

BEFORE THE  
SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL FACILITIES WORKING GROUP  
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE  
FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
210 KING STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DATE: APRIL 13, 2007  
10 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 77577

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

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		3
WELCOME & CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS		4
PRESENTATION ON FACILITIES WORKING GROUP CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGULATIONS		10
PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED PROCESS FOR REVIEWING RFA-07-01 - SHARED RESEARCH LABORATORIES AND TECHNIQUES COURSE GRANT APPLICATIONS		17
BRIEFING AND DISCUSSION OF ICOC'S INPUT ON CONCEPT PLAN FOR LARGE FACILITIES GRANTS		139
ADJOURNMENT		219

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 2007

2 10 A.M.

3

4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, LET'S GET STARTED. AND  
5 I'M GOING TO CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER, AND LET ME  
6 WELCOME YOU. THIS IS A MEETING OF THE FACILITIES  
7 WORKING GROUP FOR THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF  
8 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. I WANT TO THANK OUR WORKING  
9 GROUP MEMBERS FOR TAKING TIME TO ATTEND TODAY, AND I'D  
10 ALSO LIKE TO THANK THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR  
11 PARTICIPATING IN WHAT I THINK IS AN IMPORTANT MEETING.  
12 SHERRY LANSING AND BOB KLEIN COULD NOT BE HERE, BUT  
13 THEY WILL BE JOINING US BY TELEPHONE AT VARIOUS TIMES  
14 TODAY. PAT, WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

15 MS. BECKER: MARCY FEIT.

16 MS. FEIT: HERE.

17 MS. BECKER: SHERRY LANSING.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: SHERRY WILL BE ON THE  
19 PHONE IN ABOUT TEN MINUTES.

20 MS. BECKER: THANK YOU. JOAN SAMUELSON.

21 DR. HALL: MY UNDERSTANDING IS JOAN IS HERE  
22 AND WILL BE HERE MOMENTARILY.

23 MS. BECKER: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL. JEFF  
24 SHEEHY.

25 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

1 MS. BECKER: JANET WRIGHT.  
2 DR. WRIGHT: HERE.  
3 MS. BECKER: ROBERT KLEIN. RUSTY DOMS.  
4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: HERE.  
5 MS. BECKER: DEBORAH HYSEN.  
6 MS. HYSEN: HERE.  
7 MS. BECKER: ED KASHIAN.  
8 MR. KASHIAN: HERE.  
9 MS. BECKER: DAVID LICHTENGER.  
10 MR. LICHTENGER: HERE.  
11 MS. BECKER: THANK YOU.  
12 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANKS, PAT. I'D LIKE TO  
13 START BY INTRODUCING THE CIRM STAFF THAT ARE PRESENT  
14 TODAY. ZACH HALL, OUR PRESIDENT AND CHIEF SCIENTIFIC  
15 OFFICER; LORI HOFFMAN, CHIEF FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATIVE  
16 OFFICER; ARLENE CHIU, DIRECTOR OF SCIENTIFIC  
17 ACTIVITIES; AND RICK KELLER, OUR SENIOR OFFICER FOR  
18 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.  
19 I THINK SINCE OUR LAST PUBLIC MEETING,  
20 ARLENE -- I'M SORRY -- LORI AND RICK ARE NEW TO THE  
21 STAFF. THEY ARE WONDERFUL ADDITIONS TO THE STAFF.  
22 WE HAVE TWO IMPORTANT ITEMS FOR OUR MEETING  
23 TODAY. THE FIRST IS THAT WE NEED TO DISCUSS THE  
24 PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING THE GRANT  
25 APPLICATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE SHARED

1 RESEARCH LABORATORIES AND STEM CELL TECHNIQUES COURSE  
2 GRANTS RFA. WE WILL BE MEETING AGAIN ON MAY 2D TO  
3 CONDUCT THE ACTUAL REVIEW. TODAY'S DISCUSSION WILL  
4 HELP YOU UNDERSTAND HOW MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES  
5 WORKING GROUP WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THIS REVIEW PROCESS.

6 WHEN WE'VE FINISHED OUR REVIEW, WE WILL BE  
7 RECOMMENDING FUNDING TO PROVIDE UP TO 15 SHARED  
8 LABORATORIES FOR SUPPORTING REGIONAL NEEDS IN CULTURING  
9 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS, AND WE WILL BE RECOMMENDING  
10 FIVE SITES WHERE STEM CELL TECHNIQUES COURSES WILL BE  
11 HELD. I EXPECT THAT THE DISCUSSION OF THE REVIEW  
12 PROCESS WILL TAKE UP MOST OF THE MORNING. WE'LL THEN  
13 BREAK FOR LUNCH. WHEN WE RECONVENE, WE WILL PROCEED TO  
14 DISCUSS THE SECOND AGENDA ITEM, A BRIEFING AND  
15 DISCUSSION OF THE ICOC'S INPUT ON A CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR  
16 FACILITIES GRANTS, WHICH WILL BE LARGER GRANTS.

17 BOB KLEIN WILL BE JOINING US BY TELEPHONE  
18 LATER IN THIS DISCUSSION. THE MEETING TODAY IS OPEN TO  
19 THE PUBLIC. MORNING, DAVID.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MORNING.

21 CHAIRMAN DOMS: IN A FEW MINUTES I WILL  
22 INVITE ANYONE WHO WISHES TO ADDRESS THE WORKING GROUP  
23 TO COME FORWARD. BEFORE THE PUBLIC'S COMMENTS, I WANT  
24 TO MAKE A BRIEF STATEMENT REGARDING THE WORK OF THIS  
25 GROUP. THE MEMBERS OF THIS WORKING GROUP WILL BE

1 COLLABORATING IN THIS PROCESS WITH THE GOAL OF  
2 PROVIDING RECOMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, TO THE  
3 ICOC. THE WORKING GROUP -- THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
4 HAS ALREADY MET TO REVIEW THESE PROPOSALS TO DETERMINE  
5 SCIENTIFIC MERIT. THE MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES  
6 WORKING GROUP DO NOT KNOW THE SCORE THAT WAS GIVEN BY  
7 THE GRANTS GROUP. WE WILL NOT KNOW THAT SCORE UNTIL  
8 AFTER WE HAVE EVALUATED AND SCORED THESE APPLICATIONS.  
9 SO THERE WILL BE NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST. WE WILL NOT  
10 HAVE ANY IDEA HOW THE GRANTS GROUPS HAS SCORED THESE  
11 APPLICATIONS, SO IT WILL NOT INFLUENCE IN ANY WAY OUR  
12 REVIEW FROM A FACILITIES STANDPOINT.

13 MR. SHEEHY: COULD I MAKE A COMMENT ON IT?

14 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YEAH.

15 MR. SHEEHY: THAT'S NOT ACCURATE. I KNOW THE  
16 SCORES. AND ANYBODY -- SO HOW -- AND IT WILL INFLUENCE  
17 HOW I SCORE.

18 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, WE'LL GET INTO THE  
19 PROCESS LATER.

20 MR. SHEEHY: BUT ALL THE PATIENT ADVOCATES  
21 CAN SEE AND REALLY WOULD KNOW THE SCORES.

22 DR. HALL: THOSE WHO ARE -- I DON'T KNOW THAT  
23 ALL ARE. MAYBE THEY ALL ARE, BUT THOSE ON THE --

24 MR. SHEEHY: NOT ALL PARTICIPATED, BUT ALL  
25 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEMBERS MUST SERVE ON THE

1 GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: OKAY. I MISSPOKE THERE. THE  
3 REAL ESTATE, THE FOUR REAL ESTATE MEMBERS OF THIS  
4 GROUP, WHO WILL BE THE PRIMARY REVIEWERS FOR THESE  
5 GRANTS, WILL NOT KNOW THE SCIENTIFIC SCORES. THANK  
6 YOU.

7 MR. SHEEHY: SORRY.

8 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I WAS THINKING OF THE REAL  
9 ESTATE PEOPLE. THE REAL ESTATE PEOPLE WHO WILL DO THE  
10 PRIMARY REVIEWS WILL NOT KNOW THE SCORE FROM THE  
11 SCIENTIFIC GROUP.

12 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP WILL BE  
13 EVALUATING THE SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE APPLICATIONS  
14 CONSISTENT WITH THE PROCESS THAT WAS DEVELOPED BY THE  
15 WORKING GROUP AND APPROVED BY THE ICOC. ONE OF THE  
16 IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THIS WORKING GROUP, THE  
17 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, AND THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
18 IS THAT OUR REVIEW WILL BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.

19 I ALSO WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT DISCUSSIONS IN  
20 THIS ROOM AMONG MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP  
21 ARE TO BE FRANK AND HONEST. EACH PERSON ON THE WORKING  
22 GROUP IS ENTITLED TO VOICE THEIR OPINION ON THE  
23 BUSINESS OF THE WORKING GROUP.

24 I BELIEVE THAT IN THE COURSE OF CONDUCTING  
25 THIS BUSINESS, SOMETIMES THERE WILL BE CONCURRENCE AND

1       SOMETIMES THERE WILL BE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION. I  
2       DON'T WANT ANYBODY TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT SPEAKING THEIR  
3       MIND BECAUSE THEY MAY HAVE -- THEY MAY BE OFFENDED  
4       BY -- THINK THEY MAY OFFEND SOME PEOPLE BY THEIR  
5       REMARKS. I BELIEVE THAT FREE EXPRESSION OF YOUR  
6       OPINIONS, OUR OPINIONS, IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE WORK TO BE  
7       CREDIBLE AND OF VALUE TO THE ICOC.

8                SO AS WE GO THROUGH THIS, I'M SURE MEMBERS OF  
9       THE WORKING GROUP WILL EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS. AND AS  
10      I SAID, THERE WILL BE SOME DIFFERENCES OF OPINION, AND  
11      WE'LL WORK THROUGH THOSE.

12               THOSE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO ARE ATTENDING  
13      TODAY'S MEETING, I WANT TO, AGAIN, ADVISE YOU OF THE  
14      ROLE OF THIS WORKING GROUP. THIS ROLE IS TO MAKE  
15      RECOMMENDATIONS ALONG WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
16      REGARDING THESE APPLICATIONS. THE ICOC CAN EITHER  
17      APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OR MAKE CHANGE TO THE  
18      RECOMMENDATIONS. NOT UNTIL THE BOARD ACTS WILL THERE  
19      BE A DECISION MADE ON THE FUNDING OF THESE  
20      APPLICATIONS. THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO  
21      ADDRESS THE ICO REGARDING THESE APPLICATIONS AT THEIR  
22      JUNE 5TH MEETING.

23               IN ORDER TO COMPLETE OUR WORK IN AN EFFICIENT  
24      MANNER TODAY, I WOULD INVITE ANYONE WHO WISHES TO  
25      ADDRESS THE GROUP TO COME FORWARD, AND I'LL MENTION THE

1 APPROPRIATE TIMES. IN ADDITION, WE WILL BE ALLOWING  
2 COMMENTS TO BE MADE ON INDIVIDUAL AGENDA ITEMS. I  
3 WOULD ASK MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO KEEP THEIR COMMENTS  
4 BRIEF AND TO THE POINT. IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, I  
5 WOULD ASK YOU TO RESPECTFULLY TRY TO KEEP YOUR COMMENTS  
6 TO THREE MINUTES OR LESS.

7 NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK THOSE WHO WISH TO  
8 ADDRESS THIS GROUP FROM THE PUBLIC AT THIS TIME TO  
9 RAISE THEIR HANDS. OKAY. SEEING NO ONE, HEARING NO  
10 ONE, WE'LL CONTINUE TO MOVE ON. SO WE'LL MOVE ON TO  
11 AGENDA ITEM NO. 5.

12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: CHAIRMAN DOMS,  
13 BEFORE WE GET TO THAT, AND THIS MAY HAVE BEEN IN YOUR  
14 REPORT, AND I APOLOGIZE, COLLEAGUES, FOR COMING IN A  
15 FEW MINUTES LATE. BUT TO THE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS ON  
16 THE COMMITTEE WHO MAY NOT HAVE HEARD SOME EXCITING  
17 NEWS, YOU PROBABLY CAUGHT IT IN THE PRESS ACCOUNTS, THE  
18 GRANTING OF OUR SEED AND COMPREHENSIVE, WHICH WAS VERY  
19 EXCITING. WE HAD THE PRESENCE OF BOTH THE GOVERNOR AT  
20 ONE EVENT AND THE SPEAKER AND THE MAYOR OF LOS ANGELES  
21 AT ANOTHER EVENT. IT WAS REALLY QUITE POSITIVE.

22 WE RECENTLY REASSEMBLED -- RECONVENED,  
23 RATHER, THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE. DR. HALL  
24 HAS ANNOUNCED THAT HE IS RETIRING. WE ARE AGGRESSIVELY  
25 LOOKING FOR A SUCCESSOR, AND WE HOPE TO HAVE A NAME TO

1 THE ICOC WITHIN THE NEXT -- WELL, SHORTLY. WE HAVE A  
2 LIST. WE'RE GOING TO GET THAT LIST, INTERVIEW THE  
3 CANDIDATES, AND FIND SOMEONE TO FILL ZACH'S SHOES.

4 SO THOSE ARE THE UPDATES. THE COLLEAGUES ARE  
5 EAGER TO SEE WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO TODAY, I THINK,  
6 RUSTY.

7 CHAIRMAN DOMS: IT WILL BE AN INTERESTING  
8 DAY. THANK YOU, DAVID.

9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SURE.

10 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE'LL MOVE ON TO AGENDA ITEM  
11 NO. 5, WHICH IS PRESENTATION ON FACILITIES WORKING  
12 GROUP CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGULATIONS. I'D LIKE TO  
13 INTRODUCE JAMES HARRISON OF REMCHO, JOHANSON & PURCELL  
14 TO GIVE US A BRIEF PRESENTATION ON THESE CONFLICT OF  
15 INTEREST REGULATIONS THAT ARE PERTINENT TO THE  
16 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP.

17 MR. HARRISON: THANKS, RUSTY. GOOD MORNING,  
18 EVERYONE. I KNOW THIS IS PROBABLY NOT THE MOST  
19 EXCITING TOPIC, SO WE'LL TRY TO GET IT DONE QUICKLY.  
20 BUT IT IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE, OF COURSE, EVERYTHING THAT  
21 THE CIRM DOES IS SUBJECT TO GREAT SCRUTINY. SO IT'S  
22 IMPORTANT THAT WE CONDUCT OURSELVES IN A WAY THAT  
23 ENSURES THAT GRANTS ARE AWARDED IN A FAIR, OPEN MANNER  
24 THAT IS FREE FROM CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

25 SO WITH THAT IN MIND, I WANT TO BRIEFLY

1 DESCRIBE TO YOU WHAT THE RULES ARE THAT ARE APPLICABLE  
2 TO YOU AS MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP.  
3 FIRST OF ALL, THIS GROUP IS PURELY ADVISORY, AS RUSTY  
4 POINTED OUT. IT HAS THE POWER ONLY TO MAKE  
5 RECOMMENDATIONS. ULTIMATELY THE ICOC, UNDER  
6 PROPOSITION 71, IS THE FINAL DECISION MAKER. AS A  
7 RESULT, THE NON-ICOC MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING  
8 GROUP ARE NOT GOVERNED BY CALIFORNIA'S CONFLICT OF  
9 INTEREST LAWS. TO AVOID A GAP, THE ICOC HAS ADOPTED  
10 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STANDARDS THAT WILL APPLY TO YOU  
11 IN YOUR REVIEW OF THE APPLICATIONS. AND THESE  
12 STANDARDS ARE MODELED ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICIES  
13 ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND THE  
14 CALIFORNIA SPECIAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.

15 THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY THAT THE ICOC  
16 HAS ADOPTED REQUIRES THAT YOU DISCLOSE CERTAIN  
17 FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ALSO REQUIRES THAT YOU  
18 DISQUALIFY YOURSELF FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE  
19 CONSIDERATION OF AN APPLICATION IN THE EVENT THAT YOU  
20 HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE  
21 HERE THAT THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICIES THAT THE  
22 ICOC HAS ADOPTED TO GOVERN YOUR CONDUCT ACTUALLY GO  
23 BEYOND THE REQUIREMENTS OF STATE LAW. STATE LAW COVERS  
24 ONLY FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. AGAIN, TO ENSURE  
25 THAT THIS PROCESS IS FREE OF BIAS, THE CONFLICT OF

1 INTEREST POLICIES THAT APPLY TO YOU ALSO COVER  
2 PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

3 IN ORDER TO AVOID POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF  
4 INTEREST, THE ICOC HAS ADOPTED A POLICY THAT REQUIRES  
5 YOU TO DISCLOSE CERTAIN FINANCIAL INTERESTS. ALTHOUGH  
6 THESE DISCLOSURES ARE CONFIDENTIAL IN THE SENSE THAT  
7 YOUR FORMS WILL BE MAINTAINED IN CONFIDENCE HERE AND  
8 WILL NOT BE SUBJECT TO A PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST,  
9 THEY ARE AVAILABLE FOR AUDIT TO ENSURE THAT NO  
10 DECISIONS WERE MADE WHEN A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WAS  
11 PRESENT AND, IF THAT HAPPENS, TO TAKE REMEDIAL ACTION.

12 LET'S TALK BRIEFLY ABOUT WHAT YOU'RE REQUIRED  
13 TO DISCLOSE THEN. YOU ARE REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE CURRENT  
14 INCOME OR OTHER BENEFITS OF \$5,000 OR MORE THAT YOU  
15 RECEIVE, YOUR SPOUSE RECEIVES, OR OTHERS WITH WHOM YOU  
16 HAVE A COMMON FINANCIAL INTEREST RECEIVE FROM A  
17 CALIFORNIA-BASED ACADEMIC OR NONPROFIT RESEARCH  
18 INSTITUTION. YOU'RE ALSO REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE INCOME  
19 OR OTHER BENEFITS OF \$5,000 OR MORE, AGAIN, RECEIVED BY  
20 YOU, YOUR SPOUSE, OR SOMEONE WITH WHOM YOU HAVE A  
21 COMMON FINANCIAL INTEREST, FROM A CONSTRUCTION, REAL  
22 ESTATE, OR DEVELOPMENT FIRM. AND FINALLY, YOU'RE  
23 REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE REAL PROPERTY INTERESTS IN  
24 CALIFORNIA THAT ARE EITHER HELD BY YOU, YOUR SPOUSE, OR  
25 OTHERS WITH WHOM YOU HAVE A COMMON FINANCIAL INTEREST.

1 TO ENSURE THE INTEGRITY OF THIS PROCESS, THE  
2 CIRM POLICIES ALSO REQUIRE THAT YOU SIGN A PREREVIEW  
3 CERTIFICATION, WHICH IDENTIFIES ANY CONFLICTS OF  
4 INTEREST YOU HAVE, AS WELL AS A POSTREVIEW  
5 CERTIFICATION THAT MAKES CLEAR THAT YOU HAVE NOT  
6 PARTICIPATED IN ANY DECISIONS IN WHICH YOU HAVE A  
7 CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

8 THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY ALSO INCLUDES  
9 CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS. SOME OF THESE ARE REFLECTED IN  
10 PROP 71 ITSELF, AND SOME OF THEM HAVE BEEN ADDED BY THE  
11 ICOC, SO LET ME BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THOSE.

12 MEMBERS OF THIS WORKING GROUP ARE PROHIBITED  
13 FROM RECEIVING COMPENSATION FROM ANY CONSTRUCTION OR  
14 DEVELOPMENT ENTITY THAT PROVIDES SPECIALIZED SERVICES  
15 FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES. YOU'RE ALSO  
16 PROHIBITED FROM PROVIDING REAL ESTATE FACILITIES  
17 BROKERAGE SERVICES FOR ANY APPLICANT FOR OR RECIPIENT  
18 OF CIRM FUNDING. YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM RECEIVING  
19 COMPENSATION FROM ANY RECIPIENT OF CIRM FUNDING. AND  
20 THIS IS THE ONE WE'RE GOING TO FOCUS ON THE MOST.  
21 YOU'RE PROHIBITED FROM PARTICIPATING IN A DECISION OF  
22 THIS WORKING GROUP IN WHICH YOU HAVE A CONFLICT OF  
23 INTEREST. AND A CONFLICT OF INTEREST IS DEFINED AS  
24 EXISTING WHEN YOU HAVE A REAL OR APPARENT INTEREST IN  
25 THE OUTCOME OF AN APPLICATION SUCH THAT YOU'RE IN A

1 POSITION TO GAIN EITHER FINANCIALLY, PROFESSIONALLY, OR  
2 PERSONALLY FROM A POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE EVALUATION OF  
3 THE PROPOSAL.

4 LET'S FLESH THAT OUT A LITTLE BIT. A  
5 FINANCIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ARISES WHEN YOU, YOUR  
6 SOUSE, OR A PERSON WITH WHOM YOU HAVE A COMMON  
7 FINANCIAL INTEREST, ONE, IS AN EMPLOYEE OF ANY  
8 CONSTRUCTION, REAL ESTATE, OR DEVELOPMENT ENTITY ON AN  
9 APPLICATION; TWO, IS UNDER ACTIVE CONSIDERATION FOR  
10 EMPLOYMENT BY AN APPLICANT INSTITUTION; THREE, STANDS  
11 TO RECEIVE A FINANCIAL BENEFIT OF ANY AMOUNT FROM AN  
12 APPLICATION THAT'S UNDER REVIEW; AND, FOUR, HAS  
13 RECEIVED OR COULD RECEIVE A FINANCIAL BENEFIT OF ANY  
14 TYPE OVER \$5,000 PER YEAR FROM AN APPLICANT INSTITUTION  
15 UNRELATED TO THE PROPOSAL.

16 WHAT THAT'S REALLY INTENDED TO GET AT IS ANY  
17 FEES OR HONORARIA THAT YOU MIGHT RECEIVE FROM AN  
18 APPLICANT'S INSTITUTION THAT HAS NOTHING WHATSOEVER TO  
19 DO WITH THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED HERE, BUT,  
20 NONETHELESS, COULD CREATE AN APPEARANCE OF A CONFLICT  
21 OF INTEREST.

22 I WANT TO BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHAT A  
23 PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST IS. UNDER THE  
24 POLICY, A PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST OCCURS WHEN  
25 YOU AS A MEMBER OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP AND A

1 PROJECT DIRECTOR OF AN APPLICANT ARE EITHER ENGAGED  
2 CURRENTLY OR ARE PLANNING TO BE ENGAGED IN A JOINT  
3 PROJECT, OR IF YOU HAVE BEEN ENGAGED IN A JOINT PROJECT  
4 WITH A PROJECT DIRECTOR OR AN APPLICATION IN THE LAST  
5 THREE YEARS. AND UNDER OUR POLICY, A PROJECT DIRECTOR  
6 IS DEFINED TO BE AN INDIVIDUAL DESIGNATED BY THE  
7 APPLICANT TO DIRECT THE PROJECT THAT WOULD BE SUPPORTED  
8 BY THE GRANT OR LOAN THAT YOU ARE CONSIDERING.

9 YOU ALSO HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST UNDER  
10 CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES WHEN YOU HAVE A PERSONAL INTEREST  
11 IN AN APPLICATION, AND THAT'S DEFINED IN THE FOLLOWING  
12 MANNER: PERSONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ARISES WHEN YOU  
13 HAVE CLOSE PERSONAL TIES TO THE PROJECT DIRECTOR FOR  
14 THE APPLICANT INSTITUTION, FOR EXAMPLE, OR WHEN YOU  
15 SERVE IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY TO THE APPLICANT  
16 INSTITUTION OR ANY OF ITS DEPARTMENTS OR AFFILIATED  
17 ASSOCIATIONS. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU SERVE ON THE  
18 ALUMNI ASSOCIATION BOARD, THAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED TO  
19 BE A PERSONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST. A PERSONAL  
20 CONFLICT OF INTEREST ALSO ARISES WHEN YOU HAVE AN  
21 IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER WHO'S A CURRENT STUDENT OR  
22 FACULTY MEMBER OF AN APPLICANT INSTITUTION, OR IF YOU  
23 HAVE LONG-STANDING PERSONAL OR PROFESSIONAL DIFFERENCES  
24 WITH THE PROJECT DIRECTOR FOR THE APPLICANT  
25 INSTITUTION.

1                   UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN, YOU'RE  
2                   REQUIRED TO DISQUALIFY YOURSELF FROM PARTICIPATING IN  
3                   CONSIDERATION OF ANY DECISION THAT COMES BEFORE YOU.  
4                   WHEN YOU HAVE ANY OF THE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST THAT I  
5                   JUST ENUMERATED, FINANCIAL, PROFESSIONAL, OR PERSONAL,  
6                   YOU'RE REQUIRED TO REFRAIN FROM PARTICIPATING IN ANY  
7                   CONSIDERATION OF THE APPLICATION IN WHICH YOU HAVE A  
8                   CONFLICT OF INTEREST. AND WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT  
9                   YOU'RE NOT ONLY FORBIDDEN FROM REVIEWING THE  
10                  APPLICATION AS A PRIMARY OR SECONDARY REVIEWER, BUT  
11                  YOU'RE ALSO REQUIRED TO LEAVE THE ROOM WHEN THAT  
12                  APPLICATION IS DISCUSSED AND TO REFRAIN FROM  
13                  PARTICIPATING IN ANY CONSIDERATION OF IT, INCLUDING THE  
14                  SCORING OF THE APPLICATION.

15                  UNDER EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THE  
16                  PRESIDENT OF THE CIRM HAS THE AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE  
17                  THAT THE NEED FOR YOUR SPECIAL EXPERTISE OUTWEIGHS THE  
18                  APPEARANCE OR POSSIBLE BIAS THAT'S POSED BY THE  
19                  CONFLICT OF INTEREST. AND THAT WILL PROBABLY ARISE  
20                  ONLY IN EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES, BUT IT IS A POLICY  
21                  THAT WE HAVE IN PLACE, AGAIN, TO GET YOUR SPECIALIZED  
22                  EXPERTISE WHEN IT'S ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL.

23                  SO THAT'S A VERY BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE RULES.  
24                  ONE OF THE THINGS TO KEEP IN MIND IS THAT THE  
25                  APPLICATION OF THESE RULES IS VERY FACT SPECIFIC. AND

1 THE MOST IMPORTANT ADVICE I CAN GIVE YOU IS TO REALLY  
2 TRY TO BE AWARE OF WHAT YOUR FINANCIAL INTERESTS ARE;  
3 AND IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS WHATSOEVER ABOUT WHETHER  
4 UNDER OUR POLICY YOU MIGHT HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST,  
5 PLEASE PAUSE BEFORE ACTING. STOP AND ASK QUESTIONS AND  
6 WE'LL RESOLVE IT TO ENSURE THAT THIS PROCESS IS AS FREE  
7 OF BIAS AND AS FAIR AS POSSIBLE. I'D BE HAPPY TO  
8 ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAVE.

9 CHAIRMAN DOMS: VERY COMPREHENSIVE.

10 MR. HARRISON: THANK YOU.

11 DR. WRIGHT: RUSTY, THIS MIGHT BE A TIME -- I  
12 MEANT TO SAY THIS EARLIER, BUT I REALLY NEED TO SAY IT  
13 NOW, THAT THE BOARD WANTS TO THANK THE MEMBERS OF THE  
14 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP FOR VOLUNTEERING. I BET  
15 YOU'VE NEVER VOLUNTEERED FOR SOMETHING WITH THIS MANY  
16 STRINGS ATTACHED. BUT WE ARE VERY APPRECIATIVE OF ALL  
17 THE TIME AND EFFORT AND YOUR EXPERTISE TO MAKE THIS  
18 HAPPEN.

19 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU, JAMES.

20 THE NEXT AGENDA ITEM, AGENDA ITEM 6, IS  
21 PRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROCESS FOR REVIEWING THE  
22 RFA'S FOR THE SHARED LABORATORIES AND STEM CELL  
23 TECHNIQUES COURSE GRANT APPLICATIONS. THIS IS  
24 SOMETHING THAT WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON WITH STAFF OVER  
25 THE PAST SEVERAL MONTHS. AND I'M GOING TO ASK RICK

1 KELLER, WHO I INTRODUCED EARLIER, TO MAKE THE  
2 PRESENTATION. HE WILL MAKE THE PRESENTATION. THEN  
3 WE'LL OPEN IT UP FOR COMMENTS, REVIEWS, CONCERNS,  
4 WHATEVER IS ON THE MIND OF THE WORKING GROUP.

5 I WANT TO STRESS THAT WHEN WE DID THIS, WE  
6 HAD -- THESE ARE INTERIM PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA. AS I  
7 SAID EARLIER, WE WILL BE TALKING THIS AFTERNOON ABOUT,  
8 ON A VERY CONCEPTUAL BASIS, LARGE GRANTS. THESE GRANTS  
9 ON THE RENOVATION OF LAB SPACE ARE \$1 MILLION OR LESS.  
10 WE'RE TALKING ABOUT 15 GRANTS, IF THEY MEET THE  
11 CRITERIA, BEING APPROVED. SO WE'RE LOOKING AT \$15  
12 MILLION OR LESS IN THIS AREA.

13 SO HE'S GOING TO MAKE THE PRESENTATION, AND  
14 THEN WE'RE GOING TO OPEN IT UP AMONGST THE WORKING  
15 GROUP FOR COMMENTS AND CONCERNS AND DISCUSSION.

16 MR. SHEEHY: JUST IN FUTURE, CAN WE GET THIS  
17 IN ADVANCE SO THAT WE GET TO REVIEW IT BEFORE BECAUSE  
18 IT'S KIND OF HARD.

19 MS. HYSEN: THAT WOULD BE NICE.

20 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES. I THINK THAT'S AN  
21 EXCELLENT POINT. WE'RE LEARNING AS WE GO ALONG.

22 MR. SHEEHY: EXACTLY. I CAN TELL YOU I CAN  
23 WRITE A NOVEL.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE'VE BEEN WORKING ON GETTING  
25 IT THERE. YOU WILL RECEIVE IT IN ADVANCE. I GUARANTEE

1 YOU THAT.

2 MR. KELLER: THANK YOU, RUSTY. I THINK THIS  
3 IS -- HOPE THIS WILL BE JUST MORE CLARIFICATION OF  
4 THINGS THAT YOU'VE ALREADY BEEN MADE AWARE OF IN TERMS  
5 OF THE RFA THAT'S POSTED ON THE WEBSITE AND SOME OF THE  
6 BACKGROUND MATERIALS THAT HAVE BEEN AVAILABLE.

7 LET ME START BY SAYING THERE'S THREE  
8 COMPONENTS THAT WE WANT TO TALK ABOUT TODAY. THE  
9 TECHNICAL REVIEW IS ACTUALLY THE IDEA THAT WE HAVE  
10 THESE APPLICATIONS AND THERE ARE SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF  
11 THOSE APPLICATIONS THAT NEED TO BE EVALUATED. WE'RE  
12 CALLING THAT THE TECHNICAL REVIEW, AND THEN THOSE WOULD  
13 BE SCORED. AFTER THERE HAS BEEN A TECHNICAL REVIEW,  
14 THERE WILL BE A PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WHICH, I LIKE TO  
15 SAY, KIND OF DEALS WITH THE PORTFOLIO OF YOUR  
16 RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC. AND WHILE THAT'S BEEN  
17 FOCUSING ON THE SHARED LABS, THERE'S ALSO THIS NOTION  
18 THAT WITH SEVERAL, NOT ALL PROPOSALS, BUT ABOUT NINE OF  
19 THE 22 PROPOSALS, EXACTLY NINE OF THE 22 PROPOSALS WE  
20 RECEIVED, INCLUDES A PROPOSAL FOR A STEM CELL  
21 TECHNIQUES COURSE, AND THE INTENTION IS TO FUND FIVE OF  
22 THOSE AS WELL.

23 MR. LICHTENGER: WHEN YOU SAY TECHNICAL, CAN  
24 YOU BE A LITTLE MORE SPECIFIC?

25 MR. KELLER: WELL, I THINK THE TECHNICAL

1 REVIEW IS THE SPECIFIC REVIEW THAT ADDRESSES THE  
2 CRITERIA THAT WAS ADOPTED IN OCTOBER BY THIS COMMITTEE  
3 AND APPROVED BY THE ICOC WHERE THE SIX EVALUATION  
4 CRITERIA THAT I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH APPLIES. AND  
5 WE'RE CALLING IT TECHNICAL IN ORDER TO MAKE A  
6 DISTINCTION FROM THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

7 SO I THINK IN TERMS OF PROCESS, THE PROCESS  
8 THAT I SEE THAT WE WANT TO DEAL WITH HERE ARE BASICALLY  
9 FOUR STEPS. WE HAVE THE APPLICATIONS. YOU NEED TO  
10 REVIEW THE DATA AS IT'S BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE  
11 APPLICANTS. YOU NEED TO BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE  
12 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND FIND WHERE THE INFORMATION IS  
13 WITHIN THE APPLICATION THAT BASICALLY GIVES YOU THE  
14 INFORMATION YOU NEED TO BASICALLY EVALUATE HOW  
15 RESPONSIVE, HOW THAT PARTICULAR APPLICATION CAN BE  
16 EVALUATED, AND THEN ASSIGN IT -- AND AT THE MEETING ON  
17 MAY 2D, ASSIGN IT A SCORE. SO THAT WOULD BE SCORING.

18 FOR THE ACTUAL PROCESS, WE HAVE RECEIVED THE  
19 ONLINE APPLICATIONS, AND WE'VE GONE THROUGH AN INITIAL  
20 REVIEW OF MAKING SURE THAT THEY'RE COMPLETE, AND WE ARE  
21 EXTRACTING BASICALLY DATASETS THAT MAKE SENSE IN TERMS  
22 OF PROVIDING COMPARABLE INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW,  
23 LIKE THE COST, THE SCHEDULE, AND MATERIAL SUCH AS THAT.

24 THE NEXT STEP IS WE ARE GOING TO MAKE  
25 ASSIGNMENTS TO EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES

1 WORKING GROUP RELATIVE TO THE REAL ESTATE SPECIALISTS.  
2 THEY WILL BECOME THE PRIMARY REVIEWERS AND WILL BE  
3 REVIEWING APPLICATIONS BY BASICALLY COMPARING THE  
4 INFORMATION THAT IS, AS I SAID, INCLUDED IN THE  
5 APPLICATION AND LOOKING AND COMPARING THAT INFORMATION  
6 TO THE CRITERIA THAT YOU HAVE ADOPTED.

7 THE CRITERIA THAT WE ARE GOING TO REVIEW AND  
8 DISCUSS TODAY ARE EXACTLY WHAT WAS ADOPTED IN OCTOBER,  
9 FEASIBILITY, COST, TIMELINE/MILESTONES, INSTITUTIONAL  
10 COMMITMENT, WHICH WE THINK IS KIND OF A STAND-IN FOR  
11 MATCHING FUNDS, HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE, AND  
12 RESPONSIVENESS. I'LL GO INTO MORE DETAIL OF THESE SIX  
13 CRITERIA AND EXPLAIN WHAT WE THINK ARE THE PERTINENT  
14 ISSUES IN THE APPLICATIONS THAT APPLY TO THESE SIX.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: RICK, LET ME JUST SAY. I  
16 WANTED TO SAY INITIALLY. FOR MEMBERS OF THE WORKING  
17 GROUP, IF WE COULD LET RICK GO THROUGH HIS  
18 PRESENTATION, WE ALL HAVE THE POWERPOINT AND WE HAVE  
19 THE SLIDES HERE. LET HIM FINISH, AND THEN WE'LL OPEN  
20 IT UP TO DISCUSSION AS OPPOSED TO TALKING ABOUT  
21 SPECIFIC ITEMS BEFORE WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE WHOLE  
22 PRESENTATION. I WOULD APPRECIATE THAT.

23 MR. KELLER: WHEN I WAS MENTIONING THE  
24 REVIEWS, THE REAL ESTATE MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES  
25 WORKING GROUP WILL DO THE PRIMARY REVIEWS. THE

1 SECONDARY REVIEWS WILL BE BY THE PATIENT ADVOCATE  
2 MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. THERE'S FOUR  
3 AND SIX, SO THERE'S GOING TO BE ROUGHLY FIVE OR SIX  
4 REVIEWS BY EACH OF THE REAL ESTATE PEOPLE TO GET TO 22,  
5 AND THERE'S GOING TO BE THREE OR FOUR REVIEWS ASSIGNED  
6 TO EACH OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES TO GET TO 22. SO  
7 THAT'S HOW WE'RE GOING TO ASSIGN IT OUT.

8 FOR THESE SIX CATEGORIES, THE FIRST THING  
9 THAT WAS CONSIDERED WAS THE PROCEDURES THAT WERE  
10 ADOPTED IN OCTOBER MEETING, THAT THE SCORE WILL BE ZERO  
11 TO A HUNDRED. AND THE NOTION WAS TO TAKE THE SIX  
12 CRITERIA AND LOOK AT OPPORTUNITIES TO GIVE IT MORE  
13 GRANULARITY BY HAVING A SCORING SYSTEM THAT WOULD  
14 ASSIGN SPECIFIC ELEMENTS TO THAT. THE PROPOSAL AT THIS  
15 POINT, WHICH YOU NEED TO REVIEW AND BECOME COMFORTABLE  
16 WITH OR PROPOSE AN ALTERNATIVE, IS TO HAVE FEASIBILITY  
17 BE ZERO OR 15 POINTS. AGAIN, THIS IS A WEIGHTING BASED  
18 ON THE SIX CRITERIA. THE IDEA WOULD BE, THOUGH, THAT  
19 IF A PROPOSAL WERE DEEMED INFEASIBLE, THERE WOULD BE  
20 LIKELY SOME OTHER IMPLICATIONS FOR THAT, LIKE YOU MAY  
21 NOT WANT TO SCORE THE REST OF THE WAY.

22 COSTS, WE'VE ASSIGNED UP TO 20 PERCENT OF THE  
23 AVAILABLE SCORES, FOR TIMELINE AND MILESTONES AN  
24 ADDITIONAL 20 PERCENT, THE MATCHING FUNDS UP TO 10  
25 POINTS, AND FOR HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE 20 POINTS, AND

1       RESPONSIVENESS, AGAIN, IN THE SAME CATEGORY OF  
2       FEASIBILITY ARE ZERO OR 15 POINTS. AND IF A ZERO WERE  
3       ASSIGNED, THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE SOME LIKELY IMPACT ON  
4       OTHER CATEGORIES BY SAYING IF IT'S NOT RESPONSIVE, HOW  
5       IMPORTANT IS THE COST FOR THE HISTORIC PERFORMANCE OF  
6       THE OTHER CATEGORIES.

7                SO IF MY MATH IS CORRECT, THOSE SHOULD ADD UP  
8       TO A HUNDRED POINTS, AND THAT WOULD BE THE BASIS OF  
9       WHAT WE CALL A MORE GRANULAR EVALUATION. AND WE HAVE  
10      SUGGESTED THAT THESE BE ASSIGNED KIND OF IN INCREMENTS  
11      OF FIVE POINTS, AND WE SET UP THE ONLINE SCORING CARD  
12      TO REFLECT THAT. IF THE COMMITTEE FEELS THAT THEY WANT  
13      TO GO INTO MORE, AGAIN, PRECISE NUMBERING, EACH SCORE  
14      OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WILL BE  
15      RECORDED ON MAY 2D AND THERE WILL BE AN AVERAGING OF  
16      THOSE 11 SCORES TO ASSIGN A FINAL SCORE TO EACH  
17      APPLICANT.

18               SO I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH THESE SIX  
19      CATEGORIES WITH THE IDEA OF GIVING YOU A BIT MORE  
20      INFORMATION IN TERMS OF WHAT'S STATED IN THE RFA IN  
21      TERMS OF THE APPLICABLE QUALITIES OR ASPECTS OF THE  
22      APPLICATION THAT APPLY, AND THEN WHAT WE THINK ARE SOME  
23      OF THE THINGS YOU NEED TO LOOK AT IN ADDRESSING YOUR  
24      EVALUATION OF THAT CATEGORY.

25               WITHIN FEASIBILITY, THE RFA NOTES THAT ARE

1 THE PLANS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION/RENOVATION REASONABLE,  
2 AND ARE THEY WELL ORGANIZED, AND IS THERE SUFFICIENT  
3 DETAILS? WE WANT TO SEE A GOOD RESTRICTION. WE WANT  
4 TO SEE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE SPECIFIC KINDS OF WORK  
5 THAT'S ENGAGED IN ORDER TO BRING WHAT IS CURRENTLY  
6 EITHER AN EXISTING LAB OR EXISTING STORAGE ROOM OR AN  
7 EXISTING OFFICE SPACE AND TURN IT INTO A SHARED LAB OR  
8 TO TECHNIQUES COURSE SPACE.

9 I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT THERE BE A  
10 DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING CONDITIONS BECAUSE  
11 OFTENTIMES THE VARIABILITY OF COST IS WHAT ARE YOU  
12 STARTING WITH. IF YOU'RE STARTING WITH A SHELL SPACE  
13 IN AN EXISTING BUILDING, THAT HAS AN INFLUENCE ABOUT  
14 WHAT YOUR COSTS AND COMPLEXITY -- HOW THE COSTS WOULD  
15 BE AND THE SCHEDULE AND SOME OF THESE OTHER ISSUES OF  
16 FEASIBILITY AS WELL. IF IT'S EXISTING IN APPROVED  
17 SPACE THAT HAS TO HAVE ASBESTOS ABATEMENT OR HAS TO  
18 HAVE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF DEMOLITION, THEN THAT ADDS  
19 COST AND TIMING. AND SO THAT'S PART OF THE ISSUE OF  
20 FEASIBILITY.

21 ON THE COST SIDE, THE RFA SPECIFIES THAT IT  
22 SHOULD BE REASONABLE AND IS A COMPARABLE TO THE OTHER  
23 PROPOSALS. IS THE COST PER RESEARCHER, DOES IT ALLOW  
24 FOR MAXIMUM USE AND ACCESS BECAUSE WE ARE LOOKING FOR  
25 SHARED USE. YOU MIGHT CONSIDER THE DISCREPANCY, IF

1     THERE IS A DISCREPANCY, BETWEEN THE COST PER SQUARE  
2     FOOT AND COST PER PI, DEPENDING ON THE BALANCES WITHIN  
3     THOSE TWO CATEGORIES, AND WHAT'S THE RATIONALE FOR IT,  
4     AND HOW INSTITUTIONS LEVERAGE THE CIRM RESOURCES. I  
5     THINK A GOOD EXAMPLE OF THAT IS THAT IF A SHARED LAB IS  
6     BEING CONSTRUCTED IN AN AREA OR IN A BUILDING WHERE  
7     THERE IS ALREADY HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH IN  
8     THE AREA AND THE INSTITUTION IS LEVERAGING THAT  
9     EXISTING SPACE AND COMMITTING THAT USE OF THAT EXISTING  
10    SPACE TO SHARED USE, THEN THAT WOULD BE LEVERAGING  
11    OBVIOUSLY THE CIRM PROPOSAL.

12                 SO THE OTHER FACTORS ARE WHETHER OR NOT THERE  
13    ARE, WITH RESPECT TO COST PER SQUARE FOOT AND IF THERE  
14    ARE OUTLIERS WITHIN THE -- I THINK THAT'S KIND OF A  
15    EUPHEMISM TO SAY IF SOMEONE HAS REALLY GOT A COST  
16    THAT'S OUTSIDE OF THE NORM, WHAT ARE THE FACTORS THAT  
17    MIGHT MITIGATE THAT OR MAKE YOU BETTER UNDERSTAND WHY  
18    THAT IS THE CASE. OFTENTIMES IT HAS TO DEAL WITH  
19    CIRCUMSTANCES IN TERMS OF THE CURRENT MARKET CONDITIONS  
20    OR THE COMPLEXITY OF A PARTICULAR CONSTRUCTION SITE,  
21    WHETHER IT BE IN A HIGH RISE OR IN A VERY DENSELY  
22    OCCUPIED SPACE.

23                 AND THEN LASTLY, THIS NOTION THAT THE COST  
24    SHOULD BE A BALANCE BETWEEN WHAT'S ACTUALLY GOING IN TO  
25    IMPROVE THE SPACE TO PROVIDE FOR THE RESEARCH AND FOR

1 THE MISSION OF THE SHARED RESEARCH LAB VERSUS WHAT  
2 PORTION SEEMS TO BE GOING TO MITIGATE OTHER PROBLEMS  
3 THAT MIGHT HAVE ALREADY BEEN PREEXISTING CONDITIONS,  
4 SUCH AS HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT OR FIXING OTHER  
5 THINGS THAT WOULD BE A NORMAL INSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION.

6 NEXT CATEGORY OF EVALUATION IS TIMELINE AND  
7 MILESTONES. THIS BASICALLY IS HOW WELL THE APPLICANTS  
8 HAVE DEALT WITH THE ISSUE OF SCHEDULE. WHEN CAN IT BE  
9 COMPLETED? IS IT A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME FOR THE  
10 WORK INTENDED? AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S  
11 NO IMPEDIMENTS TO CONSTRUCTION BY VIRTUE OF EITHER  
12 PERMITS OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS. AND IS THE SCHEDULE  
13 VERY CLEAR? AND WITHIN THE APPLICATIONS WE HAVE ASKED  
14 FOR VERY SPECIFIC ABOUT -- WE HAVE ASKED FOR 15  
15 MILESTONES OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FROM PREPARATION OF  
16 ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS OR PRELIMINARY PLANS TO THE  
17 ACTUAL OCCUPANCY OF THE SPACE. SO YOU HAVE AN IDEA AND  
18 UNDERSTANDING HOW THOSE INDIVIDUAL COMPONENTS ARE BEING  
19 INCLUDED IN THE SCHEDULE. AND, AGAIN, CONSIDERING  
20 WHETHER THERE'S ANY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT MIGHT BE  
21 A SOURCE OF DELAY, FOR INSTANCE, PERMITTING OR  
22 ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS.

23 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, THE RFA SPECIFIES  
24 THAT IT HAS TO BE SUFFICIENT. WHAT THAT MEANS IS  
25 THERE'S A 20-PERCENT MATCH REQUIREMENT, 20 PERCENT OF

1 THE CIRM AMOUNT. SO A MILLION-DOLLAR CIRM CONSTRUCTION  
2 PROJECT WOULD HAVE \$200,000 OF INSTITUTIONAL MATCH. SO  
3 THE ACTUAL PROJECT COST COULD BE A \$1.2 MILLION  
4 PROJECT. WE ALSO SPECIFIED THAT SINCE PART 1 OF THIS  
5 APPLICATION, THAT WAS REVIEWED BY THE GRANTS WORKING  
6 GROUP, PROVIDES OPERATING FUNDS FOR THESE SHARED LABS  
7 AND TECHNIQUES COURSE FOR TWO TO THREE YEARS, THAT  
8 THERE OUGHT TO BE SOME ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF HOW THE  
9 INSTITUTION WOULD CONTINUE THE UTILITY AND VIABILITY OF  
10 THIS INVESTMENT BEYOND THE THREE-YEAR PERIOD.

11 THE LAST FACTOR IS CONFIRMING THAT PRIOR  
12 FUNDS ARE ACCURATE. THIS REALLY DEALS WITH A PROVISION  
13 WITHIN THE RFA THAT IF INSTITUTIONS HAVE SPENT SINCE  
14 JANUARY 2005 TO THE APPLICATION SUBMITTAL DATE, THEY  
15 HAD EXPENDED FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSES SIMILAR TO THE  
16 SHARED LAB, THEN THOSE FUNDS QUALIFY AS MATCHING FUNDS.  
17 SO IT'S A BIT LIKE A PREEXISTING OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE  
18 THE MATCHING FUNDS, AND THEN THE PROJECT THAT CIRM  
19 FUNDS BASICALLY BECOMES A MILLION-DOLLAR PROJECT AT A  
20 MAXIMUM OF \$1 MILLION.

21 HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE, AND THE RFA SPECIFIES  
22 THAT WE WANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT IF AN APPLICANT  
23 RECEIVES THE FUNDS, DO THEY HAVE THE INTERNAL CAPACITY  
24 TO DELIVER PROJECTS AND DELIVER THEM ON TIME. AND SO  
25 THIS ASPECT OF THE APPLICATION DEALS WITH HOW WELL THE

1 ACTUAL PERFORMANCE HAS BEEN BY THE APPLICANTS. WE  
2 SOLICITED INFORMATION IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION  
3 WHICH BASICALLY ASKS THAT APPLICANTS SPECIFY THREE  
4 PROJECTS THAT WERE COMPLETED RECENTLY AND TO PROVIDE  
5 INFORMATION ON HOW THE PLAN VERSUS ACTUAL BUDGETS AND  
6 SCHEDULES FOR THOSE THREE PROJECTS TURNED OUT SO THAT  
7 WE WOULD HAVE A BASIS OF COMPARISON OR BASIS OF  
8 JUDGMENT ABOUT HOW WELL THE INSTITUTION CAN PERFORM IN  
9 THE CONSTRUCTION AREA.

10 AND FINALLY, THE LAST CATEGORY,  
11 RESPONSIVENESS. IT'S ALMOST KIND OF INTRINSIC THAT IF  
12 YOU ASK IN THE RFA FOR A SHARED LAB, THAT'S EXACTLY  
13 WHAT WE'RE AFTER. A SHARED LAB, WE'RE NOT ASKING FOR  
14 SOME OTHER KIND OF LABORATORY. SO IF THERE'S MORE  
15 EXTRANEOUS OR NOT -- OR WORK THAT APPEARS TO BE  
16 PROPOSED FOR A DIFFERENT PURPOSE THAN THE SHARED LAB,  
17 THEN THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT WOULD INFLUENCE A  
18 DECISION ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THAT PROJECT OR  
19 APPLICATION IS RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF CIRM IN TERMS  
20 OF SHARED LABS OR THE TECHNIQUES COURSE.

21 SO WITH THOSE SIX CATEGORIES, THE IDEA WOULD  
22 BE TO READ THE APPLICATIONS, UNDERSTAND THE CRITERIA,  
23 APPLY THE CRITERIA, AND THEN DRAFT YOUR COMMENTS  
24 REGARDING THOSE. IT'S GOING TO TAKE SOME STUDY. YOU  
25 THEN WOULD BE -- WE WOULD RECEIVE THE COMPLETED ONLINE

1 EVALUATIONS ON THE 29TH OF APRIL IN ORDER TO HAVE THAT  
2 SHARED WITH OTHER REVIEWERS. SO IT REALLY IS A TEAM  
3 EFFORT, I THINK. AND OUR PUBLIC MEETING WILL BE ON MAY  
4 2D. I THINK THIS VENUE IS A LITTLE LARGER, I THINK  
5 IT'S LARGER, BUT WE CAN PROBABLY DO SOMETHING MORE  
6 APPROPRIATE. WE'RE HOPING IT WILL BE MORE ALONG THESE  
7 LINES.

