

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: CITY OF HOPE  
COOPER AUDITORIUM  
1500 DUARTE ROAD  
DUARTE, CALIFORNIA

DATE: THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010  
9:30 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 85108



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

### I N D E X

ITEM	PAGE NO.
1. CALL TO ORDER.	4, 120
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.	6, 120
3. ROLL CALL.	6, 120
REPORTS	
4. CHAIRMAN' S REPORT	32
5. PRESIDENT' S REPORT	8
BUDGET ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE REPORT	30
OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS	33
CONSENT CALENDAR	
6. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS OF GOVERNING BOARD.	45
ACTION ITEMS	
7. CONSIDERATION OF REPORT FROM LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SB 1064 (ALQUIST) AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING AB 1931 (TORRICO), EXTENSION OF ROMAN REED SPINAL CORD INJURY RESEARCH ACT OF 1999; AND AB 1733 (HILL) – DIRECTOR OF CALIFORNIA BIOTECHNOLOGY RETENTION AND RECRUITMENT.	214
8. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO CONTRACT POLICY.	201
9. CONSIDERATION OF PREGNANCY HEALTH LEAVE POLICY.	46
10. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP REGARDING CIRM RESEARCH LEADERSHIP AWARDS.	51, 192

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

11. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP REGARDING CIRM BASIC BIOLOGY AWARDS II.	61, 124
EXTRAORDINARY PETITION 1567	149
EXTRAORDINARY PETITION 1523	85
12. CONSIDERATION OF CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES WITH REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL.	212
14. PUBLIC COMMENT	237

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DUARTE, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

(APPLAUSE.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER HERE. I THINK, MELISSA, WHILE THEY'RE WORKING ON THE TECHNOLOGY ON THE CALL, WE CAN PROCEED WITH THE PLEDGE AND THE ROLL CALL. ALL RIGHT. I'D LIKE TO CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER AND THANK THE CITY OF HOPE FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS HOSPITALITY.

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE JUST HAD THE PRIVILEGE OF AN INCREDIBLY INSPIRING PRESENTATION ON HIV/AIDS AND ZINC FINGER TECHNOLOGIES UNDER A DISEASE TEAM GRANT HEADED BY DR. ZAI A WITH THE POTENTIAL, WITH A LOT OF STRUGGLES AND A LOT OF TIME AND DEDICATION, TO POSSIBLY CURE AIDS. I THINK IT IS REMARKABLE THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE BEFORE US. IT'S A PRIVILEGE FOR US TO PARTICIPATE IN FUNDING THIS ALL BECAUSE OF THE VISION OF 7 MILLION CALIFORNIA VOTERS.

WE WILL COMMENCE HERE WITH THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE FOLLOWED BY THE ROLL CALL. AND MELISSA KING WILL LEAD US.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ.

DR. AZZIZ: HERE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE FOR ROBERT  
2 BIRGENEAU.  
3 DR. PRICE: PRESENT.  
4 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.  
5 DR. BLOOM: PRESENT.  
6 MS. KING: GORDON GILL FOR DAVID BRENNER.  
7 DR. GILL: PRESENT.  
8 MS. KING: WILLIAM BRODY. JACOB LEVIN FOR  
9 SUSAN BRYANT.  
10 DR. LEVIN: HERE.  
11 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.  
12 MS. FEIT: HERE.  
13 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
14 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.  
15 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
16 MS. GIBBONS: HERE.  
17 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
18 MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.  
19 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
20 DR. HAWGOOD: HERE.  
21 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.  
23 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING. GERALD LEVEY.  
24 DR. LEVEY: HERE.  
25 MS. KING: TED LOVE. ED PENHOET. PHIL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PI ZZO.

2 DR. PI ZZO: HERE.

3 MS. KING: CLAI RE POMEROY.

4 DR. POMEROY: HERE.

5 MS. KING: FRANCI SCO PRI ETO.

6 DR. PRI ETO: HERE.

7 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI FOR CARMEN

8 PULI AFIT O. ROBERT QUI NT.

9 DR. QUI NT: HERE.

10 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA FOR JOHN REED.

11 DR. FONTANA: HERE.

12 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

13 MR. ROTH: HERE.

14 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON. DAVID

15 SERRANO-SEWELL. JEFF SHEEHY.

16 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

17 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.

18 MR. SHESTACK: HERE.

19 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

20 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

21 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

22 MR. TORRES: HERE.

23 MS. KING: AND WE DO HAVE A QUORUM

24 PRESENT.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE' RE GOING TO BEGIN THIS MORNING ON AGENDA ITEM 11  
2 AND THEN COME BACK TO ITEM NO. 10. DR. PIZZO.

3 DR. PIZZO: BEFORE WE BEGIN, AT THE RISK  
4 OF EMBARRASSING MY COLLEAGUE FROM UC DAVIS, I WAS  
5 INFORMED EARLIER THIS MORNING THAT THIS IS HER  
6 BIRTHDAY. AND I WOULD ENCOURAGE OUR CHAIRMAN TO  
7 LEAD US IN A SONG.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE NEED TO IDENTIFY -- WE  
9 CLEARLY NEED TO IDENTIFY A VOCAL CHAMPION HERE, BUT  
10 I THINK IT'S A GREAT SUGGESTION.

11 DR. PIZZO: YOU' RE PRETTY VOCAL, BOB.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IF WE COULD ALL BEGIN  
13 TOGETHER SO OUR VOICES BLEND.

14 (HAPPY BIRTHDAY WAS THEN SUNG. )

15 (APPLAUSE. )

16 DR. POMEROY: THANK YOU. I AM INDEED  
17 HONORED AND, YES, EMBARRASSED. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

18 DR. PIZZO: THAT WAS THE GOAL.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DULY INSPIRED BY SONG  
20 AND, AS OUR PRESIDENT SAID LAST NIGHT, SPIRITUALLY  
21 AROUSED BY STEM CELLS, WE WILL LAUNCH INTO THE DAY'S  
22 WORK.

23 ON ITEM 11 WE HAD AN EXECUTIVE SESSION  
24 YESTERDAY, AND WE ARE GOING TO BEGIN THIS SESSION,  
25 DR. TROUNSON, WITH, I THINK, A PRESENTATION FROM



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STAFF TO REORIENT THE AUDIENCE TODAY, THE AUDIO  
2 LISTENERS AND THE BOARD, AS WE THEN COMMENCE THIS  
3 REVIEW.

4 DR. TROUNSON: CAN WE ASK MICHAEL YAFFE TO  
5 COME. THIS IS THE LEADERSHIP AWARD.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO. WE ARE GOING TO ITEM  
7 11 FIRST AND THEN ITEM 10.

8 DR. TROUNSON: I APOLOGIZE. MY MISTAKE.

9 DR. GRIESHAMMER: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN,  
10 BOARD MEMBERS. DO YOU WANT ME TO PRESENT BRIEFLY --

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT WOULD BE GOOD  
12 TO REORIENT US. WE HAVE A COUPLE OF BOARD MEMBERS  
13 WHO WEREN'T HERE YESTERDAY, AND IT WILL BRING US ALL  
14 TO THE SAME PLATFORM.

15 DR. GRIESHAMMER: ALL RIGHT. VERY GOOD.  
16 SO WE RECENTLY, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, REVIEWED  
17 THE BASIC BIOLOGY II AWARDS. AND THOSE ARE THE ONES  
18 YOU ARE CONSIDERING FOR FUNDING TODAY. JUST TO  
19 REMIND YOU BRIEFLY, THE GOALS OF THIS PARTICULAR RFA  
20 WERE TO SUPPORT STUDIES TO RESOLVE ISSUES PERTINENT  
21 TO THE CONTROL OF STEM CELL FATE AND TO FOSTER  
22 CUTTING EDGE RESEARCH, AND TO UNDERSTANDING THE  
23 PLURIPOTENCY DIFFERENTIATION AND CELLULAR  
24 REPROGRAMMING IN STEM CELLS.

25 THE STUDIES WE ASKED TO BE FOCUSED

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1     PRIMARILY ON HUMAN CELLS, BUT ALLOWED EXCEPTIONS FOR  
2     GROUNDBREAKING REPROGRAMMING STUDIES IN WHICH THEN  
3     MAMMALIAN CELLS COULD BE USED.

4             ON THE NEXT SLIDE, I'M SHOWING THAT FOR  
5     THESE BASIC BIOLOGY II PROJECTS, THEY CAN BE FUNDED  
6     FOR UP TO THREE YEARS WITH DIRECT PROJECT COSTS OF  
7     UP TO \$300,000 PER YEAR. AND THE ICOC APPROVED FOR  
8     THIS OVERALL PROGRAM UP TO 20 GRANTS FOR A TOTAL  
9     COST OF UP TO \$30 MILLION.

10            ON THE NEXT SLIDE, I'LL REMIND YOU THAT  
11     FOR THIS PARTICULAR RFA, THERE WERE PRELIMINARY  
12     APPLICATIONS INVOLVED IN THE APPLICATION AND REVIEW  
13     PROCESS. THERE WERE NO INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ON THE  
14     NUMBER OF PREAPPLICATIONS. THESE PREAPPLICATIONS  
15     WERE REVIEWED BY OUTSIDE SPECIALISTS AS WELL AS CIRM  
16     STAFF, AND THE FULL INVITED APPLICATIONS WERE THEN  
17     REVIEWED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. I'D ALSO LIKE  
18     TO REMIND YOU THAT THIS RFA, BASIC BIOLOGY AWARDS  
19     II, WAS THE SECOND HALF OF OUR 2009 BASIC BIOLOGY  
20     INITIATIVE THAT INCLUDED BASIC BIOLOGY AWARDS I.  
21     WHAT'S IMPORTANT HERE IS THAT A PI WAS ONLY ELIGIBLE  
22     TO SUBMIT A PREAPPLICATION TO ONE OF THE TWO BASIC  
23     BIOLOGY AWARDS IN 2009.

24            ON THIS SLIDE NOW I'M SHOWING YOU THE  
25     NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE WHOLE 2009 PROGRAM

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT CIRM RECEIVED. IN THE RIGHT COLUMN YOU NEED TO  
2 FOCUS ON THIS RIGHT COLUMN BECAUSE THAT'S ABOUT THE  
3 BASIC BIOLOGY II RFA THAT YOU ARE CONSIDERING TODAY.  
4 WE RECEIVED 154 PREAPPLICATIONS. WE INVITED 57 FULL  
5 APPLICATIONS. AND THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, WE  
6 RECEIVED AND THEY REVIEWED 52 FULL APPLICATIONS.

7 FOR COMPARISON YOU CAN SEE THE NUMBERS FOR  
8 BASIC BIO I. IN THAT PROGRAM YOU APPROVED FOR  
9 FUNDING 12 APPLICATIONS, AND THAT COST CIRM \$16.3  
10 MILLION.

11 SO NOW WE'LL GET TO THE 52 APPLICATIONS  
12 THAT WERE REVIEWED IN FEBRUARY. WE ASKED THE  
13 REVIEWERS TO CONSIDER THE SIGNIFICANCE AND  
14 INNOVATION IN THE PROJECT, AND WE ALSO ASKED THEM TO  
15 ASSESS WHETHER THE RESEARCH AS PROPOSED WAS FEASIBLE  
16 AND WHETHER THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN WAS LOGICAL AND  
17 BASED ON SOUND RATIONALE. AND WE ASKED THEM ALSO TO  
18 CONSIDER THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL  
19 INVESTIGATOR AND THE RESEARCH TEAM TO EXECUTE THE  
20 PROPOSED STUDIES.

21 ON THE NEXT SLIDE I'M SHOWING THE RESULTS  
22 IN TERMS OF THE SCORES THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
23 ASSIGNED TO EACH OF THOSE 52 APPLICATIONS. SO AS  
24 YOU CAN SEE, ON THE X AXIS THE SCORES -- AND THESE  
25 ARE THE SCORES GIVEN AFTER THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THESE APPLICATIONS. THE SCORES RANGED FROM THE 30S  
2 TO THE 80S, AND SOME SCORES WERE GIVEN TO MORE THAN  
3 ONE APPLICATION. AND THAT'S ILLUSTRATED ALONG THE Y  
4 AXIS.

5 DURING THE PROCESS OF THE PROGRAMMATIC  
6 REVIEW, THE INITIAL CATEGORIZATION OF THESE  
7 APPLICATIONS WENT INTO THREE TIERS. FOR THAT THE  
8 GRANTS WORKING GROUP DREW THE GREEN LINE THAT YOU  
9 CAN SEE AT A SCORE OF 73, WHICH MEANS THAT ALL  
10 APPLICATIONS WITH A SCORE OF 73 OR HIGHER WERE  
11 PLACED INTO TIER I. THE RED LINE WAS DRAWN AT A  
12 SCORE OF 67, SO THAT ALL APPLICATIONS WITH A SCORE  
13 OF 67 OR LOWER WERE PLACED INTO TIER III, AND THE  
14 REMAINING APPLICATIONS WERE PLACED INTO TIER II.

15 FOLLOWING THEN PROGRAMMATIC DISCUSSIONS,  
16 ON THE NEXT SLIDE, YOU CAN SEE THE FINAL  
17 RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THEY  
18 RECOMMEND TO YOU THAT 14 APPLICATIONS BE FUNDED, AND  
19 THAT WOULD BE COSTING APPROXIMATELY \$19.6 MILLION.  
20 SO I'LL STOP HERE FOR QUESTIONS.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR  
22 YOUR REPORT AND ALL OF THE HARD WORK ON THIS  
23 EXCELLENT RFA.

24 WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS IF YOU COULD BRING  
25 UP THE CHART OF THE GRANTS UNDER CONSIDERATION. AND

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IF YOU COULD PLEASE GO OVER THE INFORMATION  
2 PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED ON THE STANDARD DEVIATIONS AS  
3 WELL AS THE RECUSALS AND THE RANGE OF SCORES. AND  
4 WE HAD ASKED THAT LAST NIGHT. AND TO BRING EVERYONE  
5 UP TO DATE, LET ME JUST FOCUS THAT REQUEST TO THE  
6 EXTRAORDINARY PETITIONS AS WELL AS THE SCORES THAT  
7 ARE JUST BELOW THE SCORING CUTOFF, THE SCORE AT 71  
8 AND THE SCORE AT 69.

9 DR. GRIESHAMMER: SO I'LL START ACTUALLY  
10 WITH THE 1645, WHICH IS THE BOTTOM OF TIER I, WHICH  
11 WAS ALSO REQUESTED YESTERDAY, THIS INFORMATION.  
12 APPLICATION 1641 HAS A SCORE, AS YOU CAN SEE, OF 66,  
13 BUT THE MEDIAN WAS ACTUALLY A 70. THE STANDARD  
14 DEVIATION OF SCORES -- THE SCORES FOR THIS  
15 APPLICATION WAS 11.3, THE RANGE WAS 50 THROUGH 85,  
16 AND THERE WAS ONE RECUSAL.

17 THE NEXT APPLICATION BELOW THAT, NO. 1512,  
18 HAD A SCORE, AS YOU CAN SEE, OF 71, A MEDIAN OF 70,  
19 THE STANDARD DEVIATION WAS 2, THE SCORE RANGE WAS 70  
20 TO 75, AND ONE RECUSAL.

21 THE NEXT APPLICATION WE TALKED ABOUT WAS  
22 1507 WITH A SCORE OF 69, A MEDIAN OF 70, A STANDARD  
23 DEVIATION OF 9, AND THE RANGE OF SCORES OF 40 TO 80,  
24 WITH ONE RECUSAL.

25 THEN THE NEXT ONE, IT'S NOT THE NEXT ONE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DOWN, BUT ONE WITH AN EXTRAORDINARY PETITION, NO.  
2 1567 RECEIVED AN AVERAGE SCORE OF 65, THE MEDIAN ON  
3 THAT ONE WAS ALSO 65, THE STANDARD DEVIATION 6,  
4 SCORE RANGE 55 THROUGH 75, AND NO RECUSALS.

5 AND FINALLY, 1523, APPLICATION NO. 1523,  
6 WHICH HAD A MEAN SCORE OF 63 AND A MEDIAN OF 60.  
7 THE STANDARD DEVIATION ON THAT APPLICATION WAS 9,  
8 AND THE RANGE 50 THROUGH 80 AND ONE RECUSAL.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

10 JEFF, WOULD YOU LIKE TO LEAD US THROUGH AS THE VICE  
11 CHAIR OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP THIS PROCESS.

12 MR. SHEEHY: SURE. SO I THINK THE FIRST  
13 MOTION THAT -- THE FIRST SET OF MOTIONS, I THINK,  
14 THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE WOULD BE TO LOOK AT THE  
15 GREEN TIER, TIER I, AND IF THERE'S ANY MOTIONS TO  
16 MOVE ANY OF THOSE GRANTS FROM THE FUNDING CATEGORY  
17 TO THE NOT-FOR-FUNDING CATEGORY.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, JUST PRECEDING  
19 THAT, I THINK DR. AZZIZ WOULD LIKE TO ASK DR.  
20 GRIESHAMMER A QUESTION.

21 DR. AZZIZ: THIS IS A QUESTION, BASICALLY  
22 I JUST CAN'T RECALL IF WE ALSO DISCUSSED 1645  
23 YESTERDAY. DID WE DISCUSS 1645?

24 DR. GRIESHAMMER: IN PUBLIC SESSION, NO.

25 DR. AZZIZ: I COULD NOT RECALL.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. GRIESHAMMER: WE PROVIDED THE STANDARD  
2 DEVIATION AND RANGE.

3 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE A MOTION TO MOVE  
4 ANYTHING OUT OF TIER I?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS A QUESTION OF  
6 WHETHER WE'RE MOVING ANYTHING OUT OF TIER I, AND I  
7 DON'T THINK -- I THINK YOU WERE THINKING WE WERE  
8 ALREADY GOING TO APPROVING TIER I. I DON'T THINK --  
9 NO. THE QUESTION JEFF WAS POSING IS DO WE WANT TO  
10 MOVE ANYTHING OUT OF TIER I. SO DOES THAT MOTION  
11 STAND OR IS THAT MOTION WITHDRAWN?

12 MR. SHEEHY: THERE WASN'T A MOTION.

13 DR. LEVEY: WITHDRAWN.

14 DR. STEWARD: COULD I ASK A QUESTION  
15 BEFORE WE DO THIS? JEFF, WOULD YOU JUST SAY A FEW  
16 WORDS ABOUT HOW THE TIERING ON THIS WAS ESTABLISHED?  
17 WE'RE SEEING AGAIN A LITTLE BIT OF A DIFFERENT  
18 OPERATION BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IN TERMS OF  
19 DRAWING A FIRM LINE AND NOT HAVING A GRAY AREA OF  
20 FUND IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE. IF YOU CAN JUST SAY A  
21 WORD ABOUT THE GREEN LINE, SO TO SPEAK.

22 MR. SHEEHY: THIS GOES TO -- AND I ALLUDED  
23 TO THIS BRIEFLY YESTERDAY. BECAUSE WE ARE NOT  
24 FUNDING TO THE FUNDING LINE, AND IN THIS INSTANCE  
25 WE'RE ROUGHLY A THIRD BELOW THE FUNDING LINE, IT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DOESN' T MAKE SENSE TO HAVE A TIER II. IT'S  
2 COUNTERINTUITIVE BECAUSE FUNDS ARE AVAIL ABLE. SO  
3 REALLY WE END UP WITH A BINARY CHOICE, EITHER FUND  
4 OR DON' T FUND.

5 I THINK YOU MAY HAVE -- ONE OF THE MEMBERS  
6 REFERRED TO THIS YESTERDAY. SOME OF THESE END UP  
7 BELOW THE FUNDING LINE NOT BECAUSE PEOPLE  
8 SPECIFICALLY SAID NOT TO FUND THESE, WHICH IN THE  
9 BOTTOM TIER PEOPLE WERE, LIKE, DON' T FUND THIS, BUT  
10 IT WAS LIKE NO ONE SUGGESTED TO FUND IT. THAT' S A  
11 FINE DETAIL, BUT IT IS FOR SOME OF THESE RIGHT BELOW  
12 THE TOP TIER. THERE WAS NO MOTIVATION TO MOVE THIS  
13 INTO FUNDING, BUT THEY DIDN' T NECESSARILY POSITIVELY  
14 SAY DON' T FUND THIS.

15 SO THEN I THINK OUR NEXT SET OF MOTIONS  
16 THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE AT THIS TIME WOULD BE IF  
17 ANYONE HAS A GRANT IN TIER II, THE NOT-FOR-FUNDING  
18 CATEGORY, THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO  
19 MOVE INTO TIER I, I THINK THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE  
20 NOW.

21 DR. STEWARD: I WILL MAKE THAT MOTION WITH  
22 REGARD TO 01512. AND THE BASIS OF THAT IS THAT, PER  
23 OUR DISCUSSION YESTERDAY, IT SEEMED TO BE MORE OF A  
24 LACK OF ENTHUSIASM AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL  
25 AS LACKING SUFFICIENT DETAILS ON SORT OF THE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INTELLECTUAL STRATEGY, BUT PLENTY OF METHODOLOGICAL  
2 DETAILS. I DIDN'T SEE A FATAL FLAW, IN OTHER WORDS.

3 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE A SECOND?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WILL SECOND THAT. I  
5 THINK WE ALSO HEARD THE ION CHANNEL IS VERY  
6 IMPORTANT AND CAN GIVE US SOME VERY VALUABLE  
7 INFORMATION. AND THERE IS A SPLIT HERE. THERE WERE  
8 SOME PEOPLE, I THINK, THAT WERE ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT  
9 THIS. THIS IS A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION. IT IS IN  
10 THE RANGE THAT WE WOULD NORMALLY CONSIDER TO BE  
11 FUNDABLE. AND GIVEN THAT WE'RE IN THE EARLY PARTS  
12 OF THIS AGENCY'S HISTORY, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO  
13 BUILD OUR BASIC SCIENCE PORTFOLIO. IF WE'RE GOING  
14 TO TAKE A CHANCE ON BASIC SCIENCE, WE'RE GOING TO  
15 GET A GREATER YIELD IF WE TAKE A GREATER CHANCE IN  
16 THE EARLY PART OF THE PORTFOLIO. WE KNOW ALL OF  
17 THESE WILL NOT WORK, BUT BY HAVING A BROADER  
18 PORTFOLIO, IF WE DO HAVE ANY INCIDENCE OF SUCCESS IN  
19 THIS EARLY PORTFOLIO, IT WILL INFORM THE WHOLE  
20 PORTFOLIO EXPERIENCE.

21 MR. SHEEHY: ANY OTHER DISCUSSION? SHALL  
22 WE JUST GO TO A VOTE? HAVE YOU DONE CONFLICTS ON  
23 THIS?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE LOOKING FOR PUBLIC  
25 COMMENT TOO HERE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. HARRISON: JUST TO BE CLEAR, EVERY  
2 MEMBER HAS A LIST OF THOSE APPLICATIONS IN FRONT OF  
3 THEM WITH WHICH THE MEMBER HAS A CONFLICT. WE'RE  
4 MONITORING THE CONVERSATION TO MAKE SURE THAT NO ONE  
5 WHO HAS A CONFLICT PARTICIPATES.

6 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT  
7 ON THIS GRANT? MELISSA.

8 MS. KING: SO FOR THE ROLL CALL VOTE, I  
9 WILL CALL ALL MEMBERS WHO ARE PRESENT AND DO NOT  
10 HAVE A CONFLICT WITH THIS GRANT.

11 DR. AZZIZ: AND REPEAT THE MOTION, PLEASE.

12 MS. KING: I WOULD LOVE COUNSEL TO DO  
13 THAT, PLEASE.

14 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION IS TO MOVE  
15 APPLICATION 1512 INTO THE FUNDING CATEGORY, TIER I.

16 MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ.

17 DR. AZZIZ: OPPOSED.

18 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

19 DR. PRICE: YES.

20 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

21 DR. BLOOM: YES.

22 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

23 DR. GILL: YES.

24 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.

25 DR. LEVIN: YES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.  
2 MS. FEIT: YES.  
3 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
4 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
5 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
6 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
7 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
8 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
9 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
10 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.  
11 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
13 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
14 DR. LEVEY: 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: ROBERT QUINT.  
22 DR. QUINT: YES.  
23 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
24 MR. ROTH: YES.  
25 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

2 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.

3 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

4 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

5 DR. STEWARD: YES.

6 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

7 MR. TORRES: AYE.

8 MS. KING: AND FOR THE RECORD, THE MOTION  
9 CARRIES.

10 MR. SHEEHY: OKAY. IS THERE A MOTION --  
11 IS THERE A MOTION TO MOVE ANOTHER GRANT FROM TIER II  
12 INTO TIER I?

13 DR. PRICE: QUESTION IS DOES THIS INCLUDE  
14 THE SPECIAL PETITION GRANTS?

15 MR. SHEEHY: THE SPECIAL PETITION GRANTS  
16 ONLY COME UP IF A MEMBER MAKES A MOTION TO MOVE IT  
17 INTO TIER I.

18 DR. PRICE: RIGHT. IT'S IN ORDER TO MAKE  
19 THAT MOTION RIGHT NOW?

20 MR. SHEEHY: IF YOU WANT TO MOVE ONE UP.

21 DR. PRICE: WHAT WAS IT? 1523, I MAKE A  
22 MOTION TO MOVE 1523 UP INTO THE FUNDING CATEGORY.

23 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE A SECOND?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION.

25 MR. SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE A DISCUSSION?

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD SPEAK TO THAT  
2 MOTION. I THINK THERE WAS QUITE A LENGTHY  
3 DISCUSSION LAST NIGHT THAT WNT SIGNALING IS AN  
4 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT SIGNALING PATHWAY, AND THAT WE  
5 SAW THAT THERE SEEMED TO BE SOME CONCURRENCE THAT  
6 WITH HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL-DERIVED CELLS, THERE  
7 WAS A GREATER DISPROPORTIONATE CLEAVAGE WITH THE  
8 HEAVY WNT SIGNALING INFLUENCE THAT IS IN PLACE ON  
9 THOSE CELLS. AND THAT SINCE THIS IS ONE OF THE  
10 BASIC SIGNALING PATHWAYS, WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO  
11 LEARN A QUITE A BIT HERE.

12 DR. TROUNSON COMMENTED ON THIS FOR US, AND  
13 I'D LIKE DR. TROUNSON PERHAPS TO GIVE US HIS VIEW ON  
14 THE POTENTIAL FOR LEARNING FROM THIS PARTICULAR  
15 APPROACH.

