BEFORE THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF 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: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: APRIL 2, 2012

3 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 92001

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL.	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT.	4, 42
4. CONSIDERATION OF CIRM BUDGET FOR FY 2012-2013 INCLUDING BACKUP DETAILS.	5, 44
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE
6. ADJOURNMENT	45

1	MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2012, 3:00 P.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: I'M GOING TO CALL THE
4	MEETING TO ORDER FROM SAN FRANCISCO AT CIRM
5	HEADQUARTERS. AND I ASK MARIA BONNEVILLE TO PERFORM
6	THE ROLL CALL.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT BIRGENEAU.
8	DR. BIRGENEAU: HERE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARCY FEIT. MICHAEL
10	GOLDBERG.
11	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: HERE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
13	DR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: TED LOVE.
15	DR. LOVE: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.
17	DR. PIZZO: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH. DAVID
19	SERRANO-SEWELL. JEFF SHEEHY.
20	MR. SHEEHY: HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN
22	THOMAS.
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: HERE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
25	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THANK YOU. WE'RE
	3

_	DARKISIERS REPORTING SERVICE
1	GOING TO ITEM 3 ON THE AGENDA, WHICH IS THE
2	AMENDMENTS PROPOSED FOR THE MISSION STATEMENT OF
3	THIS SUBCOMMITTEE. THERE'S A MEMO DATED MARCH 23D
4	PREPARED BY JAMES HARRISON WHICH LAYS OUT THE TWO
5	PRINCIPAL AREAS THAT WE'RE PROPOSING TO AMEND THE
6	MISSION STATEMENT. AND I'M ASSUME THAT EACH OF THE
7	MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE HAS READ THAT AND LET
8	MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AT THE VARIOUS SITES ASK
9	ANY QUESTIONS THEY WISH TO. AND WE'LL THEN OPEN TO
10	THE PUBLIC TO ASK ANY QUESTIONS THEY MAY WISH TO.
11	SO FIRST MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.
12	DR. LOVE: MICHAEL, THIS IS TED.
13	OBVIOUSLY I READ THEM, AND THEY LOOK VERY
14	STRAIGHTFORWARD AND NOTHING THAT I FOUND
15	CONTROVERSIAL AT ALL.
16	DR. BIRGENEAU: I AGREE.
17	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: OKAY. ANY OBJECTIONS
18	FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE? DON'T WE MOVE TO ANY
19	COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.
20	DR. JUELSGAARD: I MOVE THESE AMENDMENTS
21	BE ADOPTED.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECOND.
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: IF THERE WAS A QUORUM,
24	WE WOULD ACCEPT THAT MOTION AND THE SECOND. HAVING
25	NO QUORUM, WE'LL EITHER WAIT FOR A QUORUM LATER IN
	4
	·

1	THE MEETING OR ALTERNATIVELY WE'LL REFLECT TO THE
2	BOARD THAT IT WAS THE VIEW OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
3	SUBCOMMITTEE TO APPROVE THESE AMENDMENTS TO THE
4	MISSION STATEMENT. THANK YOU.
5	I THINK WE'RE NOW GOING TO GO TO ITEM NO.
6	4, WHICH IS THE MAJOR SUBSTANTIVE PURPOSE OF TODAY'S
7	DISCUSSION AND A REVIEW OF THE BUDGET WHICH WOULD
8	BEGIN JULY 1 OF 2012. AND WITH THAT, MATT, TURN IT
9	OVER TO YOU AND TO ALAN AND TO J.T. TO SPEAK TO THE
10	BUDGET PROPOSAL.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: WHO JUST JOINED US?
12	MS. FEIT: MARCY FEIT.
13	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: WE'RE JUST STARTING ON
14	AGENDA ITEM 4, MARCY. AGENDA ITEM NO. 4, WHICH IS
15	THE PRESENTATION OF THE BUDGET.
16	MS. FEIT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
17	DR. PLUNKETT: SO, MICHAEL, WHAT I'D
18	PROPOSE TO DO, IF YOU CONCUR, IS TO GO THROUGH THE
19	SLIDE PRESENTATION HERE WHICH GIVES A LITTLE BIT OF
20	A HIGHER LEVEL OVERVIEW, THEN WE CAN GO THROUGH THE
21	LINE ITEM DETAIL WHICH IS ALSO POSTED, I BELIEVE,
22	WHICH EVERYBODY HAS. SOUND GOOD?
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THANK YOU.
24	DR. PLUNKETT: NEXT SLIDE, PLEASE. SO
25	THIS PRESENTATION HERE IS VERY SIMILAR TO WHAT WE
	F
	5

1	PRESENTED AT THE ICOC MEETING TWO WEEKS AGO. I DO
2	KNOW THAT SEVERAL OF THOSE WHO ARE ON THE
3	SUBCOMMITTEE WEREN'T ACTUALLY ABLE TO ATTEND
4	PERSONALLY AT THE BOARD MEETING 12 DAYS AGO IN
5	SACRAMENTO. SO WHAT I'LL TRY AND DO IS HIT SOME OF
6	THE HIGH POINTS IN THIS YEAR.
7	AND ONE OF THE FIRST THINGS THAT I'D LIKE
8	TO TOUCH UPON IS HOW WE'VE REALLY TRIED TO CONSTRUCT
9	THE BUDGET THIS YEAR WITH A VERY EXPLICIT TIE-IN
10	BETWEEN THE ANNUAL GOALS FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND
11	WHERE THE DIFFERENT EXPENDITURES ARE GOING. AND
12	WHAT YOU SEE HERE ON THE SCREEN ON SLIDE 2 IS THE
13	DRAFT GOALS FOR CIRM FOR THE COMING FISCAL YEAR.
14	I THINK THE GOALS ARE SELF-EXPLANATORY.
15	ONE WHICH THERE MAY BE A LITTLE BIT OF CONFUSION
16	ABOUT IS THE 50 MILLION IN NEW OUTSIDE FINANCIAL
17	COMMITMENT FOR CIRM PROGRAMS. AND THE GOAL THERE IS
18	TO REALLY GENERATE SOME EXTERNAL FINANCIAL LEVERAGE
19	FOR A PROGRAM SUCH THAT AS WE HAVE AN INCREASING
20	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS ENTERING COSTLY AND
21	TIME-CONSUMING CLINICAL TRIALS, CIRM ISN'T PAYING A
22	HUNDRED PERCENT OF THE BILL FOR EACH AND EVERY ONE
23	OF THESE. TO THE EXTENT THAT WE CAN HAVE OUTSIDE
24	FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR AT LEAST SOME OF OUR CIRM
25	PROGRAMS, IT MAKES EACH OF OUR DOLLARS GO THAT MUCH
	6
	6

1	FARTHER.
2	ONE OF THE OTHER QUANTITATIVE THINGS WHICH
3	IS NOT ON THE SLIDE THAT I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REMIND
4	EVERYBODY IS THAT THE ORGANIZATION CURRENTLY HAS 42
5	TRANSLATIONAL PROGRAMS. IN THE COMING YEAR WE
6	ACTUALLY EXPECT TO ADD 25 TO 35 MORE PROGRAMS TO
7	THAT TOTAL. AND EACH OF THESE TRANSLATIONAL
8	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OBVIOUSLY TAKES A
9	LOT MORE EFFORT AND MANAGEMENT AND TRACKING AND SO
10	FORTH FROM THE ORGANIZATION THAN SOME OF THE SMALLER
11	AND EARLIER STAGE RESEARCH AWARDS.
12	SLIDE 3 IS AN OLD SLIDE WHICH YOU FIRST
13	SAW AT THE JANUARY BOARD MEETING. AND THAT'S SORT
14	OF THE OTHER END OF THE BOOKEND. WE HAVE THE VERY,
15	VERY AGGRESSIVE GOALS FOR BOTH FIVE-YEAR AND
16	ONE-YEAR FOR THE ORGANIZATION. ON THE OTHER HAND,
17	WE'RE MANDATED BY THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION 71 TO STAY
18	WITHIN A CUMULATIVE 3 PLUS 3 PERCENT EXPENSE CAP.
19	SO THOSE ARE REALLY THE TWO BOOKENDS AS WE'RE
20	THINKING ABOUT WHERE THE OPERATIONAL EXPENSES FOR
21	THE ORGANIZATION GO IN THE COMING YEAR.
22	I WON'T GO THROUGH EACH OF THE PROCESS
23	RECAPS. THESE ARE PRETTY SELF-EXPLANATORY.
24	SLIDE 5. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE'VE
25	TRIED TO DO IN THE PRESENTATION OF THE BUDGET IS

1	REALLY TAKE A LITTLE BIT OF A FRESH LOOK AT BOTH THE
2	DIFFERENT COST CENTERS AS WELL AS DIFFERENT EXPENSE
3	CATEGORIES. SO ONE OF THE THINGS YOU WILL NOTE IS
4	THERE IS NO EXPENSE CALLED "OTHER" IN THE BUDGET
5	THIS YEAR. WE'VE ALSO GIVEN SOME MORE GRANULARITY
6	TO THE COST CENTERS WHERE I BELIEVE IN THE CURRENT
7	FISCAL YEAR WE HAD FIVE COST CENTERS. WE'VE ADDED A
8	COUPLE MORE, AND I CALL THESE DEPARTMENTS OR COST
9	CENTERS. IT'S REALLY THE SAME CONCEPT. AND THESE
10	TRULY REFLECT FUNCTIONAL AREAS. THEY'RE NOT
11	REPORTING.
12	THERE ARE ONE OR TWO OF THESE AREAS THAT
13	DO HAVE SOME REPORTING THAT GOES TO BOTH THE
14	PRESIDENT AND THE CHAIR. THOSE WOULD INCLUDE LEGAL
15	AS WELL AS THE FINANCE GROUP. AND SO I JUST WANT
16	PEOPLE TO KEEP IN MIND THAT THE INTENT HERE IS
17	REALLY FUNCTIONAL AREA.
18	IN ADDITION, WE'VE BOTH SIMPLIFIED AND
19	CLARIFIED THE EXPENSE CATEGORIES SUCH THAT YOU
20	SHOULD REALLY BE ABLE TO LOOK AT THE BUDGET AND GET
21	A BETTER SNAPSHOT AT A GLANCE AT THE HIGH LEVEL OF
22	WHERE THE DIFFERENT EXPENSES ARE GOING.
23	NEXT SLIDE. THE ALLOCATIONS AGAINST THE
24	EXPENSE CAP ON SLIDE 6 HAVE NOT CHANGED FROM PRIOR
25	YEARS. AND THERE'S GRANTS ADMINISTRATION, WHICH IS

