

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: FRESNO CONVENTION & ENTERTAINMENT CENTER
EXHIBIT HALL, 2D FLOOR
848 M STREET
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

DATE: FRIDAY, MAY 6, 2005
8:08 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 71711

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
	CALL TO ORDER	4
	PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	6
	ROLL CALL	6
	CONSENT ITEMS:	
	APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 4/7/2005	9
	REGULAR ITEMS:	
	CHAIRMAN'S REPORT	9
	PRESIDENT'S REPORT	13
	CONSIDERATION OF SITE SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PERMANENT SITE FOR CIRM	168
	CONSIDERATION OF WORKING GROUP ISSUES AND POLICIES INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY FOR FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, MEETING POLICY FOR STANDARDS WORKING GROUP AND HAVING PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS SERVE AS WORKING GROUP CHAIRS, CO-CHAIRS OR VICE-CHAIRS.	16
	CLOSED SESSION	163
	CONSIDERATION OF CIRM TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM FOR FUTURE STEM CELL RESEARCHERS DRAFT TRAINING GRANT RFA	275
	CONSIDERATION OF STATUS REPORT FROM STANDARDS WORKING GROUP SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS (ICOC PATIENT ADVOCATES, SCIENTISTS, AND MEDICAL ETHICISTS) TO THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP.	47

CONSIDERATION OF STATUS REPORT FROM 106
GRANTS WORKING GROUP SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE,
INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CONSIDERATION
OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS (ICOC PATIENT
ADVOCATES AND SCIENTISTS) TO THE
GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

CONSIDERATION OF STATUS REPORT FROM 317
FACILITIES WORKING GROUP SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE
INCLUDING THE POSSIBILITY OF A CASE STUDY
MODEL FOR FACILITIES GRANTS

CONSIDERATION OF CIRM OPERATING BUDGET 309
CIRM UPDATE TO LEGIS. BUDGET COMMITTEE

PUBLIC COMMENT 321

ADJOURNMENT 327

1 FRESNO, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, MAY 6, 2005

2 08:08 AM

3

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BRING THE MEETING TO ORDER,
5 PLEASE. WE HAVE A VERY BUSY AGENDA. IF ALL THE BOARD
6 MEMBERS COULD PLEASE BE SEATED. WE'RE GOING TO BRING THE
7 MEETING TO ORDER, AND I WOULD LIKE, AS THE FIRST ORDER OF
8 BUSINESS BEFORE WELCOMING, IF MELISSA KING WOULD PLEASE
9 EXPLAIN THE OPERATION OF THE MICROPHONES TO THE BOARD AND
10 TO STAFF.

11 MS. KING: THOSE OF YOU THAT HAVE A BLUE
12 MICROPHONE HAVE AN ON-OFF BUTTON LEAVE AND ARE ABLE TO
13 LEAVE YOUR MICROPHONES ON. BOB, WOULD YOU HOLD UP YOUR
14 MICROPHONE AND SHOW THE BOARD.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHE'S REFERRING TO THIS BUTTON
16 HERE.

17 MS. KING: EVERYBODY WHO HAS ONE OF THOSE
18 MICROPHONES, GRAB THE NUMBER CARD IN FRONT OF IT AND HOLD
19 IT UP, PLEASE, SO THE LADY IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM CAN
20 SEE IT. IF YOU HAVE A BLUE MICROPHONE WITH AN ON-OFF
21 BUTTON, HOLD YOUR NUMBER UP, PLEASE, AND SHE'LL TURN THEM
22 ON.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF THE AUDIENCE WOULD PLEASE
24 AWARD PRIZES.

25 MS. KING: THANK YOU. SO THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE

1 THOSE MICROPHONES, IF YOU COULD MAKE SURE THAT THE ON-OFF
2 SWITCH IS IN THE OFF POSITION WHEN YOU'RE NOT SPEAKING,
3 THAT WOULD BE GREAT. WE HAVE A VERY POWERFUL AUDIO
4 SYSTEM, SO WE DON'T WANT THEM ALL ON AT ONCE SO WE GET
5 FEEDBACK FOR EVERY LITTLE SCRATCH YOU MAKE ON A PIECE OF
6 PAPER.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MELISSA, FOR THOSE WHO DO NOT
8 HAVE THAT TYPE OF MICROPHONE, HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?

9 MS. KING: THOSE OF YOU WHO DO NOT HAVE THAT
10 TYPE OF MICROPHONE, EITHER USE YOUR NEIGHBOR'S MICROPHONE
11 OR HOLD UP YOUR NUMBER CARD, AND WE'LL TURN YOUR
12 MICROPHONE ON. THERE'S A SMALL NUMBER CARD IN FRONT OF
13 YOU, DR. PIZZO, IF YOU WOULD HOLD THAT UP, THEY'LL TURN
14 YOUR MIC ON FOR YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WHEN I IDENTIFY A SPEAKER,
16 IF YOU DO NOT HAVE THIS TYPE OF MICROPHONE FIRST
17 IDENTIFIED, IF YOU WILL IDENTIFY YOUR NUMBER, IT WILL
18 HELP THE AUDIO PERSON IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM TO MAKE
19 CERTAIN IT IS ON AS YOU SPEAK.

20 WELCOME TO THE ICOC, THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE
21 FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE'S MEETING. I WENT TO HIGH
22 SCHOOL HERE IN FRESNO, FRESNO HIGH. AND THE HOTEL
23 CALIFORNIAN, WHICH YOU MIGHT RECOGNIZE FROM A FAMOUS
24 SONG, IS ABOUT TWO BLOCKS OVER. SO WE ARE HERE IN THE
25 HEARTLAND TO CELEBRATE THE ADVANCEMENT OF A NEW FRONTIER

1 OF SCIENCE. AND WE APPRECIATE DR. PRECIADO'S HOSPITALITY
2 FROM THE GOOD PEOPLE OF FRESNO. MY FATHER WAS THE FIRST
3 CITY MANAGER, SO I HAVE LONGTIME TIES TO THIS CITY AND TO
4 THIS REGION.

5 WE HAVE TO COVER A NUMBER OF VERY IMPORTANT
6 ITEMS. AND IT IS IN THE INTEREST OF MAKING CERTAIN THAT
7 WE GET A NUMBER OF THE VERY CRITICAL ITEMS DEALING WITH
8 OUR SCIENCE COVERED THAT I HAVE REORDERED THE AGENDA TO
9 SOME EXTENT. BASICALLY THE KEY THING TO UNDERSTAND IS
10 THAT THE CONSIDERATION OF THE WORKING GROUPS, GRANTS AND
11 STANDARDS, HAS BEEN MOVED BEFORE THE LUNCH AND BEFORE THE
12 EXECUTIVE SESSION, AND THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SITE
13 SUBCOMMITTEE HAS BEEN MOVED RIGHT AFTER THE EXECUTIVE
14 SESSION.

15 WE ARE ALL ENTHUSIASTIC, AND WE HAVE A
16 TREMENDOUS COMMITMENT TO THE SITE SEARCH. SCIENCE IS OUR
17 MISSION, AND WE NEED TO PUT IT RIGHT UP FRONT.

18 IF MELISSA KING COULD LEAD US IN THE PLEDGE OF
19 ALLEGIANCE.

20 (THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND, MS. KING, WILL YOU PLEASE
22 CALL THE ROLL.

23 MS. KING: DR. PAUL JENNINGS FOR DAVID
24 BALTIMORE.

25 DR. JENNINGS: (NODS HEAD.)

1 MS. KING: DR. BOB PRICE FOR DR. BIRGENEAU.
2 DR. PRICE: HERE.
3 MS. KING: DR. KEITH BLACK.
4 DR. BLACK: HERE.
5 MS. KING: DR. SUSAN BRYANT.
6 DR. BRYANT: HERE.
7 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
8 MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.
9 MS. KING: DR. FRANK MARKLAND FOR BRIAN
10 HENDERSON.
11 DR. MARKLAND: HERE.
12 MS. KING: DR. EDWARD HOLMES.
13 DR. HOLMES: HERE.
14 MS. KING: DR. DAVID KESSLER.
15 DR. KESSLER: HERE.
16 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.
18 MS. KING: MS. SHERRY LANSING.
19 MS. LANSING: HERE.
20 MS. KING: DR. GERALD LEVEY.
21 DR. LEVEY: HERE.
22 MS. KING: DR. TED LOVE.
23 DR. LOVE: HERE.
24 MS. KING: DR. RICHARD MURPHY.
25 DR. MURPHY: HERE.

1 MS. KING: DR. TINA NOVA.
2 DR. NOVA: HERE.
3 MS. KING: DR. ED PENHOET.
4 DR. PENHOET: HERE.
5 MS. KING: DR. PHILIP PIZZO.
6 DR. PIZZO: HERE.
7 MS. KING: DR. CLAIRE POMEROY.
8 DR. POMEROY: HERE.
9 MS. KING: DR. PHYLLIS PRECIADO.
10 DR. PRECIADO: HERE.
11 MS. KING: DR. FRANCISCO PRIETO.
12 DR. PRIETO: HERE.
13 MS. KING: DR. JEANNIE FONTANA HERE FOR JOHN
14 REED.
15 DR. FONTANA: HERE.
16 MS. KING: MS. JOAN SAMUELSON.
17 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.
18 MS. KING: MR. DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
19 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HERE.
20 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
21 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.
22 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK. DR. OSWALD
23 STEWARD.
24 DR. STEWARD: HERE.
25 MS. KING: DR. LEON THAL.

1 DR. THAL: HERE.

2 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

3 MS. WILSON: HERE.

4 MS. KING: DR. JANET WRIGHT.

5 DR. WRIGHT: HERE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE'LL GO
7 STRAIGHT TO PUBLIC COMMENTS. ARE THERE PUBLIC COMMENTS
8 BEFORE WE BEGIN THE FORMAL AGENDA? SEEING NO PUBLIC
9 COMMENTS, WE WILL GO TO AGENDA ITEM 4, CONSENT ITEMS.

10 THE FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS OUR CONSENT ITEM
11 OF LAST MONTH'S BOARD MEETING MINUTES. IS THERE A MOTION
12 TO PASS THIS CONSENT ITEM?

13 DR. PIZZO: SO MOVED.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY DR. PIZZO.

15 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECONDED BY DR. WRIGHT. IS
17 THERE DISCUSSION? IS THERE PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THIS
18 ITEM? SEEING NO DISCUSSION, I'LL CALL THE QUESTION. ALL
19 IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? ITEM PASSES.

20 AGENDA ITEM 5, THE CHAIRMAN'S REPORT. GIVEN THE
21 SCHEDULE TODAY, I WILL ATTEMPT TO BE BRIEF. I WANT TO
22 ACCENTUATE TWO TOPICS. THE FIRST TOPIC DEALS WITH
23 PENDING STATE LEGISLATION DEALING WITH THE CONSTITUTIONAL
24 AMENDMENT AND ACCOMPANYING LEGISLATION. I WOULD LIKE TO
25 FOCUS EVERYONE ON THE VERY THOUGHTFUL LETTERS THAT ARE IN

1 YOUR BINDERS WHERE CAL TECH, USC, STANFORD, AND UC HAVE
2 ALL WRITTEN TO THE LEGISLATURE ABOUT THEIR CONCERNS ON
3 THE LEGISLATION.

4 THIS IS A PHENOMENAL COLLABORATION OF VISION
5 REALIZED HERE, THAT WE HAVE A NORTH-SOUTH COLLABORATION,
6 ALL LOOKING AT SCIENCE AND OUR MISSION TOGETHER. BUT TO
7 HAVE BOB *HINDS, THE PRESIDENT OF THE ENTIRE UC SYSTEM;
8 DAVID BALTIMORE, THE PRESIDENT OF CAL TECH AND A MEMBER
9 OF OUR BOARD, NOT ABLE TO BE HERE TODAY, BUT SENT AN
10 ALTERNATE; THE PRESIDENT OF STANFORD, DR. HENNESSEY; AND
11 THE PRESIDENT OF USC, DR. SAMPLE, ALL TO AGREE THAT THERE
12 ARE FUNDAMENTALLY SOME MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH THE
13 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED AND THE ADJOINING
14 LEGISLATION IS A TREMENDOUS UNITED STATEMENT.

15 WE HOPE THAT INDIVIDUALS WILL LOOK BENEATH THE
16 SURFACE AT THE SUBSTANCE OF THESE ISSUES BECAUSE THOSE --
17 ALL OF THOSE ON THE BOARD, ALL OF THOSE IN THE PUBLIC,
18 SEVEN MILLION, WHO CREATED THE MANDATE FOR PROP 71, 59
19 PERCENT OF THE VOTE, ARE FOCUSED ON THE VERY BEST SCIENCE
20 AND THE VERY BEST STRUCTURE TO ADVANCE THE SEARCH FOR
21 MEDICAL THERAPIES.

22 I WOULD INDICATE THE ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAL
23 UNIVERSITIES HAS AN ATTACHED LETTER AS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF
24 THIS CONCERN, AND THE CALIFORNIA HEALTHCARE INSTITUTE,
25 WHICH IS A COLLABORATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND THE BIOTECH

1 SECTOR, ALSO HAVE A LETTER ON FILE. WE WILL NOT GO INTO
2 ANY SIGNIFICANT REVIEW OF THIS LEGISLATION TODAY. BUT I
3 WANT TO POINT OUT THAT A REAL BROAD CONSENSUS IS FORMING
4 IN OUR SOCIETY, THAT THIS LEGISLATION AND THE PROPOSED
5 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NEED TO BE SERIOUSLY LOOKED AT
6 IN-DEPTH BEYOND THE NOMINAL STATEMENTS THAT ARE BEING
7 MADE, WHICH ARE NOT BACKED UP BY GOOD SCIENCE OR A GOOD
8 UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCIENTIFIC PROCESS.

9 THE SECOND TOPIC IS A BRIDGE FINANCING PROPOSAL
10 TO ALLOW US TO MOVE FORWARD ON OUR CRITICAL GRANT PROGRAM
11 IN THE FACE OF LITIGATION. THIS IS NOT AN ACTION ITEM
12 TODAY. IT'S AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM TO MAKE IT CLEAR TO
13 EVERYONE THAT IN ORDER TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT A SMALL
14 MINORITY OF INDIVIDUALS NATIONALLY, RIGHT TO LIFE LEGAL
15 DEFENSE FUND, A GROUP THAT IS AN ANTICHOICE GROUP, THAT
16 IS AGAINST IN VITRO FERTILIZATION CLINICS, A GROUP THAT
17 IS AGAINST -- WAS AGAINST PROPOSITION 71, THEY ARE THE
18 LEGAL COUNSEL ON THE LITIGATION TO TRY AND SLOW DOWN THIS
19 INITIATIVE.

20 THEY HAVE FILED A SUIT TO TRY AND STOP US FROM
21 PUTTING MONEY OUT TO HONOR OUR MANDATE TO THE VOTERS.
22 WE'RE LOOKING AT THE POTENTIAL OF PUTTING TOGETHER \$100
23 MILLION FROM VARIOUS CHARITABLE DONORS THAT WOULD CREATE
24 A BRIDGE FINANCING OF OUR PROGRAMS SO THAT WE CAN MOVE
25 FORWARD AND HONOR THIS MANDATE FROM THE PUBLIC SO THAT WE

1 CAN HIRE ALL OF OUR SCIENTIFIC STAFF ON OUR SCHEDULE AND
2 MAKE CERTAIN THAT THIS MOMENTUM TO DEVELOP NEW RESEARCH
3 TO ADVANCE MEDICAL THERAPIES IS NOT SLOWED DOWN.

4 AS NANCY REAGAN SAID, WE CANNOT AFFORD TO LOSE
5 ANY MORE TIME. UNDER THIS BRIDGE FACILITY, THE
6 PHILANTHROPISTS, CHARITABLE GIVERS WOULD LOAN THE MONEY
7 INTO THE INSTITUTE AND ITS PROGRAMS. WHEN THE BONDS WERE
8 SOLD, THEY WOULD BE PAID BACK. THERE WOULD BE NO
9 LIABILITY TO THE STATE. IF FOR SOME TOTALLY UNKNOWN
10 REASON WE WERE NOT ABLE TO ISSUE BONDS AT ANY TIME
11 BECAUSE OF THIS LITIGATION, THE LOAN WOULD BECOME A
12 GRANT. SO THE STATE WOULD HAVE NO LIABILITY UNDER THIS.
13 THIS IS A PLAN THAT ALLOWS US TO BRING THE TREMENDOUS
14 CIVIC OUTPOURINGS OF THE STATE WE'VE SEEN IN THE
15 COMPETITION FOR THE SITES WHERE TREMENDOUS CHARITABLE
16 DONORS HAVE JOINED WITH THE CITIES TO BRING THESE
17 PHENOMENAL PROPOSALS IN FRONT OF US. IT IS TO GIVE THEM
18 AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF AN
19 ENTIRE FRONTIER OF MEDICAL SCIENCE. IT IS AN OPPORTUNITY
20 WHERE THEY CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT A MOVEMENT BORN IN
21 CALIFORNIA WILL BE HONORED, AND A MANDATE OF THE VOTERS
22 CANNOT BE DENIED BY A SMALL GROUP OF PEOPLE THAT DO NOT
23 RESPECT DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AND DO NOT RESPECT THAT
24 CHRONIC ILLNESS BRINGS SUFFERING AND DAILY DAMAGE TO
25 THESE PATIENTS OF FAMILIES THAT LIVE THROUGH THIS YEAR

1 AFTER YEAR.

2 I WOULD LIKE TO ALSO ANNOUNCE THAT BASED UPON A
3 MEETING THAT DR. ZACH HALL AND I AND ED PENHOET HAD WITH
4 THE GOVERNOR EARLIER THIS WEEK, THAT THE GOVERNOR IS VERY
5 EXCITED ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION AND THE PROGRESS WITH
6 PROP 71. AND HE'S AGREED TO BE OUR KEYNOTE SPEAKER AT
7 THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE WE HOST OR CO-HOST
8 SOMETIME THIS SUMMER OR EARLY FALL.

9 WE BELIEVE THIS WILL BRING THE MEDIA ATTENTION
10 TO SCIENCE, WHICH IS OUR CORE MISSION, AND IT IS
11 SOMETHING TO CELEBRATE. WITH THE GOVERNOR'S TREMENDOUS
12 CHALLENGES, HE IS GOING TO MAKE THIS A PRIORITY IN HIS
13 SCHEDULE TO REALLY BACK THIS INITIATIVE THAT HE ENDORSED
14 SO EARLY, ALONG WITH THE TREASURER, THE CONTROLLER, THE
15 ATTORNEY GENERAL, AND THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR.

16 I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE FORWARD AT THIS TIME AND GO
17 TO THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT. DR. ZACH HALL, YOU HAVE THE
18 FLOOR.

19 THE STAFF REMINDS ME, QUITE PROPERLY, TO SEE IF
20 THERE'S ANY ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT AT THIS POINT OR
21 MEMBERS' COMMENTS ON THE INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS. LET ME
22 TAKE MEMBERS FIRST. ANY MEMBERS COMMENTS ON THE
23 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS? NO MEMBERS' COMMENTS. PUBLIC
24 COMMENT? DR. HALL, YOU HAVE THE FLOOR.

25 DR. HALL: THANK YOU, BOB. WE HAVE SOME

1 AUDIOVISUAL DIFFICULTY HERE. I HAVE A POWERPOINT
2 PRESENTATION. THOSE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, YOU HAVE
3 IT IN YOUR NOTEBOOKS UNDER, I THINK IT'S, TAB 6; IS THAT
4 RIGHT? AND FOR OTHERS, WE'LL TRY TO GET IT WORKING AS
5 SOON AS POSSIBLE. THERE'S NOTHING OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE
6 ON IT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, YOUR MICROPHONE IS
8 ON, BUT IT APPEARS TO BE SENSITIVE TO WHERE YOU ARE
9 STANDING. SO IF YOU WILL FOCUS ON SPEAKING INTO IT.

10 DR. HALL: CAN I BE HEARD HERE? JUST DON'T
11 MOVE. SO WE'VE HAD QUITE A BUSY MONTH. BUT RATHER THAN
12 GO THROUGH SOME OF OUR ACTIVITIES, IN THE INTEREST OF
13 TIME TODAY WITH OUR BUSY SCHEDULE, I WOULD LIKE TO COVER
14 TWO THINGS. YOUR NOTES THERE WILL TELL YOU ABOUT SOME OF
15 THE THINGS THAT I WILL DISCUSS TODAY. BUT THE TWO
16 CRITICAL THINGS THAT I WANT TO TALK ABOUT IS, FIRST OF
17 ALL, TO INTRODUCE TO YOU DR. ARLENE CHIU, WHO HAS JOINED
18 US FROM NIH. PLEASE GIVE HER A WELCOME.

19 (APPLAUSE.)

20 DR. HALL: SHE'S A TERRIFIC ADDITION TO OUR
21 STAFF. AS YOU KNOW, SHE'S GOING TO BE THE DIRECTOR OF
22 OUR SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM AND REVIEW. AND WE HAVE -- SHE
23 ARRIVED ON WEDNESDAY, AND WE'VE ALREADY PUT HER TO WORK
24 IMMEDIATELY. AT ANY RATE, SHE IS GOING TO BE THE
25 CORNERSTONE OF OUR SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM, AND WE ARE

1 DELIGHTED TO HAVE HER JOIN US.

2 THE SECOND THING I JUST WANTED TO CALL YOUR
3 ATTENTION TO, THAT AMONG OTHER THINGS THAT WE'VE DONE, A
4 COUPLE OF OUR ACTIVITIES THIS MONTH, WE DID MEET RIGHT
5 AFTER THE LAST ICOC MEETING, AT LEAST MARY MAXON DID,
6 MADE A VISIT TO UCLA. AND SHE ALSO ATTENDED A MEETING IN
7 SAN DIEGO AND ACTUALLY WENT TO A STEM CELL LAB COURSE
8 SPONSORED BY THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF ORANGE COUNTY AND
9 BURNHAM INSTITUTE, WHICH WAS VERY HELPFUL TO US IN TRYING
10 TO UNDERSTAND SOME OF THE CHALLENGES OF PROVIDING, NOT
11 ONLY LABORATORY SPACE, BUT ALSO COURSEWORK FOR THE
12 STUDENTS, PEOPLE WHO WOULD BE INTERESTED IN LEARNING
13 THESE TECHNIQUES. AND THAT WILL INFLUENCE WHAT I'LL TALK
14 ABOUT LATER.

15 FINALLY, I JUST WANTED TO CALL YOUR INFORMATION
16 TO AN INFORMATION ITEM. WE HAVE BEGUN EXPLORATORY TALKS
17 WITH THE PUBLIC LIBRARY OF SCIENCE CALLED PLOS, AND THAT
18 IS A GROUP THAT HAS STARTED TO SERIES OF OPEN ACCESS
19 JOURNALS. THESE ARE WEB-BASED JOURNALS IN WHICH ARTICLES
20 ARE POSTED ON THE WEB AND ARE AVAILABLE TO ANYBODY AND
21 EVERYBODY WHO WANTS TO SEE THEM. THEY HAVE TWO JOURNALS.
22 ONE IS CALLED PLOS BIOLOGY AND THE OTHER IS CALLED PLOS
23 MEDICINE. THEY'RE EXTREMELY HIGH QUALITY. AND ONE OF
24 THE THINGS THAT WE LIKE ABOUT THEM IS THEY HAVE WONDERFUL
25 EXPLANATORY ARTICLES IN THE BEGINNING ABOUT EACH OF THE

1 SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES.

2 WE THINK THERE COULD BE A REAL OPPORTUNITY HERE
3 FOR HAVING AN OPEN-ACCESS JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STEM CELL
4 RESEARCH. AND WE HOPE TO WORK WITH THEM TO BRING THAT
5 ABOUT. WE PLAN TO HAVE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE
6 INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH IN JUNE AT
7 THEIR MEETING AND HOPE THEY WILL JOIN US AS A THIRD
8 PARTNER. WE THINK THIS COULD BE OF TREMENDOUS HELP IN
9 BRINGING THE RESULTS OF OUR RESEARCH TO THE PUBLIC
10 IMMEDIATELY. I WOULD ENCOURAGE ALL OF YOU TO GO ON-LINE
11 AND LOOK AT THEIR JOURNALS. IT'S PLOS, AND I THINK YOU
12 WILL BE IMPRESSED.

13 THAT'S REALLY ALL I WANTED TO TALK ABOUT WITH
14 RESPECT TO THESE TOPICS. I NOW WANT TO TURN -- GO AHEAD
15 WITH THE NEXT TOPIC; IS THAT RIGHT, BOB? I JUST WANT TO
16 MAKE SURE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, IN ORDER TO
18 OFFICIALLY ADVANCE THIS PROGRAM, WOULD LIKE TO GO TO
19 AGENDA ITEM 6 THAT ADDRESS -- EXCUSE ME -- AGENDA ITEM 8
20 TO ADDRESS THE BASIC GOVERNANCE OF THE WORKING GROUPS.

21 DR. HALL: THIS IS REALLY A CONTINUATION OF A
22 DISCUSSION THAT WE HAD AT THE LAST MEETING, AND IT
23 ATTEMPTS TO RESOLVE SEVERAL OF THE ISSUES. AND THEN ALSO
24 TO CONTINUE SOME OF THOSE ACTIVITIES. THAT IS IN YOUR --
25 EVERYBODY HAS FOUND THE RIGHT TABS FOR THAT, TAB 8.

1 THE FIRST IS, IF YOU RECALL AT OUR LAST MEETING,
2 WE DEALT WITH CONFLICT OF INTEREST ISSUES FOR TWO OF OUR
3 THREE WORKING GROUPS; THAT IS, THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING
4 GROUP AND THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP. WE PRESENT AND IT
5 SHOULD BE IN YOUR BOUND MATERIAL A CONFLICT OF INTEREST
6 POLICY NOW FOR OUR THIRD WORKING GROUP, WHICH IS THE
7 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP.

8 SINCE THEY WILL MAKING GRANTS AND WORKING WITH
9 THOSE WHO HAVE APPLICATION FOR FACILITIES, THIS CONFLICT
10 OF INTEREST STATEMENT IS MODELED ON THE GRANTS REVIEW
11 STATEMENT, BUT WITH APPROPRIATE MODIFICATIONS FOR
12 FACILITIES.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, TAB 8, YOU ARE ALSO
14 GOING TO COVER THE GOVERNANCE ITEM UNDER TAB 8.

15 DR. HALL: THAT COMES. I'VE GOT ABOUT THREE
16 ITEMS HERE. I'LL MOVE RIGHT THROUGH THEM. I PROMISE.
17 REVIEWERS WILL BE REQUIRED TO DISQUALIFY THEMSELVES FROM
18 APPLICATION IF THERE IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, AND IT
19 WILL BE OUR JOB TO WORK WITH THEM TO IDENTIFY THOSE.
20 THIS IS AN INFORMATION ITEM. YOU HAVE THE MATERIAL IN
21 YOUR NOTEBOOK. PLEASE LOOK AT IT, COMMENT ON IT IN OUR
22 NEXT MEETING. WE WILL HAVE AN ACTION ITEM ON THIS ISSUE.

23 THE SECOND THING I WANTED TO BRING UP WAS ALSO
24 UNFINISHED BUSINESS. WE HAD A DISCUSSION LAST ICOC
25 MEETING ABOUT WHETHER THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP SHOULD

1 HAVE CLOSED CONFIDENTIAL MEETINGS AS ORIGINALLY
2 ENVISAGED, SHOULD HAVE OPEN MEETINGS OR SHOULD HAVE A
3 COMBINATION. AND THE SENSE OF THE GROUP WAS THAT WE
4 WOULD LIKE TO BE OPEN AS POSSIBLE IN THESE MEETINGS, BUT
5 WOULD LIKE TO HAVE, IF POSSIBLE, A MORE WORKABLE VERSION
6 OF THE BAGLEY-KEENE STRICTURES.

7 AND SO WE HAVE ENGAGED A LAWYER, KENNETH
8 TAYMORE, WHO HAS AGREED ON A PRO BONO BASIS TO HELP US
9 RESOLVE THESE ISSUES. HE IS WORKING WITH MARY MAXON AND
10 CHRISTINA OLSSON. THEY HAVE BEGUN THEIR WORK BY TRYING
11 TO DEFINE THE TASK OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP BASED
12 ON PROPOSITION 71. AND THERE'S A SUMMARY OF THAT IN
13 DOCUMENT IN YOUR MATERIAL, BUT A REPORT ON THIS WILL BE
14 AT THE NEXT MEETING. I JUST WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT
15 WE ARE WORKING ON IT. AND KEN HAS DONE A TERRIFIC JOB
16 AND HAS ALREADY SPENT QUITE A BIT OF TIME ON THIS ISSUE
17 SO WE WOULD HOPE HAVE SOMETHING TO REPORT TO YOU.

18 THE NEXT ITEM IS AN ITEM THAT CAME UP LAST TIME
19 AS WE TALKED ABOUT THE NECESSITY FOR THE WORKING GROUPS
20 TO HAVE CHAIRS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS ISSUE. AND
21 JEFF SHEEHY RAISED THE POSSIBILITY OF HAVING A PATIENT
22 ADVOCATE INVOLVED IN LEADERSHIP OF OUR WORKING GROUPS.
23 AND SO I HAVE TWO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOU BASED ON
24 DISCUSSIONS WITH ICOC BOARD MEMBERS AND FOLLOWING UP ON
25 JEFF'S RECOMMENDATION.

1 THE FIRST DEALS WITH THE GRANTS REVIEW
2 COMMITTEE, AND WE RECOMMEND THAT THE SCIENTIFIC
3 EVALUATION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS IN GRANTS REVIEW BE
4 CHAIRED BY A SCIENTIFIC MEMBER OF THE WORKING GROUP WHO
5 IS A CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE WHO PRESIDES OVER THE
6 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW AS ENVISAGED IN THE PROPOSITION, WORKS
7 TO STAFF ASSIGN REVIEWERS FOR EACH OF THE GRANTS, TO
8 SCIENTIFIC AD HOCS TO FILL OPEN SLOTS FROM SCIENTIFIC
9 ALTERNATES. WE PROPOSE THAT THERE BE A VICE CHAIR WHO IS
10 A PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBER OF THE WORKING GROUP AND WILL
11 PRESIDE OVER A DISCUSSION AFTER THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
12 ABOUT OTHER GRANTS MAY WISH TO BE -- THE COMMITTEE MAY
13 WISH TO BRING BEFORE THIS GROUP FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION
14 BASED ON CONSIDERATIONS THAT MAY BE IN ADDITION TO THOSE
15 OF SCIENTIFIC MERIT. THAT IS, UNUSUAL INNOVATION, THAT
16 IS PORTFOLIO BALANCE, PARTICULAR DISEASES THAT MAY NOT BE
17 COVERED, THAT IS BASED ON PERSPECTIVES FROM PATIENT
18 ADVOCATES OR OTHER POINT OF VIEW OR SCIENTIFIC POINT OF
19 VIEW THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ADDITION.

20 SO WE PROPOSE THAT THE VICE CHAIR THEN WOULD
21 PRESIDE OVER THIS PART OF THE MEETING AND WOULD ACT AS
22 THE LIAISON BETWEEN THE CIRM STAFF AND ICOC MEMBERS ON
23 THE COMMITTEE THAT WILL BE PATIENT ADVOCATES. SO I DON'T
24 KNOW IF YOU WANT TO HAVE A DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THIS,
25 OR YOU WANT TO MOVE AHEAD TO THE NEXT AND CONSIDER

1 EVERYTHING AT ONCE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHY DON'T WE HAVE DISCUSSION BY
3 THE BOARD AND SEE IF THERE'S PUBLIC COMMENTS THIS ITEM.

4 DR. HALL: SO THIS IS JUST A QUESTION OF --
5 THERE'S NO NAMES ABOUT WHO THESE SHOULD BE, JUST A
6 QUESTION OF WHERE THE ROLES OF THESE PEOPLE AND WHAT
7 THEY'RE QUALIFICATIONS SHOULD BE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.

9 DR. POMEROY: JUST A QUESTION, ZACH. HOW ARE
10 YOU PROPOSING THAT THESE PEOPLE WOULD BE CHOSEN? THE
11 PROCESS TO IDENTIFY THE CHAIR AND THE VICE CHAIR AND HOW
12 LONG MIGHT THEY SERVE IN THOSE ROLES? IN OTHER WORDS,
13 WOULD IT BE ROTATING OR --

14 DR. HALL: THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS A SPECIFIC
15 SUGGESTION FOR THE CHAIR, AND THAT WILL BE TAKEN UP IN ED
16 HOLMES' REPORT. AND AS FAR AS I KNOW, THE QUESTION OF
17 HOW THE VICE CHAIR WOULD BE SELECTED IS OPEN. BUT
18 PRESUMABLY IT WOULD BE SELECTED BY THIS COMMITTEE.

19 DR. POMEROY: SO OKAY. THE SEARCH COMMITTEE IS
20 IN PLACE RIGHT NOW, AND SO THEY CAN FORWARD A SUGGESTION
21 FOR THE FIRST CHAIR TO US.

22 DR. HALL: YES.

23 DR. POMEROY: AFTER THAT HOW WOULD IT HAPPEN?

24 DR. HALL: WE HAVE NO PROVISION. IF YOU WISH TO
25 MAKE A SUGGESTION FOR THAT AND INCLUDE IT IN THE

1 RESOLUTION, THAT WOULD BE FINE. THE QUESTION HERE IS
2 JUST TO IDENTIFY WHO THEY SHOULD BE AND TO GET US GOING.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AT THIS MOMENT WE'RE UNDER THE
4 DISCUSSION OF THE ITEM. LET'S SEE IF WE HAVE MORE
5 DISCUSSION AND SEE IF WE HAVE A MOTION.

6 DR. PRECIADO: I THINK WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT A
7 PROCESS OF REACHING OUT FOR A CO-CHAIR, NOT JUST SORT OF
8 OPEN, LEAVING IT OPEN.

9 DR. HALL: I DON'T PROPOSE WE LEAVE IT OPEN.
10 IT'S NOT -- THE ITEM ON THE TABLE HERE IS NOT TO DECIDE
11 WHO IT IS, BUT JUST TO DECIDE FROM WHAT GROUP OF PEOPLE
12 IT SHOULD BE DRAWN.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT DR. HALL IS SUGGESTING IS
14 THAT IT'S A PERFECTLY IMPORTANT SECOND STEP. HE JUST
15 IDENTIFIED THE FIRST STEP IS TO CREATE, I BELIEVE, IT'S A
16 CHAIR OF THE GRANTS GROUP. THAT'S A SCIENTIFIC FIELD,
17 SCIENTIFIC GROUP, PATIENT ADVOCATES A CO-CHAIRS OF THE
18 STANDARDS COMMITTEE. HE'S TRYING TO SEE IF THIS CONCEPT
19 IS ACCEPTED. THEN AS A SEPARATE ITEM IS HOW THOSE
20 INDIVIDUALS ARE SELECTED AND CONFIRMED.

21 DR. HALL: IT'S JUST FOLLOWING UP. AS I SAY,
22 JEFF HAD RAISED THIS QUESTION, MR. SHEEHY, AT THE LAST
23 MEETING, SO I THOUGHT IT WAS A GOOD SUGGESTION, AND WE
24 HAVE FOLLOWED UP WITH A PROPOSAL BASED ON THAT.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HOLMES.

1 DR. HOLMES: TWO COMMENTS. FIRST, ZACH, I
2 APPLAUD WHAT YOU RECOMMENDED. I THINK IT'S A VERY
3 LOGICAL ONE FOR A CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR. I AS ONE PERSON
4 SUPPORT THAT. I PUT FORWARD TO THE GROUP, MAYBE IN THE
5 INTEREST OF TIME, I DO THIS WITH HESITATION SINCE OUR
6 SUBGROUP HAS TO MEET AGAIN, BUT OUR SUBGROUP COULD
7 DEVELOP SOME RECOMMENDATIONS, IF YOU WANT, TO BRING BACK
8 TO THE GROUP AS HOW TO THE PROCESS MIGHT WORK TO SELECT A
9 CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR. IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, WE COULD
10 BRING THAT BACK. I'M SORRY, SUBGROUP MEMBERS, THAT I DID
11 THAT TO YOU.

12 DR. PIZZO: I WELCOME DR. HOLMES' SUGGESTION. I
13 THINK THERE ARE A NUMBER OF ISSUES HERE THAT ARE REALLY
14 IMPORTANT. AND THIS WOULD BE QUITE A GOOD FORUM TO ALLOW
15 US TO DO THAT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, CAN I GET SHERRY
17 LANSING'S COMMENTS?

18 MS. LANSING: I JUST TO WANTED TO SAY -- WHEN WE
19 HAD OUR MEETING, THERE WAS A LOT OF QUESTION AS TO WHO
20 WOULD BE THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR. WOULD THE CHAIR BE
21 FROM THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY OR WOULD IT BE A PATIENT
22 ADVOCATE? AND OUR SUBGROUP COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATION
23 WAS THAT THE CHAIR BE FROM THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND
24 BE ONE OF THE PEER REVIEW SCIENTISTS AND THAT THE PATIENT
25 ADVOCATE BE THE VICE CHAIR.

1 I THINK INITIALLY WHAT WE THOUGHT IS THAT THE
2 SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD VOTE ON WHO THEY THOUGHT WOULD BE --
3 IN SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS WHO THEY THOUGHT SHOULD BE THE
4 PATIENT ADVOCATE VICE CHAIR, ALL THE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND
5 ALSO THE SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD VOTE ON WHO THEY THOUGHT
6 SHOULD BE THE CHAIR BECAUSE THIS WOULD BE THE WORKING
7 GROUP. THEY WOULD THEN COME TO US, AND WE WOULD
8 HOPEFULLY APPROVE IT. BUT IT SHOULD COME FROM THE
9 SUBGROUP BECAUSE THEY'RE THE ONES THAT ARE WORKING
10 TOGETHER. WE DON'T NEED TO DECIDE THAT TODAY. THAT WAS
11 OUR INITIAL THOUGHT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ANY ADDITIONAL
13 BOARD COMMENT ON THIS ITEM? DR -- YES, JOAN SAMUELSON.
14 I ALMOST MADE YOU A DOCTOR.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: THAT'S FINE. MY PARENTS THANK
16 YOU. THE CHEAPEST DEGREE I WOULD HAVE.

17 I THINK IT MAKES SENSE FOR US TO REFLECT ON THIS
18 A BIT MORE. I HAD A LITTLE OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE
19 PROPOSAL WITH DR. HALL YESTERDAY FOR THE FIRST TIME AND
20 THOUGHT ABOUT IT A BIT. ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT I SEE
21 RAISED IS THE JOB DESCRIPTION FOR THE VICE CHAIR INCLUDES
22 SUPERVISION OF A PROCESS THAT REALLY INVOLVES A LOT OF
23 STRATEGIC PLANNING ISSUES. WHAT WOULD THE PORTFOLIO
24 GRANTS LOOK LIKE? WHAT DISEASES WOULD BE ANTICIPATED TO
25 BE DEALT WITH, AND THE LIKE? AND THOSE ARE ISSUES THAT

1 INFORM THE PEER REVIEW.

2 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT'S A BIT BACKWARDS AND
3 THAT THE ISSUE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR THE OVERALL
4 GRANT PORTFOLIO IS ABOUT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING WE'RE
5 GOING TO ADDRESS, AND I THINK IT'S AWFULLY IMPORTANT THAT
6 THAT BE DONE DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY BEFORE WE GET INTO
7 PEER REVIEW OF SPECIFIC GRANTS.

8 SO THAT'S JUST MY THOUGHT. I WOULD LOVE TO HEAR
9 THE THOUGHTS OF THE REST OF THE COMMITTEE. I WOULDN'T
10 WANT US TO APPLY A GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE ONTO IT BEFORE WE
11 REALLY HAVE THE ABILITY TO DO THAT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOAN, AND I THINK EVERYONE ON
13 THE BOARD AND AUDIENCE REALIZES WE HAVE A SPECIFIC
14 STRATEGIC PLAN THAT WE WILL DEVELOP. WE HAVE DEFERRED
15 EMBARKING ON THAT WAITING FOR THE PRESIDENT SO THAT THE
16 PRESIDENT, WHO IS THE LEADER OF OUR SCIENTIFIC DIVISION,
17 CAN PARTICIPATE IN THAT PLAN WITH THE BOARD. IT'S VERY
18 CLEAR THAT WE WANT THAT POLICY LEVEL DISCUSSION TO HAPPEN
19 IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: RIGHT.

21 DR. KESSLER: JOAN, I WAS JUST WONDERING WHERE
22 YOU THINK THE STRATEGIC PLANNING, WHERE YOU THINK THAT
23 SHOULD BE DONE. IS THIS REALLY PART OF THE GRANTS AND
24 SECONDARY REVIEW? IS THIS A SEPARATE GROUP THAT COMES
25 BACK TO THE ICOC? IS IT THE ENTIRE ICOC?

1 DR. HALL: COULD WE DEFER THAT DISCUSSION?
2 ACTUALLY I HAVE A SUGGESTION, NOT AN ACTION ITEM, BUT A
3 SUGGESTION AND INFORMATION ITEM IN JUST ONE MOMENT THAT
4 DEALS PRECISELY WITH THAT. SO LET ME JUST SAY THIS IS
5 NOT INTENDED TO BE THE FINAL WORD AT ALL ON EITHER THE
6 SELECTION OF THE PERSON OR THE PROCESS; HOWEVER, IT
7 SEEMED TO BE SOMETHING WE MIGHT AGREE ON AT THIS POINT IN
8 RESPONSE TO, I THOUGHT, A VERY GOOD AND INTERESTING
9 SUGGESTION BY JEFF SHEEHY. IF WE COULD AGREE ON THIS
10 STRUCTURE, THEN WE COULD MOVE ON TO TALK ABOUT WHAT THE
11 DUTIES MIGHT BE AND TO TALK ABOUT HOW THE ACTUAL REVIEW
12 MIGHT TAKE PLACE, AND IN SOME WAYS TO HAVE LEADERSHIP
13 HELP IN DOING THAT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD TRY AND DRAW THIS
15 TOGETHER. LET US ASSUME THAT IN YOUR SUGGESTION YOU DID
16 NOT MEAN TO ADDRESS, AND WE WILL NOT ADDRESS IN THE
17 ROLES, WHERE THE STRATEGIC PLAN IS MADE, WHO MAKES IT.
18 AND SO THAT IS NOT INTENDED TO BE DEALT WITH IN THIS
19 DECISION. SO WE'LL LIMIT THIS DECISION DOWN TO JUST
20 MAKING SURE THAT IN THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE WE HAVE A
21 CHAIR AND A VICE CHAIR.

22 AND I BELIEVE LEON THAL HAD A COMMENT.

23 DR. THAL: I RETRACT IT.

24 DR. PIZZO: I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR AND MAYBE I
25 CAN JUST SUMMARIZE THIS. WE'RE AGREEING THAT THERE IS A

1 CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR. I CERTAINLY SUPPORT THAT. BUT
2 WE'RE NOT AGREEING TO THE CONCEPTUAL CREATION OF WHAT A
3 SECOND STAGE REVIEW IS.

4 DR. HALL: WE HAVE TO DISCUSS THAT.

5 DR. PIZZO: WE'RE NOT AGREEING TO THAT YET.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK HE'S PUT A VERY GOOD
7 FIRST SKETCH OUT THERE OF POSSIBILITIES, BUT WE'RE NOT
8 COMMITTING TO THAT OUTCOME AT THIS POINT.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS IT SEEMS THAT ALL THAT'S
10 LEFT, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS THE TITLE WITH EVERYTHING ELSE TO
11 BE DECIDED LATER. AND IT JUST DOESN'T SEEM LIKE A VERY
12 CONSIDERED, CAREFUL EVALUATION OF WHAT THIS IS,
13 UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE'S A DIFFERENT GOVERNANCE
14 STRUCTURE FOR AT LEAST ONE OF THE OTHER COMMITTEES. AND
15 SO I HAVE MANY MORE QUESTIONS THAN ANSWERS. SURE, I KNOW
16 WE WANT TO MOVE QUICKLY THROUGH THIS. AND I DON'T THINK
17 THIS IS ONE THAT WE SHOULD MOVE QUICKLY THROUGH WITH LOTS
18 OF OTHER PRESSING MATTERS ON THE AGENDA TODAY.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD SAY THAT, DR. PIZZO AND
20 JOAN SAMUELSON, THE INITIATIVE DOES HAVE A FIRST AND
21 SECOND STAGE THAT'S IN THE INITIATIVE ITSELF AS PART OF
22 THAT PROCESS. SO THAT IS ALREADY LAID OUT FOR US. DR.
23 PRECIADO.

24 DR. PRECIADO: IS IT THE CHAIR, CO-CHAIR TITLES
25 THAT YOU'RE SUGGESTING WE NEED TO DISCUSS?

1 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S THE ROLES. WHAT ARE THE
2 ROLES, AND HOW DO THEY RELATE TO THE WORK OF THE WORKING
3 GROUP?

4 DR. PRECIADO: SO IF WE CAN JUST SAY THAT WE ARE
5 CHOOSING LEADERSHIP FOR THE SCIENTIFIC GROUP AND
6 LEADERSHIP FOR THE PATIENT ADVOCATE GROUP AT THIS POINT.
7 WE'RE JUST MAKING -- WE'RE TRYING TO MAKE A MOTION TO
8 HAVE SOME LEADERSHIP UNDER THE GRANTS REVIEW.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: AND I DIDN'T COME INTO THIS
10 THINKING THAT THE PATIENT ADVOCATE GROUP WAS ITS OWN
11 LITTLE AUTONOMOUS GROUP SEPARATE FROM THE REST OF THE
12 COMMITTEE. THERE ARE SEVERAL DIFFERENT AREAS OF
13 EXPERTISE REPRESENTED HERE ON THE COMMITTEE, AND IT JUST
14 SEEMS TO BE A SHALLOW ANALYSIS.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK, JOAN, FOR DISCUSSION,
16 WHAT I HAVE HEARD, AND CERTAINLY I'M NOT ON THAT
17 COMMITTEE, BUT WHAT I'VE HEARD DESCRIBED BY DR. HALL IS A
18 PROCESS WHERE DURING THE REVIEW THERE WILL BE ABILITY FOR
19 QUESTIONS, THERE WILL BE PARTICIPATION AND UNDERSTANDING
20 OF THE DISCUSSION. BUT TO GET INTO THE SUBSTANTIVE
21 REVIEW IS AN IMPORTANT TOPIC, AN IMPORTANT TOPIC, THAT WE
22 CAN AGENDIZE AFTER YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE HAS A CHANCE TO
23 REALLY DEVELOP IT FOR US. BECAUSE STANDING ON ITS OWN,
24 IT'S AN IMPORTANT TOPIC. WHAT WE'RE REALLY DOING HERE IS
25 MAKING A DECLARATION THAT THERE'S SHARED LEADERSHIP.

1 MS. SAMUELSON: WHICH, OF COURSE, MAKES SENSE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND SO WITH THAT CONSENSUS,
3 WE'RE TRYING TO INCREMENTALLY ADDRESS THE TOPIC, ADOPT
4 THE CONCEPT OF SHARED LEADERSHIP PUBLICLY, AND THEN GO IN
5 WITH YOUR COMMITTEE AND HAVE EACH COMMITTEE, AS
6 APPROPRIATE, DEFINE THEIR OWN PROCESS, BRING IT BACK TO
7 THE BOARD, AND HAVE A FULL DISCUSSION ON THAT AS AN
8 AGENDIZED ITEM.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: AND IF IT'S CLEAR THAT ALL WE'RE
10 TALKING ABOUT IS TITLES, I'M COMFORTABLE WITH THAT, BUT I
11 THINK WE HAVE TO BE MORE CAREFUL ABOUT WHAT IT IS THAT
12 THOSE ROLES WOULD ENCOMPASS AND HOW IT RELATES TO THE
13 WORK OF THE WORKING GROUPS AND THE FULL COMMITTEE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THINK BOTH TITLES AND
15 CONCEPT OF SHARED LEADERSHIP IS AN IMPORTANT FIRST STEP.

16 ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD DISCUSSION ON THIS ITEM?
17 ANY PUBLIC DISCUSSION?

18 MR. SHEEHY: FIRST, I WANT TO COMMEND DR. HALL
19 FOR HIS HARD WORK ON TACKLING THIS THORNY ISSUE AND, I
20 THINK, BRINGING US CLOSE TO A COMPROMISE WE CAN ALL LIVE
21 WITH.

22 I JUST WANT A POINT OF CLARIFICATION BECAUSE IT
23 SEEMS LIKE FURTHER DISCUSSION IS GOING TO TAKE PLACE. IS
24 THIS GOING TO TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
25 SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE? IS THAT --

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S WHAT'S BEEN PROPOSED,
2 AND THEN IT WOULD BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE BOARD.

3 DR. HALL: I'M NOT SURE WHAT YOU'RE SAYING ABOUT
4 THAT. LET ME JUST JUMP AHEAD AND SAY THAT I'M GOING TO
5 SUGGEST THAT THE ICOC CONSIDER AT A FUTURE MEETING,
6 PERHAPS ITS NEXT MEETING, TAKING OUT OF THE GRANTS REVIEW
7 COMMITTEE THE ISSUES OF CRITERIA AND REGULATIONS AND
8 STANDARDS AND PUTTING THAT INTO A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
9 ICOC, WHICH WOULD THEN HAVE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON THOSE
10 ISSUES, AND KEEP THE GRANTS REVIEW AS THE CORE ISSUE OF
11 THE GRANTS REVIEW ISSUE.

12 I THINK THE REASON FOR THAT IS I THINK WHAT
13 WE'VE SEEN IN THE DISCUSSION HERE IS WE ARE BEGINNING A
14 NEW PROCESS. AND THERE'S GOING TO BE A LOT TO BE DEFINED
15 ABOUT HOW WE GO ABOUT IT. PROPOSITION 71 IS VERY CLEAR
16 THAT THERE SHOULD BE A REVIEW ON THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT
17 THAT IS VOTED ON BY THE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF THE
18 WORKING GROUP. I BELIEVE THAT THAT PART OF THE REVIEW
19 NEEDS TO BE CHAIRED BY ONE OF THOSE 15 SCIENTISTS.
20 THERE'S THEN A SUBSEQUENT STEP ABOUT WHICH I THINK WE ALL
21 SHARE BOTH SOME CONFUSION AND SOME LACK OF DEFINITION,
22 AND THAT NEEDS TO BE DEFINED.

23 AND I THINK I'M GOING TO SUGGEST THAT THAT BE
24 DONE NOT BY THE WORKING GROUP INVOLVING THESE 15 PEOPLE
25 WHO WE BRING IN, BUT BY A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ICOC,

1 WHETHER IT'S ED'S CURRENT COMMITTEE OR ANOTHER ONE. THAT
2 WILL BE NOT VOTED ON TODAY, BUT I JUST WANTED TO BRING
3 THAT UP AS AN INFORMATION ITEM FOR PEOPLE TO BE THINKING
4 ABOUT FOR NEXT TIME.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, I THINK YOU MIGHT
6 HAVE MISSED DR. HOLMES' COMMENT, THAT HE'S GOING TO
7 CONVENE HIS SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEY'RE GOING TO DISCUSS
8 THESE ISSUES AND BRING THEM BACK TO THE BOARD.

9 DR. HOLMES: WE OFFERED TO DO THAT IF THE BOARD
10 SO CHOOSES FOR US TO DO THAT. WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO BE
11 DISBANDED TOO.

12 DR. HALL: I HAVE NO -- THAT'S FINE. WHAT I'M
13 PROPOSING THAT WE NOT DO IS TAKE THIS 22-MEMBER COMMITTEE
14 PLUS BOB KLEIN AND SAY TO THEM YOU DECIDE THESE ISSUES.
15 THOSE ARE CORE ISSUES FOR THE ICOC, AND I THINK THEY
16 SHOULD BE DECIDED. AND I ALSO, FURTHERMORE, THINK IT'S
17 USEFUL TO DO THOSE NOT IN CLOSED SESSION, BUT IN OPEN
18 MEETING IN THE INTEREST OF TRANSPARENCY.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO AND SHERRY LANSING.

20 DR. PIZZO: I SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF WORKING
21 WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE OR THE SUBGROUP TO AT LEAST STAGE
22 THE DIFFERENT DIALOGUES AND POINT OUT THAT ZACH IS RIGHT
23 ON WE SHOULD BRING IT BACK TO THE ICOC. WHEN YOU COME
24 RIGHT DOWN TO IT, THE GRANTS REVIEW IS THE -- WHAT WE'RE
25 ABOUT, SO WE CLEARLY WANT TO GET THIS CORRECT.

1 MS. LANSING: CAN I CALL FOR THE QUESTION AND
2 MAKE IT A SIMPLE STATEMENT, THAT WE MAKE A MOTION TO
3 APPROVE THAT THERE BE A CHAIR FROM THE SCIENTIFIC
4 COMMUNITY, A VICE CHAIR FROM THE PATIENT COMMUNITY, THE
5 FUNCTIONS OF -- THIS IS THE SECOND PART. THE FUNCTIONS
6 OF THE VICE CHAIR TO BE DETERMINED BY A SUBCOMMITTEE THAT
7 IS ALREADY IN EXISTENCE, THAT ED HOLMES CONTINUE TO
8 CHAIR. WE WILL OUTLINE THOSE FUNCTIONS AND BRING THEM
9 BACK TO THE OVERALL BOARD.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE, I
11 BELIEVE, IS PROPOSING A CO-CHAIR. IS THAT INCLUDED IN
12 YOUR MOTION?

13 DR. HALL: THAT'S A SEPARATE ITEM.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S FINE. PUBLIC COMMENT.
15 WE'VE CALLED FOR THE QUESTION. DO WE HAVE A FORMAL
16 MOTION?

17 DR. PIZZO: I SECOND SHERRY'S MOTION.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SHERRY LANSING MADE A
19 MOTION, SECONDED BY DR. PIZZO. WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE
20 FLOOR. DO WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT? DR. PENHOET.

21 DR. PENHOET: I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY IF WE'RE
22 TALKING ABOUT FROM THE COMMUNITY. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
23 AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP, THE 15
24 AND THE SEVEN.

25 MS. LANSING: YES.

1 DR. PENHOET: SO THEY'RE NOT NEW PEOPLE ADDED TO
2 THE GROUP. SO THEY'RE CHOSEN FROM THE WORKING GROUPS
3 THEMSELVES RATHER FROM THAN FROM THE COMMUNITIES.

4 MS. LANSING: ABSOLUTELY. THANK YOU FOR THE
5 CLARIFICATION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CALL THE QUESTION. ALL IN
7 FAVOR. OPPOSED. ALL RIGHT.

8 ARE WE SEPARATELY NOW HANDLING --

9 DR. HALL: THANK YOU. LET ME JUST SAY THAT IT'S
10 IMPORTANT FOR US, AS WE GO ABOUT OUR BUSINESS, TO GET
11 THESE. AS QUICKLY AS WE CAN ESTABLISH THESE ISSUES, WE
12 CAN BEGIN TO CHOOSE THE LEADERSHIP, DEFINE THEIR ROLES,
13 AND WORK WITH THEM TO MAKE THIS HAPPEN. SO I APPRECIATE
14 YOUR SPIRIT OF COOPERATING WITH THIS AND HELPING US MOVE
15 THIS ON.

16 FOR THE WORKING GROUP WE RECOMMEND THAT THERE BE
17 CO-CHAIRS AND THAT THEY REPRESENT TWO OF THE THREE
18 DIFFERENT GROUPS ON THE COMMITTEE WHICH ARE PATIENT
19 ADVOCATES, ETHICISTS, AND SCIENTIST-CLINICIANS. WHICH
20 TWO ARE REPRESENTED CAN VARY WITH TIME. BUT SIMPLY THAT
21 THERE BE CO-CHAIRS AND THAT THEY REPRESENT TWO OF THE
22 THREE GROUPS. STRAIGHTFORWARD ENOUGH. THAT'S THE
23 RECOMMENDATION.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'VE HAD SOME DISCUSSION ON
25 THIS ITEM ALREADY. IS THERE ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION?

1 DR. POMEROY.

2 DR. POMEROY: IS THE PROPOSAL, THEN, DR. HALL,
3 THAT THE PROCESS WOULD BE DEFINED BY THE STANDARDS
4 WORKING GROUP SEARCH COMMITTEE ANALOGOUS TO OUR PREVIOUS
5 CONVERSATION FOR GRANTS?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. KESSLER.

7 DR. KESSLER: A REVIEW OF --

8 DR. POMEROY: THE PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING THE
9 CO-CHAIRS, WHAT THEIR JOB DESCRIPTIONS WOULD BE, HOW LONG
10 THEY WOULD SERVE? HOW WOULD ALL THAT GET DEFINED? IS
11 YOUR SEARCH COMMITTEE WILLING TO TAKE THAT ON?

12 DR. KESSLER: OUR SEARCH COMMITTEE IS PREPARED
13 TODAY TO RECOMMEND CO-CHAIRS ON AN INTERIM BASIS. WE
14 HAVE NOT DEFINED HOW LONG INTERIM IS, BUT WE WANT TO GET
15 THE FIRST SET OF MEETINGS ESTABLISHED. IT MAY BE
16 WORTHWHILE HAVING SOME CLARITY WHAT THAT INTERIM PERIOD
17 SHOULD BE. PERHAPS IT'S THREE MONTHS, PERHAPS IT'S SIX
18 MONTHS. WE WANTED TO GET IT GOING.

19 AND THEN THE QUESTION IS, AS MS. LANSING, I
20 THINK, MENTIONED, PERHAPS THE ACTUAL WORKING GROUP SHOULD
21 MAKE A RECOMMENDATION AFTER THAT PERIOD WHO THE CO-CHAIRS
22 SHOULD BE TO THE ICOC. BUT WE'RE PREPARED TO AT LEAST DO
23 THIS ON AN INTERIM BASIS AS DR. HALL HAS RECOMMENDED.

24 WE THINK THAT WHAT'S PUT UP THERE, THE
25 RECOMMENDATION TO HAVE ONE OF EACH MAKES SENSE AND, IN

1 FACT, THAT'S THE WAY IT HAS WORKED OUT, AND WE'RE
2 PREPARED TODAY TO DO THAT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY DISCUSSION?

4 MS. SAMUELSON: QUESTION OF CLARIFICATION.
5 DR. KESSLER, DID I UNDERSTAND YOU TO SAY ONE OF EACH,
6 MEANING ONE OF EACH OF THE THREE GROUPS OR MEMBERS OF THE
7 WORKING GROUP?

8 DR. KESSLER: WE DIDN'T HAVE THE WISDOM OF
9 DR. HALL'S RECOMMENDATION WHEN WE ACTUALLY DID THIS AT
10 OUR WORKING GROUP. AS YOU WILL REMEMBER, AS IT TURNS
11 OUT, WHAT WE ARE READY TO PROPOSE TODAY HAPPENS TO BE A
12 MEMBER OF THE DISEASE ADVOCATE COMMUNITY AND SOMEONE WITH
13 A BACKGROUND IN MEDICAL ETHICS.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: RIGHT. THAT WAS MY
15 UNDERSTANDING, JUST A DIFFERENT PROPOSAL. AND I GUESS --
16 I DID HAVE A CONCERN. AND DR. HALL'S PROPOSAL WOULD NOT
17 NECESSARILY ADDRESS IT. THAT IT'S IMPORTANT AT LEAST TO
18 HAVE IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WORKING GROUPS SOME MEMBER
19 OF THE ICOC WHO ALSO WOULD BE DEFINITELY A CALIFORNIA
20 RESIDENT.

21 DR. KESSLER: AS IT TURNS OUT, ONE OF THE
22 MEMBERS WE'RE RECOMMENDING AS CHAIR, CO-CHAIR IS A MEMBER
23 OF THE ICOC.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: BUT AS I UNDERSTAND DR. HALL'S
25 PROPOSAL, IT COULD PERHAPS ROTATE AMONG THE THREE GROUPS,

1 AND THAT WOULD BE THAT AT TIMES IT MIGHT BE ONE ETHICIST,
2 ONE OUTSIDE MEMBER ETHICIST, ONE OUTSIDE MEMBER SCIENTIST
3 AND NO ICOC MEMBER.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOAN, COULD I ASK DR. HALL FOR
5 CLARIFICATION OF HIS PROPOSAL. AT ALL TIMES IS IT
6 INTENDED THAT ONE OF THE TWO CO-CHAIRS BE A MEMBER OF THE
7 PATIENT ADVOCATE?

8 DR. HALL: I DIDN'T STATE THAT EXPLICITLY. I
9 LEFT IT OPEN THAT ALL THREE POSSIBILITIES AT DIFFERENT
10 TIMES MIGHT SERVE. THERE'S NO RECOMMENDATION HERE FOR
11 TERMS, FOR ROTATION, BUT SIMPLY THAT AS A FRAMEWORK THAT
12 AT LEAST TWO OF THE THREE GROUPS SHOULD BE CO-CHAIRS AND
13 TWO OF THE THREE GROUPS BE REPRESENTED.

14 LET ME JUST SAY THAT THE CHARGE TO THIS
15 COMMITTEE IS A COMPLEX ONE AND IT COVERS A BROAD AREA.
16 AND I GUESS PART OF THE RECOMMENDATION WAS JUST IT SEEMED
17 THAT CO-CHAIRS ARE ADVISABLE. THE NATIONAL ACADEMY
18 COMMITTEE THAT JUST CARRIED OUT AND PUBLISHED THE
19 GUIDELINES HAD, AS YOU KNOW, CO-CHAIRS, AND SO THERE WAS
20 NO INTENT TO PROSCRIBE HOW THAT SHOULD BE. IF IT'S AN
21 ICOC MEMBER, THEN AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE ICOC MEMBERS ON
22 THE COMMITTEE ARE PATIENT ADVOCATES. SO IF YOU WOULD
23 LIKE TO ADD THAT TO IT, YOU'RE WELCOME TO IT. I DIDN'T
24 INTEND IT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. I MEANT TO LEAVE IT
25 OPEN.

1 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK THAT MAKES IT CONSISTENT
2 WITH THE SEARCH COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS; IS THAT
3 RIGHT, DR. KESSLER? JUST SO WE'RE CLEAR WE'RE ON THE
4 SAME PAGE.

5 DR. KESSLER: I THINK IT CERTAINLY IS CONSISTENT
6 WITH WHAT WE WOULD BE RECOMMENDING TODAY.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRIETO.

8 DR. PRIETO: I THINK ONE OF THE QUESTIONS --
9 MAYBE I'M SPEAKING FOR YOU, JOAN -- THAT YOU ARE RAISING
10 IS WHO REPORTS BACK TO THE ICOC. AND IF THE CO-CHAIRS
11 DON'T ALWAYS INCLUDE AN ICOC MEMBER, THEN WHO BRINGS THE
12 RECOMMENDATION OF THAT WORKING GROUP BACK TO US?

13 DR. HALL: LET ME REMIND YOU THESE ARE NOT
14 SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE ICOC IN THE SENSE THAT THEY REPORT
15 BACK DIRECTLY. THEY ARE TO PRODUCE WORK PRODUCTS. THEY
16 ARE ADVISORY GROUPS TO THE ICOC, AND THEY MAKE
17 RECOMMENDATIONS OR PRODUCE GUIDELINES OR GRANT
18 RECOMMENDATIONS AS THE ICOC CHARGES, BUT IT'S NOT THE
19 SENSE THAT WE WOULD ALWAYS HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
20 WORKING GROUP HERE TO REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE AT EACH
21 MEETING OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

22 DR. PRIETO: HOW WOULD IT BE BROUGHT BACK TO US
23 THEN?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S AN IMPORTANT LEGAL
25 DISTINCTION THAT THESE BE ADVISORY GROUPS AND NOT

1 BAGLEY-KEENE SUBCOMMITTEES. AND IF WE COULD HAVE THE
2 ADVICE OF COUNSEL, WHEN THE SUBCOMMITTEES WORK TO MAKE
3 SURE THAT WE HAVE A STRUCTURE WITH REPORTING BECAUSE
4 THEY'RE TRULY ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

5 DR. HALL: SAY, FOR EXAMPLE, LET'S USE THE
6 RECENT NATIONAL ACADEMY REPORT. WE MIGHT EXPECT THAT
7 THIS COMMITTEE WOULD PRODUCE THE GUIDELINES FOR HUMAN
8 STEM CELL RESEARCH SPONSORED BY THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE
9 OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, AND THEY WOULD PRODUCE A
10 DOCUMENT SIMILAR TO THAT. AND I WOULD IMAGINE THAT THE
11 TWO CO-CHAIRS, WHOEVER THEY MIGHT BE, WOULD COME TO THIS
12 COMMITTEE, PRESENT THE DOCUMENT, EXPLAIN IT, ANSWER
13 QUESTIONS ABOUT IT; AND THIS COMMITTEE WOULD, UNDER
14 BOB'S -- LEADERSHIP OF THE CHAIR, MR. KLEIN, WOULD THEN
15 CONSIDER WHETHER TO MODIFY IT, WHETHER TO VOTE IT IN,
16 VOTE IT OUT, WHATEVER, BUT THERE IS THE DISTINCTION
17 THEY'RE NOT FORMALLY SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE ICOC WHICH
18 REPORT ON A REGULAR BASIS TO THE ICOC.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JUST TO CLARIFY, DR. KESSLER,
20 AS I UNDERSTAND THAT TO BE CONSISTENT WITH WHAT THE
21 SUBCOMMITTEE ACTUALLY IS RECOMMENDING, ONE OF THE
22 CO-CHAIRS WILL BE A PATIENT ADVOCATE; IS THAT A CORRECT
23 STATEMENT?

24 DR. KESSLER: WE HAVE A RECOMMENDATION TODAY OF
25 TWO INTERIM CO-CHAIRS. AS IT TURNS OUT, ONE IS A PATIENT

1 ADVOCATE FROM THE ICOC, ONE IS NOT A MEMBER OF THE ICOC.
2 THAT'S HOW WE JUST ARRIVED AT TWO INTERIM. WE DIDN'T
3 HAVE ANY FORMAL DISCUSSION OF WHETHER YOU HAD TO BE A --
4 EXACTLY HOW MANY CATEGORIES. WE DIDN'T GET INTO THAT
5 LEVEL OF DETAIL. I THINK WE DID FEEL, IF MY MEMORY
6 SERVES RIGHT, AND MY COLLEAGUES WANT TO HELP ME, THAT ONE
7 OF THE CO-CHAIRS BEING A MEMBER OF THE ICOC, I THOUGHT WE
8 HAD THOUGHT THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT HAD VALUE.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY LANSING.

10 MS. LANSING: AGAIN, I'M NOT ON THIS COMMITTEE,
11 SO I'M JUST OBSERVING THIS. BUT THAT THE ONLY -- THEN
12 THE ONLY MEMBER -- THAT WHAT WE REALLY ARE SAYING IS THAT
13 THE CO-CHAIR WILL ALWAYS BE OF ALL THESE COMMITTEES A
14 PATIENT ADVOCATE. AND I GUESS MAYBE I'M NOT
15 UNDERSTANDING QUITE -- HOW DO I SAY THIS -- THE ROLE OF
16 THE VICE CHAIR AND THE CHAIR BECAUSE SITTING ON THESE
17 COMMITTEES, I'VE ALWAYS FELT, AND I'VE BEEN NEITHER THE
18 VICE CHAIR OR THE CHAIR OF ANY OF THESE COMMITTEES, I'VE
19 ALWAYS FELT I HAD AN EQUAL VOICE. AND I'VE NEVER FELT
20 THAT BEING THE VICE CHAIR OR THE CHAIR WAS -- SAY THIS IN
21 A POLITE WAY -- THAT IMPORTANT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER,
22 BEING ABLE TO GET YOUR VOICE OUT AND BEING ABLE TO GET
23 DONE WHAT YOU WANTED TO GET DONE.

24 IN FACT, THE PERSON WHO DID THAT WAS UNDERTAKING
25 A GREAT DEAL OF WORK, BUT NOT IN ANY WAY DID ANY OF US ON

1 THESE SUBCOMMITTEES FEEL A LACK OF VOICE. QUITE THE
2 CONTRARY, TO BE HONEST WITH YOU. SO TO ME I REALLY THINK
3 THAT, YOU KNOW, JUST SAYING THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE A
4 VICE CHAIR AND A CHAIR FROM THESE THREE DIFFERENT GROUPS
5 IS REALLY ENOUGH BECAUSE THE GROUP WILL VOTE ON IT.
6 THEY'LL COME BACK TO US AND WE'LL BE ABLE TO SAY WHATEVER
7 WE WANT. AND WE'RE DETERMINING IT. I, AS A PATIENT
8 ADVOCATE, KNOW THAT THERE'S A NUMBER OF US ON THIS
9 COMMITTEE NOW, AND WE'LL BE ABLE TO SAY WHATEVER WE WANT
10 TO SAY.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK JEFF SHEEHY HAS A
12 POINT, AND WE NEED TO MOVE THIS AGENDA. THE CURRENT
13 PROPOSAL IS AN INTERIM PROPOSAL FOR TWO CO-CHAIRS, ONE OF
14 WHOM IS A PATIENT ADVOCATE. IT WOULD BE MY SUGGESTION,
15 IF THERE IS A MOTION, FOR US JUST TODAY TO DECIDE ON THE
16 INTERIM, WHICH IS THE PROPOSAL, AND ON THE PATIENT
17 ADVOCATE AND SCIENTIFIC MEMBER AND MOVE FORWARD BECAUSE
18 THIS IS PART OF A LARGER GOVERNANCE DISCUSSION THAT WE
19 NEED TO THOUGHTFULLY GO THROUGH BECAUSE THERE'S A VERY
20 IMPORTANT ROLE HERE OF PATIENT ADVOCATES IN THESE
21 COMMITTEES THAT WE NEED TO HAVE TIME TO DISCUSS, AND WE
22 NEED TO HAVE THE ROLES THOUGHT THROUGH. BUT PERHAPS WE
23 SHOULD LIMIT OURSELVES TO THE NARROW PROPOSAL THAT'S
24 BEFORE US.

25 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, FIRST, I THINK THERE'S A

1 PRINCIPLE INVOLVED HERE. AND IT'S THIS WHOLE ENTERPRISE,
2 PROP 71 ENTERPRISE IS A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE PEOPLE
3 IMPACTED BY DISEASE IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE
4 PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO PROVIDE THE CURES. AND I THINK
5 THE PRINCIPLE IS REFLECTED IN THE COMPOSITION OF THIS
6 BOARD AND COMPOSITION OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THIS BOARD,
7 AND IT SHOULD BE REFLECTED IN THE COMPOSITION EXPLICITLY
8 OF THE WORKING GROUPS. AND I THINK LOOKING AT THE
9 RESEARCH WORKING GROUP, WE WERE ABLE TO CRAFT A
10 COMPROMISE. AND I THINK THAT HERE I WOULD HOPE THAT THE
11 NARROW VIEW, WHICH I WILL MAKE A MOTION ON AT THE END OF
12 THIS, FOR THE INTERIM WILL END UP BEING THE PERMANENT.

13 AND I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO ADD I HAVE NOT ALWAYS
14 FELT THAT MY VOICE WAS HEARD ON AN EQUAL BASIS. SO I'VE
15 HAD A DIFFERENT EXPERIENCE THAN OTHERS HAVE HAD. AND SO
16 THAT'S PART OF THE REASON I THINK THAT THIS IS AN
17 IMPORTANT THING.

18 SO I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT WE ADOPT IN THE
19 INTERIM A PATIENT ADVOCATE CO-CHAIR ALONG WITH I THINK
20 IT'S AN ETHICIST CO-CHAIR FOR STANDARDS. ISN'T THAT WHAT
21 WE HAD? RIGHT. I'D LIKE TO MAKE THAT MOTION.

22 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S BEEN MADE AND SECONDED.
24 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENT ON THE MOTION? DR. PRECIADO.

25 DR. PRECIADO: I JUST HAVE SOME REAL -- I AGREE

1 WITH JEFF IN THAT AT TIMES I FEEL LIKE I'M ABLE TO SPEAK,
2 BUT WHETHER THAT IS HEARD AND THERE IS ACTION ON IT IS
3 SOMETHING THAT I FEEL WE NEED TO CONTINUE DIALOGUE ON.

4 ANOTHER REALLY IMPORTANT POINT IS WHEN WE'RE
5 TALKING ABOUT PATIENT ADVOCATES FROM THE ICOC VERSUS
6 PATIENT ADVOCATES FROM THE COMMUNITY, WHAT ROLE, FIRST OF
7 ALL, IF WE AS PATIENT ADVOCATES HAVE DIFFICULTY BEING
8 HEARD, WHAT ROLE AND HOW WILL THE PUBLIC BE HEARD?

9 THE OTHER POINT I WANTED TO MAKE WAS THAT I'M
10 WONDERING WHY THE CHAIR IS THE ETHICIST AND THAT VICE
11 CHAIR IS THE --

12 DR. HALL: CO-CHAIRS. CO-CHAIRS.

13 DR. PRECIADO: -- PATIENT ADVOCATE. AT SOME
14 POINT PATIENT ADVOCATES ON THE ICOC BOARD, I THINK, NEED
15 TO HAVE SOME LEADERSHIP. AND I DON'T KNOW -- I DON'T
16 FEEL RIGHT NOW THAT WE REALLY, REALLY DO.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IN A PARTNERSHIP WITH YOU AS
18 THE CHAIR AND BEING A PATIENT ADVOCATE, I HOPE THAT WE DO
19 HAVE SOME LEADERSHIP. IN THIS CASE THEY ARE CO-CHAIRS,
20 WHICH I THINK PARTIALLY SOLVES YOUR PROBLEM, BUT WE WILL
21 LEARN AND WE WILL STRIVE TO CONTINUE TO OPEN AND
22 ENCOURAGE THE VOICE OF PATIENT ADVOCATES IN OUR PROCESS,
23 WHICH IS, I THINK, THE FUNDAMENTAL POINT HERE.

24 THERE IS A MOTION.

25 DR. POMEROY: CLAIRE POMEROY. I JUST WANT TO

1 CLARIFY THE MOTION. YOU POINTED OUT THAT OFTEN INTERIM
2 RECOMMENDATIONS BECOME PERMANENT RECOMMENDATIONS JUST BY
3 INERTIA. I WONDER IF THERE WAS PART OF YOUR MOTION ABOUT
4 HOW LONG A PERIOD OF TIME THESE INTERIM PEOPLE MIGHT
5 SERVE BEFORE A PERMANENT PROPOSAL CAME INTO BEING.

6 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD BE HAPPY WITH PERMANENT.
7 FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO MAKE THIS AN INTERIM MOTION, I
8 ALLOW THEM. I NEVER SUGGESTED INTERIM FOR THIS CO-CHAIR
9 PROPOSAL. SO FOR THOSE WHO THINK THAT IT NEEDS TO BE
10 INTERIM, I HOPE THAT THEY COULD SUGGEST A TIME FRAME.

11 DR. HALL: I THINK WHEN YOU DISCUSS PARTICULAR
12 PEOPLE, THAT'S THE QUESTION TO MAKE THAT AN INTERIM
13 APPOINTMENT. NOW WE'RE JUST TALKING ABOUT THE OVERALL
14 FRAMEWORK OR STRUCTURE WITHIN WHICH THOSE APPOINTMENTS
15 ARE MADE. LET'S DON'T HAVE AN INTERIM POLICY IF WE CAN
16 AVOID IT.

17 DR. POMEROY: I GUESS I NEED THE MOTION
18 REPEATED.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS AN INTERIM ADOPTION.

20 DR. POMEROY: IS IT INTERIM OR IS IT PERMANENT?
21 I REALLY NEED CLARIFICATION.

22 DR. HALL: I WOULD HOPE WE COULD AGREE ON A
23 PERMANENT POLICY. IF YOU WANT TO HAVE AN INTERIM POLICY,
24 WE CAN REVISIT IT.

25 DR. POMEROY: YOUR MOTION USED THE TERM

1 "INTERIM."

2 DR. HALL: I'D LIKE TO MOVE ON JUST IN RESPECT
3 TO THE POLICY.

4 MR. SHEEHY: I'LL RESTATE THE MOTION.

5 DR. POMEROY: THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF SHEEHY AND THEN DR. LEVEY.

7 MR. SHEEHY: LET ME JUST RESTATE THE MOTION. AS
8 A MATTER OF POLICY THAT THERE BE CO-CHAIRS FOR THE
9 STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AND THAT ONE COME FROM ONE OF
10 THE TWO GROUPS, EITHER ETHICIST OR SCIENTIST-CLINICIAN,
11 AND THAT THE OTHER CO-CHAIR COME FROM THE PATIENT
12 ADVOCATES SERVING ON THAT BODY.

13 DR. LEVEY: I'M JUST SITTING HERE WITH THIS LONG
14 TABLE. I THINK THERE'S AT LEAST TWO, MAYBE THREE MOTIONS
15 THAT I'VE HEARD THAT HAVE BEEN OFFERED. AND FOR THOSE OF
16 US WHO HAVE NOT HAD A BRIEFING IN THIS AREA, IT IS
17 GETTING A LITTLE BIT CONFUSING. SO IF WE HAVE A
18 PRINCIPLE THAT WE'RE GOING TO VOTE ON AND A MOTION, LET'S
19 VOTE ON IT. AND LET STAFF AND THE COMMITTEES WORK THESE
20 THINGS OUT BECAUSE THE BOARD, IF WE'RE EVER GOING TO GET
21 DONE, IF WE SPEND 45 MINUTES DISCUSSING SOMETHING THAT
22 HASN'T BEEN PREPARED, I DON'T MEAN TO BE CURMUDGEONY, BUT
23 THIS IS THE WAY A BOARD SHOULD FUNCTION. WE SHOULD HAVE
24 CRISP DATA BEFORE US, AND THEN WE CAN VOTE ON THESE
25 THINGS.