16 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU, CHAIR. NORMALLY  
17 IN DIFFERENTIATION YOU GET A DIFFERENCE IN THE TWO  
18 DAUGHTER CELLS WHEN THEY DIVIDE. USUALLY IN  
19 PRIMITIVE SPECIES, YOU SEE THAT AS A DIFFERENCE IN  
20 SIZE, A SMALLER CELL AND A LARGER CELL. SO THERE'S  
21 A DIFFERENCE IN THE QUANTITY OF THE MATERIAL IN THE  
22 CELL.

23 WE'VE NEVER SEEN THIS REALLY HAPPENING IN  
24 THE HUMAN, AND SO THERE WAS DOUBT ABOUT WHETHER THAT  
25 MECHANISM WAS REALLY OPERATING TO PUT MATERIAL IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE DAUGHTER CELLS IN A DIFFERENT WAY. AND THE  
2 HYPOTHESIS HERE, WHICH REALLY NEEDS STILL TO BE  
3 REALLY TESTED THROUGH THESE EXPERIMENTS, IS THAT THE  
4 MESSAGE WHICH IS REALLY THE WNT 3 AND THE  
5 PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT MOLECULES ASSOCIATED WITH  
6 THAT, THE GSK3, ARE PARTITIONED DIFFERENTLY IN  
7 DAUGHTER CELLS. WHEN A CELL DIVIDES, YOU GET A  
8 PARTITIONING. THIS MATERIAL IS LOCATED IN WHAT THEY  
9 CALL THE LYSOSOMES, AN INTRACELLULAR ORGANELLE. AND  
10 THEY SAY THAT THERE'S A DIFFERENCE, RESEARCHERS SAY  
11 THERE'S A DIFFERENCE, QUITE A DRAMATIC DIFFERENCE ON  
12 OCCASIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF MATERIAL IN ONE DAUGHTER  
13 CELL COMPARED TO ANOTHER.

14 THIS HYPOTHESIS REFLECTS A WAY IN WHICH  
15 THE CELL CAN DICTATE THE WAY DIFFERENTIATION OCCURS.  
16 IF THAT'S THE CASE, IF IT TURNS OUT TO BE THE CASE,  
17 IT'S A PRETTY IMPORTANT OBSERVATION. OF COURSE, IT  
18 MAY NOT TURN OUT TO BE THE CASE; AND, THEREFORE, AS  
19 IN SCIENCE, WE WILL REJECT THE HYPOTHESIS AND IN DUE  
20 COURSE CONTINUE ON OUR WAY IN RESEARCH. BUT THIS  
21 PARTICULAR INVESTIGATOR HAS A VERY BIG REPUTATION IN  
22 DEVELOPMENT, HASN'T BEEN LONG IN EMBRYONIC STEM  
23 CELLS, BUT HE'S INSIDE A GROUP, OWEN WITTE'S GROUP,  
24 THAT IS A VERY GOOD STEM CELL GROUP. SO I ACTUALLY  
25 DON'T SEE THAT AS TOO MUCH OF A HANDICAP ALTHOUGH

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE REVIEWERS THOUGHT THAT HE HADN'T SHOWN THE KIND  
2 OF EXPERIENCE THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE HAD.

3 SO I THINK THERE'S SOME MERIT HERE, BUT  
4 THERE'S SOME RISK. THIS IS A HIGHLY RISKY PROJECT,  
5 BUT IT'S GOT MERIT. AND IT MAY HAVE A BIG IMPACT IN  
6 THE FUTURE OR IT MAY BE REJECTED AS A HYPOTHESIS IN  
7 DUE COURSE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND IN LOOKING AT THIS  
9 GRANT, WHEN WE HAVE AN EXTRAORDINARILY STRONG  
10 HISTORY AND TRACK RECORD OF A RESEARCHER IN, AS DR.  
11 TROUNSON HAS INDICATED, IN A GROUP WITH DEPTH IN  
12 STEM CELL RESEARCH, AND THAT IS THE CRITICISM, THAT  
13 HE DIDN'T HAVE A BROAD ENOUGH STEM CELL TEAM BACKING  
14 HIM UP, I THINK WE CAN TAKE GREAT CONFIDENCE IN THE  
15 STRENGTH IN THAT TEAM PARTICULARLY BECAUSE THE HEAD  
16 OF THE STEM CELL GROUP AT UCLA HAS PROVIDED A  
17 SEPARATE LETTER SUPPORTING THIS PETITION, INDICATING  
18 THE STRENGTH OF THIS EFFORT AND THIS TEAM.

19 MR. SHEEHY: DR. GILL AND THEN DR. BLOOM  
20 AND THEN DR. STEWARD.

21 DR. GILL: I'D LIKE TO JUST SPEAK IN FAVOR  
22 OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PRIORITIZATION OF THIS.  
23 THE QUESTION THAT AROSE IN THE DISCUSSION CONCERNS  
24 THE MECHANISM THROUGH WHICH WNT, AN EXTRACELLULAR  
25 SIGNAL, TURNS OFF AN ENZYME INITIALLY IDENTIFIED IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GLYCOGEN METABOLISM, GLYCOGEN SYNTHASE KINASE 3,  
2 WHICH IS THE CRITICAL MEDIATOR OF WNT. THE PROPOSAL  
3 IS THAT THIS IS TURNED OFF BY BEING SEQUESTERED  
4 WITHIN VESICULAR MEMBRANES.

5 THE WORKING GROUP CONSIDERED THAT THIS WAS  
6 NOT UNIQUE TO STEM CELLS, BUT WAS A GENERAL  
7 MECHANISM FOR WNT SIGNALING AND WOULD BE STUDIED  
8 PRIMARILY IN XENOPUS OOCYTES. AND SO I THINK THE  
9 REASON IT WAS GIVEN THE SCORE WAS THAT IT WAS A  
10 GENERAL PHENOMENA OF WNT SIGNALING STUDIED BEST IN  
11 USUAL BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS AND, THEREFORE, NOT NOVEL  
12 TO STEM CELL BIOLOGY. SO I WAS CONVINCED THAT THE  
13 STEM CELL WORKING GROUP HAD SCORED IT CORRECTLY IN  
14 DEFERENCE TO MY COLLEAGUES HERE.

15 DR. BLOOM: I AGREE WITH DR. GILL.  
16 CRITERIA NO. 3 FOR THE RFA WAS THAT THE WORK BE  
17 PRIMARILY IN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS. AND THE  
18 AUTHOR OF THE APPLICATION COULD HAVE STRUCTURED HIS  
19 RESEARCH PLAN TO SPEAK TO IT IN THAT WAY. BUT  
20 INSTEAD, THAT PERSON RELIED ON THE FIELD IN WHICH  
21 THEY ARE MUCH MORE FAMILIAR, WHICH ARE THE XENOPUS  
22 OOCYTES. SO I THINK THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MADE  
23 THE CORRECT ASCERTAINMENT OF THE RIGHT PRIORITY.

24 MR. SHEEHY: DR. STEWARD.

25 DR. STEWARD: ACTUALLY I HAVE NOTHING TO



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADD TO DR. GILL'S AND DR. BLOOM'S COMMENTS. THOSE  
2 WERE EXACTLY WHAT I WAS GOING TO RAISE.

3 DR. PRICE: I HAVE A QUESTION FOR THE  
4 STAFF. CAN YOU TELL US THE SCORES FROM THE WORKING  
5 GROUP THAT WERE OVER THE MEAN, WHAT THOSE SCORES  
6 WERE?

7 DR. TROUNSON: ROBERT, COULD YOU JUST SAY  
8 THAT AGAIN?

9 DR. PRICE: YES. THE RANGE OF SCORES FOR  
10 THIS GRANT, AND I'M CURIOUS AS TO WHAT, NOT ONLY THE  
11 RANGE, BUT WHAT THE ACTUAL SCORES WERE FOR THOSE  
12 MEMBERS WHO SCORED ABOVE THE MEAN.

13 DR. TROUNSON: ABOVE THE MEAN.

14 DR. PRICE: LET'S SAY ABOVE THE MEDIAN.

15 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE MEDIAN FOR 1523 IS A  
16 60. THE STANDARD DEVIATION IS 9.73.

17 DR. PRICE: YOU DON'T HAVE THE ACTUAL  
18 SCORES? YOU DON'T HAVE THOSE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO SAY THAT I  
20 THINK THE POINT THAT WAS MADE YESTERDAY IN THE  
21 EXTRAORDINARY PETITION AND THE POINT IN THE GRANT  
22 WHICH DOES CONTINUE TO LOOK AT AS A PART OF THIS  
23 STUDY HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS IS THAT YOU GET A  
24 MUCH LARGER DISTORTION IN THE NORMAL CLEAVAGE IN  
25 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS WHICH IS ASSOCIATED WITH

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HIGHER LEVELS OF WNT SIGNALING. AND THEY'RE TRYING  
2 TO IDENTIFY WHY YOU GET THAT MUCH GREATER ASYMMETRIC  
3 CLEAVAGE BECAUSE AND HOW IT'S ASSOCIATED WITH WNT  
4 SIGNALING.

5 I DON'T DISAGREE THAT THE PRIORITY THAT  
6 WAS ASSIGNED HERE WAS PERHAPS A PROPER PRIORITY  
7 BECAUSE THIS IS A HIGHER RISK PROJECT. BUT MY POINT  
8 IS AT THIS POINT IN THE MATURITY OF OUR BASIC  
9 SCIENCE RESEARCH, WE CAN AFFORD TO INVEST IN SOME  
10 BASIC SCIENCE THAT IS HIGHER RISK PARTICULARLY WHEN  
11 IT DEALS WITH FUNDAMENTAL SIGNALING THAT IS REALLY  
12 CRITICAL TO DEVELOPMENT. AND I DON'T THINK ANYONE  
13 DISCOUNTED THE FACT THAT IN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM  
14 CELLS, YOU GET A GREATER DISPROPORTIONATE CLEAVAGE  
15 OR ASYMMETRIC CLEAVAGE HERE.

16 DR. TROUNSON: I DON'T THINK IT'S  
17 ASYMMETRIC CLEAVAGE. IT'S ASYMMETRICAL PARTITION.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ASYMMETRIC PARTITIONING.

19 DR. BLOOM: WELL, I THINK TO ME THE POINT  
20 IS HE COULD HAVE STRUCTURED HIS EXPERIMENTAL PLAN TO  
21 SPEAK TO THOSE QUESTIONS, AND HE DIDN'T. THE  
22 REVIEWERS WERE NOT CONVINCED THAT WHAT HE WAS GOING  
23 TO DO WOULD SPEAK TO THE QUESTION HE PROPOSED THE  
24 GRANT TO SOLVE. BY DOING IT IN XENOPUS OOCYTES  
25 DOESN'T SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF HOW IT HAPPENS IN HUMAN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS OR ANY OTHER MAMMALIAN CELL  
2 LINE. SO DOING IT IN XENOPUS IS LIKE THREE STEPS  
3 OUT OF THE KILTER OF WHERE YOU WANT THE INFORMATION  
4 TO BE PERTINENT. HE COULD HAVE DONE IT THAT WAY.  
5 HE MUST HAVE SAID SOMETHING IN THE ORIGINAL  
6 APPLICATION TO BE POSITIVELY SCREENED BY THE PREAP,  
7 BUT HE DIDN'T BRING IT OFF. AND THAT'S WHAT GRANT  
8 WRITING IS ALL ABOUT IS BRINGING IT OFF AND  
9 ESTABLISHING THAT YOUR EXPERIMENTAL PLAN IS THE  
10 VIABLE AND APPROPRIATE WAY TO DO THE EXPERIMENT.

11 THE MAN IS A VERY WELL KNOWN AND HIGHLY  
12 REGARDED DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGIST FOR HIS WORK IN  
13 XENOPUS. BUT HE'S JUST STICKING HIS TOE INTO THE  
14 HUMAN STEM CELLS, AND THAT WAS THE CRITERION BY  
15 WHICH THE RFA SOLICITED GRANT APPLICATIONS. HE  
16 DIDN'T BRING IT OFF.

17 DR. PIZZO: I WOULD AGREE WITH DR. BLOOM.  
18 I THINK FROM MY POINT OF VIEW THIS IS MORE A MATTER  
19 OF IMMEDIATE RELEVANCE THAN IT IS RISK, SO I CONCUR.

20 MR. SHEEHY: THEN I HAVE DR. LEVIN AND  
21 THEN DR. FONTANA.

22 DR. LEVIN: I THINK ALSO THERE'S A  
23 QUESTION OF PROCESS HERE. AFTER WHAT WE LEARNED  
24 YESTERDAY, I'M PRETTY INTERESTED IN THIS PROJECT. I  
25 THINK IT'S PRETTY COOL. AND WNT IS AS UBIQUITOUS A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MARKER AS THERE IS AND TO SEE DIFFERENTIAL  
2 EXPRESSION IN THE SELF-RENEWING CELLS, VERY  
3 INTERESTING PROJECT. BUT CERTAINLY THE PROCESS OF  
4 THE REVIEW BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SEEMED --  
5 THERE WASN'T ANYTHING EXTRAORDINARY. THEY SAW THE  
6 APPLICATION. THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE OF SCIENTIFIC  
7 OPINION PERHAPS, AND THE CIRM STAFF REVIEWED THIS  
8 AND CONCURRED WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, IT  
9 SEEMS TO ME.

10 AND SO EVERYTHING WAS -- THAT THE ISSUES  
11 THAT THEY RAISED AS TO WHY IT WAS SCORED THE WAY IT  
12 WAS ARE STILL CONSISTENT AND THAT MOST OF THIS WORK  
13 WAS DONE AND PROPOSED IN XENOPUS. AND SO A GREAT  
14 PROJECT, BUT STILL DOESN'T SEEM QUITE ALIGNED WITH  
15 THE RFA. IF WE MADE AN EXCEPTION HERE, IT WOULDN'T  
16 BE FAIR TO THOSE WHO ALSO HAVE GREAT PROJECTS, BUT  
17 DIDN'T HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN THEM FURTHER  
18 IN FRONT OF THE BOARD.

19 DR. GRIESHAMMER: IF I COULD JUMP IN.  
20 JUST FOR CLARIFICATION, I DO WANT TO MAKE IT CLEAR  
21 THAT THE APPLICANT PROPOSES A GOOD NUMBER OF  
22 EXPERIMENTS TO BE PERFORMED IN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM  
23 CELLS, BUT THE REVIEWERS DID PICK UP ON THE FACT  
24 THAT, INDEED, QUITE A FEW EXPERIMENTS WERE ALSO  
25 PROPOSED TO BE DONE IN XENOPUS EMBRYOS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND ALSO FOR CLARIFICATION, I WANT TO SAY  
2 THAT MUCH OF THE PRELIMINARY DATA WAS IN ALL KINDS  
3 OF CELL TYPES OTHER THAN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.  
4 SO I JUST WANTED TO BE CLEAR IN TERMS OF THE SCOPE  
5 OF THE TYPES OF CELLS THAT WERE IN THE PRELIMINARY  
6 DATA AND WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED.

7 DR. FONTANA: I JUST WANT TO ADDRESS, STEP  
8 BACK HERE. THIS PROCESS I FIND BOTHERSOME. AND  
9 WE'VE BEEN DEALING WITH THESE EXTRAORDINARY  
10 PETITIONS AND TAKING A GRANT OUT OF TIER III AND  
11 PUTTING IT UP TO TIER I. AND I RECALL AT SOME POINT  
12 MONTHS AGO THAT WE DISCUSSED PERHAPS A COMMITTEE  
13 THAT WAS GOING TO LOOK AT SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FROM  
14 THE STAFF AND PERHAPS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
15 AS TO A CONSISTENT PROCEDURE OR FORM WITH WHICH WE  
16 ADDRESS THESE ISSUES. AND WASN'T THAT BROUGHT UP,  
17 JEFF, AWHILE AGO? WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT?

18 MR. SHEEHY: YEAH. I'VE BEEN ASKING FOR  
19 THAT COMMITTEE TO MEET. WE HAVE THAT AND THE PREAP  
20 PROCESS WERE THE TWO ISSUES THAT WERE AT THE TOP OF  
21 THE AGENDA FOR THAT COMMITTEE. I DON'T KNOW WHY IT  
22 DOESN'T MEET. I ASKED FOR IT TO MEET.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, I THINK YOU AND I  
24 AND MELISSA DISCUSSED SPECIFIC DATES FOR IT TO MEET,  
25 AND I THINK WE HAD AN AGREEMENT. I THINK YOU HAVE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CIRCLED ON YOUR CALENDAR SOME DATES THAT MELISSA IS  
2 WORKING TO SEE IF SHE CAN BRING THE MEMBERS TOGETHER  
3 ON. I THINK IT'S COMING, AND THAT'S IMPORTANT TO  
4 RECOGNIZE.

5 IT'S ALSO IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THAT WE  
6 ARE CHARGED SPECIFICALLY WITH LOOKING AT EVERY  
7 GRANT, WHETHER IT'S IN TIER III, TIER II, TIER I AND  
8 MAKING INDEPENDENT DECISIONS. SO WE WON'T EVER HAVE  
9 DERIVATIVE RULES THAT SET ABSOLUTE STANDARDS BECAUSE  
10 EVERY TIME THE BOARD MEETS, IT'S CHARGED WITH MAKING  
11 INDIVIDUAL DECISIONS.

12 DR. FONTANA: I'D LIKE TO ADD I EMBRACE  
13 THAT RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKE IT. I DON'T TAKE IT  
14 LIGHTLY. I JUST WANT TO COME UP WITH A FORMAT BY  
15 WHICH WE CAN PROPERLY ASSESS THESE. WE ARE NOT  
16 PRIVY TO THE WORKING GROUP'S, THERE'S TEN OF THE  
17 MEMBERS, 19 OF US AREN'T. WE'RE ASKED TO MAKE  
18 RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION OF WHICH  
19 WE DON'T HAVE ALL OF IT IN FRONT OF US, AND I THINK  
20 IT'S UNFAIR TO US AS BOARD MEMBERS TO MAKE DECISIONS  
21 WHEN WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FROM A LEGAL POINT OF  
23 VIEW AND FROM A PROCESS POINT OF VIEW, IN THE  
24 EXECUTIVE SESSION, YOU HAVE THE ABILITY TO PROBE  
25 INTO THAT PROPRIETARY INFORMATION AND HAVE THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ABILITY, AND I'M PREPARED TO EXTEND THOSE EXECUTIVE  
2 SESSIONS TO THE TIME NECESSARY TO MAKE SURE YOU'RE  
3 SATISFIED BECAUSE WE HAVE TO BE OPERATING ON THE  
4 BASIS THAT WE DO EXHAUST THE INFORMATION THAT EACH  
5 INDIVIDUAL WANTS IN THE EXECUTIVE SESSION TO BE ABLE  
6 TO MAKE A FULLY INFORMED DECISION. SO IF WE NEED  
7 LONGER SESSIONS, I'M PREPARED CERTAINLY TO DO THAT  
8 IN THE EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.

9 AND I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT IT IS  
10 IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT MY UNDERSTANDING IS  
11 THAT THE STAFF IS REALLY NOT CONCURRING WITH THE  
12 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THEY ARE WRITING A SUMMARY OF  
13 WHAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PRESENTED. THAT'S  
14 DIFFERENT THAN ASKING THE STAFF WHAT THEIR POSITION  
15 IS. SO YESTERDAY I THINK -- DR. TROUNSON MAY WANT  
16 TO COMMENT ON THIS, BUT HE MADE A COMMENT THAT HE  
17 MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT POSITION THAN THE GRANTS  
18 WORKING GROUP ON THIS PARTICULAR GRANT.

19 DR. STEWARD: JUST IF I MAY SAY, THIS WAS  
20 ONE OF THE PROJECTS THAT WE CONSIDERED IN EXECUTIVE  
21 SESSION YESTERDAY FOR THE VERY REASON THAT WE'RE  
22 TALKING ABOUT HERE. AND WE DID LOOK AT THE  
23 PROPRIETARY PRELIMINARY DATA SPECIFICALLY TO ASK THE  
24 QUESTION WHAT IS THE PROPORTION OF EFFORT DEVOTED TO  
25 STEM CELLS VERSUS OTHER MODEL SYSTEMS. I THINK WE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DID DRILL DOWN SUFFICIENTLY TO UNDERSTAND EXACTLY  
2 WHAT WAS GOING ON IN THIS GRANT. I'M ACTUALLY QUITE  
3 COMFORTABLE VOTING.

4 I GUESS AS LONG AS I HAVE THE MIC, I THINK  
5 OUR DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS ARE PRETTY WELL ESTABLISHED  
6 HERE, AND I'D LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THIS ONE.

7 MR. SHEEHY: OKAY. I THINK THAT'S  
8 APPROPRIATE. IS THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? OKAY.  
9 MELISSA, PLEASE.

10 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

11 DR. PRICE: YES.

12 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

13 DR. BLOOM: NO.

14 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

15 DR. GILL: AGAINST.

16 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.

17 DR. LEVIN: NO.

18 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

19 MS. FEIT: I BELIEVE THAT I'M CONFLICTED  
20 IN THIS GRANT. 1526, IT'S ON MY LIST.

21 MS. KING: I CAN COME BACK TO YOU.

22 MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

23 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.

24 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

25 MS. GIBBONS: YES.



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
2 MR. GOLDBERG: NO.  
3 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
4 DR. HAWGOOD: NO.  
5 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
7 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
8 DR. PIZZO: NO.  
9 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
10 DR. POMEROY: NO.  
11 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
12 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
13 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
14 DR. QUINT: ABSTAIN.  
15 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.  
16 DR. FONTANA: NO.  
17 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
18 MR. ROTH: NO.  
19 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
20 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
21 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.  
22 MR. SHESTACK: YES.  
23 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
24 DR. STEWARD: NO.  
25 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. TORRES: NO.

2 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

3 MS. FEIT: YES.

4 MR. HARRISON: THAT MOTION FAILS BY A VOTE  
5 OF 12 NOES, 7 YESES, AND ONE ABSTENTION.

6 MR. SHEEHY: OKAY. DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO  
7 MOVE ANOTHER GRANT FROM TIER II INTO TIER I? OKAY.  
8 IN THAT WE DO NOT, IS THERE -- THERE WAS AN  
9 EXTRAORDINARY PETITION THAT I THINK SOME INDIVIDUALS  
10 WANTED TO TALK TO, SO MAYBE WE SHOULD HEAR FROM  
11 THOSE FOLKS BEFORE WE DO OUR FINAL VOTE. SO DR.  
12 NOLTA MAYBE.

13 MS. KING: I ALSO JUST WANTED TO MAKE  
14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN AWARE THAT WE HAVE SOME MEMBERS OF  
15 THE PUBLIC THAT WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO APPLICATION  
16 NO. 1567.

17 DR. NOLTA: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DR.  
18 SHEEHY AND THE ENTIRE ICOC FOR GIVING US THIS --

19 MR. SHEEHY: I'M NOT A DOCTOR, BUT THANK  
20 YOU.

21 DR. NOLTA: YOU SHOULD BE. -- FOR GIVING  
22 US THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT. DR. KURZROCK, WHO'S  
23 THE PI ON THIS GRANT, IS SORRY THAT HE CAN'T BE HERE  
24 TODAY. HE HAD LIFESAVING BLADDER SURGERIES ON  
25 INFANTS SCHEDULED TODAY AND COULD NOT CANCEL THOSE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 I'M THE CO-PI ON THIS GRANT, SO I'M VERY HAPPY TO  
2 DISCUSS OUR EXTRAORDINARY PETITION. WE REALLY --

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WITH THE MICROPHONE, IT  
4 WOULD BE HELPFUL, I THINK, IF YOU SPOKE JUST A  
5 LITTLE SLOWER.

6 DR. NOLTA: WE REALLY WANT TO THANK THE  
7 GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND THE REVIEWERS. WE MEAN  
8 ABSOLUTELY NO DISRESPECT BY SUBMITTING THIS  
9 PETITION. DR. KURZROCK AND I HAVE BOTH BEEN ON  
10 NUMEROUS NIH REVIEW PANELS. I'VE BEEN ON OVER 100,  
11 AND I CHAIR REVIEWS FOR THE NYSTEM, WHICH IS THE  
12 SMALLER NEW YORK VERSION OF CIRM, MUCH SMALLER. SO  
13 WE REALLY KNOW HOW MUCH WORK AND EFFORT IT IS TO DO  
14 THESE REVIEWS, AND WE APPRECIATE EVERYTHING THAT THE  
15 REVIEWERS SAID. HOWEVER, WE THINK THAT THEY REALLY  
16 DIDN'T ADDRESS KEY COMPONENTS OF OUR APPLICATION IN  
17 THAT THE UNIQUE AND CRITICAL VALUE OF DEVELOPING  
18 UROTHELIAL CELLS FOR BLADDER REPAIR REALLY WAS NOT  
19 WEIGHTED STRONGLY ENOUGH.

20 THERE ARE ONLY A HANDFUL OF SCIENTISTS  
21 WORLDWIDE WORKING IN THIS FIELD. DR. KURZROCK IS  
22 ABSOLUTELY AT THE FOREFRONT OF THOSE INVESTIGATORS.

23 CHILDREN BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA, BLADDER  
24 EXSTROPHY -- THIS IS WHERE THE BLADDER IS ACTUALLY  
25 OUTSIDE THE BODY ON BIRTH -- CHILDREN AND ADULTS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WITH SPINAL CORD INJURY, AND BLADDER CANCER PATIENTS  
2 COULD ALL BENEFIT GREATLY FROM THIS NOVEL RESEARCH.

3 PATIENTS WHO DO NOT HAVE PROPER  
4 INNERVATION OF THEIR BLADDERS HAVE TO CONSTANTLY  
5 CATHETERIZE. THEY CAN DEVELOP SEVERE INFECTIONS IN  
6 NEUROGENIC BLADDERS WHICH GET VERY THICK. THEY  
7 DON'T HOLD THE URINE. EVEN WITH CATHETERIZATION,  
8 THE URINE IS BACKING UP INTO THE KIDNEYS, THE  
9 KIDNEYS FAIL, AND THEY GO ONTO DIALYSIS. THIS IS  
10 EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE IN HEALTHCARE. IT'S A TERRIBLE  
11 QUALITY OF LIFE.