1	THE SCIENCE OFFICE, BOTH THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT
2	PORTION OF THE I.T. DEPARTMENT, THE GENERAL AND
3	ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS. THOSE ARE ALL STILL CAPPED AT
4	3 PERCENT. AND THOSE REPRESENT THE PRESIDENT, THE
5	CHAIR, FINANCE, AND COMMUNICATIONS, AS WELL AS THE
6	REMAINDER OF THE I.T. SPENDING. AND THEN THE LEGAL,
7	ACCORDING TO THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION 71, IS
8	ALLOCATED AGAINST RESEARCH FUNDING.
9	NEXT SLIDE. SO JUST AT A HIGH LEVEL,
10	WE'LL GET INTO THE NITTY-GRITTY HERE IN THE NEXT SET
11	OF DOCUMENTS, BUT THERE'S SOME GLOBAL DRIVERS, AND
12	THEN WE'LL GO THROUGH A COUPLE OF THE MAJOR CHANGES
13	IN EACH DEPARTMENT FROM YEAR ON YEAR.
14	THE FIRST THING IS, BASED ON AN INFORMAL
15	SURVEY OF THE COMPARABLE INSTITUTIONS, WHICH OUR HR
16	CHIEF CONDUCTED, WE ARE PROPOSING AN INCREASE IN
17	EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION FOR THOSE ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE
18	MERIT INCREASES, WHICH IS THOSE THAT STARTED HERE ON
19	DECEMBER 31ST OR PRIOR, OF AN AVERAGE OF 3 PERCENT
20	PLUS 1 PERCENT FOR POTENTIAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT. SO
21	THAT WOULD INCLUDE ANYBODY THAT'S PERFORMING ABOVE
22	AND BEYOND AND WOULD HAVE A RECLASSIFICATION OF
23	THEIR JOB TITLE OR POSITION.
24	WE'RE ALSO PROPOSING TO ADD 4 FTE'S TO THE
25	ORGANIZATION. THAT'S ONE GRANTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANT

1	IN THE SCIENCE RESEARCH GROUP, A MEDICAL OFFICER IN
2	THE DEVELOPMENT GROUP, AN ADDITIONAL FTE IN THE
3	LEGAL OFFICE, AND THERE'S ONE MORE WHICH I CAN'T
4	REMEMBER NOW, BUT WE'LL FIND IT WITH THE UPCOMING
5	SLIDES. SO I THINK WE'VE COVERED THE POINTS ON
6	SLIDE 7.
7	MS. FEIT: MATT, YES, IF I COULD MAKE A
8	COMMENT RIGHT NOW SINCE WE'RE ON THIS AREA. AT THE
9	LAST BOARD MEETING, THERE WERE SEVERAL QUESTIONS
10	AROUND THAT. AND, IN FACT, I WAS ON THE PHONE, SO I
11	COULDN'T TALK, BUT IT SOUNDED LIKE OS STEWARD WAS
12	ONE OF THE ONE QUESTIONING ABOUT BENCHMARKS. YOU
13	HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO TALK (UNINTELLIGIBLE).
14	DR. PLUNKETT: MARCY, WE'RE GETTING A LOT
15	OF FEEDBACK AND WE COULDN'T HEAR YOU VERY WELL.
16	MS. FEIT: I'M SORRY. AT THE LAST BOARD
17	MEETING IS THAT BETTER?
18	DR. PLUNKETT: LITTLE BIT.
19	MS. FEIT: AT THE LAST BOARD MEETING, I
20	BELIEVE IT WAS OS STEWARD WHO WAS ASKING QUITE A FEW
21	QUESTIONS AROUND THE MERIT INCREASE. AND HE WAS
22	QUESTIONING WHERE WE GOT OUR BENCHMARKS FOR THE
23	MERIT INCREASE. HAVE YOU HAD A CHANCE TO DISCUSS
24	THIS FURTHER WITH HIM?
25	DR. PLUNKETT: I HAVE NOT HAD FURTHER
	10
	10

ا _	
1	DISCUSSIONS WITH HIM, NO.
2	MS. FEIT: YOU MIGHT WANT TO DO THAT. I
3	THINK IF HE GOES TO THE NEXT MEETING AND SAYS THAT
4	HE'S HAD A DISCUSSION WITH YOU, HE'S COMFORTABLE
5	THAT WE HAD THE RIGHT BENCHMARKS, I THINK THAT WILL
6	HELP THE REST OF THE BOARD.
7	DR. PLUNKETT: OKAY.
8	DR. JUELSGAARD: ACTUALLY I THINK IT WOULD
9	BE NICE TO IDENTIFY WHO THE SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS
10	WERE THAT WERE BENCHMARKED.
11	DR. PLUNKETT: SO THIS WAS SEVERAL OF THE
12	UC'S.
13	DR. JUELSGAARD: SEVERAL OF THE UC'S.
14	WERE THEY UC'S THAT ARE REPRESENTED ON
15	DR. PLUNKETT: ON THE BOARD. SO IT'S THE
16	ONES FROM THE COMPENSATION SECTION OF PROP 71, SO
17	THE FIVE UC'S WITH A MED SCHOOL. SHE SPOKE TO THREE
18	HR PEOPLE AT THREE OF THEM AS WELL AS THREE OR FOUR
19	OF THE PRIVATE NON-PROFIT FOUNDATIONS, RESEARCH
20	FOUNDATIONS, IN SAN DIEGO, PLUS A COUPLE OF THE
21	RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA.
22	AND THEY'RE ALL COMING AROUND THIS KIND OF 3 PERCENT
23	NUMBER.
24	DR. JUELSGAARD: I TAKE IT THAT'S ACROSS
25	THE BOARD FOR ALL THE DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES, NOT
	11

-	
1	JUST THE MEDICAL DISCIPLINES.
2	DR. PLUNKETT: NO. WE WERE REALLY FOCUSED
3	ON THE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH ASPECTS.
4	DR. JUELSGAARD: OKAY. SO YOU CAN TAKE
5	INTO ACCOUNT FINANCE PEOPLE.
6	DR. PLUNKETT: I'M SORRY. I THOUGHT YOU
7	WERE ASKING ABOUT OTHER DEPARTMENTS WITHIN. NO.
8	THIS WAS REALLY AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD NUMBER FOR ALL
9	EMPLOYEES. I'M SORRY. I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THE
10	QUESTION.
11	MR. ROTH: DUANE HAS JOINED THE CALL. I'M
12	SORRY, GUYS.
13	DR. PLUNKETT: HI, DUANE. WE'RE ON SLIDE
14	7 OF AGENDA ITEM 4.
15	OKAY. NEXT SLIDE. SO THE INFORMATION
16	TECHNOLOGY SPENDING, I KNOW, HAS BEEN A POINT OF
17	CONCERN FOR A NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE ON THE BOARD IN
18	THE PAST. I THINK MANY OF YOU KNOW THAT THE PEOPLE
19	INVOLVED WITH THE PROJECT ARE REALLY AIMING TO GET
20	IT TO BE IN A MAINTENANCE MODE BY EARLY CALENDAR
21	2013. WE'VE HAD AN OPEN I.T. DIRECTOR POSITION
22	THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE YEAR, WHICH WE'VE BEEN
23	ACTUALLY FILLING WITH A CONTRACTOR. WE ALSO HAVE
24	FOUR ADDITIONAL CONTRACTORS THAT HAVE BEEN WORKING
25	ON THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT I.T. CONTRACTING PROJECT.
	12

1	WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING FOR THE COMING YEAR
2	IS TO FILL THE OPEN I.T. DIRECTOR POSITION AND, IN
3	ADDITION, HIRE ONE PROGRAMMER AS A PERMANENT
4	EMPLOYEE SUCH THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO INNOVATE
5	AROUND NEW RFA'S AND ALL THOSE SORTS OF THINGS THAT
6	CONTINUALLY DO COME UP AT THE ORGANIZATION.
7	WHAT YOU WILL SEE IN THE LINE ITEM DETAIL
8	IS THAT WE ALSO HAVE \$150,000 FOR ENHANCEMENTS TO
9	OUR I.T. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ISSUES THAT THE
10	PERFORMANCE AUDITOR HAS IDENTIFIED.
11	AND THE UPSHOT OF THIS IS BY SPRING 2013
12	WE EXPECT TO BE AT A RUN RATE EXPENSE OF \$1 MILLION
13	PER YEAR VERSUS 1.5 MILLION IN THE CURRENT YEAR
14	BUDGET.
15	DR. JUELSGAARD: SO BOTH AT THIS LEVEL AND
16	BEYOND IN FINANCE, WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT NO
17	PERFORMANCE AUDIT (INAUDIBLE). GO AHEAD.
18	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: JUST FOR THE BENEFIT
19	OF THE BARRISTERS' WHO ARE TAKING THE NOTES OF THE
20	MEETING, YOU'RE OUR MOST NEWLY JOINED MEMBER, SO
21	THEY MAY NOT RECOGNIZE YOUR VOICE IN CONNECTION WITH
22	THIS SUBCOMMITTEE. SO THIS IS STEVE JUELSGAARD
23	SPEAKING.
24	DR. JUELSGAARD: THANK YOU, MICHAEL. A
25	QUESTION. WHAT IS A PERFORMANCE AUDIT?
	13
	±3

