

BEFORE THE
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE

SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

THE SALK INSTITUTE FOR
BIOLOGICAL STUDIES
TRUSTEE'S ROOM
10010 N. TORREY PINES ROAD
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS
AGR HALL
WALTER A. BUEHLER ALUMNI
& VISITOR CENTER
CORNER OLD DAVIS ROAD AND
MRAK HALLDRIVE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO
114 GENENTECH HALL
600 16TH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
17-187 CHS
10833 LE CONTE AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

DATE: TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2005
11 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CSR
CSR. NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 71506A

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		4
CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT VERSION OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR A LONG-TERM FACILITY FOR THE CIRM		7
ADJOURNMENT		67

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2005

2 REGULAR MEETING
3 SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR THE
4 INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
5 TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SINCE WE HAVE A QUORUM, AND
7 FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PEOPLE, SO WE CAN START ON TIME,
8 WE WILL COMMENCE WITH THE CALL TO ORDER. AND THEN WHEN
9 DAVIS JOINS THE MEETING, HOPEFULLY, WE WILL ASK THEM IF
10 THEY WANT TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT
11 PEOPLE THERE HAVE THE BENEFIT OF PROVIDING COMMENT.

12 ALL RIGHT.

13 SO THIS IS ROBERT KLEIN. AS THE CHAIRMAN, I
14 AM GOING TO CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER. AND PLEASE AS
15 EACH INDIVIDUAL SPEAKS, IF THEY COULD IDENTIFY THEIR
16 NAME BEFORE THEY SPEAK BECAUSE IT'S DIFFICULT FOR
17 INDIVIDUALS OTHERWISE TO KNOW WHO'S ADDRESSING THE
18 PUBLIC AND/OR THE BOARD MEMBERS.

19 MS. KING: AND ONE OTHER REQUEST, BOB, I KNOW
20 THEY'RE JUST GOING TO BE SAYING HERE RIGHT NOW, BUT I
21 COULD ASK PEOPLE ON THE LINE TO PLEASE MAKE SURE WHEN
22 SPEAKING TO SPEAK DIRECTLY INTO THE MICROPHONE. THAT
23 WILL MAKE FOR A VERY ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT. THANK YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. POINT WELL TAKEN.
25 ADDITIONALLY, IN ASKING FOR COMMENTS EITHER FROM BOARD
MEMBERS OR FROM THE PUBLIC, I WILL PROCEED IN A

1 SPECIFIC ORDER. THE ORDER WILL EITHER BE UC SAN
2 FRANCISCO, THEN DAVIS, SALK, AND THEN REVERSE THE ORDER
3 FOR THE FOLLOW-UP SET OF QUESTIONS SO THAT EVERYONE
4 GETS A CHANCE TO SPEAK IN FIRST AND ON ALTERNATIVE
5 POINTS SO THAT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE PUBLIC ARE
6 PROVIDED.

7 IN OPENING THE MEETING, ARE THERE
8 ANY PROBLEMS AS TO THE SITES AT THE SALK INSTITUTE WITH
9 HEARING THIS SPEAKER PHONE? IS ANYONE AT THE SALK
10 INSTITUTE NEAR THE SPEAKER PHONE?

11 DR. REED: BOB, JOHN REED AND RICH MURPHY ARE
12 HERE. WE'RE HAVING A LITTLE TROUBLE HEARING YOU, BUT
13 IT IS AUDIBLE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. GREAT. ALL RIGHT.
15 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

16 DR. POMEROY: THIS IS ALSO UC DAVIS. WE JUST
17 JOINED YOU. THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY, AND WE HAVE
18 SEVERAL PUBLIC MEMBERS HERE AS WELL.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GREAT. I THANK YOU VERY
20 MUCH. SO WE WILL COMMENCE WITH THE ROLL CALL. AMY
21 DUROSS, WILL YOU COMMENCE ROLL CALL.

22 MS. DU ROSS: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

23 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M HERE.

24 MS. DU ROSS: BOB KLEIN.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.

1 MS. DU ROSS: SHERRY LANSING.
2 MS. LANSING: HERE.
3 MS. DU ROSS: RICHARD MURPHY.
4 DR. MURPHY: HERE.
5 MS. DU ROSS: ED PENHOET.
6 DR. PENHOET: HERE.
7 MS. DU ROSS: CLAIRE POMEROY.
8 DR. POMEROY: HERE.
9 MS. DU ROSS: PHYLLIS PRECIADO.
10 DR. PRECIADO: HERE.
11 MS. DU ROSS: AND JOHN REED.
12 DR. REED: HERE.
13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE CLEARLY HAVE A
14 QUORUM, AND WE'LL PROCEED WITH THE AGENDA. BEFORE WE
15 PROCEED WITH THE FORMAL AGENDA, ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS
16 FROM THE PUBLIC HERE AT UC SAN FRANCISCO? ARE THERE
17 ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM UC DAVIS?
18 DR. POMEROY: YES, THERE ARE. WE HAVE TWO
19 PEOPLE WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK. THE FIRST IS ROBERT
20 BURRIS, AND I'LL ASK HIM TO COME UP CLOSER TO THE
21 MICROPHONE HERE, SIT IN THE FRONT ROW, INTRODUCE
22 HIMSELF AND MAKE HIS COMMENTS.
23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND HE WOULD LIKE TO
24 SPEAK AS A GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT VERSUS DISCUSSING
25 ITEMS ON THE AGENDA?

1 DR. POMEROY: LET ME ADDRESS THAT. NO, HE
2 WANTS TO SPEAK ON ITEM NO. 3.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE WILL ASK FOR HIS
4 COMMENTS AT THAT TIME. THAT'S VERY HELPFUL.

5 DOES THE OTHER PERSON AT DAVIS WANT TO SPEAK
6 AS A GENERAL COMMENT OR DOES THAT PERSON WANT TO
7 ADDRESS ITEMS ON THE AGENDA?

8 DR. POMEROY: I'M SORRY. HE WOULD ALSO, IT'S
9 THOMAS EIGNER, AND HE WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS NO. 3 AS
10 WELL.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE THANK YOU VERY
12 MUCH.

13 ARE THERE ANY GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS COMING
14 FROM UCLA?

15 MR. STRASSMAN: WELL, I DON'T KNOW. I WANT
16 TO ADDRESS WHERE TO PUT THE CENTER WITH THE CIRM.

17 MS. KING: NOT AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND ARE THERE ANY
19 GENERAL COMMENTS AT THE SALK INSTITUTE?

20 DR. REED: BOB, WE DO HAVE ONE REMARK FROM
21 THE PUBLIC.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DO THEY WANT TO MAKE A
23 GENERAL COMMENT, OR DO THEY WANT TO ADDRESS AN ITEM ON
24 THE AGENDA?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'LL ADDRESS ITEM NO.

1 3 ON THE AGENDA.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. FINE. OKAY.

3 DOES ANY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE WANT TO MAKE AN
4 OPENING COMMENT? FROM SAN FRANCISCO? FROM DAVIS, ANY
5 MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE WANT TO MAKE AN OPENING PUBLIC
6 COMMENT?

7 DR. POMEROY: NO, THANK YOU.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FROM UCLA?

9 MS. LANSING: NO, NOT UNTIL WE GET TO THE
10 AGENDA ITEM.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND FROM SALK?

12 DR. REED: NO.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE WILL PROCEED
14 IMMEDIATELY, THEN, WITH THE AGENDA ITEMS.

15 GOING IMMEDIATELY TO ITEM 3 ON THE AGENDA,
16 ALL OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ARE HERE, AND WE
17 HAVE COPIES FOR THE PUBLIC ON THE WEBSITE AS WELL AS AT
18 THE SITE OF THE RFP DRAFT THAT IS PROPOSED. THE
19 SUBJECT OF THIS MEETING IS WHETHER OR NOT THIS DRAFT
20 RFP SHOULD BE MODIFIED OR SHOULD BE ISSUED AS POSTED TO
21 MOVE FORWARD ON A PERMANENT SITE SELECTION FOR THE
22 INSTITUTE.

23 AS MEMBERS KNOW, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF
24 CRITERIA LISTED ON THIS RFP, AND THOSE CRITERIA, AS
25 WELL AS ANY OTHER PERTINENT CRITERIA AS ADDRESSED BY

1 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT THE COMMITTEE WISHES TO
2 ADOPT, CAN BE INCLUDED IN THE RFP.

3 IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE TIMETABLE BE
4 RELATIVELY SHORT, BUT CERTAINLY EVERYONE IS HAVING THE
5 ABILITY TO SEE IT FOR SOME TIME ON THE SITE, AND MOST
6 OF THE INDIVIDUALS THAT WE'RE AWARE OF IN PROPOSING
7 CITIES ARE AWARE OF IT AND HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT THEIR
8 SITES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PROPOSED RFP. SO THE
9 INTENT OF THE COMMITTEE IS TO ALSO MAKE A TIMETABLE FOR
10 THE RFP RESPONSE.

11 IN OPENING DISCUSSION ON THE SITE, ARE THERE
12 ANY COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD AT THIS TIME ON THE
13 CRITERIA IN THE RFP AS TO MODIFYING THEM OR EXPANDING
14 THEM? ANY ADDITIONAL CRITERIA THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO
15 CONSIDER?

16 MS. LANSING: UCLA HAS SOME. THIS IS SHERRY
17 LANSING AT UCLA. I HAVE ONE CLARIFICATION AND THEN ONE
18 SUGGESTION. THE FIRST IS CAN YOU -- AGAIN, I DON'T
19 UNDERSTAND THE LANGUAGE IN NO. 6. IT SAYS THAT IT MUST
20 BE IRREVOCABLE AND THEN HELD OPEN FOR 75 DAYS. CAN YOU
21 JUST CLARIFY THIS TO ME BECAUSE I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT
22 THE INTENT OF IT IS?

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE INTENT IS THAT WHILE THE
24 BOARD AT THE LAST PUBLIC BOARD MEETING MADE IT QUITE
25 CLEAR THERE WAS A DESIRE TO MOVE RAPIDLY, IT COULD BE

1 THAT CONSIDERATION OF THE ONGOING SEARCH FOR PRESIDENT
2 AND ACTING PRESIDENT, THAT THE SEARCH FIRM THAT THE
3 BOARD'S LOOKED AT SELECTING ON THE FEBRUARY 3D MEETING,
4 COULD ADVISE THE COMMITTEE THAT THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL
5 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SITES AND ITS ABILITY TO ATTRACT
6 THE RIGHT PRESIDENT OR ACTING PRESIDENT AND STAFF.

7 MS. LANSING: SO WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT
8 WE'LL FIND A SITE. AND THEN IF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE
9 SAYS TO US, THIS IS IN ADHERENCE TO GETTING WHO YOU
10 WANT, THAT WE WOULD THEN COME BACK AND CONVENE AGAIN
11 AND PERHAPS CHANGE THE SITE?

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT
13 THE PROPOSAL FOR THE SITES, WE'RE ASKING THAT THEY CAN
14 HOLD IT OPEN FOR 75 DAYS. SO THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE
15 BOARD WANTS TO GO FOR ANOTHER MEETING BEFORE MAKING THE
16 SITE SELECTION, WHICH WOULD BE THREE DAYS LATER, THE
17 SITE WOULD STILL BE AVAILABLE, ALL THE SITE PROPOSALS
18 FOR THE BUILDING WILL BE OPEN.

19 MS. LANSING: I GOT IT.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WE DON'T HAVE TO REOPEN
21 THE PROCESS.

22 MS. LANSING: AND THEN MY SECOND IS THIS IS
23 THE PERMANENT SITE. THIS IS NOT THE TEMPORARY SITE
24 THAT WE NEED JUST TO DO NORMAL BUSINESS, RIGHT?

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT. THE BOARD

1 AT THE LAST MEETING ACTUALLY PROVIDED THE CHAIR WITH
2 ABILITY TO WORK ON A TEMPORARY SITE. AND WE CAN GIVE
3 YOU A REPORT AT THE BOARD MEETING, BUT WE HAVE MADE
4 SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS THERE IN WORKING WITH THE STATE IN
5 IDENTIFYING INTERIM SITES.

6 MS. LANSING: FINAL QUESTION AND PERHAPS
7 RECOMMENDATION. AND MAYBE THIS IS NAIVE, SO I JUST
8 WANT TO ASK YOU SINCE I'M NOT AN EXPERT IN THIS AREA.
9 IS THERE ANY CHANCE THAT WE COULD GET A SITE PRO BONO
10 AND GET THINGS DONE THAT WAY, OR IS THAT JUST NAIVE AND
11 WISHFUL THINKING?

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, IN THIS CASE EVERY
13 DOLLAR WE SAVE ON A SITE IS A DOLLAR WE CAN PUT INTO
14 RESEARCH. SO IT IS CERTAINLY A GOAL. AND IN OUR
15 CRITERIA UNDER POINT FOUR, WE HAVE FACILITY MUST BE
16 COMPETITIVE WITH THE PRICE, INCLUDING SUBSTANTIAL RENT
17 AND OPERATING COST CONCESSIONS. WE WOULD HOPE, BECAUSE
18 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF CITIES THAT WOULD LIKE THE SITE
19 TO BE LOCATED IN THEIR CITIES, THAT THE CITIES IN
20 SPONSORING A SITE WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTION WOULD WORK
21 WITH A PROPERTY OWNER TO PROVIDE THE SITE AT
22 SUBSTANTIALLY BELOW THE MARKET RENT, HOPEFULLY FREE FOR
23 SOME TIME, WITH SOME SUBSTANTIAL RENT CONCESSIONS OVER
24 THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD.

25 MS. LANSING: SO MY QUESTION WAS -- GOOD.

1 I'M HAPPY TO HEAR THIS. BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY WE'RE GOING
2 TO BE ATTRACTING A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF BUSINESS TO THE
3 SITE, SO TO SPEAK, AND WE'LL BE BENEFITING WHEREVER IT
4 IS. SO I DIDN'T KNOW WHETHER, YOU KNOW, ITEM 4 COVERED
5 IT OR WHETHER WE SHOULD PUT, YOU KNOW, IT IS OUR HOPE,
6 YOU KNOW. I DON'T KNOW HOW EVERYBODY ELSE FEELS ABOUT
7 IT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT'S EXCELLENT TO
9 HIGHLIGHT THE FACT THAT AS BOARD MEMBERS WE HAVE GREAT
10 EXPECTATIONS AND THAT WE'RE VERY HOPEFUL TO HAVE MAJOR
11 RENT CONCESSIONS OVER THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD.

12 MS. LANSING: EVEN FREE. EVEN PRO BONO.
13 THAT IS --

14 DR. FRIEDMAN: EVEN AS A TAX WRITE-OFF OR
15 SOMETHING.

16 MS. LANSING: THAT'S EXACTLY RIGHT, THAT THAT
17 IS -- I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU WORD IT SO THAT IF WE END UP
18 NOT GETTING IT FREE, BUT GETTING IT FOR SUBSTANTIALLY
19 LOW RENT, WE'RE HAPPY. PERHAPS IN SOME WAY SAYING THAT
20 THAT WOULD BE A GOAL. I DON'T KNOW. I DON'T KNOW.

