

BEFORE THE
SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP
SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2005
2:33 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 72040

LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
9500 GILMAN DRIVE
OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR
HEALTH SERVICES
4TH FLOOR, ROOM 461
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

LOCATIONS (CONT'D.):

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ZILKHA NEUROGENETIC INSTITUTE
1501 SAN PABLO STREET
ROOM 112, HERKLOTZ SEMINAR ROOM
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES
10833 LE CONTE AVENUE
DIRECTOR'S CONFERENCE ROOM
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY
198 COHASSET ROAD
CONFERENCE ROOM
CHICO, CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
318 CAMPUS DRIVE
ROOM 360
JAMES H. CLARKE CENTER
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

UCSF, LAUREL HEIGHTS CAMPUS
3333 CALIFORNIA STREET
THE PRESIDENT'S ROOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

I N D E X

	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER	4
ROLL CALL	4
CONSIDERATION OF DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS TO THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP	7
CONSIDERATION OF THE SEARCH PROCESS FOR THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP	20
ADJOURNMENT	72

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2005

2 02:33 P.M.

3

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. IF YOU SAY IT'S OKAY
5 TO GET STARTED, IT'S 2:30. WE DON'T HAVE ANY PUBLIC
6 MEMBERS HERE, BUT WE'LL CALL TO ORDER. CAN WE HAVE A
7 ROLL CALL, PLEASE?

8 MS. SHREVE: KEITH BLACK WILL NOT JOINING US
9 TODAY. BRIAN HENDERSON HERE.

10 DR. HENDERSON: HERE.

11 MS. SHREVE: ED HOLMES.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: HERE.

13 MS. SHREVE: SHERRY LANSING. PHIL LEVEY.

14 DR. LEVEY: YES, PRESENT.

15 MS. SHREVE: TED LOVE.

16 DR. LOVE: HERE.

17 MS. SHREVE: PHIL PIZZO.

18 DR. PIZZO: HERE.

19 MS. SHREVE: JEANNIE FONTANA FOR JOHN REED.

20 MS. FONTANA: HERE.

21 MS. SHREVE: JEFF SHEEHY.

22 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

23 MS. SHREVE: JON SHESTACK. LEON THAL.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LEON IS AWAY WITH DEATH IN
25 HIS FAMILY.

1 MS. SHREVE: JANET WRIGHT.

2 DR. WRIGHT: YES, HERE.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: DO WE HAVE A QUORUM?

4 MS. SHREVE: WE ARE WAITING ON -- WE DO HAVE
5 A QUORUM.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. DO WE KNOW WHETHER
7 ANY OF THE PEOPLE YOU ASKED ABOUT ARE PLANNING TO JOIN
8 US, SUCH AS SHERRY LANSING OR JEFF?

9 DR. LEVEY: SHERRY IS SUPPOSED TO JOIN US.
10 WE'RE EXPECTING HER, BUT IT'S RAINING UP HERE. AND,
11 ED, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER SHE'S GOING TO BE MEGA LATE.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. AND LET'S SEE. JON
13 SHESTACK. IS JON ON THE PHONE?

14 MS. SHREVE: JON IS NOT. WE ARE STILL
15 WAITING FOR JON.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AND I'M PRETTY SURE LEON
17 THAL IS NOT ABLE TO JOIN US DUE TO THE LOSS IN HIS
18 FAMILY. I SPOKE TO HIM YESTERDAY. SO SHOULD WE MOVE
19 AHEAD THEN?

20 MS. SHREVE: YES.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. IF I MIGHT THEN,
22 FIRST OF ALL, WELCOME EVERYONE TO OUR SECOND
23 TELECONFERENCE MEETING FOR THE GRANTS SEARCH
24 SUBCOMMITTEE. AND THE OBJECTIVE OF OUR MEETING TODAY
25 IS TO DISCUSS THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE SUBCOMMITTEE

1 WILL CARRY OUT ITS CHARGE OF IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL
2 MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND I WOULD LIKE
3 TO UNDERSCORE AT THIS POINT THAT WE WILL NOT BE
4 DISCUSSING ANY INDIVIDUAL CANDIDATES DURING TODAY'S
5 SESSION. AND JUST TO REMIND EVERYONE OF THAT, WE'LL BE
6 TALKING ABOUT THE PROCESS.

7 I'D LIKE TO BEGIN, IF WE MIGHT, BEFORE WE GET
8 TO THE FORMAL AGENDA AND SEE IF THERE ARE ANY COMMENTS
9 FIRST FROM THE PUBLIC, REMINDING THE PUBLIC MEMBERS,
10 THE PUBLIC ATTENDEES, THAT THERE'S A THREE-MINUTE LIMIT
11 TO YOUR COMMENTS, AND THEN WE'LL MOVE TO ANY OPENING
12 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE BEFORE WE GET
13 INTO THE AGENDA.

14 THERE ARE NO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IN SAN
15 DIEGO, SO YOU WILL HAVE TO TELL US AT YOUR SITES
16 WHETHER THERE IS SOMEONE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK.

17 DR. PIZZO: WE HAVE MEMBERS AT STANFORD, ED,
18 AND I'LL ASK THEM IF ANYONE WISHES TO SPEAK. NO ONE
19 WISHES TO SPEAK AT STANFORD.

20 DR. HENDERSON: AT USC WE HAVE MEMBERS. NO
21 ONE WISHES TO SPEAK.

22 DR. LEVEY: WE HAVE NO PUBLIC MEMBERS HERE.

23 DR. WRIGHT: NOR IN CHICO.

24 MS. SHREVE: WE DO HAVE MEMBERS AT UCSF. NO
25 ONE WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK AT UCSF.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. HOW ABOUT ANY
2 SUBCOMMITTEE IOC MEMBERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK AT
3 THIS POINT BEFORE WE GET TO THE AGENDA? OKAY. THEN IF
4 I MIGHT HAVE US ALL COME TO AGENDA ITEM NO. 1, WHICH IS
5 A CONSIDERATION OF THE DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE
6 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP.

7 JUST TO REMIND YOU THAT WE NEED TO IDENTIFY
8 FROM THE DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC A NUMBER
9 OF SEVEN INDIVIDUALS WHO WILL SERVE ON THE GRANTS, THE
10 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING GROUP.

11 WITH THE INDULGENCE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I'D
12 LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT WE CONSIDER SIMILAR TO THE
13 APPROACH THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP TOOK, WHICH WAS TO
14 SOLICIT FROM THE ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC THEIR
15 INTEREST AND DESIRE IN SERVING ON THE WORKING GROUP.
16 IF YOU WERE TO AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL, THEN I WOULD
17 SUGGEST THAT I SEND OUT AN E-MAIL TO EACH OF THE TEN
18 DISEASE ADVOCATES ON THE BOARD TO REQUEST
19 SELF-NOMINATION.

20 AND SINCE SIX OF THE SEVEN PEOPLE THAT WE
21 CHOOSE FROM THE DISEASE ADVOCATE GROUP WILL ALSO SERVE
22 ON THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, DR. FRIEDMAN, WHO IS
23 CHAIRING THAT GROUP, HAS AGREED THAT WE WOULD SEND AN
24 E-MAIL OUT TOGETHER, DEPENDING ON THE PLEASURE OF OUR
25 PARTICULAR SUBCOMMITTEE.

1 MIGHT I THEN OPEN THIS UP FOR DISCUSSION AS
2 TO WHETHER THIS PROCESS SEEMS REASONABLE TO YOU.

3 DR. LEVEY: ED, JERRY LEVEY HERE. LET ME ASK
4 YOU A QUESTION. SINCE WE DECIDED THAT ALL OF THE
5 SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS WERE GOING TO BE OUT OF STATE TO
6 ELIMINATE POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, WILL THE
7 DISEASE ADVOCATES RECOMMEND DISEASE ADVOCATES FROM OUT
8 OF STATE, OR WILL THEY BE THE ONES -- NOBODY FROM THE
9 BOARD IS GOING TO SIT ON A GRANTS REVIEW PROCESS.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: JERRY, I BELIEVE THAT THE
11 ACTUAL LEGISLATION -- I MEAN THE BOND INITIATIVE CALLS
12 FOR THE SEVEN DISEASE ADVOCATES TO COME FROM THE ICOC,
13 SO THEY MUST BE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC IN THE DISEASE
14 ADVOCATE COMPONENT OF THAT. SO THEY ARE PROSCRIBED IN
15 THE INITIATIVE WHO THEY ARE.

16 SO WE NEED TO COME UP WITH A PROCESS TO
17 IDENTIFY SEVEN OF THE TEN MEMBERS OF THE ICOC WHO ARE
18 DISEASE ADVOCATES.

19 DR. HENDERSON: SPECIFICALLY IT'S UNDER ITEM
20 A1. ON THE MEMBERSHIP IT SAYS, THE SCIENTIFIC AND
21 MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP SHALL HAVE TEN
22 DISEASE ADVOCACY GROUP MEMBERS DESCRIBED IN PARAGRAPHS
23 3, 4, AND 5, AS YOU JUST INDICATED.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AND WE WOULD NEED TO BY
25 SOME MECHANISM, AND I WILL SUGGEST SOMETHING DEPENDING

1 ON THE WISHES OF THE GROUP IN A MOMENT, HOW WE MIGHT DO
2 THIS, BUT THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, I THINK, DECIDED
3 TO MOVE AHEAD AND ASK WHO WOULD BE INTERESTED IN
4 SERVING FIRST FROM OUR ICOC DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS.

5 DR. HENDERSON: YEAH. I THINK THAT'S AN
6 EXCELLENT IDEA. THIS IS BRIAN HENDERSON.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WOULD SOMEONE ELSE WANT TO
8 SPEAK TO THAT?

9 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY. I THINK
10 THAT THAT'S A GREAT IDEA. AND I THINK LET'S SEE WHERE
11 PEOPLE'S HEADS ARE FIRST.

12 DR. PIZZO: THIS IS PHIL PIZZO. I AGREE WITH
13 THAT.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AND WE'LL COME TO A MOTION
15 IN JUST A MOMENT WITH THAT, BUT WOULD YOU ALSO, ANYONE
16 WANTS TO OPINE ON THE IDEA THAT WE DO THIS TOGETHER
17 WITH MICHAEL FRIEDMAN'S SUBGROUP SINCE SIX OF OUR SEVEN
18 PEOPLE WILL ALSO SERVE ON THE FACILITIES GROUP?

19 DR. PIZZO: SO, IN ESSENCE -- THIS IS PHIL
20 AGAIN -- YOU'D SEND OUT A JOINT COMMUNICATION
21 REQUESTING THEM TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THE TWO, OR HOW ARE
22 YOU CONFIGURING THAT TO WORK?

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK WE WOULD ASK THEM
24 WHETHER THEY WOULD BE INTERESTED IN SERVING ON BOTH
25 GROUPS SINCE WE NEED TO COME UP WITH PEOPLE WHO WILL DO

1 BOTH.

2 DR. PIZZO: NOT THAT THIS CHANGES, BUT IT'S A
3 PRETTY HEAVY BURDEN THAT WE'RE NOW HAVING FOR THE
4 DISEASE ADVOCACY GROUP MEMBERS IN THAT THEY'RE SERVING
5 ON THE ICOC, DEALING WITH ALL THE SAME ISSUES THAT THE
6 REST OF US ARE DEALING WITH, AND NOW IN ADDITION TO
7 THAT, THEY'LL BE WORKING ON THE GRANTS REVIEW AND
8 FACILITIES REVIEW, SO THAT'S --

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AND ON THE STANDARDS
10 WORKING GROUP AS WELL, SOME OF THEM. SOME OF THEM, I
11 BELIEVE, WILL BE ON THREE SUBCOMMITTEES.

12 DR. LEVEY: WHAT IS MAGIC ABOUT THE NUMBER
13 SEVEN, JUST BECAUSE IT WAS ON THE PROP 71?

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT,
15 JERRY. I THINK IT'S MANDATED THAT WE COME UP WITH
16 SEVEN.

17 DR. PIZZO: IT STARTED WITH SEVEN, JERRY.
18 IT'S A JOKE.

19 DR. LEVEY: BUT I MEAN WHY CAN'T WE SAY THREE
20 OR FOUR? WHY DOES IT HAVE TO BE SEVEN?

21 DR. HENDERSON: IT'S WRITTEN AS SEVEN. I
22 MOVE WE PROCEED AS ED HAS OUTLINED WITH A JOINT
23 COMMUNIQUE ASKING THE ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC
24 WHICH OR BOTH OF THESE WORKING GROUPS THEY WISH TO BE
25 ON.

1 DR. WRIGHT: I'LL SECOND THAT.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. THEN, I THINK, IF I
3 MIGHT, I THINK WE NEED TO OPEN THIS UP FOR DISCUSSION.
4 PARTICULARLY AT THIS POINT WE SHOULD ASK IF MEMBERS OF
5 THE PUBLIC AT ANY OF THE SITES WANT TO COMMENT ON WHAT
6 WE ARE CONSIDERING AT THIS POINT. COULD WE GO AROUND
7 AND SEE AT EACH OF THESE SITES IF SOMEONE FROM THE
8 PUBLIC WANTS TO COMMENT.

9 DR. PIZZO: WE HAVE SOMEONE FROM STANFORD WHO
10 WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT. YOU WANT THE COMMENT NOW, ED?

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YES. LET'S GO AHEAD AND
12 WE'LL TAKE THEM FROM THE SITES.

13 MR. POSNER: THIS IS PHIL POSNER FROM ORAL.
14 JUST A THOUGHT TO EASE SOME OF THE BURDEN OF THE SEVEN
15 ICOC MEMBERS, SINCE IT'S POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO DESIGNATE
16 AN ALTERNATE FOR THE ICOC MEETINGS, I WONDER WHETHER
17 LEGALLY THEY WOULD BE PERMITTED TO DESIGNATE AN
18 ALTERNATE MAYBE AS A PERMANENT ALTERNATE TO SERVE ON
19 ONE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES. JUST AS A THOUGHT TO EASE
20 SOME OF THEIR BURDEN.

21 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY. WE
22 ACTUALLY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO DESIGNATE. AND I THINK
23 BEFORE WE START, I REALLY THINK THAT THE DISEASE
24 ADVOCATES SHOULD BE ABLE TO WEIGH IN BEFORE WE START
25 TALKING ABOUT THE TIME CONSTRAINT. IT'S KIND OF

1 INSULTING THAT EVERYBODY ELSE IS TALKING ABOUT THE
2 BURDEN ON US WHEN WE'RE THE PEOPLE MOST DIRECTLY
3 IMPACTED BY THESE DISEASES, AND IT MAY BE SOMETHING
4 THAT WE FEEL PASSIONATELY ENOUGH ABOUT TO DO WHATEVER
5 IT TAKES TO MAKE THIS GO FORWARD.

6 DR. PIZZO: SURE. THIS IS PHIL. CAN I JUST
7 MAKE A COMMENT ON THAT? MY COMMENT WAS MEANT TO BE
8 HELPFUL, NOT ADVERSARIAL.

9 MR. SHEEHY: I DIDN'T TAKE IT ADVERSARIAL,
10 BUT THE SAME THING CAME UP IN THE FACILITIES WORKING
11 GROUP. AND I HEARD FROM OTHER DISEASE ADVOCATES,
12 LOOKING OVER THE MINUTES OF THE FACILITIES WORKING
13 GROUP PRIOR TO THE PREVIOUS MEETING, THAT THERE'S A
14 CERTAIN DISCOMFORT IN THEIR TIME CONSTRAINTS BEING
15 DISCUSSED BY OTHER FOLKS --

16 DR. PIZZO: FAIR ENOUGH.

17 MR. SHEEHY: -- BEFORE THEY WERE ACTUALLY
18 POLLED ABOUT WHAT THE EFFECTS THE TIME CONSTRAINTS.

19 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S FAIR. AND CERTAINLY I
20 ACCEPT THAT. I THINK, JUST FOR THE SAKE OF COMPLETION,
21 I THINK PROBABLY THOSE WHO WERE SPEAKING, AT LEAST I
22 WAS, WAS REFLECTING ON THE BASIS OF OUR TIME PRESSURES,
23 BUT IT'S INAPPROPRIATE TO EXTRAPOLATE THOSE TO OTHER
24 PEOPLE. I CONCUR WITH THAT.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ARE THERE OTHER COMMENTS

1 FROM THE PUBLIC AT STANFORD?

2 DR. LOVE: THIS IS TED LOVE. I HAD ONE
3 QUESTION ABOUT THE COMMUNICATION. IF I UNDERSTAND IT
4 CORRECT, WE'D BE ASKING THE DISEASE ADVOCATES NOT IF
5 THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO SERVE ON ONE OR THE OTHER OR
6 BOTH, BUT RATHER IF THEY'D BE WILLING TO SERVE ON THE
7 GRANTS ALONE OR THE GRANTS PLUS FACILITIES; IS THAT
8 CORRECT?