1 I DO GET THE SENSE THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A
2 CHAIR AND A VICE CHAIR AND MAYBE OTHER COMMITTEES WITH
3 CO-CHAIRS, AND THEN WE'LL WORK OUT DETAILS AND PROVIDE
4 THIS TO THE BOARD SO WE CAN VOTE. RIGHT NOW I'M GETTING
5 CONFUSED, AND I DO THINK THERE'S MORE THAN ONE MOTION ON
6 THE FLOOR. I THINK SHERRY LANSING HAD A MOTION. I DON'T
7 KNOW WHETHER ANYONE ASKED FOR SECONDS. CLAIRE HAS A
8 MOTION, AND JEFF HAS A MOTION.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S CLARIFY HERE FOR DR.
10 LEVEY. I'D LIKE TO -- MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE
11 ACTUAL MOTION THAT IS ON THE FLOOR IS JEFF SHEEHY'S
12 MOTION AND THAT SHERRY --

13 MS. LANSING: I HAD NOTHING. MINE WAS THE
14 GRANTS.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I HAD UNDERSTOOD THAT YOU DID
16 NOT HAVE A SEPARATE MOTION. THAT WAS A CORRECT
17 UNDERSTANDING. AND WE HAD A SECOND TO JEFF SHEEHY'S
18 MOTION. SO SHERRY'S WAS ONLY TO ADDRESS THE GRANTS, AND
19 THAT WAS ACTED UPON, SO WE ONLY HAVE ONE MOTION ON THE
20 TABLE.

21 NOW, DR. WRIGHT.

22 DR. WRIGHT: I WAS JUST IN AGREEMENT. INITIALLY
23 THERE WAS CONFUSION OVER WE WERE VOTING ON ZACH'S
24 RECOMMENDATION FOR THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP OR THE
25 INTERIM PROPOSAL FROM DR. KESSLER. I THINK THAT'S BEEN

1 CLARIFIED.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. SO MOTION HAS BEEN
3 MADE AND SECONDED. WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT. SEEING NO
4 PUBLIC COMMENT, I'D LIKE TO CALL FOR THE QUESTION. ALL
5 IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? THE MOTION PASSES.

6 DR. HALL: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. LET ME JUST --
7 WE'VE ALREADY VISITED THIS, BUT JUST A QUICK STATEMENT.
8 LET ME JUST CLARIFY WHAT WE'RE SUGGESTING.

9 WE AGREED AT THE LAST ICOC MEETING THAT THE
10 GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP WOULD BE A CONFIDENTIAL
11 MEETING. PROPOSITION 71 ASSIGNS TO THE WORKING GROUP NOT
12 ONLY REVIEW, BUT ALSO ESTABLISHING CRITERIA, STANDARDS,
13 AND REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTS AND FOR SCIENTIFIC AND
14 MEDICAL OVERSIGHT OF GRANT ACTIVITY. AND I AM SUGGESTING
15 THAT AT THE NEXT ICOC MEETING WE CONSIDER TRANSFERRING
16 THESE EXTRA RESPONSIBILITIES, THAT IS, THE
17 RESPONSIBILITIES BESIDES THE GRANT REVIEW, TO A
18 SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ICOC, WHETHER IT'S ED HOLMES'
19 COMMITTEE OR ANOTHER ONE, WHICH WOULD DISCUSS THESE
20 ISSUES IN AN OPEN MEETING.

21 SO THIS WOULD, I THINK, BRING TRANSPARENCY TO
22 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT JOAN
23 SAMUELSON HAS BEEN CONCERNED WITH AND THAT WE WILL BE
24 DISCUSSING AT GREAT LENGTH AS WE GET INTO GRANTS REVIEW.
25 NO ACTION IS REQUIRED.

1 IF YOU WANT TO DISCUSS IT NOW, YOU MAY, BUT I
2 SUGGEST WE GET IT ON THE TABLE. AND YOU CAN BE THINKING
3 ABOUT IT BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING, AND THEN WE'LL DISCUSS
4 IT THEN. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT IS IMPORTANT TO REALIZE THAT
6 IN PROPOSITION 71, IT WAS ONLY AS AN ADVISORY ROLE TO DO
7 THE HOMEWORK THAT THE WORKING GROUP WAS TO LOOK AT. IT'S
8 ALWAYS BEEN INTENDED THAT A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE BOARD AND
9 THE BOARD VOTE AND DO THE FINAL DISCUSSIONS ON ANY ITEM
10 OF POLICY.

11 DR. PIZZO: MR. CHAIRMAN, A RELATED TOPIC TO
12 GOVERNANCE, AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THE PRESIDENT IS
13 GOING TO ADDRESS THIS, BUT WE SAW A NUMBER OF
14 ORGANIZATION CHARTS AT THE LAST MEETING. ARE THOSE GOING
15 TO COME BACK?

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY'RE COMING BACK AT THE END
17 OF TODAY; AND, FRANKLY, THERE'S A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT
18 BOARD MEMBERS HAVE DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES. I DO NOT
19 BELIEVE WE'RE IN A POSITION WHERE THE HOMEWORK HAS BEEN
20 COMPLETED BECAUSE OF DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES.

21 DR. PIZZO: THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN WE -- IF WE CAN GO FORWARD
23 TO THE NEXT AGENDA ITEM, AGENDA ITEM 12, I BELIEVE, IS IN
24 ORDER, WHICH IS THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, DR. KESSLER.

25 AND I WOULD LIKE TO COMMEND THE STANDARDS

1 WORKING GROUP AND DR. KESSLER FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS
2 EFFORTS. AND ON BOTH OF THESE WORKING GROUPS I'D LIKE TO
3 COMMEND KATE SHREVE AND MARY MAXON OF THE STAFF FOR THEIR
4 HEROIC EFFORTS WHICH SOMETIMES IF YOU CALL THE OFFICE AT
5 TEN OR ELEVEN AT NIGHT, YOU FIND THEM THERE AS WELL AS ON
6 WEEKENDS TRYING TO SUPPORT THE BOARD AND THE
7 SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE BOARD. DR. KESSLER.

8 DR. KESSLER: MR. CHAIR, I'M PLEASED TO REPORT
9 THAT THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY
10 WORKING GROUP SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE HAS COMPLETED ITS
11 SEARCH FOR FIVE DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC,
12 FOUR MEDICAL ETHICISTS AND NINE SCIENTISTS AND CLINICIANS
13 TO BE RECOMMENDED TO THE ICOC FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE
14 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY WORKING
15 GROUP.

16 BEFORE WE PRESENT THE NOMINEES TO YOU, I JUST --
17 I ASK TO BE ABLE TO RAISE AN ISSUE THAT I THINK WARRANTS
18 DISCUSSION BY THE FULL ICOC. THE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
19 STANDARDS ADOPTED FOR THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP DO NOT
20 ADDRESS WHETHER OR NOT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WOULD BE
21 ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR FUNDING FROM THE CIRM. I DID NOT
22 REALIZE THAT THIS WAS AN ISSUE, AND THE STANDARDS WORKING
23 GROUP SEARCH COMMITTEE NEVER REALLY DISCUSSED THAT
24 MATTER. THIS ISSUE HAS ONLY COME UP AFTER WE CAME UP
25 WITH OUR SLATE AND FOUND THAT TWO MEMBERS THAT WE WOULD

1 LIKE TO BE ABLE TO RECOMMEND TO YOU TODAY ARE, IN FACT,
2 FACULTY MEMBERS OF CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITIES. ONE IS IN
3 THE MEDICAL ETHICS CATEGORY, ONE IS IN THE SCIENTIFIC
4 CATEGORY. AND I THINK THEIR DECISION WHETHER TO BE
5 MEMBERS OF THIS WORKING GROUP WILL HINGE ON THE DECISION
6 OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY WILL BE ABLE TO APPLY FOR GRANTS.

7 WHEN WE MADE THE DECISION, WE MADE THE DECISION
8 SPECIFICALLY TO CONSIDER BOTH CALIFORNIANS AND
9 NON-CALIFORNIANS AS CANDIDATES FOR MEMBERSHIP. I THINK
10 MY OWN SENSE IS THAT MEMBERS OF THIS WORKING GROUP, IN
11 CONTRAST TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, WOULD NOT HAVE A
12 CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN APPLYING FOR FUNDING BECAUSE THE
13 WORKING GROUP HAS A DIFFERENT SET OF RESPONSIBILITIES
14 THAN THE OTHER TWO WORKING GROUPS, AND THAT IT DOES NOT,
15 IT DOES NOT MAKE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS.

16 THAT SAID, I THINK WE FEEL STRONGLY THAT THIS IS
17 AN ISSUE THAT SHOULD BE DISCUSSED BY THE FULL ICOC, AND
18 WE ASK FOR YOUR GUIDANCE ON THIS ISSUE BEFORE WE PRESENT
19 THE RECOMMENDED CANDIDATES.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. KESSLER, FOR THE BENEFIT OF
21 THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS AND ALL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE,
22 LET ME REEMPHASIZE THE POINT YOU JUST MADE. THE GRANT
23 WORKING GROUP IS COMPLETELY COVERED BY OUR ETHICS
24 STANDARDS BECAUSE EITHER THEY'RE ICOC MEMBERS AND SO THEY
25 ARE PATIENT ADVOCATE ICOC MEMBERS AND THEY CANNOT BE

1 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS, THEY CANNOT APPLY FOR GRANTS.

2 SECONDLY, THE 15 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN
3 SCIENTISTS ON THE GRANT WORKING GROUP ALL HAVE TO BE
4 OUT-OF-STATE, WHICH MEANS, BY DEFINITION, THEY CANNOT
5 RECEIVE ANY GRANT BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT IN CALIFORNIA.

6 SO OUR ETHICS STANDARDS ARE COMPLETELY SEAMLESS
7 AND COVER ALL SITUATIONS THAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT AS TO
8 THE GRANTS GROUP. AND WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT A
9 COMMITTEE, THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, THAT HAD ANY
10 FUNDING DECISIONS. SO I JUST WANTED TO REEMPHASIZE THAT
11 SO IT WAS CLEAR FOR EVERYONE. WITH THAT, DR. POMEROY.

12 DR. POMEROY: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SPEAK IN
13 SUPPORT OF DR. KESSLER'S RECOMMENDATION, THAT SERVICE ON
14 THE STANDARDS WORK GROUP WOULD NOT PRECLUDE THE ABILITY
15 TO APPLY FOR A GRANT AND JUST REEMPHASIZE THE POINT THAT
16 HE MADE, THAT THIS GROUP WILL NOT BE DISTRIBUTING ANY
17 FUNDS; AND, THEREFORE, I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT
18 WE HAVE SOME REPRESENTATION FROM CALIFORNIA IN
19 ESTABLISHING THESE IMPORTANT STANDARDS.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, DR. PIZZO.

21 DR. PIZZO: I JUST WANTED TO QUERY THE LAST PART
22 OF CLAIRE'S COMMENT. I AGREE WITH YOUR ANALYSIS, DR.
23 KESSLER, WITH REGARD TO WHETHER OR NOT THESE RULES SHOULD
24 APPLY. THE QUESTION I HAD IS ACTUALLY AN ANTECEDENT ONE,
25 WHICH IS THE NEED TO HAVE OUTSIDE OR INSIDE CALIFORNIA

1 REPRESENTATION ON THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP. IS THAT
2 PART OF THE REQUIREMENT THAT WE HAVE? AND IF SO, WHAT
3 DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE BY THE COMMITTEE IN THAT CLEARLY
4 WHEN IT CAME TO GRANTS REVIEW, ALL OF US FELT THAT IT WAS
5 IMPERATIVE THAT PEOPLE BE OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA. WHY
6 HERE DID YOU CHOOSE TO HAVE INSIDE CALIFORNIA? WHAT
7 ADDITIONAL EXPERTISE IS NECESSARY THAT WOULD BE BROUGHT
8 BY THESE INDIVIDUALS?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO, MAYBE YOU ARE ALSO
10 ASKING THE SAME QUESTION. THESE ARE THE BEST CANDIDATES
11 THEY CAME UP WITH REGARDLESS OF WHERE THEY'RE FROM.

12 DR. PIZZO: I DON'T ACCEPT THAT. I THINK THAT
13 WE COULD MAKE THAT ARGUMENT EASILY IN OTHER AREAS AS
14 WELL. THAT'S NOT A VALID ARGUMENT. WHAT I'M ASKING IS
15 THE PRINCIPLE OF WHY THEY SHOULD BE IN CALIFORNIA.

16 DR. KESSLER: LET ME ASK SOME OF MY COLLEAGUES
17 ON THE WORKING GROUP SEARCH COMMITTEE TO HELP RESPOND.
18 PERHAPS, JEFF, YOU'D LIKE TO TAKE THAT.

19 MR. SHEEHY: I KNOW MY THINKING ON THIS IS THAT
20 IT WAS ESSENTIAL THAT AT LEAST SOME OF THE MEMBERS BE
21 FROM CALIFORNIA BECAUSE OF THEIR INHERENT INTEREST IN THE
22 OUTCOME. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE ETHICAL AND MEDICAL
23 STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH THAT IS GOING TO BE CONDUCTED
24 EXCLUSIVELY WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF CALIFORNIA USING
25 TAXPAYERS' FUNDS. AND I FEEL LIKE THE PEOPLE THAT SET

1 THAT OUT OUGHT TO HAVE TO -- SOME OF THOSE FOLKS OUGHT TO
2 HAVE TO WALK DOWN THE STREET AND SEE THEIR NEIGHBORS.
3 THAT LESS THAN THE -- THE OTHER ONE IS GIVING OUT MONEY.
4 THIS ONE IS SETTING UP RULES, AND THEY SHOULD REFLECT
5 CALIFORNIA VALUES. SO THAT WAS MY THINKING.

6 DR. LEVEY: NO. 18. I WAS ON THE GRANTS WORKING
7 GROUP, AND WE MADE THAT DECISION, THAT ALL OF THE
8 REVIEWERS WOULD BE FROM OUT-OF-STATE. EVEN THOUGH
9 FUNDING IS NOT OCCURRING OUT OF THIS COMMITTEE, ONE OF
10 THE THINGS THAT YOU'VE LEARNED WHEN YOU DEAL WITH
11 ETHICISTS IS THAT MANY TIMES THEY DON'T AGREE. AND I
12 THINK THAT WE'RE WORKING IN A VERY ETHICALLY SUPERCHARGED
13 AREA. AND I THINK IF THE ETHICS WORKING GROUP MAKES A
14 MISSTEP, FOR EXAMPLE, AND TWO OR THREE OF THE PEOPLE ARE
15 FROM CALIFORNIA, IN THIS CASE TWO, I THINK YOU OPEN -- WE
16 OPEN OURSELVES TO CRITICISM.

17 I THINK THE ROLE OF CALIFORNIANS, THAT'S WHY WE
18 HAVE WHAT'S CALLED AN INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT
19 COMMITTEE. AND I THINK IF WE FIND THAT THERE ARE
20 MISSTEPS THAT ARE BEING MADE OR WE DON'T AGREE, THEN IT'S
21 OUR JOB TO SAY SOMETHING ABOUT THAT. I, FOR ONE, WOULD
22 STRONGLY ADVISE THAT THE PRINCIPLE BE THE SAME ACROSS ALL
23 THE WORKING GROUPS BECAUSE, IF NOT, THEN WE OPEN
24 OURSELVES TO INCONSISTENCIES. AND IF THERE'S AN ETHICAL
25 MISSTEP IN A VERY DIFFICULT AREA, THEN WE'RE OPEN TO

1 CRITICISM.

2 SO I WOULD NOT SUPPORT THERE BEING CALIFORNIANS
3 ON THIS COMMITTEE.

4 DR. KESSLER: DAVID.

5 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU, DR. KESSLER. AS
6 STATED EARLIER, DR. LEVEY, WE HAD THIS DISCUSSION ON THE
7 SUBCOMMITTEE LEVEL AS TO WHETHER THIS PARTICULAR WORKING
8 GROUP SHOULD BE EXCLUSIVELY POPULATED BY CALIFORNIANS OR
9 NOT CALIFORNIANS. IT WAS A HEALTHY AND ROBUST DEBATE AT
10 THAT SUBCOMMITTEE LEVEL. AND WE CAME TO THE CONCLUSION,
11 AS HAS BEEN SAID, THAT THERE WOULD BE NO HARM TO HAVE
12 SOME CALIFORNIANS, SOME CALIFORNIANS, SERVE ON THIS
13 PARTICULAR WORKING GROUP.

14 THE REASONS FOR HAVING THE NON-CALIFORNIANS ON
15 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, WHICH IS, I RECALL, A DECISION
16 WE ALL MADE AND WE ALL AGREED UPON, WE ALL ENDORSED,
17 THERE WERE SOME VERY CLEAR PUBLIC POLICY REASONS WHY WE
18 DID NOT WANT CALIFORNIANS ON THAT WORKING GROUP ON THE
19 SCIENTIST CATEGORY. AND THAT MADE A LOT OF SENSE. WE
20 ENDORSED THAT CONCEPT IN MY MIND. I DON'T THINK IT'S
21 TRANSFERABLE TO THIS WORKING GROUP OR THE FACILITIES, FOR
22 THAT MATTER.

23 THE ISSUES THAT THIS WORKING GROUP WILL BE
24 DEALING WITH ARE SET IN THE STATUTE. THERE'S NO REAL
25 HARM TO HAVE A CALIFORNIAN. AND IF, AS YOU SAY, DR.

1 LEVEY, ONE OF THE MEMBERS MAKES A MISHAP, YOU'RE RIGHT.
2 WE WILL KNOW ABOUT IT. AND THAT WILL HAVE TO BE
3 COMMUNICATED TO THAT INDIVIDUAL MEMBER, JUST AS IF ANY
4 ONE OF US MAKE A MISHAP PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT IT.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD POINT OUT THE
6 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, BY STATUTE, JUST THE WAY I
7 WROTE THE STATUTE, REQUIRES CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS ON IT.
8 SO THIS IS NOT A NEW CONCEPT OF HAVING CALIFORNIANS ON
9 THE WORKING GROUP. DR. SUSAN BRYANT.

10 DR. BRYANT: BUT THE INTENTION ON THE
11 FACILITIES, I THINK, WAS TO HAVE A REAL ESTATE EXPERT,
12 NOT NECESSARILY SCIENTISTS. THE PROBLEM WITH HAVING --
13 I'M NOT SURE HOW I FEEL ABOUT THIS ONE BECAUSE I'M NOT --
14 I CAN'T -- I CAN'T QUITE VISUALIZE THERE NEVER BEING A
15 SITUATION WHERE A PERSON FROM A GIVEN INSTITUTION MIGHT
16 NOT BE INFLUENCED BY THE CULTURE OF THAT INSTITUTION IN
17 MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STANDARDS.

18 SO I'M -- I JUST DON'T KNOW THAT I CAN ELIMINATE
19 THAT POSSIBILITY, BUT I CAN SEE THAT FOR THE REAL ESTATE
20 FOR THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE, HAVING -- YOU'RE NOT ASKING
21 FOR PEOPLE FROM INSTITUTIONS WHO ARE LIKELY TO BE
22 RECEIVING SUPPORT TO BE ON THAT COMMITTEE. WE'RE ASKING
23 FOR REAL ESTATE EXPERTS TO GIVE THAT KIND OF EVALUATION.

24 DR. THAL: I THINK THE SUBCOMMITTEE DELIBERATED
25 ON THIS AND SPENT A LOT OF TIME ON IT. I THINK THAT WE

1 SHOULD ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE AND
2 VOTE FOR THE SLATE. I THINK THAT INDIVIDUALS, AS WAS
3 EXPRESSED EARLIER, FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA CAN SERVE
4 ON THE COMMITTEE, THEY CAN RECUSE THEMSELVES IF THERE ARE
5 ISSUES THAT RELATE TO THEIR INDIVIDUAL SPECIFIC
6 INSTITUTIONS. AGAIN, THIS COMMITTEE IS NOT HANDING OUT
7 FUNDS. I DON'T SEE A SIGNIFICANT CONFLICT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO. AND THEN I THINK
9 DID SHERRY LANSING --

10 MS. LANSING: NO.

11 DR. PIZZO: CERTAINLY MY COMMENTS DO NOT IN ANY
12 WAY REFLECT ON THE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE BEING PROPOSED
13 BECAUSE THEY'RE CLEARLY EXCELLENT. BUT I CONTINUE TO
14 HAVE THE SAME CONCERN. I REALIZE THAT THIS WAS DISCUSSED
15 AT THE SUBCOMMITTEE. I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE ROBUST
16 DIALOGUE THAT MUST HAVE TAKEN PLACE AROUND THAT, BUT THIS
17 IS OUR TIME TO REFLECT ON THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS. AND MY
18 OWN VIEW IS THAT WE NEED TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO
19 CREATE THE BRIGHT LIGHT SEPARATION BETWEEN WHAT WE'RE
20 DOING INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA.

21 AND I AT LEAST FOR ONE DO NOT SEE THE DIFFERENCE
22 BETWEEN HOW THE GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE IS BEHAVING AND
23 HOW THIS COMMITTEE WOULD BE BEHAVING. SO MY OWN VIEW
24 WOULD BE, PUT SIMPLY, THAT THIS, LIKE THE GRANTS REVIEW
25 COMMITTEE, BE COMPRISED OF INDIVIDUALS OUTSIDE OF

1 CALIFORNIA. THAT'S MY PERSONAL VIEW ABOUT THIS.

2 DR. KESSLER: CAN I CLARIFY A POINT. THE
3 QUESTION THAT I'M PARTICULARLY RAISING IS NOT CALIFORNIA
4 VERSUS NOT CALIFORNIA. YOU CAN TURN DOWN PEOPLE IF YOU
5 DON'T LIKE THEM. BUT THE QUESTION THAT WE'RE RAISING
6 SPECIFICALLY IS WHETHER -- BECAUSE WE HAVE A SLATE THAT
7 WE WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT TO YOU, AND YOU CAN LOOK AT
8 THOSE NAMES AND COMMENT. THE QUESTION WE WENT THROUGH
9 AND, AS THE CHAIR HAS SAID, WE TRIED TO DETERMINE THE
10 BEST SLATE TO BE ABLE TO COME UP WITH STANDARDS.

11 THERE IS A VERY BIG DISTINCTION BETWEEN THIS
12 COMMITTEE AND THE OTHER TWO COMMITTEES. THERE ARE NO
13 FUNDS INVOLVED IN THIS COMMITTEE. TWO PEOPLE HAVE RAISED
14 THE QUESTION, FOR EXAMPLE, LET ME GIVE YOU THE
15 HYPOTHETICAL, IS ONE OF THE ETHICISTS SAID, WELL, THAT
16 MEANS IF THERE'S A TRAINING GRANT, I CAN'T BE ON OR BE
17 PART OF THAT TRAINING GRANT. AND THAT QUESTION WAS
18 RAISED. SO BEFORE -- WE CAN PRESENT THE SLATE TO YOU,
19 BUT WE THOUGHT THAT, AGAIN, WE CAN'T VOTE ON THIS TODAY
20 BECAUSE THERE'S AN ISSUE THAT IT'S NOT BEEN AGENDIZED THE
21 RIGHT WAY.

22 LET ME JUST POINT OUT OBVIOUSLY THE ICOC MEMBERS
23 ARE ALL FROM CALIFORNIA. THE DISEASE ADVOCATES ARE ALL
24 FROM CALIFORNIA. I THINK JEFF'S POINT ABOUT IN THE END
25 THE PEOPLE WHO -- WE WERE LOOKING FOR THE BEST QUALIFIED

1 PEOPLE WHO WE THOUGHT COULD COME UP WITH THESE KIND OF
2 STANDARDS.

3 DR. PIZZO: JUST, AGAIN, TO REPEAT MY COMMENT.
4 I PREFACED IT BY SAYING THE ANTECEDENT THAT WOULD
5 ELIMINATE THE CONCERN THAT WAS RAISED ABOUT WHETHER OR
6 NOT MEMBERS COULD APPLY FOR GRANTS IS CONTINGENT UPON
7 WHETHER OR NOT THEY'RE IN CALIFORNIA OR NOT. SO BY NOT
8 HAVING THEM BE IN CALIFORNIA, THAT ISSUE BECOMES A MOOT
9 ONE. I THINK THAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS COMMITTEE AT
10 LEAST PROACTIVELY MAKE A VOTE ON WHETHER OR NOT WE ACCEPT
11 THE RECOMMENDATION OR AT LEAST HAVE AN OPINION ABOUT THIS
12 AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE INDIVIDUAL SHOULD OR SHOULDN'T
13 BE FROM CALIFORNIA. I THINK THAT'S THE GOVERNING
14 PRINCIPLE THAT I'M RAISING.

15 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I HAVE A POINT OF ORDER,
16 DAVID.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: POINT OF ORDER.

18 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: IT SHOULD BE NOTED FOR THE
19 RECORD THAT ED HOLMES AND HIS GROUP, HIS COLLEAGUES ON
20 THAT SUBCOMMITTEE, ON THE FRONT END, AT THE VERY
21 BEGINNING HAD THE BENEFIT OF OUR INPUT IN TERMS OF
22 PROVIDING THAT ESSENTIAL GUIDANCE, NO CALIFORNIANS, FOR
23 THE SCIENTISTS. WHEN DAVID WAS CHARGED WITH THE
24 RESPONSIBILITY OF LEADING THIS PARTICULAR STANDARDS
25 SUBCOMMITTEE, WE DIDN'T COMMENT ON IT. SO WE DIDN'T HAVE

1 THE BENEFIT OF GUIDANCE. THAT NEEDS TO BE NOTED.

2 SO WE WENT ABOUT OUR WORK, LOOKED AT A LOT OF
3 NAMES. DINA, MARY, KATE ALL DID A FANTASTIC JOB. WE
4 WERE PERMITTED, CLEARING IT THROUGH THE CHAIR AND THE
5 PRESIDENT'S OFFICE, TO SPEAK WITH MANY OF THESE
6 CANDIDATES, TALK WITH THEM, INTERVIEW THEM. I BELIEVE
7 AFTER THIS PROCESS, AS DAVID HAS SAID, WE'VE COME UP WITH
8 SOME HIGHLY QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS THAT WILL SERVE WELL
9 FOR THIS WORKING GROUP.

10 DR. KESSLER: CAN I ALSO CLARIFY ONE POINT STAFF
11 JUST HELPED ME WITH. THIS CALIFORNIA, NON-CALIFORNIA
12 ISSUE, WHILE YOU ARE CERTAINLY FREE TO DISCUSS IT, AND WE
13 WELCOME THAT ISSUE, JUST SO YOU KNOW, THAT WAS PRESENTED
14 PREVIOUSLY IN A REPORT FROM THE STANDARDS SEARCH
15 SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE ICOC. WE SET THAT OUT AS A FRAMEWORK
16 PRIOR, AND I BELIEVE THAT WAS ADOPTED BY THE ICOC.

17 THE SPECIFIC ISSUE ON RECUSAL -- ON WHETHER YOU
18 COULD ACCEPT FUNDS WE DID NOT PRESENT. BUT WE DID SAY
19 FROM THE BEGINNING WHEN WE PRESENTED THAT WE WERE
20 CONSIDERING BOTH CALIFORNIANS AND NON-CALIFORNIANS ON
21 THIS SUBCOMMITTEE.

22 DR. PIZZO: I MAY HAVE MISSED THAT.
23 UNFORTUNATELY I DON'T RECALL THAT DISCUSSION. IF, IN
24 FACT, IT WAS VOTED ON AND APPROVED, THEN MY COMMENTS
25 BECOME ONE OF IGNORANCE, AND I ACCEPT THAT. BUT I DO

1 HAVE THE CONCERN THAT I'VE EXPRESSED. AND AS I LOOK
2 AROUND THE ROOM AND WATCH PEOPLE'S REACTION, I SUSPECT
3 THAT I'M NOT ALONE IN THAT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, DR. PIZZO, YOUR KNOWLEDGE
5 IS ALWAYS HELPFUL. THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE AN OBSERVATION
6 THAT FOLLOWED ANOTHER ACTION THAT YOU DID NOT REMEMBER IS
7 A DIFFERENT OBSERVATION, BUT IT IS AN IMPORTANT
8 OBSERVATION THAT THESE WERE THE RULES THAT THEY WORKED
9 WITHIN IN TRYING TO BRING UP THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS. AND
10 IT INFERS TO ME THAT WE WILL HAVE A DIFFERENT BURDEN IN
11 OVERCOMING AND CHANGING THAT INSTRUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE
12 WHICH THEY WORKED IN GOOD FAITH TO CARRY OUT. SO I THINK
13 IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT POINT.

14 WE HAVE A VERY EXTENSIVE AGENDA. I THINK WE'VE
15 DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE. I'D LIKE TO KNOW IF THE SPECIFIC
16 ISSUE THAT DR. KESSLER HAS ASKED, IS THERE A MOTION --

17 DR. KESSLER: MR. CHAIR, COUNSEL, JUST HELP ME.
18 WE'RE JUST ASKING FOR THIS TO BE DISCUSSED TODAY ON THE
19 ISSUE OF WHETHER MEMBERS OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE CAN RECEIVE
20 GRANTS BECAUSE THE SLATE WE'RE PRESENTING, THERE WERE TWO
21 MEMBERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT
22 QUESTION BEFORE THEY WOULD AGREE TO DO THIS.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I HOPE THAT MR. BAGLEY AND
24 MR. KEENE ARE COMFORTABLE IN HEAVEN.

25 MR. HARRISON: MR. BAGLEY IS STILL ALIVE.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OUR CONSTRAINTS ON WHAT WE CAN
2 CONSIDER. SO, SPECIFICALLY, WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS
3 ISSUE, BUT I THINK, DR. KESSLER, YOU'RE INSTRUCTING US
4 THAT WHEN WE VOTE ON THIS SLATE, WE'RE ESSENTIALLY
5 RECOGNIZING THAT WE HAVE TWO MEMBERS THAT THIS IS VERY
6 IMPORTANT FOR.

7 DR. KESSLER: THAT'S CORRECT. WE WILL ASK YOU
8 FOR YOUR VOTE ON THE SLATE TODAY. THEY CAN ALWAYS THEN
9 DECLINE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

11 DR. PENHOET: DO THAT WITH A SPECIFIC MOTION
12 WHICH IS IF THERE ARE MEMBERS FROM CALIFORNIA ON THE
13 STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, THAT WE VOTE TO ALLOW THEM TO BE
14 RECIPIENTS OF GRANTS.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE CAN'T HAVE A -- I JUST
16 CONFIRMED WITH COUNSEL -- A SPECIFIC MOTION ON THAT. SO
17 THE APPROPRIATE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT THE SLATE WITH
18 ALL THE MEMBERS OR TO ACCEPT THE SLATE WITHOUT THE
19 CALIFORNIA MEMBERS BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT WILL RESOLVE THE
20 ISSUE.

21 DR. BLACK HAS A COMMENT.

22 DR. BLACK: I JUST WANT TO ASK, MOVING PAST
23 PERCEPTION, IS THERE ANY CONCEIVABLE WAY THAT BY SERVING
24 ON THIS COMMITTEE, IF YOU'RE FROM CALIFORNIA, THAT THEY
25 COULD INFLUENCE THE AWARDING OF ANY GRANTS BY THIS

1 INSTITUTE THAT YOU CAN IMAGINE?

2 DR. KESSLER: I CAN'T COME UP WITH ANY WAY
3 STANDING HERE TODAY. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER OTHERS CAN ON
4 THE SPOT. I CERTAINLY WANT TO -- I CERTAINLY DID NOT
5 THINK SO. I WOULD NEVER WANT TO SAY THERE'S NO
6 CONCEIVABLE WAY THAT I CAN'T CONSTRUCT A HYPOTHETICAL
7 SCENARIO. IT'S POSSIBLE, BUT --

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT WOULD BE
9 APPROPRIATE, DR. KESSLER, TO SAY THAT BEYOND THE
10 STRUCTURAL INSULATION THAT THERE'S NO MONEY THAT FLOWS
11 THROUGH THIS COMMITTEE, THERE ARE ETHICAL CONDITIONS
12 AFFECTING THIS WORKING GROUP WHICH WOULD PROHIBIT THEM
13 FROM TRYING TO INFLUENCE ANY GRANT. SO WE HAVE TWO TIERS
14 OF TWO FIREWALLS.

15 DR. BLACK: IT CERTAINLY GIVES ME A LEVEL OF
16 CONFIDENCE THAT I THINK THAT THE BENEFITS OF HAVING THE
17 BEST INDIVIDUALS AND SO ON THAT HAS A VESTED INTEREST FOR
18 BEING FROM CALIFORNIA WOULD MAKE ME FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH
19 HAVING INDIVIDUALS FROM CALIFORNIA ON THIS COMMITTEE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF SHEEHY AND THEN DR. PIZZO,
21 AND I'M GOING TO DR. MURPHY, WHO HASN'T TALKED YET, AND
22 DR. LEVEY.

23 MR. SHEEHY: MY ONLY POINT WOULD BE I THINK WE
24 SHOULD SEPARATE APPLYING FOR GRANTS FROM BEING FROM
25 CALIFORNIA BECAUSE I SPOKE AT LENGTH WITH ONE OF THE

1 ETHICISTS WHO'S FROM CALIFORNIA, AND HE BRINGS UNIQUE
2 EXPERIENCE. AND I DON'T THINK HE IS ANTICIPATING
3 RECEIVING GRANTS, AND I'D SURE HATE TO SEE THAT
4 EXPERIENCE THAT WE REALLY FELT LIKE WAS VITAL TO HAVE ON
5 THIS WORKING GROUP BE LOST AS WE CAST TOO WIDE A NET.

6 SO MAYBE IF WE CAN CHANGE OUR DISCUSSION TO NOT
7 HAVING, YOU KNOW -- BECAUSE THE REAL QUESTION -- WE'VE
8 ALREADY DECIDED CALIFORNIANS CAN BE ON THIS. THE REAL
9 QUESTION IS WHETHER OR NOT PEOPLE MIGHT POTENTIALLY
10 PARTICIPATE IN GRANTS. I SURE WOULD HATE THAT IF WE GO
11 FURTHER DOWN THE ROAD WITH THIS, WE LOSE THAT ONE PERSON
12 BECAUSE THAT PERSON WAS OUTSTANDING.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO.

14 DR. PIZZO: I KNOW THAT PERSON QUITE WELL. I
15 WORKED WITH HIM IN A NUMBER OF SITUATIONS. AGREE THAT HE
16 IS ABSOLUTELY OUTSTANDING, SO THIS IS NOT ABOUT THAT.
17 BUT IT IS ABOUT HOW WE CAN ASSURE THE GREATEST DEGREE OF
18 PUBLIC TRUST AND TRANSPARENCY IN WHAT WE'RE DOING. AS A
19 MATTER OF PRINCIPLE, I THINK THERE ARE VARIANCES IN HOW
20 SOME OF US SEE THIS. CLEARLY, WE WANT THE VERY BEST
21 PEOPLE, BUT I THINK WE ALWAYS WANT TO BE ABLE TO SAY THAT
22 WE HAD ALL THE CHECKS AND BALANCES MANAGED SO THAT THE
23 ETHICAL PRINCIPLES THAT GOVERNED ARE BEING DONE IN WAYS
24 THAT ARE AT ARM'S LENGTH FROM THOSE OF US WHO ARE WORKING
25 IN CALIFORNIA.

1 SO THE CONCERN THAT I HAVE IS THAT AS WE GO
2 FORWARD AND YOU CALL FOR A VOTE, THE ONLY OPTION, FOR
3 EXAMPLE, THAT I MIGHT HAVE IS TO VOTE AGAINST THE SLATE,
4 WHICH I DON'T WANT TO DO, IF THAT'S THE ONLY WAY THAT I
5 CAN EXPRESS CONCERN ABOUT THE ISSUE OF CALIFORNIA AND
6 NON-CALIFORNIA.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO, YOU WOULD HAVE AN
8 OPTION OF HAVING A MOTION THAT WOULD APPROVE THE SLATE
9 EXCEPT FOR CALIFORNIA MEMBERS. DR. KESSLER.

10 DR. KESSLER: I GUESS, PHIL, IT WOULD ACTUALLY
11 BE MY PRESUMPTION, WHEN YOU'RE DEALING WITH ETHICAL
12 STANDARDS, AS I THINK MR. SHEEHY VERY ELOQUENTLY SAID,
13 THAT IF WE'RE GOING TO SET THE ETHICAL STANDARDS HERE,
14 AND THE STANDARD OF HOW TO OPERATE AND DO RESEARCH, THAT,
15 IN FACT, THE PRESUMPTION PROBABLY WOULD BE THAT YOU WOULD
16 WANT CALIFORNIANS. WHY WOULD YOU DISCRIMINATE AGAINST
17 CALIFORNIANS? I UNDERSTAND THERE'S THIS SEPARATE ISSUE
18 ABOUT RECEIVING FUNDS, AND THAT'S WHY I RAISED THAT ISSUE
19 ON THE FUNDS. BUT TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE CITIZENS
20 OF CALIFORNIA TO COME UP WITH THE STANDARDS THAT ARE
21 GOING TO GOVERN CALIFORNIA, I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND
22 THAT ARGUMENT.

23 DR. PIZZO: I THINK WE HAVE -- THE ARGUMENT CAN
24 BE TAKEN FURTHER. WE CAN SAY LET'S JUST HAVE TOTAL
25 CALIFORNIANS ON THIS. SO IT IS A MATTER OF DISCERNING

1 WHETHER OR NOT WE WANT TO HAVE INDIVIDUALS FROM ONE OR
2 ANOTHER OF OUR ACADEMIC CENTERS, BECAUSE THERE'S ONLY
3 GOING TO BE A SMALL NUMBER OF THEM, WHETHER THEY'LL HAVE
4 A POINT OF VIEW THAT MIGHT IN SOME WAY BE CONSIDERED TO
5 CONVEY A CERTAIN BIAS. WHAT I'M LOOKING AT IS REALLY THE
6 NEED TO HAVE THE GREATEST DEGREE OF PROTECTION OF THE
7 CIRM AS WE GO FORWARD.

8 I CAN ARGUE THIS, DAVID, FROM A VARIETY OF
9 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES. AND MY OPINION SHOULD NOT BE
10 CONFIGURED TO SUGGEST THAT THE DEBATE THAT WENT ON WITHIN
11 THE SUBCOMMITTEE REACHED AN INACCURATE CONCLUSION. I
12 UNDERSTAND HOW YOU GOT THERE, AND I'M NOT DISAGREEING
13 WITH THE RELEVANCE OF THOSE DISCUSSIONS. I'M JUST TAKING
14 IT TO ANOTHER LEVEL OF PRINCIPLE AND ASKING THIS QUESTION
15 AT A HIGHER OR DIFFERENT LEVEL ABOUT CALIFORNIA VERSUS
16 NOT, HAVING A HIGHER --

17 DR. KESSLER: JUST CLARIFY FOR ME, BECAUSE IT
18 WOULD BE HELPFUL, WHAT IS IT ABOUT BEING FROM CALIFORNIA?

19 DR. PIZZO: IT IS REALLY NOT A MATTER OF THE
20 EXCELLENCE OF THE OPINION. IT'S A MATTER OF THE
21 PERCEPTION OF THE COMMUNITY.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. KESSLER, IF WE COULD, WE
23 HAVE DR. MURPHY AND DR. LEVEY, AND LET'S GET THE REST OF
24 THESE COMMENTS ON THE TABLE, IF WE COULD. DR. MURPHY.

25 DR. MURPHY: DAVID, I THINK THERE'S ANOTHER

1 ISSUE HERE, AND THAT IS THAT THE CALIFORNIANS WHO MIGHT
2 BE ON THE COMMITTEE ARE IN A PRIVILEGED POSITION RELATIVE
3 TO THAT COMMITTEE OR IN A POSITION ON THAT COMMITTEE THAT
4 GIVES THEM A PRIVILEGED POSITION RELATIVE TO THEIR
5 COLLEAGUES WITHIN THEIR ORGANIZATIONS. AND IF ONE OF
6 THOSE MEMBERS IN THE COMMITTEE IS IN A DEPARTMENT OF
7 ETHICS, FOR EXAMPLE, AND IS TALKING WITH HIS OR HER
8 COLLEAGUES WITHIN THAT SAME DEPARTMENT AT UCSF, FOR AN
9 EXAMPLE, WHAT HAPPENS TO THE COLLEAGUES IN OTHER
10 INSTITUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA? COULDN'T THEY COMPLAIN ABOUT
11 BEING IN SOME WAY DISADVANTAGED BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE
12 THE SAME ACCESS TO THE EXPERTISE OF THAT COMMITTEE?

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. MURPHY, I WOULD CALL TO
14 YOUR ATTENTION THAT EVERY DECISION ON CREATING ANY
15 STANDARD COMES TO THIS FULL BOARD. AND THE BEAUTY OF
16 HAVING ALL THE REGIONS AND ALL THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF
17 INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED ON THIS BOARD IS THIS IS WHERE
18 THE FINAL DECISION IS. SO WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE
19 INFLUENCE OF ONE PERSON AS PART OF A MUCH LARGER
20 COMMITTEE AND THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE ADVISORY THAT
21 COMES TO US. AND WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO REBALANCE FROM
22 MANY PERSPECTIVES ON THIS BOARD WHEN IT COMES TO THE
23 BOARD.

24 DR. MURPHY: I UNDERSTAND THAT. I THINK THAT'S
25 A REASONABLE POINT, MR. CHAIRMAN. ON THE OTHER POINT

1 ABOUT THE VOTE, I WOULD HATE TO VOTE TO THE EXCLUSION OF
2 CERTAIN MEMBERS BECAUSE I THINK THAT COULD BE INTERPRETED
3 BY THOSE MEMBERS AS NOT BEING SUPPORTIVE OF THEIR
4 EXPERTISE. SO I WOULD RATHER VOTE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF
5 WHETHER WE HAVE CALIFORNIANS OR NOT CALIFORNIANS AND THEN
6 DEAL WITH THE MEMBERS.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. STEWARD.

8 DR. STEWARD: I WONDER, GIVEN THAT WE'RE
9 CONCERNED ABOUT CALIFORNIANS, IF THE DISEASE ADVOCATES
10 WOULD ALSO LOSE THEIR RIGHT TO VOTE. YOU ARE ON THE
11 STATUTE. IT DOESN'T -- IF WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT
12 CALIFORNIANS, WOULDN'T THE SAME THING APPLY TO THE
13 DISEASE ADVOCATES? AND I THINK THAT THAT IS REALLY THE
14 FUNDAMENTAL THING HERE. IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE DISEASE
15 ADVOCATES VOTING, I COULD -- IF THERE WAS SOME REMOTE
16 POSSIBILITY OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, I THINK THE SAME
17 MIGHT APPLY TO THEM AS WELL. I THINK THAT WE MADE THE
18 DECISION IN THE BEGINNING THAT CALIFORNIANS WOULD BE
19 ACCEPTABLE TO SERVE ON THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE; AND THAT
20 IF WE MAKE THE DECISION THAT THEY'RE NOT, IT CALLS INTO
21 QUESTION THE DISEASE ADVOCACY.

22 DR. LEVEY: JUST TO GO BACK TO THE ORIGINAL
23 COMMENTS I MADE, AND I AGREE WITH DR. PIZZO AND
24 DR. MURPHY. IT'S NOT AN ISSUE OF GRANTS, DAVID. IT'S AN
25 ISSUE OF MAKING DECISIONS ON ETHICAL ISSUES. AND

1 EVERYTHING THAT WE DO IS INTERTWINED. AND I THINK THAT
2 IT WOULD BE MAKING A MISTAKE.

3 I ALSO WILL NOT SUPPORT ANY MOTION WHEN WE HAVE
4 TO VOTE ON THE INDIVIDUALS; BUT I SUPPOSE THAT IF WE ARE
5 GOING TO FUNCTION LIKE A BOARD, I THINK WE PROBABLY
6 SHOULD VOTE ON THE PRINCIPLE BEFORE WE VOTE ON THE
7 MEMBERS BECAUSE, FIRST OF ALL, IF IT GETS TURNED DOWN,
8 WHICH IS A POSSIBILITY, IF IT GETS TURNED DOWN, YOU SEND
9 A BAD MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE NATIONALLY WHO VOLUNTEERED TO
10 DO THIS. AND SECONDLY, YOU SEND A BAD MESSAGE TO THE
11 CALIFORNIANS. BERNIE LO IS A TERRIFIC PERSON. HE'D BE
12 ONE OF THE LEADING ETHICISTS IN THE WORLD.

13 SO I WOULD PREFER THAT THE BOARD TAKE A VOTE ON
14 THE PRINCIPLE. AND IF THE PRINCIPLE -- IF WE LOSE ON THE
15 PRINCIPLE WITH REGARD TO THIS IN THIS SPECIFIC INSTANCE,
16 THEN IT'S A SLIPPERY SLOPE. HOW DO WE JUSTIFY, YOU KNOW,
17 THE GRANTS? SO I WOULD SAY WE VOTE ON THE PRINCIPLE
18 BEFORE WE VOTE ON THE INDIVIDUALS.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LEVEY, TO EXPEDITE THIS,
20 COULD YOU MAKE THAT A MOTION?

21 DR. LEVEY: I WOULD MAKE SUCH A MOTION, THAT WE
22 VOTE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF WHETHER THE ETHICS COMMITTEE
23 SHOULD CONTAIN EITHER CALIFORNIANS OR INDIVIDUALS FROM
24 OUTSIDE THE STATE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOUR MOTION WOULD BE -- ARE YOU

1 GOING TO STATE IT THAT THE ETHICS COMMITTEE SHOULD
2 CONTAIN CALIFORNIANS OR SHOULD NOT CONTAIN CALIFORNIANS?
3 WE NEED IT TO STATE ONE OF THEM.

4 DR. LEVEY: I WOULD PROPOSE A MOTION THAT THE
5 ETHICS COMMITTEE NOT CONTAIN INDIVIDUALS FROM CALIFORNIA.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

7 MR. SHEEHY: POINT OF ORDER.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: POINT OF ORDER. I'M ASKING IF
9 THERE'S A SECOND.

10 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF SHEEHY.

12 MR. SHEEHY: I'M NOT SURE WHAT RULES GOVERN THE
13 OPERATION OF THIS BODY, BUT IF IT'S ROBERT'S RULES OF
14 ORDER, DOESN'T IT TAKE A SUPER MAJORITY TO OVERTURN A
15 PREVIOUS DECISION THAT'S BEEN MADE BY THIS BODY? AND WE
16 HAVE, PER DR. KESSLER'S REPORT BACK FROM THE STANDARDS
17 SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE, SAID THAT CALIFORNIA CAN SERVE. BUT
18 MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER REQUIRES
19 A SUPER MAJORITY FOR THIS MOTION TO PASS.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME ASK THIS QUESTION, MR.
21 SHEEHY. IT MAY BE THAT YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE CONCERNED
22 WITH THAT DEPENDING UPON THE OUTCOME OF THIS. AND IT
23 MIGHT ALLOW PEOPLE TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES, BUT I DO
24 BELIEVE THAT YOU PROBABLY HAVE AN IMPORTANT POINT HERE.

25 DR. KESSLER: JERRY, I THINK THE WAY YOU

1 STRUCTURED THAT MOTION PROBABLY IS IN CONFLICT WITH PROP
2 71 BECAUSE THE WAY YOU'VE DONE IT IS WHETHER MEMBERS OF
3 THIS WORKING GROUP CAN BE FROM CALIFORNIA. AND YOU HAVE
4 DISEASE ADVOCATES THAT ARE FROM CALIFORNIA, SO I THINK
5 YOU WOULD HAVE TO RESTRUCTURE THAT MOTION.

6 DR. LEVEY: CALIFORNIA INSTITUTES.

7 DR. BRYANT: I WAS GOING TO MODIFY THAT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S CLARIFY THE MOTION. THE
9 MOTION IS -- WHAT DR. LEVEY WAS MAKING A MOTION IS THAT
10 FROM THE SCIENTISTS AND ETHICISTS, THAT THOSE WOULD NOT
11 BE FROM CALIFORNIA.

12 DR. LEVEY: SHOULD BE LIVING OUTSIDE THE STATE.

13 DR. BRYANT: I WOULD MODIFY THAT TO SAY SHOULD
14 NOT BE ASSOCIATED WITH A POTENTIAL GRANTEE INSTITUTION.
15 AND THEN YOU COULD HAVE CALIFORNIANS, BUT NOT BE IN A
16 POSITION TO EITHER SHARE FREE KNOWLEDGE OR ANY OTHER KIND
17 OF INFLUENCE OVER THE OUTCOME OF GRANTS.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LEVEY, IS THAT A FRIENDLY
19 AMENDMENT?

20 DR. LEVEY: THAT WOULD BE FINE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO DR. LEVEY'S MOTION IS THAT
22 YOU SHOULD NOT HAVE CALIFORNIANS AMONG THE ETHICISTS AND
23 SCIENTISTS WHO ARE ASSOCIATED WITH AN INSTITUTION THAT
24 WOULD BE A POTENTIAL GRANT RECIPIENT. IS THAT A CORRECT
25 STATEMENT?

1 DR. BRYANT: YEAH.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS YOUR MOTION. THAT HAS
3 BEEN CLARIFIED.

4 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD BEFORE I GO
5 TO THE PUBLIC? JOAN.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE CLEAR THAT
7 THE PERSPECTIVE THAT WE HAD, AFTER SPENDING HOURS AND
8 HOURS ON THIS, THE FEWER CALIFORNIANS, AND THIS ISN'T --
9 THERE WERE SEVERAL CRITERIA WE WERE LOOKING AT. WE'RE
10 TRYING TO GET THE VERY BEST WE CAN FIND WITH A WIDE
11 DIVERSITY OF EXPERTISE AS WELL AS OTHER DIVERSITY. AND
12 FROM OUR -- CERTAINLY FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, THERE'S GOING
13 TO BE CONSTANT CONTROVERSY, AT LEAST DISCUSSION IN THE
14 STATE, IN THE MEDIA ABOUT THE DECISIONS THAT THIS WORKING
15 GROUP IS MAKING THAT ARE ADVISORY TO THE FULL ICOC.

16 BUT AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE WORKING GROUPS ARE
17 GOING TO HAVE A FAIR AMOUNT OF AUTONOMY BECAUSE WE'RE
18 GOING TO HAVE A LOT TO DO, AND NOT ALL OF THAT IS GOING
19 TO BE ABLE TO BE SUBJECT TO RE-REVIEW.

20 SO THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA, WHO ARE A PARTNER
21 IN THIS, ARE GOING TO BE LOOKING TO THE WORKING GROUPS TO
22 TRUST THAT THEY ARE COMING UP WITH STANDARDS THAT REFLECT
23 THE STANDARDS THAT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA --
24 CALIFORNIANS WANT. AND IF THOSE STANDARDS ARE COMING
25 FROM PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE THE STATE, I DON'T THINK THERE'S

1 GOING TO BE THE SAME LEVEL OF TRUST. THAT WAS CERTAINLY
2 IMPORTANT TO ME IN HAVING A MEMBER OF THE ICOC AS PART OF
3 THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WORKING GROUP, AND IT'S PART OF
4 THAT SAME CONCERN. IT WAS ONE OF SEVERAL FACTORS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. DR. PIZZO.

6 DR. PIZZO: THAT WOULD ARGUE FOR HAVING
7 EVERYBODY FROM CALIFORNIA BE ON, AND IT'S JUST SORT OF
8 THE NATURAL EXTENSION, AND I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO DO
9 THAT.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: WELL, IT WAS A BALANCE OF
11 SEVERAL FACTORS. AND PARTICULARLY THAT THIS GROUP WAS
12 NOT GOING TO BE -- THERE WOULD NOT BE GRANTS REVIEWED BY
13 THAT WORKING GROUP.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I NEED TO RECOGNIZE DR. PRICE
15 AT THE END.

16 DR. PRICE: I HAVE A QUESTION FOR THE ADVOCATES
17 OF THIS RESOLUTION. THE CONCEPT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST
18 PRESUMES, IS BUILT ON THE NOTION THAT THE PERSONAL
19 INTERESTS OF A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE WILL SOMEHOW
20 INTERFERE AND INFLUENCE THE DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THE
21 COMMITTEE. WE UNDERSTAND THAT WITH GRANTS.

22 I WOULD LIKE ONE OF YOU TO OFFER US A
23 HYPOTHETICAL OF HOW BEING A MEMBER OF A CALIFORNIA
24 INSTITUTION WHICH GETS GRANTS WILL BE BENEFITED, HOW THE
25 INSTITUTION OR THE INDIVIDUAL WHO'S IN THAT INSTITUTION

1 WILL BE BENEFITED BY THE KIND OF WORK THAT THE STANDARDS
2 COMMITTEE IS DOING. IF YOU CAN'T GIVE US A HYPOTHETICAL
3 OF THAT, YOU CAN'T PINPOINT WHERE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST
4 WOULD BE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, DR. PRICE. DR.
6 HOLMES.

7 DR. HOLMES: I THINK I CAN GIVE AN EXAMPLE THAT
8 I WOULD IMAGINE THERE WOULD BE GRANTS THAT WILL PROBABLY
9 BE AWARDED AT SOME POINT THAT HAVE TO DO WITH ETHICAL
10 ISSUES. AND SETTING THE STANDARDS FOR WHAT THOSE ETHICAL
11 ISSUES ARE COULD IN THEORY SET YOUR INSTITUTION IN A
12 POSITION TO RECEIVE THAT GRANT FAVORABLY TO SOMEONE ELSE.
13 I'M NOT SAYING I'M GOING TO VOTE ON THIS. I'M SAYING I
14 THINK IT IS A THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY. YOU COULD RECUSE
15 YOURSELF. THERE ARE LOTS OF WAYS TO HANDLE IT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I'M GOING TO GO TO
17 PUBLIC, PUBLIC COMMENT?

18 MR. REED: DON REED, CALIFORNIANS FOR CURE. I
19 WOULD VOTE FOR HAVING NO CALIFORNIANS ON THIS BOARD --
20 REVIEW SITUATION BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO BE JUDGED BY THE
21 ENEMIES OF THE RESEARCH AS HARSHLY AS POSSIBLE; AND IF
22 THEY CAN FIND EVEN THE SLIGHTEST SHADE OF CONFLICT OF
23 INTEREST, THEY WILL JUMP ON IT. AND THERE WILL POSSIBLY
24 BE MORE LITIGATION. I THINK WE COULD AVOID THAT. I
25 THINK IT IS FREQUENTLY THE CASE.

1 ALSO, I HAVE TO COMPLIMENT THE PEOPLE WHO WENT
2 THROUGH THE INCREDIBLY ARDUOUS JOB OF CHOOSING THE
3 SCIENTISTS, THE REVIEW BOARD. IT WAS JUST ASTOUNDING TO
4 GO FROM 800 TO 15. IT WAS AN IMPOSSIBLE JOB.

5 BY WAY OF A SIDE COMMENT, THE ONE PERSON THAT
6 WAS CHOSEN AS FIRST ALTERNATE WAS JUST VOTED ONTO THE
7 NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY ASSOCIATION HALL OF FAME. SO
8 INSTEAD OF HAVING PEOPLE THAT ARE JUST MIDDLELEVEL, WE HAVE
9 THE ABSOLUTE BEST THERE ARE AVAILABLE. I THINK THAT'S
10 WONDERFUL. THANK YOU.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I'D LIKE
12 TO CALL THE QUESTION, BUT I THINK WE'RE GOING TO NEED A
13 ROLL CALL VOTE HERE.

14 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: DO WE HAVE A RULING FROM
15 OUR COUNSEL AS TO THE VOTE, SUPER MAJORITY, ETC., THAT
16 POINT THAT MR. SHEEHY RAISED?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COUNSEL, IS A SUPER MAJORITY
18 VOTE REQUIRED IN THIS CASE?

19 MR. HARRISON: WE'RE IN A RATHER UNIQUE
20 SITUATION HERE WHERE THE BOARD HAS NOT FORMALLY ADOPTED
21 BYLAWS. THE BOARD HAS OPERATED LOOSELY UNDER ROBERT'S
22 RULES OF ORDER, BUT THE BOARD HAS NOT FORMALLY ADOPTED
23 BYLAWS.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND WHAT IS YOUR INSTRUCTION
25 FROM ROBERTS' RULES OF ORDER?

1 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE THAT ROBERT'S RULES OF
2 ORDER REQUIRES A TWO-THIRDS VOTE TO OVERTURN AN ACTION
3 PREVIOUSLY TAKEN BY THE BOARD.

4 DR. PIZZO: HAVE WE DETERMINED THAT WE TRULY DID
5 TAKE AN ACTION BEFORE?

6 MR. HARRISON: WHAT HAPPENED IN FEBRUARY AT THE
7 FEBRUARY MEETING IS THAT THE SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE MADE A
8 STATUS REPORT TO THE BOARD, IN WHICH DR. KESSLER
9 DESCRIBED THE PROCEDURE AND THE QUALIFICATION AND
10 CRITERIA THAT THE SEARCH GROUP WOULD APPLY TO ITS
11 RECOMMENDATION OF CANDIDATES TO THE FULL BOARD.

12 DR. PIZZO: DID WE VOTE ON THAT IN SOME WAY?

13 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE THAT THE STATUS REPORT
14 WAS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS THE RECOLLECTION.

16 DR. PIZZO: JUST FOR THE RECORD, I MEAN, CAN YOU
17 GO BACK TO THE MINUTES AND ASSURE THAT THAT WAS DONE? I
18 DON'T WANT TO -- WE'RE NOT INTO THIS DEBATE AND ARGUMENTS
19 ABOUT FINE POINTS, BUT I THINK THESE ARE IMPORTANT ISSUES
20 AND WE SHOULD BE CLEAR ABOUT IT. I JUST, AGAIN, FEEL
21 STRONGLY THAT WE WANT TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO ASSURE
22 THAT WE HAVE THE PUBLIC TRUST AS WE'RE GOING FORWARD.
23 WE'VE HAD ENOUGH HOSTILE FIRE, THAT ANYTHING WE CAN DO TO
24 BE CLEAR IS GOING TO BE IMPORTANT TO US.

25 MR. HARRISON: WE WILL REFER TO THE FEBRUARY

1 MINUTES AND CONFIRM THAT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. DR. PENHOET.

3 DR. PENHOET: WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, PHIL, I
4 THINK ALL OF THE HARD DECISIONS WE MAKE BALANCE VARIOUS
5 DIFFERENT INTERESTS AROUND THE TABLE. AND I'M PERSUADED
6 BY OS STEWARD'S STATEMENT, THAT IF WE CHOOSE TO PASS THIS
7 RESOLUTION, THAT IT SENDS A MESSAGE THAT WE WILL
8 MARGINALIZE PARTICIPATION BY THE DISEASE ADVOCATES ON
9 THIS GROUP. SO I WILL VOTE PERSONALLY NO ON THIS ISSUE
10 BECAUSE I'M PERSUADED BY OS' ARGUMENT.

11 DR. PIZZO: MAY I JUST DISAGREE WITH THAT?

12 DR. PENHOET: NO, YOU CAN'T DISAGREE.

13 DR. PIZZO: I CAN INDEED, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO
14 OFFER THE ALTERNATIVE POINT OF VIEW. I TOTALLY, OF
15 COURSE, ENTHUSIASTICALLY VALUE THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE
16 DISEASE ADVOCATES. BY DEFINITION, THIS IS AN ESSENTIAL
17 CONSTITUENCY THAT WE'LL LEARN FROM AND HOLD THE INTEGRITY
18 OF BOTH CALIFORNIANS IN WHAT WE'RE ABOUT. THIS IS IN NO
19 WAY A DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT. THIS IS REALLY ABOUT THE
20 ETHICIST AND SCIENTISTS WHO HAVE A DIFFERENT ROLE, AND
21 IT'S THAT THAT I'M FOCUSING ON. CLEARLY, I WANT TO
22 VOCIFEROUSLY DISAGREE WITH ANY SUGGESTION THAT THIS IS
23 ABOUT CONCERN ABOUT THE DISEASE ADVOCATES FROM
24 CALIFORNIA.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'VE HAD -- WE HAVE A MOTION.

1 WE'VE HAD BOARD COMMENT, PUBLIC COMMENT. I'D LIKE TO
2 CALL THE -- DR. PRIETO.

3 DR. PRIETO: I'D JUST LIKE TO ECHO A LITTLE OF
4 WHAT PHIL SAID, THAT THE DISEASE ADVOCATES DON'T
5 REPRESENT INSTITUTIONS. AND SO WE DON'T PLAY A ROLE IN
6 THE ADOPTION OF POLICIES THAT MIGHT IMPACT ANY
7 INSTITUTIONS WE BELONG TO. I THINK THAT IS AN IMPORTANT
8 DISTINCTION.

9 THAT SAID, I THINK WE ALSO MIGHT LOOK AT THE
10 CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES THAT WE ADOPTED FOR OURSELVES
11 FOR SOME GUIDANCE HERE IN THAT I CAN SEE A SITUATION
12 WHERE WE WOULD HAVE SOME VERY VALUABLE CANDIDATES FROM
13 CALIFORNIA WHOSE PARTICIPATION WE MIGHT WANT, WHO WOULD
14 WANT TO, FOR EXAMPLE, PARTICIPATE IN A TRAINING PROGRAM.
15 I WOULD THINK TO AVOID AT LEAST ONE LEVEL OF CONFLICT OF
16 INTEREST, SINCE THERE ARE SO MANY, WE COULD STATE OR
17 ADOPT AS A RULE THAT THEY COULD NOT RECEIVE SALARY
18 SUPPORT, JUST AS NO ONE ON THIS BOARD CAN RECEIVE ANY
19 FINANCIAL DIRECT SALARY SUPPORT, YET THEY COULD STILL
20 PARTICIPATE THROUGH THEIR INSTITUTION IN A TRAINING
21 PROGRAM FOR NEW SCIENTISTS.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE HAVE DEBATED THIS ON
23 BOTH SIDES PRETTY THOROUGHLY. GIVEN THE AGENDA, I WOULD
24 ASK THE BOARD, IF IT'S POSSIBLE --

25 MS. KING: I CAN RESTATE THE MINUTES FROM THE

1 FEBRUARY MINUTE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MELISSA, WOULD YOU RESTATE THE
3 MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY MEETING.

4 MS. KING: I WILL. I'M JUST GOING TO START
5 SAYING THAT THERE WAS A MOTION MADE AND SECONDED TO
6 APPROVE THE REPORT PRESENTED BY THE STANDARDS WORKING
7 GROUP SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE AT THE FEBRUARY 3D MEETING.
8 I'M GOING TO SCROLL BACK IN THOSE MINUTES TO FIND EXACTLY
9 WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE, AND I'M GOING TO ASK FOR
10 DR. KESSLER'S HELP IN DOING THAT.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: WHILE THEY'RE DOING THAT, I HAVE
12 A QUESTION FOR CLARIFICATION. ONE OF OUR RECOMMENDATIONS
13 IS A THEOLOGIAN WHO IS ENORMOUSLY WIDELY PUBLISHED ON THE
14 SUBJECT OF BIOMEDICAL ETHICS. HE IS AFFILIATED WITH THE
15 GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION IN BERKELEY. I DON'T KNOW IF
16 THERE'S A RELATIONSHIP WITH UC BERKELEY. HE COULD BE
17 DISQUALIFIED PERHAPS, BUT I'M WONDERING IF THAT'S THE
18 INTENT OF THE MOTION.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO, IF WE CAN'T GET
20 TO THESE MINUTES VERY QUICKLY, I'M GOING TO SEE IF WE CAN
21 MOVE FORWARD BECAUSE THE VOTE ITSELF MAY ELIMINATE AND
22 MAKE THIS MOOT. WE'RE DOING RESEARCH TO DETERMINE
23 WHETHER OR NOT WE NEED A TWO-THIRDS, AND WE DON'T EVEN
24 KNOW IF THE MOTION IS GOING TO BE APPROVED. SO I'M GOING
25 TO ASK DR. PENHOET, AND THEN I'M GOING TO GO TO JIM

1 HARRISON, AND I'M GOING TO WANT TO MOVE THIS MOTION
2 BECAUSE WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF
3 THE OUTCOME OF THE MOTION, AND WE HAVEN'T DETERMINED THE
4 VOTE YET.

5 DR. KESSLER, SINCE YOU ARE PRESENTING, I WILL
6 DEFER TO YOU.

7 DR. KESSLER: AGAIN, I DEFER TO COUNSEL AS
8 PARLIAMENTARIAN, BUT I DO THINK IF A MAJORITY OF THE ICOC
9 THINKS THAT MEMBERS OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE SHOULD NOT BE
10 CALIFORNIANS FROM INSTITUTIONS, JUST BE FACULTY OR
11 ASSOCIATED, I THINK A MAJORITY IS A VERY STRONG SIGNAL.
12 I DON'T THINK -- I THINK WE HAVE TO LISTEN TO OUR
13 COLLEAGUES. WE MAY DISAGREE ON THIS, BUT I THINK IF
14 THERE'S A MAJORITY THAT THINKS THAT THIS IS PROBLEMATIC,
15 WE SHOULD NOT PROCEED.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD SUPPORT THAT. I THINK
17 WE HAVE TO WORK AS A BOARD. I DON'T WANT TO SEE US
18 FALLING BACK INTO TWO-THIRDS VOTES. A MAJORITY TO PULL
19 OUR CONSENSUS AND TO KEEP A WORKING CONSENSUS TOGETHER --

20 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I'D LIKE TO SEE WHAT
21 ROBERTS' RULES SAYS.

22 MR. HARRISON: ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER PROVIDES
23 THAT A MOTION TO AMEND OR RESCIND SOMETHING PREVIOUSLY
24 ADOPTED REQUIRES TWO-THIRDS VOTE IF NOTICE HAS NOT BEEN
25 GIVEN.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND DR. PENHOET.
2 FIRST OF ALL, WE MAY NOT HAVE ANY ISSUE HERE BECAUSE WE
3 DON'T EVEN KNOW IF THIS MOTION IS GOING TO GET A
4 MAJORITY. SO WE'RE TALKING ABOUT INTERPRETING THE
5 OUTCOME OF THE MOTION. I IDENTIFY WITH DR. KESSLER'S
6 STATEMENT THAT WE NEED TO HOLD THIS BOARD TOGETHER
7 WORKING WITH A WORKING CONSENSUS. I'D LIKE TO CALL THE
8 QUESTION AND CALL A ROLL CALL VOTE.

9 (SEVERAL MEMBERS ASKED THAT THE MOTION BE
10 RESTATED.)

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LEVEY, WOULD YOU LIKE FOR
12 ME OR WOULD YOU LIKE TO RESTATE THE MOTION?

13 DR. LEVEY: YOU CAN RESTATE IT.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE MOTION
15 IS THAT ON THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE BETWEEN THE SCIENTIST
16 CATEGORY AND ETHICIST CATEGORY, THERE WOULD NOT BE ANY
17 MEMBER REPRESENTING -- FROM CALIFORNIA THAT WAS
18 REPRESENTING A GRANTEE INSTITUTION. IS THAT A CORRECT
19 STATEMENT?

20 DR. LEVEY: THE ONLY THING I WOULD ADD, AND
21 MAYBE I WON'T INSIST ON THIS, BUT WHAT WE SAID ON THE
22 GRANTS WORKING COMMITTEE WAS THAT NO ONE LIVING IN THE
23 STATE OF CALIFORNIA WOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO SERVE ON THAT
24 COMMITTEE.

25 SO, SUSAN, YOU HAD --

1 DR. BRYANT: I THINK WE AMENDED THE MOTION TO
2 SAY THAT -- TO LIMIT IT TO CALIFORNIANS THAT COME FROM
3 INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE LIKELY GRANTEE INSTITUTIONS SO IT
4 ALLOWS CALIFORNIANS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE --

6 DR. LEVEY: THAT WOULD BE FINE. WE HAVE PEOPLE
7 ON THE GRANTS REVIEW WHO MAY HAVE BEEN BORN HERE OR
8 TRAINED HERE.

9 DR. STEWARD: CAN I ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION?
10 MY CLARIFYING QUESTION IS WHAT DOES THAT WORD MEAN, COME
11 FROM? DO WE MEAN THAT'S THEIR MAJOR -- I'M SERIOUS. IT
12 ACTUALLY GOES TO JOAN'S QUESTION. DO WE MEAN THAT THAT
13 IS THEIR MAJOR PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT? DO WE MEAN THAT THEY
14 HAVE SOME SORT OF A POSITION AT THAT INSTITUTION? IT
15 ACTUALLY MAKES A BIG DIFFERENCE.

16 DR. LEVEY: ANY INVOLVEMENT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE MOTION IS ANY INVOLVEMENT.
18 IT COMES FROM THE ORIGINATOR OF THE MOTION. SO IF YOU
19 HAVE ANY INVOLVEMENT WITH A GRANTEE -- A POTENTIAL
20 GRANTEE INSTITUTION, PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT WITH A
21 GRANTEE INSTITUTION. I TAKE IT THAT MEANS A PAID
22 INVOLVEMENT. DR. LEVEY, A PAID INVOLVEMENT; IS THAT
23 CORRECT?

24 DR. LEVEY: (NODS HEAD.)

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I'D LIKE TO --

1 DR. PRECIADO: I NEED TO CLARIFY THAT. WHAT IF
2 THEY'RE ON VOLUNTARY?

3 DR. PIZZO: SAME THING WE DID.

4 DR. PRECIADO: EXACTLY. PAID AND VOLUNTARY.

5 DR. LEVEY: ANY INVOLVEMENT, RIGHT.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. IT'S BEEN CLARIFIED
7 THAT DR. LEVEY INTENDED TO REACH PAID AND VOLUNTARY.

8 DR. WRIGHT: AND ACTUALLY RESIDENT OR
9 NONRESIDENT OF CALIFORNIA. SOMEONE LIVING OUTSIDE
10 CALIFORNIA WITH A PAID CONNECTION TO A UNIVERSITY,
11 POTENTIALLY GRANTING UNIVERSITY, WOULD ALSO FALL UNDER
12 THIS PROHIBITION.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. LEVEY, THAT'S YOUR
14 UNDERSTANDING?

15 DR. LEVEY: YES.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S ALL ON THE RECORD. I'D
17 LIKE TO HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE. MELISSA.

18 MS. KING: DR. PAUL JENNINGS FOR DAVID
19 BALTIMORE.

20 DR. JENNINGS: NO.

21 MS. KING: BOB PRICE FOR DR. BIRGENEAU.

22 DR. PRICE: NO.

23 MS. KING: KEITH BLACK.

24 DR. BLACK: NO.

25 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

1 DR. BRYANT: YES.
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
3 MR. GOLDBERG: NO.
4 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND FOR BRIAN HENDERSON.
5 DR. MARKLAND: YES.
6 MS. KING: EDWARD HOLMES.
7 DR. HOLMES: NO.
8 MS. KING: DAVID KESSLER.
9 DR. KESSLER: I'LL ABSTAIN.
10 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO.
12 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.
13 MS. LANSING: NO.
14 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.
15 DR. LEVEY: YES.
16 MS. KING: TED LOVE.
17 DR. LOVE: NO.
18 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.
19 DR. MURPHY: YES.
20 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.
21 DR. NOVA: YES.
22 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
23 DR. PENHOET: NO.
24 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
25 DR. PIZZO: YES.

1 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
2 DR. POMEROY: NO.
3 MS. KING: PHYLLIS PRECIADO.
4 DR. PRECIADO: YES.
5 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
6 DR. PRIETO: YES.
7 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA FOR JOHN REED.
8 DR. FONTANA: NO.
9 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
10 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.
11 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: NO.
13 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
14 MR. SHEEHY: NO.
15 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.
16 DR. STEWARD: NO.
17 MS. KING: LEON THAL.
18 DR. THAL: NO.
19 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.
20 MS. WILSON: NO.
21 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.
22 DR. WRIGHT: YES.
23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. WE'LL TALLY THE
24 VOTES. I BELIEVE THE MOTION DID NOT CARRY. I WOULD LIKE
25 TO POINT OUT TO EVERYONE THAT WE HAVE A REAL WORKING

1 CULTURE HERE WITH SCIENTISTS, PATIENT ADVOCATES,
2 BIOMEDICAL REPRESENTATIVES ALL VOTING THEIR OWN
3 CONSCIENCE FOR THE BEST APPROACH TO MEDICAL THERAPIES.
4 AND WE THANK YOU FOR THE INTENSE PASSION OF THE VIEWS,
5 WHICH ARE ALL VERY STRONGLY HELD, AND WE THANK YOU FOR
6 WORKING TOGETHER AS A GROUP.

7 I'D LIKE TO THEN ASK, DR. KESSLER, WOULD YOU
8 LIKE TO PRESENT A SLATE?

9 DR. KESSLER: YES, MR. CHAIR.

10 DR. PIZZO: BEFORE YOU DO THAT, QUESTION, DAVID.
11 ARE WE GOING TO RESOLVE AT A LATER TIME THE ISSUE OF
12 WHETHER THESE INDIVIDUALS CAN HOLD OR APPLY FOR GRANTS?

13 DR. KESSLER: YEAH. I THINK THAT PROBABLY MAKES
14 SENSE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S A SEPARATE ITEM.

16 DR. KESSLER: SEPARATE ITEM. IN ADDITION TO THE
17 MULTIPLE PDF'S THAT DESCENDED ON YOUR OFFICE IN THE LAST
18 COUPLE OF DAYS, WE DO HAVE ONE COPY, I AM TOLD, OF
19 EVERYONE'S BIO. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT, JUST RAISE
20 YOUR HAND AND STAFF WILL BE AROUND.

21 MR. CHAIR, BEFORE I PRESENT THE SLATE, LET ME
22 BRIEFLY REVIEW THE PROCESS THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOLLOWED
23 FOR SELECTING CANDIDATES FOR NOMINATION.

24 FIRST, WE SOLICITED NOMINATIONS, SECOND WE
25 REQUIRED ALL INTERESTED PARTS TO SUBMIT CV'S AND COMPLETE

1 NOMINATION FORMS. WE RECEIVED NOMINATION FORMS AND CV'S
2 FROM OVER 50 INDIVIDUALS. THE CANDIDATES WERE DIVIDED
3 AMONG THREE TWO-PERSON REVIEW TEAMS. WE HAD AN INITIAL
4 OPEN MEETING TO REVIEW THE CANDIDATES ON TUESDAY, MARCH
5 29TH. WE DISCUSSED THE ETHICIST CANDIDATES IN DETAIL AT
6 THAT MEETING AND HAD AN INITIAL DISCUSSION OF THE
7 SCIENTIST-CLINICIAN CANDIDATES.

8 WE MET AGAIN IN APRIL, AND TOOK THE TIME IN
9 BETWEEN TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE CANDIDATES. WE MET
10 RECENTLY AND ARE DELIGHTED TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING
11 CANDIDATES. FOR THE FIVE SPOTS ALLOTTED TO MEMBERS OF
12 THE ICOC FROM THE TEN DISEASE SPECIFIC AREAS, WE WOULD
13 LIKE TO RECOMMEND SHERRY LANSING, PHYLLIS PRECIADO,
14 FRANCISCO PRIETO, JEFF SHEEHY, AND JONATHAN SHESTACK.

15 I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MY COLLEAGUES ON THE SEARCH
16 COMMITTEE TO GIVE YOU A BRIEF SUMMARY TO THE FOUR
17 INDIVIDUALS WE WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND IN THE ETHICIST
18 CATEGORY. DAVID, WOULD YOU PLEASE BEGIN WITH A FEW OF
19 THEM.

20 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES.
21 THANK YOU, DEAN KESSLER. THE FIRST NAME IS BERNIE LO.
22 BERNIE LO RECEIVED AN M.D. FROM STANFORD UNIVERSITY
23 SCHOOL OF MEDICINE IN 1975. HE HAS BEEN A PROFESSOR OF
24 MEDICINE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO
25 SINCE 1980, AND DIRECTOR OF THE PROGRAM IN MEDICAL ETHICS

1 AT UCSF SINCE 1989.

2 PROFESSOR LO HAS SERVED AS CHAIR OF THE
3 CHANCELLOR'S CAMPUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ETHICAL ISSUES
4 AND EMBRYO AND STEM CELL RESEARCH SINCE 2003. PROFESSOR
5 LO HAS WRITTEN EXTENSIVELY ON ISSUES RELATING TO
6 BIOMEDICAL ETHICS, INCLUDING ARTICLES ENTITLED "INFORMED
7 CONSENT IN HUMAN AND EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH." IN
8 ADDITION, PROFESSOR LO HAS SERVED AS NATIONAL PROGRAM
9 DIRECTOR OF THE GREENWALL FACULTY SCHOLARS IN BIOETHICS
10 PROGRAMS SINCE 2001, AND HE HAS BEEN A MEMBER OF THE
11 INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE COUNCIL SINCE 2002.