21 DR. FRIEDMAN: BOB, THIS IS MIKE FRIEDMAN
22 ALSO AT UCLA. I'D LIKE TO JUST ASK ONE OR TWO
23 QUESTIONS, IF I MAY.

24 DO YOU ENVISION -- AND MAYBE THIS HASN'T BEEN
25 FULLY WORKED OUT. DO YOU ENVISION THAT THE REVIEW

1 ACTIVITIES, THAT IS, THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS WHO COME
2 FROM OUT-OF-STATE, WOULD BE CARRYING OUT THESE REVIEWS
3 AT THIS SITE? IF WE DO, BECAUSE THAT MIGHT BE A VERY
4 REASONABLE WAY TO DO THINGS BECAUSE YOU'LL HAVE THE
5 STAFF THERE, THERE ARE CERTAIN ECONOMIES OF SCALE, AND
6 SO FORTH. AND IT'S ONE PLACE WHERE EVERYBODY COULD
7 COME FOR PERIODIC PEER REVIEW SESSIONS. IF YOU DO
8 ENVISION THAT, THEN DO YOU WANT TO PUT IN SOMETHING
9 ABOUT NEARBY LODGING BECAUSE HAVING SOMETHING THAT'S
10 CLOSE AND WALKABLE. I'M NOT TRYING TO OVERDESIGN THIS,
11 BUT YOU'RE ASKING FOR A GENERAL SET OF CRITERIA, AND I
12 JUST WANTED TO ADD THAT FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF MY
13 FELLOW MEMBERS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
15 POINT. AND IN TERMS OF WHETHER THE REVIEWS ARE
16 CONDUCTED ON THE SITE, THE GRANT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE IS
17 A PROPER COMMITTEE THAT WILL ADDRESS THIS WITH THE
18 BOARD IN THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS. AS I WOULD EXPECT,
19 THAT WHILE SOME OF THOSE REVIEWS ARE DONE IN
20 SUBPORTIONS OF THE GRANT COMMITTEE, THAT THE COMMITTEE
21 AS A WHOLE, THAT IS THE SCIENTIFIC AND GRANT WORKING
22 GROUP, WOULD CONVENE AT CERTAIN POINTS. AND THE POINT
23 THAT YOU JUST MADE IS HIGHLY RELEVANT TO THAT. SO
24 THAT, INDEED, IF WE WERE TO INCORPORATE A POINT HERE
25 INDICATING PROXIMITY TO LODGING FACILITIES -- AND

1 CITIES HAVE BEEN KNOWN IN ATTRACTING CONFERENCES TO
2 WORK WITH THE HOTEL INDUSTRY WITHIN A JURISDICTION TO
3 PROVIDE FREE ROOMS. SO THAT WE COULD, IN FACT, ASK
4 THAT THERE WOULD BE PROXIMATE LODGING AND THAT, IN THE
5 PUBLIC JOINT VENTURE OR SPONSORSHIP WITH THE LOCAL
6 PROPOSAL, CONSIDERATION WOULD BE GIVEN IF THERE ARE
7 LODGING FACILITIES THAT ARE MADE AVAILABLE AT A REDUCED
8 COST OR AT NO COST AS AN ACCOMMODATION TO THE
9 ACTIVITIES OF THE INSTITUTE.

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: BOB, THIS IS MIKE AGAIN.
11 THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND I WOULD ONLY ASK THAT WE
12 CONSIDER THAT AS AN EIGHTH CRITERIA THEN FOR
13 DISCUSSION.

14 DR. REED: BOB, BOB REED HERE AT SALK. COULD
15 I MAKE A COMMENT?

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY.

17 DR. REED: I THINK FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE
18 RFP, WE SHOULD KEEP THE LANGUAGE AS SIMPLE AND AS BROAD
19 AS POSSIBLE SO THAT WE HAVE AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY AS
20 POSSIBLE IN LOOKING AT SITES. I BELIEVE THAT A LOT OF
21 THESE DETAILS SUCH AS THE PROXIMITY OF HOTEL LODGING
22 AND THOSE SORT OF THINGS CAN BE DEALT WITH ONCE WE LOOK
23 AT SPECIFIC PROPOSALS. BUT I WOULD BE HESITANT TO PUT
24 TOO MANY SPECIFIC CRITERIA IN THE RFP BECAUSE WE MAY
25 THEN BE FORCED TO OVERLOOK SITES THAT WOULD BE

1 ATTRACTIVE, BUT MIGHT NOT MEET ALL THE CRITERIA.

2 DR. FRIEDMAN: THIS IS MIKE FROM UCLA. I
3 THINK THAT'S A VALID POINT. WHAT I WOULD ASK, THOUGH,
4 BOB, IS THAT WE ASK FOR INFORMATION FROM EACH POTENTIAL
5 SITE FOR THIS. HOW WE ULTIMATELY WEIGHT THEM AND JUDGE
6 THEM, I THINK, IS AT OUR DISCRETION.

7 AND THE POINT THAT WAS JUST MADE IS AN
8 EXCELLENT ONE. THERE MAY BE A SITE THAT LACKS CERTAIN
9 OF THESE THINGS, BUT IS SO GOOD OVERALL THAT WE CHOOSE
10 TO DO IT. THESE WOULDN'T BE KNOCKOUTS, BUT I THINK IT
11 WOULD BE GOOD TO GATHER INFORMATION ABOUT THAT SO THAT
12 WHEN WE MAKE OUR CHOICE, IT'S MADE WITH THE MOST
13 COMPLETE INFORMATION SET.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT HOW WE CAN
15 HANDLE IS IT IS HELPFUL TO GIVE DIRECTION TO THE PEOPLE
16 PROVIDING RESPONSES TO THE RFP; FOR EXAMPLE, AS TO THE
17 LODGING. BUT ALSO, ON YOUR POINT, DR. REED, WE COULD
18 PUT A SPECIFIC PROVISION IN OUR MODIFICATION TO
19 INDICATE THAT THE COMMITTEE WILL MAINTAIN THE
20 DISCRETION TO WEIGHT THESE IN ITS JUDGMENT BASED UPON
21 THE OVERALL BALANCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF EACH PROPOSAL SO
22 THAT IT'S CLEAR THAT THE COMMITTEE DOES NOT HAVE TO
23 LOOK AT ANY ONE OF THESE ITEMS AS DETERMINATIVE AND CAN
24 INDIVIDUALLY WEIGHT THEM IN EACH PROPOSAL.

25 MS. LANSING: GOOD.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: GOOD.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO HAS A POINT AT
3 UC SAN FRANCISCO.

4 DR. PRECIADO: HI. I ACTUALLY DID HAVE A
5 COMMENT ABOUT THE SITE CHOSEN IN LOS ANGELES BASIN, SAN
6 FRANCISCO BAY AREA, OR THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA.
7 AS YOU ALL KNOW, I'M FROM THE CENTRAL VALLEY, AND THERE
8 ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY, AND THEY'RE
9 NOT ALL RED. SO I REALLY -- I UNDERSTAND THAT THE
10 CENTRAL VALLEY DOESN'T HAVE SOME OF THESE MAJOR POINTS
11 THAT ARE IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER, MOST PROMINENTLY THE
12 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. HOWEVER, IT IS
13 IMPORTANT TO NOT FORGET THAT FRESNO IS GROWING UP, AND
14 THAT THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT THAT IS GOING TO BE
15 SOON, THAT THE REAL ESTATE IN FRESNO IS JUST BOUNDING,
16 AND THAT UCSF IS THERE AND UC MERCED IS THERE, AND
17 THOUGH, AGAIN, THE INFRASTRUCTURE ISN'T THERE DOESN'T
18 MEAN THAT IT CAN'T BE.

19 I'M A LITTLE CONCERNED THAT THE MEETINGS
20 THAT WE'RE HAVING RIGHT NOW. I DON'T THINK I'VE EVER
21 SEEN A FRESNAN PRESENT. AND I DON'T KNOW -- I'M SURE
22 IT'S NOT JUST BECAUSE THEY'RE RED. I'M SURE THAT
23 THERE ARE OTHER ISSUES THAT ARE THERE, BUT I THINK WE
24 NEED TO SOMEHOW CREATE AN AVENUE FOR PARTICIPATION.
25 AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT MEANS. BUT WHEN WE'RE

1 LOOKING AT THIS SITE, LET'S MAKE SURE THAT WE KEEP
2 CENTRAL VALLEY IN OUR MINDS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THINK IT'S A VERY
4 IMPORTANT POINT THAT WE NEED TO HAVE AN OUTREACH TO
5 ALL AREAS OF THE STATE. AND POTENTIALLY IT WOULD BE
6 AN ACTIVITY CENTER THAT WE COULD GENERATE FROM THE
7 BOARD LEVEL DISCUSSIONS IN DEALING WITH PRESENTATIONS
8 IN THAT PART OF THE STATE OR HAVING CERTAIN HEARINGS
9 IN THAT PART OF THE STATE SO THAT THROUGH THOSE
10 ACTIVITIES WE REALLY PROVIDE EXPOSURE TO THE EXCITING
11 AREAS OF THE SCIENCE THAT ARE THE BUSINESS OF THIS
12 INSTITUTE AND DEVELOPMENT OF MEDICAL THERAPY.

13 WE HAVE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL THERE, WHICH IS
14 ONE OF THE OUTSTANDING FACILITIES IN THE ENTIRE
15 STATE. YOU HAVE A HOSPITAL COMPLEX THAT IS DOING A
16 JOINT VENTURE WITH UC SAN FRANCISCO FOR A TEACHING
17 HOSPITAL FACILITY.

18 DR. PRECIADO: UCSF MENTAL RESEARCH CENTER,
19 AND IT'S OPENING UP SOON.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THERE'S CERTAINLY A REAL
21 INCREASE IN THE LEVEL OF RESOURCES FOR BIOMEDICAL
22 RESEARCH AND CLINICAL TRIALS IN THAT PART OF THE STATE.
23 BUT I THINK WE CAN BEST ADDRESS IT AT THE BOARD LEVEL
24 BY TRYING TO DO A SPECIFIC OUTREACH PROGRAM. THE
25 INLAND EMPIRE IS ANOTHER AREA, SAN BERNARDINO,

1 RIVERSIDE, WHERE WE PROBABLY SHOULD HAVE THE SAME KIND
2 OF OUTREACH. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT RIVERSIDE AND
3 OTHER FACILITIES THERE.

4 DR. PRECIADO: MY OTHER POINT IS THAT I
5 UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF A MAJOR CENTER, BIOMEDICAL
6 RESEARCH. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT THE CENTRAL
7 VALLEY PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT AND KNOW THAT WE HAVE
8 DISCUSSED THIS DURING THE SITE MEETINGS, AND THAT WE
9 ARE COGNIZANT OF THAT. IT'S JUST A COMMUNICATION THAT
10 NEEDS TO OCCUR.

11 DR. POMEROY: BOB, THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY.
12 I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THIS SAME ISSUE, IF I COULD, AND
13 ACTUALLY A COUPLE OF OTHERS IN HERE.

14 FIRST OF ALL, MY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION,
15 WHICH I HAVE ALREADY SENT IN TO DR. PENHOET, WAS THAT I
16 THINK THAT THE WORDING WOULD BE MUCH BETTER TO JUST SAY
17 SEEKS OFFICE SPACE CLOSE TO A MAJOR CENTER OF
18 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, PERIOD, AND DOESN'T PREDETERMINE
19 WHICH AREA THAT SITE WOULD BE IN, AND THEN GO ON TO
20 OUTLINE THE OTHER CRITERIA. SO THAT WOULD BE MY
21 SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION.

22 I ALSO HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE
23 CRITERIA. AND THERE OBVIOUSLY IS IN MY MIND A NEED FOR
24 SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION WHICH MIGHT BE INCLUDED IN
25 AN RFP RATHER THAN GOING STRAIGHT INTO THE CRITERIA.

1 FOR INSTANCE, WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THIS IS, WHAT TYPE OF
2 SPACE. IT'S UNCLEAR TO ME HOW MUCH IS OFFICE SPACE,
3 HOW MUCH IS CONFERENCE ROOM SPACE. AND WHILE I AGREE
4 THAT WE DON'T WANT TO, YOU KNOW, BOX OURSELVES INTO A
5 CORNER BY HAVING TOO MANY DETAILS, I THINK WE HAVE TO
6 GIVE PEOPLE SOME IDEA SO THAT THEY KNOW WHAT WOULD BE
7 BEST.

8 ONE EXAMPLE, IS THAT 15,000 ASSIGNABLE OR
9 GROSS SQUARE FEET? THAT'S A BIG DIFFERENCE IN TERMS OF
10 THE RFP THAT YOU ARE GOING TO GET. DO YOU WANT
11 CONFERENCE ROOM SPACE ON THE SITE? WHAT KIND OF
12 AUDIOVISUAL? WHAT KIND OF FIBER TO THE BUILDING IS
13 REQUIRED? WHAT KIND OF TELEMEDICINE HOOKUPS? I DO
14 THINK WE NEED SOME MORE DETAIL IN HERE, AGAIN, ALBEIT
15 WITHOUT BOXING OURSELVES INTO A CORNER.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THINK THOSE POINTS
17 ARE VERY WELL TAKEN. I INTENDED SPECIFICALLY, FOR
18 EXAMPLE, TO MYSELF ADD DETAILS RELATED TO THE
19 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNICATIONS CAPACITY OF
20 THE SPACE. BECAUSE, AS YOU REFERENCE IN YOUR COMMENTS,
21 WE NEED VERY HIGH SPEED COMMUNICATION HOOKUPS IN THE
22 SPACE. AND IT IS HIGHLY PERTINENT WHETHER THE SPACE IS
23 IN A READY-TO-GO CONDITION OR WHETHER THE SPACE NEEDS
24 TO HAVE A RETROFIT FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES.

25 THE ISSUE HERE IS THAT WE CAN CERTAINLY LAYER

1 IN SOME ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL DIMENSIONS. WE CAN PUT IN
2 SOME RATIOS OF CONFERENCE ROOM. THE 15,000 FEET IS
3 USABLE AS VERSUS GROSS. BUT I WOULD SUGGEST THAT IT
4 WOULD BE APPROPRIATE AFTER THIS MEETING TO DELEGATE THE
5 OBLIGATION TO LAYER IN THE MORE TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS
6 ON POWER, COMMUNICATIONS, AND THINGS OF THAT KIND, AND
7 THE RATIOS OF PRIVATE OFFICE SPACE TO OPEN OFFICE SPACE
8 RATHER THAN TRYING TO DEAL WITH IT IN THE COMMITTEE
9 ITSELF. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

10 DR. POMEROY: I'M VERY FINE WITH THAT AS LONG
11 AS WE CAN SEE IT BEFORE WE OFFICIALLY APPROVE IT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

13 DR. PRECIADO: BOB, MY CONCERN WITH
14 DELEGATING IT RIGHT NOW IS WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE THE
15 STAFF THAT CAN MOVE FORWARD WITH THAT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, THE STATE GENERAL
17 SERVICES ADMINISTRATION IS HELPING US ON THE SEARCH FOR
18 INTERIM SPACE. THEY HAVE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS THAT
19 THEY'VE BEEN WILLING TO LEND TO US SO THAT WE COULD GO
20 TO THOSE EXPERTS TO GET VERY SPECIFIC TECHNICAL ADVICE
21 OF THAT KIND.

