

BEFORE THE
SITE SEARCH COMMITTEE OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

DATE: MONDAY, MAY 2, 2005
2 P.M.

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

LOCATIONS: UCSF LAUREL HEIGHTS CAMPUS
3333 CALIFORNIA STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

UCLA
ROOM 17-187 CHS
10833 LE CONTE AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

BURNHAM INSTITUTE
ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ROOM
BUILDING 4
10901 N. TORREY PINES ROAD
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

CITY OF HOPE
ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ROOM
NEEDLEMAN BUILDING
1500 E. DUARTE ROAD
DUARTE, CALIFORNIA

UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER
3030-C, ELLISON BUILDING
4860 Y STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL CENTRAL CA.
G-155 (GARDEN LEVEL)
9300 VALLEY CHILDREN'S PLACE
MADERA, CALIFORNIA

BRS FILE NO. : 72287

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		3
CONSIDERATION OF SITE VISIT SCORES AND		7
CONSIDERATION OF FINALIST AND SECOND PLACE		
SITE FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC		
ADJOURNMENT		115

1 LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, MAY 2, 2005

2 02:00 PM

3

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'D LIKE TO BEGIN WITH A
5 ROLL CALL. AND, AMY DUROSS, WOULD YOU PLEASE READ THE
6 ROLL?

7 MS. DU ROSS: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.

9 MS. DU ROSS: BOB KLEIN.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.

11 MS. DU ROSS: SHERRY LANSING. RICHARD
12 MURPHY.

13 DR. MURPHY: HERE.

14 MS. DU ROSS: ED PENHOET.

15 DR. PENHOET: HERE.

16 MS. DU ROSS: CLAIRE POMEROY.

17 DR. POMEROY: HERE.

18 MS. DU ROSS: PHYLLIS PRECIADO.

19 DR. PRECIADO: HERE.

20 MS. DU ROSS: JOHN REED.

21 DR. REED: HERE.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THAT SHERRY? DID YOU
23 JUST COME ON? OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO PUT A VERY QUICK
24 CALL INTO SHERRY LANSING. ALL RIGHT.

25 WE HAVE A CHALLENGING AGENDA HERE TODAY. AND

1 WE LOOK FORWARD TO MOVING THROUGH THE DISCUSSION OF THE
2 FOUR CANDIDATES ON OUR SHORT LIST. WE ARE GOING TO
3 HAVE TO MOVE EXPEDITIOUSLY THROUGH THE PROCESS GIVEN
4 THAT WE ONLY HAVE TWO HOURS BEFORE WE LOSE A COUPLE OF
5 OUR MEMBERS ON THE PHONE. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT
6 SHERRY LANSING IS BEING HONORED AT UCLA TODAY. SHE HAS
7 A HARD STOP. AND, JOHN REED, MY UNDERSTANDING YOU HAVE
8 A HARD STOP AS WELL?

9 DR. REED: THAT'S CORRECT, YES.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WE NEED TO HAVE A
11 COOPERATIVE CULTURE HERE, WHICH IS EXEMPLARY IN ITS
12 ABILITY AT REAL TIME LEARNING, ASSIMILATION, AND
13 ACTION.

14 VERY QUICKLY WHILE WE ARE WAITING FOR SHERRY,
15 I WANT TO REPEAT A COMMON THEME, WHICH IS WE DO KNOW
16 WHO IS GOING TO WIN HERE TODAY. BECAUSE THE PATIENTS,
17 THE MEDICAL RESEARCHERS SERVING THOSE PATIENTS TO FIGHT
18 DISEASE AND THE TAXPAYERS OF CALIFORNIA WHO BACKED THE
19 INITIATIVE FOR RESEARCH TO ADVANCE MEDICAL THERAPIES TO
20 REDUCE HUMAN SUFFERING FOR CHRONIC DISEASE WILL ALL WIN
21 TODAY IN WHATEVER THE NOMINATION IS THAT COMES TO THE
22 BOARD OF THE INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.

23 WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE BOARD MAKES THE FINAL
24 DECISION. THIS IS A RECOMMENDATION, AND THE BOARD HAS
25 THE ABILITY TO EVALUATE ALL OF THE INFORMATION WE

1 PROVIDE THEM AND COME TO A DIFFERENT CONCLUSION.

2 BUT I WOULD LIKE TO THANK THE TIRELESS
3 EFFORTS OF MY BOARD MEMBERS THAT HAVE BEEN HEROIC. WE
4 CLEARLY BELIEVE THAT WE FIGHT DISEASE SEVEN DAYS A
5 WEEK. WE JUST CAME OFF OF A SEVEN DAY A WEEK COMMITTED
6 TO ADVANCE THE IDENTIFICATION OF OUR HEADQUARTERS.
7 THROUGH THIS PROCESS WE HAVE IDENTIFIED TREMENDOUS
8 ASSETS OF CITIES AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. THAT
9 PROCESS INCLUDED THE FOUR FINALISTS AND LOS ANGELES,
10 SAN JOSE, SAN MATEO COUNTY, LONG BEACH, RICHMOND. IT
11 INCLUDED THE GREAT CITIES OF THIS STATE AND THE
12 PHILANTHROPISTS, THE CHARITABLE DONORS FROM THOSE
13 CITIES WHO ARE TOGETHER AS A STATE DEDICATED TO
14 ADVANCING MEDICAL RESEARCH AND REDUCING HUMAN
15 SUFFERING.

16 I WANT TO SPECIFICALLY THANK THE CITY OF
17 SACRAMENTO, AND THE MAYOR, HEATHER FARGO, IS HERE
18 TODAY, FOR YOUR TREMENDOUS APPLICATION AND THE
19 COORDINATED PRESENTATION. IT WAS EXTRAORDINARY. AS
20 WAS THE PRESENTATION BY SAN FRANCISCO AND THE MAYOR OF
21 SAN FRANCISCO, NEWSOM, IS HERE AS WELL. IT WAS A
22 TREMENDOUS TOUR. ANOTHER EXTRAORDINARY APPLICATION.
23 EMERYVILLE AND SAN DIEGO PUT TOGETHER EXTRAORDINARY
24 APPLICATIONS AND TOURS FOR WHICH WE THANK THEM. AND IN
25 SAN DIEGO I'M CERTAIN THAT AT BURNHAM AND -- DR.

1 MURPHY, ARE YOU AT BURNHAM OR AT SALK?

2 DR. MURPHY: I'M AT BURNHAM.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MURPHY AND DR. REED,
4 PLEASE COMMUNICATE TO THE OTHER FAMOUS MR. MURPHY THAT
5 WE THANK THEM FOR THE TEAM EFFORT IN SAN DIEGO AND,
6 EMERYVILLE, PASS ALONG THE SAME THANKS.

7 BUT THE STRENGTH OF THESE COMMUNITIES REALLY
8 PROVIDES US WITH A TREMENDOUS CHALLENGE BECAUSE BEYOND
9 OUR HEADQUARTERS, IT'S CLEAR THAT THESE CITIES HAVE
10 COME TO THE TABLE WITH TREMENDOUS ASSETS, CIVIC ASSETS,
11 CHARITABLE GIVING ASSETS, AND RESEARCH ASSETS THAT MUST
12 BE A PART OF OUR EFFORTS IF WE'RE GOING TO REALIZE THE
13 POTENTIAL OF PROPOSITION 71. IN A PARTNERSHIP WITH THE
14 INSTITUTE, THESE CITIES AND CHARITABLE DONORS AND
15 RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS CAN CHANGE THE FACE OF MEDICINE.

16 IN THAT REGARD, I WOULD HOPE THAT WE
17 IMMEDIATELY GO FORWARD TO THE BOARD WITH A SUGGESTION
18 AT THE END OF THIS SESSION, WHICH WILL BE OUTSIDE OF
19 OUR BASIC TASK, THAT WE BEGIN CASE STUDIES OF HOW WE
20 CAN SUPPORT AND INCORPORATE THESE THINGS AND
21 COMMUNICATE TO THESE CITIES THAT WE WILL BE MOVING
22 IMMEDIATELY TO SUPPORT THEIR EFFORTS.

23 CASE STUDIES THAT WOULD IDENTIFY
24 REHABILITATION OF FACILITIES AT THEIR INSTITUTIONS THAT
25 WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO RESEARCH, CASE STUDIES THAT WOULD

1 IDENTIFY NEW CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, CASE STUDIES ON
2 CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, MAKING A MODEL OF EACH OF THOSE
3 OR MORE THAN ONE MODEL OF EACH OF THOSE GOALS AND
4 MOVING THROUGH A PROCESS IN A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE
5 CITIES AND INSTITUTES TO IDENTIFY HOW OUR RESOURCES AND
6 THE RESEARCH RESOURCES OF EACH REGION CAN BE OPTIMIZED
7 TO ADVANCE THIS RESEARCH AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

8 BUT OUR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION TODAY IS TO
9 MOVE THROUGH THE GRADING PROCESS. AND HAS SHERRY BEEN
10 ABLE TO JOIN US?

11 MS. BROWN: SHERRY WON'T BE HERE TILL ABOUT 3
12 O'CLOCK. THIS IS LAURA BROWN CALLING FROM HER OFFICE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE DO HAVE A QUORUM, AND WE
14 WILL PROCEED THROUGH THE PROCESS. OUR FIRST CHALLENGE,
15 GIVEN OUR TWO HOURS WE HAVE BEFORE US, IS TO DETERMINE
16 HOW ARE PEOPLE THAT WERE NOT PRESENT FOR THE TOURS
17 GOING TO VOTE. TO CATALYZE THE CONVERSATION, I WOULD
18 LIKE TO SPECIFICALLY SUGGEST THAT AFTER THE DISCUSSION
19 OF EACH ITEM IN EXHIBIT H, THAT THOSE WHO WERE NOT
20 PRESENT, HAVING BENEFITED FROM THE PRIOR SUBMISSION AND
21 THE DISCUSSION OF THOSE WHO DID ATTEND THE TOURS, THAT
22 THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT PRESENT WOULD BE ALLOWED THEN
23 TO VOTE. IT IS A BETTER SITUATION, SUBSTANTIALLY
24 BETTER THAN A JUDGE WHO IS LOOKING AT WITNESSES HE
25 DOESN'T KNOW, CAN'T JUDGE THEIR CREDIBILITY, AND

1 DOESN'T HAVE NECESSARILY MEANINGFUL SUBMISSIONS THAT
2 ARE ACCURATE BEFORE HIM. SO I THINK WE'RE GOING TO
3 HAVE SUBSTANTIAL INFORMATION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE
4 MEMBERS WHO WERE NOT ON THE TOURS.

5 I'D LIKE TO OPEN THAT ISSUE FOR DISCUSSION.
6 IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION FIRST FROM THE MEMBERS?

7 BUT BEFORE MY STAFF REMINDS ME LET ME SUGGEST
8 THAT ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM ANY OF THE
9 SITES THAT CANNOT WAIT TO BECOME PUBLIC COMMENTS WHEN
10 WE ACTUALLY TAKE ACTION ON THE APPLICATIONS? I WOULD
11 ASK FIRST AT UC DAVIS, ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS
12 HERE THAT WOULD NOT BE WILLING TO WAIT UNTIL WE ARE IN
13 A POSITION WHERE WE ARE CONSIDERING THE ACTUAL ACTION?

14 THERE ARE NONE IN UC DAVIS. GREAT CITY OF
15 SACRAMENTO WHICH BENEFITS FROM THE GREAT UNIVERSITY OF
16 DAVIS.

17 ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC AT
18 BURNHAM?

19 DR. REED: WE HAVE ONE HERE.

20 MS. SIGNAIGO-COX: MY NAME IS JANE
21 SIGNAIGO-COX WITH THE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL EDC. AND
22 BEFORE WE BEGIN, IT WOULD HELP IMMENSELY IF WE COULD
23 HAVE A CLARIFICATION, PLEASE. HAVING ATTENDED THE
24 APRIL 25TH, I BELIEVE, MEETING OF THIS GROUP, THERE
25 WERE SEVERAL ACTIONS THAT TOOK PLACE; AND SINCE THERE

1 HASN'T BEEN ANY MINUTES OUT, IT HASN'T BEEN CONFIRMED,
2 BUT IT SEEMED LIKE THERE WERE TWO ACTIONS, SO IT'S VERY
3 UNCLEAR WHAT THE VOTE WILL BE FOR TODAY. THERE WAS ONE
4 ACTION THAT CALLED FOR THE ORIGINAL MATRIX TO BE A
5 GUIDE ONLY THAT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED, AND THERE WAS
6 ANOTHER ONE TO HAVE IT COUNTED IN THE NUMBERS, AND THAT
7 YOU UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. SO THEY CONFLICT EACH OTHER
8 WHICH CAUSED SOME CONCERN AS TO WHAT IS THE ACTUAL
9 ACTIVITY OCCURRING TODAY.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GOOD QUESTION. I'M ONLY
11 AWARE OF THE SECOND ACTION THAT YOU REFERENCE. LET ME
12 TURN TO JAMES HARRISON. JAMES, COULD YOU CLARIFY THIS
13 FOR US? JAMES HARRISON IS THE COUNSEL FOR THE
14 INSTITUTE.

15 MR. HARRISON: BASED ON MY NOTES AND I
16 BELIEVE THE NOTES OF OTHERS WHO WERE PRESENT, THERE
17 WAS, IN FACT, A MOTION PROPOSED TO USE THE SCORING
18 MATRIX AS A GUIDE, BUT IT DID NOT RECEIVE A SECOND.

19 DR. MURPHY: JAMES, I'M SORRY. WE JUST HAD A
20 PLANE GO OVER VERY CLOSELY. COULD YOU REPEAT YOURSELF?
21 WE MISSED THAT BECAUSE OF AN AIRCRAFT ABOVE US.

22 MR. HARRISON: LET ME START OVER. THERE WAS,
23 IN FACT, A MOTION TO USE THE SCORING MATRIX AS A GUIDE
24 ONLY, BUT IT DID NOT RECEIVE A SECOND AND WAS NOT VOTED
25 UPON. AND THE MOTION THAT WAS MADE AT THE END BY

1 DR. FRIEDMAN AND WAS SECONDED BY DR. PENHOET AND WHICH
2 CARRIED WAS TO ADD THE SCORE FROM ATTACHMENT H TO THE
3 SCORES DEVELOPED BY THE DGS AND CIRM STAFF AND SEND THE
4 FIRST AND SECOND HIGHEST SCORES TO THE ICOC AS THE
5 COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ALONG WITH THE SCORES OF THE
6 OTHER TWO CITIES.

7 DR. MURPHY: RICH MURPHY. I THINK THAT WAS
8 GENERALLY RIGHT, BUT I THINK WE ALSO SAID THAT WE WOULD
9 PRESENT THE TWO SCORES SEPARATELY SO THAT THE ICOC
10 COULD SEE WHAT WAS DONE IN PHASE I AND WHAT WAS DONE IN
11 PHASE II. AND SECONDLY, THAT THOSE SCORES WOULD BE
12 SCORES FOR GUIDANCE RATHER THAN DETERMINANT OF THE
13 DECISION.

14 MR. HARRISON: THE FIRST POINT YOU MADE IS
15 ACCURATE. THE SCORES WERE TO BE BROKEN OUT INTO -- THE
16 SCORES THAT THE DGS/CIRM TEAM CAME UP WITH USING THE
17 SCORING MATRIX AND THEN PRESENTED SEPARATELY WOULD BE
18 THE SCORES BASED ON ATTACHMENT H. THEY WOULD BE ADDED
19 TOGETHER, AND IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WHAT
20 DR. FRIEDMAN PROPOSED AND WHAT THE COMMITTEE AGREED
21 UPON WAS THAT THE FIRST AND SECOND HIGHEST SCORES WOULD
22 BE CONSIDERED THE RECOMMENDED FINALISTS AND RUNNER-UP.
23 AS MR. KLEIN NOTED EARLIER, THE ICOC CAN RECONSIDER
24 THIS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION IF IT CHOOSES TO DO SO.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WHAT YOU MAY BE

1 REFERRING TO, DR. MURPHY, IS THAT WE SPECIFICALLY
2 REFERENCED THE FACT THAT THE ICOC IS NOT BOUND BY THESE
3 SCORES.

4 DR. MURPHY: THAT'S RIGHT, BOB. THAT'S
5 EXACTLY RIGHT, YEAH.

6 DR. PRECIADO: SO DID SCORES -- TOTAL SCORES
7 PRIOR TO THE MOTION ARE THE SCORES THAT WE CAN GO BY,
8 CORRECT?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE SCORES FROM THE FIRST
10 STAGE OF THE PROCESS STAND AS THE SCORES THAT WERE
11 ADOPTED FOR THAT STAGE OF THE PROCESS. AND THE SCORES
12 THAT WE ARE ABOUT TO DECIDE ON TODAY WILL BE SEPARATELY
13 IDENTIFIED AS THE SCORES FOR THE SECOND STAGE OF THE
14 PROCESS, BUT THE COMBINED SCORE WILL DETERMINE OUR
15 PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION AND OUR SECONDARY
16 RECOMMENDATION, ALTHOUGH THE ICOC CAN, IN FACT, DEPART
17 FROM THAT CONCLUSION.

18 DR. REED: JOHN REED HERE FROM BURNHAM. I
19 WISH WE HAD A TRANSCRIPT FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING
20 BECAUSE MY RECOLLECTION OF THE FIRST MOTION WAS THAT WE
21 AGREED TO ACCEPT THE SCORES PRESENTED IN THE FIRST
22 MATRIX THAT TOTALS THE 200 POINTS WITH THE
23 UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WOULD BE USED TO PROVIDE
24 GUIDANCE, BUT NOT IN A LITERAL SENSE.

25 AND THE REASON FOR THAT WAS BECAUSE AS WE ARE

1 SITTING AROUND THE TABLE, VARIOUS REPRESENTATIVES FROM
2 DIFFERENT MUNICIPALITIES WERE POINTING OUT SOME OF THE
3 POTENTIAL FLAWS IN THE WAY THE SCORES WERE ASSIGNED ON
4 SPECIFIC TOPICS. AND RATHER THAN GO THROUGH WITH A
5 FINE-TOOTHED COMB ON EVERY NUMBER AND REALLY CHALLENGE
6 WHETHER EACH NUMBER WAS TRULY ACCURATE, I THOUGHT WE
7 AGREED TO ACCEPT THEM WITH THE IDEA THAT THEY WOULD BE
8 USED IN A GENERAL SENSE, BUT NOT IN A LITERAL SENSE TO
9 ACTUALLY TALLY UP NUMBERS AND DECIDE BASED ON THE
10 QUANTITATION THAT WE IDENTIFIED A WINNER.

11 DR. PENHOET: WE -- THIS WAS THE ITEM
12 DISCUSSED UNTIL THE VERY END OF THE MEETING, AND WHAT
13 WE DID AGREE WAS TO USE THESE SCORES, I THINK, IN THE
14 WAY THAT BOB DESCRIBED. AND ALSO AS BOB DESCRIBED, WE
15 AGREED TO MAKE THE RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC BASED ON
16 THESE SCORES. IN FACT, MUCH OF OUR DISCUSSION LAST
17 TIME, AS YOU MAY REMEMBER, CENTERED AROUND ADDING THIS
18 ITEM 7, GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSIONS, TO, IN FACT, TAKE
19 INTO ACCOUNT THE SOMEWHAT MORE SUBJECTIVE OVERALL
20 IMPRESSION. IN FACT, OUR DISCUSSION REALLY CENTERED
21 AROUND THE PRECISE POINT SCORES THAT WE ENDED UP WITH
22 IN ATTACHMENT H, AND THAT DISCUSSION WAS IN RESPONSE TO
23 THE FACT THAT THESE WERE GOING TO BE USED IN THE WAY
24 BOB DESCRIBED THEM.

25 DR. PRECIADO: NOT ALL OF US WILL USE THAT.

1 DR. PRECIADO HERE.

2 DR. POMEROY: THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY. I MUST
3 SAY THAT MY RECOLLECTION IS THAT I MADE A MOTION THAT
4 USED THESE ONLY AS A GUIDE, AND IT FAILED TO GET A
5 SECOND, AND THAT'S WHEN THE OTHER MOTION WAS PUT FORTH.
6 SO I HAVE TO AGREE WITH THE SUMMARY THAT WAS GIVEN BY
7 COUNSEL.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: THIS IS MIKE FRIEDMAN, CLAIRE.
9 I REMEMBER IT THE SAME WAY YOU DO.

10 DR. PRECIADO: I WASN'T PRESENT. BUT IF
11 WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH THE PROCESS, I DON'T THINK WE
12 CAN CHANGE THE SCORES. DR. PRECIADO HERE. I WASN'T
13 PRESENT, AND I DON'T HAVE THE MINUTES.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WE HAVE A
15 CONSENSUS ON WHAT IT IS, BUT WE WILL MAKE AN EFFORT TO
16 ACCELERATE THE TRANSCRIPT, DR. REED, FOR YOUR REVIEW
17 BEFORE THE BOARD MEETING. AT THIS POINT, GIVEN THE
18 CONSENSUS BEFORE US AND THE TIMING, I BELIEVE WE SHOULD
19 PROCEED. IS THAT ACCEPTABLE TO YOU, DR. REED?

20 DR. REED: YES. I THINK THERE WAS ANOTHER
21 PUBLIC COMMENT IF THE PUBLIC'S ALLOWED TO MAKE
22 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.

23 MR. PANETTA: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. THIS
24 IS JOE PANETTA IN SAN DIEGO. LET ME ONCE AGAIN THANK
25 YOU AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COME

1 DOWN HERE YESTERDAY TO SEE WHAT WE HAVE TO OFFER.

2 MY COMMENT IS A PROCEDURAL ONE. IT'S
3 ACTUALLY A QUESTION. AND THAT IS THAT AT THE LAST
4 MEETING, THE PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE MEETING WAS
5 THAT THE MEETING WAS TO BE FROM 7:30 TO 9 A.M. IN THE
6 MORNING. AND CERTAIN DECISIONS WERE MADE AFTER THE
7 OFFICIAL TIME FOR THE MEETING. AND THOSE DECISIONS
8 WERE MADE WHEN SEVERAL -- AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF THE
9 COMMITTEE WAS NOT PRESENT.

10 I'D LIKE CLARIFICATION ON HOW THE PROCESS IS
11 GOING TO PROCEED TODAY. I KNOW THIS MEETING WAS
12 ANNOUNCED TO BE FROM 2 TO 4 O'CLOCK. AND I'M ASSUMING
13 THAT DECISIONS WILL BE MADE WITHIN THAT TIME PERIOD,
14 AND I AM CONCERNED THAT IF MEMBERS ARE NOT PRESENT, AS
15 HAPPENED AT THE LAST MEETING, THAT THERE MIGHT BE
16 CONFUSION ONCE AGAIN AS TO THE PROCEEDINGS. THANK YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. JOE, I THINK THAT
18 WE'RE GOING TO MAKE A HEROIC EFFORT TO GET THROUGH THIS
19 BY 4 O'CLOCK. AND MY UNDERSTANDING IS SHERRY LANSING
20 IS NOW PRESENT; IS THAT CORRECT?

21 MS. BROWN: NO. SHE WON'T BE HERE UNTIL 3
22 O'CLOCK.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I MISINTERPRETED AN E-MAIL
24 MESSAGE. BUT OBVIOUSLY, JOE, WE'RE TRYING TO GET
25 EVERYONE PRESENT FOR THE FINAL ACTIONS. AND THE -- MY

1 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT SHERRY AND JOHN ARE -- DR. REED
2 AND SHERRY LANSING ARE THE TWO INDIVIDUALS THAT HAVE A
3 4 O'CLOCK HARD STOP. POTENTIALLY, DR. REED, WE HAVE A
4 FEW MINUTES BEYOND THAT, BUT THAT'S ALL, RIGHT?

5 DR. REED: I'VE PUSHED TILL 4:30. I CAN STAY
6 UNTIL THEN.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE THAT'S THE
8 CONDITION FOR SHERRY LANSING? THAT'S INFORMATION.

9 WE ARE GOING TO TRY AND MAKE EVERY DECISION
10 WITH ALL OF THE MEMBERS PRESENT. LEGALLY WE'RE
11 REQUIRED TO HAVE A QUORUM, BUT IT IS IN ALL OF OUR
12 INTEREST TO MAKE SURE THAT WE TRY AND GET THROUGH THIS
13 WITH ALL OF THE MEMBERS PRESENT.

14 ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM THE
15 BURNHAM?

16 DR. REED: NONE HERE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY QUESTIONS FROM CITY OF
18 HOPE?

19 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY QUESTIONS FROM FRESNO?

21 DR. PRECIADO: I DON'T HAVE A QUESTION. I
22 JUST HAVE A COMMENT. GIVEN THAT I'M HEARING THE PUBLIC
23 COMMENT FROM SAN DIEGO, I HAVE SOME CONCERNS THAT WE'RE
24 NOT RESPECTING THEIR COMMENTS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, THE ISSUE, DR.

1 PRECIADO, IS THAT THE COMMITTEE WILL NOT ALWAYS BE ABLE
2 TO OPERATE TO SATISFY EVERYONE, BUT WE WILL DO ANYTHING
3 THAT WE HEROICALLY CAN DO TO MEET THOSE OBSTACLES OR
4 THOSE OBJECTIVES. AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE A DRIVING
5 PURPOSE HERE IS TO BE ABLE TO MEET OUR DEADLINES IN THE
6 PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION PROCESS AND IN THE RECRUITMENT
7 FOR SCIENTIFIC STAFF THAT IS CRITICAL TO MOVE OUR GRANT
8 PROCESS, AND THAT'S WHY WE'RE ON THIS TIME LINE.

