From: Jennifer Ott
To: CityCouncil-List
Subject: FW: Msg from The Research Park at MV re Alameda Point
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 4:33:05 PM
Attachments: Cons Tenant Board - Q4 2023.pdf

Mayor and City Council:

Please find below an email from Dan Poritzky regarding the Science Corp agenda item.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Dan Poritzky [mailto:dporitzky@blueriseventures.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 3:49 PM
To: Jennifer Ott <jott@alamedaca.gov>; Eric Fonstein <efonstein@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Lois Butler <lbutler@alamedaca.gov>; David Farrell <dfarrell@blueriseventures.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Msg from The Research Park at MV re Alameda Point

Jennifer and Eric, I'm not one to way into other people's issues but I recently became aware of some controversy at Alameda Point. On one hand, Science/Max is one of my tenants and if they move to Alameda Point… that's probably not good for me. Max and Team have been good citizens and we have enjoyed watching them grow and be active participants in our Alameda Ecosystem.

On the other hand, we have 125 companies at The Research Park, including about 40 Life Science (LS) Companies. I say "Life Science" companies but I mean CRISPR, Cell and Gene Therapy, Food Tech, Materials Science, Clean Energy, Medical Device, etc. The research and development happening in the Bay Area is critically important. Saving lives. Coming up with vaccines. New versions of raw materials. We have worked really hard to bring all of this to Alameda.

Please see attached tenant board of recent activity at The Research Park.

Our Project Team is very detailed in what and how they build out lab space. With that said, we have to give these companies, these experts (Doctors, Scientists, Advanced Degrees, etc) the liberty to build what they need, so long as they are following Alameda Building codes.

Please appreciate the material impact this will have on the ENTIRE Life Science Community if Science is unable to move forward at Alameda Point. Thank you, Dan P

Dan J. Poritzky
Managing Partner
Blue Rise Ventures
2020 Challenger Drive, Suite 101
Alameda, CA 94501

dporitzky@blueriseventures.com
415-378-2129 cell

The Research Park
MARINA VILLAGE

BioSquare
Silicon Valley

Visionary Science. Game Changing Innovations. Enduring Relationships. Where Tenants are Treated like Partners.

Blue Rise Ventures is thankful for the below companies making their home within our East Bay and Silicon Valley portfolio

AccuraGen · Allay Therapeutics · Alveo · andes · Badass Labs · bioCube San Jose · CellFE · Checkerspot · eclipse

Emery Pharma · explora biolabs · iota Biosciences · JUST · Mekonos · mosaic · Oxford Nanopore Technologies · POW.BIO · Resilience

Santa Ana Bio · Science · scribe Therapeutics · Sepion Technologies · shiru · Terviva · turn.bio · twelve · ZestBio

Big Enough to Serve You, Small Enough to Know You...

BLUE RISE VENTURES

From: Jennifer Ott
To: CityCouncil-List
Cc: Abby Thorne-Lyman; Andrew Thomas
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: A letter from Science Corp
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 9:56:42 AM

Mayor and City Council:

Please find below some additional information from Max Hodak of Science Corporation to a Councilmember that I thought might of more general interest to the entire Council.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Max Hodak <maxh@science.xyz>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:25 PM
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: A letter from Science Corp

I'm sorry for the misunderstanding. We currently use rodent caging from Innovive and rabbit caging from Allentown. Over time, I want to shift to building animal housing ourselves, so we can build larger modular spaces that give much more volume for a full range of naturalistic behaviors compared to what you see in traditional facilities. We collaborate with zoo designers to develop these enclosures, and our goal is to create large social play spaces that can be instrumented such that our scientific tasks can be largely phrased as naturalistic behavior.

You can find USDA facility inspection records here:
https://aphis.my.site.com/PublicSearchTool/s/inspection-reports

The form doesn't change the URL so I can't easily share the results, but if you put "Science Corporation" (or "Neuralink") into the "Customer/Organization Name" field, click Search, and then click the "View Inspection Reports" tab, you can see the list of prior inspection with summary results and a downloadable report. You can see that neither Neuralink nor Science have any records of citations of any kind, including Teachable Moments.

As for my comments about Jurassic Park, while I'm a strong supporter of conservation efforts, that was not meant to be a serious proposal.

> On Oct 16, 2023 8:25 PM, Max Hodak <maxh@science.xyz> wrote:
>
> > Dear Alameda City Council,
> >
> > At Science, we are developing advanced medical devices for serious unmet medical needs. Our first program is the Science Eye retinal prosthesis for patients who suffer from profound blindness due to rod-cone dystrophies such as retinitis pigmentosa and dry macular degeneration. These patients watch their vision dwindle over years until only spots of light are left, which today is completely

irreversible.

