



HSSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2011 Meeting
665 N. Riverpoint Boulevard, Spokane, WA

Members Present:

Nancy Isserlis, Board Chair; Patricia Butterfield, Dr. Jeff Collins, Kelsey Gray, Kevin Oldenburg, Mike Wilson and Dave Vachon.

Members Absent:

Earl F. "Marty" Martin
Jason Thackston

Staff Present:

Susan Ashe, Acting Executive Director.

Counsel Present:

James Emacio

Guests:

Tom Paine, Avista and Chair, ISM; Antony Chiang and Brian Meyer, Empire Health Foundation; Tony Bonanzino and Amy Johnson, ISM; Stephen Warren, Gonzaga University; Brian Pitcher and Barb Chamberlain, WSU; Pam Pyrc, Inland Imaging; Jeff Bell, Gallatin Public Affairs; Sandra Jarrard, GSI; Anne Marie Axworth, Avista and GSI; Laird Rasmussen, CHAS, and Lee Taylor, Project Access.

1) Call to Order

Nancy Isserlis welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at approximately 3 p.m. A quorum was established.

Approval of Minutes

Kevin Oldenburg moved to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2011 Board meeting, and Mike Wilson seconded the motion.

Board Actions

- A) Mike Wilson made a motion to schedule a Public Comment Hearing on the HSSA/EHF Health Sciences Research Strategic Investment Plan on August 17, 2011, 4-6 p.m. at Sirti, 4th Floor Board Conference Room. Kevin Oldenburg seconded the motion.

2) Chair's Report

A) Authorization to Pay Warrants

Chair Isserlis informed the Board that she had signed Warrant Nos. 1150 through 1154 amounting to \$58,385.66. She and Board Grant Chair Mike Wilson also signed the Warrant Certification to Spokane County, and they both signed Warrant No. 1154, payable to Institute for Systems Medicine that was an amount over the \$10,000 signing limit and requires two signatures.

B) Draft Health Sciences Research Strategic Investment Plan Presentation

Chair Isserlis said that the bulk of today's meeting would be devoted to hearing the recommendation from consultants Jim Gore and Allegra Calder, representing BERK, with whom the Work Group collaborated. BERK is a consulting firm founded by Bonne Berk 23 years' ago and based in Seattle. Primarily a public sector consulting firm that works with a variety of clients on a variety of policy issues. Ms. Calder works specifically in economic development, health care, life sciences and global health. I just finished a project for the Washington Global Health Alliance updating some 2009 work that we did in mapping the extent of the work done around the world by organizations based here in Washington. Perhaps relative to this project, I worked for a long time for the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University where we paid overhead rates, so I'm familiar with one of the discussions about paying overhead to faculties, and have spent a lot of years at an academic institution as well.

Jim Gore said that he is a strategic advisor to BERK and was delighted to be very actively involved in this strategic planning process. He is a part-time consultant and full-time at present is serving as the Chief Operating Officer at the Puget Sound Blood Center Research Institute. He has managed non-profit research institutes focused on biomedical research for the last 12 years, including Seattle Biomedical Research Institute and the Pacific Northwest Diabetes Research Institute. His career focus/passion is supporting the growth of biomedical research that is of high relevance to our community and our world, and part of that support involves identifying highly competent researchers who can be successful today and into the future in attracting grants and contracts, and providing them with the resources they need to be successful in a really competitive world.

HSSA partnered with Empire Health Foundation on this project, the idea being that as two grant-making organizations they have similar objectives around improving health outcomes, spurring job creation and economic development, and specifically advancing health science field in Spokane particularly in research. This project was focused around how we can grow the research community in Spokane, and how together we can combine efforts to have a larger impact.

There has been much groundwork laid over the years. Spokane has been very focused on growing its health sciences centers and a lot of great work has been done, so we wanted to build on that work and acknowledge the work that has been done. As someone who

interviewed 36 individuals in the community, it's really impressive how unified the community is around growing the health sciences sector here.

HSSA and EHF convened a project team that had their directors on it. Mike Wilson, Patricia Butterfield and Susan Ashe from HSSA were on that team, along with Ken Roberts of WSU and Director of the WWAMI program, and Antony Chiang and Brian Myers of EHF. The team met regularly to test out ideas and to develop a base investment plan to develop further with the boards and other stakeholders. The 36 interviews represented Business, hospitals, education institutions and also research institutions to hear from them their priorities might be where they see opportunities and general guidance for the two grant-making organizations. There was a diversity of opinions but a number of themes that came back over and over. The need to connect back to economic development for this Board.

