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December 13, 1988

James Laney, President
Emory University
1364 Clifton Rd., N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30322

Dear Jim,

Thanks for the time and interest you showed in the various subjects we discussed. I am very enthusiastic about the Clifton Corridor project and feel certain it will succeed. As I said, I have never worked with a more dedicated group than the members of the Task Force. Bill Todd is particularly fine and I am glad to know him better.

Enclosed is a letter regarding the gift of the prayer book to Emory. I also enclose a copy of a book on the family my Uncle Harry wrote with some notes on Abraham Alexander. It's a very disjointed book, since my uncle left out anyone he didn't approve of and seems proud of my great-grandfather who spent time in a debtors prison in Philadelphia! I have clipped the pages concerning Abraham and a picture of the young Major Alexander for your contemplation.

I enjoy our time together. You're building a great university and I'm proud to know you.

Sincerely,

Cecil A. Alexander

Enc.
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October 2, 1989

Mr. Cecil Alexander
888 Oakdale Road
Atlanta, GA 30307

Dear Mr. Alexander,

I have recently rejoined the CCBRC and was saddened when informed that you were no longer working with the organization.

I enjoyed working with you last summer and look forward to keeping you updated on the Council. If you need any further information, please feel free to contact me.

Perhaps we'll meet at a Yale Club or Marist Alumni event.

Sincerely,

A. Scott Walton
Program Associate

P.S. In case you did not hear, Annie had a baby boy on Sept. 28. He was 7 pounds 15 ounces and 21 inches long. Both mother and baby (William Wood Burriss) are doing well.

The meeting began with a greeting from Dr. Mary Guinan, Assistant Director for Science at CDC, a welcome to the ATDI representatives by Greene, and introductions.

O'Connor then discussed the different classifications of membership in the CCBRC. He commented that corporate and institutional were growing steadily, but that technological and individual had little growth.

McClendon asked what the CCBRC expected to be the major expenses out of the budget and what these would cost. O'Connor answered that the executive director position will cost over $100,000 a year and that the CCBRC intends to have a three year fundraising campaign for $2 million.

Greene added that the database of researchers and resources that the CCBRC is considering would be expensive, but added that the state may contribute money to this project.

Burriss then gave a background sketch of the CCBRC. She emphasized that the Council is at a critical launching off period and informed the ATDI representatives about current projects such as the Resource Guide, the Clifton Corridor Chronicle (newsletter), and the possibility of a database.

Meyer asked about the database and whether or not the CCBRC had discussed anything with the Cartermill Group. He added that a number of institutions in the state had discussed these types of developments, but that none had made any commitments.

Todd commented that he was meeting with the president of Cartermill the following day to discuss the possibility of state money being used in the development of the database.

Greene added that it was the CCBRC's hope to coordinate such activities. He went on to discuss the Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986 and its goal of strengthening the technology transfer relationship between U.S. business and government. He offered as an example the new agreement between CDC and American Cyanamid-Lederle to develop a high potency, low cost polio vaccine. He also stated that the CDC has an obligation to support such developments and could do it through such groups as the CCBRC.

Todd then gave Emory's perspective of the CCBRC and its goals. He explained that the critical mass that has been created on Clifton Road is a direct result of the vision of Robert
Woodruff, and that Emory is only now realizing the extent of this dream and how to capitalize on it. Todd referred to President Laney's "Goals for 2000" and to the fact that they are very quantifiable making Emory very accountable. He noted that one challenge involves becoming a top ten medical school. To do this they need to increase the amount of research grants that they receive. Presently, Emory ranks 34th in NIH and contract funding out of 126 medical schools. However, Emory is the third fastest growing institution in terms of receiving such research grants, and is doing so without abandoning their commitment to high quality clinical medicine.

Todd next discussed Emory's ventures into the for-profit sector in the form of the hotel conference center and a genetics lab spin-off. He noted that the CCBRC could play an important role in increasing research dollars and for-profit research activities at Emory. Moreover, Emory, and to a greater extent the state universities, has a responsibility to create a better life for Georgians. These universities also desire to have a corporate entity associated with the school. For example, Georgia Tech wants engineering companies, UGA wants agribusiness, and Emory wants biomedicals and pharmaceuticals.

