

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

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2010  
11 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 88537

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

### I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.	5
3. ROLL CALL.	3
ACTION ITEMS	
4. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP REGARDING CIRM EARLY TRANSLATIONAL II RESEARCH AWARD APPLICATION 1785.	29
5. CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO MODIFY BOARD'S APPROVAL OF CIRM EARLY TRANSLATIONAL II RESEARCH AWARDS APPLICATION 1857.	76
6. CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO CORRECT THE AMOUNT OF THE GRANT AWARD APPROVED BY THE BOARD FOR BASIC BIOLOGY II RESEARCH AWARDS APPLICATION 1496.	85
7. CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL FOR BOARD OPTION TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS ISSUES ARISING FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP, AS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL BY THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE.	87
8. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO AND ADOPTION OF LOAN ADMINISTRATION POLICY.	8
9. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF PROPOSED REGULATION 100801, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO LOAN RECIPIENTS.	8
10. CONSIDERATION OF CIRM-FUNDED ONLINE JOURNAL.	12
11. CONSIDERATION OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE REGARDING FEDERAL STEM CELL RESEARCH LEGISLATION.	22
12. PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

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

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2010

11:07 A.M.

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MELISSA, WITH THAT, COULD  
YOU CALL THE ROLL.

MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE FOR ROBERT  
BIRGENEAU.

DR. PRICE: HERE.

MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM. DAVID BRENNER.  
WILLIAM BRODY.

MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

DR. BRYANT: HERE.

MS. KING: MARCY FEIT. MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
LEEZA GIBBONS. MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.

MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

DR. HAWGOOD: HERE.

MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.

MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

MS. LANSING: HERE.

MS. KING: TED LOVE.

DR. LOVE: HERE.

MS. KING: SHLOMO MELMED.

DR. MELMED: HERE.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: ED PENHOET. PHIL PIZZO.

2 CLAIRE POMEROY. FRANCISCO PRIETO.

3 DR. PRIETO: HERE.

4 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI FOR CARMEN

5 PULIAFITO. ROBERT QUINT. JOHN REED.

6 DR. REED: HERE.

7 MS. KING: I BELIEVE THAT WAS ELIZABETH

8 FINI IN ADDITION TO DR. REED, CORRECT?

9 DR. FONTANA: IT'S JEANNIE FONTANA.

10 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

11 MR. ROTH: HERE.

12 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.

14 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

15 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HERE.

16 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

17 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

18 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.

19 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD. ART TORRES.

20 MR. TORRES: HERE.

21 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU FOR EUGENE

22 WASHINGTON.

23 DR. ECONOMOU: HERE.

24 MS. GIBBONS: MELISSA, IT'S LEEZA GIBBONS.

25 I DISCONNECTED MYSELF MAKING SURE I WASN'T CAUSING

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THAT STATIC. SO I'M BACK.

2 MS. KING: OKAY. GREAT.

3 DR. POMEROY: THIS IS CLAIRE POMEROY. YOU  
4 RUSHED BY ME. JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE YOU KNEW I  
5 WAS HERE.

6 (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: COULD YOU THEN LEAD US IN  
8 THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

9 (THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

10 MS. KING: BOB, ONE MORE THING I'D LIKE TO  
11 DO BEFORE WE GET STARTED IS JUST CIRCLE BACK WITH  
12 THE PEOPLE THAT WERE NOT PRESENT THAT I WAS  
13 EXPECTING TO BE PRESENT BECAUSE WE MAY HAVE JUST NOT  
14 HEARD THEM GIVEN THE STATIC.

15 DAVID BRENNER. CLAIRE POMEROY.

16 DR. POMEROY: HERE.

17 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT. DR. QUINT, I  
18 THOUGHT I HEARD YOU, BUT I WASN'T SURE. ARE YOU  
19 THERE? JON SHESTACK. OSWALD STEWARD. OKAY.

20 DR. FINI: MELISSA, YOU MISSED ME.

21 ELIZABETH FINI.

22 MS. KING: SO WE ACTUALLY NOW HAVE A  
23 QUORUM, WHICH IS GOOD NEWS. AND I'LL TURN IT OVER  
24 TO YOU, CHAIRMAN KLEIN.

25 WITH ONE NOTE TO CHAIRMAN KLEIN, WE DID

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SPEAK ABOUT THIS BRIEFLY, BUT I DID WANT TO REMIND  
2 YOU THAT THERE IS A REQUEST THAT WE ALTER THE ORDER  
3 ON THE AGENDA SLIGHTLY TO MAKE SURE THAT SOME OF THE  
4 LATER ITEMS THAT ARE EITHER TIME SENSITIVE OR HAS  
5 BEEN BUMPED A NUMBER OF TIMES GIVEN TIME AND QUORUM  
6 CONSTRAINTS MOVE UP CLOSER TO THE BEGINNING.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND THAT, AND I  
8 CERTAINLY AM GOING TO DO THAT. LET ME ASK A  
9 QUESTION FOR INFORMATION WHICH WOULD BE HELPFUL TO  
10 THE PROCESS AND TIMING. LET ME ASK. IS DUANE ROTH  
11 ON?

12 MS. KING: YES.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DUANE, DO YOU HAVE ANY  
14 ISSUES WITH EITHER ITEM 8 OR 9? DID DUANE HEAR ME?

15 MR. ROTH: THE ANSWER IS NO.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF SHEEHY, DO YOU HAVE  
17 ANY PROBLEMS WITH ITEMS 8 OR 9?

18 MS. KING: WHAT YOU ARE ASKING, BOB, IS  
19 COULD WE MOVE THROUGH THOSE RELATIVELY QUICKLY, OR  
20 ARE THERE GOING TO BE DISCUSSIONS AROUND THEM MORE,  
21 RIGHT? WE'VE DISCUSSED ITEM 8 A NUMBER OF TIMES IN  
22 FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS. I DON'T WANT TO  
23 SPEAK FOR THE BOARD, BUT I BELIEVE WE'RE AT A POINT  
24 WHERE DISCUSSION COULD BE MINIMAL. AND ITEM 9 IS  
25 ACTUALLY, SCOTT TOCHER IS SITTING TO MY LEFT, AND HE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 CAN WALK US THROUGH THAT BRIEFLY, BUT I DON'T  
2 BELIEVE THERE SHOULD BE ANY CONTROVERSY OR  
3 DISCUSSION REALLY NECESSARY FOR THAT ONE. IT'S JUST  
4 SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO DO IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE  
5 OAL PROCESS, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN. IS THAT CORRECT,  
6 MR. TOCHER?

7 MR. TOCHER: THAT'S RIGHT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. I WANTED  
9 TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT, JEFF, YOU HAD SOME PRIOR  
10 QUESTIONS, I THINK, ON ITEMS. I THINK THEY WERE  
11 ADDRESSED, BUT I JUST WANTED TO MAKE CERTAIN.

12 MS. KING: MR. SHEEHY.

13 MR. SHEEHY: YES. WHAT'S 8 AND 9?

14 MS. KING: ITEM NO. 8 IS CONSIDERATION OF  
15 AMENDMENT AND AN ADOPTION OF THE LOAN ADMINISTRATION  
16 POLICY. AND YOU WOULD BE FAMILIAR WITH THAT ALONG  
17 WITH THE MEMBERS OF THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE FROM  
18 THE LAST --

19 MR. SHEEHY: I KNOW THAT.

20 MS. KING: THE ONE FOLLOWING THAT IS ITEM  
21 9, CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF PROPOSED REGULATION  
22 100801, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS APPLICABLE  
23 TO LOAN RECIPIENTS.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I'M COMFORTABLE WITH BOTH OF  
25 THOSE, BOB.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. MR. HARRISON,  
2 COULD YOU LET US KNOW ON ITEM 8 OR 9, I BELIEVE THAT  
3 THERE IS A TIMING ISSUE IN TERMS OF THE REGULATORY  
4 PROCESS IN MAKING SURE WE GET THOSE DONE TODAY. IS  
5 THAT A CORRECT STATEMENT?

6 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WOULD YOU EXPLAIN THAT TO  
8 THE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC, PLEASE?

9 MR. HARRISON: I'LL DEFER TO SCOTT TOCHER  
10 TO EXPLAIN THE OAL ASPECTS.

11 MR. TOCHER: THESE ARE REGULATIONS THAT  
12 WERE NOTICED ONE YEAR AGO ON NOVEMBER 17TH. THAT  
13 BEGAN THE PROCESS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE  
14 ACT FOR PROMULGATING THESE REGULATIONS. SO THAT  
15 ONE-YEAR TIME LIMIT EXPIRES ON NOVEMBER 17TH.  
16 THEREFORE, THE ACTION OF THE BOARD TO FORMALLY ADOPT  
17 THEM AND MOVE THE FILE ON TO OAL FOR ITS FINAL  
18 CONSIDERATION MUST OCCUR BEFORE THE 17TH.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND IS THERE  
20 ANY BOARD MEMBER THAT WISHES TO ADDRESS ANY ITEM IN  
21 8 OR 9? BECAUSE WE'VE GONE THROUGH THOSE ON SEVERAL  
22 OCCASIONS, I'M TRYING TO SEE HOW EFFICIENTLY WE CAN  
23 ADDRESS THIS ITEM.

24 MS. KING: THE QUICKEST WAY BEING JUST TO  
25 HAVE SOMEBODY MAKE A MOTION AND I CAN TAKE A ROLL



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CALL.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I DON'T HEAR ANY COMMENT.

3 MR. ROTH: I'LL MAKE A MOTION.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A MOTION TO  
5 APPROVE ITEM 8, CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO AND  
6 ADOPTION OF THE LOAN ADMINISTRATION POLICY?

7 MR. ROTH: I'LL MAKE A MOTION THAT WE  
8 APPROVE BOTH ITEMS 8 AND 9, IF I CAN DO THAT.

9 DR. HAWGOOD: SECOND.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY DISCUSSION BY THE  
11 BOARD?

12 DR. PIZZO: NO, BUT PHIL PIZZO IS JUST  
13 JOINING, AND I AGREE.

14 MS. KING: JUST FOR THE RECORD, MR.  
15 HARRISON IS NODDING HIS HEAD TO MR. ROTH'S QUESTION  
16 ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT WE CAN ALLOW A MOTION TO  
17 CONSIDER BOTH ITEMS. SO THE ANSWER TO THAT IS YES.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU. AND IS  
19 THERE A PUBLIC COMMENT FROM ANY SITE ON THESE TWO  
20 ITEMS? NOT HEARING ANY, I WOULD LIKE TO CALL THE  
21 QUESTION. AND, MELISSA, COULD YOU CALL THE ROLL.

22 MS. KING: I WILL. BEFORE I DO THAT, I  
23 JUST WANT TO CONFIRM THAT WE ALL HAVE THE SAME  
24 RECORD. WE HEARD DR. SAM HAWGOOD AS THE SECOND.  
25 THE MAKER OF THE MOTION WAS DUANE ROTH.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ROBERT PRICE.  
2 DR. PRICE: YES.  
3 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER, HAVE YOU JOINED  
4 US? SUSAN BRYANT.  
5 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
6 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
7 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
8 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
9 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
10 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
11 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.  
12 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
14 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.  
15 MS. LANSING: YES.  
16 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
17 DR. LOVE: YES.  
18 MS. KING: SHLOMO MELMED.  
19 DR. MELMED: YES.  
20 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
21 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
22 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
23 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
24 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
25 DR. PRIETO: YES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
2 DR. FINI: YES.  
3 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT. JOHN REED.  
4 DR. REED: YES.  
5 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
6 MR. ROTH: YES.  
7 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON. DAVID  
8 SERRANO-SEWELL.  
9 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
10 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
11 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: ART TORRES.  
13 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
14 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU.  
15 DR. ECONOMOU: YES.  
16 MS. KING: I WILL CIRCLE BACK. JOAN  
17 SAMUELSON, ARE YOU THERE? AND ROBERT QUINT. JON  
18 SHESTACK, HAVE YOU JOINED US YET? OSWALD STEWARD.  
19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SCOTT, DOES THE SUB VOCIA  
20 COUNT MEAN THAT WE STILL HAVE A QUORUM WITHOUT THOSE  
21 PEOPLE ANSWERING?  
22 MR. HARRISON: WE HAVE 19 YES VOTES, BUT  
23 YOU CAN LEAVE THE ROLL OPEN, CHAIR, IF YOU WOULD  
24 LIKE TO DO SO.  
25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO LEAVE THE --

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 WELL, IF WE HAVE 19 YES VOTES, WE ARE COVERED ON A  
2 QUORUM.

3 MS. KING: THE MOTION CARRIES AND WE CAN  
4 MOVE ON.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S MOVE ON. LET ME  
6 ASK ON ITEM 10, THAT'S BEEN BEFORE US BEFORE. ON  
7 THAT ITEM WE RECEIVED A NUMBER OF LETTERS IN OUR  
8 PACKET AT THE LAST BOARD MEETING ADDRESSING THE NEED  
9 FOR A VENUE FOR THE PRESENTATION OF TRANSLATIONAL  
10 MEDICINE INCLUDING CLINICAL WORK THAT WAS NOT  
11 SUCCESSFUL, WHICH IS VERY DIFFICULT TO HAVE  
12 PUBLISHED AT THIS POINT, BECAUSE THOSE LESSONS ARE  
13 INVALUABLE AND INSTRUCTIVE TO ALL OF OUR WORK GOING  
14 FORWARD.

15 I WOULD LIKE TO ASK, WE'RE GOING TO  
16 DISCUSS THIS ITEM IF WE CAN DO IT AT THIS POINT  
17 EFFICIENTLY, AND WE'LL HAVE A SHORT STAFF  
18 PRESENTATION, BUT IS THERE -- BEFORE WE PRESENT IT,  
19 IS THERE ANYONE THAT HAS AN ISSUE THAT I CAN  
20 IDENTIFY EARLY THAT'S A MATERIAL ISSUE ON THIS ITEM?  
21 NOT HEARING THAT, COULD I HAVE A SHORT STAFF  
22 PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM?

23 MR. SWEEDLER: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN KLEIN.  
24 THIS IS IAN SWEEDLER. DR. TROUNSON, AS YOU KNOW, IS  
25 OUT OF TOWN, AND HE'S ASKED ME TO JUST MAKE A BRIEF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRESENTATION ON HIS BEHALF.