12 THE NEXT NAME I'D LIKE TO DISCUSS IS HARRIET
13 RABB. SHE RECEIVED HER JURIS DOCTORATE AT COLUMBIA LAW
14 SCHOOL IN 1966. SHE IS A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY AT
15 COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL FROM 1971 TO 1993 WHERE SHE SERVED AS
16 VICE DEAN OF THE GEORGE M. *GAFFEN PROFESSOR OF LAW AND
17 SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AT COLUMBIA.

18 MS. RABB, DISTINGUISHED AND DIRECTED THE
19 SCHOOL'S ETHICS COURSE, REQUIRED FOR ALL LAW STUDENTS.
20 SHE WAS APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT CLINTON TO SERVE AS
21 GENERAL COUNSEL TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
22 HUMAN SERVICES FROM 1993 TO 2001 WHERE SHE LED THE
23 DEPARTMENT'S LEGAL EFFORTS ON HEALTHCARE POLICY ISSUES,
24 INCLUDING STEM CELL RESEARCH.

25 TOBACCO ASSISTED -- OTHER ISSUES, SHE DEALT WITH

1 TOBACCO, ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY, TISSUE AND
2 ORGAN ALLOCATION, FETAL TISSUE ON HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH,
3 INFORMED CONSENT AND VACCINE ISSUES. IN HER CURRENT
4 POSITION AS VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL AT THE
5 ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY, SHE HAS SERVED AS CHAIR OF THE
6 UNIVERSITY'S STEM CELL TASK FORCE AND AS AN EX OFFICIO
7 MEMBER OF THE PRESIDENT'S HUMAN STEM CELL BIOETHICS
8 GROUP. AT THE ROCKEFELLER SHE PROVIDES SUPPORT FOR
9 RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANT DATA REGISTRIES AND
10 CLINICAL TRIALS IN THE UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL.

11 IN ADDITION, MS. RABB IS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD
12 OF THE HASTINGS CENTER. MS. RABB AND BERNIE LO.

13 DR. KESSLER: JOAN, WOULD YOU PLEASE CONTINUE.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: THE THIRD RECOMMENDED MEMBER FOR
15 ONE OF THE ETHICIST SLOTS IS R. ALTA CHARO. SHE RECEIVED
16 A J.D. AS A STONE SCHOLAR FROM COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL
17 OF LAW IN 1982. SHE HAS BEEN ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH
18 AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
19 LAW SCHOOL SINCE 2002, AND HAS SERVED AS A PROFESSOR OF
20 LAW AND BIOETHICS WITH A JOINT APPOINTMENT AT THE LAW AND
21 MEDICAL SCHOOLS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SINCE
22 1989.

23 PROFESSOR CHARO HAS WRITTEN EXTENSIVELY ON
24 ISSUES RELATING TO BIOMEDICAL ETHICS, INCLUDING AUTHORIZING
25 CHAPTERS ENTITLED "ETHICAL ISSUES IN EMBRYO RESEARCH AND

1 RESEARCH USES OF HUMAN BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS." PROFESSOR
2 CHARO HAS SERVED AS A MEMBER OF THE HUMAN SUBJECTS
3 COMMITTEE AT THE CENTER FOR HEALTH SCIENCES AT THE
4 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MADISON. IN ADDITION, SHE HAS
5 SERVED AS A MEMBER OF THE U.S. NATIONAL BIOETHICS
6 ADVISORY COMMISSION FROM 1996 TO 2001.

7 I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SAY JEFF SHEEHY AND I
8 INTERVIEWED HER AT LENGTH ON THE PHONE, AND SHE
9 DEMONSTRATED THE ENCYCLOPEDIA COMMAND OF THIS ENTIRE
10 FIELD, WHICH I THINK WE'VE ALL WITNESSED. IN ADDITION TO
11 THAT, I FOUND IT INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT THAT SHE ALSO
12 HAD OTHER INTERESTING INFORMED ANALYSES OF ISSUES THAT
13 WILL COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE THAT WE PROBABLY HAVEN'T
14 THOUGHT NECESSARILY TO RAISE ETHICAL ISSUES, SUCH AS HOW
15 TO CHOOSE AMONG DISEASE CATEGORIES THAT WOULD RECEIVE
16 RESEARCH HELP TOWARD TREATMENT AND PERHAPS CREATE CLAIMS
17 OF PITCHING ONE AGAINST ANOTHER. AND SHE BROUGHT THIS
18 PROFOUND ETHICAL UNDERSTANDING TO A WIDE ARRAY OF
19 QUESTIONS. IT WAS A VERY PROVOCATIVE DISCUSSION.

20 THE FINAL ETHICIST WE'RE PRESENTING IS THEODORE
21 PETERS. HE RECEIVED A MASTER'S IN DIVINITY FROM TRINITY
22 LUTHERAN SEMINARY IN COLUMBUS, OHIO, IN 1967, AND A PH.D.
23 FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO IN 1973.

24 HE HAS SERVED AS A PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC
25 THEOLOGY AT PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AND AT

1 THE GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION SINCE 1978.

2 PROFESSOR PETERS HAS WRITTEN EXTENSIVELY ON
3 ISSUES RELATING TO BIOMEDICAL ETHICS, INCLUDING AUTHORIZING
4 ARTICLES ENTITLED "THEOLOGICAL SUPPORT OF STEM CELL
5 RESEARCH," AND EDITING BOOKS ENTITLED GENETICS: ISSUES
6 OF SOCIAL JUSTICE.

7 PROFESSOR PETERS HAS EXPERIENCED ADMINISTERING
8 ETHICAL SAFEGUARDS DURING THE CLINICAL TRIAL PROCESS
9 DURING HIS FOUR-YEAR TENURE ON THE ETHICS ADVISORY BOARD
10 OF THE GERON CORPORATION. AND HE MADE STRONG THE POINT
11 TO US THAT HE SAW HIS CONTRIBUTION ESSENTIALLY AS THAT OF
12 AN ACADEMIC, THAT HE COULD ASSIST US IN UNDERSTANDING THE
13 VARIOUS THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVES THAT
14 PEOPLE BRING TO THEIR ETHICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES
15 BEFORE US.

16 IT ALSO HAPPENS THAT HE IS A STRONG SUPPORTER OF
17 STEM CELL RESEARCH AND IS WRITING A BOOK ABOUT THE
18 THEOLOGICAL BASIS FOR THAT.

19 DR. KESSLER: I'D LIKE TO CONTINUE WITH THE
20 EIGHT INDIVIDUALS WE'D LIKE TO RECOMMEND IN THE
21 SCIENTIST-CLINICIAN CATEGORY. WHEN I STARTED, I SAID
22 NINE. THE REASON FOR THAT CHANGE IS THAT ONE OF THE
23 MEMBERS WE WOULD HAVE BROUGHT ACTUALLY ASKED THAT WE NOT
24 BRING THAT PERSON'S NAME BECAUSE WE'VE NOT DEALT WITH THE
25 QUESTION OF WHETHER THAT INDIVIDUAL IS ELIGIBLE FOR

1 GRANTS. SO WE WILL ONLY PRESENT EIGHT. IF THINGS
2 CHANGE, THAT WE CAN CLARIFY AT A LATER TIME.

3 DAVID, WILL YOU PLEASE BEGIN WITH THE FIRST
4 SCIENTIST-CLINICIAN? LET ME ASK JOAN -- I'M SORRY.
5 DAVID JUST STEPPED OUT. JOAN, COULD YOU, WHILE DAVID IS
6 OUT, CONTINUE.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: SURE. THE FIRST IS JEFFREY
8 KORDOWER. HE RECEIVED A PH.D. FROM CITY UNIVERSITY OF
9 NEW YORK IN 1984. DR. KORDOWER IS CURRENTLY DIRECTOR OF
10 THE SECTION OF NEUROBIOLOGY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
11 NEUROLOGICAL SCIENCES, DIRECTOR OF THE RESEARCH CENTER
12 FOR BRAIN REPAIR, AND GENE SCHWEPP ARMOR PROFESSOR OF
13 NEUROLOGICAL SCIENCES AT RUSH PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL IN
14 CHICAGO.

15 DR. KORDOWER HAS MADE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS
16 IN THE FIELDS OF GENE THERAPY, NEUROTRANSPLANTATION,
17 NONHUMAN PRIMATE MODELS OF NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE, AND
18 EXPERIMENTAL THERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES FOR PARKINSON'S AND
19 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE. HE MADE THE PIONEERING
20 DEMONSTRATION THAT FETAL TRANSPLANTS CAN SURVIVE IN
21 PATIENTS WITH PARKINSON'S DISEASE. HE HAS ALSO
22 DEMONSTRATED THAT GENE DELIVERY OF ATROPHIC FACTOR CALLED
23 GDNF CAN PREVENT DEGENERATION AND RESTORE FUNCTION IN
24 NONHUMAN PRIMATE MODELS OF PARKINSON'S DISEASE.

25 DR. KESSLER: OS, WOULD YOU PRESENT THE NEXT AND

1 SEE IF YOU CAN STALL UNTIL DAVID COMES BACK FOR THE ONE
2 LAST. I'M SORRY. JEFF, YOU'RE NEXT.

3 MR. SHEEHY: JOSE CIBELLI RECEIVED A PH.D. IN
4 REPRODUCTIVE PHYSIOLOGY FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF
5 MASSACHUSETTS IN 1998. HE RECEIVED A DVM FROM THE
6 UNIVERSITY OF LA PLATA ARGENTINA SCHOOL OF VETERINARY
7 MEDICINE IN 1989. DR. CIBELLI WAS THE SCIENTIST THAT
8 ADVANCED CELL TECHNOLOGY IN WORCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS,
9 FROM 1997 TO 2002 WHERE HE ROSE TO THE LEVEL OF VICE
10 PRESIDENT OF RESEARCH.

11 DR. CIBELLI, TOGETHER WITH HIS COLLEAGUES, WAS
12 RESPONSIBLE FOR THE GENERATION OF THE WORLD'S FIRST
13 TRANSGENIC CLONED CALVES, THE FIRST EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS
14 BY NUCLEAR TRANSFER, AND THE FIRST EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS
15 BY PARTHENOGENESIS IN PRIMATES. IN ADDITION TO HIS
16 SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS, DR. CIBELLI HAS CO-AUTHORED A
17 PAPER ENTITLED "THE ETHICAL VALIDITY OF USING NUCLEAR
18 TRANSFER IN HUMAN TRANSPLANTATION."

19 THE SECOND ONE I HAVE IS ANN KIESSLING. SHE
20 RECEIVED A PH.D. IN BIOCHEMISTRY, BIOPHYSICS FROM OREGON
21 STATE UNIVERSITY IN 1971. SHE HAS SERVED AS AN ASSISTANT
22 AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AT OREGON STATE -- AT OREGON
23 HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY FROM 1997 TO 1985. AND IS AN
24 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AT HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL SINCE 1985.

25 PROFESSOR KIESSLING STARTED THE FIRST IN VITRO

1 BIRTH FERTILIZATION LABORATORY IN OREGON AND WAS
2 RECRUITED TO HARVARD TO HEAD UP AN IVF LABORATORY AT
3 BRIGHAM AND WOMEN'S HOSPITAL WHERE SHE HAS CONTINUED HER
4 RESEARCH INTO BOTH EARLY EMBRYO DEVELOPMENT AND SEMEN
5 TRANSMISSION OF HIV.

6 PROFESSOR KIESSLING MADE SEVERAL DISCOVERIES
7 ABOUT EARLY EMBRYO DEVELOPMENT AND IS CURRENTLY
8 DEVELOPING RELIABLE SYSTEMS FOR PARTHENOGENETIC
9 ACTIVATION OF MAMMALIAN EGGS, INCLUDING HUMAN --
10 INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF ENDOGENOUS REVERSE
11 TRANSCRIPTOTASE IN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION
12 AND DEVELOPING STRATEGIES FROM MATURE OOCYTES FOR HUMAN
13 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

14 IN ADDITION TO HER SCIENTIFIC WORK, PROFESSOR
15 KIESSLING HAS SERVED ON THE ETHICS ADVISORY BOARD OF THE
16 FALKNER CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE MEDICINE, ON THE AIDS AND
17 RELATED RESEARCH, IRB'S AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF
18 HEALTH, AND ON THE ETHICS ADVISORY BOARD OF ADVANCED CELL
19 TECHNOLOGY.

20 I WOULD ADD JOAN AND I WERE FORTUNATE ENOUGH TO
21 INTERVIEW HER, AND A VERY INTERESTING COMMENT THAT SHE
22 MADE IS THAT SHE THOUGHT THAT STEM CELL RESEARCH HAS BEEN
23 SO BADLY REPRESENTED IN THE PUBLIC, THAT AS A SCIENTIST
24 SHE FELT THE NEED TO GET OUT FROM BEHIND THE BENCH AND
25 START TALKING TO FOLKS TO TRY TO ALLAY THEIR FEAR AND HAS

1 TESTIFIED BEFORE THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE ON STEM
2 CELL RESEARCH. SO IN A WAY, WE MAY BE ADDING ANOTHER
3 ADVOCATE.

4 NEXT CANDIDATE I HAVE IS KENNETH OLDEN. HE
5 RECEIVED A PH.D. IN CELL BIOLOGY BIOCHEMISTRY FROM TEMPLE
6 UNIVERSITY IN 1970. DR. OLDEN HAS MADE SIGNIFICANT
7 CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE MANUFACTURE,
8 MODIFICATION, AND SECRETION OF EXTRACELLULAR MATRIX
9 PROTEINS. MOST RECENTLY HAS BEGUN TO STUDY UNDERLYING
10 PROCESSES OF CELL GROWTH AND DEATH IN HEMATOPOIETIC STEM
11 CELLS, THE ABILITY TO ALTER THE GROWTH CHARACTERISTICS OF
12 SUCH STEM CELLS COULD HAVE MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS IN THE
13 AREAS OF CHEMOTHERAPY AND BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTATION.

14 IN ADDITION TO HIS SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS,
15 DR. OLDEN HAS SERVED AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL
16 INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCE AT THE NATIONAL
17 INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND IS DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL
18 TOXICOLOGY PROGRAM AT THE RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH
19 CAROLINA SINCE 1991.

20 DR. OLDEN IS THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN TO
21 BECOME DIRECTOR OF ONE OF THE 18 INSTITUTES FOR THE
22 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH IN THE HISTORY OF THE
23 AGENCY.

24 I WOULD ADD WE ALSO INTERVIEWED HIM. I THOUGHT
25 IT WAS INTERESTING THAT HE HAS CONDUCTED NUMEROUS

1 CLINICAL TRIALS AND SAT ON DATA SAFETY MONITORING BOARDS,
2 AND PROVIDED REALLY UNIQUE INSIGHT ON THE IMPORTANCE OF
3 INVOLVING PATIENTS ACTIVELY IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF AND
4 THE CONDUCT OF CLINICAL TRIALS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO.

6 DR. PIZZO: JUST ONE QUESTION, DAVID. YOU'LL
7 PERHAPS BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO THIS. I KNOW KEN OLDEN
8 WELL. HE'S A TERRIFIC NOMINEE. QUESTION IS IS THE NIH
9 GOING TO GIVE HIM APPROVAL TO SERVE ON THIS COMMITTEE?

10 DR. KESSLER: IT'S AN EXCELLENT QUESTION. IT
11 WAS DISCUSSED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE. WE'RE PREPARED TO
12 RECOMMEND HIS NAME TODAY WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THAT
13 DECISION HAS YET TO BE MADE. IF, IN FACT, HE GETS TURNED
14 DOWN, THEN WE HAVE TO COME BACK AND DO SOME MORE WORK,
15 SIR.

16 DR. PIZZO: I THINK, JUST GIVEN RECENT
17 EXPERIENCE OF HAVING NIH LEADERS SERVE ON ADVISORY
18 GROUPS, THE NIH HAS BEEN PRETTY CONSISTENT IN NOT BEING
19 WILLING TO DO THAT.

20 DR. KESSLER: AGAIN, THERE ARE CERTAIN ISSUES
21 WITH REGARD TO KEN. THERE ARE SOME CAREER TRANSITIONS
22 UNDERWAY. SO THERE'S A LITTLE COMPLEXITY TO THAT. WE
23 FELT WE SHOULD RECOMMEND TO YOU THE BEST. HE WANTS TO
24 BE -- HE'S WILLING TO BE PUT FORWARD. IF HE CANNOT
25 SERVE, WE'LL COME BACK TO YOU AND WE'LL APOLOGIZE FOR

1 TAKING YOUR TIME.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK GAYLE WILSON HAS A
3 COMMENT.

4 MS. WILSON: I WAS DEFINITELY IN FAVOR OF
5 CALIFORNIANS BEING ALLOWED TO SERVE, BUT I HAVE SOME
6 QUESTION ABOUT WHETHER THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO APPLY FOR
7 GRANTS. YOU MENTIONED THAT ONE PERSON DID NOT WANT HIS
8 OR HER NAME BROUGHT UP, BUT YOU MENTIONED TWO PEOPLE ON
9 HERE WHO DID ASK ABOUT THAT ISSUE. WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF
10 WE VOTE THAT PERSON IN AND THEN WE DECIDE THAT WE'RE NOT
11 GOING TO ALLOW THEM TO APPLY FOR IT?

12 DR. KESSLER: I THINK THAT PERSON HAS THE OPTION
13 OF RESIGNING FROM THE COMMITTEE. THAT PERSON WILL HAVE
14 TO LIVE BY THE RULES SET BY THE ICOC.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. WE HAVE -- ANY
16 ADDITIONAL?

17 DR. KESSLER: YES, I HAVE A FEW MORE, SIR. OS,
18 WOULD YOU PLEASE CONTINUE.

19 DR. STEWARD: JANET D. ROWLEY RECEIVED AN M.D.
20 FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO IN 1948. SHE JOINED THE
21 FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO IN 1962 AND IS
22 CURRENTLY THE BLUM-RIESE. DISTINGUISHED SERVICE
23 PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE IN MOLECULAR GENETICS AND CELL
24 BIOLOGY AND HUMAN GENETICS AT THE PRITZKER SCHOOL OF
25 MEDICINE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

1 SHE IS EXTRAORDINARILY WELL-KNOWN IN THE
2 BEGINNING FOR HER STUDIES OF CHROMOSOMAL ABNORMALITIES IN
3 HUMAN LEUKEMIA AND LYMPHOMA. MORE RECENTLY HER RESEARCH
4 HAS EXPANDED INTO CAUSES OF CANCER, INCLUDING CHANGES IN
5 GENE EXPRESSION AND DIFFERENTIATION OF HEMATOPOETIC STEM
6 CELLS. SHE'S THE RECIPIENT OF THE ALBERT LASKER MEDAL OF
7 SCIENCE AND THE ALBERT LASKER CLINICAL MEDICINE RESEARCH
8 PRIZE. AND THIS, I SHOULD NOTE, IS THE MOST
9 DISTINGUISHED NORTH AMERICAN HONOR FOR CLINICAL MEDICAL
10 RESEARCH.

11 IN ADDITION TO HER SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS,
12 SHE'S A MEMBER OF THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON BIOETHICS.

13 THE NEXT INDIVIDUAL, ROBERT M. TAYLOR, RECEIVED
14 AN M.D. AND PH.D. FROM BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE IN
15 1981. HE'S CURRENTLY PROFESSOR AND VICE CHAIR FOR
16 RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS, GYNECOLOGY, AND
17 REPRODUCTIVE SCIENCES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN
18 FRANCISCO. HOWEVER, WE NOTE THAT HE WILL BE AT EMORY
19 UNIVERSITY IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS, AND SO WILL BE OUT OF
20 THE ISSUE THAT WE'RE CURRENTLY TALKING ABOUT IN TERMS OF
21 BEING OR NOT BEING A CALIFORNIAN.

22 HE HAS BEEN INVOLVED WITH THE DIVISION OF
23 REPRODUCTIVE ENDOCRINOLOGY, IN VITRO FERTILIZATION
24 PROGRAM AT THE CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE SCIENCES AT UCSF.
25 THIS HAS GIVEN HIM TREMENDOUS EXPERTISE IN ISSUES RELATED

1 TO EGG DONATION AND EARLY EMBRYO MATTERS THAT ARE VERY
2 PERTINENT TO STEM CELL RESEARCH. AUTHORED MANY PAPERS ON
3 THE SUBJECTS OF HUMAN ENDOMETRIAL FUNCTION AND EARLY
4 PREGNANCY.

5 THIRD ON MY LIST, JAMES WILLERSON, RECEIVED AN
6 M.D. FROM BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE IN 1965, CURRENTLY
7 HOLDS THE EDWARD RANDALL, III, CHAIR IN INTERNAL MEDICINE
8 AND THE ALBERT ALKICH WILLIAMS DISTINGUISHED
9 PROFESSORSHIP.

10 IN ADDITION, DR. WILLERSON IS THE PRESIDENT OF
11 THE HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER AT HOUSTON OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
12 TEXAS AND PRESIDENT ELECT OF THE TEXAS HEART INSTITUTE.
13 HIS CURRENT RESEARCH INTERESTS INCLUDE THE USE OF STEM
14 CELLS TO IMPROVE SEVERELY DAMAGED HEART TISSUE. HE AND
15 HIS COLLEAGUES AT THE TEXAS HEART INSTITUTE NOW LEAD ONE
16 OF THE FIRST FDA-APPROVED CLINICAL TRIALS TO TREAT
17 PATIENTS WITH END-STAGE HEART DISEASE USING THEIR OWN
18 BONE MARROW DERIVED STEM CELLS. HIS LABORATORY HAS
19 DEMONSTRATED TRANSDIFFERENTIATION OF ONE TYPE OF
20 PERIPHERAL BLOOD CELL INTO THE CARDIOMYOCYTES THAT FORM
21 THE HEART WALL.

22 DR. KESSLER: DAVID, WOULD YOU FINISH UP,
23 PLEASE.

24 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SURE. THE LAST NAME FOR
25 CONSIDERATION IS KEVIN EGGAN. HE RECEIVED HIS PH.D. IN

1 BIOLOGY FROM THE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY IN
2 FEBRUARY OF 2003. HE IS CURRENTLY A JUNIOR FELLOW AT THE
3 HARVARD SOCIETY OF FELLOWS AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

4 DR. EGGAN WILL BEGIN A POSITION AS AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
5 OF BIOLOGY AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY THIS FALL.

6 DR. EGGAN HAS DEVOTED THE LAST SEVEN YEARS TO
7 PERFORMING STEM CELL RESEARCH. HE IS CURRENTLY LEADING A
8 RESEARCH GROUP THAT IS INVESTIGATING THE MECHANICS OF
9 REGULATING EPIGENETIC REPROGRAMMING AFTER SOMATIC CELL
10 NUCLEAR TRANSFER, AND USING NUCLEAR TRANSFER TECHNIQUES
11 TO DERIVE DISEASE-SPECIFIC HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
12 LINES FROM DIABETES AND PARKINSON'S PATIENTS.

13 HIS SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS INCLUDE CLONING
14 MICE FROM OLFACTORY SENSORY NEURONS, DERIVING EMBRYONIC
15 GERM CELLS FROM EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS, AND CHARACTERIZING
16 THE ABNORMALITIES THAT SOMETIMES ARISE AS A RESULT OF
17 NUCLEAR TRANSFER.

18 DR. KESSLER: ARE THERE COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS
19 FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THE INDIVIDUALS NOMINATED
20 FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL STANDARDS
21 ACCOUNTABILITY WORKING GROUP?

22 DR. PIZZO: MY FORMER COMMENTS BEING ABOUT
23 PRINCIPLE, I WOULD NOW LIKE TO COMMEND YOU, DAVID AND THE
24 SUBCOMMITTEE, FOR BRINGING FORWARD AN OUTSTANDING PANEL
25 OF HIGHLY DIVERSIFIED AND REALLY EXCELLENT CONTRIBUTORS.

1 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

2 DR. WRIGHT: I WANT TO ADD MY COMMENTS TO DR.
3 PIZZO'S. THIS IS JUST AN OUTSTANDING LIST, AND I'M
4 PERSONALLY FAMILIAR WITH DR. WILLERSON'S WORK AND
5 THRILLED THAT HE WOULD BE PART OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE OR
6 COMMITTEE.

7 JUST A POINT OF CLARIFICATION. ALTHOUGH FETUSES
8 HAVE HEARTS, IT DOESN'T SOUND LIKE DR. TAYLOR IS
9 CARDIOVASCULAR. MOLECULAR BIOLOGY; IS THAT CORRECT?
10 HE'S LISTED HERE AS REPRODUCTIVE.

11 DR. KESSLER: HE'S REPRODUCTIVE, YES.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY LANSING.

13 MS. LANSING: I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT JUST
14 LISTENING TO THIS, I HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS, I'M
15 NOT ON THE COMMITTEE, BUT I ALSO WANT TO SAY THIS IS JUST
16 AN EXTRAORDINARY LIST. AND I THINK IT SPEAKS
17 EXTRAORDINARILY WELL OF THE COMMITTEE AND OF THE WHOLE
18 INITIATIVE THAT SO MANY PEOPLE WANT TO SERVE ON THIS.
19 AND I'M FAMILIAR WITH A FEW OF THESE PEOPLE, AND THEY'RE
20 JUST OF THE HIGHEST STANDARDS. AND I WOULD LIKE TO CALL
21 FOR APPROVAL OF THE SLATE.

22 DR. HOLMES: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A MOTION AND A SECOND.

24 DR. KESSLER: BEFORE -- I APPRECIATE THE
25 ENTHUSIASM. CAN WE JUST ASK FOR COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

1 ON THE INDIVIDUALS NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT?

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? NO
3 COMMENTS FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. I WOULD LIKE TO
4 SAY FOLLOWING SHERRY LANSING'S COMMENT, ONE NEEDS TO ASK
5 WHY IS IT THAT A WORLD CLASS SLATE IS PREPARED TO COME TO
6 CALIFORNIA TO SERVE A STATE PROPOSITION. AND I HOPE THE
7 PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA UNDERSTAND THAT THE ENTIRE COUNTRY,
8 THE WORLD APPRECIATES THE INITIATIVE, THAT THEY HAVE HAD
9 THE COURAGE TO VOTE WITH A MANDATE. A WORLD CLASS SLATE
10 OF THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST IS GOING TO SERVE THE
11 PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA AND THIS INITIATIVE BECAUSE THAT IS
12 THE BEST WAY IN THIS NATION TO ADVANCE THIS FRONTIER OF
13 SCIENCE, STEM CELL RESEARCH, TO IMPROVE THERAPIES FOR THE
14 CHRONICALLY ILL.

15 THIS IS A GREAT COMPLIMENT TO THE PEOPLE OF
16 CALIFORNIA THAT A SLATE FOR STANDARDS OF THIS QUALITY
17 WOULD COME TO SERVE THIS INITIATIVE. AND, DR. KESSLER,
18 AGAIN, KATE SHREVE, MARY MAXON, THANK YOU FOR YOUR -- AND
19 DINA AS WELL, THANK YOU FOR ALL YOUR DEDICATED EFFORTS.

20 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: CALL THE QUESTION.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CALL THE QUESTION.

22 DR. KESSLER: CAN I ASK, MR. CHAIR, IF WE CAN
23 ACTUALLY SPLIT THE SLATE IN TWO. AND FOR THE RECORD, I
24 BELIEVE MR. SHEEHY AND I HAVE RECUSED OURSELVES ON TWO
25 INDIVIDUALS. SO IF WE CAN JUST SPLIT THE VOTE SO WE HAVE

1 THE OPPORTUNITY TO RECUSE OURSELVES ON CERTAIN OF THE
2 ONES THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH OUR INSTITUTION.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE CHAIR WILL ACCEPT THAT.

4 DR. KESSLER: MAY I ASK MELISSA TO READ THE
5 FIRST MOTION.

6 MS. KING: FIRST MOTION IS ON THE FOLLOWING
7 INDIVIDUALS: HARRIET RABB, TED PETERS, ALTA CHARO, ANN
8 KIESSLING, JOSE CIBELLI, KEN OLDEN, JEFFREY KORDOWER,
9 KEVIN EGGAN, JANET ROWLEY, AND JAMES WILLERSON. AND WE
10 CAN VOICE VOTE FOR THIS, SO, BOB, I TURN THAT BACK OVER
11 TO YOU. VOICE VOTE ON THOSE INDIVIDUALS.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. ALL IN FAVOR? OPPOSED?
13 MOTION PASSES.

14 MS. KING: OKAY. AND THE SECOND PART OF THIS,
15 THE TWO INDIVIDUALS YOU WILL BE VOTING ON ARE ROB TAYLOR
16 AND BERNIE LO. AND I BELIEVE THERE ARE TWO INDIVIDUALS
17 WHO NEED TO RECUSE THEMSELVES. JEFF SHEEHY.

18 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

19 MS. KING: AND DR. KESSLER.

20 DR. KESSLER: I NEED TO RECUSE MYSELF.

21 MS. KING: TURN BACK OVER TO YOU FOR A VOICE
22 VOTE, BOB.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL IN FAVOR OF THIS MOTION.
24 OPPOSED. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

25 DR. KESSLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, NOW THAT WE'VE

1 APPOINTED MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP, I'D LIKE TO
2 SUGGEST THAT WE SELECT INDIVIDUALS TO SERVE AS INTERIM
3 CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR.

4 MR. SHEEHY: YOU DIDN'T APPROVE THE PATIENT
5 ADVOCATES.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE PATIENT ADVOCATES --

7 MR. HARRISON: YOU NEED TO MAKE A MOTION AND
8 APPROVE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE APPOINTMENT OF THE FIVE
9 PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP.

10 DR. WRIGHT: I MOVE THEY RECOMMEND -- I MOVE
11 THAT WE ACCEPT THE SLATE OF PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS.

12 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A MOTION BY DR. WRIGHT,
14 A SECOND FROM DR. PIZZO.

15 MS. KING: I CAN READ THOSE NAMES, IF NECESSARY.
16 YOU'LL BE VOTING ON SHERRY LANSING, PHYLLIS PRECIADO,
17 FRANCISCO PRIETO, JEFF SHEEHY, AND JONATHAN SHESTACK AS
18 THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS.

19 MR. HARRISON: THOSE MEMBERS WHO ARE BEING VOTED
20 ON SHOULD ALSO RECUSE THEMSELVES FROM PARTICIPATING IN
21 THIS VOICE VOTE.

22 (ALL PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS RECUSED
23 THEMSELVES FROM THE VOTE.)

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE THAT SINCE WE'VE HAD
25 PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE ENTIRE SLATE, WE CAN GO FORWARD ON

1 THIS. COUNSEL CONCURS. WE HAVE A FORTUNATE DAY. ALL IN
2 FAVOR. OPPOSED. THE ENTIRE SLATE. THANK YOU, MR.
3 SHEEHY.

4 (APPLAUSE.)

5 DR. KESSLER: TO GET DOWN TO THE FIRST SEVERAL
6 MEETINGS, AS DR. HALL SUGGESTED, WE BELIEVE, MR.
7 CHAIRMAN, IF WE CAN MOVE TO THE ISSUE OF INTERIM
8 CO-CHAIRS, THERE WAS A ROBUST DISCUSSION BEFORE. AND AS
9 IT TURNS OUT, THE RECOMMENDATION IS TO ACTUALLY HAVE A
10 CHAIR FROM -- AS A DISEASE ADVOCATE FROM THE ICOC AND A
11 CO-CHAIR FROM ONE OF THE NAMES THAT WE HAVE JUST --
12 YOU'VE JUST ADOPTED. SO I THINK THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE
13 WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CHAIR BE SHERRY LANSING
14 AND THE CO-CHAIR BE HARRIET RABB. BOTH INDIVIDUALS HAVE
15 KINDLY AND GENEROUSLY SAID THAT THEY ARE WILLING TO SERVE
16 IN THIS INTERIM CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR CAPACITY.

17 ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
18 ABOUT EITHER CANDIDATE OR THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THEY
19 SERVE AS INTERIM CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR?

20 DR. PIZZO: GREAT ENTHUSIASM.

21 DR. POMEROY: JUST TO CLARIFY, THEY ARE EQUAL
22 CO-CHAIRS, CORRECT?

23 MS. LANSING: I SURE HOPE SO.

24 DR. KESSLER: MS. LANSING, I LOOK TO YOU. MS.
25 LANSING HAS DESIGNATED THAT THEY ARE EQUAL. THEY ARE

1 BOTH EQUAL AND CO-CHAIRS. I STAND CORRECTED. THEY ARE
2 CO-CHAIRS.

3 ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
4 ABOUT EITHER CANDIDATE OR THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THEY
5 SERVE AS INTERIM CO-CHAIRS?

6 WOULD ANY MEMBER OF THE BOARD LIKE TO MAKE A
7 MOTION TO NOMINATE SHERRY LANSING AND HARRIET RABB TO
8 SERVE AS INTERIM CO-CHAIRS OF THE STANDARDS WORKING
9 GROUP?

10 (ALL MEMBERS MOVED.)

11 DR. KESSLER: IS THERE A SECOND?

12 (ALL MEMBERS SECOND.)

13 DR. KESSLER: ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?
14 ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC?

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND SHERRY WOULD BE RECUSING
16 HERSELF FROM THIS VOTE.

17 DR. KESSLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF YOU CAN CALL FOR
18 THE VOICE VOTE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CALL FOR THE QUESTION. ALL IN
20 FAVOR. OPPOSED?

21 DR. KESSLER: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: QUESTION FROM DR. WRIGHT.

23 DR. WRIGHT: DOES THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAVE A LIST
24 OF ALTERNATES?

25 DR. KESSLER: WE DISCUSSED THE ISSUE, AND THE

1 COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE TO DO THAT, GO BACK AND DO FURTHER
2 WORK. IN FACT, WE HAVE TO ON ONE AND WE WILL BE BACK.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE CHAIR WOULD LIKE TO GIVE
4 THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD A FIVE-MINUTE REST BREAK.

5 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE A BIG AGENDA. WE COULD
7 MOVE FORWARD IF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS COULD BE SEATED.
8 IF SOMEONE COULD ASK SHERRY LANSING, WHO IS IN THE LOBBY
9 AND CAN'T HEAR US, IF SHE COULD JOIN US, PLEASE. IF
10 THERE'S ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBERS IN THE LOBBY, IF THEY
11 COULD JOIN US. AND I THINK PAM FOBBS IS OUT THERE AS
12 WELL. COULD SOMEONE ASK PAM TO JOIN US. I SEE PAM.

13 WHILE EVERYONE IS BEING SEATED, BEFORE WE TAKE
14 UP THE NEXT ITEM, I WOULD LIKE TO COMMEND PAM FOBBS. PAM
15 IS A LAWYER. PAM, COULD YOU STAND FOR A MOMENT? THANK
16 YOU. PAM HAS AGREED TO CHAIR A DIVERSITY ADVISORY
17 COUNCIL. THAT GROUP IS DRAWING TOGETHER IDEAS ABOUT HOW
18 WE CAN SERVE DIVERSITY, AND THOSE IDEAS WILL EVENTUALLY
19 COME TO THE BOARD. THERE WILL MOST PROBABLY BE A
20 SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNED TO LOOK AT THEM AND WORK THEM OUT
21 AND BRING THEM BACK TO THE BOARD FOR DISCUSSION AS WE GO
22 FORWARD.

23 BUT IN ORDER TO PULL TOGETHER THE RICHNESS OF
24 IDEAS FROM THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA ON HOW WE CAN BEST SERVE
25 DIVERSITY, PAM HAS AGREED TO PUT THAT GROUP TOGETHER AND

1 INITIATE THE MEETINGS, THE FIRST OF WHICH WAS IN THE WORK
2 SESSION LAST NIGHT THAT SOME OF THE BOARD MEMBERS WERE
3 ABLE TO ATTEND ALONG WITH ZACH HALL AND I AND ARLENE
4 CHIU, AND OTHER STAFF MEMBERS.

5 PAM IS THE IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR OF THE NATIONAL
6 MEDICAL ASSOCIATION REPRESENTING MINORITY DOCTORS
7 THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY. AND SHE AND HER HUSBAND, DENARD
8 FOBBS, IS THE PAST CHAIR OF THE GOLDEN WEST MEDICAL
9 ASSOCIATION, WHICH IS THE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION FOR
10 MINORITY DOCTORS IN CALIFORNIA, ONE OF THE MEDICAL
11 ASSOCIATIONS.

12 LORRAINE TAKAHASHI WAS HERE LAST NIGHT
13 REPRESENTING COMMUNITY MEDICAL FOUNDATION AND THE
14 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO FRESNO CAMPUS.
15 SHE'S ALSO THE FORMER ACTING CONSUL GENERAL TO FRANKFURT,
16 GERMANY. RANDALL PHAM WAS HERE OF THE CALIFORNIA MEDICAL
17 ASSOCIATION ETHNIC PHYSICIAN SECTION THAT HE SPOKE FOR.
18 JULIE MOLENA WAS HERE FROM THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH
19 COLLABORATIVE, ALONG WITH MALICK BOZZ, WHO IS -- WAS
20 SPEAKING ON THE DIVERSITY IN BIOLOGICAL GENETIC
21 MATERIALS. ARTHUR FLEMING, M.D., A RETIRED SURGEON WHO
22 IS CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ETHNIC PHYSICIANS
23 SECTION CHAIR, SPOKE ALONG WITH BARBARA YOUNG, PAST BOARD
24 CHAIR OF LEADERSHIP AMERICA AND RETIRED EXECUTIVE FOR THE
25 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM.

1 I GREATLY APPRECIATE ALL OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS,
2 PAM FOBBS' LEADERSHIP IN HELPING US EXPLORE THESE ISSUES,
3 AND IT IS AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT THAT WE WILL CONTINUE TO
4 FOCUS ON IN STUDY SECTIONS AS WELL AS IT WILL THEN COME
5 TO A SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEN TO THE BOARD FOR A FORMAL
6 SESSION FOR DISCUSSING THOSE ISSUES AND ADVANCING
7 DIVERSITY IN THE THERAPY DEVELOPMENT UNDER PROPOSITION
8 71.

9 (APPLAUSE.)

10 DR. PRECIADO: BOB, CAN WE ASK THE MEMBERS THAT
11 ARE PRESENT HERE TODAY TO STAND UP AND SAY THEIR NAME SO
12 THAT WE CAN PUT A FACE TO THE NAME?

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK DR. ARTHUR FLEMING IS
14 HERE.

15 (APPLAUSE.)

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND ARE ANY OF THE OTHER
17 SPEAKERS FROM LAST NIGHT PRESENT? DR. BARBARA YOUNG IS
18 HERE.

19 (APPLAUSE.)

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANYONE ELSE FROM LAST NIGHT'S
21 SESSION WHO IS A SPEAKER PRESENT? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

22 I'D TO, WITH ITEM 13, TURN THIS OVER TO
23 DR. EDWARD HOLMES TO GO THROUGH THE GRANT REVIEW WORKING
24 GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS. DR. HOLMES.

25 DR. HOLMES: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. BEFORE I

1 BEGIN THE REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I'D LIKE TO TAKE A
2 MOMENT TO COMMEND AND THANK THE MEMBERS OF THE SUBGROUP
3 WHO WORKED EXTRAORDINARILY HARD TO BRING FORWARD THE
4 NAMES WE'RE GOING TO PRESENT TO YOU TODAY AND ALSO TO
5 THANK THE STAFF. MARY MAXON AND ZACH HALL DESERVE A
6 TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF THANKS FROM THE BOARD. AND KATE,
7 YES. THANK YOU. ZACH, I THINK, PROBABLY HAS TELEPHONE
8 EAR FROM ALL THE PHONE CALLS THAT HE'S MADE RELATED TO
9 THIS.

10 IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WON'T
11 REVIEW THE ENTIRE PROCESS. THERE'S A FLOW CHART IN YOUR
12 BOOKS THAT REVIEWS WHAT WE DID AS A SUBCOMMITTEE. AND
13 I'LL SIMPLY HIGHLIGHT A FEW POINTS, THAT WE MET THREE
14 TIMES SINCE OUR COMMITTEE WAS CONSTITUTED. THE FIRST
15 MEETING WAS JANUARY THE 25TH TO DEVELOP THE CRITERIA WE
16 WOULD USE FOR SELECTING THE NAMES WE'RE BRINGING FORWARD
17 TO YOU TODAY. THEN BETWEEN JANUARY THE 26TH AND FEBRUARY
18 THE 14TH WAS A PERIOD OF ACTIVE RECRUITMENT, WHICH
19 RESULTED IN 800 CANDIDATE NAMES BEING BROUGHT FORWARD.

20 THEN THROUGH THE HARD WORK OF MANY PEOPLE, WE
21 WERE TO ABLE TO NARROW THIS INTO TWO GROUPS, ONE THAT WAS
22 CALLED A TOP TIER CANDIDATE GROUP, AND THEN A SECOND TIER
23 CANDIDATE GROUP. THE FULL LIST OF ALL OF THE CANDIDATES
24 WAS RANDOMLY AND EVENLY DISTRIBUTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEES
25 WITHIN OUR GROUP. AND THEN OVER A PERIOD OF SIX WEEKS,

1 THE TEAMS WORKED TO RANK AND INTERVIEW THE CANDIDATES.

2 SECOND MEETING WAS HELD WHILE THIS WAS GOING ON
3 TO DISCUSS THE PROCESS THAT WE WOULD FOLLOW, AND AT THAT
4 TIME THE GROUP AGREED THAT IT WOULD HELP US IF A
5 RECRUITMENT LETTER COULD BE SENT FROM ZACH, FROM CHAIRMAN
6 KLEIN, AND FROM VICE CHAIR PENHOET TO THE TOP TIER
7 CANDIDATES INDICATING THAT WE WOULD BE CONTACTING THEM
8 AND TO HOPEFULLY WARM THEM UP AND SOLICIT THEIR HELP.

9 IT WAS FURTHER AGREED AT THIS PROCESS MEETING
10 THAT WE WOULD FOLLOW A TWO-PHASE PROCESS. PHASE 1 WAS IN
11 WHICH THE MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD REVIEW THE
12 GRANTS AND THEN CALL INDIVIDUALS AND ENCOURAGE THEM TO
13 HELP US IF WE THOUGHT THEY WERE APPROPRIATE BASED ON THE
14 INTERVIEWS. AND A SECOND PHASE WAS FOLLOWED IN WHICH
15 ZACH HALL CALLED ALL OF THE NAMES THAT WERE SUBMITTED AND
16 WENT THROUGH A SERIES OF ISSUES WITH THEM THAT DEALT WITH
17 SUCH MATTERS AS CONFLICT OF INTEREST, TIME OF SERVICE,
18 ETC. TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE WERE NO DISQUALIFYING
19 CRITERIA THAT WE COULD IDENTIFY FROM THESE INDIVIDUALS.

20 A DEADLINE WAS USED IN WHICH WE SUBMITTED EIGHT
21 NAMES. WE WERE DIVIDED INTO SIX SUBGROUPS, AND EACH OF
22 THE SUBGROUPS WAS TO SUBMIT EIGHT NAMES WITH FIVE
23 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FULL MEMBERSHIP AND THREE INDIVIDUALS
24 WHO WOULD POTENTIALLY SERVE AS ALTERNATES.

25 ON APRIL THE 26TH THE SUBCOMMITTEE HELD ITS

1 THIRD MEETING, WHICH I THINK WAS A VERY SUCCESSFUL
2 MEETING, AND CAME UP WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS WE'D LIKE
3 TO PRESENT TO THE FULL BOARD TODAY AS SEVEN DISEASE
4 ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND 15
5 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS.

6 LET ME JUST COMMENT THAT I THINK THE SCIENTIFIC
7 MEMBERS THAT YOU WILL HEAR TODAY ARE TRULY OUTSTANDING.
8 DR. KESSLER'S GROUP BROUGHT FORWARD AN EXTRAORDINARY
9 GROUP OF PEOPLE, AND I THINK WE HAVE DONE THE SAME. I
10 WILL TELL YOU THAT THE MEETING THAT WE HAD ON APRIL THE
11 26TH WAS ONE IN WHICH THERE WAS A VIGOROUS AND OPEN
12 DISCUSSION. AND OUR HARDEST DILEMMA WAS TO NARROW IT
13 DOWN TO 15 NAMES TO BRING TO YOU. THERE WAS NO DEARTH OF
14 NAMES THAT WE FELT WERE HIGHLY QUALIFIED, SO THE LENGTH
15 OF THE DISCUSSION WAS MOSTLY HOW DO WE GET IT DOWN TO 15.

16 AND BASED ON THAT, WE FELT EVEN MORE STRONGLY
17 THAT HAVING ALTERNATE MEMBERS IN ADDITION TO THE FULL
18 MEMBERS IS CRITICAL. BECAUSE WE HAD SUCH HIGH QUALITY
19 PEOPLE, WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO
20 AGREED TO HELP US COME SERVE AS ALTERNATES.

21 THE ALTERNATES WOULD SERVE IN A ROLE IN WHICH,
22 IF THE GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE NEEDED ADDITIONAL
23 EXPERTISE, THAT IF SOMEONE ON THE GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE
24 COULDN'T FUNCTION AND WE NEEDED AN ALTERNATE, OR IF A
25 MEMBER OF THE GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE AT SOME SUBSEQUENT

1 DATE WAS NO LONGER ABLE TO SERVE, THAT THE ALTERNATES
2 WOULD FORM A READY LIST TO BRING BACK TO THE ICOC AS
3 POTENTIAL MEMBERS.

4 AN IMPORTANT PART OF THIS DISCUSSION WAS TO
5 RECOGNIZE THAT WE PROBABLY, AND WE HOPE THE BOARD WOULD
6 AGREE, WOULD NEED TO CONTINUE TO ENRICH THE LIST OF
7 ALTERNATES. SO THAT WE DISCUSSED AND APPROVED SEVEN
8 ALTERNATES THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT, AND WE HAD EIGHT
9 ADDITIONAL CANDIDATES THAT WERE TO BE INTERVIEWED BY
10 ZACH, AND I BELIEVE THREE OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS HAVE
11 SUBSEQUENTLY BEEN CONTACTED BY ZACH. AND HE WILL PRESENT
12 THEM TO YOU TODAY.

13 THE IMPORTANT POINT BEING IS WE DON'T VIEW THIS
14 AS FINISHED BUSINESS, THAT THE ALTERNATE LIST, WE HOPE,
15 WOULD CONTINUE TO BE ENRICHED AS WE GO FORWARD. AND WE
16 WILL BRING FORWARD TO YOU FOUR ADVOCATE -- AD HOC MEMBERS
17 OF THIS GROUP AS WELL. THESE WOULD BE INDIVIDUALS WHO
18 HAVE SPECIAL EXPERTISE THAT THE BOARD -- THAT THE GRANTS
19 WORKING GROUP COULD CALL UPON TO HELP THEM IN REVIEW OF
20 CERTAIN TYPES OF GRANTS THAT ARE PREIDENTIFIED AND, I
21 THINK, WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL TO ZACH AND THE STAFF AS
22 THEY NEED TO GET ADDITIONAL EXPERTISE.

23 WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE CHAIR, THEN WHAT I
24 WOULD PROPOSE IS THAT WE BEGIN TO CONSIDER THE NOMINEES
25 THAT WE HAVE TO BRING FORWARD TO THE GROUP AT THIS POINT,

1 IF THAT'S OKAY, OR I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS
2 RIGHT NOW WELL.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK, IN THE INTEREST OF
4 TIME -- DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL, WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE A
5 COMMENT BEFORE THE --

6 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: IT'S A PROCESS QUESTION SO
7 I'LL ASK IT NOW. WHEN DR -- MAYBE ZACH CAN ANSWER. WHEN
8 YOU CALLED ALL THE NAMES, THOSE WERE THE NAMES, THE 180
9 OR SO INDIVIDUALS THAT RECEIVED A LETTER FROM THE
10 INSTITUTE; IS THAT RIGHT?

11 DR. HOLMES: NO. THE GROUP RECEIVED THE TOP
12 TIER CANDIDATES WHO WERE APPORTIONED OUT ACROSS THE SIX
13 SUBGROUPS.

14 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: THE TOP TIER CANDIDATES
15 WERE ABOUT 186 OR SO?

16 DR. HOLMES: I DON'T REMEMBER THE EXACT NUMBER.
17 I THINK IT WAS IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD. YES, CLOSE TO 200.
18 THE SUBGROUPS THEN RANKED THE NAMES THAT THEY HAD AND
19 CONTACTED THE INDIVIDUALS. THEY THEN FORWARDED THE NAMES
20 OF THE EIGHT INDIVIDUALS THEY THOUGHT WERE -- THE FIVE
21 THEY WERE RECOMMENDING AND THE THREE ALTERNATES WERE
22 FORWARDED TO ZACH'S OFFICE, AND ZACH THEN CONTACTED THAT
23 SHORTENED LIST.

24 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HOW MANY WERE ON THAT
25 SHORTENED LIST, ABOUT 90 OR SO?

1 DR. HOLMES: ZACH, I DON'T --

2 DR. HALL: I ENDED UP MAKING ON THE ORDER OF 40
3 PHONE CALLS, BUT THEY'RE STILL COMING IN. ONE OF THE
4 PROBLEMS IS WE ARE TRYING TO MOVE AT A VERY ACCELERATED
5 PACE. SOME OF THE NAMES CAME IN LATE, AND WE ARE
6 CONTINUING TO CALL AND CONTINUING TO ADD TO THE
7 ALTERNATES LIST. I'D LIKE TO, AS DR. HOLMES SAID, THERE
8 WERE SUCH A LARGE NUMBER OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED CANDIDATES,
9 THAT WE THOUGHT WE SHOULD GO AHEAD AND KEEP MOVING IN THE
10 INTEREST OF GETTING THE SCIENCE OUT THERE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JUST SO THAT EVERYONE HEARS
12 THAT COMMENT, MY UNDERSTANDING, DR. HALL, FROM YOUR
13 COMMENT IS THAT THERE ARE HIGH QUALITY NAMES THAT
14 CONTINUE TO COME FORWARD AND THAT YOU ARE CONTINUING TO
15 LOOK AT ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC AND ALTERNATE
16 LIST; IS THAT A CORRECT STATEMENT?

17 DR. HALL: YES, THAT'S RIGHT. NO. 25.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU HAVE A BUTTON. WE'RE GOOD
19 AT SCIENCE.

20 DR. HALL: I WAS CONFUSED. I DIDN'T HAVE A BLUE
21 ONE. AT ANY RATE, YES, WE ANTICIPATE ACTUALLY SEVERAL
22 THINGS. ONE IS WE WILL WANT TO STAGGER THE TERMS. WE
23 DON'T WANT TO START OUT APPOINTING EVERYBODY FOR SIX
24 YEARS AND WE HAVE A TOTAL TURNOVER. SO WE WILL BE ADDING
25 PEOPLE IN, AND WE WILL ALSO, I BELIEVE, HAVE A HIGH

1 DEMAND FOR AD HOCS. WE WILL NOT GET ALL 15 PEOPLE EVERY
2 TIME WE MEET, AND SO WE'LL NEED TO ADD SOME OTHERS. AND
3 SO THE ALTERNATE LIST ARE THOSE PEOPLE WHO HAVE AGREED IN
4 PRINCIPLE TO SERVE AS FULL-TIME MEMBERS AND ARE AVAILABLE
5 FOR THAT AS THEY COME OPEN SO THAT WE DON'T NECESSARILY
6 HAVE TO COME TO YOU. IF SOMEBODY RESIGNS, WE DON'T
7 NECESSARILY HAVE TO COME TO YOU TO ASK TO START ALL OVER
8 AGAIN WITH THE PROCESS TO PICK OUT A PERSON, BUT WE CAN
9 CHOOSE FROM THE ALTERNATE LIST, BRING IT HERE, ASK FOR
10 YOUR CONCURRENCE.

11 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I'M GOING TO ASK MY
12 COLLEAGUES TO INDULGE ME NOW BECAUSE I'M GOING TO HAVE A
13 LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PROCESS. FORGIVE ME. THIS
14 ALTERNATE LIST, DR. HOLMES, YOU SAID IN YOUR INITIAL PART
15 OF YOUR REPORT THAT IT WOULD BE A GROWING LIST.

16 DR. HOLMES: CORRECT.

17 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HOW WILL THAT LIST GROW?

18 DR. HALL: IT WILL GROW BECAUSE FOR ONE THING
19 SOME OF THE NAMES THAT HAVE COME IN WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE
20 TO REACH. WE CALLED AND CALLED AND CALLED AND FOR
21 WHATEVER REASON COULDN'T REACH THEM, SO WE ARE CONTINUING
22 TO TRY. AND AS LATE AS TWO OR THREE DAYS AGO, WE WERE
23 STILL GETTING NAMES FROM SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO SAID,
24 OH, I MISSED THE DEADLINE, BUT HERE ARE SOME GOOD PEOPLE.
25 HERE ARE THE PEOPLE THAT WE CHOSE IN OUR SUBCOMMITTEE.

1 SO WE TREAT THEM AS WE DO THE OTHERS. WE CALL THEM AND
2 FIND OUT IF THEY'RE WILLING TO SERVE.

3 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: TO QUALIFY AS AN ALTERNATE,
4 YOU'D HAVE TO BE RECOMMENDED BY ONE PAIR GROUPS AND BE
5 CONTACTED BY YOU, HAVE A CONVERSATION. IT'S OKAY. THEY
6 CAN SERVE.

7 DR. HALL: YES. AND I ASSUME WE HAVE SOME THAT
8 ARE HERE NOW, AS THEY CONTINUE TO COME IN, I ASSUME WE
9 WILL BRING THAT GROUP BACK TO THIS COMMITTEE JUST FOR
10 RATIFICATION AS ALTERNATES.

11 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: WILL THERE, IN FACT, BE A
12 DEADLINE FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE?

13 DR. HALL: I WOULD HOPE THAT MEMBERS OF THE
14 SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD GET THEIR NAMES IN IN SOME FINITE
15 PERIOD OF TIME. I THINK THEY WILL. I CAN'T IMAGINE THIS
16 WILL GO ON INDEFINITELY. I THINK THIS WILL -- WE WILL
17 EXHAUST THAT LIST FAIRLY SOON.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT, TO PUT
19 THIS IN CONTEXT, WE'VE HAD 27 PUBLIC MEETINGS, I THINK
20 THIS IS 28 IN 22 WEEKS. THAT'S REMARKABLE AND
21 UNPRECEDENTED IN STATE GOVERNMENT. THIS IS THE MOST OPEN
22 CREATION OF ANY STATE AGENCY IN THE HISTORY OF THE STATE
23 OF CALIFORNIA. BUT THAT OPEN PROCESS HAS PUT GREAT
24 DEMANDS ON ALL OF THE MEMBERS, SO THERE ARE SOME
25 SUBCOMMITTEES -- THERE ARE SOME WORKING GROUPS OF THIS

1 SUBCOMMITTEE THAT ARE CONTINUING TO PROCESS NAMES THEY'VE
2 ALREADY GOTTEN, AND THAT'S WHAT'S BEING DESCRIBED BY DR.
3 HALL.

4 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY BECAUSE ONE OF THE
5 POINTS I WANT TO MAKE IS THAT ANY APPOINTMENT TO THE
6 WORKING GROUP FROM THE ALTERNATES LIST WOULD COME TO THIS
7 COMMITTEE. SO WE DON'T ANTICIPATE NAMING THEM, BUT WE
8 WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE FREEDOM TO DRAW FROM THIS LIST AND
9 FROM OUR AD HOC LIST AS WE NEED AD HOC MEMBERS FOR
10 PARTICULAR REVIEW WITHOUT HAVING TO COME BACK TO THIS
11 COMMITTEE.

12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: MY ONLY POINT IS TO HAVE
13 SOME CLARITY AS TO HOW THIS ALTERNATE GROUP IS PUT
14 TOGETHER, AND YOU HAVE DONE SO. SO THANK YOU.

15 DR. HALL: LET ME MAKE ONE MORE POINT ABOUT THE
16 AD HOC GROUP. THESE ARE PEOPLE, MANY OF THEM ARE QUITE
17 OUTSTANDING. IN FACT, THE FOUR HERE ARE ALL OUTSTANDING
18 PEOPLE, AMONG THE MOST HIGHLY QUALIFIED. WHAT THEY TOLD
19 US WAS I'D LOVE TO HELP YOU, BUT I CANNOT MAKE A FULL
20 COMMITMENT, BUT I WOULD BE WILLING TO COME AND HELP. AND
21 THAT'S WHERE THAT GROUP COMES FROM.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE SHERRY LANSING HAS A
23 POINT.

24 MS. LANSING: I WANTED TO CLARIFY. I THINK YOU
25 PRETTY MUCH SAID IT, BUT I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT A LOT OF

1 THESE PEOPLE SELF-SELECTED THEMSELVES. THEY DID NOT WANT
2 TO BE FULL TIME, AS YOU SAID, SO WE PUT THEM AS
3 ALTERNATES OR AD HOC BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THEY WISHED.

4 SECOND, I THINK WHAT'S GREAT ABOUT THIS
5 COMMITTEE, AND I THINK THIS WILL GIVE EVERYBODY SOME
6 COMFORT, IS IT CONTINUES TO EVOLVE AND WILL CONTINUE TO
7 EVOLVE OVER A LONG PERIOD OF YEARS BECAUSE, THOUGH THESE
8 PEOPLE ARE GOING TO SERVE FOR TERMS, THEIR TERMS WILL BE
9 UP. AND AS SCIENTISTS START TO DO WORK AND WANT TO BE
10 INVOLVED IN THIS, THIS SUBCOMMITTEE WILL MEET, MAKE
11 RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT NOBODY WILL BE APPOINTED WITHOUT
12 COMING BEFORE THE FULL BOARD.

13 DR. HOLMES: MR. CHAIR, ONE THING THAT WOULD
14 PROBABLY HELPS US FOR CLARIFICATION, TO FOLLOW UP ON
15 MS. LANSING'S COMMENT, IF THE BOARD SO CHOOSES, THE
16 SUBCOMMITTEE COULD STAY IN EXISTENCE AS SORT OF A LOW
17 LEVEL CONTINUAL SEARCH COMMITTEE TO SUPPLY NAMES,
18 EVALUATE, AND BRING BACK, OR WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO CEASE
19 AND DESIST.

20 MS. LANSING: PERSONALLY NOBODY WANTS TO GO TO
21 THESE MEETINGS AND HAVE TO STAY THERE BECAUSE -- I'M NOT
22 SAYING WE'RE GOING TO MEET EVERY WEEK, BUT NAMES ARE
23 GOING TO BE CONSTANTLY COMING IN. THE COMMITTEE'S
24 VISIBILITY IS GOING TO GROW, AND WE HAVE TO HAVE A SYSTEM
25 TWO YEARS FROM NOW WHEN SOME OF THESE PEOPLE WILL WANT TO

1 GO OFF THE BOARD TO REFURBISH IT. AND YOU'LL HAVE A
2 WHOLE BUNCH OF NAMES AND YOU'LL BE ABLE TO EVALUATE THEM
3 AND COME BACK TO YOU WITH THOSE NAMES. I THINK THIS
4 COMMITTEE MUST IN SOME FORM CONTINUE TO EXIST.

5 DR. PRECIADO: I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT WHAT
6 SHERRY IS SAYING BECAUSE WE NEED TO DOWN THE ROAD. WE
7 CAN'T -- WE'RE MOVING SO FAST AS IT IS, AND SO WE
8 CAN'T -- WE NEED TO ANTICIPATE THAT IN TWO, FIVE, TEN
9 YEARS WE'RE GOING TO STILL NEED SOME SORT OF LOCAL POINT
10 WHERE WE CAN GIVE OUR FEEDBACK.

11 DR. HOLMES: I THINK THE COMMITTEE WOULD
12 CERTAINLY BE WILLING TO CONTINUE TO SERVE. I CAN'T SPEAK
13 FOR EVERYBODY ON THE COMMITTEE, BUT I WOULD JOIN SHERRY
14 IN SAYING CERTAINLY I WOULD, AND I THINK THE OTHERS WOULD
15 ALSO.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S A STATEMENT OF
17 GREAT COURAGE. BUT CERTAINLY --

18 DR. HOLMES: DO WE HAVE TO MEET IN FRESNO EACH
19 TIME? KIDDING, PHYLLIS, KIDDING.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU WERE AHEAD, DR. HOLMES.

21 DR. LEVEY: NO. 18. THE OTHER THING, THE REASON
22 THIS COMMITTEE NEEDS TO BE SO WELL STOCKED IS THAT
23 PROBABLY OF ANY OTHER COMMITTEE THAT WE HAVE, THEY'RE
24 GOING TO WORK REALLY HARD BECAUSE THE SHEAR NUMBER OF
25 PROPOSALS THAT THEY'RE GOING TO GET FROM OUR INSTITUTIONS

1 WILL BE QUITE CHALLENGING, TO SAY THE LEAST. AND IT'S
2 ONLY 15 -- THINK OF 15 PEOPLE FACED WITH THE NUMBERS,
3 IT'S -- WE'LL HAVE TO KEEP ADDING TO IT. THEY'RE A
4 TERRIFIC GROUP OF PEOPLE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. DR. HOLMES.

6 DR. HOLMES: I MIGHT MOVE AHEAD, THEN, WITH YOUR
7 ENDORSEMENT, MR. CHAIR, TO PRESENT SOME OF THE NAMES FOR
8 THE COMMITTEE'S APPROVAL. LET ME CLARIFY THAT I HAVE THE
9 HIGHEST REGARD FOR THE CITY OF FRESNO. IT WAS JUST
10 TRAVEL.

11 DR. PRECIADO: SO THAT MEANS WE CAN HAVE ONE OF
12 THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS HERE, RIGHT? THANK YOU, DR.
13 HOLMES.

14 DR. HOLMES: I'VE GOTTEN IN TROUBLE. I SHOULD
15 HAVE SHUT UP.

16 DR. WRIGHT: YES, OR WE'LL MOVE YOU TO CHICO.

17 DR. HOLMES: I'D LIKE TO BEGIN WITH TWO PHASES,
18 IF I MIGHT, FOR THE FULL COMMITTEE'S APPROVAL. THE FIRST
19 WOULD BE THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS FROM THE ICOC WHO
20 WOULD SERVE ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. I'D LIKE TO
21 READ OUR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS GROUP FOR YOUR
22 DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION. SHERRY LANSING, PHYLLIS
23 PRECIADO, JOAN SAMUELSON, DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL, JEFF
24 SHEEHY, JONATHAN SHESTACK, AND JANET WRIGHT WERE
25 INDIVIDUALS WHO GRACIOUSLY VOLUNTEERED TO SERVE IN THIS

1 CAPACITY. AND WE FELT THAT THEY WERE EXTRAORDINARILY
2 QUALIFIED AND WOULD LIKE TO PUT FORWARD TO THE BOARD THAT
3 THESE INDIVIDUALS BE APPROVED AS DISEASE ADVOCATES WHO
4 WOULD SERVE ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

5 MS. WILSON: SO MOVED.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE A MOTION.

7 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THE DISCUSSION ON THE
9 MOTION IS IN ORDER.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: PROCEDURAL QUESTION. DO THE
11 NAMED PEOPLE RECUSE OURSELVES?

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

13 DR. HOLMES: YES. DO WE NEED TO GO TO THE
14 PUBLIC FOR COMMENT ON THIS?

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, WE DO. ANY PUBLIC
16 COMMENT? SEEING NO PUBLIC COMMENT, I'D LIKE TO CALL THE
17 QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED. YOU'RE VERY
18 EFFICIENT, DR. HOLMES.

19 DR. HOLMES: THANK YOU. NOW WE'LL MOVE TO THE
20 NEXT GROUP, AND HOPEFULLY WE CAN MAINTAIN OUR EFFICIENCY.

21 I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THIS TIME IF ZACH HALL WOULD
22 COME FORWARD AND PRESENT OUR LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR THE
23 FULL COMMITTEE FOR THE ALTERNATE AND THE AD HOC GROUP.

24 DR. HALL: LET ME SAY THAT THESE NAMES, AS YOU
25 HEARD, WERE PRESENTED TO ME BY MEMBERS OF THE

1 SUBCOMMITTEE. MY JOB WAS SIMPLY TO CALL THEM AND DEAL
2 WITH ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS IN THE FORM OF OUR CONFLICT
3 OF INTEREST POLICIES AND SO FORTH. SO THE FACT THAT I
4 DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH CHOOSING THESE PEOPLE
5 LET'S ME SAY HOW GRATIFIED I AM AND HOW PLEASED I AM BY
6 THE QUALITY OF THE PEOPLE THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS
7 CHOSEN.

8 WE WILL BE JUDGED BY THE QUALITY OF THE WORK
9 THAT WE FUND, AND THAT WILL DEPEND VERY DIRECTLY ON THE
10 QUALITY OF THE PEOPLE WHO ADVISE US ON THE SCIENTIFIC
11 MERIT OF THESE GRANTS. AND WE HAVE AN ABSOLUTELY
12 OUTSTANDING GROUP. LET ME JUST SUMMARIZE. WE HAVE FOUR
13 NATIONAL ACADEMY MEMBERS, TWO INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE
14 MEMBERS, THREE HHMI INVESTIGATORS, WE HAVE EIGHT BASIC
15 SCIENTISTS, AND SEVEN WITH STRONG CLINICAL INTEREST, SO
16 WE HAVE BALANCE IN THAT DIRECTION. AND FOR THOSE OF YOU
17 WHO SAW THE ARTICLE -- MIGHT HAVE SEEN THE ARTICLE IN THE
18 SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE THIS MORNING, HAROLD VARMUS HAS
19 ALREADY PRONOUNCED ON OUR LIST SAYING THAT IT'S AN
20 ABSOLUTELY OUTSTANDING GROUP. I'M VERY PLEASED AND
21 HONORED TO PRESENT THEM TO YOU.

22 THEY ARE IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER SUSAN
23 BONNER-WEIR, PH.D, WHO'S AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IN THE
24 DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AT HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL AND A
25 SENIOR INVESTIGATOR AT THE JOSLYN DIABETES CENTER IN

1 BOSTON. HER RESEARCH CONCERNS THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE
2 TISSUE IN THE PANCREAS THAT SECRETES INSULIN AND THE
3 FACTORS THAT REGULATE ITS GROWTH AND DIFFERENTIATION.

4 DR. BONNER-WEIR HAS SERVED ON GRANT REVIEW
5 PANELS FOR THE NIH AND THE AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION,
6 AS WELL AS ON NUMEROUS EDITORIAL BOARDS.

7 ALI BRINVANLOU, PH.D., IS PRESIDENT AND HEAD OF
8 THE LABORATORY OF MOLECULAR VERTEBRATE EMBRYOLOGY AT THE
9 ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY IN NEW YORK. DR. BRIVANLOU IS A
10 DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGIST WHO IS CURRENTLY WORKING ON
11 PRIMATE STEM CELLS TO IDENTIFY FACTORS THAT DETERMINE
12 GERM LAYER SPECIFICATION DURING EARLY DEVELOPMENT.

13 AMONG HIS AWARDS IS A VERY PRESTIGIOUS
14 PRESIDENT'S, AS IN PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, EARLY
15 CAREER AWARD FOR SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS.

16 THE THIRD IS PATRICIA DONOHOE, M.D., DIRECTOR OF
17 PEDIATRIC SURGICAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES AND PAST CHIEF
18 OF PEDIATRIC SURGERY AT MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL.
19 SHE HOLDS THE MARSHALL K. BARTLEY CHAIR OF SURGERY AT THE
20 HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL. SHE'S A MEMBER OF THE SCIENTIFIC
21 ADVISORY BOARD AT MEMORIAL SLOAN-KETTERING CANCER CENTER,
22 AND IS ALSO ON THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR CHILD HEALTH
23 AND DEVELOPMENT NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL.

24 HER WORK RANGES FROM FUNDAMENTAL DEVELOPMENTAL
25 BIOLOGY OF THE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM TO OVARIAN CANCER TO

1 SURGICAL PROCEDURES FOR REPAIR OF CONGENITAL ANOMALIES.
2 SHE REALLY HAS AN EXTRAORDINARY RANGE IN HER RESEARCH
3 CAREER. SHE'S A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF
4 SCIENCES, THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE,
5 INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE. SHE'S PRESIDENT ELECT TO THE
6 AMERICAN PEDIATRIC SURGICAL ASSOCIATION AND HAS NUMEROUS
7 AWARDS AND HONORARY DEGREES.

8 ANDREW FEINBERG, M.D., MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
9 IS DIRECTOR OF THE MEDICAL -- MEDICINE DIVISION FOR THE
10 DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AT JOHNS HOPKINS. HE AND HIS
11 COLLEAGUES HAVE PIONEERED RESEARCH ON EPIGENETIC
12 MECHANISMS IN HUMAN CANCERS. DR. FEINBERG HAS BEEN A
13 HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL INSTITUTE INVESTIGATOR AND IS A
14 CHARTER MEMBER OF THE NIH STUDY SECTION ON CANCER
15 GENETICS.

16 ALEXANDRA JOYNER, PH.D., IS A WELL-KNOWN
17 DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGIST WHO IS A PROFESSOR OF THE
18 DEPARTMENTS OF GENETICS, CELL BIOLOGY, AND PHYSIOLOGY AND
19 NEUROSCIENCE AT THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF
20 MEDICINE. SHE ALSO IS A HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL INSTITUTE
21 INVESTIGATOR, AND IS THE SKIRBALL FOUNDATION PROFESSOR OF
22 GENETICS.

23 DR. JOYNER STUDIES THE CELLULAR AND GENETIC
24 EVENTS THAT REGULATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF MAMMALIAN BRAIN
25 USING THE MOUSE AS A MODEL SYSTEM.

1 JUDITH KIMBLE, PH.D., IS A HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL
2 INSTITUTE INVESTIGATOR AND VILAS PROFESSOR OF
3 BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY AND MOLECULAR GENETICS
4 AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN IN MADISON. DR. KIMBLE'S
5 RESEARCH FOCUSES ON EARLY EMBRYOGENESIS, ORGANOGENESIS,
6 AND CELLULAR DIFFERENTIATION IN A MODEL ORGANISM,
7 CAENORHABDITIS ELEGANS.

8 DR. KIMBLE IS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY
9 OF SCIENCES AND IS CURRENTLY PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY FOR
10 DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY AND PAST PRESIDENT OF THE GENETIC
11 SOCIETY.

12 JEFF MACKLIS, M.D., IS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF
13 NEUROSURGERY, NEUROLOGY, AND NEUROSCIENCE AT HARVARD
14 MEDICAL SCHOOL AND IS THE DIRECTOR OF THE NEWLY
15 ESTABLISHED MGH-HMS RESEARCH CENTER FOR NERVOUS SYSTEM
16 REPAIR.

17 DR. MACKLIS' RESEARCH CENTERS ON MECHANISMS OF
18 BRAIN AND SPINAL CORD REPAIR WITH EMPHASIS ON NEURAL STEM
19 CELL BIOLOGY AND INDUCTION OF NEUROGENESIS.

20 DR. MACKLIS' RESEARCH EXCELLENCE HAS BEEN
21 RECOGNIZED BY HIS RECEIPT OF THE INNOVATION AWARD FROM
22 THE NIH DIRECTOR'S OFFICE.

23 STUART ORKIN, M.D., IS THE DAVID G. NATHAN
24 PROFESSOR OF PEDIATRICS AT THE HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL.
25 DR. ORKIN'S RESEARCH FOCUSES ON THE MOLECULAR GENETICS OF

1 HEMATOLOGIC DISEASE, MECHANISMS OF BLOOD DEVELOPMENT, AND
2 STEM CELL BIOLOGY.

3 HE'S A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF
4 SCIENCE, THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE, AND HAS BEEN AN
5 INVESTIGATOR OF THE HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL INSTITUTE SINCE
6 1986. HE HAS SERVED AS A MEMBER OR CHAIR ON MULTIPLE
7 ADVISORY AND REVIEW COMMITTEES AT THE NIH.

8 JEFF ROTHSTEIN, M.D., PH.D., IS PROFESSOR OF
9 NEUROLOGY AND NEUROSCIENCE AND DIRECTOR OF THE ROBERT
10 PACKARD CENTER FOR ALS RESEARCH AT JOHNS HOPKINS. HE
11 OVERSEES ONE OF THE LARGEST ALS CLINICS IN THE UNITED
12 STATES AND HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN INVESTIGATION OF BOTH
13 THE FUNDAMENTAL MECHANISMS AND THE CLINICAL TREATMENT OF
14 ALS.

15 PABLO RUBENSTEIN, M.D., IS THE FOUNDER AND
16 DIRECTOR OF THE NEW YORK BLOOD CENTER'S NATURAL CORD
17 BLOOD PROGRAM. DR. RUBENSTEIN WAS A CLINICAL PROFESSOR
18 OF PATHOLOGY AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, IS AN EXPERT IN
19 IMMUNOGENETICS. HE DEVELOPED THE PLACENTAL BLOOD PROGRAM
20 OF THE NEW YORK BLOOD CENTER AS A USEFUL AND POTENTIALLY
21 WIDELY AVAILABLE SOURCE OF STEM CELLS FOR BONE MARROW
22 REPLACEMENT.

23 DR. RUBENSTEIN HAS SERVED ON THE MAMMALIAN
24 GENETICS STUDY SECTION AT NIH AND ON REVIEW COMMITTEES
25 FOR THE JUVENILE DIABETES FOUNDATION AND THE AMERICAN

1 DIABETES ASSOCIATION.

2 DENNIS STEINDLER, PH.D., IS CURRENTLY PROFESSOR
3 OF MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
4 MCKNIGHT BRAIN INSTITUTE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.
5 DR. STEINDLER HAS BEEN STUDYING THE GROWTH AND
6 TRANSPLANTATION OF BRAIN AND STEM CELLS FOR OVER 25
7 YEARS. HE HAS RECENTLY BEEN THE CHAIR OF THE BRAIN
8 REPAIR AND STEM CELL REVIEW PANEL AT THE NATIONAL
9 INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

10 DR. RANIER STORB, M.D., IS THE HEAD OF
11 TRANSPLANTATION BIOLOGY AT THE FRED HUTCHINSON CANCER
12 RESEARCH CENTER IN SEATTLE. DR. STORB'S RESEARCH IS
13 FOCUSED ON BASIC AND TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE
14 BIOLOGY OF THE HEMATOPOETIC CELL TRANSPLANTATION.

15 CLIVE SVENDSEN, PH.D., IS DIRECTOR OF THE STEM
16 CELL RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
17 WISCONSIN-MADISON'S WAISMAN CENTER. HIS RESEARCH CENTERS
18 ON NEURAL STEM CELLS. HE HAS SERVED AS GRANT REVIEWER ON
19 MULTIPLE NIH STUDY SECTIONS AND FOR PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS.

20 ALLEN TROUNHSON, PH.D., IS PROFESSOR OF STEM
21 CELL SCIENCES AT MONASH UNIVERSITY. I FAILED TO SAY THAT
22 WE HAVE AN INTERNATIONAL GROUP HERE. AND I WAS
23 ENORMOUSLY GRATIFIED IN TALKING TO HIM ABOUT HIS
24 WILLINGNESS TO COME FROM MONASH TO SAN FRANCISCO SEVERAL
25 TIMES A YEAR FOR THIS. HE IS FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE VICE

1 CHAIR OF THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL STEM CELL CENTER. HE
2 HAS WORKED ON -- SORRY -- WORKED ON HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM
3 CELLS AND THEIR SUITABILITY FOR TRANSPLANTATION FOR THE
4 TREATMENT OF INFLAMMATORY LUNG DISEASE AND CYSTIC
5 FIBROSIS. HE IS ON THE VICTORIAN GOVERNMENT'S INNOVATION
6 ECONOMIC ADVISORY BOARD AND IS DIRECTOR OF THE VICTORIAN
7 ENDOWMENT FOR SCIENCE, KNOWLEDGE, AND INNOVATION.

8 FINALLY, GEORGE YANCOPOULOS, M.D., PH.D., IS
9 FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR. HE IS THE CHIEF SCIENTIFIC
10 OFFICER AND PRESIDENT OF REGENERON LABORATORIES IN NEW
11 JERSEY. HE IS ALSO AN ADJUNCT PROFESSOR AT COLUMBIA
12 UNIVERSITY.

13 DR. YANCOPOULOS IS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL
14 ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND
15 SCIENCES. HE IS WELL-KNOWN FOR HIS WORK ON CYTOKINES AND
16 GROWTH FACTORS AND THEIR RECEPTORS. HE HAS RECENTLY
17 DEvised A METHOD FOR GENETICALLY MODIFYING STEM CELLS
18 THAT CAN BE USED TO CREATE LIBRARIES OF STEM CELLS THAT
19 HAVE BEEN MODIFIED.

20 SO A WONDERFUL LIST OF PEOPLE THAT I COMMEND THE
21 COMMITTEE FOR CHOOSING AND RECOMMEND THEM TO YOU FOR YOUR
22 APPROVAL.

23 DR. HOLMES: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH YOUR PLEASURE,
24 WE WILL BRING FORWARD THIS GROUP FOR CONSIDERATION AND
25 THEN THE ALTERNATES AND AD HOCS SEPARATE. I HAVE BUT ONE

1 CORRECTION ON DR. HALL'S PRESENTATION, AND HE MAY NOT
2 NECESSARILY BE IN SAN FRANCISCO.

3 DR. PRECIADO: I ACTUALLY WANT TO ADD TO THAT
4 AND SUGGEST THAT WOULD HE BE WILLING, IF BY SOME MIRACLE
5 SAN DIEGO OR SACRAMENTO GET'S THE CIRM.