8 ON MAY 2D THE REVIEWERS WILL MAKE A  
9 PRESENTATION, THE PRIMARY REVIEWER AND SECONDARY  
10 REVIEWER WILL MAKE A PRESENTATION OF THEIR REVIEWS TO  
11 THE WORKING GROUP. THERE WILL THEN BE DISCUSSION OF  
12 EACH PROPOSAL. AND THEN AT THAT TIME EACH WORKING  
13 GROUP WILL ESTABLISH A SCORE, AND THAT WILL BE A  
14 PRIVATE BALLOT WITHIN THE PUBLIC MEETING. WE'LL  
15 COLLECT THOSE, AND WE WILL SCORE EACH APPLICATION, AND  
16 RANK THEM BASED ON THOSE SCORES. SO THAT WOULD BE THE  
17 COMPLETION OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW. AND THEN WE WOULD  
18 MOVE INTO PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

19 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WOULD BE IN CLOSED  
20 SESSION, AND IT WOULD CONVEINE TO RECEIVE THE  
21 PERTINENT -- SINCE WE'VE ALREADY NOW COMPLETED THE  
22 TECHNICAL, THE INFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE REVIEW  
23 BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WOULD BE IMPORTANT TO THE  
24 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP TO COMPLETE WHAT I'LL CALL A  
25 PORTFOLIO OF ITS RECOMMENDATION. AND I THINK WHAT

1 THAT'S TRYING TO DO IS MAKE SURE THAT THINGS FIT  
2 TOGETHER STRATEGICALLY.

3 AND THE TWO ISSUES THAT WERE DISCUSSED, I  
4 THINK, IN PRIOR MEETINGS OF THIS GROUP AND OF THE ICO  
5 IS GEOGRAPHY, WHICH BASICALLY SAYS IF WE'RE GOING TO  
6 HAVE SHARED LABS, THEY HAVE TO BE IN PLACES THAT CAN  
7 ADEQUATELY SERVE THE COMMUNITY OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM  
8 CELL RESEARCHERS. AND SO BY VIRTUE OF THE SCORING, AND  
9 IF WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY, WE MAY WANT TO ADJUST SO  
10 THAT WE ARE MAKING GOOD RECOMMENDATIONS THAT ADDRESS  
11 NOT ONLY THE TECHNICAL MERIT, BUT ALSO WHERE ARE  
12 OPPORTUNITIES TO MAKE THESE EITHER EFFICIENT OR MAKE  
13 SURE THAT SERVICE'S RESOURCES ARE MADE AVAILABLE IN A  
14 PATTERN THAT MAKES SENSE GEOGRAPHICALLY.

15 AND THEN THE SECOND ISSUE OF PROGRAMMATIC  
16 REVIEW WAS ALSO TO CONSIDER THE FACT THAT INSTITUTIONAL  
17 COMMITMENT MAY BE OVER AND ABOVE THE MINIMUM  
18 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, AND THAT THIS WOULD BE ONE  
19 CONSIDERATION THAT THE COMMITTEE COULD MAKE IN A  
20 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

21 WITH THOSE TWO, THE FINAL SCORES WOULD BE  
22 TALLIED AND RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED FOR THE ICOC.  
23 ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA, AGAIN, TIER 1 IS THE  
24 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, TIER 2 WOULD BE FUND IF FUNDS  
25 ARE AVAILABLE, TIER 3 NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AT

1 THIS TIME. WE WOULD HOPE THAT THERE'S PLENTY AT THE  
2 TOP SO THAT WE CAN MOVE FORWARD AND PROVIDE THESE  
3 RESOURCES TO THE SCIENTISTS THAT NEED TO SUPPORT THE  
4 MISSION OF CIRM.

5 SO WITH THAT, THAT CONCLUDES THE REVIEW. AND  
6 BE GLAD TO TURN IT BACK OVER TO RUSTY FOR QUESTIONS.

7 CHAIRMAN DOMS: BEFORE WE GET INTO DISCUSSION  
8 AND QUESTIONS AMONG THE WORKING GROUP, I'D LIKE TO MAKE  
9 ONE COMMENT REGARDING THE PROCESS. AND ONE OF THE  
10 THINGS THAT I HAVE DONE IS ASKED THE STAFF TO PROVIDE A  
11 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OR REVIEW OF THESE GRANTS FOCUSING  
12 ON THE SIX CRITERIA. THE STAFF HAS A WEALTH OF  
13 KNOWLEDGE. AND AS I MENTIONED, IT IS A RESOURCE  
14 DOCUMENT. AND THE MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE CAN USE IT  
15 AS THEY SEE FIT. IF THEY DECIDE THEY DON'T WANT TO  
16 LOOK AT IT, THAT'S UP TO THEM.

17 I THINK FROM MY STANDPOINT WE'RE TRYING TO  
18 ACHIEVE THE BEST OUTCOME POSSIBLE IN TERMS OF REVIEWING  
19 THESE GRANTS, GRANT APPLICATIONS. AND THE MORE  
20 INFORMATION, THE MORE KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE THAT CAN HELP  
21 US MAKE THAT DECISION THE BETTER OFF WE ARE. SO I'VE  
22 ASKED THEM TO MAKE IT AVAILABLE. AGAIN, TO MEMBERS OF  
23 THE COMMITTEE, SHOULD YOU WANT TO USE IT AND REFER TO  
24 IT, IT'S THERE. IF YOU WANT TO DO IT INDEPENDENTLY OR  
25 ON YOUR OWN, THAT'S UP TO YOU ALSO.

1                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: CHAIRMAN DOMS, I  
2                   HAVE A QUESTION ON THAT POINT. I'M NOT OPPOSED TO THE  
3                   IDEA, AND I THINK IT WILL HAVE A LOT OF BENEFIT IN OUR  
4                   REVIEW PROCESS. COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. THE FIRST ONE  
5                   BEING -- AND YOU CAN ANSWER THE QUESTIONS WHEN I'M  
6                   DONE. FIRST ONE IS WHICH MEMBERS OF THE CIRM STAFF  
7                   WILL PROVIDE THE ANALYSIS? THEN MY SECOND QUESTION IS  
8                   WHAT SORT OF ANALYSIS WILL IT BE? WILL THEY BE USING  
9                   THE SAME FORM HERE? WILL THEY BE DOING THE SCORING AS  
10                  WELL, OR WILL IT JUST BE A WRITTEN NARRATIVE? WHAT  
11                  WILL IT LOOK LIKE?

12                  FIRST, THOUGH, WHICH STAFF PEOPLE WILL BE  
13                  DOING THE ANALYSIS?

14                  CHAIRMAN DOMS: THE TWO STAFF PEOPLE THAT  
15                  WILL BE DOING THE ANALYSIS ARE LORI HOFFMAN AND RICK  
16                  KELLER.

17                  VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WILL ANY OTHER  
18                  MEMBERS OF CIRM STAFF BE DOING THE ANALYSIS?

19                  CHAIRMAN DOMS: I DON'T BELIEVE SO AT THIS  
20                  TIME. THEY ARE THE TWO PEOPLE WHO HAVE THE EXPERTISE  
21                  AND THE EXPERIENCE TO DO THAT.

22                  VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I AGREE.

23                  MR. SHEEHY: PREEXISTING CONFLICTS. THEY  
24                  CAN'T REVIEW EVERY GRANT.

25                  VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THEY'RE PROVIDING

1 AN ANALYSIS.

2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, THEY --

3 MS. HOFFMAN: JEFF, YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY  
4 CORRECT. AND WE'RE PROVIDING A TECHNICAL ANALYSIS, AND  
5 I WILL NOT BE WORKING ON ANY OF THE UC CAMPUS  
6 APPLICATIONS. AND, IN FACT, I BELIEVE THAT THE ONLY  
7 CONFLICT THAT EXISTS BETWEEN BOTH OF US IS, OF COURSE,  
8 UC DAVIS. AND WE HAVE -- WE WOULD LIKE TO HEAR WHAT  
9 YOU HAVE TO SAY HERE, AND WE WOULD THEN LIKE TO GO  
10 OUTSIDE AND GET AN OUTSIDE EXPERT WHO HAS NO CONFLICTS.

11 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: TO MY SECOND  
12 QUESTION, WHAT WILL THE NARRATIVE ANALYSIS LOOK LIKE?  
13 IF MS. HOFFMAN OR MR. KELLER WANT TO RESPOND TO THAT,  
14 THAT'S OKAY, OR YOU CAN, RUSTY.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'LL RESPOND TO IT. THEY  
16 WILL TAKE EACH OF THE CRITERIA, AND THEY WILL WRITE AN  
17 ANALYSIS FOCUSING ON THESE POINTS. THEY IN NO WAY  
18 SCORE THIS. IT WILL BE A STRICT ANALYSIS OFF THE GRANT  
19 APPLICATION, FACTS, FIGURES. THEY WILL NOT BE ISSUING  
20 ANY OPINIONS ON WHETHER THIS MAKES SENSE OR NOT. THEY  
21 MAY SAY THE COSTS ARE X NUMBER OF DOLLARS A SQUARE  
22 FOOT. RELATIVE TO OTHERS, THIS APPEARS TO BE ON THE  
23 HIGH SIDE, AND THAT WILL BE IT, BUT THEY WILL NOT BE  
24 SCORING IT. THEY WILL NOT BE COMMUNICATING WITH THE  
25 REVIEWERS IN TERMS OF SCORE.

1 MS. HOFFMAN: JUST A POINT OF CLARIFICATION.  
2 I DON'T BELIEVE THAT EITHER RICK OR I WOULD EVEN BE  
3 SAYING ANYTHING AS OBJECTIVE AS THIS APPEARS TO BE ON  
4 THE HIGH SIDE. I THINK THAT WHAT WE'LL DO IS PROVIDE  
5 PERHAPS A BENCHMARK. AND THOSE EVALUATIONS WILL BE  
6 DONE BY THE WORKING GROUP.

7 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU.

8 MR. LICHTENGER: ARE THEY PROVIDING A  
9 SUMMARIZATION, OR ARE THEY PROVIDING AN ANALYSIS? THE  
10 TWO ARE DIFFERENT.

11 DR. HALL: LET ME MAKE A COMMENT. MY  
12 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THESE COME IN VERY DIFFERENT  
13 FORMS FROM DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS. AND TO EXTRACT THE  
14 RELEVANT INFORMATION FOR EACH ITEM IS NOT ALWAYS EASY.  
15 AND SO I THINK ONE OF THE MAIN INTENTS IS SIMPLY THAT  
16 FOR EACH OF THE ONES TO PULL OUT THE INFORMATION THAT  
17 IS THERE, AND THEN TO MAKE SOME RELEVANT COMMENTS ABOUT  
18 HOW IT MAY COMPARE TO A BENCHMARK OR THAT. IS THAT  
19 CORRECT? THE ATTEMPT IS TO BE OF HELP TO YOU, NOT TO  
20 SOMEHOW PREJUDGE OR PASS -- DIRECT YOU EXCEPT TO SAY  
21 THERE MAY BE A PROBLEM HERE. YOU MIGHT WANT TO LOOK  
22 AT. THAT WOULD BE THE EXTENT OF IT, BUT I THINK IT'S  
23 NOT ANY ATTEMPT TO DO MORE THAN THAT. IT'S TO BE OF  
24 HELP TO YOU.

25 MS. FEIT: AS THE STAFF HAS OUTLINED THE

1 PROCESS HERE, THIS IS A GREAT PROCESS. I HAVE NO  
2 ISSUES WITH THE PROCESS. MY CONCERNS ARE OF A LARGER  
3 NATURE. WE'VE USED TERMS "CRITERIA" AND "OBJECTIVES"  
4 THAT ARE IN THE RFA. WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT THOSE ARE  
5 BASED ON. WHERE DID THEY COME FROM?

6 I HAVE A LITTLE CONCERN THAT THE INSTITUTE  
7 HAS NOT SET A SET OF GOALS FOR THESE RESEARCH  
8 FACILITIES. WE HAVEN'T REALLY CONSIDERED BROAD-RANGE  
9 GOALS OF WHAT WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH. ONCE WE COMMIT  
10 THESE DOLLARS AND THESE FACILITIES ARE BUILT, WE'RE  
11 DONE. THERE'S NO GOING BACK IN TERMS OF FINDING MORE  
12 FUNDING OR RESOURCES TO COMMIT TO THIS.

13 SO MY QUESTIONS WOULD BE AROUND WHAT ARE THE  
14 GOALS OF THE INSTITUTE IN TERMS OF THE RESEARCH  
15 FACILITIES? DO WE HAVE A GOAL THAT WE WANT A CERTAIN  
16 AMOUNT OF RESEARCH FACILITIES GEOGRAPHICALLY PLACED IN  
17 THE STATE BECAUSE THAT'S APPROPRIATE? ARE WE COMMITTED  
18 TO A RESEARCH FACILITY DEDICATED TO THE STEM CELL  
19 RESEARCH OF CHILDREN? IS THAT PART OF OUR GOAL? I'M A  
20 LITTLE CONCERNED THAT WE'RE MOVING VERY FAST AND WE'RE  
21 GOING TO BE COMMITTING A LOT OF MONEY. AND I MYSELF  
22 WANT TO FEEL MORE THAN WE HAVE SOME BROAD-BASED BRUSH  
23 DIRECTION OF SOME INTENT ON THE PART OF THE INSTITUTE  
24 OF WHAT WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH WITH THAT MONEY, AND HOW  
25 DO WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH IT.

1                   AT THE LAST BOARD MEETING, A COMMENT WAS MADE  
2 BY ONE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS THAT THERE IS A COALITION  
3 OF INSTITUTIONS WHO ARE GOING TO BE WORKING TOGETHER  
4 COLLABORATIVELY TO CONDUCT RESEARCH, SEVERAL MAJOR  
5 INSTITUTIONS. AND THAT BOARD MEMBER WAS INTERESTED IN  
6 MAKING SURE THAT MAYBE THE INSTITUTE WOULD WANT TO  
7 EMPHASIZE THAT COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH WAS A MAJOR GOAL.

8                   I'M JUST EXPRESSING THAT I'M CONCERNED THAT  
9 WE HAVEN'T COME TOGETHER ON THAT, THOSE CONCEPTS YET.

10                  VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MARCY, I'M GLAD  
11 YOU RAISED THOSE ISSUES AND THESE QUESTIONS BECAUSE  
12 THEY ARE PERTINENT TO TODAY'S DISCUSSION. IT'S MY  
13 RECOLLECTION, AND I MIGHT BE WRONG, AND I WOULD LOOK TO  
14 LORI AND RICK TO AUGMENT WHAT I'M GOING TO SAY. AND  
15 THAT IS, FOR THE SHARED, THE GRANTS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT  
16 RIGHT NOW, THERE WAS A NEED. DR. PENHOET AND DR. MAXON  
17 DID A TOUR OF THE STATE WHEN THE INSTITUTE FIRST GOT  
18 STARTED. AND THE PURPOSE OF THEIR TOUR WAS TO SORT OF  
19 DISCUSS WHAT'S GOING ON. THEY MET WITH A LOT OF  
20 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS STATEWIDE. AND WHAT THEY HEARD  
21 UNIVERSALLY ACROSS THE BOARD WAS A NEED FOR THIS KIND  
22 OF RFA BECAUSE WE NEEDED THE SAFE HAVENS. THERE'S  
23 ISSUES WITH -- YOU KNOW WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT --  
24 ATTACHMENTS WITH THE FEDERAL DOLLARS AND WHATNOT. SO  
25 STAFF HAD PRESENTED TO THE ICOC THAT THIS WAS THE MOST

1 PRESSING AND IMMEDIATE NEED. THAT'S MY RECOLLECTION.

2 NOW, IN TERMS OF DRAFTING THIS PARTICULAR  
3 RFA, I WOULD SAY THAT, YOU KNOW, WE DIDN'T HAVE THE  
4 BENEFIT OF MS. HOFFMAN OR MR. KELLER. THEY ARE REAL  
5 ESTATE FACILITIES EXPERTS ON THE STAFF SIDE. AND HAD  
6 WE HAD THE BENEFIT OF THEIR SORT OF WISDOM, THIS RFA  
7 MAY HAVE BEEN CRAFTED A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY. I THINK  
8 THAT'S FAIR TO SAY. BUT FOR ME THE IMMEDIATE QUESTION  
9 IS DOES IT SERVE THE NEED? DOES IT SERVE THE GOAL?

10 WE IDENTIFIED AN OBJECTIVE. DOES IT SERVE  
11 THAT OBJECTIVE? I THINK IT DOES. IT'S NOT PERFECT,  
12 BUT I THINK IT DOES. BUT THE ISSUES YOU RAISE ARE  
13 PERTINENT TO THE NEXT ROUND OF GRANTS. WE'RE GOING TO  
14 HAVE A DISCUSSION LATER ON. WE'VE GOT TO TALK ABOUT  
15 THE ISSUES THAT YOU'VE IDENTIFIED, AND I KNOW MY  
16 COLLEAGUES WILL HAVE OTHER PRIORITIES THAT THEY WISH TO  
17 DISCUSS AS WELL. BECAUSE AFTER THIS RFA, WE ONLY HAVE  
18 THREE MORE, THE LARGE FACILITIES, THE STEM CELL BANK,  
19 AND THE GMP. SO I DON'T KNOW IF THAT ANSWERS YOUR  
20 QUESTION.

21 MS. FEIT: YES, IT DOES. THAT'S VERY  
22 HELPFUL. THANK YOU.

23 DR. HALL: EXCUSE ME JUST A MOMENT. I JUST  
24 ASKED PAT IF SHE WOULD, JUST FOR OUR REFERENCE, MAKE A  
25 COPY OF THE RFA THAT COULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO EVERYBODY.

1 MS. FEIT: VERY HELPFUL.

2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: MARCY, LET ME JUST RESPOND  
3 ALSO. I THINK DAVID COVERED IT VERY WELL FROM A  
4 STRAIGHT REAL ESTATE STANDPOINT AND A RENOVATION  
5 STANDPOINT. THE ISSUES THAT YOU HAVE ADDRESSED, I  
6 THINK, ARE LARGER ISSUES. WE'RE REALLY FOCUSING ON NOT  
7 THE RESEARCH THAT'S GOING TO BE DONE THERE. WE'RE  
8 FOCUSING ON CREATING THE SPACE FOR RESEARCH TO BE -- IN  
9 WHICH IT WILL PERFORMED. AT LEAST THAT'S MY PERCEPTION  
10 OF HOW.

11 MR. LICHTENGER: I HAVE TWO THINGS. I WANT  
12 TO FINISH THIS ONE POINT. I THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA TO  
13 HAVE LORI AND RICK DO SOME KIND OF SUMMARIZATION OF  
14 THOSE GRANTS AND FOCUS ON KIND OF PULLING OUT THE FACTS  
15 AND THE RELEVANT PARTS BECAUSE, AGAIN, ZACH'S POINT  
16 ABOUT -- I HAVEN'T SEEN THEM, SO I WON'T KNOW WHAT THEY  
17 LOOK LIKE, BUT I GATHER SOME OF THEM MAY NOT BE ALL  
18 THAT WELL ORGANIZED.

19 DR. HALL: ORGANIZED DIFFERENTLY, I THINK.

20 MR. LICHTENGER: SO THAT WOULD CERTAINLY BE  
21 HELPFUL TO LOOK AT THAT POTENTIALLY, AFTER I READ THE  
22 GRANT APPLICATION, WITH A FOCUS ON STATING THE FACTS  
23 AND STATING WHAT VERY CLEARLY IS STATED IN THE GRANT  
24 WITH LESS FOCUS ON OPINIONS. I WOULD SUPPORT THAT  
25 IDEA.

1 THE NEXT --

2 MR. SHEEHY: MAYBE WE CAN GO BACK. I DID  
3 HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS ANALYSIS. I HAVE  
4 A WHOLE LOT OF QUESTIONS. WILL THAT BE A PUBLIC  
5 DOCUMENT?

6 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES.

7 MS. HYSEN: THEIR DOCUMENT?

8 MS. HOFFMAN: I WILL DEFER TO COUNSEL. BUT  
9 IT WOULD BE WHEN YOU'RE REVIEWING IT -- SO WHEN IT'S  
10 POSTED ON THE WEBSITE ONLINE, YOU CAN GO TO, FOR  
11 EXAMPLE, WHATEVER WE'RE GOING TO CALL IT, STAFF  
12 SUMMARY, STAFF ANALYSIS, WHATEVER YOU DEEM CORRECT. AT  
13 THAT POINT IN TIME, IT WOULD BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT  
14 ONLY. AT THE TIME OF THE PUBLIC MEETING AND WHEN YOUR  
15 REVIEWS ARE IN, THEY WILL ALSO BE ADMINISTRATIVE  
16 DRAFTS, AND THERE WILL BE AN ATTEMPT TO PUT YOUR  
17 COMMENTS AND SCORING TOGETHER FOR PUBLIC REVIEW. AND I  
18 WILL LEAVE IT UP TO COUNSEL WHAT HAPPENS TO THOSE  
19 ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFTS THAT YOU HAVE USED PRE THAT POINT  
20 IN TIME.

21 MR. HARRISON: THIS IS A QUESTION I THINK  
22 WE'LL NEED TO EXAMINE A LITTLE BIT MORE CLOSELY.  
23 LORI'S RIGHT. THERE IS AN EXCEPTION UNDER THE PUBLIC  
24 RECORDS ACT FOR DRAFTS. AND CONCEIVABLY THIS ANALYSIS  
25 OR SUMMARY COULD FALL WITHIN THAT EXCEPTION. LIKEWISE,

1 THERE'S AN EXCEPTION FOR THE RECORDS OF THE WORKING  
2 GROUP WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE RECORDS THAT ARE  
3 FORWARDED TO THE ICOC AS PART OF THE WORKING GROUP'S  
4 RECOMMENDATIONS. SO I THINK IT'S AS A LEGAL ISSUE  
5 SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO LOOK AT A LITTLE BIT MORE  
6 CLOSELY. OF COURSE, THERE ARE POLICY IMPLICATIONS AS  
7 WELL, WHICH I WILL LEAVE TO YOU.

8 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I FOLLOW UP? FIRST OF ALL,  
9 I WOULD HOPE THAT THAT WILL BE PUBLIC. SECOND, I WOULD  
10 JUST LIKE TO SUGGEST VERY STRONGLY, SINCE STAFF KNOWS  
11 THE SCORES, SINCE SOME OF THE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS  
12 KNOW THE SCORES, THAT THE SCORES SHOULD ALSO BE  
13 PROVIDED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE PROCESS. THE STAFF  
14 WILL BE DOING THE TECHNICAL ANALYSIS, TECHNICAL  
15 SUMMARIES, WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCORES, WITH THE  
16 SCIENTIFIC SCORES KNOWN.

17 MS. HOFFMAN: WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS PROCESS  
18 OF DEVELOPING THE TECHNICAL REVIEW FIRST, THEN MOVING  
19 INTO EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION FOR THE DISCUSSION WITH  
20 ARLENE ON THE SCORES OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND  
21 THEN MOVING BACK INTO PROGRAMMATIC WAS THERE WERE  
22 SEVERAL DISCUSSIONS WITH BOTH THE CHAIR AND THE VICE  
23 CHAIR OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. AND IT WAS  
24 DEEMED THAT IN AN EFFORT TO STAY FOCUSED ON THE SIX  
25 CRITERIA OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW, THAT AT THAT POINT IN

1 TIME IT WASN'T NECESSARY -- I GUESS WE'RE NOW  
2 DISCUSSING THIS AGAIN. BUT IT WASN'T NECESSARY TO  
3 UNDERSTAND WHAT THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE WAS AT THAT POINT  
4 IN TIME, BUT IT WAS NECESSARY IN TERMS OF THE, PERHAPS,  
5 GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION AND ANYTHING ELSE THAT THE  
6 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP WOULD DEEM TO BE SOMETHING  
7 THAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED UNDER PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

8 MR. SHEEHY: BUT YOU'RE GOING TO GIVE ME A  
9 SUMMARY THAT YOU PREPARED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE  
10 SCORES.

11 MS. HOFFMAN: I ACTUALLY DON'T HAVE KNOWLEDGE  
12 OF THE SCORES.

13 MR. SHEEHY: RICK DOES.

14 MS. HOFFMAN: NOR WILL I --

15 MR. SHEEHY: RICK IS GOING TO BE PREPARING  
16 MOST OF THEM.

17 MS. HOFFMAN: HALF.

18 MR. SHEEHY: BUT YOU SEE -- ACTUALLY IF  
19 YOU'VE SEEN THE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST LIKE I HAVE OVER  
20 ALL THE DOCUMENTS, ACTUALLY YOU KNOW -- THE UC WOULD  
21 MORE THAN DISQUALIFY. IT'S A LOT MORE COMPLICATED THAN  
22 YOU ARE MAKING IT SOUND. I'M VERY UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT  
23 THE ONLY PEOPLE NOT KNOWING THE SCIENTIFIC SCORES ARE  
24 THE FOUR REAL ESTATE EXPERTS. AND EVERYBODY ELSE BEING  
25 PRIVY SO THAT KNOWLEDGE, I THINK WE PUT THEM AT A

1     DISTINCT DISADVANTAGE OF GETTING SUMMARIES -- COULD YOU  
2     NOT INTERRUPT, PLEASE -- AND GETTING SUMMARIES THAT ARE  
3     PREPARED BY STAFF. WE'RE HAVING A VIRTUAL STAFF REVIEW  
4     WITH SCIENTIFIC SCORES IN MIND. I'M VERY UNCOMFORTABLE  
5     WITH THIS PROCESS.

6             I THINK THE SCIENTIFIC SCORES SHOULD BE MADE  
7     AVAILABLE TO EVERYBODY UP FRONT. THE SCORES EXIST. I  
8     MEAN I DON'T WANT TO BE PUTTING FORWARD A DOCUMENT  
9     WHERE I LOOK LIKE I DON'T KNOW WHAT I'M DOING BECAUSE  
10    THE SCIENTIFIC -- THE SCIENTISTS HAVE ALREADY DEEMED  
11    THIS THING NOT WORTH THE TROUBLE, YOU KNOW, THAT IT'S  
12    NOT SCIENTIFICALLY FEASIBILITY. AND OUR FIRST  
13    CRITERION IS FEASIBILITY. AND IF THE SCIENTISTS HAVE  
14    SAID IT'S NOT FEASIBLE, THEN I SAY, OF COURSE, IT'S  
15    FEASIBLE. DON'T I LOOK LIKE A DUMMY?

16            I CAN TELL YOU WHEN I DO MY REVIEW, IF I KNOW  
17    THAT INFORMATION, I'M GOING TO SCORE IT VERY LOW ON  
18    FEASIBILITY. BUT SOMEONE WHO'S A PRIMARY REVIEWER WITH  
19    ME WHO DOESN'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION MAY SCORE IT HIGH.  
20    THEN WE'RE LIKE WHAT'S GOING ON HERE? IT'S LIKE, YOU  
21    KNOW, IT JUST SEEMS AWKWARD. MAYBE I'M CRAZY.

22            DR. HALL: JUST MAKE A POINT. THAT IS, JEFF,  
23    I THINK, ALTHOUGH THE SCIENTIFIC GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
24    HAS MADE ITS RECOMMENDATIONS, WHICH I, BY THE WAY WAS  
25    NOT THERE, BUT THE ICOC, AS YOU KNOW, HAS THE RIGHT TO

1     FUND ANY OF THESE.   AND SO I THINK THE ISSUE IS  
2     RECOGNIZING THAT, THEN, ONE WANTS A THOROUGH TECHNICAL  
3     REVIEW OF EACH GRANT BECAUSE THERE MAY BE ONE THAT THE  
4     GRANTS WORKING GROUP DOES NOT GIVE -- DOES NOT  
5     RECOMMEND FOR FUNDING, BUT THE ICOC SAYS, WELL, WE WANT  
6     TO FUND IT, I THINK IF AT THAT POINT YOU SAY, WELL, WE  
7     REALLY DIDN'T GO THROUGH THIS BECAUSE WE KNEW THE  
8     GRANTS WORKING GROUP DIDN'T CONSIDER IT, I THINK THAT  
9     LIMITS THEIR ABILITY TO MAKE A DECISION.

10            SO I THINK THE INTENT IS SIMPLY TO TRY TO  
11     MAKE, ON TECHNICAL GROUNDS ALONE, TO MAKE A THOROUGH  
12     ANALYSIS OF EACH ONE INDEPENDENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC  
13     SCORE SO THAT IF A DECISION IS MADE TO FUND ONE AGAINST  
14     A PRIOR RECOMMENDATION, YOU HAVE A TECHNICAL SCORE THAT  
15     IS NOT SLANTED ONE WAY OR THE OTHER BASED ON THAT  
16     EARLIER SCORE.   SO THAT'S JUST A COMMENT.

17            CHAIRMAN DOMS:   I'D LIKE TO HEAR JAMES  
18     COMMENT ON THIS, PLEASE.   YOU'RE RIGHT.   THIS IS A  
19     TOUGH ISSUE.

20            MR. HARRISON:   I THINK IT IS A TOUGH ISSUE.  
21     ONE OF THE THINGS, THOUGH, YOU NEED TO KEEP IN MIND IS  
22     THAT THE CRITERIA BY WHICH YOU ARE ASKED TO REVIEW  
23     THESE APPLICATIONS, THE SIX CRITERIA THAT RICK JUST  
24     DISCUSSED, DO NOT INVOLVE ANY COMPONENT OF  
25     CONSIDERATION OF SCIENTIFIC MERIT.   FEASIBILITY, FOR

1 EXAMPLE, IS LIMITED TO THE FEASIBILITY OF THE PLANS FOR  
2 CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION AND WHETHER THEY'RE  
3 REASONABLE. SO IN THAT SENSE, WHETHER OR NOT THE  
4 RESEARCH THAT'S GOING TO BE CONDUCTED THERE IS FEASIBLE  
5 OR MERITORIOUS REALLY HAS NO RELEVANCE TO YOUR  
6 DETERMINATION OF THE FEASIBILITY TECHNICALLY FROM THE  
7 PERSPECTIVE OF THE FACILITIES REVIEW.

8 AS LORI SAID, SOME OF THESE ISSUES MAY ARISE  
9 IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. BUT WHEN  
10 YOU'RE SCORING THE APPLICATIONS BASED ON THOSE SIX  
11 CRITERIA, YOU'RE NOT SUPPOSED TO BE CONSIDERING  
12 SCIENTIFIC MERIT.

13 MS. HYSEN: MAY I JUST SAY, AS A REAL ESTATE  
14 MEMBER, I WOULD NOT REALLY CARE TO SEE THE SCIENTIFIC  
15 SCORES BECAUSE I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO VIEW THE  
16 APPLICATION STRICTLY ON ITS REAL ESTATE MERIT. I HAVE  
17 NO EXPERTISE IN THE SCIENTIFIC ARENA. AND I THINK  
18 THAT, LET'S SAY, FOR INSTANCE, THAT SCIENTIFICALLY  
19 THEY'RE DEEMED TO NOT BE WORTHY OF PROCEEDING, BUT FROM  
20 A FACILITIES STANDPOINT THEY WERE. IF I HAD KNOWN  
21 SCIENTIFICALLY THEY HAD NO MERIT, I DON'T WANT TO BE  
22 INFLUENCED BY THAT DECISION BECAUSE I WANT THOSE  
23 PEOPLE, WHEN THEY GET BACK THEIR SCORES BECAUSE THEY  
24 WILL, ALL THESE INSTITUTIONS WILL GET BACK THEIR SCORE,  
25 I WANT THEM TO KNOW WHERE THEY STOOD FROM THE

1 FACILITIES STANDPOINT. THEY NEED TO KNOW THAT THEY  
2 WERE ON TARGET WITH THE FACILITIES SIDE OF IT. THEY  
3 MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN ON TARGET WITH THE SCIENTIFIC SIDE.

4 SO THEY REALLY NEED TO HAVE SORT OF AN  
5 UNBIASED LOOK AT HOW, JUST ON THE REAL ESTATE MERITS  
6 STRICTLY, THAT THEY SCORED. I THINK THAT WOULD BE  
7 IMPORTANT FOR THEM TO KNOW THAT.

8 MS. FEIT: ARE WE GOING TO BE FUNDING, THEN,  
9 FACILITIES THAT WE ARE NOT CONSIDERING MERITORIOUS IN  
10 SCIENCE? I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THAT CONFLICT, IF THAT'S  
11 WHAT YOU'RE MEANING, BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO DO THAT.

12 MR. HARRISON: NO. NO.

13 DR. HALL: THAT'S THE ICOC'S DECISION  
14 FINALLY. IT'S THE ICOC WHO WILL TAKE THESE TWO SCORES  
15 AND MAKE THAT DECISION.

16 MR. HARRISON: ULTIMATELY REMEMBER THAT BOTH  
17 THE SCORE THAT YOU ALL ASSIGN COLLECTIVELY TO THESE  
18 APPLICATIONS, AS WELL AS YOUR RECOMMENDATION AFTER  
19 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, WILL GO TO THE ICOC ALONG WITH THE  
20 GRANTS WORKING GROUP SCIENTIFIC SCORE OF THE  
21 APPLICATION. SO THE ICOC WILL THEN HAVE BOTH OF THOSE  
22 PIECES OF INFORMATION BEFORE IT TO CONSIDER WHETHER OR  
23 NOT TO FUND A PARTICULAR APPLICATION.

24 MS. FEIT: THAT WORKS. THANK YOU.

25 MR. LICHTENGER: FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO

1 APOLOGIZE. I WASN'T AT THE LAST WORKING GROUP MEETING,  
2 SO SOME OF THE QUESTIONS I MAY HAVE MAY HAVE BEEN  
3 ADDRESSED THERE. SO FIRST OF ALL, I THINK STAFF DID A  
4 GREAT JOB IN PUTTING THIS TOGETHER. EXCELLENT JOB.

5 I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. SO YOU SPENT A  
6 LOT OF TIME TALKING ABOUT THE TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS,  
7 AND I LIKE THE REVIEW CRITERIA. I HAVE SOME CONCERNS  
8 ABOUT HOW WE HAVE THIS WEIGHTED, THOSE CRITERIA HOW WE  
9 HAVE WEIGHTED, BECAUSE HAVING THOSE SPECIFIC NUMBERS  
10 AND PERCENTAGES OF 100 GIVES ME SOME CONCERN THAT THAT  
11 COULD POTENTIALLY PUT A POTENTIAL APPLICATION IN AN  
12 OVERLY POSITIVE OR OVERLY NEGATIVE LIGHT DEPENDING UPON  
13 THE OTHER FACTORS. SO IT KIND OF SEEMS TO PIGEONHOLE  
14 WHEN YOU HAVE THESE PERCENTAGES SET UP THIS WAY.

15 AND THEN THE BIGGER QUESTION I HAVE IS WE  
16 HAVEN'T REALLY TALKED ABOUT THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW,  
17 AND HOW DO WE WEIGH -- LET'S SAY WE HAVE ALL THESE  
18 RANKED AT THE END. AND NOW WE GO INTO THE PROGRAMMATIC  
19 REVIEW. WELL, HOW DO WE WEIGH THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW  
20 RELATIVE TO THE TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS? AND HOW DOES  
21 THAT AFFECT THE OVERALL SCORE AT THE END OF THE DAY FOR  
22 EACH OF THESE GRANT APPLICATIONS?

23 DR. HALL: WHY DON'T YOU DESCRIBE WHAT  
24 HAPPENS AT THE GRANTS REVIEW.

25 MR. SHEEHY: SO I THINK WHAT THE SCORES DO IS

1 THEY GIVE YOU A BASELINE. AND LIKE MANY THINGS IN  
2 LIFE, NOT HAVING DONE THIS PROCESS, I DON'T KNOW IF  
3 THIS WILL LOOK LIKE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, BUT YOU  
4 TEND TO HAVE CLEAR EXCELLENCE AND CLEAR FAILURE. AND  
5 THE SCORES ARE A GREAT WAY OF REALLY GETTING TO THE  
6 HEART OF THAT FAIRLY QUICKLY.

7 THEN YOU HAVE USUALLY A GRAY AREA WHERE  
8 THERE'S SOME FLAWS, IT'S NOT PERFECT. AND AT THAT  
9 POINT I THINK THAT IT'S APPROPRIATE TO HAVE A  
10 DISCUSSION THAT IS BOTH STRUCTURED AND OPEN-ENDED. AND  
11 WE FOUND IN DOING THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW AT THE GRANTS  
12 WORKING GROUP THAT WE HAVE USED IN SOME WAYS SIMILAR  
13 BUT DIFFERENT CRITERIA EACH TIME. GRANTED, WE'VE HAD  
14 THREE DIFFERENT GRANTS, FOUR DIFFERENT GRANTS, SO THAT  
15 MAY COLOR HOW THE CRITERIA -- I WOULD ARGUE AGAINST  
16 SETTING VERY HARD CRITERIA IN ADVANCE FOR PROGRAMMATIC  
17 REVIEW BECAUSE A LOT OF IDEAS COME OUT IN DISCUSSION IN  
18 THE WORKING GROUP AS YOU REVIEW GRANTS, BUT SOME ARE  
19 CLEAR. AND I THINK GEOGRAPHY WILL BE CLEAR. THERE MAY  
20 BE OTHER PROGRAMMATIC ONES.

21 IN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, YOU KNOW, SOME  
22 OF THE THINGS THAT HAVE COME UP HAVE BEEN SPECIFIC  
23 DISEASES, IF THERE WAS A REASONABLE WELL-REVIEWED  
24 GRANT, BUT DIDN'T QUITE SEEM TO GET INTO THE TOP TIER,  
25 BUT IT WAS THE ONLY ONE THAT WAS ADDRESSING A SPECIFIC

1 DISEASE OR CONDITION, REVIEWERS GAVE THAT  
2 CONSIDERATION. JUST TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF ONE  
3 CRITERIA THAT CAME OUT. SO IT'S SOMETHING THAT, AT  
4 LEAST AT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, HAS BEEN BOTH  
5 DYNAMIC AND STRUCTURED.

6 MR. LICHTENGER: HERE'S MY CONCERN. SO WE  
7 GET THESE TECHNICAL SCORES, AND THEN WE GO INTO THE  
8 PROGRAMMING PORTION OF THE EVALUATION. AND  
9 HYPOTHETICALLY THERE COULD BE ONE POTENTIAL GRANT WITH  
10 A VERY HIGH SCORE, BUT NOW DURING THE WHOLE PROGRAMMING  
11 DISCUSSION, THERE ARE NEGATIVE INFLUENCES THAT ARE  
12 WEIGHING ON THAT APPLICATION. I HAVE A CONCERN HOW  
13 THAT WILL BE PERCEIVED IF THAT GRANT ISN'T APPROVED AND  
14 WE DON'T HAVE AS MANY SPECIFIC GUIDELINES IN TERMS OF  
15 THE PROGRAMMING PORTION OF THIS REVIEW.

16 SO I JUST HAVE A CONCERN ABOUT WE HAVE THIS  
17 TECHNICAL REVIEW, AND THEN THERE MAY BE AN ISSUE, FOR  
18 EXAMPLE, CREATING NEW STATEWIDE CAPACITY. OKAY. IS  
19 THAT A PROGRAMMING REVIEW ITEM? AND THAT MIGHT BE AN  
20 OVERRIDING PROGRAMMING REVIEW ITEM THAT WOULD TAKE  
21 PRECEDENCE OVER POTENTIALLY SOME OF THESE TECHNICAL  
22 CONSIDERATIONS. SO I JUST HAVE A CONCERN THAT WE MAY  
23 BE PIGEONHOLING OURSELVES WHEN WE HAVE THIS --

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: PIGEONHOLE IN WHAT RESPECT?

25 MR. LICHTENGER: WELL, THAT YOU MAY HAVE A

1 GRANT --

2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: TOO NARROW?

3 MR. LICHTENGER: THAT IT'S NUMERIC, NO. 1.

4 AND SO, FOR EXAMPLE, LET'S SAY YOU HAVE A GRANT

5 APPLICATION THAT HAS A HIGHER SCORE THAN ANOTHER, BUT

6 WE DECIDE POTENTIALLY NOT TO FUND THAT PARTICULAR GRANT

7 APPLICATION BECAUSE OF OTHER PROGRAMMING

8 CONSIDERATIONS. DOES THAT OPEN US UP TO POTENTIAL

9 LITIGATION OR CONCERNS?

10 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY --

11 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DR. HALL, RUSTY,

12 JUST A POINT OF ORDER. YOU'RE THE CHAIRMAN, SO I'D ASK

13 EVERYONE, IF THEY HAVE COMMENTS -- AND I'M ALWAYS

14 GUILTY OF THIS TOO, SO I'M GOING TO TRY TO BE ON MY

15 BEST BEHAVIOR -- IF YOU COULD SEEK RECOGNITION FROM THE

16 CHAIR, AND IF RUSTY IS NOT HERE THE VICE CHAIR.

17 DR. HALL: YES. ABSOLUTELY. I'M SORRY.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DR. HALL, YOU'RE

19 NOT A MEMBER OF THIS WORKING GROUP.

20 DR. HALL: THAT'S TRUE.

21 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SO IF YOU WOULD

22 PLEASE SEEK RECOGNITION BEFORE YOU SPEAK. THANK YOU.

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: JOAN.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: JUST A COUPLE GENERIC

25 COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROCESS THAT MAY ANSWER SOME OF YOUR

1 QUESTIONS. ONE IS THAT THIS IS A WORK IN PROGRESS.  
2 AND THAT'S WHY WE'RE ALL PAID THE BIG BUCKS. WE HAVE A  
3 MANDATE FROM THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA TO GET AN END  
4 RESULT TO TRY TO DELIVER CURES USING THE TECHNOLOGY OF  
5 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. AND THIS IS A PIECE OF THAT  
6 PROCESS. AND SO I THINK THE REASON THAT THEY PUT US ON  
7 THESE WORKING GROUPS, THE COMBINATION OF US, YOUR  
8 EXPERTISE AND OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE EXPERTISE, IS THAT  
9 WE KEEP OUR EYE ON THAT BALL. AND THE PROGRAMMATIC  
10 REVIEW IS A PLACE WHERE WE TAKE THE INFORMATION FROM  
11 THE VARIOUS SCORING HISTORIES THAT WE'VE GOT, AND WE'LL  
12 HAVE A COUPLE OF THEM IN THIS CASE, AND THEN WE THINK  
13 ABOUT THOSE OTHER OUTSIDE CONSIDERATIONS. AND IT CAN  
14 BE VERY OPEN-ENDED, AS JEFF SAID. AND THEN WE SEE WHAT  
15 WE HAVE.

16 AND I THINK THERE MAY BE SOME INCLINATION FOR  
17 SOME DEFERENCE TO SCORES BECAUSE IT'S NUMERIC. I THINK  
18 WE LOOK AT THAT AND DEAL WITH THAT.

19 DR. WRIGHT: DAVID, WHAT I HEAR YOU ASKING  
20 FOR, AND I COMPLETELY AGREE WITH YOU, IS A LITTLE BIT  
21 MORE SUBSTANCE TO THE CRITERIA FOR THE PROGRAMMATIC  
22 REVIEW. THIS A GREAT FORUM TO START TO GATHER THAT,  
23 BUT I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. YOU WANT TO BE ABLE TO  
24 REFLECT BACK AFTER THE DECISION IS MADE ON THE  
25 FOUNDATION FOR THE DECISION FROM THE PROGRAMMATIC VIEW.

1 SO GEOGRAPHY IS ONE, INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT WAS THE  
2 SECOND. SO MAYBE WE SHOULD HEAR WHAT OTHER CRITERIA  
3 SHOULD APPLY.

4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'D BE INTERESTED TO HEAR  
5 WHAT OTHER MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP HAVE TO SAY IN  
6 TERMS OF ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR THE PROGRAM SIDE. I  
7 DON'T THINK THAT THIS GROUP CAN GO INTO THE DIRECTION  
8 OF THE FOCUS OF THE SCIENCE OR THE RESEARCH. THAT'S  
9 NOT PART OF OUR CHARGE HERE.

10 SO IN THAT CONTEXT, I'D BE INTERESTED IN  
11 COMMENTS FROM THE WORKING GROUP ON OTHER POTENTIAL  
12 CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM.

13 MR. LICHTENGER: RUSTY, THIS IS A VERY  
14 SPECIFIC QUESTION. DO WE -- CAN WE HAVE THE RFA REVIEW  
15 CRITERIA AS WE HAVE IT, BUT MUST WE ASSIGN THESE  
16 PERCENTAGES IN NUMERICAL?

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THIS HERE IS WHAT  
18 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT?

19 MR. LICHTENGER: YES. DO WE HAVE TO ASSIGN  
20 SPECIFIC PERCENTAGES IN THE WEIGHTING THE WAY IT'S SET  
21 UP?

22 CHAIRMAN DOMS: DO WE HAVE TO? NO.

23 MR. LICHTENGER: OKAY.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: BUT WE HAVE TO SCORE THESE  
25 APPLICATIONS, AND I THINK THAT THE BASIS OF A HUNDRED

1 POINTS MAKES SENSE.

2 MR. LICHTENGER: I AGREE WITH THE HUNDRED  
3 POINTS; BUT IF WE HAVE -- LET ME BE A LITTLE MORE  
4 SPECIFIC. WE HAVE ALL OF THESE GRANTS SCORED AND NOW  
5 WE GO INTO THE PROGRAMMING SESSION AND EVALUATE THOSE  
6 ITEMS. WHAT IS OUR WEIGHTING OF THE PROGRAMMING  
7 REQUIREMENTS VERSUS THE TECHNICAL? THAT'S MY CONCERN.

8 DR. HALL: DAVID'S HAND WAS UP ALSO. DID YOU  
9 WANT TO SAY SOMETHING?

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: NO, I DON'T.

11 DR. HALL: AGAIN, JUST TO AMPLIFY ON WHAT  
12 JEFF SAID ABOUT HOW THIS HAS WORKED BEFORE PERHAPS AS A  
13 MODEL FOR THIS WORKING GROUP, YOU MAY END UP DOING  
14 THINGS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENTLY. THE TECHNICAL SCORE  
15 STANDS. THAT SCORE WILL GO TO THE ICOC. AND YOU WILL  
16 SEE AND YOU CAN RANK THEM. IT'S A NUMBER, SO YOU CAN  
17 RANK THEM FROM TOP TO BOTTOM. AND, IN GENERAL, THE  
18 GRANTS AREN'T REARRANGED UNLESS THERE IS A CLEAR REASON  
19 FOR DOING THAT. AND JEFF GAVE AN EXAMPLE --

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I HAVE MS. SHERRY  
21 LANSING GETTING ON THE CALL.

22 CHAIRMAN DOMS: SHERRY.

23 DR. HALL: SO AT ANY RATE, AND, IN GENERAL,  
24 THOSE HAVE NOT BEEN THINGS THAT SAY LET'S TAKE DOWN  
25 ONE, BUT HAVE SAID LET'S MOVE ONE UP FOR A REASON THAT

1 WE DON'T FEEL GOT ADEQUATELY CONSIDERED AND IT WASN'T  
2 PART OF THE STRICT TECHNICAL SCIENTIFIC REVIEW AS YOU  
3 MAY FEEL IT'S NOT PART OF THE TECHNICAL THING HERE. I  
4 THINK AS LONG AS THERE'S A CLEAR RATIONALE FOR IT, I  
5 THINK IT'S FINE. AND REMEMBER THAT THIS WORKING GROUP  
6 ONLY MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC, AND THE ICOC  
7 THEN WILL HEAR, NOT ONLY SEE THE SCORES, BUT WILL HEAR  
8 YOUR REASONS FOR THINKING THAT IT SHOULD BE REARRANGED.  
9 AND SO THEY WILL HAVE A CHANCE, THEN, TO ALSO MAKE A  
10 JUDGMENT ON THAT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.

11 MR. LICHTENGER: SO THANK YOU, RUSTY. LET ME  
12 JUST FINISH MY ONE POINT.

13 CHAIRMAN DOMS: NO, PLEASE. THIS IS WHY  
14 WE'RE HERE.

15 MR. LICHTENGER: SO HYPOTHETICALLY I'M  
16 EVALUATING A GRANT, AND LET'S JUST SAY IT'S VERY CLEAR  
17 FROM THIS GRANT APPLICATION THAT THEY HAVE BEEN  
18 UNRESPONSIVE. OKAY. SO I CAN ONLY GIVE THEM ZERO OR  
19 15 POINTS. WELL, PERHAPS --

20 MS. HYSEN: ZERO TO 15.

21 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THAT'S THE POINT. IT'S NOT  
22 ZERO TO 15. THE POINT IS -- I THINK WHERE YOU'RE  
23 GOING --

24 MR. LICHTENGER: AN UNRESPONSIVE GRANT  
25 APPLICATION WOULD MAKE ME VIEW THAT APPLICATION VERY

1       NEGATIVELY; SO, THEREFORE, I'M JUST SAYING WE'RE ONLY  
2       ASSIGNING POTENTIALLY 15 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL SCORE TO  
3       THAT ONE ITEM. I THINK THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER  
4       HOW RESPONSIVE THEY ARE AS A HIGHER PERCENTAGE. I'M  
5       JUST POINTING OUT THAT THE WEIGHTING OF THE CRITERIA IS  
6       MY CONCERN.

7                   CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M GOING TO --

8                   MR. SHEEHY: I ACTUALLY THINK ONE WAY TO DO  
9       THIS MIGHT BE JUST TO SAY THAT THESE ARE SUGGESTED  
10      WEIGHTINGS BECAUSE I ALSO KNOW, FROM SITTING IN THE  
11      SCIENTIFIC REVIEWS, FAILURE TO RESPOND TO THE GRANT WAS  
12      VERY LOW. AND I ALSO THINK, IN TERMS OF LOOKING AT OUR  
13      SCORES, WE NEED TO BE CLEAR BEFORE WE SCORE THAT WE'RE  
14      GOING TO USE THE WHOLE SCALE OR NOT USE THE WHOLE  
15      SCALE.

16                   I THINK THE THIRD POINT, JUST TO PUT -- SO  
17      THAT I THINK IT'S CLEAR, THE WAY -- I'M ASSUMING THIS  
18      IS MODELED AFTER THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THE WAY IT  
19      WORKS IS THAT THE REVIEWERS PRESENT THEIR SCORES, BUT  
20      THOSE ARE PRELIMINARY SCORES. AND THEN EVERYBODY WITH  
21      THEIR SCORE SHEET ACTUALLY WRITES DOWN THEIR FINAL  
22      SCORE.

23                   SO YOU MAY REVIEW AND WRITE DOWN A SCORE, AND  
24      YOU'LL SAY, "I HAD UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, AND I SCORED  
25      THEM AT 70." AND I'LL BE THE SECONDARY REVIEW, AND

1 I'LL SAY, "WELL, I DIDN'T LIKE THEM FOR THIS. I SCORED  
2 THEM AT 50." THEN WE'LL HAVE A DISCUSSION AND PROS AND  
3 CONS, AND THEN WE'LL GET QUESTIONS AND OTHER PEOPLE  
4 WILL FEED IN AND SAY, "WELL, I KNOW OREGON, AND THEY  
5 ACTUALLY HAVE SOME VERY NICE CAPABILITY TO DO THIS."  
6 AND THEN WE'LL GIVE FINAL SCORES. I'M JUST MODELING  
7 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND ASSUME IT'S GOING TO BE  
8 LIKE THAT. SO COME BACK TO US AND SAY, "DO YOU STAY  
9 WITH 70?" "WELL, YOU KNOW, I GIVE THEM 75." I'LL SAY  
10 I'LL COME UP TO DAVID'S SCORE OF 75. AND THEN WE ALL  
11 COLLECTIVELY WILL WRITE OUR SCORES BASED ON THOSE  
12 DISCUSSIONS, AND THOSE ARE ALL TABULATED AND AVERAGED  
13 TO GIVE THE FINAL SCORE.

14 MR. LICHTENGER: THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE TO  
15 ME. BUT IF THE RULES STATE THAT -- THE RULES STATE  
16 THAT THEY CAN ONLY GET ZERO OR 15 POINTS ON  
17 RESPONSIVENESS, IN THAT MEETING I COULD SAY, WELL, THIS  
18 PARTICULAR GRANT APPLICATION, THEY WERE VERY  
19 UNRESPONSIVE. I, THEREFORE, THINK I'M GOING TO GIVE  
20 THEM ZERO ON THAT PARTICULAR ITEM, BUT I THINK THAT  
21 SHOULD HAVE MORE THAN -- A HEAVIER WEIGHT. BUT THESE  
22 ARE THE SPECIFIC RULES THAT WE MUST FOLLOW.

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: OKAY. LET ME JUST RESPOND TO  
24 THAT. THE SIX CRITERIA ARE FIXED. THAT'S WHAT WE  
25 HAVE. THAT WAS APPROVED BY THE ICOC. THE WEIGHTING

1 SYSTEM, THIS IS WHAT IS ON THE TABLE.

2 MR. LICHTENGER: I AGREE.

3 CHAIRMAN DOMS: IS THAT A FAIR STATEMENT?

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: IS WHAT A FAIR  
5 STATEMENT, RUSTY?

6 MS. HOFFMAN: AT THIS POINT IN TIME, YES, YOU  
7 MAY CHANGE THAT. I WOULD LIKE TO REITERATE WHAT JEFF  
8 SAID, WHICH IS I THINK YOU SHOULD ALL AGREE AND BE  
9 CLEAR ABOUT WHAT THE SCORING RANGES ARE SO IT IS AN  
10 APPLES-TO-APPLES COMPARISON.