2 GOAL HERE IS TO HAVE A TRANSLATIONAL  
3 JOURNAL THAT'S FOCUSED ON STEM CELL RESEARCH THAT  
4 WOULD FILL WHAT'S CURRENTLY CONSIDERED A GAP IN  
5 SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS. THE GOAL HERE IS NOT TO HAVE  
6 CIRM PUBLISH A JOURNAL. THE GOAL HERE IS TO HAVE  
7 CIRM ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH A PUBLISHER WHEREBY  
8 CIRM WOULD ASSIST WITH A SUBSIDY FOR UP THREE YEARS  
9 UP TO \$200,000 A YEAR IN ORDER TO ACCELERATE THE  
10 CREATION OF A JOURNAL, WHICH WOULD PROBABLY HAPPEN  
11 WITHIN A FEW YEARS. BUT GIVEN THE URGENCY OF OUR  
12 MISSION, WE WANT THAT TO HAPPEN SOONER.

13 IT WOULD BE AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL. CIRM  
14 WOULD NOT OPERATE IT OR HAVE EDITORIAL CONTROL.  
15 CIRM'S ROLE WOULD PRIMARILY BE TO REACH AN AGREEMENT  
16 ABOUT THE SCOPE OF THE KINDS OF RESEARCH WE HOPE THE  
17 JOURNAL WILL INCLUDE AND TO SEE A BUSINESS PLAN THAT  
18 WOULD HAVE SELF-SUFFICIENCY WITHIN THREE YEARS. AND  
19 WE WOULD DO THAT THROUGH OUR NORMAL CONTRACTING  
20 PROCESS.

21 IN YOUR PACKET THERE'S AN EXTENSIVE LIST  
22 OF ENDORSEMENTS FROM LEADING STEM CELL SCIENTISTS  
23 THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA IN ACADEMIC AND INDUSTRY  
24 ENVIRONMENTS. AND I'M HAPPY TO PROVIDE MORE DETAIL  
25 IF ANYONE HAS QUESTIONS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IAN, COULD YOU REPEAT FOR  
2 THE RECORD, ALTHOUGH WE'VE DISCUSSED IT BEFORE, THE  
3 PUBLICATIONS THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN THE BUSINESS WHO  
4 AT THIS POINT EXPRESSED INTEREST IN DISCUSSING WITH  
5 CIRM THE POTENTIAL OF COMPETING TO BE THE PRODUCER  
6 OF THIS ONLINE JOURNAL?

7 MR. SWEEDLER: I'M AWARE OF THREE MAJOR  
8 PUBLISHERS WHO HAVE CONTACTED US AND HAVE CONTINUED  
9 TO CONTACT US. THEY'RE EAGERLY AWAITING THE RELEASE  
10 OF THE RFP. THE ONES THAT I KNOW OF ARE THE  
11 PUBLISHERS OF *CELL STEM CELL*, *PUBLIC LIBRARY OF*  
12 *SCIENCE*, AND *NATURE*.

13 BUT WE DO EXPECT THERE TO BE OTHERS, AND  
14 WE WILL MAKE AN AFFIRMATIVE EFFORT TO BRING THE RFP,  
15 THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, TO THE ATTENTION OF ANY  
16 POTENTIAL PUBLISHER.

17 MS. KING: CHAIRMAN KLEIN, IF NOW IS THE  
18 APPROPRIATE TIME, I WOULD LIKE TO READ INTO THE  
19 RECORD A STATEMENT THAT I GOT ON THIS ITEM FROM  
20 DR. BLOOM, WHO WHEN HE INFORMED ME HE COULD NOT BE  
21 PRESENT AT THIS MEETING, BUT FELT VERY STRONGLY  
22 ABOUT THIS ITEM, I SUGGESTED TO HIM THAT IF HE SENT  
23 ME SOMETHING, I COULD READ IT INTO THE RECORD. IF  
24 NOW IS THE TIME OR WHENEVER IS THE RIGHT TIME,  
25 PLEASE LET ME KNOW.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WOULD BE  
2 APPROPRIATE.

3 MS. KING: THANK YOU. SO, AGAIN, THIS IS  
4 FROM ICOC MEMBER DR. FLOYD BLOOM. BECAUSE MY  
5 COMMITMENTS AT THE ANNUAL SOCIETY FOR NEUROSCIENCE  
6 MEETING MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME TO BE ON THE  
7 TELEPHONIC MEETING OF NOVEMBER 11, 2010, I THOUGHT  
8 IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL TO EXPRESS IN WRITING WHY I  
9 SUPPORT PRESIDENT TROUNSON'S PROPOSAL THAT CIRM HELP  
10 INITIATE A NEW ONLINE JOURNAL TO FACILITATE  
11 SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION AMONG STEM CELL SCIENTISTS  
12 DEVOTED TO THE TRANSLATIONAL ASPECTS OF STEM CELL  
13 SCIENCE.

14 I JUST DID A SEARCH IN *PUBMED* FOR, QUOTE,  
15 TRANSLATIONAL MEDICINE, CLOSE QUOTE, AND, QUOTE,  
16 STEM CELLS, CLOSE QUOTE, AND GOT A LIST OF NEARLY  
17 4500 ARTICLES. STANDING OF THE JOURNALS THAT THEY  
18 ARE IN SHOWS HOW VERY SCATTERED IS THE LITERATURE  
19 THESE ARTICLES CARRY. *PUBMED* ALSO LISTS NINE  
20 JOURNALS WHOSE NAME CONTAINS SOME ASSOCIATION WITH  
21 STEM CELLS, BUT EXCEPT FOR *NATURE REPORTS STEM*  
22 *CELLS*, AND *CELL PRESSES CELL STEM CELLS* THAT DOES  
23 NOT COME UP IN THE *PUBMED* LISTING, I HAVE NEVER  
24 HEARD OF ANY OF THEM. AND NONE DEAL EXPLICITLY WITH  
25 THE TRANSLATIONAL ISSUES OF APPLIED STEM CELL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESEARCH.

2 AS ALAN NOTED IN HIS COVER NOTE TO THE  
3 ICOC, SOME OF THESE ARE FINE JOURNALS, BUT THEY TEND  
4 TO FOCUS ON BASIC RESEARCH. THERE ARE ALSO FOUR  
5 JOURNALS THAT DEAL EXPLICITLY WITH TRANSLATIONAL  
6 MEDICINE THAT INCLUDES SCIENCE'S TRANSLATIONAL  
7 MEDICINE THAT IS ONLINE, BUT COVERS MUCH MORE THAN  
8 STEM CELL RESEARCH TRANSLATION.

9 WHILE I WAS EDITOR-IN-CHIEF AT *SCIENCE*, WE  
10 STARTED SEVERAL NEW ONLINE JOURNAL-LIKE ALL  
11 ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS UNDER THE BANNER OF  
12 KNOWLEDGE ENVIRONMENTS THAT INCLUDED ORIGINALLY ONLY  
13 REVIEWS, NEWS OF MEETINGS, SEMINARS, AND LETTERS,  
14 LATER BEGAN TO INCLUDE ORIGINAL RESEARCH AS WELL.  
15 WHILE I WAS ABLE TO FINANCE THE FIRST OF THESE IN  
16 SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION, THE ONE ON AGING RELIED ON A  
17 FIVE-YEAR FUNDING COMMITMENT FROM THE ELLISON  
18 FOUNDATION, BUT WAS EVENTUALLY TERMINATED BECAUSE IT  
19 COULD NOT BECOME SELF-SUSTAINING.

20 THE SPECIFIC ELEMENTS THAT CONVINCED ME  
21 THAT THE ICOC SHOULD PURSUE THIS NEW PUBLICATION ARE  
22 DERIVED FROM THE RFP DRAFT THAT WE HAVE BEEN GIVEN.  
23 THERE ARE FOUR POINTS. ONE, CIRM WILL SEEK A HIGHLY  
24 QUALIFIED AND ESTABLISHED PUBLISHER TO OPERATE THE  
25 NEW JOURNAL AND APPLY STRINGENT PEER REVIEW TO



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SUBMITTALS. TWO, THE NEW JOURNAL WILL BE ONLINE  
2 WITH OPEN ACCESS, FACILITATING DISSEMINATION OF ITS  
3 CONTENTS BROADLY. THREE, THE NEW JOURNAL WILL BE  
4 DEVOTED TO TRANSLATIONAL ASPECTS OF STEM CELL  
5 RESEARCH. AND FOUR, THE NEW JOURNAL WILL HAVE THE  
6 COMMITMENT TO PUBLISH NEGATIVE DATA QUICKLY.

7 IT IS POINT NO. 4 THAT TO ME WOULD PROVIDE  
8 THE UNIQUE EFFECTS OF THIS FIELD OF EVOLVING BASIC  
9 AND APPLIED RESEARCH. BY SHARING WHAT DIDN'T WORK  
10 AND PERHAPS WITH SOME ATTENTION TO POSSIBLE TESTABLE  
11 REASONS WHY IT DIDN'T WORK, THE NEW JOURNAL WOULD  
12 STIMULATE BETTER REPLICATIONS AND GREATLY REDUCE THE  
13 POSSIBILITIES OF WASTE IN TIME, RESOURCES, AND  
14 EFFORTS. OFFERING AN ESTABLISHED, HIGHLY QUALIFIED  
15 SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHER A SUBSIDY FOR A THREE-YEAR  
16 PERIOD COULD INCENTIVIZE COMPETITION AND IMPROVE  
17 CHANCES FOR SUCCESS.

18 A COLUMN DEVOTED TO CIRM'S WORK COULD ALSO  
19 DESCRIBE THE AGENCY'S WORK EFFECTIVELY. THEREFORE,  
20 I STRONGLY FAVOR MOVING FORWARD WITH AN RFP SUCH AS  
21 THE DRAFT WE HAVE SEEN. I WOULD BE HAPPY TO  
22 VOLUNTEER MY EFFORTS TO WORKING WITH ALAN AND STAFF  
23 TO EVALUATE THE RESPONSES THE RFP DRAWS. WITH BEST  
24 WISHES FOR A SUCCESSFUL MEETING, FLOYD BLOOM.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 SHALL CERTAINLY THANK FLOYD FOR THE EXTENSIVE AMOUNT  
2 OF EFFORT HE PUT INTO THAT THOUGHTFUL COMMENT. IS  
3 THERE ANY BOARD MEMBER WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A  
4 COMMENT OR A MAKE A MOTION THAT INCORPORATES THE  
5 FOUR POINTS THAT FLOYD RAISED?

6 MS. LANSING: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY HOW MUCH  
7 I SUPPORT THIS. I THINK OUR WHOLE MISSION WAS ABOUT  
8 SHARING INFORMATION, AND THAT'S THE WAY WE CAN SPEED  
9 THIS UP. SO I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO MOVE  
10 THIS AGENDA ITEM.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND, SHERRY, IN THAT  
12 MOTION WOULD YOU INCORPORATE FLOYD'S FOUR POINTS  
13 FROM THE MEMO?

14 MS. LANSING: FINE WITH ME.

15 MR. SWEEDLER: CHAIRMAN KLEIN, IF I COULD  
16 JUST CLARIFY. DR. BLOOM WASN'T, AS I UNDERSTOOD  
17 THAT, SUGGESTING ANYTHING DIFFERENT. HE WAS MERELY  
18 REFERRING TO ITEMS OF THE PROPOSAL AS IT EXISTS THAT  
19 HE PARTICULARLY LIKED.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND. I'M JUST  
21 TRYING TO CAPTURE THE ESSENCE OF THE PROPOSAL IN THE  
22 MOTION.

23 MS. LANSING: I'M JUST MAKING THE MOTION  
24 AS IS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. GIBBONS: SECOND.

2 MS. KING: SECOND IS LEEZA GIBBONS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ANY DISCUSSION? I  
4 THINK WE'VE GONE THROUGH THIS BEFORE. THEREFORE,  
5 HEARING NONE, I'D LIKE TO SEE IF THERE'S ANY PUBLIC  
6 COMMENT.

7 MS. KING: WE DO HAVE ONE HERE IN SAN  
8 FRANCISCO.

9 MR. REED: DON REED. THIS IS A REALLY  
10 IMPORTANT AND SOLIDLY NEEDED ITEM. THE OPPOSITION  
11 FREQUENTLY GATHERS UP THEIR PSEUDOINFORMATION IN A  
12 VERY SYSTEMATIC WAY, AND WE NEED TO HAVE THE FACTUAL  
13 INFORMATION GATHERED AND AVAILABLE. THANK YOU.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ANY ADDITIONAL  
15 PUBLIC AT ANY SITE? WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL PUBLIC,  
16 MELISSA, COULD YOU CALL THE ROLL.

17 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

18 DR. PRICE: YES.

19 MS. KING: SUE BRYANT.

20 DR. BRYANT: YES.

21 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

22 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

24 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.

25 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.  
2 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
4 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.  
5 MS. LANSING: YES.  
6 MS. KING: TED LOVE. SHLOMO MELMED. PHIL  
7 PIZZO.  
8 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
9 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
10 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
11 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
12 DR. PRIETO: AYE.  
13 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
14 DR. FINI: YES.  
15 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
16 DR. QUINT: YES.  
17 MS. KING: JOHN REED.  
18 DR. REED: YES.  
19 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
20 MR. ROTH: YES.  
21 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON. DAVID  
22 SERRANO-SEWELL.  
23 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
24 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
25 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

2 MR. TORRES: AYE.

3 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU.

4 DR. ECONOMOU: YES.

5 MS. KING: IS THERE ANYONE ON THE LINE WHO  
6 I DIDN'T CALL? AND I WILL CIRCLE BACK. DR. LOVE.

7 DR. LOVE: YES.

8 MS. KING: AND DR. MELMED.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DID YOU HEAR MY VOTE,  
10 MELISSA?

11 MS. KING: I BELIEVE YOUR VOTE WAS YES.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT.

13 MR. HARRISON: WE HAVE 19 YES VOTES.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S MOVE ON TO THE NEXT  
15 ITEM.

16 MR. HARRISON: BOB, BEFORE WE MOVE TO THE  
17 NEXT ITEM, MELISSA POINTED OUT THAT WE HAD NOT ASKED  
18 FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS 8 AND 9. I SUSPECT IS  
19 THERE NOT ANY.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THOUGHT THAT I  
21 HAD ASKED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT IT DOESN'T HURT TO  
22 DO IT AGAIN.

23 MS. KING: I APOLOGIZE. I MISSED IT, BOB.  
24 EVERYBODY ELSE HERE IS SAYING THAT YOU DID ASK FOR  
25 IT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT NEVER HURTS TO BE  
2 CONSERVATIVE ON THAT ITEM.