Jim Gore presented the strategies in what he described as a well-developed draft, but still a draft today and through the public comment process. One of the major drivers of this plan is the number of dollars that are available from HSSA and EHF and other sources over the next 10 years. Those numbers – approximately \$12 million from HSSA and EHF and \$5 million from other sources – represent the funds that we are considering as being available to accomplish this investment plan. In the world of biomedical research investment, this is a constrained budget, a constrained number of dollars. A key set of factors that we wanted to take into account as we designed this investment plan, how can we have an impact – an economic impact, a health care delivery impact, an impact that will construct a sustainable research infrastructure in Spokane with the dollars available.

In order to minimize risk of failure and accomplish these goals with the dollars available, we began by establishing a set of guiding principles: target our resources in areas that we know an impact could be accomplished; we wanted to build on investments that had been made in the past and take advantage of those investments – leverage them; we wanted to recognize where we had as a community experience and knowledge and take advantage of that; we felt there were not dollars of adequate volume to really venture off into areas where wholly new investment may be required, especially if large dollars were necessary; we wanted our approach to be flexible so that there could be advantage taken in emerging areas of research interest where there might be funding available; we realized that the dollars from HSSA and EHF alone were probably not going to be enough so we wanted to be attractive to partner investors and philanthropists who might have an interest in this effort. We also believed that a key aspect of this program -- sustainability -- is the need that we have to demonstrate impacts, so we are encouraging a program where grantees are reporting those impacts back to grantors.

Based on this set of guiding principles, he said they established a set of recommendations that are built on three strategic goals:

Keep in mind what we are about is building and sustaining a health sciences research program in this community that can have major impacts, be long-lasting, be highly attractive to research funders including federal and state funders. We are working to

accomplish this in a highly competitive environment. We have at best a flat federal budget, in particular at NIH, NSF and related funders, and at that there is uncertainty as we go forward with our federal debt reduction planning process as to whether or not we're going to be fortunate and keep funding flat; it could go downwards. That environment has research universities, research institutes and corporations sharpening and focusing their strategies for success in a competitive domain. Organizations that are seeking the same research funding that we are seeking, they are working to be as competitive as possible, and we need to take advantage of every aspect of our strength that is derived from prior investment or other reasons to match their competitiveness.

Strategic Goal 1: Investing in Human Capital to Accelerate Spokane's Health Sciences Research Capacity

The intent is to partner with the research universities in the recruitment of faculty that are going to add research capacity to our community. It is fair to say that it takes experienced, talented, well-trained researchers to be successful in the funding environment that we are in right now. In this Plan, what we are laying out is the majority of HSSA dollars to be invested in the recruitment and retention of great research scientists, some of whom will have academic responsibilities but in any case will be spending the majority of their effort accomplishing research goals. We are looking for researchers who meet certain qualifications in order to be recruited under the funding available through this program. In essence, those qualifications are that they have tried and true research competencies; they have demonstrated their abilities to receive and retain federal funding for their research. Those qualifiers are on page three of the Plan.

We are very much seeing the importance of these research activities to be conducted by great scientists to be recruited or are already faculty to dovetail with translational and commercialization work that is happening in important biotech/biomedical device companies and other commercial activities that are in the region now.

We believe that there is an important moment that is occurring right now as the medical school campus recruitment process is under way. There is a particular need for funding for second-year faculty for the WWAMI Spokane program here. We are recommending that during this Phase 1 of this recruitment effort, that we adjust the recruitment criteria, realizing that this is a new program. We won't be recruiting funded researchers from other university campuses to a well-established, thriving research environment here. We need to build that environment so we need to recognize that in the type and amount of funding that researchers are bringing with them through this Phase 1 recruitment, and that is explained in some detail on page 4 and 5.

We are suggesting, with input from the HSSA Grants Committee, that especially at the outset about 45-60% of the investment portfolio of HSSA be aimed at human research capital in health sciences. We're making that recommendation because without great scientists and researchers there will not be success in attracting federal funds and leveraging those dollars into economic development and jobs. The highly qualified experienced researcher, who knows the ropes both on federal funding and in their research field, is the critical piece, a critical requirement for the development of a larger research presence here in the Spokane area.

