

**LIFE SCIENCES CORRIDOR
MEETING MINUTES
July 15, 2011, 2:00 PM
Conference Call**

ATTENDANCE:

Heather Belmont, Randy Berridge, Sena Black, Juan Carlos Del Valle, Andrew Duffel, Divina Grossman, Gary Hines, Linda Howdyshell (representing David Armstrong), Casey Lunceford, Gary Margules, Ed Massey, Erin McColsky (recording for Dennis Gallon), Gisela Mohring, Ramaswamy Narayanan, Roger Pynn, Marcelo Radice, Thomas Roberts, Mark Rosenberg, Steve Sauls, Ed Schons.

ABSENT:

Ivette L. Arango, J. David Armstrong, Isabel Cosio Carballo, Rudy Fernandez, Ray Ferrero, Dennis Gallon, George L. Hanbury II, John C. Hitt, Ken Jessell, Rolando Montoya, Frank Nero, Larry Pelton, Mary Jane Saunders, Donna Shalala, Kelly Smallridge, Robert Swindell, Ronald Toll.

Meeting commenced at 2:02 p.m. on July 15, 2011.

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Vice President Grossman called the roll. President Rosenberg welcomed everyone, thanked them for attending and reviewed the proposed agenda. The agenda was accepted.

II. Review of Meeting Minutes (5-25-11)

President Rosenberg inquired whether there were any comments or improvements regarding the May 25, 2011 meeting minutes. There were none and the minutes were accepted.

III. Executive Committee Membership

President Rosenberg thanked everyone for the extensive work done, particularly by Dr. Grossman and her staff. He spoke of the Executive Committee nominations list, indicating it was a work in progress that had to be pursued deliberately, and it was intended to be inclusive, not exclusive. There is a need to add someone from a life sciences company from the private sector. Mr. Del Valle expressed his desire to see someone on the list from the University of Miami's Research Department, which was currently being reorganized. President Rosenberg said a place would be held.

Mr. Radice reported that Mr. Devries had asked him to take over as the representative of the Florida network of Research, Science & Technology Parks representing the life sciences sector. Dr. Grossman confirmed that Mr. DeVries had requested the change and recommended Mr. Radice. Dr. Ram Narayanan suggested adding research parks to the asset map and putting someone from at least one of the big laboratories like Scripps or Max Planck on the Executive Committee. President Rosenberg concurred and asked for comments. Mr. Hines seconded the suggestion, saying we should start with Scripps. Dr. Massey proposed Dr. Richard Houghten from Torrey Pines, saying he was very active state-wide and would be a good partner. Dr. Harry Orf from Scripps was also suggested. Dr. Claudia Hillinger, Vice President for Institute Development with Max Planck Florida Institute proposed as a backup.

Dr. Grossman mentioned that the next conference call will be on August 16th at 2 pm for those on the Executive Committee. President Rosenberg stated that the purpose for the call will be to refine the work plan for the coming year, based on all of the concepts and discussions, and to develop a specific set of deliverables.

IV. Life Sciences and IT Asset Map

A. Educational Programs and Numbers of Graduates

Dr. Grossman directed everyone to the documents on the educational programs and numbers of graduates - by institution and the aggregate data - and the summary sheet. She asked for comments. Dr. Massey asked what the game plan was for updating these spreadsheets, whether it was to be done annually. Dr. Grossman explained that since the data for the prior academic year (AY 2009-2010) was in, we could begin to collect data for 2010-2011. She pointed out that it was easy to see the areas of strength fairly quickly from reviewing the data. She asked about everyone's willingness to share the data publicly. Mr. Hines said that they had looked into it and found that for accreditation purposes in the southern region, the data was available to the public anyway. The group members all agreed to share the data.

Dr. Grossman said there had been some issues raised about some of the data provided being on STEM areas and not a perfect fit for the life sciences definition. She questioned whether some of the programs listed that did not fit the definition should be removed. Discussion ensued and it was decided that for now, having these related areas strengthened the overall picture. Also, if included now, the information will be available if we later decide to branch out. Dr. Grossman restated the consensus that the data would be publicly shared – in individual and aggregate forms – and that STEM area data would be left in the asset map.

