

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

LOCATION: 210 KING STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DATE: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2007
1 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO. : 79835

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		3
CONSIDERATION OF PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR MAJOR FACILITIES GRANTS REVIEW PROCESS		5
PUBLIC COMMENT		96
ADJOURNMENT		98

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2007

2 1 P.M.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO CALL THE
5 MEETING TO ORDER. I'D LIKE TO ASK RICK KELLER TO PLEASE
6 CALL THE ROLL.

7 MR. KELLER: DAVID LICHTENGER.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: HERE.

9 MR. KELLER: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: HERE.

11 MR. KELLER: MARCY FEIT. DEBORAH HYSEN.

12 MS. HYSEN: HERE.

13 MR. KELLER: ED KASHIAN.

14 MR. KASHIAN: HERE.

15 MR. KELLER: BOB KLEIN.

16 MR. KLEIN: HERE.

17 MR. KELLER: STUART LAFF. JEFF SHEEHY.

18 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

19 MR. KELLER: JOAN SAMUELSON. JANET WRIGHT.

20 DR. WRIGHT: HERE.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO ASK TAMAR TO
22 CONFIRM THAT A QUORUM IS PRESENT.

23 MS. PACTER: THERE IS A QUORUM PRESENT.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU. FIRST, LET ME
25 WELCOME ALL OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE HERE TODAY FOR THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MEETING FOR THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH
2 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR
3 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. COPIES OF THE AGENDA AND OTHER
4 MATERIALS ARE AVAILABLE AT THE DOOR IF YOU DON'T HAVE A
5 COPY. IN ADDITION, THE MEMBERS THAT ARE PARTICIPATING BY
6 TELEPHONE TODAY, WE ALSO HAVE -- IS DR. MURPHY JOINING US
7 OR NOT?

8 MR. KELLER: I RECEIVED A CALL, A NOTE FROM HIM
9 A FEW MINUTES AGO, AND HE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO JOIN US OR
10 JOIN LATE.

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: HOPEFULLY HE'LL BE
12 JOINING US. I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE RICK KELLER, WHO IS
13 THE SENIOR OFFICER FOR SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH
14 FACILITIES FOR CIRM. HE WILL BE LEADING THE POWERPOINT
15 PRESENTATION TODAY ON THE PROCESS TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE
16 WORKING GROUP'S REVIEW OF PART 2 OF THE MAJOR RESEARCH
17 FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM. ALSO IN ATTENDANCE IS GENERAL
18 COUNSEL TAMAR PACHTER, INTERIM SCIENTIFIC OFFICER PAT
19 OLSON, AS WELL AS OTHER CIRM STAFF.

20 MR. KLEIN: IS JAMES HARRISON ON THE LINE AS
21 WELL?

22 MR. HARRISON: I AM HERE, BOB.

23 MR. KLEIN: OKAY. GOOD.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ALSO JAMES HARRISON, OUR
25 OUTSIDE COUNSEL.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 I'D LIKE TO NOW MOVE TO AGENDA ITEM 4,
2 CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE MAJOR
3 FACILITIES GRANTS REVIEW. BEFORE I ASK RICK TO PRESENT
4 THE MATERIALS FOR TODAY'S MEETING, I WANT TO BRIEFLY
5 REVIEW THE OVERALL PROCESS FOR THE GRANT PROGRAM.

6 THE MAJOR FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM IS A
7 COMPONENT OF CIRM'S SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC PLAN. IT IS
8 AIMED AT PROVIDING FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES,
9 TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY FOR STEM CELL
10 RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA. THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S
11 OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE HAS APPROVED \$227 MILLION FOR THIS
12 GRANT PROGRAM.

13 REVIEW OF THIS PROGRAM IS TO OCCUR IN TWO PARTS
14 AS DESCRIBED IN THE RFA OR REQUEST FOR APPLICATION. A
15 PART 1 REVIEW WILL BE CONDUCTED LATER THIS MONTH BY THE
16 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
17 THAT REVIEW WILL ADDRESS SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ASPECTS OF
18 THE APPLICATION. THE ICOC WILL CONSIDER THE
19 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AT ITS
20 MEETING IN JANUARY.

21 PART 2 OF THE REVIEW WILL BE CONDUCTED BY THIS
22 WORKING GROUP AND CONSISTS OF THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL
23 REVIEW OF ITS APPLICATIONS. ONLY THOSE APPLICATIONS THAT
24 ARE APPROVED BY THE ICOC IN ITS REVIEW OF PART 1 WILL BE
25 ASKED TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL FOR CONSIDERATION OF PART 2.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REVIEW IS
2 SCHEDULED TO TAKE PLACE ON APRIL 4TH AND 5TH HERE IN SAN
3 FRANCISCO AT CIRM.

4 MR. KELLER: ACTUALLY AT THE MIYAKO.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AT THE MIYAKO HOTEL. THE
6 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP WILL BE CONSIDERED
7 BY THE ICOC AT THE MEETING SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 23D AND
8 24TH. AT THAT TIME THE ICOC WILL MAKE FINAL DECISIONS ON
9 THE AMOUNT OF FUNDING PROVIDED TO THE APPLICANTS.

10 FINALLY, I WANT TO MAKE NOTE THAT WHILE THE
11 ICOC HAS APPROVED 277 MILLION IN CAPITAL FUNDS, IT WILL
12 BE CONSIDERING PROVIDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE
13 EQUIPMENT TO AUGMENT THE AMOUNT AVAILABLE UNDER THIS
14 PROGRAM. CONSIDERATION OF THIS ISSUE IS TENTATIVELY
15 SCHEDULED FOR THE DECEMBER ICOC MEETING.

16 THAT OUTLINES THE OVERALL PROCESS. ARE THERE
17 ANY QUESTIONS? IF THERE ARE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, RICK,
18 COULD YOU START US OFF, PLEASE.

19 MR. KELLER: BEFORE I START, I WANTED TO LET
20 TAMAR GIVE A BRIEF COMMENT REGARDING THE WORKINGS OF THE
21 WORKING GROUP.

22 MS. PACHTER: I KNOW ALL OF YOU READ YOUR
23 BYLAWS EVERY NIGHT BEFORE YOU GO TO SLEEP.

24 MR. KASHIAN: SOMETHING I FORGOT TO DO LAST
25 NIGHT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. PACHTER: BUT I WANTED TO REMIND YOU, NOW
2 THAT THE APPLICATIONS FOR PART 1 OF THE MAJOR FACILITIES
3 RFA ARE IN, THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING
4 GROUP ARE PROHIBITED UNDER THE BYLAWS FROM HAVING ANY
5 COMMUNICATIONS WITH APPLICANTS ABOUT THEIR APPLICATION.

6 MR. KLEIN: CAN'T REALLY HEAR TAMAR.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SHE'S GOING TO COME OVER,
8 BOB.

9 MS. PACHTER: SO, BOB, I WAS JUST REMINDING THE
10 MEMBERS THAT UNDER THE BYLAWS, NOW THAT THE PART 1
11 APPLICATIONS ARE IN, THERE'S A PROVISION IN THE BYLAWS
12 THAT PROVIDES THAT MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING
13 GROUP SHOULD NOT DISCUSS WITH APPLICANTS THEIR
14 APPLICATIONS, A PENDING APPLICATION. AND I WAS ADDING
15 THAT THAT DOESN'T MEAN, OF COURSE, THAT YOU CAN'T DISCUSS
16 ANYTHING WITH AN APPLICANT AT AN OPEN MEETING. WHAT THAT
17 MEANS IS YOU SHOULDN'T BE HAVING OFFLINE CONVERSATIONS
18 WITH APPLICANTS ABOUT THEIR APPLICATIONS. AND I JUST
19 WANTED TO ASK IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT.

20 MR. KLEIN: TAMAR, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. I
21 PREVIOUSLY TALKED TO VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THIS, CHAIRMAN
22 AND VICE CHAIRMAN, I THINK, AND/OR OTHER MEMBERS, TO MAKE
23 SURE THAT WE WERE CONSIDERING THE FACT THAT THERE MAY BE
24 DONATIONS FROM DONORS WHO COME TO US. AND THOSE DONORS
25 WHO ARE RELATED TO SOME APPLICANT WHO HAS PUBLICLY ON

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FILE AN APPLICATION, WHILE WE CAN'T TALK TO THE DONOR
2 ABOUT THE APPLICATION, THE DONOR CAN ASK US TO SEE THE
3 HISTORY, WHICH IS A PUBLIC RECORD, OF WHAT GRANTS HAVE
4 BEEN APPROVED FOR THAT INSTITUTION OR OTHER HISTORICAL
5 INFORMATION RELATED TO THAT INSTITUTION.

6 SO THE POINT IS WE CAN'T TALK TO THE
7 INSTITUTIONS ABOUT THEIR APPLICATIONS, BUT IT'S MY
8 UNDERSTANDING THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE CAN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS
9 AS TO PUBLICLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION OF DONORS WHO WANT
10 TO KNOW ABOUT THE PARTICULAR INSTITUTION WHERE WE HAVE A
11 PUBLIC HISTORY OF MAKING GRANTS THAT WE CAN POINT THEM
12 TO.

13 MS. PACHTER: YES. THAT'S NOT ADDRESSED AT ALL
14 IN THE BYLAWS, BOB. YOU'RE RIGHT.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, TAMAR, I JUST WANT TO
16 MAKE -- SO ANY QUESTIONS THAT ANY MEMBERS OF THE GROUP
17 MAY GET, WE WOULD JUST REFER THIS TO RICK OR TO YOU,
18 CORRECT?

19 MS. PACHTER: YES. AND THE STAFF HAS SET UP A
20 FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS SYSTEM ON THE WEBSITE SO THAT
21 WHEN WE RECEIVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE RFA OR ABOUT AN
22 APPLICATION, WE CAN RESPOND SO EVERYBODY CAN SEE THE
23 ANSWER.

24 MR. KASHIAN: COULD YOU PLEASE FORWARD THAT
25 INFORMATION?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. PACHTER: THE BYLAWS?

2 MR. KASHIAN: NO. NO. THE FREQUENTLY ASKED
3 QUESTION LINE SO IF SOMEONE CALLS ME, I CAN TELL THEM
4 WHAT TO DO.

5 MS. PACHTER: SURE. ABSOLUTELY.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT WOULD BE GREAT IF IT
7 COULD BE SENT TO ALL THE MEMBERS, RICK, JUST SO WE CAN
8 ALL HAVE A STANDARD RESPONSE. IF WE GET ASKED ANY
9 QUESTIONS, WE CAN REFER THEM TO THE SAME.

10 MR. KELLER: WE'LL MAKE SURE YOU HAVE THAT WEB
11 ADDRESS.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GREAT. ANY OTHER
13 QUESTIONS OR ISSUES BEFORE RICK GOES AHEAD AND PRESENTS
14 THE POWERPOINT? THANK YOU, RICK.

15 MR. KELLER: I APOLOGIZE FOR IT BEING KIND OF
16 WARM IN HERE, BUT WE HAD, I THINK, A LITTLE PROBLEM WITH
17 THE AIR CONDITIONING. BUT IT'S A WARM DAY IN THE CITY,
18 SO THOSE OF YOU WHO AREN'T HERE, IT'S VERY WARM, BUT WE
19 ARE WORKING ON IT. SO I APOLOGIZE.

20 WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH SEVERAL SLIDES HERE
21 RELATED TO THE REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE MAJOR FACILITIES
22 GRANT REVIEW. OUR OBJECTIVES REALLY INVOLVE THE TWO
23 MAJOR COMPONENTS OF THE REVIEW, THE TECHNICAL REVIEW,
24 THAT IS BASED ON THE CRITERIA, AND THE PROGRAMMATIC
25 REVIEW, WHICH ALLOWS THE GROUP TO RESPOND TO THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OBJECTIVES OF THE RFA.

2 LET ME GO THROUGH THE TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS
3 AND REMIND YOU, DRAWING FROM THE EXPERIENCE THAT WE HAD
4 FROM THE SHARED LAB AND SCORING SYSTEM --

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: EVERYONE HAS A COPY OF
6 THIS, CORRECT?

7 MR. KELLER: THAT'S RIGHT. IF YOU WANT TO MAKE
8 NOTES, THAT'S FINE.

9 THE TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS WILL CONSIST OF
10 THE PREPARATION OF A STAFF ANALYSIS, AND THAT STAFF
11 ANALYSIS WILL BE SIMILAR IN SCOPE TO THE STAFF ANALYSIS
12 THAT WAS PREPARED FOR THE SHARED LAB, BUT IT WILL BE
13 EXPANDED SOMEWHAT. I'LL GET INTO THAT IN A MINUTE.

14 THE REVIEW PROCESS WILL THEN BE THAT ALL
15 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WOULD REVIEW THE STAFF
16 ANALYSIS. APPLICANTS WOULD THEN BE PROVIDED THE STAFF
17 ANALYSIS, AND THEY WOULD BE ALLOWED TO PROVIDE WRITTEN
18 COMMENTS TO THE WORKING GROUP. AND THEN THE FACILITIES
19 WORKING GROUP REAL ESTATE MEMBERS WOULD LEAD THE
20 DISCUSSION OF EACH CANDIDATE INSTITUTION'S APPLICATION AT
21 THE MEETING.

22 MR. SHEEHY: I CAN'T REMEMBER. ARE THESE STAFF
23 ANALYSES PUBLIC DOCUMENTS?

24 MR. KELLER: THEY ARE ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFTS
25 UNTIL PUBLIC, AND I'LL GO THROUGH THAT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: I THOUGHT SO. I KNEW THERE WAS A
2 LITTLE --

3 MR. KLEIN: RICK, TO EXPAND ON THAT, THE
4 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REAL ESTATE MEMBERS WILL LEAD
5 THE DISCUSSION; BUT AFTER THEY'VE MADE THEIR COMMENTS,
6 THEN THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE CAN FULLY
7 PARTICIPATE IN THAT DISCUSSION.

8 MR. KELLER: ABSOLUTELY. YES. I'M SURE THAT'S
9 THE EXPECTATION. BUT JUST THAT THEY WOULD BE THE PRIME
10 PARTICIPANTS, I THINK, IS WHAT WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER
11 WORDING.

12 MR. KLEIN: NO. I THINK THE LEAD PARTICIPANTS
13 BECAUSE WITHOUT PREJUDICING HOW MUCH ANY ONE MEMBER SAYS
14 BECAUSE ANY MEMBER MAY HAVE A LOT TO SAY ABOUT ANY
15 APPLICATION.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT MAKES SENSE, BOB. I
17 THINK EVERYONE HAS A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING ON THAT. SO ANY
18 OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

19 MR. KELLER: GOING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF THE
20 STAFF ANALYSIS, WHAT WE'RE GOING TO PROVIDE YOU WILL BE A
21 STAFF ANALYSIS THAT IS AN ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION
22 AND HOW WELL IT RESPONDS TO THE REQUIREMENTS THAT HAVE
23 BEEN OUTLINED IN THE RFA AND IN THE APPLICATION. AND
24 THAT WILL LARGELY BE BASED ON NUMERICAL DATA IN TERMS OF
25 COMPARATIVE INFORMATION ABOUT COSTS AND FUNCTIONALITY AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE OTHER CATEGORIES OF REVIEW IN TERMS OF SHARED
2 RESOURCES AND LEVERAGE, AND THOSE ISSUES -- AS WELL AS
3 SCHEDULE INFORMATION. SO ALL THAT INFORMATION IS FACTUAL
4 RELATIVE TO OUR STAFF REVIEW OF THE APPLICATIONS AND
5 SUMMARIZATION OF HOW WELL THE RESPONSES TO THAT -- HOW
6 WELL THE APPLICANT HAS RESPONDED TO THE REQUESTED
7 INFORMATION.

8 IN PREPARING THAT, WE WILL BE USING AN
9 ADDITIONAL LOOKING INTO THE PROSPECT OF SUPPLEMENTING OUR
10 STAFF FOR A TEMPORARY TIME TO HELP WITH THAT ANALYSIS AS
11 WELL AS ENGAGING A PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL PLANNING
12 FIRM THAT WOULD HELP US ON SOME OF THE MORE TECHNICAL
13 ASPECTS OF THE APPLICATIONS. AND --

14 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I JUST -- SO I JUST WANT TO
15 KNOW WHAT THIS LOOKS LIKE. I LIKE THAT YOU HAVE
16 NUMERICAL DATA BECAUSE IT WOULD BE GREAT TO HAVE REALLY
17 OBJECTIVE STUFF THAT PEOPLE -- SO IT'S CLEAR WHAT WE'RE
18 DOING. CAN YOU JUST KIND OF, AND I HATE TO BE THE DUMMY
19 HERE, WALK ME THROUGH WHAT IT MIGHT LOOK LIKE AND HOW
20 THAT MIGHT BE PRESENTED IN A WAY. I KNOW WE'RE GOING TO
21 GET LATER TO SCORING, SO I'M PERHAPS ANTICIPATING. BUT
22 IF PEOPLE ARE GOING TO SCORE, LET'S JUST TAKE SOMETHING
23 LIKE SHARED RESOURCES OR FUNCTIONALITY.

24 MR. KELLER: THE EXPECTATION IS THAT WE WOULD
25 GARNER FROM THE INFORMATION REQUESTED OF THE APPLICANT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND BE ABLE TO LOOK AT PRETTY CONSISTENT MILESTONES OR
2 STANDARDS OR RESPONSE RELATIVE TO THOSE CRITERIA. SO,
3 FOR INSTANCE, ON FUNCTIONALITY WE MIGHT LOOK AT -- WE
4 WOULD HAVE IN THE REQUIREMENT AN UNDERSTANDING OF HOW
5 EFFICIENT THE BUILDING DESIGN IS RELATIVE TO GROSS SQUARE
6 FEET, TO ASSIGNABLE SQUARE FEET, OR USABLE SQUARE FEET.
7 WE WOULD -- AGAIN, UNDER FUNCTIONALITY, WE WOULD SAY WHAT
8 IS THE EXPECTED CAPACITY OF THIS SPACE IN TERMS OF EITHER
9 NUMBER OF RESEARCHERS OR NUMBER OF PRINCIPAL
10 INVESTIGATORS. AND THAT WOULD GIVE AN INDICATION OF HOW
11 FUNCTIONAL THAT SPACE IS RELATIVE TO OTHER APPLICATIONS.

12 SO THAT INFORMATION WOULD BE IN A NARRATIVE
13 FORM AND IN A NUMERICAL SUMMARY THAT WOULD BE FACTUAL
14 THAT WOULD BE GARNERED FROM THE APPLICATION TO GIVE IT
15 THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE REVIEW.

16 MR. SHEEHY: SO LET'S SAY THAT I HAVE FIVE
17 APPLICATIONS COMPETING ON THE INSTITUTE LEVEL. I WOULD
18 BE ABLE TO SET THIS REPORT DOWN AND BE ABLE TO DO A SCALE
19 AND BE ABLE TO SAY, LIKE IN FUNCTIONALITY, WHAT DID WE
20 ASSIGN, 15 POINTS, I'D BE ABLE TO SAY THIS ONE SHOULD BE
21 CLOSEST TO 15 POINTS AND THIS ONE MAYBE SHOULD BE
22 FURTHEST AWAY FROM 15 POINTS, AND THERE WOULD BE A GOOD
23 EVIDENCE BASIS THAT WOULD BE FAIRLY EVIDENT SO THAT I
24 COULD -- IF I WERE SCORING, IT WOULD BE, YOU KNOW, BOTH
25 IN TERMS OF PUBLIC RECORD AND IN TERMS OF SCORING, I JUST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE EVIDENCE BASE IS REALLY STRONG
2 SO THAT -- YOU GET WHERE I'M GOING WITH THAT? I WANT TO
3 HAVE GOOD, CONCRETE --

4 MR. KELLER: RIGHT. I WANT TO MAKE THE --

5 MR. SHEEHY: I'M HOPING.

6 MR. KELLER: -- COMMENT THAT I DON'T WANT TO
7 IMPLY THAT BY CALLING THIS NUMERICAL, THAT SOMEHOW
8 NUMERICAL IS THE ONLY CONSIDERATION. SO, FOR INSTANCE,
9 IF A FACILITY WAS HIGHLY SPECIALIZED, AND BECAUSE OF THE
10 NEED FOR HIGHER THAN NORMAL ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENTS OR
11 HVAC REQUIREMENTS, THERE MIGHT BE VERY LOW EFFICIENCY OF
12 THAT PARTICULAR PROPOSAL. SO IN MY MIND THAT WOULD NOT
13 NECESSARILY BE A DETRIMENT IF THERE'S A JUSTIFICATION
14 PROVIDED THAT SAID, WHILE THIS IS ONLY 60 PERCENT OR 55
15 PERCENT EFFICIENT, COMPARED TO SOME OTHERS THAT MIGHT BE
16 70 PERCENT EFFICIENT, THERE MIGHT BE GOOD REASON, AND WE
17 WOULD WANT TO BRING THAT OUT WITHIN THE STAFF ANALYSIS.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: RICK, CAN YOU GO TO THE
19 NEXT SLIDE. I THINK THAT -- JEFF, I JUST WANT TO EXPOUND
20 A LITTLE BIT ON THIS TO THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE WORKING
21 GROUP. SO THERE'S GOING TO BE TWO POINTS. ONE IS GOING
22 TO BE THE DATA AND WHAT WE HOPE IS PULLING OUT THE MOST
23 IMPORTANT ELEMENTS OF THE APPLICANT'S APPLICATION IN A
24 VERY CLEAR, CONCISE WAY WHERE IT CAN BE COMPARED EASILY.
25 AND THEN THERE WILL BE A SEPARATE KIND OF OPINION WHICH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE THAT AS A SEPARATE ITEM, CORRECT,
2 RICK?

3 MR. KELLER: YES.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, JEFF, WHEN YOU'RE
5 LOOKING AT THIS, YOU WILL SEE THE KIND OF DATA THAT WE'VE
6 PULLED OUT THAT IS CLEARLY KIND OF THINGS THAT THE
7 APPLICANTS HAVE PUT IN THEIR APPLICATION. BY THE WAY, WE
8 ARE GOING TO SEND THAT -- HOW ARE WE HANDLING THAT, RICK,
9 IN TERMS OF THE APPLICANTS OR IN TERMS OF THIS PART OF
10 THE --

11 MR. KELLER: THE REVIEW OF THE STAFF ANALYSIS?

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YEAH. WILL WE SEND THAT
13 OUT CONCURRENTLY?