Strategic Goal 2: Fund Innovative Research to Expedite Commercialization and Spur Job Growth

There are recommended fewer dollars going into Goal 2 and 3. The order of the goals follows the respective amounts of funding we are recommending go to them. Goal 2 is a goal that focuses on providing support to commercialization of invention in the biomedical device and health sciences arena. We are anticipating that a major area of investment underneath this goal is on the required matching dollars of SBIR and STTR grants, which are made by the federal government, many agencies within the federal government, to assist in the growth of commerce in this area. This funding mechanism has the opportunity to facilitate the application of new technologies which are coming out of the university environments in commercial environments, in small biotech, medical device companies that will create jobs and allow us to attract companies from other parts of the country and retain and expand companies who are here now.

We also understand that economic development is a central obligation of the HSSA and the resources it is responsible for managing. We see this matching role for SBIR/STTR as being a responsible way that HSSA, in collaboration with EHF, can leverage its resources, especially because they're going to be in this scenario there are going to be investor dollars or other dollars involved already.

We are suggesting about 30-45% of the HSSA investment portfolio be allocated to Strategic Goal 2.

The source that we used for estimating the volume of job creation is the TrippUmbach plan that was done and released in 2010 which estimated total job growth of 351 jobs by 2017 and over 3,400 by 2030.

Strategic Goal 3: Support Innovative Research that Advances Spokane as a National Leader in Health Delivery Research

Strategic Goal 3 is a goal that is a unique opportunity that we see being present in the Spokane area right now, and this opportunity is time-sensitive, especially as we are really emerging now as a national leader in interprofessional, interdisciplinary health sciences. We assembled this goal recognizing the strength that is emerging. This goal has as its focus the provision of funding which will enable research in this area, as well as evaluation of existing and planned programs in this area. We see interdisciplinary, interprofessional health science as being an opportunity that this community really could emerge as a leader nationally in this area where we are creating health care delivery teams that are multiprofessional representing a variety of disciplines. We have training that creates those teams, we have facilities that support their work, and it ties into the training in health sciences that are already present and planned for the WWAMI campus. The strategic elements for these plans are located on page 7. The recommendation includes analyzing the effectiveness on health care outcomes and on economic benefits of interprofessional strategies, as well as efficacy and effectiveness of adopting an evidence-based practice by medical and related health care providers.

This particular goal we see as using about 10-15% of the HSSA investment portfolio.

The plan we prepared has a series of implementation tasks that begin with the public hearing that will take place on August 17, and there are additional set of steps that are laid out. The implementation of the program is a significant undertaking and very, very important. You will also see the investment plan at a glance; there are more details for anyone who's interested in that.

Mike Wilson, as chair of the Grants Committee, thanked Jim Gore and Allegra Calder, and Empire Health Foundation. This was a great joint effort. You can see in the document that there were committee members from HSSA and Empire. It was a very good group, and there was plenty of discussion coming to this result. I'd also like to thank the committee members of the Grants Committee – Kelsey Gray, Kevin Oldenburg, Dave Vachon, Patricia Butterfield, myself and Susan Ashe. If you're not on this committee you just don't know how to have fun and excitement. Frankly, I thought that we had excellent dialogue, dialogue where everyone contributed, and in the long run we ultimately came to a consensus which is reflected in your report and one that is going to be commented on by the community in an upcoming in public comment hearing. We are really pleased with the final result.

The Board Chair asked the consultants if they had received everything they needed from HSSA and the community. Jim Gore said that they received all the information that they needed, and as Allegra Calder mentioned, there were many relevant studies that were completed that you made available to us and the core team members. Those studies were utilized and very important, especially TrippUmbach work that projected economic impact and jobs impact.

I want to emphasize that the members of the core team with leadership and board participation, especially from HSSA, also from EHF as well as the university were incredibly generous of their time, their talent, their knowledge of the community and its strengths and its gaps. That information was highly important to us. There were 36 stakeholder interviews conducted by Allegra. Those interviews provided both detailed information and strategic insight that was really very relevant to our recommendations. The input that we received that tended to serve the interests of the interviewee was recognized by the interviewee as such, and often times those interviewees also provided strategic information that helped us understand the community of health sciences research, its strengths and its gaps. We received a great deal of information from those stakeholder interviews. Having been involved in strategic planning processes like this one many, many times, the fact that 36 interviews were conducted with representatives from all parts of the health care and research and academic community here. It really formed a solid information foundation for us to build our goals on.