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TED, I THINK THE NOTE I
10 HAVE IN FRONT OF ME SAYS THAT SIX OF THE SEVEN. WE
11 NEED SEVEN ON THE GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE OF DISEASE
12 ADVOCATES. SIX OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS, BY THE DICTATE OF
13 THE MANDATE, MUST ALSO SERVE ON THE FACILITIES. SO WE
14 NEED TO KNOW FROM THESE INDIVIDUALS IF THEY WOULD AGREE
15 TO DO BOTH AS WELL AS DO ONE, I THINK.

16 DR. LOVE: IT ISN'T ONE. IT'S GRANTS ALONE
17 OR GRANTS PLUS FACILITIES. THAT WAS MY --

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ONE INDIVIDUAL WOULD BE
19 ABLE TO SERVE ON THE GRANTS ALONE, BUT SIX WOULD NEED
20 TO SERVE ON BOTH.

21 DR. LOVE: OKAY.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AND SO I THINK WITH THE
23 PERMISSION OF THE COMMITTEE AS WE GO FURTHER DOWN THIS,
24 THAT MICHAEL FRIEDMAN AND I, WORKING POSSIBLY WITH
25 ZACH'S OFFICE, COULD CONSTRUCT THIS IN SUCH A WAY TO

1 REFLECT WHAT WE'RE SAYING, WHICH IS SIX OF THE
2 INDIVIDUALS NEED TO AGREE TO SERVE ON BOTH, AND ONE
3 INDIVIDUAL WOULD BE ON ONE OF THE COMMITTEES; THAT IS,
4 THE GRANTS SUBCOMMITTEE.

5 DR. LOVE: OKAY.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: FURTHER COMMENTS FROM
7 STANFORD?

8 DR. PIZZO: NO, NONE FROM STANFORD.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. AND I GUESS UCLA OR
10 AT LEAST LOS ANGELES.

11 DR. LEVEY: NO COMMENTS.

12 DR. HENDERSON: NO COMMENTS FROM USC.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. LET'S SEE. CHICO
14 AND SAN FRANCISCO, I THINK, WERE THE OTHER TWO; IS THAT
15 RIGHT?

16 DR. WRIGHT: NOTHING FROM CHICO.

17 MS. SHREVE: NOTHING FROM UCSF.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. THEN ANY OF THE
19 MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE WHO HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO
20 SPEAK TO THIS WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THIS PARTICULAR
21 ITEM BEFORE WE CALL FOR A VOTE?

22 ONE OTHER THING WE MIGHT DO IS -- I SHOULD
23 HAVE MENTIONED BEFORE, IN LOOKING AT MY NOTES, WAS THE
24 FACT THAT SHOULD WE FIND MORE THAN SEVEN OF THE DISEASE
25 ADVOCATES WHO WANT TO VOLUNTEER FOR THIS, THAT WE COULD

1 COME UP WITH AN ALTERNATE SYSTEM, IF THAT'S AGREEABLE
2 WITH THE GROUP AS WELL. WE MAY HAVE MORE TROUBLE
3 FINDING SEVEN THAN NOT, BUT I THINK WE COULD, THROUGH
4 AN ALTERNATE PROCESS, ACCOMMODATE EVERYONE'S DESIRE TO
5 PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROCESS. IS THAT AGREEABLE WITH
6 THE GROUP?

7 DR. HENDERSON: SO AMENDED. BRIAN HENDERSON
8 HERE. SO AMENDED.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, BRIAN. AND
10 WHOEVER SECONDED, DO YOU AGREE TO THAT?

11 DR. WRIGHT: I DO. THIS IS JANET IN CHICO.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. THEN HEARING NO
13 FURTHER DISCUSSION, CAN WE DO A ROLL CALL VOTE.

14 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY. COULD I
15 SPEAK TO THE AMENDMENT?

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: PLEASE DO.

17 MR. SHEEHY: I MEAN I GUESS I KIND OF FEEL
18 LIKE THAT AT SOME POINT IT MIGHT NOT BE BAD, MAYBE AS
19 PART OF AN ICOC MEETING, TO LET THE ADVOCATES KIND OF
20 TALK, AND THIS COULD BE IN A PUBLIC FASHION, BUT LET
21 THE ADVOCATES KIND OF DISCUSS AMONGST THEMSELVES IF,
22 FOR INSTANCE, SEVEN AREN'T AVAILABLE OR, IN OTHER
23 WORDS, DO WE WANT TO GIVE THE ADVOCATES THE ABILITY TO
24 NEGOTIATE AMONGST THEMSELVES, ALBEIT IN A PUBLIC
25 FASHION, OR ARE WE GOING TO HAVE THE ICOC AS A WHOLE OR

1 THIS COMMITTEE AS A WHOLE DICTATE FOR DISEASE
2 ADVOCATES?

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I GUESS MY THOUGHT, JEFF,
4 HAD BEEN THAT IF WE SEND THIS E-MAIL OUT AS WE'RE
5 PROPOSING, WE WILL FIND OUT FROM THAT SURVEY WHAT THE
6 INTEREST IS. I DON'T THINK -- IF SOMEONE ELSE CAN HELP
7 ME. THERE IS NOTHING THAT PRECLUDES THESE DISEASE
8 ADVOCATES SPEAKING TO EACH OTHER ABOUT THIS TO DECIDE
9 WHETHER THEY --

10 DR. PIZZO: THEY WOULD HAVE TO DO IT AT A
11 PUBLIC MEETING BECAUSE THERE WOULD BE MORE THAN TWO
12 PEOPLE SPEAKING AT THE SAME TIME.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IS THERE SOMEONE FROM THE
14 ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE WHO MIGHT CLARIFY? IS THERE
15 SOME LEGAL PERSON HERE?

16 MS. PACTER: I'M ON THE PHONE. WHAT IS THE
17 QUESTION?

18 DR. WRIGHT: WHO ARE YOU?

19 MS. PACTER: TAMAR PACTER FROM THE AG'S
20 OFFICE.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THE QUESTION WAS IS COULD
22 THE PEOPLE WHO ARE ON THE ICOC WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE
23 DISEASE ADVOCATES GROUP, AFTER WE SEND OUT THIS E-MAIL,
24 SPEAK TO EACH OTHER TO HAVE SOME SORT OF A DIALOGUE?
25 SINCE THERE ARE TEN OF THEM IN THIS CATEGORY AND WE

1 NEED TO COME UP WITH SEVEN NAMES, COULD THEY TALK TO
2 EACH OTHER ABOUT THIS, OR WOULD THAT HAVE TO BE A
3 PUBLIC MEETING?

4 MS. PACTER: THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE A PUBLIC
5 MEETING.

6 DR. LOVE: THAT HAS NOTHING -- THIS IS TED
7 LOVE. THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH HAVING A QUORUM?

8 MS. PACTER: NO. THE OPEN MEETING LAWS
9 REQUIRE THAT THE MEETINGS BE OPEN IF MORE THAN TWO
10 MEMBERS ARE DISCUSSING BUSINESS.

11 DR. LOVE: THANK YOU.

12 DR. PIZZO: JEFF, THIS IS PHIL PIZZO, IF I
13 CAN SPEAK TO YOUR SERIES OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A
14 MOMENT. I CERTAINLY AGREE THAT THE DISEASE ADVOCATES
15 SHOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THEIR VIEWPOINTS
16 ABOUT THIS. NOW, WE RECOGNIZE THAT NEEDS TO BE IN A
17 PUBLIC MEETING. MY OWN PREFERENCE WOULD BE THAT THAT
18 BE PART OF THE ICOC DISCUSSION SO THAT WE COULD ALL
19 HEAR AND BENEFIT FROM THAT AT THE SAME TIME, IF YOU ARE
20 WILLING AND THE GROUP IS WILLING TO DO THAT.

21 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK THAT'S ENTIRELY
22 APPROPRIATE. THIS COULD WELL BE A MOOT QUESTION MUCH
23 AS THE STANDARDS DISCUSSION WAS. YOU COULD END UP WITH
24 SEVEN AND SIX THAT YOU NEED THROUGH THE E-MAIL
25 MECHANISM. BUT IF FOR SOME REASON THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN,

1 THEN HAVING THE DISEASE ADVOCATES DISCUSS PUBLICLY AND
2 KIND OF INDICATE THEIR INTEREST.

3 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE KIND OF LACKED
4 IS SOME OF THESE KIND OF CROSS-MEMBER DIALOGUES. I
5 THINK WE'VE BEEN A LITTLE INTIMIDATED BY THE FACT THAT
6 IT HAS TO HAPPEN IN PUBLIC, BUT PERSONALLY I DON'T SEE
7 ANYTHING WRONG WITH IT, ESPECIALLY WHEN WE HAVE TO
8 ALLOCATE SOMETHING LIKE THIS OUT. SOME FOLKS MAY BE
9 ASKED TO MAKE A SACRIFICE BY NOT SERVING. SOME PEOPLE
10 MAY BE ASKED TO MAKE A SACRIFICE BY SERVING. WHY NOT
11 TALK ABOUT IT?

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: FOLLOWING UP AGAIN, YOU
13 WOULD BE, IF I UNDERSTOOD YOU RIGHT, OKAY WITH US
14 SENDING OUT THE E-MAILS, GATHERING THE INFORMATION.
15 DEPENDING ON THE OUTCOME OF THAT INFORMATION, WE'LL
16 OBVIOUSLY HAVE TO BRING IT BACK TO THE ICOC ANYWAY FOR
17 RATIFICATION; BUT IF WE DON'T GET SEVEN PEOPLE TO SIGN
18 UP, THEN WE DEFINITELY HAVE TO TALK AT THE ICOC. IF WE
19 GET MORE THAN SEVEN SIGNING UP, WE WILL HAVE TO TALK
20 ABOUT WHO WOULD BE WILLING TO BE AN ALTERNATE. IS THAT
21 AGREEABLE WITH YOU, THAT WE GO AHEAD WITH THE E-MAIL?

22 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK THAT'S A GREAT IDEA.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. OTHER DISCUSSION ON
24 THIS TOPIC? WE DON'T WANT TO CUT IT SHORT. I DON'T
25 HEAR OTHER DISCUSSION. THEN, KATE, IF YOU WOULD PLEASE

1 TAKE A ROLL CALL VOTE TO MOVE AHEAD WITH THE E-MAIL IN
2 CONJUNCTION WITH MICHAEL FRIEDMAN'S GROUP WITH THE
3 AMENDMENT TO IT THAT WE WILL HAVE THE POSSIBILITY OF
4 COMING UP WITH ALTERNATES AS WELL.

5 MS. SHREVE OKAY. SO A ROLL CALL VOTE.
6 BRIAN HENDERSON.

7 DR. HENDERSON: YES.

8 MS. SHREVE: ED HOLMES.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YES.

10 MS. SHREVE: HAS SHERRY LANSING JOINED US?

11 DR. LEVEY: NO. NO, SHE HASN'T JOINED US.
12 NOT VOTING FOR HER.

13 MS. SHREVE. GERALD LEVEY.

14 DR. LEVEY: YES.

15 MS. SHREVE: TED LOVE.

16 DR. LOVE: YES.

17 MS. SHREVE: PHIL PIZZO.

18 DR. PIZZO: YES.

19 MS. SHREVE: JEANNIE FONTANA.

20 MS. FONTANA: YES.

21 MS. SHREVE: JEFF SHEEHY.

22 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

23 MS. SHREVE: JON SHESTACK.

24 DR. LEVEY: HE'S NOT HERE YET.

25 MS. SHREVE: JANET WRIGHT.

1 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: GOOD. THEN LET THE RECORD
3 REFLECT WE HAD A UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO MOVE AHEAD WITH
4 THE E-MAIL.

5 I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE TO AGENDA ITEM NO. 2, IF
6 I MIGHT AT THIS POINT, WHICH IS THE SEARCH PROCESS FOR
7 THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL
8 RESEARCH FUNDING GROUP.

9 THE GUIDANCE THAT ALL OF YOU HAVE RECEIVED UP
10 TO THIS POINT INCLUDED A LIST OF THE CANDIDATES, AND
11 THE GUIDANCE WAS INTENTIONALLY BARE BONES, IF YOU WILL,
12 SO EACH TEAM WOULD HAVE THE CAPABILITIES OF BRINGING A
13 DIFFERENT RECRUITMENT STYLE TO THE TASK IF THEY SO
14 CHOSE. WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO AT THIS POINT, IF I MIGHT,
15 IS TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND
16 PROVIDE SOME THOUGHTS FOR DISCUSSION AS WE MOVE FORWARD
17 WITH THE PROCESS.

18 FIRST OF ALL, JUST AN FYI, THE STANDARDS
19 SEARCH COMMITTEE HAS ALREADY IDENTIFIED ITS SCIENTIST
20 AND CLINICIAN CANDIDATES AND NO LONGER NEEDS THE HELP
21 FROM OUR SUBCOMMITTEE IN IDENTIFYING THEIR CANDIDATES.
22 IF YOU MAY REMEMBER IN EARLIER DISCUSSION, IT HAD BEEN
23 SUGGESTED WE MIGHT WANT TO REFER NAMES TO THEM. IT
24 LOOKS LIKE THEY HAVE BEEN MORE SUCCESSFUL THAN WE HAVE
25 UP TO THIS POINT.

1 SECOND IS THAT I'D LIKE TO ASK ZACH HALL, IF
2 I MIGHT, TO MAKE A COMMENT -- ZACH IS HERE WITH US IN
3 SAN DIEGO -- ABOUT A POTENTIAL RECRUITMENT LETTER THAT
4 WE WOULD SEND TO THE TOP TIER CANDIDATES. IF YOU WILL
5 RECALL ON YOUR LIST THAT YOU RECEIVED, IF YOU HAD A
6 CHANCE TO STUDY IT YET, THAT WE HAVE A TOP TIER LIST OF
7 CANDIDATES AND ANOTHER LIST OF CANDIDATES. AND TOP
8 TIER REALLY IS THAT GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS WHO CAME WITH
9 A RECOMMENDATION FROM AN ICOC MEMBER OR SOME OTHER
10 MEMBER OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, BASICALLY SOMEONE
11 WHO WAS RECOMMENDED TO US FOR CONSIDERATION. THE
12 REMAINDER OF THE NAMES ON YOUR LIST WERE REALLY NAMES
13 THAT WERE PICKED OFF OF DIFFERENT REGISTRIES BASICALLY,
14 PRIMARILY THE STEM CELL --

15 DR. MAXON: WHO'S WHO IN STEM CELL RESEARCH,
16 AND THERE'S ONE EXCEPTION TO THAT. AND THAT WOULD BE
17 THERE WERE A NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS, ALTHOUGH A VERY
18 SMALL NUMBER, THAT CAME IN AFTER THE DEADLINE ON THE
19 14TH OF FEBRUARY. WE INCLUDED THOSE NAMES AMONGST THE
20 REMAINDER OF PEOPLE THAT CAME FROM WHO'S WHO'S IN STEM
21 CELL RESEARCH STRICTLY BECAUSE OF THE TIME
22 REQUIREMENTS, BUT THEY DID GET IN.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO YOU ARE IN NO WAY
24 RESTRICTED TO WORK WITH THE TOP TIER. WE'LL COME BACK
25 TO THIS IN A MOMENT. IT WAS A GUIDE TO TRY AND HELP

1 YOU THROUGH THE PROCESS. BUT AGAIN, IN ANTICIPATION OF
2 THE FACT THAT WE MAY HAVE TO WORK A LITTLE BIT TO
3 RECRUIT PEOPLE TO DO THIS, I'D LIKE TO ASK ZACH IF HE
4 WOULD COMMENT ON A POTENTIAL LETTER THAT MIGHT HELP US
5 WITH THE PROCESS.

