

BEFORE THE  
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: SHERATON GRAND HOTEL  
1230 J STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

DATE: FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2005  
9:49 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO. : 73067

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		003
ROLL CALL		003
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 5, 2005		006
CHAIRMAN' S REPORT		006
PRESIDENT' S REPORT		007
CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP:		
	BYLAWS	026
	PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING GRANTS	034
	CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATIONS	072
	CRITERIA FOR AWARD OF TRAINING GRANTS	
	AWARD OF TRAINING GRANTS	107
CLOSED SESSION	NOT REPORTED	
PUBLIC REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION		301
CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL SECOND ROUND OF FUNDING	NOT HEARD	
CONSIDERATION OF REPORT FROM STANDARDS WORKING GROUP:		294
	INTERIM GUIDELINES	
	CONSIDERATION OF BYLAWS	
	APPOINTMENT OF CO-CHAIR	
	CONSIDERATION OF MEETING PROCEDURES	
GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT:		304
INFORMATIONAL REPORT ON CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT	NOT HEARD	
INFORMATIONAL SESSION: ETHICS TRAINING	NOT HEARD	
ADJOURNMENT		323

1 SACRAMENTO, CALI FORNIA; FRI DAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2005

2 09: 49 A. M.

3

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I F WE COULD CONVENE THE  
5 MEETING. WE ARE BENEFITING TODAY FROM A TREMENDOUS  
6 PRESENTATION ON ALZHEIMER' S DISEASE. THE ALZHEIMER' S  
7 ASSOCIATION WAS TREMENDOUS IN THE CORE PROGRAM THAT  
8 THEY ASSEMBLED. AND DR. LEON THAL FROM OUR BOARD WAS  
9 THE DISTINGUISHED SCIENTIST WHO PROVIDED INSIGHT INTO  
10 THE APPLI CATIONS OF STEM CELL RESEARCH.

11 WE ARE ALSO THANKFUL TO DR. CLAIRE POMEROY  
12 FOR BEING OUR SACRAMENTO HOST TODAY. AND WHAT WE WOULD  
13 LIKE TO DO IS ALSO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DR. PRIETO IS A  
14 CO-HOST FOR HIS LONGTIME SACRAMENTO PRESENCE AND  
15 LEADERSHIP IN THE DIABETES COMMUNITY.

16 WE' LL START WITH THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE,  
17 AND THEN MELISSA KING WILL LEAD US IN THE ROLL CALL.

18 (THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE. )

19 MS. KING: AND THE ROLL CALL. DAVID  
20 BALTI MORE.

21 MS. KING: DAVID BALTI MORE.

22 DR. BALTI MORE: HERE.

23 MS. KING: BOB PRICE FOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU.

24 DR. PRI CE: HERE.

25 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER FOR KEI TH BLACK.

1 DR. MEYER: HERE.  
2 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
3 DR. BRYANT: HERE.  
4 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
5 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.  
6 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
7 MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.  
8 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND FOR BRIAN  
9 HENDERSON.  
10 DR. MARKLAND: HERE.  
11 MS. KING: JACK DIXON FOR ED HOLMES.  
12 DR. DIXON: HERE.  
13 MS. KING: DAVID KESSLER. BOB KLEIN.  
14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.  
15 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING. GERALD LEVEY.  
16 DR. LEVEY: HERE.  
17 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
18 DR. LOVE: HERE.  
19 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
20 DR. MURPHY: HERE.  
21 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
22 DR. NOVA: HERE.  
23 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
24 DR. PENHOET: HERE.  
25 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

1 DR. PIZZO: HERE.

2 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

3 DR. POMEROY: HERE.

4 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

5 DR. PRIETO: HERE.

6 MS. KING: JOHN REED. JOAN SAMUELSON.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.

8 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

9 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HERE.

10 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

11 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

12 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK. OSWALD

13 STEWARD.

14 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

15 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

16 DR. THAL: HERE.

17 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

18 MS. WILSON: HERE.

19 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

20 DR. WRIGHT: HERE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, MELISSA.

22 WE START OUR AGENDA TODAY WITH A CONSENT ITEM

23 NO. 5, APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM AUGUST 5TH. IS

24 THERE ANY MEMBER OF THE BOARD WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE

25 ANY CHANGES TO THE MINUTES? IS THERE A MOTION FOR

1 APPROVAL?

2 DR. WRIGHT: SO MOVED.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

4 DR. LEVEY: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THE  
6 MINUTES? CONSENT ITEM, ALL IN FAVOR.

7 OPPOSED?

8 ITEM 6 IS THE CHAIRMAN'S REPORT; AND IN  
9 DEFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT WE HAVE THE HISTORIC  
10 OPPORTUNITY TODAY TO ADVANCE THE FIRST ROUND OF GRANTS,  
11 I'M GOING TO MAKE IT VERY SHORT.

12 ON A HISTORIC BASIS, IF WE LOOK BACK AT  
13 FRONTIERS OF MEDICAL RESEARCH, I THINK WE WOULD BE  
14 HARD-PRESSED TO FIND AS A PRECEDENT A MODEL WITH THE  
15 SCALE OF THE INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRAINING  
16 PROGRAM THAT IS COMING BEFORE US TODAY. THE SCOPE OF  
17 CALIFORNIA'S INSTITUTIONS AND ITS UNIVERSITIES, ITS  
18 RESEARCH HOSPITALS, AND ITS RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS, MANY  
19 OF THOSE INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED WITH GREAT  
20 DISTINCTION ON THE BOARD AND IN THE AUDIENCE HERE  
21 TODAY, IS UNPRECEDENTED. IT IS REMARKABLE THAT  
22 CALIFORNIA HAS ASSETS OF THIS INTELLECTUAL QUALITY AND  
23 BREADTH, AND WE ARE THE BENEFICIARIES OF THOSE GREAT  
24 INSTITUTIONS IN THE PROPOSALS WE HAVE BEFORE US.

25 HOPEFULLY WITH A FAVORABLE APPROVAL OF THE

1 PROGRAM TODAY, WE WILL LAUNCH AN INTELLECTUAL TRAINING  
2 PROGRAM THAT WILL BE A MODEL FOR THE NATION, THAT WILL  
3 BE A MODEL CERTAINLY FOR CALIFORNIA, AND FOR THE STUDY  
4 OF NEW FRONTIERS OF MEDICINE FOR THE FUTURE.

5 WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO TURN IT OVER TO  
6 DR. ZACH HALL FOR THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT AND TO ADVANCE  
7 OUR AGENDA.

8 DR. HALL: WE'RE TRYING TO PULL THIS UP ON  
9 THE SCREEN HERE. I HAVE A POWERPOINT PRESENTATION, I  
10 THINK.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS THE ONE INSTANCE I  
12 SHOULD HAVE TALKED LONGER.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: IS THAT IN THE FORM OF A  
14 MOTION?

15 DR. HALL: AS BOB SAYS, THIS IS REALLY A  
16 HISTORIC AND IMPORTANT OCCASION FOR US, AND I CAN'T  
17 TELL YOU HOW EXCITED THE CIRM STAFF HAVE BEEN OVER THE  
18 LAST WEEK IN PUTTING THIS TOGETHER AND THEN COMING TO  
19 THE MOMENT OF ACTUALLY AWARDING OUR FIRST GRANTS. SO  
20 WE HAVE A LOT OF WORK.

21 I WANT TO MAKE A BRIEF REPORT FROM THE  
22 PRESIDENT FIRST, AND THEN WE'LL MOVE ON TO THE ISSUES  
23 WITH THE GRANTS. LET ME SAY THAT, AS WE'LL DISCUSS  
24 LATER, WE HAVE DEFINED OUR SHORT-TERM PRIORITIES. AND  
25 AMONG THOSE ARE, NO. 1 AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, RAISING

1 BRIDGE FUNDING; NO. 2, PUTTING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE  
2 TOGETHER SO THAT WHEN THE FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE, WE  
3 WILL BE ABLE TO NOT ONLY AWARD THE GRANTS, BUT SEND  
4 GRANT MONEY OUT; AND, NO. 3, WE HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT  
5 MOVE COMING UP ON NOVEMBER 1ST.

6 AND SO WE HAVE THEN PRIORITIZED OUR PERSONNEL  
7 AND HIRING, AND I WANT TO ANNOUNCE THE HIRING OF TWO  
8 NEW VERY IMPORTANT APPOINTMENTS: JULIE KAYE, WHO IS  
9 HERE WHO IS THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIR  
10 AND WILL PROVIDE HELP TO BOB IN HIS EFFORTS TO RAISE  
11 FUNDING FOR US AND IN HIS OTHER DUTIES. AND SECONDLY,  
12 MR. ED DORRINGTON HAS JUST JOINED US AS DIRECTOR OF  
13 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY. THIS IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT  
14 BECAUSE WE ARE PUTTING OUR SYSTEMS FOR GRANTS  
15 MANAGEMENT INTO SHAPE, AND WE WILL NEED TO DO THAT  
16 BEFORE WE ACTUALLY SEND OUT THE MONEY. ED HAS WORKED  
17 AT A VARIETY OF FIRMS, HAS BEEN A PRESIDENT OF A SMALL  
18 COMPANY, AND IS EXTREMELY TALENTED. I JUST WANT TO  
19 TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THANK THE MOORE FOUNDATION WHO  
20 HAVE ADVISED US AND HELPED US FIND THE BEST POSSIBLE  
21 PERSON FOR THIS POSITION AND WHO HAVE GIVEN US VERY  
22 VALUABLE ADVICE IN THE MEANTIME. AND SO I APPRECIATE  
23 THAT VERY MUCH.

24 WE ARE CURRENTLY HIRING TWO MORE PEOPLE. ONE  
25 IS A GRANTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANT WHO WILL HELP US WITH



1 THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT UNDER DR. ARLENE CHIU AND,  
2 SECONDLY, WE'RE HIRING A FACILITIES PROCUREMENT AND  
3 OPERATIONS MANAGER WHO WILL BE ABLE TO HELP US WITH A  
4 VERY IMPORTANT PART OF OUR MOVE WHICH IS COMING UP IN  
5 NOVEMBER.

6 NOW, THE OTHER ISSUE THAT I WANTED TO DISCUSS  
7 WITH YOU WAS JUST TO REMIND YOU, OR TWO OTHER ISSUES,  
8 FIRST, TO REMIND YOU OF OUR SCIENTIFIC MEETING: "STEM  
9 CELL RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA, CHARTING NEW DIRECTIONS."  
10 IT WILL BE THE FIRST STEP IN SETTING OUR SCIENTIFIC  
11 AGENDA OCTOBER 1ST AND 2D IN SAN FRANCISCO. WE HAVE  
12 JUST FINALIZED. I THINK WE HAVE TITLES FROM ALL OF OUR  
13 SPEAKERS NOW. EVERYTHING IS FINALIZED FOR THAT  
14 MEETING. WE HAVE REGISTRATION WHICH IS LIMITED TO 200  
15 ON-SITE, AND FORTUNATELY WE ARE GOING TO HAVE  
16 WEBCASTING IN REAL TIME, SO IT WILL BE AVAILABLE TO  
17 ANYBODY WHO WANTS TO FOLLOW THE PROCEEDINGS, AND WE  
18 WILL THROUGH THAT ALSO HAVE A RECORD OF THE MEETING.  
19 SO WE ARE ALSO QUITE EXCITED ABOUT THAT AND VERY MUCH  
20 LOOK FORWARD TO THAT AS THE FIRST STEP IN REALLY  
21 ESTABLISHING OUR SCIENTIFIC PRIORITIES FOR THIS HUGE  
22 VENTURE.

23 THE NEXT POINT IS JUST TO TALK TO YOU A  
24 LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE FOR CIRM.  
25 AND I WANT TO SAY THAT WE, BOB KLEIN, OUR CHAIR, ED

1 PENHOET, OUR VICE CHAIR, AND MYSELF HAVE WORKED VERY  
2 HARD WITH A MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT AND HAVE COME UP WITH  
3 A PLAN THAT WE THINK WILL GIVE US VERY EFFECTIVE  
4 INTERNAL MANAGEMENT.

5 AND BASICALLY THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS ARE  
6 THAT THE PERSONNEL IN CIRM WILL REPORT TO THE  
7 PRESIDENT. THERE WILL BE A CHAIR'S OFFICE, AND  
8 PERSONNEL IN THE CHAIR'S OFFICE WILL REPORT THROUGH THE  
9 CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR TO THE PRESIDENT FOR PERSONNEL  
10 MANAGEMENT, BUT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE TO THE CHAIR AND  
11 VICE CHAIR INTERNALLY FOR ALLOCATION OF DUTIES,  
12 REPORTING LINES, AND TIME MANAGEMENT. ALL OTHER SENIOR  
13 OFFICERS WILL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT, AND THE BUDGET  
14 DECISIONS WILL BE MADE WHEN POSSIBLE BY CONSENSUS  
15 WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH FINAL DECISION BY  
16 THE PRESIDENT, AS REQUIRED BY PROPOSITION 71.

17 SO I'M SORRY THIS DOESN'T SHOW VERY WELL, BUT  
18 THIS JUST SHOWS THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR AND THE  
19 INDEPENDENT CITIZENS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. THE  
20 PRESIDENT THEN REPORTS TO THE ICOC, AND THEN CIRM  
21 UNDERNEATH. AND IF WE TAKE THE BOTTOM PART OF THAT AND  
22 JUST SHOW THAT, WHAT YOU SEE IS HERE. I THINK YOU  
23 SHOULD HAVE MATERIAL IN YOUR FOLDERS THAT CORRESPOND TO  
24 THIS AND IT JUST SHOWS THE VARIOUS OFFICES.

25 AS WE HAVE ALREADY DESCRIBED TO THE

1 GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE AND YOU WILL HEAR LATER FROM  
2 WALTER BARNES, WE HAVE DIVIDED THE CIRM INTO FOUR  
3 GROUPS: AN ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP, A CHAIR'S GROUP, A  
4 PRESIDENT'S GROUP, AND A SCIENCE GROUP, AND WE ARE  
5 WORKING WITH THOSE TO ESTABLISH WITHIN EACH OF THOSE  
6 REPORTING LINES AND BUDGET STRUCTURES.

7 NOW, THERE ARE SEVERAL MORE BOXES THAN FOUR,  
8 AS YOU CAN IMAGINE, AND THAT BECAUSE TWO OF OUR UNITS,  
9 COMMUNICATIONS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS, DO NOT AT THE MOMENT  
10 HAVE HEADS. AND WE HAVE DEFERRED HIRING THOSE UNTIL  
11 OUR FINANCIAL SITUATION IS MORE CLEAR. AND FOR THE  
12 MOMENT, THEY ARE REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE PRESIDENT,  
13 THOSE PEOPLE IN THOSE OFFICES. AND ALSO INFORMATION  
14 TECHNOLOGY REPORTS DIRECTLY TO THE PRESIDENT.

15 SO THIS IS THE CHART BY WHICH WE WILL OPERATE  
16 AND CARRY OUT OUR FUNCTION. THE THREE OF US ARE  
17 CONVINCED THAT THIS IS WILL GIVE US AN EFFECTIVE AND  
18 EFFICIENT ORGANIZATION AND WILL ALLOW US TO HAVE SOUND  
19 ADMINISTRATION AND TO GET OUR WORK DONE.

20 AND I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST APPROVAL FROM THE  
21 ICOC FOR THE ORGANIZATION CHART FOR CIRM AS PRESENTED;  
22 THAT IS, OUTLINING OUR ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE. MR.  
23 CHAIR, I'D TURN IT OVER TO YOU FOR THAT.

24 DR. PIZZO: FIRST, I WANT TO COMMEND YOU AND  
25 BOB AND OTHERS FOR SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS IN THE

1 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE. I THINK THIS IS MUCH CLEARER  
2 THAN IT WAS AT EARLIER TIMES, SO THAT'S PROGRESS. I'M  
3 VERY PLEASED WITH THE ORGANIZATIONAL CHART FOR THE  
4 CIRM.

5 I DO HAVE A QUESTION WHICH MAY BE A NUANCED  
6 ONE, BUT I'LL ASK IT NONETHELESS, WHICH IS UNDER MOST  
7 NONPROFITS, WHETHER IT'S UNIVERSITIES OR FOUNDATIONS, A  
8 BOARD OF DIRECTORS IS LISTED AS THE OVERSIGHT GROUP FOR  
9 THE ORGANIZATION. WHETHER IT'S UNIVERSITY, LIKE  
10 STANFORD, OR I ASSUME IT APPLIES TO STATE UNIVERSITIES  
11 AS WELL OR ANY NONPROFIT, I'VE NEVER SEEN AN  
12 ORGANIZATIONAL CHART IN WHICH A PRESIDENT AND VICE  
13 PRESIDENT WERE LISTED SEPARATELY FROM THE BOARD AND  
14 ABOVE THE ORGANIZATIONAL ENTITY OF THE BOARD.

15 UNLESS THERE'S A SPECIFIC REASON FOR THAT,  
16 I'D RECOMMEND CONFORMANCE WITH THE MORE STANDARD  
17 APPROACH. I DON'T THINK THAT CHANGES --

18 DR. HALL: YOU MEAN THE CHAIR AND THE VICE  
19 CHAIR?

20 DR. PIZZO: EXACTLY. I THINK IT'S  
21 SELF-EVIDENT THAT A CHAIR OF A BOARD OR A VICE CHAIR OF  
22 A BOARD ARE POSSESSED OF SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES THAT  
23 ARE CONCORDANT WITH THEIR ACTIVITIES, BUT I THINK THIS  
24 CREATES AN ARTIFICIAL IMAGE OF HIERARCHY THAT DOESN'T  
25 NEED TO BE IN PLACE FOR WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO ACHIEVE.

1 DR. HALL: THAT'S AN ICOC INTERNAL MATTER, SO  
2 I HAVE NO COMMENT ON THAT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AS I HAVE STATED PREVIOUSLY,  
4 THAT'S COMPLETELY CONSISTENT WITH MY VIEW, AS I'VE  
5 TALKED WITH DEAN PIZZO BEFORE, AND I'VE STATED BEFORE  
6 IN MEETINGS. I VIEW MYSELF AS A PEER WITH SPECIAL  
7 RESPONSIBILITIES, AND THERE ARE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
8 THAT HAVE SUGGESTED THE OTHER REPRESENTATION. BUT AS A  
9 MATTER OF RECORD, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, YOU'VE PROPERLY  
10 DESCRIBED HOW I SEE MY FUNCTION. AND, ED, HOW DO YOU  
11 FEEL?

12 DR. PENHOET: SAME AS YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

14 DR. PENHOET: ON THIS ISSUE.

15 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THAT THE UNUSUAL  
16 FEATURE HERE ABOUT THE WHOLE THING IS ONE THAT ACTUALLY  
17 OUR CONSULTANT POINTED OUT TO US WAS NOT SO UNUSUAL,  
18 AND THAT IS THAT WE HAVE A CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR WHO ARE  
19 OPERATIONALLY ACTIVE IN THE ORGANIZATION. AND HE SAID  
20 THE USUAL SOLUTION TO THAT IS THEN TO HAVE PEOPLE  
21 ASSIGNED TO THEM WHO REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT THROUGH  
22 THEM. AND IN THAT ROLE, THEY THEN REPORT TO THE  
23 PRESIDENT IN THE PERSONNEL ROLE, BUT OTHERWISE THEY'RE  
24 PART OF THE --

25 DR. PIZZO: AND I THINK THAT'S REFLECTED IN

1 THIS EXHIBIT AND DOESN'T NEED TO BE PRESENTED IN THE  
2 FIRST -- IF YOU GO BACK TO THE FIRST ONE, THE EARLIER  
3 SLIDE. I THINK YOU -- I DON'T THINK WE NEED -- SO THE  
4 RECOMMENDATION -- MY RECOMMENDATION FOR THIS EXHIBIT IS  
5 THAT THE PORTION THAT SAYS CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN  
6 SIMPLY BE ELIMINATED, AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE  
7 BE, IN ESSENCE, THE ICOC, WHICH IS THE BOARD OF  
8 DIRECTORS, OF WHICH THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR HAVE  
9 SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY, AND THEY  
10 COLLECTIVELY WITH THE ICOC OVERSEE THE CIRM.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THAT A  
12 MOTION, THAT WE ADOPT THAT RECOMMENDATION.

13 MS. WILSON: SECOND.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION IS MADE AND SECONDED.  
15 ANY OTHER BOARD COMMENT ON THAT? DR. WRIGHT.

16 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JUST PROBABLY, AGAIN, A  
17 CLARIFICATION, BUT, ZACH, I THOUGHT I HEARD YOU MENTION  
18 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. IF YOU DID --

19 DR. HALL: INTERNALLY, SO WE HAVE AN  
20 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT IS MYSELF, THE CHAIR, THE VICE  
21 CHAIR, AND THE SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, WALTER  
22 BARNES, AND WE MEET ONCE A WEEK.

23 DR. WRIGHT: IS THAT REFLECTED IN ONE OF  
24 THESE BOXES?

25 DR. HALL: IT IS NOT BECAUSE THE BOXES REALLY

1 HAVE TO DO MORE WITH REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS THAN  
2 WITH -- WE ALSO HAVE A SENIOR STAFF MEETING NOW EACH  
3 WEEK. SO THESE ARE JUST MECHANISMS FOR MAKING  
4 DECISIONS, AND SO WE TRY TO MAKE ALL POLICY DECISIONS  
5 WITHIN THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. AND THEN WE DEAL WITH  
6 OPERATIONAL MATTERS IN THE SENIOR STAFF MEETING EACH  
7 WEEK. AND WHEN THOSE AFFECT POLICY OR ARE OF  
8 SUFFICIENT IMPORTANCE, THEY'RE BROUGHT TO THE EXECUTIVE  
9 COMMITTEE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE  
11 BOARD? DR. MURPHY.

12 DR. MURPHY: ZACH, ON THE, I THINK IT WAS THE  
13 NEXT SLIDE, PERHAPS THE NEXT ONE, THE ISSUE OF FINAL  
14 DECISIONS ON BUDGETS. I KNOW IT'S INHERENT THAT THE  
15 RECOMMENDATION, IT SAYS HERE THAT THE BUDGET DECISIONS  
16 WILL BE MADE WITH FINAL DECISION BY THE PRESIDENT.  
17 THAT, OF COURSE, IS SUBJECT TO OVERSIGHT BY THE ICOC  
18 AND FINAL APPROVAL BY THE ICOC.

19 DR. HALL: WE BRING A BUDGET TO YOU. WE'VE  
20 DISCUSSED THIS IN THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE, AND MAYBE  
21 TINA WILL TALK ABOUT IT LATER. BUT ONCE THE BUDGET IS  
22 APPROVED, THEN WE WILL NOT BRING EVERY BUDGET DECISION  
23 TO THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OR TO THE ICOC. SO THEN  
24 WITHIN THOSE FRAMEWORK, WE WILL THEN OPERATE. AND  
25 THERE'S BEEN SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT WHETHER FOR

1 DECISIONS INVOLVING A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY, WE WANT  
2 TO HAVE SPECIFIC APPROVAL OR NOT. BUT ALL THIS IS  
3 PRESUMABLY WITHIN THE OPERATING BUDGET THAT'S APPROVED  
4 BY THE ICOC. SO, OF COURSE, THE ICOC HAS FINAL  
5 OVERSIGHT.

6 BUT THE POINT OF THAT IS WHEN WE ARE MAKING  
7 DECISIONS INTERNALLY ABOUT HOW WE SPEND DOLLARS, THEN  
8 THE AIM IS TO TRY TO WORK IT OUT IN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
9 AND REACH AGREEMENT THERE.

10 AND IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, IF WE CAN'T REACH  
11 AGREEMENT, THEN AS IN AGREEMENT WITH PROPOSITION 71,  
12 THE PRESIDENT MAKES THE FINAL DECISION.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO FOR CLARITY, THE ANSWER  
14 IS ALL BUDGETS ARE APPROVED BY THE ICOC BOARD, AND  
15 THERE'S DISCUSSION IN THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE THAT  
16 WILL BE BROUGHT TO THIS BOARD FOR ACTION THAT SPECIFIES  
17 THAT IF THERE IS A VARIANCE IN THAT BUDGET OF MORE THAN  
18 X PERCENT, THAT IT WOULD ALSO BE BROUGHT BACK EITHER TO  
19 THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE, IF IT'S A LOWER LEVEL, OR TO  
20 THE BOARD, IF IT'S A HIGHER LEVEL VARIANCE; BUT AS LONG  
21 AS IT'S WITHIN THOSE VARIANCES AND WITHIN THE BUDGET,  
22 THEN IT IS THE PRESIDENT WHO WILL LEAD THE ORGANIZATION  
23 IN IMPLEMENTING THE BUDGET. AND THAT'S WHAT -- THAT'S  
24 THE LEVEL OF THE PROCESS THAT DR. HALL IS REFERRING TO.

25 YES, JOAN SAMUELSON.



1 MS. SAMUELSON: MY QUESTION IS ABOUT ONE OF  
2 THE CHARTS WITH BOXES, WHICH HAS SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM,  
3 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, GRANTS MANAGEMENT, AND GRANTS  
4 WORKING GROUP UNDER THE SCIENCE OFFICE. AND SINCE THE  
5 TITLE IS "CIRM ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE," THIS MAY  
6 REFLECT THOSE ASPECTS THAT ARE WITHIN THE CIRM  
7 EXCLUSIVELY, BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO POINT OUT  
8 THAT THE WORKING GROUP IS ADVISORY TO THE ICOC AND THE  
9 COMMITTEE ITSELF PLAY AN ESSENTIAL ROLE IN CRAFTING  
10 AND -- CRAFTING THE SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM AND THEN THE  
11 CRITERIA WHICH WILL BE APPLIED.

12 DR. HALL: ABSOLUTELY. BUT AS I READ  
13 PROPOSITION 71, THE WORKING GROUPS ACTUALLY REPORT TO  
14 CIRM. THEY ARE PART OF THE CIRM, AND WE HAVE SENIOR  
15 STAFF THAT ARE LIAISON TO THOSE COMMITTEES AND WORK  
16 WITH THEM, BUT THEY ARE UNDER CIRM AND NOT DIRECTLY  
17 UNDER ICOC. THIS IS IN CONTRAST TO THE EARLIER  
18 SUBCOMMITTEES. JAMES, IS THAT CORRECT? IF I'M  
19 MISTAKEN IN THAT, WOULD YOU --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THE DISTINCTION THAT  
21 JOAN MAY BE DRAWING HERE IS THAT FOR RECOMMENDATIONS  
22 FOR POLICY, FOR GRANTS AWARDS, ETC., ALL OF THOSE  
23 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WORKING GROUPS COME DIRECTLY  
24 TO THE BOARD WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE CIRM STAFF.  
25 BUT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND FOR IMPLEMENTATION

1 OF THE PROGRAM PROCESSING FOR GRANTS MANAGEMENT, FOR  
2 ALL THE OPERATIONAL PURPOSES, THEY ARE UNDER THE CIRM.  
3 AND CERTAINLY WE LOOK TO THE PRESIDENT AND HIS STAFF TO  
4 LEAD THAT PROCESS WITH THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT TO CARRY  
5 OUT THE OVERALL STRATEGIC PLAN AND MISSION OF THE  
6 INSTITUTE.

7 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S A CORRECT  
8 REPRESENTATION.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. SINCE WE'VE HAD  
10 A DISCUSSION ON THE SCOPE OF THESE, TO MAKE IT CLEAR  
11 FOR THE RECORD, I THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE IF THE  
12 MOTION THAT I MADE INCLUDE NOT JUST THE AMENDMENT OF  
13 THAT CHART, BUT, IN FACT, THE APPROVAL OF WHAT'S BEEN  
14 PROPOSED SO WE DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH TWO SEPARATE  
15 PROCESSES. IF THAT'S ACCEPTABLE TO THE MAKER OF THE  
16 SECOND, THE MOTION WOULD INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE  
17 ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS THAT HAVE BEEN PROPOSED. IS THAT  
18 ACCEPTABLE TO THE MAKER OF THE SECOND?

19 MS. WILSON: YES.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THAT ACCEPTABLE -- IS  
21 THERE ANYONE ON THE BOARD THAT WOULD OBJECT TO THAT  
22 PROCESS? WITH THAT, I WOULD ASK IF THERE'S PUBLIC  
23 COMMENT. MR. HALPERN.

24 MR. HALPERN: GOOD MORNING. I HAVE TWO  
25 COMMENTS I'D LIKE TO MAKE ON THE PROPOSED

1 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE. THE FIRST IS THAT IN MY  
2 JUDGEMENT, BASED ON 30 YEARS OF NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT  
3 AND TEN YEARS AS PRESIDENT OF A SIGNIFICANT FOUNDATION  
4 IN NEW YORK CITY, THIS STRUCTURE IS ONE THAT I'VE NEVER  
5 SEEN ONE LIKE IT BEFORE. AND I JUST WANT THE ICOC TO  
6 CONSIDER CAREFULLY WHETHER THIS IS REALLY THE STRUCTURE  
7 THAT OPTIMIZES THE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESSFUL OPERATION  
8 OF THIS IMPORTANT PROGRAM.

9 SPECIFICALLY, PUTTING 20 PERCENT OF THE STAFF  
10 UNDER THE CHAIRMAN'S OFFICE, I THINK, POSES A SERIOUS  
11 QUESTION IN TERMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND THE  
12 RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NEW PRESIDENT.

13 MY SECOND POINT HAS TO DO WITH THIS DIAGRAM,  
14 WHICH I THINK INACCURATELY DESCRIBES THE RELATIONSHIP  
15 THAT IS CONCEIVED. THIS MAKES IT APPEAR THAT THE  
16 PRESIDENT SUPERVISES THE OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,  
17 SUPERVISES, INDEED, THE CHAIRMAN HIMSELF. THAT'S WHAT  
18 THE CONVENTIONS OF THESE BOXES AND ARROWS GENERALLY  
19 MEANS. THAT IS NOT WHAT IS INTENDED, I BELIEVE. MORE  
20 ACCURATELY WOULD BE TO MOVE THE CHAIR'S BOX UP ON A  
21 PARALLEL LEVEL WITH THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE, TO HAVE A  
22 DOTTED LINE CONNECT THEM TO SHOW THAT THE PEOPLE IN HIS  
23 OFFICE WHO ARE REPORTING TO HIM ON ALL SUBSTANTIVE  
24 MATTERS OR ON PERSONNEL MATTERS, VACATIONS, LEAVE,  
25 OVERTIME PAY, AND THE LIKE, ARE REPORTING TO THE

1 PRESIDENT'S OFFICE. THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING OF HOW  
2 THIS WOULD, IN FACT, WORK.

3 TO SHOW THE CHAIR REPORTING TO THE PRESIDENT  
4 IS INAPPROPRIATE; AND, SECONDLY, TO SHOW THE REAL  
5 AUTHORITY THAT THE CHAIR HAS OVER THE PEOPLE IN HIS  
6 OFFICE, I THINK, IS SOMETHING WHICH WOULD BE REVEALED  
7 BY THE DIAGRAM AND NOT HIDDEN.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, WOULD YOU LIKE TO  
9 RESPOND?

10 DR. HALL: I THINK WE SAID AND IT STATES ON  
11 THE CHART, WE SAID WHAT THIS DIAGRAM WAS INTENDED TO  
12 SHOW. AND THAT IS, THAT THE PERSONNEL IN THE CHAIR'S  
13 OFFICE ULTIMATELY REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT, AS REQUIRED  
14 BY PROPOSITION 71, BUT THEY DO SO THROUGH THE CHAIR AND  
15 VICE CHAIR, AND THAT ON PERSONNEL MATTERS, THAT THE  
16 CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR PEOPLE IN THAT  
17 UNIT TO THE PRESIDENT. AND THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE  
18 INTEND.

19 THESE PEOPLE ARE ASSIGNED TO THE CHAIR'S  
20 OFFICE, AND IT IS THEN THE CHAIR'S PREROGATIVE TO SET  
21 UP AN INTERNAL ORGANIZATION CHART AND TO ASSIGN DUTIES  
22 AND ALLOCATION OF TIME AS THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR  
23 WISH. AND I WILL SAY THAT, MR. HALPERN, IN SPIKE OF  
24 WHAT MAY BE STRANGE TO YOUR EXPERIENCE, IT WAS  
25 SUGGESTED TO US BY A VERY EXPERIENCED MANAGEMENT

1 CONSULTANT WHOM WE MET WITH SEVERAL TIMES AND DISCUSSED  
2 THIS WITH. SO HE WAS, IN FACT, THE ONE WHO SUGGESTED  
3 THAT THIS WAS PERFECTLY NORMAL, HAPPENED IN MANY LARGE  
4 ORGANIZATIONS. AND SO I, FOR ONE, AM QUITE COMFORTABLE  
5 WITH IT AND THINK IT IS THE RIGHT ORGANIZATION TO LET  
6 US DO OUR BUSINESS.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. ANY ADDITIONAL  
8 COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD? CALL THE QUESTION. ALL IN  
9 FAVOR.

10 OPPOSED?

11 MOTION PASSES.

12 DR. HALL: DO YOU WANT TO MOVE TO THE NEXT  
13 ITEM ON THE AGENDA?

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WANTED TO MAKE SURE YOU  
15 COMPLETED YOUR ITEM.

16 DR. HALL: YES. WE'RE GETTING THE THING  
17 WORKING HERE. UNFORTUNATELY WE HAVE THIS ON ONE LONG  
18 CONTINUOUS POWERPOINT.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE BEFORE US THE  
20 INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS, POSTDOCTORAL  
21 FELLOWS, POSTDOCTORAL CLINICAL FELLOWS, AND GRADUATE  
22 STUDENTS THAT WILL CREATE A TREMENDOUS INTELLECTUAL  
23 FRAMEWORK FOR ADVANCING SCIENCE AND MEDICINE IN THE  
24 STATE IN THE EMBRYONIC AND ADULT STEM CELL AREA.

25 WE WANT TO REMIND EVERYONE IN THE PUBLIC THAT

1 ANY MEMBER OF THE BOARD WHO REPRESENTS AN INSTITUTION  
2 THAT MAY BE A CANDIDATE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE  
3 IN THE DISCUSSION, NOR WILL THAT BOARD MEMBER BE ABLE  
4 TO VOTE ON THE ITEM. EVERY BOARD MEMBER THAT THIS  
5 AFFECTS HAS A LIST OF THE ITEMS THEY CANNOT VOTE ON.  
6 YOU WILL FIND THAT WE HAVE A CIRM STAFF MEMBER WHO IS  
7 MONITORING THIS PROCESS. THE VOTES WILL BE ROLL CALL  
8 VOTES TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT THERE IS NOT ANY ACCIDENTAL  
9 IMPACT IN ADDITION TO THE OVERSIGHT THAT IS BEING  
10 CONDUCTED.

11 BECAUSE THIS IS A PUBLIC MEETING AND THE  
12 PUBLIC CAN SEE WHO IS VOTING, AND THERE'S GOING TO BE A  
13 RECORD OF THIS AND HAVE THE OVERSIGHT, THE BOARD MEMBER  
14 DOES NOT NEED TO LEAVE THE ROOM DURING THE DISCUSSION,  
15 MERELY NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN EITHER DISCUSSION OR THE  
16 VOTE.

17 I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT IN ADDITION TO THE  
18 BOARD MEMBER'S OWN ACTIVITIES, THE STAFF HAS LOOKED AT  
19 ACTIVITIES OF THE FAMILY OF BOARD MEMBERS. IF ANYONE  
20 IS COMPENSATED BY ANY INSTITUTION, THAT INSTITUTION  
21 ALSO SHOWS UP AS A RECUSAL INSTITUTION ON THE BOARD  
22 MEMBER'S LIST. SO WE HAVE TRIED TO BE VERY THOROUGH  
23 AND LOOK AT BOTH THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY AND THE  
24 PRIMARY OPPORTUNITY TO AVOID CONFLICT AS WELL AS ANY  
25 SECONDARY OPPORTUNITIES TO AVOID CONFLICTS.

1                   CAN I CONFIRM THAT ANY BOARD MEMBER  
2 REPRESENTING AN INSTITUTION HAS RECEIVED THEIR  
3 INSTRUCTIONS? HAS ANYONE NOT RECEIVED THEIR  
4 INSTRUCTIONS?

5                   DR. HALL: BOB, JUST IN CASE, YOU MAY HAVE  
6 MADE THIS POINT. I'M NOT SURE. TO BE MORE SPECIFIC,  
7 WHEN THE ROLL CALL IS CALLED, THOSE WHO ARE RECUSED  
8 FROM VOTING'S NAME WILL NOT BE CALLED.

9                   CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT. THE ICOC IS  
10 THE BOARD OF FINAL DECISION, AND I WILL REMIND THE  
11 BOARD MEMBERS THAT THE MEDICAL AND SCIENTIFIC WORKING  
12 GROUP, WHILE REPRESENTING DISTINGUISHED SCIENTISTS AND  
13 PHYSICIANS FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY, IN SOME CASES FROM  
14 AROUND THE WORLD, AT TIMES REPRESENTS A SOURCE OF INPUT  
15 AS WELL AS FROM THE PATIENT ADVOCATES THAT PLAY A VITAL  
16 ROLE ON THAT WORKING GROUP.

17                   THE COMBINED KNOWLEDGE OF THOSE PATIENT  
18 GROUPS AND SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIANS IS CERTAINLY  
19 DISTINGUISHED, BUT IT COMES TO THIS BOARD AS ADVICE.  
20 THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT ARE MADE ON FUNDING, ON  
21 FUNDING CUTS FROM THE PROPOSALS, OR ON LACK OF FUNDING  
22 WILL BE LOOKED AT AS INDIVIDUAL MATTERS AND REVIEWED BY  
23 THIS BOARD FOR DECISIONS BY THIS BOARD. THE BOARD CAN  
24 DEVIATE BY INCREASING OR DECREASING THE FUNDING OR BY  
25 ANY OTHER ACTION THAT THE BOARD FEELS IS APPROPRIATE,

1 INCLUDING SUSPENDING THE REVIEW OF A PARTICULAR ITEM.

2 SO WE WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN THIS REVIEW OF THIS  
3 VERY HISTORIC INITIAL GRANT PROGRAM OF THE CALIFORNIA  
4 INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE WITH AN  
5 UNDERSTANDING THAT IT IS THE TREMENDOUS KNOWLEDGE,  
6 EXPERTISE, AND EMPATHY REPRESENTED IN THIS BOARD THAT  
7 WILL MAKE THOSE FINAL DECISIONS. DR. HALL.

8 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST ADD A NOTE TO THAT,  
9 REALLY ON A PERSONAL LEVEL. IN MY EXPERIENCE AS  
10 DIRECTOR OF AN INSTITUTE AT NIH AND WITH VARIOUS  
11 PATIENT ADVOCACY GROUPS, WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE IS NOT  
12 ONLY THE FIRST STEP IN OUR GRANTS AWARDING PROCESS, IT  
13 ALSO REPRESENTS A NEW WAY OF DOING BUSINESS. AND I,  
14 FOR ONE, HAVE BEEN EXTREMELY PLEASED WITH THE PROCESS  
15 SO FAR.

16 WE HAVE A WORKING GROUP THAT CONSISTS NOT  
17 ONLY OF OUTSTANDING SCIENTISTS, BUT ALSO PATIENT  
18 ADVOCATES. AND AS WE KNOW, JOAN SAMUELSON IS THE  
19 CO-CHAIR OF THAT GROUP, AND WE HAD A TERRIFIC REVIEW  
20 SESSION. AND I THINK THE EXPERIENCE OF SCIENTISTS AND  
21 PATIENT ADVOCATES WORKING TOGETHER WAS EXTREMELY GOOD.  
22 AND WE ALSO HERE TODAY ARE DOING SOMETHING THAT IS  
23 RATHER DIFFERENT FROM ANY ORGANIZATION I'VE EVER BEEN  
24 IN, AND THAT IS HAVING IN PUBLIC SESSION DISCUSSION OF  
25 THE AWARDS OF THE GRANTS. AND SO WE ARE EMBARKING ON



1 SOMETHING NEW HERE.

2 WE' RE GOING TO WALK YOU THROUGH THE  
3 PROCEDURES AS WE SEE THEM. THERE MAY BE SOME GLITCHES  
4 ALONG THE WAY. THESE, I THINK, WILL BE JUST NORMAL  
5 GROWING PAINS IN OUR PROCESS, BUT WE CAN CHANGE THINGS  
6 FOR THE BETTER AS WE GO ALONG. BUT AT ANY RATE, IT IS,  
7 I THINK, IMPORTANT FOR US NOT JUST AS THE FIRST STEP IN  
8 OUR SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM, AS I SAID, BUT IT IS THE FIRST  
9 STEP IN A NEW WAY OF DOING BUSINESS THAT I THINK WILL  
10 VERY MUCH CHARACTERIZE THE ICOC AND CIRM AS WE LOOK  
11 BACK IN FUTURE YEARS AT IT.

12 SO WITH THAT MODEST PREAMBLE, LET' S GO AHEAD  
13 AND GET TO WORK ON THIS. BEFORE WE CAN ACTUALLY  
14 CONSIDER THE GRANTS, WE HAVE SEVERAL GRANT  
15 APPLICATIONS, WE HAVE SEVERAL ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT WE  
16 MUST DO. THE GRANTS REVIEW OR, AS YOU WILL HEAR,  
17 RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP, HELD ITS FIRST MEETING  
18 AUGUST 3D AND 4TH IN SAN FRANCISCO. WE HAD TWO PARTS  
19 TO THAT MEETING.

20 THE FIRST PART WAS A PUBLIC MEETING THAT  
21 CONSISTED -- THAT CONSIDERED MATTERS OF PROCEDURE AND  
22 POLICY. AND THE WORKING GROUP RECEIVED PUBLIC COMMENT  
23 ON EACH OF THE ISSUES THAT IT CONSIDERED. SEVERAL OF  
24 THESE ISSUES RESULTED IN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC,  
25 AND I WILL DISCUSS THOSE IN JUST A MOMENT.

1 THE SECOND PART OF THE WORKING GROUP WAS THE  
2 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION IN WHICH THE APPLICATIONS TO OUR  
3 TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM RECEIVED SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION,  
4 AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC WERE MADE.

5 NOW, IN NEXT BIT OF TIME, I WILL PRESENT  
6 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BOTH PARTS OF THE COMMITTEE, FIRST  
7 FROM THE PUBLIC SESSION AND THEN THE GRANTS REVIEW  
8 SESSION. ONE OF THE MATTERS RAISED IN THE PUBLIC  
9 MEETING CONCERNED RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATIONS. IN THE  
10 INTEREST OF TIME, I WOULD LIKE TO DEFER THAT TO THIS  
11 AFTERNOON. HOWEVER, THREE OTHER ITEMS NEED TO BE  
12 RESOLVED BEFORE WE MOVE ON TO THE GRANTS APPLICATIONS  
13 THEMSELVES.

14 THE FIRST OF THESE IS THE BYLAWS FOR THE  
15 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. A PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF THE  
16 BYLAWS WAS DEVELOPED BY CIRM STAFF AND WAS PRESENTED TO  
17 THE ICOC FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES AT ITS JULY  
18 MEETING. THE WORKING GROUP AT ITS MEETING IN AUGUST  
19 THEN MADE SEVERAL MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT AND NOW  
20 RECOMMENDS THE AMENDED VERSION TO THE ICOC FOR  
21 APPROVAL.

22 LET ME NOTE THAT BECAUSE THE BYLAWS RELATE TO  
23 INTERNAL MATTERS, APPROVAL BY THE OFFICE OF  
24 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AS A STATE REGULATION IS NOT  
25 REQUIRED. YOU HAVE THE BYLAWS IN FRONT OF YOU. THE

1 MAJOR REVISION MADE BY THE WORKING GROUP WAS MADE IN A  
2 RESPONSE TO A SUGGESTION BY THE VICE CHAIR, JOAN  
3 SAMUELSON, WHICH IS THAT WE REFER TO THE WORKING GROUP  
4 BY A MORE ACCURATE SHORT TITLE AS THE RESEARCH FUNDING  
5 WORKING GROUP RATHER THAN THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING  
6 GROUP. AND THE WORKING GROUP THOUGHT THAT WAS A GOOD  
7 IDEA AND INCLUDED THAT IN THE BYLAWS.

8 YOU HAVE A COPY OF THE BYLAWS IN FRONT OF  
9 YOU. MR. CHAIR, MAY I REQUEST APPROVAL OF THE BYLAWS  
10 FOR THE RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP AS RECOMMENDED  
11 BY THAT GROUP AT ITS LAST MEETING?

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. BOARD COMMENTS  
13 ON THE BYLAWS? JOAN SAMUELSON.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: ONE, AND I SUPPOSE THIS COULD  
15 BE TAKEN UP LATER, BUT IT SEEMS -- I HAVE SEVERAL  
16 COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT THE OTHER PROCEDURAL  
17 RULES, THE CRITERIA AND SO ON THAT FOLLOW AFTER THE  
18 BYLAWS. AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THEY SHOULD GO BACK TO  
19 THE WORKING GROUP FOR EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
20 BASED ON WHAT WE'VE LEARNED AT THIS VERY EARLY STAGE IN  
21 THIS PROCESS. AND I THINK IT WOULD BE WELL IF THE  
22 BYLAWS WERE REVIEWED THEN AS WELL BECAUSE I THINK THEY  
23 MAY -- THAT DISCUSSION MAY INFORM MORE INFORMED  
24 RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT THE BYLAWS AS WELL.

25 I DON'T KNOW THAT THERE'S ANY REASON WE HAVE

1 TO SET THEM IN STONE NOW.

2 DR. HALL: WELL, THEY CERTAINLY CAN BE  
3 AMENDED AND CHANGED LATER. THEY WERE RECOMMENDED A  
4 MONTH AGO BY THE WORKING GROUP WHICH CONSIDERED THEM  
5 FOR APPROVAL BY THIS COMMITTEE. AND ACTUALLY YOU HAVE  
6 SEEN THEM BEFORE BECAUSE I PRESENTED THEM FOR  
7 INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES, I THINK IT WAS, AT THE AUGUST  
8 ICOC MEETING. SO THEY HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED. MY  
9 SUGGESTION WOULD BE THAT YOU VOTE ON THEM AS THEY ARE;  
10 AND THEN IF THERE'S SPECIFIC ITEMS THAT WE NEED TO  
11 AMEND OR CHANGE LATER, IT CAN BE DONE.

12 LET ME POINT OUT THAT BECAUSE THIS IS NOT  
13 STATE REGULATION, THIS CAN BE DONE IN A REASONABLE WAY;  
14 THAT IS, WE DO NOT HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE LONG APA  
15 PROCEDURE IN ORDER TO DO THIS.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: IF THAT'S THE CASE AND IT'S  
17 UNDERSTOOD THAT WE CAN BRING THEM BACK AFTER SOME MORE  
18 DELIBERATE REVIEW.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT A POSSIBLE  
20 APPROACH HERE WOULD BE A MOTION THAT WE MOVE TO ADOPT  
21 WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO SEND THEM BACK FOR ADDITIONAL  
22 REFINEMENTS. WE ARE CONSTANTLY IN REAL TIME LEARNING,  
23 AND THAT IS ONE OF THE BEAUTIFUL THINGS ABOUT THIS  
24 GROUP IS THAT THEY'RE ADAPTING AND CONSTANTLY IMPROVING  
25 THE MODEL.

1                   HAVING THE BYLAWS IN PLACE WITH THE  
2 DISCUSSION BY THE WORKING GROUP, WITH THE PUBLIC INPUT  
3 FROM THE PRIOR MEETINGS, WITH THE STAFF WORK PROVIDES A  
4 VERY USEFUL FRAMEWORK WHICH WE'RE GOING TO BE PROBABLY  
5 IMPROVING FOR SOME TIME. AND IT WOULD BE AN  
6 APPROPRIATE APPROACH TO APPROVE THEM WITH INSTRUCTION  
7 TO THEN RETURN THEM FOR ADDITIONAL SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS  
8 AND REFINEMENTS SO THAT WE WOULD HAVE SOMETHING IN  
9 PLACE THAT WILL HELP THE PUBLIC UNDERSTAND THE PROCESS,  
10 AND IT WILL HELP THE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS BECAUSE ALL  
11 OF WHAT WE HAVE BEFORE US HAS BEEN REVIEWED.

12                   DR. WRIGHT.

13                   DR. WRIGHT: I'D BE HAPPY TO MAKE THAT  
14 MOTION, BUT I JUST HAVE ONE OTHER QUESTION,  
15 CLARIFICATION. IT'S ARTICLE 6, MEETINGS, SECTION 4.  
16 I'M ASSUMING THAT THE EMERGENCY AND SPECIAL MEETINGS  
17 ARE CALLED BY THE CHAIR OF THE WORK GROUP, NOT THE  
18 CHAIR OF THE ICOC. AND IF THAT'S THE CASE, WE PROBABLY  
19 JUST OUGHT TO ADD OF THE RESEARCH FUNDING WORK GROUP.  
20 SECTION 4, SPECIAL AND EMERGENCY MEETINGS.

21                   DR. HALL: YES. YES. AND WE CAN MAKE THAT  
22 AMENDMENT.

23                   DR. WRIGHT: OKAY.

24                   CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOAN, ARE YOU COMFORTABLE  
25 WITH THE SUGGESTED MOTION WHERE WE WOULD ADOPT THESE SO

1 THAT WE HAVE A FRAMEWORK IN PLACE WITH SPECIFIC  
2 INSTRUCTIONS TO SEND THEM BACK FOR ADDITIONAL  
3 REFINEMENTS?

4 MS. SAMUELSON: SURE. WITH THE UNDERSTANDING  
5 THAT I EXPECT THAT THERE WILL BE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. WRIGHT, ARE YOU MAKING  
7 THAT MOTION?

8 DR. WRIGHT: I AM.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

10 DR. PRIETO: SECOND.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. SHEEHY.

12 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST HAD A QUESTION ON  
13 SECTION -- ARTICLE 4, SECTION 6. I THINK THAT THE  
14 LANGUAGE IN SECTION 5 AND SECTION 6 SHOULD BE FAIRLY  
15 SIMILAR IN TERMS OF SELECTION OF THOSE MEMBERS, THE AD  
16 HOC AND THE ALTERNATES. I THINK THAT IN THAT THEY BOTH  
17 HAVE VOTING PRIVILEGES. DON'T WE -- HAVEN'T WE BEEN  
18 VOTING ON AD HOC MEMBERS AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS? I  
19 THINK WE'VE APPROVED AD HOC AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS.

20 DR. HALL: SAY AGAIN, JEFF. I JUST FOUND THE  
21 PLACE.

22 MR. SHEEHY: IN SECTION 5 AND SECTION 6, WE  
23 STIPULATE AN ICOC APPROVAL PROCESS FOR THE ALTERNATES.  
24 WE DON'T HAVE SIMILAR LANGUAGE IN ARTICLE 6, BUT I  
25 THINK WE'VE VOTED -- WE'VE ALREADY APPOINTED AD HOC AND

1 ALTERNATE MEMBERS. AND IT WOULD BE -- SINCE THEY HAVE  
2 VOTING PRIVILEGES AND I THINK WE KIND OF NEED TO HAVE  
3 THEM APPROVED BY US IF THEY'RE GOING TO VOTE. SO THE  
4 LANGUAGE SHOULD BE -- I THINK IDENTICAL LANGUAGE WOULD  
5 KIND OF COVER THAT.

6 DR. HALL: THE DIFFERENCE IS -- THE  
7 DIFFERENCE IS -- THE ONE DIFFERENCE IS THAT THE AD  
8 HOC -- ALL OF THESE HAVE BEEN VOTED ON BY THE ICOC. IF  
9 YOU RECALL, YOU APPROVED --

10 MR. SHEEHY: I AGREE.

11 DR. HALL: -- MEMBERS, ALTERNATES, AND THERE  
12 WERE A SET OF APPROVED AD HOCS. AND THE DIFFERENCE IS  
13 THE AD HOCS WERE OFTEN SOME OF OUR MOST DISTINGUISHED  
14 PEOPLE, WHO SAID THEY WOULD BE HAPPY TO HELP, THEY  
15 WOULD BE HAPPY TO SERVE, BUT THEY COULD NOT DO SO ON A  
16 REGULAR BASIS. SO THEY ARE NOT MEANT TO REPLACE  
17 MEMBERS WHEN THE MEMBERS STEP DOWN, BUT THEY ARE  
18 AVAILABLE TO COME IN AT A SPECIAL TIME. BECAUSE  
19 THEY'VE BEEN APPROVED BY THE ICOC, THEN WE THOUGHT THEY  
20 SHOULD HAVE VOTING PRIVILEGES.

21 NOW, THE DIFFERENCES ARE SPECIALISTS IS THE  
22 NEXT CATEGORY, WHO WE INVITE IN BECAUSE THEY SPECIAL  
23 KNOWLEDGE ON A PARTICULAR TOPIC, AND THEY DON'T HAVE,  
24 IN THAT SENSE, VOTING PRIVILEGES AND DON'T COUNT TOWARD  
25 A QUORUM. THEY'RE THERE TO PROVIDE EXPERT ADVICE.

1 SO --

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, THE QUESTION GOES  
3 TO THE POINT THAT IN SECTION 6, IT DOESN'T REFERENCE  
4 THAT THOSE AD HOC MEMBERS HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN  
5 APPROVED.

6 DR. HALL: I BEG YOUR PARDON. I  
7 MISUNDERSTOOD. LET'S PUT THAT IN.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH OUR  
9 PROCESS AT THE BOARD LEVEL ALREADY, SO IT'S A VERY GOOD  
10 CATCH. THANK YOU, JEFF.

11 DR. HALL: AND IT'S CONSISTENT WITH THE  
12 INTENT AND ACTUALLY EVERYTHING THAT'S HAPPENED. SO IF  
13 WE CAN MARK THAT.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO ANY OTHER BOARD COMMENTS?  
15 DID THE MAKER OF THE MOTION AND THE SECOND ADOPT THOSE  
16 IMPROVEMENTS IN THE LANGUAGE OR CLARIFICATIONS TO THEIR  
17 MOTION?

18 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THE SECOND?

20 DR. PRIETO: YES.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THE MOTION IS GOING TO GO  
22 FORWARD WITH THE MODIFICATIONS, FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS  
23 THAT HAVE BEEN MADE.

24 ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC?

25 MR. HALPERN: A BRIEF COMMENT, MR. CHAIR. I



1 KNOW THE EFFORT IS TO ADAPT AND CONSTANTLY IMPROVE THE  
2 MODEL, BUT I WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT PROP 71 HAS SOME  
3 VERY SPECIFIC AND CONCRETE LIMITATIONS, AND IT CANNOT  
4 BE AMENDED FOR THREE YEARS. SO WITH REGARD TO AD HOC  
5 MEMBERS AND SPECIAL MEMBERS WHO ARE GIVEN VOTING RIGHTS  
6 IN THESE BYLAWS, I WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT NEITHER OF  
7 THOSE CATEGORIES EXIST IN PROP 71. PROP 71 STATES HOW  
8 MANY MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED, AND THERE'S ONLY ONE  
9 CLASS OF MEMBERS IN PROP 71.

10 THIS KIND OF INFORMAL INNOVATION, I THINK, IS  
11 PROHIBITED BY LAW, AND I HOPE THAT THE ICOC -- I KNOW  
12 YOU ARE NOT LAWYERS. I HOPE THE ICOC WILL CONSIDER THE  
13 FACT THAT THERE ARE MANY IN THIS STATE WHO FEEL THAT  
14 THE ICOC DOES OPERATE OUTSIDE THE EXCLUSIVE CONTROL AND  
15 MANAGEMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT. THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. AND I WILL TELL  
17 YOU THAT MR. HARRISON IS SPECIFICALLY FOCUSING ON THOSE  
18 ISSUES, AND THE EXACT NATURE OF AN AD HOC MEMBER BEFORE  
19 ANY AD HOC MEMBER SERVES WILL BE CLARIFIED BY OUR  
20 COUNSEL. THE SPECIFIC NATURE OF WHETHER THEY'RE  
21 SERVING AS A REPLACEMENT, AN INTERIM REPLACEMENT, FOR  
22 THAT MEMBER IS BEING REFINED. WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A  
23 VERY SPECIFIC PROCEDURE TO CONFIRM THE LEGAL STATUS OF  
24 AN AD HOC MEMBER BEFORE THOSE AD HOC MEMBERS ACTUALLY  
25 SERVE.

1 DR. HALL: SO COUNSEL IS LOOKING AT THAT  
2 QUESTION; AND IF NECESSARY, THE BYLAWS MAY BE MODIFIED  
3 LATER TO ACCOMMODATE COUNSEL'S OPINION.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THOSE BYLAWS DON'T  
5 SPECIFY ALL OF THE PROCESS NECESSARY TO QUALIFY THAT AD  
6 HOC MEMBER ACTUALLY FOR THE VOTING PROCESS, WHICH MAY  
7 REQUIRE SEVERAL LEGAL STEPS TO CONSUMMATE THEIR  
8 QUALIFICATION.

9 SEEING NO OTHER COMMENT, CAN I CALL FOR THE  
10 QUESTION? ALL IN FAVOR.

11 OPPOSED?

12 MOTION PASSES. THANK YOU.

13 DR. HALL: THE NEXT ITEM IS JUST A MATTER OF  
14 HOW THE GRANT APPLICATIONS ARE TO BE REVIEWED.  
15 ALTHOUGH WE'VE BEEN THROUGH THIS BEFORE, WE WENT  
16 THROUGH IT WITH THE WORKING GROUP, AND THEY RECOMMENDED  
17 THAT WE GET THE APPROVAL OF THE ICOC FOR THIS PROCESS.  
18 AND THIS WAS DONE, AS I SAY, IN PUBLIC SESSION THERE.

19 LET ME JUST REMIND YOU THAT OUR WAY OF  
20 PROCEEDING IS THAT THE ICOC APPROVES A CONCEPT OF AN  
21 RFA AND A SPECIFIED BUDGET FOR THAT RFA. THE CIRM  
22 STAFF ISSUES THE RFA AND APPLICATIONS. THESE  
23 APPLICATIONS ARE THEN EVALUATED BY THE WORKING GROUP  
24 AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE TO THE ICOC FOR FUNDING WITHIN  
25 THE BUDGET. AND THEN THE ICOC MAKES THE FINAL

1 DECISIONS ABOUT WHICH APPLICATIONS ARE THEN FUNDED.  
2 AND THE REVIEW WITHIN THE WORKING GROUP,  
3 THEN, CONSISTS OF TWO PARTS AS SPECIFIED BY PROPOSITION  
4 71. THE FIRST STAGE IS AN INITIAL SCIENTIFIC REVIEW IN  
5 WHICH THE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS EVALUATE THE SCIENTIFIC  
6 MERIT AND GIVE EACH GRANT A SCORE. LET ME JUST FILL IN  
7 SOME OF THE DETAIL ON THAT.

8 EACH GRANT APPLICATION IS ASSIGNED TO A  
9 PRIMARY AND UP TO TWO SECONDARY REVIEWERS BEFORE THE  
10 MEETING. THESE REVIEWERS GO OVER THE GRANT APPLICATION  
11 VERY CAREFULLY. THEY THEN WRITE A SHORT REVIEW BEFORE  
12 THE MEETING THAT ADDRESSES THE APPLICATION'S STRENGTHS  
13 AND WEAKNESSES IN LIGHT OF THE CRITERIA FOR REVIEW.

14 AT THE MEETING THE CHAIR, THEN, OF THE  
15 WORKING GROUP, WHO IN THIS CASE IS DR. STUART ORKIN  
16 FROM HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL, PRESIDES OVER THE  
17 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION. EACH APPLICATION IS CONSIDERED  
18 IN TURN, AND IN EACH CASE THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY  
19 REVIEWERS EACH DISCUSS THE APPLICATION. AND THEN THERE  
20 IS A GENERAL DISCUSSION OF IT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF  
21 THAT DISCUSSION, THE 15 MEMBERS, SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, OF  
22 THE RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP THEN IN SECRET  
23 BALLOT ASSIGN EACH GRANT A SCORE BETWEEN ONE AND A  
24 HUNDRED, WITH A HUNDRED REPRESENTING THE BEST SCORE.  
25 THESE SCORES ARE THEN AVERAGED, AND THE AVERAGE

1 NUMERICAL SCORE REPRESENTS THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE FOR THE  
2 APPLICATION. AND IT IS THIS SCORE THAT YOU WILL BE  
3 SEEING LATER ON THIS MORNING.

4 IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE REVIEW PRESIDED  
5 OVER BY THE VICE CHAIR, IN THIS CASE JOAN SAMUELSON,  
6 THE FULL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP CONSIDERS HOW  
7 THE GRANTS SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED TO THE ICOC, AND THEY  
8 ARE IN THREE CATEGORIES: HIGHLY MERITORIOUS, RECOMMEND  
9 FUNDING; MERITORIOUS, COULD FUND IF FUNDS ARE  
10 AVAILABLE; OR NOT SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS TO RECOMMEND  
11 FUNDING AT THIS TIME. AND YOU WILL SEE THESE LATER ON.

12 NOW, AS DESCRIBED IN PROPOSITION 71, ANY  
13 GRANT APPLICATION THAT IS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY AT  
14 LEAST 35 PERCENT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP  
15 CAN BE SUBMITTED AT THE ICOC AS A MINORITY  
16 RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING.

17 THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE THEN CONVEYED TO THE  
18 ICOC. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE WORKING GROUP, ACCORDING  
19 TO THE PROCESS WHICH WERE APPROVED AT OUR LAST ICOC  
20 MEETING, IN EFFECT, HAVE BEEN PUT IN EFFECT FOR THIS  
21 MEETING, AND THAT IS THE INFORMATION THAT'S AVAILABLE  
22 ON THE WEBSITE AND THAT YOU HAVE IN YOUR BOOKS. AND IT  
23 IS THAT INFORMATION THAT YOU USE IN ORDER TO MAKE YOUR  
24 DECISIONS.

25 MR. CHAIR, I RECOMMEND THESE PROCEDURES WHICH

1 HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE WORKING GROUP AND RECOMMENDED  
2 TO THE ICOC FOR APPROVAL.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO  
4 THIS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND I WOULD LIKE TO  
6 IN INTRODUCING THIS ITEM SAY THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
7 THAT HAVE COME FROM THIS WORKING GROUP TO US ON THE  
8 ACTUAL APPLICATIONS WERE UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATIONS, SO  
9 VOTES OF ALTERNATIVES WERE NOT NECESSARY TO THIS VOTE.  
10 THEY WOULD HAVE MADE NO DIFFERENCE IN THIS VOTE. AND  
11 THAT THE CONSENSUS OF THE GROUP REFLECTS A CULTURE THAT  
12 CAME TOGETHER VERY QUICKLY WITH THE ABLE LEADERSHIP OF  
13 JOAN SAMUELSON AND DR. STUART ORKIN, SUPPORTED BY  
14 DR. ZACH HALL AND THE TREMENDOUS WORK OF DR. ARLENE  
15 CHIU AND HER STAFF. YES, JOAN.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: AND I MUST SAY IT WAS AN  
17 INCREDIBLE, WONDERFUL, FASCINATING PROCESS. AND THAT'S  
18 COMING FROM SOMEONE WHO HAD NOT HAD EXPERIENCE IN THE  
19 PEER REVIEW PROCESS, SO IT IS VERY MUCH A WORK IN  
20 PROGRESS FOR THE GROUP. AND I'M VERY PROUD OF THE WORK  
21 PRODUCT TO DATE.

22 I DO THINK THAT, TO THE EXTENT THAT ANY OF  
23 THESE RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES WOULD BE USED BEYOND THE  
24 TRAINING GRANT PROCESS THAT WE WILL BE APPROVING TODAY,  
25 THAT WE DEFER THEM FOR FURTHER REVIEW AND

1 RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE WORKING GROUP BECAUSE IT WAS  
2 TRULY A WORK IN PROGRESS AND EVOLVING DURING THAT  
3 SESSION. SO TO THE EXTENT WE APPROVED ANY PROCEDURES  
4 AT THE OUTSET, THEY'RE NOT NECESSARILY THE ONES THAT  
5 WITH MORE REFLECTION WE WOULD WANT TO USE IN THE  
6 FUTURE.

7           THERE ARE SEVERAL THINGS THAT I HAVE  
8 QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT I THINK WE WOULD WANT TO  
9 DELIBERATE ABOUT FURTHER. I'LL JUST GIVE YOU A FEW  
10 EXAMPLES. UP AT THE TOP WHERE IT SAYS THAT THE FIRST  
11 STEP IS THE EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF GRANT  
12 APPLICATIONS, TO MY MIND THAT'S NOT THE FIRST STEP FOR  
13 THE WORKING GROUP'S INVOLVEMENT. THE FIRST STEP IS TO  
14 IN COLLABORATION AND ADVICE TO THE ICOC TO BE INVOLVED  
15 IN THE ACTUAL PLAN FOR WHAT THAT SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM IS  
16 GOING TO BE AND WHAT ITS SEVERAL PARTS IN TERMS OF  
17 DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRANT APPLICATIONS ARE GOING TO BE.  
18 IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT DO WE WANT TO FUND AND IN WHAT  
19 ORDER? IT'S A MUCH LARGER QUESTION.

20           AND THEN THERE'S A SECOND STEP, WHICH IS  
21 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CRITERIA WHICH WILL BE USED TO  
22 EVALUATE THE GRANT APPLICATIONS THAT RESULT IN ISSUANCE  
23 OF AN RFA AND IN REVIEW OF THE APPLICATIONS. THAT WAS  
24 SOMETHING WE WERE REALLY DOING AS WE WERE EVALUATING.  
25 AND I THINK THE PROCESS WILL NEED MORE REFLECTION AND

1 CRITERIA TO BE ESTABLISHED BEFORE ISSUING THE RFA'S.

2 AND THEN THE THIRD IS THE REVIEW FOR THE  
3 SCIENTIFIC MERIT. SO THERE'S AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE I  
4 THINK THE PROCEDURES NEED TO BE GIVEN MORE REVIEW.

5 THEN THERE'S LATER LANGUAGE DOWN IN THAT  
6 FIRST LARGE PARAGRAPH WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT THE  
7 REVIEWERS WRITING A REVIEW THAT ADDRESSES THE  
8 APPLICATION'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN LIGHT OF THE  
9 CRITERIA. I THINK THOSE CRITERIA HAVE TO BE GIVEN  
10 ANOTHER LOOK IN GENERAL AND THEN WITH SPECIFIC CRITERIA  
11 DEVELOPED FOR THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF RFA'S THAT WILL BE  
12 ISSUED.