Greene then commented that Dr. Palms, president of Georgia State, was very excited about the research taking place at GSU. He then asked Tate to talk about ATDI (Advanced Technology Development Institute).

Tate explained that ATDI is an organization formed in 1983 to support the growth of high tech industry in Georgia. There are 150 member companies, 12 active committees each with two co-chairs, monthly meetings, and one or two yearly conferences such as the venture capital conference. He emphasized that it is an entirely volunteer organization with relatively low dues and that all types of firms are members.

He added that he was encouraged by the discussion of Georgia's biomedical environment at this year's Biotrek Conference. He closed by stating his belief that the CCBRC is on the right track, has the necessary resources/skills to achieve their goals, and could expect the help of ATDI if it is desired.

Raney added that critical mass was very important. He recounted ATDI's contributions to bringing the American Electronics Association to Atlanta and commented that we need such a critical mass in bioscience. A joint ATDI/CCBRC effort could help bring this about.

Morrison stated that one of the keys to ATDI's success has been the effort to keep it a broad based community organization. This involves rules such as limiting the presidency to one year terms so that certain organizations can't dominate.

The meeting ended at 9:00 with both the CCBRC and ATDI representatives agreeing that it would be a good idea to meet
again in the future. A tour of CDC facilities followed for those who were interested.
Following introductions, it was explained that the purpose of the meeting was to inform Dr. Palms about the Clifton Corridor Biomedical Research Council (CCBRC) and gain any insights and/or advice that he wished to offer. This was followed by a brief overview of the CCBRC by Greene, O'Connor, and Burriss.

Palms emphasized that the concepts discussed had always been of great interest to those in the research community and alluded to the study being done by MPC Associates for the university presidents and to the McKensey Report that was completed over five years earlier. He went on to note that he was concerned about the direction of the MPC study based on the questions that were being asked.

Palms next commented that an increase in inter-university and university/government/industry collaboration was "going to happen, but could definitely happen faster". He stated that although the pieces were present, there was no one to "quarterback", and that a group with such a mandate would definitely be welcomed.

Greene reiterated that one of the CCBRC's main goals is to help bring resources together. Palms added that due to the nature of research activities, it might be prudent to concentrate on "centering" projects in Atlanta with related linkages throughout the world.

O'Connor commented that traditional sources no longer had the capability to address the corporate sector's need for research, and that Atlanta could capitalize by creating a niche to fill these needs. Palms reacted favorably to this suggestion.

Greene then asked Palms' opinion on what needed to be done in order for the CCBRC to be successful. Palms replied that it would be just as hard to break down intra-university barriers as inter-university barriers. Next he noted that "seed money" was a very important concern, and that an increase in government seed money would be very advantageous.

Palms next offered an example of how increased university cooperation could be manifested. The example pertained to a famous southern historian who was prompted to come to Georgia and teach at various institutions through the guise of the University System of Georgia. Palms noted that individually none of the universities could have been successful in luring this historian and that similar collective action could be implemented to lure a molecular biology nobel laureate or other comparable individuals.
O'Connor then asked for Palms' opinion on the research environment present in Atlanta. Palms noted that it was common practice to encourage graduating university students to seek further education elsewhere, but that increasingly PhD's were staying in Georgia. He also commented that many small companies have been created that people are simply unaware of. He offered the example that over 40 companies have been created by people who worked on Georgia Tech's reactor. Further, he pointed out that as critical mass develops, more scientists will remain in Atlanta, and that it had been his experience that many scientists were willing to come to Atlanta, especially from California. As a corollary to this point, he noted that one of the major detractors from such migration of scientists was the state's poor public school system.

In terms of scientific collaboration, Palms commented that the excitement of working with colleagues was often more important to scientists than the pursuit of monetary reward, and that this would help the CCBRC.

Greene then asked about the state of GSU's new research building. Palms explained that GSU had received $22 million from the state, groundbreaking on the 180,000 square foot complex is to begin next month, and that the major tenants will be chemistry, biology, and physics. Palms noted the fact that these departments will continue to use their old space as well, illustrating the tremendous growth GSU is experiencing.