14 MR. KELLER: WE HAVE CURRENTLY SCHEDULED,
15 BETWEEN THE COMPLETION OF THE STAFF ANALYSIS AND THE
16 SCHEDULED REVIEW SESSION, TWO WEEKS TO DISTRIBUTE THE
17 STAFF ANALYSIS. WITHIN THAT TWO WEEKS, A DRAFT WOULD BE
18 CIRCULATED TO YOU ALL TO REVIEW. AND WE WOULD EXPECT IF
19 THERE'S ANYTHING IN THERE THAT NEEDED FIXING, YOU'D LET
20 US KNOW. THEN WE WOULD ADVISE THE APPLICANTS OF THE
21 STAFF ANALYSIS BEING AVAILABLE.

22 AND ONCE WE -- AND THEY WOULD HAVE THE
23 OPPORTUNITY, THEN, TO PREPARE A RESPONSE TO THE STAFF
24 ANALYSIS OR A COMMENT LETTER. AND ONCE WE HAVE THAT
25 COMMENT LETTER, PARTICULARLY IF THERE ARE ISSUES THAT WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NEED TO MAKE SURE ARE ACCURATELY CONVEYED IN OUR STAFF
2 ANALYSIS, WE WOULD THEN MAKE THE STAFF ANALYSIS A PUBLIC
3 DOCUMENT AT THAT POINT, HAVING GARNERED THE ADDITIONAL
4 ADVICE FROM BOTH THIS GROUP AND COMMENT LETTERS FROM THE
5 APPLICANT.

6 MR. SHEEHY: ON THIS EXPERT OPINION, IS IT
7 POSSIBLE TO HAVE THAT BE EXPRESSED IN SOME SORT OF WAY IN
8 WHICH THE DIFFERENT OPINIONS CAN BE EVALUATED AGAINST
9 EACH OTHER; I. E. , AS A NUMERICAL VALUE? SO, FOR
10 INSTANCE, AT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, PEOPLE GIVE
11 SCORES, EXTERNAL EXPERT OPINIONS GIVE SCORES, AND GIVEN
12 THAT THESE ARE THE TWO PLACES WHERE SOME MEMBERS OF THE
13 WORKING GROUP, I KNOW MYSELF, I'M NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO
14 NECESSARILY INDEPENDENTLY EVALUATE VALUE AND
15 FUNCTIONALITY.

16 BUT IF I GOT SCORES FROM, YOU KNOW -- WHEREAS,
17 THE OTHER QUESTIONS, LIKE LEVERAGE, THAT'S GOING TO BE --
18 AND THAT'S POLICY -- THERE'S A LOT OF POLICY THAT'S GOING
19 TO GO INTO PLAY THERE AS WELL, BUT THAT'S DOLLARS.
20 URGENCY, I THINK THAT'S GOING TO BE FAIRLY
21 STRAIGHTFORWARD. SHARED RESOURCES, AGAIN,
22 STRAIGHTFORWARD; AND IF WE WANT TO FUDGE AROUND WITH
23 THAT, THERE'S GOING TO BE POLICY CONSIDERATIONS THAT COME
24 INTO PLAY ON THAT AND HOW WE MAY DECIDE WHAT LEVEL OF
25 POINTS WE WANT TO GIVE TO EACH. BUT THESE TWO SEEM TO BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE HARDEST --

2 MR. KELLER: RIGHT.

3 MR. SHEEHY: -- THE HARDEST ONES FOR US TO KIND
4 OF UNDERSTAND AND ONES WHERE WE OUGHT TO GET AN OPINION.
5 YOU CAN SET TWO OPINIONS SIDE BY SIDE, BUT HOW DO YOU --
6 WITHIN THE REVIEW THERE SHOULD BE SOME WAY FOR THEM TO
7 EITHER RANK OR SCORE SO THAT WE GET SOME SENSE OF WHAT --
8 A GOOD, CLEAR SENSE OF WHAT SHOULD GET OUR HIGHEST AMOUNT
9 OF POINTS AND WHAT SHOULD GET OUR LOWEST AMOUNT OF
10 POINTS. AND THESE ARE JUST OPINIONS, BUT THESE OPINIONS,
11 I THINK, SHOULD HAVE SOME NUMERICAL VALUE IN SOME WAY OR
12 SOME SCALE OR SOME WAY THAT WE CAN PUT THEM IN A VERY
13 OBJECTIVE MANNER AS OPPOSED TO JUST SITTING HERE WITH ALL
14 THESE DIFFERENT -- I MEAN I MAY GET THIS OPINION, I MAY
15 NOT UNDERSTAND THE ENTIRE OPINION; BUT IF THE OPINION
16 SAYS I THINK THIS IS THE BEST ONE, YOU KNOW, SCORES THIS
17 AS THE HIGHEST ONE AND SCORES ANOTHER ONE AS LOWER AND
18 ANOTHER AS LOWER, THEN I HAVE A SCALE AND I CAN SEE WHERE
19 THEY SHOULD FIT.

20 MR. KLEIN: JEFF, THIS IS BOB KLEIN. YOU'RE
21 TALKING ABOUT, FOR EXAMPLE, ON EFFICIENCY?

22 MR. SHEEHY: NO. I'M TALKING ABOUT VALUE AND
23 FUNCTIONALITY WHERE WE'RE GETTING SEPARATE OPINIONS BY
24 EXPERT REVIEWERS, WHICH I THINK IS A GREAT ADDITION TO
25 THIS. I THINK THAT THAT'S AN IMPORTANT FEATURE. BUT I

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WONDER IF, ALONG WITH THE OPINION, WE COULD GET SCORES.
2 AND WE CAN TAKE THOSE SCORES INTO ACCOUNT, AND THEY CAN
3 EITHER BE ON A HUNDRED-POINT SCALE OR THEY CAN BE, LIKE
4 FOR VALUE, A 25-POINT SCORE, BUT I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO
5 SEE SCORES THERE SO THAT IF MY SCORE SIGNIFICANTLY
6 DEVIATES FROM THE EXPERT, DAVID AND ED --

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ALL YOU REAL ESTATE
8 EXPERTS.

9 MR. SHEEHY: -- YOU REAL ESTATE EXPERTS CAN
10 COME BACK AND, YOU KNOW, YOU MAY NOT AGREE WITH THE
11 EXPERT OPINION, AND YOU MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT -- AND YOU
12 MAY EXPRESS IT IN THE MEETING, ETC., ETC., BUT FOR ME IT
13 WOULD BE HELPFUL TO HAVE THAT NUMBER.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I DON'T THINK WE'VE
15 GOTTEN THERE YET, BY THE WAY.

16 MR. KELLER: CAN I JUST EXPRESS TWO POINTS IN
17 RESPONSE TO JEFF'S COMMENTS? ONE IS THAT I THINK IT IS
18 IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE AN
19 EXPERT IN THE FIELD, WHO IS A LABORATORY PLANNER,
20 ARCHITECT WHO CAN LOOK AT THESE DRAWINGS FROM THE
21 STANDPOINT OF PEERSHIP OF THE DESIGNERS AND GIVE YOU AN
22 OPINION ABOUT WHAT THEY THINK OF IT RELATIVE TO VALUE AND
23 FUNCTIONALITY. I CAN'T DO THAT BECAUSE I'M NOT AN
24 ARCHITECT. I HAVE MY ABILITY TO DO OTHER ASPECTS OF THE
25 PROPOSAL AND, IN FACT, THOSE TWO ASPECTS AS WELL, BUT NOT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FROM A PEER STANDPOINT.

2 SO I EXPECT THAT IF WE HAVE -- WE EXPECT TO
3 HAVE ONE OF THOSE, ONE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEWER, AND WE'RE
4 LOOKING -- THE ATTEMPT IS TO HAVE SOMEONE FROM OUT OF
5 STATE, BUT A FIRM THAT WOULD LIKELY HAVE A CALIFORNIA
6 PRESENCE SO THAT THEY WOULD BE AWARE OF THE MARKET AND
7 UNDERSTAND THE CALIFORNIA SYSTEM.

8 THE SECOND POINT IS THAT WHETHER OR NOT THAT
9 OPINION IS EXPRESSED IN WORDS OF HIGHEST QUALITY OR
10 LOWEST RANK OR WHATEVER, THAT'S UP TO -- THE WHOLE
11 PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING IS TO ELICIT YOUR UNDERSTANDING
12 OF WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST PROCESS FOR THIS REVIEW. SO IF
13 WE HIRED AN EXPERT REVIEWER TO PROVIDE THIS, AND IF YOU
14 WANT THAT TO BE SCORED ON A SCALE OF WHATEVER, A THROUGH
15 F OR ZERO TO A HUNDRED, WE CAN WRITE THAT INTO WHAT WE
16 WANT A CONTRACT FOR IN TERMS OF THE PRODUCT. IT WILL BE
17 A NON-NEGOTIABLE -- I MEAN WE'RE GOING TO ASK THEIR
18 OPINION, AND THAT'S GOING TO BE THEIR OPINION.

19 MR. SHEEHY: RIGHT. RIGHT.

20 MR. KASHIAN: I HAVE A QUESTION ALONG THE SAME
21 LINES. WHEN YOU'RE SAYING OPINION, OPINION IS THAT OF
22 THE STAFF OR OTHER PEOPLE THAT ARE EXPERTS IN WHATEVER
23 SUBJECTS YOU'RE DEALING WITH. ARE YOU TRYING TO TELL ME
24 THAT WE'RE BOUND BY THOSE OPINIONS?

25 MR. KELLER: NO. I WAS SAYING WE WOULDN'T

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHANGE --

2 MR. KASHIAN: SO AN OPINION AND I CAN USE MY
3 OWN JUDGMENT?

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CORRECT.

5 MR. KELLER: WHAT I WAS TRYING TO GET TO WAS
6 THAT IF I DIDN'T AGREE WITH THE EXPERT OPINION, THE
7 ARCHITECTURAL FIRM THAT PROVIDED THE EXPERT OPINION, IT'S
8 NOT UP TO ME TO CHANGE HIS OPINION BECAUSE WE'RE UNDER
9 CONTRACT TO CIRM. I WOULDN'T DO THAT.

10 MR. KASHIAN: I WOULD WELCOME THE OPINIONS.

11 MR. KELLER: RIGHT. YOU HAVE YOUR OWN
12 JUDGMENT.

13 MR. KASHIAN: BUT I REQUEST THE FREEDOM TO BE
14 ABLE TO USE MY OWN JUDGMENT ON EVERY ISSUE.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ABSOLUTELY.

16 MR. KELLER: IT IS INPUT FOR YOUR
17 CONSIDERATION.

18 MR. KLEIN: JEFF, IN TERMS OF A NUMERICAL
19 ASSIGNMENT, ONE OF THE PROBLEMS HERE IS THAT IF THEY'VE
20 DONE THEIR JOB PROPERLY, A LARGE NUMBER OF THESE MAY BE
21 VERY GOOD. SO I THINK IF WE -- IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT WE
22 MIGHT BE ABLE TO GO A, B, C, D, OR SOMETHING. THE KEY IS
23 WHOEVER IS GIVING THE OPINION HOPEFULLY IS INSTRUCTED
24 THAT THEY DON'T HAVE TO GIVE SOMEONE A D EVEN IF IT WOULD
25 BE A VERY GOOD PLAN OTHER THAN THE FACT THAT THERE ARE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BETTER PLANS ABOVE IT.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DID SOMEONE ELSE JOIN THE
3 CONFERENCE CALL?

4 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JANET. I'VE BEEN
5 LISTENING ON THE CELL PHONE AND GOTTEN TO A LAND LINE.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, JANET.

7 MR. KLEIN: JEFF, DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

8 MR. SHEEHY: WELL --

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT
10 HOW WE'RE GOING TO HAVE THE INDEPENDENT OUTSIDE EXPERT
11 PRESENT THEIR OPINIONS. SO THAT'S WHAT THE SUBJECT
12 MATTER IS.

13 MR. KLEIN: SO I WAS TRYING TO -- JEFF, DID MY
14 COMMENT MAKE SENSE TO JEFF?

15 MR. SHEEHY: IT DOES, BOB. I GUESS MY BIAS, MY
16 STRONG FEELING WOULD BE THAT IT WOULD BE GREAT TO HAVE A
17 NARRATIVE AND WITH THAT SOME SORT OF SCALE SO THAT WE
18 HAVE AN OBJECTIVE. YOU KNOW, IF SOMEONE COMES BACK TO ME
19 AND SAYS YOU SCORED SOMEBODY THIS WAY, UNLESS I HAVE -- I
20 WANT TO HAVE A NICE EVIDENCE BASE FOR MY SCORING THAT'S
21 REALLY CONCRETE. AND AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, I THINK
22 NUMBERS MAKE IT EASY TO DO THAT. YOU KNOW, IT CAN BE AN
23 A, B, C, D. IT CAN BE A ONE TO A HUNDRED SCALE.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JEFF, I THINK WE SHOULD
25 HAVE A NARRATIVE. I DON'T THINK ANYONE WOULD ARGUE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE' S GOT TO BE A NARRATIVE PART. I THINK THAT IF
2 WE' RE GOING TO ASK THEM TO SCORE, I THINK WE SHOULD ASK
3 THEM TO SCORE THEM RELATIVE TO THE OTHER APPLICATIONS.
4 DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO EVERYONE?

5 MR. KLEIN: NO, DAVID. WHAT I' M TRYING TO SAY
6 HERE IS THEY SHOULD SCORE THEM RELATIVE TO A QUALITY
7 STANDARD BECAUSE WE COULD MISREPRESENT PUBLICLY THE
8 OUTCOME IF WE HAVE, YOU KNOW, 12 APPLICATIONS THAT MAKE
9 IT TO THE FACILITIES GROUP AND THEY' RE ALL VARIATIONS OF
10 VERY GOOD TO EXCELLENT. WE DON' T WANT TO GIVE THE BOTTOM
11 THREE, IF THEY THINK -- THEY' RE ACTUALLY VERY GOOD, WE
12 DON' T WANT TO GIVE THEM AN F JUST BECAUSE THEY' RE AT THE
13 BOTTOM OF AN OTHERWISE GOOD GROUP. YOU MIGHT GIVE
14 SOMEONE A TEN AND SOMEBODY A NINE AND SOMEONE AN EIGHT
15 AND SOMEONE A SEVEN; BUT IF, IN FACT, THESE ARE ALL VERY
16 GOOD, YOU DON' T WANT TO BE FORCED TO USE THE WHOLE SCALE
17 AND GO TO A THREE JUST BECAUSE IT' S IN THE BOTTOM
18 QUADRANT OF WHAT IS OTHERWISE EXCELLENT WORK.

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, I AGREE WITH YOU. I
20 THINK THAT' S A GOOD IDEA. VICE CHAIR.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: IN NO WAY, THIS
22 HAS ALREADY BEEN SAID, ARE THE CONSULTANTS' REPORTS, THE
23 STAFF ANALYSIS A SUBSTITUTE FOR EXERCISING OR OWN
24 INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. IT' S NOT. IT' S ALREADY BEEN SAID.
25 IT' S WORTH SAYING AGAIN. JUST AS OUR RECOMMENDATION TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE ICOC WILL NOT BE A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE ICOC EXERCISE
2 OF THEIR OWN INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT ULTIMATELY WHEN THEY
3 AWARD THESE GRANTS. FINE. EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS THAT.

4 I THINK HAVING NUMERICAL DATA IS A GOOD IDEA
5 BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, WE JUST HAVE TO TRUST THAT WE'RE GOING
6 TO RETAIN THE RIGHT KIND OF EXPERTS. AND I HAVE EVERY
7 CONFIDENCE THAT WE WILL. THE NARRATIVE IS CRUCIAL, BUT
8 HAVING THE THEREFORE PART OF IT WOULD BE INSTRUCTIVE.
9 AGAIN, NOT MEANT TO SUBSTITUTE MY OWN JUDGMENT, BUT, YOU
10 KNOW, WHETHER THEY NEED TO HAVE A QUALITY STANDARD OR
11 IT'S ALL VERY NICE, I DON'T KNOW. LOOK, THEY'RE GOING TO
12 BE ASSIGNED -- I ASSUME THE -- I DON'T EVEN KNOW HOW THE
13 CONSULTANTS WILL BE ASSIGNED THEIR TASK. THAT WILL BE UP
14 TO STAFF, QUITE FRANKLY, AND WHETHER THEY LOOK AT FOUR OR
15 THREE OR TWO, WHATEVER THE CASE MAY BE, JUST IN TERMS OF
16 WHAT WE HAVE IN FRONT OF US, I THINK IS A GOOD WORK
17 DOCUMENT. AND I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S ANY FURTHER
18 DISCUSSION WE NEED TO HAVE ON IT. CAN WE JUST MOVE
19 FORWARD?

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WELL, I DO -- RICK, I
21 THINK DO YOU NEED FURTHER -- DO WE NEED TO DECIDE TODAY
22 HOW WE WANT THE CONSULTANTS TO --

23 MR. KELLER: WHAT I NEED TO KNOW IS IF YOU WANT
24 THAT EXPERT OPINION EXPRESSED AS I FORESAW A NARRATIVE
25 THAT WOULD BE BASED ON THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT OF THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INDIVIDUAL OF HOW THAT APPLICATION MEETS A NATIONAL
2 STANDARD RELATIVE TO THE TOPIC AT HAND. IS IT REFLECTIVE
3 OF THE APPROPRIATE KIND OF FUNCTIONAL LAYOUT OF
4 LABORATORY SPACE, OR IS IT 20 YEARS OLD OR NOT
5 REFLECTIVE?

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO ARE WE TALKING ABOUT
7 THE VALUE AND FUNCTIONALITY?

8 MR. KELLER: THAT'S CORRECT.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE'RE NOT GOING TO ASK
10 THEM FOR AN OVERALL SCORE, JUST ON THOSE TWO ITEMS?

11 DR. WRIGHT: WHEN THERE'S A BREAK, I NEED TO
12 ASK A QUESTION.

13 MR. KELLER: I WAS EXPECTING THEM TO GIVE AN --
14 BECAUSE THOSE TWO ARE SO INTERTWINED, I WAS EXPECTING
15 THEM TO PROVIDE KIND OF A COMPOSITE SCORE FOR VALUE AND
16 FUNCTIONALITY FROM YOUR EXPERT. BECAUSE IF YOU WANT THAT
17 TO BE PARTITIONED, AGAIN, WE CAN DO THAT.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I KIND OF FEEL I WOULD
19 LIKE TO SEE IT PARTITIONED. ED.

20 MR. KASHIAN: I UNDERSTAND WHAT JEFF IS SAYING.
21 I DON'T NECESSARILY AGREE. IF WE'RE HIRING AN EXPERT AND
22 HE'S GIVING US HIS OPINION, I WOULD ASSUME HIS OPINION
23 WOULD SAY TO HIS FIELD THIS IS EXCELLENT OR THIS IS VERY
24 GOOD OR SOME SUCH THING. TO ASK HIM TO SCORE IT OR NOT
25 SCORE IT I DON'T THINK IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EVERYONE. JEFF WANTS, I BELIEVE, THE EXPERT OR WHOEVER
2 IS GIVING THE OPINION TO HAVE THEIR OPINION RELATIVE TO
3 THE PARTICULAR APPLICATION. DOES THIS MEET HIS STANDARDS
4 OR THIS DOESN'T MEET HIS STANDARDS.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: DO YOU THINK
6 THERE'S ANY HARM IN THE CONSULTANT PROVIDING A NUMERICAL
7 SCORE, ANY HARM?

8 MR. KASHIAN: A NUMERICAL SCORE RELATIVE TO
9 WHAT?

10 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: INDUSTRY STANDARD,
11 NATIONAL INDUSTRY STANDARD FOR --

12 MS. HYSEN: IS THERE?

13 MR. KASHIAN: I WANT TO EXPLAIN TO YOU THERE
14 ISN'T ANY INDUSTRY STANDARD. WE'RE CUTTING NEW
15 TERRITORY.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, JEFF, I ACTUALLY KIND
17 OF -- I'M STARTING TO THINK ED MAY BE ONTO SOMETHING
18 BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, WHEN YOU'RE REVIEWING AN APPLICATION,
19 SOMETIMES IT'S VERY DIFFICULT OTHER THAN SAYING THIS IS
20 EXCELLENT OR VERY GOOD. YOU KNOW, IT IS HARD TO GET AN
21 EXACT SCORE. I DON'T HAVE STRONG OPINION. I CAN GO
22 EITHER WAY ON THIS.

23 DR. WRIGHT: LET ME ASK MY QUESTION. I AM IN
24 COMPLETE AGREEMENT WITH JEFF, THAT FOR THOSE OF US WHO
25 DON'T DO THIS FOR A LIVING, HAVING SOME GUIDANCE IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADDITION TO THE NARRATIVE IN TERMS OF SCORING, THAT WOULD
2 BE VERY VALUABLE. WHAT I NEED FROM RICK IS CLARITY ABOUT
3 IS THIS GOING TO BE A SINGLE REVIEWER WHO LOOKS AT ALL OF
4 THE APPLICATIONS FOR VALUE AND FUNCTIONALITY, OR WE'RE
5 GOING TO ASK SEVERAL REVIEWERS TO REVIEW FOR VALUE AND
6 FUNCTIONALITY? BECAUSE IF WE'RE GOING TO RELY ON THE
7 NARRATIVE, I DON'T WANT TO HEAR NARRATIVES FROM SEVERAL
8 DIFFERENT PEOPLE. IT REALLY MAKES TRYING TO QUANTIFY OR
9 EVALUATE THESE VERY DIFFICULT IF IT'S COMING FROM SEVERAL
10 REVIEWERS.

11 MR. KELLER: DR. WRIGHT, THE INTENT WOULD BE TO
12 HAVE A SINGLE FIRM WITH A LEAD PERSON FROM OUT OF STATE
13 WHO IS AN EXPERT IN TERMS OF LAB PLANNING AND DESIGN.
14 ASSOCIATED WITH THAT INDIVIDUAL WOULD BE RESOURCES
15 AVAILABLE TO HIM THAT WOULD BE DEALING WITH COST AND
16 OTHER TYPE FACTORS THAT COULD BE BROUGHT TO BEAR IF HE
17 NEEDED THEM IN ORDER TO FULFILL OUR REQUEST FOR AN
18 OPINION ON VALUE AND FUNCTIONALITY.