6 DR. HALL: WE DISCUSSED THE POSSIBILITY OF A
7 AN E-MAIL TO THE TOP 186; IS THAT RIGHT?

8 DR. MAXON: PRETTY CLOSE.

9 DR. HALL: AND IT WOULD BE FROM BOB KLEIN, ED
10 PENHOET, AND MYSELF. I APOLOGIZE. I SHOULD READ THIS
11 OR I COULD SUMMARIZE IT IN WORDS.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: EITHER AND THEN WE WILL
13 E-MAIL IT TO EVERYONE AFTERWARDS.

14 DR. HALL: I WOULD LIKE THE CONCURRENCE OF
15 THIS GROUP THAT THAT WOULD BE USEFUL AND HELPFUL. WE
16 HAVE WAITED FOR THIS MEETING IN ORDER TO DO THAT.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MAYBE YOU SHOULD READ IT
18 THEN, ZACH, IF EVERYONE WOULD LISTEN CLOSELY.

19 DR. HALL: WE ARE WRITING ON BEHALF OF THE
20 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, THE
21 ORGANIZATION THAT IS TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSITION 71, THE
22 CALIFORNIA STEM CELL AND CURES INITIATIVE. AS YOU
23 KNOW, THE INSTITUTE WILL AWARD ALMOST \$3 BILLION OVER
24 THE NEXT TEN YEARS TO SUPPORT STEM CELL AND RELATED
25 RESEARCH.

1 AWARDS WILL BE MADE AFTER PEER REVIEW BY A
2 GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP TO BE COMPOSED OF
3 SCIENTISTS OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA. THIS WORKING GROUP IS
4 CURRENTLY BEING CHOSEN BY A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
5 INDEPENDENT CITIZENS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. YOU HAVE
6 BEEN SELECTED AS A CANDIDATE FOR THE GRANTS WORKING
7 GROUP. AS SUCH, YOU MAY RECEIVE A CALL FROM ONE OR
8 MORE ICOC MEMBERS, WHO WILL INFORM YOU ABOUT THE GRANTS
9 REVIEW WORKING GROUP AND DETERMINE YOUR WILLINGNESS TO
10 SERVE, IF ASKED.

11 IF YOU RECEIVE SUCH A CALL, WE STRONGLY URGE
12 YOU TO CONSIDER THIS INVITATION SERIOUSLY AND TO AGREE
13 TO JOIN US IN THIS PROJECT. WE KNOW THAT YOU'RE
14 EXTREMELY BUSY AND THAT YOU HAVE LITTLE TIME TO TAKE ON
15 YET ANOTHER COMMITMENT. WE BELIEVE, HOWEVER, THAT THIS
16 IS A HISTORIC PROJECT WHOSE SUCCESS IS IMPORTANT FOR
17 THE ENTIRE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. THE ONLY WAY WE CAN
18 SUCCEED IS BY ENLISTING OUTSTANDING SCIENTISTS SUCH AS
19 YOURSELF TO HELP US IN EVALUATING THE PROPOSALS THAT WE
20 RECEIVE.

21 WE WILL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO PROVIDE
22 ASSISTANCE TO YOU IN THIS IMPORTANT TASK. THE PEOPLE
23 OF CALIFORNIA HAVE GIVEN US AN ENORMOUS RESPONSIBILITY,
24 BUT ALSO A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE AN EXCITING
25 NEW FRONTIER OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE AND MEDICINE. WE

1 NEED YOUR SUPPORT TO REALIZE THIS PROMISE. THANK YOU
2 IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR HELP. SINCERELY, BOB KLEIN, CHAIR,
3 ED PENHOET, VICE CHAIR, ZACH HALL, INTERIM PRESIDENT OF
4 THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.

5 DR. LEVEY: SOUNDS LIKE A GREAT LETTER.

6 DR. PIZZO: IT IS A GREAT LETTER, ZACH.
7 THANKS FOR READING THAT. TED AND I ACTUALLY ARE --
8 THIS IS PHIL PIZZO FROM STANFORD -- WE'RE ON THE
9 COMMITTEE TOGETHER. SO WE ACTUALLY DRAFTED SOMETHING
10 THAT READS VERY SIMILARLY TO YOURS. AND THE ONLY THING
11 THAT YOU DIDN'T SAY THAT I INCLUDED IN THE ONE THAT WE
12 PUT TOGETHER WAS SOMETHING ALONG THE LINES OF ALTHOUGH
13 MANY OF THE DETAILS NEED TO BE WORKED OUT, WE
14 ANTICIPATE THERE COULD BE QUARTERLY REVIEW MEETINGS,
15 ALTHOUGH THERE MAY BE FLEXIBILITY.

16 AND WE ALSO INCLUDED THAT WE ANTICIPATE THAT
17 THE CIRM WILL OFFER AN HONORARIUM FOR PARTICIPANTS TO
18 GIVE THEM THAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT THEY MAY
19 NEED IF THEY'RE MAKING THE DECISION.

20 IN FACT, I'M GLAD WE'RE HAVING THE DISCUSSION
21 BECAUSE IF WE HADN'T, I WAS GOING TO BE SENDING OUT
22 THIS LETTER THAT WE PUT TOGETHER, WHICH IS VERY MUCH
23 LIKE YOURS TONIGHT. WE'LL OBVIOUSLY DEFER TO YOUR
24 JUDGMENT.

25 WE DID ONE OTHER THING, WHICH I THINK MAY

1 EITHER BE USEFUL OR NOT USEFUL. NOT KNOWING THAT WE
2 WERE GOING TO GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE LIST, WE ACTUALLY
3 INDEPENDENTLY RANKED THE LIST THAT WE GOT FROM YOU IN
4 THE GROUP THAT WE RECEIVED AND CAME UP WITH A QUITE
5 CONCORDANT TOP 20 BECAUSE, AT LEAST THE WAY WE
6 INTERPRETED THE RULES, WAS THAT WE WERE TO ULTIMATELY
7 SUBMIT ABOUT FIVE NAMES, SO WE WANTED ENOUGH TO WORK
8 THROUGH. AND I THINK THAT EVEN IN THE LIST WE HAD, NOT
9 EVERYBODY, I THINK, TO OUR MUTUAL REVIEW, MIGHT BE THE
10 BEST CANDIDATE FOR THIS, EVEN IN THE HIGHLY RATED
11 GROUP.

12 I DON'T KNOW WHETHER OTHER GROUPS WANT TO DO
13 THAT OR WHETHER YOU WANT TO GIVE US, ED, FLEXIBILITY TO
14 DO THAT.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IF I MIGHT INTERRUPT YOU,
16 AND I APOLOGIZE, IS THAT WE ACTUALLY WERE GOING TO GO
17 NEXT TO SOME SUGGESTED PROCESS THAT THE GROUP MIGHT
18 WANT TO DISCUSS. AND WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT FITS
19 DIRECTLY INTO THAT. IF I MIGHT ASK YOU, IT'S A GREAT
20 LEAD-IN, BUT HOLD THAT FOR JUST A MINUTE. I HAD TWO
21 MORE INFORMATION ITEMS BEFORE WE GOT TO THAT, IF THAT'S
22 OKAY.

23 DR. PIZZO: YES, ABSOLUTELY. SORRY FOR
24 GETTING AHEAD OF YOU.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: NO. THAT'S WHY YOU'RE GOOD

1 AT WHAT YOU DO IS YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO BE AHEAD OF
2 EVERYBODY ELSE.

3 AND I THINK THE REASON, WATCHING ZACH'S
4 REACTION HERE, THAT SOME OF THE CONTENTS OF YOUR LETTER
5 WE'LL COME TO IN JUST A MOMENT MIGHT BE BETTER NOT IN
6 ZACH'S LETTER FOR THE REASON WE'LL DISCUSS.

7 DR. PIZZO: OKAY.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE COULD COME BACK. I
9 THINK RIGHT NOW WHAT WE'D LIKE TO DO IS TO SEE IF THE
10 GROUP FEELS COMFORTABLE WITH A LETTER THAT ZACH COULD
11 SEND OUT. AND MAYBE WE COULD FINALIZE THAT, ZACH,
12 AFTER WE TALK ABOUT THE PROCESS A LITTLE BIT IF WE WANT
13 TO MODIFY ZACH'S LETTER. BUT AT THIS POINT WE WANTED
14 TO SEE WHETHER A LETTER LIKE THIS WAS -- THE GROUP FELT
15 COMFORTABLE WITH HAVING SOME SORT OF A WARNING SIGNAL
16 COMING OUT.

17 DR. PIZZO: THIS IS PHIL AGAIN. BY
18 DEFINITION, I THINK YOU KNOW THAT WE -- TED, I'M
19 SPEAKING WITH TED -- WE BOTH AGREE THAT THAT'S A GREAT
20 IDEA. IN FACT, IT'S HARD FOR ME TO IMAGINE THAT WE
21 WOULD BE VERY EFFICIENT IN RECRUITING PEOPLE IF WE
22 DIDN'T GIVE THIS KIND OF INFORMATION IN ADVANCE.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: RIGHT.

24 DR. HALL: PHIL, ONE THING, IF IT'S AGREED
25 THAT WE SHOULD DO THIS, AND I'LL WAIT AND SEE, IF YOU

1 WOULD E-MAIL ME YOUR LETTER, I'D BE HAPPY -- I WOULD
2 DEFER TO ANY SUPERIOR PROSE YOU MIGHT HAVE WRITTEN.

3 DR. PIZZO: SINCE YOU'RE AN ENGLISH
4 CONCENTRATOR, ZACH, IT'S HARD TO IMAGINE MY PROSE WOULD
5 BE SUPERIOR BECAUSE I WAS A PHILOSOPHY CONCENTRATOR,
6 BUT WE'LL BE HAPPY TO E-MAIL YOU THE LETTER AS WELL.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WOULD OTHERS LIKE TO SPEAK
8 TO THIS PARTICULAR INFORMATION ITEM? WE'LL COME BACK
9 TO MAYBE THE LETTER AGAIN AFTER WE TALK A LITTLE BIT
10 ABOUT THE PROCESS IN MORE DETAIL.

11 THEN TWO OTHER INFORMATION ITEMS FOR EVERYONE
12 TO MAKE SURE IS ON YOUR CALENDARS. THE FIRST, A VERY
13 IMPORTANT DATE OF APRIL 19TH. THAT'S THE DATE WHEN THE
14 NAMES OF YOUR CANDIDATES ARE GOING TO BE DUE IN ZACH'S
15 OFFICE. AND WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT, IF YOU REMEMBER
16 THE FACT THE EACH OF OUR GROUPS MUST COME UP WITH FIVE
17 NAMES, AND FOR A REASON I'LL TALK ABOUT MORE IN JUST A
18 MOMENT, WE'D ASK YOU TO THINK ABOUT HAVING THREE
19 ALTERNATES ON THAT LIST AS WELL.

20 HOW DO WE DECIDE WHAT THE LENGTH OF THE LIST
21 SHOULD BE. WE'D JUST LIKE YOU TO HAVE IN MIND THAT WE
22 NEED TO HAVE THE LIST FROM YOU BY APRIL 19TH. AND
23 THAT'S NECESSARY BECAUSE APRIL THE 26TH IS OUR NEXT
24 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING, WHICH IS ALREADY CALENDARED AND
25 HOPEFULLY IS ON YOUR SCHEDULE. AT THAT MEETING IS WHEN

1 WE WILL ACTUALLY DISCUSS THE NAMES OF THE CANDIDATES.
2 SO THE TIME LINES ARE SUCH WE NEED TO HAVE INTO ZACH'S
3 OFFICE APRIL 19TH TO THEN HAVE PREPARATION TO BE READY
4 ON APRIL 26TH TO FINALIZE THE LIST.

5 AND SOMETHING THAT WE'LL COME BACK TO IN JUST
6 A MOMENT IS WE'LL NEED PROBABLY TO MAKE A
7 RECOMMENDATION FOR ZACH ABOUT A CHAIR OF THIS GROUP.
8 SO WHEN YOU'RE THINKING ABOUT YOUR LIST OF PEOPLE,
9 THAT'S ONE OF THE THINGS TO KEEP IN MIND.

10 DR. LEVEY: ED, JERRY LEVEY HERE. THAT GIVES
11 ADDED URGENCY TO ZACH'S LETTER GETTING OUT QUICKLY
12 BECAUSE THIS IS A FAIRLY SMALL LIST. AND I'VE GONE
13 THROUGH OURS, MOST OF IT ANYWAY, AND THERE ARE SOME
14 GREAT PEOPLE. BUT I CAN SEE STRATIFICATION DEVELOPING
15 ALREADY JUST FROM WHAT I HAD. AND SO IT WOULD BE
16 IMPORTANT TO KNOW WHO'S IN THE GAME AND WHO ISN'T.

17 DR. PIZZO: RIGHT.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK WE ALL AGREE THAT
19 THAT'S ZACH WILLINGNESS TO PREPARE THIS LETTER, WHICH
20 WE MAY WANT TO TWEAK A LITTLE BIT AT THE END, I THINK
21 ZACH'S PREPARED TO GET IT OUT TODAY OR TOMORROW
22 PROBABLY.

23 DR. LEVEY: IS THERE A TIME LIMIT FOR
24 RESPONSE ON THAT?

25 DR. HALL: IT DOESN'T CALL FOR A RESPONSE.

1 IT JUST SIMPLY SAYS YOU MAY BE CALLED; AND IF SO, WE
2 HOPE YOU WILL AGREE TO TAKE THE INVITATION SERIOUSLY
3 AND AGREE TO JOIN US IN THIS PROJECT BASICALLY. I HOPE
4 YOU WILL SAY YES.

5 DR. LEVEY: DO YOU THINK MAYBE, BECAUSE WE
6 ARE SO RUSHED, THAT MAYBE IT WOULD BE BETTER TO WRITE A
7 MORE DEFINITIVE THAT YOUR NAME HAS BEEN SUBMITTED FOR
8 CONSIDERATION, SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BUT WE'D HAVE TO
9 KNOW WHETHER YOU HAVE ANY INTEREST IN EXPLORING THIS
10 FURTHER OR SOMETHING?

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LET ME, IF I MIGHT, JUST
12 SUGGEST A SET OF STEPS WE MIGHT FOLLOW, WHICH WOULD, I
13 THINK, FIT INTO ZACH'S LETTER A LITTLE BETTER. WITH
14 THE CONCURRENCE OF THE GROUP, WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS
15 JUST SUGGEST A PROCESS, THEN WE'LL OPEN IT ALL UP FOR
16 FULL DISCUSSION AND COME BACK TO ZACH'S LETTER AFTER
17 THAT. IS THE GROUP OKAY WITH THAT?

18 DR. PIZZO: YEP.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO THIS IS A SUGGESTED
20 APPROACH, AND WE CERTAINLY DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT. STEP
21 1 WOULD BE FOR EACH OF US WITHIN OUR SUBGROUP TO DO A
22 PRIORITIZED LISTS OF CANDIDATES FROM YOUR POOL. AS I
23 MENTIONED A MOMENT AGO, THAT WE'RE GOING TO SUGGEST TO
24 EVERYONE, WE HAVE TO COME UP WITH FIVE NAMES ON THE
25 LIST, BUT WOULD BE A LIST OF THREE ALTERNATES, WHICH

1 WOULD NEED TO BE PRIORITIZED ONE, TWO, THREE. THE FIVE
2 WHO ARE ON YOUR FINAL LIST DON'T NECESSARILY NEED TO BE
3 PRIORITIZED, BUT WE WOULD NEED A LIST OF ALTERNATES,
4 AND I'LL SAY MORE TO THAT IN JUST A MOMENT.

5 SO THE PROCESS WE'RE SUGGESTING WOULD BE IN
6 ADDITION TO THE FIVE WOULD BE TO PICK THREE ALTERNATES.

7 DR. PIZZO: ED, THIS IS PHIL. CAN I ASK ONE
8 QUALIFICATION ABOUT THAT, UNLESS YOU'RE GOING TO COME
9 TO THIS. THAT'S THE LIST OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN
10 CHOSEN AND AGREED THAT THEY WOULD SERVE IF FINALLY
11 SELECTED.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THAT IS CORRECT, PHIL.

