

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

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: FRIDAY, MAY 20, 2005

TIME: 2:30 PM

LOCATIONS: CITY OF HOPE
NEEDLEMAN BUILDING
ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM/ROOM 116
1500 EAST DUARTE ROAD
DUARTE, CALIFORNIA

UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER
CANCER BREAKOUT ROOM
4501 X STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

UCLA
DEAN'S CONFERENCE ROOM
10833 LE CONTE AVE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
JAMES H. CLARK CENTER
ROOM 361
318 CAMPUS DRIVE WEST
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN
CSR. NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 72483

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		3
CONSIDERATION OF DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES WORKING GROUP		6
CONSIDERATION OF REAL ESTATE SPECIALIST MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES WORKING GROUP		13
CONSIDERATION OF CANDIDATE(S) TO SERVE AS CHAIRPERSON AND POSSIBLE VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES WORKING GROUP		63
CONSIDERATION OF DEVELOPING CASE STUDY MODELS FOR FACILITIES GRANTS AND PROCESS FOR REVIEWING FACILITIES GRANT PROPOSALS		70
DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE MEETINGS		98
ADJOURNMENT		117

1 DUARTE, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, MAY 20, 2005

2

3 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IS OUR CHAIRMAN HERE? IS --
4 MR. KLEIN, ARE YOU ON THE LINE?

5 MS. KING: NOT YET, RIGHT, AMY? WE DO NOT YET
6 HAVE BOB KLEIN?

7 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: NO. WE MUST NOT. CAN
8 ANYONE TELL ME WHAT THE MINIMUM NUMBER IS FOR A QUORUM
9 FOR THIS COMMITTEE?

10 MR. HARRISON: YOU NEED FIVE.

11 MS. DALY: DR. LOVE IS HERE.

12 MR. HARRISON: AND YOU HAVE FIVE.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXCELLENT. THEN I'D LIKE TO
14 CONVENE THE MEETING. I'D LIKE TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR
15 TAKING TIME FROM THEIR BUSY SCHEDULES. AND WE WILL
16 COMMENCE WITH ROLL CALL, PLEASE.

17 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

18 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.

19 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN. TED LOVE.

20 DR. LOVE: HERE.

21 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

22 DR. POMEROY: HERE.

23 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO. JOHN REED. GAYLE
24 WILSON.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WE KNOW YOU'RE THERE, GAYLE.

1 MS. KING: GAYLE WAS THERE, RIGHT, UCLA? DID WE
2 LOSE UCLA? ALSO, DR. POMEROY, IT DOESN'T SOUND LIKE DR.
3 PRIETO HAS YET JOINED YOU; IS THAT TRUE?

4 DR. POMEROY: THAT IS CORRECT.

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WE HAVE TO WAIT A COUPLE
6 MORE MINUTES. I'M VERY SORRY. WE DON'T QUITE HAVE A
7 QUORUM, AND SO WE CAN'T CARRY OUT BUSINESS.

8 ARE THERE -- I GUESS THIS MEETING CANNOT BE
9 FORMALLY CONVENED UNTIL WE HAVE PEOPLE, THE MINIMUM
10 NUMBER. BUT LET ME JUST ASK. WE HAVE NO MEMBERS OF THE
11 PUBLIC HERE YET. ARE THERE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AT
12 OTHER SITES?

13 DR. LOVE: THERE ARE HERE IN PALO ALTO.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU.
15 THAT'S EXCELLENT.

16 DR. POMEROY: THERE ARE HERE AT UC DAVIS AS
17 WELL.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: TERRIFIC. I'M REALLY GLAD
19 TO HEAR THAT.

20 MS. SHREVE: CAN YOU HEAR US FROM UCLA?

21 MS. KING: NOW WE CAN HEAR YOU. IS GAYLE WILSON
22 THERE?

23 MS. WILSON: SHE IS HERE.

24 MS. KING: GREAT.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WE COULDN'T HEAR YOU, SO NOW

1 WE HAVE A --

2 MS. KING: WE KNOW DR. REED ISN'T COMING; BUT
3 UNTIL FRANCISCO GETS THERE, WE DON'T YET HAVE A QUORUM.

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY.

5 DR. POMEROY: IS IT CORRECT THAT WE CAN'T EVEN
6 CONVENE THE MEETING VERSUS WE CAN'T TAKE A VOTE?

7 MR. HARRISON: RIGHT. I THINK, DR. FRIEDMAN,
8 YOU CAN CONVENE THE MEETING WITH LESS THAN A QUORUM, BUT
9 YOU CAN'T TAKE ANY ACTION.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU FOR
11 THAT CLARIFICATION. I WILL -- I WOULD LIKE TO THEN
12 CONVENE THE MEETING. AND I'D LIKE TO BEGIN BECAUSE WE
13 HAVE A NUMBER OF THINGS TO DO.

14 MAY I JUST GIVE THE GENERAL OPENING COMMENTS,
15 THEN, THAT WE TYPICALLY GIVE. PUBLIC COMMENT IS VERY
16 WELCOME AT THESE MEETINGS. WHAT I ASK, PLEASE, IS THAT
17 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, SHOULD YOU WISH TO, GIVE US YOUR
18 NAME AND AFFILIATION. IT'S NOT NECESSARY, BUT IT'S OFTEN
19 HELPFUL. I ASK YOU PLEASE TO CONFINE YOUR REMARKS TO
20 THREE MINUTES OR LESS IN ORDER TO GIVE EVERYONE A CHANCE
21 TO COMMENT. AND WE WILL CERTAINLY AT EACH POINT IN THE
22 FORMAL PROCEEDINGS PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR, FIRST,
23 MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO GIVE US THEIR COMMENTS AND
24 THEN MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

25 WHAT I'D LIKE TO BEGIN WITH IS WE'RE UP TO THE

1 THIRD ITEM OF OUR AGENDA, THE CONSIDERATION OF DISEASE
2 ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL FACILITIES
3 WORKING GROUP. AND THE REASON THAT WE'RE BRINGING THIS
4 FORWARD IS THAT, AS MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP MAY
5 KNOW, BUT AS MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY NOT YET BE AWARE,
6 SADLY ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS'
7 OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE WILL BE LEAVING THE STATE OF
8 CALIFORNIA AND LEAVING HER RESPONSIBILITIES. PHYLLIS
9 PRECIADO IS MOVING TO ANOTHER LOCATION. WE'RE VERY SORRY
10 TO LOSE HER, BOTH BECAUSE OF HER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE
11 GENERAL COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS, BUT ALSO THAT SHE WAS ONE
12 OF THE MEMBERS OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES ON OUR PARTICULAR
13 WORKING GROUP.

14 THIS ABSENCE MEANS THAT WE DO NOT HAVE OR WILL
15 NOT HAVE THE REQUISITE NUMBER OF PATIENT ADVOCATES ON
16 THIS COMMITTEE, WHICH IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL.

17 I UNDERSTAND THAT MR. BUSTAMONTE IS IN THE
18 PROCESS OF SCREENING CANDIDATES AND CONSIDERING OTHER
19 CANDIDATES TO RECOMMENDED FOR MEMBERSHIP. WE WILL
20 CERTAINLY WAIT TO FIND OUT WHO HE NOMINATES FOR THIS.
21 THIS HAS TO BE A DIABETES DISEASE REPRESENTATIVE, I
22 UNDERSTAND.

23 GIVEN THE EXTRAORDINARY NUMBER OF SUBCOMMITTEES
24 THAT PEOPLE HAVE TO SERVE ON, IT'S NOT A SIMPLE THING TO
25 SIMPLY PICK ANOTHER DISEASE ADVOCATE WHO CURRENTLY EXISTS

1 ON THE ICOC AND ASK THEM TO STEP IN AT THIS TIME. BEFORE
2 OUR WORKING GROUP WILL BE FULLY STAFFED AND READY TO
3 CARRY OUT ITS BUSINESS, WE WILL NEED TO FILL THIS
4 POSITION. AND I JUST POINT THIS OUT TO EVERYONE.

5 MELISSA, IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE I SHOULD SAY
6 ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR THING?

7 MS. KING: THE ONLY THING FOR THIS SUBCOMMITTEE
8 TO KEEP IN MIND AS WE DO LOOK FOR ANOTHER PATIENT
9 ADVOCATE MEMBER IS THAT ALL OF OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE
10 MEMBERS FOR THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP HAVE TO ACTUALLY
11 BE SERVING ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SIMULTANEOUSLY.
12 AND SINCE DR. PRECIADO IS ON BOTH OF THOSE, WHAT WE SEEK
13 AT MINIMUM IS FOR A PATIENT ADVOCATE, EITHER ONE OF THE
14 ONES THAT'S CURRENTLY ON THE ICOC OR THE NEWLY APPOINTED
15 ONE, TO SERVE ON BOTH THE GRANTS AND THE FACILITIES
16 WORKING GROUP.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: RIGHT. AND WE'RE MAKING THE
18 RECOMMENDATION TO THE -- THE STAFF WILL BE MAKING THE
19 RECOMMENDATION TO MR. BUSTAMONTE TO, AS HE SCREENS
20 CANDIDATES, TO PLEASE INDICATE TO THEM THAT THE
21 EXPECTATION IS THAT WE WOULD HOPE THAT THEY WOULD BE
22 READY TO SERVE ON TWO, IF NOT ALL THREE, OF THE WORKING
23 GROUPS BECAUSE THAT WILL BE REQUIRED. AND SO HE WILL BE
24 ASKING IF THEY'RE WILLING TO DO THAT SO THAT WHOEVER
25 COMES ON, THE NEW PERSON WILL UNDERSTAND THE MAGNITUDE OF

1 THE EFFORT.

2 MS. KING: ALTHOUGH WE CAN'T REQUIRE THEM TO DO
3 THAT, IT WOULD BE GOOD IF THEY AT LEAST HAD AN INTEREST
4 IN AND POSSIBLY AN ABILITY TO TIMEWISE SERVE ON ONE OR
5 MORE OF THE WORKING GROUPS.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THEY WOULD ALMOST HAVE TO,
7 BUT YOU CAN'T REQUIRE IT. I UNDERSTAND. AND SO WE LEAVE
8 THAT TO MR. BUSTAMONTE, WHO I'M SURE WILL MANAGE THAT
9 COMPETENTLY WITHOUT ANY DOUBT.

10 DR. POMEROY: THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY FROM DAVIS.
11 MELISSA, CAN YOU REMIND US WHO THE OTHER POTENTIAL
12 PATIENT ADVOCATE CANDIDATES WOULD BE? IT WOULD BE
13 FRANCISCO AND I'M JUST BLANKING.

14 MS. KING: WELL, ONE POTENTIAL OPTION IS
15 JONATHAN SHESTACK, WHO ALREADY IS SERVING ON BOTH GRANTS
16 AND STANDARDS WORKING GROUPS; HOWEVER, TIMEWISE THAT
17 WOULD PROBABLY BE TASKING. WE'D BE THEN ASKING HIM TO
18 SERVE ON ALL THREE, LIKE PHYLLIS AND SHERRY LANSING WERE
19 BOTH SIGNED UP TO DO.

20 DR. POMEROY: THAT'S A LOT.

21 MS. KING: OTHER OPTIONS ARE VERY BUSY PEOPLE,
22 NOT THAT YOU'RE NOT ALL BUSY, BUT BUSY PEOPLE LIKE DR.
23 THAL, DR. STEWARD, DR. BLACK. NO, I'M SORRY. NOT
24 DR. BLACK. ACTUALLY --

25 DR. POMEROY: AND DR. PRIETO.

1 MS. KING: -- DR. PRIETO, EXACTLY. THE LIST IS
2 NOT LONG OF WHO WE HAVE CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE ICOC AS
3 A PATIENT ADVOCATE WHO IS EITHER NOT ON ANY OF THESE
4 WORKING GROUPS RIGHT NOW, OR THE ONLY OTHER OPTION IS
5 JONATHAN SHESTACK, BUT HE'S ALREADY ON TWO.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SO THIS IS NOT -- THERE'S NO
7 ACTION THAT WE CAN TAKE ON THIS TODAY. I JUST POINT THIS
8 OUT TO EVERYONE. WE WILL ASK MR. KLEIN TO MAKE THIS
9 POINT AT THE NEXT FULL ICOC MEETING IN TERMS OF
10 SOLICITING INTEREST TO JOIN BOTH THE REVIEW AND THE
11 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP.

12 ANYTHING ELSE ON THAT?

13 MS. KING: NO.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: LET'S GO ON.

15 MS. KING: THEY'VE ALREADY AGREED TO SERVE.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: JUST TO REMIND EVERYONE,
17 IT'S LISTED THERE, BUT SHERRY LANSING, JOAN SAMUELSON,
18 DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL, JEFF SHEEHY, AND JANET WRIGHT HAVE
19 ALL AGREED TO PARTICIPATE. AND OUR GRATITUDE TO THEM FOR
20 THEIR WILLINGNESS TO SERVE.

21 GOOD.

22 MS. WILSON: CAN THIS COMMITTEE GO AHEAD WITHOUT
23 THE FULL DISEASE ADVOCATES?

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: MR. HARRISON, WOULD YOU
25 PLEASE COMMENT ON WHETHER OR NOT -- WHETHER THIS

1 COMMITTEE CAN ACTUALLY FUNCTION WITHOUT THE FULL
2 COMPLEMENT OF DISEASE ADVOCATES.

3 MR. HARRISON: THERE IS NOTHING THAT REQUIRES
4 THAT THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP HAVE ALL OF ITS MEMBERS
5 APPOINTED BEFORE IT BEGINS TO FUNCTION. SO IT COULD
6 BEGIN TO FUNCTION IF IT WAS ONE SHY.

7 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S VERY GOOD. THANK
8 YOU, GAYLE. I WAS UNDER THE WRONG IMPRESSION. THANK
9 YOU.

10 MS. KING: JAMES, THEN IS THE MAIN REQUIREMENT
11 FOR THE WORKING GROUP THAT THEY HAVE TO JUST HAVE WHAT
12 WOULD BE A QUORUM OF THE FULL WORKING GROUP IN ORDER TO
13 DO ANY BUSINESS?

14 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

15 MS. KING: OKAY.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: GOOD TO KNOW.

17 DR. POMEROY: WE WILL HAVE TO OFFICIALLY APPROVE
18 THIS SLATE OF PATIENT ADVOCATES AT THE ICOC MEETING
19 THOUGH, RIGHT?

20 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S RIGHT. ABSOLUTELY.

21 DR. POMEROY: IF WE HAD A QUORUM HERE, SHOULDN'T
22 WE OFFICIALLY MAKE THAT RECOMMENDATION AND VOTE ON IT OR
23 NOT?

24 MS. KING: YES. ACTUALLY THAT'S A REALLY GOOD
25 POINT, EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE ALREADY AGREED, AND THAT'S

1 MORE THE ANGLE WITH THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS.

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: YOU'RE QUITE RIGHT.

3 PROCEDURALLY YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. SO WHEN WE'RE
4 JOINED BY EITHER MR. KLEIN OR DR. PRIETO, WHEN EITHER ONE
5 OF THOSE TWO INDIVIDUALS JOINS US, WE WILL COME BACK AND
6 TAKE A VOTE ON THAT.

7 MS. WILSON: WHAT WOULD CONSTITUTE A QUORUM
8 THEN, SIX?

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: FIVE.

10 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS NOT JOINING US TODAY.
11 CURRENTLY WE ARE MISSING DR. PRIETO AND BOB.

12 MS. WILSON: WHAT'S THE QUORUM OF THE FACILITIES
13 WORKING GROUP? IF THERE ARE 11 MEMBERS ON IT, DOES THAT
14 MAKE SIX?

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: MR. HARRISON, AGAIN, COULD
16 YOU --

17 MR. HARRISON: HOLD ON ONE MOMENT.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: HE'S LOOKING IT UP.

19 MR. HARRISON: IT WOULD BE SEVEN MEMBERS.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: ALTHOUGH --

21 DR. LOVE: DR. FRIEDMAN, THIS IS TED LOVE. WHAT
22 WERE WE GOING TO VOTE ON?

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WE WERE GOING TO VOTE TO
24 RECOMMEND THE SLATE OF PATIENT ADVOCATES THAT I JUST
25 NAMED WHO HAVE AGREED TO SERVE ON THIS COMMITTEE. WE

1 WERE GOING TO VOTE TO APPROVE THAT SLATE TO GO FORWARD TO
2 THE FULL ICOC FOR THEIR ENDORSEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING.

3 DR. LOVE: OKAY. ON THE OTHER COMMITTEES WE'VE
4 GENERALLY DONE IT AS ONE FULL SLATE, SO WE SELECTED THE
5 CANDIDATES WHO WERE NONPATIENT ADVOCATES AND KIND OF AS A
6 FULL SLATE. SO I WAS WONDERING WHY WE WOULD DO IT
7 DIFFERENTLY.

8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: JUST BECAUSE WE'RE TAKING
9 LITTLE BITES RATHER THAN BIG BITES.

10 DR. LOVE: OKAY. NO OBJECTION. JUST CURIOUS.

11 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: NO PROBLEM. THIS DOES GIVE
12 US AN OPPORTUNITY TO INVITE COMMENTS FROM -- OBVIOUSLY IF
13 THE OUR LITTLE COMMITTEE HAS ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THIS
14 SLATE OF ADVOCATES, I WOULD ASK FOR THAT. AND THEN WHAT
15 I'D LIKE TO DO IS ASK WHETHER THERE ARE ANY PUBLIC
16 COMMENTS ABOUT JUST THE SLATE OF PATIENT ADVOCATES. SO
17 ANYTHING FROM -- LET'S JUST GO ANYTHING IN PALO ALTO?

18 DR. LOVE: NO. I WOULD JUST SAY THAT I THINK
19 THE BIGGER ISSUE IS FOR US TO GET ON WITH SELECTION OF
20 THE OUTSIDE PEOPLE.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I AGREE. SACRAMENTO?

22 DR. POMEROY: NO.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THERE'S NO ONE HERE. UCLA,
24 PLEASE?

25 MS. SHREVE: THERE'S NO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

1 HERE.

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY. THEN WE'VE HAD
3 OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND APPRECIATE THAT. WE
4 WILL COME BACK AND VOTE ON THIS WITH A FULL SLATE WHEN WE
5 TALK ABOUT THE REAL ESTATE SPECIALISTS THAT WE'D LIKE TO
6 SELECT.

7 CAN WE THEN PLEASE GO TO ITEM NO. 4, WHICH IS A
8 DISCUSSION OF THE REAL ESTATE SPECIALISTS. AND LET ME
9 BEGIN BY FIRST THANKING THE WORKING DUETS OF REVIEWERS
10 WHO WERE KIND ENOUGH TO HAVE TELEPHONE OR IN-PERSON
11 INTERVIEWS WITH EACH OF THESE ELEVEN PEOPLE THAT ARE
12 LISTED HERE. DRS. POMEROY AND PRIETO, DR. LOVE AND MR.
13 KLEIN, DR. REED AND GAYLE WILSON EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR
14 TOGETHER MET WITH THESE PEOPLE AND WERE KIND ENOUGH TO
15 SUPPLY RATINGS AND COMMENTS BACK. I'M VERY GRATEFUL FOR
16 YOUR EFFORTS IN DOING SO.

17 THIS WAS A REALLY SOLID LIST OF SPECIALISTS AND
18 REALLY VERY ATTRACTIVE SET OF CANDIDATES.

19 WHAT I THOUGHT WE WOULD DO IS JUST TO
20 RECAPITULATE WHAT WE HAD SAID WE WOULD TRY AND BRING
21 FORWARD TO THE FULL ICOC AT ITS NEXT MEETING.

22 WE WANTED TO HAVE A MINIMUM OF FOUR HIGHLY
23 QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS; BUT IF THERE ARE MORE THAN FOUR
24 HIGHLY QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS, WE WANTED TO GIVE THE ICOC
25 A CHANCE TO SELECT FROM A SLIGHTLY LARGER POOL. WHETHER

1 THAT'S SIX OR EIGHT PEOPLE, WE ALL AGREED THAT WE WANTED
2 TO GIVE THEM AN EXTRA OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE THEIR OWN
3 DECISIONS.

4 WE WILL AT THE NEXT ICOC MEETING PRESENT
5 SUMMARIES, WRITTEN SUMMARIES, OF THE COMMENTS THAT YOU
6 REVIEWERS HAVE SUPPLIED TO US INDICATING YOUR REVIEWS OF
7 THESE INDIVIDUALS AND THE SCORING FOR THESE INDIVIDUALS.

8 AND YOU RECALL THAT AT A PREVIOUS MEETING WE HAD
9 A DISCUSSION OF AND A FORMAL ADOPTION OF A SCORING SYSTEM
10 THAT I THOUGHT WAS REALLY ELEGANT THAT THIS GROUP CAME UP
11 WITH THAT REALLY WORKED VERY WELL, LOOKING AT THEIR
12 PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE, THEIR EXPERTISE, THEIR COMPETENCIES,
13 AND SO FORTH. OF COURSE, ALL OF THESE ELEVEN PEOPLE HAVE
14 BEEN SCREENED FOR THE KINDS OF CONFLICTS OR THE KINDS OF
15 PROHIBITIONS WHICH WOULD AUTOMATICALLY BAR THEM FROM
16 BEING EVEN CONSIDERED. SO THEY'VE ALL PASSED THAT
17 INITIAL SCREEN.

18 WHAT WE HAVE, THEN, IS A LIST OF THESE PEOPLE.
19 WE HAVE SCORES THAT HAVE BEEN SUPPLIED. I WOULD BE HAPPY
20 TO HAVE A DISCUSSION OF EXACTLY WHO SHOULD GO FORWARD AS
21 OUR HIGHEST RECOMMENDED GROUP. SINCE NONE OF THESE
22 CANDIDATES FAILED, FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES, I WANT TO
23 MAKE SURE THAT ALL THIS INFORMATION GOES FORWARD TO THE
24 ICOC SO THAT EVERY MEMBER WILL HAVE THE SENSE THAT HE OR
25 SHE HAS THE FULL SLATE TO LOOK AT.

1 THERE ARE -- OF THE ELEVEN PEOPLE, THERE ARE
2 SEVEN, ACTUALLY EIGHT OUT OF THE ELEVEN WHO HAVE THE
3 HIGHEST SCORES THAT WE CAN ASSIGN. THERE ARE THREE
4 PEOPLE WHO HAVE JUST SLIGHTLY LOWER SCORES, AND WHAT I
5 WOULD SUGGEST IS THAT WE DISCUSS EACH OF THE PEOPLE WITH
6 THE LOWER SCORES FIRST. UNLESS THERE'S A STRONG
7 SENTIMENT FROM ANY OF THE REVIEWERS, I WOULD SAY THAT
8 THESE INDIVIDUALS WILL BE RETAINED AS A POTENTIAL POOL
9 FOR CONSIDERATION LATER, BUT WILL NOT GO FORWARD AS OUR
10 HIGHEST RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SLATE.

11 MS. WILSON: I AGREE WITH THAT.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IF THAT'S ACCEPTABLE, THE
13 INDIVIDUALS THAT HAVE EXCELLENT SCORES, I DON'T MEAN THIS
14 IN ANY SORT OF DISRESPECTFUL WAY, BUT THIS WAS THE BEST
15 OF THE VERY BEST. MR. JOHN ARCHIBALD, MR. ROBERT D'ELIA,
16 AND MR. STUART SHIFF HAD SCORES THAT WERE SLIGHTLY LOWER
17 THAN THEIR COUNTERPARTS. AND WHAT I WOULD ASK IS THAT I
18 WOULD LIKE TO ENTERTAIN ANY COMMENTS THAT ANY OF THE
19 REVIEWERS HAVE, EITHER BY READING THE MATERIALS OR BY
20 THEIR OWN DIRECT INTERACTIONS WITH THESE INDIVIDUALS,
21 THAT WOULD ELEVATE THEM TO THE UPPERMOST TIER.

22 IF I MADE THAT CLEAR, WHAT I WOULD DO IS I WOULD
23 ASK FIRST SACRAMENTO, IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT, AND
24 I'LL REPEAT, MR. ARCHIBALD, MR. D'ELIA, AND I APOLOGIZE
25 IF I'M MISPRONOUNCING HIS NAME, AND MR. SHIFF.

1 DR. POMEROY: THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY. I JUST
2 WANT TO BRING UP A SLIGHTLY RELATED POINT. YOU KNOW,
3 THIS FEELS A LOT LIKE A PERSONNEL ACTION, AND I WONDER IF
4 YOU CAN JUST HELP ME BY HAVING COUNSEL COMMENT. YOU
5 KNOW, IF WE'RE -- WHEN YOU ARE RANKING PEOPLE, YOU BY
6 DEFINITION START CRITIQUING CERTAIN ASPECTS OF PEOPLE.
7 AND THAT'S OFTEN WHY WE HAVE PERSONNEL ACTIONS IN CLOSED
8 SESSION. SO COULD COUNSEL JUST COMMENT ON THAT?

9 MR. HARRISON: SURE. UNFORTUNATELY, WE'RE
10 CAUGHT IN A BIT OF A CATCH 22. THE MEMBERS OF THE
11 WORKING GROUP ARE NOT CONSIDERED PUBLIC OFFICERS OR
12 EMPLOYEES FOR PURPOSES OF CONFLICT LAWS AND OTHER STATE
13 LAWS UNDER THE ACT ITSELF. SO, THEREFORE, BECAUSE THE
14 EXCEPTION IN BAGLEY-KEENE FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS ONLY
15 APPLIES TO STATE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES, WE ARE OBLIGATED
16 TO DISCUSS THESE CANDIDATES, UNCOMFORTABLE AS IT IS, IN
17 OPEN SESSION.

18 DR. POMEROY: CAN I ASK, THEN, IF IT WOULD -- IF
19 IT IS ACCEPTABLE TO REDACT FOR THE -- TO REDACT THE
20 EVALUATIONS AT ALL?

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IN OTHER WORDS, TO REDACT
22 WHO THE REVIEWERS WERE.

23 DR. POMEROY: WELL, BECAUSE, YOU KNOW --

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I UNDERSTAND, CLAIRE. I
25 UNDERSTAND. MR. HARRISON, THAT'S A QUESTION WE NEED TO

1 ASK YOU.

2 MR. HARRISON: SO THESE ARE THE SUMMARIES THAT
3 YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT?

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S CORRECT.

5 MR. HARRISON: UNFORTUNATELY, THERE'S NOT A
6 CLEAR ANSWER. I THINK THERE IS A GOOD ARGUMENT THAT THE
7 SUMMARIES ARE NOT THEMSELVES PUBLIC RECORDS UNLESS YOU
8 CHOOSE TO MAKE THEM SO BECAUSE THERE IS A DELIBERATIVE
9 PROCESS EXCEPTION UNDER THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT FOR NOTES
10 AND OTHER DRAFTS THAT REFLECT YOUR MENTAL IMPRESSIONS.