9 SO THE ISSUE HERE IS THAT WE HAVE TO GET
10 THROUGH THIS AGENDA AS FAST AS WE CAN; BUT IF THE
11 COMMITTEE DECIDES TO VOTE TO HAVE -- TO STOP AT 4:15,
12 FOR EXAMPLE, OR 4:30, THE COMMITTEE'S WILL. I DON'T
13 CONTROL THAT. AND THE COMMITTEE AS A WHOLE HAS TO VOTE
14 ON THOSE OUTCOMES.

15 ARE THERE ANY OTHER ADDITIONAL PUBLIC
16 COMMENTS AT UCLA?

17 MS. BROWN: NONE.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY AT UC SAN FRANCISCO?

19 MS. SHREVE: NONE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. PROCEEDING WITH OUR
21 FIRST TASK, THE QUESTION BEFORE US IS TO THOSE WHO WERE
22 NOT PRESENT ON THE TOUR, HOW CAN WE BEST INCORPORATE
23 OUR COLLEAGUES AND OUR PEERS ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND
24 THEIR VOTES? IS THERE DISCUSSION ON THE GENERAL
25 CONCEPTUAL MATTER FOR THE PROPOSAL THAT I PUT FORWARD?

1 DR. POMEROY: I DO HAVE SOME CONCERNS ABOUT
2 THIS. I AGREE THAT IT WOULD BE IDEAL TO GET THOSE FROM
3 ALL OF THE MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE BECAUSE THE
4 SUBCOMMITTEE WAS VERY CAREFULLY CHOSEN TO BE AS
5 REPRESENTATIVE AS POSSIBLE. I'M NOT QUITE SURE HOW
6 WE'RE GOING TO -- PERHAPS YOU COULD CLARIFY YOUR
7 PROPOSAL -- HOW WE WOULD CONVEY THE IMPRESSIONS THAT WE
8 HAD, THOSE OF US WHO WERE ON THE SITE VISITS, TO THE
9 OTHER MEMBERS BECAUSE CERTAINLY THEY CAN'T VOTE ON THE
10 SITE VISITS WITHOUT SOME DISCUSSION OF WHAT WE SAW.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE CONCEPT, AS A CONCEPT
12 ALONE, IS THAT AS WE GO THROUGH EXHIBIT H, AFTER EACH
13 ITEM, WHERE THOSE WHO WERE PRESENT ON THE TOUR PROVIDE
14 THEIR COMMENTS IN THIS MEETING, THEN THE OTHER MEMBERS
15 WHO WERE NOT ON THE TOUR WOULD BE PERMITTED TO VOTE,
16 HAVING TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THE COMMENTS FROM THOSE
17 THAT WERE PRESENT. AND I BELIEVE THAT EACH REGION HAD
18 AT LEAST ONE MEMBER ON THE TOUR. IS THAT A CORRECT
19 STATEMENT? NO.

20 DR. PENHOET: NO. THERE WAS NO ONE FROM LOS
21 ANGELES.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BUT LOS ANGELES DID NOT HAVE
23 AN APPLICATION UNDER CONSIDERATION.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS MIKE
25 FRIEDMAN. I'M NOT SURE THAT'S A RELEVANT POINT. IT'S

1 TRUE, BUT I'M NOT SURE HOW RELEVANT IT IS. WE'RE ALL
2 SERVING IRRESPECTIVE -- WE'RE ALL SERVING BLIND TO OUR
3 NATIVE HOME. AS SOMEONE WHO WAS NOT ABLE TO SIT -- TO
4 PARTICIPATE DIRECTLY IN THESE SITE VISITS, I WOULD BE
5 VERY KEEN TO HEAR THE DISCUSSION. I HAVE READ THROUGH
6 THE MATERIALS. I DO WANT TO TRY AND DISTILL THE VIEWS
7 AND JUDGMENTS THAT WERE MADE BY THOSE WHO WERE ABLE TO
8 MAKE THE SITE VISITS.

9 AND THEN WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST IS CASTING MY
10 VOTE AT THE END AFTER THE BENEFIT OF THE DIRECT
11 OBSERVATIONS AND SYNTHESIS THAT THOSE WHO PARTICIPATED
12 COULD PROVIDE. IT'S NOT IDEAL. ON THE OTHER HAND, I
13 BELIEVE IT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE ADDITIONAL COMMENT?

15 DR. PRECIADO: I AGREE. I DON'T THINK THAT
16 WE'RE MAKING COMPLETELY BLIND ASSESSMENTS GIVEN THE
17 MATERIAL THAT WE HAVE GONE THROUGH.

18 DR. FRIEDMAN: I AGREE WITH YOU.

19 DR. MURPHY: RICH MURPHY. I ALSO WOULD LIKE
20 TO BENEFIT FROM THE DISCUSSION OF THOSE WHO WERE AT THE
21 SITE VISITS. THOSE OF US WHO DID ATTEND ALL OF THEM
22 NEVER SAT DOWN TO DISCUSS OUR THOUGHTS. AND PART OF MY
23 JUDGMENT WILL, I THINK, BE BASED UPON THE REFLECTIONS
24 OF THE OTHER PEOPLE ON THE COMMITTEE WHO WERE THERE.

25 SO I MIGHT SUGGEST THAT WHAT WE WOULD DO IS

1 GO THROUGH EACH ONE OF THE SITES FOR THOSE MEMBERS WHO
2 WERE THERE TO GIVE HIS OR HER IMPRESSIONS OF THE SITE,
3 ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM THOSE WHO WERE NOT AT THE SITE
4 VISITS, AND THEN BEGIN THE VOTING PRACTICE. DOES THAT
5 SOUND REASONABLE?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT SOUNDS REASONABLE. I,
7 IN FACT, PERSONALLY AM NOT GOING TO SCORE THIS UNTIL I
8 HEAR MY COLLEAGUES' IMPRESSIONS. SHOULD WE -- DR.
9 PENHOET HAS SUGGESTED THAT WE INFORM THE PUBLIC, WHO
10 MAY NOT HAVE BEEN ON EACH OF THE TOURS, WHO WAS PRESENT
11 ON THE TOURS. AND THE INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE PRESENT ON
12 THE TOURS WERE DR. PENHOET WAS ON ALL THE TOURS, I WAS
13 ON ALL THE TOURS, DR. POMEROY WAS ON ALL THE TOURS,
14 DR. MURPHY WAS ON ALL OF THE TOURS, AND PHYLLIS
15 PRECIADO WAS ON ALL THE TOURS EXCEPT SAN FRANCISCO,
16 ALTHOUGH SHE MADE GREAT EFFORTS TO GET THERE.

17 DR. PRECIADO: THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND WOULD -- DR. MURPHY,
19 WOULD YOU LIKE TO STATE THAT POSITION AS A MOTION?

20 DR. MURPHY: YES, I DO. SO MOVED.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

22 DR. PRECIADO: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW
24 SPECIFICALLY BOARD COMMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE
25 MOTION. BOARD COMMENTS ON THIS MOTION? HEARING NO

1 BOARD COMMENTS ON THIS MOTION, ARE THERE PUBLIC
2 COMMENTS ON THIS MOTION FROM UC SAN FRANCISCO?

3 MS. SHREVE: NO COMMENTS IN SAN FRANCISCO.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: UCLA?

5 MS. BROWN: NO COMMENTS HERE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BURNHAM?

7 DR. REED: NONE HERE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DAVIS, PUBLIC COMMENTS?
9 CITY OF HOPE?

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, THERE IS A COMMENT.

11 MR. ZANOW: AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO WAS
12 NOT ABLE TO GO ON ANY OF THE TOURS, I CERTAINLY WOULD
13 BENEFIT FROM BEING BROUGHT UP TO DATE ON YOUR
14 IMPRESSIONS.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
16 CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, FRESNO?

17 DR. PRECIADO: NONE.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. HEARING NO COMMENTS,
19 I'D LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION, AND WITH A ROLL CALL
20 VOTE. TO EXPEDITE I WILL CALL THE ROLL.

21 DR. FRIEDMAN.

22 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOB KLEIN, I VOTE YES.
24 SHERRY LANSING IS NOT PRESENT. DR. MURPHY.

25 DR. MURPHY: YES.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET.
2 DR. PENHOET: YES.
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.
4 DR. POMEROY: YES.
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO.
6 DR. PRECIADO: CAN I ASK YOU TO REPEAT IT?
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. DR. MURPHY, DR.
8 PRECIADO IS ASKING YOU TO RESUMMARIZE YOUR MOTION,
9 PLEASE.
10 DR. MURPHY: THE IDEA WOULD BE, PHYLLIS, IS
11 THAT THOSE OF US WHO WERE AT THE SITE VISITS WOULD GIVE
12 THE COMMITTEE OUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE SITE VISIT, AND WE
13 WOULD THEN OPEN IT UP FOR DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FROM
14 THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. AND ONCE WE GO THROUGH
15 ALL OF THE SITES, WE WOULD THEN BEGIN THE VOTING ON
16 EACH SITE IN A WAY THAT REFLECTS THE COMMENTS THAT WE
17 HAVE MADE. AND ALSO THAT THOSE FOLKS WHO WERE NOT AT
18 THE SITE VISITS WOULD THEN HAVE THE ABILITY TO VOTE AS
19 THEY SEE FIT BASED UPON THE COMMENTS.
20 DR. PRECIADO: YES, I AGREE.
21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND DR. REED.
22 DR. REED: YES.
23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION CARRIES.
24 THE SECOND QUESTION WE NEED TO ADDRESS IS ON
25 THE VOTING ITSELF. IS IT OUR INTENTION TO PROCEED BY

1 DEVELOPING A CONSENSUS ON THE SCORING FOR EACH PROJECT
2 FOR EACH CATEGORY, OR IS IT OUR INTENTION TO AVERAGE
3 ALL THE VOTES FOR EACH PROJECT, OR IS IT OUR INTENTION
4 TO FOLLOW AN APPRAISAL PROCESS, PROCEDURE, OR PROTOCOL
5 WHICH WOULD, FOR EXAMPLE, ELIMINATE ANY SCORE THAT WAS
6 DEVIATED BY 25 PERCENT BY THE NEXT NEAREST SCORE SO ANY
7 OUTLYING SCORES THAT WERE SUBSTANTIALLY OUT OF THE NORM
8 WOULD BE ELIMINATED IN ORDER TO THEN GET TO THE SCORES
9 THAT WERE MORE REASONABLY REPRESENTATIVE OF A CONSENSUS
10 AND AVERAGE THOSE SCORES?

11 WHAT WOULD THE COMMITTEE LIKE TO DO IN THE
12 SCORING PROCESS?

13 DR. PRECIADO: WHAT DOES COUNSEL SUGGEST?

14 MR. HARRISON: ULTIMATELY IT'S A POLICY
15 JUDGMENT FOR THE COMMITTEE TO MAKE.

16 DR. PENHOET: I'D LIKE TO ARGUE FOR AVERAGING
17 ALL THE SCORES. I THINK IF WE AVERAGE -- FIRST OF ALL,
18 I SECOND WHAT DR. FRIEDMAN SAID. THIS IS A VERY GOOD
19 GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING THEIR VERY BEST TO BE
20 OBJECTIVE ABOUT THESE ANALYSES. AND I THINK BY
21 AVERAGING ALL THE SCORES, EVERY VOTE COUNTS, SO TO
22 SPEAK, AND SO I THINK I PERSONALLY WOULD BE MOST
23 COMFORTABLE AVERAGING ALL THE SCORES.

24 DR. PRECIADO: I AGREE WITH DR. PENHOET.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.

1 DR. POMEROY: THAT'S THE SYSTEM THAT WE USE
2 WHEN WE EVALUATE PROPOSALS AT THE NIH, FOR EXAMPLE, AND
3 I'M QUITE COMFORTABLE WITH THAT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY OTHER DISCUSSION BY THE
5 BOARD? WOULD SOMEONE MAKE THAT INTO A MOTION?

6 DR. PENHOET: I SO MOVE, THAT WE HAVE THE
7 DISCUSSION, INDIVIDUALLY INDICATE OUR SCORES, AND THAT
8 THE FINAL SCORE WILL BE THE AVERAGE OF THE SCORES THAT
9 WE INDICATE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. IS THERE A SECOND?

11 DR. PRECIADO: SECOND.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION IS MADE AND SECONDED.
13 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

14 DR. POMEROY: CLARIFICATION. ARE WE GOING TO
15 STATE OUT LOUD OUR SCORES IN EACH OF THE SUBCATEGORIES
16 OR JUST THE TOTAL SCORE?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO DISCUSS EACH
18 OF THE SUBCATEGORIES. ARE WE GOING TO DISCUSS OUR --
19 IS YOUR MOTION TO DO THIS WHERE WE'RE GOING TO AVERAGE
20 THEM BY SUBCATEGORY OR JUST BY THE FINAL TOTAL?

21 DR. PENHOET: I THINK WE HAVE -- MY MOTION
22 WOULD BE -- THIS MAY BE A SEPARATE MOTION, BUT I THINK
23 WE WILL HAVE TO ARTICULATE OUR SCORE FOR EACH CATEGORY
24 AND RECORD THE INDIVIDUAL SCORES ACROSS THE ENTIRE
25 GROUP FOR EACH CATEGORY AND THEN AVERAGE THOSE SCORES

1 TO ASSIGN A CONSENSUS NUMBER TO THE CATEGORY.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

3 DR. PENHOET: IT'S A TIME-CONSUMING PROCESS,
4 SO WE'LL HAVE TO BE BRIEF IN OUR COMMENTS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. PUBLIC COMMENT,
6 UC SAN FRANCISCO.

7 MS. SHREVE: NO COMMENTS IN SAN FRANCISCO.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: UCLA.

9 MS. BROWN: NOT HERE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BURNHAM.

11 DR. REED: NONE HERE.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: UC DAVIS, ANY PUBLIC
13 COMMENTS? CITY OF HOPE?

14 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO, THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF
16 CENTRAL CALIFORNIA, FRESNO?

17 DR. PRECIADO: NO.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. CALL THE
19 QUESTION.

20 DR. FRIEDMAN.

21 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOB KLEIN, YES. DR. MURPHY.

23 DR. MURPHY: YES.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET.

25 DR. PENHOET: YES.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.
2 DR. POMEROY: YES.
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO.
4 DR. PRECIADO: YES.
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. REED.
6 DR. REED: YES.
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. PROTOCOL IS
8 BEFORE US. LET US GO TO THE EXHIBIT H. FIRST ITEM IS
9 FUNCTION. OPTIMAL FUNCTIONAL ABILITY TO ACHIEVE THE
10 MISSION OF THE INSTITUTE AND TO RECEIVE RFP MINIMUM
11 REQUIREMENTS AND PREFERENCES.
12 DR. MURPHY: BOB, RICH MURPHY. I GUESS I
13 MISUNDERSTOOD, BUT I THINK MY MOTION WAS THAT WE WOULD
14 HAVE A GENERAL DISCUSSION FIRST BY THOSE WHO WENT TO
15 THE SITE VISITS TO GIVE THEIR GENERAL IMPRESSIONS. AND
16 ONCE WE WENT OVER ALL OF THE SITE VISITS, THERE WOULD
17 BE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR QUESTIONS, AND THEN WE WOULD GO
18 TO THE VOTING BY THE CRITERIA. THAT WAS THE INTENT OF
19 MY MOTION.
20 DR. POMEROY: RICH, YOUR POINT IS INTERESTING
21 BECAUSE I'M AFRAID IF WE DISCUSS EVERY SUBCATEGORY
22 SEPARATELY AND DON'T TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE SORT OF
23 OVERLAP COMMENTS, WE MIGHT BE HERE FOREVER.
24 DR. PENHOET: WE COULD DISCUSS THE GENERAL
25 IMPRESSIONS CATEGORY FIRST SINCE IT DOES TAP IN --

1 DR. POMEROY: FAIR ENOUGH.

2 DR. PENHOET: -- WITH LOTS OF OTHER THINGS
3 AND SEE THE SCORES FOR THAT CATEGORY, AND THEN MOVE TO
4 THE OTHER CATEGORIES. THAT WOULD BE ONE WAY TO DEAL
5 WITH THIS ISSUE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE CHAIR IS OPEN. THE
7 QUESTION IS, VERY QUICKLY, THE -- CAN I JUST QUICKLY GO
8 THROUGH FOR THOSE PEOPLE PARTICULARLY WHO WERE NOT
9 PRESENT. DR. FRIEDMAN, WOULD IT BE MORE HELPFUL TO DO
10 A GENERAL DISCUSSION AND THEN GO THROUGH EACH ITEM MORE
11 SUCCINCTLY, OR WOULD IT BE BETTER TO GO THROUGH EACH
12 ITEM AND DIRECT COMMENTS TO THE ITEM?

13 DR. FRIEDMAN: I WOULD APPRECIATE SOME
14 OVERALL COMMENTS, BUT I MEAN I THINK FOR THE PURPOSES
15 OF DISCIPLINE, GIVEN HOW LITTLE TIME WE HAVE, THAT WE
16 NEED TO TRY AND AVOID GENERAL COMMENTS. THESE ARE FOUR
17 VERY FINE PROPOSALS, AND I'M NOT SURE THAT WE NEED TO
18 DETAIL -- TO REPEAT THAT OR TO REPEAT THE MATERIALS
19 THAT WE'VE ALREADY BEEN GIVEN. NEW INSIGHTS,
20 UNEXPECTED FINDINGS GOOD OR LESS THAN GOOD, THAT WOULD
21 BE VERY HELPFUL TO ME. THE GESTALT THAT THE SITE
22 VISITORS HAD LOOKING AT THAT, WHAT WOULD THIS PLACE BE
23 LIKE TO WORK IN IN TERMS OF REALLY CREATING SOME
24 SYNERGIES WITH THE SURROUNDING SCIENTISTS, WITH THE
25 INSTITUTIONS, AND SO FORTH. SOME OF THOSE THINGS WOULD

1 BE VERY HELPFUL FOR ME TO HEAR.

2 I THINK THE NUMBERS WILL BE THE NUMBERS, AND
3 I REALLY DO TRUST THE SCORING THAT YOU ALL GAVE. BUT
4 IF YOU COULD JUST TALK ABOUT SOME OF THE THINGS THAT
5 WOULDN'T BE CAPTURED BY THE NUMBERS OR SOME OF THE
6 THINGS THAT WERE UNEXPECTED, MAYBE A SITE DIDN'T REALLY
7 DISPLAY SOME OF THE STRENGTHS THAT THEY HAD UNTIL YOU
8 GOT THERE AND SAW IT. THAT'S JUST ME. BUT I'M REALLY
9 FLEXIBLE ABOUT THIS.

10 IF OTHERS ON THE COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE IT DONE
11 A DIFFERENT WAY, I'M PERFECTLY COMFORTABLE WITH THAT.
12 IT'S JUST A SUGGESTION.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WOULD THAT MEET YOUR
14 REQUIREMENTS AND YOUR UNDERSTANDING, DR. MURPHY?

15 DR. MURPHY: IT WOULD, BOB. I GUESS WHAT I
16 HAD THOUGHT FOR THOSE WHO WEREN'T THERE, MAYBE SOME
17 GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE PRESENTATION.
18 I AGREE WITH MICHAEL. WE DON'T WANT TO GO THROUGH THE
19 NUMBERS. ALL OF THAT IS IN THE BOOK. AND THEN MAYBE
20 TALK ABOUT OUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE STRENGTHS AND
21 WEAKNESSES OF EACH OF THE SITES. HOPEFULLY THAT WOULD
22 BE --

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GIVEN THAT WE HAVE A
24 SHORTNESS OF TIME AND GIVEN THAT YOU MADE THE MOTION,
25 I'M GOING TO GO WITH YOUR INTERPRETATION. I WOULD LIKE

1 YOU TO BEGIN.

2 DR. MURPHY: YOU SURE? I WILL BEGIN -- SHALL
3 WE DO EACH SITE, AND PERHAPS EVERY MEMBER WOULD DO
4 THEIR IMPRESSION OF THAT SITE?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S APPROPRIATE.

6 DR. MURPHY: THE FIRST SITE WAS SAN
7 FRANCISCO. I THOUGHT THE MAYOR DID AN EXCELLENT JOB IN
8 PRESENTING SEVERAL POINTS THAT HE FELT WERE VERY
9 STRONG. THE INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO,
10 ITS STABILITY AS A CITY, THE CONVENIENCE OF
11 TRANSPORTATION FOR STAFF, THE QUALITY AND ACCESSIBILITY
12 OF HOTEL ROOMS. HE STRESSED THE FINANCIAL VALUE OF THE
13 INCENTIVES. THERE WAS AN OFFER OF 46,000 SQUARE FEET
14 OF SPACE FOR RESEARCH THAT HAD BEEN, I THINK, GIVEN UP
15 BY THE GLADSTONE. IT WASN'T CLEAR WHAT THAT WAS GOING
16 TO BE USED FOR, BUT IT WAS MADE AVAILABLE.

17 HE STRESSED THE CLOSENESS OF THE THREE
18 UNIVERSITIES, WHICH INCLUDED MISSION BAY UCSF AND THE
19 GLADSTONE, STANFORD, AND BERKELEY, AS WELL AS 17 OTHER
20 UNIVERSITIES. THE FACT THAT THE PART OF TOWN THAT THE
21 SITE WILL BE IN IS NEAR THE BALLPARK AND NEW HOUSING,
22 AND THAT THAT PART OF THE CITY HAS BEEN UNDERGOING
23 RENOVATIONS. THE PROXIMITY OF THE NEW UCSF CAMPUS AND
24 ITS FACILITIES WHICH ARE ANYWHERE FROM A QUARTER MILE
25 TO A HALF MILE AWAY. THE STRENGTH AND THE HISTORY OF

1 THE BIOTECH CLUSTER IN SAN FRANCISCO, AND THE SUPPORT
2 OF THE COMMUNITY POLITICALLY FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH.

3 TO ME THE STRENGTHS OF THE PRESENTATION AND
4 OF THE VISIT ARE THAT SAN FRANCISCO IS AN ATTRACTIVE
5 PLACE TO VISIT FOR NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL
6 SCIENTISTS AND VISITORS, THE CONVENIENCE OF
7 TRANSPORTATION, THE POLITICAL SUPPORT THAT THEY HAVE IN
8 SAN FRANCISCO, PROXIMITY TO MISSION BAY AND UCSF AND
9 THE GLADSTONE.

10 THE MAYOR POINTED OUT THERE WILL BE NEW
11 HOUSING IN THE AREA AND THAT A NUMBER OF RENOVATIONS
12 ARE ONGOING TO REALLY MAKE THIS PART OF THE CITY
13 APPEALING.

14 THE WEAKNESSES THAT I SAW OF SAN FRANCISCO,
15 IT IS IN AN AREA THAT IS STILL UNDER DEVELOPMENT. THE
16 PRECISE SITE IS ON THE THIRD FLOOR OF A MULTIUSE
17 BUILDING WHERE THERE ARE ABOVE THE SITE, I THINK, 590
18 CONDOMINIUM UNITS, AND ON THE BOTTOM OF THE SITE ON THE
19 FIRST FLOOR THERE ARE RETAIL OUTLETS, WHICH INCLUDED
20 BORDERS AND SAFEWAY.

21 THE EAST VIEW OF THE SITE IS KING STREET
22 WHERE THERE IS A TROLLY WITH DIRECTLY OPPOSITE THE SITE
23 CONDOS WITH RETAIL SPACE ON THE BOTTOM FLOOR. THE VIEW
24 TO THE NORTH CONTAINS A MCDONALD'S, SEVERAL FOOD
25 OUTLETS, A HAPPY DONUTS, A NIGHT CLUB AND BAR. IT'S

1 CLEARLY A DOWNTOWN LOCATION, AS WAS STRESSED IN THE
2 PRESENTATION. THE VIEW TO THE SOUTH DOESN'T EXIST
3 BECAUSE THE BUILDING ABUTS ANOTHER.

4 THERE IS NO OUTSIDE ACCESS OF THIS SITE TO
5 THE OUTSIDE. IN OTHER WORDS, ONCE YOU'RE ON THE THIRD
6 FLOOR, YOU ARE THERE. AND SO THERE ARE NO -- AS SOME
7 OF THE SITES HAD NO OUTSIDE TERRACES FOR DISCUSSIONS,
8 RELAXING, ETC. THE BUILDING -- THE ENTRANCE TO THE
9 BUILDING, WE WERE TOLD, IS GOING TO BE RENOVATED, AND
10 CURRENTLY IT'S A LITTLE BIT INDIRECT, BUT I'M SURE THAT
11 THE ENTRANCE TO THE ELEVATOR CAN BE IMPROVED.

12 THE SURROUNDINGS OF THE BUILDING ARE REALLY A
13 CITY LANDSCAPE WHERE THERE IS NO PLACE TO SIT, NO
14 GRASS, NONE OF THE THINGS THAT ONE WOULD HOPE ONE COULD
15 HAVE FOR AN AREA WHERE SCIENTISTS OR STAFF COULD SHARE
16 IDEAS. I'M SURE THIS WILL IMPROVE WHEN THE MISSION BAY
17 SITE IS PUT INTO PLACE.

18 THE ARGUMENT WAS MADE THAT SAN FRANCISCO IS A
19 BIOTECH CLUSTER, AND, OF COURSE, IT IS, BUT THERE WERE
20 NO BIOTECH, AT LEAST FROM WHAT I SAW, NO BIOTECH
21 ORGANIZATIONS CLOSE-BY THE SITE. AND I THINK
22 REALISTICALLY THE ONE LINKAGE THAT THE SITE HAS IS WITH
23 UCSF MISSION BAY CAMPUS AND THE GLADSTONE. BERKELEY
24 AND STANFORD ARE CERTAINLY IN THE REGION, BUT I THINK
25 ON A DAILY BASIS ARE NOT A FACTOR.