13 DR. PIZZO: SO WE NEED TO KNOW THAT THEY'RE
14 WILLING TO DO THAT.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: RIGHT. I'LL SPEAK TO THAT
16 IN JUST A MOMENT, BUT YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT.

17 THEN WHAT WE WOULD SUGGEST AS STEP 2, AFTER
18 YOU RANK YOUR LIST, WHICH WOULD BE MORE THAN THE EIGHT
19 PEOPLE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT BECAUSE THERE IS SOME CHANCE
20 THAT THE FIRST EIGHT YOU CONTACT WON'T SAY YES. SO
21 LIKE YOU HAVE SAID, I THINK, PHIL, IN YOUR GROUP YOU
22 AND TED HAVE ALREADY GOT TWENTY, I THINK, ON YOUR LIST.

23 DR. PIZZO THAT'S RIGHT.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE DON'T WANT TO PROSCRIBE
25 HOW MANY HAVE TO BE ON YOUR LIST. WHAT WE WOULD

1 SUGGEST IS TO NEXT START TO MOVE DOWN YOUR LIST,
2 CALLING THE CANDIDATES AND ATTEMPTING TO RECRUIT THEM
3 TO PROVIDE THIS SERVICE.

4 AND WHAT WE WOULD SUGGEST YOU CONSIDER DOING
5 WHEN YOU CALL IS THE FOLLOWING, THAT YOU ARE OBVIOUSLY
6 NOT -- YOU CAN DO WHATEVER YOU THINK IS MOST
7 APPROPRIATE -- WOULD BE PROBABLY TO GIVE SOME
8 INFORMATION ON THE HISTORY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF
9 PROPOSITION 71 AND A LITTLE BIT ABOUT WHAT THE
10 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IS.

11 WE ALL LIVE THIS ON A DAILY BASIS; BUT SINCE
12 THESE PEOPLE ARE OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA, SOME BACKGROUND
13 WOULD, I THINK, BE NECESSARY.

14 SECOND WOULD BE TO DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY
15 WHICH THE MEMBERS WILL BE SELECTED. THIS IS A SOMEWHAT
16 UNUSUAL SEARCH PROCESS; BUT FOR THE REASONS WE'VE
17 TALKED ABOUT TO TRY TO GET THE JOB DONE, I THINK IT
18 WOULD BE GOOD TO EXPLAIN HOW THAT'S GOING TO WORK. AND
19 THEN TO STATE THE PURPOSE OF THE CALL TO THE CANDIDATES
20 AS FAR AS THE EXPERTISE THAT'S IMPORTANT IN THIS
21 ENDEAVOR, TO -- YOU REMEMBER WE HAVE A LIST OF WHAT WE
22 THINK THE QUALIFICATIONS ARE TO BE IN THIS. AND THEN
23 TO TALK A BIT ABOUT THE JOB DESCRIPTION, WHICH WOULD BE
24 TO -- AND WE'LL TALK MORE ABOUT THIS IN A MOMENT -- BUT
25 THE SCOPE OF THE GRANTS UNDER -- WHICH WE'RE GOING TO

1 REVIEW, AND I'M GOING TO ASK ZACH TO COMMENT IN A
2 MOMENT ABOUT THAT -- THE PROPOSED TIME COMMITMENT.

3 AND THIS IS ONE WE THOUGHT MIGHT BE BETTER
4 DEALT WITH BY US THAN IN THE LETTER THAT ZACH IS GOING
5 TO SEND OUT. BUT TO TELL PEOPLE THAT THERE WOULD BE
6 REGULAR MEETINGS, LET'S SAY, THREE, BUT POSSIBLY FOUR,
7 DEPENDING UPON THE NEED, PER YEAR TO OCCUR THROUGHOUT
8 THE YEAR AND THAT FLEXIBILITY EXISTS TO ALLOW MEMBERS
9 TO SERVE BY TELEPHONE OR VIDEO CONFERENCE AND IN
10 DIFFERENT LOCATIONS. THEY DON'T ALL HAVE TO BE IN
11 CALIFORNIA, THAT WE HAVE A FAIR AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY
12 AS FAR AS NUMBER OF MEETINGS, LOCATION OF MEETINGS, AND
13 PARTICIPATION BY TELEPHONE OR VIDEO CONFERENCE.

14 THE TERM OF SERVICE IS UP TO SIX YEARS, BUT
15 IT'S NEGOTIABLE. COMPENSATION WILL BE AVAILABLE. THE
16 DETAILS ON THIS ARE ACTUALLY PENDING, SO WE CAN'T BE
17 SPECIFIC ABOUT THAT AT THE MOMENT. FINANCIAL SUPPORT
18 FOR ADMINISTRATIVE HELP WILL BE AVAILABLE. AD HOC
19 REVIEWERS ARE GOING TO BE AVAILABLE IN AN UNLIMITED
20 NUMBER SO THAT THE GROUP WILL BE ABLE TO ENLIST HELP
21 FROM OTHERS. AND THEN THE TYPES OF GRANTS THAT I'M
22 GOING TO ASK ZACH TO COMMENT ON IN JUST A SECOND.

23 IF THE SORT OF THINGS THAT I JUST COVERED
24 MAKE SENSE TO YOU, AND WE WANT TO OPEN THIS UP FOR
25 DISCUSSION, WHAT WE WOULD PROBABLY DO THEN IS PUT THIS

1 IN SOME SORT OF AN E-MAIL TO SEND TO ALL OF YOU SO YOU
2 CAN HAVE IT AS A REFERENCE POINT FOR YOUR DISCUSSION,
3 AGAIN NOT LIMITING YOU TO THESE ITEMS, BUT YOU'LL HAVE
4 THIS WITH YOU AT A TIME WHEN YOU START TO CALL PEOPLE
5 TO SPEAK TO THEM.

6 DR. LEVEY: ED, I'M A LITTLE BIT CONFUSED
7 HERE. SO WILL IT BE OUR RESPONSIBILITY IF KEITH AND I
8 COME UP WITH THE FIVE PEOPLE AND THREE ALTERNATES TO
9 CALL THEM?

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YES. YOU'LL NEED TO MAKE
11 CONTACT WITH THEM, AND I THINK A TELEPHONE CALL RATHER
12 THAN A LETTER IS GOING TO BE IMPORTANT, JERRY, BECAUSE
13 THERE'S SO MUCH TO TALK THROUGH WITH THIS, AND WE NEED
14 TO RECRUIT, I THINK --

15 DR. PIZZO: RIGHT.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: -- TO STIMULATE THE
17 INTEREST.

18 DR. LEVEY: SO THEN, PHIL, ZACH'S LETTER IS
19 APPROPRIATE THEN SINCE --

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AS YOU'VE JUST IDENTIFIED,
21 THEY WILL HAVE BEEN FOREWARNED BY THE TIME YOU CALL
22 THEM ON THE PHONE.

23 DR. PIZZO: THIS IS PHIL. CAN I OFFER A
24 MODIFIER TO THAT BECAUSE YOU HAD A LOT OF REALLY
25 IMPORTANT DETAIL IN YOUR COMMENTS, ED. AND I'M WORRIED

1 ABOUT THE EFFICIENCY OF ACTUALLY REACHING PEOPLE,
2 SCHEDULING CALLS, GIVEN ALL OF OUR SCHEDULES AND
3 KNOWING HOW LONG IT TAKES TO SOMETIMES GET THAT DONE.
4 I WOULD LIKE TO SEE SOME FLEXIBILITY SO THAT WE COULD
5 PUT A LOT OF THAT INFORMATION THAT YOU HAD IN EITHER AN
6 E-MAIL COMMUNICATION OR AN ATTACHMENT TO AN E-MAIL SO
7 THAT PEOPLE ARE ARMED WITH THAT INFORMATION. AND WE
8 USE A CALL, IF WE MAKE THE CALL, AS A WAY OF REALLY
9 AFFIRMING AND CLARIFYING. OTHERWISE, I THINK WE'RE
10 GOING TO WIND UP CHASING PEOPLE OVER THE POTENTIALLY
11 MONTH OR TWO AND LOSE SOME VALUABLE TIME.

12 IF YOU ARE WILLING TO HAVE SOME FLEXIBILITY,
13 IN THAT, I THINK THE CONTENT IS IMPORTANT; BUT FROM MY
14 POINT OF VIEW, WE'D BE MUCH BETTER SERVED BY DOING A
15 LOT OF THIS ELECTRONICALLY.

16 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JANET IN CHICO. JUST TO
17 CONTINUE THAT THOUGHT, IS IT POSSIBLE THAT MUCH OF THAT
18 CONTENT COULD BE AT THE WEBSITE AND COULD BE ACCESSED
19 BY A CANDIDATE WHO MIGHT BE INTERESTED, BUT DIDN'T HAVE
20 THE TIME TO HAVE THAT LONG A PHONE CONVERSATION OR AT
21 LEAST INITIALLY?

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'M GOING TO VOICE, NOT THE
23 CHAIR OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S OPINION, ED HOLMES'
24 OPINION, IF I MIGHT. PHIL, I HAVE A LITTLE RESERVATION
25 ABOUT THAT BECAUSE I THINK OF MYSELF, WHEN I GET THESE

1 E-MAILS OR OFFERS, I'M NOT LOOKING FOR JOBS, BUT YOU
2 GET THESE OFFERS, AND THE USUAL THING IS YOU TRASH THEM
3 IMMEDIATELY. AND I'M A LITTLE WORRIED -- I KNOW THIS
4 IS EXTRA WORK FOR ALL OF US, BUT I THINK CALLING PEOPLE
5 ON THE PHONE IS THE FIRST ENCOUNTER, GIVES US A MUCH
6 BETTER CHANCE TO ENLIST THE HELP OF THE REALLY STAR
7 CANDIDATES. I'M AFRAID IT WILL BE OFF-PUTTING WITH AN
8 E-MAIL AND SHOOT IT BACK RIGHT AWAY AND SAY THANK YOU,
9 DR. PIZZO, BUT NO THANK YOU.

10 DR. PIZZO: IT'S POSSIBLE. I HAVE --
11 OBVIOUSLY WE'RE REACTING. I WORRY ABOUT, OF COURSE, AS
12 YOU DO, THE SORT OF SPAM E-MAILS THAT WE ALL GET AND
13 IMMEDIATELY REJECT. I WAS THINKING TO PERSONALIZE IT,
14 AND THEN, OF COURSE, I THINK IT'S VERY APPROPRIATE TO
15 FOLLOW UP WITH A PHONE CALL. BUT IF THIS IS COMING
16 FROM, YOU KNOW, ONE OF US AS COMPARED TO A SEARCH FIRM
17 OR, YOU KNOW, THE USUAL THINGS THAT WE ALL GET, I THINK
18 IT WILL GET ATTENTION. AGAIN, MAYBE IT'S JUST A STYLE
19 DIFFERENCE. BUT LIKE YOU, WE ALL HAVE TO NOW SCHEDULE
20 TELEPHONE APPOINTMENTS BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE'RE CHASING
21 EVERYONE. I JUST AM VERY, VERY WORRIED ABOUT LOSING
22 TIME AND MAKING THE APRIL 19TH DEADLINE.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO, AGAIN, AS I SAID, MY
24 OPINION WAS SIMPLY THAT AS AN INDIVIDUAL. WE CAN HAVE
25 SOME MORE DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS, AND I DON'T THINK WE

1 ALL HAVE TO DO IT THE SAME WAY.

2 DR. PIZZO: RIGHT. THAT'S REALLY WHAT I WAS
3 ASKING, WHETHER THERE'S FLEXIBILITY.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ZACH, YOU MIGHT WANT TO
5 COMMENT.

6 DR. HALL: YOU KNOW, I'M A LITTLE RELUCTANT
7 TO PUT THINGS IN AN E-MAIL IN A WAY, PHIL, BECAUSE I
8 THINK A LOT OF THIS WE DON'T KNOW; I.E., HOW MANY
9 GRANTS A YEAR WILL THERE BE?

10 DR. PIZZO: BUT LET ME UNDERSCORE. I'M NOT
11 IMPLYING, ZACH, THAT WE DON'T HAVE A TELEPHONE CALL.
12 I'M REALLY STATING THAT WE TRY AND GET CONTENT INTO A
13 COMMUNICATION SO THAT WE CAN MAKE OUR TELEPHONE CALLS
14 MORE EFFICIENT AND FOCUSED.

15 DR. HALL: THIS MAY NOT BE THE BEST STRATEGY;
16 BUT AS YOU WILL HEAR, WE'RE GOING NEED TO FOLLOW UP
17 WITH THESE PEOPLE TO TALK TO THEM ABOUT OTHER ISSUES AS
18 WELL LATER. ONE POSSIBILITY IS THAT SOME OF THE MORE
19 SPECIFIC INFORMATION COULD BE CONVEYED THERE. AND ALSO
20 SOME OF THESE ISSUES ARE UNCERTAIN. WE REALLY DON'T
21 KNOW IF THREE TO FOUR A YEAR. I THINK FOUR IS ASKING A
22 LOT. IF WE CAN DO IT IN THREE, I WOULD LIKE TO DO IT.
23 WHOOPS. I BEG YOUR PARDON. I'M SORRY. IT'S IN
24 PROPOSITION 71. IT'S JUST BEEN POINTED OUT TO ME THAT
25 WE HAVE TO MEET FOUR TIMES A YEAR.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: EACH PERSON DOESN'T HAVE TO
2 MEET FOUR TIMES A YEAR. YOU CAN SET IT UP IN SUCH A
3 WAY THAT THEY CAN MEET LESS, LIKE IF YOU'RE GOING TO
4 REVIEW ONE TYPE OF GRANT OR SOMETHING; IS THAT CORRECT?

5 DR. HALL: YES. AT ANY RATE, WE'RE GOING TO
6 DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO SET UP A SYSTEM THAT WILL BE
7 RESPECTFUL OF THEIR TIME AND WILL HELP THEM TO DO THIS.
8 AND MY INTENT IS TO TRY TO DISCOURAGE TOO MUCH
9 SPECIFICS ABOUT EXACTLY WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO BECAUSE
10 WE ACTUALLY DON'T KNOW. AND JUST TO -- THAT MAY NOT
11 WORK, BUT THAT WOULD BE MY THOUGHT.

12 DR. PIZZO: HERE'S ONE CONCERN THAT I HAVE,
13 WHICH IS SINCE THERE MAY BE THINGS WE DON'T KNOW, IT'S
14 GOING TO BE VERY IMPORTANT FOR ALL OF US TO COMMUNICATE
15 THE SAME MESSAGE. OTHERWISE, WE'RE GOING TO WIND UP
16 HAVING A BUNCH OF VERY OBVIOUSLY DISSATISFIED PEOPLE
17 WHO'VE HEARD DIFFERENT THINGS FROM DIFFERENT ONES OF US
18 INADVERTENTLY.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IN THAT REGARD, MAYBE I'LL
20 JUMP TO THE END OF OUR RECOMMENDATION AND COME BACK FOR
21 MORE DISCUSSION.

22 DR. LEVEY: ED, CAN I JUST SAY ONE THING.
23 I'M SURE ZACH WILL BE THRILLED AT THIS. THIS IS JERRY
24 LEVEY AGAIN. YOU THINK TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE IS A
25 UNIFIED APPROACH TO EACH OF THE CANDIDATES, ZACH, WOULD

1 BE WILLING TO MAKE THE CALLS, AND STAFF COULD SET THEM
2 UP FOR YOU?

3 DR. HALL: LET ED WORK THROUGH IT. WE HAVE A
4 PROPOSAL HERE, AND LET ED GO THROUGH IT, AND THEN WE
5 CAN GO BACK AND MODIFY IT OR CHANGE IT.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE WANTED TO MAKE FOR OUR
7 GROUP OR OUR SUGGESTION FOR OUR GROUP IS THAT WE GET TO
8 BE THE POSITIVE ONES WHO DO THE RECRUITING AND RAH-RAH
9 AND WHY WE WANT PEOPLE TO DO THIS. OUR SUGGESTION WAS
10 GOING TO BE IS WHEN YOU GET PEOPLE TO AGREE, YOU GET
11 YOUR LIST OF EIGHT, LET'S SAY, TOGETHER, THAT WE TURN
12 THAT OVER TO ZACH'S OFFICE, AT WHICH POINT ZACH'S
13 OFFICE WOULD THEN WORK WITH THE SHORTENED LIST AND
14 CONTACT THESE INDIVIDUALS TO GO THROUGH THINGS LIKE
15 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS, COMPENSATION ISSUES.
16 THEY CAN TALK ABOUT THE OPEN MEETINGS THAT ARE GOING TO
17 BE NEEDED, TALK ABOUT THE REAL PROCESS, TALK ABOUT
18 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR THEM.