6 DR. HALL: OF COURSE.

7 DR. HOLMES: LET ME, BEFORE CALLING FOR A VOTE,
8 JUST SIMPLY REITERATE WHAT DR. HALL HAS SO NICELY SHOWN
9 YOU, THAT I THINK WE WERE FORTUNATE IN HAVING 15 TRULY
10 OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS WHO REPRESENTED DIVERSE AREAS OF
11 SCIENCE, WHICH WAS ONE OF OUR CONSIDERATIONS. WE
12 COULDN'T HIT EVERY TOPIC, BUT WE DID TRY TO BE DIVERSE.
13 I THINK THE BALANCE OF BASIC AND PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS IS
14 REALLY EXACTLY WHAT THE INITIATIVE CALLED FOR US TO DO.

15 SO AT THIS POINT I WOULD PUT TO YOU A
16 RECOMMENDATION THAT WE CONSIDER THESE CANDIDATES.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE SOMEONE WHO WOULD MAKE
18 A MOTION, AND WE'LL HAVE DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION.

19 DR. PIZZO: SO MOVED.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY DEAN PIZZO.

21 DR. LOVE: SECOND.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECONDED BY TED LOVE. WE NOW
23 HAVE DISCUSSION. ORDER, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.

24 DR. PRECIADO: I WOULD LIKE TO JUST MAKE A
25 COMMENT. THESE ARE OUTSTANDING CANDIDATES. I WOULD JUST

1 LIKE TO ENCOURAGE AND MAKE A COMMENT ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE
2 OF HAVING DIVERSITY ON THIS PANEL. I UNDERSTAND THAT
3 THIS IS A NEW FIELD OF SCIENCE AND RESEARCH, AND I
4 UNDERSTAND THAT THE POOL IS NOT AS GREAT AS IT WOULD BE
5 IN OTHER AREAS. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THAT WE MAKE A
6 CONCERTED EFFORT TO BE INCLUSIVE OF OTHER ETHNICITIES.

7 DR. HOLMES: THANK YOU. I THINK THAT'S A VERY
8 IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION AT EVERY STEP IN THE PROCESS AS
9 WE EVALUATE CANDIDATES TO ENHANCE DIVERSITY, NOT ONLY IN
10 THE FIELD OF REPRESENTATION, BASIC AND CLINICAL, GENDER
11 AND OTHER TYPES OF DIVERSITY. THANK YOU.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.

13 DR. POMEROY: IN TERMS OF ANOTHER TYPE OF
14 DIVERSITY, ONLY ONE OF THE 15 REALLY IS FROM INDUSTRY.
15 AND ONE OF THE THINGS EMPHASIZED IN PROP 71 WAS THE
16 IMPORTANCE OF TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC
17 INDUSTRY PARTNERS BEING PARTICULARLY EMPHASIZED FOR
18 FUNDING. I WONDER IF YOU COULD COMMENT ON WHETHER THIS
19 REFLECTED THE NUMBERS OR PERCENTAGES OF NOMINEES THAT
20 CAME FROM INDUSTRY AND WHAT OUTREACH EFFORTS WERE DONE TO
21 INDUSTRY TO GET ADDITIONAL NAMES.

22 DR. HOLMES: AS I MENTIONED, THAT THE NAMES THAT
23 WE RECEIVED WERE SOLICITED IN A VERY BROAD WAY FROM NOT
24 ONLY THE ICOC, BUT FROM THE GENERAL COMMUNITY AS WELL.
25 AND THERE WAS AN ATTEMPT, AND I THINK A GOOD ATTEMPT, TO

1 GET AS MANY NOMINEES AS WE POSSIBLY COULD. WE DID
2 DISCUSS THIS PARTICULAR POINT AT OUR SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
3 ABOUT HAVING INDUSTRY REPRESENTATION. AND WE WERE QUITE
4 PLEASED THAT WE HAD A CANDIDATE WHO FIT THAT CATEGORY.
5 SO IT WAS SOMETHING OF WHICH WE WERE COGNIZANT AND HAD
6 DISCUSSION ABOUT.

7 DR. HALL: I JUST MAKE THE POINT THAT WE HAD ONE
8 OTHER OUTSTANDING CANDIDATE WHO ACTUALLY WOULD PROBABLY
9 BE ON THIS LIST EXCEPT, AS WE EXPLORED THE CONNECTIONS OF
10 HIS COMPANY, IT SEEMED CLEAR THERE WAS A CONFLICT OF
11 INTEREST, AND THAT HE WOULD NOT, FOR THAT REASON, BE ABLE
12 TO SERVE. I THINK YOUR POINT IS A GOOD ONE.

13 THERE ARE MANY OUTSTANDING SCIENTISTS IN
14 INDUSTRY, AND WE PROBABLY NEED TO MAKE A CONCERTED EFFORT
15 SINCE MOST OF THE CONTACTS OF THOSE US IN ACADEMIA ARE IN
16 ACADEMIA.

17 DR. HOLMES: CLAIRE, SINCE WE HAVE THE
18 OPPORTUNITY TO CONTINUE TO ENRICH THIS LIST, I THINK THAT
19 WOULD BE AN ONGOING OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO ENCOURAGE MORE
20 SUBMISSIONS FROM THAT AREA AS WELL.

21 DR. BRYANT: I'D LIKE TO CONGRATULATE YOU ON THE
22 WOMEN CANDIDATES ON THE LIST. THEY'RE OUTSTANDING AND
23 I'M GLAD TO SEE THE NUMBER.

24 DR. HOLMES: MS. LANSING.

25 MS. LANSING: HAVING BEEN ON THIS COMMITTEE, I

1 CAN SPEAK WITH ACCURACY IN THE SENSE THAT WE WERE VERY,
2 VERY MINDFUL OF THE TWO ISSUES THAT CLAIRE AND PHYLLIS
3 ARE RAISING IN TERMS OF INDUSTRY AND IN TERMS OF
4 DIVERSITY. AND WE WERE EXTRAORDINARILY MINDFUL OF THEM,
5 AND THEN TRYING ALSO TO GET A BROAD REPRESENTATION FROM
6 THE VARIOUS DISEASES THAT ARE REPRESENTED ON THIS BOARD.

7 BUT AFTER WE LOOKED AT ALL THOSE THINGS, WHAT
8 CAME FIRST AND ABOVE ALL ELSE WAS THE SCIENTIFIC
9 CREDENTIALS OF THE CANDIDATE. AND THAT WAS THE DECISION
10 THAT WAS MADE NO MATTER WHAT ANYTHING ELSE WAS.

11 SO AS A WOMAN I CAN SAY THAT THEY WEREN'T GIVEN
12 ANY SPECIAL CONSIDERATION BECAUSE THEY WERE WOMEN.

13 DR. HOLMES: THANK YOU.

14 DR. PRECIADO: I'M NOT ASKING FOR SPECIAL
15 CONSIDERATION.

16 MS. LANSING: I DIDN'T MEAN THAT THAT WAY.

17 DR. PRECIADO: WHAT I'M SUGGESTING IS THAT I'M
18 ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THIS IS A YOUNG FIELD. SO THAT SAID,
19 I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE REACH OUT. AND I ALSO
20 WANT TO ASK DID YOU REACH OUT TO SUCH ORGANIZATIONS AS
21 THE NATIONAL HISPANIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, THE NATIONAL
22 MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, THE CALIFORNIA -- I KNOW WE CAN'T
23 LOOK AT CALIFORNIA, BUT THERE ARE MANY HISPANIC AND
24 AFRICAN AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE MEMBERSHIP THAT
25 WOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO HELP YOU.

1 DR. HOLMES: IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE
2 REACHED OUT TO A NUMBER OF SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS SINCE
3 THE THEME OF THE SEARCH WAS FOR SCIENTISTS, BE IT BASIC
4 OR PHYSICIAN-SCIENTISTS. I DON'T KNOW, MAYBE SOMEONE
5 FROM STAFF COULD COMMENT, WHETHER WE SPECIFICALLY
6 CONTACTED EITHER OF THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS YOU MENTIONED,
7 WHICH ARE EXCELLENT ORGANIZATIONS.

8 DR. PRECIADO: I MIGHT ADD THAT YOU MAY NOT FIND
9 THE SCIENTISTS THAT YOU ARE LOOKING FOR IN THESE
10 SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS; WHEREAS, YOU MIGHT FIND THEM IN
11 THE OTHER ORGANIZATIONS I MENTIONED.

12 DR. HOLMES: I THINK WE CAN CERTAINLY DO THAT AS
13 WE GO FORWARD.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I BELIEVE JOAN
15 SAMUELSON HAS A POINT AND DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S A QUICK POINT OF
17 CLARIFICATION FOLLOWING ON SHERRY LANSING'S COMMENTS,
18 WHICH I HEARTILY ENDORSE. BUT YOU SAID YOU ENDEAVORED TO
19 LOOK AT THE WIDE BREADTH OF DISEASES REPRESENTED ON THE
20 COMMITTEE. AND I THINK PROBABLY WHAT YOU MEANT WAS THE
21 DISEASES THAT THERE IS POTENTIAL FOR CURE.

22 MS. LANSING: ABSOLUTELY. YES.

23 MS. SAMUELSON: PEOPLE WITH DISEASES AND
24 DISORDERS AND INJURIES THAT ARE NOT REFLECTED BY OUR
25 REPRESENTATIVE MEMBERS COME TO ME FREQUENTLY NOW AND SAY

1 ARE YOU GOING TO TRY TO CURE WHAT I HAVE, WHAT THEY HAVE.
2 AND I TELL THEM THAT I SEE MY ROLE AS A FIDUCIARY FOR ALL
3 CALIFORNIANS WHO ARE SUFFERING FROM ANYTHING, AND THAT'S
4 A TALL ORDER FOR ALL OF US, BUT THAT'S WHAT WE'RE DOING.
5 I'M SURE THAT'S WHAT YOU MEANT.

6 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU FOR THE CORRECTION.
7 THAT IS ABSOLUTELY WHAT I MEANT.

8 DR. HOLMES: MR. CHAIR, SHOULD I RECOGNIZE
9 PEOPLE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID IS THE NEXT. GO AHEAD.

11 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU. I TOO WANT TO
12 JOIN IN THE CHORUS, DR. HOLMES AND MEMBERS,
13 CONGRATULATING YOU ON THE HARD WORK THAT YOU DID, STAFF
14 AS WELL. WITHOUT A DOUBT WE WOULDN'T HAVE COME UP WITH
15 THESE 15 OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT SOME EFFORT AND
16 WORK.

17 THIS IS AN OBSERVATION THAT FOR ME DOESN'T RAISE
18 TO A CONCERN. IT'S AN OBSERVATION, BUT I DO OBSERVE THAT
19 MS, MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS IS NOT ON THE PLATFORM. NOT A
20 SINGLE INDIVIDUAL HAS THAT EXPERTISE AMONG THESE 15. I
21 WOULD ALSO POINT OUT THEY'RE DISEASE GROUPS, BUT THAT'S
22 THE CASE AS WELL PROBABLY. AND I KNOW THAT THERE'S SOME
23 NEURO EXPERTS ON THIS.

24 I'M TALKING ABOUT 400,000 OF OUR FELLOW
25 AMERICANS WHO SUFFER FROM THIS DEVASTATING DISEASE,

1 50,000 OF OUR FELLOW CALIFORNIANS AS WELL. DESPITE MY
2 OBSERVATION, I HAVE REALLY THE BELIEF THAT I KNOW THIS
3 WORKING GROUP IS GOING TO LOOK AT EVERYTHING AS THIS
4 COMMITTEE WAS ALSO CHARGED TO DO, THAT THERE WILL BE, AS
5 YOU SAY, OPPORTUNITIES DOWN THE ROAD TO BRING IN
6 ALTERNATES, BRING IN AD HOCS, FOLLOW SOME DIRECTION FROM
7 OUR PRESIDENT, DR. HALL, IN ADDRESSING ALL THESE ISSUES.
8 BUT I FEEL COMPELLED AS THE ALS AND MS REPRESENTATIVE TO
9 HAVE THAT NOTED IN THE RECORD.

10 DR. HOLMES: THANK YOU. ON BEHALF OF THE
11 COMMITTEE, LET ME SAY THANK YOU FOR YOUR KIND COMMENTS.
12 THE COMMITTEE REALLY DID WORK VERY, VERY HARD.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO FURTHER THE COMMENT
14 MADE SO THAT EVERYONE HERE UNDERSTANDS THAT THE PATIENT
15 ADVOCATES REPRESENT THE WHOLE SCOPE OF DISEASE. WE HAVE
16 A BOND WITH EVERYONE WITH A FAMILY MEMBER, A CHILD, A
17 SPOUSE, OR AGING ADULT WHO'S SUFFERING FROM CHRONIC
18 DISEASE. I WOULD POINT OUT THE AFFIRMATIVE, THAT THERE'S
19 NO ONE ON THIS BOARD REPRESENTING ALS, BUT THERE'S TWO
20 MEMBERS OF THIS LIST WHO HAVE ALS SPECIALIZATIONS. SO
21 WE'RE LOOKING FOR THE BEST SCIENCE WITH THE MISSION OF
22 THOSE SCIENTISTS TO FIND THE BEST SCIENCE IN THE GRANTS
23 THAT ARE PROPOSED, NOT TO FIND THE BEST SCIENCE THAT THEY
24 HAPPEN TO REPRESENT, BUT TO FIND THE BEST SCIENCE AND
25 MEDICAL PROPOSALS THAT ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THE STATE AND

1 ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THE NATION.

2 ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?

3 DR. POMEROY: I JUST HAVE ONE QUESTION. PERHAPS
4 THIS IS FOR DR. HALL, BUT BOTH YOU AND SHERRY LANSING
5 MENTIONED THE CONCEPT OF TERMS. AND I WONDER WHAT WE'RE
6 APPROVING THESE PEOPLE FOR.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I CAN TELL YOU THAT BECAUSE THE
8 INITIATIVE CALLS FOR SIX YEARS; HOWEVER, AS DISCUSSED ON
9 ONE OF THE ORIGINAL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS, ALTHOUGH I WAS
10 NOT ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I WAS IN THE AUDIENCE, AND IT
11 WAS SPECIFICALLY DISCUSSED THAT, GIVEN THE DEMANDS THAT I
12 THINK DR. LEVEY PREVIOUSLY REFERENCED THESE INDIVIDUALS
13 WILL BE UNDER, IT'S EXPECTED THAT THEY'LL TURN OVER SOME
14 OF THEM IN TWO YEARS, SOME OF THEM IN THREE, SOME OF THEM
15 IN FOUR YEARS. THERE'S GOING TO BE A NATURAL ROTATION
16 THAT WILL DEVELOP BECAUSE OF THE TREMENDOUS OBLIGATION
17 AND CONTRIBUTION OF SERVICE THAT COMES WITH SERVICE ON
18 THIS COMMITTEE. WE ALSO HAVE THE ADVANTAGE THAT THESE
19 INDIVIDUALS CAN DRAW FROM AD HOC EXPERTISE TO DISTRIBUTE
20 THAT BURDEN, AND WE'LL BE LOOKING FOR WAYS TO MAKE THAT
21 BURDEN A REAL PARTICIPATION THAT IS AN HONOR, BUT WE WILL
22 HAVE TO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE'S SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES ON
23 THE WORKLOAD BEING PRESENTED TO THESE INDIVIDUALS.

24 DR. POMEROY: PERHAPS I COULD JUST ASK DR. HALL
25 TO CLARIFY HIS PREVIOUS STATEMENT OF STAGGERED TERMS.

1 WERE YOU ANTICIPATING THEN STAGGERED BY NATURAL SELECTION
2 AS OPPOSED TO STAGGERED BY APPOINTMENT?

3 DR. HALL: WE HAVEN'T FACED THAT ISSUE
4 SPECIFICALLY, AND I THINK THERE IS SOME DESIRABILITY OF
5 NOT HAVING PEOPLE TURN OVER ALL AT ONCE. I THINK WE WILL
6 LOOK THROUGH. AND WITH SOME OF THE IDEAS THAT HAVE BEEN
7 SUGGESTED ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT WE HAVE DIFFERENT KINDS
8 OF REPRESENTATION AT DIFFERENT TIMES, I THINK -- AND ALSO
9 SEVERAL PEOPLE SAID TO ME, LOOK, I'M WILLING TO KNOCK
10 MYSELF OUT FOR A YEAR OR TWO, BUT I CAN'T DO THIS FOR SIX
11 YEARS. AND SO I SAID I WAS GRATEFUL FOR THAT. SO I
12 THINK WE WILL JUST SORT OF DO THAT BY THE SEAT OF OUR
13 PANTS AND WORK OUT THOSE TERMS AND SEE HOW IT WORKS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IT SOUNDS LIKE NATURAL
15 SELECTION. OKAY.

16 ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? THEN I WILL GO
17 TO THE PUBLIC. PUBLIC COMMENTS? SEEING --

18 DR. FOBBS: GOOD MORNING. I'M PAM FOBBS,
19 FRESNO. FOR THOSE OF YOU ON THE ICOC WHO WERE AT OUR
20 DIVERSITY SEMINAR LAST NIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
21 COMING. WE REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR EFFORTS BECAUSE THE
22 WEATHER WAS REALLY BAD LAST EVENING. FOR THOSE OF YOU
23 WHO WERE NOT, I JUST WANT YOU TO HEAR MY INITIAL
24 COMMENTS.

25 WE ALL GREW UP IN AMERICA, AND WHILE WE ARE NOT

1 RACIST, WE ARE LIVING IN A RACE CONSCIOUS SOCIETY. SO
2 THE APPEARANCE OF FAIRNESS AND FAIRNESS, IN FACT, ARE TWO
3 DIFFERENT THINGS. WE APPLAUD YOU IN YOUR EFFORTS TO
4 CREATE THROUGH DIVERSITY IN ALL AREAS OF THE CALIFORNIA
5 INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. WE APPRECIATE THAT.
6 THERE ARE AREAS THAT WE WILL BE ADDRESSING AS THE
7 DIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL IN THE AREAS OF DIVERSITY AND
8 BIOLOGICAL GENETIC MATERIALS, DIVERSITY IN SCIENTISTS,
9 DIVERSITY IN THE STAFFING OF THE INSTITUTE, AND DIVERSITY
10 IN THE ACQUISITION OF BUILDERS. WE'RE NOT SEEKING TO
11 COMPROMISE DIVERSITY. WE ARE, HOWEVER -- I'M SORRY.
12 WE'RE NOT SEEKING TO COMPROMISE COMPETENCE FOR DIVERSITY.
13 WE ARE, HOWEVER, ENCOURAGING THE INSTITUTE TO TAKE THE
14 EXTRA EQUITABLE STEPS TO INCLUDE INDIVIDUALS FROM
15 ETHNICALLY DIVERSE BACKGROUNDS.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, PAM. ADDITIONAL
17 PUBLIC COMMENT? SEEING NO ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT, I'D
18 LIKE TO CALL FOR THE QUESTION. AND IS THERE A -- DO WE
19 ACTUALLY HAVE A MOTION? WE DO HAVE THE MOTION, WE HAVE
20 THE SECOND. SO I'D LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION, AND WE CAN
21 DO THIS BY VOICE VOTE. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED.
22 UNANIMOUS AGAIN.

23 I WILL POINT OUT TO ALL CALIFORNIANS THIS IS A
24 GLOBAL PLATFORM YOU'VE LAUNCHED, AND THE QUALITY OF
25 EXPERTISE ON THIS SLATE OF GRANT REVIEWERS IS A

1 DEMONSTRATION OF THE NATION'S VALIDATION AND SUPPORT FOR
2 CALIFORNIA'S INITIATIVE. THE NATION IS ENDORSING THIS
3 INITIATIVE WITH ITS VERY BEST SCIENTISTS AND
4 PHYSICIAN-SCIENTISTS, AND SCIENTISTS FROM AROUND THE
5 WORLD ARE PREPARED TO COME TO CALIFORNIA BECAUSE OF THE
6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS INITIATIVE FOR THE WORLD AND FOR
7 ADVANCING MEDICAL THERAPIES TO REDUCE HUMAN SUFFERING.

8 (APPLAUSE.)

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HOLMES.

10 DR. HOLMES: MR. CHAIR, I'D LIKE TO TURN NOW AND
11 CALL ON DR. HALL AGAIN TO PRESENT OUR LIST OF CANDIDATES
12 FOR ALTERNATES AND AD HOC. LET ME JUST REITERATE AGAIN
13 THAT THE QUALITY OF THESE INDIVIDUALS IS OUTSTANDING,
14 EQUAL TO THAT IN THE FULL MEMBER GROUP, BUT SIMPLY WE
15 COULD ONLY MOVE 15 NAMES FORWARD IN THAT FIRST GROUP.
16 ZACH.

17 DR. HALL: LET ME START WITH OUR FIRST
18 ALTERNATE, WHO IS DR. WISE YOUNG, M.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR
19 AT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, FOUNDING DIRECTOR OF THEIR KECK
20 CENTER FOR COLLABORATIVE NEUROSCIENCE. HE WAS PART OF
21 THE TEAM THAT DISCOVERED AND ESTABLISHED HIGH DOSE
22 METHYLPREDNISOLONE AS THE FIRST EFFECTIVE THERAPY FOR
23 SPINAL CORD INJURIES, AS YOU'VE HEARD EARLIER FROM
24 MR. REED. I DIDN'T REALIZE UNTIL HE TOLD ME HE HAD JUST
25 BEEN SELECTED AS THE FIRST INDUCTEE --

1 MR. REED: CHRISTOPHER REEVE, YES.

2 DR. HALL: -- INTO THE HALL OF FAME FOR SPINAL
3 CORD RESEARCH.

4 OUR OTHER ALTERNATES ARE MARIE CSETE, WHO IS AN
5 M.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF ANESTHESIOLOGY AT EMORY
6 UNIVERSITY, DIRECTOR OF THE HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
7 CORE FACILITY AT EMORY UNIVERSITY AND GEORGIA TECH. DR.
8 CSETE'S LABORATORY STUDIES THE EFFECTS OF GASES AND FREE
9 RADICALS ON STEM CELLS IN CULTURE AND THEIR EFFECTS ON
10 THE AGING OF STEM CELLS.

11 IHOB LEMISHKA, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF MOLECULAR
12 BIOLOGY AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY. HIS RESEARCH INTERESTS
13 INCLUDE HEMATOPOETIC PATENT STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND
14 DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY.

15 OLLE LINDVALL, M.D., PH.D., CHAIRMAN OF THE
16 DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL NEUROSCIENCE AND PROFESSOR AND
17 CHAIR OF THE DIVISION OF NEUROLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
18 LUND, SWEDEN.

19 DR. LINDVALL IS INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN FOR HIS
20 WORK ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CELL REPLACEMENT THERAPY FOR
21 PARKINSON'S DISEASE AND IS A WIDELY RESPECTED
22 INTERNATIONAL LEADER IN THIS FIELD.

23 RAY MACDONALD, PH.D., IS PROFESSOR OF MOLECULAR
24 BIOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SOUTHWESTERN MEDICAL
25 CENTER. HIS RESEARCH INTERESTS CONCERN PANCREATIC

1 DEVELOPMENT.

2 ARTHUR NIENHUIS, M.D., IS THE FORMER DIRECTOR OF
3 ST. JUDE'S RESEARCH HOSPITAL AND CURRENT MEMBER OF THE
4 DIVISION OF EXPERIMENTAL HEMATOLOGY. HE IS A MEMBER OF
5 THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE. NEINHUIS' LABORATORY IS
6 CONCERNED WITH STEM CELL TARGETED GENE THERAPY FOR THE
7 TREATMENT OF HEMOGLOBIN DISORDERS AND IMMUNODEFICIENCIES.

8 JON ODORICO, M.D., IS AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF
9 SURGERY AND DIRECTOR OF ISLET CELL TRANSPLANTATION AT THE
10 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE. HIS
11 LABORATORY WORK FOCUSES ON ISLET DIFFERENTIATION FROM
12 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

13 RAYMOND ROOS, M.D., IS THE PROFESSOR AND FORMER
14 CHAIR OF NEUROLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. HIS
15 RESEARCH CONCERNS ALS, PRION DISEASES, AND MULTIPLE
16 SCLEROSIS.

17 HE HAS BEEN ON A NUMBER OF NATIONAL ADVISORY
18 BOARDS AND IS A MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.

19 THOSE ARE OUR ALTERNATE MEMBERS. OUR AD HOC
20 MEMBERS ARE FOUR AT THIS STAGE. DR. GEORGE DALEY OF
21 HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL DEPARTMENTS OF BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY
22 AND MOLECULAR PHARMACOLOGY, WIDELY REGARDED AS ONE OF THE
23 OUTSTANDING LEADERS IN STEM CELL RESEARCH. HE HAS DONE A
24 VERY IMPORTANT MODEL EXPERIMENT SHOWING THAT STEM CELL
25 REPLACEMENT CAN CURE INHERITED DISEASES IN MICE, IN A

1 MOUSE MODEL.

2 DR. JOHN TROJANOWSKI -- I SHOULD SAY DALEY IS AN
3 M.D., PH.D.

4 JOHN TROJANOWSKI, ALSO M.D., PH.D, ALSO
5 PROFESSOR OF PATHOLOGY AT PENNSYLVANIA MEDICAL SCHOOL.
6 HE HAS DONE IMPORTANT WORK IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND
7 ALSO IN PARKINSON'S DISEASE.

8 JOSH SANES, PH.D., WHO WAS THE DIRECTOR FOR
9 CENTER OF NEUROSCIENCE AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY, A
10 WELL-KNOWN DEVELOPMENTAL NEUROBIOLOGIST, WHO IS A MEMBER
11 OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE.

12 AND FINALLY, ALAN SPRADDLING, WHO IS PH.D. WHO
13 IS A PROFESSOR AT THE CARNEGIE INSTITUTE FOR EMBRYOLOGY
14 AND JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. HE IS INTERESTED IN STEM
15 CELLS IN A MODEL ORGANISM, DROSOPHILA. HE WAS WIDELY
16 REGARDED AS A LEADING DROSOPHILA GENETICIST AND CELL
17 BIOLOGIST.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DR. HALL.
19 AND, DR. HOLMES, WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADD ANY COMMENTS?

20 DR. HOLMES: NO. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE
21 COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THIS SLATE OF CANDIDATES AT THIS
22 TIME, PLEASE, MR. CHAIR.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?

24 MS. SAMUELSON: QUESTION FOR CLARIFICATION.
25 WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN ALTERNATE AND AN AD

1 HOC? AND I NOTICE THAT YOU NAMED THE ALTERNATES IN A
2 DIFFERENT ORDER FROM THE WAY THEY'RE LISTED, AND I
3 WONDERED IF THE WAY YOU INDICATED THEM IS THE ORDER IN
4 WHICH THEY WOULD TAKE OVER FOR SOMEONE DROPPING OUT OR
5 WHAT THE PROCESS IS.

6 DR. HALL: TWO QUESTIONS. FIRST OF ALL, THE
7 ALTERNATES HAVE EXPRESSED THE WILLINGNESS TO SERVE FULL
8 TIME AS A REGULAR MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEES. THE AD HOCS
9 HAVE SAID THEY SUPPORT US, THEY'D BE HAPPY TO DO IT, BUT
10 THEY COULDN'T POSSIBLY FIND THE TIME TO BE A REGULAR
11 MEMBER.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL, DOES THAT MEAN THAT
13 THE ALTERNATES ARE AVAILABLE FOR AD HOC SERVICE?

14 DR. HALL: YES. WE WILL CALL ON THEM AS WELL
15 FOR AD HOC SERVICE.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: WOULDN'T THERE BE OTHERS,
17 PERHAPS, THAT MIGHT ALSO BE CALLED UPON, IF NECESSARY?

18 MS. LANSING: IT'S AN EVOLVING LIST.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS A LIST THAT IS GOING TO
20 GROW.

21 DR. HALL: WELL, I HOPE THAT WHEN WE CALL ON AD
22 HOC MEMBERS, THAT WE WILL NOT HAVE TO COME TO THE
23 COMMITTEE FOR EVERY AD HOC MEMBER BECAUSE WE MAY HAVE
24 VERY SPECIAL NEEDS WHERE THERE'S A PARTICULAR GRANT THAT
25 CONCERNS SOMETHING AND WE SAY THE ONLY PERSON THAT WE

1 KNOW IS SOMEBODY FROM FLORIDA WHO'S AN EXPERT ON THIS.
2 AND WE DO NOT WANT TO COME TO THE COMMITTEE FOR EACH ONE
3 OF THOSE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FOR OUR PURPOSES TODAY, WE ARE
5 GOING TO THE AD HOC AND POTENTIALLY THE ALTERNATES LIST
6 THROUGH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION, AND WE CAN IDENTIFY
7 THOSE PEOPLE. THERE MAY BE OTHERS THAT HAVE VERY
8 SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE, BUT AT LEAST WE WILL KNOW THAT
9 CERTAIN PEOPLE ARE AVAILABLE IMMEDIATELY BECAUSE THEY
10 HAVE BEEN PRESCREENED AND WE KNOW THEY HAVE AGREED TO
11 SERVE.

12 DR. HALL: THE AD HOCS WE MENTIONED SPECIFICALLY
13 HERE, BOTH BECAUSE THEY HAVE SELF-IDENTIFIED AS WILLING
14 TO HELP. AND ALSO, FRANKLY, IT'S AN ALL STAR CAST. I
15 THINK WE ALL OUGHT TO BE IMPRESSED WITH THAT.

16 YOU HAD TWO OTHER QUESTIONS. ONE IS THEY WERE
17 NOT IN THE ORDER MENTIONED BECAUSE WISE YOUNG WAS THE
18 FIRST ALTERNATE, AND THEY WERE LISTED JUST
19 ALPHABETICALLY.

20 AND THE SECOND IS I REALIZE WHEN YOU SAID THAT I
21 SKIPPED THE LAST PAGE, AND I HAVE ONE MORE NAME IF I MAY
22 READ IT. AND I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. THIS ADDS TO OUR
23 INTERNATIONAL LUSTER. THIS IS THE ALTERNATE LIST.

24 DR. FIONA WATT, PH.D., IS HEAD OF THE
25 KERATINOCYTE LABORATORY AT THE CANCER RESEARCH U.K.

1 LONDON RESEARCH INSTITUTE. SHE HAS BEEN A LEADER IN
2 INVESTIGATION OF EPIDERMAL CELL SELF-RENEWAL AND THE USE
3 OF STEM CELLS IN WOUND REPAIR. SHE'S A FELLOW OF THE
4 ROYAL SOCIETY AND THE BRITISH ACADEMY OF MEDICAL
5 SCIENCES, AND IS THE PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR
6 CELL BIOLOGY. I APOLOGIZE FOR LEAVING HER NAME OFF.

7 MS. LANSING: I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE
8 WHOLE BOARD UNDERSTANDS WHAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE IS
9 RECOMMENDING. WE'RE RECOMMENDING THESE ALTERNATE PEOPLE
10 NOW. THEY WOULD FILL IN IN CASE ANY OF THE 15 SCIENTISTS
11 DROPPED OUT. THEY'VE AGREED TO DO THAT. WE ARE ALSO
12 RECOMMENDING THE AD HOCS AS SPECIAL REFERENCE PEOPLE.

13 NOW, WHAT I JUST WANT TO ADD, AND THIS ISN'T
14 PART OF THE RESOLUTION, BUT I WANT EVERYONE TO FEEL
15 COMFORTABLE WITH THIS IS WE WILL CONTINUE TO EVOLVE, OUR
16 LITTLE SUBCOMMITTEE WILL CONTINUE TO EVOLVE, AND ZACH
17 WILL COME BACK FOR FULL BOARD APPROVAL FOR ALTERNATES.
18 HOWEVER, THE AD HOCS WHICH WE WILL LEAVE UP TO THE
19 SCIENTISTS TO SAY I WANT TO GO TALK TO THIS PERSON OR I
20 WANT TO GO TALK TO THAT PERSON, AND ZACH WON'T HAVE TO
21 COME BACK BECAUSE THAT WOULD JUST BE TOO CUMBERSOME AND
22 IT WOULD SLOW THE GRANT PROCESS.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THAT
24 EXPLANATION. ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? BOARD'S
25 OKAY. PUBLIC COMMENT? NO ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT. IS

1 THERE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR?

2 DR. PIZZO: SO MOVED.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO.

4 DR. PRIETO: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY DR. PRIETO. I'M
6 GOING TO CALL FOR A VOICE VOTE. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED.
7 APPROVED.

8 (APPLAUSE.)

9 DR. HOLMES: MR. CHAIR, WE HAVE ONE FINAL ITEM.
10 I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE
11 DISCUSSED THIS, THAT WE IDENTIFIED SOMEONE AS AN INTERIM
12 CHAIR TO BEGIN TO WORK WITH THE CIRM STAFF IN
13 FACILITATING AND GETTING INITIAL MEETINGS PLANNED AND PUT
14 TOGETHER. IT'S VERY LIKELY THAT THE GROUP WILL BEGIN TO
15 WORK EVEN OVER THE SUMMER. AND I THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE
16 THAT WE BEGIN TO THINK RIGHT NOW ABOUT SOMEONE WHO COULD
17 SERVE IN THIS INTERIM ROLE.

18 SO AT OUR SUBCOMMITTEE ON APRIL 26TH, THE GROUP
19 AUTHORIZED ZACH TO CONTACT AN INDIVIDUAL NAMED STUART
20 ORKIN, WHOM YOU JUST APPROVED, AT HARVARD TO INQUIRE
21 WHETHER HE WOULD BE WILLING TO SERVE AS AN INTERIM CHAIR,
22 IF IT WERE THE PLEASURE OF THIS BODY TO DO SO. SO
23 DEPENDING ON YOUR DECISION TODAY, WE WOULD BE IN A
24 POSITION TO MOVE FORWARD.

25 SO I'D LIKE TO BRING TO THE GROUP'S ATTENTION

1 FOR CONSIDERATION THE RECOMMENDATION THAT WE DO APPOINT
2 DR. STUART ORKIN AS THE INTERIM CHAIR OF THIS BOARD TO
3 HELP GET THINGS GOING, COMING BACK, AS WE SAID, WITH DUE
4 PROCESS ABOUT THE LONG-TERM POSSIBILITY HERE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. SHEEHY.

6 MR. SHEEHY: I THOUGHT THE PROCESS IS THAT -- I
7 CLEARLY REMEMBER JONATHAN EXPRESSING SOME DISCOMFORT IN
8 MOVING FORWARD ON THE CHAIR. AND MY RECOLLECTION OF THE
9 PROCESS WAS THAT ZACH WAS GOING TO SEE IF THERE WAS SOME
10 INTEREST, BUT THAT THE COMMITTEE WAS GOING TO MAKE THE
11 RECOMMENDATION ON IT. THE SUBCOMMITTEE WASN'T GOING TO
12 MAKE A RECOMMENDATION ON A CHAIR AT THIS POINT. IT SEEMS
13 LIKE THAT WE KIND OF SKIPPED THAT, AND JONATHAN WAS
14 FAIRLY ADAMANT THAT HE HADN'T EVEN SEEN ANY -- HAD NO
15 BACKGROUND, NO NOTHING ON THIS PERSON WHO'S GOING TO BE
16 HEADING UP THIS WORKING GROUP.

17 SO I THINK -- I MEAN IF WE WANT TO SKIP OVER THE
18 SUBCOMMITTEE PROCESS, BUT THE SUBCOMMITTEE WAS ACTUALLY
19 MOOT ON THIS POINT.

20 DR. NOVA: COULD YOU CLARIFY WHO JONATHAN IS?

21 DR. HOLMES: JONATHAN SHESTACK IS ONE OF THE
22 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

23 DR. PIZZO: I SURELY NEVER WANT TO DISAGREE WITH
24 JEFF, BUT I WAS AT THE SAME MEETING, AND I HAD A VERY
25 DIFFERENT IMPRESSION OF THIS. AND I VIEW THIS AS AN

1 INTERIM ACTIVITY JUST AS WE DID FOR THE STANDARDS
2 COMMITTEE SIMPLY HELPING TO ORGANIZE THE PROCESS GOING
3 FORWARD. I THINK THAT WE'VE HEARD ABOUT THE COMMITTEE
4 MEMBERS, THAT NOMINEES HAVE COME FORWARD, AND IT'S A
5 SPECTACULAR GROUP. SURELY ANY ONE OF THESE COULD SERVE
6 AS CHAIR, BUT I THINK THAT, AS YOU HEARD AT THE MEETING,
7 STU ORKIN HAS CHAIRED A NUMBER OF MAJOR COMMITTEES FOR
8 THE NATIONAL ACADEMY, NIH.

9 AND I THINK WE'LL AT LEAST GET THIS LAUNCHED. I
10 THINK WHAT IS MISSING FROM THIS IS, AS WE HEARD EARLIER
11 THIS MORNING FROM ZACH, WE WOULD BE LOOKING FOR A VICE
12 CHAIR FOR THIS, AND I THINK WE SHOULD COMPLETE OUR
13 PROPOSAL, HAVE A VICE CHAIR FROM THE GROUP NAMED AS WELL.
14 IF NOT TODAY, THEN VERY, VERY SHORTLY.

15 DR. HOLMES: I THINK, PHIL, IF I UNDERSTOOD
16 EARLIER, THAT THE CHARGE WAS BACK TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO
17 COME BACK TO THIS GROUP AND ZACH WILL MAKE THAT
18 RECOMMENDATION.

19 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: WHAT RECOMMENDATION?

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ON THE -- ON HOW THE GOVERNANCE
21 AND JOB DESCRIPTION.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS THIS FOR ME AGAIN RAISES
23 THESE FOUNDATIONAL QUESTIONS OF THE OVERALL STRUCTURE OF
24 THE GRANT FUNDING PROCESS. I'VE ASKED A LOT OF PEOPLE
25 AND ESPECIALLY PEOPLE WHO ARE IMMersed IN THE NIH

1 PROCESS, PEOPLE AT VERY HIGH LEVELS OF THE NIH. AND TO A
2 PERSON THEY ALL SAID DON'T JUST DO THIS WHEN WE'RE DOING
3 IT. AND MANY OF THEM SAY DO THIS VERY DIFFERENTLY. IF
4 THIS IS GOING TO BEGIN SETTING UP AN NIH MODEL, THEN THAT
5 IS IN CONTRADICTION TO THE WISDOM OF THOSE PEOPLE. AND
6 THAT IS WHY I AM SORT OF BEATING THIS DRUM ABOUT
7 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND GETTING THAT FOUNDATIONAL APPROACH
8 SET AND CAREFULLY CONSIDERED BEFORE WE BEGIN PIECEMEAL
9 PUTTING TOGETHER A PROCESS THAT MAY NOT BE VIABLE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, I THINK, JOAN, THERE'S A
11 VERY BROAD AGREEMENT ON THE BOARD AND IN THE INITIATIVE
12 THAT A STRATEGIC PLAN IS AN ABSOLUTE PRIORITY. AND I
13 ASSURE YOU THAT THE COMMITTEE WHICH YOU SERVE WITH, AS
14 YOU KNOW, THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE IS MAKING
15 EVERY EFFORT TO GET A PRESIDENTIAL DECISION SO THAT WE
16 HAVE THAT LEADERSHIP FOR THAT STRATEGIC PLAN.

17 THERE ARE NO GRANTS BEFORE THE WORKING GROUP AT
18 THIS TIME FOR PEER REVIEW. SO THIS IS, I THINK, ONLY A
19 PRELIMINARY INTERIM ISSUE OF JUST GETTING THE
20 COMMUNICATION SET UP, GETTING THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
21 SET UP BECAUSE THERE ARE NO GRANTS TO BE PUT BEFORE THEM
22 AT THIS TIME.

23 THE LATER ITEM ON TODAY'S AGENDA IS THE
24 INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT WHICH THIS BOARD
25 PREVIOUSLY HAS DISCUSSED TO REBUILD THE HUMAN RESOURCES,

1 POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWS AND POST-DOCTORAL CLINICAL FELLOWS,
2 BUT THERE ARE NO LEVEL 1 INVESTIGATOR GRANTS, AND THE
3 STRATEGIC PLAN IS INTENDED TO MOVE FORWARD VERY, VERY
4 QUICKLY.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: I APPRECIATE THE COMPETING
6 PRESSURE TO GET GOING. AND SO IF THAT'S THE
7 UNDERSTANDING, I WOULDN'T WANT TO NOT RAISE THIS NOW AND
8 GET A PROCESS SET IN PLACE THAT --

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IT'S THE VERY LIMITED ROLE
10 WE'RE TALKING ABOUT.

11 DR. PIZZO: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S PERHAPS
12 INAPPROPRIATE TO DO THIS IN A PUBLIC FORUM, BUT SINCE WE
13 ARE SO ATTENTIVE TO BEING IN A PUBLIC FORUM, I WOULD LIKE
14 TO SUGGEST THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO JOAN SAMUELSON
15 AS BEING THE VICE CHAIR OF THIS COMMITTEE WITH THE GOAL
16 THAT THAT WILL HELP TO CREATE THE KIND OF BALANCED VIEW
17 AND PERSPECTIVE THAT I THINK WE ALL WISH TO SEE HAPPEN.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S A DAUNTING CHALLENGE, AND I
19 APPRECIATE YOUR CONFIDENCE.

20 DR. HOLMES: SHALL I ASK FOR ONE THING. IT
21 MIGHT BE HELPFUL TO THE GROUP IF WE COULD ASK DR. HALL TO
22 COMMENT ON HIS CONVERSATION WITH DR. ORKIN AND HIS
23 AGREEMENT TO THE BREVITY OF THE TIME HE MIGHT BE WILLING.

24 DR. HALL: LET ME MAKE TWO COMMENTS. PERHAPS I
25 SHOULD START BY SAYING THAT LEON THAL SPOKE VERY

1 ELOQUENTLY AT THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING TO THE EFFECT THAT
2 TAKING THE POSITION OF CHAIR IS A TASK AND A CHORE THAT
3 ONE DOES AS A MATTER OF COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY. IT
4 CERTAINLY CARRIES VERY LITTLE HONOR, AND IT IS VERY
5 DEMANDING OF TIME FOR VERY BUSY PEOPLE. ON THE OTHER
6 HAND, IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT -- IT CARRIES VERY LITTLE
7 HONOR, AND LEON ALSO MADE THE POINT, AS WAS MADE BY BOB
8 KLEIN, OUR CHAIR TODAY, OR SOMEONE, THAT IN TERMS OF THE
9 VOTE, IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE EITHER. THAT IS, YOU HAVE
10 NO PARTICULAR POWER.

11 WITH THAT SAID, IT IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT'S A
12 POSITION THAT IN SCIENTIFIC REVIEW ONE NEEDS SOMEBODY
13 THAT COMMANDS THE RESPECT OF THE COMMITTEE, THAT IS FAIR,
14 THAT CAN CONDUCT OFTEN CONTENTIOUS DISCUSSIONS IN AN
15 EVENHANDED WAY.

16 FOR THOSE OF US WHO KNOW HIM, STUART ORKIN
17 COMMANDS ENORMOUS RESPECT. I WAS ASKED BY THE COMMITTEE
18 TO INQUIRE IF HE WERE AVAILABLE, AND I HAD -- I RECOUNT
19 MY CONVERSATION WITH HIM. I WOULD SAY IT WAS A CONDITION
20 OF HIS TAKING IT THAT HE ONLY DO IT FOR SOME PERIOD OF
21 TIME. AND I SAID IF HE COULD HELP GET US STARTED, IT
22 WOULD BE APPRECIATED. I WAS VERY CLEAR, BY THE WAY, THAT
23 THIS WAS NOT AN INVITATION TO DO IT, BUT JUST TO INQUIRE
24 ABOUT HIS WILLINGNESS. AND I SAID I THOUGHT THAT NINE
25 MONTHS WAS AN APPROPRIATE TIME. THAT COULD BE CHANGED,

1 I'M SURE. BUT MY POINT IS IF WE WERE TO PROBABLY ASK HIM
2 TO DO IT FOR A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME, I DOUBT THAT HE
3 WOULD DO IT. HE DID SAY TO ME, I MUST HAVE A MASOCHISTIC
4 STREAK FOR AGREEING TO DO THIS, BUT I WILL DO IT BECAUSE
5 I THINK IT'S SO IMPORTANT, IF YOU ASK ME.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD COMMENT, AS WE MOVE THE
7 STRATEGIC PLAN AND STEP UP THE TEMPO ON THE GRANTS SIDE,
8 THAT PROBABLY IT WOULD BE A RELIEF FOR HIM IF THAT BECAME
9 FIVE MONTHS OR FOUR MONTHS OR SOME VERY SHORT PERIOD OF
10 TIME.

11 DR. PRIETO: THE POINT WAS MADE EARLIER TODAY
12 THAT INTERIM CAN EASILY BECOME PERMANENT JUST THROUGH
13 INERTIA. I WANTED TO RAISE THE QUESTION WHETHER THIS
14 BOARD WANTS TO DETERMINE EXACTLY WHAT INTERIM MEANS IN
15 THESE VARIOUS INSTANCES.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WOULD YOU LIKE US -- WE ARE ON
17 A PROCESS WHERE WE WON'T BE BACK HERE UNDER THE RFP FOR A
18 NUMBER OF MONTHS EVEN ON THE INITIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
19 GRANTS WHERE WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE RFP PROCESS.
20 WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE THAT FOUR MONTHS TO BRING IT BACK
21 TO THE BOARD FOR A QUESTION?

22 DR. PRIETO: I THINK THAT'S A LITTLE SHORT. I
23 WOULD SAY --

24 MS. LANSING: HE WON'T DO IT MORE THAN NINE.

25 DR. PRIETO: I WOULD LIKE TO SET A LIMIT OF SOME

1 SORT.

2 DR. PIZZO: JUST SAY NOT TO EXCEED A YEAR.

3 DR. HALL: I'D BE FINE WITH THAT.

4 DR. PRIETO: FINE WITH ME.

5 DR. PIZZO: THAT WOULD APPLY TO ALL PEOPLE,
6 CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.

7 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION THAT
8 STUART ORKIN BE CHAIR AND JOAN SAMUELSON BE VICE CHAIR ON
9 AN INTERIM BASIS NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR.

10 DR. WRIGHT: I SECOND IT.

11 DR. HOLMES: THE BEGINNING TIME FOR THAT WOULD
12 BE -- WE HAVE TO DECLARE THE BEGINNING TIME SO WE HAVE
13 THE --

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHEN THEY'RE ACTUALLY APPROVED.
15 THEY WILL BE APPROVED TODAY, IF THIS MOTION WERE TO PASS.
16 LET ME MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE CLARIFIED FOR THE RECORDER,
17 THE MOTION WAS MADE BY JEFF SHEEHY AND THE SECOND WAS BY
18 DR. WRIGHT. SO THAT IS THE MOTION THAT'S ON THE TABLE.

19 DR. STEWARD: HOPEFULLY FRIENDLY AMENDMENT HERE,
20 WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF REAPPOINTMENT.

21 MR. SHEEHY: I ACCEPT THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S NO -- THE MOTION
23 DOESN'T CARRY WITH IT ANY PREJUDICE AS TO REAPPOINTMENT.

24 DR. MURPHY: I CERTAINLY WILL SUPPORT THAT
25 MOTION, BUT A WORD OF CAUTION. I THINK WE ARE MAKING A

1 MISTAKE IF THE ICOC STARTS GETTING TOO INVOLVED IN
2 OPERATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE. AND I REALIZE WE'RE AT A
3 VERY EARLY STAGE NOW. WE'RE JUST SETTING THE STAGE. I
4 THINK WE DO HAVE TO HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THE PRESIDENT AND
5 THOSE RUNNING THE INSTITUTE TO MAKE THE RULES AND BRING
6 THE RULES BACK TO THE ICOC. AND I DON'T WANT TO SET A
7 PRECEDENT OF US MICROMANAGING THE INSTITUTE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

9 DR. PRIETO: I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE A SEPARATE
10 MOTION THAT ALL INTERIM APPOINTMENTS SHALL NOT EXCEED A
11 TERM OF ONE YEAR AND SHALL NOT EXCLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF
12 REAPPOINTMENT.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE
14 FLOOR, AND THERE IS -- I BELIEVE IT COVERED ALL INTERIM
15 APPOINTMENTS ALREADY.

16 DR. PRIETO: I DON'T THINK IT WAS WORDED THAT
17 WAY.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME ASK THE PERSON WHO MADE
19 THE MOTION. YOU WERE COVERING CHAIRS AND VICE CHAIRS?

20 MR. SHEEHY: YEAH.

21 DR. PRIETO: IT WAS WORDED TO REFER TO THIS
22 SPECIFIC APPOINTMENT. PERHAPS YOU WOULD ACCEPT A
23 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ACTUALLY SPECIFICALLY WITH REGARDS
24 TO --

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT APPEARS TO BE ACCEPTABLE TO

1 THE MAKER OF THE MOTION, THAT ALL APPOINTMENTS FOR CHAIRS
2 AND VICE CHAIRS OR CO-CHAIRS WOULD BE INTERIM.

3 DR. PIZZO: THAT NEEDS TO BE AN ADDENDUM.

4 DR. PRIETO: THAT SHOULD BE AN ADDENDUM. IT'S
5 COVERING TWO SUBJECTS.

6 MR. SHEEHY: I ACCEPT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THE SECOND.

8 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MAKER OF THE SECOND ACCEPTS.
10 THE MOTION HAS BEEN MADE AND AMENDED AND ACCEPTED. THE
11 AMENDMENT IS ACCEPTED BY THE MAKER OF THE MOTION.

12 ANY COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?

13 DR. PIZZO: ACCORDING TO ROBERT'S RULES OF
14 ORDER. JUST KIDDING.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE PREPARED TO LEARN AT
16 EVERY TURN. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE? NO COMMENTS
17 FROM THE AUDIENCE. I'D LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION. ALL
18 IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? MOTION CARRIES.

19 DR. HOLMES: THAT COMPLETES MY REPORT.

20 (APPLAUSE.)

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AGAIN, KATE SHREVE, MARY MAXON,
22 AND THE REST OF THE SUPPORTING STAFF WHO WENT THROUGH 600
23 BIOS, AN EXTRAORDINARY EFFORT IN THIS, SHOULD BE
24 TREMENDOUSLY COMMENDED. WE WOULDN'T HAVE GOTTEN TO THIS
25 HISTORIC POINT WITHOUT THAT DEDICATION.

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

(APPLAUSE.)

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE ARE ABOUT TO GO INTO AN EXECUTIVE SESSION. THAT EXECUTIVE SESSION WILL COVER, AS ANNOUNCED, TWO SUBJECTS, BOTH PERSONNEL AND SEARCH FOR THE PRESIDENT AND LITIGATION RELATED TO ITEMS THEREAFTER.

WE WILL COME BACK, AND GIVEN THE TIME, WE WILL TAKE A LOOK AT THE TIME WHEN WE COME BACK. WE'LL EITHER GO DIRECTLY TO SITE OR DO BUDGET BEFORE SITE. BUT THE ORDER WILL EITHER BE, BASED ON THE TIME, THE SITE SELECTION FINALIZATION OR A SHORT BUDGET REVIEW AND THEN SITE.

WE THANK YOU ALL. THE MEMBERS ARE EXITING ON THE LEFT. WE WILL ATTEMPT TO DO THIS IN 45 MINUTES TO AN HOUR. DR. PRECIADO.

DR. PRECIADO: GIVEN THAT THE AGENDA WAS CHANGED THIS MORNING, DO YOU WANT TO ASK FOR -- THERE ARE PEOPLE HERE THAT CANNOT BE HERE IN THE AFTERNOON. CAN WE ASK FOR PUBLIC COMMENT IN GENERAL.

DR. PIZZO: EVEN ONE OTHER ELEMENT TO THAT BEFORE YOU GET TO THAT. THERE ARE SOME WHO WANT TO VOTE ON THIS SITE WHO HAVE TO LEAVE AT 3:00 OR 3:15 OR SO, SO I JUST WANT TO BE SURE WE GET TO THAT, SO I WOULD PROPOSE WE DO SITE FIRST, IF YOU AGREE TO THAT.

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S THE SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE.

1 AND ASKING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, IS ANYONE HERE
2 WHO WISHES TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT WHO CANNOT BE HERE IN
3 THE AFTERNOON? COULD YOU APPROACH.

4 MS. ABULAD: THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO BE
5 HERE. I'M SORRY. I DON'T WANT TO TAKE TOO MUCH OF YOUR
6 TIME. I KNOW YOU'RE ALL TIRED AND HUNGRY.

7 MY NAME IS RUTH ABULAD (PHONETIC). I'M A
8 PRACTICING PHYSICIAN IN LOS ANGELES. I DID MY TRAINING
9 THERE AND CAME HERE TO THE VALLEY. I WANT TO WELCOME YOU
10 HERE BECAUSE IT'S ADOPTED ME FOR THE PAST 16 YEARS,
11 FRESNO AND SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY WHICH IS RICH AND UNTAPPED
12 UNFORTUNATELY.

13 BASICALLY JUST LOOKING AT THE RFP AND THE SITE
14 POINTS, ONE THING I WANT TO HIGHLIGHT --

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXCUSE ME. IF THESE ARE
16 SITE -- IF THESE ARE SITE COMMENTS, THEY'RE APPROPRIATE
17 AS A PART OF THAT SITE PROCESS. ARE YOU SAYING THAT YOU
18 CANNOT BE HERE?

19 MS. ABULAD: NO. I HAVE PATIENTS I NEED TO SEE
20 THIS AFTERNOON. I'M SORRY. I HAVE A WHOLE -- MANY
21 PATIENTS I HAVE TO SEE, SO I HAVE TO DO THIS NOW.

22 SO BASICALLY IT'S UNFORTUNATE I COULDN'T DO THIS
23 AFTER THAT PRESENTATION, BUT BASICALLY THE THING I WANTED
24 TO POINT OUT IS THE RFP, THE NUMBER OF POINTS THAT WERE
25 ALLOTTED FOR THE LOCATION OF WHERE MOST RESEARCHERS ARE

1 LOCATED. AND ALTHOUGH IT APPEARS THAT SAN FRANCISCO WON
2 OUT OVER SACRAMENTO OVER POINTS, I THINK IT PROBABLY
3 WOULD GIVE SACRAMENTO MORE POINTS IN THAT AREA BEING THAT
4 THOSE PROFESSIONALS, AS FAR AS COST OF LIVING, YOU KNOW,
5 AS MANY THE BAY AREA AND SAN FRANCISCO HAVE RELOCATED
6 BECAUSE THE COST OF LIVING IS SO GREAT, BASICALLY THEY'RE
7 REAL ESTATE REFUGEES IN COMING TO VALLEY AREAS OR TO
8 SACRAMENTO.

9 AND YOUR POINT IS WELL TAKEN, THAT YOU WANT THE
10 BRIGHTEST AND THE BEST THAT'S GOING TO CARRY ON THE
11 RESEARCH THAT'S ALREADY EXISTING AT THESE LOCATIONS IN
12 SAN FRANCISCO. MANY OF THOSE BRIGHTEST AND BEST ARE VERY
13 YOUNG AND DON'T -- ARE NOT ESTABLISHED ECONOMICALLY AND
14 FINANCIALLY, AND THEY'LL PROBABLY BE MORE APT, I WOULD
15 THINK, TO BE IN AN AREA THAT IS -- COST OF LIVING IS LOW,
16 TRANSPORTATION IS LOW. I THINK YOU BUILD THAT SOCIETY
17 THERE, THEY WILL COME. THEY WILL BE THERE.

18 WHY THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF POINTS WERE ALLOTTED
19 TO THAT ONE PARTICULAR CATEGORY AND THEN BEING NEAR
20 SACRAMENTO IS MUCH, MUCH LESS. I DON'T KNOW WHO DECIDED
21 WHY THOSE NUMBER OF POINTS WENT TO DIFFERENT THINGS, BUT
22 I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE MAKE SURE THAT THE
23 CONVENIENCE FACTOR IS ON THE SIDE OF THE PEOPLE, THE
24 REPRESENTATION OF PEOPLE WHICH EXISTS IN SACRAMENTO. I
25 THINK THERE'S MORE APT TO BE BETTER CHECKS AND BALANCES.

1 ALSO TOO, I JUST THINK THAT THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN
2 MORE POINTS, TOTAL POINTS, AND I THINK THEY WOULD HAVE
3 DONE BETTER AS FAR AS THE RFP.

4 THE SITE POINTS, AS YOU KNOW, THAT SACRAMENTO
5 WON OUT NARROWLY; BUT I THINK IF WE CONSIDER THAT THE
6 REPRESENTATION OF CITIZENS, THE DIVERSE POPULATION IN THE
7 STATE, IS IN SACRAMENTO, THE MECHANISMS IS THERE, PART OF
8 THE SET AND CULTURE, THAT SHOULD BE VERY MUCH
9 OVEREMPHASIZED. IT WAS THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA THAT
10 ALLOWED THIS PROPOSITION TO GO -- TO PASS THROUGH. WE
11 SHOULD NOT LOSE SIGHT THAT WE ARE SERVING THEIR
12 INTERESTS. THEY ARE OUR BOSSES. MY PATIENTS ARE MY
13 BOSS. I AM A SERVANT LEADER TO THEM. AND IN THAT SENSE,
14 I NEED TO BE SENSITIVE OF WHAT'S BEST. I DON'T DICTATE
15 AND TELL THEM WHAT I THINK IS BEST FOR THEM. I ASK THEM
16 WHAT IS BEST AND HOW I CAN SERVE THEM.

17 I KNOW THAT MANY OF YOU HAVE THAT TYPE OF MIND
18 SET, BUT THEY ARE GOING TO KEEP US HONEST AND KEEP US
19 HUMBLE. I THINK THE FACT THAT THE ACCESSIBILITY OF
20 SACRAMENTO BY BEING IN SACRAMENTO IS ONE THING YOU SHOULD
21 WEIGH HEAVILY.

22 THE OTHER THING IS POLITICALLY, AS IS,
23 ESPECIALLY AN INCREASINGLY CONSERVATIVE MIND SET WITHIN
24 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR THE NATION, THERE'S ALREADY A
25 HEIGHTENED SENSE OF DEFENSIVENESS WITH SAN FRANCISCO.

1 THEY'RE GOING TO BE READY TO JUMP ON EVERY LITTLE THING.
2 YOU DON'T HAVE THAT TO THAT DEGREE WITHIN SACRAMENTO. SO
3 THAT'S SOMETHING TO CONSIDER, THAT IF YOU WANT MORE
4 PUBLIC -- BETTER PR OR PUBLIC SUPPORT, THAT WOULD BE A
5 BETTER LOCATION TO CONSIDER OTHER THAN SAN FRANCISCO.

6 AND BASICALLY THAT'S THE HIGHLIGHTS OF THAT.
7 I'M SURE I'VE RUN OUT OF MY TIME.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. JUST TO
9 ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, SPENCERSTUART, WHO'S THE EXPERT IN
10 PERSONNEL, WHETHER IT'S A PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH OR OTHER
11 SEARCHES, ADVISED THE BOARD AND THE COMMITTEE THAT THE
12 CONCENTRATION OF BIOMEDICAL JOBS WAS A CRITICAL ISSUE IN
13 THE PROVEN ABILITY TO RECRUIT THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST TO
14 HONOR OUR MISSION TO ADVANCE MEDICAL THERAPIES. AND THAT
15 OVER A PERIOD OF TIME, OVER A YEAR, PEOPLE HAVE VOTED
16 WITH THEIR FEET, AND THEY HAVE VOTED TO -- WHETHER IT'S
17 SAN DIEGO IS ANOTHER TREMENDOUS OF BIOMEDICAL JOBS, OF
18 GREAT EXCELLENCE AND DISTINCTION. IN SAN DIEGO, IN THE
19 BAY AREA, IN LOS ANGELES THERE ARE GREAT NUMBER OF
20 BIOMEDICAL JOBS THAT DEMONSTRATE A POTENTIAL RECRUITMENT
21 POOL OF GREAT SIGNIFICANCE. AND WE'VE BEEN TOLD THAT
22 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT WHEN RECRUITING PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE
23 AREAS -- AREAS OF THE CALIFORNIA -- OUTSIDE OF AREAS OF
24 CALIFORNIA, THAT IF THEY COME TO AN AREA THEY'RE MORE APT
25 TO COME TO AN AREA THAT IF THE JOB DOESN'T WORK, THEY CAN

1 FALL BACK INTO A MAJOR BIOMEDICAL POOL WITHOUT HAVING TO
2 RELOCATE AGAIN.

3 THAT IS -- I THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS. WE
4 NEED TO MOVE FORWARD. WE NEED TO ADJOURN. AND I WOULD
5 ASK IF THERE'S ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS? THESE ARE ONLY
6 PUBLIC COMMENTS WHO CANNOT MAKE THEIR COMMENTS IN THE
7 AFTERNOON.

8 MS. SOTO: MY NAME IS THIEL SOTO. I'M AN ALUMNI
9 FROM UC DAVIS. I'M A GRADUATE STUDENT HERE AT FRESNO
10 STATE GETTING MY MASTER'S IN PUBLIC HEALTH.

11 I HAD ATTENDED THE SITE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS,
12 AND I WANTED TO BRING UP TWO THINGS. ONE IS MY OWN
13 COMMENTS AS WELL AS TO READ A PROXY FROM A PROFESSOR OF
14 BIOETHICS AT UC BERKELEY.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU'RE A GRADUATE STUDENT?

16 MS. SOTO: I'M A GRADUATE STUDENT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND YOU CANNOT ATTEND IN THE
18 AFTERNOON?

19 MS. SOTO: I REALLY CAN'T. WE HAVE SOME OTHER
20 FRESNO STATE STUDENTS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RIDE,
21 SO I HAVE TO GO.

22 BUT ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I WANTED TO COMMENT
23 WAS THAT THERE'S TWO POINT SYSTEMS THAT HAPPENED WITH THE
24 SITE SELECTION. AND WITH THE RFP POINT SYSTEM A LOT OF
25 THINGS HAPPENED WITH THE SITE COMMITTEE -- SUBCOMMITTEE

1 MEETINGS WHERE A LOT OF CITIES QUESTIONED A LOT OF THE
2 POINT SYSTEMS. AND LIKE DR. RUTH ABULAD JUST QUESTIONED
3 THE POINT SYSTEM FROM THE RFP. AND THE IMPRESSION THAT I
4 RECEIVED FROM THE SITE COMMITTEE MEETINGS WAS THAT THE
5 RFP POINT SYSTEM WAS TO BE USED TO NARROW DOWN THE LIST
6 OF CITIES. AND WHEN LOOKING AT THE TOTAL NUMBER, IT
7 PLAYED A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN NARROWING DOWN, ESPECIALLY
8 FOR SAN FRANCISCO BECAUSE THE RFP POINT SYSTEM WAS NOT
9 DONE ENTIRELY BY THE SITE COMMITTEE. IT WAS DONE BY A
10 COMBINATION OF THE SITE COMMITTEE AND OTHER PEOPLE.

11 BUT WHEN IT COMES TO THE SITE VISIT POINT SYSTEM
12 THAT WAS DONE BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE, SAN FRANCISCO, IF YOU
13 LOOK, OUT OF THE THREE TOP SITES, IT GOT THE LOWEST
14 NUMBER OF POINTS. AND BOTH SYSTEMS, SACRAMENTO WAS AMONG
15 THE TOP TWO IN BOTH THE RFP AND THE SITE VISIT POINT
16 SYSTEM.

17 AND I'M SPEAKING FROM A PERSON WHO IS FROM
18 SACRAMENTO AND HERE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. I REALLY
19 BELIEVE THAT HAVING THE SITE IN SACRAMENTO WILL GIVE THE
20 VOICE OF CENTRAL VALLEY, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, AS WELL AS
21 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WILL HAVE MORE OF A VOICE IN THIS
22 INSTITUTE BY HAVING IT IN SACRAMENTO.

23 IN TERMS OF CONCERN ABOUT THE BIOTECH INDUSTRY,
24 I REALLY BELIEVE SACRAMENTO IS REALLY GROWING IN THIS
25 AREA. AND SINCE AN INSTITUTE -- SINCE IT'S SO EARLY IN

1 THE PROCESS AND IT'S IN DEVELOPMENT, THAT I REALLY
2 BELIEVE THAT THE BIOTECH INDUSTRY IS GOING TO BE
3 DEVELOPED BY THE TIME THE INSTITUTE IS GOING TO BE FULLY
4 RUNNING. WE HAVE FACILITIES IN THE SACRAMENTO AREA THAT
5 ARE NOT AVAILABLE IN SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN DIEGO, SUCH AS
6 THE PRIMATE RESEARCH CENTER AND OUR VETERINARY SCHOOL,
7 AND, OF COURSE, WE ALSO HAVE OUR MEDICAL SCHOOL AND
8 TEACHING HOSPITAL.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF YOU COULD LIMIT YOUR
10 COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES.

11 MS. SOTO: SO I'M DONE WITH MY PERSONAL
12 COMMENTS. AND SO I'M GOING TO READ A PROXY. DAVID
13 WINNICOFF PRESENTS THIS COMMENT, THIS PUBLIC COMMENT. AS
14 A CONCERNED CITIZEN OF CALIFORNIA, AS A LICENSED
15 ATTORNEY, AND AS A PROFESSOR OF BIOETHICS AT THE
16 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, IT IS MY OPINION THAT
17 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE'S
18 PERMANENT FACILITY SHOULD LIE AT THE POLITICAL HEART OF
19 CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO.

20 THE GREATEST STRENGTH OF THIS INITIATIVE IS ITS
21 COMMITMENT TO IMPROVING THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH. ITS
22 GREATEST WEAKNESS IS THE LACK OF POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY
23 IN THE FACE OF WORK THAT IS SURE TO BE POLITICALLY
24 CONTESTED, ALLOCATING BILLIONS OF TAX DOLLARS, SETTING
25 THE TRAJECTORY OF SENSITIVE BIOTECHNOLOGIES, LIKE CLONING

1 AND CHIMERIC RESEARCH, WRITING GUIDELINES FOR HUMAN AID
2 EXTRACTION, AND ASSIGNING PATENTS TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR.
3 SOME MIGHT ARGUE THAT INSULATION FROM POLITICS WILL HELP
4 THE INSTITUTE ACHIEVE ITS GOALS. QUITE THE CONTRARY.

5 VIABILITY OF THIS POLITICAL AND SOCIAL
6 EXPERIMENT WILL REQUIRE THE TRUST AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE
7 PEOPLE. PROP 71 EMPOWERED THE INSTITUTE TO DO MANY
8 THINGS. IT DID NOT EMPOWER THE INSTITUTE TO STRAY FROM
9 THE DEMOCRATIC WILL. THAT WILL IS EMBODIED IN SACRAMENTO
10 WHERE LEGISLATORS WILL MEET CIVIL SOCIETY AND POLITICAL
11 DIALOGUE. THE INSTITUTE SHOULD SIT CLOSE-BY SO IT MAY
12 LISTEN. THANK YOU. FROM DAVID WINNICOFF.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE HAVE
14 ANOTHER COMMENT?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: YES.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND AGAIN, YOU CANNOT BE HERE
17 THIS AFTERNOON?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: NO.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I AM A SMALL BUSINESS
21 OWNER AND I'M HERE ON MY OWN TIME.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU KNOW, MANY OF THE OTHER
23 MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE ARE HERE ON THEIR OWN TIME. IT
24 REALLY NEEDS TO BE A PATIENT OR SOME CRITICAL ISSUE.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'M NOT A DOCTOR.

1 SESSION AND A LUNCH RECESS.)

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE A REAL
3 CHALLENGE HERE. I'M GOING TO ASK THAT EVERY REPORTER AND
4 EVERY CAMERA THAT'S HERE TODAY, AS WE DO EVERY GREAT
5 SCIENTIFIC ANNOUNCEMENT, FOR THEM TO BE PRESENT. THAT
6 WOULD BE A GREAT SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA AND
7 PEOPLE OF THE WORLD.

8 THERE'S AN UNBELIEVABLE AMOUNT OF EXCITEMENT
9 HERE AROUND THE SELECTION OF THE PERMANENT SITE AS
10 EVIDENCED BY THE TURNOUT OF THE PUBLIC AND THE MEDIA. IT
11 IS TREMENDOUSLY REFRESHING TO SEE THE CHARITABLE
12 CONTRIBUTORS AND THE CITIES MARSHALING THEIR STRENGTH
13 TOGETHER UNITED BEHIND MEDICAL SCIENCE TO ADVANCE THE
14 MEDICAL THERAPIES TO REDUCE HUMAN SUFFERING. ADVANCING
15 THE STEM CELL RESEARCH FRONTIER FOR THERAPIES TO REDUCE
16 HUMAN SUFFERING IS A TREMENDOUS GOAL SET OUT BY
17 PROPOSITION 71. AND THE CITIES, ALONG WITH THEIR GREAT
18 CHARITABLE AND CIVIC LEADERS, HAVE MARSHALED THEIR
19 RESOURCES IN AN UNBELIEVABLE OUTPOURING OF STRENGTH
20 BEHIND THE SITE SELECTION, WHICH IS ONE OF THE FIRST
21 COMPETITIONS FOR THE RESOURCES OF PROP 71.

22 WE GREATLY ARE INDEBTED TO THEIR LEADERS AND
23 CIVIC PARTNERS FOR THE TREMENDOUS CONTRIBUTIONS THEY'RE
24 MAKING. I CAN TELL YOU WHO WILL WIN TODAY BECAUSE
25 PATIENTS WILL WIN TODAY. CHILDREN, SPOUSES, AND AGING

1 PARENTS SUFFERING FROM CHRONIC DISEASES WILL WIN TODAY
2 BECAUSE THERE WILL BE 12 TO \$18 MILLION NOT SPENT ON
3 SITES, BUT SPENT ON MEDICAL RESEARCH GIVEN THE GENEROSITY
4 BEFORE US TODAY.

5 MEDICAL RESEARCHERS WILL WIN TODAY BECAUSE
6 THEY'RE DEDICATING THEIR LIFE, AND THERE WILL BE MORE
7 RESOURCES FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH AND NOT FOR FACILITIES TO
8 HOUSE THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEADQUARTERS.

9 AND THE TAXPAYERS OF CALIFORNIA WILL WIN TODAY
10 BECAUSE THE TAXPAYERS OF CALIFORNIA WILL BENEFIT THAT
11 MORE OF THEIR DOLLARS WILL REALLY END UP GOING TO MEDICAL
12 RESEARCH.

13 WITH THAT, IN KEEPING WITH THE INTENT OF THE
14 MOMENTUM IN THIS MEETING THAT IS VERY ESSENTIAL, AFTER
15 THE SELECTION OF THE PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS, WE'LL ASK
16 THE MEDIA TO MOVE TO ROOM 211, AND WE'D ASK THE MAYORS
17 AND CIVIC LEADERS AND CHARITABLE DONORS WHO ARE WITH
18 THEM -- 2011, IF THEY COULD ALL AGGREGATE IN ROOM 2011 SO
19 THAT THE MEDIA HAS A CHANCE TO INTERVIEW THEM, AND YET
20 THE MOMENTUM OF THE MEETING CAN CONTINUE.

21 WITH THAT, WE HAVE A PROCEDURAL ITEM, TWO
22 PROCEDURAL ITEMS, I THINK, TO DISCUSS. ONE IS THAT THE
23 CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS SUBMITTED A LETTER. IT IS VERY
24 IMPORTANT THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD BE ABLE TO VOTE.
25 AND THE SALK CONFERENCE FACILITIES WAS INADVERTENTLY

1 INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSAL. THE SAN DIEGO PROPOSAL HAS
2 SEVERAL CONFERENCE FACILITIES; AND IF THAT FACILITY WERE
3 TAKEN OUT, IT WOULD NOT CHANGE THE SCORING BECAUSE THEY
4 WOULD STILL HAVE THE NUMBER OF -- SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF
5 CONFERENCE FACILITIES THAT WOULD QUALIFY THEM FOR THE
6 SAME SCORE. SO IT DOESN'T CHANGE ANY SCORING THAT HAS
7 HAPPENED TO DATE.

8 BUT IN ORDER FOR DR. MURPHY'S PARTICIPATION IN
9 THIS, IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING, IF THERE'S NOT OBJECTION
10 FROM THE BOARD, I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT SALK BE ABLE TO
11 REMOVE THOSE CONFERENCE FACILITIES FROM THE BID WE'RE
12 CONSIDERING. I DON'T SEE ANY OBJECTION, SO THE CHAIR
13 WILL MAKE THAT RULING.

14 ADDITIONALLY, I'D LIKE TO DISCUSS THE SAME KINDS
15 OF TECHNICAL ISSUE THAT WE'RE ADDRESSING TO CLARIFY FOR
16 THE PUBLIC FOR DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

17 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: NO. 21. I WOULD LIKE TO
18 DISCLOSE FOR THE RECORD THAT I AM EMPLOYED IN THE SAN
19 FRANCISCO CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CITY, AND THE
20 CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO IS ONE OF THE BIDDERS. I WAS NOT
21 INVOLVED IN THE CITY'S BID.

22 COUNSEL HAS ADVISED ME THAT UNDER CALIFORNIA
23 CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS, THIS IS NOT CONSIDERED A
24 FINANCIAL INTEREST BECAUSE IT DOES NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVE
25 THE DEPARTMENT FOR WHICH I WORK; NAMELY, THE CITY

1 ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, BUT THAT I MUST, NONETHELESS, DISCLOSE
2 IT BEFORE PARTICIPATING IN THE BOARD'S DISCUSSION.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD ALSO -- THANK YOU,
4 DAVID. I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT THAT DR. KESSLER AND JEFF
5 SHEEHY, WHO ARE WITH THE MEDICAL SCHOOL AT UC SAN
6 FRANCISCO, DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE BID OF THE CITY OF
7 SAN FRANCISCO, AND THEY ARE OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL. THE
8 CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE SEPARATELY WAS INVOLVED, AND COUNSEL
9 HAS MADE A DECISION THAT THERE IS NO CONFLICT THERE; IS
10 THAT CORRECT?

11 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO WE'RE BEING VERY
13 CAREFUL TO MAKE SURE EVERYONE UNDERSTANDS THAT WE BELIEVE
14 WE'VE EXAMINED EVERY ROLE APPROPRIATELY.

15 DR. POMEROY.

16 DR. POMEROY: I ALSO HAVE A DISCLOSURE TO MAKE.
17 FOR THE RECORD, THE UC DAVIS GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
18 MANAGEMENT INCLUDED ACCESS TO A CONFERENCE ROOM FOR CIRM
19 AT NO CHARGE AS PART OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO'S BID. I
20 WASN'T INVOLVED IN THAT DECISION, AND COUNSEL HAS ADVISED
21 ME THAT THIS IS NOT CONSIDERED A FINANCIAL INTEREST
22 BECAUSE IT DOESN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVE THE DEPARTMENT FOR
23 WHICH I WORK OR THE UNIT FOR WHICH I WORK, THE SCHOOL OF
24 MEDICINE AT UC DAVIS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. THE CHAIR IS AWARE OF THE

1 LEGAL REASONING, THE CASES, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
2 OPINIONS AND BELIEVE IT'S TOTALLY CONSISTENT WITH THOSE.
3 THANK YOU, DR. POMEROY.

4 SO WITH THOSE PRELIMINARY MATTERS BEING
5 ADDRESSED, WALTER, COULD YOU BEGIN THIS PRESENTATION WITH
6 A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS?

7 WALTER BARNES, FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC AND
8 THE PRESS, IS WITH THE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE. WALTER IS ON
9 LOAN TO THE INSTITUTE TO PROVIDE US THE ABILITY TO
10 ADVANCE OUR MISSION. AND WALTER FROM THE INSTITUTE SIDE
11 LED THE INSTITUTE'S PARTICIPATION IN THIS PROCESS, IN THE
12 SCORING PROCESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SIDE OF THE
13 RELATIONSHIP WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES AND
14 THEIR PARTICIPATION.

15 MR. BARNES: THANK YOU. I MENTIONED AT ONE OF
16 THE SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETINGS THAT AFTER WORKING
17 FOR 40 YEARS WITH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, I HAD NEVER
18 SEEN SUCH AN ENTHUSIASTIC RESPONSE BY BIDDERS TO A
19 PROCUREMENT LIKE THIS. ALL 17 CITIES INCLUDED IN THE TEN
20 BIDS THAT WERE RECEIVED EXERCISED THE HIGHEST LEVELS OF
21 CREATIVITY IN RESPONDING TO AN RFP DOCUMENT THAT WAS
22 EXTREMELY INNOVATIVE AND CREATIVE ITSELF.

23 BEFORE DISCUSSING THE RESULTS OF THE RFP AND THE
24 SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION, I WOULD LIKE TO
25 TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THANK THE STAFF FROM THE

1 DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES FOR THEIR SUPPORT,
2 PARTICIPATION, AND GUIDANCE IN THIS PROCESS.