1 SO I THOUGHT THOSE WERE THE STRENGTHS AND
2 WEAKNESSES OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSAL.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MURPHY, TO GET THROUGH
4 THIS, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ESSENTIALLY HAVE EACH
5 PERSON, I THINK, TALK ABOUT THE DISTINGUISHING
6 CHARACTERISTICS, TWO OR THREE DISTINGUISHING
7 CHARACTERISTICS AND STRENGTHS, TWO OR THREE WEAKNESSES
8 ON EACH SITE. BUT IT'S VERY CLEAR YOU PAID CLOSE
9 ATTENTION TO THAT TOUR.

10 I THINK YOU WILL FIND A RANGE OF PERCEPTION,
11 BUT THE KEY IS LET'S TALK ABOUT TWO OR THREE WEAKNESSES
12 UNLESS IT IS COMPELLING EVIDENCE THAT IS LONGER. IF
13 YOU ARE GOING GO THROUGH YOUR OTHER SITES, DR. MURPHY?
14 I THINK DR. PENHOET IS INDICATING WE SHOULD GO THROUGH
15 ALL THE SAME SITE SO WE HAVE THE COMPARISON.

16 DR. PENHOET, SINCE YOU'RE SEATED HERE, WOULD
17 YOU GO THROUGH SAN FRANCISCO?

18 DR. PENHOET: WELL, I AGREE WITH MUCH OF WHAT
19 DR. MURPHY HAS STATED. AND TO SOME DEGREE A NUMBER OF
20 US COMMENTED THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT AN ISSUE OF
21 PERSONALITY FOR THIS ORGANIZATION BECAUSE THE
22 PERSONALITIES ARE QUITE DIFFERENT. IT IS AN URBAN
23 LOCATION. IT CAN BE SEEN AS EITHER A STRENGTH OR A
24 WEAKNESS, AND IT DEPENDS WHETHER YOU LIKE URBAN
25 LOCATIONS. IT'S CLOSE TO A COFFEE SHOP. I THINK ONE

1 OF THE ADVANTAGES IS THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE GINSLER
2 FIRM, WHICH IS THE LARGEST ARCHITECTURAL FIRM IN THE
3 U.S., WHO HAS AGREED PRO BONO TO PROVIDE AB INITIO
4 INTERIOR DESIGN SPACE FROM THAT FIRM FOR THE
5 ORGANIZATION.

6 I THINK MANY OF THE FEATURES THAT DR. MURPHY
7 INDICATED WERE EVIDENT IN SAN FRANCISCO, AND IT'S
8 CLEARLY A VERY ATTRACTIVE LOCATION FOR PEOPLE WHO ENJOY
9 LIVING IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING
10 EXTRAORDINARILY GOOD ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

11 I THINK ON THE WEAKNESS SIDE, I ALSO NOTED
12 THAT THERE WERE NO REPRESENTATIVES FROM UCSF OR FROM
13 THE BIOTECH COMMUNITY PRESENT DURING OUR VISIT,
14 ALTHOUGH THEY'RE WELL REPRESENTED IN THE COMMUNITY.
15 AND SO I THOUGHT THAT WAS THE ONE NEGATIVE FACTOR THAT
16 PERHAPS STOOD OUT IN MY MIND ABOUT THE SAN FRANCISCO
17 VISIT.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. AND I
19 WOULD SAY THAT, AND I WILL TRY AND MAKE THIS VERY
20 CLEAR, COMPACT TO SUMMARIZE MY COMMENTS GOING FORWARD.
21 SAN FRANCISCO IS CLEARLY A CLASS A OFFICE SITE, AND IT
22 HAS ACCESS TO LANDSCAPE BOULEVARDS ALONG THE BAY FOR
23 RUNNING. RUNNING TRAILS AT AN URBAN SITE ARE
24 UNPARALLELED. THE FACT THAT IT HAS CONFERENCE
25 FACILITIES THAT CAN GO TO 150, 25, A HUNDRED, A HUNDRED

1 FIFTY, IT CAN GO TO A THOUSAND, OR IT CAN GO TO 40,000
2 IS IMPORTANT. THE BIOTECH CONFERENCE LAST YEAR WAS
3 20,000. OVER A PERIOD OF TEN YEARS, THIS INSTITUTE
4 WILL NEED TO ATTRACT THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST FROM THE
5 NATION, THE WORLD. AND IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO HAVE
6 FREE CONFERENCE FACILITIES THAT ARE VERY CLOSE TO THE
7 SITE. THE MOSCONE CENTER IS A MATTER OF FEW BLOCKS.
8 THE FACILITIES AT UC SAN FRANCISCO WERE EXTRAORDINARY,
9 AS WERE THE GLADSTONE INSTITUTE.

10 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE, TOO, I
11 THINK, THE COMMENT THAT WAS MADE ABOUT THE EMBASSIES IN
12 THE CITY. EVIDENTLY THERE ARE MORE THAN 50 DIFFERENT
13 EMBASSIES IN THE CITY. IN THE LAST THREE WEEKS WE'VE
14 MET WITH THE CONSULS FROM BRITAIN, THE CONSUL FROM
15 SWEDEN, BOTH OF WHOM BROUGHT SCIENTISTS FROM AROUND THE
16 WORLD TO SEE WHAT THEY COULD DO WITH THE BRITAIN STEM
17 CELL BANK, TO SEE WHAT WE COULD WITH TRAINING THE
18 INSTITUTE, FOR EXAMPLE, SINGAPORE, SCOTLAND.

19 MY UNDERSTANDING IS THE CONSUL FACILITIES IN
20 CALIFORNIA ARE FOCUSED IN SAN FRANCISCO AND LOS
21 ANGELES. AND THOSE BRIDGES TO WORK WITH THOSE
22 GOVERNMENTS AROUND THE WORLD WERE NOT REPEATING
23 RESEARCH, BUT DOING COMPLEMENTARY RESEARCH AROUND THE
24 WORLD IS VERY IMPORTANT.

25 THE -- CERTAINLY I THINK THAT WE HAVE A

1 SITUATION HERE WHERE WE HAVE ARCHITECTS WHO ARE GOING
2 TO DO A CLASS A JOB IN SACRAMENTO, IN SAN DIEGO, IN
3 EMERYVILLE, AND IN SAN FRANCISCO. AND THE KEY, I
4 BELIEVE, HERE IS WHAT ARE THE OTHER RESOURCES THAT WE
5 CAN BRING TO OUR MISSION AND BEING ABLE TO HAVE THESE
6 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL CONFERENCES WITH FACILITIES
7 AND HOTEL ROOMS THAT MAKE IT ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE TO
8 GET NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTISE IS CRITICAL.

9 IF WE LOOK AT THE PRIOR MATERIALS AND WHAT WE
10 SAW IN THESE TOURS, WE REALIZE THAT THERE'S A MILLION
11 DOLLARS -- \$900,000 IN FREE OR DISCOUNTED HOTEL ROOMS
12 IN SAN FRANCISCO, WHICH IS NOT REPEATED IN ANY OF THE
13 OTHER SITES. AND I FELT THAT WAS IMPORTANT
14 FINANCIALLY, ALONG WITH THE SIZE OF THE CONFERENCE
15 FACILITIES.

16 DR. POMEROY.

17 DR. POMEROY: TO BE BRIEF, I THOUGHT THE
18 STRENGTHS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSAL INCLUDED THE
19 MAYOR'S LEADERSHIP AND ENTHUSIASM FOR THIS PROJECT. I
20 AGREE THAT THE HOTEL AND CONFERENCE FACILITIES WERE
21 ACTUALLY UNPARALLELED IN ANY OF THE OTHER PROPOSALS,
22 AND THAT THE INTERNATIONAL LOCATION WOULD BE A DRAW FOR
23 STEM CELLS.

24 THE WEAKNESSES, I THOUGHT, DESPITE THE
25 GENEROSITY OF THE DONATION OF THE FREE RENT, THE

1 BUILDING ITSELF DIDN'T REALLY PRESENT THE FACADE THAT I
2 WAS HOPING THAT WOULD SORT OF ATTRACT PEOPLE IN AND
3 GIVE US A FACE TO THE WORLD GIVEN ITS SORT OF LOCATION
4 UP ABOVE A BORDERS BOOK SHOP. I LOVE BORDERS, BY THE
5 WAY. JUST WANT THAT ON THE RECORD. I ALSO BELIEVE
6 THERE'S COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR THIS, BUT IT CERTAINLY
7 WAS NOT DEMONSTRATED ON THE SITE VISIT, WHICH IS WHAT
8 WE'RE RATING RIGHT NOW IN TERMS OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC
9 FOLKS.

10 AND PART OF THIS, AS DR. PRECIADO HAS
11 REPEATEDLY POINTED OUT, IS PULLING THE PUBLIC IN. AND
12 I WILL ATTEMPT TO REMAIN TOTALLY OBJECTIVE IN THIS, BUT
13 COST OF LIVING HAS TO BE PUT IN HERE. AND THE COST OF
14 RELOCATING BUSINESS HAS TO BE PUT IN HERE. SO SOME
15 REALLY PLUSES AND SOME REAL CONCERNS.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE SOME
17 GENERAL STATEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE ON SAN
18 FRANCISCO. AND DR. PRECIADO WAS NOT AT THAT TOUR. I
19 BELIEVE IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE, IF IT MEETS THE
20 COMMITTEE'S DESIRE, SINCE THE -- MAYBE I NEED TO MAKE
21 IT OPEN FOR COMMENT.

22 WE ARE HONORED BY THE PRESENCE OF MAYOR
23 NEWSOM FROM SAN FRANCISCO AND MAYOR FARGO FROM
24 SACRAMENTO.

25 THE QUESTION FOR THE COMMITTEE IS SHOULD WE,

1 WHEN THOSE CITIES ARE PRESENTED, GIVE THEM FIVE MINUTES
2 TO COMMENT, OR SHOULD WE, IN FACT, HOLD OUR COMMENTS TO
3 THE END WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS?

4 DR. PRECIADO: I DON'T THINK -- AGAIN, WE'RE
5 LOOKING AT TIME HERE. AND NOT ALL SITES HAVE THE MAYOR
6 PRESENT. I'M NOT TRYING TO SAY ANYTHING NEGATIVE HERE,
7 BUT I REALLY DO BELIEVE WE HAVE A PROCESS HERE THAT IS
8 GOING TO TAKE UP EVERY MINUTE THAT WE HAVE. AND I
9 THINK WE SHOULD LEAVE THE COMMENTS TO THE END.

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: I WOULD AGREE WITH THAT, MR.
11 CHAIRMAN. IT'S MIKE FRIEDMAN.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT SEEMS THAT THAT'S A
13 DEVELOPING CONSENSUS. SO WE WILL MOVE FORWARD.

14 DR. REED: MR. CHAIRMAN, JOHN REED. BEFORE
15 WE LEAVE THE SAN FRANCISCO, IF THAT'S OUR INTENT, I
16 JUST WONDER IF WE COULD ASK BOARD MEMBERS IF THEY HAD
17 ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT, OR DO YOU WANT US TO HOLD
18 OUR QUESTIONS TO THE END AS WELL?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE --
20 LET ME FIRST ASK BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE NOT PRESENT ON
21 THE TOUR IF THEY HAVE QUESTIONS.

22 DR. REED: I DO HAVE ONE. I JUST WANT TO
23 CLARIFY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE OTHERS THAT, AS I WAS
24 UNABLE TO ATTEND THE SITE VISITS DUE TO A PREVIOUS
25 OBLIGATION TO BE AT THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE, I

1 SENT AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC OUR FACILITIES DIRECTOR
2 FROM BURNHAM WITH A LIST OF A VARIETY OF ISSUES TO
3 INVESTIGATE ON MY BEHALF, AND HE'S DEBRIEFED ME ON HIS
4 FINDINGS. HE DID ATTEND ALL FOUR OF THE SITE VISITS,
5 AND HE'S HERE TODAY TO ANSWER ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.

6 I HAVE ONE QUESTION. THAT'S ABOUT THE MEGA
7 CONFERENCE FACILITIES AND THE ROLE OF THAT. THERE'S A
8 COUPLE QUESTIONS. I KNOW ALL THE MAJOR METROPOLITAN
9 AREAS HAVE MEGA CONFERENCE FACILITIES. THAT'S
10 CERTAINLY TRUE IN L.A. AND SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN DIEGO.
11 I THINK ALL THOSE FACILITIES WILL ACCOMMODATE 20,000
12 PLUS PEOPLE.

13 THE QUESTION I REALLY HAVE FOR THE COMMITTEE
14 IS DO WE ENVISION THAT INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES WILL
15 ALWAYS BE STEERED TO A SINGLE MUNICIPALITY IN THE
16 STATE, OR WILL WE TRY TO MIX IT UP AND HAVE EVERY
17 REGION IN THE STATE HAVE SOME REPRESENTATION IN TERMS
18 OF HOSTING THESE CONFERENCES?

19 I WOULD PERSONALLY HOPE IT'S THE LATTER SO
20 THAT THE WHOLE STATE PARTICIPATES AND THAT IT'S NOT ANY
21 ONE SINGLE MUNICIPALITY THAT'S SINGLED OUT AS THE SITE
22 FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES.

23 DR. PRECIADO: DR. REED, THIS IS DR.
24 PRECIADO. I AGREE. I SUPPORT YOUR COMMENT
25 WHOLEHEARTEDLY AS SOMEONE COMING FROM THE VALLEY AND AS

1 SOMEONE WHO DOES NOT GET THE OPPORTUNITY OF HAVING
2 THOSE KINDS OF CONFERENCES HERE IN THE VALLEY. IT IS
3 VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE NOT STAY AT ONE LOCALE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE KEY HERE, WHEN WE MADE
5 THE REQUEST FOR COMMITMENTS, DR. REED, THE KEY WAS TO
6 IDENTIFY AND LOCK IN AS A PART OF THIS NEGOTIATION FREE
7 CONFERENCE FACILITIES. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THE SAN
8 FRANCISCO CONFERENCE FACILITY IS BEING PROVIDED AT
9 MOSCONE FREE OF CHARGE. WHERE WE CAN AFFORD TO HAVE
10 CONFERENCES IS GOING TO BE A MATERIAL DRIVER SINCE WE
11 SPECIFICALLY LIMITED OUR OVERHEAD IN THE INSTITUTE TO
12 MAKE SURE THAT THE MONEY GOT TO RESEARCH.

13 AND TO THE EXTENT THAT WE CAN REACH OUT AND
14 LATER GET FREE FACILITIES FROM OTHER LOCATIONS, WHAT WE
15 HAVE TO JUDGE TODAY IS WHAT INDIVIDUAL CITIES SAID WERE
16 FREE CONFERENCE FACILITIES IN THEIR APPLICATION AND
17 THEY SHOWED US SPECIFICALLY. THAT'S THE PURPOSE OF
18 THAT SPECIFIC COMMENT, BUT CERTAINLY WE CAN HAVE
19 CONFERENCES, WHETHER NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL, AT
20 OTHER SITES.

21 SAN DIEGO HAS A PHENOMENAL CLUSTERING OF
22 FACILITIES, A TREMENDOUS CENTER OF EXCELLENCE THERE
23 THAT I WOULD HOPE WOULD DRAW CONFERENCES, BUT THESE ARE
24 FREE SITES THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE TO JUDGE AS A PART OF
25 THIS PROCESS.

1 DR. REED: THANK YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS, THEN,
3 FROM OTHER INDIVIDUALS WHO DID NOT ATTEND?

4 DR. FRIEDMAN: I HAVE NO ADDITIONAL
5 QUESTIONS. THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM
7 THOSE WHO DID ATTEND? SEEING NO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS
8 ON BOARD, I WOULD POINT OUT, IN TERMS OF THE FACTUAL
9 INFORMATION, THAT THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO DID HAVE A
10 LIST THERE OF 12 OR 13 DIFFERENT REPRESENTATIVES FROM
11 THE GOVERNMENTAL SECTOR THAT HAD BEEN SUPPORTIVE, ALONG
12 WITH BUSINESS SUPPORTERS. THEY DIDN'T HAVE THOSE
13 PEOPLE PRESENT, BUT THEY DID HAVE LISTS OF THEM PRESENT
14 TO EVIDENCE THE COMMITMENT. AND THERE'S EXTENSIVE
15 COMMITMENT IN WRITING THAT WAS PRESENTED TO US IN OUR
16 WRITTEN MATERIALS PREVIOUSLY. AND WE DEEPLY APPRECIATE
17 THAT SUPPORT FROM SAN FRANCISCO, SAN DIEGO, EMERYVILLE,
18 AND SACRAMENTO.

19 ALL RIGHT. WITH THAT PREAMBLE AND
20 INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION, ARE WE PREPARED TO MOVE TO
21 DISCUSS FUNCTION?

22 DR. PENHOET: DO YOU WANT TO DO IT FOR EACH
23 ONE OR COME BACK?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. IT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED
25 BY DR. POMEROY THAT AS A COMPARATIVE EVALUATION THAT WE

1 SHOULD PROCEED. AND THE CHAIR, I'M ADVISED, WILL TAKE
2 THAT RECOMMENDATION AND MOVE TO A DISCUSSION OF
3 EMERYVILLE, WHICH WAS THE SECOND CITY TO BE VISITED.
4 IF WE COULD -- ACTUALLY WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH
5 EVERYONE'S COMMENT ON SAN FRANCISCO. WE'RE GOING TO GO
6 THROUGH, DR. REED, ON ALL THE CITIES FIRST.

7 DR. PENHOET: WE'VE GONE THROUGH SAN
8 FRANCISCO, SO NOW WE GO TO EMERYVILLE AND HAVE THE SAME
9 PEOPLE.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE NOT GOING TO GO
11 THROUGH THE POINT SYSTEM THAT WE ASSIGNED ON SAN
12 FRANCISCO?

13 DR. PENHOET: AFTER THE END.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FINE. CLEARLY WE HAVE AN
15 OPEN PROCESS HERE. ON EMERYVILLE, CAN WE START WITH
16 DR. MURPHY.

17 DR. MURPHY: I WILL BE MUCH BRIEFER, BOB.
18 AND I APOLOGIZE FOR NOT BEING BRIEF ON THE FIRST ONE.

19 THE STRENGTH OF THIS PROPOSAL, I THINK, IS A
20 VERY NICE BUILDING WITH A VERY PLEASANT FOYER AS YOU
21 ENTER THE BUILDING THAT HAS A GARDEN AND CAFETERIA.
22 THE SITE ON THE THIRD FLOOR OF THE BUILDING WAS BRIGHT.
23 IT HAD ACCESS TO OPEN SPACE FOR DISCUSSIONS. IT ALSO
24 HAD DIRECT ACCESS TO THE STREET. AND IT WAS A BUILDING
25 WITH OPEN -- WITH THE WINDOWS COULD OPEN TO THE

1 OUTSIDE.

2 THE AREA WAS CLOSE TO TRANSPORTATION. THERE
3 WAS A NICE SHOPPING CENTER CLOSE-BY AND, OF COURSE,
4 IT'S ACROSS THE BRIDGE FROM SAN FRANCISCO, WHICH AND --
5 THAT BRIDGE IS ACCESSIBLE, ALTHOUGH SOMETIMES AFFECTED
6 BY TRAFFIC.

7 ALSO, EMERYVILLE STRESSED ITS TIES TO THE
8 BIOTECH INDUSTRY, SPECIFICALLY CHIRON AND CEDIS. THOSE
9 WERE THE STRENGTHS.

10 THE WEAKNESSES I FOUND WERE THERE ARE NO
11 UNIVERSITIES CLOSE-BY. THE PROPOSAL LARGELY RELIES ON
12 THE GENEROSITY OF CHIRON AND PIXAR FOR THE MEETING
13 FACILITIES THAT CIRM MIGHT USE IN ADDITION TO THE HOTEL
14 SPACE, WHICH SEEMS TO CREATE SOME PRESSURE ON THE
15 COMPANIES, AS WELL AS QUESTIONS ABOUT ACCESSIBILITY
16 BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THOSE COMPANIES NEED TO RELY ON THEIR
17 OWN BUSINESS NEEDS BEFORE THE CIRM. AND I FELT THAT
18 THAT WAS A DOWNSIDE OF THE PROPOSAL.

19 THOSE ARE MY COMMENTS.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PENHOET.

21 DR. PENHOET: I'VE CHOSEN TO RECUSE MYSELF
22 FROM THIS DISCUSSION BECAUSE CHIRON IN WHICH I'M A
23 DIRECTOR AND A SHAREHOLDER IS A JOINT SPONSOR OF THE
24 EMERYVILLE PROPOSAL, SO I WILL NOT DISCUSS NOR WILL I
25 VOTE ON EMERYVILLE.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS BOB
2 KLEIN. EMERYVILLE, SINCE WE ARE PHYSICALLY IN THE
3 BUILDING, HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF INFORMATION ON IT, BUT
4 I'LL LIMIT IT TO WHAT WAS PRESENTED IN THE TOUR BECAUSE
5 THE TOUR WAS A DIFFERENT SPACE THAN THE ONE IN WHICH WE
6 RESIDE IN. WE HAD NOT PREVIOUSLY SEEN THAT SEPARATE
7 SPACE BECAUSE I WANTED TO SEE IT ONLY THROUGH THE TOUR.

8 I WOULD SPECIFICALLY INDICATE THAT I THINK IT
9 IS A GREAT URBAN LOCATION. THAT LOCATION, LIKE SAN
10 FRANCISCO, HAS THE BENEFIT OF RESTAURANTS THAT ARE IN
11 WALKING DISTANCE OF ONE TO THREE OR FOUR BLOCKS FROM
12 ACROSS THE PRICE RANGE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE
13 INDIVIDUALS WORKING THERE, FOR THE BENEFIT OF FORMAL
14 MEETINGS. IT HAS THE BENEFIT OF RUNNING TRAILS AND
15 ACCESS, BIKE TRAILS, AS DOES SACRAMENTO AND SAN
16 FRANCISCO.

17 IT IS A VERY INVITING ENVIRONMENT THAT HAS
18 BEEN PUT TOGETHER. EMERYVILLE HAS THIS DEPENDENCE ON
19 THE PRIVATE CORPORATE CONFERENCE FACILITIES FROM CHIRON
20 AND ALSO FROM PIXAR. THE VULNERABILITY FROM PRIVATE
21 CORPORATE CONFERENCES FACILITIES IS THAT OVER A
22 TEN-YEAR PERIOD, THERE CAN BE A RELATIONSHIP CHANGE
23 WHERE IT'S DIFFICULT TO REALLY GET ACCESS BECAUSE THE
24 AVAILABILITY OF THOSE IS BASED UPON ACCESS AS IN
25 JUDGMENT OF THOSE COMPANIES; AND OVER A PERIOD OF TIME,

1 THOSE COMPANIES MAY NOT HAVE THE SAME DIRECTORS OR
2 MANAGEMENT. ACCESS TO THE PUBLIC CONFERENCE
3 FACILITIES, I WOULD VIEW AS MORE DEPENDABLE. IT IS
4 SOMETHING WE DEEPLY APPRECIATE THE GENEROSITY OF THOSE
5 COMPANIES COMING FORWARD WITH THOSE OFFERS.

6 I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE OTHER STRENGTHS OF
7 THIS IS THAT IT HAS TREMENDOUS LOCATION ADVANTAGES.
8 AND ALTHOUGH WE DISCUSSED COST OF LIVING ISSUES BEFORE,
9 THEY PRODUCED CHARTS TO SHOW THAT THE COST OF LIVING IN
10 EMERYVILLE IS COMPARABLE ON A FIVE-MILE RADIUS TO
11 SACRAMENTO. I WOULD POINT OUT THAT WITHIN THE GREATER
12 BAY AREA REGION WHAT THEY'RE SAYING IS THAT THERE'S
13 POCKETS OF AFFORDABILITY AT ALL LEVELS IN THE GREATER
14 BAY AREA REGION. THAT MEANS THAT EMERYVILLE, WHICH IS
15 TEN MINUTES OVER THE BRIDGE FROM SAN FRANCISCO, IS AN
16 ACCESSIBLE HOUSING SITE FOR SAN FRANCISCO AS WELL, BUT
17 MAIN ARGUMENT IS THAT INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE GOING TO
18 WORK FOR THIS INSTITUTE ARE IN LARGE PART, EXCEPT FOR
19 THE VERY TOP LEVEL, LIKELY TO COME FROM THE AREA SINCE
20 THERE'S 89,000 PROFESSIONALS IN THE AREA, AND THEY'VE
21 ALREADY ADJUSTED TO THE COST OF LIVING REGARDLESS OF
22 WHAT ONE'S PERSPECTIVES ARE ON THE DATABASE THEY DREW
23 IT FROM.

24 DR. POMEROY: I THOUGHT THE STRENGTHS OF
25 EMERYVILLE CAME ACROSS VERY NICELY AS THE SMALL TOWN

1 SUPPORT, THE ABILITY TO PICK UP THE PHONE, AND JUST
2 TALK TO THE PERSON NEXT DOOR. I THOUGHT ITS LOCATION
3 IN TERMS OF THE LACK OF TRAFFIC AND THE FACT THAT IT'S
4 SOMEWHAT BETWEEN SACRAMENTO AND SAN FRANCISCO, GIVING
5 YOU ACCESS TO BOTH OF THOSE. IT IS A VERY NICE
6 FACILITY IN TERMS OF THE INITIAL APPROACH TO THE
7 BUILDING. THE ACTUAL SPACE WAS NICE, ALTHOUGH CLEARLY
8 NOT AS DRAMATIC AS THE LOBBY. I THOUGHT EMERYVILLE DID
9 A NICE JOB IN PRESENTING THEIR SMALL TOWN STRENGTHS.