19 DR. HALL: ANOTHER ISSUE CAME UP WITH
20 SOMEBODY I RAN INTO TODAY AND I SAID I HOPE YOU'RE ON
21 THE MEETING. HE SAID, WELL, I HAVE A CONFLICT OF
22 INTEREST. I SAID YOU ARE BEING RECRUITED TO
23 CALIFORNIA? AND HE SAID YES. THAT WILL HAVE TO BE
24 DISCUSSED, AND THAT'S SORT OF A PRIVATE DISCUSSION.
25 AND AT ANY RATE, ALL OF THESE ISSUES WE'LL HAVE TO GO

1 THROUGH WITH PEOPLE JUST AS FOLLOW-UP. I THINK WE HAVE
2 TO GIVE THEM SOME WARNING.

3 OUR THOUGHT WAS ED SAID TO GIVE THEM -- GET
4 THEM ON BOARD AND GIVE THEM THE POSITIVE MESSAGE, AND
5 THEN DEAL WITH SOME OF THESE STICKIER ISSUES LATER IN
6 THE FOLLOW-UP. AND THAT MIGHT ALSO BE A TIME TO
7 DISCUSS QUESTIONS THAT THEY MAY HAVE ABOUT THE WHOLE
8 PROCESS AND WHAT IT IS THEY'RE GOING TO BE DOING.

9 DR. PIZZO: I CAN SUPPORT THAT.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: COULD I THEN MAYBE, AND
11 THEN WE'LL COME BACK AND TRY TO FRAME THIS UP, ASK ZACH
12 TO GIVE THE GROUP, BECAUSE I THINK ONE THING WE WILL
13 NEED TO TELL THEM IN ADDITION TO THE THINGS THAT I
14 MENTIONED BEFORE IS WHAT TYPES OF GRANTS MIGHT THEY BE
15 ASKED TO CONSIDER. AND WHILE WE DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER
16 TO THAT YET EITHER, WE SORT OF HAVE SOME GENERAL
17 CATEGORIES. AND MAYBE, ZACH, IF YOU COULD COMMENT SO
18 THAT PEOPLE HAVE SOME IDEA, AND THEN WE'LL COME BACK
19 AND SEE IF WE CAN'T FRAME IT UP.

20 DR. HALL: I THINK THESE ARE -- THERE'S
21 NOTHING UNUSUAL HERE WITH PERHAPS ONE EXCEPTION. THESE
22 ARE THE KINDS OF GRANTS THAT WILL BE FAMILIAR TO PEOPLE
23 IN THE NIH SYSTEM. AND LET ME JUST GO THROUGH THEM IN
24 CASE ANYBODY ON THE COMMITTEE OR MEMBERS ATTENDING WANT
25 INFORMATION. ONE IS TRAINING GRANTS AND INTELLECTUAL

1 INFRASTRUCTURE, AND I WILL BE PRESENTING A PROPOSAL FOR
2 THAT ON APRIL 7TH AT THE ICOC MEETING.

3 A SECOND POSSIBILITY IS INFRASTRUCTURE
4 GRANTS. BY THAT WE MEAN THESE WOULD BE ALMOST, AS WE
5 CONCEIVE THEM, CONTRACTS. AND THEY SHOULD GO OUT VERY
6 EARLY. MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN
7 DOING SOME EXPERIMENTS ARE UNABLE TO DO SO BECAUSE
8 THEIR LABS AND LAB EQUIPMENT HAVE BEEN NIH FUNDED. SO
9 THEY ACTUALLY DON'T HAVE A PLACE THEY CAN DO THESE
10 EXPERIMENTS. ONE IDEA WOULD BE TO HAVE IN A NUMBER OF
11 INSTITUTIONS A SPACE, AND WE WOULD PAY FOR SOMEBODY TO
12 BE ON-SITE AND STAFF IT SO THAT PEOPLE IN THAT
13 INSTITUTION AND IN SOME CASES PERHAPS NEIGHBORING
14 INSTITUTIONS COULD COME AND CARRY OUT EXPERIMENTS WITH
15 NON-NIH FUNDED EQUIPMENT AND BE SURE THAT THEY WERE
16 SAFE IN DOING THAT.

17 AS WE GO ALONG AND WE BEGIN TO FUND
18 FACILITIES GRANTS, THESE WILL BECOME LESS IMPORTANT.
19 BUT A NUMBER OF PEOPLE HAVE SAID HOW CAN I GET
20 PRELIMINARY DATA OR HOW CAN I EXPLORE OR EVEN IF I WERE
21 TO GET, LET'S SAY, A SEED GRANT, HOW CAN I DO THE WORK?
22 I DON'T HAVE AVAILABLE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT'S NOT NIH
23 FUNDED. SO THAT IS A POSSIBLE THING WE WOULD DO. AND
24 WE WOULD ASK THAT IT BE OPEN, AS I SAY, TO A VARIETY OF
25 PEOPLE AND PROBABLY ALMOST LIKE A CONTRACT.

1 MY THOUGHT IS WE SHOULD COME BACK AT THE END
2 OF THE YEAR AND SAY WHO'S USED THE FACILITY AND HOW IS
3 IT WORKING AND SO FORTH. THAT'S ONE TYPE.

4 THEN SEED GRANTS, RELATIVELY MODEST IN
5 AMOUNT, AND THE INTENT WOULD BE TO ATTRACT PEOPLE IN
6 FROM OUTSIDE. REGULAR RO1 INVESTIGATOR INITIATED
7 GRANTS, PROGRAM PROJECT GRANTS THAT MIGHT HAVE FOUR OR
8 FIVE INVESTIGATORS TOGETHER, AND THEN LARGE CENTER
9 GRANTS.

10 NOW, THAT'S AMONG THE RANGE. WE WILL NOT
11 NECESSARILY USE EVERY ONE OF THOSE MECHANISMS, BUT
12 THAT'S AMONG THE RANGE THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED. AND
13 WE WILL BE DISCUSSING WITH THE ICOC WHAT THEIR THOUGHTS
14 ARE ABOUT THESE. AND I HOPE WE WILL IN THE FUTURE BE
15 ABLE TO BRING A PROPOSAL TO YOU FOR DISCUSSION THAT
16 WOULD INVOLVE OUR PLANS BEYOND THE FIRST ROUND OF
17 TRAINING GRANTS. AT ANY RATE, THAT'S JUST THE KIND OF
18 GRANTS WE'RE THINKING OF.

19 DR. PIZZO: GREAT.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO THEN TO CONTINUE ALONG
21 THIS THOUGHT FOR A SECOND, THAT DEPENDING ON HOW THE
22 DISCUSSION GOES, AND WE'LL NEED TO HAVE MORE
23 DISCUSSION. I'M LOOKING AT MARY WHO'S SITTING ACROSS
24 THE TABLE TO MAKE AN ASSIGNMENT HERE IN A MOMENT. THAT
25 AT THE PLEASURE OF THE COMMITTEE, WHAT WE COULD DO IS

1 TRY AND PUT ALL OF THIS THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT AT THE
2 END TOGETHER AS AN E-MAIL THAT WILL BE AVAILABLE TO
3 EACH OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES SO WHEN THEY MAKE THE PHONE
4 CALL, THEY'LL AT LEAST HAVE THIS LIST THAT THEY CAN
5 SPEAK FROM, NOT LIMITING YOU TO THAT OR SAYING YOU HAVE
6 TO COVER ALL OF THOSE TOPICS, BUT AT LEAST YOU WON'T
7 HAVE TO TRY AND REMEMBER THEM OFF THE TOP OF YOUR HEAD.

8 DR. PIZZO: WE'LL PROBABLY READ ABOUT IT IN
9 ONE OF THE NEWSPAPERS, RIGHT.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THE OTHER THING THAT ZACH
11 VOLUNTEERED TO DO, I THINK, WOULD BE IF ANY OF US HAVE
12 QUESTIONS FROM OUR SUBCOMMITTEE WORK, YOU MIGHT NOT
13 KNOW ALL THE PEOPLE WHO ARE ON YOUR LIST; AND IF YOU
14 WANTED TO CALL ZACH AND ASK ZACH AND MARY TO DO SOME
15 MORE HOMEWORK ABOUT CANDIDATES THAT YOU DON'T HAVE ANY
16 INFORMATION ON OR YOU'RE UNSURE, THAT I THINK HE'S
17 WILLING TO MAKE AVAILABLE HIS OFFICE SO THAT AS YOU
18 START TRYING TO PRIORITIZE THE GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS YOU
19 WANT TO WORK WITH AND YOU DON'T FEEL LIKE YOU HAVE
20 ENOUGH INFORMATION, IS THAT CORRECT, ZACH, THEY COULD
21 CALL YOU OR MARY?

22 DR. HALL: WE'D DO WHAT WE COULD.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TO HELP YOU WITH THAT.
24 RIGHT. SO THAT YOU KNOW THAT YOU -- THAT THERE'S
25 ADDITIONAL RESOURCE AVAILABLE TO YOU BECAUSE WE MAY NOT

1 KNOW WHO ALL THESE PEOPLE ARE ON THE LIST.

2 THE OTHER THING, OF COURSE, TO REMEMBER IS
3 THAT IN ADDITION TO THE FIVE PLUS THREE, IF WE AGREE ON
4 THAT, WE'RE ENCOURAGING YOU TO HAVE A BALANCE OF BASIC
5 SCIENTISTS AND CLINICAL SCIENTISTS THAT'S REALLY
6 ESSENTIAL FOR IN THE END TO HAVE THAT REPRESENTATION ON
7 THE COMMITTEE.

8 SO LET ME RECAP AGAIN, BUT THEN GET US INTO
9 MORE DISCUSSION WITH THIS AND ASK OUR MEMBERS OF THE
10 PUBLIC, AS WELL AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, TO
11 CONTRIBUTE. THE GENERAL SCENARIO WOULD BE IS WE WOULD
12 COME UP WITH A LIST OF THINGS THAT, AFTER YOU HAVE
13 PRIORITIZED TO WHATEVER LIST YOU WANT, TO START MAKING
14 PHONE CALLS TO A MINIMUM OF EIGHT INDIVIDUALS TO REVIEW
15 THE ISSUES WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. AFTER YOU GET YOUR
16 LIST OF EIGHT PEOPLE, FIVE WHO WILL BE PUT FORWARD AND
17 THREE ALTERNATES, YOU WOULD TURN THAT LIST OVER TO
18 ZACH'S OFFICE, AND THEY WOULD THEN CONTACT THE TOP FIVE
19 PEOPLE THAT YOU HAVE AND MAKE SURE THERE ARE NO
20 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OR OTHER THINGS THAT WOULD LEAD
21 TO THEIR DROPPING OUT.

22 AND THEY WOULD THEN GO TO YOUR ALTERNATE LIST
23 IN THE ONE, TWO, THREE ORDER THAT YOU GIVE THAT TO THEM
24 WITH THE HOPE THAT WE WOULD THEN BE -- WE'LL HAVE A
25 DIALOGUE WITH YOU THROUGHOUT THIS -- WOULD BE ABLE TO

1 HAVE YOUR SUBGROUP HAVE FIVE PEOPLE AVAILABLE TO BRING
2 FORWARD BY THE 26TH, WHICH IS THE DATE WE'RE TRYING TO
3 REACH. THAT WOULD BE ROUGHLY THE PROCESS. LET ME STOP
4 THERE AND FIRST GO TO THE COMMITTEE AND HAVE
5 DISCUSSION. THEN WE'LL GO TO THE PUBLIC AND SEE WHERE
6 YOUR PLEASURE IS WITH THIS.

7 DR. LOVE: THIS IS TED LOVE. I UNDERSTAND
8 THE LETTER AND THE CALL, BUT I'M STILL JUST WONDERING
9 IF WE WOULDN'T BE BETTER OFF AT SOME POINT TO HAVE KIND
10 OF A BACKGROUND DOCUMENT. I KNOW WE CAN SHARE A LOT
11 WITH PEOPLE OVER THE PHONE, BUT THERE ARE A LOT OF
12 PIECES HERE, AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF IT WOULDN'T BE
13 APPROPRIATE AT SOME POINT TO BE ABLE TO HAND TO THESE
14 PEOPLE A NICE DOCUMENT THAT GIVES THEM SOME BACKGROUND
15 AND INFORMATION ABOUT THE OVERALL PROCESS AND THE
16 SPECIFICS OF THIS GROUP THAT THEY'RE BEING SOLICITED TO
17 JOIN.

18 DR. HALL: WE'LL DO THE BEST WE CAN, TED.
19 SOME OF THESE WE'RE ALL CATCHING THIS ON THE RUN. WE
20 DON'T HAVE A CIO POLICY FOR WORKING GROUP MEMBERS AT
21 THIS STAGE. WE HOPE WE WILL HAVE. WE'RE DEVELOPING
22 THAT NOW. AND SO I'M HAPPY TO DO IT. IT IS WE DON'T
23 KNOW ALL THE DIFFERENT KIND OF GRANTS WE'RE GOING TO
24 USE. WE DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW WE'RE GOING TO ARRANGE
25 IT. SO WE'RE ASKING PEOPLE -- WE'LL DO THE BEST WE

1 CAN, AND I'LL BE HAPPY TO PROVIDE AS MUCH INFORMATION
2 AS WE CAN. THE PROBLEM IS ONCE IT'S DOWN ON PAPER, OF
3 COURSE, IT TAKES A LIFE OF ITS OWN. BUT I THINK WE
4 JUST WILL DRAW UP A LIST AND DO THE BEST WE CAN WITH IT
5 AND SEE WHAT WE HAVE.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TED, I THINK MARY HAS
7 NODDED THAT SHE WILL DO HER DEAD LEVEL BEST TO COME UP
8 WITH THE THINGS WE TALKED ABOUT, WHICH IS THE HISTORY
9 AND IMPORTANCE OF PROP 71, WHAT PROCESS HAS BEEN, A
10 LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE SCOPE OF THE GRANT REVIEW AS WE'VE
11 TALKED ABOUT THAT, THE TIME COMMITMENT, THE SERVICE,
12 COMPENSATION, ETC., SO YOU WILL ALL HAVE THAT AVAILABLE
13 TO YOU AT LEAST IN A BULLET FORM TO USE WHEN YOU TALK
14 TO PEOPLE. I CERTAINLY LIKE TO HAVE THAT MYSELF.

15 DR. LOVE: GREAT.

16 DR. HENDERSON: THE OTHER THING THAT MIGHT
17 HELP IS TO HAVE THE WEBSITE ACCESS READILY AVAILABLE TO
18 THE PEOPLE WE TALK TO.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK THE ONLY THING,
20 BRIAN, THAT I HAD HEARD ZACH SAY, BUT HE CAN SPEAK FOR
21 HIMSELF, IS THERE'S SOME RELUCTANCE TO PUT SOMETHING
22 DOWN IN EITHER A WEBSITE OR WRITTEN FORMAT. IT TAKES
23 ON A LIFE OF ITS OWN. IT'S DEFINITIVE BEFORE IT IS
24 DEFINITIVE.

25 DR. HENDERSON: SORRY. EXCUSE ME. I WAS

1 JUST TALKING ABOUT THE LEGISLATION ITSELF.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY.

3 DR. HENDERSON: I WASN'T TALKING ABOUT
4 ANYTHING EXCEPT THE LEGISLATION ITSELF. IT GIVES SOME
5 INFORMATION THAT THEY CAN ACCESS.

