

BEFORE THE
SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL FACILITIES WORKING GROUP
OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: MIYAKO HOTEL
1625 POST STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DATE: THURSDAY, MAY 3, 2007

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

BRS FILE NO.: 77580

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

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		341
ROLL CALL		341
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS		341
PUBLIC COMMENT		342, 452
REVIEW OF DRAFT FACILITIES GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY		350
DISCUSSION OF FUTURE FACILITIES RFA'S		358
ADJOURNMENT		454

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, MAY 3, 2007
9 A.M.

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

CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: MAY I ASK THE MEMBERS TO TAKE THEIR SEATS AND OTHERS COME TO ORDER. MELISSA, IF YOU CAN ANNOUNCE THE ROLL.

MS. BECKER: MARCY FEIT.

MS. FEIT: HERE.

MS. BECKER: BOB KLEIN.

MR. KLEIN: HERE.

MS. BECKER: SHERRY LANSING. JOAN SAMUELSON. JEFF SHEEHY. DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL. JANET WRIGHT.

DR. WRIGHT: HERE.

MS. BECKER: DEBORAH HYSEN.

MS. HYSEN: HERE.

MS. BECKER: DAVID KASHIAN.

MR. KASHIAN: HERE.

MS. BECKER: DAVID LICHTENGER.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: HERE. SO I'D LIKE TO WELCOME ALL OF THOSE WHO ARE PRESENT FOR THE MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE'S FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. IN ADDITION TO THE MEMBERS PRESENT, WE HAVE STAFF PRESENT. THAT WOULD BE LORI HOFFMAN, THE INTERIM PRESIDENT OF THE CIRM; RICK KELLER, SENIOR OFFICER OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL FACILITIES WORKING GROUP; AND TAMAR PACHTER, OUR COUNSEL.

1 RICK, CAN YOU PLEASE INTRODUCE THE OTHER
2 MEMBERS HERE IN SUPPORT OF THE FACILITIES WORKING
3 GROUP?

4 MR. KELLER: PAT BECKER IS HERE AND MAYBEL
5 CORTEZ.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AND DR. ARLENE CHIU.

7 DR. CHIU: OBSERVER.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YOU ARE THE CHIEF
9 SCIENTIFIC OFFICER OF CIRM. SO I'D LIKE TO INVITE THE
10 PUBLIC TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT NOW AT THIS TIME. I'D
11 ASK YOU TO LIMIT YOUR COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES.
12 PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND AFFILIATION. THANK YOU.

13 MS. HADDAD: THANK YOU. MY NAME IS DEBORAH
14 HADDAD. I'M WITH THE J. DAVID GLADSTONE INSTITUTES
15 HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO. I JUST WANT TO SAY THREE
16 MINUTES ISN'T ADEQUATE TO COMMEND THE WORKING GROUP,
17 THE CIRM STAFF. YOU'VE JUST DONE AN INCREDIBLE JOB.
18 WHAT A DIFFICULT PROCESS. AND I'M GOING TO MAKE A
19 COUPLE OF SUGGESTIONS HERE OF THINGS, BUT MY FOCUS IS
20 GOING TO BE WHAT DIDN'T HAPPEN AS OPPOSED TO EVERYTHING
21 THAT DID, WHICH IS TRULY INCREDIBLE. SO THANK YOU.

22 I THINK I HEARD THE WORKING GROUP RECOGNIZE
23 THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH THE PI
24 COUNTS AND THE WAY THOSE ARE HANDLED. I KNOW MY
25 SCIENTISTS WERE A LITTLE DISAPPOINTED THAT THEY DIDN'T

1 GET FULL CREDIT FOR WHAT THEY FELT OUR PROPOSAL WOULD
2 DO. SO IF THE RFI COULD MAKE A MORE SPECIFIC, A MORE
3 CLEARER GUIDELINE FOR EXACTLY WHO YOU WILL COUNT, WHO
4 YOU WON'T COUNT AND WHY, THAT WOULD BE VERY, VERY
5 HELPFUL TO US.

6 SQUARE FOOT COST, YOU SEE IT'S ALL OVER THE
7 MAP. AND I'M APPRECIATIVE THAT THE COMMITTEE DIDN'T
8 MAKE THAT A BIGGER ISSUE THAN YOU DID. YOU SEEM TO
9 RECOGNIZE THAT WE DO HAVE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES IN
10 ALL OUR ORGANIZATIONS, AND WE DO. FOR EXAMPLE, I'M
11 ACROSS THE STREET FROM UCSF, WHO DOES SPEND \$1500 A
12 SQUARE FOOT. IN MY BUILDING I'VE SPENT ANYWHERE FROM
13 50 TO A THOUSAND A SQUARE FOOT, DEPENDING ON WHAT TYPE
14 OF REMODEL I'M DOING. AND I'M IN AN AREA WHERE THERE'S
15 TWO DEVELOPERS AND FOUR BUILDINGS GOING UP, AND THAT
16 CAN HUGELY AFFECT THE MARKET IN MY AREA.

17 EDWARD KASHIAN NOTED THAT WHEN YOU'RE TRYING
18 TO REMODEL WITHIN A STATE-OF-THE-ART BUILDING, YOU WANT
19 TO KEEP THE INTEGRITY OF THE BUILDING. WE'RE TRYING TO
20 CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT THAT WILL ATTRACT SCIENTISTS, AND
21 SOMETIMES THAT COSTS A LITTLE BIT MORE THAN \$600 A
22 SQUARE FOOT. SO THANK YOU FOR RECOGNIZING THAT.

23 THE TYPES OF SPACE MAKE A HUGE DIFFERENCE.
24 IF YOU ARE DOING OFFICE SPACE, IT'S MUCH LESS EXPENSIVE
25 THAN LAB, WHICH IS MUCH LESS EXPENSIVE THAN VIVARIUM,

1 SO THAT CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE. AND THE SIZE OF A
2 PROJECT MAKES A HUGE DIFFERENCE. IF YOU'RE REMODELING
3 600 SQUARE FEET VERSUS 4,000 SQUARE FEET, IN AGGREGATE
4 YOU'RE GOING TO PAY MORE PER SQUARE FOOT BECAUSE
5 THERE'S JUST CERTAIN COSTS YOU CAN'T SPREAD OUT.

6 SO I WON'T EVEN GET INTO WARM SHELL AND COLD
7 SHELL. THERE WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT TEPID SHELL, AND
8 I'VE HAD MORE TROUBLE WITH SOME WARM SHELLS THAN I'VE
9 HAD WITH COLD SHELLS JUST BECAUSE THINGS WERE SO
10 DISCOMBOBULATED, I'VE HAD TO GO IN AND REDO THEM, AND
11 SOMETIMES THAT CAN COST MORE. I'M NOT SURE WHAT THE
12 ANSWER IS. MAYBE IF THE COST PER SQUARE FOOT COULD
13 HAVE SOME KIND OF CONTEXT AROUND IT. I DON'T KNOW IF
14 THERE IS ONE, BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT'S GOING TO BE A
15 DIFFICULT ISSUE FOR EVERYBODY. JUST SOME KIND OF
16 BENCHMARK AND SOME KIND OF CONTEXT FOR DEALING WITH
17 THAT.

18 THE OTHER THING I HEARD WAS THAT THE WORKING
19 GROUP, AFTER READING PROPOSALS, THERE WERE SEVERAL
20 THINGS YOU LIKED. YOU LIKED GREEN BUILDINGS, YOU LIKED
21 BUILDINGS THAT WERE NEAR PUBLIC TRANSIT, YOU LIKED
22 CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER VERIFICATION, YOU LIKED MORE COST
23 DETAIL. WE DIDN'T KNOW THAT. AND IF WE HAD KNOWN
24 THAT, WE WOULD HAVE ADDRESSED IT MORE FULLY. WHEN YOU
25 ARE APPLYING FOR GRANTS FROM NIH, WHICH MOST OF US DO

1 ALL THE TIME, SOMETIMES GIVING TOO MUCH INFORMATION OR
2 INFORMATION THAT'S NOT REQUESTED CAN GET YOU DINGED, SO
3 WE FOLLOW DIRECTIONS. THAT'S OUR MIND-SET. YOU ASK
4 FOR IT, WE'LL GIVE IT TO YOU. SO IF YOU MAKE IT CLEAR
5 WHAT YOU WANT, WE WILL FOLLOW YOUR GUIDELINES.

6 THE OTHER ISSUE I WANTED TO BRING FORWARD IS
7 I KNOW THAT THE CIRM FACILITIES GROUP DID A GREAT JOB
8 ON THE ANALYSIS, AND I'VE BEEN READING MEETING MINUTES
9 OVER THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS AND WONDERING HOW THIS WAS
10 GOING TO WORK OUT. AND WHEN I SAW THE ANALYSIS ONLINE,
11 I THOUGHT WHOA. THIS IS THE FIRST TIME I'VE BEEN ABLE
12 TO SEE WHAT ALL MY COMPETITORS HAVE DONE, AND I ENJOYED
13 IT. I LEARNED A LOT. IT'S AN INTERESTING PROCESS.

14 I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE BEEN ABLE TO SEE
15 MY ANALYSIS BEFORE IT WENT TO THE WORKING GROUP JUST TO
16 ASK A FEW QUESTIONS. I KNOW YOU CAN'T CHANGE IT. IF
17 THERE'S ONE THING THAT'S OVERLOOKED, IF THERE'S ONE
18 TYPO, IF EVEN OUT OF 20, IF THERE'S ONLY ONE AND YOU'RE
19 THE PERSON IT HAPPENED TO, THAT'S ALL YOU THINK ABOUT.
20 SO YOU WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT JUST SOME CHANCE TO SAY,
21 HEY, DID YOU NOTICE THAT I DID THIS OR DID YOU CATCH
22 THIS? SOME THINGS WERE IN THE NARRATIVE. SOME OF US
23 DID THEM ON THE DRAWING. IT WAS A LITTLE INCONSISTENT.

24 SO IF THAT COULD BE DONE, THAT WOULD BE
25 APPRECIATED. I DO UNDERSTAND THAT YOU CAN'T MAKE

1 CHANGES ONCE A GRANT IS SUBMITTED. YOU CAN'T ADD
2 ADDITIONAL INFLUENCE, BUT JUST AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE A
3 CORRECTION, IF IT'S POSSIBLE.

4 FOR THE FACILITIES, THE LARGER FACILITIES
5 GRANT, FOR THE MEETING ON FRIDAY, THE 13TH, I WOULD
6 LOVE TO SEE A DISCUSSION ABOUT PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD.
7 IT'S A HUGE ISSUE FOR US. WHENEVER YOU GET PUBLIC
8 FUNDS, HAVING TO GO WITH A LOW BID CONTRACTOR IS A
9 NIGHTMARE. IT DELETES QUALITY, IT DELETES EFFICIENCY,
10 IT INCREASES CHANGE ORDERS, AND THERE ARE OTHER METHODS
11 FOR DOING THIS THAT CAN ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF MAKING
12 SURE YOU ARE GETTING BEST COST. AND I HOPE THAT
13 THERE'S A DISCUSSION TO EXPLORE THOSE ISSUES BECAUSE IF
14 WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH A LOW BID PROCESS, IT'S GOING TO
15 BE REALLY, REALLY DIFFICULT TO DO THAT.

16 THE OTHER THING I WANTED TO BRING FORTH IS
17 ANOTHER ASPECT TO THIS PROCESS. AND THAT'S FACILITIES
18 OPERATIONS MANAGERS. WE'RE THE ONES THAT DO THESE
19 PROJECTS FOR OUR COMPANIES. AND WE HAVE A DIFFERENT
20 TAKE ON THESE PROJECTS, AND I DON'T SEE A LOT OF
21 REPRESENTATION IN THE DECISION-MAKING PART OF THIS FROM
22 THAT VOICE. AFTER THE ARCHITECTS DESIGN THE BUILDING
23 AND WALK OUT, WE'VE GOT TO MAKE IT WORK. WE'VE GOT TO
24 KEEP IT RUNNING. WE'VE GOT TO LOOK AT ONGOING COSTS,
25 AND A LOT OF TIMES WE WILL IMPLEMENT THINGS OR TRY TO

1 IMPLEMENT THINGS IN THE DESIGN PROCESS THAT WE KNOW
2 WILL SAVE OUR COMPANIES HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF
3 DOLLARS A YEAR IN MAINTENANCE, IN OPERATION, IN PARTS
4 REPLACEMENT THAT MAY ADD ADDITIONAL COST TO THE
5 CONSTRUCTION PROJECT. BUT THE MONEY THAT WE SAVE GOES
6 DIRECTLY TO SCIENCE. IT GOES TO SUPPLIES, IT GOES TO
7 EQUIPMENT.

8 AND IF THE COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE TO ENTERTAIN
9 THE IDEA OF HAVING SOME PEOPLE OF THAT BACKGROUND ALONG
10 WITH A LITTLE MORE SCIENCE REPRESENTATION, I KNOW YOU
11 HAVE A COUPLE OF SCIENTISTS ON YOUR COMMITTEE, BUT WE
12 CAN TELL YOU WHY WE DO THINGS THE WAY WE DO BECAUSE
13 IT'S A MYSTERY ON SOME LEVELS, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU'RE
14 COMING FROM A REAL ESTATE MARKET. IS THAT ME?

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IT ISN'T, BUT I WANT TO
16 THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS. THEY WERE VERY
17 INTERESTING AND PRODUCTIVE. AND THANK YOU FOR
18 PARTICIPATING. I WILL JUST HAVE ONE COMMENT, THAT
19 THERE WILL BE SOME TYPE OF PUBLIC FORUM AVAILABLE THAT
20 WE'RE GOING TO BE DISCUSSING AFTER PUBLIC COMMENTS
21 WHERE YOU WILL BE ABLE TO HAVE AND OTHERS WILL HAVE
22 OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVE INPUT INTO THE FUTURE RFA
23 PROCESS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

24 MS. HADDAD: THANK YOU.

25 MR. KLEIN: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF I COULD ASK

1 TODAY DURING OUR MEETINGS, THIS TYPE OF INPUT IS, I
2 THINK, VERY HELPFUL. ARE WE GOING TO HAVE SOME INTERIM
3 TIME DURING THAT PROCESS WHERE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF
4 THIS TYPE COULD BE MADE?

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK IN TERMS OF OUR
6 DISCUSSION TODAY, I THINK THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL. SO WE
7 WILL HAVE -- DURING OUR DISCUSSION OF FUTURE RFA'S, WE
8 WILL ALLOW THE PUBLIC TO SPEAK AGAIN WITH IDEAS AS WE
9 COME TO CERTAIN BREAK POINTS. THANK YOU.

10 ANY OTHER PUBLIC SPEAKERS?

11 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON, FOUNDATION FOR
12 TAXPAYER AND CONSUMER RIGHTS. IT'S NOW AFTER 9 O'CLOCK
13 IN THE MORNING, AND I CAN GET THAT OUT OF MY MOUTH,
14 UNLIKE YESTERDAY AT SEVEN.

15 I JUST WANTED TO HAVE A COUPLE OF QUICK
16 REFLECTIONS ON WHAT MORE YOU CAN DO TO ENHANCE THE
17 TRANSPARENCY OF THE PROCESS. AND I HEARD IN THE
18 PREVIOUS SPEAKER'S WORDS THE NOTION THAT WE'RE
19 COMMITTED TO, THAT AS MANY OF THE DOCUMENTS THAT CAN BE
20 MADE AVAILABLE TO AS MANY PEOPLE AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE
21 ACTUALLY SERVES EVERYONE AND EVERYONE'S INTEREST.

22 AND I THINK, AS I RECALL, I COULD BE IN ERROR
23 ON THIS, BUT THE ACTUAL DOCUMENTS THAT WERE DISCUSSED
24 HERE, I THINK, DIDN'T GET POSTED UNTIL, I BELIEVE IT
25 WAS, FRIDAY NIGHT ON THE WEB. THAT'S AHEAD OF THE

1 MEETING, AND THOSE OF US WHO ARE LOOKING FOR SOMETHING
2 INTERESTING AND EXCITING TO DO ON WEEKENDS PERHAPS
3 SPENT SOME OF THE TIME REVIEWING THEM; BUT IF IT COULD
4 HAVE BEEN -- I WOULD THINK THAT IF THEY ARE AVAILABLE,
5 THEY SHOULD GO UP ONLINE JUST AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE.
6 AND YOU'VE PROBABLY HEARD ME SAY THIS BEFORE, SO I'LL
7 STOP WITH THAT.

8 THE OTHER THING, I WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU FOR
9 YOUR OWN EASE IN YOUR DISCUSSIONS TO ACTUALLY, SINCE
10 THE SCORES ARE ULTIMATELY POSTED, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
11 MUCH CLEARER AND PROBABLY WOULD HAVE GONE FASTER IN
12 YOUR DISCUSSIONS YESTERDAY IF, INSTEAD OF SAYING THE
13 VAGUE, WELL, I SCORED THIS IN THE UPPER, HIGHER, MAYBE
14 MIDDLE, WHATEVER, JUST SAY, WELL, GEE, IT WAS A 92 OR
15 WHATEVER. AND I DON'T THINK THAT THERE'S ANY TERRIBLE
16 PROBLEM WITH THAT.

17 I MEAN I HAVE HEARD FROM SCIENTISTS WHEN
18 YOU'RE DOING PEER REVIEW AND SCIENTIFIC SCORES, THAT IF
19 YOU GET DINGED, THIS PERHAPS RUINS YOUR CAREER FOREVER.
20 I AM SKEPTICAL OF THAT, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT THAT
21 MODEL IS APPLICABLE AT ALL WHEN YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT
22 INSTITUTIONS AND TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY AND SOME OF
23 THOSE KINDS OF THINGS. SO, AGAIN, AT THE FEAR OF
24 BEATING A DEAD HORSE, ANYTHING YOU CAN DO TO BRING OUT
25 INTO THE PUBLIC THE MECHANISM OF THE SCORING WOULD BE

1 JUST TREMENDOUSLY USEFUL AND HELPFUL AND PROBABLY WOULD
2 ENHANCE MORE PUBLIC INPUT AND MORE AND FULLER
3 DISCUSSION, WHICH SOMETIMES TAKES A LITTLE BIT LONGER,
4 BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, YOU HAVE THE GRASS ROOTS
5 SUPPORT FOR WHAT IT IS THAT YOU ARE DOING THAT'S
6 ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR
8 COMMENTS, JOHN. ANY OTHER PUBLIC SPEAKERS? OKAY.
9 THEN WE WILL GO TO THE DISCUSSION OF FUTURE RFA'S. SO
10 I'D LIKE TO OPEN UP --

11 MR. KELLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I KNOW WE
12 DISCUSSED THIS BEFORE THE MEETING, BUT I THINK IF WE
13 ARE GOING TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY JUST TO INTRODUCE --
14 WE HAD DISCUSSED YESTERDAY. MAYBE WOULD COULD DO THIS
15 ONE FIRST. WE DID SAY TIME PERMITTING, BUT WE'LL GO
16 AHEAD AND DO IT NOW.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, RICK. SO
18 HOPEFULLY EVERYONE, MEMBERS, HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU THE
19 CIRM INTERIM GRANT ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR FACILITIES
20 AND EQUIPMENT GRANTS. IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN IN YOUR
21 PACKET. WHAT I'D LIKE TO PROPOSE TO THE MEMBERS, AND
22 SEE IF WE CAN GET CONSENSUS ON THIS, IS THAT WE CAN
23 TAKE A LITTLE BIT OF TIME WITH THIS DOCUMENT NOW FOR A
24 FEW DAYS AND ASK STAFF TO POST THIS ONLINE SO THAT THE
25 MEMBERS CAN PUT COMMENTS. IS THIS POSSIBLE SO THAT

1 MEMBERS --

2 MR. KELLER: IT'S ALREADY BEEN POSTED ON OUR
3 PUBLIC WEBSITE.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BUT IS THERE A WAY TO
5 HAVE IT AS A SHARED DOCUMENT? SOME MEMBERS HAVE
6 EXPRESSED AN INTEREST --

7 MS. HYSEN: PART OF THAT, DEPENDING ON WHAT
8 TECHNOLOGY YOU USE TO DO IT, A SHARED DOCUMENT INVOLVES
9 A LITTLE BIT OF A TRAINING PIECE FOR THE END USER. AND
10 I'M HOPING THAT THAT CAN COME WITH THAT DOCUMENT.

11 MR. KLEIN: FOR DOCUMENTS THAT ARE GOING TO
12 END UP GOING THROUGH TO THE BOARD, WE CAN CERTAINLY
13 GET -- MELISSA KING, CAN'T WE GET THAT ON OUR WEBSITE?

14 MS. KING: FIRST OF ALL, THIS DOCUMENT IS
15 ACTUALLY ALREADY POSTED ON THE WEBSITE. I POSTED IT
16 TWO NIGHTS AGO. SO THIS DOCUMENT IS POSTED FOR THE
17 PUBLIC; BUT IF YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT A WAY FOR THIS
18 GROUP TO WORK ON IT INTERACTIVELY, THERE MAY BE A WAY
19 FOR US TO DO THAT THROUGH A SECURE PAGE ON OUR WEBSITE.
20 THAT'S POSSIBLE, AND THERE MAY ALSO BE OTHER WAYS TO DO
21 THAT. I CAN WORK ON THAT WITH ED.

22 MS. HOFFMAN: SO WHAT WE'LL DO IS, THROUGH
23 THE TECHNOLOGY OFFICE AT CIRM, WE'LL SET UP A SHARE
24 POINT, AND WE'LL WALK THE MEMBERS THROUGH THIS.

25 MR. KLEIN: BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO BE THE

1 FACILITIES STAFF THAT WORKS THROUGH THIS.

2 MS. HOFFMAN: WE'LL ABSOLUTELY PUT THAT
3 TOGETHER.

4 MS. HYSEN: AND IT MAY NOT BE THAT THE
5 CHANGES TO THIS DOCUMENT, GIVEN THAT IT'S AN INTERIM
6 GUIDELINE, ARE GOING TO BE SUBSTANTIVE. BUT HAVING
7 THAT TOOL FOR LATER DOCUMENTS THAT ARE GOING TO BE MUCH
8 MORE DETAILED WOULD BE, I THINK, REALLY HELPFUL BECAUSE
9 THAT WILL PROVIDE THE ABILITY FOR US WHEN WE GET TO
10 PERMANENT STANDARDS AND A PERMANENT RFA. IT WILL
11 REALLY FACILITATE A LOT OF WORK OFFLINE THAT WE CAN
12 COME HERE AND REALLY START TO DIVE IN PRETTY QUICKLY.

13 MR. KLEIN: IF I CAN UNDERSTAND, LORI
14 HOFFMAN. SO THE FACILITIES GROUP IS GOING TO BE
15 WORKING WITH THIS DOCUMENT IN SOME FASHION, AND THEN AT
16 VARIOUS POINTS, WHEN YOU GET TO WHERE WHATEVER DRAFTS
17 ARE THEN SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD IN THE PROCESS, IT WILL
18 GET POSTED IN THE NORMAL BOARD SITE. AND IN THE
19 INTERIM, AS YOU WORK ON IT, ALL OF THOSE ARE GOING TO
20 BE THROUGH SOME FACILITIES SITE THAT'S SPECIALLY SET
21 UP. IS THAT HOW IT WILL WORK?

22 MS. HOFFMAN: THAT'S CORRECT.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I WANT TO UNDERSTAND
24 ONE THING, RICK, LORI. SO WE CAN POST THIS DOCUMENT IN
25 SOME KIND OF SHARED SITUATION WHERE THE FACILITIES

1 WORKING GROUP CAN MAKE COMMENTS. AND THEN I WOULD
2 ASSUME THAT WE WOULD WANT TO HAVE A CONFERENCE CALL
3 WITH THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP TO GO OVER ANY OF
4 THOSE COMMENTS AND FINALIZE THE DOCUMENT?

5 MS. HOFFMAN: I CAN IMAGINE THAT YOU WOULD
6 WANT TO DO THAT AND WE WILL HELP TO FACILITATE THIS. I
7 WANT TO REMIND THE WORKING GROUP THAT THIS NEEDS TO GO
8 TO THE ICOC IN JUNE, ON JUNE 5TH. SO WE'LL TRY TO THEN
9 HAVE A FACE-TO-FACE MEETING BETWEEN NOW AND THEN OR A
10 CONFERENCE CALL AS WELL, AND WE'LL MAKE THESE COMMENTS
11 AVAILABLE TO EVERYBODY.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT'S FINE. I'D LIKE
13 TO KIND OF AT LEAST ESTABLISH SOME KIND OF, LET'S SAY,
14 DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS FROM THE FACILITIES WORKING
15 GROUP, BASICALLY GIVE THE WORKING GROUP A WEEK OR SO
16 AFTER IT'S POSTED. IS THAT ACCEPTABLE TO EVERYONE? SO
17 THAT WAY WE CAN TRY TO GET IT DONE. DOES THAT WORK?

18 MS. HYSEN: YES. BUT WHAT WOULD BE HELPFUL
19 TO ADD TO THIS IS ALONG THE WAY YESTERDAY WE SAID THIS
20 WILL BE GOOD TO HAVE, THIS WOULD BE NICE TO HAVE, LET'S
21 REMEMBER TO PUT THAT IN, I'M ASSUMING THE STAFF
22 CAPTURED SOME OF THAT INFORMATION SO THAT WE CAN JUST
23 MAKE SURE THAT THOSE THINGS WE MENTIONED YESTERDAY ARE
24 IN THIS DOCUMENT TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY SHOULD BE OR
25 AT LEAST IN A FINAL DOCUMENT AT SOME POINT.

1 MR. KLEIN: IN THAT CONTEXT, FOR EXAMPLE, ON
2 THE 20-PERCENT MATCH, IT SPECIFIES CASH HERE, BUT WE'LL
3 CONFORM THAT, OF COURSE, TO WHAT WE JUST APPROVED. IS
4 THAT CORRECT? BECAUSE WE APPROVED MATCHES THAT ARE NOT
5 CASH AS WELL AS CASH.

6 MS. HOFFMAN: THAT'S CORRECT. FOR THIS LAST
7 RFA.

8 MR. KLEIN: RIGHT. THEN YOU WILL SUGGEST AND
9 THERE WILL BE DISCUSSION TODAY ON WHAT YOU WOULD
10 SUGGEST ON POLICY GOING FORWARD AS TO HOW WE COUNT
11 MATCHES AT 20 PERCENT AND ABOVE 20 PERCENT FOR THE
12 MAJOR FACILITIES.