3 OKAY. SO WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR CAUTION.

4 SO ONE OTHER ITEM TO TRY AND GET QUICKLY  
5 OUT OF THE WAY, IF WE CAN, ON ITEM 11, WE HAVE THE  
6 POSTELECTION CYCLE COMING UP. THERE ARE TWO BILLS  
7 PENDING ADDRESSING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL  
8 RESEARCH ON A BASIS CONSISTENT WITH THE ETHICAL  
9 STANDARDS PUT OUT BY THE NIH UNDER THE OBAMA  
10 ADMINISTRATION TERM. AND THE DEANS AND OTHER  
11 ACADEMIC LEADERS IN THE COUNTRY HAVE SIGNED A VERY  
12 SUPPORTIVE STATEMENT FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
13 ENDORSING THE WHOLE SPECTRUM OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH,  
14 INCLUDING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH, THAT  
15 IS EMBODIED IN THESE PIECES OF LEGISLATION.

16 SENATOR TORRES, COULD YOU PRESENT THE ITEM  
17 THAT WENT TO THE LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE?

18 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WHAT  
19 YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU IN ITEM 11 IS A RESOLUTION THAT  
20 WE OWE A LOT OF CREDIT TO DR. FONTANA, JEFF SHEEHY,  
21 DR. LOMAX, BOB, YOU, DUANE, ALAN, ELONA, AND IAN,  
22 AND ALSO TO JAMES FOR TREMENDOUS INPUT IN PUTTING  
23 TOGETHER WHAT I THINK IS A GOOD COMPROMISE THAT  
24 TRANSCENDS NOT ONLY THIS LAME DUCK SESSION, IF  
25 SOMETHING WERE TO COME UP -- WE ANTICIPATE THAT THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WILL BE NOT BE THE CASE -- BUT JUST IN CASE WE WOULD  
2 ALREADY BE PREPARED WITH A RESOLUTION THAT COULD BE  
3 VIEWED BY THE START OF THIS LAME DUCK SESSION  
4 NOVEMBER 15TH.

5 BUT ALSO AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, AS DUANE  
6 HAS MENTIONED, TO TRY AND DETERMINE OUR POSITION  
7 EARLY ON AS THE CONGRESS EMERGES AND NOT TO LOSE  
8 SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THESE ISSUES COULD BE  
9 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO THE NEW SPEAKER AND TO  
10 WHOMEVER IS THE NEW CHAIR OF THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE  
11 IN THE HOUSE, PRESENTLY CHAIRED BY HENRY WAXMAN.

12 SO WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU ARE A NUMBER  
13 OF WHEREAS CLAUSES WHICH INCORPORATE MUCH OF THE  
14 IDEAS PUT FORWARD BY ALL THE PARTICIPANTS THAT I  
15 MENTIONED AND INCLUDING DON REED, WHO WAS VERY  
16 HELPFUL IN ENSURING THAT WE INCLUDED THE FACT THAT  
17 CIRM HAS BEEN CREATING JOBS IN CALIFORNIA, WHICH IS  
18 VERY UNIQUE FOR A STATE AGENCY IN THESE TIMES.

19 THE RESOLVED CLAUSE SPEAKS FOR ITSELF, AND  
20 I WOULD URGE AN AYE VOTE AND I SO MOVE.

21 MS. LANSING: CAN I ASK A QUESTION?

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SURE, SHERRY. JUST ONE  
23 MOMENT. COULD I SEE IF THERE'S A SECOND.

24 DR. PRIETO: I'LL SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY, YOU HAVE THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 FLOOR.

2 MS. LANSING: MY QUESTION IS -- MAYBE WE  
3 SHOULD TAKE THE VOTE, AND THEN I HAVE A QUESTION  
4 RELATED TO THIS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S FINE. THIS IS BOB  
6 KLEIN AGAIN. I WOULD LIKE TO AGAIN JUST EMPHASIZE  
7 THE TREMENDOUS RESPECT I HAVE FOR THE SCIENTIFIC AND  
8 CLINICAL LEADERS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH STANDING UP  
9 TO DEFEND THE RIGHT OF SCIENTISTS TO EXPLORE HUMAN  
10 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS ALONG WITH EVERY OTHER CELL  
11 TYPE TO FIND THE BEST THERAPEUTIC APPROACH FOR EACH  
12 DISEASE ON SCIENTIFIC MERIT. IT'S EXTREMELY  
13 IMPORTANT TO PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE SCIENTIFIC  
14 PROCESS IN THIS COUNTRY, AND I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO  
15 PERSONALLY APPLAUD THEIR COURAGE IN STANDING UP AND  
16 TAKING A POSITION.

17 DR. PIZZO: CAN I JUST MAKE A COMMENT ON  
18 THIS?

19 MS. LANSING: I WANT TO ASK MY QUESTION  
20 THEN AS WELL.

21 DR. PIZZO: THE COMMENT IS FIRST TO THANK  
22 YOU. AND I THINK, AS SAM HAWGOOD KNOWS, THIS WAS  
23 NOT AN EASY THING TO DO BECAUSE THERE ARE MANY  
24 PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES. THESE ARE DEANS OF SCHOOLS OF  
25 MEDICINE THAT SIGNED THIS. IT WAS COORDINATED



**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THROUGH THE COUNCIL OF DEANS. AND I THINK IT DOES  
2 REPRESENT A VERY STRONG AFFIRMATION DESPITE ALL THE  
3 ISSUES THAT EXIST AROUND THE COUNTRY THAT WOULD  
4 OTHERWISE CONSPIRE AGAINST THIS KIND OF UNIFORMITY.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
6 SHERRY.

7 MS. LANSING: I JUST WANT TO BE SURE I  
8 UNDERSTAND THIS BECAUSE WE'RE ASKING THEM TO SUPPORT  
9 THE LEGISLATION THAT ARLEN SPECTER IS PUTTING  
10 FORWARD, RIGHT?

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND DIANA DEGETTE. WE'RE  
12 AGNOSTIC AS TO WHICH OF THE BILLS GO FORWARD, BUT WE  
13 BELIEVE, AS THE SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL LEADERS DO,  
14 THAT THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO AFFIRM THE RIGHT TO  
15 DO THIS RESEARCH.

16 MS. LANSING: WE'RE ASKING THEM TO REPEAL  
17 DICKEY-WICKER.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE ASKING THEM TO  
19 SPECIFICALLY CLARIFY THE UNDERSTANDING THAT  
20 DICKEY-WICKER DOES NOT PREVENT DOING RESEARCH ON  
21 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES.

22 MS. LANSING: SO MY QUESTION IS THIS  
23 THING -- I'M ALL FOR THIS. AND MY QUESTION IS CAN  
24 WE GET THIS TO HARRY REID ALSO BECAUSE I THINK HE'S  
25 THE ONE THAT WOULD HAVE TO BRING THE SPECTER BILL OR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE DEGETTE BILL FORWARD, ESPECIALLY THE SPECTER  
2 BILL.

3 MR. TORRES: THAT'S MY INTENT, SHERRY.

4 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU. THAT WAS MY ONLY  
5 QUESTION BECAUSE I HAD A CONVERSATION WITH ARLEN  
6 SPECTER, WHO REALLY WANTS TO MOVE IT FORWARD, BUT HE  
7 SAID THE PERSON THAT CONTROLS THAT IS HARRY REID.

8 MR. TORRES: THE OTHER VITAL PERSON IN  
9 THIS WHOLE DEBATE IS, AS YOU WELL KNOW, SHERRY, IS  
10 DIANE FEINSTEIN BECAUSE OF HER POSITION ON THE  
11 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE.

12 MS. LANSING: WE'LL GET IT TO BOTH OF  
13 THEM. AND THEN ARE WE ALLOWED AS INDIVIDUAL  
14 CITIZENS TO CALL THOSE PEOPLE?

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, WE'RE ALLOWED AS  
16 INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS. AND WITH THE BOARD TAKING A  
17 PUBLIC POSITION, WE'RE ALLOWED AS MEMBERS OF THE  
18 BOARD, WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE RESOLUTION, TO  
19 SUPPORT THIS LEGISLATION AS FURTHERING THE  
20 SCIENTIFIC MISSION OF THE INITIATIVE AND THE STATE.

21 MS. LANSING: THAT WAS MY QUESTION. THANK  
22 YOU.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO ADDITIONAL BOARD  
24 COMMENT? ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT FROM ANY SITE?  
25 OKAY. NOT HEARING ANY, MELISSA, UNLESS SENATOR

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 TORRES WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A CONCLUDING COMMENT.

2 MR. TORRES: NO. NO. BREVITY IS  
3 IMPORTANT. CALL FOR THE VOTE.

4 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

5 DR. PRICE: YES.

6 MS. KING: SUE BRYANT.

7 DR. BRYANT: YES.

8 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

9 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

10 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

11 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.

12 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

13 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.

14 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

16 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

17 MS. LANSING: YES.

18 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

19 DR. LOVE: YES.

20 MS. KING: SHLOMO MELMED. PHIL PIZZO.

21 DR. PIZZO: YES.

22 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

23 DR. POMEROY: YES.

24 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

25 DR. PRIETO: AYE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
2 DR. FINI: YES.  
3 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
4 DR. QUINT: YES.  
5 MS. KING: JOHN REED.  
6 DR. REED: YES.  
7 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
8 MR. ROTH: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON. DAVID  
10 SERRANO-SEWELL.  
11 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
12 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
13 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
14 MS. KING: ART TORRES.  
15 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
16 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU.  
17 DR. ECONOMOU: YES.  
18 MS. KING: I'LL JUST CIRCLE BACK WITH  
19 SHLOMO MELMED. JOAN SAMUELSON.  
20 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M CALLING BACK IN ON MY  
21 CELL PHONE. SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH THE OTHER  
22 PHONE, AND I DIDN'T HEAR THE DISCUSSION, SO I SHOULD  
23 PROBABLY ABSTAIN.  
24 MS. KING: OKAY. THE VOTE FROM MS.  
25 SAMUELSON, FOR THE RECORD, IS AN ABSTENTION. AND IS

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THERE ANYBODY ELSE ON THE LINE THAT I DID NOT CALL?

2 OKAY. I WILL JUST CHECK WITH LEEZA JUST IN CASE.

3 LEEZA GIBBONS, ARE YOU THERE AND MAYBE HAD YOUR

4 PHONE MUTED?

5 MS. GIBBONS: YES, I'M HERE.

6 MS. KING: DID YOU HEAR THAT DISCUSSION,

7 LEEZA?

8 MS. GIBBONS: I DID AND I VOTED YES.

9 MS. KING: MAYBE WE JUST DIDN'T HEAR YOU.

10 ALL RIGHT. FOR THE RECORD THAT MOTION CARRIES.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND

12 WE'LL NOW MOVE BACK TO THE TOP OF THE AGENDA TO ITEM

13 4. IS DR. OLSON THERE OR WHO, DR. OLSON, WOULD YOU

14 LIKE TO PRESENT THIS ITEM?

15 DR. OLSON: I AM HERE AND WILL SPEAK TO

16 THIS ITEM.

17 MS. KING: WE HAVE DR. OLSON.

18 DR. HAVTON: DR. HAVTON IS HERE.

19 MS. KING: THANK YOU SO MUCH, DR. HAVTON.

20 THAT'S WONDERFUL. I WAS HOPING YOU WERE ALREADY ON

21 THE LINE. SO WHAT WE'LL DO IS WE'LL START WITH A

22 PRESENTATION BY DR. OLSON. BUT CHAIRMAN KLEIN,

23 PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THE APPLICANT, DR. HAVTON

24 FROM UCLA, IS ALSO ON THE LINE AND WOULD LIKE TO

25 MAKE A BRIEF STATEMENT AND IS ALSO AVAILABLE FOR

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 QUESTIONS.

2 MR. HARRISON: CAN I JUST REMIND EVERYONE  
3 THAT THIS APPLICATION WAS THE SUBJECT OF A MOTION BY  
4 DR. PRIETO AND JEANNIE FONTANA TO FUND THE  
5 APPLICATION.

6 DR. REED: CAN I HAVE A CLARIFICATION ON  
7 HOW MUCH TIME THE PETITIONERS HAVE TO MAKE THE  
8 REMARKS?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS,  
10 SINCE WE HAVE ADDRESSED THIS PREVIOUSLY, HAVE THIS  
11 BE FIVE MINUTES. BUT IF ANY BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS  
12 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM THE PETITIONER, I'M  
13 GOING TO ASK THE PETITIONER TO STAY AT THE MIC AND  
14 CONTINUE TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS UNTIL THEY ARE  
15 RESOLVED.

16 MS. KING: BEFORE DR. OLSON GETS STARTED,  
17 I'LL JUST REMIND THE BOARD THAT YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF  
18 YOU THE PUBLIC SUMMARY OF THE APPLICATION, A  
19 TRANSCRIPT EXCERPT FROM THE DISCUSSION OF THIS  
20 APPLICATION AT THE BOARD MEETING IN L.A. ON OCTOBER  
21 21ST, AND ALSO THE ORIGINAL EXTRAORDINARY PETITION  
22 SENT IN BY DR. HAVTON.

23 AND THEN THE OTHER THING TO REMIND YOU OF  
24 IS THAT YOU SHOULD HAVE A SHEET IN FRONT OF YOU THAT  
25 AMY CHEUNG E-MAILED TO YOU LISTING WHETHER OR NOT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 YOU HAVE A CONFLICT WITH THIS APPLICATION. AND IF  
2 YOU DO, PLEASE REFRAIN FROM DISCUSSING OR VOTING ON  
3 IT. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO COULD WE HAVE THE  
5 SCIENTIFIC STAFF TO PROVIDE A SUMMARY, AND THEN I'M  
6 GOING TO CALL ON DR. HAVTON AND THEN DISCUSSION.  
7 BUT CERTAINLY IF A BOARD MEMBER HAS QUESTIONS AS TO  
8 THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF'S PRESENTATION, WE'LL TAKE  
9 THOSE AT THIS TIME, OR WE COULD ALSO TAKE THOSE  
10 AFTER DR. HAVTON, WHICHEVER THE MEMBERS WOULD  
11 PREFER.

12 DR. OLSON: I'M GOING TO GIVE THE REVIEW  
13 SUMMARY. THIS IS AN APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT  
14 CANDIDATE FEASIBILITY AWARDS THAT PROPOSES TO USE  
15 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL-DERIVED MOTOR NEURONS AND  
16 AUTONOMIC NEURONS TO TREAT INJURIES OF THE LOWER  
17 SPINAL CORD. IN PARTICULAR, WHAT THE APPLICANT IS  
18 FOCUSING ON IS A RAT MODEL OF BLADDER CONTROL.