1	DR. PLUNKETT: SO A PERFORMANCE AUDIT WAS
2	MANDATED BY SB 1064, AND IT'S A ONCE EVERY
3	THREE-YEAR REVIEW OF THE OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF
4	CIRM. AND THIS IS A GROUP WHICH WE PUT OUT AN RFP
5	AND CONTRACTED WITH AN AUDITING FIRM CALLED MOSS
6	ADAMS TO DO A REVIEW OF A NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONAL
7	ASPECTS.
8	DR. JUELSGAARD: SO IT'S AN INTERNAL
9	CONTROL AUDIT?
10	DR. PLUNKETT: NO. IT'S MUCH MORE THAN
11	JUST INTERNAL CONTROLS. IT'S REALLY A LOT OF
12	OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE ORGANIZATION. AND THEY
13	HAVE BEEN DOING THE WORK OVER THE THROUGH THE
14	PAST FALL AND INTO THE WINTER. AND THEY'LL BE
15	DELIVERING A REPORT TO THE BOARD. WE EXPECT THAT IT
16	WILL BE OUT AT THE MAY BOARD MEETING. AND BASED ON
17	SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT THEY HAVE BEEN ASKING US
18	SO FAR, WE EXPECT THAT THEY WILL HIGHLIGHT A NUMBER
19	OF THINGS THAT WE CAN DO BETTER IN TERMS OF MANAGING
20	OUR INFORMATION AND GIVING INFORMATION OUT TO THE
21	PUBLIC AND THINGS LIKE THAT.
22	DR. JUELSGAARD: DO WE DO INTERNAL CONTROL
23	AUDITS?
24	DR. PLUNKETT: THAT IS PART OF THE ANNUAL
25	AUDIT, YES.
	1.4
	14

1	SO ON SLIDE 9, I THINK THE BIGGEST CHANGE
2	TO HIGHLIGHT ON THE COMMUNICATIONS BUDGET IS THAT
3	THERE WERE A NUMBER OF EXTERNAL FUNCTIONS THAT WE
4	HAD IN THE BUDGET FOR CONTRACTS THAT REALLY WERE,
5	WITH THE DELIGHTFUL ADDITION OF KEVIN MCCORMACK TO
6	THE TEAM, THAT WE EXPECT TO REALLY GET MORE BANG FOR
7	THE BUCK ON THAT IN THE COMING YEAR.
8	IN FINANCE WE CUT A NUMBER OF THE
9	EQUIPMENT AND OTHER SMALL EXPENSES TO WRING ABOUT A
10	\$100,000 OUT OF THE BUDGET. AND IN ADDITION, THERE
11	WILL NOT BE ANOTHER PERFORMANCE AUDIT EXPENSE FOR
12	ANOTHER TWO YEARS.
13	AND THEN FINALLY, IN THE LEGAL BUDGET,
14	THAT'S BASICALLY FLAT YEAR ON YEAR. AND WHAT WE'RE
15	PROPOSING TO DO FOR THE COMING FISCAL YEAR IS
16	REPLACE \$190,000 IN EXTERNAL LEGAL SERVICES
17	PRIMARILY AROUND CONTRACTS AND TRANSACTIONAL WORK
18	WITH AN IN-HOUSE PERSON TO HANDLE BOTH SOME IP AS
19	WELL AS TRANSACTIONAL STUFF.
20	MR. TORRES: THIS IS ART TORRES. WE'RE
21	GOING TO HIRE ANOTHER LAWYER AT 190,000 A YEAR?
22	DR. PLUNKETT: ELONA, DO YOU WANT TO TALK
23	ABOUT THAT?
24	MS. BAUM: I THINK WE TALKED ABOUT IT AT
25	THE BOARD MEETING AND THAT THAT

MR. TORRES: NO, WE DIDN'T TALK ABOUT IT
AT THE BOARD MEETING BECAUSE IT WAS VERY CONFUSING
WHAT WAS SAID AT THE BOARD MEETING. AND EVEN AFTER
I REVIEWED THE TRANSCRIPT, IT STILL DIDN'T MAKE
SENSE TO ME. I DON'T KNOW WHY WE NEED TO SPEND
ANOTHER 190,000 FOR ANOTHER LAWYER THAT WE MAY NOT
NEED.
MS. BAUM: WELL, I'M HAPPY TO GO THROUGH
THE RATIONALE FOR HIRING THAT OTHER LAWYER. FIRST
OF ALL, WE HAVE AN EXPANDING DEMAND
MR. TORRES: I THOUGHT WE WERE CUTTING
BACK ON THE LOAN PROGRAM, AND I THOUGHT THAT WE HAD
DONE ALL OF THE TRANSACTIONAL WORK THAT NEEDED TO BE
DONE, AND THAT THE INDIVIDUAL GRANTEES WOULD DO THAT
TRANSACTIONAL WORK, NOT US.
MS. BAUM: SO RIGHT NOW IT'S UNCERTAIN
WHETHER OR NOT WE'RE CUTTING BACK OR NOT.
MR. TORRES: WELL, THEN, WE HAVE TO MAKE
THAT DECISION LATER UNTIL WE FIGURE OUT WHAT WE'RE
CUTTING BACK AND WHAT WE'RE NOT.
MS. BAUM: HE IS GIVING PEOPLE THE OPTION
TO TAKE A LOAN VERSUS TO GO WITH THE GRANT REVENUE
SHARING. AND SO THERE WAS ALREADY, YOU KNOW, A
BUDGET THAT WE MIGHT END UP WITH FIVE LOANS. THAT
SAID, THERE'S STILL PLENTY OF OTHER ADDITIONAL WORK
16

1	WHEN WE ARE NOW FOCUSING ON PROTECTING IP
2	MR. TORRES: WELL, WAIT A MINUTE. WE
3	ALREADY HAVE YOU. WE HAVE IAN. WE HAVE SCOTT. WE
4	HAVE JAMES. WHAT MORE DO WE NEED TO ADD MORE TO OUR
5	LEGAL SERVICES BUDGET, WHICH LOOKS AWFULLY BLOATED
6	IN THE I.T. BUDGET.
7	MS. BAUM: THERE'S A VERY IN-DEPTH MEMO
8	THAT TALKS ABOUT THE DIFFERENT ITEMS THAT APPARENTLY
9	YOU HAVEN'T SEEN, AND I THOUGHT
10	MR. TORRES: WELL, I HAVE SEEN IT, AND
11	THAT'S WHY I RAISED THE ISSUE OF ARE WE PAYING A NEW
12	LAWYER TO NEGOTIATE ON BEHALF OF GRANTEES FOR THEIR
13	NEEDS, OR ARE WE DOING SOMETHING ELSE?
14	MS. BAUM: WELL, THERE'S MANY DIFFERENT
15	THINGS THAT WE'RE DOING. ONE OF THEM WOULD BE TO
16	MAKE SURE THAT WE SPEND MORE TIME AT THE AWARD STAGE
17	MAKING SURE THAT THESE PROGRAMS ARE COMMERCIALLY
18	VIABLE AND THAT THEY HAVE THE APPROPRIATE IP AND
19	RIGHTS NEEDED SO THAT THEY MAY BE ACTUALLY
20	COMMERCIALIZED. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE HAVEN'T
21	DONE. IT'S AN EXPANSION OF WHAT I THINK WE REALLY
22	NEED TO DO.
23	MR. TORRES: YOU SAY THAT WE NEED TO DO
24	THAT. SHOULDN'T THAT BE THE GRANTEE OR THE
25	INSTITUTION THAT IS SPONSORING A GRANTEE TO BEAR
	17
	17

1	THAT EXPENSE?
2	MS. BAUM: WELL, SO I'LL GIVE YOU AN
3	EXAMPLE. I WENT OUT WITH SOMEBODY WHO'S A HEAD OF
4	ONE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S TECH TRANSFER OFFICES, AND I
5	WON'T SAY WHICH ONE. IN OUR DISEASE TEAM II AWARDS,
6	WE SAY THAT WE WANT TO HAVE EVIDENCE OF FTO, FREEDOM
7	TO OPERATE, AND ALL LICENSES AND PATENTS THAT ARE
8	CRITICAL TO EXECUTING ON THE PROGRAM WE WOULD LIKE
9	THEM TO LIST. THEY WERE FLABBERGASTED THAT THEY
10	MIGHT ACTUALLY HAVE TO GO AND INVEST LARGE SUMS OF
11	MONEY TO DO THESE TYPES OF POLICIES. AND I SAID,
12	LOOK, WHAT YOU NEED TO DO IS MAKE SURE THAT YOU
13	PROVIDE US WITH A LIST OF YOUR KEY ASSETS IN THE IP
14	AREA, AND WE'LL REQUIRE YOU TO DO SO, BUT WE WILL
15	TAKE IT UPON OURSELVES TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE DOING
16	OUR OWN DUE DILIGENCE.
17	SO WE HAVE SITUATIONS WHERE
18	MR. TORRES: SO WE'LL HAVE TWO LAWYERS
19	WORKING ON THE SAME ISSUES, THE LAWYERS FOR THE
20	INSTITUTION AND A NEW LAWYER FOR US.
21	MS. BAUM: THEY DON'T HAVE LAWYERS TO DO
22	THIS, ART. THAT'S THE PROBLEM.
23	DR. TROUNSON: I THINK, CHAIR, THIS IS
24	ALAN TROUNSON. I THINK YOU HAVE TO THE BOARD HAS
25	TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE'RE MOVING INTO THIS AREA OF