13 MS. HOFFMAN: THAT'S CORRECT.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GREAT. RICK.

15 MR. KELLER: I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THAT I
16 THINK WHILE WE HAVE TAKEN A LOT OF INPUT IN THE LAST
17 DAY AND FROM OTHER TESTIMONY AND SO FORTH ABOUT THE
18 GRANTS ADMINISTRATION ISSUES, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO
19 NOTE THAT WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THIS IS ADOPTED BY
20 THE ICOC IN TIME FOR THE APPLICANTS TO UNDERSTAND THE
21 ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR THE SHARED LAB. THAT DOESN'T
22 MEAN THAT AS WE GO ALONG AFTER THAT POINT -- WE'VE
23 LEARNED A BIT FROM THE SHARED LAB; BUT AS WE GO FORWARD
24 AND IF WE HAVE INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC AND SO FORTH, WE
25 MAY WANT TO FURTHER AMEND THESE. SO I WANT TO MAKE

1 SURE. I DON'T KNOW THAT THESE WILL BE COMPREHENSIVE.
2 I DON'T WANT THE GROUP TO REVIEW THESE WITH THE IDEA
3 THAT THEY ARE SO COMPREHENSIVE, THAT ALL OF THE FUTURE
4 FACILITIES RFA'S ARE COVERED. I DON'T THINK THAT'S OUR
5 INTENT HERE TODAY.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AT LEAST I CAN SPEAK
7 FOR MYSELF, THAT I THOUGHT IT WAS PRETTY CLEAR THAT
8 THIS WAS FOR THE SHARED LABORATORY GRANTS, AND THAT
9 THESE COMMENTS ARE GOING TO APPLY TO THIS. AND THEN
10 THAT WILL BE KIND OF A BASELINE DOCUMENT THAT WE CAN
11 WORK FROM FOR FUTURE GRANTS.

12 MS. HYSEN: IS THIS DOCUMENT HERE WHAT GUIDED
13 OUR DECISIONS YESTERDAY? NO.

14 MR. KELLER: THIS IS AN ADMINISTRATION POLICY
15 THAT DEALS WITH THE APPLICANTS AND THE CONDITIONS UNDER
16 WHICH THEY AGREE, WHEN THEY ACCEPT A CIRM GRANT, THE
17 PROVISIONS. SO IT DOES NOT INVOLVE THE SCORING OR ANY
18 OF THAT ASPECT OF IT.

19 MS. HYSEN: OKAY.

20 MS. FEIT: THIS IS PROBABLY FOR STAFF TO
21 ANSWER. IN THE PAST OTHER WORKING GROUPS, WHEN WE
22 DEVELOPED STANDARDS AND POLICIES, WE WENT THROUGH QUITE
23 A RIGOROUS PERFORMANCE BEHAVIOR AROUND INPUT AND
24 REFINEMENT, AND THEN THERE WAS IN SOME CASES, IN CASE
25 OF OUR STANDARDS AND SOME OF THOSE, WE WENT THROUGH

1 PUBLIC NOTICE, AND THEN WE WERE TOLD SOME OF THIS
2 BECOMES LAW. SO WHAT DOES THIS DOCUMENT REPRESENT TO
3 THE INSTITUTE IN THAT PROCESS OF EVERYTHING ELSE WE'VE
4 DONE IN THE PAST?

5 MS. PACHTER: MARCY, RECALL THAT THE ICOC
6 ADOPTED A GAP, AND THIS IS IN ADDITION TO THAT. SO THE
7 GAP IS ONE OF CIRM'S REGULATIONS, AND THIS WILL BE A
8 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THOSE REGULATIONS. AND IT WILL
9 GO THROUGH THE SAME OAL AND NOTICE PERIOD AND COMMENT
10 PERIOD JUST LIKE THE GAP.

11 MS. FEIT: THANK YOU. THAT'S JUST EXACTLY
12 WHAT I THOUGHT IN THAT THERE WAS A LOT OF DISCUSSION
13 YESTERDAY THAT WE SHOULD SOMEHOW BRING FORWARD. AND I
14 KNOW IN PAST SOME OF THE POLICIES THAT WE HAD WORKED ON
15 IN OTHER WORKING GROUPS WE WOULD GET SORT OF LINED --
16 YOU KNOW, DRAFTS THAT SAID, OKAY, WE ADDED THIS
17 WORDING, WE TOOK THIS OUT SO THAT THE WORKING GROUP
18 COULD REALLY SEE THE CHANGES IN THE DOCUMENT. AN
19 EXAMPLE WE TALKED ABOUT YESTERDAY, THAT WE WOULD NOT
20 PERFORM REIMBURSEMENTS PRIOR. YOU COULD NOT APPLY AND
21 GET. I THINK THAT KIND OF INFORMATION NEEDS TO BE IN
22 THIS DOCUMENT BECAUSE THOSE ARE SOME OF THE THINGS THAT
23 WE DID YESTERDAY.

24 I'M JUST SAYING THAT UNDERSTANDING THE
25 PROCESS WE'VE BEEN THROUGH BEFORE IN OTHER WORKING

1 GROUPS AND KNOWING WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE, SOMEHOW WE
2 NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN GET SOME OF THOSE THINGS
3 WE TALKED ABOUT STARTED IN LANGUAGE HERE, NOT THAT IT
4 WILL END UP BEING THE WORDING, BUT AT LEAST STARTED.

5 MS. PACHTER: I THINK YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT
6 TWO THINGS. ONE IS BEING ABLE TO SEE CHANGES THAT
7 DIFFERENT MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP MAY PROPOSE TO
8 THIS DRAFT. AND I THINK THAT'S SOMETHING YOU'LL BE
9 ABLE TO DO ON THE SHARED SPACE THAT WE'RE GOING TO
10 CREATE ON THE INTERNET. AND ONCE STAFF COMPILES THOSE
11 SUGGESTIONS AFTER A MEETING, YOU WILL BE ABLE TO SEE
12 STAFF'S ATTEMPT TO HARMONIZE ALL OF THAT ON A RED LINE
13 OR SOMETHING SIMILAR TO THAT.

14 THE OTHER THING IS THE GRANT ADMINISTRATION
15 POLICY IS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THE GRANT IS
16 AWARDED. AND MANY OF THE THINGS THAT THIS PANEL WAS
17 TALKING ABOUT YESTERDAY HAD TO DO WITH WHAT KIND OF
18 NOTICE ARE WE GIVING APPLICANTS ABOUT THE REQUIREMENTS
19 FOR RECEIVING THE GRANT. SO THERE'S A TIME DIFFERENCE
20 IN WHAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT YESTERDAY AND WHAT WE'RE
21 TALKING ABOUT TODAY THAT I THINK YOU WANT TO KEEP IN
22 MIND.

23 MS. FEIT: MY FINAL REQUEST WOULD BE THAT
24 MAYBE IT WOULD BE HELPFUL ALSO IF WE COULD PUT THIS ON
25 THE WEBSITE FOR THE WORKING GROUP IS SORT OF A PROCESS

1 TIMELINE, THAT IF IT GETS ADOPTED IN JUNE, THEN WHAT
2 HAPPENS AFTER THAT AND WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THAT AND WHAT
3 HAPPENS AFTER THAT SO THAT THE WORKING GROUP HAS A FAIR
4 IDEA OF WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN. AND THAT, I THINK,
5 GIVES US A SENSE OF URGENCY ABOUT OUR TIMELINES IF
6 THAT'S POSSIBLE. THANK YOU.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, MARCY. ARE
8 THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON THE INTERIM GRANT
9 ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
10 GRANTS? SO THEN I THINK WE HAVE OUR NEXT STEPS ON
11 THAT, RICK, LORI. AND, AGAIN, I JUST WANT TO REITERATE
12 THAT WE NEED TO GET THIS DONE IN A TIMELY WAY FOR THE
13 MEMBERS AND GET OUR COMMENTS ON THIS. I KNOW I'LL MAKE
14 THE TIME.

15 SO I'D LIKE TO MOVE ON TO THE NEXT AGENDA
16 ITEM, DISCUSSION OF FUTURE FACILITIES RFA'S. AND I'D
17 LIKE TO OPEN IT UP TO MEMBERS TO MAKE COMMENTS AND
18 START THE DISCUSSION. WELL, I CAN CERTAINLY OPEN UP
19 THE DISCUSSION.

20 SO ONE OF THE, I THINK, MOST IMPORTANT THINGS
21 THAT WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE COMMUNICATE TO THE
22 APPLICANTS ON THIS NEXT ROUND OF FUNDING IS THAT, YOU
23 KNOW, WE EXPECT -- WE HAVE 220 MILLION FOR THE MAJOR
24 FACILITIES GRANTS?

25 MS. HOFFMAN: 222.

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT WE WERE HOPING TO
2 HAVE BETWEEN FOUR AND \$500 MILLION OF GRANT
3 APPLICATIONS FOR THAT \$222 MILLION. SO THAT'S BEEN
4 BASED UPON -- BOB, YOU'VE BEEN SURVEYING SOME OF THE
5 STATEWIDE INTEREST, AND THAT'S OUR ESTIMATE OF --

6 MR. KLEIN: WHAT IS YOUR NUMBER YOU'RE USING?

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I WAS SAYING FOUR TO
8 500.

9 MR. KLEIN: YEAH. I WOULD SAY THAT I WOULD
10 HOPE IT WOULD EXCEED FOUR TO 500 MILLION.

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU FOR THAT
12 CLARIFICATION. SO I WANT TO COMMUNICATE TO POTENTIAL
13 APPLICANTS THAT WE REALLY, THE FACILITIES WORKING
14 GROUP, WANT TO SEE CERTAIN THINGS. AND THIS RFA IS
15 GOING TO INCLUDE VERY CLEAR DIRECTION ON SOME OF THESE
16 ITEMS THAT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN AS CLEAR IN THIS LAST
17 GO-ROUND, THAT LEVERAGE IS A HUGE ISSUE FOR THE
18 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, AND INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.
19 THAT'S GOING TO BE ONE ITEM THAT'S GOING TO BE VERY,
20 VERY IMPORTANT TO US.

21 DO OTHER MEMBERS HAVE ANY THINGS THEY WANT TO
22 START THE CONVERSATION BY BRINGING UP AS WELL?

23 MS. HYSEN: I'D LIKE TO ADD A FEW THINGS.
24 FIRST, I'D LIKE TO SAY I APPRECIATE THE COMMENTS OF THE
25 WOMAN FROM GLADSTONE. DEBORAH, IS IT? I LIKE YOU

1 BECAUSE OF THAT. YOU KNOW, YOU MENTION A COUPLE OF
2 THINGS THAT WE WERE LOOKING AT. IN MY MIND SOME OF
3 THEM WERE QUALITATIVE THINGS THAT ENHANCED THE
4 APPLICATIONS SUCH AS GREEN BUILDING DESIGN. GOOD
5 BUILDING DESIGN IS A REALLY GOOD THING FOR EVERYONE.
6 IN PARTICULAR THE PERFORMANCE ASPECTS OF THE BUILDING
7 AS IT RELATES TO GREEN BUILDING DESIGN ARE IMPORTANT TO
8 ME.

9 SO I WANTED YOU TO KNOW THAT THOSE ARE THE
10 KINDS OF THINGS THAT I WANT TO BRING TO THE GROUP AS WE
11 GO FORWARD. AND I REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR CONVERSATION
12 ABOUT FIRST-TIME COSTS VERSUS WHAT I CALL LIFE-CYCLE
13 COSTS. I'VE HAD A BATTLE WITH VARIOUS STATE ENTITIES
14 OVER THE YEARS BECAUSE THEY ONLY RECOGNIZE FIRST-TIME
15 COSTS. AND I CAME FROM A FACILITY BACKGROUND, SO I
16 KNOW VERY WELL THAT SOMETHING THAT MIGHT BE CHEAP IN
17 THE BEGINNING COSTS TWO TO THREE TIMES AS MUCH AS YOU
18 OPERATE IT. AND BECAUSE OUR FUNDING IS GOING TO
19 PROVIDE FOR OPERATIONS, I BELIEVE, FOR THE LARGE
20 FACILITIES? YES?

21 MS. HOFFMAN: UNFORTUNATELY NOT ONGOING, BUT,
22 YES, CERTAINLY IN THE FIRST SEVERAL YEARS.

23 MS. HYSEN: IN THE FIRST ROUND. I THINK IT'S
24 IMPORTANT THAT WE LOOK AT THOSE FACTORS. WE ALL
25 REMEMBER OUR ENERGY CRISIS FROM YEARS AGO, AND WE DON'T

1 WANT TO COMPOUND THAT BY BUILDING BUILDINGS THAT AREN'T
2 THE BEST IN ENERGY CONSERVATION. THOSE ARE THE KINDS
3 OF THINGS THAT I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE BUILD, NOT
4 ONLY A BUILDING THAT MEETS THE OBJECTIVES OF THE
5 SCIENTISTS, BUT IS A REALLY GOOD BUILDING AND WILL
6 STAND THE TEST OF TIME. I CAN'T TELL YOU HOW MANY
7 BUILDINGS THE STATE HAS BUILT THAT ARE NOT THAT OLD
8 THAT THEY'VE HAD TO TAKE DOWN BECAUSE THEY WERE JUST
9 OBSOLETE WITHIN A MATTER OF A FEW DECADES. THAT'S NOT
10 GOOD INVESTMENT OF TAXPAYER'S MONEY. SO I WILL BE
11 LOOKING AT THAT.

12 COST PER SQUARE FOOT IS KIND OF ONE OF THOSE
13 UNFORTUNATE THINGS BECAUSE IT IS PROBABLY THE TRUEST
14 BENCHMARK FOR THE REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY. IT'S WHAT WE
15 ALL LOOK AT. COST PER SQUARE FOOT FOR TI'S, THE COST
16 PER SQUARE FOOT TO BUILD A BUILDING. IT'S A KNOWN
17 NUMBER. AND WHEN I MENTIONED YESTERDAY THAT I WOULD BE
18 VERY RELUCTANT TO APPROVE SOMETHING THAT COSTS \$1600 A
19 FOOT WHEN THE NEXT NEAREST COMPETITORS WERE ROUGHLY
20 HALF THAT COST, UNDERSTANDING, THOUGH, THAT THERE IS A
21 WIDE RANGE OF THINGS, BUT I THINK THE COST PER SQUARE
22 FOOT IS GOING TO BE IMPORTANT TO SOME PEOPLE AS THEY
23 LOOK OVER WHAT WE'RE DOING BECAUSE THERE IS EMBEDDED IN
24 THE BODY OF LAW THE NOTION THAT THIS BE COST
25 COMPETITIVE. AND SO WE HAVE TO LOOK AT THAT. AND I

1 THINK THE WAY YOU DO THAT IS NOT GO WITH THE LOWEST
2 BIDDER BECAUSE THE LOWEST BIDDER CAN BE A BIG PROBLEM
3 FOR YOU IN THE LONG RUN.

4 I LIKE THIS NOTION THAT WE SHOULD EXPLORE
5 ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS. THERE ARE SOME
6 ALTERNATIVE --

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: LORI.

8 MS. HOFFMAN: I'M SORRY. THERE'S CERTAINLY
9 AN ISSUE, AND WE WOULD ALWAYS WANT TO THEN HONOR THE
10 INSTITUTIONS THAT WOULD BE APPLYING AND THEIR SPECIFIC
11 REQUIREMENTS. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, A STATE PUBLIC RESEARCH
12 INSTITUTION WOULD NEED TO FOLLOW THE COMPETITIVE
13 BIDDING RULES THAT APPLY TO THEM.

14 MS. HYSEN: I UNDERSTAND THAT. I THINK UC'S
15 HAVE DESIGN BUILD AUTHORITY?

16 MS. HOFFMAN: THEY DO.

17 MS. HYSEN: SO THEY'RE THE ONLY ONES THAT
18 ARE, I THINK, STATE AGENCIES -- THAT'S ONE.
19 UNFORTUNATELY THERE'S NOT MORE OPPORTUNITIES BECAUSE
20 THERE'S SO MANY DIFFERENT ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS
21 THAT YOU CAN USE. ED AND I WERE TALKING ABOUT A COUPLE
22 THAT HE'S FOUND SUCCESSFUL IN THE PAST, AND IT'S
23 UNFORTUNATE WE CAN'T EXPLORE THAT FULL REALM OF
24 OPPORTUNITIES. BUT I THINK THE UC'S WERE AHEAD OF THE
25 GAME BY GETTING THAT DESIGN BUILD AUTHORITY. SO I

1 THINK PERSONALLY THAT'S THE WAY WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO
2 PROCEED IF WE WANT TO EXPEDITE THIS WORK. SO I'LL BE
3 LOOKING AT THAT.

4 IN FACT, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I FOUND VERY
5 SUCCESSFUL, THE DGS HAD INTERIM DESIGN BUILD AUTHORITY
6 SPECIFIC TO PROJECTS. AND SO WE USED THE DESIGN BUILD
7 PROCESS ON THE SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING, OUR OAKLAND
8 BUILDING, AND OUR LOS ANGELES BUILDING. AND WE
9 ACTUALLY HAD KIND OF A DESIGN BUILD COMPETITION. AND
10 IT WAS REALLY INTERESTING BECAUSE WE WERE ABLE TO
11 ATTRACT A WHOLE ARRAY OF BUILDINGS BECAUSE WE SIMPLY
12 SAID WE JUST WANT TO HAVE -- THIS IS WHAT OUR OBJECTIVE
13 IS IN THIS FACILITY. THESE ARE THE THINGS THAT WE WANT
14 THIS FACILITY TO BE.

15 AND IT WOULD BE INTERESTING IF WE COULD, YOU
16 KNOW, DO SOME KIND OF COMPETITION IN THE LARGER
17 FACILITIES FOR THE POT OF MONEY. WHO'S THE BEST
18 BUILDING -- WHO'S THE BEST PROJECT OUT THERE TO MEET
19 THE OVERALL PROGRAM OBJECTIVES? AND I DON'T KNOW IF
20 THIS IS KIND OF A WILD IDEA, BUT THE NOTION OF HAVING
21 KIND OF A COMPETITION LIKE THAT WOULD BE INTERESTING,
22 AND THAT INCLUDES SITE VISIT, INCLUDES MEETING THE TEAM
23 MEMBERS, THE FACILITIES TEAM, THE BUILD TEAM, THE
24 IN-HOUSE STAFF, AND THE OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS HIRED.

25 I EVEN PERSONALLY WOULD LIKE TO SEE A LITTLE

1 SEED MONEY GO TOWARDS FORMING THAT IDEA A LITTLE BIT.
2 I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S POSSIBLE. SO THAT THEY HAVE
3 SOME OPPORTUNITY TO KIND OF GET A PROJECT FORMED AND
4 PRESENTED IN A COHESIVE MANNER TO US. THOSE ARE JUST
5 SOME INITIAL IDEAS I HAVE.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GREAT. THANK YOU FOR
7 YOUR COMMENTS, DEBORAH. I THINK I WANT TO NARROW OUR
8 DISCUSSION RIGHT NOW ABOUT THE ICOC ASKED THE
9 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP TO HAVE SOME TYPE OF PUBLIC
10 FORUM/HEARINGS, AND I THINK I WANT TO FOCUS OUR EFFORTS
11 ON THAT SUBJECT MATTER FIRST ABOUT THE RIGHT TYPE OF
12 FORMAT FOR THAT KIND OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND OPEN UP
13 THE FLOOR TO THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP FOR IDEAS. I
14 KNOW WE'VE TALKED ABOUT SOMETHING LIKE THREE TO FOUR
15 MEETINGS, AND THERE'S BEEN SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT
16 EXACTLY WHAT TYPE OF FORMAT THAT SHOULD BE, WHETHER IT
17 SHOULD BE AN OPEN DISCUSSION INVITING CERTAIN EXPERTS,
18 POTENTIALLY FACILITIES OPERATIONS MANAGERS AND OTHER
19 EXPERTS IN THE INDUSTRY, TO GIVE US PUBLIC COMMENT AS
20 TO WHAT THEY THINK WOULD BE THE BEST RFA PROCESS.

21 MR. KLEIN: IF WE WERE TO FOCUS ON THE AGENDA
22 TOPICS WE TALKED ABOUT, DEFINITIONS, RULES, AND POLICY,
23 MOST OF THE DISCUSSION WE'VE HAD THUS FAR TODAY FITS
24 INTO THOSE CATEGORIES. FOR EXAMPLE, WE NEED TO
25 UNDERSTAND THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE MEMBERS ON THIS

1 COMMITTEE AS WELL AS THE PERSPECTIVES OF INSTITUTIONS
2 IN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC ON HOW WE BALANCE LEVERAGE
3 AGAINST COST. SO THAT COULD BE UNDER POLICIES ONE OF
4 THE AGENDA ITEMS.

5 UNDER OUR STRATEGIC PLAN PRINCIPLES, CALLED
6 STRATEGIC PRINCIPLES PROPERLY, ONE OF OUR STRATEGIC
7 PRINCIPLES IS LEVERAGING RESOURCES. NOW, I THINK
8 ACTUALLY IF YOU LOOK AT THE TRANSCRIPT THAT THIS WAS
9 BUILT OFF OF, THE ONE SENTENCE ANNOTATION OF THAT
10 HEADNOTE DOESN'T CAPTURE THE DISCUSSION ABOUT NOT JUST
11 LEVERAGING THROUGH CREATING PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER
12 ORGANIZATIONS, BUT LEVERAGING FINANCIAL RESOURCES WAS
13 DISCUSSED AT SOME DEPTH IN DEVELOPING THIS ITEM IN THAT
14 HEARING.

15 WE MIGHT LOOK BACK AT THAT HEARING IN TERMS
16 OF THE DISCUSSION WHICH WAS IN MUCH MORE DEPTH ON EACH
17 OF THESE STRATEGIC PRINCIPLES AND HOW THEY APPLY TO OUR
18 POLICIES HERE.

19 BUT IN TERMS OF THE DEFINITIONS AREA, WE'VE
20 SEEN THAT, AND I'VE REFERENCED EARLIER, THAT THE
21 20-PERCENT MATCH IS PROPOSED TO BE MET ON AN ALL CASH
22 BASIS IN THIS DOCUMENT MIGHT BE A VERY APPROPRIATE WAY
23 TO PROCEED. WILL WE SAY THAT ABOVE 20 PERCENT ALL OF
24 THE MONEY HAS TO BE CASH, OR CAN IT BE PURCHASE OF
25 EQUIPMENT, PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT? AND WHEN WE TALK

1 ABOUT PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT, HOW DID WE DEFINE THAT?
2 WE NEED TO MAKE IT CLEAR IF IN-KIND IS NOT A PURCHASE.

3 SO WE'RE GOING TO BE LOOKING, I THINK, IN
4 SOME CASES FOR A 200-PERCENT MATCH OR MORE BECAUSE OF
5 HIGH COSTS IN PRODUCING IN SOME AREAS OF THE STATE SO
6 WE BRING THE VALUES IN LINE BETWEEN THE LOWER COST
7 AREAS OF THE STATE AND VERY HIGH COST AREAS OF THE
8 STATE. IT'S ALSO TRUE THAT INSTITUTIONS IN THE HIGHER
9 COST AREAS HAPPEN TO BE CLOSER TO THE CONCENTRATIONS OF
10 CAPITAL AND HAVE GREATER ABILITY TO RAISE FUNDS, WHICH
11 IS AN INTERESTING ALIGNMENT WITH THEIR ABILITY TO GET
12 GREATER LEVERAGE.

13 SO I THINK THAT WE DEFINITELY NEED TO DEVELOP
14 THE WHOLE SET OF DEFINITIONS. I WOULD THINK THE STAFF
15 COULD DRAW A LOT FROM THE SHARED LABS THAT WE'VE GONE
16 THROUGH IN TERMS OF DEFINITIONS WE NEED TO EXPLORE.
17 AND IT WOULD BE INTERESTING TO HEAR FROM THIS COMMITTEE
18 WHAT OTHER DEFINITIONS.

19 BUT IN TERMS OF DEBORAH'S RECENT REFERENCE TO
20 DESIGN BUILD, ONE OF OUR VALUES IN OUR STRATEGIC PLAN
21 IS INNOVATION. AND CERTAINLY THERE'S A BIG LEAD-TIME
22 TO THESE MAJOR PROJECTS, AND WE CAN'T SLOW DOWN WHERE
23 INSTITUTIONS HAVE BEEN, BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT
24 INSTITUTIONS ARE DOING DESIGN BUILD, WE SHOULD PERHAPS
25 SEND OUT A MESSAGE TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY CAN SHOW

1 THAT THAT MAY HELP WITH TIME OR COST, THAT IT MAY BE
2 CONSISTENT WITH OUR STRATEGIC PRINCIPLES AND VALUES.
3 IN TERMS OF OUR POLICY DISCUSSION, THIS WOULD BE
4 WORTHWHILE COMMUNICATING, AND THAT THEY MIGHT WANT TO
5 MAKE AN ADVOCACY STATEMENT IN THEIR APPLICATION RELATED
6 TO HOW THIS IS GOING TO SAVE TIME, WHICH IS, IN FACT,
7 GOING TO HELP OUR MISSION AND OUR MISSION DELIVERY.

8 SO I'D LIKE TO, IN TRYING TO FOLLOW YOUR
9 DIRECTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, TO SEE WHAT OUR SUGGESTIONS
10 WOULD BE IN ALL THREE CATEGORIES FOR THE AGENDA,
11 DEFINITIONS, RULES, AND POLICIES.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, BOB. LORI.

13 MS. HOFFMAN: YES. THANK YOU. ALL THIS
14 INITIAL DISCUSSION HAS BEEN REALLY QUITE HELPFUL, AND I
15 THINK THAT THERE SHOULD BE A SECTION ABOUT INNOVATION,
16 AND IT COULD BE DESIGN BUILD, IT COULD BE THIRD PARTY.
17 I DON'T THINK THAT WE HAVE PRESCRIBED ANY KIND OF
18 DELIVERY METHOD IN THIS LAST RFA, NOR WOULD WE WANT TO
19 IN THE FUTURE RFA.

20 MS. HYSEN: IS THERE A WAY, THOUGH, BECAUSE I
21 DON'T THINK WE WANT TO PRESCRIBE EITHER. INNOVATION
22 MEANS YOU LEAVE IT TO THE INNOVATOR TO FIGURE OUT HOW
23 TO DO IT. BUT IF WE SET, I DON'T WANT TO SAY
24 AGGRESSIVE, BUT IF WE SET TIMEFRAMES SUCH THAT THE ONLY
25 WAY TO ACHIEVE THE CIRM OBJECTIVE AND THE OBJECTIVE IN

1 THE PROPOSITION IS TO EXPLORE ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY
2 METHODS, ALTERNATIVE FINANCING METHODS, IT WOULD
3 BASICALLY FORCE THEM TO BE INNOVATIVE.

4 MS. HOFFMAN: I IMAGINE THAT MOST OF THESE
5 INSTITUTIONS, HAVING PLANNED THESE PROJECTS OVER THE
6 LAST TWO YEARS, HAVE REALLY STRETCHED BEYOND JUST THE
7 STANDARD LUMP-SUM DELIVERY METHOD. AND I THINK THAT WE
8 SHOULD TRY TO FIGURE OUT A WAY TO CAPTURE THAT, AND
9 THEN ESSENTIALLY HAVE A CATEGORY FOR SCORING.

10 WHAT I'D LIKE TO ASK THE FACILITIES WORKING
11 GROUP RIGHT NOW IS TO HELP TO DIRECT STAFF TOWARDS
12 LOGISTICS IN TERMS OF THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS. AND
13 CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE SUGGESTIONS FOR WHAT THE
14 AGENDA FOR THE PUBLIC MEETING WOULD BE. I UNDERSTAND
15 THAT THERE'S THREE PUBLIC HEARINGS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE
16 FOR US TO HOLD. I ASSUME THAT THIS IS A FACILITIES
17 WORKING GROUP MEETING.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CORRECT.

19 MS. HOFFMAN: SO THAT THE CHAIR WOULD BE
20 RUNNING THESE MEETINGS.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THE CHAIR OR THE VICE
22 CHAIR.

