

Agenda Item II.a.

Annual Governing Board Retreat 11 September 2024, Boulder, CO - Minutes

In Attendance: Jon Reuter, Joanna Zeiger, Cinnamon Bidwell, Mike Hennesy, Elyse Contreras, John Harloe, Scott McWhorter, Melissa Reynolds, Dieter Raemdonck, Emma Hudson, Wendy Fairchild, DuShunte Carmen, Sang Park, Jeff Smith, Kyle Blakely, Chad Kinney
Absent: Malik Hasan, Sherard Rogers, Armando Valdez

Called to order at 10:10 am

Consent agenda

- Vote passed for expenditure of research funds
- Suggestion for AR to have more lay-friendly research descriptions
- Approved by vote

SWOT analysis (Blakely)

- New SWOT analysis first (before reviewing last year's)
- KB recorded responses from retreat attendees (listed on large sheets of paper around the room). KB to compile and refine list into a SWOT summary.
- Items not immediately identified that were on last year's SWOT
 - STRENGTHS
 - Increasing number of applications
 - Growing funding
 - Growing pool of CO research
 - Good relationship with CSU Pueblo
 - WEAKNESSES
 - Human resources – board and staff
 - OPPORTUNITIES
 - CME credits to engage clinicians with ICR or other workshops at conference
 - Focus on clinical, regulation, policy, testing for conference workshops
 - Connect with law enforcement and regulation
 - Uniting cannabis organizations
 - THREATS
 - Stigma of cannabis
 - Competition

Review of the bylaws

- Modification number of voting members
 - Change in quorum based on number of seated members and 51% present for voting, needs to be updated in bylaws "51% of seated members" instead of 7
- Electronic/absentee voting is not allowed, must be in person at advertised meeting, needs to be reviewed in the future, could be added/changed in the future, CK will check with AG to see what is allowable
- Change to subcommittee language/list? Revise to add conference subcommittee and discuss the possibility of de-listing ones on list that have not been active or have membership
- Strike language about chair being ex officio of all subcommittees?
- Change language to annual not quarterly in person meetings
- Add something about participation e.g. reviewing applications, consequences for skipping?
- Board member attendance, consequences for missing?
- Review policies for board member replacement/dismissal

- Process to improve participation
 - Reach out to non-participants to find out what could increase involvement, what are reasons for non-participation, e-mails to provide respectful way to step out has been effective in the past
 - Has improved as a result of improved experience by board members at meetings
 - Still wish to improve the board
 - Changing from Friday to Wednesday was a helpful change
 - Better assignments of members to committees
 - Change language around participation in bylaws? “expectation – type language”
 - Suggestion: Point out lack of participation? Honest conversation... “board meetings and at least one committee expected”
 - “non-participants who miss 2 consecutive meetings will receive notice....consequence”
 - Might need to talk with AG office about changing language to include specific requirements/consequences (Michael McMaster)
 - State residency of board members? – not required. Out of state board member in the past.
 - Next steps – board will review and discuss changes and vote at the next meeting (needs to be on the agenda)
 - Numbering needs to be fixed
 - Voting to majority from 7 based on seated member count
 - Active participation committees under expectations
 - Missing 2 consecutive meetings language (missing without good cause)
 - COI note to “describe process to avoid COI in RFA creation/review” members should know there is a process EC
 - Trim down list of subcommittees, *ad hoc* PR subcommittee or greater board member involvement in PR?
Government relations

Dieter Raemdonck and Emma Hudson

- Amber Valdez stepping out, Emma stepping in, Emma: introductions, specializes in lobbying intersection of health and policy, excited to join ICR, works a lot in state budget process
- Background on state budget forecast for next year
 - Not a great forecast for next budget year, structural challenges
 - structural deficit of about 0.5 B in the red remains
 - Ex. Problem with Medicaid funding - disenrollments will need to be reconciled at great cost without budget for it
 - need long-term fixes.
 - Low tolerance for new budget requests, need to demonstrate value for programs
 - MCTF – forecast is coming but trend has been downwards
 - Positive news, JBC generally aware and supportive of ICR, understands value of research
 - CK has Annual Report and ROI doc which make good value/investment argument for distribution to legislators
 - ICR would like feedback on ROI doc from Emma and Dieter
 - outreach to JBC may be appropriate going forward