18

1	COMMERCIALIZATION WORKING WITH INDUSTRY, WORKING
2	WITH TEAMS WHICH ARE NOW MOVING THROUGH TO PHASE I,
3	PHASE II STUDIES. WE'RE REQUIRED NOW TO REALLY TAKE
4	VERY SERIOUSLY THE ISSUES OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
5	AND HOW THEY IMPACT ON
6	MR. TORRES: I AGREE THAT WE NEED TO TAKE
7	IT SERIOUSLY. I'M NOT QUESTIONING
8	DR. TROUNSON: YOU KNOW
9	MR. TORRES: THERE ARE CURRENT COUNSELS
10	WITHIN THE UC AND STANFORD AND USC THAT OUGHT TO BE
11	TAKING CARE OF THIS FOR THEIR GRANTEES.
12	DR. TROUNSON: WELL, THEY'RE NOT YOU
13	KNOW, THIS IS NOT BEING TAKEN CARE OF IN A WAY WHICH
14	IS WHICH IS WHICH IS REASONABLE TO THE
15	ORGANIZATION HERE. AND I THINK IT'S PUTTING THE
16	ORGANIZATION AT RISK OF FUNDING MORE WORK WHICH IS
17	GOING TO BE OTHERWISE HELD UP FOR LONG PERIODS OF
18	TIME. AND WE CAN ALREADY SEE THIS HAPPENING IN
19	SEVERAL INSTANCES BECAUSE WE HAVEN'T BEEN PAYING
20	SUFFICIENT ATTENTION TO THESE AREAS AND ARE MAKING
21	SURE THAT WE'VE GOT CLARITY ON THE ABILITY FOR THESE
22	TEAMS TO WORK IN THESE AREAS.
23	PARTICULARLY AS YOU MOVE INTO THE CLINICAL
24	TRIALS, THESE BECOME ISSUES WHICH COMPANIES AND
25	OTHER INSTITUTIONS WILL BECOME VERY ACTIVE IN MOVING

1	FORWARD.
2	MR. TORRES: THEN I THOUGHT ELONA'S
3	PROMOTION TO SENIOR VP OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT WAS
4	TO TAKE CARE OF THAT.
5	DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S NOT A LAWYER. YOU
6	KNOW, YOU HAVE TO HAVE YOU HAVE TO HAVE AN
7	RFP-TRAINED BASE LAWYER, SOMEBODY WHO'S GOT
8	EXPERTISE IN THESE PARTICULAR AREAS. WE DON'T HAVE
9	ANY OF THAT EXPERTISE. AND OTHERWISE WE HAVE TO GET
10	IT BY CONTRACT FROM OUTSIDE. SO WHAT WE'RE
11	PROPOSING TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE WAS TO DOWNSIZE SOME
12	OF OUR OTHER ACTIVITIES AND TO BRING IN SOMEBODY WHO
13	WOULD TAKE CARE OF THIS IN A WAY WHICH WE COULD FEEL
14	CONFIDENT ABOUT. CURRENTLY I DON'T FEEL CONFIDENT
15	THAT WE'VE GOT THIS SUITABLY UNDER CONTROL. AND I
16	THINK IT'S A MAJOR ISSUE.
17	MR. TORRES: WE DON'T
18	DR. TROUNSON: YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE
19	CONFIDENCE.
20	MR. TORRES: YOU'RE CONCERNED THAT WE
21	DON'T HAVE THE CURRENT STAFF THAT IS EXPERT IN THIS
22	AREA TO GIVE YOU ENOUGH CONFIDENCE TO MOVE FORWARD?
23	DR. TROUNSON: ABSOLUTELY, ART.
24	MR. TORRES: OKAY.
25	DR. TROUNSON: AND I FEEL VERY CONCERNED
	20

1	THAT I'M PUTTING THE ORGANIZATION AT RISK, AND THIS
2	WOULD GET CONTROL OF THIS MATTER. AND IF YOU WERE
3	WORKING IN THESE SPACES, IF YOU'RE IN A COMMERCIAL
4	SITUATION, THIS IS THE NO. 1 QUESTION THAT YOU ASK.
5	AND IT'S THE FIRST QUESTION THAT WE COME UP WITH
6	WHEN WE'RE TALKING WITH INDUSTRY. AND WE REALLY
7	DON'T WE'VE ALLOWED THE INSTITUTIONS AND
8	COMPANIES ACTUALLY THAT ARE IN THIS SPACE, THESE
9	EARLY STAGE COMPANIES, TO PROGRESS WITH THEIR OWN
10	IN-HOUSE ACTIVITIES, AND THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ROBUST
11	ENOUGH.
12	MR. TORRES: I THOUGHT NANCY KOCH WAS
13	DOING SOME OF THAT WORK. I GUESS I WAS MISTAKEN.
14	DR. TROUNSON: NO. SHE'S NOT EXPERT IN
15	THAT PARTICULAR AREA. NO. NO.
16	MS. BAUM: MAY I ALSO ADD THAT THE BD
17	ROLE, SHE WOULDN'T BE A PART FROM THAT ROLE, AND
18	THERE'S ONLY SO MANY HOURS IN THE WEEK. AND THE BD
19	ROLE IS ACTUALLY TO GO OUT AND MAKE FACE-TO-FACE OR
20	PHONE CALLS WITH SOME OF THE KEY BIOPHARMAS AND THE
21	COMPANIES AND CREATE MORE OF AN OUTREACH TO ALL OF
22	THEM IN ORDER TO, ONE, MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE
23	LEVERAGED FINANCING, FOLLOW-ON FINANCING, THAT WE
24	REPAIR AND DEVELOP RELATIONS WITH LOCAL COMPANIES
25	THAT WE HAVE LONG BEEN CITED AS NOT ADEQUATELY
	21
	21

1	SUPPORTING. AND A LOT OF TIME HAS GONE INTO DOING
2	JUST THAT. THAT'S NOT THAT'S NOT A REVIEW OF THE
3	IP, AND IT'S CERTAINLY NOT A NEGOTIATION WITH A
4	NUMBER OF THE DIFFERENT RIGHTS HOLDERS, PATENT
5	HOLDERS.
6	MR. TORRES: I'M SORRY. WHEN I FIRST CAME
7	TO THE INSTITUTION, IT WAS SAID TO ME THAT NANCY
8	KOCH WAS ONE OF THE EXPERTS IN IP ALONG WITH SCOTT
9	TOCHER WORKING WITH ED PENHOET. SO THAT'S NOT THE
10	CASE.
11	MS. BAUM: WELL, IT CERTAINLY WOULD BE
12	MORE COST-EFFECTIVE TO IN-HOUSE THAT ROLE ANYWAY.
13	DR. TROUNSON: THEY'RE NOT OF THAT
14	PARTICULAR EXPERTISE, ART.
15	MR. ROTH: ALAN, I DON'T THINK THAT'S
16	REALLY TRUE. I WOULD THINK NANCY IS AS QUALIFIED AS
17	ANYBODY I EVER WORKED WITH.
18	MR. TORRES: THAT'S WHAT ED TOLD ME,
19	RIGHT.
20	MR. ROTH: BUT THAT DOESN'T CHANGE THE
21	DISCUSSION. I DON'T WANT TO LEAVE IT THAT NANCY
22	WOULDN'T HAVE THAT KIND OF EXPERTISE. SHE CLEARLY
23	DOES.
24	MS. BAUM: I THINK IT'S A QUESTION OF
25	IN-HOUSING THAT EXPERTISE. SHE'S IF YOU NOTICE
	22
	~~

1	FROM THE BUDGET, HER AMOUNT HAS ACTUALLY GONE DOWN
2	FROM 325 IN 2011 AND 250. IT'S BECAUSE SHE'S
3	SPENDING MORE MOSTLY ALL OF HER TIME THESE DAYS
4	ON THE ALLIANCES FOR THE COLLABORATIVE FUNDING
5	PARTNERS AND NOT A WHOLE LOT OF IT. AND IF YOU WANT
6	TO BE COST-EFFECTIVE, YOU COULD FIND SOMEONE THAT
7	COULD KILL TWO BIRDS WITH ONE STONE BY IN-HOUSING
8	THAT. ONE THAT HAS NOT ONLY THE IP EXPERTISE, BUT
9	THAT CAN HELP OUT WITH SOME OF THE TRANSACTIONS WORK
10	THAT NEEDS TO OCCUR.
11	MR. TORRES: THAT'S WHY I THOUGHT NANCY
12	WAS PERFECT FOR THAT ROLE.
13	MS. BAUM: WELL, IF YOU WANT TO PAY THE
14	FEES OF AN OUTSIDE LAWYER. IT'S JUST NOT
15	COST-EFFECTIVE TO DO THAT.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ELONA, WHAT'S THE
17	LIKELIHOOD YOU ARE GOING TO FIND SOMEBODY WITH THE
18	DISPARATE SKILL SETS TO DO ALL THE DIFFERENT NEEDS
19	YOU'VE ARTICULATED?
20	MS. BAUM: WELL, YOU KNOW, THERE WAS A
21	POINT IN TIME WHERE I FOUND WHILE I WAS TALKING TO
22	SOMEBODY THAT WAS RIGHT ON THE MARK, AND I HAPPEN TO
23	KNOW THAT THEIR HUSBAND SINCE LEFT THE BAY AREA. SO
24	I DON'T KNOW IF THEY WOULD EVEN BE INTERESTED, BUT
25	IT GAVE ME CONFIDENCE TO FEEL THAT WE COULD ATTRACT