3 I'D LIKE TO TAKE A MOMENT JUST TO EXPLAIN WHY
4 THEIR PARTICIPATION WAS SO IMPORTANT. UNDER PROP 71 THE
5 INSTITUTE AND THE COMMITTEE ENJOY CERTAIN INNOVATIONS IN
6 GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS; HOWEVER, THE INSTITUTE IS STILL A
7 STATE AGENCY. AS A STATE AGENCY, IT'S REQUIRED TO FOLLOW
8 CERTAIN PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES WHEN PERFORMING A
9 PROCUREMENT LIKE THIS.

10 THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES WAS A
11 CREATIVE PARTNER IN THIS EFFORT, BUT WAS ALSO THERE TO
12 ENSURE THAT THE RESULTS WERE ARRIVED AT IN AN OBJECTIVE
13 MANNER WITH SUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION TO SUPPORT A FINAL
14 RECOMMENDATION. THE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES THAT WERE
15 DESIGNED ARE TO ENSURE THAT A DECISION IS BASED ON
16 OBJECTIVE FACTORS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THE SUCCESS OF THE
17 CIRM.

18 THE SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE MADE SEVERAL
19 DECISIONS, AND THESE DECISIONS ARE DETAILED IN EXHIBIT 1
20 OF YOUR AGENDA REGARDING THE FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED,
21 WHICH INCLUDED A LIST OF MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS THAT ALL
22 BIDDERS HAD TO MEET, AND PREFERENCES, WHICH WERE WEIGHTED
23 AND USED TO SELECT THE BEST PROPOSAL. IT ALSO MADE
24 DECISIONS ON THE PROCESS BY WHICH RESPONSES TO THE
25 FACTORS WOULD BE CONSIDERED, WHICH INVOLVED A TWO-PART

1 PROCESS AND A VALUATION OF THE RESPONSES TO THE RFP AND
2 SITE VISITS BY THE MEMBERS THEMSELVES.

3 THESE DECISIONS WERE IMPLEMENTED BY A JOINT
4 CIRM/DGS STAFF, AND ALL RESULTS WERE APPROVED BY THE SITE
5 SELECTION COMMITTEE AT ONE OF ITS FIVE REGULAR MEETINGS.
6 SO DETAILS ABOUT ALL OF THESE MEETINGS, ALL OF THE
7 DECISIONS MADE, ALL OF THE INFORMATION AND WORK THAT WAS
8 DONE IN BETWEEN EACH OF THOSE MEETINGS IS DETAILED IN
9 EXHIBIT 1.

10 ONE OF THOSE DECISIONS WAS TO PROVIDE THE FULL
11 ICOC WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR A WINNER AND A RUNNER-UP.
12 THE PURPOSE OF THE RUNNER-UP IS THAT IN THE EVENT THAT
13 LEASE NEGOTIATIONS BREAK DOWN OR THE WINNER IS UNABLE TO
14 MEET THE TERMS OF THE BID, THE AWARD WOULD BE GIVEN TO
15 THE RUNNER-UP.

16 ANOTHER DECISION WAS THAT THE INFORMATION ON THE
17 POINTS AWARDED TO ALL FOUR FINALISTS, WHICH ARE
18 EMERYVILLE, SACRAMENTO, SAN DIEGO, AND SAN FRANCISCO,
19 WOULD BE PROVIDED AS INFORMATION TO THE ICOC, AND THAT
20 THE BIDDER WITH THE MOST POINTS RESULTING FROM THE REVIEW
21 OF THE RFP DOCUMENTS AND THE SITE VISIT WOULD BE THE
22 RECOMMENDED WINNER.

23 IF YOU GO TO PAGE 1 OF THE ATTACHMENT -- AGENDA
24 7, YOU HAVE THOSE POINTS LISTED. BASED UPON THE
25 DECISIONS OF THE SITE COMMITTEE AND THOSE POINTS, THE

1 RECOMMENDATION IS THAT, FIRST, THE ICOC SELECT THE CITY
2 OF SAN FRANCISCO AND ITS BUILDING OWNER PARTNER AS THE
3 PERMANENT CIRM SITE.

4 A SECOND RECOMMENDATION IS THAT THE ICOC SELECT
5 THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO AND ITS BUILDING OWNER PARTNER AS
6 THE RUNNER-UP SITE.

7 BEFORE YOU TAKE AN ACTION, I SHOULD POINT OUT
8 THAT CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL INCENTIVES OR PERKS NOT
9 CONSIDERED -- NOT CONTAINED IN THE ORIGINAL BIDS IN
10 MAKING YOUR FINAL DECISION COULD RESULT IN A CHALLENGE BY
11 OTHER BIDDERS AND MIGHT REQUIRE THE CANCELLATION OF THE
12 ENTIRE PROCESS.

13 IN ADDITION, ANY CHANGES IN THE POINTS SHOULD BE
14 BASED ON SPECIFIC INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE WRITTEN
15 PROPOSALS OR EVIDENT THROUGH THE SITE VISITS IN ORDER TO
16 AVOID THE SAME RESULT.

17 IN CLOSING, I ALSO WANT TO TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY
18 TO THANK THE MEMBERS OF THE SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE ON
19 BEHALF OF BOTH THE STAFF FROM CIRM AND DGS. THIS WAS A
20 UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN AN EXTREMELY
21 INTERESTING PROCUREMENT, AND WE THANK THEM FOR THEIR
22 ATTENTION TO MY RAMBLINGS AS THE BUREAUCRATIC PROCESS
23 THAT WE HAD TO DEAL WITH, AS WELL AS THEIR SUPPORT FOR
24 ALL THE EFFORTS THAT WE MADE.

25 THAT'S A SUMMARY OF MY PRESENTATION. AND I'M

1 READY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU HAVE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM
3 THE BOARD?

4 DR. NOVA: NO. 19, TINA NOVA. THANK YOU SO MUCH
5 FOR GOING THROUGH THAT. I REALLY APPRECIATE THAT, AND I
6 APPRECIATE THE WORK THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS DONE. I
7 KNOW HOW MUCH WORK THEY DID, AND IT'S ADMIRABLE.

8 I'D JUST LIKE TO HAVE A LITTLE BIT MORE COMMENT
9 FROM YOU ON THE SCORING SYSTEM, THE ORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT
10 OF THE MATRIX SCORING SYSTEM, THE PEOPLE THAT WERE
11 INCLUDED IN THAT, AND HOW THAT'S COME ABOUT.

12 AND MY SECOND QUESTION IS ABOUT THE WEIGHT THAT
13 IS GIVEN TO PHASE I VERSUS PHASE II AND WHY THERE WERE
14 200 POINTS VERSUS THE 90 POINTS IN THE PHASE II AND THE
15 ADDING TOGETHER OF THOSE TO MAKE A TOTAL POINT SYSTEM.

16 MR. BARNES: THE INITIAL SCORING SYSTEM, WHICH
17 WAS RELATED TO THE REVIEW OF THE BIDS, WAS DEVELOPED BY
18 THE JOINT DGS/CIRM EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSED OF THREE
19 MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES, TWO
20 MEMBERS -- TWO EMPLOYEES WITH CIRM, AS WELL AS MYSELF.
21 AT THE TIME WE SAT DOWN TO DEVELOP THE SCORING SHEET, NO
22 ONE, INCLUDING OURSELVES, HAD SEEN ANY OF THE BIDS. SO
23 WE WERE WORKING IN SOMEWHAT OF A BLIND SITUATION TO TRY
24 TO DETERMINE WHAT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY WAS GOING TO BE
25 INCLUDED IN HERE.

1 AT THE SAME TIME, WE DID HAVE SOME FAIRLY CLEAR
2 INFORMATION FROM THE SITE COMMITTEE BASED UPON THEIR
3 COMMENTS AT THE VARIOUS MEETINGS AND THE RFP DOCUMENT
4 THAT THEY HAD APPROVED AT A PREVIOUS MEETING ABOUT WHICH
5 ITEMS WERE CONSIDERED TO BE MORE IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS,
6 PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO THE PREFERENCE POINTS.

7 THERE IS -- ATTACHMENT C, I BELIEVE IT IS, IS AN
8 EXPLANATION OF THE MATERIAL THAT -- OF THE RATIONALE FOR
9 WHY EACH OF THE VARIOUS PREFERENCES WERE SCORED THE WAY
10 THEY WERE. SO THAT'S THE PROCESS ON HOW THAT CAME UP.
11 WE ALSO ARRIVED AT THE 20 POINTS, AGAIN, BASED ON JUST
12 THE SUMMATION OF ASSIGNING THOSE POINTS.

13 I SHOULD ALSO SAY THAT WHEN WE TOOK THE
14 RECOMMENDATION FOR SCORES TO THE SITE COMMITTEE AT THE
15 SUBSEQUENT MEETING, WE LAID OUT THIS EXPLANATION, WE LAID
16 OUT THE PROCESS, WE LAID OUT THE SCORES THAT WE WERE
17 RECOMMENDING, AND THE SITE COMMITTEE TOOK THAT UNDER
18 ADVISEMENT AND MADE A DECISION TO ACCEPT BOTH THE TOTAL
19 NUMBER OF SCORES AS WELL AS THE INDIVIDUAL SCORINGS THAT
20 WE GAVE.

21 I SHOULD ALSO SAY THAT WE GAVE A PRELIMINARY
22 LISTING OF MATRIX SCORES, WHICH SOME OF THE CITIES
23 INDICATED THEY FELT WERE -- HAD SOME ERRORS IN IT, SO WE
24 DID SOLICIT AT THE SITE COMMITTEE'S REQUEST ADDITIONAL
25 INFORMATION THAT WOULD POINT OUT IN THE BID WHERE THINGS

1 THAT WE MIGHT HAVE MISSED TOOK PLACE. AND SO THE SCORING
2 MATRIX THAT YOU HAVE IN YOUR AGENDA ITEM IS THE REVISED
3 SCORING MATRIX THAT BASICALLY AWARDED SOME ADDITIONAL
4 POINTS TO SOME OF THE MEMBERS.

5 WITH REGARD TO THE SITE COMMITTEE, THAT WAS A
6 DECISION THAT WAS MADE BY -- THE SITE VISITS, I SHOULD
7 SAY, THAT WAS A DECISION THAT WAS MADE BY THE SITE
8 COMMITTEE ITSELF. WE PROVIDED SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES OF
9 WHAT THEY MIGHT WANT TO LOOK AT AND THE TYPES OF THINGS
10 THAT THEY MIGHT WANT TO LOOK AT AND A SUGGESTED SCORING
11 METHODOLOGY FOR THAT. I THINK OUR ORIGINAL
12 RECOMMENDATION WAS FOR 10 POINTS FOR SIX DIFFERENT ITEMS.
13 THEY ENDED UP COMING UP WITH 90 POINTS FOR SEVEN ITEMS
14 PLUS A POTENTIAL NEGATIVE 10 POINTS RELATED TO WHAT THEY
15 CALLED BURDEN. SO THAT DECISION WAS MADE BY THE SITE
16 COMMITTEE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JUST IN THE INTEREST OF
18 COMPLETENESS, VERY QUICKLY, PRECEDING THE STEP THAT WAS
19 JUST DESCRIBED, IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT IN THE
20 ALLOCATION OF POINTS, THOSE ALLOCATION OF POINTS CAME
21 FROM THE RECORDS OF THE DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMITTEE IN
22 ITS PRIOR MEETINGS. AND FROM THOSE RECORDS OF WHAT WAS
23 IMPORTANT, THERE WAS A PRELIMINARY ALLOCATION THAT CAME
24 UP. THE -- WALTER AND I WORKED ON THAT WITH DGS, AND
25 THEN IT WENT TO ONE PERSON FROM EACH REGION: DR.

1 MURPHY, DR. POMEROY, SHERRY LANSING AND I, TO SEE IF THAT
2 ALLOCATION MADE SENSE.

3 AND AFTER THAT STEP, WE GAVE IT BACK TO DGS, WHO
4 IMMEDIATELY CHANGED IT. THEY, OF COURSE, BEING A STATE
5 AGENCY, USED TO A FOCUS ON THE FINANCIAL ISSUES,
6 INCREASED THE ALLOCATION FOR DOLLARS OF SUBSIDY, AND ALL
7 THREE OF THE CANDIDATES BEFORE US TODAY ARE PROVIDING TEN
8 YEARS OF FREE RENT. SO THAT EQUALIZES THAT ADJUSTMENT.
9 THEY MADE SOME OTHER MINOR ADJUSTMENTS IN CATEGORIES
10 BASED ON THEIR READING OF THE COMMITTEE'S OWN
11 PRONOUNCEMENTS IN THE TEXT AS AN INDEPENDENT ENTITY.

12 DR. LOVE: WALTER, MANY OF US HAVE NOT BEEN
13 INVOLVED IN A PROCESS WHERE THE GOVERNMENT IS SELECTING A
14 SITE. SO I WANTED TO JUST ASK IF YOU IN YOUR EXPERIENCE
15 COULD PUT THAT PROCESS INTO SOME CONTEXT FOR US IN TERMS
16 OF THE RIGOR RELATIVE TO OTHER DECISIONS THAT YOU MADE
17 FOR SITE SELECTION. AND ALSO GIVE US SOME GUIDANCE ON
18 YOUR SENSE OF THE INTEGRITY OF HOW THIS WAS ALL CARRIED
19 OUT AND WHETHER ANY OF US HAVE ANY CONCERN ABOUT ANY OF
20 THAT.

21 MR. BARNES: AS I SAID, I WORKED FOR THE STATE
22 FOR 40 YEARS. THERE ARE TIMES IT SEEMS LIKE A LOT LONGER
23 THAN THAT. I WILL SAY THAT I PARTICIPATED IN A NUMBER OF
24 MAJOR PROCUREMENTS, BOTH FOR SPACE AS WELL AS FOR OTHER
25 TYPES OF THINGS, INCLUDING I.T. SYSTEMS AND THAT KIND OF

1 THING. THIS ONE WAS ONE OF THE LARGER AND MORE
2 SIGNIFICANT PROCUREMENTS THAT I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN. AND
3 I WOULD SAY THAT THE PROCESS PARTICULARLY BECOMES
4 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT PARTICULARLY WITH THE SIGNIFICANCE OF
5 THE DECISION THAT GOES INTO IT. AND SO, AS I SAID, WITH
6 DGS AS OUR PARTNER, WE MADE SURE THAT THE PROCESS WOULD
7 BE ONE THAT WOULD HAVE AS MUCH OBJECTIVITY BUILT INTO IT,
8 AND THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WE PROVIDED TO THE SITE
9 COMMITTEE AND THE DECISIONS THE SITE COMMITTEE WOULD BE
10 CALLED UPON TO MAKE WERE AS OBJECTIVE AS WE COULD
11 POSSIBLY MAKE THEM.

12 I FEEL PERSONALLY VERY COMFORTABLE WITH THE
13 INTEGRITY OF THE PROCESS THAT HAS GONE THROUGH BOTH FROM
14 THE PERSONAL STANDPOINT AS WELL AS FROM THE PEOPLE THAT
15 WERE INVOLVED WITH ME ON THE EVALUATION TEAM AND, AS I
16 SAID ALREADY, THE SITE COMMITTEE MEMBERS THEMSELVES WHO I
17 FEEL REALLY ATTEMPTED TO TRY TO ARRIVE AT AN OBJECTIVE
18 DECISION.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

20 DR. HOLMES: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR. I TOO WOULD
21 LIKE TO APPLAUD THE EXTRAORDINARY WORK OF THE
22 SUBCOMMITTEE AND INDICATE MY RESPECT FOR THE MEMBERS OF
23 THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND REALLY THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS.

24 I HAVE A QUESTION. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER WE WANT
25 TO DISCUSS THIS NOW OR AT A SUBSEQUENT POINT, WHICH WAS

1 REFERRED TO EARLIER. I'M HAVING DIFFICULTY WHEN IT'S
2 REALLY THE SUBCOMMITTEE THAT'S RECOMMENDING TO THE FULL
3 COMMITTEE WHAT THEIR RECOMMENDATION IS IS THAT THEIR
4 RECOMMENDATION IS ONE-HALF THE VALUE OF THE GOVERNMENT
5 OFFICIALS' RECOMMENDATION. AND THAT SEEMS STRANGE TO ME
6 AS PART OF THE PROCESS, AND I'D LOVE TO HEAR THE
7 COMMITTEE SHED SOME LIGHT ON THAT.

8 WHEN I READ THE CRITERIA FOR THE TWO GROUPS THAT
9 LOOKED AT THIS, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT, AS AN INDIVIDUAL,
10 THE CRITERIA THAT WE'RE EVALUATED BY THE SITE COLLECTION
11 COMMITTEE ARE MUCH MORE TO THE POINT OF THE FUNCTION OF
12 WHAT THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE IS GOING TO DO, WHICH IS TO
13 SELECT THE BEST POSSIBLE RESEARCH IN THE NATION -- I MEAN
14 FOR THIS GROUP.

15 SO I'M QUITE MIFFED BY THE DISPARITY IN THE
16 RANKINGS OF THE TWO GROUPS. AND I HOPE AT SOME POINT,
17 MR. CHAIR, WE COULD HEAR FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE
18 SUBCOMMITTEE, AND I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE RIGHT TIME IS TO
19 DO THAT, BUT THE PROCESS, IT SEEMS TO ME TOPSY-TURVY.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO, IF POSSIBLE, GET
21 THE PRESENTATIONS OUT ON THE TABLE. WE HAVE VERY LIMITED
22 TIME. WE NEED TO BE VERY EFFECTIVE WITH OUR TIME, AND
23 HOPEFULLY WE CAN COMBINE THE MEMBERS' COMMENTS ON THE
24 WEIGHTING OF ITEMS BECAUSE WHEN THEY MAKE A PRESENTATION
25 ON WHY THEY FEEL A CERTAIN SITE IS BETTER, THEY CAN

1 EMPHASIZE THE WEIGHTING. WOULD THAT BE ACCEPTABLE?

2 DR. HOLMES: SURE.

3 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST WOULD LIKE TO NOTE THAT IT'S
4 KIND OF CURIOUS BECAUSE THIS MIRRORS THE PEER REVIEW
5 PROCESS. AND WE SET UP AN INDEPENDENT GROUP SEPARATE
6 FROM OURSELVES TO GIVE TOTALLY OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS, AND
7 THEN WE HAVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WEIGH IN. PRESUMABLY I
8 WOULD THINK THAT YOU WOULD HOPE IN THE RESEARCH GRANTS
9 WORKING GROUP THAT THE REAL WEIGHT WOULD COME FROM THE
10 OBJECTIVE SCIENTISTS WHO KIND OF PLAY THE SAME ROLE THAT
11 THE GSA DID IN THIS PARTICULAR PROCESS. AND IT JUST
12 TROUBLES ME THAT WE WOULD EVEN COUNTENANCE ASSAULTING THE
13 OBJECTIVE PROCESS WHEN THIS MIRRORS EXACTLY HOW WE'RE
14 GOING TO GIVE OUT \$2.7 BILLION IN GRANTS. THE PROCESS
15 THAT YOU OVERSAW WAS THE SELECTION OF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE
16 GOING TO DO THAT.

17 SO I JUST WANT TO PUT THAT OUT THERE. IF WE'RE
18 GOING TO START PULLING THREADS, I THINK WE PULL A LOT OF
19 THREADS APART.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK WE'RE ALL VERY
21 PASSIONATE AND ALL BELIEVE WE'RE HERE TO MAKE SURE WE
22 HAVE THE BEST RESULT. AND I'M NOT SURE THAT, JUST AS WE
23 HAD SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS RELATED TO THE EARLIER PANELS OR
24 SLATES, THERE'S VERY APPROPRIATE SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS
25 NOW.

1 DR. HOLMES: COULD I RESPOND? THANK YOU. I
2 COULDN'T AGREE MORE THAT I'M PUTTING A LOT OF CONFIDENCE
3 IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION, AND THAT'S THE
4 POINT I WAS TRYING TO MAKE WAS THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE, THE
5 SITE COMMITTEE OF THIS GROUP THAT WENT AND LOOKED AT ALL
6 SITES, I'M HAVING TROUBLE RECONCILING THEIR
7 RECOMMENDATION VERSUS THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE FIRST
8 COMMITTEE. MAYBE I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE PROCESS, BUT IT
9 SEEMED TO ME THERE WAS A DISPARITY THERE. AND I HAVE
10 MORE CONFIDENCE IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE I GUESS I'M TRYING TO
11 SAY.

12 MR. SHEEHY: WOULD YOU HAVE MORE CONFIDENCE IN
13 PATIENT ADVOCATES AND THEIR DECISIONS ON GRANTS OR THE
14 SCIENTISTS THAT YOU PICK, THE EXPERTS THAT HAVE EXPERTISE
15 IN BUILDING PROCUREMENT THAT MADE THIS VERY OBJECTIVE
16 DECISION? WHILE I GIVE CREDENCE TO ALL THE MEMBERS OF
17 THE SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE, THEY ARE NOT EXPERTS IN
18 BUILDING -- IN OBTAINING SITES FOR GOVERNMENT -- SPACE
19 FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

20 THE STATE AGENCY THAT OVERSAW THAT PROCESS DID
21 THAT SCORING, HAS THAT EXPERTISE, WHICH IS THE SAME
22 ARGUMENT WE MADE IN PEER REVIEW.

23 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I'LL BE VERY BRIEF. I WANT
24 THE PRESENTATIONS AS WELL. DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL
25 SPEAKING. I WANT TO GET TO PRESENTATIONS AS WELL. I

1 SHARE MY COLLEAGUE, JEFF SHEEHY'S, COMMENTS. WE ALL --
2 AS A MEMBER, DR. HOLMES, I KNEW ABOUT THE PROCESS. WE
3 HAD CONSTANT COMMITTEE REPORTS. I DON'T RECALL YOU EVER
4 RAISING A QUESTION IN THAT PROCESS.

5 TO GET INTO THE SECOND-GUESSING GAME, WHEN WE
6 KNOW -- MR. BARNES IS BEING MODEST. HE'S THE CZAR OF
7 THIS PROCESS. IT WAS OBJECTIVE. IT WAS DONE WITH
8 INTEGRITY. THERE ARE REPRESENTATIVES FROM DGS. IF YOU
9 WANT TO ASK THEM QUESTIONS, YOU SHOULD.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVID, I THINK THAT IT'S VERY
11 IMPORTANT, SINCE WE HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT DECISION HERE,
12 THAT WE GO FORWARD. EVERYONE HERE IS JUST TRYING TO GET
13 TO THE BEST RESULT. DR. PENHOET.

14 DR. PENHOET: I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY FOR DR.
15 HOLMES. ED, THE REASON IN SOME SENSE THERE'S A DISPARITY
16 BETWEEN THE TWO SETS OF NUMBERS IN RANK ORDER IS THEY
17 MEASURE DIFFERENT THINGS. SO THE FIRST SCORING MEASURED
18 A WHOLE SET OF CRITERIA THAT WERE DECIDED IN THE FIRST
19 ROUND. WE WERE SPECIFICALLY ASKED WHEN WE MADE THE SITE
20 VISITS NOT TO RECONSIDER THOSE ITEMS THAT WERE ALREADY
21 CONSIDERED IN THE FIRST EVALUATION. WE LOOKED AT
22 ADDITIONAL THINGS IN THE SECOND ROUND, SO IT WASN'T MEANT
23 TO EITHER OVERRIDE OR IN A SENSE CHANGE THE OVERALL
24 PROCESS. WE WERE ASKED TO LOOK AT A DIFFERENT SET OF
25 CRITERIA DURING THE SITE VISITS THAN WERE EXAMINED IN THE

1 FIRST.

2 SO THERE WASN'T AN INTENT THAT THE SITE
3 COMMITTEE ITSELF WOULD OVERRIDE, BUT SIMPLY SUPPLEMENT
4 WHAT HAD ALREADY BEEN DETERMINED IN THE FIRST ROUND.

5 DR. BRYANT: SO THEN THAT LEADS TO THE QUESTION
6 OF HOW THE WEIGHT OF THE DIFFERENT RATING SCALES WAS
7 DETERMINED BECAUSE I THINK THAT IS ALSO -- THAT ACTUALLY
8 IS WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO, I THINK, IS WHAT IS THE
9 RELATIVE WEIGHTING THAT'S GIVEN TO THESE THINGS? I'M NOT
10 ASKING BECAUSE I HAVE ANY PREJUDICE. I'D JUST LIKE TO
11 KNOW HOW THAT WAS DETERMINED.

12 DR. PRECIADO: I GUESS I'M STARTING TO GET A
13 LITTLE CONFUSED BY THIS BECAUSE WHEN I PARTICIPATED IN
14 THE SITE VISITS, IT BECAME VERY CLEAR TO ME WHAT MY
15 PREFERENCE WAS BASED ON THE POINT SYSTEMS WE WERE GIVEN.
16 NOW WE'RE BEING ASKED TO RECOMMEND, BASED ON A POINT
17 SYSTEM, OUR NO. 1 AND NO. 2 DECISIONS. AND I DON'T THINK
18 THAT I CAN SAY WITH ALL HONESTY THAT I CAN GO FORWARD AND
19 RECOMMEND SAN FRANCISCO AS NO. 1, SACRAMENTO AS NO. 2
20 BASED ON JUST THE POINT SYSTEM.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO, THE
22 RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE IS BECAUSE THE
23 COMMITTEE IN A VERY SPIRITED DISCUSSION ON A SUBCOMMITTEE
24 MEETING THAT YOU WERE NOT PRESENT VOTED TO ADVANCE THE
25 RECOMMENDATION BASED UPON THE POINT SYSTEM. IT'S THE

1 SAME COMMITTEE MEETING THAT APPROVED THE POINTS FROM THE
2 FIRST ROUND. WE'RE ONLY CARRYING OUT THE PROCESS AS WE
3 VOTED THROUGH THE PROCESS.

4 DR. POMEROY: AS A PERSON WHO WENT ON ALL THE
5 SITE VISITS AND PARTICIPATED IN THIS PROCESS, I'D JUST
6 LIKE TO MAKE A FEW COMMENTS ABOUT THIS.

7 FIRST OF ALL, AND MOST IMPORTANTLY TO ME,
8 THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS WE EMPHASIZED THAT THE POINT
9 SYSTEM WAS MERELY A GUIDE, AND THAT THE FINAL DECISION
10 WOULD BE MADE ON THE CONSCIENCE OF EACH MEMBER OF THE
11 ICOC. I THINK THAT WE DISCUSSED THE WEIGHTING, AND
12 THAT'S WHY WE WANTED BOTH SETS OF SCORES REPORTED SO THAT
13 PEOPLE COULD MAKE UP IN THEIR OWN MIND HOW IMPORTANT RFP
14 POINTS WERE AND HOW IMPORTANT SITE VISIT POINTS WERE.
15 PEOPLE MIGHT HAVE LEGITIMATELY DIFFERENT OPINIONS ABOUT
16 THAT.

17 THAT WAS THE REASON FOR GIVING ALL OF THE
18 SCORES. I THINK THAT IN MY OPINION THIS SCORING SYSTEM,
19 THERE WAS A WIDE RANGE OF SCORES ON THE SITE VISIT, A
20 VERY WIDE RANGE, AND THOSE ARE OUTLINED, I THINK, IN OUR
21 BOOK SO PEOPLE CAN LOOK THOSE OVER. AND I WILL SAY THAT
22 I THINK FUNCTIONALLY WITH THAT RANGE THERE'S PROBABLY
23 LITTLE STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE TOP THREE
24 SCORES. AND I THINK THAT'S WHY WE AS A SUBCOMMITTEE
25 RECOMMENDED THAT THE CITIES, IN FACT, COME BACK FOR THE

1 OPPORTUNITY TO GIVE THESE TEN-MINUTE PRESENTATIONS AND
2 KIND OF SUMMARIZE THE FACTS FOR EVERYBODY ON THE BOARD.
3 AND SO I WOULD HOPE THAT WE, AS EVERYONE IS URGING, COULD
4 MOVE ON TO THE CITY PRESENTATIONS AND EVERYONE COULD GO
5 INTO THAT LISTENING CAREFULLY TO WHAT THEY HAVE TO SAY.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRIETO, IS IT POSSIBLE --

7 DR. PRIETO: WILL THE BOARD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY
8 TO COMMENT AFTER THE PRESENTATIONS?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. DR. MURPHY.

10 DR. MURPHY: LET ME JUST FOLLOW UP ON THOSE LAST
11 COMMENTS. I THINK THERE WERE SEVERAL PRINCIPLES THAT THE
12 SUBCOMMITTEE FOLLOWED. NO. 1 PRINCIPLE WAS THAT THE
13 DECISION WOULD BE MADE BY THE ICOC, AND THAT WHAT WE WERE
14 DOING AS A SUBCOMMITTEE WAS TEEING UP THE PROCESS FOR THE
15 SUBCOMMITTEE TO MAKE ITS FINAL DECISION.

16 THE TWO PROCEDURES, THE STAFF PROCEDURE I LOOK
17 AT AS BUYING A HOUSE. IT'S GOING TO THE REALTOR, IT'S
18 LOOKING AT THE DATA AND DECIDING WHICH OF THOSE
19 PROPERTIES REALLY HAVE THE QUALITIES THAT MAKE THEM OF
20 VALUE. THE SITE VISIT WAS GOING TO LOOK AT THE
21 PROPERTIES, AND WE REALIZED THAT THE TWO PROCEDURES HAD
22 DIFFERENT NUMBERS. THE FIRST PROCEDURE WAS 200 POINTS,
23 AND THAT WAS DONE, IN MY VIEW, VERY WELL.

24 THE SITE COMMITTEE DECIDED THAT THE SITE VISITS
25 WOULD BE 90 POINTS, AND I THINK THAT WAS DONE VERY WELL

1 ALSO. THE NOTION WAS THAT WE WANTED TO PRESENT BOTH OF
2 THOSE NUMBERS TO THE COMMITTEE SO THAT THE COMMITTEE
3 COULD SEE WHAT THE FIRST PHASE DID AND WHAT THE SECOND
4 PHASE DID. AND AS WAS JUST STATED, THE IDEA WAS WE WERE
5 PROVIDING GUIDANCE TO THE COMMITTEE, AND THAT THE REASON
6 THAT THE COMMITTEE, I THINK, ALLOWED THE TWO NUMBERS TO
7 BE COMBINED IS THAT WE DID NOT CONSIDER THESE TO BE
8 BINDING NUMBERS. WE CONSIDERED THESE TO BE NUMBERS
9 SIMPLY THAT WOULD BE PRESENTED BOTH SEPARATELY AND
10 TOGETHER. BUT AT LEAST MY FEELING WAS THAT THESE WE'RE
11 NOT BINDING. THEY WERE NUMBERS TO GUIDE THE COMMITTEE IN
12 ITS DECISIONS.

13 AND I AGREE THAT THAT'S EXACTLY WHY WE
14 RECOMMENDED TODAY TO BRING THE FINALISTS BACK FOR THE
15 PRESENTATION BECAUSE WE FELT THAT ONE PART OF THE
16 PROCEDURE SHOWED ONE ASPECT, THE DGS PART, THE SITE VISIT
17 SHOWED ANOTHER ONE, AND WE NEEDED THE COMMITTEE TO SEE
18 THE PRESENTATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE TO MAKE ITS DECISION.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S VERY WELL
20 STATED. AND I'D LIKE TO INDICATE THAT, ALTHOUGH THERE
21 ARE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE SITE VISIT BETWEEN THE
22 SCORING OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I BELIEVE
23 THAT THERE ARE VERY LEGITIMATE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION OF
24 THE BEST PHILOSOPHY FOR THIS FACILITY. ONE MIGHT NOTICE,
25 I THINK I GAVE 10 POINTS ON FUNCTION TO ALL THREE OF

1 THESE BECAUSE I RECOGNIZE IF THERE'S A SUBURBAN
2 PHILOSOPHY, IF THERE'S AN URBAN PHILOSOPHY, THEY CAN BOTH
3 HAVE LEGITIMACY, AND THEY CAN ALL BE CLASS A FACILITIES,
4 ALL BE CLASS A SITES.

5 SO THE POINT IS THAT THIS BOARD NEEDS TO SEE THE
6 PRESENTATIONS AND HAVE THE VISUAL INFORMATION TO MAKE THE
7 DECISION THEMSELVES.

8 DR. BLACK: I JUST WANTED TO -- JUST A
9 CLARIFICATION ON THE PROCESS. SO AFTER THE
10 PRESENTATIONS, WILL WE HAVE A CHANCE TO SORT OF VOTE UP
11 OR DOWN ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, OR
12 WILL WE GET A CHANCE TO VOTE ON THE INDIVIDUAL SITES
13 THEMSELVES?

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU WILL HAVE A CHANCE TO VOTE
15 ON THE RECOMMENDATION FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IF THAT DOESN'T
16 CARRY A MAJORITY, WE'LL GO TO SACRAMENTO. IF THAT
17 DOESN'T A CARRY MAJORITY, WE'LL GO TO SAN DIEGO. SO
18 WE'RE GOING TO GO IN ORDER, BUT SEE WHERE WE HAVE A
19 MAJORITY OF THE VOTES. AND AFTER WE SELECT THE SITE THAT
20 HAS THE MAJORITY OF THE VOTES, WE'LL GO TO VOTE ON THE
21 BACKUP SITE.

22 DR. KESSLER: CAN YOU JUST CLARIFY. WHAT WAS
23 AGREED TO UP FRONT AS FAR AS THE POINT SYSTEM AND THESE
24 TWO SETS? WAS THERE AN AGREED UPON DECISION BASE THAT
25 WAS AGREED TO BEFORE THE ACTUAL ANALYSIS TOOK PLACE?

1 MR. BARNES: THAT'S CORRECT.

2 DR. KESSLER: AND THAT AGREED UPON DECISION BASE
3 WAS WHAT? WHEN YOU HAVE BOTH THE DGS AND YOU HAVE THE
4 SITE SELECTION, WHAT WAS THE AGREED SCENARIO?

5 MR. BARNES: I GUESS I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE WHAT
6 YOU'RE ASKING.

7 MS. LANSING: ALL THAT WE DECIDED IN A BLIND
8 WAY, THAT DGS AND OUR SUBCOMMITTEE, REPRESENTATIVES FROM
9 EACH GEOGRAPHICAL AREA, AGREED THE POINTS BEFORE ANY OF
10 THE BIDS WERE OPENED. THEN THOSE POINTS WERE DONE AND WE
11 WERE GIVEN THAT. THEN WE VISITED SITES. BEFORE WE
12 VISITED THE SITES, WE HAD ADDITIONAL POINTS THAT WE
13 WANTED TO ADD TO IT. AND THEN WE WENT AND SAW -- THAT
14 WAS DONE BEFORE WE SAW THE SITES.

15 NOW, THIS IS THE IMPORTANT THING, AND I THINK
16 THIS IS WHAT WE HAVE TO GET OUT. ALL WE WANT YOU TO USE
17 THESE POINTS FOR IS IT'S INFORMATION. WE SHOULD ALL
18 ENTER THIS PROCESS NOW IN AN OBJECTIVE AND FAIR WAY. THE
19 POINTS ARE THERE FOR YOU LOOK AT, BUT TO BE QUITE HONEST
20 WITH YOU, THEY'RE SO CLOSE THAT IT REALLY DOESN'T MAKE
21 ANY DIFFERENCE. IT'S NOT LIKE ONE THING IS A HUNDRED
22 POINTS AHEAD OF SOMETHING ELSE. WE'LL HAVE THE
23 OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS. THEY WERE NEVER TO
24 DETERMINE HOW YOU VOTE. THEY WERE ONLY AS A GUIDELINE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY WERE, I THINK, A GUIDANCE

1 ON VOTING. AND ONE OF THE IMPORTANT THINGS IS THE FIRST
2 PART OF THAT POINT SYSTEM WAS INTENDED TO AVOID
3 INSTITUTIONAL BIAS OR REGIONAL BIAS SO THAT YOU COULD SEE
4 HOW POINTS WOULD MATCH UP THE CRITERIA ARTICULATED BY THE
5 SUBCOMMITTEE BEFORE THEY SAW ANY BIDS. AND THEY HAVE A
6 VALUE IN GUIDANCE IN TELLING US HOW ON AN OBJECTIVE BASIS
7 WHAT INDEPENDENT PEOPLE THOUGHT BECAUSE NONE OF THE BOARD
8 MEMBERS TOOK PART IN THAT PROCESS.

9 DR. FONTANA: DR. JEANNIE FONTANA SPEAKING ON
10 BEHALF OF JOHN REED WHO SITS ON THIS COMMITTEE AND
11 APOLOGIZES FOR NOT BEING HERE, BUT THE SCIENTIFIC
12 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING FOR THE BURNHAM WAS OCCURRING
13 TODAY. I'D LIKE TO JUST BRING UP AN OVERVIEW OR READ TO
14 YOU A POSITION STATEMENT THAT HE ASKED ME TO DO.

15 HE WANTED TO POINT OUT THAT THE FUNDAMENTAL
16 QUESTION FOR THE ICOC TO CONSIDER IS WHAT ROLE DOES IT
17 ENVISION FOR THE CIRM. WE HAVE TWO VERY DIFFERENT
18 CHOICES. FIRST, CIRM CAN SERVE AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE
19 ORGANIZATION THAT ROBOTICALLY PROCESSES GRANT
20 APPLICATIONS AND PRINTS CHECKS MUCH LIKE THE CALIFORNIA
21 RESEARCH GRANTS ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATIONS WE HAVE
22 CURRENTLY THAT SUPPORT BREAST CANCER RESEARCH,
23 TOBACCO-RELATED DISEASE RESEARCH, AND HIV/AIDS.

24 THE CURRENT STATE GRANTING ADMINISTRATING
25 ORGANIZATIONS DO A COMPETENT JOB AND ARE STAFFED BY

1 DEDICATED STATE EMPLOYEES, BUT THEY'RE NOT PROVIDING
2 NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP WITH RESPECT TO
3 CUTTING-EDGE THINKING ABOUT HOW TO DEFEAT THESE DISEASES.
4 IF THAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S INTENT, THEN IT DOES NOT MAKE
5 MUCH DIFFERENCE WHERE THIS SITE IS LOCATED.

6 SECOND, IF OUR DESIRE IS THAT THE CIRM EMERGES
7 AS AN ORGANIZATION THAT IS PROVIDING CUTTING-EDGE
8 THINKING ABOUT STEM CELL RESEARCH AND THAT IS SEEN AS A
9 THOUGHT LEADER IN THE FIELD BOTH NATIONALLY AND
10 INTERNATIONALLY, THEN IT'S CRITICAL THAT THE HEADQUARTERS
11 FOR THE SITE IS SITUATED IN A ROBUST ACADEMIC COMMUNITY
12 THAT OFFERS A DIVERSITY OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR CREATIVE
13 EXCHANGE OF IDEAS ON A DAILY BASIS. IF THAT IS THE
14 COMMITTEE'S INTENT, THEN THERE'S NO OTHER SITE TO
15 CONSIDER THAN SAN DIEGO.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WILL RESERVE EQUAL TIME UNDER
17 PUBLIC COMMENT FOR SACRAMENTO AND FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

18 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I JUST WANT TO MAKE ONE
19 THING CLEAR IN MY MIND. I HAVE A QUESTION. DID THE SITE
20 SELECTION COMMITTEE, AND I HOPE I CAN PHRASE THIS IN A
21 YES-OR-NO WAY. DID THE SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE, OUR
22 ESTEEMED COLLEAGUES, AS THEY WENT ABOUT THIS PROCESS
23 DECIDE THAT THE CITY WITH THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF POINTS
24 WOULD BE THE RECOMMENDED SITE? ED IS NODDING YES.
25 SHERRY IS NODDING NO. HENCE, I'M CONFUSED.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IN THE COMMITTEE MEETING THAT I
2 CHAired, I BELIEVE THAT IT DID, BUT IT'S IMPORTANT TO
3 UNDERSTAND --

4 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: WAS MS. LANSING AT THAT
5 MEETING?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXCUSE ME. IT WOULD BE THE
7 RECOMMENDED SITE, BUT IT'S ALSO LEGITIMATE THAT THE ICOC
8 WOULD DECIDE ON THE BEST SITE FOR THE INSTITUTE.

9 MS. LANSING: LET ME CLARIFY. THE WAY THAT I
10 UNDERSTOOD IT, AND I WAS AT THE MEETING. THE WAY I
11 UNDERSTOOD IT WAS THAT THERE WAS A POINT SYSTEM, AND THAT
12 WE WERE GOING TO BRING BACK TO THE ICOC THE POINT SYSTEM
13 AND THE POINT RANKINGS, AND WE WERE INITIALLY ONLY GOING
14 TO BRING BACK TWO, BUT THEY WERE SO CLOSE THAT WE BROUGHT
15 BACK THREE. SO WE ALREADY ADJUSTED IT BECAUSE THEY WERE
16 SO CLOSE.

17 ALL THAT I UNDERSTAND WE ARE SUPPOSED TO DO,
18 OTHERWISE THERE WOULD NOT BE A NEED FOR THIS MEETING,
19 BECAUSE OTHERWISE EVERYBODY WOULDN'T BE UP HERE FOR TEN
20 MINUTES SPEAKING, AND WE WOULD NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY
21 TO ASK QUESTIONS. ALL THAT I UNDERSTOOD THAT WE WERE
22 SUPPOSED TO DO WAS TO USE THIS POINT SYSTEM AS A
23 GUIDELINE TO INFORM US, TO PREPARE US. AND THEN WE WERE
24 GOING TO ASK QUESTIONS OF THE VARIOUS PARTICIPANTS AND
25 THEN VOTE WITH OUR CONSCIENCE.

1 DR. PIZZO: JUST A QUALIFICATION OF THAT. IF,
2 IN FACT, THAT IS TRUE, SHERRY, AND I ACCEPT THAT THAT
3 MIGHT BE TRUE, THEN I THINK IT DOES BEG THE PROPOSITION
4 THAT WAS OFFERED BY OUR CHAIR. IF WE'RE THEN GOING TO
5 VOTE AD SERIATIM STARTING WITH SAN FRANCISCO AND THEN
6 MOVING DOWN, MY CONCLUSION FROM HIS RECOMMENDATION WAS
7 THAT WE WERE GOING TO BE VOTING ON A PLATFORM OR A SLATE
8 THAT HAD ALREADY BEEN REVIEWED. AND THAT'S A VERY
9 DIFFERENT CONFIGURATION THAN WHAT YOU ARE POSITING.

10 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT CLEARLY THIS ISSUE HAS
11 CAPTURED EVERYONE'S ATTENTION. AND THERE ARE MANY GOOD
12 REASONS FOR THAT, BUT WE SHOULDN'T AT THE END OF THE DAY
13 MISS WHAT WE'RE HERE FOR. WE'RE HERE TO SUPPORT THE
14 CIRM, WHICH IS GOING TO PROVIDE SUPPORT THAT'S GOING TO
15 TAKE PLACE THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. SO IN
16 MANY WAYS WHILE THE ISSUE ABOUT WHERE THE LOCATION IS IS
17 IMPORTANT, IT'S NOT AS IMPORTANT AS WHERE THE FUNDS GO TO
18 DO THE RESEARCH THAT'S SO ESSENTIAL.

19 AND I ALSO FEEL IN SORT OF A DERIVATIVE WAY THAT
20 WE HAVE TO BE SURE THAT WE'RE NOT LIKE SOME OLYMPIC
21 COMMITTEE JUDGES HAVE BEEN IN WHICH WE ARE BEGINNING TO
22 DECIDE HOW WE'RE GOING TO EVALUATE THE POINTS OR AWARD
23 THE POINTS BASED ON OUR PRIOR COUNTRY OF PREFERENCE. SO
24 LET'S BE AS OBJECTIVE AS WE CAN AND REALLY DECIDE WHAT'S
25 BEST TO ALLOW THE RESEARCH TO GO FORWARD AND TO ALLOW THE

1 COMMUNITY OF EXCELLENCE TO TAKE PLACE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF THE BOARD MEMBERS WOULD
3 PLEASE, I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE IT IF WE COULD MOVE
4 FORWARD WITH THE COMMENTS FROM THE CITIES.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: THAT WAS MY POINT. I WOULD LIKE
6 TO HAVE THE BENEFIT OF THE PRESENTATIONS, AND THEN WE CAN
7 HAVE A DISCUSSION BASED ON ALL THE INFORMATION.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I HAVE A CLARIFYING
9 QUESTION, IF I MAY, EVEN THOUGH I'M PUBLIC.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: AND MY QUESTION TO YOU,
12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN, IS I DIDN'T QUITE UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS
13 THAT YOU WERE RECOMMENDING AS THE PROCESS, BUT WOULDN'T
14 IT BE MORE APPROPRIATE FOR EACH MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE
15 TO VOTE FOR THE CITY OF THEIR CHOICE?

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, EACH MEMBER IS GOING TO
17 VOTE FOR THE --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: THAT'S NOT WHAT YOU SAID
19 EARLIER.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXCUSE ME, SIR. EACH MEMBER
21 WILL VOTE FOR THE CITY OF THEIR CHOICE, BUT WE'RE GOING
22 TO START WITH THE RECOMMENDATION, AND WE ARE GOING TO GO
23 DOWN THE ROW AND SEE HOW PEOPLE VOTE BECAUSE THAT'S THE
24 WAY THEY WERE BROUGHT TO THE COMMITTEE.

25 DR. FRIEDMAN MADE A SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION,

1 WHICH WE VOTED ON AND APPROVED THAT ACTUALLY ORIGINALLY
2 SAID WE WOULD SEND THE FIRST AND SECOND HIGHEST SCORE TO
3 THE ICOC. WE'RE GOING TO, IN FACT, VOTE ON ALL THREE,
4 AND WE'RE GOING TO VOTE ON THEM INCREMENTALLY, AND PEOPLE
5 CAN HOLD THEIR VOTE --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: WOULDN'T IT BE MORE
7 APPROPRIATE THE WAY THE VATICAN DOES IT FOR ELECTING A
8 POPE OR THE WAY THE MAYOR OF -- THE CITIES ELECT MAYORS?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO PROCEED. I'D
10 LIKE TO BEGIN WITH THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. WE'RE GOING TO
11 GO SAN DIEGO, SACRAMENTO, AND SAN FRANCISCO. WE'RE GOING
12 TO GO IN REVERSE ORDER. AND THE CITY OF -- THE SLIDES
13 ARE IN THE OTHER ORDER? THE SLIDES ARE IN THE OTHER
14 ORDER. CHAIR STANDS CORRECTED. WE WILL START WITH THE
15 CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

16 EACH CITY WILL DO TEN MINUTES, AND WE WILL STAY
17 VERY DISCIPLINED IN THE TEN MINUTES. THERE'S NO
18 QUESTIONS DURING THESE PRESENTATIONS OR BETWEEN
19 PRESENTATIONS.

20 IF YOU COULD IDENTIFY YOURSELF WHEN YOU ARE
21 MAKING THE PRESENTATIONS. YOU'RE NOT OBLIGATED AS A
22 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC TO IDENTIFY YOURSELF, BUT IT WOULD
23 BE HELPFUL.

24 MR. BYERS: THANK YOU. MY NAME IS BROOK BYERS.
25 I'M HERE TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF SAN FRANCISCO.

1 CIRM SHOULD BE LOCATED IN A COMMUNITY THAT HAS A
2 VIBRANT INTERDISCIPLINARY MIX OF FIVE FACTORS: WORLD
3 CLASS BASIC SCIENCE RESEARCH AT A BROAD BASE OF DIVERSE
4 INSTITUTIONS. TWO, CLINICAL RESEARCH TO TRANSLATE
5 DISCOVERIES INTO EXPERIMENTAL THERAPIES. THIRD,
6 INNOVATIVE COMPANIES THAT CAN FINISH THAT JOB OF
7 DEVELOPMENT AND MOVE THEM FROM BENCH TO BEDSIDE,
8 SCALABLE, WORKING HAND IN HAND WITH DRUG DEVICE COMPANIES
9 THAT WILL DELIVER THE CELLS TO THE POINT OF USE. FOURTH,
10 PHILANTHROPIC AND VENTURE CAPITAL IN ABUNDANCE. AND
11 FIFTH, A POSITIVE POLITICAL AND POLICY ENVIRONMENT.

12 ALL THESE THINGS WORKING TOGETHER IN A COHESIVE
13 WAY IS WHAT'S REQUIRED TO HELP CIRM BE IN A LOCATION TO
14 BRING OUT THE BEST TEAMWORK, ATTITUDE, INSPIRATION, AND
15 TALENT AS MEASURED BY NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, NUMBER OF
16 SCIENTISTS, NIH FUNDING, NUMBER OF COMPANIES, NUMBER OF
17 TRAINED EMPLOYEES AND SCIENTISTS CAPABLE OF DOING ALL
18 THIS. SAN FRANCISCO AND ITS BAY AREA IS THE BEST.

19 HOW DO I KNOW THIS? I WAS INVOLVED IN STARTING
20 THE FIRST BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANY IN THE WORLD, GENENTECH,
21 30 YEARS AGO. I WAS ALSO INVOLVED IN STARTING THE FIRST
22 BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANY IN SAN DIEGO, HYBERTECH, AND A
23 VARIETY OF OTHERS UP AND DOWN THE STATE.

24 WHAT I'VE LEARNED IS CIRM, AS ANY NEW
25 ENTERPRISE, NEEDS TO BE LOCATED IN A PLACE WHERE IT CAN

1 BE SURROUNDED BY THE INSPIRATION AND THE CREATIVITY OF
2 EVERYTHING I JUST WENT THROUGH.

3 IF YOU WANT CIRM TO BE SUCCESSFUL, THEN YOU HAVE
4 TO PUT IT IN A PLACE THAT HAS THE OVERWHELMING ABUNDANCE
5 OF WHAT I LISTED, AND THAT IS SAN FRANCISCO. THAT IS ONE
6 OF THE REASONS WHY THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR STEM
7 CELL RESEARCH HAS CHOSEN THE LOCATION OF ITS CONVENTION
8 THIS YEAR, THIS SCIENTIFIC MEETING, TO BE SAN FRANCISCO
9 JUNE 23D AND 25TH.

10 I'D NOW LIKE TO INTRODUCE PAUL BERG FROM
11 STANFORD, WHO IS A NOBEL LAUREATE RECIPIENT IN MEDICINE.

12 DR. BERG: THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO
13 ADDRESS THIS GROUP. IT'S MY VIEW, WHICH IS A VIEW WHICH
14 IS SHARED WIDELY AS I TRAVEL AROUND THE WORLD AND THE
15 REST OF THE COUNTRY, THAT THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA'S
16 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND BIOTECH INDUSTRY ARE PREEMINENT
17 ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD. AND IT'S FOR THAT REASON WHICH I
18 BELIEVE SAN FRANCISCO SHOULD BE ADOPTED AS THE SITE FOR
19 THE INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.

20 I WANT TO RECALL FOR THOSE WHO ARE NOT AWARE
21 THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMBINANT DNA OCCURRED IN THE
22 BAY AREA PRIMARILY IN THE LABORATORIES OF STANFORD AND
23 UCSF. AND FOR THAT BREAKTHROUGH, I THINK WE CAN
24 ATTRIBUTE THE GREAT BIOTECH INDUSTRY THAT THE COUNTRY
25 ENJOYS.

1 UCSF WAS ALSO ONE OF THE PLACES WHERE STEM CELL
2 BIOLOGY BEGAN. THIRTY YEARS AGO EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS
3 FROM THE MOUSE WERE PIONEERED AT UCSF, AND IT'S THE
4 AVAILABILITY OF THE LINES THAT WERE GENERATED THERE THAT
5 HAVE MADE THE ENORMOUS PROGRESS IN THAT LINE OF RESEARCH.

6 I THINK WHEN YOU BEGIN TO THINK ABOUT HOW YOU GO
7 FROM THE BASIC RESEARCH TO CLINICAL APPLICATIONS, AGAIN,
8 I THINK THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA IS PREEMINENT IN THE
9 NUMBER OF HOSPITALS, STANFORD, UCSF, THE SAN FRANCISCO
10 GENERAL HOSPITAL. ALL OF THESE FACILITIES ARE REGARDED
11 AS AMONGST THE VERY BEST IN THE WORLD. AND FOR THAT I
12 THINK SAN FRANCISCO, AGAIN, STANDS AT THE TOP OF THE
13 LIST.

14 AT STANFORD THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES HAS EXPRESSED
15 THEIR COMMITMENT TO STEM CELL BIOLOGY BY APPROVING THE
16 CREATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF CANCER AND STEM CELL BIOLOGY
17 UNDER THE LEADERSHIP ONE OF THE WORLD'S LEADERS, IRVING
18 WEISSMAN, AND I THINK IT REFLECTS THE COMMITMENT OF
19 INSTITUTIONS IN THE BAY AREA, STANFORD BEING ONE OF THEM,
20 TO MOVING THIS FIELD AHEAD.

21 AND I THINK IF WE SITE THE INSTITUTE OF
22 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE THERE, I THINK WE WILL GET THE FULL
23 EMPLOYMENT OF ALL OF THAT TALENT AND INTERACTION AND
24 COMMITMENT THAT ALREADY IS THERE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

25 MR. RUTTER: MY NAME IS BILL RUTTER. I WAS A

1 FOUNDER OF CHIRON WITH ED PENHOET, SITTING JUST IN FRONT
2 OF ME, AS WELL AS SOME OTHER COLLEAGUE, AND PRIOR TO THAT
3 I WAS AT UCSF AS A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY AND CHAIRMAN OF
4 THE DEPARTMENT IN WHICH MANY OF THESE DISCOVERIES
5 INVOLVING RECOMBINANT DNA WERE DEVELOPED.

6 I'M HERE TO SPEAK FOR SAN FRANCISCO. I WOULD
7 JUST EMPHASIZE THREE GENERAL POINTS. THE FIRST ONE IS
8 THAT THIS IS AN UNUSUAL PROGRAM, UNUSUAL PROJECT THAT
9 WE'RE FOCUSING ON, STEM CELLS. STEM CELLS HAVE BEEN
10 KNOWN AND STUDIED IN SIMPLER ANIMALS FOR DECADES.

11 IN HUMANS WE KNOW VERY LITTLE.
12 PHENOMENOLOGICALLY WE KNOW OF THINGS THAT THEY DO IN
13 ARTIFICIAL ENVIRONMENTS AND SOMETIMES IN REAL
14 ENVIRONMENTS, THAT IS IN REAL HUMANS.

15 THE REMARKABLE THING ABOUT IT, ABOUT THE FIELD
16 IS THAT AT THE SAME TIME WE NEED STUDIES,
17 MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES, TO STUDY A BIOLOGICAL
18 PHENOMENON. WE HAVE SITUATIONS IN WHICH PRECURSOR CELLS,
19 WHICH COULD BE STEM CELLS, OR AT LEAST PLURIPOTENT CELLS,
20 EXIST, FOR EXAMPLE, IN CORD BLOOD AND ARE BEING USED
21 CLINICALLY TODAY. SO WE HAVE A PROCESS IN WHICH BOTH
22 CLINICAL ACTIVITIES ARE GOING ON IN PARALLEL TO
23 FUNDAMENTAL BIOLOGY, BOTH OF WHICH NEED TO CONVERGE ON
24 THE THEME OF HOW BEST BY WHICH MANKIND CAN BE BENEFITED.

25 THERE'S NO PLACE IN THE WORLD IN WHICH THE

1 COLLABORATION BETWEEN BASIC SCIENCE AND CLINICAL SCIENCE
2 IS BETTER THAN IN THE BAY AREA. IT STARTED IN A WAY AS A
3 MEANS OF DIFFERENTIATING UCSF FROM OTHERS, AND STANFORD
4 HAS A SIMILAR CONVERGENT SET OF INTERESTS BETWEEN THE
5 FACULTY AND THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND BASIC SCIENCES.

6 LET'S BE SURE THAT IN THIS CONTEXT THAT WE PUT
7 THIS IN OUR FOCUS WHEN WE DECIDE WHERE THE CENTRAL
8 ADMINISTRATION IS. BECAUSE OF THE PROFUNDITY OF GOOD
9 SCIENCE AND MEDICAL SCIENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO, AS WELL AS
10 THE AMENITIES OF THE CITY, PEOPLE FROM ALL AROUND THE
11 WORLD WANT TO CONVERGE HERE AND WILL CONVERGE HERE BOTH
12 IN TERMS OF DEBATING AND DEVELOPING THE SCIENCE AND
13 PUBLIC ISSUES SURROUNDING THE SCIENCE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. RUTTER, LET ME BE HELPFUL
15 HERE BY SAYING THAT YOU ARE DOWN TO ABOUT THREE MINUTES;
16 AND IF THE CITY IS GOING TO DESCRIBE THESE PICTURES, THEY
17 NEED TO DECIDE ON THEIR ALLOCATION OF TIME.

18 DR. RUTTER: THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO SAY AND THANK
19 YOU.

20 (APPLAUSE.)

21 MR. BURRELL: MY NAME IS STEVE BURRELL. I'D
22 LIKE TO MAKE A COUPLE OF QUICK POINTS. FIRST, THERE'S NO
23 QUESTION THAT SAN FRANCISCO IS THE CENTERPIECE OF THE
24 WORLD'S BIOMEDICAL WORLD. AS OTHERS HAVE SAID, WE
25 STARTED THIS INDUSTRY IN THE LATE '60S AND '70S HERE.

1 MORE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY GRADUATES GRADUATED FROM BAY
2 AREA UNIVERSITIES THAN ANY OTHER PLACE IN THE COUNTRY.
3 BOSTON IS SECOND; SAN DIEGO IS SEVENTH. THE BAY AREA
4 LEADS IN TERMS IF NIH FUNDING. EIGHTEEN NATIONAL
5 RESEARCH LABS AND TEN COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH LABS ARE
6 THERE. IT LEADS IN THE WORLD'S FINANCIAL CENTER, LEGAL,
7 BANKING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN SUPPORTING THIS INDUSTRY.

8 OUR PROPOSAL IS QUANTITATIVELY AHEAD OF ANY
9 OTHER PROPOSAL THAT'S BEEN MADE TO THE CIRM. AND AS OUR
10 CLOSER, I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE OUR MAYOR GAVIN NEWSOM.

11 MAYOR NEWSOM: JUST QUICKLY AND WE'LL GET THE
12 SLIDES UP THERE. AGAIN, JUST REINFORCING THAT SAN
13 FRANCISCO BEING THE HUB OF THE LARGEST BIOMEDICAL
14 COMMUNITY IN THE WORLD, 85,000 LIFE SCIENCES EMPLOYEES,
15 OVER 800 COMPANIES LOCATED IN THE BAY AREA AND, OF
16 COURSE, THE NEXUS BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH
17 INSTITUTIONS.

18 I REALLY WANT TO REINFORCE THE INTERNATIONAL
19 STATUS OF SAN FRANCISCO. I THINK THIS IS A HUGE
20 COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE FOR THIS INSTITUTE. YOU'RE NOT
21 JUST TRYING TO MAKE A NAME IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND
22 NATIONALLY, BUT THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONNECT WITH 84
23 CONSULATES, COMPARED TO SAN DIEGO, COMPARED TO
24 SACRAMENTO, I THINK IS SIGNIFICANT. WE'RE NO. 1 RANKED
25 U.S. CITY IN THE UNITED STATES 12 YEARS RUNNING. PEOPLE

1 WANT TO COME TO SAN FRANCISCO. AND WE THINK FROM A
2 COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN TERMS OF GETTING STAFF, THAT
3 THAT'S SOMETHING THAT'S GOING TO MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE.

4 BEST TRANSPORTATION IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
5 WE CAN GO DOWN THE STATISTICS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
6 FLIGHTS THROUGH SF0, WHICH ARE 583 A WEEK VERSUS SAN
7 DIEGO'S 46. SACRAMENTO HAS ONLY INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS TO
8 MEXICO. SEVEN HUNDRED MORE WEEKLY DOMESTIC FLIGHTS THAN
9 OUR COMPETITORS; AND, OF COURSE, MORE SERVICED CITIES IN
10 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAN ALL OF THE OTHER
11 COMPETITORS.

12 IN TERMS OF THE SITE ITSELF, WE BELIEVE WE HAVE
13 THE BEST SITE IN THE CONTEXT OF A NUMBER OF FACTORS. NOT
14 ONLY DO WE HAVE MORE USABLE SQUARE FEET BEING OFFERED,
15 BIGGER SPACE, CLASS A SPACE THAT'S FLEXIBLE, CLASS A
16 SPACE THAT WILL BE BUILT OUT BY THE PREEMINENT
17 ARCHITECTURAL FIRM IN THE UNITED STATES, AND THAT MATTER
18 THE WORLD, GINSLER. WE ALSO HAVE EXTRAORDINARY TRANSIT
19 ACCESS, PARKING ACCESS, AND SHUTTLE SERVICES.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, IF YOU COULD GO TO
21 PICTURES IF YOU'RE GOING TO SHOW THEM.

22 MAYOR NEWSOM: IF I CAN INDULGE, I'LL LEAVE THAT
23 FOR Q&A IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PICTURES.
24 THOSE ARE PICTURES OF THE SITE AND PROXIMITY TO UCSF.
25 AND THE QUALITY OF THE SITE IS SOMETHING I KNOW IS GOING

1 TO COME UP, AND I LOOK FORWARD TO ANSWER THE QUESTION.
2 THIS IS THE BIGGEST THING, IF I COULD JUST MAKE THIS
3 POINT, UNPARALLELED INCENTIVES: 46,000 SQUARE FEET OF
4 LABS THAT ARE UNENCUMBERED BY FEDERAL RESTRICTIONS AT OUR
5 OWN SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL HOSPITAL. THESE ARE FORMALLY
6 THE GLADSTONE LABS; 2600 FREE HOTEL ROOMS, 14,000
7 DISCOUNTED, CLOSE TO \$1 MILLION OF INCENTIVE; SEVEN
8 CONFERENCE FACILITIES, THREE OF WHICH ARE IN THE
9 PARAMETERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

10 AND WE'RE SITTING HERE TO GUARANTEE YOU NOT ONLY
11 THE CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU STATUS AS IT RELATES
12 TO ACCESS TO THESE, BUT WE HAVE OUR MOSCONE CENTER, WHICH
13 IS AVAILABLE UP TO 49,000 PEOPLE. WE HAVE BILL GRAHAM
14 CIVIC AUDITORIUM, OUR OWN CITY HALL, AND MOST IMPORTANTLY
15 AT THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, SFO WILL GIVE UP ITS
16 CONFERENCE FACILITIES AS YOU ENGAGE IN TRYING TO GET
17 PEOPLE IN AND OUT OF THE CITY IN AN EXPEDITIOUS MANNER.

18 IN ADDITION TO THAT, YOU'LL SEE THE FIBER
19 NETWORK WE'RE OFFERING, THE E-NET, THE CNIC, WE GOT HALF
20 A MILLION DOLLARS OF FURNITURE, WHITEBOARDS, DIGITAL
21 BOARDS, INTERACTIVE PLASMAS, PRO BONO LEGAL SERVICES,
22 RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, ACCESS TO 110,000 SQUARE FEET OF
23 RECREATIONAL SPACE --

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I THINK --

25 MAYOR NEWSOM: -- AND ALL KINDS OF OTHER

1 OPPORTUNITIES, INCLUDING, MOST IMPORTANTLY, UNMATCHED
2 COMMUNITY SUPPORT. RARE DO YOU HAVE THE FAITH-BASED
3 COMMUNITY AGREEING WITH THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AGREEING
4 WITH FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE, GEORGE SCHULTZ, SENATOR
5 FEINSTEIN, THE HEAD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN THE STATE
6 OF CALIFORNIA, HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN THE UNITED
7 STATES OF AMERICA, UNPARALLELED COMMUNITY SUPPORT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD THANK YOU
9 FOR THE ELOQUENT --

10 MAYOR NEWSOM: WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR
11 CONSIDERATION, AND WE AGREE WITH THE SITE SELECTION
12 COMMITTEE.

13 (APPLAUSE.)

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF WE CAN HAVE SACRAMENTO,
15 PLEASE. AND IN THE INTEREST OF FAIRNESS, THERE WAS, I
16 BELIEVE, ABOUT 11 MINUTES, AND SO SACRAMENTO AND SAN
17 DIEGO WILL BE GIVEN 11 MINUTES.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I THINK IT'S ONE
19 PRESENTATION AT A TIME. IF I MAY SUGGEST THE BUILDING
20 IMAGES GO DOWN WHEN SACRAMENTO IS PRESENTING UNLESS
21 THEY'RE SACRAMENTO'S IMAGES.

22 MAYOR FARGO: WE DIDN'T GET A CHANCE TO PUT OURS
23 UP YET. YOU SAID THERE WAS GOING TO BE 15 MINUTES OF
24 PUBLIC COMMENT AFTER THE TEN MINUTES.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SACRAMENTO, WE'RE GOING TO TAKE

1 THEM DOWN AND PUT THEM UP WITH EACH PRESENTATION.

2 MAYOR FARGO: JUST TO CLARIFY, PARDON ME, PRIOR
3 TO THE PRESENTATION, WE WERE TOLD THERE WOULD BE TEN
4 MINUTES AND THEN 15 MINUTES OF PUBLIC COMMENT. NOW WE'RE
5 SWITCHING TO --

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: TEN MINUTES OF PRESENTATION IS
7 FIRST FOR EACH CITY.

8 MAYOR FARGO: THAT WAS NOT WHAT WE UNDERSTOOD,
9 BUT THAT'S FINE. WE ARE HERE; WE ARE READY.

10 DR. POMEROY: BOB, COULD I MAKE A SUGGESTION?
11 IT SEEMS LIKE, IN THE INTEREST OF FAIRNESS, MAYBE THE
12 BEST THING TO DO WOULD BE FOR EVERYONE TO TAKE JUST A
13 THREE-MINUTE BREAK, DEBRIEF, LET THEM GET SET UP, AND
14 THEN WE CAN PROCEED.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THEY'RE SETTING UP VERY
16 QUICKLY, AND WE'LL GIVE THEM THE TIME TO SET UP.

17 OKAY. YOUR HONOR, ARE YOU PREPARED? YES.
18 OKAY. WE ARE GOING TO PROCEED WITH SACRAMENTO'S
19 PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.

20 MAYOR FARGO: GOOD AFTERNOON. ON BEHALF OF THE
21 CITY OF SACRAMENTO, I'M MAYOR HEATHER FARGO, AND I WILL
22 BE FOLLOWED BY THE CHANCELLOR OF UC DAVIS, LARRY
23 VANDERHOEF, AND THEN BY OUR STATE SENATOR, DEBORAH ORTIZ.

24 I'M GOING TO HIGHLIGHT THE ADVANTAGES OF
25 SELECTING SACRAMENTO AS THE HEADQUARTERS LOCATION FOR THE

1 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. AFTER
2 ALL, SACRAMENTO IS WHERE THE PUBLIC COMES TO BE HEARD.

3 WE WERE PLEASED TO HOST THE SITE SELECTION
4 COMMITTEE IN OUR CITY LAST WEEK. I'D LIKE TO ALSO THANK
5 EACH OF YOU FOR YOUR EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF STEM CELL
6 RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA. OBVIOUSLY WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS
7 VERY IMPORTANT. YOU ARE GIVING HOPE TO A LOT OF PEOPLE
8 WHO AWAIT RELIEF BASED ON YOUR DISCOVERIES. CALIFORNIA
9 SPOKE VERY CLEARLY WITH THE OVERWHELMING PASSAGE OF
10 PROPOSITION 71, AND IT'S ENTRUSTED YOU WITH AN AWESOME
11 RESPONSIBILITY. SACRAMENTO WELCOMES THE OPPORTUNITY TO
12 HELP YOU FULFILL THAT RESPONSIBILITY.

13 YOU'RE EMBARKING ON A MISSION THAT IS VERY MUCH
14 LIKE STARTING A BUSINESS. AND LIKE A BUSINESS, LOCATION
15 MATTERS. AS A START-UP, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO BE IN
16 A PLACE THAT WILL NURTURE YOU, PROVIDE WITH YOU
17 OPPORTUNITIES, AND ALLOW YOU TO GROW AND FLOURISH.

18 LET ME COVER FIRST THE BUILDING, WHICH YOU CAN
19 SEE HERE TO THE SIDE. WE HAVE A PICTURE OF IT. WE ALSO
20 HAVE A PICTURE OF THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING IN THE
21 PACKET IN FRONT OF YOU. THE PROPOSED BUILDING SITE IS
22 ONE CAPITOL MALL. IT'S A BEAUTIFUL CLASS A OFFICE
23 BUILDING. IT HAS A WELCOMING LOBBY. IT IS ALSO THE
24 LOCATION OF THE UC DAVIS SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT, A GRADUATE
25 SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT. IT HAS VIEWS OF THE CAPITOL AND

1 DOWNTOWN SACRAMENTO, AND IT HAS UNDERGROUND PARKING.

2 THE LOCATION, AND THERE'S A MAP HERE IN FRONT OF
3 YOU AND ALSO IN YOUR PACKET AS WELL. IT IS IN A PREMIERE
4 LOCATION. IT IS ADJACENT TO OLD SACRAMENTO, WHICH HAS
5 DOZENS OF RESTAURANTS. IT IS ON THE SACRAMENTO RIVER
6 WATERFRONT WITH ITS MILES OF TRAILS. IT'S ACROSS THE
7 STREET FROM THE CITY'S NEWEST HOTEL, EMBASSY SUITES,
8 ACROSS TOWER BRIDGE FROM RALLY FIELD, WHICH IS OUR
9 BASEBALL STADIUM. AND LIKE A LOT OF THINGS IN
10 SACRAMENTO, A LOT LESS EXPENSIVE THAN SBC PARK IN SAN
11 FRANCISCO.

12 YOU WOULD BE SEVEN BLOCKS FROM THE STATE
13 CAPITOL, ONE MILE FROM THE SACRAMENTO CONVENTION CENTER,
14 WHICH IS PART OF OUR PROPOSAL AND IN YOUR PACKET, WHICH
15 IS ALSO ADJACENT TO THE SHERATON AND HYATT HOTELS. YOU'D
16 BE TWO BLOCKS FROM THE CROCKER ART MUSEUM, FIVE BLOCKS
17 FROM THE AMTRAK STATION WITH DIRECT ACCESS TO SAN
18 FRANCISCO, 15 MINUTES FROM THE AIRPORT, 15 MINUTES FROM
19 UC DAVIS, AND 15 MINUTES TO THE UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER
20 CAMPUS, WHICH INCLUDES THE MIND INSTITUTE, YOU'LL HEAR
21 MORE ABOUT IN A FEW MINUTES, THE CANCER CENTER, AND, OF
22 COURSE, SHRINER'S HOSPITAL, WHICH RECENTLY RELOCATED FROM
23 SAN FRANCISCO.

24 THE CITY IS KNOWN FOR ITS QUALITY OF LIFE AND
25 ITS OUTDOOR RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES, WHICH WILL ALLOW

1 YOU TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN EMPLOYEES. OUR DOWNTOWN IS
2 WALKABLE, IT'S ATTRACTIVE, AND IT'S COMFORTABLE, AND IT'S
3 ALSO GOING THROUGH A RENAISSANCE. WE HAVE QUALITY
4 HOUSING NEARBY ALONG WITH PARKS, WITH MORE COMING SOON.
5 THE COST OF LIVING IS ABOUT HALF OF THAT OF SAN
6 FRANCISCO. THE MAJORITY OF RESIDENTS AND YOUR FUTURE
7 EMPLOYEES CAN, IN FACT, AFFORD TO BUY HOMES IN OUR CITY
8 AND RENT IS ALSO AFFORDABLE.

9 WE HAVE HIGHLIGHTED THE CULTURAL AMENITIES OF
10 OUR CITY, ARTS, THEATRE, OPERA, ETC., ON THE MAP AND IN
11 YOUR PACKET. WE HAVE LESS TRAFFIC CONGESTION THAN MOST
12 LARGE CITIES IN OUR STATE, WHICH WOULD, OF COURSE, ALLOW
13 YOUR EMPLOYEES TO EITHER WORK OVERTIME OR SPEND MORE TIME
14 WITH THEIR FAMILIES, BUT CERTAINLY HAVE A HIGHER QUALITY
15 OF LIFE.

16 IN TERMS OF PUBLIC SAFETY, WE HAVE A LOW CRIME
17 RATE, SEISMIC STABILITY, FLOOD PROTECTION, AND A WORKING
18 RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STATE POLICE TO HANDLE ANY
19 POTENTIAL PUBLIC PROTESTS. AND, OF COURSE, MOST
20 IMPORTANTLY IS THE PROXIMITY TO THE LEGISLATURE, THE
21 GOVERNOR, AND THE STATE OFFICES THAT YOU WILL NEED TO
22 INTERACT WITH.

23 WE HONESTLY BELIEVE THAT SACRAMENTO IS THE BEST
24 LOCATION FOR THE INSTITUTE AND WOULD SERVE YOU AND THE
25 CITIZENS OF CALIFORNIA BEST BECAUSE SACRAMENTO IS THE

1 STATE CAPITAL WHERE POLITICAL AND PUBLIC POLICY DECISIONS
2 ARE MADE. IT'S WHERE THE PUBLIC, INCLUDING HEALTHCARE
3 ADVOCACY GROUPS, COME TO MAKE THEIR CASE AND EFFECT
4 PUBLIC POLICY. YOU HAVE TEN YEARS OF FUNDING, AND YOU
5 NEED TO SPEND IT WELL. BUT FOR THIS EFFORT TO CONTINUE,
6 WE BELIEVE YOU NEED TO BE NEAR THE LEGISLATURE AND THE
7 PUBLIC ADVOCACY GROUPS THAT WILL HELP YOU GET FUTURE
8 FUNDING BEYOND THE INITIAL TEN YEARS.

9 WE HAVE A NUMBER OF LETTERS OF SUPPORT. WE HAVE
10 ONE LETTER HERE. WE HAVE 40 DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS AND
11 INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING OUR ETHNIC CHAMBERS AND OUR
12 BIOTECH EMPLOYERS, WHICH HAVE SIGNED ON. WE HAVE A
13 WELL-ESTABLISHED RELATIONSHIP WITH UC DAVIS, WHICH YOU
14 WILL HEAR. YOU NEED TO DECIDE WHAT IS BEST, AND I THINK
15 YOU NEED TO MAKE THAT DECISION BASED ON WHERE YOU THINK
16 THE INSTITUTE WILL BE MOST SUCCESSFUL, WHERE YOUR
17 EMPLOYEES WILL BE THE MOST HAPPY AND EFFECTIVE, AND WHERE
18 THE STATE TAX DOLLARS CAN BE SPENT MOST EFFICIENTLY. WE
19 KNOW THAT'S SACRAMENTO.

20 OUR NEXT SPEAKER WILL BE CHANCELLOR LARRY
21 VANDERHOEF, FOLLOWED BY STATE SENATOR DEBORAH ORTIZ.

22 CHANCELLOR VANDERHOEF: THANK YOU, HEATHER.
23 AGAIN, MY NAME IS LARRY VANDERHOEF. I'M THE CHANCELLOR
24 AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS. AND ON BEHALF OF
25 UC DAVIS, I AM HERE TO SUPPORT THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO'S

1 PROPOSAL TO HOST THE INSTITUTE'S HEADQUARTERS.

2 UC DAVIS IS A LIFE SCIENCES POWERHOUSE BY MANY
3 DEFINITIONS AND IS, IN FACT, THE MOST SCIENCE INTENSIVE
4 OF ALL OF THE UC GENERAL CAMPUSES. IT HAS EXCEPTIONAL
5 BREADTH AND DEPTH IN THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AT BOTH OUR
6 MEDICAL CENTER IN SACRAMENTO AND ON THE DAVIS CAMPUS AS
7 WELL. AMONG OUR MANY PARTNERS ARE SUCH STATE AGENCIES AS
8 THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND NEARBY
9 BIOTECH COMPANIES, SUCH AS GENENTECH, A COMPANY THAT WHEN
10 IT CAME TIME TO EXPAND CHOSE THE SACRAMENTO AREA.

11 WE AWARD MORE BACHELOR DEGREES AND PH.D.'S IN
12 THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES THAN ANY OTHER UNIVERSITY IN THE
13 NATION, AND THIS YEAR WE ANTICIPATE REVENUE OF \$450
14 MILLION IN RESEARCH FUNDS. THAT RANKS 14TH IN THE
15 NATION. WE ARE HOME OF A SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
16 AND ALSO A CALIFORNIA NATIONAL PRIMATE RESEARCH CENTER
17 THAT IS ONE OF EIGHT CENTERS IN THE NATION, AND THE ONLY
18 ONE ON THE WEST COAST. IT'S SURELY AN ESSENTIAL RESOURCE
19 FOR THE WORK THAT WILL GATHER AROUND THE INSTITUTE.

20 OUR LIFE SCIENCES FACULTY ARE ALREADY WORKING
21 WITH ADULT STEM CELLS FROM HUMANS AND NONHUMAN PRIMATES,
22 AND WE ARE RAPIDLY EXPANDING AS ARE ALL -- MANY RESEARCH
23 UNIVERSITIES IN THE COUNTRY, BUT ESPECIALLY HERE IN
24 CALIFORNIA RAPIDLY EXPANDING OUR RESEARCH IN STEM CELLS.