11 DR. POMEROY: BUT THEY WERE JUST HANDED OUT AT
12 THE PUBLIC SESSION FOR THIS MEETING.

13 MR. HARRISON: I SEE.

14 MS. KING: THIS IS MELISSA AT CITY OF HOPE.
15 JUST A QUICK COMMENT ON THAT. AND I APOLOGIZE THAT THERE
16 WAS NOT UNIFORMITY ACROSS SITES. BUT I'M PRETTY SURE
17 THAT FOR EVERY OTHER SITE THERE IS JUST ONE FOLDER OF
18 INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC SO THAT AT THE VERY LEAST
19 THESE EVALUATIONS COULD NOT BE TAKEN AWAY BY ANY PUBLIC
20 MEMBER. AND IF THE SUBCOMMITTEE SO CHOSE, AND, JAMES,
21 MR. HARRISON, IF THIS WAS OKAY, WE COULD JUST PULL THAT
22 PART OF THE BOOK OUT SO THAT THE PUBLIC CAN'T EVEN LOOK
23 THROUGH IT, AND IN SACRAMENTO YOU COULD JUST REMOVE THAT
24 DOCUMENT FROM PUBLIC CONSUMPTION, IF POSSIBLE. I DON'T
25 KNOW. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE EVERYBODY KNEW THAT THE

1 INTENTION WAS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS
2 GOT THESE EVALUATIONS, BUT THAT THERE WERE NOT COPIES OF
3 IT LAYING AROUND FOR THE PUBLIC NECESSARILY, CERTAINLY
4 NOT TO WALK AWAY WITH.

5 MR. HARRISON: I WOULD RECOMMEND TO, IN AN
6 EFFORT TO PROTECT THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THOSE MATERIALS,
7 THAT THEY BE RETAINED AND NOT MADE AVAILABLE TO THE
8 PUBLIC.

9 DR. POMEROY: I'VE JUST BEEN CORRECTED. THEY
10 WERE NOT HANDED OUT TO THE PUBLIC HERE IN SACRAMENTO. I
11 GUESS THAT MEANS THEY WOULD NOT BE HANDED TO THE PUBLIC
12 AT THE ICOC; IS THAT CORRECT?

13 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

14 DR. POMEROY: WELL, IN THAT CASE, I'M A LOT MORE
15 COMFORTABLE. THANK YOU FOR CLARIFYING THAT. I
16 APOLOGIZE.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, CLAIRE.

18 DR. LOVE: DR. FRIEDMAN, THIS IS TED LOVE. I
19 WOULD SAY THAT, FOLLOWING UP ON DR. POMEROY'S POINT, I
20 WOULD FEEL MORE COMFORTABLE --

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXCUSE ME. WE NEED -- WE
22 NEED TO HAVE EVERYBODY ON MUTE WHO ISN'T TALKING, PLEASE.
23 GO AHEAD.

24 DR. LOVE: I WOULD FEEL PERSONALLY MORE
25 COMFORTABLE, GIVEN THAT I DID INTERVIEW THREE CANDIDATES,

1 MAKING A CASE FOR THE VERY TOP CANDIDATE AND EXPLAINING
2 WHY I THINK THAT WOULD BE THE VERY TOP CANDIDATE. ALL
3 THREE PEOPLE I TALKED TO I THOUGHT WERE EXCELLENT. AND I
4 THOUGHT IT WAS AMAZING THAT THESE PEOPLE ARE WILLING TO
5 GIVE THEIR TIME, BUT I THINK I'D STILL FEEL BETTER
6 TALKING ABOUT THE POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF MY NO. 1 CHOICE
7 AS MY FIRST CONVERSATION ANYWAY.

8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I UNDERSTAND YOUR POINT.
9 OTHER DISCUSSION FROM THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS?

10 MS. WILSON: GAYLE WILSON. JOHN REED AND I
11 INTERVIEWED FOUR, THREE OF WHOM WE GAVE THE HIGHEST
12 MARKS. THE ONLY REASON THE OTHER ONE DIDN'T GET AS HIGH,
13 FRANKLY, IS HE WAS JUST YOUNGER AND LESS EXPERIENCED.
14 NOTHING AGAINST HIM.

15 MY SECOND COMMENT IS WHEN WE HAD TALKED ABOUT
16 BRINGING FORTH EIGHT NAMES, THAT'S THE NUMBER I REMEMBER.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: YES.

18 MS. WILSON: THAT THE ICOC WOULD PICK THE TOP
19 FOUR. I THINK THERE ARE SOME OTHER CONSIDERATIONS. IF
20 WE HAVE ALL TOP PEOPLE, HOW DO YOU PICK FOUR? I THINK,
21 FOR INSTANCE, THERE SHOULD BE SOME GEOGRAPHICAL
22 DISTRIBUTION.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WELL, AND I THINK THAT'S A
24 VALID POINT, GAYLE. SO LET ME THEN, BASED UPON THIS VERY
25 USEFUL DISCUSSION, LET ME PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING. THERE

1 ARE, IN FACT, EIGHT PEOPLE WHO HAVE GOTTEN 4 OR 4+, WHICH
2 ARE THE HIGHEST MARKS THAT THE REVIEWERS COULD GIVE. AND
3 I MUST TELL YOU I REVIEWED THE COMMENTS FOR EACH OF THE
4 CANDIDATES, AS I'M SURE MANY OF YOU DID, AND I SUPPORT,
5 BASED UPON MY READING AND MY EVALUATION, THE SCORES OF 4
6 OR 4+ THAT WERE GIVEN.

7 I WOULD SAY THAT THERE ARE EIGHT INDIVIDUALS,
8 MR. DOMS, MR. FRAGER, MR. HYSEN -- MS. HYSEN,
9 MR. KASHIAN, MR. LAFF, MR. LICHTENGER, AND MR. MOCK, AND
10 MR. SPIEKER ALL OF WHOM HAD 4 OR 4+ SCORES BY THEIR
11 NAMES. AND I HEAR A GOOD DEAL OF SENTIMENT TO SAY THAT
12 THIS SHOULD BE THE SLATE WHICH IS SENT FORWARD TO THE --
13 WE'RE NOT TAKING A VOTE BECAUSE WE DON'T YET HAVE A
14 QUORUM, BUT THAT THERE'S A LOT OF SENTIMENT ABOUT THESE
15 ARE THE INDIVIDUALS WHO SHOULD GO FORWARD.

16 THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THESE INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE
17 4+, AND I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ENTERTAIN THE IDEA THAT THE
18 TWO 4+ SHOULD BE AT THE VERY TOP WITH OUR RECOMMENDATION,
19 THAT THESE BE CONSIDERED THE TWO TOP PEOPLE, BUT THE
20 REST, THE OTHER SIX, ARE UNIFORMLY GOOD CANDIDATES WITH
21 EXCELLENT EXPERIENCES AND SKILLS. AND WE CAN LEAVE IT TO
22 THE ICOC TO PICK. I THINK HAVING SOME BACKUPS, HAVING
23 SOME PEOPLE WHO ARE AVAILABLE SHOULD EXTRA PEOPLE BE
24 NEEDED ON AN AD HOC BASIS TO SUPPLEMENT PARTICULAR
25 QUESTIONS THAT MIGHT COME UP. I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY

1 MUCH IN OUR INTEREST TO HAVE A POOL WHICH IS SLIGHTLY
2 LARGER THAN THE FOUR WHICH HAVE BEEN APPROVED AND VETTED
3 AND ARE AVAILABLE TO SERVE IF ASKED.

4 MS. WILSON: YOU WILL NOTICE UNDER SCORE 2, THAT
5 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF BLANKS.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: YES.

7 MS. WILSON: I KNOW FOR ONE OF THEM IS A 4+.
8 AND I WAS NOT GIVING PLUSES. I ALWAYS LOVED TO GET A+
9 WHEN I WAS IN SCHOOL. I DIDN'T THINK ABOUT IT HERE, BUT
10 JOHN REED DID. AND, FOR INSTANCE, UNDER NED SPIEKER IN
11 THAT ONE BLANK SHOULD BE A 4+.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXCELLENT. THANK YOU.

13 DR. LOVE: I WOULD DO THE SAME THING. I HAD
14 GAYLE'S EXACT REACTION TO THE PLUS SYSTEM. I LIKED IT
15 WHEN I OCCASIONALLY GOT ONE, BUT I WASN'T THINKING ABOUT
16 IT HERE. I WOULD ACTUALLY GIVE, AT LEAST FOR ME, A 4+
17 FOR RUSTY DOMS. AND I WOULDN'T BE SURPRISED, IF BOB WERE
18 ON THE PHONE, HE WOULD DO THE SAME THING.

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU.
20 QUITE FRANKLY, THE DIFFICULTY HERE IS THESE WERE
21 EXCEPTIONALLY GOOD FOLKS, ALL OF WHOM HAD DEEP SKILLS,
22 REAL COMMITMENT TO DOING THIS, AND THIS WAS A VERY HARD,
23 VERY HARD ANALYSIS. WE ARE MISSING TWO, THREE SCORES.

24 MS. KING: IN A COUPLE OF CASES, LET ME JUST
25 CLARIFY, IN A COUPLE OF CASES, THE REASON THERE ARE NOT

1 TWO SCORES IS BECAUSE IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE FOR BOTH
2 MEMBERS OF THE INTERVIEW TEAM TO DO THE INTERVIEW, AND
3 THAT'S DEFINITELY THE CASE WITH MR. FRAGER. AND THEN IN
4 THE CASE OF DAVID LICHTENGER AND NED SPIEKER --

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WE GOT THAT ONE JUST NOW.

6 MS. WILSON: I DID ALL FOUR OF THEM TOGETHER.

7 MS. KING: IN OTHER WORDS, YOU'RE PROBABLY --
8 YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET THESE OTHER SCORES.

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THE OTHER MEMBER DIDN'T HAVE
10 A CHANCE TO DO IT. SINCE THOSE ARE 4S, THEY MAKE IT TO
11 THE TOP TIER ANYWAY.

12 DR. POMEROY: I'M STILL STUCK ON PROCESS HERE.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: GOOD.

14 DR. POMEROY: ONE OF MY CONCERNS IS THAT IN
15 ADDITION TO THE GEOGRAPHIC BALANCE THAT GAYLE MENTIONED,
16 THERE'S ALSO SORT OF SKILL BALANCE, AND THIS BECAME CLEAR
17 TO ME AS I WAS INTERVIEWING PEOPLE. I NOTE THAT FOR THE
18 OTHER WORK GROUPS ONE SLATE OF SORT OF FINALISTS WAS
19 RECOMMENDED AND THEN AD HOCS.

20 I WONDER IF WE WERE TO PUT FOUR NAMES FORTH AS
21 SORT OF OUR FIRST CHOICES, IF WE SHOULD BRIEFLY HEAR
22 ABOUT EACH OF THESE 4S AND TRY DO SOME BALANCE. I'LL
23 GIVE YOU ONE EXAMPLE, PUBLIC EXPERIENCE VERSUS PRIVATE
24 EXPERIENCE, CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE VERSUS LEASING
25 EXPERIENCE.

1 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK THAT'S A VERY, VERY
2 GOOD POINT THAT YOU'RE MAKING, CLAIRE. AND I WOULD BE
3 HAPPY TO WALK THROUGH THE EIGHT CANDIDATES WHO ARE AT THE
4 VERY TOP HERE AND TO HEAR WHAT THE UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS
5 ARE THAT WOULD RECOMMEND THESE INDIVIDUALS FOR
6 CONSIDERATION FOR THE TOP TIER. AND I THINK QUESTIONS OF
7 EXPERIENCE, PARTICULAR SKILLS, OR GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION ARE
8 VALID FOR DISCUSSION HERE.

9 CAN WE JUST PROCEED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER THEN?
10 WHAT I'M GOING TO DO IS ASK, AS WE GO THROUGH THIS,
11 PLEASE FEEL FREE TO SPEAK OBVIOUSLY FIRST FOR YOUR
12 EXPERIENCE, IF YOU INTERVIEWED THE INDIVIDUAL, SECOND IF
13 YOU'VE HAD ANY EXPERIENCE OR KNOWLEDGE OF THIS INDIVIDUAL
14 EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE INTERVIEWED HIM OR HER, AND
15 THIRD, ANYTHING THAT YOU READ THAT LEADS YOU TO HAVE
16 CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS. SO COULD WE BEGIN PLEASE WITH
17 MR. DOMS.

18 DR. PRIETO: THIS IS FRANCISCO PRIETO. I DID
19 JUST WANT TO LET YOU KNOW THAT I WAS HERE.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WELCOME. WE'RE VERY PLEASED
21 TO HAVE YOU.

22 DR. PRIETO: I'LL ECHO THAT -- WHEN WE GET TO
23 THE CANDIDATE, I'LL ECHO WHAT CLAIRE SAID, THAT THERE WAS
24 ONE CANDIDATE WHO STOOD OUT BECAUSE OF SORT OF THE
25 UNIQUENESS OF HER EXPERIENCE, AND I'LL BRING THAT UP WHEN

1 WE GET TO HER.

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD. I'M DELIGHTED.
3 AND SHE'S ONLY TWO AWAY, SO WE'RE ALMOST THERE.

4 MR. HARRISON: WE HAVE A QUORUM.

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WE DO HAVE A QUORUM, SO WE
6 CAN NOW REALLY GET SERIOUS.

7 ANY COMMENTS, PLEASE, OF UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS
8 OF MR. DOMS? MR. DOMS IS ONE OF OUR HIGHEST RANKING
9 INDIVIDUALS.

10 DR. LOVE: I'LL KIND OF QUICKLY REVIEW HIM, IF
11 THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT WOULD BE GOOD.

13 DR. LOVE: MR. DOMS AND I -- MR. DOMS WAS
14 INTERVIEWED ACTUALLY BY ME AND BOB TOGETHER. BOTH OF US
15 HAD A CHANCE TO SPEAK WITH HIM. AND JUST SO THE PEOPLE
16 HAVE A PERSPECTIVE ON HIM, HE'S ACTUALLY A GENTLEMAN WHO
17 HAD A VERY SUCCESSFUL CAREER AT BUILDING A PRIVATE REAL
18 ESTATE FIRM, WHICH HE SOLD, PRESUMABLY FOR A CONSIDERABLE
19 AMOUNT. AND SINCE THAT TIME, HE'S ACTUALLY SPENT ALMOST
20 ALL OF HIS TIME GIVING HIS TIME TO PLACES LIKE POMONA,
21 THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, BUILDING BUILDINGS AT POMONA,
22 BUILDING BUILDINGS IN L.A. MORE IN ADVISORY, KIND OF
23 HIGH-LEVEL ROLE. SO I THINK GEOGRAPHICALLY HE'S IN
24 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

25 THE REAL STRENGTH OF THIS GUY IS THAT HE IS

1 REALLY VERY, VERY SHARP, HAS A LOT OF EXPERIENCE AT A
2 HIGH LEVEL THINKING ABOUT CONSTRUCTION, DESIGN, AND
3 ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION OF BUILDINGS FROM VERY SMALL SIZE
4 UP TO A 650-PATIENT -- 650-BED HOSPITAL AT USC.

5 I THINK BOTH BOB AND I WERE EXTREMELY IMPRESSED
6 WITH HIM AND FELT THAT HE'S SOMEONE WHO HAS A LOT OF
7 TIME. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT HE IS PARTICULARLY
8 INTERESTED IN IN TERMS OF STEM CELL RESEARCH, AND HE MADE
9 IT VERY CLEAR THAT HE ACTUALLY FELT THIS GROUP SHOULD
10 MEET MORE FREQUENTLY BECAUSE IN HIS EXPERIENCE IN
11 BUILDING BUILDINGS, YOU REALLY NEED TO STAY ON TOP OF THE
12 PROCESS BEFORE THINGS ARE DONE WHICH ARE IRREPARABLE OR
13 VERY EXPENSIVE TO REPAIR.

14 SO I ACTUALLY DID KIND OF WRITE UP A SUMMARY OF
15 HIM, WHICH IS CONTAINED HERE, THAT LISTS SPECIFIC
16 STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. AGAIN, IF I COULD JUST
17 EMPHASIZE, THE ONLY WEAKNESS OF HIM IS THAT HE HASN'T
18 REALLY BEEN THE OWNER OF BUILDINGS. HE'S REALLY BEEN
19 MORE IN THE SUPERVISORY KIND OF OVERSIGHT ROLE, WHICH IS
20 PROBABLY THE ROLE THAT WE ACTUALLY WANT THIS COMMITTEE TO
21 PLAY TO BEGIN WITH, BUT HE DOES NOT HAVE A LOT OF
22 EXPERIENCE OF BUILDING A BUILDING FROM INSIDE OF A
23 COMPANY, FOR EXAMPLE.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, TED.
25 ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT MR. DOMS FROM ANY OF

1 THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS?

2 MS. WILSON: I WAS THE ONE THAT HAD RECOMMENDED
3 HIM. I DON'T KNOW HIM PERSONALLY, BUT HIS REPUTATION
4 HERE IN LOS ANGELES AS A BUILDER, AS WELL AS JUST A
5 PERSON IS JUST ABSOLUTELY TOPNOTCH. I THINK WE WOULD BE
6 LUCKY TO HAVE HIM.

7 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXCELLENT. CAN WE GO ON
8 PLEASE -- I'M NOT TRYING TO CUT THE DISCUSSION SHORT, BUT
9 I WANT TO MOVE AHEAD. SO WE CAN STOP AND TAKE MORE TIME
10 WITH ANY OF THESE. THERE WILL BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE
11 PUBLIC COMMENT AT THE END WHEN WE FINISH THESE
12 INDIVIDUALS.

13 THE NEXT IS MR. FRAGER. ANY COMMENTS ABOUT
14 MR. JAMES FRAGER, ALSO HIGHLY SCORED?

15 DR. LOVE: I GUESS I'LL GET MY TWO OUT OF THE
16 WAY. I HAD A CHANCE TO INTERVIEW MR. FRAGER.
17 UNFORTUNATELY, BOB WASN'T ABLE TO JOIN IN, SO I WAS THE
18 ONLY ONE FROM THE GROUP WHO HAD A CHANCE TO SPEAK WITH
19 HIM.

20 OBVIOUSLY A MUCH YOUNGER PERSON; BUT AS YOU CAN
21 SEE AS YOU GET A CHANCE TO LOOK AT HIS CV, VERY FAST
22 RISER IN HIS CAREER. HE'S NOW EMPLOYED AT A FIRM WHICH
23 IS A CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT FIRM IN THE SAN DIEGO AREA.
24 I'M BLANKING ON THE NAME.

25 MS. KING: IT'S ACTUALLY HIS OWN COMPANY. IT'S

1 TAYLOR FRAGER.

2 DR. LOVE: RIGHT. ACTUALLY IT DIDN'T START OUT
3 AS HIS OWN COMPANY, WHICH KIND OF SPEAKS TO WHAT I WAS
4 SAYING. HE WAS HIRED THERE AND WITHIN, I THINK, 18
5 MONTHS OF BEING THERE, THEY ACTUALLY PROMOTED HIM TO THE
6 POSITION OF BEING PRESIDENT AND A COOWNER OF THE COMPANY.
7 HE DIDN'T BUILD THE COMPANY. HE CAME TO THE COMPANY, BUT
8 I THINK TESTAMENT AT HOW TALENTED HE IS. HE ROSE TO A
9 POSITION OF NOW BEING A PARTIAL OWNER OF THE COMPANY.

10 THE ONLY THING ABOUT HIM THAT I THINK WOULD MAKE
11 ME RANK HIM A LITTLE BIT LOWER THAN MR. DOMS, QUITE
12 FRANKLY, WHO I WOULD GIVE THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE SCORE TO,
13 WAS THAT I SENSE THAT MR. FRAGER IS PRETTY BUSY. AND
14 BEING HONEST, HE WAS LATE FOR HIS INTERVIEW, AND EVEN AT
15 THE END OF HIS INTERVIEW, IT WAS PRETTY CLEAR THAT HE HAD
16 TO MOVE ON. SO I THINK THAT WOULD BE THE ONLY THING I
17 WOULD SAY. BUT VERY TALENTED, VERY BRIGHT. WE'D BE
18 LUCKY TO HAVE HIM, BUT I DO THINK THAT TIME BALANCE WOULD
19 BE AN ISSUE, AND THAT'S WHY I RANK HIM A LITTLE BIT LOWER
20 THAN MR. DOMS.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IF I COULD JUST ASK YOU A
22 QUESTION, PLEASE. AS I READ YOUR REVIEW, HE HAS HAD
23 EXPERIENCE WITH GMP FACILITIES AND FDA APPROVED
24 FACILITIES, WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT MR. DOMS AND SOME OF
25 THE OTHER CANDIDATES DID NOT HAVE. AM I CORRECT IN THAT?

1 DR. LOVE: YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY CORRECT. BECAUSE
2 HE'S BEEN WORKING FOR THESE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT
3 FIRMS, HE'S WORKED WITH COMPANIES LIKE AMGEN, HE'S WORKED
4 WITH CITIES. HE'S REALLY BEEN INVOLVED IN A VERY BROAD
5 WAY.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SO IN PICKING UP ON THE
7 POINT THAT WAS MADE EARLIER, WE'RE LOOKING FOR SKILL
8 DISTRIBUTION, FOR EXPERIENCE DISTRIBUTION, AND FOR
9 GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION. I JUST WANTED TO POINT THAT
10 OUT. THAT'S AN INTERESTING -- AGAIN, WHETHER HE IS
11 SELECTED TO BE ONE OF THE PRIMARY FOUR, WHETHER HE IS AN
12 AD HOC MEMBER WHO'S AVAILABLE FOR SPECIFIC THINGS, OR
13 WHETHER THE ICOC CHOOSES TO NOT HAVE HIM AT ALL, I JUST
14 THINK THAT WE WANT TO ASSEMBLE THESE SORTS OF
15 INFORMATION.

16 DR. LOVE: THAT'S A GOOD POINT.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK I INTERRUPTED
18 SOMEBODY. PLEASE LET ME ASK YOU TO COMMENT.

19 DR. PRIETO: TED, FRANCISCO PRIETO HERE. JUST A
20 QUESTION ABOUT YOUR COMMENT THAT HE SEEMED VERY BUSY.
21 DID YOU GET THE FEELING THAT HE WAS COMMITTED TO THE
22 ENTERPRISE ENOUGH THAT HE'D BE WILLING TO DEVOTE
23 SUFFICIENT TIME AND ENERGY TO IT?

24 DR. LOVE: WELL, I'M BEING A BIT CRITICAL HERE
25 OBVIOUSLY; BUT WHEN I SCHEDULE AN INTERVIEW WITH

1 SOMEBODY, I GENERALLY AM AVAILABLE AT THE SCHEDULED
2 INTERVIEW, AND HE WASN'T. AND WHEN WE WENT TO CHASE HIM
3 DOWN, HE WASN'T READILY AVAILABLE. WE DID MANAGE TO GET
4 HIM ON THE PHONE THAT DAY; AND WHEN WE GOT HIM ON THE
5 PHONE, HE WAS VERY IMPRESSIVE TO TALK TO. BUT IT WAS
6 PRETTY CLEAR TOWARD THE END OF THE INTERVIEW THAT HE HAD
7 TO GO. AND IT WAS A LITTLE BIT BEFORE I WAS READY TO
8 TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW. BUT THAT'S JUST THAT I SHOULD
9 BE HONEST AND MENTION.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S EXCELLENT.

11 DR. PRIETO: I APPRECIATE THAT. I THINK THERE'S
12 NOTHING WRONG WITH BEING CRITICAL. IT'S INTERESTING YOU
13 MENTION THAT ONE OF OUR FOUR CANDIDATES MADE THE POINT,
14 IF YOU WANT SOMETHING DONE, ASK A BUSY PERSON.

15 DR. LOVE: THAT'S A GOOD POINT.

16 DR. PRIETO: HE WAS A VERY BUSY PERSON, BUT HE
17 DID NOT MAKE US FEEL AS IF WE WERE RUSHING HIM IN ANY
18 WAY. INTERESTING CONTRAST.

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD.

20 MS. WILSON: I BELIEVE THAT JOHN REED
21 RECOMMENDED MR. FRAGER. I DON'T KNOW HIM. I'M JUST
22 SORRY THAT WE DON'T HAVE JOHN TO GIVE HIS IMPRESSION OF
23 HIM BECAUSE HE ACTUALLY KNOWS HIM.

24 DR. LOVE: HE MENTIONED THAT JOHN HAD NOMINATED
25 HIM. THEY'RE BOTH IN THE YOUNG PRESIDENTS ORGANIZATION

1 IN SAN DIEGO.

2 DR. PRIETO: ONE QUESTION I HAVE. I WONDER, YOU
3 MADE THE COMMENT IN YOUR EVALUATION, I PRESUME THIS IS
4 WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT, THAT A LIMITED HISTORY OF
5 COMMUNITY AND CIVIC INTEREST. AND I JUST WONDER IF YOU
6 GOT THE FEELING AT ALL THAT PERHAPS HE SAW THIS AS A
7 NETWORKING OPPORTUNITY NOTCH ON THE RESUME, SO TO SPEAK,
8 RATHER THAN AN OPPORTUNITY TO SIT DOWN AND GET SOME WORK
9 DONE.

10 DR. LOVE: WAS THAT TO ME?

11 DR. PRIETO: YES, TED.

12 DR. LOVE: WELL, I MEAN I DID WONDER ABOUT THAT,
13 BUT I DIDN'T HAVE ANY CONVERSATION DIRECTLY ALONG THOSE
14 LINES. AND I THINK THAT'S THE KIND OF THING, AS GAYLE
15 SAID, IT'D BE NICE TO GET JOHN'S PERSPECTIVE IF JOHN
16 ACTUALLY KNOWS HIM.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WELL, WE HAVE THE GOOD
18 FORTUNE OF HAVING ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY FOR A COMPLETE
19 DISCUSSION OF THIS. AND I THINK I'LL ASK MELISSA TO
20 PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT DR. REED IS PREPARED TO SPEAK TO
21 THIS AT THE ICOC MEETING SO THAT WE WILL HAVE THE BENEFIT
22 OF HIS PERSONAL EXPERIENCE.

23 MS. WILSON: I'LL POINT OUT THAT HE IS THE ONLY
24 ONE ON THIS LIST FROM THE SAN DIEGO AREA. I SEE HE'S THE
25 ONLY ONE THAT HAS WORKED ON GMP AND FDA APPROVED

1 FACILITIES. THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY PUT HIM UP IN THE
2 TOP FOUR, BUT I THINK HE'D BE A REAL ASSET TO HAVE
3 WORKING FOR US.