10 IN TERMS OF THE WEAKNESSES, THE LACK OF
11 EMERYVILLE AS SORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL DRAW WAS THERE.
12 THE LACK OF PROXIMITY TO MAJOR HOSPITALS AND
13 UNIVERSITIES HAS BEEN MENTIONED. AND THE FACT THAT
14 THERE ARE FEWER HOTEL AND CONFERENCE ROOMS AND THE
15 DEPENDENCE UPON PIXAR AND CHIRON, I THINK, HAS BEEN
16 PRESENTED BOTH AS A POTENTIAL STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS AND
17 WELL DISCUSSED ALREADY.

18 I WOULD SAY THE COST OF LIVING ARGUMENT IS
19 REAL THERE, ALTHOUGH IT'S CERTAINLY A REGENTRIFYING
20 COMMUNITY, AND THAT ENTERS INTO THAT DECISION-MAKING
21 PROCESS IN TERMS OF THE ABILITY TO RECRUIT AS WELL.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THOSE ARE THE
23 DISCUSSION.

24 DR. PRECIADO: DR. PRECIADO HAS SOMETHING TO
25 SAY.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THOSE ARE THE DISCUSSIONS OF
2 EMERYVILLE FROM DR. POMEROY, AND WE NEED THE GREAT
3 CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL SITE IN FRESNO.

4 DR. PRECIADO: THANK YOU. I THOUGHT THAT
5 THEIR STRENGTHS, I AGREE WITH THE SMALL TOWN FEELING
6 WITHIN AN URBAN AREA. I REALLY LIKE THE FACT THAT THE
7 TRAINS TAKE US RIGHT INTO THE CENTRAL VALLEY. I LIKE
8 THE BUILDING. IT HAD A REALLY NICE AURA OF CREATIVITY.
9 GOING THROUGH PIXAR WAS A GREAT EXPERIENCE FOR ME.

10 WE DIDN'T HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT AFTERWARDS.
11 I SENSED SOME COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FROM SOME OF THE
12 COMMENTS THE LEADERS MADE. COST OF LIVING IS NOT AS
13 HIGH AS SAN FRANCISCO, AND I SAW THAT AS A STRENGTH.

14 THE WEAKNESSES ARE AS EVERYONE IS COMMENTING.
15 THERE IS NO UNIVERSITY NEARBY AND NO MAJOR HOSPITAL.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE THE
17 COMMENTS ON EMERYVILLE, AND WE WILL NOW GO TO THE
18 COMMENTS ON SACRAMENTO.

19 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS MIKE
20 FRIEDMAN. COULD I JUST ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION,
21 PLEASE? WOULD THAT BE OKAY? THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GOING THROUGH THE PROCESS
23 HERE OF BOTH TRYING TO KEEP SOME WRITTEN NOTES AND
24 FOLLOW THE PROCESS. I WILL IMPROVE ON THIS AS WE GO
25 FORWARD.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: IS THIS AN OKAY TIME TO ASK A
2 QUESTION, OR WOULD YOU RATHER I WAIT UNTIL LATER?

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY, DR. FRIEDMAN.
4 WE'LL CONTINUE THE PROCESS WE STARTED EARLIER.

5 DR. FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. MY -- YOU HAVE
6 RAISED -- THIS HAS BEEN VERY HELPFUL. THESE COMMENTS
7 HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL TO ME TO GIVE ME A SENSE OF WHAT
8 THE VISITORS ACTUALLY SAW.

9 THE ISSUE ABOUT CONFERENCE FACILITY IS
10 ACTUALLY ONE THAT I DIDN'T APPRECIATE SO WELL WHEN I
11 READ THE MATERIALS, BUT THIS DISCUSSION HAS HELPED
12 CLARIFY IN MY MIND. I FEEL THAT A CITY SUCH AS THE
13 MAYOR OF SAN FRANCISCO CAN MAKE SOME SORT OF COMMITMENT
14 ABOUT MOSCONE CENTER AND SO FORTH BECAUSE THESE ARE
15 CIVIC RESOURCES TO BE MOVED AROUND.

16 NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERY GOOD INTENTIONS OF A
17 PRIVATE COMPANY, BE IT CHIRON OR PIXAR, BOTH OF WHICH
18 ARE WELL-ESTABLISHED, SOLID INSTITUTIONS, NONETHELESS,
19 LEADERSHIP CHANGES. AND UNFORTUNATELY IN THE
20 PHARMACEUTICAL AND THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY, THERE
21 ARE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS. THERE ARE ALL SORTS OF
22 THINGS THAT HAPPEN. WHAT GUARANTEES DO WE HAVE FOR THE
23 FUTURE, IF ANY, FOR EITHER ONE OF THOSE FACILITIES.

24 AND, AGAIN, I'M NOT QUESTIONING THEIR MOTIVES
25 NOW OR THEIR INTENTIONS. I KNOW THAT IF THINGS REMAIN

1 STABLE, THEY WILL CERTAINLY MEET THE COMMITMENTS THAT
2 THEY'VE OFFERED. BUT MY QUESTION IS WHAT IF SOMETHING
3 UNFORESEEN HAPPENS TWO YEARS FROM NOW, FOUR YEARS FROM
4 NOW, EIGHT YEARS FROM NOW?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT ISSUE.
6 THEY HAVE COMMITTED TEN YEARS OUT. THE PROBLEM IS IT'S
7 BASED UPON THEIR OWN VIEW OF AVAILABILITY.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: EXACTLY. IF THEY'RE TAKEN
9 OVER, IF SOMETHING UNFORESEEN HAPPENS AND CHIRON IS
10 ACQUIRED BY SOMEONE OR PIXAR IS ACQUIRED BY SOMEONE, WE
11 KNOW THESE THINGS HAPPEN, THEIR GOOD INTENTIONS WOULD
12 NOT BE ABLE TO BE TRANSLATED INTO ACTION. I'M NOT
13 TRYING TO BE NEGATIVE. I JUST NEED TO UNDERSTAND THIS
14 POINT A LITTLE MORE CLEARLY.

15 DR. PRECIADO: I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO
16 TAKE -- I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, DR. FRIEDMAN,
17 BUT WE HAVE TO TAKE WHAT WE WERE PRESENTED WITH AT FACE
18 VALUE NOW.

19 DR. FRIEDMAN: I UNDERSTAND. AS OPPOSED TO
20 SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE I THINK, YOU KNOW, COMMITMENTS
21 THAT ARE MADE ARE MUCH MORE LIKELY, THEY'RE MORE
22 RELIABLY TO BE KEPT. THAT'S ALL. IF I'M MISTAKEN
23 ABOUT THAT, I WANT SOMEONE TO CORRECT ME BECAUSE I
24 COULD BE WRONG.

25 DR. PRECIADO: I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT. I

1 FEEL A LITTLE UNCOMFORTABLE WITH TRYING TO MAKE
2 COMMENTS ABOUT SOMETHING THAT POTENTIALLY CAN HAPPEN.
3 WE CAN SAY SAN FRANCISCO IS GOING TO HAVE A MAJOR
4 EARTHQUAKE AND ALL THE BUILDINGS WILL BE BLACKENED OUT.
5 I KNOW THAT SOUNDS RIDICULOUS, BUT I JUST WANT US TO BE
6 CAREFUL ABOUT OUR FEARS.

7 DR. FRIEDMAN: I UNDERSTAND. ACTS OF GOD CAN
8 HIT ANY SITE. CORPORATE AMERICA ONLY HITS SOME SITES.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

10 DR. PRECIADO: I WANT TO HEAR FRESNO.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE TO KEEP GOING. WE
12 NOTED THE COMMENTS. WE NEED TO MOVE FORWARD. AND THE
13 INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS WILL HAVE TO EVALUATE THEM.

14 CAN WE HAVE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS RELATED TO
15 THE EMERYVILLE SITE?

16 AS A DOCUMENTARY POINT, I WOULD LIKE TO
17 INDICATE BOTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OAKLAND AND UC
18 BERKELEY ARE VERY CLOSE TO THIS SITE, AND UC SAN
19 FRANCISCO IS RIGHT OVER THE BRIDGE. STANFORD
20 UNIVERSITY IS ABOUT 40 MINUTES AWAY FROM THIS SITE, SO
21 IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THERE IS A COMMUNITY -- A
22 RESEARCH COMMUNITY THAT CAN BE REACHED ALONG WITH THE
23 GLADSTONE INSTITUTE, FOR EXAMPLE.

24 THE BIOTECH COMMUNITY, JUST AS A PHYSICAL
25 EVIDENCE POINT, SURROUNDS THIS AREA WITH NUMEROUS

1 INSTALLATIONS. SO THIS IS IN THE CENTER -- AS MUCH IN
2 THE CENTER OF A COMPLEX OF RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS,
3 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, AS ANY SITE IN THE UNITED STATES.
4 JUST A FACTUAL MATTER.

5 THE QUESTION OF CLUSTERING AND HOW CLOSE THEY
6 ARE, IT ONLY RELATES TO WHETHER WE BELIEVE THAT IT'S
7 INHERENTLY IMPORTANT PEOPLE WALK TO THE BUILDING.

8 THE NEXT ITEM TO DISCUSS HERE IS TO SEE IF WE
9 HAVE ANY BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE THERE THAT HAVE
10 QUESTIONS. ANY BOARD MEMBERS HAVE QUESTIONS? NOT
11 FINDING ANY, WE WILL GO TO THE SACRAMENTO SITE. AND IF
12 WE COULD AT THIS POINT REVERSE DIRECTIONS, SO WE HAVE
13 SOME DIFFERENT SEQUENCING FOR THE SECOND HALF OF THE
14 SITES AS WE DID IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SITES. AND
15 I'D LIKE DR. PENHOET TO START ON SACRAMENTO.

16 DR. PENHOET: WELL, WE WERE HOSTED BY A VERY
17 GRACIOUS COMMUNITY IN SACRAMENTO ON SATURDAY AFTERNOON.
18 GRACIOUS IN EVERY SENSE OF THAT WORD, I THINK. THERE
19 WAS PROBABLY THE STRONGEST TURNOUT OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS
20 AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT AMONG THE SITES THAT WE VISITED.

21 THE BUILDING ITSELF WOULD BE A PERFECTLY
22 ADEQUATE BUILDING FOR THE HOME OF THE CIRM. THE
23 CURRENTLY UNDEVELOPED STATE, IT WOULD BE DEVELOPED
24 PARTICULARLY FOR THE INSTITUTE. THE FRIENDLY
25 ENVIRONMENT IN SACRAMENTO WAS EVIDENT THROUGHOUT,

1 ESPECIALLY INCLUDING HOW MUCH MORE FRIENDLY DAVIS
2 WAS -- NOT NECESSARILY --

3 DR. MURPHY: BOB, THERE'S SOME BACKGROUND
4 NOISE. WE CANNOT HEAR ED.

5 MS. KING: IF THERE'S SOMEONE POURING LIQUID
6 NEAR A PHONE, IF YOU COULD STOP DOING THAT, PLEASE.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE CHAIRMAN IS GUILTY OF
8 ADVERTISING THE WATER. DR. PENHOET, WOULD YOU GO
9 THROUGH THOSE COMMENTS.

10 DR. PENHOET: IT DOESN'T APPEAR TO BE
11 HEMLOCK.

12 DR. REED: IS THIS A SUBLIMINAL ATTEMPT TO
13 SUGGEST THE WATER QUALITY IS BETTER IN NORTHERN
14 CALIFORNIA THAN IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA?

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT'S THE SAME WATER
16 BECAUSE WE SEND YOU OUR WATER.

17 DR. FRIEDMAN: I THINK IT MAY BE THAT WE'RE
18 DROWNING IN DATA.

19 DR. PENHOET: AMONG THE OTHER REAL STRENGTHS
20 OF THIS LOCATION IS PROXIMITY TO THE STATE CAPITAL,
21 EMPHASIZED OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN THE PRESENTATION TO
22 US BY THE SACRAMENTO TEAM, WHICH INCLUDED NOT ONLY
23 PEOPLE FROM THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO, BUT A NUMBER OF
24 STATE LEGISLATORS AS WELL. AND THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT
25 SACRAMENTO IS THE CLOSEST CITY TO SACRAMENTO.

1 I THINK ON THE NEGATIVE SIDE, YOU KNOW, THE
2 BUILDING TO SOME DEGREE IS NEITHER HERE NOR THERE.
3 IT'S NEITHER IN THE STRICTLY URBAN ENVIRONMENT THAT YOU
4 WOULD ASSOCIATE WITH A PLACE SURROUNDED BY SHOPS AND
5 QUICK-SERVES, ETC., IN DIRECT PROXIMITY, NOR IS IT IN A
6 PARK WITH TREES, ETC. ALTHOUGH IT IS CLOSE TO OLD
7 SACRAMENTO WHERE PEOPLE COULD DEFINITELY WALK.

8 AND I THINK THE OTHER THING WHICH CONCERNED
9 ME WAS LACK OF A SIGNIFICANT BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY OTHER
10 THAN UC DAVIS, WHICH, OF COURSE, IS UC DAVIS MEDICAL
11 CENTER AND UC DAVIS, NEITHER OF WHICH, UNFORTUNATELY,
12 IS WITHIN VERY CLOSE PROXIMITY. IT'S A 15-MINUTE DRIVE
13 PROBABLY FROM THE SITE THAT'S CHOSEN TO UC DAVIS
14 MEDICAL CENTER. AND MY OWN VIEW IS LOCAL PROXIMITY TO
15 LIBRARIES ON THE CAMPUS TO LIFE ON CAMPUS, ETC., WOULD
16 BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THIS.

17 SO FOR ME IT'S A VERY WELCOMING COMMUNITY, A
18 VERY STRONG SENSE OF PARTICIPATION, GOOD ACCESS TO THE
19 POLITICAL LEADERS OF THE STATE, BUT IT CAN'T BE SEEN IN
20 MY VIEW IN THE SAME CONTEXT IN TERMS OF A VIBRANT
21 BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY THAT WE SAW IN BOTH SAN DIEGO AND
22 IN SAN FRANCISCO.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I WOULD
24 TELL YOU THAT FROM SOMEONE IN REAL ESTATE, THIS IS THE
25 FINEST BUILDING OF THE FOUR, THE HIGHEST QUALITY. THE

1 TSAKOPOULOS FAMILY'S GENEROSITY OF THIS BUILDING IS A
2 TREMENDOUS ASSET.

3 IN THE APPLICATION, AND I WOULD POINT OUT
4 THAT AS AN URBAN SETTING, THIS SITE AS WELL AS THE
5 OTHER SITES WE'RE LOOKING AT, EMERYVILLE, SAN
6 FRANCISCO, AND SAN DIEGO, ARE TEXTBOOK EXAMPLES OF
7 WHERE WITHIN A COUPLE OF BLOCKS OF EVERY SITE YOU HAVE
8 RUNNING TRAILS, BIKE TRAILS, WALKING VISTAS THAT ARE
9 AVAILABLE. SO I THINK THAT WE SHOULD ALSO RECOGNIZE
10 THAT COMMUNITY SUPPORT ON THE EXHIBIT H THAT WE'RE ALL
11 TALKING ABOUT WAS AS IS DOCUMENTED IN THE RFP.

12 THE PRESENCE OF COMMUNITY LEADERS FROM THE
13 DIFFERENT SECTORS IS VERY IMPRESSIVE REPRESENTATION OF
14 THAT SUPPORT, BUT IT WAS AS IS DOCUMENTED IN THE RFP.
15 AND SACRAMENTO, LIKE THE OTHER CITIES, HAD TREMENDOUS
16 COMMUNITY SUPPORT DOCUMENTED IN THE RFP.

17 I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT THAT FROM MY
18 PERSPECTIVE IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO BE IN A COMMUNITY
19 WITH REAL DEPTH IN BIOMEDICAL JOBS. THAT'S A KEY
20 DRIVER ACCORDING TO SPENCERSTUART IN DETERMINING WHERE
21 THE PRESIDENT AND THE TOP SCIENTIFIC TALENT IN THE
22 COUNTRY ARE WILLING TO MOVE TO. AND WHILE SACRAMENTO
23 DOESN'T HAVE THE DEPTH OF THAT, THAT WAS GRADED IN THE
24 OTHER PART OF THE APPLICATION. AND THIS PORTION OF THE
25 APPLICATION IN DEALING WITH LOCATION RELATED TO

1 UNIVERSITIES AND THE PROXIMITY OF THAT DOES GIVE
2 ESSENTIALLY A BONUS FOR PROXIMITY. BUT TO BE WITHIN A
3 15-MINUTE DRIVE OF THE UC DAVIS CAMPUS IS HIGHLY
4 PROXIMATE. TO BE WITHIN A TEN-MINUTE DRIVE OF UC DAVIS
5 MEDICAL SCHOOL IS HIGHLY PROXIMATE. FROM THE SCALE
6 THAT WE'RE MEASURING, I DON'T SEE ANY MAJOR DIFFERENCE
7 BETWEEN A 15-MINUTE TRANSIT TIME AND WALKING SEVERAL
8 BLOCKS TO THESE FACILITIES BECAUSE IN MOST CASES I
9 THINK PEOPLE BELIEVE THAT A TRANSIT TIME OF 15 OR 20
10 MINUTES IS HIGHLY ACCEPTABLE.

11 DR. POMEROY: IF THAT WATER SPILLS, WE'LL
12 NEVER LIVE IT DOWN. THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY. I'LL TRY
13 AND BE OBJECTIVE HERE AS ALL MY COLLEAGUES HAVE BEEN IN
14 THE EVALUATION. I WOULD -- I WAS GOING TO SAY THAT I
15 THOUGHT THE QUALITY OF THE ACTUAL BUILDING WAS THE
16 HIGHEST THAT WE SAW, THE MATERIALS THEMSELVES. IT WAS
17 WONDERFUL. ACCESS TO THE CAPITAL WE DON'T NEED TO TALK
18 ABOUT.

19 I WAS SORRY YOU HAD TO LEAVE, BOB, AND DIDN'T
20 GET TO HEAR THE PUBLIC COMMENTS SECTION. I KNOW YOU
21 HAD TO, BUT IT DID REFLECT, I THINK, THE PUBLIC
22 SUPPORT. AND THE AVAILABILITY OF HOTELS AND THE
23 CONVENTION CENTER RIGHT THERE I WOULD VIEW AS A PLUS AS
24 WELL. CLEARLY, THERE'S LESS PRIVATE BIOMEDICAL
25 RESEARCH GOING ON IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY. YOU'VE

1 ALREADY COMMENTED ON THE PUBLIC BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AT
2 THE UNIVERSITY.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. DR. PRECIADO.

4 DR. PRECIADO: WELL, I WAS REALLY, REALLY
5 IMPRESSED WITH SACRAMENTO. I WAS MOST IMPRESSED WITH
6 THE COMMUNITY SUPPORT. YOU WEREN'T PRESENT, BOB, AT
7 THE VERY END, BUT IT WAS REALLY -- I WAS ENLIGHTENED
8 AND FELT LIKE SACRAMENTO SHOWED A SIDE THAT NO OTHER
9 SITE SHOWED IN THAT THEY HAD POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS,
10 UNDERGRAD STUDENTS, A PATIENT. THEY HAD PEOPLE FROM
11 ALL WALKS ATTENDING AND GIVING COMMENT AT THE END OF
12 THIS SITE. A REPRESENTATIVE FROM JDRF WAS THERE. I
13 ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE
14 COMMUNITY, AND THEY WERE ADDRESSED. I WAS VERY, VERY
15 PLEASED TO SEE THAT OUTPOURING OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT IN
16 SACRAMENTO.

17 IN ADDITION, I LIKED THE -- I THOUGHT THE
18 TOUR AROUND THE AREA WHERE WE SAW THE HOUSING, THE
19 MIXED-USE HOUSING COMPLEXES THAT ARE GOING UP, I
20 THOUGHT THAT WAS REALLY SOMETHING THAT WAS A PLUS,
21 ESPECIALLY GIVEN THE FACT THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
22 RECRUIT BASED ON COST OF LIVING ISSUES.

23 I THOUGHT THAT THE FUTURE OF STEM CELL
24 RESEARCH HAD THE ABILITY TO MOVE FAST IN SACRAMENTO IN
25 PART BECAUSE SACRAMENTO HAS A VETERINARY SCHOOL AND A

1 PRIMATE CENTER THAT THE OTHER LOCATIONS DON'T HAVE. I
2 THOUGHT THAT WAS A REAL STRENGTH.

3 THEY WERE VERY FRIENDLY. I REALLY LIKED THE
4 FRIENDLINESS OF THE ENVIRONMENT. THEY HAVE TWO TRAINS
5 TO FRESNO EVERY DAY. AND THEY'RE THE ONLY ONE WHO HAVE
6 TWO NONSTOP -- NOT NONSTOP, BUT DIRECT TRAINS TO
7 SACRAMENTO. I WAS PLEASED AND I ACTUALLY LOOKED AT THE
8 FLIER THAT CHRISTINA HANDED ME. AND I WAS -- I LOOKED
9 AT ALL THE CAPABILITIES OF SACRAMENTO OF BEING ABLE TO
10 GO TO SACRAMENTO IF THAT SITE WAS CHOSEN. ALTHOUGH I
11 HAVE TO SAY, TOO, THAT THEIR TRAINS TO SAN DIEGO, SAN
12 FRANCISCO, AND EMERYVILLE, THEY JUST DON'T HAVE THE
13 DIRECTNESS THAT SACRAMENTO HAS.

14 AND IN TERMS OF WEAKNESSES, THEY DO LACK A
15 THRIVING BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY. CERTAINLY THEY DON'T
16 HAVE ONE LIKE SAN DIEGO HAS. HOWEVER, IT DOES EXIST,
17 AND I KNOW I CAN'T SAY THAT IT WILL EXIST, BUT I CAN
18 SAY THAT I HAVE HOPE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. DR. REED.
20 DR. MURPHY.

21 DR. MURPHY: I THINK MUCH OF MY POINTS WERE
22 ALREADY COVERED. I THOUGHT THE BUILDING WAS
23 FIRST-RATE. I THOUGHT THE PEOPLE WERE TERRIFIC, VERY
24 COMMITTED, FRIENDLY. I TOO WAS IMPRESSED BY THE PUBLIC
25 SESSION. AND I THINK THE STRENGTH AND THE MAJOR

1 ARGUMENTS WERE TWO. ONE IS BEING CLOSE TO THE SEAT OF
2 GOVERNMENT WHERE THAT COULD BE USEFUL AND IMPORTANT
3 AND, TWO, THE PROXIMITY OR THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE DAVIS
4 IN THE LIFE OF SACRAMENTO. I THOUGHT THAT POINT WAS
5 MADE VERY EFFECTIVELY.

6 THE DOWNSIDES I THINK IS THE FACT THAT THERE
7 IS NOT A STRONG BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY AROUND THERE WITH
8 THE EXCEPTION OF DAVIS, WHICH WE DID NOT VISIT. AND I
9 DO NOT THINK IT WILL BE AN ATTRACTIVE SITE FOR
10 SCIENTISTS FROM AROUND THE WORLD TO TRAVEL TO TO DO THE
11 WORK OF THE INSTITUTE.

12 THE ONLY NEGATIVE I THOUGHT ABOUT THE
13 BUILDING WAS IT WAS VERY CLOSE TO THAT HIGHWAY, AND YOU
14 COULD HEAR NOISE IN THE BUILDING, TRAFFIC NOISE IN THE
15 BUILDING. I GUESS I FOCUS ON THE QUALITY OF THESE
16 BUILDINGS BECAUSE I THINK 90 PERCENT OF OUR TIME IS
17 GOING TO BE OR THE STAFF'S TIME IS GOING TO BE SPENT IN
18 THESE BUILDINGS. AND I THINK THAT IT NEEDS TO BE A
19 PLEASANT WORK ENVIRONMENT, NOT ONLY FOR THE STAFF, BUT
20 THOSE SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS WHO VISIT THE SITE OF THE
21 HEADQUARTERS. SO I CONSIDER THAT AN IMPORTANT PART OF
22 THE DISCUSSION.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE'VE NOW HAD
24 THE COMMENTS OF ALL THOSE WHO VISITED THE SITES. SO WE
25 WILL GO TO DR. REED. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OF

1 THOSE WHO DID VISIT THE SITES?

2 DR. REED: NO, I HAVE NO QUESTIONS. I THINK
3 THE COMMENTS ARE PRETTY MUCH ON TARGET WITH THE
4 INFORMATION I OBTAINED SECONDHAND FROM OUR FACILITIES
5 DIRECTOR AND FROM WHAT WAS IN THE PROPOSALS.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS SHERRY LANSING --

7 MS. LANSING: YEAH. I'VE BEEN HERE FOR ABOUT
8 25, 30 MINUTES NOW. SO I'VE BEEN LISTENING. I THINK I
9 STARTED -- ANYWAY, I MISSED THE FIRST PRESENTATION, I
10 BELIEVE, AND HALF OF THE OTHER ONES, BUT I'M UP TO DATE
11 NOW ON EVERYTHING. I HAVE AN ASSOCIATE HERE WHO'S
12 TAKING NOTES FOR ME.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. AND WE
14 UNDERSTAND YOU ARE GOING TO BE HONORED TONIGHT AT UCLA.

15 MS. LANSING: I AM BEING HONORED TONIGHT AT
16 UCLA, AND IT'S NOT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST BECAUSE
17 THERE'S NO SITE AT UCLA TO TALK ABOUT. BUT I DO HAVE
18 TO LEAVE AT EXACTLY FOUR.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CONGRATULATIONS.

20 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ARE THERE ADDITIONAL
22 QUESTIONS ON SACRAMENTO? IF WE CAN GO TO THE
23 DISCUSSION ON SAN DIEGO. WE'LL START AGAIN WITH DR.
24 PENHOET.