25 WE'VE ACHIEVED OUR STATURE BY SUCCESSFULLY

1 RECRUITING THE WORLD'S BEST SCIENTISTS AND ACADEMIC
2 ADMINISTRATORS, EXACTLY THE SAME KIND OF PEOPLE FROM THE
3 SAME NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL POOLS FROM WHICH THE
4 INSTITUTE WILL BE RECRUITING. OUR SUCCESS IN ATTRACTING
5 AND RETAINING THESE OUTSTANDING PEOPLE IS DUE TO THE
6 QUALITY AND REPUTATION OF OUR SCIENCE, THE AFFORDABILITY,
7 AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN OUR REGION, AND THE CRITICAL
8 MASS AND QUALITY OF INTELLECTUAL, ENTREPRENEURIAL, AND
9 COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP IN OUR REGION.

10 OUR UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER IS A PRIME EXAMPLE
11 OF WHAT CAN HAPPEN WHEN A COMMUNITY AND A UNIVERSITY AND
12 THE LEGISLATURE WORK TOGETHER. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE
13 DO UNUSUALLY WELL. A GOOD EXAMPLE IS THE MIND INSTITUTE.
14 THAT WAS BUILT BECAUSE OF THE CONCERN OF A SMALL GROUP OF
15 PARENTS WHO WERE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE RESEARCH AND
16 THE NEED FOR MORE RESEARCH ON AUTISM AND AUTISTIC
17 CHILDREN.

18 THE STORY OF HOW THAT INSTITUTE CAME TO BE SHOWS
19 HOW, THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS LIKE THE ONES INVOLVED THERE,
20 WE CAN ADVANCE RESEARCH AND MEDICINE WHILE SERVING THE
21 PUBLIC INTEREST.

22 I ALSO WANT TO POINT OUT THE UNIQUE
23 OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED BY THE SITE PROPOSED FOR THE
24 INSTITUTE IN SACRAMENTO. THIS IS THE SAME BUILDING THAT
25 HOUSES OUR NATIONALLY RANKED MANAGEMENT SCHOOL. IT IS A

1 SCHOOL THAT IS CHARACTERIZED BY STRONG EMPHASIS IN THE
2 COMMERCIALIZATION OF SCIENCE, THE POTENTIAL FOR SYNERGIES
3 BETWEEN INSTITUTE STAFF AND OUR MANAGEMENT FACULTY AND
4 STUDENTS IS IMMEASURABLY ENHANCED BY THE PROXIMITY OF THE
5 TWO UNITS.

6 IT'S CLEAR TO ME HOW WISE A CHOICE FOR MANY,
7 MANY REASONS SACRAMENTO WOULD BE AS THE SITE OF THE
8 INSTITUTE. IT'S NOT BOOSTERISM FOR THE UNIVERSITY. I DO
9 LOTS OF THAT, BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT THIS IS ABOUT. AND
10 IT'S NOT BOOSTERISM FOR THE REGION THAT PROMPTS ME TO SAY
11 ANY OF THIS. IT'S AN ABSOLUTE CONFIDENCE THAT I HAVE
12 THAT NO OTHER CITY OFFERS THE INSTITUTE THE POTENTIAL,
13 THE POTENTIAL, THAT SACRAMENTO DOES. THIS IS BASED ON
14 BOTH MY LIFETIME IN ACADEME ON THE EAST COAST, BUT
15 EVENTUALLY ON THE WEST COAST, AND ON MORE THAN 20 YEARS
16 THAT I HAVE SPENT NOW IN THE CAPITAL REGION.

17 THERE'S NO DOUBT THAT EACH OF THE CITIES VYING
18 TO BE THE INSTITUTE'S HEADQUARTERS HAS MUCH TO OFFER, BUT
19 NONE, NONE, REALLY HAS SACRAMENTO'S DRAMATIC POTENTIAL
20 FOR GROWTH. THIS GROWTH IS FUELED BY UNIQUE ACADEMIC
21 ASSETS, A RUNAWAY HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT FOR INDUSTRY
22 EXPANSION, SHORTER COMMUTING TIMES, BOTH BACK AND FORTH
23 BETWEEN WORK AND ALSO TO THE AIRPORT, MORE AFFORDABLE
24 HOUSING, DAILY ACCESS TO THE STATE'S DECISION MAKERS, AND
25 VERY HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE IN WHAT TIME MAGAZINE HAS

1 DESIGNATED AMERICA'S MOST DIVERSE CITY.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU'RE AT THREE MINUTES. I
3 JUST WANT YOU TO BE ABLE TO ALLOCATE YOUR TIME.

4 CHANCELLOR VANDERHOEF: I JUST HAVE ANOTHER
5 THREE SECONDS. IT'S THE CERTAIN AND UNIQUE POTENTIAL,
6 THIS CLEAR FUTURE THAT ELEVATES SACRAMENTO AND CAN BEST
7 HELP THE INSTITUTE REALIZE ITS OWN CERTAIN AND UNIQUE
8 POTENTIAL.

9 NOW I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE STATE SENATOR DEBORAH
10 ORTIZ. THANK YOU.

11 SENATOR ORTIZ: THANK YOU TO THE MEMBERS OF THE
12 ICOC, SOME OF YOU WHO I WORKED WITH OVER THE YEARS AND
13 OTHERS THAT I'VE BEEN VERY IMPRESSED WITH THE TALENT OF
14 OTHERS ASSEMBLED HERE. AND I THANK YOU FOR THE TIME YOU
15 HAVE GIVEN THUS FAR AND THE TIME THAT YOU ARE GOING TO
16 GIVE IN THE FUTURE ON THIS IMPORTANT WORK.

17 I'M HERE TO MAKE THE CASE FOR OUR CITY, MY CITY,
18 MY HOMETOWN. LET ME SHARE WITH YOU THAT I BELIEVE OUR
19 CITY REPRESENTS THE BEST AND FINEST OF THE STATE OF
20 CALIFORNIA. IT REPRESENTS THAT VERY CONVERGENCE OF
21 MEDICINE, SCIENCE, ACADEMIA, AS WELL AS THE VOICE OF THE
22 PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA.

23 IT HAS BEEN THAT VERY LOCATION THAT I WANT TO
24 REMIND THOSE OF YOU WHO WERE A PART OF IT AND THOSE OF
25 YOU WHO MAY NOT HAVE BEEN A PART, LET ME WALK YOU THROUGH

1 WHAT SACRAMENTO SERVED IN YOUR GREAT MISSION.

2 SACRAMENTO WAS THE HOME OF THE VERY PROCESS
3 THAT -- THE PARTICIPATORY PROCESS OF THE PATIENT ADVOCACY
4 GROUPS, OF THE RESEARCHERS, OF THE SCIENTISTS, THE GREAT
5 LEADERS LIKE PAUL BERG AND IRV WEISSMAN, AS WELL AS BILL
6 RUTTER FROM CHIRON. IT'S WHERE WE SAT IN THE HALLS OF
7 THE LEGISLATURE, IN THE COMMITTEE ROOMS OF THE
8 LEGISLATURE AND WE DEBATED THIS GREAT DREAM.

9 IT IS IN THE VERY HALLS OF THE LEGISLATURE THAT
10 OUR GOVERNOR SIGNED THE FIRST LAW IN THE NATION
11 AUTHORIZING EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH, MY BILL IN
12 SEPTEMBER OF 2002 BEFORE ANY OTHER STATE EMBARKED UPON
13 THAT. IT WAS IN THE HALLS OF THE STATE CAPITOL IN WHICH
14 WE HANDLED THE VERY CONTENTIOUS DISCUSSIONS AROUND THIS
15 ISSUE, AND WE PREVAILED. WE HAVE NOT PASSED IN OUR STATE
16 LEGISLATURE ONE PENALIZING OR LIMITING PIECE OF
17 LEGISLATION IN THIS INCREDIBLE POLICY AREA.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SENATOR, IF YOU COULD CONCLUDE,
19 PLEASE.

20 SENATOR ORTIZ: WE'RE AT THREE MINUTES ALREADY.
21 LET ME ASK YOU TO CONSIDER THE NIH AND THE NSI AND THE
22 NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE ARE SITUATED IN WASHINGTON,
23 D.C. PROP 39, WHICH WAS ENACTED BY THE VOTERS OF
24 CALIFORNIA AS WELL AS PROP 10 THAT ADMINISTER HUNDREDS OF
25 MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, HAS ALSO FOUND ITS HOME IN OUR GREAT

1 CITY. LET ME ASK YOU TO CONSIDER THIS PROCESS A
2 COLLABORATIVE ONE, ONE THAT HAS PRECEDENT THAT IS
3 SUPPORTIVE, BUT IS ONE THAT THE PEOPLE DESERVE TO HAVE A
4 VOICE IN THE HOME OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND THE HALLS
5 OF THE CAPITOL. COME HOME TO WHERE THIS ALL BEGAN. COME
6 BACK TO OUR GREAT CITY.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. SENATOR ORTIZ
8 REALLY PIONEERED THIS AREA WITH THE LEGISLATURE. SAN
9 DIEGO.

10 SAN DIEGO, ARE YOU PREPARED?

11 MS. MEIER WRIGHT: WE'LL NEED THE LIGHTS DOWN A
12 LITTLE BIT.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN WE HAVE THE LIGHTS DOWN,
14 PLEASE, FOR SAN DIEGO? THIS IS MUCH BETTER THAN THE LAST
15 SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING WHERE THEY LOWERED THE LIGHTS BY
16 PULLING THE PLUG.

17 MS. MEIER WRIGHT: I'M JULIE MEIER WRIGHT. I'M
18 THE CEO OF THE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
19 CORPORATION, AND WE ARE THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO'S
20 REPRESENTATIVE ON THE SAN DIEGO PROPOSAL. AND WITH
21 BIOCUM AND CONNECT, WE'VE BUILT A VERY STRONG COALITION
22 IN SUPPORT OF THE CIRM HEADQUARTERS.

23 AND OUR COMMITMENT TO YOU IS NOT SIMPLY TO BRING
24 THE HEADQUARTERS TO SAN DIEGO, BUT TO CREATE A LONG-TERM
25 PARTNERSHIP THAT WILL ENSURE YOUR SUCCESS. WE'RE

1 DELIGHTED TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT TODAY
2 BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT SAN DIEGO IS BY FAR THE IDEAL
3 SITE FOR THE CIRM HEADQUARTERS IF ITS AIM IS TO BE THE
4 GLOBAL THOUGHT LEADER IN STEM CELL RESEARCH. AND I THINK
5 THAT WAS BORNE OUT IN THE RANKINGS IN THE SITE VISITS.

6 TODAY OUR PRESENTATION IS GOING TO BE MADE BY
7 DUANE ROTH, WHO IS NOT ONLY A SAN DIEGO BIOTECH CEO, BUT
8 HE IS THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF UCSD CONNECT AND A KEY
9 MEMBER OF THE VERY BROAD COALITION THAT PUT TOGETHER SAN
10 DIEGO'S PROPOSAL.

11 MR. ROTH: THANK YOU, JULIE. I HAVE A NUMBER OF
12 SLIDES, SO I INVITE YOU TO TURN YOUR CHAIRS BECAUSE I'M
13 GOING TO GO QUICKLY THROUGH THIS SINCE WE'RE ON THE
14 TIMER, SO TO SPEAK.

15 LET ME BEGIN BY TALKING JUST ABOUT OUR FOUR
16 PILLARS OF OUR PROPOSAL: PEOPLE, FACILITIES, THE
17 COMMUNITY, AND, OF COURSE, GREAT SCIENCE. THIS IS WHAT
18 YOU TOLD US WERE THE IMPORTANT THINGS ABOUT THE STEM CELL
19 HEADQUARTERS: THE SIZE AND PROXIMITY TO THE SCIENTIFIC,
20 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH BASE, YOU WANTED A BUILDING THAT WAS
21 FUNCTIONAL AND FREE, YOU WANTED INCENTIVES THAT WOULD
22 ENHANCE THE MISSION OF THE CIRM. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
23 WERE CONFERENCE FACILITIES, HOTELS, INTERNATIONAL
24 AIRPORT, PROXIMITY TO SACRAMENTO OR AT LEAST ACCESS TO,
25 AND COST OF LIVING.

1 LET ME BEGIN BY THE RESEARCH CLUSTER AND START
2 WITH THIS SLIDE, WHICH IS UP HERE ON TORREY MESA.
3 THERE'S A GOLF COURSE ABOUT RIGHT HERE AND TALK ABOUT 40
4 YEARS AGO ROGER ROVELLE HAD A VISION TO PUT THE
5 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO THERE AND HE DID.

6 COUPLE YEARS LATER A MAN NAMED JONAS SALK WALKED
7 ACROSS THE STREET, LOOKED OUT OVER THE OCEAN AND ASKED
8 THE CITY FATHERS TO GIVE HIM SOME LAND, AND THEY DID.
9 SINCE THAT TIME, THE REST IS HISTORY. THERE ARE NOW 18
10 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS LOCATED IN THAT
11 FOUR-AND-A-HALF-MILE RADIUS YOU'RE LOOKING AT.

12 TWENTY YEARS AGO THERE WAS ONE BIOTECHNOLOGY
13 COMPANY IN SAN DIEGO, HYBERTEC. MY FRIEND BROOK BYERS, I
14 THINK, HELPED FINANCE. TODAY THERE ARE 200 BIOTECHNOLOGY
15 COMPANIES WITHIN THE RADIUS IMMEDIATELY AROUND THOSE
16 RESEARCH CENTERS.

17 FINALLY, SOMETHING REMARKABLE. THE LARGE
18 PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES MOVED RESEARCH INSTITUTES INTO
19 THIS CLUSTER. SO JOHNSON & JOHNSON, NOVARTIS, PFIZER,
20 AND OTHERS.

21 WE CONSIDERED MULTIPLE PLACES TO PUT THE CIRM.
22 WE THOUGHT ABOUT CARLSBAD. THERE'S A BIOTECH CLUSTER,
23 BUT IT'S 20 OR 30 MILES AWAY. WE THOUGHT ABOUT SORRENTO
24 VALLEY, BIOTECH CLUSTER, BUT IT'S TOO FAR AWAY TO GET TO
25 THE HUB OF THIS. AND FINALLY, DOWNTOWN, AN URBAN AREA,

1 UP AND COMING, AGAIN TOO FAR AWAY. SO WE SAID TO THE
2 EDC, WHO WAS LOOKING FOR SITES, ANYPLACE YOU WANT AS LONG
3 AS IT'S A PITCHING WEDGE FROM THAT GOLF COURSE, AND
4 THAT'S WHERE WE SELECTED THE SITE, NORTH TORREY PINES
5 ROAD, RIGHT IN THE CENTER OF THIS CLUSTER.

6 THE BUILDING ITSELF IS A BEAUTIFUL BUILDING.
7 IT'S DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE GOLF COURSE,
8 NATURAL LIGHT, MANY PARKING SPACES, 40 COVERED. THE
9 ENTIRE REGION IS ZONED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH. THERE'S NO
10 RETAIL. THERE'S NO ANY KIND OF ANYTHING EXCEPT
11 SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE AREA RESTAURANTS AND HOTELS.
12 MODERN INFRASTRUCTURE AND A SECURE AND SAFE FACILITY. IN
13 FACT, THE CRIME RATE IN THE TORREY MESA IN 2004 WAS ZERO.

14 WALKING DISTANCE TO BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH
15 FACILITIES, HOTELS, AND ALL KINDS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC
16 INDICATIONS. THE EMPLOYEES THAT WILL WORK IN YOUR
17 INSTITUTE ALREADY WORK IN THOSE ZIP CODES THAT ARE SHOWN
18 HERE. WE HAVE ABOUT 30,000 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH
19 PROFESSIONALS IN THOSE ZIP CODES WITHIN A FOUR-MILE
20 RADIUS OF THE HEADQUARTERS.

21 YOU ALSO HAVE THE 18 INSTITUTES. AND IN THOSE
22 INSTITUTES WORK CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND AUDIT PEOPLE. YOU
23 WILL RECRUIT FROM THIS GROUP, AND THEY WILL SIMPLY CHANGE
24 PARKING LOTS TO WORK IN YOUR INSTITUTE. THEY WILL NOT
25 RELOCATE, THEY WILL NOT TAKE THEIR KIDS OUT OF SCHOOL,

1 THEY'LL CHANGE PARKING LOTS AND MIGRATE TO WORK FOR YOU.
2 AND WHEN THE INSTITUTE ENDS, IF IT DOES, WE HOPE IT
3 WON'T, THEY'LL MIGRATE BACK TO ANOTHER PARKING LOT IN THE
4 SAME REGION.

5 WE HAVE WORLD CLASS SCIENCE. WE'VE RECRUITED
6 SOME OF THE GREATEST PEOPLE, GREATEST SCIENTISTS EVER TO
7 BUILD THESE INSTITUTES, WHICH ARE VERY YOUNG INSTITUTES
8 THAT I JUST MENTIONED. I WON'T GO THROUGH ALL THE
9 STATISTICS, BUT I'LL TELL YOU THAT WE RANK, AND MY
10 NUMBERS ARE A LITTLE DIFFERENT THAN MY FRIEND STEVE'S
11 NUMBERS, BUT ACCORDING TO OUR NUMBERS, SAN DIEGO RANKS
12 NO. 1 IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND NATIONALLY IN TERMS
13 OF RESEARCH DOLLARS FROM NIH.

14 SO WHAT DID WE THINK ABOUT WHEN WE THOUGHT ABOUT
15 THIS INSTITUTE AND WHAT WAS GOING TO BE NECESSARY? AND
16 REALLY WE HAD A LOT OF RESOURCES COMING INTO THIS, BUT WE
17 FELT THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING WAS TO GET THIS
18 INSTITUTE UP AND RUNNING. IT STARTED ABRUPTLY. IT WAS A
19 BOAT, AND NOW YOU GOT TO OPERATE IT. THE NATIONAL
20 INSTITUTE OF HEALTH HAS BEEN DOING THIS FOR MANY DECADES.
21 YOU'VE GOT TO DO IT IN MONTHS.

22 SO WHAT CAN WE DO TO HELP THAT? SO WE DEVELOPED
23 THIS CONCEPT OF READINESS TEAMS WHERE WE CAN LOOK AT
24 PEOPLE AND BRING THESE EMPLOYEES, SCREEN THEM, GET THEM
25 READY SO YOU CAN MAKE THE DECISIONS. WE HAVE A PROGRAM

1 THAT INVITROGEN IS GOING TO DO TO HELP EMPLOYEES BECOME
2 ORIENTED, ADMINISTRATIVE PEOPLE, WITH WHAT STEM CELL
3 VOCABULARY IS ALL ABOUT.

4 SYSTEMS AND STANDARDS, WE HAVE GREAT FIRMS,
5 ERNST & YOUNG AND HELLER EHRMAN, AND PROBABLY THE MOST
6 IMPORTANT PART OF WHAT WE OFFER IS A COMPANY YOU PROBABLY
7 NEVER HEARD OF, SAIC. IT'S A LITTLE COMPANY, 42,000
8 EMPLOYEES, HEADQUARTERED IN THE CLUSTER IN SAN DIEGO IN
9 THAT RESEARCH MESA. THEY DO ALL THE GOVERNMENT GRANTS
10 FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH AND FREDERICK, NCI
11 FREDERICK. THEY'VE BEEN DOING THAT FOR OVER A DECADE.
12 THEY PUT THE SYSTEM IN. THEY MANAGE \$3 BILLION OF
13 CONTRACTS FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES.
14 THEY KNOW WHAT THEY'RE DOING.

15 THEY GAVE US SOMETHING THAT I THINK IS PRICELESS
16 TO WORK WITH, AND THAT IS ADVICE AND CONSULTATION ABOUT
17 HOW TO BRING UP THE CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND MANAGEMENT
18 SYSTEM IN A SECURE WAY THAT YOU CAN BECOME OPERATIONAL AS
19 QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. YOU DON'T HAVE TO HAVE PEOPLE
20 DEDICATED TO FIGURING OUT WHAT TO DO. WE'LL TELL YOU
21 WHAT TO DO AND HELP WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THAT.

22 WE HAVE BEEN LOBBYING WHEN LOBBYING WASN'T
23 POPULAR. I NOTICED DR. KESSLER HERE. I REMEMBER WHEN
24 THE CONNECT FDA REPORT WAS PRESENTED TO HIM BY PRICE
25 WATERHOUSE COOPERS AND MY PREDECESSOR, BILL OTTERSON, WHO

1 SET HIS BOTTLE OF INTERFURON ON HIS DESK AND SAID, "WE'RE
2 NOT COMMUNICATING." HE CAME BACK NEXT YEAR AND SAID
3 WE'RE NOT COMMUNICATING, AND EVENTUALLY DR. KESSLER LED
4 US TO THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG USER FEE ACT AND THE
5 MODERNIZATION OF THE FDA IN ANTICIPATION OF NEW
6 TECHNOLOGIES WHERE THE FDA WOULD BE BETTER ABLE TO
7 RESPOND TO THESE TYPES OF NEW INVENTIONS.

8 WE HELPED TO LOBBY TO DOUBLE THE NIH FUNDING.
9 PROP 71, WE'VE DONE MANY THINGS, INCLUDING GETTING ALL
10 THE BIOTECHNOLOGY ORGANIZATIONS TO ENDORSE THAT. WE
11 DEFENDED AGAINST SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION. WHEN PEOPLE
12 TRIED TO COME UP ON THE TORREY MESA IN THE EARLY '90S AND
13 TAKE OVER THE RESEARCH INSTITUTES THAT WERE DOING ANIMAL
14 RESEARCH, MY FRIEND, DANI GRADY, WHO'S HERE, AND BILL
15 OTTERSON STOOD TOE TO TOE WITH THEM AND SAID THERE'S
16 ANOTHER SIDE TO THIS STORY. WE'RE DYING OF CANCER, AND
17 WE WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT WE NEED THIS RESEARCH TO GO
18 FORWARD. WE'RE ON RECORD TAKING -- HOW MUCH TIME?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU HAVE TWO MINUTES.

20 MR. ROTH: WE'RE ON RECORD TAKING THE POSITION
21 AGAINST TWO CURRENT BILLS, THE OOCYTE DONATION BILL,
22 BIOCOM, CONNECT, AND OTHERS. AND IF THE CONFLICT OF
23 INTEREST BILL PASSES, I THINK HALF THE PEOPLE SITTING IN
24 THIS LITTLE RECTANGLE WILL HAVE TO LEAVE THIS, AND THAT
25 WOULD BE A SHAME, SO WE'VE COME OUT AGAINST THOSE TWO.

1 THESE ARE OUR ENDORSEMENTS. I WON'T GO THROUGH
2 THOSE. COLLABORATION, I WANT TO GIVE MY FRIEND BROOK
3 BYERS SOME PRESS. THERE'S SOMETHING SPECIAL ABOUT HOW
4 UCSD, SCRIPPS, AND THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY WORK TOGETHER.
5 MICHAEL PORTER, I THINK THIS IS EXTREMELY WELL
6 RECOGNIZED, THAT THE INSTITUTES COLLABORATE WITH THE
7 ORGANIZATIONS, AND WE HELP TRANSFER TECHNOLOGY. WE'VE
8 CREATED MANY, MANY, MANY COMPANIES. CONNECT ITSELF HAS
9 BEEN INVOLVED OVER THE LAST 20 YEARS IN THE CREATION OF A
10 THOUSAND COMPANIES.

11 THE MILLIKIN INSTITUTE RATED THE SAN DIEGO
12 CLUSTER LESS THAN A YEAR AGO NO. 1 IN TERMS OF ALL THE
13 PARAMETERS YOU SEE UP THERE, AHEAD OF ALL THE OTHER
14 CLUSTERS: BOSTON, SEATTLE, RALEIGH, AND SO ON DOWN THE
15 LINE.

16 HOTELS ARE EMBEDDED AND CONFERENCE FACILITIES
17 ARE EMBEDDED IN THAT CLUSTER. THEY ARE FOUR AND FIVE
18 STAR. YOU GET THEM AT STATE RATES, \$110 A NIGHT.
19 THERE'S A SAVINGS TO THE CIRM, A GREAT SAVINGS TO THEM
20 FOR THOSE HOTEL NIGHTS THAT ARE GOING TO BE STATE RATES.

21 I POINT YOUR ATTENTION HERE TO THE SIMILARITIES
22 BETWEEN THE CAMPUS AT NIH AND THE TORREY MESA. THE
23 EMPLOYEES ARE 17,000 NIH, 29,000; 27 INSTITUTES, 18
24 INSTITUTES; FIVE HOTELS. THE CONFERENCE FACILITIES, A
25 THOUSAND AT THE LARGEST AT NIH ON THE CAMPUS. WE HAVE A

1 1,000, 2, 3, 4, 500 AS WELL.

2 THERE'S SOMETHING GOING ON IN RESEARCH. WE'VE
3 ALREADY DONE TWO STEM CELL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES FOR
4 ABOUT 300 PEOPLE EACH LAST OCTOBER AND THIS MARCH. COST
5 OF LIVING DIFFERENCES, WE'RE ABOUT 10 OR 11 PERCENT LESS.
6 QUALITY OF LIFE --

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: PLEASE WRAP IT UP.

8 MR. ROTH: -- I'LL WRAP IT UP RIGHT HERE. OKAY.
9 YOU HAVE A CHOICE, AND IT'S REALLY THREE CHOICES. IF YOU
10 BELIEVE THAT THIS CENTER SHOULD BE IN AN URBAN
11 REDEVELOPMENT AREA, THEN YOU SHOULD PUT IT IN SAN
12 FRANCISCO. IF YOU BELIEVE IT SHOULD BE CLOSE TO
13 GOVERNMENT, THEN YOU SHOULD PUT IT IN SACRAMENTO. AND IF
14 YOU BELIEVE IT OUGHT TO BE IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESEARCH
15 CLUSTER, THEN YOU SHOULD PUT IT IN LA JOLLA. THANK YOU.

16 (APPLAUSE.)

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AS I SAID, IT'S CLEAR THE
18 PATIENTS ARE GOING TO WIN BECAUSE THESE ARE THREE
19 EXTRAORDINARY PROPOSALS.

20 I HAVE ASKED IF WE CAN DO SOME PUBLIC COMMENT SO
21 THAT WITH THE TIME REMAINING, WE'RE GOING TO LOSE OUR
22 VOTERS HERE IN ABOUT 30 MINUTES, I BELIEVE. IS THAT
23 CORRECT? WHO ARE WE LOSING AT 3:30? DR. PIZZO IS
24 LEAVING AT 3:30.

25 WHAT WE NEED TO DO HERE IS LET ME ASK THIS. HOW

1 MANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC -- WE'RE GOING TO HAVE SOME
2 COMMENT ORGANIZED IN SEQUENCE RELATED TO THE THREE
3 PROPOSALS, BUT I NEED TO KNOW HOW MANY MEMBERS OF THE
4 PUBLIC DO WE HAVE THAT WANT TO MAKE COMMENTS OUTSIDE OF
5 THE COMMENTS RELATED TO EACH SPONSOR. HANDS? ANY
6 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? THE PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT ARE NOT
7 RELATED TO THESE, NOT RELATED TO ANY ONE OF THE THREE
8 APPLICATIONS; IS THAT IS RIGHT? BUT NOT RELATED TO THOSE
9 GROUPS; IS THAT RIGHT?

10 THERE'S TWO DIFFERENT QUESTIONS I'LL ASK. WE'RE
11 GOING TO HAVE LATER PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT THESE ARE PUBLIC
12 COMMENTS NOT RELATED TO ONE OF THE DELEGATIONS; IS THAT
13 CORRECT?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: NO, SIR.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WANT TO KNOW PUBLIC COMMENT
16 NOT RELATED TO THE DELEGATIONS. ANYONE? ONE IN THE
17 BACK. EMERYVILLE, I'M GOING TO GIVE EMERYVILLE SEPARATE
18 TIME AFTER WE GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS. OKAY.

19 WHAT WE'D LIKE TO DO HERE IS WE'RE GOING TO HAVE
20 TO GO TO A ONE-MINUTE RULE FOR EACH COMMENT, MUCH LIKE
21 THE REGENTS OFTEN HAVE TO GO TO. WE'VE BEEN THROUGH
22 WEEKS AND MONTHS, AND WE WELCOME PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT
23 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE IT SHORT AND VERY
24 DISCIPLINED.

25 I'M GOING TO START FIRST WITH THE PUBLIC

1 COMMENTS RELATED TO SAN DIEGO, AND THEN I'M GOING TO GO
2 THROUGH THE CITIES, AND THEN GET GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS.
3 SAN DIEGO FIRST.

4 MR. ROYSTON: ONE MINUTE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ONE MINUTE. WE'RE GOING TO
6 HAVE NARROW THIS DOWN TO SEVEN OR EIGHT MINUTES.

7 MR. ROYSTON: SO I'M UNDER ONE MINUTE. I JUST
8 WANT TO LEAVE THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS -- BY THE WAY, I'M
9 IVAN ROYSTON. I'M THE FAMILY MANAGING PARTNER OF FORWARD
10 VENTURES, ONE OF THE MAJOR LIFE SCIENCE VENTURE FIRMS IN
11 THE SAN DIEGO REGION. BEFORE THAT, I WAS A MEMBER OF THE
12 FACULTY AT UCSD, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SYDNEY KIMMEL
13 CANCER CENTER, ONE OF THE MANY NONPROFIT INSTITUTES THAT
14 YOU HEARD ABOUT ON THE MESA.

15 SO I WANT TO LEAVE THIS COMMITTEE WITH THE
16 FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. WHY DID PFIZER CHOOSE TO BUILD AN
17 800,000 SQUARE FOOT FACILITY ON THE TORREY PINES MESA OF
18 LA JOLLA AND ESTABLISH THIS AS ONE OF ITS TOP THREE
19 GLOBAL R & D CENTERS? WHY DID NOVARTIS AND J & J BUILD
20 THEIR RESEARCH INSTITUTES ON THE TORREY PINES MESA OF LA
21 JOLLA WHEN THEY COULD HAVE BUILT THEM ANYWHERE ELSE IN
22 THE COUNTRY?

23 THESE COMPANIES WANT TO BE PART OF THE MOST
24 IMPORTANT, THE MOST VIBRANT, AND THE LARGEST BIOLOGICAL
25 RESEARCH AREA IN THE WORLD. AND THAT IS WHY -- I'M

1 FINISHING -- CIRM SHOULD PUT ITS HEADQUARTERS IN THAT
2 CLUSTER. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NEXT.

4 MR. PANETTA: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I WANT
5 TO TELL THE MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE THAT WHEN YOU COME
6 TO, SAN DIEGO, YOU WILL COME TO A COMMUNITY THAT WILL
7 WELCOME YOU WITH OPEN ARMS. IN 2001, WE WELCOMED THE
8 WORLD FOR A BIOTECHNOLOGY MEETING, AND IN 2008, ONCE
9 AGAIN, WE WILL WELCOME THE WORLD TO SAN DIEGO.

10 WE WORK TOGETHER IN A COMMUNITY IN SAN DIEGO
11 WHERE EXECUTIVES IN BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY RESEARCHERS,
12 PEOPLE FROM THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY BREAK BREAD TOGETHER
13 ON A MONTHLY BASIS AND KNOW EACH OTHER BY NAME. I HOPE
14 YOU WILL COME TO SAN DIEGO BECAUSE THAT'S THE KIND OF
15 COMMUNITY THAT WE HAVE TO OFFER. WE WORK CLOSELY WITH
16 OUR PATIENT ADVOCATES; WE GO TO SACRAMENTO WITH THEM
17 REGULARLY. AND WE APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO GET
18 BEFORE YOU TODAY TO TELL YOU ABOUT OUR COMMUNITY. THANK
19 YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

21 MR. HUNT: I AM LARRY HUNT. I'M THE PRESIDENT
22 OF THE PARKINSON'S DISEASE ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO. I
23 REPRESENT PARKINSON'S PATIENTS AND FAMILIES.

24 WE STRONGLY SUPPORT STEM CELL RESEARCH. WE
25 BELIEVE THERE'S STRONG POTENTIAL FOR CURE DOWN THE LINE.

1 MR. PRESIDENT, YOU'VE SAID THAT PATIENTS WIN TODAY. I
2 ASK THAT YOU CONSIDER HOW YOU CAN MAKE PATIENTS WIN
3 FASTER, HOW YOU CAN SPEED UP THAT PROCESS TO THE CURE.

4 I THINK THAT SAN DIEGO OFFERS SEVERAL THINGS
5 THAT WILL SPEED THIS UP. IS MY MINUTE UP?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

7 MS. GRADY: MY NAME IS DANI GRADY. I'M A
8 17-YEAR SURVIVOR OF ADVANCED BREAST CANCER, RECURRENT
9 BREAST CANCER, AND I'M HERE TODAY TO BE THE VOICE FOR
10 PEOPLE WHO CANNOT BE HERE FOR ALL DIFFERENT TYPES OF
11 DISEASE AND TO KEEP IT FOCUSED ON THE PATIENTS.

12 I DID COME UP WITH THE SAN DIEGO COALITION
13 BECAUSE IN SAN DIEGO I WANTED YOU TO KNOW THAT WE WORK
14 TOGETHER. THERE'S COLLABORATION. I KNOW EVERYONE ON
15 THIS COMMITTEE WHO'S FROM SAN DIEGO. I'M NOT A RICH
16 WOMAN. I'M JUST SOMEONE WHO SPEAKS UP, AND THEY HAVE LET
17 ME IN THEIR OFFICES.

18 THE MOST IMPORTANT THING SAN DIEGO, PATIENTS ARE
19 INVOLVED WITH THE RESEARCHERS, WITH CLINICIANS. WE HAVE
20 SUPPORT FROM THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY. WE CAN MAKE A PHONE
21 CALL AND GET IN. THAT RESULTED IN SOMETHING THAT WE WANT
22 TO SHARE WITH YOU, THE CANCER NAVIGATOR PROGRAM, WHICH IS
23 GOING TO BE VERY IMPORTANT. IN SAN DIEGO EVERYONE
24 DIAGNOSED KNOWS WHERE TO GO AND HOW TO GET THROUGH IT.
25 WHAT'S IMPORTANT IS THE STEM CELL COMMITTEE, PLEASE MAKE

1 SURE THAT YOU INCLUDE INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC. AND IN
2 SAN DIEGO, WHEN THE DEBATE HAPPENS ABOUT WHAT YOU'RE
3 DOING, WE WILL BE THERE FOR YOU. AND WE WILL BE THERE AS
4 PATIENT ADVOCATES AND EDUCATE THE PUBLIC TO MAKE SURE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BEAUTIFUL COMMUNICATION TOOLS.
6 I THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

7 MR. BURNHAM: MY NAME IS MALIN BURNHAM. I'M A
8 NATIVE OF SAN DIEGO. I'M GOING TO TALK FAST BECAUSE I
9 DON'T HAVE MUCH TIME.

10 I'M SIMPLY A REAL ESTATE GUY. I'VE ALSO BEEN
11 INVOLVED WITH THE BURNHAM INSTITUTE FOR OVER 20 YEARS AS
12 ITS CHIEF CHEERLEADER. SOME PEOPLE TODAY HAVE BEEN
13 TALKING ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IN THE FUTURE. AT THE
14 BURNHAM INSTITUTE, BEFORE LAST NOVEMBER'S ELECTION, WE
15 HAD OVER A HUNDRED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT PEOPLE WORKING IN
16 STEM CELL RESEARCH. WE'RE DOING IT NOW.

17 ONE THING THAT WE NEED TO CONCENTRATE ON IS
18 WHAT'S BEST FOR YOUR STAFF. IN 40 YEARS OF COMMERCIAL
19 REAL ESTATE WORK, MY COLLEAGUES AND I HAVE PUT TENANTS
20 INTO MILLIONS AND MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF SQUARE FEET,
21 AND NEVER HAVE USED A SCORECARD TO DO IT. I BELIEVE
22 THAT'S BOGUS, AND YOU SHOULDN'T DO IT. WE ARE -- WE ARE
23 SUGGESTING YOU PUT YOUR STAFF IN THE EPICENTER OF THE
24 STRONGEST, DEEPEST, CLOSEST KNIT CLUSTER OF BIOMEDICAL
25 RESEARCH FACILITIES AND PEOPLE IN THE ENTIRE WORLD, NOT

1 JUST SAN DIEGO. I REST MY CASE.

2 (APPLAUSE.)

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE'RE NOW
4 GOING TO GO TO SACRAMENTO. THANK THE SPEAKERS SO MUCH
5 FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

6 MS. THOMAS: GOOD AFTERNOON. TINA THOMAS FROM
7 THE LAW FIRM OF REMY, THOMAS, MOOSE & MALEY IN
8 SACRAMENTO, 455 CAPITOL MALL, A STONE'S THROW FROM WHERE
9 WE HOPE YOU'RE GOING TO BE.

10 I'M HERE TODAY REPRESENTING THE TSAKOPOULOS
11 FAMILY, AND WE'RE PLEASED AND DELIGHTED TO GIVE YOU AND
12 TO OFFER TO YOU 17,000 SQUARE FEET OF CLASS A OFFICE
13 SPACE. IT'S BEEN DESCRIBED TO YOU. IT'S SAFE, SECURE,
14 WITH 24 HOURS OF SECURITY. WE HAVE PARKING AND WE'VE
15 OFFERED SPACE PLANNING FOR A TOTAL OF \$5.5 MILLION. AS
16 THE MAYOR SAID, WE'RE LOCATED CLOSE TO THE CAPITOL, THE
17 AMTRAK, LIGHT RAIL, I-5, 99, 80, AND THE AIRPORT.

18 BUT BEYOND THE PHYSICAL PROPERTIES, THE
19 TSAKOPOULOS FAMILY WOULD LIKE TO ALSO URGE YOU TO LOCATE
20 AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT. YOU'RE A STATE AGENCY. WE
21 WANT YOU THERE. PROP 71 LISTS -- SETS FORTH A NUMBER OF
22 OBLIGATIONS AND DUTIES THAT YOU AS THE COMMITTEE HAVE TO
23 CONFORM WITH. COMBINE THAT WITH THE ROBUST PHYSICAL
24 FACILITIES OF UC. WE WANT YOU TO JOIN THE FIRST FIVE
25 COMMITTEE AND THE PROP 63 COMMITTEE IN SACRAMENTO. IT'S

1 A WINNING COMBINATION. THANK YOU.

2 MR. GARDNER: THANK YOU. MY NAME IS CHUCK
3 GARDNER. I'M ACTUALLY ONE OF THE FOUNDERS OF THE UC
4 DAVIS MIND INSTITUTE. I THINK THE MIND INSTITUTE HAS
5 PROBABLY RUN A LOT OF PARALLEL COURSES TO WHAT YOU GUYS
6 ARE DOING RIGHT NOW. I THINK WE ARE PROBABLY LARGELY
7 REGARDED AS THE MOST SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC-PRIVATE
8 PARTNERSHIP IN THE HISTORY OF THE STATE.

9 IF YOU READ YOUR NEWSPAPER THIS MORNING, YOU
10 WILL PROBABLY SEE THAT WE MADE ONE OF THE BIGGEST
11 DISCOVERIES IN AUTISM IN OVER 60 YEARS OF ITS HISTORY.

12 BUT I WANTED TO SAY THAT THE REASON THAT WE WERE
13 SUCCESSFUL AT THE MIND INSTITUTE IS WE HAD ACCESS, AND
14 IT'S ONE OF THE THINGS THAT, OF ALL THE GREAT PROPOSALS
15 WE'VE HEARD TODAY, I HAVEN'T HEARD ANY OTHER CITY THAT
16 HAS WHAT SACRAMENTO HAS. THAT'S ACCESS TO THE PUBLIC
17 PROCESS. AND WITHOUT THAT ACCESS, WE WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN
18 AS SUCCESSFUL AS WE WERE AS QUICKLY AS WE WERE. BEING
19 ABLE TO SEE YOUR STATE LEGISLATOR IN A MATTER OF MINUTES,
20 NOT A MATTER OF HOURS IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT.

21 I KNOW THERE MAY BE SOME CONCERNS THAT ACCESS
22 MAY ACTUALLY RESULT IN MEDDLING. IN OUR CASE I WAS
23 SURPRISED, BUT IT DIDN'T RESULT IN MEDDLING ACTUALLY
24 BECAUSE THE LEGISLATORS HAD MINUTES ACCESS TO US AND US
25 TO THEM. THEY ACTUALLY LEFT US ALONE BECAUSE THEY KNEW

1 IF WE WERE DOING ANYTHING UNFORETOLD, THAT THEY COULD
2 COME SEE US. SO THANK YOU.

3 MS. FREISNER: GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS
4 JOANNA FREISNER, AND I'M A POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHER AT UC
5 DAVIS. I'VE LIVED IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA MY WHOLE LIFE,
6 AND I WENT TO UC BERKELEY AS AN UNDERGRADUATE BEFORE
7 MOVING ON TO UC DAVIS TO ENTER THE GENETICS PROGRAM.
8 WHILE I ENJOYED MY TIME AT UC BERKELEY, I NOTICED AN
9 IMMENSE DIFFERENCE AS SOON AS I WENT TO UC DAVIS.

10 THE ATMOSPHERE WAS DIFFERENT. THE CAMPUS WAS
11 FRIENDLY. IT WAS OPEN, AND IT FELT LIKE A COMMUNITY
12 EXISTED, A COMMUNITY MADE UP OF FACULTY, STAFF, AND
13 STUDENTS, BOTH GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE. THERE WAS A
14 PALPABLE FEELING OF COLLEGIALITY AND RESPECT THAT WASN'T
15 LIMITED TO SIMPLY INTERACTIONS BETWEEN THE FACULTY OR
16 EVEN BETWEEN FACULTY AND GRADUATE STUDENTS.

17 THIS FEELING OF COMMUNITY EXTENDS TO BEYOND THE
18 CAMPUS ITSELF AND INCLUDES THE ENTIRE CITY OF DAVIS,
19 WHICH IS A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE, WORK, RAISE A FAMILY, AND
20 A GREAT PLACE TO PLAY. I LOVE TO GO OUTSIDE AND RIDE MY
21 BIKE AROUND SACRAMENTO AND DAVIS AREAS.

22 THIS LAST DECEMBER I COMPLETED MY PH.D. IN
23 GENETICS WHERE I STUDIED DNA REPAIR IN PLANTS OF ALL
24 THINGS BECAUSE THE GENES IN REPAIR PATHWAYS ARE THE SAME.
25 THE PLANTS ARE A GREAT MODEL SYSTEM FOR DNA REPAIR. I

1 URGE YOU TO STRONGLY CONSIDER THE NETWORK OF RESOURCES
2 AVAILABLE AND THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION AT UC
3 DAVIS WHEN DECIDING THE LOCATION. WE WELCOME YOU TO THE
4 REGION AND HOPE YOU WILL JOIN OUR COMMUNITY.

5 MR. COELHO: MY NAME IS PHIL COELHO. I'M THE
6 CHAIRMAN OF THERMOGENESIS CORPORATION IN RANCHO CORDOVA,
7 AND I LIVE IN SACRAMENTO.

8 THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION 71 AND THE CREATION
9 OF THE ICO WAS A REMARKABLY DEFT AND DARING POLITICAL
10 ACT. NOW IT FALLS TO THE ICOC TO DELIVER THE GOODS.
11 THAT'S NOT GOING TO BE EASY. THERE ARE FORMIDABLE
12 TECHNICAL PROBLEMS TO BE OVERCOME. AND THE CIRM MAINLY
13 NEEDS TO BEFRIEND AND EDUCATE THE ELECTED OFFICIALS,
14 STATE AND HEALTH AUTHORITIES, AND PUBLIC TO FULLY
15 UNDERSTAND AND EMBRACE PROPOSITION 71'S LONG-TERM MISSION
16 AND TO WORK WITH THE STATE TO GET ADDITIONAL FUNDING IN
17 THE FUTURE.

18 IT IS LIKELY THAT THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA AND
19 SAN DIEGO WILL RECEIVE THE GREATEST SHARE OF PROPOSITION
20 71'S \$3 BILLION IN GRANT MONEY. THE VERY SUBSTANTIAL
21 SIZE OF THEIR BIOTECH INFRASTRUCTURE MAKES THAT A
22 REASONABLE OUTCOME, BUT THESE AWARDS SHOULD BE ANNOUNCED
23 BY CIRM LOCATED ELSEWHERE.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

25 MR. COELHO: SPECIFICALLY IN SACRAMENTO. IT IS,

1 IN FACT, THE BULLY PULPIT OF THE STATE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

3 MR. PEREZ: JOSE PEREZ, PUBLISHER OF LATINO
4 JOURNAL. AND YOU'VE HEARD A LOT ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT
5 PERSPECTIVE, AND I ECHO THAT, BUT THE MESSAGE I WANT TO
6 GIVE YOU IS THAT THE LATINO COMMUNITY IN CALIFORNIA IS
7 HUGE. IT'S LIKE 11 MILLION PEOPLE, 33 PLUS PERCENT.

8 IF WE TAKE A LOOK AT THE GOVERNING BODY RIGHT
9 HERE, THE QUESTION IS DOES IT LOOK LIKE THAT. THE OTHER
10 QUESTION IS WHERE IS THE POPULATION LOCATED? MOSTLY IN
11 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, RURAL, CENTER VALLEY, SAN JOSE. AND
12 INTERESTINGLY, WHERE THERE'S GREATEST ISOLATION FOR
13 LATINOS IS ACTUALLY IN THE BAY AREA. IT'S IN SAN
14 FRANCISCO. IF YOU LOOK AT THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC
15 UTILITIES COMMISSION, LOOK AT THEIR WORKFORCE, LOOK AT
16 THEIR GOVERNANCE, IT DOESN'T LOOK LIKE CALIFORNIA. DON'T
17 MAKE THE SAME MISTAKE. PUT IN IT SACRAMENTO, THE MOST
18 DIVERSE COMMUNITY IN CALIFORNIA.

19 MS. FERN: HI, MY NAME IS JUDY FERN. I MOVED TO
20 SACRAMENTO FROM SAN FRANCISCO ABOUT THREE YEARS AGO, AND
21 I WANTED TO OPEN WITH A QUOTE. "IN SUMMARY, THE
22 INSTITUTE MUST WORK CLOSELY WITH THE STATE LEGISLATURE
23 AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF STATE GOVERNMENT IF IT'S TO BE
24 SUCCESSFUL AND TO ACHIEVE THE HIGHEST STANDARDS OF
25 INTEGRITY AND EXCELLENCE TO WHICH WE ASPIRE. MOST OF

1 ALL, WE LOOK FORWARD TO COLLABORATING WITH YOU TO ADVANCE
2 STEM CELL RESEARCH. TOGETHER WE CAN MAKE MEDICAL HISTORY
3 IN CALIFORNIA." TESTIMONY OF ZACH HALL, PROP 71
4 OVERSIGHT HEARING, MARCH 9, 2005, THE CAPITOL.

5 AT THIS HEARING THIS QUOTE, COMBINED WITH THE
6 SENATOR'S STATEMENTS CHANGED MY LIFE. I'M NOW GOING FROM
7 A VOLUNTEER OF JDRF TO ACTUALLY LEAVING THE FOOD BUSINESS
8 WHERE I'VE BEEN EMPLOYED FOR 12 YEARS TO BE THE EXECUTIVE
9 DIRECTOR OF OUR CHAPTER. IT IS THE COMBINED EFFORTS OF
10 THESE TWO INDIVIDUALS THAT HELPED ME MAKE THAT DECISION.
11 AND I THINK THAT YOU CAN OFFER THAT SAME OPPORTUNITY IN
12 THE CAPITAL FOR THE REST OF CALIFORNIA. THANK YOU.

13 MR. BUTLER: GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIRMAN KLEIN,
14 MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION. MY NAME IS DAVE BUTLER. I'M
15 SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT WITH SACRAMENTO METRO CHAMBER OF
16 COMMERCE. WE'VE HEARD A LOT ABOUT THE PUBLIC SECTOR IN
17 SACRAMENTO. WE'D LIKE TO TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE
18 PRIVATE SECTOR IN OUR REGION.

19 OUR LEADERSHIP INCLUDES MOST OF THE STATE'S
20 LARGEST EMPLOYERS, INCLUDING INTEL, HP, SBC, BANK OF
21 AMERICA, WELLS FARGO, PG&E. THE METRO CHAMBER AND OUR
22 AFFILIATE, THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA WORLD TRADE CENTER,
23 ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR GROWING AND EXPANDING BUSINESSES BOTH
24 DOMESTICALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY FROM AGRI BUSINESS TO
25 BIOSCIENCE.

1 AS YOU'VE HEARD, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
2 DAVIS COMBINED WITH UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER, SUTTER,
3 KAISER, CATHOLIC HEALTHCARE WEST, COMPRISE AN
4 INCREASINGLY EXPANDING NODE OF BIOSCIENCE WITHIN OUR
5 REGION.

6 ONE LAST THING BECAUSE I'M PAID TO DO THIS. THE
7 BUSINESS COMMUNITIES OFFERED A HOST OF INCENTIVES TO YOUR
8 ORGANIZATION TO LOCATE IN SACRAMENTO. WE'D BE HAPPY TO
9 SHARE THOSE WITH YOU.

10 MR. JACOBS: THANK YOU. MY NAME IS MATT JACOBS.
11 I'M A LAWYER FROM SACRAMENTO. AND I WANT TO TALK VERY
12 BRIEFLY ABOUT SOMETHING THAT NOBODY HAS MENTIONED SO FAR,
13 AND THAT IS THAT THERE'S SOMETHING OF A PRESUMPTION
14 ACTUALLY IN CALIFORNIA LAW THAT ALL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
15 SHOULD BE IN SACRAMENTO. FOR EXAMPLE, GOVERNMENT CODE
16 SECTION 450, ENTITLED "LOCATION" STATES THAT, QUOTE, THE
17 PERMANENT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE IS AT THE CITY
18 OF SACRAMENTO. THERE'S GOOD REASONS FOR THAT.

19 THERE ARE EFFICIENCIES FROM CENTRALIZED
20 GOVERNMENT. THAT'S, IN FACT, WHY WE HAVE CAPITALS IN THE
21 FIRST PLACE. ANY AGENCY THAT IS NOT HEADQUARTERED IN
22 SACRAMENTO HAS A SPECIFIC STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL
23 AUTHORIZATION FOR NOT BEING IN SACRAMENTO.

24 SO THAT PRESUMPTION IS THAT ALL AGENCIES ARE IN
25 SACRAMENTO. THAT PRESUMPTION IS STRENGTHENED BY

1 PROPOSITION 71 HERE, WHICH REQUIRES CLOSE COORDINATION.
2 JUST ONE FINAL THING, THE CAPITAL IS THE CAPITAL FOR A
3 REASON. IT'S THE LOCUS OF ALL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES. IT
4 SHOULD BE THE LOCUS OF THIS ONE. THANK YOU.

5 ASSEMBLYMEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS,
6 ASSEMBLYMEMBER DAVE JONES. I HAVE THE PLEASURE OF
7 CHAIRING THE ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE. TWO SIMPLE
8 POINTS.

9 FIRST, FUNDAMENTALLY YOU'RE LOCATING AN
10 ADMINISTRATIVE HEADQUARTERS. WE CAN THINK OF NO BETTER
11 PLACE TO LOCATE THAT HEADQUARTERS THAN SACRAMENTO. I
12 THINK IF YOU LOOK AT THE DEAL POINTS AND COMPARE THEM,
13 THIS IS THE BETTER DEAL.

14 SECOND POINT. WHY DO ALL OTHER QUASI-PUBLIC OR
15 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION HEADQUARTERS LOCATE IN SACRAMENTO?
16 IT'S ACCESS TO THE DECISION MAKERS. YOU WILL HAVE THE
17 CHANCE TO DRIVE HEALTH POLICY INTO THE NEXT DECADES, INTO
18 THE NEXT CENTURY. THE PLACE TO DO THAT IS IN SACRAMENTO.
19 DECISIONS GET MADE IN A VERY SHORT TIME. IT'S ACCESS.
20 IT HELPS YOU MAKE THOSE DECISIONS, INFLUENCE THOSE
21 DECISIONS. YOU CAN DO THAT IN SACRAMENTO. WE URGE YOU
22 TO PICK SACRAMENTO. THANK YOU.

23 (APPLAUSE.)

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HE'S THE MOST PRECISE
25 ONE-MINUTE SPEAKER WE'VE HAD ALL DAY.

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CAN WE HAVE THE SAN FRANCISCO
2 SPEAKERS, PLEASE.

3 MR. VAN GORDER: DANA VAN GORDER, STATE POLICY
4 DIRECTOR FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION. IT'S AN
5 HONOR TO BE HERE GIVEN OUR AFFINITY FOR THE GENESIS OF
6 YOUR WORK FOR WE TOO DEAL WITH THE HOSTILITY TO SCIENCE
7 THAT IS PREVALENT IN OUR COUNTRY TODAY.

8 GIVEN THE STRONG HISTORY OF HIV RESEARCH AND
9 PIONEERS LIKE J. LEVEY AND PAUL VOLBERDING AND UCSF AND
10 GLADSTONE, IT IS ENTIRELY FITTING THAT THE INSTITUTE IS
11 LOCATED IN SAN FRANCISCO.

12 AS AN ORGANIZATION, A FOUNDATION, AND AS A
13 LEADER OF THE HIV COMMUNITY, WE BELIEVE WE CAN PROVIDE
14 THE INSTITUTE WITH CERTAIN THINGS IN SAN FRANCISCO AND
15 CERTAIN EXPERTISE. WE CAN CERTAINLY HELP TO GUIDE THE
16 DIRECTION OF RESEARCH WITH REGARDS TO HIV AND AIDS, AS
17 WELL AS CLINICAL TRIALS. WE CAN CONSULT ON ETHICAL AND
18 BIOETHICAL ISSUES RELATED TO YOUR WORK, AND WE CAN BUILD
19 COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR THE MISSION OF YOUR ORGANIZATION
20 AMONG ADVOCACY GROUPS BEYOND THE HIV AND AIDS COMMUNITY.

21 WE STAND WITH OUR MAYOR, IN WHOM WE HAVE GREAT
22 RESPECT AND LOYALTY, AND ASK THAT YOU TO APPROVE THE BID.
23 THANK YOU.

24 MR. REED: UNFORTUNATELY, WE MUST STILL DEFEND
25 STEM CELL RESEARCH. THE BEST WAY TO DO THIS IS TO HAVE A

1 SHOWPLACE. WHAT BETTER PLACE THAN THE NO. 1 DESTINATION
2 IN AMERICA, WHICH IS SAN FRANCISCO.

3 MY SON, ROMAN REED, IS PARALYZED. ONE DAY I
4 HOPE HE WILL WALK AGAIN. SAN FRANCISCO IS A PART OF THAT
5 DREAM. THANK YOU.

6 MR. SCHUPPENHAUER: MIKE SCHUPPENHAUER. I
7 GRADUATED WITH A PH.D. FROM THE *SWISS FARRELL INSTITUTE
8 OF TECHNOLOGY IN THE FIELD OF IN VITRO FERTILIZATION. I
9 CAME TO THE U.S. IN THE YEAR 2000 AS AN IMMIGRANT TO THE
10 LOCATION WHERE I BELIEVE THE NEW TECHNOLOGY REVOLUTION
11 WILL START, NO MATTER WHAT THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IS.

12 I'VE BEEN WORKING WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE
13 AFTER I HAD A SUCCESSFUL CAREER IN EUROPE WORKING WITH
14 THE GERMAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ON VARIOUS BIOTECH
15 INITIATIVES. I'VE BEEN WORKING WITH THE CITY OF SAN
16 JOSE. I THINK WE SUBMITTED AN OUTSTANDING PROPOSAL THAT
17 WOULD HAVE ACHIEVED YOUR GOALS; HOWEVER, LOCATING THE
18 INSTITUTE IN THE BAY AREA IS, AFTER ALL, NOW THE BEST
19 SOLUTION FOR THE PEOPLE IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. SAN
20 FRANCISCO IS THE BEST CHOICE TO ENSURE THAT THE GOALS OF
21 THE STATE'S VOTERS AND PROP 71 ARE MET. AND THAT IS WHY
22 SAN JOSE'S MAYOR RON GONZALES HAS PUT HIS VOTE AND
23 ENDORSEMENT AND THE ECONOMIC POWER OF THE CITY OF SAN
24 JOSE BEHIND THE PROPOSAL OF THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
25 THANK YOU.

1 MR. AMON: MY NAME IS NATHAN AMON. I'M THE
2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF A BUSINESS TRADE ASSOCIATION MADE
3 UP OF THE CEO'S OF THE LARGEST PRIVATE EMPLOYERS IN SAN
4 FRANCISCO.

5 THE DECISION YOU ARE ABOUT TO MAKE TODAY IS NOT
6 ABOUT THE PAST. IT'S ABOUT THE FUTURE. IF THE CIRM IS
7 SUPPOSED TO BE SUCCESSFUL, IT WILL BE BECAUSE OF THE
8 GLOBAL IMPACT THAT IT HAS AND THE GLOBAL ATTENTION THAT
9 IT WILL ATTRACT. SAN FRANCISCO IS THAT INTERNATIONAL
10 CITY, IT IS THAT GLOBAL CITY.

11 WE HAVE A NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS.
12 SACRAMENTO HAS FIVE INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS A DAY, SAN
13 DIEGO 46, 540 IN SAN FRANCISCO. WE HAVE 84 CONSULATES,
14 NOT FIVE LIKE SACRAMENTO OR 26 IN SAN DIEGO.

15 PLEASE ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF YOUR
16 COLLEAGUES, THE ONES THAT DID THE HARD WORK, THAT
17 UNDERSTAND THAT SAN FRANCISCO, AN INTERNATIONAL AND
18 GLOBAL CITY, SHOULD BE THE HOME OF THE CIRM.

19 MR. BLITCH: THANK YOU. MY NAME IS LEE BLITCH.
20 I'M THE PRESIDENT OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF
21 COMMERCE. WE WERE THE FIRST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN THE
22 STATE OF CALIFORNIA TO ENDORSE THE INITIATIVE WHEN IT
23 STARTED, THE FIRST MAJOR BUSINESS ORGANIZATION.

24 I HAVE 75 MEMBERS ON MY BOARD. THEY VOTED 100
25 PERCENT. WE DID THIS BEFORE WE FOUND OUT HOW THE

1 GOVERNOR WAS GOING TO GO OR TESTING THE WINDS OR WHAT WAS
2 POLITICALLY CORRECT. WE'VE BEEN BEHIND THIS FROM THE
3 VERY BEGINNING.

4 ALSO REFLECTED WAS THE FACT THAT THE CITIZENS OF
5 SAN FRANCISCO VOTED 71 PERCENT IN FAVOR OF THE
6 PROPOSITION WHEN IT CAME OUT, NOT A SLIM MAJORITY. SO
7 THE COMMUNITY IS SUPPORTED. MOST OF ALL, I LIVE IN THE
8 NEIGHBORHOOD, 650 DELANCEY, AROUND THE CORNER. OUR
9 NEIGHBORHOOD WANTS YOU TO COME IN THERE. IT'S A GREAT
10 NEIGHBORHOOD. LOVE TO HAVE YOU OVER FOR COFFEE OR WINE.

11 PLEASE USE THE DATA MATRIX LIKE YOU'RE GOING TO
12 USE DATA WHEN YOU DO YOUR GRANTS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

13 RABBI WEINER: GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS RABBI
14 MARTIN WEINER. I'M SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE MANY
15 CHURCHES, SYNAGOGS, MOSQUES, AND TEMPLES WHICH ARE PART
16 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO INTERFAITH COUNCIL. I'M A PAST
17 CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL AND NATIVE OF SAN FRANCISCO.

18 OUR COMMUNITY'S INTERFAITH COUNCIL, IT'S AN
19 ORGANIZATION THAT BRINGS TOGETHER PEOPLE OF VARIOUS
20 RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS TO BUILD UNDERSTANDING, TO WORK ON
21 VITAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS. I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT THE
22 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT YOU SHOULD -- IF YOU SHOULD
23 DECIDE TO LOCATE THE HEADQUARTERS IN SAN FRANCISCO, THE
24 RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS OF THE BAY AREA AND OF THE CITY
25 ITSELF WOULD EXTEND A VERY WARM AND SINCERE WELCOME TO

1 THE SCIENTISTS, THE STAFF, THEIR FAMILIES.

2 IN ADDITION TO ALL THE MEDICAL RESEARCH
3 INSTITUTES IN THE CITY, IT'S ALSO A HOME TO MANY
4 WONDERFUL RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS TO WHICH A NUMBER OF
5 SCIENTISTS ARE AFFILIATED. THANK YOU.

6 MR. KIWATA: GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M RICHARD KIWATA
7 WITH AN ENTITY CALLED GLOBAL BIO. WE ARE LOCATED IN SAN
8 FRANCISCO PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE NONSTOP FLIGHT ACCESS.
9 YOU CAN FLY NONSTOP TO OSAKA, TOKYO, HONG KONG, LONDON,
10 PARIS, ETC. AND OUR ENTITY HAS THE SUPPORT OF JAPAN AS
11 WELL AS THE PREFECTOR OF OSAKA.

12 THERE ARE THREE S'S IN JAPANESE BUSINESS CULTURE
13 AS THE THREE BEST PLACES TO WORK IN THE WORLD STARTING
14 WITH S. THERE'S ONLY ONE IN CALIFORNIA. THERE'S
15 SINGAPORE, THERE'S SYDNEY, AND THERE'S SAN FRANCISCO.
16 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

17 MR. CONAHAN: THANK YOU. DENNIS CONAHAN, SAN
18 FRANCISCO'S CENTER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. I HAVE WITH
19 ME IN MY HANDS HERE A MEMO AND LETTER SIGNED BY 16 MAYORS
20 FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, 18 SAN FRANCISCO
21 BUSINESS LEADERS, AND 51 ELECTED OFFICIALS FROM AROUND
22 THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA. THAT'S TRULY AMAZING IN
23 ITSELF.

24 AND THE CONSUL, JUST FOR A FRAME OF REFERENCE,
25 REPRESENTS NINE BAY AREA COUNTIES AND OVER SEVEN MILLION

1 PEOPLE.

2 LET'S THINK ABOUT BASICS FOR ONE SECOND. WE
3 HEARD ABOUT REAL ESTATE. I'VE BEEN IN THE REAL ESTATE
4 BUSINESS FOR OVER 30 YEARS. IT'S A 20,000 SQUARE FOOT
5 SITE, 46,000 LAB SITES -- SQUARE FEET OF LAB SPACE IS
6 AVAILABLE, 2600 HOTEL ROOMS VERSUS SAN DIEGO'S 50 HOTEL
7 ROOMS, THE MOSCONE CONVENTION FACILITY, CITY HALL AND THE
8 VARIOUS HOTELS THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT, UNPARALLELED.
9 \$500,000 WORTH OF FREE FURNITURE. AND, OF COURSE, SAN
10 FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. THANK YOU.

11 MS. REED: HELLO. MY NAME IS GLORIA REED. MY
12 SON IS ROMAN REED, QUADRIPLAGIC. SAN FRANCISCO IS
13 OFFERING \$18 MILLION FOR RESEARCH. THE NEXT HIGHEST IS
14 12,000. I'M AN HISPANIC FROM SAN FRANCISCO.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. VERY QUICKLY, ANY
16 PUBLIC SPEAKERS THAT ARE NOT PART OF A DELEGATION? IS IT
17 POSSIBLE THAT WE COULD HAVE EMERYVILLE SPEAK A LITTLE
18 LATER? GREATLY APPRECIATE THAT.

19 ANY OTHER PUBLIC SPEAKERS? NO OTHER PUBLIC
20 SPEAKERS. I'D LIKE TO GO TO THE BOARD COMMENTS. IF THE
21 BOARD WILL MAKE THEIR COMMENTS BRIEF, BUT COVER ALL YOUR
22 POINTS SO AS MANY BOARD MEMBERS CAN TALK AS POSSIBLE.

23 DR. PRIETO: I'LL TRY TO KEEP THIS BRIEF, UNDER
24 A MINUTE, IF I CAN. I APPRECIATE THAT OUR SCORING SYSTEM
25 THAT WAS DEVELOPED IN DOING THIS EVALUATION WAS AN

1 ATTEMPT TO BE FAIR AND OBJECTIVE, BUT I THINK AS A BOARD
2 WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE A JUDGMENT AND TO
3 CONSIDER FACTORS THAT CAN'T BE REDUCED TO PURE NUMBERS.

4 I THINK HUMANS ARE SUBJECTIVE CREATURES. WE'RE
5 NOT REALLY CAPABLE OF COMPLETE AND TOTAL OBJECTIVITY, AND
6 I THINK IT'S MORE HONEST TO PUT OUR BIASES ON THE TABLE.
7 SO I WILL PUT MINE IN FAVOR OF SACRAMENTO. I'M VERY
8 HAPPY THAT MY WIFE BROUGHT ME THERE AND HAVE NEVER
9 REGRETTED IT.

10 THE NIH AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE
11 FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING ARE LOCATED IN AND AROUND
12 WASHINGTON, D.C., AND I THINK THERE'S A GOOD REASON FOR
13 THAT. THEY'RE PUBLIC AGENCIES SPENDING THE PUBLIC MONEY
14 FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD. THAT IS WHAT WE HOPE TO BE.

15 I THINK THERE'S NO REASON TO HIDE FROM THAT, AND
16 I THINK WE SHOULD BE PROUD THAT THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA
17 HAVE THEIR CONFIDENCE IN THE EFFORT WE'RE UNDERTAKING.
18 GOOD QUALITY SCIENCE DOES REQUIRE INDEPENDENCE, IT
19 REQUIRES AUTONOMY, BUT IT ALSO REQUIRES PUBLIC CONFIDENCE
20 IN THIS KIND OF A SETTING.

21 I THINK THAT LOCATING IN SACRAMENTO IS A
22 STATEMENT OF TRANSPARENCY. IT'S A STATEMENT THAT WE HAVE
23 NOTHING TO HIDE FROM THE PUBLIC, FROM ITS
24 REPRESENTATIVES, AND THAT WE INVITE THEM TO SEE WHAT WE
25 ARE DOING, JOIN IT, AND SUPPORT US.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY LANSING.

2 MS. LANSING: FIRST, I WANT TO SAY THAT I THINK
3 THAT ALL THREE CITIES ARE EXTRAORDINARY. I THINK THAT WE
4 HAVE WHAT I WOULD CALL A HIGH CLASS PROBLEM. WE REALLY
5 HAVE A VERY, VERY DIFFICULT CHOICE TO MAKE. AND IS THIS
6 NOW THE APPROPRIATE TIME WHEN I CAN ASK QUESTIONS OF EACH
7 OF THE VENUES?

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

9 MS. LANSING: SO THE FIRST THING I WANT IS A
10 POINT OF CLARIFICATION BECAUSE I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED, AND
11 THIS WOULD APPLY TO EVERYBODY. ARE WE ALLOWED TO TAKE
12 FREE HOTEL ROOMS AND FREE CONVENTION CENTERS?

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

14 MS. LANSING: WE ARE. WE DON'T HAVE TO TAKE THE
15 STATE RATES?

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT.

17 MS. LANSING: SO I HAVE A QUESTION FOR SAN
18 FRANCISCO. PERHAPS YOU CAN -- WHOEVER WANTS TO ANSWER
19 IT. I'VE HEARD A LOT OF VARYING THINGS ABOUT THE
20 BUILDING. I WAS NOT ABLE TO SEE THE BUILDING IN PERSON,
21 AND I'D LIKE YOU TO DESCRIBE, IF YOU CAN, WITH PICTURES
22 OR VERBALLY, THE FIRST FLOOR. WHAT'S ON THE FIRST FLOOR?
23 WHAT'S ON THE VARIOUS FLOORS OF THE BUILDING?

24 MAYOR NEWSOM: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WITH
25 RESPECT TO THE SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE, AND AGAIN, WE

1 CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE RECOMMENDATION. ONE OF THE
2 FRUSTRATIONS IS THAT WE HAD FEWER PEOPLE FROM THAT
3 COMMITTEE SEE THE SAN FRANCISCO SPACE THAN ANY OF THE
4 OTHER PROPOSALS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD STAFF HELP HIM HOLD IT
6 UP, PLEASE?

7 MAYOR NEWSOM: THAT'S WHY. APPRECIATE THE
8 QUESTION AND APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHOW YOU THE
9 SITE. SOMETHING THAT HASN'T BEEN TALKED ABOUT, THE
10 ALTERNATIVE SITE THAT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN 18 MONTHS,
11 WHICH WE THINK PROVIDES EXTRAORDINARY FLEXIBILITY TO THIS
12 INSTITUTE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FOCUS ON THIS SITE, PLEASE.

14 MAYOR NEWSOM: IT'S PART OF THE BID. YOU WILL
15 SEE HERE A PICTURE. THIS IS ACTUALLY ONE OF THE
16 PHOTOGRAPHS FROM RIGHT ABOVE THE SPACE IN ONE OF THE
17 UNITS THAT'S BEEN DEVELOPED SEEN OUT FROM THE SPACE
18 TOWARDS THE BAY, TOWARDS OBVIOUSLY SBC PARK.

19 THIS IS A SCHEMATIC OF THE ACTUAL SPACE. YOU
20 CAN SEE THE TRANSPORTATION RIGHT DOWN THE LINE ON THE FAR
21 LEFT OR THE FAR RIGHT, DEPENDING ON YOUR PERSPECTIVE.
22 YOU WILL SEE THE CALTRANS STATION RIGHT THERE, WHICH
23 EXTENDS RIGHT DOWN INTO THE SAN JOSE AREA, AND THEN RIGHT
24 HERE AS WELL IS 12.7 MILES AWAY FROM THE INTERNATIONAL
25 AIRPORT.

1 IN ADDITION, THIS IS A LARGER PERSPECTIVE, TO
2 GIVE YOU A SENSE OF THE QUALITY OF THE CONSTRUCTION IN
3 AND AROUND THE AREA. THIS IS ONE OF THE MOST DYNAMIC
4 AREAS IN SAN FRANCISCO. AL GORE AND HIS NEW TELEVISION
5 NETWORK JUST MOVED LITERALLY A FEW DOORS DOWN BECAUSE OF
6 THE DYNAMISM OF THE AREA AND THE EXCITEMENT AROUND IT.
7 RIGHT HERE IS AN ACTUAL SCHEMATIC OF THE PLACE, GIVES YOU
8 A PERSPECTIVE OF CALTRANS STATION, PAC BELL HERE, AND
9 AGAIN MISSION --

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD YOU POINT OUT THE
11 BUILDING FOR THEM?

12 MAYOR NEWSOM: RIGHT HERE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS BUILDING IS RIGHT THERE,
14 RIGHT ON THE CORNER.

15 MAYOR NEWSOM: RESTAURANTS, RETAIL, HOTELS ALL
16 NEARBY.

17 MS. LANSING: THE BUILDING WAS DESCRIBED -- I
18 TRULY WAS NOT ABLE TO SEE THE SITES. THE BUILDING WAS
19 DESCRIBED, AND I HOPE I'M CORRECT, BY PEOPLE THAT SAW IT
20 AS HAVING A SAFEWAY ON THE BOTTOM, AS HAVING A MCDONALD'S
21 OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. WHAT'S ON THE FIRST FLOOR?

22 MAYOR NEWSOM: THERE'S NO SAFEWAY ON THE FIRST
23 FLOOR. THERE'S NO MCDONALD'S ON THE FIST FLOOR.

24 MS. LANSING: WHAT IS ON THE FIRST FLOOR?

25 MAYOR NEWSOM: AROUND THE BACK THERE IS A

1 MCDONALD'S THAT'S BEING TORN DOWN FOR A HOTEL AS PART OF
2 THE EXCITEMENT AND DYNAMISM OF THE AREA. THERE IS A BOOK
3 STORE ON THE BOTTOM. IT'S A CLASSIC SMART GROWTH
4 CONSTRUCTED PROJECT RIGHT ALONG A KEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR
5 WITH DENSITY AROUND THE NOTION THAT YOU HAVE RETAIL ON
6 THE BOTTOM, COMMERCIAL IN THE MIDDLE SPACE, AND
7 RESIDENTIAL ABOVE. SO THERE IS -- SAFEWAY IS DOWN THE
8 BLOCK AT THE FAR END OF THAT PHOTO. YOU'VE GOT RIGHT ON
9 THE BASE HERE A BOOK STORE AND THEN YOU'VE GOT SOME
10 RETAIL STORES RIGHT NEXT DOOR, BUT NO MCDONALD'S.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BARNES AND NOBLE IS ON THE
12 BOTTOM.

13 MS. LANSING: SO YOU HAVE BARNES AND NOBLE AND
14 RETAIL STORES.

15 MAYOR NEWSOM: YOU'VE GOT TO BE FAIR TO BORDERS.
16 SINCE THE BORDERS FAMILY LIVES IN SAN FRANCISCO, I'LL BE
17 GENEROUS.

18 MS. LANSING: HONESTLY, I'M NOT TRYING TO IN ANY
19 WAY IMPUGN NEGATIVE OR POSITIVE. I'M JUST TRYING TO
20 UNDERSTAND. SO YOU HAVE A BORDERS AND YOU HAVE OTHER
21 RETAIL STORES ON THE FIRST FLOOR.

22 MAYOR NEWSOM: ACTUALLY IN THIS BUILDING NEXT
23 DOOR DOWN THE LINE THERE'S RETAIL STORES.

24 MS. LANSING: THEN WE WOULD BE ON WHAT FLOOR?

25 MAYOR NEWSOM: THIRD FLOOR.

1 MS. LANSING: SO FOR TWO FLOORS OR ONE FLOOR?

2 MAYOR NEWSOM: IT'S ONE LARGE FLOOR WITH VERY
3 LARGE CEILINGS, 28,000 TOTAL SQUARE FEET.

4 MS. LANSING: AND THEN YOU HAVE CONDOMINIUMS
5 ABOVE IT?

6 MAYOR NEWSOM: AND THAT'S ONE OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS
7 THAT WAS TAKEN. RIGHT THERE YOU WILL SEE TWO FLOORS
8 ABOVE.

9 MS. LANSING: SO IT'S A MULTI-USE BUILDING?

10 MAYOR NEWSOM: THAT'S CORRECT.

11 MS. LANSING: I BELIEVE THAT'S MY ONLY QUESTION
12 FOR SAN FRANCISCO, BUT I HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS.

13 MAYOR NEWSOM: JUST QUICKLY BECAUSE I THINK THIS
14 HAS NEVER GOTTEN THE ATTENTION. WE SPECIFICALLY IN THIS
15 SITE, TALKING OF LOCATION, TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTION ABOUT
16 LOCATION, IN YOUR PACKET AT NO COST FOR AN EQUIVALENT
17 SIZE SPACE RIGHT NEXT TO THE GLADSTONE INSTITUTE IS
18 ALEXANDRIA THAT'S BUILDING THIS SPACE AND IS ABOUT TO HIT
19 GROUNDBREAKING WITHIN 60S DAYS. IF THINGS CHANGE IN YOUR
20 INSTITUTE, IF DYNAMICS CHANGE, YOU HAVE THE ABILITY AT NO
21 COST TO MOVE LITERALLY FIVE BLOCKS AWAY INTO THIS SPACE,
22 WHICH IS, I THINK, AN EQUIVALENT SPACE IN TERMS OF ITS
23 FUNCTION AND BEAUTY AND PROXIMITY.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT THE MAYOR IS SAYING IS
25 THAT THE ACTUAL APPLICATION PRESENTED A SITE WITH THE

1 ABILITY TO RELOCATE THE SITE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE
2 INSTITUTE IF WE CHOSE TO WHEN THE OTHER BUILDING WAS
3 FINISHED, SO THEY GAVE US SOME FLEXIBILITY.

4 MS. LANSING: WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO MOVE TO THE
5 OTHER SITE?

6 MAYOR NEWSOM: PURELY UP TO YOU. WE LIKE
7 OPTIONS IN SAN FRANCISCO AND FLEXIBILITY. THIS IS AN
8 EXTRAORDINARY LOCATION. I SAY 13.3 -- IT'S AMAZING SOME
9 OF THE MYTH THAT'S BEEN CREATED AROUND IT. MAYBE I'M A
10 LITTLE DEFENSIVE IN THIS CONTEXT, THAT YOU'RE TALKING
11 ABOUT A WORLD CLASS AREA BY ANY OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS. YOU
12 CANNOT -- PEOPLE ARE -- 96 PERCENT OF THIS AREA IS
13 ALREADY BOOKED UP WITH OCCUPANTS BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE SO
14 HIGHLY DESIROUS TO BE RIGHT NEXT TO THE MISSION BAY AREA.

15 MS. LANSING: ON THIS OTHER BUILDING, THAT WOULD
16 BE COMPLETED WHEN?

17 MAYOR NEWSOM: IN 18 MONTHS.

18 MS. LANSING: AND IS THAT -- THEN YOU'RE
19 OFFERING SPECIFIC FLOORS?

20 MAYOR NEWSOM: THE TOP FLOOR.

21 MS. LANSING: THE TOP FLOOR, AND IT WILL ALSO BE
22 A MULTI-USE BUILDING.

23 MAYOR NEWSOM: PRIMARILY, THOUGH IT WILL HAVE
24 LABS AND BIOSPACE AND BC'S. IT'S KIND OF A MIXED USE
25 SPACE, BUT FOCUSED. ALEXANDRIA IS ONE OF THE LARGEST

1 REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS IN THE UNITED STATES OF
2 AMERICA, SO IT'S PRIMARILY FOR BIOTECH, LIFE SCIENCES,
3 NANOTECH, AND RELATED INDUSTRIES.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I THANK
5 YOU VERY MUCH. DR. LEON THAL HAS A QUESTION.