13 DOWN AT THE BOTTOM, THE LAST FULL PARAGRAPH  
14 THAT STARTS IN THE SECTION "STAGE OF REVIEW," IT TALKS  
15 ABOUT THE REVIEW CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY THE CIRM. I  
16 DON'T THINK IT'S PURSUANT TO 71'S LANGUAGE. IT'S JUST  
17 THE CIRM SHOULD BE ESTABLISHING THOSE CRITERIA. ON THE  
18 FACE OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE INITIATIVE, IT TALKS ABOUT  
19 THE WORKING GROUP ADVISORY TO THE ICOC TOGETHER  
20 DEVELOPING THOSE CRITERIA.

21 SO I THINK THIS NEEDS TO BE GIVEN MORE REVIEW  
22 AND THAT IT SHOULD GO BACK TO THE WORKING GROUP TO TAKE  
23 A FIRST STAB AT IT.

24 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST MAKE A COUPLE OF  
25 POINTS. RIGHT NOW WE'RE TALKING, JOAN, ABOUT THE

1 TRAINING GRANTS EXCLUSIVELY. AND WE ARE DOING THIS SO  
2 WE CAN MOVE INTO CONSIDERING THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT  
3 WERE MADE. WE WILL DISCUSS THIS AFTERNOON THE RESEARCH  
4 GRANT CRITERIA, AND I'D LIKE TO HOLD THAT FOR THE  
5 MOMENT, IF WE COULD.

6 LET ME JUST SAY THAT IN ACTUAL FACT WE  
7 BROUGHT TO THE ICOC THE CONCEPT FOR THE RFA. IT'S THE  
8 ICOC WHO PARTICIPATES IN THAT FIRST STEP, AND IT WAS  
9 APPROVED. IN FACT, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, THE  
10 SPECIFIC RFA WAS APPROVED. THAT RFA INCLUDED CRITERIA  
11 FOR THE TRAINING GRANTS, AS WE WILL DISCUSS, AND THEN  
12 WE BROUGHT THEM BACK TO THE ICOC ON JULY 12TH FOR  
13 INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES TO BE CONSIDERED. THEY WERE  
14 THEN CONSIDERED BY THE WORKING GROUP AND SO FORTH.

15 WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS SIMPLY THE STRUCTURE BY  
16 WHICH THE GROUP OPERATES. THE FIRST PART IS STIPULATED  
17 BY PROPOSITION 71, AND THE SECOND PART SIMPLY DESCRIBES  
18 THE CATEGORIES FOR RECOMMENDATION. AND I THINK BEYOND  
19 THAT, I WILL CONSIDER THE CRITERIA FOR TRAINING GRANTS  
20 IN JUST A MOMENT. BUT THIS IS JUST A GENERAL FRAMEWORK  
21 BY WHICH WE OPERATE, AND I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY  
22 HELPFUL IF WE COULD REACH A DECISION ON THIS. AGAIN,  
23 IT'S NOT WRITTEN IN STONE. WE CAN COME BACK AND MODIFY  
24 IT LATER; BUT I THINK IF WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO MOVE  
25 AHEAD, THEN I THINK WE NEED TO AGREE NOW THAT THIS IS



1 SUFFICIENT FOR HOW THE WORKING GROUP WILL OPERATE. I  
2 THINK WE CAN'T HOLD EVERYTHING IN SUSPENSION FOR THIS.  
3 I THINK WE NEED TO DECIDE AND GO AHEAD WITH THE  
4 UNDERSTANDING THAT WE CAN COME BACK IN THIS CASE AND  
5 MODIFY THESE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, I THINK THAT'S A  
7 VERY APPROPRIATE FOUNDATION. JOAN AND I, IN FACT, HAVE  
8 TALKED ABOUT THE FACT THAT, AND SHE, I THINK, HAS  
9 TALKED TO A NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS ABOUT THE FACT THAT  
10 AS WE GO THROUGH EACH DIFFERENT TYPE OF GRANT, WE'LL  
11 NEED TO HAVE AN ITERATIVE PROCESS BETWEEN THE BOARD AND  
12 THE ADVISORY GROUP'S GIVE-AND-TAKE ON HOW THESE  
13 CRITERIA SHOULD RELATE TO OUR STRATEGIC PLAN OR ANNUAL  
14 STRATEGIC PLAN OR LONG-TERM STRATEGIC PLAN AND HOW THEY  
15 SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED.

16 BUT IN WRITING THE INITIATIVE, I CAN TELL YOU  
17 THAT IN THE INITIAL START-UP STAGE, THE FACT THAT THE  
18 ICOC FUNCTIONS SPECIFICALLY REQUIRE THE ICOC TO DEVELOP  
19 THE ANNUAL AND LONG-TERM STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLANS AND  
20 ESTABLISH THE RULES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE OPERATION OF  
21 THE ICOC AND ITS WORKING GROUPS, CONTEMPLATED THIS TYPE  
22 OF A PROCESS WHERE IN START-UP IN PARTICULAR THE ICOC  
23 WOULD PROVIDE SOME INITIAL DIRECTION TO THE WORKING  
24 GROUP, WHICH THEN DID IN PUBLIC HEARINGS CONSIDER THE  
25 CRITERIA.

1                   AND CERTAINLY WE EXPECT, GIVEN THE FERTILE  
2                   AND CREATIVE DRIVE THAT JOAN ALWAYS BRINGS TO THE TABLE  
3                   AND SOME GREAT STATEMENTS AND IDEAS THAT SHE BROUGHT  
4                   INTO THE WORKING GROUP, THAT WHEN WE GO TO THE NEXT  
5                   RFA, WE WILL HAVE THE BENEFIT OF HER COMMENTS AND THE  
6                   WORKING GROUP'S COMMENTS THAT COME TO THE BOARD IN  
7                   FORMING THE CRITERIA. BUT THIS IS COMPLETELY  
8                   CONSISTENT WITH HOW IT WAS INTENDED WITHIN THE  
9                   INITIATIVE TO WORK IN THE START-UP PHASE, IN  
10                  PARTICULAR.

11                 DR. BALTIMORE, AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO DAVID  
12                 SERRANO-SEWELL AND THEN TO JEFF SHEEHY.

13                 DR. BALTIMORE: I'M GOING TO, I THINK,  
14                 LARGELY SUPPORT WHAT ZACH JUST SAID, WHICH IS THAT  
15                 THESE ARE PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION. THEY'RE NOT  
16                 PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING WHAT GRANTS ARE TO BE MADE  
17                 OR TO BE PROPOSED UNDER AN RFA PROCESS. I THINK THAT  
18                 IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ICOC AND OF THE STAFF --  
19                 THE CIRM STAFF TO DECIDE THAT AN APPROPRIATE RFA WILL  
20                 TAKE US IN A GIVEN DIRECTION WITH A GIVEN KIND OF  
21                 PROPOSAL. AND THAT THEN THIS GROUP'S JOB IS TO TAKE  
22                 THE DIRECTION FROM THAT RFA AND USE THEIR SCIENTIFIC  
23                 KNOWLEDGE TO EVALUATE THE GRANTS THAT HAVE COME IN IN  
24                 RESPONSE TO THAT RFA.

25                 NOW, THESE ARE VERY SMART PEOPLE. THEY HAVE

1 A WIDE RANGE OF EXPERIENCE. I THINK WE SHOULD TAKE  
2 ADVANTAGE OF THEIR EXPERIENCE TO GET ADVICE, BUT I  
3 DON'T THINK WE SHOULD WRITE INTO OUR PROCEDURES THAT  
4 THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RFA PROCESS. WE REALLY  
5 NEED TO MAINTAIN THAT SEPARATION.

6 I DO THINK THAT THIS GROUP MAY WANT TO ASK  
7 FOR ADVICE FROM SCIENTIFIC PEERS, AND SOME OF THOSE  
8 MIGHT, IN FACT, BE THE SAME PEOPLE, BUT I THINK THAT  
9 NEEDS TO BE A SEPARATE PROCESS.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL AND  
11 THEN JEFF SHEEHY.

12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I HAD A QUESTION FOR DR.  
13 HALL, AND THAT IS THIS ITEM BEFORE US, AND I JUST WANT  
14 TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU SAID, THIS PROCESS  
15 FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW, THIS IS JUST FOR THE TRAINING  
16 GRANT APPLICATIONS.

17 DR. HALL: NO. THIS IS GENERAL -- THIS IS A  
18 GENERAL PROCEDURE.

19 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HENCEFORTH.

20 DR. HALL: IT CAN BE CHANGED. PART 1 IS IN  
21 PROPOSITION 71, SO IT WILL NOT BE ABLE TO BE CHANGED  
22 FOR THREE YEARS. THE QUESTION IS -- AND PART 2 IS JUST  
23 A REASONABLE WAY OF HANDLING THE QUESTION OF HOW DOES  
24 THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMEND, MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
25 FUNDING TO THE ICOC. AND SO WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS

1     HERE BEFORE, ACTUALLY. I MEAN IN THE WHOLE ISSUE OF  
2     WHAT INFORMATION COMES TO THE ICOC FROM THE WORKING  
3     GROUP, WHICH REMEMBER WE DISCUSSED LAST TIME, THESE  
4     THREE CATEGORIES HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED MANY, MANY TIMES  
5     HERE. THE WORKING GROUP CONSIDERED THEM. THEY WERE  
6     DISCUSSED IN THE PUBLIC MEETING THERE. THE WORKING  
7     GROUP RECOMMENDED THAT THEY BE APPROVED BY THE ICOC,  
8     AND THEN, IN FACT, IT WAS ACCORDING TO THESE THAT WE  
9     CARRIED OUT OUR BUSINESS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF  
10    DR. ORKIN AND MS. SAMUELSON.

11           MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I HEARD YOU PREVIOUS  
12    TIMES IN WHICH YOU TOLD US ABOUT WHICH YOU INFORMED  
13    THIS COMMITTEE IN THOSE INSTANCES AND TIMES IN WHICH WE  
14    SPOKE ABOUT THIS ITEM. I ATTENDED SOME OF THOSE  
15    MEETINGS, AND I'M AWARE OF THAT. I STILL HAVE SOME  
16    QUESTIONS THOUGH ABOUT IT, IF THAT'S OKAY.

17           DR. HALL: OF COURSE, IT'S OKAY. LET ME JUST  
18    SAY THAT IT IS NOT -- I'M SAYING IT IS NOT MEANT TO BE  
19    JUST FOR -- THIS IS SUCH A GENERAL FRAMEWORK, IT'S NOT  
20    MEANT TO BE JUST FOR THE TRAINING GRANTS, BUT IT'S  
21    MEANT TO BE FOR THE WAY IN WHICH WE HANDLE THE GRANTS  
22    IN GENERAL.

23           CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, I THINK YOU SAID  
24    QUITE CORRECTLY EARLIER THAT THIS FRAMEWORK APPLIES TO  
25    THE INFRASTRUCTURE TRAINING GRANTS, AND WE PROVIDE

1 REFINEMENTS TO THAT WHEN WE COME BACK TO A DIFFERENT  
2 TRAINING GRANT SO THAT WE HAVE INPUT THAT MAY BE  
3 PARTICULARLY APPROPRIATE TO DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRANTS.

4 DR. HALL: I THINK WE'RE CONFUSING SEVERAL  
5 THINGS HERE. I THINK THE ISSUE OF WHAT WE FUND, AND  
6 THEN WE HAVEN'T REALLY TALKED ABOUT CRITERIA YET, AND  
7 THIS IS SORT OF THE BAREST FRAMEWORK FOR HOW THINGS ARE  
8 HANDLED. AND I WOULD SUGGEST IF WE HAVE TO REVIEW THIS  
9 EVERY TIME WE HAVE A NEW RFA OR WE HAVE A NEW THING, I  
10 THINK THAT'S TOO CUMBERSOME. THIS IS REALLY QUITE  
11 SIMPLE. THERE ARE SOME ISSUES THAT JOAN RAISES THAT WE  
12 WILL GET INTO THAT REFER TO CRITERIA AND OTHER THINGS,  
13 BUT I VIEW THIS AS JUST THE SORT OF SIMPLE BARE BONES  
14 OF THE WAY WE OPERATE.

15 THE FIRST PART OF THIS IS SPECIFIED BY  
16 PROPOSITION 71. THE SECOND PART IS JUST MEANT TO BE  
17 WHAT WE SEE AS A REASONABLE OPERATIONAL WAY OF HANDLING  
18 GRANTS. THAT IS, THAT YOU RECOMMEND SOME FOR FUNDING,  
19 SOME ARE SORT OF IN THE NEXT CATEGORY, AND THEN SOME  
20 ARE JUDGED TO BE NOT READY TO BE FUNDED AT THIS TIME.

21 SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THERE ARE IMPORTANT  
22 ISSUES HERE THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED IN THE DISCUSSION,  
23 BUT I DON'T THINK -- I THINK MOST OF THEM ARE SEPARATE  
24 FROM THIS PARTICULAR ITEM, WHICH IT SEEMS TO ME IS SORT  
25 OF STRAIGHTFORWARD AND CLEAR, AND I WOULD ASK THAT WE

1 DO THIS NOT PROVISIONALLY OR NOT WITH THE SENSE THAT  
2 WE'RE GOING TO COME BACK AND REVISIT IT. WE CAN IF  
3 NEED ARISES, BUT NOT THAT WE'RE GOING TO SORT OF DO IT  
4 EACH TIME BECAUSE I THINK THAT CONFUSES MATTERS FOR US.

5 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: WHAT'S CONFUSING, BOB,  
6 AND THIS WILL BE MY LAST STATEMENT ON THIS AND I'LL  
7 MOST LIKELY BE SUPPORTING THIS MOTION BECAUSE WE HAVE  
8 HAD TIME TO LOOK AT IT. NOT CONFUSING, BUT WHAT SHOULD  
9 BE POINTED OUT IS WHAT'S BEFORE US, SOME OF IT IS  
10 CALLED FOR IN PROPOSITION 71. THAT'S CLEAR. SOME OF  
11 IT ISN'T, THE CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR OF THE  
12 WORKING GROUP, ETC., ETC. THOSE ARE ITEMS THAT WE PUT  
13 INTO IT AFTER THERE WAS A DISCUSSION AND A PROCESS AND  
14 AN AGREEMENT AND AN UNDERSTANDING. SO IT'S NOT  
15 EXCLUSIVELY WHAT'S IN PROPOSITION 71.

16 AND I JUST HAD A QUICK QUESTION, AND THAT IS  
17 WITH THAT FIRST PART IN THAT FIRST PARAGRAPH, ZACH, IT  
18 SAYS AFTER RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS, CIRM STAFF WITH  
19 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR, AS NECESSARY. THIS IS  
20 CHAIR OF THAT WORKING GROUP, WHO IS A BRILLIANT PERSON,  
21 WHO I THOUGHT DID A FANTASTIC JOB, DR. ORKIN. WHAT  
22 INSTANCES WOULD YOU SEE WHERE MIGHT IT BE NECESSARY TO  
23 CONSULT THE CHAIR?

24 DR. HALL: THAT'S A GOOD POINT. HERE WE HAVE  
25 A WHOLE BUNCH OF APPLICATIONS THAT COME IN IN RESPONSE

1 TO AN RFA, RESEARCH APPLICATIONS. WE LOOK DOWN THE  
2 APPLICATIONS, AND ONE OF THEM CONCERNS METHOD FOR HIGH  
3 THROUGHPUT SCREENING OF CHEMICAL COMPOUNDS. WE LOOK AT  
4 OUR WORKING GROUP AND THERE'S NOBODY THAT WE KNOW. WE  
5 DON'T KNOW WHO HAS THE BEST EXPERTISE IN THIS. SO WE  
6 CALL STUART ORKIN AND SAY WHO'S AN APPROPRIATE PRIMARY  
7 REVIEWER? AMONG OUR MEMBERS WHO DO YOU SUGGEST? WE'RE  
8 NOT SURE. WE DON'T KNOW IF THIS PERSON COULD DO IT OR  
9 THAT PERSON COULD IT OR ANOTHER PERSON COULD DO IT.  
10 AND IN CONSULTATION WITH HIM, WE WOULD WORK OUT OR WE  
11 MIGHT CALL PEOPLE.

12 ONE OF THE CHALLENGES OF DOING THIS IS TO  
13 GIVE THE BEST POSSIBLE ASSIGNMENTS OF THE GRANTS SO  
14 THAT THEY MATCH THE EXPERTISE OF YOUR REVIEWERS. AND  
15 THEN YOU GET THE BEST SORT OF MOST INFORMED INFORMATION  
16 ABOUT IT. AND WE DON'T KNOW EVERYTHING ABOUT THE  
17 SCIENTIFIC INTEREST OF THE REVIEWERS, AND SOMETIMES  
18 THERE ARE ONES THAT ARE PROBLEMATIC IN WHICH IT'S NOT  
19 CLEAR. SO IN THOSE ASSIGNMENTS JUST TO SAY WHO'S GOING  
20 TO BE THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY, ALL THAT SAYS IS THAT  
21 IN MOST CASES WE CAN MAKE THE ASSIGNMENTS WITHOUT  
22 BOTHERING DR. ORKIN, BUT THERE MAY BE TIMES WHEN WE  
23 SAY, LOOK, WE'RE NOT SURE WHAT TO DO ABOUT THIS. MAYBE  
24 EVEN LET'S GIVE DR. ORKIN A CALL AND ASK IF HE COULD  
25 GIVE US SOME ADVICE ON THAT, SO THAT'S WHAT IT'S MEANT

1 TO DO.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF SHEEHY.

3 MR. SHEEHY: I'D LIKE TO ACTUALLY MOVE TO  
4 ADOPT THESE AS AN INTERIM PROCESS. AND I THINK WE'RE  
5 KIND OF MISSING KIND OF THE POINT THAT JOAN WAS TRYING  
6 TO MAKE. WE HAVE A NOVEL PROCESS, AND IT HASN'T EVEN  
7 BEEN REVIEWED BY THE PEOPLE WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN  
8 THE PROCESS TO SEE HOW WELL IT WORKED. I THINK ANOTHER  
9 RUN THROUGH THE COMMITTEE. I MEAN I THOUGHT IT WAS  
10 INTERESTING, BUT IT'S A NEW PROCESS. I MEAN USUALLY  
11 YOU HAVE ADVOCATE MEMBERS AND YOU HAVE SCIENTIST  
12 MEMBERS AND YOU HAVE A VERY COMPLEX INTERACTION. I  
13 THINK THAT'S ALL JOAN IS REALLY ASKING FOR IS TO GET  
14 THEIR FEEDBACK. THEY'RE OUR BRAIN TRUST. AND IF THEY  
15 THINK THAT THE PROCESS IS NOT WORKING TO TAKE THE BEST  
16 ADVANTAGE OF THEIR SKILLS, WE OUGHT TO KNOW THAT RATHER  
17 THAN PUT IN PLACE IN CEMENT A PROCESS WITHOUT HAVING  
18 HAD ANY FEEDBACK FROM THEM ON WHETHER OR NOT IT WORKS  
19 WELL FOR THEM.

20 DR. HALL: JEFF, IN ANSWER TO THAT, I'M QUITE  
21 HAPPY TO DO THAT, AND WE CAN CALL THEM IN THE INTERIM  
22 AND GET THEIR FEEDBACK.

23 TWO POINTS, MOST OF THESE PEOPLE ARE VERY  
24 EXPERIENCED REVIEWERS WHO HAVE DONE THIS KIND OF THING  
25 MANY TIMES BEFORE, NO. 1. NO. 2, ALTHOUGH WE DIDN'T



1 ASK FORMALLY FOR FEEDBACK, WHICH WE COULD EASILY DO,  
2 THE INFORMAL FEEDBACK THAT CERTAINLY I GOT AND OTHERS  
3 WAS HIGHLY POSITIVE ABOUT THE PROCESS. ACTUALLY ONE OF  
4 THE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WHO HAD CHAIRED STUDY  
5 SECTIONS AT NIH BEFORE CAME UP AFTERWARDS AND SAID, "I  
6 HAVE NEVER SEEN A GROUP WORK SO WELL TOGETHER AFTER ONE  
7 MEETING AS THIS GROUP DID." HE SAID THIS WORKED  
8 SUPERBLY WELL.

9 SO OUR GENERAL SENSE, I DON'T THINK THERE'S  
10 ANYTHING SERIOUSLY AWRY HERE, BUT I'M HAPPY TO GO BACK  
11 TO THE GROUP AFTER OUR FIRST MEETING AND SAY IF YOU  
12 HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS YOU WANT TO MAKE IN THESE  
13 PROCEDURES, PLEASE LET US KNOW. BUT JUST IN OUR OWN  
14 WAYS OF OPERATING, WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE SOME SORT OF  
15 STABLE GUIDELINES THAT WE CAN USE ABOUT HOW WE'RE GOING  
16 TO DO OUR PROCEDURES. SO IF WE COULD PASS THESE, IF  
17 YOU WISH, ON AN INTERIM BASIS OR JUST PASS THEM WITH  
18 THE UNDERSTANDING THAT, AGAIN, THESE ARE NOT  
19 REGULATIONS. THEY'RE INTERNAL MATTERS OF THE  
20 ORGANIZATION, SO THEY COME UNDER THE APA, SO IT'S A  
21 DIFFERENT MATTER AND WE CAN AMEND THEM WITHOUT  
22 DIFFICULTY; IS THAT CORRECT, JAMES?

23 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT.  
24 WE'LL TAKE A LOOK.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT THE GOAL HERE

1 IS THAT, AS WE'VE SAID, WE'RE LEARNING REAL TIME. WE  
2 HAVE TREMENDOUS ASSETS IN THESE GROUPS. THE FEEDBACK  
3 CAN BE QUITE HELPFUL. WE CAN USE THIS AS A GOOD, SOUND  
4 FRAMEWORK, GOOD PLATFORM TO START WITH, AND THEN WE CAN  
5 REFINE THIS AS WE GO FORWARD. PERHAPS, AGAIN, A MOTION  
6 WOULD BE IN ORDER TO APPROVE THESE WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO  
7 REFER THEM TO THE WORKING GROUP FOR --

8 DR. BALTIMORE: I THINK JEFF MADE THAT.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, DID YOU MAKE THAT AS A  
10 FORMAL MOTION?

11 MR. SHEEHY: YEAH.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND TO THAT  
13 MOTION?

14 MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE MOTION IS MADE AND  
16 SECONDED. DR. PRIETO HAS A COMMENT.

17 DR. PRIETO: JUST A COMMENT TO MAYBE MAKE THE  
18 LANGUAGE MORE CONSISTENT WITH THE POINTS THAT JOAN WAS  
19 BRINGING UP. IN THE THIRD PARAGRAPH, WHETHER THAT  
20 THIRD LINE SHOULD NOT READ "BASED ON THE REVIEW  
21 CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY THE ICOC AND CIRM."

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WOULD BE A GOOD  
23 IMPROVEMENT BECAUSE IT DOES REFLECT THE PROCESS.

24 DR. HALL: ACTUALLY CIRM. IT'S THE ICOC THAT  
25 ESTABLISHES THE CRITERIA. TAKE CIRM OUT. THAT'S A

1 MI STAKE.

2 DR. PRIETO: I WOULD ACCEPT THAT. THE CIRM  
3 STAFF PLAYS A ROLE HERE.

4 DR. HALL: OUR JOB IS TO MAKE PROPOSALS, BUT  
5 YOU MAKE THE DECISIONS. WE DON'T.

6 DR. PRIETO: AGREED.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DOES THE MAKER OF THE MOTION  
8 AND THE SECOND ACCEPT THAT AMENDMENT?

9 DR. BALTIMORE: COULD I SECOND?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOTH THE MAKER AND THE  
11 SECOND ACCEPT THAT AMENDMENT. DR. POMEROY.

12 DR. POMEROY: I'D LIKE TO START OFF BY SAYING  
13 THAT I SUPPORT THESE PROPOSALS AS INTERIM MEASURES OF  
14 HOW THE RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP WILL WORK. I  
15 THINK SOME OF THE CONFUSION COMES HERE IN THE TITLES.  
16 I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO CLARIFY THAT IT IS THE  
17 ICOC THAT MAKES RESEARCH FUNDING DECISIONS. IT IS NOT  
18 THE WORK GROUP. AND, THEREFORE, IN FACT, THE CHANGE OF  
19 THE NAME FROM THE GRANTS REVIEW WORK GROUP TO THE  
20 RESEARCH FUNDING WORK GROUP IS SOMETHING I WOULD LIKE  
21 TO REVISIT.

22 WHEN YOU'RE ON NIH STUDY SECTION, YOU ARE, IN  
23 FACT, NOT ALLOWED TO SAY THE "F" WORD AT STUDY SECTION.  
24 THE "F" WORD BEING FUNDING BECAUSE YOU ARE MAKING  
25 EVALUATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC MERIT, WHICH IS WHAT I THINK

1 WE THINK THAT THIS WORKING GROUP SHOULD BE DOING. SO I  
2 WOULD SPECIFICALLY LIKE TO REVISIT THE NAME OF THE  
3 WORKING GROUP.

4 I WOULD ALSO SUGGEST THAT THE TITLE OF THIS  
5 BE RETITLED NOT TO THE PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW OF  
6 GRANT APPLICATIONS BECAUSE I THINK, AS WAS POINTED OUT,  
7 THAT'S A MUCH LONGER PROCESS. THIS IS, IN FACT, THE  
8 PROCESS FOR REVIEWING THE GRANTS. THE PROCESS FOR THE  
9 ENTIRE GRANT APPLICATION AND FUNDING PROCESS STARTS  
10 WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN, THE ICOC PRIORITIZATION, AND  
11 GOES ALL THE WAY THROUGH THIS REVIEW PROCESS, AND THEN  
12 COMES BACK TO THE ICOC FOR THE ACTUAL FUNDING  
13 DECISIONS. SO I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE  
14 CLARIFY THE ROLES OF THE GROUPS HERE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I UNDERSTAND ONE OF YOUR  
16 PROPOSALS, IF THIS WERE TO BE AN AMENDMENT TODAY, WOULD  
17 BE -- IS TO REMOVE THE WORDS IN ITALICS "RESEARCH  
18 FUNDING" AND WHEREVER ELSE IT OCCURS TO REFER TO THE  
19 WORKING GROUP. AND WHAT WAS THE SECOND PROPOSAL  
20 SPECIFICALLY?

21 DR. POMEROY: JUST THE TITLE. THAT THIS IS  
22 ACTUALLY THE PROCESS FOR HOW THE WORKING GROUP WILL  
23 REVIEW GRANTS.

24 DR. HALL: COULD I ASK THAT IF YOU REMOVE THE  
25 TITLE, YOU GIVE US SOMETHING TO PUT IN ITS PLACE?

1 DR. POMEROY: I THOUGHT THIS WAS THE GRANT  
2 REVIEW.

3 DR. BALTIMORE: LET'S NOT WORDSMITH THIS NOW.

4 DR. POMEROY: BUT I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE  
5 CLARIFIED THAT THIS GROUP, THIS WORKING GROUP, IS NOT  
6 MAKING FUNDING DECISIONS. THE ICOC IS MAKING FUNDING  
7 DECISIONS.

8 DR. HALL: YOU'RE SUGGESTING THAT IT BE  
9 CALLED THE GRANT REVIEW WORKING GROUP. THAT'S WHAT I'M  
10 ASKING.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: THE PROBLEM IS IT'S PROP 71  
12 THAT HAS GIVEN IT THIS NAME.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FOR PURPOSES OF -- IF IT'S  
14 CALLED THE GRANT REVIEW WORKING GROUP AS A SHORTENED  
15 INFORMAL REFERENCE THAT IS ESTABLISHED AS AN  
16 APPROPRIATE SHORTENED REFERENCE, WE WON'T CHANGE THE  
17 LEGAL WORD IN THE PROPOSITION; BUT WITH THE MODIFIED  
18 NAME, I THINK IT QUITE PROPERLY FOLLOWS THE INTENT,  
19 GRANT REVIEW WORKING GROUP.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: NOT TO GET DOWN TO SPENDING  
21 TOO MUCH TIME ON A COUPLE OF WORDS, BUT I THINK IT'S AN  
22 IMPORTANT DISTINCTION. I READ THE LANGUAGE OF THE  
23 INITIATIVE AS GIVING THE WORKING GROUPS A BROAD  
24 RESPONSIBILITY IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY. AND I THINK WE  
25 HAVE A BRAIN TRUST THERE THAT WE SHOULD BE TALKING WITH

1 ABOUT WHAT IS THE OPTIMAL WAY TO PROCEED, AND THAT WE  
2 WOULD BENEFIT FROM THEIR INSIGHTS AFTER ONE ROUND OF  
3 THE PROCESS.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, COULD WE PERHAPS USE  
5 GRANT REVIEW WORKING GROUP AS THIS IS INTERIM, AND THEN  
6 COME BACK WITH YOUR SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS, SO WE HAVE  
7 TIME TO WORK OUT WHAT THE SPECIFIC SUGGESTION WOULD BE?

8 DR. HALL: LET ME SUGGEST THAT WE NOT ASK THE  
9 WORKING GROUP WHAT THEY SHOULD CALL THEMSELVES. LET'S  
10 MAKE THAT DECISION HERE. AND I THINK THEY WOULD  
11 APPRECIATE THAT AS WELL.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE NEED TO MOVE  
13 FORWARD HERE. LET'S NOT GET CAUGHT UP ON WORDING. I  
14 WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE USE THE FULL TITLE FROM THE  
15 INITIATIVE IN THIS INTERIM DRAFT AND WE MOVE FORWARD.

16 ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?  
17 RECOGNIZING THIS IS SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED AS AN  
18 INTERIM DOCUMENT OF GOOD SUBSTANCE THAT WORKED QUITE  
19 WELL AS A PROCESS. NO MORE COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD.  
20 COMMENTS FROM THE -- DR. MURPHY.

21 DR. MURPHY: ZACH, THIS MAY BE PREMATURE AT  
22 THIS POINT, BUT ON THESE THREE CRITERIA THAT WE HAVE UP  
23 HERE, TO FUND, TO NOT FUND, AND THEN THE MIDDLE, IF  
24 FUNDING IS AVAILABLE. IF THE ICOC WERE TO RECOMMEND  
25 FUNDING AS -- ADOPT THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS AS

1 SUGGESTED BY THE COMMITTEE, IS THERE SOME FLEXIBILITY  
2 ON THAT MERITORIOUS IF FUNDING? I SEE THERE'S ONLY ONE  
3 THAT, AT LEAST MY READING, THERE'S ONLY ONE GRANT THAT  
4 SAYS IT SHOULD BE FUNDED IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE. CAN  
5 YOU GIVE US SOME GUIDELINES AS TO WHERE THE  
6 RECOMMENDATIONS FALL VERSUS HOW MUCH MONEY IS AVAILABLE  
7 IN THIS COMPETITION?

8 DR. HALL: CAN WE DEAL WITH THAT SPECIFIC  
9 ITEM LATER?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: VERY SPECIFICALLY, THOUGH,  
11 AS A REFERENCE FOR THE BOARD, THE BOARD -- THIS IS ONLY  
12 THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS. THE  
13 BOARD CAN CHANGE THESE. THERE'S NO DEFINITIVE CONTROL  
14 OVER US BY THIS CHARACTERIZATION.

15 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THAT THE INTENT OF  
16 THE SECOND HALF OF THIS IS TO ALLOW THE WORKING GROUP  
17 TO SAY THREE THINGS TO THE BOARD. THIS IS A GRANT  
18 APPLICATION WE REALLY LIKE AND THINK SHOULD BE FUNDED.  
19 THIS IS ONE WE THINK IS NOT READY FOR FUNDING AT THIS  
20 TIME. AND HERE'S SOME IN THE MIDDLE THAT WE THINK YOU  
21 MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER. IF THERE ARE FUNDS AVAILABLE,  
22 THEN YOU MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER FUNDING THESE AS WELL.  
23 WE ARE NOT QUITE AS ENTHUSIASTIC AS WE ARE ABOUT THE  
24 FIRST GROUP, AND THAT GIVES SOME SHADING TO THEN THE  
25 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP. OTHERWISE IT'S

1 EITHER YES OR NO.

2 NOW, THE POINT IS THAT THE NUMBER IN THAT  
3 CATEGORY IS NOT SPECIFIED. AS IT HAPPENED, WE'LL SEE  
4 LATER, THERE WAS ONLY ONE GRANT APPLICATION IN THIS  
5 PARTICULAR ROUND THAT FELL INTO THAT CATEGORY. IT  
6 COULD HAVE BEEN FIVE. IT WAS THE EXPRESSION OF THE  
7 GROUP'S ENTHUSIASM THAT THERE WAS ONLY ONE THAT WAS IN  
8 THIS SORT OF MIDDLING RANGE, AND YOU WILL SEE THAT  
9 LATER.

10 DR. MURPHY: SO IN MAKING OUR DECISIONS THEN,  
11 WE SHOULD NOT AT THIS POINT BE CONCERNED WITH THE TOTAL  
12 AMOUNT OF MONEY IN THE POT?

13 DR. HALL: WE'LL DEAL WITH THAT LATER, AND  
14 I'LL EXPLAIN EXACTLY HOW THAT WORKS IN TERMS OF THIS  
15 ROUND.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MORE SPECIFICALLY, THE BOARD  
17 WILL DECIDE SEPARATE FROM THE ADVISORY GROUP WHETHER  
18 THERE'S ENOUGH MONEY FOR FUNDING AND WHETHER THERE'S  
19 ENOUGH MONEY FOR FUNDING THE SECOND GROUP, WHICH SAYS  
20 IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE, AND WHETHER THERE'S ENOUGH  
21 MONEY FOR FUNDING TO FURTHER BROADEN IT INTO THE THIRD  
22 GROUP, WHICH IS NOT RECOMMENDED AT THIS TIME. THE  
23 BOARD MAY DECIDE, IN FACT, THERE IS SUFFICIENT MONEY TO  
24 FUND SOME OF THOSE. SO THOSE ARE COMPLETELY THE  
25 PURVIEW OF THE BOARD.



1 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THAT ITS  
2 USEFULNESS FOR US, RICH, IS AS FOLLOWS, AND ALSO SAYS  
3 INTENT. IF THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT SPECIFIED WITH  
4 THE RFA, WHICH IS THE WAY WE OPERATED THIS TIME, THEN  
5 WHEN ALL THE GRANTS ARE RATED AND YOU HAVE THE BUDGETS,  
6 THEN YOU COULD SAY IF WE WERE TO GO DOWN THE LIST IN  
7 TERMS OF STRICT ORDER OF SCIENTIFIC MERIT AS REFLECTED  
8 IN THE SCORE, WE WOULD HAVE ENOUGH TO FUND TO HERE.  
9 OKAY. AND SO THAT DEFINES YOUR LIMITS. AND THEN YOU  
10 CAN SAY, WELL, YOU MAY WISH -- THERE'S SOME JUST BELOW.  
11 YOU MAY WISH TO SWITCH THEM UP INSTEAD OR YOU MAY WISH  
12 TO BRING THEM DOWN. AND THE WORKING GROUP ITSELF GOES  
13 THROUGH A PRELIMINARY ROUND OF THAT IN PART 2 HERE, BUT  
14 THE FINAL ANALYSIS IS HERE.

15 AND AS BOB SAID, IT'S THEN YOUR PURVIEW TO  
16 STICK TO THE ORIGINAL BUDGET AND MOVE SOME IN OR OUT,  
17 SOME OF THESE FROM THE BOTTOM TWO CATEGORIES, MOVE THEM  
18 UP, OR TO EXPAND THE BUDGET AND INCLUDE MORE. THE  
19 FINAL DECISION IS ABSOLUTELY UP TO YOU. THIS IS MEANT  
20 TO GIVE YOU THE BEST INFORMATION THAT WE CAN IN THE  
21 SORT OF MOST CONDENSED WAY OF THE RELATIVE LEVEL OF  
22 ENTHUSIASM OF THE WORKING GROUP CONSIDERED BEYOND THE  
23 SCIENTIFIC SCORE FOR THESE GRANTS.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. BALTIMORE, I THINK WE  
25 CAN THEN MOVE ON TO THE PUBLIC AFTER DR. BALTIMORE'S

1 COMMENTS, IF THE BOARD SO PLEASES.

2 DR. BALTIMORE: AS WE WERE LOOKING AT THIS, I  
3 REALIZED THAT BEFORE THOSE THREE RECOMMENDED FOR  
4 FUNDING, PENDING, AND NOT RECOMMENDED, IT SAYS THAT THE  
5 APPLICATIONS WERE DEFINED INTO TWO OR THREE GROUPS, AND  
6 I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY IT SAYS THAT.

7 DR. HALL: LET ME LOOK AND SEE THE TEXT. I  
8 DON'T HAVE THE TEXT IN FRONT OF ME.

9 DR. BALTIMORE: IT SEEMS TO ME IT SHOULD JUST  
10 SAY THREE GROUPS. ONE COULD BE EMPTY, BUT THAT'S FINE.  
11 EMPTY SETS ARE ALLOWED.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S WHAT THEY'RE REALLY  
13 REFERENCING, I BELIEVE, HERE.

14 DR. BALTIMORE: YOU DON'T KNOW WHICH TWO  
15 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT. IT'S JUST AN AMBIGUITY THAT --

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. BALTIMORE IS SUGGESTING  
17 THAT IF THERE'S THREE GROUPS, ONE GROUP --

18 DR. HALL: LET'S TAKE OUT TWO THEN. THAT'S  
19 SOMETHING WE JUST FAILED TO PICK UP. THAT'S A  
20 HISTORICAL ERROR.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, DO  
22 THE MAKER AND THE SECOND ACCEPT IT? YES.

23 DR. BALTIMORE: I HAVE ANOTHER POINT, THOUGH,  
24 WHICH IS PERHAPS MORE SUBSTANTIVE OR MAYBE NOT.

25 NOWHERE IN HERE DOES IT TALK ABOUT THE REVIEW GROUPS

1 CHANGING THE BUDGETS OR CHANGING THE RECOMMENDED  
2 BUDGETS. AND YET THE REVIEW GROUPS HAVE RECOMMENDED  
3 CHANGING THE BUDGETS.

4 DR. HALL: I SEE. IN TERMS OF THE PARTICULAR  
5 GRANTS?

6 DR. BALTIMORE: YEAH.

7 DR. HALL: YES. THAT CAME UP. AS THAT WAS A  
8 RECOMMENDATION BY THE WORKING GROUP, WE DID NOT SAY  
9 THEY WERE FORBIDDEN TO DO THAT, BUT THERE IS NO  
10 EXPLICIT RECOMMENDATION FOR THAT. SO LET ME JUST MAKE  
11 CLEAR FOR EVERYBODY, SO IN SEVERAL CASES, WHICH WE'LL  
12 DISCUSS LATER, THERE WERE CASES IN WHICH THE WORKING  
13 GROUP SAID THIS IS A TERRIFIC GRANT, BUT THIS PART OF  
14 IT IS NOT VERY GOOD. AND IN ALL THE CASES WHAT WAS  
15 SUGGESTED WAS THAT SLOTS FOR THAT PARTICULAR PORTION OF  
16 THE PROGRAM BE WITHHELD AT THE PRESENT TIME, AND  
17 SOMETHING I'LL TALK ABOUT LATER, THE WORKING GROUP  
18 STRONGLY URGED THAT THERE BE A SECOND ROUND OF TRAINING  
19 GRANT FUNDING IN WHICH PEOPLE COULD THEN REMEDY THESE  
20 DIFFICULTIES AND COME IN AGAIN ON A COMPETITIVE BASIS  
21 TO SEE THAT THEY DID WELL.

22 ONE OF THE INTERESTING DISCUSSIONS, JUST TO  
23 JUMP AHEAD, THAT WE HAD AT THE WORKING GROUP MEETING,  
24 WHICH WAS VERY INTERESTING BECAUSE, AS JOAN SAYS, WE  
25 HAD PATIENT ADVOCATES THERE WHO HAD NEVER BEEN IN A

1 GRANT REVIEW, AND WE HAD SCIENTISTS WHO HAD NEVER BEEN  
2 ON A REVIEW GROUP WITH PATIENT ADVOCATES, AND SO THERE  
3 WAS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF PEOPLE UNDERSTANDING THIS.

4 AND ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT WAS RAISED, AND  
5 THERE WAS ACTUALLY A VERY CONCRETE EXAMPLE OF IT THAT  
6 WE SAW, WAS THE ISSUE OF HAVING PEOPLE COME IN FOR THE  
7 SECOND TIME IS OFTEN A DEVICE FOR GETTING THE BEST  
8 POSSIBLE GRANT AND PROGRAM. THAT IS, IT'S NOT MEANT TO  
9 SAY -- ONE OF THE MEMBERS WAS VERY UNCOMFORTABLE WITH  
10 SAYING ANY GRANT WAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS. THE  
11 SCIENTISTS ALL SAID, "OH, NO. NO. NO. THIS HAPPENS  
12 ALL THE TIME." AND THE POINT IS THAT YOU CAN NOW  
13 IMPROVE IT AND IT CAN BE MERITORIOUS THE NEXT TIME.

14 SO THAT IDEA OF BEING ABLE TO EVEN TAKE A  
15 PART OF A GRANT AND SAY THIS PART, WE LIKE THIS  
16 OVERALL, BUT THIS PART IS VERY WEAK, AND WE'D LIKE YOU  
17 TO IMPROVE IT AND COME BACK WAS ONE THAT THE WORKING  
18 GROUP ADOPTED. IF THE ICOC IS UNCOMFORTABLE, DOESN'T  
19 WISH TO DO THAT, IT'S YOUR PREROGATIVE AND WE CAN  
20 CHANGE THAT.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: HOWEVER, IT WOULD BE MY  
22 GUESS, I WASN'T THERE, THAT THE RATINGS THAT ARE ON  
23 THESE SHEETS AND THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE DEALING WITH  
24 ARE RATINGS THAT REFLECT THE BUDGET CHANGES BECAUSE THE  
25 RATINGS WOULD BE DIFFERENT IF THE BUDGETS HADN'T BEEN

1 CHANGED.

2 DR. HALL: IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, IT DID  
3 NOT. THAT DISCUSSION, ALTHOUGH THE WEAKNESSES WERE  
4 IDENTIFIED, THE DISCUSSION CAME UP IN PART 2 THAT JOAN  
5 PRESIDED OVER, IN WHICH WE WERE DISCUSSING AND, AS YOU  
6 WILL SEE, HOW TO HANDLE THESE AND TO REFLECT THE  
7 REDUCED ENTHUSIASM. PEOPLE SAID, LOOK, THESE TWO  
8 GRANTS, I AM HAPPY TO HAVE THEM IN THIS CATEGORY AND  
9 HAPPY TO HAVE THEM RECOMMENDED, BUT I THINK THAT THIS  
10 OUGHT TO HAPPEN, AND PEOPLE SAID THAT'S A GOOD IDEA.  
11 WE THINK THAT SHOULD HAPPEN AS WELL.

12 DR. BALTIMORE: WHAT I'M SUGGESTING, AND  
13 MAYBE IT'S CONSISTENT WITH WHAT JOAN WAS SAYING BEFORE,  
14 IS THAT IN THESE GUIDELINES, GENERAL GUIDELINES, TO BE  
15 FUNDED, I THINK THIS QUESTION OUGHT TO BE DEALT WITH.  
16 I DON'T THINK WE OUGHT TO TRY TO CRAFT THAT LANGUAGE  
17 TODAY.

18 DR. HALL: WE'RE HAPPY TO DO THAT. LET ME  
19 ASK WHAT YOUR DESIRE IS. SHOULD WE --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT IT REFERENCES,  
21 DR. BALTIMORE, YOU'RE SAYING WHEN THEY COME BACK WITH  
22 SUGGESTIONS FROM THE WORKING GROUP, WE CONSIDER THAT IN  
23 THE NEXT ROUND AS A POSSIBLE REFINEMENT TO THESE  
24 INTERIM GUIDELINES TO SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS THIS  
25 QUESTION?

1 DR. HALL: DO YOU WANT US TO WRITE --  
2 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.  
3 DR. HALL: -- LANGUAGE, DAVID, THAT WOULD  
4 ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN?  
5 DR. BALTIMORE: YES. I'M PERFECTLY HAPPY  
6 WITH IT HAPPENING, AND I THINK, IN FACT, IT OUGHT TO  
7 HAPPEN.  
8 DR. HALL: YOU'RE SAYING IF WE'RE GOING TO DO  
9 IT, WE SHOULD HAVE IT HERE AND EXPLICITLY CONSIDERED.  
10 POINT TAKEN.  
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY OTHER BOARD COMMENTS?  
12 ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS?  
13 MS. FOGEL: THANK YOU. I'M SUSAN FOGEL WITH  
14 PRO CHOICE ALLIANCE FOR RESPONSIBLE RESEARCH. THANK  
15 YOU. I HAVE TWO COMMENTS, ONE TECHNICAL AND ONE  
16 SUBSTANTIVE MAYBE.  
17 IN THE BYLAWS AND IN THE CRITERIA, THE  
18 FRAMEWORK, RATHER IN THE CRITERIA FOR THE FRAMEWORK FOR  
19 EVALUATION, WE TALK ABOUT VITAL RESEARCH OPTIONS; IN  
20 OTHER WORDS, THINGS THAT COULD BE FUNDED BECAUSE OF  
21 THEIR VERY SPECIAL NEED, ETC., BUT THE BYLAWS DO NOT  
22 REFLECT PROP 71'S REQUIREMENT THAT THOSE FUNDING  
23 CHOICES NEED A TWO-THIRDS OF A QUORUM, NOT A MAJORITY  
24 OF A QUORUM.  
25 SO THE BYLAWS, THE BYLAWS MERELY SAY

1 RECOMMENDATIONS DA-DA-DA-DA SHALL BE MADE BY A MAJORITY  
2 VOTE OF A QUORUM OF THE MEMBERS, BUT IGNORES THIS OTHER  
3 CATEGORY OF RESEARCH THAT REQUIRES A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF  
4 THE QUORUM.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT THAT'S VERY  
6 APPROPRIATE. AND WHY THESE SPECIFICALLY WERE DESIGNED  
7 TO DEAL WITH THIS PROGRAM, BUT IT'S ONE OF THOSE  
8 COMMENTS WE EXPECT TO GET BACK FROM THE WORKING GROUP  
9 BECAUSE IT SHOULD BE IN THERE ON A GOING FORWARD BASIS  
10 IN TERMS OF THE BOARD'S DECISION. BUT IN TERMS OF THE  
11 WORKING GROUP, IT DOESN'T REQUIRE -- JAMES --

12 DR. HALL: IT SHOULD BE COUNSEL WHO JUST  
13 CHECKS THIS OUT FOR US. I THINK WE WANT TO ABIDE BY  
14 THE PROPOSITION, SO I'D SUGGEST THAT WE URGE COUNSEL,  
15 JAMES, TO CHECK IT OUT FOR US, AND WE WILL DO WHAT THE  
16 PROPOSITION SAYS.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE DEFINITELY --

18 DR. HALL: AGAIN, I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD  
19 ASK THE WORKING GROUP ABOUT THIS.

20 MS. FOGEL: I WASN'T SUGGESTING YOU ASK THE  
21 WORKING GROUP. I WAS SUGGESTING YOU FIX IT BEFORE YOU  
22 PASS THESE INTERIM BYLAWS. THAT'S MY FIRST QUESTION,  
23 MY FIRST COMMENT.

24 MY SECOND COMMENT IS THAT THERE'S NOTHING  
25 EITHER IN THE BYLAWS OR IN THESE CRITERIA, PROCEDURES

1 THAT TALK ABOUT THE CONTENT OF WHAT COMES TO THE ICOC  
2 IN TERMS OF THE RECOMMENDATION. IT USES JUST SCORING  
3 AND EVALUATION. BUT IF YOU ARE TRULY DECISION MAKERS  
4 AS OPPOSED TO THE WORKING GROUPS BEING DECISION MAKERS,  
5 THEN THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME CLARITY ABOUT WHAT  
6 INFORMATION COMES TO YOU SO THAT YOU CAN MAKE GOOD  
7 DECISIONS.

8 THE CRITERIA ON THE TRAINING GRANTS, FOR  
9 EXAMPLE, HAVE MANY ELEMENTS THAT HAVE TO DO WITH THE  
10 ACTUAL INSTITUTION THAT IS SUPPORTING THE TRAINING  
11 GRANT, THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM THERE, THE HISTORY,  
12 THE STAFF, THE LEVEL OF MENTORSHIP IN WHICH THE NAME OF  
13 THE INSTITUTION IS RELEVANT TO YOUR DECISION.

14 NOW, AS SOME SUGGEST, YOU AROUND THE TABLE  
15 ACTUALLY KNOW WHO ALL THE APPLICANTS ARE, BUT WE IN THE  
16 PUBLIC DON'T KNOW, THEN THAT'S A DIFFERENT PROBLEM.  
17 BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU HAVE CRITERIA THAT YOU ARE  
18 GOING TO VOTE ON THAT SAY THE APPLICANT IS RELEVANT,  
19 THEN YOU OUGHT TO HAVE BYLAWS AND REQUIREMENTS THAT SAY  
20 YOU NEED TO KNOW WHO THE APPLICANT IS, OR ELSE YOU ARE  
21 MAKING A DECISION IN THE DARK, OR THE WORKING GROUP IS  
22 MAKING A DECISION. AND IF THE WORKING GROUP IS MAKING  
23 A DECISION, THEN THEY HAVE TO BE HELD TO HIGHER  
24 STANDARDS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURE AS ALL  
25 DECISION MAKERS ARE REQUIRED TO DO. THANK YOU.



1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: TWO THINGS. ONE, JAMES,  
2 IT'S SUBSECTION D, AND I THINK SHE'S QUITE APPROPRIATE  
3 WITH HER RECOMMENDATION, THAT WE SHOULD INCORPORATE THE  
4 TWO-THIRDS VOTE AT THE WORKING GROUP LEVEL. DO YOU  
5 CONCUR WITH THAT?

6 MR. HARRISON: YES, THAT'S ACCURATE.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S 125290.60(D). DR.  
8 HALL, THIS IS QUITE APPROPRIATE.

9 DR. HALL: THANK YOU, SUSAN.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHILE IT DOESN'T AFFECT THIS  
11 SPECIFIC ROUND OF GRANTS, GOING FORWARD WE MIGHT AS  
12 WELL INCORPORATE THIS BECAUSE IT'S STRAIGHT FROM THE  
13 INITIATIVE RIGHT NOW.

14 DR. HALL: ABSOLUTELY.

15 DR. MURPHY: MAY I JUST RESPOND TO THE  
16 COMMENT. I, AS A MEMBER OF THE ICOC, DO NOT KNOW WHOSE  
17 GRANT IS IN FRONT OF ME EXCEPT FOR MY OWN ORGANIZATION  
18 BECAUSE I SAW THE RETURN ON THAT, BUT I KNOW NOTHING  
19 ELSE ABOUT ANY OF THE OTHER GRANTS, AND I WOULD SUGGEST  
20 THAT MOST OF MY COLLEAGUES ON THE ICOC ARE IN THE SAME  
21 BOAT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD ASK THE MAKER OF  
23 THE MOTION --

24 DR. HALL: WE HAVE A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION, BOB.

25 MS. FOGEL: I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION.

1 THEN IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHO THE APPLICANTS ARE, HOW ARE  
2 YOU GOING TO ABIDE BY THESE CRITERIA THAT REQUIRE THAT  
3 YOU VOTE BASED ON THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE TRAINING  
4 PROGRAM, THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PROGRAM  
5 LEADERSHIP -- I'M READING FROM YOUR CRITERIA -- THE  
6 RESEARCH AND TRAINING STRENGTH OF THE PROPOSED MENTORS,  
7 THE QUALITY OF EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS, AND THE  
8 STRENGTH OF STEM CELL RESEARCH AT THE INSTITUTION? HOW  
9 WILL YOU VOTE ON THAT IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY INFORMATION  
10 ABOUT THE APPLICANT?

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE DO HAVE THAT INFORMATION,  
12 AND PERHAPS DR -- AND SO DO THE PUBLIC, BUT I'D LIKE  
13 DR. CLAIRE POMEROY TO RESPOND TO THAT.

14 DR. POMEROY: I THINK THAT THE ROLE OF THE  
15 WORKING GROUP IS TO ASSESS THE QUALITY OF THE FACULTY,  
16 THE QUALITY OF THE SCIENTIFIC WORK THAT'S HAPPENING AT  
17 THE INSTITUTION, ALL OF THOSE CRITERIA THAT YOU JUST  
18 LISTED. THEY HAVE GIVEN US A SUMMARY OF THEIR  
19 DISCUSSION AND THEIR REVIEW. AND I THINK THAT WE CAN  
20 TAKE THAT INFORMATION WITHOUT KNOWING THE NAME OF THE  
21 INSTITUTION. SO IF THEY -- AND THEY DID SAY ON SOME OF  
22 THESE THERE ARE INADEQUATE NUMBERS OF FACULTY AT THIS  
23 TIME. SO WE HAVE THAT INFORMATION. I THINK IT IS OUR  
24 JOB TO INCORPORATE THOSE SUMMARIES INTO OUR  
25 DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

1 MS. FOGEL: I AGREE. YOU ARE INCORPORATING  
2 THEM, BUT YOU HAVE NO INDEPENDENT KNOWLEDGE, THEN, ON  
3 WHICH TO MAKE A DECISION, WHICH MAKES YOU A RUBBER  
4 STAMP. OTHER ASPECTS OF THE APPLICATIONS TALK ABOUT  
5 THE TYPE OF SCIENCE, THE STRUCTURE, WHAT IT WILL LOOK  
6 LIKE. YOU ARE HERE BECAUSE YOU'RE ALL EXPERTS, AND  
7 YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO BE BRINGING YOUR INDEPENDENT  
8 KNOWLEDGE TO DECISION MAKING. IF YOU THEN ARE JUST  
9 GOING TO READ WHAT THEY SAID AND SAY, FINE, WE VOTE  
10 YES, THEN YOU ARE NOT BEING DECISION MAKERS. YOU ARE  
11 NOT FULFILLING YOUR OBLIGATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF  
12 CALIFORNIA, AND YOU'RE RUBBER STAMPING A WORKING GROUP.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SUSAN, I WOULD POINT OUT  
14 THAT IN BOTH THE ABSTRACT SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT  
15 AND IN THE REVIEW SUMMARY, THERE'S SUBSTANTIAL  
16 INFORMATION THAT EACH OF US, BASED ON OUR EXPERIENCE  
17 AND KNOWLEDGE AND ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS, MAY VIEW VERY  
18 DIFFERENTLY THAN THE ADVISORY GROUP. AND WHEN THEY SAY  
19 THAT THERE'S NOT SUFFICIENT MENTORS, THE NEEDS OF  
20 MEDICAL SCHOOLS OR THE RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS,  
21 UNIVERSITIES MAY DECIDE THAT THERE'S ADEQUATE MENTORS.  
22 WHEN THEY SAY WHAT SOMEONE'S CREDENTIALS ARE, THEY MAY  
23 FEEL THAT THERE'S ENOUGH DEPTH IN THE PROGRAM. EACH OF  
24 THESE PEOPLE HAS PLENTY OF INFORMATION AS BOARD MEMBERS  
25 TO MAKE A VERY SUBSTANTIVE DECISION ON HOW THEY REVIEW

1 THE SUBSTANTIVE MATERIAL AND INFORMATION PROVIDED AS A  
2 SUMMARY OF THE APPLICANT. DR. BALTIMORE.

3 DR. BALTIMORE: I RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE. IF  
4 THEY SAY THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH MENTORS, AND WE DON'T  
5 KNOW WHAT INSTITUTION IT IS, WE CERTAINLY CANNOT GO AND  
6 SAY THERE ARE ENOUGH MENTORS. IN FACT, EVEN IF WE DO  
7 KNOW THE INSTITUTION, WE PROBABLY DON'T KNOW IT WELL  
8 ENOUGH TO MAKE THAT STATEMENT. AND PRESUMABLY IN THE  
9 APPLICATION, WHICH IS MUCH LONGER THAN WHAT WE'RE  
10 SEEING HERE, THEY'VE DESCRIBED WHAT THEIR MENTORSHIP  
11 WAS, AND THE COMMITTEE SAID, NO, THIS IS NOT  
12 SUFFICIENT. I THINK WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE  
13 WORKING GROUP DID TAKE THAT INTO ACCOUNT, BUT THEN WE  
14 HAVE TO TAKE THEIR WORD FOR IT BECAUSE WE'RE NOT  
15 REHEARSING THE WHOLE PROCESS OF EVALUATION HERE.

16 SO I THINK THE PROBLEM IS THAT YOU GET BUZZ  
17 WORDS AND THEN TRY TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT BUZZ  
18 WORDS. THE BUZZ WORD IN THIS CASE WAS RUBBER STAMP.  
19 WE'RE NOT RUBBER STAMPING, BUT WE'RE NOT REEVALUATING.  
20 WE'RE IN A DIFFERENT POSITION. WE'RE LOOKING AT THE  
21 PROCESS, WE'RE MAKING SURE THE RIGHT CRITERIA WERE  
22 TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. WE MAY FIND AN INCONSISTENCY IN  
23 THE DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION THAT WOULD  
24 LEAD US TO ASK A QUESTION, BUT WE'RE NOT SUBSTITUTING  
25 OUR OWN KNOWLEDGE OF THOSE INSTITUTIONS FOR THE

1 KNOWLEDGE THAT WAS PRESENTED TO THE WORKING GROUP AND  
2 WHICH THEY USED FOR THEIR EVALUATION.

3 AND WE REALLY NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT. THE  
4 PUBLIC NEEDS TO UNDERSTAND THAT BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE'D  
5 HAVE TO RE-SPEND THE TIME THAT WAS SPENT, AND WE WOULD  
6 NEED TO HAVE MUCH BROADER KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT WAS IN THE  
7 APPLICATIONS THAN WE HAVE.

8 DR. PIZZO: I JUST WANT TO AFFIRM THE POINTS  
9 BEING MADE BY DR. BALTIMORE. I THINK OUR PRIMARY  
10 RESPONSIBILITY WAS TO APPROPRIATELY CHARGE AND HAVE  
11 OVERSIGHT OVER THE SELECTION OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE  
12 ON THE REVIEW COMMITTEE. AND IF WE WERE GOING TO,  
13 INDEED, BE ABLE TO MAKE JUDGMENTS ABOUT ALL OF THE  
14 AREAS OF SUBSTANCE OF ANY GRANT, WE WOULD HAVE TO, IF  
15 WE'RE REALLY DOING APPROPRIATE DUE DILIGENCE, REVIEW  
16 EACH OF THOSE GRANTS OURSELVES IN ADDITION. AND THAT  
17 IS A PROCESS THAT MAKES NO SENSE. I DON'T KNOW OF ANY  
18 OTHER ORGANIZATION THAT WOULD DO THAT.

19 SO IN A WAY, ALTHOUGH I DON'T THINK IT'S  
20 RUBBER STAMPING, WE HAVE DELEGATED THE INTENSITY OF  
21 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW TO A GROUP OF NATIONALLY RENOWN,  
22 INTERNATIONALLY RENOWN EXPERTS, AND NOW WE ARE GOING TO  
23 UTILIZE THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS TO FORMULATE OUR  
24 DECISIONS. IT'S AN ITERATIVE PROCESS. AND I THINK THE  
25 CRITICAL OVERSIGHT THAT WE'LL MAKE IS ABOUT THE OVERALL

1 QUALITY, THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSALS. THIS WILL COME  
2 UP, NOT JUST WITH REGARD TO TRAINING GRANTS, BUT IT  
3 WILL CLEARLY COME UP WHEN WE GET INTO  
4 INVESTIGATOR-DRIVEN OR MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL-DRIVEN  
5 GRANTS AND THE LIKE, AND WE WON'T HAVE ALL OF THAT  
6 INFORMATION.

7 BUT I THINK, BASED UPON THE WAY THAT WE'RE  
8 OPERATING AND THE WAY OTHER INSTITUTIONS HAVE OPERATED,  
9 WE CAN DO A VERY REASONED AND SOUND JOB IN THIS REGARD.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DON REED.

11 MR. REED: DON REED, CALIFORNIANS FOR CURE.  
12 JUST THE PEOPLE THAT WILL BE GIVING YOU THAT  
13 INFORMATION, AS YOU KNOW, ARE TREMENDOUS EXPERTS IN  
14 THEIR FIELD. THEY WERE CHOSEN BECAUSE THEY ARE -- THEY  
15 CAN PROVIDE THE SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE THAT IS NEEDED,  
16 AND YOU ARE CHOSEN BECAUSE YOU BRING A MULTIPLICITY OF  
17 VIEWPOINTS. SO IF YOU SPOT SOMETHING YOU DON'T LIKE,  
18 YOU CAN SPEAK UP. I THINK THE SITUATION WE HAVE IS  
19 VERY GOOD. I THINK THE 15 SCIENTISTS THAT WERE CHOSEN  
20 OUT OF A VAST NUMBER OF PEOPLE ARE TOPS IN THEIR FIELD,  
21 AND YOU'RE GOING TO BE GETTING THE BEST INFORMATION. I  
22 THINK IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE FOR YOU TO HAVE TO  
23 INDIVIDUALLY GO OUT AND REPEAT THE WORK THAT'S ALREADY  
24 BEEN DONE BY THE PEOPLE WHO WERE ASSIGNED THAT TASK AND  
25 WHO ARE VERY WELL QUALIFIED TO DO IT.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY AS A  
2 LEGAL FOUNDATION FOR THIS, AS AN INDIVIDUAL ON THIS  
3 BOARD, AND LIMITING MY COMMENT, FOR EXAMPLE, ON MENTORS  
4 TO THE FACT THAT SOME OF THE EVALUATIONS SAY THEY'VE  
5 ONLY ASSIGNED FOUR MENTORS TO A CERTAIN NUMBER OF  
6 POSTDOCTORAL AND POSTDOCTORAL CLINICAL SLOTS, THAT IF  
7 ONE OF THE DEANS OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOLS OR YOU, DR.  
8 BALTIMORE, SAY, LOOK, FOUR MENTORS SEEMS FINE FOR SIX  
9 POSTDOCTORAL SLOTS, I'M GOING TO LISTEN VERY CLOSELY  
10 AND THEN MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION.

11 SO THERE IS ENOUGH SPECIFIC INFORMATION  
12 PROVIDED FOR ME TO MAKE A SUBSTANTIVE DECISION IN THAT  
13 CONTEXT, WHILE I CAN'T LOOK AT WHATEVER THE CAPACITY IS  
14 FOR MENTORING AT THE INSTITUTION, BUT THERE'S A LOT OF  
15 SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION THAT IS A FOUNDATION FOR GOOD  
16 INDEPENDENT DECISIONS SO THAT WE TRULY ARE THE FINAL  
17 DECISION MAKER HERE IN THIS PROCESS.

18 ANY OTHER COMMENTS? PUBLIC COMMENTS? I'D  
19 LIKE TO THEN ASK IF THERE -- TO MAKE CERTAIN, HAVE ALL  
20 OF THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE MAKER  
21 OF THE MOTION AND THE SECOND? THE ANSWER IS YES? YES.  
22 OKAY. CALL FOR THE QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR.

23 OPPOSED?

24 MOTION PASSES.

25 WE WILL GO TO THE NEXT ITEM AND THEN HAVE A

1 FIVE-MINUTE COMFORT BREAK.

2 DR. HALL: I'M GLAD WE'RE POSTPONING THE  
3 COMFORT BREAK. PERHAPS THAT WILL SPEED THE DISCUSSION  
4 OF THE NEXT ISSUE, WHICH IS THE CRITERIA FOR THE GRANTS  
5 WORKING GROUP. AND THAT IS, ACCORDING TO PROPOSITION  
6 71, THE CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND REQUIREMENTS ARE TO BE  
7 RECOMMENDED BY THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP TO THE  
8 ICOC FOR ADOPTION.

9 NOW, IN THE CASE OF THE TRAINING GRANTS, WE  
10 HAVE A SET OF CRITERIA WHICH SHOULD BE FAMILIAR TO YOU  
11 BY NOW. THEY WERE PART OF THE TEXT OF THE TRAINING  
12 GRANT RFA, WHICH WAS PRESENTED TO YOU ON MAY 6TH AND  
13 WHICH YOU APPROVED. AND IN A SENSE, WHENEVER WE PUT  
14 OUT A REQUEST FOR APPLICATION OR RFA, ONE ALWAYS SAYS  
15 THE APPLICATIONS WILL BE JUDGED WITH THE FOLLOWING  
16 CRITERIA, WHICH IS NECESSARY TO DO. AND SO WE INCLUDED  
17 THOSE. YOU APPROVED THEM. THEN ON JULY 12TH THESE  
18 SAME CRITERIA WERE PRESENTED AS AN INFORMATION ITEM TO  
19 THE ICOC AND TO THE PUBLIC WITH REQUESTS FOR  
20 MODIFICATION BEFORE PRESENTATION TO THE WORKING GROUP.  
21 THERE WERE NO MODIFICATIONS AT THAT TIME.

22 THE WORKING GROUP THEN AT ITS MEETING ON  
23 AUGUST 3D CONSIDERED THE CRITERIA IN PUBLIC SESSION,  
24 AND THEN RECOMMENDED THEM AT THAT TIME TO THE ICOC FOR  
25 APPROVAL. WE PRESENT THEM HERE AND REQUEST APPROVAL



1 FOR THEM AS INTERIM CRITERIA. AND LET ME REMIND YOU OF  
2 WHAT THEY ARE.

3 THEY CONCERN THE ONES THAT SUSAN FOGEL JUST  
4 MENTIONED, THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE TRAINING  
5 PROGRAMS, THE QUALIFICATION OF THE PROGRAM LEADERSHIP,  
6 THE RESEARCH AND TRAINING STRENGTH OF THE PROPOSED  
7 MENTORS, THE QUALITY OF THE EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS,  
8 AND THE STRENGTH OF STEM CELL RESEARCH AT THE  
9 INSTITUTION.

10 WE WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE THESE AS CRITERIA  
11 FOR OUR CONSIDERATION OF TRAINING GRANTS NOW AND IN THE  
12 FUTURE. LET ME SAY THAT IN THIS CASE THESE, BECAUSE  
13 THEY AFFECT OUR PUBLIC DECISIONS, WOULD BECOME A  
14 REGULATION UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT.  
15 AND SO THE ADOPTION HERE WOULD BE THE FIRST STEP IN THE  
16 PROCEDURE OF ADOPTING THEM AS A PERMANENT FIRM  
17 REGULATION.