25 DR. PENHOET: OF THE FOUR SITES, I THINK IT

1 WAS CLEAR THAT SAN DIEGO HAD THE STRONGEST INVOLVEMENT
2 AND PARTICIPATION BY THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY. AND THE
3 VISIT ITSELF WAS EXTREMELY WELL ORGANIZED. IT WAS WELL
4 PRESENTED. THE TURNOUT BY VARIOUS SUPPORTING GROUPS
5 THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY WAS SOLID WITH PEOPLE FROM
6 GOVERNMENT, FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND FROM UCSD, AND
7 FROM A NUMBER OF THE INSTITUTES IN THE NONPROFIT
8 SECTOR. AS WELL AS A VERY, VERY PERSUASIVE PRESENCE OF
9 THE BIOTECH COMMUNITY IN SAN DIEGO. THEY POINT OUT,
10 CORRECTLY SO, IT'S THE HIGHEST CONCENTRATION PROBABLY
11 OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE IN THE
12 WORLD, I SUSPECT, AND THAT IS A REALITY. SO THAT PART
13 OF THE VISIT I THINK WAS EXTREMELY IMPRESSIVE.

14 THE FACILITY ITSELF IS A NICE FACILITY.
15 COMING BACK TO THE ISSUE BEFORE, TO SOME DEGREE IT'S
16 PERSONAL TASTE WHETHER A PERSON WOULD LIKE AN URBAN OR
17 A MORE SUBURBAN ENVIRONMENT. THIS BUILDING, SOMEWHAT
18 AGED BUILDING, I THINK IT'S 20 YEARS OLD, THE BUILDING
19 IS IN A LOVELY SETTING, BUT IT PROBABLY IS A LONG WALK
20 TO STARBUCKS FROM THAT BUILDING.

21 IT HAS NO -- NONE OF THE URBAN AMENITIES THAT
22 YOU WOULD NORMALLY ASSOCIATE WITH AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT.
23 SO IT'S A LIFE STYLE CHOICE TO SOME DEGREE BETWEEN THAT
24 BUILDING AND AT THE OTHER END OF THE SPECTRUM, FOR
25 EXAMPLE, A BUILDING ON KING STREET SOUTH OF MARKET AREA

1 IN SAN FRANCISCO.

2 I THINK THAT PEOPLE THERE ARGUED PERSUASIVELY
3 THAT THEY HAVE IN PLACE SO-CALLED READINESS TEAMS THAT
4 WOULD DELIVER THIS SITE ON TIME, AND THAT WOULD HELP
5 THE INSTITUTE IN MANY OF ITS ACTIVITIES. VERY
6 INTERESTING DISCUSSION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF A COMPANY
7 CALLED SAIC, WHO IS THE WORLD'S LARGEST GRANTS
8 MANAGEMENT COMPANY, AND ABOUT THE HELP THAT THEY WOULD
9 BE WILLING TO OFFER US IN SAN DIEGO WITH OUR WHOLE
10 GRANTS MANAGEMENT PROCESS. I THINK THAT WAS ANOTHER
11 INDICATION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR COMMITMENT ON THE PART
12 OF SAN DIEGO.

13 OVERALL, VERY IMPRESSIVE PRESENCE IN SAN
14 DIEGO. VERY HIGH CONCENTRATION OF BIOMEDICAL
15 FACILITIES IN THE REGION. AND A CLEAR COMMITMENT AT
16 ALL DIFFERENT LEVELS TO HELP MAKE THIS PROJECT
17 SUCCESSFUL. AS I SAID BEFORE, TO SOME DEGREE IT'S A
18 STYLE ISSUE. IT IS SOMEWHAT DISTANT FROM ANY KIND OF A
19 TOWN CENTER, SO TO SPEAK. AND THE HOTEL FACILITIES,
20 ETC., ALTHOUGH QUITE BEAUTIFUL, ARE LIMITED IN THEIR
21 CAPACITY IN THE LOCAL REGION THERE. SO THAT WOULD BE
22 MY OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF SAN DIEGO.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I WOULD
24 AGREE WITH DR. PENHOET'S COMMENTS. THE ADVANTAGE OF
25 THOUSANDS OF HOTEL ROOMS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS THAT

1 ARE FREE OR DISCOUNTED IS A SIGNIFICANT COST ADVANTAGE
2 FOR US, BUT THE HOTELS THAT ARE AVAILABLE IN SAN DIEGO
3 AND WHO ARE COOPERATING WITH THIS PROPOSAL ARE FIRST
4 CLASS FACILITIES. IT IS ABSOLUTELY NO -- THIS IS TOP
5 OF THE LINE QUALITY. THE PROBLEM IS HOW DO WE AFFORD
6 IT?

7 IN SAN FRANCISCO THERE WAS \$900,000 IN
8 SAVINGS THAT WAS SCORED IN THE APPLICATION IN HOTEL
9 DISCOUNTS AND FREE HOTELS. IN SAN DIEGO IT WAS 40,000.
10 SO THE PROBLEM IS HOW DO WE AFFORD WHAT'S THERE?

11 ON THE OTHER SIDE, THERE'S A TREMENDOUS
12 CENTER OF EXCELLENCE HERE. ABSOLUTELY REACHES OUT TO
13 YOU AS A CENTER OF EXCELLENCE BETWEEN SCRIPPS, SALK,
14 BURNHAM, AND UC SAN DIEGO, A PHENOMENAL CONCENTRATION
15 OF RESEARCH CAPACITY. BUT THAT RESEARCH CAPACITY IS
16 NOT WHERE THE STAFF WILL BE WORKING EVERY DAY. AND
17 WHETHER IT'S A FIVE-MINUTE DRIVE TO AN INSTITUTION OR A
18 15- OR 20-MINUTE DRIVE, I BELIEVE THAT THE SCIENTIFIC
19 STAFF NEED TO BE IN AN AREA WITH TREMENDOUS RESEARCH
20 INSTITUTIONS AND CAPACITY, BUT WHETHER IT'S ACROSS THE
21 STREET OR A SHORT DRIVE, AS LONG AS WE'RE NOT TALKING
22 ABOUT HALF AN HOUR DRIVE OR AN HOUR DRIVE, BEING VERY
23 CLOSE TO OUTSTANDING FACILITIES AND LIBRARIES WOULD BE
24 A BENEFIT, BUT I DON'T THINK IT'S THE MOST COMPELLING
25 ISSUE WHICH, AGAIN, I THINK IS THE WORKFORCE.

1 AND WE TALKED ABOUT COST OF LIVING. SAN
2 DIEGO AND SAN FRANCISCO HAVE THE HIGHEST COST OF
3 LIVING. SAN DIEGO IS BETTER THAN SAN FRANCISCO. THE
4 MATERIAL THAT'S BEEN DISCUSSED IN THE SITE VISITS AND
5 WERE SUBMITTED TO US AS BACKUP DOCUMENTATION OF THIS
6 SUGGESTS THAT SAN DIEGO IS GAINING QUICKLY ON SAN
7 FRANCISCO IN COST WITH FASTER PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE.
8 IN A FEW YEARS THE DIFFERENCE MAY WELL BE WIPED OUT.

9 BUT THE KEY IS THAT WHETHER SAN DIEGO OR SAN
10 FRANCISCO, THEY HAVE THIS TREMENDOUS CONCENTRATION OF
11 BIOTECH JOBS. WHAT WE UNDERSTAND IS FOR THE LOWER
12 RANGES OF HIRING, WE'RE GOING TO BE HIRING FROM THE
13 COMMUNITY ITSELF. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO COME ACROSS THE
14 COUNTRY. THEY ALREADY LIVE THERE. THEY'VE ALREADY
15 ADAPTED TO THE COST OF LIVING. AT THE HIGHER RANGES OF
16 JOBS, WE'RE BEING TOLD BY EXPERTS IN THE COUNTRY THAT
17 IT IS THE CONCENTRATION AND DEPTH OF BIOTECH JOBS THAT
18 IS THE DETERMINANT IN WHERE THEY GO, NOT COST OF
19 LIVING. SO WHEN YOU'RE TRYING TO GET A PRESIDENT OR
20 TRYING TO GET THE CHIEF SCIENTIFIC OFFICER OR THE CHIEF
21 OF DIVISIONS IN SCIENTIFIC DIVISIONS ON COMMITTEES, YOU
22 HAVE TO RECRUIT ALL THE WAY ACROSS THE COUNTRY.
23 THEY'RE COMING TO AREAS WITH DOMINANT BIOTECH JOBS AND
24 STRONG BIOTECH COMMUNITIES WITH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
25 PARTICIPATION.

1 AND SAN DIEGO AND SAN FRANCISCO CLEARLY EXCEL
2 IN THAT CATEGORY, ALONG WITH EMERYVILLE, WHICH FALLS
3 INTO THAT. THAT IS THE DISADVANTAGE OF THE SACRAMENTO
4 MARKET. THE ADVANTAGE OF THE SITE OF SACRAMENTO IS THE
5 TREMENDOUS ACCESS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND THE EXECUTIVE
6 BRANCH, WHICH WE WILL BE AT MANY, MANY TIMES.

7 THOSE, I THINK, ARE MY COMMENTS. I'M
8 EXTRAORDINARILY IMPRESSED BY THE BACKING OF THE
9 COMMUNITY IN SAN DIEGO, AND I BELIEVE THAT THE LOCAL
10 CHALLENGES THEY'RE FACING SHOULD NOT BE A DETERMINANT.
11 IT IS, IN FACT, IMPRESSIVE THAT IN THE MIDST OF CRISIS,
12 THEY'VE MADE A COMMITMENT TO THIS AS A PRIORITY, AND
13 THAT COMMITMENT IS A STRONG COMMITMENT.

14 DR. POMEROY: CLAIRE POMEROY. I THINK IN
15 TERMS OF THE STRENGTHS OF THE SAN DIEGO PROPOSAL, WHICH
16 WAS VERY WELL DONE, THEY CLEARLY IMPRESSED US ALL WITH
17 THE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY THAT THEY HAVE THERE.
18 THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE AREA WAS ALSO STRESSED AND
19 WAS QUITE APPEALING, I SHOULD SAY. AND THEY ARE AN
20 INTERNATIONAL DRAW FOR BRINGING PEOPLE IN AS WELL.

21 I THINK IN TERMS OF THE WEAKNESSES, THE COST
22 OF LIVING IS ALSO AN ISSUE THERE. AND, YOU KNOW, IT'S
23 OBVIOUS, BUT THE DISTANCE TO SACRAMENTO.

24 I WOULD JUST LIKE TO TAKE A BRIEF MOMENT TO
25 FOLLOW UP ON WHAT DR. PENHOET SAID, WHICH IS IT IS AN

1 INTERESTING DISCUSSION AND PERHAPS A PERSONAL
2 PHILOSOPHY OF THE MISSION OF THIS OF WHETHER THE
3 MISSION OF THE INSTITUTE CAN BEST BE ACCOMPLISHED IN
4 SORT OF THE BUCOLIC CAMPUSLIKE THINK TANK SETTINGS THAT
5 SAN DIEGO PRESENTED TO US OR THE URBAN SETTING PERHAPS
6 WITH MORE OBVIOUS ACCESS TO THE PUBLIC WOULD BE BETTER
7 FOR ACCOMPLISHING OUR GOALS. AND I THINK THAT'S
8 SOMETHING THAT EVERYONE WILL HAVE TO DECIDE FOR
9 THEMSELVES.

10 AND, AGAIN, I MUST JUST ADD, BECAUSE YOU MADE
11 A FEW EDITORIAL COMMENTS, BOB, SO I WILL MAKE ONE,
12 WHICH IS THAT ACTUALLY ONE OF THE REASONS THAT UC DAVIS
13 IS ABLE TO RECRUIT SOME REALLY TOPNOTCH FOLKS HERE TO
14 UC DAVIS IN SCIENCE IS THAT THEY FIND THE COST OF
15 LIVING AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE HERE VERY ATTRACTIVE.
16 SO I THINK THERE ARE POTENTIAL TRADE-OFFS IN THAT ARENA
17 AS WELL.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND DR. MURPHY. WE WILL GO
19 TO DR. MURPHY AND THEN TO DR. PRECIADO.

20 DR. MURPHY: BOB, I WILL TRY TO BE OBJECTIVE
21 HERE AS WELL, OF COURSE. I THOUGHT THE BUILDING WAS A
22 MAIN ATTRACTION HERE, ONE OF THE ATTRACTIONS. IT'S THE
23 ONE OF THE FOUR BUILDINGS THAT HAS MORE OF A CAMPUS
24 FEEL THAN THE OTHER BUILDINGS, WHICH HAD MORE OF A
25 BUSINESS OFFICE BUILDING FEEL.

1 I LIKE THE IDEA THERE WERE OPEN SPACES,
2 ACCESS TO THE OUTSIDE, A NICE VIEW TOWARDS THE WEST
3 TOWARDS THE OCEAN, AND TOWARDS THE EAST IT'S A TREED
4 AREA, AND THE ENTRANCE TO THE BUILDING WAS FLOWERED.
5 AND I THINK IT WOULD BE A VERY WELCOMING BUILDING FOR
6 ESPECIALLY ACADEMICS WHO ARE USED TO BEING IN A CAMPUS
7 SETTING.

8 I THOUGHT THE ARGUMENT WAS MADE VERY
9 COMPELLINGLY AND THE TOUR SHOWED THAT IT REALLY IS A
10 SITE WHERE BUSINESS AND ACADEMIA COME TOGETHER, NOT
11 ONLY THE BIOTECH PART, BUT THE ACCESS TO THE INSTITUTES
12 THAT ARE WITHIN A MILE OR TWO AWAY FROM THE SITE, AS
13 WELL AS UCSD.

14 I THOUGHT ONE OF THE REAL STRENGTHS WAS THE
15 POINT THAT ED ALREADY BROUGHT UP. THERE WERE A NUMBER
16 OF INCENTIVES THAT I THOUGHT WERE WELL DONE. HAVING
17 THE AVAILABILITY OF SAIC, WHICH IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL
18 OF THE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, I BELIEVE, AT NCI, TO HAVE
19 THAT BE APPLIED TO THE INSTITUTE COULD REALLY GIVE US A
20 HEAD START IN GETTING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTE
21 MOVING IN A VERY QUICK AND EFFECTIVE WAY.

22 SO I WAS, TOO, VERY IMPRESSED WITH THE --
23 WITH ALL OF THOSE THINGS. I GUESS TO YOUR POINT, BOB,
24 ABOUT WHAT IS THE OFFICE GOING TO DO, I THINK THE POINT
25 WAS MADE THAT MOST OF THE MONEY THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE

1 SPENDING IS GOING TO BE ON SCIENCE, WHICH IS CERTAINLY
2 APPROPRIATE. SO I THINK THAT TO ME ONE OF THE MOST
3 IMPORTANT THINGS IS MAKING SURE THAT THE BUILDING IS IN
4 AN AREA WHERE THERE ARE TERRIFIC SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES
5 BECAUSE I THINK THAT CAN BE VERY HELPFUL TO THE PEOPLE
6 IN THE UNIT OR ON THE STAFF AS THEY GO THROUGH, NOT
7 ONLY MAKING GRANTS, BUT REALLY UNDERSTANDING THE WHOLE
8 SCIENTIFIC MILIEU THAT WE'RE IN.

9 AND I THINK I WOULD AGREE THAT, LIKE SAN
10 FRANCISCO, SAN DIEGO IS A PLACE WHERE SCIENTISTS ARE
11 GOING TO BE EAGER TO COME FOR THE SCIENTIFIC STRENGTH
12 OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. QUESTIONS?
14 YOU'RE EXACTLY RIGHT. DR. PRECIADO, AS I CHANGE THE
15 SEQUENCING, I GET OUT OF ORDER ON THE REST OF THE
16 PROCESS.

17 DR. PRECIADO: MR. KLEIN, YOU JUST DON'T WANT
18 TO HEAR FROM ME.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FRESNO IS CLOSE TO MY HEART.
20 DR. PRECIADO.

21 DR. PRECIADO: I WAS -- SOME OF THE STRENGTHS
22 OF SAN DIEGO, OF COURSE, I AGREE WITH A LOT OF WHAT
23 OTHERS HAVE SAID IN TERMS OF THE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH
24 THAT'S GOING ON THERE, THE SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES. SAIC
25 I THOUGHT WAS GREAT. THE FACT THAT THERE IS THIS SORT

1 OF ATMOSPHERE FOR BRAINSTORMING, SO TO SPEAK.

2 I GUESS SOME OF MY WEAKNESSES OR A WEAKNESS,
3 AND I SEE THIS SORT OF AS A BIG WEAKNESS, IS THAT I
4 FELT AS THOUGH THE ENVIRONMENT WAS ISOLATED AND
5 DISTANT. I FELT AS THOUGH THE BUSINESS AND ACADEMIC
6 WORLD LOST CONNECTION TO THE PEOPLE.

7 CAN I MAKE AN EDITORIAL COMMENT AS WELL?

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S YOUR -- ABSOLUTELY.
9 WE'RE ALL PUTTING OUR INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS ON THE TABLE.

10 DR. PRECIADO: OKAY. JUST SOMETHING I'VE
11 BEEN THINKING ABOUT, AND AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE, I
12 ALWAYS THINK IN TERMS OF HOW IS THIS GOING TO AFFECT
13 THE PATIENTS AND THE PEOPLE THAT WE'RE TRYING TO
14 AFFECT. AND SOMETHING I READ RECENTLY TALKED ABOUT THE
15 IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTISTS MOVING OUTSIDE OF THE SAFETY
16 OF THEIR IVORY TOWER TO SEE, ACTUALLY SEE THE FACES OF
17 THE PEOPLE. AND I THINK THAT SOME OF THE STRENGTHS THE
18 OTHER SITES HAD WAS THAT THEY WERE IN MORE OF AN URBAN
19 AREA AND THERE WAS MORE ACCESS TO THE PUBLIC.

20 AND SAN DIEGO, THOUGH IT'S BEAUTIFUL, AND I
21 CERTAINLY WOULD LOVE TO LIVE IN THAT AREA IF I WAS
22 DOING THAT RESEARCH, DIDN'T HAVE THAT CONNECTION. AND
23 I SAW THAT AS A WEAKNESS. AND IN ADDITION, I SAW THE
24 COST OF LIVING AS A WEAKNESS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. NOW WE GO TO THE

1 QUESTION OF QUESTIONS. DR. FRIEDMAN, ANY QUESTIONS?

2 DR. FRIEDMAN: I HAVE NO QUESTIONS, MR.

3 CHAIRMAN. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. REED.

5 DR. REED: I GUESS I JUST HAD ONE IN TERMS OF
6 PERHAPS GETTING SOME ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FROM THE
7 COMMITTEE ON THE -- REALLY ON THE ISSUE OF PROXIMITY.
8 YOU KNOW, I JUST FIND MY OWN BUSY LIFE THAT OBVIOUSLY
9 THE CLOSER THE BETTER. WE HOPE THAT THE CIRM STAFF IS
10 GOING TO BE ABLE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF SEMINAR
11 OPPORTUNITIES AND SYMPOSIA AND THINGS LIKE THIS THAT
12 ARE OCCURRING AT THE ACADEMIC CAMPUSES NEAR THE SITES.
13 AND SO THE ISSUE FOR ME IS REALLY HAVING SOME
14 ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS FROM THE OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON
15 THAT.

16 SOME OF THE SITES, IT SOUNDS LIKE, WELL, IF
17 YOU DRAW A 45-MINUTE COMMUTE WITHOUT TRAFFIC, SORT OF A
18 RADIUS AROUND THEM, YOU CAN CERTAINLY SAY THAT THERE'S
19 ACCESS TO A NUMBER OF OPPORTUNITIES THERE. BUT I THINK
20 THE QUESTION I HAVE IS ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS OF
21 ACTUALLY GETTING IN YOUR CAR AND DRIVING TO ATTEND A
22 SEMINAR, IF YOU'RE TALKING HALF AN HOUR TO AN HOUR TO
23 GET THERE, PARK, ETC., GO TO SEMINAR AND COME BACK,
24 YOU'VE NOW LOST HALF A DAY IN ORDER TO AVAIL YOURSELF
25 OF A SEMINAR OPPORTUNITY OR A SYMPOSIUM ON SOMETHING TO

1 DO WITH STEM CELLS. I JUST WOULD LOVE MORE
2 CONVERSATION ABOUT THAT FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE
3 COMMITTEE IN TERMS OF HOW IT SHOULD BE WEIGHED IN OUR
4 THOUGHTS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE THERE IS A
6 CATEGORY ON PROXIMITY WHICH IS THE ONE YOU CREATED, DR.
7 REED, WHICH IS ITEM 3, LOCATION. THEN THERE ARE OTHER
8 CATEGORIES THAT WEIGHT OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.

9 DR. MURPHY: JOHN -- BOB, MAY I RESPOND TO
10 THAT?

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY.

12 DR. MURPHY: I THINK, JOHN, THE ISSUE YOU
13 RAISE IS A GOOD ONE. AND FROM MY ASSESSMENT OF THE
14 FOUR SITES, THE TWO SITES THAT WOULD ALLOW IMMEDIATE
15 ACCESS WITHIN A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME ARE SAN
16 FRANCISCO'S ACCESS TO MISSION BAY AT UCSF, WHICH I
17 THINK IS EASY, AND I THINK THE SITE IN SAN DIEGO'S
18 ACCESS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND THE RESEARCH INSTITUTES
19 THAT ARE RIGHT NEXT DOOR.

20 DR. REED: THANK YOU.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS? WE'RE
22 FACED WITH A CHALLENGE HERE NOW ON TIME. WE HAVE A
23 COUPLE OF OPTIONS THAT I WILL PUT FORWARD, AND THEN WE
24 HAVE ENDLESS OPTIONS FROM THE CREATIVITY OF THIS
25 COMMITTEE.

1 FIRST OF ALL, WE NEED TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE
2 PUBLIC COMMENT HERE. AND BEFORE WE DO VOTING, WE'RE
3 GOING TO NEED THAT PUBLIC COMMENT.

4 THE NEXT ITEM IS THAT IN ORDER TO GET THIS
5 VOTING DONE BEFORE THE INDIVIDUALS NEED TO LEAVE, THE
6 ONLY POSSIBILITY THAT I CURRENTLY CAN IDENTIFY IS THAT
7 IF EACH OF US WITH ALL OF THIS INFORMATION WERE NOW TO
8 TAKE A FEW MINUTES AND VOTE, AND THEN GIVE THOSE TO THE
9 STAFF TO TABULATE AFTER THE PUBLIC COMMENT, SO WE CAN
10 TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION, THEN THE STAFF COULD
11 TABULATE AN AVERAGE. BUT I'M OPEN TO ANY OPTION. WHAT
12 IS THE COMMITTEE'S WILL?

13 MS. LANSING: BOB, THIS IS SHERRY LANSING.
14 CAN I HAVE -- MAKE A RECOMMENDATION, I GUESS, IS THE
15 BEST WAY TO PUT IT. I WAS THE MEMBER THAT WAS UNABLE
16 TO ATTEND ONE OR MORE OF THE SITE VISITS BECAUSE OF A
17 SCHEDULING CONFLICT. AND SO I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST,
18 AND MAYBE THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WILL MAKE IT GO EASIER
19 ACTUALLY, THAT I ABSTAIN FROM THE VOTING AND THAT THEN
20 EVERYBODY -- I'M THE ONLY MEMBER THAT WASN'T ABLE TO
21 ATTEND ONE OR MORE, AND THOUGH I HAVE LISTENED AND HAVE
22 OPINIONS, BUT I FEEL NOT EQUAL TO THE PEOPLE THAT
23 ATTENDED IT. I WONDER IF THEN EVERYBODY ELSE COULD
24 VOTE. WE COULD GET IT DOWN -- BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO
25 GET A CONSENSUS BECAUSE THIS IS SUCH A VERY IMPORTANT

1 ISSUE.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY, LET ME GIVE YOU SOME
3 INFORMATION THAT WILL BE HELPFUL. DR. PRECIADO WAS NOT
4 ABLE TO GO TO ALL THE SITES.

5 MS. LANSING: ONLY MISSED ONE IS WHAT I WAS
6 TOLD.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. REED COULD NOT ATTEND
8 THE SITES, AND DR. FRIEDMAN COULD NOT ATTEND.

9 MS. LANSING: ANY OF THEM?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WE HAVE A QUORUM ISSUE IF
11 WE WERE TO ADOPT THAT APPROACH.

12 MS. LANSING: SO YOU MEAN DR. FRIEDMAN AND
13 DR. REED DIDN'T ATTEND ANY OF THE SITES EITHER?

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S A CORRECT STATEMENT.

15 MS. LANSING: WELL, I SHOULD STATE FOR THE
16 RECORD ANYWAY I HAVE ACTUALLY BEEN TO EACH OF THESE
17 CITIES MANY TIMES, SO I HAVE NOT SEEN THE ACTUAL
18 PHYSICAL SITE. ALL RIGHT. FINE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IT IS A VERY GRACIOUS
20 ATTEMPT TO MOVE THIS FORWARD. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

21 DR. MURPHY: BOB, COULD I MAKE A COMMENT?
22 RICH MURPHY. THE STAFF HAS KINDLY POINTED OUT TO ME
23 THAT WHEN I WAS TALKING ABOUT EMERYVILLE, I MADE THE
24 COMMENT THAT THERE WERE NOT UNIVERSITIES OR HOSPITALS
25 CLOSE-BY. THEY POINTED OUT THAT BERKELEY IS NOT FAR

1 AWAY AND THAT THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL IN OAKLAND IS NOT
2 FAR AWAY. WE DID NOT VISIT THOSE, AND I WANTED TO
3 CORRECT THE RECORD BEFORE WE TOOK A VOTE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. DR.
5 POMEROY.