The Board Chair said that she had a numbers question, and referred to page 8 of the Plan. It was her understanding that Empire Health Foundation's contribution was \$2.5 million. Antony Chiang, President, EHF, responded and said the target is \$250,000 a year for 10 years, or \$2.5 million.

Mike Wilson asked whether the funding that was given by the HSSA – that the goal of the funds would be lived out through this plan and the dollars would be allocated for the

purpose of generating greater research jobs and improving the overall economy within the region. With your experience you have had elsewhere and with this, just give us your perspective on that.

Jim Gore responded that the goals that are laid out here are areas of investment that are most likely to cause an expansion of the research infrastructure, which in turn would most likely trigger an economic favorable result. One of the challenges here is that we live in a complex system that is our research community, and whereas the investments that are made by EHF and HSSA under this program might be successful, there could be other changes in the research community that are occurring outside this particular domain that would blunt benefits of it. When you look at overall benefit, microeconomics are very complex, but the three goals that we have identified – strengthening our academic faculty research program through recruitment and focused retention activity, working closely with existing or emerging biotech or biomed device companies through the mechanisms that are outlined here, and really underscoring the unique, time-sensitive opportunity that exists to build a future health care model through interdisciplinary medical service – these are high probability of success areas for investment. That said, I wish we had more dollars to invest in each of these areas, but the only way that is going to occur is for these investments to be successful. We need to start with the resources that are available, and given the resources we suggest that these three areas are strong.

Allegra Calder, BERK, said that the only other way that I would respond to that, as well, it is actually based on interviews. I did want to say thank you. In hearing the introductions, there were a great number of people who gave of their time in the interviews. The three goals also address three of the main themes that we were hearing in the interviews so I feel like it's addressing either a gap or a need or an opportunity in the community. First, human capital was addressed again and again as a need for Ph.D. level researchers to attract a community of like-minded people to work around and the need to build that critical mass. The second was the lack of VC money and how difficult that can be to attract, and from an economic development perspective, the idea that even a small amount of money can give you that push you need to get FDA approval to move to the next step and suddenly you are able to actually build up a company and hire staff. The third being this idea is that it is hugely competitive. People around the country are scrambling for research dollars for one reason or another. You have to find a competitive advantage. If you pick something that the UW is already strong at, you're not going to be a winner. So, what is the competitive advantage, and a lot of people said that one thing that is great is that we actually are a newer community, we're not in silos, we have a lot of opportunities to work with each other, we have this incredible hospital community and are there ways we can work together that can be different than somewhere else.

Jim Emacio asked a question regarding the first strategic goal. He understands that human capital is critical for biomedical research, and he noticed that the goal was amended a little with regard to the qualifiers and funding phases to acknowledge that the HSSA will not be funding teaching element of it. When he looks at the amount of money that EHF is making available for this goal, and the amount of money HSSA is making available, and recognizing that many people coming here will be doing research and teaching, is there

enough money with EHF's contribution toward this goal to meet the goal to getting researchers here. I don't know what their salaries might be, \$200,000?, so if they spend 70% of time researching but not teaching, HSSA's money can be used for research, but it cannot be used just for teaching. Does this first strategic goal accommodate that element?

Jim Gore, BERK, comment that the question was excellent, and just to give a little background on this. We are seeking to recruit and retain in this area great health sciences researchers and the greater that health science researcher is, on any number of measures, the more expensive it will be for us to recruit that individual and to retain them. When we look at a researcher, often times we look at their performance in terms of the amount of extramural grant funding that that individual has been successful in attracting, and then we profile those grants. We want to know the amount of federal dollars that are going to reimburse all of our administrative and overhead costs, and the amount of private dollars that may not. Virtually without exception, the larger the amount of funding that an individual has assembled, the more publications the person is going to have, the higher profile the individual is going to be in the area of research specialization, and the higher their value they will be to the organization that employs them now. So, a recruitment package would have to be attractive to that individual given that individual's unique situation. The recruiting organization in these cases, almost without exception, is going to be the university, maybe in collaboration with UW, but WSU would really be leading the recruitment and leading the negotiation with a researcher over what the terms of a recruitment package will be. That recruitment package, which could be partially funded with a request to this program, would be to fund research and not to fund that individual's activity associated with teaching or community service or anything else. It would be for research and it would be made clear that those funds would be used for those purposes. The purpose of the investment of those dollars is to gain initial preliminary data or new research insight that is going to lead to more grants. So, HSSA and EHF will share with university employers of these faculty members that goal because universities are seeking faculty members who are going to at minimum maintain necessary research levels through grants if not increase those. So your question, are these dollars adequate. The dollars necessary will depend on the requirements and in general terms, recruitment packages of the size contemplated here are adequate. They are effective in attracting faculty members. It will be very important the details of how that recruitment is accomplished, the department into which the faculty members is recruited, the individual's peers, the strategic trajectory of the department, all of those factors come into play because these individuals are highly valuable, relative scarce and they are valued across the country.