Burris then asked Palms' opinion on a possible database of equipment that is present at various institutions that could be made available to private companies. Palms warned that such use had occurred elsewhere and smaller companies that provided the same resources successfully sued the institutions on the basis that the institutions had an unfair tax advantage.

Continuing, Palms suggested that equipment that was prohibitively expensive for one university might be funded by a collection of universities and that such unique equipment could be offered without fear of law suits and could conceivably make the area a research hub. He added that the unsuccessful example of the supercomputer at UGA and the reactor at Tech illustrate the need for extreme caution in such a program.

Palms also suggested that pharmaceutical companies might be convinced to contribute on a regular basis to a high-cost machine. Greene added that the NIH also has similar funding programs.

The following discussion concerned the future of the CCBRC. Palms noted his concerns about the physical constraint of the term "Clifton Corridor" and suggested that one location that the CCBRC should include in the catalogue of Georgia's strengths is the Savannah River Lab. He stated that $1 billion a year in biomedical research is undertaken at the lab, originally by Dupont and now by Westinghouse. He went on to say that the lab had tremendous resources and equipment and was very eager to please our state.

Lastly, Palms was presented with an executive membership packet and job description for the CCBRC executive director, and asked to contact the CCBRC if he had any comments, questions, or suggestions for a director.
Minutes of the
Clifton Corridor Biomedical Research Council
Board Meeting
American Cancer Society
July 19, 1989

Attendees: Eric Greene, John O'Connor, Annie Hunt Burriss, Jim Bell, Don Elliot Heald, Dr. Hamblin Letton, Becky Blalock, Corneila Sullivan, Bill Todd, Wayne Hodges, Marcey Dolgoff, Ray White, Jim Apple (for Randy Cardoza), Scott Walton, Gail Goldsmith, David Chesnut.

Eric Greene called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. Jim Bell moved approval of the minutes and Bill Todd seconded the motion. Greene then made several announcements. He encouraged board members' organizations to set a precedent by paying CCBRC dues and announced that a letter to this effect would go out next week. He said that the board officers had met three times since the last meeting. He also reminded the board of the educational focus of the CCBRC. For the purposes of our desired IRS tax status, it is important that the Council carry out a strong educative function and not focus mainly on business development.

John O'Connor then delivered a report on membership efforts. On July 18, O'Connor hosted a Finance and Membership Planning Committee meeting at First Atlanta bank. Attendees were Ray White of DeKalb County Planning Department; Roger Sund of the Cobb Chamber of Commerce, Chapman Crawford of Technology Park, Len Silverman of the Gwinnett Chamber, Bob Shepherd and Tom Ulbricht of Fulton County Economic Development, Glen Cornell of C & S bank, Ron Robinson of Trust Company Bank, Nancy Nolan and Roy Cooper of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce Economic Development. This group was briefed on Clifton Corridor efforts to present, as well as on current and future plans. They recommended a number of action items. The enclosed report, written by White, summarizes their recommendations (see attached).

A discussion followed, concerning that group's suggestions that the CCBRC's name be changed to something not reflecting the Clifton Corridor location. The Georgia Biomedical Research Council name was suggested. Burriss stated that that was somewhat amorphous and would be a weak concept to communicate. The Clifton Corridor concept has already received international press. Todd said that the greatest danger to the project was dilution to the point of mediocrity. Hodges stated that those on the Finance and Membership Planning Committee who brought up this discussion have their own interests to protect.

David Chesnut said that the Council must convey the concept that Clifton Corridor is a concept and not a location. This must be done through the education and communication efforts of the Council. Chesnut suggested several possibilities for immediate action. First, the presidents of all research institutions involved should be brought together to discuss, among other things, the name, and to advise on it. Second, certain county-wide leaders should be brought together with certain academic, and/or business leaders to be briefed on the CCBRC. This should be done between now and September. Greene recommended that the Communications Committee develop ways to communicate the Clifton Corridor concept so that it transcends Clifton Road.
O'Connor reported that the Council has about $56,000 in the bank. Goldsmith added that a balance sheet would be included with the minutes (see attached).