6 DR. POMEROY: JUST AS A -- SO WE DON'T SPEND
7 ALL OUR TIME ON PROCESS, I'LL MAKE A SUGGESTION. IF
8 THE TWO -- IF ANY OF THE CITIES THAT ARE REPRESENTED
9 WANTED TO MAKE TO THREE- TO FIVE-MINUTE COMMENT, MAYBE
10 WE COULD GET THAT, AND THEN WE COULD BE TABULATING OUR
11 VOTES, AS YOU SUGGEST, AND TURN THEM IN AS THE PUBLIC
12 COMMENTS PROCEED.

13 MS. LANSING: I HAVE ANOTHER SUGGESTION.
14 CLAIRE, I AGREE WITH WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, BUT I JUST
15 WANT TO ADD SOMETHING BECAUSE I'M GOING TO THE END
16 RESULT. IT IS CONCEIVABLE THAT WE'RE GOING TO GET ONE
17 SITE ABOVE ANOTHER SITE, AND THEY'RE GOING TO BE SO
18 CLOSE. AND SO I GUESS WHAT I'M TRYING TO GET TO IS
19 AFTER WE'VE DONE OUR FIRST VOTE, IS IT POSSIBLE THAT WE
20 WOULD TAKE THE TOP TWO, AND THEN VOTE AGAIN BECAUSE I'M
21 TRYING TO GET SOME SORT OF CONSENSUS SO THAT SOMEONE
22 DOESN'T LOSE BY TWO POINTS OR SOMETHING, WHICH DOESN'T
23 SEEM --

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE ARE GOING TO ADVANCE NO.
25 1 AND NO. 2 TO THE WHOLE BOARD.

1 MS. LANSING: ALL RIGHT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF IT'S VERY CLOSE AT THE
3 WHOLE BOARD, THEY WILL SEE THAT. MY SUGGESTION IS
4 ACTUALLY ADVANCE ALL FOUR OF THE SCORES TO THE WHOLE
5 BOARD SO THAT THEY HAVE THE ABILITY TO SEE THE SCORES
6 ON EVERYTHING AND MAKE THEIR DECISION FULLY INFORMED.

7 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU. I ACTUALLY LIKE
8 THAT EVEN BETTER.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS PART OF OUR PROCESS.
10 SO HERE'S THE SUGGESTION.

11 DR. PENHOET: WE SHOULD HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT
12 BEFORE WE VOTE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS ABSOLUTELY CORRECT.
14 IS THE PROCESS THAT I JUST OUTLINED ACCEPTABLE TO THE
15 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE?

16 DR. REED: YES.

17 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

18 MS. LANSING: YES.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WILL NOT -- I DON'T --
20 LET'S MAKE A MOTION AND A VOTE. IS THERE A MOTION TO
21 ADOPT THAT PROCESS?

22 DR. PENHOET: SO MOVED.

23 DR. POMEROY: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A MOTION AND A
25 SECOND. ROLL CALL.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN.
2 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO.
4 DR. PRECIADO: YES.
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MURPHY.
6 DR. MURPHY: YES.
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. REED.
8 DR. REED: YES.
9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET.
10 DR. PENHOET: YES.
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOB KLEIN IS HERE. SHERRY
12 LANSING.
13 MS. LANSING: YES.
14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHO HAVE I MISSED? CLAIRE.
15 DR. POMEROY: YES.
16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHO MADE THE MOTION? DR.
17 POMEROY. ALL RIGHT. THE MOTION PASSES. THAT WILL BE
18 OUR PROCESS. I'M GOING TO START PUBLIC COMMENT RIGHT
19 NOW. WE'RE GOING TO LIMIT TO FIVE MINUTES PUBLIC
20 COMMENT. WE'LL BEGIN HERE, AND IS THERE PUBLIC COMMENT
21 FROM THOSE PRESENT?
22 COULD WE DO THE MAYORS FIRST AND SEE IF THEY
23 HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT? THIS IS THE HOME CITY.
24 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS MIKE
25 FRIEDMAN. WE CERTAINLY WANT TO HAVE THE PUBLIC

1 COMMENTS, AND I'M NOT TRYING TO CUT THAT SHORT AT ALL.
2 I JUST HAVE A PROCEDURAL QUESTION. AFTER THIS PUBLIC
3 COMMENT, THERE'S GOING TO BE, THEN, A DISCUSSION OF THE
4 ADDITIONAL POINTS THAT ARE GIVEN IN ATTACHMENT H FOR
5 EACH OF THESE FOUR SITES AND THAT WILL BE AVERAGED?
6 I'M WONDERING --

7 DR. PENHOET: WE WILL EACH FILL OUT THE SCORE
8 SHEET GIVING A POINT SCORE TO EACH OF THE EIGHT
9 CRITERIA FOR EACH OF THE FOUR CITIES UNDER
10 CONSIDERATION, GIVE THAT TO STAFF, WHO WILL CALCULATE
11 THE AVERAGES AND REPORT BACK.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DID YOU HEAR THAT, DR.
13 FRIEDMAN?

14 DR. FRIEDMAN: I DID.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE PROBLEM IS THE ONLY
16 PROCESS WE HAVE TIME FOR, THAT'S WHY I MADE THAT
17 MOTION, IF EVERYONE SCORES EACH OF THE CATEGORIES AND
18 THEN THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO CALL IN TO AMY DUROSS OR
19 E-MAIL IN FROM YOUR LOCATIONS WHAT THE SCORES ARE OFF
20 THOSE SHEETS SO THEY CAN AVERAGE THEM. WALTER BARNES
21 HERE --

22 DR. FRIEDMAN: SO WE NEED TO DO THAT WHILE
23 THESE COMMENTS ARE BEING GIVEN?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU CANNOT -- YOU HAVE TO
25 LISTEN TO THE COMMENTS.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: I MEANT WHILE WE LISTEN TO THE
2 COMMENTS OR ELSE WE WON'T SCORE --

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU SCORE EACH CITY AS YOU
4 LISTEN TO THE COMMENTS BY THAT CITY.

5 DR. PRECIADO: TOTAL SCORE OR FOR EACH
6 CRITERIA?

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EACH CRITERIA YOU ARE GOING
8 TO SCORE, AND THEN YOU WILL CALL AMY DUROSS, READ HER
9 YOUR SCORES, OR E-MAIL AMY DUROSS AT
10 ADUROSS@CIRM.CA.GOV. THAT'S THE PROCESS. AND THEN THE
11 STAFF HERE WILL TABULATE THE SCORES AND AVERAGE THEM.

12 MS. KING: THIS IS A PROCEDURAL QUESTION FROM
13 SAN DIEGO. IF THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ARE GOING TO
14 STATE THEIR SCORES FOR EACH CRITERIA FOR EACH CITY
15 PUBLICLY, WHY DO THESE --

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY'RE NOT GOING TO.
17 THEY'RE GOING TO SCORE THEM, AND THEN THEY'RE GOING TO
18 CALL THEM IN, AND STAFF IS GOING TO TABULATE THEM.

19 DR. PRECIADO: I'M GOING TO NEED A CALL-IN
20 NUMBER SO TONA CAN CALL.

21 MS. LANSING: WHEN IS THE DEADLINE BY WHICH
22 WE HAVE TO DO THIS? IN THE NEXT TEN MINUTES, YOU ARE
23 SAYING?

24 DR. REED: SHERRY, WE'RE TRYING TO FINISH BY
25 4:30.

1 DR. MURPHY: BOB, DO WE NEED TO HAVE OUR
2 VOTES BE PUBLIC? THEY WON'T BE PUBLIC IF WE JUST SEND
3 THEM TO MELISSA AND SHE AVERAGES THEM. UNLESS THEY'RE
4 PUT ON THE PUBLIC RECORD AFTER THE MEETING.

5 BOB.

6 (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

7 DR. REED: BOB, FROM THE SAN DIEGO SITE HERE,
8 IS BOB KLEIN THERE?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I WANT TO REPORT FOR
10 THE RECORD THAT SACRAMENTO IS BACK ON-LINE. NO SCORING
11 HAS TAKEN PLACE. NO COMMENT HAS TAKEN PLACE. THE CORD
12 WAS INADVERTENTLY TRIPPED OVER.

13 TO ANSWER A PROCESS QUESTION, WE HAVE
14 CONFERRED WITH COUNSEL IN THE INTERIM. AND IN ORDER
15 FOR ALL OF THESE TO BE ON THE RECORD, WE WILL GO
16 THROUGH EACH OF THE SCORES ORALLY THAT HAVE BEEN
17 AWARDED BY EACH INDIVIDUAL. AND WE WILL START WITH
18 SHERRY LANSING, GO TO JOHN REED --

19 MS. LANSING: I HAVEN'T EVEN BEGUN TO DO THE
20 SCORING. I'M BEING AS HONEST AS I CAN. I JUST
21 FINISHED LISTENING.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND.

23 MS. LANSING: I CAN'T DO IT THAT FAST. I
24 ACTUALLY --

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY, WE'RE GOING TO GO

1 THROUGH PUBLIC COMMENT FIRST. AND DURING THE PUBLIC
2 COMMENT RELATED TO EACH CITY, YOU CAN BE DOING SCORING
3 WHILE YOU'RE LISTENING TO THEIR PUBLIC COMMENTS. BUT
4 AFTER WE FINISH THE PUBLIC COMMENT, WE WILL THEN, IF
5 IT'S FINE, WE'LL START WITH DR. REED AND THEN GO TO
6 YOU.

7 DR. PENHOET: I DON'T THINK EVERY BOARD
8 MEMBER, COMMITTEE MEMBER, IS OBLIGATED TO PLACE A SCORE
9 BY EVERY ITEM ON THE LIST. THE ONES THAT ARE TURNED IN
10 WILL BE AVERAGED; BUT IF ANYBODY FEELS THEY'RE NOT IN A
11 POSITION ON A PARTICULAR ITEM, I DON'T THINK --

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE POINT WAS FROM DR.
13 PENHOET IS THAT IF ANY COMMITTEE MEMBER DOES NOT
14 BELIEVE THEY CAN VOTE ON ANY ITEM, THEY DON'T HAVE TO.
15 WE'LL AVERAGE THE SCORES WE DO RECEIVE ON THE ITEM.

16 DR. REED: BOB, COULD I MAKE A SUGGESTION ON
17 THE SCORING. THOSE OF US WHO HAVE BEEN RELYING ON THE
18 TESTIMONY OF OUR -- TESTIMONY AND COMMENTS OF OUR
19 COLLEAGUES TO HELP US WITH HAVING AN UNDERSTANDING OF
20 THE SITES IF WE WERE UNABLE TO ATTEND THEM, I WONDER IF
21 WE COULD DO OUR SCORES LAST BECAUSE IT IS TAKING US A
22 LITTLE LONGER THAN THE OTHERS TO GET OUR SCORES DOWN ON
23 THE PIECE OF PAPER. I WOULD BENEFIT FROM THE PUBLIC
24 COMMENT AS WELL.

25 MS. LANSING: I SECOND THAT.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE WILL TAKE
2 COMMENT STARTING WITH MAYOR FARGO FROM SACRAMENTO.

3 MAYOR FARGO: THANK VERY MUCH, CHAIR. AND
4 AGAIN, MY THANKS TO THOSE SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE
5 MEMBERS HERE AND THOSE OF YOU ON THE PHONE. THIS IS AN
6 INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT EFFORT THAT YOU'RE EMBARKING ON.
7 WE ARE VERY EXCITED THAT SACRAMENTO IS BEING
8 CONSIDERED, AND WE ARE VERY HOPEFUL ABOUT YOUR
9 DECISION-MAKING. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE A FEW FINAL
10 COMMENTS.

11 WE HAD A WONDERFUL TIME WITH THOSE WHO WERE
12 ABLE TO COME ON SATURDAY, AND I APPRECIATE THE COMMENTS
13 OF THOSE THAT WERE IN ATTENDANCE. WE FELT THAT IT WAS
14 VERY WELL. AND I THINK THAT, BASED ON WHAT I SAW THERE
15 AND WHAT I'VE HEARD AND WHAT I'VE HEARD EVEN MORE
16 TODAY, I DON'T THINK THAT THE BUSINESS SUPPORT OR THE
17 COMMUNITY SUPPORT OR, FRANKLY, THE UNIVERSITY AND
18 EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT IS HIGHER IN ANY OTHER CITY THAN IT
19 WAS EXPRESSED IN SACRAMENTO, EITHER IN THE PROPOSAL OR
20 IN PERSON.

21 WE ARE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF NOT ONLY THIS
22 EFFORT, BUT OF SECURING THE HEADQUARTERS IN THE CITY OF
23 SACRAMENTO, THE CAPITAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

24 I THINK THAT THE ONE WEAKNESS THAT I HAVE
25 HEARD PEOPLE EXPRESS, WHICH I DON'T REALLY SEE

1 IDENTIFIED ON THE CRITERIA, BUT THE WEAKNESS THAT I
2 HAVE HEARD PEOPLE EXPRESS ABOUT THE LACK OF BIOMEDICAL
3 FIRMS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO, I THINK
4 IT'S A MATTER OF LOOKING TO THE PAST OR LOOKING TO THE
5 FUTURE. OUR SACRAMENTO ALLIANCE OF REGIONAL AND TRADE
6 THAT WAS STARTED, WHICH WAS THERE AND WHICH HELPED PUT
7 TOGETHER OUR PROPOSAL, IS VERY MUCH MONITORING THE
8 ESTABLISHMENT AND THE GROWTH OF BIOMEDICAL AND BIOTECH
9 FIRMS IN SACRAMENTO.

10 THEY HAVE ASSURED US THAT WE HAVE QUITE A
11 HEALTHY GROWTH RATE, AND THAT WE ARE REALLY ATTRACTING
12 A LOT OF ENTREPRENEURS THAT ARE INTERESTED IN THIS
13 AREA. OBVIOUSLY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS, AND I
14 MIGHT SAY WE NOT ONLY HAVE THEIR STRONG SUPPORT, THE
15 CHANCELLOR HIMSELF ALONG WITH A NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE
16 FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS CAME TO OUR
17 PROPOSAL PRESENTATION ON SATURDAY TO THE SITE TOUR.
18 THEY HAVE BEEN ACTIVE PARTNERS, NOT ONLY IN THIS
19 PROPOSAL, BUT WE HAVE AN ONGOING RELATIONSHIP WITH THEM
20 WHICH WE DO NOT NEED TO STRENGTHEN OR TO RESURRECT OR
21 TO INVENT. IT'S THERE. THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF
22 OUR REGIONAL ECONOMY. WE ARE VERY PROUD OF UC DAVIS
23 MED CENTER CAMPUS IN THE CITY AS WELL AS OUR
24 RELATIONSHIP TO UC DAVIS.

25 THAT IS NOT ONLY BECAUSE THE MAYOR IS AN

1 ALUMNI AND ALSO ON THE UC DAVIS FOUNDATION BOARD, BUT
2 THERE IS A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAVIS AND
3 SACRAMENTO. AND WE ALSO REALLY SEE OURSELVES AS, AND I
4 THINK WE HAVE BECOME THE REGIONAL HUB FOR HEALTHCARE
5 OUTSIDE OF THE BAY AREA IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA.

6 IN ADDITION, JUST TO REITERATE A FEW OTHER
7 COMMENTS, THE ACTIVITIES OF UC DAVIS FROM THE MIND
8 INSTITUTE, THE PRIMATE CENTER, AND THE VETERINARY
9 SCHOOL ARE ONLY -- THEY ONLY EXIST IN SACRAMENTO. THEY
10 DON'T EXIST ELSEWHERE IN CALIFORNIA. THE MIND
11 INSTITUTE DOESN'T EXIST ELSEWHERE IN THE WORLD. SO IN
12 TERMS OF OUR ABILITY TO ATTRACT PEOPLE WHO ARE
13 INTERESTED IN THE VERY THING THAT YOU ARE INTERESTED IN
14 DOING, WE HAVE IT HERE AND ATTRACTING MORE OF IT.

15 ONE OTHER COMMENT. I THINK THAT IN OUR TOUR,
16 WE DIDN'T MAYBE SHOW AS CLOSE A PROXIMITY OF THE
17 ACTIVITIES THAT EXIST IN OLD SACRAMENTO AND ALONG OUR
18 WATERFRONT. WE TALKED ABOUT THE FACT THAT WE WERE ONLY
19 A FEW BLOCKS AWAY FROM OUR CROCKER ART MUSEUM, ACROSS
20 THE STREET FROM THE EMBASSY SUITES HOTEL WITH ITS
21 RESTAURANTS. BUT THROUGHOUT OLD SACRAMENTO, THERE ARE
22 DOZENS OF RESTAURANTS AND SHOPS, AND OUR MAJOR DOWNTOWN
23 SHOPPING CENTER IS JUST A FEW BLOCKS AWAY AS WELL.

24 SO WE DIDN'T POINT THOSE THINGS OUT AS MUCH
25 BECAUSE WE DIDN'T THINK THAT WAS WHAT WE WERE ASKED TO

1 DO IN THE TOUR, BUT THEY ARE, IN FACT, THERE. SO
2 SACRAMENTO IS PROUD TO BE IN THE RUNNING. WE DO THINK
3 THAT BEING IN THE STATE CAPITAL WILL HELP YOU ADVANCE
4 THE EFFORTS OF YOUR INSTITUTE. AND WE ARE, IN FACT,
5 THE LOGICAL LOCATION FOR YOUR SELECTION. THANK YOU
6 VERY BE. I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS IF YOU HAVE
7 ANY.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MAYOR
9 FARGO. I CAN TELL YOU FROM PRIOR EXPERIENCE OF WORKING
10 WITH HER IN COMMUNITY MEETINGS, THAT SHE ALWAYS FOLLOWS
11 THROUGH ON WHAT SHE SAYS. GREATLY RESPECTED. WE DON'T
12 HAVE TIME FOR QUESTIONS. WE'LL NEED TO GO ON TO THE
13 NEXT COMMENT.

14 MAYOR FARGO: AND I'D LIKE TO WELCOME MAYOR
15 NEWSOM TO SACRAMENTO. WELCOME BACK.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE NEXT COMMENT FROM THE
17 SACRAMENTO SITE, IF I COULD GO TO MAYOR NEWSOM.

18 MAYOR NEWSOM: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THANK
19 YOU, BOB, AND THANK ALL THOSE WHO ARE LISTENING.

20 APPRECIATE MAYOR FARGO'S KIND WORDS AND YOUR GREAT
21 EFFORTS AS WELL AS EMERYVILLE, SAN DIEGO IN ADVANCING
22 THIS IMPORTANT INITIATIVE.

23 I WILL SAY, HAVING LISTENED VERY CLOSELY AND
24 TAKEN NOTES QUITE DILIGENTLY ABOUT THE PROS AND CONS OF
25 SITE, I WANT TO THANK EACH AND EVERY ONE OF YOU, AND I

1 MEAN THIS SINCERELY, FOR YOUR OBJECTIVITY. I THOUGHT
2 THE COMMENTS WERE APPROPRIATE. AND THE COMMENTS, I
3 THOUGHT, WERE QUITE ILLUMINATING.

4 ACCORDINGLY, HAVING FOCUSED ON THE COMMENTS
5 OF CONCERN IN SAN FRANCISCO, I WANT TO TAKE THIS TIME
6 JUST TO REINFORCE ANY OF THOSE CONCERNS OR RATHER
7 REINFORCE YOUR FEARS OR ILLUMINATE THEM FROM YOUR
8 CONSIDERATION AS IT RELATES TO SAN FRANCISCO'S
9 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, IN PARTICULAR. I DON'T KNOW OF
10 ANOTHER CITY IN AMERICA THAT CAN LAY CLAIM TO THE KIND
11 OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT FROM THE INTERFAITH COMMUNITY AS
12 WELL AS THE COLLECTIVE DOWNTOWN AND POLITICAL FOLKS
13 THAN SAN FRANCISCO.

14 WE, PURSUANT TO THE ATTACHMENT H, AND I THINK
15 IT'S ITEM 5, WE DID NOT BRING OUT THE 29 ORGANIZATIONS
16 THAT CAME ON RECORD SUPPORTING THIS INSTITUTE LOCATING
17 IN SAN FRANCISCO, NOR DID WE BRING OUT THE 18
18 POLITICIANS BECAUSE IN THE ATTACHMENT IT SAYS AS
19 DOCUMENTED IN THE RFP. SO WE DOCUMENTED THAT COMMUNITY
20 SUPPORT IN THE RFP, AND HAVE BEEN MORE THAN HAPPY --
21 BOY, IN SAN FRANCISCO WE KNOW HOW TO BRING GREAT CROWDS
22 OUT. WE COULD HAVE BROUGHT THEM ALL OUT. EVERYWHERE
23 FROM LABOR, DOWNTOWN BUSINESS, AND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
24 WERE THE FIRST ONE TO GO ON RECORD SUPPORTING PROP 71,
25 I AS MAYOR. I THINK I WAS ONE OF THE MAYORS.

1 CERTAINLY OUR COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2 DEMONSTRATED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD, THE
3 PRESIDENT UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORTED THIS INITIATIVE. AND,
4 OF COURSE, HEAD OF APPROPRIATIONS, OUR OWN SENATOR
5 MIGDEN, WHO HAS TAKEN THIS AS SERIOUSLY AS SHE HAS. I
6 THINK SHE SNUCK OUT OF HER OTHER DUTIES IN ORDER TO BE
7 HERE TO LAY WITNESS TO THAT BROAD SUPPORT, POLITICAL
8 SUPPORT, AS WELL AS BROAD COMMUNITY SUPPORT.

9 THE ISSUE OF OPEN SPACE AND SUBURBAN/URBAN
10 DISCUSSION IS QUITE INTRIGUING. I SHOULD NOTE THOUGH,
11 NOT AS WE ARE, AS WE WILL BE. SOON YOU'LL HAVE 9100
12 RESEARCHERS JUST WITHIN A FEW HUNDRED YARDS OF THE
13 PROPOSED SITE, 250 KING SITE OF THE UCSF CAMPUS, SIX
14 MILLION SQUARE FEET OF BIOSPACE HAS BEEN SET ASIDE.
15 AND, OF COURSE, IT'S ANCHORED BY UCSF, A 43-ACRE
16 MISSION BAY CAMPUS SITE, OVER 43 ACRES OF OPEN SPACE
17 AND PARKS IN ADDITION TO GOLDEN GATE PARK AND 226
18 NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS. WE REALLY BELIEVE IN THE QUALITY
19 OF LIFE AND LIVABILITY IN SAN FRANCISCO AND OUR
20 PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY ATTITUDES AND ALTERNATIVE
21 TRANSPORTATION BENEFITS.

22 WE DID NOT, THOUGH, HEAR MUCH ABOUT AIRPORTS,
23 AND I WANT TO REINFORCE THE PROXIMITY OF THE SAN
24 FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, JUST 18 MINUTES FROM
25 THE SITE. YOU'RE RIGHT THERE AT THE SITE, TOWARDS THE

1 FREEWAY, THE CALTRANS STATION, AND THE LIKE, SOME
2 100,000 FLIGHTS A WEEK OUT OF SAN FRANCISCO COMPARED,
3 WITH RESPECT, SAN DIEGO JUST ABOUT 5100. SO FROM AN
4 INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE, REINFORCING OUR
5 INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT THAT WE RECEIVED FROM CONSULATES
6 ACROSS THE WORLD, 84 LOCATED IN SAN FRANCISCO, 26 IN
7 SAN DIEGO, FIVE IN SACRAMENTO, AND ZERO IN EMERYVILLE.
8 WE ARE AN INTERNATIONAL CITY AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE IN
9 THE CONTEXT OF OUR CULTURAL AMENITIES, UNIVERSITIES,
10 NOT JUST UCSF AND USF AND PROXIMITY TO STANFORD, BUT
11 ALSO OUR COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM IS CREATING
12 CURRICULUM FOCUSED ON EMERGING INDUSTRIES OF BIOTECH,
13 LIFE SCIENCES, AND NANOTECHNOLOGY.

14 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL, IT WAS CONCEIVED OF AND
15 COINED BY OUR OWN UCSF BY A DOCTOR. WE ARE PROUD OF
16 THAT, AND WE'RE PROUD OF OUR REPUTATION AS THE
17 BIRTHPLACE OF OVER 70 BIOTECH COMPANIES, THREE OF WHICH
18 MOVED BACK JUST IN THE LAST FEW MONTHS. SO BROAD
19 COMMUNITY SUPPORT. IT'S DEEP, NOT ON THE SURFACE.
20 COMMITMENT FROM ELECTED FAMILY, THE LIKES OF WHICH I'VE
21 NEVER SEEN THIS KIND OF CONSENT.

22 MR. MURPHY WAS FUNNY WHEN HE HAD TONGUE IN
23 CHEEK, "I DIDN'T KNOW SAN FRANCISCO WAS RUN BY 30
24 SOMETHINGS." I GUESS THE GOOD THING ABOUT THAT,
25 MR. MURPHY, IS THEY'RE GOING TO BE AROUND TO MAKE SURE

1 THAT THE NEXT DECADE IS A PROSPEROUS ONE FOR THE
2 INSTITUTE.

3 SO WE APPRECIATE, AGAIN, YOUR DELIBERATIONS
4 AND LOOK FORWARD TO THE CONCLUSION OF THIS VERY
5 DIFFICULT ANALYSIS. AND I THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
6 ALLOWING ME TO SPEAK.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU AS WELL FOR SAN
8 FRANCISCO BEING THE FIRST CITY IN CALIFORNIA TO BACK
9 PROPOSITION 71.