19 ONE FIRM OR ONE CONSULTANT WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE
20 FOR ALL THE REVIEWS SO THAT WE HAVE A CONSISTENT BASIS.
21 I DON'T THINK -- I THINK IT WOULD BE TOO DIFFICULT
22 BECAUSE, BY DEFINITION, PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT IS A
23 JUDGMENT. AND IF IT VARIES, I DON'T THINK IT'S GOING TO
24 SERVE THIS WORKING GROUP WELL. SO I WANT TO HAVE AS
25 UNIFORM A CIRCUMSTANCE AS POSSIBLE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. WRIGHT: THANK YOU.

2 MS. HYSEN: I JUST APPLAUD THE FACT THAT YOU'RE
3 GETTING A LABORATORY PLANNER ON BOARD. IT MADE MY JOB
4 DIFFICULT, I THOUGHT, IN THE SHARED LAB GRANTS TO NOT
5 HAVE THAT EXPERTISE. IF THERE IS A STANDARD, THEN IT
6 WOULD BE NICE TO ADHERE TO THAT STANDARD. I DON'T KNOW
7 THAT THERE IS ONE. I'M DEFERRING TO YOU GUYS TO TELL ME
8 THAT. BUT I LIKE THE MIX OF THE QUALITATIVE DATA
9 PROVIDED BY THE EXPERT AND THE QUANTITATIVE DATA PROVIDED
10 IN THIS NUMERICAL ANALYSIS. I DON'T MIND THAT THEY ALSO
11 THEN PROVIDE A NUMERICAL RATING, BUT I DO LIKE THE MIX OF
12 BOTH.

13 MR. KELLER: THE ONLY THING I WOULD CAUTION
14 ABOUT A NUMERICAL SCALE AS OPPOSED TO MAYBE AN
15 ALPHANUMERIC WOULD BE I DON'T THINK YOU WANT THE
16 CONSULTANT BEING THE ONE THAT IS -- WE WERE CAREFUL IN
17 THE SHARED LABS THAT STAFF DID NOT SCORE THE PROPOSALS SO
18 THAT IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE EVALUATIVE PROCESS THAT YOU
19 ALL WENT THROUGH RESULTED IN THE SCORE. SO IF THEY HAD A
20 DIFFERENT SCALE, EITHER ZERO TO TEN OR A THROUGH F OR
21 WHATEVER, THEN IT DOESN'T GET -- YOU THEN CAN, AGAIN,
22 INTERPRET THAT IN TERMS OF IS THAT AN 85 OR A 15 OR 14?

23 DR. WRIGHT: TO BOB'S POINT, THIS REVIEWER
24 COULD JUDGE THEM ALL A'S OR B PLUSES, RIGHT? IT'S NOT
25 AGAINST ONE ANOTHER --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KELLER: IT'S ALL HOW YOU WANT TO DO IT.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JEFF, I MEAN WE COULD
3 HAVE A SIMPLE THAT THIS IS BASED AGAINST A NATIONAL
4 STANDARD, AND WE COULD HAVE AVERAGE, ABOVE AVERAGE, YOU
5 KNOW, OR WE COULD GO WITH THE NUMERICAL. I DON'T FEEL
6 STRONGLY. I DO HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF A CONCERN ABOUT
7 USING NUMERICAL, BUT WE COULD HAVE A VOTE.

8 MR. SHEEHY: I LIKE THE A TO F. I'D BE HAPPY
9 WITH A TO F. AND THAT SEEMS THAT THAT'S FAIRLY NEUTRAL
10 IN TERMS OF HOW WE INTERPRET THAT FOR OUR OWN SCORING.
11 FOR JANET AND I, I THINK WE WOULD GET A LOT OF
12 INFORMATION FROM A TO F. YOU WOULD TAKE THAT THE SAME
13 WAY YOU MIGHT TAKE A REPORT CARD AND GO, WELL, I DIDN'T
14 LIKE THAT TEACHER THAT MUCH, AND YOU HAD THE KNOWLEDGE
15 BASE TO TAKE A DIFFERENT STANCE ON THAT. FOR THOSE OF US
16 WHO DON'T, IT WOULD BE A VERY FIRM DIRECTION, WHICH IS
17 ALL I'M LOOKING FOR IS A CLEAR DIRECTION.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: MY ONLY PROBLEM WITH THAT
19 IS THAT, YOU KNOW, WE'VE ALL -- THERE'S DIFFERENT -- YOU
20 KNOW, AN A AT ONE COLLEGE MAY MEAN DIFFERENT THINGS AT
21 DIFFERENT PLACES. I KIND OF LIKE THE AVERAGE, ABOVE
22 AVERAGE, EXCELLENT BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, SAYING A C MAY NOT
23 BE SEEN AS GOOD; BUT IF WE PUT IT IN THE CONTEXT THAT
24 IT'S AVERAGE AGAINST A NATIONAL STANDARD, THAT TO ME
25 SEEMS BETTER.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: IT'S A LINGUISTIC.

2 MR. KELLER: COULD I MAKE AN OFFER TO, AS WE GO
3 DOWN THE PATH OF ENGAGING THIS LAB PLANNING EXPERT, I'M
4 SURE THAT THERE ARE --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: STANDARDS THEY
6 HAVE.

7 MR. KELLER: -- THERE MAY BE SOME VEHICLES
8 AVAILABLE THAT THEY'VE USED IN THE PAST THAT HAVE WORKED
9 WELL, BUT I UNDERSTAND COMPLETELY WHAT YOU'RE AFTER AND
10 WE'LL WORK ON THAT.

11 MR. SHEEHY: AND THE ONLY OTHER POINT THAT WE
12 KIND OF LEFT OUT THERE IS DO WE WANT TO DIVIDE VALUE AND
13 FUNCTIONALITY? I ACTUALLY WAS SUPPORTIVE OF THAT.

14 MR. KELLER: YES, I GOT THAT.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO WE'LL PLAN THAT WE'LL
16 DIVIDE VALUE AND FUNCTIONALITY, THAT WE'LL GET SOME INPUT
17 FROM THE EVENTUAL EXPERT THAT WE RETAIN, AND WE WILL TRY
18 TO GET SOME KIND OF SCORING THAT GIVES US A SENSE, BUT
19 NOT A STRICT NUMERICAL SCORING.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: DID WE, AND I
21 PROBABLY MISSED IT AND YOU ANSWERED THE QUESTION -- YOU
22 PROBABLY ANSWERED IT, RICK -- DID WE DECIDE, AND DAVID,
23 DID WE DECIDE ON HOW WE'RE GOING TO MEASURE THESE
24 APPLICATIONS AGAINST ONE ANOTHER, AGAINST THE NATIONAL --
25 INDIVIDUALLY AGAINST THE NATIONAL STANDARD? HOW DID WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LEAVE THAT, TO REFRESH MY MEMORY?

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK AGAINST A
3 NATIONAL STANDARD.

4 MR. KELLER: AS I SAID, ENGAGING A
5 PROFESSIONAL, WHO'S BY DEFINITION, THAT PROFESSIONAL HAS
6 SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE IN A FIELD.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: ALL RIGHT. I
8 JUST WANTED TO KNOW. THANK YOU.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR
10 QUESTIONS BY ANY MEMBERS? BOB? JANET?

11 DR. WRIGHT: NO, THANKS.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: RICK, PLEASE PROCEED.

13 MR. KELLER: THEN SLIDE 7 TAKES YOU TO KIND OF
14 WHAT THE ACTUAL TECHNICAL REVIEW MEETING, HOW IT WOULD
15 TAKE PLACE ON APRIL 4TH AND 5TH, THAT WE WOULD MEET IN
16 OPEN SESSION TO REVIEW THE APPLICATIONS. WE WOULD GROUP
17 THOSE APPLICATIONS INTO THE CATEGORIES, AND I'LL REVIEW
18 THOSE IN A MINUTE. WE WOULD PROVIDE AN ORAL STAFF
19 SUMMARY OF THE STAFF ANALYSIS. THEN THE REAL ESTATE
20 WORKING GROUPS WOULD COLLECTIVELY DISCUSS STRENGTHS AND
21 WEAKNESSES AND POSE QUESTIONS AND PRESENT THEIR GENERAL
22 IMPRESSIONS OF THE APPLICATION, AS WELL AS THE OTHER
23 MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ENGAGING IN THAT DIALOGUE TO
24 HAVE AN OVERALL DISCUSSION OF THE APPLICATION. THEN --

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WEREN'T WE GOING TO HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE OF THE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS LEAD THAT REVIEW, CORRECT,
2 IN THE TECHNICAL? AM I INCORRECT?

3 MR. KELLER: I THOUGHT THERE WAS A CONSENSUS
4 THAT IT WOULD BE -- THAT DR. MURPHY AND BOB, IN REVIEWING
5 THIS, WE HAD TALKED ABOUT A COLLECTIVE DISCUSSION.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK WE WERE GOING TO
7 HAVE IT, BUT I THOUGHT WE WERE GOING TO HAVE WHOEVER THE
8 REAL ESTATE EXPERT WHO DID THAT REVIEW WOULD BE THE --

9 MR. KELLER: SURE.

10 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, DIDN'T WE DECIDE
11 THAT WE THOUGHT IT WOULD MAKE SENSE TO HAVE WHOEVER DID
12 THAT REVIEW TO LEAD THAT DISCUSSION?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I THOUGHT IN A
14 PREVIOUS SLIDE THERE WAS SOME REFERENCE TO THAT, RICK.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, ARE YOU THERE?

16 MR. KLEIN: I'M HERE.

17 MR. KELLER: THE QUESTION IS WHETHER OR NOT IN
18 THE REVIEW OF THE INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION BY A REAL ESTATE
19 SPECIALIST, WOULD THERE STILL BE THAT RESPONSIBILITY TO
20 LEAD THAT DISCUSSION BY ONE HAVING BEEN ASSIGNED THE
21 REVIEW?

22 MR. KLEIN: THE PRIOR DISCUSSION WAS THAT THE
23 REAL ESTATE -- THERE WOULD BE SOMEONE ASSIGNED, BUT THEN
24 THE OTHER REAL ESTATE EXPERTS WOULD COMMENT, AND AFTER
25 THEIR COMMENTS ARE THERE, THEN ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMITTEE WOULD, OF COURSE, HAVE A FREE DISCUSSION, OPEN
2 DISCUSSION ON EACH APPLICATION. SO THE REAL ESTATE
3 EXPERTS WOULD LEAD BY OPENING THE DISCUSSION TECHNICALLY
4 ON THE APPLICATION. THAT WAS THE PRIOR DISCUSSION.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, I THINK WHERE THE
6 CONFUSION CAME, RICK, IS THAT IF YOU LOOK AT SLIDE 7
7 VERSUS 11, THEY'RE A LITTLE DIFFERENT. ELEVEN, I
8 THINK --

9 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: AND FOUR.

10 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AND FOUR. THAT'S WHERE I
11 GOT CONFUSED WAS THAT SLIDE 7 WAS DIFFERENT THAN WHAT 4
12 AND 11 SAID.

13 MR. KELLER: I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT I -- WE
14 STILL WILL HAVE ASSIGNMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL REVIEWS
15 PREPARED BY THE REAL ESTATE MEMBERS. THEN THERE WOULD BE
16 KIND OF A TWO-STAGE DISCUSSION. THAT'S THE WAY I'M
17 HEARING PROPOSED, ONE WITH THE REAL ESTATE GROUP KIND OF
18 LEADING ON ISSUES, AND THEN OPENING UP TO THE FULL
19 WORKING GROUP.

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: NO. THAT SECOND --

21 MR. KASHIAN: I THINK THE REVIEW IS SLIDE 11.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THOUGHT WE WERE GOING
23 TO HAVE ALL FACILITY -- THAT THERE WAS -- WE WERE GOING
24 TO HAVE THE REAL ESTATE EXPERT WHO DID THE REVIEW TO LEAD
25 THE DISCUSSION WITH ALL THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MEMBERS.

2 MR. KELLER: OKAY.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

4 DR. HALME: PUBLIC QUESTION. WHAT DO YOU MEAN
5 THE REAL ESTATE MEMBER WHO DID THE REVIEW? BECAUSE I
6 DON'T SEE ANYTHING WHERE THERE'S A PRIMARY AND SECONDARY
7 REVIEWER THE WAY IT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST. THAT MAY
8 BE WHAT YOU HAVE IN MIND, BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT -- WHAT
9 DOES IT MEAN FOR YOU TO HAVE DONE THE REVIEW AS OPPOSED
10 TO SOMEONE HAD DONE THE REVIEW?

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK IT'S RELEVANT WE
12 ADDRESS THIS QUESTION IN THE PUBLIC NOW. SO THE WAY
13 WE'RE ENVISIONING IT IS TO HAVE ONE REAL ESTATE EXPERT DO
14 ONE PRIMARY REVIEW, BUT LEAD A DISCUSSION WITH ALL THE
15 MEMBERS, INCLUDING THE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS. AM I CORRECT
16 ON THIS, RICK?

17 MR. KELLER: YES.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ALL THE MEMBERS AND HAVE
19 AN OPEN DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION OF THIS REVIEW AND
20 JUST HAVE A DIALOGUE SO THAT EVERYONE CAN BE INVOLVED IN
21 ACTUALLY FORMING THEIR OWN OPINION AND THEIR OWN SCORING
22 ON THAT. SO THERE WILL NOT BE A SECONDARY REVIEW THE WAY
23 THERE WAS IN THE SHARED LABS.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: TO FOLLOW UP ON
25 THAT JUST VERY QUICKLY, RICK, SO STAFF WILL THEN ASSIGN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THREE TO FIVE, WHATEVER ENDS UP BEING THE NUMBER,
2 INSTITUTIONS TO THE FOUR REAL ESTATE EXPERTS ON THIS
3 COMMITTEE.

4 MR. KELLER: RIGHT. MY INTENTION WOULD BE, IN
5 CONSULTATION WITH THE PRESIDENT, TO BALANCE IT OUT BASED
6 ON THE NATURE OF THE APPLICATIONS AMONG --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THREE CATEGORIES
8 OR HOWEVER YOU WANT TO DO IT.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: RICK, THE ONLY THING, IF
10 I LOOK AT SLIDE 7, 11, I THINK WHERE THE -- IS THAT THE
11 STAFF WILL SUMMARIZE THE STAFF ANALYSIS ON A PARTICULAR
12 APPLICATION, AND THEN THE REAL ESTATE MEMBER THAT DID
13 THAT REVIEW WILL THEN LEAD THE DISCUSSION AFTER STAFF
14 PRESENTS. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?

15 MR. KELLER: FINE. YES.

16 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DOES THAT WORK FOR
17 EVERYONE?

18 MS. HYSEN: I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED ON SLIDE 7.
19 IF THE REAL ESTATE MEMBER LEADS THE DISCUSSION, IS THE
20 COLLECTIVE DISCUSSION THEN WITH ALL OF THE FACILITIES
21 WORKING GROUP?

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YEAH. I THINK THERE WAS
23 JUST A LITTLE CONFUSION ON IT. SO THE STAFF WILL DO A --
24 SUMMARIZE THE APPLICATION AND START OUT THAT WAY, AND
25 THEN THE REAL ESTATE EXPERT THAT HAS REVIEWED THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICATION WILL THEN LEAD THE DISCUSSION WITH ALL THE
2 MEMBERS.

3 MR. SHEEHY: SO THE REAL ESTATE MEMBER'S REVIEW
4 WILL BE A FULL WRITTEN REVIEW. WILL IT BE SCORED?

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I THINK THE WAY RICK
6 AND I WERE TALKING ABOUT THIS WAS THAT THE REAL ESTATE
7 EXPERT WAS NOT GOING TO GIVE A PUBLIC SCORE, BUT HE WAS
8 GOING TO LEAD THE DISCUSSION AND KIND OF TALK THE SAME
9 WAY WE DID IN THE SHARED LABS. AT LEAST I REMEMBER WHEN
10 I TALKED ABOUT MY REVIEW IN THE SHARED LABS, I TALKED
11 ABOUT --

12 MR. KELLER: I THINK IT WAS JUST THROUGH THE
13 EDITING PROCESS, IT GOT KIND OF GARBLED. IN THIS LAST
14 BULLET ON SLIDE 7 WHERE I SAY DISCUSS STRENGTHS AND
15 WEAKNESSES, I MEAN IT'S SIMILAR TO WHAT IS DONE AT THE
16 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THAT SHOULD BE THE PART THAT'S
17 COMING FROM THE LEAD REVIEWER.

18 MR. SHEEHY: WILL THAT BE -- SO WE HAVE -- ARE
19 WE TALKING ABOUT -- I MEAN, WELL, THE GRANTS WORKING
20 GROUP ASSIGNS A SCORE, AND THEN THEY EXPLAIN THAT SCORE
21 BY A DISCUSSION OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. SO IT'S THE
22 SCORE REALLY ALMOST THAT IS INTEGRATED INTO THE
23 DISCUSSION OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES AND NOT
24 DISAGGREGATED. I MEAN I'M JUST TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THE
25 PROCESS, SO I HAVE NO OPINION. I JUST WANT TO -- SO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE DOESN'T NEED TO BE A SCORE ASSIGNED, BUT IS THERE
2 SOMETHING GOING TO BE WRITTEN DOWN? IS THIS JUST GOING
3 TO BE A CONVERSATION? IS THIS GOING TO BE SEPARATE FROM
4 THE STAFF?

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YES. IT WILL BE SEPARATE
6 FROM THE STAFF.

7 MR. KELLER: THE WAY THIS WAS DISCUSSED WITH
8 DR. MURPHY AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WAS THAT THIS
9 WOULD BE A DISCUSSION -- THAT THE DISCUSSION WILL BE LED
10 BY THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP PRIMARY REVIEWER, BUT
11 THAT WOULD NOT BE A DOCUMENT. THAT IS, IT WOULD BE
12 BASICALLY NOTES AND COMMENTS THAT THEY WOULD MAKE IN
13 ORDER TO MAKE THE ORAL PRESENTATION.

14 MR. SHEEHY: WOULD THAT BE ORGANIZED BY THE
15 DIFFERENT CRITERIA THAT WE'VE --

16 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME COMMENT
17 ON THAT. AND I THINK AS THE CHAIR, DAVID, YOU NEED TO
18 PROVIDE SOME DIRECTION TO THE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS IN
19 GIVING THEM SOME GUIDANCE AS TO WHAT YOU THINK THE
20 EXPECTATIONS ARE. I'M NOT ONE OF THE REAL ESTATE
21 EXPERTS. I DON'T HAVE TO DO THIS. IT'S GOING TO BE YOU
22 FOUR THAT ARE GOING TO HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO GO
23 THROUGH -- THIS IS HOW I ENVISION IT -- TO GO THROUGH
24 EACH APPLICATION AND REALLY FOCUS ON, WHEN THAT
25 APPLICATION COMES UP FOR DISCUSSION, WHAT YOUR GENERAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IMPRESSIONS ARE. THIS IS WHAT THE INSTITUTION IS. THIS
2 IS WHAT THEY'RE LOOKING AT. I LIKE THIS. I DIDN'T LIKE
3 THAT. COLLEAGUES, THEN IT'S OPEN TO THE FLOOR.

4 IT WASN'T MY EXPECTATION, I MAY BE WRONG,
5 DAVID, THAT IT WOULD BE A DETAILED, IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS,
6 BUT RATHER JUST KEEPING IT VERY GENERAL, KEEPING IT
7 GENERAL, AND THEN WE JUST SORT OF MOVE ON. AND THEN DOWN
8 THROUGH THE PROCESS, AS IT'S BEEN RECOMMENDED BY STAFF,
9 EACH ONE OF US WOULD ASSIGN AN INDIVIDUAL SCORE, THERE
10 WOULD BE THE AGGREGATE SCORE, ETC., ETC.

11 DAVID, WAS THAT SORT OF YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF
12 HOW YOU THOUGHT THIS PROCESS MIGHT WORK IN TERMS OF THE
13 REAL ESTATE EXPERTS?

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT WAS MY THOUGHT
15 PROCESS.

16 MR. KASHIAN: I WANT TO ANSWER JEFF'S CONCERN.
17 I'M GOING TO EVALUATE AS ONE OF THE REAL ESTATE PEOPLE AN
18 APPLICATION. THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT I'VE EVALUATED A
19 SCORE UNTIL AFTER I HEAR THE DISCUSSION. SO THE POINT
20 I'M TRYING TO MAKE IS THAT YOU ARE GOING TO GET AN
21 APPLICATION PRESENTATION, YOU ARE GOING TO GET THE
22 OPINION OF THE STAFF, YOU'RE GOING TO GET MY OPINION, AND
23 THEN THIS GROUP AS A WHOLE HAS TO DECIDE WHAT THE SCORES
24 ARE FOR THEMSELVES AFTER DISCUSSION. WHAT YOU SAY MIGHT
25 INFLUENCE MY DECISION ABOUT THE AREA. I'M GIVING YOU MY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BEST OPINION.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK THAT'S A GREAT
3 POINT THAT ED IS BRINGING UP BECAUSE I MAY HAVE DONE SOME
4 PRELIMINARY -- I KNOW THIS HAPPENED ON THE SHARED LABS.
5 I DID SOME PRELIMINARY SCORING; AND THEN WHEN I MIGHT
6 HAVE HEARD ED OR DEBORAH'S OPINION ON SOMETHING, I
7 ACTUALLY MOVED -- I'M NOT SAYING THERE WERE DRAMATIC
8 CHANGES, BUT THERE WERE SOME SHIFTS IN TERMS OF MY
9 SCORING. SO I DO THINK WE SHOULD PRESENT IN A GENERAL
10 WAY, BUT NOT HAVE FINAL SCORING AND RELEASE THAT.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU THINK THIS
12 IS A WRITTEN DOCUMENT THAT YOU WOULD PROVIDE? I DIDN'T
13 THINK IT WOULD BE.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: NO, I WASN'T THINKING IT
15 WOULD BE WRITTEN.