O'Connor reported that, at the suggestions of some friends of the CCBRC, the Board officers have investigated the use of the professional fundraising firm of Alexander O'Neill Haas. After conversations with Be Haas, the Board officers submitted to the Board a proposal for her services. A copy is enclosed (see attached). Haas proposes to conduct three months of pre-campaign counseling with Board officers and fundraising committees, and to prepare and revise documents for fundraising as necessary. After four months, a campaign would begin, which Haas or one of her associates would manage. The total cost for raising $1.8 million dollars is between $60,000 and $70,000, of which approximately $8-11,000 is for pre-campaign counseling. Jim Bell made a motion to authorize the Board officers to negotiate for pre-campaign counseling not to exceed $15,000. Letton seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Burriss added that Haas recommends the CCBRC has an Executive Director on board before the campaign and that the CCBRC might look for a grant to pay a year of the Director's salary. Greene added that Board officers have already interviewed one candidate, Bert Silverstein, and will be interviewing a second one today.

Marcey Dolgoff, who works on the DeKalb Delivers! campaign for the DeKalb Chamber, spoke to the Board about her work as part-time support to the Clifton Corridor membership effort. Jim Dunn of the DeKalb Chamber has offered Marcey's support services to the Council. Dolgoff circulated a form developed to track membership, from initial contact through issuance of a membership card and renewal. She also spoke to the board about a wish list of computer equipment needed for the membership drive. O'Connor requested she write down her recommendations and circulate them with the minutes. Perhaps a Board member or members could donate some of this equipment from within their own organizations. (see attached).

Scott Walton, under contract to the CCBRC to develop and produce a Biomedical Resource Guide before the end of August, circulated a report on the publication. Walton is a recent graduate of Yale. Last summer he performed intern assignments which helped to launch the Clifton Corridor effort.

Goldsmith described recent Program Associate activities, including re-working the pamphlet, editing a newsletter, producing collateral materials for the membership effort, responding to inquiries and working with the finance and membership planning committee. She announced that Georgia Power has volunteered to print 3000 copies of the pamphlet.

Bill Todd gave an update on the Emory Conference Center. He stated that the Conference Center will measure our commitment to develop Clifton Corridor's biomedical research, as the proposed center will provide a focus and a space for meetings. It will cost $30 million and bring 300 new jobs to the area. Further, this conference center honors part of the commitment to the American Cancer Society in landing their corporate headquarters on Clifton Road. If Emory fails at the Conference Center project, there is the fear that it might discourage them from further economic development-related efforts. At present, the project's height variance request before the county has been delayed until August 8. Emory has been told it needs to talk more with its neighbors in Victoria Estates and other nearby neighborhoods. That is going on at this time. Emory advocates the 18-story structure because it would be less damaging to the environment than a 5-story building. The conference center is the most important aspect of this project, according to Todd, not the hotel. The issue of a
conference center has been on the table for 35 years. Todd proposed he draft a letter of the CCBRC Board's support and return to the Board for approval. This was approved. He specified that 22 acres of land would be set aside as a botanical preserve. Letton commented that the ACS was promised a conference center as part of its relocation package.

Greene proposed the creation of a new committee to be called the Member Functions and Planning Committee. This group would focus on specific programs of the CCBRC over the next months. Greene proposed Burriss, Blalock, Letton, and anyone else interested serve on this committee. Burriss told the Board that October was High Tech Month, and that the CCBRC would be sponsoring Biomedical Week during the fourth week of that month. Some of the anticipated programs of Biomedical Week will revolve around a CDC poster session. Burriss also proposed a membership function in the second or third week of September, to tie in all those who have expressed an interest in the Council. The Board agreed that a breakfast meeting would be a good format, and settled tentatively on the third Thursday of each month for a date.

O'Connor mentioned the planned meeting between the CCBRC Board and the Advanced Technology Development Institute (ATDI) board. This will take place sometime during the week of September 11. There may be valuable possibilities for support from within that board.

Chesnut motioned adjournment. Todd seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 a.m.
Key Questions/Recommendations from Statewide Developers et. al. Regarding the Establishment of the CCBRC
May 18, 1989

1. Are the universities and colleges buying into the Clifton Corridor Biomedical Research Council concept? They are key to its success.

2. The presidents of the major universities need to be brought together early on in the process to provide their support.