19 SO THE IDEA -- WHAT THE APPLICANT PROPOSES  
20 TO DO IS TO IN THIS RAT MODEL OF LOWER SPINAL CORD  
21 INJURY TO ESSENTIALLY TRANSPLANT THE ESC-DERIVED  
22 MOTOR AND AUTONOMIC NEURONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH A  
23 SURGICAL TREATMENT TO PUT IN A NERVE ROOT AND LOOK  
24 AT THOSE BOTH TO DO THIS TRANSPLANTATION IMMEDIATELY  
25 AFTER THE INJURY AND A MONTH LATER.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO BASICALLY IT IS A PRECLINICAL MODEL  
2 FEASIBILITY STUDY. REVIEWERS BASICALLY WERE  
3 SUPPORTIVE OF THE RATIONALE. THEY CONSIDERED THE  
4 IMPACT HIGH. IT IS AN UNMET MEDICAL NEED. THEIR  
5 BIG CONCERN HAD TO DO WITH FEASIBILITY OF DOING  
6 THIS.

7 SO TO DO THIS STUDY, THERE WERE TWO MAIN  
8 ISSUES. THEY NEEDED TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THE CELL  
9 TYPES THAT THEY PROPOSE TO TRANSPLANT. THE  
10 PRELIMINARY DATA PRESENTED BY THE APPLICANT AND, IN  
11 FACT, IS ALSO IN A PUBLICATION BY THE APPLICANT, AS  
12 TO THEIR ABILITY TO MAKE THE MOTOR NEURONS THEY WERE  
13 GOING TO USE. I BELIEVE THE APPLICANT MENTIONED  
14 THIS IN HIS EXTRAORDINARY PETITION. SO THE  
15 PARTICULAR MOTOR NEURONS, THEY DID IT WITH A GREEN  
16 FLUORESCENT PROTEIN RAT. SO A RAT INTO RAT, A RAT  
17 THAT HAD BEEN LABELED WITH GREEN FLUORESCENT PROTEIN  
18 FOR THIS PARTICULAR MOTOR NEURON SUBTYPE. THEY  
19 SHOWED THAT YOU COULD GET -- THEY SHOWED THAT THE  
20 NUMBER OF MOTOR NEURONS THAT THE SUBTYPE OF MOTOR  
21 NEURON THAT HAD THAT PHENOTYPE WHEN THEY DID THE  
22 DIFFERENTIATION WAS A VERY LOW PERCENTAGE.

23 THEY SHOWED NO DATA THAT THEY COULD GET  
24 THE AUTONOMIC MOTOR NEURON. SO THE QUESTION TO THE  
25 REVIEWERS WAS IF YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT TAKING



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOMETHING FORWARD INTO THE CLINIC AND YOU HAVEN'T  
2 BEEN ABLE TO SHOW AT ALL THAT YOU CAN GET THE ONE  
3 TYPE OF NEURON YOU'RE LOOKING FOR, YOU'VE BEEN ONLY  
4 ABLE TO SHOW THAT YOU HAVE A VERY LOW PERCENTAGE OF  
5 THE OTHER TYPE OF MOTOR NEURON, THEN, YOU KNOW, HOW  
6 CAN YOU SAY WHAT IS DOING IT? HOW CAN YOU SAY  
7 EVIDENCE YOU GET OF EFFICACY IS ATTRIBUTED TO THAT?  
8 SO THAT WAS ONE THING, THE ABILITY TO PRODUCE THE  
9 NEURONS THAT THEY CONSIDERED TO BE IMPORTANT FOR  
10 THIS.

11 THE OTHER ONE HAD TO DO WITH THE ABILITY  
12 TO SHOW ACCURATE REINNERVATION. I MISSPOKE MYSELF  
13 BEFORE. THIS WAS ACTUALLY DONE IN THE RAT MODEL  
14 WITH THE RAT CELLS. AND THIS IS CONSIDERED TO BE A  
15 VERY CHALLENGING THING, AND THEY DID NOT CONSIDER  
16 THAT THE DATA SUPPORTED THE ABILITY TO DO THIS AT  
17 ALL. BUT, IN FACT, WHAT THE APPLICANT SHOWED WAS  
18 THAT WHEN THE ROOT WAS REIMPLANTED, YOU GOT A LITTLE  
19 BIT BETTER OUTCOME THAN WHEN IT WASN'T. SO THEY  
20 ATTRIBUTED THAT TO TROPHIC SUPPORT RATHER THAN TO  
21 ANY FUNCTION OF IN THE NEURONS. AND, IN FACT, THE  
22 DATA THAT THEY SHOWED THAT HAD TO DO WITH THE  
23 LABELED MOTOR NEURON IN THE INJURY, THE APPLICANT --  
24 THE REVIEWERS CONSIDERED TO BE DUE TO CELL DEATH AND  
25 ABSOLUTELY NOT CONVINCING.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO WHEN THE PREMISE OF THE PROPOSAL IS TO  
2 DO THESE PRECLINICAL MODEL STUDIES, THE REVIEWERS  
3 FELT THAT THE INABILITY TO SHOW THAT THEY WERE ABLE  
4 TO GENERATE THE NEURONS NEEDED TO BE TESTED, THAT  
5 THEY WERE UNABLE TO SHOW IN THE RAT MODEL WITH THE  
6 RAT CELLS THAT THEY COULD GET ANY EVIDENCE THAT THIS  
7 COULD HAPPEN, THAT THIS WAS WAY TOO EARLY, AND THAT  
8 THERE NEEDED TO BE MORE EVIDENCE.

9 SO THEY DO NOT DISPUTE THE IMPORTANCE OF  
10 THE IMPACT, BUT THEY DO DISPUTE WHETHER THEY CAN  
11 CONDUCT THE STUDIES.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. OLSON, THIS IS BOB  
13 KLEIN. DR. COLLINS AT THE LAST BOARD MEETING IN THE  
14 TRANSCRIPT THAT WE HAVE SUMMARIZED A PORTION OF THE  
15 DISCUSSION FROM THE PEER REVIEW MEETING THAT LOOKED  
16 AT A DIFFERENT AIM THAN YOU'VE JUST DESCRIBED, AS I  
17 UNDERSTAND IT. SHE SAID THAT THIS AS A DEVELOPMENT  
18 CANDIDATE PROPOSAL IS TO GENERATE HUMAN EMBRYONIC  
19 STEM CELL-DERIVED HEPATOCYTES TO SERVE AS A BRIDGE  
20 TO REGENERATION FOR ACUTE LIVER FAILURE AND ALSO TO  
21 SUPPORT PATIENTS WHO REQUIRE LARGE LIVER RESECTIONS  
22 TO THE POINT WHERE THERE WOULD BE INADEQUATE LIVER  
23 LEFT TO PROMOTE SURVIVAL UNTIL THE PATIENT'S OWN  
24 LIVER COULD REGENERATE.

25 MS. KING: I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT YOU, BUT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 I BELIEVE THE APPLICATION THAT YOU'RE DISCUSSING  
2 THAT DR. COLLINS COMMENTED ON IS AGENDA ITEM NO. 5.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU BECAUSE I WAS  
4 HAVING A PROBLEM RECONCILING THIS ITEM, AND IT CAME  
5 LABELED TO ME AS A PART OF THIS ITEM. SO THAT'S  
6 VERY HELPFUL. I APPRECIATE THAT CLARIFICATION. IT  
7 MAKES MY LIFE A LOT SIMPLER.

8 MS. KING: I KNOW THAT FOR THIS PARTICULAR  
9 MEETING, THERE WERE LOTS AND LOTS OF DOCUMENTS. AND  
10 SOME OF THEM CAME TO YOU AT DIFFERENT TIMES, AND I  
11 APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. SO IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS  
12 ABOUT THE DOCUMENTS IN FRONT OF YOU AT ANY TIME,  
13 PLEASE DON'T HESITATE TO ASK BECAUSE THIS MEETING  
14 SEEMS TO HAVE MORE DOCUMENTS THAN MEETINGS WITH  
15 AGENDAS THAT ARE FOUR TIMES AS LONG.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LIKE TO RAISE ONE  
17 POINT FOR CLARIFICATION OR A QUESTION. CAN YOU HEAR  
18 ME FIRST?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES, JOAN.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: MY READING OF THE DOCUMENT  
21 SHOWS A DIVERGENCE OF VIEWS ABOUT THE SUFFICIENCY OF  
22 THE DATA, AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT THAT OUT.  
23 THE PRIMARY REVIEWER THOUGHT THAT PRELIMINARY DATA  
24 WAS SOLID WITH SOME NOTABLE EXCEPTIONS. AND I THINK  
25 PROBABLY THE POINTS THAT DR. OLSON WAS TALKING

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ABOUT.

2 ONE OF THE OTHER THREE REVIEWERS, HOWEVER,  
3 GAVE IT A VERY SOLID HIGH SCORE AND SAID THAT THE  
4 PRELIMINARY DATA SUPPORT THE ABILITY OF THE PI AND  
5 HIS COLLEAGUES TO CREATE THE SPINAL CORD LESION,  
6 SURGICALLY REPLANT INVOLVED ROOTS, AND CHARACTERIZE  
7 NEWLY DIFFERENTIATED NEURONS, SO THE MOTOR NEURON  
8 AND AUTONOMIC MARKERS. THERE ALSO ARE SOME DATA IN  
9 SUPPORT OF THE ABILITY OF IMPLANTED NEURAL PRECURSOR  
10 CELLS TO SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE LENGTH OF THE SPINAL  
11 CORD FOLLOWING REPLANTATION. THERE ALSO IS  
12 PROVOCATIVE DATA ON SENSORY CHANGES FOLLOWING  
13 IMPLANTATION. ALL OF THESE ARE ENCOURAGING.

14 AND THERE ARE SEVERAL OTHER POINTS OF  
15 SUPPORT FOR THE GRANT, NOT ON THIS POINT, BUT I  
16 THOUGHT THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO PUT BEFORE THE BOARD.

17 DR. OLSON: AS MS. SAMUELSON IS WELL  
18 AWARE, THAT THE INFORMATION THAT IS PRESENTED AT THE  
19 MEETING ARE IN THE ACTUAL -- IS THE PART OF THE  
20 DISCUSSION AND DOES NOT REPRESENT THE SUMMARY SCORE  
21 THAT IS REFLECTED. I CAN GO INTO THE PRELIMINARY  
22 DATA, BUT THIS IS NOT A CLOSED SESSION. AND I AM  
23 NOT TOTALLY COMFORTABLE WITH DISCLOSING INFORMATION  
24 THAT, YOU KNOW, I WOULD CONSIDER CONFIDENTIAL.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AT THIS POINT IT MIGHT BE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HELPFUL FOR THE BOARD FOR DR. HAVTON TO SPEAK  
2 BECAUSE HE CAN DECIDE WHICH INFORMATION HE FEELS IS  
3 APPROPRIATE TO DISCLOSE AND WHICH HE THINKS HE'D  
4 LIKE TO KEEP ON A PROPRIETARY BASIS.

5 DR. HAVTON: EVERYTHING IN THE APPLICATION  
6 CAN BE DISCUSSED. THERE ARE NO SECRETS. WE HAVE AN  
7 OPEN POLICY HERE, SO YOU ARE FREE TO SPEAK ABOUT ANY  
8 ASPECT OF IT.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. HAVTON, WOULD YOU  
10 MAKE YOUR PRESENTATION? AND THEN WE'LL SEE IF  
11 THERE'S QUESTIONS THAT RELATE TO THAT.

12 DR. HAVTON: IS NOW A TIME FOR THAT? WHAT  
13 I WOULD LIKE TO DO, THEN, IS FIRST MAKE A RESPONSE  
14 AND COMMENT TO THE ASPECT OF THE TRANSPLANTED CELLS.  
15 I THINK THERE IS A BIT OF A MISUNDERSTANDING WHAT  
16 THE PURPOSE WAS FOR THE TRANSPLANTATION OF THE  
17 RAT-TO-RAT CELLS.

18 OUR GOAL IN THAT PART OF THE PRELIMINARY  
19 STUDIES WAS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT WE HAVE A METHOD OF  
20 FINDING TRANSPLANTED CELLS IN THE RAT SPINAL CORD BY  
21 USING THE GREEN FLUORESCENT PROTEIN AS A MARKER. WE  
22 SHOW IN OUR PRELIMINARY DATA THAT WE CAN, IN FACT,  
23 TRANSPLANT AND IDENTIFY CELLS THAT HAPPEN TO BE OF  
24 RAT ORIGIN. I THINK THERE'S A BIT OF  
25 MISUNDERSTANDING HERE THAT THE REVIEWERS MAY HAVE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FELT THAT WE INJECTED CELLS THAT WERE TARGETED TO BE  
2 MOTOR NEURONS, AND THAT IS NOT THE CASE. THE RAT  
3 CELLS THAT WERE TRANSPLANTED WERE NOT  
4 DIFFERENTIATED. WE WERE NOT AIMING OR TRANSPLANTING  
5 MOTOR NEURONS THERE. IT WAS MORE AN EXPERIMENT TO  
6 SHOW THAT WE CAN TRANSPLANT AND IDENTIFY THE  
7 CRITICAL MARKER OF GSP. AND THAT'S WHY THERE IS A  
8 LOW PERCENTAGE OF MOTOR NEURONS AS EXPECTED IN THE  
9 POPULATION OF CELLS.

10 WHAT OUR DATA SHOW THERE IS THAT WE ARE  
11 CAPABLE OF FINDING TRANSPLANTED CELLS. WE'VE DONE  
12 SIMILAR EXPERIMENTS WITH NONDIFFERENTIATED HUMAN  
13 CELLS WITH SIMILAR RESULTS, BUT WITH OTHER MARKERS.  
14 WE'RE ALSO ABLE TO SHOW THAT OUR ROOT REPLANTATION  
15 PROCEDURE, WHICH IS A SURGICAL PROCEDURE THAT WE DO  
16 IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CELL TRANSPLANTATION, AND  
17 THEN THAT ROOT PROCEDURE IS PROTECTED, MEANING THAT  
18 IT INCREASES THE SURVIVAL OF THE TRANSPLANTED CELLS.  
19 THIS IS ACTUALLY A GREAT AND UNEXPECTED FEATURE OF  
20 OUR APPROACH BECAUSE IT ALLOWS US FOR USING SMALLER  
21 VOLUMES IN THIS VERY SENSITIVE PART OF THE NERVOUS  
22 SYSTEM. SO THAT IS ACTUALLY A FEATURE THAT WAS VERY  
23 WELCOME AND IS NOT A PROBLEM AS THE REVIEWERS  
24 INDICATED IN THEIR COMMENTS.

25 WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SAY ALSO IS THAT,

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 JUST REEMPHASIZE THE FACT THAT THE RAT CELLS HAD A  
2 DIFFERENT PURPOSE. THEY WERE NOT MOTOR NEURONS.  
3 BUT WHAT WE HAVE, MY COLLEAGUES NOVITCH AND DR.  
4 KORNBLUM HAVE EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE IN MAKING MOTOR  
5 NEURONS. SO THEY HAVE, IN FACT, PUBLISHED SUCH  
6 PAPERS IN VERY PRESTIGIOUS JOURNALS AND SHOWN VERY  
7 SOLID SCIENCE ON OUR ABILITY TO MAKE THOSE CELLS.