There have been prior commercial attempts at visual prostheses, but none with the potential to achieve single-neuron resolution, which is necessary to restore high-resolution vision to the brain. We hope to offer patients who have spent many years in darkness the ability to see their childrens' faces again, or the independence to walk across town on their own to buy coffee.

Our therapies, alongside every other medical device and drug from pacemakers to paxlovid, require animal research as mandated by the FDA and regulated by the USDA. While recent legislation allows the FDA to consider evidence other than animal studies, FDA reviewers and consultants have significant discretion in what they ask for, and they have told us through formal feedback that they require animal studies in order to seek approval for a first-in-human clinical trial in the US.

The FDA Modernization Act cites a range of new tools, including induced pluripotent stem cells, artificial intelligence, and organoid technologies as alternatives to animal studies. We use all of these, but unfortunately they are only a partial substitute. This is fundamentally a scientific technical limitation: in an ideal world no animal testing would be required, but today there is no other source of the critical safety and efficacy data used to justify risking a human patient, requirements imposed by federal regulators. Personally, I believe there are often opportunities that make sense to go into human patients earlier than we do today, and would love to discuss FDA reform with anyone who will hear me, but on our path to reaching patients today this is not our call to make.

The species we use and the number of each is based on a dialog with those regulators. For example, whether we can use only rabbits or if some primate studies will be required is an active topic of discussion between our regulatory team and the FDA. If primate studies are required, it is possible we could do them elsewhere than Alameda Point.

With the complexity of our studies, it is not feasible to outsource them. Our vertical integration, where our electrical engineers are only a few steps from our surgeons and our stem cell biologists, is a key element of why we have been able to move as fast as we have in our two years of existence. Dividing the company would result in higher costs and longer timelines to reach patients, potentially even lowering the chance it reaches them at all.

The medicines we develop involve gene and cell therapies, and if they reach patients will be among the most complex pieces of biotechnology to ever reach the clinic. The assertions by PCRM that there are alternatives which don't require testing, such as focused ultrasound or non-invasive electrical stimulation are not rooted in reality. If there were a non-invasive, wearable device that could be built to restore vision to patients, believe me, we would be building that instead. I have a family history of retinitis pigmentosa and grew up around it. It is hurtful for these groups to simply hand-wave away potential progress citing other technologies they do not understand which do not in fact work in the way they are suggesting.

As for the Neuralink allegations, I really cannot speak for them, as I am still under NDA from my time there. But I will say the recent pressure campaign coverage is a heavy mischaracterization of the facts. I know the Neuralink animal care team cares deeply about animal welfare and follows standards far in excess of traditional guidelines. Not many companies try to retire animals to sanctuary, but Neuralink has invested in doing just that when appropriate. In response to PCRM's campaign, they have written a handful of articles providing more context on PCRM's claims. You can find those articles here:

- https://neuralink.com/blog/neuralink-s-commitment-to-animal-welfare/
- https://neuralink.com/blog/championing-the-3-rs/
- https://neuralink.com/blog/husbandry-refinement/
- https://neuralink.com/blog/environmental-enrichment/
- https://neuralink.com/blog/the-role-of-the-institutional-animal-care-and-use-committee/

Further, per public information, all of the records cited by PCRM are from the California National Primate Research Center at UC Davis under protocols approved by their Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. All of that work was reviewed and monitored by a panel of UC Davis faculty per field standards. Further, the 2021 pig study they reference happened after I had left the company, and I had no part in its design or implementation; all I know about it is from news articles.

At Science we are developing very different technology than Neuralink, and accordingly the species we have to use are different. Regardless, we commit to following the same high standards as evidenced in those blog posts, and doing what we can to give our research animals exceptional housing conditions and empower our vet med staff to provide the best possible care. All of this is regulated by the US Department of Agriculture, whose reports are public records, and who make unannounced inspections at least once a year in addition to responding to complaints.

The Science Eye is the first in a range of devices we plan to announce over the coming years, each focused on a different critical unmet medical need. More is possible than many believe today, and I am confident that the coming years are going to be surprising. We feel a deep moral obligation to bring these innovations to patients who can benefit from them the most.

Due to the nature of our operations, it is difficult to keep moving the company every few years as we outgrow facilities. Animal research is only a small part of what we do: the rest of the company needs highly-rated cleanrooms and extensive technical infrastructure. Moving all of this is extremely disruptive and complex. Our goal is to put down roots and spend the next several decades investing in our community and growing to be valuable members of the Alameda Point community. I have spent several years searching the Bay Area for this home, and we have no runner up. I am convinced that Alameda Point will be a highlight of the whole Bay Area by the end of this decade. We would love to be part of that as we work towards bringing these important therapies to patients.

If you have any questions, I can be flexible at your convenience to discuss further.

Thank you for your consideration,

Max Hodak
Science Corporation