23 MS. HOFFMAN: THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR. I
24 CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE TO SEEK COUNSEL ON THE ISSUE OF IF
25 FOR WHATEVER REASON WE DIDN'T HAVE QUORUM, UNDER

1 ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER, I'VE BEEN TOLD THAT WE
2 COULDN'T HAVE -- WE COULDN'T PROCEED WITH THE MEETING,
3 SO WE NEED TO DISCUSS IF THIS WOULD BE INFORMATIONAL.

4 MR. KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO ASK COUNSEL. I HAVE
5 A DIFFICULT TIME WITH THAT.

6 MS. PACHTER: I DON'T THINK WE NEED TO
7 ADDRESS THAT AT THIS POINT. I THINK WHAT -- I THINK WE
8 CAN WORK AROUND THE RESTRICTIONS IN OUR BYLAWS AND
9 ROBERTS RULES OF ORDER, AND YOU CAN LEAVE THAT TO
10 COUNSEL TO TAKE CARE OF. BUT I THINK WE SHOULD TALK
11 ABOUT THE LOGISTICS AND WHEN WE CAN MEET.

12 MS. HOFFMAN: SO IF I COULD JUST PROCEED AND
13 LOOKING FOR INPUT AS WELL. SO I ASSUME THAT WE WOULD
14 THEN ADVERTISE A FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEETING.
15 THOSE OF YOU WHO COULD ATTEND WOULD. I'D LIKE SOME
16 DIRECTION IN PERHAPS WHERE YOU WOULD LIKE THESE THREE
17 MEETINGS TO TAKE PLACE. IF YOU'D LIKE THEM TO ALL TAKE
18 PLACE IN SEQUENCE OR OVER THE COURSE OF A FEW WEEKS.
19 IF WE SHOULD JUST PROPOSE SOMETHING TO YOU, THAT WOULD
20 BE FINE AS WELL.

21 MS. HYSEN: I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY THAT THE
22 DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES DOES HAVE A LIST OF
23 STATE FACILITIES THAT ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AND HAVE
24 VIDEOCONFERENCING CAPABILITIES, AND THAT'S A GOOD PLACE
25 TO START. BECAUSE IT IS A PUBLIC BUILDING, IT NORMALLY

1 WOULD MEET ALL THE PUBLIC REQUIREMENTS SUCH AS ADA AND
2 PARKING, ETC., SO THAT IS ONE OPPORTUNITY.

3 MS. HOFFMAN: MORE I THINK I'M LOOKING FOR
4 REGIONAL MEETING LOCATIONS. I KNOW THERE WAS SOME TALK
5 ABOUT CENTRAL VALLEY, MAYBE SACRAMENTO, SAN DIEGO, SO
6 THERE'S MANY OPTIONS, AND I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT
7 YOU'VE HAD SOME INPUT INTO THIS PROCESS.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO THANK YOU, LORI.
9 THANK YOU, DEBORAH. I THINK WE NEED TO FOCUS ON
10 ESTABLISHING AN AGREEMENT AMONG THE FACILITIES WORKING
11 GROUP MEMBERS WHERE WE WANT THE LOCATIONS, THE NUMBER
12 OF MEETINGS, AND THE FORMAT. I THINK THAT'S WHAT I'D
13 LIKE TO FOCUS ON FIRST.

14 SO IN TERMS OF THE FORMAT, I'D LIKE TO
15 DISCUSS THAT FIRST BECAUSE I THINK ACTUALLY THAT'S THE
16 MORE, I THINK, MEANINGFUL QUESTION IS DO WE WANT TO
17 MAKE THIS AN OPEN PUBLIC HEARING, OR ARE WE LOOKING FOR
18 THIS TO BE MORE OF AN OPEN DISCUSSION WITH FOLKS IN THE
19 INDUSTRY THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND CAN HAVE A POSITIVE
20 INPUT TO THE RFA PROCESS, BUT ADVERTISE IT TO THE
21 PUBLIC AS WELL AS EXPERT TESTIMONY? SUGGESTIONS,
22 PLEASE.

23 MR. KLEIN: I DEFER TO JANET. WELL,
24 CERTAINLY THE PUBLIC HAS TO BE INVITED, BUT IN THESE
25 MEETINGS, BY FORMAT, ONE OF THE GROUPS THAT'S BEEN

1 REPEATEDLY MENTIONED ARE THE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT
2 PERSONNEL FROM POTENTIAL APPLICANTS. THE FACILITIES
3 MANAGERS HAVE BEEN MENTIONED SPECIFICALLY FOR THEIR
4 INPUT. AND THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICERS, FRANKLY, OF
5 THESE VARIOUS APPLICANT INSTITUTIONS OR THEIR DEPUTIES
6 SHOULD CERTAINLY BE INVITED BECAUSE THEY ALL ARE GOING
7 TO HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF INPUT INTO THE APPLICATIONS,
8 AND THEY'RE GOING WANT TO KNOW AS TO THEIR PORTION OF
9 THE INPUT A LOT OF ANSWERS, ANSWERS OF QUESTIONS WE
10 CANNOT ALWAYS ANTICIPATE.

11 SO MAKING SURE THAT WE GET OUT TO ALL
12 POTENTIAL APPLICANTS AND REQUEST SPECIFICALLY THAT THEY
13 HAVE THEIR KEY PERSONNEL THERE, TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY
14 HAVE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS. IT'S ALL OBVIOUSLY TOTALLY
15 OPTIONAL.

16 IN TERMS OF EXPERT INPUT, I DON'T THINK WE
17 CAN AFFORD TO REALLY SLOW THIS DOWN FOR THIRD-PARTY
18 EXPERTISE. AND CERTAINLY THE APPLICANT INSTITUTIONS
19 REPRESENT A LOT OF EXPERTISE ON THEIR OWN. BUT TO THE
20 EXTENT THAT THERE ARE SOME SIGNAL INDIVIDUALS WHO COULD
21 BE IDENTIFIED, WITHOUT SLOWING DOWN THE PROCESS, WHO
22 COULD ADDRESS SOME MAJOR TOPICS, THAT WOULD BE AN
23 ENRICHMENT OF THE PROCESS, BUT NOT SOMETHING TO DRAG
24 THE PROCESS. THEORETICALLY, WHETHER YOU HAVE THREE
25 MEETINGS OR FOUR, AND YOU COULD HAVE TWO A WEEK IN TWO

1 SUCCEEDING WEEKS, YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO COVER THIS AREA
2 FAIRLY QUICKLY AND HAVE ENOUGH TIME FOR NOTICE SO THAT
3 PEOPLE WOULD BE ABLE TO PREPARE IN ADVANCE.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, BOB. JANET.

5 DR. WRIGHT: I THINK WHAT I HAD IN MIND WHEN
6 THIS CAME UP IN OUR LAST MEETING IS SOMETHING BUILT ON
7 THE MODEL THAT WE'VE SEEN WORK IN STANDARDS AND IN THE
8 IP WHERE YOU HAVE A FORMAL PRESENTATION NOTICED IN
9 ADVANCE SO THAT THOSE INSTITUTIONS WHO WANT TO
10 SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS THAT ISSUE CAN ATTEND THAT
11 PRESENTATION. BUT AT THAT SAME MEETING, IN ADDITION TO
12 SORT OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT, THEN WE GATHER THE
13 EXPERTISE IN THE ROOM. LOTS OF TIME FOR PUBLIC
14 COMMENT.

15 ONE COMMUNITY THAT YOU MENTIONED IS THE
16 SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, TO HAVE SOMEONE MAKE A
17 PRESENTATION ON THE SCIENTIST ANGLE. THERE ARE
18 INNUMERABLE EXAMPLES IN CARDIOLOGY WHERE A FABULOUS
19 CATHETER IS DESIGNED. IT DOESN'T ABRADE THE VESSEL
20 WALL. IT'S VERY SMOOTH. IT'S SMALL. IT'S EASY TO
21 USE. AND NO CARDIOLOGISTS EVER USED IT WHEN IT WAS IN
22 ITS BETA TESTING, SO IT'S NEVER IMPLEMENTED. SO WE
23 WANT TO MAKE SURE WE GET THE SCIENCE STANDPOINT.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JANET.
25 THAT'S AN EXCELLENT SUGGESTION.

1 DR. CHIU: MAY I RESPOND TO THAT? I THINK
2 IT'S HIGHLY IMPORTANT THAT THE SCIENTIFIC ASPECT AND
3 WHAT THESE BUILDINGS, THE GOAL OF HAVING THESE
4 BUILDINGS NOT BE IGNORED, BUT I DON'T THINK THEY'RE
5 NECESSARILY TIED IN WITH THE FUNCTION OF THIS WORKING
6 GROUP. I THINK WE NEED TO DISSOCIATE THAT. TO EXPLORE
7 THE SCIENTIFIC NEED, WE WILL GO TO THE GRANTS WORKING
8 GROUP, AND THEY WILL POSSIBLY BE CHIMING IN ON THESE
9 NEEDS.

10 WE WERE WAITING TO HEAR, BECAUSE THIS HAS
11 MOVED SO FAR AFIELD, WHAT YOUR NEEDS ARE IN TERMS OF
12 HOW YOU VALUATE THE BUILDINGS. WE HAVE THOUGHT OF
13 SEVERAL POTENTIAL NEEDS FOR THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY
14 THAT COULD BE QUITE BROAD. THIS IS NOT LIKE A SHARED
15 LAB WHERE IT'S VERY TARGETED AND YOU COUNT HOW MANY
16 LABS ARE DOING WORK. THIS IS MUCH BROADER. I THINK
17 THE VISION MIGHT BE TO BUILD NEW PROGRAMS, IF I MAY
18 JUST SPEAK OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD, TO BUILD NEW
19 PROGRAMS, TO HAVE INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS,
20 COLLABORATIONS. IN FACT, EVEN MORE NOVEL GATHERING BY
21 THE WATER COOLER CONCEPT AS WELL AS IN AN AREA WHERE
22 THERE ARE MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS TO COME TOGETHER AND
23 HAVE A JOINT PROGRAM. THOSE THINGS ALL COME TO MIND,
24 AND THEY REQUIRE DIFFERENT TYPES OF BUILDINGS. I DON'T
25 THINK WE CAN ANTICIPATE THE SCIENTIFIC NEEDS.

1 SO I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THE SCIENTIFIC
2 DISCUSSION AWAY FROM THE FACILITIES DISCUSSION.

3 MS. FEIT: I AGREE WITH JANET ABOUT HAVING A
4 FORMALIZED PRESENTATION, IF ANYTHING, JUST TO GIVE
5 INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT OUR GOALS ARE, WHAT WE EXPECT TO
6 SEE IN AN RFA, IF POSSIBLE. AND I THINK WE SHOULD
7 DISCUSS THAT TODAY, THE QUICK SUMMATION OF WHAT OUR RFA
8 WOULD LOOK LIKE, AND THAT, I THINK, WOULD SOLICIT THE
9 RIGHT KIND OF FEEDBACK AND INFORMATION THAT WILL BE
10 VERY HELPFUL AS WE GO THROUGH THAT PROCESS. AND I
11 THINK THAT'S THE KIND OF OPEN FORUM THAT I WOULD BE
12 LOOKING FOR.

13 MS. HOFFMAN: I'D JUST LIKE TO COMMENT ON
14 THAT. I CERTAINLY SEE THE DIRECTION THAT YOU WOULD
15 LIKE TO HEAD. I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT PERHAPS,
16 BECAUSE THIS IS AN INTERESTING MIX OF BEING A GOVERNING
17 BOARD AS WELL AS LOOKING TO DEFINE AND MAYBE MANAGE THE
18 PROCESS AS WELL, I'D LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT WE TRY TO
19 STAY WITH THE CRITERIA AND THE PROCEDURES FOR THIS
20 FUTURE RFA AND KEEP A BOX AROUND IT SO THAT WE DON'T GO
21 TOO FAR AFIELD.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CAN YOU GIVE US SOME
23 DEFINITION ON SPECIFICS ON THIS?

24 MS. HOFFMAN: WHAT I MEAN BY CRITERIA? SO I
25 THINK SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT I HEARD BEFORE IN TERMS

1 OF WHAT IS IT THAT YOU WOULD BE LOOKING FOR IN TERMS OF
2 INNOVATION, IN TERMS OF TECHNOLOGY, HOW TO ADDRESS THE
3 SCIENCE AND NASCENT PROGRAMS, HOW TO ADDRESS THE
4 SCIENCE AND VERY DEVELOPED PROGRAMS AND
5 INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS, AND HOW THE BUILDING ITSELF
6 WILL ANSWER THAT. SO IF YOU COULD -- SOME IT IS
7 LEVERAGE, BUT, IN FACT, I THINK THAT WHAT I'VE HEARD
8 OVER TODAY AND YESTERDAY, I THINK WE'RE GETTING VERY
9 CLOSE TO WHAT THAT MEANS FOR YOU IN TERMS OF MATCH AND
10 IN TERMS OF LEVERAGE. AND I THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE
11 AN EASY TOPIC PERHAPS TO MAYBE BRING UP AT ONE OF THE
12 PUBLIC MEETINGS, STAY WITH THOSE DEFINITIONS, HAVE
13 ANOTHER PUBLIC MEETING AT A VERY HIGH LEVEL IN TERMS OF
14 POLICY AND WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING FOR. AND THEN ALLOW
15 STAFF TO TAKE THAT INFORMATION AND PROVIDE A PROCESS IN
16 WHICH YOU CAN AND THE ICOC CAN REVIEW AND THEN APPROVE
17 BECAUSE I THINK THAT THERE'S SOME INTERESTING ISSUES
18 ABOUT THESE PARALLEL TRACKS OF SCIENCE AND THE
19 TECHNICAL PIECE.

20 MR. KLEIN: TWO THINGS. ONE, ARLENE, WHILE
21 THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE -- WORKING GROUP IS GOING TO
22 REALLY CONTRIBUTE THE SCORING INFORMATION AND
23 EVALUATION ON THE SCIENCE, IT IS, I THINK, EXTREMELY
24 VALUABLE FOR THE PUBLIC AND, FRANKLY, FOR THE
25 INSTITUTIONS IN RAISING FUNDS IF, JUST AS WE HAVE

1 SPOTLIGHTS ON DISEASE TO BEGIN BOARD MEETINGS, WE HAVE
2 SOME INDIVIDUALS WHO SPEAK TO THE SCIENCE, IF THEY'RE
3 AVAILABLE AND DON'T SLOW DOWN THE PROCESS, SO THAT
4 WITHIN EACH REGION OF THE STATE, THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS
5 THE NEED FOR THESE AND THE RESOURCES AND THE POTENTIAL
6 OF THIS SCIENTIFIC RESOURCE. AND IT ALSO HELPS EDUCATE
7 THIS PANEL. IT'S NOT THE CORE OF WHAT WE'RE TALKING
8 ABOUT, BUT DEAN PIZZO BROUGHT THIS UP ON OUR BOARD CALL
9 THE OTHER DAY. SO IN THAT CONTEXT I THINK IT IS
10 HELPFUL.

11 IN TERMS OF THE ISSUE OF HAVING INDIVIDUAL
12 MEETINGS FOCUSED ON INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS, I WOULD
13 SUGGEST THAT THE DEFINITIONS ON LEVERAGE, ON THE ISSUE
14 OF MATCHING FUNDS, THE ISSUES ON WHETHER YOU CAN DO A
15 SHARED FACILITY AND ALSO DO AN INDIVIDUAL GRANT FOR
16 YOUR OWN FACILITY, THAT INPUT IS GOING TO VARY BY WHERE
17 YOU ARE IN THE STATE AND WHO THE INSTITUTIONS ARE IN
18 THE STATE. AND SO I THINK THAT A PART OF EVERY MEETING
19 IS GOING TO NEED TO HAVE SOME COMMONALITY IN ALLOWING
20 PEOPLE TO ADDRESS THOSE DEFINITIONS AND POLICIES IN
21 EACH MEETING SO THAT THE PEOPLE IN SAN DIEGO WHO MAY BE
22 VERY DIFFERENT THAN THE PEOPLE IN SAN FRANCISCO CAN PUT
23 IN THEIR POSITION BECAUSE IN THE DEBATE BETWEEN
24 COMPETING POINTS OF VIEW, THIS PANEL WILL HAVE TO
25 DECIDE HOW TO BALANCE THOSE WITH THE BENEFIT OF STAFF'S

1 EXPERT GUIDANCE AND EXPERIENCE THAT HAS BEEN IN
2 FACILITIES FOR MUCH LONGER THAN MANY OF US HAVE.

3 DR. CHIU: MAY I RESPOND TO THAT. I JUST
4 WANT TO AGAIN SAY THAT I'M ALWAYS IMPRESSED BY THE
5 INNOVATIONS THAT I HEAR FROM SCIENTISTS AS THEY COME IN
6 AND PROVIDE PROJECTS. AND SO IN THINKING OUT LOUD,
7 WHICH IS WHAT I WAS DOING, RATHER THAN HAVING DONE A
8 SURVEY, I IDENTIFIED SEVERAL COMPONENTS THAT POSSIBLY
9 THINKING -- HAPPENING OUT THERE IN THE FIELD. WHAT I
10 WANT TO CAUTION IS THAT MY MIND IS LIMITED, MY
11 KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT'S OUT THERE IS LIMITED. I WOULD HATE
12 TO CONFINE THE RFA TO ONLY THOUGHTS THAT WE CAN PRESENT
13 IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. I UNDERSTAND THAT PEOPLE
14 ARE THINKING WIDELY. WE HAVE A NARROW WINDOW OF TIME.
15 THESE HEARINGS ARE COMING RIGHT UP NOW. I THINK THERE
16 ARE SCIENTISTS AND HIGHER LEVEL LEADERS WHO HAVE
17 CONCEPTS OF DIFFERENT WAYS OF COLLABORATION. BUT I'D
18 HATE FOR US TO THINK THOSE ARE THE ONLY THINGS AROUND
19 WHEN WE'RE JUST SORT OF SPOT TESTING THEM. AND THEN
20 WHEN THEY COME UP, THEY ARE ONLY THEN CONFINED, BASED
21 ON THE WAY RFA IS STRUCTURED, CONFINED TO ONLY THOSE
22 TYPES OF APPROACHES. THAT WAS THE INPUT THAT I WANTED
23 TO PROVIDE, THAT WE WANT TO BE TRULY THINKING OUTSIDE
24 THE BOX, AND NOT BOX IN THE POTENTIAL OF ALL KINDS OF
25 PROGRAMS THAT MIGHT COME IN BECAUSE THIS IS A

1 ONCE-IN-A-LIFETIME POSSIBILITY.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU.

3 MS. HYSEN: ISN'T THAT WHY IT'S IMPERATIVE,
4 THEN, TO HAVE THE SCIENTISTS AT THESE MEETINGS BECAUSE
5 YOU DON'T WANT TO BUILD THE BUILDING THAT LIMITS THEIR
6 FLEXIBILITY AND HOW THEY FUNCTION?

7 DR. CHIU: I'M SURE THAT WHEN THEY'RE
8 PLANNING FOR IT, THAT THEY WOULD GIVE MUCH MORE THOUGHT
9 THAN WHEN THEY COME TO A HEARING AND GIVE A FEW
10 EXAMPLES AT THE SPUR OF THE MOMENT. THAT IS MY ONLY
11 CONCERN.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU. MARCY.

13 MS. FEIT: YEAH. I THINK THERE'S A REAL
14 BALANCE THAT WE WANT TO STRIKE IF WE'RE GOING TO OPEN
15 THIS UP TO PUBLIC COMMENT. I AGREE WITH BOB. I
16 WOULDN'T WANT TO TAKE A DIFFERENT SUBJECT UP NORTH AND
17 TAKE ANOTHER SET OF SUBJECTS DOWN SOUTH BECAUSE THEN
18 WHAT YOU HAVE IS SOMEBODY SAYING, WELL, THEY DIDN'T
19 DISCUSS THAT WITH US. WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO HEAR ABOUT
20 THAT? I THINK WE NEED SOME CONSISTENCY IN WHAT WE'RE
21 GOING TO DO IN THIS APPROACH BECAUSE WE WANT TO BE ABLE
22 TO ELICIT FEEDBACK, AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
23 SORT IT OUT. SO I THINK WE WANT TO GET AS CLOSE TO
24 SOME CONSISTENCY AS POSSIBLE, BUT NOT STIFLE THE
25 CREATIVITY THAT MIGHT BE OUT THERE AND BE VERY OPEN TO

1 LISTENING TO THE INPUT.

2 AND I THINK EVERYONE WHO HAS ANY INTEREST AT
3 ALL IN WHAT WE'RE DOING AND TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH IN THE
4 INSTITUTE SHOULD BE INVITED TO COME IN. IF IT'S A
5 SCIENTIST, GREAT. IF IT'S A FACILITIES MANAGER,
6 WONDERFUL. IF IT'S A FINANCE OFFICER, I THINK THAT'S
7 EVEN BETTER. BUT I REALLY THINK WE WANT TO STAY VERY
8 OPEN TO THAT INPUT. THAT'S THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THIS
9 TRANSPARENCY ON THE PART OF THE INSTITUTE IS BEING VERY
10 OPEN TO WHAT THE PUBLIC WOULD LIKE TO SEE US DO WITH
11 THESE FUNDS.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, MARCY. I'M
13 GOING TO PROPOSE A FIVE-MINUTE RECESS TO CONSULT WITH
14 STAFF. THANK YOU.

15 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO RECONVENE
17 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. I'D LIKE TO ASK MEMBERS
18 TO TAKE THEIR SEATS AND OTHERS TO COME TO ORDER.

19 SO I BELIEVE THE ICOC APPROVED THREE PUBLIC
20 MEETINGS; IS THAT CORRECT, LORI?

21 MS. HOFFMAN: JUST THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC
22 MEETINGS.

23 MR. SIMPSON: IT COULD BE 300.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: EXCUSE ME. THIS IS NOT
25 ONE OF THOSE PUBLIC COMMENT MOMENTS. THANK YOU. WE

1 MAY HAVE TO REVOKE THAT PRIVILEGE TO TALKING BETWEEN
2 THE BEGINNING AND END OF THOSE MEETINGS.

3 ALL KIDDING ASIDE, I'D LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT
4 WE HAVE THREE PUBLIC MEETINGS. I'D LIKE TO GET
5 DISCUSSION FROM THE MEMBERS.

6 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT IN
7 ONE WEEK WE HAVE A MEETING IN SAN FRANCISCO AND
8 SACRAMENTO, ANOTHER WEEK WE HAVE A MEETING IN L.A. AND
9 SAN DIEGO. WE HAVE FOUR, BUT WE HAVE THEM GROUPED
10 TOGETHER LOGISTICALLY. WE CAN GET THEM QUICKLY. AND
11 THE VALLEY IS ALWAYS GOING TO SAY THEY'RE TRYING TO
12 REALLY CONTRIBUTE TO OUR MISSION, AND THEY WOULD LIKE
13 TO HAVE A LOGISTICALLY FEASIBLE WAY TO DO THAT.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, MY NEXT AGENDA
15 ITEM WAS THAT I WANTED TO OPEN DISCUSSION ABOUT
16 LOCATIONS OF THESE THREE MEETINGS. SO I THINK IT DOES
17 MATTER HOW MANY MEETINGS WE HAVE BECAUSE IF WE HAVE
18 FOUR, WE CAN HAVE AN ADDITIONAL LOCATION. SOME OF MY
19 INITIAL THOUGHTS WERE THAT, TRYING TO SPREAD THE
20 GEOGRAPHY OUT, WAS POTENTIALLY TO, AND I WANT TO GET
21 MEMBERS' INPUT, BUT TO HAVE ONE POTENTIALLY IN SAN
22 DIEGO, WHICH WOULD BE GEOGRAPHICALLY CLOSE TO L.A., ONE
23 IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY, AND ONE IN POTENTIALLY SAN
24 FRANCISCO. IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE THREE MEETINGS, THAT
25 WAY WE'RE ABLE TO DIVIDE THE STATE INTO THREE PARTS AND

1 TRY TO MAKE IT AS CONVENIENT AS POSSIBLE FOR THOSE
2 INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING TO GET TO THE MEETINGS.

3 CAN I OPEN THIS UP TO DISCUSSION WITH THE
4 MEMBERS, PLEASE.

5 MS. HYSEN: I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY THAT I THINK
6 THREE WOULD BE FINE. I DO THINK THAT VIDEOCONFERENCING
7 IS A REALLY GOOD OPPORTUNITY TO ALLOW PEOPLE ON THE
8 FRINGES OF THE STATE TO COME IN. YOU SAW KIND OF THE
9 BIG BUBBLES ON THE GRAPHS YESTERDAY SHOWING THAT THE
10 BIG PLAYERS WERE GETTING THE BIG ATTENTION, SAN DIEGO
11 AND SAN FRANCISCO AND LOS ANGELES. AND IT LEFT SOME OF
12 THOSE PLACES THAT AREN'T REALLY IN THOSE LOCATIONS KIND
13 OF -- THEY CLEARLY LOOKED LIKE THEY WERE ALONE. AND I
14 DON'T WANT THEM TO FEEL LIKE THAT. AND I THINK
15 VIDEOCONFERENCING IS ONE GOOD OPPORTUNITY. I DON'T
16 LIKE THE TELEPHONE CALL-INS BECAUSE INEVITABLY SOMEONE
17 CAN'T HEAR AND IT'S DISTRACTING. AND IT'S NOT REALLY
18 CONDUCIVE TO THINGS. SO IF THERE'S OPPORTUNITIES, I
19 WOULD JUST SUGGEST, TO ENHANCE THE FULL PUBLIC
20 PARTICIPATION, VIDEOCONFERENCING WOULD AUGMENT WHATEVER
21 LOCATIONS WE FIND.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DEBORAH, THANK YOU. I
23 THINK THAT WAS A GREAT IDEA. IF WE CAN MAKE IT -- PICK
24 A LOCATION WHERE VIDEOCONFERENCING AND WE CAN TIE INTO
25 OTHER LOCATIONS ACROSS THE STATE, I THINK THAT WOULD

1 JUST ADD TO THE PROCESS IN A POSITIVE WAY.

2 ANY COMMENTS? MARCY.

3 MS. FEIT: IT WOULD BE NICE IF WE HAD TIME TO
4 HOLD MANY SO THAT WE COULD COVER OUR WONDERFUL STATE.
5 I DO SHARE THE CONCERN ABOUT THE FRINGE PLAYERS. WE
6 JUST SEEM TO WALK AWAY FROM THEM IN TERMS OF ATTENTION.
7 NOT PURPOSELY, IT JUST WORKS OUT THAT WAY. SO, YOU
8 KNOW, IT PROBABLY IS GOING TO TAKE FOUR MEETINGS TO
9 ACCOMPLISH WHAT WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH. BUT I DO LIKE
10 THE IDEA THAT MAYBE INSTEAD OF L.A., WE MOVE ONE MORE
11 CENTRALLY TO THE STATE. SO I ADVOCATE FOR TWO NORTH
12 AND TWO SOUTH, BUT I WOULD ADVOCATE THAT ONE, EITHER
13 ONE OF THE NORTH OR ONE OF THE SOUTH, BE MOVED MORE
14 CENTRALLY TO THE STATE.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, MARCY, CAN YOU BE
16 SPECIFIC BECAUSE I WAS PROPOSING AS DISCUSSION POINTS
17 ONE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE TALKING
18 ABOUT FRINGE? I DON'T CONSIDER THEM FRINGE, BUT --

19 MS. FEIT: I THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE TO PICK A
20 SITE WHERE WE'RE EXPECTING TO GET INPUT FROM, WE'RE
21 EXPECTING TO GET AN RFA FROM, WE'RE EXPECTING TO HAVE
22 IT. UC SANTA CRUZ, UC SANTA BARBARA. SANTA BARBARA
23 WOULD BE WONDERFUL. DID HAWAII APPLY? SO I THINK
24 THAT, YOU KNOW, HAVING THAT KIND OF EXPOSURE OF THE
25 INSTITUTE TO SOME OF THOSE AREAS IS REALLY IMPORTANT

1 BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY YOU CAN TAKE THE SPREAD THAT WE HAD
2 YESTERDAY AND YOU CAN JUST SEE WHERE IT SHOULD BE. AND
3 THOSE CAMPUSES HAVE WONDERFUL FACILITIES. MAYBE THEY
4 WOULD ACCOMMODATE A HEARING THERE. SO I SEE US HAVING
5 AT LEAST FOUR, BUT I DEFINITELY THINK IT WOULD BE
6 REALLY GREAT TO CENTRALIZE ONE OF THEM.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I AGREE WITH THAT,
8 MARCY.