B. Research Capabilities

Dr. Grossman explained that the information was presented by institution but a short summary of key areas of research strengths was also developed. There were no suggested revisions.

C. Venture Capital Companies

Dr. Grossman directed everyone to the Venture Capital Companies list and thanked Ms. Mohring and Mr. Duffel for their comments. President Rosenberg pointed out that the documents were all marked "Draft" and there would be continual revision. A question was raised about whether the companies were national or regional. Dr. Grossman replied that the companies were active in the region; this was an asset map of the region. Mr. Duffel replied that he had reviewed the list and removed those that were not venture capital companies. Dr. Grossman replied that the comments sent by Mr. Duffel would be incorporated into the next iteration of the list and asked anyone else with comments to forward them to her.

D. Life Sciences Corporations

Dr. Grossman explained that the original list of companies came from the Beacon Council but the information was being collected and verified by her staff. She reported that at present, only one-third of the list (300 out of 900) had been verified. Discussion was held about the best sources for this data. The UF Sid Martin Incubator's BioFlorida database was proposed. Enterprise Florida was also mentioned. Ms. Black responded that the statewide BioFlorida database, was, by definition, inclusive of medical device companies and biotech. She recommended that if we review South Florida and the major health care

centers, we may want to expand that definition. She said Enterprise Florida uses the BioFlorida list and the Life Sciences Corridor may want to look at it as a starting point.

The issue of how the BioFlorida list was validated was raised. Dr. Grossman asked Mr. Radice if Patti Breedlove was the contact person and proposed that they contact Ms. Breedlove and obtain more information. All agreed that it would be good to know how the data are collected and how often the list was scrubbed.

Mr. Hines volunteered that the Business Development Board for Palm Beach County has a current list of life sciences companies for Palm Beach County and was being vetted now for accuracy. Dr. Grossman thanked him and asked that he and Mr. Radice provide the respective information when it was available. Ms. Black suggested the Agency for Workforce Innovation as a possible source of data. Dr. Grossman agreed and said she would follow up on the suggestions for further data.

V. Naming the Corridor

Mr. Pynn reported that he had spent some time reviewing the asset map and congratulated everyone on the work done. He said the data proved that the area was rich with both life sciences research and educational strength, with a lot of ancillary technology activity around it. With the universities and colleges as partners, it is a great deal of critical mass compared to what the Florida High Tech Corridor had when it started 15 years ago.

Mr. Pynn stated that the larger regional economic development clusters are the most successful. What LSC has done by spreading from coast to coast is good, but he would still be concerned about limiting the name to a regional moniker. Other regions often use names representative of their area or coined terms. The Florida High Tech Corridor (FHTC) found that “corridor” is used a lot. Mr. Pynn pointed out that gaining recognition is more about achievement than branding though, and it is a long process to develop the name. Many regions find it necessary to invest in marketing to reinforce the name. However, the most important thing is to decide what you want to be called, rather than letting others begin to make a reference to you.

A strategic path to the name should begin with a decision on whether it is assets or geography that drives the brand, life sciences or the region, and whether to limit yourself to one technology or broaden to include ancillary technologies. One thing that clearly helped the FHTC was that the three presidents of the universities never missed an opportunity to mention the brand and it developed to the point that people were proud to say they lived in the Corridor.

Mr. Pynn said the last question to consider was how to build a long-term and lasting recognition and awareness outside the area and what kind of financial commitment could be made to marketing and advertising? It took FHTC a decade before they started to see national references, which are now pretty common. For what LSC is trying to do, we think a coined word that can be attached to your geography is the best choice. While Life Sciences is at the heart of it, there are other technologies, and when LSC started, there was discussion about IT being added. He said that although Governor Bush equated IT to High Tech, it is not always the same. In many cases it is the enabling technology for some high tech field and in fact, it can be limiting. He reported that they had done some research and found some use of the term “Life Tech.” In Brussels, there is the “Life-Tech Cluster.” He said they reserved Life Tech Florida.com, and all other iterations of it are also available. He said it was possible to use Life Tech Florida as a web address and still be South Florida Life Tech or the South Florida Life Sciences Alliance.