18 AND I MIGHT JUST SAY, AND, JAMES, YOU COULD  
19 CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, THAT THESE WILL BE SUBMITTED  
20 TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. THERE WILL THEN  
21 BE A 45-DAY PERIOD DURING WHICH THE PUBLIC OR MEMBERS  
22 OF THE ICOC ACTUALLY CAN COMMENT ON THEM, AND THEN THEY  
23 WILL BE, IF THE MODIFICATIONS ARE NOT EXTENSIVE, WILL  
24 THEN BE -- CAN BE MODIFIED AND THEN, I GUESS, MADE INTO  
25 A PERMANENT REGULATION. OTHERWISE, IF THEY'RE

1 SUBSTANTIALLY MODIFIED, THEY GO THROUGH A SECOND PERIOD  
2 OF PUBLIC HEARING.

3 SO MY POINT HERE IS THAT WE NEED TO ADOPT  
4 THESE IN ORDER TO MOVE FORWARD. THEY WILL BECOME PART  
5 OF THE PROCEDURE FOR THE APA, BUT THERE WILL BE A  
6 POSSIBILITY FOR MODIFICATION LATER ON.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IN FACT, WHAT WE'RE SAYING  
8 HERE IS WE'RE STARTING A 270-DAY PROCESS FOR PUBLIC  
9 HEARINGS, INPUT, MODIFICATION THAT WILL BE QUITE  
10 EXTENSIVE, INVOLVE MULTIPLE HEARINGS AND MULTIPLE  
11 POINTS OF INPUT. DR. POMEROY.

12 DR. POMEROY: ZACH, ONE OF THE SUGGESTED  
13 CRITERIA THAT WE DISCUSSED THE FIRST TIME WE SAW THESE  
14 WAS THE QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF THE APPLICANT POOL  
15 THAT WAS AVAILABLE. THE APPLICANTS THEMSELVES DON'T  
16 APPEAR ON THIS LIST, AND I THOUGHT WE HAD TALKED ABOUT  
17 THAT JUST BEING AN OVERSIGHT AND WE WERE GOING TO  
18 INCORPORATE IT. SO I WOULD LIKE TO INCLUDE THE QUALITY  
19 AND THE DIVERSITY OF THE APPLICANT POOL.

20 DR. HALL: I APOLOGIZE. YOU ARE CORRECT.  
21 AND I WONDER --

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WAS ACTUALLY PART OF THE  
23 RFP. THE RFA'S INCLUDED DIVERSITY.

24 DR. HALL: SO THERE'S TWO THINGS. WE DID  
25 ASK --

1 DR. POMEROY: I THINK IT'S JUST A PROBLEM ON  
2 THE SLIDE BECAUSE I KNOW THIS WAS VERY IMPORTANT.

3 DR. HALL: SO DIVERSITY WAS MENTIONED IN THE  
4 RFA, AND THAT WAS ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS, THAT THEY  
5 TELL US WHAT THEIR PLANS FOR DIVERSITY WERE. THAT WAS  
6 A REQUIREMENT IN THAT SENSE. WE CAN CERTAINLY ADD THAT  
7 TO IT, AND I --

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WAS DISCUSSED IN THE  
9 PUBLIC HEARING AS WELL OF THE WORKING GROUP ITSELF, AND  
10 IT WAS ALSO ONE OF THE THINGS DISCUSSED THROUGH THE  
11 PROCESS. SO IT'S CONSISTENT WITH WHAT THE PROCESS  
12 ACTUALLY CARRIED OUT.

13 DR. HALL: RIGHT. WE ASK ACTUALLY IN THE RFA  
14 THAT THEY TELL US HOW THEY WERE GOING TO CHOOSE THE  
15 APPLICANTS, WHAT THE APPLICANT POOL WAS GOING TO BE,  
16 WHO IT WAS GOING TO BE DRAWN FROM. SO ALL OF THAT WAS  
17 VERY MUCH INCORPORATED INTO THE RFA AND WAS USED BY THE  
18 WORKING GROUP, SO I DON'T THINK THAT'S A PROBLEM. I'M  
19 HAPPY TO PUT THAT IN. YOU WANT TO STATE IT.

20 DR. POMEROY: THE QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF  
21 THE APPLICANT SCHOLAR POOL.

22 DR. BALTIMORE: SORRY. I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU  
23 MEAN BY THE APPLICANT SCHOLAR POOL.

24 DR. POMEROY: FOR THE TRAINING GRANT, THE  
25 PEOPLE THAT WOULD BE APPLYING. SO AT THIS INSTITUTION

1 THERE ARE A LOT OF WELL-PREPARED POST DOCS WHO COULD  
2 QUALIFY. SO IT'S THE AVAILABILITY -- IT'S THE QUALITY  
3 OF THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE BEING TRAINED IN THE TRAINING  
4 GRANT.

5 DR. HALL: I THINK THE ORIGINAL INTENT HERE  
6 WAS THAT THAT INFORMATION CERTAINLY WAS IMPLICIT IN THE  
7 OVERALL OF THE QUALITY OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS BECAUSE  
8 THESE PEOPLE WILL BE CHOSEN IN GENERAL TO PARTICIPATE  
9 IN THIS FROM PREEXISTING PH.D. PROGRAMS, FOR EXAMPLE.  
10 NOBODY IS SETTING UP A PH.D. PROGRAM IN STEM CELL  
11 BIOLOGY, BUT PARTICIPATING IN THE STEM CELL TRAINING  
12 GRANT WILL BE STUDENTS FROM PROGRAMS IN NEUROSCIENCE,  
13 POSSIBLY ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY, AND I  
14 THINK IT WAS THOUGHT THAT IT WAS IMPLICIT THERE. AND  
15 THE DIVERSITY ISSUE WAS DEALT WITH AS A SPECIFICATION  
16 IN THE RFA SPECIFICALLY.

17 I'M HAPPY TO ADD IT. I CAN ONLY ASSURE YOU  
18 THAT IT WAS TAKEN VERY SERIOUSLY AND USED  
19 OPERATIONALLY. DAVID, I DON'T KNOW IF THE TERM  
20 "SCHOLAR" WAS THE MISUNDERSTANDING OR NOT.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: NO. IT WAS APPLICANT POOL  
22 BECAUSE I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEANT BY POOL.

23 DR. POMEROY: I WILL TAKE THAT AS A FRIENDLY  
24 AMENDMENT AND MAYBE CHANGE THE WORDING TO THE TRAINEE  
25 POOL.

1 DR. BALTIMORE: WHAT -- POOL MEANS ALL OF THE  
2 TRAINEES WHO EXIST AT THE INSTITUTION ALREADY, AND  
3 YOU'RE JUDGING BOTH THEIR EXCELLENCE AND THEIR  
4 DIVERSITY. DIVERSITY MEANING?

5 DR. HALL: LET ME CLARIFY THE DIVERSITY.  
6 WHAT WE ASKED PEOPLE TO DO WAS TO -- WE EXPRESSED OUR  
7 STRONG INTEREST IN HAVING A DIVERSE TRAINING FORCE.  
8 AND WE ASKED THEM TO TELL US WHAT THEIR PLANS WERE TO  
9 ACHIEVE THAT GOAL, AND THAT WAS PART OF WHAT WAS DONE.

10 I THINK THE PROBLEM THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS  
11 WE ASKED PEOPLE TO TELL US HOW THEY WERE GOING TO  
12 CHOOSE THE PEOPLE. AND I THINK THE IDEA WAS THAT THE  
13 QUALITY OF THE CURRENT TRAINING PROGRAMS WERE AN  
14 EXAMPLE OF WHERE THESE PEOPLE WERE GOING TO COME FROM.  
15 NOBODY CAN TELL YOU -- IN THE ABSENCE OF A PROGRAM,  
16 NOBODY CAN TELL YOU THE QUALITY OF THE APPLICANTS THAT  
17 ARE BEING PROPOSED TO THE PROGRAM. MAYBE THAT'S THE  
18 DIFFICULTY.

19 DR. BALTIMORE: THAT IS THE DIFFICULTY.

20 DR. HALL: WOULD YOU, CLAIRE, ACCEPT THAT THE  
21 DIVERSITY ISSUE IS SPECIFIED AND ASKED FOR SPECIFICALLY  
22 IN THE RFA, AND THAT IT IS LIKE GIVING A COURSE IN  
23 ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS. WE ALSO  
24 SPECIFIED THAT. WE SPECIFIED THAT THERE BE A PLAN FOR  
25 DIVERSITY. AND THEN THAT THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE

1 TRAINING PROGRAMS WOULD INCLUDE THE POOL, OR IF YOU  
2 WISH TO ADD A SEPARATE STATEMENT, THAT WOULD BE FINE  
3 TOO.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CLAIRE, I THINK WHAT YOU ARE  
5 GETTING AT IS THAT THERE'S A PROCESS FOR JUDGING THE  
6 QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF THE TRAINEES.

7 DR. POMEROY: OKAY.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHICH IS REALLY WHAT WAS IN  
9 THE RESPONSES TO THE RFA WAS THEY OUTLINED THEIR  
10 PROCESS.

11 DR. POMEROY: I THINK THAT, JUST TO CLARIFY,  
12 I THINK THAT WE HEARD VERY STRONGLY FROM THE PUBLIC  
13 THAT DIVERSITY WAS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, AND THAT BY  
14 SPECIFICALLY STATING THAT, WE'RE SENDING A MESSAGE  
15 ABOUT OUR VALUES. AND SO I WOULD BE SUPPORTIVE OF  
16 SPECIFICALLY STATING THAT.

17 I WOULD ALSO SAY THAT WHAT MAKES A TRAINING  
18 PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL IS THE QUALITY OF THE TRAINEES. THE  
19 MENTORS ARE IMPORTANT AND, YOU KNOW, THE COURSES ARE  
20 IMPORTANT, BUT WE ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT ONE OF THE VERY  
21 SPECIAL THINGS ABOUT THIS WILL BE THE TRAINEES WHO ARE  
22 IN THIS PROGRAM.

23 DR. HALL: I THINK YOU WILL SEE THIS  
24 AFTERNOON, AFTERNOON IS ABOUT RIGHT, BUT I THINK YOU  
25 WILL SEE LATER TODAY, AS WE TALK ABOUT IT, THAT THESE

1 ISSUES WERE TREATED.

2 DR. BRYANT: I JUST WANTED TO SUGGEST AN  
3 AMENDMENT TO THE FIRST LINE, WHICH WOULD SAY OVERALL  
4 QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS,  
5 WHICH WOULD COVER WHAT YOU'RE SAYING.

6 DR. POMEROY: THAT WOULD FIX IT FOR ME.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE MAY NOT HAVE -- DO WE  
8 NEED THE WORD "EXISTING"? THEY MAY BE IMPLEMENTING A  
9 NEW TRAINING PROGRAM.

10 DR. BRYANT: DELETE EXISTING.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXISTING OR PROPOSED  
12 TRAINING PROGRAM. IS THAT AN ACCEPTABLE AMENDMENT?

13 DR. BRYANT: NOT PROPOSED BECAUSE YOU CAN'T  
14 JUDGE THE QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED.

15 DR. BALTIMORE: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE  
16 FOURTH LINE. I'M READING FROM WHAT'S IN FRONT OF US  
17 HERE. IT'S THE FOURTH LINE THERE TOO. QUALITY OF  
18 EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS, AND YOU'RE SUGGESTING  
19 QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OF EXISTING OR PROPOSED.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: NO. NO. PROPOSED ARE  
22 SOMEWHERE ELSE. THEY'RE UP AT THE TOP. OVERALL  
23 QUALITY OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE THE PROPOSED ONES.  
24 THE BOTTOM ONE IS THE POOL, IN A SENSE, AND IT GETS AT  
25 CLAIRE'S ISSUE ABOUT THE POOL.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO IS THAT  
2 AMENDMENT ACCEPTED?

3 DR. HALL: AS I LOOK AT THIS, I'VE LOOKED AT  
4 THIS SO MANY TIMES, I ACTUALLY DON'T SEE IT ANYMORE.  
5 AND I SEE THAT ITEMS NO. 1 AND 4 ARE REDUNDANT. MY  
6 SUSPICION IS THAT ONE OF THEM REFERRED TO THE --

7 DR. BALTIMORE: PROPOSED.

8 DR. HALL: -- OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED  
9 TRAINING PROGRAM AS NO. 1. NO. 4 IS THE QUALITY OF THE  
10 EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS, WHICH IS MEANT TO  
11 REFLECT --

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF YOU'RE NOT GOING TO  
13 COMBINE THEM, YOU NEED TO MODIFY NO. 1.

14 DR. HALL: OKAY. THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. STEWARD.

16 DR. STEWARD: THIS IS A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT  
17 POINT. ARE WE FINISHED WITH THAT?

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY NEED TO ADD THE WORD  
19 "DIVERSITY," I BELIEVE.

20 DR. HALL: ADD THE WORD "DIVERSITY" AND TAKE  
21 THE "S" OFF NO. 1.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WOULD BE IN -- NOT NO. 1?

23 DR. POMEROY: NO. NO. 1 IS THE PROPOSED.  
24 NO. 1 -- DR. HALL IS CORRECT. NO. 1 IS OVERALL QUALITY  
25 OF THE PROPOSED TRAINING PROGRAM. NO. 4 IS QUALITY AND



1 DIVERSITY OF THE EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD POINT OUT THE  
3 INFORMATION WE ASKED THEM FOR IN THE RFA WAS HOW  
4 THEY'RE GOING TO GET DIVERSITY IN THE PROPOSED TRAINING  
5 PROGRAM.

6 DR. PENHOET: THAT'S AN ASPECT OF QUALITY.  
7 INTERESTINGLY ENOUGH, I THINK THE REVIEWERS DIDN'T HAVE  
8 AS MUCH TROUBLE WITH THIS AS WE DID BECAUSE EVERY  
9 SINGLE REVIEW SUMMARY ADDRESSES THE QUALITY AND  
10 DIVERSITY OF THE POOL. THEY UNDERSTOOD THE CONCEPT.

11 DR. STEWARD: IF WE'RE DONE WITH THAT, CAN I  
12 ASK A DIFFERENT QUESTION?

13 DR. BALTIMORE: BOB, I BELIEVE THAT THERE'S  
14 NO MOTION ON THE FLOOR.

15 DR. PENHOET: THERE WILL BE IN A MOMENT.

16 DR. BRYANT: I PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT TO NO.  
17 4.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: PROCEDURALLY HERE, LET'S  
19 FORMALIZE THIS DISCUSSION. DR. BRYANT, WOULD YOU LIKE  
20 TO MAKE A MOTION OR, DR. POMEROY, WOULD YOU LIKE TO  
21 MAKE A MOTION SO WE PUT THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR?

22 DR. BRYANT: SURE. SO I WOULD PROPOSE THAT  
23 WE CHANGE BULLET 4 TO READ QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF THE  
24 EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS.

25 DR. POMEROY: SECOND.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THERE'S A MOTION AND A  
2 SECOND. I BELIEVE THAT SINCE WE WERE JUDGING THE  
3 DIVERSITY AS WELL OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM, THAT LINE 4  
4 SHOULD BE -- LINE 1 SHOULD ALSO BE AMENDED TO SAY  
5 QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF THE PROPOSED.

6 DR. HALL: LINE 1 IS THE OVERALL QUALITY OF  
7 THE PROPOSED TRAINING PROGRAM COMPLETELY. SO THIS IS A  
8 SHORTHAND. IT'S THE PROPOSED TRAINING PROGRAM.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS INTERPRETED --

10 DR. HALL: YOU CAN'T JUDGE THE DIVERSITY OF  
11 THAT EXCEPT WE HAVE PLANS OF HOW TO ADDRESS DIVERSITY.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S THE PROPOSED PROCESS  
13 FOR ACCOMPLISHING DIVERSITY.

14 DR. HALL: I WOULD JUST SUGGEST PUT QUALITY  
15 AND DIVERSITY OF THE EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS WOULD,  
16 I THINK, ACCOMPLISH IT. IS THAT ACCEPTABLE TO YOU,  
17 CLAIRE?

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT  
19 WE SPECIFIED FOR THE PUBLIC'S BENEFIT IN THE RFA THAT  
20 THEY NEEDED TO BE VERY CLEAR ABOUT HOW WE'RE GOING TO GET  
21 DIVERSITY IN THE PROPOSED PROGRAM.

22 DR. HALL: WE DID SPECIFY IN THE RFA.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NEXT COMMENT. DR. STEWARD.

24 DR. STEWARD: I'D ACTUALLY LIKE TO PICK UP ON  
25 SOMETHING THAT DR. BALTIMORE RAISED WHICH, IN FACT, WAS

1 SORT OF AN IMPLIED CRITERION IN THE EVALUATION THIS  
2 TIME AROUND AND PROBABLY OUGHT TO BE FORMALLY STATED.  
3 THAT IS, THAT THE OVERALL RATING IS IN SOME RESPECT  
4 BASED ON BUDGETARY AMENDMENTS MADE AT THE TIME OF THE  
5 REVIEW. SO PERHAPS A BULLET SHOULD BE ADDED  
6 "APPROPRIATENESS OF BUDGET."

7 DR. HALL: THAT'S NOT CORRECT ACTUALLY. I  
8 THINK THE RATINGS, THE NUMBER, IS DONE INDEPENDENTLY OF  
9 THAT. THE RECOMMENDATION IS BASED -- TAKES INTO  
10 CONSIDERATION THE REDUCTIONS.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE RATING DID NOT LOOK AT  
12 THE DOLLARS. IT LOOKED AT SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL  
13 MERIT.

14 DR. HALL: WE DISCUSSED THE WEAKNESSES IN THE  
15 COURSE OF THOSE DISCUSSIONS, BUT THERE WAS NO -- THE  
16 QUESTION OF -- AND WE DISCUSSED THE POSSIBILITY OF  
17 THAT, MAYBE THEY SHOULDN'T BE FUNDED FOR THAT, BUT THEN  
18 IN THE END THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION WAS WHERE IT WAS  
19 DECIDED TO RECOMMEND THAT THE SPECIFIC SLOTS BE TAKEN  
20 OUT FOR PARTICULAR PROGRAMS.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: ZACH, THAT DOESN'T MAKE  
22 SENSE.

23 DR. STEWARD: ISN'T THAT A BUDGETARY  
24 AMENDMENT REALLY?

25 DR. HALL: WELL, MY POINT IS IT AFFECTS THE

1 RECOMMENDATION, BUT NOT THE NUMBER. OKAY.

2 DR. BALTIMORE: THAT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE.

3 IF --

4 DR. HALL: I THINK YOU WILL SEE THIS IN  
5 ACTION LATER.

6 DR. BALTIMORE: IT MAY BE TRUE.

7 DR. HALL: LET'S NOT HAVE THIS DISCUSSION  
8 UNTIL WE GO THROUGH. PEOPLE RATED THEM. AND I'M GOING  
9 TO MAKE UP SOME NUMBERS, ALL RIGHT? SO YOU HAVE ONE  
10 THAT'S AT 60 OR ONE THAT'S AT A HUNDRED OR WHATEVER IT  
11 IS, ONE THAT'S AT 90 AND ONE THAT'S AT 80 AND ONE  
12 THAT'S AT 70. THEN YOU COME TIME TO DRAW THE LINE AND  
13 SAY WHICH ONES ARE WE GOING TO PUT IN WHICH CATEGORY.  
14 AND SO THE DECISION WAS TO LOOK AT ONE, LET'S SAY,  
15 AROUND 80 AND TO SAY, YOU KNOW, I WOULD VOTE TO  
16 RECOMMEND THIS IF WE CUT THE SLOTS. AND SO IT  
17 INFLUENCED WHERE THE LINE WAS DRAWN AND THE CATEGORY  
18 THAT IT WAS PUT INTO, BUT THE NUMBER WAS MADE ON THE  
19 BASIS OF THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION.

20 LET'S GO THROUGH IT, AND THEN I THINK THE  
21 QUESTIONS WILL BE -- THE WAY IT WORKED OUT IN PRACTICE  
22 WILL BE MORE CLEAR.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

24 DR. BALTIMORE: YOU'RE MAKING A DISTINCTION  
25 BETWEEN THE RATING AND THE CUTOFF LINE, AND WE ACTUALLY

1 HAVEN' T SEEN THE CUTOFF LINE.

2 DR. HALL: THAT' S WHY I' M ASKING YOU TO WAIT.  
3 I THINK YOU WILL SEE HOW IT WORKS JUST AFTER THE BREAK.

4 DR. PIZZO: IT' S EVEN BEYOND THE CUTOFF LINE.  
5 YOU' RE ALSO TALKING ABOUT REDUCTIONS IN THE AMOUNT THAT  
6 YOU PROVIDE PER GRANT OR PER PROPOSAL, WHICH IS ANOTHER  
7 WHOLE SET OF ISSUES, IF I UNDERSTAND.

8 DR. HALL: LET' S HOLD THIS, IF WE MAY, AND  
9 ACTUALLY SEE THE THING WORK.

10 DR. PIZZO: THEN WE' LL OBJECT TO IT THEN.

11 DR. HALL: THEN YOU CAN HAVE AT IT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE SPECIFIC PROPOSAL THAT' S  
13 ON THE TABLE WILL BE SUMMARIZED WITH THE ELOQUENCE OF  
14 THE VICE CHAIR.

15 DR. PENHOET: SO I BELIEVE WE DECIDED THAT  
16 ITEM 1 WILL READ "OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED  
17 TRAINING PROGRAM," AND THAT ITEM 4 WILL SAY "QUALITY  
18 AND DIVERSITY OF EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS." SO WE  
19 JUST ADD TWO WORDS; IS THAT RIGHT?

20 DR. HALL: OKAY.

21 DR. PENHOET: THAT' S THE MOTION.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A COMMENT FROM THE  
23 PUBLIC?

24 MS. SAMUELSON: EXCUSE ME. THE FIRST  
25 QUESTION IS I' M LOOKING AT TWO DOCUMENTS AND THEN

1 THERE'S THAT SLIDE, AND I'M WONDERING WHICH IT PERTAINS  
2 TO. ONE BEING THE INTERIM CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF  
3 RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATIONS, AND THEN THE NEXT ONE  
4 BEING INTERIM --

5 DR. HALL: I'M SORRY. WE HAVEN'T GOTTEN TO  
6 THAT YET. THE RESEARCH APPLICATIONS WE'RE GOING TO  
7 HOLD TILL AFTER LUNCH.

8 MS. SAMUELSON: THAT'S IN THE BOOK BEFORE THE  
9 NEXT ONE.

10 DR. HALL: I'M SORRY. I SAID I WAS GOING TO  
11 PULL ONE OF THOSE OUT AND HOLD IT IN THE INTEREST OF  
12 TIME UNTIL AFTER LUNCH, AND THAT DEALT WITH THE  
13 RESEARCH GRANTS, SO THAT'S OFF THE TABLE FOR THE  
14 MOMENT.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE IS WHY I THINK, EXCEPT  
16 TO THE EXTENT WE NEED TO APPROVE ANY OF THIS TO BE ABLE  
17 TO PROCEED WITH THE TRAINING GRANTS, WHICH WE WANT TO  
18 GET GOING, I THINK IT'S PREMATURE AND I THINK WE SHOULD  
19 SEND IT BACK TO THE WORKING GROUP TO GET THE BENEFIT OF  
20 THEIR THOUGHTS. BECAUSE AS WE WERE -- WELL, I WASN'T.  
21 I WAS JUST LISTENING, SO I TOOK A LOT OF NOTES, IN THE  
22 DISCUSSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT. AND THERE WERE  
23 MANY QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN  
24 THE COURSE OF THAT DISCUSSION WHICH ALL SEEMED TO BE  
25 REVOLVING AROUND THE QUESTION OF WHAT IS IT WE'RE

1 TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH WITH THE TRAINING GRANTS.

2 AND THERE WERE QUESTIONS LIKE ARE WE TRYING  
3 TO ENCOURAGE COLLABORATION, AND HOW ACTIVE ARE WE GOING  
4 TO BE IN ENCOURAGING THAT? AND THERE WERE COMMENTS,  
5 THAT THERE ARE OTHER WAYS OF GOING ABOUT THE PROCESS  
6 BESIDES THE NIH MODEL, WHICH WE WERE BASICALLY  
7 FOLLOWING, AND SOME ENTHUSIASM ABOUT PERHAPS MOVING IN  
8 THAT DIRECTION IN THE FUTURE. THERE WERE QUESTIONS  
9 ABOUT ARE WE TRYING TO ENCOURAGE OR DISCOURAGE  
10 PARTICIPATION FROM NONRESIDENTS, AND THERE WERE SOME  
11 INTERESTING COMMENTS ABOUT THAT. ARE WE TRYING TO  
12 ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW STEM CELL RESEARCH, AND DO  
13 THESE CRITERIA SO EMPHASIZE THE STATUS QUO AVAILABILITY  
14 OF STEM CELL EXPERTISE IN THE GIVEN APPLICANT THAT IT  
15 IS GIVING THAT UNDUE MERIT AND DOWNGRADING THOSE THAT  
16 ARE TRYING TO GET INTO THE PROCESS, WHICH, OF COURSE,  
17 WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF.

18 THERE WERE QUESTIONS ABOUT ARE WE TRYING TO  
19 STAY AWAY FROM GRANTS RAISING IP ISSUES, OR DO WE WANT  
20 TO USE THIS PROCESS TO ADDRESS THEM PERHAPS IN  
21 COLLABORATION WITH THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP?

22 SO THERE WERE -- DO WE WANT TO BE ENCOURAGING  
23 NEW IDEAS, NOVEL AND INNOVATIVE APPROACHES, OR NOT, AND  
24 A THOUGHT THAT MAYBE THE CRITERIA WE'RE EMPHASIZING  
25 AWAY FROM THE NOVEL AND THE INNOVATIVE, SO THERE WERE

1 SEVERAL DIFFERENT KINDS OF QUESTIONS THAT REALLY DO  
2 DEVOLVE INTO CRITERIA THAT WERE ADDRESSED IN THE  
3 WORKING GROUP. AND I THINK WE SHOULD BE, EXCEPT TO THE  
4 EXTENT WE WANT TO GET GOING WITH THESE TRAINING GRANTS,  
5 SENDING THIS BACK TO THEM TO FLESH OUT WHAT THEIR  
6 THOUGHTS WERE AND GIVE US RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
7 ADDITIONAL CRITERIA WE MIGHT WANT TO BE USING OR TO  
8 REFINE THE ONES WE HAVE.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT THE POINT IS  
10 CONSISTENT WITH THE PRIOR POINTS IN THAT THIS IS  
11 INTERIM CRITERIA TO START THIS PROCESS, AND THIS IS  
12 ESSENTIAL TO GOING FORWARD WITH THE GRANTS THAT WE'RE  
13 CONSIDERING TODAY. BUT CERTAINLY WITH THE BENEFIT OF  
14 THE SCIENTIFIC MEETING ON OCTOBER 1ST AND 2D AND THE  
15 WHOLE STRATEGIC PLAN PROCESS THAT THE CIRM STAFF IS  
16 EMBARKING ON AND THE BOARD IS EMBARKING ON, THESE ARE  
17 ALL EXTRAORDINARILY IMPORTANT QUESTIONS THAT WILL BE  
18 DISCUSSED. AND THE BOARD WILL HAVE TO DECIDE HOW MUCH  
19 DIRECTION ON THESE SPECIFIC ISSUES THEY WANT TO GIVE TO  
20 THE WORKING GROUP.

21 BUT WHAT WE'RE DISCUSSING RIGHT HERE IS THE  
22 BASIC FRAMEWORK OF WHAT WE NEED TO START THE 270-DAY  
23 PROCESS AND TO APPROVE THE GRANTS BEFORE US TODAY.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: WELL, I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST  
25 THAT WE SPECIFICALLY MAKE IT INTERIM IF IT'S NOT



1 ALREADY SPECIFIC AND THAT WE SEND IT BACK TO THE  
2 WORKING GROUP TO FLESH OUT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT DOES SAY INTERIM, BUT  
4 WOULD THE MAKER OF THE MOTION FOR APPROVAL ALSO BE OPEN  
5 TO A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, THAT WHILE WE START THE  
6 270-DAY PROCESS, WE ALSO SEND THIS BACK TO THE WORKING  
7 GROUP FOR ADDITIONAL INPUT DURING THAT PROCESS OF  
8 QUESTIONS THAT THEY WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO DEAL WITH  
9 CLARIFICATION ON?

10 DR. BRYANT: SURE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE ANSWER IS YES. AND THE  
12 SECOND?

13 DR. POMEROY: YES.

14 DR. STEWARD: MAY I ASK A QUESTION? IF THERE  
15 ARE SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS, DOESN'T THAT RESTART THE  
16 270-DAY PROCESS?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YEAH. IF THERE ARE --

18 MR. HARRISON: ONCE YOU ADOPT THESE AS YOUR  
19 INTERIM STANDARDS, THEY HAVE A 270-DAY LIFE. DURING  
20 THAT PERIOD OF TIME, YOU NEED TO GO THROUGH THE  
21 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION  
22 OF THESE STANDARDS AS PERMANENT REGULATIONS. AS ZACH  
23 EXPLAINED, THE APA PROVIDES A 45-DAY WINDOW FOR PUBLIC  
24 COMMENT. IF DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME SUBSTANTIVE  
25 CHANGES ARE MADE, THEN YOU HAVE ANOTHER 45-DAY COMMENT

1 PERIOD. BUT OVER 270 DAYS, THERE SHOULD BE AMPLE TIME  
2 FOR CONSIDERATION OF SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES AS WELL.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: SO THAT PROCESS IS FLEXIBLE  
4 ENOUGH THAT WE COULD INCORPORATE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT  
5 THE COMMITTEE RECEIVED FROM THE WORKING GROUP THAT WE  
6 DECIDED WE WANT TO --

7 MR. HARRISON: PROVIDED THAT IT'S DONE IN A  
8 TIMELY MANNER. AGAIN, YOU NEED TO WORK BACKWARDS  
9 BECAUSE THERE'S NOT ONLY A 45-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT  
10 PERIOD, BUT A 30-DAY WORKING DAY PERIOD FOR OFFICE OF  
11 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW REVIEW. SO WE'LL HAVE TO LOOK AT  
12 THE CALENDAR TO MAKE SURE THERE'S SUFFICIENT TIME, BUT  
13 THEORETICALLY, YES, THERE SHOULD BE SUFFICIENT TIME FOR  
14 THAT TO OCCUR.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AS LONG AS IT'S DONE IN A  
16 TIMELY MANNER, THE ANSWER IS YES?

17 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: SO IT WOULD BE THE UNDERSTANDING  
19 THAT -- SOMEONE IS WATCHING THOSE TIME FRAMES, AND WE  
20 WOULDN'T -- THE POSSIBILITY OF MAKING THESE ADDITIONAL  
21 CHANGES WOULDN'T BE PROHIBITED. OKAY.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S A CORRECT STATEMENT.  
23 ALL RIGHT. ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? PUBLIC  
24 COMMENTS?

25 MR. HALPERN: I WANT TO TAKE UP FROM

1 MS. SAMUELSON'S POINT BECAUSE I THINK HER COMMENT  
2 HIGHLIGHTS NOT ONLY THE LEGAL INSUFFICIENCY OF THIS  
3 PROCESS, WHICH IS REASONABLY CLEAR TO ME, BUT ALSO THE  
4 SERIOUS UNDERLYING SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES THAT ARE BEING  
5 ELIDED AND OUGHT TO BE ADDRESSED. FIRST OF ALL ON THE  
6 LEGAL ISSUE, IT PLAINLY VIOLATES PROPOSITION 71 FOR A  
7 BODY WHICH IS SUPPOSED TO RECOMMEND INTERIM STANDARDS,  
8 INTERIM CRITERIA TO THIS BODY, AND THEN AT A LATER  
9 POINT AFTER THIS BODY HAS ADOPTED INTERIM CRITERIA, TO  
10 APPLY THEM TO THE APPLICANT POOL. INSTEAD TO TAKE  
11 THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS AND JUST APPLY THEM AS IF THEY  
12 WERE ACTUAL CRITERIA THAT HAD BEEN ADOPTED BY THE ICOC  
13 VIOLATES PROP 71.

14 PARTICULARLY IT APPEARS THAT THE MEMBERS OF  
15 THAT COMMITTEE FELT THAT THESE CRITERIA DIDN'T REALLY  
16 DO THE SORTING JOB THAT WAS NEEDED, AS MS. SAMUELSON  
17 SAYS. THEY REALLY FELT THAT THERE WERE A SERIES OF  
18 OTHER QUESTIONS THAT HADN'T BEEN RESOLVED.

19 I WANT TO ADD TO THAT THREE OTHER CRITERIA.  
20 YOU ALL SAW MY LETTER. THESE CRITERIA ARE A FINE  
21 STARTING POINT, BUT THEY ARE DEFICIENT IN FUNDAMENTAL  
22 RESPECT THAT GO TO THE CORE OF THIS PROGRAM, ISSUES  
23 THAT WERE NOT CONSIDERED AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN. WE'RE  
24 TALKING ABOUT TRAINING GRANTS.

25 FIRST QUESTION. WHAT IS THE ATTITUDE OF ANY

1 PARTICULAR APPLICANT INSTITUTION TOWARD REPRODUCTIVE  
2 CLONING? NOBODY PERMITS IT ON THEIR PREMISES, BUT HOW  
3 COMMITTED ARE THEY TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY POLICE THE  
4 BOUNDARIES SO THAT WORK THAT DEVELOPS IN THEIR  
5 LABORATORIES OR PEOPLE THEY TRAIN IN THEIR LABORATORIES  
6 DON'T END UP GOING TO SOME OTHER PLACE WHICH HAS A  
7 DIFFERENT SET OF MORAL VALUES THAN WE HAVE HERE IN  
8 CALIFORNIA AND APPLYING THEIR SKILLS OR THEIR KNOWLEDGE  
9 TO REPRODUCTIVE CLONING? THAT IS SOMETHING THAT SHOULD  
10 BE AN IMPORTANT CRITERIA IN CHOOSING AN INSTITUTION.

11 SECOND, WHAT HAS THEIR PAST PERFORMANCE BEEN  
12 IN THE AREA OF STEM CELL RESEARCH? MANY OF THESE  
13 APPLICANTS HAVE BEEN CONDUCTING SUBSTANTIAL PROGRAMS  
14 ALREADY. TO WHAT DEGREE HAVE THOSE PROGRAMS COMPLIED  
15 WITH THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES' STANDARDS? AS  
16 WE KNOW, THEY'RE JUST GENERAL PRINCIPLES AT THIS TIME,  
17 BUT THEY'RE OUT THERE. FOR EXAMPLE, HAVE THESE  
18 INSTITUTIONS BEEN PERMITTING THE BREEDING OF ANIMALS  
19 THAT HAVE HAD STEM CELLS INTRODUCED INTO THEM? ARE  
20 THESE INSTITUTIONS ONES WHICH IN THEIR LABORATORIES  
21 HAVE PERMITTED THE IMPLANTING OF HUMAN STEM CELLS INTO  
22 PRIMATES? MAYBE YES; MAYBE NO. WE DON'T KNOW. NOBODY  
23 ASKED THEM. TO ME THAT'S A HIGHLY RELEVANT CRITERION  
24 IN DECIDING WHETHER WE WANT THIS TO BE THE PLACE THAT  
25 IS TRAINING THE NEXT GENERATION OF CALIFORNIA

1 SCIENTISTS.

2           THIRD POINT, CALIFORNIA SCIENTISTS. THERE IS  
3 IN EACH OF THESE WRITE-UPS THAT YOU'VE RECEIVED AN ODD  
4 LITTLE REFERENCE OF BENEFIT TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.  
5 AND FOR EACH OF THEM THERE IS, ODDLY ENOUGH, AN  
6 IDENTICAL PHRASE. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THE APPLICANTS  
7 DIDN'T TAKE THE ISSUE OF BENEFIT TO THE STATE OF  
8 CALIFORNIA SERIOUSLY AND REALLY ADDRESS IT AS ONE  
9 COULD? ONE COULD SAY, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT AN INSTITUTION  
10 WOULD COMMIT TO TRY TO PLACE THEIR GRADUATE FELLOWS IN  
11 POSITIONS WITHIN THIS STATE AFTER THEIR FELLOWSHIP, OR  
12 THEY MIGHT HAVE GONE FURTHER AND REQUIRED THEIR FELLOWS  
13 TO MAKE A COMMITMENT TO MAKE BEST EFFORTS TO FIND  
14 PHYSICIANS IN THE STATE, OR THEY MIGHT HAVE EXPLAINED  
15 HOW THEIR TRAINING PROGRAM FIT IN INTEGRALLY TO THEIR  
16 OVERALL COMMITMENT TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF POOR AND  
17 DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS OF THESE STATES.

18           I WOULD HAVE WANTED THAT KIND OF COMPETITIVE  
19 PRESENTATION BY POTENTIAL APPLICANTS TO SHOW THAT THE  
20 STATE OF CALIFORNIA WAS DERIVING BENEFIT. SOME OF YOU  
21 MAY BE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT THERE HAS BEEN SOME  
22 DISCOMFORT IN THE STATE ABOUT WHAT SEEM TO BE THE  
23 CAVALIER TREATMENT OF THE BENEFIT-TO-THE-STATE ISSUE IN  
24 THE RECENT REPORT INVOLVING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, THAT  
25 THE STATE REALLY WASN'T GOING TO BE GETTING ANY BENEFIT

1 FROM ROYALTIES OR FRANCHISE AGREEMENTS, AND IT  
2 SHOULDN'T EVEN EXPECT THEM. PEOPLE THOUGHT THAT THE  
3 BENEFIT-TO-CALIFORNIA PROBLEM HAD BEEN TREATED TOO  
4 LIGHTLY, AND I THINK THAT SAME CONCERN MIGHT ARISE  
5 HERE.

6 NOW --

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. HALPERN, ARE YOU  
8 FINISHING YOUR THREE-MINUTE STATEMENT?

9 MR. HALPERN: I'M FINISHING. I JUST WANT TO  
10 MAKE ONE MORE POINT; AND THAT IS, IF THERE WAS ANY  
11 QUESTION ABOUT THE IMPROPRIETY OF THE PROCESS OF HAVING  
12 THE WORKING GROUP APPLY ITS PROPOSED CRITERIA AND THEN  
13 MAKE COMMITMENTS ABOUT HOW THE STATE'S MONEY SHOULD BE  
14 DISTRIBUTED. THE FACT THAT THESE CRITERIA ARE BEING  
15 AMENDED HERE BY THIS GROUP SUGGEST THAT THERE'S NO  
16 ALTERNATIVE BUT TO SEND BACK THIS LIST OF THIS  
17 APPLICANT POOL AND THE NEWLY REVISED CRITERIA, WHICH  
18 WILL, I HOPE, ADDRESS THE THREE POINTS THAT I'VE JUST  
19 MADE AND WILL ALSO INCLUDE THIS DIVERSITY PROGRAM, SO  
20 DIVERSITY CONSIDERATION ISN'T JUST CONSIDERED AS A KIND  
21 OF, WELL, OF COURSE, WE TOOK THAT INTO ACCOUNT, BUT THE  
22 DETAILED INFORMATION IS GATHERED ABOUT WHAT'S THE  
23 DIVERSITY PROFILE OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL IN THAT  
24 INSTITUTION, IF IT HAS ONE, OR IN THE BIOMEDICAL  
25 RESEARCH PROGRAMS --

1 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: MR. HALPERN, WE HAVE  
2 YOUR LETTER.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D LIKE TO  
4 RESPOND TO THAT.

5 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D  
6 LIKE -- YOU KNOW, THE PUBLIC IS ENTITLED TO PARTICIPATE  
7 IN THIS PROCESS. WE HAVE BEEN TRANSPARENT IN EVERY  
8 RESPECT. AND I WOULD ASK THAT SOMEONE KEEP TRACK OF  
9 THE THREE MINUTES.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I THANK YOU,  
11 DAVID. JOAN.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LIKE TO RESPOND TO THAT  
13 SINCE YOU STARTED WITH ME. AND I HAVE TWO THOUGHTS,  
14 AND ONE IS I HOPE WE HAVE A RECORD OF ALL OF THOSE  
15 COMMENTS. WE'LL HAVE A TRANSCRIPT. IS THAT THE CASE?

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT  
18 WE HAVE THEM, AND I WOULD LIKE THEM TO BE REFERRED TO  
19 THE WORKING GROUP AND TO DR. HALL AND THE ICOC FOR  
20 INCORPORATION INTO OUR EVALUATION WITH ANY REVISIONS WE  
21 MIGHT MAKE. I THINK IT'S, OF COURSE, A WORK IN  
22 PROGRESS. WE DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO DO THIS IN SOME  
23 WAY THAT MIGHT FIVE YEARS FROM NOW APPEAR TO BE PERFECT  
24 IN EVERY PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE DETAIL. I'M  
25 COMPLETELY COMFORTABLE THAT THE PROCESS THAT THE

1 WORKING GROUP USED WITH THE CIRM THAT HAS RESULTED IN  
2 THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT BEING MADE TODAY FOR TRAINING  
3 GRANTS WAS THOROUGH, IT WAS PROCEDURALLY APPROPRIATE,  
4 IT WAS SUBSTANTIVELY COHERENT, IT WAS THOUGHTFUL.

5 THAT GROUP OF SCIENTISTS WORKED EXTREMELY  
6 HARD. THEY CAME COMPLETELY PREPARED. THEY HAD  
7 TERRIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS. WILL WE WANT TO MODIFY IT IN  
8 THE FUTURE? I HOPE SO BECAUSE I THINK THIS IS GOING TO  
9 BE A WORK IN PROGRESS EVERY DAY UNTIL WE ANNOUNCE THE  
10 FIRST CURE THAT RESULTS FROM THE MONEY WE'RE SPENDING.

11 BUT IT ALSO IS AN APPROPRIATE FOUNDATION FOR  
12 THIS FIRST EXPENDITURE, AND I HOPE WE CAN SPEND IT AS  
13 FAST AS WE POSSIBLY CAN.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WITH FULL ACCOUNTABILITY AND  
15 RESPONSIBILITY, WHICH WE CERTAINLY TAKE VERY SERIOUSLY.  
16 JEFF.

17 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST WANT TO MAKE A QUICK  
18 COMMENT ABOUT I THINK MR. HALPERN IS MIXING A LITTLE  
19 APPLES AND ORANGES. I THINK IT'S A LITTLE INFLAMMATORY  
20 TO KEEP RAISING REPRODUCTIVE CLONING. ACTUALLY ALL  
21 STEM CELL RESEARCH THAT'S GOING ON IN CALIFORNIA IS  
22 GOVERNED BY STATE LAW. ALL RESEARCH PROGRAMS USING  
23 STEM CELL RESEARCH HAVE TO GO THROUGH IRB'S. THIS IS  
24 AN ISSUE WE TALKED ABOUT IN THE STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE  
25 AND THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AND PART OF TODAY'S



1 AGENDA IS TO ADOPT THE INTERIM STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH  
2 WHICH IS BASED ON THE NAS STANDARDS.

3 SO YOU'RE KIND OF LEAVING THE IMPRESSION  
4 WE'RE APPROVING THESE GRANTS IN THE ABSENCE OF A  
5 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK AND ENVIRONMENT. AND, INDEED,  
6 THERE ALREADY IS AN EXISTING REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT,  
7 AND THAT WILL BE STRENGTHENED BY THE ADOPTION OF OUR  
8 STANDARDS, INTERIM STANDARDS, LATER IN THE AGENDA  
9 TODAY.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D SUPPLEMENT THOSE  
11 COMMENTS BY SAYING THAT OUR FUNDING CONTRACTS WILL  
12 REQUIRE THEM TO OBSERVE STATE LAW AND THE  
13 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION THAT PROPOSITION 71 PUT IN  
14 PROHIBITING HUMAN REPRODUCTIVE CLONING AT ANY OF THE  
15 INSTITUTIONS THAT RECEIVE THE FUNDS OF THIS PROPOSITION  
16 71 PROGRAM. SO THE STANDARDS THAT ARE ADOPTED, AS JEFF  
17 SAYS, UNDER ITEM 12 TODAY WILL BE PART OF THE  
18 CONTRACTUAL FRAMEWORK THAT ALL INSTITUTIONS RECEIVING  
19 THESE FUNDS HAVE TO OBSERVE. AND EVERY GRANTEE WOULD  
20 HAVE TO FOLLOW THOSE PROCEDURES.

21 MY ESTEEMED VICE CHAIR WANTS TO ALSO MAKE THE  
22 POINT THAT THERE IS, BEYOND THE LEGAL STANDARDS, WE  
23 HAVE A REQUIRED COURSE IN THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC AND  
24 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS THAT AFFECT THIS RESEARCH THAT  
25 WILL BE A PART OF EVERY PROGRAM APPROVED HERE TODAY.

1 MS. FOGEL: THANK YOU. SUSAN FOGEL. ONE  
2 QUICK THING, MR. KLEIN, IF I MAY REMIND YOU, THERE  
3 IS -- WE'VE HAD THIS DISCUSSION BEFORE. THERE'S A  
4 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A PUBLIC MEETING AND A HEARING. YOU  
5 HAVE NOT HELD ANY HEARINGS. WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT THAT  
6 THERE ARE GOING TO BE PUBLIC HEARINGS, THAT IS PART OF  
7 THE REGULATORY PROCESS OF ADOPTING REGULATIONS TO HAVE  
8 PUBLIC HEARINGS. AND I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT.  
9 IT'S NOT A SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE. IT'S A REAL  
10 SUBSTANTIVE DIFFERENCE, SO THERE HAVE BEEN NO PUBLIC  
11 HEARINGS ON ANYTHING.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE HAVE BEEN PUBLIC  
13 MEETINGS; AND AS PART OF OUR STANDARDS PROCESS, YOU  
14 QUITE APPROPRIATELY FOCUS ON THE FACT WE'RE HAVING BOTH  
15 PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS.

16 MS. FOGEL: IN THE FUTURE WE WILL BE HAVING  
17 PUBLIC HEARINGS AS WE GO INTO THE REGULATORY PROCESS.  
18 THAT'S WHAT REALLY WHAT I WANT TO TALK ABOUT. TO THE  
19 EXTENT THAT MR. HARRISON IS TECHNICALLY CORRECT, I  
20 DON'T THINK YOU WANT TO DO BUSINESS BASED ON  
21 TECHNICALITIES. THE PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT OPEN  
22 PROCESS FOR ADOPTING REGULATIONS IS BECAUSE REGULATIONS  
23 ARE LAWS. THEY ARE THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK TO IMPLEMENT  
24 STATUTES, AND THE PUBLIC IS SUPPOSED TO KNOW WHAT THOSE  
25 PROPOSED REGULATIONS ARE IN ORDER TO GIVE INTELLIGENT

1 COMMENT. YOU CAN'T GIVE COMMENT ON A MOVING TARGET.  
2 AND THE IDEA THAT YOU WOULD, FRANKLY, BE DISRESPECTFUL  
3 TO THAT PROCESS TO BE INTERNALLY REWRITING THESE AT THE  
4 SAME TIME AS YOU WILL BE SENDING THE PUBLIC A COPY OF  
5 SOMETHING ELSE TO WHICH THE PUBLIC IS BEING ASKED TO  
6 RESPOND AND COMMENT, AND IT'S AN UNFAIR PROCESS.

7 AND I RESPECT THE NEED TO DO MORE HERE,  
8 ESPECIALLY BECAUSE THIS PAGE IS NOTHING. I MEAN A  
9 REGULATION, YOU ARE CHARGED BY STATUTE TO DEVELOP  
10 CRITERIA. THIS MERELY SAYS AMONG THE CRITERIA ARE  
11 THESE FIVE THINGS. THAT'S GREAT, THESE FIVE THINGS.  
12 AND THANK YOU, DR. POMEROY, FOR STAYING FOCUSED ON  
13 IMPROVING THE DIVERSITY OF THE SCIENTISTS WHO WILL BE  
14 DOING THIS WORK. BUT THIS IS WHOLLY INADEQUATE TO BE A  
15 REGULATION THAT IMPLEMENTS THE STATUTE THAT REQUIRES  
16 THAT YOU ADOPT CRITERIA.

17 YOU NEED TO HAVE A FULLY THOUGHT THROUGH  
18 LIST. I MEAN YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE SCIENTIFIC QUALITY ON  
19 THIS LIST. THIS IS NOT ADEQUATE, AND I URGE YOU. DO  
20 NOT SUBMIT THESE AS IF THEY WERE REGULATIONS BECAUSE  
21 THAT'S LIKE BAIT AND SWITCH ON THE PUBLIC. THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JAMES HARRISON, WOULD YOU  
23 PLEASE EXPLAIN FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC? IN OUR  
24 PROPOSED STANDARDS PROCESS, WE WILL HAVE BOTH PUBLIC  
25 MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS. WE HELD A PUBLIC MEETING

1 THE OTHER DAY. COULD YOU EXPLAIN? AND, SUSAN, YOU'RE  
2 QUITE CORRECT. SOMETIMES I DO USE THE WRONG  
3 TERMINOLOGY, AND I APPRECIATE YOU CORRECTING THAT  
4 BECAUSE WE WILL BE USING BOTH PUBLIC MEETINGS AND  
5 PUBLIC HEARINGS.

6 MS. FOGEL: THAT'S RIGHT. AND WE DON'T WANT  
7 TO HAVE CONFUSION MOVING FORWARD.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

9 MR. HARRISON: WITH RESPECT TO THE STANDARDS  
10 WORKING GROUP, THERE'S ACTUALLY A TWO-STEP PROCESS THAT  
11 ALLOWS PUBLIC COMMENTS AT BOTH STAGES OF THE PROCESS.  
12 WHILE THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP IS TAKING THE INTERIM  
13 REGULATIONS THAT YOU WILL ADOPT TODAY, IT WILL BE  
14 HOLDING PUBLIC HEARINGS. ONE HAS ALREADY BEEN HELD IN  
15 LOS ANGELES TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE DRAFT  
16 STANDARDS. AND IT WILL CONSIDER THOSE COMMENTS IN  
17 MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO YOU FOR ADOPTION AS PERMANENT  
18 REGULATIONS.

19 ONCE YOU'VE MADE A DECISION TO ADOPT  
20 PERMANENT REGULATIONS, YOU WILL UNDERGO THE PROCEDURE  
21 SET FORTH BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT, WHICH  
22 PROVIDES FOR YET A SECOND LEVEL OF PUBLIC HEARINGS. SO  
23 IN OTHER WORDS, THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO  
24 PARTICIPATE BOTH AT THE DRAFTING LEVEL BEFORE THE  
25 REGULATIONS EVEN GET TO YOU AS WELL AS AFTERWARDS ONCE

1 YOU APPROVE THEM.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU.

3 MS. FOGEL: THEREFORE, YOU ARE NOT STARTING  
4 THE 270-DAY CLOCK ON THIS; IS THAT CORRECT OR NOT  
5 CORRECT?

6 MR. HARRISON: FIRST OF ALL, MR. KLEIN ASKED  
7 ME ABOUT THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, NOT ABOUT THESE  
8 REGULATIONS.

9 MS. FOGEL: I UNDERSTAND. I THINK THE ICOC  
10 MEMBERS NEED TO BE MORE CLEAR, HAVE MORE CLARITY ABOUT  
11 WHAT IT MEANS TO START THE 270-DAY CLOCK, NO. 1; AND,  
12 NO. 2, WHAT IS THE SUBSTANCE OF THOSE PROPOSED  
13 REGULATIONS THAT THE PUBLIC WILL BE ASKED TO COMMENT  
14 ON? AND THE DISCUSSION I'M HEARING NOW IS THAT THIS IS  
15 GOING BACK TO A WORKING GROUP FOR REVISIONS, WHICH  
16 MEANS YOU GIVE THIS TO THE PUBLIC ON WHICH TO COMMENT,  
17 WE ARE NOT -- SO THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME CLARITY, I  
18 THINK, AROUND THIS TABLE ABOUT WHAT YOU'RE ACTUALLY  
19 GOING TO BE VOTING ON.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME SAY TWO THINGS. ONE,  
21 THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP HELD A PUBLIC MEETING  
22 BEFORE THE PUBLIC HEARING. A PUBLIC MEETING IN L.A.,  
23 THEN A PUBLIC HEARING BOTH WITH THE PUBLIC IN  
24 ATTENDANCE.

25 JAMES, COULD YOU SPECIFICALLY ANSWER THE

1 QUESTION ON THE INTERIM REGULATIONS WHEN THE 270-DAY  
2 CLOCKS STARTS? AND TO THE EXTENT THAT THERE ARE  
3 SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS THAT CHANGE THE DOCUMENT, JAMES,  
4 ADDRESS HOW THAT RESTARTS A PORTION OF THE INTERNAL  
5 CLOCK WITHIN THE 270-DAY PERIOD.

6 MR. HARRISON: IF YOU AS A BOARD TODAY  
7 APPROVE THESE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TRAINING GRANTS  
8 AS INTERIM CRITERIA, IT BEGINS A 270-DAY PERIOD DURING  
9 WHICH THESE CRITERIA HAVE APPLICATION. DURING THAT  
10 PERIOD OF TIME, THIS LANGUAGE WILL BE TAKEN AND PUT  
11 INTO REGULATORY FORMAT. IT WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE  
12 CALIFORNIA NOTICE REGISTRY. THAT WILL TRIGGER A 45-DAY  
13 WINDOW FOR THE PUBLIC TO SUBMIT WRITTEN COMMENTS.  
14 PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME  
15 TO ACCEPT OTHER COMMENTS. ANY MODIFICATIONS, IF  
16 THEY'RE SUBSTANTIVE, DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME, WILL  
17 RETRIGGER A NEW 45-DAY CLOCK AS TO THOSE PROVISIONS SO  
18 THAT THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME STOP AND EMPHASIZE  
20 THAT. SO IF THERE'S SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES, THERE'S A NEW  
21 45-DAY PERIOD FOR THE PUBLIC, SO THE PUBLIC ALWAYS HAS  
22 INSURANCE UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT TO  
23 MAKE SURE THEY'RE REVIEWING WHAT IS THE FINAL DRAFT OF  
24 THESE REGULATIONS.

25 MS. FOGEL: HOWEVER, IF YOU ALREADY --

1 DR. STEWARD: MR. CHAIRMAN, POINT --

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE GONE THROUGH THE  
3 THREE MINUTES.

4 DR. STEWARD: WAY. I THINK I WOULD LIKE TO  
5 JUST SAY IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PUBLIC IS  
6 ALLOWED TO MAKE ONE THREE-MINUTE COMMENT, NOT A SERIES  
7 OF COMMENTS.

8 MS. FOGEL: I THOUGHT WE WERE HAVING A  
9 DISCUSSION BECAUSE I THOUGHT WE WERE ALL INTERESTED IN  
10 AN IMPROVED PRODUCT.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SUSAN, WE ARE, BUT I WOULD  
12 SUGGEST, AND WE'RE VERY INTERESTED IN YOUR COMMENTS, IF  
13 YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS COULD BE SUBMITTED IN WRITING.  
14 AS MR. HALPERN KNOWS, WE CIRCULATED HIS LETTER TO ALL  
15 THE BOARD MEMBERS, AND WE WILL CIRCULATE ALL OF YOUR  
16 COMMENTS TO THE BOARD MEMBERS AS WELL AS ANY COMMENTS  
17 THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE PUBLICLY. BUT I THINK WE  
18 HAVE GONE THROUGH A REASONABLE TIME LIMIT, AND  
19 DR. STEWARD IS CORRECT, THAT WE SHOULD MOVE ON TO THE  
20 NEXT SPEAKER BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO LOSE OUR QUORUM AT  
21 3 O'CLOCK TODAY. WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE GRANTS, WE  
22 HAVE TO ADOPT ITEM 12, WHICH ARE THE INTERIM STANDARDS,  
23 AND WE'RE GOING TO NEED TO HAVE TIME FOR GOOD  
24 SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSION. YES, JESSE REYNOLDS.

25 MR. REYNOLDS: THANKS. JESSE REYNOLDS FROM

1 THE CENTER FOR GENETICS AND SOCIETY. MY COMMENT IN A  
2 WAY APPLIES TO AGENDA ITEM 8 AS A WHOLE, BUT THERE'S A  
3 CERTAIN FOCUS ON THIS PARTICULAR SUBITEM ON THE  
4 CRITERIA FOR TRAINING GRANTS.

5 NOW, KEEPING IN MIND THAT THE AGENDA TODAY  
6 INCLUDES -- SEEMS TO INCLUDE THE APPROVAL FOR GRANTS  
7 FOR WHICH THERE'S NO FUNDS AT THE INSTITUTE CURRENTLY  
8 AVAILABLE. I FEEL THAT THIS IS SHOWING A DEGREE OF  
9 HASTE THAT IS UNNECESSARY AND PERHAPS IRRESPONSIBLE.

10 ON THE BENEFIT SIDE OF MOVING AHEAD, THE ONLY  
11 BENEFIT I CAN SEE IS TO MAINTAIN THE PERCEPTION OF  
12 FORWARD MOMENTUM; THAT IS, TO MAINTAIN POSITIVE PUBLIC  
13 RELATIONS. BUT I CAN THINK OF FOUR COSTS OF MOVING  
14 AHEAD, NOW THREE OF WHICH ARE BASICALLY MISSED  
15 OPPORTUNITIES. ONE MR. HALPERN BROUGHT UP, AND THAT IS  
16 THIS MIGHT ALLOW TIME FOR THE INSTITUTIONS TO START  
17 MOVING FORWARD SETTING UP ESCRO'S AND OTHER ASPECTS OF  
18 THE STANDARDS, AND THAT COULD BE PART OF THE  
19 EVALUATION.

20 SECOND IS WHAT WE'RE WITNESSING NOW IS THAT  
21 YOU ARE DEBATING WHETHER THE RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR  
22 THE TRAINING GRANTS ARE APPROPRIATE, MAKING SUGGESTED  
23 CHANGES, AND EVEN TALKING ABOUT HAVING THE WORKING  
24 GROUP RECONSIDER IT, BUT YET YOU'RE ALSO GOING TO MOVE  
25 FORWARD WITH RECOMMENDED -- APPROVING THE GRANTS BASED



1 UPON THE CRITERIA WE HAVE BEFORE US NOW. THAT DOES NOT  
2 SEEM TO BE FOLLOWING THROUGH WITH THE PROCESS OF PROP  
3 71 WHERE THE WORKING GROUPS ARE ADVISORY ONLY.

4 THIRD IS THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP AN  
5 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY FRAMEWORK BEFORE THE GRANTS GET  
6 OUT THE DOOR. I FEEL THAT THIS WOULD LIKELY HAVE A  
7 BEARING UPON TRAINING GRANTS. WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF  
8 THERE WAS A PATENTABLE DISCOVERY DURING THE TRAINING  
9 GRANTS? OBVIOUSLY RESEARCH WILL BE DONE BY  
10 POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHERS.

11 AND FINALLY, THERE'S A TENDENCY AT  
12 INSTITUTIONS THAT, WHEN THEY'RE PROMISED MONEY, TO  
13 START SPENDING IT BEFORE THEY HAVE IT IN THEIR POCKET.  
14 AND THERE IS SOME DOUBT AS TO WHEN THESE FUNDS WOULD  
15 BECOME AVAILABLE, IF AT ALL. I WOULD HATE TO SEE THIS  
16 RESULT AS A MATTER OF CONFUSION ON THE PART OF THE  
17 RECIPIENT.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: TIME IS UP. THANK YOU.

19 MR. REYNOLDS: THANK YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. REED, DID YOU HAVE A  
21 COMMENT?

22 MR. REED: YES. JUST THAT ON BEHALF OF THE  
23 PARENTS AND FRIENDS OF THE PATIENTS THAT ARE AT STAKE  
24 HERE, THE MOST IMPORTANT THING, IT SEEMS TO ME, IS TO  
25 DO WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO AND JUST TO GO FORWARD.

1 WE' RE NOT HERE TO REDEBATE. YOU' VE ALREADY HAD THE  
2 DEBATE. WE' RE HERE TO GET THIS MOVING FORWARD, AND  
3 YOU' RE DOING IT. THANK YOU. PLEASE KEEP IT UP.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE  
5 HAVE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. ANY OTHER BOARD COMMENTS?  
6 I' D LIKE TO MOVE THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR.

7 OPPOSED? THANK YOU. DR. HALL.

8 DR. HALL: I THINK YOU PROMISED US ALL A  
9 COMFORT BREAK, MR. CHAIR. AFTER THAT, WE' LL MOVE ON TO  
10 CONSIDERATION OF THE GRANT APPLI CATIONS THEMSELVES.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE -- WE' LL KEEP THIS  
12 VERY SHORT, JUST FIVE MINUTES, PLEASE.

13 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF WE CAN RECONVENE THE  
15 MEETING. WE DO HAVE A CHALLENGING AGENDA, AND WE NEED  
16 TO TRY AND MOVE FORWARD. DR. HALL WILL BEGIN WITH THE  
17 FIRST ITEM. IF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD COULD PLEASE  
18 BE SEATED. IF THE STAFF COULD PLEASE ASK THE OTHER  
19 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD THAT MIGHT BE IN THE BACK TO COME  
20 FORWARD. IF THE BOARD MEMBERS COULD PLEASE BE SEATED.  
21 IF THE STAFF COULD PLEASE ASSI ST. CHRIS TINA, COULD YOU  
22 SEE IF THERE' S SOME BOARD MEMBERS OUT IN THE LOBBY,  
23 PLEASE. JENNIFER, COULD YOU PLEASE SEE WHAT BOARD  
24 MEMBERS ARE OUTSIDE THAT MIGHT COME IN, PLEASE.

25 LET ME REMIND THE BOARD AGAIN THAT ABOUT 3

1 O' CLOCK WE LOSE OUR QUORUM. WE WANT TO HAVE A  
2 SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSION HERE, THAT WITH THE TIME WE HAVE  
3 AVAILABLE, THERE ARE CERTAIN GRANTS THAT WILL BE  
4 DISCUSSED HERE THAT HAVE BEEN RATED EXTRAORDINARILY  
5 HIGHLY THAT REPRESENT THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST CAPACITY  
6 OF THE WHOLE NATION. IN FACT, ON A RELATIVE SCALE I  
7 THINK PERHAPS THE WHOLE SPECTRUM OF THE PROPOSALS YOU  
8 SEE HERE TODAY REPRESENT THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST OF THE  
9 NATION.

10 AND IT IS ONLY RELATIVE TO THAT STANDARD THAT  
11 THESE JUDGMENTS ARE MADE ON RELATIVE VALUE, BUT THEY  
12 ARE ALL EXTREMELY GOOD APPLICATIONS IN AN ABSOLUTE  
13 SENSE.

14 THE GROUP DID MAKE SOME DIFFERENTIATION  
15 BECAUSE THERE ARE SOME PROPOSALS THAT NEED SIGNIFICANT  
16 DEVELOPMENT AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR FUNDING AT  
17 THIS TIME. DR. HALL WILL LEAD US THROUGH THIS PROCESS.  
18 IF IT IS APPROPRIATE AND IF THE BOARD MEMBERS FEEL IT'S  
19 APPROPRIATE AND THE PUBLIC FEELS IT'S APPROPRIATE, WE  
20 MIGHT WANT TO REDUCE THE TIME WE SPEND ON THE HIGHEST  
21 RANKING RATHER THAN GOING THROUGH REPETITIVE EXEMPLARY  
22 STATEMENTS ABOUT THE TREMENDOUS QUALITY OF HIGHEST  
23 RANKING AND RESERVE MORE OF OUR TIME FOR DISCUSSION ON  
24 THE ONES AT THE MARGIN OF FUNDING. DR. HALL.

25 DR. HALL: SO WE NOW MOVE ON TO CONSIDERATION

1 OF THE GRANT APPLICATIONS THEMSELVES. LET ME JUST  
2 REMIND YOU THAT THE RFA DESCRIBED GRANTS IN THREE  
3 CATEGORIES. TYPE 1, WHICH WERE THE LARGEST GRANTS WITH  
4 UP TO 16 TRAINEES AND WITH TRAINING AT THE THREE LEVELS  
5 OF PREDOCTORAL, POSTDOCTORAL, AND CLINICAL FELLOWS.  
6 TYPE 2 FOR SMALLER PROGRAMS WITH UP TO TEN TRAINEES AND  
7 COMMONLY TWO OF THE THREE LEVELS OF TRAINING. AND TYPE  
8 3 FOR THE SMALLEST, MOST SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS WITH UP  
9 TO SIX TRAINEES AT A SINGLE LEVEL.

10 THE RFA STATED THAT THE INSTITUTIONS MUST  
11 OFFER A COURSE IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND MUST OFFER A  
12 COURSE IN THE SOCIAL, LEGAL, AND ETHICAL ASPECTS OF  
13 STEM CELL RESEARCH FOR THEIR TRAINEES AND FOR OTHERS IN  
14 THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY. THE RFA EMPHASIZED SEVERAL  
15 POINTS. FIRST, THAT WHERE APPLICABLE, THAT IS, WHETHER  
16 IT WAS CLINICAL AND BASIC SCIENCE TRAINING, THAT THESE  
17 SHOULD BE COMBINED INTO A SINGLE INTEGRATED TRAINING  
18 PROGRAM FOR BASIC AND CLINICAL SCIENTISTS. SECOND,  
19 THAT THERE IN ALL CASES BE AN ORIENTATION TOWARD  
20 DISEASE AND DISEASE PROBLEMS. AND THIRD, WE STATED THE  
21 STRONG INTEREST OF CIRM IN TRAINING A DIVERSE WORKFORCE  
22 AND ASKED EACH INSTITUTION TO DESCRIBE ITS PLANS FOR  
23 ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF DIVERSITY.

24 WE RECEIVED 26 APPLICATIONS, EACH OF WHICH  
25 WAS REVIEWED ACCORDING TO THE PROCEDURES THAT WE'VE

1 DISCUSSED THIS MORNING WITH A RECOMMENDATION, AS  
2 DESCRIBED, EITHER TO FUND, TO FUND PENDING AVAILABLE  
3 FUNDS, OR NOT TO FUND AT THIS TIME.

4 SO LET ME MAKE -- FIRST OF ALL, JUST TO GO  
5 THROUGH THE SLIDE WITH YOU, AND THEN I WANT TO MAKE  
6 SOME GENERAL COMMENTS WHICH WERE BASED ON THE  
7 DISCUSSION OF THE WORKING GROUP. AND THEN FINALLY,  
8 DR. ARLENE CHIU WILL DESCRIBE EACH OF THE APPLICATIONS  
9 SEPARATELY SO THAT YOU MAY VOTE ON THEM.

10 NOW, WHAT YOU SEE ARE THE GRANTS IDENTIFIED  
11 BY NUMBERS, AND THEY ARE TYPE 1, TYPE 2, TYPE 3, AND  
12 THEY'RE ARRANGED IN DESCENDING ORDER OF THE SCORE IN  
13 EACH CASE. THE ONES IN TAN HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR  
14 FUNDING. THERE IS ONE TYPE 2 GRANT IN WHITE, WHICH IS  
15 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE. AND  
16 THEN THE GRANTS IN BLUE ARE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING  
17 AT THIS TIME. THOSE ARE ARRANGED IN ORDER -- IN  
18 NUMERICAL ORDER ACCORDING TO GRANT NUMBER. THAT IS,  
19 THEY'RE NOT ARRANGED BY SCORE, BUT BY NUMERICAL ORDER.  
20 AS YOU CAN SEE, 2 AND 7 IN ONE CASE AND 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,  
21 8, 10, AND 11 IN THE OTHER.