8 AND WHAT THE FEASIBILITY PROPOSAL IS ALL  
9 ABOUT IS TO TAKE THOSE CELLS THAT HAVE BEEN WELL  
10 PUBLISHED AND WELL CHARACTERIZED AND TEST THEM IN  
11 THIS FEASIBILITY PROPOSAL TO USE THE DETECTION  
12 METHODS THAT WE HAVE ALREADY DEVELOPED AND TO SEE  
13 CAN WE ALSO MAKE THOSE PARTICULAR CELLS SURVIVE AND  
14 GROW IN THE INJURED NERVOUS SYSTEM IN THIS MODEL.  
15 AND THAT'S WHERE THE FEASIBILITY COMES IN, THAT OUR  
16 NEXT STEP IS TO TEST THE HUMAN EMBRYONIC-DERIVED AND  
17 MOTOR NEURONS IN THIS MODEL.

18 SO THAT'S THE RESPONSES TO THE ASPECT OF  
19 THE CELL-TO-RAT TRANSPLANTATION. WHAT I WOULD ALSO  
20 LIKE TO DO IS TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO JUST VERY  
21 BRIEFLY COMMENT UPON WHY WE BELIEVE THIS PROPOSAL IS  
22 IMPORTANT.

23 FIRST OF ALL HERE, THERE IS NO PRESENT  
24 CURE FOR SPINAL CORD INJURY, OF ANY TYPE OF SPINAL  
25 CORD INJURY. WE ARE TARGETING A KIND OF SPINAL CORD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INJURY THAT AFFECTS ABOUT 20 PERCENT OF ALL SPINAL  
2 CORD INJURED PATIENTS THAT HISTORICALLY HAVE BEEN  
3 EXCLUDED FROM ALL THE CURRENT AND PAST CLINICAL  
4 TRIALS, AT LEAST MOST OF THE TRIALS. ALMOST ALL  
5 TRIALS, THEY'RE NOT WELCOME IN THOSE TRIALS BECAUSE  
6 THEY HAVE A DIFFERENT KIND OF INJURY THAT OFTEN  
7 BECOMES A COMPOUNDING FACTOR IN MOST CLINICAL  
8 STUDIES.

9 CURRENTLY THERE ARE NO TREATMENTS AND  
10 THERE ARE NO CURES FOR THESE PATIENTS. WE ARE  
11 TARGETING THE CHRONIC INJURIES WHICH ARE INJURIES  
12 THAT WOULD INVOLVE ALL PATIENTS WITH THESE INJURIES.  
13 ALL SPINAL CORD INJURED PATIENTS EVENTUALLY BECOME A  
14 CHRONIC INJURED SPINAL CORD PATIENT. SO BY GOING  
15 THAT APPROACH, WE'RE TARGETING A POPULATION THAT  
16 ALSO HAVE NOT BEEN TARGETED BY THE SCIENTIFIC  
17 COMMUNITY BECAUSE MOST OF THE RESEARCH ATTEMPTS AND  
18 ALSO CLINICAL AMBITIONS HAS BEEN FOR THE ACUTE  
19 INJURY.

20 WE'RE ALSO LOOKING AT THE BLADDER  
21 DYSFUNCTION AS AN OUTCOME MEASURE AND AS A TARGET.  
22 HERE WE HAVE TREMENDOUS SUPPORT FROM THE SPINAL CORD  
23 INJURED COMMUNITY, INCLUDING PUBLISHED REPORTS WHERE  
24 THE SPINAL CORD INJURED COMMUNITY HAS PRIORITIZED  
25 THEIR MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS. AND BLADDER



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FUNCTION IS THE TOP OF THAT.

2 AND, AGAIN, OUR APPROACH HERE IS A CELL  
3 REPLACEMENT STRATEGY, WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM THE  
4 STRATEGIES THAT OTHER OR I WOULD SAY MOST SPINAL  
5 CORD INJURY PROPOSALS AND STUDIES ONGOING RIGHT NOW  
6 ARE USING. MANY STUDIES RIGHT NOW ARE USING  
7 REMYELINATION STRATEGIES OR ACUTE STRATEGIES, BUT  
8 CELL REPLACEMENT STRATEGY IS VERY DIFFERENT. THIS  
9 IS ACTUALLY A STRATEGY THAT CAN ALSO BE OF INTEREST  
10 FOR OTHER NEURODEGENERATIVE CONDITIONS SUCH AS ALS,  
11 SPINAL MUSCULAR ATROPHY, BUT ALSO MORE BROADLY  
12 SPEAKING ALZHEIMER'S, PARKINSON'S, AND HUNTINGTON'S  
13 WOULD ALSO HAVE AN INTEREST IN FINDING OUT IN OUR  
14 MODEL HOW DO CELLS SURVIVE? WHAT ENVIRONMENTS DO  
15 CELLS SURVIVE IN A CLINICALLY RELEVANT TRANSLATIONAL  
16 PROJECT?

17 SO I THINK THAT HERE WE'VE TOUCHED ON A  
18 NUMBER OF UNDERFUNDED AND UNDERSTUDIED AREAS IN  
19 NEUROLOGICAL RESEARCH. AND AS A NEUROLOGIST WHO  
20 TAKES CARE OF PATIENTS ON A REGULAR BASIS WITH THESE  
21 INJURIES, I MUST SAY THAT THESE PATIENTS ARE VERY  
22 FRUSTRATED. THEY FEEL VERY ISOLATED AND ALONE, AND  
23 THEY ARE LOOKING FOR HELP. AND WE WOULD LIKE TO  
24 GIVE THEM HOPE AND WOULD LIKE TO GIVE THEM A CHANCE  
25 TO FOLLOW PROPOSALS AND STUDIES THAT CAN HOPEFULLY

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 HELP THEM IN THE LONG TERM.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY  
3 MUCH. BOARD MEMBERS, QUESTIONS?

4 MR. TORRES: DR. HAVTON, THANK YOU FOR  
5 JOINING US ON THIS CALL. AS A MEMBER OF THE GRANTS  
6 WORKING GROUP, I REMEMBER VERY CLEARLY THIS  
7 APPLICATION. AND ONE THING THAT STRUCK ME WAS PAGE  
8 1 WHERE WE FIND THAT THE EXPERIMENTAL GOALS MAY NOT  
9 BE ACHIEVABLE, AND THERE WAS CONSISTENT DISCUSSION  
10 ON THAT MATTER. COULD YOU GO OVER AS TO YOUR  
11 REBUTTAL ON THAT AGAIN FOR ME, PLEASE?

12 DR. HAVTON: WHICH COMMENT WAS THAT?

13 MR. TORRES: IT WAS PAGE 1.

14 DR. HAVTON: IN WHICH DOCUMENT?

15 MR. TORRES: REGARDING YOUR EXTRAORDINARY  
16 PETITION SUMMARY. THE LINE THAT STRUCK ME WHICH I  
17 REMEMBER FROM OUR DISCUSSION WAS THAT THE LAST  
18 COMMENT, NO. 3, HOWEVER, REVIEWERS DID NOT THINK THE  
19 PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL GOALS WERE ACHIEVABLE. THAT  
20 WAS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN OUR DISCUSSION. COULD  
21 YOU RESPOND TO THAT?

22 DR. HAVTON: DEFINITELY. I JUST WANTED TO  
23 HAVE THE COMMENT IN FRONT OF ME. I HAVE THAT NOW.  
24 SO LET ME JUST SEE HERE. YES. THIS IS -- I KNOW  
25 WHAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO HERE. WHAT THE REVIEWERS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BROUGHT UP HERE IS THAT THEIR IMPRESSION, THAT ONE  
2 MAY NEED ANATOMICALLY VERY ACCURATE AND TOPOGRAPHIC  
3 OR VERY PRECISE REINNERVATION TO GET FUNCTIONAL  
4 RECOVERY.

5 AND WE HAVE A DIFFERENT VIEW ON THIS. ONE  
6 REASON FOR CHOOSING THE LOWER URINARY TRACT AND THE  
7 BLADDER FOR REINNERVATION IS THAT IT'S A PROXIMAL  
8 TARGET. NERVE CELLS NEED TO REGENERATE A MUCH  
9 SHORTER DISTANCE COMPARED TO IF YOU ARE TRYING TO  
10 REINNERVATE A LOWER EXTREMITY OR A HAND. AND FOR  
11 THAT REASON, WE HAVE AN ADVANTAGE BECAUSE OF  
12 DISTANCE THAT WE CAN REACH THE TARGET MORE QUICKLY.

13 ALSO, WHEN WE REINNERVATE A BLADDER, THE  
14 FUNCTION THAT WE WANT IN THE END IS EITHER FOR THE  
15 BLADDER TO CONTRACT OR TO BE QUIET. THERE ARE NO  
16 INTERMEDIARY STAGES THAT REQUIRE MORE OF A  
17 NEUROLOGICAL, SOPHISTICATED FINE-TUNING. IT'S YES  
18 OR NO, ON OR OFF. AND WE BELIEVE THAT THAT IS MORE  
19 EASILY ACHIEVED THAN A MORE DURATED FUNCTION SUCH AS  
20 A FINE MOTOR TASK OR A COGNITIVE TASK OR ANYTHING  
21 THAT WOULD REQUIRE MUCH MORE SOPHISTICATION.

22 SO I THINK THAT WHEN IT COMES TO THE  
23 PRECISE ANATOMICAL PRECISION, THAT WE DON'T THINK  
24 THAT IS AS BIG OF AN ISSUE. WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT  
25 THERE IS A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF PLASTICITY IN THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SYSTEM. AS A NEUROLOGIST WORKING WITH PATIENTS WITH  
2 NEUROLOGICAL INJURIES, WE WORK WITH THIS EVERY DAY  
3 AND RETRAIN THE NERVOUS SYSTEM. AND WE THINK IF WE  
4 CAN ACHIEVE A CONNECTION OF ANY TYPE, THAT THAT  
5 CONNECTION IS NOT A FIXED CONNECTION. THAT'S A  
6 CONNECTION THAT'S GOING TO BE TRAINABLE. AND, OF  
7 COURSE, IN STEM CELL SCIENCE, THAT IS ONE OF OUR BIG  
8 HOPES, THAT TRANSPLANTED STEM CELLS THAT BECOME  
9 NEURONS CAN ALSO BE TRAINED.

10 AND SO IN OUR PROPOSAL WE PROVIDE THE  
11 BIOLOGICAL TRANSLATIONAL ASPECT. BUT, OF COURSE, IN  
12 CLINICAL PRACTICE, IN CLINICAL TRIALS IN THE FUTURE,  
13 THERE WILL ALWAYS BE A COMPONENT OF TRAINING IN  
14 NEUROLOGICAL REHABILITATION WITH PHYSICAL THERAPY  
15 AND OTHER TASKS WHERE WE CAN HOPEFULLY ALSO TRAIN  
16 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL-DERIVED NEURONS INTO DOING  
17 SPECIFIC TASKS AND FINE-TUNING THE TASK. THERE ARE  
18 OTHER EXAMPLES IN MEDICINE WHERE WE TAKE ADVANTAGE  
19 OF PLASTICITY IN REHABILITATION. SO I THINK THAT'S  
20 A REASONABLE ASSUMPTION, THAT THIS IS NOT A FIXED,  
21 HARDWIRED SYSTEM, BUT THERE'S A LOT OF OPPORTUNITY  
22 TO WORK WITH THE SYSTEM. AND THAT WILL BE SOMETHING  
23 THAT WILL BE TARGETED FOR FUTURE STUDIES, I'M SURE.

24 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SENATOR TORRES, THIS IS

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 BOB KLEIN. I BELIEVE THAT, IN FACT, THERE WAS A  
2 DISCUSSION IN THE PEER REVIEW THAT THE EXAMPLES OF  
3 FAILURES DID INVOLVE LONGER DISTANCES. AND A  
4 REVIEWER BROUGHT UP AS A STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE THAT  
5 THIS WAS A SHORTER DISTANCE THAT WAS CONTEMPLATED;  
6 AND, THEREFORE, THERE WAS A STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE IN  
7 THIS APPROACH AT WHAT HE'S CALLING A PROXIMATE  
8 TARGET, BUT THERE WAS CERTAINLY DISAGREEMENT ON THIS  
9 POINT --

10 MR. TORRES: RIGHT.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: -- IN THE DISCUSSION.

12 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, BOB. YOU ARE  
13 CORRECT. AND THAT WAS THE DISCUSSION.

14 MS. KING: DR. OLSON HAS A COMMENT.

15 DR. OLSON: I JUST WANT TO RESPOND FROM  
16 THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE REVIEWERS. AND THEN IF IT  
17 WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE BOARD, ALSO I WOULD BE HAPPY  
18 TO PROVIDE THE SCORE AND THE RANGE OF SCORES THAT  
19 EXPERT REVIEWERS DID GIVE TO THIS PROPOSAL.

20 I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THE COMMENT THAT,  
21 YOU KNOW, A SHORT DISTANCE IN A RAT IS NOT A SHORT  
22 DISTANCE IN A HUMAN. SO ONE ALWAYS MUST KEEP THAT  
23 IN MIND.

24 I ALSO JUST IN THE CONTEXT -- AND, AGAIN,  
25 I'M TRYING TO HIGHLIGHT WHAT THE REVIEWERS' CONCERNS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WERE. AND I APPRECIATE THE POINT MADE BY THE  
2 APPLICANT, THAT IT'S AN ON-OFF SYSTEM. I THINK THE  
3 REVIEWER'S POINT WAS THAT, AS IN FACT THE APPLICANT  
4 HAS JUST NOTED IN HIS EARLIER DISCUSSION WITH YOU,  
5 THAT THE PRELIMINARY DATA THAT SHOWED THE STUDY IN  
6 THE MOUSE OR -- PARDON ME -- IN THE RAT MODEL WITH  
7 THE RAT CELLS SHOWED THAT THEY COULD LOOK AT IT. IN  
8 FACT, DID NOT SHOW ANY EVIDENCE THAT THEY COULD DO  
9 ANY KIND OF REINNERVATION. AND THAT'S WHAT THE  
10 REVIEWERS ARE CONCERNED ABOUT.