9 MR. KLEIN: VERY SPECIFICALLY, WHAT I WAS
10 SUGGESTING IS IF YOU DO ONE IN SACRAMENTO, WHICH IS A
11 PLACE WHERE WE EXPECT TO GET PROPOSALS, ONE IN THE BAY
12 AREA, ONE IN L.A. OR ORANGE COUNTY, AND ONE IN SAN
13 DIEGO, THAT GIVES YOU FOUR. AND I'D LIKE TO EMPHASIZE
14 PART OF OUR MISSION IS TO INFORM THE PUBLIC AS WE GO,
15 AND GETTING INTO THE MAJOR MEDIA MARKETS IN THE STATE
16 WITH INFORMATION IS IMPORTANT, AND IT WILL HELP THESE
17 INSTITUTIONS IN THOSE AREAS RAISE FUNDS BECAUSE THEY'LL
18 REALIZE -- DONORS WILL REALIZE THE IMMEDIACY OF THEIR
19 NEED FOR MATCHING FUNDS. AND IT WILL HELP
20 INSTITUTIONS. SO WE HAVE A SECONDARY BENEFIT TO WHAT
21 WE'RE DOING.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, BOB, THANK YOU FOR
23 YOUR COMMENTS. ED, JUST ONE POINT. I WOULD LIKE TO
24 MAKE IT SO THAT IF PICK WE THREE LOCATIONS, THAT
25 THEY'RE CENTRALLY LOCATED ENOUGH THAT THESE

1 INSTITUTIONS AND POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS AND FOLKS THAT
2 ARE INTERESTED ARE WITHIN NO MORE THAN A TWO-HOUR DRIVE
3 TIME.

4 MR. KASHIAN: CONTRARY TO PUBLIC OPINION, THE
5 SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY IS A PART OF CALIFORNIA. WE DO HAVE
6 FACILITIES FOR UCSF AND UC MERCED IN FRESNO. IT IS
7 CENTRALLY LOCATED, AND IT HOUSES 10 PERCENT OF THE
8 POPULATION OF CALIFORNIA, MOST OF WHICH ARE -- NOT MOST
9 OF WHICH. IT IS A MICROCOSM OF THE RESIDENTS OF
10 CALIFORNIA. WE HAVE ALMOST A 50-PERCENT HISPANIC
11 POPULATION, WE HAVE ALMOST A 10-PERCENT ASIAN
12 POPULATION, AND WE HAVE PARTICULAR DISEASES THAT ARE
13 PERTINENT TO THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTE.

14 I WOULD STRONGLY REQUEST THAT WE HOUSE ONE OF
15 THE MEETINGS IN FRESNO.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, ED. DULY
17 NOTED. MORNING, JEFF. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT LOCATIONS
18 OF HAVING PUBLIC MEETINGS AS PER THE ICOC AND TRYING TO
19 LOCATE THREE LOCATIONS. SOME FOLKS HAVE SUGGESTED FOUR
20 LOCATIONS, FOUR MEETINGS. I'M TRYING TO GAUGE THE
21 MEMBERS' VIEW WHETHER WE SHOULD HAVE THREE OR FOUR AND
22 ALSO TRYING TO COME UP WITH THE MOST OR THE LEAST
23 INCONVENIENT THREE LOCATIONS FOR ALL THOSE.

24 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION,
25 JUST SO WE CAN TRY AND RESOLVE SOMETHING, I'D LIKE TO

1 MAKE A MOTION FOR FOUR MEETINGS SEPARATE FROM THE
2 LOCATION. WE CAN COME BACK AND DEAL WITH LOCATION.
3 AND SEE IF THERE'S A SECOND FOR FOUR MEETINGS.

4 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE HAVE A SECOND FROM
6 JANET. SO I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE A ROLL CALL. WE'LL
7 HAVE A VOTE ON THIS.

8 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

9 MS. FEIT: YES.

10 MS. KING: ROBERT KLEIN.

11 MR. KLEIN: YES.

12 MS. KING: WE CAN CIRCLE BACK TO MEMBER
13 SAMUELSON AND REPEAT THE MOTION FOR HER. JEFF SHEEHY.

14 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

15 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

16 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

17 MS. KING: DEBORAH HYSEN.

18 MS. HYSEN: YES.

19 MS. KING: DAVID KASHIAN.

20 MR. KASHIAN: YES.

21 MS. KING: COULD THE MAKER OF THE MOTION, MR.
22 KLEIN, COUPLE YOU PLEASE REPEAT THE MOTION FOR MEMBER
23 SAMUELSON?

24 MR. KLEIN: YES. MEMBER SAMUELSON, THE
25 MOTION IS TO HAVE FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS AS VERSUS THREE.

1 SO I MADE A MOTION TO HAVE FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS, AND
2 WE'LL COME BACK AND THEN DECIDE WHERE THEY WOULD BE.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

4 MS. KING: MEMBER SAMUELSON'S VOTE IS YES.
5 THANK YOU. THAT MOTION CARRIES.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. VERY GOOD. YOU
7 DIDN'T ASK FOR ME VOTE THOUGH.

8 MS. KING: DAVID LICHTENGER.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'M GOING TO ABSTAIN
10 FROM THAT ONE. SO THE MOTION CARRIES. WE'RE GOING TO
11 HAVE FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS.

12 SO NOW DOES ANYBODY HAVE A MAP OF CALIFORNIA?
13 PUBLIC COMMENT.

14 MR. KASHIAN: FRESNO IS RIGHT IN THE CENTER.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, I THINK -- GO
16 AHEAD. STATE YOUR NAME AND AFFILIATION, PLEASE.

17 MR. REED: DON REED, CALIFORNIANS FOR CURES.
18 I LIKE THE IDEA OF FOUR, BUT I WONDER IT IT'S POSSIBLE
19 FOR MEMBERS OF THE GROUP TO DO ANY SITE VISITS WHILE IN
20 THE AREA SO THEY CAN BRING BACK THAT INFORMATION?

21 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S A SEPARATE QUESTION.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR
23 APPROVAL, YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT. NOW YOU HAVE A
24 QUESTION, AND THE QUESTION IS?

25 MR. REED: THE QUESTION WAS WHEN WE CHOSE THE

1 SITE, THERE WERE SITE VISITS. I THINK IT WOULD BE --
2 FOR THE LOCATION OF THE CIRM. AND I'M WONDERING IF
3 IT'S POSSIBLE TO DO SITE VISITS FOR SOME OF THE
4 CONTENDERS FOR THE FACILITIES.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO THAT'S GOING TO BE
6 PART OF A SUBSEQUENT PROCESS. WE'RE NOT ADDRESSING
7 THAT ISSUE NOW. WE'RE JUST TRYING TO ESTABLISH THE
8 NUMBER OF LOCATIONS, WHICH WE JUST HAVE, THE LOCATIONS
9 OF THOSE PUBLIC MEETINGS, AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO TALK
10 ABOUT THE GOALS OF THOSE PUBLIC MEETINGS.

11 MR. REED: SO IT'S A SEPARATE TIME?

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YES. THANK YOU. SO
13 WE'VE DECIDED ON FOUR MEETINGS. SO, YOU KNOW, I'M
14 OPENING THIS UP TO DISCUSSION AGAIN BY THE MEMBERS. I
15 THINK WE WANT -- NOW THAT WE HAVE FOUR LOCATIONS, I
16 ABSOLUTELY SUPPORT A CENTRAL VALLEY LOCATION. SO DO
17 MEMBERS HAVE A PERSPECTIVE ON WHAT IS THE MOST CENTRAL
18 CENTRAL VALLEY LOCATION?

19 MR. KASHIAN: I WOULD BE HAPPY TO PROVIDE A
20 DART BOARD. I'LL MAKE A MOTION THAT ONE OF THOSE
21 LOCATIONS BE FRESNO, CALIFORNIA.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DO WE HAVE
23 DISCUSSION -- DO WE HAVE A SECOND ON THIS MOTION?

24 DR. WRIGHT: I'LL SECOND THAT.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DO WE HAVE ANY

1 DISCUSSION?

2 MR. KLEIN: AS ED KASHIAN KNOWS, PART OF MY
3 FAMILY HISTORY IS IN FRESNO. MY FATHER WAS THE FIRST
4 CITY MANAGER IN FRESNO. AND WHILE I HAVE A GREAT DEAL
5 OF RESPECT FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE STATE, I THINK
6 MARCY FEIT'S POINT IS IMPORTANT, THAT IF WE HAVE A
7 HEARING IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY, IF WE GO SOMEPLACE WHERE
8 WE CAN EXPECT AN APPLICATION OR A LOCUS OF ACTIVITY
9 RELATED TO THE RESEARCH THAT WE'RE DOING, WE HAVE A
10 GREATER PROBABILITY OF GETTING EXPERT TESTIMONY FROM
11 PEOPLE WHO ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THE AREA OR
12 PARTICIPATING, WHETHER FROM PRIVATE SECTOR PEOPLE OR
13 PUBLIC SECTOR. AND SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT GOING TO
14 THE SACRAMENTO AREA PROVIDES A GREATER YIELD AND
15 PARTICIPATION THAN GOING TO FRESNO.

16 AND WE DID DURING THE HEADQUARTERS VISITS, AS
17 YOU KNOW, ED, WE HAD, IN FACT, THE SEMINAL MEETING FOR
18 THE HEADQUARTERS SELECTION IN FRESNO. SO THAT IS A
19 SITE WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY HAD A MAJOR MEETING.

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I'D LIKE TO -- WE'RE
21 ON DISCUSSION NOW. I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE POTENTIALLY
22 MERCED AS A CENTRAL VALLEY LOCATION AND ASK MEMBERS
23 WHAT THEY THINK ABOUT THAT.

24 DR. WRIGHT: DAVID, I WAS TALKING OR
25 LISTENING WHILE YOU WERE SPEAKING. I JUST WANT TO MAKE

1 A COMMENT ABOUT FRESNO. EVEN THOUGH I SECONDED THAT
2 MOTION, I WAS PART OF THE ICOC MEETING THAT OCCURRED IN
3 FRESNO. THAT WAS CHALLENGING FROM A LOGISTICAL
4 STANDPOINT TO GET THERE. I LIVE IN THE OTHER PART OF
5 THE CENTRAL VALLEY, CHICO, SO I'M USED TO LOGISTICAL
6 CHALLENGES IN TRAVEL. SO I AGREE THAT WE NEED TO BE
7 SOMEWHERE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY AND KEEP AN EYE ON THE
8 IDEA OF ENCOURAGING AS MUCH PARTICIPATION AS POSSIBLE.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JANET.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: THIS IS JUST MY PERSPECTIVE
11 AS A CALIFORNIAN. IT'S A BIG STATE, SO WHAT IT
12 TYPICALLY GETS DOWN TO, I THINK, IS TRANSPORTATION,
13 ACCESS TO THE CITY. AND ALL THOSE CENTRAL VALLEY
14 CITIES ARE FAR FROM EACH OTHER. AND MY HUNCH, AND IT'S
15 JUST SPECULATION, WOULD BE THAT MANY CENTRAL CALIFORNIA
16 RESIDENTS, CENTRAL VALLEY RESIDENTS, WOULD GO TO L.A.
17 OR SAN FRANCISCO OR SACRAMENTO BECAUSE THEY CAN GET
18 THERE. MORE SIMPLY, ESPECIALLY IF IT'S USING
19 TRANSPORTATION OTHER THAN A CAR.

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. THANK YOU,
21 MEMBER SAMUELSON.

22 MR. SHEEHY: AND I APPRECIATE THE URGE TO
23 HAVE ONE IN FRESNO OR MERCED, BUT I DO THINK IT IS
24 IMPORTANT, BECAUSE WE ARE A STATE AGENCY AND BECAUSE
25 THE GOVERNOR, THE LEGISLATURE ARE IN SACRAMENTO. YOU

1 KNOW, ONCE WE'VE DECIDED ON FOUR SITES, YOU KIND OF
2 HAVE TO DO THE BAY AREA, YOU CANNOT NOT DO L.A., AND
3 YOU HAVE TO DO SAN DIEGO. AND I JUST THINK OUT OF
4 RESPECT FOR THE POLITICAL PROCESS THAT WE'RE PART OF,
5 THE POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT THAT WE EXIST WITHIN, THAT IT
6 WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL TO BE IN SACRAMENTO.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JEFF.

8 MS. FEIT: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE HAVE A MOTION. ARE
10 YOU -- ED, YOU STILL WANT TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THAT
11 MOTION?

12 MR. KASHIAN: I DO. I'D LIKE TO COMMENT.

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: PLEASE COMMENT AND THEN
14 CALL A ROLL.

15 MR. KASHIAN: FROM THE STANDPOINT OF A
16 CENTRAL LOCATION INCLUDING APPLICATIONS, IT'S A VERY
17 EASY COMMUTE FROM SACRAMENTO AND SANTA BARBARA TO
18 FRESNO. UNIVERSITY OF MERCED -- CALIFORNIA MERCED AND
19 THE INSTITUTIONS IN SACRAMENTO HAVE OFFICES AND
20 FACILITIES IN FRESNO. SO IT IS THE CENTRAL POINT OF
21 THE VALLEY AS OPPOSED TO GETTING SANTA BARBARA AND
22 EVERYONE ELSE THERE.

23 NOW, THAT BEING SAID, IN TERMS OF INVITING
24 APPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE, IT SEEMS TO ME LIKE WE
25 OUGHT TO START DEALING WITH INCLUDING PEOPLE IN THE

1 GROUP FOR FUTURES AS OPPOSED TO WHAT WE DID ON THE
2 SHARED LAB THING, WHICH IS DEALING WITH THE PRESENT.
3 AND I BELIEVE THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MERCED
4 AND I BELIEVE THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF SACRAMENTO -- OR
5 THE UNIVERSITY OF DAVIS IN SACRAMENTO ARE GOING TO BE
6 MAJOR PLAYERS, BUT I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE FUTURE IS
7 GOING TO INCLUDE FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS, AND IT
8 DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH THAT
9 BECAUSE THE FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS HAVE THE ABILITY
10 TO BE ABLE TO LOCATE IN FRESNO. IT HAS HOUSING AND THE
11 AREA NECESSARY TO BE ALL ANCILLARY SERVICES THAT ARE IN
12 FRESNO; WHEREAS, THE OTHER MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS
13 DON'T HAVE THE LAND AND DO NOT HAVE THE INFRASTRUCTURE
14 NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THIS KIND OF INFRASTRUCTURE.

15 ANYWAY, I DO. I MAY BE THE ONLY YES VOTE,
16 BUT I'M GOING TO GET THAT VOTE.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IS THIS REGARDING THE
18 MOTION ON THE FLOOR?

19 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S A PROPOSED FRIENDLY
20 AMENDMENT, THAT WE CONSIDER MAKING THE FRESNO LOCATION
21 A FIFTH LOCATION.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'LL COMMENT ON THAT.
23 I DON'T THINK IT'S GOING TO FLY. SO --

24 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S JUST TOO MANY.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IT'S GOING TO BE

1 CHALLENGING. SPEAKING FOR MYSELF, I CAN TELL YOU THAT
2 I WILL DEFINITELY NEED THE VICE CHAIR TO BE ASSISTING
3 ME WITH THESE. I DOUBT I'LL BE ABLE TO DO ALL FOUR.
4 I'D LIKE TO CALL A VOTE, ROLL CALL, NOW ON THE MOTION
5 ON THE FLOOR.

6 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

7 MS. FEIT: NO.

8 MS. KING: ROBERT KLEIN.

9 MR. KLEIN: NO.

10 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.

12 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

13 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

14 MS. KING: JANET WRIGHT.

15 DR. WRIGHT: NO.

16 MS. KING: DEBORAH HYSEN.

17 MS. HYSEN: ABSTAIN.

18 MS. KING: EDWARD KASHIAN.

19 MR. KASHIAN: YES.

20 MS. KING: DAVID LICHTENGER.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: NO.

22 MS. KING: THAT MOTION FAILS.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THE MOTION FAILS.

24 MARCY, YOU HAD ANOTHER MOTION YOU'D LIKE TO PROPOSE?

25 MS. FEIT: YES. I MOVE THAT WE CHOOSE FOUR

1 SITES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. ONE OF THE SITES
2 SHOULD BE SAN FRANCISCO, ONE SHOULD BE SACRAMENTO, ONE
3 SHOULD BE UC IRVINE IN ORANGE COUNTY, AND ONE SHOULD BE
4 SAN DIEGO.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CAN YOU REPHRASE -- DO
6 THAT A LITTLE MORE SLOWLY. SO YOU'RE PROPOSING SAN
7 FRANCISCO.

8 MS. FEIT: SAN FRANCISCO, SACRAMENTO, UC
9 IRVINE, ORANGE COUNTY, AND SAN DIEGO.

10 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DO WE HAVE A SECOND?

11 MS. HYSEN: CAN WE REPHRASE THAT SO IT'S NOT
12 INSTITUTION SPECIFIC, PLEASE?

13 MS. FEIT: ORANGE COUNTY.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY.

15 MR. KLEIN: I'LL SECOND.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB KLEIN IS SECOND.
17 DISCUSSION? SO THE ONLY QUESTION I'D LIKE TO JUST ASK
18 THE MEMBERS IS ORANGE COUNTY VERSUS L.A.?

19 MS. FEIT: YES. LITTLE BIT IN THE CENTER.

20 MR. KLEIN: I DIDN'T KNOW SHE WAS GOING TO
21 PROPOSE THAT, BUT THE REASON I'M SUPPORTING IT AS WELL
22 IS THAT, YOU KNOW, UNIVERSITY OF RIVERSIDE CAN GET TO
23 ORANGE COUNTY PRETTY EFFECTIVELY. THERE'S NO
24 DIFFERENCE FOR SANTA BARBARA BETWEEN L.A. AND ORANGE
25 COUNTY. THERE'S A SHORT SHUTTLE TO EITHER ONE OF THEM.

1 BUT IN ANY CASE, ORANGE COUNTY IS AN AREA WHERE WE HAVE
2 NOT HAD MANY MEETINGS OF THIS AGENCY. IN THAT CASE,
3 IT'S AN ABILITY TO HAVE OUTREACH IN AN EFFECTIVE WAY.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. THANK YOU, BOB.
5 ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE MEMBERS?

6 MR. SHEEHY: I JUST THINK IT'S HARD NOT TO BE
7 IN L.A. I REALLY DO. GIVEN THAT TYPICALLY WHEN WE
8 MEET IN SAN DIEGO, WE'RE REALLY ON THE VERY NORTHERN
9 EDGE. I MEAN HAVING DRIVEN BETWEEN LA JOLLA AND LAGUNA
10 BEACH BEFORE, THAT'S NOT A LONG DRIVE. AND HAVING
11 DRIVEN BETWEEN L.A. AND THE SAME AREA, THAT THAT IS A
12 BIT OF A STRETCH.

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IS THAT A FRIENDLY
14 MOTION -- AMENDMENT?

15 MS. FEIT: I WOULD BE GLAD TO AMEND MY
16 MOTION.

17 MR. KLEIN: AS THE SECOND, I'D BE HAPPY TO
18 AMEND AS WELL.

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: NOW THE MOTION READS
20 SAN DIEGO, L.A., SAN FRANCISCO, AND SACRAMENTO?

21 MS. FEIT: YES, CORRECT.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE HAVE A SECOND FROM
23 BOB KLEIN. ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THIS REVISED
24 AMENDMENT? OKAY. SO THEN I'D LIKE -- I DON'T KNOW IF
25 WE NEED TO DO A ROLL CALL. SO ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY

1 AYE. ANY OPPOSED? OKAY. SO IT PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
2 WE ARE GOING TO HAVE FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN
3 SACRAMENTO, SAN FRANCISCO, L.A., AND SAN DIEGO.

4 MS. HOFFMAN: YES. AND THANK YOU FOR THAT
5 GUIDANCE. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO PROPOSE, BEFORE YOU GO
6 TO THE NEXT TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION, THAT WE JUST WORK
7 BACKWARDS ON TIMING. SO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET TO IS
8 THE AUGUST 5TH ICOC MEETING, EARLY AUGUST. IN ORDER TO
9 DO THAT, WE WILL HAVE THESE FOUR PUBLIC HEARINGS PRIOR
10 TO MID-JUNE. I'D ALSO LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT ONE OF
11 THOSE MEETINGS WE SEEK A QUORUM IN AN EFFORT TO APPROVE
12 THE FACILITIES GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY AFTER
13 YOU'VE HAD TIME TO REVIEW IT. I ALSO THINK THAT WE'RE
14 GOING TO NEED TO HAVE ANOTHER FACILITIES WORKING GROUP
15 AFTER THE FOUR PUBLIC HEARINGS, BUT PRIOR TO THE AUGUST
16 MEETING SO THAT YOU CAN REVIEW THE FINDINGS, THE
17 TRANSCRIPTS, DISCUSS THAT, AND FINALIZE THOSE CRITERIA
18 AND PROCEDURES AS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC BOARD AT
19 THEIR AUGUST MEETING. AND ARE WE OKAY WITH THE
20 LOGISTICS ON THAT?

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO LET'S TAKE ONE OF
22 THOSE AT A TIME. SO WE'RE PROPOSING DOING THESE FOUR
23 MEETINGS IN KIND OF MID-JUNE.

24 MS. HOFFMAN: PRIOR TO MID-JUNE.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: PRIOR TO MID-JUNE.

1 MS. HOFFMAN: WE WILL SOLICIT INPUT FROM ALL
2 THE MEMBERS AND TRY TO GET AS MANY OF YOU THERE.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IS THERE A CONSENSUS?
4 THAT WORKS FOR MY SCHEDULE.

5 MS. HYSEN: SO JUST FOR LOGISTICS PURPOSES,
6 ARE YOU EXPECTING -- HOW MANY ARE WE?

7 MS. HOFFMAN: ELEVEN.

8 MS. HYSEN: ARE YOU EXPECTING A COMPLEMENT OF
9 US AT EACH OF THEM WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PROBABLY THE
10 ONE LAST WHERE YOU WOULD EXPECT A QUORUM?

11 MS. HOFFMAN: ACTUALLY I THINK, GIVEN TIMING
12 AND TRYING TO GET TO THE JUNE 5TH ICOC MEETING WITH THE
13 FACILITIES GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY, THE QUORUM,
14 WE'D SEEK THE QUORUM AT ONE OF YOUR FIRST MEETINGS AS
15 OPPOSED TO YOUR LAST.

16 MS. HYSEN: OTHERWISE THREE TO FOUR PEOPLE
17 WOULD BE SUFFICIENT.

18 MS. HOFFMAN: I CERTAINLY -- WE WOULD LEAVE
19 IT UP TO YOU. I KNOW THAT THIS WAS A UNANIMOUS
20 DECISION BY THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, AND I KNOW
21 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO YOU, SO I ASSUME THAT YOU WILL
22 ALL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO GET THERE. AND WE WILL -- I
23 WILL LOOK TO MELISSA KING, WHO IS EXCELLENT AT THIS, TO
24 TRY TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'VE ACCOMMODATED ALL YOUR
25 SCHEDULES.

1 MR. KLEIN: IF I COULD ASK A QUESTION HERE.
2 MAYBE WE SHOULD WORK AT THE SCHEDULE FROM BOTH ENDS.
3 SO HOW LONG IN ADVANCE OF THE AUGUST 8TH MEETING WOULD
4 THE MEETING NEED TO BE FOR YOU TO THEN TAKE THE RESULTS
5 AND PRESENT THEM FOR THE AUGUST 8TH MEETING?

6 MS. HOFFMAN: WELL, THE FACILITIES WORKING
7 GROUP WOULD NEED TO VOTE ON THE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
8 AND THE CONCEPT PLAN PRIOR TO THAT MEETING, AND I WOULD
9 ASSUME AT LEAST FIVE DAYS PRIOR TO THAT MEETING SO THAT
10 WE COULD POST FOR THE PUBLIC.

11 MR. KLEIN: WELL, TEN DAYS.

12 MS. HOFFMAN: JUST THE AGENDA ITEM. I ASSUME
13 WE'RE GOING TO THE AUGUST 8TH AGENDA.

14 MR. KLEIN: SO IN WORKING BACKWARDS, IF WE
15 WERE DONE BY AUGUST 10TH --

16 MS. HOFFMAN: IF YOU WERE DONE BY AUGUST 1ST.

17 MR. KLEIN: EXCUSE ME. IF WE'RE DONE BY JULY
18 10TH, I'M SORRY, IF WE WERE DONE BY JULY 10TH, THAT
19 WOULD THEORETICALLY GIVE YOU ENOUGH TIME SOMEWHERE
20 BETWEEN THE 10TH AND THE 15TH OF JULY.

21 MS. HOFFMAN: TO COME BACK TO THE WORKING
22 GROUP WITH A SUMMARY OF THE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES IN
23 WHICH TO VOTE ON TO RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC? I THINK
24 THAT'S ACTUALLY TIGHT. I WOULD LIKE TO -- UNLESS
25 THERE'S SOME REASON THAT YOU DON'T WANT TO DO THESE

1 FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN THE NEXT SIX WEEKS, I WOULD
2 SUGGEST, AND CERTAINLY IT'S DIFFICULT ON STAFF TO DO
3 THIS IN THE NEXT SIX WEEKS, WE MIGHT WANT TO SEEK SOME
4 OUTSIDE HELP AS WELL, TO COORDINATE THESE MEETINGS TO
5 MID-JUNE SO THAT THERE'S TIME MOSTLY FOR THE WORKING
6 GROUP TO REVIEW ALL OF THE INPUT, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT
7 OF THE FACT THAT YOU PROBABLY ALL WON'T BE ABLE TO MAKE
8 ALL FOUR MEETINGS.

9 MR. KLEIN: IT MIGHT BE ADVISABLE TO GET THE
10 BEST ATTENDANCE IF WE HAD A COUPLE OF MEETINGS IN ONE
11 TIME PERIOD AND A COUPLE OF MEETINGS THAT ARE AT LEAST
12 TWO WEEKS OFF OF THAT SO THAT IF WE HAVE VACATIONS THAT
13 PEOPLE PROBABLY CAN'T MOVE TOO FLEXIBLY RIGHT NOW, THAT
14 THAT MEANS THAT EVERYONE WOULD HAVE A CHANCE TO
15 PROBABLY ATTEND TWO OF THE FOUR. SO IF YOU HAVE A
16 SPREAD OF TIME BETWEEN THEM, IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL.