22 NOW, IN SEVERAL CASES, AS WE'VE DISCUSSED,  
23 THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDED -- IDENTIFIED ISOLATED  
24 AREAS OF WEAKNESS AND RECOMMENDED THAT THE NUMBER OF  
25 SLOTS AND THE BUDGET BE CORRESPONDINGLY REDUCED WITH AN

1 OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK IN FOR FUNDING AT A LATER  
2 TIME.

3 NOW, AS YOU CAN SEE FROM THIS, THE WORKING  
4 GROUP RECOMMENDED THAT 16 OF THE APPLICATIONS BE  
5 FUNDED, THAT ONE BE FUNDED IF FUNDS WERE AVAILABLE, AND  
6 THAT NINE NOT BE FUNDED AT THE PRESENT TIME. LET ME  
7 NOTE PARENTHETICALLY THAT IF ALL 16 WERE TO BE FUNDED,  
8 THIS WOULD RESULT IN AN ACCEPTANCE RATE OF  
9 APPROXIMATELY 60 PERCENT, WHICH BY TYPICAL NIH  
10 STANDARDS IS VERY HIGH. AND I TAKE THAT AS A TESTAMENT  
11 TO THE VERY HIGH QUALITY OF OUR APPLICANTS.

12 (APPLAUSE.)

13 DR. HALL: NOW, THE ICOC APPROVED FUNDING OF  
14 UP TO \$15.3 MILLION PER YEAR FOR A PERIOD OF THREE  
15 YEARS FOR THESE GRANTS. AND LET ME INDICATE THAT IF  
16 THE GRANTS IN BROWN OR KHAKI WERE FUNDED AND IF THE  
17 REDUCTIONS WERE MADE AS RECOMMENDED BY THE WORKING  
18 GROUP, THE TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT IS APPROXIMATELY 12.8  
19 MILLION FOR THE FIRST YEAR. LET ME SAY THAT WHERE  
20 THERE ARE CHANGES IN THE SLOTS OR AMOUNTS, WE HAVE TO  
21 ESTIMATE THOSE. WE HAVE NOT GONE THROUGH CAREFULLY.  
22 IN EACH CASE IT'S DIFFERENT, SO THIS IS A ROUGH  
23 ESTIMATE, AND THESE NUMBERS WILL HAVE TO BE TRUED UP AT  
24 A LATER TIME, BUT THIS IS APPROXIMATELY CORRECT.

25 NOW, RATHER THAN -- SO THE RECOMMENDATION IN

1 THE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IS LESS THAN THE TOTAL  
2 AMOUNT, AND THE WORKING GROUP MADE THE DECISION THAT  
3 RATHER THAN EXTEND THE NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS THAT THEY  
4 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, THEY STRONGLY RECOMMENDED THAT  
5 THERE BE A SECOND ROUND OF COMPETITIVE FUNDING FOR NEXT  
6 YEAR THAT WOULD ALLOW THOSE INSTITUTIONS THAT WERE NOT  
7 FUNDED TO HAVE A CHANCE TO REMEDY THE DIFFICULTIES THAT  
8 WERE IDENTIFIED, TO ALLOW THOSE WITH SLOTS THAT WERE  
9 REDUCED TO ALSO ADDRESS THE DIFFICULTIES IN THE REASON  
10 FOR REDUCTION AND TO COMPETITIVELY REAPPLY, AND,  
11 FINALLY, TO ALLOW ANY OTHER INSTITUTION THAT WISHED TO  
12 PARTICIPATE TO ALSO APPLY FOR FUNDING.

13 IN ADDITION, THE WORKING GROUP MADE A VERY  
14 SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION WITH REGARD TO CLINICAL  
15 TRAINING. ALTHOUGH THERE WERE SEVERAL EXCELLENT  
16 PROGRAMS FOR TRAINING CLINICAL FELLOWS AMONG THE  
17 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE RECEIVED, THE WORKING GROUP  
18 EXPRESSED OVERALL DISAPPOINTMENT WITH THE QUALITY OF  
19 THE CLINICAL TRAINING PROGRAMS. AND IN PARTICULAR, THE  
20 MEMBERS URGED CIRM AND THE ICOC TO TAKE MEASURES THAT  
21 WOULD ENCOURAGE INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS FOR PATIENT-BASED  
22 RESEARCH; I. E. , PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT SIMPLY PUT  
23 CLINICAL FELLOWS IN AN EXCELLENT BASIC SCIENCE  
24 LABORATORY, BUT PROGRAMS THAT SPECIFICALLY TRAIN  
25 FELLOWS TO DO STATE-OF-THE-ART CLINICAL RESEARCH.

1           NOW, THEY NOTED, AND MANY OF US ALSO KNOW,  
2    THAT THIS IS NOT A PROBLEM THAT IS SPECIFIC TO STEM  
3    CELL RESEARCH, BUT THE PROBLEM OF THE BEST WAY TO TRAIN  
4    TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL INVESTIGATORS IS A NATIONAL  
5    PROBLEM THAT THE NIH AMONG OTHERS HAS TRIED TO ADDRESS.  
6    IT'S A VERY DIFFICULT PROBLEM, AND I THINK EVERYBODY  
7    REALIZES THAT THIS IS AN ISSUE.   HOWEVER, THE WORKING  
8    GROUP MADE TWO RELEVANT POINTS TO US.

9           FIRST OF ALL, THEY THOUGHT WE HAVE A SPECIAL  
10   RESPONSIBILITY IN THIS AREA BECAUSE OF THE IMPORTANCE  
11   OF TRAINING CLINICAL INVESTIGATORS TO OUR MISSION; THAT  
12   IS, FUNDING WORK THAT MOVES THIS RESEARCH ALL THE WAY  
13   THROUGH TO THE CLINIC, AND THAT WE WILL NEED PEOPLE  
14   TRAINED IN THAT WAY SPECIFICALLY.   AND SECONDLY, THEY  
15   SUGGESTED THAT WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY TO  
16   ENCOURAGE OUR INSTITUTIONAL INVESTIGATORS TO DO  
17   SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE TRULY INNOVATIVE AND MIGHT BE  
18   EVEN USEFUL AS A MODEL ON A NATIONWIDE BASIS.   SO THEY  
19   URGED US TO DO THAT.   AND THE STAFF RECOMMENDS --  
20   AGREES WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION, AND WE WILL ADDRESS  
21   THIS POSSIBILITY LATER IN THE MEETING WITH A SPECIFIC  
22   PROPOSAL FOR THAT.

23           NOW, LET ME JUST SAY ONE OTHER THING, THAT WE  
24   WERE VERY PLEASED WITH THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE  
25   PROGRAMS THAT WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE



1 WORKING GROUP. AND ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT WE'VE  
2 ALREADY DISCUSSED THIS MORNING WAS THE DIVERSITY ISSUE.  
3 AND SEVERAL OF THESE INSTITUTIONS HAVE VERY STRONG  
4 PROGRAMS OR WERE KNOWN FOR THEIR STRENGTH IN THIS AREA,  
5 AND WE WERE VERY PLEASED TO SEE THAT ALL OF THE  
6 INSTITUTIONS DESCRIBED PLANS FOR DOING THIS, BUT SOME  
7 OF THEM HAD ALREADY MADE SPECIAL EFFORTS IN THIS AREA  
8 AND WE WERE DELIGHTED TO SEE THIS PROGRESS.

9 SO WITH THIS, I WOULD LIKE TO THEN TURN THE  
10 PODIUM OVER TO DR. ARLENE CHIU. IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER  
11 GENERAL QUESTIONS, I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER THEM.  
12 OTHERWISE I SUGGEST WE GO THROUGH THE APPLICATIONS ONE  
13 BY ONE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD START WITH DR.  
15 LOVE AND GO TO DR. BALTIMORE.

16 DR. LOVE: I JUST HAD ONE COMMENT AND ONE  
17 QUESTION FOR YOU. I THINK ONE COMMENT THAT I WANTED TO  
18 MAKE, AS SOMEBODY WHO'S FOCUSED ON DIVERSITY A FAIR  
19 AMOUNT, IS THAT I THINK IT IS APPROPRIATE TO CONSIDER,  
20 AND MAYBE YOU WERE REFERRING TO THIS EARLIER, DIVERSITY  
21 PART OF THE ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY. I UNDERSTAND THE  
22 POINT ABOUT POINTING IT OUT SPECIFICALLY, BUT I ALSO  
23 THINK THAT IT CREATES SOMETIMES THIS DYNAMIC THAT  
24 DIVERSITY EFFORTS COMPROMISE QUALITY. AND, IN FACT, I  
25 THINK WE OUGHT TO BE CLEAR THAT WE THINK IT CAN ENHANCE

1 QUALITY.

2 THE COMMENT ACTUALLY WAS IN TERMS OF THE  
3 UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS, WHAT IS THE PROCESS FOR  
4 GETTING THEM INFORMATION BACK ABOUT THEIR APPLICATION,  
5 PARTICULARLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS?

6 DR. HALL: I'M GLAD YOU ASKED THAT BECAUSE I  
7 FAILED TO ADDRESS THAT AND I SHOULD HAVE. AFTER THE  
8 MEETING, OUR STAFF SUMMARIZED -- YOU REMEMBER I SAID  
9 EACH OF THE THREE PRIMARY REVIEWERS HAD WRITTEN A SHORT  
10 REVIEW OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. AND OUR STAFF,  
11 AND BY THAT I MEAN ARLENE CHIU AND GIL SIMBRANO  
12 ASSISTED BY PATRICIA CHIVERA AND OTHERS, PUT TOGETHER  
13 STATEMENTS THAT, I GUESS, ON AVERAGE WERE FIVE PAGES OR  
14 SO THAT SUMMARIZED THE VARIOUS COMMENTS, THE  
15 DESCRIPTION, THE COMMENTS, AND SUMMARIZED THE  
16 DISCUSSION. AND THESE WERE SENT BACK. AS THESE ARE  
17 CONFIDENTIAL, THEY'RE NOT SHOWN TO ANYBODY ELSE. WE  
18 REGARD THEM AS BETWEEN US AND THE APPLICANT. IF THE  
19 APPLICANT CHOOSES TO DISTRIBUTE IT, THAT'S THEIR  
20 BUSINESS; BUT AS FAR AS WE'RE CONCERNED, THAT IS A  
21 CONFIDENTIAL RETURN TO THEM AND OFFERS THEM AN  
22 OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR WHAT WAS SAID AND PROFIT BY THAT.

23 NOW, WHAT YOU HAVE AND IS POSTED ON THE WEB  
24 FOR THE PUBLIC TO SEE IS A CONDENSED VERSION OF THAT,  
25 THOSE COMMENTS. AND SO WE HAVE THAT SORT OF DOUBLE

1 SCALE FOR THAT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND AGAIN, FOR THE RECORD,  
3 DR. HALL, THAT IS THE PROCESS WITH THE NIH, THAT THE  
4 NIH HAS CONFIDENTIALITY BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND THE  
5 REVIEWING AGENCY ON THE IN-DEPTH REVIEW.

6 DR. HALL: THAT'S RIGHT.

7 DR. BALTIMORE: I HAVE A NUMBER OF PROCEDURAL  
8 SUGGESTIONS AND A COMMENT OR TWO. I THINK IT WOULD BE  
9 USEFUL, WHEN YOU PRESENT THIS TO US, TO PROVIDE AT  
10 LEAST A SUMMARY OF THE RFA ITSELF SO WE CAN REMIND  
11 OURSELVES WHAT IT IS THAT WE'RE RESPONDING TO BECAUSE  
12 WE DON'T HAVE THAT.

13 DR. HALL: I THINK THAT'S A VERY GOOD POINT.

14 DR. BALTIMORE: ALL RIGHT.

15 DR. HALL: IT'S BEING FAXED HERE RIGHT NOW SO  
16 WE CAN DISTRIBUTE IT.

17 DR. BALTIMORE: THE SECOND IS THAT I THINK IT  
18 WOULD BE USEFUL FOR US TO KNOW WHO THE REVIEWERS WERE  
19 WHO SPECIFICALLY WERE AT THE MEETING. WE DO HAVE THAT  
20 LIST SOMEWHERE, BUT WE DON'T KNOW HOW MANY OF THEM  
21 ACTUALLY CAME, SO WE DON'T HAVE AN IDEA OF THE  
22 EXPERTISE OF THE GROUP.

23 DR. HALL: FAIR ENOUGH. THAT'S GOOD. GOOD  
24 SUGGESTION.

25 DR. BALTIMORE: THE THIRD IS THAT WE DON'T

1 HAVE KNOWLEDGE HERE, ALTHOUGH IT MAY COME UP IN THE  
2 DISCUSSION, OF WHAT OF THE REVIEWERS' SUGGESTIONS WERE  
3 ALTERED BY THE PATIENT ADVOCATE SECOND LEVEL REVIEW.  
4 SO WE'RE SEEING THE NUMBERS THAT WERE PROVIDED BY  
5 THE --

6 DR. HALL: YOU'VE SEEN THE NUMBERS PROVIDED  
7 BY THE SCIENTISTS, AND THE COMMENTS REFLECT THE OVERALL  
8 DISCUSSION. IT IS AN AMALGAM OF DISCUSSION AT BOTH  
9 LEVELS, BOTH DURING THE INITIAL SCIENTIFIC REVIEW AND  
10 THEN SUBSEQUENTLY DURING THE SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION THAT  
11 RESULTED IN THESE RECOMMENDATIONS. SO WE DID NOT TRACK  
12 THEM. AND OFTEN IT WAS DIFFICULT TO DO THAT BECAUSE  
13 PEOPLE WERE -- I MEAN THERE WOULD BE A DISCUSSION WITH  
14 A NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, BOTH SCIENTISTS AND PATIENT  
15 ADVOCATES.

16 DR. BALTIMORE: SO THE REVIEW PROCESS WAS NOT  
17 ONE IN WHICH YOU HAD, FIRST, ALL OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND  
18 THEN A SECOND REVIEW.

19 DR. HALL: SO WHAT HAPPENED WAS THE  
20 FOLLOWING. EVERYBODY WAS IN THE ROOM. AND SO WE WENT  
21 THROUGH THE APPLICATIONS ONE BY ONE IN THE WAY THAT I  
22 DESCRIBED. THE THREE REVIEWERS WOULD GIVE THEIR  
23 SYNOPSIS, THERE WOULD BE DISCUSSION, AND THEN THERE  
24 WOULD BE A VOTE BY THE 15. ANYBODY WAS FREE TO ASK  
25 QUESTIONS OR TO MAKE COMMENTS DURING THAT, SO IT WASN'T

1 JUST THAT THE SCIENTISTS TALKED AMONG THEMSELVES  
2 NECESSARILY. EVERYBODY IS FREE TO COMMENT AND  
3 EVERYBODY HEARD THE DISCUSSION.

4 AND THEN THOSE NUMBERS CAME OUT, AND THEN WE  
5 PUT THOSE ON THE BOARD, AND THEN THERE WAS A VERY  
6 LIVELY DISCUSSION, THEN, ABOUT HOW THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
7 SHOULD BE MADE. THAT'S WHEN THE ISSUE OF WHETHER OR  
8 NOT TO RECOMMEND CUTS CAME UP. AND, YOU KNOW, AS  
9 HAPPENS IN THOSE DISCUSSIONS, DIFFERENT PEOPLE HAVE  
10 DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW. AND JUST AS ONE EXAMPLE, THE  
11 ISSUE OF THE QUALITY OF THE FACULTY VERSUS THE QUALITY  
12 OF THE PROGRAM THAT WAS PROPOSED OFTEN CAME IN THIS.  
13 THEY'VE PLANNED A VERY CAREFUL PROGRAM HERE, BUT THIS  
14 FACULTY IS NOT SO STRONG AND THIS IS A GROUP THAT LOOKS  
15 TERRIFIC, BUT LOOKS LIKE THERE'S NOTHING NEW THAT'S  
16 GOING TO BE ADDED. SO THOSE KINDS OF DISCUSSION. WHAT  
17 ARE WE TRYING TO DO? GET THE BEST POSSIBLE FACULTY  
18 INVOLVED? AS WE ALL KNOW, WHO'VE PARTICIPATED IN  
19 THOSE, THOSE ISSUES WORKED THEMSELVES OUT.

20 AND I THINK I WOULD ASK THOSE WHO WERE HERE  
21 TO COMMENT ON IT. IN MY VIEW, THERE WAS REMARKABLE  
22 CONSENSUS REACHED DURING THESE DISCUSSIONS ABOUT WHAT  
23 TO DO.

24 SO THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS, AS BOB  
25 INDICATED, WERE BY CONSENSUS. SO THERE WAS A CONSENSUS

1 VOTE TO PRESENT THESE AS DESCRIBED HERE. I HOPE THAT'S  
2 HELPFUL TO YOU.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BUT VERY SPECIFICALLY, IN  
4 TERMS OF YOUR COMMENT, DR. BALTIMORE, THE INITIATIVE  
5 CALLS FOR THE 15 SCIENTISTS AND MEDICAL EXPERTS TO DO  
6 THE SCORING. SO THE SCORES REFLECT THEIR POSITION.

7 DR. BALTIMORE: THEN FINALLY, JUST IN TERMS  
8 OF OUR OWN PROCEDURE, ARE YOU EXPECTING TO HAVE A VOTE  
9 ON EACH ONE OF THESE?

10 DR. HALL: YES. THAT IS LEGALLY REQUIRED,  
11 AND THERE WILL BE A ROLL CALL VOTE ON EACH ONE, AND  
12 THERE WILL NOT BE -- YOUR NAME WILL NOT BE CALLED IF  
13 CALTECH IS ONE OF THE APPLICANTS.

14 DR. BALTIMORE: I UNDERSTAND THAT. THAT'S  
15 GOING TO BE A LENGTHY PROCESS.

16 MY FINAL COMMENT, WHICH IS JUST IN RELATION  
17 TO WHAT YOU'VE BEEN SAYING ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE OF  
18 POSITIVES, 70 PERCENT ACCEPTANCE IS EXTREMELY HIGH.

19 DR. HALL: I THINK I SAID IF YOU TOOK ALL THE  
20 ONES IN TAN, I THINK I SAID IT WOULD BE 60.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: I REMEMBERED THE NUMBER  
22 WRONG, BUT IN ANY CASE, 60 PERCENT IS ALSO VERY HIGH.  
23 AND WERE WE TO GO TO 60 PERCENT FOR NIH REVIEWS, I  
24 THINK MANY OF US, AS SCIENTISTS, WOULD BE VERY  
25 UNCOMFORTABLE WITH THE QUALITY OF WHAT WAS BEING

1 ACCEPTED. AND SO I REALLY DO WONDER WHETHER THE CUTOFF  
2 LINE HERE ISN'T TOO HIGH -- OR TOO LOW.

3 DR. HALL: THAT'S FOR YOU TO JUDGE. I WOULD  
4 JUST SUGGEST AS YOU GO THROUGH, AND PART OF THE POINT  
5 HERE IS THAT EACH ONE WILL GO DOWN IN ORDER SO THAT YOU  
6 WILL KNOW --

7 DR. BALTIMORE: I UNDERSTAND. WE CAN HAVE  
8 THAT DISCUSSION, BUT I WAS JUST MAKING A POINT.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LEON THAL.

10 DR. THAL: THIS IS PROBABLY NOT ALLOWED UNDER  
11 PROP 71; BUT WHEN WE SIT ON COUNCIL, THERE ARE OTHER  
12 PIECES OF INFORMATION THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE TO US. SO  
13 VERY SPECIFICALLY, IN ADDITION TO THE SUMMARY  
14 STATEMENTS PREPARED FOR COUNCILMEMBERS, WE HAVE  
15 SOMETHING CALLED THE ELECTRONIC COUNCIL BOOK, WHICH  
16 YOU'RE FAMILIAR WITH, WHICH ACTUALLY CONTAINS THE  
17 STATEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN SENT TO THE INDIVIDUAL  
18 INVESTIGATORS.

19 WHEN I WENT THROUGH THESE, I THINK, BECAUSE  
20 OF THE DESIRE TO PRESERVE ANONYMITY, A LOT OF VERY  
21 PERTINENT INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED. FOR EXAMPLE,  
22 TRAINING GRANTS VERY MUCH DEPEND ON THE FACULTY, BUT WE  
23 HAVE NO FACULTY NAMES. SO IF WE DON'T KNOW THE  
24 FACULTY, WE ARE THEN RELIANT ON THE STATEMENT THAT IT'S  
25 A SUPERB FACULTY WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO MAKE AN

1 INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. WE DON'T WANT TO RE-REVIEW THE  
2 GRANTS, AND IN MOST CASES IT DOESN'T REALLY MATTER. IN  
3 MOST CASES WE WILL BE ABLE TO EITHER APPROVE OR  
4 DISAPPROVE THE GRANT VERY QUICKLY ON AN UP-OR-DOWN  
5 BASIS. THE ONLY TIME IT BECOMES IMPORTANT IS SOME OF  
6 THE GRANTS THAT ARE ON THE MARGINS, AND THERE MORE  
7 INFORMATION WOULD BE NEEDED.

8 IN THE NIH PROCESS, AT LEAST, WE CAN OBTAIN  
9 THE ENTIRE STATEMENT, WHICH IS THE STATEMENT YOU SEND  
10 TO THE APPLICANT. IF WE WANT TO DRILL DOWN FURTHER, WE  
11 CAN ACTUALLY OBTAIN THE ENTIRE GRANT.

12 DR. HALL: YOU UNDERSTAND THE DISTINCTION.  
13 IF YOU SEE IT, IT'S A PUBLIC DOCUMENT.

14 DR. THAL: I GUESS THE QUESTION TO MR.  
15 HARRISON IS IS THERE ANY WAY THAT ICOC MEMBERS CAN SEE  
16 ADDITIONAL DATA WITHOUT MAKING THOSE DOCUMENTS PUBLIC?

17 MR. HARRISON: UNDER PROPOSITION 71 ALL THE  
18 MATERIALS THAT ARE FORWARDED TO THE ICOC AS PART OF THE  
19 WORKING GROUP'S RECOMMENDATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO THE  
20 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT AND, THEREFORE, BECOME PUBLIC  
21 RECORDS. SO ANYTHING THAT'S PROVIDED TO YOU ALONG WITH  
22 THE WORKING GROUP'S RECOMMENDATIONS IS SUBJECT TO  
23 PUBLIC ACCESS.

24 DR. HALL: WE WILL TAKE YOUR SUGGESTIONS AT  
25 THE END OF THIS PROCESS ABOUT MORE OR LESS, BUT I THINK



1 THE DIFFICULTY THAT WE HAVE FACED IS ONCE YOU HAVE SUCH  
2 A DISCUSSION AND DISCUSS THE FACULTY, THEN YOU'VE  
3 BASICALLY GOT A PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF THAT INSTITUTION.

4 I ACTUALLY THINK THAT PERHAPS IN TERMS OF  
5 TRAINING GRANTS, THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF EXACTLY WHICH  
6 INSTITUTION IT IS IS LESS IMPORTANT, ALTHOUGH I DO  
7 THINK IT HAS SOME IMPORTANCE. IT WILL BECOME VERY  
8 IMPORTANT, I THINK, ONCE WE MOVE INTO INDIVIDUAL  
9 RESEARCH APPLICATIONS. THAT BECOMES A DIFFERENT  
10 MATTER.

11 SO LET'S PROCEED ON AND LET ME TURN IT OVER  
12 TO ARLENE CHIU. DR. CHIU WILL BEGIN AND WILL LEAD US  
13 THROUGH THE DISCUSSION OF EACH GRANT.

14 DR. CHIU: GOOD AFTERNOON. BEFORE WE START  
15 TO REVIEW EACH APPLICATION, I'D LIKE TO REMIND EVERYONE  
16 HERE THAT SUMMARIES OF EACH REVIEW HAVE BEEN POSTED ON  
17 THE CIRM WEBSITE SINCE AUGUST 30TH, TEN DAYS FROM THIS  
18 MEETING.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: POINT OF INFORMATION, ARLENE.  
20 WHEN YOU BEGIN TO TALK ABOUT THEM, THERE'S BEEN A  
21 REQUEST. CAN YOU, YOU MIGHT BE DOING IT ANYWAY,  
22 RESTATE WHAT THE THREE TYPES OF GRANTS ARE?

23 DR. CHIU: I SHALL. WELL, YOU MEAN THE TYPE  
24 1, TYPE 2, TYPE 3? IN ADDITION, I WAS GOING TO MENTION  
25 THAT THE REVIEWS ARE PRESENT IN TAB 8 IN YOUR BINDERS.

1 SO IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, I'M NOT GOING TO READ  
2 THROUGH THE WHOLE TEXT OF EACH. INSTEAD, I PLAN TO  
3 PROVIDE A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF EACH WITH DIRECT QUOTES  
4 TAKEN FROM THE REVIEW.

5 WE WILL BEGIN WITH TYPE 1S, WHICH ARE THE  
6 MOST COMPREHENSIVE ONES, FUNDING 16 POSITIONS, AND  
7 COVERING PREDOCTORAL, POSTDOCTORAL, AND CLINICAL  
8 FELLOWS. TYPE 2S ARE LESS EXTENSIVE, 10 POSITIONS AND  
9 WILL FUND UP TO TWO TYPES OF GRANTEES, PRE AND POST OR  
10 ETC. THE TYPE 3S ARE THE MOST FOCUSED AND THE  
11 SMALLEST, AND THEY FUND UP TO SIX TRAINEES AND ONLY  
12 PERHAPS ONE LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL TRAINEE.

13 SO WE WILL BEGIN WITH THE TYPE 1S. ALL HAVE  
14 BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, SO I WILL PROCEED IN  
15 DESCENDING ORDER OF SCIENTIFIC SCORE. I SHOULD POINT  
16 OUT THAT THE TOP FIVE OF THESE ARE RECOMMENDED FOR  
17 FUNDING AS REQUESTED. SEVERAL APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN  
18 IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK. HERE YOU WILL FIND THAT  
19 THE REVIEWERS RECOMMENDED A REDUCTION OF TRAINEE SLOTS  
20 WITH CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN BUDGET. WE WILL BE  
21 GOING OVER THE REASONS FOR DOING SO INDIVIDUALLY. THE  
22 TYPE 1S WILL THEN BE FOLLOWED BY THE TYPE 2S. AGAIN,  
23 WE WILL REVIEW THE FIRST FOUR, RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING,  
24 IN DESCENDING ORDER OF SCIENTIFIC SCORE. WE WILL THEN  
25 REVIEW APPLICATION T20001, WHICH IS RECOMMENDED FOR

1 FUNDING AND BEING WORTHY OF YOUR CONSIDERATION IF FUNDS  
2 ARE AVAILABLE.

3 THE OTHER TYPE 2 APPLICATIONS, THOSE MARKED  
4 WITH A PLUS, IDENTIFIED WITH A PLUS, HAVE SCORES OF 60  
5 OR BELOW AND ARE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT THIS TIME.  
6 THEY WILL BE REVIEWED NOT IN DESCENDING ORDER OF  
7 SCIENTIFIC SCORE. RATHER THEY ARE REVIEWED ACCORDING  
8 TO APPLICATION NUMBER IN ASCENDING ORDER OF APPLICATION  
9 NUMBER.

10 FINALLY, TO THE TYPE 3S. THE TOP FOUR WILL  
11 BE REVIEWED IN DESCENDING ORDER OF SCIENTIFIC SCORE.  
12 THE OTHERS, WHICH ARE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT  
13 THIS TIME, WILL BE REVIEWED IN ASCENDING ORDER OF  
14 APPLICATION NUMBER.

15 I WANT TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO MENTION  
16 THAT IF YOU WERE ABLE TO SEE THE RFA, YOU WILL NOTE  
17 THAT THE CRITERION OF QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF  
18 APPLICANT POOL IS AN IMPORTANT ONE AND HAS BEEN  
19 ADDRESSED IN THE RFA AND DURING THE REVIEW.

20 ONE MORE POINT. I APOLOGIZE FOR NOT  
21 PROVIDING THE ROSTER. I WILL VERY QUICKLY READ OVER  
22 THE NAMES OF THE REVIEW MEMBERS AND THE ICOC MEMBERS  
23 WHO ATTENDED THIS PARTICULAR REVIEW. DR. SUSAN  
24 BONNER-WIER, DR. ALI BRIVANLOU, DR. PATRICIA DONAHOE,  
25 DR. ALEXANDRA JOYNER, DR. JEFFREY MACKLIS, DR. STU

1 ORKIN, OUR CHAIR, DR. JEFFREY ROTHSTEIN, DR. PABLO  
2 RUBENSTEIN, DR. DENNIS STEINDLER, DR. CLIVE SVENSEN,  
3 DR. GEORGE YANCOPOULIS, AND FOUR ALTERNATES TO TAKE THE  
4 PLACE OF FOUR STANDING MEMBERS WHO COULD NOT ATTEND:  
5 DR. FRANK RAUSCHER, DR. JAMES ROBERTS, DR. MARIE CSETE,  
6 AND DR. ARTHUR NIENHUIS. THE ICOC PATIENT ADVOCATE  
7 MEMBERS WHO ATTENDED WERE MR. ROBERT KLEIN, OUR CHAIR,  
8 MS. SHERRY LANSING, MS. JOAN SAMUELSON, THE VICE CHAIR  
9 OF THE MEETING, MR. DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL, MR. JEFF  
10 SHEEHY, AND DR. JANET WRIGHT.

11 WITH THAT, WE WILL MOVE TO THE FIRST  
12 APPLICATION, THE TYPE 1S, T101 WITH A SCIENTIFIC SCORE  
13 OF 98. THIS COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SIX  
14 POSTDOCTORAL, FIVE POSTDOCTORAL -- I BEG YOUR PARDON --  
15 SIX PREDOCTORAL, FIVE POSTDOCTORAL, AND FIVE CLINICAL  
16 FELLOWS PROPOSES TO INTEGRATE BASIC SCIENCE OF  
17 EMBRYONIC, ADULT, AND NUCLEAR TRANSFER STEM CELL  
18 RESEARCH WITH APPLICATIONS TO HUMAN DISEASE.

19 THE REVIEWERS FELT THAT THE STRENGTHS WERE  
20 NUMEROUS AND INCLUDE THE DESIGN OF THE TRAINING  
21 PROGRAM, AND THE INTEGRATION OF THE COMPONENTS APPEAR  
22 TO BE OF THE HIGHEST LEVEL. THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR WAS  
23 FOUND TO BE EXTREMELY EXPERIENCED AND LEADS AN ALREADY  
24 ESTABLISHED INSTITUTE ON STEM CELL BIOLOGY.

25 THE REVIEWERS FOUND -- COMMENTED ON THE

1 OUTSTANDING QUALITY OF THE INSTITUTE'S EXISTING POOL OF  
2 TRAINEES AND FELT, IN SUMMARY, THAT THE INSTITUTION  
3 OFFERS PERHAPS ONE OF THE STRONGEST ENVIRONMENTS IN THE  
4 WORLD WITH A HIGH LEVEL OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT,  
5 EXCELLENT QUALITY OF FACILITIES, AND APPROPRIATE STEM  
6 CELL RELATED RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT. NO  
7 WEAKNESSES WERE IDENTIFIED.

8 THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION FOUND THIS  
9 HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED IT FOR FULL FUNDING.

10 MR. CHAIR, I SEEK -- REQUEST ACTION ON THIS  
11 APPLICATION.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND I  
13 REMIND THE PUBLIC AND THE MEMBERS THAT THEY EACH HAVE A  
14 SHEET TELLING THEM WHICH ITEMS THEY CANNOT VOTE ON. I  
15 WOULD ALSO LIKE, AS A GENERAL COMMENT, TO SAY THAT  
16 WHILE THERE WAS A REFERENCE TO A DESIRE FOR GREATER  
17 BREADTH IN STRONG CLINICAL PROGRAMS, THERE WERE  
18 CERTAINLY SOME EXTRAORDINARY CLINICAL PROGRAMS THAT  
19 WERE INCLUDED, AS EXAMPLES ARE SHOWING UP IN THE  
20 NARRATIVE DESCRIBED, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR THIS PROPOSAL.

21 IS THERE A BOARD COMMENT ON THIS PROPOSAL?

22 MR. SHEEHY: I'D LIKE TO MOVE TO APPROVE THIS  
23 APPLICATION.

24 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND

1       SECONDED.   IS THERE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS PROPOSAL?  
2       CALLING THE QUESTION.   WE WILL HAVE TO DO A ROLL CALL  
3       VOTE.

4               MS. KING:   DAVID BALTIMORE.

5               DR. BALTIMORE:   YES.

6               MS. KING:   BOB PRICE.

7               DR. PRICE:    YES.

8               MS. KING:   DAVID MEYER.

9               DR. MEYER:   YES.

10              MS. KING:   SUSAN BRYANT.

11              DR. BRYANT:   YES.

12              MS. KING:   MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

13              DR. FRIEDMAN:   YES.

14              MS. KING:   FRANCIS MARKLAND.

15              DR. MARKLAND:   YES.

16              MS. KING:   JACK DIXON.

17              DR. DIXON:    YES.

18              MS. KING:   BOB KLEIN.

19              CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   YES.

20              MS. KING:   GERALD LEVEY.

21              DR. LEVEY:    YES.

22              MS. KING:   TED LOVE.

23              DR. LOVE:     YES.

24              MS. KING:   RICHARD MURPHY.

25              DR. MURPHY:   YES.

1 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
2 DR. NOVA: YES.  
3 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
4 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
5 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
6 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
7 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
8 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
10 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
11 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
13 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
14 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
15 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
16 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
17 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
18 DR. THAL: YES.  
19 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
20 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. CHIU. MOTION PASSES.  
22 DR. CHIU: WE MOVE TO T102 WITH A SCIENTIFIC  
23 SCORE OF 96. THE PROPOSAL SEEKS TO DEVELOP AN  
24 INTEGRATED TRAINING PROGRAM IN STEM CELL RESEARCH TO  
25 TRAIN SIX PREDOCTORAL, SIX POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS IN

1 BASIC RESEARCH AND FOUR CLINICAL SCHOLARS WHO CAN  
2 TRANSLATE THE POTENTIAL OF STEM CELLS. THIS PROGRAM  
3 BUILDS ON A LONG-STANDING STRONG BASE OF STEM CELL  
4 RESEARCH AT THIS INSTITUTION, WHICH WAS ONE OF THE  
5 FIRST TO STUDY HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

6 THE REVIEWERS FELT THAT THIS IS ONE OF THE  
7 BEST OPPORTUNITIES TO BEGIN A STEM CELL PROGRAM IN THE  
8 STATE OF CALIFORNIA. AND THE STRENGTHS ARE, ONE, AN  
9 EXTREMELY WELL-ORGANIZED PROGRAM; TWO, OUTSTANDING  
10 LEADERSHIP CAPABILITIES; THREE, OUTSTANDING FACULTY  
11 RESOURCES; FOUR, A GREAT HISTORY OF TRAINING PROGRAMS;  
12 AND, FIVE, WELL-DEFINED PROGRAM OF COURSES IN  
13 MENTORING. NO WEAKNESSES WERE IDENTIFIED.

14 THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT IT IS HIGHLY  
15 MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED FOR FULL FUNDING.

16 MR. CHAIR, I REQUEST ACTION ON THIS  
17 APPLICATION.

18 DR. LEVEY: SO MOVED.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY DR. LEVEY. IS  
20 THERE A SECOND?

21 DR. PRIETO: SECOND.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY DR. PRIETO. ARE  
23 THERE COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD? COMMENTS FROM THE  
24 PUBLIC? MELISSA KING, COULD I HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE.

25 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.



1 DR. BALTI MORE: YES.  
2 MS. KI NG: BOB PRI CE.  
3 DR. PRI CE: YES.  
4 MS. KI NG: DAVI D MEYER.  
5 DR. MEYER: YES.  
6 MS. KI NG: SUSAN BRYANT.  
7 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
8 MS. KI NG: MI CHAEL FRI EDMAN.  
9 DR. FRI EDMAN: YES.  
10 MS. KI NG: MI CHAEL GOLDBERG.  
11 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
12 MS. KI NG: FRANCI S MARKLAND.  
13 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
14 MS. KI NG: JACK DI XON.  
15 DR. DI XON: YES.  
16 MS. KI NG: BOB KLEI N.  
17 CHAI RMAN KLEI N: YES.  
18 MS. KI NG: GERALD LEVEY.  
19 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
20 MS. KI NG: TED LOVE.  
21 DR. LOVE: YES.  
22 MS. KI NG: RI CHARD MURPHY.  
23 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
24 MS. KI NG: TI NA NOVA.  
25 DR. NOVA: YES.

1 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
2 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
3 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
4 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
5 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
6 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
7 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
8 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
10 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
11 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
13 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
14 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
15 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
16 DR. THAL: YES.  
17 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
18 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. CHIU. THE MOTION  
20 PASSED.  
21 DR. CHIU: NEXT, T105 WITH A SCIENTIFIC SCORE  
22 OF 94. THIS MULTIDISCIPLINARY AND COMPREHENSIVE  
23 PROGRAM WILL TRAIN BASIC SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS, AND  
24 PHYSICIANS TO BECOME LEADERS IN STEM CELL RESEARCH AND  
25 CLINICAL PROGRAMS IN ACADEMIA AND INDUSTRY. FIVE

1 PREDOCTORAL FELLOWS, FIVE POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS, AND SIX  
2 CLINICAL FELLOWS WILL BE MENTORED BY FACULTY FROM THE  
3 COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE AND SCHOOLS OF  
4 DENTISTRY, ENGINEERING, LAW, NURSING, MEDICINE, AND  
5 PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

6 THE REVIEWERS FELT THAT THERE WAS NOTABLE  
7 STRENGTH AND JUST A FEW WEAKNESSES. THE STRENGTHS ARE  
8 AS FOLLOWS: IT BUILDS ON A STRONG FOUNDATION OF A  
9 NEWLY FORMED STEM CELL INSTITUTE. THERE IS STRONG  
10 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT. THE NEW INSTITUTE HAS 12 NEW  
11 FACULTY POSITIONS SAVED AND MAJOR SPACE COMMITMENTS FOR  
12 STEM CELL RESEARCH. THIRD, THE TWO PROGRAM DIRECTORS  
13 BOTH ARE OUTSTANDING SCIENTISTS AND ADMINISTRATORS  
14 STRONGLY DEDICATED TO THIS NEW PROGRAM. FOUR, THE  
15 REVIEWERS FELT THAT THERE'S STRONG PREEXISTING INTEREST  
16 IN STEM CELLS AND THEIR MEDICAL USE AT THIS  
17 INSTITUTION. STRONG RESEARCH COMMUNITY. THERE WERE 60  
18 MENTORS IDENTIFIED, MANY ALREADY WORKING WITH MOUSE OR  
19 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM OR PROGENITOR CELLS. THE FACULTY  
20 HAS A VERY STRONG RECORD OF MENTORING, OF EXTERNAL  
21 FUNDING, AND HAVE A NUMBER OF WELL-ESTABLISHED TRAINING  
22 GRANTS ALREADY. AND FINALLY, THE LAST STRENGTH WAS  
23 THAT THE REQUIRED COURSE AND ASSESSMENT OF TRAINEES ARE  
24 VERY WELL DESCRIBED.

25 THE WEAKNESS THAT WAS IDENTIFIED WAS THAT

1 THERE WAS AN ABSENCE OF INFORMATION ON PREVIOUS  
2 TRAINING PROGRAMS. OVERALL THE REVIEWERS FELT THAT  
3 THIS PROPOSAL PRESENTS A NEAR COMPLETE AND EXCITING  
4 STEM CELL TRAINING PROGRAM, AND THE WORKING GROUP  
5 RECOMMENDATION IS THAT IT'S HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND  
6 RECOMMENDED FOR FULL FUNDING.

7 MR. CHAIR, I REQUEST ACTION ON THIS  
8 APPLICATION.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A MOTION?

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: MOVE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S BEEN MOVED, AND IS  
12 THERE A SECOND?

13 DR. WRIGHT: SECONDED.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND SECONDED. COMMENTS FROM  
15 THE BOARD? COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? MELISSA KING,  
16 WILL YOU DO A ROLL CALL VOTE.

17 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

18 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

19 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

20 DR. PRICE: YES.

21 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

22 DR. BRYANT: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

1 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
2 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
3 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
4 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
5 DR. DIXON: YES.  
6 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
8 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
9 DR. LOVE: YES.  
10 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
11 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
13 DR. NOVA: YES.  
14 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
15 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
16 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
17 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
18 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
19 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
20 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
21 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
22 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
23 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
24 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
25 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

1 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
2 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
3 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
4 DR. THAL: YES.  
5 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
6 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION PASSED.  
8 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. NEXT IS T10003 WITH A  
9 SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 91. THIS PROPOSAL AIMS TO PROVIDE  
10 INTERDISCIPLINARY TRAINING FOR CLINICIANS, SCIENTISTS,  
11 AND ENGINEERS, SPECIFICALLY SIX PREDOCTORAL, FOUR  
12 POSTDOCTORAL, AND SIX CLINICAL FELLOWS WILL BE TRAINED  
13 TO APPLY QUANTITATIVE AND ENGINEERING APPROACHES, SUCH  
14 AS CHEMISTRY, COMPUTATION, AND MATERIAL SCIENCE, TO  
15 STEM CELL RESEARCH IN ORDER TO MAKE NOVEL DISCOVERIES  
16 IN BASIC AND CLINICAL BIOMEDICINE.  
17 THE REVIEWERS IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING  
18 STRENGTHS: ONE, A STRONG AND EXPERIENCED PROGRAM  
19 DIRECTOR WITH A GOOD MENTORING PLAN. TWO, AN EXCELLENT  
20 TRAINING FACULTY WITH WORLD CLASS LEADERS IN STEM CELL  
21 BIOLOGY. THREE, THE INTERDISCIPLINARY AND  
22 INTERINSTITUTIONAL NATURE OF THE PROGRAM WAS LAUDED,  
23 AND IT WAS THOUGHT TO BE A UNIQUE PLAN TO INTEGRATE  
24 STEM CELL BIOLOGY WITH AREAS LIKE COMPUTATIONAL AND  
25 PHYSICAL SCIENCE. FOUR, THERE WAS STRONG INSTITUTIONAL

1 COMMITMENT TO NEW FACULTY RECRUITMENTS AS WELL AS  
2 DEDICATING 3,000 SQUARE FEET OF SPACE TO HUMAN  
3 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL ACTIVITIES. FIVE, THE EXISTING  
4 TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY  
5 RENOWN AND DRAW A VERY GOOD APPLICANT POOL IN BOTH  
6 BASIC RESEARCH AND CLINICAL AREAS. AND, SIX, THERE WAS  
7 EXCELLENT LIKELIHOOD OF DRAWING IN MINORITY STUDENTS IN  
8 THIS INSTITUTION.

9 THE FOLLOWING WEAKNESSES WERE OBSERVED. THE  
10 REVIEWERS FELT THAT THE COURSES, PARTICULARLY THE  
11 REQUIRED COURSE IN ETHICS, LEGAL, AND SOCIAL ISSUES,  
12 ARE NOT WELL PLANNED OR ARTICULATED AND, SECOND, THE  
13 BASIC RESEARCH AND MEDICAL APPLICATION FOR DISEASE,  
14 THESE TWO ARE NOT WELL-INTEGRATED AS DESCRIBED.

15 THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDS THAT THIS IS  
16 HIGHLY MERITORIOUS OVERALL AND RECOMMENDS IT FOR FULL  
17 FUNDING.

18 MR. CHAIR, I REQUEST ACTION ON THIS  
19 APPLICATION.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A MOTION ON T103?

21 DR. LEVEY: SO MOVED.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY DR. LEVEY. SECOND?

23 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY DR. WRIGHT. BOARD

25 COMMENTS?

1 DR. PIZZO: COMMENT. REALLY FORM OF A  
2 QUESTION. AND THAT IS, WHEN YOU IDENTIFY A DEFICIENCY  
3 AS YOU DID, WHICH IS IMPORTANT AND CAN BE ADDRESSED,  
4 WHAT ARE THE EXPECTATIONS THAT THAT WILL BE ADDRESSED,  
5 OR ARE WE IN A CASE LIKE THIS REALLY GOING TO GO AHEAD  
6 AND FUND AND NOT HAVE ANY ASSURANCE THAT THOSE THINGS  
7 WILL BE ADDRESSED? I THINK THAT WILL BECOME A CONCERN  
8 AS WE MARCH DOWN THE PATHWAY OF CONCERNS THAT ARE  
9 RAISED BY THE REVIEW GROUPS.

10 DR. HALL: CAN I ANSWER THAT, DR. PIZZO,  
11 BECAUSE WE HAD CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION IN THE WORKING  
12 GROUP ABOUT, WELL, MAYBE WE COULD DO THIS AND STAFF  
13 COULD BE SURE THAT SUCH-AND-SUCH AND SUCH HAPPENS. AND  
14 I FOUND MYSELF VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THAT. WE RIGHT  
15 NOW, IN ADDITION TO MYSELF, AND I HAVE A COUPLE OF  
16 OTHER THINGS TO DO, WE HAVE TWO SCIENTIFIC STAFF,  
17 ARLENE CHIU AND GIL SIMBRANO, WHO HAS JUST JOINED US.  
18 AND SO WE WILL OVER TIME WORK WITH INSTITUTIONS TO  
19 ADDRESS THESE, BUT I'M VERY CONCERNED THAT WE NOT HAVE  
20 TO GO IN AND SPEND A LOT OF STAFF TIME. WE JUST DON'T  
21 HAVE THE STAFF TO DO THAT AT THIS STAGE.

22 SO MY SUGGESTION IS IF YOU WANT TO US TO ADD  
23 THAT TO THE LETTER, THAT WE WOULD LIKE THEM TO ADDRESS  
24 THIS OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, THAT'S FINE. PLEASE DO  
25 NOT -- I DON'T WANT TO COME OUT OF TODAY WITH A LONG



1 LIST OF THINGS THAT WE HAVE TO ENSURE THAT INSTITUTIONS  
2 DO.

3 DR. PIZZO: I UNDERSTAND THAT AND, OF COURSE,  
4 AM APPRECIATIVE OF THE LIMITATIONS THAT YOU FACE. THE  
5 QUESTION IS HOW OR WHAT LEVELS OF ACCOUNTABILITY WILL  
6 WE HAVE AS WE GO FORWARD? AND THAT COULD COME ABOUT BY  
7 AN EXPECTATION OF A SUBMISSION OF HOW A CONCERN HAS  
8 BEEN ADDRESSED AT SOME POINT IN TIME, WHETHER IT'S A  
9 YEAR OR TWO YEARS INTO THE FUNDING CYCLE. SO AT LEAST  
10 WE KNOW THAT THEIR CONCERNS HAVE BEEN HEARD AND ARE  
11 BEING DEALT WITH.

12 DR. CHIU: WE WILL LOOK FOR IT IN THE  
13 PROGRESS REPORTS AND REQUEST ADDRESSING THEM.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND CERTAINLY THERE'S A  
15 GRANTS MANAGEMENT PROCESS WITH OVERSIGHT TO MAKE SURE  
16 THE CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS FOR ACCOUNTABILITY ARE BEING  
17 MET THROUGH THAT GRANTS MANAGEMENT CONTRACT. BUT AS  
18 THE LITIGATION IS COMPLETED AND OUR FULL FUNDING IS  
19 OBTAINED, WE GET TO A STAFF LEVEL WHERE WE HAVE A GREAT  
20 DEAL OF STAFF CAPACITY THAT THEN CAN DEAL WITH BETTER  
21 MANAGEMENT AND THE FULL PROGRAM OVERSIGHT, WHICH SHOULD  
22 BE IN PLACE IN A REASONABLY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. ON  
23 AN INTERIM BASIS, WE DO HAVE A LIMITED PROGRAM, SO OUR  
24 STAFF CAN MANAGE THAT OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
25 FUNCTION. YES.

1 MR. ELIASON: PLEASE PARDON THE INTERRUPTION.  
2 I'M SORRY. PAUL ELIASON. IS IT POSSIBLE FOR THE  
3 ABSTAINING BOARD MEMBER TO BE PUBLICLY IDENTIFIED?  
4 THANK YOU.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AT THE CULMINATION -- WELL,  
6 DR. HALL, WHY DON'T YOU RESPOND TO THIS ONE?

7 DR. HALL: I THINK THE BUCK STOPS HERE. THEY  
8 WILL HAVE AVAILABLE IN REAL TIME, WE ARE TRACKING THESE  
9 WITH THE NAMES OF THE INSTITUTIONS. WE'LL HAVE  
10 AVAILABLE AT THE END THE NAMES OF THE INSTITUTIONS THAT  
11 ARE PARTICIPATING IN OUR PROGRAM. JUST AFTER OUR  
12 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION, WE'LL HAVE THE WHOLE LIST OF  
13 THOSE WHO RECEIVE AWARDS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU WILL HAVE ALL THE  
15 INSTITUTIONS AND YOU'LL HAVE A PUBLIC RECORD OF THE  
16 VOTE, AND YOU WILL BE ABLE, THE PUBLIC WILL BE ABLE TO  
17 RECONCILE AND COMPARE THEM. THANK YOU.

18 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

19 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

20 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

21 DR. PRICE: YES.

22 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

23 DR. MEYER: YES.

24 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

25 DR. BRYANT: YES.

1 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
2 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
3 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
4 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
5 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
6 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
7 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
9 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
10 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
11 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
12 DR. LOVE: YES.  
13 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
14 DR. NOVA: YES.  
15 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
16 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
17 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
18 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
19 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
20 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
21 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
22 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
23 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
24 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
25 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

1 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

2 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

3 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

4 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

5 DR. STEWARD: YES.

6 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

7 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

8 DR. CHIU: NEXT IS T104, SCORE OF 84. THIS

9 PROPOSAL SEEKS TO CREATE A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM TO

10 TRAIN FIVE TO TEN PREDOCTORAL, TWO TO FOUR

11 POSTDOCTORAL, AND TWO TO FOUR CLINICAL TRAINEES DRAWN

12 FROM A LARGE NUMBER OF CLINICAL AND BASIC SCIENCE

13 DEPARTMENTS. THE PROGRAM IS BEING DEVELOPED AND PLANS

14 INTEGRATION OF BASIC RESEARCH AND MEDICAL APPLICATIONS

15 ACROSS THREE INSTITUTIONS.

16 THE MAJOR STRENGTHS AS IDENTIFIED BY THE

17 REVIEWERS OF THIS APPLICATION ARE THE HIGH QUALITY OF

18 THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, THE EXPERIENCE OF THE STAFF IN

19 RESEARCH TRAINING, THE STRONG INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

20 TO DEVELOPING A MAJOR EFFORT IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY. AND

21 I WOULD STRESS THAT THERE IS NEW DEDICATED SPACE IN

22 THIS APPLICATION OF 90,000 SQUARE FEET FOR STEM CELL

23 RESEARCH, WHICH INCLUDES A NEW STEM CELL CORE FOR

24 SELF-CULTURE, DERIVATION, MAINTENANCE, AND

25 DIFFERENTIATION OF STEM CELLS. ANOTHER STRENGTH

1 IDENTIFIED WAS THE SUBSTANTIAL POOL OF HIGH QUALITY  
2 APPLICANTS. AND FINALLY, THAT THE PROGRAM WAS HIGHLY  
3 INTERDISCIPLINARY.

4 ONE WEAKNESS THAT WAS IDENTIFIED WAS THAT THE  
5 APPLICATION DID NOT PROVIDE SOME IMPORTANT INFORMATION  
6 ABOUT EXISTING PREVIOUS TRAINING PROGRAMS. OVERALL THE  
7 RECOMMENDATION OF THE WORKING GROUP WAS THAT THIS IS  
8 HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDS IT FOR FULL FUNDING.

9 MR. CHAIR, ACTION ON THIS APPLICATION.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A MOTION?

11 DR. FRIEDMAN: QUESTION. ARLENE, PERHAPS YOU  
12 CAN -- IT SAYS IMPORTANT ANTECEDENTS, SUCH AS PREVIOUS  
13 TRAINING PROGRAM AND THEIR RESULTS. I'M NOT SURE I  
14 UNDERSTAND THE WORD "ANTECEDENTS," AND WERE THERE OTHER  
15 THINGS THAT THEY WERE CONCERNED ABOUT? HERE'S THE  
16 POINT I'M GETTING TO, WHICH IS THE FIRST GROUP OF  
17 APPLICATIONS THAT YOU DISCUSSED ARE CLEARLY VERY, VERY  
18 STRONG. WE ARE GETTING TO A POINT WHERE THE CONCERNS  
19 ARE BEING RAISED ABOUT SOME OF THE APPLICATIONS IN  
20 ESPECIALLY THE LOWER 80S AND THE UPPER 70S.

21 AND I THINK THE QUESTION IS, SINCE I HAVE A  
22 VERY STRONG PREJUDICE, THAT WE SHOULD HAVE ADDITIONAL  
23 ROUNDS OF APPLICATIONS TO IMPROVE THESE APPLICATIONS.  
24 AND SINCE I'M VERY INFLUENCED BY WHAT DR. HALL JUST  
25 SAID IN TERMS OF THE ABILITY OF THE STAFF TO, IF YOU

1 WILL, OVERSEE AND MAKE SURE THAT EVERYTHING IS DONE  
2 VERY, VERY WELL, IT SEEMS INCUMBENT ON US TO MAKE SURE  
3 THAT THE APPLICATIONS -- THAT THE PROPOSALS, WHEN THEY  
4 COME IN, ARE VERY, VERY SOLID. AND IF THAT MEANS A  
5 SECOND ROUND, SO BE IT.

6 I THINK THIS IS -- I DON'T MEAN TO SAY  
7 ANYTHING PEJORATIVE OR NEGATIVE ABOUT THIS APPLICATION  
8 SINCE I DON'T KNOW WHICH INSTITUTION THIS IS, BUT MY  
9 SUSPICION IS WE'RE GOING TO QUICKLY COME TO A POINT  
10 WHERE WE MAY NOT WISH TO AUTOMATICALLY APPROVE THE  
11 PROPOSALS. AND WHETHER THAT'S AT 80, WHETHER THAT'S AT  
12 75, WHATEVER THAT LEVEL IS, OR MAYBE IT'S GOING TO BE  
13 AT 60 OR BELOW, THAT THAT'S UP FOR DISCUSSION, I HAVE  
14 RESERVATIONS ABOUT THIS THAT I'D LIKE TO HAVE A LITTLE  
15 BIT FURTHER DISCUSSION. AND I'M SORRY TO SLOW WHAT'S  
16 BEEN A VERY NICE TEMPO OF APPROVALS.

17 DR. CHIU: I THINK THE POINT THAT REVIEWERS  
18 ARE TRYING TO MAKE IS THAT THEY WISHED THEY HAD  
19 PROVIDED MUCH MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE OTHER EXISTING  
20 PROGRAMS, HOW WELL THE STUDENTS OR THE TRAINEES DID,  
21 HOW DID THEY FARE, HOW LONG THEY STAYED IN THE PROGRAM,  
22 AND WHAT THE OUTCOMES WERE. WHERE DID THEY MOVE ON TO?  
23 THAT KIND OF INFORMATION. SOME INSTITUTIONS PROVIDED  
24 THAT, OTHERS CHOSE NOT TO, TO USE THE LIMITED SPACE ON  
25 OTHER INFORMATION. AND IN THIS CASE THAT WAS ONE

1 RESERVATION THEY HAD.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MURPHY.

3 DR. MURPHY: ARLENE, THE RECOMMENDATION IS TO  
4 FUND 9 TO 16 POSITIONS, AND YET THERE IS A HARD BUDGET  
5 NUMBER. COULD YOU RELATE THE BUDGET NUMBER TO THE 9 TO  
6 16? HOW WILL THAT WORK?

7 DR. CHIU: THAT'S A VERY GOOD QUESTION. AND  
8 WE ARE NEEDING A GRANTS MANAGEMENT OFFICIAL WHO WILL  
9 LOOK AT ALL THE NUMBERS. SO ALL THE NUMBERS THAT YOU  
10 LOOK AT ARE VERY FLUID. ONCE YOU HAVE APPROVED  
11 FUNDING, WE GO IN AND THEY WILL BE COUNTED BY SLOTS, SO  
12 A CERTAIN AMOUNT PER TRAINEE. WHEN A PROGRAM REPORTS  
13 THEY TRAINED X NUMBER, THAT'S HOW THE FUNDS WILL BE  
14 ADJUSTED. SO SINCE THIS PROGRAM IS IN DEVELOPMENT, MY  
15 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT IN THE BEGINNING THEY WILL ONLY  
16 START WITH MAYBE FIVE, TWO, AND TWO, AS SHOWN UP THERE,  
17 AND IN LATER YEARS, SECOND OR THIRD YEAR, THEY'LL RAMP  
18 UP AND THE BUDGET WILL REFLECT THAT.

19 DR. MURPHY: THANK YOU.

20 MR. SHEEHY: I'M WITH RICH ON THIS. THIS IS  
21 NOT REAL CLEAR TO ME. WHAT ARE WE REALLY APPROVING?  
22 ARE WE APPROVING NINE SLOTS? MY SENSE IS WHAT THE  
23 INTENT HERE IS TO APPROVE NINE SLOTS. I'M RELUCTANT TO  
24 SAY THAT WE'RE GOING TO APPROVE UP TO 16 SLOTS.

25 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THIS IS NOT THE

1 WORK OF THE WORKING GROUP. THE APPLICATION ITSELF, IF  
2 I'M CORRECT, CAME IN SAYING WE ARE GOING TO BUILD A  
3 PROGRAM. AND THEIR PROPOSAL WAS THAT IT BE GRADUATED,  
4 AND THE WORKING GROUP TREATED IT THAT WAY, MADE NO  
5 RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGING IT. THIS SIMPLY IS THE  
6 SLOTS FOR THE FIRST YEAR. I PRESUME IN THE LATER YEARS  
7 IT WILL GO TO THE FULL 16 SINCE THAT'S WHAT THE  
8 WRITE-UP SAYS. AND IF --

9 DR. PENHOET: ARE WE APPROVING THE BUDGETED  
10 AMOUNT OF DOLLARS OR THE NUMBER OF POSITIONS? THAT'S  
11 THE QUESTION.

12 DR. HALL: WELL, SO THE BUDGET IS A ONE-YEAR  
13 AND A THREE-YEAR BUDGET. NOTICE THAT THREE YEARS IS  
14 NOT THREE TIMES THE FIRST YEAR.

15 DR. PENHOET: I UNDERSTAND. THAT'S THE  
16 NUMBER WE'RE APPROVING HERE.

17 DR. HALL: SO YOU'RE APPROVING THE GRADED  
18 INCREASE IN SLOTS THAT THEY PROPOSE. YOU'RE PROPOSING  
19 THE PROPOSAL AS IT STANDS, AND THESE ARE THE DOLLAR  
20 AMOUNTS OF THOSE FIGURES.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO YOU'RE APPROVING IT  
22 STARTING WITH NINE SLOTS FOR THE FIRST YEAR.

23 DR. HALL: YES. THAT'S WHAT THEY REQUESTED.

24 MR. SHEEHY: WE HAVE A MOTION? I'D LIKE TO  
25 AMEND THE -- PERHAPS OFFER A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT THAT WE



1 ONLY FUND THE NINE SLOTS THAT EVERYONE CAN SEEM TO  
2 AGREE TO. I'M NOT COMFORTABLE APPROVING A THREE-YEAR  
3 PROGRAM, ESPECIALLY WITH THE DEFICIENCIES IDENTIFIED,  
4 MYSELF. I DON'T KNOW HOW OTHER PEOPLE FEEL. IT SEEMS  
5 A LITTLE LOOSE. THEY CAN COME BACK. WE'RE GOING TO  
6 HAVE ANOTHER ROUND.

7 DR. POMEROY: I ACTUALLY SUPPORT APPROVING  
8 THE 9 GOING UP TO 16, AND I'LL TELL YOU WHY. I THINK  
9 IT ACTUALLY TAKES INSIGHT ON THE PART OF AN INSTITUTION  
10 TO SAY YEAR ONE WE'RE READY TO PROVIDE NINE SLOTS, BUT  
11 WE HAVE A PLAN FOR GROWTH. AND I ACTUALLY THINK THAT  
12 THAT MAKES MORE SENSE THAN SAYING WE CAN TAKE 16 RIGHT  
13 AWAY IF, IN FACT, THEY'RE NOT RAMPED UP.

14 SO IF WHAT THIS IS SAYING, WHICH IS WHAT I  
15 UNDERSTAND FROM YOU, ARLENE, YEAR ONE IS NINE, YEAR TWO  
16 IS 12, AND YEAR THREE IS 16 OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT,  
17 THAT SOUNDS LIKE A VERY STRATEGIC APPROACH TO ME.

18 MR. SHEEHY: I'LL WITHDRAW MY AMENDMENT.

19 DR. LEVEY: BUT I THINK IT RAISES ANOTHER  
20 QUESTION. IF THE SCORE GIVEN WAS AN 84 VERSUS THE  
21 PROGRAM THAT HAD 98, WHICH WAS ABSOLUTELY PERFECT, AND  
22 THE 98 HAS 16 TRAINEES AND THE 84 HAS 16 TRAINEES,  
23 GIVEN WE DON'T HAVE AN ABUNDANCE OF MONEY, YOU WOULD  
24 THINK THAT WE WOULD PROBABLY BE CAUTIOUS ABOUT  
25 INVESTING IN A PROGRAM FOR 16 FELLOWS THE SAME AS THE

1 PROGRAM WITH 98. SO I THINK WE WOULD WANT TO LOOK AT  
2 THAT. OBVIOUSLY IT'S A WORTHY PROGRAM. BUT OBVIOUSLY  
3 THE 84 DIDN'T JUST COME BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T DEFINE  
4 SUCCESSIVE TRAINEES. THERE MUST HAVE BEEN OTHER THINGS  
5 THAT THE REVIEWERS SAW IN THAT PROPOSAL THAT LOWERED IT  
6 FROM THE OTHER PROGRAMS THAT WERE IN THE 90S.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, ONE OF THE POINTS HERE  
8 IS THAT IF THERE'S A FIRST-YEAR PROGRAM AND IT'S  
9 SMALLER WITH THE IDENTIFICATION IN THE DESCRIPTION AS  
10 THIS INSTITUTION QUALITATIVELY HAS THE ABILITY TO BUILD  
11 A STRONG PROGRAM, THAT SINCE THEY'RE STARTING OFF  
12 LOWER, THEY WERE RATED ON THEIR OVERALL ABILITY TO  
13 ACCOMPLISH THEIR PLAN. BUT I THINK WE HAD OTHER  
14 COMMENTS.

15 DR. PENHOET: THE BUDGET FOR THE FIRST WITH A  
16 SCORE OF 98 IS \$600,000 HIGHER TOTAL. THAT'S WHY I  
17 ASKED THE QUESTION. WE ARE VOTING TO FUND THE  
18 REQUESTED BUDGET. THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF FTE'S  
19 ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROPOSAL WOULD BE 12 OVER THE  
20 THREE-YEAR PERIOD, 9 IN THE FIRST, 12 IN THE SECOND,  
21 AND IF IT WERE 15, IT WOULD BE 12. THE ONE WITH THE  
22 SCORE OF 98 HAS 16 THROUGHOUT THE THREE YEARS. SO IT'S  
23 A LOWER LEVEL OF FUNDING AND A LOWER AVERAGE LEVEL OF  
24 TRAINEES.

25 DR. PIZZO: I THINK DR. LEVEY IS RAISING A

1       SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT QUESTION, IF I HEAR HIM CORRECTLY.  
2       IT'S NOT JUST THE FUNDING. IT'S WHAT GOES INTO A SCORE  
3       COMPOSITION. SO COMING TO A SCORE OF 84, AND I THINK  
4       DR. FRIEDMAN RAISED THIS EARLIER, I DON'T KNOW  
5       PRECISELY WHERE THE CUTOFF OUGHT TO BE. BUT COMING  
6       BACK TO A POINT THAT DR. BALTIMORE MADE, WHEN YOU ARE  
7       FUNDING 60, 70 PERCENT OF PROGRAMS, IN ALL OF OUR  
8       EXPERIENCE, THAT TURNS OUT TO BE HIGH. NOW, I'M NOT  
9       SAYING THAT IT'S WRONG. IT'S JUST THAT THAT'S THE  
10      EMPIRIC OBSERVATION.

11               THE QUESTION IS HOW DO WE INTERPRET THAT  
12      GRADIENT? BECAUSE I DON'T SEE IT AS JUST BEING WHETHER  
13      OR NOT YOU'RE PRESENTED LESS INFORMATION ABOUT TRAINING  
14      PROGRAMS. THERE MUST HAVE BEEN OTHER THINGS THAT COME  
15      UP THAT LED SCORERS TO HAVE A DIFFERENT APPRECIATION.

16               DR. CHIU: MAY I SUGGEST THAT THE FIRST TWO  
17      WERE SUPERB AND HAD ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS, AND PERHAPS  
18      THIS ONE, AS I SAID, IS A PROGRAM IN DEVELOPMENT AND  
19      PERHAPS THAT CAME INTO THE SCORE.

20               CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

21               MS. SAMUELSON: TO ME THAT ARGUES FOR TWO  
22      THINGS, I THINK. ONE IS TO BE CONSERVATIVE IN THE  
23      FUNDING NOW, AND THE OTHER IS TO BE VERY AGGRESSIVE IN  
24      QUICKLY TURNING AROUND A SECOND ROUND. I'M NOT  
25      SPEAKING SPECIFICALLY TO THIS ITEM HERE AT THE MOMENT,

1 BUT THE OVERALL PROCESS WITH A VERY ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT  
2 OF THE WORKING GROUP WITH ITS FAMILIARITY UP TO NOW AND  
3 STAFF TO ENSURE THAT ALL THE RIGHT COMPONENTS ARE  
4 PRESENT. BUT TO HONOR THE URGENCY OF GETTING UP TO  
5 SPEED, MANY PROGRAMS WITH POTENTIAL, BUT THAT HAVE NOT  
6 BEEN ABLE TO GET INTO THIS BUSINESS BECAUSE THEY HAVE  
7 NOT HAD THE MONEY, SO THEY DON'T HAVE A TRACK RECORD.