22 OKAY. ARE THERE ADDITIONAL BOARD MEMBERS WHO
23 HAVE COMMENTS? I DON'T THINK WE'VE HEARD FROM THE SALK
24 SITE YET. DR. REED, CAN YOU HEAR US?

25 DR. REED: YES, WE CAN HEAR YOU.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS FROM
2 YOUR MEMBERS BEFORE WE GO TO PUBLIC COMMENT?

3 DR. MURPHY: BOB, CAN YOU HEAR US?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, WE CAN HEAR YOU NOW.

5 DR. MURPHY: WE CAN HEAR THE FOLKS IN L.A.
6 VERY WELL, BUT WE'RE HAVING TROUBLE PICKING YOU UP. I
7 DON'T KNOW IF YOU NEED TO BE CLOSER TO THE PHONE OR
8 IT'S A BAD CONNECTION.

9 MY OWN VIEW OF THE DISCUSSION, I THINK ALL OF
10 THESE POINTS ARE RELEVANT. I GUESS THE ONLY OTHER
11 QUESTION I WOULD HAVE IS GIVEN THAT WE ARE IN A BIG
12 STATE AND THERE ARE GOING TO BE A NUMBER OF FUNCTIONS
13 THAT THE INSTITUTE WILL CARRY OUT, HAS THERE BEEN ANY
14 DISCUSSION OF HAVING A MAIN OFFICE AND THEN A SATELLITE
15 OFFICE THAT COULD BE CLOSER TO THE SCENE OF ACTION IN
16 ONE PART OF THE STATE OR THE OTHER SO THAT THERE WOULD
17 BE SOME EFFICIENCY IN HAVING CERTAIN STAFF CLOSER TO
18 THE ACTION THAN THEY MIGHT BE IF THERE WERE ONLY ONE
19 CENTRAL OFFICE? HAS THAT BEEN CONSIDERED, OR IS THAT
20 SOMETHING WE MIGHT CONSIDER DOWN THE ROAD?

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S CERTAINLY SOMETHING WE
22 COULD CONSIDER DOWN THE ROAD. THE INTENT WAS TO TRY
23 AND AT LEAST GET A PRIMARY OFFICE SO THAT THE STAFF
24 COULD BECOME FUNCTIONAL AT THAT SITE. AND THERE'S
25 CERTAINLY A NUMBER OF REASONS WHY A SATELLITE OFFICE

1 MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE, BUT AT THIS POINT THE INTENT WAS
2 TO FOCUS ON GETTING THE PRIMARY FACILITY TO REALLY
3 ALLOW THE OPTIMIZATION OF THE STAFF EFFORTS AT A SITE
4 WHERE THEY COULD WORK OUT OF.

5 DR. MURPHY: I GUESS THE OTHER POINT I MIGHT
6 MAKE IS I THOUGHT ABOUT WHERE THE PEER REVIEW WILL BE
7 CARRIED OUT WAS A VERY GOOD ONE AS WELL. ONE WAY, I
8 THINK, TO KEEP THE PUBLIC EDUCATED ON THE PROCESS THAT
9 THE INSTITUTE WOULD BE GOING THROUGH WOULD BE TO MOVE
10 THE SITES OF PEER REVIEW PERIODICALLY. BECAUSE WHEN A
11 PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE IS MEETING, IT WOULD BE OF
12 INTEREST, I THINK, TO THE PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF
13 COUNTRY -- PARTS OF THE STATE TO KNOW THAT THE PROCESS
14 IS ONGOING, THAT IT IS HAPPENING LOCALLY, AND IT GIVES
15 US AN OPPORTUNITY TO KEEP THE PUBLIC ENGAGED AND
16 INFORMED AND EDUCATED ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE
17 INSTITUTE. THAT MIGHT BE PREFERABLE TO HAVING IT ONLY
18 HAPPEN AT ONE POINT ALL THE TIME.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
20 POINT. AND WE REALLY NEED TO TAKE THAT TO THE
21 SUBCOMMITTEE THAT IS DEALING WITH GRANTS NOMINEES AND
22 CANDIDATES AS WELL AS POLICY, BUT THERE'S VERY
23 COMPELLING LOGIC FOR THAT, AND IT WOULD HELP ACHIEVE
24 SOME OF THE GOAL DR. PRECIADO WAS REFERENCING.

25 OKAY. I THINK WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE MEMBER

1 COMMENTS AT THE DIFFERENT SITES. IF THERE ARE NO MORE
2 MEMBER COMMENTS FOR THE MOMENT, I'D LIKE TO ASK FOR
3 PUBLIC COMMENT, STARTING IN SAN FRANCISCO. IS THERE
4 PUBLIC COMMENT IN SAN FRANCISCO?

5 DR. POSNER: PHIL POSNER, OAK RIDGE
6 ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES. AND YOU ALREADY MENTIONED THE
7 NEED FOR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES. AND I THINK YOU
8 MIGHT WANT TO EXPAND THAT TO SECURE INTERNET FACILITIES
9 BECAUSE ONE OF THE GRANT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED, THEY MAY
10 BE SUBMITTED ON-LINE TO THAT AREA, AND BECAUSE THERE
11 ARE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ISSUES, YOU DEFINITELY WANT
12 TO HAVE A SECURE INTERNET FOCUS. AND IF THE REVIEWS
13 ARE GOING TO TAKE PLACE THERE, YOU WANT HARD WIRED
14 CAPABILITY FOR CONFERENCE ROOMS SO THE REVIEWS CAN BE
15 DONE ON COMPUTERS THE WAY THEY'RE DONE AT NSF OR OAK
16 RIDGE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ARE THERE OTHER
18 PUBLIC COMMENTS IN SAN FRANCISCO?

19 MR. BLOUT: JESSE BLOUT WITH THE MAYOR'S
20 OFFICE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JUST A SECOND. IN SAN
22 FRANCISCO THERE WILL BE A SLIGHT PAUSE BECAUSE WE'LL
23 BRING THE SPEAKERS UP TO THE SPEAKER PHONE AS THEY HAVE
24 THEIR TURN.

25 MR. BLOUT: THIS IS JESSE BLOUT WITH THE SAN

1 FRANCISCO MAYOR'S OFFICE. JUST ONE MORE CLARIFICATION.
2 THE RFP SPEAKS TO THE NEED FOR FIVE PARKING SPACES PER
3 1,000 SQUARE FEET OR SUFFICIENT ALTERNATIVE PARKING
4 FACILITIES, WITH THE POTENTIAL FOR THOSE PARKING
5 REQUIREMENTS TO BE REDUCED BASED ON PUBLIC
6 TRANSPORTATION ACCESS. BUT WE WOULD LIKE CLARIFICATION
7 JUST ON THE FIVE PER THOUSAND, THE BREAKDOWN BETWEEN
8 SPACES FOR PERMANENT EMPLOYEES VERSUS VISITORS, AND
9 ROUGHLY HOW THAT BREAKS DOWN. IF THERE'S A POSSIBILITY
10 TO CLARIFY THAT.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S SOMETHING WE'LL TAKE
12 TO THE ON-SITE TECHNICAL ADVISORS IF THAT IS ADOPTED AS
13 PART OF THIS PROCESS.

14 ANY OTHER SAN FRANCISCO REQUESTS? COULD WE
15 DO THIS. IF YOU CAN MOVE A LITTLE BIT THAT WAY, I WANT
16 TO MAKE SURE -- LET'S MOVE FURTHER IN SO THAT EVERYONE
17 IN SAN FRANCISCO.

18 OKAY. NOW, AGAIN, ARE THERE ANY OTHER PUBLIC
19 COMMENTS FROM SAN FRANCISCO? SEEING NO OTHER PUBLIC
20 COMMENTS FROM SAN FRANCISCO, I WOULD TO LIKE TO GO
21 UCLA. ANY COMMENTS AT UCLA?

22 MS. KING: YES, WE DO. WE HAVE MARC
23 STRASSMAN HERE.

24 MR. STRASSMAN: CAN YOU HEAR ME?

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

1 MR. STRASSMAN: I'D LIKE TO THANK MR. KLEIN
2 AND THE REST OF THE PANEL FOR LISTENING TODAY TO THIS.
3 I'D LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT INSTEAD OF PUTTING THE CIRM IN
4 ONLY ONE OF THE FOUR HIGHLY QUALIFIED PLACES THAT YOU
5 ARE CONSIDERING, THAT YOU PUT IT EVERYWHERE IN
6 CALIFORNIA, BY ALLOWING THE PRESIDENT AND THE 50 STAFF
7 MEMBERS WHO WILL BE WORKING THERE TO TELECOMMUTE TO A
8 CYBERSPACE VIRTUAL CIRM. THIS WILL, AT THE LEAST,
9 ALLOW TO YOU TO AVOID THE INEVITABLE DISAPPOINTMENT AND
10 HUMILIATION OF THREE OF THE FOUR PROPOSED SITES. IT
11 WILL MEAN THAT THE CIRM'S WORK OF SEARCHING FOR CURES
12 CAN BEGIN MUCH SOONER.

13 IT WILL SAVE THE CIRM AND THE ICOC THE COST
14 OF RENT OR BUILDING A NEW BUILDING OR BEING BEHOLDEN TO
15 WHOMEVER CONVINCES YOU TO ACCEPT THEIR GIFT OF FREE
16 SPACE. IT WILL ALLOW THE CIRM TO DO ITS BUSINESS USING
17 THE BEST TOOLS AND BEST PRACTICES THAT MODERN
18 TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT SCIENCE CAN PROVIDE. IT WILL
19 SAVE CIRM EMPLOYEES THE INDIGNITY, WASTED TIME, AND
20 FRUSTRATION OF BEING STUCK ON THE FREEWAYS OF THE
21 GRIDLOCKED URBAN AREAS WHERE YOU MIGHT CHOOSE OTHERWISE
22 TO PUT A PHYSICAL CIRM.

23 PUTTING THE CIRM INTO CYBERSPACE WILL LAY THE
24 GROUNDWORK FOR BUILDING THE CALIFORNIA BIOGRID THAT
25 WILL ALLOW EVERY ORGANIZATION GETTING A CIRM GRANT TO

1 TAP INTO MASSIVE AGGREGATIONS OF COMPUTE CYCLES
2 COLLECTED FROM SUPERCOMPUTING CENTERS IN SAN DIEGO,
3 UNDERUTILIZED NETWORK SYSTEMS IN THE SILICON VALLEY,
4 STATE GOVERNMENT COMPUTERS, AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF
5 MILLIONS OF CALIFORNIANS WILLING TO LET THEIR PC'S
6 UNRAVEL THE MYSTERIES OF PROTEIN FOLDING WHILE THEY
7 SLEEP.

8 CREATING A CYBER CIRM AND A CALIFORNIA
9 BIOGRID WOULD CATALYZE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIELD OF
10 COMPUTATIONAL BIOLOGY, FACILITATE THE GENOMIC
11 SEQUENCING OF EVERY CALIFORNIAN, MAKE MORE LIKELY AND
12 EASIER THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BROADBAND CALIFORNIA IN
13 WHICH EVERY INSTITUTION AND EVERY INDIVIDUAL HAS ACCESS
14 TO LIBERATING AMOUNTS OF COMPUTING POWER AND EMPOWERING
15 TORRENTS OF INTELLIGIBLE INFORMATION.

16 THIS SCENARIO WOULD ALSO GENERATE THE MEANS
17 TO EXPAND E GOVERNMENT, UPGRADE EVERY ASPECT OF PUBLIC
18 AND PRIVATE EDUCATION TO UNDREAMED LEVELS OF EFFICIENCY
19 AND SCOPE, PROVIDE INSTANTANEOUS MULTIMEDIA
20 COMMUNICATIONS FOR EVERY CALIFORNIAN, ENABLE SMART
21 INITIATIVES AND REMOTE INTERNET VOTING FOR REAL
22 DEMOCRACY, AND OFFER MORE ENTERTAINMENT OPTIONS THAN
23 COULD HAVE BEEN CONCEIVED EVEN IN THE MOST RECENT PAST
24 IN THE FEVERED IMAGINATION OF THE MOST FERVENT
25 HOLLYWOOD STUDIO EXECUTIVE.

1 BUILDING A CYBER CIRM AND A CALIFORNIA
2 BIOGRID WOULD GIVE CALIFORNIA'S HARD TECH SECTOR --

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD YOU LIMIT YOUR
4 COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES?

5 MS. KING: JUST ABOUT DONE.

6 MR. STRASSMAN: JUST ABOUT DONE. THIS IS ALL
7 ON MY WEBSITE. JUST ASK FOR CIRM AT GOOGLE NEWS.

8 TO KEEP CALIFORNIA IN FRONT OF THE PACK, TO
9 SPEED THE FINDING OF CURES, TO SAVE MONEY, TO ENHANCE
10 THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF CIRM EMPLOYEES, TO LAY THE
11 GROUNDWORK FOR A CYBER CALIFORNIA THAT CAN LEAD THE
12 WORLD, NOT JUST IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, BUT IN ECONOMIC
13 DEVELOPMENT, DEMOCRACY, AND STILL UNIMAGINED FORMS OF
14 SELF AND COLLECTIVE EXPRESSION, I URGE YOU TO PUT THE
15 CIRM EVERYWHERE IN CALIFORNIA BY PUTTING IT IN
16 CYBERSPACE. THANK YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, I THANK YOU. IT WAS A
18 VERY ELOQUENT STATEMENT. AND IF WE CAN IMAGINE ALL THE
19 POSSIBILITIES YOU'VE RAISED, I WOULD HOPE THAT WHEREVER
20 IT'S LOCATED THE CALIFORNIA BIOGRID CAN BE CREATED
21 REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE LOCATION IS OF THIS INSTITUTE.