6 DR. HALL: I THINK PART OF THIS IS A QUESTION
7 OF TIMING. LET US SEE WHAT WE CAN PUT TOGETHER NOW.
8 WE OBVIOUSLY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO SAY ANYTHING ABOUT
9 CONFLICT OF INTEREST TILL AFTER THE MEETING, THE NEXT
10 ICOC MEETING, BUT WE WILL -- LET US TRY TO DEVELOP
11 SOMETHING THAT WE CAN SEND OUT TO YOU AND THAT WOULD BE
12 HELPFUL FOR YOU. AND THEN IF -- WE MAY WISH TO MODIFY
13 IT. ONCE YOU MADE YOUR CHOICE ON THE 19TH, YES, I
14 THINK IT WOULD BE FOR COMMITTEE USE ONLY AT THIS POINT.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK WE WANT TO BE VERY
16 CAREFUL ABOUT TYPES OF GRANTS BECAUSE WE WOULD BE
17 USURPING THE POWER OF ICOC FOR US TO TELL PEOPLE THAT
18 UNTIL THE ICOC HAS DECIDED. I THINK THERE WAS SOME
19 DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT LAST TIME, AND I THINK THE FULL
20 COMMITTEE WANTS TO BE ENGAGED IN THAT, RIGHTLY SO.

21 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JANET WRIGHT. I HAVE A
22 QUESTION THAT COMES UP IN MY MIND WHEN I IMAGINE MY
23 CONVERSATIONS WITH SOME OF THESE CANDIDATES. I MIGHT
24 NOT KNOW THE CANDIDATE, BUT I MIGHT KNOW OTHER
25 INDIVIDUALS AT THAT CANDIDATE'S INSTITUTION AND WOULD

1 BE TEMPTED TO ASK THOSE COLLEAGUES OF MINE TO PREVAIL
2 UPON THE CANDIDATE TO AT LEAST CONSIDER THIS SERIOUSLY.

3 I ASK THE QUESTION, I DON'T THINK THERE'S
4 ANYTHING WRONG WITH THAT, BUT I'VE BEEN SURPRISED WITH
5 SOME OF THE RESTRICTIONS ON US. IS THERE ANY PROBLEM
6 WITH THAT APPROACH?

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: JANET, ZACH AND MARY AND I
8 ARE SITTING HERE SHAKING OUR HEADS YES, YES, YES. I
9 THINK ANYTHING WE CAN DO TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO
10 PARTICIPATE. UNLESS THE GROUP THINKS DIFFERENTLY, I
11 WOULD CERTAINLY THINK THAT'S A WONDERFUL SUGGESTION.

12 DR. WRIGHT: SO WE CAN DO ANYTHING.

13 DR. HALL: WELL, IF YOU WANTED TO HAVE A
14 CONFIDENTIAL PHONE CALL TO THOSE PEOPLE ABOUT THE
15 PERSON, I THINK THAT'S FINE TOO. THAT'S PART OF YOUR
16 DUE DILIGENCE. PART OF YOUR DUE DILIGENCE. AND THEN
17 YOU CAN SAY I HOPE YOU WILL SUPPORT WHAT WE'RE DOING.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE HAVE OTHERS WHO WOULD
19 LIKE TO COMMENT ABOUT THE GENERAL PROCESS WE'RE
20 PROPOSING AT THE MOMENT ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE?

21 DR. HENDERSON: WE SHOULD SAY THAT WE'VE BEEN
22 JOINED BY TWO PUBLIC MEMBERS AT THIS SITE.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE'RE GOING TO GET TO THE
24 PUBLIC IN A SECOND. I WANT THE PUBLIC TO BE GETTING
25 READY FOR THEIRS. IF THE SUBCOMMITTEE WANTS TO HAVE

1 MORE INPUT, WE CERTAINLY WANT TO HEAR FROM EVERYONE.
2 MAYBE WE'LL TURN TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO MIGHT BE
3 AT A SITE IN SAN DIEGO. EITHER OF THE TWO PUBLIC
4 MEMBERS SITTING HERE WANT TO MAKE A COMMENT? NO.
5 LOS ANGELES?
6 DR. LEVEY: ANY COMMENT? WE HAVE TWO MEMBERS
7 OF THE PUBLIC. NO COMMENTS.
8 DR. HENDERSON: USC, WE HAVE ONE INDIVIDUAL
9 WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT, TWO.
10 MR. ZAYER: I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS
11 COMMITTEE -- THIS IS CHRIS ZAYER (PHONETIC), USC. I
12 UNDERSTAND THIS COMMITTEE IS AUTHORIZED TO OFFER
13 HONORARIA TO THE SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL MEMBERS OF THE
14 GRANTS COMMITTEE; IS THAT CORRECT?
15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YES, THERE WILL BE AN
16 HONORARIUM. I THINK -- ZACH'S SITTING HERE, BUT I
17 DON'T THINK THE AMOUNT HAS BEEN DETERMINED YET.
18 MR. ZAYER: SO I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THAT
19 I BELIEVE I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE
20 DISEASE ADVOCACY GROUP WHO WILL BE SERVING ON THE
21 GRANTS COMMITTEE WILL BE RECEIVING THEIR STIPEND, THEIR
22 PER DIEM OF \$100 PER DAY FOR THAT WORK; IS THAT
23 CORRECT?
24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO
25 THAT. ZACH OR MARY, WE MIGHT HAVE TO FIND OUT.

1 DR. MAXON CAN WE REFER TO THE AG'S OFFICE ON
2 THAT? WHAT DOES THE LEGISLATION SAY FOR THAT?

3 MS. PACTER: THE LEGISLATION SAYS THAT THE
4 ICOC CAN DETERMINE HONORARIA FOR NON-ICOC MEMBERS OF
5 THE WORKING GROUP. IF YOU LOOK AT WHAT'S NOW HEALTH
6 AND SAFETY CODE 125290.45, ITEM (B)(3), THE ICOC SHALL
7 ESTABLISH DAILY CONSULTING RATES AND EXPENSE
8 REIMBURSEMENT STANDARDS FOR THE NON-ICOC MEMBERS OF ALL
9 ITS WORKING GROUPS.

10 WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THE PRINCIPLE THAT
11 ICOC MEMBERS, WHETHER THEY ARE ON THE WORKING GROUP OR
12 NOT, ARE GETTING WHAT THEY GET FOR BEING ON THE ICOC,
13 WHICH IS A \$100 PER DAY PLUS REASONABLE AND NECESSARY
14 EXPENSES.

15 MR. ZAYER: RIGHT. SO I JUST WANT TO BRING
16 THESE TWO PARTS TO YOUR ATTENTION SO THAT AS YOU
17 DETERMINE THE LEVEL OF HONORARIA, THERE IS NOT REAL OR
18 PERCEIVED INEQUITY ACROSS THE GROUPS.

19 DR. LEVEY: CERTAINLY WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
20 GIVE A PRETTY DARN NICE HONORARIUM TO THESE PEOPLE, OR
21 I THINK WE'RE GOING TO IMMEDIATELY REMOVE A SUBSET OF
22 PEOPLE WHO SAY WHY ARE THEY GOING TO DO THAT.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MAYBE I THINK, SINCE WE
24 CAN'T ANSWER THAT TODAY, WE COULD DEFER TO THAT ZACH'S
25 GROUP, WHICH I PRESUME WILL MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO

1 THE ICOC WHAT THE HONORARIUM IS. IS THAT THE WAY YOU
2 PLAN TO DO IT?

3 MR. SHESTACK: WHY CAN'T WE DISCUSS IT TODAY?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THERE'S A MEMBER ACTUALLY
5 IN SAN DIEGO WHO WANTS TO COMMENT.

6 DR. LEVEY: ED, CAN I ASK WHAT WE'RE THINKING
7 OF? MUST HAVE BEEN SOME THOUGHT OR ZACH.

8 DR. HALL: TO BE HONEST WITH YOU, JERRY, I
9 HAVEN'T -- THERE'S BEEN ENOUGH ISSUES, THAT'S BEEN WAY
10 DOWN THE LIST. I HAVE NOT THOUGHT ABOUT IT. DO YOU
11 HAVE A SUGGESTION?

12 DR. LEVEY: WELL, I THINK YOU PROBABLY OUGHT
13 TO THINK IN TERMS OF OFFERING PEOPLE MAYBE A \$1,000 A
14 DAY TO DO THAT.

15 MR. SHESTACK: PER MEETING BASICALLY.

16 DR. LEVEY: FOR DOING THIS WORK. IT WOULD BE
17 FOR REVIEWING IT, AND COMING AND MAKING THE TRIPS, THEY
18 GET THEIR EXPENSES REIMBURSED. AND CERTAINLY IT'S
19 GOING TO TAKE THEM HOURS AND HOURS TO REVIEW GRANTS.
20 AND I WOULD THINK --

21 DR. HALL: THAT'S A GOOD STARTING POINT, I
22 WOULD SAY. THAT'S FINE.

23 THE OTHER THING THAT I THINK IS THAT THE
24 CHAIR WILL HAVE TO RECEIVE A SUBSTANTIAL COMPENSATION
25 BECAUSE THOSE ARE GOING TO BE CRITICAL POSITIONS FOR

1 THESE COMMITTEES. THEY WILL HAVE TO REALLY TAKE SOME
2 RESPONSIBILITY. AND SO I THINK IT SHOULD BE SOME
3 MULTIPLE OF THAT CERTAINLY.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IF I MIGHT, I WANT TO TURN
5 TO OUR PUBLIC MEMBER IN SAN DIEGO WHO WANTED TO COMMENT
6 ON THIS SPECIFIC ISSUE.

7 MS. CHARLESTON: MY NAME IS HEATHER
8 CHARLESTON. I AM ACTUALLY FROM PRINCETON UNIVERSITY IN
9 NEW JERSEY. MY QUESTION OR MY CONCERN WITH THE
10 HONORARIUM IS THAT SCIENTISTS MAY HAVE A CONFLICT OF
11 INTEREST THAT THEY'RE RECEIVING NIH FUNDING. I'M JUST
12 WORRIED ABOUT WHAT THE NIH MAY DO IF THEY FIND OUT THAT
13 THESE SCIENTISTS OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA ARE RECEIVING
14 FUNDS THAT ARE SOMEHOW LINKED TO CALIFORNIA. I'M
15 WORRIED THAT YOU MAY BEGIN WITH A POOL OF SCIENTISTS
16 WHO ARE VERY WILLING AND VERY EAGER, AND THAT THIS POOL
17 WILL BE AFFECTED BY WHATEVER THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION OR
18 NIH DECIDES TO ENACT OR WHAT KIND OF GUIDELINES THEY
19 DECIDE TO CHANGE.

20 SO THAT'S JUST A CONFLICT OF INTEREST
21 CONCERN, KNOWING THAT THE NIH HAS ALREADY IN-HOUSE
22 DECIDED THAT THEY'RE GOING TO ELIMINATE CONFLICTS OF
23 INTEREST THEY DON'T REALLY AGREE WITH.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU. I THINK THAT'S
25 A GOOD ONE FOR US TO REFER TO THE AG'S OFFICE TO

1 INVESTIGATE THIS AND ADVISE BACK, I THINK, TO ZACH'S
2 OFFICE, IF THAT'S AGREEABLE WITH THE GROUP. THAT'S A
3 GOOD COMMENT, AND WE'LL FOLLOW THAT UP.

4 DR. HENDERSON: WE HAVE ANOTHER PUBLIC
5 COMMENT AT LOS ANGELES, USC.

6 MS. MAJEAU: THIS IS CONNIE MAJEAU
7 (PHONETIC). I'M STILL BACK ON THE FULL DISCLOSURE
8 ISSUE ABOUT WHAT SOMEONE IS BEING TO ASKED TO GET INTO.
9 AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT SOMEONE WHO'S OFTEN SOLICITED
10 FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF SPECIAL PROJECTS, I WANT TO
11 KNOW -- I WOULD WANT TO KNOW WHAT CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN
12 STIPULATED BY THE LEGISLATION, WHAT BINDING DECISIONS
13 HAVE ALREADY BEEN MADE BY THIS COMMITTEE, AND THEN I
14 WOULD WANT TO KNOW WHAT IS STILL UNDER DISCUSSION, EVEN
15 IF YOU HAVEN'T MADE A DETERMINATION YET, AND WHETHER OR
16 NOT THE NEW COMMITTEE'S MEMBERS WILL BE INVOLVED IN
17 SETTling THOSE MATTERS.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ED HOLMES, AND I DON'T KNOW
19 THAT I CAN ANSWER, BUT I GUESS MY THOUGHT HAD BEEN THAT
20 WAS ONE OF THE REASONS WE HAD THIS TWO-STEP PROCESS
21 WOULD BE THAT AFTER A PERSON HAD INDICATED THEIR
22 WILLINGNESS TO DO THIS, THEN THE CIRM OFFICE WOULD
23 CONTACT THOSE INDIVIDUALS TO TRY AND ANSWER THESE VERY
24 SPECIFIC TYPE OF QUESTIONS THAT I'M AFRAID THOSE OF US
25 ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE MIGHT NOT BE PREPARED TO DO. IS

1 THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING OR AGREEABLE TO DO THAT, ZACH?

2 DR. HALL: YEAH.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO I THINK IT'S A VERY GOOD
4 ISSUE FOR US TO BE PREPARED TO ADDRESS. BUT IF
5 THAT'S --

6 DR. HALL: IT GIVES ME AN OPPORTUNITY FOR
7 THEM TO ASK QUESTIONS. AND WE -- I HOPE WE WILL, AS
8 TED LOVE SUGGESTED, HAVE SOME SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR
9 THEM AT THAT POINT, SUCH AS A WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF
10 THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUIREMENTS. BUT IT WILL BE
11 JUST AN OPPORTUNITY TO GO OVER IT WITH THEM, TO DISCUSS
12 ANY CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS THEY MIGHT HAVE REGARDING
13 CONFLICT OF INTEREST. AND SO I WOULD THINK THAT THEIR
14 CONCERNS AT THAT POINT ABOUT THOSE ISSUES COULD
15 SURFACE. THANK YOU FOR THE COMMENT. I APPRECIATE THE
16 POINT.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU. ARE THERE OTHER
18 COMMENTS, BRIAN, AT YOUR SITE?

19 DR. HENDERSON: NO, THAT'S IT.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: JERRY, DID ALREADY COMMENT
21 THERE WERE NO.? I CAN'T REMEMBER.

22 DR. LEVEY: NO, I DON'T HAVE ANY MORE
23 COMMENTS. AND NO ONE HERE -- NONE OF THE PUBLIC HAS
24 ANY COMMENTS.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO AND THEN

1 CHICO.

2 MS. SHREVE: ONE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC AT
3 SAN FRANCISCO.

4 MR. REED: THIS IS DON REED. AT WEDNESDAY'S
5 MEETING SPENCER STUART STATED THAT THEY GOT THEIR MOST
6 EFFECTIVE RESPONSE FROM GROUND MAIL MORE SO THAN PHONE
7 CALLS OR E-MAILS. THAT MIGHT BE SOMETHING WORTH
8 CONSIDERING.

9 SECONDLY, I WONDER IF WE COULD INSERT A
10 SENTENCE IN THE LETTER TO THE SCIENTISTS, HONORING THEM
11 FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS AND VALUING THEM SO THAT IT'S
12 LIKE BEING NOMINATED FOR THE ACADEMY AWARD. EVEN IF
13 THEY'RE NOT CHOSEN, IT'S STILL A HIGH HONOR. MAYBE WE
14 COULD EVEN SAY SOMETHING -- SOMETHING CAME UP EARLIER
15 ABOUT IF A PERSON WASN'T CHOSEN FOR SOMETHING, THEY
16 WOULD STILL BE PART OF AN AD HOC COMMITTEE SO THEY CAN
17 STILL NOT FEEL REJECTED AND MAYBE DOWN THE LINE BE USED
18 AGAIN. THAT WAS MY THOUGHTS.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU. THAT'S AN
20 EXCELLENT COMMENT, AND I THINK ZACH IS ALREADY WORKING
21 ON INCORPORATING THAT IN HIS LETTER.