11 I JUST WANT TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE  
12 REVIEWERS DO NOT DISPUTE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FACT  
13 THAT THERE ARE NO OPTIONS FOR SPINAL CORD INJURY  
14 PATIENTS. THE REVIEWERS ARE JUST CONCERNED THAT,  
15 GIVEN WHAT THE APPLICANT WANTS TO DO, THAT THERE IS  
16 NOT ADEQUATE EVIDENCE TO SUGGEST THAT HE CAN DO IT  
17 AT THIS POINT.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. OLSON, COULD YOU GIVE  
19 US THE SCORE AND THE STANDARD DEVIATION AND THE HIGH  
20 AND LOW?

21 DR. OLSON: SO THE AVERAGE SCORE ON THIS  
22 APPLICATION WAS 56. THE MEDIAN SCORE WAS 53.  
23 STANDARD DEVIATION WAS 11, BUT NO EXTRAORDINARY --  
24 NO MINORITY REPORT WAS REQUESTED TO BE FILED EVEN  
25 WHEN THAT OPTION WAS MADE AVAILABLE, AND THE RANGE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 WAS 40 TO 75.

2 DR. REED: QUESTION FOR DR. OLSON IF I  
3 MAY. JOHN REED HERE. THANK YOU. DR. OLSON, IS  
4 IT -- WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THE OPINION OF  
5 YOURSELF AND THE STAFF IN TERMS OF WHETHER THE STAFF  
6 BELIEVES THAT THE GRANT SHOULD BE FUNDED BY  
7 EXCEPTION?

8 DR. OLSON: STAFF HAS NOT -- DOES NOT HAVE  
9 AN OPINION.

10 DR. LOVE: PAT, COULD YOU GIVE US A LITTLE  
11 BIT OF INSIGHT INTO WHY -- I HEARD ALL THE SCORES  
12 THAT YOU GAVE AROUND THE MEDIANS, THE AVERAGE, AND  
13 STANDARD DEVIATION. BUT THE SCORE OF 75 OBVIOUSLY  
14 WASN'T A SUPER HIGH SCORE. WHY DO YOU THINK THAT  
15 PERSON WAS GRAVITATING SO MUCH HIGHER THAN THE  
16 PERSON SCORED AT 40?

17 DR. OLSON: I THINK -- YOU'RE GETTING MY  
18 OPINION. I ACKNOWLEDGE WHAT YOU'RE HEARING. AND I  
19 AM NO EXPERT IN SPINAL CORD INJURY AS WELL. WHAT I  
20 WOULD SAY IS WHAT I THINK YOU'RE HEARING FROM THE  
21 REVIEWERS, IF THE LIKELIHOOD OF ACHIEVING POSSIBLY  
22 THE OBJECTIVES OF THE GRANT IS LOW, OKAY, BECAUSE  
23 THEY HAVEN'T PROVIDED ADEQUATE DATA, WILL THE  
24 APPLICANT TRY AND GENERATE MOTOR NEURONS? WILL THE  
25 APPLICANT TRY AND GENERATE -- WILL THEY CONDUCT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESEARCH THAT PERHAPS WILL LEAD TO MOTOR NEURONS OF  
2 THE CELL MARKER STATUS THEY WANT? WILL THE  
3 APPLICANT BE ABLE TO GENERATE AUTONOMIC NEURONS?  
4 BECAUSE THAT'S SOMETHING THAT THEY'LL HAVE TO DO  
5 PRESUMABLY AND GET THEM IN HIGHER THAN MAYBE A  
6 COUPLE OF PERCENTAGES. THAT'S ALL I NOTE. SO  
7 THEY'LL DO RESEARCH, I'M SURE, THAT IS ALONG THE  
8 PATH TO. OKAY.

9 WILL THEY COME ANYWHERE NEAR TO ACHIEVING  
10 THE OBJECTIVES THEY LAID OUT IN THE APPLICATION IS  
11 WHAT THE REVIEWERS ARE QUESTIONING BASED ON WHAT  
12 THEY SAID. SO I THINK THAT IS MY OPINION.

13 DR. LOVE: THANK YOU, PAT.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: I CAN READ FROM THE  
15 CRITIQUE BY THE REVIEWER WHO GAVE A PRELIMINARY  
16 SCORE OF 80 AND, ACCORDING TO MY NOTES, WENT DOWN TO  
17 70 AFTER THE COMPLETE DISCUSSION. SHALL I DO THAT?

18 DR. OLSON: I WOULD POINT OUT THAT THE  
19 CRITIQUES ARE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE REVIEW. THEY DO  
20 NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE OPINION AFTER THE  
21 REVIEW, AFTER THE DISCUSSION. SO I WOULD STRONGLY  
22 ENCOURAGE THAT I ACTUALLY THINK IT'S NOT APPROPRIATE  
23 TO READ INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER CRITIQUES.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, JOAN, WITHOUT READING  
25 IT, THE PERSON CAME DOWN TO 70, MAYBE YOU COULD JUST



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SUMMARIZE THEIR POINTS WITHOUT USING THEIR LANGUAGE.

2 WE WANT TO PROTECT ALWAYS THE INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: RIGHT. SOMEHOW IT SEEMS  
4 TO ME WE NEED TO COME UP WITH A PROCESS THAT SHARES  
5 WITH THE BOARD THE SUM TOTAL OF VIEWS BECAUSE  
6 THEY'RE NOT MONOLITHIC USUALLY IN MY EXPERIENCE OF  
7 THIS PROCESS, BUT HAVING PARTICIPATED FOR A WHILE.  
8 AND THERE'S A QUESTION REALLY ON THAT POINT. SO LET  
9 ME DO THAT, BOB.

10 DR. PIZZO: IN ALL DUE RESPECT, BEFORE YOU  
11 DO THAT, CAN I JUST OFFER A COMMENT ABOUT DOING IT,  
12 AND OTHERS COULD REFLECT ON IT. I APPRECIATE ALL  
13 THE THINGS YOU JUST SAID AND BOB'S REQUEST. MY  
14 CONCERN IS THAT WE ARE, BY DOING THAT, ESTABLISHING  
15 ANOTHER PRECEDENT, AND I WORRY ABOUT WHAT WE'RE  
16 ABOUT TO EMBARK ON. IF WE START IN THESE SESSIONS  
17 GETTING INTO INDIVIDUAL REVIEWS OR COMMENTS ABOUT  
18 INDIVIDUAL REVIEWS, I THINK IT'S OPENING YET ANOTHER  
19 DOOR THAT'S GOING TO ULTIMATELY CREATE MORE  
20 CONFUSION.

21 I WOULD -- BEFORE YOU READ IT, JOAN, IF  
22 I'M THE ONLY VOICE THAT HAS AN ANXIETY ABOUT THIS,  
23 SO BE IT. BUT IF OTHERS --

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXECUTIVE --

25 DR. PIZZO: BOB, WOULD YOU WAIT A SECOND

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 FOR ME TO FINISH?

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I APOLOGIZE. I THOUGHT  
3 YOU WERE FINISHED.

4 DR. PIZZO: NO, I'M NOT. IF OTHERS HAVE A  
5 VIEW ABOUT BEGINNING TO REFER OR PARAPHRASE  
6 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS, I THINK THEY  
7 SHOULD BE REGISTERED. IF THERE ARE NONE, THEN I'LL  
8 STAND QUIET.

9 MR. GOLDBERG: I SHARE YOUR CONCERN.

10 MR. ROTH: OBVIOUSLY I DON'T UNDERSTAND  
11 THIS WHOLE PROCESS WE'RE GOING THROUGH.

12 DR. HAWGOOD: I'M VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTIVE  
13 OF WHAT PHIL JUST SAID. I THINK THIS IS DANGEROUS  
14 TERRITORY.

15 MR. TORRES: I'D LIKE TO OFFER MY SUPPORT  
16 TO PHIL'S COMMENT AS WELL.

17 DR. POMEROY: AGREED.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: I DON'T DISAGREE WITH YOU.  
19 WHAT CONCERNS ME IS HAVING SAT THROUGH THESE  
20 DISCUSSIONS, AS WELL AS HAVING CAREFULLY READ THE  
21 CRITIQUES, TO SAY THAT THE REVIEWERS FELT AND THEN  
22 CONCLUDE THAT THERE WAS A SHARED VIEW OF A LACK OF  
23 FEASIBILITY DOES NOT ACCURATELY REFLECT WHAT I  
24 OBSERVED AND READ.

25 DR. PIZZO: I APPRECIATE THAT VERY MUCH,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND I UNDERSTAND THE INTENT OF THE COMMENTS, AND I  
2 ACCEPT THEM WITH ALL DUE RESPECT. BUT I KNOW FROM  
3 PRIOR EXPERIENCE THAT THERE'S GOING TO ALWAYS BE A  
4 RANGE OF REVIEWS. THAT'S WHY WE HAVE THE RANGE.  
5 BUT THERE WILL BE SOME WHO HAVE A STRONG REACTION  
6 EITHER POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY. AND SO IF WE START  
7 GETTING INTO THE INDIVIDUAL REVIEWS, WE COULD  
8 COUNTER BY SAYING LET'S HEAR THE MOST NEGATIVE ONE,  
9 AND I THINK THAT'S GOING TO MOVE US IN A VERY MORE  
10 DANGEROUS DISCUSSION ABOUT HOW WE RATE ANYTHING  
11 GOING FORWARD.

12 DR. PRIETO: BOB, COULD I RESPOND TO THAT?  
13 A COUPLE OF POINTS. I THINK I KNOW WHERE THIS  
14 DECISION IS LIKELY TO LAND, BUT I'D LIKE TO JUST  
15 ECHO SOME OF JOAN'S COMMENTS AND MAKE THE POINT AND  
16 REMIND THE BOARD THAT IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT WE REMAIN  
17 AS THE DECISION-MAKING BODY AND NOT THE REVIEWERS.  
18 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF REASONS WHY THAT'S IMPORTANT  
19 THAT I THINK BOB AND OTHERS HAVE DISCUSSED LONG  
20 BEFORE TODAY.

21 BUT BEING THE DECISION-MAKING BODY MEANS  
22 THAT WE CANNOT RUBBER STAMP THE ACTIONS OF THE  
23 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. I THINK WE'RE ENTIRELY WITHIN  
24 OUR APPROPRIATE ROLE IN DISCUSSING APPLICATIONS AND  
25 DISCUSSING THE RANGE OF OPINION. I THINK THAT THOSE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF US WHO SIT ON THAT BODY AS PATIENT ADVOCATES ARE  
2 ABLE TO SHARE, AND I THINK THAT'S WHAT JOAN IS DOING  
3 NOW, THE FLAVOR OF THE DISCUSSION AND THE ISSUES  
4 THAT WERE BROUGHT UP FOR PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS.

5 THIS HAPPENS TO BE ONE WHERE THERE WAS A  
6 WIDE DISPARITY OF OPINIONS. I THINK THAT'S  
7 REFLECTED IN THE VERY LARGE STANDARD DEVIATION. AND  
8 THAT'S CENTERED ON IN LARGE PART A STRONG DIFFERENCE  
9 OF OPINION, STRONGER THAN THERE IS FOR MOST  
10 APPLICATIONS, ON WHETHER OR NOT THE GOALS OF THE  
11 RESEARCHER WERE ACHIEVABLE OR NOT.

12 DR. PIZZO: SO I JUST WANT TO JUST FOR THE  
13 RECORD MAKE CLEAR THAT I ABSOLUTELY AGREE WITH THE  
14 LAST COMMENT AND UNDERSTAND THAT WE MUST BE AN  
15 INDEPENDENT REVIEW BODY, THAT THE ICOC HAS TO  
16 EXERCISE THAT ROLE. THAT SAID, I THINK IF WE START  
17 GETTING INTO INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER COMMENTS, I THINK  
18 IT OPENS A PATH THAT HAS LOTS OF LIABILITIES  
19 ASSOCIATED WITH IT.

20 SO WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, I DO WANT US TO,  
21 OF COURSE, BE INDEPENDENT. WE'VE ALL BEEN COUNSELED  
22 ABOUT THAT. WE KNOW THAT THAT'S PART OF OUR  
23 OBLIGATION. MY COMMENTS HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH  
24 THAT RESPONSIBILITY, BUT ONLY WITH REGARD TO HOW WE  
25 PROCEED GOING FORWARD.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PRIETO: I AGREE WITH THAT.

2 MR. SHEEHY: COULD I MAKE A COMMENT? I  
3 THINK I WANT TO SUPPORT WHAT DR. PRIETO HAS BEEN  
4 SAYING. I THINK ONE OF THE THINGS THAT'S KIND OF  
5 MISSING HERE IS THE BREADTH OF THE SCIENCE THAT WE  
6 COVER IN A REVIEW AND THEN THE NARROWNESS. YOU HAVE  
7 15 SCORES, BUT THERE ARE ONLY GOING TO BE ONE OR TWO  
8 OF THOSE WHO ARE SPECIALISTS, IF EVEN ONE, THAT  
9 REALLY KNOWS SPINAL CORD INJURY IN ANY REVIEW. I  
10 KNOW THAT YOU GUYS AT NIH HAVE A STUDY SECTION  
11 COMPOSED OF A WHOLE GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO ARE  
12 SPECIALISTS IN THE PARTICULAR BRANCH OR AREA THAT  
13 YOU ARE REVIEWING SO THAT WHEN YOU GET THIS SCORE,  
14 IT REFLECTS A CONSENSUS OPINION AMONG EXPERTS, A  
15 LARGE NUMBER OF EXPERTS.

16 WHEN YOU HAVE THREE REVIEWERS AND YOU HAVE  
17 A SIGNIFICANT DEVIATION OF OPINION BETWEEN TWO OF  
18 THE REVIEWERS AND THEN YOU ARE A REVIEW GROUP, WHICH  
19 A LARGE NUMBER OF THEM REALLY ARE NOT SPECIALISTS IN  
20 THAT FIELD, THEN A STRONG OPINION BY ONE REVIEWER  
21 VERSUS A STRONG OPINION OF ANOTHER REVIEWER, I  
22 THINK, HAS A LITTLE BIT MORE CONTEXT AND TEXTURE  
23 THAN WHEN YOU HAVE 15 NEUROLOGISTS SITTING AROUND  
24 AND TWO OF THEM DISAGREE AND THEN THAT GROUP OF  
25 NEUROLOGISTS WHO HAVE GENERAL EXPERTISE IN THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FIELD KIND OF FALL ON ONE SIDE, YOU'VE GOT  
2 HEMATOPOETIC PEOPLE, YOU'VE GOT LIVER PEOPLE, YOU'VE  
3 GOT THIS AND THAT AND THAT AND THEY KIND OF BET ON  
4 ONE INDIVIDUAL VERSUS THE OTHER.