22 BUT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW ARE THERE ADDITIONAL
23 PUBLIC COMMENTS AT UCLA?

24 MS. KING: NOT AT THIS TIME.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND ARE THERE

1 PUBLIC COMMENTS AT UC DAVIS?

2 DR. POMEROY: YES. THE FIRST SPEAKER IS
3 ROBERT BURRIS FROM FACTO.

4 MR. BURRIS: HELLO. I'M ROBERT BURRIS WITH
5 THE FRESNO AREA COMMERCE AND TRADE ORGANIZATION. AND
6 IN THE SPIRIT OF SOME OF THE COMMENTS MADE BY THE PANEL
7 A LITTLE BIT EARLIER, WE'D LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT THE
8 SACRAMENTO REGION BE CONSIDERED FOR A LOCATION FOR THIS
9 HEADQUARTER FACILITIES BASICALLY FOR FOUR REASONS THAT
10 WE THINK ARE GOING TO BE SIGNIFICANT FACTORS IN THE
11 SITE SELECTION PROCESS.

12 FIRST OF ALL IS THAT SACRAMENTO PROVIDES A
13 VERY EFFICIENT ACCESS TO THE ENTIRE STATE. SACRAMENTO
14 INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IS LOCATED ROUGHLY NINE MILES
15 FROM THE DOWNTOWN AREA, 10 TO 15 MINUTES ACTUAL DRIVING
16 TIME, AND SACRAMENTO IS ALSO WITHIN ROUGHLY 130 MILES
17 OF THE BAY AREA. SACRAMENTO IS ALSO ONE OF THE FASTEST
18 GROWING AREAS IN THE STATE AND IS QUICKLY EMERGING AS
19 ANOTHER CENTER FOR TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION AND
20 DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA. IN TERMS OF LIFE SCIENCES,
21 UC DAVIS AND UC DAVIS MEDICAL SYSTEMS ARE AT THE CORE
22 OF THAT GROWING SECTOR, HAVING BEEN CLEARLY DEFINED AS
23 WORLD CLASS INSTITUTIONS.

24 I'D ALSO LIKE TO MENTION THAT, AS MENTIONED
25 IN THE DRAFT RFP, THE FACILITY MUST BE COMPETITIVELY

1 PRICED, INCLUDING RENT AND OPERATING COST CONCESSIONS.
2 IT'S REASONABLY CLEAR THAT THE SACRAMENTO REGION WOULD
3 BE THE LEAST POSSIBLY FEASIBLE COMPARED TO THE MARKETS
4 INITIALLY BEING CONSIDERED. BASED ON FOURTH QUARTER
5 AVERAGE OFFICE MARKET LEASE RATES PROVIDED BY CB
6 RICHARD ELLIS, SACRAMENTO IS ROUGHLY 17 PERCENT LESS IN
7 THE LEASE RATE THAN SAN DIEGO, 19 PERCENT LESS THAN THE
8 SILICON VALLEY, AND 21 PERCENT LESS THAN THE SAN
9 FRANCISCO AREA. AND IF YOU CONSIDER THE 25- TO 30-CENT
10 RATE SAVINGS PER MONTH PER FOOT OVER THE TEN-YEAR
11 PERIOD, YOU'RE TALKING HALF A MILLION DOLLARS IN COST
12 SAVINGS.

13 AND FINALLY, AS A NEWLY FORMED PUBLIC ENTITY,
14 INTERACTION WITH A VARIETY OF STATE AGENCIES AND
15 ELECTED DECISION MAKERS WILL BE NECESSARY. THERE ARE
16 MANY SITES IN THE SACRAMENTO REGION THAT WILL ENABLE
17 THE INSTITUTE TO MAINTAIN A SEPARATE LOCATION AND AN
18 INDEPENDENT IDENTITY WHILE STILL ALLOWING THE NECESSARY
19 INTERACTION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT. SACRAMENTO WOULD
20 ALSO ALLOW A DEGREE AT MINIMUM PERCEIVED INDUSTRY AND
21 GEOGRAPHIC NEUTRALITY.

22 I WOULD LIKE TO ADD THAT THE POTENTIAL
23 SAVINGS FROM A LOCATION IN SACRAMENTO MIGHT ALSO ALLOW
24 FIELD OFFICES IN AREAS OF HIGHER AMOUNT OF BIOTECH
25 RESEARCH ACTIVITY SUCH AS THE BAY AREA AND SAN DIEGO.

1 AND WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO
2 MAKE MY COMMENTS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. DO WE
4 HAVE AN ADDITIONAL SPEAKER AT DAVIS?

5 DR. POMEROY: YES, WE DO. TOM ZEIDNER FROM
6 THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO.

7 MR. ZEIDNER: GOOD MORNING. I'M TOM ZEIDNER
8 WITH THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
9 DEPARTMENT. HAVING SEEN THE RFP AND NOTICING THAT
10 THERE APPEAR TO BE THREE REGIONAL AREAS THAT ARE
11 MENTIONED AS PREFERENCES, AND ECHO SOME OF THE COMMENTS
12 THAT HAVE BEEN MADE EARLIER, DO HOPE THAT THE COMMITTEE
13 WILL OPEN THE PROCESS UP STATEWIDE.

14 TOWARDS THAT END, THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO, IN
15 PARTNERSHIP WITH A LOCAL DEVELOPER, IS PREPARED TO
16 OFFER THE INSTITUTE A VERY ATTRACTIVE PACKAGE WITHIN
17 OUR CITY. IT HAS A PRO BONO RENT COMPONENT TO IT. AND
18 I THINK THE COMMITTEE WOULD CERTAINLY BE WELL SERVED TO
19 BE ABLE TO CONSIDER OUR PROPOSAL. THERE'S SOME FURTHER
20 DETAILS ABOUT OUR PROPOSAL AND LIKE INFORMATION IN A
21 LETTER FROM OUR CITY MANAGER THAT'S GOING OUT TO
22 MR. KLEIN TODAY. I APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO
23 COMMENT.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANY
25 OTHER PRESENTATIONS FROM UC DAVIS?

1 DR. POMEROY: I THINK THAT SUMS UP FROM UC
2 DAVIS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND FROM THE SALK, DR.
4 MURPHY OR DR. REED, ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS THERE?

5 DR. MURPHY: WE HAVE ONE SPEAKER, ANDREA
6 MOSER.

7 MS. MOSER: THIS IS ANDREA MOSER. I'M WITH
8 THE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
9 CORPORATION, AND I REALLY DIDN'T COME PREPARED TO LAY
10 MY CARDS ON THE TABLE, BUT WE ARE WORKING ON WHAT WE
11 THINK WILL BE A COMPREHENSIVE AND COMPETITIVE PROPOSAL
12 TO SITE THE INSTITUTE IN SAN DIEGO. AND I THINK WE ARE
13 WELL AWARE, AS YOU ARE, OF THE ADVANTAGES TO BEING
14 SITED IN SUCH AN INCREDIBLE CENTER FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY
15 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT. THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WELL,
17 I'D LIKE TO SAY ON BEHALF OF THE COMMITTEE THAT IT IS
18 GREAT TO BE WANTED. IT IS TREMENDOUSLY ENCOURAGING AND
19 VALIDATING THAT THE CITIES IN THIS STATE SEE THIS AS A
20 BOOST TO THEIR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TO ATTRACT THIS
21 HEADQUARTERS. AND WE TREMENDOUSLY APPRECIATE THE
22 CITIES WORKING WITH THEIR LOCAL DEVELOPERS TO PROVIDE
23 THE MOST HIGHLY INCENTIVIZED PACKAGE OF PROGRAM OPTIONS
24 TO THE INSTITUTE IN RESPONSE TO THIS RFP.

25 WE HAVE NOW GONE THROUGH BOTH BOARD AND

1 PUBLIC COMMENTS.

2 DR. FRIEDMAN: IT'S SHERRY AND MIKE A
3 CAPPELLA IN LOS ANGELES. WE JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE
4 THAT THE SENTIMENT OF BROADENING THE GEOGRAPHIC
5 RESTRICTIONS IS LIFTED FROM THE RFP. I THINK WE'VE
6 HEARD A LOT OF REASONS WHY YOU MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER A
7 LARGER NUMBER OF PLACES. THERE ARE ATTRACTIONS AT MANY
8 DIFFERENT SITES. WE JUST HEARD ABOUT ONE PRO BONO ONE.
9 I THINK IT MIGHT BE BETTER FROM A PUBLIC PERSPECTIVE TO
10 SIMPLY BE VAGUE AND NOT SPECIFY THAT IT HAS TO ONLY BE
11 THREE SITES AND LET THE BEST APPLICATIONS COME IN AND
12 THEN JUDGE THEM.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S A VERY APPROPRIATE
14 COMMENT. I WAS GOING TO ASK FOR THE BOARD MEMBERS, IF
15 WE COULD TRY AND DRAW OUT THE POINTS OF THE CONSENSUS
16 FROM THIS DISCUSSION. AND THAT SEEMS TO BE ONE OF
17 THEM.

18 ON THAT POINT, BEFORE WE GO TO ADDITIONAL
19 POINTS, ARE THERE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS THAT WOULD LIKE
20 TO REINFORCE OR OTHERWISE DIFFERENTIATE THEIR VIEWS
21 FROM THAT POINT JUST VOICED FROM UCLA?

22 MS. LANSING: I WANT TO REINFORCE IT. THIS
23 IS SHERRY AS WELL.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PRECIADO IS
25 SUPPORTIVE OF THAT POSITION AS WELL.

1 IN TERMS OF THE POINT THAT WAS RAISED EARLIER
2 ON PROVIDING MORE TECHNICAL GUIDANCE TO THE CHARACTER
3 OF THE STATE, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF THERE'S BOARD
4 MEMBERS WHO WOULD SUPPORT A DELEGATION TO THE CHAIR AND
5 VICE CHAIR TO WORK WITH THE TECHNICAL STAFF THAT IS
6 AVAILABLE THROUGH THE STATE GOVERNMENT ON IDENTIFYING
7 THE TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS WE'D LIKE TO LAYER INTO
8 THIS. IT PROVIDES THOSE PEOPLE MAKING PROPOSALS
9 PERHAPS A MORE ACUTELY FOCUSED IDEA OF THE NATURE OF
10 THE SPACE.

11 DR. POMEROY: THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY FROM
12 DAVIS. AGAIN, I WOULD BE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF GETTING
13 THAT EXPERTISE, BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT THE
14 RESULT COME BACK TO THIS SUBCOMMITTEE FOR REVIEW BEFORE
15 WE MAKE A FINAL APPROVAL.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. CLAIRE, LET ME
17 ASK THIS QUESTION. THIS ITEM IS AGENDIZED FOR THE
18 FEBRUARY 3D BOARD, AND IT IS AGENDIZED FOR
19 CONSIDERATION AND A REPORT. IF WE WERE TO MAKE A
20 REPORT AND PROVIDE THE TECHNICAL INFORMATION AT THAT
21 MEETING AND HAVE THAT REVIEWED BY THE BOARD AS A WHOLE,
22 IS THAT AN APPROPRIATE REVIEW?

23 DR. POMEROY: IT SEEMS LIKE THE TIMETABLE IS
24 GETTING VERY TIGHT HERE FOR ME, SO WE WOULD GET THESE
25 MATERIALS TO REVIEW WHEN?

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, WE WOULD GET THESE
2 MATERIALS TO REVIEW SEVERAL DAYS BEFORE THE FEBRUARY 3D
3 BOARD MEETING. AND THEN THERE WOULD BE A DISCUSSION AT
4 THE BOARD MEETING. IT'S ALREADY AN AGENDIZED ITEM ON
5 THE BOARD MEETING.

6 DR. POMEROY: SO I THINK IF WE COULD GET
7 THESE AT LEAST THREE OR FOUR DAYS IN ADVANCE SO THAT WE
8 COULD TALK TO OUR TECHNICAL PEOPLE, YOU KNOW, I HAVE
9 PEOPLE THAT I TRUST TO HELP ADVISE ME ON THESE TYPES OF
10 THINGS, THEN I WOULD BE COMFORTABLE WITH THE PROPOSAL
11 TO DISCUSS IT AT THE LARGER BOARD MEETING. BUT I
12 REALLY WOULD LIKE TO GET IT IN ADVANCE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I THINK THAT IF
14 WE WERE TO ADDRESS THAT ITEM ON THE BASIS IF WE CAN
15 PROVIDE IT THREE TO FOUR DAYS IN ADVANCE, IT WILL BE
16 DISCUSSED AT THE BOARD MEETING, THE TECHNICAL
17 PROVISIONS. IF IT CAN'T, IT WILL HAVE TO BE DISCUSSED
18 AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE.

19 DR. PENHOET: IF I UNDERSTAND YOUR INTEREST,
20 CLAIRE -- THIS IS ED PENHOET SPEAKING -- IT WOULD BE
21 DEFINE AS PRECISELY AS POSSIBLE OUR NEEDS FOR THESE
22 VARIOUS AREAS THAT YOU MENTIONED, THE IT
23 INFRASTRUCTURE, NEED FOR SPACE, ETC., THAT ENSURING
24 THAT IN SO DOING, WE DON'T CONSTRAIN THE GEOGRAPHICAL
25 CHOICES THAT WE WOULD ULTIMATELY WANT TO MAKE

1 ASSOCIATED WITH THIS; IS THAT RIGHT? IS THAT YOUR
2 DESIRE, CLAIRE?

3 DR. POMEROY: I'M SORRY. EXACTLY.

4 DR. PENHOET: OKAY.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. IN TERMS OF THE
6 OTHER PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT FORWARD
7 HERE, DR. REED MADE THE POINT THAT WE WANT TO BE CLEAR
8 ABOUT THE FACT THAT NONE OF THESE ITEMS ARE
9 DETERMINATIVE INDIVIDUALLY, THAT THE COMMITTEE WILL
10 HAVE THE OPTION OF LOOKING AT THE ENTIRE PACKAGE ON ANY
11 SITE AND INDIVIDUALLY WEIGHTING THE ITEMS FOR
12 CONSIDERATION TO DECIDE WHAT IS THE OPTIMAL PACKAGE.

13 AT THE SAME TIME IT'S BEEN REFERENCED THAT
14 THERE ARE OTHER COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS, SUCH AS THE
15 PROXIMITY OF LODGING, THAT COULD FACILITATE IT.
16 OBVIOUSLY THE PROXIMITY OF CONFERENCE SPACE COULD ALSO
17 FACILITATE THE INSTITUTE'S ACTIVITIES. BUT I WOULD DO,
18 UNLESS WE HAVE OTHER BOARD POSITIONS ON THIS, AND I'D
19 LIKE THE BOARD GENERALLY TO DISCUSS THIS POINT, IS BE
20 ABLE TO LIST LODGING, CONFERENCE FACILITIES, AND ANY
21 OTHER ITEMS BOARD MEMBERS MIGHT SUBMIT AS POTENTIAL
22 CONSIDERATIONS IN THE OVERALL PACKAGE WITH THIS VERY
23 CLEAR STATEMENT BEING ADDED, THAT THE COMMITTEE RETAINS
24 THE DISCRETION TO EVALUATE THE ENTIRE PACKAGE AND NO
25 SINGLE ITEMS OR GROUP OF ITEMS WOULD BE DETERMINATIVE.