1	PEOPLE BECAUSE OF OUR MISSION. AND THERE'S A LOT OF
2	PEOPLE OUT THERE THAT ARE TWO INCOME FAMILIES WHERE
3	ONE OF THE SPOUSES IS WILLING TO TAKE A CUT IN PAY
4	IN ORDER TO BE AFFILIATED WITH THE GREAT MISSION OF
5	CIRM.
6	MR. TORRES: THAT'S NOT BEEN THE CASE WITH
7	THE SITUATION NOW. I'M JUST CONCERNED THAT WE'RE
8	SPENDING A LITTLE TOO MUCH WHEN WE COULD SPEND THE
9	MONEY THAT WE DO HAVE ON THE PEOPLE THAT ARE THERE
10	LIKE A NANCY KOCH OR SOMEONE ELSE.
11	MS. BAUM: BUT NANCY KOCH IS AN OUTSIDE
12	CONSULTANT, AND I THINK IT'S \$300 AN HOUR. IF WE
13	HAD HER DOING THAT WORK, WE WOULD HAVE TO PAY
14	PROBABLY ANOTHER \$250,000 A YEAR. THIS IS GOING TO
15	BE A LOT MORE COST-EFFECTIVE.
16	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: JEFF SHEEHY HAS BEEN
17	TRYING TO GET A COMMENT IN.
18	MR. SHEEHY: YEAH. I'M JUST CURIOUS
19	BECAUSE THE NIH, WHICH FUNDS LATE STAGE CLINICAL
20	TRIALS, DO THEY GO THROUGH THIS SAME PROCESS? DO
21	THEY HIRE DO THEY HAVE PATENT ATTORNEYS AND IP
22	ATTORNEYS THAT DO DUE DILIGENCE? SO I WONDER
23	WHAT WHEN WE FIRST SET THIS UP, WE WERE PRETTY
24	CLEAR IN THE ORIGINAL IP TASK FORCE THAT WE WERE
25	GOING TO LEAVE THIS TO THE INSTITUTIONS. AND IT
	24
	2 4

1	DOESN'T YOU KNOW, BRINGING THIS IN-HOUSE AND
2	INVOLVING US IN THE IP PROCESS IS NOT SOMETHING WE
3	ORIGINALLY CONTEMPLATED IN OUR INITIAL DISCUSSIONS
4	FIVE YEARS AGO.
5	SO I'M KIND OF AND THE NIH DOESN'T DO
6	THIS. I DON'T KNOW HOW WE MANAGE THIS PROCESS.
7	WHAT IF WE HAVE A DISPUTE? WHAT IF THE GRANTEE SAYS
8	THAT THEY HAVE AND OUR PERSON SAYS THAT THEY
9	HAVEN'T, HOW DO WE RESOLVE THIS? IT JUST SEEMS LIKE
10	WE'RE OPENING UP A WHOLE CAN OF WIGGLE WORMS IN A
11	PLACE WHERE OTHER GRANTEE AGENCIES DON'T TREAD. AND
12	I'M NOT SURE WHY WE'RE TREADING DOWN THIS ROAD.
13	I DON'T KNOW. STEVE, YOU PROBABLY KNOW
14	MORE
15	DR. JUELSGAARD: I THINK THERE ARE
16	DIFFERENT EXPECTATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS
17	THAT DRIVES THIS DIFFERENCE. SO THE NIH DOESN'T
18	HAVE AN EXPECTATION OF EARNING ANY REVENUE FROM ANY
19	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY THAT'S GENERATED FROM THE
20	MONEY THAT IT SPENDS ON RESEARCH. IT LEAVES THAT TO
21	THE INSTITUTIONS THAT IT GIVES A LOAN TO, ACADEMIC
22	INSTITUTIONS OR RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS, TO WORK OUT
23	THE WHOLE NOTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND RETURN
24	ON IT. ALL THAT THE NIH IS CONCERNED ABOUT IS THAT
25	IF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GETS DEVELOPED, IT GETS

1	UTILIZED. AND IF IT DOESN'T, THEY HAVE MARCH-IN
2	RIGHTS TO TAKE CARE OF THAT.
3	I'VE ALWAYS UNDERSTOOD, AND, AGAIN, I'M
4	THE ONE WITH THE SHORTEST TENURE HERE, THAT CIRM HAS
5	AN INTEREST IN THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SIDE OF THE
6	THINGS BECAUSE IT WOULD LIKE TO SEE A RETURN
7	GENERATED ON THAT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY THAT WOULD
8	COME BACK TO THE STATE OR STATE INSTITUTION OF SOME
9	SORT. SO IF THAT'S NOT TRUE, THEN WE SHOULD BE JUST
10	LIKE THE NIH. BUT IF THAT IS TRUE, THEN WE DO HAVE
11	SOME STAKE IN THIS.
12	BUT I THINK YOU'RE RIGHT TO QUESTION WHAT
13	LEVEL OF STAKE WE SHOULD HAVE. I DON'T KNOW HOW BIG
14	OF A DISCUSSION WE'VE EVER HAD ABOUT THAT, AND I
15	THINK THAT'S PROBABLY A DISCUSSION WORTH HAVING.
16	MR. SHEEHY: WHEN WE ORIGINALLY DID THIS,
17	WE WERE RELIANT UPON THE GRANTEE INSTITUTIONS TO DO
18	THE ENFORCEMENT, WHICH I THINK WE CHANGED. AND
19	WHERE THE GRAY AREA EXISTS RIGHT NOW IS WITH
20	FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS. I THINK WE FELT FAIRLY
21	COMFORTABLE THAT THE GRANTEE INSTITUTIONS WERE
22	BECOMING MORE AND MORE DILIGENT ABOUT PURSUING THEIR
23	IP, AND THEN WE WERE GOING TO ATTACH THEIR CUT,
24	WHICH IS HOW OUR ROLES WERE SET UP. WE WOULD COUNT
25	ON THE STANFORDS AND THE OTHER PLACES TO DO THE DUE

1	DILIGENCE.
2	BUT THE PLACE WHERE THIS KIND OF BREAKS
3	DOWN IS THAT FOR FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS WE IMAGINED
4	A LOAN PROGRAM WHICH WOULD BE SEPARATELY
5	ADMINISTERED.
6	NOW, WHERE IT GETS TO BE A GRAY AREA IS AS
7	WE START DOING GRANTS OF THE MAJOR AMOUNTS TO
8	FOR-PROFITS. HOW DO WE WANT TO ENGAGE WITH IP ON
9	THAT PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCE, WHICH IS A SLIGHTLY
10	DIFFERENT YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE THE
11	SAME SENSE OF METERED WITH STANFORD, STANFORD
12	DOESN'T DEVELOP PRODUCTS. STANFORD OUT-LICENSES.
13	SO STANFORD PURSUES REVENUE WITH THE EXPECTATION
14	THAT WE'LL GET A CUT. WHEN THE REVENUE PRODUCER IS
15	ALSO THE LICENSE HOLDER, THEN I DON'T THINK WE HAVE
16	THE SAME TYPE OF I DON'T KNOW IF I'M MAKING
17	SENSE THE SAME TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP IF YOU'RE
18	DEALING WITH A COMPANY THAT HAS THE LICENSE ATTACHED
19	TO THE PRODUCT THAT'S GOING TO DEVELOP THE PRODUCT.
20	IT MAY NOT NECESSARILY FEEL LIKE THAT WAS IN OUR
21	INTEREST.
22	SO I THINK IT'S AN INTERESTING QUESTION,
23	BUT I'M NOT SURE HOW WE APPROACH IT OR ATTACK IT.
24	DR. JUELSGAARD: LET ME JUST RESPOND REAL
25	QUICKLY, AND I WON'T SAY ANYTHING MORE TO WHAT YOU

1	JUST SAID, WHICH IS WHAT A COMMERCIAL INSTITUTION
2	WANTS IS IS IT WANTS STRONG INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
3	AROUND A PRODUCT TO AVOID THE FREERIDER NOTION, THAT
4	OTHER PEOPLE WILL SIMPLY FOLLOW IN ITS WAKE USING
5	THE DATA IT'S GENERATED, AND IT CAN'T PROTECT IT
6	BECAUSE IT WAS SPENDING TREMENDOUS AMOUNTS OF MONEY
7	AND TIME AND EFFORT ON ALL THIS. AND SO A
8	COMMERCIAL INSTITUTION, WHEN THINGS ARE BEING
9	GENERATED AT THIS STAGE AND THERE'S NO COMMERCIAL
10	INSTITUTION INVOLVED, THE RISK IS THAT YOU DON'T
11	GENERATE STRONG ENOUGH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY THAT
12	WILL ATTRACT A COMMERCIAL INSTITUTION.
13	THAT'S WHY THE ORGANIZATIONS LIKE
14	STANFORD IS PROBABLY A GOOD EXAMPLE, DO A PRETTY
15	DARN GOOD JOB OF TRYING TO PROTECT IMPORTANT
16	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY. SO, YOU KNOW THE CD 47 AS A
17	TARGET AND PROBABLY THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ANTIBODY
18	OR SEVERAL TYPES OF ANTIBODIES TO ANTI-CD 47, THAT
19	STANFORD IS GOING TO BE ALL OVER THAT, YOU KNOW, AS
20	MUCH AS THEY CAN. BUT I JUST DON'T KNOW I'M
21	PROBABLY MOSTLY FAMILIAR WITH STANFORD BECAUSE I
22	HAVE A LOT OF AFFILIATION.
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: I'M GOING TO EXERCISE
24	THE CHAIR'S PREROGATIVE. WE'RE NOT GOING TO RESOLVE
25	THIS IN THE COURSE OF THIS MEETING. WE ONLY HAVE