Mr. Emacio, as he understands from a legal perspective so that HSSA is lawfully spending the \$10 million of taxpayer money that is coming from the state. So as I understand this first goal, we are going to hire researchers and the researchers are going to be in this community and the researchers will bring with them their present grants, and get new grants that promote bioscience-based research.

Mr. Gore clarified that the "we" on the hiring is not HSSA.

Mr. Emacio said he understood that. HSSA would be applying the resources to do that. And it is true that these researchers are going to be housed where? On campus at WSU here? Mr. Gore replied in the affirmative.

Susan Ashe added that we always have envisioned that private money, or other sources of funding beyond HSSA and EHF will be necessary as well. There is a plan, and Antony Chiang, EHF, is here and he has taken that on and may want to speak on that.

Antony Chiang said that to go to your question, that first component of Strategy 1, which is about taking advantage of the four-year medical school WWAMI program to be piloted Phase 1 as early as Fall 2013, to get that off the ground will require several million dollars to hire faculty, to design curriculum, to get student support services in place ... of that, the recommendation in Strategy 1 is to anchor a funding consortium to raise that several million dollars. Just on that component, it will be approximately \$1.5 million to \$2 million per year for those two years to get that second year faculty off the ground. For example, the HSSA piece, the \$250,000, within that \$1.5–2 million per year, there's no question that that is set aside only for research. All the rest of it, including EHF, will take care of all of the rest, the teaching duties, the student support services, the administration ... what it's looking like now is roughly a third will be anchored by HSSA and EHF, one-third will be anchored by the business and rest of the community including individual donors and the City and so on, and a third is coming from in-kind investment by WSU and UW. So it's a nice combination. Basically, even if you take the lower number, the \$1.5 million number per year, the \$250,000 part of Strategy 1 by HSSA already has a \$1.25 million leverage to that \$250,000, so already there's a 5:1 ratio just on that component of Strategy 1. Getting the four-year medical school off the ground will create the platform to attract these "rock star" faculty members, these researchers that will anchor and create critical mass for an academic research center that then get us to the TrippUmbach number for growing it from anywhere from the \$12 million to \$70 million by 2030.

The rest of the Board may not be aware, but the Project Team was, I want to give a little more context to Jim's expertise. Seattle Biotechnology Research Institute had a very parallel goal to grow their \$3 million a year NIH portfolio, and they targeted \$20 million by the end of five years, almost a 7x increase and to do that Strategy 1 anchored their strategy. They went on a path to recruit, with recruitment packages just like Strategy 1, and actually achieved that goal within five years. Since then, they've grown to \$40 million or more now. We look at that as a tried and true strategy to get critical mass to grow the number of NIH dollars coming to the region.

Mr. Emacio said that you have outside funding that is going to make a portion of the funding that is needed for hiring the rock star researchers, and if for some reason there's not that outside funding available, do you still believe we have enough money with HSSA's and EHF's money to hire those researchers to make that work. It is possible these outside agencies may not come through.

Jim Gore answered that if the universities are unable to financially participate in the construction of a recruitment package for a given position that they really want to fill, I would recommend that these agencies seriously evaluate whether or not they want to proceed. In other words, this is a matching arrangement, and it could be very helpful for there to be help from both sides of the equation and if that's not present I think there are questions that need to be answered.

Jim Emacio asked if Mr. Gore expected that there would be a written agreement between WSU, Empire Health Foundation and the HSSA with respect to the annual allocation of the \$250,000 that says that we will make our \$250k available if it's matched by you in some amount, and EHF by \$250k and then once we get all this money in the bucket then at that point we start the recruiting process, as I'm just trying to visualize how we move forward with this element to ensure that we meet the goal but that we don't allocate resources until we have everyone agreed.