1 DR. PENHOET: THIS IS ED PENHOET. IF I
2 MIGHT, BOB, I THINK WHAT WE'VE ENDED UP WITH IS SOME
3 ITEMS WHICH ARE REQUIRED.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT.

5 DR. PENHOET: WE NEED A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF
6 SPACE. WE NEED ACCESS TO IT INFRASTRUCTURE, ETC. WE
7 HAVE ANOTHER SET OF ITEMS WHICH WILL ULTIMATELY BE
8 PREFERABLE. PROPOSALS WHICH ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING
9 THINGS WILL RECEIVE, IN A SENSE, A PREFERENCE AS A
10 RESULT OF ADDRESSING THESE OTHER ISSUES, BUT THEY'RE
11 NOT ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENTS. SO IN SOME SENSE, WE'VE GOT
12 SOME ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENTS AND SOME THINGS WHICH ARE
13 PREFERRED, BUT NOT NECESSARILY DETERMINATIVE IN THE
14 SAME SENSE REQUIREMENTS WOULD BE. AND MAYBE IF WE
15 COULD CLARIFY THAT WE HAVE THOSE TWO CATEGORIES HERE,
16 WE COULD ARTICULATE THEM IN THAT WAY.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO, YOU HAVE A
18 COMMENT?

19 DR. PRECIADO: I'M JUST LOOKING AT THE DRAFT,
20 AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT NO. 2, THAT'S A GIVEN. THAT'S
21 A REQUIREMENT. WE CANNOT MOVE WITH THAT ONE.

22 THE OTHER ARE REAL APPROXIMATE. THEY'RE NOT
23 EXACTLY. I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN SAY EXACTLY 15,000
24 USABLE SQUARE FEET. SO THE ADA IS A REQUIREMENT, AND
25 THAT SHOULD BE ACTUALLY IN THE MAIN -- I WOULD CONSIDER

1 IT TO BE IN THE MAIN PARAGRAPH WHERE WE'RE LOOKING AT
2 SEEKS OFFICE SPACE TO HOUSE STAFF, CLOSE TO MAJOR
3 CENTER OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, THAT COMPRISES ADA.
4 THAT IS JUST A REALLY SOLID REQUIREMENT THAT WE WANT TO
5 PUT FORTH.

6 THE OTHERS, I DON'T KNOW IF WE WANT TO DIVIDE
7 THEM SO STRINGENTLY. I DON'T KNOW IF I CAN SEE THAT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S A VERY
9 APPROPRIATE COMMENT. FOR EXAMPLE, IT MAY BE THAT WE
10 ARE DISQUALIFYING CERTAIN FIRST CLASS FACILITIES BY
11 REQUIRING IT BE HELD OPEN FOR 75 DAYS. THAT'S A
12 CONSERVATIVE TIMETABLE. DO WE WANT TO, FOR EXAMPLE,
13 SHOW THAT IN THAT SPECIFIC ITEM THAT IT IS OUR DESIRE
14 TO HAVE IT BE HELD OPEN FOR 75 DAYS. IF THAT IS NOT
15 POSSIBLE, THEY'RE TO STATE THE MAXIMUM TIME LIMIT THEY
16 CAN HOLD IT OPEN. AND THEN THE BOARD HAS THE OPTION TO
17 CONSIDER WHETHER THAT WILL MEET OUR REQUIREMENTS OR
18 NOT.

19 MS. LANSING: BOB, THIS IS SHERRY FROM UCLA.
20 I THINK THAT YOU HAD THIS WONDERFUL ITEM 8 OR WHATEVER,
21 SAYING THAT, PERHAPS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF NO. 2, THAT
22 THESE ITEMS WOULD BE WEIGHTED, AND WE'RE NOT SAYING
23 THAT ALL OF THEM HAVE TO BE ACHIEVED, BUT, YOU KNOW,
24 THAT THESE ARE RECOMMENDED POSSIBILITIES. SO THEN THAT
25 WOULD TAKE CARE OF THE FACT THAT IF YOU FOUND SOMETHING

1 THAT COULDN'T BE HELD OPEN FOR 75 DAYS, YOU COULD STILL
2 GO WITH IT. DO YOU KNOW?

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THINK THAT'S VERY
4 APPROPRIATE. AND I'D LIKE TO COMMENT THAT DR. PRECIADO
5 POINTED OUT THE COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH
6 DISABILITIES ACT IS AN EXAMPLE OF LEGAL REQUIREMENTS
7 THAT ARE NONNEGOTIABLE, PART OF STATE LAW. AND I'VE
8 ASKED OUR GENERAL COUNSEL TO RESEARCH AND INDICATE
9 WHETHER THERE'S ANY OTHER STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS THAT
10 NEED TO BE ADOPTED AND AMENDED INTO THIS AS SPECIFIC
11 REQUIREMENTS. THOSE, OF COURSE, WOULD BECOME
12 APPENDICES TO THIS, BUT BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE
13 PROPOSED RFP.

14 BUT WE HAVE HAD A GOOD GENERAL DISCUSSION
15 HERE. IN THIS DISCUSSION, THE ONE THING THAT WE
16 HAVEN'T TOUCHED ON FULLY IS THIS ISSUE OF TIMING AND
17 PROCESS. THE RFP HAS SEVERAL CRITICAL QUESTIONS IN
18 TERMS OF TIMING. ONE IS WHAT'S OUR GOAL IN TERMS OF
19 ACTUALLY ISSUING THE RFP? THEN HOW MANY DAYS AFTER WE
20 ISSUE THE RFP DO WE EXPECT RESPONSES? WE WOULD THEN
21 SCHEDULE A MEETING AROUND THAT TIMETABLE, AND WE NEED
22 TO GIVE THE PEOPLE AND THE CITIES MAKING PROPOSALS SOME
23 PREDICTABILITY HERE SO THAT THEY WOULD REALLY KNOW THAT
24 THIS IS GOING TO BE A QUICK DECISION BECAUSE THEY CAN'T
25 HOLD HIGH QUALITY SPACE LIKE THIS AVAILABLE FOR LONG

1 PERIODS OF TIME.

2 SO IN THAT CONTEXT, IF WE COULD MOVE TO A
3 DISCUSSION OF TIMETABLE AND THEN POSSIBLY COME BACK TO
4 A CONCLUSIVE MOTION THAT INCORPORATES THESE VARIOUS
5 ACTIONS, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE'VE HAD SUFFICIENT
6 DISCUSSION OF THE ITEMS IN THE RFP OTHER THAN THE
7 TIMETABLE.

8 FOR THIS PROCESS TO GO FORWARD, IF WE CAN
9 MEET THE TECHNICAL TIMETABLE FOR THE EXHIBITS AND HAVE
10 THIS ON A BOARD DISCUSSION ON FEBRUARY 3D, IT WOULD BE
11 POSSIBLE, SUBJECT TO LEGAL COUNSEL'S REVIEW, FOR THE
12 BOARD TO APPROVE THE MODIFIED RFP PUT FORTH BY THE
13 COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY THE 3D, IF THAT'S THE DESIRE OF
14 THIS COMMITTEE. AND THEN WE WOULD NEED TO SPECIFY HOW
15 MANY DAYS AFTER THAT THE RFP WOULD GO OUT AND HOW MANY
16 DAYS IT WOULD TAKE FOR THE RESPONSE.

17 I WOULD SUGGEST, WITH THE BOARD'S ADOPTION,
18 UNLESS THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATIONS, THE RFP
19 COULD GO OUT IN THE FOLLOWING TWO DAYS. WHAT DAY OF
20 THE WEEK IS FEBRUARY 3D? SO THE FOLLOWING TWO BUSINESS
21 DAYS. AND THE PROPOSALS, IT'S CLEAR, THERE'S THE FOCUS
22 OF THE LANDOWNERS, PROPERTY OWNERS, AND THE CITIES THAT
23 IS ALREADY CRYSTALLIZED. I WOULD HOPE THAT THE
24 PROPOSALS COULD BE RETURNED WITHIN TWO WEEKS
25 THEREAFTER.

1 I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IF THERE IS BOARD
2 DISCUSSION ON THAT TIMETABLE AND WHAT THE GENERAL
3 THOUGHTS ARE, AND THEN WE'LL ASK FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION
4 ON THAT TIMETABLE. BOARD DISCUSSION ON THAT TIMETABLE,
5 DR. PRECIADO.

6 DR. PRECIADO: I UNDERSTAND THAT WE NEED TO
7 MOVE QUICKLY. IT JUST SEEMS SHORT TO ME TO HAVE AN RFP
8 GO OUT AND THEN HAVE TWO WEEKS' TURNAROUND TIME. I'M
9 NOT SURE WHAT'S DONE IN THE BUSINESS WORLD. IS THAT
10 COMMON TO HAVE SUCH A SHORT TIME PERIOD?

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YEAH. IT'S QUITE COMMON IN
12 THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY. IF IT WERE TECHNICAL LAB SPACE
13 RATHER THAN OFFICE SPACE, IT WOULD BE A MUCH LONGER
14 PERIOD OF TIME. AND WE'RE ASKING FOR EXISTING SPACE,
15 NOT TO BE BUILT SPACE. BUT I'D LIKE TO HAVE THE SENSE
16 OF THE BALANCE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND WHAT THEIR
17 FEELING IS ABOUT THE ADEQUACY OF TIME.

18 DR. POMEROY: BOB, THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY.
19 YOU KNOW, I THINK YOU MADE A PUBLIC COMMENT AT A
20 PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING ABOUT THIS CONCEPT. AND SO I
21 THINK PEOPLE HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO THINK THIS
22 THROUGH. SO GIVEN THE URGENCY WITH GETTING THIS WHOLE
23 PROCESS GOING, I WOULD BE SUPPORTIVE OF THE TWO-WEEK
24 TURNAROUND TIME.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ARE THERE ANY

1 COMMENTS FROM THE UCLA SITE?

2 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO COMMENTS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM THE SALK
4 SITE?

5 DR. REED: BOB, JOHN REED HERE. I'M AS
6 ANXIOUS AS ANYONE TO GET THIS STARTED, BUT I WAS
7 WONDERING IF A 30-DAY MIGHT JUST MAKE MORE SENSE TO
8 ALLOW, AGAIN, AS MANY ATTRACTIVE PROPOSALS TO BE
9 ORGANIZED AS POSSIBLE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. LET'S SEE. WHEN IS
11 THE MEETING IN APRIL?

12 MS. DU ROSS: IT'S MARCH 1ST. FEBRUARY 1ST,
13 MARCH 1ST.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I'VE BEEN INFORMED
15 THAT THE MEETING IN APRIL IS APRIL 7TH. TO THE EXTENT,
16 JOHN, THAT WE COULD HAVE A COMPROMISE OF SOMETHING LIKE
17 THREE WEEKS, IT WOULD GIVE US THE ABILITY FOR THIS
18 COMMITTEE TO MEET BEFORE THE NEXT BOARD MEETING IN
19 APRIL. SO IF WE WORK WITH A THREE-WEEK TIMETABLE
20 INSTEAD OF TWO WEEKS -- EXCUSE ME. ACTUALLY I MEAN
21 BEFORE THE MARCH 1ST BOARD MEETING. IF WE WENT WITH
22 THE THREE-WEEK TIMETABLE, IT WOULD POTENTIALLY GIVE US
23 THE ABILITY TO THEN HAVE THIS COMMITTEE MEET BEFORE THE
24 NEXT BOARD MEETING, SO THE BOARD WOULD BE IN A
25 POSITION, POTENTIALLY, TO TAKE ACTION.

1 DR. PRECIADO, DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

2 DR. PRECIADO: MAKES SENSE.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. REED, DOES THAT MAKE
4 SENSE?

5 DR. REED: YES. UNDERSTOOD. THAT DOES MAKE
6 SENSE.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WITH THAT
8 GENERAL TIMETABLE LAID OUT, I WOULD LIKE TO TRY AND
9 SUMMARIZE THE VARIOUS POINTS CONCEPTUALLY. ALTHOUGH
10 FOR ACCURACY, I'LL GO TO THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE STAFF
11 TO TRY AND INCORPORATE THE NUANCES OF THE DISCUSSION.

12 DR. MURPHY: I THINK WE NEED PUBLIC COMMENT
13 ON THE TIMETABLE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT I WAS INTENDING TO DO,
15 FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC AND THE MEMBERS, IS TRY
16 AND SUMMARIZE AND THEN GET THE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE
17 OVERALL CRITERIA AND TIMETABLE AND THEN BOARD MEMBER
18 COMMENT ON WHETHER THERE'S AN ACTUAL MOTION THAT WOULD
19 BE MADE TO ACCOMPLISH THAT.

20 LET US BREAK THIS DOWN INTO FOUR BASIC
21 POINTS. POINT ONE IS WE WILL WORK WITH THE STATE
22 OFFICE OF FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION ON TECHNICAL
23 SUPPORT AND OTHER STATE EXPERTS IN ORDER TO PROVIDE
24 TECHNICAL GUIDANCE ON THE FACILITY UNDER QUESTION WITH
25 THE GOAL OF GETTING THAT TO THE MEMBERS THREE TO FOUR

1 DAYS BEFORE THE NEXT BOARD MEETING, SO THEY CAN HAVE
2 CONSIDERATION OF THAT FOR DISCUSSION AT THE BOARD
3 MEETING.

4 NO. 2 IS THAT WE WILL STATE AS AN ADDITIONAL
5 ITEM ON THE CRITERIA LIST VARIOUS OPTIMIZING
6 CONSIDERATIONS SUCH AS LODGING OR CONFERENCE FACILITIES
7 THAT COULD BE BROUGHT UNDER CONSIDERATION WITHOUT
8 LIMITING THAT LIST, HOPEFULLY ALLOWING FOR THE
9 CREATIVITY OF THE CITIES AND THE PROPERTY OWNERS IN
10 EACH JURISDICTION.

11 NO. 3 IS THAT WE WOULD PROVIDE A VERY CLEAR
12 STATEMENT THAT NO ONE ITEM WOULD BE DETERMINATIVE, THAT
13 THERE ARE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS WHICH WOULD BE VIEWED AS
14 UNCONDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP. THE OTHER
15 REQUIREMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE IN
16 TERMS OF THE WHOLE PACKAGE PRESENTED, AND THE COMMITTEE
17 RETAINS THE DISCRETION TO WEIGHT THOSE IN ITS JUDGMENT
18 IN A MANNER THAT PROVIDES THE BEST OUTCOME ON AN
19 OVERALL PACKAGE FOR THE INSTITUTE.

20 NO. 4 WOULD BE THAT THE INTENDED TIMETABLE IS
21 TO ATTEMPT TO CONSIDER THIS AT THE FEBRUARY 3D BOARD
22 MEETING, WITHIN THE FOLLOWING TWO DAYS TO PUT OUT THE
23 AMENDED RFP, WITHIN THREE WEEKS, APPROXIMATELY THREE
24 WEEKS, THEREAFTER TO SCHEDULE A PUBLICLY NOTICED
25 MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSALS.