1	ABOUT 23 MINUTES REMAINING TO GET THROUGH OTHER
2	AREAS OF THE BUDGET. WHAT I'D LIKE TO SUGGEST IS WE
3	PUT A PIN IN THE LEGAL BUDGET AND REFER IT BACK TO
4	MANAGEMENT TO TRY TO RATIONALIZE AND UNDERSTAND.
5	I'M HAPPY TO GET INVOLVED TO PARTICIPATE IN THOSE
6	DISCUSSIONS AND BRING IT BACK WHEN WE COME BACK TO
7	THE BOARD LATER IN MAY.
8	I'D INVITE STEVE TO PARTICIPATE BECAUSE
9	STEVE'S CHAIRING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
10	COMMITTEE, AND IT'S REALLY KIND OF PRINCIPALLY
11	BETWEEN, I THINK, OUR TWO SUBCOMMITTEES WHERE THAT
12	RESIDES. AND I WOULD INVITE ANYONE ELSE WHO WOULD
13	LIKE TO PARTICIPATE FROM THIS COMMITTEE TO JOIN ME
14	AND STEVE.
15	DR. PIZZO: MICHAEL, THIS IS PHIL. I'M
16	NOT SUGGESTING THAT I PARTICIPATE, BUT JUST THAT IF
17	STANFORD IS GOING TO BE REFERENCED, WE OUGHT TO BE
18	CLEAR THAT WE'VE GOT ALL THE FACTS CORRECT ABOUT
19	WHAT STANFORD DOES OR DOESN'T DO.
20	DR. JUELSGAARD: YOU DON'T THINK YOU DO
21	SUCH A GOOD JOB, PHIL?
22	DR. PIZZO: WE DO A GREAT JOB. WE ALSO
23	DIVEST EQUITY WHEN WE ENGAGE IN CLINICAL TRIALS.
24	DR. TROUNSON: THE SITUATIONS OF
2.5	
25	DIFFICULTY HAVE ARISEN BOTH THROUGH THE

1	NOT-FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND THE COMPANIES,
2	MICHAEL. SO, YOU KNOW, THE DEGREE OF ANALYSIS AND
3	UNDERSTANDING IN THIS AREA REALLY DOES REQUIRE THAT
4	YOU DO A PROPER JOB OF IT. AND IT'S NOT I THINK
5	IT'S A HANDICAP FOR US.
6	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THAT'S A POINT WELL
7	TAKEN. I THINK THAT STEVE AND I WILL APPROACH THIS
8	WITHOUT BIAS.
9	DR. JUELSGAARD: COULD I JUST MAKE ONE
10	MORE QUICK COMMENT, MICHAEL? THIS IS REALLY A
11	TWO-STEP PROCESS. WHAT'S IN THE BUDGET IS ONE
12	THING, BUT MOVING TO HIRE SOMEBODY IS YET A SECOND
13	STEP. SO YOU CAN TAKE THE FIRST STEP, BUT NOT
14	NECESSARILY TAKE THE SECOND STEP. SO EVEN IF THE
15	BUDGET IS APPROVED WITH ANOTHER HEAD COUNT, IT STILL
16	DOESN'T GET YOU ANOTHER PERSON NECESSARILY.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I WOULD SUGGEST WHEN
18	YOU'RE CONSIDERING THIS ISSUE, MR. CHAIR, THAT YOU
19	ALSO HAVE TO FACTOR IN THE OTHER COSTS THEY'RE
20	PROPOSING ELIMINATING AND THE ROLES THAT ARE
21	INVOLVED THERE AND HOW THAT ALL FITS INTO EVERYTHING
22	AS WELL.
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: YEAH. I MEAN THERE
24	WAS REFERENCE TO A MEMO THAT I HAVEN'T SEEN THAT I'D
25	LIKE TO SEE. I'D LIKE STEVE TO BE ABLE TO SEE.

1	APPARENTLY THAT WAS AN INTERNAL MEMO. ART HAS SEEN
2	IT.
3	ART, WOULD YOU LIKE TO JOIN THIS SUBGROUP?
4	MR. TORRES: YES, I'D BE HAPPY TO. AND
5	ALSO JEFF'S COMMENTS WOULD PREDISPOSE MY PRESENCE ON
6	THE BOARD, IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL TO SEE AND TO TALK TO
7	ED PENHOET TO SEE WHAT THEIR THOUGHTS WERE WHEN THE
8	WHOLE IP REGULATIONS WERE BEING INITIALLY PROPOSED.
9	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: OKAY. THERE IS SOME
10	QUESTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE A BAGLEY-KEENE
11	ISSUE WITH A THIRD MEMBER. SO PERHAPS WE'LL
12	MR. TORRES: I'LL BE ON THE SIDELINES
13	WAITING TO HEAR.
14	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
15	MATT, WE'LL GO BACK TO YOU WITH REGARD
16	TO
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK MARCY HAD A
18	COMMENT.
19	MS. FEIT: I JUST HAD ONE COMMENT. I
20	DON'T WANT TO LOSE SIGHT OF THE ISSUE THAT JEFF
21	RAISED IS THAT IS THIS THE DIRECTION THAT THE BOARD
22	ORIGINALLY WANTED TO GO IN? I DON'T WANT TO LOSE
23	THAT. MY MEMORY WON'T ALLOW ME (UNINTELLIGIBLE),
24	BUT I DON'T REMEMBER
25	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: I THINK THE SIMPLE
	31

1	ANSWER WAS IS THAT WE AREN'T THE NIH IN THIS
2	SEQUENCE BECAUSE WE'RE ACTUALLY PARTICIPATING ON
3	BEHALF OF THE TAXPAYERS AND THE INTENT TO EARN A
4	RETURN ON THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY. AND THAT MAKES
5	US VERY DIFFERENT THAN THE NIH AND ITS ROLE AS A
6	GRANT FUNDER. BUT YOUR POINT IS WELL TAKEN, MARCY,
7	AND WE'LL THOROUGHLY REVISIT THAT QUESTION.
8	MS. FEIT: THANK YOU.
9	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: MATT.
10	DR. PLUNKETT: CONTINUING ON SLIDE 10
11	HERE, A LOT OF NUMBERS HERE, AND I WON'T GO THROUGH
12	EACH OF THESE, BUT I DO WANT TO HIGHLIGHT JUST A
13	COUPLE OF YEAR-ON-YEAR CHANGE NUMBERS. THE FIRST IS
14	THE CURRENT YEAR BUDGET OF 18.50 MILLION TO THE
15	PROPOSED NEXT YEAR BUDGET OF 17.85 MILLION, THAT IS
16	DOWN 3.5 PERCENT. HOWEVER, FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO SAW
17	THE FINANCIAL REPORT AT THE BOARD MEETING LAST
18	MONTH, WE ARE FORECASTING AN EXPENSE OF 16.6
19	MILLION FOR THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR, WHICH IS
20	ACTUALLY 1.9 MILLION LESS THAN THE CURRENT YEAR
21	BUDGET OF 18.5 MILLION.
22	OVER HALF OF THAT DIFFERENCE, 1.0 MILLION,
23	IS ACTUALLY DUE TO EMPTY POSITIONS, POSITIONS WHICH
24	WE HAD BUDGETED FOR, WHICH ACTUALLY TOOK MUCH LONGER
25	TO FILL THAN WE HAD HOPED. AND SO REALLY IF YOU

1	KIND OF LOOK AT IT ON AN APPLES-TO-APPLES
2	SPENDING-TO-PROPOSED BUDGET BASIS, THE SPENDING FOR
3	THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR, EVEN WITH ADDING 4 FTE'S, WE
4	ACTUALLY EXPECT WE'LL BE ROUGHLY IN LINE WITH THE
5	SORT OF NORMALIZED RUN RATE FOR THE CURRENT FISCAL
6	YEAR.
7	NEXT SLIDE. I'LL JUST TOUCH REALLY
8	BRIEFLY ON THE METHODOLOGY USED TO FORECAST THE
9	EXPENSE CAPS GOING OUT IN THE FUTURE HERE. THERE'S
10	REALLY A DOZEN OR 15 DIFFERENT IRREGULAR EXPENSES,
11	THINGS WHICH EITHER HAPPEN EVERY THREE YEARS, LIKE
12	THE PERFORMANCE AUDIT, OR WHICH HAPPENED IN THE PAST
13	WHICH WE CAN'T COUNT ON IN THE FUTURE, LIKE WE'RE
14	RECEIVING DONATED FUNDS, OR AN EXPECTED DECREASE IN
15	I.T. CONTRACTING WHERE WE EXPECT AN ANNUAL SAVINGS
16	OF 500,000 A YEAR AFTER JUNE 30TH, 2013.
17	AND THEN, IN ADDITION, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY
18	THAT WE EXPECT TO ACHIEVE IN THE MONTH OF APRIL AND
19	HAVE INCORPORATED INTO THE LONG-TERM FORECAST AN
20	ADDITIONAL 200,000 IN RECURRING EXPENSE SAVINGS. I
21	BELIEVE THIS IS IMMINENTLY ACHIEVABLE, AND WE'LL
22	HAVE SOME MORE INTERNAL DISCUSSIONS IN THE COMING
23	WEEKS AND EXPECT THAT WE SHOULD FIND SOME AMPLE
24	GROUND TO WRING A FEW HUNDRED THOUSAND IN ADDITIONAL
25	SAVINGS OUT FROM ITEMS SUCH AS MEETINGS, EXTERNAL
	33