Research futures and outcomes

- Priorities
 - Would changes in process be helpful? How to align with state priorities?
 - Perhaps Links to **advancement** initiative
 - Fundraising subcommittee identified three priorities 1) older Americans, 2) impaired driving, 3) intoxicating hemp, made doc for potential donors, review by full board:

- Ask will vary with donor portfolio, e.g. business vs medical, should have tailored approach to different audiences
 - Should the one-pager be broadened? Specific one pagers under development for each research area
 - Develop focused fundraising with individuals is a good strategy MR
 - Need to be diligent to ensure fundraising does not compromise independent, unbiased selection of research - process consistent with the RFA process.
 - May donor's ID contribute to appearance of COI/bias? Will donor's ID be public? DR, might be up to donor, could create perceived COI which should be avoided. (DR and CB) CB is thoughtful about potential damage to reputation, need to communicate our unbiased process CK
 - Emphasize ICR unbiased process to website JZ
 - How will donor supported research impact state funding for research?
- Any potential priorities in the **RFA** should be informed by input from key stakeholders such as state and policy makers, community and industry groups, etc. - diversity of opinions "listening ear"
 - Do we really want to focus research priorities in RFA CB? Could be limiting given short list of Colorado researchers, CB open process leads to best proposals since it matches with the available scientific expertise
 - How would priorities in RFA best meet state needs? Board can help shift priorities in most helpful way, need to protect faculty time in preparing proposals (bad to not fund an area that faculty have submitted to), LOI helps curtail this problem
 - Can we help inform legislators of best practices when funding research through law? EC
 - CDOT distribution of research money and school of public health are examples where the ICR as the State's cannabis research organization was overlooked.
 - How can ICR better capture management of this type of research funding? DR Ideally need to get into the process before bill is signed, more legislative awareness of ICR is needed
 - Could ICR do a day at the legislature KB? DR not as effective as one might think...but do this as a parallel track with 15 talk with a particularly likely helpful group of Legislators
 - Avoiding overlap with research done by other state entities is strategic. EC
 - OK to go to legislature with focused research areas ICR IDs as best likely ROI,
- **Research project outcomes, ROI** CK
 - Annual Report provides guide to key outcomes from projects that concluded in May
 - A growing list of pubs is emerging
 - 9.1 M in added non-ICR research funding from our researchers (4X) to continue projects ICR seeded
 - Post-doctoral and student involvement, preparing next generation of cannabis researchers – 7 postdocs and 29 students – mostly graduate students
 - Might include more/different questions in post-project metrics that include continuing research by students and post docs
 - Workforce development piece in reporting might add value to decision makers for funding the ICR MR, fits with mission JR
- **Rescheduling** JH
 - ALJ hearing is in December
 - Likely will go through late 2025 given large number of public comments
 - Federal election could impact outcomes
 - How would 1>>3 change materials handling and testing CK?
 - License would be broader and open, less tailored to specific project, would curtail requirement to provide new application for different or evolving research plans
 - Could accept materials from non-schedule 1 distributors? Not likely, increased bulk manufacture licenses would improve access to real products for research, but won't open up availability to research real products

- Observational research is open MH
- Second ICR research position is being advertised following resignation of recent hire
 - Board member help in disseminating the announcement is needed to increase the pool size

Research presentation SP

- Review of hemp sequencing and gene identification work
- Review of CBD as an insecticide in hornworm work, what is biological role of CBD? Pest protection for plant, change in dopamine levels in worm
- Review of stress as effector of cannabinoid production in hemp work
- Review of reference genome work
- Review of Y chromosome work
- Review of CBD oil color and improper storage work
- Review of oil microbes work
- Review of humidity and *C. sativa* growth work
- 15 peer reviewed papers since 2022

Awards and contracts report DC

- Model process after natl. best practices NIH
- Walked the Board through the post-award process
 - Research Agreement (contract)
 - Amendments – years 2 & 3 funding
 - Carry forward
 - Reporting requirements – part of the Agreement (contracting)