17 MS. FEIT: I UNDERSTAND THAT. I THINK
18 THERE'S A SENSE OF URGENCY HERE BECAUSE I THINK WE HAVE
19 A LOT OF THE WORK TO GET DONE. THE STAFF IS GOING TO
20 NEED TIME, AND WE WANT TO GET THESE ITEMS APPROPRIATELY
21 TO THE ICOC BOARD. SO WHY DON'T WE DO THIS? WHY DON'T
22 WE TARGET JUNE 15TH AND SEE -- LET STAFF WORK ON A
23 CALENDAR. THEY CAN POLL OUR CALENDARS. LET'S SEE WHAT
24 WE CAN DONE AND SCHEDULED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE IN THE
25 NEXT FEW WEEKS, SIX WEEKS. LET'S SAY SIX WEEKS,

1 WHATEVER THAT TAKES US TO. I THINK THERE IS A SENSE OF
2 URGENCY TO MOVE THIS ALONG. IF THE STAFF CAN HANDLE
3 THE LOGISTICS, AND WE CALL POLL OUR CALENDARS, AND WE
4 CAN GET A REASONABLE RESPONSE FROM THE WORKING GROUP TO
5 THESE MEETINGS, THEN I THINK WE SHOULD MOVE AHEAD.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: MARCY, THANK YOU FOR
7 THE COMMENTS. I CONCUR WITH MARCY'S ASSESSMENT. I
8 JUST WANT TO MENTION THAT I KNOW MY VACATION SCHEDULE
9 KIND OF STARTS AT THE END OF JUNE, AND I THINK EVERYONE
10 ELSE'S. I THINK JULY AND AS WE GET LATER IN THE MONTH,
11 AND WE'RE GOING REALLY BE HITTING THE SUMMER SEASON,
12 IT'S GOING TO BE, I THINK, DIFFICULT TO GET AS MANY
13 MEMBERS AS WE MIGHT LIKE. ED, YOU WANT TO COMMENT?

14 MR. KASHIAN: I'M UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT PEOPLE,
15 THE GENERAL PUBLIC OR FUTURE APPLICANTS, THAT WE'RE
16 TRYING TO ATTRACT FOR THESE MEETINGS.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YOU KNOW, WE WILL BE
18 POSTING PUBLIC NOTICE.

19 MR. KASHIAN: YOU'RE WANTING PUBLIC MEETINGS,
20 AND I KNOW JEFF WAS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT IT, AND I
21 TOTALLY SUPPORT IT, BUT WHO IS IT YOU ARE TRYING TO
22 ATTRACT TO THESE MEETINGS? FUTURE APPLICANTS OR
23 INSTITUTIONS OR THE GENERAL PUBLIC OR THE MEDICAL
24 COMMUNITY? WHAT IS IT YOU'RE TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH?

25 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A RESPONSE TO THAT,

1 BUT IF YOU'RE TRYING DIRECT THAT CONVERSATION.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ED, CAN WE SHELF -- PUT
3 THAT ON THE SHELF FOR TWO MINUTES? I JUST WANT TO
4 FINISH THIS ONE POINT.

5 MR. KASHIAN: THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO DO AS
6 WELL BECAUSE THE SCHEDULING, IN MY MIND, SHOULD DEPEND
7 ON THE URGENCY OF THE ICOC. AND IF THERE'S SOME PEOPLE
8 THAT CAN'T BE THERE OR BE THERE, THEN THEY HAVE TO MAKE
9 ARRANGEMENTS. THE POINT I'M MAKING IS THIS. IF YOU'RE
10 GOING TO TRY TO ATTRACT THE GENERAL PUBLIC AS WELL AS
11 MEDICAL PEOPLE OR SCIENTISTS OR FUTURE SCIENTISTS OR
12 THE GENERAL PUBLIC OR ADVOCATES, YOU MIGHT WANT TO MAKE
13 SURE THAT THERE'S MAJOR ADVERTISING GOING ON PRIOR TO
14 THE MEETING. AND SO THAT YOU CAN'T ADJUST THE SCHEDULE
15 OF THE MEETING ONCE YOU'VE STARTED AND BE ABLE TO GET
16 PEOPLE TO THE MEETING.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ED, I AGREE 100 PERCENT
18 WITH YOU. AND WE WILL ADDRESS THAT ISSUE. WE'LL HAVE
19 STAFF ADDRESS THAT ISSUE IN TERMS OF MAKING SURE WE
20 HAVE ENOUGH NOTICE.

21 MS. HOFFMAN: I ACTUALLY THINK YOU MAKE AN
22 EXCELLENT POINT. WE TALKED ABOUT OUTREACH AS WELL AND
23 HOW LONG IT WOULD TAKE A VERY BROAD BASE OF INPUT.
24 GIVEN THE URGENCY, CERTAINLY, AND THE FACT THAT THE
25 ICOC HAS ALREADY NOW DELAYED THE CONCEPT PLAN COMING

1 FROM THEM FROM THEIR JUNE MEETING TO THE AUGUST
2 MEETING, WE WILL CERTAINLY ADVERTISE ON OUR WEBSITE TEN
3 DAYS BEFORE YOUR FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEETING. IF
4 YOU WOULD LIKE FOR US TO TRY TO DO A BROADER PUBLIC
5 OUTREACH, THE STAFF CERTAINLY DOES NOT HAVE THAT
6 EXPERTISE OR NECESSARILY THE TIME, SO I WOULD LIKE TO
7 SEEK YOUR INPUT, THAT IT WOULD BE REASONABLE TO LOOK TO
8 HAVE SOMEBODY DO THAT FOR US OR FOR YOU.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I DEFINITELY THINK WE
10 WOULD LIKE TO SEE -- AT LEAST I CAN SPEAK FOR MYSELF --
11 AN OUTREACH. HOW WE ACHIEVE THAT, YOU KNOW, I GUESS
12 I'M OPEN TO SUGGESTIONS. IF STAFF IS UNABLE TO -- HAS
13 THE TIME OR EXPERTISE.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: IT SEEMS TO ME IT'S IMPORTANT
15 ENOUGH THAT WE WANT TO MAKE SURE -- I'M AGREEING WITH
16 ED COMPLETELY -- THAT THE WORLD THAT IS INTERESTED IN
17 THIS, I THINK THE STEM CELL STAKEHOLDERS, IF YOU WILL,
18 AND BEYOND CALIFORNIA KNOW ABOUT THESE MEETINGS AND
19 HAVE THE ABILITY TO PLAN AHEAD ENOUGH. I THINK IT'S
20 GOT TO BE A TIGHT TIMEFRAME, BUT WE HAVE TO HAVE ENOUGH
21 TIME THAT IT'S REALISTIC. AND MY HUNCH IS THAT WE
22 WOULD BE BEST SERVED AND THE STAFF WOULD BE ASSISTED
23 WITH SOME SORT OF AN EVENT PLANNER. I'M NOT SURE
24 THAT'S NECESSARILY THE TITLE, BUT SOMEONE WHO KNOWS HOW
25 TO PUT THESE EVENTS TOGETHER AND GET THE WORD OUT TO

1 HELP YOU SHARE THE LOAD, AND THAT THERE'S A BUDGET FOR
2 THIS THAT IS SUFFICIENT; THAT IF THERE'S SOME PEOPLE
3 OUTSIDE THE STATE WHO ARE EXPERT ON THIS SUBJECT OR
4 HAVE VERY USEFUL INFORMATION TO BRING TO US, THAT WE
5 CAN PAY TO GET THEM HERE.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR
7 COMMENTS.

8 MR. KLEIN: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY THAT WE
9 CAN HELP YOU WITH THAT FROM THE CHAIRMAN'S OFFICE.
10 FROM THE HEADQUARTERS SEARCH, WE WERE ABLE TO MARSHAL
11 SUBSTANTIAL PORTIONS OF THE PUBLIC WITH VERY LITTLE
12 MONEY AND, IN FACT, GOT GREAT MEDIA PENETRATION SO THAT
13 THE PUBLIC KNEW ABOUT IT AND FOLLOWED IT THROUGH THE
14 PROCESS. WE THINK IT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED PRETTY
15 READILY.

16 MS. HOFFMAN: THANK YOU. I PERHAPS MISSPOKE.
17 THERE IS EXTRAORDINARY EXPERTISE ON STAFF TO PUT THESE
18 MEETINGS TOGETHER. WHAT I WOULD NOT LIKE TO SEE IS
19 THAT, FOR WHATEVER REASON, ANY OUTREACH EFFORTS THAT WE
20 DID NOT MEET WITH YOUR STANDARDS AND SOMEHOW WE WERE
21 HELD TO UNREASONABLE EXPECTATIONS GIVEN THE TIMEFRAME.
22 SO RATHER THAN -- LET US FIGURE THIS OUT, AND I
23 CERTAINLY AGREE THAT THE OFFICE OF THE CHAIR HAS THE
24 EXPERTISE TO PULL ALL OF THIS TOGETHER, AND THEN WE
25 JUST WON'T DO ANY MORE ADVERTISING THAN WE NORMALLY DO

1 BECAUSE I THINK THAT MEMBER SAMUELSON IS INDEED
2 CORRECT, THAT FOLKS ARE WATCHING THE FACILITIES WORKING
3 GROUP. I'M CONCERNED ABOUT MEMBER KASHIAN'S COMMENT ON
4 THE OUTREACH. THOSE THAT AREN'T WATCHING US, HOW FAR
5 DO YOU WANT TO PURSUE THIS?

6 MR. KASHIAN: I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN,
7 THAT WE DELEGATE THE CHAIR, MR. KLEIN, AND THE DIRECTOR
8 TO ESTABLISH DATES AND LOCATIONS AND TIMES AND GETTING
9 THEM PUBLIC AS OPPOSED TO TRY TO FIGURE OUT A SPECIFIC
10 DATE FOR A SPECIFIC POINT.

11 MR. KLEIN: THE ACTING PRESIDENT AND THE
12 FACILITIES DIRECTOR WILL NEED TO REALLY BE IN CONTROL
13 OF THE DATES AND TIMES, BUT WE WOULD SUPPORT THEM IN
14 ANY WAY WE COULD.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: UNLESS THERE'S
16 CONTROVERSY ON THIS ISSUE, I'D LIKE TO ASK THE ACTING
17 PRESIDENT TO KIND OF GATHER THE INFORMATION ABOUT,
18 GIVEN YOUR INTERNAL RESOURCES AND THE RESOURCES THAT
19 ARE MADE AVAILABLE TO YOU AND THE MEMBERS' SCHEDULES,
20 TO COME UP WITH A PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND GET BACK TO US
21 ON THIS. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

22 MR. KASHIAN: THAT FROM MY VIEWPOINT, THAT
23 YOU AND THE ACTING PRESIDENT AND MR. KLEIN BE ABLE TO
24 CONSULT WITH HER, AND YOU HAVE MY SUPPORT AS OPPOSED TO
25 TRYING TO PICK A DATE OR A TIME RIGHT NOW.

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, ED.

2 MS. HOFFMAN: CERTAINLY -- I'M SORRY, CHAIR
3 LICHTENGER. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE CLEAR.
4 SO WE'RE GOING TO TRY TO DO FOUR MEETINGS PRIOR TO
5 MID-JUNE. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE ANOTHER FACILITIES
6 WORKING GROUP MEETING IN JULY TO DISCUSS AT THAT POINT
7 THE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES AND WHAT YOU'VE ALL LEARNED
8 FROM THOSE FOUR MEETINGS.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I JUST WANT TO MAKE A
10 CLARIFICATION. I WASN'T -- I GUESS POTENTIALLY IN A
11 PERFECT WORLD WE GET ALL FOUR IN MID TO LATE JUNE, BUT
12 IF FOR SOME REASON SOME OF THOSE MEETINGS HAVE TO DRAG
13 INTO LATER JUNE OR EARLY JULY, I GUESS -- WHY DON'T YOU
14 CHECK MEMBERS' SCHEDULES, AND WE'LL TRY TO FIGURE THAT
15 OUT.

16 MS. HYSEN: I WANT TO GO BACK TO ED'S
17 COMMENTS REGARDING WHO IS THE PUBLIC. WHAT IS OUR
18 DEFINITION OF THE PUBLIC BECAUSE THAT REALLY FORMS THE
19 PURPOSE OF WHY WE'RE DOING THE MEETING. I THINK THE
20 PUBLIC IS REALLY ALL OF THE ABOVE THAT ED MENTIONED.
21 THERE ARE SO MANY CONSTITUENCIES THAT CARE ABOUT THIS
22 FROM THE PATIENT ADVOCACY GROUPS TO THE BUILDING
23 INDUSTRY TO THE CITIES IN WHICH THESE FACILITIES WILL
24 BE LOCATED, AS WE SAW WITH THE INTEREST FROM SAN
25 FRANCISCO FOR OUR HEADQUARTERS. THIS IS A BIG DEAL

1 BECAUSE IT REALLY -- FOR SOME CITIES TO HOUSE A VERY
2 INNOVATIVE FACILITY THAT IS CONDUCTING GROUNDBREAKING
3 SCIENCE IS SOMETHING THEY'RE GOING TO TOUT WHEN THEY
4 ATTRACT OTHER BUSINESSES. SO THAT'S A GROUP THAT I
5 THINK WOULD BE VERY INTERESTED.

6 AND SO OUR OUTREACH REALLY HAS TO FOCUS ON
7 WHAT DO WE HOPE TO IMPART TO THE PUBLIC, AND WHAT DO WE
8 HOPE TO GAIN FROM THE PUBLIC?

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, DEBORAH, THANK YOU.
10 SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO PROPOSE NOW IS THAT WE TALK ABOUT
11 THE GOALS AND FRAME OUR DISCUSSION NOW WITH THE GOALS
12 OF WHAT WE'D LIKE TO ACHIEVE AT THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS.
13 I THINK YOUR COMMENTS ARE WITHIN THAT CONTEXT. BUT I
14 JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE MEMBERS ARE CLEAR WHAT WE'RE
15 ASKING STAFF TO DO.

16 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS, AND
17 WE'RE GOING TO TRY TO HAVE THEM IN MID-JUNE, AS MANY OF
18 THEM AS POSSIBLE, MID TO LATE JUNE, AND WE'LL ALLOW THE
19 ACTING PRESIDENT TO TRY TO SPEARHEAD THAT AND REPORT
20 BACK TO US BASED ON EVERYONE'S SCHEDULES.

21 MR. KLEIN: IN TERMS OF THE GOALS, THERE'S A
22 MAJOR TOPIC THAT DID NOT GET DISCUSSED YESTERDAY AND
23 HAS NOT BEEN DISCUSSED IN THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS THAT
24 WE UTILIZED EFFECTIVELY IN THE HEADQUARTERS PROGRAM,
25 WHICH IS READINESS. THE INITIATIVE SAYS YOU NEED TO

1 HAVE THE FACILITY BUILT WITHIN TWO YEARS OF GRANT AWARD
2 IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR A PREFERENCE. NOW, IN ORDER TO
3 DO THAT, YOU NEED COOPERATION FROM THE LOCAL
4 GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY, UNLESS YOU'RE THE UC SYSTEM AND
5 HAVE AN EXEMPTION, AND EVEN THEN IT'S NOT SOMETIMES A
6 COMPLETE EXEMPTION.

7 SO THE ISSUE OF READINESS IS IMPORTANT. AND
8 IN THE TRACKING CHART THAT DEBORAH REFERENCED
9 YESTERDAY, IF ONE OF OUR GOALS WAS PROVING YOUR
10 READINESS ON A COMPETITIVE BASIS TO ACTUALLY BE ABLE TO
11 PERFORM, WE DON'T WANT TO APPROVE MONEY AND FIND OUT
12 TWO YEARS LATER THEY STILL HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO PULL A
13 BUILDING PERMIT. SO ON A COMPETITIVE BASIS, THESE
14 COMMUNITIES, KNOWING THAT READINESS IS AN ISSUE, COME
15 FORWARD AND FORM A PARTNERSHIP AND PROVIDE SUPPORTING
16 LETTERS TO THE INSTITUTION SAYING WE'RE GOING TO
17 FAST-TRACK THIS, AND THIS IS WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO TO
18 MAKE SURE THAT THIS CAN REALLY COMPETE ON READINESS.
19 THAT'S A HUGE BENEFIT TO THE INSTITUTIONS. IT'S A HUGE
20 BENEFIT TO OUR MISSION. AND THE EARLIER WE GET THAT
21 OUT THERE, THE EARLIER THE COMMUNITIES CAN HELP.

22 IN SAN FRANCISCO WE GOT A BUILDING PERMIT IN
23 45 DAYS. NOW, AS MANY PEOPLE KNOW IN SAN FRANCISCO,
24 THAT'S NOT ALWAYS COMMON WITHOUT AN EXPEDITER. THE
25 ISSUE OF READINESS IN PERFORMING OUR MISSION SHOULD BE

1 ON THE TABLE AS ONE OF OUR OBJECTIVES TO COMMUNICATE
2 HERE.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO BASICALLY YOU'RE
4 SAYING THAT -- SO YOU'RE SAYING THAT'S A GOAL IS TO
5 COMMUNICATE READINESS AS ONE OF THE --

6 MR. KLEIN: URGENCY IS ONE OF OUR VALUES.
7 OKAY. AND SO IN OUR RANKINGS, IN ORDER TO HIT THE
8 TWO-YEAR REQUIREMENT OF THE INITIATIVE FOR PREFERENCE,
9 THE ABILITY TO PERFORM AND WHETHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS
10 SUPPORTING YOUR EFFORT SHOULD BE ONE OF OUR CRITERIA.

11 MS. HOFFMAN: AND I THINK, AS YOU IDENTIFIED,
12 IT IS IN PROPOSITION 71. SO WE CERTAINLY WILL FIGURE
13 OUT HOW TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT IS CAPTURED IN THE
14 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES AND, IN FACT, IN YOUR ULTIMATE
15 SCORING. I THINK WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR HERE IN TERMS
16 OF GOALS ARE THOSE ISSUES THAT ARE NOT NECESSARILY
17 ADDRESSED. FOR EXAMPLE, THE ISSUE OF HOW -- AND NOT TO
18 HAVE YOU OPINE ABOUT THE SCIENCE, BUT HOW DO YOU SEE
19 YOUR ROLE OR WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING FOR IN TERMS OF
20 AUGMENTING THE SCIENCE AND MOVING THAT FORWARD, AND HOW
21 DOES THIS FACILITIES WORKING GROUP SCORE THOSE
22 APPLICATIONS THAT BEST SUIT THE SCIENCE? AND HOW DO
23 YOU EXPECT TO GET THAT INFORMATION FROM THE PUBLIC, OR
24 IF YOU ARE GOING TO BE SEEKING THAT FROM THE PUBLIC.
25 IF THAT'S NOT ONE OF THE GOALS OF THE PUBLIC MEETING,

1 THAT'S FINE.

2 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK THAT'S A GREAT LEAD-IN.
3 THAT KIND OF CAPTURES ONE OF THE ISSUES WE NEED TO HAVE
4 DEVELOPED IN AT LEAST ONE OF THESE MEETINGS. WHAT I
5 WANTED TO REFERENCE WAS HISTORY, AND HOW WE'VE DONE THE
6 IP TASK FORCE, HOW WE'VE DONE THE STRATEGIC PLAN. AND
7 TYPICALLY THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS HAVE HAD A THEME, AND
8 THERE HAVE BEEN PRESENTATIONS BY EXPERTS. SO, FOR
9 INSTANCE, THE SCIENTIFIC RATIONALE, THE SCIENTIFIC
10 JUDGMENTS THAT SHOULD BE DRIVING WHAT WE APPROVE, YOU
11 KNOW, BASICALLY THE NECESSITY, RIGHT, SHOULD BE -- IT
12 SEEMS TO ME THAT THAT SHOULD BE ONE THEME, THAT WE
13 SHOULD HEAR FROM SCIENTISTS AND FROM, YOU KNOW, WHAT WE
14 SHOULD BE LOOKING FOR, WHAT WE SHOULD WANT TO
15 ACCOMPLISH WITH THE MAJOR FACILITIES. I JUST SUGGEST
16 THAT AS ONE. AND I HOPE THAT STAFF, BECAUSE STAFF WAS
17 VERY INSTRUMENTAL IN DETERMINING AND SHAPING THE INPUT
18 OF THESE MEETINGS, BOTH FOR IP AND FOR THE STRATEGIC
19 PLAN.

20 AND TO GET BACK TO ONE OF ED'S EARLIER
21 POINTS, PART OF THIS IS TO GET INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC,
22 BUT THE OTHER PART OF IT IS ACTUALLY TO SHOW OUR CARDS,
23 TO HAVE TRANSPARENCY, TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC. WHEN YOU
24 SPEND THIS KIND OF MONEY, THE PUBLIC SHOULD UNDERSTAND
25 WHY WE'RE SPENDING IT, WHAT WE HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH. SO

1 IT'S TO REALLY HAVE THE PUBLIC TO BE ABLE TO BE THERE
2 AND TO HEAR OUR THOUGHT PROCESS IS A BIG PIECE OF THIS.

3 MS. FEIT: I HOPE WE DON'T PUT TOO MUCH
4 EMPHASIS ON WHAT THE SCIENTISTS MIGHT SAY IN TERMS OF
5 THE SCIENCE, BUT IN TERMS OF THEIR POSITION AS USERS OF
6 THE FACILITY. I THINK WHAT THE SCIENTISTS WILL
7 PROBABLY SAY, BECAUSE SOME OF THEM HAVE SAID IT TO ME,
8 I JUST NEED TO GET MY PI'S IN A BUILDING. I NEED TO --
9 I WANT TO PROVIDE A COURSE, SO I NEED THIS KIND OF -- I
10 NEED MORE BENCHES. I NEED AN ANIMAL LAB. I NEED TO
11 REFURBISH MY ANIMAL LAB BECAUSE WE WANT TO EXPAND WHAT
12 WE'RE DOING. SO I DON'T KNOW THAT WE'RE GOING TO GET
13 REAL SCIENTIFIC INPUT IN TERMS; BUT IT'S LIKE ANYTHING
14 ELSE, THEY'RE USERS OF THE FACILITIES, SO THEY'LL
15 DEFINITELY HAVE INPUT INTO WHAT THEY'D LIKE TO SEE
16 HAPPEN.

17 AND PARTICULARLY, I'M INTERESTED IN HEARING
18 FROM THOSE WHO WANT TO ESTABLISH TRUE COLLABORATIONS
19 BECAUSE CERTAINLY THEIR IDEAS OF FACILITIES MIGHT BE
20 VERY DIFFERENT FROM WHAT THEY TRADITIONALLY ARE USED TO
21 PARTICIPATING IN, AND THIS IS OUR FACILITY, THIS IS MY
22 INSTITUTION, AND SO LIFE IS GOOD. BUT WHEN WE'RE
23 TALKING NOW GOING FORWARD CONSORTIUMS AND SHARED, THAT
24 MIGHT BE A LITTLE DIFFERENT. SO I THINK WE SHOULD BE
25 LOOKING TO HEAR FROM THAT.

1 BUT I THINK THAT ONE OF THE MAJOR GOALS THAT
2 WE SHOULD PROBABLY TALK ABOUT IS, YOU KNOW, WHAT DO WE
3 WANT TO FUND? WE TALKED ABOUT CAN WE AFFORD TO FUND
4 EVERYTHING, AND WHAT KINDS OF FACILITIES ARE WE
5 TARGETING IN TERMS OF DO WE WANT SMALLER INSTITUTIONS
6 WHO HAVE YOUNG, VERY PASSIONATE SCIENTISTS STARTING UP
7 TO COMPETE WITH VERY LARGE SEASONED INSTITUTIONS WHO
8 ARE USED TO BEING IN THAT ARENA BECAUSE WE MAY BE DOING
9 A DISSERVICE TO THEM BY SAYING, WELL, YOU WERE
10 COMPETING WITH THIS HUGE INSTITUTION THAT'S WORLD
11 RENOWN AND THEY RECEIVED FIVE AND YOU DIDN'T GET ANY.

12 SO I THINK WE HAVE SORT OF AN OVERALL GOAL
13 AND POLICY ABOUT MAYBE WE WANT TO RETHINK HOW
14 INSTITUTIONS CAN APPLY FOR AN RFA, THAT SOMEHOW WE ARE
15 ABLE TO MATCH THEM UP MORE LOGISTICALLY IN SIZE OR
16 SOMETHING. I'M JUST PUTTING THAT OUT THERE AS A
17 THOUGHT.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, MARCY. I
19 JUST WANT TO MAKE A COMMENT, AND THEN WANT JANET TO
20 SPEAK. SO, YOU KNOW, EVERYONE'S TALKING ABOUT THE
21 SCIENTISTS. I THINK IT'S FINE THAT WE WANT TO INVITE
22 SCIENTISTS TO MAKE COMMENTS TO THE FACILITIES WORKING
23 GROUP; BUT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, I WANT TO HEAR THE
24 SCIENTISTS TELLING ME WHAT'S GOING TO HELP FACILITATE
25 THEIR SCIENCE BETTER, WHAT TYPES OF FACILITIES, NOT

1 NECESSARILY ABOUT THEIR SPECIFIC SCIENCE, BUT DO THEY
2 NEED MORE VIVARIUMS, DO THEY NEED MORE LABS, EXACTLY
3 WHAT TYPE OF SPACE AND WHAT TYPE OF FACILITIES ARE
4 REALLY GOING TO HELP BRING ALONG OUR STRATEGIC
5 OBJECTIVES.

6 DR. WRIGHT: I COMPLETELY AGREE, DAVID. IN
7 FACT, I WAS JUST TOYING WITH THE IDEA THAT JEFF BROUGHT
8 UP OF ASSIGNING A THEME TO THIS AS WE TRAVEL AROUND THE
9 STATE. THE CONCEPT OF BUILDING FOR SCIENCE. WHAT WE
10 REALLY WANT IS TO GATHER ALL THE EXPERTS WHO CAN
11 CONTRIBUTE TO A DIALOGUE ABOUT BUILDING THE BEST
12 FACILITIES FOR SCIENCE. AND I THINK BOB BROUGHT UP WE
13 NEED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, WE NEED TO ENGAGE THEM, GET
14 THEM GEARED UP. THE SCIENTISTS, I AGREE THAT
15 PARTICULAR PERSPECTIVE, WHAT ENVIRONMENT DO YOU NEED IN
16 GENERAL TO PRODUCE THE MOST SCIENCE? WE'VE UNDERSTOOD
17 LATELY THAT CURRENT HOSPITAL PRACTICE IS NOT HELPING
18 TREAT PEOPLE. HOSPITALS ARE GETTING IN THE WAY FOR THE
19 MOST PART OF GETTING PEOPLE HEALTHY. SO THERE ARE LOTS
20 OF INNOVATIVE MODELS OF HOW TO CARE FOR SICK PEOPLE,
21 AND I THINK THERE ARE PROBABLY SOME PARALLELS.
22 ALTHOUGH WE DON'T HAVE TO BE COMPREHENSIVE IN THAT, WE
23 COULD PERHAPS TAP INTO SOME NEWER IDEAS ABOUT HOW TO
24 BUILD FOR SCIENCE.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, AND THEN I'M GOING

1 TO TAKE DR. CHIU.

2 MR. KLEIN: WELL, A COUPLE OF POINTS HERE.
3 ONE IS, JEFF, I THINK RIGHT BEFORE YOU CAME IN, DR.
4 CHIU MADE SOME GREAT COMMENTS ABOUT GENERAL SCIENTIFIC
5 PRINCIPLES AND IDEAS ABOUT INNOVATIVE WAYS TO ADDRESS
6 THEIR NEEDS. I MADE A COMMENT THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT
7 IN EACH JURISDICTION WE CAN HAVE SOMEONE ADDRESSING
8 YOUR SUBJECT OF THE NECESSITY OF SCIENCE AT THE
9 BEGINNING OF THE MEETING. IT SETS IT IN CONTEXT FOR
10 THE PUBLIC IN THE AREA, UNDERSTANDING WHY WE'RE DOING
11 THIS. AND CERTAINLY THE MARKETING APPROACH THAT JANET
12 HAS SUGGESTED OF CALLING THIS THE THEME OF ALL THESE
13 HEARINGS, BUILDING FOR SCIENCE, IS A GREAT THEME.