Mr. Berridge praised Mr. Pynn for his work and thanked him for his time. Mr. Pynn said these ideas could be the fast track to a name with both regional and technology assets built in. The term “cluster” was proposed. Mr. Pynn said that “circle” was something they took a long look at, as well as “hub” and “alliance.” He said they were happy to do more research but he really feels that the combination of “Life” and “Technology” is the brand that we want to evolve. President Rosenberg expressed his gratitude for the work done and summarized saying that there were several discrete components: the regional component and “Life Sciences.” He asked about the preference for “Life Tech” over “Life Sciences.” Mr. Pynn said there are too many associated technologies throughout the region that are not necessarily life sciences companies, but that can be part of the mix. He feels it would be a shame to exclude any assets that can support the broad life science activity. He also did not think that the majority of people would look at all of the companies as “science,” and thinks “Life Tech” is a broader reference, which we could build on. He offered to send some information relative to usage of the term.

President Rosenberg asked about the differentiation between “alliance” and “cluster” as concepts. Mr. Pynn said that the “cluster” concept, in terms of economic development, has been around for 25 years. He felt that there is some potential negative to it, and it is not as cohesive as “alliance.” He said we could also consider “collaborative,” as opposed to something more static. President Rosenberg asked about “initiative.” Mr. Pynn said we think you should marry “South Florida” and “Life Tech” with “initiative” or “alliance” or “collaboration. The general idea is to come up with a strategic effort to move forward. Mr. Berridge mentioned Chiang Mai, Thailand, setting up a corridor similar to FHTC, and said the important thing was to consider what the world sees. He reminded everyone that the FHTC had originally been called the “I-4 High Tech Corridor” and they spent a lot of money rebranding themselves in year six.

Dr. Massey said he thought the presentation was very good. He said that “Life Sciences” was going to get old over the decade it will take to develop this initiative and he felt “Life Tech” was preferable. He said that there was nothing wrong with either “initiative” or “alliance” but he felt that “initiative” was more about constantly moving forward. President Rosenberg said that we would put together some names using different combinations of the terms “South Florida” and “Alliance” or “Initiative.”

Ms. Black reported that Enterprise Florida was being reorganized and expanded with the new legislation, and many of their committees had been temporarily suspended including the Tech and Life Sciences Committees. They will not meet in August. She reported on the 2011 Bio International Conference in Washington. Florida is now the second fastest growing biotech market in the U.S. . She provided the weblink for the conference: www.eflorida.com/bio2011 and concluded by saying that it was a terrific voice for Florida. Florida has come a long way, and there is a great deal of convergence of technologies. Enterprise Florida sees a great area of opportunity. Mr. Berridge added a final comment about funding, acknowledging that although state funds had declined, FHTC had started with only a modicum of funds and it takes time to build a regional economic development area.

VI. Questions/Future Directions

President Rosenberg thanked Ms. Black for her dedication and service and Mr. Berridge for his support and that of the FHTC. He reminded everyone that we are not trying to sprint; we consider this a marathon. It is overdue, and we are going to stick with it until it has the same success as that of Central Florida.

Action Items

1. Dr. Grossman and Mr. Radice will follow up the Florida Biodatabase with Patti Breedlove.
2. Follow up with those proposed for the Executive Committee (Dr. Richard Houghten from Torrey Pines, Dr. Harry Orf from Scripps, and Max Planck) and contact the Beacon Council regarding their contact from BD Biosciences.
3. Executive Committee to prepare a work plan for the upcoming year with a defined set of deliverables.
4. Gary Hines will provide the Business Development Board of Palm Beach County's list of life sciences companies once they finish vetting it.
5. Mr. Pynn will send material on the usage of the term "life tech."
6. Decide on issues related to naming the "corridor":
 - a. the technologies to be included
 - b. whether to include ancillary ones
 - c. the term to be used in order to name this collection ("Life Sciences," "Life Tech"), and the best moniker to go with "South Florida" and the technology term chosen ("alliance," "initiative," or another choice).

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m. on July 15, 2011.