12 BLADDER CANCER PATIENTS COULD ALSO BENEFIT  
13 FROM THIS RESEARCH OF UNDERSTANDING HOW THE  
14 PRIMITIVE STEM CELLS BECOME UROTHELIUM. THEY'RE THE  
15 MOST EXPENSIVE CANCER PATIENTS TO TREAT BECAUSE THEY  
16 LIVE, WHICH IS GREAT, BUT THE CANCER KEEPS COMING  
17 BACK. I HAVE A FAMILY MEMBER WITH BLADDER CANCER.  
18 HE'S BEEN THROUGH FOUR SURGERIES AND RECOVERIES,  
19 CONSTANT MONITORING. SO IT'S A VERY EXPENSIVE  
20 CANCER.

21 OUR RESEARCH TO DEVELOP UROTHELIUM FROM  
22 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS COULD REALLY HELP ALL OF  
23 THESE PATIENTS THAT I'VE JUST DISCUSSED.

24 DR. KURZROCK HAS JUST PUBLISHED THE FIRST  
25 REPORT EVER DESCRIBING THE LONG-TERM FATE OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1     TRANSPLANTED UROLOGIC TISSUE. THIS WAS JUST  
2     PUBLISHED IN *TISSUE ENGINEERING*. THE WORK HAS MAJOR  
3     IMPACT FOR THE FIELD OF BLADDER ENGINEERING. IT  
4     VALIDATES THE EXPERIMENTAL PLAN SPECIFICALLY IN FOUR  
5     COMPLETELY.

6             ALTHOUGH THE REVIEWERS HAD PRAISED THE  
7     NOVELTY OF THE RESEARCH IN AIMS 2 TO 4, THEY  
8     QUESTIONED THE NEED FOR AIM 1. THIS IS WHERE WE'RE  
9     DEVELOPING METHODS TO GENERATE HIGHER QUALITY  
10    IMPURITY DEFINITIVE ENDODERM FROM HUMAN EMBRYONIC  
11    STEM CELLS. AND THEIR STATEMENT WAS THAT MANY OTHER  
12    GROUPS ARE ALSO WORKING ON THIS. THE STAGES ARE  
13    NEEDED ALSO FOR GENERATION OF PANCREAS, LIVER, AND  
14    OTHER TISSUES, ENDODERMAL TISSUES FROM EMBRYONIC  
15    STEM CELLS.

16            I WANTED TO POINT OUT THAT OUR METHOD USES  
17    HALF OF THE ACTIVAN A. THIS IMPROVEMENT ALONE SAVES  
18    \$1200 PER EXPERIMENT, AND THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT  
19    SAVINGS. SO WITH THE MONEY THAT WE'VE SAVED, WE'VE  
20    BEEN ABLE TO OFFER STIPENDS, FOR INSTANCE, TO  
21    SEVERAL SUMMER STUDENTS THAT ARE COMING TO WORK WITH  
22    US FROM LOCAL HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. WE DO FEEL  
23    THAT THIS SAVINGS, THIS MONEY SAVINGS OVER TIME IS A  
24    SIGNIFICANT ADVANCE ALREADY.

25            IN AIM 1 WE'RE ALSO MAKING THE METHODS TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DERIVE DE MORE CLINICALLY RELEVANT. OUR GOAL IS TO  
2 TRANSLATE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS UROTHELIUM FROM  
3 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS INTO THE CLINIC TO HELP OUR  
4 PATIENTS AND MANY OTHERS THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA AND  
5 BEYOND.

6 FOR AIMS 2 AND 3, WE ADDED AS MUCH  
7 EXPERIMENTAL DETAIL AS THE FOUR PAGES ALLOWED. WE  
8 MADE SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONAL PROGRESS SINCE THEN.  
9 I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT DR. KURZROCK AND I HAVE  
10 NO OTHER FUNDING FOR EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH.  
11 SO THIS IS VERY CRITICAL TO US TO HAVE THIS FUNDING  
12 CONSIDERED -- VERY WELL CONSIDERED FOR THIS PROJECT.  
13 IT'S VERY KEY.

14 AND FINALLY, WHAT'S VERY INTERESTING ABOUT  
15 THIS PROJECT IS THAT THIS IS ONE CELL TYPE, THE  
16 UROTHELIUM, THE LINING OF THE BLADDER. IT DOES HAVE  
17 UNIQUE MARKERS, THE UROPLAKINS. THIS MEANS, UNLIKE  
18 OTHER TISSUES, MANY OTHER TISSUES, WE HAVE A SINGLE  
19 UNIQUE MARKER. WE CAN SORT THE UROTHELIAL  
20 DERIVATIVES THAT COME FROM THE EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS  
21 UNLIKE MANY OTHER TISSUES THAT MIGHT BE CONTAMINATED  
22 WITH PRIMITIVE TISSUES. AND ESPECIALLY SINCE WE  
23 HAVE THE FIRST CLINICAL GRADE FLOW SORTER EVER IN  
24 OUR NEW CIRM-FUNDED GMP FACILITY, WE'LL BE ABLE TO  
25 SORT OUT THIS TISSUE FOR ENDOSCOPIC PLACEMENT INTO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE BLADDER IN PATIENTS THAT HAVE HAD A NEUROGENIC  
2 BLADDER AND PART OF IT'S DIED OFF OR SLOUGHED OR TO  
3 ACTUALLY REBUILD BLADDERS FOR OUR PATIENTS.

4 AND SO THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO COME  
5 HERE TODAY AND TO SAY JUST A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT  
6 OUR GRANT, WHICH WE FELT THAT THE REVIEWERS HAD  
7 REALLY MISSED.

8 MR. REED: DON REED, CALIFORNIANS FOR  
9 CURES. I THINK OF ALL THE PROJECTS UP HERE TODAY,  
10 THIS ONE HAS THE GREATEST POTENTIAL FOR PUBLIC  
11 AWARENESS BECAUSE EVERYBODY HAS TO USE THE RESTROOM.  
12 IT'S INESCAPABLE, SEVERAL TIMES A DAY. NOW, IF YOU  
13 WALK DOWN THE GROCERY AISLES AND LOOK AT THE DEPENDS  
14 SECTION, YOU SEE THAT BLADDER PROBLEMS ARE GIGANTIC.  
15 AND THIS GOES RIGHT TO THE HEART OF A MALFUNCTIONING  
16 BLADDER, THE INNER LINING, BUILDING NEW BLADDERS,  
17 HEALING THEM. 464,000 CALIFORNIANS WITH SPINAL CORD  
18 INJURIES, ONE OF THE GREATEST RISKS IS THE URINARY  
19 TRACT INFECTIONS. THIS IS DEVASTATING TO THE LIVES  
20 AND HEALTH AND WELL-BEING AND ENERGY LEVELS OF  
21 PARALYZED PEOPLE. THIS IS JUST A TREMENDOUS  
22 POSSIBILITY OF A PROJECT.

23 I NOTICED -- I READ THE REVIEWS OF IT  
24 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE LAST NIGHT, AND IT SAID THAT  
25 THIS PROJECT WAS OVERLY AMBITIOUS. OVERLY AMBITIOUS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IS A JOB DESCRIPTION OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF  
2 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. EVERYTHING THAT YOU GUYS  
3 DEAL WITH IS SOMETHING THAT TRADITIONAL MEDICINE HAS  
4 SIGNED OFF ON AS INCURABLE. THIS IS HUGE. THIS IS  
5 FOR EVERYBODY. AND I WOULD URGE YOU TO RECONSIDER  
6 THIS. THANK YOU.

7 MS. BROGER: HELLO. MY NAME IS ADRIANNA  
8 BROGER, AND I'M HERE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT MY SON  
9 BENJAMIN JAMES BROGER. FIRST OF ALL, I'D LIKE TO  
10 THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS MY  
11 THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS THIS AFTERNOON. THIS IS MY  
12 FIRST EXPERIENCE WITH THE WORK THAT YOU DO. AND AS  
13 A MOTHER OF FOUR LITTLE BOYS, I'M GOING TO GO HOME  
14 AND TELL THEM THAT I WAS IN A ROOM FULL OF SUPER  
15 HEROES TODAY.

16 ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2003, MY SON BENJAMIN  
17 JAMES BROGER WAS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA. THIS IS  
18 BEN. AND HE'S A CHAMPION. IT IS FOR BEN THAT I'M  
19 HERE TODAY, FOR BEN AND FOR ALL OF THE CHILDREN THAT  
20 I'VE MET WHO SUFFER -- THANK YOU -- SUFFER FROM  
21 NEUROGENIC BLADDER AND BOWEL, WHICH IS WHAT BEN  
22 DEALS WITH. THE COMPLICATIONS OF BEN'S SPINA BIFIDA  
23 ARE MANY. AND AS A PARENT AND AS HIS MOTHER, AS A  
24 FAMILY MEMBER OF ANYONE DEALING WITH THE DIAGNOSIS,  
25 THE REASON THAT I'M HERE IS BECAUSE THIS FUELS THE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE THING THAT KEEPS A FAMILY GOING, AND THAT'S  
2 HOPE. AND THE FUNDS THAT YOU ARE CONSIDERING, DR.  
3 KURZROCK'S WORK IS THAT HOPE.

4 I WAS SO MOVED BY LAWRENCE'S PRESENTATION,  
5 I CRIED BECAUSE CERTAINLY IT RESONATED WITH ME AND  
6 WHAT MY FAMILY DEALS WITH, WHAT SO MANY PEOPLE DEAL  
7 WITH. SPINA BIFIDA IS A VERY COMMON NEURAL TUBE  
8 DEFECT, AND MANY, MANY CHILDREN AND ADULTS DEAL WITH  
9 MANY IMPLICATIONS, BUT NINE OUT OF TEN, WHETHER OR  
10 NOT THEY'RE AMBULATORY, DEAL WITH BLADDER OR BOWEL  
11 MALFUNCTION. WHAT THAT MEANS FOR US IS CATHING BEN  
12 EVERY FOUR HOURS.

13 THIS YEAR HE'S IN FIRST GRADE. IN THE  
14 FALL HE'LL GO INTO SECOND GRADE. IF YOU CAN JUST  
15 IMAGINE WHAT THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF WEARING A  
16 PULL-UP IN SECOND GRADE IS, IT'S REALLY ROUGH. AND  
17 THE THING THAT KEEPS ME GOING AS HIS MOTHER, WHEN I  
18 CAN'T CRY IN FRONT OF BEN, IS THE HOPE THAT  
19 SOMEWHERE, SOMEPLACE SOMEONE IS WORKING ON SOMETHING  
20 THAT WILL CHANGE OUR LIVES. AND THAT PLACE IS UC  
21 DAVIS WITH DR. KURZROCK. THE WORK THAT HE'S DOING  
22 IS CRITICAL. THESE FUNDS ARE SO IMPORTANT. IT  
23 MEANS AN IMPROVED QUALITY OF LIFE FOR LITTLE  
24 CHILDREN. AS A PEDIATRIC UROLOGIST, THE WORK THAT  
25 HE DOES WHEN WE GO TO SEE HIM GIVE ME HOPE THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MAYBE ONE DAY WE WON'T HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE CATHING  
2 EVERY FOUR HOURS.

3 JUST RECENTLY, BEN IS IN FIRST GRADE, AS I  
4 MENTIONED, AND FIRST GRADERS ARE GOING TO GET TO GO  
5 ON A FIELD TRIP, A LIFE SCIENCE FIELD TRIP. AND  
6 IT'S FROM 8 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING TO 2 O'CLOCK IN  
7 THE AFTERNOON. AND THEY SENT A LETTER HOME SAYING  
8 THAT PARENTS WERE NOT GOING TO BE ALLOWED TO BE  
9 CHAPERONES DUE TO BUDGET CONSTRAINTS AND NO SPACE ON  
10 THE SCHOOL BUS. AND SO I HAD TO PETITION OUR SCHOOL  
11 AND WRITE FORMAL LETTERS, AGAIN BECAUSE IT'S ALWAYS  
12 SOMETHING, AND SAY THAT IN BEN'S CASE IT ISN'T A  
13 CHAPERONE TO HOLD A HAND, BUT RATHER SOMEBODY TO BE  
14 THERE TO TAKE CARE OF HIM AND HIS CATHETERIZING  
15 NEEDS BECAUSE IF HE DOESN'T AND IF WE DON'T CATH, WE  
16 DEAL WITH THE REFLUX UP INTO THE KIDNEYS. AND WE  
17 KNOW ABOUT HYDRONEPHROSIS AND WE KNOW ABOUT SO MANY  
18 THINGS THAT I WISH I DIDN'T HAVE TO KNOW ABOUT.

19 BUT HE IS MY CHAMPION, AND GETTING ON THE  
20 PLANE AND SPENDING THE NIGHT IN A HOTEL TO COME HERE  
21 AND TALK TO YOU IS NOTHING BECAUSE I WOULD TRAVEL TO  
22 THE ENDS OF THE EARTH TO TELL YOU THAT THIS IS SO  
23 CRITICAL. I IMPLORE YOU TO PLEASE RECONSIDER.  
24 AGAIN, MY BEN NEEDS AN IMPROVED QUALITY OF LIFE. HE  
25 NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO RUN AND JUMP AND ENJOY KICKING A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOCCER BALL WITHOUT WORRYING ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT  
2 HE'S GOING TO LEAK. THESE ARE VERY REAL THINGS THAT  
3 WE DEAL WITH ON AN EVERYDAY BASIS. AND AGAIN, THE  
4 HOPE THAT ONE DAY WE WON'T HAVE TO DEAL WITH IT IS  
5 WHAT DRIVES US. IT'S WHAT KEEPS US GOING EVERY DAY.

6 THE WORK THAT YOU ARE DOING HERE IS SO  
7 IMPORTANT, SO IMPORTANT BECAUSE YOU REALLY HAVE A  
8 CHANCE TO CHANGE LIVES. I AM SO GRATEFUL FOR YOUR  
9 WORK, SO GRATEFUL FOR ASKING YOU TO PLEASE  
10 RECONSIDER. AGAIN, DR. KURZROCK'S WORK IS VERY  
11 WORTHWHILE AND HAS ALL THE MERIT IN THE WORLD. I  
12 THANK YOU FROM THE BOTTOM OF MY HEART AND I PLORE  
13 YOU TO PLEASE KEEP THESE CHILDREN IN MIND THAT CAN'T  
14 COME UP AND HAVE A VOICE. SO HOPEFULLY I'VE BEEN  
15 ABLE TO CONVEY A LITTLE BIT ABOUT WHAT I FEEL AS I  
16 THINK THERE ARE NO WORDS TO EXPRESS THAT. IF YOU'VE  
17 EVER LOVED SOMEONE SO DESPERATELY AND WANTED  
18 SOMETHING, AND AS A PARENT THERE'S NOTHING WORSE  
19 THAN FEELING POWERLESS. AND I CAN STRAP HIM INTO  
20 HIS LITTLE AFO'S, ANKLE/FOOT ORTHOSIS AND HE CAN RUN  
21 AROUND AND HAVE SOME BALANCE, BUT I CAN'T ADDRESS  
22 HIS BLADDER. I CAN'T PUT A BAND-AID ON THAT, AND I  
23 CAN'T FIX THAT. SO I HAVE TO RELY ON OTHER PEOPLE  
24 WHO CAN. THAT'S WHAT I'M ASKING YOU TO DO TODAY.  
25 THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT WAS THE -- COULD WE  
2 ASK WHAT WAS THE --

3 MR. SHEEHY: WE STILL HAVE -- MAYBE WE  
4 SHOULD GET THROUGH THE PUBLIC COMMENTS.

5 MR. REED: I'M ROMAN REED. I'M HERE NOT  
6 TO SPEAK ON MYSELF OR THE 464,000 CALIFORNIANS. I'M  
7 HERE NOW MOVED TO ASK YOU FOR BEN'S SAKE TO PLEASE  
8 TAKE A STAND FOR THIS RESEARCH THAT MUST BE DONE.  
9 I'M HONORED TO COME AFTER BEN'S MOTHER WHO IS A  
10 CHAMPION AND TAKING A STAND. TAKE A STAND FOR BEN.  
11 TAKE A STAND SO ONE DAY EVERYBODY CAN. THANK YOU.

12 MS. REED: HI. I WASN'T PLANNING ON  
13 TALKING TODAY, BUT BASICALLY, AS YOU LOOK AT ME, I'M  
14 SUPPOSED TO BE DEAD. I'M A PATIENT HERE AT CITY OF  
15 HOPE. I HAVE THE HONOR OF BEING ROMAN REED'S AUNT  
16 AND THE HONOR OF BEING DON REED'S LITTLE SISTER.

17 SO I JUST WANTED THAT YOU GUYS NEED TO SEE  
18 WHAT YOU'RE WORKING FOR. I'M HERE. I'M ALIVE. I  
19 HAD A STEM CELL TRANSPLANT. FORTUNATELY NOW I HAVE  
20 A GRAFT THAT'S TAKING OVER MY BODY, BUT I GOT  
21 LEUKEMIA BECAUSE OF THE CHEMO THAT I GOT FROM BREAST  
22 CANCER. SO OBVIOUSLY, ALTHOUGH I'M REALLY GRATEFUL  
23 TO BE HERE RIGHT NOW, I'D LIKE TO BE LIKE YOU GUYS  
24 OR SOME OF YOU GUYS CAN AT LEAST LIKE PLAN YOUR  
25 RETIREMENT WITH YOUR SPOUSES. I'VE BEEN TOLD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE' S NOTHING COMING DOWN THE PIKE FOR ME. AND  
2 PEOPLE LOOK AT ME AND I' M UPRIGHT. I DID HAVE TO  
3 LEARN HOW TO WALK AGAIN AFTER BEING IN A COMA. IT' S  
4 BEEN A ROUGH TIME. AND I' VE GOTTEN SICKER BECAUSE  
5 OF THE MEDS THAT I HAVE TO TAKE FOR THE CANCERS I  
6 HAVE.

7 I WANT TO THANK YOU ALL FOR SACRIFICING  
8 YOUR TIME AND YOUR ENERGY AND ESPECIALLY MY BROTHER  
9 WHO SACRIFICES SO MUCH OF HIS TIME AND HIS LIFE.  
10 IT' S JUST AMAZING. SO BASI CALLY WANT TO THANK YOU  
11 VERY MUCH.

12 MR. SHEEHY: COULD WE GET -- COULD STAFF  
13 PERHAPS GIVE US THE SCORES AND THEN MAYBE A LITTLE  
14 SYNOPSIS FOR 1567?

15 DR. SAMBRANO: CERTAINLY. SO FOR 1567 THE  
16 SCORE AND THE MEDI AN ARE BOTH 65, HAD A STANDARD  
17 DEVIATION OF 5.88.

18 MR. SHEEHY: WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST SCORE?  
19 WHAT WAS THE RANGE?

20 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE RANGE WAS 55 TO 75,  
21 SO EVERYTHING CENTERED AROUND 65.

22 MR. SHEEHY: AND THE MEDI AN?

23 DR. SAMBRANO: 65.

24 MR. SHEEHY: SO HALF OF THE GROUP SCORED  
25 IT ABOVE 65 AND HALF OF THE GROUP SCORED IT BELOW

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 65?

2 DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S CORRECT.

3 MR. SHEEHY: AND WHAT WERE THE STRONG  
4 POINTS AND THE WEAK POINTS OF THIS APPLICATION?

5 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THIS PROPOSAL HAD FOUR  
6 AIMS. VERY BRIEFLY, THE FIRST AIM WAS TO IMPROVE A  
7 PROTOCOL TO DIFFERENTIATE HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS  
8 INTO DEFINITIVE ENDODERM.

9 FROM THERE IN AIM 2, THE DEFINITIVE  
10 ENDODERM WOULD BE DIFFERENTIATED INTO UROTHELIUM  
11 SPECIFICALLY VIA AN INDUCTIVE SIGNALING PROTOCOL.

12 THE THIRD AIM WERE STUDIES ON  
13 OVEREXPRESSION IN KNOCKDOWN APPROACHES OF SPECIFIC  
14 CANDIDATE GENES TO TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE MECHANISM  
15 BEHIND THE DIFFERENTIATION FROM DEFINITIVE ENDODERM  
16 TO UROTHELIUM.

17 AND THEN AIM 4 HAD A SOMEWHAT  
18 TRANSLATIONAL ASPECT TO IT; THAT IS, TO TEST THE  
19 FEASIBILITY OF TRANSPLANTING THE UROTHELIUM DERIVED  
20 THROUGH THIS PROTOCOL INTO A BLADDER MODEL THAT HAS  
21 BEEN DEVELOPED IN THE LABORATORY.

22 AND SO THE CRITICISMS SURROUNDED -- WERE  
23 RELATED TO AIM 1 IN TERMS OF THE NOVELTY OF THE  
24 APPROACH. SO THE PROTOCOL FOR DIFFERENTIATING HUMAN  
25 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS TO DEFINITIVE ENDODERM HAVE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALREADY BEEN ESTABLISHED BY OTHER LABS, AND THERE  
2 WAS THE COMMENT THAT THERE HAVE BEEN TWO COMMERCIAL  
3 ENTITIES THAT HAVE ALSO PRODUCED A PROTOCOL THAT  
4 COULD HAVE BEEN USED SUCH THAT THE APPLICANTS MAY  
5 HAVE FOCUSED THEIR ATTENTION MOSTLY ON THE SECOND  
6 AIM, WHICH WAS THE DIFFERENTIATION OF THE DEFINITIVE  
7 ENDODERM TO THE UROTHELIUM.

8 THE OTHER CRITICISM SURROUNDED AIMS 3 AND  
9 4 IN THE GENERAL SENSE THAT THEY THOUGHT THAT THESE  
10 WERE A BIT PREMATURE IN PART BECAUSE THERE'S NOT  
11 VERY MUCH THAT'S UNDERSTOOD IN TERMS OF HOW YOU GET  
12 FROM DEFINITIVE ENDODERM TO THE UROTHELIUM. AND SO  
13 THERE ARE, FOR EXAMPLE, CANDIDATE GENES THAT ARE  
14 BEING CONSIDERED FOR STUDY. AND IT WAS UNCLEAR TO  
15 REVIEWERS WHAT THE RATIONALE FOR SELECTING SPECIFIC  
16 GENES TO STUDY WERE OR WHY THESE WERE SPECIFICALLY  
17 CHOSEN.

18 SO THE OVERAMBITIOUS PART REALLY HAD TO DO  
19 WITH AIM 3 IN TERMS OF A LOT OF KNOCKDOWN AND  
20 OVEREXPRESSION STUDIES WHERE THEY FELT THAT THE  
21 PROPOSAL COULD GET STUCK FOR A LONG A TIME AND WERE  
22 UNCLEAR THAT THEY MIGHT ACTUALLY MAKE IT TO AIM 4  
23 AND BE ABLE TO TEST IT IN THEIR TRANSLATIONAL MODEL.

24 SO THOSE WERE SOME OF THE CRITICISMS, BUT  
25 ON THE OTHER HAND, THEY DID ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THIS IS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AN AREA THAT HAS BEEN LARGELY UNDERSTUDIED AND  
2 CERTAINLY HIGHLIGHTED THAT THIS WAS AN IMPORTANT  
3 PROBLEM TO ADDRESS AND CONSIDERED THIS THE KEY  
4 INNOVATIVE ASPECT OF THE PROJECT. THEY ALSO FELT  
5 THAT THE PI AND THE TEAM OVERALL WAS A VERY CAPABLE  
6 RESEARCH TEAM. THEY HAD ESTABLISHED COLLABORATIONS  
7 THAT HAD EXISTED ALREADY FOR SEVERAL YEARS AND  
8 OVERALL WAS A GOOD TEAM TO ACCOMPLISH THIS.

9 SO I THINK JUST VERY BASICALLY INNOVATIVE  
10 AND SIGNIFICANT, BUT CERTAINLY THOUGHT THAT THE  
11 SCOPE, PARTICULARLY IN AIM 3, WAS A BIT  
12 OVERAMBITIOUS AND WAS SOMEWHAT PREMATURE.

13 MR. SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE A MOTION ON THIS  
14 GRANT?

15 MR. TORRES: SOMETIMES THE MEMBERS AND THE  
16 PUBLIC DON'T REALIZE THAT SOME OF US ARE PATIENT  
17 ADVOCATES. AND I'M A COLON CANCER SURVIVOR, SON OF  
18 A BREAST CANCER SURVIVOR, AND UNFORTUNATELY RECENTLY  
19 THE BROTHER OF A COLON RECTAL CANCER SURVIVOR. I  
20 WISH WE COULD FUND EVERY COLON CANCER PROJECT THAT  
21 COMES BEFORE ME, BUT WE CAN'T BECAUSE WE HAVE A DUTY  
22 TO DEAL WITH WHAT IS THE BEST SCIENCE.

23 AND SO I JUST WANT PEOPLE IN THE AUDIENCE  
24 TO KNOW THAT SOME OF US GRAPPLE WITH THIS ALL THE  
25 TIME. BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, WE HAVE A DUTY TO



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS LAW AND TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE TO  
2 MAKE THE DECISIONS THAT ARE BASED UPON WHAT WE  
3 CONSIDER, AFTER REVIEWING WITH OTHER SCIENTISTS,  
4 QUITE FRANKLY, FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD BECAUSE I WAS  
5 IN THIS WORKING GROUP, TO RESPECT THEIR JUDGMENT, TO  
6 RESPECT THEIR EXPERTISE, AND AT THE END OF THE DAY  
7 MAKE YOUR OWN DECISION. AND SOMETIMES THOSE  
8 DECISIONS ARE NOT EASY TO MAKE. BUT I WANTED TO  
9 MAKE SURE THE PEOPLE IN THE AUDIENCE HERE KNOW THAT  
10 SOME OF US ARE PATIENTS, ARE SURVIVORS, AND TAKE  
11 THIS VERY, VERY SERIOUSLY.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D JUST LIKE TO ADD TO  
13 THAT COMMENT THAT THOSE WHO SPOKE TODAY REALLY  
14 SENSITIZE US FURTHER TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE  
15 PROGRAMMATIC AREA OF DEALING WITH ISSUES WITH THE  
16 BLADDER. AND THAT IT MAY BE THAT IF WE DO NOT PASS  
17 THIS OR APPROVE THIS PARTICULAR GRANT, THAT IN THE  
18 TRANSLATIONAL, EARLY TRANSLATION GRANT THAT COMES  
19 UP, THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY. WE'RE CERTAINLY WITH  
20 THE ELOQUENT TESTIMONY WE'VE HEARD TODAY GOING TO  
21 FOCUS ON THIS AREA AND LOOK FOR WAYS WE CAN DEAL  
22 WITH IT.