1 ALL PROPOSALS MUST BE SUBMITTED IN THAT TIME PERIOD.
2 AND THAT RECOMMENDATION FROM OUR COMMITTEE WOULD THEN
3 GO TO THE BOARD, IF TIMING PERMITS, AT THE MARCH
4 MEETING.

5 WITH THOSE FOUR ITEMS BEING UNDER
6 CONSIDERATION, I WOULD ASK THE PUBLIC IF THEY HAVE
7 COMMENTS ON THOSE ITEMS, STARTING WITH SAN FRANCISCO.

8 MR. MOCKYER: I'M JOE MOCKYER (PHONETIC) IN
9 SAN FRANCISCO. QUESTION I HAVE IS UNDER THE TIMETABLE,
10 WHEN WOULD THE 75 DAYS COMMENCE? AFTER THE RFP HAS
11 BEEN APPROVED OR TWO WEEKS? HOW LONG WILL WE HAVE TO
12 HOLD THE SPACE OFF THE MARKET, 75-DAY REQUIREMENT?

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE THE INTENT WAS 75
14 DAYS FROM WHEN YOU SUBMIT IT. SO IF YOU SUBMITTED
15 IMMEDIATELY WHEN THE RFP COMES OUT, IT WOULD BE 75 DAYS
16 FROM THAT DATE.

17 MR. MOCKYER: SECONDLY, IT JUST SORT OF
18 DAWNED ON ME IT'S VERY IMPORTANT FOR A LANDLORD TO KNOW
19 WHEN THE LEASE, IF THAT'S THE DOCUMENT TO BE USED, WHEN
20 THAT WILL COMMENCE AFTER THE RFP IS APPROVED.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT,
22 GIVEN APPROVAL, THERE WILL NEED TO BE A STATEMENT THAT
23 WILL BE MADE BY THE COMMITTEE. BUT AS A GENERAL
24 MATTER, THE BOARD HAS ALREADY STATED IT'S CRITICAL TO
25 GET THE STAFF INTO A FACILITY IMMEDIATELY. SO IT'S MY

1 EXPECTATION THAT IF BOARD MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO VOICE
2 DIFFERENT POSITIONS, THAT IT WOULD BE INTENDED TO
3 COMMENCE IMMEDIATELY.

4 MR. MOCKYER: THANK YOU.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IMMEDIATELY MEANING WITHIN
6 THE NEXT 30 TO 45 DAYS.

7 MS. RILEY: ALLISON RILEY (PHONETIC), SAN
8 JOSE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY. MY QUESTION IS WHETHER
9 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES WILL HAVE THE
10 OPPORTUNITY TO SCHEDULE A MEETING BEFORE ACTUALLY
11 SUBMITTING THE PROPOSAL? IS THAT PART OF THE PROCESS?

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE QUESTION IS LOCAL
13 GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SCHEDULE A
14 MEETING WITH STAFF PRIOR TO THE ACTUAL SUBMISSION OF
15 THEIR RFP'S. MY REACTION WOULD BE THAT IN ORDER TO
16 ACCOMMODATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT, WE CAN SET UP STAFF
17 MEETINGS TO HELP THEM ANSWER QUESTIONS; BUT
18 DETERMINATIVE INFORMATION WILL BE POSTED ON THE SITE.
19 IF THERE IS ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT COMES OUT
20 OF THOSE MEETINGS, IT WILL BE PUT ON THE SITE AS WELL
21 FOR EVERYONE TO LOOK AT.

22 ANY OTHER POINTS FROM SAN FRANCISCO?

23 MR. BLOUT: ONE MORE. JESSE BLOUT, SAN
24 FRANCISCO MAYOR'S OFFICE, POINT OF CLARIFICATION AGAIN
25 ON THE TIME FRAME FOR THE EXECUTION OF THE LONGER-TERM

1 LEASE. THERE MAY BE, FOR INSTANCE, AN OWNER THAT WANTS
2 TO DO ADDITIONAL TENANT IMPROVEMENTS ON THE FACILITY TO
3 MAKE IT THAT MUCH MORE ACCEPTABLE TO THE INSTITUTE.
4 WOULD THERE BE ACCOMMODATION FOR A TIME FRAME FOR
5 TENANT IMPROVEMENTS? I UNDERSTAND THERE IS AN ACTIVE
6 SEARCH FOR INTERIM SPACE THAT WOULD BRIDGE THIS GAP FOR
7 SIX MONTHS. JUST WANTED, IN THE SPIRIT OF TRYING TO
8 FIELD THE BEST PROPOSAL, WANT TO UNDERSTAND A LITTLE
9 BIT MORE ABOUT THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A BUILDOUT OF SPACE,
10 LIMITED BUILDOUT OF SPACE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT, SO
12 THAT THE COMMITTEE IS CONSIDERING TIMING ON AN EQUAL
13 BASIS FOR ALL APPLICANTS, FOR THE OWNER TO CITE THE
14 AMOUNT OF TIMING THAT WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR THOSE
15 TENANT IMPROVEMENTS. THE PROPOSAL OF THE PROPERTY
16 OWNER TO PROVIDE A TENANT IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCE FOR
17 MODIFICATIONS WOULD GENERALLY BE VIEWED AS A VERY
18 POSITIVE ITEM, BUT THE TIME FRAME WOULD NEED TO BE
19 CITED SO THE COMMITTEE COULD TAKE THAT INTO
20 CONSIDERATION.

21 OKAY. ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL POINTS AT THE
22 SAN FRANCISCO SITE? HEARING NONE, ARE THERE ADDITIONAL
23 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC AT UC DAVIS?

24 DR. POMEROY: NONE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ARE THERE ADDITIONAL

1 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AT UCLA?

2 MS. KING: YES, THERE ARE.

3 MR. STRASSMAN: I'D LIKE TO -- THIS IS MARC
4 STRASSMAN AT UCLA. I THINK TWO WEEKS OR THREE WEEKS IS
5 PLENTY OF TIME FOR THE RESPONDENTS TO RESPOND. I THINK
6 MOVING AHEAD AS FAST AS YOU'RE PROPOSING NOW IS TOO
7 FAST. I THINK THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING TO DO IS
8 HAVE THE SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE SIT DOWN WITH ITSELF IN
9 SOME WAY AND DETERMINE BEFOREHAND WHAT THE NEEDS ARE
10 FOR THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE WORKING AT THE CIRM. WHAT
11 THEY NEED IN TERMS OF SPACE FOR THE INDIVIDUAL WORKERS,
12 FOR CONFERENCE SPACE IN SPECIFIC TERMS WITH A
13 PROJECTION ABOUT WHAT THE ACTIVITIES WILL BE AND WHAT
14 THE NEEDS WILL BE FOR CONFERENCES AND INDIVIDUAL SPACES
15 AND LODGING AND SO ON. THOSE CRITERIA SHOULD BE
16 SPECIFICALLY SPECIFIED.

17 THEY SHOULD BE WEIGHTED BEFORE THE
18 PROPOSALS -- RESPONSES COME IN SO THAT YOU CAN SAY
19 WHETHER YOU WANT TO COUNT THE VIEW OR THE WEATHER OR
20 THE PROXIMITY TO X NUMBER OF BIOTECH COMPANIES, AND
21 THAT OUGHT TO BE QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED THAT THE
22 NUMBER OF BIOTECH COMPANIES WITHIN A FIVE-MILE OR
23 TEN-MILE RADIUS IS IMPORTANT TO A CERTAIN EXTENT, THAT
24 THE AMENITIES, THE WEATHER, THE TRAFFIC.

25 THE MEMBERS OF THE SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE

1 SHOULD SPECIFICALLY SPECIFY WHAT THEY NEED IN THIS
2 SPACE BEFORE THE ICOC SETS OUT AN RFP TO ASK PEOPLE TO
3 PROVIDE THOSE SPECIFIC NEEDS. I'D ALSO LIKE TO SEE A
4 SPECIFIC PROVISION IN THE RFP ALLOWING A CYBER CITY,
5 CYBER SPACE ALTERNATIVE TO ANY OF THE SPECIFIC CITIES.
6 THANK YOU.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OTHER COMMENTS FROM UCLA?

8 MS. KING: YES, WE HAVE ONE MORE.

9 MR. HOLTZMAN: DAVID HOLTZMAN. I'M A HEALTH
10 SCIENTIST AND AN ATTORNEY. I HAVE EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE
11 WORKING FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. AND I THINK TO,
12 AS A GOOD GOVERNMENT GUY, I THINK TO SAVE YOU FUTURE
13 FRUSTRATION, IT WOULD BE GOOD IF YOU HAD THE
14 PARTICIPATION IN THESE MEETINGS OF PEOPLE FROM THE
15 DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES. YOU SAY THEY'RE
16 OFFERING PROFESSIONAL STAFF ASSISTANCE. I'M SURPRISED
17 ACTUALLY THAT THERE'S NO DGS PROCUREMENT EXPERT OR
18 PERHAPS AN ATTORNEY SITTING IN ON THIS MEETING TO TELL
19 YOU WHAT THE PROCESS REALLY SHOULD BE.

20 MY SENSE OF WHAT I'M HEARING TODAY, FROM WHAT
21 I'M HEARING TODAY, IS THAT IF YOU DON'T DO THIS RIGHT,
22 YOU'RE FACING SEVERAL LAWSUITS FROM DISAPPOINTED CITIES
23 OR PROPOSERS. THANK YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FRANKLY, MY EXPERIENCE WITH
25 CITIES IN COOPERATIVE VENTURES HAS BEEN THAT THEY WORK

1 IN GOOD FAITH WITH INSTITUTIONS TRYING TO LOCATE IN
2 THEIR JURISDICTIONS. NEVER SEEN A LAWSUIT BY A CITY AS
3 LONG AS WE HAD A GOOD FAITH PROCESS. BUT IN ANY CASE,
4 WE HAVE SIGNIFICANT REAL ESTATE EXPERTISE AVAILABLE TO
5 US. AND I THINK THAT THE TECHNICAL MATERIALS WE'RE
6 GOING TO ADD TO THIS PROPOSAL WILL BE VERY HELPFUL. I
7 BELIEVE BOTH THE CITIES AND THE PROPERTY OWNERS ARE
8 VERY SOPHISTICATED.

9 AS YOU NOTED EARLIER, THE CITIES, ALONG WITH
10 THEIR PROPERTY OWNER PARTNERS IN THESE PROPOSALS, IF
11 THEY CAN MEET WITH STAFF, WHICH THEY CAN, I BELIEVE
12 THEY WILL HAVE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO REALLY FOCUS
13 THE OUTCOME ON A QUALITY SITE.

14 IS THERE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM SALK?

15 DR. MURPHY: YES. WE HAVE JANE SIGNAIGO-COX
16 WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE.

17 MS. SIGNAIGO-COX: THANK YOU. I'M WITH THE
18 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION HERE, AND I TOO WOULD
19 LIKE TO CLARIFY THE TIME FRAME THAT'S HERE. ACCORDING
20 TO WHAT I SEE, IF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS IS TO BE
21 GIVEN TO THE BOARD ON FEBRUARY 3D FOR APPROVAL, ISSUED
22 TWO BUSINESS DAYS LATER, WHICH WOULD BE FEBRUARY 7TH.
23 IF YOU'RE GIVING THREE WEEKS, THAT WOULD BE ALL OF THEM
24 BACK BY FEBRUARY 28TH, WHICH IS THE DAY BEFORE THE NEXT
25 BOARD MEETING.

1 QUESTION IS WHAT IS YOUR INTENTION OF WHAT
2 YOU WANT TO ACCOMPLISH AT THE MARCH 1ST BOARD MEETING
3 WITH THOSE PACKETS? JUST TO HAVE THEM THERE OR HAVE
4 HAD TIME TO REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT THE COMMITTEE
6 WILL NEED TO DECIDE THAT, BUT YOU ARE CORRECT ON YOUR
7 TIMING CALCULATION. WITH GOING TO THREE WEEKS, IT
8 REALLY PUTS US RIGHT UP NEXT TO THE BOARD MEETING.

9 IN TRYING TO PROVIDE MORE PROCESS TIME, THAT
10 DOES LIMIT US IN TERMS OF WHAT WE CAN DO IN TERMS OF
11 SUMMARIZING THE INFORMATION FOR THE BOARD. IT IS
12 POTENTIALLY POSSIBLE THAT THE COMMITTEE MAY DECIDE,
13 UPON LOOKING AT THE MATERIAL, TO PROVIDE AN
14 INFORMATIONAL BRIEFING TO THE BOARD AND ASK THE BOARD
15 TO DELEGATE RESPONSIBILITY TO THE COMMITTEE TO MAKE A
16 FINAL DECISION. BUT WITHOUT PREJUDGING THAT, WE NEED
17 TO SEE THE NUMBER OF PROPOSALS, THE QUALITY OF THE
18 PROPOSALS. AND HOW MANY DAYS IS IT, ACTUALLY
19 CALCULATING OUT TO, THAT THIS WOULD BE BEFORE THE
20 BOARD, IT'S THE NEXT DAY BECAUSE WE HAVE 28 DAYS IN
21 FEBRUARY.

22 DR. PRECIADO: WE NEED MORE THAN ONE DAY.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE DO.

24 DR. PRECIADO: HOWEVER, THREE DAYS MIGHT BE
25 SUFFICIENT FOR US. SO I'M WONDERING, RATHER THAN

1 STATING THREE WEEKS, WE STATE TWO AND A HALF WEEKS. WE
2 NEED TO BE FLEXIBLE WITH OUR OWN TIMETABLE, TAKING
3 EVERYTHING INTO CONSIDERATION. SO INSTEAD OF 14 DAYS,
4 MAYBE IT'S 17 DAYS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PRECIADO HAS MADE
6 A SUGGESTION THAT I THINK IS VERY HELPFUL HERE, THAT WE
7 GO TO TWO AND A HALF WEEKS FOR THE RFP TO ALLOW US
8 ENOUGH TIME TO SUMMARIZE THE MATERIALS BEFORE THE BOARD
9 MEETING. AND COULD I HAVE BOARD COMMENT ON THAT? LET
10 ME DO THIS.

11 I HAVE PREVIOUSLY STATED FOUR POINTS. THOSE
12 ARE A MATTER OF RECORD IN THE TRANSCRIPT. IF I AMEND
13 THE TIME FRAME FROM THREE WEEKS TO TWO AND A HALF
14 WEEKS, WOULD THERE BE A MOTION SUPPORTING THOSE FOUR
15 POINTS BY THIS COMMITTEE?

16 DR. PRECIADO: I MOTION.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO MAKES A MOTION.
18 IS THERE A SECOND?

19 MS. LANSING: SECOND.

20 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING SECONDS.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY SHERRY LANSING.
22 MOTION AND SECOND BEING MADE, DISCUSSION ON THAT MOTION
23 BY THE BOARD? IS THERE A QUESTION ON THAT MOTION FROM
24 UCLA?