16 MR. KASHIAN: SIMPLY MY OPINION OF THE REVIEW.

17 MR. SHEEHY: I HAD TWO POINTS. ONE IS THAT I
18 WASN'T VISUALIZING -- AGAIN, I'M JUST WORKING OFF ANALOGY
19 TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND WHAT HAPPENS THERE IS
20 PEOPLE OFFER THEIR PRELIMINARY SCORES. THE DISCUSSION
21 TAKES PLACE AND THEN SCORES ARE RESTATED. AND THERE'S
22 VERY OFTEN, ESPECIALLY WITH ROBUST DEBATE, IT'S VERY
23 INTERESTING WHEN PEOPLE MARKEDLY RESTATE THEIR SCORES.
24 IT'S ALSO VERY INTERESTING WHEN SOMEONE DIGS IN AND SAYS
25 I'M STICKING WITH A 90. BOTH OF THOSE ARE VERY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INFORMATIVE MOMENTS. I'M NOT WEDDED TO ANY SCORING IN
2 THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE. I WAS JUST DESCRIBING A
3 SEPARATE PROCESS.

4 THIS SOUNDS LIKE A GREAT PROCESS. I'M NOT --
5 I'M JUST TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THIS. THE ONLY
6 RECOMMENDATION I MIGHT MAKE, AND I DON'T KNOW HOW
7 FEASIBLE IT IS BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW WHAT WE'RE GOING TO
8 END UP WITH, BUT AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE TO MAKE SURE APPLES
9 ARE REVIEWED BY APPLES. IN OTHER WORDS, I WOULDN'T
10 NECESSARILY SPREAD OUT THE CATEGORIES AMONGST REVIEWERS.
11 BUT LET'S SAY WE HAVE FIVE INSTITUTES AND FIVE CENTERS OF
12 EXCELLENCE AND FIVE PROGRAMS, TRY TO HAVE AS MUCH AS
13 POSSIBLE ONE PERSON DO THE INSTITUTES, ONE PERSON DO THE
14 CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE SO THAT THERE'S A BASIS OF
15 COMPARISON WITHIN THE REVIEWER'S MIND SO THAT -- BECAUSE
16 I THINK IT'S INFORMATIVE IF A REVIEWER CAN SEE EVERYBODY
17 WHO'S COMPETING AGAINST EACH OTHER, AND THEN THERE'S A
18 UNI FORMITY TO THAT OPINION. THAT'S JUST --

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JEFF, THAT'S AN
20 INTERESTING IDEA. I THINK THAT I'D LIKE TO -- I THINK
21 THAT WE WILL HAVE TO SEE EXACTLY HOW MANY APPLICANTS KIND
22 OF GET PAST PART 1 FIRST. I MEAN HOW MANY APPLICATIONS
23 DO WE HAVE?

24 MR. SHEEHY: SEVENTEEN.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SEVENTEEN. BUT I DO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THINK THERE'S SOME VALIDITY TO YOUR POINT ABOUT TRYING TO
2 KEEP IT AS CONSISTENT AS POSSIBLE.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: TAKE IT UNDER
4 ADVISEMENT.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY
6 COMMENTS TO JEFF'S POINT? I THINK IT'S AN INTERESTING
7 PERSPECTIVE, AND I'D LIKE TO THINK ABOUT THAT.

8 MR. KELLER: COUPLE OTHER ASPECTS OF THE
9 MEETING THAT DRAW FROM THE EXPERIENCE IN THE SHARED LAB
10 WAS THAT ONCE THE DISCUSSION IS COMPLETED, THEN EACH
11 MEMBER OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP COULD CAST AN
12 INDIVIDUAL SCORE FOR THAT APPLICATION, BUT THAT SCORE
13 WOULD BE PRIVATE. AND THEN THE STAFF WOULD COLLECT THOSE
14 AND WOULD CALCULATE THE AGGREGATE SCORE FOR EACH
15 APPLICATION. AND THAT'S SIMILAR, AGAIN, TO THE PROCESS
16 ON THE SHARED LAB.

17 OBVIOUSLY, FOLLOWING UP ON JEFF'S POINT, WE
18 WOULD WANT, OF COURSE, TO DISCUSS THESE BY CATEGORY AS
19 WELL. AND SO I'M JUST SAYING THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO GROUP
20 THEM BY THE PROGRAM AND FUNDING LINES OF THE INSTITUTES,
21 CENTERS, AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND DEAL WITH THOSE
22 INDIVIDUALLY.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: NOW, THE STAFF
24 CALCULATES THE AGGREGATE SCORE FOR EACH APPLICATION. SO
25 THAT WILL BE THE -- WHEN YOU JUST ADDED UP EACH CATEGORY,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LET' S SAY SOMEONE GETS AN 80. THAT' S WHAT' S GOING TO
2 BE -- IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE THINKING OF? WE WON' T HAVE
3 THE AGGREGATE, I GUESS, OF EACH INDIVIDUAL CATEGORY -- DO
4 YOU FOLLOW ME? -- FOR THIS. WE COULD DO IT THAT WAY.

5 MR. KELLER: IF SOMEBODY SAID WHAT WAS THE
6 SCORE FOR VALUE --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: WHAT WAS THE
8 AVERAGE FOR VALUE, WE COULD DO IT THAT WAY. I DON' T KNOW
9 IF IT WOULD ILLUMINATE THE PROCESS IN ANY WAY. NEVER
10 MIND. IT WAS A FOLLOW-UP ON JEFF' S POINT WHEN YOU SORT
11 OF SEE WHERE PEOPLE ARE COMING AT AVERAGEWISE FOR EACH
12 CATEGORY.

13 MR. KELLER: IT MAY ENTER INTO THE PROGRAMMATIC
14 WHERE YOU' RE LOOKING BACK AT WHAT YOU DID AND YOU WANT TO
15 SAY WHY IS THIS WHERE IT IS.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: RIGHT.

17 MR. KELLER: BY THE TIME YOU' VE GONE THROUGH
18 12, 15 OF THESE, YOU MAY WANT TO COME BACK AND REVISIT AN
19 ISSUE. WE CAN COLLECT THE DATA, AND WE' RE LOOKING INTO A
20 MORE SPEEDY WAY OF TURNING THAT AROUND SO THAT WE CAN DO
21 THAT MAYBE ON AN EXCEL SPREADSHEET AND HAVE YOU SCORE IT
22 ELECTRONI CALLY.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT COULD BE AN
24 OPTI ON.

25 MR. KELLER: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KASHIAN: I WAS CURIOUS ABOUT HOW MANY
2 APPLICATIONS YOU EXPECT TO REVIEW AT ONE MEETING.

3 MR. KELLER: ALL OF THEM.

4 MR. KASHIAN: HOW MANY IS ALL OF THEM? TWENTY
5 OR FIFTY?

6 MR. KELLER: WE HAVE 17.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SEVENTEEN APPLIED FOR
8 PART 1, SO PRESUMABLY SOME NUMBER LESS THAN 17 WILL MAKE
9 IT PAST THE SCIENCE.

10 MR. KELLER: THEY WOULD HAVE TO GET APPROVAL BY
11 A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND THEN
12 APPROVAL BY THE ICOC IN JANUARY IN ORDER TO GET INTO THE
13 PROCESS FOR PART 2 REVIEW. SO WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THE
14 ATTRITION WILL BE.

15 MR. KASHIAN: I KNOW IT'S NOT GOING TO BE
16 ABSOLUTELY ACCURATE, BUT WHAT WOULD YOU GUESS WOULD BE
17 COMING TO THE APRIL MEETING?

18 MR. KELLER: I CAN'T ADVISE YOU ON THAT.

19 MR. KASHIAN: I'M NOT ASKING FOR ADVICE. I'M
20 ASKING WOULD YOU SAY TEN? WHAT I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND
21 IS DOES EVERYBODY HAVE SUFFICIENT TIME WITHIN A FOUR- OR
22 FIVE-HOUR PERIOD TO GIVE THOSE PEOPLE ADEQUATE ATTENTION?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME JUST SAY,
24 ED, AS A COLLEAGUE, WE'RE SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY AND
25 SATURDAY, AND WE'RE STARTING OUR FRIDAY MEETING AT TWO.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WAS A REQUEST THAT I HAD MADE.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THOUGHT IT WAS ONE.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. ONE. ON
4 REFLECTION NOW I'M SAYING MAYBE WE NEED TO START EARLIER
5 THAT DAY IF THAT STILL WORKS WITH EVERYBODY'S SCHEDULES.
6 YOU'RE RIGHT. THE MAGNITUDE, WE WANT TO MAKE SURE
7 EVERYBODY HAS A FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME.

8 MR. KASHIAN: IF YOU HAVE TEN APPLICANTS AND
9 HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, IS IT FAIR TO ALLOCATE?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME JUST SAY
11 THAT IF IT WORKS WITH EVERYBODY'S SCHEDULE, THIS IS JUST
12 A SIDE THING, DAVID, IF IT WORKS WITH EVERYBODY'S
13 SCHEDULE AND IF WE COULD START EARLIER THAT DAY, I CAN
14 MAKE IT WORK FOR MY SCHEDULE GIVEN JUST THE MAGNITUDE OF
15 THE ASSIGNMENT.

16 BUT AS TO THE ISSUE OF HOW MANY APPLICATIONS --

17 MR. KASHIAN: THE REASON I WAS ASKING FOR
18 NUMBERS IS TO GET AN ESTIMATE OF TIME.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: WE DON'T KNOW.

20 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, YOUR SUGGESTION IS A VERY
21 GENEROUS ONE, TO CHANGE THAT STARTING TIME. I THINK IT
22 WOULD BE HELPFUL PROBABLY.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: RICK, IF YOU COULD PLEASE
24 MAKE IT SO.

25 MR. KELLER: OH, SURE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU, MR. VICE
2 CHAIR.

3 MR. KELLER: I HAVE PROVIDED IN YOUR PACKET THE
4 DOCUMENT THAT WAS PRESENTED OF THE CRITERIA FOR SCORING.
5 WE'VE SPENT TEN HOURS OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND SO FORTH.
6 WE DON'T NEED TO GO INTO THESE WITH ANY KIND OF DETAIL,
7 BUT CERTAINLY WANTED TO REMIND YOU OF THE CATEGORIES THAT
8 WE'RE DEALING WITH WITHIN THE SCORING.

9 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I JUST ASK, BECAUSE I NOTICE
10 YOU MENTION, WILL THERE BE ANY OPPORTUNITY IN THE REVIEW
11 PROCESS FOR FEEDBACK FROM THE INSTITUTIONS?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: AT THE ACTUAL
13 MEETING ITSELF?

14 MR. SHEEHY: AT THE ACTUAL MEETING ITSELF.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK, RICK, WE WERE
16 GOING TO GET INPUT TO THE STAFF REVIEWS, RIGHT? TELL US
17 HOW -- I KNOW WE DISCUSSED THIS, BUT TELL ME --

18 MR. KELLER: AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, WHAT WE
19 WOULD DO IS WE WOULD HAVE THE -- AFTER YOU HAVE REVIEWED
20 THE STAFF ANALYSIS INITIALLY, SO AFTER THE FACILITIES
21 WORKING GROUP, YOU WILL GET IT TWO WEEKS BEFORE THE
22 MEETING. SO SAY YOU DO A QUICK REVIEW AND SAY I'M FINE
23 WITH THE STAFF ANALYSIS OR HERE'S SOMETHING I CAUGHT THAT
24 NEEDS TO BE CHECKED OUT, THEN WE WOULD MAKE THAT STAFF
25 ANALYSIS AVAILABLE TO THE APPLICANTS, AND THEY WOULD BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OFFERED THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE A LETTER TO THE
2 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP DEALING WITH THAT STAFF
3 ANALYSIS.

4 AND ONCE THOSE LETTERS ARE RECEIVED, AND WE
5 WOULD GIVE A THREE- OR FOUR-DAY RESPONSE TIME FOR THAT
6 BECAUSE WE'RE ONLY WORKING WITH TWO WEEKS HERE, THEN WE
7 WOULD REVIEW THOSE AND MAKE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR EDITS
8 WE WOULD NEED TO MAKE TO THE STAFF ANALYSIS. AND THAT
9 WOULD BECOME THEN A PUBLIC DOCUMENT.

10 MR. SHEEHY: WE'RE HAVING A PUBLIC MEETING, WE
11 DISCUSSED AN APPLICATION. IF THE APPLICANT IS THERE AND
12 THEY WANT TO MAKE A COMMENT, IF WE HAVE QUESTIONS FOR THE
13 APPLICANT, ISN'T THERE GOING TO BE SOME OPPORTUNITY TO
14 HAVE THIS DIALOGUE? IT SEEMS TO ME WITH THIS AMOUNT OF
15 MONEY AND THIS LEVEL OF COMPLEXITY, THAT IT MAKES SENSE
16 TO BUILD IN THAT OPPORTUNITY. YOU THINK ABOUT WE'RE
17 GOING TO HAVE THIS ENTIRE PROCESS. AT WHAT POINT IS
18 THERE -- I KNOW WE TALKED ABOUT PRESENTATIONS AT ONE
19 POINT, WHICH I PERSONALLY WAS VERY SUPPORTIVE OF, BUT
20 THEN I'M NOT A PAPER PERSON. I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF
21 INFORMATION THAT COULD BE GLEANED FROM HEARING FROM
22 APPLICANTS. BUT I DON'T KNOW. I THINK THAT MAY HAVE
23 FALLEN OFF THE TABLE, BUT I THINK THE NOTION THAT YOU
24 COULD HAVE AT LEAST SOME WAY TO RESPOND.

25 MR. KELLER: I THINK IT'S A MATTER OF YOU

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DECIDING HOW YOU WANT TO GET THAT RESPONSE INFORMATION
2 CLARIFIED TO WHAT LEVEL AND JUST MANAGING THE OVERALL
3 PROCESS TO --

4 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD RATHER -- IF YOU THINK
5 ABOUT THE PLACES WHERE THEY MIGHT BE ABLE TO DIRECTLY
6 PUBLICLY PROVIDE FEEDBACK, THE GRANTS REVIEW IS NOT AN
7 APPROPRIATE PLACE. THERE MAY BE AN OPPORTUNITY AT THE
8 ICOC FOLLOWING THE GRANTS REVIEW, BUT IN GENERAL THERE'S
9 SO MUCH RESPECT FOR THE SCIENTIFIC OPINIONS THAT ARE
10 EXPRESSED, THAT SOMEONE WOULD HAVE TO REALLY BUNGLER IT AT
11 THE GRANTS REVIEW. THIS SEEMS LIKE A GREAT OPPORTUNITY
12 FOR PEOPLE TO BE ABLE -- I DON'T KNOW. WE HAVE
13 APPLICANTS IN THE AUDIENCE, BUT THIS WOULD BE A GREAT
14 OPPORTUNITY TO GET SOME FEEDBACK. YOUR APPLICATION HAS
15 BEEN DISCUSSED, YOU'VE HEARD ALL OF THIS, YOU'VE MADE IT
16 TO THIS POINT. IF YOU WANT TO SAY SOMETHING ABOUT IT, IF
17 YOU DIDN'T THINK SOMETHING WAS REPRESENTED RIGHT, IF WE
18 HAVE A QUESTION, WE DIDN'T UNDERSTAND SOMETHING, WE COULD
19 ASK THAT QUESTION.

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK THERE'S
21 POTENTIALLY TWO OPTIONS. ONE OPTION IS WE COULD ALLOW
22 EVERY APPLICANT WHO MAKES IT TO PART 2 TO PRESENT FOR 10
23 OR 15 MINUTES. NOW, I PERSONALLY DON'T THINK THAT WOULD
24 NECESSARILY BE, GIVEN HOW TIGHT OUR SCHEDULE WILL BE AND
25 HOW MUCH WE'LL HAVE ON OUR PLATE, BUT THAT IS AN OPTION.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE OTHER OPTION IS TO HAVE THOSE APPLICANTS
2 AVAIL ABLE FOR QUESTIONS BY THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP
3 WHEN WE'RE REVIEWING THEIR APPLICATION. I THINK THAT
4 WOULD PERFECTLY MAKE GOOD SENSE, THAT THE APPLICANTS
5 COULD BE AVAIL ABLE. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO EVERYONE?

6 MR. KLEIN: WELL, LET ME UNDERSTAND THAT,
7 DAVID. I HAD THOUGHT THAT THE PRIOR DISCUSSION HAD BEEN
8 IF THE APPLICANTS WERE AWARE OF SOME INFORMATION THAT IT
9 APPEARED FROM THE DISCUSSION WAS NOT FULLY UNDERSTOOD,
10 THAT THEY COULD GET UP AND GIVE US SOME FEEDBACK SO THAT
11 WE COULD REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT THE KEY POINTS WERE IN
12 THEIR PROPOSAL SO WE DON'T JUST KEEP GOING FORWARD
13 WITHOUT REALIZING THAT WE REALLY HAVEN'T COMPLETELY
14 UNDERSTOOD WHAT'S BEEN PRESENTED.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE DID -- BOB, WE DID
16 DISCUSS THAT. ASSUMING THAT THERE WAS SOMETHING IN THE
17 STAFF ANALYSIS THAT WAS -- THAT THEY HAD OBJECTION TO OR
18 THOUGHT THAT IT WASN'T -- WE DIDN'T GET IT CORRECT.

19 MR. KELLER: RIGHT. THAT COMMENT LETTER
20 PROVIDES THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THAT TO BE CORRECTED. THE
21 DELIBERATIONS -- I GUESS THE QUESTION IS IF SUBSEQUENT TO
22 THE REVIEW OF THE STAFF ANALYSIS AND THE OPINION THAT
23 THERE'S SUBSTANTIAL DISCUSSION BY THIS GROUP THAT LEADS
24 TO A DIFFERENT TOPIC THAT WASN'T PART OF THE STAFF
25 ANALYSIS, WOULD THERE BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD IDENTIFY WITH JEFF'S
2 COMMENT THAT I MEAN THERE'S A LOT OF MONEY HERE. AND IF
3 THEY'VE HEARD THE DISCUSSION AND REALIZE WE'RE REALLY NOT
4 UNDERSTANDING IT, YOU KNOW, WE SHOULD GIVE EACH OF THEM A
5 LIMITED AMOUNT OF TIME TO TRY AND HIGHLIGHT THOSE POINTS
6 THAT WE'RE REALLY NOT GETTING.

7 MR. SHEEHY: I MEAN I THINK MAYBE BEFORE WE
8 SCORE, AFTER WE'VE HAD OUR DISCUSSION, BEFORE WE ACTUALLY
9 SIT DOWN AND WRITE DOWN OUR SCORES, IT'S NOT MANDATORY,
10 YOU DON'T HAVE TO SHOW UP, YOU DON'T HAVE TO PREPARE AN
11 ELABORATE PRESENTATION, BUT THERE'S THE OPPORTUNITY, IF
12 YOU'RE AN APPLICANT AND YOU'VE BEEN IN THE AUDIENCE AND
13 YOU'VE HEARD DISCUSSION OF YOUR APPLICATION. AND IT MAY
14 BE THE BEST WAY TO DO IT IS MAYBE TO BE PRETTY FIRM. I
15 THINK THE CHAIR IS WELL ABLE TO DO THIS, TO NOT HAVE A
16 RECAPITULATION OR AN ARGUMENT; BUT IF THERE WERE THINGS
17 THAT WERE SAID THAT YOU DON'T AGREE WITH, YOU HAVE THE
18 CHANCE TO REBUT, SO TO SPEAK, OR TO OFFER ADDITIONAL
19 EVIDENCE AND NOT TO GET INTO A LONG DISCUSSION, BUT THAT
20 THAT INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE TO US RIGHT BEFORE WE MAKE
21 OUR SCORES JUST SO THAT THERE'S A TOTAL FAIRNESS -- THAT
22 WE CAN CREATE AS MUCH FAIRNESS IN THE PROCESS AS
23 POSSIBLE.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: HERE'S THE THING. WHAT
25 HAPPENS IF WE GET AN APPLICANT AND THEY DON'T DISPUTE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STAFF'S ANALYSIS, RIGHT, AND, THEREFORE, THEY DON'T GET
2 AN OPPORTUNITY TO STATE WHATEVER THEY FEEL THEY WOULD
3 WANT TO STATE TO US, BUT YET OTHERS OBJECT. SO THEY HAVE
4 AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET IN FRONT OF THE WORKING GROUP TO
5 KIND OF HAVE ANOTHER KIND OF, QUOTE, UNQUOTE, PITCH.
6 WHAT I WANT TO AVOID IS FULL-BLOWN -- WHAT I WANT TO
7 AVOID IS I DON'T WANT THE APPLICANTS TO OBJECT AS A WAY
8 OF GETTING IN FRONT OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP TO
9 KIND OF TELL US HOW WONDERFUL THEIR APPLICATION IS.

10 MR. KLEIN: SO AFTER THE DISCUSSION, WHY CAN'T
11 YOU JUST, OUT OF FAIRNESS, GIVE EACH APPLICANT A CERTAIN
12 AMOUNT OF TIME FOR KIND OF A SUMMARY STATEMENT AND
13 CORRECTION?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, I'VE GIVEN
15 THIS A LOT OF THOUGHT. AND THERE'S A LOT OF DIFFERENT
16 WAYS WE CAN DO THIS. BUT I THINK WHAT HAS DRIVE, IN MY
17 OPINION, WHAT NEEDS TO DRIVE THIS DECISION IS JUST BEING
18 PRAGMATIC. WE'RE GOING HAVE TWO FULL DAYS TO MAKE A
19 DECISION. THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE ENOUGH TIME. AND I
20 THINK IF WE ALLOW THE APPLICANTS TO MAKE A
21 PRESENTATION -- BOB, WE ARE BEING FAIR TO THE APPLICANTS
22 BY ALLOWING THEM TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO STAFF REPORTS.
23 THAT'S VERY FAIR. SO IN TERMS -- IN MY MIND, IN TERMS OF
24 THE FAIRNESS, WE'VE DONE OUR JOB.

25 IF WE GIVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO AN APPLICANT TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SPEAK FOR WHATEVER REASON, WHETHER IT BE TO GIVE A
2 SUMMARY, TO COMMENT ON THEIR COMMENTS, WHATEVER, YOU GIVE
3 AN APPLICANT AN INCH, THEY'RE GOING TO TAKE A MILE. AND
4 THEY'RE ALL GOING TO HAVE THEIR TIN CUPS OUT WANTING
5 MONEY. I DON'T WANT THIS PROCESS TO BECOME UNRULY.