14 BUT IN TERMS OF OUR GOALS, IF AT THE POLICY
15 LEVEL WE TAKE OUR VALUE, FOR EXAMPLE, OF COLLABORATION
16 THAT MARCY REFERENCED, WE NEED TO TAKE THAT VALUE AND
17 DEVELOP IT INTO POLICIES THAT WOULD SUPPORT
18 COLLABORATIVE MODELS LIKE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, FOR
19 EXAMPLE. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? IT CONVERTS INTO RULES
20 AT THE RULE LEVEL OF POSSIBLY CAN YOU DO THE SHARED
21 FACILITY SUBMISSION AND A SUBMISSION OF AN INDIVIDUAL
22 LAB AS WELL IF YOU HAVE A SPECIALIZATION THAT'S OF
23 PARTICULAR VALUE.

24 SO IN EACH OF THESE HEARINGS, I THINK WE NEED
25 TO COME OUT WITH A PRODUCT, AND THAT PRODUCT HAS TO

1 TAKE POLICY TO RULES AND DEFINITIONS AND BE CONSISTENT
2 WITH OUR VALUES AND OUR STRATEGIC PRINCIPLES.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, BOB.

4 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I THINK
5 THAT'S A LOVELY TITLE ACTUALLY FROM JANET. BUILDING
6 THE SCIENCE, BUILDINGS FOR SCIENCE. I THINK IT'S A
7 GREAT MOTTO FOR WHAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO EMBARK UPON. I
8 JUST WANT TO SAY THAT TALKING WITH INDIVIDUAL
9 SCIENTISTS CAN PRODUCE A DIFFERENT IMAGE FROM TALKING
10 ABOUT THESE BIGGER FACILITIES. SO THE SHARED LABS,
11 IT'S VERY CLEAR THE NEEDS OF THE SPECIFIC LABS. BUT
12 WHEREAS INDIVIDUAL SCIENTISTS WILL TALK TO YOU ABOUT
13 WHAT I NEED TODAY, WHAT MY LAB IS LACKING TODAY TO MOVE
14 FORWARD, THESE BIGGER FACILITIES HAVE A BROADER
15 UMBRELLA TO EMBRACE MANY CONCEPTS, WHICH IS WHY I WAS
16 MUCH MORE COMFORTABLE TO HEAR BOTH FROM SMALL
17 INSTITUTIONS FROM EACH LOCATION THAT HAD A VERY
18 DIFFERENT VISION OF WHAT WOULD HELP THEIR PROGRAMS,
19 CREATE NEW PROGRAMS, BRING TOGETHER EXISTING PROGRAMS
20 IN A NEW MODEL, ETC. THAN LARGER FACILITIES.

21 I THINK IT'S GREAT THAT YOU HAVE FOUR
22 LOCATIONS. I WAS GOING TO, JUST PENCILING ON THE BACK
23 OF A MATCHBOOK, SUGGEST THAT AT EACH HEARING THAT YOU
24 MIGHT, WHERE POSSIBLE, INVITE ONE REPRESENTATIVE FROM A
25 LARGE ACADEMIC, WHATEVER, MODEL AND ONE FROM A SMALLER

1 ONE TO GIVE DIFFERENT VISIONS OF IT AND TO RESTRICT IT
2 TO NOT A LENGTHY PRESENTATION OF MY DREAM OF WHAT THE
3 NEXT FLOOR OR NEXT BUILDING WOULD LOOK LIKE, WHAT THE
4 GOALS OF THIS FACILITY, WHATEVER IT IS, WOULD PRODUCE.
5 IT COULD HAVE A VIVARIA, IT COULD HAVE GMP FACILITIES,
6 OR IT COULD BE VERY DISCRETE TO BRING TOGETHER NEW
7 DISCIPLINES. I JUST CANNOT IMAGINE THE NOVEL IDEAS
8 THAT ARE OUT THERE. I'D RATHER THE COMMUNITY BRING IT
9 FORWARD.

10 BUT ONCE YOU HAVE THE DATE SET, I WOULD HOPE
11 THAT WE GIVE THEM AMPLE TIME TO REALLY COME AND GIVE A
12 GOOD PRESENTATION. AND I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST
13 THAT SINCE WE ACCOMMODATE, SAY, TWO 10-MINUTE
14 PRESENTATIONS, THAT WE OPEN THE PODIUM FOR ANY OTHER
15 NOT INVITED, BUT LOCAL SCIENTISTS OR WHATEVER TO COME
16 UP AND SAY THEIR THREE MINUTES OF WHAT THEY NEED. I
17 THINK THAT WOULD BE A FAIR, BUT QUICK WAY OF PRESENTING
18 THEIR NEEDS.

19 DR. WRIGHT: ARLENE, CAN THE IOM HELP US
20 HERE? IS THERE ANY --

21 DR. CHIU: I THINK THEY TAKE TOO MUCH TIME.
22 IF YOU'RE MOVING AT SUCH A FAST SCALE, THEY HAVEN'T
23 EVEN ARRANGED THE FIRST MEETING WOULD BE MY IMPRESSION.

24 DR. WRIGHT: I MEANT IN TERMS OF -- I'M
25 LOOKING FOR AN OUT-OF-THE-STATE, BUT A NATIONAL BODY

1 THAT MIGHT TELL US WHERE SCIENCE MODELS ARE HEADING,
2 SCIENCE ENVIRONMENTS ARE HEADING.

3 DR. CHIU: I THINK THAT'S A GREAT IDEA. IT'S
4 THE TIME ELEMENT. AROUND THIS TIME OF YEAR, MY
5 EXPERIENCE WITH SCIENTISTS ARE THEY'RE ABOUT TO DO
6 SABBATICALS, MAKE ARRANGEMENTS WITH THEIR KIDS, SO
7 WE'RE RUNNING A TIGHT SHIP HERE.

8 MS. FEIT: ONE OTHER THING THAT JUST I HAD
9 MADE A NOTE I WANTED TO COMMENT ON IS I WOULD LIKE TO
10 KNOW IF WE'RE SETTING SOME STANDARDS THAT SAY TWO YEARS
11 IS SORT OF OUR MAXIMUM TIME TO SEE A FACILITY GET UP.
12 I WANT TO KNOW IS THAT REASONABLE BECAUSE OSHPD, FOR
13 THOSE FACILITIES WHO HAVE TO GET AN OSHPD APPROVAL, I
14 CAN TELL YOU MY EXPERIENCE RIGHT NOW IN THE HEALTHCARE
15 INDUSTRY IS WE ARE NOT GETTING IT ON A TIMELY BASIS.
16 AND THERE'S A GOOD CHANCE A YEAR, A YEAR AND A HALF CAN
17 GO BY, DEPENDING ON THE SIZE THE RENOVATION, IF IT'S A
18 SMALL OVER-THE-COUNTER PROJECT. I KIND OF WOULD LIKE
19 TO HEAR THAT KIND OF THING. WHAT ARE THEY EXPERIENCING
20 OUT THERE? IS OUR TWO-YEAR TIMEFRAME A REASONABLE
21 THING TO EXPECT IN TERMS OF GETTING ALL THAT WORK DONE?

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO ASK RICK
23 KELLER TO COMMENT ON THAT. RICK, MY ONLY PERSPECTIVE
24 IS I DON'T THINK THESE PROJECTS NEED OSHPD APPROVAL.

25 MS. HYSEN: THE HOSPITALS WILL.

1 MR. KELLER: IT DEPENDS ON THE LOCATION OF
2 THE LABORATORY, WHETHER IT'S AN ACUTE CARE HOSPITAL.
3 IF IT'S ATTACHED TO AN ACUTE HOSPITAL SITE RATHER THAN
4 A STAND-ALONE BUILDING, IT WOULD HAVE TO HAVE OSHPD.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: IS THAT AN IPOD FROM
6 WISCONSIN?

7 MR. KELLER: I'M SORRY. OFFICE OF STATEWIDE
8 HEALTH PLANNING HAS JURISDICTION OVER ACUTE CARE
9 HOSPITALS; AND, THEREFORE, THEY REVIEW PLANS FOR ALL
10 ACUTE CARE HOSPITALS. AND THAT PROCESS OF REVIEWING
11 PLANS AND INSPECTING THE CONSTRUCTION OF ALL HOSPITALS
12 IN CALIFORNIA ADDS AN ELEMENT TO THE TIMING OF BOTH THE
13 PLAN, PREPARATION REVIEW, AND THE CONSTRUCTION SINCE
14 THEY HAVE THEIR OWN INSPECTORS WHO COME TO THE SITES
15 AND ALSO DEAL WITH THEM. AS MEMBER FEIT WAS NOTING,
16 THERE'S NOW A SUBSTANTIAL BACKLOG AS PEOPLE WHO WANT TO
17 EXPAND OR DEAL WITH ALTERATIONS WITHIN HOSPITALS, THEY
18 OFTEN INCUR A YEAR OR YEAR AND A HALF DELAY. TO THE
19 EXTENT THAT RESEARCH FACILITIES THAT ARE ATTACHED TO
20 THESE FACILITIES, THEY WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE SAME
21 OBLIGATIONS.

22 MR. KLEIN: I THINK WE'VE LOOKED AT THIS
23 ISSUE. AND FROM THE MAJOR FACILITIES IN THE STATE WITH
24 MAYBE ONE EXCEPTION THEY'RE BUILDING OUTSIDE OF
25 HOSPITALS. SO EVEN WHERE CITY OF HOPE, FOR EXAMPLE, I

1 THINK THEY HAVE THE BECKMAN CENTER, WHICH IS NOT
2 ATTACHED AND INTENTIONALLY SO SO THAT THEY CAN BUILD IN
3 A REASONABLE TIMEFRAME. AND I KNOW THE ACTING
4 PRESIDENT HAS DONE SOME STRATEGIC THINKING ABOUT HOW TO
5 EXPEDITE THESE FACILITIES THAT ARE PART OF THE UC
6 SYSTEM AND STREAMLINE IT. AND SOMEWHERE IN THIS
7 TIMEFRAME THERE WILL NEED TO BE SOME FOREIGN DIPLOMACY
8 WITH THE UC SYSTEM TO HOPEFULLY GET A SPECIAL CHANNEL
9 FOR EXPEDITING WITHIN THE UC SYSTEM.

10 THAT'S ALREADY HAPPENED, AND MAYBE LORI CAN
11 COMMENT, THAT THE UC SYSTEM HAS ALLOWED \$1 MILLION
12 EARLY PLANNING GRANTS IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THE UC
13 SYSTEM'S COMPETITIVE ABILITY TO MEET THESE SCHEDULES.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CAN YOU TELL THE
15 MEMBERS YOUR EXPERIENCE ON A MAJOR FACILITY, A TYPICAL
16 TIMEFRAME, JUST SO THE MEMBERS HAVE YOUR EXPERIENCE IN
17 TERMS OF THE PLANNING?

18 MR. KELLER: THERE'S AS MANY SCENARIOS AS
19 THERE ARE PROJECTS, LET'S SAY. BUT GENERALLY SPEAKING,
20 ON A CAPITAL PROJECT ON A UC CAMPUS, YOU'RE GENERALLY
21 LOOKING AT FOUR YEARS BY VIRTUE OF THE FACT THAT
22 THERE'S A YEAR FOR PRELIMINARY PLANNING, THERE'S A YEAR
23 FOR WORKING DRAWINGS OR DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILED
24 DRAWINGS LEADING TO A LUMP SUM DESIGN, BID, BUILD
25 CIRCUMSTANCE, AND MAYBE TWO YEARS OR MORE OF

1 CONSTRUCTION DURATION.

2 NOW, THE VARIATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED
3 HERE WHERE INNOVATION IS OCCURRING TO LOOK AT THINGS
4 SUCH AS DESIGN BUILD WILL OBVIOUSLY SHAVE THINGS DOWN,
5 BUT THE GOAL -- I THINK, THE OPERABLE ISSUE HERE IS THE
6 GOAL OF TWO YEARS IS GOING TO BE A STRETCH FOR A LOT OF
7 FOLKS IN TERMS OF MEETING SOME OF THE -- WHETHER OR
8 NOT -- DEPENDING ON HOW MUCH THEY'VE STARTED EARLY ON
9 TO GET UP TO SPEED.

10 MR. KLEIN: I THINK THE INSTITUTIONS KNOW THE
11 TWO-YEAR GOAL. SOME OF THEM HAVE BEEN WORKING ON IT
12 FOR TWO YEARS. AND, IN FACT, SOME OF THEM ARE GOING TO
13 EVEN MODULAR MIDRISE CONSTRUCTION. WE SHOULD GET
14 EVERYONE THE SLIDES THAT UC IRVINE PRESENTED AT OUR
15 HEADQUARTERS ABOUT A YEAR AGO. AND THEIR TRACK RECORD,
16 I THINK THEY WERE BUILDING IN 21 MONTHS. IN FACT, THEY
17 HAD THEIR WORKING DRAWINGS PROCESSED AND THEIR
18 CONSTRUCTION ON A VERY FAST-TRACK SYSTEM. NOT
19 EVERYBODY CAN DO THAT, BUT I THINK WE NEED TO
20 UNDERSTAND THAT GREAT THINGS CAN HAPPEN WHEN PEOPLE
21 KNOW THERE'S A DEADLINE, THINGS THAT HAVEN'T HAPPENED
22 BEFORE.

23 AND THE MESSAGE OF THAT INITIATIVE IS
24 WHATEVER YOUR OBSTACLES ARE, FIGURE A WAY AROUND THEM
25 BECAUSE IF YOU WANT A PREFERENCE, IT SAYS TWO YEARS.

1 AND I THINK THEY HAVE TO TAKE IT SERIOUSLY. AND IF
2 THEY TAKE IT SERIOUSLY, THEY CAN GO TO THEIR LOCAL
3 GOVERNMENTS AND SAY, I HAVE TO FAST-TRACK IT. THEY CAN
4 GO TO THE UC SYSTEM AND SAY I NEED A SEPARATE CHANNEL.
5 AND THOSE THINGS HAVE TO HAPPEN BECAUSE WE NEED TO
6 DELIVER SPACE FOR THE RESEARCHERS IN THE STATE. THAT'S
7 OUR MISSION. THE STATUTE TELLS US THE TIMELINE. AND
8 PEOPLE HAVE TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO GET THROUGH THESE
9 OBSTACLES.

10 MS. HOFFMAN: I JUST WANTED TO -- BOB HAD
11 SUGGESTED THAT I OUTLINE THE PROCESS THAT UC HAS BEEN
12 EMBARKING ON. SO IN JULY OF '06, THE UC REGENTS, IN
13 FACT, DELEGATED THE AUTHORITY TO THE OFFICE OF THE
14 PRESIDENT TO ALLOW CAMPUSES TO MOVE FORWARD WITH
15 PRELIMINARY PLANS UP TO \$1.5 MILLION. THERE ARE MANY
16 CAMPUSES THAT HAVE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF IT. THERE IS
17 CERTAINLY ONE CAMPUS THAT WENT FAR IN EXCESS OF THAT
18 AND HAS ALREADY GONE BACK TO THE REGENTS FOR ADDITIONAL
19 APPROVAL FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS IN ORDER TO MEET THIS
20 READINESS CRITERIA.

21 I'M SURE ALL THE PRIVATES ARE DOING THE SAME
22 AS WELL. AND SO I WOULD CERTAINLY SAY THAT IT IS OUR
23 OBLIGATION, IF WE'RE GOING TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF THE
24 CRITERIA, THAT WE DO SO AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE SO THAT
25 THESE CAMPUSES AND INSTITUTIONS DON'T CONTINUE ALONG A

1 PATH THAT HASN'T REALLY ADDRESSED SOME OF THESE ISSUES
2 IF, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE'S A CHALLENGE OUT THERE FOR
3 GREEN BUILDING OR BEATING TITLE 24 OR WHATEVER IT MAY
4 BE.

5 MS. HYSEN: CAN I JUST COMMENT ON THAT ONE
6 EXAMPLE IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE AS TO WHAT I THINK OUR
7 CHARGE IS. I THINK OUR CHARGE IS TO FIND OPPORTUNITIES
8 AND REMOVE IMPEDIMENTS TO GET THIS WORK DONE. THE
9 NOTION THAT THEY ARE SEEDING PRELIMINARY PLANS AND
10 WORKING DRAWINGS IN ANTICIPATION OF A PROJECT IS
11 ABSOLUTELY PHENOMENAL, BUT I DON'T BELIEVE OUR CURRENT
12 PROCESS WOULD ALLOW FOR US TO REIMBURSE SUCH AN
13 ACTIVITY. AND SO THAT'S -- CORRECT? IT'S A MATCH.

14 MR. KELLER: IT'S NOT EXPECTED.

15 MS. HOFFMAN: SINCE IT WOULD BE THIS PROJECT,
16 I THINK IT WAS THE UNDERSTANDING, AND I CERTAINLY
17 BELIEVE THAT MOST OF THE INSTITUTIONS BELIEVE THAT AT
18 LEAST THE FUNDS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT FORWARD FOR THAT
19 SPECIFIC PROJECT WOULD COUNT AS A MATCH.

20 MS. HYSEN: AS A MATCH. SOME OF THESE CAN BE
21 FAIRLY SIGNIFICANT, AND DO WE WANT TO HAVE, JUST AS AN
22 EXAMPLE, DO WE WANT TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO REIMBURSE
23 ACTUAL COSTS FOR DESIGN FEES VERSUS CONSIDERING IT AS A
24 MATCH? THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE SHOULD AT LEAST LOOK
25 AT AND CONSIDER BECAUSE, AGAIN, COULD THAT BE AN

1 IMPEDIMENT? SOME OF THESE INSTITUTIONS MAY NOT HAVE
2 THAT KIND OF MONEY AND MAY BE CONCERNED ABOUT BEING
3 ABLE TO HAVE THAT MATCH. SO THOSE ARE THE KIND OF
4 THINGS.

5 LET ME SPEAK TO THE AGENCY --

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DEBORAH, YOU KNOW, I
7 JUST WANT TO TRY TO FOCUS ON THE ISSUE OF GOALS.

8 MS. HYSEN: THAT'S WHAT I'M GOING TO DO.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BECAUSE AFTER WE GET
10 THE GOALS, I DO WANT TO TALK ABOUT THESE OTHER ISSUES,
11 BUT I WANT TO TRY TO MAKE IT SO THAT WE CAN MAKE
12 PROGRESS IN TERMS OF THESE MEETINGS. THANK YOU.

13 MS. HYSEN: I LOVE THE IDEA OF A THEME,
14 BUILDING FOR SCIENCE, BECAUSE I THINK WE NEED TO GET
15 INPUT, WE NEED TO IMPART INPUT, AND WE NEED TO EXCITE
16 PEOPLE. SO I LIKE JUST KIND OF HAVING A THEME, WHETHER
17 IT'S BUILDING FOR SCIENCE OR SOMETHING, BUT SOMETHING
18 THAT KIND OF WRAPS AROUND OUR EFFORTS.

19 I THINK WE REALLY NEED TO HAVE -- IF WE'RE
20 GOING TO HAVE FOUR MEETINGS, MAYBE WE HAVE FOUR
21 DISTINCT GOALS THAT ARE COVERED IN-DEPTH AT EACH
22 MEETING VERSUS COVERED IN A CURSORY MANNER EACH
23 MEETING. MY IDEA IS THAT WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND THE
24 PROGRAM NEEDS. WE HAVE TO SORT OF UNDERSTAND HOW THE
25 PROGRAM NEEDS TRANSLATE INTO THE BUILDING REQUIREMENTS.

1 I WOULD LOVE TO HAVE A GOAL OF UNDERSTANDING
2 THE ALTERNATIVE BUILDING STRATEGIES THAT ARE OUT THERE.
3 I WOULD LOVE TO HAVE SOME BEST PRACTICE SCENARIOS
4 PRESENTED TO US FROM LARGE INSTITUTIONS. THEY DON'T
5 HAVE TO BE IN CALIFORNIA, BUT ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE
6 BEEN ABLE TO DO THE IMPOSSIBLE, WHICH IS BUILD A
7 BUILDING FROM SCRATCH IN TWO YEARS. SO IN THAT THESE,
8 THE ALTERNATIVE BUILDING STRATEGIES, I WANT TO HEAR
9 FROM CONTRACTORS, FROM OWNERS, FROM DESIGNERS AND
10 ARCHITECTS WHAT ARE SOME OF YOUR BEST PRACTICES AND HOW
11 CAN WE USE SOME OF THE LANGUAGE THAT FACILITATED THOSE
12 BEST PRACTICES AND PUT THAT INTO OUR RFA?

13 I WANT TO HAVE A GOAL THAT'S DEALING WITH THE
14 RFA ITSELF, THE TECHNICAL PIECES OF THE RFA. SO I
15 REALLY WANT TO REALLY GET INTO THAT.

16 FINALLY, I WANT TO HAVE A COLLABORATIVE, A
17 GOAL OF LOOKING AT COLLABORATIVE MODELS BECAUSE I THINK
18 THAT WAS A DISADVANTAGE IN THE SHARED LAB, THAT SOME
19 SAID THEY'D COLLABORATE, BUT YOU COULDN'T SEE HOW THEY
20 WOULD COLLABORATE. AND I THINK COLLABORATION AMONG
21 INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE THEIR OWN VERY DETAILED
22 EXPERTISE IN THEIR OWN INSTITUTIONS COULD BE DIFFICULT.
23 I MAY BE WRONG, BUT I THINK IT COULD BE DIFFICULT. I'D
24 LIKE TO SEE SOME JOINT VENTURE MODELS THAT HAVE EXISTED
25 OUT THERE WHERE THESE DIFFERENT ENTITIES HAVE COME

1 TOGETHER WITH A COMMON PURPOSE. AND THE ONE THAT COMES
2 TO MIND FOR ME IS THE JOINT CRIME LABORATORY MODEL
3 WHERE I THINK DOJ AND CITY OF L.A. AND SOME OTHERS KIND
4 OF CAME TOGETHER, VERY DISTINCT ENTITIES, BUT THEY HAD
5 A COMMON PURPOSE. THOSE ARE THE GOALS I'D LIKE TO SEE,
6 HOW WE CAN COLLABORATE BECAUSE --

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO YOU'RE SAYING
8 COLLABORATION, TO EXPLORE COLLABORATION AT THESE
9 MEETINGS AS A GOAL? THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE PROPOSING?

10 MS. HYSEN: BECAUSE IT ULTIMATELY LEADS TO
11 DOES SIZE MATTER? DO WE BUILD BIG? DO WE BUILD A
12 COUPLE BIG BUILDINGS? DO WE BUILD SEVERAL SMALLER
13 BUILDINGS? AND HOW YOU DO THAT, DOES A CONSORTIUM
14 WORK? DOES A COLLABORATIVE PROCESS WORK? OR DOES IT
15 MAKE MORE SENSE FOR INSTITUTIONS? SO THAT'S KIND OF
16 THAT GOAL.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOARD, I HATE TO CUT
18 YOU OFF, BUT I THINK THERE ARE SOME FOLKS THAT NEED
19 ABOUT A FIVE-MINUTE COFFEE AND RESTROOM BREAK, SO WE'RE
20 GOING TO ADJOURN FOR FIVE MINUTES.

21 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I'M OFFICIALLY
23 CALLING THE MEETING TO ORDER. SO I JUST WANT TO TRY,
24 AT LEAST INITIALLY, TO KEEP US FOCUSED ON THE NEXT
25 AGENDA ITEM. WE DID FINISH -- WE DECIDED THE NUMBER OF

1 PUBLIC MEETINGS. WE DECIDED THE APPROXIMATE SCHEDULE
2 OF THOSE MEETINGS DEPENDING ON MEMBERS' SCHEDULES. AND
3 WHAT I WANT TO TALK ABOUT NOW AND TRY TO KEEP US --
4 IT'S HARD FOR ME TO TOO TO FOCUS ON, BUT I THINK
5 THERE'S A NATURAL INCLINATION BY ALL THE MEMBERS,
6 INCLUDING MYSELF, TO LEAP AHEAD TO THE KIND OF FINISH
7 LINE, BUT WHAT I REALLY WANT TO TALK ABOUT NOW IS WHAT
8 SHOULD THE GOALS BE FOR THE PUBLIC MEETING. VERY
9 SPECIFICALLY, WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACHIEVE AT THOSE
10 PUBLIC MEETINGS?

11 DEBORAH, NOT WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACHIEVE FOR
12 THE RFA. THAT'S A DIFFERENT QUESTION, AND I WANT TO
13 TALK ABOUT THAT NEXT. BUT I WANT TO KEEP US FOCUSED ON
14 THE END ZONE HERE. WHAT ARE THE GOALS FOR THE PUBLIC
15 MEETING? WHAT WOULD WE LIKE TO COME OUT OF --

16 MS. HYSEN: WASN'T THE GOAL OF THE PUBLIC
17 HEARING TO FORM THE RFA?

18 MS. HOFFMAN: THE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES,
19 YES. I WOULD AGREE.

20 MS. HYSEN: THAT'S THE GOAL.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: LORI, CAN YOU BE MORE
22 SPECIFIC?

23 MS. HOFFMAN: SURE. AT YOUR OCTOBER '06
24 MEETING, THIS WORKING GROUP APPROVED THE INTERIM
25 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SHARED LABS. THAT

1 COULD CERTAINLY BE THE BASIS IN WHICH TO BEGIN, BUT
2 THAT THOSE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES WERE NEVER DEVELOPED
3 WITH THE LARGER FACILITIES IN MIND. SO I DO BELIEVE
4 THAT THE GOAL OF THE WORKING GROUP TO GET TO THE AUGUST
5 ICOC MEETING IS TO DEVELOP THOSE CRITERIA AND
6 PROCEDURES FOR THIS FUTURE RFA TO CAPTURE WHAT YOU
7 WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE AS A BASIS OF INFORMATION TO THE
8 APPLICANTS AND HOW YOU WILL BE SCORING AS WELL AS THE
9 PROCEDURE WHERE THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP FITS IN
10 THE MIX OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. HOW PROGRAM
11 LEADS, WHERE THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS COME IN, AND THEN
12 WHAT YOU WOULD ULTIMATELY SEE AS PRESENTING TO THE ICOC
13 FOR THEIR CONCURRENCE AND APPROVAL.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO DOES THAT MAKE
15 SENSE, THAT WE WANT TO GET PUBLIC INPUT AND TESTIMONY
16 FROM INSTITUTIONS, ANY INTERESTED PARTIES, EXPERTS IN
17 THE FIELD ON OUR CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE RFA?
18 DOES THAT MAKE SENSE? THAT'S ONE OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT
19 GOALS FOR THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS?