25 MS. LANSING: I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT YOU

1 CAN ACTUALLY PUT A LOT OF IT IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH,
2 JUST TO MAKE IT CLEAR. WHEN YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT,
3 YOU KNOW, THE FIRST PARAGRAPH THAT STATES, NOW IT WILL
4 STATE THAT, YOU KNOW, BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH IN THE STATE
5 OF CALIFORNIA, AND THEN IT WILL BE COMPLIANT WITH STATE
6 LAWS, SUCH AS THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITY ACT, AND
7 THAT THESE ITEMS WILL BE WEIGHTED. IT CAN ACTUALLY ALL
8 BE IN YOUR FIRST PARAGRAPH. JUST MAKES IT CLEAR.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THINK THAT'S A GOOD
10 RECOMMENDATION. AND I THINK THAT CAN BE CONSIDERED
11 INCLUDED BY THE PRIOR COMMENTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS
12 RESOLUTION.

13 IS THERE COMMENT FROM SAN DIEGO?

14 DR. MURPHY: BOB, RICH MURPHY. ACCORDING TO
15 THE PLAN NOW, IS THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THE DECISION
16 WOULD BE MADE BY THE BOARD ON MARCH 1?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE DECISION COULD BE MADE
18 BY THE BOARD ON MARCH 1, DR. MURPHY. OR IF THE
19 COMMITTEE MEETING THREE OR FOUR DAYS BEFORE THE BOARD
20 MEETING DECIDED THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A
21 RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD WITH THE COMMITTEE TO MEET
22 AGAIN SHORTLY AFTER THE BOARD MEETING, THAT WOULD BE AN
23 OPTION OF THE COMMITTEE.

24 DR. MURPHY: IT WOULD SEEM TO ME, THOUGH,
25 THAT SOMEWHERE ALONG THE LINE SOMEONE SHOULD BE

1 VISITING THESE SITES TO GET A CLEAR IDEA OF WHAT THE
2 QUALITY OF THE SITE IS AND ITS SUITABILITY. AND I
3 DON'T SEE IN THE PLAN RIGHT NOW ANY OPPORTUNITIES TO DO
4 THAT UNLESS THE BOARD GAVE THIS COMMITTEE THE GO-AHEAD
5 TO MAKE THE DECISION AT A POINT AFTER MARCH 1ST.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD POINT.
7 AND I THINK IT'S A GOOD REASON TO ASK THE BOARD TO
8 REALLY APPROVE THE PROCESS AND APPROVE THE CRITERIA
9 THAT HAVE BEEN USED, BUT GENERALLY DELEGATE TO THE
10 COMMITTEE THE FINAL DECISION. BUT I THINK THAT WITHOUT
11 PREJUDGING IT, THIS WILL BE SOMETHING WE SHOULD
12 CONSIDER AT THE MEETING AT THE END OF FEBRUARY. BUT IT
13 SOUNDS LIKE A VERY APPROPRIATE POINT TO BE MADE TO ADD
14 THAT STEP IN THE PROCESS.

15 IT WAS OUR INTENT TO HAVE STAFF VISIT THE
16 SITE, THE SITES AS THEY ARE SUBMITTED, BUT I THINK IT'S
17 VERY IMPORTANT THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE VISIT
18 THE SITES. AND THE COMMITTEE AS A WHOLE CAN'T VISIT
19 THE SITES WITHOUT CALLING A MEETING AT EACH SITE, WHICH
20 WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT, BUT WE COULD CREATE A
21 TWO-PERSON SITE VISIT TASK FORCE AS PART OF DUE
22 DILIGENCE. AND AS SOON AS WE KNOW HOW MANY SITES THERE
23 ARE, WE CAN MAKE THE DECISION ON WHAT TIME WOULD BE
24 REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THAT. OKAY.

25 DOES THAT SOUND RESPONSIVE TO YOUR POINT?

1 DR. MURPHY: IT DOES. YEAH, I THINK IT DOES.
2 I'M NOT SURE OF THE MECHANISM. I UNDERSTAND HOW
3 DIFFICULT IT IS. BUT I DO THINK THERE HAS TO BE AN
4 ON-SITE INSPECTION TO BE SURE WE'RE MAKING THE RIGHT
5 RECOMMENDATION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YEAH. AND I THINK
7 DEFINITELY THE ON-SITE INSPECTION HAS TO GO BEYOND THE
8 STAFF INSPECTION TO AT LEAST A TWO-MEMBER COMMITTEE.

9 SO WITH THE DECISION ON THE MECHANISM THAT
10 THIS COMMITTEE WILL ADOPT TO ACTUALLY IMPLEMENT, BEING
11 DEPENDENT UPON THE NUMBER OF PROPOSALS THAT ARE
12 RECEIVED, WHICH WOULD INFLUENCE THE TIMETABLE, I WOULD
13 SAY THAT THE MEETING THAT IS THREE OR FOUR DAYS BEFORE
14 THE MARCH 1ST BOARD MEETING IS THE APPROPRIATE MEETING
15 TO FIGURE OUT THAT EXACT TIMETABLE, BUT IT WOULD
16 CERTAINLY INCORPORATE THE SITE VISITATION REQUIREMENTS.

17 DR. FRIEDMAN: BOB.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE FURTHER DISCUSSION
19 FROM THE SALK INSTITUTE?

20 DR. FRIEDMAN: BOB, THIS IS MIKE FRIEDMAN AT
21 UCLA. MAY I MAKE A POINT? I DON'T WANT TO BE OUT OF
22 ORDER.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: SINCE WE HAVE SUCH
25 EXPECTATIONS FOR THE MARCH MEETING, FOR THE ENTIRE ICOC

1 TO MAKE A SET OF DECISIONS OR AT LEAST TO NARROW THINGS
2 DOWN THAT CAN BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE COMMITTEE, CAN I
3 ASK FOR TWO PIECES OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO BE
4 SUPPLIED TO ALL THE ICOC MEMBERS IN ORDER TO MAKE THAT
5 DECISION? THE FIRST IS THE BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS. IN
6 OTHER WORDS, YOU ARRIVED AT 15,000 SQUARE FEET AND
7 CERTAIN NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES BASED UPON CERTAIN
8 EXPECTATIONS OF THE SIZE OF THE STAFFING AND WHAT SORT
9 OF FACILITIES YOU WOULD NEED, SCALABILITY, YOU KNOW,
10 HOW MANY GRANTS WOULD BE PROCESSED OR HOW MANY MEETINGS
11 THERE WOULD BE. WHATEVER THE ASSUMPTIONS WERE, I THINK
12 IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL TO SHARE THAT WITH ALL THE
13 ICOC MEMBERS SO THEY COULD UNDERSTAND HOW RESPONSIVE
14 EACH OF THE PROPOSALS ARE TO THE EXPECTATIONS THAT YOU
15 AND OTHERS HAVE LAID OUT.

16 THE SECOND IS TO FACILITATE THAT DISCUSSION
17 OR AT LEAST THAT CONSIDERATION AT THE MARCH MEETING, TO
18 PLEASE HAVE SOME SIMPLE SORT OF MATRIX WHICH LISTS ALL
19 THE CHARACTERISTICS, THE MAJOR ONES, THE MINOR ONES,
20 AND HOW RESPONSIVE EACH OF THE INDIVIDUAL SITES ARE TO
21 THOSE EXPECTATIONS. AND WHERE YOU CAN QUANTIFY IT, YOU
22 QUANTIFY IT. SO THE SITE IN SACRAMENTO IS THREE MILES
23 FROM THE AIRPORT, OR, YOU KNOW, THE SITE IN SAN
24 FRANCISCO IS 20 MILES OR WHATEVER IT IS, JUST SO WE CAN
25 SORT OF SEE IT QUICKLY LAID OUT TO MAKE IT MORE

1 CONVENIENT. OTHERWISE, I FEAR IT'S GOING TO BE A VERY
2 COMPLICATED AND NOT VERY HELPFUL DISCUSSION THAT WE'LL
3 BE FACING IN MARCH.

4 I'M SORRY TO GET SO MECHANICAL, BUT THOSE ARE
5 JUST SUGGESTIONS THAT THE STAFF CAN MODIFY, BUT JUST TO
6 PREPARE THE MATERIALS CLEARLY SO WE CAN REALLY HAVE A
7 CRISP DISCUSSION. THANK YOU.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THOSE ARE EXCELLENT.
9 I WOULD SAY THAT AT THE BOARD MEETING, I WOULD EXPECT,
10 IF THERE ARE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PROPOSALS, THAT WE
11 WILL BE ABLE TO ESTIMATE SOME DISTANCES AND ESTIMATE
12 SOME QUANTITATIVE FACTORS. BUT, IN FACT, WHEN THE
13 COMMITTEE MEETS FOLLOWING THE BOARD MEETING, WITH SOME
14 ADDITIONAL TIME, WE'LL BE ABLE TO REFINER THEM, BUT
15 CERTAINLY WITH ENOUGH CLARITY TO HAVE A VERY GOOD
16 CONCEPTION COMPARISON OF THESE SITES.

17 DR. FRIEDMAN: BOB, I THINK THAT'S A GOOD
18 POINT. I THINK ACTUALLY IF YOU MAKE IT CLEAR THOSE ARE
19 THE SORT OF THINGS YOU ARE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT, THAT
20 THE PROPOSALS WILL SUPPLY THOSE TO YOU. NOW, THEY NEED
21 TO BE CHECKED, OF COURSE, BY THE SITE VISITORS. YOU'RE
22 RIGHT. BUT I THINK A LOT OF THAT CAN BE PREPROVIDED TO
23 AT LEAST HELP US.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PRECIADO HAS A
25 POINT.

1 DR. PRECIADO: IT'S A WONDERFUL POINT,
2 DR. FRIEDMAN. AND IN ADDITION TO THAT, IT WOULD
3 PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH SORT OF A VISUAL OF WHAT IT IS
4 THAT WE'RE CONSIDERING. I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT
5 FOR US, AGAIN FOR THE TRANSPARENCY ISSUE, AS MUCH AS WE
6 CAN PUT FORTH WHAT WE'RE THINKING AND WHERE WE'RE GOING
7 TO THE PUBLIC IN A MANNER THAT THE PUBLIC CAN READILY
8 SEE, IT KEEPS THOSE LINES OPEN.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THAT'S VERY HELPFUL.
10 AND FROM UC DAVIS?

11 DR. POMEROY: JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT I
12 UNDERSTAND WHAT THE PROPOSAL IS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
13 RIGHT NOW. SO RIGHT NOW THE DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF
14 RFP'S IS FEBRUARY 24TH. THIS GROUP WOULD ANTICIPATE
15 MEETING SOMETIME IN THE NEXT FOUR DAYS BEFORE THE MARCH
16 1ST MEETING TO TALK ABOUT PROCESS AND GIVE A
17 PRELIMINARY OUTLINE AT THE BOARD MEETING, AND THEN WE
18 WOULD MEET AGAIN TO MAKE A FINAL DECISION.

19 THE REASON I'M CLARIFYING THIS IS THIS IS A
20 MAJOR DECISION. AND I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT FOR
21 PUBLIC PERCEPTION THAT WE EACH BE ABLE TO SAY THAT WE
22 CAREFULLY READ AND REVIEWED EACH OF THE PROPOSALS. AND
23 I PERSONALLY WOULDN'T FEEL COMFORTABLE MAKING THIS
24 DECISION SOLELY ON THE BASIS OF A SUMMARY. I REALLY
25 WANT ONE. I THINK IT'S A GREAT IDEA, BUT I FEEL

1 OBLIGATED TO READ THESE PROPOSALS. AND WE NEED TO MAKE
2 SURE THAT THERE'S TIME BUILT IN FOR US TO TAKE THAT
3 RESPONSIBILITY SERIOUSLY.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. THE INTENT OF THE
5 MEETING PRIOR TO THE BOARD MEETING IS, IN FACT, TO
6 REALLY CAPTURE THE SCALE OF THE PROPOSALS, THE
7 COMPLEXITY, THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS SO THAT WE CAN
8 EVALUATE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD ON OUR NEXT
9 ACTION. BUT AS I THINK I SAID AT THE BEGINNING OF THE
10 MEETING, THAT IF WE END UP WITH A VERY LIMITED SCOPE OF
11 THREE DIFFERENT PROPOSALS, WE MAY BE ABLE TO HAVE A
12 VERY DIFFERENT KIND OF A MEETING WITH THE BOARD. IF WE
13 END UP WITH 15 PROPOSALS, WE MAY END UP MERELY BEING
14 ABLE TO REPORT A CONCEPTUAL SUMMARY TO THE BOARD; BUT
15 ASKING THE BOARD TO THEN DELEGATE TO THIS COMMITTEE THE
16 AUTHORITY TO PURSUE ITS RFP AS PROPOSED BASED UPON WHAT
17 HAS BEEN RECEIVED AND GET ANY REFINING DIRECTION FROM
18 THE BOARD IN REACHING A DECISION.

19 THE BOARD MAY DECIDE TO BRING THIS BACK TO
20 THE BOARD AT THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEETING. SO I DON'T
21 WANT TO PREJUDGE THE PROCESS. BASICALLY THE MEETING ON
22 THE 24TH WOULD ALLOW US TO SIZE UP THE TASK WE HAVE, TO
23 SUMMARIZE WHERE WE ARE, AND PROVIDE MATERIALS TO THE
24 BOARD AS A STATUS REPORT ON OUR ACTIONS, AND TO RECEIVE
25 ADDITIONAL DIRECTIONS BASED UPON THE PROCESS THAT THIS

1 COMMITTEE DECIDES TO RECOMMEND AFTER ITS MEETING. AND
2 IF OUR DEADLINE IS THE 24TH, WE COULD MEET
3 THEORETICALLY THE AFTERNOON OF THE 25TH OR THE MORNING
4 OF THE 26TH HAVING SOME BASIC SUMMARIES. I THINK
5 ACTUALLY THE MORNING OF THE 26TH WOULD BE THE EARLIEST.
6 WHAT DAY OF THE WEEK IS THAT?

7 DR. POMEROY: I CAN TELL YOUR STAFF HAVE A
8 LOT OF 2 A.M. SUMMARY REPORTS THAT THEY WRITE UP.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE STAFF IS HIGHLY
10 DEDICATED, HIGHLY DEDICATED.

11 DR. MURPHY: BOB, RICH MURPHY. YOU KNOW, IT
12 WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT GIVEN THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS, I
13 THINK YOUR CAUTION IS WISE. I WOULD GUESS THAT THE
14 BOARD ITSELF WOULD -- THAT THE FULL BOARD WOULD WANT TO
15 MAKE THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION ON THE PROPOSALS. AND I
16 THINK THAT SEEKING THE BOARD'S ADVICE ON MARCH 1ST AS
17 TO THE FULL PROCESS IS THE APPROPRIATE THING TO DO.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND I THINK THAT'S, IN FACT,
19 WHY WE ARE, IN FACT -- IN FEBRUARY IT IS AGENDIZED AS A
20 STATUS REPORT AND A DISCUSSION OF PROGRESS.