8 DR. PIZZO: IF I COULD JUST FOLLOW UP ON  
9 THAT. I ABSOLUTELY ACCEPT THAT AS AN IMPORTANT  
10 OBJECTIVE. WE KNOW THAT THE PIPELINE IS PRETTY DRY IN  
11 THIS AREA. CERTAINLY GETTING PROGRAMS, QUOTE, IN  
12 DEVELOPMENT STAGES MAKES EMINENT SENSE AND WE'D LIKE TO  
13 DO THAT. AND I THINK IF THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING,  
14 THAT'S A HELPFUL WAY. IT STILL IS A BIG GRADIENT TO GO  
15 FROM DOWN TO THE MID-80S, BUT I'LL ACCEPT THAT AS THE  
16 CASE. AND CERTAINLY THAT WOULD CHANGE MY IMPRESSION OF  
17 THIS.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IN TERMS OF THE PUBLIC  
19 HEARING OF THIS BOARD AND THE PUBLIC HEARING OF THE  
20 WORKING GROUP, JUST TO REITERATE JOAN'S COMMENT, ONE OF  
21 THE POLICY OBJECTIVES WAS CLEARLY TO REBUILD THE  
22 INFRASTRUCTURE BECAUSE IF YOU SAY, DR. PIZZO, THE  
23 OBJECTIVE WE'RE IDENTIFYING HERE IS THAT THE PIPELINE  
24 OF PHYSICIANS AND SCIENTISTS IS DRIED UP BECAUSE OF A  
25 LACK OF FUNDING AND THERE WAS A SPECIFIC INTENT TO

1 REBUILD THAT INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE, SO WE'RE  
2 TRYING TO EXPAND THE INFRASTRUCTURE. AND A LOT OF  
3 THESE ARE PROGRAMS IN DEVELOPMENT.

4 DR. LEVEY: COULD I ASK JUST ONE OTHER  
5 QUESTION. SO WHEN THE WORKING GROUP WAS CONCERNED WITH  
6 THE OUTCOME OF PREVIOUS TRAINING PROGRAMS, ARE THEY  
7 TRAINING PROGRAMS IN ADULT STEM CELL RESEARCH, OR IS  
8 THIS ALL TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT WERE IN THE SCIENCES?

9 DR. CHIU: ALL TRAINING PROGRAMS, JUST TO SEE  
10 IF THEY HAVE EXPERIENCE IN HAVING GOOD, STRONG, ROBUST  
11 TRAINING PROGRAMS PRODUCING GOOD TRAINEES IN CAREERS IN  
12 ACADEMIA, ETC.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. CHIU, ARE WE READY?

14 DR. CHIU: FOR A VOTE? MR. CHAIR, I'M ASKING  
15 FOR YOUR ACTION ON THIS APPLICATION.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FINE. I WANTED TO MAKE SURE  
17 YOU WERE THROUGH. IS THERE A MOTION FOR APPROVAL ON  
18 THIS ITEM?

19 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SO MOVED.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION HAS BEEN MADE FOR  
21 APPROVAL. IS THERE A SECOND?

22 DR. BRYANT: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MADE AND SECONDED. PUBLIC  
24 COMMENT? NO PUBLIC COMMENT. MELISSA KING, A ROLL CALL  
25 VOTE.

1 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.  
2 DR. PRICE: YES.  
3 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
4 DR. MEYER: YES.  
5 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
6 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
7 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
8 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
9 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
10 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
11 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
12 DR. DIXON: YES.  
13 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
15 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
16 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
17 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
18 DR. LOVE: YES.  
19 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
20 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
21 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
22 DR. NOVA: YES.  
23 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
24 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
25 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

1 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
2 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
3 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
4 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
5 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
6 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
7 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
8 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
9 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
10 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
11 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
13 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
14 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
15 DR. THAL: YES.  
16 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
17 MS. WILSON: YES.  
18 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
19 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. MOTION PASSES.  
21 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR. NEXT IS  
22 T1007, AND NOTE THAT IT HAS AN ASTERISK ASSOCIATED WITH  
23 IT. THIS HAS A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 80. THIS PROGRAM  
24 PLANS EIGHT PREDOCTORAL, SIX POSTDOCTORAL, AND TWO  
25 CLINICAL FELLOWS FOCUSING IN THE RENEWAL AND

1 DIFFERENTIATION OF EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS AND CORD BLOOD  
2 CELLS AND THEIR THERAPEUTIC APPLICATION.

3 THE REVIEWERS IDENTIFIED MANY STRENGTHS WHICH  
4 INCLUDE STRONG LEADERSHIP AND MENTORS, EXCELLENT  
5 TRAINING PLANS FOR THE ETHICS AND HUMANITIES COURSE, A  
6 UNIQUE STRENGTH AND EMPHASIS ON CORD BLOOD STEM CELL  
7 BIOLOGY, A LARGE AND HIGHLY QUALIFIED POOL OF  
8 APPLICANTS AMONG ALL TRAINEE LEVELS; AND LAST, BUT NOT  
9 LEAST, THE INSTITUTION HAS ALREADY RECEIVED A MILLION  
10 DOLLARS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STEM CELL CENTER, AND  
11 THIS HAS ALREADY ATTRACTED SOME KEY STEM CELL  
12 RESEARCHERS.

13 HOWEVER, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF WEAKNESSES  
14 IDENTIFIED. THE SPECIFIC DETAILS OF THE COURSE DESIGN  
15 WERE LESS THAN WHAT THE REVIEWERS WOULD HAVE LIKED TO  
16 SEE. THEY LACKED DETAIL IN ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM  
17 MANAGEMENT AS WELL, AND THERE IS NO EXPERTISE IN  
18 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL BIOLOGY EVEN THOUGH THAT IS ONE OF  
19 THE AREAS THAT THEY PLAN TO PURSUE.

20 THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE WORKING GROUP IS  
21 THAT THIS IS HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED FOR  
22 FUNDING WITH A REDUCTION OF TRAINEE SLOTS. THE  
23 REVIEWERS ENCOURAGED THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT AN  
24 APPLICATION AT A LATER DATE FOR A SUPPLEMENT TO FUND  
25 THESE POSITIONS WHEN THEIR CONCERNS HAVE BEEN



1       ADDRESSED.

2               MR. CHAIR, I REQUEST.

3               CHAIRMAN KLEIN:  THANK YOU.  PLEASURE OF THE  
4 BOARD.  IS THERE A DISCUSSION OR IS THERE A MOTION?

5               DR. POMEROY:  I MOVE TO ADOPT THE WORKING  
6 GROUP'S RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING WITH A REDUCTION IN  
7 SLOTS.

8               DR. WRIGHT:  SECOND.

9               CHAIRMAN KLEIN:  AND THERE IS A SECOND.  
10 ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD?  YES, DR.  
11 BALTIMORE.

12              DR. BALTIMORE:  IT'S HARD TO LOOK FOR THE  
13 LINE WHERE YOU MAY FEEL THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE  
14 GONE TOO LOW, BUT I THINK THIS IS JUST ABOUT THE LINE.  
15 THERE ARE ENOUGH NEGATIVES IN THIS THAT I THINK IT  
16 SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED AND SHOULD GO BACK TO THE  
17 INSTITUTION.

18              CHAIRMAN KLEIN:  ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION?  DR.  
19 FRIEDMAN.

20              DR. FRIEDMAN:  DAVID HAS STATED WHAT I WAS  
21 PREPARED TO STATE.  I THINK THERE MANY GOOD THINGS  
22 HERE, BUT THERE ARE A LOT OF -- THERE'S ENOUGH  
23 DYNAMISM, THINGS IN TRANSITION, THAT I THINK ANOTHER  
24 OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY AND SOLIDIFY SOME OF THESE  
25 THINGS WOULD MAKE THIS A MUCH STRONGER APPLICATION.

1 AND, AGAIN, SINCE OUR STAFF DOESN'T HAVE TIME TO REALLY  
2 POLICE AND OVERSEE THIS, I THINK THIS IS AN INSTITUTION  
3 THAT I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO REVISE  
4 THE APPLICATION.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO SAY THAT I THINK  
6 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF  
7 FINDING SUFFICIENT FUNDS REGARDLESS OF THE PROBLEMS  
8 CREATED BY THE OPPOSITION'S LITIGATION TO GET  
9 ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR OUR STAFF, OUR SCIENTIFIC STAFF,  
10 WHICH WE'RE WORKING ON RIGHT NOW. WE WILL WITH BRIDGE  
11 FINANCING PICK UP SOME ADDITIONAL OVERHEAD THAT CAN BE  
12 COMMITTED TO OVERSIGHT BECAUSE ANY GRANT WE APPROVE HAS  
13 TO HAVE FULL ACCOUNTABILITY AND FULL OVERSIGHT. SO  
14 THAT'S, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, AN ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENT OF  
15 OUR OWN PERFORMANCE AS A BOARD.

16 DR. FRIEDMAN: I THINK THAT'S REASONABLE, BUT  
17 I STILL THINK THERE'S A SERIOUS LIST OF QUESTIONS THAT  
18 HAVE BEEN RAISED. MY GUESS IS THE INSTITUTION HAS GOOD  
19 ANSWERS FOR THEM, BUT I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE THOSE  
20 ANSWERS COME BACK.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. STEWARD.

22 DR. STEWARD: I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO THE  
23 QUESTION OF RE-REVIEWING THE APPLICATION, BUT THERE'S  
24 ONE PART OF THIS THAT DOES BOTHER ME, I GUESS. AND IT  
25 ISN'T SO MUCH WHERE WE DRAW THE LINE, BUT REALLY SOME

1 OF THE ISSUES THAT RELATE TO THE FUNDING OF THE  
2 RESEARCH GRANTS THEMSELVES. IT IS THE ISSUE OF  
3 ELIGIBILITY FOR NIH FUNDING.

4 THE FACT IS THAT CORD BLOOD STEM CELLS WOULD  
5 BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING THROUGH NIH. AND MY QUESTION  
6 IS TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE REVIEW GROUP TALK ABOUT THIS,  
7 CONSIDER THIS, AND IS THIS SOMETHING THAT -- THIS IS  
8 CLEARLY, I THINK, SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO CONSIDER AS  
9 PART OF OUR CORE CRITERIA BECAUSE IT IS, IN FACT, PART  
10 OF PROP 71.

11 DR. HALL: COULD I JUST COMMENT ON THAT, MR.  
12 CHAIR? LET ME SAY THAT IN THE RFA, AND I APOLOGIZE, WE  
13 HAVE ONE HERE, BUT WE EMPHASIZE THAT WE THOUGHT IT WAS  
14 INAPPROPRIATE TO RESTRICT THE TRAINING PROGRAM TO HUMAN  
15 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS. THAT IS, WE WANT A BROAD  
16 EDUCATION IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY WITH THE IDEA THAT A LOT  
17 OF PEOPLE NOW WHO MIGHT BE WORKING IN OTHER SYSTEMS  
18 WILL DO WORK THAT'S EITHER RELEVANT TO OR WILL MOVE  
19 INTO. SO IT WASN'T SPECIFICALLY CAST IN THAT WAY.

20 I THINK THAT WILL BE MUCH MORE OF AN ISSUE  
21 WITH RESEARCH FUNDING, BUT JUST TO SAY THAT OUR INTENT  
22 THROUGH THIS WAS TO HAVE A BROADLY BASED STEM CELL AND  
23 WE SAID IN DIFFERENT ANIMALS AND AT DIFFERENT STAGES,  
24 INCLUDING ADULT AND EMBRYONIC, JUST SO YOU KNOW THAT.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THERE WAS JUST

1 GENERAL COMMENTS TOO IN THE PUBLIC HEARINGS, THAT  
2 STUDYING OF THE ADULT AND CORD BLOOD WOULD HELP AS A  
3 GENERAL EDUCATIONAL MODEL TO LEAD INTO EMBRYONIC. SO  
4 WHILE THEY WERE PRESENTING EMBRYONIC, AS WELL PICK UP  
5 KNOWLEDGE WORKING ON ADULTS THAT MIGHT BE USED IN  
6 CONJUNCTION WITH EMBRYONIC IN SOME LATER TRIALS OR  
7 EXPERIMENTATION. TED LOVE.

8 DR. LOVE: I WAS GOING TO ASK ZACH A  
9 QUESTION. I THINK ONE OF THE CHALLENGES HERE IS THAT  
10 ON THIS COMMITTEE THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE A GREAT  
11 DEAL OF EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ACTUALLY DOING WHAT  
12 THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS BEEN ASKED TO DO. AND, THEREFORE,  
13 THERE COULD BE THE POTENTIAL TO REVISIT THEIR DECISION  
14 AT A PRETTY DETAILED LEVEL.

15 BUT TO THE QUESTION THAT WE'VE BEEN KIND OF  
16 GETTING AT ABOUT THE LINE, ZACH, DID YOU HAVE ANY  
17 CONCERN THAT ANY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS COMING TO THIS  
18 COMMITTEE WERE REALLY FOR RESEARCH THAT DOES NOT MEET A  
19 STANDARD WHERE YOU PERSONALLY FEEL THAT WE SHOULD BE  
20 SUPPORTING IT? BECAUSE I THINK WE'RE TRYING TO GET AT  
21 THIS THROUGH NUMBERS; AND AT THE END OF THE DAY, I'M  
22 NOT SURE IF WHAT WE HAVE IN FRONT OF US REALLY ALLOWS  
23 US TO MAKE THE ASSESSMENT I THINK MANY OF US REALLY  
24 WANT TO MAKE, WHICH IS ARE WE FUNDING STUFF THAT WE  
25 SHOULD FEEL GOOD ABOUT FUNDING?

1 DR. HALL: LET ME ANSWER. YOU PUT ME IN AN  
2 AWKWARD POSITION BECAUSE I REALLY TRIED TO FULFILL MY  
3 INSTITUTIONAL ROLE; THAT IS, MY ROLE AS A SORT OF  
4 NONPARTISAN FACILITATOR OF WHAT'S HAPPENING AND NOT TO  
5 HAVE MY OWN INDIVIDUAL STANDARDS.

6 I AM -- SO THE PROGRAMS THAT WERE LOOKED AT  
7 AND EXAMINED COVERED A BROAD RANGE. AS YOU KNOW OF  
8 INSTITUTIONS, AND WE'LL GET, AS WE MOVE FURTHER INTO  
9 TYPE 2, TYPE 3, TO INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE MUCH SMALLER,  
10 THAT IS, THEY CAN'T OFFER THE WHOLE. AND I THINK ONE  
11 OF THE VIEWS OF THE WORKING GROUP WAS THAT IF YOU  
12 CONSIDER IT AS AN OVERALL TRAINING PROGRAM, THAT  
13 DIFFERENT EMPHASES OF DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS WERE VERY  
14 IMPORTANT, THAT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THE WHOLE  
15 PROGRAM BROUGHT DIFFERENT TALENTS TO BEAR ON PARTICULAR  
16 PROBLEMS. AND SO THE EMPHASIS WASN'T THAT EVERY  
17 INSTITUTION HAD TO EXCEL IN EVERYTHING NECESSARILY.  
18 THE VERY BEST ONES APPROACH THAT, BUT THAT IN EVERY  
19 CASE THAT WAS RECOMMENDED, I THINK THE WORKING GROUP  
20 FOUND A VERY IMPORTANT COMPONENT THAT THEY THOUGHT  
21 WOULD BE IMPORTANT FOR THE OVERALL TRAINING PROGRAM  
22 CONSIDERED AS A WHOLE.

23 OUR INTENT GOING FORWARD, UNDERLINING THE  
24 CHAIR'S OPTIMISTIC STATEMENT THAT WE WILL HAVE MORE  
25 STAFF EVENTUALLY, WHICH I THINK WE WILL, WE WILL

1 ACTUALLY WANT TO CONVENE PEOPLE FROM THE DIFFERENT  
2 SCHOOLS SO THAT WE HAVE A MECHANISM FOR PROVIDING SOME  
3 SORT OF CROSS FERTILIZATION BETWEEN THEM.

4 ALREADY, I MIGHT ADD, THAT AS A RESULT OF  
5 THIS TRAINING GRANT RFA, INSTITUTIONS HAVE GOTTEN  
6 TOGETHER AND POOLED RESOURCES IN SEVERAL CASES. THAT  
7 IS, WE'LL TEACH A COURSE IN THIS, WE'RE GOOD AT THAT,  
8 YOU TEACH A COURSE IN THAT, WE'LL HAVE ALL OUR TRAINEES  
9 TAKE ALL OF THESE COURSES, AND THAT ACTUALLY HAS BEEN  
10 ONE OF THE STRONGEST THINGS AND PROMISING THINGS, I  
11 THINK, TO HAVE COME OUT OF THIS; AND THAT IS, CASES IN  
12 WHICH WE PREPARE.

13 SO TO GET BACK TO YOUR ORIGINAL QUESTION, I'M  
14 CERTAINLY COMFORTABLE WITH THE WORKING GROUP, THE  
15 RECOMMENDATIONS THE WORKING GROUP MADE, AND I DON'T  
16 THINK THAT WE WOULD IN ANY WAY EMBARRASS OURSELVES BY  
17 FUNDING THOSE GRANTS. IT IS, HOWEVER, YOUR PREROGATIVE  
18 TO DECIDE WHERE, THAT'S THE QUESTION YOU'RE ALL  
19 STRUGGLING WITH NOW, WHERE YOU WANT TO DRAW THE LINE.  
20 IT MAY EVEN BE POSSIBLE TO GO THROUGH THIS A LITTLE  
21 FURTHER AND THEN TO COME BACK AND REVISIT SOME OF THESE  
22 TO LOOK AT THE OVERALL THING.

23 THE ANSWER IS I'M COMFORTABLE WITH THE  
24 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP. I THINK THEY  
25 WERE VERY CAREFULLY CONSIDERED, LOTS OF DISCUSSION WENT

1 INTO IT; AND AS I SAY, THE SENSE THAT THERE WAS  
2 SOMETHING REALLY GOOD IN EACH ONE OF THE ONES THAT WAS  
3 RECOMMENDED, I THINK, WAS VERY STRONG.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD REFER US TO THE  
5 WRITE-UP, IT SAYS, IN ILLUSTRATING THE POINT THAT DR.  
6 HALL JUST MADE, COURSES IN ETHICS, INTELLECTUAL  
7 PROPERTY LAW, AND HUMANITIES ARE STELLAR AND FEATURE  
8 FACULTY WITH A DEEP KNOWLEDGE IN THIS AREA. THIS  
9 PARTICULAR APPLICATION HAPPENED TO HAVE REALLY  
10 OUTSTANDING CAPACITY IN THAT AREA, WHICH COULD BENEFIT  
11 ALL OF THE INSTITUTIONS. SO THAT THROUGH THE WHOLE  
12 PORTFOLIO, AS I READ THESE DIFFERENT WRITE-UPS, YOU  
13 WILL SEE THAT IF WE HAVE POINTS OF REAL BRILLIANCE IN  
14 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS THAT CAN BENEFIT ALL OF THE  
15 INSTITUTIONS IF, IN FACT, THESE PROGRAMS ARE FUNDED AND  
16 THEY'RE ABLE TO BUILD A PROGRAM CONCURRENTLY, IT HAS  
17 SYNERGISTIC VALUE TO THE STATE AND TO THE INTELLECTUAL  
18 ASSETS.

19 DR. MEYER AND THEN WE'LL GO OVER TO --

20 MR. SHEEHY: YOU SKIPPED ME.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M SORRY. YOU'RE RIGHT AND  
22 I APOLOGIZE.

23 MR. SHEEHY: FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO SAY THAT  
24 THE TONE OF THIS WORKING GROUP WAS EXTREMELY  
25 CONSERVATIVE. SO WHEN YOU SEE HIGH 70S, I MEAN THINK

1 ABOUT WHAT THAT'S IN COMPARISON TO. I MEAN THE  
2 INSTITUTIONS THAT SCORED AT THE VERY TOP HERE ARE THE  
3 TOP IN THE WORLD. SO MEASURED ON THAT STANDARD, YOU  
4 MAY SEE SOMETHING AT 80 AND SAY, GOD, THAT'S 80; BUT  
5 MEASURED AGAINST, I THINK, MOST OF THE PEOPLE DOING  
6 RESEARCH IN THE WORLD, THEY WOULD BE IN THE 90S, BUT  
7 THEY'RE BEING MEASURED AGAINST THE GOLD STANDARD. I  
8 FOUND IT TO BE A VERY, VERY, VERY CONSERVATIVE GROUP OF  
9 FOLKS. THEY WEREN'T EAGER TO PASS OUT MONEY.

10 AND I WOULD LIKE TO REALLY EMPHASIZE BOB'S  
11 POINT, THAT THEY REALLY POINTED OUT THAT THE ETHICS AND  
12 LAW AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, THIS WHOLE PIECE, THEY  
13 HAD DONE MORE WITH THAN ANYONE ELSE AT ANY OTHER  
14 INSTITUTION. AND THEY EVEN PROPOSED PERHAPS SETTING  
15 THEM UP AS A CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR THIS.

16 I WOULD ALSO NOTE THAT THEY HAD ONE OF THE  
17 BEST CLINICAL PROGRAMS, WHICH WAS AN AREA THAT WAS VERY  
18 DEFICIENT KIND OF ACROSS THE BOARD. SO I WOULD HATE TO  
19 JUST COMPLETELY KNOCK THEM OUT OF THE BOAT, IF PEOPLE  
20 WANT TO CUT BACK, BUT THE CLINICAL PROGRAM WAS  
21 EXTREMELY STRONG AND SO WAS THEIR ETHICAL PROGRAM.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WE HAVE DR.  
23 MEYER, DR. DIXON, AND DR. PRIETO.

24 DR. MEYER: I WOULD JUST LIKE US TO LOOK --

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MEYER, IF YOU COULD TALK



1 A LITTLE CLOSER TO THE MIC.

2 DR. MEYER: I THINK WE SHOULD SERIOUSLY LOOK  
3 AT WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT WHEN WE'RE SAYING DRAWING A  
4 LINE. IF YOU LOOK AT THE NIH METHOD, YOU BASICALLY, A  
5 STUDY SECTION, AN INITIAL REVIEW GROUP, WHICH IS WHAT  
6 THIS WAS, RANKS PROPOSALS, AND THE LINE IS DRAWN BY HOW  
7 MUCH MONEY YOU HAVE. WE CLEARLY DON'T HAVE THE  
8 SITUATION HERE. WE HAVE LESS MONEY THAN WE'RE GIVING  
9 OUT THAN WE ACTUALLY HAVE IN OUR POCKET.

10 I THINK THE LINE DRAWING WAS DONE BY THE  
11 INITIAL REVIEW GROUP, AND IT WAS DONE BY QUALITY. IT  
12 WAS NOT DONE BY THE USUAL MECHANISM OF HOW MUCH MONEY  
13 DO WE HAVE, AND THEY THOUGHT LONG AND HARD IS WHAT I'M  
14 GATHERING FROM THIS ABOUT WHAT IS MERITORIOUS AND WHAT  
15 ISN'T. SO FOR US TO SIT HERE AND REDRAW THEIR LINE ON  
16 SOME BASIS OF QUALITY WOULD BE NOT IN OUR PURVIEW  
17 REALLY BECAUSE THEY ARE THE JUDGES OF THE SCIENTIFIC  
18 QUALITY. WE DIDN'T GO INTO IT LIKE THEY DID. IF WE  
19 WANT TO ARGUE ABOUT DRAWING A FUNDING LINE, THAT'S  
20 FINE, BUT I DON'T SEE US HAVING THAT PROBLEM.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MEYER, WE ACTUALLY HAVE  
22 THE PURVIEW OF -- AND WE HAVE ENOUGH SUBSTANCE TO JUDGE  
23 SCIENTIFICALLY ON THE MERITS AS THE INFORMATION OR  
24 DEFICIENCIES AND STRENGTHS IS PRESENTED TO US, WHETHER  
25 WE WANT TO MAKE THAT DECISION, WHICH I THINK YOU

1 RECOGNIZE -- HE INDICATES HE DOES -- BUT, IN FACT, SO  
2 TO SOME EXTENT WE ARE REVISITING THE REVIEW. IN TERMS  
3 OF OUR AUTHORITY, WE'RE TOTALLY REVISITING THE DECISION  
4 AND REEVALUATING BASED UPON WHAT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THIS  
5 WHOLE GROUP BEFORE US. DR. DIXON.

6 DR. DIXON: SO I THINK I WANT TO -- YOU  
7 MENTIONED SOME OF THE STRENGTHS, BUT I THINK THE  
8 WEAKNESSES ARE REALLY SPELLED OUT IN DETAIL.  
9 WEAKNESSES IN SPECIFIC AREAS OF COURSE DESIGN,  
10 ADMINISTRATION, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT, DEPTH OF KNOWLEDGE,  
11 AND EMBRYONIC STEM CELL BIOLOGY. SO MY QUESTION WOULD  
12 BE WHAT'S WRONG WITH BASICALLY GIVING A PROPOSAL THAT  
13 HAS THESE WEAKNESSES AN OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK IN AND  
14 STRENGTHEN THEM?

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRIETO.

16 DR. PRIETO: I JUST THINK -- I'M VERY  
17 COGNIZANT OF THE FACT THAT WE HAVE TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT  
18 SPENDING THE PUBLIC'S MONEY, WHICH IS WHAT WE'RE DOING  
19 HERE, BUT ALSO THAT THIS IS A NEW AREA OF RESEARCH, ONE  
20 IN WHICH FUNDING HAS BEEN LIMITED. AND I DON'T THINK  
21 IT'S REALISTIC FOR US TO EXPECT ALL THE INSTITUTIONS  
22 APPLYING FOR THIS TRAINING TO HAVE THE BROAD AND FULLY  
23 DEVELOPED EXPERTISE IN ALL POSSIBLE AREAS OF STEM CELL  
24 RESEARCH THAT WE'RE FORTUNATE TO HAVE IN ONE OR TWO  
25 INSTITUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA. WE'RE HOPING TO DEVELOP

1 THAT IN THE REST OF OUR INSTITUTIONS AND IN THE STATE,  
2 BUT I DON'T THINK WE CAN EXPECT TO HAVE IT NOW. I  
3 THINK THIS LOOKS TO ME LIKE A MERITORIOUS APPLICATION  
4 THAT WE SHOULD FUND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK CERTAINLY, AS A  
6 PATIENT ADVOCATE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE THAT WE PRESENTED  
7 IN THE PROP 71 CAMPAIGN, FROM THE PERSPECTIVE THAT WE  
8 PRESENTED IN OUR PUBLIC HEARINGS, AGAIN, IF WE ACCEPT  
9 THE RESPONSIBILITY OF REBUILDING THE INTELLECTUAL  
10 ASSETS IN THIS AREA, WE HAVE TO RECOGNIZE, AS DR.  
11 PRIETO SAYS, THAT ONLY THOSE INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE  
12 MAJOR CHARITABLE DONATIONS HAD THE ABILITY TO REALLY  
13 BUILD UP BEFORE THESE FUNDS WERE AVAILABLE THEIR FULL  
14 CAPACITY IN THESE AREAS, BUT THE PEER REVIEW GROUP IS  
15 REALLY SAYING TO US THIS IS MERITORIOUS IN THAT THEY  
16 HAVE THE CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES OR THEY  
17 WOULDN'T HAVE RECOMMENDED IT FOR FUNDING. DR. BRYANT.

18 DR. BRYANT: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY  
19 SOMETHING ALONG THOSE LINES. I THINK HAVING HEARD WHO  
20 THE MEMBERS OF THE REVIEW GROUP WERE, I THINK WE HAD AN  
21 EXCELLENT GROUP OF PEOPLE REVIEWING THEM, AND I THINK  
22 IF THESE ARE THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS, I WOULD THINK I  
23 WOULD HAVE TO SEE A LOT MORE THAN WHAT WE'RE SEEING  
24 HERE IN TERMS OF NEGATIVES IN ORDER TO SAY, WELL, WE  
25 KNOW BETTER THAN THEY DO BECAUSE I THINK THESE ARE THE

1 PEOPLE WHO ARE THE EXPERTS AND THEY KNOW WHAT THEY'RE  
2 LOOKING FOR. AND THEY COULD SEE MORE OF THE DETAILS  
3 THAN WE DO ABOUT WHAT'S IN THE PROPOSAL. SO I'M  
4 WILLING TO GO WITH THE REVIEW GROUP'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND I WOULD RECOMMEND,  
6 THOUGH, CERTAINLY WE HAVE GREAT DISTINCTION ON THIS  
7 BOARD, AND I REAFFIRM THAT EVERY INDIVIDUAL ON THIS  
8 BOARD NEEDS TO VOTE THEIR CONSCIENCE AND THEIR  
9 VIEWPOINT ON THE INFORMATION WE HAVE AND HOW THEY  
10 EVALUATE IT INDIVIDUALLY.

11 DR. PIZZO: MAY I MAKE A COMMENT? AT RISK OF  
12 OPENING A LARGE ISSUE, I CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND SUSAN'S  
13 POINT, AND I MADE IT EARLIER WHEN I SAID THAT IN A  
14 SENSE OUR JOB WAS TO REALLY CHOOSE OR APPROVE THE  
15 PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO BE REVIEWERS. AND BY WAY OF  
16 DELEGATED AUTHORITY, WE'RE ASKING THEM TO MAKE  
17 RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH ARE REALLY DECISIONS BECAUSE WE  
18 DON'T HAVE ALL THE DATA. YOUR POINT EXACTLY.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO, WE REALLY CAN'T  
20 DELEGATE THAT AUTHORITY.

21 DR. PIZZO: WHAT I MEAN BY DELEGATE IS --  
22 POOR CHOICE OF WORDS -- BUT WHAT I MEAN IS THAT WE ARE  
23 ASKING FOR THEIR ADVISORY INPUT TO US, BUT THE REALITY  
24 IS THAT WE'RE GOING TO NOW COME UP AGAINST THIS  
25 CONUNDRUM WHERE WE GET INTO WHAT ALWAYS HAPPENS AT

1 GRANT REVIEW PROCESSES WHEN YOU FALL INTO THE GROUP  
2 THAT IS IN THE GRAY ZONE BETWEEN THE VERY FUNDABLE AND  
3 THOSE THAT ARE UNFUNDABLE. THERE'S NEVER MUCH  
4 DISCUSSION ABOUT THE EXTREMES. ALL OF US HAVE  
5 PARTICIPATED IN THIS, AND THE EFFORT GOES INTO THIS  
6 CENTRAL ACTIVITY AND CENTER GROUP, AND THE PROBLEM IS  
7 THAT WE DON'T HAVE SUFFICIENT DATA TO BE ABLE TO MAKE  
8 THAT KIND OF A JUDGMENT. IN A SENSE WE HAVE TO BE  
9 HONEST THAT WE ARE RELYING, JUST AS DR. BRYANT SAID, WE  
10 ARE RELYING UPON THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT CAME FROM THE  
11 REVIEW GROUP IN ORDER TO MAKE THAT DECISION. AND IN A  
12 SENSE THAT IS PUTTING US IN THE POSITION OF HAVING TO  
13 USE THAT INFORMATION UNDER GUIDANCE TO MAKE THE  
14 CONCLUSIONS THAT WE'RE NOW BEING ASKED TO MAKE.

15 THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE IS FOR THE GRAY AREA  
16 PROJECTS TO HAVE THEM COMPLETELY REVIEWED BY THIS  
17 GROUP. AND I WOULD ARGUE THAT THAT WOULD NOT BE THE  
18 MOST RESPONSIBLE THING TO DO BECAUSE I DON'T THINK WE  
19 HAVE THE EXPERTISE TO NECESSARILY DO THAT COMPLETELY  
20 ACROSS THE BOARD IN THIS ROOM DESPITE THE KNOWLEDGE  
21 THAT WE POSSESS. SO I THINK THIS IS NOW ONE OF THE  
22 CHALLENGES THAT WE'RE GOING TO FACE.

23 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: CALL THE QUESTION.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE ONE OTHER ALTERNATIVE  
25 POSSIBILITY, WHICH I'M HOPING MAYBE WE COULD ALL

1 SUPPORT, WHICH WOULD BE THAT FOR THOSE WHERE THERE IS  
2 SOME SIGNIFICANT CONCERN, THAT WE WOULD NOT APPROVE IT  
3 AT THIS TIME, PERHAPS POSTPONE APPROVAL, BUT  
4 UNDERSTANDING THAT WE ARE TRUSTING A RIGOROUS PROCESS  
5 THAT WE HAVE HAD AT THE WORKING GROUP LEVEL AND A  
6 RECOMMENDATION OF FUNDING, THAT FOR SOME OF THESE, AND  
7 THIS MAY BE ONE THAT SHOULD BE IN THAT CATEGORY, THAT  
8 IT GOES THROUGH ANOTHER PROCESS IN WHICH THE CONCERNS  
9 ARE ADDRESSED, BUT WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THAT,  
10 ASSUMING THAT THEY ARE SATISFIED, THAT IT BE FUNDED.

11 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: CALL THE QUESTION.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL HAS  
13 ASKED THAT WE CALL THE QUESTION ON THIS PARTICULAR  
14 APPLICATION. WE DON'T HAVE A --

15 DR. FRIEDMAN: THERE IS A MOTION TO APPROVE.

16 DR. BRYANT: I MADE IT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE IN ORDER. MELISSA  
18 KING.

19 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

20 DR. BALTIMORE: NO.

21 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

22 DR. MEYER: YES.

23 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

24 DR. BRYANT: YES.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.  
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
3 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
4 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
5 DR. MARKLAND: NO.  
6 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
7 DR. DIXON: NO.  
8 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
10 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
11 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: TED LOVE HAS STEPPED OUT, BUT IS  
13 VOTING YES. RICHARD MURPHY.  
14 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
15 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
16 DR. NOVA: YES.  
17 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
18 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
19 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
20 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
21 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
22 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
23 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
24 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
25 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

1 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

2 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

3 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

4 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

5 DR. STEWARD: YES.

6 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

7 DR. THAL: YES.

8 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

9 MS. WILSON: YES.

10 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

11 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND FROM THE VOTE COUNT, DID

13 THE MOTION PASS? THE MOTION DID PASS. THANK YOU.

14 DR. LEVEY, WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE YOUR

15 COMMENT NOW?

16 DR. LEVEY: I WOULD JUST ASK THE QUESTION. I

17 AGREE WITH A LOT OF THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE, BUT

18 THEN WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING EVERYTHING ON AN

19 INDIVIDUAL BASIS? WHY DON'T WE JUST VOTE ON BLOCK, AND

20 IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR THIS BOARD -- LET'S JUST

21 GIVE A HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION WHERE WE ONLY HAVE ENOUGH

22 MONEY TO FUND, WHAT DID YOU SAY, BOB, 12 MILLION THE

23 FIRST YEAR?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE BUDGET THAT WAS SENT OUT

25 BY THIS BOARD IN THE RFA IS 15.3 MILLION. AND I WOULD



1 POINT OUT THAT THE FUNDING LINE RECOMMENDED WAS LESS  
2 THAN THAT. THE ACTUAL FUNDING LINE RECOMMENDED WAS  
3 ABOUT 13.6 MILLION.

4 DR. LEVEY: LET'S JUST SAY WE'RE FORTUNATE  
5 ENOUGH TO HAVE AT OUR DISPOSAL EIGHT MILLION OR NINE  
6 MILLION FOR THE FIRST YEAR FOR THESE TRAINING GRANTS.  
7 THEN THE BOARD PRODUCTIVELY WOULD GO AND SAY, LISTEN,  
8 WE HAVE \$8 MILLION. HOW ARE WE GOING TO DO THAT? THEN  
9 A DISCUSSION OF WHETHER AN 80 OR 84 OR 79 HAS THE SAME  
10 PRIORITY AS 91 OR A 98 OR A 96 OR A 94, ANY OF THOSE  
11 THINGS, BECAUSE RIGHT NOW IT'S JUST -- WE'RE JUST GOING  
12 THROUGH THIS ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS, BUT IT HAS NO  
13 MEANING.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH  
15 THIS ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS BECAUSE OF THE LAWS OF THE  
16 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND TO OBSERVE THE VERY HIGH  
17 STANDARD OF CONFLICTS ADOPTED BY THIS BOARD, WE HAVE TO  
18 MAKE SURE WE HAVE ROLL CALL VOTES ON EVERY APPLICATION.  
19 THAT IS THE CHALLENGE AND IT IS A NEW PROCESS FOR  
20 CALIFORNIA AS WELL AS A NATION.

21 DR. LEVEY: CAN I SUGGEST THAT WE JUST READ  
22 THE GRANTS AND SAY APPROVE OR NOT, WHAT HAVE YOU?

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, THE DISCOURSE WE HAD,  
24 DR. LEVEY, WAS VERY SUBSTANTIVE AND VERY REWARDING.  
25 SOME INDIVIDUALS FIND THEY HAVE PLENTY OF SUBSTANTIVE

1 INFORMATION TO MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL SUBSTANTIVE DECISION.  
2 OTHERS LIKE MORE. THIS IS A BALANCED PROCESS. THE  
3 BOARD AS A WHOLE DID APPROVE THE LAST GRANT HAVING THE  
4 BENEFIT OF THE INPUT FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS. DR.  
5 ARLENE CHIU.

6 DR. CHIU: SHALL WE PROCEED? NEXT GRANT IS  
7 T106 WITH A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 79. THE GOAL IS TO  
8 PROVIDE SIX PREDOCTORAL, SIX POSTDOCTORAL, AND FOUR  
9 CLINICAL CIRM SCHOLARS WITH STATE-OF-THE-ART  
10 MULTIDISCIPLINARY TRAINING TO BECOME TECHNICALLY  
11 SKILLED, CRITICALLY THINKING, AND COLLABORATIVE  
12 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIANS IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND  
13 MEDICINE.

14 THE STRENGTHS, AS IDENTIFIED BY THE  
15 REVIEWERS, WERE, ONE, THAT IT IS A WELL-ORGANIZED  
16 PROPOSAL AND PLAN WITH A TIGHT ADMINISTRATIVE  
17 STRUCTURE; TWO, THAT THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR IS EXTREMELY  
18 WELL QUALIFIED AND EXPERIENCED IN DIRECTING TRAINING  
19 PROGRAMS AND IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY; AND, THREE, THAT THE  
20 CALIBER OF THE TRAINING FACULTY IS OUTSTANDING, IF  
21 SOMEWHAT INEXPERIENCED IN STEM CELL WORK.

22 HOWEVER, THE PROGRAM APPEARS TO BE IN AN  
23 EARLY STATE OF DEVELOPMENT, AND A NUMBER OF WEAKNESSES  
24 WERE, NO. 1, THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE APPEARS  
25 TO BE SOMEWHAT EXCESSIVE WITH UNREALISTIC EXPECTATIONS

1 FOR THE PROGRESS OF THE STUDENTS. SOME CONCERN WAS  
2 RAISED THAT THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE TRAINEES MIGHT BE  
3 TOO HIGH AND THAT THE MANY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES MIGHT  
4 DISTRACT FROM THE STRONG SCIENTIFIC TRAINING. TWO,  
5 ALTHOUGH THE PROPOSED PROGRAM HAS VERY STRONG  
6 POTENTIAL, THE ELEMENTS -- NOT ALL THE ELEMENTS ARE  
7 WELL DEVELOPED. AND FINALLY, THE FACULTY MENTORS WITH  
8 EXPERTISE IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY ARE NOT YET ALL  
9 RECRUITED.

10 THE WORKING GROUP'S RECOMMENDATION IS THAT  
11 THIS IS HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED IT FOR  
12 FUNDING WITH A REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF TRAINEE SLOTS  
13 REDUCED TO FOUR PRE DOCS AND FOUR POST DOCS. THE  
14 REVIEWERS ENCOURAGED THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT AN  
15 APPLICATION AT A LATER DATE FOR A SUPPLEMENT TO FUND  
16 THESE POSITIONS WHEN THE CONCERNS THAT THEY RAISED HAVE  
17 BEEN ADDRESSED.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. DR. PRICE.

19 DR. PRICE: WOULD YOU ELABORATE ON THAT  
20 SENTENCE, THERE WAS A CONCERN THAT EXPECTATIONS OF  
21 TRAINEES MIGHT BE TOO HIGH. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?  
22 SUPPORT ACTIVITIES MIGHT GET IN THE WAY? THEY'RE GOING  
23 TO BE PARTYING ON THE WEEKENDS?

24 DR. CHIU: NO. ACTUALLY THEY HAD A VERY  
25 ELABORATE PROGRAM AMONG WHICH, AS I RECALL, WERE THAT

1 AFTER THE FIRST YEAR, POST DOCS WERE EXPECTED TO WRITE  
2 A PAPER, AND PRE DOCS WOULD BE EXPECTED TO WRITE A  
3 GRANT APPLICATION. THERE WERE A SERIES OF EXPECTATIONS  
4 THAT SOME OF THE REVIEWERS FELT WERE NOBODY IN MY  
5 PROGRAM COULD POSSIBLY DO THAT, AND OTHERS THOUGHT,  
6 WELL, CERTAINLY IN MY PROGRAM THEY DO.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE  
8 PUBLIC, DR. CHIU, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT PUBLISHING A  
9 SCIENTIFIC PAPER IN A RESPECTED JOURNAL.

10 DR. CHIU: YES.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE TALKING ABOUT  
12 EXTRAORDINARY ACHIEVEMENT IN A YEAR. SO ACTUALLY THE  
13 COMMENTS HERE ARE THAT THIS WAS AN EXTREMELY RIGOROUS  
14 PROGRAM AND MAYBE EVEN TOO RIGOROUS. THE EXPECTATIONS  
15 WERE TOO TOUGH FOR ANYONE TO ACHIEVE OVER A BROAD  
16 PROGRAM. DR. MURPHY.

17 DR. MURPHY: ARLENE, WE'RE GETTING DOWN TO  
18 THE GRAY AREA OF TYPE 1. AND I NOTICED WHEN YOU  
19 PRESENTED OR ZACH PRESENTED THE FIRST SLIDE, ALL OF  
20 TYPE 1S WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, TYPE 2S, THERE  
21 WERE SOME THAT WERE AND SOME WERE NOT; AND TYPE 3,  
22 THERE WAS A LARGE NUMBER THAT WERE NOT. WE ALL KNOW  
23 THAT WHEN YOU HAVE A GRANTS PANEL LOOKING AT GRANTS  
24 OVER THE COURSE OF A DAY, THERE'S A CERTAIN PACE OF  
25 LOOKING AT GRANTS.

1                   AND COULD YOU JUST EXPLAIN WERE ALL TYPE 1S  
2   LOOKED AT FIRST, THEN FOLLOWED BY TYPE 2 AND TYPE 3?  
3   HOW DID THAT WORK?

4                   DR. HALL:   I JUST REQUESTED THAT THAT FIRST  
5   SLIDE BE PUT UP SO YOU CAN SEE BOTH -- SO YOU CAN SEE  
6   BOTH THE SORT OF DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE TYPES, AND YOU  
7   CAN SEE THE SCORES AND THE COMPARISONS.  THE ACTUAL --

8                   CHAIRMAN KLEIN:  IF YOU COULD SPEAK INTO THE  
9   MIC, DR. HALL.

10                  DR. HALL:  IN THE ACTUAL MEETING THEY  
11  CONSIDERED TYPE 3, TYPE 2, TYPE 1.

12                  CHAIRMAN KLEIN:  DR. HALL, IF YOU COULD SPEAK  
13  INTO THE MIC BECAUSE OF THE TRANSCRIPT.  SPECIFIC  
14  QUESTION WAS WHICH TYPE OF GRANTS WAS REVIEWED FIRST.

15                  DR. HALL:  TYPE 3, TYPE 2, TYPE 1 IN THE  
16  MEETING ITSELF.  I JUST ASKED THAT THIS BE PUT UP SO  
17  THAT YOU COULD SEE THE OVERALL CONFIGURATION AMONG THE  
18  TYPE AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES THAT WE HAD.

19                  SO WHAT YOU CAN SEE IS THAT THE SCORES MATCH  
20  UP ACROSS, BUT THAT THE TYPE 1S HAD A HIGHER  
21  PREPONDERANCE OF HIGHER SCORES.

22                  DR. MURPHY:  TYPE 1 WAS EVALUATED THE LAST  
23  PART OF THE DAY?

24                  DR. HALL:  SO IT WENT FROM THE TYPE 3, TYPE  
25  2, TYPE 1, AND THEN THEY WERE ALL CONSIDERED TOGETHER.

1 THIS IS ACTUALLY -- A SCHEME VERY SIMILAR TO THIS WAS  
2 PUT UP AT THE TIME OF THE PART 2 OF THE EVALUATION IN  
3 WHICH IT WAS DECIDED WHICH ONES TO RECOMMEND.

4 DR. MURPHY: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS  
6 HERE? JEFF SHEEHY.

7 MR. SHEEHY: YOU KNOW, I KNOW PEOPLE FEEL  
8 LIKE WE'RE GETTING TO THE BOTTOM OF THE BARREL. THIS  
9 JUST LITERALLY DOES NOT REFLECT THIS APPLICATION, AND  
10 IT'S KIND OF LIKE WE HAVE -- FIRST OF ALL, I THOUGHT  
11 THAT THE RIGOROUSNESS -- THIS IS ONE WHERE I WOULD HAVE  
12 VOTED TO ADD BACK POSITIONS THAT WERE TAKEN AWAY. IT  
13 HAS EXTRAORDINARY CAPACITY FOR WORKING WITH ANIMALS,  
14 WHICH IS CAPACITY THAT WE'RE GOING TO NEED.

15 I KEEP COMING BACK. WHAT IS OUR GOAL HERE?  
16 I THINK WE HAVE TO BE REALLY SPECIFIC ABOUT THIS, AND  
17 THIS WAS ASKED IN THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE. ARE WE  
18 ONLY GOING TO FUND THE VERY BEST WHO ARE DOING THE WORK  
19 RIGHT NOW? OR ARE WE GOING TO EXPAND THE CAPACITY THAT  
20 IS OUT THERE TO THE FULLEST DEGREE? AND THIS IS A  
21 QUESTION WE NEED TO DECIDE.

22 IF WE ARE, LET'S JUST ROLL IT BACK AND JUST  
23 CUT OUT ALL THE REST OF THESE AND JUST FUND THE TOP TWO  
24 OR THREE OF THE TIER 1S. OR, OR LET'S TRY TO LOOK AT  
25 THIS AS BUILDING AN INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE TO

1 SERVE THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA, BUT THAT'S REALLY THE  
2 CUSP THAT WE'RE ON, AND WE'RE GETTING CAUGHT UP AT  
3 THESE NUMBERS.

4 AND THIS, AGAIN, I REITERATE, THIS IS AN  
5 EXTREMELY CONSERVATIVE GROUP. AND TO SUGGEST THAT THEY  
6 WOULD -- I MEAN THERE WAS STUFF THAT ADVOCATES WERE  
7 PUSHING TO FUND THAT THEY DIDN'T WANT TO FUND. THEY  
8 WERE PUSHING IT DOWN THE WHOLE TIME, SO THIS IS NOT --  
9 NOTHING GOT PUT FORWARD THAT WAS NOT GOOD.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND POINT OUT THAT NONE OF  
11 THE SCORING WAS DONE BY THE PATIENT ADVOCATES. DR.  
12 BALTIMORE.

13 DR. BALTIMORE: I THINK IT'S QUITE  
14 INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE PEOPLE WHO WERE AT THAT MEETING  
15 TO USE THE KNOWLEDGE THAT THEY HAVE TO MAKE SPECIAL  
16 ARGUMENTS FOR INDIVIDUAL CASES. THAT JUST THROWS THE  
17 WHOLE PROCESS INTO A COCKED HAT. WE'RE HERE TO  
18 EVALUATE BASED ON WHAT WE'VE READ.

19 FROM WHAT I READ HERE, THIS IS NOT AN  
20 INSTITUTION THAT SHOULD BE TRUSTED WITH THE TRAINING OF  
21 THE NEXT GENERATION OF PEOPLE IN THIS AREA. TRAINING  
22 IS NOT A SIMPLE PROCESS. IT REQUIRES A COMPREHENSIVE  
23 ABILITY TO DEAL WITH ALL LEVELS OF THE ACTIVITY. IT IS  
24 NOT SUFFICIENT TO BE GOOD IN ONE AREA, PARTICULARLY IF  
25 IT'S IN THE AREA OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND ETHICS.

1 YOU HAVE TO BE GOOD ENOUGH IN ALL AREAS IN ORDER TO  
2 PROVIDE PEOPLE WITH THE KIND OF TRAINING THAT WILL MAKE  
3 THEM INTO THE NEXT GENERATION OF EFFECTIVE SCIENTISTS.

4 SO THERE'S NO QUESTION IN MY MIND THAT THIS  
5 IS NOT AT A FUNDABLE LEVEL, NO MATTER HOW MUCH MONEY IS  
6 AVAILABLE.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE  
8 BOARD? DR. STEWARD.

9 DR. STEWARD: THIS IS ACTUALLY ONE THAT IS  
10 MORE SORT OF RELATED TO THE PRINCIPLE. I WASN'T  
11 HEARING JEFF ARGUE FOR A PARTICULAR CASE. I THOUGHT HE  
12 WAS ARGUING IN PRINCIPLE THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF  
13 GRANTS THAT WAS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING WAS APPROPRIATE  
14 AND IN TERMS OF THE QUALITY.

15 AND I GUESS I'M A LITTLE -- JUST SORT OF  
16 LOOKING FORWARD, I WONDER IF WE SHOULD -- THAT REALLY  
17 IS A STATEMENT OF ALMOST A RULE, AND I'M NOT SURE  
18 THAT'S THE RULE WE WANT TO MAKE RIGHT NOW, NO COMMENTS  
19 FROM THE PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ADDITIONAL  
21 COMMENTS? DR. PRICE.

22 DR. PRICE: IN LOOKING AT THIS PARTICULAR  
23 APPLICATION, I WANT TO SAY THAT I'M NOT AT ALL  
24 INFLUENCED BY THE NUMBER. I THINK THAT WE'RE OFF ON  
25 THIS MISPLACED CONCRETENESS THAT THESE NUMBERS ACTUALLY



1 MEAN ANYTHING.

2 FOR ONE THING, THE REVIEWERS HAD ONE THING IN  
3 MIND WHEN THEY WERE GIVING OUT NUMBERS, AND THEN WE'RE  
4 MAKING UP AD HOC WHAT WE THINK THEY HAD IN MIND. WE  
5 HAVE OUR OWN SCALE, SO I DON'T THINK NUMBERS MEAN  
6 ANYTHING.

7 WHAT I FIND TROUBLING ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR  
8 PROPOSAL IS THIS STATEMENT THAT THE PROGRAM IS IN THE  
9 PROCESS OF TRYING TO RECRUIT STEM CELL BIOLOGISTS.  
10 THAT'S A PRETTY -- HOW DO YOU HAVE A TRAINING PROGRAM  
11 IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY IF YOU DON'T HAVE THE PERSONNEL TO  
12 DO THE MENTORING? AND THE PROMISE OF RECRUITING IS  
13 JUST THAT. IT'S A PROMISE.

14 SO WHAT GUARANTEE IS IT THAT A YEAR FROM NOW  
15 THEY'RE ACTUALLY GOING TO HAVE THE PEOPLE TO IMPLEMENT  
16 THE PROGRAM?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S --

18 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE IS THE PROBLEM THAT I  
19 SAW ADDRESSED BY THAT.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS JOAN SAMUELSON  
21 SPEAKING.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: THAT THE REVIEWERS HAD MANY  
23 POSITIVE COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROGRAMS AND OBVIOUSLY FELT  
24 THAT IT WAS PROGRAM THAT SHOULD GO FORWARD CONDUCTING  
25 STEM CELL RESEARCH. THEY DIDN'T HAVE THAT EXPERTISE,

1 SUFFICIENT EXPERTISE NOW, BUT THEY WERE READY TO GO GET  
2 IT IF THEY HAD THE MONEY. AND THERE WERE OTHER  
3 COMPONENTS OF THE PROGRAM THAT WERE SO EXCELLENT, THAT  
4 THEY WANTED THAT TO MOVE AHEAD. IT'S A CHICKEN AND EGG  
5 THING.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S VERY -- JOAN, IT'S VERY  
7 CLEAR FROM THE WRITTEN TEXT THAT EVERYONE HAS BEFORE  
8 THEM, INCLUDING THE PUBLIC, THAT WHERE THE REVIEW  
9 COMMITTEE FELT THERE WAS INADEQUATE TRAINED STEM CELL  
10 SCIENTISTS ON STAFF AT THAT TIME, THEY DID NOT  
11 RECOMMEND FUNDING. THEY CALLED THAT OUT SPECIFICALLY  
12 AND ISOLATED THAT SEPARATELY. SO IT'S -- THE FACT IS  
13 THAT THEY'RE IDENTIFYING IN THE WRITE-UP THAT THEY HAVE  
14 THE ADEQUATE PERSONNEL TO DO THE TRAINING AND ARE  
15 FURTHERMORE RECRUITING SCIENTISTS TO ENHANCE THEIR  
16 PROGRAM. VERY DIFFERENT.

17 DR. PRICE: THAT'S DIFFERENT THAN I READ.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S A VERY DIFFERENT  
19 PROPOSITION. SO ON A COMPARATIVE BASIS, BY READING  
20 THEM, YOU CAN SEE THEY'RE CALLING IT OUT VERY CLEARLY  
21 IF THEY THINK THE STAFFING IS INADEQUATE AT THIS TIME.

22 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS?

23 DR. PIZZO: AT THE RISK OF MAKING ANOTHER  
24 COMMENT. BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH THIS IN THE  
25 FUTURE, IT JUST SEEMS TO ME THAT WE SHOULD TRY TO

1 REALLY FOCUS AND GET THIS RIGHT NOW. I ACTUALLY FIND  
2 IT HELPFUL TO HEAR COMMENTS FROM JEFF OR OTHERS WHO  
3 WERE AT THE MEETING ONLY BECAUSE THEY ADDED TEXTURE  
4 THAT WE DON'T HAVE, AND THAT'S PRECISELY THE PROBLEM.

5 SO EITHER WE HAVE THE FULL TEXTURE AND WE CAN  
6 MAKE WISE DECISIONS IN GRAY AREAS OR WE DON'T. BECAUSE  
7 WE DON'T AND WE'RE NOT GOING TO, I THINK DR. LEVEY'S  
8 RECOMMENDATION, ALTHOUGH I'D LIKE TO KNOW THAT IT TRULY  
9 IS ILLEGAL THAT WE CAN'T ADOPT THAT, IS THE MOST  
10 SENSIBLE BECAUSE WE'RE EITHER GOING TO SAY THAT THE  
11 RECOMMENDATIONS WE'RE HEARING FROM THE COMMITTEE ARE  
12 ONES THAT WE'RE GOING TO ACCEPT, OR WE'RE GOING TO GET  
13 INTO A VERY NUANCED DISCUSSION, AS WE ARE NOW, ABOUT  
14 HOW WE INTERPRET THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE INFORMATION  
15 THAT WE'RE RECEIVING. AND IT GETS EXTRAORDINARILY  
16 SUBJECTIVE.

17 THE REALITY IS NONE OF US WANT TO HOLD BACK  
18 PROGRAMS FROM DEVELOPING THAT ARE GOING TO BE IMPORTANT  
19 TO THIS MISSION. THAT'S KEY TO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO  
20 DO, AND ALL OF US WANT TO SPEND THE MONEY RESPONSIBLY.  
21 BUT WE CAN'T QUITE LINK THOSE TOGETHER WHEN WE DON'T  
22 HAVE THE INFORMATION, AND WE SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THAT.  
23 THIS PROCESS THAT WE'RE GOING THROUGH RIGHT NOW IS WHEN  
24 WE GET INTO THIS GRAY ONE AS COMPARED TO THE EXTREMES  
25 IS NOT AS FUNCTIONAL AS WE'RE MAKING IT SEEM TO BE.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THE IMPORTANT POINT  
2 IS WHEN THE INITIATIVE WAS WRITTEN, THE INTENT WAS THAT  
3 THE PATIENT ADVOCATES THAT SIT ON THAT COMMITTEE WOULD  
4 BRING BACK TO THE BOARD THE TEXTURE THAT JEFF HAS  
5 BROUGHT BACK. AND ALL OF THOSE COMMENTS ARE BEING MADE  
6 IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN SO THE PUBLIC HAS THE BENEFIT OF  
7 UNDERSTANDING THOSE COMMENTS IN REAL TIME JUST AS THE  
8 BOARD DOES. SO THEY'RE PROPERLY PART OF THE CONTEXT  
9 FOR THE DECISION THAT THE PUBLIC CAN SEE, THE MEDIA CAN  
10 SEE, AND THE BOARD CAN SEE AND INDIVIDUALLY MAKE  
11 DECISIONS ON.

12 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? PUBLIC COMMENTS?  
13 PROCEDURALLY WE'RE PREPARED FOR -- DO WE HAVE  
14 A MOTION ON THIS ITEM?

15 DR. PENHOET: SO MOVED.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET MOVES APPROVAL.  
17 IS THERE A SECOND?

18 DR. PRIETO: SECOND.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND FROM DR. PRIETO.

20 MELISSA KING, PROCEED WITH A ROLL CALL VOTE.

21 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

22 DR. BALTIMORE: NO.

23 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

24 DR. PRICE: YES.

25 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

1 DR. MEYER: YES.  
2 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
3 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
4 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
5 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.  
6 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
7 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
8 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
9 DR. MARKLAND: NO.  
10 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
11 DR. DIXON: NO.  
12 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
14 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
15 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
16 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
17 DR. LOVE: YES.  
18 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
19 DR. MURPHY: NO.  
20 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
21 DR. NOVA: YES.  
22 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
23 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
24 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
25 DR. PIZZO: NO.

1 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
2 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
3 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
4 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
5 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
6 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
7 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
8 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
9 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
10 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
11 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
12 DR. THAL: YES.  
13 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
14 MS. WILSON: NO.  
15 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
16 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
17 DR. CHIU: MR. CHAIR?  
18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO UNDERSTAND  
19 THE OUTCOME ON THAT MOTION. WHAT IS THE OUTCOME ON  
20 THAT MOTION?  
21 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION CARRIED.  
22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.  
23 DR. THAL: THESE MOTIONS DO REQUIRE  
24 TWO-THIRDS VOTE?  
25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO. NO. IF YOU AMEND THE

1 BYLAWS, IT REQUIRES A TWO-THIRDS VOTE, BUT FUNDING  
2 MOTIONS REQUIRE A MAJORITY VOTE.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: POINT OF INFORMATION. WHAT  
4 WAS THE VOTE?

5 DR. MAXON: SIXTEEN YESES AND EIGHT NOES --  
6 SEVEN NOES.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. CHIU.

8 DR. CHIU: THE NEXT APPLICATION IS T108 WITH  
9 A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 77. PROPOSES A COMPREHENSIVE  
10 TRAINING PROGRAM IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY FOR EIGHT  
11 POSTDOCTORAL, FOUR -- EIGHT PREDOCTORAL, FOUR  
12 POSTDOCTORAL, AND FOUR CLINICAL FELLOWS TO BE  
13 ADMINISTERED BY A STEM CELL RESEARCH CENTER AT THE  
14 APPLICANT INSTITUTION.

15 THE REVIEWERS IDENTIFIED FOUR MAIN STRENGTHS.  
16 FIRST, THAT THE PROGRAM WAS WELL ORGANIZED FOR  
17 PREDOCTORAL AND POSTDOCTORAL TRAINEES. THE INSTITUTION  
18 HAS A LARGE POOL OF HIGH QUALITY MENTORS AND A STRONG  
19 ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT, AND THE LEADERSHIP WAS VERY  
20 STRONG FROM THE DIRECTOR AND THE CO-DIRECTOR. THE  
21 PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND CO-DIRECTOR BOTH HAVE BROAD AND  
22 SIGNIFICANT EXPERIENCE IN INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP  
23 CAPACITIES, IN RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION, AND IN  
24 DIRECTING TRAINING PROGRAMS AT THE PRE AND POSTDOCTORAL  
25 LEVELS.

1 TWO WEAKNESSES WERE IDENTIFIED. OF THE ABOUT  
2 33 FACULTY MEMBERS THAT ARE NAMED AS POTENTIAL MENTORS,  
3 MOST ARE NOT CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN STEM CELL RESEARCH.  
4 AND THE SECOND WEAKNESS WAS THAT THERE WAS -- THE  
5 APPLICATION LACKED ADEQUATE DETAIL IN DESCRIBING THE  
6 TRAINING OF CLINICAL FELLOWS.

7 THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDED THE DELETION,  
8 THEREFORE, OF THE FOUR CLINICAL SLOTS FROM THIS PROGRAM  
9 WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF AWARDING THEM IN THE FUTURE IF  
10 THE PANEL'S CONCERNS WERE ADDRESSED. SO THE  
11 RECOMMENDATION IS HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED  
12 FOR FUNDING WITH THE REDUCTION OF THE CLINICAL TRAINEE  
13 SLOTS.

14 MR. CHAIR JUST LEFT THE ROOM.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN PENHOET: THE VICE CHAIR WILL  
16 TAKE HIS PLACE. DO WE HAVE A MOTION ON THIS?

17 MR. SHEEHY: I MOVE TO ADOPT.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN PENHOET: SECOND?

19 DR. POMEROY: SECOND.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN PENHOET: ANY DISCUSSION? CALL  
21 THE VOTE. I'M SORRY. ANY DISCUSSION FROM THE PUBLIC?

22 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

23 DR. BALTIMORE: NO.

24 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

25 DR. PRICE: YES.



1 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
2 DR. MEYER: YES.  
3 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
4 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
5 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
6 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
7 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
8 DR. MARKLAND: NO.  
9 MS. KING: JACK DIXON. BOB KLEIN.  
10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
11 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
12 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
13 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
14 DR. LOVE: YES.  
15 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
16 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
17 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
18 DR. NOVA: YES.  
19 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
20 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
21 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
22 DR. PIZZO: NO.  
23 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
24 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
25 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

1 DR. PRIETO: YES.

2 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

4 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

5 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

6 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

7 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

8 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

9 DR. THAL: YES.

10 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

11 MS. WILSON: NO.

12 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

13 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

14 MS. KING: JACK DIXON, COULD WE POSSIBLY GET

15 YOUR VOTE ON THIS ONE?

16 DR. DIXON: NO.

17 MR. HARRISON: MOTION CARRIES 17 TO 5.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

19 DR. CHIU: WE NOW MOVE TO THE TYPE 2

20 APPLICATIONS, AND THE FIRST IS T206 WITH A SCIENTIFIC

21 SCORE OF 90. THIS PROPOSAL FROM A PREMIERE RESEARCH

22 INSTITUTION PROPOSES TO TRAIN TEN POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS

23 IN AN INTEGRATED PROGRAM OF BASIC RESEARCH WITH MEDICAL

24 APPLICATIONS THROUGH COLLABORATIONS WITH A NEARBY

25 MEDICAL SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL.

1           THE REVIEWERS FOUND THE APPLICATION IS VERY  
2 STRONG IN ALL RESPECTS, INCLUDING THE OUTSTANDING  
3 FACULTY, MENTOR FACULTY, AND THE TRAINING ENVIRONMENT.  
4 THEY NOTE THAT THE CALIBER OF THE TRAINING FACULTY IS  
5 AMONG THE VERY BEST IN THE WORLD. THERE'S GREAT  
6 STRENGTH IN AREAS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE STEM CELL  
7 TRAINING PROGRAM, SUCH AS DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY,  
8 NEUROBIOLOGY, BLOOD CELL DEVELOPMENT, AND IMAGING.  
9 SECOND, THEY NOTED THE STRONG LEADERSHIP, THE DIRECTOR  
10 BEING EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED FOR THIS ROLE. THIRD,  
11 THEY NOTED THE WELL-DESCRIBED COURSEWORK WITH A  
12 DETAILED SYLLABUS ALREADY AVAILABLE FOR EACH COURSE  
13 BECAUSE THIS PROGRAM BUILDS ON THE EXISTING SCIENTIFIC  
14 STRENGTHS OF THE INSTITUTE COMPLEMENTED BY A  
15 WELL-ORGANIZED TRAINING PROGRAM IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY.  
16 FOURTH, THEY NOTED THE IMPRESSIVE APPLICANT POOL WITH  
17 STRONG EFFORT TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN MINORITY TRAINEES.  
18 AND FIFTH, THEY NOTED THE INTEGRATION OF BASIC RESEARCH  
19 WITH MEDICAL APPLICATIONS WAS HIGHLY LAUDED THROUGH THE  
20 COLLABORATIONS WITH NEARBY MEDICAL SCHOOLS AND  
21 HOSPITAL.

22           THE WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM ARE CONSIDERED  
23 MINOR, BUT ARE AS FOLLOWS: THEY DID NOT OFFER AN  
24 ORGANIZED LAB TRAINING COURSE IN THE APPLICATION, AND  
25 THEY ONLY OFFERED TO TRAIN POST DOCS, ALL TEN OF THEM,

1 EVEN THOUGH THEY COULD ALSO TRAIN THEIR OWN PREDOCTORAL  
2 FELLOWS AT THEIR INSTITUTION.

3 OVERALL THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT THIS IS A  
4 HIGHLY MERITORIOUS APPLICATION AND RECOMMENDED FOR FULL  
5 FUNDING.

6 MR. CHAIR.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION OR MOTION BY THE  
8 BOARD?

9 DR. WRIGHT: I MOVE APPROVAL.

10 DR. PENHOET: SECOND.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. WRIGHT MOVES APPROVAL;  
12 DR. PENHOET IS THE SECOND. DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD? I  
13 SEE NO DISCUSSION. FROM THE PUBLIC? MELISSA KING,  
14 WILL YOU CALL THE ROLL.

15 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

16 DR. PRICE: YES.

17 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

18 DR. MEYER: YES.

19 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

20 DR. BRYANT: YES.

21 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

22 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

24 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.

25 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.

1 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
2 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
3 DR. DIXON: YES.  
4 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
6 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
7 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
8 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
9 DR. LOVE: YES.  
10 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
11 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
13 DR. NOVA: YES.  
14 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
15 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
16 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
17 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
18 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
19 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
20 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
21 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
22 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
23 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
24 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
25 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

1 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
2 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
3 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
4 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
5 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
6 DR. THAL: YES.  
7 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
8 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION PASSES. NEXT ITEM.  
10 DR. CHIU: THIS T204 HAS AN ASTERISK, HAS A  
11 SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 85. THIS PROPOSAL FROM AN  
12 INSTITUTION WITH A STRONG FOCUS ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND  
13 USE OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS SEEKS TO TRAIN FIVE  
14 PREDOCTORAL AND FIVE POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS BY AUGMENTING  
15 AN EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAM IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY.  
16 THERE WERE NUMEROUS STRENGTHS POINTED OUT.  
17 PERHAPS THE STRONGEST ASPECT OF THIS  
18 APPLICATION IS THAT THE PRIMARY FOCUS WILL BE ON THE  
19 DERIVATION AND USE OF NEW HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL  
20 LINES TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED RESEARCH  
21 TECHNOLOGIES AND MEDICAL APPLICATIONS. SECOND, THE  
22 REVIEWERS THOUGHT THAT THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR IS AN  
23 EXCEPTIONALLY GIFTED LEADER, ADMINISTRATOR, MENTOR,  
24 TRAINER, AND RESEARCHER WITH MANY YEARS OF LEADERSHIP.  
25 THIRD, THE OUTSTANDING FACULTY WITH EXPERTISE IN STEM

1 CELL RESEARCH. THESE ARE WELL-KNOWN INVESTIGATORS WITH  
2 HIGH PRODUCTIVITY, AND THEIR WORK IS WELL SUPPORTED BY  
3 FEDERAL GRANTS. THEY ARE ALSO EXPERIENCED IN  
4 MENTORING. FOURTH, THE QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED  
5 TRAINING PROGRAM AND INTEGRATION OF ITS COMPONENTS IS  
6 VERY HIGH. TRAINING WILL BE COMPREHENSIVE FROM  
7 CLASSROOM TO LAB AND ACTIVE RESEARCH SETTINGS. AND  
8 FIFTH, THEY OFFER ALSO AN NIH-FUNDED HUMAN EMBRYONIC  
9 STEM CELL TRAINING COURSE AND AN NIH-FUNDED  
10 INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT.