20 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK THERE'S A BROADER
21 QUESTION AS WELL, WHICH IS WHAT IS THE ROLE OF FUNDING
22 OF FACILITIES IN THE MISSION TO GET THE FASTEST
23 POSSIBLE CURES USING STEM CELL TECHNOLOGY. THERE'S
24 FUNDING OF RESEARCH, BUT THEN THERE'S ANOTHER
25 COMPONENT, WHICH IS FACILITIES AND HOW DOES THAT FIGURE

1 INTO THIS. AND I THINK IT INVOLVES -- I SCRIBBLED DOWN
2 A COUPLE QUESTIONS.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GO AHEAD.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: WHICH ARE IS THE EXPENDITURE
5 OF A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF FUNDING, LIKE 200 PLUS
6 MILLION DOLLARS, FOR FACILITIES NOW THE BEST STRATEGY
7 TO ADVANCE THE SCIENCE ON THE MOST URGENT BASIS? OR IS
8 THERE SOME OTHER USE OF THAT SAME MONEY NOW? OR SHOULD
9 SOME OF THIS FACILITIES MONEY BE SPENT LATER? AND HOW
10 DOES THAT FIGURE INTO THE MOST URGENT -- ON THE MOST
11 URGENT BASIS THE DEVELOPMENT OF CURES USING STEM CELL
12 TECHNOLOGY?

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, JOAN, I DON'T THINK
14 THAT'S REALLY A QUESTION FOR THIS GROUP. I MEAN IT MAY
15 BE AN INTELLECTUAL QUESTION FOR THIS GROUP; BUT IF
16 WE'RE SENDING OUT AN RFA FOR MAJOR FACILITIES AND WE'RE
17 TASKED WITH HOW TO SPEND RESPONSIBLY \$222 MILLION, I
18 THINK THAT'S KIND OF THE FOCUS OF WHERE WE'RE AT ON
19 THIS.

20 MR. KLEIN: I'D SAY THAT OUR CORE MISSION IN
21 THE BOARD APPROVAL TO IS SET THE CRITERIA AND
22 PROCEDURES; HOWEVER, JOAN'S QUESTION DEALS DIRECTLY
23 WITH A QUESTION THE LEGISLATURE AND THE PUBLIC NEED TO
24 HAVE ANSWERED. AND WHILE IT IS ESSENTIALLY A
25 BACKGROUND WHEN THEY ADDRESS JEFF'S POINT, WHAT'S THE

1 SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY, THEY ARE ADDRESSING JOAN'S
2 QUESTION OF HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS USE? HOW IMPORTANT
3 IS THIS USE NOW? WHY IS IT IMPORTANT? AND HAVING A
4 PART OF EACH MEETING THAT ADDRESSES THOSE THINGS IS A
5 VERY VALUABLE COMMUNICATION MISSION. IT IS NOT THE --
6 IT IS NOT THE CORE MISSION OF THESE HEARINGS, BUT IT IS
7 A VERY VALUABLE CORE MISSION BECAUSE, AS JEFF SAID, WE
8 HAVE CONSTITUENCIES IN THE LEGISLATURE, CONSTITUENCIES
9 IN THE ADVOCACY GROUPS, CONSTITUENCIES IN THE GENERAL
10 PUBLIC. HAVING A SECTION OF EACH MEETING THAT
11 DISCUSSES THE SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY IS A VERY VALUABLE
12 WAY TO ADDRESS JOAN'S POINT.

13 MR. SHEEHY: I MEAN JOAN JUST IN A MORE
14 ELEGANT WAY EXPRESSED WHAT I WAS TRYING TO SAY WHEN I
15 WAS TALKING ABOUT SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY. I THINK IT'S
16 IRONIC THAT OUR FEARLESS, PEERLESS JOHN SIMPSON HAD
17 JUST VIRTUALLY IN ANOTHER FASHION MADE THE SAME COMMENT
18 TO DEBORAH AND I, THAT THIS KIND OF VERY BASIC
19 RATIONALE NEEDS TO BE ESTABLISHED BEFORE WE GO FORWARD
20 BECAUSE -- I DON'T NEED TO ELABORATE. I THINK JOAN
21 SAID IT VERY WELL.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ISN'T THAT THE ICOC'S
23 ROLE, NOT THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP'S ROLE?

24 MR. KLEIN: I DON'T THINK SO. IT'S NOT THE
25 EXCLUSIVE DOMAIN OF THE ICOC. I THINK THAT, YOU KNOW,

1 WE HAVE A BUDGETED AMOUNT OF TIME. WE ARE GOING TO
2 NEED TO BE DISCIPLINED. BUT WITHIN THAT DISCIPLINE, I
3 THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT, AND OVER FOUR MEETINGS, IF
4 YOU HAD AN HOUR AT EVERY MEETING TO DEAL WITH THAT,
5 WE'D HAVE FOUR HOURS EFFECTIVELY ADDRESSING THIS. SO
6 WE'D HAVE A REAL SUBSTANTIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE PUBLIC
7 UNDERSTANDING THE ANSWER.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, JEFF, ONE THING. I
9 JUST WANT TO CLARIFY ONE QUESTION FOR JOAN. JOAN, ARE
10 YOU SUGGESTING THAT ONE OF THE GOALS FOR THESE MEETINGS
11 WOULD BE TO UNDERSTAND THE SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY FOR
12 THESE TYPES OF FACILITIES? IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

13 MS. SAMUELSON: SURE. FOR EXAMPLE, THERE MAY
14 BE SOMEONE FROM THE VENTURE CAPITAL WORLD OR FROM BIG
15 PHARMA, THE FOLKS WHO TAKE THE RESULTS OF ALL THIS
16 RESEARCH AND THEN ACTUALLY DEVELOP THEM INTO THE
17 PRODUCT THAT'S ACTUALLY GOING TO HELP SOMEBODY. THEY
18 MAY COME IN AND SAY, WELL, SOME OF THIS MONEY WILL BE
19 SPENT -- WOULD BE BETTER SPENT LATER OR BETTER SPENT
20 NOT ON A MAJOR INSTITUTION, BUT ON SOME CONSORTIUM OF
21 RESEARCHERS AND BIOTECH OWNERS WHO ARE FOCUSED IN ON A
22 PRODUCT AND TAKING IT FROM A PRECLINICAL STATUS WHERE
23 IT COMES OUT OF THE ACADEMIC UNIVERSITY TO SOMETHING
24 THAT'S READY FOR BIG PHARMA, FOR EXAMPLE.

25 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK JUST BECAUSE WE CAN

1 SPEND THIS MONEY DOESN'T MEAN WE SHOULD. SO THAT'S THE
2 FIRST POINT.

3 AND THEN THE SECOND, I THINK THE ICOC,
4 BECAUSE OF ITS -- HOW SHOULD I SAY THIS -- BECAUSE OF
5 THE WAY IN WHICH IT'S PUT TOGETHER IS PROBABLY
6 PARTICULARLY CONSTRUCTED NOT TO BE ABLE TO ANSWER THIS
7 QUESTION. WHAT YOU DO IS YOU PUT SOME MEMBERS OF THE
8 ICOC, I THINK, IN A VERY AWKWARD POSITION WHEN THEY,
9 FROM A VERY PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW, CAN SEE THE NEED
10 AND THEY CAN'T REALLY ENTER INTO THAT DISCUSSION IN THE
11 WAY IN WHICH WE PROBABLY SHOULD HAVE THAT DISCUSSION
12 SEPARATE FROM THE ICOC, WHICH MAKES THIS GROUP, I
13 THINK, UNIQUELY WELL-SUITED TO CONDUCT THAT DISCUSSION.
14 DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YES. THANK YOU, JEFF.
16 SO JUST GOING BACK TO JOAN'S POINT, JOAN, I WANT TO
17 RESTATE THIS BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO GET MY ARMS AROUND
18 THIS. SO, IN ESSENCE, YOU'RE SUGGESTING A GOAL OF
19 THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS SHOULD BE TO GET A DIVERSITY OF
20 OPINION, DIVERSE UNIVERSE OF OPINION, ON THE CRITERIA
21 AND PROCEDURES DEVELOPED FOR THE RFA; IS THAT CORRECT?

22 MS. SAMUELSON: SURE. AND THE STRATEGIC
23 CONSIDERATIONS UNDERLYING IT.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'M SORRY.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: AND THE UNDERLYING STRATEGIC

1 CONCERNS.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO THE MISSION VALUE
3 AND STRATEGIC SET OUT BY THE CIRM, CORRECT? IS THAT
4 WHAT YOU'RE STATING?

5 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS, YEAH. I'M NOT SURE
6 HOW THAT FITS IN.

7 MR. KLEIN: IN OTHER WORDS, CAN WE FULFILL
8 OUR STRATEGIC MISSION THROUGH THESE INSTITUTIONS IF
9 THEY DON'T HAVE THESE FACILITIES, BUT WITHOUT -- THE
10 NECESSITY OF THE SCIENCE NEEDS TO BE DOCUMENTED IN THE
11 PROCESS.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: YEAH.

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I WANT TO COME UP --

14 MS. SAMUELSON: THERE MAY BE MORE THAN ONE
15 WAY THAT FACILITIES FUNDING CAN HELP SKIN THAT CAT.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: COMMENTS?

17 MS. HYSEN: I ACTUALLY LIKE THAT IDEA. I
18 WISH I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT OF IT MYSELF. BECAUSE I
19 THINK WHENEVER YOU BEGIN A DISCUSSION, YOU BEGIN AT THE
20 BEGINNING. AND THAT IS THE BEGINNING. WHY ARE WE
21 HERE? AND EVEN IF IT MIGHT BE A MOOT POINT TO ALL OF
22 US, BECAUSE WE ARE, LIKE, GOING FULL BORE AHEAD, IT MAY
23 NOT BE A MOOT POINT TO THE PUBLIC WHO STILL NEEDS TO
24 UNDERSTAND. ALTHOUGH THIS WAS VOTED BY THE PUBLIC, I
25 DON'T THINK IT WAS A MAJORITY, SIGNIFICANT MAJORITY. I

1 THINK IT WAS A CLOSE VOTE.

2 MR. KLEIN: FIFTY-NINE PERCENT.

3 MS. HYSEN: BUT THAT MEANS 30 PERCENT THAT
4 DIDN'T. THAT 30 PERCENT MAY BE VERY INTERESTED IN
5 HEARING THE SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY. THEY MAY BE THE
6 ONES. YOU ALWAYS GET IN THESE PUBLIC HEARINGS THE ONES
7 THAT ARE FOR IT AND REALLY AGAINST IT. YOU NEVER GET
8 THE MIDDLE. SO I THINK TO BEGIN A DISCUSSION FROM THE
9 BEGINNING, WHICH IS WHY ARE WE ALL HERE AND DO WE NEED
10 TO BE HERE, IS A NICE FRAME TO MOVE FORWARD. I LIKE
11 THAT.

12 MR. KLEIN: NOT SEQUENTIALLY -- WE DON'T HAVE
13 THE TIME TO REALLY DO THIS SEQUENTIALLY IN THE SENSE
14 THAT IN EACH REGION OF THE STATE, JEFF, I THINK BEFORE
15 YOU WERE HERE, I SUGGESTED AS TO POLICIES, RULES, AND
16 DEFINITIONS, WE NEED TO HAVE THAT CONSISTENT PORTION IN
17 EACH MEETING SO THAT PEOPLE IN SAN FRANCISCO WHO MAY
18 HAVE DIFFERENT NEEDS FOR RESEARCH FACILITIES THAN
19 PEOPLE IN SAN DIEGO WHO ARE TRYING TO DO THE SHARED
20 FACILITY CAN ALL CONTRIBUTE TO THAT DISCUSSION. BUT IN
21 EACH MEETING WE GIVE EVERYONE IN EACH PORTION OF THE
22 STATE THE ABILITY TO HEAR THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE
23 NECESSITY OF SCIENCE AND TO PARTICIPATE IN THAT
24 MESSAGING AND THEIR POSITION.

25 MR. SHEEHY: I ALSO THINK THAT SOME PORTION

1 OF THIS SHOULD BE DEVOTED TO THE STATUTORY OBLIGATION
2 IN PROP 71 AND THE FULFILLMENT OF THE STATUTORY
3 OBLIGATION TO HAVE, ONCE WE MAKE THE INVESTMENT IN A
4 FACILITY, FACILITY COSTS IN OUR GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS
5 ARE THEN DIMINISHED. SO I WOULD HOPE THAT WE COULD GET
6 A CLEAR SET OF RULES AND PROCEDURES TO SHOW BECAUSE
7 THAT PROVIDES A LOT OF THE FINANCIAL BASIS FOR MOVING
8 FORWARD.

9 SO, FOR INSTANCE, LIKE RIGHT NOW, AND PERHAPS
10 ARLENE CAN SAY, I THINK IT VARIES, BUT THERE'S A
11 PERCENTAGE OF EACH RESEARCH GRANT THAT THE INSTITUTION
12 RECEIVES TO PAY FOR THE FACILITIES THAT THEY PROVIDED.
13 ONCE WE MAKE THESE INVESTMENTS IN THESE FACILITIES AT
14 THESE INSTITUTIONS, THEN THE RESEARCH GRANTS THAT WE
15 GIVE SUBSEQUENT TO THAT SHOULD NOT CONTINUE TO HAVE THE
16 SAME FACILITIES CHARGE BECAUSE WE ALREADY PAID FOR THE
17 FACILITIES. THERE SHOULDN'T BE THIS DOUBLE-DIPPING OR
18 DOUBLE BILLING. AND I THINK HOW THAT PROCEDURE IS
19 GOING TO PLAY OUT, WE NEED TO BE UP FRONT WITH THE
20 INSTITUTIONS THAT THIS IS A STATUTORY REQUIREMENT THAT
21 I THINK AS CHAIRMAN KLEIN --

22 MR. KLEIN: IT'S IN THE STATUTE.

23 MR. SHEEHY: IT'S IN THE STATUTE. THEY NEED
24 TO UNDERSTAND HOW THEY'RE GOING TO FULFILL THIS. WHEN
25 THEY COME IN AND APPLY FOR ONE OF THESE GRANTS AND THEN

1 WE GIVE THEM THIS GRANT, WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO HAVE
2 THAT GRANT REDUCED, THE AMOUNT OF THAT GRANT THAT GOES
3 TO FACILITIES REDUCED. AND IN SOME WAYS THAT PROVIDES
4 SOME OF THE JUSTIFICATION. BUT WHAT I THINK JOAN AND I
5 BOTH FEAR IS THAT WE GO OUT AND WE BUILD FACILITIES AND
6 WE GIVE OUT RESEARCH GRANTS AND WE PAID FOR THE
7 FACILITIES TWICE, AND THAT MONEY COULD HAVE GONE TO PAY
8 FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JEFF, WHAT WOULD BE THE
10 GOAL OF THE PUBLIC MEETINGS RELATED TO THIS TOPIC?

11 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, THE GOAL IS TO COME OUT
12 WITH PROCEDURES THAT ARE UNIFORM, AND THE INSTITUTIONS
13 CAN PROVIDE THIS, THE STAFF MAY HAVE SOME IDEAS ON
14 THIS, BUT UNIFORM PROCEDURES THAT WILL RECOGNIZE THE
15 REDUCTION IN SUBSEQUENT RESEARCH GRANTS FOR FACILITIES
16 COSTS THAT OCCUR AFTER WE'VE MADE A MAJOR RESEARCH
17 GRANT TO THESE INSTITUTIONS -- MAJOR FACILITIES GRANTS.

18 MR. KLEIN: AS A MATTER OF TIMING AND OF WORK
19 MANAGEMENT, I THINK, LORI, THE KEY HERE IS THAT WHILE
20 WE'RE FOCUSING ON THESE IN THE AGENDA OF THESE PUBLIC
21 HEARINGS ON OUR CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES, WHAT JEFF IS
22 REFERENCING WILL REALLY END UP IN THE GRANT
23 ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR THE MAJOR FACILITIES. AND SO
24 WHAT WE NEED TO DO IS MAKE SURE PEOPLE ARE ON NOTICE
25 THAT THAT IS GOING TO OCCUR UP FRONT BECAUSE IT IS A

1 PART OF THE STATUTE.

2 MS. PACHTER: AND IT'S IN THE GRANT
3 ADMINISTRATION POLICY.

4 MR. KLEIN: IT'S ALREADY IN THE ONE.

5 MS. PACHTER: IT SAYS COSTS ALREADY PROVIDED
6 FOR A FACILITIES OR INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT FROM ANY
7 SOURCE ARE NOT ALLOWABLE FOR FACILITIES COSTS IN A CIRM
8 RESEARCH GRANT.

9 MR. KLEIN: WHAT DOES THE WORD FROM ANY
10 SOURCE MEAN? I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT. THAT'S NOT THE
11 STATUTE. THE STATUTE PROVIDES --

12 MR. HARRISON: I THINK IT'S IN THE GAP. THE
13 STATUTE PROVIDES THAT WHEN CIRM HAS PROVIDED A
14 FACILITIES GRANT OR LOAN, THAT THAT PORTION OF THE
15 FUND -- THAT PORTION OF THE FACILITY THAT'S PAID FOR
16 WITH CIRM FUNDING CANNOT BE THEN TAKEN AS A DIRECT
17 COST.

18 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. BECAUSE IT'S NOT
19 INTENDED TO PENALIZE PEOPLE FOR GETTING CONTRIBUTIONS
20 FROM PRIVATE SECTOR SOURCES. THE LEVERAGE WE'RE TRYING
21 TO SOLICIT IS NOT INTENDED TO PENALIZE THEM IN THEIR
22 FUTURE FACILITIES COSTS.

23 MR. SHEEHY: WHAT WE'RE DOING IN THESE
24 FACILITIES IS REALLY NOVEL, AND I DON'T THINK THE
25 INSTITUTIONS ARE PREPARED WHEN THEY GET GRANTS,

1 FOLLOWING GETTING A MAJOR FACILITIES GRANTS, TO HAVE A
2 DIMINISHED GRANT AMOUNT BASED ON HAVING RECEIVED A
3 FACILITIES GRANT. AND WE NEED TO BE VERY EXPLICIT
4 ABOUT THIS BECAUSE THEY NEED TO FACTOR THIS INTO THEIR
5 ECONOMIC CALCULATIONS.

6 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS LIKE THE UC SYSTEM WHERE
7 THEY HAVE A LOWER EFFECTIVE OVERHEAD BECAUSE THEY HAVE
8 BUILDINGS THAT HAVE BEEN ALREADY CONSTRUCTED. THIS IS
9 NOT LIKE THAT ACTUALLY. IT'S A BAD ANALOGY.
10 EFFECTIVELY IT WILL MEAN THAT LONG TERM THEY'LL BE ABLE
11 TO WORK ON LOWER MARK-UPS IN TERMS OF RESEARCH FUNDING
12 BECAUSE A PORTION OF IT WE WILL HAVE PAID FOR. BUT WE
13 DON'T WANT TO CREATE A POLICY WHERE IF THEY GET PRIVATE
14 DONOR MONEY, THAT WE PENALIZE THEIR FACILITIES LOAD
15 RELATED TO THAT PRIVATE DONOR MONEY BECAUSE WE NEED
16 THEM TO HAVE THE INCENTIVE TO GET THE PRIVATE DONOR
17 MONEY TO GET THE LEVERAGE IN BUILDING THESE FACILITIES,
18 WHICH IS ALSO CALLED OUT IN THE INITIATIVE.

19 MR. SHEEHY: I CAN IMAGINE US RECOUPING A
20 GOOD PIECE OF THE FACILITIES GRANTS OVER THE COURSE --
21 OVER THE LIFETIME OF GIVING OUT THE REMAINDER OF THE
22 RESEARCH GRANTS IF WE STRUCTURE THIS CORRECTLY. THIS
23 NEED NOT BE STRAIGHT OUT THE DOOR IF A GRANT -- IF THAT
24 STRETCHES THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WE HAVE FOR
25 RESEARCH.

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JEFF. I
2 WANT TO JUST TALK ABOUT ONE THOUGHT I'VE BEEN HAVING
3 ABOUT A GOAL OF THESE PUBLIC HEARINGS, AT LEAST ONE OF
4 THE THINGS THAT I'VE BEEN FOCUSED IN ON, AND WE HAD
5 SOME PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS, IS TO GET REALLY A
6 DIVERSITY OF OPINION AND INDUSTRY EXPERTS AND FOCUSED
7 IN ON FACILITIES OPERATIONS MANAGERS, FACILITIES
8 MANAGERS, CFO'S, AND GET SOME INPUT ON THE CRITERIA AND
9 PROCEDURES, HOW WE CAN BEST PROMOTE THE CORE MISSION,
10 VALUES, AND STRATEGIC PRINCIPLES OF THE CIRM. SO I'D
11 LIKE TO GET COMMENT FROM THE MEMBERS ON THIS SPECIFIC
12 POINT, AND I ACTUALLY WOULD TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT AT THAT
13 TIME AS WELL. MEMBERS?

14 MS. SAMUELSON: COULD YOU SAY THAT AGAIN?

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I THINK ONE OF THE
16 GOALS SHOULD BE THAT WE'RE ABLE TO GET, YOU KNOW, A
17 DIVERSITY OF OPINION FROM INDUSTRY EXPERTS, INCLUDING
18 CFO'S AND FACILITIES OPERATIONS MANAGERS, THAT ARE
19 INTIMATELY FAMILIAR WITH THE FINANCES AS WELL AS THE
20 OPERATIONS OF THESE TYPES OF FACILITIES AND GET THEIR
21 INPUT IN A GENERAL WAY, NOT NECESSARILY SPECIFICALLY
22 PITCHING THEIR PROJECTS TO US, BUT IN A GENERAL WAY OF
23 SOME POSITIVE INPUT THEY CAN GIVE US ON THE CRITERIA
24 AND PROCEDURES TO HELP PROMOTE THE STRATEGIC MISSION
25 AND GOALS OF THE CIRM.

1 MR. KLEIN: JUST AS AN EXAMPLE, I THINK,
2 DAVID, WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT, ONE OF OUR STRATEGIC
3 PRINCIPLES IS TARGETING CRITICAL GAPS. SO IT'S NOT IN
4 THIS UPCOMING RFA, BUT ONE OF THE THINGS THAT'S BEEN
5 SUGGESTED IS A STEM CELL BANK. THAT'S A CRITICAL GAP
6 THAT SOMEBODY NEEDS TO ADDRESS, AND THERE'S A SET ASIDE
7 OF FUNDS TO TRY AND DEAL WITH THAT. ARLENE CHIU, AS
8 OUR CHIEF SCIENTIFIC OFFICER, IS TRYING TO LEAD THAT
9 EFFORT IN IDENTIFYING HOW WE APPROACH THAT MISSION. IT
10 MAY BE A BUILDING, IT MAY NOT BE A BUILDING. HOW DO WE
11 IDENTIFY AND ADDRESS THAT CRITICAL GAP?

12 ANOTHER ISSUE IS GMP FACILITIES, GOOD
13 MANUFACTURING PRODUCT FACILITIES, SO THEY MEET FDA
14 STANDARDS. IS THAT A CRITICAL GAP? AND THEORETICALLY
15 THERE'S MONEY THAT MAY ADDRESS THAT. SO EACH OF THESE
16 STRATEGIC PRINCIPLES SHOULD BE THOUGHT OF IN TERMS OF
17 THE POLICIES THAT WE'RE TRYING TO IMPLEMENT AS WELL AS
18 THE INITIATIVE'S EMBEDDED POINTS SUCH AS LEVERAGE, FOR
19 EXAMPLE, THAT ARE CALLED OUT, SUCH AS THE URGENCY, THE
20 TWO-YEAR TIMEFRAME THAT IS CALLED OUT. THEY NEED TO BE
21 RELATED TO THE POLICIES AND THEN PULLED DOWN INTO THE
22 RULES.

23 THERE'S ANOTHER EXAMPLE THAT WAS RAISED AS TO
24 THE -- JUST SO WE FOCUS ON THE CLARITY WE HAVE TO
25 PROVIDE, IN THE INTERMISSION I WAS ASKED A QUESTION.

1 THEY SAID, WELL, IS THIS AN ABSOLUTE RULE ABOUT TWO
2 YEARS, OR IS THIS AN EXPECTED CASE? MY PERSONAL, AS
3 ONE INDIVIDUAL, VIEW IS THIS IS THE EXPECTED CASE.
4 YOU'VE GOT TO SHOW A CREDIBLE TIMELINE THAT YOU CAN
5 DELIVER IN TWO YEARS. IF THERE'S A STRIKE, WE MIGHT
6 NEED TO MAKE IT CLEAR, WE'RE NOT HOLDING PEOPLE TO
7 IMPOSSIBLE STANDARDS. WE ARE HOLDING PEOPLE TO
8 REASONABLE BUT ACCOUNTABLE STANDARDS. WE NEED THAT
9 KIND OF CLARITY.

10 MR. KASHIAN: BOB, ARE YOU VIEWING THESE
11 PUBLIC HEARINGS AS A FORUM FOR CREATING POLICY FOR THE
12 FUTURE? OR ARE YOU VIEWING THEM AS THE ABILITY TO BE
13 ABLE TO GET INFORMATION SO WHEN YOU DO MAKE THE
14 POLICYMAKING DECISIONS, YOU HAVE THE PUBLIC INPUT OF
15 THE VARIOUS PEOPLE? I'M NOT QUITE CLEAR ABOUT WHERE
16 WE'RE GOING.

17 MR. KLEIN: THERE'S A LOT OF GOALS THAT HAVE
18 BEEN SET UP BETWEEN THE STATUTE AND THE STRATEGIC PLAN.

19 MR. KASHIAN: FOR OUR FUTURE PERFORMANCE.

20 MR. KLEIN: FOR OUR FUTURE PERFORMANCE.
21 THOSE HAVE TO BE DISTILLED INTO INTELLIGIBLE, SUCCINCT
22 POLICIES, RULES, AND DEFINITIONS THAT THE INSTITUTIONS
23 THAT ARE TRYING TO DELIVER CAN UNDERSTAND.

24 MR. KASHIAN: I TOTALLY AGREE, AND I SUPPORT
25 THAT. THE POINT IS ARE YOU GOING TO DO IT AT THESE

1 PUBLIC HEARINGS, OR ARE YOU GOING TO DO IT AFTER YOU
2 HAVE THE PUBLIC HEARINGS?

3 MR. KLEIN: THERE'S GOING TO BE A DISCUSSION
4 AT THESE PUBLIC HEARINGS. THE BOARD MEMBERS WILL
5 DISCUSS DIFFERENT IDEAS, AND THE RESULT IS IN THIS
6 FINAL HEARING THAT LORI HOFFMAN HAS TALKED ABOUT, THIS
7 FINAL PUBLIC MEETING THAT LORI HOFFMAN HAS TALKED ABOUT
8 WHERE THIS IS ALL ROLLED UP INTO DECISIONS ON WHAT'S
9 ACTUALLY THE CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC.