3. Short-term measurable objectives need to be established for the "to-be-hired" executive director.

4. Institutions should be encouraged to form closer collaborative bonds. We need "structure."

5. Mechanisms should be evaluated to ensure collaboration. This should be the first priority program effort. It should be a "niche." We need to formalize our efforts here (i.e., evaluating mechanisms) first.

6. Money is the basis for collaboration. Any researcher will get involved if CCBRC is viewed as helping them to make money. Tapping institutions' entry point into companies is the best way to get a private business involved with the CCBRC.

7. The CCBRC needs a new name. "The Georgia Biomedical Corridor or another name could be used."
Minutes
Board of Directors
Clifton Corridor Biomedical Research Council
Wednesday, August 16, 1989
7:45 a.m.
Georgia Power Business Location Center

Attendees: Eric Greene, John O'Connor, Annie Hunt Burriss, Don Elliot Heald, Jim Bell, Scott Walton, Clyde Shepherd, Becky Blalock, Randy Cardoza, Bill Todd, David Chesnut, Ray White, Gail Goldsmith, Tom Hier (MPC & Associates).

Eric Greene opened the meeting at 8:10 a.m. O'Connor motioned for approval of the minutes, Shepherd seconded, and all were in favor.

John O'Connor delivered the treasurer's report. He presented a balance sheet showing the Council's current financial status. He then described his draft of a financial analysis. The universe of potential dues-paying entities in Georgia is not large enough to cover all of the Council's proposed costs. O'Connor's analysis proposes that the shortfall be covered through corporate grants attracted through fundraising. A contract with Alexander, O'Neal, Haas has these efforts underway.

O'Connor also gave a membership drive report. Mike Faith of Rosser-FABRAP has volunteered to oversee that effort working with Walton and Dolgo. O'Connor also reported that he will be working with Fulton and Cobb to involve them in the CCBRC and its mission with a focus of particular interest to those two counties. Burriss questioned when it would be appropriate for the CCBRC to approach Atlanta-area and other foundations in the fundraising drive. Bell responded that was positive and necessary. Shepherd volunteered that it was often a multiyear process to receive a favorable foundation grant decision and to pursue it continuously.

On Wednesday, September 13, the CCBRC Board will meet with the Advanced Technology Development Institute (ATDI) board at the CDC, O'Connor announced. The ATDI is the leading organization developing Georgia as a technology marketplace. Greene will orchestrate a CCBRC presentation for the meeting.
Burriss announced that the IRS form 1023 for non-profit status was fully completed by both the Council and its attorneys, and was enroute to the IRS.

On the subject of the Executive Director search, Greene said that two candidates had been interviewed but that the officers were not able to recommend a name at present. Greene encouraged board members to submit suggestions for potential candidates. The salary will be negotiable. Burriss raised the question of engaging a search firm to identify candidates and administer the process. A discussion of the workings of search firms ensued. Bell and Heald pointed out that search firms offer considerable assistance and that an Executive Director search should be coordinated with fundraising efforts. Heald recommended that the Council consult Bill Tipping of the American Cancer Society since he was formerly partner-in-charge of a leading executive search firm. Greene said that the Council might be able to get an interim Executive Director for a short period.

Goldsmith reported on membership. In recent weeks, approximately $1500 has been received in membership dues. In addition, the Georgia Department of Industry, Trade & Tourism has provided $6000 through a contract mechanism. In total, eleven organizations and one individual have become paying members of the Council. These include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Arthur Young</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>Annual Audit $125</td>
<td>Tom Tripp, Jack Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Carlson Associates</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Frank W. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) C&amp;S National Bank</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Howard J. Morisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Decatur Town Center Associates</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Adams D. Little, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Georgia Power Company</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Becky Blalock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Hanscomb Associates</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Robert W. Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Powell, Goldstein, Frazer and Murphy</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>John Gornall, Judy Becker, and Jay Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Howard N. Mead (Southerlin, Asbill and Brennan)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Howard N. Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) DeKalb Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Annie Hunt Burriss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Fulton County Planning and Economic Development</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Tom Ulbricht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Morehouse School of Medicine</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas E. Norris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports from the Communications, Scientific, and Membership Functions committees followed. Heald explained recent proposed brochure amendments to the Board. O'Connor suggested adding Norcross and Marietta to the town labels on the brochure’s map. Burriss recommended adding airport names. Chesnut suggested the addition of "To UGA" on I-85/316 and "To UMCG" on I-20. Burriss proposed adding those names plus Mercer-Macon to the map.