11 THE MAIN WEAKNESS RESTS ON THE AVAILABILITY  
12 OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM. THIS INSTITUTION PLANS TO  
13 LAUNCH AN INDEPENDENT GRADUATE PROGRAM THIS YEAR, SO  
14 THERE IS NO HISTORY OF AN IN-HOUSE STANDING GRADUATE  
15 PROGRAM. THE APPLICANT POOL IS EXPECTED TO BE VERY  
16 GOOD GIVEN THEIR AFFILIATION WITH A MAJOR UNIVERSITY'S  
17 HIGHLY REGARDED GRADUATE PROGRAMS; BUT BECAUSE THIS NEW  
18 GRADUATE PROGRAM WILL STAND ON ITS OWN, THE REQUESTED  
19 PREDOCTORAL SLOTS SHOULD AWAIT DEMONSTRATION THAT THE  
20 NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM IS ADEQUATE FOR TRAINING IN STEM  
21 CELL BIOLOGY.

22 THE RECOMMENDATION, THEREFORE, FROM THE  
23 WORKING GROUP IS THAT IT'S HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND  
24 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. CIRM RECOMMENDS A REDUCTION  
25 OF THE PREDOCTORAL TRAINING SLOTS BECAUSE OF THE

1 CONCERNS JUST POINTED OUT AND ENCOURAGES THE APPLICANT  
2 TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION AT A LATER DATE FOR A  
3 SUPPLEMENT TO FUND THESE POSITIONS WHEN THE CONCERNS  
4 HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED AND THEIR PROGRAM CAN BE EVALUATED.  
5 AND IN ITS STEAD CIRM RECOMMENDED SIX POSTDOCTORAL  
6 POSITIONS INSTEAD OF THEIR REQUESTED FIVE.

7 MR. CHAIR.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A MOTION?

9 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: DISCUSSION FIRST.

10 MR. SHEEHY: FIRST I HAVE A QUESTION. SO  
11 CIRM RECOMMENDED THE REDUCTION, NOT THE WORKING GROUP,  
12 RIGHT?

13 DR. HALL: YES. SO WHAT HAPPENED WAS THE  
14 QUESTIONS WERE RAISED IN THE WORKING GROUP ABOUT THE  
15 STATUS OF THEIR GRADUATE PROGRAM, WHICH WAS NOT  
16 DESCRIBED. IT SAID THERE WAS GOING TO BE A NEW ONE.

17 THERE WAS ALSO A MISUNDERSTANDING WHICH IS AS  
18 FOLLOWS. THE INTENT OF THE RFA, WHICH IS, WE FELT,  
19 VERY CLEARLY STATED, WAS THAT IN ORDER TO HAVE A  
20 PREDOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAM, THE INSTITUTION ITSELF  
21 HAD TO HAVE A GRADUATE PROGRAM. AND SO THIS IS AN  
22 INSTITUTION WHOSE FACULTY PARTICIPATED IN THE GRADUATE  
23 PROGRAM OF A NEIGHBORING INSTITUTION. OKAY.

24 WE HAD A NUMBER OF OTHER APPLICATIONS THAT  
25 WERE IN THAT EXACT SAME POSITION. NONE OF THEM



1 APPLIED. THEY ALL UNDERSTOOD AND DID NOT APPLY FOR  
2 PREDOCTORAL SLOTS BECAUSE THE SLOTS GO TO THE  
3 INSTITUTION THAT HAS THE TRAINING PROGRAM.

4 SO THE APPLICATION WAS AMBIGUOUS ON THIS  
5 POINT. ON THE ONE HAND IT SAID, WELL, OUR FACULTY  
6 TRAINED GRADUATE STUDENTS FROM THIS OTHER INSTITUTION.  
7 ON THE OTHER IT SAYS WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A NEW  
8 GRADUATE TRAINING PROGRAM. SO WE WERE ASKED AT THE  
9 TIME WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM, AND WE  
10 SAID WE DON'T KNOW. AND WE ALSO DON'T KNOW WHETHER THE  
11 TRAINING PROGRAM IS, IN FACT, THEIRS OR BELONGS TO A  
12 NEIGHBORING INSTITUTION.

13 SO WE CALLED THEM AFTERWARDS AND ASKED, AND  
14 THEY SAID, IN FACT, THE TRAINING PROGRAM IS THAT OF A  
15 NEIGHBORING INSTITUTION. IT'S NOT OURS. AND WE'RE  
16 GOING TO START ONE LATER THIS YEAR. AND SO WE  
17 RECOMMENDED, THEN, AT A STAFF LEVEL, GIVEN THAT  
18 INFORMATION, THAT, IN FACT, WE NOT FUND THE PREDOCTORAL  
19 GRANTS -- THE PREDOCTORAL SLOTS. THEY HAD REQUESTED  
20 FIVE OF EACH.

21 AND THEY -- WE HAD AN E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE  
22 WITH THEM. THEY ACCEPTED THAT IF THAT WAS APPLIED  
23 ACROSS THE BOARD, THAT THAT SEEMED REASONABLE. THAT  
24 IS, IF THEY WERE BEING TREATED THE SAME AS OTHER  
25 INSTITUTIONS, THEY THOUGHT THAT WAS FAIR.

1           THEY DID POINT OUT, HOWEVER, THEY SUGGESTED  
2 ONE POSSIBILITY, THAT THE ICOC MIGHT GIVE THEM ALL THE  
3 SLOTS AS POSTDOCTORAL SLOTS THAT COULD BE LATER  
4 CONVERTED. THEY POINTED OUT IF WE GAVE THEM ONLY THE  
5 FIVE, THAT PUT THEM LOWER THAN A TYPE 3, AND WE THOUGHT  
6 THAT WAS A REASONABLE POINT. SO WE SUGGEST FOR YOUR  
7 CONSIDERATION THAT YOU FUND SIX POSTDOCTORAL SLOTS AND  
8 LET THEM, ONCE THE PROGRAM IS ESTABLISHED, COME IN  
9 AGAIN. WE HOPE IT WILL BE A STRONG PROGRAM. THEY CAN  
10 COME IN AGAIN AND APPLY FOR SUPPLEMENT IN THE  
11 PREDOCTORAL SLOTS. THAT'S THE INFORMATION WE HAVE.

12           MR. SHEEHY: WHAT WAS THE WORKING GROUP  
13 RECOMMENDATION? TO FUND TEN SLOTS, I THINK.

14           DR. HALL: THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDED THE  
15 TEN, BUT THEY HAD QUESTIONS. AND THEY ASKED US. THEY  
16 SAID WE HAD A DISCUSSION ABOUT IT. IT WAS NOT  
17 RESOLVED, AND THE ISSUE WAS THERE WAS LACK OF  
18 INFORMATION. WE COULD NOT ANSWER THE INFORMATION. IT  
19 WAS NOT CLEAR IF THEY HAD A TRAINING PROGRAM.

20           MR. SHEEHY: ZACH, WE HAVE A PROCESS PROBLEM.  
21 I MEAN THE WORKING GROUP IS SUPPOSED TO RECOMMEND THE  
22 FUNDING, NOT CIRM STAFF.

23           DR. HALL: WELL, YOU ARE FREE TO DO THAT.  
24 WHAT I'M TELLING YOU IS THAT WE GOT FURTHER  
25 INFORMATION. IT WASN'T POSSIBLE TO RECONVENE THE

1 WORKING GROUP. SO WE TOOK THAT INFORMATION AND GIVEN  
2 THE INTENT OF THE ORIGINAL GRANT AND THE FACT THAT  
3 OTHER INSTITUTIONS IN THE SAME POSITION SEEMED TO HAVE  
4 UNDERSTOOD THE ORIGINAL THING. IT'S UP TO YOU.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS A  
6 CLARIFICATION THAT THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION IS  
7 TO FUND TEN SLOTS, AND THE STAFF HAS A SEPARATE  
8 RECOMMENDATION THAT PERHAPS WE FUND SIX POSTDOCTORAL  
9 SLOTS AND --

10 DR. HALL: BASED ON THE INFORMATION THAT WE  
11 FOUND OUT AFTER THE WORKING GROUP MEETING; AND THAT IS,  
12 THE STATUS OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT THIS INSTITUTE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT  
14 THIS INSTITUTION IS CREATING ITS OWN DOCTORAL PROGRAM.  
15 AND THE FACULTY HERE HOLDS JOINT APPOINTMENTS WITH THE  
16 OTHER INSTITUTION?

17 DR. HALL: THEY HOLD JOINT APPOINTMENTS, AND  
18 THEY HAVE STUDENTS CURRENTLY THROUGH THAT INSTITUTION.  
19 SO WE HAVE A POSSIBILITY OF FUNDING THAT INSTITUTION.  
20 AND IN EVERY OTHER CASE IN WHICH -- THERE ARE SEVERAL  
21 OTHER CASES IN WHICH WE HAVE INSTITUTIONS WHOSE FACULTY  
22 ALSO HAVE JOINT APPOINTMENTS, AND THEY GET PREDOCTORAL  
23 STUDENTS THROUGH THE JOINT APPOINTMENTS.

24 OUR POINT WAS CLEAR, THAT THE FUNDING SHOULD  
25 BE -- FOR PREDOCTORAL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE TO THE

1 INSTITUTION TO HAVE CONTROL OF THE PROGRAM AND NOT TO  
2 FACULTY WHO MIGHT HAVE JOINT APPOINTEES. AS I SAY, ALL  
3 OTHER INSTITUTIONS SEEMED TO UNDERSTAND THAT. THERE  
4 WAS A MISUNDERSTANDING THERE. AND SO THAT'S THE STATUS  
5 OF THE INFORMATION, AND YOU MAY DO WITH IT AS YOU WISH.

6 MR. SHEEHY: OTHER INSTITUTIONS GOT DINGED  
7 FOR NOT HAVING VERY STRONG RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER  
8 INSTITUTIONS. SO BASICALLY WE'VE GOTTEN CHOPPED ON  
9 BOTH ENDS.

10 DR. HALL: THAT'S A SEPARATE ISSUE.

11 MR. SHEEHY: THIS HAD A VERY STRONG -- WELL,  
12 IN ANY INSTANCE, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT WE AWARD  
13 TEN -- THAT WE DO THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION; AND  
14 IT ASKED TO BE TEN POST DOCS, WE AWARD, WHICH IS I  
15 BELIEVE WHAT THE INSTITUTION REQUESTED.

16 DR. HALL: NO. THE INSTITUTION REQUESTED  
17 FIVE PRE DOCS AND FIVE POST DOCS.

18 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD RECOMMEND THE FIVE PRE  
19 DOCS AND THE FIVE POST DOCS. THAT WOULD BE MY MOTION.

20 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SECOND.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A MOTION AND A  
22 SECOND. DISCUSSION?

23 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A QUESTION TO DR.  
24 HALL. IF THE MONEY WERE TO BE GOING TO THE TRAINING  
25 INSTITUTION, HOW WOULD THE APPLICANT BE FUNDED TO GET

1 THEIR STAFF TRAINED? BECAUSE BOTH --

2 DR. HALL: THIS IS THE CASE WITH THE NUMBER,  
3 AND WE HAVE AT LEAST THREE AND MAYBE FOUR, I HAVEN'T  
4 COUNTED, SITUATIONS LIKE THAT IN WHICH WE HAVE A  
5 GRADUATE PROGRAM SITUATED IN ONE INSTITUTION, AND THEN  
6 THERE ARE SEVERAL OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE FACULTY  
7 WITH JOINT APPOINTEES. AND SINCE WE ARE ENCOURAGING --  
8 SO THE FACULTY IN THESE OTHER INSTITUTIONS DRAW  
9 TRAINEES TO WORK IN THEIR LABS. THE INTENT HERE WAS TO  
10 FUND PROGRAMS AND TO ENCOURAGE COURSES. SO THE IDEA  
11 WAS THEN FOR PREDOCTORAL, IN PARTICULAR, TO GIVE THE  
12 FUNDS TO THE INSTITUTION THAT CONTROLLED THE COURSES.  
13 THEY THEN ARE ABLE TO TAKE MORE APPLICANTS, AND THESE  
14 APPLICANTS ARE ABLE TO WORK IN THE LABS OF PEOPLE, ANY  
15 OF THE FACULTY IN THEIR PROGRAM, INCLUDING THOSE IN THE  
16 SO-CALLED SMALLER INSTITUTIONS.

17 AND SO THAT WAS THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF THE  
18 APPLICATION, AND THAT'S THE WAY WE HANDLED IT. AND SO  
19 IN ALL OF THESE CASES, INsofar AS THE FACULTY  
20 PARTICIPATED IN THE GRADUATE TRAINING PROGRAM IN  
21 ANOTHER INSTITUTION, THEY'RE ELIGIBLE TO GET STUDENTS  
22 FROM THAT PROGRAM FUNDED BY US WHO COME INTO THEIR  
23 LABS.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. DR. DIXON.

25 DR. DIXON: I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT ZACH'S

1 COMMENTS AND NOT SUPPORT THE MOTION ON THE BASIS OF THE  
2 FACT THAT I THINK THE ADDED DUE DILIGENCE REALLY POINTS  
3 UP A DEFICIENCY AT THE INSTITUTION. IN FACT, ONE MIGHT  
4 EVEN GO SO FAR AS TO IMPLY THAT THE ABSENCE OF A  
5 GRADUATE PROGRAM DOESN'T -- WOULD INDICATE THAT THEY'RE  
6 NOT AN ACCREDITED INSTITUTION FOR BASICALLY GRANTING A  
7 PH. D. , AND THEY'RE OBVIOUSLY COLLABORATING WITH A JOINT  
8 INSTITUTION TO TRAIN STUDENTS WHO ARE, IN FACT, GRANTED  
9 THEIR DEGREE THROUGH ANOTHER INSTITUTION.

10 SO I THINK ZACH'S DUE DILIGENCE HERE REALLY  
11 IS VERY USEFUL, SHOULD BE VERY USEFUL TO THE COMMITTEE,  
12 AND WE SHOULD CONSIDER THAT STRONGLY. SO I THINK NOT  
13 HAVING INFORMATION ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY THAT THAT  
14 INSTITUTION COULD EVEN GRANT A PH. D. IN A GRADUATE  
15 PROGRAM IS A SERIOUS CONSIDERATION.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET HAS A COMMENT,  
17 AND HE JUST HAS TAKEN THE MICROPHONE. AND THEN WE WILL  
18 GO DOWN THIS SIDE.

19 DR. PENHOET: THE CHOICE MAY COME DOWN TO  
20 WHETHER WE MAKE A GRANT TO THE TEN, FIVE AND FIVE,  
21 CONTINGENT ON THEIR ABILITY TO ACTUALLY PUT THE PROGRAM  
22 IN PLACE OR WHETHER, IN FACT, WE MAKE A GRANT FOR FIVE,  
23 SIX POST DOCS AND ASK THEM TO COME BACK A SECOND TIME.  
24 SO IT'S EITHER A CONTINGENT GRANT OR THE TEN. I DON'T  
25 THINK WE CAN OFFER THEM THE FULL GRANT FOR FIVE PRE

1 DOCS IF THEY DON'T END UP HAVING A PROGRAM. SO WE  
2 COULD DO IT CONTINGENT ON THAT, OR WE COULD ASK THEM TO  
3 COME BACK. IT SEEMS TO ME THOSE MUST BE THE TWO  
4 CHOICES WE FACE HERE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, DR. LEVEY.

6 DR. LEVEY: WELL, IF THE RULES WERE THAT THEY  
7 SHOULDN'T HAVE APPLIED, THEN WHY SHOULD WE FUND THEM?  
8 IF IT'S IN VIOLATION OF THE RULES, WE DO HAVE A LOT OF  
9 INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED HERE THAT DON'T HAVE GRADUATE  
10 PROGRAMS. WHATEVER THE RULES ARE THE RULES ARE. SO I  
11 DON'T SEE HOW WE CAN CONSIDER THEIR APPLICATION. IT  
12 SHOULD HAVE BEEN PUT IN WITH THE DEGREE GRANTING  
13 SCHOOL, OR THE DEGREE GRANTING SCHOOL SHOULD HAVE PUT  
14 IT IN AND THEY WORK SOMETHING OUT TO BETWEEN THE TWO OF  
15 THEM. JUST GOING IN, WHOEVER THEY ARE, BY THEMSELVES,  
16 I DON'T SEE HOW WE CAN APPROVE IT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT,  
18 DR. HALL, YOU'LL CLARIFY IT, IS THEY HAVE AN EXISTING  
19 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE DEGREE GRANTING SCHOOL  
20 WHERE THE DEGREE IS IN THE NAME OF THE GRANTING SCHOOL,  
21 BUT IT IS DONE BY JOINT FACULTY. DR. HALL, COULD YOU  
22 COMMENT?

23 DR. HALL: THAT'S AN ADDITIONAL COMPLICATION.  
24 SO THERE IS A -- THEIR FACULTY, THE RELEVANT FACULTY,  
25 ALL HAVE JOINT APPOINTMENTS AT ANOTHER INSTITUTION

1 WHERE THEY CAN TAKE STUDENTS. FOR ONE OF THE  
2 DEPARTMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY, THERE IS A JOINT  
3 NAME. AND OUR UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THEY CONTRIBUTE  
4 SOME AMOUNT OF MONEY TO THAT DEPARTMENT, BUT THE DEGREE  
5 IS AWARDED AND PRESUMABLY THE STANDARDS ENFORCED BY THE  
6 PARENT INSTITUTION.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THE DEGREE IS IN THE NAME  
8 OF BOTH INSTITUTIONS?

9 DR. HALL: NO. THE DEGREE THAT THEY RECEIVE,  
10 THE DEPARTMENT OR THE PROGRAM HAS THE NAME OF BOTH  
11 INSTITUTIONS ON IT, BUT THE DEGREE THEY RECEIVED HAS  
12 THE NAME OF THE PARENT INSTITUTION AND NOT THE OTHER.  
13 AND SO THAT'S THE SITUATION. THAT'S THE INFORMATION WE  
14 HAVE ABOUT IT.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MEYER.

16 DR. MEYER: I THINK THIS NEEDS A LITTLE MORE  
17 CLARIFICATION. YOU HAVE A SITUATION, MANY PARTS OF THE  
18 COUNTRY, WHERE WE HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE BASIC SCIENTISTS,  
19 THEY PARTICIPATE IN GRADUATE EDUCATION, THEY HAVE  
20 PEOPLE IN THEIR LAB, THE DEGREE IS GRANTED BY A LOCAL  
21 UNIVERSITY WHERE THEY HOLD A FACULTY APPOINTMENT. I  
22 DON'T THINK THAT THIS SHOULD DISQUALIFY ANYONE. YOU  
23 ARE GETTING PREDOCTORAL STUDENTS, YOU HAVE IN THE PAST,  
24 YOU ARE TRAINING PREDOCTORAL STUDENTS. THE FACT WHERE  
25 THE DEGREE COMES FROM THAT THESE PREDOCTORAL STUDENTS



1 ACTUALLY GET THAT ARE TRAINED AT THIS INSTITUTION  
2 SHOULDN'T BE RELEVANT. THE FACT IS THEY'RE GETTING A  
3 PH. D. , AND THEY'RE PH. D. STUDENTS. HOW GOOD IS THE  
4 INSTITUTION THAT YOU'RE CONSIDERING IS THE REAL  
5 QUESTION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. STEWARD.

7 DR. STEWARD: I'LL TRY TO MAKE THIS BRIEF.  
8 PH. D. PROGRAMS ARE COMPLICATED, AND THEY -- IT ISN'T  
9 THAT THIS INSTITUTION AND THE PEOPLE IN IT ARE  
10 UNQUALIFIED TO TRAIN PH. D. STUDENTS, BUT THEY MAY NOT  
11 BE QUALIFIED TO HAVE A DEGREE GRANTING PROGRAM. THAT'S  
12 REALLY THE ISSUE HERE. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A TRAINING  
13 PROGRAM, NOT A GRANT WHERE YOU MIGHT GET FUNDS TO  
14 SUPPORT A PREDOCTORAL FELLOW.

15 THE REAL ISSUE HERE IS THAT THEY MAY NOT, IN  
16 FACT, BECAUSE OF JUST SORT OF THE NORMAL ACADEMIC  
17 ISSUES, BE ABLE TO PUT TOGETHER A PH. D. GRANTING  
18 PROGRAM, A TRAINING PROGRAM, IF YOU WILL, IN ANY  
19 REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME. I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN  
20 CREATING A COUPLE OVER THE YEARS, AND I THINK THAT THE  
21 RECORD IS THREE YEARS. FAST. IT TAKES A LOT LONGER  
22 USUALLY. I THINK THAT IN THIS CASE REALLY THE ISSUE IS  
23 THAT THIS IS TRAINING. THEY DON'T HAVE A PH. D.  
24 GRANTING PROGRAM, AND, IN FACT, ESTABLISHING ONE MAY  
25 TAKE A LOT LONGER THAN THEY PROPOSE. IF THIS WAS TO A

1 PARENT INSTITUTION WITH A COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENT  
2 WHERE THEY ALREADY HAD A PH.D. GRANTING PROGRAM, THAT  
3 WOULD BE A TOTALLY DIFFERENT THING.

4 DR. MEYERS: LET'S JUST SAY, CORRECT ME IF  
5 I'M WRONG, BUT LET'S JUST SAY YOU'RE AT MASS GENERAL,  
6 AND YOU HAVE A GREAT STEM CELL PROGRAM AND THE DEGREE  
7 IS GRANTED BY HARVARD UNIVERSITY BECAUSE THE FACULTY  
8 MEMBER HAS AN APPOINTMENT AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY.  
9 OBVIOUSLY, I DON'T KNOW WHAT GROUPS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT  
10 HERE. BUT I CERTAINLY WOULDN'T -- THIS IS A GOOD  
11 ENVIRONMENT FOR TRAINING PEOPLE IN STEM CELL RESEARCH.  
12 THE NAME OF THE UNIVERSITY ON THEIR PH.D. SHOULDN'T  
13 MATTER. THE PEOPLE AT MASS GENERAL ARE PART OF A  
14 TRAINING PROGRAM EMANATING OUT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
15 AND I WOULD IMAGINE THAT THIS IS A COMPARABLE  
16 SITUATION.

17 DR. PIZZO: I'M NOT SO SURE ABOUT THAT. LAST  
18 I CHECKED --

19 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST MAKE A POINT HERE.  
20 THE INTENT -- THE DIFFERENCE HERE, I THINK, IS THAT IF  
21 WE WERE FUNDING PREDOCTORAL SLOTS AND SAYING YOU CAN  
22 SUPPORT SO MANY PEOPLE IN YOUR LAB, THAT'S FINE. AND  
23 IT'S A PERFECTLY GOOD WAY TO DO IT. YOU COULD HAVE A  
24 PREDOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAM, AND YOU HAVE PEOPLE APPLY  
25 OR YOU COULD GIVE IT TO INSTITUTIONS. BUT THE INTENT

1     HERE, AS I SAY, WAS TO GET THE INSTITUTIONS NOT JUST  
2     WHO HAD THE LABS WITH THE PEOPLE IN THEM, LIKE MASS  
3     GENERAL, BUT WHO RUN THE TRAINING COURSES AND WHO  
4     DESIGN THE CURRICULUM AND WHO PUT TOGETHER THE WHOLE  
5     PROGRAM.

6             AND PART OF THE RFA -- PART OF THE RFA HAS --  
7     THERE IS A PART OF THE RFA THAT STATES THAT YOU GET  
8     MONEY TO HELP OUT YOUR PROGRAM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE  
9     EXPENSES, FOR COURSEWORK, OR ALL THESE THINGS,  
10    DEPENDING ON THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS YOU GET. SO IT  
11    REALLY WAS DESIGNED TO GO TO THE PROGRAM.

12            NOW, THAT MAY HAVE BEEN A MISTAKE. AND I'M  
13    HAPPY IF YOU SAY NEXT TIME YOU SHOULD DO IT  
14    DIFFERENTLY. I CERTAINLY ACCEPT THAT. BUT WE DID IT  
15    THAT WAY, AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS UNDERSTOOD IT. AND I  
16    THINK MY CONCERN IS THAT IF WE MAKE AN EXCEPTION HERE,  
17    THEN IT MEANS THAT WE ARE TREATING DIFFERENT  
18    INSTITUTIONS IN A DIFFERENT WAY, AND THAT WAS THE  
19    INTENT.

20            LET ME JUST READ. IT SAYS IF TRAINING AT THE  
21    PREDOCTORAL LEVEL IS OFFERED, AND WE ACTUALLY DIDN'T  
22    SPECIFY THIS IN LEGAL DETAIL BECAUSE WE FELT WE WERE  
23    BEING CLEAR, THE INSTITUTION MUST HAVE RELEVANT  
24    GRADUATE PROGRAMS OF HIGH QUALITY FROM WHICH  
25    PREDOCTORAL TRAINEES MAY BE DRAWN.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME TRY AND SEE IF WE CAN  
2 ADVANCE THIS. DR. PENHOET MADE A SUGGESTION, JEFF.  
3 THE SUGGESTION HE MADE, I BELIEVE, WAS TO APPROVE FIVE  
4 POST DOCS AND FIVE PRE DOC CONDITIONAL UPON THEM HAVING  
5 THEIR DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN PLACE. IS THAT A FRIENDLY  
6 AMENDMENT YOU CAN ACCEPT?

7 MR. SHEEHY: I CAN ACCEPT THAT.

8 DR. PENHOET: I WAS JUST TRYING TO CLARIFY  
9 THE DISCUSSION.

10 DR. HALL: I WOULD LIKE NOT TO HAVE -- THAT  
11 WE HAVE, THEN, TO DECIDE WHEN THEIR GRADUATE PROGRAM IS  
12 ADEQUATE. IF YOU WANT TO DO THAT, THEY NEED TO GIVE US  
13 INFORMATION ON IT. WE DON'T HAVE ANY INFORMATION IN  
14 THE APPLICATION ABOUT IT. IF YOU WANT TO DO THAT, I  
15 PLEASE ASK YOU TO HAVE THEM COME IN AGAIN AND NOT PUT  
16 IT ON THE CIRM STAFF TO DETERMINE WHEN THEIR PROGRAM IS  
17 ESTABLISHED OR MATURE ENOUGH THAT WE CAN ACTUALLY GIVE  
18 THEM FUNDING FOR THE SLOTS. SO THAT WOULD BE MY  
19 SUGGESTION AND --

20 DR. DIXON: I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO TRY  
21 TO --

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS DR. DIXON.

23 DR. DIXON: -- SUPPORT ZACH'S SUGGESTION ONLY  
24 BECAUSE I THINK IF WE BASICALLY SAY WE'LL DO FIVE AND  
25 FIVE CONTINGENT UPON YOU ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM, I

1 THINK THE POINT WAS MADE BY SOMEONE THAT IT COULD TAKE  
2 SEVERAL YEARS TO GET THIS ESTABLISHED. IN FACT, WE  
3 COULD BE DOING THEM A DISSERVICE BY HAVING THAT ADDED  
4 OBLIGATION. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE RIGHT THING TO DO  
5 IS TO AWARD THE POSTDOCTORAL POSITIONS AND TELL THEM  
6 THAT WHEN THAT GRADUATE PROGRAM IS IN PLACE, WE'D  
7 CERTAINLY LIKE TO HEAR FROM THEM AGAIN.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

9 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I SECONDED THE MOTION,  
10 SO I THINK WE SHOULD GET TO A VOTE SOON. I'LL JUST SAY  
11 THAT THIS IS AN INSTITUTION, JUST LOOKING AT THE  
12 SUMMARY THAT WAS PROVIDED TO US, HIGHEST QUALITY WITH A  
13 TRACK RECORD OF SUCCESS. I THINK THESE ARE THE SORT OF  
14 COLLABORATIONS WE ON THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD LOOK INTO  
15 AND ENCOURAGE. SO I HAVE TO SAY TO MY COLLEAGUES THIS  
16 WAS A VERY EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE, UNDERSTANDING PH.D.  
17 PROGRAMS, THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS. I'M GRATEFUL FOR  
18 IT AND THANK YOU.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN I HAVE LEGAL COUNSEL'S  
20 CLARIFICATION HERE OF WHAT OUR OPTIONS ARE TO MAKE SURE  
21 WE'RE DOING THIS PROPERLY.

22 MR. HARRISON: THE ONE CONCERN I WANTED TO  
23 RAISE IS TO THE EXTENT THAT THIS IS AN APPLICATION THAT  
24 DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA THAT ARE SPECIFIED IN THE  
25 RFA, IT RAISES A POTENTIAL QUESTION ABOUT THE PROCESS

1 ITSELF. IN OTHER WORDS, IF WE ARE PERMITTING AN  
2 APPLICANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROCESS AND THE  
3 APPLICANT ISN'T ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDS PURSUANT TO THE RFA  
4 ITSELF, IT RAISES A QUESTION OF WHETHER THERE ARE OTHER  
5 ENTITIES OUT THERE THAT MIGHT FIND THEMSELVES IN A  
6 SIMILAR SITUATION AND BELIEVE THAT THEY WERE DENIED THE  
7 SAME OPPORTUNITY.

8 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: COUNSEL, I APPRECIATE  
9 THAT STATEMENT, AND IT'S AN IMPORTANT ONE. IF THAT'S  
10 THE -- IF YOU ARE OPINING THAT, IN FACT, THIS  
11 INSTITUTION -- I'M SORRY FOR INTERRUPTING -- BUT DOES  
12 NOT QUALIFY, AND FOR THOSE -- IS THAT THE OPINION OF  
13 COUNSEL?

14 MR. HARRISON: I DON'T HAVE THE RFA IN FRONT  
15 OF ME.

16 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU JUST SAID THAT IF  
17 THIS APPLICATION DIDN'T FIT THE CRITERIA, THAT'S WHAT  
18 YOU SAID, RIGHT?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF WE CAN FOCUS IT --

20 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: EITHER IT DOES OR  
21 DOESN'T.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID, LET'S TAKE A MOMENT  
23 HERE. FIRST OF ALL, DR. HALL, DID THE RFA SPECIFICALLY  
24 IDENTIFY WHETHER THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM HAD TO BE IN  
25 PLACE?

1 DR. HALL: IF TRAINING AT THE PREDOCTORAL  
2 LEVEL IS OFFERED, THE INSTITUTION MUST HAVE RELEVANT  
3 GRADUATE PROGRAMS OF HIGH QUALITY FROM WHICH  
4 PREDOCTORAL TRAINEES MAY BE DRAWN.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IS MY UNDERSTANDING OF  
6 YOUR POSITION, JAMES, THAT WE CAN'T APPROVE THE  
7 PREDOCTORAL SLOTS; BUT SINCE THEY HAVE POSTDOCTORAL  
8 SLOTS AND APPLIED FOR THOSE, WE COULD APPROVE  
9 POSTDOCTORAL SLOTS? IS THAT A CORRECT UNDERSTANDING?

10 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE THAT'S ACCURATE  
11 WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE RFA.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: AND IS IT CLEAR THAT THE  
13 PREDOCTORAL PROGRAM CAN'T BE DRAWN FROM A COLLABORATION  
14 WITH ANOTHER INSTITUTION? THAT'S NOT CLEAR ME IN THAT  
15 LANGUAGE.

16 DR. HALL: ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT EVERY OTHER  
17 INSTITUTION TO WHICH THIS APPLIED UNDERSTOOD IT AS  
18 BEING SO. AND I HAVE AN E-MAIL FROM THEM WHO SAID IF  
19 THIS IS THE WAY YOU APPLY IT TO THIS INSTITUTION, THEIR  
20 REPRESENTATIVE SAID IF THIS IS APPLIED EVENLY ACROSS  
21 THE WHOLE SYSTEM, THEN WE ACCEPT THAT.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS I STILL HAVE MY  
23 QUESTION, AND IT AFFECTS HOW I'M GOING TO VOTE.

24 DR. LEVEY: THE ANSWER IS THEY COULD, BUT  
25 THEY DIDN'T.

1 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I'M INTERESTED IN HOW  
2 ZACH UNDERSTOOD THE RFA AND BOB AND COUNSEL, NOT OTHER  
3 INSTITUTIONS. THAT HELPS FRAME THE ISSUE AND OUR  
4 UNDERSTANDING OF THE RFA, BUT ULTIMATELY IT'S STAFF.

5 DR. HALL: NO. I MEAN WE WROTE --

6 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: IT MAKES THE CALL.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S PROCEED WITH DR. HALL.  
8 THEN WE HAVE DR. PRICE AND WE HAVE DR. THAL.

9 DR. HALL: OUR INTENT WAS TO FUND  
10 INSTITUTIONS THAT THEMSELVES SPONSORED AND WERE  
11 RESPONSIBLE FOR THE QUALITY OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAMS.  
12 OKAY.

13 NEXT QUESTION. DID WE EXPRESS THAT INTENT  
14 CLEARLY? AND I OFFER EVIDENCE FOR THAT ONLY TO SAY  
15 THAT EVERYBODY SEEMED TO UNDERSTAND THAT EXCEPT IN THIS  
16 ONE CASE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YES,  
18 DR. PRICE.

19 DR. PRICE: POINT OF INFORMATION. IN THAT  
20 PROPOSAL, DO THEY INTEND TO DRAW THE PREDOCTORAL  
21 FELLOWS FROM THIS GRADUATE PROGRAM, THE INDEPENDENT ONE  
22 THAT THEY'RE ABOUT TO ESTABLISH?

23 DR. HALL: THE PROPOSAL WAS A BIT VAGUE ABOUT  
24 WHERE THE STUDENTS WERE COMING FROM, WHICH IS PART OF  
25 THE DIFFICULTY BECAUSE ON THE ONE HAND THEY SAID THEY



1 GOT STUDENTS FROM NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS, YES. NO.  
2 2, THERE WAS CITED THIS DEPARTMENT WITH A NAME, DOUBLE  
3 NAME; AND NO. 3, THEY SAID THEY WERE STARTING A  
4 PROGRAM.

5 DR. PRICE: AS AMBIGUOUS AS THAT IS, BECAUSE  
6 AFTER ALL, IF THEY'RE GOING TO DRAW FROM THIS NEW  
7 PROGRAM THEY HAVE, THE RFA SAYS IT HAS TO BE A HIGH  
8 QUALITY PROGRAM. HOW DO WE KNOW IF WE'RE GIVING THEM  
9 MONEY FOR A PROGRAM THAT DOESN'T EXIST?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S -- DR. LEON THAL.

11 DR. THAL: I THINK THE STATEMENT IN THE RFA  
12 WAS VERY CLEAR. WE JUST HAD IT READ TO US. I THINK  
13 EVERYONE SITTING AROUND THIS TABLE INTERPRETS IT TO  
14 MEAN THAT YOU HAVE TO HAVE A GRADUATE PROGRAM. IF YOU  
15 DON'T HAVE A GRADUATE PROGRAM, YOU CAN'T GIVE THEM  
16 GRADUATE SLOTS, PERIOD.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. BRYANT.

18 DR. BRYANT: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY THAT IF  
19 THIS IS -- GIVEN THE HIGH RANKING OF THIS PROPOSAL  
20 OTHERWISE, THAT YOU COULD DO THE SAME AS YOU DID WITH  
21 ONE OF THE OTHER -- AS WE DID WITH ONE OF THE OTHER  
22 PROPOSALS; AND THAT IS, SUGGEST THAT THEY COME BACK AND  
23 REQUEST A SUPPLEMENT WHEN THEY HAVE THE UNDERLYING  
24 INFRASTRUCTURE IN PLACE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. JEFF SHEEHY, WITH THE

1 INFORMATION YOU NOW HAVE AVAILABLE, DO YOU HAVE ANY  
2 INTEREST IN CHANGING THE MOTION, OR WOULD YOU LIKE TO  
3 GO FORWARD WITH THIS MOTION?

4 MR. SHEEHY: I'D BE HAPPY TO CHANGE THE  
5 MOTION. MY DIFFICULTY IS I'M VERY UNHAPPY -- I DON'T  
6 THINK IT'S LEGAL FOR ME TO GO FORWARD WITH THE  
7 RECOMMENDATION FROM CIRM STAFF WHEN THE RECOMMENDATION  
8 IS SUPPOSED TO COME FROM THE WORKING GROUP. IF SOMEONE  
9 ELSE ON THIS COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A  
10 RECOMMENDATION THAT IS NOT THE RECOMMENDATION OF CIRM  
11 STAFF, BECAUSE THE STATUTE CLEARLY SAYS THAT THE  
12 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING COME FROM THE WORKING  
13 GROUP, NOT FROM CIRM STAFF.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. FOR CLARITY, THE  
15 WORKING GROUP, BASED ON ITS INFORMATION, RECOMMENDED  
16 FIVE FOR EACH OF THE CATEGORIES. WOULD SOMEONE LIKE TO  
17 MAKE -- YOU'RE WITHDRAWING YOUR MOTION?

18 MR. SHEEHY: YEAH.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HE'S WITHDRAWING HIS MOTION.  
20 IS THE SECOND WITHDRAWING THE MOTION?

21 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SUBSTITUTE MOTION  
23 THAT HAS AN INDEPENDENTLY DERIVED, SINCE WE NOW KNOW  
24 WHAT THE RECOMMENDATION WAS FROM THE WORKING GROUP AND  
25 THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE

1 ANOTHER MOTION?

2 DR. PENHOET: I MOVE THAT WE FUND THIS GRANT  
3 AT THE LEVEL OF SIX POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS.

4 MR. GOLDBERG: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED AND SECONDED.  
6 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?

7 DR. POMEROY: CAN I JUST ASK A QUESTION OF  
8 DR. PENHOET. THIS APPLICATION DID GET A VERY HIGH  
9 SCORE ON THE BASIS OF THE SCIENTIFIC QUALITY. HOW DID  
10 YOU PICK SIX AS OPPOSED TO SEVEN OR EIGHT POSTDOCTORAL  
11 SLOTS? BECAUSE I MEAN I'M REALLY INTERESTED IN THE  
12 REASONING HERE BECAUSE SOME OF THE SMALLER TYPE 3  
13 GRANTS HAVE SIX POST-DOC SLOTS. SO I WONDER IF YOU  
14 MIGHT TELL ME YOUR THOUGHTS.

15 DR. PENHOET: WELL, THEY ASKED FOR FIVE AND  
16 FIVE. PRESUMABLY THEY HAD A RATIONALE FOR THEIR  
17 ABILITY TO TRAIN FIVE POST DOCS. I THINK WE ALL  
18 RECOGNIZE A VERY HIGH QUALITY AND DECIDED THAT, GIVEN  
19 THE FACT THEY'RE NOT TAKING ON THE BURDEN OF TRAINING  
20 FIVE PRE DOCS, THEY CAN PROBABLY TRAIN AT LEAST ONE  
21 MORE POST DOC.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WITH THAT IN MIND, IT SAYS  
23 THE FACULTY OF 26 WELL-KNOWN INVESTIGATORS. WOULD YOU  
24 ACCEPT A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO MOVE IT TO EIGHT POST  
25 DOCS INSTEAD OF SIX? THAT'S A QUESTION.

1 DR. PENHOET: PROBABLY NOT, NO.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GREAT.

3 DR. LEVEY: COULD I ASK OUR DISTINGUISHED  
4 VICE CHAIR BECAUSE THIS IS CONFUSING. EITHER THEY DID  
5 OR THEY DIDN'T GO ALONG WITH WHAT THE RFA SAID. I'M  
6 VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THAT. I WOULD SUGGEST, IF YOU  
7 WOULD CONSIDER IT, ED, CHANGING THIS TO SAYING WE'RE  
8 GOING TO TABLE THE DECISION ON THIS AND WRITE THEM AN  
9 EXPLANATORY LETTER AND TELL THEM WHAT IS NECESSARY AND  
10 STRONGLY ENCOURAGE THEM TO SUBMIT SOMETHING IN THE NEXT  
11 ROUND THAT WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH WHAT THE RFA WAS.  
12 THAT'S WHAT I'M CONCERNED ABOUT. WHY SHOULD THEY DO  
13 WHAT OTHER PEOPLE MAYBE COULDN'T HAVE DONE?

14 DR. PENHOET: THE RATIONALE IS IT WAS A  
15 TWO-PART APPLICATION, AND IT'S AN EXTRAORDINARILY  
16 STRONG GROUP. AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE HAVE AN  
17 OBLIGATION TO MOVE FORWARD WITH TRAINING PROGRAMS OF  
18 EXCELLENCE. AND ALTHOUGH THIS ONE AS A WHOLE, ONE  
19 PIECE OF IT DIDN'T MEET THE QUALIFICATIONS, THE OTHER  
20 ONE MORE THAN MET THE QUALIFICATIONS, EXTREMELY HIGHLY  
21 REGARDED BY EVERYONE WHO'S LOOKED AT THIS SO FAR. SO  
22 THE RATIONALE WAS NOT TO PENALIZE THEM FOR  
23 MISINTERPRETING ONE PART OF THEIR APPLICATION, BUT  
24 REMOVING THE WHOLE APPLICATION. BUT I WHOLEHEARTEDLY  
25 SUPPORT THE NOTION THAT WE SHOULD NOT FUND ANY OF THE

1 PREDOCTORAL POSITIONS ON A CONTINGENCY BASIS, BUT  
2 SIMPLY FUND THOSE AND ASK THEM TO COME BACK, WRITE A  
3 SEPARATE APPLICATION FOR THE PREDOCTORAL PROGRAM.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ADDITIONAL  
5 COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD? ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE  
6 PUBLIC? MELISSA KING, WILL YOU CALL THE ROLL.

7 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

8 DR. BALTIMORE: WHAT ARE WE VOTING ON?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE VOTING ON SIX.

10 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

11 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

12 DR. PRICE: YES.

13 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

14 DR. MEYER: YES.

15 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

16 DR. BRYANT: YES.

17 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

18 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

19 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

20 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.

21 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.

22 DR. MARKLAND: YES.

23 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.

24 DR. DIXON: YES.

25 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
2 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
3 DR. LEVEY: NO.  
4 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
5 DR. LOVE: YES.  
6 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
7 DR. NOVA: YES.  
8 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
9 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
10 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
11 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
12 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
13 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
14 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
15 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
16 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
17 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
18 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
19 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
20 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
21 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
22 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
23 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
24 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
25 DR. THAL: YES.

1 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
2 MS. WILSON: YES.  
3 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
4 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, DR. CHIU.  
6 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. THE NEXT --  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, DR. PIZZO.  
8 DR. PIZZO: BEFORE WE GET OFF THIS TOPIC, IS  
9 THERE A REASON WHY WE COULD NOT HAVE THE CHAIR OF THE  
10 REVIEW GROUP COME TO SESSIONS LIKE THIS WHEN WE'RE  
11 REVIEWING GRANTS IN THE FUTURE?  
12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO  
13 THAT, BUT WE'D BE HAPPY TO --  
14 DR. PIZZO: I WOULD STRONGLY RECOMMEND THAT  
15 IF THERE'S NOT A LEGAL REASON WHY WE CAN'T DO THAT OR  
16 IT DOESN'T VIOLATE ANY OF THE PROP 71 RULES, THAT WE  
17 WOULD BENEFIT FROM HAVING CONTEXTUAL INPUT FROM THAT  
18 PERSON.  
19 DR. HALL: IF HE WERE WILLING TO DO THAT, I'D  
20 BE PLEASED TO ASK HIM. IT IS -- THE PEOPLE ON THIS  
21 GROUP, BECAUSE THEY ARE ALL VERY EMINENT AND THE CHAIR  
22 PREEMINENT AMONG THEM, ARE VERY, VERY DISTINGUISHED  
23 PEOPLE WITH LOTS AND LOTS TO DO. AND IF HE IS WILLING  
24 TO GIVE THE TIME, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO HAVE HIM DO IT.  
25 I SUGGEST THAT WE NOT MAKE IT A REQUIREMENT BECAUSE IT

1 MEANS EXTRA TRIPS OUT TO THE WEST COAST IN THIS CASE.

2 DR. PIZZO: I APPRECIATE THAT, BUT I WOULD  
3 ARGUE, ZACH, PARTICULARLY IN THE FORMATIVE STAGES WHEN  
4 WE'RE TRYING TO UNDERSTAND HOW TO MAKE THIS PROCESS  
5 WORK SMOOTHLY, BECAUSE MANY OF THE QUESTIONS THAT WE'VE  
6 RAISED TODAY ARE SIMPLY A FUNCTION OF NOT HAVING ALL  
7 THE INFORMATION. AND I JUST THINK WE WOULD BENEFIT  
8 FROM THAT.

9 DR. HALL: I AGREE IT WOULD BE BETTER IF HE  
10 WERE HERE, AND I CERTAINLY WILL EXTEND THAT INVITATION.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

12 DR. CHIU: APPLICATION T205, SCIENTIFIC SCORE  
13 OF 81. THIS PROPOSAL FROM AN INSTITUTION THAT HAS  
14 BUILT A WELL-KNOWN RESEARCH PROGRAM IN STEM CELL  
15 BIOLOGY WITH EXPERTISE IN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS  
16 SEEKS TO TRAIN SEVEN POSTDOCTORAL AND THREE CLINICAL  
17 FELLOWS IN BASIC SCIENCE, CLINICAL, AND ETHICAL ASPECTS  
18 OF STEM CELLS.

19 THE STRENGTHS WERE RECOGNIZED BY THE  
20 REVIEWERS AS, ONE, CLINICAL SCIENCE STRENGTH OF THIS  
21 INSTITUTION PARTICULARLY IN THE APPLICATION OF STEM  
22 CELL RESEARCH TO PEDIATRIC DISEASE. THIS IS A UNIQUE  
23 FOCUSED APPLICATION TO DISORDERS SUCH AS DIABETES,  
24 CYSTIC FIBROSIS, AND CONGENITAL BIRTH DEFECTS. TWO,  
25 HAS A STRONG PROGRAM DIRECTOR, A WELL-RESPECTED



1 CLINICAL INVESTIGATOR, AND AN EXPERIENCED ADMINISTRATOR  
2 WHOSE RESEARCH FOCUSES ON CORD BLOOD CELLS. THIRD IS  
3 EXCELLENT FACILITIES OFFERED. THEY OFFER CORE  
4 FACILITIES WITH HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH AS  
5 WELL AS STEM CELL EXPERIMENTS IN MICE. THERE IS A GOOD  
6 MIXTURE OF BASIC RESEARCH AND CLINICAL APPLICATION, AND  
7 THE REVIEWERS NOTED THAT MANY MENTORS IN  
8 STEM-CELL-RELATED AREAS, ALTHOUGH THEY ALSO FOUND MANY  
9 JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBERS WITH ONLY AVERAGE TO GOOD  
10 PUBLICATION RECORDS. AND, FINALLY, PAST TRAINEES OF  
11 THIS INSTITUTION DEMONSTRATE A DIVERSE ETHNIC  
12 DISTRIBUTION.

13 THE MAIN WEAKNESS IS THE SOMEWHAT  
14 UNIMPRESSIVE PUBLICATION RECORD OF THE LARGELY JUNIOR  
15 TRAINING FACULTY.

16 THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT OVERALL IT'S  
17 HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AS  
18 PROPOSED.

19 MR. CHAIR.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE DISCUSSION OR A  
21 MOTION?

22 DR. BALTIMORE: MOVE.

23 MS. WILSON: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WAS MOVED FROM DR.

25 BALTIMORE, SECOND FROM GAYLE WILSON. FURTHER

1 DISCUSSION? PUBLIC DISCUSSION? CALL THE ROLL.  
2 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.  
3 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.  
4 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.  
5 DR. PRICE: YES.  
6 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
7 DR. MEYER: YES.  
8 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
9 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
10 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN. MICHAEL  
11 GOLDBERG.  
12 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
13 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
14 DR. DIXON: YES.  
15 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
17 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY. TED LOVE.  
18 DR. LOVE: YES.  
19 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
20 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
21 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
22 DR. NOVA: YES.  
23 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
24 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
25 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

1 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
2 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
3 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
4 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
5 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
6 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
7 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
8 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
9 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
10 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
11 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
13 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
14 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
15 DR. THAL: YES.  
16 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
17 MS. WILSON: YES.  
18 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
19 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
20 MS. KING: DR. FRIEDMAN.  
21 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. MOTION IS  
23 PASSED.  
24 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. NEXT IS APPLICATION  
25 T203 WITH A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 80 PROPOSES TO TRAIN

1 SEVEN POSTDOCTORAL AND THREE CLINICAL TRAINEES IN THREE  
2 PRIMARY AREAS, INCLUDING CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE,  
3 NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE, AND HEMATOPOETIC STEM CELLS.

4 THE STRENGTHS AS IDENTIFIED BY THE REVIEWERS  
5 WERE AN INCREDIBLY GIFTED AND PRODUCTIVE TEAM OF  
6 INVESTIGATORS. THEY WERE IMPRESSIVE AND EXTREMELY  
7 COMPLEMENTARY IN SKILL AND AREAS OF EXPERTISE. THIS  
8 WOULD EXPOSE TRAINEES TO A VARIETY OF POWERFUL  
9 APPROACHES IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. SECOND STRENGTH  
10 IS THE INSTITUTION'S HISTORY OF SUCCESSFULLY TRAINING  
11 POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS. THIRD, THE CLINICAL FOCUS ADDS  
12 AN IMPORTANT TRANSLATIONAL ELEMENT. FOURTH, THE  
13 REVIEWERS NOTED THAT THE LEADERSHIP IS VERY STRONG.  
14 THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR HAS IMPRESSIVE QUALIFICATIONS, HAS  
15 PUBLISHED HIGH QUALITY WORK. THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR  
16 ALSO HAS OUTSTANDING SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE AND IS AN  
17 EXPERIENCED ADMINISTRATOR. AND FINALLY, THE TRAINING  
18 ENVIRONMENT IS EXCELLENT AND INCLUDES AVAILABLE SPACE  
19 THAT DOES NOT HAVE NIH FUNDING FOR USE IN HUMAN  
20 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES. DID I MAKE THAT CLEAR?

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. CHIU, IF I CAN ASK YOU  
22 THE QUESTION. THE TRAINING, THE WEAKNESS WAS THAT THEY  
23 HAVE TREMENDOUS EXPERTISE, BUT THEIR CURRICULUM ITSELF  
24 WASN'T AS WELL LAID OUT.

25 DR. CHIU: I WILL COME TO THE WEAKNESS, AND

1 YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. THERE WERE TWO WEAKNESSES.  
2 ONE IS THAT THE APPLICATION LACKS SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION  
3 ON PROPOSED TRAINING AND COURSEWORK. THEY DID NOT  
4 PRESENT CLEARLY WHAT STEM CELL RESEARCH IS ONGOING, NOR  
5 WHAT SPECIFIC TRAINING IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY WILL BE  
6 OFFERED. AND THE SECOND IS THAT ONLY TWO OF THE  
7 MENTORS ARE CURRENTLY WORKING DIRECTLY WITH STEM CELLS  
8 OR PROGENITORS. THOSE WERE THE TWO WEAKNESSES.

9 THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION IS THAT IS IT HIGHLY  
10 MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AS PROPOSED.

11 MR. CHAIR.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION OR A MOTION?

13 DR. POMEROY: I GUESS IF MAYBE DR. CHIU COULD  
14 CLARIFY. WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A TRAINING GRANT, TO  
15 SAY THE TRAINING WASN'T DESCRIBED, WAS IT PARTIALLY  
16 DESCRIBED?

17 DR. CHIU: WELL, APPARENTLY WITH INSUFFICIENT  
18 DETAIL FOR THE REVIEWERS.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE ANSWER IS IT WAS  
20 DESCRIBED, BUT NOT IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS SOME OF THE  
21 OTHER APPLICATIONS.

22 DR. CHIU: SOME OF THEM PROVIDED EVEN  
23 CURRICULA AND COURSEWORK, ETC. THIS WAS NOT PRESENT.

24 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JUST A COMMENT. AND AT  
25 THE RISK OF MAKING A COMMENT FROM SOMEONE WHO WAS ON

1 THIS GROUP, I OBSERVED AND LEARNED OF TWO CONTINUA  
2 WHILE WE WERE IN THESE DISCUSSIONS FOR TWO DAYS. ONE  
3 WE'VE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT, AND THAT IS DO WE -- THE  
4 STATEMENT WAS MADE MORE THAN ONCE. LET'S FUND THE  
5 BEST. LET'S FUND THE BEST. AND THE OTHER APPROACH WAS  
6 TO BUILD PROGRAMS, TO HELP SUPPORT PROGRAMS WHO PERHAPS  
7 WERE NOT FULLY -- WERE NOT COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS AT  
8 THIS POINT, THAT WERE MISSING A FEW PIECES, BUT THAT WE  
9 PROVIDE THAT FUNDING AND GIVE THEM A LEG UP.

10 THE OTHER CONTINUUM THAT WE HEARD ABOUT WAS  
11 DO WE BELIEVE IN THE FACULTY THAT WE SEE THAT ARE SO  
12 SUPERB, AND WE'RE GOING TO BET THAT THESE FACULTY WILL  
13 PUT THE OTHER PIECES IN PLACE THAT ARE MISSING, OR DO  
14 WE LOOK FOR PROGRAMMATIC DETAILS THAT ARE VERY WELL  
15 DELINEATED AND DESCRIBED AND ASSUME THAT THEY'LL GET  
16 THE FACULTY PIECES?

17 SO THIS PROPOSAL TO ME REPRESENTS ONE THAT'S  
18 DEEP IN FACULTY, BUT A LITTLE BIT LACKING IN THE  
19 DELINEATION OF HOW THAT'S GOING TO BE EXECUTED.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. BALTIMORE.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: I CAN'T TELL FROM THE  
22 WRITE-UP WHAT KIND OF CLINICAL FACILITIES THIS  
23 ORGANIZATION HAS. THEY'RE PROPOSING TO TRAIN PEOPLE IN  
24 CLINICAL -- I GUESS IN THE CLINICAL USE OF STEM CELLS,  
25 BUT IS THIS A CLINICAL ORGANIZATION?

1 DR. HALL: NO. THEY HAVE AN AFFILIATION WITH  
2 A HOSPITAL, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, BUT IT IS ITSELF NOT A  
3 CLINICAL ORGANIZATION. THEY ALSO -- ALL OF THEIR  
4 FACULTY ARE MEMBERS OF ANOTHER INSTITUTION, OF A LARGER  
5 INSTITUTION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, THEY ARE  
7 COLLABORATING WITH AN AFFILIATED RESEARCH HOSPITAL. IS  
8 THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

9 DR. HALL: YES. THEY ARE COLLABORATING WITH  
10 A NEIGHBORING HOSPITAL, A RESEARCH INSTITUTION AT A  
11 NEIGHBORING HOSPITAL, SO THAT IS WHERE THE CLINICAL  
12 PART COMES THROUGH. I CAN LOOK FURTHER IN THIS IF YOU  
13 WANT AS WE TALK, BUT AT ANY RATE, I THINK THAT  
14 INFORMATION, I THINK, IS CORRECT.

15 DR. BALTIMORE: IS THIS SIMILAR TO THE  
16 PROBLEM THAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT PREVIOUSLY OF THE  
17 INSTITUTION NOT BEING ABLE TO PROVIDE A COMPREHENSIVE  
18 TRAINING IN CLINICAL MEDICINE BECAUSE IT DOESN'T DO  
19 CLINICAL MEDICINE?

20 DR. HALL: WELL, IT COULD. THE CLINICAL  
21 TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE NOT GENERALLY PARTS, AT LEAST IN  
22 THE RESEARCH FUNCTION, PARTS OF ORGANIZED TRAINING  
23 PROGRAMS IN THE SAME WAY THAT PREDOCTORAL TRAINING  
24 PROGRAMS ARE. AND SO IN THAT SENSE IT'S A LITTLE BIT  
25 DIFFERENT. I'M SORRY I DON'T REMEMBER THIS. LET ME --

1 I DO SEEM TO REMEMBER THAT THEY SAID SOMETHING ABOUT  
2 THAT. IF I CAN FIND IT, I'LL BE HAPPY TO READ IT FOR  
3 YOU. WHY DON'T YOU LET THE DISCUSSION GO ON FOR A  
4 MOMENT.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO COME BACK TO  
6 THIS ITEM. DR. POMEROY.

7 DR. POMEROY: BUT I PRESUME THAT THIS IS TO  
8 TRAIN CLINICAL FELLOWS IN STEM CELL RESEARCH, NOT TO  
9 TRAIN CLINICAL FELLOWS IN THE CLINICAL ASPECTS OF CARE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT.  
11 THAT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT. AND IN THIS PARTICULAR  
12 CASE, IS IT CORRECT TO STATE THERE'S AN OPEN STATED  
13 COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THESE INSTITUTIONS, AND  
14 THAT, IN FACT, WAS, DR. HALL, PERMITTED WITHIN THE  
15 TERMS OF THE RFA. AND, IN FACT, OTHER INSTITUTIONS DID  
16 JOINT APPLICATIONS?

17 DR. HALL: YES. SO I THINK THEIR INTENTION  
18 IS, AND I'M SORRY, THEIR INTENTION IS TO TAKE ADVANTAGE  
19 OF THEIR COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER  
20 INSTITUTIONS TO BRING THESE PEOPLE INTO THE LABS,  
21 CLINICAL FELLOWS INTO THEIR LABS, AND I THINK THEY'RE  
22 MAKING A COMMITMENT TO DOING THAT. BUT THEY THEMSELVES  
23 DO NOT HAVE A PATIENT-BASED TRAINING PROGRAM, AND I  
24 THINK THAT'S -- THIS WAS ONE --

25 DR. BALTIMORE: ALL RIGHT. ZACH, BUT IN



1 OTHER CASES WHERE WE HAVE APPROVED CLINICAL SLOTS, WERE  
2 WE APPROVING -- I SHOULD ASK IT NOW -- WERE WE  
3 APPROVING THE TRAINING OF PEOPLE IN THE CLINICAL USE OF  
4 STEM CELLS, OR WERE WE APPROVING THE TRAINING OF  
5 CLINICAL PEOPLE IN BASIC RESEARCH OR IN RESEARCH ON  
6 STEM CELLS?

7 DR. HALL: SO THE CLINICAL SLOTS ARE  
8 SPECIFICALLY FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE CLINICAL TRAINEES AND  
9 WHO TAKE FELLOWSHIP, AND THAT CAN BE EITHER FELLOWSHIPS  
10 THAT CAN GO TO A BASIC SCIENCE LABORATORY OR THEY CAN  
11 GO TO -- BE INVOLVED IN TRAINING FOR CLINICAL TRIALS,  
12 LET'S SAY.

13 THE WORKING GROUP COMMENTED ON THE PAUCITY OF  
14 THE LATTER EFFORT. AND THE --

15 DR. BALTIMORE: SO THIS IS NO DIFFERENT THAN  
16 MANY OTHER CLINICAL SLOTS THAT WE HAVE AWARDED?

17 DR. HALL: I DON'T THINK SO. IT'S VERY  
18 VARIABLE AND DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS HAVE DIFFERENT  
19 CAPABILITIES. IN SOME CASES THERE WERE RELATIONSHIPS  
20 WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THOSE WERE EXPLORED.  
21 IN ONE CASE THAT WE DISCUSSED ALREADY, THERE WAS A CASE  
22 IN WHICH WE HAVE AN INSTITUTION THAT FORMED A  
23 RELATIONSHIP WITH A NEARBY HOSPITAL, AND THEY WERE  
24 GOING TO COLLABORATE WITH THEM, BOTH TO HAVE THE  
25 PREDOCTORAL AND POSTDOCTORAL TRAINEES RECEIVE EXPOSURE

1 TO THE CLINICAL PART AND ALSO TO HAVE THE CLINICAL  
2 FELLOWS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME INTO THE BASIC  
3 SCIENCE LABS. SO BOTH OF THOSE. I DON'T THINK THIS IS  
4 DIFFERENT FROM WHAT WE HAVE DONE BEFORE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ADDITIONAL  
6 COMMENTS? PUBLIC COMMENTS? MELISSA KING, WILL YOU  
7 CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

8 MS. KING: WAS THERE A MOTION?

9 DR. LOVE: I MOVE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LOVE WAS MAKING THE  
11 MOTION.

12 DR. THAL: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LEON THAL SECOND. THANK  
14 YOU VERY MUCH.

15 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

16 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

17 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

18 DR. PRICE: YES.

19 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

20 DR. MEYER: YES.

21 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

22 DR. BRYANT: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

1 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
2 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
3 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
4 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
5 DR. DIXON: YES.  
6 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
8 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
9 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
10 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
11 DR. LOVE: YES.  
12 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
13 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
14 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
15 DR. NOVA: YES.  
16 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
17 DR. PENHOET: NO.  
18 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
19 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
20 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
21 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
22 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
23 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
24 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
25 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

1 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
2 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
3 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
4 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
5 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
6 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
7 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
8 DR. THAL: YES.  
9 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
10 MS. WILSON: YES.  
11 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
12 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION PASSED. DR. CHIU.  
14 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. NOW WE MOVE INTO THE  
15 ONE SINGLE ONE THAT WAS REPRESENTED AS A WHITE BLOCK,  
16 IF YOU RECALL, ON THE VERY FIRST SLIDE. THIS IS  
17 APPLICATION T201, AND IT BEARS AN ASTERISK. THE SCORE  
18 IS 68. AND THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES A SMALL AND VERY  
19 FOCUSED PROGRAM TO TRAIN CHEMISTS TO WORK WITH STEM  
20 CELL BIOLOGISTS IN DEVELOPING HIGH THROUGHPUT SCREENING  
21 METHODS FOR THE STUDY OF STEM CELLS. FIVE PREDOCTORAL  
22 AND FIVE POSTDOCTORAL TRAINEES PER YEAR IS PROPOSED.  
23 THE STRENGTHS OF THIS APPLICATION ARE THE  
24 FOLLOWING, AS RECOGNIZED BY THE REVIEWERS: ONE, AN  
25 EXCELLENT GROUP OF FACULTY, ALL EXPERIENCED AND IDEALLY

1 SUITED TO MENTORSHIP IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY; TWO, GREAT  
2 LEADERSHIP OF THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR WHO IS A LEADING  
3 CHEMIST WITH ENORMOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC  
4 EXPERIENCE; THREE, IT OFFERS THE UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO  
5 BRING TOGETHER THE APPLICATION OF HIGH THROUGHPUT  
6 METHODS AND SMALL MOLECULE DRUG DISCOVERY TECHNOLOGY TO  
7 STEM CELL RESEARCH; AND, FOUR, THE APPLICANT POOL IS  
8 STRONG, GIVEN THE HIGHLY REGARDED GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN  
9 CHEMISTRY AND BIOLOGY AT THE INSTITUTION.

10 THE WEAKNESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS: IT LACKS A  
11 CLEAR CONSTRUCTION OF FORMAL TRAINING PROGRAM ALTHOUGH  
12 IT IS EVIDENT THAT MANY OF THESE ELEMENTS WILL BE DONE  
13 IN COLLABORATION WITH NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS.  
14 SECONDLY, THERE IS VERY LITTLE MENTION OF ETHICS AND  
15 HUMANITIES TRAINING. AND THIRD, SURPRISINGLY, THE  
16 REVIEWERS NOTED THAT DESPITE A LARGE IN-HOUSE FACULTY  
17 TO DRAW UPON, ONLY SIX MENTORS WERE LISTED TO COVER THE  
18 TRAINING OF TEN TRAINEES. THE RATIO OF TRAINEES  
19 REQUESTED TO THE MENTORING FACULTY, THEY FELT, WAS TOO  
20 HIGH.

21 THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT THIS IS A  
22 MERITORIOUS APPLICATION, AND THEY RECOMMENDED IT FOR  
23 FUNDING IF THERE WERE AVAILABLE FUNDS WITH REDUCTION OF  
24 TRAINEE SLOTS FROM FIVE PRE AND FIVE POST TO THREE PRE  
25 AND THREE POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS IN TUNE WITH THE

1 MENTORING FACULTY.

2 MR. CHAIR.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION OR MOTION? NO  
4 DISCUSSION. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO STATE WITH 200  
5 FACULTY MEMBERS, THE FACT THEY'RE DOWNGRADED BECAUSE  
6 THEY HAVE SIX MEMBERS TO TRAIN TEN PROPOSED TRAINING  
7 POSITIONS, CERTAINLY WITH A LETTER ASKING THAT THEY  
8 INCREASE THEIR RATIO OF MENTORS TO FACULTY, THIS IS AN  
9 INSTITUTION THAT CAN CLEARLY COMPLY WITH THIS REQUEST.  
10 AND THAT'S ONE OF THE PRINCIPAL REASONS WE HEAR THAT  
11 THEY ARE DOWNGRADED.

12 BUT THE CHEMISTRY AND BIOLOGY FOCUS IS  
13 SOMETHING THAT BRINGS, AGAIN, THESE VERY SPECIFIC AREAS  
14 OF EXPERTISE THAT IS A STRENGTH AND THAT IS AN  
15 ADVANTAGE TO ALL OF THESE INSTITUTIONS TO HAVE SOMEONE  
16 WITH THAT STRENGTH IN THIS MIX.

17 SO, AGAIN, THIS IS A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE  
18 BEING TOLD IT'S AN EXTREMELY HIGH QUALITY AND VERY  
19 LARGE FACULTY WITH DEPTH, AND THEY CAN CERTAINLY BUILD  
20 OUT THE DETAIL OF THEIR ETHICS. THE EXACT TITLE OF  
21 WHAT WE REQUESTED IS ETHICS. WHAT ARE THE TWO OTHER?  
22 SOCIAL, LEGAL, AND ETHICAL. THEY CAN CERTAINLY WITH  
23 THE RESOURCE OF AN INSTITUTION WITH A FACULTY OF THIS  
24 SIZE BUILD OUT A STRONGER PROGRAM IN THAT AREA IF WE  
25 ASK THEM. WE EXPECT THEM TO BE EXTREMELY RESPONSIVE IN

1 THIS AREA. WE'LL CERTAINLY BE REVIEWING FUTURE  
2 APPLICATIONS FROM AN INSTITUTION OF THIS SIZE, AND WE  
3 CAN MAKE CERTAIN THAT THEY HAVE FOLLOWED THOSE REQUESTS  
4 CONSCIENTIOUSLY.