6 MR. KLEIN: BUT IF YOU GIVE --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, LET ME
8 FINISH. AND IT THEN BECOMES, IN MY OPINION, I COULD BE
9 WRONG, KIND OF AN UNRULY PROCESS. AND WE HAVE THE
10 SUFFICIENT AMOUNT OF INFORMATION TO MAKE A DECISION.
11 WE'LL HAVE THE STAFF ANALYSIS. WE'LL HAVE THE
12 CONSULTANTS' REPORTS. WE WILL HAVE REVIEWED THE
13 APPLICATIONS OURSELVES. WE WILL HAVE GIVEN THE
14 APPLICANTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT. YOU KNOW, IF THEY
15 STILL HAVE A PROBLEM WITH WHAT STAFF DID, THAT'S LIFE IN
16 THE BIG CITY. UNLESS THERE'S SOME GLARING THING, THEY
17 CAN STILL GIVE US SOMETHING THAT DAY, I SUPPOSE, A
18 WRITTEN DOCUMENT OF SOME KIND, BUT WE HAVE TO BE VERY
19 CAREFUL ABOUT GIVING THE APPLICANTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO
20 SPEAK BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO OPEN THIS UP AS PRECEDENCE
21 FOR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP OR AT AN ICOC MEETING, BOB,
22 AND THAT WILL GIVE SOME PRECEDENCE FOR APPLICANTS TO
23 SPEAK AT THE ICOC. HEY, I WANT A CHANCE TO TALK, I WANT
24 TO GIVE A SUMMARY. WE JUST HAVE TO BE VERY SENSITIVE
25 ABOUT OUR DUTIES AND THE TIME. MY ARGUMENT IS A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRAGMATIC ARGUMENT. THAT'S ALL.

2 MR. SHEEHY: FIRST OF ALL, THIS IS WHY I
3 SUGGESTED WE DO IT BEFORE WE SCORE, AND I ALSO WOULD RELY
4 ON THE CHAIR TO MAKE CLARITY ABOUT THE GROUND RULES. I
5 THINK IF I ASK -- IF AN APPLICANT HAS BEEN ASKED TO
6 PROVIDE -- HERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY. IF WE'RE ALL -- IF
7 EVERYBODY IS GLOWING ABOUT AN APPLICATION, I'M READY TO
8 GIVE IT A HUNDRED POINTS MYSELF. AND I THINK ONLY, YOU
9 LAWYERS KNOW ABOUT THIS, WHEN YOU'RE WINNING A CASE, YOU
10 SIT DOWN AND SHUT UP. I REMEMBER YOU AT APPEALS COURT.
11 I THINK I'M JUST -- I'M WINNING. I'M NOT GOING TO GET
12 TOO MUCH INTO THIS. ATTORNEYS HAVE A STRONG SENSE OF NOT
13 TO STOP A HORSE THAT'S RUNNING THE WAY YOU WANT IT TO
14 RUN.

15 APPLICANTS DO PUT THEMSELVES AT RISK IF THEY
16 GET UP THERE AND THEY START TALKING ABOUT STUFF THAT'S
17 NOT RELEVANT. HOWEVER, I DO -- IF WE HAVE HAD A
18 DISCUSSION ABOUT THEIR APPLICATION, WE'VE BROUGHT UP
19 INFORMATION THAT WE'VE HAVEN'T DESCRIBED IN THE
20 APPROPRIATE WAY, THIS IS THEIR CHANCE TO ADDRESS THAT.
21 IF THEY MAKE GOOD ARGUMENTS, THEY CAN AFFECT THE SCORE.
22 BUT IF THEY GET UP THERE AND WASTE OUR TIME, START TO
23 TELL US ABOUT WHAT A FABULOUS, BEAUTIFUL PLACE THIS IS
24 GOING TO BE, I THINK THAT THAT'S GOING TO HURT THEM. AND
25 I THINK THE CHAIR CAN SAY THAT IN DIRECTION AND ACTUALLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CUT THEM OFF AND SAY, "I DON'T THINK YOU ARE GOING TO
2 HELP YOUR CASE. YOU'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE ISSUES AT
3 THIS TIME AS PROVIDED FOR. IF YOU WANT TO CONTINUE, I
4 HAVE TO TELL YOU, IT MAY NOT HELP YOUR SCORE, AND MAY
5 ACTUALLY HURT YOUR SCORE, "AND TRY TO GUIDE IT THROUGH
6 THE MECHANISM OF THE CHAIR. BUT I JUST FEEL
7 UNCOMFORTABLE HAVING GONE THROUGH THIS ENTIRE PROCESS AND
8 NOT GIVING PEOPLE A CHANCE TO GET UP AND TALK ABOUT IT.
9 AND THIS IS SUBSTANTIALLY LARGER GRANTS THAN WE'VE EVER
10 GIVEN. THEY'RE INCREDIBLY COMPLEX.

11 THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE OTHER GRANTS WE GIVE
12 ARE SCIENTIFIC GRANTS. AND IF PEOPLE WANT TO START
13 DEGRADING THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS AS SCIENTISTS, THEN
14 HAVE AT IT. WE'LL FIGURE OUT ANOTHER WAY TO REVIEW THE
15 GRANTS IN PUBLIC, AND JOHN SIMPSON WILL LOVE US.

16 MR. KASHIAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, I REALLY SUPPORT
17 DAVID'S POINT OF VIEW WITH THE FOLLOWING CAVEAT. JEFF
18 STARTED OUT HIS DISCUSSION BY SAYING WHAT IF I WANT TO
19 ASK THEM A QUESTION THAT I DON'T UNDERSTAND. WHAT I'M
20 SAYING, WOULD IT BE FAIR TO HAVE THEM AVAILABLE FOR
21 QUESTIONS BY THE PANEL BEFORE THEY MAKE THEIR DECISION
22 RATHER THAN MAKING A PRESENTATION OF SOMETHING YOU DON'T
23 UNDERSTAND. I TOTALLY SUPPORT DAVID'S POINT OF VIEW.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT
25 PRESENTATIONS, BUT IF THEY WANT TO GET UP, THERE'S A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PERIOD OF TIME.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THAT'S A
3 PRESENTATION.

4 MR. SHEEHY: WE CAN ASK QUESTIONS. THAT'S
5 AVAILABLE.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DEBORAH, DO YOU HAVE AN
7 OPINION ON THIS?

8 MS. HYSEN: I AGREE WITH ED.

9 MR. KLEIN: DEBORAH, WHAT WERE YOU AGREEING
10 WITH?

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WITH ED AND DAVID.

12 MS. HYSEN: WITH ED, THAT IF THERE'S A SPECIFIC
13 QUESTION, THAT THEY SHOULD ANSWER THE SPECIFIC QUESTION.
14 I THINK THAT THIS SHOULDN'T TURN INTO A DOG AND PONY
15 SHOW. THEN THEY'LL ALL FEEL OBLIGATED TO BRING THEIR
16 SCIENTISTS, THEIR BEST WHATEVER, AND I DON'T THINK THAT'S
17 A GOOD USE OF THEIR TIME. SO A SPECIFIC QUESTION WOULD
18 BE GOOD.

19 MR. KLEIN: I PERSONALLY THINK IT SHOULD BE
20 BROADER THAN THAT. I'VE BEEN ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS
21 WHERE EVEN THOUGHTFUL PEOPLE SUBMITTING FULLY DEVELOPED
22 APPLICATIONS CAN SIT BEFORE A COMMITTEE AND REALIZE THAT
23 A PORTION OF THE APPLICATION IS NOT BEING UNDERSTOOD;
24 AND/OR IN REVIEWING WHAT THE STRONG POINTS OF THE
25 APPLICATIONS ARE, THEY'VE COMPLETELY MISSED FOUR OR FIVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REALLY UNIQUE, STRONG POINTS. I THINK WE HAVE TWENTY TO
2 \$50 MILLION AT RISK ON SOME OF THESE GRANTS, THAT GIVING
3 EACH OF THEM TEN MINUTES, THEY'RE LIMITED IN TIME, IT'S
4 GOING TO BE HIGHLY UNDER CONTROL, DAVID, AND GIVING THEM
5 TEN MINUTES TO JUST HIT THE HIGH POINTS AND CORRECTIONS
6 CAN PROVIDE THAT EXTRA MEASURE OF INSULATION.

7 THIS IS THE LARGEST INDIVIDUAL GRANTS WE'LL
8 EVER SEE IN THE WHOLE PROGRAM. AND AT THAT LEVEL, I
9 THINK THE EXTRA TEN MINUTES EACH WOULD BE VALUABLE.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: AS I SEE IT,
11 DAVID, THERE'S REALLY TWO PROPOSALS ON THE FLOOR RIGHT
12 NOW. LET ME TAKE THE LIBERTY OF SORT OF SUMMARIZING
13 THEM. ONE IS SORT OF JEFF AND BOB'S. I DON'T KNOW IF
14 YOU AGREE WITH BOB, JEFF. GENERALLY SPEAKING, THEY GIVE
15 A PRESENTATION; IF THERE'S QUESTIONS, YOU CAN ASK
16 QUESTIONS, THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THEM TO COMMENT ON
17 THE COMMENTS.

18 MR. SHEEHY: I BELIEVE IN GIVING THEM AN
19 OPPORTUNITY FOR FEEDBACK.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I JUST WANT TO
21 MAKE SURE I UNDERSTOOD THE PROPOSAL.

22 THE OTHER PROPOSAL IS LIMITED IN SCOPE; AND
23 THAT IS, IF THERE IS ONLY A QUESTION, THAT THE APPLICANTS
24 ARE AVAILABLE, BUT THERE'S NO PRESENTATION, THERE'S NO
25 EXPECTATION OF A PRESENTATION, ONLY IF THERE ARE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 QUESTIONS, THEY'RE THERE TO ANSWER THE QUESTION.

2 MR. SHEEHY: THEY CAN'T ASK QUESTIONS?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: NO.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO ACTUALLY INTERESTING
5 ENOUGH AT THIS POINT, I'D LIKE TO OPEN UP AND SEE IF THE
6 PUBLIC HAS ANY OPINION ON THIS SUBJECT MATTER. PLEASE
7 STATE YOUR NAME AND AFFILIATION, DON.

8 MR. REED: THIS IS DON REED. MY FEELING IS
9 THAT ABOUT A YEAR PROBABLY HAS BEEN SPENT BY THE
10 APPLICANTS PREPARING FOR THIS. AND I THINK THAT THEY
11 NEED A LAST CHANCE TO GIVE THEIR BEST SHOT. WE DON'T
12 WANT THEM TO WALK AWAY FEELING, WELL, GEE. IF WE JUST
13 HAD A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME, WE COULD HAVE WON. WE DON'T
14 WANT TO LEAVE THEM WITH NEGATIVE FEELINGS TOWARDS THE
15 PROCESS. THIS IS A HUGE, HUGE PART OF THEIR APPLICATION.
16 SO I'D BE IN FAVOR OF ERRING ON THE SIDE OF GIVING THEM A
17 LITTLE BIT OF EXTRA TIME. I KNOW IT'S EASY FOR ME TO SAY
18 AS A WATCHER. YOU GUYS ARE DOING THE WORK, BUT I'D
19 RATHER ERR ON THE SIDE OF GIVING THEM A LITTLE BIT EXTRA
20 TIME TO SUM UP THEIR BEST CASE.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ANY OTHER PUBLIC?

22 MR. SIMPSON: THIS IS JOHN SIMPSON.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: HEY, JOHN. GO AHEAD,
24 PLEASE.

25 MR. SIMPSON: I AGREE WITH DON. I THINK YOU

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NEED TO GIVE THEM SOME LIMITED, FINITE, VERY SHORT
2 OPPORTUNITY TO RESTATE THEIR BEST CASE. AND AS JEFF HAS
3 JUST SAID, MANY OF THEM MIGHT UNDERSTAND THAT THE BEST
4 THEY CAN DO WOULD BE REMAIN SILENT. I THINK YOU OUGHT TO
5 OFFER THEM THE OPPORTUNITY OF, SAY, A THREE-MINUTE
6 COMMENT. THANK YOU.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE HAVE ANOTHER MEMBER OF
8 THE PUBLIC.

9 DR. HALME: THIS IS DINA HALME FROM UCSF, AND
10 I'M SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF UCSF AND UC IRVINE. WE AGREE
11 WITH JOHN SIMPSON. WE THINK THAT A THREE-MINUTE REBUTTAL
12 WOULD ALLOW US TO PREVENT -- AS AN APPLICANT, IF THE
13 DISCUSSION IS MISINFORMED OR INCORRECTLY INFORMED, TO
14 RESPOND TO THAT, BUT TO NOT DO A DOG AND PONY SHOW ABOUT
15 WHY WE'RE SO GREAT. JUST IT'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO PREVENT
16 A MISTAKE, BUT NOT TO MAKE A PRESENTATION. NOTHING WOULD
17 BE PREPARED. ESSENTIALLY YOU WOULD HAVE TO COME AND
18 YOU'D LISTEN TO THE DISCUSSION, AND YOU EITHER STAND UP
19 AND SAY YOU GOT IT RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, OR I
20 THINK YOU GOT IT MOSTLY RIGHT --

21 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU GOT IT RIGHT
22 IN YOUR OPINION. DR. HALME, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, YOUR
23 OPINION DOESN'T MATTER HERE. IT DOESN'T. IT HAS NO
24 BEARING.

25 DR. HALME: THAT MAY BE. BUT IF THE POINT OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GIVING ME THREE MINUTES TO RESPOND IS TO SAY IN MY
2 OPINION I THINK YOU GOT ALL THESE THINGS RIGHT, BUT I'M
3 CONCERNED THAT YOU MISINTERPRETED WHAT WE WROTE, WHAT WE
4 INTENDED BY THIS SENTENCE WAS SUCH-AND-SUCH AND YOU'RE
5 ALL SAYING SOMETHING ELSE, THEN THAT WOULD BE IT.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU.

7 DR. HALME: THESE ARE MY THREE MINUTES.

8 MR. OREAR: MY NAME IS RALPH OREAR, AND I'M
9 COMFORTABLE WITH THE IDEA THAT APPLICANTS HAVE A CHANCE
10 TO RESPOND TO STAFF SUMMARY. I THINK THAT WHAT WAS BUILT
11 INTO IT SO FAR IS THAT ONCE THE STAFF ANALYSIS IS DONE,
12 ALL THE EMPIRICAL DATA IS THERE, TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY
13 TO LOOK AT THAT TO MAKE SURE IT'S FACTUALLY ACCURATE AND
14 THAT ANY MISCONCEPTIONS OR MISUNDERSTANDINGS ARE COVERED
15 AT THAT POINT. I THINK THAT GIVES US THE OPPORTUNITY TO
16 DO IT.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ANY OTHER PUBLIC
18 COMMENTS?

19 DR. WRIGHT: MY OWN MUTE BUTTON GOT IN MY WAY A
20 LITTLE WHILE AGO. I THINK EVERYBODY SAID IT. TO ME THE
21 RISKS ARE THAT WE'VE COME THIS FAR, WE'VE BEEN SO CAREFUL
22 AND SO THOUGHTFUL AND PROCEEDED METHODICALLY, BUT TO FAIL
23 TO HEAR PEOPLE, FAIL TO ALLOW THEM A CHANCE TO CLARIFY,
24 OR TO KEEP FROM BEING MISUNDERSTOOD, I THINK THE EFFORT
25 THAT WE SPEND THERE IS WELL WORTH IT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I'D LIKE TO -- BOB, I
2 DON'T KNOW IF WE NEED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, BUT MY
3 THOUGHT PROCESS, ACTUALLY I LIKE THE PUBLIC'S IDEA ABOUT
4 A THREE-MINUTE REBUTTAL OR CLARIFICATION PERIOD WHERE IT
5 IS A NO POWERPOINT ALLOWED, AND ESSENTIALLY THEY CAN
6 RESPOND TO ANYTHING THEY FEEL IN THE STAFF ANALYSIS THAT
7 WE GOT WRONG OR ANYTHING THEY FEEL THAT WE DIDN'T
8 UNDERSTAND OR WE UNDERSTOOD FULLY OR WE MISSED IN OUR
9 DISCUSSION. I WOULD KIND OF SUPPORT THAT THREE-MINUTE
10 RULE WITH THE CHAIR'S DISCRETION, THAT IF IT IS A
11 COMMERCIAL, THAT I CAN CUT THEM OFF.

12 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, I THINK THAT YOU'RE CREATING
13 TOO ARTIFICIAL AND TIGHT A STRUCTURE IN THAT WE NEED TO
14 GIVE OURSELVES ENOUGH ROOM THAT WE DON'T CREATE A
15 PROCEDURE THAT WE THEN VIOLATE BECAUSE WE FOUND OUT THAT
16 THERE'S A MORE COMPLEX PROBLEM THAN CAN BE DISCUSSED IN
17 THREE MINUTES. SO I WOULD SUGGEST A TEN-MINUTE GUIDELINE
18 THAT CAN BE REASONABLY VARIED BY THE CHAIR BASED UPON THE
19 NEEDS OF THE COMMITTEE.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME --

21 DR. WRIGHT: . . . , RIGHT, BOB?

22 MR. KLEIN: SOME PEOPLE MAY NOT NEED TEN
23 MINUTES.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: SOME PEOPLE
25 MIGHT NOT NEED THAT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KLEIN: NO POWERPOINT. YOU CAN SAY NO
2 POWERPOINT SO THAT IT AVOIDS KIND OF A SHOW BEING PUT ON.
3 BUT IF SOMEBODY HAD AN ARCHITECTURAL DRAWING THAT THEY'RE
4 TRYING TO POINT OUT AND ANSWER ON FUNCTIONALITY OR
5 SOMETHING, THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO DISPLAY THAT. BUT YOU
6 JUST COULD SAY IN THE GUIDELINES THAT THERE ARE NO SHOWS
7 THAT ARE ALLOWED HERE. THIS IS JUST TECHNICAL
8 INFORMATION.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, ONE SECOND. JEFF,
10 PLEASE.

11 MR. SHEEHY: I ACTUALLY LIKE THE CHAIR'S
12 SUGGESTION AND DR. HALME'S. THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT I HAD IN
13 MIND WAS A SHORT PERIOD. I THINK THE THREE-MINUTE --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK SHE
15 DISAGREES WITH A PIECE OF BOB'S RECOMMENDATION.

16 DR. HALME: NOT THE ICOC CHAIR, BUT THE WORKING
17 GROUP CHAIRS.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU AGREE WITH
19 BOB?

20 DR. HALME: DAVID.

21 MR. SHEEHY: WHEN I FIRST BROUGHT THIS UP,
22 THAT'S WHAT I ENVISIONED WAS JUST AN OPPORTUNITY TO
23 REDRESS, TO REBUT. AND I THINK THE THREE-MINUTE --
24 FRANKLY, THREE MINUTES IS A LONG TIME TO TALK. I THINK
25 IT GETS EXTENDED IF WE HAVE BACK AND FORTH. IF THEY'RE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MAKING GOOD POINTS, WE WILL DRAG THAT OUT.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AT THE CHAIR'S -- BOB, IF
3 THERE'S A COMPLEX ISSUE THAT NEEDS MORE THAN THREE
4 MINUTES, I WILL EXTEND WHATEVER THE RELEVANT AMOUNT OF
5 TIME NECESSARY FOR THE WORKING GROUP TO HAVE A BETTER
6 UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE.

7 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S REASONABLE.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK, AS I
9 UNDERSTOOD, WHAT JEFF AND DAVID IS SAYING IS A REASONABLE
10 COMPROMISE FROM MY POSITION BECAUSE I DON'T WANT -- I
11 DON'T SUPPORT WHAT YOU'RE PROPOSING, BOB.

12 MR. KLEIN: OKAY. I'M PREPARED WITH WHAT WAS
13 JUST CLARIFIED BY THE CHAIR.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THREE MINUTES,
15 THERE'S NO EXPECTATION THAT THEY SPEAK, THAT IF THERE'S
16 ISSUES OF REDRESS AND FOLLOW-UP, THAT THAT IS THEN THE
17 OPPORTUNITY FOR THAT TO HAPPEN.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AT THE CHAIR'S
19 DISCRETION --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: IT COULD BE
21 EXTENDED.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: -- IT COULD BE EXTENDED
23 IF I FEEL THAT THE ISSUE AT HAND NEEDS FURTHER
24 CLARIFICATION IN ORDER FOR THE MEMBERS TO HAVE A FULL
25 UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: CAN I HAVE TWO
2 MORE FOLLOW-UPS, AND THE FIRST ONE IS WOULD THE
3 APPLICANTS THEN -- SO REDRESS IS A TWO-WAY CONVERSATION.
4 IF THEY WANT TO REDRESS, WE SAID THEY THEN COULD, RIGHT?

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YES.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I JUST WANTED TO
7 MAKE SURE THAT'S CLEAR.

8 SECONDLY, AT WHAT POINT WOULD WE AFFORD THIS
9 THREE MINUTES? WHERE IN THE PROCESS DO WE ENVISION
10 HAVING THESE THREE MINUTES? BEFORE SCORING. SO SORT OF
11 TOWARDS THE END.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: TOWARDS THE END OF THE
13 DISCUSSION, BUT BEFORE SCORING.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: SEEMS LIKE THAT
15 WOULD BE THE PLACE WHERE IT WOULD MAKE SENSE BECAUSE THEY
16 WOULD SAY THE WORKING GROUP HAS HAD THIS DISCUSSION, I'VE
17 BEEN TAKING NOTES, THERE'S THIS AND THERE'S THAT.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BUT ARE WE SCORING
19 EVERYONE'S AT THE END?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: EACH
21 INDIVIDUALLY.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AS WE'RE GOING ALONG, BUT
23 WE'RE GIVING THE FINAL --

24 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I'M JUST SAYING
25 WHERE? WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GIVE PEOPLE THREE MINUTES?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK GIVE THEM THREE
2 MINUTES TOWARD THE END OF THE DISCUSSION ON THAT
3 PARTICULAR APPLICATION.

4 MR. SHEEHY: THAT'S WHAT I MEAN. SO LIKE WE
5 DISCUSS UC IRVINE. WE HAVE THE PRESENTATION. WE'VE
6 FINISHED OURSELVES. AND THEN THERE'S THREE MINUTES FOR
7 UC IRVINE TO SAY YOU GOT IT WRONG --

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: EXACTLY.