10 WE ARE ALSO DISTINGUISHED HERE TODAY WITH
11 ANOTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL, SENATOR CAROL MIGDEN.
12 WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS, SENATOR?

13 THE SENATOR ASSOCIATES HERSELF WITH THE
14 DISTINGUISHED MAYOR'S REMARKS. THAT IS THE SPIRIT OF
15 MOVING THIS FORWARD.

16 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC FROM THIS
17 SITE? AND I COULD ASK, GIVEN THE TIME WE'RE AT, IF
18 ANYONE THAT DOES NOT FEEL THAT THEIR COMMENTS ARE
19 ESSENTIAL TO THE VOTING, AFTER THE VOTING I WILL MAKE
20 ANOTHER PUBLIC COMMENT FOR A PERIOD SPECIFICALLY FOR
21 THAT PURPOSE. WOULD THAT BE ACCEPTABLE, MR. REED?

22 MR. REED: MY NAME IS DON REED FROM
23 CALIFORNIANS FOR CURES. I JUST WANT TO SAY I'VE BEEN
24 TO THREE OF THE SITE VISITS. ALL SITES DID EXCELLENT
25 JOBS, BUT I STILL FEEL SAN FRANCISCO IS THE BEST. THE

1 REASON IS I WANT RESPECT GIVEN TO STEM CELL RESEARCH.
2 AND I FEEL THAT NO CITY IS MORE COSMOPOLITAN, MORE
3 ELEGANT, MORE REFINED, AND OUTSTANDING THAN SAN
4 FRANCISCO. THAT'S WHY AGAIN I LEFT MY HEART IN SAN
5 FRANCISCO. THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I APPRECIATE THE SHORT AND
7 TO-THE-POINT REMARKS. I'M SURE THAT OTHERS HAVE THEIR
8 HEARTS IN SAN DIEGO, EMERYVILLE, AND SACRAMENTO.

9 GOING TO THE SITE IN FRESNO, ANY PUBLIC
10 COMMENTS THERE, DR. PRECIADO?

11 DR. PRECIADO: NO.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GOING TO THE SITE IN SAN
13 DIEGO, ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM SAN DIEGO?

14 DR. REED: YES, WE DO HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT
15 HERE.

16 MR. ROTH: HI. IT'S DUANE ROTH. I WOULD
17 LIKE TO ONCE AGAIN THANK THE COMMITTEE FOR THE TIME
18 THEY SPENT WITH US YESTERDAY. I WOULD MAKE JUST A FEW
19 OVERARCHING COMMENTS HERE.

20 FIRST, THE FUNCTION OF THE BUILDING, THE
21 DISCUSSION ABOUT URBAN VERSUS A MORE RESEARCH-FOCUSED
22 AREA. WE THINK -- WE OBVIOUSLY FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT
23 HAVING THIS INSTITUTE EMBEDDED AMONG OTHER INSTITUTES
24 IN A VERY NARROW RADIUS, A TWO- OR THREE-MILE RADIUS,
25 WOULD BE A GREAT BENEFIT TO THE PEOPLE THAT WORK THERE.

1 THE INTERACTIONS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT DURING OUR
2 PRESENTATION, I THINK THE COMMENT WAS MADE THAT THERE
3 WERE 25 SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS IN SAN DIEGO ON THE TORREY
4 MESA LAST WEEK ALONE. AND THAT HAPPENS EVERY DAY HERE.
5 SO GETTING THE STAFF OF THE INSTITUTE TO INTERACT WITH
6 THE SCIENCE, WE THINK, IS COMPELLING AND WHY WE CHOSE
7 THE LOCATION WE DID AS OPPOSED TO A DOWNTOWN LOCATION
8 THAT WE COULD HAVE USED.

9 IN TERMS OF INCENTIVES, I WAS PLEASED THAT
10 YOU RECOGNIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF SAIC AND WHAT THEY
11 COULD BRING TO GET THIS NEW INSTITUTE UP AND RUNNING IN
12 TERMS OF CONTRACTS, GRANTS, THE MANAGEMENT OF THOSE,
13 THE AUDIT OF THOSE. THEY JUST HAVE AN EXPERIENCE
14 THAT'S UNMATCHED ANYWHERE IN THE COUNTRY.

15 THE READINESS TEAMS THAT WE EMPHASIZED ALSO,
16 WE THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THE FOCUS ON
17 GETTING THIS INSTITUTE FUNCTIONAL. YOU HAVE MANY OTHER
18 THINGS TO WORRY ABOUT. THE BUILDING AND GETTING
19 ORGANIZED SHOULD NOT BE ONE OF THEM. WE EXPECT TO DO
20 THAT FOR YOU.

21 WE MIGHT COMMENT THAT THERE ARE 25,000
22 WORKERS IN THAT TWO-ZIP CODE AREA WHERE WE'VE EMBEDDED
23 THIS INSTITUTE ON THE TORREY MESA.

24 IN TERMS OF CONFERENCE FACILITIES AND HOTELS,
25 THERE WAS A QUESTION ASKED. CAN WE AFFORD IT? BOB, I

1 KNOW THEY'RE FOUR AND FIVE STAR HOTELS, BUT I WANT TO
2 MAKE SURE YOU DIDN'T MISS THOSE ARE ALL STATE RATES,
3 ALL AT STATE RATES. SO THAT MEANS REGARDLESS OF WHAT
4 THEY GO FOR ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS, THEY WOULD BE
5 AVAILABLE FOR THAT.

6 ALSO, JUST IN TERMS OF HOTEL ROOMS AND LARGE
7 CONFERENCES, I HAVE YET TO FIGURE OUT HOW YOU WOULD
8 DONATE THOSE TO WHICH PARTIES. IF YOU HAVE A
9 CONFERENCE FOR 20,000 PEOPLE, WHO GETS THE FREE ROOMS
10 AND WHO PAYS? SO WE DID DO THAT. WE DID THINK ABOUT
11 THE COMMITTEE ITSELF. WE DID THINK ABOUT THE MEETINGS
12 WHERE YOU'VE GOT A HUNDRED OR 150 PEOPLE FOR A VERY
13 HIGH LEVEL SCIENTIFIC MEETING, AND THAT WAS A BIG PART
14 OF OURS.

15 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, I HOPE WE DEMONSTRATED
16 THAT. I'M SORRY THAT WE DID NOT AND WERE NOT ABLE TO
17 BRING IN THE PATIENT ADVOCATE GROUPS THAT WE HAVE DOWN
18 HERE. WE HAVE ONE OF THE STRONGEST PATIENT ADVOCATE
19 GROUPS, OBVIOUSLY BECAUSE OF SO MUCH WORK THAT WE DO IN
20 THE BIOMEDICAL FIELD IN CONJUNCTION WITH THESE RESEARCH
21 CENTERS. BUT IT WAS SUNDAY MORNING. THAT WAS PROBABLY
22 A BIT TO OUR DISADVANTAGE IN TERMS OF THAT.

23 AND THE SECOND THING, THE QUALITY OF THIS
24 SETTING VERSUS WHAT'S AVAILABLE IN THE IMMEDIATE
25 VICINITY, TWO MILES UP THE ROAD NORTH IS THE CITY OF

1 DEL MAR AND THREE MILES DOWN THE HILL IS LA JOLLA.
2 YOU'RE CLOSE TO THE UNIVERSITY TOWN CENTER, ALL OF
3 WHICH ARE SURROUNDING THIS RESEARCH HUB AND EMBEDDED IN
4 IT.

5 SO LAST COMMENT, SAN DIEGO IS KNOWN AS SORT
6 OF A CONSERVATIVE AREA, BUT WE TOO HAD THE CHAMBER OF
7 COMMERCE VOTE FOR PROP 71, SORT OF UNHEARD OF. WE LED
8 THE EFFORT TO GET THE BIOCUM, BIO, THE NATIONAL
9 ORGANIZATION, THAT MOTION WAS MADE FROM SAN DIEGO TO
10 SUPPORT PROP 71, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. AND THE
11 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF HEALTH MEETING THAT, BOB, YOU
12 ATTENDED, WE WERE FIRST TO DO THAT.

13 AND THEN I WANT TO ADD, FINALLY, THE LINCOLN
14 CLUB OF SAN DIEGO, A REPUBLICAN CONSERVATIVE GROUP,
15 ENDORSED PROP 71 JUST SO THAT WE COULD OFFSET THE FAR
16 RIGHT WHO WE WERE WORRIED WOULD COME AFTER THIS. SO WE
17 WOULD LOVE TO HAVE THIS INSTITUTE. WE HOPE YOU'LL
18 CHOOSE IT HERE, AND I'D BE HAPPY TO ANY ANSWER
19 QUESTIONS YOU HAVE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, DUANE. AND I
21 WOULD ECHO YOUR COMMENTS, THAT SAN DIEGO WAS A REAL
22 LEADER IN MANY AREAS OF KEY BUSINESS ENDORSEMENTS IN
23 THE STATE, AND THE BIOCUM ORGANIZATION, ALONG WITH
24 CALIFORNIA HEALTHCARE ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHERS LOCATED
25 IN THAT AREA REALLY LED AND, DUANE, WE THANK YOU FOR

1 YOUR LEADERSHIP IN THAT EFFORT.

2 ANY ADDITIONAL SAN DIEGO COMMENTS? NO
3 ADDITIONAL SAN DIEGO COMMENTS.

4 DR. REED: I DON'T SEE ANY, NO.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: UCLA COMMENTS?

6 MS. LANSING: NONE.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THAT LEAVES US ANY
8 CITY OF HOPE COMMENTS?

9 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, I DO HAVE ONE COMMENT.

10 MR. ZANOW: I HAVE ONE COMMENT. NEARLY EVERY
11 SITE THERE WAS A COMMENT OR CONCERN EXPRESSED ABOUT THE
12 AVAILABILITY OR ACCESS TO UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES. I
13 SIMPLY WANT TO POINT OUT THAT ALL OR MOST RELEVANT
14 JOURNALS ARE AVAILABLE ON-LINE THESE DAYS, AND THE
15 ACCESS TO LIBRARY SHOULD NOT BE OF TOO GREAT A CONCERN.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK FOR THE RECORD,
17 CNET, WHICH ALL THOSE SITES THAT ARE CONNECTED TO FIBER
18 OPTICS AND CNET WOULD HAVE ACCESS TO ALL THE UNIVERSITY
19 LIBRARY SYSTEMS IS OUR UNDERSTANDING. DR. POMEROY
20 INDICATES THAT IS CORRECT.

21 HAVE WE COVERED ALL THE SITES FOR PUBLIC
22 COMMENTS?

23 MS. SHREVE: WE HAVE ONE ADDITIONAL COMMENT
24 HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO.

25 MR. SEARS: THIS IS JEFF SEARS, AND I'M HERE

1 WITH PAT O'KEEFE REPRESENTING THE PROPOSAL MADE BY THE
2 CITY OF EMERYVILLE. AND WE REALLY APPRECIATED ALL THE
3 TIME YOU ALL HAVE TAKEN OUT OF YOUR BUSY SCHEDULES TO
4 VISIT US. WE HOPE THAT YOU SAW WHAT EMERYVILLE HAS TO
5 OFFER. IT SOUNDED LIKE FROM THE COMMENTS YOU'VE GOT A
6 VERY GOOD FLAVOR. I'LL BE BRIEF BECAUSE YOUR TIME IS
7 VALUABLE.

8 I WAS GLAD TO HEAR THAT PEOPLE DID RECOGNIZE
9 THAT UC BERKELEY AND THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF OAKLAND
10 ARE VERY, VERY NEARBY, JUST A MATTER OF A COUPLE MILES.
11 AND OBVIOUSLY THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF OAKLAND HAS
12 ALREADY BEEN ENGAGED IN SOME VERY IMPORTANT STEM CELL
13 RESEARCH, AND THAT WOULD BE AN IMPORTANT LINKAGE, WE
14 THINK, WOULD GROW WITH YOU LOCATED IN EMERYVILLE.

15 THERE WAS A CONCERN ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE
16 PRIVATE COMMITMENT MADE BY PIXAR AND CHIRON AS HOSTING
17 CONFERENCES. AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT THOSE
18 COMMITMENTS WERE TAKEN VERY SERIOUSLY BY THOSE
19 ENTITIES, AND THOSE WERE COMMITMENTS THEY MADE TO THE
20 CITY ITSELF. AND BOTH ENTITIES, I THINK, STRESSED
21 DEEPLY ON THE TOUR THAT YOU CAN EVALUATE FOR YOURSELVES
22 THEIR CLOSE WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CITY. SO I
23 WOULD VENTURE THAT THOSE ARE AS STRONG OF A COMMITMENT
24 OVER TIME AS WOULD BE IF AN ADMINISTRATION CHANGED,
25 DIFFERENT CITIES OFFERING THEIR MUNICIPAL FACILITIES.

1 HOPEFULLY, IF YOU SELECTED EMERYVILLE AS A
2 LOCATION, THE WISE LEADERS OF SAN FRANCISCO WOULD STILL
3 SEE FIT TO MAKE SOME OF THOSE LARGER FACILITIES
4 AVAILABLE THAT THE ONE SQUARE MILE CITY OF EMERYVILLE
5 ISN'T ABLE TO HAVE.

6 MOST IMPORTANTLY, I THINK, IS THAT EMERYVILLE
7 WANTED TO STRESS THAT IT HAS BEEN A MAJOR LOCATION OF
8 PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BIOTECH EFFORTS FOR OVER 20 YEARS.
9 WHILE SOME AREAS ARE EMERGING AS NEW BIOTECH CENTERS,
10 EMERYVILLE HAS BEEN THAT QUITE SOME TIME, AND WE THINK
11 IT WOULD BE A VERY ATTRACTIVE PLACE FOR YOU TO RECRUIT
12 INTO AND IN WHICH TO LOCATE YOUR FACILITY. THANK YOU.

13 MS. LANSING: ONE QUESTION, WHICH YOU MAY
14 HAVE COVERED BEFORE I WAS HERE. ISN'T EMERYVILLE ONLY
15 LIKE A 35-MINUTE DRIVE FROM SAN FRANCISCO, OR AM I
16 WRONG?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S ONLY ABOUT A 12- TO
18 15-MINUTE DRIVE FROM SAN FRANCISCO. ALL RIGHT.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT IS COMPLETED. I'D ASK THAT
20 THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS NOW VOTE, AND THEN WE WILL GO
21 THROUGH EACH COMMITTEE MEMBER'S VOTE VERY QUICKLY. THE
22 STAFF WILL TABULATE THOSE VOTES, AND I BELIEVE,
23 COUNSEL, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, BASED UPON THE
24 PROCESS WE'VE ALREADY IDENTIFIED TO IDENTIFY NO. 1 AND
25 NO. 2, THAT IF SHERRY LANSING OR MR. REED WOULD NOT

1 NEED TO REMAIN FOR THE TABULATIONS BECAUSE THE ACTUAL
2 TABULATIONS WILL DICTATE NO. 1 AND NO. 2?

3 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE COUNSEL SAYS THAT IS
5 CORRECT. SO BUT RECOGNIZING MR. REED'S COMMENT, WE
6 WILL START WITH THE SCORING BY MEMBERS WHO WERE PRESENT
7 BECAUSE THEY'VE HAD MORE TIME TO CONSIDER THIS FOR THEM
8 TO ANNOUNCE THEIR SCORES. BUT DR. REED AND SHERRY
9 LANSING, KNOWING YOUR TIME CONSTRAINT, IF YOU WILL
10 PLEASE ANNOUNCE AT THE BREAK BETWEEN MEMBERS' SCORES,
11 IF YOU ARE PREPARED, WE'LL TAKE YOUR SCORES SO THAT YOU
12 COULD THEN MEET YOUR OBLIGATION.

13 MS. LANSING: I'M ALREADY 15 MINUTES LATE, SO
14 I'M GOING TO GO AFTER THE FIRST TWO BECAUSE I AM
15 PREPARED, BUT I'D RATHER LISTEN.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF WE COULD BEGIN WITH --

17 MS. KING: BOB, QUESTION FROM SAN DIEGO. ARE
18 THEY TO GIVE YOU THEIR TOTAL SCORES OR INDIVIDUAL
19 SCORES BY NUMBER?

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COUNSEL HAS INDICATED BY
21 CATEGORY. I WOULD LIKE TO START WITH DR. POMEROY IF
22 THAT'S ACCEPTABLE. BY CITY, YOU WILL GO DOWN EACH
23 CATEGORY ITEM. DR. POMEROY.

24 DR. POMEROY: I'LL DO IT IN THE ORDER THAT WE
25 VISITED. FUNCTION, 5; INCENTIVES, 8; LOCATION, 7;

1 CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT,
2 6; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 5; GENERAL OVERALL
3 IMPRESSION, 15 POINTS; BURDEN, I TOOK OFF 6 POINTS FOR
4 COST OF LIVING.

5 MS. LANSING: WHAT TOWN?

6 DR. POMEROY: THAT WAS SAN FRANCISCO.

7 EMERYVILLE: FUNCTION, 6; INCENTIVES, 3; LOCATION, 5;
8 CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 4; COMMUNITY SUPPORT,
9 8; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 5, GENERAL OVERALL
10 IMPRESSIONS, I GAVE 10 POINTS; AND I TOOK OFF 6 POINTS
11 FOR THE RELATIVE LACK OF DISTANCE FROM THE NUMBERS OF
12 HOTELS AND UNIVERSITIES, RECOGNIZING THE LOCATION OF UC
13 BERKELEY.

14 THIRD CITY WAS SACRAMENTO THAT WE VISITED.
15 FUNCTION, 8; INCENTIVES, 7; LOCATION, 5; CONFERENCE AND
16 HOTEL FACILITIES, 6; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 9; QUALITY OF
17 WORK SETTING, 8; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, I GAVE 20
18 POINTS; AND I TOOK OFF 6 POINTS FOR THE RELATIVE LACK
19 OF PRIVATE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

20 AND SAN DIEGO. FUNCTION, 5; INCENTIVES, 9;
21 LOCATION, 9; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 6;
22 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 7; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 7;
23 GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, I GAVE 23 POINTS; AND I
24 TOOK OFF 7 POINTS FOR COMBINATION OF COST AND LIVING
25 CONSIDERATIONS AND THE DISTANCE TO SACRAMENTO.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO GO TO
2 DR. PENHOET.

3 DR. PENHOET: FOR SAN FRANCISCO: FUNCTION,
4 8; INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 8; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL
5 FACILITIES, 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK
6 SETTING, 9; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 25; PRIMARILY
7 DUE TO THE COST OF LIVING, MINUS 5 ON THE BURDEN.

8 I WILL NOT VOTE ON EMERYVILLE, AS I DISCUSSED
9 BEFORE.

10 FOR SACRAMENTO, FUNCTION, 8; INCENTIVES, 8;
11 LOCATION, 5; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 7;
12 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 8; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 7;
13 OVERALL IMPRESSION, 20, AND NO DEDUCTIONS.

14 FOR SAN DIEGO: FUNCTION, 8; INCENTIVES, 8;
15 LOCATION, 8; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 7;
16 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 9; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 10;
17 OVERALL IMPRESSION, 25.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE ARE GOING TO GO
19 TO -- WELL, WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE FIRST TWO, SO SHERRY
20 LANSING, WE'RE GOING TO YOU.

21 MS. LANSING: I WAS A LOT EASIER. MAYBE
22 THAT'S THE DIFFICULTY OF LISTENING. I'LL JUST START IN
23 THE ORDER THAT THE PAPERS ARE HANDED TO ME. SAN
24 FRANCISCO: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 10;
25 CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT,

1 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, I GAVE IT A 5, AND I JUST
2 I'M -- FROM WHAT I'VE HEARD, I'M JUST VERY THROWN BY
3 THE FACT THAT THERE IS NOT -- THAT IT'S A BUILDING THAT
4 HAS A BORDERS AND IT HAS CONDOMINIUMS IN IT. THAT'S
5 THE THING THAT THREW ME THE MOST ABOUT SAN FRANCISCO
6 BECAUSE OF MY DESIRE FOR IT TO BE A PRESTIGIOUS
7 BUILDING THAT I THINK WILL BE PHOTOGRAPHED ALL OVER THE
8 WORLD. AND THAT THREW ME.

9 OVERALL IMPRESSION, 30; AND I TOOK OFF ONE
10 POINT FOR COST OF LIVING.

11 THEN SACRAMENTO: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVES,
12 10; LOCATION, BECAUSE THOUGH IT IS NEXT TO CERTAIN
13 OBVIOUSLY DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITIES, NOT AS MANY, I
14 GAVE IT A 7 THERE; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 10;
15 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 10;
16 GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 30; AND I TOOK OFF 5 JUST
17 BECAUSE OF IT NOT BEING AS MUCH OF AN INTERNATIONAL
18 DRAW AND NOT BEING A PLACE THAT I THINK WILL -- I LOVE
19 SACRAMENTO, AND I DO, I DON'T FEEL IT'S AS MUCH OF AN
20 INTERNATIONAL DRAW, SO I TOOK OFF 5 THERE.

21 SAN DIEGO: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVES, 10;
22 LOCATION, 10; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, I GAVE
23 IT AN 8, MINDFUL OF THE FACT THAT THERE WAS SUCH A
24 SWING IN THE COST THAT THEY COULD SUPPLY AS COMPARED TO
25 OTHER LOCATIONS; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK

1 SETTING, I GAVE IT A 10 BECAUSE I FEEL BEING IN A RURAL
2 ENVIRONMENT IS NOT A NEGATIVE, BUT PROVIDES A COLLEGIAL
3 ENVIRONMENT; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 30; AND I TOOK
4 OFF ONE BECAUSE OF JUST GENERAL IMPRESSION.

5 EMERYVILLE: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVES, 10;
6 LOCATION, I GAVE IT A 9 BECAUSE THOUGH IT IS CLOSE TO
7 CERTAIN UNIVERSITIES, IT IS NOT AS CLOSE AS OTHER
8 PLACES, BUT IT DOES HAVE ACCESS. AND YOU'RE TELLING ME
9 IT'S 12 MINUTES, NOT EVEN THE 25 MINUTES I ANTICIPATED;
10 CONFERENCE HOTEL FACILITIES, 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10;
11 QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 10; GENERAL OVERALL
12 IMPRESSION, 30; AND THEN I TOOK OFF 5 JUST BECAUSE A
13 FEELING THAT IT ISN'T VIEWED -- IT'S VIEWED PRIMARILY
14 AS A BIOTECH CENTER, AND THOUGH THAT IS NOT A NEGATIVE,
15 IT DIDN'T SEEM TO HAVE AS MUCH OF A BALANCE.

16 HAVING GIVEN YOU THESE VOTES, I JUST WANT TO
17 SAY FOR THE RECORD IT IS EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO DO THIS
18 THIS FAST, AND IT IS ALSO EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO DO IT
19 HAVING NOT SEEN THE SITES. BUT THAT IS WHAT I
20 INTERPRETED FROM WHAT MY PARTNERS ON THE COMMITTEE WERE
21 SAYING.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. DR.
23 FRIEDMAN.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M STILL SCORING SOME OF
25 THESE. IF I COULD GO LAST.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. REED.

2 DR. REED: ONE SEC. OKAY. SO SAN FRANCISCO:
3 FUNCTION, 3; THE MULTIUSE ASPECT OF THAT BUILDING IS A
4 REAL TURNOFF FOR ME WITH REAL ESTATE AT THE BOTTOM,
5 ETC.; INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 3. THE FACT THAT
6 THERE'S REALLY ONLY ONE MAJOR ORGANIZATION WITHIN SOME
7 DISTANCE, AND MOST OF THE BUILDOUT ON THAT CAMPUS IS
8 STILL OCCURRING WAS A TURNOFF FOR ME. CONFERENCE AND
9 HOTELS, 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK
10 SETTING, 5; OVERALL IMPRESSION, 9; NO BURDENS.

11 FOR EMERYVILLE: I HAVE 3 FOR FUNCTION, THE
12 FACT THAT WE HAVE TO GO TO CORPORATE PLACES FOR OUR
13 CONFERENCE ROOMS IS A MAJOR CONCERN FOR ME; INCENTIVES,
14 5; LOCATION, 2; CONFERENCE/HOTELS, 3; COMMUNITY
15 SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 5; OVERALL
16 IMPRESSIONS, 10; NO BURDENS.

17 SACRAMENTO: SIX FOR FUNCTION; 5 FOR
18 INCENTIVES; LOCATION, 2; CONFERENCE AND HOTELS, 4;
19 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 3;
20 OVERALL IMPRESSION, 10; NO BURDENS.

21 SAN DIEGO: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVES, 10;
22 LOCATION, 10; CONFERENCE/HOTELS, 9; COMMUNITY SUPPORT,
23 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 9; OVERALL IMPRESSIONS,
24 27; NO BURDENS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO.

1 DR. PRECIADO: SAN FRANCISCO: FUNCTION, 10;
2 INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 10; CONFERENCE/HOTELS, 10 --
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HOLD ON.
4 DR. PENHOET: CAN YOU START FROM THE
5 BEGINNING AGAIN, PLEASE?
6 DR. PRECIADO: SAN FRANCISCO --
7 DR. POMEROY: MAKING SURE WE HAVE ALL THE
8 RIGHT NUMBERS IN THE RIGHT COLUMNS, PHYLLIS, ON THE
9 PREVIOUS VOTES.
10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: PHYLLIS, JUST GO A LITTLE
11 SLOWER.
12 DR. PRECIADO: SAN FRANCISCO: FUNCTION, 10;
13 INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 10; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL, 10;
14 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORKPLACE, 10;
15 OVERALL GENERAL THOUGHTS, 13; AND COST OF LIVING, MINUS
16 10, WHICH I THINK IS A HUGE BURDEN.
17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MINUS TEN.
18 DR. PRECIADO: EMERYVILLE: FUNCTION, 9;
19 INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 7; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL, 8;
20 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 8; QUALITY OF WORKPLACE, 8; GENERAL
21 13, AND MINUS 5 FOR COST OF LIVING.
22 CAN I GO ON? SACRAMENTO: FUNCTION, 10;
23 INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 8; CONFERENCE/HOTEL, 10;
24 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORKPLACE, 10;
25 OVERALL GENERAL IMPRESSION, 25; AND NO DEDUCTIONS.