The Membership Functions and Scientific committee reports were combined. Burriss announced the first function, a meeting at 7:45 a.m. on September 12 at the American Cancer Society. This first membership meeting will overview the Clifton Corridor concept and evolution, as well as giving those present an opportunity to sign up for committees. Next, Greene presented a proposal for an October event featuring Dr. Leslie Misrock of Pennie & Edwards and a Mr. Metzenhoff of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. The combination, said Greene, would appeal to a broad spectrum of scientific, medical, business, and legal interests. Inforum and the Wardlaw Center at Georgia Tech were mentioned as possible sites for this gathering. Burriss raised the possibility of a November program involving co-sponsoring Arthur Young’s annual presentation of Steve Burrell and their biotech industry overview report. O’Connor said he would make inquiries. The Board proposed other possible speakers for the future, including Louis Sullivan, C. Everett Koop, James Mason, and Bill Foege.

Ray White then presented the final draft outline for the Organization and Implementation Plan. This report will not take the place of a business plan. Rather, it will serve as an analysis of the structure and goals of the CCBRC and as a plan of action. It will be a blueprint for the permanent board, to inform them what the CCBRC’s organizers had in mind. Greene said that any comments on the outline were due to White within 48 hours.

Staff gave updates on their activities. Scott Walton presented the Clifton Corridor Resource Guide to the Board. Gail Goldsmith presented the newsletter.

Under Other Business, Burriss raised the issue of price differentials on Council programs and materials for members versus non-members. According to Walt Plosilla of the Montgomery County High Technology Council (MCHTC), they charged everyone the same price for the first three years. Then they instituted higher prices for non-members. At that point, many non-members who had become active participants saw the benefits of membership and joined.
Chesnut moved the application of one price for all benefits for the present time. Clyde Shepherd seconded. It was unanimously approved. Bell commented that, with ACS programs and materials, the home office underwrites costs of development, while reproduction and mailing are charged to the field offices.

Bill Todd introduced his guest, Tom Hier, a senior associate with MPC & Associates. MPC is under contract to develop a plan for a comprehensive statewide technological development initiative and implementation plan, which is sponsored by Central Atlanta Progress and funded by the CF Foundation. He is working with a board consisting of Georgia's four major research university presidents and a number of business leaders. The project has involved an initial assessment and the development of models. These models will be presented to a working group, who will choose directions for the state. The study involved the three questions: (1) What do institutions need to make them stronger forces for economic development in the state?, (2)What university/business interactions exist which encourage economic development linkages?, and (3)What is the relation of universities to the public sector? Hier would welcome any suggestions for other people to talk to in this area.

Greene announced two major agreements recently concluded between the CDC and Lederle and the CDC and CryoLife. The word should be spread that CDC is available as both a community and a national resource for collaboration.

Todd thanked the Board for its support in The Emory Conference Center vote by the DeKalb Board of Commissioners. Emory was successful in gaining the variance it sought.

Greene moved adjournment at 9:43. O'Connor seconded. All were in favor.
Minutes
CCBRC Meeting with Be Haas (Alexander, O'Neil, Haas)
August 23, 1989

Attending: Haas, Burriss, Greene, O'Connor, Goldsmith

Haas began by emphasizing that the CCBRC needs a definite fundraising goal. She suggested $2 million. She added that hiring a Director would be a tremendous help to the campaign, and that once $500,000 was raised the CCBRC would have enough credibility to get a three year commitment from an Executive Director.

Returning to the discussion of the campaign, Haas said that the CCBRC needed a clear statement of need/purpose and a more definite campaign plan. She stated that the Council needs a $500,000 gift to raise $2 million. She suggested approaching Pete McTier of the Woodruff Foundation.

Next Haas circulated a breakdown of the number and monetary amounts of gifts that need to be solicited (attached). She explained that the top four gift levels make or break the campaign. She again emphasized the dire need for hiring an executive director to help in this fundraising process.