9 MR. SHEEHY: -- ON THIS POINT. YOU HAD THIS
10 BIG DISCUSSION.

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OR YOU GUYS GOT IT REALLY
12 RIGHT. YOU REALLY FULLY UNDERSTOOD OUR APPLICATION.
13 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

14 MR. SHEEHY: I ACTUALLY WOULD JUST SCORE IT --

15 DR. HALME: I LOOK FORWARD TO SAYING THAT.

16 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD HOPE THE CHAIR WOULD
17 DISCOURAGE THOSE COMMENTS.

18 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'M KIDDING. I'M
19 TEASING.

20 MR. SHEEHY: THAT COMES INTO THE PITCH. I
21 AGREE WITH EVERYBODY'S FEELING HERE THAT WE DON'T NEED
22 THE SALES PITCH.

23 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE DON'T NEED THE SALES
24 PITCH.

25 MS. HYSEN: ONE QUESTION AND A CONCERN, AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PERHAPS THE ATTORNEYS HERE. I'M CONCERNED THAT AN
2 APPLICATION MAY COME IN AND BE FAULTY IN SOME MANNER, AND
3 THAT THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT THAT MISTAKE IN
4 THIS FORUM, AND THAT MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CAN YOU GIVE ME AN
6 EXAMPLE?

7 MS. HYSEN: IF, FOR INSTANCE, THEY MISSED
8 SOMETHING, IT ISN'T A QUESTION OF WE DON'T GET IT, THEIR
9 APPLICATION MISSED A POINT. AND THEY CAN SEE IN OUR
10 DIALOGUE, OOPS, I MESSED UP. AND THEN THEY'RE GIVEN AN
11 OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT IT HERE. AND I JUST DON'T KNOW IF
12 THAT'S LEGALLY APPROPRIATE.

13 MR. KELLER: OUR INTENT, BECAUSE OF THE
14 TWO-STEP PROCESS, WE'RE INVITING THE APPLICANTS WHO ARE
15 SUCCESSFUL ON THE PART 1 TO PROPOSE ON PART 2. I THINK
16 WE HAVE LATITUDE HERE THAT IF THERE ARE CURATIVE
17 DEFICIENCIES, OUR FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS IS TO REVIEW
18 EACH APPLICATION; AND IF THERE IS A PIECE MISSING, A
19 DOCUMENT THAT IS NOT PROVIDED, WE WILL CONTACT -- I THINK
20 WE CAN ALL AGREE THAT IT'S IN OUR BEST INTEREST THAT THE
21 APPLICANTS RESPOND FULLY TO THE RFA AND NOT BE CAUGHT ON
22 SOME TECHNICALITY. SO WE WILL GIVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR
23 CORRECTIVENESS AT THAT VERY FIRST --

24 MS. HYSEN: AT THE FIRST STEP, NOT AT THIS
25 STEP.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KELLER: RIGHT. WHEN WE RECEIVE THE
2 APPLICATION, OUR FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS IS TO REVIEW IT
3 FOR COMPLETENESS.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: RIGHT. IF
5 THEY'RE NONRESPONSIVE IN SOME WAY. WHAT I UNDERSTOOD
6 DEBORAH TO SAY IS IT'S NOT AN ISSUE OF THE APPLICATION
7 BEING NONRESPONSIVE, THEY FORGOT TO PUT A FINANCIAL
8 STATEMENT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. BUT IT'S A MORE
9 SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE WITH THEIR APPLICATION, AND THAT THE
10 APPLICANT SEES THIS THREE-MINUTE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE
11 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. THEY GET THE SENSE OF THE STAFF
12 COMMENTS AND THE BACK AND FORTH. HEY, I'M GOING TO USE
13 THIS THREE MINUTES, AND I'LL FIND A CREATIVE WAY TO
14 INSERT IT BECAUSE IT WON'T BE DIFFICULT TO FIGURE THAT
15 PART OF IT OUT, AND GIVE THIS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO
16 SWITCH A SCORE OR INCREASE MY SCORE OR GET IN THE NEXT
17 CATEGORY.

18 I CAN SEE DEBORAH'S POINT, AS I UNDERSTOOD IT,
19 THAT, YOU KNOW, WE JUST NEED TO BE CLEAR. AT SOME POINT
20 THERE IS A DEADLINE. THAT'S ALL.

21 MR. KLEIN: WELL, BUT --

22 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: AT SOME POINT
23 THERE'S A DEADLINE AT WHICH WE DON'T TAKE ADDITIONAL
24 INFORMATION TO MAKE OUR DECISION. IF WE WANT TO SAY THAT
25 DEADLINE IS WHEN THE APPLICANT USES THEIR THREE MINUTES,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FINE. FINE. BUT I DON'T UNDERSTAND DEADLINES IN A
2 COMPETITIVE BID PROCESS TO MEAN THAT AT ALL.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GO AHEAD, BOB. WHAT WERE
4 YOU GOING TO SAY?

5 MR. KLEIN: WE'RE NOT -- THIS IS NOT A
6 SITUATION WHERE WE'RE PURCHASING AUTOMOBILES. THIS IS A
7 SITUATION WHERE OUR MISSION IS TO CREATE THE VERY BEST
8 RESEARCH FACILITIES IN THE STATE. AND WHILE ON THE
9 SHARED LABS WE DID A BUNCH OF CURATIVE MEASURES WHICH
10 WERE IN EXCESS OF WHAT WE WOULD HAVE WANTED TO DO, IT IS
11 CRITICAL TO US THAT WE AS A COMMITTEE RETAIN OUR
12 AUTHORITY AND DON'T BOX OURSELVES IN BY SAYING WE WON'T
13 UNDER ANY CONDITIONS HAVE A CURATIVE MEASURE WHERE WE
14 MIGHT TAKE ONE OF THE FINEST INSTITUTIONS IN THE ENTIRE
15 STATE AND KNOCK IT OUT FOR SOME HIGHLY TECHNICAL REASON.
16 WE HAVE TO RETAIN OUR CURATIVE POWER IF WE'RE GOING TO BE
17 TRUE TO OUR MISSION BECAUSE THIS IS A ONE-TIME EVENT, AND
18 WE WOULDN'T WANT TO SACRIFICE TREMENDOUS EXPERTISE AND A
19 PHENOMENAL SCIENTIFIC CAPACITY BECAUSE WE SURRENDERED OUR
20 TECHNICAL ABILITY TO HAVE A CURATIVE PROVISION.

21 SO I WOULD JUST CAUTION US NOT TO HAVE, YOU
22 KNOW -- WE CAN HAVE A VERY STRONG DIRECTION TO THE
23 APPLICANTS THAT WILL NEGATIVELY IMPACT THEM, BUT WE NEED
24 TO RETAIN THE POWER TO CURE TO MAKE SURE WE DON'T
25 INADVERTENTLY REALLY SACRIFICE SOME HUGE OPPORTUNITY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I DON'T HAVE
2 ANYTHING MORE. WE GOT OTHER THINGS TO DEAL WITH.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ARE THERE ANY OTHER
4 COMMENTS ON THIS ISSUE? DO WE HAVE A CONSENSUS OF THE
5 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP? I THINK WE WANT TO HAVE A
6 PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT IS THERE A CONSENSUS NOW HOW WE'RE
7 GOING TO PROCEED ON THIS?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I WANT TO STATE
9 FOR THE RECORD THAT ANYTHING THAT, AND I'M GOING TO STATE
10 IT AGAIN IN APRIL, AND THIS IS MY OWN OPINION, THAT ANY
11 ORAL DISCUSSION WILL HAVE ZERO IMPACT ON MY DECISION
12 BECAUSE I WILL BASE MY DECISION, WHICH I'M LEGALLY
13 ENTITLED TO DO, ON THE WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION PRESENTED TO
14 ME SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING ON -- OUR APRIL MEETING,
15 WHICH I CAN DO. PEOPLE, YOU MAKE YOUR OWN DECISION, BUT
16 FOR ME THAT'S WHAT I AM MOST COMFORTABLE WITH.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: FAIR ENOUGH. WE HAVE A
18 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT.

19 MR. REED: I JUST THOUGHT I HEARD TWO DIFFERENT
20 SUBJECTS BEING TALKED ABOUT. IT SEEMED TO ME THAT
21 DEBORAH HYSEN WAS TALKING ABOUT SWEETENING THE POT, WHICH
22 WE ALL AGREE THERE HAS TO BE A DEADLINE AT WHICH NOTHING
23 NEW CAN BE ADDED. AND THEN IT SOUNDED LIKE BOB WAS
24 TALKING ABOUT CURATIVE STATEMENTS. SO IF THERE WAS AN
25 ERROR OR SOMETHING THAT HAD TO BE FIXED, IT SEEMED LIKE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE' S TWO DIFFERENT PURPOSES BEING TALKED AT.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I THINK THERE' S AN
3 UNDERSTANDING THAT IF THERE ARE CURATIVE MEASURES, STAFF
4 IS GOING TO ADDRESS THAT WITH THE APPLICANTS EARLIER IN
5 THE PROCESS, CORRECT, RICK?

6 MR. KELLER: WITH RESPECT TO THOSE ITEMS THAT
7 DEAL SPECIFICALLY WITH REQUIREMENTS OF THE APPLICATION.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO THERE WILL BE -- IN
9 TERMS OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE APPLICATION, IF THERE
10 ARE ITEMS THAT ARE CURABLE --

11 MR. KELLER: CAN I OFFER. MAYBE THE
12 DISTINCTION HERE IS THAT SAY, FOR INSTANCE, WE SAID THAT
13 YOU ARE TO, AS PART OF THE VALUE, EXPLAIN HOW YOUR
14 PROJECT IS INNOVATIVE OR HOW IT IS SUSTAINABLE, AND IF
15 YOU MADE A JUDGMENT THAT SAID, WELL, THE INFORMATION
16 PROVIDED WAS INADEQUATE BY VIRTUE OF THE FACT THAT IT DID
17 NOT EXPLAIN FULLY HOW THEY' RE RESPONDING TO THOSE TWO
18 ISSUES, THE QUESTION BECOMES CAN THEY THEN ORALLY COME IN
19 AND FIX THAT DEFICIENCY BY PRESENTING IN THREE MINUTES
20 THIS IS WHAT WE MEAN BY THIS, THIS IS WHAT WE MEAN BY
21 SUSTAINABILITY. SO THAT' S ADDING TO THE UNIVERSE OF
22 INFORMATION THAT IS BEING DEVELOPED IN A COMPETITIVE WAY.

23 WHILE I THINK WE AGREE THAT WE' RE TRYING TO GET
24 THE BEST VALUE FOR THE DOLLARS INVESTED, WE ALSO NEED
25 PEOPLE THAT COMMUNICATE, AND PART OF IT IS COMMUNICATING

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WELL.

2 MR. KASHIAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D LIKE TO HAVE
3 DAVID MAKE THE MOTION HE'S MAKING AND CALL FOR THE
4 QUESTION.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: DO WE NEED TO HAVE A
6 MOTION ON THIS? NO, WE DON'T NEED A MOTION ON THIS. IS
7 EVERYONE COMFORTABLE WITH WHERE WE'RE GOING ON THIS?
8 DEBORAH, BASICALLY THAT THREE-MINUTE -- FROM MY
9 PERSPECTIVE, THAT THREE MINUTES IS REALLY FOR THE
10 APPLICANT IF, A, THERE WAS SOMETHING THAT THEY FELT THE
11 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REALLY JUST DIDN'T UNDERSTAND
12 ABOUT THEIR APPLICATION OR DIDN'T HAVE THE RIGHT
13 PERSPECTIVE WHAT THEY MEANT TO COMMUNICATE, THEY WOULD
14 HAVE --

15 MS. HYSEN: BUT I THINK RICK MAKES A GOOD
16 POINT. I THINK IT'S INCUMBENT UPON THE CHAIR AND OUR
17 QUESTION TO THE APPLICANT HOW WE SET A TIGHTER PARAMETER
18 AROUND THAT. IF WE SAY, FOR INSTANCE, THE INFORMATION
19 CONTAINED IN RESPONDENT X IS INADEQUATE, IT DOES ALLOW
20 FOR THEM TO COME UP AND PROVIDE A WHOLE SERIES OF THINGS
21 WHICH CAN POTENTIALLY SWEETEN THE POT. SO I THINK IT'S
22 INCUMBENT UPON OUR QUESTION TO THAT INDIVIDUAL TO TIGHTEN
23 THE TYPE OF RESPONSE BECAUSE IF WE SAY IT'S INADEQUATE,
24 IT CERTAINLY ALLOWS THEM AN OPPORTUNITY TO ELABORATE.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WELL, I WOULD AGREE WITH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 YOU, DEBORAH, AND ACTUALLY I KIND OF AGREE WITH DAVID,
2 ALTHOUGH I MIGHT NOT BE SO SET IN STONE ON HOW YOU'RE
3 VIEWING IT IN TERMS --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I'M A PUBLIC
5 CONTRACTS AND A CONCESSION LEASE ATTORNEY. I ADVISE MY
6 CLIENT ALL DAY LONG ABOUT HOW TO GO ABOUT THE COMPETITIVE
7 BID PROCESS. I THINK LIKE A PUBLIC CONTRACTS LAWYER.
8 AND I'M JUST TRYING TO FOLLOW MY OWN ADVICE I WOULD GIVE
9 MY OWN CLIENT. THAT IS, SET A PROCESS ANY WAY YOU WANT.
10 YOU CAN DO THAT. BUT SET A DEADLINE AND MAKE SURE
11 THERE'S A LINE IN THE SAND. THAT'S ALL. THAT'S ALL I
12 ADVISE MY CLIENT TO DO.

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: MAYBE THE DEADLINE IS
14 THAT THEY CAN'T PRESENT ANY NEW WRITTEN INFORMATION AT
15 THIS THREE-MINUTE PRESENTATION. THEY CAN ONLY TALK TO
16 ANY ISSUES. TAMAR.

17 MS. PACHTER: YOU KNOW, IT'S GOING TO BE A
18 PUBLIC MEETING. AND WE ALWAYS BUILD INTO OUR PUBLIC
19 MEETINGS OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND BECAUSE WE
20 ARE THE STATE, WE DON'T INTERFERE WITH THE FIRST
21 AMENDMENT. SO ANYBODY CAN REALLY GET UP AND SAY ANYTHING
22 IN A PUBLIC MEETING. AND THE REAL ISSUE IS HOW EACH OF
23 YOU ARE GOING TO DECIDE TO USE THAT INFORMATION. AND YOU
24 MAY DECIDE, GEE, THIS INFORMATION WAS NOT BEFORE THE
25 EXPERTS WHO SO CAREFULLY REVIEWED THE APPLICATION. SO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MAYBE I'M NOT GOING TO TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION.
2 THAT WOULD BE DAVID'S POSITION. OR MAYBE YOU THINK
3 THERE'S SOMETHING HIGHLY CREDIBLE THAT YOU SHOULD TAKE
4 INTO ACCOUNT.

5 I THINK THAT'S GOING TO BE AN INDIVIDUAL
6 DECISION FOR EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THIS PANEL TO MAKE.
7 I DON'T THINK YOU'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO DECIDE WHAT IT
8 IS THEY CAN GET UP AND SAY WHEN YOU GIVE THEM TIME AT THE
9 PUBLIC MIC. IT'S REALLY A DECISION THAT EACH ONE OF YOU
10 IS GOING TO MAKE ABOUT WHAT WEIGHT THAT IS GOING TO HAVE
11 IN YOUR DECISION.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: BUT IT'S TWO
13 DIFFERENT CONTEXTS, THOUGH, TAMAR. ONE CONTEXT IS IF WE
14 SAY TO THE APPLICANTS WE'RE GOING TO AFFORD YOU THREE
15 MINUTES, THAT'S ONE THING, AND THAT'S SORT OF A RULE
16 WE'RE MAKING. YOU'RE RIGHT. IT'S A PUBLIC MEETING, SO
17 AT SOME POINT IN THE AGENDA, WE HAVE TO MAKE EVERYBODY
18 INCLUDING THE APPLICANTS CAN SPEAK. THAT'S SORT OF A
19 DIFFERENT THING. YOU'RE RIGHT. WE CAN'T INTERFERE. IF
20 THEY WANT TO TALK ABOUT TODAY'S WEATHER, THEY COULD. BUT
21 IF WE SAY WE'RE SETTING ASIDE THREE MINUTES SPECIFICALLY
22 FOR YOU TO TALK ABOUT XYZ, WE CAN DO THAT, AND ASK THAT
23 THEY ONLY SPEAK TO XYZ. I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE'RE
24 DIGGING INTO RIGHT NOW, MAYBE A LITTLE TOO MUCH, BUT HOW
25 WE CAN SET THE PARAMETERS, IF ANY, IF ANY, TO THAT THREE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MINUTES.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I'D LIKE TO MOVE ON TO
3 LET RICK FINISH HIS PRESENTATION. EVERYONE OKAY WITH
4 THAT?

5 MR. KASHIAN: I'D LIKE TO ASK JUST ONE SHORT
6 QUESTION. I FEEL LIKE, AS AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER, IF I'M
7 UNCLEAR ABOUT AN APPLICATION, AM I ENTITLED TO ASK THE
8 APPLICANT A SPECIFIC QUESTION THAT ISN'T INVOLVED IN THAT
9 THREE MINUTES? AND I BELIEVE I SHOULD BE ENTITLED TO DO
10 THAT.

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK YOU ARE ENTITLED
12 TO ASK THAT. AND I GUESS WE WON'T HAVE THE CLOCK
13 TICKING.

14 MR. KASHIAN: IF THAT'S A YES ANSWER, I DON'T
15 HAVE TO HAVE ANY MORE DISCUSSION.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I UNDERSTOOD IT
17 TO BE WITHIN THE THREE MINUTES. IF THERE WAS A QUESTION
18 FROM A WORKING GROUP MEMBER TO AN APPLICANT, WE WOULD TRY
19 TO SORT OF LIMIT THINGS WITHIN A THREE-MINUTE CONTEXT,
20 ED; AND AT THE CHAIR'S DISCRETION, HE COULD EXTEND THAT
21 THREE MINUTES.

22 MR. KLEIN: DAVID, I DISAGREE WITH THAT. I
23 THINK YOU'RE TAKING THE RIGHTS AWAY OF THE FACILITIES
24 GROUP MEMBER. IF THERE'S AN ISSUE THAT ONE OF THE
25 MEMBERS IS NOT CLEAR ON, I THINK WE HAVE A REAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OBLIGATION TO ALLOW THAT MEMBER TO ASK THAT QUESTION AND
2 GET AN ADEQUATE RESPONSE.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I WOULD AGREE WITH BOB ON
4 THIS, DAVID. I THINK THAT IF WE HAVE QUESTIONS AND WE
5 WANT TO ASK THE APPLICANT QUESTIONS, THAT IS NOT GOING TO
6 GO TOWARDS THEIR THREE-MINUTE TALK TIME. SO, AGAIN, AT
7 MY DISCRETION, WE CAN EXTEND THAT IF THERE'S AMBIGUITIES
8 OR QUESTIONS WE HAVE. I'D LIKE TO MOVE ON FROM THAT.
9 WE'VE TALKED ABOUT IT A LOT, BUT I THINK WE HAVE A
10 GENERAL CONSENSUS OF HOW WE'RE GOING TO DEAL WITH IT. IT
11 SOUNDS LIKE WE'RE ON TRACK TO GIVE APPLICANTS A
12 THREE-MINUTE OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND. AND THEN IF WE HAVE
13 QUESTIONS, WE'LL ASK THE APPLICANTS THOSE QUESTIONS
14 BEFOREHAND.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: ONE LAST POINT
16 TO RICK, AND THAT IS PLEASE INCLUDE THIS DISCUSSION IN
17 THE RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC. MAYBE AT THE ICOC THERE
18 MIGHT BE A DISCUSSION ON IT AS WELL ON THIS POINT. SO IF
19 IT'S BEING INCORPORATED INTO THE PROCESS, IT NEEDS TO BE
20 INCORPORATED INTO WHATEVER PRESENTATION YOU MAKE, RIGHT?

21 MR. KELLER: I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTOOD THAT.
22 THE PRESENTATION I'M MAKING RELATIVE TO --

23 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: RELATIVE TO THE
24 DECEMBER 1ST MEETING AT THE ICOC. DECEMBER 12TH.
25 ASSUMING THAT THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE ICOC ON DECEMBER

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 12TH. THAT WILL BE UP TO THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR OF
2 THE ICOC.

3 MR. KELLER: WE DON'T BELIEVE ANY OF THE
4 PROCEDURES OR PROCESSES THAT YOU'RE ADOPTING HERE NEED TO
5 BE APPROVED BECAUSE THEY APPROVED THE CRITERIA FOR
6 EVALUATION, WHICH YOU DID --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YES. YES. YES.

8 MR. KELLER: THE ICOC APPROVED THAT. THIS IS
9 MORE THE --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. IF ICOC
11 APPROVED IT, THEN FINE. NEVER MIND.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: RICK.

13 MR. KELLER: I THINK WE'VE REALLY RUN THROUGH
14 THE TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS, AND THE CHECKMARKS HERE ARE
15 TALKING ABOUT JUST WHAT WE ACCOMPLISHED IN TERMS OF
16 UNDERSTANDING WHAT IS IN THE STAFF ANALYSIS, HOW THE
17 WORKING GROUP WILL CONDUCT ITS DISCUSSIONS, AND THEN HOW
18 THAT WILL LEAD TO A SCORE. SO ALL THAT, IF YOU RECALL,
19 THEN LEADS, WE SCORE THE APPLICANTS, AND WE GO INTO WHAT
20 IS CALLED FOR IN THE INITIATIVE, PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'VE HAD A REQUEST BY THE
22 VICE CHAIR TO TAKE A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: IS THAT OKAY?
24 JUST TAKE A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK BECAUSE WE'RE DONE WITH
25 TECHNICAL, AND WE CAN START WITH PROGRAMMATIC.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. HALME: CAN WE GET ONE PUBLIC COMMENT ON
2 TECHNICAL? IT CAN BE AFTER THE BREAK. DINA HALME, UCSF
3 AGAIN ON BEHALF OF UCSF AND UC IRVINE. WE FEEL THAT IF
4 THERE WILL BE A PRIMARY REVIEWER, WHICH WAS NOT
5 ORIGINALLY CLEAR TO US IN THE MATERIALS, IT SOUNDS LIKE
6 WILL BE THE CASE, THAT WE WOULD STRONGLY SUGGEST THAT
7 THERE BE A SECONDARY REVIEWER RATHER THAN ONLY A FREE FOR
8 ALL. I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE A LOT OF APPLICATIONS
9 AND NOT THAT MANY PEOPLE, BUT CERTAINLY IN THE HISTORICAL
10 CONTEXT OF SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO HAVE
11 SOMEBODY WHOSE JOB IT IS TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THEY
12 DISAGREE WITH THE PRIMARY REVIEWER. OTHERWISE THE
13 PRIMARY REVIEWER ESSENTIALLY CAN CARRY THE DAY, AND
14 YOU'RE NOT GOING TO READ ALL THE APPLICATIONS WITH THE
15 SAME DEGREE OF DETAIL.