_	
1	RESOURCES.
2	NEXT SLIDE. THE GRAPH ON SIDE 12 JUST
3	SHOWS THE PROJECTIONS WHICH I MENTIONED THERE. I
4	THINK THAT THAT'S PRETTY SELF-EXPLANATORY.
5	AND IS THERE ONE MORE SLIDE? UPCOMING
6	STEPS ALSO SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.
7	IF THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE
8	PRESENTATION, I CAN FIELD THOSE NOW. AND IF NOT, WE
9	CAN GO INTO THE LINE ITEM DETAIL.
10	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: IS THERE ANY QUESTIONS
11	FROM MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE AT ANY OF THE
12	REMOTE SITES? SHALL WE TAKE QUESTIONS FROM THE
13	PUBLIC AT THIS STAGE? QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC
14	HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO? HEARING NONE, ANY OF THE
15	REMOTE SITES?
16	DR. PIZZO: NO PUBLIC AT STANFORD.
17	MR. ROTH: NO.
18	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: MATT, PLEASE PROCEED.
19	AND WHY DON'T YOU SEE IF YOU CAN RESTRICT THIS TO
20	SEVEN MINUTES.
21	DR. PLUNKETT: SO FIRST SLIDE I'LL SPEAK
22	TO MARIE, YOU CAN GO ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE. THIS
23	IS THE ONE LABELED ONE OF EIGHT AT THE BOTTOM, WHICH
24	I APOLOGIZE IS ACTUALLY THE SECOND OF NINE, THE
25	SCIENCE OFFICE RESEARCH. WHAT I'M GOING TO DO WITH
	34

1	EACH OF THESE IS JUST FLAG A COUPLE OF THE BIG ITEMS
2	HERE.
3	THE FIRST IS ONE OF THE LARGER EXPENSES IN
4	THE OPERATING EXPENSE DETAIL FOR THE COMING YEAR
5	BUDGET IS THE \$262,000 WHICH WE BUDGETED FOR THE
6	GRANTEE MEETING. THIS WOULD BE AN EVERY 18-MONTH
7	AFFAIR WHERE WE GET TOGETHER WELL OVER 500 OF THE
8	CIRM AWARDEES AND THEN THEY SHARE RESEARCH RESULTS
9	AND SO FORTH.
10	THE OTHER ITEM IS WE HAVE, I THINK IT'S,
11	ABOUT A HALF A DOZEN SCIENTIFIC REVIEWS PLANNED IN
12	THE COMING YEAR STARTING IN JULY, AND THAT'S A
13	\$570,000 TOTAL LINE ITEM. AND THAT'S OBVIOUSLY ONE
14	OF THE THINGS THAT'S MOST IMPORTANT FOR US TO HAVE
15	QUALITY SCIENCE REVIEWED AND FUNDED.
16	ON THE NEXT PAGE
17	MR. SHEEHY: IT LOOKS TO ME LIKE THE
18	WORKSHOPS ARE BEING CUT. I'M NOT I JUST KNOW
19	YOU KNOW, YOU'VE DONE A GREAT ONE, THE STEM CELL
20	BANKING ONE. YOU KNOW, THESE WORKSHOPS HAVE BEEN
21	TREMENDOUS, AND THEY REALLY DO DRIVE OUR SCIENCE,
22	SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS. ARE WE CUTTING TOO CLOSE TO
23	THE BONE THERE? I JUST BECAUSE I DO THINK THAT
24	THEY'RE YOU KNOW, THEY HAVE PROVIDED SO MUCH OVER
25	THE LAST FEW YEARS. THEY'VE BEEN WELL ATTENDED, AND

1	STAFF HAS DONE A PHENOMENAL JOB, AND THEY HAVE
2	REALLY DRIVEN OUR PROGRAM IN A WAY THAT I DON'T
3	THINK PEOPLE REALLY RECOGNIZE.
4	BUT HAVING SAT THROUGH SOME OF THEM, I
5	JUST THINK WE PROBABLY (INAUDIBLE).
6	DR. TROUNSON: WELL, I THINK, JEFF, THIS
7	IS REASONABLY CLOSE TO ACTUAL IN TERMS OF \$40,000.
8	SO WE'RE WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE NORM FOR WORKSHOPS.
9	SOMETIMES THEY'RE A LITTLE MORE EXPENSIVE, SOMETIMES
10	THEY'RE A LITTLE LESS EXPENSIVE DEPENDING ON WHICH
11	ONES THEY ARE AND HOW MANY PEOPLE WE'RE TRYING TO
12	BRING ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE, FOR EXAMPLE.
13	BUT THE OTHER IMPORTANT, AND WE'VE HAD TO
14	LIMIT THEM BECAUSE THIS IS ONE AREA WHERE WE WERE
15	ASKED TO SORT OF CREATE SOME LIMITS ON IT. AND SO I
16	DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY DOUBT THAT WE CAN DO MORE,
17	BUT IT'S ALSO CHALLENGING FOR US TO BE ABLE TO DO
18	THEM BECAUSE THERE'S A LOT OF WORK INVOLVED. SO
19	THAT'S THE OTHER ASPECT. AND I'M CONSCIOUS OF NOT
20	SORT OF PUSHING THE STAFF REALLY TOO HARD.
21	SO I THINK WE'VE GOT A BALANCE THERE. AND
22	IF I HAD MORE MONEY AVAILABLE, YES, I WOULD DO
23	SEVERAL MORE WORKSHOPS, I THINK, BECAUSE I THINK, AS
24	YOU KNOW, THIS IS REALLY SORT OF PRIMARY WAYS INTO
25	SEEKING ENOUGH INFORMATION ON A SUBJECT TO GET A
	36

1	WHITE PAPER THAT'S SUBSTANTIAL ENOUGH TO ANSWER
2	BROADLY THE QUERIES THAT COME UP AROUND PARTICULARLY
3	NEW AREAS.
4	BUT AS I SAID, WE HAVE A NUMBER IN PLACE.
5	I THINK WE'VE GOT SUFFICIENT, BUT I DID PRESS PAT
6	OLSON VERY HARD OVER THIS AND ALSO ELLEN FEIGAL TO
7	KEEP THEM AT A MINIMUM, BUT STILL ENABLE US TO GET
8	THE OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE OUT OF WHAT WE'RE DOING
9	IN THESE 12 MONTHS. IF WE'RE ABLE TO GET ADDITIONAL
10	FUNDS, LOVE TO DO MAYBE ONE OR TWO MORE, BUT THAT'S
11	REALLY WHERE WE ARE.
12	MR. SHEEHY: I MEAN, YOU KNOW, THIS IS ONE
13	OF OUR BEST VALUES. I MEAN I DON'T KNOW WHAT OUR
14	PROCESS SHOULD BE; BUT IF THERE WAS A PLACE WHERE WE
15	MIGHT WANT TO ADD BACK A LITTLE BIT, THIS WOULD BE
16	ONE THAT I WOULD BE STRONGLY SUPPORTIVE OF. IT'S
17	NOT SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE SEE, THAT'S SO VISIBLE TO
18	FOLKS, BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT REALLY DRIVES OUR
19	SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM. AND NEW SCIENCE IS HAPPENING
20	ALL THE TIME AND IT EDUCATES OUR STAFF. AND IT
21	KEEPS OUR FOLKS ON TOP OF IT. YOU KNOW, IF THERE'S
22	SOME WAY TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT STILL REMAINS A
23	ROBUST FUNCTION, I WOULD BE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THAT.
24	DR. PLUNKETT: JEFF, IF I COULD ADD,
25	THERE'S ACTUALLY A \$100,000 IN WORKSHOPS ON THE

1	DEVELOPMENT TAB AS WELL. AND ADDING THOSE TWO
2	TOGETHER IS ACTUALLY 7,000 MORE THAN THE TOTAL FOR
3	THIS YEAR. SO I THINK WE'RE ACTUALLY PLANNING TO
4	HAVE MAYBE ONE MORE WORKSHOP IN THE COMING YEAR,
5	ALTHOUGH THE COST PER WORKSHOP ACTUALLY REFLECTS THE
6	FACT THAT IT WAS A LITTLE BIT OVERBUDGETED FOR THIS
7	YEAR, SLIGHTLY OVERBUDGETED. SO IN TERMS OF THE
8	NUMBER OF EVENTS, WE'RE NOT PLANNING TO CUT
9	WHATSOEVER.
10	MR. SHEEHY: WELL, IT'S NOT
11	NECESSARILY I KNOW THAT'S AN ACCOUNTING
12	MECHANISM, BUT THE ONES THAT ARE COMING ON IN
13	ELLEN'S SHOP WELL, ELLEN IS JUST GETTING UP TO
14	SPEED. DR. FEIGAL IS JUST GETTING UP TO SPEED. AND
15	THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT YOU KNOW, WE STILL DON'T
16	HAVE A BASICALLY TRANSLATIONAL PORTFOLIO THAT WE'RE
17	DEVELOPING. BUT, AGAIN, I DON'T KNOW IF THE
18	MECHANISM I DON'T WANT TO START TAKING APART THE
19	BUDGET; BUT IF THERE NEEDS TO BE ADVOCACY FROM THIS
20	PARTICULAR ITEM, I'M VERY SUPPORTIVE OF SUPPORTING
21	SCIENTIFIC STAFF TO WHATEVER DEGREE NECESSARY.
22	DR. TROUNSON: AND, AGAIN, I THINK IT'S A
23	VERY IMPORTANT POINT. WE'RE DOING A PARKINSON'S
24	DISEASE WORKSHOP. I THINK IT'S REALLY CRUCIAL. I
25	THINK THERE'S SEVERAL OTHER AREAS THAT WE SHOULD BE