22 YOU REMINDED ME OF SOMETHING I FORGOT TO
23 MENTION IN THE NOTES THAT I HAD, THAT WHEN WE CALL
24 PEOPLE, THAT EVEN IF THEY CHOOSE NOT TO BE ON THE LIST
25 OF THE FIVE PEOPLE WE PUT FORWARD, IF WE COULD PLEASE

1 ASK THEM IF THEY WOULD CONSIDER BEING AD HOC MEMBERS OR
2 COULD WE CONTACT THEM OTHERWISE TO HELP SERVE IN THIS
3 CAPACITY, WHICH I THINK MIGHT ADDRESS YOUR QUESTION OR
4 YOUR COMMENT, WHICH IS I SHOULD HAVE MENTIONED BEFORE.
5 EVEN IF WE CAN'T RECRUIT THEM TO BE ON THE FINAL LIST,
6 IF WE COULD RECRUIT THEM TO HELP US FOR OTHER NEEDS,
7 WE'RE GOING TO NEED AD HOC MEMBERS.

8 OTHER COMMENTS IN SAN FRANCISCO?

9 MS. SHREVE: NO OTHER COMMENTS IN SAN
10 FRANCISCO.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: CHICO.

12 DR. WRIGHT: NONE IN CHICO.

13 DR. PIZZO: WHAT ABOUT ANY HERE AT STANFORD?

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: FORGOT ABOUT YOU.

15 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S OKAY. THAT OFTEN HAPPENS.
16 WE HAVE NO COMMENTS ANYWAY.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'M CERTAINLY GLAD WE
18 RECOGNIZED YOU, PHIL.

19 DR. PIZZO: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. HOPEFULLY
20 WE'LL DO BETTER TONIGHT AT THE BASKETBALL GAME.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO IT SEEMS TO ME, THEN,
22 WOULD WE WANT TO HAVE MORE DISCUSSION AMONG THE GROUP,
23 OR COULD SOMEONE POTENTIALLY -- I DON'T KNOW THAT WE SO
24 MUCH NEED A MOTION. MY NOTES DIDN'T SAY WE NEEDED A
25 MOTION ON THIS, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SURE -- MAYBE

1 I CAN TRY AND RESTATE IT AGAIN FOR THE GROUP TO MAKE
2 SURE WE AGREE ON WHAT IT IS WE'RE GOING TO DO WITH THE
3 PROCESS TO MOVE FORWARD. IS THAT OKAY WITH THE GROUP
4 THAT I TRY AND ATTEMPT THAT?

5 DR. PIZZO: GREAT. AND ACTUALLY HOPEFULLY
6 SOMEONE COULD CODIFY WHAT YOU ARE SAYING WHEN WE'RE
7 FINISHED WITH THAT AND SEND IT OUT TO US SO WE'LL ALL
8 HAVE THE SAME RECORD.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YOU MIGHT BE SURPRISED TO
10 KNOW IT'S ALREADY BEEN CODIFIED TO HELP ME TO SAY IT.
11 LISTEN CAREFULLY AND SEE IF I SAY IT CORRECTLY THAT WE
12 GET BACK TO YOU WITH THIS. BUT WHAT WE WOULD DO, THEN,
13 IS THE NEXT STEP WOULD BE THE SUBGROUP WOULD BEGIN
14 IMMEDIATELY TO PRIORITIZE THEIR LIST TO WHATEVER LENGTH
15 THEY WANTED WITH THE IDEA OF BEING ABLE TO COME FORWARD
16 WITH FIVE FINALISTS AND THREE ALTERNATES THAT YOU WILL
17 SEND BY APRIL THE 19TH TO ZACH'S OFFICE. AND THE EIGHT
18 PEOPLE ON YOUR LIST --

19 DR. PIZZO: ED, CAN I INTERRUPT YOU FOR ONE
20 SECOND? ISN'T THE ANTECEDENT TO THAT THAT ZACH'S
21 LETTER IS GOING TO GO OUT?

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'M SORRY. YOU'RE RIGHT.
23 THANK YOU, PHIL. ZACH'S LETTER WILL GO OUT HOPEFULLY
24 THIS WEEK OR NEXT WEEK AS SOON AS HE CAN --

25 DR. HALL: MONDAY MORNING.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MONDAY MORNING.

2 MR. SHESTACK: EXCUSE ME. THIS IS JON

3 SHESTACK IN LOS ANGELES. AT WHAT POINT ARE YOU

4 ANTICIPATING THAT WE ACTUALLY START CALLING THE PEOPLE

5 ON OUR LIST?

6 DR. PIZZO: RIGHT AFTER ZACH'S LETTER GOES

7 OUT.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: RIGHT. ARE YOU GOING TO

9 SEND YOUR LETTER BY E-MAIL, ZACH?

10 DR. HALL: YES.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. IT WILL BE BY

12 E-MAIL. I WOULD SAY YOU COULD START CALLING AS EARLY

13 AS MONDAY.

14 MR. SHESTACK: SO THIS WILL BE FOR MANY OF

15 THESE PEOPLE, UNLESS WE'VE TALKED TO THEM ALREADY, THIS

16 WILL BE THEIR FIRST CONTACT, AND THEY DON'T EVEN KNOW

17 HERETOFORE THAT THEY'RE ON THIS WONDERFUL LIST.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THAT'S CORRECT. NO ONE HAS

19 BEEN CONTACTED TO MY KNOWLEDGE AT ALL.

20 DR. HENDERSON: JON SHESTACK, I THINK THAT'S

21 AFTER YOU AND I AGREE ON WHO WE'RE CALLING.

22 MR. SHESTACK: RIGHT. SO WE'LL GET TOGETHER

23 AND DO THAT. I'LL CALL YOU AFTERWARDS AND WE'LL SET A

24 TIME TO DO THAT.

25 DR. WRIGHT: JUST TO CLARIFY, THIS LETTER OF

1 YOURS, ZACH, IS GOING OUT TO THE 186 TOP TIER?

2 MR. SHESTACK: NO. IT'S GOING OUT TO US.

3 IT'S GOING OUT TO THE ICOC.

4 DR. HALL: THE 186 PEOPLE.

5 MR. SHESTACK: THAT'S THEIR NOTIFICATION.

6 DR. HALL: WE CAN'T DO IT INSTANTLY. WE

7 CAN'T DO IT TONIGHT. IT WOULD EVEN BE HARD THIS

8 WEEKEND. WE CAN GET IT DONE MONDAY MORNING.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE WILL GET A COPY ALSO AS

10 A MEMBER OF THIS COMMITTEE AS TO WHAT WENT OUT.

11 DR. WRIGHT: IT'S GOING TO THE 186 ON THE TOP

12 TIER.

13 DR. LEVEY: EXCUSE ME. IS STAFF GOING TO

14 GIVE US THE PHONE NUMBERS?

15 DR. PIZZO: THEY HAVE. YOU'VE GOT THE PHONE

16 NUMBERS AND THE E-MAIL ADDRESSES IN THE COMMUNICATION

17 YOU'VE ALREADY RECEIVED.

18 MS. SHREVE I SENT THEM OUT AGAIN TODAY SO

19 THAT YOU HAVE ELECTRONIC COPY IN TODAY'S MAIL.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, KATE. I HAVE

21 NOT GOTTEN TO E-MAIL YET TODAY. SO TO START AGAIN, AND

22 IT'S MY MISTAKE. ZACH WOULD GET HIS LETTER OUT ON

23 MONDAY TO THE TOP TIER CANDIDATES, AND WE WOULD BEGIN,

24 CERTAINLY BEGIN BEFORE THAT, TO PRIORITIZE YOUR LIST OF

25 PEOPLE AND TO BEGIN YOUR TELEPHONE CALLS. AND WE WILL

1 HAVE FOR YOU -- WHEN DO YOU THINK, MARY, YOU WILL HAVE
2 THIS LIST OF THINGS THAT THEY WOULD WANT TO DISCUSS?

3 DR. MAXON KATE'S GOT IT PRETTY MUCH ALREADY.
4 WE CAN TOUCH IT UP OVER THE WEEKEND.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO WE'LL HAVE THAT TO YOU
6 FIRST OF THE WEEK, WHICH WOULD BE A LITTLE BIT ON THE
7 HISTORY OF PROP 71 AND CIRM, THE PROCESS, AND THEN THE
8 GROUP OF GRANT REVIEW, THE TIME COMMITMENT, THE TIME OF
9 SERVICE, THE ADMINISTRATIVE HELP THAT'S AVAILABLE TO
10 YOU, AND THE GRANT THAT WILL BE UNDER CONSIDERATION SO
11 YOU WILL HAVE ALL OF THIS INFORMATION IN FRONT OF YOU
12 WHEN YOU SPEAK TO THE PEOPLE.

13 MR. SHESTACK: YOU ARE GOING TO SEND A LETTER
14 OUT TO 186 PEOPLE, BUT THEN EACH REVIEWING TEAM IS
15 GOING TO PRIORITIZE, HAVE A LIST OF 30 SOME PEOPLE, AND
16 EACH PRIORITIZE. SO IT'S REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT
17 SOME OF THOSE 186 PEOPLE WILL NEVER ACTUALLY GET A CALL
18 FROM ANY ICOC MEMBER BECAUSE THEY JUST WON'T BE
19 PRIORITIZED.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: UNLESS YOU'RE VERY UNLUCKY
21 ON YOUR LIST, CORRECT.

22 DR. PIZZO: AND IF WE'RE REALLY UNLUCKY ON
23 OUR LIST, THEN I ASSUME WE GO TO SOMEONE ELSE'S LIST
24 WHO WORKED ON THE ENTIRE THING.

25 MR. SHESTACK: SO WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS 186

1 PEOPLE WILL GET A LETTER, AND PART OF THAT LETTER WILL
2 SAY YOU MAY BE CALLED, BUT YOU MIGHT NOT.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THAT'S CORRECT. MIGHT I
4 SUGGEST THAT YOU EXHAUST YOUR LIST, THAT YOU CONTACT
5 ZACH BEFORE YOU START WORKING. YOU DON'T HAVE ANYBODY
6 ELSE'S LIST.

7 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S WHAT I MEANT. EXACTLY.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I JUST WANT TO REMIND YOU
9 THAT YOU SHOULD CERTAINLY LOOK THROUGH THE PEOPLE WHO
10 ARE NOT IN THE TOP TIER BECAUSE THERE MAY WELL BE SOME
11 NAMES ON YOUR LIST OF PEOPLE WHO ARE QUITE OUTSTANDING
12 THAT JUST DIDN'T GET RECOMMENDED FOR ONE REASON OR THE
13 OTHER, SO YOU'RE NOT RESTRICTED TO THE TOP TIER LIST.

14 DR. PIZZO: WE DO ALL HAVE THE SAME TOP TIER
15 LIST?

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: NO. THOSE HAVE ALSO BEEN
17 DIVIDED INTO SIX GROUPS, PHIL.

18 DR. PIZZO: OKAY. APPRECIATE THAT.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IT'S BECAUSE WHAT WE DIDN'T
20 WANT TO DO IS HAVE TWO SUBGROUPS RECOMMEND THE SAME
21 PERSON.

22 DR. PIZZO: I KNEW THAT FOR THE FIRST TIER OF
23 THIS. I DIDN'T KNOW THAT FOR THE SECOND TIER LIST.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AND THEN, IF YOU WILL,
25 AFTER WE GET THE LIST SUBMITTED TO ZACH'S OFFICE, HE

1 WILL CONTACT, STARTING WITH YOUR TOP FIVE AND MOVING
2 DOWN THE LIST, GO THROUGH THE ISSUES THAT WE TALKED
3 ABOUT THAT MIGHT BE THE MORE THORNY ISSUES ABOUT
4 COMPENSATION, ABOUT TIME, ABOUT CONFLICT OF INTEREST,
5 ETC., OR IF THEY'VE GOT ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS THAT
6 THEY WANT TO ADDRESS IN A SPECIFIC WAY WITH ZACH'S
7 OFFICE, WHO WILL BEING WORKING WITH THESE PEOPLE
8 CLOSELY AFTER THEY ARE SELECTED.

9 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S TERRIFIC. NOW, JUST TO
10 THAT REGARD, AND THIS QUESTION IS TO ZACH, SHOULD WE
11 SAY TO THE PEOPLE WHO ARE INTERESTED THAT THEY'RE GOING
12 TO SPEAK WITH YOU, ZACH, OR WITH SOMEONE FROM YOUR
13 OFFICE?

14 DR. HALL: I'LL TRY TO DO IT MYSELF. IT WILL
15 BE BY 30 PHONE CALLS. I'LL JUST SIT DOWN ONE DAY AND
16 WORK THROUGH THEM. I THINK THAT'S BEST. I THINK IT
17 SHOULD BE ME. I DON'T SEE ANY WAY OUT OF THAT. JUST
18 TELL THEM THAT I'LL BE GIVING THEM A FOLLOW-UP PHONE
19 CALL.

20 DR. PIZZO: ALL RIGHT.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MIGHT I ASK WHETHER THERE'S
22 ANYONE WHO WANTS TO COMMENT WHETHER WE SHOULD NOT
23 FOLLOW THIS PROCEDURE, OR DO YOU WANT -- IT'S NOT IN MY
24 NOTES THAT WE HAVE TO HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE ON THIS.
25 SO I THINK I WOULD JUST SAY IF ANYONE WANTS TO SAY WE

1 SHOULD'N'T DO THIS, WOULD YOU MIND SPEAKING UP AT THIS
2 TIME OR ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS ANYBODY HAS?

3 DR. WRIGHT: I JUST HAVE A QUESTION. I DON'T
4 REMEMBER, ZACH, WHEN YOU READ THE LETTER, WAS THERE
5 MENTION OF THE TIME LINE IN THE LETTER, A NEED TO
6 RESPOND OR TO THINK THIS OVER QUICKLY BECAUSE OF OUR
7 TIME LINE?

8 DR. HALL: I JUST SAY YOU MAY RECEIVE A CALL
9 FROM ONE OR MORE ICOC MEMBERS WHO WILL INFORM YOU ABOUT
10 THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP AND DETERMINE YOUR
11 WILLINGNESS TO SERVE, IF ASKED. IF YOU RECEIVE SUCH A
12 CALL, WE STRONGLY URGE YOU TO CONSIDER THIS INVITATION
13 SERIOUSLY, AND TO AGREE TO JOIN US IN THIS PROJECT.

14 DR. PIZZO: I THINK THAT'S FINE, BUT PER
15 JANET'S COMMENT, I THINK WE MAY WANT TO INDICATE TO
16 THEM THAT WE'RE ON A VERY TIGHT TIME LINE, AND WE HAVE
17 TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS EARLY -- BY EARLY APRIL SO THAT
18 WE'RE GOING TO BE CALLING THEM IMMEDIATELY, JUST THAT
19 KIND OF LANGUAGE.

20 DR. WRIGHT: RIGHT. ADDING THAT ELEMENT OF
21 URGENCY IS A GOOD IDEA TO THE HEADS-UP LETTER.

22 DR. HALL: I THINK THE URGENCY IS NOT IN THE
23 CALL, BUT IN THEIR NEED TO RESPOND QUICKLY. SAY WE
24 HOPE TO HAVE THESE FIRST INITIAL LISTS CHOSEN --

25 DR. PIZZO: RIGHT.

1 DR. HALL: -- BY APRIL 19TH.

2 DR. PIZZO: THAT WAY IF OUR OFFICE MAKES THE
3 CALL, THAT THEY KNOW THAT THEY'VE ALERTED THEIR
4 ASSISTANT TO PUT US THROUGH.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OR TO NEVER LET US THROUGH.

6 DR. PIZZO: WE UNDERSTAND BOTH OF THOSE,
7 DON'T WE?

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. THEN THOSE WERE THE
9 ITEMS THAT I HAD THAT WERE AGENDIZED. LET ME TURN, IF
10 I MIGHT, TO ASK IF ANY OTHER THINGS FROM THE COMMITTEE
11 OR THE PUBLIC THAT ANYONE WANTS TO MAKE AT THIS POINT.