16 AND SO WE WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST, JUST GIVEN THE
17 MAGNITUDE OF THE DECISIONS, THAT IF THERE'S A PRIMARY
18 REVIEWER, THAT THERE'S ALSO A SECONDARY REVIEWER.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I THOUGHT, AND I
20 DIDN'T WANT TO BRING IT UP AT THE TIME, BUT I THOUGHT THE
21 TERM "PRIMARY REVIEWER" WAS WRONG. I THOUGHT WHEN WE
22 WERE LOOKING TOWARDS THE REAL ESTATE EXPERTS, IT WAS FOR
23 THEM TO JUST TO GIVE GENERAL IMPRESSIONS AND LEAD THE
24 DISCUSSION AND SET THE GROUNDWORK, THAT IT WASN'T A
25 PRIMARY REVIEW AS IT'S UNDERSTOOD WHEN WE DID OUR SHARED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LABS AND AS IT'S UNDERSTOOD IN THE SCIENTIFIC GRANTS
2 CONTEXT. IT'S NOT -- I DIDN'T WANT TO SAY IT BECAUSE I
3 DIDN'T WANT TO DELAY THE MEETING. IT'S NOT REALLY A,
4 QUOTE, PRIMARY REVIEW BECAUSE THEN PEOPLE ARE GOING TO
5 THINK SHOULDN'T THERE BE A SECONDARY REVIEW.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: SO THAT WOULD BE
8 SORT OF MY ANSWER.

9 DR. HALME: MY ANSWER WOULD BE THAT IF SOMEONE
10 IS LEADING THE DISCUSSION, THEY ARE BY DEFAULT THE
11 PRIMARY REVIEWER.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: HERE'S THE THING. WE ARE
13 GETTING AN OUTSIDE REVIEW AS WELL. SO I GUESS WE --

14 DR. HALME: THAT IT COMES DOWN TO THE
15 LOGISTICS, RIGHT. YOU'VE GOT A PIECE OF PAPER THAT RICK
16 WILL EITHER PRESENT PARTS OF OR NOT. HE CAN'T DESCRIBE
17 THE WHOLE THING. AND THEN YOU'VE GOT SOMEONE WHO'S
18 PASSIONATELY SAYING I THINK THIS IS GREAT, OR I THINK
19 THIS IS REALLY, REALLY SUBPAR. AND SOMEBODY SHOULD BE
20 WELL VERSED ENOUGH TO RESPOND TO SAY I AGREE THIS IS
21 REALLY GREAT OR THIS IS REALLY SUBPAR, OR I DISAGREE AS A
22 MATTER OF FACT.

23 I KNOW THAT IN DISCUSSIONS OF THE SHARED LABS,
24 FOR INSTANCE, THERE WERE DIFFERENT OPINIONS ON WHETHER OR
25 NOT YOU WERE BUILDING THE BEST LABS OR MANY ADEQUATE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LABS. THOSE ARE LEGITIMATE DISTINCTIONS AND THEY'RE
2 GOING TO BE INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT GIVEN THE NUMBER OF
3 APPLICATIONS AND THE AMOUNT OF MONEY YOU HAVE. SO I JUST
4 FEEL LIKE IT ENDS UP BEING VERY ARBITRARY AS TO WHO GETS
5 ASSIGNED TO BE THE PRIMARY REVIEWER, AND THAT IT'S LESS
6 ARBITRARY IF YOU HAVE TWO ASSIGNMENTS RATHER THAN ONE.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU. WE HAVE
8 ANOTHER MEMBER. PLEASE STATE YOUR INSTITUTION AND YOUR
9 NAME.

10 MR. CLEARY: JOHN CLEARY, USC. ACTUALLY A
11 DIFFERENT TOPIC. I WANTED TO COME BACK TO A SIDE
12 COMMENT, DAVID, THAT YOU MADE, AND I JUST WANTED TO MAKE
13 SURE WE UNDERSTOOD. YOU HAD MENTIONED AT ONE POINT, I
14 DIDN'T QUITE HEAR, EITHER THAT APPLICATIONS WOULD BE
15 SCORED IN SUCCESSION, OR THAT YOU'D WAIT UNTIL AN ENTIRE
16 LEVEL HAD BEEN DISCUSSED AND THEN SCORE ALL OF THEM AT
17 THAT TIME. AND IF YOU CAN PLEASE DESCRIBE FOR US WHAT
18 THE PLAN IS, WE'D APPRECIATE IT.

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO, RICK, I DON'T THINK
20 WE ACTUALLY FINALIZED THAT, DID WE?

21 MR. KLEIN: MAYBE SOMEONE SHOULD EXPLAIN THE
22 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW AS WELL SO PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT
23 THERE'S TWO.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE WERE -- BOB, WE WERE
25 GOING TO GO TO THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. SO I GUESS,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RICK, CAN WE ANSWER THAT WHEN WE GET BACK FROM BREAK?
2 BUT IT'S A GOOD QUESTION. WE'LL TAKE A FIVE-MINUTE
3 BREAK.

4 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I'D LIKE TO CALL THE
6 MEETING BACK TO ORDER. OKAY. SO WE HAD A VERY -- IS
7 EVERYONE BACK? BOB?

8 MR. KLEIN: I'M HERE.

9 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JANET?

10 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. GOOD. SO WE HAD A
12 QUESTION FROM THE GENTLEMAN FROM USC, WHICH ACTUALLY WAS
13 A GOOD QUESTION FROM THE PUBLIC. I LIKE THAT. SO ABOUT
14 THE SCORING PROCESS. SO, RICK, WHAT I WAS THINKING WE
15 COULD DO IS AFTER EACH APPLICATION AND THE REVIEW AND THE
16 COMMENTS, IF ANY, FROM THE APPLICANT, THAT THE MEMBERS
17 CAN DO A PRELIMINARY SCORE FOR THAT APPLICATION, AND THEN
18 WE HAVE A CHOICE OF EITHER PUTTING THE FINAL SCORE AT THE
19 VERY END OF ALL THE APPLICATIONS FOR ALL OF THEM OR WE
20 COULD POTENTIALLY DO IT IN GROUPING IT; FOR EXAMPLE,
21 AFTER ALL THE REVIEWS FOR THE CIRM INSTITUTES AND THEN
22 THE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND THEN THE SPECIAL PROGRAMS.
23 SO I'D LIKE TO GET MEMBER'S COMMENTS ON THIS
24 POINT IF ANYONE HAS STRONG FEELINGS ABOUT THIS.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: WE CAN DO IT AT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE WORKING GROUP.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I THINK EVERYONE
3 AGREES WE SHOULD DO PRELIMINARY SCORES AFTER WE'VE HAD
4 THE REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND COMMENTS FROM OR POTENTIAL
5 COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT. AND THEN THE QUESTION IS DO
6 WE WAIT TO THE VERY END TO PUT OUR FINAL SCORES, OR DO WE
7 DO FINAL SCORES FOR EACH GROUPING OF APPLICATIONS?

8 MR. KELLER: I'M NOT FOLLOWING YOU. SO IF
9 APPLICANT A COMES IN AND YOU DISCUSS THAT APPLICATION A,
10 THEN YOU SCORE IT. THAT'S PRELIMINARY?

11 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: NO. YOU DO A
12 PRELIMINARY -- SO, FOR EXAMPLE, SO LET'S JUST SAY
13 HYPOTHETICALLY, I'M JUST GOING TO SAY THERE ARE THREE
14 APPLICANTS FOR THE CIRM INSTITUTES, RIGHT, AND I'M JUST
15 USING THAT NUMBER, THAT AFTER EACH REVIEW, I WOULD BE
16 MARKING DOWN WHAT MY PRELIMINARY SCORES WERE, BUT I MIGHT
17 GO BACK AND REVISIT THOSE SCORES AFTER I'VE HEARD ALL OF
18 THOSE.

19 MR. KELLER: THAT'S WHAT I WANTED. AT THE END
20 OF ALL OF THE INSTITUTES, LET'S SAY THERE ARE SEVEN OR
21 EIGHT INSTITUTES, THEN YOU WOULD AT THE END OF THOSE, YOU
22 WOULD THEN HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW ALL SEVEN
23 INDIVIDUALLY, YOUR SEVEN SCORES, AND MAKE ANY ADJUSTMENTS
24 BY VIRTUE OF THE FACT YOU NOW HAVE MORE COMPARABLE
25 INFORMATION.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CORRECT. OR THE OTHER
2 OPTION IS THAT WE DO THAT AT THE VERY END AFTER WE
3 REVIEWED THE SPECIAL PROGRAMS.

4 MR. KELLER: I THINK JUST IN TERMS OF
5 LOGISTICS, IT MAKES SENSE TO DO EACH ONE AS A MODULE AND
6 COMPLETE YOUR THOUGHT ON IT.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JEFF.

8 MR. SHEEHY: IT'S REALLY A STRUCTURAL ISSUE.
9 WHEN DO YOU COLLECT THEM? BECAUSE --

10 MR. KELLER: WELL, WE WOULD COLLECT THEM AT THE
11 VERY END. SO YOU DO CIRM INSTITUTES, TECHNICAL SCORES,
12 PRELIMINARY, PRELIMINARY, PRELIMINARY, AND THEN SAY,
13 OKAY, YOU NEED TO MAKE YOUR INSTITUTES FINAL. NOW WE'LL
14 GO INTO THE CENTERS FOR EXCELLENCE, PRELIMINARY,
15 PRELIMINARY, PRELIMINARY. OKAY, WE'RE DONE, ADJUST YOUR
16 FINAL. AND THEN WE'D DO THE SPECIALS.

17 MS. PACHTER: FOR PURPOSES OF CONFLICTS, TO
18 INTERJECT A LEGAL ISSUE, IT WILL BE IMPORTANT TO COMPLETE
19 THE DISCUSSION OF THE INSTITUTES BEFORE MOVING ON TO THE
20 DISCUSSION OF THE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE OR SPECIAL
21 PROGRAMS BECAUSE THERE WILL BE MEMBERS WHO ARE RECUSED
22 FOR DISCUSSION OF THE INSTITUTES WHO WILL THEN COME BACK
23 INTO THE ROOM FOR INSTITUTES AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS. SO
24 THAT SHOULD FACTOR INTO YOUR DECISION AS WELL.

25 MS. HYSEN: FOR ME, I'LL LOSE MY TRAIN OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THOUGHT AND MY PRIMARY FOCUS IF I GO OFF THAT CATEGORY.

2 I THINK THAT --

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT'S FINE.

4 MS. HYSEN: -- WHAT I'VE FOUND IS THERE'S SO
5 MUCH INFORMATION IN HERE, THAT TO FOCUS ON THOSE GROUPS
6 AND THEN DECIDE.

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT'S FINE. I DON'T
8 HAVE -- I THINK THAT MAKES GOOD SENSE. YES, JEFF.

9 MR. SHEEHY: ONLY THING I WOULD SUGGEST IS
10 CREATING SEPARATE SCORE SHEETS AND ACTUALLY COLLECTING
11 THE SCORES AFTER EACH CATEGORY. AND THAT ACTUALLY GIVES
12 YOU A LEG UP IF YOU HAVE SOMEBODY ADDING IT UP.

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I LIKE THAT IDEA.

14 MR. KELLER: OKAY.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: GOOD SUGGESTION.

16 MR. SHEEHY: PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WILL GO
17 FASTER, AND THEN THAT ALSO TAKES -- THEN THAT REALLY
18 DOES, IN TERMS OF THE CONFLICTS, THAT DOESN'T HAVE --
19 LEAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT THAT CATEGORY MIGHT STILL BE
20 LIVE SIMPLY BY THE FACT THE SCORE SHEETS ARE STILL THERE.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BOB, JANET, DOES THAT
22 MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

23 MR. KLEIN: MAKES SENSE TO ME.

24 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. SO BE IT. ANY
25 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC? GOOD. I LIKE THAT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KELLER: SO THAT TAKES US THROUGH THE
2 TECHNICAL REVIEW. I'VE GONE OVER THAT. THE PROGRAMMATIC
3 REVIEW, WE WOULD PREPARE THE USUAL HISTOGRAM CHART
4 DISPLAYING THE SCORES, AND WE WOULD GO CATEGORY BY
5 CATEGORY AGAIN IN PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. SO YOU WOULD THEN
6 CONSIDER WHAT YOUR RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE FOR THE --
7 BASED ON THE TARGET FUNDING LEVEL THAT HAD BEEN
8 DESIGNATED FOR THAT CATEGORY BY THE ICOC WHEN THEY
9 ESTABLISH THE TARGET AMOUNT.

10 I DIDN'T SAY THAT RIGHT. YOU WOULD KNOW --
11 YOU WILL BE GIVEN A TARGET AMOUNT BY THE ICOC AT THE
12 JANUARY MEETING WHEN THEY KNOW HOW MANY APPLICATIONS ARE
13 COMING FORWARD TO PART 2. THEN YOU WOULD RECOMMEND A
14 SPECIFIC FUNDING LEVEL FOR EACH APPLICATION. YOU WOULD
15 DO THIS FOR EACH CATEGORY. YOU WOULD ALSO THEN HAVE THE
16 ABILITY TO DISCUSS THE AMOUNT WITHIN THE DESIGNATED RANGE
17 FOR THAT CATEGORY AND, IF NECESSARY, RECOMMEND A FUNDING
18 RANGE SHOULD BE ADJUSTED FOR ANY CATEGORY OF FUNDING.

19 SO THIS IS THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE MONEY THAT
20 WAS -- IF THE ICOC APPROVES AN AMOUNT PER CATEGORY, AND
21 YOU WANT, BASED ON YOUR REVIEW IN PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW,
22 THAT YOU SEE THAT IT IS MERITORIOUS TO GO ABOVE IN ONE
23 AND BELOW IN ANOTHER, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT YOU COULD
24 CONSIDER UNDER THIS BULLET.

25 OKAY. THEN THE QUESTION ABOUT WHAT WOULD THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FUNDING BE PER APPLICATION, THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT
2 YOU WOULD HAVE DISCRETION WITHIN THE RANGES, FULL
3 DISCRETION WITHIN THE RANGES THAT WERE IDENTIFIED IN THE
4 RFA, AND THAT YOU WOULD REACH A CONSENSUS ON THE AMOUNT
5 OF FUNDING BASED ON YOUR PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW OF EACH
6 APPLICATION IN EACH CATEGORY. SO --

7 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THIS WILL BE DONE THE
8 SAME WAY AS THE SHARED LABS AND NOT IN PUBLIC, CORRECT?

9 MR. KELLER: THIS WAS PUBLIC.

10 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THIS WAS PUBLIC IN THE
11 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW?

12 MR. KELLER: YES, IT WAS.

13 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. I THOUGHT THAT WAS
14 PART OF THE --

15 MR. KELLER: WELL, YOU HAD RECEIVED THE
16 SCIENTIFIC SCORES IN PRIVATE --

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IN PRIVATE. I SEE.

18 MR. KELLER: -- SESSION WITH DR. CHIU. SINCE
19 PART 1 WILL HAVE BEEN COMPLETED, EVERYONE WILL KNOW THE
20 SCORES OF PART 1. SO THERE'S NO NEED TO HAVE THAT
21 SESSION.

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY.

23 MR. KELLER: SO WHAT COMES OUT OF THE
24 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW IS A RECOMMENDATION AT OR BELOW THE
25 ICOC APPROVED AMOUNT OR A RECOMMENDATION TO INCREASE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FUNDING IF YOU SEE THE NEED TO CORRECT OR DEAL WITH THAT
2 CIRCUMSTANCE.

3 MS. PACHTER: JUST TO CLARIFY, THAT'S TO MOVE
4 FUNDING BETWEEN BUCKETS. SO YOU MAY DECIDE THAT THE
5 ICOC -- ICOC PUT \$10 MILLION INTO THE CIRM SPECIAL
6 PROGRAMS.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: PER APPLICATION.

8 MS. PACHTER: NO. \$10 MILLION FOR THE WHOLE
9 BUCKET.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: OKAY. THANKS.

11 MS. PACHTER: AND AFTER REVIEWING THE
12 APPLICATIONS, YOU MAY DECIDE NONE OF THEM ARE WORTHY, AND
13 SO YOU MAY RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC THAT THAT MONEY INSTEAD
14 BE PUT IN CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE OR CIRM INSTITUTES. SO
15 IT'S NOT A RECOMMENDATION TO INCREASE THE TOTAL AMOUNT.
16 IT'S A RECOMMENDATION TO MOVE MONEY BETWEEN BUCKETS.

17 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO CONCEIVABLY WE COULD
18 HAVE APPLICANTS WHERE THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP DOES
19 NOT RECOMMEND FUNDING, CORRECT?

20 MR. KELLER: I THINK IT'S MORE LIKELY THAT --
21 WE'RE NOT GOING TO KNOW HOW MUCH MONEY IS BEING
22 REQUESTED. SO IN THIS CASE IF THERE WERE, SAY, FOUR
23 APPLICANTS IN THE SPECIAL PROGRAMS CATEGORY AND WE ASSUME
24 10 MILLION IS AVAILABLE FOR EACH, THAT'S 40 MILLION. AND
25 THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT LOOKING AT THEIR REQUEST,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEIR REQUESTS WERE 5 MILLION, 8 MILLION, AND 10 MILLION
2 AND 10 MILLION. SO THERE'S ACTUALLY A CONSIDERABLE
3 AMOUNT MORE AVAILABLE THAN IS BEING REQUESTED, AND IT'S
4 GOT TO BE A COMPETITIVE PROCESS.

5 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED
6 ON THIS PROGRAMMATIC PART MYSELF. SO WE KNOW WHAT THE
7 BUCKET WILL BE, RIGHT? AND WE KNOW WHAT THE APPLICANTS
8 ARE ASKING FOR. BUT DURING PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, WE CAN
9 DECIDE TO INCREASE OR DECREASE THOSE AMOUNTS OR TO
10 RECOMMEND NO FUNDING; IS THAT CORRECT?

11 MS. PACHTER: THAT'S CORRECT.

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THIS WAS AND/OR,
14 RIGHT, THOSE TWO SUBDASHES?

15 MR. KELLER: RIGHT.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: IT'S AND/OR.
17 DOES EVERYBODY GET THAT? I JUST FIGURED THAT OUT RIGHT
18 NOW. YOU KNOW, FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS AT OR BELOW THE
19 ICOC APPROVED AMOUNT, AND WE JUST HAD, LIKE, A LITTLE
20 DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT OR RECOMMENDATION TO INCREASE
21 FUNDING. RICK'S QUESTION TO US IS WHICH -- WHAT THE
22 RECOMMENDATION WOULD LOOK LIKE.

23 MR. KELLER: I GUESS IN FURTHER DISCUSSION, AS
24 TAMAR EXPLAINED, IT WOULD BE RECOMMEND TO CHANGE FUNDING
25 BETWEEN CATEGORIES BECAUSE THE INCREASE --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. PACHTER: MOVE MONEY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY
2 ASSIGNED TO ONE BUCKET TO ANOTHER BUCKET.

3 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YES, JEFF.

4 MR. SHEEHY: SHOULD NOT THE WORKING GROUP BE
5 ABLE TO RECOMMEND INCREASE IN THE GLOBAL NUMBER?

6 MS. PACHTER: WELL, THAT'S AN INTERESTING
7 QUESTION. I MEAN GENERALLY THE ICOC HAS NOT ASKED THE
8 WORKING GROUP TO GIVE IT A RECOMMENDATION ABOUT HOW MUCH
9 MONEY SHOULD BE IN THE RFA. THAT'S BEEN EXCLUSIVELY AN
10 ICOC CONCERN.

11 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I TALK ABOUT THE GRANTS
12 WORKING GROUP? THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP HAS ACTUALLY --

13 MS. PACHTER: BUT THAT MOVED MONEY FROM THE
14 SEED -- FROM THE COMPREHENSIVE TO THE SEED.

15 MR. SHEEHY: IN THE ORIGINAL DISCUSSION OF THE
16 SEED GRANTS, THE WORKING GROUP STRONGLY RECOMMENDED THAT
17 THE ICOC -- NOW, IT HELPED WE HAD THE CHAIR SAYING I KNOW
18 WHERE MONEY IS, WHO HAD A BIG HIP POCKET, BUT THAT THEY
19 MADE A STRONG RECOMMENDATION BASED ON THE QUALITY OF THE
20 APPLICATIONS TO FIND ADDITIONAL MONEY. SO --

21 MS. PACHTER: THIS IS SIMILAR -- I THINK IT'S
22 SIMILAR IN THAT REALLY WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE IS THREE
23 RFA'S IN ONE, RIGHT? WE'RE DOING CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE,
24 INSTITUTES, AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS. AND SO THE ANALOGY TO
25 THE SEED AND COMPREHENSIVE GRANTS, WHICH WERE REVIEWED AT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE SAME TIME, WAS THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SAID,
2 GEE, THE SEEDS ARE SO GOOD, THERE'S MONEY LEFT, THERE ARE
3 MORE THAT YOU SHOULD FUND. AND I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE'RE
4 TALKING ABOUT HERE IS TO SAY, GEE, IF THERE'S TOO MUCH
5 MONEY, WE THINK, IN ONE BUCKET AND THERE ARE MERITORIOUS
6 APPLICATIONS THAT ARE UNDERFUNDED IN ANOTHER BUCKET, SO
7 WE RECOMMEND THAT YOU MOVE IT.