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK YOU MAKE A VERY GOOD
5 POINT, GAYLE.

6 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I APOLOGIZE. I
7 WAS IN MEETINGS WITH A STATE SENATOR ABOUT THE ORTIZ
8 LEGISLATION.

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, BOB. WELCOME.
10 WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF DISCUSSING THESE CANDIDATES. AND
11 WE'RE JUST UP TO -- IF THERE'S NO FURTHER DISCUSSION
12 ABOUT MR. FRAGER, I'M LOOKING FORWARD VERY MUCH TO
13 HEARING THE DISCUSSION OF MS. HYSEN, PLEASE.

14 DR. POMEROY: FRANCISCO AND I HAD A GREAT TALK
15 WITH HER. VERY IMPRESSIVE PERSON. STARTED OFF WITH A
16 LONG HISTORY IN PRIVATE REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT AND THEN
17 MOVED INTO STATE SERVICE. AND SHE WAS THE ONLY ONE WE
18 TALKED TO WHO HAD A LOT OF HISTORY WORKING WITH STATE
19 GOVERNMENT. SHE'S CURRENTLY THE ACTING CHIEF DEPUTY
20 DIRECTOR OF DGS. AND I THOUGHT THAT BROUGHT A REALLY
21 IMPORTANT PERSPECTIVE.

22 SHE HAS DONE A LOT OF BUILD VERSUS LEASE
23 DECISION, AND WE SPENT SOME TIME TALKING ABOUT
24 PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING AND INCENTIVES. AND SHE
25 SPECIFICALLY WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR OVERSEEING THE BUILDING

1 OF THE RICHMOND LABORATORY BUILDING FOR HEALTH SERVICES.
2 SO, YOU KNOW, WHERE THEY DO THE SMALLPOX VACCINE
3 RESEARCH. SO SHE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH ANIMAL FACILITIES,
4 PERIMETER SECURITY, THOSE TYPES OF THINGS.

5 SO I THOUGHT IT WAS REALLY A GREAT MIX OF PUBLIC
6 AND PRIVATE EXPERIENCE. THE ONLY QUESTION WAS THAT SHE
7 WAS INTERVIEWING FOR A COUPLE OF POSITIONS. MELISSA, I
8 DON'T KNOW IF YOU WERE ABLE TO FIND OUT WHAT HER CURRENT
9 POSITION IS GOING TO BE. ONE OF THEM WAS IN A LEADERSHIP
10 ROLE WITH THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

11 MS. KING: RIGHT. I STILL HAVE NOT HEARD BACK
12 FROM HER OR BEEN ABLE TO GET AHOLD OF HER. IT MAY BE
13 BECAUSE SHE'S IN SOME KIND OF TRANSITION PERIOD. I
14 APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. I'VE BEEN TRYING TO GET AHOLD OF HER
15 FOR A COUPLE WEEKS NOW. STILL TRYING.

16 DR. POMEROY: SHE WAS JUST AMAZINGLY IMPRESSIVE,
17 COMMITTED, AND BROUGHT A REMARKABLE SPECTRUM OF
18 EXPERIENCE.

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, CLAIRE. THAT'S
20 VERY HELPFUL.

21 DR. PRIETO: I REALLY HAD THE SAME SORT OF
22 IMPRESSION FROM MS. HYSEN. SHE'S REALLY ONE OF TWO OUT
23 OF OUR FOUR WHO I THOUGHT STOOD OUT BECAUSE SHE HAD VERY
24 UNIQUE EXPERIENCE AND AN EXCELLENT GRASP OF THE INTERFACE
25 BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FROM A POINT OF VIEW THAT OUR

1 OTHER CANDIDATES COULD NOT REALLY ADDRESS. I WOULD
2 ABSOLUTELY PUT HER AT THE TOP OF MY LIST. I THINK THAT
3 HER UNIQUENESS WOULD MAKE HER A UNIQUE ASSET FOR US. SO
4 I REALLY, IF SHE IS AVAILABLE, WOULD WANT TO SEE HER AS
5 PART OF THE WORKING GROUP.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, FRANCISCO. IT'S
7 ALSO NOTED THAT SHE HAS PERSONAL INTEREST IN STEM CELLS,
8 HAS PERSONAL FAMILY EXPERIENCE WITH DIABETES. AND BOTH
9 REVIEWERS COMMENTED ON THE PASSION THAT SHE SEEMS TO
10 BRING TO THIS.

11 ARE THERE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT
12 HAVE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS, PLEASE, ABOUT MS. HYSEN?

13 DR. LOVE: JUST KIND OF PICKING UP ON SOME OF
14 THE POINTS THAT WERE MADE, I WAS TRYING TO KEEP A LIST OF
15 GEOGRAPHY, GMP, THOSE KINDS OF THINGS. WHERE IS SHE
16 GEOGRAPHICALLY?

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SHE'S IN SACRAMENTO, I
18 BELIEVE.

19 DR. PRIETO: I'M NOT SURE WHERE SHE'S FROM
20 ORIGINALLY. I BELIEVE SHE TOLD US, BUT I DIDN'T INCLUDE
21 THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: DOESN'T MATTER.

23 DR. PRIETO: SHE DOES HAVE STATEWIDE EXPERIENCE,
24 WHICH I THOUGHT WAS VERY VALUABLE.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: TED, YOU AND I ARE MAKING

1 THE SAME KIND OF CHART OBVIOUSLY AS WE GO THROUGH THIS.
2 EXCELLENT. ANY OTHER COMMENTS, PLEASE, ABOUT MS. HYSEN?

3 I THEN WOULD SUGGEST, PLEASE, THAT WE MOVE TO
4 MR. KASHIAN. AND IF I COULD HAVE EITHER OF THE REVIEWERS
5 COMMENT, PLEASE, ON MR. KASHIAN.

6 MS. WILSON: GAYLE WILSON. JOHN REED AND I
7 INTERVIEWED HIM. MR. KASHIAN IS SORT OF A FIXTURE IN THE
8 FRESNO AND THE VALLEY AREA, HAS BEEN A VERY SUCCESSFUL
9 REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER, VERY INVOLVED IN THE CREATION OF
10 UC MERCED. I BELIEVE HE SAID HE WAS ON THE FOUNDING
11 GROUP TO BRING A UC CAMPUS TO THE VALLEY.

12 HE'S BEEN A VISIONARY. HE SAID HE FEELS VERY
13 QUALIFIED TO REVIEW FACILITIES GRANTS, AND PARTICULARLY
14 THE FINANCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSALS. HE'S VERY
15 FAMILIAR WITH ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS AND HAS WON
16 CALIFORNIA AND NATIONAL AWARDS FOR CREATING GREEN
17 BUILDINGS. HE SAID HIS EXPERIENCE WITH PERMITTING IS
18 EXTENSIVE. HE HAS VERY CREATIVE IDEAS OF WAYS TO SAVE
19 TIME AND MONEY FOR THE STATE. YOU KNOW, I THINK HE MAY
20 NOT HAVE BEEN THE TOP OF THE FOUR THAT WE INTERVIEWED,
21 BUT THE FACT THAT HE CAME FROM THE VALLEY, I FELT, WAS A
22 REAL PLUS.

23 MR. KLEIN: HE'S ON THE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL
24 BOARD, THE LARGEST PUBLIC HOSPITAL IN SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY.
25 SO HE HAS BEEN -- HE'S BEEN INVOLVED DURING THE PERIOD

1 THAT THEY EXPANDED TO INCLUDE THE UNIVERSITY OF
2 CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO TEACHING FACILITIES THERE AS A
3 PART OF THE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL. THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I
4 DIDN'T INTERVIEW HIM, BUT I KNOW WHO HE IS.

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: HE ALSO HAS EXTENSIVE
6 FINANCING EXPERIENCE, IT SAYS. THANK YOU. OTHER
7 COMMENTS, PLEASE, ABOUT MR. KASHIAN?

8 MR. KLEIN: IS HE A REGENT?

9 MS. WILSON: NO. HE SAID SOMETHING ABOUT BEING
10 A TRUSTEE AT UC MERCED. I THINK EACH OF THE UC CAMPUSES
11 HAS A GROUP THAT ARE NOT REGENTS, BUT THEY DO WORK FOR
12 THAT PARTICULAR CAMPUS.

13 MR. KLEIN: THAT MAKES SENSE. THAT WOULD BE
14 PROBABLY WHAT IT IS.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD. OKAY. CAN WE
16 MOVE TO MR. STUART LAFF, PLEASE.

17 DR. POMEROY: FRANCISCO AND I INTERVIEWED
18 MR. LAFF. HE WAS VERY IMPRESSIVE, LONG HISTORY OF WORK
19 IN REAL ESTATE, AND MORE RECENTLY CONSULTATION REGARDING
20 SORT OF FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF REAL ESTATE OPPORTUNITIES.

21 HE'S MANAGED BUILDINGS. HE'S DONE JOINT
22 VENTURES FOR EDUCATION BOND MEASURES, AND I THOUGHT THAT
23 BROUGHT SOME, PERHAPS, HOPEFULLY PERTINENT EXPERIENCE.
24 AND HE'S DONE GENERAL MANAGEMENT OF BUILDING PROJECTS FOR
25 L.A. COMMUNITY COLLEGES, BOND ISSUE IN THE L.A. SCHOOL

1 DISTRICT, AS WELL AS PRIVATE.

2 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT REALLY IMPRESSED ME WAS
3 HIS EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL
4 VOLUNTEERISM. HE IS ON THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE
5 FOUNDATION, BOARD MEMBER OF A CHARTER SCHOOL
6 ORGANIZATION. HE'S INVOLVED WITH THE L.A. BUSINESS
7 COUNCIL. AND HE'S VERY COMMITTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE. HAS
8 GOOD EXPERIENCE DEALING WITH THE MEDIA, ESPECIALLY ABOUT
9 BOND ISSUES, GOOD SPECIFICS. HE WAS JUST VERY IMPRESSIVE
10 WITH A BROAD BACKGROUND.

11 DR. PRIETO: AGAIN, I THINK CLAIRE AND I AGREED
12 ON ALL FOUR OF OUR INTERVIEWS, AND THIS WAS A VERY STRONG
13 CANDIDATE. EXPERIENCE IN BANKING, EXPERIENCE IN
14 ACCOUNTING, COMMUNITY SERVICE, AND VERY ACCOMPLISHED
15 INDIVIDUAL. ANOTHER ONE WHO I WOULD HATE TO LOSE.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: VERY GOOD. OTHER PEOPLE ON
17 THE COMMITTEE WHO KNOW THIS INDIVIDUAL OR WHO HAVE
18 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS ABOUT MR. LAFF, PLEASE?

19 MS. KING: I JUST WANTED, ESPECIALLY GAYLE
20 WILSON, TO KNOW THAT THIS PERSON ACTUALLY CAME IN THROUGH
21 ANOTHER ONE OF YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS, GAYLE. A GENTLEMAN
22 THAT YOU HAD RECOMMENDED TO US FROM AE COM. AND HE PUT
23 FORTH MR. LAFF AS WHAT HE THOUGHT A BETTER CANDIDATE, AND
24 THE GENTLEMAN I'M SPEAKING ABOUT IS RAY HOLDSWORTH AT AE
25 COM. THE COMPANY THAT MR. LAFF WORKS FOR IS A WHOLLY

1 OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF AE COM, AND THEY WORK TOGETHER. LIKE
2 I SAID, MR. HOLDSWORTH, WHILE INTERESTED HIMSELF, PUT
3 MR. LAFF AS WHAT HE THOUGHT WAS A BETTER CANDIDATE FOR
4 THIS WORKING GROUP. JUST THOUGHT EVERYONE SHOULD KNOW
5 THAT.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. LET'S PROCEED,
7 THEN, TO MR. LICHTENGER. REVIEWERS -- I'M SORRY. LET ME
8 JUST POINT OUT THAT I BELIEVE MR. LAFF IS FROM THE LOS
9 ANGELES AREA, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN. MR. LICHTENGER IS
10 FROM THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AREA, I BELIEVE SANTA CLARA.
11 ANY OF THE REVIEWERS COMMENTS, PLEASE, ABOUT
12 MR. LICHTENGER.

13 MS. WILSON: JOHN REED AND I BOTH INTERVIEWED
14 HIM. WE BOTH HAD POSITIVE FEELINGS ABOUT HIM, AND WE'D
15 PROBABLY GIVE HIM A 4+.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY.

17 MS. WILSON: HE'S HAD 20 YEARS REAL ESTATE
18 EXPERIENCE, DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION, ALL IN
19 CALIFORNIA. HE'S A FAIRLY RECENT IMMIGRANT TO
20 CALIFORNIA. MOST OF HIS EXPERIENCE HAS BEEN IN NEW YORK.
21 HIS COMPANY IN CALIFORNIA IS SOMETHING CALLED INTEGRITY
22 OFFICE SOLUTIONS. WHAT THEY DO, THEY PROVIDE TURNKEY
23 OPERATION TO ALL KINDS OF BUSINESS. THEY FIND OUT WHAT
24 THE BUSINESS NEEDS, AND THEY CONSTRUCT IT. THEY DO
25 EVERYTHING DOWN TO THE FURNITURE.

1 MR. KLEIN: GAYLE, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I DIDN'T
2 INTERVIEW HIM, BUT I MET HIM PREVIOUSLY. AND MY
3 RECOLLECTION WAS THAT IN NEW YORK HE BUILT LOTS OF BIG
4 MEDICAL FACILITIES, HOSPITALS, RESEARCH CENTERS; IS THAT
5 RIGHT?

6 MS. WILSON: I THINK I REMEMBER HE SAID ABOUT 10
7 TO 15 PERCENT OF HIS BUSINESS WAS THAT.

8 MR. KLEIN: RIGHT. BUT THEY WERE -- I ACTUALLY
9 TALKED TO HIM DURING THE CAMPAIGN BECAUSE I WAS
10 INTERESTED IN INFORMATION ON MEDICAL BUILDINGS. HE
11 SEEMED TO HAVE LOTS OF INFORMATION ON THE TECHNICAL
12 ASPECTS OF DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, AND CONSTRUCTION.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S VERY USEFUL.

14 MS. WILSON: HIS STATED EXPERTISE IS KEEPING THE
15 CAPITAL COSTS DOWN. I THINK HE WOULD BE VERY CREATIVE AT
16 ANY KIND OF RENOVATION AND SAVING MONEY IN RENOVATION AND
17 REDUCING THE COST. HE SAID HE'S A REAL ESTATE BROKER.
18 HE HAS ALSO CALLED BACK, I BELIEVE CALLED THE CIRM
19 STATING HOW REALLY INTERESTED HE IS, HOW MUCH HE IS
20 INTERESTED IN GETTING INVOLVED. HIS SON IS NOW EIGHT.
21 AT THE AGE OF TWO DEVELOPED A RARE FORM OF EYE CANCER.
22 AND BECAUSE OF THAT, HE AND HIS WIFE HAVE FOUNDED A
23 CANCER RESEARCH FOUNDATION.

24 SO FOR ALL HIS REAL ESTATE EXPERTISE, HE BRINGS
25 THE EXTRA PASSION THAT I THINK JOHN AND I -- IT REALLY

1 RESONATED WITH BOTH OF US.

2 MR. KLEIN: THE RESUME SAID HE'S DONE MISSION
3 CRITICAL DATA CENTERS, BIOTECH, AND ENGINEERING LABS,
4 CLEAN ROOMS, MEDICAL FACILITIES, OFFICE AND
5 MANUFACTURING. BUT VERY, VERY DEEP TECHNICAL
6 CONSTRUCTION KNOWLEDGE OF THE KIND OF FACILITIES WE'RE
7 TALKING ABOUT.

8 MS. KING: THIS IS MELISSA. JUST TO BACK UP
9 WHAT GAYLE WILSON SAID, HE DOES ACTUALLY CALL IN PROBABLY
10 ONCE A WEEK TO GET AN UPDATE ON HOW EVERYTHING IS GOING
11 WITH THE CIRM AND TO LET ME KNOW HE'S SO INTERESTED AND
12 NOT PRESSURING THE SUBCOMMITTEE, BUT JUST WANTS TO MAKE
13 SURE HE KNOWS THE TIMING. AND SO HE'S VERY INTERESTED IN
14 BOTH THE SUCCESS OF THE CIRM AND POTENTIALLY SERVING ON
15 THIS WORKING GROUP.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. OTHER COMMENTS,
17 PLEASE, ABOUT MR. LICHTENGER? CAN WE MOVE, THEN, PLEASE,
18 TO MR. MOCK.

19 DR. POMEROY: WE REALLY LIKED MR. MOCK WHEN WE
20 INTERVIEWED HIM. LONG HISTORY OF REAL ESTATE EXPERIENCE,
21 PORTFOLIO ASSET MANAGEMENT AND REAL ESTATE CONSULTATION.
22 HE WAS ORIGINALLY APPROACHED BY BOB ABOUT THE SITE
23 HEADQUARTERS, AND HAS KIND OF STAYED IN TOUCH WITH THE
24 INITIATIVE SINCE THEN. HE'S DONE A LOT OF TI
25 NEGOTIATIONS. HE'S CURRENTLY SORT OF MANAGING THE

1 PORTFOLIO FOR A COUPLE OF MAJOR COMPANIES. LOT OF
2 EXPERIENCE WITH ARCHITECTURE AND BUDGETING PROCESS, LEASE
3 NEGOTIATIONS, TI'S, AND CONTRACTS.

4 HE EMPHASIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF FUNCTIONAL
5 BUILDINGS AND NOT WASTING MONEY ON TAJ MAHALS. HE ALSO
6 POINTED OUT THAT HIS TIME IS REALLY HIS OWN, AND THAT HE
7 WAS WILLING TO TAKE THE TIME THAT WAS NEEDED TO GIVE
8 REALLY CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO THE APPLICATIONS, WHICH
9 WASN'T SOMETHING WE HEARD FROM EVERYBODY.

10 WE RATED HIM JUST BELOW THE OTHER TWO CANDIDATES
11 THAT I'VE TALKED ABOUT JUST BECAUSE HIS EXPERIENCE DIDN'T
12 SEEM AS DIRECTLY APPLICABLE TO SORT OF THE BIOTECH WORLD.
13 ALTHOUGH HE HAD DONE WORK WITH PLACES LIKE GENENTECH AND
14 STUFF.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: RIGHT.

16 DR. PRIETO: I THINK HE'S ALSO DONE WORK FOR
17 UCSF, BUT AGAIN NOT SPECIFICALLY WITH BIOTECH. BUT HE
18 CERTAINLY PRESENTED VERY WELL, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS. I'D
19 HAVE NO HESITATION HAVING HIM ON THE WORKING GROUP.

20 MR. KLEIN: DR. PRIETO, JUST HE DOESN'T HAVE
21 ANY -- MAYBE YOU JUST ALREADY SAID THIS WHEN I WAS JUST
22 REREADING A PART OF THIS DOCUMENT. BUT HE DOESN'T HAVE
23 THE SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE OF MEDICAL FACILITIES OR
24 HOSPITAL FACILITIES, DOES HE?

25 DR. PRIETO: NO, I DON'T BELIEVE SO. HE HAS A

1 LOT OF OTHER EXPERIENCE IN BUILDING MANAGEMENT AND ASSET
2 MANAGEMENT AND, YOU KNOW, HAD -- WAS ABLE TO TALK
3 INTELLIGENTLY ABOUT IT, BUT ADMITTED HE DIDN'T HAVE SOME
4 OF THOSE DIRECT PERSONAL EXPERIENCES.

5 DR. POMEROY: I THINK THAT WAS PRECISELY WHY WE
6 PUT HIM, OF THE FOUR, THIRD ON OUR LIST, EVEN THOUGH HE
7 WAS INCREDIBLY DEDICATED AND ARTICULATE.

8 DR. PRIETO: HE SEEMED LIKE SOMEBODY WHO'S VERY
9 BRIGHT AND ABLE TO GRASP RELEVANT ISSUES VERY QUICKLY,
10 BUT I WOULD HAVE TO PUT HIM A NOTCH BELOW SOMEONE LIKE
11 STUART LAFF.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. OTHER COMMENTS,
13 PLEASE, ABOUT MR. MOCK? LET'S GO, THEN, TO MR. SPIEKER,
14 THE LAST CANDIDATE THAT WE'RE DISCUSSING HERE.

15 MR. KLEIN: I THINK YOU SKIPPED STUART SHIFF.

16 DR. POMEROY: DELIBERATELY.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WHAT WE'RE DOING IS
18 CONCENTRATING ON THE TOP EIGHT SCORING INDIVIDUALS.

19 MR. KLEIN: I SEE. OKAY.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: AND ALL ELEVEN WILL BE
21 PRESENTED TO THE ICOC WITH INFORMATION AND THE
22 OPPORTUNITY FOR THE ICOC TO REVISIT THIS. BUT WHAT WE
23 WERE GOING TO TRY AND DO, BOB, IS TO, IF WE CAN, SELECT
24 THE TOP EIGHT. AND IF WE HAVE SOME CLEAR PREFERENCES
25 WITHIN THAT TOP EIGHT, TO HELP DIRECT THE ICOC TO THAT

1 FOR THEIR DISCUSSION.

2 MR. KLEIN: WELL, IF IT HELPS, I RECOMMENDED
3 SHIFF, BUT HE DOESN'T HAVE THE MEDICAL EXPERTISE THAT
4 SOME OF THESE OTHER PEOPLE HAVE, SO I THINK THAT, FROM
5 EVERYTHING THAT I KNOW, HE DOESN'T -- THE RATING SEEMS
6 CORRECT.

7 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OBVIOUSLY HE'S A VERY
8 SKILLED AND VERY GOOD PERSON, BUT THIS IS ONLY THE BEST
9 OF THE BEST, AND SO THAT'S THE PROBLEM.

10 MR. KLEIN: I'M JUST BEING TOTALLY SUPPORTIVE OF
11 THE RATING SYSTEM.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. MR. SPIEKER,
13 PLEASE.

14 MS. WILSON: JOHN REED AND I INTERVIEWED HIM.
15 HE'S THE FIRST PERSON WE INTERVIEWED. WE THOUGHT, WELL,
16 WE JUST CAN'T GET ANY BETTER THAN NED SPIEKER. JOHN REED
17 DID NOMINATE HIM, JUST SO YOU KNOW. HE CAN SPEAK BETTER
18 ON HIM THAN I CAN.

19 NED SPIEKER SAID HE'S HAD 35 YEARS OF
20 EXPERIENCE. HE IS NOW THE PRESIDENT AND CEO OF SPIEKER
21 PROPERTIES. DEMONSTRATED LEADERSHIP AS WELL AS
22 COMMUNICATION SKILLS, PART OF THE SCORING THAT WE LOOKED
23 AT RELEVANT TO WHAT WE NEED ON THE FACILITIES WORKING
24 GROUP. BOB KLEIN, DO YOU KNOW HIM?

25 MR. KLEIN: I KNOW ABOUT HIM. LET ME ASK YOU.

1 WHO DID YOU INTERVIEW BESIDES HIM?

2 MS. WILSON: WE INTERVIEWED ED KASHIAN, DAVE
3 LICHTENGER, AND STUART SHIFF.

4 MR. KLEIN: WELL, HE'S GOT A FABULOUS
5 REPUTATION. THE ISSUE IS THAT THESE OTHER PEOPLE THAT
6 YOU MENTIONED, KASHIAN AND LICHTENGER, THEY HAVE THE
7 SPECIALIZED EXPERTISE IS THE ONLY WAY I DIFFERENTIATE
8 THEM.

9 MS. WILSON: LET ME JUST SAY THIS. I DID NOT
10 PUT NED SPIEKER ON MY TOP LIST OF FOUR ONLY BECAUSE -- I
11 MEAN I THINK HE COULD BE TERRIFIC FOR US, BUT NOT
12 SOMETHING HE WAS REALLY SEEKING; WHEREAS, DAVID
13 LICHTENGER JUST -- NED SPIEKER, I KNOW, WOULD DO A GREAT
14 JOB FOR US, BUT HE SAYS I GOT OTHER THINGS I'M DOING.

15 MR. KLEIN: WELL, THAT'S A PRETTY GOOD
16 INDICATION.

17 DR. PRIETO: CAN I ASK A QUESTION, I GUESS, TO
18 GAYLE THEN. WOULD YOU HAZARD A RANKING OF THE CANDIDATES
19 YOU INTERVIEWED?

20 MS. WILSON: YEAH. I WOULD. I WOULD HAVE
21 STUART SHIFF AS NO. 4, DAVID LICHTENGER AND NED -- DAVID
22 LICHTENGER NO. 1, NED SPIEKER NO. 2, AND THE ONLY REASON
23 I PUT ED KASHIAN NO. 3, I WOULD DEFINITELY WANT HIM UP
24 THERE IN THE TOP, BUT HE'S FROM THE VALLEY. SO I WOULD
25 PUT DAVID LICHTENGER NO. 1.

1 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY.

2 DR. PRIETO: THANK YOU.

3 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. YOU KNOW,
4 ACTUALLY THAT'S A REALLY INTERESTING WAY OF THINKING
5 ABOUT THIS THAT YOU JUST SUGGESTED. GAYLE, YOU SHARED
6 WITH US WHO YOUR NO. 1 PERSON IS. I WONDER IF I COULD
7 JUST GO AROUND TO THE VARIOUS SITES AND ASK FOR YOUR NO.
8 1 CANDIDATE, IF YOU COULD, PLEASE.

9 AND, GAYLE, YOU GAVE MR. LICHTENGER. IF I COULD
10 ASK, FRANCISCO, COULD YOU PLEASE SHARE WITH US WHO YOUR
11 NO. 1 CANDIDATE THAT YOU INTERVIEWED?

12 DR. PRIETO: DEBORAH HYSEN.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. MAY I ASK,
14 CLAIRE, FOR YOUR NO. 1?

15 DR. POMEROY: HYSEN.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. MAY I ASK TED
17 FOR YOURS?

18 DR. LOVE: MR. DOMS.

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: MR. DOMS. THANK YOU.
20 MR. KLEIN, MAY I ASK FOR YOURS?

21 MR. KLEIN: MR. DOMS.

22 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY.

23 MR. KLEIN: IT'S AMAZING HOW CONSISTENTLY WE SEE
24 THESE THINGS.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: NO. WELL, IT'S VERY

1 INTERESTING TO ME BECAUSE I'VE LISTED PEOPLE WHO I
2 THOUGHT WERE AT THE VERY TOP, AND THE PEOPLE IN MY VERY
3 TOP ARE MR. DOMS, MS. HYSEN, AND MR. LICHTENGER. SO I
4 GUESS I WAS PERSUADED BY YOUR REVIEWS. THAT'S NOT TO
5 FORESHADOW A VOTE OR ANYTHING. I APPRECIATE THIS.