11 I THINK ALSO I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT, JEFF,  
12 ALTHOUGH YOU DO USE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FORMAT, I  
13 WOULD LIKE TO JUST REMIND YOU ALL THAT IT WOULD BE IN  
14 PUBLIC AS OPPOSED TO A CLOSED SESSION. AND SO YOU'RE  
15 NOT OBLIGATED TO SAY A SCORE WHETHER IT'S AN OVERALL  
16 SCORE OF PERHAPS 70 OUT OF A HUNDRED OR IN ANY ONE OF  
17 THE AREAS, THAT YOU MIGHT WANT TO USE MORE DESCRIPTORS  
18 BECAUSE, AS WITH TODAY, THERE WILL BE APPLICANTS THAT  
19 WILL BE SITTING IN THE AUDIENCE.

20 MR. SHEEHY: HOW DO WE SCORE? IF YOU LOOK AT  
21 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THE BASIS FOR THE ONSET OF  
22 THE DISCUSSION OF THE INITIAL SCORES BY THE PRIMARY AND  
23 SECONDARY REVIEWER, SO HOW DO YOU -- YOU SAY, WELL, I  
24 KIND OF LIKE THIS ONE. AND I DON'T HAVE A SCORE FOR  
25 IT, BUT I KIND OF LIKED IT, SO MAKE SOME DECISION. I

1 DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW THAT DISCUSSION GETS INITIATED.

2 MS. HOFFMAN: I AGREE. TO FINISH, BECAUSE I  
3 THINK THE IMPORTANT PIECE HERE, AND THIS IS ONE OF THE  
4 REASONS THAT, I BELIEVE, RUSTY IS ASKING FOR MAYBE A  
5 TECHNICAL SUMMARY, THAT IT'S IMPORTANT WHEN YOU'RE  
6 SPEAKING ABOUT COST, THAT IT'S NOT, OH, I THINK THIS  
7 COST IS HIGH OR I THINK THIS COST IS LOW. I'M NOT SURE  
8 IF THE INSTITUTION CAN BUILD AT THIS COST. BUT THERE  
9 ARE SOME REAL BENCHMARKS AND SOME ABILITY TO KIND OF  
10 SEE WHERE THESE INSTITUTIONS ARE FALLING EITHER  
11 RELATIVE TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS OR CERTAINLY WITHIN  
12 THEMSELVES IN THAT REGIONAL AREA.

13 MR. SHEEHY: WHY WOULD WE NOT DECLARE OUR  
14 SCORES IN PUBLIC SESSION?

15 MS. HOFFMAN: YOU CERTAINLY COULD.

16 MR. KELLER: THE ONLY REASON WAS BECAUSE THE  
17 WAY THE PROCEDURES WERE ADOPTED GUARANTEED A SECRET  
18 BALLOT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL.

19 MR. SHEEHY: WHY WOULDN'T OUR SCORE SHEETS BE  
20 PUBLIC?

21 MR. KELLER: BECAUSE THE PROVISION -- THAT IS  
22 THE WAY THE ICOC DECIDED IT WOULD BE HANDLED, I GUESS.

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: JUST A SECOND. I'D LIKE  
24 ZACH. ZACH HAD SOMETHING HE WANTED TO SAY.

25 DR. HALL: WELL, THERE ARE SEVERAL ISSUES

1     HERE.  LET ME JUST TRY TO ADDRESS.  ONE IS, I THINK,  
2     JEFF, THERE WAS THE SENSE, FIRST OF ALL, IN GIVING --  
3     IN ALLOCATING THESE AMONG THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES,  
4     THAT THE TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR CONSTRUCTION HAD MORE  
5     OBJECTIVE CRITERIA THAN A SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION MIGHT  
6     DO.  AND THE EFFORT WAS TO HAVE A RECORD THAT WOULD SAY  
7     EXACTLY WHAT THE SCORE WAS IN EACH OF THESE PARTICULAR  
8     CATEGORIES.

9             NOW, ONE ALTERNATIVE THAT THE WORKING GROUP  
10    MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER THAT WE DISCUSSED WAS OF HAVING  
11    TWO OF THOSE, RESPONSIVENESS AND FEASIBILITY, BE  
12    ABSOLUTE CRITERIA.  THAT IS, IF YOU GOT A ZERO ON  
13    THOSE, END OF STORY.  AND YOU HAD TO HAVE A 15 ON THOSE  
14    IN ORDER TO GO FORWARD.  BUT THAT THE OTHERS COULD THEN  
15    BE GRADED.

16            AND LET JUST SAY THERE'S ONE OTHER ISSUE,  
17    JEFF.  AND THAT IS, YOU CAN HAVE A REVIEWER, PRIMARY  
18    REVIEWER, LET'S SAY, HERE'S THE WAY I GRADED THIS.  I  
19    GAVE IT X ON FEASIBILITY, Y ON COST, Z, GO DOWN THE  
20    LIST, FOR A TOTAL SCORE OF WHATEVER IT IS.  AND THEN TO  
21    HAVE EACH OF THE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS ALSO VOTE IN  
22    THOSE CATEGORIES.  THAT'S ONE WAY TO DO IT.  AND THEN  
23    YOU WOULD HAVE A RECORD THAT WOULD BE AN AVERAGE FOR  
24    EACH OF THE CATEGORIES, AND INSTITUTIONS COULD SEE  
25    WHICH PARTS THEY'D DONE WELL AND WHICH PARTS THEY

1 HADN'T.

2 ALTERNATIVELY, WHICH IS MORE LIKE THE GRANTS  
3 WORKING GROUP, YOU COULD SIMPLY HAVE EVERYBODY VOTE FOR  
4 THE FINAL NUMBER, AND THEN YOU COME OUT WITH A NUMBER.  
5 THE PROBLEM THERE IS THERE'S LESS OF A CLEAR RECORD  
6 ABOUT WHERE THAT NUMBER CAME FROM. SO THOSE ARE THE  
7 CONSIDERATIONS. THESE ARE YOUR CHOICES, I WOULD SAY,  
8 NO. 1, ABOUT WHETHER TO HAVE ABSOLUTE CRITERIA OR NOT;  
9 NO. 2, ABOUT WHETHER YOU WANT TO KEEP THESE STRICT  
10 CATEGORIES WITH THEIR POINTS AND/OR REARRANGE THEM;  
11 AND, NO. 3, WHETHER YOUR VOTE IS WITHIN THE CATEGORIES  
12 SO THAT THERE'S A RECORD CLEAR OR WHETHER YOU JUST HAVE  
13 A SINGLE NUMBER.

14 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM OTHER  
15 MEMBERS.

16 MS. HYSEN: I'M CONCERNED, AND MAYBE BECAUSE  
17 I HAVE PROBABLY THE ONLY STATE EXPERIENCE ON THE REAL  
18 ESTATE PANEL WORKING WITH THE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD AND  
19 ALSO ON THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS. THE WAY THIS IS  
20 WRITTEN NOW, I CAN'T GO PAST FEASIBILITY IF I RATE IT  
21 NOW. IT'S CONSIDERED A NONRESPONSIVE BID. SO YOU KIND  
22 OF ESTABLISH THIS THRESHOLD, AND YET IT'S NOT CLEARLY  
23 WRITTEN AS SUCH. I THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE CLARIFIED  
24 BECAUSE YOU CANNOT -- THERE WOULD BE NO PURPOSE, AND  
25 YOU WOULD BE SUBJECT TO A LOT OF PUBLIC SCRUTINY IF YOU

1 WERE TO PROCEED PAST FEASIBILITY IF YOU RATE IT AT  
2 ZERO.

3 AND THE WAY IT'S WRITTEN, I DON'T THINK YOU  
4 CAN. YOU'VE ASKED QUESTIONS THAT MAYBE PORTIONS OF IT  
5 AREN'T REASONABLE, BUT IT'S WELL ORGANIZED. YOU  
6 HAVEN'T WRITTEN IT IN A WAY THAT WOULD MAKE YOU SAY YES  
7 OR NO BECAUSE THERE ARE MULTIPLE QUESTIONS THAT FORM  
8 THAT PARTICULAR ITEM. SO I MEAN THERE MAY BE BIDS THAT  
9 ARE NONRESPONSIVE AND THAT SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AS  
10 SUCH. WHAT WOULD DEEM A BID TO BE NONRESPONSIVE? WHAT  
11 WOULD BE SO PROBLEMATIC FOR THE GROUP THAT WE SIMPLY  
12 COULDN'T GO BEYOND LOOKING AT ANY OTHER CRITERIA?

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE DIDN'T  
14 ESTABLISH -- MAYBE WE DID -- MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS IN  
15 THIS RFA, DID WE?

16 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THAT'S RIGHT.

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE DID NOT. THE  
18 RFA'S THAT I'M ACCUSTOMED TO DRAFTING AND ADVISING MY  
19 CLIENT FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY IS YOU DO HAVE A SET OF  
20 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS. FEASIBILITY COULD BE ONE OF  
21 THEM. AND IF YOU DON'T MEET THESE MQ'S, AND OFTEN  
22 STAFF CAN DO THAT ANALYSIS. I'M NOT SAYING THEY'D DO  
23 IT HERE. I'M SAYING THAT'S HOW WE DO IT AT THE CITY.  
24 IF YOU DON'T MEET THE MQ, THEN YOU DON'T PASS GO. THE  
25 REVIEWERS DON'T HAVE TO LOOK AT IT. THE PROPOSERS ARE

1 NOTIFIED THAT YOU DON'T MEET THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS  
2 AND YOU'RE DONE WITH IT. AND THE REJECTED PROPOSER  
3 DOESN'T HAVE A BASIS FOR A CHALLENGE BECAUSE YOU'VE  
4 OUTLINED AT THE VERY BEGINNING, AT THE ONSET, WHAT  
5 THOSE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS ARE, THE MQ'S. WE HAVEN'T  
6 DONE THAT IN THE RFA.

7 I WANT TO POINT OUT FOR THE FUTURE RFA'S, I  
8 THINK WE SHOULD GIVE SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT MQ'S. THAT  
9 BEING SAID, WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE?

10 MS. HYSEN: I DON'T LIKE -- I'VE NEVER LIKED  
11 THRESHOLDS. I'VE NEVER LIKED -- BECAUSE THERE'S SO  
12 MUCH WORK THAT GOES INTO PREPARING THIS, AND I IMAGINE  
13 THAT ALL THE INSTITUTIONS ARE VERY WELL QUALIFIED.  
14 THEY HIRE QUALIFIED STAFF TO HANDLE THE GRANTS PROCESS.  
15 SO I CAN'T IMAGINE ANY ONE OF THESE INSTITUTES BEING  
16 NONRESPONSIVE.

17 DR. HALL: CAN I GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF A  
18 NONRESPONSIVE APPLICATION, AND IT'S ONE THAT RICK GAVE.  
19 THESE ARE FOR SHARED LABORATORIES MEANT TO SERVE A  
20 LARGE COMMUNITY. IF WE GOT AN APPLICATION IN WHICH IT  
21 WAS CLEAR THAT, ALTHOUGH THERE ARE A NUMBER OF  
22 RESEARCHERS AT THE INSTITUTION DOING THIS WORK, THIS  
23 LABORATORY WAS REALLY BEING BUILT FOR THE BENEFIT OF  
24 ONE OR TWO RESEARCHERS, WE WOULD SAY THAT'S A  
25 NONRESPONSIVE. THIS IS NOT A SHARED LABORATORY. THIS

1 IS A PLAN FOR A LABORATORY TO HELP YOU RECRUIT A SINGLE  
2 INDIVIDUAL, AND THAT WAS NOT THE PURPOSE.

3 MS. HYSEN: AND THEN IF THAT'S WHAT THIS  
4 COMMITTEE WANTS TO DO, THEN IT NEEDS TO WRITE THIS  
5 DIFFERENTLY. IT NEEDS TO SAY THAT A POINT OF ZERO IN  
6 THIS KIND OF CATEGORY WOULD BE DEEMED NONRESPONSIVE. I  
7 PERSONALLY DON'T LIKE THEM BECAUSE I FEEL LIKE IT'S AN  
8 EDUCATIONAL PROCESS FOR THE SUBMITTALS. THEY NEED TO  
9 KNOW WHERE THEY WENT WRONG BECAUSE THE NEXT TIME AROUND  
10 THEY NEED TO CORRECT THAT ERROR. IF WE SIMPLY STOP  
11 HERE, THEY WON'T BE ABLE TO SEE WHAT THEY COULD HAVE  
12 DONE DIFFERENTLY GOING FORWARD.

13 BECAUSE THESE ARE INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE  
14 OF CALIFORNIA AND THESE ARE OUR PARTNERS AND OUR  
15 COLLABORATORS, I REALLY WANT THEM TO UNDERSTAND HOW  
16 THEY CAN DO THINGS DIFFERENTLY AND BETTER. SO I HATE  
17 NONRESPONSIVE BECAUSE I JUST THINK THAT YOU STOP THE  
18 COMMUNICATION THERE. THEY DON'T LEARN FROM THIS.

19 DR. HALL: THEY LEARNED THAT THEY WEREN'T  
20 RESPONSIVE.

21 MS. HYSEN: IN THAT CATEGORY.

22 DR. HALL: YOU WOULD SAY -- BUT YOU WOULD SAY  
23 WHY THEY WEREN'T RESPONSIVE.

24 MS. HYSEN: WELL, THEY WILL LEARN THAT THEY  
25 SCORED LOW, AND THEY WILL LEARN WHY THEY SCORED LOW,

1 AND THEY'LL DO BETTER NEXT TIME. BUT TO JUST SIMPLY  
2 STOP IT AND NOT SCORE ON THE OTHER POINTS, I THINK,  
3 DOESN'T GIVE THEM THE ADVANTAGE OF OUR EXPERTISE.

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DEBORAH, DO I  
5 TAKE YOU TO UNDERSTAND, THEN, IF AN APPLICATION WAS  
6 GIVEN A ZERO, THEN THE REVIEWER COULD STILL PROCEED?

7 MS. HYSEN: I DON'T THINK IT CAN THE WAY  
8 WE'VE WRITTEN IT.

9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: IS THAT WHAT YOU  
10 WOULD LIKE, THOUGH?

11 MS. HYSEN: YES. I THINK IF YOU GIVE THEM --

12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: FOR THE REASONS  
13 YOU ARTICULATED.

14 MS. HYSEN: IF YOU GIVE THEM ZERO IN THIS  
15 CATEGORY AND 20 HERE AND 15 THERE, THEY STILL CAN  
16 PROCEED. HOWEVER, IF WE WRITE IT -- I THINK WE'VE  
17 WRITTEN IT SUCH THAT, ESPECIALLY FEASIBILITY, MY GOD,  
18 IF IT'S NOT FEASIBLE, THEN WHAT DOES IT MATTER WHAT IT  
19 COSTS AND HOW THEY'VE HISTORICALLY DONE THINGS? IT  
20 JUST LOOKS BAD. I DON'T PERSONALLY LIKE ZERO EVER AS A  
21 SCORE, BUT I THINK IT HAS TO BE WRITTEN DIFFERENTLY IF  
22 THAT'S THE WAY THAT WE NEED TO PROCEED.

23 MR. LICHTENGER: I AGREE WITH WHAT DEBORAH IS  
24 SAYING. I THINK THAT WE COULD HAVE A SLIGHT TWEAKING  
25 OF THE CRITERIA WEIGHTING AND, I THINK, SOLVE THIS

1 ISSUE. I'D LIKE TO MAKE A PROPOSITION THAT IF A GRANT  
2 APPLICATION IS NOT FEASIBLE, THEN WE REALLY WOULDN'T  
3 NEED TO CONSIDER THE BALANCE OF THESE ITEMS, AND THAT  
4 WE COULD PUT ALL THESE OTHER ITEMS AS RECOMMENDED  
5 PERCENTAGES OF THE HUNDRED. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, COST, WE  
6 CAN SAY WE ARE RECOMMENDING GUIDELINES THAT IT CAN  
7 WEIGHT UP TO 20 PERCENT OF A HUNDRED. WE RECOMMEND UP  
8 TO, TIMELINE AND MILESTONES, UP TO 20 PERCENT;  
9 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT UP TO 10 PERCENT. SO MAKE IT  
10 A RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE. RESPONSIVENESS, YOU KNOW, IF  
11 SOMEBODY IS NOT RESPONSIVE AT ALL, WE COULD MAKE THAT A  
12 DISQUALIFYING ITEM, BUT THERE ARE DEGREES OF  
13 RESPONSIVENESS.

14 I MEAN I'VE SEEN WHERE PEOPLE ARE TOTALLY  
15 UNRESPONSIVE. WELL, YOU CAN'T REALLY CONSIDER THEM,  
16 BUT THERE MAY BE SOME FOLKS THAT ARE EXTREMELY  
17 RESPONSIVE, AND I MIGHT WANT TO GIVE THEM A 15, AND  
18 THERE MAY BE SOME OTHER FOLKS THAT MIGHT BE A 12. SO I  
19 WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE TO MAKE IT IF IT'S NOT FEASIBLE,  
20 THAT POTENTIALLY WE WOULD NOT NEED TO GO THROUGH THE  
21 REST OF THAT APPLICATION, AND WE COULD DISQUALIFY THAT.  
22 I MEAN I'M PROPOSING THAT. AND THEN POTENTIALLY MAKE  
23 THESE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES AS PERCENTAGES.

24 MS. HYSEN: NOT THE WAY THE QUESTION IS  
25 WRITTEN. REASONABLENESS IS SORT OF QUALITATIVE. I'M

1 CONCERNED BECAUSE, FOR INSTANCE, SOME OF THE REAL  
2 ESTATE EXPERTS MAY HAVE A LEASING BACKGROUND AND NOT A  
3 CONSTRUCTION BACKGROUND. CAN THEY JUDGE ON THAT? AND  
4 THAT'S WHY I THINK THAT PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW IS SO  
5 CRITICAL BECAUSE IT'S REALLY THE DIALOGUE WITH THE  
6 PEERS THAT HAVE VARIOUS LEVELS OF EXPERTISE TO LOOK AT  
7 SOMETHING LIKE THAT BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW THAT A LEASING  
8 PERSON HAS THE EXPERTISE TO LOOK AT WHETHER OR NOT A  
9 PROJECT CAN BE DONE -- IF THE BLUEPRINTS ARE ALL IN  
10 PLACE, IF IT CAN BE DONE WITH THE PROJECT MANAGERS THAT  
11 THEY'VE PROVIDED.

12 I THINK THAT WHEN YOU HAVE A QUESTION LIKE IS  
13 IT REASONABLE, HOW DO YOU GIVE IT A ZERO? AND THEN IF  
14 YOU GIVE THAT 15, DO YOU GIVE THE NEXT QUESTION -- IT'S  
15 JUST NOT WRITTEN TECHNICALLY VERY WELL TO BE ABLE TO  
16 THEN REJECT ENTIRELY THIS KIND OF APPLICATION.

17 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M GOING TO ASK JAMES.

18 MR. HARRISON: ONE THING TO BEAR IN MIND  
19 HERE, AND ONE REASON WHY YOU REALLY DO NEED TO CONSIDER  
20 ALL OF THE CRITERIA, IS THAT ULTIMATELY YOU'RE MAKING  
21 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC. SO IF THE ICOC,  
22 NOTWITHSTANDING YOUR DETERMINATION THAT AN APPLICATION  
23 WAS NOT FEASIBLE, DECIDES THAT IT IS, IT WILL NEED TO  
24 HAVE THE INFORMATION IN FRONT OF IT ABOUT HOW YOU  
25 EVALUATED THE APPLICATION BASED ON THE OTHER CRITERIA.

1 MS. HYSEN: WHY CAN'T THAT HAVE A SLIDING  
2 SCALE LIKE THE OTHER ONES DO?

3 MR. HARRISON: I THINK THAT'S ENTIRELY UP TO  
4 YOUR JUDGMENT. YOU COULD DO ZERO TO 15. BY THE WAY, I  
5 CREDIT SCOTT TOCHER WITH THAT POINT.

6 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE CAN HAVE A SLIDING SCALE  
7 ON FEASIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS. DOES THAT ADDRESS  
8 YOUR CONCERN?

9 MR. LICHTENGER: PARTLY.

10 CHAIRMAN DOMS: NOT REALLY.

11 MR. LICHTENGER: I'M CONCERNED ABOUT HAVING  
12 SET PERCENTAGES ASSIGNED TO ANY ONE ITEM. THAT'S  
13 REALLY MY BIG CONCERN VERSUS RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES OF  
14 PERCENTAGES. THAT'S MY BIG CONCERN. AGAIN, YOU KNOW,  
15 I'M JUST GOING TO PICK ONE. HISTORIC PERFORMANCE,  
16 WELL, LET'S JUST SAY HYPOTHETICALLY THAT THERE WAS A  
17 PARTICULAR APPLICATION THAT SCORED VERY WELL ON ALL OF  
18 THEM EXCEPT THAT ON HISTORIC PERFORMANCE, IT DID  
19 HORRIBLY. WELL, AGAIN, SHOULD THAT HAVE GREATER  
20 WEIGHTING WHEN YOU'RE LOOKING AT THAT APPLICATION THAN  
21 20 PERCENT?

22 MR. SHEEHY: OR LESS. IT WAS THEIR FIRST --  
23 MAYBE IT'S THE FIRST ONE THEY'VE EVER DONE. THERE IS  
24 NO HISTORIC PERFORMANCE. SHOULD THEY START OFF 20  
25 POINTS BEHIND, WHICH SEEMS UNFAIR. AND IT MAY BE THAT

1     THEY HAVE VERY GOOD COST, THEY HAVE GREAT COST, AND  
2     THEY HAVE A GREAT INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, AND THEY  
3     SET A GOOD TIMELINE AND MILESTONES, THEN YOU'RE GOING  
4     TO SAY THEY GET 80.  SO THEY SCORED 80 AND THEY START  
5     OFF AT 80 BECAUSE THEY'VE NEVER DONE A SHARED LAB  
6     BEFORE.

7             CHAIRMAN DOMS:  BUT I'M NOT SURE THAT BECAUSE  
8     THEY HAVEN'T DONE IT, IF ALL THE OTHER FACTORS -- I'M  
9     NOT GOING TO GIVE THEM A ZERO.

10            MR. HARRISON:  ONE OF THE CHALLENGES YOU  
11     FACE, IF DON'T USE A SCALE LIKE HAS BEEN DESCRIBED  
12     HERE, IS THAT IF YOU EACH HAVE A DIFFERENT IDEA ABOUT  
13     THE VALUE OR WEIGHTING OF A PARTICULAR CRITERIA, SAY,  
14     ONE OF YOU BELIEVES THAT HISTORIC PERFORMANCE IS SO  
15     IMPORTANT, THAT YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE ASSIGNED A VALUE  
16     UP TO 35 POINTS; WHEREAS, SOMEBODY ELSE THINKS IT'S  
17     REALLY ONLY WORTH 5 POINTS EVEN IF THE ENTITY HAS THE  
18     GREATEST TRACK RECORD IN HISTORY.  THEN YOU'RE REALLY  
19     ULTIMATELY NOT COMPARING THINGS ON AN EQUIVALENT BASIS.

20            THE OTHER THING I'D REMIND YOU IN THE EXAMPLE  
21     THAT YOU POSED, IF AN ENTITY HAS NO HISTORIC  
22     PERFORMANCE; BUT, NONETHELESS, BASED ON THE REMAINDER  
23     OF THE APPLICATION, YOU THINK THIS IS ONE THAT REALLY  
24     STANDS OUT ABOVE THE OTHERS, THIS IS SOMETHING THAT YOU  
25     CAN CONSIDER IN YOUR PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.  AGAIN, AS

1 ZACH STATED, IF YOU CLEARLY DELINEATE THE REASONS WHY  
2 YOU BELIEVE AN APPLICATION DESERVES TO BE BUMPED UP  
3 OVER OTHERS NOTWITHSTANDING THAT SCORE, IT'S SOMETHING  
4 THE ICOC CAN THEN EVALUATE AND DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT  
5 IT AGREES WITH THAT RECOMMENDATION.

6 MR. SHEEHY: BUT IF WE'RE CONSISTENT, LIKE  
7 LET'S SAY I OVERVALUE THIS HISTORIC PERFORMANCE, AS  
8 LONG AS I'M SCORING THAT WAY ON EVERY SINGLE GRANT,  
9 THAT'S OKAY. THAT'S PART OF THE REASON WHY I'M HERE  
10 BECAUSE I MAY HAVE EXPERTISE IN THAT AREA, AND I MAY  
11 OVERWEIGHT IT. IT DOESN'T MEAN MY COLLEAGUES SHOULD BE  
12 ASSIGNING THE SAME WEIGHT TO THAT CRITERIA. AND IF YOU  
13 LOOK AT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, I THINK PEOPLE DO USE  
14 DIFFERENT CRITERIA, EACH OF THEM, AND THEY WEIGHT THEM,  
15 BUT THEY WEIGHT THEM CONSISTENTLY ACROSS EVERY GRANT.  
16 THEY'RE NOT SAYING ON THIS GRANT, I'M GOING TO WEIGH.  
17 SO I DON'T WANT TO CUT PEOPLE OFF AT THE KNEES AND SAY  
18 WE ALL HAVE TO LOOK AT EVERYTHING THROUGH THE SAME PAIR  
19 OF GLASSES.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: VERY QUICKLY.  
21 WHAT I HEARD FROM STAFF, THEY SAID, YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T  
22 HAVE -- EACH REVIEWER, IN MY OPINION, HAS TO HAVE THE  
23 SAME CRITERIA, HAS TO HAVE THE SAME SET OF  
24 INSTRUCTIONS. AND THEN IT'S UP TO THAT REVIEWER TO  
25 SORT OF INTERNALIZE IT BASED ON THEIR EXPERIENCE AND

1 WHAT'S BEFORE THEM AND ASSIGN A SCORE. I THINK THAT'S  
2 OKAY. BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, THAT'S ONLY FAIR TO THE  
3 APPLICANTS. WE DON'T WANT TO DO THE APPLES AND  
4 ORANGES, EACH ONE THINKING A DIFFERENT THING, AND WE  
5 DON'T WANT TO SUBJECT OURSELVES TO ANY SORT OF A LEGAL  
6 CHALLENGE. IF EACH ONE OF US IS USING THEIR OWN SYSTEM  
7 OF DOING IT, AND THAT'S NOT ARTICULATED IN THE RFA, IT  
8 THEN BECOMES, I THINK, ARBITRARY, AND THAT CAN POSE  
9 SOME LEGAL PROBLEMS, IN MY OPINION.

10 SECONDLY, I WANT TO GET BACK TO DAVID BROUGHT  
11 UP A VERY GOOD POINT, AND IT WAS SOMETHING THAT OF ALL  
12 THE ASSIGNING OF SCORES, THIS IS THE ONE THAT IN MY  
13 MIND JUMPED OUT THE HIGHEST. THAT IS HISTORICAL  
14 PERFORMANCE. I THINK THAT'S TOO MANY POINTS. I DO.  
15 TODAY WE CAN CHANGE IT. TODAY WE CAN CHANGE IT. I'LL  
16 JUST SAY I THINK IT'S TOO HIGH. I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT  
17 SHOULD BE. MAYBE FIVE, MAYBE TEN POINTS, AND I'LL GIVE  
18 YOU A REASON, AN EXAMPLE.

19 UC MERCED. IT'S A NEW UNIVERSITY. THEY'RE  
20 JUST STARTING. I DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE ANY  
21 FACILITIES LIKE THIS. THEY SHOULDN'T BE, AS YOU SAY,  
22 JEFF AND DAVID, DINGED BECAUSE OF THAT AT ALL. SO I  
23 THINK HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS  
24 RFA OUGHT TO BE ADJUSTED IN TERMS OF POINTS DOWNWARD  
25 AND MAYBE ADDED TO FEASIBILITY, SOMEWHERE ELSE THAT'S

1 OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. IN TERMS OF FEASIBILITY, I THINK  
2 A SLIDING SCALE IS OKAY, BUT IT OUGHT TO BE IN SEGMENTS  
3 OF WHATEVER WE DECIDE COLLECTIVELY, 5, 10, 15,  
4 WHATEVER, BUT EVERYONE NEEDS TO BE DOING THE SAME SORT  
5 OF THING.

6 I THINK WHAT'S IMPORTANT TODAY IS, AND I  
7 DON'T WANT ANYBODY TO FEEL PRESSURED, BUT WE HAVE TO  
8 GET A WORK PRODUCT OUT OF HERE SO WE CAN BEGIN THE  
9 REVIEW PROCESS.

10 MR. LICHTENGER: JUST ONE OTHER POINT. I  
11 WANT TO BRING UP ANOTHER INTERESTING DILEMMA. LET'S  
12 TALK ABOUT COST, UP TO 20 PERCENT. WELL, BUT YET YOU  
13 HAVE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT OR LEVERAGE ONLY UP TO 10  
14 POINTS. LET'S SAY HYPOTHETICALLY YOU'VE GOT A GRANT  
15 APPLICATION THAT LOOKS VERY GOOD EXCEPT THAT  
16 HYPOTHETICALLY IT'S MORE EXPENSIVE THAN OTHERS, BUT  
17 THEY'VE GOT TEN-TO-ONE LEVERAGE WHERE SOMEONE ELSE ONLY  
18 HAS FIVE-TO-ONE LEVERAGE. WELL, TO ME YOU'VE GOT THOSE  
19 TWO MISALIGNED BECAUSE THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT OF  
20 MATCHING FUNDS SHOULD BE AT LEAST EQUAL TO WHAT THE  
21 COST IS BECAUSE THOSE TWO ARE IN LINE. AM I WRONG ON  
22 THAT?

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: NO. I AGREE WITH YOU.

24 MR. KELLER: I'D JUST LIKE TO COMMENT. KIND  
25 OF THE DERIVATION OF SOME OF THESE WEIGHTING CRITERIA

1 WAS REALLY LOOKING AT WHAT THE CRITERIA OF THE  
2 COMMITTEE AND THE ICOC APPROVED AND THEN DECIDING HOW  
3 MUCH LATITUDE IS THERE IN TERMS OF MAKING IT MORE,  
4 LET'S SAY, RESPONSIVE OR WORKABLE FOR THE ACTUAL  
5 APPLICATION SINCE THIS IS OUR FIRST TIME. I JUST WANT  
6 TO MAKE THE POINT THAT SOMETIMES THERE'S ISSUES THAT  
7 MAY NOT BE FAIR. WE WANT FAIRNESS AND WE WANT THINGS  
8 TO BE EQUITABLE, BUT WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO DO BOTH.

9 SO THE TWO EXAMPLES, THE CRITERIA THAT, AS IT  
10 EXISTS, THE CRITERION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT IS IS  
11 THE INSTITUTION GOING TO HAVE FUNDING TO THE PROJECT  
12 SUFFICIENT? SO THAT'S VERY DISTINCT. SO THAT'S WHY  
13 THE PROGRAMMATIC, AND WE THOUGHT THAT YOU ALL NEEDED TO  
14 HAVE SOME FLEXIBILITY RELATED TO THAT, SO WE THOUGHT  
15 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WOULD HAVE TO COVER BOTH AREAS FOR  
16 THAT VERY REASON. AND WHERE WE HAVE THE CIRCUMSTANCE  
17 WHERE THERE'S -- WHEREAS THERE'S A CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE,  
18 SAY, SIX VERY HIGHLY RATED STEM CELL COURSES ARE ALL IN  
19 THE SAME GEOGRAPHIC AREA AND THERE'S NONE IN ANOTHER  
20 AREA, WE WANT -- SO THE MERIT OF THE PROPOSAL IS  
21 PREEMPTIVE, IF YOU WILL, BY THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

22 DR. HALL: PROGRAMMATIC -- EXCUSE ME. SO THE  
23 POINT, I THINK, MAYBE WE'RE ADDRESSING, THE  
24 PROGRAMMATIC, THE IDEA IS IF WE END UP WITH 15 GRANTS  
25 IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND NONE IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA.

1                   MR. SHEEHY: I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY WE'RE  
2                   EVEN LOOKING AT THE TECHNIQUES COURSE IN THIS WORKING  
3                   GROUP. I DON'T SEE ANY ABILITY TO MAKE THE EVALUATION  
4                   ON THAT RELATIVE TO THIS WORKING GROUP. I DON'T THINK  
5                   THAT'S PART. IT'S NOT A FACILITY.

6                   DR. WRIGHT: WELL, APPARENTLY, THOUGH, THERE  
7                   WERE FACILITY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COURSE, AS I READ  
8                   THE RFA.

9                   CHAIRMAN DOMS: THAT'S RIGHT. ON A LIMITED  
10                  BASIS.

11                  MR. KELLER: THE RFA OFFERED THE APPLICANTS  
12                  THE OPPORTUNITY TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR  
13                  CONSTRUCTION IF THEY WERE TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONAL SPACE  
14                  FOR THE TECHNIQUES COURSE.

15                  MR. SHEEHY: WHAT CRITERIA ARE WE GOING TO  
16                  USE TO EVALUATE THE TECHNIQUES COURSE?

17                  MR. KELLER: WELL, WE THINK THAT THERE WILL  
18                  BE A JUDGMENT ABOUT -- GOING BACK TO HOW REASONABLENESS  
19                  CAN BE INTERPRETED, IF, FOR INSTANCE, THE AMOUNT OF  
20                  SPACE THAT THEY ARE SAYING THEY NEED FOR A TECHNIQUES  
21                  COURSE IS FIVE TIMES LARGER THAN WHAT OTHERS ARE USING,  
22                  AND IT APPEARS THAT THAT SPACE IS REALLY INTENDED TO BE  
23                  USED FOR SOME OTHER PURPOSE RATHER THAN A TECHNIQUES  
24                  COURSE, WE MIGHT MAKE A JUDGMENT THAT THAT COMPONENT  
25                  HAS A DIFFERENT SCORE THAN THE SHARED RESEARCH LAB.

1 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST DON'T SEE THESE SIX  
2 CRITERIA BEING APPLIED TO A TECHNIQUES COURSE. I  
3 REALLY DON'T.

4 DR. HALL: ISN'T THAT RIGHT? THE ONLY  
5 POSSIBILITY MIGHT BE --

6 MR. KELLER: IT WOULD BE APPLIED TO THE SPACE  
7 COMPONENT FOR THE PROVISION OF SPACE FOR THE TECHNIQUES  
8 COURSE AS IT WAS PRESENTED IN PART 2. AGAIN, PART 1  
9 HAVING BEEN DETERMINED WHO CAN PUT ON A TECHNIQUES  
10 COURSE, THEN THIS WOULD PARALLEL THAT PROCESS AS A  
11 SHARED LAB THAT SAYS OF THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT'S  
12 BEING REQUESTED OF CIRM FOR THE TECHNIQUES COURSE, IF  
13 IT'S UP OR DOWN, HOW DOES THAT INVESTMENT STACK UP IN  
14 THESE CATEGORIES, OR IS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME? IS THERE  
15 A RATIONALE FOR A DIFFERENCE?

16 DR. HALL: I HAVE A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE, IF I  
17 COULD, MR. CHAIR.

18 MR. SHEEHY: IT'S ALLUDING ME. I'M HAVING  
19 TROUBLE UNDERSTANDING.

20 DR. HALL: CAN I GIVE A SPECIFIC, JEFF, I  
21 THINK THAT MIGHT BE RELEVANT AND MAYBE NOT. BUT  
22 SUPPOSE AN INSTITUTION SAYS, OKAY, I WANT, WHAT IS IT,  
23 \$2 MILLION TO OUTFIT AND RENOVATE THE BASIC LABORATORY,  
24 AND THAT LABORATORY WILL BE 1500 SQUARE FEET. NOW, WE  
25 ALSO WANT TO GIVE A COURSE THERE, AND NOW WE WANT

1 ANOTHER HALF MILLION DOLLARS TO RENOVATE THAT, AND THE  
2 ADDITION FOR THE COURSE IS ONLY GOING TO BE A HUNDRED  
3 SQUARE FEET. DO YOU SEE WHAT I'M SAYING? THEN THEY'RE  
4 ASKING FOR A VERY SMALL ADDITION IN SPACE, BUT A LOT OF  
5 MONEY MORE TO ADD THAT SMALL ADDITION.

6 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT'S WITHIN THE REALM OF THE  
7 COMMITTEE TO SAY THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE. IF YOU CAN  
8 BUILD FOR A MILLION DOLLARS, YOU CAN RENOVATE 1500  
9 SQUARE FEET, WHY DO YOU NEED ANOTHER HALF A MILLION  
10 JUST TO ADD A HUNDRED SQUARE FEET TO IT? IT'S THINGS  
11 LIKE THAT, I WOULD THINK. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT MAKES  
12 SENSE TO YOU, BUT TO EVALUATE WHETHER THE AMOUNT OF  
13 MONEY THEY WANT TO ADD THAT ADDITIONAL SPACE IS  
14 REASONABLE IN TERMS OF THE SPACE THAT THEY'RE ADDING  
15 IS, I THINK, A RELEVANT CRITERIA.

16 MR. SHEEHY: SO WE'RE GOING TO APPLY ALL SIX  
17 OF THESE CRITERIA TO THE TECHNIQUES COURSES?

18 MS. HOFFMAN: I WOULD SAY THAT IN MANY CASES  
19 HISTORIC PERFORMANCE WOULD BE THE SAME. I CAN'T  
20 IMAGINE THAT YOU WOULD JUDGE THE TECHNIQUES COURSE  
21 DIFFERENTLY THAN YOU WOULD JUDGE THE SHARED LABS ON  
22 HISTORIC PERFORMANCE. BUT CERTAINLY ON COST, AS ZACH  
23 JUST GAVE AN EXAMPLE, TIMELINE AND MILESTONE, IT COULD  
24 BE THAT SOME OF THE APPLICANTS HAVE ONLY ADDED A MONTH  
25 TO THE TIMELINE AND SOME HAVE ADDED AN ADDITIONAL SIX

1 MONTHS FOR SOME REASON. SO YOU'D WANT TO TAKE THAT  
2 INTO CONSIDERATION. AND THEN THE INSTITUTIONAL  
3 COMMITMENT, SINCE WE'VE ASKED FOR A MATCH ON THAT AS  
4 WELL, AND, OF COURSE, RESPONSIVENESS.

5 MR. LICHTENGER: I HAVE A QUESTION FOR JAMES.  
6 SO, JAMES, CAN WE HAVE THE RFA CRITERIA WEIGHTING AS A  
7 RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE, OR IT HAS TO BE MORE SPECIFIC?

8 MR. HARRISON: WELL --

9 MS. SAMUELSON: LET ME ADD TO THAT SINCE  
10 THAT'S MY QUESTION TOO. IS THERE AN EXTENT TO WHICH WE  
11 CAN TAKE THE ICOC CRITERIA AND INTERPRET THEM WHERE  
12 THERE'S ANY DEGREE OF --

13 CHAIRMAN DOMS: FLEXIBILITY?

14 MS. SAMUELSON: YEAH.

15 MR. HARRISON: LET ME TRY TO RESPOND TO THAT.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: TO MAKE SENSE OF IT IN THE  
17 CONTEXT WE'RE OPERATING IN. AND THEN PERHAPS LATER  
18 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISIONS, BUT WHEN WE INTERPRET  
19 WHAT WE'RE GIVEN.

20 MR. HARRISON: FIRST OF ALL, THE ICOC HAS  
21 ADOPTED THESE CRITERIA. THEY'RE INCLUDED WITHIN THE  
22 RFA, SO THE CRITERIA THEMSELVES CANNOT BE ALTERED AT  
23 THIS POINT IN TIME. FURTHERMORE, THE CRITERIA INCLUDES  
24 SOME ELABORATION OF THE TYPES OF ITEMS THAT WOULD BE  
25 CONSIDERED PURSUANT TO EACH CRITERIA. SO I DON'T THINK

1 THERE'S A LOT OF ROOM THERE TO CHANGE WHAT THOSE  
2 QUESTIONS ARE, FOR EXAMPLE.

3 MR. LICHTENGER: AND I WASN'T PROPOSING THAT.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: SOUNDS LIKE THE ISSUE IS MORE  
5 THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE POINT STRUCTURE.

6 MS. HYSEN: YOU KNOW, MY EXPERIENCE IN THE  
7 PUBLIC BIDDING PROCESS IS YOU REALLY WANT TO BE VERY  
8 QUANTITATIVE. THE MORE QUALITATIVE YOU ARE, THE MORE  
9 OPEN TO PUBLIC SCRUTINY YOU BECOME. IT'S SO MUCH  
10 EASIER TO DEAL IN VERY CONCRETE. IN FACT, THERE'S  
11 ALREADY GOING TO BE SUCH DIVERSITY AMONGST OUR  
12 OPINIONS, EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE NUMBERS AND THOSE ARE  
13 VERY CONCRETE FACTS, I THINK THERE'S GOING TO BE ENOUGH  
14 DIVERSITY THAT THAT ALONE MAY RAISE SOME QUESTIONS.  
15 WELL, WHY DID THIS REVIEWER RATE MY GRANT THIS WAY?  
16 AND WERE THEY UNFAIRLY REVIEWED? I THINK IT'S SO MUCH  
17 EASIER, I THINK, WHEN YOU HAVE VERY CONCRETE FACTS. I  
18 THINK WE'RE GOING TO HAVE MORE PROBLEMS IN THE  
19 QUALITATIVE, THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, IF THEY DIFFER  
20 SIGNIFICANTLY FROM THE TECHNICAL PORTION. THAT'S JUST  
21 MY BELIEF.

22 MR. HARRISON: SO, DAVID, TO RESPOND TO YOUR  
23 QUESTION, I CAN'T TELL YOU THAT IT'S LEGALLY COMPELLED  
24 THAT YOU ASSIGN SCORES TO EACH CRITERIA. HOWEVER, TO  
25 THE DEGREE THAT YOU INTRODUCE MORE ARBITRARINESS OR THE

1 POTENTIAL FOR ARBITRARINESS INTO THE PROCESS, I THINK  
2 YOU DO CREATE A GREATER RISK, NOT ONLY OF PUBLIC  
3 SCRUTINY AND CRITICISM, BUT ALSO THAT AN APPLICANT  
4 BELIEVES THAT IT HAS BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY BECAUSE  
5 CERTAIN REVIEWERS ASSIGN A MUCH HIGHER VALUE TO ONE  
6 CRITERIA THAN ANOTHER. AND, THEREFORE, THE  
7 APPLICATIONS WERE REALLY WEIGHTED DIFFERENTLY  
8 ULTIMATELY. AND WE DO HAVE TO REMEMBER THAT THIS IS  
9 OUR FIRST EFFORT, AND WE HAVE NOT OBVIOUSLY PERFECTED  
10 IT YET, BUT WE DO NEED TO TRY TO STRIVE TO ENSURE THAT  
11 IT'S AS FAIR AS POSSIBLE TO MINIMIZE, NOT ONLY THE RISK  
12 OF PUBLIC CRITICISM, BUT ALSO A POTENTIAL LITIGATION  
13 EMANATING OUT OF THIS PROCESS.

14 MR. KLEIN: RUSTY AND DAVID, THIS IS BOB  
15 KLEIN. I'M JUST ON AND LISTENING. I DIDN'T WANT TO  
16 INTERRUPT JAMES HARRISON.

17 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU. I'D LIKE TO BRING  
18 THIS TO SOME KIND OF A CONSENSUS CONCLUSION OF THIS  
19 DISCUSSION. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT, ONE, THE SIX  
20 CRITERIA, WE'RE GOING TO LIVE WITH THAT. THAT'S WHAT'S  
21 BEEN IDENTIFIED AND APPROVED BY THE ICOC.

22 I THINK THAT THE WEIGHTING SYSTEM IS  
23 SOMETHING THAT, FOR BETTER, FOR WORSE, WE HAVE TO USE  
24 AT THIS POINT. I THINK THE FLEXIBILITY THAT WE DO HAVE  
25 IS THE POINTS IN EACH CATEGORY. AND I WELCOME

1 SUGGESTIONS ON THAT, BUT LET'S REACH A CONSENSUS AND  
2 MOVE ON. I THINK WE MADE A LOT OF PROGRESS. WE  
3 BROUGHT UP A LOT OF ISSUES THAT ARE EXCELLENT ISSUES.  
4 I THINK THE DISCUSSION IS INCREDIBLY GOOD AND HEALTHY.  
5 WE HAVE DISAGREEMENTS, AND I THINK WE'RE WORKING  
6 THROUGH THOSE. BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE'RE LOCKED IN  
7 ON CRITERIA. WE'RE LOCKED IN ON A WEIGHTING OR SCORING  
8 SYSTEM. WE CAN TALK ABOUT HOW WE WANT TO ALLOCATE THE  
9 POINTS IF WE'RE UNCOMFORTABLE WITH IT AS IT STANDS. I  
10 THINK THERE IS SOME CONCERN ABOUT THAT, PARTICULARLY ON  
11 FEASIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS, AND ONE VERSUS THE  
12 OTHER, COST VERSUS HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE. SO I WOULD  
13 TAKE SUGGESTIONS ON THAT.

14 DR. WRIGHT: I WOULD MOVE, TO GET US ROLLING  
15 HERE, TO REDUCE THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS FOR  
16 HISTORIC PERFORMANCE TO TEN.

17 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WHERE WOULD YOU PUT IT?

18 DR. WRIGHT: THAT'S A SEPARATE MOTION.

19 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YOU GOT TO PUT IT SOMEWHERE  
20 ELSE.

21 DR. WRIGHT: WELL, WE TALK -- THAT WILL BE  
22 THE NEXT MOTION. I'LL GO WITH DOWN TO TEN.

23 MR. LICHTENGER: SECOND.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THERE WAS A  
25 SECOND BY DAVID. DISCUSSION?

1 CHAIRMAN DOMS: DISCUSSION? ALL IN FAVOR.

2 DR. HALL: JUST ASK IF THERE'S PUBLIC

3 COMMENT.

4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: IS THERE PUBLIC COMMENT?

5 DR. HALME: IT'S NOT ABOUT THE TEN POINTS,  
6 BUT JUST IN GENERAL -- DINA HALME FROM UCSF. AS  
7 INSTITUTIONS WHO ARE APPLICANTS, IT WOULD BE REALLY  
8 USEFUL FOR US, AND WE UNDERSTAND THIS TIME THERE WAS A  
9 RUSH, BUT MOVING FORWARD TO KNOW WHAT THE SYSTEM IS  
10 GOING TO BE PRIOR TO SUBMITTING THE APPLICATION BECAUSE  
11 WE MAKE CHOICES EVERY DAY ABOUT, WELL, WE COULD PUT  
12 MORE MONEY OR WE COULD MAKE IT BIGGER, OR WE COULD DO  
13 THIS, THAT, AND THE OTHER. KNOWING THAT AHEAD OF TIME  
14 WOULD BE EXTREMELY HELPFUL.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I THINK THAT'S AN EXCELLENT  
16 AND A FAIR POINT, AND WE WILL ENDEAVOR TO DO THAT.  
17 THANK YOU.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ARE THERE ANY  
19 OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT WISH TO SPEAK TO THE  
20 MOTION? IF NOT, I'D LIKE TO CALL A ROLL CALL VOTE.  
21 I'LL DO IT. I'LL ACT AS SECRETARY.

22 DEBORAH.

23 MR. HYSEN: AYE.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID. AYE.  
25 RUSTY.

1 CHAIRMAN DOMS: AYE.  
2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JANET.  
3 DR. WRIGHT: AYE.  
4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ED.  
5 MR. KASHIAN: AYE.  
6 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MARCY.  
7 MS. FEIT: AYE.  
8 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID.  
9 MR. LICHTENGER: AYE.  
10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF.  
11 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JOAN.  
13 MS. SAMUELSON: AYE.  
14 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB KLEIN.  
15 MR. KLEIN: AYE.  
16 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SHERRY LANSING.  
17 MS. LANSING: AYE.  
18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MOTION PASSES.  
19 CHAIRMAN DOMS: NOW, I STILL THINK THAT WE  
20 HAVE A GOAL --  
21 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE SHARE THAT  
22 DUTY, BY THE WAY.  
23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: -- OF A HUNDRED POINTS, SO --  
24 DR. WRIGHT: WE HAVE TEN POINTS HANGING  
25 AROUND THERE.

1                   CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE'VE TAKEN TEN OFF. OTHER  
2 CONSIDERATIONS?

3                   MR. LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO MAKE ANOTHER  
4 MOTION, THAT WE CAN MAKE THE FEASIBILITY AND  
5 RESPONSIVENESS ZERO TO 15 POINTS ON EACH VERSUS ZERO OR  
6 15 POINTS.

7                   DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

8                   MS. HYSEN: I WOULD LIKE TO ADD TO THAT  
9 SIMPLY THAT I THINK FEASIBILITY SHOULD BE HIGHER, AND  
10 THAT THAT MAY BE WHERE SOME OF THOSE POINTS THAT WE  
11 JUST REDUCED GO TO.

12                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: TO THE FIRST  
13 MOTION -- DAVID SPEAKING -- COULD YOU REPEAT YOUR  
14 MOTION?

15                   MR. LICHTENGER: MY MOTION IS TO CHANGE THE  
16 RFA CRITERIA WEIGHTING FOR FEASIBILITY AND  
17 RESPONSIVENESS FROM A RANGE OF ZERO TO 15 POINTS, NOT  
18 ZERO OR 15 POINTS FOR EACH.

19                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SO, DEBORAH, TO  
20 THAT DISCRETE ISSUE, THAT DISCRETE MOTION, I THINK IT  
21 MIGHT BE BETTER IF WE JUST TAKE A MOTION, BY MOTION.  
22 AND PERHAPS YOUR MOTION NEXT COULD BE TO INCREASE THE  
23 FEASIBILITY IF YOU SO WANT TO MAKE THAT MOTION BECAUSE  
24 WE HAVE TEN POINTS FLOATING AROUND. IS THAT OKAY?

25                   MS. HYSEN: THAT'S FAIR.

1                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. ARE THERE  
2 ANY -- I'LL SECOND THE MOTION. OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE  
3 COMMITTEE MEMBERS?

4                   MR. KLEIN: WHAT IS THE EXACT MOTION? YOU  
5 EITHER GIVE SOMEONE ZERO OR 15?

6                   DR. WRIGHT: THAT'S THE STATUS RIGHT NOW,  
7 BOB. HE'S RECOMMENDING A RANGE INSTEAD OF AN ALL OR  
8 NOTHING, ZERO OR 15.

9                   MR. KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY. I THINK THAT IT'S  
10 VERY IMPORTANT, SO WE'RE NOT PUT INTO A POSITION WHERE  
11 SOMEONE HAS BEEN MOSTLY RESPONSIVE, BUT MAYBE NOT A  
12 HUNDRED PERCENT, AND WE NEED TO PUT CONDITIONS ON AN  
13 APPROVAL OF THEM BEING FORCED TO GIVE THEM ZERO. SO I  
14 THINK THAT'S VERY VALUABLE.

15                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SHERRY, DO YOU  
16 HAVE ANY COMMENTS?

17                   MS. LANSING: I AGREE WITH THAT. I'VE  
18 ACTUALLY BEEN LISTENING BECAUSE THIS IS ALL SO NEW TO  
19 ME, THAT I'M LEARNING AS I GO, BUT I AGREE WITH THAT.

20                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU. ARE  
21 THERE ANY COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE MOTION?

22                   MS. SAMUELSON: ONE QUESTION, DAVID, FOR THE  
23 REAL ESTATE FOLKS. ARE FEASIBILITY -- FEASIBILITY AND  
24 COST, ARE THEY COMPLETELY INDEPENDENT?

25                   MS. HYSEN: I THINK EVERYTHING IS

1 INTERRELATED TO SOME EXTENT. IS THE COST COMPARATIVE  
2 TO THE CONSTRUCTION? YOU REALLY CAN'T, I DON'T THINK,  
3 SEPARATE ANY OF THESE FROM EACH OTHER.

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DID THAT ANSWER  
5 YOUR QUESTION, JOAN?