6 DR. THAL: SAN FRANCISCO. WHAT IS THE
7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ANY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
8 BIOTECHNOLOGY SECTOR AND THIS LOCATION?

9 MAYOR NEWSOM: ALEXANDRIA IS BUILDING OUT FOR
10 SPEC IN THE MIDDLE OF -- THIS WHOLE AREA IS A
11 REDEVELOPMENT AREA WITH 6,000 NEW UNITS OF HOUSING THAT
12 ARE BEING DEVELOPED, THE ANCHOR OF WHICH IS THE 43-ACRE
13 UCSF MISSION CAMPUS BAY SITE. SO RIGHT NEXT DOOR TO THIS
14 CURRENTLY IS THE GLADSTONE INSTITUTE, WHICH IS ALREADY
15 BUILT. THIS IS 1700 OWENS, AND IT'S LITERALLY TO THE
16 SOUTH OF THAT. AND IT'S BUILT BY ALEXANDRIA, WHICH HAS
17 PURCHASED THE PROPERTY OR RATHER PURCHASED THE LAND AND
18 IS DEVELOPING THE PROPERTY.

19 DR. THAL: BESIDES THE UCSF BUILDOUT, ARE THERE
20 OTHER BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANIES IN THE AREA?

21 MAYOR NEWSOM: THERE'S A NUMBER. STEVE, YOU
22 WANT TO GO INTO MORE DETAIL ABOUT WHAT'S HAPPENING THERE?

23 MR. BURRELL: THIS PARTICULAR AREA SHOWS THE
24 ENTIRE BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY THAT'S BEING BUILT. IT'S THE
25 CENTERPIECE OF UCSF'S NEW MISSION BAY CAMPUS. IN THE

1 BLUE THERE'S HOUSING UNITS BEING BUILT IN THE SURROUNDING
2 AREA. AND THE ALEXANDRIA PROPERTIES ARE BEING INDICATED
3 NOW. ALEXANDRIA, BY THE WAY, IS A NEW YORK STOCK
4 EXCHANGE LISTED PUBLICLY HELD REIT SO THAT IT'S THE
5 LARGEST PROVIDER OF SPACE TO THE BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY IN
6 THE U.S.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: JUST ONE THING TO TALK
8 ABOUT IN TERMS OF MISSION BAY. SO MISSION BAY HAS -- THE
9 43-ACRE RESEARCH CAMPUS WILL HAVE 9,000 RESEARCHERS AND
10 STAFF AT FULL BUILDOUT. THERE'S ABOUT 2500 OR SO NOW
11 ABOUT HALFWAY THROUGH CONSTRUCTION.

12 THE SITE THAT THE MAYOR WAS REFERRING TO IS
13 LOCATED ON BLOCK 41. IT WILL BE BUILT THIRD QUARTER NEXT
14 YEAR. THE SITE THAT WE'RE PROPOSING FOR IMMEDIATE
15 OCCUPANCY, YOU CAN HAVE IT FOR TEN YEARS, YOU CAN HAVE IT
16 FOR A YEAR AND A HALF. IT'S REPRESENTED BY THE GREEN DOT
17 ON THE UPPER PART OF THE MAP. REALLY WHAT IT IS IS IT'S
18 A TRADE-OFF BETWEEN BEING CLOSE TO THE BALLPARK, RIGHT
19 NEXT TO CALTRANS, AND TRANSIT OPPORTUNITIES THERE, OR IF
20 YOU WANT TO BE A LITTLE BIT CLOSER TO THE -- DIRECTLY
21 NEXT TO THE RESEARCH FACILITY. YOU CAN MOVE TO THE
22 RESEARCH FACILITY IN 18 MONTHS, BE IN THIS TRANSLATIONAL
23 RESEARCH BUILDING THAT THE INSTITUTE IS BUILDING.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK WE'VE ANSWERED THE
25 QUESTION. I THINK THERE ARE QUESTIONS DOWN AT THIS END;

1 IS THAT CORRECT? DR. MURPHY.

2 DR. MURPHY: MR. MAYOR, I WAS THE ONE THAT
3 RAISED THE ISSUE ABOUT THE APPEARANCE OF THE BUILDING
4 BECAUSE WHEN I FIRST SAW IT, IT STRUCK ME AS A MULTI-USE
5 BUILDING, AS YOU DESCRIBE. BUT MY FIRST REACTION WAS IS
6 THIS REALLY THE ARCHITECTURE WE WANT FOR A WORLD CLASS
7 SITE? YOU WENT VERY QUICKLY.

8 I GUESS WHAT I NEED IS A CLEAR STATEMENT AS TO
9 WHAT EXACTLY IS THAT RETAIL SPACE AT THE BUILDING? IS
10 THERE SOMEONE OF YOUR GROUP THAT CAN NAME EVERY ONE OF
11 THE RETAIL SHOPS?

12 MR. BYERS: AS THE MAYOR SAID, THIS BUILDING IS
13 A TYPICAL MIXED USE BUILDING TYPICAL OF SAN FRANCISCO
14 WHERE YOU HAVE OFFICE ABOVE GROUND-FLOOR RETAIL, TYPICAL
15 OF AN URBAN CITY WHERE WE HAVE A LOT OF POPULATION
16 DENSITY. THE RETAIL RIGHT BELOW THE SITE IS A BORDERS
17 BOOKS. GOING FURTHER DOWN ALONG KING STREET TOWARDS THE
18 OTHER SIDE OF THE BUILDING WE HAVE A AMICE'S PIZZA,
19 STARBUCKS, AND THEN AN URBAN SAFEWAY, THEIR NEW MODEL,
20 WHICH HAS A LOT OF GOURMET FOOD. SO YOUR EMPLOYEES WILL
21 BE ABLE TO EAT RIGHT ON SITE.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THAT IN THIS BUILDING OR A
23 SEPARATE BUILDING?

24 MR. BYERS: IT'S ON THE OTHER HALF OF THE
25 BUILDING. IT'S TECHNICALLY ONE BLOCK. THERE'S A

1 COURTYARD IN THE MIDDLE, SO IT PHYSICALLY LOOKS
2 SEPARATED, BUT IT'S ONE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THE ANSWER IS IT PHYSICALLY
4 LOOKS SEPARATE BECAUSE THERE'S A COURTYARD IN THE MIDDLE,
5 BUT IS TECHNICALLY PART OF THE SAME OWNERSHIP.

6 MR. BYERS: ABSOLUTELY. IT'S ALL OWNED BY ONE
7 COMPANY.

8 DR. MURPHY: MAY I ASK ANOTHER QUESTION. WHEN
9 WE TOURED THE BIOTECH PART, YOU'RE RIGHT, MAYBE A HALF
10 MILE, QUARTER MILE IS THE NEW UCSF BUILDING, THE
11 GLADSTONE BUILDING, AND THEN THERE'S THIS LARGE VACANT
12 AREA, WHICH I ASSUME IS WHERE YOU ARE INDICATING THAT THE
13 BUILDOUT IS GOING TO BE. AND THIS IS A BIOTECH BUILDOUT,
14 INCLUDING THE UCSF BUILDOUT; IS THAT RIGHT? CAN YOU GIVE
15 US A TIME FRAME OVER -- HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE, DO YOU
16 THINK, TO BUILD THAT OUT? AND DO YOU HAVE PERMISSION?
17 AND DO YOU HAVE CLIENTS TO FILL ALL THE BIOTECH SPACE
18 THAT YOU FEEL WILL BE BUILT? SO WHEN WILL IT HAPPEN?
19 AND HOW COMMITTED IS THAT SPACE?

20 MR. BYERS: I THINK MR. BURRELL MENTIONED
21 ALEXANDRIA JUST MADE AN ACQUISITION OF ABOUT 2 MILLION
22 SQUARE FEET OF BIOTECH ENTITLEMENT THERE. THEY'RE GOING
23 FORWARD WITH THE FIRST BUILDINGS, BREAKING GROUND NEXT
24 MONTH. WE EXPECT ALL OF THAT ENTITLEMENT WILL BE UP IN
25 THE NEXT COUPLE OF YEARS.

1 THE FIRST BUILDING WILL BE ON-LINE THIRD QUARTER
2 NEXT YEAR. THERE'S A TOTAL OF SIX MILLION SQUARE FEET OF
3 ENTITLEMENT THAT IS ALL FULLY PERMITTED, FULLY ENTITLED.
4 SEVERAL DEVELOPERS ARE MOVING FORWARD RIGHT NOW WITH
5 THEIR FINAL CONSTRUCTION PERMITS, SO YOU ARE GOING TO SEE
6 STUFF COMING OUT OF THE GROUND.

7 DR. MURPHY: IS IT FULLY COMMITTED TO BE BUILT?

8 MR. BYERS: YES.

9 DR. MURPHY: GIVE ME A TIME FRAME AS TO WHEN IT
10 WILL ALL BE DONE AND THAT LARGE LOT WILL BE FILLED.

11 MR. BYERS: WITHOUT -- I HAVEN'T TALKED TO THE
12 SPECIFIC DEVELOPERS ABOUT THEIR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS, BUT I
13 WOULD SAY WITHIN THE NEXT TWO TO THREE YEARS, YOU WILL
14 SEE SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF DEVELOPMENT. WHETHER ALL SIX
15 MILLION SQUARE FEET WILL BE BUILT IN THAT PERIOD OF TIME,
16 THAT'S A LOT OF ABSORPTION, BUT CERTAINLY -- THE HEART OF
17 THE MISSION BAY PROJECT, THE UCSF CAMPUS IS ABOUT HALFWAY
18 THROUGH. 2.5 MILLION SQUARE FEET TOTAL IN THAT CAMPUS,
19 AND THEY'RE ABOUT HALFWAY THROUGH. AS YOU SAW, THERE'S
20 STILL CONSTRUCTION GOING ON.

21 DR. LEVEY: I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. ONE,
22 CAN SOMEONE COMMENT -- ALL THESE PROPOSALS ARE GREAT. I
23 DON'T SEE HOW CIRM CAN LOSE IN EITHER CITY. ONE THING
24 I'D LIKE TO ASK IS THERE ANY SUBSTANCE TO THE FACT THAT
25 AS A GOVERNMENT AGENCY, WE HAVE TO BE IN SACRAMENTO?

1 THAT'S THE FIRST QUESTION.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO.

3 DR. LEVEY: AND THE SECOND IS THAT WE'VE BEEN
4 WORKING AT BREAKNECK PACE, GOOD RHYTHM. HOW DISRUPTIVE
5 WILL THIS BE TO MOVE THIS ELSEWHERE? I GUESS I'D DIRECT
6 THAT TO YOU, CHAIRMAN KLEIN.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE ISSUE IS THAT WE DO HAVE A
8 TREMENDOUS INTERFACE WITH SACRAMENTO. WE HAVE CRITICAL
9 LEGISLATION GOING. WE HAVE BRIDGE FINANCING FOR PROGRAMS
10 GOING. WE HAVE A STAFF IN PLACE. AND I THINK WE NEED TO
11 ACCEPT WHATEVER THE DISRUPTION AND THAT CHALLENGE IS AND
12 MOVE TO THE BEST SITE THAT THE INSTITUTE, THE BOARD
13 DECIDES ON, BUT IT IS A CHALLENGE, LIKE MANY THINGS. WE
14 WILL MEET THE CHALLENGE, BUT IT IS A SUBSTANTIAL
15 CHALLENGE.

16 IT IS IMPORTANT TO REALIZE THAT, AS I'VE STATED
17 PUBLICLY MANY TIMES, THAT THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP WITH
18 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ISSUES THAT ARE VERY SUBSTANTIAL.
19 THERE ARE FINANCIAL ISSUES. THERE ARE PATENT HOLDERS IN
20 THIS STATE THAT WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH. THERE ARE
21 LEGISLATIVE AUDITS, THERE'S BOND FINANCING TO DEAL WITH.
22 THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS THAT MAKE IT IMPORTANT TO HAVE
23 ACCESS TO SACRAMENTO, WHICH IS WHY THAT WAS AN IMPORTANT
24 CRITERIA THAT WAS ARTICULATED. AND AS LONG AS WE
25 RECOGNIZE AND MAKE PROVISION THAT WE CAN QUICKLY ACCESS

1 THAT ANY TIME OF DAY OR NIGHT, ANY DAY OF THE WEEK,
2 FORGETTING WHETHER -- WE HAVE TO BE RESPONSIVE TO
3 SACRAMENTO. IT IS THE CAPITAL. AND WE HAVE TO BE
4 RESPONSIVE TO IT. IF WE TAKE THAT INTO ACCOUNT, WE'LL
5 MAKE THE ARRANGEMENTS AND GET THROUGH THE RELOCATION.

6 DR. LEVEY: IS THERE A VALID -- IS THERE A LAW
7 THAT WE HAVE TO BE IN SACRAMENTO?

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO. IT'S JUST THE KEY IS
9 ACCESSIBILITY AT ANY TIME, AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.
10 THAT'S WHY IT WAS A CRITERIA.

11 DR. STEWARD: THANK YOU. THERE WAS A COMMENT
12 EARLIER ON ABOUT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RFP AND SITE
13 VISIT POINTS, AND MAYBE AN IMPLICATION THAT ICOC MEMBERS
14 WOULD NOT AGREE WITH RFP POINTS OR THE SITE VISITING
15 TEAM. I GUESS I PUT A GREAT DEAL OF STOCK IN MY
16 COLLEAGUES WHO HAVE TAKEN SO MUCH TIME IN LOOKING AT ALL
17 OF THIS. AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ASK: DID THE TEAM,
18 SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE, DO THEY AGREE WITH THE RANKINGS
19 IN THE RFP PROCESS, MAYBE NOT TO THE NUMBER, BUT JUST THE
20 RANKINGS?

21 DR. PENHOET: IF I COULD RESPOND TO THAT BECAUSE
22 THERE SEEMS TO BE SOME MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT THE MOTION
23 MADE BY DR. FRIEDMAN AND VOTED UPON BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE.
24 THAT WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE, THAT THE
25 SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD GENERATE THESE TWO RANKINGS. AND THEN

1 IT WOULD MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC AS A WHOLE ON
2 THE BASIS OF THE NUMERICAL SCORES. SO THAT WAS AN
3 OFFICIAL ACTION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE.

4 HAVING SAID THAT, THERE IS NO BINDING -- IT
5 DOESN'T BIND THE ICOC IN ANY WAY TO MAKE ITS OWN
6 DECISION. BUT THE COMMITTEE DECIDED TO MAKE A
7 RECOMMENDATION FORMALLY IN A PUBLIC MEETING AND VOTED
8 UNANIMOUSLY TO MAKE THAT RECOMMENDATION BASED ON THE
9 POINT SCORE. SO WE CAME TODAY WITH THE RECOMMENDATION;
10 HOWEVER, AT THE FINAL MEETING WE DECIDED THAT SACRAMENTO
11 AND SAN DIEGO WERE SO CLOSE, THAT IT WAS INAPPROPRIATE TO
12 DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THOSE TWO.

13 DR. PRECIADO: WE AGREED THAT WE WOULD TAKE THE
14 POINTS FORWARD. THAT IS TRUE. HOWEVER, IT WAS TRUE IN
15 THE LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT WE WANTED TO HOLD DISCUSSION
16 BECAUSE I CAN TELL YOU THAT IF YOU LOOK AT NO. 1 AND NO.
17 2, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, NO. 1 WOULD NOT BE MY NO. 1
18 CHOICE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO TRY AND GET THIS
20 DONE VERY QUICKLY. DR. KESSLER.

21 DR. KESSLER: JUST A POINT OF CLARIFICATION. MY
22 COLLEAGUES HAVE ASKED WHAT THE BUILDING LOOKS LIKE, THE
23 AREA LOOKS LIKE. WE HAVE LITERALLY RENTED, PROBABLY
24 HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF SQUARE FEET, WE HAVE LEASED A
25 SPACE LITERALLY ADJACENT TO THAT BUILDING ACROSS THE

1 STREET. NOT ONLY IS THE MISSION BAY AND THE ALEXANDRIA,
2 BUT THE EXISTING PROPOSAL IS RIGHT NEXT TO A NUMBER OF
3 OUR KEY DEPARTMENTS. IT'S A VERY DESIRABLE LOCATION.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A VERY CLEAR
5 STATEMENT. I MADE THE STATEMENT BEFORE. I THINK ALL
6 THREE OF THESE SITES REPRESENT THE GOLD STANDARD FROM A
7 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE. THE SAN FRANCISCO SITE UNDER THE
8 URBAN LAND INSTITUTE STANDARDS FOR AN URBAN SITE WITH
9 MIXED USE BEING AN EXTRAORDINARILY RECOMMENDED WORK
10 ENVIRONMENT IS A GOLD STANDARD FOR THAT. THE SAN DIEGO
11 SITE, FOR A SUBURBAN LOCATION ON A CAMPUS WITH -- IN A
12 BIOMEDICAL CAMPUS IS A GOLD STANDARD FOR THAT. AND THE
13 SACRAMENTO CAMPUS IS A COMBINATION BECAUSE IT'S A GOLD
14 STANDARD BUILDING NEXT TO OLD SACRAMENTO WITH ALL OF THE
15 AMENITIES AND BENEFITS THAT YOU WOULD LOOK FOR IN A MIXED
16 USE ENVIRONMENT.

17 SO WE HAVE TREMENDOUS SITE LOCATION.

18 DR. PIZZO: I THINK THIS HAS BEEN VERY, VERY
19 HELPFUL. MAYBE TEN IS THE NUMBER BECAUSE MY OLYMPIC
20 CRITERIA MIGHT STILL APPLY.

21 I THINK WE CAN SPEND A LONG TIME FURTHER IN THE
22 DISCUSSIONS. WHAT I'M HEARING ARE MANY OPINIONS, ALL
23 VALID, BUT THEY ARE OPINIONS. I WOULD ASK US, BECAUSE
24 TIME IS PRESSING, THAT WE REALLY CALL THE QUESTION.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO

1 RECOGNIZE DR. POMEROY.

2 DR. PIZZO: YES, YOU CAN ASK DR. POMEROY, OF
3 COURSE.

4 DR. POMEROY: AS SOMEONE WHO SPENT A LOT OF TIME
5 LOOKING AT ALL OF THESE SITES, I DID WANT TO ADDRESS THE
6 QUESTION THAT WAS ASKED AND THEN MAKE JUST A COUPLE OF
7 QUICK COMMENTS.

8 FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THE CHALLENGE WITH
9 INTERPRETING THE RANKINGS FOR THE SITE VISITS IS THAT IF
10 YOU LOOK THROUGH THE SCORES, WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN YOUR
11 BOOK, THEY -- EVERY SINGLE ONE OF THE PLACES HAD SOME NO.
12 1 RANKINGS AND SOME NO. 3 RANKINGS. AND SO I THINK THAT
13 IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO INTERPRET THE AVERAGING OUT OF
14 THE SITE VISIT POINTS. SO I'LL JUST SAY THAT IN RESPONSE
15 TO YOUR QUESTION.

16 I JUST WANTED TO GIVE MY IMPRESSIONS OF THE SITE
17 VISIT VERY BRIEFLY. FIRST, I JUST WANT TO CONGRATULATE
18 ALL THREE CITIES. THEY ARE ABSOLUTELY FANTASTIC
19 PROPOSALS.

20 I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE REMEMBER THE
21 PURPOSE OF THIS. AND SOME OF THE DISCUSSION THAT'S GOING
22 ON IS SOME OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF WHAT THE INSTITUTE SHOULD
23 DO AND SHOULD BE. AND THIS IS AN ADMINISTRATIVE
24 HEADQUARTERS. FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, AND THIS MAY REFLECT
25 THE FACT THAT I CHOOSE TO LIVE IN SACRAMENTO, I

1 ACKNOWLEDGE THAT, BUT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, THIS INSTITUTE
2 WILL BE OUR FACE TO THE PUBLIC. AND THAT'S HOW THE
3 MESSAGE WILL GET OUT ABOUT STEM CELL. THAT'S HOW WE WILL
4 INTERACT. AND I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE COME
5 ACROSS AS INCLUSIVE TO ALL THE CONSTITUENCIES AND THAT WE
6 DO HAVE TO WORK CLOSELY WITH THE LEGISLATURE, THAT WE DO
7 HAVE TO WORK CLOSELY WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCIES. WE DO
8 HAVE TO WORK CLOSELY WITH PATIENT ADVOCATE GROUPS,
9 ACADEMIA, AND INDUSTRY.

10 AND ACKNOWLEDGING THAT I AM FROM SACRAMENTO,
11 FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, ALL OF THOSE COME TOGETHER MOST
12 EFFECTIVELY TO COMMUNICATE, TO DEVELOP THE PUBLIC
13 POLICIES IN A PLACE LIKE SACRAMENTO. THANK YOU.

14 DR. MURPHY: LET ME GIVE YOU THE SAN DIEGO
15 PERSPECTIVE. I THINK BOB MADE AN EXCELLENT POINT. ALL
16 THREE SITES ARE EXCELLENT. THE TWO SITES, SAN FRANCISCO
17 AND SACRAMENTO, ARE BUSINESSLIKE BUILDINGS. THEY WILL BE
18 A GOOD SITE FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT OF
19 GRANTS.

20 MY OWN VIEW IS THAT WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY HERE
21 TO DO SOMETHING BIGGER THAN THAT. WE CAN NOT ONLY MANAGE
22 AND ADMINISTER GRANTS, BUT WE CAN CREATE A PLACE WHERE
23 SCIENTISTS ARE GOING TO WANT TO COME AND THEY'RE GOING TO
24 WANT TO VISIT, THEY'RE GOING TO WANT TO SIT DOWN AND CHAT
25 WITH EACH OTHER. THEY'RE GOING TO WANT TO HAVE THAT VERY

1 IMPORTANT INVOLVEMENT WITH EACH OTHER AND WITH THE STAFF
2 TO MAKE IT A VIBRANT SCIENTIFIC VENUE.

3 IN MY VIEW THE SAN DIEGO SITE, WHICH HAS OUTDOOR
4 SPACE, IT'S IN A VERY NICE RURAL SETTING. IT'S RIGHT
5 NEXT TO THE HIGH TECH AREA, IT'S RIGHT NEXT TO ALL THESE
6 RESEARCH INSTITUTES YOU TALKED ABOUT. TO ME IT'S THE
7 HIGHEST DENSITY OF SCIENCE IN A LOVELY SETTING, WHICH I
8 THINK NEEDS TO BE OUR NO. 1 PRIORITY.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO INDICATE THAT I
10 ABSOLUTELY SUPPORT THIS CONCEPT. WE'RE LOOKING FOR
11 TREMENDOUS REACH IN THIS CONCEPT. I BELIEVE THIS IS NOT
12 AN ADMINISTRATIVE HEADQUARTERS. IT'S A SCIENTIFIC
13 FUNDING HEADQUARTERS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT. BUT
14 MORE IMPORTANTLY, IF WE ARE GOING TO REACH TO THE WORLD,
15 IF WE ARE GOING TO BRING THE BEST MINDS OF THE WORLD
16 TOGETHER, IF WE ARE GOING TO BRING THE BEST MINDS OF THE
17 NATION TOGETHER, WE ARE NEEDING CONFERENCE FACILITIES,
18 CONFERENCE FACILITIES THAT HOUSE NOT A HUNDRED OR 200 OR
19 300, BUT A THOUSAND AND 2,000 AND 5,000 BECAUSE WE NEED
20 THE REACH OF THE WORLD, WE NEED LEVERAGE ON OUR SITE. WE
21 NEED THE BEST MINDS AND THE BEST RESEARCH AROUND THE
22 WORLD SO WE'RE COMPLEMENTARY IN OUR RESEARCH.

23 WHEN OUR STAFF GOES OUT TO THESE CONFERENCES,
24 THEY WILL LOOK AT 30, 40, 50 DIFFERENT SPEECHES IN ONE
25 DAY, IN TWO DAYS TO SEE AND COMPARE THE LEADING FRONTIER

1 OF SCIENCE AROUND THE WORLD. WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO BRING
2 THE RESOURCES OF THE WORLD AND THE NATION TO OUR
3 DOORSTEP. AND I WAS VERY CLEAR THAT THAT'S WHY I RANKED
4 SAN FRANCISCO ABOVE THIS BECAUSE THIS IS TO LEAD THE
5 WORLD, IT IS TO LEAD THE NATION, AND THOSE RESOURCES ARE
6 VITAL TO IT.

7 I DEEPLY RESPECT THE CONTRIBUTIONS BROUGHT TO US
8 BY THE OTHER CITIES. I DEEPLY RESPECT THE DIFFERENCE IN
9 VISION BECAUSE EACH ONE HAS ITS GREAT MERITS, AND WE HAVE
10 A PHENOMENAL CHOICE BEFORE US.

11 MS. WILSON: WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, I MEAN SAN
12 DIEGO HAS BEEN ABLE TO HOST HUGE CONFERENCES, HUGE
13 CONVENTIONS. IT'S NOT JUST SAN FRANCISCO THAT CAN DO
14 THAT. IT MAY NOT BE MOSCONE CENTER FIVE MILES AWAY, BUT
15 IT'S CERTAINLY NO MORE THAN 20 MILES.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GAYLE WILSON, I WAS COMMENTING
17 ON THE FACT THAT WE HAVE SEVEN VENUES THAT ARE FREE UP TO
18 40,000 PEOPLE, AND WE HAVE 16,000 HOTEL ROOMS. WE HAVE A
19 VERY NARROW AND LIMITED BUDGET ADMINISTRATIVELY, LIMITED
20 TO 6 PERCENT; WHEREAS, MANY FOUNDATIONS WORK ON 12
21 PERCENT. SO THE ISSUE IS DO WE HAVE RESOURCES AVAILABLE
22 TO US TO MARSHAL AND CONTROL THESE CONFERENCES WITHOUT
23 THESE INCENTIVES? THAT'S THE QUESTION.

24 DR. BLACK: I THINK THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA
25 SHOULD BE VERY PROUD THAT WE HAVE INCREDIBLE PROPOSALS

1 FROM THREE GREAT WORLD CLASS CITIES. I WOULD JUST LIKE
2 TO SAY THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I THINK, DID A GREAT JOB.
3 BUT WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE IS THAT, AS A COMMITTEE,
4 WE BE ALLOWED TO VOTE INDIVIDUALLY FOR EACH CITY RATHER
5 THAN SORT OF AN UP-OR-DOWN VOTE GOING THROUGH ONE AT A
6 TIME.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO ACCEPT THAT
8 PROPOSAL, AND WE COULD GO THROUGH AND SEE HOW MANY VOTES
9 ARE FOR EACH CITY, IF THAT IS ACCEPTABLE TO THE
10 COMMITTEE, AND THEN WE'D VOTE BETWEEN THE TOP TWO. IS
11 THAT SOMETHING THAT SOUNDS ACCEPTABLE?

12 DR. PIZZO: DO THAT NOW.

13 DR. STEWARD: I GUESS I'M A LITTLE UNCOMFORTABLE
14 WITH THAT BECAUSE WE REALLY NEED TO BASE OUR VOTES ON
15 OBJECTIVITY. I THINK WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO POINT AT THE
16 END OF THE DAY TO THE THINGS THAT WE USE TO MAKE OUR
17 DECISION AND NOT JUST OUR PERSONAL CHOICES. LET ME MAKE
18 A RECOMMENDATION. I DO HAVE A RECOMMENDATION THAT
19 FOLLOWS FROM THAT.

20 IT IS FUNDAMENTALLY ONE SITE DEPENDS ON WHETHER
21 OR NOT WE THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO BE CENTERED IN A PLACE
22 WITH LOTS OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH GOING ON. AND THAT'S
23 REALLY THE FUNDAMENTAL DECISION THAT WE NEED TO MAKE. IN
24 OTHER WORDS, THE GOVERNMENT IN THE PREFERENCES, POINT NO.
25 1, ACCOUNT FOR 60 POINTS.

1 WHAT I WOULD TO SUGGEST IS THAT WE DECIDE
2 WHETHER THAT'S IMPORTANT OR NOT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. STEWARD. DR. BLACK, WOULD
4 YOU MAKE -- IS THAT A MOTION?

5 DR. BLACK: IT'S A MOTION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

7 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

8 MR. SHEEHY: CALL THE QUESTION.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT APPEARS THAT THE SENSE IS TO
10 HAVE A VOTE ON THAT MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR OF THAT MOTION.
11 OPPOSED? THAT'S WHAT WE'RE GOING TO FOLLOW.

12 WE WILL SEQUENTIALLY GO THROUGH THE THREE
13 STARTING, WITH SAN FRANCISCO. THAT'S FINE. WE WILL DO
14 IT THAT WAY.

15 ROLL CALL VOTE AND WOULD YOU PROCEED, MELISSA,
16 WITH THE ROLL CALL VOTE?

17 MS. KING: DR. PAUL JENNINGS FOR DAVID
18 BALTIMORE.

19 DR. JENNINGS: I NEED A CLARIFICATION. WHAT IS
20 PRECISELY --

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU'RE GOING TO VOTE -- YOU'RE
22 GOING TO SAY SAN FRANCISCO, SACRAMENTO, OR SAN DIEGO.
23 WHAT IS YOUR FIRST CHOICE?

24 DR. JENNINGS: SAN DIEGO.

25 MS. KING: BOB PRICE FOR DR. BIRGENEAU.

1 DR. PRICE: SAN FRANCISCO.
2 MS. KING: KEITH BLACK.
3 DR. BLACK: SAN DIEGO.
4 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.
5 DR. BRYANT: SAN DIEGO.
6 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
7 MR. GOLDBERG: SAN FRANCISCO.
8 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND FOR BRIAN HENDERSON.
9 DR. MARKLAND: SAN DIEGO.
10 MS. KING: EDWARD HOLMES.
11 DR. HOLMES: SAN DIEGO.
12 MS. KING: DAVID KESSLER.
13 DR. KESSLER: SAN FRANCISCO.
14 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SAN FRANCISCO.
16 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.
17 MS. LANSING: SAN DIEGO.
18 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.
19 DR. LEVEY: SAN FRANCISCO.
20 MS. KING: TED LOVE.
21 DR. LOVE: SAN FRANCISCO.
22 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.
23 DR. MURPHY: SAN DIEGO.
24 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.
25 DR. NOVA: SAN DIEGO.

1 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
2 DR. PENHOET: SAN FRANCISCO.
3 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
4 DR. PIZZO: SAN FRANCISCO.
5 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
6 DR. POMEROY: I'LL BE DIFFERENT. SACRAMENTO.
7 MS. KING: PHYLLIS PRECIADO.
8 DR. PRECIADO: SO DO I. SACRAMENTO.
9 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
10 DR. PRIETO: SACRAMENTO.
11 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA FOR JOHN REED.
12 DR. FONTANA: SAN DIEGO.
13 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
14 MS. SAMUELSON: SAN FRANCISCO.
15 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
16 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SAN FRANCISCO.
17 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
18 MR. SHEEHY: SAN FRANCISCO.
19 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.
20 DR. STEWARD: SAN FRANCISCO.
21 MS. KING: LEON THAL.
22 DR. THAL: SAN DIEGO.
23 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.
24 MS. WILSON: SAN DIEGO.
25 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

1 DR. WRIGHT: SAN FRANCISCO.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S NOT OVER. THE TWO TOP
3 VOTE GETTERS HERE, I BELIEVE, ARE SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN
4 DIEGO.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE NEED TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THE
6 TOP TWO VOTES AT THIS POINT. WE WILL DO A ROLL CALL
7 BETWEEN THE TOP TWO. AND THOSE ARE SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN
8 DIEGO.

9 MS. KING: I WOULD JUST ASK THE AUDIENCE. I'M
10 GOING TO HAVE TO DO ANOTHER ROLL CALL VOTE, SO THANK YOU.
11 ACTUALLY I'M GOING TO TURN THAT BACK OVER TO BOB.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE VOTES, I UNDERSTAND, ARE --

13 MR. HARRISON: THIRTEEN FOR SAN FRANCISCO, 11
14 FOR SAN DIEGO, AND THREE FOR SACRAMENTO.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SOUNDS LIKE SACRAMENTO IS
16 PRETTY IMPORTANT HERE.

17 DR. POMEROY: I'LL TELL YOU SACRAMENTO IS
18 IMPORTANT.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S -- I
20 THINK WHAT WE REALLY SHOULD DO IS GO BACK THROUGH THE
21 ROLL CALL, IF WE COULD, PLEASE.

22 DR. PIZZO: NO ABSTENTIONS.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD SUGGEST IT MIGHT BE
24 APPROPRIATE TO START WITH SACRAMENTO. WE'RE GOING TO GO
25 THROUGH THE SAME WAY. ROLL CALL. MELISSA, CAN YOU

1 PROCEED THROUGH THE ROLL CALL? THE CHOICES ARE SAN
2 FRANCISCO OR SAN DIEGO.

3 MS. KING: DR. PAUL JENNINGS FOR DAVID
4 BALTIMORE.

5 DR. JENNINGS: SAN DIEGO.

6 MS. KING: BOB PRICE FOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU.

7 DR. PRICE: SAN FRANCISCO.

8 MS. KING: KEITH BLACK.

9 DR. BLACK: SAN DIEGO.

10 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

11 DR. BRYANT: SAN DIEGO.

12 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

13 MR. GOLDBERG: SAN FRANCISCO.

14 MS. KING: FRANCIS MARKLAND FOR BRIAN HENDERSON.

15 DR. MARKLAND: SAN DIEGO.

16 MS. KING: ED HOLMES.

17 DR. HOLMES: SAN DIEGO.

18 MS. KING: DAVID KESSLER.

19 DR. KESSLER: SAN FRANCISCO.

20 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SAN FRANCISCO.

22 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

23 MS. LANSING: SAN DIEGO.

24 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

25 DR. LEVEY: SAN FRANCISCO.

1 MS. KING: TED LOVE.
2 DR. LOVE: SAN FRANCISCO.
3 MS. KING: RICHARD MURPHY.
4 DR. MURPHY: SAN DIEGO.
5 MS. KING: TINA NOVA.
6 DR. NOVA: SAN DIEGO.
7 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
8 DR. PENHOET: SAN FRANCISCO.
9 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
10 DR. PIZZO: SAN FRANCISCO.
11 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
12 DR. POMEROY: SAN FRANCISCO.
13 MS. KING: PHYLLIS PRECIADO.
14 DR. PRECIADO: SAN FRANCISCO.
15 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
16 DR. PRIETO: SAN FRANCISCO.
17 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA FOR JOHN REED.
18 DR. FONTANA: SAN DIEGO.
19 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
20 MS. SAMUELSON: SAN FRANCISCO.
21 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
22 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SAN FRANCISCO.
23 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
24 MR. SHEEHY: SAN FRANCISCO.
25 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

1 DR. STEWARD: SAN FRANCISCO.
2 MS. KING: LEON THAL.
3 DR. THAL: SAN DIEGO.
4 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.
5 MS. WILSON: SAN DIEGO.
6 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.
7 DR. WRIGHT: SAN FRANCISCO.
8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT IS THE COUNT?
9 MR. HARRISON: SAN FRANCISCO HAS 16 VOTES, SAN
10 DIEGO HAS 11.
11 (APPLAUSE.)
12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT I AM
13 INSPIRED BY THE COMMITMENTS OF THE OTHER CITIES THAT ARE
14 HERE THAT ARE IN THE FINALISTS IN THE COMPETITION. I
15 WOULD LIKE TO THANK EMERYVILLE. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE
16 EMERYVILLE MAKE A STATEMENT AT THIS TIME.
17 I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT WE HAVE PHENOMENAL
18 QUALITIES IN EACH OF THESE CITIES IN EACH OF THESE
19 APPLICATIONS. AND I WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE THE FACT --
20 EXCUSE ME -- I WOULD LIKE TO COMMEND THE DELEGATION FROM
21 EACH OF THESE CITIES FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS CONTRIBUTION.
22 LET US FOCUS FOR A MOMENT HERE ON THE EMERYVILLE
23 SPEAKER.
24 MR. SEARS: I'M JEFF SEARS OF WAREHAM
25 DEVELOPMENT. I'M HERE WITH CHRIS BARLOW. WE'RE THE

1 DEVELOPER PARTNERS WITH THE CITY OF EMERYVILLE. I
2 BROUGHT A LETTER FROM THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF
3 EMERYVILLE, AND I'LL JUST PARAPHRASE BECAUSE AT THIS
4 POINT, DON'T WANT TO WASTE ANY MORE TIME.

5 THE CITY OF EMERYVILLE WANTED TO EXPRESS, ONE,
6 THAT THEY AND WE ARE THRILLED THAT YOU'RE CURRENTLY
7 HEADQUARTERED IN EMERYVILLE. AND THE MAYOR AND ALL THE
8 CITY COUNCIL WANT TO EXTEND WHATEVER CAPABILITIES THEY
9 HAVE TO CONTINUE TO MAKE THE TRANSITION PERIOD FRUITFUL
10 FOR YOU. WE'RE THRILLED THAT YOU'VE BEEN THERE IN THAT
11 1.2 SQUARE MILE CITY. WE'RE THRILLED THAT YOU WILL BE
12 NEARBY.

13 WE THINK THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA BIOTECH CLUSTER
14 IS A CRITICAL ONE AND IT WILL BENEFIT YOU. SO RATHER
15 THAN READ IT ALL, THIS WAS DELIVERED TO YOUR EXISTING
16 HEADQUARTERS, WHICH IS THE CITY OF EMERYVILLE, WE WERE
17 THRILLED TO BE THERE IN OLYMPICS EVEN THOUGH WE FINISHED
18 OUT OF THE MEDALS.

19 (APPLAUSE.)

20 MR. BARLOW: MY NAME IS CHRIS BARLOW. I'M ALSO
21 WITH WAREHAM DEVELOPMENT. I'LL ALSO PARAPHRASE, BUT THIS
22 IS A LETTER THAT WAS SENT TO REBECCA DONNACHIE YESTERDAY.

23 YOUR CURRENT LEASE IN OUR BUILDING ALLOWS FOR
24 SEVEN MONTHS OF FREE RENT FOLLOWED BY THREE MONTHS OF
25 DISCOUNTED RENT AND ONE MONTH OF FULL RENT AND EXPIRES

1 END OF JANUARY. IN A GESTURE OF GOODWILL, BOTH YOUR
2 ORGANIZATION, DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES, WE'D LIKE
3 TO AMEND YOUR LEASE TO GIVE YOU A FULL PERIOD OF FREE
4 RENT RIGHT THROUGH 1/31.

5 (APPLAUSE.)

6 MR. BARLOW: THEREBY MAXIMIZING THE RESOURCES
7 AVAILABLE FOR YOUR RESEARCH INTO STEM CELLS IN
8 CALIFORNIA. ALSO, SHOULD YOUR MOVE TO SAN FRANCISCO NOT
9 BE AS SMOOTH AS OUR COLLEAGUES WHO HAVE JUST LEFT WOULD
10 LIKE TO THINK, WE WILL HAPPILY EXTEND THAT LEASE FOR
11 ANOTHER 60 DAYS PAST JANUARY 31ST AT NO COST TO YOU.

12 (APPLAUSE.)

13 MR. BARLOW: SO ON BEHALF OF ALL THE LIFE
14 SCIENCE COMMUNITY IN THE EAST BAY, IT'S BEEN OUR HONOR
15 AND PRIVILEGE TO BE YOUR HOST AND FIRST LANDLORD, AND WE
16 LOOK FORWARD TO A LONG AND FRUITFUL RELATIONSHIP. GOOD
17 LUCK.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. AND THIS IS A GREAT
19 FACILITY. I'M GOING TO GIVE A FIVE-MINUTE REST BREAK FOR
20 EVERYONE, AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO RECONVENE. DR.
21 POMEROY.

22 DR. POMEROY: I HAVE A COMMENT. I WOULD ASK
23 JUST EVERYONE FOR ONE MINUTE. I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A
24 FORMAL MOTION FROM THIS COMMITTEE TO THANK THE CITY OF
25 EMERYVILLE AND THE DEVELOPER FOR THEIR GENEROSITY AND THE

1 HIGH CLASS FACILITIES THAT THEY'VE GIVEN TO US OVER THE
2 PAST FEW MONTHS.

3 (APPLAUSE.)

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

5 DR. PRECIADO: SECOND.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO. A VOICE VOTE.
7 ALL IN FAVOR. THANK YOU.

8 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE RECONVENING. WE HAVE TO
10 GET THESE ACTION -- THE TRAINING GRANTS CONSIDERED HERE.
11 LET'S SEE WHAT WE'VE GOT TO WORK WITH HERE IN TERMS OF
12 THE BOARD.

13 DR. HALL: ALL RIGHT. THE EXCITEMENT IS OVER,
14 AND NOW THE REAL EXCITEMENT STARTS. THIS IS ACTUALLY A
15 MOMENTOUS OCCASION.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MURPHY IS COMING. COULD
17 THE STAFF GO OUT AND PLEASE LET THEM KNOW THAT WE'RE
18 WITHIN THREE OF A QUORUM?

19 MS. SAMUELSON: IS THERE ANYONE THAT HAS A
20 FLIGHT FROM FRESNO TO SAN FRANCISCO EARLIER THAN 8:20?
21 I'M JUST WONDERING WHAT THE FLIGHT OPTIONS ARE.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOAN, WE CAN PROVIDE A RIDE AS
23 WELL. JOAN, YOU CAN RIDE WITH ME.

24 OKAY. DO WE HAVE A QUORUM?

25 MR. HARRISON: WITH DR. MURPHY WE HAVE A QUORUM.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. DR. HALL, COULD YOU
2 PROCEED WITH THE TRAINING GRANT ITEM.

3 DR. HALL: IF ANYBODY IS GOING TO LEAVE IN THE
4 NEXT TWO MINUTES, I WILL MAKE THIS THE FASTEST TALK YOU
5 EVER HEARD IN YOUR LIFE. I VERY MUCH WANT TO REQUEST
6 ACTION ON THIS BECAUSE, AS I SAID, IT'S A VERY EXCITING
7 MOMENT IN OUR HISTORY HERE BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS OUR
8 FIRST PROGRAM.

9 MANY OF YOU SAW THE MATERIAL LAST MEETING,
10 ALTHOUGH WE DID NOT GET TO FORMALLY PRESENT IT. THIS
11 MEETING WHAT I WILL BE PRESENTING IS A TRUNCATED VERSION
12 OF THAT. WE HAVE SCALED IT DOWN BECAUSE OF THE
13 LITIGATION AND THE PROSPECT THAT WE MAY BE WORKING ON A
14 BIT REDUCED DOLLARS, AND SO WE HAVE SCALED BACK THE
15 PROPOSAL THAT YOU SAW BEFORE. I WANT TO QUICKLY PRESENT
16 THE PROPOSAL HERE.

17 BECAUSE WE ARE EAGER TO MOVE AHEAD, WE HAVE ALSO
18 WRITTEN AN RFA WHICH IS IN YOUR MATERIALS. WE WILL NOT,
19 IN GENERAL, BRING EACH AND EVERY RFA TO YOU FOR APPROVAL.
20 WE WILL PRESENT THE CONCEPT, GET DIRECTION FROM YOU, AND
21 WE WILL WRITE IT AND SEND IT OUT BASED ON YOUR
22 PROSCRIPTION, BUT WE WON'T, I HOPE, REQUIRE THE APPROVAL
23 OF THE DOCUMENT EACH TIME. BUT THIS TIME I WANTED YOU TO
24 SEE IT. AND IF YOU HAVE THOUGHTS, MODIFICATIONS BEYOND
25 WHAT'S IN THE DISCUSSION HERE, PLEASE GET THEM TO US.

1 NOW, THE IMPETUS FOR THIS IS THAT WITH THE
2 GRANTS THAT WE SEND OUT, WE'RE GOING TO REQUIRE A VASTLY
3 EXPANDED WORKFORCE ON STEM CELL RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA.
4 IN ORDER TO PROVIDE FOR THAT WORKFORCE, WE NEED TO BEGIN
5 NOW TO TRAIN STEM CELL RESEARCHERS. WE NEED TO TRAIN
6 THEM AT THE PREDOCTORAL LEVEL. WE NEED TO TRAIN THEM AS
7 POST-DOCS, AND WE ALSO NEED TO TRAIN CLINICAL FELLOWS.

8 THESE ARE THE PEOPLE WHO WILL MOVE UP THROUGH
9 THE RANKS; THAT IS, IF THEY'RE PRE-DOCS, THEY WILL BECOME
10 POST-DOCS, THEY WILL THEN TAKE POSITIONS, AND IT IS THESE
11 PEOPLE AS WE GO THROUGH WHO WE HOPE WILL BE APPLYING TO
12 US FOR GRANTS, DEPENDING ON WHERE THEY ARE NOW, IN THREE,
13 FIVE, SIX, SEVEN YEARS. SO THIS IS PART OF THE
14 EXCITEMENT OF WHAT WE'RE DOING, AND IT REALLY IS ONE OF
15 THE IMPORTANT FIRST STEPS IS TO BUILD OUR INTELLECTUAL
16 INFRASTRUCTURE.

17 WE OBVIOUSLY CANNOT SUPPORT ALL STEM CELL
18 TRAINEES IN THE STATE, AND SO OUR PURPOSE IS TO ENCOURAGE
19 INSTITUTIONS TO DEVELOP COURSES OF INSTRUCTION IN STEM
20 CELL BIOLOGY. WE ALSO HAVE AS AN AIM TO INCREASE
21 AWARENESS OF ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF
22 STEM CELL RESEARCH. AS YOU WILL SEE, WE ARE REQUIRING
23 THAT EACH INSTITUTION PROVIDE SUCH A COURSE FOR ITS
24 TRAINEES. AND ALSO, WE WANT TO FACILITATE WHERE
25 APPROPRIATE INTEGRATED TRAINING AND BASIC AND CLINICAL

1 ASPECTS OF STEM CELL RESEARCH; THAT IS, WE WANT TO BRING
2 THE BASIC SCIENTISTS AND THE CLINICAL SCIENTISTS IN
3 CONTACT WITH EACH OTHER AS PART OF THE SAME TRAINING
4 PROGRAM WHERE THEY WORK TOGETHER, LEARN FROM EACH OTHER,
5 AND WHERE THEY DEVELOP WHAT WE HOPE WILL BE OVER THE LONG
6 TERM INTEGRATED TRANSLATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT WILL MOVE
7 DISCOVERIES FROM THE LABORATORY INTO THE CLINIC.

8 AND FINALLY, WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE A DIVERSE
9 WORKFORCE. AND EACH OF THESE ITEMS IS REFLECTED IN OUR
10 RFA. THE FEATURES ARE, AS I HAVE SAID, PROVIDING FOR
11 TRAINING AT THESE THREE LEVELS. THE TRAINING WILL BE
12 OFFERED BY NONPROFIT, ACADEMIC, AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS
13 IN CALIFORNIA. AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE RECOGNIZE
14 IS THAT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS HAVE DIFFERENT
15 CAPABILITIES. THAT IS, TRAINING OF CLINICAL FELLOWS CAN
16 ONLY OCCUR IN PLACES THAT HAVE CLINICAL PROGRAMS, EITHER
17 HOSPITALS OR MEDICAL SCHOOLS. TRAINING FOR PREDOCTORAL
18 STUDENTS CAN ONLY OCCUR WHERE THERE ARE, IN FACT, IN
19 PLACE DOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.

20 AS I HAVE SAID, WE WANT EACH INSTITUTION TO HAVE
21 A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM, BUT WE RECOGNIZE THAT
22 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS HAVE DIFFERENT CAPABILITIES. AND
23 AS I WILL SHOW YOU IN JUST A MOMENT, WE, THEREFORE, HAVE
24 DEvised A PLAN WHERE WE HAVE THREE DIFFERENT TYPES --
25 THREE LEVELS OF TRAINING, IF YOU WILL.

1 WE WANT TO MAKE THE POINT THAT FOR THESE
2 PURPOSES, STEM CELL BIOLOGY IS BROADLY INTERPRETED; THAT
3 IS, INCLUDING MODEL SYSTEMS AND INCLUDING ADULT AND FETAL
4 AND EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS. THE BIOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES ARE
5 SIMILAR, THEY'RE INTERRELATED, AND WE THINK IT'S THIS
6 BROAD TRAINING THAT WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT GOING
7 FORWARD.

8 FINALLY, WE HAVE IT AS A SPECIFIC AND CONSCIOUS
9 AIM OF THIS TO FOSTER AN INTEREST IN DISEASE AND IN
10 FUNDAMENTAL BIOLOGY; THAT IS, WE WANT OUR BASIC
11 SCIENTISTS TO LEARN ABOUT AND BE INTERESTED IN SPECIFIC
12 DISEASES AND TO BE AWARE OF THEM. AND WE ALSO WANT THE
13 CLINICIANS WHO START WITH A DISEASE FRAMEWORK TO HAVE THE
14 BEST POSSIBLE TRAINING IN FUNDAMENTAL BIOLOGY.

15 WE WILL OFFER SUPPORT FOR THE TRAINEES, STIPEND
16 SUPPORT, AT THE THREE LEVELS. WE WILL OFFER RESEARCH
17 FUNDS; THAT IS, FUNDS THAT TRAINEES CAN TAKE INTO THE
18 LABORATORIES AND USE TO HELP FUND THEIR RESEARCH. WE
19 WILL PAY PARTIAL TUITION ACCORDING TO NIH FORMULA. WE
20 WILL PAY FEES AND HEALTH INSURANCE, AND WE WILL ALSO
21 PROVIDE, ACCORDING TO A FORMULA, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT
22 FOR CLASSROOM COURSES AND FOR PROGRAM. WE WILL NOT PAY
23 ALL EXPENSES, BUT WE WILL PROVIDE SUPPORT THAT WILL
24 ENCOURAGE INSTITUTIONS TO PUT IN PLACE THESE TRAINING
25 PROGRAMS.

1 AND, AGAIN, LET ME POINT OUT THAT THE TRAINING
2 PROGRAMS ARE NOT JUST FOR THE TRAINEES THAT WE SUPPORT
3 WITH STIPENDS. IN A SENSE THAT IS TO ENCOURAGE
4 INSTITUTIONS TO PUT TOGETHER TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT WILL
5 BENEFIT AN ENTIRE COMMUNITY AND THAT WILL BRING IN PEOPLE
6 FROM MANY DIFFERENT AREAS WHO WANT TO LEARN ABOUT STEM
7 CELL RESEARCH, INCLUDING VARIOUS BRANCHES OF BIOLOGY.
8 AND IN INSTITUTIONS WHERE IT'S APPROPRIATE, THERE MAY BE
9 PEOPLE IN ETHICS OR IN LAW OR IN OTHER AREAS THAT WISH TO
10 COME AND LEARN FROM AND BE ENRICHED BY THE RESOURCES OF
11 THESE TRAINING PROGRAMS.

12 SO THE WAY WE HAVE STRUCTURED IT IS ACCORDING TO
13 THREE LEVELS WHICH ARE AIMED AT DIFFERENT SIZE
14 INSTITUTIONS. AND THE POINT HERE IS THAT WE DON'T WANT A
15 SMALLER INSTITUTION WHICH MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE VERY
16 FOCUSED AND VERY EXCELLENT TRAINING TO HAVE TO COMPETE
17 WITH AN EXTREMELY LARGE INSTITUTION HEAD TO HEAD THAT CAN
18 OFFER A VERY LARGE PROGRAM. SO THE POINT IS WE WILL HAVE
19 A NUMBER OF COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS WHICH WE SEE
20 AS SPONSORING UP TO 16 TRAINEES. THESE WOULD OFFER
21 TRAINING AT THREE LEVELS, PREDOCTORAL, POSTDOCTORAL, AND
22 CLINICAL. AND THAT THESE GRANTS WOULD BE UP TO 1.25
23 MILLION PER YEAR FOR THREE YEARS.

24 NOW, I SAY UP TO BECAUSE THE MIX OF THE TRAINEES
25 WHICH HAVE DIFFERENT STIPEND LEVELS MAY DIFFER AT

1 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS, AND THINGS LIKE TUITION COSTS AND
2 OTHERS MAY COME IN. THAT'S THE GENERAL PLAN.

3 WE THEN IMAGINE THAT THERE WILL BE INSTITUTIONS
4 THAT WILL WANT TO DO AN INTERMEDIATE TRAINING PROGRAM.
5 THESE ARE INSTITUTIONS THAT MAY NOT HAVE A VERY
6 WELL-DEVELOPED STEM CELL PROGRAM AT THE MOMENT. THEY MAY
7 BE INSTITUTIONS THAT DON'T HAVE A MEDICAL SCHOOL, SO THEY
8 CAN'T OFFER A CLINICAL PROGRAM OR DON'T HAVE PREDOCTORAL
9 TRAINING SO THEY CAN'T OFFER THAT. BUT THEY CAN OFFER
10 TWO OF THE THREE LEVELS, EITHER PRE AND POST OR POST AND
11 CLINICAL. THESE WOULD BE SMALLER, UP TO TEN TRAINEES,
12 AND, AGAIN, UP TO \$800,000 PER YEAR FOR THREE YEARS.

13 FINALLY, THERE WILL BE SOME INSTITUTIONS THAT
14 WILL OFFER VERY SPECIALIZED TRAINING PROGRAMS. THEY MAY
15 HAVE NEITHER, FOR EXAMPLE, CLINICAL FACILITIES NOR
16 PREDOCTORAL PROGRAMS. THEIR FACULTY MAY PARTICIPATE IN
17 PREDOCTORAL PROGRAMS AT ANOTHER INSTITUTION, BUT THEY MAY
18 HAVE A VERY STRONG RESEARCH PROGRAM IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY
19 AND WISH TO OFFER POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING. THESE, AGAIN,
20 WOULD BE UP TO SIX TRAINEES AND HALF MILLION DOLLARS PER
21 YEAR FOR THREE YEARS.

22 OUR STIPENDS AS ARE FOLLOWS. THE PREDOCTORAL
23 WILL BE SLIGHTLY MORE THAN THE NIH. THAT'S A MISTAKE I
24 MEANT TO TAKE OUT. THE POSTDOCTORAL STIPENDS, AND WE DO
25 THAT BECAUSE OF IN CALIFORNIA MOST INSTITUTIONS CANNOT

1 RECRUIT EFFECTIVELY BY OFFERING JUST THE NIH STIPEND, SO
2 THIS HELPS THAT PROBLEM. THE POSTDOCTORAL STIPENDS ARE
3 GEARED TO THE NIH LEVELS. AND THEN WE GIVE A CLINICAL
4 FELLOW A STIPEND, WHICH IS ALSO A LITTLE BIT RICHER THAN
5 PROVIDED BY THE NIH, AND WE THINK IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT
6 IS A VERY DIFFICULT PROBLEM FOR PEOPLE WHO UNDERGO LONG
7 CLINICAL TRAINING TO DO THIS WITHOUT SOME KIND OF HELP.
8 THAT IS, MANY END UP MEDICAL SCHOOL IN DEBT. THEY THEN
9 HAVE A CHOICE OF GOING INTO PRACTICE OR GOING INTO THE
10 LAB, AND IT'S A BIG HELP IF WE'RE -- IF WE ARE GOING TO
11 ATTRACT THEM, WE NEED TO GIVE THEM A REASONABLE STIPEND.
12 THEY ARE GENERALLY MUCH FURTHER ALONG IN TERMS OF YEARS
13 OF TRAINING IN THOSE OTHER CATEGORIES.

14 AS I SAID, HEALTH INSURANCE FEES, TUITION
15 SUBSIDY FOR PREDOCTORAL FELLOWS. AND THEN ANNUAL SUPPORT
16 FOR RESEARCH SUPPLIES, TRAVEL, BOOKS. SOMEBODY SAID THIS
17 SHOWED -- THIS BETRAYED MY GENERATION, THAT ANYBODY WOULD
18 BE INTERESTED ACTUALLY IN BUYING A BOOK, ANY STUDENT
19 TODAY. BUT AT ANY RATE, THEY CAN GET A LAPTOP IF THEY
20 WANT. SO THIS WOULD BE THE STIPENDS THAT WE WOULD OFFER.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE AND COURSE SUPPORT, THIS JUST
22 FILLS THAT OUT. WE WILL OFFER INDIRECT COST TO THE
23 INSTITUTION OF 10 PERCENT, WHICH IS A LITTLE BIT MORE
24 THAN THE NIH, WHICH IS 8 PERCENT.

25 AND HERE'S THE SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAMS THAT WE

1 IMAGINE. WE IMAGINE THAT THERE WILL BE UP TO SIX OF THE
2 TYPE 1S, UP TO SIX OF THE TYPE 2S, AND UP TO SIX OF THE
3 TYPE 3S. IF WHEN THE GRANTS COME IN, WE NEED TO READJUST
4 THAT, WE CAN DO SO, BUT THAT IS WHAT WE CURRENTLY
5 IMAGINE.

6 THIS WOULD GIVE US, THEN, AT THE NUMBER OF
7 TRAINEES PER GRANT THAT YOU SEE THERE, WE WOULD BE
8 SUPPORTING 192 TRAINEES IN 18 INSTITUTIONS. AND THE
9 TOTAL COST OF THIS WOULD BE A LITTLE OVER \$15 MILLION PER
10 YEAR. WE WOULD OFFER THESE TRAINING GRANTS FOR INITIALLY
11 THREE YEARS. AND IF OUR FINANCIAL STATUS IMPROVES AND
12 BECOMES CLEAR, THEN WE CAN CONSIDER THE QUESTION OF
13 EXTENDING THEM TO FIVE OR MAKING THAT COMMITMENT LATER,
14 BUT INITIALLY WE PLAN TO OFFER THEM FOR THREE YEARS.

15 WE THINK THIS WOULD PROVIDE A ROBUST START TO
16 TRAINING STEM CELL RESEARCHERS IN THE STATE OF
17 CALIFORNIA. I THINK THE IDEA OF HAVING AS MANY AS 18
18 INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED IN THIS IS THRILLING. AND ALSO THE
19 FACT THAT WE'LL BE TRAINING DIRECTLY ALMOST 200 TRAINEES
20 SUPPORTING DIRECTLY, AND THEN INDIRECTLY WE THINK THE
21 BENEFITS OF THIS WILL RADIATE OUT TO MANY, MANY MORE
22 PEOPLE AND WILL BE VERY POSITIVE EFFECTS ON THE CAMPUSES.

23 NOW, I SHOULD SAY WE DON'T ANTICIPATE THAT
24 PEOPLE WILL START A PH.D. IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY. THAT
25 ISN'T THE POINT. THE POINT IS TO TAKE STUDENTS WHO ARE

1 IN DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY PROGRAMS, WHO ARE IN
2 NEUROSCIENCE PROGRAMS, WHO MAY BE IN ENGINEERING
3 PROGRAMS, WHO MAY BE IN CHEMISTRY PROGRAMS, BUT WHO HAVE
4 AN INTEREST IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY, BRINGING THEM TOGETHER
5 IN THESE CROSSCUTTING PROGRAMS. AS I SAID BEFORE, IN
6 PLACES WHERE IT'S APPROPRIATE, THAT THE EXTENSION AND THE
7 EFFECT, THE INFLUENCE OF THESE TRAINING PROGRAMS MAY BE
8 EVEN BROADER INTO AREAS LIKE PHILOSOPHY AND PUBLIC POLICY
9 AND LAW AND THE REST.

10 SO THAT IS WHAT WE PROPOSE. I HAVE A COPY OF
11 THE RFA IN YOUR BOOKS. AND WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU
12 FOR IS A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTE TO ISSUE
13 THE RFA THAT WE HAVE FOR A TOTAL OF 15.3 MILLION A YEAR
14 FOR THREE YEARS IN THE FIRST FUNDING CYCLE. AND IF YOU
15 HAVE SUGGESTIONS, PLEASE MAKE THEM, AND WE WOULD THEN
16 SHAPE THE RFA WITHIN THE GUIDELINES THAT YOU SUGGEST HERE
17 OR DOCTOR IT UP AS YOU WISH.

18 LET ME JUST SAY I HAD PREVIOUSLY A SCHEDULE
19 SLIDE; THAT IS, HOW DO WE ANTICIPATE THAT THIS WOULD
20 MARCH OUT GOING FORWARD. TO BE HONEST WITH YOU, FOR GOOD
21 LUCK, I TOOK IT OUT. WE THINK WE CAN GET THE RFA OUT
22 WITHIN A COUPLE WEEKS NOW THAT ARLENE CHIU IS ON BOARD
23 AND CONNIE ATWELL, WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN HERE TODAY AS OUR
24 CONSULTANT. SO WE ARE BUILDING UP OUR WORKFORCE. MARY
25 MAXON, OF COURSE, HAS BEEN THE OTHER PERSON WITH ME

1 WORKING ON THE SCIENCE.

2 WE THINK WE CAN GET THE RFA OUT. WE THEN NEED
3 TO -- WE WILL HAVE LETTERS OF INTENT, ASKING PEOPLE TO
4 SEND IN WITHIN A COUPLE OF WEEKS WHETHER THEY INTEND TO
5 APPLY AND WHAT KIND, TYPE 1, TYPE 2, TYPE 3. THAT WILL
6 GIVE US AN, IDEA, THEN OF HOW MANY APPLICATIONS WE'LL
7 HAVE, WHAT KINDS THEY'LL BE, AND HELP US PLAN. AND THEN
8 WORKING WITH OUR NEW VICE CHAIR AND WITH THE CHAIR, WE
9 WILL BEGIN TO PLAN FOR A STUDY SECTION MEETING -- SORRY
10 -- A WORKING GROUP MEETING, WHICH WOULD BE -- WE THINK WE
11 CAN DO THAT IN LATE JULY, MAYBE EARLY AUGUST. AND THEN
12 WE WILL HOPEFULLY COME BACK TO YOU WITH SOME GRANTS TO
13 RECOMMEND IN THE FIRST OF SEPTEMBER, FIRST OF OCTOBER.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR
15 TREMENDOUS WORK AND DEDICATION IN MOVING THIS FORWARD.
16 MARY, I KNOW THAT YOU WORKED VERY HARD TO SUPPORT THIS
17 EFFORT AS WELL AS SOME OTHER STAFF MEMBERS, BUT IT'S A
18 TREMENDOUS EFFORT YOU PUT FORWARD.

19 DR. PRECIADO: I'M REALLY EXCITED TO SEE THIS
20 MOVING FORWARD AS WELL. I HAVE A CONCERN ABOUT THE
21 GRANTS OR THE RESEARCH TRAINING GRANTS THAT WILL BE
22 OFFERED IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. WE DON'T HAVE A MEDICAL
23 SCHOOL OR A UNIVERSITY WITH A MEDICAL SCHOOL. WE'RE NOT
24 EVEN CLOSE TO THAT.

25 DR. HALL: YOU HAVE A HOSPITAL.

1 DR. PRECIADO: WE HAVE A HOSPITAL.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: UC SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY
3 HOSPITAL.

4 DR. PRECIADO: YES. WE HAVE THAT. THAT MEDICAL
5 SCHOOL IS NOT LOCATED IN FRESNO. IT'S LOCATED IN SAN
6 FRANCISCO.

7 DR. HALL: LET ME SAY A WORD ABOUT THAT. I
8 DIDN'T SAY THAT. WE HAVE AREAS WHERE WE HAVE SEVERAL
9 INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE COMPLEX RELATIONSHIPS. ONE THAT I
10 KNOW VERY WELL IS THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND USC, OR IN
11 THE SAN DIEGO AREA WE HAVE THE SALK, WE HAVE THE BURNHAM,
12 WE HAVE UC SAN DIEGO. AND WE IMAGINE -- AND THEN YOU
13 HAVE THE FRESNO PROGRAM AND YOU HAVE UCSF ATTACHMENT
14 THERE.

15 SO WE IMAGINE, THEN, THAT IT WOULD BE PERFECTLY
16 REASONABLE TO HAVE A GRANT FROM, LET'S SAY, SAN DIEGO,
17 FOR EXAMPLE, FROM UC SAN DIEGO THAT WOULD BE A TYPE 1
18 GRANT, PREDOCTORAL, POSTDOCTORAL, CLINICAL. THEN THERE
19 ARE ALSO MIGHT BE GRANTS FROM THE BURNHAM FOCUSING ON
20 POSTDOCTORAL OR THE SALK FOCUSING ON POSTDOCTORAL. I
21 DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S LOCAL HOSPITAL THAT'S AFFILIATED
22 THERE THAT'S SEPARATELY INDEPENDENT FINANCIALLY OR NOT,
23 BUT ONE COULD IMAGINE AT USC THAT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL
24 L.A., FOR EXAMPLE, MIGHT PUT IN A SEPARATE ONE OR EVEN
25 THE LOCAL HOSPITAL HERE.

1 SO IF YOU HAVE PEOPLE DOING WORK THAT'S RELATED
2 TO STEM CELL WORK THAT COULD OFFER TRAINING, THEN I DON'T
3 SEE ANY REASON --

4 DR. PRECIADO: I THINK WHAT I'M SUGGESTING IS
5 THAT WE DON'T EVEN HAVE THAT. WHAT I'M SUGGESTING IS
6 THAT WE -- FRESNO AREA, CENTRAL VALLEY JUST DOESN'T HAVE
7 THE PULL THAT SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN DIEGO AND SACRAMENTO
8 HAVE. THERE'S NO WAY THE CENTRAL VALLEY IS EVER GOING TO
9 COMPETE UNLESS WE START MAKING A MOVEMENT TO BE INCLUSIVE
10 IN THE WORK THAT IS GOING ON IN FRESNO. THERE'S SOME
11 WORK GOING ON. IT'S JUST NOT AT THE LEVEL OF SAN
12 FRANCISCO, SAN DIEGO, AND SACRAMENTO.

13 MY FEAR IS THAT IF WE DON'T OUTREACH TO USC,
14 FRESNO, WE DO HAVE A NEW MEDICAL RESEARCH BUILDING GOING
15 UP, IF WE'RE NOT INCLUSIVE OF THE POTENTIAL FOR THAT
16 RESEARCH GOING ON THERE, IT'S NOT GOING TO HAPPEN. NIH,
17 WE NEVER GET NIH FUNDING. CAL STATE FRESNO DOES, BUT WE
18 DON'T.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO, ISN'T THERE STEM
20 CELL RESEARCH GOING ON UC MERCED?

21 DR. PRECIADO: THERE IS. DR. MARIA
22 PELLAMANCHINI IS DOING WONDERFUL WORK THERE IN CANCER.
23 YEAH, THEY WOULD BE SOMEBODY THAT HOPEFULLY WILL BE ABLE
24 TO COMPETE.

25 DR. HALL: WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO DISCUSS THAT

1 WITH YOU AND TALK ABOUT THAT. UNDERSTAND, FOR TRAINING,
2 OF COURSE, WE HAVE TO BRING TRAINEES TO PLACES WHERE --
3 THERE HAS TO BE SOMEBODY THERE TO TRAIN THEM.

4 DR. PRECIADO: THAT'S EXACTLY THE PROBLEM
5 THOUGH. THAT IS EXACTLY THE PROBLEM IS THAT'S ALWAYS THE
6 REASON GIVEN IS THAT WE CAN'T HELP YOU, PHYLLIS, IN
7 FRESNO BECAUSE THERE'S NOBODY THERE DOING WHAT IT IS THAT
8 YOU WANT TO DO. THE SOLUTION HAS TO GO BEYOND WHAT HAS
9 BEEN DONE IN THE PAST IS WHAT MY SUGGESTION IS.

10 DR. HALL: I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. I
11 THINK IT IS A LEGITIMATE CONCERN AND A SERIOUS PROBLEM
12 FROM YOUR POINT OF VIEW. BUT I THINK IT'S A PROBLEM THAT
13 GOES BEYOND THE TRAINING GRANT. IT IS --

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S ADDRESS IF WE CAN --

15 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE SOME SUGGESTIONS TO THAT
16 POINT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK WE HAVE AN OUTSTANDING
18 COMMENT FROM DR. PRICE.

19 DR. PRICE: I DON'T KNOW HOW OUTSTANDING IT IS.
20 NO. 1. YOU SPOKE ABOUT COMPLEMENTARY INSTITUTIONS
21 OFFERING OR APPLYING SEPARATELY FOR SEPARATE GRANTS. DO
22 YOU NOT FORESEE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS BETWEEN
23 COMPLEMENTARY --

24 DR. HALL: YES. WE WELCOME THAT, BUT EACH
25 INDIVIDUAL ONE WILL HAVE TO STAND OR FALL ON ITS OWN.

1 DR. PRICE: YOU WOULDN'T IMAGINE A TRAINING
2 GRANT WHICH WOULD COMBINE UC BERKELEY AND UCSF FOR A PRE,
3 POST, CLINICAL EFFORT?

4 DR. HALL: WELL --

5 DR. BRYANT: HE SAYS A SINGLE INSTITUTION.

6 DR. PRICE: SINGLE INSTITUTE.

7 DR. HALL: IT'S GOES TO THE SINGLE INSTITUTION.

8 DR. PRICE: WHAT ABOUT SUBCONTRACT?

9 DR. HALL: WHAT YOU COULD DO WOULD BE -- I DON'T
10 THINK THAT IS IN THE SPIRIT OF GETTING -- WHAT YOU COULD
11 DO WOULD BE, SINCE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A PROGRAM AT
12 BERKELEY, LET'S SAY, THAT'S GOING TO TRAIN PREDOCTORAL
13 FELLOWS AND POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS, SO THAT ALREADY
14 QUALIFIES YOU FOR A TYPE 2. YOU COULD SAY THAT PART OF
15 OUR TRAINING PROGRAM ACTUALLY WILL BE TO USE A LABORATORY
16 COURSE AT UCSF, AND THEY HAVE AGREED TO THAT. WE WILL
17 OFFER THEM A COURSE IN -- THEIR STUDENTS ARE GOING TO
18 TAKE A COURSE IN METAL ENGINEERING.

19 DR. PRICE: IT'S JUST THAT A LOT OF THE GRANTING
20 WORK IN THE SCIENCES NOW IS MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL.

21 DR. HALL: WE ENCOURAGE MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL
22 ARRANGEMENTS, BUT WHAT WE WANT TO DO IS TO HAVE EACH
23 INSTITUTION HAVE ITS OWN GRANT, WHICH THEN WILL RELATE TO
24 OTHERS. AND THAT COULD VERY WELL --

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND WHILE YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT

1 POLICY, DR. HALL, WOULD YOU COMMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF
2 THE BOARD WHETHER THERE WILL BE ANY EFFORT HERE AT THE
3 INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE WITH BUILDING THE HUMAN
4 RESOURCES IN THIS FIELD TO ASK IN THE RFP FOR
5 INSTITUTIONS TO REACH OUT FOR DIVERSITY?

6 DR. HALL: ACTUALLY IT IS IN THE RFP. WE ASKED
7 THEM TO RESPOND AND EXPLICITLY SAY WHAT THEY PLAN TO DO
8 ABOUT TRYING TO GET A DIVERSE POPULATION OF TRAINEES.
9 AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT THEY ARE ASKED TO EXPLICITLY
10 ADDRESS. I FORGET THE EXACT WORDING.

11 DR. PRECIADO: THERE ARE MINORITY SUPPLEMENTS.

12 DR. HALL: WE SAY EARLY ON AT THE BEGINNING THAT
13 THIS IS THE CASE, AND THEN WE SAY AS PART OF THE PLAN, WE
14 ASK THE PROGRAM -- EVERY PROGRAM THAT APPLIES WILL BE
15 ASKED TO SAY WHAT ITS PLANS ARE FOR INCREASING THE
16 DIVERSITY OF ITS TRAINEES.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO TURN THE CHAIR
18 OVER TO DR. PENHOET FOR A MOMENT BECAUSE THE STATE
19 FINANCE COMMITTEE STAFF IS MEETING AND NEEDS AN URGENT
20 ANSWER AS THEY'RE PREPARING FOR MONDAY. I WILL BE BACK
21 MOMENTARILY.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: WE'RE CONTINUING ON THE SAME
23 SUBJECT. OKAY. I GUESS TWO SUGGESTIONS. ONE WOULD BE
24 THAT THE PROCESS GETS BUILT INTO AN UNUSUALLY LONG PERIOD
25 FOR OUTREACH -- DEVELOPING THE OUTREACH TO THE POPULATION

1 OF CLINICS AND RESEARCH LABS AND SO ON THAT MAY BE
2 INTERESTED IN SUBMITTING A LETTER OF INTENT SINCE WE'RE
3 STARTING THIS FOR THE FIRST TIME AND BECAUSE WE MIGHT BE
4 REACHING OUT TO INTERESTED PARTIES WHO MAY NOT HAVE BEEN
5 THE RECIPIENT, FOR EXAMPLE.

6 DR. HALL: WE HAVE IDENTIFIED, I GUESS, AS PART
7 OF THE WORK THAT WAS DONE BEFORE I GOT THERE A LIST OF
8 SOME 70 ODD INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT
9 ARE THOUGHT TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDS FROM THE CIRM. AND
10 SO WE CERTAINLY WOULD CONTACT EACH OF THEM AND INVITE
11 THEM TO SUBMIT.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: PERHAPS LOOK A LITTLE HARDER AND
13 INVITE, SAY, PHYLLIS, FOR EXAMPLE, TO ASSIST STAFF IN
14 BEING SURE THAT FOLKS WHO MIGHT BE ELIGIBLE, BUT AREN'T
15 ON THE LIST COULD APPLY. PERHAPS ALSO CONSIDER
16 GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY IN THE KIND OF TRAINING -- THE
17 OBJECTS OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM, I GUESS. THE TRAINING
18 PROGRAMS MIGHT BE RUN BY FOLKS IN, LET'S SAY, THE BAY
19 AREA, FOR EXAMPLE, BUT HAVE AS PART OF THEIR OBJECT
20 TRAINING RESEARCHERS, SCIENTISTS, CLINICIANS IN THE
21 CENTRAL VALLEY, FOR EXAMPLE.

22 ARE YOU FOLLOWING? THAT MIGHT FACILITATE, AND I
23 CAN SEE VARIOUS BENEFITS.

24 DR. HALL: I THINK YOU WOULD HAVE TO TALK TO
25 UCSF ABOUT THAT AND SEE IF THEY'LL INCLUDE THAT IN THEIR

1 PROGRAM AS PART OF THEIR DIVERSITY PLAN MAY BE ONE
2 POSSIBILITY. I THINK THAT WOULD BE FINE.

3 DR. PRIETO: I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE
4 QUESTION DR. PRICE RAISED. IS THERE ANY REASON WHY THE
5 RFP COULD NOT INCLUDE SPECIFICALLY MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL
6 GRANTS WORKING ON AN INTEGRATED PROGRAM?

7 DR. HALL: SO ONE OF THE THINGS -- WE CAN DO
8 THAT, BUT IT HAS TO RISE OR FALL AS ONE.

9 DR. PRIETO: I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND.

10 DR. HALL: IF YOU COUPLE THREE OR FOUR
11 INSTITUTIONS TOGETHER, THEN THEY EITHER RISE OR FALL ON
12 THEIR OWN. AND THEN THE WHOLE THING GOES IF THERE'S A
13 WEAK PART. OUR SENSE IS THAT WE SHOULD GIVE THE MONEY TO
14 THE OTHER -- THE POINT WE THINK IT'S HEALTHIER TO HAVE
15 THE MONEY GO TO INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS SO THAT THE
16 BURNHAM, FOR EXAMPLE, DOESN'T HAVE TO GET ITS MONEY FROM
17 UC SAN DIEGO ON A SUBCONTRACT, THAT THE BURNHAM ITSELF
18 HAS ITS OWN MONEY THAT IT CAN USE FOR ITS OWN TRAINING
19 PROGRAM. AND WE WANT THE BURNHAM ALSO TO DEVELOP, AS AN
20 EXAMPLE, NOTHING SPECIFIC ABOUT THAT, BUT WE WANT AN
21 INSTITUTION LIKE THAT TO DEVELOP ITS OWN TRAINING
22 PROGRAM. AND WE THINK THE LINKS TO OTHERS WILL BE
23 STRONG.

24 OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH PEOPLE AT VARIOUS LOCALES
25 MAKE IT SEEM AS IF THIS WOULD WORK QUITE WELL.

1 DR. PRIETO: SO WE DON'T FORESEE THAT WE'D BE
2 ANYBODY'S SOLE FUNDING SOURCE FOR THEIR TRAINING PROGRAM?

3 DR. HALL: FOR STEM CELL BIOLOGY.

4 DR. PRIETO: FOR STEM CELL BIOLOGY? THEY WOULD
5 ALSO BE DEVELOPING OTHER RESOURCES.

6 DR. HALL: THEY WOULD DRAW FROM PROGRAMS --
7 THERE WILL BE STUDENTS INTERESTED IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY
8 THAT WE DON'T PAY FOR. ALSO, THEY WILL DRAW THESE
9 STUDENTS, IN THIS CASE OF PREDOCTORAL FELLOWS, AS I SAID,
10 A VARIETY OF TRAINING PROGRAMS WHICH COULD RANGE ACROSS A
11 WIDE AREA AND ALSO DEPEND ON THE INSTITUTION. THAT IS,
12 COULD BE ENGINEERING. NOT EVERY PLACE HAS AN ENGINEERING
13 SCHOOL. COULD BE A DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY, NEUROSCIENCE,
14 MOLECULAR BIOLOGY. TREMENDOUS -- WHAT WE WANT ARE
15 PROGRAMS THAT DRAW -- BRING TOGETHER STUDENTS FROM ALL
16 THESE AREAS OR WHATEVER RELEVANT ONES THERE ARE, HAVE
17 THEM BE TRAINED, WORK TOGETHER, IN THAT SENSE PARTICIPATE
18 IN A TRAINING PROGRAM. AND WE SEE THAT AS THE BEST WAY
19 TO MARSHAL THE DIVERSE SCIENTIFIC TALENTS, IF YOU WILL,
20 THAT WE NEED TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY
21 IN MEDICINE.