O'Connor then proposed that the CCBRC go to the universities and ask them to fund the executive director and staff salaries on a rotating basis.

Haas inquired as to whether such a proposal was realistic. Burriss commented that Emory was about to launch a $300 million fundraising drive and that other programs such as the Olympic 1996 pursuits drained metro Atlanta and funding sources.

Burriss went on to explain that the CCBRC Board had agreed to try and implement a meeting of Presidents Laney, Crecine, and Palms.

Haas then asked what corporate entities were most important. It was decided that Georgia Power, Southern Bell, MCI, First Atlanta, C & S, and Trust Company needed to be a major part of the project.

Haas then suggested that Dahlberg might be helpful in calling meetings of influential representatives of these groups and possibly others.

O'Connor commented that the university presidents should discuss the executive director and program administrator positions. Burriss suggested that the Council should possibly try for a loaned executive then go with an executive search firm thereby adding 30% to the cost of executive director's salary. O'Connor added that the loaned executive role fit with his idea for a rotational program administrator.

Haas then asked why UGA had been left out of three presidents meeting. Burriss commented that the right contact had not been found.
The following discussion concerned the role of the executive director. O'Connor, Greene, and Burriss explained what he/she would be charged with including: creating linkages, increasing awareness, increasing CCBRC credibility, overseeing everyday operations, etc.

Haas asked if the state needed to be involved. O'Connor suggested that Larry Gellerstadt could represent the state and the CF Foundation.

Haas then asked about Atlanta Chamber of Commerce representation. Burriss commented that since Busbee is next president of Atlanta Chamber, he might be the correct target.

Haas asked if the Business Plan was complete. Burriss explained that it was not yet complete, but would be forwarded to Haas upon completion.

To finalize, the schedule of events was reviewed. First, the presidents of the universities had to be brought together. Once this stage is complete, the corporate leadership should be brought together. This meeting should include Gellerstedt, Busbee, Clendenin, Dahlberg, Strickland, Bennett Brown, and Ray Riddle. The next step is to approach Pete McTier of the Woodruff Foundation for a $500,000 challenge grant (i.e. challenge CCBRC to raise $1.5 million balance of the goal). Haas added that a college president should attend this meeting.

It was decided that the next meeting would take place September 1st at Haas' office.
**CLIFTON CORRIDOR**

**GOAL: $2,000,000**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>$500,000 *</td>
<td>= $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>$300,000 ($100,000 x 3 years)</td>
<td>= $600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>$150,000 ($50,000 x 3 years)</td>
<td>= $300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>$75,000 ($25,000 x 3 years)</td>
<td>= $300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>$30,000 ($10,000 x 3 years)</td>
<td>= $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>$10,000 ($3,333 x 3 years)</td>
<td>= $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requires a committee of 15 to solicit 75 prospects.

* $500,000 would cover salary of Director, secretary and contingencies for 3 years.
MINUTES

September 1, 1989  1:00 - 2:00 p.m.

CCBRC Meeting with Be Haas

Alexander, O'Neil, Haas

Attending: Burriss, Greene, Haas, O'Connor, Walton

Haas was given a copy of:
  the CCBRC executive membership packet,
  a letter from O'Connor to Greene concerning the CCBRC budget,
  a job description for the Executive Director,
  an explanation of the "general partnership" concept for a research
  park, and
  the CCBRC tentative schedule of events.

Burriss reported on her recent presentation to the Mercer Board of Trustees
about the CCBRC.

Burriss then commented that the presidents of Emory, Georgia Tech, and
Georgia State were going to be brought together to discuss the CCBRC and asked
Haas if she thought Mercer should be included in this meeting.

Haas expressed concern due to the credibility problem with Mercer's present
financial status and suggested that it may be best to wait to bring Mercer on
line.