6 MS. SAMUELSON: YEAH.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ARE THERE  
8 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THIS MOTION? HEARING NONE,  
9 I'LL CALL THE ROLL CALL. JOAN.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: WHICH IS THIS?

11 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THIS IS DAVID'S  
12 MOTION.

13 DR. WRIGHT: ZERO TO 15.

14 MS. LANSING: THIS IS THE ZERO TO 15.

15 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JOAN. AYE.  
16 JEFF.

17 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID.

19 MR. LICHTENGER: AYE.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MARCY.

21 MS. FEIT: YES.

22 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ED.

23 MR. KASHIAN: AYE.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JANET.

25 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

1 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: RUSTY.  
2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES.  
3 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID. AYE.  
4 DEBORAH.  
5 MS. HYSEN: YES.  
6 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB. BOB.  
7 SHERRY.  
8 MS. LANSING: YES.  
9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MOTION PASSES.  
10 I THINK, DEBORAH, YOU NOW WANT TO MAKE A  
11 MOTION. YOU DON'T HAVE TO.  
12 MS. HYSEN: WELL, WE DO HAVE THOSE EXTRA TEN  
13 POINTS. AND I THINK BEFORE I MAKE A MOTION, I WOULD  
14 SIMPLY LIKE TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION THAT SOME OF THOSE  
15 POINTS GO TO FEASIBILITY. I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE  
16 REMAINING POINTS WOULD GO, BUT I WOULD SAY THAT AT  
17 LEAST FIVE OF THEM WOULD GO TO FEASIBILITY.  
18 MR. LICHTENGER: I FEEL LIKE THERE SHOULD BE  
19 SOME BALANCE BETWEEN COST AND THE INSTITUTIONAL  
20 COMMITMENT MATCHING FUNDS BECAUSE, AGAIN, IF THE COST  
21 IS SOMEWHAT HIGHER, BUT THERE'S GREATER LEVERAGE IN  
22 THERE, I MEAN I KIND OF FEEL LIKE THOSE TEN POINTS  
23 SHOULD GO TO INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT UNLESS THAT'S NOT  
24 DEFINED AS I'M SEEING THAT IN TERMS OF LEVERAGE.  
25 DR. WRIGHT: I'M JUST WONDERING. THIS MAY BE

1 A REALLY BAD IDEA, BUT I'LL TOSS IT OUT THERE. SINCE  
2 WE HAVE TEN POINTS TO SPEND, DO WE NEED AN OTHER  
3 CATEGORY? DO WE NEED TO PROGRAM -- NO. BAD. THAT'S  
4 WIGGLE ROOM. OKAY. IT'S A GOOD GROUP FOR DISCUSSION.

5 MR. LICHTENGER: WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF  
6 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT?

7 MS. HOFFMAN: EXCELLENT QUESTION BECAUSE I  
8 THINK THAT IF YOU'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT INCREASING IT,  
9 YOU ALSO NEED TO SAY, THEN, WHAT IS THE THRESHOLD FOR  
10 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT? RIGHT NOW THE REQUIREMENT OR  
11 MINIMUM REQUIREMENT IS 20 PERCENT. SO THE QUESTION  
12 WOULD BE IS IF YOU WANTED TO INCREASE IT, IF AN  
13 INSTITUTION MET THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF 20 PERCENT,  
14 HOW MUCH DO THEY GET? AND THEN HOW MANY MORE POINTS  
15 WOULD YOU LIKE TO AWARD BASED ON ADDITIONAL COMMITMENTS  
16 THAT HAVE BEEN MADE? OR IF YOU'RE JUST TRYING TO LOOK  
17 FOR THE MINIMUM 20 PERCENT COMMITMENT.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU KNOW, ON THAT  
19 POINT, MS. HOFFMAN, THE 20 PERCENT IS REQUIRED UNDER  
20 PROP 71.

21 MS. HOFFMAN: THAT IS CORRECT.

22 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SO I MEAN THAT'S  
23 THE MINIMUM.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THEY HAVE TO DO IT OR THEY'RE  
25 NOT ELIGIBLE.

1                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I DON'T KNOW IF  
2 WE WANT TO GIVE MORE POINTS THERE BECAUSE IF THEY MEET  
3 THE -- IF THEY JUST MEET THE 20 PERCENT, OKAY, FINE,  
4 THAT'S A REQUIREMENT OF THE RFA AND OF PROP 71.

5                   MR. LICHTENGER: SO MY QUESTION, THOUGH, IS  
6 IF WE HYPOTHETICALLY INCREASED THE INSTITUTIONAL  
7 COMMITMENT TO 20 POINTS AND SOMEONE HAD A MUCH GREATER  
8 LEVERAGE, WOULD WE BE ABLE TO GIVE THEM A HIGHER SCORE  
9 THAN SOMEONE WHO HAD THE MINIMUM?

10                  MS. HYSEN: REMEMBER THE WAY THIS IS WRITTEN,  
11 THIS IS YES OR NO. THIS ISN'T A SLIDING SCALE, SO  
12 YOU'D HAVE TO NOT ONLY INCREASE THE AMOUNT, BUT ALSO  
13 MAKE IT A SLIDING SCALE. IT'S A YES OR NO IN OUR  
14 SCORING. IT MIGHT LOOK LIKE THAT, BUT IT'S YES OR NO.

15                  MS. HOFFMAN: THAT'S RIGHT. THAT'S JUST A  
16 REVIEW PIECE. WHEN YOU ACTUALLY HAVE YOUR SCORECARD,  
17 YOU'LL BE ABLE TO ASSIGN ANY POINTS.

18                  MS. HYSEN: IT'S NOT CLEAR ON OUR SCORECARD.

19                  CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE'RE GOING TO GET A MOTION  
20 REAL QUICKLY HERE.

21                  MS. HYSEN: THAT'S WHY WE WERE CONCERNED WITH  
22 THE FEASIBILITY AND THE RESPONSIVENESS. SO ALL OF  
23 THESE ARE SLIDING SCALE THEN? NONE OF THESE -- BECAUSE  
24 THIS SAYS YES OR NO.

25                  MR. KLEIN: I WAS TRYING TO HEAR. SO WE

1 REALLY NEED TO MAKE A MOTION TO MAKE IT A SLIDING SCALE  
2 SO THE PUBLIC KNOWS THAT IT'S GOING TO BE A SLIDING  
3 SCALE. IS THAT WHAT WE'RE DOING?

4 MS. HYSEN: SO WE KNOW BECAUSE OUR REVIEW  
5 DOES NOT SAY THAT. WE EITHER GET TO GIVE THEM TEN OR  
6 ZERO.

7 MR. KELLER: I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. THAT'S A  
8 DISCREPANCY IN PUTTING THE SLIDE TOGETHER.

9 MR. LICHTENGER: I THINK IT SHOULD BE SLIDING  
10 SCALE.

11 MR. SHEEHY: COULD I JUST -- COULD WE GET  
12 SOME CLARIFICATION ON THIS INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT  
13 BECAUSE I DON'T THINK MATCHING THE MINIMUM SHOULD  
14 RECEIVE ANY POINTS BECAUSE IF THEY DON'T MATCH THE  
15 MINIMUM, THEY'RE NOT RESPONSIVE. DOES THAT COLOR HOW  
16 MANY POINTS -- DO YOU WANT TO GIVE THEM MORE THAN TEN  
17 POINTS FOR ADDING BEYOND THE 20 PERCENT?

18 MR. LICHTENGER: THAT'S WHAT I WAS ASKING IS  
19 THAT CAN WE DEFINE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT DIFFERENTLY  
20 AS A LEVERAGE VERSUS MEETING THE MINIMUM COMMITMENT?

21 MR. KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S THE RIGHT  
22 DIRECTION BECAUSE, AS JEFF SHEEHY SAYS, MEETING THE  
23 MINIMUM IS JUST QUALIFYING TO HAVE YOUR GRANT  
24 CONSIDERED.

25 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT

1 SPECIFIC LEVELS OVER AND ABOVE THE MINIMUM?

2 MR. LICHTENGER: YES. YES. SO I'M SAYING  
3 THAT I THINK THAT IF THEY DON'T HAVE THE MINIMUM, THEN  
4 THEY'RE NOT RESPONSIVE, AND WE OBVIOUSLY SCORE IT  
5 ACCORDINGLY. THERE MAY BE CERTAIN GRANT PROPOSALS THAT  
6 ARE HIGHLY LEVERAGED, AND I THINK WE SHOULD AT LEAST  
7 WEIGH THAT ISSUE AS MUCH AS WE'RE WEIGHTING COST  
8 BECAUSE IF THE COSTS ARE OFFSET BY THE LEVERAGE,  
9 OBVIOUSLY THAT WOULD MAKE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE.

10 MR. KLEIN: I THINK --

11 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, WE'LL GET TO  
12 YOU. MARCY IS SPEAKING.

13 MS. FEIT: I BELIEVE IF PROP 71 STATES THAT  
14 THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT IS 20 PERCENT, I DON'T EVEN  
15 THINK WE SHOULD BRING IT FORWARD FOR SCORING. I MEAN  
16 WE'RE AUTOMATICALLY VIOLATING PROP 71. SO THOSE SHOULD  
17 BE JUST DISQUALIFIED. IT'S JUST DIFFERENT. WE  
18 SHOULDN'T EVEN SCORE THEM. SO I THINK THEN WE SHOULD  
19 TALK, OKAY, FROM THAT POINT ON, WHAT IS THE DEFINITION?

20 MR. LICHTENGER: I AGREE. THAT MAKES SENSE.

21 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I THINK YOU'RE -- THAT WAS MY  
22 UNDERSTANDING OF HOW IT WOULD FUNCTION.

23 MS. SAMUELSON: MAYBE TO CLARIFY, WE SIMPLY  
24 CHANGE THE PHRASE TO INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT  
25 OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, SO THAT IT REFERENCES THAT.

1                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB AND SHERRY,  
2 DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THIS SORT OF ISSUE?

3                   MR. KLEIN: DAVID, SO YOU CAN FINALLY TELL I  
4 HAVE MY HAND UP. SO AS I UNDERSTAND IT, DON'T WE NEED  
5 A RECORD HERE THAT IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE POINTS  
6 ASSIGNED FOR BEING OVER 20 PERCENT OR AUTHORIZING THE  
7 COMMITTEE TO AWARD POINTS FOR OVER 20 PERCENT, WE  
8 SHOULD REALLY PUT THAT IN A RESOLUTION OR A MOTION OF  
9 SOME KIND SO THAT IT'S PART OF THE FORMAL RECORD,  
10 SHOULDN'T WE?

11                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

12                   MS. HYSEN: CAN I RAISE A QUESTION? AND  
13 MAYBE IT'S ADDRESSING THE UCSF RESPONSE. WE DIDN'T ASK  
14 TO SHOW THE ENHANCEMENT. I FEEL THAT THAT WOULD  
15 PROBABLY HAVE TO COME THROUGH AN ADDENDUM TO THE RFA.  
16 IF YOU LOOK AT WHAT YOU ASK YOUR SUBMITTERS TO RESPOND  
17 TO, YOU REALLY ASKED THEM JUST FOR THE MATCHING FUND.  
18 I DON'T SEE, AND MAYBE SOMEONE CAN ARTICULATE HERE, HOW  
19 WOULD YOU OFFER AN ENHANCEMENT TO THE APPLICATION  
20 BECAUSE I THINK THAT WOULD BE AN UNFAIR ADVANTAGE IF  
21 SOMEONE TOOK IT UPON THEMSELVES TO DESCRIBE WHAT THOSE  
22 ENHANCEMENTS MIGHT BE.

23                   MR. KLEIN: THE INITIATIVE MAKES IT QUITE  
24 CLEAR THAT HIGHER LEVERAGE IS TO BE GIVEN A PRIORITY.  
25 THAT'S IN THE INITIATIVE ITSELF.

1 MS. HYSEN: I KNOW, BUT THE ACTUAL RFA  
2 DOESN'T DETAIL IT UNLESS SOMEONE CAN POINT IT OUT. I'M  
3 RAISING THAT. MAYBE SOMEONE FROM THE PUBLIC WOULD LIKE  
4 TO COMMENT.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT THE  
6 DIFFERENCE IS?

7 MS. HYSEN: WHEN YOU GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS,  
8 THERE'S SOME VERY CONCRETE THINGS YOU ASK FOR. AND SO  
9 IF YOU'RE SOMEONE ON THE TEAM THAT'S SUBMITTING THESE  
10 APPLICATIONS, YOU DO ADDRESS THOSE CONCRETE THINGS, SO  
11 YOU DON'T MISS ANYTHING. BUT SOMEONE THAT'S REALLY  
12 GOOD AT WHAT THEY DO, AND I'M SURE THEY'RE ALL VERY  
13 GOOD AT WHAT THEY DO, WANTS TO ENHANCE. THEY WANT TO  
14 MAKE THEIR PROPOSAL MORE ATTRACTIVE. IT'S NOT A  
15 REQUIREMENT, BUT IT'S CERTAINLY YOU'RE INCENTIVIZED TO  
16 DO THAT BECAUSE, AS BOB SAID, IT PROBABLY WAS IN THE  
17 INITIATIVE THAT WE WANT TO SEE ADDITIONAL KINDS OF  
18 LEVERAGE OPPORTUNITIES. BUT IF THE ACTUAL GRANT  
19 PREPARER IS SIMPLY FOLLOWING POINT A, B, C, D, THEY'RE  
20 NOT GOING TO SEE THAT THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS  
21 REQUESTED. AND IT'S NOT REQUESTED. EVEN IN A  
22 QUALITATIVE WAY, IT'S NOT ASKED FOR HERE.

23 SO I'M JUST CONCERNED THAT WE'RE PUTTING SOME  
24 HIGHER RATE ON SOMETHING THAT WE ACTUALLY DIDN'T EVEN  
25 POINT OUT.

1 MR. KLEIN: DON'T WE ASK IN THE RFA FOR  
2 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT?

3 MS. HYSEN: YOU DO, BUT IF YOU READ THE  
4 DESCRIPTION, IT'S REALLY JUST MATCHING.

5 MR. KLEIN: IT SAYS ONLY SHOW THE 20 PERCENT  
6 MATCHING. IS THAT WHAT IT SAYS?

7 MS. HYSEN: IT DOES. NOW, IT DOES SAY DETAIL  
8 THE USE OF THE SPACE AFTER THE THREE-YEAR PERIOD. AND  
9 PERHAPS THAT'S WHERE YOU GET SOME ENHANCED RESEARCH  
10 ACTIVITY, BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT A GRANT APPLICANT WOULD  
11 NECESSARILY SEE THAT.

12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME ASK A  
13 QUESTION TO LEGAL. JUST TAKE -- I DON'T KNOW IF THIS  
14 WILL HELP US OR HURT US. BUT WERE WE TO -- THERE SEEMS  
15 TO BE A DESIRE AMONGST SOME OF US TO AWARD MORE POINTS  
16 TO INSTITUTIONS THAT EXCEED THE 20-PERCENT MATCH. AND  
17 WE WANT TO ARTICULATE THAT SOMEHOW IN THIS APPLICATION  
18 FORM. I'M GETTING TO MY QUESTION.

19 SO MY QUESTION IS I GUESS CAN WE DO THAT?  
20 AND WOULD WE BE IN ANY WAY IN CONFLICT WITH WHAT  
21 DEBORAH'S SAYING OR STATED IN THE RFA? IF WE CAN DO  
22 IT, I THINK THERE'S A MOVEMENT TO DO IT. IF WE CAN'T  
23 AND IT WOULD EXPOSE US TO LAWSUITS, THAT'S SOMETHING  
24 THAT WE HAVE TO FACTOR IN WHEN WE MAKE THIS DECISION.  
25 SO THAT IS MY QUESTION TO MR. HARRISON.

1 MR. HARRISON: WELL, LET ME START BY  
2 SAYING --

3 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I DON'T KNOW THE  
4 ANSWER.

5 MR. HARRISON: -- THAT, FIRST OF ALL, THE  
6 CRITERIA ITSELF, AS SPECIFIED IN THE RFA UNDER  
7 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, ASKS IS THE INSTITUTIONAL  
8 COMMITMENT OF FUNDING TO THIS PROJECT SUFFICIENT. SO  
9 IT, FRANKLY, DOESN'T ADDRESS THIS PRECISE QUESTION ONE  
10 WAY OR ANOTHER. SO WE HAVE SOME AMBIGUITY HERE.

11 IT IS, AS BOB KLEIN NOTED, HOWEVER, A  
12 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE OF PROPOSITION 71 TO GIVE PRIORITY  
13 WHERE MATCHING FUNDS EXCEED 20 PERCENT. SO ONE WAY TO  
14 POTENTIALLY DEAL WITH THIS IS TO LOOK AT THAT AS A  
15 STRATEGIC ISSUE AND TAKE IT INTO CONSIDERATION IN YOUR  
16 PROGRAMMATIC EVALUATION.

17 DR. HALL: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A POINT HERE IF I  
18 COULD. LET ME JUST SAY THAT IT SEEMS TO ME THE  
19 QUESTION OF 20-PERCENT MATCHING FUNDS IS NOT QUITE SO  
20 OPEN AND SHUT AS IT'S PRESENTED HERE. HAVING BEEN AT  
21 AN INSTITUTION IN WHICH MATCHING FUNDS ARE REQUIRED FOR  
22 A PARTICULAR PROJECT, YOU CAN MAKE ALL SORTS OF CLAIMS  
23 ABOUT MATCHING FUNDS. YOU CAN SAY, WELL, WE ACTUALLY  
24 RENOVATED THIS FOR WHEELCHAIR SPACE THREE YEARS AGO AND  
25 THAT'S OUR MATCH. WE'VE ALREADY INVESTED IN THIS SPACE

1 TO MAKE IT AVAILABLE FOR THE DISABLED VERSUS OR, WELL,  
2 THE INVESTIGATORS WHO ARE GOING TO GET THIS ARE GOING  
3 TO BRING IN INDIRECT COSTS, SO THAT'S ALSO GOING TO BE  
4 PART OF THE MATCH. OR TO SAY THE INSTITUTION IS  
5 ACTUALLY VERY COMMITTED TO THIS PROJECT. WE HAVE SPENT  
6 \$750,000 ALREADY, OR WE WILL SPEND \$750,000 ON  
7 EQUIPMENT FOR THIS SPACE. OR WE WILL PROVIDE  
8 TWO-THIRDS OF THE SALARY OF A PERSON. AND THE QUALITY  
9 OF THOSE DIFFERENT MATCHING FUNDS IS VERY DIFFERENT.

10 I WOULD SUBMIT THAT THE FIRST TWO ARE  
11 DUBIOUS, AND THE LAST TWO ARE VERY CONCRETE AND  
12 INDICATE. SO THERE IS A QUALITY JUDGMENT TO BE MADE  
13 HERE ABOUT WHETHER THE INSTITUTION IS REALLY SORT OF  
14 MEETING THIS LETTER OF THE LAW BY GENNING UP SOME  
15 THINGS, OR WHETHER IN ACTUAL FACT THEY'RE GOING TO MAKE  
16 A REAL COMMITMENT OF DOLLARS ON THE TABLE FOR THIS  
17 PROPOSAL.

18 AND SO I WOULD SAY THAT IS -- IT'S NOT SIMPLY  
19 THAT THEY'VE DONE IT OR NOT. I WOULD SAY THAT'S WHAT  
20 YOU MEAN BY INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT. ARE THEY REALLY  
21 BEHIND THIS PROJECT? ARE THEY REALLY GOING TO PUT  
22 THEIR OWN RESOURCES INTO IT IN A VERY DIRECT AND  
23 SPECIFIC WAY? OR ARE THEY GOING TO, YOU KNOW, DO  
24 SOMETHING ELSE? THAT WOULD BE MY ARGUMENT OR MY  
25 SUGGESTION OF SOMETHING TO CONSIDER, THAT IT'S NOT

1 NECESSARILY AN ALL OR NONE THING, AND YOU MIGHT WANT TO  
2 KEEP THAT SLIDING SCALE AND REALLY JUDGE IT ON A MATTER  
3 OF NOT JUST OF DID THEY COME UP WITH A NUMBER, BUT  
4 WHAT'S THE QUALITY OF THAT COMMITMENT.

5 MR. KLEIN: ZACH, IN TERMS OF THE QUALITY,  
6 WHICH IS A VERY IMPORTANT POINT, SINCE THERE WASN'T A  
7 LOT OF DEFINITION IN THE RFA OF WHAT THE MATCH WAS, AS  
8 FAR AS I KNOW. I DON'T HAVE THAT IN FRONT OF ME WHERE  
9 I AM, BUT CERTAINLY IN GIVING ADDITIONAL POINTS THAT  
10 THIS COMMITTEE CAN EVALUATE BOTH AND SHOULD EVALUATE,  
11 AND I THINK I'M AGREEING WITH YOU IN TERMS OF -- I'M  
12 SURE I'M AGREEING WITH YOU IN TERMS OF THE SCALE,  
13 EVALUATING BOTH THE AMOUNT AND THE QUALITY OF THE MATCH  
14 SO THAT BOTH THINGS ARE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION. BUT  
15 THIS GROUP CERTAINLY HAS THE ABILITY TO LOOK AT BOTH OF  
16 THOSE COMPONENTS IN REACHING A SCORE.

17 BUT YOU'RE ALSO POINTING OUT THAT IT'S VERY,  
18 VERY CRITICAL FOR US TO GET OUT DEFINITIONS ON WHAT  
19 MATCHING FUNDS WILL MEAN FOR MAJOR FACILITIES BECAUSE  
20 WITH THE HUGE DOLLARS, WE'VE GOT TO BE VERY CLEAR ON  
21 HOW WE'RE GOING TO EVALUATE MATCHING FUNDS AND GIVE  
22 POTENTIALLY EXAMPLES OF WHAT WOULD FALL INTO DIFFERENT  
23 CATEGORIES SO THAT PEOPLE HAVE THE PROPER DIRECTION  
24 BEFORE THEY EVEN SUBMIT A LETTER OF INTENT.

25 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, THAT'S A

1 GOOD POINT. LET ME JUST SAY TO MY COLLEAGUES -- I  
2 DON'T EVEN HAVE A MOTION TO MAKE. I THINK WE'VE HAD A  
3 HEALTHY DISCUSSION ON THIS ISSUE. I WANT TO SAY A  
4 COUPLE OF THINGS.

5 IN A SIDEBAR CONVERSATION WITH DEBORAH, SHE  
6 BROUGHT UP A VERY GOOD POINT. I JUST WANT TO REPEAT  
7 IT. AND THAT IS, ONE, IF THERE'S ANY MINIMUM  
8 QUALIFICATIONS, THEY'RE EMBODIED IN PROPOSITION 71.  
9 OKAY. ONE OF THEM IS YOU HAVE MEET THE 20-PERCENT  
10 MATCHING GRANTS. OKAY. IF YOU DON'T MEET THE  
11 20-PERCENT MATCHING GRANT, THE APPLICATION ON ITS FACE  
12 CAN'T BE CONSIDERED. OKAY. IT CAN'T BE CONSIDERED.

13 MR. KASHIAN: WHY WOULD IT EVEN BE IN FRONT  
14 OF US?

15 MS. HYSEN: EXACTLY. IT SHOULD NOT BE HERE.

16 MR. KASHIAN: WHY ISN'T THE DECISION MADE BY  
17 STAFF PRIOR TO BEING SUBMITTED?

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I WOULD SUBMIT  
19 THAT IT OUGHT TO BE.

20 MR. KASHIAN: SO THEN THE SLIDING SCALE  
21 BECOMES PERTINENT. THE MORE THEY HAVE AND THE HIGHER  
22 POINT AVERAGE.

23 MS. HYSEN: WE THINK YOU CAN LEAVE THIS IN AS  
24 AN ENHANCEMENT, BUT CERTAINLY NOT THE WAY IT'S WRITTEN  
25 BECAUSE THIS IS A NONRESPONSIVE ITEM RIGHT HERE. SO IF

1 YOU WRITE IT SUCH THAT, AND KEEP THE ZERO TO TEN  
2 BECAUSE IT IS QUALITATIVE, IF YOU WRITE IT SUCH THAT  
3 WHAT IS THE ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT THAT'S  
4 OFFERED RELATIVE TO THIS RFA, THAT MAKES SENSE. THE  
5 WAY IT'S WRITTEN NOW --

6 DR. HALL: DEBORAH, ALSO THE QUALITY.

7 MS. HYSEN: -- IT'S A NO GO AT THIS POINT IF  
8 THEY SAY NO.

9 DR. HALL: I WOULD ALSO INSERT THE QUALITY.  
10 WHAT THEY HAVE GIVEN AS THEIR INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT  
11 MAY BE MORE OR LESS.

12 MS. HYSEN: RIGHT. THAT MAKES SENSE.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: THIS MIGHT BE A WAY OF  
14 RESOLVING THIS FOR THIS PHASE, WHICH WOULD BE TO DECIDE  
15 AMONG US THAT, IN INTERPRETING THESE CRITERIA FOR THIS  
16 ROUND, THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT WOULD BE ZERO  
17 POINTS. AND THAT BECAUSE OF THE COST ITEM, THE LAST  
18 QUESTION, IS HAS THE INSTITUTION LEVERAGED THE CIRM  
19 RESOURCES? MAYBE THAT CAN BE A PLACE TO PUT THE EXTRA  
20 POINTS WHICH WOULD GO TOWARD INCREASED ENHANCEMENT ON  
21 THE PART OF THE INSTITUTION OVER AND ABOVE THE REQUIRED  
22 MATCH.

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: JOAN, I THINK WE HAVE TO  
24 LEAVE THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT IN.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M SAYING LEAVE IT IN, BUT

1 DECIDE AMONG US, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS ROUND, THAT  
2 IT WILL BE ZERO POINTS.

3 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, I DON'T THINK YOU CAN  
4 HAVE A CRITERIA THAT HAS ZERO POINTS.

5 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I'D LIKE TO HEAR  
6 FROM JAMES.

7 MR. HARRISON: RICK MAKES AN EXCELLENT POINT.  
8 AND THE REASON WHY YOU HAVE TO CONTINUE TO CONSIDER  
9 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, IT'S NOT TRULY A MINIMUM  
10 QUALIFICATION BECAUSE UNDER PROPOSITION 71 YOU HAVE THE  
11 ABILITY TO RECOMMEND THAT IT BE WEIGHED IN CASES OF  
12 EXCEPTIONAL MERIT. SO THE ONE MINIMUM QUALIFICATION  
13 YOU HAVE HERE IS IT BE A NONPROFIT ENTITY. IF YOU WERE  
14 TO RECEIVE AN APPLICATION FROM A FOR-PROFIT ENTITY --

15 MR. KASHIAN: COUNSEL, ISN'T THAT THE  
16 DECISION OF THE ICOC?

17 MR. HARRISON: ULTIMATELY IT'S THE DECISION  
18 OF THE ICOC.

19 MR. KASHIAN: IT'S NOT MINE. I CAN'T MAKE  
20 THAT DECISION.

21 MR. HARRISON: NO, BUT YOU CAN RECOMMEND TO  
22 THE ICOC THAT AN APPLICATION IS OF SUCH EXCEPTIONAL  
23 MERIT, THAT NOTWITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT IT HAS LESS  
24 THAN A 20-PERCENT MATCH, IT SHOULD BE FUNDED. YOU HAVE  
25 THE SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORITY.

1 MR. KASHIAN: FROM A REAL ESTATE POINT OF  
2 VIEW? I CAN'T AGREE WITH YOU. THE MERIT LIES IN THE  
3 TECHNICAL PART. FROM THE REAL ESTATE POINT OF VIEW,  
4 IT'S CLEAR.

5 MS. HYSEN: WOW, YOU GOT AN ATTORNEY TO NOT  
6 TALK.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME JUST SEE.  
8 DOES EVERYBODY AGREE THAT INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, IT  
9 OUGHT TO BE A SLIDING SCALE? I'M PROBABLY STATING THE  
10 OBVIOUS. YES. OKAY.

11 MR. KLEIN: DO YOU NEED A MOTION?

12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE DO. YES,  
13 WE'LL GET TO IT. DO WE THINK IT SHOULD BE MORE THAN  
14 TEN POINTS BECAUSE WE STILL HAVE THE TEN POINTS OUT  
15 THERE, TEAM?

16 MS. HYSEN: NO, I DON'T.

17 DR. WRIGHT: I AGREE.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: LET'S POLL  
19 EVERYONE. LET'S JUST SEE IF WE CAN GET A CONSENSUS. I  
20 THINK -- I'LL WAIT FOR MINE. YOU THINK NO, RUSTY?

21 CHAIRMAN DOMS: NO.

22 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JANET.

23 DR. WRIGHT: NO.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ED.

25 MR. KASHIAN: I'M SORRY. I DIDN'T HEAR.

1 DR. WRIGHT: TEN POINTS IS THE MAX ON THAT  
2 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT?

3 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE ALL AGREE IT  
4 SHOULD BE A SLIDING SCALE. SHOULD WE PUT MORE POINTS  
5 TO IT?

6 MR. KASHIAN: I AGREE.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU DO. OKAY.  
8 MARCY.

9 MS. FEIT: I AGREE. MORE POINTS TO IT.

10 MR. LICHTENGER: I THINK IT SHOULD BE HIGHER,  
11 GIVEN AT LEAST AS MUCH AS COST BECAUSE, AGAIN, THAT HAS  
12 TO DO WITH LEVERAGE.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF.

14 MR. SHEEHY: YEAH. I THINK IT SHOULD BE  
15 HIGHER. I AGREE IT SHOULD BE MATCHED TO COST.

16 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JOAN.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: YES, AS LONG AS IT DOESN'T  
18 JUST PERTAIN TO THE 20-PERCENT MATCH.

19 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB.

20 MR. KLEIN: I AGREE WITH, I THINK, JEFF. IT  
21 SHOULD BE MATCHED WITH COST BECAUSE YOU CAN HAVE HIGH  
22 COST, BUT YOUR LEVERAGE IS VERY HIGH, IT TOTALLY  
23 OFFSETS -- IT SHOULD TOTALLY OFFSET THE COST. WE'RE  
24 GETTING MUCH MORE VALUE.

25 MR. KASHIAN: IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE.

1 IT'S LIKE SELLING TWO \$500,000 CATS FOR A  
2 MILLION-DOLLAR DOG.

3 MS. HYSEN: I JUST WANT TO PUT ON RECORD. MY  
4 CONCERN IS THAT YOU DIDN'T ASK THE APPLICANTS TO  
5 PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION, AND IT MIGHT BE DEEMED TO BE  
6 UNFAIR IN THE REVIEW PROCESS. SO I JUST WOULD LIKE TO  
7 BE ON RECORD THAT, ALTHOUGH I UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE  
8 OF LEVERAGE BECAUSE LEVERAGE BUYING IS KEY TO  
9 MAXIMIZING YOUR DOLLARS, I THINK THAT WE DID NOT  
10 NECESSARILY SPELL THAT OUT TO THE APPLICANTS.

11 DR. HALME: I THINK YOU DID. SORRY TO  
12 INTERRUPT.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DR. HALME, WE'LL  
14 RECOGNIZE YOU.

15 DR. HALME: THANK YOU. SO GIVEN THAT THIS IS  
16 A QUOTE FROM THE RFA, PART OF THE COST PIECE, AS JOAN  
17 HAS POINTED OUT, HAS THE INSTITUTION LEVERAGE TO CIRM  
18 RESOURCES. FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE AS AN INSTITUTION,  
19 WHEN WE LOOKED AT COST, WE WANTED TO KNOW IS THAT COST  
20 PER SQUARE FOOT OR IS THAT CIRM COST PER SQUARE FOOT?  
21 IF WE HAVE A 10,000 SQUARE FOOT PROJECT, CIRM IS  
22 EFFECTIVELY PAYING THE 5,000 SQUARE FEET, THEN YOU COST  
23 PER SQUARE FOOT AND CUT IT IN HALF, OR HOW DO YOU DO  
24 THAT? SO THIS WOULD BE -- WE DID FEEL LIKE WE WERE  
25 ASKED. IT'S ON THE SLIDE.

1 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: IT'S IN THE RFA  
2 THE QUESTION IS IS IT IN THE RFA?

3 DR. HALME: IT SAYS RFA HERE IN THE SLIDE. I  
4 BELIEVE IT'S IN THE RFA.

5 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S WHAT WE'RE  
6 LOOKING TO FIND.

7 MS. BECKER: UNDER COST.

8 MS. HYSEN: IT'S UNDER THE COST PORTION OF  
9 THE ANALYSIS.

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THE RFA.

11 DR. SAMBRANO: IT'S PAGE 12 OF THE RFA.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: ON PAGE 12 OF THE RFA.

13 MS. HYSEN: WELL, WOULDN'T THAT MAKE SENSE TO  
14 MOVE THOSE POINTS INTO THE COST PORTION IF IT WAS ASKED  
15 IN THE COST SECTION?

16 MR. LICHTENGER: NO. BECAUSE, AT LEAST HOW  
17 I'M SEEING IT, IS THAT IT'S REALLY THE COST OF THE  
18 CIRM, AND THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE LEVERAGE AND THE  
19 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT. SO, NO, I ACTUALLY THINK IT  
20 SHOULD GO IN THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT SECTION.

21 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. I'M GOING  
22 TO MAKE A MOTION.

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: PLEASE.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I MOVE THAT  
25 THE -- THERE'S TWO COMPONENTS TO THE MOTION. I'M JUST

1 GOING TO MAKE TWO COMPONENTS TO THE MOTION. FOR  
2 INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT, THAT IT BE A SLIDING SCALE.  
3 THAT'S THE FIRST COMPONENT OF THE MOTION. THE SECOND  
4 COMPONENT IS THAT THE POINTS AWARDED BE ON A SLIDING  
5 SCALE ZERO TO 20. IS THERE A SECOND?

6 MR. LICHTENGER: SECOND.

7 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD MAKE A SECOND IF THE  
8 MAKER OF THE FIRST WILL INCLUDE IN THAT THAT THE  
9 QUALITY OF THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT WILL BE  
10 CONSIDERED AS A PART OF THAT.

11 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S FINE.  
12 ACCEPTED. THE MOTION HAS BEEN SECONDED BY DAVID. IS  
13 THERE DISCUSSION AMONGST THE COLLEAGUES? IS THERE  
14 DISCUSSION AMONGST THE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS?

15 MS. MOSCA: EXCUSE ME. CAN I ASK A --

16 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: NO. WE'RE GOING  
17 TO GET TO THE PUBLIC COMMENT IN ONE MOMENT.

18 MS. MOSCA: AFTER THE VOTE?

19 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: NO, OF COURSE,  
20 NOT. THAT'S NOT THE WAY WE DO IT. ALL RIGHT. WE'LL  
21 GET TO YOU.

22 IS THERE COMMENTS FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE  
23 WORKING GROUP? NO. SEEING NONE, MEMBERS OF THE  
24 PUBLIC. MA'AM, WOULD YOU LIKE TO SPEAK?

25 MS. MOSCA: DEBBIE MOSCA FROM THE SCRIPPS

1 RESEARCH INSTITUTE. FIRST IF ALL, CONGRATULATIONS TO  
2 EVERYBODY FOR A VERY DIFFICULT PROCESS. AND BEING ON  
3 THE APPLICANT SIDE, WE REALLY ARE LOOKING FOR CLARITY  
4 IN DEFINITIONS. AND I THINK ZACH MADE A GOOD COMMENT,  
5 AND BOB HAS SUPPORTED THAT IN TERMS OF QUALITY. BUT  
6 EVEN AMONGST YOURSELVES, IT'S LIKE HOW DO YOU DEFINE  
7 QUALITY? HOW DO YOU DEFINE -- ONE PERSON MAY VALUE THE  
8 QUALITY, AS ED WAS SAYING BEFORE, OF SOME REAL ESTATE  
9 ASPECTS VERSUS THE ABILITY OF AN INSTITUTION TO  
10 LEVERAGE NOT ONLY AMONG SEVERAL INSTITUTIONS IN A  
11 CERTAIN LOCATION, BUT ALSO AMONG OTHER FACULTY WITHIN  
12 THE INSTITUTION. SO LARGER INSTITUTIONS MAY BE ABLE TO  
13 LEVERAGE BETTER BECAUSE THEY HAVE MORE FACULTY TO PULL  
14 ON AND MORE DRAW FOR OTHER FACULTY TO JOIN THEIR  
15 INSTITUTION.

16 I APPLAUD YOUR EFFORTS. I THINK DEBORAH'S  
17 COMMENTS ARE VERY WELL TAKEN. IT MAY HAVE BEEN STATED,  
18 BUT IT WASN'T REALLY DEFINED WELL ENOUGH SO THAT PEOPLE  
19 COULD BE STRATEGIC IN HOW THEY MADE THEIR APPLICATION  
20 PROCESS. AND IT MAY BE TOO LATE AT THIS POINT, BUT I  
21 THINK GOING FORWARD IT HAS TO BE DEFINED BETTER THAN  
22 JUST QUALITY. MATCHING FUNDS, THE DEFINITIONS HAVE TO  
23 BE DEFINED. ALL THAT HAS TO BE WORKED OUT. FOR THIS  
24 ONE, I AM CONCERNED BECAUSE THERE DOES SEEM TO BE A LOT  
25 OF DISCORD AMONG THE MEMBERS HERE AS TO HOW IN THE

1 ACTUAL PROCESS THAT WILL WORK OUT. AND I UNDERSTAND  
2 THAT PROCESS WILL BE PUBLIC, SO I'M JUST CONCERNED  
3 ABOUT HOW IT'S GOING GET WEIGHTED. BY INCREASING THE  
4 20 PERCENT NOW THE INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT AND WHETHER  
5 OR NOT OTHER THINGS ABOUT THEIR COMMITMENT, IT'S NOT  
6 JUST DOLLARS. COMMITMENT IS MORE THAN DOLLARS.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU, MA'AM.  
8 ARE THERE ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT WOULD  
9 WISH TO SPEAK TO THIS MOTION? SIR.

10 MR. OSHIRA: I WAS GOING TO SHARE EXACTLY THE  
11 SAME THING. DAN OSHIRA FROM J. DAVID GLADSTONE  
12 INSTITUTES. I ACTUALLY RAISED EXACTLY THE SAME POINT  
13 YOU MADE AND WHISPERED IT TO ARLENE WHEN YOU SAID THAT,  
14 BUT I AGREE THAT IT'S NOT CLEAR UP FRONT THAT THE MORE  
15 YOU PROVIDE IN MATCHING, THE BETTER THE SCORE YOU ARE  
16 GOING TO GET. EVEN THIS, HAS IT BEEN LEVERAGED? WELL,  
17 YES, IT'S BEEN LEVERAGED. IT DOESN'T INDICATE THAT THE  
18 MORE YOU LEVERAGE IT, THE BETTER OFF YOUR SCORE WILL  
19 BE. AND I THINK WHAT IT DOES IS IT BIASES IT TO A  
20 LARGER ORGANIZATION THAT HAS MORE RESOURCES AND IS ABLE  
21 TO PERHAPS LEVERAGE MORE AS BIASED AGAINST A SMALLER  
22 ORGANIZATION, WHICH MAY, IN FACT, BE THE BEST PROJECT  
23 GEOGRAPHICALLY AND PROGRAMATICALLY.

24 MS. OLSON: PATRICIA OLSON, CIRM. I JUST HAD  
25 ONE QUESTION. IF WE INCREASE OR IF THE GROUP VOTES TO

1 INCREASE THIS CRITERIA TO SAY A 20 WEIGHTING, DOES THAT  
2 MEAN IT ALSO GETS REVISITED AGAIN IN THE PROGRAMMATIC  
3 BECAUSE AT LEAST WHAT I'VE HEARD IS THAT IS ONE OF THE  
4 PROGRAMMATIC CRITERIA AS WELL. SO IT SEEMS TO ME YOU  
5 END UP CONSIDERING IT TWICE IF YOU DO IT THAT WAY. SO  
6 I JUST THROW THAT OUT FOR THE WORKING GROUP'S  
7 CONSIDERATION.

8 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU. ARE  
9 THERE ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT WISH TO  
10 COMMENT? SEEING NONE, WE'LL DO A ROLL CALL VOTE, IF  
11 THAT'S OKAY. I'LL START WITH JOAN.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF.

14 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

15 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID.

16 MR. LICHTENGER: YES.

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MARCY.

18 MS. FEIT: YES.

19 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ED.

20 MR. KASHIAN: NO.

21 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JANET.

22 DR. WRIGHT: NO.

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: RUSTY YES. DAVID  
25 YES. YOU CAN ABSTAIN.

1 MS. HYSEN: I'D LIKE TO ABSTAIN.

2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THE MOTION

3 CARRIES -- OH, I'M SORRY. BOB KLEIN.

4 MR. KLEIN: YES.

5 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SHERRY LANSING.

6 MS. LANSING: I'M SO CONFUSED, I THINK I'M

7 GOING TO HAVE TO ABSTAIN.

8 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. THAT'S

9 FINE. THAT'S FINE. I BELIEVE THE MOTION CARRIES. ARE

10 THERE OTHER --

11 MS. LANSING: SORRY. I DON'T USUALLY DO

12 THAT.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S FINE,

14 SHERRY.

15 MS. HYSEN: I DON'T EITHER.

16 MS. LANSING: I JUST AM SO CONFUSED. I SEE

17 BOTH SIDES OF IT. SO I FEEL LIKE I NEED MORE DIALOGUE,

18 BUT I'M COMFORTABLE WITH -- BECAUSE I'M ABSTAINING, I'M

19 COMFORTABLE WITH WHATEVER THE MAJORITY WANTS.

20 CHAIRMAN DOMS: OKAY.

21 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D ALSO LIKE TO POINT OUT

22 THAT WE HAVE THE BENEFIT OF THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW TO

23 REVISIT THIS PIECE.

24 MS. HYSEN: I HAVE A COUPLE OF JUST TECHNICAL

25 QUESTIONS RELATED TO THIS. ARE THE RFA'S, WHEN WE'RE

1 REVIEWING THEM, ARE THEY COMPLETELY SELF-CONTAINED  
2 DOCUMENTS? CAN WE CONSIDER ANY OTHER EXTERNAL  
3 INFORMATION WHILE WE'RE REVIEWING THESE?

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: LEGAL.

5 MR. KLEIN: CERTAINLY THERE ARE PROVISIONS IN  
6 THE INITIATIVE LIKE THE PROHIBITION AGAINST DOING  
7 REPRODUCTIVE CLONING. THERE ARE -- I WOULD THINK THAT  
8 THERE ARE -- THE INITIATIVE LANGUAGE WOULD NEED TO BE  
9 CONSIDERED AS THE CONTEXT FOR THE RFA, BUT I'D LIKE TO  
10 HEAR JAMES HARRISON'S VIEW.

11 MS. HYSEN: WELL, FOR MY PURPOSES, FOR  
12 INSTANCE, I LOVE TO RESEARCH INFORMATION. AND SO IF I  
13 WAS LOOKING AT, LET'S JUST DRAW OUT UC IRVINE. I DON'T  
14 KNOW IF ANYONE IS HERE FROM THAT INSTITUTION. BUT IF  
15 THEY WERE TO SUBMIT A GRANT AND I FELT LIKE I NEED A  
16 LITTLE BIT OF CLARIFICATION, IF I WENT TO THEIR WEBSITE  
17 AND LOOKED AT SOMETHING IN THERE, LOOKED AT THEIR  
18 FACILITIES, LOOKED AT THEIR STAFF, I MEAN CAN I DO ANY  
19 OF THOSE THINGS? CAN I AUGMENT THE INFORMATION IN  
20 FRONT OF ME TO MAKE A BETTER DECISION OTHER THAN THE  
21 ADVISORY DOCUMENT THAT THE STAFF IS PREPARING FOR US?

22 MR. HARRISON: LET ME, FIRST YOU ALL, RESPOND  
23 TO BOB'S QUESTION. AFTER THE GRANT AWARDS ARE MADE,  
24 STAFF WILL DO A REVIEW BEFORE THE DOLLARS ARE ACTUALLY  
25 ISSUED. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT WAS DETERMINED THAT ONE

1 OF THE APPLICANTS WAS NOT A NONPROFIT, AT THAT POINT IN  
2 TIME, THE APPLICATION WOULD BE REJECTED. SO THAT IS TO  
3 RESPOND TO BOB'S QUESTION.

4 I THINK WHEN YOU BEGIN TO INTRODUCE  
5 INFORMATION THAT'S OUTSIDE OF THE RECORD THAT'S BEEN  
6 SUBMITTED AND SHARED AMONG ALL OF YOU, YOU AGAIN  
7 INTRODUCE A RISK FOR ARBITRARINESS TO SET IN BECAUSE  
8 YOU HAVE INFORMATION IN FRONT OF YOU THAT YOUR  
9 COLLEAGUES DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE WHICH MAY INFLUENCE  
10 YOUR DECISION. SO THE BEST COURSE IS PROBABLY ONLY TO  
11 RELY UPON WHAT THE APPLICANT HAS SUBMITTED AND ANY  
12 DISCUSSION THAT OCCURS IN AN OPEN PUBLIC MEETING.

13 MS. HYSEN: I CONCUR ON THAT. I THINK THAT'S  
14 PRETTY IMPORTANT, THAT THAT'S ONE OF THE GUIDELINES SET  
15 FOR THE TEAM.

16 MR. KLEIN: BUT, JAMES, THERE ARE LEGAL  
17 REQUIREMENTS THAT ARE OBVIOUS IN THE INITIATIVE THAT,  
18 AS I SAID, PROHIBITION OF HUMAN REPRODUCTIVE CLEANING,  
19 I MEAN THEY'RE ON NOTICE OF. NOW, I AM AN ADVOCATE FOR  
20 COMPLETELY DEVELOPING DEFINITIONS AND GUIDELINES SO  
21 THAT THE APPLICANT HAS THE GREATEST ABILITY TO PERCEIVE  
22 THE INTENT, SUBSTANCE, AND QUALITY OF THE REQUEST IN  
23 THE RFA. WOULD THEY NEED MORE DIRECTION? THIS WHOLE  
24 DISCUSSION WE JUST HAD ON MATCHING IS A GREAT EXAMPLE,  
25 PARTICULARLY BEFORE WE GET TO MAJOR PROJECTS. BUT I

1 WOULD THINK THAT THE INITIATIVE LANGUAGE ITSELF ALWAYS  
2 CREATES A LEGAL CONTEXT IN WHICH AN RFA IS PERMITTED TO  
3 BE ISSUED, AND IT EXISTS WITHIN THAT LEGAL CONTEXT.

4 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. AS I  
5 POINTED OUT, A GRANT COULD NOT AWARDED, FOR EXAMPLE, TO  
6 A FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTION BECAUSE THAT'S PROHIBITED  
7 UNDER PROPOSITION 71. LIKewise, AS BOB POINTS OUT, YOU  
8 COULDN'T FUND A GRANT OR FACILITY IN WHICH HUMAN  
9 REPRODUCTIVE CLEANING WOULD OCCUR. SO THESE ARE LEGAL  
10 BASELINES THAT EVERY APPLICANT HAS TO ADHERE TO.

11 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU. DAVID.

12 MR. LICHTENGER: THIS IS JUST A QUICK  
13 QUESTION. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE THE ABILITY  
14 TO PUT CONDITIONS UPON THESE GRANTS. THAT'S ALL.

15 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: CONDITIONAL  
16 APPROVAL?

17 MR. LICHTENGER: YES. POTENTIALLY REQUIRING  
18 THE APPLICANT TO REBID. I'M JUST THROWING THAT OUT AS  
19 AN IDEA, ESPECIALLY WHEN WE GET INTO THE LARGER DOLLARS  
20 THAT WE'LL BE CONCERNED WITH THIS AFTERNOON.

21 CHAIRMAN DOMS: LET'S KEEP IT SEPARATE.  
22 LET'S TALK ABOUT THE CONDITIONS ON GRANTS THAT WE'RE  
23 TALKING ABOUT TODAY, THE SHARED RESEARCH LAB SPACE.

24 MS. HYSEN: ONE LAST TECHNICAL QUESTION.

25 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M NOT QUITE FINISHED. I'D

1 ASK YOU, JAMES, ABOUT CONDITIONS. I'M NOT QUITE SURE  
2 WHAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO, DAVID.

3 MR. LICHTENGER: I'M TALKING ABOUT LET'S SAY  
4 THERE'S AN APPLICATION THAT HAS A LOT OF MERIT, IT HAS  
5 A HIGH SCORE, BUT THERE'S A PARTICULAR CONCERN THAT THE  
6 COMMITTEE HAS ON IT. CAN WE GIVE CONDITIONAL APPROVAL  
7 OR PUT A CONDITION THAT THEY --

8 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YOU MEAN APPROVED WITH  
9 CERTAIN CONDITIONS?

10 MR. LICHTENGER: CORRECT.

11 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M NOT SURE.

12 MR. KLEIN: THE --

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, THERE'S  
14 OTHER PEOPLE THAT WANT TO TALK HERE.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: JAMES.

16 MR. HARRISON: I THINK WE'LL HAVE TO TAKE A  
17 CLOSER LOOK AT THAT, DAVID, BEFORE WE ANSWER THAT  
18 QUESTION. YOU DO HAVE THE POWER TO RECOMMEND PARTIAL  
19 FUNDING. WHETHER YOU COULD IMPOSE SOME CONDITION ON AN  
20 APPLICANT, I THINK, WOULD DEPEND UPON WHETHER IT'S  
21 ENCOMPASSED WITHIN THE RFA OR NOT. SO IT'S SOMETHING  
22 THAT I'D LIKE TO TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT BEFORE ANSWERING  
23 AT THIS TIME.

24 MR. KLEIN: JAMES, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. THAT  
25 HAS ALREADY BEEN ADOPTED AND HOPEFULLY LEGALLY APPROVED

1 IN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THAT WE CAN DO CONDITIONS.  
2 AND IN A PUBLIC DISCUSSION, I BELIEVE, THAT THAT TOPIC  
3 HAS BEEN RAISED BEFORE WITHOUT OBJECTION. BUT IT IS IN  
4 THE NORMAL COURSE OF GRANTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY THAT  
5 INSTITUTIONS ARE ABLE TO PUT CONDITIONS ON THEM SO THAT  
6 THEY MAKE CERTAIN THAT -- AND REQUIRED AS A CONDITION  
7 OF FUNDING. IT SHOULDN'T BE A LEGAL ISSUE TO PUT  
8 CONDITIONS ON A GRANT AS PART OF THE CONSIDERATION.  
9 CERTAINLY IN PORTFOLIO REVIEW, THE VERY EXISTENCE OF  
10 PORTFOLIO REVIEW MAY BE BASED UPON THE EVALUATION THAT  
11 CERTAIN PUBLIC POLICY OBJECTIVES ARE BEING REACHED, AND  
12 THAT THERE BE CONDITIONS TO MAKE SURE THAT THOSE ARE  
13 ACHIEVED.

14 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU, BOB.  
15 ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

16 MR. SHEEHY: LET'S CUT TO THE CHASE. I'D  
17 LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION THAT WE CAN IMPOSE CONDITIONS ON  
18 THE GRANTS IF THE WORKING GROUP DEEMS NECESSARY. AND  
19 THE REASON THAT IT MAKES SENSE IS THAT THIS IS A  
20 ONE-TIME ONLY. SO THERE'S NO ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS  
21 DEFICIENCIES AND COME BACK A SECOND TIME.

22 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF, I'D LIKE TO  
23 SECOND THE MOTION, AND YOU DON'T HAVE TO ACCEPT THE  
24 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. IF YOU DON'T, THAT'S FINE AND I'LL  
25 STILL SECOND THE MOTION. THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT WOULD

1 BE THAT WE WOULD SEEK THE ADVICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL AND  
2 INCORPORATE ANY RECOMMENDATION THEY HAVE INTO YOUR  
3 MOTION. SO WE'RE WITHIN THE LEGAL PARAMETERS OF WHAT  
4 WE'RE ALLOWED TO DO. DO YOU ACCEPT THAT?