5 I THINK JOAN'S ATTEMPT TO KIND OF, WITHOUT  
6 NECESSARILY READING THE EXACT REVIEW, THE TENOR AND  
7 THE TEXTURE OF THE REVIEWER WHO FELT STRONGLY THAT  
8 THIS IS A MERITORIOUS APPLICATION IS SOMETHING THAT  
9 WE OUGHT TO BE WILLING TO CONSIDER WITHIN OUR  
10 PROCESS GIVEN THE BREADTH OF SCIENCE AND THE  
11 LIMITATIONS ON OUR REVIEW THAT EXIST IN OUR SYSTEM.

12 HAVE I BEEN CLEAR ON THAT? WE HAVE A LOT  
13 OF SCIENCE THAT WE REVIEW ACROSS A WHOLE BREADTH OF  
14 SPECIALTIES. SO I WOULD AGREE WITH -- IN AN  
15 NIH-TYPE REVIEW WHERE YOU HAVE A WHOLE GROUP OF  
16 PEOPLE WHO REALLY KNOW THAT FIELD, YOU DON'T WANT TO  
17 START TALKING ABOUT ONE INDIVIDUAL'S OPINION. BUT  
18 WHEN YOU'VE GOT THREE PEOPLE, ONE PERSON'S OPINION  
19 VERSUS ANOTHER MIGHT BE WORTH US GIVING A LITTLE BIT  
20 OF WEIGHT TO.

21 DR. PIZZO: I DON'T WANT TO OVERDOMINATE  
22 THIS, BUT I THINK THAT THE CAVEATS ARE UNDERSTOOD.  
23 WE'VE BEEN PART OF REVIEW GROUPS WHERE ALL THE  
24 ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN STATED APPLY. MANY OTHER  
25 FOUNDATIONS DO HAVE A BROAD RANGE, NOT A SPECIFIC

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RANGE. I THINK THAT UNLESS WE'RE GOING TO WIND UP  
2 HEARING EVERY REVIEW FOR EVERY GRANT, I THINK WE'RE  
3 OPENING UP A VERY DANGEROUS DISCUSSION. I RESPECT  
4 THE POINTS THAT ARE BEING MADE, BUT I JUST DISAGREE  
5 WITH THEM.

6 AND SO I DON'T KNOW HOW TO HANDLE THIS,  
7 BOB, BECAUSE YOU'RE THE PERSON WHO GAVE CONSENT TO  
8 GO FORWARD, AND I'M OFFERING A COUNTER TO THAT. AND  
9 I THINK BEFORE WE GO FORWARD, WE SHOULD AT LEAST BE  
10 SURE THAT THAT'S THE VIEW OF THE MEMBERS OF THE  
11 BOARD.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, DR. PRIETO -- I MEAN  
13 DR. PIZZO, JEFF'S POINT AND DR. PRIETO'S POINT ARE  
14 FUNDAMENTAL TO THE DISCUSSIONS WE'VE HAD ON 50, 60,  
15 A HUNDRED GRANTS, WHICH IS THAT IN ORDER TO TALK  
16 ABOUT THE CONTRASTING POSITIONS WHEN YOU HAVE SPLIT  
17 OPINIONS, YOU REALLY HAVE TO PRESENT BOTH SIDES OF  
18 THE ISSUE. CERTAINLY NOT WITH STATING THE LANGUAGE  
19 OF ANY PARTICULAR REVIEWER, BUT ONE OF THE  
20 FUNDAMENTAL REASONS FOR THE PATIENT ADVOCATES TO BE  
21 ON THE PEER REVIEW IS TO BRIDGE OVER TO THE BOARD  
22 AND COMMUNICATE WHAT THESE OPPOSING POSITIONS ARE.  
23 SO --

24 DR. PIZZO: I'M NEUTRALIZING THE  
25 DISCUSSION ABOUT WHO'S BRINGING FORWARD THE CONCERN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND TRYING TO PLACE IT IN THE CONTEXT OF HOW WE GO  
2 THROUGH THE PROCESS OF DOING REVIEWS AND SIMPLY  
3 ARTICULATING THE POSITION THAT UNLESS WE'RE PREPARED  
4 TO LOOK AT ALL THE REVIEWS AND TALK ABOUT ALL THE  
5 REVIEWS FOR EVERY GRANT, I'M WORRIED THAT WHAT WE'RE  
6 ABOUT TO NOW OR POTENTIALLY NOW DO OPENS UP A  
7 DIFFERENT PATH FOR HOW WE'RE GOING TO FOLLOW  
8 SUBSEQUENT BOTH UNIQUE POSITIONS AS WELL AS  
9 INDIVIDUAL GRANT REVIEWS.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: REALIZING YOUR CONCERN,  
11 DR. PIZZO, AND THE OTHER CONCERNS THAT WERE STATED,  
12 I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE THIS ISSUE GO TO  
13 THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE AND HAVE A THOUGHTFUL  
14 DISCUSSION THERE. WE CAN TRY AND CREATE A FRAMEWORK  
15 FOR UNDERSTANDING WHEN IT'S APPROPRIATE, WHAT THE  
16 LIMITATIONS SHOULD BE, WHAT THE GUIDELINES SHOULD BE  
17 THAT ARE INFORMATIVE AND IMPORTANT TO THE  
18 DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, AND RETAIN THE INTEGRITY OF  
19 EQUIVALENT REVIEWS FOR EQUIVALENT APPLICATIONS.

20 DR. ECONOMOU: CAN I MAKE A COMMENT? I'M  
21 GLAD THAT SOMEONE BROUGHT UP -- I'M GLAD THAT JEFF  
22 BROUGHT UP THE MATTER OF STUDY SECTIONS. I THINK  
23 THAT THERE MIGHT BE A BIT OF A MISPERCEPTION. IN A  
24 STUDY SECTION, A STUDY SECTION HAS SCIENTISTS ALL OF  
25 WHOM ARE CAPABLE OF UNDERSTANDING THE SCIENCE AND



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEN THREE OR FOUR REVIEWERS WHO ACTUALLY HAVE READ  
2 THE APPLICATION FROM BEGINNING TO END AND THEN  
3 PROVIDE A CRITIQUE. AND SO IN A STUDY SECTION, THE  
4 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY, TERTIARY REVIEWERS WILL GO  
5 OVER THEIR REVIEWS, THEN THEY CAN BE QUESTIONED BY  
6 OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE THAT CAN UNDERSTAND  
7 THE SCIENCE, AND THEN THEY TRY TO COME TO A  
8 CONSENSUS VOTE.

9 THE THING THAT HAS CONCERNED ME ABOUT  
10 THESE EXTRAORDINARY PETITIONS -- AND BY THE WAY, I  
11 WANT MY COMMENTS TO BE NOT SPECIFIC TO THIS  
12 APPLICATION BECAUSE I HAVE A CONFLICT HERE, BUT JUST  
13 IN GENERAL TO THIS PROCESS IS THAT NO ONE ON THIS  
14 COMMITTEE HAS ACTUALLY READ THIS APPLICATION.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DOCTOR, YOU KNOW, WHAT  
16 I'M GOING TO NEED TO DO IS, BECAUSE WE ARE VERY  
17 CAUTIOUS ON CONFLICTS, IS THAT I'M GOING TO RESERVE  
18 YOUR COMMENTS TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE BECAUSE  
19 WE'VE GOT TO AVOID ANY COMMENTS THAT MAY SWAY  
20 INDIVIDUALS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER RELATED TO THIS  
21 APPLICATION.

22 DR. ECONOMOU: I UNDERSTAND.

23 MS. KING: FIRST OF ALL, YOUR COMMENTS MAY  
24 BE APPROPRIATE TO ITEM NO. 7, WHICH WE HAVE NOT  
25 GOTTEN TO YET. IT'S POSSIBLE. THEY MAY NOT BE, BUT

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 ITEM NO. 7 IS WITH REGARD TO THE EXTRAORDINARY  
2 PETITION PROCESS.

3 SECOND, ELONA BAUM HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO  
4 HAS BEEN WAITING PATIENTLY TO MAKE A COMMENT, SO,  
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN, I SUGGEST WE HAVE MS. BAUM MAKE HER  
6 COMMENTS.

7 DR. ECONOMOU: LET ME WITHDRAW MY COMMENT  
8 AND I'LL MAKE IT AT A MORE APPROPRIATE TIME.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
10 WELCOME YOUR COMMENT AT A LATER TIME.

11 MS. BAUM: AND THANK YOU FOR GIVING ME AN  
12 OPPORTUNITY TO REFLECT WHAT I THINK DR. TROUNSON  
13 WOULD LIKE TO REFLECT ON THIS VERY TOPIC OF THE  
14 PROCESS AND SCOPE OF DISCLOSURES. I THINK THAT HE  
15 WOULD 100 PERCENT SUPPORT WHAT DR. PIZZO HAS JUST  
16 SAID. I THINK THAT IT'S IMPERATIVE THAT WE HAVE A  
17 PROCESS THAT WE STICK WITH. AND I'M SURE THAT DR.  
18 TROUNSON WOULD FULLY ENDORSE EVERYTHING THAT WAS  
19 ARTICULATED SO WELL BY DR. PIZZO. I DON'T NEED TO  
20 REPEAT IT, BUT I JUST THOUGHT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO  
21 HIGHLIGHT THAT FOR THE RECORD RIGHT NOW SINCE  
22 UNFORTUNATELY DR. TROUNSON COULDN'T BE WITH US AT  
23 THE MOMENT.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO LET ME ASK THIS  
25 QUESTION. JOAN, IN ORDER TO MOVE FORWARD ON THIS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICATION, COULD YOU MAKE JUST A GENERAL STATEMENT  
2 OF WHAT YOU THOUGHT WAS THE GENERAL STRENGTH BROUGHT  
3 UP DURING THE DISCUSSION OR DEFICIENCY. AND WE WILL  
4 THEN SEE IF WE CAN MOVE FORWARD ON THIS APPLICATION.  
5 YOU CAN TAKE THE OVERALL VIEW OF WHAT YOU HEARD FROM  
6 DIFFERENT PEOPLE AND CONTRAST THE STRENGTH VERSUS  
7 THE DEFICIENCY IF YOU'D LIKE, BUT THAT WILL HELP US  
8 THROUGH THIS ITEM.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: OKAY. I'M NOT GOING TO  
10 ATTEMPT TO SUMMARIZE THE FULL BREADTH OF THE  
11 COMMENTS OF ALL OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THAT REVIEW.  
12 I THINK THAT'S -- I THINK THAT'S FRAUGHT WITH  
13 DIFFICULTY, AND THAT WAS MY REASON FOR FIRST  
14 SPEAKING. BUT I DO THINK THAT THE ISSUE OF THE FULL  
15 BREADTH OF THE POINTS OF VIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC  
16 REVIEWERS NEEDS TO BE SOMEHOW COMMUNICATED TO THE  
17 BOARD SO THAT THAT IS PART OF THEIR EDUCATION ABOUT  
18 A GIVEN GRANT BEFORE MAKING A DECISION ABOUT ITS  
19 FUNDABILITY --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S --

21 MS. SAMUELSON: -- OR WE LOSE OUR ABILITY  
22 TO REALLY BE SUFFICIENTLY EDUCATED ABOUT IT TO MAKE  
23 AN INFORMED JUDGMENT.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CONCEPTUALLY AND LEGALLY  
25 I BELIEVE YOU'RE CORRECT, JOAN. IF YOU WILL -- IF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 YOU HAVE A STATEMENT TO MAKE ABOUT A POSITION HELD  
2 BY SOME OF THE REVIEWERS, IN SUMMARY MAYBE YOU COULD  
3 STATE WHAT THAT IS.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: OKAY. THERE WAS, IT  
5 SEEMS, AND I DON'T THINK ANYBODY DISAGREES WITH  
6 THIS, UNANIMOUS BELIEF THAT THERE'S A TREMENDOUS  
7 NEED FOR THE THERAPIES THAT COULD COME FROM THIS  
8 RESEARCH. AND WITH THAT AND THE FACT THERE WAS SOME  
9 SUPPORT FOR THE EFFICACY, FEASIBILITY OF THE GRANT,  
10 THAT THAT HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED, SO WITH ADEQUATE  
11 EVIDENCE OF THAT, THAT I THINK THE BOARD COULD VERY  
12 COMFORTABLY CONCLUDE THAT, BECAUSE OF THE TREMENDOUS  
13 NEED FOR THIS GRANT, IT'S ENTIRELY APPROPRIATE THAT  
14 IT BE FUNDED. AND THAT IS ESPECIALLY TRUE BECAUSE  
15 OF THE ABILITY TO IN PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW GIVE  
16 SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE NEED AS ANOTHER SORT OF  
17 CRITERION. I THINK THAT'S IT.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ARE THERE  
19 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS?

20 DR. POMEROY: THOUGH THIS HAS BEEN  
21 SOMEWHAT LONG, I THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT DISCUSSION  
22 FOR US TO HAVE. I WOULD LIKE TO JUST SAY THAT I  
23 THINK AS A BOARD MEMBER, I'M DEPENDENT UPON THE  
24 STAFF REPORTS ON THESE THINGS TO GIVE US AN  
25 UNDERSTANDING OF THE FULL RANGE OF OPINIONS THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WERE DISCUSSED WITHOUT IDENTIFYING INDIVIDUAL  
2 REVIEWERS. AND I DON'T THINK IT SHOULD HAVE TO  
3 BE -- I APPRECIATE JOAN DOING IT, BUT I DON'T THINK  
4 IT SHOULD BE THE PATIENT ADVOCATES' ROLE TO DO THAT.

5 SO I JUST WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT I WANT TO  
6 BE COMFORTABLE THAT THE STAFF GIVE US THE FULL RANGE  
7 OF THE DISCUSSION THAT TOOK PLACE SO THAT WE CAN  
8 MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THAT'S IMPORTANT AS  
10 WELL TO DISCUSS IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE BECAUSE  
11 MY PERCEPTION THAT THE STAFF VIEWS THEIR FUNCTION AS  
12 SUMMARIZING THE DOMINANT POSITION IF THERE'S NO  
13 MINORITY REPORT FILED AND NOT GIVING YOU THE  
14 CONTRAST, ALTHOUGH WE HAVE HEARD SOME REVIEWS FROM  
15 THE STAFF THAT DOES VERY WELL PROVIDE US WITH THE  
16 CONTRAST. SO I THINK THIS IS AN IMPORTANT  
17 DISCUSSION WE NEED TO CONTINUE.