Board Chair Isserlis responded that we are not making in grant decisions today and that we have a long way to go in terms of process and context to get there. I'm assuming there will be a lot of "devil in the details" here that will have to be worked out and we'll use in contracts and agreements. This is a concept of how to spend the money and the concept is going to require other partners to come in to match, and if those other community partners are not there, I don't view this as an obligation to spend money unless we get buy-in and matches from the partners that need to be there.

Susan Ashe added that this is why we allowed flexibility to answer Jim Emacio's greater question, because if we don't get that match we could reallocate those funds to another strategy.

Kevin Oldenburg said that along those lines, I know there is someone from Greater Spokane Incorporated here, I would really like to hear at the public comment hearing, their ideas/plan for GSI, the Mayor, the County Commissioners, could use that money to attract new companies to the area by matching funding. I'd really to hear how these entities plan to do that. I have an aversion to setting a bit pot of money aside and then not knowing what the plan is to recruit more companies here.

Mike Wilson said that he keeps Kevin's point and the question are really important because there was a lot of commentary about the fact that ... in just setting this up ... in the first place our goal was to create a collaborative relationship where we built on the resources of the community, and in this Strategy Goal 1, the resource in the community is the full engagement of the universities in the effort to attract researchers. We are piggybacking on multiple organizations here, and if there aren't multiple organizations it's going to be difficult to meet our goal. Same is true in number 2, there have to be other dollars out there, there has to be a track record of having proven to at least one body that this is a worthwhile venture, and we will look to the GSI and others to help us note that.

On behalf of the Grants Committee, I would like to make motion that we open this dialogue up to a Public Comment Hearing on August 17, 2011 in this room (and Susan will be responsible for appropriate advertising and notification). Kevin Oldenburg seconded the motion and suggested we post the Plan on the HSSA website the following Monday, along with the survey questions and answers. Mr. Wilson accepted the friendly amendment.

Ms. Ashe reminded the Board that the monies that HSSA is dedicating toward this effort come from the money that this Board bonded through the County last year. It comes from the portion of HSSA funds that is the 75% of revenues that promote economic development through bioscience research. It does not impact the 15% of our funds that go to those entities and organizations in our community who increase access to health care for the under and uninsured. We are mixing those dollars at all.

Patricia Butterfield also added clarification in terms of the total HSSA dollars, when we look at the three initiatives that are proposed here, the last one that focuses on interprofessional activity, she thought a clarifier is that this is for research.

3) **Executive Director's Report**

- HSSA has been contacted by the Washington State Auditor and will have the pleasure of being audited by the State for the first time sometime shortly after October 15th, if they concur with our recommendation to them. They do call Board members, so you are aware. They have new rates of \$83.50 an hour as they have not raised their rates for many years. We budgeted for about 30 hours of their time since we are such a small entity. The State is budgeted 60 hours for their time.
- Ms. Ashe said she would participate at the request of WSU in their annual tour of Congressional staff and legislative folks from Olympia, along with Mike Wilson in a Community Roundtable. Patricia Butterfield has a key role in this event.

4) **Board Committee Reports**

A) **Finance Committee** – Gaylene Lewin, on behalf of Jason Thackston, reported for the Finance Committee:

- The Committee has reviewed the financials through June 30, 2011 and finds the HSSA to be in good financial shape.
- HSSA has received \$114,291 for the month of June from county-wide state sales and use tax revenues and \$13,290 in interest from the County investment pool.
- The County reports that HSSA's ending cash balance as of June 30, 2011 is \$13,769,981. Of this, \$1,406,667 is restricted for bond debt, and \$494,413 is reserved for current grants payable.
- Administrative costs for June were \$9,104 or about 7% of total state sales tax and interest earnings.

- Sales tax collections continue to be greater than anticipated, we are currently running about 1.5% above what we budgeted.
- On July 27th the County reported the biannual interest payment of \$219,191.98 was processed and will be reflected in the July or August financial reports.

B) **Grant Committee**

5) **Counsel's Report – James Emacio**

There was no further report from the legal counsel.

6) **Board Member Comments and Announcements**

7) **Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

Board Chair Isserlis adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:45 p.m.

The Board will hold a **Public Comment Hearing** on the HSSA/EHF Health Sciences Research Strategic Investment Plan on **August 17, 2011**, 4-6 p.m. at Sirti, 665 N. Riverpoint Boulevard, Fourth Floor Board Meeting Room.

The next **HSSA Board meeting** will be **September 7, 2011**, 3 p.m. at Sirti, 665 N. Riverpoint Boulevard, Fourth Floor Board Meeting Room.