5 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

6 DR. WRIGHT: I JUST HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE  
7 MOTION.

8 MR. KLEIN: QUESTION ON THE MOTION. IF WE  
9 CAN MAKE THAT GENERAL COUNSEL AND OUTSIDE COUNSEL SINCE  
10 OUTSIDE WAS INVOLVED IN DRAFTING. THERE'S LEGAL  
11 RESEARCH THAT MIGHT BE CLEARLY AVAILABLE AS WELL.

12 DR. HALL: WE'LL GET REMCHO IN HERE.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: HE NEEDS MORE  
14 BILLABLE.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ONE COMMENT HERE.

16 DR. WRIGHT: I JUST HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT  
17 YOUR MOTION, JEFF. WOULD THAT APPLY TO ALL THE WORK OF  
18 THIS GROUP OR JUST THE SHARED LABS?

19 MR. SHEEHY: THE SHARED LABS.

20 CHAIRMAN DOMS: JUST THIS.

21 MR. HARRISON: RUSTY, COULD I JUST MAKE ONE  
22 CLARIFICATION? AGAIN, WHAT YOU WOULD BE DOING IS  
23 RECOMMENDING THAT CONDITIONS BE IMPOSED UPON  
24 APPLICANTS. AND BECAUSE THE ICOC HAS NOT YET  
25 CONSIDERED THIS ISSUE, THEY WOULD HAVE TO CONSIDER BOTH

1 THE NATURE OF THE POWER AS WELL AS THE PARTICULAR  
2 CONDITION THAT YOU RECOMMENDED.

3 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK THE WAY IT WOULD GO IS  
4 THAT IT WOULD BE RECOMMENDED TO THE ICOC AS A  
5 MERITORIOUS GRANT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.  
6 ABSENT THOSE CONDITIONS, IT WOULDN'T BE RECOMMENDED FOR  
7 FUNDING.

8 CHAIRMAN DOMS: OKAY. IS THERE ANY PUBLIC  
9 COMMENT ON THIS?

10 MR. REED: DON REED. I WONDER ISN'T THERE A  
11 PRECEDENT IN THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS WHERE PEOPLE  
12 WERE NOT ALLOWED TO SWEETEN THE DEAL LATER ON? IF WE  
13 WERE TO SAY WE ACCEPT THIS WITH THESE CONDITIONS  
14 CHANGED, COULD NOT SOMEONE ELSE SAY, HEY, WE'RE HAPPY  
15 TO CHANGE OUR PROPOSAL AS WELL. WOULDN'T THAT CREATE  
16 ARGUMENT THERE?

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DON, TO RESPOND  
18 TO YOU, AND THAT'S A VERY GOOD POINT, PART OF THE  
19 MOTION NOW IS TO SEEK LEGAL COUNSEL ADVICE. BOB  
20 SUGGESTED THAT WE GO WITH MR. HARRISON SINCE HE HAD A  
21 HAND IN THIS. I COULD CARE LESS. I THINK TAMAR  
22 PACHTER IS EQUALLY AS QUALIFIED TO OPINE ON THE MATTER.  
23 I'LL LEAVE IT TO THE ATTORNEYS TO DEAL WITH. BUT THAT  
24 IS THE MOTION, AND WE WOULDN'T WANT TO DO ANYTHING THAT  
25 WOULD GET US IN ANY TROUBLE. YOU RAISE A GOOD POINT,

1 DON.

2 MR. KLEIN: IN THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH, WE  
3 SPECIFICALLY HAVE PROVISIONS THAT SAID WE WOULD NOT  
4 CONSIDER AMENDMENTS OR CHANGES OF ANY KIND. AND WE HAD  
5 POLICY DISCUSSIONS ABOUT CONDITIONS AND DIDN'T HAVE  
6 CONDITIONS IN WHAT -- I'D JUST LIKE TO INDICATE THERE  
7 WAS A DIFFERENT RULEMAKING CONTEXT. HERE WE'RE  
8 SPECIFICALLY ADOPTING CONDITIONS BEFORE WE DO THE  
9 EVALUATIONS AS ONE OF THE THINGS WE CAN PUT INTO A  
10 RECOMMENDATION.

11 DR. HALL: BOB, I THINK YOU MEAN THE SITE  
12 SEARCH. I CERTAINLY WASN'T AWARE OF ANY CONDITIONS ON  
13 MY PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH.

14 DR. WRIGHT: JUST THAT YOU STAY FOREVER.

15 MR. KLEIN: YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY CORRECT.

16 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M GOING TO CALL -- ANY  
17 OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT? POLL THE GROUP. JOAN.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

19 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

20 MR. LICHTENGER: YES.

21 MS. FEIT: YES.

22 MR. KASHIAN: NO.

23 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES.

25 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

1 MS. HYSEN: YES.

2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: BOB.

3 MR. KLEIN: YES.

4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: SHERRY.

5 MS. LANSING: YES.

6 MS. HYSEN: I HAVE ONE LAST TECHNICAL  
7 QUESTION. YOU KNOW I DO. YOU MENTIONED THAT A NUMBER  
8 OF THE AREAS THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT, THAT THEY'RE,  
9 COMPARATIVELY SPEAKING, THESE COSTS COMPARATIVE TO THE  
10 OTHERS. NOW WE'RE SPLITTING THESE FACILITIES UP. I  
11 IMAGINE WE'LL GET FIVE OR SIX EACH. IS THIS  
12 COMPARATIVE TO THE ONES WE HAVE, OR ARE WE ALLOWED TO  
13 SAY, BECAUSE PERHAPS WE MIGHT HAVE ONES THAT ARE VERY  
14 COMPARATIVE TO EACH OTHER, BUT COMPLETELY NOT  
15 COMPARATIVE TO MAYBE THE GROUP THAT ANOTHER MEMBER HAS.  
16 SO IS THERE AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMPARE THE ENTIRE GROUP  
17 BECAUSE OF THE CONFLICT ISSUES? I'M VERY CONCERNED  
18 ABOUT LOOKING AT THINGS THAT I'M NOT SUPPOSED TO.

19 MS. HOFFMAN: MAY I ANSWER THAT?

20 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES, LORI.

21 MS. HOFFMAN: WHAT RICK AND I ARE PREPARING  
22 FOR YOUR USE, AND YOU WILL RECEIVE THAT IN YOUR INITIAL  
23 PACKAGES WITH YOUR ASSIGNMENTS, IS A SPREADSHEET THAT  
24 WILL HAVE ALL THE FACTS FOR ALL OF THE INSTITUTIONS,  
25 THE APPLICANTS. AND THAT'S FOR YOUR USE. THERE WILL

1 BE NO JUDGMENT THERE. IT WILL BE FACTUAL INFORMATION  
2 ONLY.

3 MS. HYSEN: OKAY.

4 MR. KLEIN: LET ME --

5 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT, BOB.  
6 JEFF.

7 MR. SHEEHY: JUST BEFORE, AND I HAVE TO MAKE  
8 THE MOTION THAT THAT INFORMATION IN THOSE DRAFTS, THOSE  
9 TECHNICAL ANALYSES, BE PUBLIC RECORDS, THAT THE VOTES  
10 OF THE REVIEWERS, THEIR NUMERICAL SCORES BE STATED IN  
11 PUBLIC, AND THAT OUR SCORE SHEETS BE PUBLIC RECORD.  
12 I'D LIKE TO MAKE THAT MOTION.

13 CHAIRMAN DOMS: IS THAT HOW IT'S CURRENTLY  
14 SPELLED OUT?

15 MS. HOFFMAN: IN THE INTERIM CRITERIA AND  
16 PROCEDURES THAT WAS ADOPTED BY THIS WORKING GROUP IN  
17 OCTOBER AND THEN FORWARDED TO THE ICOC FOR  
18 RECOMMENDATION IN OCTOBER, IT SAYS THAT, AND I DON'T  
19 LIKE USING THIS TERM, BUT IT SAYS SECRET BALLOT.

20 MR. SHEEHY: AT A MINIMUM I'D LIKE THE  
21 TECHNICAL ANALYSES AND THE DRAFT DOCUMENTS THAT WE'RE  
22 GOING TO USE TO MAKE OUR DECISIONS, THOSE BE PUBLIC  
23 RECORDS. AND I THINK WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO ANNOUNCE OUR  
24 SCORES IN PUBLIC BECAUSE I DON'T THINK WE'RE GOING TO  
25 BE ABLE TO HAVE A DISCUSSION. I THINK THOSE TWO

1 POINTS, THOSE TWO SHOULD BE PUBLIC.

2 MR. LICHTENGER: JEFF, HOW DID THE GRANT  
3 DIVISION WORK THIS?

4 MR. SHEEHY: THEY MEET IN CLOSED SESSION.

5 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THEY DON'T.

6 MS. FEIT: SCIENTISTS WOULD NOT REVEAL THE  
7 SCIENCE PUBLICLY.

8 MR. SHEEHY: I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU HAVE A  
9 DISCUSSION WITHOUT SOME ANNOUNCEMENT OF SCORES.  
10 TRANSPARENCY, I JUST WANT TO MAKE FOR THE RECORD, WE'RE  
11 GOING TO BE ENDING UP GIVING OUT A LOT OF MONEY. AND  
12 TRANSPARENCY IS A WAY THAT WE PROTECT OURSELVES. WHEN  
13 WE SUPPLY INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC, WHICH I BELIEVE IS  
14 GOOD IN AND OF ITSELF, BUT I ALSO WOULD SAY FOR THE  
15 COMMITTEE MEMBERS, THE MORE TRANSPARENT WE ARE, YOU  
16 KNOW, AT LEAST IF WE MAKE MISTAKES, THEY'LL JUST SAY WE  
17 WERE STUPID. THEY WON'T ACCUSE US OF ANYTHING ELSE  
18 BECAUSE IT'S ALL OUT THERE FOR EVERYBODY TO SEE.

19 I'M NOT UNCOMFORTABLE WITH GETTING  
20 STAFF-PREPARED DOCUMENTS THAT CAN MATERIALLY AFFECT HOW  
21 WE MAKE OUR JUDGMENT, INCLUDING COST COMPARISONS THAT  
22 AREN'T AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC, AND WE COME BACK AND WE  
23 DON'T DO GRANTS. THEY SAY, WELL, WE GOT ALL THIS STUFF  
24 FROM STAFF. AND I'M JUST NOT COMFORTABLE WITH THAT.

25 IN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, ALL YOU GET IS A

1 GRANT APPLICATION TO MAKE YOUR DECISION. AND THE  
2 APPLICANT KNOWS EXACTLY WHAT THE REVIEWER BASED THEIR  
3 REVIEW ON. WE'RE RECEIVING ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS ON  
4 WHICH WE'RE GOING TO BE BASING OUR REVIEW THAT NEITHER  
5 THE APPLICANT NOR THE PUBLIC WILL BE PRIVY TO. AND  
6 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT SCORES WITHOUT  
7 ACTUALLY USING THOSE SCORES. AND WE'RE GOING TO BE  
8 SCORING WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT THOSE SCORES ARE THAT THE  
9 PEOPLE MADE. I DON'T KNOW HOW I'M GOING TO COME UP  
10 WITH A SCORE WHEN PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT  
11 SCORES IN THE ABSTRACT WITHOUT ACTUALLY DECLARING THE  
12 SCORES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE REVIEW.

13 DR. HALL: THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT THE  
14 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS THAT THE STAFF WILL MAKE HERE WILL  
15 BE A PUBLIC DOCUMENT. I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY  
16 QUESTION ABOUT THAT.

17 MS. HOFFMAN: ALL I SAID WAS THAT WAS A DRAFT  
18 ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENT, AND THEN COUNSEL WOULD REVIEW  
19 THAT. WE HAD NOT GOTTEN TO THAT, JEFF. I WOULD LIKE  
20 TO SAY THAT, IN FACT, THERE IS NO COST COMPARISON. IT  
21 REALLY IS FACTUAL DATA, SO THAT IS ALL PUBLIC. SO I  
22 DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY PROBLEM WITH THE SPREADSHEET  
23 BEING AVAILABLE AT ALL. I THINK THAT THAT'S FINE.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST WANT FOR THE APPLICANTS  
25 TO KNOW WHAT WE HAD IN FRONT OF US BESIDES THEIR

1 APPLICATION AND OUR OWN WITS TO MAKE OUR DECISION. I  
2 THINK THAT'S ONLY FAIR.

3 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WHY DON'T YOU RESTATE YOUR  
4 MOTION?

5 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, THE MOTION IS THAT  
6 DOCUMENTS WERE PROVIDED BY THE -- THAT STAFF PROVIDES  
7 US IN ORDER TO MAKE EVALUATION OF THE GRANTS BE PUBLIC  
8 DOCUMENTS.

9 AND THE SECOND IS THAT IN THE REVIEW PROCESS,  
10 THAT WE PUBLICLY ANNOUNCE OUR SCORES, THE PRIMARY AND  
11 SECONDARY REVIEWER, BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW HOW WE'RE  
12 GOING TO HAVE A DISCUSSION. SO WE'RE GOING TO SAY I  
13 HAVE A GRANT FROM SO-AND-SO. WE HAVE TO PUBLICLY SAY I  
14 SCORED IT AT X.

15 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ARE THERE ANY  
16 OTHER ELEMENTS TO YOUR MOTION?

17 MR. SHEEHY: NO. THAT'S THE ONLY ELEMENT.  
18 THE OTHER ONE IS ALREADY PRECLUDED BY --

19 CHAIRMAN DOMS: IS THERE A SECOND?

20 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

21 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ANY DISCUSSION?

22 MR. LICHTENGER: YEAH. SO THE FIRST PART I  
23 TOTALLY AGREE WITH. I'M NOT SURE ON THE SECOND PART.  
24 I'M NOT SAYING NO, BUT I THINK WE NEED SOME FURTHER  
25 DISCUSSION TO UNDERSTAND THE RAMIFICATIONS FOR THE

1 SECOND PART.

2 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, OKAY. WE'RE ALL GOING TO  
3 HAVE SCORE SHEETS LIKE THIS. AND FOR EVERY GRANT THAT  
4 WE'RE NOT CONFLICTED ON, WE'RE GOING TO WRITE DOWN A  
5 SCORE. RIGHT? BUT WE'RE NOT GOING TO WRITE DOWN  
6 SCORES FOR THE ONES WE DIDN'T REVIEW. THE ONES WE  
7 REVIEWED, WE'RE GOING TO COME UP -- YOU'RE GOING TO  
8 COME UP -- LET'S JUST DO A SCENARIO. WE'LL USE OREGON.  
9 SO YOU DO THE PRIMARY REVIEW. YOU'VE GONE THROUGH  
10 THESE CRITERIA. YOU AWARDED POINTS. YOU HAVE A  
11 NUMBER. I DO A SECONDARY REPORT. I DO A NUMBER.

12 NOW, THE WAY WE HAVE SET UP THE PROCESS, WHEN  
13 WE COME TO THE GROUP AS A WHOLE, AND THERE WILL BE  
14 MEMBERS THERE, NONE OF THESE PEOPLE WILL HAVE LOOKED AT  
15 THIS, BUT THEY'LL HAVE A SCORE SHEET THAT THEY'RE  
16 SUPPOSED TO FILL IN, RIGHT, THAT'S GOING TO PROVIDE THE  
17 SCORE THAT WE HAVE AT THE END. THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE  
18 THE ABILITY TO LOOK AT THE APPLICATIONS THAT THEY'RE  
19 NOT CONFLICTED ON AND TO MAKE SOME EVALUATION OF THEIR  
20 OWN, BUT THEY'RE GOING TO BE RELYING ON US. THEY'LL  
21 ASK US QUESTIONS.

22 NOW, WE'RE GOING TO COME UP AND WE'RE GOING  
23 TO SAY, WELL, I THOUGHT IT WAS A GOOD GRANT, BUT I'M  
24 NOT GOING TO GIVE YOU A NUMBER. THE WAY WE HAVE SET UP  
25 THE PROCESS, I'M NOT GOING TO DECLARE A SCORE AND

1 YOU'RE NOT GOING TO DECLARE A SCORE. AND THEN WE'RE  
2 ALL GOING TO SIT THERE AND FILL OUT ON OUR SHEET  
3 SCORES.

4 WHEREAS, THE WAY IT WORKS IN THE GRANTS  
5 WORKING GROUP IS THE PRIMARY REVIEWER ANNOUNCES THEIR  
6 SCORE, THE SECONDARY REVIEWER ANNOUNCES THEIR SCORE --

7 DR. HALL: RECOMMENDED SCORE.

8 MR. SHEEHY: RECOMMENDED SCORE. AND I THINK  
9 THIS IS A GOOD PROCESS, BY THE WAY, AND THIS IS THE  
10 PROCESS I'D LIKE TO SEE US USE. AND THEN WE HAVE A  
11 HOPEFULLY ROBUST, OR IF IT'S GREAT OR TERRIBLE, IT  
12 MIGHT NOT BE THAT ROBUST, BUT WE HAVE A DISCUSSION.  
13 AND THEN THEY COME BACK AND THEY ASK US IF WE WANT TO  
14 CHANGE OUR SCORES FOR OUR FINAL SCORING. WE MAY DECIDE  
15 TO GO UP BECAUSE I MAY HAVE BEEN PERSUADED BY YOU, YOU  
16 MAY HAVE BEEN PERSUADED BY ME. WE MAY GET NEW  
17 INFORMATION FROM THE KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER WORKING GROUP  
18 MEMBERS THAT CAUSES US TO RAISE OR LOWER OUR SCORES.  
19 WE GIVE OUR FINAL SCORES.

20 USING THAT AS THE BASIS FOR DOING THEIR OWN  
21 SCORING, THE OTHER MEMBERS WRITE DOWN SCORES. BUT IF  
22 WE DON'T DECLARE A SCORE, OUR WHOLE DISCUSSION BECOMES  
23 RATHER DIFFICULT TO HAVE.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF, WE SORT OF  
25 WENT OVER THIS AT THE LAST MEETING -- IT'S OKAY TO

1 CHANGE. IT'S FINE -- THAT WE WANTED, AS LORI SAID, THE  
2 BALLOT TO BE SECRET. THE ONE DIFFERENCE -- WHAT YOU'RE  
3 DESCRIBING IS AN EXCELLENT PROCESS FOR THE GRANTS  
4 WORKING GROUP. THEY CONDUCT THEIR PROCEEDING --

5 MR. SHEEHY: THE BALLOT IS STILL SECRET.

6 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I UNDERSTAND. I  
7 UNDERSTAND. THEY CONDUCT THEIR PROCEEDINGS IN CLOSED  
8 SESSION, AS WE KNOW. SO THAT DIALOGUE, THAT ORGANIC  
9 PROCESS THAT HAPPENS AT THE SCIENTIFIC GRANTS WORKING  
10 GROUP, BECAUSE THERE'S SO MUCH PROPRIETARY INFORMATION  
11 DISCUSSED, AND FOR OTHER POLICY REASONS, THAT  
12 DISCUSSION IS IN PRIVATE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE  
13 MEETING LAWS. I THINK HERE -- I'M UNDECIDED. HERE  
14 IT'S A LITTLE SQUISHY BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO BE MEETING  
15 IN PUBLIC. WE MAY, FOR POLICY REASONS, NOT WANT TO  
16 DISCLOSE THE SCORES OF CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS BECAUSE  
17 THEY SCORED REALLY LOW. YOU KNOW, WE DON'T WANT TO  
18 EMBARRASS THOSE ORGANIZATIONS. WE HAVE THE TIERED  
19 PROCESS. SO THOSE ARE MY ONLY COMMENTS.

20 MR. SHEEHY: LIKE YOU COME UP AND YOU'RE  
21 GOING TO DELIVER A REVIEW. HOW AM I GOING TO SCORE  
22 YOUR REVIEW?

23 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU'LL HAVE YOUR  
24 SCORE, AND I'LL HAVE MY SCORE.

25 MR. SHEEHY: NO. I'M NOT PART OF YOUR REVIEW

1 TEAM, BUT I'M NOT CONFLICTED BECAUSE I HAVE TO SCORE  
2 EVERY GRANT TO WHICH I'M NOT CONFLICTED EVEN THOUGH I  
3 DID NOT REVIEW EVERY GRANT I WILL SCORE. SO I'M GOING  
4 TO HAVE TO REVIEW YOUR GRANTS. LET'S SAY IT'S UCLA.  
5 I'M NOT CONFLICTED ON UCLA. THE TWO OF YOU DID UCLA.  
6 SO I HAVE UCLA AND I'VE GOT TO GIVE THEM A SCORE OF  
7 ZERO TO A HUNDRED, A TECHNICAL SCORE. NOW, YOU'RE NOT  
8 GOING TO TELL ME A SCORE. YOU'RE JUST GOING TO IN  
9 GENERIC TERMS DISCUSS HOW YOU FELT ABOUT IT. SO I'M  
10 GOING TO GUESS A NUMBER.

11 DR. WRIGHT: JEFF, I THINK YOU'RE GOING TO  
12 RELY ON DAVID'S ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE THE QUALITY.

13 MR. SHEEHY: WHY NOT DECLARE A SCORE?

14 MR. HARRISON: I JUST WANT TO MAKE A  
15 CLARIFICATION. IT'S THE BALLOT ON WHICH EACH OF YOU  
16 ASSIGN THE ULTIMATE SCORES THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE  
17 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. IF YOU WANT TO VOLUNTEER WHAT  
18 SCORE YOU HAVE ASSIGNED, THAT'S COMPLETELY WITHIN YOUR  
19 RIGHTS. BUT IT'S JUST THAT BALLOT THAT AT THIS POINT  
20 IN TIME, UNLESS THE ICOC CHANGES THE PROCEDURES, THAT  
21 CONTINUES TO BE PRIVATE.

22 DR. HALL: SO WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS THAT  
23 THERE'S NO REASON UNDER THE PROVISIONS THAT WE'VE  
24 ADOPTED NOT TO DO WHAT JEFF SAYS, TO HAVE A PRIMARY  
25 REVIEWER SAY I WILL GIVE THIS -- I'M GOING TO GIVE IT

1 TEN POINTS ON THIS, FIVE POINTS ON THIS, SIX POINTS ON  
2 THIS, WHATEVER IT IS, FOR A TOTAL SCORE OF 79 POINTS.  
3 THAT'S MY RECOMMENDATION.

4 MR. SHEEHY: THAT WOULD BE TRANSPARENT. I  
5 DON'T THINK WE NEED TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT OFFENDING  
6 INSTITUTIONS. THE REASON THAT WE HAVE ALL THIS IS  
7 BECAUSE ONE OF THE THINGS IS WE DON'T WANT TO  
8 DISCOURAGE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCHERS FROM PARTICIPATING.  
9 LIKE IF SOMEONE GIVES A GRANT AND THEY GET A REALLY  
10 LOWER SCORE, WE DON'T WANT TO HOLD THEM UP AS AN  
11 INDIVIDUAL TO PUBLIC RIDICULE. I THINK INSTITUTIONS  
12 HAVE THICKER SKINS.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. SO, MARCY,  
14 DID YOU HAVE A COMMENT?

15 MS. FEIT: YEAH. I'M GOING TO MAKE A  
16 RECOMMENDATION. I'M GOING TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION  
17 THAT WE ARE ALLOWED TO PUBLICLY DECLARE OUR SCORES OF  
18 GRANTS THAT WE HAVE REVIEWED, BUT THAT I WOULD  
19 RECOMMEND ALSO THAT THE FINAL BALLOTS ARE KEPT  
20 CONFIDENTIAL AS WE ORIGINALLY AGREED.

21 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S ANOTHER  
22 WAY TO ARTICULATE YOUR MOTION, JEFF. IS THAT OKAY?

23 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE ALREADY HAVE --

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I UNDERSTAND  
25 THAT, BUT IS THAT OKAY?

1 DR. HALL: JAMES HAS GOT A POINT.

2 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S A RESTATEMENT OF WHAT  
3 THE EXISTING PROCEDURES ARE.

4 DR. HALL: UNLESS YOU WANT TO CHANGE IT,  
5 THERE'S NO REASON TO VOTE.

6 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THERE'S A MOTION  
7 ON THE FLOOR. I WANT TO HONOR THE MOTION. IS THAT  
8 OKAY? AS VICE CHAIR CAN I DO THAT?

9 MS. FEIT: I'M JUST TRYING TO CLARIFY WHERE  
10 WE'RE AT.

11 MR. LICHTENGER: I'M STILL A LITTLE FUZZY ON  
12 IT, BUT I DON'T FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT THIS ISSUE. I  
13 THINK I NEED TO EXPLORE THIS MORE, BUT I'M OKAY WITH IT  
14 IF EVERYONE ELSE IS OKAY WITH IT.

15 DR. HALL: I THINK IT WILL BE VERY HELPFUL TO  
16 GO THROUGH THE PROCESS. IT WILL BE TREMENDOUSLY  
17 HELPFUL. EVERYBODY WILL UNDERSTAND MUCH BETTER HOW IT  
18 WORKS ONCE YOU'VE GONE THROUGH IT AND WHAT YOU NEED TO  
19 DO.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF, GIVEN THE  
21 DISCUSSION HERE AND WHAT WE'VE HEARD FROM STAFF AND  
22 COUNSEL, THAT WHAT YOU'VE SAID IS IN NO WAY COUNTER TO  
23 OUR EXISTING RULES THAT THE ICOC HAS ADOPTED, ARE YOU  
24 THEN -- YOU STILL HAVE YOUR MOTION ON THE FLOOR. I'M  
25 OKAY WITH VOTING YES ON IT BECAUSE IT'S A REAFFIRMATION

1 OF WHAT WE'VE ALREADY DONE, I THINK, AND IS NOT COUNTER  
2 TO WHAT WE'VE ALREADY ADOPTED, OR DO YOU WANT TO  
3 WITHDRAW THE MOTION AND SORT OF WE CAN MOVE ON? IT'S  
4 UP TO YOU, JEFF.

5 MR. SHEEHY: I'D LIKE TO GO AHEAD WITH THE  
6 MOTION.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THERE'S A MOTION.  
8 THERE'S BEEN A SECOND.

9 DR. WRIGHT: I ALREADY SECONDED.

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JANET HAS ALREADY  
11 SECONDED. THANK YOU. ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM THE  
12 PUBLIC? YES, COUNSEL.

13 MR. HARRISON: I'M JUST WONDERING IF WE  
14 COULD -- SINCE WE'VE HAD THE DISCUSSION ABOUT TWO  
15 DIFFERENT ITEMS, IF WE COULD CLARIFY WHAT THE MOTION IS  
16 THAT YOU'RE CONSIDERING NOW FOR THE RECORD.

17 MR. SHEEHY: SURE. I'LL RESTATE IT, THAT THE  
18 DOCUMENTS THAT WE RECEIVE FROM STAFF RELATED TO GRANT  
19 APPLICATIONS BE MADE PUBLIC DOCUMENTS SO THAT THE  
20 APPLICANTS AND THE PUBLIC WILL KNOW WHAT INFORMATION WE  
21 HAD IN FRONT OF US TO MAKE OUR DECISION, AND THAT WE  
22 ANNOUNCE OUR -- PRIMARY AND SECONDARY REVIEWERS  
23 ANNOUNCE SCORES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE REVIEW OF EACH  
24 INDIVIDUAL GRANT. THAT THEY ANNOUNCE IN PUBLIC --

25 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THEY CAN IF THEY

1 WANT TO.

2 MR. SHEEHY: THEY CAN.

3 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: IT'S VOLUNTARY.

4 MR. SHEEHY: WE'LL MAKE IT VOLUNTARY. WE

5 WON'T MAKE ANYONE -- IF SOMEONE FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE

6 ABOUT ANNOUNCING --

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DOES COUNSEL

8 UNDERSTAND THE MOTION?

9 MR. HARRISON: I DO. THERE'S ONE REQUEST FOR

10 CLARIFICATION. YOU ARE ALSO DOING REVIEWS YOURSELF?

11 CHAIRMAN DOMS: SECONDARY.

12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES, SECONDARY,

13 YEAH.

14 MR. HARRISON: IS THAT ENCOMPASSED WITHIN

15 THIS OR NOT?

16 MR. SHEEHY: WHAT DO YOU MEAN?

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK IT IS.

18 MR. KASHIAN: DOES THE SECONDARY REVIEWER

19 HAVE TO DECLARE HIS SCORE?

20 MR. SHEEHY: CAN. PRIMARY AND SECONDARY

21 REVIEWERS CAN.

22 MS. HOFFMAN: I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THAT IN

23 THE INTERIM PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR CONDUCTING YOUR

24 SHARED SPACE LABORATORY APPLICATIONS APPROVED BY YOU

25 AND THE ICOC IN OCTOBER, ONE OF THE SENTENCES, AND I'LL

1 JUST READ FROM THE LAST PART OF THIS PARAGRAPH, A DRAFT  
2 OF EACH REVIEWER'S COMMENTS WILL BE SUBMITTED TO CIRM  
3 STAFF AT LEAST THREE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE THE MEETING  
4 FOR CIRCULATION TO OTHER REVIEWERS OF THE APPLICATION.

5 SO THE QUESTION IS, AND THAT'S ALSO WHAT I  
6 WOULD DEEM AN ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT DOCUMENT, SO AT THIS  
7 POINT WOULD THAT ALSO BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC? JUST  
8 A CLARIFICATION.

9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: LORI, I THINK YOU  
10 NEED TO WORK IT OUT WITH COUNSEL WHEN YOU WANT TO  
11 DEFINE WHAT'S A DRAFT AND WHAT'S NOT A DRAFT. I'LL  
12 LEAVE THAT TO COUNSEL TO DECIDE. THERE'S PLENTY OF  
13 CASE LAW AROUND THAT TOPIC. I'VE RESEARCHED IT MYSELF  
14 AND I'LL LET COUNSEL DEAL WITH IT. AND I, FOR ONE --

15 MR. SHEEHY: I WITHDRAW THE MOTION IF THERE'S  
16 SOME CONFIDENCE THAT EVERYTHING THAT WE WERE GOING TO  
17 RECEIVE TO MAKE OUR DECISION --

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: AND I'M OKAY WITH  
19 COUNSEL SAYING WHEN IT'S A DRAFT AND WHEN IT'S NOT A  
20 DRAFT.

21 DR. HALL: IT'S WHAT YOU RECEIVE. IT'S WHAT  
22 YOU PRODUCE. I DON'T THINK YOU WANT THE DRAFT OF WHAT  
23 YOU PRODUCE MADE PUBLIC UNTIL AFTER THE DISCUSSION  
24 BECAUSE YOUR OPINIONS MAY CHANGE.

25 MR. SHEEHY: IT'S GENERATED --

1 DR. HALL: STAFF STUFF WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.  
2 THERE'S NO QUESTION ABOUT THAT.

3 MR. SHEEHY: I'LL WITHDRAW THE FIRST PART AND  
4 RELY ON THE -- I'M GOING TO TAKE THE ASSURANCE OF THE  
5 PRESIDENT THAT -- BECAUSE WHAT WE'RE REALLY TALKING  
6 ABOUT IS A NEW DOCUMENT THAT WILL BE PRODUCED THAT IS  
7 AN ANALYSIS OR A SUMMARY, SOMETHING RELATED TO THIS.  
8 BECAUSE I THINK IF AN APPLICANT FELT LIKE THERE WAS  
9 INFORMATION IN THERE THAT WAS NOT ACCURATE ABOUT THE  
10 GRANT AND THAT WAS SOMETHING WE HAD IN FRONT OF US TO  
11 MAKE OUR DECISION, THEY SHOULD HAVE THAT -- THEY SHOULD  
12 BE ABLE TO KNOW THAT.

13 DR. HALL: THAT'S FAIR.

14 MS. HYSEN: KIND OF TO CLARIFY FOR MY  
15 PURPOSES, THE LAW IS VERY CLEAR THAT THE RECORDS OF THE  
16 WORKING GROUP ARE PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. I  
17 THINK IT'S VERY CLEAR. ALL RECORDS OF THE WORKING  
18 GROUP SUBMITTED AS PART OF THE WORKING GROUP'S  
19 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC FOR APPROVAL SHALL BE  
20 SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. I RELY ON YOU AS  
21 THE ATTORNEY FOR THE ICOC TO KEEP ME HONEST AS IT  
22 RELATES TO THE LAW.

23 SO IF A RECORD IS DEFINED AS ACTS, THEN I  
24 WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT I'M VERY AWARE THAT THAT'S A  
25 PUBLIC DOCUMENT. IT'S NOT TYPICAL OF AN ADVISORY BODY

1 TO PROVIDE ADVISORY DOCUMENTATIONS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO  
2 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. SO FOR ME I'M IN SORT OF NEW  
3 TERRITORY. I DEFINITELY WILL RELY ON YOU TO MAKE SURE  
4 THIS GROUP IS VERY CLEAR ON WHAT'S TO BE SUBMITTED.  
5 AND IF THERE'S -- EVEN IF THERE'S A LITTLE SCRATCH  
6 PAPER, IF I'M WRITING LITTLE NOTES -- I MEAN IN THE  
7 PAST, SOME OF MY SCRATCH PAPER HAS HAD TO BE SUBMITTED  
8 AS PART OF PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. E-MAIL COMMUNICATIONS  
9 BACK AND FORTH. SO I REALLY NEED YOU TO CLARIFY FOR ME  
10 WHAT WILL BE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT.

11 MR. KLEIN: DAVID.

12 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

13 MR. KLEIN: IF JAMES HARRISON COULD ADDRESS.  
14 IT'S VERY PRECISE WHAT IS SUBMITTED FROM THE WORKING  
15 GROUP TO THE ICOC IS WHAT IS ADDRESSED AS BEING SUBJECT  
16 TO THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. SO IT'S NOT SCRATCH PAPER  
17 YOU'RE WORKING ON IN A COMMITTEE SESSION. THAT'S NOT  
18 SUBMITTED TO THE ICOC. MAYBE JAMES COULD EXPAND ON  
19 THAT.

20 DR. HALL: DAVE, JEFF HAS MADE THE ADDITIONAL  
21 RECOMMENDATION THAT ANY MATERIAL PROVIDED BY THE STAFF  
22 THAT AIDS THE WORKING GROUP SHOULD BE MADE PUBLIC.

23 MR. SHEEHY: MY THING IS DOCUMENTS PRODUCED  
24 BY STAFF EVALUATING OR SUMMARIZING OR LOOKING AT THE  
25 APPLICATION FOR THE TECHNICAL REVIEW, AND EXCEPTING THE

1 GRANTS WORKING GROUP THINGS BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW WHAT  
2 THAT'S GOING TO LOOK LIKE YET, BUT FOR THE TECHNICAL  
3 REVIEW, BECAUSE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT NEW DOCUMENTS  
4 SEPARATE FROM THE GRANT APPLICATION, THAT THOSE BE MADE  
5 PUBLIC.

6 MS. HYSEN: MY CONCERN IS THAT THIS GROUP IS  
7 OVERSTEPPING ITS BOUND BY MAKING THAT RECOMMENDATION.  
8 IT SEEMS THAT IT WOULD BE MORE RELEVANT THAT THE ICOC  
9 MAKE THAT RECOMMENDATION, THAT DOCUMENTS, THE INTERNAL  
10 WORKING DOCUMENTS, BECOME PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD  
11 ACT.

12 MR. SHEEHY: I DON'T THINK IT'S ANTICIPATED  
13 BY THE APPLICANTS TO THE GRANT THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE  
14 ANOTHER DOCUMENT ABOUT THEIR GRANT PRODUCED BY STAFF  
15 THAT WILL BE ADDED TO THEIR GRANT APPLICATION BEFORE  
16 IT'S REVIEWED.

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK THE  
18 CHALLENGE WE HAVE HERE, DEBORAH, IS STAFF HAS  
19 INTRODUCED TODAY A NEW CONCEPT. THAT IS, THIS STAFF  
20 ANALYSIS REPORT. WE'RE DECIDING AS A WORKING GROUP AS  
21 A POLICY MATTER HOW BEST TO PROCEED WITH IT AND AT WHAT  
22 STAGE IT BECOMES PUBLIC.

23 MS. LANSING: CAN'T WE JUST SAY THAT WHATEVER  
24 THEY PRESENT TO US, NOT THEIR NOTES, NOT WHAT THEY GET,  
25 BUT WHATEVER IS PRESENTED TO OUR WORKING GROUP BECOMES

1 PUBLIC, WHICH IT WOULD ANYWAYS, I THINK.

2 MR. KLEIN: AS A CLARIFICATION, JEFF, AS A  
3 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, WOULD YOU EXCLUDE FROM THAT ITEMS  
4 THAT UNDER OUR OWN RULES WOULD BE CONFIDENTIAL, LIKE  
5 LAND SALES CONTRACTS THAT MAY BE IN ESCROW? THERE'S A  
6 SPECIFIC CLASS OF THINGS WE'VE IDENTIFIED IN OUR OWN  
7 OPERATING PROCEDURES LIKE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS THAT  
8 ARE IN NEGOTIATION OR SOMETHING THAT COULD BE EXCLUDED.  
9 BUT I CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND THAT ANY ANALYSIS THAT'S  
10 SUBMITTED TO US THAT IS NOT IN THOSE PARTICULAR  
11 SENSITIVE CATEGORIES.

12 MS. HOFFMAN: MAYBE IN AN EFFORT TO KIND OF  
13 MOVE THROUGH THE MEETING, AND I WANTED TO SAY AS WELL  
14 THAT THERE WAS EVERY INTENTION OF ULTIMATELY HAVING  
15 THIS STAFF REVIEW BE AVAILABLE CERTAINLY TO THE ICOC AS  
16 WELL. IF THEY WANTED TO USE IT, THEY COULD. I THINK  
17 THE ONLY INSTANCE THAT YOU WOULD WANT TO NOT MOVE  
18 FORWARD ON MAKING AN ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT NOW PUBLIC  
19 RECORD IS THAT MIGHT PUT INTO QUESTION SOME OTHER  
20 ISSUES. YOU CAN BRING THIS UP AGAIN AT THE MAY 2D  
21 MEETING, AND AT THAT POINT DECIDE THAT THIS SHOULD BE  
22 AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC CONSUMPTION OR NOT.

23 DR. HALL: LET ME --

24 MR. KASHIAN: WOULD THIS IN ANY WAY LIMIT OUR  
25 ABILITY AS INDIVIDUALS TO BE ABLE TO TALK TO THE STAFF

1 ABOUT THE DOCUMENT?

2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I DON'T THINK  
3 THERE'S ANY LIMITATION ON YOU SPEAKING WITH STAFF.

4 MS. FEIT: SINCE THERE SEEMS TO BE SO MUCH  
5 CONFUSION AROUND WHAT DOCUMENTS WE CAN OR CANNOT, I  
6 REALLY THINK WE SHOULD TAKE THE TIME TO ALLOW LEGAL  
7 COUNSEL TO ADVISE US ON WHAT DOCUMENTS SHOULD GO  
8 FORWARD. AND SO RATHER THAN JEFF MAKING A MOTION,  
9 WE'RE ASKING LEGAL TO COME BACK. WE'RE ASKING LEGAL A  
10 QUESTION AND ASKING THEM TO COME BACK TO ADVISE THE  
11 WORKING GROUP.

12 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK THIS IS A POLICY  
13 QUESTION, AND LEGAL STATED THAT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE  
14 MEETING WHETHER OR NOT THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS GENERATED  
15 BY STAFF THAT IS EXTRANEIOUS TO THE GRANT APPLICATION,  
16 WHICH TYPICALLY HAVE BEEN IN OTHER WORKING GROUPS THE  
17 ONLY DOCUMENT ON WHICH DECISIONS AND ANALYSIS HAS BEEN  
18 DONE. WE'RE INTRODUCING A NEW STAFF-GENERATED DOCUMENT  
19 ABOUT A GRANT APPLICATION THAT THE GRANT APPLICANTS  
20 HAVE NOT SUBMITTED THEMSELVES, NOR HAVE THEY SEEN.  
21 THEY COULD HAVE INFORMATION THAT GRANT APPLICANTS OR  
22 THE PUBLIC -- I THINK IT'S HIGHLY UNFAIR TO HAVE TO  
23 PRODUCE A SUMMARY THAT'S NOT AVAILABLE TO THE  
24 APPLICANTS ABOUT THEIR APPLICATION. IF WE'RE NOT GOING  
25 TO WORK DIRECTLY OFF THE APPLICATION, AND I'M HAPPY TO

1 HAVE THE ANALYSIS OF STAFF, BUT THAT SHOULD BE  
2 AVAILABLE SO THAT IF THERE'S SOMETHING THAT IS NOT  
3 ACCURATE, THE APPLICANT HAS SOME SORT OF REDRESS.  
4 OTHERWISE, THEY'LL NEVER SEE IT, AND THEY COULD HAVE  
5 THEIR APPLICATION KNOCKED OUT BY SOMETHING IN THAT  
6 SUMMARY.

7 I DO NOT -- EVEN A MISTAKE, YOU KNOW, JUST A  
8 CLERICAL ERROR COULD HAVE AN IMPACT THAT MIGHT  
9 MATERIALLY NEGATIVELY AFFECT THAT. IT MAKES NO SENSE  
10 TO ME WHY THIS WOULD NOT BE A PUBLIC DOCUMENT.

11 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF, I'M WITH  
12 YOU ONE HUNDRED PERCENT. IT OUGHT TO BE A PUBLIC  
13 DOCUMENT. I THINK UNDER ANY LEGAL ANALYSIS, IT  
14 EVENTUALLY BECOMES A PUBLIC DOCUMENT. TO ME THE ISSUE  
15 IS, AND MAYBE I'M SENSING THIS FROM STAFF, AND I'LL  
16 DEFER TO STAFF. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE SENSING, BUT  
17 WHEN DOES IT BECOME A PUBLIC DOCUMENT? IF I STAMP  
18 ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT ON IT, GUESS WHAT. IT'S PROTECTED  
19 UNDER THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. IT'S NOT AVAILABLE TO  
20 THE PUBLIC.

21 NOW, THERE ARE SOME REALLY LEGITIMATE POLICY  
22 REASONS WHY THAT'S THE CASE BECAUSE YOU DON'T WANT TO  
23 SHARE DRAFTS, IT'S AN EARLIER DRAFT, YOU'RE GOING BACK  
24 AND FORTH. THERE'S REASONS WHY DRAFTS ARE NOT SUBJECT  
25 TO THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. SO I SEE IT AS A WHEN DOES

1 IT BECOME PUBLIC. IN MY MIND IT IS A PUBLIC  
2 DOCUMENT -- EVENTUALLY BECOMES A PUBLIC RECORD.

3 THE QUESTION IS WHEN IN THIS PROCESS DO YOU  
4 THINK IT OUGHT TO BE A PUBLIC RECORD?

5 MR. SHEEHY: I FEEL LIKE IF IT'S NOT A PUBLIC  
6 RECORD, WE'RE SUBSTITUTING STAFF'S JUDGMENT FOR THE  
7 WORKING GROUP AND POTENTIALLY FOR THE --

8 MS. HOFFMAN: THAT WAS VERY GOOD. I'M SORRY,  
9 JEFF, THAT YOU FEEL -- AND I'M CERTAINLY HAPPY TO  
10 EITHER NOT DO IT OR DO IT IN A DIFFERENT WAY THAT HELPS  
11 THE WORKING GROUP. BUT IT IS THE ISSUE OF TIMING. AND  
12 THANK YOU FOR CLARIFYING THAT.

13 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY, AGAIN, THE  
14 ATTEMPT HERE IS TO HELP YOU IN YOUR WORK AND NOT TO  
15 IMPOSE AN OPINION ON YOU OR TO SAY THIS IS WHAT YOU  
16 OUGHT TO DO. THAT'S NOT PART OF IT.

17 I TAKE YOUR POINT, AND IT IS REALLY TO TRY TO  
18 ORGANIZE AROUND THE ISSUES WHAT THE STAFF SEES. AND WE  
19 HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE VERY HIGHLY QUALIFIED IN TERMS OF  
20 UNDERSTANDING HOW RESEARCH SPACE IS CONSTRUCTED, HOW  
21 THE FIGURES ARE CALCULATED, WHAT THE COMPARATORS ARE,  
22 AND SO THAT INFORMATION IS AN ATTEMPT TO AID YOU IN  
23 YOUR WORK, SHOULD YOU WANT IT, BY ORGANIZING THAT  
24 INFORMATION IN A CONSISTENT WAY FOR ALL THE DIFFERENT  
25 APPLICATIONS.

1 I TAKE VERY SERIOUSLY YOUR POINT THAT THERE  
2 COULD BE AN ERROR IN THAT THAT WOULD HAVE CONSEQUENCES.  
3 WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE MOST EFFICIENT WAY TO DO  
4 THIS WOULD BE THAT WE PROVIDE THAT MATERIAL TO YOU, TO  
5 THE REVIEWERS, AT THE BEGINNING, AND THAT WE NOT AT  
6 THAT POINT MAKE IT PUBLIC. BUT THAT AT THE TIME THE  
7 MEETING IS ANNOUNCED BEFORE -- I FORGET HOW THE  
8 SCHEDULE GOES -- BUT AT SOME TIME BEFORE THE MEETING  
9 MAY 2D AND 3D, THE DOCUMENT BE MADE PUBLIC.

10 THE REASON I SAY THAT IS I THINK WHAT WE  
11 DON'T WANT TO GET INTO -- SO THE INTENT HERE IS TO  
12 CLEAR UP ANY UNINTENTIONAL ERRORS THAT MAY BE IN THERE.  
13 WHAT I DON'T WANT TO ENCOURAGE, HOWEVER, IS  
14 INSTITUTIONS ENGAGING PERHAPS IN SOME ARGUMENTATIVE WAY  
15 WITH US ABOUT WHETHER SOME PHRASE OR SENTENCE OR  
16 WHATEVER MIGHT BE BIASED IN IT BEFORE THE PROCESS HAS  
17 REALLY GOTTEN GOING.

18 AND SO MY SUGGESTION -- THERE'S NO QUESTION  
19 IN THE END, I BELIEVE, THAT, JUST AS DAVID SAID, IT IS  
20 AND SHOULD BE A PUBLIC DOCUMENT. MY SUGGESTION WOULD  
21 BE THAT IT BE ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT UNTIL SOME PERIOD OF  
22 TIME BEFORE THE MEETING SO THAT APPLICANTS HAVE A  
23 CHANCE TO SEE IT, AND THEN THEY CAN COME TO THE MEETING  
24 AND SAY, BY THE WAY, WE NOTICED THAT YOU'VE SAID IN  
25 HERE THAT THIS IS TRUE, AND WE DON'T THINK THAT'S

1 RIGHT. AND THEN IT CAN BE DISCUSSED IN THE OPEN  
2 MEETING.

3 MR. SHEEHY: THAT'S FINE.

4 DR. HALL: OTHERWISE WE GET INTO SORT OF THE  
5 INSTITUTION CALLS US UP AND SAYS YOU MADE A MISTAKE  
6 HERE, AND THEN THERE'S ALL THIS BEHIND THE SCENES STUFF  
7 GOES ON THAT I THINK IS NOT --

8 MR. SHEEHY: NO. I THINK THAT'S NOT  
9 CONDUCTIVE.

10 DR. HALL: THIS WAY IT'S IN THE PUBLIC, AND  
11 EVERYBODY HAS A CHANCE TO SEE IT BEFORE THE MEETING.  
12 AND THEN IF THERE ARE ERRORS, THEY CAN BE CALLED OUT  
13 RIGHT THEN AND THERE.

14 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH  
15 THAT, JEFF?

16 MR. SHEEHY: I'M VERY COMFORTABLE.

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: AS A POLICY  
18 MATTER, DO YOU THINK WE NEED A VOTE ON IT? I DON'T.

19 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I DON'T THINK WE DO.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, YOU WANT TO  
21 VOTE ON IT? HELLO, BOB?

22 MR. KLEIN: COULD I ASK A QUESTION? IN THE  
23 STAFF ANALYSIS, THERE COULD BE SECTIONS PICKED UP FROM  
24 THE LAWYERS THAT SAYS THERE'S A LEGAL PROBLEM IN THE  
25 LAND SALES CONTRACT. SUCH-AND-SUCH A PROBLEM MAY

1 CREATE A PROBLEM TRYING TO CLOSE THIS, OR IN A  
2 CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT. WE SHOULD PROVIDE A PROVISION  
3 THAT WHERE THERE'S LEGAL ANALYSIS THAT CAN DAMAGE THE  
4 POSITION OF THE APPLICANT IN RESOLVING THE PROBLEM,  
5 THAT PERHAPS WE CAN SAY THOSE LEGAL PROVISIONS COULD BE  
6 IN THE FINAL DRAFT REVISED SO THAT THEY DO NOT  
7 PREJUDICE THE APPLICANT'S ABILITY TO RESOLVE THE  
8 PROBLEM, THAT THIS ADDRESSES ISSUES THAT UNDER OUR OWN  
9 OPERATING POLICIES WE'VE ADDRESSED AS BEING SOMETHING  
10 THAT WOULD BE DONE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION.

11 MR. HARRISON: IF THERE ARE CONFIDENTIAL  
12 ASPECTS OF THE STAFF ANALYSIS THAT PERTAIN TO LEGAL  
13 ADVICE OR CONFIDENTIAL LAND NEGOTIATIONS, I WOULD  
14 RECOMMEND THAT YOU CONSIDER REDACTING THOSE PROVISIONS  
15 BEFORE THEY'RE MADE PUBLIC SO IT DOESN'T PREJUDICE THE  
16 APPLICANTS OR THE INSTITUTE ITSELF.

17 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S MY POINT.

18 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE DON'T NEED A MOTION.  
19 YOU'RE COMFORTABLE WITH IT AS OUTLINED?

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: UNLESS YOU WANT A  
21 MOTION, JEFF. IT'S YOUR CALL.

22 MR. SHEEHY: OKAY. I'LL WITHDRAW THE MOTION.  
23 I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THE PRESIDENT.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ON THE SHARED LAB SPACE,  
25 WE'RE COMPLETE ON THAT SUBJECT. WE NEED TO TAKE ABOUT

1 A 20-MINUTE LUNCH, AND WE'LL COME BACK AND TALK ABOUT  
2 NEW FACILITIES.

3 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: LET'S GET STARTED, PLEASE.  
5 WE'RE GOING TO GET STARTED. SO THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE IN  
6 HERE FOR THE AFTERNOON SESSION, THANK YOU AND I HOPE  
7 YOU LEARN SOMETHING FROM IT. BUT OUR NEXT AND FINAL  
8 AGENDA ITEM IS A BRIEFING AND DISCUSSION ON THE ICOC'S  
9 INPUT ON THE CONCEPT PLAN. IT'S OPEN FOR DISCUSSION.  
10 WE'RE GOING TO DISCUSS IT. ZACH WILL GIVE US A  
11 PRESENTATION ON THE CURRENT THINKING OF THE ICOC ON  
12 LARGER GRANTS. WE'RE NOT MAKING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS.

13 DR. HALL: SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS JUST SIT  
14 IN MY SEAT HERE RATHER THAN USE THE PULPIT, IF THAT'S  
15 ALL RIGHT. WE CAN ASK THE REVEREND KELLER TO PRESS THE  
16 APPROPRIATE BUTTON AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME.

17 MR. KELLER: I'M HERE TO SAVE YOU.

18 DR. HALL: I BELIEVE. I BELIEVE. OKAY. SO  
19 AS WE'VE HAD SEVERAL ALLUSIONS TO ALREADY, WE ARE  
20 APPROACHING THE CRITICAL STAGE OF OUR REVIEW OF THE  
21 SHARED LABORATORY FACILITIES AND AT THE SAME TIME ARE  
22 ALSO BEGINNING A MUCH BIGGER PROJECT, AND THAT IS TO  
23 CONSIDER OUR OVERALL FACILITIES GRANTS AND IN  
24 PARTICULAR OUR FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANTS.

25 SO I WANTED TO JUST TALK ABOUT THAT. AND THE

1 PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING IS REALLY TO GET INFORMATION  
2 FROM YOU. ALSO, TO LET YOU KNOW WHERE WE ARE IN THE  
3 PLANNING PROCESS AND TO GET INFORMATION AND INPUT FROM  
4 YOU THAT WE CAN USE GOING FORWARD.