23 THE OTHER POINT HERE IS THAT THIS GRANT  
24 CYCLE FOR BASIC SCIENCE IS REPEATED ESSENTIALLY  
25 ANNUALLY. AND SO THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THIS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GRANT TO COME BACK WITH THE INVESTIGATOR HAVING  
2 ADDRESSED THE ISSUES RAISED BY THE REVIEWERS AS A  
3 STRONGER CANDIDATE. BUT WE WILL TAKE WITH US AS  
4 PART OF OUR LIBRARY OF CRITICAL CONCERNS THE  
5 SENSITIVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE IMPACT THIS HAS ON  
6 INDIVIDUAL LIVES AND LOOK FOR PROGRAMMATIC WAYS TO  
7 ADDRESS IT.

8 MR. SHEEHY: ANY OTHER? WELL, NOT TO  
9 EDITORIALIZE, BUT IT JUST BOTHERS ME WHEN SOMETHING  
10 IS SHOT DOWN BECAUSE IT'S TOO AMBITIOUS AND IS  
11 PREMATURE. I MEAN I THINK WE'RE HERE TO BE  
12 AMBITIOUS AND TO PUSH THINGS ALONG. AND THERE WAS  
13 SOME ENTHUSIASM FOR THIS GRANT AT THE WORKING GROUP.

14 SO SINCE I'M CHAIRING THIS, I'M RELUCTANT  
15 TO MAKE MOTIONS FROM THE CHAIR, BUT I DON'T KNOW.

16 DR. STEWARD: JEFF, I WILL MAKE A MOTION  
17 THAT WE ELEVATE THIS TO THE FUNDING RANGE. AND I'D  
18 LIKE TO JUST RAISE FOR DISCUSSION THE POSSIBILITY  
19 THAT WE CONSIDER FUNDING IT AT A REDUCED EITHER TIME  
20 OR AMOUNT. IT SEEMS CLEAR THAT THE ISSUES HERE WERE  
21 RAISED WITH RESPECT TO SCOPE AND SOME QUESTIONS  
22 ABOUT FEASIBILITY OF THE LATER AIMS, AIMS 3 AND 4.

23 IN READING WHAT I SEE HERE, THERE WAS MUCH  
24 LESS CONCERN ABOUT AIMS 1 AND 2. PERHAPS I'M WRONG  
25 ABOUT THAT. MAYBE GIL COULD SPEAK TO THAT. IF WE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CAN DO THIS, THAT MIGHT BE A WAY TO GET THIS VERY  
2 CRITICAL WORK GOING. AS BOB SAYS, THEY WOULD BE  
3 ELIGIBLE TO COME BACK IN FOR A LATER ROUND; BUT IF  
4 WE FUNDED IT FOR A SHORT DURATION WOULD GIVE THEM  
5 THE HEAD START TO GET THE PROJECT GOING AND THEN  
6 COME BACK TO US WITH A MUCH STRONGER PROJECT  
7 ESPECIALLY IN TERMS OF THE TRANSLATIONAL ASPECTS.

8 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THERE WERE CRITICISMS OF  
9 AIM 1, BUT THOSE WERE REALLY RELATED TO THE  
10 EXISTENCE OF PROTOCOLS. AND SO IN THIS APPLICATION  
11 THEY DESCRIBED APPROACHES THAT WOULD BE POTENTIALLY  
12 DIFFERENT OR IMPROVEMENTS ON THOSE PROTOCOLS. AND  
13 SO THE CRITICISM WAS WHY SPEND TIME DOING THAT IF  
14 THERE ARE ALREADY SOME THAT EXIST WHERE YOU CAN GO  
15 ONTO AIM 2 AND FOCUS ON THE DIFFERENTIATION OF THE  
16 DE TO UROTHELIUM. SO IT DEPENDS ON HOW YOU TAKE  
17 THAT CRITICISM, WHETHER IT'S WORTH SPENDING THAT  
18 TIME ON THAT ASPECT OF IT.

19 SO THE OTHER DIFFICULTY IS, I THINK THE  
20 BUDGETS ARE LAID OUT IN SUCH A WAY THAT THIS IS  
21 MEANT TO COVER A FULL PROPOSAL FROM AIMS 1 THROUGH  
22 4. SO TO KIND OF TRY TO BIFURCATE IT AND ASSUME  
23 THAT THE BUDGET WILL BE ABLE TO COVER ALL THOSE  
24 COSTS, I THINK, IS DIFFICULT TO ASSESS. BUT I THINK  
25 JAN MAY WANT TO SPEAK TO THAT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: DO I HAVE A SECOND FOR  
2 DR. STEWARD'S MOTION?

3 MS. GIBBONS: SECOND.

4 MR. SHEEHY: SO WE HAVE A SECOND FROM  
5 LEEZA. LET'S LET DR. NOLTA RESPOND.

6 DR. NOLTA: I JUST WANTED TO POINT OUT AS  
7 FAR AS THE PREMATUREITY AND FEASIBILITY THAT WE HAVE  
8 PUBLISHED TWO PAPERS SINCE WE SUBMITTED THIS GRANT.  
9 MY LAB JUST PUBLISHED A PAPER IN *TISSUE ENGINEERING*  
10 USING SHRNA TO KNOCK DOWN SPECIFIC FACTORS. I  
11 LITERALLY WROTE THE BOOK ON GENETIC ENGINEERING OF  
12 STEM CELLS. I WAS THE EDITOR. SO OVEREXPRESSION IS  
13 NOT AN ISSUE FOR US.

14 THE FACTORS THAT WERE CHOSEN COME FROM  
15 DR. KURZROCK'S NIH-FUNDED ADULT UROTHELIAL STEM CELL  
16 WORK, BUT WE HAVE NO FUNDING FOR EMBRYONIC. AND THE  
17 ADULT STEM CELLS DON'T DO ENOUGH. WE NEED THE  
18 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS IN THIS CASE. WE HAVE TO WORK  
19 ON THIS.

20 AND THEN AS FAR AS THE FEASIBILITY OF AIM  
21 4, WHICH WAS ALSO AN ISSUE, THE KURZROCK LAB HAS  
22 JUST PUBLISHED THE TRANSPLANT MODEL, WHICH I THINK  
23 ADDRESSES THE PREMATUREITY OF THAT AIM.

24 MR. SHEEHY: THEN I HAVE JON SHESTACK AND  
25 THEN LEEZA GIBBONS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHESTACK: JEFF, I WANTED TO ASK YOU A  
2 QUESTION. IS THIS REALLY -- IN THIS PROCESS IN  
3 GENERAL, IS IT REALLY A MATTER OF GOING OVER THE  
4 MERITS OF INDIVIDUAL GRANTS, OR IS IT MORE  
5 APPROPRIATE FOR THIS GROUP TO TALK ABOUT CHANGING  
6 WHAT THE PAYLINE IS? PAYLINE IS SORT OF LIKE A BET,  
7 LIKE WE BET THAT BELOW A CERTAIN SCORE YOU DON'T  
8 HAVE A CHANCE OF SUCCESS, ABOVE A CERTAIN SCORE  
9 WE'RE WILLING TO BET. IT'S BASICALLY WE'RE WILLING  
10 TO SORT OF BET ON YOUR EXCELLENCE AND THAT YOU WILL  
11 COME UP WITH SOMETHING THAT'S IMPORTANT FOR THE  
12 FIELD. AND I FEEL THERE'S SOMETHING ODDLY  
13 DISINGENUOUS ABOUT THE SORT OF AUTOPSY ON THE  
14 REVIEWS OF THE REVIEWS AND MAYBE A MORE GLOBAL  
15 QUESTION IS FITTING, WHICH IS DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE  
16 THE PAYLINE TO 64 OR WHATEVER IT MIGHT BE? SO  
17 EXPLAIN THE PROCESS. MAYBE I'VE TOTALLY  
18 MISUNDERSTOOD IT.

19 MR. SHEEHY: THE WAY IN WHICH WE DO THIS  
20 IS WE TAKE THE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS. AND  
21 THEN IF MEMBERS WANT TO CHANGE THOSE  
22 RECOMMENDATIONS, AND WE DO IT WITH A SPECIFIC BASIS,  
23 THAT'S WHAT WE DO.

24 MR. SHESTACK: AT THE WORKING GROUP'S  
25 SUGGESTION.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, THE WORKING GROUP  
2 ACTUALLY MOVED 66 INTO THE FUNDABLE CATEGORY FOR  
3 PROGRAMMATIC REASONS. JUST ON THIS ONE, I'LL JUST  
4 QUOTE FROM ONE OF THE REVIEWS, THE PI HAS ONE OF THE  
5 FEW LABORATORIES EXAMINING STEM CELL-DERIVED  
6 UROTHELIAL CELLS AND ASSESSING THEIR FEASIBILITY IS  
7 THE SOURCE OF BIOENGINEERED TISSUE FOR BLADDER  
8 REPAIR. SO FROM A PROGRAMMATIC POINT OF VIEW,  
9 THERE'S NOT A LOT OF PEOPLE DOING THIS WORK. AND  
10 WE'VE HEARD FROM PATIENTS THAT THIS IS AN IMPORTANT  
11 AREA FOR THEM.

12 AND, YOU KNOW, I KNOW WE'RE NOT SUPPOSED  
13 TO -- FOR SOME REASON I JUST AM NOT MOTIVATED BY THE  
14 HEGEMONY OF SCIENCE OVER PROGRAMMATIC  
15 CONSIDERATIONS. THAT'S WHY WE'RE HERE. BOB, I  
16 THINK YOU HAD A COMMENT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D JUST LIKE TO POINT  
18 OUT A POINT THAT I REFERENCED BEFORE. IT'S DR.  
19 BALTIMORE, WHEN I WAS WRITING THIS INITIATIVE AS  
20 PART OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY GROUP, THAT  
21 SUGGESTED TO ME THAT WE NEEDED TO CREATE SOMETHING  
22 WHICH IS NOW THE MINORITY REPORT PROCEDURE. HIS  
23 POSITION WAS THAT SCIENCE DOES NOT NECESSARILY HAVE  
24 THE BEST CHANCE OF MOVING FORWARD WITH NEW IDEAS BY  
25 TOTAL CONSENSUS; THAT, IN FACT, YOU HAVE GRANTS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHERE YOU HAVE SOME STRENGTH AMONG REVIEWERS WHO  
2 SEIZE ON A NEW IDEA AND NEW APPROACHES AND SEE THE  
3 POTENTIAL AND WILL SCORE OUTSIDE THE RANGE AND  
4 CREATE HIGHER RANKINGS. THEY REPRESENT A MINORITY  
5 OF THE POSITION, BUT THEY BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION  
6 WHAT WE HAVE HERE.

7 I THINK WE HAVE TO DEVELOP THE MINORITY  
8 REPORT PROCEDURE BECAUSE I THINK WE NEED IT IN  
9 WRITING TO PROVIDE THAT TO REVIEWERS SO THEY FEEL  
10 MORE COMFORTABLE WITH IT AND UNDERSTAND ITS  
11 BACKGROUND.

12 I ACTUALLY THINK THAT IT'S RELATIVELY HARD  
13 EVEN WHEN YOU GET A GROUP SCORING OUTSIDE OF THE  
14 MIDDLE -- THE MEDIAN CLUSTER TO STAND UP AND TAKE  
15 THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADING THAT MINORITY REPORT.  
16 THEY DON'T QUITE UNDERSTAND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES.  
17 BUT IT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO LOOK INDIVIDUALLY,  
18 AND WE MAY DECIDE FOR PROGRAMMATIC REASONS OR OTHER  
19 REASONS THAT WE SEE THE VISION OF THOSE THAT SCORED  
20 IT DIFFERENTLY THAN THE MEDIAN OR THE MEAN.

21 DR. TROUNSON: BOB, I THINK THE SCIENTISTS  
22 TOOK GREAT RESPONSIBILITY IN EACH OF THESE PROJECTS.  
23 AND CLEARLY HALF OF THEM VOTED BELOW 65, AND SO THEY  
24 DON'T BELIEVE THAT THIS PROJECT IS REALLY IN ANY WAY  
25 COMPETITIVE. SO I THINK YOU HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEY DID THAT WITH -- THEY SPENT TRUE TIME AND TRUE  
2 ENTHUSIASM TO REVIEW THIS PROJECT. AND I THINK THE  
3 CRITICISM FOR THE REVIEWERS STILL STAND.

4 SO IF YOU WANT TO MOVE IT IN A  
5 PROGRAMMATIC WAY WHICH IS NOT JUSTIFIED  
6 SCIENTIFICALLY FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE  
7 REVIEWERS, I THINK THEY WERE CORRECT. I THINK  
8 THEY'VE GOT IT IN ABOUT THE RIGHT POSITION. IF YOU  
9 WANT TO MOVE IT PURELY AND SIMPLY FOR PROGRAMMATIC  
10 REASONS, THAT'S CLEARLY YOUR OPTION TO DO THAT, BUT  
11 IT'S NOT JUSTIFIED BY THE SCIENCE.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WAS MERELY DISCUSSING  
13 THE -- RESPONDING TO MEMBER SHESTACK'S QUESTION  
14 ABOUT THE OVERVIEW OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF BEING ABLE  
15 TO ADDRESS INDIVIDUAL GRANTS.

16 MR. SHEEHY: SO WE HAVE DR. STEWARD AND  
17 THEN DR. PIZZO.

18 DR. STEWARD: IS IT STILL THE CASE THAT  
19 THE REVIEW GROUPS DO NOT HAVE THE ABILITY TO MAKE  
20 THE RECOMMENDATION THAT I DID TO CUT THE BUDGET AND  
21 TIME?

22 MR. SHEEHY: NO. THEY DON'T HAVE THE  
23 ABILITY TO CUT THE BUDGET, AND I THINK WE DO HAVE TO  
24 BE SENSITIVE. YOU KNOW, I'M A PATIENT. I'M  
25 SENSITIVE. NEW DATA COMES IN THAT ADDRESSES THE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ISSUES THAT VERKLEMP THE REVIEWERS, SO I'M GOING TO  
2 TELL THESE FOLKS TO WAIT ANOTHER YEAR. NOBODY IS  
3 DOING THIS RESEARCH, YOU KNOW. AND SO THEY'VE BEEN  
4 PUBLISHING PAPERS THAT KIND OF SAY, YEAH, WE DO --  
5 WE CAN DO THIS. WE'RE LIKE ALMOST A THIRD BELOW  
6 BUDGET. IF WE WERE PUSHING MONEY OUT THE DOOR, YOU  
7 KNOW, AND SO FOR ME IT'S A NO BRAINER.

8 YOU'RE RIGHT. WE CAN'T CUT BUDGETS.

9 DR. STEWARD: SO COULD I JUST MAKE IT  
10 CLEAR TO EVERYONE. AT NIH IN THE REVIEW PROCESS, IT  
11 IS POSSIBLE TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO CUT THE  
12 SCOPE AND/OR THE BUDGET OF A PROJECT AND THEN  
13 RECOMMEND FUNDING OF THAT PROJECT. I THINK IN THIS  
14 CASE THAT MIGHT BE A WAY TO GET THIS PROJECT GOING.  
15 AND JUST TO REMIND EVERYBODY THAT I AM SUGGESTING  
16 THAT IT NOT BE FUNDED AT ITS FULL REQUESTED VALUE,  
17 BUT AT A LOWER LEVEL. AND I'LL SAY TWO YEARS FOR  
18 TWO-THIRDS THE COST.

19 DR. PIZZO: SO FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO  
20 THANK THOSE WHO SPOKE IN FAVOR OF THIS GRANT. I  
21 THOUGHT THE COMMENTS WERE ELOQUENT AND MOVING AND  
22 REALLY IMPACT ALL OF US. I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT  
23 THERE ARE REALLY THREE CONVERGING ISSUES THAT WE'RE  
24 STRUGGLING WITH, ONE OF WHICH IS THE QUALITY OF THE  
25 SCIENCE, THE SECOND IS THE LEAP THAT IT MIGHT YIELD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN TERMS OF INNOVATION AND SOMETHING NEW, AND THE  
2 THIRD IS THE RELEVANCE. AND THE LATTER PART IS  
3 UNCONTESTABLE.

4 THE RELEVANCE IS EXTRAORDINARILY IMPORTANT  
5 AND I THINK HAS BEEN REALLY WELL ARTICULATED AND  
6 SOMETHING WE ALL WANT TO RESONATE TO. AND I THINK  
7 WE ALWAYS WANT TO, TO THE COMMENT THAT WAS MADE BY  
8 OTHERS, TRY TO TAKE HIGH RISK SITUATIONS WHEREVER WE  
9 CAN BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE SOME REAL PAYOFF MAY COME.  
10 BUT THAT SAID, WE ALSO WANT TO BE RESPONSIBLE WHEN  
11 WE TAKE THOSE HIGH RISKS TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S  
12 AT LEAST A REASONED CHANCE OF A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME.  
13 BECAUSE WE DON'T HONOR THE EMOTIONAL RELEVANCE OF  
14 THOSE IN NEED BY TAKING A RISK THAT DOESN'T YIELD A  
15 POSITIVE RESULT. WE SIMPLY DELAY THE PROCESS RATHER  
16 THAN MAKE IT BETTER.

17 AND SO TO ME THE ISSUE THAT I'M STRUGGLING  
18 WITH IS WOULD THIS PROJECT, AS MERITORIOUS AS IT IS,  
19 BE BETTER IF THE INVESTIGATORS BENEFIT FROM THE  
20 COMMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN PROVIDED AND THINK THROUGH  
21 HOW TO MAKE IT STRONGER SO THAT IT CAN BE  
22 POTENTIALLY MORE SUCCESSFUL IN WHAT WILL BE ANOTHER  
23 ROUND. I'M VERY SENSITIVE TO THE TIMING ISSUE  
24 THAT'S BEEN PUT FORTH, BUT I THINK THE WORST CASE  
25 WOULD BE TO DO SOMETHING THAT WAS LESS SUCCESSFUL IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 A SHORTER TIME AND DIDN'T YIELD THE POSITIVE RESULT  
2 THAN ONE THAT DELAYED SLIGHTLY AND THEN DID HAVE THE  
3 CHANCE FOR POSITIVE RESULT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN I ASK A QUESTION OF  
5 THE SPEAKER?

6 MR. SHEEHY: I HAD ONE QUESTION FOR GIL.  
7 SO HOW MANY PREAPS WERE SUBMITTED?

8 DR. SAMBRANO: 154.

9 MR. SHEEHY: AND THIS GRANT IS, WHAT, NO.  
10 18 ROUGHLY IN SCORE?

11 DR. SAMBRANO: IN RANK, YES.

12 MR. SHEEHY: IN RANK IT'S ABOUT 18, 18,  
13 19. IF YOU DO THE GLOBAL -- THIS GOES TO MY POINT  
14 THAT I WAS TRYING TO MAKE YESTERDAY. SO THIS IS  
15 JUST SLIGHTLY ABOVE, WHAT, THE 12TH OR 14TH  
16 PERCENTILE, TOP PERCENTILE, BASED ON THE GLOBAL  
17 NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO ARE LOOKING TO APPLY FOR THIS.  
18 AND SO WE -- I JUST FEEL LIKE THERE'S AN OBSESSION  
19 WITH THIS NUMBER.

20 DR. PIZZO: JEFF, I WANT TO JUST BOTH  
21 AGREE WITH YOU AND COUNTER. I AGREE THAT IF YOU  
22 JUST DO THIS ON AN ACCOUNTING BASIS, THAT'S TRUE.  
23 BUT WE'RE TALKING SOMETHING BEYOND THAT. I THINK  
24 THE NATURAL CONSEQUENCE OF YOUR LAST COMMENT IS THAT  
25 YOU'D THEN MOVE THAT EVERYTHING ABOVE A CERTAIN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NUMBER WAS FUNDED, AND I DON'T THINK THAT'S WHERE  
2 WE'RE AT. SO I KNOW WE'RE FACING THIS ISSUE ON  
3 RELEVANCE AND ALL OF OUR SENSE OF COMPASSION AND  
4 COMMITMENT, BUT I THINK WE SHOULD DO IT ULTIMATELY  
5 ON THE BASIS OF THE SCIENCE.

6 MR. SHEEHY: I ALWAYS HAVE TROUBLE  
7 WHENEVER WE TRY TO ARGUE TO A SPECIFIC AND IT GETS  
8 TAKEN TO A GENERAL. I REALLY WANT TO STAY ON THE  
9 SPECIFIC. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT ONE GRANT. WE'RE NOT  
10 TALKING ABOUT MOVING IT UP TEN GRANTS.

11 DR. PIZZO: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT AT  
12 LEAST --

13 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST MEAN GLOBALLY THAT  
14 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THIS, YOU'RE LOOKING AT THIS  
15 FALLING RELATIVE TO OTHER ONES AT A LOWER SCORE; BUT  
16 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE ENTIRE UNIVERSE IN WHICH IT FIT  
17 INTO, IT'S NOT -- I JUST THINK THAT IT DOES BETTER  
18 IF YOU HAVE A LARGER PERSPECTIVE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, IF I COULD ASK DR.  
20 PIZZO. DR. STEWARD PROPOSED THAT WE FUND THE FIRST  
21 TWO AIMS WITH TWO-THIRDS OF THE FUNDS TO MOVE AN  
22 AREA FORWARD WHERE WE HAVE A PROGRAMMATIC DEFICIT,  
23 AND IT WOULD ALLOW PROGRESS TOWARD MATURING OF THE  
24 SCIENCE IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA. IS THAT AN  
25 APPROPRIATE RESPONSE FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE TO TRY

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND DEAL WITH THE PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES BUT, IN FACT,  
2 NOT TRY AND COMMIT OURSELVES TO AIMS THAT CAN'T BE  
3 ACCOMPLISHED?

4 DR. PIZZO: ONE WAY TO GO ABOUT IT, IT'S  
5 NOT THE ONLY WAY TO GO ABOUT IT, AND I THINK THE  
6 ISSUE THAT I WOULD STRUGGLE WITH IS WOULD THE FIRST  
7 TWO AIMS OF WHICH THERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS  
8 ULTIMATELY GET US TO THE PLACE THAT WE WANT TO GET  
9 TO, WHICH IS A CLINICAL APPLICATION. IN THIS  
10 REGARD, IF THE SCIENCE IS GOOD AND DOESN'T  
11 ULTIMATELY CREATE THAT OPPORTUNITY, THEN THOSE WHO  
12 ARE SPEAKING IN NEED WILL NOT BE FULFILLED. THAT'S  
13 REALLY WHERE I THINK THE ISSUE IS. SO I THINK IT'S  
14 A BALANCE, BOB, BETWEEN WHAT YOU DO NOW AND WHAT YOU  
15 DO LATER. AND THE QUESTION IS IS THIS AS STRONG AS  
16 IT CAN BE NOW? WILL DELAY HELP IT OR WILL FUNDING  
17 PART OF IT JUST MOVE THAT PART FORWARD, BUT WITHOUT  
18 MAKING IT AS STRONG AS POSSIBLE.

19 DR. SAMBRANO: SO I JUST WANT TO MAKE TWO  
20 POINTS AS YOU CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AWARD  
21 THAT WOULD BE FOR AIMS 1 AND 2 AND AT A REDUCED  
22 BUDGET. THE OVERALL OBJECTIVES OF THIS RFA WAS TO  
23 TRY TO UNDERSTAND MECHANISMS OF HUMAN STEM CELL  
24 BIOLOGY. AIMS 1 AND 2 ARE FOCUSED ON DEVELOPING A  
25 PROTOCOL THAT WOULD LEAD TO UROTHELIUM AND SO WOULD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ESSENTIALLY BE OUT OF SCOPE BECAUSE THE MECHANISTIC  
2 ASPECTS OF THIS GRANT APPLICATION WERE REALLY IN AIM  
3 3, REALLY TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THE DRIVERS, THE  
4 GENES THAT ARE SPECIFIC TO THAT PROCESS, WHAT THEY  
5 WOULD BE. SO THAT'S ONE CONSIDERATION.

6 THE OTHER IS THAT ALTHOUGH IT HAS FOUR  
7 SPECIFIC AIMS, THE BUDGET MIGHT NOT NECESSARILY  
8 LOGICALLY DIVIDE ACROSS THOSE FOUR SPECIFIC AIMS.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D JUST ASK GIL. AIM 1  
10 INTENDS TO IMPROVE THE EFFICACY OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC  
11 STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION INTO DEFINITIVE ENDODERM.  
12 SO IT IS FOCUSED ON ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF  
13 MOVING STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION INTO ENDODERM.

14 DR. SAMBRANO: IT'S FOCUSED ON TRYING TO  
15 IMPROVE A PROTOCOL. IT'S NOT AIMED AT TRYING TO  
16 UNDERSTAND A BASIC BIOLOGICAL MECHANISM.

17 DR. TROUNSON: SO THE INNOVATION IS REALLY  
18 NOT IN THAT STEP, BOB. IT'S IN THE SECOND STEP.  
19 AND REALLY WHAT YOU GOT TO DO IS BE ABLE TO WORK OUT  
20 WHAT MARKERS YOU REALLY WANT TO SELECT FOR. AND  
21 THIS IS REALLY ONE OF THE DEFICIENCIES IN THIS  
22 STUDY. SO IT REALLY NEEDS A BIG CONCENTRATION ON  
23 THAT COMPONENT PART BECAUSE DEFINITIVE ENDODERM IS  
24 BEING BUILT BY MANY, MANY PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD,  
25 MANY PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA. SO YOU COULD HAVE A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SYSTEM THERE, BUT WHAT YOU NEED TO DO IS FIGURE OUT  
2 WHAT ARE THE RIGHT MARKERS TO SELECT. YOU SHOULDN'T  
3 SPEND ALL YOUR TIME DEEP IN THAT. AND THEN FROM  
4 THERE I THINK YOU'VE GOT A GAME PLAN SET FOR THE  
5 REST. SO THE REVIEWERS HAD A PROBLEM KNOWING  
6 WHETHER THEY WERE REALLY GOING TO GET TO PART 3 OR  
7 4.