21 I THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENT. I THINK IT'S A
22 VERY APPROPRIATE COMMENT.

23 SO IF WE SET UP A MEETING FOR THE 25TH, WHICH
24 IS THE DAY AFTER THESE ARE RECEIVED, WE WILL HAVE
25 ESSENTIALLY A SUMMARY. WE WILL BE ABLE TO HOPEFULLY

1 SCALE OUR TASK, HAVE SOME SENSE OF HOW MANY SITES, THE
2 QUALITY OF THE DIFFERENT SUBMISSIONS, AND WE'LL TRY IN
3 REAL TIME AS WE RECEIVE THESE TO TRY AND START
4 SUMMARIZING THEM. BUT THE INTENT HERE IS REALLY TO
5 MAKE SURE THAT WE COME TO A FINAL VOTE, AS I'M
6 LISTENING TO THIS WHOLE DISCUSSION, BY THE BOARD
7 MEETING ON APRIL 7TH, WHICH WOULD GIVE US SUFFICIENT
8 TIME TO DO SITE VISITS AND EVEN ACCOMMODATE A
9 SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS BEING RECEIVED.

10 THE MOTION THAT IS BEFORE US RIGHT NOW,
11 THOUGH, ONLY TAKES US THROUGH THE POINT THAT ON THE
12 24TH WE WILL RECEIVE THE RFP'S BACK, AND ON THE 25TH WE
13 WOULD HAVE A MEETING TO CONSIDER OUR RECOMMENDATION TO
14 THE BOARD ON THE BALANCE OF THE PROCESS AND THE
15 TIMETABLE FOR THE BALANCE OF THE PROCESS.

16 DR. PRECIADO: OR THE DAY AFTER.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. AS I SAID, IF
18 WE END UP WITH THREE PROPOSALS, WE WILL HAVE A
19 PREDICTABLY DIFFERENT TIMETABLE THAN IF WE END UP WITH
20 FIFTEEN.

21 DR. POMEROY: I SUGGEST WE VOTE ON THAT
22 MOTION.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. CALL FOR THE
24 QUESTION.

25 MS. KING: BOB, ARE THERE GOING TO BE

1 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THAT BEFORE THE VOTE?

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: VERY GOOD, MELISSA. THANK
3 YOU. WE'VE HAD COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AT AN EARLIER
4 POINT, BUT I THINK IT'S VERY APPROPRIATE, SINCE WE'VE
5 HAD ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION THAT HAS MODIFIED THE
6 PROCESS, TO RECEIVE AN ADDITIONAL ROUND OF COMMENTS.
7 FROM SAN FRANCISCO, ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: YOU HAVE ANY IDEA HOW
9 MUCH --

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD YOU APPROACH?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA
12 HOW MUCH MONEY THIS CAMPUS IS GOING TO COST?

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, THE QUESTION, IF I CAN
14 REPEAT IT, IS DO I HAVE ANY IDEA HOW MUCH THE FACILITY
15 LEASE IS GOING TO COST. I THINK THAT THE EXPECTATIONS
16 FROM THE BOARD IS WE ARE GOING TO GET SOME VERY
17 ATTRACTIVE PROPOSALS THAT HAVE A VERY MINIMUM RENT
18 NUMBER ATTACHED TO THEM, BUT THERE IS QUITE A POTENTIAL
19 RANGE BASED UPON WHERE IT IS IN THE STATE AND THE
20 ACTUAL SITES PROPOSED. SO WE HAVE NOT ATTACHED A
21 BUDGET NUMBER AT THIS TIME.

22 IF, IN FACT, THE BUDGET NUMBER IS NOT ONE
23 THAT IS ATTRACTIVE TO THE INSTITUTE, WE MAY HAVE TO GO
24 BACK AND SCALE DOWN THE FOOTAGE TO GET TO THAT RESULT
25 WHERE WE HAVE A VERY COST-EFFECTIVE, HIGH QUALITY SITE

1 FOR THE FACILITY.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: WHAT RANGE ARE YOU
3 THINKING OF?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M THINKING OF FROM NO RENT
5 AT ALL.

6 MS. LANSING: WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT IS A
7 POSSIBILITY WE'VE ALL SAID.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SOMETHING THAT IS A
9 POSSIBILITY. TO SEVERAL DOLLARS A SQUARE FOOT.

10 ALSO, ANOTHER QUESTION FROM SAN FRANCISCO.

11 MR. REED: I WOULD -- I'M DON REED. I WOULD
12 QUESTION THE ADDITIONAL THREE DAYS. I THINK TWO WEEKS
13 IS PLENTY OF TIME TO GIVE FOR INSTITUTIONS INTERESTED.
14 THEY'VE ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERING IT. I THINK THAT
15 WE'RE PUTTING TOO MUCH PRESSURE ON THE BOARD TO DECIDE
16 ALL THIS INFORMATION. I THINK THEY NEED THREE DAYS
17 MORE THAN THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE ALREADY HAD THE TIME TO
18 CONSIDER IF THEY'RE INTERESTED.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I APPRECIATE THAT
20 COMMENT, MR. REED. UNDER OUR TIMETABLE, AS WE WORK
21 THROUGH THIS PROCESS, WE'RE NOT GOING TO BE MAKING
22 DECISIONS ON THE 24TH ON THE SITES. WE'RE GOING TO BE
23 SCALING AND ANALYZING OUR TASK TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS
24 TO THE BOARD ON THE TIME PERIOD WE'LL NEED TO COMPLETE
25 THAT TASK. AND SO IN THAT CONTEXT, I THINK WE CAN DEAL

1 WITH THE ISSUE.

2 IS THERE ANY OTHER COMMENT FROM THE SAN
3 FRANCISCO SITE?

4 MR. BLOUT: JESSE BLOUT FROM THE MAYOR'S
5 OFFICE. IT MIGHT BE NICE TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY AT THE
6 NEXT SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE, GIVEN THAT THE PROPOSALS
7 WILL BE DUE DAY BEFORE, FOR THE PROPOSAL ENTITIES TO
8 PROPOSE OR TO PRESENT THEIR PROPOSALS.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. LET ME DO THIS.
10 LET ME TAKE THAT UP WITH THE MEMBERS IMMEDIATELY
11 FOLLOWING THIS VOTE, IF I COULD.

12 ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE MOTION ON THE
13 FLOOR FROM UC DAVIS?

14 DR. POMEROY: NONE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FROM THE SALK INSTITUTE?

16 DR. MURPHY: YEAH, BOB. RICH MURPHY AGAIN.
17 AMY DALY JUST MADE A GOOD POINT. IF IT'S THE 24TH, WE
18 ARE MEETING ON THE 25TH, DOESN'T THAT CUT SHORT
19 CLAIRE'S QUESTION THAT SHE WANTED TO HAVE SOME TIME FOR
20 CONSIDERATION BEFORE WE GO BACK TO THE BOARD? AND IS
21 THERE A PROBLEM IF THE RFP'S ARE DUE THE 24TH AND US
22 RESCHEDULING, SO IT WOULDN'T BE THE 25TH, BUT RATHER
23 WOULD BE THE 28TH? THEN WE WOULD BE BETTER PREPARED TO
24 PRESENT TO THE BOARD ON THE 1ST.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT THAT IS

1 CORRECT. IN FACT, A STAFF MEMBER WAS SUGGESTING IT,
2 AND I WASN'T FOCUSING ON THE SUGGESTION AND ITS
3 SIGNIFICANCE EARLIER. BUT IT IS, IN ORDER TO MEET
4 CLAIRE'S PARAMETERS, WE DO NEED TO DO THAT. SO I THINK
5 WE WOULD AMEND THE MOTION TO INCORPORATE THAT CHANGE IN
6 THE DATE.

7 DR. MURPHY: THANK YOU.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT
9 FROM UCLA?

10 MS. KING: YES.

11 MR. STRASSMAN: THIS IS MARC STRASSMAN. I
12 WANTED TO SUPPORT DR. FRIEDMAN'S POINT AND EMPHASIZE
13 THAT THE BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS AND THE MATRIX FOR THE
14 CRITERIA OUGHT TO BE EXPLICITLY STATED IN THE RFP
15 BEFORE IT GOES OUT. I WANTED TO SUPPORT DR. MURPHY'S
16 POSITION THAT THE ICOC SHOULD MAKE THE FINAL DECISION,
17 NOT THE COMMITTEE. THE U.S. SENATE, THE
18 SELF-PROCLAIMED GREATEST DELIBERATIVE BODY IN THE
19 WORLD, SENDS THINGS TO COMMITTEES, COMMITTEES MAKE
20 DECISIONS, AND THEY PRESENT IT TO THE ENTIRE BODY TO
21 MAKE THE DECISION. THAT'S HOW THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM
22 WORKS.

23 FINALLY, I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IT'S
24 EXPLICITLY STATED IN THIS MOTION BEFORE IT'S PASSED
25 THAT A CYBER ALTERNATIVE IS ALLOWED AND WILL BE JUDGED

1 BY THE SAME CRITERIA EXPLICIT THAT DR. FRIEDMAN HAS
2 CALLED FOR PUTTING INTO THE SIMPLE MATRIX.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS A MOTION ON THE
4 TABLE AT THIS TIME. IF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WISH
5 AFTER THIS MOTION TO PROPOSE A CYBER FACILITY, THEY CAN
6 DO SO. AND AS STATED EARLIER, THIS COMMITTEE WILL
7 PRESENT ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC BOARD AS A
8 WHOLE. THE BOARD AS A WHOLE WILL DECIDE WHETHER IT
9 WANTS TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE OR IT
10 WANTS THE BOARD AS A WHOLE TO MAKE THE DECISION.

11 MS. KING: WE HAVE ONE MORE COMMENT IN UCLA
12 FROM THE PUBLIC.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, GO AHEAD.

14 MR. HOLTZMAN: HI. DAVID HOLTZMAN AGAIN. MY
15 POINT IS THAT THERE ARE PROBABLY LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR
16 RFP'S RELATED TO CONTENT AND TIME LINE AND PROCESS, FOR
17 EXAMPLE, PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL STATE'S CONTRACTS
18 REGISTER OR IN NEWSPAPERS. AND I WONDER HOW DO YOU
19 KNOW THAT WHAT YOU'RE DISCUSSING NOW MEETS SUCH LEGAL
20 REQUIREMENTS?

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, OUR GENERAL COUNSEL IS
22 STANDING ABOUT A FOOT BEHIND ME. AND AS I INDICATED
23 BEFORE, WE WILL ADD THE INFORMATION, IF ANY, ON ANY
24 ADDITIONAL STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS TO THE RFP. AND IF
25 THEY ARISE OR COME TO OUR ATTENTION DURING THE PROCESS,

1 WE WILL ADD THEM AT THAT TIME. SO IT WOULD BE GOOD FOR
2 PEOPLE TO CONTINUE TO UPDATE THEIR ANALYSIS OF THE
3 WEBSITE.

4 I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO CORRECT THE PRIOR
5 STATEMENT. MY UNDERSTANDING, AT LEAST, OF
6 DR. FRIEDMAN'S POINT, IS THAT IN THE MATERIALS THAT
7 WILL GO TO THIS COMMITTEE PRIOR TO ITS NEXT MEETING
8 WILL PROVIDE THE BACKGROUND CONSIDERATIONS ON WHY WE
9 CAME UP WITH 15,000 SQUARE FEET, BUT WE WILL NOT SUBMIT
10 THOSE WITH THE RFP. THE RFP IS FOR 15,000 SQUARE FEET.

11 ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM SALK?

12 DR. MURPHY: NO.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR
14 SALK. ARE WE PREPARED TO CALL FOR THE QUESTION? I'D
15 LIKE TO CALL FOR THE QUESTION. WE'LL DO A ROLL CALL
16 VOTE. AMY DUROSS WILL CONDUCT THE ROLL CALL VOTE.

17 MS. DU ROSS: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

18 DR. FRIEDMAN: I VOTE YES.

19 MS. DU ROSS: SHERRY LANSING.

20 MS. LANSING: YES.

21 MS. DU ROSS: RICHARD MURPHY.

22 DR. MURPHY: YES.

23 MS. DU ROSS: ED PENHOET.

24 DR. PENHOET: YES.

25 MS. DU ROSS: CLAIRE POMEROY.

1 DR. POMEROY: YES.

2 MS. DU ROSS: PHYLLIS PRECIADO. AND JOHN
3 REED.

4 DR. REED: YES.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ALL OF THE MEMBERS
6 HAVE VOTED. IT IS UNANIMOUS. THANK YOU. I THINK THIS
7 DEFINITION WILL HELP EVERYONE. AND THE PUBLIC COMMENT
8 WAS QUITE HELPFUL IN THE PROCESS.

9 THERE IS AN ITEM REMAINING OPEN. WOULD ANY
10 BOARD MEMBER LIKE TO ADDRESS THE PREVIOUS POINT OF
11 SUGGESTING A CYBER SITE?

12 I DON'T HEAR ANY BOARD MEMBER THAT WOULD LIKE
13 TO MOVE FORWARD WITH A MOTION ON THAT POINT, BUT I
14 WOULD SAY THAT WE DEFINITELY APPRECIATE THE CREATIVITY
15 AND THOUGHTFULNESS OF THE PROPOSAL. AND WE HOPE THAT
16 THE CALIFORNIA BIOGRID, AS ENVISIONED IN YOUR VERY
17 CREATIVE STATEMENT, DOES COME TO PASS. IT CERTAINLY
18 WILL BE TREMENDOUS IF DURING THE PROCESS OF THIS
19 INSTITUTE'S LIFE IT HELPS AND SUPPORTS THINGS LIKE THE
20 ON-LINE PUBLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC DATA SO WE CAN
21 ADVANCE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH THROUGHOUT THIS COUNTRY AND
22 THE STATE AT A VERY RAPID PACE.

23 WITH THAT CONCLUSION OF THE DISCUSSION AND
24 THIS MOTION, I'D LIKE TO CONFER WITH STAFF. ARE THERE
25 ANY OTHER ITEMS THAT HAVE COME TO YOUR ATTENTION, ANY

1 DUROSS, WE NEED TO COVER BEFORE WE CLOSE? STAFF
2 FINDING NO OTHER ITEMS, BUSINESS BEFORE US, I WOULD
3 LIKE TO MOVE FOR ADJOURNMENT.

4 DR. FRIEDMAN: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND I BELIEVE THAT I CAN
6 TAKE A VOICE VOTE ON THIS ITEM. ALL IN FAVOR.
7 OPPOSED? OKAY. THANK YOU ALL, AND WE APPRECIATE THE
8 FACT THAT THIS WAS DEFINITELY A CYBER MEETING.

9 (THE PROCEEDING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
10 12:49 P.M.)

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25