12 MS. PACTER: BEFORE WE CONCLUDE, THIS IS
13 TAMAR, I WANT TO CORRECT SOME ADVICE I GAVE ABOUT
14 BAGLEY-KEENE WITH RESPECT TO THE FIRST AGENDA ITEM. I
15 DIDN'T SEIZE IT IMMEDIATELY BECAUSE I THINK YOU WANTED
16 TO HAVE A DISCUSSION AT THE ICOC LEVEL ANYWAY, BUT TO
17 CORRECT MYSELF, THE OPEN MEETING ACT ONLY APPLIES WHEN
18 A QUORUM OR MORE OF THE ICOC MEETS.

19 SO SINCE THERE ARE ONLY -- HOW MANY
20 REPRESENTATIVES OF THESE GROUPS ARE ON THE ICOC?

21 MR. SHESTACK: TEN.

22 MS. PACTER: I THINK THEY'RE LESS THAN A
23 QUORUM, SO THEY COULD MEET SEPARATELY.

24 DR. PIZZO: COULD YOU CLARIFY THAT BECAUSE
25 THE DISEASE GROUPS ARE NOT A COMMITTEE IN THEIR OWN

1 RIGHT?

2 MS. PACHTER: THEY'RE NOT.

3 DR. PIZZO: SO HOW COULD THEY FORM OR NOT
4 FORM A QUORUM? THEY'RE PART OF THE OVERALL ICOC.

5 MS. PACHTER: RIGHT. THERE ARE 29 MEMBERS OF
6 THE ICOC. IF THERE WERE --

7 DR. HALL: QUORUM IS 19 MEMBERS, 65 PERCENT
8 OR 19 MEMBERS.

9 MS. PACHTER: THAT WOULD BE A QUORUM, AND
10 THEY COULD NOT MEET SEPARATELY.

11 DR. PIZZO: WHY HAVE WE BEEN TOLD, IF WE HAVE
12 MORE THAN TWO PEOPLE SPEAKING, THAT THAT CONSTITUTES
13 GROUNDS FOR PUBLIC MEETING?

14 MS. PACHTER: THAT'S ONLY FOR YOUR TWO-MEMBER
15 REVIEW COMMITTEES, TWO- OR THREE-MEMBER REVIEW
16 COMMITTEES.

17 DR. PIZZO: NO. WE'VE BEEN TOLD THAT THAT'S
18 FOR EVERYTHING, THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE COMMUNICATING
19 WITH EACH OTHER IN GROUPS MORE THAN TWO.

20 MR. SHESTACK: IF WE TAKE AN ACTION. IF AN
21 ACTION ITEM COMES OUT OF IT, OTHERWISE IT'S A PRETTY
22 RESTRICTIVE INTERPRETATION.

23 DR. PIZZO: I THOUGHT IT WAS PRETTY
24 RESTRICTIVE AS WELL. THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING IF THERE'S
25 LENIENCY ABOUT THAT. THAT'S TERRIFIC.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MARY, I THINK, MIGHT BE
2 ABLE TO ADDRESS THIS. SHE'S LOOKING AS THOUGH SHE
3 MIGHT.

4 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S GREAT.

5 DR. MAXON YOU ALL RECEIVED, I BELIEVE, A
6 COPY OF THE BAGLEY-KEENE QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE FOR ICOC
7 MEMBERS. YOU GUYS HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT THIS LONGER
8 THAN I HAVE, BUT MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT FOR ICOC
9 ISSUES, A QUORUM OF 19 PEOPLE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO BE
10 IN VIOLATION OF BAGLEY-KEENE UNLESS THERE WERE AN OPEN
11 MEETING BEFOREHAND FOR AN ACTIONABLE ITEM.

12 NOW, FOR SUBCOMMITTEES THAT HAVE BEEN
13 DELEGATED BY THE ICOC FOR PARTICULAR TASKS LIKE THIS
14 ONE, A SUBCOMMITTEE TO ACTUALLY FIND RECRUITMENT FOR A
15 WORKING GROUP, THE QUORUM IS OBVIOUSLY A SMALLER
16 NUMBER. THEREFORE, IT PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF YOUR
17 SEQUENTIAL MEETINGS RESULTING IN AN INADVERTENT QUORUM,
18 THE COUNSEL HAS ADVISED US TO KEEP EVERYTHING TO
19 TWO-PEOPLE DISCUSSION.

20 MS. PACHTER: SO WHAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT,
21 I THINK, WAS HAVING THE TEN MEMBERS OR SEVEN WHO ARE
22 DISEASE ADVOCACY MEMBERS OF THE ICOC.

23 DR. MAXON THEY HAVE NOT BEEN APPOINTED AS A
24 DELEGATED GROUP BY THE ICOC. SO I'M NO LAWYER, BUT IT
25 SEEMS TO ME SINCE THEY HAVE NOT BEEN DELEGATED AS AN

1 APPOINTED TASK TEAM OF THE ICOC, THEY CAN'T BE IN
2 VIOLATION OF ANY QUORUM SINCE THERE NOT 19 OF THEM.

3 MS. PACTER: THAT'S CORRECT.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO THEN IT OFFERS US THE
5 POTENTIAL, WHEN WE DEVELOP THIS E-MAIL TO THEM, THAT WE
6 CAN SAY TO THEM IF THEY CHOSE TO SPEAK TO EACH OTHER,
7 THEY WERE FREE TO DO SO.

8 MS. LANSING: I DON'T THINK THAT'S TRUE.
9 THIS IS SHERRY LANSING. I KNOW I'VE BEEN LATE, BUT I
10 WALKED IN ON THIS HOT BUTTON ISSUE. I APOLOGIZE FOR
11 BEING LATE. I DON'T KNOW THAT THAT'S TRUE. I THINK
12 YOU BETTER RESEARCH THAT PRETTY CAREFULLY. I CAN ONLY
13 GO BY WHAT WE DO, JERRY LEVEY AND MYSELF, AS REGENTS.
14 I KNOW THAT THE ICOC IS HELD TO EVEN STRONGER
15 ACCOUNTABILITY IS WHAT I'VE BEEN TOLD BY THE CHAIRMAN
16 HERE, FOR REASONS I DON'T UNDERSTAND, BUT I ACCEPT THAT
17 THEY WANT IT TO BE THAT WAY. WHAT I UNDERSTAND IS THE
18 REGENTS, A QUORUM IS A QUORUM. SO ANYTHING UNDER 19
19 PEOPLE, IF YOU WERE REGENTS, IF THIS WERE A REGENTAL
20 BODY, WE COULD TALK. IF WE WERE 15 PEOPLE, WE WEREN'T
21 A QUORUM, WE COULD TALK.

22 THE THING IS THAT THE PATIENT ADVOCATES, WE
23 WERE APPOINTED TO BE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC. I THINK WE
24 STILL QUALIFY TO ALL THE SAME RULES. THE THING THAT I
25 DON'T UNDERSTAND IS WHY, IF YOU ARE A SUBCOMMITTEE

1 THAT'S LESS THAN 19 PEOPLE, WHY YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED TO
2 TALK ABOUT AMONG EACH OTHER AS MUCH AS YOU WANT.

3 MS. PACHTER: WE COULD HAVE A LARGER
4 DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT SOME OTHER TIME. BUT THE REASON
5 IS BECAUSE YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC TASK DELEGATED TO YOU BY
6 THE ICOC. YOU HAVE TO FUNCTION WITH A QUORUM. AND IF
7 YOU HAVE A QUORUM OR MORE MEETING, YOU HAVE TO OPERATE
8 PURSUANT TO THE OPEN MEETING LAW. THAT IS --

9 MS. LANSING: I UNDERSTAND.

10 DR. PIZZO: CAN I ASK A QUESTION? NOT THAT I
11 WOULD EVER INTEND FOR THIS TO HAPPEN, BUT JUST TO BE
12 SURE. IF A GROUP OF ALL OF THE DEANS GOT TOGETHER,
13 THEY WOULDN'T CONSTITUTE A QUORUM, BUT WANTED TO
14 DISCUSS SOMETHING, IS THAT ALLOWED?

15 MS. PACHTER: NO. THEY ARE FUNCTIONING AS A
16 SEPARATE SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH A DECISION HAS BEEN
17 DELEGATED.

18 DR. PIZZO: WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE
19 DEANS GETTING TOGETHER VERSUS THE ADVOCACY GROUPS
20 GETTING TOGETHER?

21 MS. PACHTER: NOTHING AT THIS POINT. FOR
22 INSTANCE, IF THE ICOC DELEGATED SOME TASK TO ALL THE
23 ADVOCACY MEMBERS OF THE SEPARATE SUBCOMMITTEE, THEY
24 COULD ONLY TALK ABOUT IT ALTOGETHER IF THEY COMPLIED
25 WITH BAGLEY-KEENE.

1 DR. PIZZO: OKAY.

2 DR. HENDERSON: I SUGGEST WE HOLD ALL OF THIS
3 TO THE NEXT GENERAL MEETING AND GO OVER IT AGAIN WHEN
4 WE'RE ALL PRESENT TOGETHER.

5 DR. PIZZO: I THINK SO. THAT'S A GREAT IDEA.

6 DR. HENDERSON: I REALLY WOULD RATHER WE
7 DON'T CHANGE THE WAY WE'VE BEEN DOING THINGS.

8 DR. PIZZO: UNTIL WE'VE REALLY GOT THAT DOWN
9 CLEARLY. I AGREE.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THIS IS ED HOLMES SPEAKING
11 AGAIN. FOR OUR LITTLE SUBCOMMITTEE WORKING, THAT WE
12 ARE AGREED THAT THE -- NOW THAT WE'RE BROKEN UP INTO
13 THESE SIX GROUPS OF TWO, WE WON'T TALK TO EACH ABOUT
14 THE SEARCH PROCESS. WE'LL WORK INDEPENDENTLY ON THAT
15 IN COMING FORWARD WITH OUR NAMES. AND SINCE WE SORT OF
16 WORKED OUT THIS MECHANISM, IF EVERYONE IS AGREEABLE,
17 WE'LL STICK BY THAT AT LEAST FOR THE TIME BEING.

18 DR. PIZZO: RIGHT. I CONCUR WITH THAT.

19 DR. HENDERSON: I DO TOO.

20 MS. PACHTER: NOBODY IS SAYING THAT THE
21 GROUPS OF TWO SHOULD BE ABLE TO TALK TO EACH OTHER,
22 JUST TO BE CLEAR.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ALL RIGHT. THEN COULD I
24 ASK IF THERE ARE OTHER ITEMS THAT SOMEONE WANTS TO
25 BRING UP AT THIS POINT SO THAT WE HAVE A COMPLETENESS

1 TO THIS MEETING?

2 DR. WRIGHT: I JUST WANT TO SAY, AT THE RISK
3 OF LOOKING TOO MUCH OF A LOSER, I SPENT MY SATURDAY
4 NIGHT WITH THIS BOX OF APPLICANT OR POTENTIAL
5 CANDIDATES FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS, AND I WAS JUST SO
6 IMPRESSED AND IT MADE ME SO OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE WORK
7 WE HAVE AHEAD OF US. I REALIZE I'M ONLY LOOKING AT A
8 SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE CANDIDATES.

9 DR. PIZZO: IT'S A TERRIFIC GROUP. I THINK
10 ALL OF US, I'M SURE, ARE VERY IMPRESSED. THE ONE
11 CONCERN, OBVIOUSLY, IS THE GROUP IS SO GOOD, WE'LL JUST
12 SEE HOW MANY OF THEM WE'LL BE ABLE TO GET BECAUSE
13 THEY'RE ALL SO BUSY WITH OTHER THINGS, BUT IT IS
14 WONDERFUL.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SO, AGAIN, I JUST WANT TO
16 REMIND EVERYONE WE'LL PUT THIS TOGETHER, BUT YOU NEED
17 TO GET A MIXTURE OF BASIC AND CLINICAL SCIENTISTS ON
18 YOUR COMMITTEE. SO BE SURE TO KEEP THAT BALANCE IN
19 MIND AS YOU GO THROUGH THIS, IF YOU WOULD.

20 DR. LEVEY: I PUT MY OWN LIST TOGETHER THAT
21 WAY. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN MORE HELPFUL TO HAVE THE
22 MASTER LIST TO HAVE THAT SAME INDICATION, BUT I LISTED
23 THEM ALL OUT BY M.D., M.D./PH.D., PH.D.'S AND THE TYPE
24 OF -- WHETHER THEY'RE CLINICAL SCIENTISTS OR NOT.

25 DR. PIZZO: I'M SURE IT'S ALSO SELF-EVIDENT

1 TO ALL OF US, BUT WE NEED TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE
2 DIVERSITY ON THIS LIST AS WELL.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: VERY IMPORTANT. THANK YOU
4 FOR BRINGING THAT UP, PHIL. OF COURSE, WE NEED TO DO
5 THAT.

6 ARE THERE OTHER ISSUES?

7 DR. HENDERSON: MOVE WE ADJOURN.

8 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY.

9 DR. LEVEY: BUT THE ONLY THING WE CAN DIVERSE
10 ABOUT IS MEN AND WOMEN.

11 MS. LANSING: WE WERE JUST GOING TO SAY AT
12 THIS END, JON SAID AND I SAID, ALL YOU ARE GOING TO
13 HAVE IS THEIR NAMES.

14 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S OKAY. I'M HAPPY WITH
15 THAT. I JUST WANTED TO UNDERSCORE THAT WE DO THAT.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THERE'S ACTUALLY A COMMENT
17 FROM THE PUBLIC HERE IN SAN DIEGO, SO I WANT TO MAKE
18 SURE WE GET ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS BEFORE WE CONCLUDE.

19 MS. CHARLESTON: I JUST WANTED TO ADD,
20 SPEAKING TO THE DIVERSITY ISSUE, I WANTED TO KIND OF
21 EMPHASIZE THE NEED FOR DIVERSITY IN THE AGE AND
22 EXPERIENCE, TYPICALLY EXPERIENCE OF THE ELITE
23 SCIENTISTS. AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO EMPHASIZE
24 DIVERSITY IN EXPERIENCE AND AGE IN ADDITION TO GENDER.
25 SO IF YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE SCIENTISTS, JUST KIND

1 OF CREATE AN EQUAL MIX OF YOUNGER INVESTIGATORS.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU.

3 DR. LEVEY: YOU CAN'T DO THAT. YOU CAN'T DO
4 THAT. YOU CAN'T SEGREGATE BY AGE.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THE COMMENT'S BEEN MADE TO
6 TAKE THAT AT LEAST UNDER CONSIDERATION.

7 DR. HALL: AGE YOU CAN'T. EXPERIENCE YOU
8 CAN.

9 DR. LEVEY: EXPERIENCE YOU CAN.

10 DR. PIZZO: I THINK SHE MEANT EXPERIENCE.

11 DR. LEVEY: AGE YOU CAN'T DO.

12 MS. LANSING: AGE, RACE, OR GENDER YOU CAN'T
13 LOOK AT.

14 DR. PIZZO: WE UNDERSTAND THAT.

15 MS. CHARLESTON: BY AGE OR RACE OR GENDER, I
16 JUST MEANT MORE AGE AS FAR AS EXPERIENCE.

17 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY IN SAN
18 FRANCISCO. I JUST WANT TO ASK A QUESTION ABOUT
19 SOMETHING ZACH SAID. HE INDICATED THAT CONFLICT OF
20 INTEREST LANGUAGE FOR THESE WORKING MEMBERS WOULD BE
21 PRESENTED AT THE APRIL 7TH MEETING AS WELL AS
22 INFORMATION ON THE INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS.
23 CAN WE GET THOSE IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING IN ORDER TO
24 REVIEW THEM?

25 DR. HALL: YES, WE WILL GET THEM TO YOU IN

1 ADVANCE. DEFINITELY WILL. BOTH OF THOSE THINGS.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: FURTHER COMMENT?

3 DR. PIZZO: MOVE ADJOURN.

4 DR. LOVE: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BEFORE WE CLOSE, I'D LIKE
6 TO THANK EVERYBODY WHO'S ON THE COMMITTEE FOR YOUR
7 PARTICIPATION AND FOR WHAT I KNOW IS GOING TO BE A LOT
8 OF WORK OVER THE NEXT FEW WEEKS TO PULL THIS TOGETHER.
9 SO THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.

10 (END OF MEETING AT 03:58 P.M.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25