8 I ACTUALLY -- FOR OS I'D DOUBLE THE GRANT  
9 IF YOU WANT TO GET IT TO BE DONE, TO BE HONEST. I  
10 WOULDN'T CUT IT IN HALF. THAT JUST DOESN'T DO IT  
11 FOR ME. I THINK, AGAIN, YOU NEED TO FOCUS ON THE  
12 PROGRAMMATIC ISSUE. THE SCIENCE HAS BEEN REVIEWED  
13 BY A REALLY TOP-LINE LEVEL OF SCIENTISTS. AND SO IF  
14 YOU WANT IT PROGRAMMATICALLY, I THINK YOU NEED TO  
15 SORT OF STATE THAT CLEARLY BECAUSE IT'S NOT ENDORSED  
16 REALLY STRONGLY ENOUGH BY THE REVIEW GROUP.

17 DR. BLOOM: MAYBE WE COULD PURSUE A  
18 SUGGESTION THAT BOB MADE EARLIER, WHICH IS TO REFER  
19 THIS TO THE NEXT ROUND OF EARLY TRANSLATIONAL TO  
20 WHICH IT WOULD SEEM TO ME EQUALLY APPLICABLE. AND  
21 WITH THE FEEDBACK THAT'S BEEN GIVEN, HE MIGHT BE  
22 ABLE TO REVISE THE APPLICATION UNDER THAT AEGIS AND  
23 COME BACK WITH A STRONGER GRANT IN A SHORTER PERIOD  
24 OF TIME.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD WE HAVE A COMMENT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ON WHETHER THIS GRANT WITH THIS KNOWLEDGE COULD BE  
2 APPROPRIATE FOR THAT ROUND?

3 DR. TROUNSON: IN MY VIEW THAT WOULD BE  
4 BECAUSE YOU WANT TO FOCUS ON -- THE EARLY  
5 TRANSLATIONAL GRANTS DO THAT. YOU ARE WORKING YOUR  
6 WAY TO A CANDIDATE. THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT YOU ARE  
7 DOING. BUT IT WOULD BE KIND OF HANDY TO KNOW YOU'RE  
8 ON A TRACK TO GET THERE. CURRENTLY YOU COULD GET  
9 THERE, BUT IT WASN'T PERSUASIVE, THE PROPOSAL, FROM  
10 THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE REVIEWERS. INDIVIDUALS HAD  
11 SOME ELASTICITY, BUT THE MAJORITY WERE NOT  
12 SUPPORTED.

13 MR. SHEEHY: LEEZA.

14 MS. GIBBONS: AT THE RISK OF TALKING US TO  
15 DEATH, BECAUSE I KNOW RICARDO HERE IS DYING TO CALL  
16 THE QUESTION ON THIS ONE AS PROBABLY ARE MANY  
17 OTHERS, I JUST WANT TO ECHO WHAT SOME OF MY  
18 COLLEAGUES HAVE SAID AS WELL ABOUT OUR RESPECT FOR  
19 THE SPEAKERS. AND IT MAKES US A BETTER BOARD TO  
20 HAVE THIS DYNAMIC CONVERSATION. WE WORK FOR YOU.  
21 AND I REALLY APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO AT  
22 SOME TIMES TALK IT TO DEATH BECAUSE THAT'S THE  
23 SERIOUSNESS WITH WHICH WE TAKE OUR CHARGE HERE ON  
24 THE BOARD. AND I KNOW THAT EVERY TIME A MEMBER OF  
25 THE PUBLIC MAKES AN EFFORT TO COME HERE, THERE'S A



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LOT OF WAITING AROUND, THERE' S EXPENSE, THERE' S  
2 OVERNIGHT STAYS, THERE' S BEING AWAY FROM YOUR  
3 FAMIL IES, AND THAT' S WHAT THE PROCESS IS ALL ABOUT.  
4 AND SO FOR ALL OF YOU THANK YOU. AND ESPECIALLY FOR  
5 BEN' S MOM, I WANT TO WISH YOU A VERY MEANINGFUL  
6 MOTHER' S DAY UPCOMING, AND I HOPE THAT YOUR FAMILY  
7 HAS LOTS AND LOTS OF REASONS TO CONTINUE TO HANG ON  
8 TO THAT HOPE AND THAT PROMISE THAT BEN IS INSPIRING.

9 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK AT THIS POINT -- YOU  
10 WANT TO CALL THE QUESTION, DON' T YOU, DR. AZZIZ?

11 DR. AZZIZ: I DO WANT THE CALL THE  
12 QUESTION ON THIS MOTION. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT  
13 YOU HAVE A MOTION TO FUND ONLY PART OF THE  
14 APPLICATION; IS THAT CORRECT?

15 MR. SHEEHY: I WAS ASKING FOR A  
16 RESTATEMENT OF THE MOTION.

17 DR. AZZIZ: I THINK WE NEED TO RESTATE IT.  
18 WE' VE HAD VARIOUS ISSUES. SO LET' S RESTATE THE  
19 MOTION, AND I' D LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION. NOT THAT  
20 WE DON' T APPRECIATE EVERYBODY' S CONVERSATIONS AND  
21 EVERYBODY' S CONTRIBUTIONS. IT' S VERY CRITICAL.  
22 EVERYBODY HAS DONE A TREMENDOUS EFFORT, BUT THERE' S  
23 A LOT OF INFORMATION ON THE GROUND, AND WE NEED TO  
24 MAKE A TIMELY DECISION.

25 DR. STEWARD: SO THE SUGGESTION IS TO FUND

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS GRANT FOR TWO YEARS AT TWO-THIRDS THE TOTAL  
2 COST. I DO NOT INCLUDE A SPECIFICATION IN TERMS OF  
3 WHICH AIMS ARE BEING ADDRESSED HERE. I THINK THAT  
4 IS SOMETHING THAT CAN BE WORKED OUT BETWEEN THE  
5 INVESTIGATORS AND CIRM STAFF. IT'S A MATTER OF  
6 FOCUSING TIME AND THE AMOUNT, NOT THE EXACT  
7 EXPERIMENTS.

8 MR. SHEEHY: COUNSEL, DO WE NEED TO TAKE  
9 PUBLIC COMMENT AGAIN BECAUSE I DON'T THINK -- THE  
10 COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE WERE PRIOR TO THE MOTION  
11 BEING MADE. NOW THAT WE'RE IN CONSIDERATION OF THE  
12 MOTION, DO WE NEED TO HAVE ANOTHER PUBLIC COMMENT?

13 MR. HARRISON: I THINK IT WOULD BE  
14 APPROPRIATE TO REQUEST IT, BUT TO ASK THE PUBLIC TO  
15 PLEASE LIMIT THEIR COMMENTS IF THEY HAVE ANY.

16 MR. REED: JUST BRIEFLY, IF THIS IS A  
17 BORDERLINE ONE, BORDERLINE THINGS DESERVE A CHANCE.  
18 IT'S A HUGE ISSUE. IT'S NOT BEING DEALT WITH  
19 ANYWHERE. SO WHY NOT TAKE A CHANCE? AND IF IT  
20 DOESN'T WORK OUT, CUT OFF THE PAYMENTS. THERE ARE  
21 CLEAR POINTS THAT HAVE TO BE MET, AND THE POINTS IF  
22 IT'S BEEN REDUCED ALREADY AND IT COULD BE CUT OFF IF  
23 IT DOESN'T WORK OUT. IT'S WORTH A SHOT.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK WE'RE READY FOR A  
25 ROLL CALL.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ.  
2 DR. AZZIZ: AGAINST.  
3 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.  
4 DR. PRICE: NO.  
5 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.  
6 DR. BLOOM: NO.  
7 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.  
8 DR. GILL: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.  
10 DR. LEVIN: NO.  
11 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
12 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.  
13 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
14 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
15 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
16 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
17 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
18 DR. HAWGOOD: NO.  
19 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO PASS FOR THE  
21 MOMENT.  
22 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
23 DR. LEVEY: NO.  
24 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
25 DR. PIZZO: YES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
DR. QUINT: YES.  
MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.  
DR. FONTANA: NO.  
MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
MR. ROTH: NO.  
MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.  
MR. SHESTACK: YES.  
MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.  
DR. STEWARD: YES.  
MS. KING: ART TORRES.  
MR. TORRES: AYE.  
MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT'S THE VOTE?  
MS. KING: LET ME COME BACK TO YOU AGAIN.  
JOAN SAMUELSON.  
MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
MR. HARRISON: THAT MOTION CARRIES WITH A  
11 YES VOTES, NINE NO VOTES.  
CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO EMPHASIZE  
HERE, IF I COULD, THAT THE PROGRAMMATIC REASONS HERE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WERE VERY IMPORTANT IN TERMS OF ADDRESSING AN AREA  
2 THAT HAS NOT HAD ADEQUATE FOCUS. AND I THINK WE  
3 SHOULD MAKE IT VERY CLEAR THAT WE WANT THE COMMENTS  
4 OF THE REVIEWERS TO BE LOOKED AT EXTREMELY SERIOUSLY  
5 AND FOR THE SCIENTISTS TO REALIZE THE RESPONSIBILITY  
6 THEY UNDERTAKE FOR THIS PROGRAMMATIC AREA TO  
7 ADVANCE.

8 MS. KING: WE HAVE AN URGENT REQUEST FOR A  
9 THREE-MINUTE BREAK. THANK YOU.

10 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WE'RE ABOUT  
12 TO MOVE FAIRLY QUICKLY THROUGH THE REST OF THIS  
13 AGENDA. I DON'T SEE A LOT OF INTEREST IN ADDITIONAL  
14 MOTIONS. AT LEAST IT'S NOT BEEN BROUGHT TO MY  
15 ATTENTION OR I THINK JEFF SHEEHY'S ATTENTION. DO WE  
16 HAVE A QUORUM IN THE ROOM COUNTING THE INDIVIDUALS  
17 WALKING FROM THE BACK?

18 MS. KING: THERE ARE A FEW PEOPLE THAT ARE  
19 RIGHT ACROSS THE HALL THAT WILL BE BACK IN JUST A  
20 MOMENT.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. JEFF IS  
22 APPROACHING. JEFF, IF YOU WOULD COME QUICKLY  
23 BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO MOVE TO GET THROUGH  
24 THE REST OF OUR AGENDA HERE. JEFF, IN YOUR ABSENCE  
25 I INDICATED I WASN'T AWARE OF ADDITIONAL MOTIONS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT PEOPLE WERE MAKING TO MOVE ANY INDIVIDUAL  
2 GRANTS. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY?

3 MR. SHEEHY: NO. I DON'T THINK WE HAVE  
4 ANY -- UNLESS A MEMBER WANTS TO MAKE A MOTION, I  
5 THINK THE POINT THAT WE ARE AT IS WE NEED TWO  
6 MOTIONS BOTH FROM MEMBERS WITHOUT CONFLICTS. THE  
7 FIRST MOTION WOULD BE TO FUND ALL OF THOSE GRANTS  
8 THAT ARE MARKED GREEN.

9 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND.

11 MR. SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT ON  
12 THIS MOTION? OKAY. AND THEN MAYBE COUNSEL CAN  
13 REMIND THE BOARD ON HOW WE SHOULD VOTE AND THEN WE  
14 CAN HAVE THE ROLL CALL.

15 MR. HARRISON: MEMBERS SHOULD INDICATE  
16 THEIR POSITION ON THE MOTION; AND IF THEY HAVE ANY  
17 CONFLICTS BASED ON THE SHEET IN FRONT OF THEM WITH  
18 RESPECT TO APPLICATIONS IN TIER I, THEY SHOULD  
19 INDICATE THAT THEY'RE VOTING YES OR NO EXCEPT FOR  
20 THOSE APPLICATIONS IN WHICH THEY HAVE A CONFLICT.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FOR THE MEMBERS WHO JUST  
22 REJOINED US, THERE'S A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. THAT  
23 MOTION IS TO APPROVE ALL THOSE IN TIER I MARKED IN  
24 GREEN.

25 DR. PRICE: POINT OF ORDER. SO WE CAN NOW

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VOTE IN FAVOR OF A GRANT -- FUNDING A GRANT WHICH WE  
2 JUST A MOMENT AGO VOTED AGAINST FUNDING.

3 MR. SHEEHY: WHAT YOU'RE VOTING IS TO  
4 APPROVE THE ENTIRE GROUP.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ARE WE READY, MR. SHEEHY,  
6 TO CALL THE ROLL?

7 MR. SHEEHY: WE ARE.

8 MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ.

9 DR. AZZIZ: I WAS OUT, AND SO YOU WILL  
10 NEED TO REPEAT WHATEVER IT WAS.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE MOTION IS TO APPROVE  
12 EVERYTHING THAT'S RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, AND YOU  
13 CAN VOTE FOR OR AGAINST APPROVAL WITH EXCEPTION OF  
14 THOSE IN WHICH YOU HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 DR. AZZIZ: FOR, EXCEPT FOR THAT WITH  
16 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

18 DR. PRICE: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

21 DR. BLOOM: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

24 DR. GILL: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
25 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.

2 DR. LEVIN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
3 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

4 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

5 MS. FEIT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
6 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
9 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

10 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

11 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

12 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

13 DR. HAWGOOD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
14 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

17 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

18 MR. GOLDBERG: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

21 MS. LANSING: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

24 DR. LEVEY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
25 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

2 DR. PIZZO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
3 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

4 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

5 DR. POMEROY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
6 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

8 DR. PRIETO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
9 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

10 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

11 DR. QUINT: YES.

12 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.

13 DR. FONTANA: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
14 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

16 MR. ROTH: YES.

17 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

18 MR. SHEEHY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.

21 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

22 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

23 DR. STEWARD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
24 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. TORRES: AYE.

2 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

5 MR. SHEEHY: I BELIEVE THAT MOTION PASSES.

6 SO THEN THE NEXT MOTION WOULD BE TO NOT FUND ALL OF

7 THOSE GRANTS THAT -- CAN WE GET THE SCREEN UP. I'M

8 GOING TO DO IT BY COLOR THAT ARE MARKED IN WHITE.

9 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.

10 MR. SHEEHY: WHO'S THE SECOND?

11 DR. HAWGOOD: SECOND.

12 MR. SHEEHY: WE NEED A NONCONFLICTED

13 SECOND.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND.

15 MR. SHEEHY: JOAN. PUBLIC COMMENT? CALL

16 THE ROLL.

17 MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ.

18 DR. AZZIZ: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH

19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

21 DR. PRICE: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH

22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

24 DR. BLOOM: YES.

25 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. GILL: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.

4 DR. LEVIN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

7 MS. FEIT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

13 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

14 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

15 MR. GOLDBERG: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
16 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

18 DR. HAWGOOD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

22 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

23 MS. LANSING: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
24 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LEVEY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

4 DR. PIZZO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

7 DR. POMEROY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

10 DR. PRIETO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

13 DR. QUINT: YES.

14 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.

15 DR. FONTANA: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
16 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

18 MR. ROTH: YES.

19 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

21 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

22 MR. SHEEHY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
23 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

24 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK. OSWALD STEWARD.

25 DR. STEWARD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

2 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

3 MR. TORRES: AYE.

4 MR. SHEEHY: I BELIEVE THAT MOTION  
5 CARRIES, SO WE'RE DONE. IT'S FANTASTIC.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
7 WE'RE GOING TO NOW MOVE VERY QUICKLY TO ITEM NO. 10.  
8 WE DISCUSSED THIS YESTERDAY. I'D LIKE A VERY SHORT  
9 STAFF SUMMARY, IF I CAN, JUST TO REMIND EVERYONE AND  
10 THOSE MEMBERS WHO HAVE JOINED US TODAY OF WHAT THE  
11 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRANT WORKING GROUP ARE ON  
12 THE LEADERSHIP AWARD.

13 MR. ROTH: COULD I JUST, BEFORE WE GO TO  
14 THIS, STRONGLY REINFORCE WHAT WE TALKED ABOUT  
15 EARLIER, THAT THERE BE A HIGH PRIORITY GIVEN TO THE  
16 PROCESS FOR EXTRAORDINARY PETITIONS AND HOW WE DEAL  
17 WITH CONFLICTS OF SCIENTIFIC CREDIBILITY, THAT  
18 COMMITTEE WE TALKED ABOUT, THAT IT BE GIVEN A VERY  
19 HIGH PRIORITY SO WE GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS  
20 THOROUGHLY?

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MAKE IT CLEAR AGAIN,  
22 MELISSA IS SURVEYING MEMBERS BASED UPON DATES THAT  
23 JEFF SHEEHY HAS PROVIDED, SO WE HOPE TO HAVE THAT  
24 COMING TOGETHER IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

25 DR. YAFFE: FIRST SLIDE, PLEASE. I WILL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 JUST REMIND YOU THAT THE GOALS OF THIS INITIATIVE  
2 ARE TO FACILITATE THE RECRUITMENT TO CALIFORNIA OF  
3 THE MOST PRODUCTIVE AND PROMISING EARLY TO MIDCAREER  
4 SCIENTISTS IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND REGENERATIVE  
5 MEDICINE. AND SHOULD THOSE RECRUITMENTS BE  
6 SUCCESSFUL, TO THEN SUPPORT THE ROBUST AND  
7 INNOVATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAMS FOCUSED ON FUNDAMENTAL  
8 STUDIES IN PLURIPOTENT AND PROGENITOR STEM CELL  
9 BIOLOGY AND TRANSLATIONAL STUDIES LEADING TO  
10 INNOVATIVE STEM CELL-BASED THERAPIES FOR DISEASE AND  
11 INJURY.

12 I THINK RATHER THAN GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE  
13 THING, WE CAN GO TO THE LAST SLIDE, WHICH IS A  
14 SUMMARY OF CYCLE I. REMEMBER WE'LL HAVE EIGHT  
15 CYCLES IF ENOUGH APPLICATIONS AND AWARDS ARE  
16 AVAILABLE. CYCLE I HAD ONE APPLICATION RECEIVED.  
17 IT WAS REVIEWED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP LAST  
18 MONTH IN A TELEPHONIC REVIEW. THE RECOMMENDATION ON  
19 THAT APPLICATION IS THAT IT'S RECOMMENDED FOR  
20 FUNDING. THE TOTAL REQUESTED AMOUNT IS  
21 APPROXIMATELY 5.9 MILLION, THE SCORE RECEIVED WAS  
22 83, THE STANDARD DEVIATION WAS 3. I'M HAPPY TO  
23 ANSWER ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS APPLICATION  
24 OR THE PROGRAM.

25 DR. POMEROY: MOVE APPROVAL.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. GOLDBERG: SECOND.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: A MOTION FOR APPROVAL AND  
3 A SECOND. I'D LIKE TO REITERATE HERE THAT WE  
4 HAVE -- AN OUTSTANDING CANDIDATE HAS BEEN  
5 IDENTIFIED. THERE IS A TIME PERIOD THAT THEY'RE  
6 GOING TO NEED TO IDENTIFY FOR CONCLUDING THIS  
7 BETWEEN THE INSTITUTION AND THE CANDIDATE. SO DR.  
8 TROUNSON, BECAUSE WE HAVE A LIMIT OF EIGHT SLOTS  
9 HERE, I THINK IT WOULD BE IMPORTANT TO WORK WITH  
10 THEM TO CREATE A DEFINITIVE TIME DURING WHICH THESE  
11 DECISIONS ARE CONCLUDED BECAUSE WE WOULD NOT WANT TO  
12 GET INTO A SUBSEQUENT PEER REVIEW SESSION, WHICH I  
13 THINK COMES UP IN JULY; IS THAT RIGHT?

14 DR. TROUNSON: YEAH.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WITHOUT KNOWING WHETHER  
16 WE HAVE SEVEN POSITIONS LEFT OR NOT. SO IT IS  
17 IMPORTANT, I THINK, IN MAKING THIS VOTE THAT WE ASK  
18 THE INSTITUTION TO MOVE AHEAD WITH ALL DUE RESPECT  
19 FOR THE CHALLENGE. AND I THINK THAT THE INSTITUTION  
20 HAS INDICATED THAT'S A FAIRLY REASONABLE REQUEST; IS  
21 THAT CORRECT, DR. TROUNSON?

22 DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S CORRECT, CHAIR.  
23 EXPECT TO HAVE RESOLUTION OF THAT MATTER BY THE END  
24 OF JUNE, AND WE'RE REASSURED THAT THAT WILL BE THE  
25 CASE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. DR. AZZIZ.

2 DR. AZZIZ: I JUST WANTED CLARIFICATION OF  
3 PROCEDURE. DO WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE TABLE?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE  
5 TABLE. DISCUSSION IS IN ORDER.

6 DR. AZZIZ: VERY WELL. I'D LIKE TO  
7 DISCUSS THE MOTION. I ACTUALLY WANTED TO PUT A  
8 COUNTER OR AMEND THE MOTION IN ORDER TO DELAY THIS  
9 VOTE TILL THE JUNE MEETING THAN IN THIS MEETING.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THE CONCLUSION OF  
11 THE DISCUSSIONS THAT WE HAVE HAD IS THAT AT THIS  
12 POINT, BECAUSE THE CANDIDATE IS PUBLICLY KNOWN, THE  
13 ISSUE IS THE INSTITUTION IS PUBLICLY KNOWN, THAT AT  
14 THIS POINT I THINK THE CONCLUSION WAS THAT IT WOULD  
15 BE HELPFUL TO CONCLUDING THE RELATIONSHIPS TO HAVE  
16 THE VOTE AT THIS TIME, IF POSSIBLE. BUT THE BOARD  
17 CAN CHOOSE WHATEVER COURSE IT WISHES TO TAKE.

18 SO THE QUESTION IS DOES THE MAKER OF THE  
19 MOTION AND THE SECOND WANT TO ACCEPT AN AMENDMENT?

20 DR. AZZIZ: THAT'S CORRECT. THAT'S WHAT  
21 I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT.

22 DR. POMEROY: NO, THANK YOU.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ALL RIGHT.

24 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU.

25 DR. POMEROY: YOU'RE WELCOME TO VOTE IT



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DOWN THEN.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO ANY ADDITIONAL MEMBERS  
3 DISCUSSION? ANY AUDIENCE DISCUSSION?

4 DR. LEVIN: I JUST HAVE A QUICK QUESTION  
5 ABOUT THE SCORING PROCESS FOR THE LEADERSHIP AWARDS.  
6 THIS IS TO SOME EXTENT A DIFFERENT KIND OF AWARD  
7 THAN ALL THE RESEARCH GRANT AWARDS THAT WE'VE BEEN  
8 LOOKING AT PREVIOUSLY IN THAT IT'S ASSUMED FROM THE  
9 START THAT WHATEVER CANDIDATE IS PROPOSED IS AN  
10 EXCEPTIONAL CANDIDATE. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE LOOKING  
11 FOR. SO I'M WONDERING HOW THE REVIEW, THE GRANTS  
12 WORKING GROUP COMMITTEE WAS INSTRUCTED TO SPREAD  
13 THEIR SCORING. IN 83, FOR EXAMPLE, OUTSTANDING  
14 SCORE AND WOULD BE FUNDED IN ANY OF OUR GRANT  
15 REVIEWS, BUT MAYBE FOR A LEADERSHIP AWARD, THAT'S  
16 NOT AS HIGH A SCORE. IT'S A B MINUS.

17 I'M JUST WONDERING IF THE GRANTS WORKING  
18 GROUP HERE FOR THIS PARTICULAR -- WITH AN N OF 1,  
19 IT'S HARD TO TELL, RIGHT? HAVE THEY BEEN INSTRUCTED  
20 TO USE THE ENTIRE RANGE AND ASSUME 70 WAS  
21 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING OR SLIGHTLY ABOVE THAT THE  
22 SAME AS WITH THE RESEARCH GRANTS?

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. TROUNSON, WOULD YOU  
24 LIKE TO ADDRESS IT, OR WOULD YOU LIKE DR. YAFFE?

25 DR. TROUNSON: JUST A COMMENT AND ASK GIL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAMBRANO TO ADD SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. BUT A  
2 NUMBER OF THE REVIEWERS HAVE BEEN REVIEWING FOR US  
3 IN THE PAST. THE CHAIR OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
4 WAS THE CHAIR OF THIS GRANTS WORKING GROUP. HE  
5 INTRODUCED IT AND PROVIDED THEM A BASIS FOR BEING  
6 ABLE TO TAKE UP THE WHOLE SCALE. AND THAT IF YOU  
7 GET TO 80S AND 90S, THESE ARE REALLY EXTRAORDINARY  
8 PEOPLE, AND I'D EXPECT TO HAVE A HIGH LEVEL OF  
9 SUPPORT. IT WAS UNANIMOUS SUPPORT, AS I RECALL.

10 AND, YOU KNOW, IF IT WAS IN THE 70S, I  
11 THINK, AGAIN, YOU WOULD HAVE SOME AMBIVALENCE THERE  
12 AND SOME RANGE. AND IN THE 60S I THINK THAT YOU  
13 WOULD FIND THAT THEY WERE NOT BEING VERY SUPPORTIVE  
14 AT ALL. AS YOU SAY, IT WOULD BE UNLIKELY THAT IT  
15 WOULD GET DOWN TO THE 20S AND 30S BECAUSE AN  
16 INSTITUTION WOULDN'T GO THERE, WOULD THEY, REALLY?

17 I THINK THE ONLY THING THAT IS OF SOME  
18 IMPORTANCE THAT DESERVES SOME DISCUSSION, IF YOU  
19 MAY, CHAIR, AT SOME POINT IN THIS IS THAT WE  
20 POSSIBLY DON'T WANT ALL OF THE CANDIDATES TO BE, FOR  
21 EXAMPLE, CANCER STEM CELL PEOPLE PERHAPS. AND I'M A  
22 LITTLE THOUGHTFUL IN THE PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES NOT TO  
23 SORT OF MAKE EIGHT AWARDS IN THAT AREA. AND I'M  
24 TRYING TO HELP INSTITUTIONS SEE THAT A RANGE OF  
25 EXPERTISE WOULD BE GOOD FOR CALIFORNIA; BUT, OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COURSE, IT MAY TURN UP THAT WE MAY HAVE TO MAKE  
2 PROGRAMMATIC DECISIONS THAT WOULD PERHAPS ENTER INTO  
3 THIS SPACE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, DR. TROUNSON, IN THE  
5 INTEREST OF TIME, THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT SUBJECT  
6 YOU'VE IDENTIFIED. I'D LIKE TO SEE IF WE CAN HAVE  
7 THAT ADDRESSED IN THE SCIENTIFIC SUBCOMMITTEE. AND  
8 THAT, I BELIEVE, IS A MEETING THAT WE'RE ATTEMPTING  
9 TO SCHEDULE IN MAY. AND THAT WOULD GIVE THE STAFF  
10 TIME TO PRESENT THEIR IDEAS ON WHAT MIGHT BE A  
11 RECOMMENDED DISTRIBUTION OF EXPERTISE AND WHAT THE  
12 COUNTERVAILING ISSUES ARE, HOPEFULLY LEAVING ROOM IN  
13 THOSE AS GUIDANCE FOR EXCEPTIONAL CANDIDATES EVEN IF  
14 IT'S ALREADY REPRESENTED WITHIN THE RANGE OF  
15 EXPERTISE THAT WE HAVE SELECTED.