1	DOING AND WE'VE LIMITED THOSE. AND I THINK WE NEED
2	TO DO MORE AND MORE AS WE SORT OF MOVE DOWN INTO
3	CLINICAL TRIALS AREAS TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'VE REALLY
4	GOT WHAT WE REALLY NEED, MOVING FROM TRANSLATION TO
5	CLINICAL TRIAL. SO I DO THINK THERE'S A GOOD
6	ARGUMENT FOR IT. BUT, AGAIN, WE'RE LIMITED WITH
7	WHAT WE CAN DO WITHIN THE TOTAL BUDGET.
8	DR. PLUNKETT: ON THE DEVELOPMENT PAGE
9	DR. JUELSGAARD: THIS IS STEVE JUELSGAARD.
10	MATT, JUST A QUESTION. SO YOU MENTIONED THIS A
11	COUPLE TIMES. IS IT POSSIBLE JUST FOR FUTURE
12	PRESENTATIONS, NOT FOR THIS ONE, BUT TO DO ACTUALS
13	RATHER THAN BUDGET FOR THE PAST YEAR?
14	DR. PLUNKETT: YEAH.
15	DR. JUELSGAARD: THAT'S WHAT WE SHOULD
16	REALLY BE COMPARING.
17	DR. PLUNKETT: RIGHT. I TALKED ABOUT
18	THAT, AND WE DID PUT A FORECAST IN OUR MARCH
19	FINANCIAL REPORT, WHICH WE DIDN'T INCLUDE FOR THIS
20	PRESENTATION. BUT WE CAN CERTAINLY INCLUDE A
21	FORECAST OF FORWARD-LOOKING FINANCIALS GOING
22	FORWARD.
23	DR. JUELSGAARD: WE'RE PRETTY FAR ALONG.
24	DR. PLUNKETT: PART OF THE OTHER
25	CHALLENGE, THOUGH, WAS THAT, GIVEN THAT WE DID THE
	39

1	RECATEGORIZATION FROM YEAR ON YEAR, IT WAS ACTUALLY
2	REALLY CHALLENGING TO ACTUALLY LOOK AT THOUSANDS OF
3	EXPENSES AND ACTUALLY HAVE THEM
4	DR. JUELSGAARD: AND IT MAY NOT BE
5	POSSIBLE RIGHT NOW, BUT FOR FUTURE YEARS IF YOU LINE
6	UP THE ACTUALS WITH THE
7	DR. PLUNKETT: IN FUTURE YEARS IT WILL
8	CERTAINLY BE A LITTLE MORE STRAIGHTFORWARD THAN IT
9	WAS WHEN WE WERE DOING THESE THINGS. BUT THE BIG
10	PICTURE, AGAIN, 16.6 MILLION IS WHAT WE'RE
11	FORECASTING FOR THE SCIENCE.
12	ON THE DEVELOPMENT PAGE, THE ONLY THING
13	i'll highlight is the largest item of \$280,000. The
14	CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL MEETINGS, YOU
15	WILL NOTE THAT THAT'S DOWN FROM THE BUDGET ITEM OF
16	500,000; HOWEVER, I WILL SAY THAT THIS ACTUALLY
17	REFLECTS THE ACTUAL EXPENSES FOR THAT ITEM.
18	NEXT PAGE IS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.
19	ACTUALLY DID SPEND A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME ON THIS
20	THAN THE OTHER ITEMS GOING FORWARD, SO I WON'T DIVE
21	INTO THIS IN ANY GREAT DETAIL IN THE INTEREST OF
22	TIME HERE.
23	IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, REALLY THE
24	BIGGEST SINGLE LINE ITEM IS THE SPONSORSHIP OF THE
25	ONLINE JOURNAL, THE SECOND OF, I BELIEVE, THREE

1	YEARS FOR THAT PROGRAM. SO THAT IS AN EXPENSE THAT
2	WE EXPECT WILL GO AWAY THE YEAR AFTER NEXT.
3	SIMILARLY, IN THE OFFICE OF THE CHAIR, WE
4	EXPECT TO PAY THE LAST \$300,000 FOR THE IOM REVIEW
5	IN THE 1213 YEAR. AND, AGAIN, THAT IS AN EXPENSE
6	WHERE WE DON'T CURRENTLY EXPECT TO HAVE THAT ON A
7	RECURRING ANNUAL BASIS.
8	ON THE PUBLIC COMMUNICATION BUDGET, THIS
9	IS ONE WHERE THE ACTUALS FOR THE YEAR ARE
10	ACTUALLY MY SENSE IS THEY'RE ACTUALLY GOING TO BE
11	PRETTY CLOSE TO THE BUDGET NEXT YEAR OF \$1.0
12	MILLION. YOU CAN SEE THAT IT'S DOWN ABOUT \$300,000
13	ON YEAR ON YEAR, BUT THIS IS ONE WHERE, DUE TO
14	THINGS LIKE MARIA HAS IDENTIFIED A TREMENDOUS COST
15	SAVINGS IN THE ANNUAL REPORT, WHICH WILL BE SAVING
16	US TENS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, HAVING KEVIN AND
17	THE TEAM REALLY ABLE TO DO SOME STUFF WHICH WE
18	FULFILL WITH MORE EXPENSIVE OUTSIDE CONTRACTORS AND
19	SO FORTH. I THINK IT'S THE EXPECTATION OF EVERYBODY
20	THAT WE'LL GET A LOT MORE BANG FOR THE BUCK ON THIS
21	ITEM.
22	ON FINANCE AND OPERATIONS, I ALREADY
23	MENTIONED THAT WE WON'T HAVE THE PERFORMANCE AUDIT
24	EXPENSE IN THE COMING FISCAL YEAR. AND THEN SOME
25	ADDITIONAL TRIMS HERE AND THERE RESULT IN THE

_	
1	OVERALL BUDGET OF THE 1.49 MILLION FOR THAT GROUP.
2	AND THEN, FINALLY, LEGAL, AND I THINK WE
3	DID DISCUSS THAT AT LENGTH ALREADY.
4	SO THAT'S WHAT I HAVE FOR PREPARED
5	MATERIALS. IF THERE'S QUESTIONS, I'D LIKE TO FIELD
6	THOSE AT THIS TIME.
7	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: ANY QUESTIONS FROM
8	MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO MATT ON THE SPECIFIC
9	DETAIL? HEARING NONE, WE'LL ASK MEMBERS OF THE
10	PUBLIC. HEARING NONE, I'D LIKE TO ASK MARIA, DO WE
11	HAVE A QUORUM.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: I BELIEVE WE HAVE A
13	QUORUM, YES.
14	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: OKAY. SO I'D LIKE TO
15	RETURN TO ITEM NO. 3, WHICH WAS THE PROPOSED
16	AMENDMENTS TO THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MISSION
17	STATEMENT. THERE WAS PREVIOUSLY A MOTION AND A
18	SECOND TO APPROVE THOSE AMENDMENTS. DO WE HAVE
19	IS THAT MOTION STILL IN FORCE.
20	DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
21	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: IS THE SECOND STILL IN
22	FORCE?
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, SIR.
24	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: OKAY. WE JUST DO A
25	ROLL CALL. SO THE MOTION, JAMES, WILL YOU RECOUNT
	42
	74

_	BARRISTERS REPORTING SERVICE
1	THE MOTION?
2	MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION IS TO APPROVE
3	RECOMMENDING TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE
4	AMENDMENTS TO THE MISSION STATEMENT OF THE FINANCE
5	SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE BOARD.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT BIRGENEAU. MARCY
7	FEIT.
8	MS. FEIT: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
10	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
12	DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: TED LOVE.
14	DR. LOVE: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.
16	DR. PIZZO: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH.
18	MR. ROTH: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
20	JEFF SHEEHY.
21	MR. SHEEHY: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN
23	THOMAS.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
	43
	19

1	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THE MOTION PASSES.
2	I'D LIKE TO NOW MOVE TO ITEM NO. 4, AND IS
3	THERE A MOTION FOR APPROVAL FOR A RECOMMENDATION OF
4	THIS BUDGET TO THE ICOC WITH SOME OF THE PROVISOS
5	THAT WE DISCUSSED IN OPEN SESSION?
6	DR. JUELSGAARD: I SO MOVE.
7	DR. PIZZO: WHAT DOES A VOTE MEAN? THIS
8	IS OUR VOTE FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE SUPPORTING
9	IT, IS THAT THE POINT?
10	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THAT'S CORRECT.
11	DR. PIZZO: OKAY.
12	MR. ROTH: SO I'LL SECOND IT.
13	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: OKAY. ANY FURTHER
14	COMMENT? ROLL CALL, PLEASE.
15	DR. PIZZO: HOW ABOUT PUBLIC COMMENT?
16	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: I'M SORRY. WE ASKED
17	FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, DIDN'T HEAR ANY. IF THERE IS
18	PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE. HEARING NO PUBLIC COMMENT,
19	WE'RE GOING TO ASK FOR ROLL CALL.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT BIRGENEAU. MARCY
21	FEIT.
22	MS. FEIT: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
24	CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
	44

```
1
                DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
 2
                MS. BONNEVILLE: TED LOVE.
 3
                DR. LOVE: YES.
 4
               MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.
 5
                DR. PIZZO: YES.
 6
               MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH.
 7
               MR. ROTH: YES.
 8
               MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
 9
     JEFF SHEEHY.
10
               MR. SHEEHY: YES.
11
               MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN
12
     THOMAS.
13
               CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
14
               MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
15
               CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: THE MOTION PASSES.
16
               THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE
17
     COMMITTEE, I MOVE ADJOURNMENT. WE'RE ADJOURNED.
18
     THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.
19
                     (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
                               45
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON APRIL 2, 2012, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

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