5 SO LET ME JUST REMIND YOU WITH THE NEXT SLIDE  
6 THE OVERALL AIMS OF THE FACILITIES GRANTS AND,  
7 REMEMBER, I'M SURE YOU DON'T NEED TO BE REMINDED, THAT  
8 SOME 10 PERCENT OF THE FUNDS OF THE OVERALL BOND ISSUE,  
9 THAT IS UP TO \$300 MILLION TOTAL, CAN BE USED FOR  
10 CONSTRUCTION, A LITTLE BIT LESS THAN THAT ACTUALLY.  
11 THAT'S OKAY. LORI IS WINCING AT MY IMPRECISE USE OF  
12 NUMBERS.

13 BUT THE POINT OF THIS IS, AND, AGAIN, LET ME  
14 GIVE CREDIT TO THE CHAIR, BOB KLEIN, WHO WROTE  
15 PROPOSITION 71 AND I THINK IS VERY PRESCIENT IN  
16 UNDERSTANDING THAT IF WE'RE GOING TO EXPAND THIS  
17 EXCITING NEW ENTERPRISE OF STEM CELL RESEARCH IN  
18 CALIFORNIA, THAT IT'S NOT ENOUGH JUST TO GIVE GRANT  
19 MONEY AND TO TRAIN PEOPLE AND TO BRING PEOPLE IN, BUT  
20 THAT WE'RE GOING TO NEED NEW FACILITIES IN ORDER TO DO  
21 THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ZACH, EXCUSE ME FOR  
23 INTERRUPTING. ARE BOB AND SHERRY ON THE LINE HERE?

24 MR. KLEIN: I'M ON THE LINE. THIS IS BOB.

25 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WHAT ABOUT SHERRY? DO WE

1 NEED TO RECONNECT WITH HER?

2 MS. BECKER: NO. SHE WILL CALL IN WHEN SHE  
3 CAN.

4 DR. HALL: SO THE OVERALL AIMS OF THE  
5 FACILITIES, THEN, ARE JUST HERE SUMMARIZED. TO  
6 FACILITATE AND STIMULATE STEM CELL RESEARCH IN  
7 CALIFORNIA, PARTICULARLY RESEARCH ON PLURIPOTENT HUMAN  
8 STEM CELLS, BY PROVIDING NEW FACILITIES FOR RESEARCH.  
9 AND THAT ARISES FROM REALLY THREE SOURCES. ONE IS THE  
10 EXPANSION IN THE OVERALL RESEARCH ENTERPRISE, WHICH IS  
11 REPRESENTED BY THIS. AND SINCE THIS IS A NET ADDITION  
12 TO THE CALIFORNIA BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH ENTERPRISE, IT  
13 MAKES SENSE THAT WE REQUIRE A NET ADDITION OF SPACE IN  
14 ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE THIS RESEARCH.

15 SECONDLY, THE ISSUE THAT I'M SURE YOU'RE ALL  
16 FAMILIAR WITH, THAT SPACE IS NEEDED FOR RESEARCH  
17 OUTSIDE THE FEDERAL GUIDELINES. AND, FINALLY, THERE'S  
18 A VERY POSITIVE SCIENTIFIC BENEFIT HERE, WHICH IS NOT  
19 ALWAYS PLAIN OR I THINK UNDERSTOOD BY PEOPLE WHO ARE  
20 NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE SCIENTIFIC CULTURE. AND THAT IS,  
21 IN SPITE OF THE POPULAR STEREOTYPES OF SCIENTISTS AS  
22 LONELY INDIVIDUALS WHO SIT IN THEIR CLOSETS AND THINK  
23 GREAT THOUGHTS, IN FACT, MOST SCIENCE, AND PARTICULARLY  
24 THESE DAYS, IS INTENSELY SOCIAL. IF YOU GO TO ANY  
25 LABORATORY NOW IN BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE, YOU WILL FIND --

1 ANY ACTIVE LABORATORY, YOU WILL FIND THAT THEY'RE  
2 ENGAGED WITH ACTIVE COLLABORATIONS WITH MAYBE TEN OR  
3 TWELVE OTHER LABORATORIES ON VARIOUS PROJECTS. IT'S A  
4 CONSTANTLY SHIFTING THING. AS PROJECTS CHANGE AND COME  
5 AND GO, THEN THOSE COLLABORATIONS CHANGE. BUT IN  
6 ACTUAL FACT, SCIENTISTS WORK AND LEARN FROM EACH OTHER  
7 AND ARE DEPENDENT ON EACH OTHER. AND HAVING A  
8 DEDICATED FACILITY FOR AN EMERGING AREA LIKE STEM CELL  
9 RESEARCH IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT IN PROMOTING THAT AREA  
10 AND ATTRACTING YOUNG PEOPLE AND BEING A PHYSICAL LOCUS  
11 FOR THE WORK THAT GOES ON.

12 AND I'M, AS I SAID, A GREAT BELIEVER IN  
13 SCIENCE BY THE WATER FOUNTAIN. THAT IS, YOU GO GET A  
14 DRINK OF WATER AND RUN INTO SOMEBODY AND SAY, "OH, BY  
15 THE WAY, HOW DID THIS EXPERIMENT GO? HOW'S THAT  
16 STUDENT'S PROJECT GOING? GEE, I HAD A FUNNY IDEA THE  
17 OTHER DAY THAT YOU MIGHT BE ABLE TO HELP ME WITH." AT  
18 ANY RATE, IT'S THOSE SORTS OF INFORMAL AND INADVERTENT  
19 EVEN ASSOCIATIONS THAT ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO THE  
20 OVERALL SUCCESS.

21 AND WHAT'S IMPORTANT IN CALIFORNIA IS THAT WE  
22 ARE NOT ONLY CREATING AN INCREASED NUMBER OF  
23 LABORATORIES DOING STEM CELL RESEARCH. WE ARE, MORE  
24 IMPORTANTLY, CREATING A VERY VITAL AND VIABLE COMMUNITY  
25 OF STEM CELL RESEARCHERS. AND THE WAY IN WHICH PEOPLE

1 FEED OFF EACH OTHER TO MAKE THESE THINGS HAPPEN IS  
2 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT.

3 SO THOSE THREE REASONS, THEN, ARE THE  
4 RATIONALE BEHIND IT ALL.

5 NOW, THE FACILITIES PROGRAM, THEN, STARTS  
6 WITH A SHARED RESEARCH LABORATORIES PROGRAM, WHICH WE  
7 ARE CONCERNED WITH NOW. AND, AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE IC  
8 APPROVAL FOR UP TO 15 GRANTS OF ABOUT ONE TO ONE AND A  
9 HALF MILLION, DEPENDING ON WHETHER OR NOT CONSTRUCTION  
10 MONEY, FACILITIES MONEY, DEPENDING ON WHETHER OR NOT  
11 THERE'S A COURSE INVOLVED, AND THE ROUGH TOTAL OF THAT  
12 IS ABOUT \$17 MILLION.

13 WE ALSO HAVE, THEN, TARGETED FACILITIES  
14 CONSTRUCTION GRANTS, WHICH ARE GRANTS FROM FIVE MILLION  
15 TO TENS OF MILLIONS THAT COULD BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTING  
16 LARGER FACILITIES.

17 NOW, OF THE ORIGINAL AMOUNT OF MONEY,  
18 ACCORDING TO THE SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC PLAN, WE HELD OUT  
19 35 MILLION FOR FUTURE USES HAVING TO DO WITH STEM CELL  
20 BANK, GMP PRODUCTION FACILITIES, PERHAPS A NEED FOR  
21 FIXED EQUIPMENT, WHICH ACCORDING TO THE PROPOSITION  
22 FALLS UNDER THE FACILITIES GRANTS, AND THIS IS, IN  
23 ESSENCE, SORT OF SO THAT WE DON'T COMMIT AND SPEND ALL  
24 THE MONEY UP FRONT, BUT MAKE PROVISION FOR FUTURE  
25 NEEDS, SOME OF THEM WHICH MAY BE UNFORESEEN.

1                   AND THE NEXT FIGURE WHICH, THANKS TO RICK  
2                   KELLER, JUST ILLUSTRATES HOW THIS FITS INTO OUR OVERALL  
3                   BUDGET. AND THE OVERALL PIE THERE IS THE TOTAL AMOUNT  
4                   OF MONEY THAT WE HAVE. THE RESEARCH GRANTS, AS YOU  
5                   SEE, COME TO ABOUT 2.5 MILLION ROUGHLY, WE HAVE  
6                   ADMINISTRATION AND ISSUANCE COST, AND THEN WE HAVE 274  
7                   MILLION THAT'S AVAILABLE FOR CAPITAL USES. AND THE  
8                   BREAKDOWN THERE IS JUST WHAT I'VE SAID, ABOUT 17  
9                   MILLION FOR THE SHARED LABS, 222 MILLION FOR THE  
10                  FACILITIES GRANTS, LARGE FACILITIES GRANTS, AND THEN  
11                  STEM CELL BANK, CORE LABS, AND OTHER OPPORTUNITIES  
12                  WOULD BE ABOUT 35 MILLION OF THAT.

13                  NOW, WE HAVE A TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR THE  
14                  FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANTS. AND LET ME UNDERLINE  
15                  THE WORD "TENTATIVE" BECAUSE, AS YOU WILL SEE, WE HAVE  
16                  A LOT OF WORK TO DO, BUT THIS IS SORT OF THE OVERALL  
17                  PLAN BY WHICH WE'RE PROCEEDING.

18                  WE BEGAN BY GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT THIS  
19                  AT THE APRIL 10TH ICOC MEETING LAST WEEK. AND WE ARE  
20                  ALSO HERE TO GATHER INFORMATION AND IDEAS FROM YOU. WE  
21                  WILL NEED, ACCORDING TO PROPOSITION 71, TO DEVELOP  
22                  CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC, AND BOTH  
23                  GRANTS AND FACILITIES WORKING GROUPS WILL HAVE TO DO  
24                  THAT. AND I THINK OUR DISCUSSION THIS MORNING IS A  
25                  VERY GOOD PREAMBLE TO THAT DISCUSSION, WHICH WE HOPE TO

1 HAVE ACTUALLY BEFORE THE JUNE MEETING. AND IT'S CLEAR  
2 THAT WE NEED, AS WE'VE HEARD THIS MORNING, NOT ONLY TO  
3 RECOMMEND CRITERIA, BUT TO BE VERY SPECIFIC ABOUT HOW  
4 THEY WILL BE WEIGHTED, I THINK, AND ALSO TO BE VERY  
5 SPECIFIC ABOUT AS MANY ITEMS AS WE CAN SO THAT WE HELP  
6 THE INSTITUTIONS AS THEY PREPARE THESE GRANTS. SO THAT  
7 WORK CAN BE DONE.

8 OUR RATHER AGGRESSIVE SCHEDULE HERE CALLS FOR  
9 POSSIBLE CONCEPT APPROVAL OF AN RFA AT THE JUNE ICOC  
10 MEETING. THE RFA WOULD BE ISSUED IN JUNE OR JULY,  
11 REVIEWED IN THE FALL, AND APPROVED, WE HOPE, BY THE  
12 MARCH 2008 ICOC MEETING. SO THAT'S AT LEAST THE  
13 TARGET, AND WE MAY OR MAY NOT MEET THAT.

14 NOW, THE NEXT SLIDE JUST SUMMARIZES THE  
15 RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSION THAT WE HAD LAST TUESDAY AT  
16 THE ICOC MEETING. AND I THINK THE FIRST POINT THAT WE  
17 HEARD FROM CERTAINLY THOSE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC WHO ARE  
18 CONCERNED WITH RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS WAS A SENSE OF  
19 URGENCY ABOUT THIS. AND THAT DRIVES FROM TWO THINGS,  
20 NO. 1, THE LENGTH OF TIME REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF  
21 OUR LARGE-SCALE FACILITIES, AND THE OVERALL PLANNING  
22 AND CONSTRUCTION OF THESE CAN TAKE SEVERAL YEARS. AND  
23 SO IF WE'RE GOING TO MAKE USE OF THESE MAXIMALLY IN A  
24 TEN-YEAR TIMELINE, WE NEED TO GET UNDER WAY AS QUICKLY  
25 AS POSSIBLE IN ORDER TO GET THEM GOING. AND THAT'S

1 VERY CLEAR.

2 AND THEN THE OTHER THING WHICH IS NOT SO  
3 OBVIOUS TO THOSE NOT IN THE BUSINESS, BUT IS VERY, VERY  
4 REAL, IS THE CONTINUING COST ESCALATION. I DON'T KNOW  
5 RIGHT NOW, BUT AT LEAST I'M A LITTLE BIT OUT OF THE  
6 LOOP ON THIS, BUT I THINK NOT TOO LONG AGO THERE WAS A  
7 BIG INCREASE IN THE COST OF STEEL WHICH HAD HUGE EFFECT  
8 ON BUDGETS. COST OF CONCRETE HAS GONE UP. AND ALMOST  
9 NEVER DO THESE THINGS GO BACK DOWN. SO THERE IS SOME  
10 FLUCTUATION, BUT THE OVERALL TREND IS CLEAR, THAT  
11 CONSTRUCTION GETS MORE AND MORE EXPENSIVE WITH EACH  
12 PASSING YEAR. AND SO THE SOONER THAT WE CAN ENGAGE IN  
13 THIS THE BETTER.

14 THE INSTITUTIONS MADE CLEAR THAT MANY OF THEM  
15 HAVE BEEN PLANNING FOR THIS PRACTICALLY SINCE THE  
16 PROPOSITION WAS PASSED. AND THEIR PLANS FOR  
17 RECRUITMENT OF NEW FACULTY MEMBERS AND THEIR PLANS FOR  
18 MOVING AHEAD ARE DEPENDENT ON THEM KNOWING AT LEAST  
19 WHAT KIND OF COMMITMENT THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE FROM CIRM  
20 FOR CONSTRUCTION. SO THAT WAS ONE THEME.

21 A SECOND THEME WAS THE CONSTRUCTION GRANTS  
22 SHOULD BE STRONGLY LINKED TO PROGRAMMATIC AIMS. THAT  
23 IS, IT'S NOT ENOUGH TO SAY WE'RE JUST GOING TO PUT UP A  
24 BUILDING, BUT THE INVESTMENT IN FACILITIES SHOULD BE  
25 JUSTIFIED BY PROGRAMMATIC COMPONENTS. AND BY THIS I

1 MEAN WHAT ADDITIONAL VALUE IS GOING TO BE GAINED FROM  
2 THIS? WHAT NEW FACILITIES WILL YOU BE ABLE TO BUILD?  
3 WHAT NEW SERVICES WILL YOU BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THE STEM  
4 CELL PEOPLE AT YOUR INSTITUTION? AND WHY DOES IT MAKE  
5 SENSE FROM A SCIENTIFIC AND PROGRAMMATIC POINT OF VIEW  
6 FOR CIRM TO INVEST IN THE BUILDING FOR YOU?

7 NOW, THE STRATEGIC PLAN HAD ORIGINALLY  
8 ENVISAGED A GROUP OF RELATIVELY LARGE GRANTS, TENS OF  
9 MILLIONS, AND THEN A LARGER GROUP OF SOMEWHAT SMALLER  
10 GRANTS OF FIVE TO 10 MILLION. THE ICOC MADE VERY CLEAR  
11 AT THE MEETING LAST TUESDAY THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO  
12 CONSIDER GRANTS OF VARIOUS SIZES ALL AT ONE TIME AND  
13 NOT HAVE THEM BROKEN UP IN THIS WAY. SO THERE WOULD BE  
14 A CONTINUOUS RANGE OF FUNDING AVAILABLE, THEN,  
15 PRESUMABLY FROM FIVE MILLION UP TO 50 OR MORE, AND IT  
16 WOULD BE UP TO THE APPLICANTS TO BOTH, THEN, SAY WHY  
17 THEY NEEDED A PARTICULAR AMOUNT OF MONEY AND TO BE ABLE  
18 THEN TO JUSTIFY THE FACILITY THAT THEY WERE GOING TO  
19 CONSTRUCT IN TERMS OF THE VALUE TO THE PROGRAM AND THE  
20 SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY THAT WOULD BE USING IT.

21 AND I THINK WE ALL RECOGNIZE AND VALUE THAT  
22 WITHIN THE STATE THERE ARE A RANGE OF INSTITUTIONS THAT  
23 RANGE IN SIZE AND THAT RANGE IN DEGREE OF  
24 SPECIALIZATION. SOME INSTITUTIONS ARE VERY HIGHLY  
25 SPECIALIZED FOR ONE THING OR ANOTHER SO THAT OUR AIM IS

1 TO SERVE THIS DIVERSE CONSTITUENCY, AND IT'S VERY CLEAR  
2 THAT ONE SIZE WILL NOT FIT ALL, BUT THAT WE WILL NEED  
3 TO HAVE FACILITIES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL TO QUALITY  
4 INSTITUTIONS AT A VARIETY OF LEVELS, SOME RATHER MODEST  
5 IN THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE THEY HAVE, BUT WITH VERY HIGH  
6 QUALITY, OTHERS, SOME OF THE LARGER INSTITUTIONS HAVE  
7 LITERALLY ALMOST HUNDREDS OF RESEARCHERS WHO ARE  
8 INTERESTED IN STEM CELL RESEARCH. SO WE WANT TO  
9 RECOGNIZE THAT DIFFERENCE SORT OF IN THE SAME WAY WE  
10 DID WITH THE TRAINING GRANTS. NOT SIMPLY SAY THAT  
11 WE'RE GOING TO -- WELL, WE RECOGNIZE THAT DIFFERENCE  
12 AND BE ABLE TO SUPPORT THAT DIVERSITY ACROSS A RANGE.

13 A VERY ACTIVE DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING WAS  
14 THE VALUE OF COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS. AND I THINK  
15 THE CONSENSUS WAS THAT WE VALUE COLLABORATION, AND  
16 WHERE INSTITUTIONS CAN GET TOGETHER AND PUT UP A JOINT  
17 FACILITY THAT WILL ENHANCE WORK AT THE INSTITUTIONS,  
18 THAT'S TERRIFIC. I THINK IT WAS ALSO RECOGNIZED AT THE  
19 MEETING THAT THIS IS NOT ALWAYS POSSIBLE FOR GEOGRAPHIC  
20 OR CULTURAL OR OTHER REASONS; AND ALTHOUGH WE WANT TO  
21 PROMOTE THAT AS VALUE, WE WOULD ENCOURAGE IT WHERE  
22 FEASIBLE.

23 AN ISSUE THAT AROSE TODAY THAT WAS SPELLED  
24 OUT VERY CLEARLY AT THE MEETING WAS A DESIRE FOR  
25 CLARITY FOR THE 20-PERCENT MATCH. I THINK WHAT WE ALSO

1 HEARD THIS MORNING WAS WHATEVER ARRANGEMENTS WE HAVE  
2 ABOUT LEVERAGING ABOVE THAT, WE NEED TO BE VERY CLEAR  
3 ABOUT HOW THAT IS DONE AND WHAT KINDS OF THINGS ARE  
4 ACCEPTABLE AND WHAT ROLE THAT WILL PLAY IN THE OVERALL  
5 EVALUATION. AND, AGAIN, AS I SAY, THESE ISSUES WERE --  
6 I THINK THE DISCUSSION THIS MORNING WAS A VERY NICE  
7 PRELUDE TO JUST THIS QUESTION.

8 AND FINALLY, THERE WAS SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT  
9 WHETHER OR NOT WE NEEDED A PRIOR SURVEY OR  
10 PREQUALIFICATION. AND THE CONSENSUS AT THE ICOC WAS  
11 THAT THIS WAS NOT REQUIRED.

12 SO THIS IS MORE OR LESS WHERE WE STAND RIGHT  
13 NOW. AND THE INTENT OF THIS MEETING WAS TO GET INPUT  
14 FROM THE REAL ESTATE MEMBERS, ALSO THE PATIENT  
15 ADVOCATES ON THE WORKING GROUP, AND ALSO FOR THOSE HERE  
16 WHO ARE REPRESENTING INSTITUTIONS WHO HAVE SOME  
17 CONTRIBUTION TO MAKE TO THIS OVERALL PROCESS. WE'D BE  
18 HAPPY TO HEAR THAT AS WELL. SO OUR INTENT IS TO GATHER  
19 INFORMATION, TO GET IDEAS, AND THEN TO TRY TO PUT  
20 TOGETHER SOME SORT OF CONCEPT CLEARANCE DOCUMENT THAT  
21 WOULD OUTLINE RATHER SPECIFICALLY ALL THE MAIN ELEMENTS  
22 THAT MIGHT BE IN AN RFA AND SEE IF WE CAN TAKE THAT TO  
23 THE JUNE ICOC MEETING.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU, ZACH. WHAT I'D  
25 LIKE TO DO, HOW I'D LIKE TO START IS HAVE A DISCUSSION

1 AMONG THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEMBERS FIRST, AND  
2 THEN WE'LL OPEN IT UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. WE'RE VERY  
3 INTERESTED IN PUBLIC COMMENT BECAUSE WE'RE EMBARKING IN  
4 A NEW AREA, AND WE WOULD BE VERY RECEPTIVE TO LISTENING  
5 TO YOUR IDEAS, COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, WHATEVER. SO  
6 WE'RE GOING TO GET TO YOU. I WANT TO START FIRST WITH  
7 THE WORKING GROUP AND THEIR COMMENTS ON THIS.

8 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I ATTENDED THE  
9 MEETING. I THINK, ZACH, THAT'S A GOOD SUMMARY OF WHAT  
10 WAS DISCUSSED. I JUST WANT TO, SINCE WE'RE QUOTING  
11 PROP 71, AND I HOPE I'M NOT TAKING THIS OUT OF CONTEXT,  
12 I DON'T THINK I AM, THIS WORKING GROUP SHALL -- THIS IS  
13 UNDER PROP 71 -- PERFORM THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS: MAKE  
14 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC ON INTERIM AND FINAL  
15 CRITERIA, REQUIREMENTS, AND STANDARDS FOR APPLICATIONS,  
16 ETC., FOR AWARD OF GRANTS. SO THAT'S WHAT WE GET TO DO  
17 IN ADDITION TO DECIDING, WE HAVE TO ESTABLISH AND  
18 IDENTIFY THE CRITERIA. AND THAT IS NO EASY TASK, IN MY  
19 MIND.

20 I WROTE THAT NUMBER UP THERE NOT TO BE OVERLY  
21 DRAMATIC, \$222 MILLION; BUT WHERE I COME FROM, THAT'S A  
22 LOT OF MONEY. IT'S A BIG RFA. AND THAT'S WHAT THE  
23 ICOC HAS ASKED US TO DO. FOR THIS NEXT RFA, PUT IT OUT  
24 ON THE STREET FOR \$222 MILLION. OKAY. I THINK WE CAN  
25 HANDLE THAT. I THINK WE CAN. BUT IT WILL TAKE SOME

1 TIME. IT WILL TAKE SOME DUE DILIGENCE ON OUR PART TO  
2 IDENTIFY THAT CRITERIA, TO HAVE A DIALOGUE AMONGST  
3 OURSELVES, PRIORITIZE WHAT WE THINK IS IMPORTANT.  
4 THAT'S SORT OF OUR JOB. THEN PITCH IT TO THE ICOC.  
5 AND I THINK WE CAN DO THAT, BUT I WANT TO MAKE SURE  
6 THAT WE HAVE A SUFFICIENT AMOUNT OF TIME, THAT WE'RE  
7 NOT RUSHED. I DON'T WANT TO BE RUSHED WITH \$222  
8 MILLION. I WANT TO TAKE MY TIME, AND I DON'T WANT TO  
9 FEEL PRESSURED BY MY COLLEAGUES ON THE ICOC.

10 I KNOW THAT THEY ARE ANXIOUS. THERE'S  
11 ESCALATING COST, COST FOR MONEY, EVERYTHING ACROSS THE  
12 WORLD A BIG BUILDING BOOM. BUT LET'S GET THIS RIGHT.

13 SO LET'S JUST PLAY IT OUT. WE HAVE OUR  
14 MEETING TODAY. MOST OF IT WAS CONSUMED DISCUSSING THE  
15 SHARED LAB SPACE, WHICH WAS APPROPRIATE. THIS WAS  
16 TAGGED ON AT THE LAST MINUTE, THIS AGENDA ITEM. WE  
17 HAVE OUR MEETING IN JUNE -- EXCUSE ME -- MAY 2D AND 3D.  
18 THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THAT MEETING IS TO GO OVER THE  
19 SHARED LAB APPLICATIONS THEMSELVES AND SCORE THEM AND  
20 DO WHAT WE DISCUSSED TODAY. AFTER MAY IS JUNE.  
21 THERE'S THE ICOC MEETING. SO WE HAVE TODAY, AND MAYBE  
22 WE CAN TACK ON PART OF THAT MAY 2D AND 3D MEETING TO  
23 RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC A \$222-MILLION RFA. I'M HOPEFUL  
24 AND I'M OPTIMISTIC, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT'S ENOUGH  
25 TIME. I REALLY DON'T. I THINK WE'VE LEARNED A LOT

1 FROM THIS SHARED LAB RFA. I THINK WE'VE LEARNED A LOT,  
2 RUSTY, FROM THIS DISCUSSION WE'VE HAD, AND IT WILL  
3 BENEFIT US IN DRAFTING AND MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT  
4 IN NO WAY IS IT SUFFICIENT.

5 THOSE ARE MY INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS. THAT'S  
6 JUST SORT OF HOW I FEEL. I'M NOT OUT TO STALL THE  
7 PROCESS. I'M NOT OUT TO BE AN OBSTRUCTIONIST. BUT  
8 WE'VE ALL GOT OUR FINGERPRINTS ON THIS RFA, EACH ONE OF  
9 US. AND WE NEED TIME. MARCY, YOU BROUGHT UP ISSUES.  
10 WHAT ABOUT THE CHILDREN? WHAT ARE WE DOING IN CENTRAL  
11 VALLEY? WHAT'S GOING ON ELSEWHERE? THOSE ARE ALL  
12 LEGITIMATE POLICY QUESTIONS THAT WE ARE EMPOWERED TO  
13 DISCUSS.

14 CHAIRMAN DOMS: MARCY.

15 MS. FEIT: THERE WERE SOME QUESTIONS ON THE  
16 ICOC AT THE LAST MEETING THIS WEEK ABOUT, YOU KNOW,  
17 HAVE WE SET ASIDE ENOUGH ALLOCATION FOR THE BANKS  
18 BECAUSE IF THERE'S A CHANGE IN THE THINKING AT THE  
19 FEDERAL LEVEL AND MORE MONEY BECOMES AVAILABLE FOR  
20 RESEARCH, THEN ARE WE MISSING A CUE NOT HAVING A LARGER  
21 ALLOCATION TOWARD BUILDING THE BANKS INSTEAD OF  
22 FACILITIES? SO I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF DUE DILIGENCE  
23 THAT HAS TO BE DONE BEFORE WE CAN SAY WE KNOW WHAT THE  
24 CRITERIA AND OBJECTIVES ARE FOR CASTING THE \$222  
25 MILLION.

1                   CHAIRMAN DOMS: LET ME RESPOND TO THAT. IT  
2 WOULD SEEM TO ME -- I'M NOT ON THE SCIENCE SIDE  
3 OBVIOUSLY -- BUT IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT YOU'RE  
4 ABSOLUTELY RIGHT, BUT THAT HAS TO COME FROM THE ICOC  
5 BEFORE WE CAN REALLY FOCUS ON IT.

6                   MS. FEIT: WELL, THEN I CAN TELL YOU AT THE  
7 LAST MEETING WE HAD A SHORTENED MEETING THAT WE BARELY  
8 GOT THROUGH THE AGENDA. THIS TOPIC COULD HAVE BEEN  
9 DISCUSSED FOR TWO MORE HOURS, THIS FACILITY TOPIC. WE  
10 WERE -- WE DIDN'T EVEN GET THROUGH A BREAK OR LUNCH,  
11 AND WE WENT DIRECTLY INTO MEETINGS WITH LEGISLATORS.  
12 SO IF YOU'RE SAYING THAT A REASONABLE DISCUSSION AT THE  
13 ICOC NEEDS TO TAKE PLACE, THEN WE NEED TO SET ASIDE  
14 TIME FOR THAT TO TAKE PLACE. AND WE NEED TO HAVE INPUT  
15 FROM THE GENERAL ARENA IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ON  
16 WHAT THEIR THINKING IS ON THIS TOPIC BEFORE WE SPEND  
17 THIS KIND OF MONEY. THAT'S JUST MY THINKING, WHATEVER  
18 FORM THAT TAKES. AND I DON'T WANT TO BE AN  
19 OBSTRUCTIONIST EITHER. I DON'T WANT TO DELAY THE  
20 PROCESS BECAUSE I'M WELL AWARE OF WHAT CONSTRUCTION  
21 COSTS ARE. I BUILD BUILDINGS ALL THE TIME. BUT AT THE  
22 HEART OF IT IS WE HAVE ONE TIME HERE TO MAKE A  
23 DIFFERENCE, AND WE DON'T WANT TO BE SO QUICK TO DRAW ON  
24 ASSUMPTIONS THAT WE MISS AN OPPORTUNITY.

25                   SHOULD THERE BE A WITHHOLD TO LET SOME OF

1 THIS EVOLVE, AND THEN MAYBE COME FORWARD WITH ANOTHER  
2 ROUND OF FACILITY ALLOCATION? IS THAT THE RIGHT  
3 THINKING? WE DON'T HAVE THE ANSWERS TODAY. AND I  
4 COULDN'T GIVE THEM TO YOU. SO WHATEVER PROCESS WE USE  
5 TO GET THAT DUE DILIGENCE DONE, I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE  
6 DONE.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: RUSTY, JUST SO  
8 OUR COLLEAGUES UNDERSTAND, THIS IS JUST A FACT, BEFORE  
9 WE ISSUED THAT FIRST ROUND OF SCIENTIFIC GRANTS, WE HAD  
10 THAT TWO-DAY SYMPOSIUM. STAFF WAS INVOLVED IN THAT.  
11 WE HAD INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL EXPERTS COME AND TALK  
12 ABOUT THE STATE OF STEM CELL SCIENCE. THEN WE ISSUED  
13 THE RFA'S. TWO DAYS. LOT OF STAFF TIME WAS SPENT ON  
14 IT. THEY DID A GREAT JOB.

15 MS. FEIT: WE HAD INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS.

16 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: EXPERTS. WE  
17 DIDN'T TALK ABOUT FACILITIES SO MUCH AT THAT SYMPOSIUM.  
18 IN DRAFTING THIS SCIENTIFIC DOCUMENT HERE, WHICH IS A  
19 FINE DOCUMENT, WE HAD FOCUS GROUPS. I DON'T REMEMBER.  
20 THERE WERE EIGHT TO TWELVE, AND I DON'T RECALL ANY ONE  
21 OF THOSE FOCUS GROUPS TOUCHING ON FACILITIES. SO THE  
22 QUESTION OF DUE DILIGENCE, ONE, THE ICOC ON TUESDAY,  
23 THAT WAS THE FIRST DISCUSSION THEY EVER HAD ABOUT MAJOR  
24 FACILITIES. TECHNICALLY THIS IS THE SECOND DISCUSSION  
25 WE'RE HAVING IF WE COUNT THIS AS A DISCUSSION.

1                   SO IF YOU LOOK AT THE DUE DILIGENCE WE'VE  
2                   DONE AND WHAT THE ICOC HAS DONE IN THE PAST AS  
3                   PRECEDENCE, THAT SHOULD HELP GUIDE THIS DISCUSSION.

4                   CHAIRMAN DOMS:   SHERRY, WE CAN PICK UP YOUR  
5                   CONVERSATION.

6                   MS. LANSING:   SORRY.   HOW IS THAT POSSIBLE?  
7                   I'M LISTENING AND MULTITASKING.   I AM LISTENING AND  
8                   MULTITASKING.   I FEEL LIKE I'M GETTING A CRASH COURSE  
9                   IN THINGS I KNOW NOTHING ABOUT.   I APOLOGIZE.   AND THEN  
10                  I WAS MULTITASKING BECAUSE AT 2 O'CLOCK I WAS SUPPOSED  
11                  TO DO SOMETHING ELSE, SO I DIDN'T WANT TO GET OFF THE  
12                  PHONE.   SO I APOLOGIZE.

13                  CHAIRMAN DOMS:   THANK YOU.   THE REPORTER WAS  
14                  HAVING TROUBLE.

15                  MS. LANSING:   WHATEVER I SAID WASN'T VERY  
16                  INTERESTING IN MY MULTITASKING.

17                  DR. HALL:   IT WILL APPEAR IN THE TRANSCRIPT  
18                  OF THIS MEETING, SHERRY, DON'T WORRY.

19                  MS. LANSING:   LAURA, TAKE CARE OF THIS.  
20                  OKAY.

21                  CHAIRMAN DOMS:   SORRY, DAVID.

22                  VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:   THAT WAS IT.   I  
23                  JUST WANTED TO SHARE THAT FACT.

24                  MR. LICHTENGER:   WELL, I HAVE SEVERAL  
25                  THOUGHTS, BUT ONE OF THEM IS I AGREE THAT THAT'S AN

1 AGGRESSIVE SCHEDULE. AND, AGAIN, I DON'T WANT TO RUSH.  
2 I'M ALSO VERY KEENLY AWARE OF CONSTRUCTION INFLATION  
3 RIGHT NOW. BUT PERHAPS MAYBE WE COULD HAVE SOME MORE  
4 FREQUENT INFORMAL MEETINGS THAT ARE BETWEEN THE WORKING  
5 GROUP TO MAKE SOME PROGRESS ON SOME OF THESE  
6 GUIDELINES. AND THIS WOULD NOT BE -- THERE WOULD NOT  
7 BE ANY DECISIONS MADE, BUT JUST, YOU KNOW,  
8 INFORMATIONAL EXCHANGES IN A WAY THAT WOULD ALLOW US TO  
9 MAKE PROGRESS IN BETWEEN THESE QUARTERLY MEETINGS SO WE  
10 COULD DISCUSS, YOU KNOW, POTENTIAL GUIDELINE RULES AND  
11 THAT WOULD ALLOW US TO MAKE PROGRESS.

12 MS. HYSEN: YOU HAD MENTIONED THAT WE HAVE  
13 OUR FINGERPRINTS ON THIS RFA, AND WE DON'T. I THINK  
14 THAT'S PROBABLY PART OF THE PROBLEM. I THINK WE COULD  
15 HAVE HEADED OFF SOME OF THE PROBLEMS THAT ABSORBED A  
16 LOT OF THE DISCUSSION. I REALLY THINK -- AND I THOUGHT  
17 I MADE A POINT TO ASK TO SEE THE RFA FIRST GO-ROUND,  
18 BUT I THINK IT'S REALLY CRITICAL THAT WE'RE PART OF THE  
19 RFA DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE A LOT OF CONCERNS THAT WE'RE  
20 HAVING AT THIS MEETING COULD HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED THERE.

21 AND I REALLY THINK WE NEED TO LEVERAGE  
22 TECHNOLOGY. THERE'S LOTS OF SHARED DOCUMENTATION  
23 SOFTWARE OUT THERE. SHAREPOINT IS ONE WHERE THE STAFF  
24 CAN GO AHEAD AND PUT THE RFA IN PLACE, AND WE CAN GO IN  
25 ONLINE AND START TO MAKE OUR COMMENTS THERE. THEY CAN

1 BE LOOKED AT, INCORPORATED, WE CAN ALL SEE WHAT'S GOING  
2 ON. BECAUSE I THINK THAT, ONE, YOU WANT TO HAVE A  
3 DOCUMENT THAT ASKS THE RIGHT QUESTIONS AND THAT'S  
4 CONSISTENT WITH THE LAW, AND GET THAT RFA WHERE WE ALL  
5 HAVE INPUT BECAUSE WHEN WE GET TO A MEETING LIKE THIS,  
6 IT'S PRETTY HARD TO GO THROUGH. FOR ME, IT'S KIND OF  
7 EMBARRASSING TO SIT BEFORE YOU AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT A  
8 DOCUMENT THAT WE'RE SUPPOSED TO BE PRESENTING IS  
9 FLAWED.

10 AND I THINK IT'S MORE APPROPRIATE FORM TO DO  
11 IT INTERNALLY AND ALLOW US THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE  
12 INPUT SO THAT IT'S -- WE COULD EXPEDITE THIS PROCESS, I  
13 THINK, MUCH MORE QUICKLY IN MAY IF WE WERE TO ACTUALLY  
14 OPINE ON THE ISSUES INTERNALLY AND THEN HAVE A DOCUMENT  
15 THAT WE ALL AGREE IS THE GOOD DOCUMENT STARTING FROM  
16 RIGHT THEN AND THERE.

17 DR. HALL: IT'S A LITTLE -- LET ME JUST SAY  
18 IT'S A LITTLE COMPLICATED IN PUTTING THIS TOGETHER IN  
19 THAT WE NEED TO CONSULT WITH YOU, BUT ALSO, THEN, ICOC,  
20 AND WE HAVE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. SO WE HAVE A  
21 VERY COMPLICATED CONSTITUENCY HERE TO CONSULT. AND OUR  
22 APPROACH HAS BEEN TO TRY TO GET WHAT WE CALL CONCEPT  
23 CLEARANCE; THAT IS, GO THROUGH ALL THE IMPORTANT  
24 POINTS, INCLUDING THE CRITERIA, AND WE LEARNED A LOT  
25 FROM THIS FIRST TIME AROUND, BUT THEN TO HAVE THE FINAL

1 WORDING WHICH WERE SENT FOR COMMENT ACTUALLY TO THE  
2 HEADS -- FOR THIS RFA TO THE HEADS OF THIS WORKING  
3 GROUP, THE HEADS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. JUST IF  
4 YOU HAVE, HOW MANY PEOPLE, 22 PEOPLE ON THE GRANTS  
5 GROUP, HOW MANY PEOPLE ON THIS GROUP ALL WORKING ON A  
6 DOCUMENT AND THEN THE ICOC AS WELL, IT GETS PRETTY  
7 COMPLICATED.

8 SO WE DO NEED TO THINK ABOUT HAVING A PROCESS  
9 FOR PRODUCING THESE IN WHICH ALL THE ESSENTIAL POINTS  
10 ARE POINTS THAT WE CAN DISCUSS, AGREE ON, BUT THEN IN  
11 WHICH THERE'S A FAIRLY EFFICIENT WAY OF GETTING THE  
12 FINAL DOCUMENT OUT. SO JUST A POINT OF LOGISTICS. I  
13 UNDERSTAND YOUR INTEREST IN SEEING IT, COMMENTING ON  
14 IT, BUT WE HAVE A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT COULD BE  
15 CONSULTED IN A SIMILAR WAY, AND IT MAKES IT DIFFICULT.

16 MS. HYSEN: IT WORKS THOUGH. LET ME TELL YOU  
17 IT DOES WORK. I HAD A SHAREPOINT DOCUMENT FOR BIDS  
18 GOING OUT TO 60, 70 PEOPLE, AND IT DOES WORK.  
19 TECHNOLOGY IS REALLY THERE TO FACILITATE THIS. IT CAN  
20 BE A BIT CUMBERSOME, PARTICULARLY IF YOU'RE THE PERSON  
21 THAT'S TRYING TO INCORPORATE ALL THOSE DOCUMENTS. BUT,  
22 YOU KNOW, TO COME TO A MEETING WHERE MAYBE -- LET'S SAY  
23 WE COME IN MAY OR JUNE OR WHENEVER WE COME, AND THE  
24 RFA, WE'RE LOOKING AT IT AND WE DON'T LIKE IT, AND  
25 WE'VE JUST SPENT A WHOLE DAY AND WE'VE DECIDED THAT

1 THIS IS NOT A DOCUMENT WE CAN LIVE WITH. WE'VE SORT OF  
2 WASTED A LOT OF TIME.

3 SO IT'S JUST -- I THROW IT OUT THERE AS AN  
4 EXAMPLE THAT YOU COULD POSSIBLY DO USING TECHNOLOGY.

5 CHAIRMAN DOMS: LET ME JUST SAY. I GUESS I  
6 WOULD TAKE ISSUE ON YOUR COMMENT THAT THAT DOCUMENT IS  
7 FLAWED. WE COULD HAVE DONE A BETTER JOB, BUT I THINK  
8 THERE'S A LOT OF VALUE TO THAT DOCUMENT AS IT WAS  
9 PRESENTED.

10 MS. FEIT: YOU KNOW, MY COMMENTS ARE NOT IN  
11 ANY WAY, SHAPE, OR FORM TO NOT APPRECIATE THE TALENTS  
12 AND SKILLS THAT WE HAVE ON THE CIRM STAFF. THEY JUST  
13 DO HEROIC THINGS FOR US, AND I REALLY PERSONALLY  
14 APPRECIATE THAT. BUT IN THIS WHOLE ASSIGNMENT THAT WE  
15 HAVE HAD FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, REPRESENTING WHAT  
16 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA WANT, WE HAVE  
17 MADE SURE THAT WE HAVE ENSURED A PROCESS. AND THE  
18 SIMPLE THING THAT DEBORAH IS ASKING IS PART OF THAT.

19 WE ALSO MADE SURE WHEN WE WERE DEVELOPING  
20 STANDARDS AND WE WERE DEVELOPING THE GRANTS PROCESS  
21 THAT WE TOOK IN EXPERT TESTIMONY FROM THOSE WE SOUGHT  
22 TO DEVELOP OUR CRITERIA, TO DEVELOP OUR DOCUMENTS, AND  
23 TO DEVELOP THE PROCESS. AND I REALLY FEEL STRONGLY  
24 RIGHT NOW WE ARE AT THAT POINT. AND I DON'T CARE IF WE  
25 HAVE TO MEET WITH A HUNDRED PEOPLE OR A MILLION PEOPLE

1 IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. THAT'S OUR RESPONSIBILITY  
2 BEFORE WE GO FORWARD. AND I THINK DEBORAH IS RAISING A  
3 KEY POINT ABOUT PROCESS. I THINK IT'S JUST A SMALL  
4 PART OF THE PROCESS. I THINK WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY  
5 TO APPLY THE SAME PROCESS THAT WE DID IN THE OTHER  
6 PARTS OF OUR WORK THAT WE HAVE DONE IN THE LAST TWO OR  
7 THREE YEARS IN MOVING AHEAD BECAUSE I THINK WE'VE DONE  
8 AN OUTSTANDING JOB OF THAT.

9 WE HAD A LOT OF INPUT. WE HELD PUBLIC  
10 HEARINGS. WE DID A LOT OF WORK BEFORE WE MOVED AHEAD  
11 TO BE CLEAR THAT WE UNDERSTOOD WHAT WAS EXPECTED OF US  
12 BECAUSE AT THIS POINT IN TIME, BASED ON THE TIMEFRAME  
13 YOU GAVE, THERE IS NO POSSIBLE WAY THAT RESPONSIBLE  
14 PEOPLE CAN MOVE AHEAD IN THAT FASHION. THAT HAS TO  
15 HAPPEN. SHE IS ASKING FOR A VERY SIMPLE PROCESS. THAT  
16 IS TO ME JUST A SMALL PART OF WHAT HAS TO BE DONE HERE  
17 BEFORE WE MOVE AHEAD. I AGREE WITH HER WHOLEHEARTEDLY.  
18 WE SHOULD WANT AS MUCH INPUT AS POSSIBLE.

19 JUST IN THE BRIEF TIME THIS MORNING, I HEARD  
20 SEVERAL COMMENTS FROM PEOPLE HERE WHO ARE ADVISING US  
21 IF WE HAD ONLY KNOWN WHAT THE DEFINITIONS WERE. WHERE  
22 WAS THE DEFINITION FOR LEVERAGE? AND SO WE ARE MISSING  
23 A LOT HERE. I WOULD NOT WANT TO GO AHEAD AND SPEND  
24 THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY WITH THIS PROCESS THAT WE USED  
25 TODAY.

1 MR. LICHTENGER: AGREED.

2 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I THINK WE'RE ALL IN  
3 AGREEMENT. I THINK YOUR COMMENTS ARE WELL TAKEN,  
4 DEBORAH, IN TERMS OF HOW WE INTEGRATE THIS WHOLE  
5 PROCESS. BUT I DON'T WANT ANYBODY TO THINK THAT THE  
6 PROCESS THAT WE USED TODAY IS ONE THAT WILL BE USED IN  
7 THE FUTURE. THESE ARE FOR SMALLER GRANTS. THEY'RE FOR  
8 EXISTING SPACE. IT'S GOING TO BE RENOVATED. IT'S A  
9 MUCH LESS COMPLICATED UNDERTAKING. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT  
10 MAJOR FACILITIES, AND SO WHAT IS DONE TODAY, THAT'S HOW  
11 WE'LL HANDLE THE SHARED RESEARCH LAB SPACE, BUT WE'LL  
12 TAKE WHAT WE'VE LEARNED TODAY AND MOVE FORWARD AND COME  
13 UP WITH A MUCH BETTER PROCESS.

14 MR. SHEEHY: FIRST, I WANT TO SUPPORT DEBORAH  
15 ON HAVING AN ITERATIVE PROCESS ON THE RFA. AND I  
16 ACTUALLY THINK WHEN YOU START TO DECONSTRUCT THAT, IN  
17 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THERE'S NOT A DESIRE TO BE  
18 PART OF THE RFA DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE THE RELATIONSHIP OF  
19 THE SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEWER TO AN RFA IS DIFFERENT, I  
20 THINK, THAN WHAT YOU VISUALIZE FROM THIS WORKING GROUP  
21 WHERE THERE ACTUALLY NEEDS TO BE SOME LINKAGE BETWEEN  
22 THE TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU ARE GOING TO  
23 EVALUATE IN THE RFA. YOU KNOW, THAT TYPE OF BRIDGE  
24 ACTUALLY DOESN'T EXIST IN THE SCIENTIFIC.

25 IN THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, THEY WOULD LIKE

1 THOSE PARTS TO BE SEPARATE. SO WE'RE ONLY TALKING  
2 REALLY ABOUT A HANDFUL OF PEOPLE THAT WE WOULD WANT TO  
3 BE. AND I CERTAINLY WOULD NOT WANT -- I THINK MARCY  
4 MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE USEFUL. I WOULDN'T NEED TO LOOK AT  
5 AN RFA IN ANY DETAIL. I DON'T HAVE THAT KIND OF  
6 EXPERTISE. SO THAT'S POINT ONE.

7 I DON'T THINK WE WOULD BE INVOLVING A CAST OF  
8 THOUSANDS. I THINK WE'D PROBABLY ONLY BE INVOLVING A  
9 RELATIVELY SMALL GROUP OF PEOPLE TO HAVE AN ITERATIVE  
10 PROCESS ON THE RFA DEVELOPMENT AT THE WORKING GROUP  
11 LEVEL.

12 THE SECOND POINT IS THE MORE I STARTED  
13 THINKING ABOUT OUR PROCESSES, AND I'M SO GRATEFUL FOR  
14 MARCY'S COMMENTS, YOU KNOW, WE REALLY HAVE HAD PUBLIC  
15 HEARINGS. WE HAD SEVERAL PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR THE  
16 STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT. WE HAD SEVERAL PUBLIC HEARINGS  
17 IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RULES.  
18 WE HAD SEVERAL PUBLIC HEARINGS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
19 THE STRATEGIC PLAN. AND THIS IS THE ONLY THING THAT WE  
20 HAVEN'T GONE UP AND DOWN STATE AT HEARINGS AND LISTENED  
21 TO WHAT PEOPLE WANT, WHAT THEY NEED, WHAT THEY THINK WE  
22 SHOULD BE DOING.

23 I THINK I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT WE HAVE  
24 A HEARING IN THE BAY AREA, THAT WE HAVE A HEARING IN  
25 LOS ANGELES, THAT WE HAVE A HEARING IN SAN DIEGO, THAT

1 WE HAVE A HEARING IN THE CENTER OF THE STATE, AND KIND  
2 OF GET A REAL ASSESSMENT OF WHAT THE NEED IS SO THAT  
3 WE'RE NOT GOING INTO THIS BLINDLY, JUST BACK IN THE  
4 BRINKS.

5 I HAVE A FEELING THAT IF WE DON'T, WE'RE  
6 GOING TO BE IN A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE BACKING THE  
7 BRINKS TRUCK UP TO A COUPLE OF REALLY WELL-ESTABLISHED  
8 INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE ACCESS TO A TON OF WEALTH, AND  
9 WE'RE NOT DOING THE JOB WE SHOULD BE DOING IN TERMS OF  
10 DISTRIBUTING RESEARCH FACILITIES AROUND THE STATE.  
11 WE'RE NOT GIVING AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO ANYBODY IN  
12 THIS STATE WHO WANTS TO DO STEM CELL RESEARCH. WE'RE  
13 NOT GOING TO GIVE THE SMALLER, MORE NIMBLE INSTITUTIONS  
14 AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMPETE FAIRLY. AND I THINK JUST  
15 THIS GIANT GRANT WHERE EVERYBODY IS THROWN TOGETHER IN  
16 A BIG POT KIND OF SCARES ME. AND I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM  
17 THE PUBLIC. THAT'S HOW WE'VE DONE EVERYTHING UP TO  
18 NOW.

19 IF I NEED TO MAKE A MOTION TO THAT, I'D BE  
20 HAPPY TO DO THAT, BUT I THINK WE SHOULD HOLD SOME  
21 PUBLIC HEARINGS AND LISTEN TO FOLKS. THIS IS ALMOST 10  
22 PERCENT OF THE MONEY WE'VE GOT TO SPEND.

23 DR. HALL: SO LET ME JUST -- CAN I JUST FOR  
24 INFORMATION ASK WHAT WOULD YOU WANT TO HEAR? YOU WANT  
25 TO HEAR PROGRAMMATIC?

1 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE'S ONE THING I WOULD WANT  
2 TO HEAR, WHICH IS WHAT IS IT WE KNOW OR IS KNOWN THAT  
3 TELLS US THAT SPENDING THAT MONEY ON FACILITIES AS  
4 OPPOSED TO SOMETHING ELSE, LIKE MORE RESEARCH GRANTS OR  
5 A HUGE PRIZE FOR A SCIENTIFIC TEAM THAT DEVELOPS A  
6 THERAPEUTIC BREAKTHROUGH.

7 DR. WRIGHT: IT'S THE CASE FOR THE  
8 FACILITIES, RIGHT? YOU WANT SOMEONE TO MAKE THE CASE  
9 FOR FACILITIES.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: WHAT ELSE IS THAT GOING TO  
11 ACCOMPLISH BEYOND WHAT THE RESEARCH GRANTS THEMSELVES  
12 WILL ACCOMPLISH? I HAVEN'T HEARD THAT CASE MADE.

13 MR. LICHTENGER: HAVE A PLACE TO WORK.

14 DR. HALL: YOU'RE NOT INTERESTED IN HEARING  
15 ARCHITECTS WHO DESIGN BUILDINGS OR FLOORS COME IN; IS  
16 THAT RIGHT OR NOT?

17 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MAYBE.

18 MR. SHEEHY: MAYBE. I'D BE INTERESTED IN  
19 HEARING WHAT THE NEED IS. I'D LIKE TO HEAR PEOPLE'S  
20 EXISTING PLANS BECAUSE I GET THE SENSE THAT WE'RE  
21 TALKING ABOUT AN RFA IN THE CONTEXT OF PEOPLE WHO ARE  
22 ALREADY DEVELOPING. YOU KNOW, THE SAN DIEGO CONSORTIUM  
23 IS -- YOU KNOW, WHY ARE WE GOING TO ISSUE AN RFA THAT  
24 MAY NOT -- I'M NOT SAYING WE SHOULD ISSUE AN RFA FOR  
25 THAT CONSORTIUM, BUT I'M ALSO SAYING WE SHOULD NOT

1 ISSUE AN RFA THAT'S AT LOGGERHEADS WITH THAT CONSORTIUM  
2 WHEN THEY'RE DOING EXACTLY WHAT WE HAVE ENCOURAGED FROM  
3 DAY ONE. THEY PARTNERED. THEY'RE SHARING RESOURCES.  
4 THEY'RE SHARING SCIENCE. AND WE COULD ISSUE AN RFA  
5 THAT IS CONTRADICTORY TO WHAT I THINK HAS BEEN A  
6 LAUDABLE EFFORT BY THE PEOPLE OF SAN DIEGO TO COME  
7 TOGETHER AND, I THINK, WITH LEVERAGE AND CREATE VALUE  
8 COLLECTIVELY.