16 IS THERE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS THAT THE  
17 MEMBERS WOULD LIKE ADDRESSED?

18 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK I'D JUST LIKE GIL  
19 TO COMPLETE THE ANSWER FOR DR. LEVIN IF IT'S  
20 POSSIBLE.

21 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE IS  
22 SEPARATE FROM THE RECOMMENDATION. SO THEY ARRIVE AT  
23 A SCIENTIFIC SCORE BASED ON THEIR ASSESSMENT AGAINST  
24 THE SPECIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA. AND SO IN THIS CASE  
25 THE CRITERIA WERE RELATED TO THE CANDIDATE'S

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BACKGROUND, THE COMMITMENT OF THE INSTITUTION, AND  
2 SO FORTH. AND SO THEY WERE ASKED, ESPECIALLY  
3 BECAUSE THERE WAS ONE APPLICATION, TO CONSIDER THE  
4 FULL SPECTRUM FROM ONE TO A HUNDRED BASED ON THE  
5 UNIVERSE OF WHAT THEY CAN IMAGINE TO BE THE BEST  
6 POSSIBLE CANDIDATE THAT WOULD MEET THOSE CRITERIA OR  
7 THE ELIGIBLE, BUT LEAST MERITORIOUS CANDIDATE, AND  
8 THEN PLACE THEIR ASSESSMENT AGAINST THAT SCALE.

9 ONCE THEY ARRIVE AT A SCORE, THEN THEY  
10 DETERMINE WHETHER THIS SCORE AND THIS CANDIDATE  
11 DESERVES TO BE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS  
13 FROM THE BOARD? ALL RIGHT. PUBLIC COMMENTS? I'D  
14 LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THIS, PLEASE. AND  
15 REMEMBER TO VOTE WITH THE EXCEPTION -- YOU WILL NOT  
16 BE CALLED IN THIS CASE IF YOU HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ.

18 DR. AZZIZ: FOR.

19 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

20 DR. PRICE: FOR.

21 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

22 DR. BLOOM: FOR.

23 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

24 DR. GILL: FOR.

25 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LEVIN: YES.  
2 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.  
3 MS. FEIT: YES.  
4 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
5 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.  
6 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
7 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
8 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
9 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
10 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
11 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.  
12 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
14 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.  
15 MS. LANSING: YES.  
16 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.  
17 DR. LEVEY: 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: ROBERT QUINT.  
25 DR. QUINT: YES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

2 MR. ROTH: YES.

3 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

5 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

6 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

7 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.

8 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

9 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

10 DR. STEWARD: YES.

11 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

12 MR. TORRES: AYE.

13 MS. KING: AND THE MOTION CARRIES.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. WE'RE GOING  
15 TO MOVE TO ITEM NO. 8, DR. TROUNSON, THE AMENDMENTS  
16 TO THE CONTRACT POLICY. WHO WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE  
17 PRESENT THAT?

18 DR. TROUNSON: IF WE CAN ASK IAN SWEEDLER  
19 TO ADDRESS THAT FOR YOU, CHAIR.

20 MR. SWEEDLER: GOOD MORNING. MELISSA IS  
21 BRINGING UP THE SLIDES, BUT I CAN SET THE STAGE FOR  
22 YOU. WHAT WE'RE BRINGING BEFORE YOU TODAY ARE SOME  
23 CHANGES TO OUR CIRM STANDING POLICY ON CONTRACTING  
24 AND CONSULTING PROCEDURES.

25 BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, PROPOSITION 71 SAYS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT THE ICOC IS TO ADOPT CONTRACTING PROCEDURES FOR  
2 THE INSTITUTE BASED ON THOSE USED BY THE UNIVERSITY  
3 OF CALIFORNIA. THE ICOC ADOPTED A VERY -- A  
4 SOMEWHAT -- AN INITIAL CONTRACTING POLICY IN 2005,  
5 AND THEN IN 2006 A MUCH MORE DETAILED POLICY THAT  
6 TRACKED FAIRLY CLOSELY TO WHAT THE UNIVERSITY OF  
7 CALIFORNIA CONTRACTING POLICY WAS AT THE TIME.

8 IN THE INTERVENING FOUR YEARS, THE  
9 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA HAS MODIFIED THEIR  
10 CONTRACTING POLICIES. AND SO WHAT WE'RE BRINGING TO  
11 YOU TODAY ARE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CIRM'S  
12 POLICY THAT WOULD IMPLEMENT THE RELEVANT CHANGES  
13 FROM WHAT THE UNIVERSITY HAS DONE.

14 SO SLIDES, THIS IS AT TAB 8 IN YOUR  
15 BINDERS. THE FIRST SECTION THAT I CAN TALK ABOUT  
16 IS --

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IAN, IF YOU WILL TRY AND  
18 FOCUS ON WHAT YOU CAN CONSIDER THE SUBSTANTIVE  
19 HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS.

20 DR. SWEEDLER: SO I WILL JUST REVIEW THE  
21 SUBSTANTIVE ONES. THE FIRST IS COMPETITIVE BIDDING.  
22 THE UC POLICY TODAY IS AS FOLLOWS: FOR CONTRACTS  
23 THAT ARE EXPECTED TO BE ABOVE \$50,000, THE  
24 REQUIREMENT IS THAT WE SOLICIT AT LEAST THREE  
25 WRITTEN BIDS BASED ON SPECIFICATIONS FOR WHAT WE'RE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1       LOOKING FOR IN THE CONTRACT.   BELOW \$50,000 THE  
2       REQUIREMENT IS THAT THE APPROVING OFFICIAL, WHICH  
3       FOR CIRM IS EITHER GOING TO BE DR. TROUNSON OR DR.  
4       ROBSON, BE SATISFIED THAT THE PRICE STATED, THE RATE  
5       STATED IS REASONABLE UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES.   SO  
6       WE'RE PROPOSING TO ADOPT AN IDENTICAL PROVISION TO  
7       WHAT THE UNIVERSITY HAS.

8                 WE ARE ALSO SEEKING A CHANGE IN THE  
9       PROPOSAL REGARDING HOW WE REPORT ON CONTRACTING  
10      ACTIVITY.   RIGHT NOW IT SAYS THAT WHENEVER THERE'S A  
11      GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING, WE REPORT.   WHAT  
12      THAT MEANS IS THAT THE REPORTS END UP COVERING  
13      VARYING LENGTHS OF TIME.   WE PROPOSE TO JUST  
14      REGULARIZE THAT TO A SEMI ANNUAL REPORT, REPORTING  
15      TWICE A YEAR TO GOVERNANCE, ONCE A YEAR TO THE FULL  
16      BOARD ON CONTRACTING ACTIVITY, AND TO FOCUS THOSE  
17      REPORTS ONLY ON THE CONTRACTS THAT ARE \$20,000 OR  
18      ABOVE BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SEEM NECESSARY TO REPORT ON  
19      EVERY SMALL ITEM.

20                CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   LET ME ASK THIS QUESTION.  
21      SO IF THE CHAIR OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE WANTED  
22      INDIVIDUAL REPORTS MORE FREQUENTLY, THAT WOULD STILL  
23      REMAIN THE PREROGATIVE OF THE CHAIR OF THE  
24      GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE.

25                MR. SWEEDLER:   THOSE WOULD ABSOLUTELY BE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AVAILABLE, YES.

2 AND THEN, FINALLY, WE WANTED TO ADDRESS  
3 THE LEVEL OF WHO HAS AUTHORIZATION TO APPROVE  
4 DIFFERENT LEVELS OF CONTRACTS. CURRENTLY THE  
5 PRESIDENT CAN APPROVE CONTRACTS UP TO \$250,000.  
6 WE'D LIKE TO RAISE THAT TO 300,000. THE GOVERNANCE  
7 SUBCOMMITTEE CAN APPROVE CONTRACTS UP TO \$500,000.  
8 WE'D LIKE TO RAISE THAT TO 600,000. OVER 600,000  
9 WOULD REQUIRE ICOC APPROVAL.

10 AGAIN, WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS FOCUS  
11 AUTHORIZATION AND ATTENTION WHERE IT'S MOST NEEDED.  
12 AS THE INSTITUTE HAS GROWN, IT TAKES A LITTLE MORE  
13 TO DO SOME OF SAME KINDS OF TASKS THAT IT USED TO  
14 TAKE WHEN WE WERE A 15-PERSON AGENCY WITH A MUCH  
15 SMALLER GRANT PORTFOLIO.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD ASK A QUESTION  
17 HERE, AND OTHERS MIGHT HAVE QUESTIONS AS WELL.  
18 WHILE I WASN'T AWARE THAT WE WERE CHANGING THAT  
19 LIMIT BY 50 AND A HUNDRED THOUSAND, IT SEEMS  
20 REASONABLE TO ME INDIVIDUALLY.

21 THE KEY HERE FROM MY PERSPECTIVE IS THAT  
22 IN SOME PREVIOUS YEARS, WE HAVE AGGREGATED CONTRACTS  
23 FOR ALL THE YEARS IN WHICH THEY'RE RUNNING. SO IF  
24 YOU HAVE A 100,000 IN ONE YEAR AND YOU HAVE A  
25 100,000 THE SECOND YEAR, YOU HAVE A 100,000 IN THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIRD YEAR, IT COMES BACK TO US AS A \$300,000 ITEM.  
2 AND MY UNDERSTANDING IS ONE OF THE THINGS THIS  
3 INCORPORATES IS THAT THE CONTRACT WILL BE JUDGED ON  
4 THE FISCAL YEAR FOR WHICH THE CONTRACT APPLIES.

5 MR. SWEEDLER: WITH ONE CORRECTION. IT  
6 WOULD BE ON 12 MONTHS OF THE CONTRACT. SO THAT IF  
7 IT'S GOING TO BE \$400,000 OVER 12 MONTHS, WE WOULD  
8 BRING THAT FOR AUTHORIZATION TO THE GOVERNANCE  
9 SUBCOMMITTEE EVEN IF THAT STRADDLED A FISCAL YEAR.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FINE. SO ESSENTIALLY  
11 YOU'RE NOT -- IF YOU HAVE AN INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT FOR  
12 AN INDIVIDUAL PERIOD, IT WILL BE APPROVED FOR THE  
13 DOLLAR AMOUNT THAT THE CONTRACT IT IS. IT WON'T  
14 AGGREGATE ALL THE PREVIOUS YEARS BECAUSE OTHERWISE  
15 EVERYTHING WILL END UP AT GOVERNANCE AND THE BOARD.  
16 SHERRY LANSING.

17 MS. LANSING: THIS IS THE ONLY PART OF IT  
18 THAT I WAS A LITTLE FAMILIAR WITH. THE REST OF  
19 THIS, I THINK, IS NEW TO ALL OF US, INCLUDING  
20 GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, BECAUSE WE HAVE NEVER  
21 REALLY TALKED ABOUT THIS. BUT THIS PART I REALLY DO  
22 RECOMMEND.

23 WHAT WAS HAPPENING TO US, JUST SO I CAN  
24 MAKE IT CLEAR, IS IF WE WERE SIGNING A TWO- OR  
25 THREE-YEAR CONTRACT, IT WAS REALLY ONLY ONE YEAR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WITH AN OPTION FOR THE NEXT YEAR WITH AN OPTION FOR  
2 THE NEXT YEAR. BUT IT WAS BEING PRESENTED TO US AS  
3 A THREE-YEAR CONTRACT, WHICH WAS EXTREMELY  
4 MISLEADING BECAUSE WE HAD THE CHANCE TO CANCEL IT OR  
5 REUP IT. SO UNCOUPLING THAT OR UNTRIPLING THAT,  
6 WHATEVER THE CONTRACT WAS, SEEMS TO ME AN EXTREMELY  
7 GOOD IDEA SO THAT WE CAN EVALUATE IT EACH TIME WE  
8 HAVE TO PAY IT. SO IT SEEMED MORE TRANSPARENT, AND  
9 IT SEEMED ACTUALLY CLEARER. THAT'S THE ONLY PART OF  
10 THIS FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
11 THAT ARE ASKING HAVE WE DISCUSSED THIS PRIOR. NOT  
12 TO MY KNOWLEDGE.

13 MR. ROTH: COULD I JUST FOLLOW THAT UP.  
14 SO WAS THERE A PROBLEM WITH THE CURRENT LEVEL OF  
15 AUTHORITY THAT YOU WERE RUNNING INTO? AND IF SO,  
16 WAS IT BECAUSE OF WHAT SHERRY JUST MENTIONED?

17 MR. SWEEDLER: A PART OF IT WAS THE  
18 AGGREGATION OVER MULTIPLE YEARS. THE ADJUSTMENT IN  
19 THE THRESHOLDS IS INTENDED TO REFLECT THE FACT THAT  
20 THE SAME KIND OF FUNCTION THAT AT ONE TIME WOULD  
21 HAVE HAPPENED BELOW THAT THRESHOLD WAS MOVING  
22 FARTHER AND FARTHER UP JUST AS A MATTER OF THE SCALE  
23 OF OUR OPERATIONS IS CHANGING, SO IT WAS GOING TO  
24 BECOME AN INCREASING ISSUE. WHAT WE HAD ARE THESE  
25 CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE OUR CONTRACTS MANAGER HAS TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SEND AN E-MAIL TO MELISSA CAN WE GET A GOVERNANCE  
2 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ASAP BECAUSE WE'VE GOT TO GET  
3 THIS CONTRACT FINISHED. AND WE JUST WANTED TO MAKE  
4 SURE THAT WE'RE USING THOSE OPPORTUNITIES ONLY WHEN  
5 THEY'RE MOST NEEDED.

6 MS. LANSING: AGAIN, I THINK THIS IS THE  
7 ONLY AREA, AGAIN, BECAUSE GOVERNANCE PEOPLE ARE  
8 ASKING HAVE WE GONE THROUGH THIS. NO IS THE ANSWER.  
9 SO THIS IS THE ONLY AREA THAT I HAD SOME DISCUSSION  
10 ON JUST ON A ONE-ON-ONE THING. THIS ISN'T -- THIS  
11 IS BETTER BUSINESS PRACTICES FOR US, TO EVALUATE  
12 EACH CONTRACT ON A YEARLY BASIS. AND IT MAKES US  
13 MORE EFFICIENT AND IT ALSO MAKES US MORE  
14 TRANSPARENT. TO BE PRESENTED WITH A THREE-YEAR  
15 CONTRACT OR A TWO-YEAR CONTRACT WHEN REALLY WE ONLY  
16 HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION YEAR AT A TIME IS  
17 MISLEADING.

18 MR. SWEEDLER: THE ONLY OTHER SUBSTANTIVE  
19 PROCESS CHANGE IS THE BIDDING PROCESS. AND IF IT  
20 WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR ME TO EXPLAIN HOW THAT'S  
21 DIFFERENT FROM WHAT WE HAVE NOW, I'D BE HAPPY TO DO  
22 THAT. WHAT STAYS THE SAME IS THAT \$50,000 AND  
23 ABOVE, WE GET -- WE SOLICIT WRITTEN PROPOSALS,  
24 COMPARATIVE WRITTEN PROPOSALS. CURRENTLY WHERE THE  
25 UNIVERSITY HAS JUST ONE STEP BELOW 50,000, WE HAVE A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HYBRID. BELOW 15,000, IT'S BASED ON AN ASSESSMENT  
2 THAT THE PRICE IS REASONABLE. BETWEEN 15 AND 50, WE  
3 SOLICIT COMPETITIVE WRITTEN PROPOSALS, BUT THE  
4 POLICY SAYS THEY DON'T HAVE TO BE IN WRITING.  
5 THAT'S NOT REALLY ACCOMPLISHING ANYTHING WE'RE NOT  
6 GOING TO BE DOING ANYWAY.

7 AT THE TIME, THE LOWER THRESHOLD FOR THE  
8 UNIVERSITY WAS 15, SO IT GAVE US AN INTERMEDIATE  
9 GROUND. NOW THAT THE UNIVERSITY HAS MOVED IT UP TO  
10 50, WE DON'T NEED TO HAVE TWO DIFFERENT LEVELS  
11 THERE.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME ASK THE CHAIR OF  
13 GOVERNANCE, SHERRY LANSING, FROM A BOARD  
14 PERSPECTIVE, AND PLEASE OTHER MEMBERS COMMENT, I  
15 HAVE NO PROBLEM IN SAYING THAT GOVERNANCE SHOULD  
16 HAVE A HIGHER LIMIT. GOVERNANCE HAS A LARGE  
17 COMMITTEE AND IS WELL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE BOARD.  
18 SO MOVING THE GOVERNANCE LIMIT OVER WHAT GOVERNANCE  
19 CAN MAKE DECISIONS ON FROM 500,000 TO 600,000 IS NOT  
20 A PROBLEM FROM MY PERSPECTIVE. IS THAT SOMETHING  
21 THAT THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE --

22 MS. LANSING: I ACTUALLY FEEL  
23 UNCOMFORTABLE, TO BE HONEST WITH YOU, BECAUSE I  
24 DON'T HAVE THE INPUT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE. I  
25 CAN SPEAK PERSONALLY, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT'S

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REALLY FAIR. SO THIS IS AN AWKWARD SITUATION  
2 BECAUSE VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE,  
3 AND I THINK THEY SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO SPEAK FOR  
4 THEMSELVES, HAVE SAID, THOUGH THEY'VE READ THIS,  
5 WE'VE HAD NO DISCUSSION. I THINK THERE MIGHT BE  
6 SOME --

7 FIRST OF ALL, AS A REGENT, I OBVIOUSLY  
8 THINK THAT THE UC HAS A VERY GOOD WAY OF DOING  
9 THINGS. SO LET ME SAY THAT. I CAN RECUSE MYSELF  
10 FROM THAT STATEMENT. I DON'T MIND -- I LOVE  
11 COMPETITIVE BIDDING. I THINK THAT'S GREAT. SO I'M  
12 SPEAKING PERSONALLY NOW, BUT I THINK PERHAPS THE  
13 GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE A CHANCE TO  
14 DISCUSS THIS. IF THERE IS SOME URGENCY, WHICH I  
15 THINK THERE IS, TO UNCOUPLE THE CONTRACTS, I WOULD  
16 FEEL COMFORTABLE. THIS IS WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST  
17 BECAUSE THIS KIND OF CAUGHT ME UNAWARE AND IT'S  
18 NOBODY'S FAULT, MAYBE IT'S A LACK OF COMMUNICATION.

19 WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST IS THAT GOVERNANCE  
20 COMMITTEE HAVE A CHANCE TO REVIEW EVERYTHING ELSE.  
21 I KNOW IT'S NOT VERY SUBSTANTIVE, BUT TO GIVE MY  
22 GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERS A CHANCE TO WEIGH IN ON  
23 WHAT THEY FEEL AND THEN COME BACK TO THE BOARD WITH  
24 RECOMMENDATIONS. AND WE CAN DO IT RATHER QUICKLY.  
25 AND THEN I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST, BECAUSE OF THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 URGENCY OF A PARTICULAR CONTRACT, THAT PERHAPS WE  
2 JUST VOTE ON THE YEARLY REVIEW PROVISION. I THINK  
3 THAT'S --

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD  
5 SOLUTION. I'M NOT FAMILIAR AS WELL WITH THESE  
6 CHANGES AGAIN. WE HAVE A LOT OF COMPETING THINGS  
7 THAT HAVE BEEN GOING ON, SO I COULD HAVE INVESTED  
8 MORE TIME PERSONALLY. I'LL TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY  
9 HERE. I WAS AWARE OF THE PARTICULAR ISSUE, SHERRY,  
10 THAT YOU WERE AWARE OF, WHICH IS MAKING SURE THAT  
11 WE'RE JUDGING THINGS AS THEY ARE PROPERLY  
12 REPRESENTED. IF IT'S A YEAR CONTRACT, WE'LL JUDGE  
13 IT ON A YEAR. SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE CONSIDER A  
14 MOTION WHEN THIS REPORT IS FINISHED THAT ADDRESSES  
15 NOT CHANGING THESE OTHER LEVELS OF AUTHORITY UNTIL  
16 THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE HAS A CHANCE TO LOOK AT  
17 THOSE ISSUES.

18 MS. LANSING: I SUPPORT THAT, AND THEN I  
19 SUPPORT THAT WE JUST REVIEW THE UNCOUPLING OF THE  
20 CONTRACTS. AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR COMING HERE TODAY.  
21 THIS JUST WAS A LACK OF COMMUNICATION ON OUR PART.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. YOU HAVE --

23 MR. SWEEDLER: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY  
24 THAT THE MOTION, IF YOU ARE GOING TO MAKE THAT  
25 MOTION, IT WOULD BE TO ADOPT THE SENTENCE AT THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MIDDLE OF PAGE 7 THAT'S CHANGED, THE ONE ABOUT  
2 ANNUALIZED AUTHORITY LEVELS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD YOU READ US THE  
4 SENTENCE, PLEASE?

5 MR. SWEEDLER: YES. WHEN A CONTRACT HAS A  
6 DURATION GREATER THAN 12 MONTHS, THE APPROVAL  
7 THRESHOLD SHALL BE BASED ON THE CONTRACT AMOUNT  
8 AUTHORIZED FOR THE INITIAL YEAR AND SEPARATELY FOR  
9 EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT  
11 APPROPRIATELY STATES THE POINT. I WILL MAKE THE  
12 MOTION TO SUPPORT THAT. NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER  
13 PROVISIONS OF WHAT YOU'RE PUTTING BEFORE US TODAY?  
14 IS THERE AN URGENCY TO OTHER PROVISIONS IN THE  
15 DOCUMENTS?

16 MR. SWEEDLER: NO, I DON'T THINK SO.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND FOR  
18 THAT?

19 DR. HAWGOOD: SECOND.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A SECOND FOR THAT  
21 FROM DR. HAWGOOD. DISCUSSION? SEEING NO  
22 DISCUSSION, PUBLIC DISCUSSION? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
23 AND WHAT WE'LL DO HERE IS WE WILL PROCEED TO A VOTE  
24 ON THIS, AND WE WILL AGENDIZE THE REST OF THESE  
25 ITEMS FOR THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE. BUT THANK THE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STAFF FOR THEIR WORK, AND WE' LL ALL BE IN TOUCH.

2 SO I' M GOING TO CALL THE QUESTION BY VOICE  
3 VOTE. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? THE MATTER PASSES.

4 I' M GOING TO GO TO ITEM 12.

5 MR. TORRES: WHAT HAPPENED TO ITEM 7?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU' RE THE HIGHLIGHT OF  
7 THE MEETING.

8 MR. TORRES: I WON' T BE HERE FOR THE  
9 HIGHLIGHT.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS ITEM SHOULD TAKE  
11 JUST A COUPLE MINUTES. THIS IS A REAL SHORT ITEM.  
12 WE HAVE A PRESENTATION ON ITEM 12.

13 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED TO ACCEPT THE  
14 CONTRACT.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME TRY AND SUMMARIZE  
17 THE CONTRACT FOR US VERY QUICKLY. THE PROPOSAL IS  
18 TO AMEND THE EXISTING REMCHO CONTRACT TO COVER  
19 THROUGH THE BALANCE OF THIS FISCAL YEAR THROUGH JUNE  
20 30TH TO ADD \$150,000. STARTING WITH THE NEXT FISCAL  
21 YEAR, THAT CONTRACT WOULD BE PROPOSED FOR \$475,000.  
22 WE ALWAYS TRY AND ASK FOR WHAT' S NEEDED. PRIOR  
23 YEARS IT' S BEEN 450. BECAUSE OF TRYING TO BE  
24 RESPONSIVE TO THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER THINGS THAT  
25 COME UP, IT GENERALLY RESULTS IN BEING HIGHER THAN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE'VE REQUESTED, BUT WE WANT TO PUT PRESSURE ON  
2 KEEPING IT UNDER, AS CONTAINED AS POSSIBLE.

3 I THINK THE REMCHO FIRM HAS PROVIDED  
4 TREMENDOUS EXPERTISE, AND I WOULD EMPHASIZE THAT  
5 BECAUSE OF THE HISTORY OF JAMES HARRISON IN WORKING  
6 WITH US FROM THE VERY BEGINNING OF THIS AGENCY, WE  
7 DON'T HAVE TO PAY FOR REDUNDANT RESEARCH. YEARS OF  
8 RESEARCH HAVE BEEN DONE. THAT IS AN ASSET WE HAVE  
9 THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO REPEAT. AND I THINK HIS RATES  
10 HAVE BEEN ESSENTIALLY MUCH BETTER THAN OTHER PARTIES  
11 HAVE PAID FOR THE SAME SERVICES. IT REPRESENTS A  
12 GOOD VALUE FOR THIS.

13 SO IS THERE A MOTION TO SUPPORT?

14 MR. TORRES: YES. MOVED AND SECONDED.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY?

16 MR. TORRES: CLAIRE POMEROY.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHO'S THE MOTION?

18 MR. TOCHER: BY SENATOR TORRES, SECOND BY  
19 SAMUELSON.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY?

21 MR. TOCHER: SAMUELSON.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WAS A LITTLE TAKEN OUT  
23 OF ORDER. I WASN'T SURE WE GOT IT ON THE RECORD.

24 ANY DISCUSSION? ANY PUBLIC DISCUSSION?

25 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LIKE TO SAY SOMETHING

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BRIEFLY, BOB. MAYBE THIS GOES WITHOUT SAYING, BUT I  
2 THINK WE SHOULD JUST THINK FOR A MOMENT ABOUT THE  
3 ENORMOUS SERVICE WE'VE RECEIVED FROM JAMES HARRISON  
4 AND HIS FIRM.

5 (APPLAUSE.)

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: I SHUDDER TO THINK WHAT WE  
8 WOULD HAVE DONE IN SOME OF THE SITUATIONS THAT WE  
9 FACED, TERRIBLY DIFFICULT SITUATIONS, WITHOUT YOUR  
10 WISE LEADERSHIP. THANK YOU.