5 DR. STEWARD.

6 DR. STEWARD: I SORT OF HESITATE TO SAY THIS,  
7 BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT, AGAIN, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT  
8 SOMETHING THAT WAS A REQUIREMENT OF THE RFP.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY HAVE A PROGRAM. THE  
10 QUESTION WASN'T AS DEVELOPED AS OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

11 DR. STEWARD: AS LONG AS THEY HAVE SOMETHING.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY DO HAVE THE PROGRAM.

13 IT WASN'T DEVELOPED ENOUGH. YES, DR. FRIEDMAN.

14 DR. FRIEDMAN: JUST A QUESTION, PLEASE. I  
15 HAD DIFFICULTY ASSESSING THE STATE OF THEIR CURRENT  
16 STEM CELL PROGRAM. THERE'S CONSIDERABLE BIOLOGY AND  
17 CHEMISTRY STRENGTH. THAT'S CLEAR. AND IT'S OBVIOUSLY  
18 A DISTINGUISHED INSTITUTION, AND IT'S PROBABLY IN HERE  
19 AND I JUST DIDN'T -- I JUST DON'T GET IT. SO CAN YOU  
20 HELP ME UNDERSTAND WHAT THE CURRENT STATE OF STEM CELL  
21 BIOLOGY OR STUDIES IS? AND I APOLOGIZE IF IT'S THERE.

22 DR. CHIU: WE'RE CHECKING.

23 DR. HALL: MAYBE I CAN COMMENT. THE COMMENT  
24 IN YOUR NOTES, I THINK, IS VERY USEFUL. THEY WILL HAVE  
25 A FOCUS ON THE APPLICATION OF HIGH THROUGHPUT SCREENING

1 METHODS FOR THE STUDY OF STEM CELLS. THE PROPOSAL AIMS  
2 TO TRAIN CHEMISTS TO WORK SPECIFICALLY WITH STEM CELL  
3 BIOLOGISTS ON INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAMS.

4 DR. FRIEDMAN: I UNDERSTAND THAT. WHAT I'M  
5 SAYING IS DO THEY HAVE STEM CELL BIOLOGISTS? THIS  
6 LEADS ME TO BELIEVE THEY HAVE WONDERFUL CHEMISTRY.

7 DR. HALL: MY UNDERSTANDING IS THEY DO NOT  
8 ALTHOUGH I MAY BE WRONG. I THINK THE IDEA IS THAT THEY  
9 EXPECT TO CARRY OUT COLLABORATIONS WITH STEM CELL  
10 BIOLOGISTS IN NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS AND THAT THE  
11 TRAINEES WOULD BE THOSE WHO WOULD BE TRAINED, NOT ONLY  
12 IN CHEMISTRY, BUT TRAINED IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND  
13 WOULD PARTICIPATE IN THOSE COLLABORATIONS. I DON'T  
14 THINK THEY THEMSELVES HAVE.

15 DR. FRIEDMAN: THAT'S OKAY IF THERE WAS A  
16 REALLY CLEAR AND SOLID DESCRIPTION OF WHAT THE  
17 RELATIONSHIPS WOULD BE WITH THE NEIGHBORING  
18 INSTITUTIONS. MAY I JUST ASK THAT QUESTION FOR  
19 CLARIFICATION? DID THEY HAVE FORMAL LINKAGES AND THEY  
20 TALKED ABOUT HOW THEY WOULD WORK TOGETHER ON THIS?

21 DR. CHIU: I BELIEVE THEY DO HAVE FORMAL  
22 LINKAGES. AND IF I COULD READ A LITTLE BIT MORE  
23 DETAIL. THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND COLLEAGUES HAVE  
24 PIONEERED THE APPLICATION OF HIGH THROUGHPUT, ETC., TO  
25 STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION. THAT TELLS ME THAT THEY



1 HAVE STEM CELL EXPERTISE BECAUSE THEY PIONEERED THE USE  
2 OF IT TO LOOK AT STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION. WHETHER  
3 THEY THEMSELVES ARE DOING OTHER KINDS OF STEM CELL  
4 RESEARCH IS NOT CLEAR FROM THE REVIEW; HOWEVER, THEY  
5 ARE ALREADY PIONEERING THE USE OF THESE TOOLS TO LOOK  
6 AT STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING  
8 YOUR ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, THEY ARE WELL-DOCUMENTED  
9 IN EXISTING COLLABORATION WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAT  
10 HAVE VERY STRONG STEM CELL BIOLOGY DEPARTMENTS THAT  
11 INTERFACE ON AN EXISTING, ESTABLISHED, AND DOCUMENTED  
12 BASIS; IS THAT CORRECT?

13 DR. CHIU: THAT IS CORRECT.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS  
15 FROM THE BOARD? ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC?

16 MS. SAMUELSON: ONE MORE COMMENT FROM THE  
17 BOARD. AS FAR AS THE SOCIAL, LEGAL, ETHICAL COMPONENT  
18 GOES, IT SEEMS TO ME WE SHOULD HAVE THE CAPACITY TO  
19 MAKE ADJUSTMENTS AS WE GO BASED ON WHAT WE'RE LEARNING.  
20 AND IN THAT -- IN THAT COMPONENT, THERE ARE ONE OR MORE  
21 PROGRAMS THAT CAME BACK TO THE RFA THAT HAD SUPERIOR  
22 PROGRAMS. I DON'T KNOW WHY WE WOULD NECESSARILY INSIST  
23 THAT A SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTION, WHICH IS WHAT WE'RE  
24 MOSTLY CONCERNED WITH, BE ABLE TO REPLICATE THAT AT  
25 EVERY SITE. AND SO I WOULDN'T BE INCLINED TO DING AN

1 OTHERWISE IMPORTANT PROPOSAL FOR LACK OF THAT ONE WHEN  
2 WE COULD GET SOME OF THE OTHER PLACES TO SHARE THEIR  
3 EXPERTISE.

4 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THAT SEVERAL OF  
5 THE GROUPS HERE HAVE SAID THAT THEY WOULD SHARE COURSES  
6 AMONG SEVERAL INSTITUTIONS. AND I THINK HERE'S A CASE  
7 IN WHICH WE WOULD SAY THAT WE WOULD REQUIRE THAT THEIR  
8 STUDENTS TAKE SUCH A COURSE AT A NEIGHBORING  
9 INSTITUTION IF THEY THEMSELVES DID NOT HAVE ONE.  
10 THAT'S A CLEAR CASE IN WHICH I THINK WE CAN JUST STATE  
11 THAT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THEY'VE SAID THAT  
13 THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE ONE. THEY DIDN'T PROVIDE ENOUGH  
14 DETAIL. DR. LOVE.

15 DR. LOVE: I WAS JUST CURIOUS TO UNDERSTAND  
16 THE TECHNICAL SCORE OF 68. IT DID STRIKE ME AS  
17 BEING -- I DIDN'T WANT FOCUS TOO MUCH ON THE SCORE, BUT  
18 I KNOW HOW THE PROCESS WAS DONE WITH KIND OF THE  
19 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION AND THEN THE MORE INTEGRATED  
20 EVALUATION. I'M JUST CURIOUS. WHAT WERE THE ELEMENTS  
21 THAT DROVE THE TECHNICAL SCORE BEING AS LOW AS 68?

22 DR. CHIU: I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY ONE POINT  
23 BEFORE ADDRESSING THAT. AND THAT IS, IT PERHAPS  
24 EXPLAINS WHY ONLY SIX OUT OF 200 PLUS FACULTY MEMBERS  
25 WERE PUT INTO THE APPLICATION. IT SAYS EACH FACULTY

1 MEMBER HAS AN INTEREST AND BACKGROUND IN STEM CELL FATE  
2 DETERMINATION. THAT SAYS TO ME THAT THEY DID NOT  
3 CHOOSE THE OTHER 190, WHATEVER, SIX OR FOUR BECAUSE  
4 THEY DID NOT HAVE SUCH A BACKGROUND. AND MAYBE PERHAPS  
5 THEY WERE BEING VERY SELECTIVE; BUT IN DOING SO, I  
6 THINK THAT MAY HAVE BEEN ONE OF THE REASONS THE SMALL  
7 SIZE OF THE ACTUAL FACULTY PROPOSED, ONLY SIX MEMBERS,  
8 MIGHT HAVE CAUSED THE SCORE TO BE LOWER THAN -- THE  
9 LEVEL OF ENTHUSIASM TO BE LOWER.

10 THE OTHER WERE, AS WE HAD MENTIONED, LITTLE  
11 MENTION OF THE REQUIRED ETHIC, SOCIAL, AND LEGAL  
12 COURSE, AND SEVERAL OTHER POINTS SUCH AS THAT, AND THE  
13 VERY NARROW FOCUS, ALTHOUGH SHARPLY FOCUSED, OF THIS  
14 APPLICATION.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BUT THERE IS -- IN THE AREA  
16 THEY WERE FOCUSING, THERE WAS A VERY HIGH DEGREE OF  
17 EXPERTISE AND QUALITY; WHEREAS, THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE  
18 BREADTH, THEY DIDN'T GET THE SAME SCORE AS ANOTHER  
19 INSTITUTION THAT HAD GREATER BREADTH, BUT THEY HAD  
20 TREMENDOUS QUALITY IN THEIR FOCUS AREA.

21 DR. LOVE: SO IT WAS REALLY AN ISSUE OF SCOPE  
22 AS OPPOSED TO QUALITY OF WHAT THEY WERE DOING.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SCOPE, THE MENTOR RATIO, AND  
24 THE OTHER ISSUE CALLED OUT IN HERE, WHICH IS DOWNGRADED  
25 BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T HAVE AS WELL DEVELOPED ETHICS

1 COURSE.

2 DR. CHIU: ALSO THAT THEY DIDN' T DESCRIBE THE  
3 COURSEWORK I N GENERAL VERY WELL.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDI TIONAL BOARD DI SCUSSION?  
5 ADDI TIONAL PUBLI C DI SCUSSION? MELI SSA.

6 MR. HARRI SON: WE NEED A MOTI ON.

7 DR. BALTI MORE: THERE I SN' T A MOTI ON.

8 DR. DI XON: SO MOVED.

9 DR. PRI ETO: SECON D.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTI ON FROM DR. DI XON,  
11 SECONDED FROM DR. PRI ETO.

12 DR. WRI GHT: I S THAT FOR FUNDI NG OF THE THREE  
13 FELLOWS?

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RI GHT.

15 MS. KI NG: DAVID BALTI MORE.

16 DR. BALTI MORE: I F THE MOTI ON WAS TO ACCEP T  
17 THE RECOMMENDATI ON OF THREE FELLOWS, THEN I VOTE YES.  
18 I S THAT WHAT I T WAS, JACK?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I T' S THREE AND THREE.

20 DR. BALTI MORE: OKAY.

21 MS. KI NG: BOB PRI CE.

22 DR. PRI CE: YES.

23 MS. KI NG: DAVID MEYER.

24 DR. MEYER: YES.

25 MS. KI NG: SUSAN BRYANT.

1 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
3 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
4 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
5 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
6 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
7 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
8 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
9 DR. DIXON: YES.  
10 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
12 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
13 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
14 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
15 DR. LOVE: YES.  
16 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
17 DR. NOVA: YES.  
18 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
19 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
20 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
21 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
22 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
23 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
24 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
25 DR. PRIETO: YES.

1 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
2 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
3 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
4 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
5 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
6 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
7 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
8 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
9 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
10 DR. THAL: YES.  
11 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
12 MS. WILSON: YES.  
13 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
14 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
15 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR.  
16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, THE MOTION PASSED. THE  
17 NEXT APPLICATION.  
18 DR. CHIU: NEXT APPLICATION IS T202 WITH A  
19 SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 60 OR BELOW. THIS APPLICATION  
20 PROPOSES TO DEVELOP A NEW PROGRAM IN STEM CELL RESEARCH  
21 TO TRAIN BETWEEN TWO TO FOUR PREDOCTORAL --  
22 DR. BALTIMORE: EXCUSE ME. FOR THE ONES THAT  
23 ARE LOWER THAN -- THE 60 AND LOWER, WHICH ARE NOT  
24 RECOMMENDED, I UNDERSTAND WE NEED A FORMAL VOTE, COULD  
25 WE DISPENSE WITH READING THE PROS SINCE WE HAVE IT ALL

1     HERE; AND IF ANYBODY WANTS TO READ IT, THEY CAN READ  
2     IT, AND GET ON WITH THE VOTE? OTHERWISE, WE'RE HERE  
3     FOR HOURS FOR NO REASON.

4             CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT THE ISSUE HERE,  
5     PARTICULARLY BECAUSE WE'RE GOING THROUGH THE FIRST  
6     GRANT APPROVAL --

7             DR. BALTIMORE: YOU SAID WE'RE LOSING OUR  
8     QUORUM AT THREE, WHICH IS WHAT IT IS.

9             CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE DEFINITELY HAVE A COMPLEX  
10    CHALLENGE HERE.

11            DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF I CAN MAKE A  
12    SUGGESTION. THIS INFORMATION WAS SUPPLIED AHEAD OF  
13    TIME. I THINK THE ASSUMPTION SHOULD BE BY DR. CHIU  
14    THAT WE'VE ALL READ THIS. I VERY MUCH WOULD LIKE HER  
15    TO OFFER ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, AS SHE'S DONE, TO  
16    SORT OF PROVIDE A LITTLE CONTEXT, BUT I THINK WE HAVE  
17    TO ASSUME THAT EVERYONE ON THIS PANEL HAS READ THESE  
18    AND DIGESTED THESE, AND WE DON'T NEED TO REPEAT THAT.  
19    SO ADDITIONAL COMMENTS WOULD BE VERY WELCOME, BUT I  
20    THINK WE'VE ALL DONE OUR DILIGENCE ON THIS.

21            CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I THINK THAT'S A  
22    VERY GOOD SUGGESTION. ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS DR. CHIU  
23    WOULD LIKE TO OFFER, AND, OF COURSE, WE'LL TAKE  
24    COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC IN MAKING  
25    DECISIONS HERE.

1 DR. CHIU: I WAS JUST GOING TO RESTATE WHAT  
2 YOU ALREADY HAVE ONLY IN THE SYNOPSIS, SO I DON'T HAVE  
3 ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO ADD FOR ANY OF THE  
4 APPLICATIONS. IT'S JUST A REMINDER IN CASE YOU HAVE  
5 QUESTIONS.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

7 DR. LOVE: IS IT POSSIBLE THAT ONE COULD  
8 OFFER A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION TO NOT FUND  
9 ANY OF THESE IN THIS CATEGORY?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT IS POSSIBLE TO MAKE A  
11 MOTION NOT TO FUND ANY OF THE APPLICANTS' REQUESTS IF  
12 THAT'S WHAT THE BOARD WOULD LIKE TO DO.

13 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE VOTING ON  
14 THAT WILL BE COMPLICATED. MAY I SUGGEST THAT WE RUN  
15 THROUGH THESE --

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT HAS TO BE INDIVIDUAL. IT  
17 HAS TO BE INDIVIDUAL. I'M SORRY. I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND  
18 THE QUESTION. EXCUSE ME.

19 I WOULD LIKE TO ASK, DR. CHIU, CAN YOU TELL  
20 US IS THIS APPLICANT CLOSE TO THE FUNDING LINE OR FAR  
21 FROM THE FUNDING LINE?

22 DR. CHIU: THIS IS CLOSE.

23 DR. HALL: FUNDING LINE, CLOSE TO 60, YOU  
24 MEAN?

25 DR. CHIU: CLOSE TO 60.



1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS IT CLOSE TO 60?

2 DR. CHIU: YES.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT WE  
4 HAVE APPROVED OTHER GRANTS THAT HAD SPECIFIC AREAS OF  
5 SPECIALIZATION BECAUSE WE NEEDED, FOR THE OVERALL  
6 CAPACITY OF THE STATE, TO HAVE THAT CAPACITY.

7 DR. PIZZO: THOSE WERE ALL WITH THE  
8 RECOMMENDATION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT.

10 DR. PIZZO: IF I'M READING IT CORRECTLY, IT  
11 SAYS NOT RECOMMENDED.

12 DR. BALTIMORE: NOT AT THE LEVEL OF OTHER --

13 DR. PIZZO: SO IF WE HAVE THE ADVISORY  
14 COMMITTEE THAT'S MADE THAT RECOMMENDATION, IN ALL  
15 FAIRNESS, IT SEEMS TO ME IF WE'RE GOING TO FOLLOW WHAT  
16 WE'VE SAID WE'RE DOING, WE SHOULD LISTEN TO THIS.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, IT'S VERY IMPORTANT  
18 THAT THIS BOARD IS GOING TO MAKE INDEPENDENT DECISIONS  
19 AS A MATTER OF LAW, AS A MATTER OF PROCESS. AND AS A  
20 MEMBER OF THE BOARD, I'D LIKE TO MAKE COMMENTS BECAUSE  
21 I BELIEVE THAT THIS GRANT SHOULD BE FUNDED.

22 DR. PIZZO: APPRECIATE THAT.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT IS IMPORTANT HERE TO  
24 UNDERSTAND THAT PART OF THEIR DESCRIBED PROGRAM IS  
25 GMP/GLP PRODUCTION OF CELL-BASED PRODUCTS. AND FOR

1 TRANSLATIONAL MEDICINE, IT IS CRITICAL, AS A RESOURCE  
2 TO THE STATE, THAT WE HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE OF GMP/GLP  
3 PRODUCTION. THIS IS THE ONLY TRAINING PROGRAM THAT IS  
4 SUGGESTING, OUT OF ALL THE TRAINING PROGRAMS WE HAVE,  
5 THAT WE HAVE THAT CAPACITY TO EDUCATE THE STATE. IF,  
6 IN FACT, WE GO DOWNSTREAM ON ALL OF OUR GRANTS THAT  
7 COME LATER AND WE DO NOT HAVE GMP BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS  
8 IN A CELL LINE AND WE HAVE TO START OVER WITH AN  
9 FDA-APPROVED GMP BIOLOGICAL, WE COULD LOSE YEARS IN THE  
10 PROCESS.

11 SO BECAUSE WE HAVE A VERY SPECIALIZED AREA OF  
12 CAPACITY HERE, I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT WE CONSIDER  
13 FOUR TO SIX POSTDOCTORAL SLOTS, NOT THE PREDOCTORAL  
14 SLOTS REQUESTED, BUT A LIMITED PROGRAM OF FOUR TO SIX  
15 POSTDOCTORAL SLOTS ON THIS PROGRAM.

16 DR. CHIU: JUST A POINT OF INFORMATION.  
17 APPLICATION T105 IS THE OTHER APPLICATION THAT ALSO  
18 NOTES UNDERSTANDING OF GOOD GMP.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I ACCEPT THE CORRECTION.  
20 THIS IS ONE OF TWO IN THE ENTIRE STATE. THERE'S VERY  
21 LIMITED CAPACITY AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE STATE OF THESE  
22 CRITICAL PRODUCTION ABILITIES. AND I WOULD SAY THAT  
23 WHILE THE POINT IS THAT WHEN WE LOOK AT THIS, THIS  
24 GRADUATE SCHOOL ALREADY OFFERS A STEM CELL BIOLOGY  
25 COURSE. IT SAYS THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR IS AN

1 ACCOMPLISHED SCIENTIST WHO'S MADE IMPORTANT  
2 CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND SERVES AS THE  
3 FOUNDING DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL. WE HAVE A VERY  
4 WELL-DEVELOPED PROGRAM THAT MAY NOT HAVE HAD AS MUCH  
5 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION, BUT HAS SOME VERY  
6 SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE. AND ON A MORE LIMITED PROGRAM,  
7 I THINK THAT THERE IS THE ABILITY TO ACCOMMODATE THIS,  
8 PARTICULARLY BECAUSE THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE 13.6  
9 MILLION OR LESS WHEN WE HAD ADVERTISED AT A \$15.3  
10 MILLION LEVEL, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO AT LEAST PUT THIS  
11 INTO DISCUSSION. DR. PIZZO.

12 DR. PIZZO: SO THERE'S NO QUESTION ABOUT THE  
13 IMPORTANCE OF HAVING GMP AND GLP FACILITIES, BUT THAT'S  
14 A DIFFERENT ISSUE TO ME THAN A TRAINING GRANT WHICH IS  
15 INVOLVED IN TRAINING INDIVIDUALS IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY.  
16 ONE MAY BE MORE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE AS COMPARED TO  
17 PROFICIENCY IN SCIENCE. I JUST DON'T SEE THIS AS BEING  
18 RELATED DIRECTLY TOGETHER.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I VIEW -- CERTAINLY I  
20 RESPECT YOUR OPINION, BUT TRAINING SCIENTISTS AND  
21 CLINICIANS IN THE INTERFACE BETWEEN THE GMP/GLP  
22 PRODUCTION, THE REQUIREMENTS, THE PROCESS I VIEW AS  
23 HAVING SOME POTENTIAL PARTICULARLY BECAUSE THE  
24 LIMITATIONS OF THAT PROCESS MAY BE VERY IMPORTANT  
25 KNOWLEDGE TO PEOPLE THAT ARE TRYING TO MOVE DOWNSTREAM

1 ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS AREA OF SCIENCE AND  
2 MEDICINE. AN INDIVIDUAL PERSPECTIVE.

3 DR. PIZZO: UNDERSTAND.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

5 MR. GOLDBERG: I AGREE WITH YOUR PERSPECTIVE  
6 ON THIS, BOB. I THINK FROM THE STANDPOINT OF  
7 COMMERCIAL LIFE SCIENCE ENTITIES IN CALIFORNIA, AND MY  
8 COLLEAGUES ON THE COMMITTEE CAN WEIGH IN ON THIS AS  
9 WELL, AND THIS IS ULTIMATELY WHAT'S GOING TO BE  
10 REQUIRED TO MANUFACTURE AND SCALE UP EVEN TO DO LARGER  
11 SCALE CLINICAL TRIALS LONG BEFORE WE EVEN GET TO  
12 THERAPIES READY FOR POST-FDA APPROVAL. SO I WOULD  
13 SUPPORT SPENDING A PORTION OF OUR FUNDS FOR THIS  
14 PURPOSE.

15 DR. PENHOET: CLARIFYING QUESTION. BOB, ARE  
16 YOU PROPOSING FOUR, FIVE, OR SIX POST DOCS? AND OF THE  
17 STAFF, WHAT WOULD BE THE RAMIFICATIONS OF THAT PROPOSAL  
18 ON THE RECOMMENDED BUDGET, WHICH IS HIGHER THAN WE'VE  
19 AWARDED SOME OF THE -- WHICH IS MORE MONEY, AS LISTED  
20 TODAY, REQUESTED THAN SOME OF THE HIGHER RATED GRANTS  
21 WE'VE ALREADY APPROVED HERE TODAY?

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE AMENDED BUDGET, IF WE,  
23 FOR EXAMPLE, TOOK FIVE POSTDOCTORATES, WOULD BE REDUCED  
24 SUBSTANTIALLY. BUT WHAT WOULD BE THE ESTIMATE OF THE  
25 AMOUNT?

1 DR. CHIU: IT'S HARD TO ESTIMATE. THEY'RE  
2 REQUESTING FROM TWO TO FOUR PRE DOCS, FOUR TO SIX POST  
3 DOCS.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I AM LIMITING MY PROPOSAL SO  
5 WE CAN HAVE A DEFINITIVE OF FIVE POST DOCS.

6 DR. CHIU: JUST FIVE POST DOCS AND NO PRE  
7 DOCS?

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO PRE DOCS.

9 DR. CHIU: I CAN ONLY GIVE YOU, YOU KNOW,  
10 FROM REDUCING FROM TEN TO FIVE WOULD BE HALVING IT, AND  
11 THAT'S JUST A BALLPARK BECAUSE THIS IS AN ESCALATING  
12 SCENARIO. SO, YOU KNOW, THE FIRST YEAR BEING 400,000  
13 INCLUDES TWO PRE DOCS AND FOUR POST DOCS, AND YOU UP  
14 THAT TO FIVE POST DOCS, THAT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO  
15 ESTIMATE ON THE WING.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT SAYS --

17 DR. CHIU: PRE DOCS AND POST DOCS ASK FOR  
18 DIFFERENT AMOUNTS OF MONEY.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND THAT.

20 DR. CHIU: SO IF YOU REDUCE THE TWO PRE DOCS  
21 IN YEAR ONE AND ADD ONE MORE POST DOC TO FIVE POST DOCS  
22 IN YEAR TWO, IT PROBABLY WON'T MAKE MUCH CHANGE.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BUT IN THE LATER YEARS IT  
24 WILL SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCE THE PROGRAM.

25 DR. CHIU: IN LATER YEARS MOST LIKELY, BUT WE

1 WILL HAVE TO GO OVER IT YEAR BY YEAR AND ITEM BY ITEM.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION?

3 YES. DR. LOVE AND THEN DR. BALTIMORE.

4 DR. LOVE: I THINK, BOB, WHAT I WANTED TO SAY  
5 IS THAT I THINK I AGREE WITH YOUR POSITION ABOUT THE  
6 NEEDS FOR GMP/GLP DOWN THE ROAD AT SOME POINT  
7 ULTIMATELY. I DO WONDER IF THAT ISN'T THE OBJECTIVE,  
8 IF THERE ISN'T A DIFFERENT WAY TO APPROACH THAT, MAYBE  
9 A BETTER WAY TO APPROACH THAT BECAUSE HERE I THOUGHT  
10 THE INTENT REALLY WAS TRAINING GRANTS. AND AT SOME  
11 POINT WE ARE GOING TO REWARD RESEARCH GRANTS, AND I  
12 REALLY DO SEE GMP/GLP AS MORE OF A RESEARCH ISSUE, AND  
13 IN SOME WAYS AN AREA WHERE INDUSTRY TRADITIONALLY HAS  
14 ACTUALLY DONE A VERY GOOD JOB.

15 SO I HATE TO DISAGREE, BUT -- AND I DON'T  
16 DISAGREE WITH THE CONCEPT THAT IT'S IMPORTANT, BUT I  
17 WONDER IF THIS ISN'T THE WRONG WAY TO APPROACH DEALING  
18 WITH THAT ISSUE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.

20 DR. POMEROY: I'LL JUST THROW IN A THOUGHT  
21 FROM MAYBE A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE. AS I WAS  
22 READING OVER THIS ABSTRACT, THIS STRUCK ME JUST FROM  
23 THIS LIMITED AMOUNT OF INFORMATION, ONE OF THE ONES  
24 WHERE THEY HAD REALLY THOUGHT THROUGH WHAT THE  
25 EXPERIENCE OF THE TRAINEES WOULD BE.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT.

2 DR. POMEROY: AND YOU HAVE TO HAVE GOOD  
3 FACULTY, BUT YOU ALSO HAVE TO HAVE A TRAINING PROGRAM.  
4 I THINK JANET TALKED ABOUT THIS YEN AND YANG EARLIER.

5 PERHAPS CONSIDERATION TO A VERY SMALL NUMBER  
6 OF TRAINEES THAT COULD BE HANDLED BY THE SMALL NUMBER  
7 OF FACULTY THAT THEY HAVE, GIVEN THE THOUGHT THAT  
8 APPEARS TO HAVE GONE INTO THIS TRAINING, IS SOMETHING  
9 TO THINK ABOUT.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IS THERE A SUGGESTION YOU  
11 WOULD MAKE TO ACCOMPLISH THAT GOAL?

12 DR. POMEROY: WELL, ONE THING YOU MIGHT THINK  
13 ABOUT FOR YOUR -- IN YOUR PROPOSAL IS THAT THEY MIGHT  
14 GO FROM THREE TO FOUR TO FIVE POST DOCS, WHICH WOULD  
15 REALLY BE CUTTING THIS WAY BACK, BUT IN AN ESCALATING  
16 FASHION BECAUSE JUMPING RIGHT IN WITH FIVE POST DOCS,  
17 THAT IS A LOT OF PROGRAMS. BUT IF THEY HAVE A FEW  
18 MENTORS, MAYBE THEY COULD.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS HAS AN EXISTING PROGRAM  
20 THAT HAS A SEASONED AND A REPUTATION, BUT I WOULD LIKE  
21 TO MAKE A MOTION THAT WE START WITH THREE THE FIRST  
22 YEAR, GO TO FOUR IN THE SECOND YEAR, AND FIVE IN THE  
23 THIRD YEAR IN LINE WITH YOUR SUGGESTION.

24 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL IS THE

1 SECOND. ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION?

2 MS. SAMUELSON: I AGREE WITH THAT. MY NOTES  
3 REFLECT THE WORKING GROUP REALLY STRUGGLING WITH THIS  
4 ONE BECAUSE THERE WERE SOME REAL AREAS OF EXCELLENCE.  
5 AND THE QUESTION I KEEP HAVING WITH SOME OF THESE THAT  
6 DO HAVE THAT COMMITMENT TO DEVELOPING THEIR STEM CELL  
7 PROGRAM AND HAVE OTHER AREAS OF STRONG EXCELLENCE THAT  
8 ARE IMPORTANT TO THE GAMUT OF EXPERTISE WE'RE GOING TO  
9 NEED IN THIS STATE, HOW OTHERWISE DO THEY START GETTING  
10 IN THE GAME?

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT. AND THIS IS A VERY  
12 SELECT INDIVIDUAL CASE THAT I'M TRYING TO FOCUS ON  
13 HERE, NOT A GENERAL ISSUE OF A DIFFERENT VIEW FROM THE  
14 PEER REVIEW.

15 DR. BALTIMORE: BOB, I JUST GOT TO ASK. YOU  
16 REALLY THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE FOR THE CHAIRMAN TO DO  
17 THIS?

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I AM A MEMBER OF THE BOARD  
19 WITH AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION AND AN INDIVIDUAL POINT OF  
20 VIEW ON THIS.

21 DR. BALTIMORE: I'VE HEARD LARRY SUMMERS SAY  
22 THAT TOO.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AT LEAST IF I'M MAKING A  
24 MISTAKE, I'M IN DISTINGUISHED COMPANY.

25 DR. PIZZO: THAT IS IN THE EYE OF THE



1 BEHOLDER.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE ADDITIONAL  
3 DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD? DR. MURPHY.

4 DR. MURPHY: BOB, I AGREE WITH YOUR DESIRE,  
5 BUT I THINK WE'RE GETTING INTO A DANGEROUS GROUND IF WE  
6 ENGINEER OUR DECISIONS BASED ON WHAT WE WANT. I THINK  
7 WE'VE GOT A DISTINGUISHED COMMITTEE HERE THAT LOOKED AT  
8 THIS AND SAID THIS JUST DOESN'T MAKE THE MARK DESPITE  
9 THE FACT THAT IT HAS AN ULTIMATE GOAL THAT WE ALL  
10 SUPPORT. I THINK THIS GROUP SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO  
11 COME BACK WITH A MUCH TIGHTER PROPOSAL. THAT ALLOWS US  
12 TO GET WHAT WE WANT, BUT IT ALSO ALLOWS US TO RESPECT  
13 THE WISH OF THE COMMITTEE.

14 DR. DIXON: I SECOND RICH'S COMMENT.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHILE I GENERALLY  
16 INDIVIDUALLY AGREE WITH THAT PERSPECTIVE, IN THIS  
17 PARTICULAR CASE, I THOUGHT THAT, IN FACT, MANY OF THE  
18 INDIVIDUALS ON THE FACULTY, ALTHOUGH JUNIOR, WERE  
19 DESCRIBED AS HAVING VERY STRONG POTENTIAL AND  
20 CREDENTIALS. AND BECAUSE WE'RE TRYING TO BUILD A  
21 PROGRAM, AND GIVEN THAT THEY HAD A STRONG LONG-TERM  
22 REPUTATION, AND IT INDICATES AN EXISTING GRADUATE  
23 PROGRAM AND ALREADY WITH A STEM CELL BIOLOGY COURSE,  
24 THAT EVEN THOUGH THEY WERE DOWNGRADED ON NOT HAVING THE  
25 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, I ACTUALLY FELT THAT THE

1 FACULTY STRENGTH WAS THERE. BUT THAT'S AN INDIVIDUAL  
2 PERSPECTIVE, QUITE AN INDIVIDUAL PERSPECTIVE.

3 ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD? ANY  
4 COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE? YES, DR. WRIGHT.

5 DR. WRIGHT: I WOULD MAKE A COMMENT. IT'S  
6 MORE OF A QUESTION. FOR THOSE OTHERS OF YOU WHO SERVED  
7 ON THIS GROUP, SO MUCH OF WHAT WE DO IS A PERSPECTIVE.  
8 AND ONE OF THE GENIUSES OF THE DESIGN OF THIS BOARD IS  
9 THAT IT COMBINES UNIVERSITY, BRAIN TRUST, AND PATIENT  
10 ADVOCATES IN THE BIOTECH. I'M WONDERING NOW, THINKING  
11 ABOUT IT, I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE NOT BEING  
12 SKEWED BY THE SCIENTISTS WHO HELPED CREATE THIS  
13 NUMERICAL SCORE. I JUST WONDER IF THEY WERE AS ATTUNE  
14 TO THE IMPORTANCE OF GMP AS PERHAPS SOMEONE FROM  
15 BIOTECH MIGHT BE OR SOMEONE WHO HAS MAYBE BOB'S  
16 PERSPECTIVE.

17 I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE ANSWER IS, BUT I  
18 REALIZE I PERSONALLY HAVE BEEN VERY INFLUENCED BY THE  
19 OPINIONS OF THE SCIENTISTS ON THAT GROUP, BUT THEY ARE  
20 COMING FROM AN ACADEMIC SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, AND I'M  
21 NOT SURE THAT THEY WOULD NECESSARILY UNDERSTAND THE  
22 SIGNIFICANCE OF THAT GMP PIECE. THAT'S ALL.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND DEAN PIZZO.

24 DR. PIZZO: I UNDERSTAND YOUR POINT AND  
25 APPRECIATE IT, BUT IT'S HARD FOR ME TO IMAGINE THAT,

1 KNOWING THE PEOPLE ON THAT BOARD, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO  
2 UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF GMP FACILITIES. ALL OF US  
3 RECOGNIZE THAT. THE QUESTION IS HOW TO GET THERE. AND  
4 I THINK THAT THE RECOMMENDATION THAT YOU'VE HEARD FROM  
5 DR. MURPHY AND OTHERS IS VERY CONSISTENT WITH MY OWN.  
6 WE WANT TO SEE THIS HAPPEN. I JUST THINK THIS IS MORE  
7 OF A CONTRIVED WAY OF GETTING THERE AND NOT THE IDEAL.  
8 AND I ALSO DON'T THINK -- IT SETS A PRECEDENT WHICH I  
9 HAVE CONCERN ABOUT BECAUSE WE'VE SOUGHT ADVICE FROM  
10 PEOPLE WHO WE RESPECT, AND IN A SENSE, FOR OTHER  
11 REASONS, MOVING THINGS IN A DIFFERENT DIRECTION AND TO  
12 ME THIS IS NOT SIMPLY ABOUT TRAINING. THIS IS ABOUT  
13 IT'S A ROUTE TO GETTING A GMP FACILITY. LET'S FIND  
14 ANOTHER WAY OF GETTING THERE TO MAKE THAT SUCCESSFUL.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME NOT -- I FOCUSED ON  
16 THAT AS A SPECIALIZATION, BUT I WOULD NOT BE PROPOSING  
17 THIS IF I DIDN'T BELIEVE THE OVERALL PROGRAM WERE  
18 STRONG. I SHOULD HAVE PERHAPS EMPHASIZED THAT TO START  
19 WITH, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY HERE --

20 DR. BALTIMORE: BOB, YOU'RE TAKING ADVANTAGE  
21 OF YOUR POSITION AS CHAIRMAN. I JUST CANNOT SIT HERE  
22 AND SEE THAT HAPPEN. A CHAIRMAN IS SUPPOSED TO RUN A  
23 MEETING. THE CHAIRMAN IS NOT SUPPOSED TO BE IN A  
24 DIALOGUE WITH INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS ABOUT HIS OPINION AS  
25 OPPOSED TO THEIR OPINION.

1 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I TAKE ISSUE WITH THAT,  
2 DR. BALTIMORE.

3 DR. BALTIMORE: YOU CAN TAKE ISSUE WITH IT.

4 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I AM AND I'M GOING TO.  
5 I MEAN WE LOOK TO ED AND BOB TO OFFER THEIR OPINION IN  
6 A VARIETY OF ISSUES. THEY'VE PROVIDED ENLIGHTENED  
7 GUIDANCE AND HAVE LED US TO A LOT OF WHAT I THINK ARE  
8 SOUND DECISIONS. I DON'T VIEW THIS AS AN ABUSE OF  
9 ANYONE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WHAT'S  
11 APPROPRIATE GUIDANCE HERE IS THAT IF I'M GOING TO MAKE  
12 A POINT HERE, THAT I WILL TURN THE CHAIR OVER TO THE  
13 VICE CHAIR, AND THAT WILL PROVIDE AN APPROPRIATE  
14 EQUIVALENCY POSITION WITH OTHER COMMENTS MADE BY THE  
15 BOARD MEMBERS. AND I APPRECIATE YOUR GUIDANCE, DR.  
16 BALTIMORE, AND I WILL CERTAINLY, SINCE MY COMMENTS ARE  
17 FINISHED HERE, THE NEXT TIME I AM IN THIS POSITION, I  
18 WILL TURN IT OVER TO THE VICE CHAIR, WHICH IS  
19 APPRECIATED. THANK YOU. IS THAT AN APPROPRIATE? YES.  
20 THANK YOU.

21 MS. SAMUELSON: IN RESPONSE TO JANET,  
22 DR. WRIGHT'S QUESTION, MY PERSPECTIVE WAS IN THE CASE  
23 OF THIS APPLICANT, THAT THE REVIEWERS DID STRUGGLE WITH  
24 THIS ONE BECAUSE THEY SAW OTHER COMPONENTS THAT WERE  
25 IMPORTANT AND MAYBE UNIQUE IN WHAT THEY OFFERED, AND

1 THAT THEY WOULD NOT BE OFFENDED EITHER BY IT BEING  
2 FUNDED BY THIS COMMITTEE; OR IF IN A QUICK TURNAROUND,  
3 WE CAME BACK AND HAD THEM DEAL WITH THE DEFICIENCIES  
4 THAT ARE PERCEIVED AND COME UP WITH AN APPROVABLE  
5 APPLICATION WITHOUT WAITING UNTIL NEXT SPRING. THERE  
6 ARE A FEW IN THAT CASE, AND THIS IS ONE OF THEM IN MY  
7 ESTIMATION.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, DR. STEWARD.

9 DR. STEWARD: MAYBE WHAT WE WOULD WANT TO DO  
10 HERE IS TO MOVE THE DISCUSSION A LITTLE BIT AWAY FROM  
11 THIS APPLICATION AND REALLY TO THE POINT, WHICH IS THAT  
12 THE IMPORTANCE OF A GMP-TYPE APPROACH IS REALLY WELL  
13 RECOGNIZED, BUT PROBABLY WASN'T SOMETHING THAT WE  
14 REALLY HAD IN MIND WHEN WE BROUGHT UP THESE TRAINING  
15 GRANT APPLICATIONS IN THE FIRST TIME. WHERE I'M GOING  
16 WITH THIS IS I COULDN'T AGREE MORE THAT THIS IS  
17 SOMETHING THAT WE REALLY NEED TO GET GOING RIGHT NOW,  
18 BUT MAYBE THAT IS SOMETHING THAT SHOULD CALL FOR  
19 ANOTHER RFP FOR SOME KIND OF A VERY HIGHLY TARGETED  
20 TRAINING PROGRAM OR TRAINING EFFORT IN THAT AREA WHERE  
21 WE COULD SOLICIT PROPOSALS FROM A NUMBER OF SITES AND  
22 SELECT THE VERY BEST ONE.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
24 COMMENTS. ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? FROM THE  
25 PUBLIC?

1 MR. REED: AS A 17-YEAR PUBLIC SCHOOL  
2 TEACHER, AS THE SON OF A SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, AS  
3 THE GREAT GRANDSON OF THE FIRST WOMAN SUPERINTENDENT OF  
4 SCHOOLS IN TENNESSEE, I THINK THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT  
5 THING IS THE TEACHERS AND THE STAFF. YOU'VE GOT 16  
6 MENTORS THAT WANT TO TEACH THIS. IT IS A BORDERLINE  
7 CALL, BUT I THINK YOU WANT TO HAVE PEOPLE THAT REALLY  
8 WANT TO DO THIS AND THEY REALLY WANT TO DO IT AND  
9 THEY'RE QUALIFIED. I SAY GO FOR IT.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE HAVE THE COMMENTS.  
11 MELISSA KING, WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE. MOTION  
12 IS SPECIFICALLY -- WAS SPECIFICALLY AMENDED TO BE THREE  
13 IN THE FIRST YEAR, FOUR IN THE SECOND YEAR, AND FIVE IN  
14 THE THIRD YEAR POST DOCS ONLY. AND THE SECOND, I  
15 BELIEVE, ACCEPTED THAT AMENDMENT; IS THAT CORRECT?

16 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

17 DR. PIZZO: MR. VICE CHAIRMAN, WHATEVER YOU  
18 ARE NOW, BEFORE WE GO FORWARD, BECAUSE I THINK IN THE  
19 SPIRIT THAT YOU'VE HEARD, I THINK ALL OF US WANT TO SEE  
20 SUPPORT FOR GMP FACILITIES AND FOR PEOPLE TO BE TRAINED  
21 IN THIS AREA. I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THAT KIND OF A  
22 MOTION. I'M NOT GOING TO VOTE JUST TO GET AN ADVANCE  
23 FOR THE MOTION THAT'S ON THE TABLE, AND THAT BELIES OR  
24 DISTORTS THE WAY I SEE THIS. I WOULD MUCH RATHER HAVE  
25 YOU CONSIDER WITHDRAWING YOUR MOTION AND HAVING ONE

1 COME ON THAT IS VERY CONGRUENT FROM THE ONE WE'VE  
2 HEARD, WHICH IS THAT WE CONSTRUCT AN RFA TO HAVE GMP  
3 FACILITIES WHICH INCLUDES A TRAINING COMPONENT AS PART  
4 OF THAT AND THAT WE FIND THE VERY BEST PROGRAMS IN THE  
5 STATE TO ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN. I THINK THAT WOULD  
6 ACCOMPLISH THE GOAL.

7 HOPEFULLY IF THIS PROGRAM IS AS GOOD AS WE  
8 THINK IT IS, AND I DON'T KNOW WHICH ONE IT IS, THEY'LL  
9 BE VERY COMPETITIVE FOR THAT. SINCE WE'RE NOT GOING TO  
10 BE FUNDING ANYTHING TOMORROW, WE'RE NOT GOING TO LOSE  
11 ANYTHING IMMEDIATELY, AND IT WILL GIVE US TIME TO DO  
12 THIS IN GOOD ORDER THAT WE CAN ALL BE BEHIND.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN PENHOET: I BELIEVE, PHIL, THAT  
14 WE HAVE TO VOTE EACH OF THESE GRANTS UP OR DOWN. AFTER  
15 THIS DISCUSSION IS OVER, WE COULD HAVE A DISCUSSION  
16 ABOUT MAKING A MOTION TO PRODUCE SUCH AN RFA AND HAVE  
17 ANOTHER ROUND OF FUNDING, IF YOU THOUGHT THAT WAS  
18 APPROPRIATE. BUT I BELIEVE THE QUESTION HAS BEEN  
19 CALLED, AND WE MUST GO THROUGH ALL OF THESE GRANTS AND  
20 VOTE ON THIS ONE.

21 MELISSA, IF WE COULD HAVE THE ROLL CALL.

22 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

23 DR. BALTIMORE: NO.

24 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

25 DR. PRICE: NO.

1 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
2 DR. MEYER: NO.  
3 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
4 DR. BRYANT: NO.  
5 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
6 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
7 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
8 DR. MARKLAND: NO.  
9 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
10 DR. DIXON: NO.  
11 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
13 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
14 DR. LEVEY: NO.  
15 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
16 DR. LOVE: NO.  
17 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
18 DR. MURPHY: NO.  
19 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
20 DR. NOVA: YES.  
21 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
22 DR. PENHOET: NO.  
23 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
24 DR. PIZZO: NO.  
25 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.



1 DR. POMEROY: NO.

2 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

3 DR. PRIETO: NO.

4 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

6 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

7 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

8 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

9 MR. SHEEHY: ABSTAIN.

10 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

11 DR. STEWARD: NO.

12 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

13 DR. THAL: NO.

14 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

15 MS. WILSON: YES.

16 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

17 DR. WRIGHT: NO.

18 DR. POMEROY: BOB, CAN I ASK A QUESTION HERE?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, CERTAINLY. DR.

20 POMEROY.

21 DR. POMEROY: WE'VE TALKED ABOUT HAVING A

22 SECOND ROUND, AND I KNOW THAT'S COMING UP AS AN AGENDA

23 ITEM, BUT DO WE HAVE THE OPTION OF IDENTIFYING

24 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE ON THE CUSP, ONES PERHAPS LIKE

25 THIS ONE, THAT WE COULD INVITE TO COME BACK SOONER THAN

1 WAITING FOR A YEAR BEFORE THEY COULD APPLY? IS THAT --

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. HARRISON, MY  
3 UNDERSTANDING IS IT'S WITHIN THE ABILITY OF THE BOARD  
4 TO MAKE ANY REQUESTS.

5 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S RIGHT. YOU COULD  
6 REQUEST AN APPLICANT MAKE REFINEMENTS AND COME BACK FOR  
7 FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

8 DR. HALL: DO YOU MEAN NOW WITH THE WORKING  
9 GROUP? WE RECONVENE THE WORKING GROUP FOR A  
10 RECONSIDERATION OF THIS APPLICATION?

11 DR. POMEROY: WELL, MY QUESTION WAS ABOUT ONE  
12 OR MORE THAT MIGHT BE VERY CLOSE.

13 DR. HALL: LET ME SUGGEST WE GO THROUGH THE  
14 VOTING AND COME BACK AND DEAL WITH THOSE ISSUES.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. NEXT  
16 ITEM, DR. CHIU.

17 DR. CHIU: NEXT IS THE LAST OF THE T2S.  
18 T207, 60 OR BELOW. MR. CHAIR, WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO  
19 READ IT?

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WE'VE  
21 ESTABLISHED A PROCESS THAT WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH  
22 BOARD COMMENTS. IF YOU HAVE ANY DISTINGUISHING ITEMS  
23 YOU'D LIKE TO BRING TO OUR ATTENTION, PLEASE DO SO.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M NOT SURE IF THIS IS THE  
25 WAY TO HANDLE THIS, BUT MY INCLINATION IS TO MOVE THAT

1 THIS NOT BE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THAT A MOTION?

3 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

4 DR. POMEROY: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION IS MADE AND SECONDED.

6 BOARD COMMENT? PUBLIC COMMENT?

7 MS. KING: JUST TO BE CLEAR FOR ALL THE BOARD

8 MEMBERS, THE MOTION IS TO NOT APPROVE THIS FOR FUNDING.

9 I KNOW SOME OF YOU WERE HAVING OTHER CONVERSATIONS.

10 DR. PRIETO: TO BE CLEAR, A YES VOTE MEANS WE

11 TURN THIS APPLICATION DOWN.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. OKAY.

13 MELISSA KING, ROLL CALL.

14 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

15 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

16 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

17 DR. PRICE: NO -- I MEAN YES.

18 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

19 DR. BRYANT: YES.

20 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

21 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

22 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

23 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.

24 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.

25 DR. MARKLAND: YES.

1 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
2 DR. DIXON: YES.  
3 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
5 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
6 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
7 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
8 DR. LOVE: YES.  
9 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
10 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
11 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
12 DR. NOVA: YES.  
13 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
14 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
15 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
16 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
17 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
18 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
19 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
20 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
21 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
22 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
23 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
24 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
25 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

1 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

2 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

3 DR. STEWARD: YES.

4 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

5 DR. THAL: YES.

6 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

7 MS. WILSON: YES.

8 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

9 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

10 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR. WE'RE NOW

11 ON TO THE TYPE 3 APPLICATIONS. THE FIRST ONE IS T307

12 WITH A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 89, TRAINING FOR SIX

13 POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS WITH EXCELLENT COURSES IN STEM

14 CELL BIOLOGY AND EXISTING PROGRAMS ON THE BIOLOGY OF

15 EARLY EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS, RENEWAL AND SELF-CYCLE

16 KINETICS. THIS APPLICATION UNIQUELY COMBINES

17 BIOINFORMATICS, COMBINATORIAL CHEMISTRY, AND

18 BIOENGINEERING TO EXISTING PROGRAMS IN CANCER.

19 STRENGTHS ARE WELL-ORGANIZED TRAINING PROGRAM

20 UNDER STRONG LEADERSHIP OF THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR,

21 EXCELLENT TRAINING ENVIRONMENT FOR BASIC RESEARCH WITH

22 INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER LOCAL INSTITUTIONS WITH GREAT

23 STRENGTHS, AN OUTSTANDING FACULTY OF MENTORS, APPLICANT

24 POOL IS SUPERB WITH AN INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF BEING

25 ABLE TO DRAW UPON EXCELLENT POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS.

1 THE INSTITUTION HAS AN EXCELLENT REPUTATION  
2 AND TRACK RECORD, HAVING TRAINED MORE THAN 2,000  
3 SCIENTISTS, MANY OF WHOM HAVE GONE ON TO POSITIONS OF  
4 LEADERSHIP IN OTHER PROMINENT RESEARCH CENTERS.

5 THE WEAKNESS, THE SINGLE WEAKNESS, IS LIMITED  
6 EXPOSURE TO CLINICAL ASPECTS OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY.

7 RECOMMENDATION, HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND  
8 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AS REQUESTED.

9 MS. WILSON: MOVE APPROVAL.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: I MOVE ACCEPTANCE OF THIS  
11 APPLICATION FOR FUNDING.

12 DR. LEVEY: SECOND. CAN'T WE GO BACK TO JUST  
13 GOING AHEAD AND MAKE THE GRANT. IF ANYBODY HAS A  
14 COMMENT, LET'S VOTE.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN PENHOET: YES, WE CAN. PLEASE  
16 CALL THE ROLL.

17 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

18 DR. PRICE: YES.

19 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

20 DR. MEYER: YES.

21 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

22 DR. BRYANT: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

1 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
2 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
3 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
4 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
6 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
7 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
8 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
9 DR. LOVE: YES.  
10 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
11 DR. NOVA: YES.  
12 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
13 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
14 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
15 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
16 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
17 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
18 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
19 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
20 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
21 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
22 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL. JEFF  
23 SHEEHY.  
24 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
25 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

1 DR. STEWARD: YES.

2 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

3 DR. THAL: YES.

4 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

5 MS. WILSON: YES.

6 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

7 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

8 MS. KING: FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND, THE BOARD  
9 DOES NOT NEED DR. CHIU TO GO THROUGH THE PROCESS OF  
10 READING THIS TO YOU, SO WE'RE JUST GOING TO TURN IT  
11 BACK OVER TO THE CHAIR.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO. WE'RE GOING TO ASK DR.  
13 CHIU IN EACH CASE IF SHE HAS ANY SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS  
14 SHE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE, THEN WE WILL TAKE THE ITEM UP.

15 DR. CHIU: THIS INCLUDES ALL THE ONES  
16 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AS WELL OR JUST THOSE 60 OR  
17 UNDER?

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE BOARD IS ASKING, SINCE  
19 WE NOW HAVE SUBSTANTIAL DEPTH IN THESE CONVERSATIONS,  
20 AND THEY'VE READ ALL OF THESE AND THE PUBLIC HAS READ  
21 THEM, IF WE FOCUS ON ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WOULD  
22 LIKE TO OFFER.

23 DR. CHIU: SO THE NEXT APPLICATION IS T306  
24 WITH A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 75. AND THE ONLY POINT IS  
25 THAT BECAUSE OF THE EXCELLENT CALIBER OF THE RESEARCH



1 FACULTY AND THE UNIQUENESS OF THE INTERFACE OF BIOLOGY  
2 AND ENGINEERING, THAT THE REVIEWERS THOUGHT THIS  
3 PROGRAM SHOULD PROVIDE AN EXCELLENT AND UNIQUE TRAINING  
4 EXPERIENCE.

5 THE RECOMMENDATION IS FOR FULL FUNDING AS  
6 REQUESTED.

7 DR. WRIGHT: SO MOVED.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A MOTION BY DR.  
10 WRIGHT, THE SECOND WAS DR. FRIEDMAN. BOARD DISCUSSION?  
11 PUBLIC DISCUSSION?

12 MS. SAMUELSON: CALL THE QUESTION.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CALL THE ROLL.

14 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

15 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

16 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

17 DR. PRICE: YES.

18 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

19 DR. MEYER: YES.

20 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

21 DR. BRYANT: YES.

22 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

23 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

24 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

25 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.

1 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
2 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
3 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
4 DR. DIXON: YES.  
5 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
7 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
8 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
9 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
10 DR. LOVE: YES.  
11 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
12 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
13 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
14 DR. NOVA: YES.  
15 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
16 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
17 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
18 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
19 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
20 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
21 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
22 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
23 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
24 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
25 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL. JEFF

1 SHEEHY.

2 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

3 MS. KING: OS STEWARD.

4 DR. STEWARD: YES.

5 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

6 DR. THAL: YES.

7 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

8 MS. WILSON: YES.

9 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

10 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

11 DR. CHIU: THE NEXT APPLICATION IS T309 WITH

12 A SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 72. THE HIGHLIGHT IS THE SHARP

13 FOCUS ON UNDERSTANDING HOW HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS

14 CAN DIFFERENTIATE INTO CELLS THAT MIGHT BE USED TO

15 TREAT EYE DISEASE.

16 THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT IT'S HIGHLY

17 MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED FOR FULL FUNDING AS

18 REQUESTED.

19 MR. CHAIR.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?

21 DISCUSSION OR A MOTION?

22 MS. WILSON: MOVE APPROVAL.

23 MR. SHEEHY: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHO WAS THE MOTION FROM?

25 GAYLE WILSON. SECOND IS FROM JEFF SHEEHY. DISCUSSION?

1 PUBLIC DISCUSSION?

2 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

3 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

4 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

5 DR. PRICE: YES.

6 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

7 DR. MEYER: YES.

8 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

9 DR. BRYANT: YES.

10 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

11 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

12 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

13 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.

14 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.

15 DR. MARKLAND: YES.

16 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.

17 DR. DIXON: YES.

18 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

20 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

21 DR. LEVEY: YES.

22 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

23 DR. LOVE: YES.

24 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.

25 DR. MURPHY: YES.

1 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
2 DR. NOVA: YES.  
3 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
4 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
5 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
6 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
7 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
8 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
9 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
10 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
11 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
12 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
13 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
14 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
15 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
16 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
17 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
18 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
19 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
20 DR. THAL: YES.  
21 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
22 MS. WILSON: YES.  
23 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
24 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
25 DR. CHIU: THE NEXT APPLICATION T305 WITH A

1 SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF 70. UNIQUE FEATURE OF DEVELOPING A  
2 STEM CELL COURSE TEXTBOOK AND A HIGH QUALITY OF  
3 TRAINING PROGRAM WITH INTEGRATION AND INTERDISCIPLINARY  
4 ELEMENTS.

5 RECOMMENDATION IS THAT IT'S HIGHLY  
6 MERITORIOUS AND RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AS REQUESTED.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: I MOVE FUNDING.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

9 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION?

11 DR. POMEROY: CAN I ASK A QUESTION ABOUT THIS  
12 ONE? I ACTUALLY REALLY LIKE THE TEXTBOOK IDEA. I  
13 THINK THAT'S VERY CLEVER. BUT CAN YOU BALANCE FOR US  
14 HOW THE DISCUSSION WENT? THIS ONE NOTES NOT VERY MANY  
15 FACULTY, BUT PLANS TO RECRUIT THEM. AND WE'VE JUST  
16 DINGED ONE SIGNIFICANTLY THAT HAD NOT VERY MANY FACULTY  
17 AND PLANS TO RECRUIT THEM. CAN YOU HIGHLIGHT HOW THE  
18 DISCUSSION WENT, THAT THIS WAS DIFFERENT SO THAT IT WAS  
19 HIGHLY MERITORIOUS DESPITE THAT?

20 DR. CHIU: THEY HAD UNIQUE FEATURES, BUT IN  
21 PARTICULAR THIS INSTITUTION HAS AN EXCELLENT RECORD OF  
22 TRAINING UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS, HAS A RECORD OF THAT.  
23 AND THAT WAS ONE OF THE HIGHLIGHTS. IT INTEGRATES  
24 COMPONENTS FROM 12 DIFFERENT GRADUATE PROGRAMS. THE  
25 PROGRAM DIRECTOR IS EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED, AND THEY

1 HAVE A STRONG APPLICANT POOL, AND INSTITUTION  
2 COMMITMENT IS HIGH AND PLANS TO RECRUIT ADDITIONAL  
3 FACULTY.

4 THE NEGATIVES WERE THAT LAB SPACE  
5 CURRENTLY -- FOR TRAINING IS UNDERDEVELOPED, AND  
6 THERE'S LITTLE EMPHASIS ON DISEASE, AND THAT THE  
7 FACULTY IS GOOD, BUT HAS LIMITED BACKGROUND IN STEM  
8 CELLS AT THE MOMENT.

9 DR. POMEROY: WOULD IT BE FAIR TO INTERPRET  
10 FROM THAT THAT THERE WAS MORE ANTICIPATION ON THE PART  
11 OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE THAT THESE FACULTY WERE GOING  
12 TO COME AND BE PRODUCTIVE COMPARED TO THE ONE THAT WE  
13 CRITIQUED FOR THAT?

14 DR. CHIU: RIGHT. AGAIN, THE PROGRAM IN  
15 DEVELOPMENT, AND CONSIDERING THAT THE RECRUITS WOULD BE  
16 HIGHLY DIVERSE WAS A STRONG ELEMENT.

17 DR. PRICE: I'M REALLY SKEPTICAL ABOUT THIS  
18 DESCRIPTION OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. IT STARTS  
19 WITH A PROMISE THAT THEY'RE GOING TO HIRE FACULTY, AND  
20 WE UNDERSTAND THE DESIRE TO BUILD OUT A CAPACITY FOR  
21 STEM CELL RESEARCH ACROSS THE STATE. BUT ANY OF US WHO  
22 HAVE BEEN INVOLVED WITH RECRUITING FACULTY KNOW IT  
23 TAKES MORE TO ACTUALLY SUCCESSFULLY RECRUIT HIGH-FLYING  
24 FACULTY THAN SIMPLY THE DESIRE TO RECRUIT THEM OR EVEN  
25 THE MONEY PLUS THE DESIRE. THAT'S A BIG IF.

1                   SECONDLY, THEY PROMISE A TEXTBOOK, WHICH IS  
2 ALSO A NICE IDEA, BUT THEY DON'T HAVE PEOPLE ON THE  
3 FACULTY WHO CAN WRITE THE TEXTBOOK. SO THEY'RE GOING  
4 TO RECRUIT THEM. WELL, AS WE ALL KNOW, NOT EVERY  
5 HIGH-FLYING FACULTY MEMBER THEY WANT TO RECRUIT WOULD  
6 BE INTERESTED IN WRITING A TEXTBOOK. SO THERE'S A BIG  
7 IF.

8                   AND THEN THEY'RE GOING TO DO ALL THIS, AND  
9 THEY LACK EXPERIENCE IN BIOLOGICAL AND TRANSLATIONAL  
10 EXPERTISE. WHAT'S GOING TO GO INTO THE TEXTBOOK? SO I  
11 FIND THIS DESCRIPTION QUITE PROBLEMATIC.

12                  CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION?  
13 AND, DR. PRICE, WERE YOU PROPOSING TO CUT THE PROGRAM  
14 OR TO ELIMINATE THE PROGRAM?

15                  DR. HALL: BOB, LET ME JUST MAKE A COMMENT,  
16 IF I MAY, POINT OF INFORMATION. SO IT WAS INTERESTING,  
17 THE PERSON WHO PRESENTED THIS AT THE MEETING DESCRIBED  
18 IT AS ONE OF THE BEST ORGANIZED AND ONE OF THE MOST  
19 THOUGHTFUL PROGRAMS BY A VERY EXPERIENCED -- A GROUP  
20 THAT IS EVERY EXPERIENCED IN TEACHING. AND THE  
21 INSTITUTION HAD MADE A COMMITMENT, UNDERSTANDING THE  
22 DIFFICULTIES, BUT IT WAS ONE OF THOSE CASES WHERE WE  
23 HAD THE DISCUSSION ABOUT WHETHER A REALLY GREAT,  
24 WELL-ORGANIZED, COHERENT, WELL-THOUGHT OUT PROGRAM AS  
25 OPPOSED TO THE BEST INVESTIGATORS IN THE FIELD.



1                   AND I THINK THE THOUGHTFULNESS OF IT, THE  
2 EXPERIENCE OF THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, AND THE TEXTBOOK,  
3 WHICH INTRIGUED PEOPLE, AND ALSO I THINK THE STRONG  
4 UNDERGRADUATE IDEA THAT A LOT OF THIS WOULD SPILL OVER  
5 IN UNDERGRADUATE IS WHAT TIPPED THE BALANCE FOR THE  
6 WORKING GROUP. AND SO THOSE ARE THE THINGS THAT I  
7 REMEMBER FROM THAT DISCUSSION. OTHERS MAY WISH TO ADD  
8 POINTS THAT THEY REMEMBER.

9                   DR. PIZZO: JUST ALONG THAT LINE, ZACH, WAS  
10 THERE ANY DISCUSSION OF WHAT WAS MEANT BY TEXTBOOK? I  
11 WOULD IMAGINE THAT IN THIS FIELD, WHATEVER TEXT YOU'RE  
12 GOING TO WRITE IS GOING TO HAVE A HALF-LIFE THAT'S  
13 QUITE SHORT. SO IS THIS AN ON-LINE KIND OF BOOK?

14                  DR. HALL: AS I RECALL, IT WAS SORT OF LIKE  
15 MAYBE EARLY GRADUATE STUDENT, HIGH LEVEL UNDERGRADUATE  
16 TEXT THAT WOULD BE -- THEY HAVE A VERY STRONG  
17 DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY PROGRAM THERE IN TERMS OF  
18 TEACHING. I WAS TRYING TO REMEMBER WITH ARLENE. IT  
19 SEEMS TO ME THEY HAD ACTUALLY HAD EXPERIENCE WITH A  
20 TEXTBOOK BEFORE.

21                  DR. PIZZO: IN AN ESTABLISHED AREA WHERE  
22 THERE'S SOME LONGEVITY OF INFORMATION, THAT MAKES  
23 SENSE. BUT THIS AREA IS SO DYNAMIC, THAT IT'S HARD TO  
24 IMAGINE, QUOTE, A TEXTBOOK BEING A BIG SELLING POINT,  
25 QUOTE HONESTLY.

1 DR. CHIU: I JUST WANTED TO QUOTE FROM THE  
2 LONGER VERSION. THE STEM CELL BIOLOGY COURSE IS WELL  
3 DESIGNED AND COVERS THE MAJOR ISSUES IN STEM CELL  
4 BIOLOGY, AND THE QUALITY OF THE PROFESSORS IS  
5 EXCELLENT. READING LISTS ARE ALSO GIVEN, WHICH  
6 HIGHLIGHTS THE AMOUNT OF THOUGHT THAT HAS GONE INTO  
7 THIS APPLICATION. SO SOUNDS LIKE IT'S PRETTY CURRENT,  
8 WHATEVER THEY HAD IN MIND.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE  
10 BOARD? ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? CALL THE  
11 ROLL.

12 MS. KING: WAS THE MOTION TO APPROVE OR NOT  
13 TO APPROVE?

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE IS A MOTION, I  
15 BELIEVE, TO APPROVE BY JOAN SAMUELSON AND THE SECOND  
16 WAS BY DR. WRIGHT.

17 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

18 DR. BALTIMORE: NO.

19 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

20 DR. PRICE: NO.

21 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

22 DR. MEYER: NO.

23 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

24 DR. BRYANT: NO.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.  
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
3 DR. GOLDBERG: NO.  
4 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
5 DR. MARKLAND: NO.  
6 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
7 DR. DIXON: NO.  
8 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO.  
10 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
11 DR. LEVEY: NO.  
12 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
13 DR. LOVE: NO.  
14 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
15 DR. MURPHY: NO.  
16 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
17 DR. NOVA: NO.  
18 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
19 DR. PENHOET: NO.  
20 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
21 DR. PIZZO: NO.  
22 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
23 DR. POMEROY: NO.  
24 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
25 DR. PRIETO: YES.

1 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
2 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
3 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
4 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: NO.  
5 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
6 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
7 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
8 DR. STEWARD: NO.  
9 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
10 DR. THAL: NO.  
11 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
12 MS. WILSON: NO.  
13 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
14 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT WAS THE OUTCOME OF THAT  
16 VOTE? DID NOT PASS. OKAY.  
17 DR. CHIU: NEXT IS -- FROM NOW ON ALL THESE  
18 APPLICATIONS ARE 60 OR BELOW AND NOT RECOMMENDED FOR  
19 FUNDING AT THIS TIME. WE NOW REFER TO T301. MR.  
20 CHAIR.  
21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD  
22 ON THIS ITEM? ANY COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THIS  
23 ITEM? IS THERE A MOTION FROM THE BOARD?  
24 DR. BALTIMORE: MOVE DISAPPROVAL.  
25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVE DISAPPROVAL BY DR.

1 BALTIMORE. IS THERE A SECOND?  
2 DR. MURPHY: SECOND.  
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY DR. MURPHY.  
4 PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.  
5 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.  
6 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.  
7 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.  
8 DR. PRICE: YES.  
9 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
10 DR. MEYER: YES.  
11 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
12 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
13 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
14 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
15 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
16 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
17 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
18 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
19 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
20 DR. DIXON: YES.  
21 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
23 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
24 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
25 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

1 DR. LOVE: YES.  
2 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
3 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
4 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
5 DR. NOVA: YES.  
6 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
7 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
8 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
9 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
10 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
11 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
13 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
14 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
15 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.  
16 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
17 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
18 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD STEWARD.  
19 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
20 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
21 DR. THAL: YES.  
22 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
23 MS. WILSON: YES.  
24 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
25 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

1 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR. NEXT  
2 APPLICATION IS T302 WITH A SCORE OF 60 OR BELOW.  
3 RECOMMENDATION IS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT THIS  
4 TIME. THE ONLY POINT I WANTED TO MAKE IS THAT THIS  
5 FOCUSES ON A DISEASE THAT COULD BE A VERY LIKELY TARGET  
6 FOR STEM CELL THERAPY.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. DISCUSSION FROM  
8 THE BOARD? DISCUSSION FROM THE PUBLIC? ANYONE LIKE TO  
9 MAKE A MOTION?