22 DR. BRYANT: SO I UNDERSTAND WHY YOU ARE DOING
23 IT THIS WAY, BUT I ALSO THINK THAT MAYBE PEOPLE SHOULD
24 HAVE THE OPTION TO GO IN WITH MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL
25 PROPOSALS. AND THE REASON I SAY THAT IS THAT ONE OF THE

1 GOALS IS TO FOSTER COLLABORATION OUTSIDE OF THE
2 INSTITUTION. I THOUGHT IT WAS ANYWAY, THAT ONE OF THE
3 THINGS WE WANTED TO -- I MEAN THAT IS THE TREND. SO IF
4 YOU CAN DO PART OF THE PROGRAM, IT CAN BE DONE BY FACULTY
5 AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS. THAT MIGHT BE A STRENGTH IN
6 SOME CASES, SO NOT TO ELIMINATE THAT AS A POSSIBILITY.

7 DR. HALL: MAYBE WE CAN DISCUSS THAT AT ANOTHER
8 TIME. I THINK IT IS A MORE COMPLICATED SOLUTION. AT
9 LEAST THAT'S THE CONCLUSION THAT WE CAME TO PARTLY
10 BECAUSE OF THE WAY THE FUNDS FLOW, PARTLY BECAUSE OF THE
11 VARIOUS INTERDEPENDENCIES, AND ALSO THEN OUR CATEGORIES
12 GET COMPLICATED. YOU KNOW, WE CAN HAVE AS BIG A GRANT AS
13 YOU WANT OR AS SMALL A GRANT AS YOU WANT. IT SEEMED TO
14 US THAT IT WAS MUCH MORE COMPLICATED TO DO IT THAT WAY.
15 THIS WAY THE MONEY GOES DIRECTLY TO A PARTICULAR
16 INSTITUTION. WE SEND MONEY. WE THINK THIS IS A STRENGTH
17 TO 18 INSTITUTIONS.

18 JOAN, I DIDN'T ANSWER THIS, WITH 18, THESE WILL
19 BE, WE HOPE, SCATTERED OVER THE STATE SO THAT WE'LL
20 PROVIDE GEOGRAPHIC OPPORTUNITIES, BUT STUDENTS MAY TAKE
21 COURSES AT OTHER CAMPUSES IF THEY SO WISH.

22 DR. MARKLAND: AS I UNDERSTAND THE RFA, SEVERAL
23 INSTITUTIONS CAN USE THE SAME TRAINING PROGRAM AND
24 INDICATE IN THE LETTER OF INTENT THAT THEY WILL BE
25 APPLYING SEPARATELY?

1 DR. HALL: NO. NO. SO WE WOULD ANTICIPATE IN
2 YOUR CASE GETTING AN APPLICATION, LET'S SAY WE COULD,
3 FROM USC, CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL L.A., AND CALTECH, THREE
4 SEPARATE APPLICATIONS, BUT THE CALTECH APPLICATION MIGHT
5 SAY WE PLAN TO SEND OUR STUDENTS TO UCHLA TO TAKE A
6 LABORATORY COURSE, AND THAT WOULD BE PART OF THE TRAINING
7 PROGRAM. THE CHLA PEOPLE WOULD PARTICIPATE PRESUMABLY AS
8 USC FACULTY GIVING PREDOCTORAL TRAINING GIVEN AT USC, BUT
9 THEY MAY WISH TO HAVE THEIR OWN POSTDOCTORAL AND CLINICAL
10 TRAINING PROGRAM. AND THAT THIS COULD BE IN ADDITION TO
11 THE OTHERS, BUT AGAIN BE SEPARATE -- THREE SEPARATE AND
12 INTERLINKED PROGRAMS, BUT IT WOULD BE UP TO YOU TO PUT
13 THAT TOGETHER; AND IF IT WERE BE DONE IN THE RIGHT WAY,
14 THEN IT'S NOT DEPENDENT. IF ONE OF THE THREE WERE NOT
15 ACCEPTED FOR SOME REASON, IT WOULDN'T JEOPARDIZE THE
16 OTHER TWO NECESSARILY.

17 DR. STEWARD: ZACH, YOU PROBABLY HAVE TALKED
18 ABOUT THIS OR THOUGHT ABOUT IT, BUT ONE OF THE THINGS
19 THAT ISN'T PRESENT HERE IS LET'S CALL IT INDIVIDUAL
20 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM. AND I REALIZE WE CAN'T PROBABLY PUT
21 IT ON THE TABLE AS AN ACTION ITEM, BUT TO THINK ABOUT
22 WAYS TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE ISSUES OF DIVERSITY. FOR
23 EXAMPLE, ONE COULD EASILY IMAGINE A FACULTY MEMBER AT A
24 CAMPUS IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY WHO WANTED TO DEVELOP STEM
25 CELL EXPERTISE. AND MAYBE HAVING A SEPARATE PROGRAM

1 AVAILABLE FOR A SUCH PERSON COULD APPLY FOR A YEAR'S
2 SUPPORT FOR A SABBATICAL TO WORK IN THE STEM CELL LAB.
3 IT'S NOT PART OF THIS PROGRAM.

4 DR. HALL: WE'RE TRYING TO GET SORT OF A PLAIN
5 VANILLA PROGRAM STARTED TO WHICH WE CAN LATER ADD. I
6 WOULD SAY THAT ONE OF THE INTERESTING SUGGESTIONS THAT'S
7 COME UP THAT YOU MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN, PHYLLIS, IS THE
8 SUGGESTION THAT WE'RE NOT ONLY GOING TO NEED SCIENTISTS,
9 BUT WE'RE GOING TO NEED TECHNICAL PEOPLE WHO WORK IN THE
10 LABS. AND SEVERAL INSTITUTIONS HAVE TRAINING PROGRAMS AT
11 THE SORT OF JUNIOR COLLEGE OR CITY COLLEGE LEVEL, VERY
12 HIGH MINORITY POPULATION. AND ONE OF THE RESEARCHERS,
13 FOR EXAMPLE, WE TALKED TO AT CALTECH HAD HAD SEVERAL
14 PEOPLE COME TO THESE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE LAB.

15 HE MADE AN INTERESTING POINT. HE SAID FOR MOST
16 OF THEM, GETTING A PH.D. IS NOT A REALISTIC OPTION GIVEN
17 THEIR BACKGROUND. SOMETIMES THEIR VERBAL SKILLS AREN'T
18 GREAT, BUT TURN THEM LOOSE IN THE LAB AND GET THEM
19 STARTED AND THEY TURN OUT TO BE FANTASTIC.

20 SO THERE IS A SUGGESTION ON HAVING A PROGRAM
21 THAT WOULD BE AIMED, NOT JUST AT PRODUCING PH.D.'S, BUT
22 IT WOULD BE PRODUCING LABORATORY TECHNICIANS, THE PEOPLE
23 WHO WOULD DO -- ACTUALLY CARRY OUT SOME OF THESE
24 EXPERIMENTS. MANY OF THESE EXPERIMENTS, AS SOME YOU MAY
25 KNOW, REQUIRE QUITE DELICATE LABORATORY SKILLS. THIS CAN

1 BE TAUGHT AND TRAINED, AND WE WANT TO THINK ABOUT THE
2 POSSIBILITY OF STARTING SOMETHING LIKE THIS, BUT NOT
3 INCLUDED IN THIS. IT'S SOMETHING WE'LL DO THAT LATER ON.
4 BUT I ACTUALLY FOUND THAT A VERY EXCITING IDEA BECAUSE I
5 THINK IT WOULD INCREASE OUR -- PEOPLE FROM WHOM THIS IS A
6 BENEFIT IN TERMS OF THE TRAINED PERSONNEL BEYOND THE KIND
7 OF PEOPLE THAT YOU FIND AT TOP-FLIGHT UNDERGRADUATE
8 SCHOOLS AND GRADUATE SCHOOLS AND ALL THE REST, BUT IT
9 WOULD REACH OUT TO A BROADER SEGMENT OF THE POPULATION,
10 SOME OF WHOM MAY NOT BE FOR REASONS OF INCOME OR PREVIOUS
11 TRAINING FOR WHOM PH.D.'S JUST MAY NOT BE A REALISTIC
12 OPTION.

13 DR. THAL: VERY SMALL POINT. THE TRAINING OF
14 THE CLINICAL FELLOWS, THE AMOUNT PROBABLY SHOULD BE A
15 LITTLE BIT MORE FLEXIBLE THAN THE 65,000. THE K AWARDS
16 HAVE ACTUALLY CREPT UP OVER THE YEARS SO THAT MOST K
17 AWARDEES ARE NOW RECEIVING AROUND 75,000 FROM NIH. JUST
18 LIKE TO MAKE IT AT LEAST COMPETITIVE.

19 DR. HALL: THE K AWARDS ARE -- WE SHOULD TALK
20 ABOUT THAT LATER PERHAPS. I'D BE HAPPY TO DO THAT. WE
21 KEYED THESE TO BE A PART OF A UNIVERSITY, WHAT THEY PAID
22 THEIR CLINICAL FELLOWS. THIS WAS MORE OR LESS KEYED TO
23 THAT.

24 THE K AWARDS ARE SORT OF THE TOP-OF-THE-LINE
25 PEOPLE WHO ARE ALMOST READY TO GO OFF INTO INDEPENDENT

1 LABS. I WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO CHAT WITH YOU ABOUT THAT
2 BEFORE WE SEND THIS OUT TO SEE IF WE CAN FIND A WAY TO DO
3 THAT. THANK YOU.

4 DR. PRECIADO: ZACH, I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE WHAT
5 YOU HAD TO SAY ABOUT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES. I THINK
6 THAT, IN FACT, YOU DO FIND A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF
7 UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS ATTENDING THESE COLLEGES. IT'S
8 NOT BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT TO GET A PH.D. IT'S
9 IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT SOME OF THE TECHNICAL AND BENCH
10 RESEARCH KINDS OF ACTIVITIES ARE OPEN TO ANYBODY WHO
11 WANTS TO ATTEND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE. COMMUNITY
12 COLLEGES ARE AFFORDABLE TO THE UNDERREPRESENTED
13 COMMUNITIES IN A WAY THAT OTHER HIGHER INSTITUTIONS ARE
14 NOT.

15 DR. HALL: ABSOLUTELY. WHAT I'M SUGGESTING IS
16 WHAT IF WE HAD TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT WOULD ACKNOWLEDGE
17 THAT WE ACTUALLY --

18 DR. PRECIADO: I THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE --

19 DR. HALL: -- TRAIN THEM TO DO THESE KIND OF
20 DELICATE MANEUVERS.

21 DR. PRECIADO: I THINK THAT'S A WONDERFUL IDEA.
22 IN ADDITION, I THINK IT WOULD BE GOOD TO HAVE PROGRAMS
23 THAT REALLY PUSH THEM TO GO BEYOND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

24 DR. HALL: OKAY.

25 DR. BRYANT: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY WE HAVE A

1 MASTER'S IN BIOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM AT UCI, WHICH IS A
2 TWO-YEAR RESEARCH PROGRAM THAT TRAINS STUDENTS IN JUST
3 THAT -- SUCH THAT WAY TO GO INTO INDUSTRY. SO I THINK
4 THAT -- AND THAT WOULD BE THE EQUIVALENT OF BEING A
5 TECHNICIAN REALLY. IT'S AT THAT LEVEL THAT YOU CAN GET
6 THAT EXPERTISE. THAT'S A GOOD MODEL.

7 DR. HALL: YES. THERE ARE SEVERAL OF THESE
8 PROGRAMS AROUND. WE DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THEM YET,
9 BUT I JUST SAW THAT AS A VERY INTERESTING POSSIBILITY. I
10 HOPE WE'LL BRING IT TO YOU IN THE FUTURE.

11 DR. POMEROY: MY QUESTION IS MUCH MORE MUNDANE.
12 I'M CONCERNED THAT THERE'S NO FACULTY SALARY SUPPORT
13 INCLUDED IN THIS TRAINING GRANT. AND GENERALLY SPEAKING,
14 THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT IT TAKES A PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND
15 COUPLE OF KEY FACULTY CAN BE QUITE SIGNIFICANT. AS MANY
16 OF US KNOW, IN THE UC SYSTEM, MANY OF THE SCHOOL OF
17 MEDICINE FACULTY, FOR EXAMPLE, DON'T HAVE ANY STATE BASE,
18 AND THEY MUST WORK IN CLINIC TO GENERATE THEIR SALARIES
19 OR GENERATE SALARIES OFF OF RESEARCH GRANTS IF THEY'RE
20 NOT IN CLINIC.

21 SO I WONDER HOW MUCH ROOM THERE IS IN THIS
22 PROPOSAL, NOT FOR THE PERSON WHO GIVES AN INDIVIDUAL
23 LECTURE OR HAS SOMEONE IN THEIR LAB, BUT FOR THE
24 ADMINISTRATIVE LEADER AND SOME KEY FACULTY TO GET SOME
25 FACULTY SALARIES.

1 DR. HALL: SO THERE IS AN ADMINISTRATIVE
2 STIPEND. MARY, HELP ME. I THINK IT'S \$3500 PER TRAINEE
3 THAT GOES TO THE PROGRAM. AND THEY CAN USE THAT FOR
4 ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES. THEY CAN USE IT TO SUPPLEMENT
5 AN ACADEMIC SALARY. THEY CAN USE IT ANY WAY THEY WANT
6 TO. IF YOU GET INTO BIG-TIME ACADEMIC SALARIES, IT
7 REALLY CUTS VERY HEAVILY INTO YOUR TRAINEE PROGRAMS. MY
8 OWN EXPERIENCE WAS THAT FOR EXCITING AREAS LIKE THIS, YOU
9 DON'T HAVE ANY TROUBLE GETTING FACULTY TO PARTICIPATE.
10 IF YOU WANT TO BRING IN SOMEBODY FROM THE OUTSIDE, WHICH
11 YOU CAN DO OCCASIONALLY --

12 DR. POMEROY: WELL, I WOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE
13 COMMENTS FROM THE OTHER DEANS, BUT AS A DEAN, I CAN TELL
14 YOU VERY STRONGLY THAT IF SOMEONE NEEDS TO DEVOTE 30
15 PERCENT EFFORT, FOR EXAMPLE, TO BEING A PROGRAM DIRECTOR
16 OF A NEW TRAINING PROGRAM, THEY WOULD HAVE TO HAVE SALARY
17 SUPPORT FOR THAT.

18 DR. BRYANT: SPEAKING FROM THE BASIC SCIENCE
19 SIDE, THEY DO REQUIRE A SMALL STIPEND, BUT IT WOULD BE
20 WITHIN THE RANGE OF WHAT WOULD BE ACHIEVED FROM THAT.
21 WE'RE NOT DEALING WITH PEOPLE THAT HAVE TO MAKE THEIR OWN
22 SALARY.

23 DR. POMEROY: SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE ARE DIFFERENT
24 THAN BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

25 DR. HALL: IS THAT TRUE IN THE BASIC SCIENCES?

1 I KNOW IN THE CLINICAL DEPARTMENTS IT'S OFTEN TRUE, BUT
2 IN THE BASIC SCIENCES --

3 DR. POMEROY: IN BASIC SCIENCE WE HAVE MANY
4 PEOPLE IN THE N RESIDENT SERIES IN THE UC SYSTEM WHO HAVE
5 TO GENERATE THEIR SALARIES COMPLETELY FROM GRANTS.

6 DR. HALL: I THINK OUR CONCERN IN THIS WAS TO
7 MAKE THE MONEY GO AS FAR AS POSSIBLE IN TERMS OF STUDENT
8 SUPPORT. I THINK IF WE GET OUR FINANCES STRAIGHTENED OUT
9 AND THE LITIGATION SOLVED, THEN I THINK WE CAN THINK
10 ABOUT SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE MORE GENEROUS IN THAT
11 REGARD.

12 I SHOULD SAY ALSO ANOTHER ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN
13 RAISED IS TRAINING FOR FACULTY, AND OUR OWN VIEW IS THAT
14 THAT SHOULD BE LINKED TO SPECIFIC PROJECTS AND WOULD BE
15 PART OF PERHAPS AN INNOVATION GRANT OR SOMETHING LIKE
16 THAT WOULD COME ALONG AT A LATER TIME. SO --

17 DR. PENHOET: MAYBE IF WE COULD RETURN TO THE
18 ISSUE, WHICH WE WOULD LIKE TO EMPOWER ZACH AND STAFF TO
19 GO FORWARD AND SEND OUT RFA'S. AND WE DISCUSSED MANY OF
20 SORT OF TWEAKS, IF I MIGHT, TO THE PROPOSAL WE GOT TODAY,
21 BUT THE FUNDAMENTAL PROPOSAL IS FOR THREE LEVELS OF
22 FUNDING.

23 MS. SAMUELSON: ONE MORE QUESTION. COULD YOU
24 ELABORATE ON YOUR REFERENCES TO ENGINEERING AND THEN
25 TO -- I THINK YOU MENTIONED ETHICS AND THE LAW OR SOME

1 COMBINATION LIKE THAT. AND MIGHT ANY OF THAT
2 ACCOMMODATE SOMETHING AT SOME POINT WE WOULD WANT, WHICH
3 IS TRAINING OF THE ICOC, AT LEAST THOSE OF US WHO ARE NOT
4 SCIENTISTS TO GET US UP TO SPEED.

5 DR. HALL: I THINK IT WOULD BE WONDERFUL FOR
6 ICOC MEMBERS TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE COURSES. AND I
7 THINK, AGAIN, AS WE MOVE ALONG, I THINK IT WOULD BE
8 WONDERFUL EVEN TO HAVE TRAINING FOR ICOC MEMBERS. THAT
9 WOULD BE GREAT.

10 I'M A LITTLE UNEASY ABOUT STIPENDS FOR ICOC
11 MEMBERS.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: EVERYONE IS.

13 DR. PENHOET: IF I MIGHT, ZACH, I THINK THE CORE
14 OF THE PROPOSAL IS \$15.2 MILLION A YEAR IN THREE TIERS OF
15 GRANTS. AND SOME OF THESE WILL SHIFT AROUND A LITTLE
16 BIT, AND ZACH WILL BRING US A PROGRESS REPORT BEFORE WE
17 MAKE ANY FINAL GRANTS, AND WE WILL ADDRESS A NUMBER OF
18 THESE ISSUES. BUT IN ORDER TO MOVE FORWARD, ZACH NEEDS
19 AUTHORITY TODAY TO GO FORWARD AND SEND OUT RFA'S BASED ON
20 THESE SORT OF MACRO LEVEL PRINCIPLES WE'VE BEEN
21 DISCUSSING SUBJECT TO FURTHER ANALYSES.

22 TED. WE DO HAVE SOME OTHER ITEMS TO COVER.

23 DR. HALL: YES, WE DO.

24 DR. LOVE: I'D LIKE TO ADD IN --

25 DR. HALL: I'M NOT GOING TO LET YOU GO UNTIL I

1 GET SOMETHING.

2 DR. LOVE: I DON'T THINK WE'VE HEARD ANY
3 DISCUSSION MOVING FORWARD WITH THE PROPOSAL. I WOULD
4 MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDED ACTION TO MOVE
5 FORWARD WITH THE RFA, TARGET THE AMOUNT OF 15.3 MILLION
6 PER YEAR FOR THREE YEARS, AND ALSO THAT WE CHARGE THE
7 STAFF WITH SHAPING THE RFA AS OUTLINED IN THE ACTION.

8 DR. BRYANT: SECOND.

9 DR. PENHOET: DO WE NEED A ROLL CALL VOTE? ALL
10 IN FAVOR. I'M SORRY. PLEASE.

11 MR. SCHUPPENHAUER: TWO COMMENTS. HAVING BEEN
12 INVOLVED IN RESEARCH ON THE EUROPEAN SIDE, I JUST WANTED
13 TO ENCOURAGE YOU TO LOOK AT THE EUROPEAN MODEL AND
14 EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK FOR RESEARCH PROGRAMS. MOST OF THE
15 RESEARCH FUNDING IN EUROPE IS GIVEN OUT AT LEAST TO TWO
16 INSTITUTIONS FROM THE DIFFERENT COUNTRIES. I THINK THAT
17 IS ONE OF THE STRENGTHS OF THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AT THIS
18 POINT. I THINK THAT MODEL IN EUROPE WORKS VERY WELL, AND
19 I THINK YOU SHOULD LOOK AT THAT VERY SERIOUSLY TO
20 REQUIRE, IN FACT, TWO INSTITUTIONS -- TWO DIFFERENT
21 INSTITUTIONS TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS.

22 IF YOU IN PARTICULAR ARE LOOKING AT THE HEATED
23 DISCUSSION THAT YOU HAD IN THE COMPETITION OF WHERE TO
24 LOCATE THE INSTITUTE, I THINK IT WILL BE VERY A STRONG
25 POINT TO FOSTER COLLABORATION. IT COULD EVEN BE DIVIDED

1 UP IN THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND REQUIRE
2 THAT, NO. 1.

3 NO. 2, HAVING BEEN A SCIENTIST WHO HAS ACTUALLY
4 WORKED IN TISSUE CULTURE AND CELL CULTURE, ONE OF THE
5 BIGGEST ISSUES THAT I FACE IS ACTUALLY TRAINING PEOPLE
6 THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO WORK FOR ME, WITH ME IN CELL CULTURE
7 AND TISSUE CULTURE. I THINK IT IS A WASTE OF TIME AND
8 MONEY TO WAIT UNTIL THE PH.D. LEVEL OR THE MASTER'S LEVEL
9 TO EDUCATE PEOPLE AS TO HOW TO PROPERLY HANDLE BOTTLES,
10 HOW TO WASH, WHAT IS CLEAN, NOT TO FORGET PUTTING
11 SOLUTIONS INTO A BIOREACTOR WHEN YOU'RE STARTING IT UP SO
12 THAT YOU'RE BURNING OUT THE HEATING THINGS, ETC., ETC.

13 YOUR COLLEAGUES AT GENENTECH CAN TELL YOU AT
14 WHAT LEVEL WE HAVE THE STAFF THAT IS WORKING THERE. IT
15 IS ONE OF THE KEY PROBLEMS WHEN YOU ARE GETTING INTO GNP
16 PRODUCTION IN THE BIOTECH INDUSTRY. A LOT OF THE STAFF
17 IS NOT APPROPRIATELY EDUCATED.

18 I'M MISSING THIS POINT ABOUT BUILDING A
19 WORKFORCE THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE. THIS IS NOT ONLY
20 AFFECTING CENTRAL VALLEY, BUT IT'S ALSO AFFECTING OTHER
21 CITIES WHERE THE WORKFORCE IS BUILT AND SUPPORT. I THINK
22 THOSE TWO POINTS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED IN THAT
23 PROPOSAL. THANKS VERY MUCH.

24 MR. REYNOLDS: I'M JESSE REYNOLDS FROM THE
25 CENTER FOR GENETICS IN SOCIETY. AND I HAVE A COUPLE OF

1 GENERALLY POSITIVE COMMENTS.

2 WE SAID BEFORE THAT THE STANDARDS FOR CONDUCTING
3 THIS RESEARCH ARE VERY CRITICAL; AND ALTHOUGH THE CENTER
4 HAS SOME CONCERN ABOUT THE BALANCE REPRESENTED ON THE
5 STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, WE'RE ENCOURAGED TO SEE THAT AT
6 LEAST IT APPEARS NO RESEARCH GRANTS ARE GOING TO BE GOING
7 FORWARD UNTIL AT LEAST THE INTERIM RESEARCH STANDARDS ARE
8 IN PLACE AND, INSTEAD, IS MOVING FORWARD WITH THE
9 TRAINING GRANTS, WHICH DON'T SEEM TO PRESENT THE TYPE OF
10 PROBLEMS THAT NEED THE STANDARDS IN THE FIRST PLACE.

11 AND WE'RE PARTICULARLY ENCOURAGED BY HAVING THE
12 PRESENCE OF A COMPONENT TO LOOK AT THE ETHICAL, LEGAL,
13 AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF STEM CELL RESEARCH AS PART OF
14 THE TRAINING GRANT. WE HOPE THAT MAINTAIN -- THAT
15 CONTINUES TO -- BECOMES A SERIOUS AND RIGOROUS COMPONENT
16 OF THIS TRAINING AND HOPEFULLY OF ALL TRAINING INTO STEM
17 CELL RESEARCH BECAUSE, AS WE'VE SEEN, RESEARCH MATTERS.

18 AND WHILE ON THE TOPIC, FOR THE FUTURE, I'D
19 RECOMMEND THAT YOU CONSIDER SOMETHING OF A DEDICATED
20 STREAM OF FUNDING FOR WORK OF THIS TYPE, ETHICAL, LEGAL,
21 AND SOCIAL IMPLICATION TRAINING, BOTH IN THE RESEARCH
22 AREA AND THE TRAINING OF SCIENTISTS IN THIS AREA. THANK
23 YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
25 MR. REYNOLDS. WE GREATLY APPRECIATE IT.

1 MR. GANCHOFF: MY NAME IS CHRIS GANCHOFF. I'M A
2 GRADUATE STUDENT AT UCSF, AND I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT THE
3 DRAFT OF THE RFP LOOKS GREAT. I WOULD JUST PROPOSE ONE
4 LITTLE CHANGE, WORDSMITHING.

5 ON PAGE 5 WITH THE COURSES, THE RFP CALLS FOR A
6 MANDATORY COURSE IN ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND SOCIAL
7 IMPLICATIONS. AT UCSF, WE'RE ON THE QUARTER SYSTEM.
8 THAT'S NINE WEEKS, AND REALLY THE ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND
9 SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS ARE SO COMPLICATED, THAT IT'S
10 IMPOSSIBLE TO COVER THEM ALL IN ONE COURSE. SO I WOULD
11 RECOMMEND THAT PERHAPS MANDATORY COURSES ALLOWING FOR
12 DIFFERENT WAYS THAT THE COMPLEXITIES OF THE ETHICAL,
13 LEGAL, AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS CAN BE CAPTURED AND NOT
14 JUST COMPRESS THEM INTO ONE NINE-WEEK, TRUNCATED, DASH,
15 COMPLICATED WORK.

16 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY THAT WE HOPE THERE
17 WILL BE COURSES; HOWEVER, WE WANT TO BE SURE THAT EACH
18 ONE OF THE TRAINEES SUPPORTED BY OUR STIPENDS TAKES AT
19 LEAST ONE COURSE. AND THAT'S THE INTENT. THANK YOU FOR
20 YOUR COMMENT.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I WANT TO MAKE A PUBLIC
22 COMMENT HERE. I WAS ABLE TO COME AFTER WORK AND SEE PART
23 OF THIS BECAUSE I THOUGHT IT WAS VERY IMPORTANT FOR
24 RESIDENTS OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE
25 AND STATE OUR CONCERNS, SO I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU ALL

1 FOR TAKING THIS DAY. IT'S PROBABLY BEEN A VERY LONG DAY
2 ON YOUR PART.

3 AS I SAID, I'M A NEUROLOGY NURSE PRACTITIONER.
4 I SEE DEGENERATIVE DISEASES ALL THE TIME HERE IN THE
5 CENTRAL VALLEY. AND I AM ALSO, I UNDERSTAND, ONE OF
6 THOSE RARE PEOPLE WHO VOTED FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH IN THE
7 CENTRAL VALLEY. SO I AM REQUESTING THAT THE COMMITTEE
8 REALLY THINK ABOUT THE CENTRAL VALLEY WHEN YOU ARE IN THE
9 PROCESS OF DISTRIBUTING THIS MONEY. WE HAVE A VERY
10 TALENTED POOL HERE WHO, OVER THE COURSE OF THE YEARS IN
11 THE PAST, HAS BEEN PRETTY MUCH NEGLECTED. HOWEVER, WE
12 HAVE A LOT OF INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS GOING ON. FOR EXAMPLE,
13 WE DO HAVE THE HEART CENTER FOR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.
14 THAT'S A COMBINATION OF FRESNO UNIFIED AND CLOVIS
15 UNIFIED, AND WE ARE WORKING TO HAVE SCIENCE AND
16 TECHNOLOGY PROMOTED IN OUR HIGH SCHOOLS.

17 I WOULD -- I UNDERSTAND THAT DEANS HAVE TO START
18 LOOKING FOR PH.D.'S, BUT YOU HAVE TO REMEMBER YOU'RE NOT
19 GOING TO GET PH.D. CANDIDATES UNLESS YOU START WITH THEM
20 IN HIGH SCHOOL. PLEASE THINK ABOUT US WHEN YOU ARE
21 DISTRIBUTING THE MONEY. THANK YOU.

22 DR. PENHOET: SO WE HAVE A MOTION BY DR. LOVE.

23 DR. POMEROY: I HAVE ONE MORE QUESTION FOR ZACH.
24 ZACH, CAN YOU JUST REMIND US WHETHER MEMBERS OF THE ICOC
25 CAN BE PI'S OR KEY PERSONNEL ON THE TRAINING GRANTS BY

1 OUR CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES?

2 DR. HALL: CERTAINLY NOT PI'S, NO. I WOULD HAVE
3 TO LOOK AT THE EXACT WORDING OF IT. I THINK WE HAD SOME
4 DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS, BUT I THINK IT WAS PARTICIPATE IN
5 A SUBSTANTIAL WAY, I THINK, WAS THE PHRASE.

6 MR. HARRISON: MEMBERS SHALL NOT APPLY FOR OR
7 RECEIVE SALARY SUPPORT THROUGH GRANTS, LOANS, OR
8 CONTRACTS FROM THE ICOC, NOR SHALL THEY ACT AS A
9 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR.

10 DR. POMEROY: SO THERE'S NO FACULTY SALARY
11 SUPPORT IN THIS, I GUESS. OKAY.

12 DR. PENHOET: DO I HAVE A SECOND TO DR. LOVE'S
13 MOTION?

14 DR. PRECIADO: SECOND.

15 DR. PENHOET: ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED.

16 (APPLAUSE.)

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS WAS A GREAT HISTORIC
18 MOMENT FOR STARTING OUR GRANT PROCESS.

19 DR. PRIETO: I JUST WANT TO MAKE A COMMENT THAT
20 IN SPITE OF ALL THE MEDIA ATTENTION TO SOMETHING ELSE, I
21 THINK THIS IS PROBABLY THE MOST IMPORTANT THING WE'VE
22 DONE.

23 (APPLAUSE.)

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WAS ALSO GREAT THAT THE
25 MEDIA SAT THROUGH TO SEE THE WORLD CLASS SLATES THAT WERE

1 PUT FORWARD BY THE GRANTS COMMITTEE AND THE STANDARDS
2 COMMITTEE BECAUSE IT GAVE FOCUS TO SOME VERY HIGHLY
3 QUALIFIED AND DEDICATED INDIVIDUALS AND SOME TREMENDOUS
4 COMMITTEE WORK THAT GOT US THERE. WE WOULD HOPE THAT
5 THEY WILL MAKE THAT THE FOCUS OF THEIR STORY.

6 WE NEED TO PROCEED TO THE BUDGET ITEM IF WE
7 COULD AND WALTER COULD MAKE A PRESENTATION. TAB 15.

8 MR. BARNES: AGENDA ITEM 15. AT THE JANUARY
9 MEETING THE ICOC DID APPROVE A REQUEST TO SEEK A \$3
10 MILLION LOAN FROM THE GENERAL FUND FROM THE STATE OF
11 CALIFORNIA. THIS \$3 MILLION LOAN WAS PROVIDED FOR IN
12 PROPOSITION 71 AND WAS INTENDED TO FUND INITIAL
13 ADMINISTRATIVE AND IMPLEMENTATION COSTS FOR THE CIRM AND
14 THE ICOC.

15 MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT THE \$3 MILLION WAS
16 ESTIMATED TO LAST FOR APPROXIMATELY ONE YEAR, AND THE
17 PROVISION IS THAT THE LOAN IS TO BE REPAID FROM BOND
18 FUNDS WHEN THEY ARE ISSUED.

19 I'M NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH ALL OF THIS
20 INFORMATION, BUT JUST TO TELL YOU THAT WE'VE BEEN VERY
21 STRINGENT IN TRYING TO KEEP OUR COSTS AS LOW AS POSSIBLE.
22 WITH ALL OF THESE COST REDUCTIONS IN PLACE, ATTACHMENT A
23 INDICATES THAT WITH NO ADDITIONAL FUNDING COMING IN, WE
24 WILL ACTUALLY BE ABLE TO CONTINUE AT OR CURRENT LEVEL OF
25 ACTIVITIES THROUGH NOVEMBER OF 2005, WHICH IS

1 APPROXIMATELY ONE YEAR FROM THE DATE THE LOAN -- OR
2 ACTUALLY YOU ACTUALLY STARTED OPERATION IN DECEMBER.

3 I SHOULD ALSO SAY THAT THIS PROJECTION INCLUDES
4 EXPENDITURES FOR THE HIRE OF DR. ARLENE CHIU AND ALSO THE
5 HIRE OF A PERMANENT PRESIDENT, SHOULD YOU DECIDE YOU WISH
6 TO TAKE CARE OF THAT WITHIN THIS TIME.

7 I'M NOT GOING INTO THE DISCUSSION ABOUT FUNDING
8 BECAUSE BASICALLY IT REPEATS ALL THE STUFF THAT CHAIRMAN
9 KLEIN MENTIONED IN HIS REPORT EXCEPT TO REFER YOU TO
10 ATTACHMENT B. ATTACHMENT B IS A PROJECTION OF THE
11 EXPENDITURES, WHICH INCLUDES GRANT EXPENDITURES,
12 ASSOCIATED WITH THE ISSUANCE OF A \$200 MILLION BOND
13 ISSUANCE. SO THAT GIVES YOU SOME SENSE OF HOW THAT WILL
14 PLAY ITSELF OUT.

15 I'VE ALSO INCLUDED IN HERE AS ATTACHMENT C A
16 COPY OF AN INFORMATION PRESENTATION I MADE TO A COMMITTEE
17 AT THE STATE LEGISLATURE THIS WEEK REGARDING THE
18 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE AND THE INSTITUTE. THE
19 CHAIRPERSON WAS MERVYN DYMALLY, AND HE INDICATED HE WAS
20 VERY APPRECIATIVE OF THE EFFORT THAT WE MADE TO INFORM
21 HIM AND HIS COMMITTEE ABOUT ALL THE EFFORTS THAT WE'RE
22 MAKING.

23 I SHOULD ALSO SAY THAT THERE ARE TWO MEMOS THAT
24 ARE IN PLACE OR IN PROGRESS COMING TO YOU AS MEMBERS.
25 THESE ARE MEMOS TO IMPLEMENT DECISIONS THAT YOU MADE AT

1 THE LAST MEETING WITH REGARD TO POLICIES FOR CLAIMING PER
2 DIEM, THE \$100 PER DIEM, AS WELL AS IMPLEMENTING THE NEW
3 TRAVEL POLICIES RELATED TO THE UC SYSTEM. I APOLOGIZE
4 FOR NOT GETTING THOSE OUT SOONER, BUT THEY WILL TELL YOU
5 ALL YOU NEED TO KNOW, HOPEFULLY, ABOUT HOW TO CLAIM, WHAT
6 TO DO, AND WHAT FORMS TO FILL OUT.

7 AND ONE OF THE INNOVATIONS THAT CIRM STAFF,
8 PARTICULARLY MELISSA AND HER STAFF, HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO
9 IS THAT WE'RE PUTTING BOTH THE TRAVEL EXPENSE CLAIM FORM
10 AND THE FORM TO CLAIM YOUR PER DIEM EMBEDDED INTO THE
11 CIRM WEBSITE. THEY ARE A FILL-AND-PRINT FORM, SO YOU CAN
12 GO IN THERE AND ACTUALLY PUT YOUR HOURS AND YOUR TRAVEL
13 CLAIMS RIGHT ON OUR WEBSITE. UNFORTUNATELY, YOU CAN'T
14 SUBMIT THEM THROUGH THE INTERNET, BUT YOU CAN FILL THEM
15 OUT, DOWNLOAD THEM, ATTACH YOUR RECEIPTS, AND SEND THEM
16 IN, AND WE'LL MOVE THEM THROUGH AND GET YOUR
17 REIMBURSEMENT.

18 THERE'S NO ACTION ON THIS ITEM, BUT I'M
19 CERTAINLY AVAILABLE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

20 DR. POMEROY: SO HOW DOES THIS IMPACT THE
21 PREVIOUS ITEM; I.E., WHEN WOULD THE LETTERS OF INTENT ON
22 THE TRAINING GRANT APPLICATIONS BE DUE VIS-A-VIS THE
23 AVAILABILITY OF MONEY?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HALL.

25 DR. HALL: YES. WE WILL MOVE AS SOON AS WE

1 ARE -- WE ARE CLOSELY COORDINATED WITH THE FINANCIAL
2 SIDE. SO AS SOON AS WE HAVE SOME ASSURANCE THAT WE'LL
3 GET AT LEAST SOME MONEY, WE WILL MOVE RIGHT AHEAD. MY
4 OWN VIEW IS ACTUALLY THAT WE SHOULD, UNLESS IT SEEMS THAT
5 WE'RE GOING TO BE WAITING FOR TWO YEARS, I THINK WE
6 SHOULD MOVE AHEAD. I THINK WE SHOULD GO AHEAD. WE ARE
7 GOING TO HAVE MONEY. THERE IS NO QUESTION ABOUT IT, AND
8 I THINK IT CREATES -- I THINK THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE
9 LITIGATION BECOME VERY CLEAR IF WE HAVE GRANTS THAT ARE
10 APPROVED AND WE'RE WAITING TO SEND OUT MONEY. WE JUST
11 DON'T HAVE MONEY BECAUSE OF THE LITIGATION.

12 I THINK THE ISSUE THAT WAS RAISED EARLIER BY
13 MS. LANSING, I THINK THIS MAKES A VERY POWERFUL STATEMENT
14 ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF THIS. AND MY OWN PERSONAL VIEW IS
15 THAT WE SHOULD PROCEED FULL SPEED AHEAD UNLESS IT
16 ABSOLUTELY LOOKS LIKE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO PUT THINGS
17 ON HOLD FOR TWO YEARS, AND I DON'T THINK THAT'S GOING TO
18 BE THE CASE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE EXPECT THAT THE FINANCE
20 COMMITTEE ON MONDAY, ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
21 THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, THE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE,
22 AND THE TREASURER'S OFFICE, WE EXPECT THAT THOSE REQUESTS
23 FOR THE INITIAL 200 MILLION IN BOND PARTICIPATION NOTES,
24 BUT THAT 200 MILLION WILL MOVE FORWARD OUT OF THAT
25 COMMITTEE ON MONDAY.

1 AND THERE IS SUPPORT FROM THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
2 AND THE STATE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, TREASURER'S OFFICE,
3 CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, AND
4 THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE FOR THE BRIDGE FINANCING
5 CONCEPT TO BRING SUPPORT AND MAKE CERTAIN THAT THE
6 MANDATE OF THE PUBLIC IS OBSERVED AND WE CAN MOVE FORWARD
7 WITH PROGRAMS, ALTHOUGH I WOULD SAY IT'S VERY IMPORTANT
8 TO NOTE THAT BUT FOR THE LITIGATION, WE WOULD BE DOING A
9 \$200 MILLION PROGRAM TIME FRAME INSTEAD OF A HUNDRED
10 MILLION. SO IT'S STILL CRITICAL THAT WE GET THIS
11 LITIGATION RESOLVED.

12 DR. MURPHY: WALTER, I KNOW WE'RE JUST GETTING
13 INTO THIS, BUT HOW ARE WE AUDITING OURSELVES? OBVIOUSLY
14 WE HAVE TO BE HOLIER THAN THE POPE WHEN WE PRESENT OUR
15 FINANCIALS. HOW DO YOU PLAN ON DOING THAT? AND HOW WILL
16 WE BE ASSURED WORKING WITH YOU THAT WE'RE NOT STUBBING
17 OUR TOE?

18 MR. BARNES: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT AUDITING
19 THE --

20 DR. MURPHY: OUR OWN EXPENDITURES SO THAT WE AS
21 RESPONSIBLE BOARD MEMBERS CAN FEEL COMFORTABLE SUPPORTING
22 IT.

23 MR. BARNES: THE BIGGEST EXPENDITURES FOR THE
24 BOARD MEMBERS, OF COURSE, IS TRAVEL EXPENSES.

25 DR. MURPHY: NO. NO. I'M TALKING FOR THE

1 INSTITUTE ITSELF. SINCE WE ARE ULTIMATELY RESPONSIBLE
2 FOR THE BUDGET, HOW DO WE ASSURE THE PUBLIC THAT IT'S
3 BEING DONE WELL? AND WHAT'S THE PROCEDURES YOU'RE USING
4 TO AUDIT YOURSELF, AUDIT THE INSTITUTE, AND HOW ARE WE
5 GOING TO BE INVOLVED IN THAT?

6 MR. BARNES: ESSENTIALLY EVERY BILL THAT COMES
7 INTO THE OFFICE, WHETHER IT'S A TRAVEL EXPENSE CLAIM,
8 WHETHER IT'S TELEPHONE, WHETHER IT'S FOR EXPENDITURES
9 ASSOCIATED WITH AN ICOC MEETING, ALL OF THOSE HAVE TO
10 COME IN AND ARE APPROVED BY EITHER STAFF THAT ARE WORKING
11 UNDER ME OR BY MYSELF PERSONALLY. IN ADDITION, ALL BILLS
12 GO TO THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE FOR PAYMENT. AND
13 THEY ALSO CONDUCT A SUPPLEMENTAL AUDIT. IN ADDITION, WE
14 HAVE SOME ADDITIONAL STAFF THAT ARE UNDER CONTRACT TO US
15 THROUGH THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE WHICH ARE ALSO
16 REVIEWING AND PREPARING ALL THE CLAIMS THAT GO IN. SO WE
17 HAVE, YOU KNOW, A PROCESS SET UP TO ENSURE THAT
18 EVERYTHING IS BEING DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH EITHER
19 CURRENT STATE REQUIREMENTS OR REQUIREMENTS THAT YOU
20 YOURSELF HAVE ADOPTED.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND LET ME GIVE A LITTLE BIT
22 MORE DETAIL HERE. EVERY SINGLE BILL, AS FAR AS I KNOW,
23 IS APPROVED BY WALTER AND --

24 MR. BARNES: ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S 40 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

1 BEHIND THAT. WE WORK WITH CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, NOT ONLY
2 TO HAVE THEM HELP US IN SETTING UP OUR SYSTEM, BUT
3 THEY'LL COME THROUGH AND DO A TEST AUDIT OF OUR SYSTEM TO
4 VALIDATE THE SYSTEM AS SET UP. AND THE LEVEL OF DETAIL,
5 JUST TO GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, IS THAT I MADE A REQUEST
6 THAT THERE BE AN ICEBOX, REFRIGERATOR, FOR THE STAFF
7 BECAUSE THEY'RE WORKING THROUGH LUNCH AND WORKING THROUGH
8 DINNER, SO THEY COULD BRING FOOD IN. AND IT WAS MADE
9 CLEAR TO ME THAT THAT WAS NOT APPROVED UNDER NORMAL STATE
10 PROCESSES FOR THE STATE TO BUY REFRIGERATORS FOR THE
11 WORKERS.

12 I POINTED OUT THAT THIS ENHANCED THE
13 PRODUCTIVITY AND THE ABILITY TO BE HEALTHY WORKERS. THEY
14 INDICATED TO ME VERY CLEAR THAT THIS WAS NOT PROTOCOL FOR
15 THE STATE, AT WHICH TIME I BOUGHT THE STAFF A
16 REFRIGERATOR. SO WE ARE DEFAULTING TO THE MOST
17 CONSERVATIVE STANDARD AS WE KNOW IT TO BE, AND WE'RE
18 TRYING TO MAKE SURE THERE'S A COUPLE OF EYES THAT LOOK AT
19 EVERYTHING AS WE GO FORWARD.

20 MR. BARNES: AND I WOULD JUST SAY THAT WITH THE
21 REFRIGERATOR EXAMPLE, THAT'S WHAT OTHER STATE AGENCIES DO
22 AS WELL. THE BOSS BUYS IT OR THE STAFF GET TOGETHER AND
23 BUY IT THEMSELVES. SO IN THAT REGARD, WE ARE CONSISTENT
24 WITH THE STATE AGENCY OPERATIONS.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M GOING TO EXPRESS A BIAS

1 HERE. I GUESS MY HOPE IS THAT IT MAY WELL BE THAT OUR
2 STAFF WILL WORK SUCH LONG HOURS BECAUSE THEY'RE SO
3 DRIVEN, FAR BEYOND WHAT IS REALLY REQUIRED OF A STATE
4 EMPLOYEE, THAT THOSE KIND OF PERKS WOULD BE TINY
5 INVESTMENTS IN COMPARISON WITH THE RETURN.

6 IS THERE A WAY THAT, IF THAT WERE THE CASE, AND
7 IT WERE A MATTER OF MORALE, BOOSTING THIS WONDERFUL,
8 NOVEL, NEW VENTURE, THAT WE COULD HAVE A DIFFERENT SET OF
9 REGULATIONS FOR THAT KIND OF THING? JUST A THOUGHT FOR
10 FUTURE REFLECTION, I GUESS.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD POINT OUT THAT IN TERMS
12 OF BEING ABLE TO WORK LATE AND BE HEALTHY, IT IS TO OUR
13 GREAT BENEFIT THAT ALL THREE PROPOSALS HAD MICROWAVES,
14 OVENS, AND REFRIGERATORS IN THEM. AND I THINK THE STAFF
15 RELAXED WHEN THEY KNEW THAT AT LEAST THEY COULD EAT THEIR
16 FOOD AND WORK TILL MIDNIGHT, BUT IT IS A VERY DEDICATED
17 STAFF. I'D LIKE TO JUST TAKE A MOMENT AND SEE IF WE
18 COULD GIVE THEM A HAND OF APPLAUSE.

19 (APPLAUSE.)

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANY
21 ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS?

22 DR. MURPHY: ARE WE AT THE END OF THE AGENDA?

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE ONE MORE ITEM. I'D
24 LIKE EVERYONE TO TURN TO ITEM 8. THAT'S NOT THE RIGHT
25 ITEM. IT'S ITEM 14. I HAVE A VERBAL SUMMARY. I WASN'T

1 CLEAR WHETHER DR. FRIEDMAN HAD A WRITTEN SUMMARY AS WELL.
2 DR. FRIEDMAN WISHED ME TO REPORT THAT HE HAS TREMENDOUS
3 CANDIDATES FOR THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE, AND THEY HAVE
4 PROCEEDED WITH IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS OF THOSE CANDIDATES.
5 THEY EXPECT TO BE THROUGH IN A COUPLE OF WEEKS WITH
6 THOSE, AND WOULD HOPE TO COME TO THE NEXT MEETING WITH
7 THEIR FULL STAFFING RECOMMENDATION.

8 THE ADDITIONAL ITEM THAT I DISCUSSED WITH
9 DR. FRIEDMAN IS THAT AS WE WENT THROUGH AND LEARNED IN
10 THIS PROCESS, THIS RFP, WHERE WE ACTUALLY KNEW A GREAT
11 NUMBER OF DETAILS ABOUT WHAT WE EXPECTED AND WANTED FROM
12 THE PROPOSALS, WE LEARNED THAT IF WE EDUCATE OURSELVES AS
13 MUCH AS POSSIBLE, WE WILL ELIMINATE DISAPPOINTMENT AND
14 CONFUSION, MISCOMMUNICATION SO THAT WE REALLY GET
15 PROPOSALS THAT REFLECT WHAT WE'RE ASKING FOR AND WHAT OUR
16 BUDGET WOULD SUGGEST.

17 AND UNDER FACILITIES IT'S COME TO MY ATTENTION,
18 AS A MEMBER OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP THAT IS BEING
19 CREATED, THAT THERE ARE VERY DIFFERENT FACILITIES IN
20 DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE STATE THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED
21 AND WORKED ON. AND THERE'S MONEY BEING PUT IN PLANS BY
22 DIFFERENT INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS. AND THAT MY CULTURE
23 IS ONE FROM LAW SCHOOL OF CASE STUDIES WHERE YOU LEARN
24 FROM THE PROCESS BY CULTURE. IN BUSINESS YOU HAVE CASE
25 STUDIES WHERE YOU HAVE A COMPLICATED PROJECT, YOU DO A

1 CASE STUDY, THAT USE THAT CASE STUDY AS A MODEL.

2 AND I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT WE ALLOW STAFF
3 TO PUT OUT A REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF INTENT THAT WOULD
4 IDENTIFY FACILITIES AROUND THE STATE, THROUGHOUT THE
5 STATE OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES THAT COULD BE COMPLETED
6 WITHIN TWO YEARS FROM THE GRANT BEING MADE. THIS IS TO
7 CREATE CASE STUDIES WITH A VERY EXPLICIT RECOGNITION THAT
8 THIS DOES NOT ENSURE ANYONE OF ANY APPROVAL. BUT IT DOES
9 MEAN SOMEONE WON'T GO DESIGNING A \$100 MILLION FACILITY
10 THINKING WE'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM A HUNDRED MILLION
11 DOLLAR GRANT AND INVEST A HUGE AMOUNT OF RESOURCES WHEN
12 THAT DOESN'T FIT WHAT THIS COMMITTEE WOULD CONSIDER.

13 WE WOULD BRING BACK THE INFORMATION FROM THE
14 LETTERS OF INTENT TO THE JUNE MEETING AND CONSIDER
15 WHETHER WE COULD PROCEED WITH DIFFERENT CASE STUDY MODELS
16 IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE STATE. ONCE THE CASE STUDY
17 MODELS WERE COMPLETED WITH THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE AND
18 THE STAFF OVER THE NEXT FIVE MONTHS OR SO, THAT WE WOULD
19 THEN COME, AND EVERYONE WOULD COMPETE, INCLUDING THE
20 ENTITY IN WHICH THE CASE STUDY WOULD BE DONE, BUT AT THE
21 VERY LEAST THAT INSTITUTION AND THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS
22 WOULD BE SUBMITTING SOMETHING THAT REALLY REFLECTS WHAT
23 WE WANT.

24 AND IF WE ARE TO SUBMIT -- CREATE ANYTHING
25 WITHIN TWO YEARS OF THESE GRANTS, WE NEED TO GIVE PEOPLE

1 EARLY INFORMATION, NOT LET THEM WANDER IN THE WILDERNESS
2 WITHOUT GOOD INFORMATION.

3 AND IT'S BECAUSE SOME ARE REHABS, SOME ARE NEW
4 CONSTRUCTION, SOME ARE LEASES OF LOW-COST EMPTY SPACE
5 THAT MIGHT HAVE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IN THEM, WE NEED TO
6 WORK OUT SOME CASE STUDIES TO GIVE PEOPLE DIRECTION IN
7 THESE DIFFERENT AREAS.

8 I WOULD MAKE A VERY EXPLICIT STATEMENT THAT I
9 DON'T BELIEVE \$1 OF THE BRIDGE FINANCING CAN GO TO CASE
10 STUDIES. IT'S GOT TO GET OUT THERE TO RESEARCH, BUT IT'S
11 VERY CLEAR FROM THIS SURPRISE AUDIT OF THE HARVARD LABS
12 BY THE NIH, THAT WE NEED TO GET FACILITIES IN PLACE. THE
13 NEXT CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION MAY MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT,
14 NOT EASIER TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH. WE HOPE IT GOES THE
15 OTHER WAY. THINGS HAVE FLIPPED BACK AND FORTH VERY
16 QUICKLY OVER TWO-YEAR CYCLES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL; AND
17 WE, THEREFORE, CREATED A PRIORITY IN THE INITIATIVE TO
18 SEE WHAT WE COULD GET BUILT WITHIN TWO YEARS. THAT'S AN
19 ITEM FOR DISCUSSION.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: COULD WE HAVE STAFF OR MAYBE
21 IT'S LEGAL COUNSEL PROVIDE US WITH A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE
22 STATE OF THE RESTRICTIONS THAT ARE REQUIRING IN THE
23 FACILITIES?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. I THINK IF STAFF AND THE
25 LEGAL COUNSEL WORK TOGETHER, AND WE'VE GOT THE BENEFIT OF

1 LEGAL COUNSEL, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT'S BEEN OFFERED FROM
2 HARVARD UNIVERSITY AS WELL AS FROM THE UC SYSTEM, WE
3 COULD REALLY GET REAL INSIGHT INTO THE KINDS OF
4 LIMITATIONS ON EQUIPMENT THAT'S PAID FOR AND NOT USED,
5 EMPTY SPACE, ON ACCOUNTING FOR SOFT COSTS, THAT WOULD BE
6 VERY HELPFUL.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: MAYBE OUR PRO BONO SAN FRANCISCO
8 COUNSEL.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE QUESTION IS CAN STAFF WORK
10 OUT A LETTER OF INTENT THAT WOULD GO OUT WORKING UP SOME
11 GUIDANCE, BUT WE'RE ONLY TALKING ABOUT FOUR- OR FIVE-PAGE
12 CONCEPTUAL SUBMISSIONS THAT WOULD COME BACK TO THIS BOARD
13 IN JUNE SO WE CAN GET AN IDEA AS WELL ON THE SCOPE OF
14 WHAT'S OUT THERE AND WHAT IS POSSIBLE.

15 DR. POMEROY: I WOULD LIKE TO ENDORSE THE
16 CONCEPT OF CASE STUDIES TO DETERMINE SORT OF THE IMPACT
17 AND THE FEASIBILITY OF THE DIFFERENT MODELS. I THINK IT
18 WILL SEND A VERY POWERFUL MESSAGE THAT WE'RE REALLY
19 THINKING ABOUT THIS, WE'RE MOVING FORWARD, AND WE'RE
20 EXPLORING OPTIONS; AND AS SOON AS WE GET THE MONEY, WE'LL
21 BE ABLE TO DO THESE THINGS, SO I WOULD ENDORSE THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS?

23 DR. BRYANT: I THINK IT'S A VERY GOOD IDEA. AND
24 I ALSO HAVE A COMMENT ABOUT THE -- THERE WAS ANOTHER
25 ITEM. THE REGULATIONS. SO I THINK THAT THERE ARE SOME

1 ADDITIONAL ITEMS OTHER THAN THE DIRECTLY OBVIOUS ONES
2 THAT ARE GOING TO BE AN ISSUE, LIKE SCANNERS OR SOMETHING
3 LIKE THAT, THAT HAVE MULTIPLE SOURCES OF FUNDING ALREADY.
4 THEY COST HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS. SOME
5 ARRANGEMENT TO REIMBURSE ANY PART OF NIH FUNDING OR
6 SOMETHING LIKE THAT HAS TO BE WORKED OUT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND IT WOULD BE GREAT FOR EACH
8 OF THE INSTITUTIONS ON THE BOARD TO HELP US BY EVEN A
9 SHORT MEMO SUBMITTED FROM THEIR COUNSEL OR FROM THE
10 DEAN'S OFFICE FROM INFORMATIONALLY THEIR VIEW OF HOW THE
11 NIH REGULATIONS COULD POTENTIALLY IMPACT US.

12 DR. STEWARD: I SUSPECT THAT BECAUSE MANY
13 INSTITUTIONS EVEN NOW ARE THINKING ABOUT HOW TO GATHER
14 PRELIMINARY DATA, THAT, IN FACT, MOST ARE PUTTING
15 TOGETHER, IF YOU WANT, GUIDELINES FOR THEIR OWN STAFF AND
16 FACULTY. AND I WONDER IF WE SHOULD REALLY TAKE ADVANTAGE
17 OF THOSE RATHER THAN THINKING ABOUT THAT FROM OUR
18 PERSPECTIVE AND POINT OF VIEW OF LEGAL STAFF HERE, AND
19 I'M SAYING THAT BECAUSE ANYTHING THAT WE DO IS GOING TO
20 BE SEEN AS MUCH MORE, I THINK, AUTHORITATIVE. I'M NOT
21 SURE WE WANT TO TAKE THAT POSITION. IT MIGHT BE BETTER
22 FOR THE DIFFERENT UNIVERSITIES TO DEVELOP THEIR
23 VIEWPOINTS ON THIS, LET US SEE WHERE IT GOES. THOSE CAN
24 INFORM US AS WE THINK ABOUT THESE BUILDING PROPOSALS, BUT
25 FOR US TO MAKE ANY KIND OF A LEGAL DETERMINATION OR EVEN

1 OPINION --

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ON THE NIH ISSUE?

3 DR. STEWARD: NIH, EXACTLY.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME DO THIS. LET ME
5 SEPARATE THE TWO ITEMS FOR A MOMENT, IF WE COULD.
6 CLAIRE, WOULD YOU LIKE --

7 DR. POMEROY: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION THAT WE
8 REQUEST THAT STAFF PREPARE A REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF
9 INTENT FOR CASE STUDIES TO LOOK AT THE VARIOUS MODELS FOR
10 BUILDING FACILITIES AND BRING THAT BACK TO THE JUNE
11 MEETING.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THEY WOULD SEND OUT THESE
13 REQUESTS, GET BACK PRELIMINARY INFORMATION, AND BRING
14 BACK INFORMATION. IS THERE A SECOND?

15 DR. BRYANT: SECOND.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: A SECOND FROM DR. BRYANT.
17 DISCUSSION ON THIS MOTION? ANY PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THIS
18 MOTION?

19 MS. HALME: CAN I MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT. I HAVE
20 A POINT OF CONFUSION. SO ARE LETTERS OF INTENT THE
21 SAME -- LETTERS OF INTENT, ARE THEY THE SAME THING AS
22 CASE STUDIES OR CASE --

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THESE ARE LETTERS OF INTENT
24 THAT WOULD BE SUBMITTED, JUST CONCEPTUAL FOUR- OR
25 FIVE-PAGE SUMMARIES OF WHAT THEY'RE CONTEMPLATING, THE

1 SCALE, THE DOLLARS.

2 MS. HALME: SO HOW DOES THAT RELATE TO CASE
3 STUDIES?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY WOULD MAKE A LETTER OF
5 INTENT THAT THEY'D LIKE TO PARTICIPATE IN A CASE STUDY
6 AND THIS IS WHAT THEY WOULD PROPOSE.

7 MS. HALME: AND THEN FROM ALL THOSE LETTERS OF
8 INTENT, THE BOARD WOULD SELECT A SUBSET.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SUBSET OF EACH TYPE.

10 MS. HALME: AND THEN THE FUNDING FOR THOSE CASE
11 STUDIES, YOU SAID, CAN'T COME, YOU DON'T BELIEVE, FROM
12 THE BRIDGE FUNDING?

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NO.

14 MS. HALME: SO IT WOULD HAVE TO COME FROM
15 PHILANTHROPIC SOURCES.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OR BONDS.

17 MS. HALME: OR BONDS. OKAY. THANK YOU.

18 DR. POMEROY: SO THE LETTER OF INTENT --

19 MS. HALME: IS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CASE STUDY.

20 DR. POMEROY: -- IS BASICALLY A SUMMARY, A
21 CONCEPTUAL SUMMARY OF WHAT YOUR CASE STUDY WOULD BE IN
22 FOUR OR FIVE PAGES.

23 MS. HALME: OKAY.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT WOULD GO TO THE STAFF, AND
25 AS SOON AS THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE IS CONSTRUCTED, IT

1 WILL END UP BEING PROCESSED THROUGH THE FACILITIES
2 COMMITTEE. BUT JUST TO GET A PRELIMINARY SIZING ON THE
3 ISSUE, THE INITIAL RESULTS WOULD COME BACK TO THE BOARD
4 SO WE CAN SEE WHAT'S HAPPENING AROUND THE STATE AND GET
5 SOME SCOPE ON THIS OF WHAT WE HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO
6 DELIVER. AND DR. FRIEDMAN PROVIDED SOME COMMENTS ABOUT
7 SOME POTENTIAL IDEAS TO PUT INTO THIS LETTER ABOUT CASE
8 STUDY, ASKING QUESTIONS. AND IF OTHER MEMBERS OF THE
9 BOARD HAVE IDEAS ABOUT WHAT WOULD BE USEFUL INFORMATION,
10 PLEASE GIVE IT TO STAFF AND WE'LL TRY AND TAKE THEM INTO
11 CONSIDERATION.

12 MR. SCHUPPENHAUER: CAN YOU HELP ME CLARIFY MY
13 CONFUSION AS TO AT WHAT POINT YOU WOULD ACTUALLY NEED
14 MONEY? YOU'RE TALKING ON ONE SIDE ABOUT LETTERS --
15 REQUESTS FOR LETTERS OF INTENT, SO YOU'RE GETTING A FOUR-
16 OR FIVE-PAGE SUMMARY. WHERE IS THE MONEY INVOLVED HERE?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IS AT THE
18 JUNE MEETING, WE WILL PICK OUT DIFFERENT APPROACHES,
19 DIFFERENT MODELS, REHAB, NEW CONSTRUCTION, CAPITALIZED
20 LEASE SPACE. WE WILL ADDRESS WHICH ONES WE'RE GOING TO
21 PURSUE CASE STUDIES AND HOPEFULLY HAVE GOOD REGIONAL
22 DISTRIBUTION. AND THEN WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IS THOSE CASE
23 STUDIES WOULD GO ON TO THE FALL, AND THROUGH THE
24 FACILITIES COMMITTEE, THEY WOULD COME BACK WITH
25 RECOMMENDATIONS. THERE WOULD BE AN RFP THAT THEN WOULD

1 GO OUT TO HAVE A COMPETITION BASED ON THE MODELS THAT
2 WOULD BE CREATED IN EACH TYPE WITH THE KNOWLEDGE WE WOULD
3 GAIN. AND THEN BASED ON THAT COMPETITION, WE WOULD
4 SELECT FACILITIES TO FUND WHICH WE COULDN'T FUND WITHOUT
5 EITHER A BOND ISSUE BEING EFFECTIVE, SO WE'RE TALKING
6 PROBABLY SIX TO EIGHT MONTHS OUT, AT THE VERY BEST, OR
7 ADDITIONAL CHARITABLE SOURCES IDENTIFIED, BUT
8 SPECIFICALLY THE INITIAL CHARITABLE DONATIONS HAVE TO ALL
9 GO INTO RESEARCH.

10 MR. SCHUPPENHAUER: BOND MEASURE IS REFERRING TO
11 THE CIRM BOND?

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. ALL RIGHT. I THINK WE'RE
13 PREPARED TO CALL THE QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED.
14 THANK YOU.

15 I THINK WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE AGENDA. THERE
16 WAS A DESIRE FROM DR. MURPHY.

17 DR. MURPHY: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS HAS BEEN A VERY
18 LONG DAY, AND WE WENT THROUGH WHAT I THOUGHT WAS A VERY
19 EXCITING, BUT VERY DIFFICULT PROCESS. AND I THINK THE
20 INSTITUTE CAME OUT WELL AHEAD, AND I JUST WANTED TO
21 SUGGEST TO THE BOARD THAT A MOTION OF THANKS TO OUR
22 CHAIRMAN, WHO HANDLED THIS WHOLE DAY BEAUTIFULLY, AND I
23 THINK HANDLED THE WHOLE SITE MEASURE WITH GREAT GRACE AND
24 SKILL. AND WE'RE ALL STILL VERY GOOD FRIENDS, AND WE'RE
25 ALL STILL VERY EXCITED ABOUT THIS HAPPENING.

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

(APPLAUSE.)

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DR. MURPHY. AND I THANK EVERYONE FOR THE GRACIOUSNESS AND UNDERSTANDING. I WOULD LIKE US AS A BOARD TO REALIZE THAT WHEN WE STARTED THIS, I THINK I REFERRED TO THE FACT THAT DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES SAID TO ME, "YOU ARE GOING TO ASK PEOPLE TO GIVE YOU FREE RENT?" AND I SAID YES. AND THEY SAID, "AND SO SIX MONTHS?" I SAID NO, TEN YEARS.

WE NEED TO REALIZE THAT THIS INSTITUTE AND THE PRESTIGE OF THE MEMBERS ON THIS BOARD AND THE BELIEF IN PROPOSITION 71 HAS FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THE HISTORY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA LED TO CHARITABLE DONORS AND CITIES FUNDING TEN YEARS OF FREE RENT, FREE OPERATING COST, FREE FURNITURE, FREE TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, FREE CONFERENCE FACILITIES, HOTEL ROOMS. IT IS A GREAT COMPLIMENT TO THIS BOARD AND TO THE RESPECT WITH WHICH THIS INSTITUTION IS MOVING FORWARD, THAT THE CITIES OF THE STATE AND THE CHARITABLE DONORS HAVE RALLIED AND UNITED BEHIND WHAT WE ALL BELIEVE IN IS A GREAT FUTURE FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH. BUT IT IS A GREAT AND HISTORIC DAY FOR THE STATE. THANK YOU.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

MR. O'RORKE: MR. KLEIN, HONORED MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, MY NAME IS JOHN O'RORKE. I LIVE IN KINGSBERG,

1 WHICH IS A LITTLE SWEDISH TOWN SOUTH OF FRESNO, AND I'M
2 THE ONLY IRISHMAN THERE.

3 YOU WANT TO KNOW WHO THAT MASKED MAN WAS WHO'S
4 BEEN SENDING YOU LITERATURE IN THE MAIL AND A PERSONAL
5 LETTER BACK IN JANUARY. THAT WAS ME. I JUST WANT TO
6 TAKE A FEW MINUTES BECAUSE I KNOW IT'S BEEN A LONG DAY
7 FOR YOU, AND I'VE REALLY BEEN IMPRESSED WITH THE TALENT
8 THAT I'VE BEEN VISITING WITH IN THE LAST FEW HOURS.

9 I ON BEHALF OF THE PSP ORGANIZATION IN
10 BALTIMORE, PSP MEANING PROGRESSIVE SUPRANUCLEAR PALSY.
11 MOST OF US HAVE NEVER HEARD OF IT. IN FACT, HALF THE
12 WORLD HASN'T HEARD OF IT. IT'S ONE OF THE MOST RAREST
13 DISEASES, I GUESS, IN THIS CENTURY. SO I KNOW I'M GOING
14 TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THE PSP SOCIETY, BUT FOR MY WIFE
15 WHO'S BEEN STRICKEN WITH THIS.

16 PROGRESSIVE SUPRANUCLEAR PALSY IS THE DIEASE
17 THAT MANY OF YOU REMEMBER DUDLEY MOORE, THE BRITISH ACTOR
18 AND TALENTED MUSICIAN, SUFFERED WITH FOR SEVERAL YEARS
19 AND PASSED AWAY BACK IN 2002. I HAD JUST TAKEN MY WIFE
20 TO THE BALTIMORE SYMPOSIUM JUST BEFORE HE PASSED AWAY,
21 HOPING THAT WE WOULD MEET HIM. I WAS HONORED, IN
22 SPEAKING WITH THE CARETAKERS THAT TOOK CARE OF HIM UP
23 UNTIL HIS PASSING, AND IT WAS JUST AWESOME TO KNOW THAT A
24 MAN OF THIS TREMENDOUS TALENT HAD BE IMPRISONED LITERALLY
25 IN HIS BODY BY THIS DISEASE CALLED PSP.

1 SO I JUST WANT TO TAKE A FEW MOMENTS TO NOTE
2 THAT WHEN WE LOST DUDLEY, WE LOST THE NATIONAL
3 SPOKESPERSON, SHALL WE SAY, SIMILAR TO WHAT MICHAEL J.
4 FOX IS DOING FOR PARKINSON'S. AND I THINK HE'S DONE A
5 TREMENDOUS JOB IN HIS APPEALS TO THIS BOARD, NIH,
6 CONGRESS, WHEREVER HE'S BEEN. I THINK DUDLEY HAD THAT IN
7 MIND, BUT HE WASN'T ABLE TO MAKE IT.

8 SO THE REASON I'M ASKING TO SPEAK TO YOU FOR A
9 FEW MINUTES, AND I'M GOING TO REFER TO MY NOTES SO I CAN
10 MAKE IT BRIEF BECAUSE I CAN SPEAK ABOUT THIS FOR AN HOUR.

11 THIS DISEASE IS MULTIFACETED. IT'S GOT SO MANY
12 ANGLES TO IT, THAT, I SAY THIS RESPECTFULLY, MOST DOCTORS
13 MISS IT. THEY'RE THROWING IT INTO THE PARKINSON'S
14 DISEASE BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH IT WHEN
15 THEY SEE IT. MY WIFE ENCOUNTERED THIS IN THE YEAR 2000
16 SIMPLY BY HAVING STUMBLING AND FALLING BACKWARDS THAT I
17 THOUGHT SHE HAD STUMBLERD OR TRIPPED, BUT SHE DIDN'T. SHE
18 LITERALLY LOSES HER BALANCE AND FALLS BACKWARDS.

19 LATER ON SHE STARTED HAVING SIGHT PROBLEMS WHERE
20 SHE SAID I'M SEEING DOUBLE VISION DRIVING THE CAR. SO WE
21 WITHDREW WITH THAT AND WENT FOR A NEW PAIR OF GLASSES AND
22 AN OPHTHALMOLOGIST STUDY. SHE SAID LATER I DON'T SEE ANY
23 BETTER THAN I DID BEFORE, SO WE HAD HER REEXAMINED. HER
24 GLASSES ARE FINE. HER EYES WERE 20/20. THEY ASKED, I
25 DON'T SEE ANYTHING WRONG. NEVER DID WE REALIZE THAT IT

1 WAS THE MOTOR NERVES FROM THE NEUROLOGICAL END OF IT
2 CONTROLLING HER EYEBALL MOVEMENTS. SHE CAN'T SEE
3 FORWARD. NOW SHE CAN'T EVEN SEE HER PLATE TO EAT HER
4 DINNER BECAUSE THEY'RE JUST LIKE LOCKED. THAT'S ONE OF
5 THE MANY FACETS.

6 FIVE YEARS DOWN THE ROAD NOW SHE'S UNABLE TO
7 SPEAK. SHE DOESN'T COMMUNICATE AT ALL OTHER THAN A GROAN
8 HERE OR SOMETHING THAT SHE TRIES TO SAY. SHE HAS
9 DIFFICULTY EATING BECAUSE SHE CAN'T SEE HER PLATE. HER
10 HAND COORDINATION IS SHOT. SHE CAN'T FIND HOW TO PUT
11 FOOD IN HER MOUTH. THE MOTOR MOVEMENTS OF HER MOUTH ARE
12 ALMOST LOCKING DOWN. SHE CAN'T SWALLOW WITHOUT CHOKING.
13 SO WE'RE JUST ON THE EDGE OF THE FIFTH YEAR.

14 SHE CAN'T DRESS OR BATHE HERSELF WITHOUT
15 ASSISTANCE. AND SHE'S WHEELCHAIR BOUND FOR SAFETY
16 PURPOSES. HER MIND IS CLEAR AS A BELL. IN THE VARIOUS
17 WAYS THAT SHE AND I COMMUNICATE BY HAND SIGNALS LIKE ONE
18 IS YES, TWO IS NO. I KNOW THAT SHE THINKS BETTER THAN I
19 DO AT TIMES. I WAS WORKING A CROSSWORD PUZZLE THE OTHER
20 NIGHT AND I CAME UP WITH A WORD LIKE I HAVE A NAME
21 SMASHING SOMETHING. SMASHING WHAT? AND SHE SAID
22 PUMPKIN. I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT SMASHING PUMPKINS ARE.
23 MAYBE YOU DO, BUT I NEVER HEARD IT. IT'S A BROADBAND.

24 HER MIND IS CLEAR AS A BELL. AND IN LOOKING
25 BACK AT THIS, I WAS THINKING THE OTHER DAY, A FEW MONTHS

1 AGO WHEN I HAD A PHYSICAL, GETTING AN MRI FOR MY BACK, IF
2 YOU CAN ENVISION YOURSELF LAYING IN AN MRI TUNNEL, YOU
3 KNOW YOU CAN TALK TO THE PERSON OUTSIDE, YOU DON'T SEE
4 ANYBODY, BUT YOU'RE TRAPPED IN A TUBE. IT'S LIKE BEING
5 IN A PADDED CELL AND YOU'RE DYING. YOU HAVE NO CONTROL
6 OF WHATEVER.

7 THIS IS PSP. IT'S HORRIBLE. AND THE POINT IS,
8 THE REASON I'M HERE, I REALIZE THIS IS WAY DOWN THE ROAD,
9 BUT OUR HOPES AND PRAYERS ARE WITH YOU FOR THE STEM CELL
10 RESEARCH TO BE ABLE TO OPEN A DOOR THAT IN TURN WILL CURE
11 DIABETES AND DR. PHYLLIS AND OTHERS AND THESE HORRIBLE
12 DISEASES THAT WE'RE RUNNING INTO. EVERY DAY I HEAR OF
13 SOMEBODY'S DISEASE I NEVER KNEW EXISTED. I'M SURE THERE
14 ARE HUNDREDS OUT THERE.

15 SO MY GOAL TODAY IS JUST TO DRAW AWARENESS TO
16 PSP AND WHAT IT REPRESENTS. AND THE NUMBERS ARE ONE IN A
17 HUNDRED THOUSAND, THEY SAY. THEY DON'T KNOW BECAUSE WE
18 MISS IT. IT'S JUST COMPLETELY SHOTGUN APPROACH TO
19 WONDERING WHAT DOES PSP DO, EXCEPT WE KNOW IT'S SHORT.
20 WE DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH TIME WE'VE GOT LEFT. WE'RE
21 PLUGGED INTO THE BEST NEUROLOGIST AVAILABLE AT THE
22 MOMENT, BUT THERE'S NO TREATMENT. THEY DON'T KNOW WHERE
23 IT COMES FROM. SO WE'RE AT THE MERCY OF HOPING THAT STEM
24 CELL OPENS THOSE DOORS.

25 SO I JUST WANTED TO SAY THANK YOU FOR THE

1 OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO YOU FOR A MOMENT, SPEAKING TO
2 PEOPLE THAT DID RESPOND TO MY LETTER WONDERING WHO WAS
3 THIS MASKED MAN FROM THE VALLEY. PARTICULARLY
4 DR. PHYLLIS I SPOKE TO SEVERAL TIMES ON THE PHONE. BUT
5 THE GENTLEMEN LIKE DAVID SEWELL AND MICHAEL GOLDBERG,
6 THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR ANSWERING MY LETTERS. I LOOK
7 FORWARD TO MEETING AMY DALY. I MET HER EARLIER. I
8 APPRECIATE HER EFFORT. NEEDLESS TO SAY, MELISSA, GREAT.
9 THANK YOU. SO I'M VERY IMPRESSED WITH THE FEW HOURS I'VE
10 SPENT WITH YOU THIS AFTERNOON AND THE ACTIONS BEING
11 TAKEN. I'M A HUNDRED PERCENT FOR YOU, AND I APPRECIATE
12 THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO YOU. THANK YOU.

13 (APPLAUSE.)

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO, AFTER THE
15 ELOQUENT STATEMENT, WHICH WE THANK YOU FOR, IT'S HARD TO
16 FOLLOW, BUT, DR. PRECIADO, YOU HAVE THE FLOOR.

17 DR. PRECIADO: I WON'T BE ABLE TO FOLLOW. IT
18 ACTUALLY FOLLOWS IN A WAY. WE HAVE DISCUSSED THE
19 IMPORTANCE OF PATIENT EDUCATION IN GETTING OUT TO THE
20 COMMUNITY AND EDUCATING THE COMMUNITY ABOUT STEM CELL
21 RESEARCH, AND ABOUT DISEASES LIKE MR. O'RORKE SPOKE OF.
22 I KNOW THAT WE HAVE A LOT ON OUR PLATE IN THAT WE'VE BEEN
23 WORKING REALLY HARD TO GET THE SITE AND THE PRESIDENT AND
24 THE GRANTS, ETC.

25 I KNOW THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT AGENDIZING THIS

1 ISSUE. I WOULD LIKE FOR US TO PUT IT ON THE AGENDA FOR
2 JUNE AND THAT WE REALLY SPEND SOME TIME TALKING ABOUT
3 PATIENT EDUCATION AND FIGURE OUT A WAY THAT WE CAN REALLY
4 GIVE TO THE PEOPLE IN A MANNER THAT THEY DESERVE. I DO
5 NOT WANT TO CONTINUE IN THE MANNER THAT WE'RE CONTINUING
6 WITHOUT ADDRESSING THIS ISSUE. I JUST NEEDED TO SAY
7 THAT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. LET'S TAKE A HARD
9 LOOK AT THE JUNE AGENDA AND SEE IF WE CAN DO THAT. ANY
10 OTHER BOARD COMMENTS BEFORE WE ADJOURN?

11 I THANK THE BOARD. IT IS WITH DEEPEST RESPECT
12 FOR THE TIME AND COMMITMENT TO BE HERE FOR THIS MEETING
13 AND FOR YOUR INDIVIDUAL COMMITMENTS, WE CLOSE THIS
14 SESSION.

15 (APPLAUSE.)

16 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 05:41
17 P.M.)

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25