9 DR. HALL: EXCUSE ME, JEFF. I DON'T SEE  
10 THERE'S ANY WAY WE CAN DO THAT. WE HAVE SAID FROM THE  
11 BEGINNING HOW MUCH WE VALUE THAT CONSORTIUM. AND WE  
12 HAVE BEEN IN CONVERSATION WITH THEM.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ZACH, I THINK  
14 WE'RE HAVING A DISCUSSION HERE, AND IT'S A BEAUTIFUL  
15 THING, BUT LET'S LET THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS SPEAK. I  
16 SAW JANET'S HAND UP.

17 DR. WRIGHT: I WAS JUST GOING TO ASK THE  
18 QUESTION THAT ZACH ASKED, WHICH IS LET'S TALK ABOUT --  
19 LET'S USE THIS FORUM TODAY TO TALK ABOUT THE CONTENT OF  
20 THOSE PRESENTATIONS. WHAT DO WE NEED TO LEARN? LEAVE  
21 THE DOOR OPEN FOR SOMETHING WE'RE NOT SOLICITING, BUT  
22 LET'S SPECIFICALLY SOLICIT SOME CONTENT THAT WILL HELP  
23 US CRAFT AN RFA THAT DRAWS IN WHAT WE WANT TO  
24 ACCOMPLISH.

25 MR. SHEEHY: LET'S HEAR WHAT PEOPLE NEED,

1 WHAT THEY'RE DOING.

2 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, WHEN IT'S APPROPRIATE,  
3 BECAUSE THERE ARE OTHER PEOPLE ASKING TO SPEAK, I'D  
4 LIKE TO SPEAK.

5 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, GO AHEAD.

6 MR. KLEIN: WELL, IN RESPONSE TO JANET'S  
7 QUESTION, I MEAN THERE'S REALLY THREE DIFFERENT THINGS  
8 I THINK WE NEED TO DEVELOP HERE: POLICY GUIDELINES,  
9 RULES, AND DEFINITIONS. AN EXAMPLE OF POLICY  
10 GUIDELINES WOULD BE HOW IMPORTANT IS LEVERAGE? YOU  
11 KNOW, IN TERMS OF OUR OBJECTIVE IS TO SPREAD FACILITIES  
12 ACROSS THE STATE, LEVERAGE MAY BE VERY IMPORTANT IN  
13 BEING ABLE TO HAVE ENOUGH FUNDS TO DISTRIBUTE TO AREAS  
14 THAT ARE DEVELOPING CAPACITY, THAT ARE NOT AT THE SAME  
15 LEVEL OF SOME OF THE AREAS THAT HAVE CONCENTRATED  
16 CAPACITY NOW.

17 IN RULES, AN EXAMPLE WOULD BE IF YOU HAVE A  
18 SHARED FACILITY IN SAN DIEGO THAT YOU ARE PARTICIPATING  
19 IN, AND YOU HAVE A SPECIALIZATION IN YOUR FACILITY,  
20 LET'S CALL IT ROBOTICS, CAN YOU ALSO APPLY FOR A SMALL  
21 FACILITY GRANT? OR IF YOU ARE ALLOWED TO ALSO APPLY  
22 FOR A SMALL FACILITY GRANT AS WELL AS PARTICIPATE IN A  
23 LARGE ONE, DO YOU HAVE SPECIAL POLICY JUSTIFICATION  
24 WHERE THAT SMALL FACILITY WILL BE A SHARED FACILITY AND  
25 AVAILABLE AS A RESOURCE TO THE STATE, JUST LIKE THE

1 CURRENT ROUND OF EVEN KIND OF TRANSITIONAL VERY SMALL  
2 FACILITIES GRANTS?

3 IN TERMS OF DEFINITIONS, WE REFERENCED IN  
4 MANY DISCUSSIONS TODAY, FOR EXAMPLE, WHAT IS A MATCHING  
5 GRANT? ZACH PROPERLY RAISED THE QUESTION OF QUALITY.  
6 JUST BECAUSE PEOPLE SAY THEY'RE GOING TO PROVIDE A  
7 MATCH, IS THAT IN CASH? DO WE TREAT LAND THE SAME AS  
8 CASH? HOW IS IT WE'RE GOING TO TREAT THAT?

9 FURTHERMORE, IN TERMS OF DEFINITIONS, WHAT  
10 COSTS ARE QUALIFIED? ARE COSTS INCURRED, YOU KNOW,  
11 FROM THE DAY THE PROPOSITION 71 WAS PASSED? ARE  
12 ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING QUALIFIED? I WOULD HOPE  
13 SO, BUT THIS COMMITTEE HAS TO DEFINE THAT SO PEOPLE  
14 REALLY KNOW WHAT THEY HAVE TO DEAL WITH HERE.

15 SO I THINK THERE'S THREE LEVELS OF INPUT THAT  
16 WE NEED TO MAKE INFORMED DECISIONS. AND THERE ARE  
17 POLICY GUIDELINES, RULES, AND DEFINITIONS THAT THE  
18 PEOPLE THAT ARE GOING TO MAKE THE APPLICATIONS DESERVE  
19 TO BE INFORMED ABOUT, BUT THIS WOULD BE A WAY TO GET  
20 THAT INFORMATION AS PROPOSED BY JEFF AND OTHERS IN  
21 TALKING ABOUT THE HISTORICAL PROCESS WE'VE GONE  
22 THROUGH. MARCY REFERENCED WE'VE ALWAYS HELD HEARINGS  
23 TO GET PUBLIC INPUT AND SHOW THAT WE CLEARLY ARE  
24 COMMITTED TO TRANSPARENCY.

25 CHAIRMAN DOMS: LET ME ASK A QUESTION. IN

1 THESE GRANTS THERE WILL BE A SCIENTIFIC GRANT REVIEW;  
2 IS THAT CORRECT?

3 DR. HALL: YES.

4 CHAIRMAN DOMS: AND WE'RE GOING TO HAVE SOME  
5 VERY LARGE GRANTS HERE. IF THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW,  
6 MAYBE THIS GETS INTO PROCESS, BUT I SEE THE DUE  
7 DILIGENCE BEING QUITE CONSIDERABLE ON LOOKING AT THESE  
8 GRANT REQUESTS, PARTICULARLY FOR THE LARGER ONES,  
9 WHICH, AS DEBORAH SAID WHEN WE WERE HAVING LUNCH, SITE  
10 VISITS, MEETING WITH, DEPENDING ON THE STAGE OF THE  
11 BUILDING, MEETING WITH, IF IT'S UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR  
12 DESIGN, THE ARCHITECT, THE VARIOUS GROUPS, THE USER  
13 GROUPS, LOOKING AT SUCH THINGS AS THE LAB SPACE AND HOW  
14 IT'S GOING TO BE LAID OUT, GOING INTO THOSE KINDS OF  
15 ISSUES. HOW IS THE ICOC OR THE GRANTS GROUP GOING TO  
16 EVALUATE THESE PROPOSALS? AND IF SOME OF THEM ARE NOT  
17 FOLLOWING THE LINES THAT MARCY WAS TALKING ABOUT, HOW  
18 DO WE DO THAT IF WE DON'T WORK TOGETHER?

19 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: RUSTY, DO YOU  
20 MEAN BY WORKING TOGETHER, WORKING WITH THE OTHER  
21 WORKING GROUPS IN THE ICOC?

22 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YEAH.

23 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MY ANSWER TO THAT  
24 IS, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT TO THE SCIENTIFIC GRANTS  
25 WORKING GROUP, THEY'RE EQUAL IN THIS PROCESS. THEY'RE

1 A PARTNER. THE BODY THAT'S OVER EVERYONE IS THE ICOC  
2 OBVIOUSLY. BUT WHEN WE'RE DEALING WITH AN RFA THAT'S  
3 \$222 MILLION, I SAY, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, OKAY, IT'S  
4 GOING TO HAVE TO WAIT, FOLKS. I DON'T WANT TO THROW A  
5 MONKEY WRENCH INTO ANYBODY'S SCHEDULING, BUT I DON'T  
6 HAVE A PROBLEM GOING TO THE ICOC. I DON'T HAVE A  
7 PROBLEM PICKING UP THE PHONE AND CALLING DR. STUART  
8 ORKIN AT HARVARD AND SAYING, "DR. ORKIN, I KNOW YOU  
9 HAVE A SCHEDULE. I KNOW YOU WANT TO OPINE ON THIS, BUT  
10 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP FELT VERY STRONGLY THAT IT  
11 NEEDED TO DO SOME DUE DILIGENCE. THEREFORE, IT'S GOING  
12 TO TAKE A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME. SORRY." SORRY IN A  
13 GOOD WAY, LIKE, SORRY, WE NEED TO DO OUR JOB FOR \$222  
14 MILLION.

15 NOW, I THINK SOMEONE LIKE A STUART ORKIN WILL  
16 UNDERSTAND THAT. I THINK ANYBODY WHO'S EVER GONE  
17 THROUGH THIS PROCESS WILL SAY, "YEAH, YOU'RE RIGHT.  
18 YOU HAVEN'T DONE THE HEARINGS."

19 DR. HALL: I DON'T THINK STUART ORKIN HAS A  
20 HORSE IN THIS RACE.

21 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I USED HIM ONLY  
22 AS AN EXAMPLE, ZACH.

23 DR. HALL: IT'S NOT STUART THAT'S PUSHING FOR  
24 THE URGENCY.

25 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I UNDERSTAND

1 THAT. BUT YOU DID BRING UP THE OTHER STAKEHOLDERS, SO  
2 I WAS JUST USING STUART AS AN EXAMPLE. I'LL USE THE  
3 STANDARDS CHAIR AS AN EXAMPLE, BERNIE LO, IF YOU FEEL  
4 BETTER ABOUT THAT. I'M JUST SAYING THOSE OTHER WORKING  
5 GROUPS, THEY JUST NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE NEED TO  
6 GATHER MORE INFORMATION BEFORE WE GO ABOUT OUR PROCESS.  
7 AND THAT'S JUST SORT OF WHAT RESPONSIBLE PEOPLE DO, IN  
8 MY OPINION.

9 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, THE OTHER CONCERN THAT  
10 I HAVE IS, ONE OF THE CONCERNS I HAVE IS THE WHOLE  
11 ISSUE OF STAFFING. WE'VE GOT TWO INCREDIBLY CAPABLE  
12 PEOPLE WITH US TODAY. AND RICK'S PRIMARY  
13 RESPONSIBILITIES IS IN THE FACILITIES AREA. LORI DOES  
14 A LOT OF OTHER THINGS IN ADDITION TO WORKING WITH THE  
15 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. THIS IS A HUGE UNDERTAKING,  
16 AND IT'S -- WITH EVERYTHING THAT WE HAVE TO GET DONE  
17 BETWEEN NOW AND MAY 2D AND THEN THE ADMINISTRATION AND  
18 GETTING EVERYTHING READY FOR THE ICOC, THEY HAVE TO  
19 WRITE THEIR REPORTS, AND THEN TRYING TO DO ALL THAT,  
20 HAVING THEM DO ALL THAT, TAKING THE WORK THAT WE'VE  
21 DONE, I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE ISSUE OF STAFF.

22 MR. KASHIAN: DAVID.

23 MR. LICHTENGER: ADDRESSING THAT CONCERN, I  
24 AGREE WITH YOU. YOU KNOW, ONE IDEA THAT BOB HAD  
25 BROUGHT UP PREVIOUSLY WAS EVENTUALLY HAVING SOME KIND

1 OF APPLICATION FEE OF A QUARTER OR A HALF A PERCENT  
2 POINT TO HELP FUND STAFF REQUIREMENTS TO FACILITATE  
3 THIS PROCESS. I MEAN THIS IS -- SPENDING \$222 MILLION  
4 RESPONSIBLY IN A HOST OF DIFFERENT WAYS REQUIRES A LOT  
5 OF DIFFERENT EXPERTISE IN THE CONSTRUCTION AREA. THERE  
6 SHOULD BE PEOPLE THAT HAVE GROUND-UP CONSTRUCTION  
7 EXPERIENCE. THERE SHOULD BE PEOPLE POTENTIALLY ON  
8 STAFF WHO HAVE A LOT OF PROCESS PIPING EXPERIENCE, MEP  
9 EXPERIENCE. SO THERE'S NO DOUBT THAT WE CAN -- THAT  
10 CIRM CAN USE MORE BANDWIDTH AND MORE STAFF WITH  
11 DIFFERENT EXPERTISE THAT WILL MAKE SURE THE MONEY IS  
12 SPENT WISELY.

13 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, FIRST OF ALL, TWO POINTS.  
14 ONE, I THINK THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WILL BE ABLE  
15 TO COME UP WITH SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA, BUT I DON'T THINK  
16 THAT -- THEY'RE ALL OUT OF STATE. THEY DON'T NEED TO  
17 BE PART OF AN ELABORATE PROCESS. SO I THINK IT REALLY  
18 WILL BE MORE OF THIS WORKING GROUP, AND I THINK THAT'S  
19 ENTIRELY APPROPRIATE. I MEAN GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS  
20 REALLY LOOKING AT SCIENTIFIC ISSUES, AND THOSE WILL BE  
21 CRITICAL; BUT I THINK ONCE WE DECIDE MORE WHAT WE'RE  
22 GOING TO DO, THE SCIENCE WILL THEN FOLLOW AND THEN  
23 LEAD, YOU KNOW, BUT THERE WILL BE A RELATIONSHIP. IT'S  
24 BOTH SEPARATE AND INTEGRAL TO WHAT WE'RE DOING.

25 THE SECOND POINT I WANT TO COME UP TO, AND I

1 THINK THE STAFFING ISSUE IS AN IMPORTANT ONE, IS I WANT  
2 TO LOOK AT OUR HISTORY. SO WHEN WE NEEDED STANDARDS,  
3 THE ACTUAL FIRST RUN WAS DONE BY THE NATIONAL ACADEMY  
4 OF SCIENCES, SO WE WENT TO AN OUTSIDE BODY. WE NEEDED  
5 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY. THE FIRST RUN WAS DONE BY CHI,  
6 OUTSIDE BODY. WHEN WE DID THE STRATEGIC PLAN, WE HIRED  
7 A CONSULTING FIRM, PRICE WATERHOUSE.

8 SO, YOU KNOW, IN ALL OF THESE INSTANCES WITH  
9 VARYING DEGREES OF INTERRELATIONSHIPS, CHI DID THEIR  
10 THING COMPLETELY SEPARATE FROM US, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF  
11 SCIENCES, I THINK, GOT A LITTLE PROD FROM THE CAMPAIGN.  
12 WE DIRECTLY HIRED A CONSULTING FIRM TO HELP CREATE THE  
13 STRATEGIC PLAN. ANY ONE OF THOSE MODELS WOULD BE  
14 APPROPRIATE TO ASSIST US IN DOING THE KIND OF DUE  
15 DILIGENCE WE NEED TO DO TO SPEND THIS MONEY. AND I  
16 WOULD BE PERFECTLY HAPPY TO BRING ON A CONSULTING FIRM  
17 TO ASSIST WITH DOING THIS MYSELF. I DON'T THINK THAT  
18 THAT WOULD BE AN IRRESPONSIBLE USE OF THE MONEY, AND I  
19 THINK SOME EXPERTISE AND SOME EXTERNAL ANALYSIS BY AN  
20 OBJECTIVE VIEWPOINT MIGHT BE VERY HELPFUL IN  
21 DETERMINING HOW WE GO FORWARD.

22 MR. KLEIN: JEFF, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. IF  
23 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT SETTING UP HEARINGS AND THEY'RE IN  
24 MAY, WE DON'T HAVE A BOARD MEETING IN MAY. AND MY  
25 STAFF COULD VOLUNTEER, SINCE THEY'RE USED TO SETTING UP

1 PUBLIC MEETINGS, IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE SOME PUBLIC  
2 MEETINGS THAT JEFF HAS SUGGESTED IN MAY, THEY COULD  
3 ACTUALLY HELP MOBILIZE THAT BECAUSE WE'RE FAMILIAR WITH  
4 THE SITES THAT HAVE BEEN CONTRIBUTED IN THE PAST BY  
5 INSTITUTIONS. WE KNOW THE LOGISTICS. AND WE CAN KEEP  
6 THEM SIMPLE AND SET THEM UP PRETTY QUICKLY.

7 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE HAVE SET UP PUBLIC  
8 MEETINGS ON THE FACILITIES SIDE. WE HAD ONE IN SAN  
9 FRANCISCO AND ONE IN IRVINE AND HERE.

10 MR. KASHIAN: HOW COME YOU FORGOT MY PART OF  
11 THE WORLD?

12 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M JUST SAYING WHAT WE'VE  
13 DONE. I'M NOT SAYING WHAT WE SHOULD DO. YOU'RE RIGHT,  
14 ED. I'M NOT SURE THAT THE PUBLIC MEETING IS ONE OF THE  
15 TASKS THAT WE NEED TO UNDERTAKE TO DO THIS CORRECTLY.

16 MS. HYSEN: I WAS GOING TO SAY ONE OF THE  
17 THINGS THAT YOU CAN DO, AND WE'VE DONE PARTICULARLY ON  
18 CONTROVERSIAL BIDS AND HIGH PROFILE BIDS, IS THAT YOU  
19 ISSUE WHAT WOULD BE CALLED A PRELIMINARY RFA. AND YOU  
20 GET IT OUT THERE IN THE PUBLIC FORUM, AND YOU ASK FOR  
21 PUBLIC COMMENTARY. CAN BE ONLINE, CAN BE FACILITATED  
22 IN PUBLIC HEARING, BUT THAT WAY THE STAKEHOLDERS THAT  
23 ARE PART OF THE PROCESS CAN LOOK AT IT AND SAY -- THEY  
24 CAN GIVE COMMENTS AND THEIR INPUT. DOESN'T MEAN YOU  
25 HAVE TO INCORPORATE IT, BUT IT CAN BE CONSIDERED.

1                   NOW, IT CAN GET A LITTLE COMPLICATED LEGALLY  
2   WHEN YOU'RE HAVING STAKEHOLDERS THAT HAVE A VESTED  
3   INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF THAT RFA CHIME IN ON THE  
4   DOCUMENTATION. SO THERE HAVE TO BE SOME PARAMETERS  
5   THERE, BUT YOU CAN DO PIECES OF THAT.

6                   MR. KASHIAN: DAVID, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, I  
7   HAVEN'T BEEN PRIVY TO ALL OF THE MEETINGS YOU GUYS HAVE  
8   BEEN TO WITH ALL THE OTHER GROUPS, SO I REALLY HAVE A  
9   VAGUE UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT.  
10   HOWEVER, I AGREE TOTALLY WITH AN ARTIFICIAL DEADLINE IN  
11   DEALING WITH THESE ISSUES. I DON'T THINK THAT IT WOULD  
12   SET BACK THE PROCESS A GREAT DEAL BECAUSE YOU'RE GOING  
13   FORWARD WITH THE SMALLER GRANTS AS YOU GO. AND THE  
14   IDEA OF HAVING PUBLIC HEARINGS AROUND THE STATE I  
15   TOTALLY SUPPORT.

16                   YOU CAN'T GET ENOUGH PUBLIC INPUT. AND I  
17   BELIEVE IT CAN BE DONE IN A REASONABLY SHORT PERIOD OF  
18   TIME, BUT A MUCH LONGER PERIOD OF TIME THAN MAY 2D.

19                   MS. FEIT: I ALMOST LOST MY POINT. I WAS SO  
20   INTENT. I ALMOST LOST MY POINT. GO AHEAD. IT WILL  
21   COME BACK TO ME.

22                   DR. CHIU: WELL, I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT ALL  
23   THE COMMENTS I'VE HEARD, AND RIGHTLY SO, AT THIS  
24   MEETING DEAL WITH THE TECHNICAL ISSUES OF CONSTRUCTION,  
25   BIDDING, APPROPRIATENESS, FEASIBILITY. AND I THINK

1 JEFF IS EXACTLY RIGHT, THAT THE SCIENTIFIC, THE REVIEW,  
2 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, WILL DEAL WITH HOW STRONG THE  
3 SCIENCE IS AT EACH INSTITUTION. THE ONE LINK THAT I  
4 SEE IS HOW WILL WE TOGETHER REACH THE GOAL OF THE WHOLE  
5 INITIATIVE? AND THE GOALS OF THE INITIATIVE ARE AS  
6 CITED IN THE FIRST SLIDE OF THE PRESIDENT. AND THAT  
7 IS, TO MOVE THOSE THREE THINGS FORWARD. AND THAT IS TO  
8 BUILD PROGRAMS IN THE STATE THAT COULDN'T HAVE BEEN  
9 BUILT BEFORE THROUGH FACILITIES AND THROUGH SOME STRONG  
10 SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS AND THE INSTITUTIONS FIVE-YEAR  
11 PLAN, TEN-YEAR PLAN, THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS, NOT ONLY  
12 MONETARILY OR IN LAND, BUT ALSO IN SUPPORT OF THE  
13 SCIENCE. ARE THEY GOING TO PUT IN FACULTY, ETC.?

14 SO IN THE SENSE OF LOOKING AROUND FOR  
15 INFORMATION UP AND DOWN, WE SHOULD HEAR, NOT ONLY ABOUT  
16 THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS, BUT ALSO ABOUT THEIR SCIENTIFIC  
17 ASPIRATIONS TOO BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO TIE TOGETHER.  
18 THAT'S ALL. OTHERWISE --

19 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT SOUNDS LIKE,  
20 DR. CHIU, WHAT JOAN SAID A LITTLE BIT. WHAT ARE THESE  
21 INSTITUTIONS DOING? WHAT COMMITMENTS HAVE THEY MADE ON  
22 THE SCIENCE? WHAT ARE THOSE SETS OF PRIORITIES? I  
23 SUPPORT THE IDEA OF HAVING A HEARING. I LIKE WHAT  
24 DEBORAH SAID. PERHAPS IT WOULD EXPEDITE THINGS A BIT  
25 TO SAY, OKAY, LET'S TRY TO HOBBLE TOGETHER A

1 PRELIMINARY RFA. LET'S PUT THAT OUT THERE. BUT IN  
2 THAT PROCESS INCLUDE A HEARING, AT A MINIMUM TWO, AT A  
3 MINIMUM TWO, AND MAYBE MORE. AND IN THOSE HEARINGS WE  
4 CAN TAKE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, FROM INTERESTED  
5 PARTIES. I KNOW THESE HEARINGS WILL MAKE THIS A BETTER  
6 DOCUMENT. I KNOW THEY WILL.

7 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, JEFF SHEEHY SUGGESTED THE  
8 BAY AREA, L.A., AND SAN DIEGO, AND MAYBE CENTRAL  
9 CALIFORNIA. AND I KNOW FROM THE SITE SELECTION  
10 PROCESS, THERE'S A GREAT DEAL OF SENSITIVITY UNLESS YOU  
11 GO TO EACH OF THOSE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS. BUT IT'S  
12 IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT IN THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS,  
13 NOT ALL OF THAT COMMITTEE WAS AT EACH HEARING SO THAT  
14 YOU DIDN'T HAVE TO HOLD IT UP TO GET EVERYBODY PRESENT.  
15 SOME HEARINGS HAD, YOU KNOW, EIGHT OR NINE MEMBERS,  
16 SOME HAD FIVE. THESE ARE PUBLIC INPUT HEARINGS, SO  
17 HAVING FOUR HEARINGS DOESN'T DISABLE AND CREATE HUGE  
18 OBSTACLES IN PULLING EVERYONE TOGETHER BECAUSE YOU'RE  
19 NOT GOING TO TAKE ACTION IN THESE HEARINGS. YOU'RE  
20 COLLECTING PUBLIC INPUT, AND THERE ARE GOING TO BE  
21 TRANSCRIPTS SO THAT EVERYONE ON THE COMMITTEE WOULD GET  
22 THE BENEFIT OF THE INPUT.

23 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE'LL GET MARCY,  
24 JEFF, AND JOAN.

25 MS. FEIT: I REMEMBERED MY POINT. I DON'T

1 WANT TO LOSE TRACK OF THE THOUGHT THAT JEFF PUT OUT A  
2 MOMENT AGO REGARDING THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE MAY WANT  
3 TO HAVE AN INDEPENDENT SURVEY OF THE CLIMATE. AND LET  
4 ME SAY THIS. WE'RE MAKING AN ASSUMPTION, AND WE KNOW  
5 IN OUR HEART, IN OUR GUT, IT'S A GOOD ASSUMPTION, THAT  
6 THERE'S THIS HUGE NEED. WE'RE MAKING THAT ASSUMPTION  
7 BECAUSE WE'VE HEARD IT. WE NEED NEW RESEARCH  
8 FACILITIES. WE NEED THIS. WE NEED THIS. AND I'LL  
9 TELL YOU IN MY OWN ORGANIZATION, NO MATTER HOW MUCH WE  
10 SPEND AND HOW MUCH WE BUILD, THEY CAN STILL GENERATE A  
11 LIST THAT WOULD CHOKE A HORSE.

12 HAVING SAID THAT, WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO  
13 REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT'S IN THE ENVIRONMENT ALREADY,  
14 WHAT ALREADY EXISTS, WHAT'S THERE. BECAUSE IT'S LIKE  
15 GOING BLINDLY INTO THE FOREST AND TRYING TO DECIDE  
16 WHERE EVERYTHING SHOULD BE. JEFF MADE THE POINT THAT  
17 IN THE PAST WE HAVE USED OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS TO COME  
18 IN AND GIVE US ADVICE OR OFFER THAT OPPORTUNITY. SO I  
19 JUST DIDN'T WANT TO LOSE THAT THOUGHT BECAUSE I STILL  
20 THINK IT'S A GOOD ONE.

21 MR. SHEEHY: SINCE I WAS NEXT UP, BUT I WAS  
22 COMING BACK TO THAT BECAUSE I COULD SEE THEM DOING THAT  
23 ROLE AND FACILITATING THE DATA COLLECTION AND  
24 ORGANIZATION THAT WOULD TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE CONTEXT  
25 OF THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS SO THAT STAFF ISN'T

1 OVERWHELMED WITH IT, BUT IN MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT THEY  
2 DID WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN. THEY WERE AT ALL THE  
3 PUBLIC MEETINGS, THEY COLLECTED ALL THE INFORMATION,  
4 COLLATED IT. AT THE SAME TIME THEY WERE LOOKING AT,  
5 INDEPENDENT OF ALL OF THIS, THE SCIENTIFIC NEED. AND  
6 SO I THINK THAT IF WE COULD IDENTIFY SOMEONE, THAT  
7 MIGHT BE A GOOD WAY, AND THAT REPORT WOULD BE A NICE,  
8 CLEAN, OBJECTIVE DOCUMENT TO START FROM.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: WELL, I GUESS THE FIRST  
10 THING, FOR THE RECORD, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO SAY  
11 THIS, I THINK IT WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE FOR US TO SPEND  
12 THAT MUCH MONEY ON FACILITIES WITHOUT A MUCH BETTER  
13 DOCUMENTED LINK BETWEEN THAT AND OUR END RESULT. SO I  
14 THINK ALL THESE IDEAS ARE WELCOMED, AND WE SHOULD  
15 EMBARK ON THEM.

16 AND SORT OF ON THE NEGATIVE SIDE OF THE  
17 QUESTION, I'VE BEEN HEARING FROM LOTS OF PEOPLE DON'T  
18 THROW A LOT OF MONEY AT FACILITIES. THIS IS FROM  
19 SCIENTISTS AND ACADEMIC MEDICINE AND FROM HIGH LEVEL  
20 MANAGERS IN THE PATIENT ADVOCACY MOVEMENT AND SO ON.  
21 SO IT'S ANOTHER REASON I THINK WE SHOULD REALLY LOOK  
22 CLOSELY AT IT.

23 AND TO AMPLIFY ON WHAT ARLENE SAID, WE HAVE  
24 WONDERFUL SCIENTISTS EMBARKED ON THIS IN OUR GRANTS  
25 WORKING GROUP, OUTSIDE EXPERTS, AND SO ON. BUT

1 ACADEMIC MEDICINE ISN'T WHERE CURES TYPICALLY COME  
2 FROM. THEY COME FROM BIG PHARMA. THEY COME FROM IDEAS  
3 AT BIOTECHS. AND WE CAN'T GIVE THIS MONEY TO THEM. IS  
4 THERE SOMETHING THAT WOULD GIVE THEM AN INCENTIVE TO  
5 GET THEM GOING SO THAT WE'RE JUMP STARTING THE END  
6 GAME, WHICH WE HAVE TO DO IF WE'RE GOING TO SATISFY THE  
7 MANDATE OF PROP 71. AND IF WE DON'T DO THAT AFTER  
8 SPENDING ALL THIS MONEY, WE'RE GOING TO BE IN BIG  
9 TROUBLE.

10 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'D LIKE TO ASK JAMES TO  
11 COMMENT ON THAT.

12 MR. HARRISON: WELL, PROPOSITION 71 REQUIRES  
13 YOU -- IT DOESN'T REQUIRE YOU. IT ALLOWS THE ICOC TO  
14 SPEND UP TO 10 PERCENT OF THE PROCEEDS ON FACILITIES.  
15 IN TERMS OF THE FACILITIES AWARD, THEY'RE STRICTLY  
16 LIMITED TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.

17 CHAIRMAN DOMS: SO MAKING THE BRIDGE TO THOSE  
18 INSTITUTIONS THAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: YEAH. FOR EXAMPLE, ONE  
20 CALIFORNIAN, A SYSTEMS ENGINEER, SAID TO ME, WHY IN THE  
21 WORLD WOULDN'T YOU SPEND -- TAKE A NICE CHUNK OF MONEY,  
22 ENOUGH, WHATEVER THAT IS, FOR INCENTIVE GRANTS,  
23 INCENTIVE PRIZES TO A SCIENTIFIC TEAM THAT DEVELOPS A  
24 THERAPEUTIC BREAKTHROUGH? IT GETS THE END GAME DONE SO  
25 THOSE GUYS ARE MOTIVATED. BECAUSE PRESUMABLY THE

1 FACILITIES MONEY IS NEEDED TO MOTIVATE THE INSTITUTIONS  
2 ENOUGH THAT THEY'LL WORK HARDER ON THE GRANTS THAT  
3 THEY'VE GOT THAN THEY ARE RIGHT NOW OR THEY'LL BE ABLE  
4 TO APPLY FOR MORE GRANTS. WE DON'T KNOW THAT. IN ANY  
5 CASE, IT'S ESSENTIALLY ENOUGH OF AN INCENTIVE. IS  
6 THERE AN INCENTIVE WE CAN GIVE BIOTECH OR BIG PHARMA OR  
7 SOME BRIGHT GUY WHO'S GOT A GREAT IDEA SOMEWHERE?

8 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: RUSTY, IF I CAN  
9 MAKE A MOTION, IF THAT'S OKAY. I'D LIKE TO MOVE THAT  
10 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP CONDUCT A MINIMUM OF TWO,  
11 BUT NO MORE THAN FOUR, HEARINGS IN RELATION TO THE  
12 ISSUANCE OF THE \$222 MILLION RFA. THEY'RE CALLING IT  
13 THE FACILITIES GRANTS RFA. AND THAT THE PURPOSE OF THE  
14 HEARING IS TO INCORPORATE THE COMMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN  
15 MADE DURING THIS PORTION OF THE DISCUSSION THAT CAN BE  
16 DISTILLED LATER ON BY STAFF, SO I DON'T HAVE TO RECITE  
17 EACH ONE OF THEM, BUT THEY CAN DO THAT LATER, THAT, AS  
18 BOB KLEIN SAID, ATTENDANCE IS NOT MANDATORY AT THESE  
19 HEARINGS, BUT THAT WE INVITE ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND  
20 WORK WITH MR. KLEIN'S STAFF TO PUT THOSE -- AND THE  
21 PRESIDENT'S STAFF TO PUT THESE HEARINGS TOGETHER, AND  
22 THAT THE STATED NEED FOR PUTTING THESE HEARINGS IS THAT  
23 THE COMMITTEE FEELS THAT IT NEEDS TO DO MORE DUE  
24 DILIGENCE BEFORE WE MAKE A FINAL RECOMMENDATION TO THE  
25 RFA -- TO THE ICOC. IS THERE A SECOND?

1 MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND.

2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ANY FURTHER  
3 DISCUSSION -- WE'LL GET TO PUBLIC COMMENT. ANY FURTHER  
4 DISCUSSION AMONGST THE COLLEAGUES?

5 MS. HYSEN: AND THAT'S FOR THE PURPOSES OF  
6 CREATING THE RFA?

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

8 DR. WRIGHT: I HEARD THE NEED FOR TWO THINGS.  
9 MAYBE YOU'RE PLANNING TO MAKE TWO MOTIONS, BUT ONE IS  
10 INPUT FROM INSTITUTIONS AROUND THE STATE AND OTHER  
11 SOURCES WHO FEEL THEY HAVE INFORMATION THAT WILL HELP  
12 US. BUT THE OTHER IS THE EXPERTISE ANGLE. I'M NOT  
13 SURE THAT WE CAN CAPTURE THAT IN A PUBLIC HEARING. THE  
14 IDEA OF PRESENTATIONS. MAYBE WE'LL TAKE THAT UP IN A  
15 SEPARATE MOTION.

16 MR. LICHTENGER: INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS.

17 DR. WRIGHT: SIMILAR TO WHAT WE WENT THROUGH  
18 FOR IP POLICY, FOR THE STRATEGIC PLAN.

19 MR. LICHTENGER: CONFERENCE CALLS.

20 DR. HALL: GET PEOPLE TO TALK ABOUT  
21 CONSTRUCTION, ABOUT CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH  
22 FACILITIES. WE CAN GET PEOPLE TO TALK ABOUT PLACES  
23 WHERE THEY HAVE OR HAVE NOT BUILT NEW FACILITIES AND  
24 THEY'VE HAD PAYOFF OR NOT.

25 AND THEN IN ANSWER TO JOAN'S QUESTION --

1 DR. WRIGHT: EVEN USING BOB'S'S EXAMPLE --

2 DR. HALL: -- WE CAN GET PEOPLE TO TALK ABOUT  
3 SCIENTIFIC NEED IN THE STATE. IT'S A VERY, VERY BROAD  
4 ISSUE.

5 DR. WRIGHT: POLICY, RULES, DEFINITIONS.

6 CHAIRMAN DOMS: LET ME JUST SAY I'M VERY  
7 CONCERNED. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT DOING -- I THINK WE'RE  
8 GOING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. I THINK WHAT'S BEEN  
9 PROPOSED HERE IS GREAT, BUT WHO'S GOING TO DO IT?

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THERE'S A MOTION  
11 AND A SECOND, RUSTY.

12 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, WE'RE TALKING -- OKAY.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WE'RE HAVING  
14 DISCUSSION. YOU'RE ASKING WHO'S GOING TO DO IT?

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I'M HAVING DISCUSSION. I'M  
16 COMING BACK TO THE ISSUE GOING EITHER WITH JEFF IN  
17 TERMS OF SOME KIND OF A CONSULTANT TO HELP US OR STAFF.  
18 BUT I JUST DON'T THINK WE CAN DO ALL THIS IN THE WAY IT  
19 NEEDS TO BE DONE WITH THE EXISTING STAFF.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: AS A COROLLARY TO  
21 THIS MOTION, I WOULD ALSO, ASSUMING IT PASSES, AND IT  
22 MAY NOT, BUT IF IT WERE TO PASS, I WOULD MAKE THE  
23 MOTION THAT WE RECOMMEND TO THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE,  
24 BECAUSE THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE, THE ICOC GOVERNANCE  
25 COMMITTEE, HAS JURISDICTION OVER THE AWARDING OF

1 CONTRACTS OR THE PRESIDENT DOES UP TO 250,000, ZACH, UP  
2 TO TWO FIFTY, THE PRESIDENT CAN EXECUTE A CONTRACT  
3 WITHOUT ANY SIGN-OFFS. HE'S BEEN DELEGATED THAT  
4 AUTHORITY. IF IT'S SOMETHING THAT'S OVER \$250,000, IT  
5 REQUIRES OR BETWEEN 250 AND 500, IT REQUIRES GOVERNANCE  
6 COMMITTEE CONSENT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

7 SO IF MY FIRST MOTION PASSES, MY SECOND  
8 MOTION WILL BE THAT WE ASK THE PRESIDENT, AND IT'S UP  
9 TO THE PRESIDENT AT HIS DISCRETION, BUT WE ASK THE  
10 PRESIDENT TO HIRE A CONSULTANT TO ASSIST STAFF IN THIS  
11 ENDEAVOR.

12 MR. LICHTENGER: OR ADDITIONAL STAFF.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: OR ADDITIONAL  
14 STAFF.

15 DR. HALL: OKAY. LET ME -- MAYBE I SHOULD  
16 SAY A FEW WORDS. SO I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. THAT  
17 IS, THAT YOU WOULD LIKE THERE TO BE A PERIOD OF  
18 CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS, A PERIOD OF PUBLIC HEARING,  
19 DEVELOPMENT OF A CONSENSUS ABOUT WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE  
20 IN AREAS THAT CONCERN CONSTRUCTION, THAT CONCERN  
21 SCIENCE, THAT CONCERN THE RELATION BETWEEN THE TWO.  
22 AND THERE IS NO QUESTION BUT WHAT WE CAN DO THAT.  
23 WE'VE DONE THAT. WE DID THAT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
24 STRATEGIC PLAN. WE DID IT WITH THE ORIGINAL  
25 CONFERENCE. WE CAN BRING IN EXPERTS TO GIVE TALKS. WE

1 CAN HAVE PUBLIC HEARINGS SO THAT PEOPLE SAY WHAT THEY  
2 WANT TO DO.

3 LET ME JUST SAY, AS PRESIDENT I'M FACED WITH  
4 A PECULIAR DILEMMA HERE BECAUSE THERE IS A REAL SPLIT  
5 BETWEEN WHAT THIS COMMITTEE IS SAYING, THIS WORKING  
6 GROUP IS SAYING, AND WHAT WAS SAID AT THE ICOC MEETING  
7 BY IN PARTICULAR THOSE REPRESENTING THE SCIENTIFIC  
8 COMMUNITY.

9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THE INSTITUTIONS.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: BUT THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT  
11 CONFLICT OF INTEREST BY EVERY ONE OF THESE SPEAKERS.  
12 SIGNIFICANT. I WOULD HAVE SAID THAT HAD I BEEN THERE.

13 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: WITH ALL DUE  
14 RESPECT, YOU JUST HAVE TO WAIT.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ONE PERSON AT A TIME. GO  
16 AHEAD.

17 DR. HALL: IF ONE WANTS TO SAY THERE'S A  
18 CONFLICT OF INTEREST, THAT HAS TO BE IDENTIFIED AND  
19 SAID SO. WE HAD A MEETING JUST LAST WEEK. WE HAD  
20 DISCUSSION, AND THERE SEEMED TO BE A CONSENSUS  
21 DEVELOPING OUT OF THAT.

22 NOW, I KNOW DAVID AND MARCY AND OTHERS  
23 REPRESENTED A MINORITY POINT OF VIEW.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SHERRY LANSING.

25 DR. HALL: JEFF WASN'T THERE AND JOAN WASN'T

1     THERE.  BUT WHAT I'M SAYING AS PRESIDENT, I FEEL LIKE  
2     I'M GETTING TWO CONFLICTING BITS OF INFORMATION.  I  
3     HAVE HEARD FROM THE BEGINNING ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF  
4     GETTING THESE FACILITIES GOING, THAT THIS WAS A DIRECT  
5     DRIVER FOR BUILDING THE RESEARCH ENTERPRISE IN  
6     CALIFORNIA.  AND IF WE NEEDED TO DO IT, WE NEEDED TO  
7     GET GOING WITH IT.  THERE WAS TALK WHEN THE BIG MONEY  
8     CAME, WHEN THE BOND MONEY CAME, HOW NICE IT WOULD BE IF  
9     WE WERE ALONG IN THIS PROCESS SO THAT WHEN THE MONEY  
10    CAME, WE WOULD BE ABLE TO GET IT OUT VERY QUICKLY TO  
11    THE INSTITUTIONS SO THAT THEY COULD BUILD AND GET THESE  
12    BUILDINGS GOING.

13                 SO I'M NOT -- WE CAN DO IT EITHER WAY.  AND  
14    I'M NOT -- BUT I THINK THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT NEEDS TO  
15    BE SORTED OUT AT THE ICOC MEETING.  AND IF YOU FEEL THE  
16    INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES HAVE A CONFLICT, THEN YOU  
17    NEED TO SAY THAT, BUT I'M GETTING CONFLICTING  
18    DIRECTIONS.  I GOT ONE SET OF DIRECTIONS IN THE ICO  
19    MEETING.

20                 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:  WE'RE ENTITLED TO  
21    EXPRESS OUR OPINION, ARE WE NOT?

22                 DR. HALL:  YOU'RE ENTITLED TO EXPRESS YOUR  
23    OPINION.

24                 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:  THANK YOU VERY  
25    MUCH.  AS A WORKING GROUP, WE CAN EXPRESS OUR OPINION.

1 DR. HALL: YOU CERTAINLY CAN.

2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THANK YOU.

3 DR. HALL: I WILL NOT ACT ON IT UNTIL I HEAR  
4 FROM THE ICOC.

5 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S FINE.

6 CHAIRMAN DOMS: TIME OUT. TIME OUT.

7 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. CAN I  
8 ADDRESS THAT FROM AN ICOC PERSPECTIVE?

9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES, PLEASE.

10 MR. KLEIN: I'VE BEEN ONE OF THE ADVOCATES  
11 FOR MOVING QUICKLY, BUT PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY IS  
12 CRITICAL. THIS COMMITTEE IS THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE  
13 WHO IS SUPPOSED TO DEVELOP THE CRITERIA AND THE POLICY  
14 CONSIDERATIONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD. THIS  
15 COMMITTEE HAS A RESPONSIBILITY. AND I HEARD A LOT OF  
16 REALLY GOOD REASONS, INCLUDING THE COMMITMENT TO THE  
17 PUBLIC PROCESS WE'VE BEEN THROUGH FOR EVERY OTHER  
18 DECISION, AND THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD ACT ON WHAT IT  
19 BELIEVES ITS BEST RECOMMENDATIONS ARE AND CARRY THEM  
20 OUT.

21 THIS COMMITTEE CAN CARRY OUT ACTIONS AND  
22 DIRECT THE STAFF. IN ADDITION, I'M NOT HAPPY ABOUT  
23 MARCH OF 2008, BUT I THINK THERE'S FAR TOO MUCH TIME IN  
24 THE PROCESS. BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE CAN'T TAKE  
25 PROPER AMOUNT OF TIME IN THE FRONT END TO GET PUBLIC

1 INPUT BECAUSE IF WE HIRE MORE STAFF SO THAT WE HAVE  
2 FOUR OR FIVE STAFF MEMBERS, THEN WE CAN CUT DOWN ALL OF  
3 THAT TIME THAT'S IN THE HUGE PROCESSING TIME BECAUSE WE  
4 DON'T HAVE THE STAFF, ADEQUATE STAFF, TO MOVE THESE  
5 APPLICATIONS FORWARD.

6 SO I DO THINK WE CAN, A, ACCOMPLISH THE  
7 PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY THAT'S BEEN SO CRITICAL TO OUR  
8 EXISTENCE; AND, B, SPEED UP THE PROCESS AS WELL BY  
9 HIRING MORE STAFF? ONCE THE APPLICATIONS COME IN, WE  
10 HAVE THE EXPERT WOMANPOWER AND MANPOWER TO REALLY MOVE  
11 THESE THROUGH THE SYSTEM FASTER.

12 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE'LL GO TO MARCY AND THEN  
13 WE'LL ASK FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

14 MS. FEIT: YOU KNOW, I WAS AT THE ICOC  
15 MEETING. AND, ZACH, I AGREE ON ONE POINT THAT YOU MADE  
16 IS THAT THEY WANTED THE PROCESS TO MOVE EXPEDITIOUSLY,  
17 THAT THEY WANT TO MOVE THIS ALONG BECAUSE THEY ARE  
18 RECRUITING SCIENTISTS AND THEY NEED A PLACE TO PUT  
19 THEM. HOWEVER, SAYING THAT, THEY ALSO DIRECTED THIS  
20 WORKING GROUP TO DEVELOP THE PROCESS. AND WE HAVE A  
21 RESPONSIBILITY. AND IF WE HAVE TO GO BACK TO THEM, I'M  
22 WILLING TO DO THAT AND GO BACK TO THEM AND SAY WE'RE  
23 NOT COMFORTABLE.

24 DR. HALL: THAT'S FINE. I'M HAPPY TO DO  
25 THAT.

1 MS. FEIT: THEY'RE RELYING ON US TO MAKE THE  
2 DETERMINATION ON THESE GRANTS; AND UNTIL WE'RE  
3 COMFORTABLE AND WE HAVE A PROCESS THAT WE FEEL THAT IS  
4 APPROPRIATE FOR SPENDING THE TAXPAYER DOLLARS, THEN WE  
5 WILL MOVE AHEAD. AT NO TIME IN THE HISTORY OF THIS  
6 INSTITUTE DID I EVER HEAR THE ICOC AND A WORKING GROUP  
7 GET IN CONFLICT. IT WAS CLEAR THAT I DIDN'T HEAR THAT  
8 CONFLICT THEN AND I DON'T HEAR IT NOW. I DON'T HEAR IT  
9 THE WAY YOU'RE DESCRIBING IT. THEY GAVE THE DIRECTION  
10 TO THIS WORKING GROUP TO MOVE THIS PROCESS AHEAD, BUT  
11 WE WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT PROCESS.

12 DR. HALL: I'M NOT TRYING TO TAKE  
13 RESPONSIBILITY AWAY FROM YOU, MARCY, AT ALL. IT IS IN  
14 THE END, HOWEVER, THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESIDENT  
15 AND THE STAFF TO DEVELOP AN RFA IN CONSULTATION WITH  
16 THE WORKING GROUPS TO BRING TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL  
17 CONCEPT APPROVAL. MY UNDERSTANDING --

18 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S --

19 DR. HALL: BOB, I'M SORRY. I'VE GOT THE  
20 FLOOR RIGHT NOW. BUT MY UNDERSTANDING FROM THE MEETING  
21 LAST TUESDAY WAS THAT WE WERE GOING TO TRY TO DO THAT  
22 FOR THE JUNE MEETING. I DON'T -- IF WE CAN'T DO IT, WE  
23 CAN'T DO IT. WHAT'S BECOME VERY CLEAR FROM THIS AND --  
24 BY THE WAY, THE PRESIDENT NEEDS TO DO THIS IN  
25 CONSULTATION AND WORKING WITH THE FACILITIES WORKING

1       GROUP.  THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT THAT -- BUT I FEEL LIKE  
2       I HAVE GOTTEN TWO DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS.  ONE IS TO  
3       LET'S MOVE AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE, AND THE OTHER  
4       IS THAT WE NEED TO HAVE AN EXTENSIVE PERIOD OF PUBLIC  
5       HEARING AND PUBLIC PROCESS BEFORE WE REALLY MAKE THESE  
6       FINAL DECISIONS.

7                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:  AND THAT WAS THE  
8       UNFORTUNATE RESULT OF SCHEDULING, ZACH.  WE HAD THE  
9       ICOC MEETING ON TUESDAY AND THE FACILITIES WORKING  
10      GROUP MEETING ON A FRIDAY.  I GUESS IN HINDSIGHT, IT  
11      WOULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT, SCHEDULED DIFFERENTLY.  WHAT  
12      CAN YOU DO ABOUT THAT?  IT'S OVER WITH.

13                   DR. HALL:  IT'S VERY CLEAR THAT THERE IS A  
14      DISAGREEMENT, IN MY MIND, BETWEEN THE DIRECTION IN  
15      WHICH YOU'RE GOING, AND I'M NOT SAYING YOU SHOULDN'T GO  
16      IN THAT DIRECTION.  ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT IN THE END I  
17      TAKE MY DIRECTION AS PRESIDENT, RESPONSIBLE FOR  
18      DEVELOPING THE RFA'S, FROM THE ICOC.  AND SO WE WILL  
19      NEED TO GO BACK TO THE ICOC AND THEN HASH THIS OUT.  
20      AND IF THE ICOC SAYS TO GO AHEAD WITH THESE BIDS, I'M  
21      HAPPY TO DO IT.

22                   VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:  THAT'S FINE.

23                   MR. KASHIAN:  MR. CHAIRMAN.

24                   CHAIRMAN DOMS:  WAIT.  WAIT.  WAIT.  BOB'S  
25      BEEN WANTING TO SAY SOMETHING.

1           MR. KLEIN:  EXCUSE ME.  THAT'S NOT THE WAY  
2           THIS INITIATIVE WAS WRITTEN.  THE INITIATIVE WAS  
3           WRITTEN SO THAT THE PRESIDENT'S STAFF PROVIDES THE  
4           SUPPORT TO THE FACILITIES COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP ITS  
5           RESPONSIBILITIES.  IT HAS SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES  
6           UNDER THE INITIATIVE THAT DAVID WAS KIND ENOUGH TO READ  
7           AT THE VERY BEGINNING.

8           DR. HALL:  WE'RE NOT TRYING TO EVADE THOSE  
9           RESPONSIBILITIES.

10          MR. KLEIN:  WE'RE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THIS  
11          ENTITY.  WHILE THE DIRECTIONS OF THIS COMMITTEE ARE  
12          BEING CARRIED OUT, YOU WANT TO ASK ME TO CALL A NEW  
13          ICOC MEETING, I'D BE HAPPY TO HAVE YOU MAKE THAT  
14          REQUEST.  BUT IN THE MEANTIME, WE HAVE TO CARRY OUT THE  
15          DIRECTIONS OF THIS COMMITTEE.  IT'S THE WAY THE  
16          INITIATIVE WAS WRITTEN.  THEY HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES.  
17          THEY'RE TRYING TO CARRY THEM OUT.

18          DR. HALL:  BOB, I'M SORRY.  AS PRESIDENT, I  
19          RESPOND TO THE ICOC.  IT IS MY JOB TO DO THAT.  AND I  
20          WILL BE HAPPY TO TAKE WHATEVER YOU DECIDE HERE THAT  
21          WILL GO BACK TO THE ICOC.  WE CAN HAVE A DISCUSSION.  
22          AND I WILL DO WHATEVER IS DECIDED.  BUT THAT IS WHERE I  
23          TAKE MY ULTIMATE -- THAT'S WHO I REPORT TO.

24          MR. KASHIAN:  I DON'T SEE ANY CONFLICT IN THE  
25          TWO STATEMENTS.  I HEARD DAVID SAYING THAT WE RECOMMEND

1 TO THE ICOC THAT THEY EXTEND THE TIMELINE AND ALLOW US  
2 TO DO THIS. I DON'T THINK HE RECOMMENDED --

3 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S MY MOTION.

4 MR. KASHIAN: -- HE DIRECTED YOU TO DO  
5 ANYTHING.

6 MR. LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO VOTE ON DAVID'S  
7 MOTION.

8 CHAIRMAN DOMS: CAN WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT --  
9 CAN WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE WE VOTE ON IT?

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I WANTED TO  
11 CREATE A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS.

12 MR. REED: I'M GLAD TO SEE THIS BE TALKED  
13 OUT. IT'S VITAL. THIRTY YEARS AGO IN MY SCHOOL  
14 DISTRICT THERE WAS A BUILDING MADE VERY FAST. IT WAS  
15 THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE DISTRICT. THE TEACHERS UNIONS  
16 WERE NOT CONSULTED. IT BECAME A HUGE ISSUE. IT LED TO  
17 A STRIKE. THIRTY YEARS LATER IT'S STILL REFERRED TO AS  
18 THE TAJ MAHAL IN TERMS OF CONTEMPT AND ANGER. WE ARE  
19 GOING TO BE WATCHED CAREFULLY. WHATEVER WE PUT OUT,  
20 THESE ARE GOING TO BE BIG BUILDINGS, COULD BE THE POINT  
21 OF ANGER AND PUBLIC AGAINST US. IT'S GOT TO BE DONE  
22 VERY CAREFULLY. THANK YOU FOR FIGHTING THIS OUT.  
23 WE'RE ALL ON THE SAME PAGE. WE ALL WANT THE BEST FOR  
24 WHAT MUST GO FORWARD.