6 WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS WHILE WE DIGEST THIS
7 INFORMATION, I WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A
8 PERIOD OF PUBLIC COMMENT. AND SO IF -- AND THEN WE'LL
9 PROCEED TO A PROCEDURAL ISSUE AND TRY AND VOTE ON WHO WE
10 CONSIDER TO BE -- WE'LL DIVIDE THE QUESTION UP. DO WE
11 WISH TO GO FORWARD WITH ALL EIGHT OF THESE INDIVIDUALS?
12 THAT WILL BE THE FIRST QUESTION. AND THE SECOND QUESTION
13 WILL BE DO WE HAVE ANY DIFFERENTIATION OR GRADIENT? I
14 DON'T WANT TO PICK ONE, TWO, THREE, AND FOUR. I DON'T
15 THINK THAT'S NECESSARY. WHAT I WOULD ONLY SUGGEST IS
16 WHETHER WE WANT TO HAVE A TOP GROUP OF FOUR OR FIVE AND
17 THEN ANOTHER VERY CLOSE FOLLOW-ON GROUP OF FOUR OR THREE,
18 OR HOW WE WISH TO DO THAT.

19 SO WHILE WE'RE THINKING ABOUT THAT, I WONDER IF
20 I COULD BEGIN BY ASKING IF THE PUBLIC HAS ANY COMMENTS.
21 AND I'D LIKE TO BEGIN IN SACRAMENTO, IF I MAY, PLEASE.

22 DR. POMEROY: NONE.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: MAY I ASK AT STANFORD IF
24 THERE ARE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS, PLEASE?

25 MR. REED: YEAH. THIS IS DON REED. I KNOW

1 NOTHING ABOUT THE EXPERTISE OR THE AREA. I WOULD JUST
2 SAY IF IT'S A VERY CLOSE CALL BETWEEN PEOPLE, I THINK IT
3 WOULD BE GOOD TO HAVE THE PERSON THAT REALLY WANTS IT,
4 THAT FEELS THE MOST DRAWN TO IT BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO BE
5 A DIFFICULT JOB.

6 ALSO, WE DID NOT HAVE A GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT
7 AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SESSION LIKE WE USUALLY DO, AND I
8 HOPE THAT THERE WILL BE ONE LATER ON BECAUSE I HAVE AN
9 UNRELATED ITEM TO BRING UP.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IT'S A VERY GOOD POINT. I
11 APOLOGIZE TO YOU FOR THAT. THAT'S MY FAULT ENTIRELY.
12 AFTER THIS PIECE OF BUSINESS, I WILL ABSOLUTELY PROVIDE
13 AN OPPORTUNITY FOR GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT. I THANK YOU
14 FOR BRINGING IT TO OUR ATTENTION. YOUR POINT --

15 I DID, I'M JUST TOLD. I'M THE PERSON THAT WE
16 NEED STEM CELLS FOR BECAUSE MY MEMORY IS FAILING. BUT
17 I'M GLAD THAT MELISSA WAS HERE TO KEEP TRACK OF THINGS.
18 IT DOESN'T MATTER WHETHER I ASKED FOR IT. WE'LL GIVE YOU
19 ANOTHER CHANCE BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A SHAM. WE REALLY ARE
20 INTERESTED IN THE PUBLIC COMMENT, SO WE WILL TAKE THE
21 TIME TO DO THAT.

22 AT UCLA, GAYLE, ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS
23 THERE, PLEASE?

24 MS. WILSON: THERE IS NOT.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THEN WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO

1 REQUEST, PLEASE, IS A MOTION FROM ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF
2 OUR WORKING GROUP TO PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU WISH TO
3 ACCEPT THE SLATE OF EIGHT GOING FORWARD, AND THEN I WILL
4 ENTERTAIN A SECOND MOTION ABOUT HOW YOU WISH TO
5 CHARACTERIZE OR GRADE -- HAVE SOME WITHIN THIS RANKING
6 GRADED. ANY MOTION, PLEASE?

7 MS. WILSON: I SO MOVE THAT WE PUT FORTH THESE
8 EIGHT PEOPLE, BUT I'M INTERESTED IN THE SECOND MOTION
9 MORE.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I KNOW. ME TOO.

11 MR. KLEIN: SECOND.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: DO WE NEED A ROLL CALL VOTE,
13 MR. HARRISON?

14 MR. HARRISON: YOU DO.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THEN MAY I CALL FOR A --
16 MELISSA WILL CALL FOR A ROLL CALL.

17 DR. PRIETO: BEFORE WE DO THAT, ARE THE EIGHT
18 THAT WE'RE PUTTING FORWARD THOSE WHO WERE RANKED FOUR?

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: LET ME REPEAT. YES. AND
20 THANK YOU, FRANCISCO. THESE ARE ALL THE PEOPLE WHO ARE
21 RANKED FOUR OR BETTER. IT CONSISTS OF MR. DOMS, FRAGER,
22 MS. HYSEN, MR. KASHIAN, LAFF, LICHTENGER, MOCK, AND
23 SPIEKER.

24 DR. PRIETO: SO THE MOTION IS THAT WE PUT THESE
25 FORWARD AS ALL CAPABLE AND RECOMMENDED CANDIDATES?

1 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S CORRECT. AND FOR
2 FULL CONSIDERATION BY THE ICOC, IF THEY WISH TO PICK AND
3 CHOOSE A DIFFERENT GROUP THAN THAT, WE MAY IN OUR SECOND
4 MOTION, BUT WE'RE NOT THERE YET.

5 DR. PRIETO: OKAY. THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I WILL VOTE YES.

7 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

8 MR. KLEIN: YES.

9 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

10 DR. LOVE: YES.

11 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

12 DR. POMEROY: YES.

13 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

14 DR. PRIETO: YES.

15 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT. GAYLE WILSON.

16 MS. WILSON: YES.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. THAT PASSES.

18 NOW, I WILL BE VERY HAPPY TO HEAR DISCUSSION AND
19 ENTERTAIN A SECOND MOTION CONCERNING WHETHER WE WISH TO
20 OR HOW WE WISH TO MAKE THIS A MORE DIGESTIBLE
21 PRESENTATION TO THE ICOC.

22 DR. POMEROY: I'LL PUT FORTH A MOTION JUST FOR
23 DISCUSSION.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU.

25 DR. POMEROY: THAT WE RECOMMEND MR. DOMS,

1 MS. HYSEN, MR. LAFF, AND MR. LICHTENGER AS THE FOUR
2 APPOINTEES, WITH MR. KASHIAN AS THE FIRST ALTERNATE, AND
3 THE REMAINING THREE AS AD HOC MEMBERS/ALTERNATE MEMBERS.

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S A VERY CLEAR
5 PROPOSAL. IS THERE A SECOND FOR THAT? AND THEN WE'LL
6 HAVE DISCUSSION.

7 DR. PRIETO: I'LL SECOND.

8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. THAT WAS
9 FRANCISCO? THANK YOU. ANY DISCUSSION, PLEASE, ABOUT
10 THIS?

11 MR. KLEIN: BETWEEN MR. LAFF AND MR. KASHIAN,
12 HOW -- CLAIRE, WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE DISTINGUISHING
13 CHARACTERISTICS?

14 DR. POMEROY: VERY FEW. AND I'M OPEN TO A
15 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE ORDER.

16 MR. KLEIN: WELL, I WOULD -- I HAVE TO LOOK BACK
17 SINCE I DIDN'T INTERVIEW MR. LAFF. DID HE HAVE MAJOR
18 MEDICAL FACILITY EXPERIENCE?

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: HIS DISTINGUISHING FEATURES,
20 MR. KLEIN, ARE A DEEP COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC
21 SERVICE, A LONG EXPERIENCE -- FINANCIAL AND BANKING
22 EXPERIENCE. THOSE ARE THE --

23 DR. POMEROY: AND BONDS.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. THANK YOU.

25 DR. POMEROY: PROJECTS THAT WERE SPONSORED BY

1 BONDS.

2 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD SUGGEST THAT MR. KASHIAN HAS
3 MAJOR EXPERIENCE IN ACQUIRING FOR THE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL,
4 THE DEFAULTED FRESNO COUNTY PUBLIC HOSPITAL FACILITY, AND
5 DEVELOPING IN CONJUNCTION WITH UC SAN FRANCISCO A
6 TEACHING FACILITY AS PART OF THE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, AND
7 AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE MAJOR HOSPITAL FOR YEARS
8 THAT DOUBLED OR MORE IN SIZE, THAT THAT SPECIFIC RELEVANT
9 EXPERIENCE MIGHT JUSTIFY REVERSING THE RANKING AND MAKING
10 MR. KASHIAN NO. 4 AND MR. LAFF THE FIRST ALTERNATE.

11 DR. POMEROY: I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ACCEPT THAT AS
12 A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: MAY I, AS A POINT OF
14 INFORMATION, JUST MENTION THAT THERE'S A VERY NICE
15 BALANCE, CLAIRE, THAT YOU'VE GIVEN TO THIS SLATE.
16 MR. DOMS IS FROM THE LOS ANGELES AREA, MS. HYSEN FROM THE
17 SACRAMENTO AREA, MR. KASHIAN FROM THE CENTRAL VALLEY,
18 MR. LICHTENGER FROM NORTHERN CALIFORNIA. MR. LAFF IS
19 FROM THE LOS ANGELES AREA. SO THERE'S BOTH A
20 DISTRIBUTION OF SKILLS AND GEOGRAPHY.

21 AND NOW I JUST WOULD INVITE FURTHER DISCUSSION,
22 PLEASE.

23 MS. WILSON: DO WE NEED AN ALTERNATE? IS THAT
24 SORT OF THE WAY WE WANT TO HAVE THIS STRUCTURED, OR
25 SHOULD WE JUST PUT FORTH THE OTHER FOUR AS AN AD HOC

1 GROUP THAT WE COULD USE AND CALL ON?

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S A PERFECTLY FAIR
3 QUESTION. ANOTHER COMPROMISE THAT COULD BE PUT FORWARD
4 IS SIMPLY TO PICK FIVE TOP PEOPLE AND HAVE THREE OTHERS,
5 AND LET THIS -- BECAUSE, IN FACT, THIS WILL BE SORTED OUT
6 AT THE ICOC DISCUSSION. AND THE FINENESS OF AN ALTERNATE
7 OR SO FORTH, WE COULD SIMPLY SAY THAT THESE ARE THE TOP
8 FIVE, AND THAT THE OTHER THREE ARE SUPERB, BUT FOR
9 EXPERIENCE OR TIME OR OTHER REASONS ARE NOT IN OUR VERY
10 MOST SELECT GROUP.

11 DR. LOVE: I WOULD ENCOURAGE US TO AT LEAST
12 THINK -- I HAVE A FEELING THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO GET
13 THE FOUR. AND JUST KNOWING THAT THE FIVE -- OF THE WHOLE
14 COMMITTEE, AND IF I WEREN'T ON THIS COMMITTEE, I WOULD
15 PROBABLY WANT THIS COMMITTEE, IF POSSIBLE, TO TRY TO
16 NARROW IT TO FOUR RATHER THAN GIVE US FIVE AND LEAVE IT
17 UP TO US.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: TED, WE APPRECIATE YOUR
19 COURAGE. THANK YOU. THAT'S A GOOD POINT.

20 DR. LOVE: IT'S EASIER TO BE COURAGEOUS WHEN
21 YOU'RE NOT THE CHAIRMAN.

22 MR. KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, I THINK WE GOT TO FOUR
23 WITH A FIRST ALTERNATE. I WOULD WONDER IF CLAIRE WOULD
24 ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION OF FOUR PLUS MAKING ALL THE
25 OTHERS ALTERNATES?

1 DR. POMEROY: YES. WITH THE FOUR BEING DOMS,
2 HYSEN, KASHIAN, AND LICHTENGER?

3 MR. KLEIN: YES.

4 DR. POMEROY: THE ONE REASON I WAS GOING FOR A
5 FIRST ALTERNATE WAS THIS REMAINING QUESTION OF WHETHER
6 DEBORAH HYSEN'S EMPLOYMENT IS GOING TO ALLOW HER TO
7 SERVE. I THINK WE MIGHT BE DEALING WITH HAVING THE
8 POSSIBILITY OF HAVING TO REPLACE ONE OF THESE CANDIDATES
9 EARLY ON.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK THAT'S A VERY GOOD
11 POINT YOU'RE MAKING, CLAIRE. THAT'S A VERY GOOD POINT.

12 DR. PRIETO: I THINK WE HAVE SOMETHING LIKE THIS
13 IN THE WORKING GROUPS THAT WERE NAMED AT THE ICOC MEETING
14 WHERE THE SUBCOMMITTEE BROUGHT FORWARD THE SLATE WITH THE
15 NUMBER OF MEMBERS THAT IS ALLOWED WITHIN THE INITIATIVE
16 AND ALTERNATES, AND ALTERNATES WERE SET AS A SEPARATE
17 CATEGORY FROM AD HOC. AND I THINK THAT THERE IS A USEFUL
18 DISTINCTION THERE. I'D AGREE WITH TED, THAT I THINK WE
19 SHOULD TRY TO COME UP WITH A FINAL RECOMMENDATION THAT'S
20 WITHIN THOSE NUMERICAL LIMITS, AND JUST PUT THAT UP
21 BEFORE THE ICOC.

22 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXCELLENT.

23 MS. WILSON: THEN HAVE ALL THE OTHER FOUR BE
24 ALTERNATES SO THAT THEY WOULD HAVE A POOL TO DRAW FROM.

25 DR. PRIETO: ACTUALLY WHAT I'M SUGGESTING IS

1 THAT WE DO ALONG THE STRUCTURE OF CLAIRE'S FIRST
2 PROPOSAL, FOUR MEMBERS AND A FIRST ALTERNATE, AND THE
3 REST AD HOC OR ALTERNATE. I DON'T KNOW IF THE
4 TERMINOLOGY IS THAT CRITICAL.

5 MR. KLEIN: BY DESIGNATING THE REST AS
6 ALTERNATES, THEN IF THERE'S ANOTHER VACANCY THAT OCCURS,
7 THEY CAN DRAW FROM IT IMMEDIATELY.

8 DR. PRIETO: THAT'S A GOOD POINT.

9 DR. POMEROY: THAT'S AN ADVANTAGE.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXACTLY. GOOD. ANY OTHER
11 DISCUSSION, PLEASE? WE'VE HAD A MOTION AND A SECOND.
12 I'LL JUST RESTATE THE MOTION JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DO
13 THIS PROCEDURALLY AS CLEARLY AS POSSIBLE. MR. DOMS, MS.
14 HYSEN, MR. KASHIAN, AND MR. LICHTENGER ARE THE TOP SLATE.
15 MR. LAFF IS THE FIRST ALTERNATE. THE OTHER THREE
16 INDIVIDUALS, MR. FRAGER, MR. MOCK, MR. SPIEKER, ARE
17 CONSIDERED ALTERNATES AND THOROUGHLY ACCEPTABLE AS WELL
18 SHOULD ONE OF THE OTHERS NOT BE ABLE TO SERVE. IS THAT A
19 FAIR STATEMENT?

20 DR. LOVE: RIGHT. YES.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: GOOD. LET'S CALL THE ROLE,
22 IF WE MAY, PLEASE. I WOULD VOTE YES.

23 MR. HARRISON: DR. FRIEDMAN, DO YOU WANT TO TAKE
24 ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M SORRY. YOU'RE QUITE

1 CORRECT. THANK YOU. THANK YOU. THANK YOU.
2 PUBLIC COMMENT PLEASE, FIRST FROM SACRAMENTO.
3 DR. POMEROY: NONE. THANK YOU.
4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THEN FROM UCLA, PLEASE.
5 MS. WILSON: NO ONE HERE.
6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: FROM STANFORD, PLEASE.
7 DR. LOVE: NONE HERE.
8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THERE'S NO ONE HERE AT CITY
9 OF HOPE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. HARRISON, FOR POINTING
10 THAT OUT.
11 WE'LL PROCEED TO A VOTE, PLEASE. AND I WILL
12 BEGIN BY VOTING YES.
13 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
14 MR. KLEIN: YES.
15 MS. KING: TED LOVE.
16 DR. LOVE: YES.
17 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
18 DR. POMEROY: YES.
19 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
20 DR. PRIETO: YES.
21 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT. GAYLE WILSON.
22 MS. WILSON: YES.
23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. I WOULD LIKE TO
24 CONDUCT ONE OTHER PIECE OF BUSINESS, TO GO BACK TO NO. 3
25 FOR A MOMENT, THAT WE DIDN'T VOTE ON A PROCEDURAL VOTE,

1 WHICH IS TO RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC AS THE PATIENT ADVOCATE
2 MEMBERS OF THIS FACILITIES WORKING GROUP THE FOLLOWING
3 INDIVIDUALS. WE HAD THE DISCUSSION, AND WE HAD AN
4 OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AT THAT TIME. I CERTAINLY
5 WOULD ENTERTAIN MORE DISCUSSION IF THAT'S NECESSARY NOW,
6 BUT THE FIVE INDIVIDUALS THAT WE ARE RECOMMENDING ARE
7 MS. LANSING, MS. SAMUELSON, MR. SEWELL, MR. SHEEHY, AND
8 DR. WRIGHT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE NEEDS TO BE
9 YET ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL APPOINTED EITHER FROM OUR
10 CURRENTLY EXISTING PATIENT ADVOCATES OR FROM
11 MR. BUSTAMONTE'S SELECTION OF A NEW ADVOCATE.

12 I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION FOR THAT
13 SLATE OF PATIENT ADVOCATES GOING FORWARD TO THE NEXT ICOC
14 MEETING.

15 DR. LOVE: SO MOVED.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SECOND, PLEASE.

17 MS. WILSON: SECOND.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, GAYLE. ANY
19 DISCUSSION, PLEASE, FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS?

20 DR. PRIETO: DR. FRIEDMAN, DO WE ALSO NEED TO
21 RECOMMEND CHAIRS OR CO-CHAIRS?

22 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WELL, THAT'S NO. 5.

23 DR. PRIETO: I'M SO SORRY.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: FRANCISCO, THANK YOU BECAUSE
25 I'M USUALLY ACCUSED OF BEING THE PERSON WHO IS RACING

1 AHEAD. AND I'M SO GLAD TO HAVE SOMEBODY ELSE JUST TO
2 TAKE THE HEAT OFF OF ME. THANK YOU. THANK YOU. THANK
3 YOU. NO, YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. WE NEED TO DISCUSS
4 THAT. YOU'RE AHEAD OF THE CURVE.

5 AND I PRESUME THAT WE NEED A ROLL CALL VOTE --
6 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FROM PALO ALTO.

7 DR. LOVE: NONE.

8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SACRAMENTO.

9 DR. POMEROY: NONE.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: UCLA. NONE. LET'S GO AHEAD
11 WITH A VOTE, PLEASE THEN. I WOULD VOTE YES FOR THIS
12 SLATE.

13 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

14 MR. KLEIN: YES.

15 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

16 DR. LOVE: YES.

17 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

18 DR. POMEROY: YES.

19 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

20 DR. PRIETO: YES.

21 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT. GAYLE WILSON.

22 MS. WILSON: YES.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, GAYLE. MUST HAVE
24 BEEN MUTED OR SOMETHING. THANK YOU. THAT'S QUITE
25 COMPLETE.

1 NOW, I SAID JUST A MOMENT AGO THAT I WANTED TO
2 PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO MAKE ANY GENERAL
3 COMMENTS, AND I DO WANT TO TAKE THAT OPPORTUNITY NOW
4 BEFORE WE GO TO ITEM NO. 5, WHICH WILL BE CONSIDERATION
5 OF CANDIDATES TO SERVE AS CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR OF THE
6 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. SO WE CAN TAKE A STEP BACK
7 FROM THAT ITEM OF BUSINESS, PLEASE, AND INVITE ANY PUBLIC
8 COMMENT. I BELIEVE WAS THAT INDIVIDUAL IN SACRAMENTO?

9 I'M SORRY, DON. PLEASE MAKE YOUR COMMENTS, AND
10 I APOLOGIZE.

11 MR. REED: IF I MISSED MY EARLIER SPOT, I
12 APOLOGIZE. YOU'RE RUNNING A BEAUTIFULLY ORGANIZED
13 MEETING.

14 I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE ORTIZ LEGISLATION,
15 AND I WOULD INVITE EVERYBODY THAT CAN POSSIBLY COME UP.
16 THERE'S A MEETING THIS THURSDAY AT 1 O'CLOCK, ROOM 4302
17 IN SACRAMENTO. THERE WAS A MEETING JUST A COUPLE DAYS
18 AGO WHICH WAS VERY -- SHE IS A VERY POWERFUL PERSON, AND
19 IT'S JUST BEING RAILROADED THROUGH VERY FAST. SO IF
20 ANYBODY HAS ANY FEELINGS ON THE RESTRICTIONS THAT WILL BE
21 IMPOSED ON THIS THROUGH A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, IT
22 WOULD BE A VERY GOOD THING TO GET UP THERE AND HELP.

23 MR. KLEIN: DON, ON MONDAY IT'S ON THE AGENDA AS
24 AN AGENDIZED ITEM BECAUSE OF ITS CRITICAL IMPORTANCE.

25 MR. REED: IS THAT IN PLACE OF THURSDAY OR IN

1 ADDITION TO?

2 DR. LOVE: OUR MEETING.

3 MR. KLEIN: IN ADDITION TO THURSDAY.

4 MR. REED: THE SACRAMENTO ONE IS THURSDAY OR
5 MONDAY?

6 MR. KLEIN: THURSDAY IS SACRAMENTO. MONDAY IS
7 OUR BOARD MEETING THAT IT'S AGENDIZED AS A CRITICAL
8 DISCUSSION ITEM.

9 MR. REED: OKAY. THEN I AM HAPPY TO BE PROVEN
10 IRRELEVANT AS I OFTEN AM.

11 MR. KLEIN: ALWAYS APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENTS.

12 DR. LOVE: YOU'RE NEVER IRRELEVANT. YOU JUST
13 JUMPED THE GUN. THAT'S ALL.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ARE
15 THERE ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS? OKAY.

16 MELISSA REMINDS ME THAT WE HAVE -- JUST GOING
17 BACK TO ITEM NO. 4 FOR A MOMENT, WE HAD SAID EARLIER THAT
18 THE OTHER THREE INDIVIDUALS IN ADDITION TO THE EIGHT THAT
19 WERE SENT FORWARD AS OUR PRIMARY AND OUR ALTERNATES, THAT
20 THE OTHER THREE INDIVIDUALS WERE VERY TALENTED AND THEIR
21 NAMES WOULD GO FORWARD FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES AS
22 WELL, MR. ARCHIBALD, MR. D'ELIA, AND MR. SHIFF.

23 I PRESUME THAT STILL IS ACCEPTABLE. AND THESE
24 COULD SERVE AS AD HOC MEMBERS. IF WE NEED TO ACTUALLY
25 FORMALLY CONSIDER AND VOTE ON THAT, I'D LIKE TO MAKE SURE

1 THAT WE DON'T LET THAT SLIP THROUGH.

2 MR. KLEIN: HAVING THEM GO FORWARD AS AD HOC
3 MEMBERS WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA. SO I WOULD MAKE THE MOTION
4 FOR THEM TO BE AD HOC MEMBERS.

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, MR. KLEIN. IS
6 THERE A SECOND TO THAT MOTION?

7 DR. LOVE: SECOND.

8 DR. POMEROY: I KNOW THAT MR. ARCHIBALD ACTUALLY
9 HAD A LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TIME COMMITMENT AND
10 MAYBE SOME MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT EXACTLY WHAT THE ROLE
11 INVOLVED. SO I MIGHT JUST AMEND THAT TO SAY IF THEY'RE
12 CONTACTED BY STAFF AND AGREE THAT THEIR INTEREST WOULD
13 REMAIN.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK THAT'S A FAIR WAY TO
15 SAY IT, CLAIRE. ANOTHER WAY TO SAY IT WOULD BE TO SAY
16 THAT THESE WOULD BE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE AS AD HOC
17 MEMBERS. AND SHOULD THEY CHOOSE NOT TO, OBVIOUSLY WE
18 UNDERSTAND THAT THESE ARE VERY, VERY BUSY PEOPLE.

19 MR. KLEIN: WELL, I WILL TAKE THAT AS FRIENDLY
20 AMENDMENT.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU.

22 MS. WILSON: I HOPE THEY ALL WILL BE CONTACTED
23 BECAUSE THEY'VE BEEN PUT IN THE PROCESS HERE.

24 MS. KING: ABSOLUTELY. THIS IS MELISSA. I'VE
25 ACTUALLY BEEN IN CONTACT WITH ALL OF THE CANDIDATES

1 BEYOND THESE ELEVEN, ALL 25. AND I WILL CLOSE THE LOOP
2 CERTAINLY WITH ALL ELEVEN THAT YOU'VE BEEN DISCUSSING
3 TODAY.

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: AND THAT'S A VERY GOOD POINT
5 THAT'S BEING MADE. LET'S FIRST VOTE ON THIS, AND THEN
6 WE'LL TALK ABOUT A COUPLE OF OTHER THINGS.

7 IS THERE ANY MORE DISCUSSION THAT PEOPLE WOULD
8 LIKE TO HAVE ABOUT THESE THREE BEING OFFERED THE
9 OPPORTUNITY TO BE AD HOCS? SACRAMENTO?

10 DR. PRIETO: JUST A QUESTION. CAN WE HAVE IT
11 RESTATED BEFORE WE VOTE?

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: CERTAINLY. MY UNDERSTANDING
13 OF THE MOTION IS THAT THREE INDIVIDUALS, MR. ARCHIBALD,
14 MR. D'ELIA, AND MR. SHIFF, WOULD BE INVITED TO BE AD HOC
15 MEMBERS IF THE ICOC APPROVES THAT. AND THAT'S MY
16 UNDERSTANDING OF THE MOTION.

17 DR. PRIETO: THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: ANY DISCUSSION AT STANFORD?
19 OR AT UCLA?

20 MS. WILSON: NO.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: ANY PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE?

22 DR. LOVE: NONE HERE.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THEN WHAT I WOULD -- WE HAVE
24 TO HAVE ANOTHER ROLL CALL, SO I WILL VOTE YES, PLEASE.

25 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

1 MR. KLEIN: YES.

2 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

3 DR. LOVE: YES.

4 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

5 DR. POMEROY: YES.

6 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

7 DR. PRIETO: YES.

8 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT. GAYLE WILSON.