8 BUT THE TRUTH IS THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP
9 CAN RECOMMEND ANYTHING IT LIKES TO THE ICOC.

10 MR. KELLER: I WAS GOING TO MENTION THAT I
11 THINK THIS CAN BE HANDLED BY THE ICOC IN JANUARY WHEN
12 THEY -- BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ESTABLISH THE
13 AMOUNT PER CATEGORY. AND THE CONTEXT OF THAT CAN BE
14 EXPRESSED. THE ICOC CAN EXPRESS WHAT WE INTEND THERE;
15 AND IF THAT LATITUDE IS WHAT YOU INTEND, THE ICOC
16 INTENDS, RATHER, THAT CAN BE COMMUNICATED AS PART OF THE
17 ACTION AT THE JANUARY MEETING TO SAY WE WANT YOU -- THESE
18 ARE OUR TENTATIVE AMOUNTS PER, WE WANT TO STAY WITHIN
19 THIS OR COME BACK WITH A DIFFERENT AMOUNT.

20 THE REASON THAT THIS IS DIFFERENT THAN THE
21 GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS BECAUSE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
22 HAS THAT MIDDLE CATEGORY, THAT FUND WHEN FUNDS ARE
23 AVAILABLE. SO YOU'VE GOT KIND OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO GIVE
24 A KIND OF WHAT-IF CIRCUMSTANCE TO THE ICOC IN TERMS OF IF
25 FUNDING IS AVAILABLE, THESE ARE MERITORIOUS. THIS IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MORE A BRIGHT LINE IN TERMS OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS.
2 AND SO YOU'RE GOING TO COME OUT WITH A HARD
3 RECOMMENDATION, AND THEN HOW DOES THAT COMPARE TO THE
4 BUCKETS? THAT'S GOING TO BE THE ISSUE. DO YOU GO BACK
5 AND SQUEEZE THINGS TO STAY WITHIN THE BUCKET, OR DO YOU
6 STAND PAT AND SAY THIS IS A MERITORIOUS PROGRAM;
7 THEREFORE, WE'D LIKE TO SEE SOME ADJUSTMENT IN THE
8 DOLLARS.

9 MR. KASHIAN: IF YOU'RE ESTABLISHING THE
10 BUCKET, IS THE GOAL OF THE ICOC TO GET ALL THE MONEY OUT
11 THE DOOR? OR IF THERE IS MONEY LEFT OVER, IS THERE A
12 SECOND ROUND OF APPLICATIONS?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: NO. NO SECOND
14 ROUND.

15 MS. PACTER: THERE'S NO SECOND ROUND OF
16 APPLICATIONS, BUT THERE ARE OTHER FACILITIES THAT THE
17 ICOC COULD FUND AND THAT ARE IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN.

18 MR. KASHIAN: SO THE GOAL ISN'T TO GET IT ALL
19 OUT THE DOOR, JUST MERITORIOUS. AND IF THERE'S SOME
20 MONEY LEFT OVER, THEY CAN REALLOCATE IT.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: IF THERE'S MONEY
22 LEFT OVER.

23 MS. PACTER: IF THERE'S MONEY LEFT OVER.

24 MR. KASHIAN: IF THERE'S MONEY LEFT OVER. IS
25 THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING, DAVID?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YEAH, MINE.

2 MS. PACTER: THERE'S A LIMITED AMOUNT OF
3 FACILITIES MONEY AVAILABLE IN THE WAY THAT ISN'T THE
4 RESEARCH. SO YOU'RE ACTUALLY DEALING WITH A SMALLER POT.

5 MR. SHEEHY: SEE, AND THAT'S THE CONTEXT THAT I
6 THINK IS IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN MIND IS THAT WE'RE FIXED
7 AT -- WE CAN ONLY SPEND A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE OF OUR
8 OVERALL FUNDING ON FACILITIES. SO, YOU KNOW, IF WE NEED
9 OTHER FACILITIES DOWN THE LINE, TWO, THREE, FOUR, FIVE
10 YEARS FROM NOW, YOU KNOW, IT'S ALWAYS GOOD TO BE MINDFUL
11 OF THAT. SO THERE'S BOTH. THERE'S BOTH -- YOU'RE RIGHT
12 HERE IN THE MIDDLE BECAUSE WE ALL RECOGNIZE WHAT A
13 MASSIVE BOOST THIS WOULD BE TO GET A LOT OUT THE DOOR
14 RIGHT NOW TO GET THIS THING GOING, BUT AT THE SAME TIME
15 WE DON'T WANT TO BE WASTEFUL AT ALL BECAUSE THERE IS THIS
16 POTENTIAL FOR HAVING OTHER NEEDS THAT WE HAVEN'T
17 ANTICIPATED DOWN THE LINE AND WE'RE FIXED AT WHAT WE CAN
18 SPEND ON BUILDINGS.

19 MR. KASHIAN: THANK YOU. THAT CLARIFIES IT.

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: YES, MR. VICE CHAIR.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THIS IS TO RICK.
22 TO THE FIRST ONE, FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS, THAT'S WHAT IT
23 SAYS. AND THEN IT SAYS THE ICOC APPROVED AMOUNT. I
24 GUESS THAT ASSUMES WHAT YOU HAD STATED EARLIER, THAT THE
25 ICOC WILL SET AN APPROVED AMOUNT FOR EACH CATEGORY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. KELLER: YES.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: WE DON'T KNOW
3 THAT TO BE THE CASE.

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OR THEY COULD GIVE A
5 RANGE, CORRECT?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THEY COULD GIVE
7 A RANGE. I MEAN I GUESS WHAT I'M GETTING AT IS INSTEAD
8 OF LOOKING AT IT AS AN EITHER/OR, FOR ONE I HOPE THE ICOC
9 DOES GIVE SOME GUIDANCE TO US AND TO ITSELF ULTIMATELY AS
10 TO FOR EACH CATEGORY, AND I THINK IT WILL HAVE TO ADJUST
11 AS A REALISTIC THING TO DO. BUT COULD WE JUST SAY
12 FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS BELOW, AT, OR ABOVE THE ICOC
13 APPROVED AMOUNT, SORT OF THAT'S WHAT THE EXPECTATION IS
14 OF THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW RECOMMENDATION.

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. YEAH, THAT MAKES
16 SENSE.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: IT SORT OF
18 INCORPORATES BOTH THE OR AND IT STICKS IT TOGETHER AND
19 PUTS THE ONUS, THEREFORE, ON THE ICOC TO GIVE US SOME SET
20 AMOUNT FOR EACH CATEGORY.

21 MR. KELLER: MY ONLY CAVEAT ABOUT THAT, DAVID,
22 IS THAT IN THE PROPOSITION, THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE
23 FUNCTIONS TO THIS FACILITIES WORKING GROUP IS TO
24 UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS A COMPETITIVE PROCESS. AND WE
25 WOULDN'T WANT TO BE IN A CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE ALL THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RECOMMENDATION IS TO ADD MORE MONEY TO FUND EVERYTHING
2 BECAUSE THAT WOULD NOT BE COMPETITIVE. IN ORDER TO BE
3 COMPETITIVE, SOMEONE HAS TO LOSE SOMETHING, MAYBE 5
4 PERCENT OF THE MONEY OR WHATEVER. BUT IT SEEMS TO ME
5 THAT COMPETITION IMPLIES THAT YOU WIN IF YOU'RE BETTER
6 THAN SOMEONE AND SOMEBODY ELSE DOESN'T GET AS MUCH.

7 SO I WOULD WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IN OUR
8 PROCESS THAT IT'S A COMPETITIVE BID, RESPONDS TO THAT
9 REQUIREMENT.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME THEN SAY,
11 RECOMMEND TO MY COLLEAGUES, GIVEN THAT I THINK THIS IS A
12 STICKY, COMPLEX ISSUE AND IT SORT OF STARTS TO BEG OTHER
13 QUESTIONS IN MY MIND ABOUT THIS PROCESS, THAT IT'S
14 SOMETHING THAT THE ICOC WILL NEED TO OPINE ON AND GIVE US
15 DIRECTION ON. WE CERTAINLY CAN MAKE A RECOMMENDATION,
16 AND MAYBE WE SHOULD DO THAT RIGHT NOW, AND I DON'T WANT
17 TO PUNT EVERY ISSUE TO THE ICOC, BUT THIS IS ONE IN WHICH
18 I THINK WE NEED SOME GUIDANCE IN TERMS OF DO THEY WANT TO
19 SET LIMITS. NOT SO MUCH TO US. IT WILL BE SETTING
20 LIMITS FOR THEMSELVES ULTIMATELY WHEN THEY MAKE THIS
21 DECISION IN LATE APRIL, RIGHT? WILL THEY SET CAPS FOR
22 EACH CATEGORY? AND SO IT'S A QUESTION THE ICOC WILL HAVE
23 TO GRAPPLE WITH. MIGHT AS WELL GRAPPLE WITH IT NOW. I
24 DON'T SEE ANY DOWNSIDE, AND LET'S DO IT THAT WAY.

25 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I AGREE. I THINK WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SHOULD LET THE ICOC GIVE US THEIR OPINION ON THIS. AND
2 THEN IF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP FEELS DIFFERENTLY,
3 THEN WE WILL DEAL WITH IT.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: GET BACK TO
5 THEM.

6 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: WE'LL GET BACK TO THEM IN
7 APRIL.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: CERTIFY THE
9 QUESTION.

10 MR. KELLER: SO THAT'S THE LAST I HAD ON THE
11 PROGRAMMATIC. TO SUMMARIZE --

12 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ON THE PROGRAMMATIC
13 REVIEW, ONE THING, RICK, AND THIS IS -- YOU KNOW, I SPENT
14 A LOT OF MY TIME AND EFFORT IN LOOKING ON THE TECHNICAL
15 REVIEW, BUT I THINK THAT I WOULD LIKE TO JUST SPEND SOME
16 TIME. WE NEED TO -- I THINK WE SHOULD FLESH OUT A LITTLE
17 BIT MORE DETAIL ON THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

18 MR. KELLER: OKAY.

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: BECAUSE I THINK WE'VE GOT
20 A LOT OF DETAIL ABOUT EXACTLY HOW WE'RE GOING TO DO THE
21 TECHNICAL REVIEW. I THINK AT LEAST FOR ME AND, AGAIN,
22 YOU KNOW, I HAVE NOT SPENT MUCH TIME WITH YOU ON THAT, SO
23 YOU AND I CAN SPEND SOME TIME AND THEN WE CAN CERTAINLY
24 LOOP THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP INTO THAT PROCESS AND
25 GIVE A LITTLE BIT GREATER GRANULARITY AND DETAIL ON THAT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YOU WILL, DAVID,
2 CHAIR THE TECHNICAL REVIEW. AS VICE CHAIR, I WILL CHAIR
3 THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. SO IF THERE'S ANY GRANULARITY
4 THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN, YOU AND I CAN WORK TOGETHER, BUT I
5 THINK IT'S WELL -- I THINK THE BEST PRECEDENT FOR THE
6 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW IS WHAT WE DID LAST TIME, BUT ALSO
7 THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW THAT HAPPENS AT THE SCIENTIFIC
8 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, THE RFA
9 ITSELF, RFP, SETS FORTH THAT THERE WILL BE A PROGRAMMATIC
10 REVIEW, AND THESE WILL BE THE CONSIDERATIONS AND FACTORS
11 THAT THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WILL DISCUSS. IT'S A
12 YES-OR-NO QUESTION, I THINK, ADDRESSED SOMEWHERE IN THE
13 RFA.

14 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ANYWAY, DAVID, I'M FINE.
15 I KNOW YOU'RE HEADING UP THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. I JUST
16 FEEL, AT LEAST AS A FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEMBER, THAT
17 WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH GRANULARITY. I DON'T REALLY
18 UNDERSTAND ENOUGH DETAIL ON THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, AND
19 I THINK OTHER MEMBERS MAY WANT THAT AS WELL.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: WE HAD A --
21 OKAY. OKAY. WE'LL DO THAT. ONE OF THE COMPONENTS,
22 THOUGH, IN THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW THAT I DO WANT TO JUST
23 SPEND A COUPLE OF MINUTES ON, AND THAT IS, AS WE
24 IDENTIFIED EARLIER, THE SCIENTIFIC SCORES WILL BE PUBLIC
25 AT THAT POINT. WE'LL KNOW THE PUBLIC. WE'LL KNOW THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SCIENTIFIC SCORES. AND AGAIN, JUST THINKING FROM A
2 PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE, YOU KNOW, FOR US AS A WORKING
3 GROUP TO SAY, "YOU KNOW WHAT, I'M GOING TO IGNORE THE
4 SCIENTIFIC SCORES. I'M JUST GOING TO IGNORE IT. IT'S
5 JUST UNREALISTIC," IT WILL SEEP IN AND FACTOR IN. AND I
6 THINK IT MIGHT EVEN BE APPROPRIATE THAT IT DOES ON SOME
7 LEVEL.

8 I DON'T THINK IT'S -- AND IF WE WANT TO, THE
9 RIGHT PLACE TO TALK ABOUT IT IS IN THE TECHNICAL REVIEW
10 BECAUSE WE'VE ALREADY ESTABLISHED WHAT THE TECHNICAL
11 REVIEW WILL LOOK LIKE, BUT IF THERE IS ANY SORT OF
12 FACTORING IN OR DISCUSSION OR RECOGNITION OF THE
13 SCIENTIFIC SCORES, WHICH WILL BE PUBLIC AT THAT POINT,
14 IT'S BEST TO HAVE IT AT THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW --

15 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: AGREED.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: -- PORTION OF
17 THE DISCUSSION. AND I JUST THROW THAT OUT THERE AS
18 SOMETHING.

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: I THINK THAT MAKES GOOD
20 SENSE. OKAY. RICK, I'M SORRY. PLEASE PROCEED.

21 MR. KELLER: WE WERE JUST CHECKING TO MAKE
22 SURE. I DON'T SEE WHERE WE ACTUALLY SPELL OUT --

23 MS. PACTER: WE ACTUALLY ONLY TALKED ABOUT THE
24 TECHNICAL REVIEW IN THE RFA. WE DID NOT TALK ABOUT THE
25 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: THERE WAS A
2 DISCUSSION ABOUT PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW AND WHAT THOSE
3 DISCUSSION POINTS WOULD BE THOUGH. THAT IS MY
4 RECOLLECTION.

5 MS. PACHTER: ALTHOUGH THERE WAS IN THE
6 MEETINGS, YES.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: YES, IN THE
8 MEETINGS. AND WE SORT OF PUT IT UP THERE, AND YOU EVEN
9 RECOMMENDED SOME THINGS THAT WE MIGHT CONSIDER; IS THAT
10 RIGHT, RICK? AM I GETTING CONFUSED WITH SOMETHING ELSE,
11 WHICH IS POSSIBLE? I MIGHT BE GETTING CONFUSED WITH THE
12 SHARED LABS.

13 MR. KELLER: I THINK FOR EFFICIENCY PURPOSES, I
14 THINK IF WE HAVE THE JANUARY MEETING AND WE UNDERSTAND
15 THE ACTION THAT THE ICOC WILL TAKE IN JANUARY, THEY WILL
16 APPROVE THE PART 1 APPLICATIONS, THEY WILL ESTABLISH THE
17 TENTATIVE AMOUNTS BY CATEGORY, AND THEN GIVE ANY OTHER
18 DIRECTION TO THIS GROUP IN TERMS OF THE PART 2. I MEAN
19 WE CAN GET THE CHAIR AND THE VICE CHAIR, WE CAN GET
20 TOGETHER WITH THE PRESIDENT AND BASICALLY MAKE SURE WE'RE
21 ALL ON THE SAME PAGE IN TERMS --

22 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THAT WORKS FOR ME.
23 THAT'S FINE. I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT BASED ON WHAT I
24 WAS SEEING HERE, I WAS -- I HADN'T FELT THAT WE
25 SUFFICIENTLY FLESHED OUT WHAT THAT PROCESS WOULD BE. SO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT' S FINE.

2 WE HAVE A PUBLIC.

3 DR. HALME: AFTER YOU HAD THAT --

4 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: CAN YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR
5 NAME AND AFFILIATION.

6 DR. HALME: DINA HALME, UCSF. AFTER THE CHAIR
7 AND VICE CHAIR HAVE THAT CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT,
8 IT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL IF THAT COULD OCCUR PRIOR TO THE
9 SUBMISSION OF PART 2 BECAUSE AS AN APPLICANT --

10 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: IT WILL.

11 DR. HALME: -- I WANT TO KNOW ARE YOU
12 INTERESTED IN GEOGRAPHY? ARE YOU INTERESTED IN
13 PARTICULAR AREAS OF DISEASE? YOU KNOW, I MEAN THERE ARE
14 LOTS OF THINGS THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED, AND IT WOULD BE
15 VERY IMPORTANT FOR US TO HAVE THAT INFORMATION.

16 MR. SHEEHY: DISEASE ISSUES ARE HANDLED AT THE
17 GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

18 DR. HALME: WELL, BUT YOU CAN DECIDE
19 PROGRAMMATIC -- WHAT YOU WANT IN THE PROGRAMMATIC.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: MAYBE THAT' S A
21 BETTER PROGRAMMATIC DISCUSSION --

22 DR. HALME: I MEAN JUST HAVING THAT
23 INFORMATION. IT PROBABLY WON' T BE POINTS THE WAY IT HAD
24 BEEN POINTS IN THE PAST, BUT I DON' T KNOW HOW IT WILL BE
25 DONE. HAVING INFORMATION ABOUT HOW IT WILL BE DONE WOULD

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BE HELPFUL.

2 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: ONCE THAT'S DECIDED,
3 RICK, I THINK WE CAN DISSEMINATE THAT INFORMATION,
4 CORRECT?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: ABSOLUTELY.

6 MR. KELLER: I THINK WE CAN MAKE IT PART OF THE
7 JANUARY ACTION IN TERMS OF THE ICOC SO THAT THERE'S
8 KNOWLEDGE ABOUT IT. WE DON'T HAVE TO WAIT. IN TERMS OF
9 THE ICOC UNDERSTANDING WHAT PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WOULD BE
10 LIKE FOR THIS RFA. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE, DAVID?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I MEAN WHETHER
12 WE DISCUSS IT INTERNALLY AND ISSUE A BULLETIN TO THE
13 INTERESTED PARTIES, WHETHER WE TALK ABOUT IT IN JANUARY
14 AND THEY'RE THERE, IT DOESN'T REALLY MATTER TO ME.

15 MR. KELLER: OKAY.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: JUST SO LONG AS
17 IT'S SENT OUT TO THE INTERESTED PARTIES FOR THIS ONE.
18 THE OTHER ONE I WANT THE ICOC FOR SURE TO OPINE ON.

19 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: OKAY. RICK.

20 MR. KELLER: THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.

21 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: SO I THINK THAT CONCLUDES
22 THE ACTION ON THIS AGENDA ITEM. SO NOW WE'LL GO TO ITEM
23 5 ON THE AGENDA AND TAKE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS. AS NOTED
24 ON THE AGENDA, COMMENTS ARE LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES.
25 AND SINCE WE HAVE PEOPLE PARTICIPATING BY PHONE, PLEASE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STATE YOUR AFFILIATION AND YOUR NAME. WOULD ANY MEMBERS
2 OF THE PUBLIC LIKE TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS? ANYONE ON THE
3 PHONE WANT TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC?

4 MR. SIMPSON: YES, I WOULD. THIS IS JOHN
5 SIMPSON WITH THE FOUNDATION FOR TAXPAYER AND CONSUMER
6 RIGHTS. AT THE WORKING GROUP MEETING FOR THE GRANTS
7 WORKING GROUP, I SUGGESTED IN A WRITTEN STATEMENT THAT
8 WAS DELIVERED ON MY BEHALF BY DAVID JENSON THAT THE
9 IDENTITIES OF ALL OF THE APPLICANTS SHOULD BE MADE PUBLIC
10 AT THE BEGINNING OF THE WHOLE PROCESS. AND I WOULD
11 SIMPLY LIKE TO GO ON RECORD AGAIN AS MAKING THAT POINT.

12 IT'S INCONCEIVABLE TO ME THAT THE INSTITUTIONS
13 THEMSELVES DON'T WANT TO MAKE THE FACT KNOWN THAT THEY'RE
14 APPLYING. SO FAR ALL WE KNOW IS THAT 17 INSTITUTIONS
15 HAVE APPLIED. I THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR ALL OF
16 THEM TO BE NAMED. I DON'T THINK THAT IT'S NECESSARY
17 OBVIOUSLY TO DO THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW IN PUBLIC, BUT AT
18 LEAST KNOWING WHO THE INSTITUTIONS ARE IS TERRIBLY
19 IMPORTANT. THANK YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: JOHN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR
21 COMMENTS. I REALLY DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO SAY BECAUSE
22 THAT'S NOT KIND OF WITHIN THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP'S
23 KIND OF JURISDICTION.

24 WOULD ANYONE ELSE LIKE TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS,
25 ANY FACILITIES WORKING GROUP MEMBERS, STAFF, PUBLIC?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VICE CHAIRMAN SERRANO-SEWELL: I KNOW WE ALL
2 WANT -- I THOUGHT THIS WAS -- THIS IS A VERY COMPLICATED
3 ISSUE, AND THIS WAS A GOOD DOCUMENT. SO RICK, LORI, OR
4 ANYBODY ELSE WHO HAD A HAND IN THIS, THANK YOU. THIS WAS
5 VERY HELPFUL, AND I THINK THIS DISCUSSION MASSAGED IT IN
6 A WAY THAT, TO THE EXTENT THAT THE ICOC IS BRIEFED ON IT,
7 THEY' LL BE PLEASED WITH THE WORK PRODUCT AS WELL.

8 CHAIRMAN LICHTENGER: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER
9 COMMENTS? SO I'D LIKE TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR COMING AND
10 THE MEMBERS FOR PARTICIPATING AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC,
11 AND THE MEETING IS ADJOURNED. THANK YOU.

12 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 3:15
13 P. M.)

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

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

REPORTER' S CERTIFICATE

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

210 KING STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
ON
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2007

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



BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152
BARRISTER' S REPORTING SERVICE
1072 BRISTOL STREET
SUITE 100
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626
(714) 444-4100