25 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ANY OTHER -- YES. COULD YOU

1 IDENTIFY?

2 DR. HALME: DINA HALME, UCSF. I WAS ONE OF  
3 THE PERSONS THIS MORNING WHO ASKED FOR MORE  
4 CLARIFICATION, AND I APPRECIATE THAT THAT TAKES TIME.  
5 BUT I REALLY LIKE THIS IDEA OF A DRAFT RFA BECAUSE  
6 HAVING A PUBLIC HEARING, I'M UNFORTUNATELY NOT GOING TO  
7 COME AND TELL YOU WHAT UCSF IS PLANNING BECAUSE MY  
8 DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUE HERE IS NOT GOING TO COME AND  
9 TELL YOU WHAT IRVINE IS PLANNING. WE COLLABORATE ON  
10 THE SCIENCE, AND WE COMPETE FOR FACILITIES. AND SO  
11 HAVING A DOCUMENT, A DRAFT, TO RESPOND TO WOULD HELP  
12 WITH THE SITUATION. MAYBE THE SAN DIEGO CONSORTIUM  
13 SEES THERE'S A PROBLEM, SO THEY TELL YOU THAT THERE'S A  
14 PROBLEM RATHER THAN THIS OPEN-ENDED GAMISH WHERE PEOPLE  
15 ARE BEING CAGEY OR THEY'RE STRATEGIZING, AND THAT MAKES  
16 ME UNCOMFORTABLE. AND WE ARE IN A RUSH BECAUSE WE  
17 WOULD LOVE TO HIRE MORE PEOPLE TO GET MORE CIRM GRANTS,  
18 AND WE HAVE NOWHERE TO PUT THEM.

19 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ARE THERE ANY  
20 OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC?

21 MS. CORY: JENNIFER CORY FROM STANFORD. I  
22 WOULD HAVE TO SECOND WHAT SHE SAID JUST BECAUSE THERE  
23 IS A HUGE NEED FOR FACILITIES RIGHT NOW. YOU ALL, I  
24 THINK, UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT SCIENCE IS MOVING VERY  
25 QUICKLY. I GOT THE SENSE THAT THERE WAS SOME UNEASE

1 ALMOST THAT MAYBE THERE WASN'T THIS HUGE SCIENCE NEED  
2 FOR ACTUAL FACILITIES, BUT I CAN TELL YOU FROM AN  
3 INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE THAT THERE IS A HUGE NEED FOR  
4 FACILITIES. WE HAVE NOWHERE TO DO THIS RESEARCH RIGHT  
5 NOW. AND SO I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO MOVE  
6 FORWARD CAUTIOUSLY, BUT THERE SHOULD BE A SHORTER  
7 TIMELINE, I THINK, THAN -- LET'S NOT DRAG THIS OUT.

8 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WELL, I DON'T THINK ANYBODY  
9 WAS TALKING ABOUT DRAGGING IT OUT. I THINK IT'S THE  
10 PROCESS AND MAKING SURE THE PROCESS GETS THE BEST END  
11 RESULT. AND I THINK WE ALL SHARE THE SAME FEELING,  
12 THAT THERE IS A TREMENDOUS NEED FOR THESE FACILITIES,  
13 AND THE SOONER THE BETTER FOR ALL OF US. FACILITIES,  
14 THE RESEARCH, ETC., I MEAN IT'S BIG WIN FOR EVERYBODY.

15 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DID YOU WANT TO  
16 MAKE A COMMENT?

17 MR. WOODS: JOHN WOODS, AND I'M RECENTLY  
18 RETIRED FROM UCSD, AND I HAD THE FACILITIES  
19 RESPONSIBILITY. AND I THOUGHT THE THINGS I'D BE  
20 TALKING ABOUT ARE THINGS YOU'VE ALL ALREADY  
21 ACKNOWLEDGED. I FELT VERY PAINFULLY OVER THE LAST  
22 EIGHT OR NINE YEARS WHAT INFLATION HAS DONE TO US AND  
23 TO OUR BUDGETS. AND THE SCIENTISTS ARE SO EXCITED, ALL  
24 THESE FOUR INSTITUTIONS WORKING TOGETHER. WE WOULD BE  
25 HAPPY TO TALK TO YOU IF YOU NEED TO LEARN MORE ABOUT

1 ALL THE THINGS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO DO AND CAN'T DO,  
2 BOTH BECAUSE OF THE SPACE WE DON'T HAVE FOR THE PEOPLE  
3 WE ALREADY HAVE, AS WELL AS THE SPACE WE DON'T HAVE FOR  
4 THE PEOPLE WHO WE'RE TRYING TO RECRUIT FROM OUT OF  
5 STATE TO MAKE US AN EVEN RICHER PROGRAM.

6 AND FOR MANY OF THEM, THE AWARD OF THESE  
7 GRANTS, ASSUMING WE WERE LUCKY ENOUGH TO GET ONE, IS  
8 BOTH SYMBOLIC AS WELL AS PRACTICAL IN TERMS OF MAKING  
9 THAT SPACE AVAILABLE. THAT'S WHAT'S GOING TO TELL  
10 FOLKS THAT THE DOORS ARE REALLY OPEN TO THE CONTRACTS  
11 AND GRANTS THAT WILL FOLLOW WITH ALL OF THIS. AGAIN,  
12 WE ONLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO MOVE AS SPEEDILY AS YOU'RE  
13 COMFORTABLE MOVING.

14 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: IF THERE'S NO  
15 OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT, I THINK WE'RE PREPARED TO VOTE.  
16 JOAN SAMUELSON.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JEFF SHEEHY.

19 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

20 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID.

21 MR. LICHTENGER: AYE.

22 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: MARCY.

23 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ED.

24 MR. KASHIAN: YES.

25 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: JANET.

1 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: RUSTY.

3 CHAIRMAN DOMS: YES.

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID. AYE.

5 DEBORAH.

6 MS. HYSEN: YES.

7 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB.

8 MR. KLEIN: YES.

9 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: SHERRY LANSING.

10 SHERRY. SHE'S NOT ON. MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

11 MR. LICHTENGER: I HAVE A QUESTION FOR

12 COUNSEL. SO IS THERE ANY REASON WHY, BESIDES THESE --

13 ARE THESE QUARTERLY MEETINGS WE'RE HAVING? OR ARE WE

14 JUST CALLED ON ESSENTIALLY WHEN WE --

15 MR. KELLER: AS NEEDED.

16 MR. LICHTENGER: AS NEEDED. IS THERE ANY

17 REASON WHY ALL OR PART OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP

18 CAN'T MEET MORE REGULARLY IN DISCUSSION PRIVATE

19 MEETINGS?

20 DR. HALL: NO.

21 DR. WRIGHT: YES, THERE'S A REASON.

22 MR. HARRISON: THE ANSWER IS, YES, THERE IS A

23 REASON. THE ICOC HAS ADOPTED A POLICY THAT THE

24 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP WILL MEET IN OPEN PUBLIC

25 SESSION EXCEPT FOR VERY LIMITED SPECIFIED PURPOSES TO

1 HEAR INFORMATION REGARDING CONFIDENTIAL LAND  
2 NEGOTIATIONS, FOR EXAMPLE. HOWEVER, YOU CAN DO  
3 TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS IF YOU DESIRE.

4 MR. LICHTENGER: OKAY. THANK YOU.

5 MR. HARRISON: PUBLIC TELECONFERENCE  
6 MEETINGS.

7 MR. KLEIN: CAN I ASK A QUESTION? THAT, YOU  
8 KNOW, I DO HAVE A FUNDAMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE  
9 INSTITUTIONS, THAT WE SHOULD TRY AND EXPEDITE THIS  
10 PROCESS. AND THE STAFFING ISSUE WAS RAISED, I GUESS,  
11 BY DAVID LICHTENGER, WHO MENTIONED THAT FOR THE VARIOUS  
12 KINDS OF SPECIALIZATION IN A STATE THE SIZE OF  
13 CALIFORNIA, YOU'RE GOING TO NEED MORE STAFF. THE  
14 PROPOSED SCHEDULE HAD A JUNE 1 RFA AND A MARCH  
15 COMPLETION DATE.

16 NOW, WE NEED THE PROPER TIME FOR TRANSPARENCY  
17 AND WORKING OUT THE PUBLIC POLICY AND HAVING THE RFA.  
18 I WOULD SUGGEST IT WILL SAVE TIME ON THE BACK END, BUT  
19 SHOULDN'T WE ALSO HAVE A MOTION HERE TO REQUEST THAT  
20 THE FACILITIES STAFF COMES BACK TO THIS COMMITTEE WITH  
21 A STAFFING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN THAT WOULD TAKE US FROM  
22 THE DATE THAT WE ACTUALLY HAVE THE RFA SUBMITTED, MAYBE  
23 IT'S JULY 1ST, AND PROVIDING A STAFFING PLAN THAT WOULD  
24 IMMEDIATELY HIRE MORE MANPOWER SO THAT THE PROCESSING  
25 TIME COULD BE CUT DOWN AND HOPEFULLY, EVEN WITH USING

1 THE PROPER TIME FOR PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY, WE COULD HAVE  
2 THESE DONE AND PROCESSED FOR A BOARD VOTE BY THE END OF  
3 THE YEAR?

4 DR. HALL: JUST ONE POINT OF INFORMATION. IN  
5 DOING THE SCHEDULES, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT IS VERY  
6 HARD IS THE LENGTH OF TIME FOR THE INSTITUTIONS TO  
7 PREPARE THESE GRANTS. EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE BEEN  
8 WORKING ON THIS AND KNOWING ABOUT IT IN TERMS OF  
9 PUTTING TOGETHER THE FINANCING, PUTTING TOGETHER  
10 DETAILS -- I DON'T KNOW OF EITHER LORI OR RICK OR ANY  
11 OF THE OTHER PEOPLE IN THE ROOM WHO REPRESENT THE  
12 INSTITUTIONS MIGHT WANT TO COMMENT ON THIS -- BUT MY  
13 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT, PARTICULARLY FOR THE UC'S FOR  
14 VARIOUS REASONS, YOU SIMPLY CANNOT MOVE THESE THINGS  
15 THROUGH IN A MATTER OF MONTHS.

16 THIS WAS REFLECTED IN OUR SHARED EVEN  
17 LABORATORY FACILITIES GRANTS, AND NOTICE THE WAY IT WAS  
18 PHASED, PART 1 AND PART 2, AND PART OF THE REASON FOR  
19 THAT IS YOU COULD PREPARE THE SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION  
20 MUCH MORE QUICKLY THAN YOU CAN PREPARE EVEN FOR A  
21 THOUSAND SQUARE FEET. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT MUCH LESS,  
22 MANY THOUSAND SQUARE FOOT BUILDING, SO THAT IS BUILT  
23 IN.

24 MR. KLEIN: WELL, THERE'S A LOT OF THINGS IN  
25 THE SYSTEM THAT ARE BUILT IN THAT UC COULD CREATE A

1 SPECIAL TRACK TO BE ABLE TO PROPERLY COMPETE WITH THE  
2 OTHER INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE FOR FACILITIES GRANTS.  
3 AND I WOULD MAYBE BROADEN WHAT MY STATEMENT WAS TO ASK  
4 THAT THEY COME BACK WITH A STAFF AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
5 TO ACCELERATE THE PROCESS AS WELL AS RECOMMENDATIONS OF  
6 WHAT WE CAN DO WITH THE UC SYSTEM OR ANY OTHER  
7 STRUCTURAL DELAY IN THE SYSTEM TO TRY AND REQUEST  
8 THOSE -- THAT THERE BE INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES TO  
9 ACCOMMODATE A FASTER PROGRAM FOR PROCESSING.

10 DR. HALL: I THINK -- LET ME JUST ADD. I  
11 THINK WE CAN CERTAINLY TAKE A REQUEST TO DEVELOP A  
12 PLAN. I THINK WE WOULD REQUEST INPUT FROM THIS  
13 COMMITTEE, BUT I THINK THE APPROVAL FOR ANY STAFFING  
14 PLAN OF THAT WOULD GO THROUGH GOVERNANCE AND THROUGH  
15 THE ICOC.

16 MR. KLEIN: WELL, THAT COULD BE FINE, BUT AT  
17 LEAST WE CAN GET A COPY OF THAT PLAN.

18 CHAIRMAN DOMS: WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT.

19 MS. HEINEKE: I'M TRUDY HEINEKE FROM THE  
20 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT. I  
21 THINK THE TIME IT TAKES FOR ONE OF OUR CAMPUSES TO PUT  
22 TOGETHER AN APPLICATION IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE KIND  
23 OF REVIEW YOU'RE GOING TO DO. I HEAR TALK ABOUT  
24 SPECIALISTS, ENGINEERS, AND ARCHITECTS, AND WHATEVER.  
25 AND I MUST SAY I NEVER REALLY CONSIDERED THAT WE WOULD

1 HAVE TO -- THERE WOULD BE A DETAILED ARCHITECTURAL  
2 ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW. IT NEVER EVEN  
3 CROSSED MY MIND.

4 IF THAT'S WHAT YOU WANT, THEN INSTITUTIONS  
5 HAVE TO SPEND A LOT OF MONEY TO GET TO THE POINT OF  
6 PREPARING PLANS FOR YOU TO REVIEW. SOME OF OUR  
7 CAMPUSES HAVE MOVED FORWARD WITH DESIGN FASTER THAN  
8 OTHERS, AND WE WOULD HAVE TO KNOW THAT IN ADVANCE IF  
9 YOU WANT DETAILED CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS. SO THAT'S A  
10 PRIMARY CONSIDERATION AS OPPOSED TO A KIND OF REVIEW  
11 THAT LOOKS AT UNIT COST AND REASONABLENESS OF SCHEDULE  
12 AND WHATEVER.

13 SO THE TIME FOR US TO PREPARE IS DIRECTLY  
14 RELATED TO THE CRITERIA YOU ADOPT.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: THIS IS ON A SOMEWHAT  
17 SEPARATE SUBJECT, AND IT'S KIND OF A CLEANUP MOTION  
18 BASED ON MY BEING COMPLETELY PERSUADED BY SOME COMMENTS  
19 OF DEBORAH AND SOME OF THE OTHER FOLKS. I WOULD  
20 PROPOSE THAT THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP HAVE SIGN-OFF  
21 AUTHORITY FOR ANY RFA, INCLUDING THIS ONE THAT WE'RE  
22 TALKING ABOUT NOW.

23 MR. SHEEHY: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: ANY DISCUSSION?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'M SORRY. I COULDN'T

1 HEAR HER OVER HERE. COULD YOU REPEAT IT, JOAN?

2 MS. SAMUELSON: YEAH. I WAS RESOLVING THAT  
3 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP WOULD HAVE SIGN-OFF ON  
4 RFA'S, AS DEBORAH WAS DESCRIBING.

5 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK THAT'S AN  
6 INTERESTING MOTION, JOAN, AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT TO DO  
7 WITH IT. OKAY.

8 MS. SAMUELSON: IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY NEED  
9 TO BE HANDLED.

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME FINISH.  
11 LET ME JUST SAY THAT WE AS A WORKING GROUP WERE  
12 UNANIMOUS IN COMMUNICATING ONE THOUGHT TO THE ICOC.  
13 THAT IS, WE WANT TO DO OUR DUE DILIGENCE, AND WE NEED  
14 MORE TIME. I DON'T WANT TO OBSTRUCT THAT MESSAGE IN  
15 ANY WAY OR CLOUD IT WITH ADDITIONAL LATCH-ONS. OKAY.  
16 BECAUSE WHEN I GO TO THE ICOC --

17 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S SEPARATE.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I UNDERSTAND  
19 THAT. BUT WHEN I GO TO THE ICOC IN JUNE AT THE JUNE  
20 MEETING SO WE CAN RESOLVE THIS CONFLICT OF  
21 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FOLKS AND WHAT TO DO, YOU KNOW, I  
22 JUST WANT THEM TO LOOK AT THAT SINGLE QUESTION. SHOULD  
23 YOU OR SHOULD YOU NOT ALLOW US -- SHOULD YOU OR SHOULD  
24 YOU NOT GIVE US MORE TIME? YES OR NO, ICOC? I'M SURE  
25 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A REALLY HEALTHY DISCUSSION AT THAT

1 JUNE MEETING.

2 IF THE ICOC SAYS YES, THEN THAT GIVES US SOME  
3 COMFORT, I THINK. THEN WE CAN SAY, OKAY, WELL, THEN  
4 LET'S LOOK AT THE RFA. AT WHAT POINT DO WE WANT TO  
5 HAVE SIGN-OFF AUTHORITY ON IT, OTHER ELEMENTS OF WHAT  
6 WE'VE DISCUSSED TODAY. TO PIGEONHOLE NOW IT, JOAN, I  
7 JUST WANT TO CAUTION --

8 MS SAMUELSON: I AGREE WITH YOU. I'LL  
9 WITHDRAW IT.

10 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: -- TO PIGEONHOLE  
11 IT NOW MIGHT BE A LITTLE TOO MUCH. I JUST WANTED -- TO  
12 ME THAT'S CENTRAL --

13 MS. SAMUELSON: CAN WE CALENDAR IT FOR A  
14 FUTURE AGENDA? I'M NOT DISAGREEING WITH YOU.

15 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: TO ME THAT  
16 CENTRAL ISSUE -- TO ME IT'S A CENTRAL ISSUE HERE, AND I  
17 WANT IT RESOLVED, AND WE CAN GET IT RESOLVED IN THE  
18 NEXT FIVE WEEKS OR WHENEVER THE JUNE MEETING IS.

19 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. IT  
20 WOULD BE A REAL SHAME IF THOSE HEARINGS COULDN'T START  
21 RIGHT AWAY. THERE IS NO REASON TO WASTE FIVE WEEKS TO  
22 GET TO THE JUNE DATE. THOSE HEARINGS COULD BE DONE.

23 NOW, IF ALL THE HEARINGS AREN'T DONE BY THE  
24 JUNE 2D MEETING, THAT'S A SEPARATE SUBJECT. BUT  
25 CERTAINLY WE HAVE, YOU KNOW, FIVE WEEKS OR SIX WEEKS

1 BETWEEN NOW AND -- SIX WEEKS OR MORE BEFORE THE JUNE  
2 MEETING. AND THOSE HEARINGS, SEVERAL OF THOSE HEARINGS  
3 COULD BE CONDUCTED AND BE OUT OF THE WAY.

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, LET'S BE  
5 FRANK. WE CAN'T CONDUCT THESE HEARINGS WITHOUT THE  
6 EXPRESS SUPPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT AND HIS STAFF. IF  
7 THERE'S ANY AMBIGUITY AS TO WHAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD  
8 DO, AS HE ARTICULATED, THEN I DON'T SEE US GETTING THAT  
9 AID. ZACH, I'M SORRY IF I'M SPEAKING FOR YOU, BUT I  
10 DID THINK I HEARD YOU SAY YOU WERE SORT OF UNCLEAR  
11 ABOUT WHAT IT IS YOU HAD TO DO.

12 DR. HALL: WELL, I'M CONFUSED IN THE SENSE  
13 THAT THE ICOC MEETING LAST TUESDAY, IT'S AMAZING OVER  
14 THE COURSE OF THREE DAYS, IT'S BEEN QUITE AMAZING. THE  
15 NO. 1 THING I PUT UP HERE IS, IN FACT, THE NO. 1  
16 MESSAGE THAT I HEARD FROM THIS. IN FACT, IT BEGAN  
17 DURING MY PRESIDENT'S REPORT WHEN ONE OF THE  
18 INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES SAID WHAT POSTURE SHOULD  
19 WE TAKE FROM RECRUITMENT, WAS ASKING ABOUT FURTHER  
20 PLANS, FUTURE PLANS. AND WE HAVE HEARD AGAIN AND AGAIN  
21 ACTUALLY GOING BACK SEVERAL MEETINGS ABOUT THE URGENCY  
22 OF GETTING STARTED ON THE FACILITIES. SO I HAVE TRIED  
23 TO RESPOND TO THAT. AND SO THAT IS WHAT THIS  
24 AGGRESSIVE SCHEDULE THAT YOU ALSO SAW THIS MORNING WAS  
25 IN RESPONSE TO THAT DIRECTIVE FROM THE ICOC.

1 WE TALKED AT THE ICOC MEETING LAST TIME ABOUT  
2 WHETHER OR NOT THERE SHOULD BE A PRELIMINARY SURVEY.  
3 AND, AGAIN, ALTHOUGH THERE SEEMED TO BE SOME VALUE IN  
4 THAT, THE ISSUE OF MOVING FORWARD AND TRYING TO GO  
5 AHEAD WITH THIS BY VOTE, STRAW VOTE, SEEMED TO TRUMP  
6 THAT ISSUE. AND THE DIRECTIVE I TOOK AWAY FROM THAT  
7 MEETING WAS LET'S TAKE THIS AMBITIOUS SCHEDULE, SEE IF  
8 WE CAN COME UP WITH THE OUTLINES FOR AN RFA IN JUNE.

9 NOW, GIVEN THE UNANIMOUS VOTE OF THIS WORKING  
10 GROUP, THERE IS NO -- I THINK THERE'S NO POINT IN US  
11 DOING THAT. IT'S VERY CLEAR. BUT IT'S ALSO VERY CLEAR  
12 TO ME THAT THERE ARE TWO DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW  
13 REPRESENTED ON THE ICOC.

14 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: ZACH, IT'S A  
15 SIMPLE QUESTION. YES OR NO? BEFORE THE JUNE MEETING,  
16 WILL YOU AID THIS WORKING GROUP IN A HEARING?

17 DR. HALL: I WILL.

18 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YES OR NO? WILL  
19 YOU ASSIST THIS WORKING GROUP?

20 DR. HALL: I WANT DIRECTION FROM THE ICOC  
21 ABOUT HOW WE SHOULD PROCEED ON THIS.

22 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I'LL TAKE THAT AS  
23 A NO. IF YOU'RE NOT HELPING US BEFORE THE JUNE MEETING  
24 BY COMMITTING RESOURCES, SAYING, YES, WORKING GROUP, I  
25 WILL COMMIT RESOURCES, I WILL COMMIT TIME IN AIDING YOU

1       SETTING UP THESE HEARINGS WHICH YOU UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

2               DR. HALL:  I'M SORRY.

3               VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:  IT'S EITHER A YES  
4       OR A NO.

5               DR. HALL:  WE WILL BEGIN PLANS GIVEN -- THIS  
6       NOW GIVES US TWO STRETCHES.  I FRANKLY THINK IT WILL BE  
7       SURPRISING TO ME IF THE ICOC WERE TO HEAR THAT THE  
8       FACILITIES WORKING GROUP HAD TAKEN A UNANIMOUS VOTE,  
9       AND THEY SAID WE'RE GOING TO IGNORE THIS.  LET'S GO  
10      AHEAD.  ON THE OTHER HAND, I FEEL THIS IS A VERY, VERY  
11      STRONG ISSUE.  THIS IS AN ISSUE ON WHICH THERE ARE  
12      STRONG FEELINGS ON BOTH SIDES.  I FEEL IT IS VERY  
13      IMPORTANT THAT IT BE WORKED OUT AT THE HIGHEST  
14      GOVERNANCE LEVEL FOR THIS WHOLE ORGANIZATION, WHICH IS  
15      THE BOARD.  I THINK THAT IS THE KEY.  THIS IS A REALLY  
16      IMPORTANT ISSUE HERE, AND THERE'S A, I WOULD EVEN SAY,  
17      A CULTURAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE INVOLVED IN THE  
18      SCIENTIFIC CULTURE WHO SEE THE NEED, WHO UNDERSTAND THE  
19      URGENCY, AND WHO ARE TRYING TO MOVE THIS FORWARD IN  
20      ORDER TO GET THE WHOLE PROJECT GOING, AND THOSE HERE  
21      WHO'S POINT OF VIEW I HAVE HEARD --

22              MS. SAMUELSON:  WHO SEE A NEED AND KNOW THE  
23      URGENCY.

24              VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL:  I DISAGREE WITH  
25      THAT DICHOTOMY.

1 DR. HALL: JUST A MOMENT.

2 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK DAVID AND  
3 MARCY AND JANET WANT TO SPEAK.

4 DR. HALL: I'M NOT FINISHED YET. AND THE  
5 POINT THAT I'VE HEARD TODAY, WHAT I'VE HEARD TODAY, IS  
6 THAT WE NEED PUBLIC INPUT. THAT TO UNDERTAKE THIS  
7 WITHOUT GOING THROUGH SOME PUBLIC HEARINGS, SOME SENSE  
8 OF GATHERING INFORMATION FROM A VARIETY OF EXPERTS, AND  
9 GETTING THE SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC FOR THIS WOULD BE A  
10 MISTAKE. I THINK THAT IS AN IMPORTANT POINT. AND I  
11 THINK THAT THAT WILL -- THE ICOC NEEDS TO HEAR THAT AND  
12 NEEDS TO DECIDE THAT.

13 ON THE OTHER HAND, I SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF  
14 THE ICOC. THAT IS WHO I TAKE MY DIRECTIONS FROM, THE  
15 ENTIRE ICOC. THIS GROUP IS ADVISORY TO CIRM AND TO THE  
16 ICOC, AND I DON'T TAKE MY DIRECTIONS DIRECTLY FROM YOU.  
17 I'M SORRY. THAT'S JUST THE WAY IT IS.

18 MS. FEIT: WELL, YOU DO FROM ME BECAUSE I'M  
19 ON THAT BOARD. WAIT A MINUTE.

20 DR. HALL: PLEASE LET ME JUST FINISH.

21 MS. FEIT: WAIT A MINUTE, ZACH.

22 DR. HALL: PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE LET ME  
23 FINISH. WHAT WE WILL DO, GIVEN THIS SITUATION, IS MAKE  
24 A CONTINGENCY PLAN BASED ON EACH OF THESE. THAT IS, WE  
25 WILL BEGIN TO PLAN FOR A SERIES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS AND

1 PUBLIC MEETINGS AND STAFFING SO THAT WE CAN MOVE AHEAD  
2 WITH THAT. BUT I WILL NOT IMPLEMENT THAT UNTIL I'M  
3 SURE THAT I HAVE THE ICOC BEHIND ME. AND I THINK WE  
4 WILL ALSO CONTINUE TO THINK ABOUT WHAT WE MIGHT DO FOR  
5 THE RFA.

6 MS. FEIT: I'M JUST SAYING THAT A SENSE OF  
7 URGENCY WAS NOT DEFINED AT THAT BOARD MEETING. AND I  
8 THINK IF TWO HEARINGS WERE HELD IN THE NEXT COUPLE OF  
9 WEEKS OR THREE WEEKS OR FOUR WEEKS, WE WOULD BE MEETING  
10 EVERYBODY'S NEEDS TO FEEL VERY TRANSPARENT. THIS IS A  
11 PUBLIC AGENCY WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS. AND WE ARE  
12 FOOLHARDY IF WE DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO OUR  
13 RESPONSIBILITY. BUT NOWHERE ON THAT BOARD MEETING DID  
14 I HEAR ANY BOARD MEMBER NOT ENCOURAGE US TO DO OUR JOB.

15 SO I WOULD BEG TO DIFFER WITH YOU, THAT THERE  
16 IS A CULTURAL DIFFERENCE. THERE IS NOT A CULTURAL  
17 DIFFERENCE. I THINK IF THERE WERE THE REST OF THE  
18 BOARD MEMBERS HERE TODAY, THEY WOULD AGREE WITH US  
19 BOARD MEMBERS WHO WOULD SAY WE HAVE A PUBLIC  
20 RESPONSIBILITY TO FOLLOW A PUBLIC PROCESS IN DOING  
21 THIS. SO NOWHERE DID THE SENSE OF URGENCY INTERFERE  
22 WITH THAT MANDATE. NOWHERE DID I HEAR THAT FROM ANY  
23 BOARD MEMBER, NOWHERE.

24 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: DAVID.

25 MR. LICHTENGER: SO, ZACH, I THINK THE

1 WORKING GROUP, MYSELF INCLUDED, HAVE A SENSE OF  
2 URGENCY, AND THAT'S WHY WE WANT TO PUSH FORWARD WITH  
3 PUBLIC HEARINGS, AND I'M ASKING FOR YOUR SUPPORT NOW TO  
4 HAVE THOSE MEETINGS HAPPEN IMMEDIATELY SO THAT WE CAN  
5 MAKE PROGRESS. I WANT TO MAKE PROGRESS JUST AS MUCH  
6 YOU DO AND THE ICOC. I THINK EVERYONE HERE REALIZES  
7 THAT, GIVEN THE PUBLIC NATURE OF WHAT WE'RE DOING,  
8 WE'RE GOING HAVE TO DO THIS, AND WE NEED TO DO IT  
9 QUICKLY, AND WE'RE ASKING FOR YOUR SUPPORT. I DON'T  
10 THINK THEY'RE MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. IT'S NOT A ZERO-SUM  
11 SITUATION HERE. WE CAN HAVE A SENSE OF URGENCY AND GO  
12 AHEAD AND HAVE PUBLIC HEARINGS.

13 DR. HALL: I'M NOT SAYING YOU DON'T HAVE A  
14 SENSE OF URGENCY. I JUST --

15 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB.

16 DR. HALL: BOB, PLEASE.

17 MR. KLEIN: ALL THOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS CAN BE  
18 HELD. THERE'S NO DIFFERENCE. ALL THOSE PUBLIC  
19 HEARINGS CAN BE HELD, URGENCY CAN BE ATTAINED, AND  
20 PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY CAN BE HONORED.

21 DR. HALL: I HAVE NOT DONE ANYTHING LIKE THIS  
22 WITHOUT CONSULTING THE ICOC. I HAVE NOT. AND THIS  
23 WOULD BE THE FIRST TIME IN MY PRESIDENCY THAT I HAVE  
24 SAID, WELL, HERE'S ONE SET OF INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE  
25 ICOC --

1 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S NOT TRUE.

2 DR. HALL: -- AND NOW WE GET ANOTHER POINT ON  
3 IT.

4 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: I CAN GIVE YOU  
5 EXAMPLES WHERE YOU'VE DONE THAT, ZACH.

6 DR. WRIGHT: I HAVE A MOTION, RUSTY.

7 CHAIRMAN DOMS: NO. NO. WAIT. I WANT JANET  
8 TO SPEAK.

9 DR. WRIGHT: I WOULD -- I THINK THERE ARE A  
10 LOT OF IMPORTANT ISSUES HERE. I DON'T HEAR AS MUCH  
11 DISAGREEMENT AS I THINK HAS BEEN TALKED ABOUT. I WOULD  
12 PROPOSE THAT WE CALL A PHONE CALL OF THE ICOC OR SOME  
13 WAY FOR US ALL TO COMMUNICATE BECAUSE THERE'S A KEY  
14 ISSUE THAT WE'RE NOT SPEAKING ABOUT. AND THAT IS,  
15 INFORMING THE ENTIRE BOARD OF THE DISCUSSION THAT TOOK  
16 PLACE HERE TODAY, WHICH IS VERY VALUABLE. AT THE BOARD  
17 MEETING WE DID GET A SENSE THAT PEOPLE WANT TO MOVE AS  
18 QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. WE ALL DO, BUT WE HAVE TO PUT  
19 METHODICALLY, WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE WE UNDERSTAND THIS,  
20 WE HAVE TO BE EDUCATED ABOUT AREAS THAT ARE UNIQUE TO  
21 THE FACILITIES.

22 IF WE GET THE BOARD'S BLESSING, BUT WE DON'T  
23 WAIT UNTIL THE MAY MEETING OR THE JUNE MEETING, WE CAN  
24 USE THE TIME BETWEEN NOW AND JUNE TO BE DOING THE  
25 HEARINGS WITH ZACH'S FULL ENGAGEMENT. I JUST -- MAY I

1 MOVE THAT WE HAVE AN EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE BOARD?

2 CAN WE DO THAT BY PHONE, JAMES?

3 MR. KLEIN: I CAN CALL AN EMERGENCY MEETING  
4 OF THE BOARD, JANET. SO IF ZACH DECIDES THAT HE CAN'T  
5 MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT AND HONOR THE REQUEST OF THIS  
6 UNANIMOUS VOTE, I CAN CALL AN EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE  
7 BOARD. I'D LIKE TO GIVE ZACH SOME TIME TO THINK ABOUT  
8 THAT, BUT I WILL ACT TO DO THAT IF THAT'S NECESSARY.

9 MR. SHEEHY: I ONLY WANT TO SAY A COUPLE OF  
10 POINTS. NO. 1, ALL WE'RE PROPOSING IS THAT THIS  
11 WORKING GROUP CONVENE A PUBLIC MEETING FOR A VERY  
12 SPECIFIC PURPOSE. AND I'VE NEVER HEARD OF ANY OF THE  
13 OTHER WORKING GROUPS BEING TOLD THEY CAN'T SET THEIR  
14 OWN SCHEDULE. SO I DON'T SEE THAT CONFLICT, YOU KNOW.  
15 I ALSO WOULDN'T OBJECT TO GETTING THE ACTUAL RESOLUTION  
16 THAT THE BOARD PASSED SO I COULD BE INSTRUCTED BECAUSE  
17 I WASN'T AT THAT MEETING. I'M SURE THAT THERE'S A  
18 PUBLIC RECORD THAT CAN BE OBTAINED.

19 DR. HALL: THERE WAS NO FORMAL VOTE BECAUSE  
20 IT WAS NOT AGENDIZED AS SUCH. IT WAS A STRAW VOTE, AND  
21 IT WAS WORKING BY CONSENSUS.

22 MR. SHEEHY: SO I SEE OUR LEGAL  
23 RESPONSIBILITY IN ACTUALLY -- NO RFA CAN GO FORWARD  
24 UNTIL WE PROPOSE CRITERIA, AS I UNDERSTAND THE READING  
25 OF THE PROPOSITION. SO IF WE'RE NOT -- YOU KNOW, I

1 DON'T KNOW WHY WE CAN'T HOLD A COUPLE OF PUBLIC  
2 MEETINGS. IF WE'RE NOT GOING TO FORWARD WITH A  
3 CRITERIA BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION TO DO  
4 SO, I DON'T THINK THAT PUTS US IN ANY KIND OF CONFLICT  
5 WITH THE ICOC AND THEIR OBJECTIVES. WE'RE JUST TRYING  
6 TO FULFILL OUR STATUTORY MANDATE. WE'RE TRYING TO HOLD  
7 ADDITIONAL MEETINGS. CERTAINLY IT IS PREPOSTEROUS TO  
8 THINK THAT WE WOULD HAVE WALKED OUT OF THIS MEETING  
9 TODAY WITH CRITERIA FOR A GRANT OF \$222 MILLION.

10 NOW, I DON'T THINK THE ICOC --

11 DR. HALL: THAT WAS NEVER ANTICIPATED.  
12 THAT'S NOT ON THE SCHEDULE.

13 MR. SHEEHY: SO AT WHAT POINT WOULD WE HAVE  
14 COME UP WITH OUR CRITERIA TO PRESENT TO THE ICOC FOR  
15 THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR RFA? WHAT WAS THE PLAN?

16 DR. HALL: THAT WAS GOING TO BE DISCUSSED ON  
17 THE SECOND DAY OF THE MAY 2D AND 3D MEETING, ASSUMING  
18 THERE WERE TIME. AND IF THERE WASN'T TIME, WE WOULDN'T  
19 MEET THE SCHEDULE. WE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO DO IT.

20 MR. SHEEHY: THEN I'M JUST NOT GETTING WHAT  
21 ALL THESE DIFFERENT CONFLICTS ARE. WE DON'T HAVE A  
22 RESOLUTION FROM THE ICOC. WE HAVE A STATUTORY MANDATE.  
23 WE'RE TRYING TO FULFILL IT. WE PROPOSED A PROCESS, AND  
24 WE'RE BEING TOLD WE CAN'T DO IT BECAUSE IN SOME WAY  
25 WE'RE IN CONFLICT WITH THE ICOC, WHICH DIDN'T EVEN TAKE

1 A FORMAL MOTION. I'D LIKE A RULING FROM COUNSEL WHY WE  
2 CAN'T GO FORWARD WITH FULFILLING -- WHAT I DID THINK --  
3 WHAT I AM HEARING WAS A CLEAR INTENT OF THE ICOC, WHICH  
4 IS TO START DEVELOPING THE CRITERIA, WHICH WE'RE  
5 STATUTORILY OBLIGATED TO DO, BEFORE ANY RFA CAN GO  
6 FORWARD.

7 MR. HARRISON: JEFF IS CORRECT, THAT ONE OF  
8 THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE WORKING GROUP IS TO MAKE  
9 RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE CRITERIA BY WHICH  
10 GRANT APPLICATIONS WILL BE REVIEWED. AND THIS WORKING  
11 GROUP IS ALSO EMPOWERED TO SCHEDULE PUBLIC MEETINGS  
12 THROUGH THE CHAIR WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF STAFF.

13 ZACH IS CORRECT, THAT THE ICOC EXPRESSED ITS  
14 INTENT THAT GATHERING INFORMATION THROUGH A SURVEY OR  
15 THROUGH SOME PRENOTICED LETTER WAS NOT NECESSARY OR  
16 DESIRABLE IN LIGHT OF THE SENSE OF URGENCY THAT WAS  
17 EXPRESSED.

18 DR. HALL: IN TERMS OF DEVELOPING CRITERIA,  
19 JEFF, THERE IS NO -- THERE'S NO PROBLEM ABOUT THAT.  
20 ONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES WE HAD CONSIDERED WAS IF WE  
21 DIDN'T GET TO IT OR WE WEREN'T FINISHED WITH IT MAY 2D,  
22 WE WOULD SEE IF WE COULD SCHEDULE A LATER MEETING.  
23 THAT'S NOT AN ISSUE. BUT WHAT'S BEEN PROPOSED IS  
24 SOMETHING RATHER DIFFERENT. WHAT'S BEEN PROPOSED IS A  
25 WHOLE PROGRAM OF PUBLIC HEARINGS AROUND THE STATE,

1 ENGAGING SCIENTISTS, ARCHITECTS, MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC,  
2 PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS.

3 SO WHAT IS NEEDED NOW AT THIS STAGE IS, BY  
4 COMPARISON WITH THE PLAN FOR A PLAN, THE SCIENTIFIC  
5 STRATEGIC PLAN, IS BASICALLY A CAMPAIGN PLAN NOW. SO  
6 WE WOULD SAY HERE'S HOW WE'RE GOING TO DO THIS. HERE'S  
7 HOW WE'RE GOING TO ORGANIZE IT. HERE'S HOW WE'RE GOING  
8 TO DEVELOP CRITERIA. HERE'S HOW WE'RE GOING TO INVOLVE  
9 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. HERE'S HOW WE'RE GOING  
10 TO INVOLVE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. HERE'S HOW WE'RE  
11 GOING TO INVOLVE THE ICOC. HERE'S HOW WE'RE GOING TO  
12 STAFF IT. I MEAN IT'S NOT WHAT I HAVE HEARD TODAY, AND  
13 I HAVE HEARD WHAT YOU'VE SAID IS THAT YOU WANT A REAL  
14 PROCESS. AND THAT TOOK ABOUT SIX MONTHS WITH THE  
15 SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC PLAN. WE PRESUMABLY COULD DO THAT  
16 MORE QUICKLY HERE, BUT I THINK THE RIGHT THING TO DO IS  
17 FOR US TO TRY TO PREPARE SUCH A PLAN AND THEN PRESENT A  
18 PLAN FOR A PLAN, IF YOU WILL, AT THE ICOC MEETING AND  
19 TRY TO GET SOME RESOLUTION ON THIS. AND I WOULD BE  
20 HAPPY TO HAVE AN EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE ICOC MEETING  
21 BEFORE JUNE. I DON'T OBJECT TO THAT AT ALL.

22 MY POINT IS THAT WE SHOULD NOT DO THIS JUST  
23 ON THE GROUNDS OF DEVELOPING CRITERIA BECAUSE YOU'RE  
24 TALKING ABOUT SOMETHING THAT'S MUCH BIGGER.

25 MR. KLEIN: IN A FIVE- OR SIX-WEEK PERIOD YOU

1       COULD HAVE THREE PUBLIC MEETINGS.   AND SO WE'RE NOT  
2       TALKING ABOUT A SIX-MONTH PROCESS.   IT'S A MISSTATEMENT  
3       TO CHARACTERIZE IT IN THOSE TERMS.   AND, IN FACT, ALL  
4       THOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS COULD TAKE PLACE BEFORE THE JUNE  
5       BOARD MEETING.

6                 MR. SHEEHY:   MAYBE LET'S TAKE SOME OF THE  
7       HEAT OUT.   I THINK -- COULD I JUST ASK AN OBJECTIVE  
8       OPINION OF THE PRESIDENT.   BECAUSE I THINK THERE'S A  
9       SENSE THAT YOU'VE GOT YOUR FINGER ON THE SCALE ONE WAY  
10      OR THE OTHER, AND I'M NOT COMPLETELY SURE THAT IT'S  
11      TRUE.   YOU SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD.  
12      WHATEVER THEY TELL YOU TO DO YOU'RE GOING TO DO.   BUT I  
13      WONDER IF YOU'RE LOOKING AT THE TWO OPTIONS AS THEY'RE  
14      RATHER STARKLY PRESENTED JUST AS OBJECTIVE.   AND I'M  
15      HEARTBROKEN THAT WE'RE LOSING YOU.   BUT SO YOU CAN KIND  
16      OF MAYBE SPEAK A LITTLE BIT OUT OF SCHOOL, BUT JUST AS  
17      SOMEONE WHO HAS BEEN THROUGH SOME OF OUR PROCESSES AND  
18      IS RESPONSIBLE, I THINK, FOR A TREMENDOUS NUMBER OF  
19      VERY, VERY POSITIVE PROCESSES AND ENORMOUS,  
20      UNBELIEVABLY STRONG RESULTS IN RECORD TIME WITH AN  
21      INCREDIBLE SENSE OF URGENCY, IS IT NOT -- DON'T YOU  
22      THINK THAT A LITTLE MORE PROCESS THAN WHAT KIND OF CAME  
23      OUT OF THE ICOC MAYBE MIGHT NOT BE WELL ADVISED SO  
24      WE'RE NOT WORKING AT CROSS PURPOSES?

25                 DR. HALL:   LET ME BE STRAIGHT.   I REALLY DO

1 TRY TO SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF THE ICOC AND TO DO WHAT  
2 IS WANTED TO DO. THIS IS LIKE A HUNDRED PERCENT  
3 REORIENTATION FOR ME BECAUSE WHAT WE'VE BEEN HEARING IS  
4 LET'S GET THIS DONE. LET'S GET THIS DONE. AND WE  
5 TALKED ABOUT HAVING, EVEN BEFORE THE BOND MONEY IS  
6 READY, HAVING ALL THIS DECIDED, SO WE ALREADY HAD THE  
7 INSTITUTIONS LINED UP, READY TO GO, THE MONEY WAS OUT  
8 THE DOOR. THE BOND MONEY NOW IS GOING TO BE READY IN  
9 THE SUMMER. I'M ABOUT TO LEAVE.

10 I THOUGHT THE BEST THING I CAN DO IS TO TRY  
11 TO GET THIS ON TRACK BEFORE I GO BECAUSE THERE IS THIS  
12 SENSE OF URGENCY. OKAY. I AM PERFECTLY WILLING TO GO  
13 THROUGH A PROCESS. IF I'M GOING TO DO IT AND BE  
14 RESPONSIBLE FOR IT, I WANT IT TO BE CAREFULLY PLANNED.  
15 I WANT IT TO BE THOUGHT OUT. I WANT TO THINK THROUGH  
16 THE ISSUES OF PROCESS, WHO WILL TAKE AND SYNTHESIZE ALL  
17 THE RESULTS OF THESE VARIOUS MEETINGS. EXACTLY WHO DO  
18 WE WANT? HOW DO WE DO IT? FOR ME IT'S LIKE TURNING  
19 UPSIDE DOWN. IF I CAN DO IT, THERE IS NO PROBLEM. I  
20 CAN GET STARTED.

21 BUT THE POINT IS I'M WILLING TO DO IT, BUT I  
22 WANT TO DO IT RIGHT, AND IT OUGHT TO BE DONE RIGHT, AND  
23 IT OUGHT TO BE DONE WELL, AND IT OUGHT NOT TO BE RUSHED  
24 INTO. AND IT OUGHT TO BE DONE BY THE PRESIDENT WITH  
25 THE STAFF OF THE CIRM. AND WE WOULD ALSO HAVE A STAFF

1 PLAN FOR THIS. AND WHETHER WE HIRE OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS  
2 OR GET INSIDE PEOPLE OR STAFF, AN ESTIMATE, WE ARE  
3 MOVING AT LIGHTNING SPEED HERE. AND THIS IS A COMPLETE  
4 180-DEGREE TURNAROUND FROM THREE DAYS AGO.

5 MS. FEIT: I DON'T BELIEVE IT IS. IT IS NOT.  
6 I WILL BEG TO DIFFER, BEG TO DIFFER. THAT IS NOT WHAT  
7 I HEARD SAID.

8 DR. HALL: MARCY, I RESPECT YOUR OPINION.

9 MS. FEIT: I WAS AT THE BOARD MEETING. IT IS  
10 NOT.

11 DR. HALL: AS THE PRESIDENT, I HAVE TO HEAR  
12 WHAT I HEARD. IF WE DISAGREE, WE DISAGREE.

13 MR. KASHIAN: MR. CHAIRMAN.

14 DR. HALL: I'M TRYING TO DO MY JOB HERE.

15 MR. KASHIAN: WE CAN BEAT THIS HORSE TO  
16 DEATH.

17 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I AGREE WITH YOU.

18 MR. KASHIAN: I THINK WE'VE HAD ENOUGH. I  
19 THINK DR. HALL HAS SAID THAT HE BELIEVES THAT HE HAS TO  
20 HAVE THE OPINION OF THE ICOC, THE COMMITTEE. BOB KLEIN  
21 HAS SAID, IF NECESSARY, AND WE'LL GET TOGETHER AND I'LL  
22 HAVE AN EMERGENCY PHONE MEETING. IN THE MEANTIME, WHY  
23 DON'T WE ALLOW HIM TO START HIS PLANNING CONTINGENCY  
24 AND MOVE ON?

25 VICE CHAIR SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU HAVEN'T

1 WORKED AS CLOSELY AS WE HAVE WITH ZACH. LET'S SEE IF  
2 WE CAN'T HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT AND MOVE THIS MEETING  
3 TO A CLOSE. ARE THERE ANY MORE LAST COMMENTS FROM THE  
4 PUBLIC?

5 MR. REED: JUST THAT I'M ENDLESSLY PROUD TO  
6 BE ASSOCIATED WITH THIS OUTSTANDING GROUP OF PASSIONATE  
7 PEOPLE. WE HAVE DONE A FANTASTIC JOB. JUST THANK YOU  
8 SO MUCH FOR GOING THROUGH ALL THIS HASSLE FOR  
9 EVERYBODY. THANK YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I WOULD LIKE TO -- I THINK  
11 YOU'RE ON THE RIGHT TRACK, ED. THEY WILL CALL THE  
12 MEETING, SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ICOC, AND WE WILL GET  
13 SOME DIRECTION FROM THEM.

14 MR. KASHIAN: I THINK BOB IS PASSIONATE ABOUT  
15 THE ISSUE, AND SO IS DR. HALL, AND SO IS EVERYONE ELSE.  
16 THE POINT IS THAT WE'VE GOT QUALIFIED PEOPLE THAT ARE  
17 DOING THE RIGHT THING. I'LL GUARANTEE. I'VE KNOWN BOB  
18 KLEIN FOR A LONG TIME. AND IF HE DOESN'T MAKE THAT  
19 THING HAPPEN FAST, I'D BE VERY SURPRISED.

20 MR. LICHTENGER: ZACH, LET'S ASSUME  
21 HYPOTHETICALLY THAT THE ICOC AGREES WITH THE DIRECTION  
22 WE'RE GOING. COULD WE, YOU KNOW, TRY TO BE A LITTLE  
23 PROACTIVE? OBVIOUSLY YOU WOULD NEED TO GET THAT  
24 DIRECTION, BUT ARE THERE STEPS THAT WE COULD TAKE IN  
25 BETWEEN AND THEN? AND IF WE MAKE THAT ASSUMPTION,

1 OBVIOUSLY IF WE DON'T GET THAT DIRECTION --

2 MR. KASHIAN: PLANNING PROCESS WHICH HE SAID  
3 HE WILL START.

4 DR. HALL: MYSELF AND THE STAFF NEED TO THINK  
5 THROUGH THE IMPLICATIONS OF WHAT WE'VE HEARD TODAY, AND  
6 WE NEED TO THINK ABOUT WHAT WE CAN DO. AND THEN I  
7 THINK IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR AND THE VICE CHAIR  
8 OF THIS WORKING GROUP, WE WOULD RECONVENE THE WORKING  
9 GROUP. WE'RE CERTAINLY GOING TO SEE YOU IN, WHAT, LESS  
10 THAN A MONTH TO DEAL WITH THESE ISSUES. AND SO WE  
11 WILL -- TO DEAL WITH THIS PARTICULAR RFA. SO WE WILL  
12 BE IN CONTACT WITH YOU. AND, YEAH, OUR POINT IS NOT TO  
13 EITHER TRY TO CONTRAVENE YOU OR TO IGNORE YOU, BUT TO  
14 TRY TO COME UP WITH A PLAN THAT WILL BOTH FULFILL WHAT  
15 WE'VE HEARD HERE TODAY. AND I THINK WE DO -- I THINK  
16 THE ICOC HAS REAL WORK TO DO, I BELIEVE, TO RESOLVE  
17 SOME OF THE ISSUES AMONG ITSELF. I THINK THAT IS THE  
18 CASE. I THINK THERE WILL BE A RESOLUTION, AND I THINK  
19 IT WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT, VERY STRONG ACCOUNT, WHAT'S  
20 HAPPENED HERE. BUT I THINK THAT GROUP DOES NEED TO  
21 SORT OUT THESE ISSUES. I HAVE NO DOUBT ABOUT THAT.

22 MR. LICHTENGER: I WOULD BE OPEN TO A  
23 CONFERENCE CALL.

24 CHAIRMAN DOMS: I WILL SAY, ZACH, ONCE YOU  
25 HAVE SORTED OUT THE ISSUES WITH THE ICOC, IF WE HAVE TO

1 HAVE A TELECONFERENCE MEETING PRIOR TO MAY 2D, WE WILL  
2 DO THAT.

3 MR. KASHIAN: THERE'S ONE OTHER THING I'D  
4 LIKE TO CLEAR UP FROM MY POINT OF VIEW. I'M NOT SURE  
5 WHAT EVERYBODY THINKS ABOUT CONSULTANTS AND WHAT WE'RE  
6 TALKING ABOUT PUBLIC HEARINGS, BUT I DON'T THINK  
7 ARCHITECTURAL PLANS SHOULD HAVE ANY PART IN THE INITIAL  
8 APPLICATION OR CONTRACTORS OR ANY OF THE TECHNICAL  
9 CONSTRUCTION ISSUES. THIS IS STRICTLY A SCIENTIFIC  
10 PROCESS AND IT HAS TO DEAL WITH ALL THE PEOPLE.

11 DOCTOR, I WOULD BE VERY PLEASED IF YOU COULD  
12 SET A SCHEDULE OR MEETINGS IN ADVANCE OF GETTING THE  
13 APPROVALS, AND DON'T MAKE IT A BIG THING. JUST MAKE  
14 SURE THAT EVERYBODY KNOWS THE HEARINGS ARE ON.

15 CHAIRMAN DOMS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU ALL.

16 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 3:20  
17 P.M.)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
210 KING STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA  
ON  
APRIL 13, 2007

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 S.E. BRISTOL STREET  
SUITE 100  
SANTA ANA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA  
(714) 444-4100