9 MS. WILSON: YES.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU.

11 IF I COULD RECOMMEND, PLEASE, THAT A FORMAL

12 LETTER OF APPRECIATION BE DRAFTED BY THE STAFF. AND,

13 MR. KLEIN, IF I COULD ASK THAT EITHER YOU SIGN IT OR

14 SOMEBODY SIGN IT IN YOUR STEAD, THANKING THESE

15 INDIVIDUALS FOR THEIR APPLICATION, INFORMING WHO'S GOING

16 FORWARD. I'M SURE YOU WILL FIND THE RIGHT WORDS FOR IT.

17 MR. KLEIN: I CERTAINLY WILL. AND I WOULD POINT

18 OUT THAT PEOPLE LIKE STUART SHIFF AND NED SPIEKER ARE

19 FABULOUS. THEY'RE THE BEST IN THE WORLD IN OFFICE

20 BUILDINGS. THEY CAN BE GREAT AD HOC SPECIALISTS, AND I'M

21 SURE THE OTHER PEOPLE HAVE THE SAME QUALITY.

22 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IT'S A REALLY DEEP

23 APPRECIATION FOR THEM GOING THROUGH THIS PROCESS. YOU

24 KNOW -- I LEAVE THE PHRASING OF IT TO YOU AND THE STAFF,

25 BUT JUST OUR SUBCOMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION THAT EVERYBODY

1 BE FORMALLY THANKED FOR PARTICIPATING.

2 MS. KING: WE'VE DONE THAT. KATE SHREVE HAS
3 DONE THAT WITH THE OTHER TWO WORKING GROUPS, AND I'LL
4 WORK WITH KATE AND BOB ON THIS.

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. EXCELLENT.

6 DR. LOVE: MICHAEL, I WAS JUST GOING TO ADD TO
7 THAT. I THINK IT ACTUALLY REQUIRES GREAT COURAGE OF
8 PEOPLE TO APPLY FOR THESE KIND OF POSITIONS AND PUT
9 THEMSELVES UP FOR REVIEW IN A PUBLIC FORUM LIKE THIS. SO
10 I REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE BEND OVER BACKWARDS TO
11 THANK EVERYBODY WHO APPLIES FOR THIS. LET THEM KNOW THAT
12 WE THINK THEY WERE ALL TERRIFIC PEOPLE, TERRIFIC
13 CANDIDATES, AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THEM IN
14 ONE CAPACITY OR ANOTHER. I REALLY WANT TO MAKE THAT WE
15 EMPHASIZE THE POSITIVE NOTE TO EVERY PERSON WHOSE NAME
16 WAS UNDER REVIEW TODAY.

17 MR. KLEIN: TED, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I THINK
18 THAT IT WOULD PROBABLY BE APPROPRIATE, WITH THE SUPPORT
19 OF THE COMMITTEE, TO ADD THAT EVERY ONE OF THESE IS
20 OUTSTANDING IN THEIR REAL ESTATE KNOWLEDGE, BUT WE WERE
21 LOOKING FOR SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE. AND THAT'S WHAT IS
22 GUIDING THE SELECTION WE'RE MAKING.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK THOSE ARE JUST
24 SUPERB POINTS, AND THE STAFF IS OBVIOUSLY CAPTURING THAT.
25 SO GOOD. THANK YOU.

1 IF WE COULD PROCEED, PLEASE, TO NO. 5, WHICH IS
2 CONSIDERATION OF CANDIDATES TO SERVE AS CHAIR AND VICE
3 CHAIR. MELISSA, COULD I ASK YOU OR MR. HARRISON TO STATE
4 ANY SORT OF BINDING RULES THAT DICTATE OR LIMIT THIS.

5 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE, DR. FRIEDMAN, THAT THE
6 ONLY BINDING RULES, AS DETERMINED BY THE ICOC AT THE LAST
7 MEETING, ARE THAT THE CHAIRS WILL SERVE AN INITIAL TERM
8 OF ONE YEAR.

9 DR. LOVE: BUT IT COULD BE RENEWABLE.

10 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

11 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THE CHAIR -- MELISSA,
12 PLEASE.

13 MS. KING: THE ONE THING THAT I WAS GOING TO
14 BRING UP, AND I'M SORRY I DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE TO DO THAT
15 EARLIER WITH YOU, DR. FRIEDMAN, IS THAT, LIKE WE'VE DONE
16 WITH THE OTHER WORKING GROUPS, FOR EXAMPLE, THE GRANTS
17 WORKING GROUP, HAVING A SCIENTIST SERVE AS THE CHAIR AND
18 A PATIENT ADVOCATE SERVE AS THE VICE CHAIR OR CO-CHAIR IN
19 THE CASE OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP. I'M JUST
20 THINKING OUT LOUD. A SIMILAR STRUCTURE HERE WOULD
21 PROBABLY BE GOOD, PROBABLY ONE OF THE REAL ESTATE
22 CANDIDATES AS THE CHAIR BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE SPECIALIZED
23 KNOWLEDGE ON FACILITIES, AND A PATIENT ADVOCATE AS
24 POTENTIALLY A VICE CHAIR OR CO-CHAIR. I'M NOT
25 RECOMMENDING THAT. I'M JUST THINKING OUT LOUD TO HELP

1 THE DISCUSSION.

2 DR. LOVE: MELISSA, THE ONLY OTHER THING I MIGHT
3 ADD IS I THINK SOMEBODY WHO REALLY HAS THE TIME. I WOULD
4 IMAGINE THAT BEING THE CHAIR WILL REQUIRE A LITTLE BIT
5 MORE TIME. SOMEBODY WHO HAS THE TIME TO PUT INTO THAT
6 SPECIAL ROLE IS KIND OF THE WAY I WAS THINKING ABOUT IT.

7 MS. WILSON: I'D LIKE TO NOMINATE RUSTY DOMS AS
8 THE CHAIRMAN.

9 DR. LOVE: I WAS GOING TO DO THE EXACT SAME
10 THING, SO I'LL SECOND THAT.

11 MS. WILSON: I GOT AHEAD OF YOU.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK THAT IT'S A LITTLE
13 BIT HARD TO -- I'M -- I HAVE A QUESTION, AND I COULD USE
14 THE COMMITTEE'S ADVICE ON THIS. IT'S A LITTLE BIT HARD
15 WHEN WE HAVEN'T ASKED MR. DOMS IF HE WOULD AGREE TO SERVE
16 IN THAT CAPACITY, NOR CAN WE EVEN ASSURE HIM THAT THE
17 ICOC WILL SELECT HIM IN THAT CAPACITY. SO WE CAN
18 CERTAINLY EXPRESS A PREFERENCE. AND, TED, I HAVE TO SAY
19 MR. DOMS SOUNDS LIKE A -- WOULD BE MY FIRST CHOICE GIVEN
20 HIS EXPERIENCE AND FREE TIME AND SO FORTH. BUT I GUESS I
21 COULD USE SOME ADVICE FROM THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABOUT
22 HOW FAR WE GO WITH THIS RIGHT NOW SINCE WE DON'T EVEN
23 HAVE A SLATE SELECTED. IT SEEMS --

24 MR. KLEIN: WELL, THE OTHER COMMITTEES DID COME
25 WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR.

1 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M CERTAINLY HAPPY TO DO
2 THAT.

3 DR. POMEROY: DR. FRIEDMAN, IF I RECALL IN THE
4 GRANTS GROUP, THE PERSON WHO WAS SELECTED TO BE PUT FORTH
5 AS A POSSIBLE CHAIR WAS CONTACTED AND ASKED, IF THEY WERE
6 APPROVED BY THE ICOC, WOULD THEY BE WILLING TO HAVE THEIR
7 NAME GO FORTH AS CHAIR. AND MAYBE WE COULD DO SOMETHING
8 LIKE THAT.

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
10 SUGGESTION, CLAIRE. IS THERE ANYONE WHO WOULD BE OPPOSED
11 TO THAT? WE WOULD THEN TASK MELISSA OR OTHERS TO PLEASE
12 REACH OUT TO WHOEVER WE ULTIMATELY CHOOSE, AND WE HAVEN'T
13 GOTTEN TO THAT POINT YET, TO ASK WHETHER THAT INDIVIDUAL
14 WOULD BE WILLING TO SERVE IN THAT CAPACITY.

15 DR. PRIETO: JUST LOOKING OVER THE CANDIDATE
16 EVALUATIONS HERE, I'D SAY THAT ANY OF OUR TOP FOUR OR
17 REALLY THE TOP FIVE HAVE LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE. SO I
18 THINK WE'D BE HARD-PRESSED TO GO WRONG.

19 DR. LOVE: I AGREE WITH THAT.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY
21 RIGHT. JUST AS WE DID BEFORE, IN ORDER TO JUST MAKE IT
22 EASY FOR THE ICOC, I THINK I WOULD ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO
23 SAY WHO THE FIRST PERSON WE'D REACH OUT TO. AND IF
24 ANYONE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THAT MOTION, I'D BE HAPPY TO
25 ENTERTAIN IT.

1 DR. LOVE: I WILL BE HAPPY TO MOVE THAT WE
2 PROCEED TO CONTACT MR. DOMS, ASK HIM IF HE'D BE WILLING
3 TO SERVE AS THE INTERIM CHAIRMAN.

4 MR. KLEIN: AND IF HE WOULD, TO THEN RECOMMEND
5 HIM AS THE PREFERENCE?

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: CORRECT. IS THERE A SECOND,
7 PLEASE?

8 MR. KLEIN: I'LL SECOND IT.

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, MR. KLEIN. ANY
10 DISCUSSION, PLEASE, FROM THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN UCLA?
11 GAYLE, DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS?

12 MS. WILSON: I'M ALL FOR HIM.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SACRAMENTO.

14 DR. PRIETO: I THINK I CAN SUPPORT THAT.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: PALO ALTO, PLEASE.

16 DR. LOVE: NO COMMENT.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC
18 COMMENTS, PLEASE, AT ANY OF THE SITES? AND RATHER THAN
19 JUST READ THROUGH THE NAMES, WHAT I WOULD ASK YOU TO DO
20 IS I WILL GIVE A MOMENT OF SILENCE, AND PLEASE SOMEONE
21 SPEAK UP BECAUSE I'M SURE YOU'RE TIRED OF HEARING ME
22 MONOTONOUSLY REPEAT THE THREE CITIES OVER AND OVER AGAIN.
23 I APOLOGIZE. IS THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON OFFERING
24 MR. DOMS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE AS THE CHAIR?

25 DR. LOVE: PALO ALTO REFUSES TO COMMENT UNTIL

1 YOU SAY PALO ALTO.

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I AM SUITABLY REBUKED. IS
3 THERE ANYONE AT PALO ALTO? GOOD. I'M JUST GLAD THAT
4 CLAIRE HASN'T CHASTISED ME FOR NOT SAYING DAVIS INSTEAD
5 OF SACRAMENTO BECAUSE I REALIZE THE ERROR OF MY WAYS.
6 AND I'M SURE THAT GAYLE IS GOING TO SAY WHY DON'T YOU SAY
7 WESTWOOD, BUT THAT'S OKAY. I'M LEARNING ON THE JOB. SO
8 WE'LL CONTINUE TO TRY AND MAKE PROGRESS IN A REGULAR
9 FASHION.

10 IF THERE IS -- SERIOUSLY, IF THERE IS NO PUBLIC
11 COMMENT, I'D LIKE TO, I GUESS, ASK FOR A VOTE, PLEASE.
12 I'D LIKE TO VOTE YES IN FAVOR OF OFFERING MR. DOMS THE
13 OPPORTUNITY. AND IF HE AGREES, TO THEN PUT HIS NAME
14 FORWARD AS THE CHAIR.

15 MR. KLEIN: KNOWING THAT I'M SECOND, THIS IS BOB
16 KLEIN, I VOTE YES.

17 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

18 DR. LOVE: YES.

19 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

20 DR. POMEROY: YES.

21 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

22 DR. PRIETO: YES.

23 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

24 MS. WILSON: YES.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU.

1 NOW, THAT'S HALF THE BATTLE. THE OTHER HALF, OF
2 COURSE, IS THE POSSIBLE VICE CHAIR. I LIKE VERY MUCH THE
3 SUGGESTION OF AN ADVOCATE TO SERVE IN THAT CAPACITY. AND
4 I WILL ENTERTAIN ANY SUGGESTIONS ABOUT HOW YOU'D LIKE TO
5 PROCEED. THE ONLY THING THAT I WOULD SAY IS WE CAN'T
6 PICK THE PLAYER TO BE NAMED AS THE VICE CHAIR.

7 DR. POMEROY: THE UNKNOWN.

8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IT'S LIKE EVERY OTHER SPORTS
9 DEAL. THE PLAYER TO BE NAMED IS THE MOST CRITICAL
10 PERSON.

11 DR. POMEROY: CAN YOU REMIND US? THE GRANTS
12 WORK COMMITTEE, WAS SHERRY THE VICE CHAIR OF THE GRANTS?

13 MS. KING: CORRECT. AND STANDARDS, I BELIEVE.
14 KATE SHREVE; IS THAT CORRECT?

15 MS. SHREVE: JOAN SAMUELSON.

16 DR. LOVE: JOAN IS GRANTS.

17 DR. POMEROY: JOAN IS GRANTS.

18 MR. KLEIN: SHERRY IS STANDARDS.

19 DR. POMEROY: SHERRY IS STANDARDS, SO IT MIGHT
20 BE GOOD TO LOOK AT THE OTHER PEOPLE.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
22 SUGGESTION. IF I MAY REMIND YOU, IT'S DAVID
23 SERRANO-SEWELL, JEFF SHEEHY, JANET WRIGHT. THOSE ARE THE
24 OTHER THREE NAMES.

25 MR. KLEIN: WELL, DAVID IS -- WELL, I'M JUST

1 TRYING TO FIGURE IT OUT HERE. I WAS GOING TO SAY THAT IN
2 THE NEXT 45 DAYS, DAVID IS VERY DEEPLY INTO THE
3 LEGISLATION, BUT THAT'S GOING TO PASS OVER BEFORE THIS
4 BECOMES REAL ACTIVE. SO DAVID HAS THE LEGAL TRAINING,
5 WHICH MIGHT BE VERY HELPFUL ON THE REAL ESTATE SIDE.

6 DR. PRIETO: THIS IS FRANCISCO PRIETO. I WAS
7 THINKING ALONG THE SAME LINES, THAT I THINK DAVID, HAVING
8 THE LEGAL SKILLS, WOULD BE VERY VALUABLE IN THIS
9 POSITION.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: DO I HEAR A MOTION FOR
11 INVITING MR. SERRANO-SEWELL TO SERVE AS THE VICE CHAIR,
12 ASSUMING THAT HIS PARTICIPATION WILL BE APPROVED BY THE
13 ICOC BECAUSE HE'S ALREADY ON THE ICOC? AND IS THAT A
14 MOTION THAT I'M HEARING?

15 DR. PRIETO: I'LL SO MOVE, YES.

16 MS. WILSON: SECOND.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: ANY DISCUSSION, PLEASE, BY
18 THE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS? ANY DISCUSSION, PLEASE, BY
19 THE PUBLIC? I'D LIKE TO THEN ASK FOR A VOTE, AND
20 WE'RE -- MELISSA IS GETTING READY TO RECORD THE VOTES, SO
21 I VOTE YES.

22 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

23 MR. KLEIN: YES.

24 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

25 DR. LOVE: YES.

1 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
2 DR. POMEROY: YES.
3 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
4 DR. PRIETO: YES.
5 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT. GAYLE WILSON.
6 MS. WILSON: YES.
7 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. VERY EFFICIENTLY
8 DONE.
9 THIS BRINGS US, THEN, TO THE SIXTH ITEM ON THE
10 AGENDA. AND THIS IS A DISCUSSION OF SOMETHING THAT
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN DISCUSSED AT THE LAST GENERAL ICOC BOARD
12 MEETING AND SOMETHING THAT WE WANTED TO SPEND SOME TIME
13 DISCUSSING HERE.
14 PERHAPS THE MOST EFFICIENT WAY TO PROCEED WOULD
15 BE, MR. KLEIN, IF I COULD ASK YOU, AND I'M GOING TO LIMIT
16 YOUR REMARKS TO THREE MINUTES, MR. KLEIN, WHETHER YOU'D
17 LIKE TO MAKE ANY BACKGROUND OR INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.
18 YOU'VE THOUGHT ABOUT THIS A GREAT DEAL AND HAVE CERTAINLY
19 DISCUSSED IT WITH A NUMBER OF THE ICOC MEMBERS, AND I
20 KNOW YOU'VE THOUGHT ABOUT THIS A LOT. COULD YOU PLEASE
21 SHARE WITH THIS GROUP AT THIS MOMENT WHAT YOUR LATEST
22 THOUGHTS ARE AND DIRECTIONS THAT YOU WOULD BE INTERESTED
23 IN SEEING US PROCEED WITH OUR DISCUSSIONS.
24 MR. KLEIN: WELL, TO SUMMARIZE, AT THE LAST
25 BOARD MEETING, DR. FRIEDMAN, HOPEFULLY WITH YOUR APPROVAL

1 BASED ON OUR PRIOR DISCUSSION, I PROPOSED TO THE BOARD
2 THAT IN ORDER TO LEARN ENOUGH TO INTELLIGENTLY HAVE
3 COMPETITIONS FOR FACILITIES, GIVEN THAT FACILITY TYPES
4 WERE VERY DIFFERENT, AND THERE MAY BE UNIQUE
5 OPPORTUNITIES IN THE STATE THAT WE'RE NOT AWARE OF, THAT
6 WE PUT TOGETHER A REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF INTENT FOR
7 INSTITUTIONS AROUND THE STATE, AND ONLY NONPROFIT
8 INSTITUTIONS QUALIFY UNDER THE INITIATIVE, WHO WOULD BE
9 WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN CASE STUDIES TO PROPOSE
10 SPECIFIC FACILITIES. MIGHT BE A REHAB FACILITY, MIGHT BE
11 CONVERSION OF USE, MIGHT BE NEW CONSTRUCTION, MIGHT BE A
12 FACILITY CONNECTED TO A CENTER OF EXCELLENCE, SUCH THAT
13 WE COULD, THROUGH THE WORKING GROUP, IDENTIFY, FIRST OF
14 ALL, INVENTORY OF ALL THE DIFFERENT IDEAS IN THE STATE,
15 SEE WHERE THE OPPORTUNITIES WERE, AND SELECT, THEN,
16 HOPEFULLY AT THE JUNE MEETING, VARIOUS CASE STUDIES THAT
17 WE COULD MOVE FORWARD WITH BECAUSE WE FOUND THAT IN THE
18 CASE OF THE COMPETITION FOR THE HEADQUARTERS, WE HAD A
19 VERY EXACTING VIEW OF WHAT WE WERE LOOKING AT, AND STILL
20 THERE WERE LOTS OF QUESTIONS THAT AROSE THAT WE LEARNED
21 THROUGH THE PROCESS, AND IT RAISED ISSUES OF FAIRNESS.

22 IN THIS CASE IF WE DO CASE STUDIES, AND IN THE
23 FALL, HAVING DONE THE CASE STUDIES, THEN WITH THE MODEL
24 IN PLACE, HAVING EVERYONE COMPETE, WE WILL HAVE A MUCH
25 HIGHER LEVEL OF INFORMATION. AND MY CULTURE IS THE LEGAL

1 CULTURE WHERE YOU WORK BY CASE STUDIES, AND THAT'S HOW
2 YOU LEARN. SO IT'S PERHAPS THAT CONDITIONING THAT
3 SUGGESTS THIS AS A LEARNING TOOL HERE THAT WILL HELP THE
4 APPLICANTS AND HELP THE INSTITUTE REFINE ITS KNOWLEDGE SO
5 THAT WE CAN BETTER MEET THE NEEDS OF THE STATE.

6 BUT WE WOULD SEND OUT SPECIFICALLY A LETTER OF
7 INTENT, ASKING FOR A FIVE-PAGE CONCEPT STUDY, FIVE-PAGE
8 WRITTEN CONCEPT DESCRIPTION. THEY CAN ATTACH ADDENDA OR
9 EXHIBITS THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE, AND WE WOULD BRING THOSE
10 TOGETHER AT THE JUNE MEETING.

11 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: NO, MR. KLEIN, WE COULDN'T
12 DO IT BY JUNE. I THINK BECAUSE WE'VE GOT TO ISSUE THE
13 LETTER, AND I THINK THE JULY MEETING WOULD BE -- WE CAN
14 CERTAINLY BRING IT BACK FOR THE JULY MEETING, BUT IT'S SO
15 LATE IN THE MONTH OF MAY, THAT I'M NOT SURE THAT THAT
16 GIVES US ENOUGH TIME.

17 MR. KLEIN: POINT WELL TAKEN, MR. CHAIRMAN.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: BUT OTHER THAN THAT --

19 MR. KLEIN: BRING IT BACK AT THE JULY MEETING
20 FOR SELECTIONS OF CASE STUDIES THAT COULD PROCEED WHICH
21 WOULD NOT STOP US FROM ACCEPTING OTHER CASE STUDIES LATER
22 THAT WE WOULD ALSO STUDY.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IF I COULD JUST ALSO
24 ELABORATE, AS YOU'VE DESCRIBED THIS TO ME, THIS IS NOT IN
25 ANY SENSE A GUARANTEE OR COMMITMENT FOR FUNDING. QUITE

1 THE OPPOSITE. THIS IS MERELY TO ALLOW THE REAL ESTATE
2 COMMITTEE AND THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE THE CHANCE TO BEGIN
3 TO INVENTORY DIFFERENT IDEAS TO HELP THEM AT A TIME WHEN
4 THERE IS GOING TO BE A STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS.

5 MR. KLEIN: AND TO HELP PEOPLE DEVELOP CASE
6 STUDY MODELS. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IN A SPECIFIC PRODUCT
7 TYPE, YOU KNOW, WE MAY PUT -- DECIDE THAT WHEN THIS CASE
8 STUDY GOES OUT TO BID AND COMPETING WITH OTHER
9 OPPORTUNITIES, THAT IT NEEDS AT LEAST A ONE-TO-ONE LOCAL
10 MATCH.

11 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: RIGHT. ANY OTHER NUMBER OF
12 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.

13 MR. KLEIN: ANY NUMBER OF A HUNDRED OTHER
14 VARIABLES.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: SO LET ME JUST LAY THIS OUT
16 FOR THE PUBLIC BECAUSE THIS IS REALLY IMPORTANT, AT LEAST
17 AS I WOULD RECOMMEND AND ENVISION. THIS IS JUST FOR
18 DISCUSSION, AND I VERY MUCH WELCOME THE COMMENTS OF MY
19 FELLOW BOARD MEMBERS AND ALSO THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

20 THE USE OF CONSTRUCTION FUNDS IS, I CONSIDER, A
21 HIGHLY SENSITIVE MATTER AS PART OF THIS INITIATIVE. AND
22 THERE IS A CAP BY THE LEGISLATION OF 10 PERCENT OF THE \$3
23 BILLION TO COME FROM STATE FUNDS. NOW, I KNOW THAT
24 MR. KLEIN AND OTHERS THINK THAT THERE ARE REALLY
25 IMPORTANT OPPORTUNITIES FOR RAISING BONDS OR FINDING

1 PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY TO SUPPLEMENT AND PERHAPS GREATLY
2 MAGNIFY THAT. AND THOSE ARE INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT
3 CONSIDERATIONS, BUT I WOULD URGE US NOT TO GET INTO THOSE
4 TODAY EXCEPT TO SAY THAT THEY ARE WORTH EXPLORING AND
5 IMPORTANT.

6 SUFFICE IT TO SAY, THOUGH, IF WE HAVE \$300
7 MILLION OF STATE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FACILITIES, I HAVE
8 EVERY REASON TO SUSPECT THAT THERE WILL BE A VASTLY
9 LARGER NUMBER OF REQUESTS COMING IN THAN COULD BE
10 SATISFIED BY THAT AMOUNT. WE'RE VERY KEEN TO MAKE SURE
11 THAT WE GET THE BEST USE OF EVERY TAX DOLLAR, EVERY BOND
12 DOLLAR. WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE MAKE THE BEST USE
13 OF THE TIMING OF FACILITIES SO THAT FACILITIES THAT NEED
14 TO BE CONSTRUCTED EARLY IN THE COURSE OF THIS 10-YEAR OR
15 MORE CYCLE ARE DONE -- ARE PLANNED AND EXECUTED IN A VERY
16 EFFICIENT WAY.

17 WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE FACILITIES MEET
18 THE NEEDS OF THE SCIENTISTS AND THE SCIENCE IN ORDER TO
19 SERVE THE PATIENTS BETTER. AND SO WHILE ZACH HALL AND
20 OTHERS HELP, FROM THE TOP DOWN, DESCRIBE WHAT THE
21 STRATEGIC PLAN WILL BE FOR THE FIRST YEAR, TWO, OR THREE
22 OF THIS INITIATIVE, WE THINK THAT THERE'S A VALUE IN
23 HAVING A BOTTOMS-UP APPROACH AS WELL, WHICH IS GARNERING
24 INFORMATION FROM INSTITUTIONS AROUND THE STATE ABOUT WHAT
25 SORT OF FACILITIES THEY THINK WE SHOULD BE CONSIDERING AS

1 AN ORGANIZATION.

2 AND SO I SEE THESE AS COMPLEMENTARY AND MUTUALLY
3 HELPFUL APPROACHES TO THINKING ABOUT A VERY IMPORTANT
4 RESOURCE. IF I MAY JUST SAY A COUPLE OF OTHER THINGS
5 THAT ARE MY PERSONAL OPINION AND I FEEL VERY STRONGLY
6 ABOUT. THERE ARE A LARGE NUMBER OF ISSUES THAT HAVE NOT
7 YET BEEN DEALT WITH AND WILL BE DEALT WITH BEFORE I WILL
8 RECOMMEND SPENDING A SINGLE DOLLAR ON FACILITIES. AND I
9 SAY THAT TO SORT OF LAY OUT, TO MARK A PLACE OF OUR
10 RESPONSIBILITY AS AN ICOC TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE FULL
11 DESCRIPTION OF WHAT SORTS OF RESEARCH CAN BE CONDUCTED IN
12 A FACILITY THAT IS PARTIALLY OR ENTIRELY CONSTRUCTED OR
13 RENOVATED WITH PROPOSITION 71 FUNDS, WHAT INTERACTIONS
14 WITH INDUSTRY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE THERE. WHAT
15 HAPPENS TO THAT FACILITY AFTER PROPOSITION 71 LAPSES, THE
16 FUNDING DIRECTLY LAPSES. I LIST THESE NOT AS AN
17 INCLUSIVE LIST, BUT JUST AS A BEGINNING OF A VERY LONG
18 LIST.