10 MR. KASHIAN: FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, I THINK
11 ONE OF THE GOALS AT THESE PUBLIC HEARINGS OUGHT TO BE
12 TO EDUCATE ALL OF THE STAKEHOLDERS ABOUT WHAT OUR
13 MISSION IS, THAT THIS OPPORTUNITY IS AVAILABLE TO THEM,
14 AND BY COLLABORATING WITH MUNICIPALITIES AND GOVERNMENT
15 AND EACH OTHER, THEY HAVE A GREATER OPPORTUNITY TO DO
16 IT. AND I FEEL THAT THAT HASN'T BEEN PUT ACROSS TO THE
17 GENERAL PUBLIC.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ED, THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
19 GOAL. I THINK THAT'S REALLY RIGHT ON TARGET. THANK
20 YOU VERY MUCH. I WISH I HAD THOUGHT OF THAT. SO I
21 THINK THAT -- MARCY.

22 MS. FEIT: I'D LIKE TO GO BACK AND RESTATE
23 ANOTHER COMMITMENT THAT I THINK IS IMPORTANT. DR. CHIU
24 MENTIONED THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE WOULD SEND A SPECIAL
25 INVITATION TO A LARGE ORGANIZATION AND A SMALLER ONE

1 AND HAVE THEM PRESENT THE ELEMENTS OF WHAT THEY NEED.
2 AND THAT, I THINK, BALANCES THE FORUMS THAT WE WOULD BE
3 HAVING, AND SO I SAY THAT I'D LIKE TO KEEP THAT IN
4 FRONT OF US AS AN OPTION FOR A FORMAT.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO COULD WE INVITE MORE
6 THAN ONE OF EACH BECAUSE SOME MAY NOT BE ABLE TO
7 ATTEND?

8 MS. HOFFMAN: I THINK THAT IS CERTAINLY AN
9 EXCELLENT IDEA. AND PERHAPS WHAT I'M HEARING HERE IS
10 THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS PLAN OR ALLOW STAFF TO
11 TAKE ALL THESE COMMENTS FROM THIS MORNING AND FORMAT
12 THEM IN A WAY THAT YOU CAN SEE HOW SOME OF THESE
13 MEETINGS WILL LOOK, AND MAYBE WE WILL HAVE A MEETING
14 THAT HAS A THEME. WE COULD BRING IN THE REVIEWER FROM
15 THE UC DAVIS APPLICATION, WHO IS THE CHIEF ARCHITECT
16 FOR HHMI, THE HOWARD HUGHES MEDICAL INSTITUTE, ABOUT
17 BUILDING FOR SCIENCE. CONTINUE TO KEEP IT ON THE LEVEL
18 OF BUILDING AND THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THIS. AND I
19 HOPE THAT YOU HAVE FAITH THAT WE CAN PUT THIS TOGETHER
20 IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO
21 INVITE LARGE AND SMALL INSTITUTIONS TO EVERY MEETING,
22 BUT I THINK WE CAN PROBABLY DO IT FOR ONE.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: LORI, I THINK ONE
24 IMPORTANT GOAL FOR THIS MEETING IS THAT WE KEEP OUR EYE
25 ON THE BALL, THAT THIS IS ALL TO CREATE BETTER RULES,

1 CRITERIA, AND PROCEDURES FOR THE RFA. THAT SHOULD BE
2 THE GOAL -- ONE OF THE GOALS FOR ALL THE DISCUSSION
3 THAT WE'RE HAVING. SO I JUST IF WE COULD MAKE SURE
4 THAT WE FORMAT EVERYTHING. AND WHEN WE DO ADVERTISE
5 THIS ON THE WEBSITE AND TO THE PUBLIC AND WE INVITE
6 FOLKS TO THESE MEETINGS, THAT THEY UNDERSTAND THAT
7 THIS IS -- WE WANT TO TRY TO KEEP IT FOCUSED HOW DO WE
8 HAVE THE BEST RFA POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE THE STRATEGIC
9 MISSION AND VALUES OF CIRM.

10 MR. KLEIN: I THINK THAT THIS CONCEPT DR.
11 CHIU PUT FORWARD IS A VERY GOOD ONE, THAT MARCY FEIT
12 JUST REFERRED TO. I DO THINK THAT IT WOULD BE OUR
13 OBLIGATION IN FAIRNESS TO SAY ALL THE INSTITUTIONS IN
14 THE STATE, IN TEN MINUTES, IF YOU WANT TO COME ONE OF
15 THESE MEETINGS, YOU NEED TO DO SO. I MEAN THE WHOLE
16 UNIVERSE IS MAYBE 20. THAT'S 200 MINUTES. IT'S THREE
17 AND A HALF HOURS OUT OF FOUR MEETINGS. IT'S NOT A LOT
18 OF TIME AND WOULD GIVE ANYONE THE OPPORTUNITY IF THEY
19 WANT. THEY WON'T ALL DO IT, BUT WE DON'T WANT TO BE IN
20 A POSITION OF GIVING SOME OF THEM THE OPPORTUNITY
21 WITHOUT THE GIVING THE OTHERS.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M WONDERING IF THE TITLE
23 MIGHT BE ADJUSTED SOMEWHAT TO BUILDING FOR CURES. I
24 THINK THAT'S MORE THE ACTUAL WORK PRODUCT OF PROP 71,
25 AND I THINK IT ENCOMPASSES MORE, AND I THINK THAT IS --

1 AND IT'S CLEAR.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO YOU MEAN --

3 MS. SAMUELSON: WE'RE NOT TRYING TO BUILD
4 SCIENCE.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BUILDING FOR CURES.

6 MR. KASHIAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOB, MY
7 SUGGESTION IS I THINK AS A PRELUDE TO THESE MEETINGS, I
8 WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE ACTING PRESIDENT AND YOU AND OUR
9 CHAIRMAN AND ONE OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES HOLD A PRESS
10 CONFERENCE ON A STATEWIDE BASIS AND EXPLAIN THE
11 HEARINGS ARE COMING UP AND WHAT THE GENERAL PURPOSE IS.
12 AND I BELIEVE THAT YOU INDIVIDUALLY CAN PROVIDE A LOT
13 OF PREMEETING EXCITEMENT AND KNOW THAT IT'S COMING AND
14 KNOW THAT FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW, EVERYONE IN
15 CALIFORNIA IS ELIGIBLE, AND THIS IS WHAT WE'RE DOING,
16 AND THESE ARE OUR SET OF RULES. AND WE'RE LOOKING FOR
17 ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS THAT YOU MAY HAVE.

18 MR. KLEIN: WELL, ED, MY PERSONAL VIEW IS
19 THAT WHATEVER THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR AND THE ACTING
20 PRESIDENT BELIEVE IS MOST HELPFUL, I WOULD SUPPORT
21 COMPLETELY, BUT I WOULD LOOK TO THEM TO DEFINE THAT.
22 BUT I WOULD CERTAINLY BE SUPPORTIVE OF ANYTHING THAT
23 WAS HELPFUL.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, ED, FOR YOUR
25 COMMENT. I HAD MENTIONED THAT I WOULD ALLOW PUBLIC

1 COMMENTS REGARDING ONE OF MY GOALS THAT I HAD SET OUT,
2 AND I WANTED TO ASK IF THERE WERE ANY MEMBERS OF THE
3 PUBLIC THAT WANTED TO SPEAK TO THE ISSUE I RAISED.

4 MS. HADDAD: DEBBIE HADDAD FROM GLADSTONE.
5 ONE OF THE SUGGESTIONS THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED AMONGST
6 OURSELVES WAS SETTING ASIDE SOME VOLUNTARY ADVISOR
7 GROUP, AND I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT THIS
8 SERVES AT THE PLEASURE OF YOU AND OF THE CIRM STAFF
9 OFFICE. THIS IS NOT A SEPARATE BODY. IT'S JUST IF YOU
10 HAD QUESTIONS, IF THERE'S SOMEONE -- ANOTHER OPINION
11 YOU WANTED, AND IT WOULD BE ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS.
12 CFO'S, QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW THIS FUNDING WOULD AFFECT
13 YOU IF WE FUNDED IT THIS WAY? FACILITIES PEOPLE, DO
14 YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR THE RFA? IT'S REALLY --
15 YOU GUYS HAVE A REALLY COMPLICATED PROCESS. NOBODY
16 WANTS TO MAKE IT MORE COMPLICATED. NOBODY WANTS TO
17 THROW ANY MORE OPINION. I MEAN YOU'RE GOING TO GET
18 OPINIONS FROM THE PUBLIC, FROM US, FROM EVERYBODY, AND
19 IT STILL HAS TO BE FILTERED THROUGH THE EXISTING
20 PROCESS. AND IF THERE'S A WAY TO DO THAT TO FACILITATE
21 THIS AND NOT GET YOU OFF TRACK, THAT WOULD BE OUR
22 SUGGESTION.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GREAT. THANK YOU FOR
24 YOUR COMMENTS. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND AFFILIATION.

25 MR. WOODS: JOHN WOODS, RECENTLY RETIRED VICE

1 CHANCELLOR FOR UCSD, AND I'VE BEEN ASKED TO HELP WITH
2 THE SAN DIEGO CONSORTIUM THAT'S COMING TOGETHER. I
3 GUESS THE BRIEF COMMENT I'D MAKE IS I THINK WHAT YOU'RE
4 PUTTING TOGETHER IS A VERY THOUGHTFUL PROCESS. YOU'VE
5 THOUGHT THROUGH A LOT OF THE CONDITIONS YOU THINK YOU
6 WANT TO USE. NOW YOU WANT TO GET OUT AND HAVE
7 HEARINGS, AND YOU'RE GOING TO EXPLAIN THAT IN MORE
8 DETAIL. THUS, YOU'LL BE GIVING US AN OPPORTUNITY TO
9 GIVE OUR COMMENTS AS TO HOW IT MIGHT AFFECT EACH OF US
10 INDIVIDUALLY. I THINK THE FINAL PROCESS WILL BE BETTER
11 FOR IT.

12 I THINK THE ONLY THING THAT I WOULD EMPHASIZE
13 IS YOU'RE NOT ONLY DEALING WITH LARGE INSTITUTIONS
14 INTERESTED IN FACILITIES AND SMALL, BUT IN OUR CASE
15 WE'RE TALKING ABOUT FOUR DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS COMING
16 TOGETHER. I THINK YOU'RE GOING TO FIND THAT SOME OF
17 THE RULES, I WOULD HOPE, WOULD HAVE A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF
18 FLEXIBILITY BECAUSE YOU WILL BE SEEING DIFFERENT
19 CIRCUMSTANCES IN EACH OF OUR CASES. IT'S VERY LIKELY
20 TO BE TALKING ABOUT A RATHER LARGE BUILDING, WHICH WE
21 WOULD BE PUTTING A LOT OF MONEY UP FOR. LARGE TAKES
22 LONGER THAN SMALL. IT MIGHT WELL BE THAT INTERIM SPACE
23 AS A PART OF OUR PROPOSAL AS WE PHASE INTO IT MIGHT BE
24 SOMETHING THAT'S RELEVANT.

25 I THINK THE EXCHANGE OF TALKING WITH US AND

1 GIVING US A CHANCE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT OUR PLANS WILL
2 BE VERY BENEFICIAL, NOT JUST FOR US, BUT FOR THE OTHERS
3 AS WELL. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR
5 COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATING TODAY.

6 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON, FOUNDATION FOR
7 TAXPAYER AND CONSUMER RIGHTS. I'D LIKE TO JUST ENDORSE
8 WHAT THE LAST SPEAKER SAID ABOUT THE NEED TO TALK TO
9 EVERYONE THAT IS POSSIBLY INVOLVED IN THIS. IT DOES
10 SEEM TO ME THAT THESE -- I WON'T CALL THEM PUBLIC
11 HEARINGS. I'LL CALL THEM INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS
12 BECAUSE I THINK IF YOU RUN THEM AS INFORMATIONAL
13 HEARINGS, IT GIVES YOU A LITTLE MORE FLEXIBILITY IN
14 TERMS OF STATE LAW. I THINK YOU NEED TO BE COMPLETELY
15 OPEN AND TRANSPARENT, BUT I THINK THERE ARE WAYS TO DO
16 THAT WITHOUT HAVING SOME OF THE MORE RIGOROUS ASPECTS
17 OF FORMAL PUBLIC HEARINGS, WHICH MAY SOUND STRANGE
18 COMING FROM SOMEONE LIKE ME.

19 NONETHELESS, AS LONG AS YOU HAVE A COMMITMENT
20 TO TRANSPARENCY, THAT'S FINE. YOU HAVE TWO THINGS TO
21 DETERMINE, IT SEEMS TO ME. NUMBER ONE IS WHAT'S THE
22 SHAPE OF YOUR NEXT RFA? BUT YOU ALSO HAVE THIS
23 FUNDAMENTAL OVERARCHING METAPHYSICAL SORT OF QUESTION
24 OF, YOU KNOW, MAYBE THIS RFA SHOULD BE A NULL SET, AS A
25 MATHEMATICIAN WOULD SAY. THAT IS TO SAY, THAT THERE'S

1 NOTHING APPROPRIATE RIGHT NOW, PERHAPS. I'M COMPLETELY
2 AGNOSTIC ON THIS. AND I THINK THAT'S WHY THIS
3 PROCEDURE IS VERY IMPORTANT. WE HAD BEEN GOING HELL
4 BENT ON THE NOTION THAT WE WERE GOING TO SPEND \$220
5 MILLION BECAUSE WE HAD IT. NOW IS THE TIME TO JUST
6 SORT OF SAY, YOU KNOW, MAYBE THE BEST THING FOR SCIENCE
7 IS TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO ENCOURAGE CONSORTIA, I
8 GUESS WOULD BE THE PLURAL, AND ALL OF THESE
9 INSTITUTIONS THAT WANT TO BUILD THEIR OWN PARTICULAR
10 EDIFICES CAN GO OUT AND GET A FELLOW TO DONATE IT IN
11 HIS OR HER NAME, BUT THAT FOLKS IN SAN DIEGO WHO, FOR
12 WHATEVER REASON, DECIDED TO PUT FOUR INSTITUTIONS
13 TOGETHER, AS AN EXAMPLE, IS EXACTLY WHAT THIS BODY
14 WANTS TO ENCOURAGE. AND SO THEY'RE GOING TO WRITE AN
15 RFA THAT WAY, AND THAT'S THE ONLY KIND OF PEOPLE THAT
16 ARE GOING TO GET MONEY, MAYBE, AGAIN. THOSE ARE THE
17 KINDS OF QUESTIONS THAT SHOULD BE EXPLORED IN AN
18 ATMOSPHERE THAT PRODUCES FULL, FAIR, FRANK, AND
19 CHEERFUL EXCHANGES, WHICH, I THINK, THIS ONE HAS BEEN
20 AND THIS PROCESS HAS BEEN, INCLUDING YOUR LAST MEETING
21 THAT WAS DESCRIBED BY SOME AS SOMEWHAT CONTENTIOUS.
22 LITTLE BIT OF BRUISED EGO IS NOT A BAD THING, AND WE
23 SEEM TO BE GETTING WHERE WE NEED TO GO, I THINK.

24 ONE OTHER THING TO THROW INTO THE MIX THAT
25 SHOULD COME OUT AT THE HEARINGS. BUILDINGS, BECAUSE

1 THEY TAKE SOME TIME TO DO, ALL TOO OFTEN ARE PREDICATED
2 ON THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE TIME YOU START THE PLANS, NOT
3 WHEN THEY'RE COMPLETED. WE SAW THAT IN EDUCATION WHERE
4 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WERE BUILT ASSUMING A CERTAIN KIND
5 OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY. BY THE TIME SCHOOLS WERE OPEN,
6 THAT PHILOSOPHY NO LONGER WORKED AND THE SCHOOL WOULD
7 HAVE TO BE RETROFITTED. THE BUILDING HERE AND THE
8 HASTE WAS ASSUMED ON THE SITUATION WHEN THE PROPOSITION
9 71 WAS PASSED, WHICH WAS THE OUTRAGEOUS FEDERAL POLICY
10 AND THE ABSOLUTE NEED TO CONSTRUCT LABORATORY SPACE
11 THAT GOT AROUND THE NIH GUIDELINES. THAT'S NOT GOING
12 TO BE WITH US NO MATTER WHO WINS THE NEXT ELECTION.
13 THAT COULD SERIOUSLY CHANGE THE TYPE OF BUILDINGS THAT
14 YOU WANT TO HAVE.

15 SO THOSE ARE THE KINDS OF THINGS, I THINK,
16 THAT YOU NEED TO GET TO. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU. PLEASE
18 STATE YOUR NAME AND AFFILIATION.

19 MR. REED: DON REED, CALIFORNIANS FOR CURES.
20 SOME SCIENTISTS WERE TALKING A FEW MINUTES AGO, AND I
21 ASKED THEM ARE THERE CERTAIN THINGS EVERY FACILITY MUST
22 HAVE IN COMMON? THEY SAID, WELL, THIS IS A TISSUE
23 CULTURE SITUATION, AND SO THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS
24 EVERYONE MUST HAVE IN COMMON. MY QUESTION IS THERE IS
25 A GROUP CALLED THE INTERNATIONAL STEM CELL RESEARCHERS.

1 I WONDER IF A LETTER TO THEM ASKING WHAT ARE THE THINGS
2 THAT MUST BE IN A FACILITY MIGHT BE USEFUL.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, DON, FOR
4 YOUR COMMENTS.

5 MR. REED: IT WAS A QUESTION.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IT'S A QUESTION. I'M
7 NOT SURE WE NECESSARILY NEED TO ADDRESS THAT RIGHT NOW,
8 BUT THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS.

9 MR. KLEIN: JUST A COMMENT IN RELATIONSHIP TO
10 JOHN SIMPSON'S POINT, TWO POINTS. ONE IS THAT ON -- WE
11 HAVE A VALUE FOR COLLABORATION WHICH IS EFFECTIVELY
12 WE'LL CREATE A POLICY, AND ONE OF THE THINGS WE'RE
13 GOING TO DO IN THIS IS WEIGH POLICIES LIKE THE
14 PREFERENCE FOR TWO YEARS AND THE PREFERENCE FOR
15 COLLABORATION. POSSIBLY THE PREFERENCE FOR
16 COLLABORATION MEANS THAT WE GIVE SOME PEOPLE SOME ROOM
17 OR POINTS THAT COUNTERBALANCE ON THE TWO YEARS BECAUSE
18 THEY CAN'T, IF THEY'RE COLLABORATING, GET IT BUILT IN
19 EXACTLY THE SAME TIME PERIOD, BUT MAYBE CLOSE.

20 THE OTHER POINT IS THAT IT IS VERY IMPORTANT
21 TO REALIZE THAT EVERY TWO YEARS WITH A HOUSE ELECTION
22 PRESIDENT CLINTON LEARNED THAT BEING PRESIDENT DOESN'T
23 MEAN YOU CAN FUND EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH. AND
24 VOLATILITY OF THE HOUSE ELECTIONS RUNNING EVERY TWO
25 YEARS, IT MAY BE FOUR YEARS FROM NOW THAT WE'RE BACK

1 WITH A HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT IS TRYING TO STOP
2 THIS RESEARCH, AS THE HOUSE DID IN 1994 IN STOPPING
3 CLINTON FUNDING RESEARCH.

4 AND THE VALUE OF BUILDINGS THAT ARE INSULATED
5 FROM THAT VOLATILITY PUTS INSTITUTIONS IN A POSITION
6 THAT THEY CAN MAKE LONG-TERM PLANS. STANFORD RETURNED
7 \$80 MILLION FOR THEIR BUILDING X PROGRAM THAT WAS
8 INTENDED FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT
9 THEY WOULDN'T HAVE LONG-TERM STABILITY. WE HAVE THE
10 ABILITY TO PROVIDE THE STABILITY THAT IS SO IMPORTANT
11 AND CRITICAL TO SCIENTISTS CREATING A CAREER AND
12 INSTITUTIONS BUILDING THE DEPARTMENTS TO KNOW THAT THEY
13 CAN DEVELOP THOSE OVER A LONG PERIOD OF TIME AND ADAPT
14 THOSE PROGRAMS AS THEY NEED TO WITHOUT POLITICAL
15 REPERCUSSIONS AND VULNERABILITY.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, BOB. SO I
17 THINK WE'RE GOING TO RECESS NOW FOR LUNCH AND RECONVENE
18 AT 1 O'CLOCK.

19 MR. KASHIAN: CAN I MAKE ONE BRIEF COMMENT?
20 I THINK WE JUST SAW A MICROCOSM OF WHAT I THINK A
21 HEARING SHOULD BE ON WHATEVER FLAVOR. AND I, FOR ONE,
22 TOTALLY APPRECIATE THAT INPUT. OUR JOB, AS I BELIEVE
23 IT, IS TO HELP THE PROCESS ALONG, NOT MANAGE IT OR
24 MICROMANAGE IT.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GREAT. THANK YOU, ED.

1 DR. WRIGHT: I PROMISE I'LL BE QUICK, BUT I
2 WANT TO SPECIFICALLY ACKNOWLEDGE HEARING THE IMPORTANCE
3 OF RIGHT SIZING THIS RFA OR ALLOWING THE RFA TO ADDRESS
4 DIFFERENT SIZES OF INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR NEEDS AND TO
5 NOT SERVE AS AN IMPEDIMENT. YOU SPOKE ABOUT DEFINING
6 OPPORTUNITIES AND REDUCING IMPEDIMENTS. THAT'S A
7 REALLY IMPORTANT TASK OF THIS GROUP. CLEARLY DIFFICULT
8 TO DO, BUT THERE ARE SENSITIVITIES ALL ACROSS THIS
9 BOARD ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT WE MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL
10 THE INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE AND TRY TO RIGHT SIZE.

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JANET.
12 WE'LL RECESS NOW TILL ONE.

13 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO CALL THE
15 MEETING TO ORDER, ASK THE MEMBERS WHO ARE LEFT IN THE
16 BUILDING TO TAKE THEIR SEATS AND ALL THOSE PUBLIC
17 MEMBERS TO COME TO ORDER.

18 I JUST WANT TO SUMMARIZE FOR THE MEMBERS AND
19 THE PUBLIC WHAT THE NEXT STEPS ARE AND WHAT WE'VE
20 AGREED UPON HERE TODAY. FIRST OF ALL, WE'VE AGREED
21 THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE FOUR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN THE
22 TIMEFRAME OF MID TO LATE JUNE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE
23 MEMBERS, MID-JUNE, EARLY TO MID-JUNE, JUNE. WE HAVE A
24 CONSENSUS ON JUNE. WE'RE GOING TO FOUR LOCATIONS.
25 THOSE FOUR LOCATIONS ARE SAN DIEGO, L.A., SAN

1 FRANCISCO, AND SACRAMENTO.

2 STAFF, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR, THE
3 VICE CHAIR, AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING
4 GROUP, ARE GOING TO TAKE THE GOALS THAT WE DISCUSSED
5 THIS MORNING AND PUT THEM TOGETHER AS A DRAFT DOCUMENT
6 THAT WE WILL EVENTUALLY REFINE AND SEND OUT AND USE FOR
7 OUR AGENDA AT THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS.

8 DID I MISS ANYTHING, LORI? OKAY. AND JUST
9 ONE THING THAT I WANT EVERYONE TO UNDERSTAND, THAT WE
10 ARE REALLY GOING TO TRY AT THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS TO
11 KEEP PUBLIC COMMENTS, TEN MINUTES, IF WE'RE ALLOWING
12 FOLKS TO TALK FOR TEN MINUTES, TO KEEP THOSE COMMENTS
13 DIRECTED FOR THE KIND OF RFA, THE RULES AND ALL THE
14 THINGS RELATED TO THE RFA.

15 SO ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS BY MEMBERS? THEN I
16 WILL ASK FOR FINAL PUBLIC COMMENTS AT THE END OF THE
17 DAY HERE TODAY.

18 MS. HOFFMAN: YES. I HAD JUST ONE OTHER
19 REMINDER, THAT I BELIEVE THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP
20 HAD COMMITTED TO HAVING ANOTHER MEETING, WHICH WOULD BE
21 A FIFTH MEETING, IN JULY TO REVIEW THE FINDINGS FROM
22 ALL FOUR HEARINGS AND TO DEFINE AND THEN APPROVE AND
23 RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC THE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CAN WE HAVE THAT
25 MEETING IN PALO ALTO? I'M KIDDING. WE COULD. THERE

1 YOU GO. THERE'S STEM CELL RESEARCH BEING DONE IN PALO
2 ALTO THESE DAYS, ISN'T THERE? I'M KIDDING.

3 YES, I THINK THAT WORKS OUT FINE. I'M FINE
4 WITH HAVING ANOTHER MEETING, BUT WE'LL OBVIOUSLY ASK
5 STAFF TO TAKE NOTE OF EVERYONE'S VACATION TIMES AND TRY
6 TO FIGURE OUT THE BEST TIME TO DO THAT.

7 I'D LIKE TO ASK THOSE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
8 THAT WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO LIMIT THEIR COMMENTS TO
9 THREE MINUTES OR LESS. AND FOR THE RECORD, AGAIN,
10 STATE YOUR NAME AND AFFILIATION, JOHN.

11 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON, FOUNDATION FOR
12 TAXPAYER AND CONSUMER RIGHTS. JUST ONE VERY BRIEF
13 THING. I MENTIONED IT BRIEFLY TO THE CHAIRMAN AT A
14 BREAK, BUT I THOUGHT I WANTED TO GET IT ON THE RECORD
15 AS WELL. THERE HAS BEEN A WONDERFUL HISTORY IN
16 VIRTUALLY ALL THINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ICOC OF GOING
17 ABOVE AND BEYOND THE CALL OF TRANSPARENCY IN TERMS OF
18 INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC. I THINK MOST PEOPLE WHO ARE ON
19 THE ICOC WOULD AGREE THAT OVER THE HISTORY THAT HAS
20 BEEN A USEFUL PURPOSE.

21 THIS COMMITTEE IN THESE SESSIONS DID NOT, AND
22 YOU WEREN'T REQUIRED TO, BUT YOU DID NOT FOLLOW WHAT
23 HAS BECOME SORT OF TRADITION AND I THINK SERVES THE
24 MEETINGS WELL, OF WHEN YOU DO HAVE MOTIONS, BEFORE YOU
25 VOTE FOR THEM, YOU GENERALLY ASK FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

1 AND I WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO DO THAT IN THE FUTURE.
2 AND I THINK THE PUBLIC GENERALLY IS VERY COOPERATIVE
3 AND KEEPS IT WELL UNDER THREE MINUTES, AND IT DOES NOT
4 ADD THAT MUCH MORE TO THE TIME OF THE MEETING AND, DARE
5 I SAY, OCCASIONALLY ADDS SOME VERY PRODUCTIVE THOUGHTS.
6 NEVER FROM ME, BUT FROM SOME OF THE OTHER PEOPLE THAT
7 DO SPEAK. I JUST WANTED TO POINT THAT OUT. THANK YOU.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JOHN. AND
9 WE WILL TAKE THAT UNDER CONSIDERATION. ANY OTHER
10 PUBLIC COMMENTS? OKAY. WELL, MEETING IS ADJOURNED.
11 THANK YOU VERY MUCH. HAVE A GREAT DAY.

12 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 1:10
13 P.M.)

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL FACILITIES WORKING GROUP OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD AT THE LOCATION INDICATED BELOW

MIYAKO HOTEL
1625 POST STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
ON
THURSDAY, MAY 3, 2007

WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

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

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