Haas then asked for an update on the CCBRC's contact with Peter McTier of
the Woodruff Foundation. Greene responded that the CCBRC would not approach
McTier until more precise documentation was created and O'Connor added the
Council also intended to wait until after the "presidents meeting". Haas
commented that this strategy was quite prudent and suggested that the Council
should consider waiting until May to file a grant request if the CCBRC were not
completely prepared to "present their case". Haas also suggested that the
CCBRC may wish to contact McTier, ask how late grant proposals can be
completed, and indicate to him that the Council will present a proposal to him
if the preliminary work can be completed and meetings arranged. Greene,
O'Connor, and Burriss agreed that Burriss should take this action.
Haas next commented that the Council needed to arrange for the creation of a "case study" either through Alexander, O'Neil, Haas or in house. It was agreed that Walton would complete this with the guidance of examples provided by Haas and that this could be presented to Alexander, O'Neil, Haas for final review. Haas explained that this was a very important tool for fundraising; helpful in assuring that all involved in the project understand and agree on the major goals and for use by those who do the eventual solicitation.

Burriss then asked Haas' opinion on soliciting funds from foundations outside the Atlanta area. Haas answered that she thought it better to show that those in Atlanta were interested before approaching others. However, she did think it would be helpful to research the national foundations. Greene then commented that a list of such foundations was available through the CDC.

Greene next asked for Haas' opinion of the CCBRC strategic plan document. Her reaction was that it was good for college presidents, but needed to be changed before approaching corporate executives. More specifically, the technical language needed to be taken out and examples needed to be added.

Haas suggested adapting the document into the "case study". She added that it was often good to use a one page letter from the Executive Director or his equal explaining the program. All decided it would be best to use an inexpensive cover with our logo. She also suggested that the CCBRC not reprint any literature until the "case study" is completed.

Haas re-emphasized the importance of finding an Executive Director. In addition, Haas commented that the CCBRC's ideas/presentation was "a little fuzzy" and that the Council should not "take busy people's time" until more support work was complete.

Burriss/O'Connor commented that one exception to this rule may be Larry Gellerstadt who could offer unique advice as to what community concerns needed to be addressed.

Haas concluded by saying that the bottom line was that the information needed to be "shaped up".

It was agreed that the time of the next meeting would be set in accordance with progress on the case study.
Land Acquisition Committee (Clifton Corridor)

Members
Representatives from the private sector and the county

Co-Chair
Clyde Shepherd - Private sector - Dekalb Development
Ray White - Dekalb County

Purpose
To establish land requirements for a research park

a) Size
d) Utilities
b) Location (time to reach corridor)
e) Soil - soil

c) Transportation
f) Zoning
g) Environment of surroundings

To identify possible tracts
To determine price of land.
To determine price users can pay
2. While a great deal of the success of the Center will depend on the development of a research park, it is believed that the creation of a Development Facility Center is necessary.
Financing (Clifton Corridor)

Membership
Representatives of institutions, governments, foundations and financial institutions.

Co-Chairs
John O'Conner
David Chemat
Sid Topol

Purpose
To investigate various means of financing:
a) Administration
b) Land acquisition
c) Land infrastructure
d) Construction of facilities such as "incubators", conference center, etc.
Marketing (Clifton Corridor)

Membership:
Personnel to conduct research as to potential users
Personnel to handle public relations

Purpose:
To solicit probable users of the park
To arrive at the best means of marketing property
To develop collateral?
To promote p.r. experts from Clifton Corridor for press coverage nationally
Administrative Center

Membership (Clifton Corridor) - Educational Institutions
Research Institutions - Government

Co-Chairs (Clifton Corridor)
  Bill Todd
  Eric Green

Purpose.
To establish a framework for coordinating
the efforts of the various institutions in the
various fields of research, to develop "incubator"
and research parks.

An attempt should be made to assign
primary research areas to each institution,
i.e.,
Georgia Tech     Physical Sciences
U. of Georgia    Agricultural Sciences
Mercer U.      Pharmaceuticals

A permanent organization should be formed to
administer the collective efforts of its members.
Goals should be established.
By-laws governing this body should be written.

Questions:
Should a profit corporation similar to Dorno be
set up? Should each institution have its own?
Administrative Costs (Cont.)

2. Should an investment fund similar to Triad be set up? Should each institutional have its own?
3. How will the organization be financed?
4. Where should its office be located?
5. What role should the state play?
6. Where will "incubator" facility be located?
7. Will each unit have its own park?
8. Others