19 THESE ALL NEED TO BE DEALT WITH AND ANSWERS NEED
20 TO BE GIVEN BEFORE WE CAN COMMIT FUNDS BECAUSE THE
21 CITIZENS OF THE STATE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE
22 SPENDING THIS MONEY IN A VERY APPROPRIATE AND REASONABLE
23 WAY. AND IT IS MY PURPOSE HERE TO SAY THIS, IF YOU WILL,
24 ON THE PUBLIC RECORD TO SAY THAT WE ALL, ALL OF US ON THE
25 ICOC RECOGNIZE THAT THESE ARE IMPORTANT ISSUES. WE ARE

1 NOT GLOSSING OVER THEM. WE'RE NOT GOING TO BE MAKING
2 FUNDING DECISIONS UNTIL WE'VE DEALT WITH THESE AND MANY,
3 MANY OTHER ISSUES, BUT WE RECOGNIZE THAT WE ARE NOT
4 ENTIRELY CAPABLE OF IDENTIFYING ALL THE POTENTIAL
5 QUESTIONS AND ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE DEALT WITH. AND
6 THAT'S WHERE THE PUBLIC HAS A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE IN OUR
7 CONSIDERATIONS, OF COURSE, IN ALL OF THE PROPOSITION 71
8 CONSIDERATIONS.

9 AND I'VE BEEN SPEAKING WITH MR. KLEIN TO SORT OF
10 HAVE A PILOT STUDY, IF YOU WILL, OF GARNERING PUBLIC
11 COMMENTS IN A MORE EFFECTIVE WAY. WE DO PROVIDE SPEAKING
12 MOMENTS AT THIS KIND OF MEETING AND AT THE ICOC PUBLIC
13 MEETINGS, AND THOSE, OF COURSE, ARE VERY VALUABLE.

14 A SECOND SOURCE OF COMMUNICATION IS INDIVIDUALS
15 SEND US LETTERS. I GUESS THAT A THIRD SOURCE IS
16 INDIVIDUALS SUE US, AND THAT'S PROBABLY A WAY OF
17 COMMUNICATING AS WELL. BUT I'M PARTICULARLY INTERESTED
18 AND HAVE BEEN SPEAKING WITH MR. KLEIN ABOUT THE
19 OPPORTUNITY FOR ON OUR WEBSITE FOR THE CIRM HAVING A
20 MECHANISM WHERE CITIZENS CAN SEND THEIR COMMENTS AND
21 THOUGHTS AND SUGGESTIONS TO US IN A DIRECT WAY THAT WOULD
22 BE SEGREGATED BY THINGS THAT HAVE TO DO WITH FACILITIES,
23 THINGS HAVE THAT TO DO WITH PATIENT SAFETY OR
24 CONFIDENTIALITY OR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.

25 WE CAN HAVE THE WEBSITE DESIGNATED IN CERTAIN

1 WAYS SO THAT CITIZENS COULD FEEL FREE TO COMMUNICATE WITH
2 US. MR. KLEIN HAS MADE THE VERY THOUGHTFUL SUGGESTION
3 THAT WE CAN BEGIN TO DESIGN A FORM SO THAT WE WOULD
4 UNDERSTAND IF A COMMENT COMES IN FROM SOMEONE WHO HAS A
5 PARTICULAR KIND OF BACKGROUND, AN EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE,
6 PERSONAL EXPERIENCE. WE COULD HELP USE THAT INFORMATION
7 TO GIVE US A BETTER SENSE OF WHAT THAT INDIVIDUAL'S
8 COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS ARE NESTED IN OR WHERE THEY
9 SPRING FROM. AND THESE ARE THINGS THAT ARE YET TO BE
10 DONE. I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT THIS IS ALL SET UP. IT IS
11 NOT.

12 I AM SUGGESTING THAT I THINK AT LEAST AS A PILOT
13 TRIAL, IT WOULD BE VERY VALUABLE AND WORTHWHILE FOR
14 CITIZENS TO BE ABLE TO COMMENT ON FACILITIES-TYPE ISSUES,
15 AND THAT I'M WORKING WITH MR. KLEIN TO HELP DESIGN HOW
16 OUR WEBSITE, THE CIRM WEBSITE, MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO THAT.
17 AND IF I MAY ASK, I'LL ASK MELISSA TO PLEASE COMMENT AS
18 WELL.

19 MS. KING: I WAS JUST POINTING OUT TO DR.
20 FRIEDMAN THAT AT LEAST AS OF RIGHT NOW I'M STILL THE
21 PERSON THAT PUTS EVERYTHING UP ON THE WEBSITE, WORKING
22 WITH TEAL DATA CENTER IN SACRAMENTO THAT ACTUALLY DOES
23 THE BACK-END WORK ON THE WEB. I'M HAPPY TO WORK WITH DR.
24 FRIEDMAN AND BOB TO PUT SOMETHING TOGETHER FOR THIS.
25 THAT'S ALL I WANTED TO SAY.

1 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THIS WOULD JUST MERELY MEAN
2 HAVING A PORTAL IN WHICH PEOPLE COULD COMMENT, AND WE
3 COULD MAKE SURE THAT WE ACCEPT -- THAT WE HAVE A WAY OF
4 GETTING THOSE COMMENTS. IT'S JUST ANOTHER MECHANISM THAT
5 WOULD ALLOW US TO BE SURE THAT WE'RE GATHERING THE
6 PUBLIC'S COMMENTS, AND IT WOULD BE A WAY OF ASSURING THE
7 PUBLIC THAT THEY HAVE ACCESS TO US. THOSE PEOPLE WHO
8 AREN'T ABLE TO COME TO THESE MEETINGS, THOSE PEOPLE WHO
9 FEEL LIKE THEY DON'T WANT TO WRITE A LETTER, IT WOULD BE
10 A WAY TO GATHER THAT INFORMATION.

11 CAN I TELL YOU WHETHER THERE WILL BE A LOT OF
12 VALUABLE INFORMATION PROVIDED THERE OR SOME VALUABLE
13 INFORMATION? WELL, FRANKLY, IT DOESN'T MATTER AS LONG AS
14 THERE'S ANY GOOD IDEA THAT COMES THROUGH, IT'S PROBABLY
15 WORTH IT TO US. WE'RE SERVING IN THE INTEREST OF OUR
16 CITIZENS HERE OF THE STATE, AND THIS IS JUST ANOTHER WAY
17 TO DO IT.

18 SO I MAKE THAT AS A SUGGESTION BECAUSE I'D LIKE
19 TO GET MY FELLOW COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS ON THAT, NOT
20 THE DETAILS OF EXACTLY HOW WE'LL DO IT, BUT TO GENERALLY
21 STATE THAT BEFORE WE TAKE ANY STEPS AS AN ICOC COMMITTEE,
22 WE WILL HAVE ALL THE DETAILS DEALT WITH, AND WE WANT TO
23 GIVE THE PUBLIC THE MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE WITH US
24 THEIR THOUGHTS, CRITICISMS, CONCERNS, AND IDEAS.

25 MR. KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, THIS IS INCOMING

1 INFORMATION. THIS IS -- YOU'RE NOT, AGAIN, JUST TO
2 RECLARIFY FOR EVERYONE, YOU'RE NOT SUGGESTING THOSE
3 COMMENTS ALL BE MAINTAINED AS POSTED ON THE WEB. THIS IS
4 JUST TO COLLECT INFORMATION?

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT IS ABSOLUTELY CORRECT.
6 AND THANK YOU FOR THAT CLARIFICATION. I MEANT THIS AS AN
7 ENTRY PORTAL ONLY. WE WOULDN'T POST THIS INFORMATION SO
8 THAT PEOPLE WOULD FEEL THAT THEY COULD SHARE WITH US
9 ANYTHING THEY WANTED WITHOUT THIS BEING IN THE PUBLIC
10 DOMAIN. AND I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT A BULLETIN BOARD. I'M
11 NOT TALKING ABOUT A BLOG. I'M TALKING ABOUT MERELY A WAY
12 OF COMMUNICATING WITH US SO THAT WE COULD GET THE BEST
13 IDEAS. DATA CAPTURE.

14 DR. PRIETO: I JUST -- A COMMENT ABOUT THAT, AND
15 THEN I'D LIKE TO ASK ABOUT SOMETHING ELSE. THAT I WOULD
16 HOPE WE'D DO IT IN SOME WAY THAT MINIMIZES ANY EXTRA
17 WORKLOAD THAT WE PUT ON OUR VERY HARDWORKING AND LIMITED
18 BY THE INITIATIVE STAFF. THAT WE LIMIT THEIR WORKLOAD TO
19 FORWARDING THE COMMENTS TO US ON THE ICOC.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I REALLY THINK THAT'S
21 EXACTLY WHAT I WAS SUGGESTING. AND TO BE PERFECTLY FRANK
22 WITH YOU, I WASN'T EVEN SURE WHETHER EVERYBODY ON THIS
23 COMMITTEE WOULD WANT ACCESS TO THAT. I'M NOT TRYING TO
24 KEEP YOU AWAY FROM INFORMATION. I AM MERELY SAYING THAT
25 I'M PREPARED TO TAKE ON THE EXTRA WORK OF READING THAT

1 MATERIAL. OBVIOUSLY I'LL SHARE IT WITH WHOEVER WANTS IT.

2 BUT I FULLY ACCEPT YOUR POINT THAT THE STAFF IS
3 HEAVILY BURDENED, BUT I DO THINK WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO
4 MAKE IT CLEAR TO THE PUBLIC THAT WE REALLY ARE INTERESTED
5 IN THEIR COMMENTS.

6 MS. KING: I CAN DEFINITELY FORWARD IT ON TO
7 YOU.

8 DR. PRIETO: I HAVE A QUESTION ALSO ABOUT THE
9 CASE STUDY MODELS. IS THIS ESSENTIALLY AN OPEN-ENDED RFP
10 THAT WE'RE PUTTING OUT?

11 MR. KLEIN: AT LEAST I WAS PROPOSING THAT RIGHT
12 AT THIS MOMENT WE ASK FOR INITIAL LETTERS OF INTEREST
13 WITH A FOCUS IN PARTICULAR, AS THE INITIATIVE SPECIFIES,
14 GIVING A PREFERENCE TO PROJECTS THAT CAN BE BUILT WITHIN
15 TWO YEARS AFTER THE GRANTS ARE MADE. AND ASSUMING WE CAN
16 GET THROUGH OUR LITIGATION, THESE GRANTS WOULD BE MADE AT
17 THE END OF THIS YEAR.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IF I COULD ADD A COUPLE OF
19 COMMENTS AS WELL. RATHER THAN CALLING THIS AN RFA OR
20 RFP, I ACTUALLY WOULD CALL THIS RFI. IT'S A REQUEST FOR
21 IDEAS. AND IN ORDER TO MAKE THIS A DIGESTIBLE UNIT, I
22 WOULD SAY THAT THE REQUEST WOULD BE THAT ONE AND ONLY ONE
23 IDEA COME FROM EACH NONPROFIT INSTITUTION. THAT DOESN'T
24 MEAN THAT YOU ARE LIMITED IN TERMS OF WHEN THE FULL
25 FUNDING IS AVAILABLE. INSTITUTIONS WILL PUT IN AS MANY

1 FACILITIES GRANTS AS THEY WISH TO. WE'RE NOT RESTRICTING
2 THAT.

3 I THINK, HOWEVER, AS A CASE STUDY, AS A PILOT
4 PROGRAM, JUST TO KEEP THIS AT A WORKABLE LEVEL, I WOULD
5 ASK EACH INSTITUTION, AND THE STAFF WILL COMPOSE A LETTER
6 THAT WE WILL THEN ISSUE AND HAVE READY FOR THE JUNE
7 MEETING, MR. KLEIN, IF THAT'S OKAY WITH YOU, WHICH SAYS
8 FIVE PAGES ONLY MAX, ONE IDEA FOR EACH NONPROFIT
9 INSTITUTION, AND THAT WE HAVE YET TO THEN TALK ABOUT HOW
10 THOSE IDEAS WILL BE SORTED AND SIFTED AND HOW WE WILL --
11 I MEAN THE FIRST THING THAT WE WILL DO IS JUST COMBINE
12 THE IDEAS, HOW MANY ANIMAL FACILITIES, HOW MANY WET LABS,
13 HOW MANY DATA CENTERS, HOW MANY THIS, HOW MANY THAT, AND
14 WE CAN SORT OF LOOK AT THAT AND BEGIN TO GET SOME IDEA OF
15 WHAT ARE THE KINDS OF FACILITIES THAT PEOPLE ENVISION
16 WILL BE NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE SCIENCE AS THIS GOES
17 FORWARD. HOW MANY BASIC FACILITIES? HOW MANY CLINICAL
18 FACILITIES, AND SO FORTH.

19 AND THEN TO BEGIN TO SAY, NOW, HOW CAN WE DELVE
20 INTO THIS MORE DEEPLY AND UNDERSTAND SOMETHING ABOUT HOW
21 ONE MIGHT SHARE RESOURCES, WHAT THE OPTIMAL LOCATION
22 MIGHT BE. HAVE WE FORGOTTEN ABOUT UNIQUE KINDS OF
23 FACILITIES THAT MIGHT BE EXCEPTIONALLY IMPORTANT? AND
24 BEGIN TO DO WHAT REALLY IS MORE QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENTS
25 AT THIS POINT.

1 AT SOME POINT THERE WILL BE A REQUEST FOR THE
2 APPLICATIONS. AN RFP OR RFA PROCESS WILL COME FORWARD.
3 THIS IS MERELY TO HELP GIVE ZACH HALL AND OTHERS A SENSE
4 OF WHAT ARE THE KINDS OF FACILITIES THAT WE WISH TO BE
5 THINKING ABOUT. AT LEAST THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING.

6 MR. KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, IT'S AN ITERATIVE
7 PROCESS WHERE THE IDEAS CAN BE MORE FULLY DEVELOPED, SO
8 WHEN WE REALLY GO TO HAVE A COMPETITION, WE REALLY HAVE
9 EXPLORED THE IDEAS AND THE QUESTIONS PEOPLE NEED
10 ANSWERED, AND WE PUT OUT A THOUGHTFUL DOCUMENT THAT
11 REALLY BRINGS OUT THE OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF
12 EACH TYPE.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK THAT'S ABSOLUTELY
14 CONSISTENT WITH WHAT I ENVISION. I FEAR I'VE TALKED TOO
15 MUCH. I REALLY DO WANT TO HAVE -- I WOULD ASK FOR OTHER
16 COMMENTS FROM FIRST THE BOARD AND THEN ANY PUBLIC
17 COMMENTS. SO PLEASE, GAYLE, ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS YOU
18 HAVE AT UCLA?

19 MS. WILSON: NO. I FIND THIS AN INTERESTING
20 THING TO CONSIDER. I HADN'T THOUGHT VERY MUCH ABOUT IT
21 BEFORE.

22 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY. DAVIS, PLEASE.

23 DR. POMEROY: IN CONTRAST, I HAVE A LOT OF
24 QUESTIONS. AND I THINK THAT IT'S A LITTLE UNCLEAR TO
25 MANY OF US EXACTLY HOW THIS PROCESS IS GOING TO GO, WHICH

1 MAKES IT SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT TO DECIDE WHETHER TO ENDORSE
2 IT OR NOT. I'VE HEARD SORT OF TWO VERSIONS.

3 I THINK IT'S NOT CLEAR WHAT THE GOAL OF HAVING
4 THESE IDEA LETTERS IS. AND IT'S NOT CLEAR TO ME WHAT THE
5 INSTITUTIONS GET OUT OF THE PROCESS. IF I COULD JUST
6 SORT OF LAY OUT ALL MY QUESTIONS, AND MAYBE THEY CAN GET
7 ADDRESSED.

8 SO CLEARLY THIS IS NOT AN INSTITUTION'S TOTAL
9 PLAN BECAUSE THAT WILL COME LATER.

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: CORRECT.

11 DR. POMEROY: AND THIS IS JUST, SAY, A SLICE OF
12 THEIR PLAN. BUT I THINK WE HAVE TO GIVE PEOPLE SOME IDEA
13 OF THE SIZE OF THE PROJECTS THAT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE
14 CASE STUDIES, THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT THEY SHOULD
15 INCLUDE, HOW THEY WILL BE REVIEWED, WHEN -- YOU KNOW, A
16 TIMETABLE BY WHICH THEY WILL BE REVIEWED AND FEEDBACK
17 WILL BE PROVIDED.

18 I GUESS I'VE HEARD IT VERY CLEARLY THAT NO FUNDS
19 WOULD BE AWARDED EVEN FOR CASE STUDIES AT THIS POINT, BUT
20 I THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE VERY CLEAR TO PEOPLE IF THAT'S
21 WHAT'S BEING SAID.

22 AND I WOULD ALSO URGE US TO THINK VERY CAREFULLY
23 ABOUT THIS ONE IDEA PER INSTITUTION BECAUSE THAT REALLY
24 WORKS AGAINST THE COLLABORATIVE PROPOSAL THAT CUTS ACROSS
25 INSTITUTIONS, WHICH IS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE'VE BEEN

1 TRYING TO DO.

2 SO THERE ARE JUST SO MANY UNKNOWNNS, THAT IT
3 MAKES ME A BIT UNCOMFORTABLE ENDORSING ANYTHING AT THIS
4 POINT TILL IT'S MORE CLEAR.

5 MR. KLEIN: CLAIRE, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. THE LAST
6 POINT YOU JUST MADE, DR. FRIEDMAN'S VERY GOOD POINT HERE
7 IS THAT ANY INSTITUTION MAY HAVE ONE IDEA AS TO THEIR
8 INSTITUTION, BUT WE DO WANT TO ENCOURAGE COLLABORATIVE
9 IDEAS. SO MAYBE THEY WOULD BE PERMITTED ONE IDEA JUST
10 RESTRICTED TO THEIR INSTITUTION AND ONE IDEA THAT IS
11 COLLABORATIVE THAT BRINGS IN MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS.

12 DR. POMEROY: THAT WOULD ADDRESS THAT PARTICULAR
13 CONCERN VERY NICELY, I THINK.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I WOULD FIND THAT UTTERLY
15 AGREEABLE.

16 MR. KLEIN: THEN SECONDLY, THERE'S A NUMBER OF
17 QUESTIONS YOU RAISE, CLAIRE, THAT COULD BE TAKEN OFF OF
18 THIS TAPE TRANSCRIPT AND ADDRESSED IN THE APPLICATION.
19 BUT AS TO SCALE AND SIZE, THE PROBLEM HERE IS THAT WE
20 HAVE TO GET ENOUGH PRELIMINARY INFORMATION FROM AROUND
21 THE STATE TO GET SOME IDEA OF WHAT THE NEEDS ARE. AND
22 THEN IN THE CASE STUDY PROCESS IN THE INITIAL PHASE, THE
23 WORKING GROUP COULD COME BACK TO THE ICOC FOR DIRECTION
24 WHEN THEY SAW MORE MATURE INFORMATION ON THE SCALE OF THE
25 CHALLENGE BEFORE US.

1 AS DR. FRIEDMAN MENTIONED, I PERSONALLY THINK
2 THAT OUR 300 MILLION WILL END UP BUILDING AT LEAST 600
3 MILLION IN FACILITIES THROUGH SOURCES OF PHILANTHROPY AND
4 OTHER SOURCES OF FINANCING THAT WE CAN IDENTIFY, BUT
5 STILL IT'S VERY LIMITED IN TERMS OF THE TOTAL NEEDS FOR
6 THE STATE. AND I THINK IT'S A PROCESS WHERE THE WORKING
7 GROUPS, WHILE THEY'RE DOING THE CASE STUDIES, ARE GOING
8 TO HAVE TO COME BACK FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE ICOC TO GET
9 DIRECTION. AND AS DR. FRIEDMAN SAID, THERE WILL BE A
10 STRATEGIC PLAN IN PROCESS WHICH WILL POTENTIALLY PROVIDE
11 SOME OF THAT DIRECTION GIVEN THAT THE STRATEGIC PLAN HAS
12 THE BENEFIT OF INPUT FROM THIS PROCESS AS TO THE TOTAL
13 DEMAND OUT THERE.

14 BUT ONE THING WE DON'T WANT TO DO IS WE WANT TO
15 THROUGH THE CASE STUDY GIVE BACK ENOUGH INFORMATION TO
16 THE INSTITUTIONS SO THAT THEY DON'T GO OUT AND SPEND
17 MASSIVE AMOUNTS ON PLAN SETS FOR SOMETHING FAR TOO BIG
18 FOR WHAT WE COULD HELP THEM ACHIEVE, FOR EXAMPLE.

19 DR. POMEROY: THAT IS, YOU KNOW, A GREAT
20 SERVICE. LET ME GIVE A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE, AND MAYBE THAT
21 WILL HELP CLARIFY IT FOR EVERYBODY AS IT CLARIFIES IT FOR
22 ME.

23 OBVIOUSLY, MANY MAJOR RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS WILL
24 HAVE AN IDEA FOR A WET LAB COMPONENT AND AN ANIMAL
25 COMPONENT AND A DATA CENTER AND MAYBE A GMP FACILITY, FOR

1 EXAMPLE. NOW, WOULD THEY BE EXPECTED TO JUST PUT THE WET
2 LAB IN AS THE CASE STUDY, OR WOULD THEY HAVE ALL FOUR
3 COMPONENTS IF THAT WAS THE SPECTRUM THAT THEY THOUGHT
4 THEY NEEDED?

5 MR. KLEIN: WELL, FOR EXAMPLE, THE ANIMAL
6 FACILITY, YOU KNOW, VERY FEW INSTITUTIONS HAVE THAT
7 EXPERTISE. AND THE ANIMAL FACILITY SOUNDS TO ME LIKE
8 SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE COLLABORATIVE AND COULD BE
9 PROPOSED AS SERVING LARGE PORTIONS OF THE STATE. THE WET
10 LAB FACILITY IS IN ANOTHER CATEGORY THAT MIGHT JUST SERVE
11 A SINGULAR INSTITUTION. THOSE ARE TWO DIFFERENT
12 CATEGORIES THAT WE JUST DISCUSSED OF APPLICATIONS.

13 IF THE WET LAB IS PART OF A DIFFERENT FACILITY,
14 THEN THE THIRD CATEGORY YOU MENTIONED UNDER THE PROPOSAL
15 WE'RE DISCUSSING HERE, YOU WOULD PUT FORTH, YOU KNOW,
16 YOUR BEST AND MOST INNOVATIVE TWO IDEAS, ONE THAT WOULD
17 SERVE MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS AND ONE THAT WOULD SERVE JUST
18 YOUR OWN INSTITUTION.

19 DR. POMEROY: SO THIS SHOULD CLEARLY NOT BE YOUR
20 COMPREHENSIVE PROPOSAL THAT YOU WOULD PUT IN LATER AS
21 YOUR FACILITIES PROPOSAL?

22 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. AND HOPEFULLY
23 EVERYONE WILL LEARN FROM THE PROCESS WHERE THIS KNOWLEDGE
24 IS INTEGRATED IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN, AND THE ICOC SITTING
25 AS A FULL BOARD THEN PROVIDES INFORMATION THAT WILL BE

1 HELPFUL TO EVERYONE IN SUBMITTING THEIR OVERALL PLAN.

2 DR. POMEROY: AND THEN ONE OTHER QUESTION. FOR
3 THE RESPONSES, A BUDGET SHOULD BE INCLUDED, RIGHT?

4 MR. KLEIN: YES. BECAUSE WE HAVE TO FIGURE OUT
5 JUST WHAT'S THE RAW DEMAND AND THEN INTEGRATE THAT INTO
6 THE STRATEGIC PLAN, AND THEN BRING BACK USEFUL
7 INFORMATION AFTER THE ICOC REVIEWS IT AND GIVES
8 DIRECTION.

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: CLAIRE, I DON'T ENVISION
10 THAT THE NUMBERS WOULD BE FULLY VETTED. THESE WOULD BE
11 ESTIMATES, I BELIEVE.

12 MR. KLEIN: JUST CONCEPTUAL.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M SORRY. I INTERRUPTED.
14 PLEASE GO AHEAD.

15 DR. PRIETO: BOB AND DR. FRIEDMAN, ARE WE
16 ANTICIPATING AND WILL THIS BE SPECIFICALLY STATED IN THE
17 LETTERS THAT WE WILL NOT BE THE SOLE SOURCE OF FUNDING
18 FOR FACILITIES PROPOSALS?

19 MR. KLEIN: THE INITIATIVE SPECIFICALLY SAYS
20 THERE'S A PREFERENCE FOR LEVERAGE. IT MAKES IT ONE OF
21 THE CRITERIA THAT'S IN THE INITIATIVE. AND SO I WOULD
22 THINK THAT THAT SHOULD BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION WHEN WE
23 SEND OUT THE REQUEST FOR LETTERS.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IT'S NOT AN ABSOLUTE
25 PROHIBITION. IT SIMPLY SAYS -- I THINK THERE WILL BE --

1 THERE WILL BE THE RECOGNITION THAT IF YOU HAVE
2 ALTERNATIVE SOURCES, THAT MAKES IT A MORE ATTRACTIVE
3 PROPOSITION. IF IT'S A SHARED FACILITY, THAT MAKES IT A
4 MORE ATTRACTIVE PROPOSITION. WE WILL BE ABLE, I THINK,
5 TO COME UP WITH A HIERARCHY WITHIN THOSE THINGS THAT ARE
6 PROPOSED.

7 DR. PRIETO: OKAY. THANK YOU.

8 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: CLAIRE, IF I COULD GIVE YOU
9 MY ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION, WHICH MIGHT BE A LITTLE BIT
10 DIFFERENT THAN BOB'S ANSWER, WHICH IS IF YOU ENVISION
11 THAT HAVING THE ANIMAL FACILITY AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF
12 THE WET LAB, I WOULD SEE THOSE ACTUALLY GOING IN
13 TOGETHER. BUT THAT'S SOMETHING WE NEED TO CLARIFY
14 BECAUSE I COULD SEE GOING EITHER WAY.

15 DR. POMEROY: THAT'S WHY I'M CONFUSED BECAUSE
16 OBVIOUSLY YOU REALLY -- IT WOULD BE -- YOU WOULD WANT A
17 MOUSE FACILITY FOR YOUR WET LAB.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: ATTACHED. AND THAT'S WHY I
19 THINK IF YOU HAVE, LET'S SAY, THAT UC DAVIS WAS GOING TO
20 PROPOSE A MONKEY COLONY, WHICH IS SOMETHING YOU'RE
21 UNIQUELY QUALIFIED TO DO.