10 DR. LOVE: I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE  
11 RECOMMENDATION NOT TO FUND.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LOVE MOVES NOT TO FUND.  
13 THAT'S THE MOTION.

14 DR. LEVEY: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY DR. LEVEY.  
16 MELISSA, CALL THE ROLL.

17 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

18 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

19 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

20 DR. PRICE: YES.

21 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

22 DR. MEYER: YES.

23 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

24 DR. BRYANT: YES.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
3 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
4 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
5 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
6 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
7 DR. DIXON: YES.  
8 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
10 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
11 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
13 DR. LOVE: YES.  
14 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
15 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
16 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
17 DR. NOVA: YES.  
18 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
19 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
20 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
21 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
22 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
23 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
24 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
25 DR. PRIETO: YES.



1 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
2 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
3 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD STEWARD.  
4 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
5 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
6 DR. THAL: YES.  
7 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
8 MS. WILSON: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
10 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
11 DR. CHIU: NEXT APPLICATION IS T303 WITH A  
12 SCORE OF 60 OR BELOW, NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT  
13 THIS TIME. THIS PROPOSAL FOCUSES ON THE ROLE OF THE  
14 MICROENVIRONMENT IN REGULATING STEM CELL FATE. MR.  
15 CHAIR.  
16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?  
17 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? IS THERE A MOTION?  
18 DR. MURPHY: SO MOVED TO NOT APPROVE.  
19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVE BY DR. MURPHY TO NOT  
20 APPROVE.  
21 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.  
22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND, DR. WRIGHT. PLEASE  
23 CALL THE ROLL.  
24 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.  
25 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

1 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.  
2 DR. PRICE: YES.  
3 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
4 DR. MEYER: YES.  
5 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
6 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
7 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
8 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
9 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
10 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
11 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
12 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
13 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
14 DR. DIXON: YES.  
15 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
17 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
18 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
19 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
20 DR. LOVE: YES.  
21 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
22 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
23 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
24 DR. NOVA: YES.  
25 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.

1 DR. PENHOET: YES.

2 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

3 DR. PIZZO: YES.

4 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

5 DR. POMEROY: YES.

6 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

7 DR. PRIETO: YES.

8 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

10 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

11 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

12 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD STEWARD.

13 DR. STEWARD: YES.

14 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

15 DR. THAL: YES.

16 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

17 MS. WILSON: YES.

18 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

19 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

20 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. THE NEXT APPLICATION

21 IS T304, NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT THIS TIME.

22 MAIN STRENGTH IS EMPHASIS ON TRANSLATIONAL USE OF STEM

23 CELLS IN PEDIATRIC DISEASES. MR. CHAIR.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD?

25 DR. BALTIMORE: MOVE DISAPPROVAL.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVE DI SAPPROVAL. IS THERE  
2 A SECOND?  
3 DR. FRIEDMAN: SECOND.  
4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION FROM THE PUBLIC?  
5 CALL THE ROLL.  
6 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.  
7 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.  
8 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.  
9 DR. PRICE: YES.  
10 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.  
11 DR. MEYER: YES.  
12 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.  
13 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
14 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
15 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
16 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
17 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
18 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
19 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
20 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
21 DR. DIXON: YES.  
22 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
24 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
25 DR. LEVEY: YES.

1 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
2 DR. LOVE: YES.  
3 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
4 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
5 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
6 DR. NOVA: YES.  
7 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
8 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
9 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
10 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
11 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
12 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
13 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
14 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
15 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
16 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
17 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
18 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
19 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD STEWARD.  
20 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
21 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
22 DR. THAL: YES.  
23 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
24 MS. WILSON: YES.  
25 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

1 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

2 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. NEXT APPLICATION IS  
3 T308, NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT THIS TIME. THE  
4 EMPHASIS IS ON MATHEMATICAL MODELING AND USE OF STEM  
5 CELL BIOLOGY TO FOSTER A SYSTEMS LEVEL APPROACH TO  
6 DIFFERENTIATION. MR. CHAIR.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?  
8 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? IS THERE A MOTION?

9 MS. WILSON: MOVE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION NOT  
10 TO APPROVE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GAYLE WILSON MOVES NOT TO  
12 APPROVE. IS THERE A SECOND?

13 DR. LEVEY: SECOND.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND FROM DR. LEVEY.  
15 MELISSA, CALL THE ROLL.

16 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

17 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

18 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

19 DR. PRICE: YES.

20 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

21 DR. MEYER: YES.

22 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

23 DR. BRYANT: YES.

24 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

25 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

1 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
2 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
3 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
4 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
5 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
6 DR. DIXON: YES.  
7 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
9 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
10 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
11 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
12 DR. LOVE: YES.  
13 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
14 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
15 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
16 DR. NOVA: YES.  
17 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
18 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
19 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
20 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
21 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
22 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
23 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
24 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
25 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

1 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

2 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

3 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

4 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD STEWARD.

5 DR. STEWARD: YES.

6 MS. KING: LEON THAL.

7 DR. THAL: YES.

8 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

9 MS. WILSON: YES.

10 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

11 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

12 DR. CHIU: THE NEXT APPLICATION IS T310, NOT

13 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT THIS TIME. IT'S A PROPOSAL

14 TO FUND A PROGRAM ON LAB METHODS INCLUDING DNA TRANSFER

15 INTO STEM CELLS AND STEM CELL ISOLATION. MR. CHAIR.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD?

17 DISCUSSION FROM THE PUBLIC?

18 DR. PIZZO: NOT TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO MOVES NOT TO

20 ACCEPT. IS THERE A SECOND?

21 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND, DR. WRIGHT.

23 DR. PIZZO: ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION NOT TO

24 FUND.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION



1 NOT TO FUND. THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION FROM  
2 THE BOARD? FROM THE PUBLIC? CALL THE ROLL.

3 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

4 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

5 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

6 DR. PRICE: YES.

7 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

8 DR. MEYER: YES.

9 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

10 DR. BRYANT: YES.

11 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

12 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

13 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

14 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.

15 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.

16 DR. MARKLAND: YES.

17 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.

18 DR. DIXON: YES.

19 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

21 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

22 DR. LEVEY: YES.

23 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

24 DR. LOVE: YES.

25 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.

1 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
2 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
3 DR. NOVA: YES.  
4 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
5 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
6 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
7 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
8 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
9 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
10 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
11 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
12 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
13 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
14 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
15 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
16 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD STEWARD.  
17 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
18 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
19 DR. THAL: YES.  
20 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
21 MS. WILSON: YES.  
22 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
23 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
24 DR. CHIU: THE LAST APPLICATION FOR  
25 CONSIDERATION IS T311, NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT

1 THIS TIME.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND LET ME TELL THE BOARD  
3 IMMEDIATELY AFTER THIS WE'RE GOING TO ITEM 12, THE  
4 STANDARDS, WHICH HAVE BEEN BEFORE THIS BOARD AND THE  
5 STANDARDS COMMITTEE AND ARE BACK HERE AS INTERIM  
6 REGULATIONS.

7 ANY DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD? IS THERE A  
8 MOTION FROM THE BOARD?

9 DR. LEVEY: SO MOVED, NOT TO FUND.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED FROM DR. LEVEY NOT TO  
11 FUND.

12 DR. MURPHY: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND, DR. MURPHY.

14 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? CALL THE ROLL.

15 MS. KING: DAVID BALTIMORE.

16 DR. BALTIMORE: YES.

17 MS. KING: BOB PRICE.

18 DR. PRICE: YES.

19 MS. KING: DAVID MEYER.

20 DR. MEYER: YES.

21 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

22 DR. BRYANT: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

1 DR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
2 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND.  
3 DR. MARKLAND: YES.  
4 MS. KING: JACK DIXON.  
5 DR. DIXON: YES.  
6 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
8 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
9 DR. LEVEY: YES.  
10 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
11 DR. LOVE: YES.  
12 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.  
13 DR. MURPHY: YES.  
14 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.  
15 DR. NOVA: YES.  
16 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.  
17 DR. PENHOET: YES.  
18 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
19 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
20 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
21 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
22 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
23 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
24 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
25 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

1 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
2 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES. JEFF SHEEHY.  
3 OSWALD STEWARD.  
4 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
5 MS. KING: LEON THAL.  
6 DR. THAL: YES.  
7 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.  
8 MS. WILSON: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.  
10 DR. WRIGHT: YES.  
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE  
12 COMPLETED THIS. I THINK WE HAVE A GREAT HAND FOR  
13 DR. ARLENE CHIU.  
14 (APPLAUSE.)  
15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: PLEASE FOR DR. ZACH HALL AS  
16 WELL.  
17 (APPLAUSE.)  
18 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THAT WE HAVE THE  
19 PRELIMINARY TOTAL FOR THE GRANTS, JUST TO LET YOU KNOW.  
20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, WHAT IS THAT?  
21 DR. HALL: TWELVE AND A HALF MILLION.  
22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: TWELVE AND HALF MILLION.  
23 ALL RIGHT.  
24 ARE WE LOSING OUR QUORUM WITH THE TWO THAT  
25 JUST WALKED OUT THE DOOR? NO. OKAY.

1 WE HAVE TO MOVE VERY QUICKLY TO ITEM 12, AND  
2 THEN WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A FIVE-MINUTE EXECUTIVE  
3 SESSION ON AN IMPORTANT ITEM HERE, IN HERE. AND IF  
4 IMMEDIATELY AFTER ITEM 12, IF THE AUDIENCE WOULD PLEASE  
5 LEAVE THE ROOM FOR JUST A MOMENT, AND THEN WE CAN COME  
6 BACK IN, HOPEFULLY, WITH SOME VERY POSITIVE  
7 INFORMATION.

8 ITEM 12, DR. HALL.

9 DR. HALL: I PRESENT FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION  
10 THE INTERIM STANDARDS FOR HUMAN STEM CELL RESEARCH.  
11 AND THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP MET TOWARD THE END OF  
12 THIS LAST MONTH AND BASICALLY CONSIDERED -- AS YOU  
13 RECALL, WE HAD APPROVED THE NATIONAL ACADEMY STANDARDS.  
14 AND THE FIRST MEETING OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP  
15 TASKED THE STAFF, AND BY THIS IN THIS CASE WE MEAN  
16 MOSTLY JAMES HARRISON, TO PUT THE NATIONAL ACADEMY  
17 STANDARDS INTO REGULATORY LANGUAGE THAT WAS APPROPRIATE  
18 FOR CIRM AND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. AND THERE WERE  
19 SEVERAL CHANGES THAT WE MADE MOSTLY TO BRING IT IN LINE  
20 WITH PROPOSITION 71 AND TO SUBSTITUTE CIRM.

21 THAT HAS BEEN DONE. IT'S IN YOUR BOOKS UNDER  
22 ITEM NO. 11. THE REVISED STANDARDS WERE PRESENTED AT  
23 THE RECENT --

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ITEM 12.

25 DR. HALL: ITEM 12. I'M SORRY. THE REVISED

1 STANDARDS PLACED IN THIS FORM WERE AT THE -- PRESENTED  
2 AT THE RECENT STANDARDS WORKING GROUP MEETING. THEY  
3 MADE SEVERAL FURTHER CHANGES. AND LET ME SAY THAT THE  
4 MOST IMPORTANT OF THEM WAS A STRONGLY STATED DESIRE  
5 THAT ALL INVESTIGATORS FUNDED BY CIRM PLACE ANY CELL  
6 LINE OR MATERIAL FUNDED BY CIRM INTO A STEM CELL BANK  
7 FROM WHICH IT WOULD BE ACCESSIBLE TO A BROAD GROUP OF  
8 RESEARCHERS.

9 AND SO THE OTHER QUESTION WAS TO -- CHANGE  
10 WAS TO REMOVE THE INJUNCTION THAT EACH INSTITUTION  
11 NEEDED TO SET UP ITS OWN STEM CELL BANK, BUT TO SAY  
12 SIMPLY THAT ITS INVESTIGATORS NEEDED TO DEPOSIT  
13 MATERIAL AND IT SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN A BANK, AND WE  
14 LEFT OPEN THE QUESTION OF WHETHER -- I THINK THE IDEA  
15 WAS THAT THERE MAY BE SOME OTHER ARRANGEMENT IN  
16 CALIFORNIA FOR THOSE BANKS, AND EACH INSTITUTION WOULD  
17 NOT HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE PLANNING FOR THAT.

18 THE OTHER CHANGES, I THINK, WERE MINOR. LET  
19 ME JUST CHECK. THERE WAS CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION ABOUT  
20 HOW TO DEAL WITH CELL LINES THAT WERE GENERATED UNDER  
21 CONDITIONS THAT WERE DIFFERENT FROM THOSE OF THE  
22 GUIDELINES, PARTICULARLY THOSE THAT WERE PREEXISTING.  
23 AND SO WE ADDED THAT IT WAS ACCEPTABLE TO USE NIH AND  
24 UK, UNITED KINGDOM, STEM CELL BANK LINES THAT HAD  
25 ALREADY BEEN APPROVED FOR USE.

1           AND I THINK THOSE WERE THE MAJOR CHANGES.  
2       THE TEXT IS IN THE ITEM 12, AS WE SAID. AND IF YOU  
3       APPROVE THESE STANDARDS, THEY WILL THEN BE NOTICED  
4       ACCORDING TO THE APA, AND WE WILL BEGIN THE CLOCK FOR  
5       THE APA PROCESS OF 270 DAYS. WE HAVE ALREADY BEGUN  
6       DISCUSSION OF THESE IN THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AND  
7       WE HELD OUR FIRST PUBLIC MEETING IN LOS ANGELES. FOR  
8       THOSE OF YOU WHO WERE PRESENT, VERY GOOD MEETING. WE  
9       HAVE ANOTHER ONE SCHEDULED FOR SAN FRANCISCO AND  
10      ANOTHER ONE FOR SACRAMENTO.

11           CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE TO BE CORRECT, WE  
12      HELD BOTH A PUBLIC MEETING AND A PUBLIC HEARING.

13           DR. HALL: I'M SORRY. YES. WE HELD A  
14      MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP, WHICH IS OPEN TO THE  
15      PUBLIC. WE ALSO HELD A MEETING IN WHICH THE PUBLIC WAS  
16      INVITED TO COME AND TESTIFY.

17           DR. PIZZO: MR. CHAIRMAN AND ZACH, WE HAVE A  
18      NUMBER OF COMMENTS TO MAKE ON THIS. AND ONE PRACTICAL  
19      PROBLEM IS TIME, AT LEAST FOR ME, BECAUSE I HAD ALREADY  
20      STAYED ABOUT AN HOUR MORE THAN I COULD HAVE BECAUSE I  
21      HAVE TO RUN A FUNCTION TONIGHT. HOW DO I GET OUR  
22      COMMENTS TO YOU? I'LL BE HAPPY TO DO THAT, BUT I'M --  
23      SOME OF THEM RELATE TO THE FACT THAT THERE'S VARIANCE  
24      IN THIS FROM WHAT WE'VE SEEN IN THE NAS GUIDELINES, AND  
25      WE'D LIKE TO GET THESE AS CONSTANT AS WE CAN.



1 MS. SAMUELSON: WHY CAN'T WE TAKE IT UP AT  
2 OUR NEXT MEETING?

3 DR. HALL: OUR NEXT MEETING WILL BE IN TWO  
4 MONTHS, AND WE'LL HAVE TO GET FROM JAMES THE QUESTION  
5 ABOUT THAT. BUT I THINK WE HAVE A -- JAMES, QUESTION  
6 HAS BEEN CAN WE TAKE THIS UP IN TWO MONTHS?

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME MAKE A SUGGESTION  
8 CREATIVELY. IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE THESE  
9 ADOPTED BEFORE WE HAVE ANY FUNDING THAT'S RELEASED.  
10 VERY CLEARLY OUR FUNDING IS GOING TO BE SUBJECT TO  
11 THESE REGULATIONS. ASSUMING THAT WE ARE FORTUNATE  
12 ENOUGH TO FUND THROUGH A BOND ANTICIPATION NOTE, WE  
13 COULD, IN FACT, FUND AND HOLD THOSE FUNDS PENDING  
14 THE -- NOT DISTRIBUTE THEM UNTIL WE HAVE THIS APPROVED  
15 AT THE NOVEMBER MEETING.

16 DR. HALL: ACTUALLY WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO  
17 ISSUE FUNDS UNTIL AFTER THE NOVEMBER MEETING BECAUSE  
18 WE'LL HAVE TO APPROVE A GRANTS POLICY AT THE SAME TIME.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THAT WOULD SEEM  
20 TO SOLVE THAT SO THAT EVEN THOUGH THE FUNDS MIGHT BE  
21 RAISED PRIOR TO THE DATE, WE HAVE TO HAVE THE GRANTS  
22 POLICY STATEMENT. WE WOULDN'T BE RELEASING ANY FUNDS.

23 DR. HALL: THERE'S NO DOWNSIDE TO POSTPONING  
24 THIS? I THOUGHT THERE WAS IN TERMS OF THE ABSOLUTE  
25 TIME WITHIN WHICH WE WERE SUPPOSED TO DO THIS.

1 MR. HARRISON: NO. THE CURRENT STATUS IS THE  
2 WORKING GROUP HAS MADE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC  
3 BASED ON THE ICO'S DIRECTION TO THE WORKING GROUP TO GO  
4 BACK AND TAKE THE NAS GUIDELINES AND PUT THEM INTO  
5 REGULATORY LANGUAGE. WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IN THE MEANTIME  
6 IS THAT THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE  
7 PENDING SO THAT THE 270-DAY CLOCK ON THE PROCEDURES  
8 THEMSELVES WOULD NOT BEGIN UNTIL THE ICOC APPROVES THEM  
9 AS ITS INTERIM GUIDELINES.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: DIDN'T WE ALREADY APPROVE THE  
11 NAS GUIDELINES AS INTERIM GUIDELINES FOR OUR WORK?

12 MR. HARRISON: WELL, YOU DID, BUT WHAT  
13 HAPPENED IS THAT THE MOTION THAT WAS MADE APPROVING  
14 THOSE WAS ITSELF AMENDED ONCE SOME QUESTIONS WERE  
15 RAISED ABOUT THE CONTENT OF THE GUIDELINES THEMSELVES.  
16 AND THE AMENDED MOTION DIRECTED THE WORKING GROUP TO GO  
17 BACK AND ESSENTIALLY START OVER AND PROPOSE THE NAS  
18 GUIDELINES IN A REGULATORY FORMAT, WHICH IS WHAT THE  
19 WORKING GROUP HAS DONE. THAT'S THE DECISION THAT'S  
20 BEFORE YOU TODAY, AND THE QUESTION IS WHETHER IT CAN BE  
21 POSTPONED UNTIL NOVEMBER. I THINK AS LONG AS THE  
22 FUNDING IS NOT GOING TO GO OUT PRIOR TO THAT TIME, THEN  
23 IT CAN BE POSTPONED UNTIL NOVEMBER.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: WE DON'T HAVE ANY MONEY NOW.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE ISSUE IS -- THE POINT IS

1 IF THE MONEY IS RAISED PRIOR TO NOVEMBER, WE'RE MAKING  
2 A PUBLIC STATEMENT WE WOULD NOT BE RELEASING THAT MONEY  
3 UNTIL AFTER THE NOVEMBER MEETING BECAUSE WE NEED OUR  
4 POLICY STATEMENT ADOPTED AND WE NEED THESE ADOPTED, SO  
5 WE ARE NOT RELEASING ANY MONEY UNTIL WE HAVE OUR  
6 STANDARDS IN PLACE.

7 DR. HALL: DR. PIZZO AND OTHERS, IF YOU HAVE  
8 COMMENTS ON THESE GUIDELINES, PLEASE GET THEM TO US SO  
9 WE TRY TO WORK TOWARDS RESOLUTION AT THE NEXT MEETING.

10 DR. PIZZO: WE'LL GET THEM TO YOU IN THE NEXT  
11 FEW DAYS.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: I WOULD URGE THAT WE GET THAT  
13 WORK PRODUCT TO US, TO THE FULL COMMITTEE, AS SOON AS  
14 POSSIBLE AS WELL.

15 DR. HALL: IT'S IN YOUR BOOK.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: BUT IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER  
17 COMMENTS OR REVISIONS.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRIETO.

19 DR. PRIETO: JUST A COMMENT AS SOMEONE WHO  
20 PARTICIPATED IN THIS. I'D LIKE TO REMIND EVERYONE THAT  
21 WITHIN THE 270-DAY WINDOW THAT THERE ARE AMPLE  
22 OPPORTUNITIES FOR US TO MAKE MAJOR AND MINOR REVISIONS  
23 AS WELL AS TO USE PUBLIC COMMENT TO MAKE MAJOR OR MINOR  
24 REVISIONS TO THESE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND --

1 DR. HALL: SMALL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WAIT. WE NEED TO TAKE  
3 ACTION. SO FORMALLY WE'RE GOING TO MOVE THIS --  
4 SOMEONE MAKE A MOTION TO MOVE THIS ITEM FOR  
5 CONSIDERATION ON NOVEMBER 2D?

6 DR. PRIETO: SO MOVED.

7 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SECOND.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOARD COMMENT? PUBLIC  
9 COMMENT? ALL IN FAVOR.

10 WE HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT EXECUTIVE SESSION  
11 ITEM THAT WE WILL NEED A QUORUM FOR JUST A VERY QUICK  
12 ITEM THAT HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED IN DETAIL.

13 DR. BALTIMORE: DO WE HAVE A QUORUM?

14 DR. HALL: TWO QUICK COMMENTS. I'D LIKE TO  
15 INTRODUCE GEOFF LOMAX, WHO IS THE SENIOR STAFF LIAISON  
16 TO THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AND IS DOING A GREAT  
17 JOB WORKING WITH KATE SHREVE. I'D ALSO LIKE TO  
18 ANNOUNCE THAT, AS YOU KNOW, DR. HARRIET RABB STEPPED  
19 DOWN AND HAD TO RESIGN FROM THE COMMITTEE FOR PERSONAL  
20 AND PROFESSIONAL UNEXPECTED DEVELOPMENTS. AND  
21 DR. BERNIE LO HAS AGREED TO CO-CHAIR THE MEETING, THE  
22 STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AT LEAST ON AN INTERIM BASIS.  
23 WHETHER THAT NEEDS APPROVAL HERE OR NOT, I'M NOT SURE.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE  
25 DR. BERNARD LO?

1 MS. SAMUELSON: SO MOVED.

2 DR. BRYANT: SECOND.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DISCUSSION? PUBLIC  
4 DISCUSSION?

5 MS. SAMUELSON: CALL THE QUESTION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL IN FAVOR. THANK YOU.

7 AND GEOFF LOMAX AND KATE SHREVE DID A  
8 PHENOMENAL AMOUNT OF WORK ON THESE STANDARDS THROUGH  
9 THE PROCESS TO DATE. I THINK THEY DESERVE A GREAT  
10 HAND.

11 (APPLAUSE.)

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF THE AUDIENCE WOULD KINDLY  
13 GIVE US JUST A FEW MINUTES, WE WILL THEN RECONVENE VERY  
14 QUICKLY FOR HOPEFULLY A VERY QUICK ACTION ITEM.

15 (THE BOARD THEN RECESSED TO CLOSED  
16 SESSION, WHICH WAS NOT REPORTED, NOR HEREIN  
17 TRANSCRIBED. THE FOLLOWING WAS THEN HEARD IN OPEN  
18 SESSION:)

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE ARE RECONVENING THE  
20 SESSION. WE ARE RECONVENING THE PUBLIC SESSION. I'D  
21 LIKE TO MAKE AN ANNOUNCEMENT ON ACTION TAKEN IN THE  
22 EXECUTIVE SESSION.

23 THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE HAS  
24 PROVIDED PREVIOUSLY TO THE BOARD IN EXECUTIVE SESSION  
25 RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PERMANENT PRESIDENT. AND THE

1 SPENCER-STUART FIRM HELPED US LEAD A NATIONAL SEARCH  
2 WITH TREMENDOUS CANDIDATES. AMONG THOSE CANDIDATES  
3 RECEIVING THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS WAS DR.  
4 ZACH HALL. AFTER INTERVIEWS WITH THE LEADING  
5 CANDIDATES FROM ALL PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND  
6 CANDIDATES' PRESENTATIONS HERE IN CALIFORNIA AND AT A  
7 MEETING OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE, AS WELL  
8 AS IN THE BOARD MEETING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, DR. ZACH  
9 HALL WAS THE CLEAR CHOICE AS THE VERY BEST CANDIDATE  
10 FOR THE COMBINATION OF HIS SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL  
11 RESEARCH RECORD, HIS RECORD AS A LEADER AT THE NIH, AND  
12 HIS STRATEGIC VISION THAT HE ARTICULATED WITH SUCH  
13 ELOQUENCE IN AN EXECUTIVE SESSION.

14 WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE HIM AS WE GO INTO OUR  
15 STRATEGIC PLANNING TO PROVIDE AN INSIGHT TO THAT IN A  
16 PUBLIC STATEMENT. THE BOARD HAS HAD THE GOOD FORTUNE  
17 TO SEE DR. HALL'S PERFORMANCE, VALIDATING THE  
18 RECOMMENDATIONS. AND I WOULD MAKE THE POINT THAT THE  
19 RECOMMENDATIONS OF DR. HALL WERE FROM THIRD-PARTY  
20 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIANS IN THE FIELD FROM ALL OVER  
21 THE NATION, SO HE WAS VALIDATED IN THE NOMINATION  
22 PROCESS AS GETTING SOME OF THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF  
23 NOMINATIONS, AND HE HAS BEEN VALIDATED BY THE  
24 PERFORMANCE AND BY THE CONFIDENCE OF THIS BOARD.

25 SO IT IS, THEREFORE, WITH GREAT PRIDE ON

1 BEHALF OF THE BOARD AND FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PEOPLE  
2 OF CALIFORNIA AND THIS NATION THAT WE ANNOUNCE THAT DR.  
3 HALL, AT THE PRESENT SALARY THAT HE'S ALREADY AT, WILL  
4 BE OFFERED AND HAS ACCEPTED THE PRESIDENCY OF THE  
5 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.

6 AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE, I WOULD LIKE TO THANK  
7 HIM PERSONALLY ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD FOR HIS  
8 WILLINGNESS TO DEFER HIS PERSONAL PLANS THAT WERE VERY  
9 THOUGHTFULLY ARRIVED AT TO CONTINUE THIS CRITICAL  
10 LEADERSHIP WITH CIRM.

11 I WOULD LIKE TO LEAD THE BOARD AND THE  
12 AUDIENCE IN APPLAUSE AND THANKS FOR --

13 (APPLAUSE.)

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A FORMAL MOTION TO  
15 ACCEPT DR. HALL AS THE -- TO APPROVE DR. HALL AS THE  
16 FORMAL PRESIDENT, PERMANENT PRESIDENT OF THE  
17 INSTITUTION AT HIS CURRENT SALARY?

18 (MOVED BY ALL MEMBERS.)

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? LET  
20 IT BE KNOWN THAT IT WAS UNANIMOUS SUPPORT. THANK YOU  
21 VERY MUCH. AND WE'RE GOING TAKE A SHORT 15-MINUTE  
22 BREAK AND RECONVENE FOR SOME ADDITIONAL ITEMS.

23 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I APOLOGIZE FOR THE DELAY.  
25 WE HAVE THIS GREAT NEWS WITH DR. ZACH HALL'S

1 PRESIDENCY, ALONG WITH THE GRANT PROGRAM. AND IT WAS  
2 IMPORTANT, GIVEN THAT WE HAVE SUCH POSITIVE NEWS, THAT  
3 IN THE EYES OF THE COMMUNICATION STAFF AND EXECUTIVE  
4 COMMITTEE THAT WE COMMUNICATE IT IMMEDIATELY TO MAKE  
5 THE DEADLINES.

6 NEVERTHELESS, IN TERMS OF THE REMAINING  
7 ACTIONS THAT ARE BEFORE US, ITEM 13, I BELIEVE, IS THE  
8 ONLY ADDITIONAL ITEM THAT WE REALLY SHOULD  
9 INFORMATIONALLY COVER TODAY AS IT DEALS WITH THE  
10 GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE. AND DR. HALL IS NOT BACK YET.

11 THE BUDGETARY PRESENTATION FROM THAT  
12 COMMITTEE CAN BE MADE BY WALTER. THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT  
13 INFORMATION. THAT'S, I THINK, HIGHLY RELEVANT FOR THE  
14 PUBLIC.

15 MR. BARNES: IN THE INTEREST OF TIME AND THE  
16 HOUR AND THAT KIND OF STUFF, I'M GOING TO TRY AND MOVE  
17 THROUGH THIS FAIRLY QUICKLY. THE LAST TWO PAGES OF THE  
18 ITEM 13 IS THE REPORT ON CONTRACTS AND INTERAGENCY  
19 AGREEMENTS. THIS IS THE REPORT THAT WE AGREED TO  
20 PROVIDE TO THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE EACH TIME IT MEETS  
21 THAT WOULD SUMMARIZE OUR PROGRESS WITH REGARD TO  
22 CONTRACTS AS WELL AS REPORT ON ANY NEW CONTRACTS EITHER  
23 REQUIRED AND APPROVED BY ZACH HALL AS THE PRESIDENT OR  
24 THAT MIGHT NEED APPROVAL BY THE ICOC OR THE GOVERNANCE  
25 COMMITTEE ITSELF.



1 AS YOU CAN SEE, THERE'S NOT A LOT OF ACTION.  
2 MOST OF THE ACTION GOT TAKEN CARE OF AT THE LAST  
3 MEETING. AND THE TWO CONTRACTS, ACTUALLY ONE CONTRACT  
4 AND ONE EXTENSION OF A CONTRACT, THE EDELMAN CONTRACT  
5 AND THE REMCHO EXTENSION THAT WERE APPROVED, HAVE BEEN  
6 EXECUTED. SO THAT IS BASICALLY FOR INFORMATION ONLY.

7 WITH REGARD TO THE BUDGET, I HAVE INCLUDED,  
8 STARTING ON PAGE 1, A SUMMARY SHEET WITH REGARD TO THE  
9 BUDGET. AT THE JULY 29TH MEETING, THE GOVERNANCE  
10 COMMITTEE DID APPROVE, REVIEW AND APPROVE, A PROPOSED  
11 BUDGET PLAN FOR THE OPERATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR THE  
12 CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. AND THERE'S REALLY TWO PARTS TO  
13 THIS TO BUDGET.

14 THE FIRST QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH HOW MUCH  
15 FUNDING IS AVAILABLE. DEPENDING UPON WHAT FUNDING IS  
16 AVAILABLE, WE CAN DO A CERTAIN LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES BOTH  
17 IN TERMS OF OUR OWN OPERATIONS AS WELL AS FUNDING  
18 GRANTS. SINCE THERE ARE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH TRYING  
19 TO GET FUNDING, WE HAVE -- ZACH HAS, AS PRESIDENT,  
20 IDENTIFIED THREE GOALS FOR US. AND HE MENTIONED THAT  
21 EARLIER IN HIS PRESENTATION. THE FIRST BEING  
22 FUND-RAISING, THE SECOND EXPANDING THE GRANT PROGRAM,  
23 AND THE THIRD BEING SUPPORTING THE MOVE TO THE NEW  
24 HEADQUARTERS SITE.

25 SO OUR BUDGET HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED ALONG THE

1 LINES OF AVAILABLE FUNDING AND THESE GOALS. AND WHAT  
2 WE HAVE DONE IS WE'VE GIVEN YOU THREE ALTERNATIVES, AND  
3 EACH OF THOSE ALTERNATIVES TRIES TO ADDRESS THOSE THREE  
4 GOALS AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF FUNDING. AND WHAT WE HAVE  
5 GIVEN YOU HERE IS NOT THREE ALTERNATIVES FOR YOU TO  
6 CHOOSE FROM. IN EFFECT, WHAT WE ARE SAYING HERE IS  
7 THAT ALTERNATIVE ONE, WHICH IS OUR BARE-BONES BUDGET,  
8 IS BASED ON WHATEVER MONEY IS LEFT FROM THE \$3 MILLION  
9 LOAN THAT WE GOT FROM THE GENERAL FUND AND THE \$5  
10 MILLION DOLBY GRANT, HERE ARE THE THINGS WE CAN DO AND  
11 WILL ACCOMPLISH GEARED TOWARDS THESE THREE GOALS.

12 AS FUNDING, MORE FUNDING, BECOMES AVAILABLE,  
13 WHETHER THE FUNDING COMES FROM BAN'S OR WHETHER THE  
14 FUNDING COMES FROM BONDS, WE CAN EXPAND OUR ACTIVITIES,  
15 BOTH OUR OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND OUR GRANT  
16 ACTIVITIES. SO THE PLAN THAT THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
17 APPROVED WAS FOR US TO CONTINUE OUR OPERATIONS UNDER  
18 ALTERNATIVE ONE, BUT TO THEN MOVE TO ALTERNATIVE TWO  
19 AND THREE AS FUNDING BECAME AVAILABLE.

20 SO HAVING SAID THAT, JUST THE INFORMATION  
21 ABOUT ALTERNATIVE ONE, WHICH IS OUR BARE-BONES BUDGET,  
22 THAT'S WHAT'S LEFT OF THE \$3 MILLION, AND I'M ON PAGE  
23 3, WHAT'S LEFT OF THE \$3 MILLION AND THE \$5 MILLION  
24 DOLBY GRANT. THIS LAYS OUT THE MAJOR EXPENDITURES THAT  
25 WE WOULD INTEND TO INCUR.

1           THE TWO BIGGEST ITEMS, AS USUAL, ARE PERSONAL  
2 SERVICES, WHICH IS THE SALARIES, BENEFITS, AND OVERTIME  
3 FOR ALL OF OUR STAFF. IN ADDITION, IT INCLUDES THE  
4 ICOC PER DIEM COSTS THAT BASICALLY WE'RE PAYING NOW AS  
5 WELL, THE \$100 PER MEETING. THE OPERATING EXPENSE,  
6 AGAIN, OUR BIGGEST ITEM IS RELATED TO INTERAGENCY  
7 AGREEMENTS AND EXTERNAL CONTRACTS. THIS, AGAIN, IS A  
8 REFLECTION OF THE FACT THAT WE CAN'T HIRE STAFF TO  
9 CARRY OUT OUR ACTIVITIES, SO WE CONTINUE TO RELY UPON  
10 CONTRACTORS TO HELP US OUT, EITHER INTERAGENCY  
11 AGREEMENTS WITH STATE AGENCIES OR PRIVATE CONTRACTORS.  
12 AND THE MAJOR EXPENDITURES ARE EXPECTED TO BE EITHER  
13 FOR LEGAL SERVICES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OR  
14 REMCHO, WHICH IS A REFLECTION OF THE FACT THAT WE  
15 CONTINUE TO HAVE LITIGATION ISSUES AND ARE EXPECTING TO  
16 HAVE LITIGATION ISSUES THAT HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH THIS  
17 YEAR.

18           THE SECOND ITEM BEING THE EDELMAN CONTRACT,  
19 WHICH IS RELATED TO OUR COMMUNICATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL  
20 PROGRAM. AND THEN THE LAST ONE IS THE STATE  
21 CONTROLLER'S OFFICE. IT'S AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT,  
22 AND UNDER THAT AGREEMENT THOSE ARE THE PEOPLE THAT  
23 ACTUALLY HELP US PAY OUR BILLS AND KEEP TRACK OF OUR  
24 ACCOUNTING RECORDS AND PROCESS SOME OF OUR PERSONNEL  
25 TRANSACTIONS. SO THESE ARE THE DETAIL PROCESS ORIENTED

1 PEOPLE.

2 BEYOND THAT, WE HAVE BUDGETED MONEY FOR THE  
3 ICOC MEETINGS. AND THIS INCLUDES COST FOR ROOMS,  
4 TRAVEL, SPOTLIGHT, EVERYTHING BASED ON THE IDEA THAT  
5 THERE WOULD BE 11 ICOC MEETINGS THIS YEAR. ALREADY  
6 CANCELED THE OCTOBER ONE OR DECIDED NOT TO HOLD ONE IN  
7 OCTOBER. SO THAT FUNDING, BASED UPON OUR EXPERIENCE  
8 WITH THE EXPENDITURES THAT WE'VE SPENT IN THE PAST ICOC  
9 MEETINGS, IS WHAT'S UNDER THIS PARTICULAR CATEGORY.  
10 THAT ADDS UP TO ABOUT \$204,000 EXPECTED FOR THE CURRENT  
11 YEAR, WHICH MEANS THAT THE ICOC MEETINGS ARE RUNNING US  
12 ABOUT \$20,000 PER MEETING.

13 NOW, THIS INCLUDES, MAKE SURE, IT INCLUDES  
14 THE ROOM, IT INCLUDES THE SPOTLIGHT WORK, IT INCLUDES  
15 THE TRANSCRIBER THAT WE HAVE, IT INCLUDES ALL OF YOUR  
16 TRAVEL AND REIMBURSEMENT TO GET YOU HERE AND GET YOU  
17 HOME SAFELY AND ALL THAT KIND OF STUFF.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WALTER, MY ESTEEMED VICE  
19 CHAIR HAS POINTED OUT THAT SINCE ALL OF THESE ITEMS  
20 HAVE BEEN MADE PUBLIC AND ALL OF THE MEMBERS OF THE  
21 BOARD HAVE THESE ITEMS, AND SINCE WE'LL BE TAKING  
22 ACTION IN NOVEMBER, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS MEETING,  
23 IF YOU COULD HIT THE HIGH POINTS SO THAT THE PUBLIC  
24 UNDERSTAND THE CONTEXT FOR THIS, THAT WOULD BE PROBABLY  
25 SUFFICIENT.

1           MR. BARNES: SOUNDS GOOD. I THINK PROBABLY  
2 THE ONLY OTHER THING I'D POINT OUT ON HERE IS THE NEXT  
3 TWO BULLETS, SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES AND  
4 WORKING GROUPS. AND THIS IS BASICALLY RELATED TO OUR  
5 PUSHING THE PROGRAM THROUGH THE GRANTS PROGRAM. THE  
6 SCIENTIFIC MEETING AND CONFERENCE IS A CONFERENCE  
7 THAT'S GOING TO TAKE PLACE ON OCTOBER 1ST AND 2D OF  
8 THIS YEAR. AND THE WORKING GROUPS ARE, OF COURSE, THE  
9 KEY TO MOVING ALONG OUR GRANTS PROGRAM.

10           THERE IS A TYPO HERE UNDER THIS. WE HAVE  
11 GRANTS WORKING GROUP PROGRAM. IT SAYS IT'S MEETING FOR  
12 FOUR MEETINGS. IT ACTUALLY ANTICIPATES ONLY ONE  
13 MEETING THIS YEAR. FACILITIES SAYS THREE MEETINGS.  
14 AGAIN, UNDER THIS PARTICULAR ALTERNATIVE, WE WOULD HAVE  
15 ONLY ONE MEETING. HOWEVER, THE EXPECTATION IS THAT ALL  
16 OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP MEETINGS WOULD BE HELD  
17 THIS YEAR, FEELING BEING WE NEED TO MOVE AHEAD ON THOSE  
18 PARTS OF IT EVEN THOUGH WE MAY NOT BE MOVING VERY FAST  
19 ON SOME OF THE ACTUAL AWARD PROCESSES.

20           HAVING SAID THAT, THAT'S PRETTY MUCH IT. THE  
21 RESULTS OF THIS PARTICULAR BUDGET IS THAT THE  
22 REDUCTIONS IN ADMINISTRATIVE SPENDING WILL PROBABLY  
23 HAVE TO TAKE PLACE TO MAKE SURE THAT WE LIVE WITHIN  
24 THIS. AS YOU CAN SEE FROM THE BUDGET THAT'S LISTED ON  
25 PAGE 5, THERE'S A SHORTFALL OF ABOUT \$400,000. ZACH

1 HAS REQUESTED THAT WE COME UP WITH A PROPOSAL SO THAT  
2 BEGINNING JANUARY 1ST, IF WE HAVEN'T GOT ANY NEW  
3 FUNDING COMING IN, THAT WE TAKE SOME STRATEGIC ACTIONS  
4 TO REDUCE THAT DOWN AND MAKE OUR WAY THROUGH THAT. I'M  
5 CONFIDENT THAT WE CAN DO THAT. BUT ALSO UNDER THIS  
6 PARTICULAR ALTERNATIVE THERE ARE NO GRANTS TO BE  
7 FUNDED.

8 GOING TO ALTERNATIVE TWO, UNDER THIS ONE OUR  
9 ASSUMPTION --

10 DR. LOVE: ONE QUESTION. YOU MENTION AT SOME  
11 POINT THAT PER DIEM FOR ICOC MEMBERS WERE INCLUDED. I  
12 KNOW SOME OF US DON'T BOTHER WITH THAT. I ASSUME THAT  
13 THAT'S BUILT IN.

14 MR. BARNES: YES. THIS IS BASED ON THOSE OF  
15 YOU THAT HAVE OPTED TO TAKE PER DIEM.

16 UNDER ALTERNATIVE TWO, OUR ASSUMPTION IS THAT  
17 A CERTAIN LEVEL OF BAN'S HAVE BEEN SOLD AND THE  
18 PROCEEDS ARE COMING IN. THIS WILL ACTUALLY GIVE US  
19 MONEY FOR TWO THINGS. IT WILL GIVE US MONEY TO  
20 ACTUALLY FUND THE TRAINING GRANTS THAT YOU'VE APPROVED  
21 TODAY, AND IT WILL ALSO GIVE US SOME ADDITIONAL MONEY  
22 TO GO INTO OUR OPERATING PROGRAM. AND THAT OPERATING  
23 PROGRAM WILL UNDERGO A FEW CHANGES. AND PROBABLY THE  
24 MOST CRITICAL ONE IS THAT WE HIRE SOME ADDITIONAL  
25 STAFF, TWO MORE STAFF, BOTH OF WHOM WOULD BE INVOLVED

1 WITH THE GRANTS PROGRAM. AND SINCE WE'RE NOW PUTTING  
2 MONEY OUT, THE EXPECTATION IS WE SHOULD PUT MORE PEOPLE  
3 ON TO ACTUALLY MONITOR AND OVERSEE THE GRANTS.

4 THE OTHER, I THINK, MAJOR CATEGORY THAT WE  
5 WOULD FUND UNDER HERE, WE'VE HEARD A LOT OF ABOUT  
6 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE NEED TO CONDUCT STRATEGIC  
7 PLANNING. AND WHAT WE HAVE DONE IS WE PUT AN ESTIMATED  
8 AMOUNT OF \$250,000 INTO THIS BUDGET TO ACTUALLY DO THE  
9 WORK ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPING AND BRINGING TO THIS  
10 ORGANIZATION A STRATEGIC PLAN.

11 NOW, THE DETAILS OF THAT IS SOMETHING THAT WE  
12 STILL HAVE TO WORK OUT, BUT WE WANTED TO GET THE MONEY  
13 IN HERE AND TO EARMARK IT AND MAKE SURE THAT YOU KNEW  
14 THAT THAT'S WHAT OUR PLANNING IS TO DO. THERE WILL  
15 PROBABLY BE SOME CONTRACTORS THAT WE'LL HIRE TO COME IN  
16 AND HELP US. THERE WILL PROBABLY BE SOME MEETINGS THAT  
17 WE'LL HOLD, THAT KIND OF THING, BUT THAT'S WHAT THAT  
18 IS.

19 SO ESSENTIALLY UNDER THIS PARTICULAR BUDGET,  
20 WE MEET ALL OF OUR ADMINISTRATIVE OBLIGATIONS. WE WILL  
21 BE ABLE TO AWARD AND ACTUALLY GET MONEY OUT FOR THE  
22 TRAINING GRANTS. WE'LL HAVE STARTED OUR WORK ON THE  
23 STRATEGIC PLAN, AND WE CAN ACTUALLY BEGIN TO START  
24 WORKING ON A SECOND ROUND OF GRANTS. AGAIN, WE DON'T  
25 HAVE MONEY TO FUND THOSE GRANTS, BUT AT LEAST WE CAN

1 BEGIN TO START WORKING ON IT. AND SO THAT'S WHY THE  
2 WORKING GROUPS, WE ADD ON ANOTHER MEETING ASSOCIATED  
3 WITH GRANTS. SO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WOULD GET  
4 BACK TOGETHER. THAT'S THE SECOND ALTERNATIVE.

5 THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE BASICALLY GOES BACK TO  
6 SOMETHING THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT BEFORE, \$100 MILLION  
7 IN BOND PROCEEDS OR BAN PROCEEDS. COULD BE EITHER ONE.  
8 UNDER THIS ONE, OBVIOUSLY WE'RE MORE INTO FULL-BLOWN  
9 GRANTS PROGRAM. WE NOT ONLY HAVE A LOT MORE MONEY TO  
10 ACTUALLY PUT OUT FOR GRANTS AND RESEARCH, BUT IN  
11 ADDITION, IT ALLOWS US TO GO AHEAD AND REALLY START  
12 HIRING THE STAFF THAT ARE NECESSARY TO STAFF UP OUR  
13 GRANTS PROGRAM.

14 SO WHAT YOU CAN SEE THE HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS IS  
15 THAT WE'D BE ABLE TO HIRE SOMETHING AROUND 13  
16 POSITIONS, MOST OF WHOM WILL BE IN THE GRANTS PROGRAM,  
17 IN THE SCIENCE PROGRAM. THE OTHERS THAT AREN'T, THE  
18 CHIEF COUNSEL, THE CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER, HUMAN  
19 RESOURCES OFFICER, ALL OF THESE ARE RELATED TO THE  
20 CONTRACTS THAT WE HAVE RIGHT NOW. SO THAT WHILE THERE  
21 MAY NOT BE AN IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON OUR USE OF CONTRACT  
22 AND INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WORK, THE EXPECTATION IS THAT  
23 BY THE TIME WE GET INTO THE NEXT YEAR, THE HIRING OF  
24 THESE FOUR STAFF WILL ALLOW US TO START TO SEE OUR  
25 RELIANCE ON CONTRACTS BEGIN TO FADE AWAY. WE'VE TALKED



1 ABOUT THAT BEFORE. SO THAT'S THE MAJOR ITEM.

2 IN ADDITION, THE OTHER TWO OTHER MAJOR ITEMS  
3 IS THAT WE'D LIKE TO TRY AND HOLD MORE THAN ONE SCIENCE  
4 CONFERENCE IN OUR LIFETIME, SO WE PUT IN MONEY FOR  
5 ANOTHER ONE TO BE HELD IN THE SPRING. IN ADDITION,  
6 WE'RE NOW ALSO CONTEMPLATING HAVING ALL THE WORK GROUP  
7 MEETINGS MEET UP TO FOUR TIMES, FOUR TIMES FOR THE  
8 GRANTS THIS YEAR, AND THE FACILITIES MEETINGS WOULD  
9 CARRY OUT AND GO TO THEIR THREE PROJECTED MEETINGS.

10 THE RESULTS OF THIS IS THAT WE'LL BE ABLE TO  
11 MEET OUR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, WE'LL HAVE SOMEWHERE IN  
12 THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF 75 MILLION OR SO FOR GRANTS, AND  
13 WE'LL HAVE OUR STRATEGIC PLAN BY THEN AS WELL. SO THIS  
14 IS THE PROGRESS THAT WE HOPE TO MAKE.

15 AND WHAT THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE TOLD US AND  
16 APPROVED FOR US, WHICH THEY THEN WANTED TO BRING TO YOU  
17 FOR A RECOMMENDATION, IS THAT OUR PLAN, OUR THREE-STEP  
18 PLAN HERE, BE APPROVED AND THAT WE BE APPROVED TO  
19 OPERATE UNDER ALTERNATIVE ONE UNTIL FUNDING STARTS  
20 COMING IN. WHEN IT GETS TO THE 21, \$22 MILLION LEVEL,  
21 WE'LL MOVE TO ALTERNATIVE TWO. AND AS WE MAKE PROGRESS  
22 TOWARDS THE HUNDRED MILLION, WE'LL MOVE INTO  
23 ALTERNATIVE THREE.

24 QUESTIONS?

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE QUESTIONS AND

1 DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD AT THIS TIME?

2 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE ONE. IT'S MORE OF A  
3 SUGGESTION, I GUESS. I'M WONDERING IF A LA THE  
4 GENEROSITY OF THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, IF WE MIGHT  
5 NOT APPROACH VENDORS LIKE SHERATON AND SOUTHWEST  
6 AIRLINES AND YELLOW CAB AND OFFICE DEPOT AND XEROX WITH  
7 OUR HAT IN HAND AND ASK THEM TO HELP UNDERWRITE OUR  
8 OPERATION FOR A FEW MONTHS UNTIL WE CAN GET PAST THE  
9 LAWSUITS. ASIDE FROM JUST RAISING THE MONEY, IT WOULD  
10 RAISE PUBLIC AWARENESS BECAUSE THE PUBLIC DOES KNOW  
11 WE'RE UNDER THESE CONSTRAINTS. I THINK OUR EFFORT TO  
12 TRY TO KEEP GOING AGAINST ALL ODDS BY AWARDING THE  
13 GRANTS AND SO ON SUGGESTS THAT WE ACTUALLY HAVE MONEY,  
14 AND THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT WE'RE DOING, WHAT WE'RE  
15 ENDURING, WHAT THEY'RE ENDURING. AND WHEN I TELL  
16 PEOPLE, THEY'RE FURIOUS.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY'RE FURIOUS THAT WE'RE  
18 BEING HELD UP IN LITIGATION.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: EXACTLY. THEY SAY YOU'RE  
20 KIDDING. DIDN'T WE VOTE FOR THAT? WHAT ARE THEY DOING  
21 UNDOING OUR WORK? AND THEY PUT IT THAT WAY. THEY  
22 THINK THEY ARE A PARTNER IN THIS.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S A --

24 MS. SAMUELSON: SHERATON MIGHT.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXCELLENT SUGGESTION. LET'S

1 SEE WHAT WE CAN DO WITH THAT SUGGESTION AND COME BACK  
2 WITH A REPORT TO YOU.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: GREAT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION AT  
5 THIS TIME?

6 WE HAVE ONE OTHER ITEM THAT CAME THROUGH THE  
7 GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE WHICH I'LL PRESENT VERY QUICKLY  
8 TO GET A SENSE OF HOW THE BOARD FEELS. IT IS A  
9 PROPOSAL THAT WITH A CLEARANCE FROM THE EXECUTIVE  
10 COMMITTEE, WHICH IS THE VICE CHAIR, THE CHAIR, AND THE  
11 PRESIDENT, IF THERE IS A PARTY WHO IS PREPARED TO BUY  
12 NO LESS THAN \$10 MILLION OF THE BAN FOR A PARTICULAR  
13 PROGRAM LIKE THIS PROGRAM FOR THE FELLOWSHIPS, THAT WE  
14 WOULD HAVE THE ABILITY TO NAME THAT PROGRAM THE CIRM  
15 SCHOLARS, FOR EXAMPLE. BUT IF, FOR EXAMPLE, THE PATTON  
16 FOUNDATION -- I DON'T KNOW OF ANY PATTON FOUNDATION --  
17 WERE TO BUY 10 MILLION OF BAN'S, IT WOULD BE THE  
18 PATTON/CIRM SCHOLARS AS GIVING RECOGNITION TO A  
19 PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATION THAT'S STEPPING FORWARD IN  
20 THE FACE OF A LITIGATION RISK AND TAKING A LEADERSHIP  
21 ROLE IN THE FUNDING.

22 AGAIN, I WOULD WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT I WANT  
23 TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT DR. HALL AND THE REST OF THE  
24 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WOULD BELIEVE THAT THIS PARTICULAR  
25 PARTY WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATELY DISTINGUISHED GROUP TO

1 MERIT HAVING THIS RECOGNITION BEFORE ANY OFFER WAS MADE  
2 TO THEM FOR THIS RECOGNITION.

3 BUT THE QUESTION FOR THE BOARD IS DOES THAT  
4 SEEM LIKE AN APPROPRIATE APPROACH?

5 NOW, CERTAINLY WE HAVE, THROUGH THE  
6 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM, WHICH IS A PUBLIC  
7 SYSTEM, BUILDINGS NAMED AFTER PEOPLE WHO HAVE MADE  
8 CONTRIBUTIONS AND CHARITABLE DONATIONS AS A PRECEDENT,  
9 BUILDINGS AND, IN FACT, CLASSROOMS OR AUDITORIUMS.

10 FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION, HOW DO THE BOARD  
11 MEMBERS FEEL ABOUT THIS CONCEPT?

12 MS. SAMUELSON: SURE. WHATEVER RAISES MONEY.

13 DR. LOVE: THE ONLY DIFFERENCE I CAN SEE,  
14 THOUGH, IS USUALLY PEOPLE DO THAT, THEY ACTUALLY ARE  
15 GIVING YOU THE MONEY AND NOT LOANING YOU THE MONEY. SO  
16 THERE IS A LITTLE BIT OF A DISTINCTION, PARTICULARLY IF  
17 THEY ARE ULTIMATELY PAID BACK. AT THE END OF THE DAY,  
18 I THINK WE WANT THE MONEY COME IN AND GET THE PROCESS  
19 MOVING.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE CONCEPT HERE AS WELL IS  
21 THAT POTENTIALLY WE COULD NEGOTIATE WITH THE  
22 RECOGNITION FOR THE PROGRAM IF THE PROGRAM WERE NAMED  
23 AFTER THE PARTY, ONLY THE INITIAL FELLOWSHIPS WOULD,  
24 FOR EXAMPLE, BE NAMED. IF THEY WERE TO THEN CONTRIBUTE  
25 10 MILLION, THEN THE PROGRAM COULD PERMANENTLY BE NAMED

1 AFTER THAT. AND THERE WAS SOME DESIRE AND DISCUSSION  
2 IN THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE THAT ONCE THEY HAVE THE  
3 RECOGNITION, THEY MIGHT DECIDE THAT THEY REALLY FEEL  
4 THIS IS A GREAT DISTINCTION BECAUSE IT'S A HISTORIC  
5 PROGRAM AND HAVE A VESTED INTEREST IN THEN CONTRIBUTING  
6 THE MONEY EVEN AFTER THE BONDS ARE AUTHORIZED TO PAY  
7 THEM BACK.

8 SO THERE WAS QUITE A BIT OF DISCUSSION AT THE  
9 END THAT THAT WAS A CONCEPT THAT WE SHOULD FOLLOW  
10 THROUGH ON. NOW, THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE CHAIR AND  
11 THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MIGHT FEEL THAT WE CAN ALSO GET  
12 FAR ENOUGH BY JUST SAYING UP FRONT, DEPENDING UPON THE  
13 PARTY, THAT YOU NEED TO AGREE TO CONTRIBUTE THE MONEY  
14 EVEN IF YOU'RE PAID BACK AS A CONDITION OF NAMING. I  
15 LOOK TO MY ESTEEMED COLLEAGUES FOR DIRECTION IN THAT.  
16 THAT IS ONE OF THE OPTIONS THAT WAS DISCUSSED AS WELL.

17 DR. PRICE: THESE NAMING OPPORTUNITIES ARE  
18 GREAT FOR FUND-RAISING, BUT I WORRY POTENTIALLY ABOUT  
19 THE POLITICAL PROBLEMS THAT THEY MAY PRESENT TO US.  
20 FOR ONE EXAMPLE, HARVARD HAD THE BIN LADEN CHAIR IN  
21 MIDDLE EAST STUDIES BACK BEFORE 9/11. OUR EQUIVALENT  
22 WOULD BE BIG PHARMA ON THIS.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK DISCRETION IS  
24 IMPORTANT. I THINK YOUR INSTITUTION DOES NAME PARTS OF  
25 BUILDINGS.

1 DR. PRICE: IT DOES, BUT WE RUN INTO  
2 PROBLEMS. BUSINESS SCHOOL HAD A MIKE MILKIN  
3 SCHOLARSHIP FUND. THEY SPENT A LOT OF TIME TRYING TO  
4 FIGURE OUT WHAT TO DO WITH IT. SO JUST IMAGINE IF, YOU  
5 KNOW, I HOPE THEY WOULD. LET'S SAY PHIZER COMES  
6 FORWARD AND GIVES US \$50 MILLION. WHAT ARE THE  
7 POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS IF WE DO TURN THEM DOWN, BECAUSE  
8 THEN WHAT DO WE DO? WELL, YOU GET THE PICTURE. I  
9 THINK THERE ARE POTENTIAL POLITICAL PITFALLS.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND FOR THE RECORD, OUR  
11 HISTORY THROUGH THE CAMPAIGN AND THROUGH THIS PERIOD IS  
12 WE'VE ALL -- WE'VE REJECTED ANY FUNDS, WHETHER LOANS,  
13 GRANTS, OR ANYTHING FROM ANY PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANY.  
14 IT IS -- AS I SAID, ANY NAME WOULD HAVE TO BE CLEARED  
15 BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE EVEN IF THE BOARD DECIDED  
16 THAT THIS WAS APPROPRIATE.

17 ANY OTHER COMMENTS? WHAT IS THE --

18 MR. GOLDBERG: I'M SUPPORTIVE.

19 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SUPPORTIVE.

20 DR. STEWARD: I AM STRONGLY IN SUPPORT OF  
21 THIS. IN FACT, I'M WONDERING IF YOU WANT TO EXCLUDE  
22 PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES AS POTENTIAL DONORS HERE. I'M  
23 NOT SURE THAT WOULD MATTER IF IT HAPPENED TO BE ELI  
24 LILLY SCHOLARSHIPS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE,

1 I'D WANT TO BRING THAT BACK TO THE BOARD.

2 DR. STEWARD: I THINK THAT WHAT WE SHOULD  
3 RECOGNIZE IS THAT THESE PEOPLE ARE ALLOWING US TO GET  
4 THIS PROGRAM GOING, AND APPROPRIATE RECOGNITION IS  
5 HIGHLY DESERVED. WHETHER OR NOT THESE END UP BEING  
6 PAID BACK AT SOME POINT IN TIME, THIS RECOGNITION IS  
7 HIGHLY APPROPRIATE, I THINK.

8 DR. POMEROY: AT THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
9 THERE WAS EXACTLY THIS CONVERSATION. SO IT'S GOOD TO  
10 KNOW THAT WE ENDED UP IN THE SAME PLACE. I THINK THAT  
11 WE DID MAKE THE DISTINCTION, TED, THAT A LOAN FOR A  
12 LIMITED AMOUNT OF TIME WAS ONE SITUATION. A LOAN THAT  
13 WENT ON FOR A LONG TIME, BECAUSE THINGS GOT POSTPONED,  
14 MIGHT BE A SECOND CONSIDERATION. AND CLEARLY, IF THEY  
15 TURNED IT AROUND INTO A DONATION AND DIDN'T ACCEPT THE  
16 PAYBACK, THAT WAS THE THING THAT PEOPLE WERE MOST  
17 COMFORTABLE WITH.

18 I THINK ONE OF THE THINGS WE TALKED ABOUT IS  
19 THAT IN THE UC SYSTEM, WE HAVE A NAMING COMMITTEE THAT  
20 KIND OF REVIEWS THESE OPPORTUNITIES AND SETS OUT  
21 PROCEDURES, AND THAT THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT WE WERE  
22 GOING TO REVISIT IN THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF HOW TO  
23 DO THAT, BUT WE WANTED TO AT LEAST GET THE CONVERSATION  
24 GOING IN CASE SOMEONE WANTED TO STEP UP TODAY.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND IN CASE SOMEONE WANTED

1 TO STEP UP TODAY, I NEED SOME GUIDANCE, BUT WE WOULD  
2 CLEARLY BE VERY CONSERVATIVE IN OFFERING THIS TO A VERY  
3 RESTRICTED GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE INTERIM OF  
4 HAVING A MORE DEVELOPED POLICY.

5 MS. WILSON: BOB, WE'RE CONSIDERED A STATE  
6 AGENCY; AM I RIGHT? ARE THERE ANY OTHER STATE AGENCIES  
7 THAT TAKE DONATIONS?

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

9 MS. WILSON: WELL, I THINK THE UNIVERSITY OF  
10 CALIFORNIA IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT. IS THERE ANYBODY  
11 ELSE? DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

12 MR. HARRISON: CAL STATE SYSTEM DOES AS WELL.

13 MS. WILSON: THAT'S ANOTHER SCHOOL. I DON'T  
14 KNOW.

15 DR. PRIETO: HOW ABOUT DEPARTMENTS OF  
16 JUSTICE? ANY OTHER DEPARTMENTS ACCEPT FOR NAMING  
17 BUILDINGS, AUDITORIUMS?

18 MR. HARRISON: I THINK THE ONLY OTHER ANALOGY  
19 THAT WALTER AND I COULD THINK OF COLLECTIVELY IS THAT  
20 CALTRANS WILL OFTEN PUT UP SIGNS ON THE FREEWAY TO HELP  
21 TO CLEAN IT UP.

22 MS. WILSON: AND IF YOU DIE.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CALTRANS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS  
24 DOES NAME PARTS OF FREEWAYS OR GIVE RECOGNITION FOR  
25 PARTS OF FREEWAYS THAT ARE MAINTAINED BY PRIVATE



1 COMPANIES AS WELL AS INDIVIDUALS.

2 MS. WILSON: WELL, ANYWAY, I JUST REGISTER I  
3 DON'T THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA. I THINK WE'LL BE BLASTED  
4 FOR IT.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

6 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: GAYLE'S POINT IS WELL  
7 TAKEN. OUTSIDE OF ACADEMIA, THIS IS A RARE INSTANCE  
8 FOR THE STATE AGENCIES TO ENGAGE IN THIS SORT OF  
9 ARRANGEMENT. SO IT HAS TO BE DONE WITH A LOT OF  
10 CAUTION. AND I KNOW THAT'S WHAT THE GOVERNANCE  
11 COMMITTEE TALKED ABOUT. THERE'S A LOT OF POLITICAL  
12 IMPLICATIONS HERE. I RECOGNIZE THAT RON BROUGHT IT UP.  
13 IF THERE'S A WAY, I BELIEVE WE SHOULD EXPLORE IT. AND  
14 I KNOW YOU WILL COME BACK TO THE FULL BOARD AND GET OUR  
15 ENDORSEMENT. WITH SOME GOOD COMMON SENSE, I THINK WE  
16 COULD ACCOMPLISH THIS, SO I'M SUPPORTIVE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I JUST NEED ENOUGH DIRECTION  
18 SO THAT I KNOW THAT IN GOOD FAITH, IF WE PROPOSE  
19 SOMETHING SUBJECT TO BRINGING IT BACK TO THE BOARD FOR  
20 CONFIRMATION, THAT THERE'S ENOUGH OF A SUPPORT HERE FOR  
21 THE CONCEPT THAT IT'S WORTH MOVING FORWARD WITH. AND  
22 THE -- GAYLE, I REALIZE WE HAVE TO BE VERY SENSITIVE  
23 HERE.

24 MS. WILSON: I'M JUST ONE VOTE ON HERE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU'RE A VERY DISTINGUISHED

1 VOTE, GAYLE. VERY DISTINGUISHED VOTE. WE WILL ATTEMPT  
2 TO BE VERY CAREFUL. IT SEEMS LIKE THE SENSE OF THE  
3 BOARD IS THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE SHOULD  
4 SERIOUSLY TRY AND ADVANCE WITH CARE AND SENSITIVITY IN  
5 THE PROCESS.

6 DR. PRIETO: I WOULD ALSO SUPPORT THIS, BUT I  
7 THINK IT HAS TO BE DONE VERY JUDICIALLY, THAT WE NEED  
8 TO BE CLEAR THAT ANYONE WHO GOT THIS KIND OF AN  
9 OPPORTUNITY OR GAVE US THE OPPORTUNITY WAS NOT SOMEONE  
10 WHO COULD DIRECTLY OR EVEN DOWNSTREAM INDIRECTLY  
11 BENEFIT IN ANY WAY.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT. I THINK THAT'S VERY  
13 CLEAR.

14 DR. LOVE: I GOT TO SAY I TEND TO PROBABLY  
15 COME OUT WHERE GAYLE WAS. AND THAT IS, THAT I CAN SEE  
16 A LOT OF DOWNSIDE BECAUSE, AS WE ALL KNOW, PEOPLE ARE  
17 CONSTANTLY TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT ARE THE  
18 MOTIVATIONS, WHAT ARE THE HIDDEN AGENDAS. AT THE END  
19 OF THE DAY, PEOPLE WHO ARE TRYING TO SUPPORT THIS  
20 INITIATIVE IN A PURE SENSE OUGHT TO BE DOING IT FOR THE  
21 BENEFIT OF SEEING THE RESEARCH ADVANCE AND NOT FOR THE  
22 BENEFIT OF SEEING THEIR NAME ASSOCIATED WITH FELLOWS  
23 WHO ARE TRAINED. SO I THINK I'M PROBABLY MORE CAUTIOUS  
24 BECAUSE I DO WONDER IF AT THE END OF THE DAY WE COULD  
25 CREATE MORE CHALLENGES AND IF IT REALLY DOES HELP US

1 THAT MUCH. DO WE THINK IT REALLY WILL HELP US  
2 DRAMATICALLY?

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M TAKING INSTRUCTION FROM  
4 SEEING THAT BOTH THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF  
5 HIGHER LEARNING IN THEIR SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS, LIKE WE  
6 ARE CREATING FOR THIS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM AND IN  
7 BUILDINGS, DO NAME THEM AFTER DONORS. SO EVEN THOUGH  
8 THE PRIMARY MOTIVATION IS CERTAINLY TO ADVANCE THE  
9 SCIENCE, IT WOULD BE UNLIKELY THAT THEY'RE ALL WRONG.  
10 SO SEEING THIS CONSISTENCY ACROSS PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS  
11 AND PRIVATE, I AM TRYING TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT WE DO  
12 HAVE RESOURCES AVAILABLE IF WE HAVE TO USE THEM TO MAKE  
13 SURE THAT WE GET THIS PROGRAM GOING.

14 OKAY. I THINK WE'VE COVERED WHAT WE NEED TO.  
15 IS THAT A CORRECT STATEMENT, JAMES, STAFF? I THANK  
16 YOU. I THANK THE BOARD MEMBERS FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS  
17 DEDICATION, AND I THANK YOU FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF BEING  
18 PART OF THIS HISTORIC EVENT OF ADVANCING THE GRANT  
19 PROGRAMS AND CELEBRATING THE ESTEEMED PRESIDENCY OF  
20 ZACH HALL. THANK YOU.

21 (APPLAUSE.)

22 (THE PROCEEDING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT  
23 5:09 P.M.)

24

25