11 MR. ROTH: CAREFUL, JOAN, OR HE'LL RAISE  
12 THE RATES.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE VOICE VOTE. ALL IN  
14 FAVOR. OPPOSED. AGAIN, THANK YOU, JAMES HARRISON,  
15 FOR YOUR OUTSTANDING SERVICE.

16 SO I PROMISED YOU A QUICK ITEM.

17 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND  
18 MEMBERS. IF YOU WILL TURN TO YOUR ITEM NO. 7, WE  
19 HAVE THREE ISSUES TO RAISE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE  
20 SUBCOMMITTEE.

21 THE FIRST IS AB 1931 BY ASSEMBLYMEMBER  
22 TORRICO. I BELIEVE THERE'S SOME VERY QUICK  
23 TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF THIS LEGISLATION. THE  
24 RECOMMENDATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, THE CONSENSUS  
25 WAS TO APPROVE THIS PIECE OF LEGISLATION. MR. REED.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. REED: FIRST I MUST EXPRESS MY JOY,  
2 SUPPORT, AND APPRECIATION TO THE CALIFORNIA  
3 INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. CIRM IS TRULY  
4 THE PRIDE OF OUR STATE, JOY OF OUR NATION, AND  
5 FRIENDLY BEACON OF HOPE TO ALL THE WORLD. SOME  
6 CRITICS MIGHT SAY NOW THAT WE HAVE CIRM, WHAT IS  
7 THEIR NEED FOR THE ROMAN REED SPINAL CORD INJURY  
8 RESEARCH ACT. THE SHORT ANSWER IS ONLY 10 PERCENT  
9 OF WHAT WE FUND IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO STEM CELLS.  
10 MOST OF OUR WORK IS RELATED ON THE VERY IMPORTANT  
11 SUPPORTIVE PIECES SUCH AS LIMITING THE CASCADING  
12 EFFECT OF POSTINJURY, SUCH AS FINDING NEW INNOVATIVE  
13 WAYS OF SPECIALIZED REHABILITATION AND USE OF  
14 THERAPEUTIC ROBOTS.

15 WE ALSO FIND A NEW WAY OF USING A SKULLCAP  
16 TO CONTROL OUR OWN PERSONAL THOUGHTS THROUGH YOUR  
17 OWN AVATAR AND ABLE TO USE YOUR MIND AND BE ABLE TO  
18 LINK UP THROUGH AN ALGORITHM AND FIND OUT A WAY TO  
19 CONTROL A PERSONALIZED COMPUTER SO SOMEONE WHO HAS  
20 NO MOVEMENTS CAN BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THEIR VOICE TO  
21 THE OUTSIDE WORLD. THESE ARE JUST SOME OF THE  
22 THINGS THAT ARE AMONG THE 175 PUBLISHED, PEER  
23 REVIEWED MEDICAL PAPERS THAT ADVANCE THE WORLD'S  
24 KNOWLEDGE BASE.

25 THERE IS MUCH THAT WE CAN SAY ABOUT THIS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GREAT LAW, BUT WHAT I WILL SAY IS THIS LAW GIVES  
2 HOPE. THIS LAW GIVES HOPE TO THE MANY THAT ONE DAY  
3 WE WILL BE ABLE TO RISE UP OUT OF OUR WHEELCHAIRS  
4 AND WALK AWAY FROM THEM FOREVER AS THE GREAT  
5 CHRISTOPHER REEVE ONCE SAID. THANK YOU, CIRM FOR  
6 GIVING ME HOPE. I THANK YOU FROM THE BOTTOM OF MY  
7 HEART FOR SUPPORTING AB 1931.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, MR. REED. ANY  
9 FURTHER PUBLIC TESTIMONY? ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS  
10 OF THE BOARD? THIS BILL IS PRESENTLY -- THE FATHER  
11 IS GOING TO HAVE TO TESTIFY AS WELL.

12 MR. REED: I JUST WANTED TO SAY IT WOULD  
13 BE AN HONOR TO BE ENDORSED BY THIS FANTASTIC BOARD.

14 MR. TORRES: WELL PUT. WELL PUT. ANY  
15 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? THE BILL IS  
16 CURRENTLY IN WHAT'S CALLED THE SUSPENSE FILE, WHICH  
17 MEANS IT HAS A FIGHT AHEAD IN TERMS OF GETTING OUT  
18 OF THAT COMMITTEE WITH THE APPROPRIATION THAT IS  
19 ATTACHED TO IT. CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE. IS THERE A  
20 MOTION TO APPROVE?

21 DR. BLOOM: SO MOVED.

22 DR. HAWGOOD: SECOND.

23 MR. TORRES: CALL THE ROLL. I'LL JUST SAY  
24 A VOICE VOTE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING  
25 AYE. ALL THOSE OPPOSED. ABSTENTIONS. THE MOTION

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CARRIES.

2 DR. STEWARD: I JUST NEED TO GO ON RECORD  
3 AS ABSTAINING FROM THE VOTE BECAUSE OF CONFLICT OF  
4 INTEREST.

5 MR. TORRES: AB 1733 THAT IS BEFORE YOU  
6 WAS INTRODUCED BY ASSEMBLYMEMBER HILL, FORMER MEMBER  
7 OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, TO  
8 CREATE A DIRECTOR OF BIOTECHNOLOGY. I THINK IT'S  
9 PRETTY SELF-EXPLANATORY. IT'S SUPPORTED BY BOTH  
10 REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS. I DON'T KNOW IF MR. ROTH  
11 WANTED TO MAKE A COMMENT ON THAT BILL. NO.

12 IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE, TO CREATE A  
13 DIRECTOR OF BIOTECHNOLOGY FOR THE STATE OF  
14 CALIFORNIA?

15 DR. BLOOM: SO MOVED.

16 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

17 MR. TORRES: ANY PUBLIC TESTIMONY? THERE  
18 BEING NONE, ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING  
19 AYE. ALL THOSE OPPOSED. ABSTENTIONS. THE MOTION  
20 CARRIES.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF I  
22 COULD MAKE A COMMENT RELEVANT TO THAT, THE ASSEMBLY  
23 SELECT COMMITTEE ON BIOTECHNOLOGY CHAIRED BY  
24 ASSEMBLYMEMBER JERRY HILL WILL CONDUCT A HEARING  
25 FRIDAY, MAY 21ST AT THE CITY OF HOPE ABOUT HOW BASIC

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESEARCH LEADS TO CLINICAL TRIALS AND SUCCESSFUL  
2 TREATMENT. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE REPRESENT A LOT  
3 OF CONSTITUENCIES THAT WOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO  
4 MAKE A STRONG CASE ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF BASIC  
5 RESEARCH AND THE RELATIONSHIP. SO YOU MIGHT WANT TO  
6 BE IN CONTACT WITH DR. FRIEDMAN, AND YOU MIGHT WANT  
7 TO HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE THERE. THIS IS AN  
8 OPPORTUNITY TO GET SUBSTANTIVE TIME WITH MEMBERS OF  
9 THE LEGISLATURE TO REALLY MAKE THE CASE FOR  
10 CALIFORNIA'S INVESTMENTS IN BASIC RESEARCH WHETHER  
11 THROUGH THE UC SYSTEM'S SUPPORT OR THROUGH  
12 SUPPORTING PROGRAMS LIKE PROPOSITION 71.

13 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, DR. KLEIN -- MR.  
14 KLEIN. WE'RE NOW READY TO TAKE UP SENATE BILL 1064  
15 BY SENATOR ALQUIST. LET ME FIRST INDICATE TO YOU  
16 HOW GRATEFUL I AM FOR ALL OF YOU WHO TOOK THE TIME  
17 TO MEET WITH LEGISLATORS AT OUR MEETING IN  
18 SACRAMENTO. I ESPECIALLY WANT TO THANK LEEZA AND  
19 MICHAEL GOLDBERG WHO HAD THE TEMERITY TO VISIT WITH  
20 SENATOR ALQUIST AND TO LET HER KNOW WHAT THEIR  
21 POSITION WAS ON THIS LEGISLATION.

22 I ALSO WANT TO THANK REGENT LANSING FOR  
23 THE TIME THAT SHE SPENT IN A VERY HECTIC DAY WHEN  
24 HER NOMINATION WAS UP BEFORE THE SENATE RULES  
25 COMMITTEE TO TAKE THE TIME TO SIT WITH PRESIDENT PRO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TEM STEINBERG AND ARTICULATE THE ISSUES REGARDING  
2 SENATE BILL 1064.

3 I ALSO WANT TO THANK OUR VICE CHAIR DUANE  
4 ROTH, WHO HAS A VERY GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH SENATOR  
5 KEHOE, WHO IS THE CHAIR OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS  
6 COMMITTEE, FOR TAKING THE TIME MANY TIMES SINCE THAT  
7 TIME TO EDUCATE THE SENATOR. I ALSO WANT TO THANK  
8 BOB KLEIN, ALAN TROUNSON, ELONA BAUM, JAMES  
9 HARRISON, SCOTT TOCHER FOR TAKING THE TIME TO SIT  
10 WITH SENATOR ALQUIST FOR MORE THAN TWO AND A HALF  
11 HOURS AND THEN AN INCREDIBLE LUNCH, WHICH WE PAID  
12 FOR OUR OWN LUNCH AT THAT TIME, TO MAKE SURE THAT  
13 SHE UNDERSTOOD WHERE WE WERE COMING FROM AND WHAT  
14 THE ISSUES ARE BEFORE HER.

15 WE SAT DOWN WITH THE PRESIDENT OF THE  
16 SENATE AS WELL AS SENATOR FLOREZ AND MYSELF AND  
17 JAMES HARRISON AND STAFF TO GO OVER ALL OF THE  
18 ISSUES REGARDING THE LEGISLATION. I THINK WHAT WE  
19 ARE CONCLUDING IS THAT THERE WILL BE A PIECE OF  
20 LEGISLATION. IT'S THE NATURE AND THE SCOPE OF THAT  
21 LEGISLATION WHICH WE'RE WORKING ON NOW.

22 TWO OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES THAT WE  
23 INTRODUCED WAS, OF COURSE, REMOVING THE 50-EMPLOYEE  
24 CAP TO MAKE SURE THAT WE NEGOTIATE AN APPROPRIATE  
25 RESOLUTION. AND SECONDLY, TO PROVIDE -- I PUT



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FORWARD ON THE TABLE AND WAS ACCEPTED BY SENATOR  
2 ALQUIST TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR ICOC MEMBERS OF  
3 THE WORKING GROUPS WHO TAKE TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF  
4 HOURS TO BE AT THOSE WORKING GROUPS AND NEVER  
5 RECEIVE REMUNERATION FOR THEIR SERVICES. THAT  
6 EXCLUDES MR. KLEIN AND MYSELF, BUT THE PATIENT  
7 ADVOCATES REALLY OUGHT TO BE REIMBURSED FOR  
8 REASONABLE EXPENSES. AND IT WILL BE TIED TO THE  
9 6-PERCENT CAP OF OPERATIONAL COST.

10 AT THIS POINT THE PREVIOUS MOTION OF THIS  
11 BODY WAS TO MOVE THIS BILL TO INTERIM STUDY, WHICH  
12 MEANS FOR INTERIM HEARING. I WOULD LIKE TO  
13 ENTERTAIN A NEW MOTION TO ALLOW MR. HARRISON AND I  
14 TO CONTINUE NEGOTIATIONS WITHOUT A POSITION ON THE  
15 BILL AND, THEREFORE, COME BACK TO YOU MAYBE  
16 TELEPHONICALLY TO SUPPORT A BILL IF IT'S AMENDED TO  
17 MEET THE ISSUES THAT WE'VE RAISED AND MR. ROTH HAS  
18 RAISED WITH SENATOR KEHOE.

19 I'D LIKE TO ASK DUANE IF HE HAS ANY  
20 COMMENTS TO MAKE ON THE MATTER.

21 MR. ROTH: I WOULD AGREE THAT AS OF NOW I  
22 THINK WE'RE MOVING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. THERE'S  
23 REAL WILLINGNESS, AND I THINK IT'S GENUINE, TO DO  
24 THE RIGHT THING HERE AND TO GIVE US THE FLEXIBILITY  
25 WE NEED, BUT TO ALSO ADDRESS SOME OF THE THINGS WE'D

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LIKE TO HAVE ADDRESSED IN THE 50-PERSON CAP AND SOME  
2 OF THE OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU MENTIONED, THE  
3 REMUNERATION FOR THE PATIENT ADVOCATES AND SO ON.

4 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU. YOU KNOW, WHEN  
5 YOU VOTED FOR TWO VICE CHAIRS, YOU MADE A GREAT  
6 DECISION BECAUSE I HAVE NEVER ENJOYED MORE WORKING  
7 WITH DUANE ROTH IN A TRUE BIPARTISAN NATURE ON THESE  
8 ISSUES. AND I JUST WANT TO SAY HOW MUCH I ADMIRE  
9 AND RESPECT YOU, DUANE, BECAUSE YOU REALLY ADDED TO  
10 THIS LEGISLATIVE PROCESS BY BRINGING YOUR EXPERTISE  
11 TO THE TABLE AND SOMETHING I HAD NO EXPERIENCE IN  
12 OBVIOUSLY, BUT YOU HAVE. AND YOU PAID YOUR DUES ON  
13 THAT ISSUE. I JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU, DUANE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHEN YOU SAY YOU HAD NO  
15 EXPERTISE IN DEALING WITH IT, YOU MEAN WITH  
16 REPUBLICANS?

17 MR. TORRES: YOU ARE WORKING WITH THE  
18 DEMOCRATS. REGENT LANSING.

19 MS. LANSING: SHERRY. I JUST WANT TO SAY  
20 WHEN I WAS THERE SPEAKING TO THE VARIOUS SENATORS  
21 AND ASSEMBLYMEN, THE THING THAT CAME BACK OVER AND  
22 OVER AND OVER AGAIN WAS THE EXTRAORDINARY RESPECT  
23 THAT THEY HAVE FOR YOU, ART, AND AS WELL AS FOR  
24 DUANE. AND SO I JUST THINK THAT WE ARE SO WELL  
25 SERVED BY OUR VICE CHAIRS. AND THE WAY THAT THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISCUSSION IS BEING HANDLED ON THIS BILL IS IN SUCH  
2 A THOUGHTFUL MANNER AND SUCH A BIPARTISAN MANNER,  
3 AND I PERSONALLY AM EXTRAORDINARILY GRATEFUL TO BOTH  
4 OF YOU FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP.

5 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, REGENT.

6 DR. TROUNSON: SO, MR. DEPUTY CHAIR, I  
7 JUST WONDERED IF YOU CAN ALSO INCLUDE IN THE GOING  
8 FORWARD NEGOTIATIONS A DIALOGUE AND CONSIDERATION  
9 FOR MANAGEMENT BECAUSE SOME OF THESE ISSUES DIRECTLY  
10 REFLECT ON MANAGEMENT AND OBVIOUSLY SOME  
11 NEGOTIATIONS MAY PUT POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE SPIN ON  
12 HOW IT AFFECTS THE WAY WE DELIVER THE OPERATIONS.

13 MR. TORRES: OF COURSE. IF YOU REFER TO  
14 THE E-MAIL I SENT TO YOU A FEW WEEKS AGO, I THINK  
15 YOU WILL UNDERSTAND THAT I WELCOME THAT INPUT FROM  
16 YOU. AND, THEREFORE, I INDICATED TO YOU THAT WE  
17 WERE NOT IN POWER TO NEGOTIATE ANYTHING OTHER THAN  
18 TO CONTINUE TO WORK ON THESE CONCEPTS, AND THEN WE  
19 WOULD BRING THOSE CONCEPTS BACK TO THE BOARD AND TO  
20 MANAGEMENT AS WELL. MR. HARRISON, DID YOU WANT TO  
21 ADD ANYTHING?

22 MR. HARRISON: UNLESS THE BOARD WOULD LIKE  
23 MORE DETAILS, I DON'T THINK I HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD.

24 MR. TORRES: ALL RIGHT.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D JUST LIKE TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EMPHASIZE HERE TO MAKE IT CLEAR THE PATIENT  
2 ADVOCATES, AGAIN, EXCLUDING THE CHAIR AND VICE  
3 CHAIR, HAVE A NUMBER OF COMMITTEES, WORKING GROUPS  
4 THAT THEY HAVE TO SERVE ON, AND THIS IS A PROPOSAL  
5 THAT WOULD GIVE THEM ESSENTIALLY A PER DIEM FOR THE  
6 TIME THEY SPEND IN PREPARING FOR THOSE WORKING  
7 GROUPS AS WELL AS SERVICE ON THE WORKING GROUPS. SO  
8 THAT AS WE HAVE A VERY BUSY AGENDA, THEY CAN  
9 ACTUALLY MAINTAIN THEIR LIVELIHOOD AND BE ABLE TO  
10 SERVE SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT STUDY SESSIONS AND  
11 WORKING GROUP SESSIONS THAT FEED INTO THIS BOARD AND  
12 ITS FINAL CONSIDERATION ON A FULLY INFORMED BASIS.  
13 THIS IS A PER DIEM THAT IS SET REALLY FOR THE OTHER  
14 MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP WHICH WILL NOW APPLY TO  
15 THE PATIENT ADVOCATES.

16 MR. TORRES: ALL RIGHT. SO THE MOTION ON  
17 THE FLOOR IS TO ALLOW US TO CONTINUE TO NEGOTIATE ON  
18 THIS ISSUE. AND ONCE WE'VE DONE ON THE CONCEPTS, AS  
19 PRESIDENT TROUNSON HAS INDICATED, AND WE ALL HAVE  
20 COMMITTED TO TO BRING IT BACK TO MANAGEMENT FOR  
21 THEIR INPUT AS WELL AND TO THE BOARD FOR THEIR INPUT  
22 BEFORE WE MOVE FORWARD, HOPEFULLY, TO HAVE A  
23 POSITION OF SUPPORT ON AN AMENDED PROPOSAL THAT WILL  
24 COME BEFORE US ALL.

25 NOW, TIMING, THE BILL IS NOW IN WHAT'S

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CALLED THE SUSPENSE FILE IN THE SENATE  
2 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, WHICH GIVES US ABOUT THREE  
3 MORE WEEKS TO CONTINUE TO WORK ON IT. SO I THINK  
4 IT'S A GOOD TIMELINE. AND THEN WE'LL REPORT BACK TO  
5 YOU BEFORE THAT TIME BECAUSE SENATOR KEHOE HAS  
6 COMMITTED TO DUANE AND TO MYSELF THAT NOTHING WILL  
7 COME OUT UNTIL WE'VE HOPEFULLY RESOLVED ANY OF THE  
8 DISAGREEMENTS AND ISSUES THAT ARE STILL BEFORE US  
9 WHICH RELATE, VERY QUICKLY, TO ACCESSIBILITY AND HOW  
10 THAT'S DEFINED AND THE NATURE AND THE FORMULA FOR  
11 REVENUE TO BE RETURNED BACK TO THE STATE. AND WE'LL  
12 GET BACK TO YOU WITH THOSE SPECIFICS.

13 DR. TROUNSON: I WONDER IF WE COULD  
14 INCLUDE GENERAL COUNSEL IN PART OF THOSE  
15 NEGOTIATIONS BECAUSE I THINK THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL  
16 TO HAVE INPUT.

17 MR. TORRES: I'M NOT EXCLUDING ELONA. I  
18 JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THAT  
19 SOMETIMES SHE'S VERY BUSY. WE HAVE TO HAVE THE  
20 FLEXIBILITY TO BE IN SACRAMENTO AND NEGOTIATE THAT,  
21 AND I THINK I'VE MADE -- I THINK I'VE GIVEN YOU  
22 EVERY E-MAIL THAT WE'VE HAD IN TERMS OF THE  
23 LANGUAGE. AND I KNOW JAMES HAS AS WELL. SO WE'LL  
24 CONTINUE TO KEEP HER IN TOUCH ABSOLUTELY.

25 DR. TROUNSON: I'M SIMPLY ASKING THAT SHE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BE INVOLVED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. I THINK THAT'S A  
2 REASONABLE REQUEST.

3 MR. SHEEHY: IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THIS IS A  
4 BOARD DECISION. IT'S NOT -- STAFF WORKS FOR THE  
5 BOARD UNLESS I'M MISTAKEN. SO THIS IS A DECISION  
6 THAT TAKES PLACE AT A BOARD LEVEL.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK ON AN INFORMAL  
8 LEVEL THAT THERE IS A DESIRE TO ALWAYS MAKE SURE  
9 THAT WE HAVE THE INPUT FROM THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE  
10 AND GENERAL COUNSEL'S OFFICE.

11 MR. TORRES: ABSOLUTELY.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THOSE WILL ALL BE, AS ART  
13 HAS INDICATED, BROUGHT BACK TO THE BOARD AS PART OF  
14 THE OVERALL PACKAGE. BUT IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO US  
15 THAT WE END UP WITH A FINAL PRODUCT THAT DOESN'T  
16 CREATE A PROBLEM AT THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL AND THE  
17 OPERATIONAL LEVEL OF THIS AGENCY. SO I THINK ART  
18 HAS INDICATED HE'LL BE VERY SENSITIVE TO THAT AND  
19 WORKING WITH THE INPUT FROM THE STAFF.

20 MR. TORRES: FOR EXAMPLE, I'VE NOT  
21 INCLUDED MR. TOCHER IN THESE INTIMATE NEGOTIATIONS  
22 BECAUSE I FEEL THE FEWER PEOPLE IN THE ROOM, THE  
23 BETTER OFF WE'RE GETTING AT A RESOLUTION. AND QUITE  
24 FRANKLY, THE FEWER PEOPLE IN THE ROOM, THE MORE  
25 HONEST PEOPLE ARE IN THOSE NEGOTIATIONS. BUT I'VE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 KEPT IN TOUCH WITH VICE CHAIR ROTH AS WELL AS WITH  
2 BOB KLEIN AS WELL AS WITH THE PRESIDENT AS WELL AS  
3 ELONA AS WELL AS MR. TOCHER, THANK YOU AGAIN FOR ALL  
4 YOUR HELP, TO KEEP THEM INVOLVED, BUT SOMETIMES THE  
5 FEWER PEOPLE IN THE ROOM MAKE A BETTER APPROACH IN  
6 MY OPINION.

7 MR. SHEEHY: I ALSO THINK IT'S VERY  
8 IMPORTANT THAT THE CHAIR VIEWS AND BOARD COUNSEL  
9 VIEWS ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SOME OF THE  
10 CHANGES THAT ARE BEING PROPOSED IS TAKEN INTO  
11 ACCOUNT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I ASSURE EVERYONE THAT  
13 ART IS A GREAT LEAD TO THIS WITH DUANE. IT'S A  
14 TREMENDOUS TEAM. THEY KEEP ME INFORMED AND IN THE  
15 LOOP. AND ART BROUGHT BOTH ALAN AND I AND ELONA AND  
16 JAMES HARRISON UP FOR A MARATHON MEETING, AS HE  
17 INDICATED, WITH SENATOR ALQUIST AND STAFF. WE HAVE  
18 TO HAVE LEADERSHIP. WE HAVE A STRONG LEADERSHIP IN  
19 THIS NEGOTIATING TEAM, AND I THINK WE'RE GOING TO  
20 FIND THAT THE RESULTS REPRESENT A MEETING OF THE  
21 MINDS WITH THE LEGISLATURE ON WHAT'S PRODUCTIVE FOR  
22 THE AGENCY, THE STATE, AND PATIENTS AND REFLECT A  
23 PLAN THAT WILL BENEFIT MANAGEMENT AND REPRESENT  
24 THEIR VIEWS OF WHAT'S ESSENTIAL FOR THE EFFECTIVE  
25 OPERATION OF THE AGENCY, BUT IT'S ALL GOING TO COME

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BACK HERE FOR A FINAL DISCUSSION.

2 MS. KING: AND THIS MAY BE WELL  
3 UNDERSTOOD, BUT I JUST WANTED TO REMIND EVERYBODY WE  
4 NEED AT THE VERY LEAST A SECOND TO THE MOTION THAT  
5 SENATOR TORRES POSSIBLY MADE.

6 MR. SHEEHY: SECOND.

7 MR. TORRES: ANY PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THE  
8 MOTION? DR. LEVEY HAD A FEW QUESTIONS.

9 DR. LEVEY: YEAH. I WANT TO THANK YOU AND  
10 DUANE FOR YOUR HARD WORK ON THIS. I KNOW IT'S  
11 DIFFICULT. IS THE END GAME TO GET TO A POINT WHERE  
12 WE WILL PUBLICLY SUPPORT OR GO AGAINST THIS MOTION?  
13 THAT'S ONE QUESTION. SO IF YOU WANT TO HANDLE THAT  
14 FIRST.

15 MR. TORRES: YES.

16 DR. LEVEY: WELL DONE. AND, WELL, I'LL  
17 JUST LEAVE IT AT THAT. BUT I WOULD LIKE AT SOME  
18 POINT PERHAPS WHEN YOU THINK YOU HAVE A FINAL  
19 PRODUCT OR CLOSE TO IT, IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO GO  
20 THROUGH THIS. I WENT THROUGH THIS FROM BACK TO  
21 FRONT TO BACK. SO THE QUESTION IS CAN YOU PUT  
22 TOGETHER SOMETHING OR WITH COUNSEL WHICH WILL SHOW  
23 HOW THIS CHANGES THE ORIGINAL PROP 71 AND YOUR  
24 OPINIONS WITH REGARD TO THAT?