22 DR. POMEROY: LET'S SAY THAT.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT WOULD BE -- THAT MIGHT
24 BE JUST A STAND-ALONE FACILITY BECAUSE IT COULD EASILY BE
25 SEEN AS SOMETHING THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE PRIMATE

1 BREEDING FACILITIES OR LABS ALL OVER THE STATE, IT WOULD
2 BE MY VISION. YOU WOULD SAY, WELL, THAT'S SORT OF A
3 STAND ALONE. BUT A WET LAB THAT HAS WITHIN IT, YOU KNOW,
4 SOME OTHER COMPONENTS THAT ARE KEY, I WOULD SORT OF SEE
5 THOSE AS INTEGRAL. BUT, AGAIN, I WOULD TAKE YOUR ADVICE
6 AND THOUGHT ON THIS.

7 THERE'S AN ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGE HERE. WE TALKED
8 ABOUT THE STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVANTAGE. WE TALKED ABOUT
9 BEGINNING TO GET SOME IDEA OF JUST THE PRACTICALITY OF
10 PHASING AND TIMING ON WHAT KINDS OF FACILITIES NEED TO BE
11 BUILT WHEN. WE TALKED ABOUT HOW THIS MIGHT HELP US
12 UNDERSTAND THE BUDGET AND WHAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE.
13 THAT'S VERY VALUABLE.

14 THERE'S A FOURTH THING THAT I THINK IS AWFULLY
15 VALUABLE, WHICH IS THAT WE HAVE TO LEARN WHAT THE
16 INTERACTIONS WILL BE THE BETWEEN THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
17 COMMITTEE AND THE FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE. BECAUSE
18 NONE OF THESE WILL BE SEEN AS STAND-ALONE FACILITIES.
19 THEY ALL NEED TO BE NESTED IN THE SCIENCE. IN OTHER
20 WORDS, THE SCIENCE IS WORTHWHILE, AND THAT'S WHY WE'RE
21 GOING TO TALK THEN ABOUT WHETHER THE FACILITY MAKES
22 SENSE.

23 THERE'S A GENERAL UNDERSTANDING THAT ED HOLMES
24 AND I HAVE ABOUT HOW THESE COMMITTEES MIGHT BEGIN TO
25 INTERACT, BUT IT WILL ACTUALLY BE UP TO THE CHAIRS AND

1 THE VICE CHAIRS OF THESE WORKING GROUPS AS TO HOW THEY
2 ACTUALLY FIGURE OUT HOW THEY PASS IDEAS BACK AND FORTH
3 ONE TO THE OTHER. AND I SEE THESE CASE STUDIES AS VERY
4 GOOD MODELS FOR UNDERSTANDING WHAT SOME OF THOSE
5 INTERACTIONS MIGHT BE.

6 DR. PRIETO: AREN'T THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS
7 OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP OVERLAPPING WITH THE
8 SCIENTIFIC GRANTS WORKING GROUP?

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I SEE THAT AS A HUGE
10 ADVANTAGE, YES.

11 DR. PRIETO: I WOULD THINK THAT THAT'S A VERY
12 LARGE INTERFACE THERE.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OH, NO. NO. IT IS. I'M
14 NOT TALKING ABOUT HAVING THE PEOPLE KNOWLEDGEABLE. I'M
15 TALKING ABOUT THE FORMAL PROCESS WHICH IS THAT THE
16 SCIENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE MIGHT SAY WE WANT TO SEE THE
17 IDEA FIRST; AND THEN IF WE THINK THE SCIENCE IS GOOD, WE
18 SEND IT TO FACILITIES. OR FACILITIES MIGHT WANT TO SAY
19 WE WANT TO SEE WHETHER IT'S EVEN POSSIBLE TO DO THIS, AND
20 THERE WILL BE JOINT REVIEWS. I'M JUST TALKING ABOUT THE
21 GOVERNANCE PROCESS, THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ACTUAL
22 APPLICATIONS.

23 I CAN SEE A DOZEN DIFFERENT WAYS OF DOING IT,
24 AND I'M SURE THEY'LL COME UP WITH A GOOD ONE. BUT THIS
25 IS JUST A WONDERFUL CHANCE FOR THEM TO THINK ABOUT HOW

1 THEY WORK TOGETHER. THE ADVOCATES ARE A COMMON BRIDGE.
2 THAT'S SUPERB. THE EXPERTS FOR THESE TWO COMMITTEES, THE
3 MEDICAL AND RESEARCH EXPERTS AND THE FACILITIES EXPERTS,
4 WON'T OTHERWISE COME TOGETHER. AND WE NEED TO HELP THEM
5 FIGURE OUT HOW TO MAKE THAT WORK.

6 DR. PRIETO: THAT'S A QUESTION I WOULD HAVE.
7 CAN WE BRING THEM TOGETHER? IS THERE A REASON WHY TWO
8 WORKING GROUPS COULD NOT SCHEDULE A JOINT MEETING?

9 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: QUITE THE CONTRARY. IN
10 FACT, THEY WILL. I'M NOT GOING TO PRE-DICTATE THAT TO
11 THEM. I'M JUST GOING TO SAY WE KNOW THAT YOU ARE GOING
12 TO HAVE TO WORK CLOSELY TOGETHER. WE KNOW THAT THERE'S
13 GOT TO BE SOME PASS-BACK, SOME CROSSTALK. AND I WOULD
14 LEAVE IT TO THE CHAIRS AND VICE CHAIRS AND THE MEMBERS TO
15 SAY WHAT THE MOST -- AND THE STAFF, QUITE FRANKLY, TO SAY
16 WHAT THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY TO DO THAT IS. ALL I KNOW IS
17 IT'S GOT TO BE DONE.

18 AND ONE OF THE PERIPHERAL ADVANTAGES OF THESE
19 CASE STUDIES IS THAT IT BEGINS TO HELP PEOPLE THINK
20 ABOUT, GEE, WHAT KINDS OF INTERACTIONS AND HOW WOULD THEY
21 BE STRUCTURED. IT JUST MIGHT BE VERY HELPFUL TO SOLVE
22 SOME OF THE PRACTICAL DETAILS.

23 MR. KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, THIS IS BOB.
24 POTENTIALLY IF WE CAN THINK ABOUT CALLING THE QUESTION ON
25 JUST THIS PORTION THAT DEALS WITH CASE STUDIES. AND I

1 WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT IF THERE'S TIME UNDER THIS
2 SAME ITEM OF CONSIDERATION, IT SAYS CONSIDERATION OF THE
3 PROCESS FOR REVIEWING FACILITIES GRANT PROPOSALS, IT
4 WOULD BE GOOD IF WE HAD TIME IN THIS MEETING TO ALSO JUST
5 ADDRESS THE SAME SUBJECT THAT HAS BEEN ADDRESSED BY THE
6 OTHER SUBCOMMITTEES DEALING WITH WORKING GROUPS. THAT
7 IS, THAT IF WE HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO CONSIDER A
8 RECOMMENDATION BACK TO THE BOARD, TO PUT ON THE RECORD AT
9 THE BOARD THAT POLICY AND CRITERIA FOR PROJECT SELECTION
10 WOULD BE DEVELOPED BY THIS WORKING GROUP IN PUBLIC
11 HEARINGS. SO MUCH LIKE THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE, THERE
12 WOULD BE A PUBLIC HEARING PORTION OF ITS WORK AND A
13 CONFIDENTIAL HEARING PART.

14 BUT THE ISSUE IS DO WE HAVE TIME TO CONSIDER
15 THAT, AND ARE WE AT A POINT WHERE WE CAN CALL FOR THE
16 QUESTION ON THIS CASE STUDY LETTERS OF INTENT.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, LET'S
18 REVIEW WHAT THAT MOTION MIGHT SOUND LIKE. YOU'RE MAKING
19 A MOTION THAT WE RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC THIS PILOT PROJECT
20 OR CASE STUDY FORMAT, REQUESTING -- REQUESTS FOR IDEAS TO
21 COME IN, THAT THE CATEGORIES WOULD BE AS DESCRIBED, THE
22 FIVE PAGES, APPENDED MATERIALS AND SO FORTH, ONLY FROM
23 NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, THAT THERE WOULD BE TWO KINDS OF
24 PROPOSALS THAT WOULD BE OF INTEREST. ONE IS A UNIQUE
25 FACILITIES PROPOSAL, THE SECOND WOULD BE SHARED

1 FACILITIES OR CORE FACILITIES, AS DR. POMEROY TALKED
2 ABOUT. YOU TALKED ABOUT HAVING THIS ANNOUNCED AT THE
3 JUNE MEETING WITH APPLICATIONS OR THESE LETTERS TO COME
4 IN TO --

5 MR. KLEIN: JULY MEETING.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: -- THE JULY MEETING, AND
7 THAT THEN OTHER IMPORTANT DETAILS TO BE WORKED OUT. THE
8 LETTER WOULD HAVE TO BE DRAFTED BY STAFF. THAT WOULD BE
9 ABLE TO BE ISSUED AFTER THE JUNE MEETING. DOES THAT
10 CAPTURE SOME OF WHAT YOU WERE PROPOSING?

11 MR. KLEIN: YEAH. WE'RE ACTUALLY ONE STEP
12 DOWNSTREAM FROM THAT IN THAT THE BOARD AT THE END OF THE
13 LAST MEETING AUTHORIZED OUR COMMITTEE HERE TO ACTUALLY
14 PROCEED WITH THIS IF WE WISH TO. SO THAT THE MOTION
15 WOULD ACTUALLY BE THAT IF WE ADOPT IT, THEN WE COULD
16 DIRECT STAFF TO ISSUE THE LETTER.

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IS THERE A SECOND FOR THAT
18 MOTION, PLEASE?

19 DR. LOVE: I'LL SECOND IT.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'D LIKE TO ASK FOR ANY
21 DISCUSSION. THERE ARE A LOT OF IMPORTANT DETAILS.
22 CLAIRE HAS LISTED SOME, BUT THERE ARE OTHER IMPORTANT
23 DETAILS AS WELL THAT NEED TO BE CLARIFIED. OTHER
24 COMMENTARY, PLEASE, FROM THE COMMITTEE. AND LET'S START
25 IN PALO ALTO, PLEASE.

1 DR. LOVE: NO COMMENTS HERE.

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: UCLA, PLEASE.

3 MS. WILSON: NO COMMENTS HERE EITHER.

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: DAVIS, PLEASE.

5 DR. POMEROY: NONE.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: DO WE NEED TO TAKE A ROLL
7 CALL VOTE ON THIS?

8 MR. HARRISON: DO YOU WANT TO ASK FOR PUBLIC
9 COMMENT, DR. FRIEDMAN?

10 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M SORRY. THANK YOU.
11 PUBLIC COMMENT, PLEASE, FROM UC DAVIS.

12 DR. POMEROY: ONE COMMENT.

13 MR. O'SHEAR: DAN O'SHEAR. I'M FROM THE J.
14 DAVID GLADSTONE INSTITUTES IN SAN FRANCISCO. I GUESS
15 IT'S JUST A CLARIFICATION OF THIS DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A
16 REQUEST FOR IDEA VERSUS A LETTER OF INTENT. AND I'M
17 ASKING THE QUESTION BECAUSE WHAT I HEARD ABOUT THE
18 REQUEST FOR IDEA IS TO PUT FORTH THE SINGLE MOST
19 INNOVATIVE IDEA. AND IF ONE OF THE OBJECTIVES IS TO GET
20 SOME SENSE OF SCOPE, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET THAT WITH A
21 REQUEST FOR IDEA. SO I WAS JUST LOOKING FOR SOME
22 CLARIFICATION ABOUT THAT.

23 MR. KLEIN: I THINK, DR. FRIEDMAN, THE POINT
24 HERE IS THAT WE REALLY DO NEED TO BE ABLE AT THE ICOC
25 LEVEL TO EVALUATE THE LEVELS OF DEMAND OUT THERE AND HOW

1 MANY INSTITUTIONS HAVE HOW MUCH DEMAND OUT THERE. WHAT,
2 DR. FRIEDMAN, WOULD YOU THINK IF THEY WERE ABLE TO SEND
3 IN MORE THAN ONE, BUT TO PRIORITIZE SO THAT THEY WOULD
4 GIVE US THEIR MOST IMPORTANT IDEA BECAUSE WE HAVE TWO
5 REALLY FUNCTIONS HERE. ONE IS TO UNDERSTAND THE LEVEL OF
6 DEMAND AND THE SCOPE OF DEMAND, BUT THE OTHER ONE IS TO
7 PICK OUT ACTUAL CASE STUDIES.

8 DR. POMEROY: I'M REALLY GLAD THIS CAME UP
9 BECAUSE THIS IS WHAT I WAS STRUGGLING WITH THE IDEA OF
10 ONE PROPOSAL THAT WAS NARROW VERSUS THE TOTAL SPECTRUM.
11 ONE WAY TO SOLVE THIS THAT I WAS THINKING ABOUT IS WE
12 COULD DESIGNATE THAT YOU SHOULD PUT FORTH YOUR MOST
13 INNOVATIVE IDEA, BECAUSE THAT'S SORT OF WHAT WE'RE TRYING
14 TO GET, BUT INCLUDE A PAGE WHERE YOU SAID HOW THIS FIT
15 INTO THE OVERALL SCOPE OF YOUR PROGRAM AND OUTLINE YOUR
16 PROGRAM.

17 JUST TAKING MYSELF, IF WE WERE GOING TO RENOVATE
18 SOME LABS, I COULD ALSO SAY, WITHOUT THE SPECIFICS, PLUS
19 I'M GOING TO HAVE AN ANIMAL MOUSE FACILITY, PLUS I'M
20 GOING TO HAVE A DATA CENTER, PLUS A CLINICAL TRIALS AREA,
21 AND JUST OUTLINE HOW THIS FIT INTO THE LARGER PICTURE.
22 MAYBE THAT WOULD ACCOMPLISH BOTH GOALS.

23 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD TAKE THAT AS A FRIENDLY
24 AMENDMENT.

25 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK IT'S AN EXCELLENT

1 SUGGESTION.

2 DR. PRIETO: WILL WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEE
3 THESE LETTERS BEFORE THEY GO OUT?

4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: YES.

5 DR. PRIETO: THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: NOT ONLY THAT, NOT JUST THE
7 LETTER, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK IF THE STAFF CAN PLEASE
8 AT LEAST MOCK UP A FORM SO THAT THE INFORMATION WILL COME
9 BACK IN A STANDARDIZED WAY. OTHERWISE, IT'S GOING TO BE
10 A NIGHTMARE TRYING TO DISSECT OUT DIFFERENT KINDS OF
11 FORMS.

12 MR. KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, WHAT ABOUT THE
13 POSSIBILITY OF YOU JUST REACHING OUT TO INDIVIDUAL
14 COMMITTEE MEMBERS FOR IDEAS BECAUSE IF YOU CIRCULARIZE
15 THE WHOLE LETTER TO ALL OF US, THEN YOU HAVE TO CALL
16 ANOTHER NOTICED MEETING.

17 DR. PRIETO: THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU FOR THAT
19 CLARIFICATION. WE WILL REACH OUT ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS
20 TO GET IDEAS THEN.

21 OTHER DISCUSSION OR COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC,
22 PLEASE? THAT WAS A VERY VALUABLE ONE. FROM PALO ALTO.

23 DR. LOVE: THERE IS ONE COMMENT.

24 MR. REED: JUST AS SOMEBODY WHO READS AN AWFUL
25 LOT OF PAPERWORK AND IT'S EASY TO GET MOUNTAINS OF AND

1 GET BURIED UNDER IT, WHAT ABOUT HAVING YOUR MAIN IDEA BE
2 THE FIVE-PAGER, AND ANY ADDITIONAL IDEAS BE LIMITED TO
3 ONE PAGE, JUST TO KEEP THE AMOUNT OF READING TIME DOWN?

4 MR. KLEIN: DON, THAT'S WHAT CLAIRE JUST
5 PROPOSED AND I ACCEPTED.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THOUGHT THAT WHAT CLAIRE
7 PROPOSED, AND WE SHOULD ASK CLAIRE, WAS A FIVE-PAGE FOR
8 THE BIG IDEA, AND THEN ONE PAGE THAT CAPTURES, JUST LISTS
9 ALL THE OTHER THINGS, NOT ONE PAGE EACH. WHICH DID YOU
10 INTEND, CLAIRE?

11 DR. POMEROY: ONE PAGE TOTAL.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S WHAT I THOUGHT. AND
13 THAT WOULD BE A SIMPLE LISTING WITH NO PREJUDICE ABOUT --
14 THERE'D BE NO DISADVANTAGE IN DOING THAT.

15 DR. POMEROY: EXACTLY.

16 MR. KLEIN: ONE PAGE WOULD LIST EVERYTHING,
17 CLAIRE, BUT YOU'D STILL HAVE THE FIVE PAGES ON YOUR
18 INNOVATIVE IDEA.

19 DR. POMEROY: EXACTLY. ONE PAGE TOTAL IN
20 ADDITION. SORRY.

21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU.

22 DR. POMEROY: I THINK WE'RE ALL AGREEING.

23 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I THINK SO TOO. HEARING NO
24 OTHER COMMENT, I'D LIKE TO MOVE TO A VOTE, PLEASE. WE'VE
25 DONE A LOT OF VOTING AT THIS MEETING.

1 AND I'D LIKE TO VOTE YES ON THIS ITEM.

2 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I'M NEXT ON THE

3 LIST, I BELIEVE. I VOTE YES.

4 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

5 DR. LOVE: I VOTE YES.

6 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

7 DR. POMEROY: YES.

8 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

9 DR. PRIETO: YES.

10 MS. KING: GAYLE WILSON.

11 MS. WILSON: YES.

12 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THIS THEN BRINGS US TO THE

14 LAST NOTED ITEM, WHICH, MR. KLEIN, YOU HAD A COMMENT

15 ABOUT PROCESSES THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS.

16 MR. KLEIN: BECAUSE THE PUBLIC HAS SUCH A GREAT

17 INTEREST IN KNOWING WHICH WAY WE'RE GOING IN TERMS OF

18 WHETHER THIS WORKING GROUP WILL BE -- HAVE PUBLIC

19 HEARINGS OR ONLY CONFIDENTIAL MEETINGS, I'VE HEARD IT

20 DISCUSSED AT THE BOARD PREVIOUSLY SOME THOUGHTS THAT

21 POLICY AND DISCUSSIONS OF CRITERIA FOR PROJECT SELECTION

22 ARE AN APPROPRIATE CATEGORY, AND THERE MAY BE OTHERS, FOR

23 PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THIS WORKING GROUP, AND THAT IT

24 WOULD -- IF WE COULD REACH A CONCEPTUAL IDEA, AS THE

25 STANDARDS WORKING GROUP DID, THAT POLICY AND CRITERIA FOR

1 PROJECT SELECTION AND OTHER APPROPRIATE ITEMS WOULD
2 BECOME PART OF THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS OF THIS WORKING
3 GROUP. AND BUT THERE COULD BE CONFIDENTIAL SESSIONS, FOR
4 EXAMPLE, IF YOU ARE TRYING TO EVALUATE WHETHER THE
5 SCIENTIFIC OR STAFF OR THE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS IN A
6 PARTICULAR INSTITUTION COULD HANDLE THE SIZE OF FACILITY
7 THAT THEY WERE PROPOSING. BUT THERE CERTAINLY ARE AREAS
8 WHERE CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSIONS MIGHT BE IMPORTANT.

9 THE BASIC CORE CONCEPT IS POLICY AND CRITERIA
10 FOR PROJECT SELECTION. CAN WE DEFINITELY SUGGEST THAT
11 THAT WOULD BE PART OF A PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS FOR THIS
12 WORKING GROUP? THAT'S THE QUESTION.

13 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I WOULD LIKE TO INVITE MY
14 FELLOW COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO COMMENT FIRST IN PALO ALTO.

15 DR. LOVE: COULD WE RESTATE WHAT I'M COMMENTING
16 ON AGAIN?

17 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WHAT BOB -- AND LET ME TRY
18 AND SUMMARIZE IT, IF I UNDERSTAND IT. BOB IS SAYING THAT
19 HE'D LIKE TO HAVE SOME DISCUSSION OF WHICH PORTIONS OF
20 THE FACILITIES PROCESSES WOULD BE PUBLIC AND WHICH WOULD
21 BE PRIVATE. BOB HAS MADE THE CASE THAT GENERAL
22 PROCEDURAL, GENERAL PHILOSOPHIC DISCUSSIONS WOULD BE,
23 STANDARDS KINDS OF DISCUSSIONS, THOSE WOULD BE ENTIRELY
24 PUBLIC.

25 BOB HAS MADE THE SUGGESTION THAT WHEN IT COMES

1 TO THE ACTUAL REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL PROPOSALS, THAT,
2 SIMILAR TO THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP, THOSE BE
3 CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVATE.

4 DID I SAY THAT CORRECTLY, MR. KLEIN?

5 MR. KLEIN: YES. AND I WAS HOPING THAT WE COULD
6 AT LEAST GET A MOTION OUT OF THIS DISCUSSION, IF IT GOES
7 IN THAT DIRECTION, WHERE WE COULD AT LEAST BE IN A
8 POSITION TO REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD MEETING ON MONDAY
9 THAT POLICY AND GENERAL STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR
10 PROJECT SELECTION WOULD BE DECIDED IN PUBLIC MEETINGS,
11 AND THAT WE'RE WORKING ON REFINING THAT LANGUAGE, BUT
12 THAT'S THE CONCEPTUAL STATEMENT.

13 DR. LOVE: I WOULD SAY I THINK THAT THERE ARE
14 SOME SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THESE KINDS OF PROPOSALS AND
15 GENERAL SCIENTIFIC GRANT PROPOSALS, BUT THE CONCEPT, BOB,
16 TO ME MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF SENSE. AND I THINK IT WOULD,
17 IN FACT, ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO COME FORWARD WITH THEIR MOST
18 INNOVATIVE IDEAS IF THEY FEEL THAT THOSE IDEAS ARE NOT
19 AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY AND COMPETITION.

20 BUT I WOULD ASK DO WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO DO THAT
21 UNDER BAGLEY-KEENE, OR CAN WE DO THAT UNDER BAGLEY-KEENE?

22 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AND
23 SO RIGHT NOW UNDER THE INITIATIVE, UNLESS WE CHANGE IT,
24 IT'S ALL CONFIDENTIAL. SO THE POINT IS WE'RE TRYING TO
25 SAY TO THE PUBLIC WHAT CAN WE MAKE PUBLIC IN THE SPIRIT

1 OF TRYING TO LISTEN TO REQUESTS FOR MORE PUBLIC
2 DISCUSSION. AND IF WE CAN MAKE ALL OUR POLICIES, OUR
3 CRITERIA FOR PROJECT SELECTION, OUR STANDARDS FOR PROJECT
4 SELECTION ALL DECIDED IN A PUBLIC SESSION, THAT WOULD BE
5 A HELPFUL MESSAGE FOR THE PUBLIC, IF WE THINK THAT THAT'S
6 APPROPRIATE.

7 DR. LOVE: I THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE. AND THE
8 OTHER THING I WOULD EVEN SUGGEST IS THAT -- AND MAYBE YOU
9 ALREADY ARE SUGGESTING THIS -- IS THAT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT
10 THESE IN PUBLIC, WE MAY NOT EVEN HAVE TO MENTION THE NAME
11 OF THE INSTITUTION. WE COULD SIMPLY NUMBER THEM OR
12 ALPHABETIZE THEM OR SOMETHING, CODE THEM SO THAT THERE'S
13 NO TYING BACK, IF THAT'S POSSIBLE.

14 MR. KLEIN: BECAUSE THEY'RE PRETTY UNIQUE, THAT
15 MIGHT BE DIFFICULT BECAUSE CHARACTERISTICS ARE SUCH THAT
16 YOU MIGHT BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THE INSTITUTION. BUT I'M
17 TRYING TO LIMIT DOWN THE ISSUE TO AT LEAST GET TO A
18 CONCEPTUAL AGREEMENT ON MAKING PUBLIC JUST THE POLICY,
19 CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR PROJECT SELECTION.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: MR. KLEIN, LET ME USE MY
21 CHAIRMAN'S PREROGATIVE TO SAY SOMETHING AT THIS MOMENT,
22 AND IT MAY BE CONTRARIAN, SO I BETTER SAY IT EARLY IF I'M
23 GOING TO TOSS A HAND GRENADE INTO THE DISCUSSION.

24 I STRONGLY SUPPORT YOUR POSITION ON POLICY,
25 PROCEDURES, PHILOSOPHY BEING A PUBLIC DISCUSSION. I

1 ACTUALLY, THOUGH, ASK THE QUESTION: WHY WOULDN'T WE HAVE
2 FACILITIES GRANT REVIEWS IN PUBLIC? AND THERE ARE A FEW
3 AREAS THAT I CAN THINK OF WHERE I WOULD ASK FOR
4 CONFIDENTIALITY. THIS IS DIFFERENT THAN THE SCIENCE
5 REVIEWS WHERE THERE'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, WHERE
6 THERE'S AN INTENSE COMPETITION WITH SCIENTISTS, NOT FROM
7 CALIFORNIA, BUT FROM OTHER PLACES, AND THAT INSIGHTS INTO
8 THAT RESEARCH GIVES UNIQUE ADVANTAGES OR DISADVANTAGES,
9 AND THAT IT BECOMES VERY PERSONAL. AND SO I ACCEPT THE
10 NECESSITY OF A SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BEING UNDER CLOSELY
11 HELD, CLOSED PROCEEDINGS.

12 I WOULD ARGUE THAT, TO ME, A FACILITIES
13 APPLICATION SHOULD BE DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC WITH THE
14 FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS. IF THERE ARE SPECIFIC DONORS -- AS
15 YOU TALKED ABOUT EARLIER, YOU'RE EXPECTING LEVERAGED
16 KINDS OF PROPOSALS, AT LEAST IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES.
17 THERE MAY BE FOUNDATIONS OR DONORS WHERE THIS INFORMATION
18 IS SENSITIVE, AND THEY WISH IT TO BE HELD CONFIDENTIAL.
19 I WOULD RESPECT THAT. I THINK THAT THERE MAY BE SOME
20 BONDS ISSUES AND SOME RATING ISSUES ABOUT AN INSTITUTION,
21 SOME FINANCIAL ISSUES THAT FOR ONE REASON OR ANOTHER,
22 ALTHOUGH I CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT THOSE WOULD BE TODAY, BUT
23 I'M WILLING TO BELIEVE THAT THERE MAY BE SOME ISSUES THAT
24 THEY'D LIKE TO KEEP CONFIDENTIAL AND AREN'T PUBLICLY
25 DISCLOSED. I WOULD BE RESPECTFUL OF THAT.

1 SHORT OF THAT, I WOULD LIKE -- IT SORT OF
2 DOESN'T BOTHER ME TO HAVE A PUBLIC DISCUSSION IN WHICH
3 YOU SAY WHAT DOES IT COST TO RENOVATE PER SQUARE FOOT?
4 WHAT DOES IT COST TO BUILD PER SQUARE FOOT? WHAT ARE YOU
5 GOING TO DO HERE? HOW MUCH OF IT IS SHARED? HOW MUCH OF
6 IT IS UNIQUE? I KNOW I MAY BE TAKING AN EXTREME
7 POSITION.