1 SAN DIEGO: FUNCTION, 9; INCENTIVES, 10;
2 LOCATION, 10; QUALITY OF CONFERENCE/HOTEL, 8; COMMUNITY
3 SUPPORT, 7; QUALITY OF WORKPLACE, 8; MY OVERALL
4 IMPRESSIONS IS 8; AND MINUS 5 FOR COST OF LIVING.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. MURPHY.

6 DR. MURPHY: SAN FRANCISCO: FUNCTION, 5;
7 INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 7; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL
8 FACILITIES, 9; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 8; QUALITY OF WORK
9 SETTING, 4; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 10; AND A MINUS
10 3 FOR THE BUILDING, WHICH I THOUGHT WAS SUBOPTIMAL.

11 EMERYVILLE: FUNCTION, 8; INCENTIVES, 7;
12 LOCATION, ZERO; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 2;
13 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 8; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 5;
14 GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 5; AND BURDEN, MINUS 5 FOR
15 THE RELIANCE ON THE COMMERCIAL ENTITIES FOR MEETING
16 SPACE.

17 SACRAMENTO: FUNCTION, 7; INCENTIVES, 7;
18 LOCATION, 4; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL, 8; COMMUNITY
19 SUPPORT, 8; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 6; GENERAL OVERALL
20 IMPRESSION, 15, WITH NO BURDENS.

21 SAN DIEGO: FUNCTION, 9; INCENTIVES, 10;
22 LOCATION, 10; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 10;
23 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 8;
24 GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 26; NO BURDENS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN.

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: SAN FRANCISCO: FUNCTION, 5;
2 INCENTIVES, 10; LOCATION, 8; CONFERENCE/HOTEL
3 FACILITIES, 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 9; QUALITY OF WORK
4 SETTING, 5; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 20; BURDEN,
5 MINUS 5.

6 NEXT IS EMERYVILLE. DID I MISS SOMETHING?
7 OKAY. FUNCTION, 8; INCENTIVES, 8; LOCATION, 6;
8 CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 6; COMMUNITY SUPPORT,
9 8; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 5; GENERAL OVERALL
10 IMPRESSION, 15; BURDEN, MINUS 5.

11 NEXT IS SACRAMENTO: THE FUNCTION, 8;
12 INCENTIVES, 8; LOCATION, 6; CONFERENCE/HOTEL
13 FACILITIES, 8; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK
14 SETTING, 8; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 20; I HAVE NO
15 BURDENS ON THAT ONE.

16 AND THE LAST ONE IS SAN DIEGO: HERE I HAVE
17 FUNCTION, 8; INCENTIVES, 9; LOCATION, 9; CONFERENCE AND
18 HOTEL FACILITIES, 7; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 8; QUALITY OF
19 WORK SETTING, 8; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 20, WITH A
20 MINUS 5.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THIS IS BOB
22 KLEIN. I BELIEVE WE COVERED EVERYONE ELSE; IS THAT
23 CORRECT?

24 MS. KING: YES.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SAN FRANCISCO: FUNCTION,

1 10; INCENTIVES, 10, VERY SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE OF THE
2 INCLUSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC FACILITIES, 45,000 FEET,
3 WHICH I HOPE WE CAN USE IN LIEU OF SOME MAJOR FACILITY
4 BUILDING; LOCATION, 8; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES,
5 10; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 9;
6 GENERAL IMPRESSION, 27; NO BURDENS.

7 EMERYVILLE: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVE, 7;
8 LOCATION, 9; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 6;
9 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 8;
10 GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 23; NO BURDENS.

11 SACRAMENTO: FUNCTION, 10; INCENTIVES, 6;
12 LOCATION, 5, WHICH IS PROXIMITY; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL
13 FACILITIES, 8; COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK
14 SETTING, 7; GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSION, 25; NO BURDENS.

15 SAN DIEGO: FUNCTION, 9; INCENTIVES, 8;
16 LOCATION, 10; CONFERENCE AND HOTEL FACILITIES, 5;
17 COMMUNITY SUPPORT, 10; QUALITY OF WORK SETTING, 8;
18 GENERAL OVERALL IMPRESSIONS, 25; NO BURDENS.

19 DR. PRECIADO: BOB, FOR GENERAL IMPRESSIONS
20 FOR SACRAMENTO, I DIDN'T ADD MY POINTS BECAUSE I
21 DIVIDED EVERYTHING CORRECTLY. CAN I CHANGE THAT?

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF THERE WAS AN ERROR, YOU
23 CAN CORRECT AN ERROR.

24 DR. PRECIADO: I NEED TO CORRECT AN ERROR FOR
25 SACRAMENTO. IN GENERAL IMPRESSIONS, I GAVE IT 25.

1 IT'S ACTUALLY A 30.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. ALL OF
3 THE VOTES HAVE BEEN ENTERED. THEY HAVE BEEN ENTERED
4 REAL TIME ON A LAPTOP, AND WE WILL WAIT FOR THE STAFF
5 TO VALIDATE THE OUTCOME. SHERRY LANSING.

6 MS. BROWN: SHERRY HAS LEFT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WE WILL SEND HER WITH
8 OUR BEST REGARDS FOR HER AWARD. AND DR. REED.

9 DR. MURPHY: HE HAS LEFT, BOB.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE SEND HIM TO HIS MEETING
11 WITH THANKS FOR THE EXTRA HALF HOUR.

12 DR. MURPHY: CAN I MAKE A COMMENT BEFORE THE
13 VOTES ARE TALLIED OR WHILE THEY'RE BEING TALLIED? I
14 JUST WANT TO CONGRATULATE THE COMMITTEE FOR WORKING
15 VERY HARD ON THIS AND BEING AS OBJECTIVE AS I THINK WE
16 CAN BE. AND ALSO TO THANK, AGAIN, THE PEOPLE FROM THE
17 DIFFERENT SITES FOR DOING A TERRIFIC JOB IN PUTTING
18 TOGETHER VERY COMPELLING APPLICATIONS. I THINK IT WAS
19 A PROCESS, NO MATTER WHO WINS, THAT WE CAN ALL BE VERY
20 PROUD OF.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO ECHO THAT,
22 AND I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT I REALLY TRULY BELIEVE
23 THAT THE COMBINATION OF THE CITIES' WORK AND EFFORT,
24 WITH THE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM BOTH THE CHARITABLE DONORS
25 IS A TREMENDOUS ASSET FOR THE FUTURE OF THIS

1 INSTITUTION. AND I THINK THAT IT IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR
2 US TO IMMEDIATELY MOVE TO A PROCESS WHERE THOSE
3 CONTRIBUTIONS CAN BE CAPTURED IN A PARTNERSHIP WITH THE
4 INSTITUTE.

5 COUNSEL HAS A COMMENT.

6 MR. HARRISON: IF THE MEMBERS OF THE
7 COMMITTEE WOULD PLEASE SEND THEIR SCORING SHEETS INTO
8 STAFF AT CIRM, SO WE CAN MAINTAIN THEM FOR THE RECORD,
9 THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

10 DR. PRECIADO: I DON'T HAVE A FAX MACHINE.
11 CAN I MAIL IT?

12 MR. BARNES: YOU MAY MAIL OR FAX, EITHER ONE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO ANNOUNCE THE
14 TOTALS. THESE ARE AVERAGES OF THE SCORES, AND I WILL
15 BREAK THEM DOWN FOR YOU AS FIRST ROUND AND SECOND
16 ROUND. AND I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT, AS I STATED
17 BEFORE, THAT WE'RE GOING TO ADVANCE ALL FOUR OF THE
18 SCORES TO THE BOARD. AND IT WILL BECOME QUITE APPARENT
19 THAT TURNS OUT TO BE A VERY GOOD IDEA.

20 THE SCORES, NO. 1 IS SAN FRANCISCO WITH 158
21 POINTS IN THE FIRST ROUND, 64.7 AVERAGE IN THE SECOND
22 ROUND. NO. 2 IS SACRAMENTO, 135 IN THE FIRST ROUND,
23 65.5 IN THE SECOND ROUND. THAT TOTAL IS 200.5. THE
24 SAN DIEGO TOTAL IS 199.8, AND THE SAN FRANCISCO TOTAL
25 IS 222.85.

1 DR. PRECIADO: BOB, YOU LOST ME. I DON'T
2 UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU REPEAT YOURSELF?

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME GO BACK THROUGH.
4 FIRST OF ALL, LET ME GIVE YOU EMERYVILLE'S SCORES FIRST
5 ON THE FIRST PART. EMERYVILLE, FIRST PART WAS 119;
6 SECOND ROUND WAS 52.7; TOTAL IS 171.7.

7 BACK THROUGH IT TO MAKE SURE.

8 MS. KING: YOU DIDN'T GIVE US SAN DIEGO.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO GO BACK THROUGH
10 SAN DIEGO AGAIN. FIRST ROUND IS 127; SECOND ROUND IS
11 72.8; TOTAL IS 199.8. MY POINT IS THAT THERE IS
12 SEVEN-TENTHS OF ONE POINT SEPARATING SAN DIEGO AND
13 SACRAMENTO.

14 DR. PRECIADO: CAN YOU REPEAT SAN FRANCISCO
15 AND SACRAMENTO, PLEASE?

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WILL DO THAT. SAN
17 FRANCISCO: FIRST ROUND, 158; SECOND ROUND, 64.75;
18 TOTAL OF 222.75. I THINK I SAID .85 BEFORE. I
19 COULDN'T READ IT. IT IS 222.75 IS THE CORRECT NUMBER.

20 AGAIN, LET ME REPEAT SACRAMENTO. FIRST
21 ROUND, 135; 65.5, SECOND ROUND; 200.5.

22 DR. PRECIADO: I DON'T KNOW WHY I'M HAVING A
23 HARD TIME UNDERSTANDING YOU, BOB. 135 FOR SAC FIRST.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: 65.5 SECOND ROUND.

25 DR. PRECIADO: TOTAL?

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: 200.5.

2 DR. PRECIADO: FIRST IS SAN FRANCISCO AND
3 SACRAMENTO SECOND?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT.

5 I'D LIKE TO, AGAIN, EMPHASIZE FOR EVERYONE
6 THAT THE REAL WINNERS IN THIS COMPETITION ARE THE
7 PATIENTS THAT WE'RE SERVING BECAUSE DOLLARS SAVED MEANS
8 DOLLARS FOR RESEARCH. THE REAL WINNERS ARE MEDICAL
9 RESEARCHERS WHO ARE COMMITTING THEIR LIVES TO CURE
10 CHRONIC DISEASE, TO REDUCE HUMAN SUFFERING BECAUSE
11 DOLLARS MEAN MORE RESEARCH DOLLARS TO ADVANCE THOSE
12 DEDICATED EFFORTS OF MEDICAL RESEARCHERS.

13 AND FINALLY, THE REAL WINNERS ARE THE
14 TAXPAYERS OF CALIFORNIA BECAUSE DOLLARS SAVED MEAN
15 DOLLARS THAT WILL GO INTO MEDICAL RESEARCH, WHICH IS
16 THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTE AND WHICH WAS THE
17 COMMITMENT AND THE MANDATE OF THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA.
18 SO THIS IS A TREMENDOUS ENTERPRISE THAT NOW HAS TEN
19 YEARS OF FREE RENT, ABSOLUTELY PRECEDENT SETTING FOR
20 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. NEVER BEFORE IN ITS HISTORY
21 HAS THERE BEEN THE CITIES AND CHARITABLE DONORS GIVING
22 A STATE AGENCY TEN YEARS OF FREE RENT. NEVER BEFORE IN
23 THE HISTORY OF THE STATE HAS A STATE AGENCY BEEN GIVEN
24 TEN YEARS, THE CONFERENCE FACILITIES AND HOTEL ROOMS TO
25 ADVANCE THE MISSION OF BRINGING THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST

1 MINDS FROM AROUND THE WORLD TO ADDRESS THE MISSION OF
2 THE VOTERS.

3 THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. THANK YOU
4 FOR THE DEDICATION OF THE PRESS. AND THANKS TO ALL THE
5 CITIES AND THEIR CONTRIBUTORS FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS
6 EFFORTS AND EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTION TO THIS PROCESS.

7 (APPLAUSE.)

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ANY ADDITIONAL
9 COMMENTS FROM ANY OF THE MEMBERS?

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S MIKE
11 FRIEDMAN. ONLY ONE BRIEF COMMENT, IF I MAY. THE COST
12 OF THE EXTRAORDINARILY CLOSE CLUSTERING OF THESE
13 NUMBERS WHICH REFLECTS THE FINE QUALITY OF THE
14 APPLICATIONS, I THINK IT PLACES A PARTICULAR BURDEN ON
15 THE FULL ICOC IN REVIEWING THIS AND MAKING A FINAL
16 DECISION. AND I WOULD JUST URGE STAFF TO THINK ABOUT
17 WAYS IN WHICH THIS INFORMATION CAN BE MOST DIGESTIBLY
18 PRESENTED TO HAVE THE DISCUSSION FOCUS AS CAREFULLY AS
19 POSSIBLE ON WHAT WILL TURN OUT TO BE RELATIVELY SMALL
20 NUANCES BETWEEN HIGH QUALITY APPLICATIONS.

21 AND I THINK THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT MEETING
22 MANAGEMENT ISSUE BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO BE A HARD
23 DECISION TO MAKE THE FINAL CHOICE. AND WE NEED TO GIVE
24 SOME THOUGHT TO HOW BEST TO HELP THE COMMITTEE MAKE
25 THAT DECISION.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THANK YOU VERY
2 MUCH. ANY OTHER ANY COMMITTEE COMMENTS?

3 DR. MURPHY: BOB, WE HAD TALKED ABOUT
4 PRESENTATIONS BEING MADE BY THE CENTERS AT THE ICOC.
5 HAS THAT -- HAVE YOU GIVEN MORE THOUGHT TO THAT, AND IS
6 THAT SOMETHING THE COMMITTEE SHOULD CONSIDER?

7 MS. KING: WE'RE HEARING SOME COMMENTS.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: PLEASE MUTE EVERYBODY EXCEPT
9 THE SPEAKER.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. MURPHY HAS BROUGHT UP
11 THE ISSUE OF PRESENTATIONS AT THE ICOC.

12 DR. PRECIADO: BOB, THERE IS TOO MUCH
13 DISTRACTION. I CANNOT HEAR YOU.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THE SUGGESTION WAS
15 THAT IF EVERYONE ELSE COULD MUTE, WE WOULD APPRECIATE
16 IT.

17 DR. MURPHY, I THINK BECAUSE OF THE CLOSENESS
18 OF THESE SCORES, IT WOULD BE VERY APPROPRIATE IF THE
19 TOP THREE SITES WERE TO MAKE PRESENTATIONS AT THE ICOC,
20 BUT I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR DISCUSSION BY THE COMMITTEE
21 MEMBERS.

22 DR. PRECIADO: THIS IS DR. PRECIADO. I WAS
23 UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT WE WERE GOING TO HAVE THE TOP
24 TWO UP FOR CONSIDERATION.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO, THAT WAS THE

1 PRIOR POSITION. GIVEN THAT THERE'S ONLY SEVEN-TENTHS
2 OF A POINT SEPARATING NO. 2 AND NO. 3, I WANT TO PUT
3 THAT ISSUE ON THE TABLE FOR DISCUSSION.

4 DR. PRECIADO: WELL, JUST TO REITERATE WHAT
5 I'VE BEEN TOLD OVER AND OVER, WE MUST GO THROUGH -- WE
6 MUST DO THIS BY A PROCESS. AND WE HAVE SET UP OUR --
7 THE PROCESS THAT WE WERE GOING TO USE. AND WE WOULD BE
8 CHANGING THE PROCESS IF WE ADDED THREE.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE WON'T BE CHANGING THE
10 SCORING PROCESS, AND WE WOULD NOT -- WE ARE STILL
11 SUBMITTING THE NO. 1 AND NO. 2 RECOMMENDATION. I AM
12 ONLY RAISING IT OUT OF A CONCERN FOR FAIRNESS. AND
13 IT'S OPEN -- IT DOES NOT MODIFY ANYTHING WE'VE DONE
14 BEFORE, AND IT DOES NOT CHANGE THE SCORING. I'M
15 CONCERNED BECAUSE OF THE CLOSENESS OF THIS VOTE. WE
16 HAVE EXTRAORDINARY APPLICATIONS HERE, AND I'M CONCERNED
17 THAT SAN DIEGO, REPRESENTING A TREMENDOUS OPPORTUNITY,
18 SHOULD ALSO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT. BUT I WOULD
19 LIKE DISCUSSION ON THAT ITEM FROM THE MEMBERS.

20 DR. POMEROY: I'D LIKE TO COMMENT ON THIS. I
21 ACTUALLY WOULD SUPPORT ALL THREE -- TOP THREE SITES
22 PRESENTING. AND I THINK THAT MY REASON FOR THAT IS
23 THAT NOT ALL OF THE PEOPLE VOTING HAD THE CHANCE TO SEE
24 EVERYTHING. AND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A SCORE OF 222
25 AND 200 OR 199 IS VERY, VERY SMALL. AND I THINK THAT

1 THE FULL COMMITTEE NEEDS TO REACH A CONSENSUS. AND
2 THEY CAN DO IT BEST IF WE HAVE ALL THREE OF THESE
3 PEOPLE PRESENTING.

4 I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT THAT WE COULD HAVE
5 EVEN MORE THAN THAT SHOULD THEY CHOOSE TO MAKE THOSE
6 COMMENTS DURING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. SO I WOULD
7 BE IN FAVOR OF ACCOMMODATING ALL THREE.

8 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S MIKE
9 FRIEDMAN. I WOULD AGREE WITH THAT. AND I WOULD MAKE
10 IT CLEAR TO THE REPRESENTATIVES FROM EMERYVILLE THAT
11 SHOULD QUESTIONS ARISE FROM THE COMMITTEE AT THE
12 MEETING OR SHOULD THERE BE A TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT,
13 THAT THEIR REMARKS AND EXPANSIONS WOULD BE THOROUGHLY
14 WELCOMED.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PENHOET.

16 DR. PENHOET: I AGREE WITH THAT POINT OF
17 VIEW. I BELIEVE WE SHOULD EXTEND ALL THREE OF THESE
18 AND ALLOW EMERYVILLE TO MAKE COMMENTS IF THEY CHOOSE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE A
20 CHALLENGING MEETING ON MAY THE 6TH. I BELIEVE THAT THE
21 CONSENSUS THAT WE'RE DEVELOPING HERE IS THAT WE WOULD
22 ALLOW THE TOP THREE TO MAKE COMMENTS. THOSE WOULD BE A
23 LIMITED TIME DURATION. AND WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS
24 SOMETHING IN THE ORDER OF 10 TO 15 MINUTES. TEN
25 MINUTES IN COMMENTS, TEN MINUTES IN QUESTIONS? TEN

1 MINUTES IN COMMENTS AND TEN MINUTES IN QUESTIONS EACH.
2 THAT WOULD MEAN WE TAKE AN HOUR BEFORE COMMITTEE
3 CONSIDERATION WITH 15 ITEMS OR SO ON THAT AGENDA.

4 IS THERE ANYONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A
5 MOTION TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE?

6 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M SORRY, MR. CHAIRMAN. DO
7 YOU MEAN EACH OF THE THREE MUNICIPALITIES WOULD MAKE A
8 TEN-MINUTE PRESENTATION AND THEN HAVE TEN MINUTES FOR
9 QUESTIONS?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

11 DR. FRIEDMAN: WOULD THERE BE ADDITIONAL
12 THEN -- OBVIOUSLY THERE WOULD BE ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION
13 AND COMMENTS BY THE SITE VISITORS AND OTHER MEMBERS OF
14 THE COMMITTEE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION
16 WOULD BE OUTSIDE OF THE TIME ALLOCATED EACH OF THE
17 JURISDICTIONS.

18 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M GOING TO SUGGEST THAT
19 THAT'S LONG.

20 DR. PRECIADO: I AM GOING TO SECOND THAT
21 SUGGESTION.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. LET'S MAKE -- IF
23 SOMEONE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION, I'M PREPARED TO
24 ENTERTAIN A MOTION.

25 DR. FRIEDMAN: JUST FOR DISCUSSION SAKE, I'LL

1 MOVE FIVE MINUTES OF PRESENTATION BY THE CITIES, AND
2 THEN THE QUESTIONS WILL BE ROLLED INTO THE QUESTION
3 TIME THAT'S AVAILABLE. IT WOULD BE CLEAR THAT LOTS OF
4 THE MATERIAL HAS ALREADY BEEN CIRCULATED. THE
5 PRESENTERS SHOULD ASSUME THAT WE'VE READ IT AND
6 DIGESTED ALL THAT MATERIAL. AND THIS WOULD BE AN
7 OPPORTUNITY TO SYNTHESIZE NEW FACTS OR TO PUT THINGS IN
8 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE, TO PRESENT INFORMATION THAT
9 WASN'T ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED BEFORE. THIS WOULD BE JUST
10 SORT OF THE CROWNING MOMENT. AND THEN TO BE AVAILABLE
11 TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS. I VOTE FOR A
12 SHORT TIME.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, TO MAKE IT
14 CLEAR, THOUGH, NO ONE CAN CHANGE THEIR APPLICATION.

15 DR. FRIEDMAN: ABSOLUTELY NOT. I'M TALKING
16 ONLY ABOUT CLARIFICATIONS AND ANSWERING QUESTIONS. NO
17 ONE MAY CHANGE THEIR APPLICATION. IT'S JUST THAT IF
18 THERE'S QUESTIONS THAT CAN BE ANSWERED, THIS WOULD BE
19 THE TIME TO DO IT.

20 DR. MURPHY: MIKE, RICH MURPHY. I THINK FIVE
21 MINUTES IS TOO SHORT. I THINK WE HAVE TO PROVIDE AT
22 LEAST TEN MINUTES BECAUSE IN FIVE MINUTES -- TO ME FIVE
23 MINUTES JUST DOESN'T GIVE ANYONE A CHANCE TO EXPLAIN,
24 ESPECIALLY TO THOSE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC WHO HAVE NOT
25 BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS. I WOULD ARGUE FOR

1 CLOSER TO TEN MINUTES WITH THEN TEN MINUTES FOR
2 DISCUSSION.

3 DR. POMEROY: AS A POSSIBLE COMPROMISE, I'D
4 LIKE TO SUGGEST THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE GIVE EACH OF
5 THE THREE TEN MINUTES FOR PRESENTATION, BUT WE CONFINE
6 THE QUESTIONS TO A LATER PERIOD OF TIME.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. LET US DO THIS.
8 LET'S SET THE PRESENTATION -- I WOULD, TAKING DR.
9 POMEROY'S LEAD, IS THERE A MOTION TO PROVIDE TEN
10 MINUTES OF PRESENTATION FOR EACH OF THE THREE, AND THEN
11 THE BOARD WILL DECIDE HOW MUCH QUESTION TIME TO BE
12 ALLOCATE RELATED TO THIS PROCESS?

13 DR. PENHOET: SO MOVED.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THAT A MOTION, DR.
15 PENHOET?

16 DR. PENHOET: I MOVE THAT WE ADOPT THE
17 LANGUAGE YOU JUST ARTICULATED.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET IS MOVING THAT
19 WE WILL HAVE TEN MINUTES FOR EACH OF THE JURISDICTIONS,
20 NO. 1, NO. 2, AND NO. 3, SAN FRANCISCO, SACRAMENTO, AND
21 SAN DIEGO, FOR PRESENTATIONS. THE BOARD WILL SET THE
22 AMOUNT OF TIME FOR QUESTIONS. IS THERE A SECOND?

23 DR. POMEROY: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND FROM DR. POMEROY.
25 ROLL CALL VOTE WILL COME AFTER PUBLIC COMMENT. ANY

1 PUBLIC COMMENT FROM THE SITE HERE IN SACRAMENTO? MAYOR
2 FARGO COMMENTS SHE LOOKS FORWARD TO SEEING US AT THE
3 NEXT LOCATION.

4 ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENT FROM SACRAMENTO? NO
5 ADDITIONAL COMMENT FROM SACRAMENTO. ANY COMMENTS FROM
6 THE SAN FRANCISCO SITE?

7 MR. SHREVE: NO COMMENTS.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MAYOR NEWSOM SAYS HE IS FOR
9 WHAT WE ARE FOR.

10 ANY COMMENTS FROM THE SITE AT UC SAN
11 FRANCISCO?

12 MS. SHREVE: NO COMMENTS.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM BURNHAM?

14 MS. KING: NONE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM CITY OF
16 HOPE?

17 DR. FRIEDMAN: NONE.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO CALL THE MOTION.
19 ROLL CALL VOTE.

20 DR. FRIEDMAN.

21 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BOB KLEIN, YES. DR. MURPHY.

23 DR. MURPHY: YES.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET.

25 DR. PENHOET: YES.

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.
2 DR. POMEROY: YES.
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRECIADO.
4 DR. PRECIADO: YES.
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I DON'T BELIEVE DR. REED IS
6 THERE.
7 MS. KING: CORRECT.
8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION PASSES. THAT IS THE
9 PROCESS, AND THE MEETING STANDS ADJOURNED.
10 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 5
11 P.M.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25