25 MR. TORRES: YES.



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. ROTH: I MIGHT JUST ADD TO THAT THAT  
2 WE'RE DOING A LOT OF LISTENING AND UNDERSTANDING THE  
3 RATIONALE BEHIND THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AND WHY  
4 WE DEVELOPED THEM. AND THAT REALLY DOES TAKE PEOPLE  
5 THAT WERE IN THOSE ROOMS WHEN THAT WAS BEING  
6 DISCUSSED TO EXPLAIN WHY WE DID WHAT WE DID. THAT  
7 HAS SEEMED TO HELP MOVE THE PROCESS ALONG. AND  
8 THAT'S WHY WHEN WE GET TO THE POINT WHERE YOU NOW  
9 THINK THERE'S A MEETING OF THE MINDS, THEN WE SHOULD  
10 HAVE LOTS OF DISCUSSION TO SEE IF THERE'S THINGS WE  
11 STILL NEED TO CHANGE IN THERE. RIGHT NOW IT'S I  
12 WOULD SAY GIVE-AND-TAKE AND UNDERSTANDING.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE ALSO NEED TO REMEMBER  
14 THAT THE PRECEDENT OF WHAT WE AGREED TO IS CRITICAL.  
15 WE HAVE A VERY STRONG CONSTITUTIONAL LINE PROTECTING  
16 THIS INITIATIVE. THE INITIATIVE CAN BE CHANGED TO  
17 ENHANCE THE INITIATIVE. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AND  
18 WE'VE TRIED TO MAKE IT VERY CLEAR AND WE HAVE TWO  
19 CONSTITUTIONAL OPINIONS RELATED TO SOME OF THE  
20 RECOMMENDATIONS PREVIOUSLY MADE THAT THERE CANNOT BE  
21 CHANGES WHICH CHANGE OVERSIGHT OR OTHER FUNCTIONS  
22 UNDER THIS INITIATIVE. IF THAT WERE TO OCCUR, IT  
23 WOULD REDEFINE HOW DEEPLY THIS INITIATIVE COULD BE  
24 CHANGED, WHETHER PEER REVIEW OR THE BOARD FUNCTIONS  
25 OR ANY OTHER PART OF OUR OPERATIONS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO UNDERSTANDING THE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT  
2 OF THESE CHANGES IS SOMETHING WE'RE WATCHING VERY  
3 CLOSELY.

4 MR. TORRES: DR. POMEROY.

5 DR. POMEROY: I JUST WANT TO REMIND ALL OF  
6 US THAT WE PREVIOUSLY STATED THAT OUR REAL GOAL WAS  
7 TO WORK PRODUCTIVELY WITH THE LEGISLATURE AND TO  
8 FIND COMMON GROUND. AND I WANT TO SUPPORT THE  
9 MOTION THAT WE ENDORSE ART AND DUANE TO BE OUR  
10 SPOKESPEOPLE TO ACCOMPLISH THAT GOAL.

11 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, DR. POMEROY.  
12 PUBLIC COMMENT?

13 MR. REED: YES. CALIFORNIA VOTED FOR SOME  
14 VERY SPECIFIC BALANCES OF POWER. AND THE ICOC IS  
15 BASICALLY A LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE CIRM AND THE  
16 PRESIDENT ARE THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. YOU GUYS MAKE  
17 THE POLICY. CIRM CARRIES OUT IT. I SEE SOME ITEMS  
18 IN 1064 WHICH THREATEN THAT BALANCE OF POWER. AND I  
19 REALLY THINK THAT IT'S IMPORTANT. WE HAVE HAD A  
20 SUCCESS BECAUSE AT EVERY STEP OF THE WAY, WE HAD 29  
21 OVERSIGHT PEOPLE WHO WOULD FIGHT OUT THE PROBLEMS  
22 AND FIND OUT AN EQUITABLE ANSWER TO EVERYTHING.  
23 IT'S BEEN MAGNIFICENT. I WOULD HESITATE VERY MUCH  
24 TO SEE THAT BALANCE OF POWER SHIFTED. SO THAT'S  
25 SOMETHING THAT CALIFORNIA VOTED FOR, AND I THINK IT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MUST BE PROTECTED. THANK YOU.

2 MR. TORRES: ANY FURTHER COMMENTS OR  
3 QUESTIONS? IF NOT, ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY  
4 SAYING AYE. ALL THOSE OPPOSED. ABSTENTIONS.  
5 MOTION CARRIES. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD LIKE  
7 TO RECOGNIZE THAT WE'RE ON THE PIVOT POINT OF  
8 HISTORY. WE HAVE ONE OF OUR DEDICATED MEMBERS ABOUT  
9 TO LEAVE US FOR GEORGIA, BECOMING EFFECTIVELY THE  
10 PRESIDENT OF THE MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA. AND I  
11 THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO RECOGNIZE HIS  
12 SERVICE. AND I'D ASK IF THERE ARE BOARD MEMBERS WHO  
13 WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO DR. AZZIZ' PHENOMENAL  
14 COMMITMENT AND DEDICATION TO SOMETIMES TRAVELING,  
15 SOMETIMES IN THE MIDDLE OF CRITICAL -- HIS OWN  
16 CRITICAL WORK, HE'S ALWAYS MADE TIME REGARDLESS OF  
17 HIS STRESS LEVEL. HE HAS BEEN AVAILABLE WHEN WE  
18 NEEDED TO REACH HIM UNDER EXTRAORDINARY  
19 CIRCUMSTANCES.

20 SO I PERSONALLY WOULD LIKE TO START BY  
21 SAYING IT'S BEEN A PRIVILEGE TO SERVE WITH YOU.  
22 IT'S BEEN REMARKABLE YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS, YOUR  
23 INSIGHTS, AND YOUR DEDICATION TO THIS MISSION.

24 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN, HAVING BEEN A  
25 LATINO ALL MY LIFE, I WANT TO SHARE YOUR COMMENTS AS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WELL AND TO WISH HIM WELL IN A RED STATE AND TO KNOW  
2 THAT WE REALLY HAVE APPRECIATED YOUR PRESENCE HERE,  
3 RICARDO, AND WE ESPECIALLY WISH GOD SPEED TO YOU AND  
4 YOUR FAMILY.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO GO TO DR.  
6 FRIEDMAN NEXT.

7 DR. FRIEDMAN: I HAVE SPEAK NEXT BECAUSE I  
8 KNOW PHIL IS WAITING. I'D LIKE TO ASK PHIL TO  
9 PLEASE SING MIDNIGHT TRAIN TO GEORGIA.  
10 CONGRATULATIONS.

11 DR. PIZZO: AS LONG AS YOU PLAY ALONG WITH  
12 ME. SO I'VE HAD THE PRIVILEGE OF WORKING WITH  
13 RICARDO AS WELL ON A NUMBER OF SUBCOMMITTEES, AND IT  
14 REALLY HAS BEEN AN HONOR. AND I WISH YOU REALLY  
15 VERY WELL. I THINK, BASED UPON WHAT I'VE SEEN OF  
16 YOU IN THIS SETTING, YOU ARE GOING TO DO  
17 EXTRAORDINARILY WELL. AND I'M SURE MEDICAL COLLEGE  
18 OF GEORGIA WILL BENEFIT TREMENDOUSLY. SO GOOD LUCK.  
19 ALSO GOODBYE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO GO TO DR.  
21 LEVEY, THEN DR. POMEROY, AND THEN I THINK TO SHERRY.  
22 I'D LIKE TO SAY I HOPE YOUR BOARD DOES NOT HAVE 29  
23 MEMBERS. DR. LEVEY.

24 DR. LEVEY: THANK YOU SO MUCH. I'M GOING  
25 TO MISS HIM. HE'S BEEN A GREAT COLLEAGUE DOWN IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LOS ANGELES. HE'S GOING TO BE MISSED AT CEDARS.  
2 HE'LL BE MISSED AT UCLA. WE WERE TALKING LAST  
3 NIGHT, AND IT'S JUST AMAZING. I REMEMBER WHEN HE  
4 FIRST CAME ON THE BOARD, I DID NOT KNOW HIM. AND HE  
5 JUST CAME ON THIS BOARD FROM THE VERY FIRST MEETING,  
6 HE KNEW WHAT THE AGENDAS WERE, HE KNEW WHAT THE  
7 MISSION WAS, AND HE'S NEVER BEEN AFRAID TO SPEAK OUT  
8 ON THE ISSUES. HE'S ARTICULATE AND HE'S ENERGETIC  
9 AND, MOST IMPORTANTLY, HE'S REALLY VERY THOUGHTFUL  
10 ABOUT WHAT HE HAS TO SAY.

11 AND I'VE BEEN ALSO PROUD TO HELP MENTOR  
12 HIM. I THINK THOSE OF US IN ACADEMIC MEDICINE ARE  
13 GOING TO BENEFIT FROM HIM BECAUSE I THINK WE FINALLY  
14 GOT ANOTHER GREAT LEADER COMING INTO THE TRIBE, SO  
15 TO SPEAK. SO, RICARDO, ALL THE BEST TO YOU AND  
16 CINDY. AND SHE CAN WORK ON HER DRAWL. SHE'S FROM  
17 ALABAMA. AND YOU CAN USE YOUR EXPERTISE IN SPANISH.  
18 CONGRATULATIONS AND THANK YOU FOR ALL YOU'VE DONE  
19 FOR US HERE AT THE ICOC.

20 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU. THANK YOU VERY  
21 MUCH.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO --

23 MS. GIBBONS: BOB, MAY I JUST ADD THAT I  
24 THINK THAT AS MUCH AS RICARDO HAS BEEN VERY KIND AND  
25 HAS ALWAYS OUTREACHED OR GIVEN ME YOUR OUTREACH OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SUPPORT AND KNOWLEDGE AND MENTORED ME ALONG AND  
2 TUTORED ME WITH MY EMERGENT AND STILL NASCENT SKILL  
3 SET AS IT RELATES TO THIS BOARD, IF YOU NEED THAT  
4 KIND OF SUPPORT IN THE SOUTHERN REGIONS OF OUR  
5 COUNTRY, YOU KNOW, I'M FROM SOUTH CAROLINA AND I  
6 CAN -- I KNOW CINDY'S GOT IT GOING ON, BUT I CAN  
7 TUTOR YOU, AND I SAY THIS WITH GREAT LOVE AND  
8 AFFECTION, AND I AM A RECOVERING RED NECK AND I CAN  
9 HELP YOU WITH THAT. SO IF YOU NEED ME, I'M HERE FOR  
10 YOU. YOU AND CINDY WILL CERTAINLY BE MISSED. AND I  
11 GUESS YOUR ART IS JUST GOING TO HAVE TO TAKE A FEW  
12 MORE YEARS BEFORE YOU HAVE TIME TO EXPRESS  
13 CREATIVELY BECAUSE YOU'VE GOT A BIG JOB AHEAD OF  
14 YOU. BEST OF LUCK.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY, AND THEN I'M  
16 GOING TO GET SHERRY LANSING, AND THEN I THINK DR.  
17 TROUNSON.

18 MS. LANSING: WELL, EVERYTHING HAS BEEN  
19 SAID, SO I'M GOING TO TRY AND PUT IT IN MY OWN  
20 WORDS. YOU HAVE JUST BEEN AN EXTRAORDINARY PERSON  
21 FOR ME TO WORK WITH. I HAVE ALWAYS RESPECTED YOUR  
22 KEEN INTELLIGENCE AND YOUR INTEGRITY. YOUR  
23 INTEGRITY SHINES THROUGH EVERYTHING THAT YOU DO.  
24 AND SO, AS DR. LEVEY SAID, YOU'RE NOT AFRAID TO TAKE  
25 AN UNPOPULAR OPINION, YOU'RE NOT AFRAID TO STATE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 YOUR VIEWS. AND IT'S JUST BEEN AN HONOR TO WORK  
2 WITH YOU. SO I CAN SAY ON BEHALF ALL OF THE MEMBERS  
3 OF THE BOARD THAT WE MISS YOU ALREADY, AND WE WISH  
4 YOU NOTHING BUT CONTINUED SUCCESS.

5 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

6 DR. POMEROY: I WANT TO ALSO ADD MY VOICE  
7 OF BOTH GRATITUDE AND CONGRATULATIONS. YOU KNOW, I  
8 THINK THAT THE CONCEPT OF DOING THINGS FOR THE  
9 GREATER GOOD, THE SERVANT LEADERSHIP THAT YOU'VE  
10 DEMONSTRATED FROM DAY ONE ON THIS BOARD HAS REALLY  
11 SET A HIGH BAR FOR ALL OF US. AND YOU GET THE  
12 MISSION, YOU KEEP YOUR EYE ON THE PRIZE, AND YOU  
13 HAVE MOVED THIS BOARD FORWARD BECAUSE OF THAT. AND  
14 I HAVE EVERY CONFIDENCE THAT YOU WILL DO THAT AT  
15 MCG, AND I WISH YOU GREAT SUCCESS.

16 MR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU.

17 MR. ROTH: NO ONE HAS YET MENTIONED HIS  
18 BUSINESS ACUMEN, BUT I DO RECALL THE MEETING WHERE  
19 HE EXPLAINED SUBORDINATED DEBT TO SHERRY LANSING.  
20 SO DON'T FORGET HE HAS A GREAT FINANCIAL BACKGROUND  
21 AND MASTER'S IN BUSINESS. IT WILL SERVE YOU WELL.

22 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO HAVE DR.  
24 TROUNSON, THEN DR. FONTANA, AND THEN MARCY FEIT.

25 DR. TROUNSON: RICARDO, YOU'RE A GENTLEMAN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND A SCHOLAR, A TRUE GENTLEMAN. AND FOR ALL OF US  
2 IN MANAGEMENT, WE REALLY APPRECIATED THE INTERACTION  
3 WITH YOU. I IN PARTICULAR TREAT YOUR ADVICE AND  
4 YOUR GUIDANCE AS BEING FANTASTIC. AND I'M GOING TO  
5 MISS YOU, MATE. I REALLY AM. SO WILL ALL OF  
6 MANAGEMENT. YOU'RE A VERY SPECIAL PERSON AND  
7 SOMEBODY ON THE BOARD WE FELT THAT WE COULD GO AND  
8 TALK TO WHEN TIMES WERE A BIT BLUE AND WHEN TIMES  
9 WERE GOOD TOO. SO THANK YOU FOR BEING YOU.

10 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU.

11 DR. FONTANA: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ADD ALL  
12 THE AMAZING QUALITIES PEOPLE ARE USING TO DESCRIBE  
13 YOU WITH, YOUR KEEN MIND BOTH ACADEMICALLY,  
14 BUSINESS, YOUR ABILITY TO GET TO THE HEART OF THE  
15 SUBJECT LIKE A HOT KNIFE THROUGH BUTTER. BUT  
16 THERE'S ONE QUALITY THAT YOU HAVE IN PARTICULAR THAT  
17 I ASPIRE TO, AND IT'S YOUR ABILITY TO PUBLISH OVER  
18 200 PAPERS, SIX CHAPTERS, SO ON, SO FORTH WITH TWO  
19 FINGERS TYPING. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY PEOPLE KNOW  
20 THAT THIS MAN HAS PUBLISHED PROBABLY MORE THAN ALL  
21 OF US PUT TOGETHER WITH TWO FINGERS.

22 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU. IT'S ACTUALLY ONE  
23 FINGER.

24 MS. FEIT: DR. AZZIZ, I'M A PART-TIME  
25 NORTH CAROLINA RESIDENT, AND THEY TALK ABOUT US BACK



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE. THOSE PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA, THEY HAVE NO  
2 MONEY, YET THEY'RE SPENDING MONEY ON STEM CELL  
3 RESEARCH. SO YOU CAN INFORM THEM WHAT A WONDERFUL  
4 JOB WE'RE DOING HERE. AND I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR  
5 BEING ON THIS BOARD WITH ALL OF US. AND THE WORD  
6 THAT COMES TO MY MIND IS JUST THE COMMON SENSE THAT  
7 YOU WOULD SPEAK WHEN WE GET ALL WRAPPED UP IN WHAT  
8 WE WANT TO DO. SO THANK YOU, AND IT WAS MY HONOR TO  
9 GET TO KNOW YOU. SO YOU CAN LET THEM KNOW BACK  
10 THERE IN THE SOUTH WHAT WE'RE DOING.

11 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THANK  
12 YOU, EVERYBODY. I'LL GET THE YA'LL DOWN SOON BACK  
13 AGAIN. IT'S BEEN ACTUALLY AN HONOR AND A PRIVILEGE  
14 FOR ME TO BE HERE. THIS IS AN EXTRAORDINARY BOARD,  
15 THE DEDICATION THAT ALL OF YOU HAVE DEMONSTRATED IS  
16 TRULY EXTRAORDINARY. AS THE STATE LOOKS TO CIRM AND  
17 THE ICOC AND LOOKS TO PERHAPS WITH CONCERN ABOUT  
18 YOUR FUNCTIONS, THEY REALLY DO NEED TO KNOW HOW  
19 EXTRAORDINARILY DEDICATED YOU ARE. MOST OF ALL, I  
20 REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR FRIENDSHIPS BECAUSE I WILL  
21 MISS THAT. ALL OF YOU HAVE TAUGHT ME A TREMENDOUS  
22 AMOUNT. THAT'S WHAT I'M TAKING WITH ME TO GEORGIA.  
23 SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. LET'S DO  
25 THIS. WE'RE GOING GET A CIRM SLIDE BEHIND US, AND

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IF WE HAVE ONE OF OUR STEM CELL PICTURES, WE'RE  
2 GOING TO PRESENT TO DR. AZZIZ. IF WE COULD ALL  
3 STAND TOGETHER IN THIS PRESENTATION WITH THIS  
4 BACKDROP AND WE'LL GIVE HIM A GREAT PICTURE TO TAKE  
5 WITH HIM.

6 WITH THAT, UNLESS OTHERWISE ADVISED, THE  
7 MEETING WILL BE ADJOURNED.

8 (APPLAUSE.)

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF WE COULD REASSEMBLE  
10 FOR A MOMENT. WE NEGLECTED ENDING WITH PUBLIC  
11 COMMENT, AND WE HAVE A MEMBER IN THE AUDIENCE THAT  
12 WANTED TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT. SO I WANT EVERYONE  
13 TO PLEASE SIT DOWN FOR JUST A MINUTE. WE'RE GOING  
14 TO HAVE ONE LAST PUBLIC COMMENT. WE WERE NOT AWARE  
15 THERE WAS ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS TO BE MADE, BUT  
16 IT IS IMPORTANT ALWAYS TO GET THOSE PUBLIC COMMENTS.  
17 WE HAVE A PUBLIC COMMENT. THESE MOMENTS OF --

18 MS. KING: EVERYBODY IN THE ROOM PLEASE  
19 MAKE SOME AUDIO SPACE FOR THE PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT  
20 WE HAVE AT THE END OF THE MEETING. I'M TERRIBLY  
21 SORRY TO INTERRUPT, BUT EVERYBODY ELSE HERE HAD AN  
22 OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE THEIR COMMENTS, AND THE PEOPLE  
23 THAT WAITED THROUGH THE WHOLE MEETING HAVE NOT.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO COULD YOU PLEASE  
25 APPROACH THE PODIUM IF YOU HAVE A PUBLIC COMMENT,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND PLEASE GIVE YOUR NAME AND ANY ASSOCIATION YOU  
2 WOULD LIKE TO IDENTIFY YOURSELF WITH. I APOLOGIZE.  
3 WE WEREN'T AWARE THAT THERE WERE PUBLIC COMMENTS  
4 STILL.

5 MR. KRAMER: YOU GUYS GOT A LOT TO DO. I  
6 APPRECIATE THAT. SORRY TO HOLD YOU UP HERE. MY  
7 NAME IS TED KRAMER. MY WIFE CARLA AND I JUST WANTED  
8 TO STOP BY. I WAS AT YOUR LAST MEETING IN L. A., AND  
9 I WAS MAYBE A LITTLE BIT ABRUPT. I WANT TO  
10 APOLOGIZE FOR THAT NOW, BUT WHAT I WANTED TO TALK  
11 ABOUT IS OUR DAUGHTER EMILY.

12 SHE WAS DIAGNOSED AT 18 WITH HUNTINGTON'S  
13 DISEASE. SHE BECAME SYMPTOMATIC WHEN SHE WAS 14.  
14 SHE WAS VERY ACTIVE IN SPORTS. SHE LIKED SCHOOL,  
15 READING, FISHING, EVERYTHING THAT LITTLE KIDS DO.  
16 AND STARTING ABOUT 14 SHE BECAME SYMPTOMATIC, AND WE  
17 KIND OF WATCHED HER GO DOWNHILL AS HER BRAIN CELLS  
18 STARTED TO DIE ON HER. SHE BECAME LESS AND LESS  
19 FUNCTIONAL, COULDN'T EAT, SWALLOW, CHEW, WALK, AND  
20 IT JUST BECAME REAL HARD FOR HER. THE HARDEST THING  
21 WAS WHEN WE WERE TOLD THAT THERE WAS NO CURE, WAS NO  
22 TREATMENT, WAS NO HOPE. WITH JUVENILE THEY SAID  
23 APPROXIMATELY TEN YEARS IS WHAT THEY EXPECT FROM  
24 ONSET. WE WEREN'T REALLY SURE WHEN THAT WAS.

25 SHE RESPONDED TO THAT BY JUST ENJOYING

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EVERYTHING SHE DID. AND WE DID EVERYTHING WE COULD  
2 WITH HER. SHE SPOKE OUT. WE WERE WITH HER WHEN SHE  
3 CAME HOME FROM SCHOOL CRYING BECAUSE THE TEACHER  
4 ASKED HER IF SHE WAS RETARDED AND TOLD HER SHE  
5 SHOULD DROP THE CLASS OR SHE WAS GOING TO FLUNK, OR  
6 GOING TO KNOTTS BERRY FARM, THEY WANTED TO DRUG TEST  
7 HER BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT SHE HAD BEEN DRINKING OR ON  
8 DRUGS OR SOMETHING, BUT SHE STOOD UP TO THEM,  
9 EVERYTHING THEY THREW AT HER.

10 SHE PARTICIPATED IN ANY RESEARCH. SHE'D  
11 GET OUT AND TALK TO PEOPLE, AND SHE WAS REAL OPEN  
12 ABOUT IT. HER WISH WAS THAT THEY COULD FIND A CURE  
13 FOR HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE. YOU GUYS ARE A BIG PART  
14 OF THAT. I KNOW YOU VOTED ON A LOT OF THINGS AND  
15 SPENT A LOT OF MONEY ON HD RESEARCH. AND WE  
16 APPRECIATE THAT. WE REALLY DO.

17 LIKE I SAY, HER WISH WAS FOR A CURE, AND  
18 IT STILL IS. EMILY PASSED AWAY IN OCTOBER. SHE WAS  
19 21. ABOUT A MONTH LATER A FRIEND OF HERS, A FRIEND  
20 OF OURS ALSO PASSED AWAY. SHE ALSO HAD JUVENILE  
21 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE. THIS IS EMILY. SHE WAS, I  
22 THINK, IN ONE OF YOUR VIDEOS THAT YOU HAD. SHE HAD  
23 GONE OUT AND SEEN DR. NOLTA. THE ONE -- AND THIS  
24 WAS MARIE SALDANA. SHE PASSED A MONTH AFTER THAT  
25 ALSO WITH JUVENILE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE OF THE REALLY SHINING POINTS IS WE  
2 HEARD THE OTHER DAY FROM DR. LESLIE THOMPSON THAT  
3 HER CELLS ARE STILL GROWING. EMILY PARTICIPATED IN  
4 THE IPS CELL RESEARCH PROGRAM THEY HAD THERE. SO  
5 SHE'S STILL FIGHTING, SO ARE WE, AND JUST WANTED TO  
6 SAY WE APPRECIATE EVERYTHING YOU GUYS DO. I KNOW  
7 YOU'RE BUSY. YOU'RE GOING A THOUSAND DIFFERENT  
8 DIRECTIONS, AND YOU DO PAY ATTENTION TO EVERYTHING  
9 THAT COMES BEFORE YOU. BASICALLY THAT WAS IT.  
10 SORRY TO HOLD YOU UP.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. DR.  
12 POMEROY.

13 DR. POMEROY: YOU'RE NOT HOLDING US UP.  
14 AND I WANT TO THANK YOU BECAUSE WHAT YOU ARE DOING  
15 IS INSPIRING US. AND YOU GUYS ARE THE REASONS WE DO  
16 THIS WORK. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE  
17 TIME TO COME HERE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR  
18 COURAGE AND SHARING YOUR STORY. AND THANK YOU FOR  
19 ALL YOUR ON-GOING SUPPORT.

20 MR. KRAMER: YOU'RE WELCOME. THANK YOU.

21 MS. SAMUELSON: I AGREE. MR. CHAIRMAN, I  
22 JUST WANT TO ECHO THE LAST COMMENT. AND ALSO ASK IF  
23 WE MIGHT NOT GET COPIES OF THE PICTURES OF YOUR  
24 DAUGHTER? I THINK THAT WILL HELP US. YOUR BRIEF  
25 WORDS KEEP US PRESENT IN THE WORK THAT THE PEOPLE OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE STATE ASKED US TO DO. AND I GREATLY APPRECIATE  
2 THAT. AND IT IS HARD WITH EVERYTHING WE HAVE TO DO  
3 AND ALL THE TIME WE SPEND BETWEEN MEETINGS TO KEEP  
4 THAT FOCUS, AND SO THINGS LIKE THAT MIGHT HELP US DO  
5 THAT. THANKS SO MUCH.

6 MS. LANSING: I JUST CAN'T THANK YOU  
7 ENOUGH FOR YOUR STATEMENTS. I THINK I SPEAK FOR ALL  
8 OF US HERE IN SAYING THAT THEY WERE SO  
9 EXTRAORDINARILY MOVING. AND THE COURAGE OF YOU AND  
10 YOUR FAMILY AND YOUR DAUGHTER AND HER FRIENDS  
11 INSPIRES ALL OF US. AND I REALLY WANT TO THANK YOU  
12 FOR YOUR ADVOCACY AND FOR THE ADVOCACY THAT YOUR  
13 DAUGHTER HAD AND FOR CONTINUING TO DRAW ATTENTION TO  
14 THIS DISEASE. SO YOU INSPIRE US, AND ALSO THE WORK  
15 THAT YOU DO IS EXTRAORDINARY. SO THANK YOU.

16 MR. KRAMER: WE'RE HAPPY TO DO IT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE  
18 APPRECIATE IT.

19 (APPLAUSE.)

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE ANY ADDITIONAL  
21 PUBLIC COMMENT? WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO THANK THE  
22 STAFF FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS WORK ON THE BASIC SCIENCE  
23 RFA. HUGE EFFORT WAS PUT INTO THIS. DEDICATION,  
24 THEIR PATIENCE, THEIR BROAD VIEW OF OUR MISSION, I  
25 THINK WE SHOULD GIVE ALL OF THE STAFF A HAND OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLAUSE.

2 (APPLAUSE. )

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WITH THAT, I THINK WE CAN  
4 NOW ADJOURN.

5 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT  
6 12: 45 P. M. )

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

### REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD AT THE LOCATION INDICATED BELOW

CITY OF HOPE  
COOPER AUDITORIUM  
DUARTE, CALIFORNIA  
ON  
THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010

WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152  
BARRISTER'S REPORTING SERVICE  
1072 BRISTOL STREET  
SUITE 100  
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA  
(714) 444-4100