8 MR. KLEIN: ALL OF THOSE EXAMPLES YOU'RE GIVING
9 ME I WOULD AGREE WITH. BUT WHAT WOULD YOU DO, FOR
10 EXAMPLE, IF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE, IF YOU COULD ONLY
11 DO UCLA OR USC, AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE WERE ASKED
12 TO EVALUATE WHICH FACULTY COULD BETTER ACCOMPLISH MORE
13 SCIENCE AT THIS FACILITY?

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: BOB, LET ME INTERRUPT YOU.
15 YOU SEE, I SAID THAT I WOULD HAVE THE SCIENCE REVIEW,
16 BECAUSE I UNDERSTAND THE NEED FOR WHAT THE INDIVIDUAL
17 LABORATORIES WOULD BE DOING AND THE INDIVIDUAL
18 INVESTIGATORS, THAT WOULD BE A CLOSED SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
19 EXACTLY AS THE NIH DOES IT, EXACTLY AS PRIVATE
20 FOUNDATIONS DO IT. I THINK THAT WOULD BE -- YOU WOULD
21 GET FEEDBACK FROM THE SCIENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE THAT SAYS
22 WE SEE WHICH PROJECTS ARE BEING PROPOSED, AND WE THINK
23 THESE ARE VALID PROJECTS, AND WE THINK THESE ARE
24 APPROPRIATE FOR THE FACILITIES GROUP TO CONSIDER.

25 NOW, WE PASS THIS TO THE FACILITIES GROUP, AND

1 YOU PUT ON THE FILTER OF IS IT SHARED? IS IT UNIQUE? IS
2 IT COST-EFFECTIVE? WILL IT BE BUILT IN THE RIGHT TIME
3 SCALE? ARE THERE TOO MANY FACILITIES LIKE THIS IN ONE
4 GEOGRAPHIC AREA VERSUS ANOTHER? ALL THE UNIQUE
5 CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA THAT THE FACILITIES GROUP
6 WOULD BRING TO PLAY WOULD BE PUBLIC. THERE WOULD BE A
7 PRIVATE, IF YOU WILL, MEETING TO SAY THAT THE SCIENCE
8 QUALIFIES AND GOES FORWARD.

9 I HAVEN'T WORKED OUT ALL THE DETAILS ABOUT THIS,
10 BUT I'M JUST RECOMMENDING THAT WE BEND OVER BACKWARDS TO
11 HAVE WHAT REALLY CAN BE PUBLICLY DISCUSSED AVAILABLE IN
12 THE PUBLIC.

13 MR. KLEIN: I THINK WE CAN COMMUNICATE THAT
14 INTENT, BUT CERTAINLY LITIGATION WOULD HAVE TO BE
15 CONFIDENTIAL. CERTAINLY NEGOTIATIONS OVER LAND FOR A
16 FACILITY YOU WOULDN'T WANT PUBLIC BECAUSE YOU WOULDN'T
17 WANT THE LAND SELLER TO KNOW WHAT THE DISCUSSION WAS SO
18 THAT THEY COULD ANTICIPATE WHAT THEY COULD GET OUT OF THE
19 INSTITUTION. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF -- I THINK WHAT
20 STANDARDS SAID IS THEY NAMED A NUMBER OF EXCEPTIONS AND
21 SAID AND OTHER IMPORTANT DISCUSSIONS THAT THE
22 CONFIDENTIALITY IS CRITICAL TO THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE
23 MISSION OF THE COMMITTEE.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: AND I TAKE YOUR POINT. I
25 THINK THOSE ARE VALID CONSIDERATIONS. THE DEFAULT

1 POSITION WOULD BE THE DISCUSSION IS PUBLIC EXCEPT UNDER
2 THE FOLLOWING CIRCUMSTANCES.

3 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD AGREE WITH THAT AND SUPPORT
4 IT.

5 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S DIFFERENT THAN SAYING
6 IN GENERAL THEY'LL BE PRIVATE WITH THE FOLLOWING
7 EXCEPTIONS. WE'RE GOING TO SAY THEY'RE PUBLIC WITH THE
8 FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS. I BELIEVE EVERY MEMBER OF THE
9 PUBLIC WOULD BE SENSITIVE TO UNIQUE NEGOTIATIONS OR
10 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS OR A DONOR WHO WISHES TO REMAIN
11 ANONYMOUS OR SO FORTH. OBVIOUSLY UNDER THOSE
12 CIRCUMSTANCES, WE WOULD BE RESPECTFUL.

13 SO I DON'T THINK YOU WANT US TO TRY AND CRAFT
14 ALL THE WORDS AND EXCEPTIONS TODAY, BUT WE WOULD NEED TO,
15 BEFORE THIS IS TAKEN TO THE ICOC, AT LEAST TO HAVE A
16 FURTHER DISCUSSION OF WHAT SOME OF THOSE CRITERIA MIGHT
17 BE SO THAT WE CAN HAVE AN EXPRESSION OF SENTIMENT TO THE
18 ICOC BECAUSE THEY'RE THE ONES WHO VOTE ON THIS.

19 MR. KLEIN: WHAT THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE DID
20 THAT WAS VERY HELPFUL, SO THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS WHICH
21 DIRECTION WE'RE GOING, IS HAVE A CONCEPTUAL RESOLUTION AS
22 YOU JUST ARTICULATED IT SO THAT THEY KNOW THAT WE'RE
23 WORKING ON IT AND INTEND TO HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION OF
24 THIS BEING PUBLIC. THAT'S VERY HELPFUL BECAUSE THE
25 PUBLIC, WITHOUT THAT INFORMATION, IS ASSUMING WE'RE GOING

1 TO TRY AND KEEP EVERYTHING PRIVATE.

2 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY.

3 MR. HARRISON: DR. FRIEDMAN, IT'S JAMES
4 HARRISON. WHAT THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP SEARCH
5 SUBCOMMITTEE IS DOING IS THE STAFF IS ACTUALLY DRAFTING
6 PROPOSED RULES TO GOVERN THE MEETINGS OF THE STANDARDS
7 WORKING GROUP WHICH WILL COME BACK TO THE ICOC FOR
8 APPROVAL. SO THERE WILL BE OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC
9 COMMENT ON THE FINER DETAILS.

10 MR. KLEIN: SO WHAT WE WOULD DO IS IF WE COULD
11 PASS A RESOLUTION AS YOU JUST ARTICULATED IT; AND THEN IF
12 THE ICOC APPROVES OUR CONCEPT, THEN STAFF WOULD BE
13 DIRECTED TO DRAFT IT, BRING IT BACK TO THIS COMMITTEE FOR
14 SPECIFIC REVIEW.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'D LIKE TO HAVE -- THANK
16 YOU FOR THAT CLARIFICATION. I'D LIKE TO HAVE DISCUSSION,
17 PLEASE, FROM VARIOUS COMMITTEE MEMBERS FIRST, AND THEN
18 THE PUBLIC. GAYLE, DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS, PLEASE?

19 MS. WILSON: WELL, I JUST THOUGHT -- YOU KNOW,
20 YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO BE THROWING A BOMB IN THE
21 MIDDLE OF ALL THIS, SO I THINK IT'S A VERY THOUGHTFUL
22 PROPOSAL. AND I ALSO THINK THAT AS MUCH AS WE CAN HAVE
23 IN PUBLIC IS GOOD, SO I THINK IT'S A GOOD THING.

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. I'M GLAD TO KNOW
25 I'M NOT THE ONLY ANARCHIST. IT MAKES ME FEEL SO MUCH

1 BETTER, GAYLE.

2 CAN I ASK, PLEASE, AT UC DAVIS FOR YOUR
3 COMMENTS?

4 DR. PRIETO: I WAS READY TO PULL THE PIN ON YOUR
5 GRENADE.

6 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: EXCELLENT.

7 DR. PRIETO: I THINK THAT ABSOLUTELY OUR DEFAULT
8 POSITION SHOULD BE THAT EVERYTHING IS PUBLIC UNLESS THERE
9 ARE STRONG, COMPELLING REASONS. THE EXAMPLE THAT BOB
10 GAVE IS A GOOD ONE. WE DON'T WANT TO TIP OUR HANDS THAT
11 WE'RE LOOKING AT A PIECE OF LAND BECAUSE THAT OBVIOUSLY
12 IS AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND ALLOWS THE LANDHOLDER
13 TO JACK THE PRICE UP. BUT WITHOUT -- OTHER THAN THOSE
14 SPECIFIC EXEMPTIONS, WHICH WE SHOULD HAVE STAFF PREPARE
15 FOR US AND REVIEW AT THE ICOC, THE DEFAULT POSITION
16 ABSOLUTELY SHOULD BE THAT ALL OUR DISCUSSIONS ARE IN
17 PUBLIC.

18 DR. POMEROY: THERE'S OBVIOUSLY CONSENSUS THAT
19 THE PHILOSOPHIES AND THE GENERAL CRITERIA SHOULD BE
20 PUBLIC. I THINK WE OUGHT TO BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT THE
21 CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUAL APPLICATIONS. I THINK IT'S
22 GOING TO BE EXTRAORDINARILY DIFFICULT TO EVALUATE
23 FACILITIES WITHOUT EVALUATING THE SCIENCE THAT WILL
24 HAPPEN WITHIN THOSE FACILITIES.

25 MR. KLEIN: EXACTLY. I THINK WHAT DR. FRIEDMAN

1 WAS SUGGESTING IS THAT THE SCIENCE EVALUATION PORTION
2 THAT COMES FROM THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE WOULD BE KEPT
3 CONFIDENTIAL.

4 DR. POMEROY: I WOULD PERSONALLY BE SURPRISED
5 THAT YOU COULD HAVE A DISCUSSION OF A FACILITIES GRANT
6 WITHOUT DISCUSSING THE SCIENCE, SO I THINK THAT
7 FUNCTIONALLY IT MAY BE THAT YOU END UP CLOSING A LOT OF
8 DISCUSSIONS BECAUSE I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD BE GIVING ANY
9 MONEY OUT FOR A FACILITY WITHOUT CONSIDERING IN THE
10 DISCUSSION OF THAT THE SCIENCE THAT WILL HAPPEN WITHIN
11 IT.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: LET ME JUST CLARIFY MY POINT
13 HERE BECAUSE YOU AND I ARE IN SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT. I
14 BELIEVE THAT THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE WOULD SAY THERE ARE
15 THESE WONDERFUL IDEAS, AND WE SEE A JUSTIFICATION FOR N
16 THOUSAND FEET OF LAB SPACE AND ANIMAL FACILITIES, A PET
17 SCANNER, WHATEVER IT IS. THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE REVIEWS
18 THIS AND BELIEVES THIS IS APPROPRIATE. AND THEN THAT'S
19 ALL DONE AS YOU WOULD REVIEW ANY SCIENTIFIC GRANT UNDER
20 THOSE CONFIDENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS.

21 YOU THEN WOULD SAY, OKAY, WE HAVE A
22 JUSTIFICATION FOR N THOUSAND FEET OF LAB SPACE IN THIS
23 SORT OF FACILITY AND SO FORTH. THEN IT GOES TO THE
24 FACILITIES GROUP, AND YOU SAY YOU'RE PROPOSING TO DO THIS
25 AT \$8,000 A SQUARE FOOT. UNACCEPTABLE. YOU'RE ASKING TO

1 DO THIS WHEN THERE'S AN INSTITUTION 20 MINUTES AWAY THAT
2 HAS ALREADY GOT THIS FACILITY. WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND WHY
3 YOU AREN'T SHARING THEIR FACILITY. OR YOU'RE SETTING UP
4 A FACILITY THAT IS UNIQUE IN YOUR AREA. EXPLAIN TO US
5 WHY YOU'RE NOT SHARING IT WITH OTHER SISTER INSTITUTIONS
6 IN YOUR LOCALE. OR IT GOES ON AND ON. THOSE KINDS OF
7 THINGS, I THINK, CAN ABSOLUTELY BE DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC
8 AND SHOULD BE.

9 DR. POMEROY: I THINK THE CONCERN THAT I HAVE IS
10 THAT WHEN THE FACILITIES GROUP GETS AN APPLICATION,
11 THEY'RE GOING TO GET AN APPLICATION FROM TWO DIFFERENT
12 INSTITUTIONS FOR A WET LAB. AND THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
13 SAY WE THINK THE MONEY SHOULD GO TO INSTITUTION X OVER
14 INSTITUTION Y. THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO GIVE A RANKING.

15 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THAT'S EXACTLY RIGHT.

16 DR. POMEROY: AND THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
17 JUSTIFY THAT RANKING ON THE BASIS OF THE SCIENCE AS WELL
18 AS THE FACILITIES PART.

19 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: BUT, CLAIRE, THAT'S GOING TO
20 HAPPEN AT THE ICOC MEETING. THAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN
21 BECAUSE THERE'S GOING TO BE A DISCUSSION, A PUBLIC
22 DISCUSSION OF THE GRANTS, AND INSTITUTIONS WILL BE
23 COMPETING. WE WON'T GET INTO DETAILS ABOUT WHY
24 INSTITUTION A IS SUPERIOR TO INSTITUTION B, BUT THAT'S
25 GOING TO HAPPEN IN PUBLIC ANYWAY. AND YOU ARE NOT GOING

1 TO HAVE THE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS TALKING ABOUT WHETHER THE
2 GENOMICS CORE AT INSTITUTION A IS BETTER THAN THE B.
3 THEY WILL BE ACCEPTING THAT FROM THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE.
4 THAT'S WHY WORKING OUT THE DETAILS OF HOW THESE TWO
5 COMMITTEES INTERACT IS REALLY PRETTY IMPORTANT AND A
6 LITTLE BIT TRICKY RIGHT NOW.

7 DR. POMEROY: ALL I'M SAYING IS THAT WITHOUT
8 THOSE DETAILS WORKED OUT, I DON'T THINK WE KNOW EXACTLY
9 WHAT WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE FACILITIES MEETING. SO I
10 PERSONALLY WOULD BE VERY COMFORTABLE ENDORSING TODAY
11 PHILOSOPHIES AND GENERAL CRITERIA SHOULD BE OPEN AND THAT
12 MORE DISCUSSION IS NEEDED ABOUT HOW THE ACTUAL GRANTS
13 WILL BE REVIEWED BECAUSE WE HAVEN'T DEFINED THE PROCESS.

14 MR. KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO
15 GET ENDORSED TODAY.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WELL, BOB, I'M SORRY.
17 THAT'S MOST OF WHAT WE'RE -- SOME OF US WANT TO GET
18 ENDORSED TODAY. THE OTHER IS THE DEFAULT POSITION THAT,
19 IN GENERAL, DISCUSSIONS WILL BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. AND
20 NOT JUST AS A SORT OF GENERAL, VAGUE STATEMENT, BUT THAT
21 WE WILL REALLY STRETCH TO MAKE SURE THAT WHEREVER
22 POSSIBLE, WITHOUT VIOLATING CONFIDENTIALITY, FISCAL
23 RESTRAINT, OR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, THAT WE REALLY
24 ADHERE TO THAT. I'M PROPOSING SOMETHING ONE STEP ABOVE
25 WHAT YOU'RE SUGGESTING.

1 MR. KLEIN: CLAIRE, WHAT DR. FRIEDMAN
2 ARTICULATED IS, IN FACT, MY THOUGHT OF WHERE WE SHOULD
3 GO, BUT CAN'T WE MAKE THAT STATEMENT THAT DR. FRIEDMAN
4 JUST MADE AND ALSO RECOGNIZE IN THE COMMUNICATION THAT
5 THE SCIENCE AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SCIENCE TO THE
6 FACILITY IS INTENDED TO BE A CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION
7 BECAUSE EFFECTIVELY, I THINK, AS DR. FRIEDMAN SAID, WHEN
8 THE FACILITIES GROUP FORWARDS A FACILITY TO THE BOARD, IT
9 WILL SAY WE HAVE RECOMMENDED THIS BASED UPON A HIGH
10 SCIENCE EVALUATION AND ALL OF THIS DETAIL ON THE FACILITY
11 AND WHY IT MAKES SENSE AND WHY THE DOLLARS MAKE SENSE,
12 ETC.

13 WE DON'T HAVE TO DECIDE EXACTLY HOW THIS PROCESS
14 IS ARTICULATED TODAY, BUT CAN'T THE DEFAULT POSITION
15 REALLY BE PUBLIC HEARINGS?

16 DR. POMEROY: I THINK IT CAN. IT'S THE
17 ENUMERATION OF THE EXCEPTIONS, THAT IT WILL BE CRITICAL
18 TO THE WORDING OF THE MOTION.

19 MR. KLEIN: OKAY. AND THE ENUMERATION OF THE
20 EXCEPTIONS IS SOMETHING THAT THE STAFF IS GOING TO TRY
21 AND WORK OUT AND BRING BACK TO US.

22 DR. POMEROY: OKAY.

23 MR. KLEIN: IS THAT CORRECT, DR. FRIEDMAN?

24 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M SORRY.

25 MR. KLEIN: THE ENUMERATING OF THE EXCEPTIONS IS

1 SOMETHING THE STAFF IS GOING TO TRY AND WORK OUT AND
2 BRING BACK.

3 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M VERY COMFORTABLE WITH
4 THAT.

5 DR. LOVE: I WOULD JUST SAY I TEND TO AGREE WITH
6 CLAIRE, AND I THINK THAT THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT. AND, DR.
7 FRIEDMAN, I DEFINITELY AGREE AND UNDERSTAND YOUR POINT,
8 BUT I THINK THERE ARE LIKELY TO BE THINGS THAT WE DON'T
9 FULLY ANTICIPATE THAT COULD COME UP THAT WOULD BE HIGHLY
10 INJURIOUS TO SOMEONE OR SOME PROCESS, AND WE NEED TO BE
11 VERY CAREFUL ABOUT EITHER HAVING SOME LANGUAGE THAT
12 COVERS SOMETHING UNEXPECTED IN THE PROPOSAL, OR WE MAY
13 COMPROMISE OURSELVES ULTIMATELY.

14 MR. KLEIN: DR. LOVE, ON THE STANDARDS SIDE, I
15 THINK THAT THE LANGUAGE, THEY'RE GOING TO ENUMERATE
16 CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS AND ALSO HAVE A PROVISION AND SAY AND
17 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS WHERE IT'S CRITICAL TO THE MISSION
18 OF THE WORKING GROUP THAT THE INFORMATION REMAIN
19 CONFIDENTIAL.

20 DR. LOVE: I'D BE MUCH MORE COMFORTABLE IF WE
21 HAD THAT KIND OF LANGUAGE IN THERE BECAUSE I THINK WE
22 DON'T WANT TO BIND OURSELVES AND ULTIMATELY HURT THE
23 INITIATIVE.

24 DR. PRIETO: ISN'T THAT WHAT WE'RE ASKING STAFF
25 TO COME BACK WITH?

1 MR. KLEIN: YEAH. EXCEPTIONS AND THAT SPECIFIC
2 TYPE LANGUAGE, DR. LOVE.

3 DR. LOVE: OKAY.

4 MR. KLEIN: GIVEN THIS DISCUSSION, NOW THAT I
5 THINK WE'VE REFINED IT, I WOULD LIKE TO ACCEPT -- I WOULD
6 LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION FROM YOUR LAST STATEMENT, DR.
7 FRIEDMAN, WITH THE SPECIFICATION THAT WE WOULD
8 COMMUNICATE THIS TO THE ICOC AND ASK THEM TO APPROVE THE
9 CONCEPT WITH STAFF TO BRING BACK TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE THE
10 SPECIFIC LANGUAGE, INCLUDING THE EXCEPTIONS AND A
11 SPECIFIC MISSION STATEMENT THAT DEALS WITH -- THAT GIVES
12 US THE ABILITY TO ADJUST UNANTICIPATED CRITICAL
13 SITUATIONS WHERE CONFIDENTIALITY WOULD BE IMPORTANT.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY.

15 DR. LOVE: I WOULD SECOND THAT.

16 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY. ANY DISCUSSION,
17 PLEASE, FROM THE COMMITTEE?

18 DR. POMEROY: I THINK WE BETTER RESTATE THE
19 ENTIRE MOTION.

20 DR. LOVE: I'D BE HAPPY TO. I THINK THE MOTION
21 WAS FOR US TO HAVE THE DEFAULT POSITION BE THAT AS MUCH
22 OF THE DISCUSSIONS WOULD GO ON IN PUBLIC AS POSSIBLE,
23 WITH THE EXCEPTION OF CERTAIN DEFAULTS, AND WE HAD SOME
24 SPECIFIC DEFAULTS, BUT WE'RE GOING -- WE WILL HAVE A MORE
25 GENERAL ELABORATION OF THE DEFAULT LANGUAGE BY THE STAFF.

1 MR. KLEIN: AND SPECIFICALLY INCLUDING, FOR
2 EXAMPLE, THAT PUBLIC DISCUSSION INCLUDE STANDARDS,
3 CRITERIA FOR SELECTION, POLICY, AND MANY OTHER AREAS.
4 THOSE AREAS ARE WORTH USING AS EXAMPLES BECAUSE THE
5 PUBLIC IS SPECIFICALLY INTERESTED IN THOSE BEING IN THE
6 PUBLIC DOMAIN.

7 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IS THAT A CLEAR ENOUGH
8 STATEMENT, CLAIRE?

9 DR. POMEROY: IT'S GOING TO BE INTERESTING TO
10 SEE HOW IT'S TRANSCRIBED FOR PRESENTATION TO THE ICOC.

11 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: IT WILL BE INTERESTING.

12 MR. KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, WE CAN LOOK TO YOU
13 REVIEWING THE TRANSCRIPTION.

14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I CAN PROMISE YOU THAT I
15 WILL, AND HAVE SOME EXAMPLES AT THE ICOC MEETING THAT I
16 CAN EXPLAIN SO PEOPLE WILL UNDERSTAND PRECISELY WHAT
17 WE'RE TALKING ABOUT.

18 OTHER DISCUSSION, PLEASE, PALO ALTO.

19 DR. LOVE: THERE'S A PUBLIC COMMENT.

20 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I'M VERY HAPPY TO GET
21 PUBLIC. IS THERE ANY OTHER COMMITTEE COMMENTS? GOOD.
22 LET'S GO TO PUBLIC. PLEASE, THE PUBLIC COMMENT.

23 MR. REED: I THINK IT'S -- THIS SAME SITUATION
24 CAME UP AT THE RECENT MEETING IN SACRAMENTO ON THE
25 PRIVACY ISSUE. AND THE CRITICS OF US WERE SAYING THAT IT

1 WAS ESSENTIAL THAT THE CRITERIA AND THE RESULTS BE
2 TRANSPARENT, BUT EVEN THEY COULD UNDERSTAND THE NEED FOR
3 SOME PRIVACY IN THE PROCESS. SO I THINK AS LONG AS WHAT
4 YOU ARE WORKING TOWARDS IS EXCELLENT AND WOULD BE IN
5 TOUCH WITH THE PUBLIC'S MOOD TO WANT TO KNOW, BUT ALSO TO
6 UNDERSTAND THE NEED FOR SOME PRIVACY IN THE MIDDLE AS
7 LONG AS THERE'S SOME LANGUAGE WHICH STATES THAT THERE IS
8 A NEED FOR PRIVACY IN THE MIDDLE IN THE PROCESS ITSELF,
9 BUT THAT THE CRITERIA BEFOREHAND IS CLEAR, TRANSPARENT,
10 AND THE END RESULT IS TRANSPARENT.

11 DR. POMEROY: I LIKE THAT WORDING.

12 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU. I THINK THAT'S
13 VERY HELPFUL. ARE THERE OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS, PLEASE?

14 HEARING NO OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS, WE'LL CALL FOR
15 THE VOTE THEN, PLEASE. I WILL VOTE YES.

16 MS. KING: OKAY. I'M GOING TO ACTUALLY CIRCLE
17 TO GAYLE WILSON NEXT. I UNDERSTAND SHE HAS TO LEAVE
18 EARLY.

19 MS. WILSON: YES.

20 MS. KING: AND BACK TO BOB KLEIN.

21 MR. KLEIN: YES.

22 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

23 DR. LOVE: YES.

24 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

25 DR. POMEROY: YES.

1 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
2 DR. PRIETO: YES.
3 MS. KING: JOHN REED IS ABSENT.
4 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU.
5 ARE THERE ANY OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE
6 COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO BRING TO DISCUSSION THAT
7 HAVE BEEN NOTICED AND WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR
8 DISCUSSION?
9 ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? AND NOW
10 I'M WILLING TO ENTERTAIN GENERAL COMMENTS OR ANY COMMENTS
11 WHATSOEVER THAT THE PUBLIC WOULD LIKE TO GIVE. ANY
12 COMMENTS IN SACRAMENTO, PLEASE?
13 DR. POMEROY: NONE.
14 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: PALO ALTO.
15 MR. REED: JUST ALWAYS WATCH THE CAMARADERIE AND
16 THE COURTESY AND THE CIVILITY OF PEOPLE WORKING TOGETHER.
17 THANK YOU.
18 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: WHICH COMMITTEE HAVE YOU
19 BEEN ATTENDING?
20 MR. REED: I TRY TO ATTEND ALL OF THEM.
21 CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: OKAY. THANK YOU. I'M
22 SORRY. THAT'S VERY KIND OF YOU, SERIOUSLY.
23 ANY COMMENTS, PLEASE, FROM UCLA? AND THERE ARE
24 NO COMMENTS HERE EITHER.
25 IS THERE ANY REASON NOT TO SUSPEND, NOT TO

1 ADJOURN THIS MEETING AT THIS MOMENT THEN?

2 I'D LIKE TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR THEIR KIND
3 ATTENTION THIS AFTERNOON. I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU ONCE
4 AGAIN FOR THE THOUGHTFUL AND CAREFUL WAY THAT YOU
5 INTERVIEWED AND SCREENED ALL THE CANDIDATES. YOU'VE
6 REALLY MADE A COMPLEX PROCESS AS LITTLE BURDEN AS
7 POSSIBLE, AND I'M VERY GRATEFUL TO ALL THE HARD WORK THAT
8 EACH ONE OF YOU HAS PUT IN. I REALLY DO APPRECIATE IT
9 VERY, VERY MUCH. THANK YOU.

10 AND WITH THAT, I WILL CLOSE THIS MEETING AND
11 WISH EVERYBODY A GOOD WEEKEND. THANKS, EVERYBODY.
12 PLEASE TAKE CARE.

13 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 05:14
14 P.M.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25