18 MS. KING: DR. OLSON WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A  
19 COMMENT.

20 DR. OLSON: I DO JUST WANT TO COMMENT THAT  
21 THE STAFF DOES CONSIDER IT ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO  
22 ADEQUATELY CONVEY TO THE BOARD THE RANGE OF  
23 DISCUSSION. I WOULD ALSO REMIND THE BOARD THAT AT  
24 THE REVIEW WE PURPOSELY TELL THE REVIEWERS THAT THEY  
25 CAN WEIGHT THE CRITERIA ANY WAY THEY CHOOSE, THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REVIEW CRITERIA. SO HIGH SCORES MAY IN SOME  
2 REVIEWERS' MINDS JUST PUT MORE EMPHASIS ON IMPACT,  
3 SO I THINK -- BUT THIS IS REALLY A GOAL OF STAFF, TO  
4 TRY AND ADEQUATELY REFLECT TO THE BOARD WHAT THE  
5 DISCUSSION IS AND WHAT IS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND THEN ANY  
7 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENT?

8 DR. REED: I HAVE ONE. I GUESS TO COME  
9 BACK TO THE POINT PHIL WAS MAKING. I DO HAVE A LOT  
10 OF CONCERNS ABOUT DELVING INTO THE INTRICACIES OF  
11 SOME OF THESE REVIEWS FOR THE REASONS ALREADY  
12 ARTICULATED. I THINK WHAT I WOULD PROPOSE AS AN  
13 ALTERNATIVE IS THAT THE ROLE OF THIS BOARD IN  
14 PARTICULAR SHOULD BE TO LOOK AT GRANTS THAT HAVE A  
15 SPECIAL STRATEGIC VALUE TO THE OVERALL INITIATIVE  
16 AND TO ASK OURSELVES WHETHER SOME THAT PERHAPS THE  
17 STUDY SECTION DIDN'T FIND SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS  
18 TO MAKE THE PAYLINE SHOULD RISE TO THE LEVEL OF  
19 FUNDABILITY BASED ON SPECIAL STRATEGIC MERIT OR  
20 VALUE.

21 AND IF THE ARGUMENT THAT SOME WANT TO MAKE  
22 FOR THIS PARTICULAR APPLICATION IS THAT THIS IS,  
23 YES, IT'S HIGH RISK, IT'S CHALLENGING, TECHNICALLY  
24 CHALLENGING WORK, BUT IT'S MERITORIOUS BECAUSE OF  
25 THE IMPACT IT WOULD HAVE IF IT WORKED AND THAT,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEREFORE, IT DESERVES SPECIAL CONSIDERATION, I  
2 THINK THAT WOULD BE A VERY SUITABLE WAY FOR THE  
3 BOARD TO PROCEED AND TO DELIBERATE. BUT TO GET INTO  
4 THE DETAILS OF THE LINE BY LINE OF THE CRITIQUES I  
5 THINK IS NOT TERRIBLY USEFUL. SO I'D RATHER SEE IT  
6 BROUGHT FORWARD BASED ON THE ARGUMENT THAT THIS IS  
7 AN AREA THAT'S BEING OVERLOOKED BY OTHERS, IT'S  
8 INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT CLINICALLY, AND, THEREFORE, WE  
9 OUGHT TO GIVE THE GRANT A CHANCE ON THOSE GROUNDS  
10 RATHER THAN QUESTIONING WHETHER THE REVIEW WAS DONE  
11 AS PERFECTLY AS IT COULD HAVE BEEN.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LEGALLY, JOHN, WHILE THAT  
13 COULD BE A STRUCTURE THAT WOULD WORK, WITHIN STATE  
14 LAW THAT'S NOT GOING TO WORK BECAUSE THE PEER REVIEW  
15 CANNOT BECOME DEFINITIVE DECISIONS EITHER ON  
16 SCIENTIFIC GROUNDS OR ON STRATEGIC GROUNDS. SO WE  
17 HAVE TO AND IN EXECUTIVE SESSION HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY  
18 TO LOOK AT PROPRIETARY INFORMATION. AND WE HAVE IN  
19 MANY CASES MADE DECISIONS THAT ARE DIFFERENT THAN  
20 THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP BASED  
21 UPON SCIENTIFIC DIFFERENCES, INCLUDING SOME WHERE  
22 THERE WERE MISTAKES, SUCH AS THE KAREN ABOODY GRANT,  
23 WHICH JUST GOT AN FDA APPROVAL FOR A PHASE AHEAD OF  
24 THE PHASE THAT WE FUNDED, BUT NEVERTHELESS HAD SOME  
25 OF THE SAME QUESTIONS ON.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1           IN ANY CASE WE NEED TO DEAL WITH THIS AT A  
2           SCIENTIFIC SUBCOMMITTEE BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE'RE NOT  
3           GOING TO PROCEED THROUGH THIS AGENDA.

4           MS. KING: I JUST WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT  
5           THERE'S NOT YET A MOTION ON THE TABLE WITH REGARD TO  
6           THIS APPLICATION.

7           CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND THAT. I  
8           HAVEN'T ASKED FOR A MOTION YET.

9           MR. HARRISON: TO CLARIFY, BOB, THERE WAS  
10          A MOTION MADE AT THE LAST MEETING BY DR. PRIETO AND  
11          JEANNIE FONTANA TO FUND THIS APPLICATION. WE LOST A  
12          QUORUM, SO NO VOTE WAS TAKEN ON IT, BUT THERE IS A  
13          PENDING MOTION.

14          CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO INFORM ME, PLEASE,  
15          BECAUSE I HAD TO LEAVE BEFORE THE END OF THE LAST  
16          MEETING. SO THE BOARD MEETING WAS LEFT OPEN ON THIS  
17          ISSUE, SO THIS IS CONSIDERED A PENDING MOTION; IS  
18          THAT CORRECT?

19          MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

20          CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. SO THERE IS A  
21          MOTION PENDING. IS THERE ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD  
22          DISCUSSION?

23          MR. SHEEHY: I JUST -- I THOUGHT IT WAS  
24          INTERESTING, NOTWITHSTANDING THE PROCESS QUESTION  
25          THAT DR. REED RAISED, THAT HE PRETTY MUCH SUMMARIZED



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE REASON WHY I THINK WE OUGHT TO APPROVE THIS  
2 GRANT. I THINK WHAT JOAN WAS TRYING TO GET TO IS  
3 THAT THERE IS SOME FUNDAMENTAL SCIENTIFIC MERIT  
4 THERE, THAT THIS IS A HIGH RISK, HIGH REWARD GRANT  
5 REALLY FROM A STRATEGIC AND PROGRAMMATIC POINT OF  
6 VIEW, AN AREA THAT IS NOT BEING WELL -- THAT A LOT  
7 OF PEOPLE AREN'T DOING WORK IN. THIS IS A SERIOUS  
8 PROBLEM FOR PEOPLE, FOR PATIENTS. AND THAT I ALMOST  
9 WANT TO SAY THAT DR. REED ACTUALLY OFFERED THE BEST  
10 RATIONALE FOR GOING FORWARD. AND THIS IS PARTIALLY  
11 WHY WE EXIST, TO KIND OF CATCH SOME OF THIS. WE  
12 HAVE TO TAKE SOME RISK SOMETIMES, AND WE HAVE TO BE  
13 THINKING ABOUT THE PATIENTS THAT ARE OUT THERE THAT  
14 CAN BENEFIT FROM THIS.

15 IF SOME AREAS OF RESEARCH ARE  
16 UNDERSTUDIED, ARE NOT WELL DEVELOPED, AND WE CAN  
17 HELP MOVE THINGS ALONG, I THINK THAT'S WHY WE'RE  
18 HERE. THIS IS CLEARLY AN AREA WHERE CELL THERAPY IS  
19 ESSENTIAL FOR COMING UP WITH SOME SORT OF RELIEF FOR  
20 THESE PATIENTS. SO I WOULD HOPE THAT WE WOULD GET  
21 THIS -- THAT MEMBERS WILL LOOK AT THIS POSITIVELY  
22 FROM A PROGRAMMATIC POINT OF VIEW NOTWITHSTANDING  
23 THE VARIOUS DISCUSSIONS WE'VE HAD ABOUT SCIENCE.  
24 AND I WOULD REMIND PEOPLE THAT THERE WAS A HIGH  
25 STANDARD DEVIATION. THERE WERE SOME SCIENTISTS WHO

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 FELT STRONGLY THAT THIS HAD SOME MERIT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU, JEFF.

3 IS THERE ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENT?

4 MS. SAMUELSON: JUST TO AGREE, YES, THAT  
5 IS WHAT I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SAID COULD I HAVE  
6 BEEN SO ARTICULATE. AND I DO THINK THERE ARE  
7 IMPORTANT ISSUES OF WHY THE APPLICATION RAISED BY  
8 THIS GRANT, THE STUDY OF PLASTICITY, FOR EXAMPLE, IN  
9 THIS APPLICATION TO A WIDE ARRAY OF DISORDERS,  
10 INCLUDING PARKINSON'S.

11 MS. GIBBONS: I JUST WANT TO ECHO SUPPORT  
12 FOR DR. REED'S COMMENTS, WHICH I THOUGHT WERE VERY  
13 CONCISE AND VERY ON TARGET, AND TO JUST MIRROR AND  
14 SUPPORT WHAT JEFF AND JOAN HAVE SAID.

15 MS. KING: IN THE INTEREST OF TIME, BOB,  
16 I'D LIKE TO HAVE YOU MAYBE HAVE JAMES HARRISON READ  
17 THE MOTION FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S FINE. MR.  
19 HARRISON.

20 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION, AS I SAID, WAS  
21 MADE BY DR. PRIETO, SECONDED BY JEANNIE FONTANA TO  
22 FUND EARLY TRANSLATION II RESEARCH APPLICATION 1785.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THIS IS A  
24 FEASIBILITY LEVEL GRANT. IS THAT A CORRECT  
25 STATEMENT?

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. OLSON: THAT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME ASK DR. OLSON. IS  
3 THERE AN ABILITY TO HAVE A MILESTONE IN THIS GRANT  
4 TO ACHIEVE A PARTICULAR CRITICAL FACTOR THAT WOULD  
5 DETERMINE WHETHER THE GRANT COULD SUCCESSFULLY  
6 PROCEED TO ITS TARGET?

7 DR. OLSON: IF FUNDED BY THE BOARD, WE  
8 WOULD WORK CLOSELY WITH THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE  
9 APPROPRIATE MILESTONES.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO I WOULD  
11 LIKE TO ACTUALLY SEE IF THE MAKERS OF THE MOTION  
12 WOULD ACCEPT A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT THAT MILESTONES  
13 SPECIFICALLY BE NEGOTIATED BY STAFF TO ENSURE THAT  
14 FUNDS ARE ADVANCED WHEN CRITICAL POINTS ARE ACHIEVED  
15 THAT ARE NECESSARY TO PROGRESS TOWARDS THE ULTIMATE  
16 OBJECTIVE.

17 DR. PRIETO: AS THE MAKER OF THE MOTION, I  
18 WOULD ACCEPT THAT AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

19 MS. KING: IF WE COULD ASK DR. REED --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHO WAS SECOND?

21 MS. KING: IT WAS JEANNIE FONTANA, WHO WAS  
22 PRESENT FOR DR. REED. AND WE HAVE DR. REED PRESENT  
23 ON THE PHONE TODAY. WE ALSO HAVE DR. FONTANA  
24 JOINING US AS A SPECIAL GUEST, BUT I THINK IT'S MORE  
25 APPROPRIATE TO HAVE DR. REED COMMENT IN THIS CASE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 SINCE HE'S PRESENT AND VOTING AT THE MEETING.

2 DR. REED: I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED. WHAT  
3 EXACTLY DO YOU NEED ME TO COMMENT ABOUT?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEANNIE FONTANA WAS ONE  
5 OF THE CO-MAKERS OF THIS MOTION. AND I'VE ASKED IN  
6 THE CONSIDERATION OF THE MOTION, SEPARATE FROM  
7 WHETHER IT'S APPROVED OR DISAPPROVED, IF THE MAKER  
8 OF THE MOTION WOULD ACCEPT AN AMENDMENT THAT THE  
9 STAFF WILL INCORPORATE, IF IT'S APPROVED, MILESTONES  
10 THAT ARE SET AT CRITICAL POINTS THAT ARE NECESSARY.

11 DR. REED: I SO ACCEPT.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

13 DR. POMEROY: CAN STAFF CLARIFY HOW THIS  
14 WOULD DIFFER FROM THEIR USUAL PROCESS?

15 DR. OLSON: IT WOULD NOT.

16 DR. POMEROY: THAT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ON THE FEASIBILITY, ON  
18 FEASIBILITY GRANTS AT A MILLION SIX, DO YOU HAVE  
19 MULTIPLE MILESTONES GENERALLY?

20 DR. OLSON: WE WOULD ALSO HAVE MILESTONES  
21 THERE DIRECTED TOWARDS THE AIMS PROPOSED BY THE  
22 INVESTIGATOR.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. GENERALLY ON  
24 FEASIBILITY GRANTS I HAVEN'T SEEN MILESTONES THAT  
25 RIGOROUSLY UPHELD.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. OLSON: WE'VE NEVER HAD A FEASIBILITY  
2 AWARD BEFORE.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO I WASN'T  
4 FAMILIAR WITH THE FACT THAT YOU HAD THIS LEVEL OF  
5 CONTROL INTENDED FOR FEASIBILITY GRANTS.

6 DR. OLSON: I THINK THE IDEA WAS THAT  
7 WE'RE LOOKING AT OUR EARLY TRANSLATIONAL AS PART OF  
8 OUR PIPELINE PROGRAM, PART OF OUR APPLIED RESEARCH.  
9 AND, THEREFORE, IT'S A LITTLE BIT MORE -- WE'RE MORE  
10 CONCERNED. WE'RE MORE STRUCTURED.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GREAT. THAT'S VERY  
12 WELCOME NEWS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IS THERE  
13 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENT? IS THERE PUBLIC COMMENT?

14 MS. KING: THERE IS HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO.  
15 WE ARE HONORED WITH THE PRESENCE OF ROMAN REED HERE  
16 IN SAN FRANCISCO. HE'D LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT.

17 MR. REED: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MELISSA.  
18 I APPRECIATE THE CHANCE. AS MOST OF YOU KNOW, THE  
19 ROMAN REED SPINAL CORD INJURY RESEARCH ACT WAS  
20 RECENTLY RENEWED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY EVERY MEMBER  
21 OF THE ASSEMBLY, THE SENATE, AND GOVERNOR  
22 SCHWARZENEGGER. UNFORTUNATELY IT CAME WITH NO  
23 MONEY.

24 THIS LOSS OF FUNDING WILL AFFECT PROMISING  
25 SCIENCE AND SCIENTISTS LIKE DR. LEIF HAVTON. OVER

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE LAST EIGHT YEARS, DR. HAVTON WAS FUNDED SEVEN  
2 TIMES BY A CALIFORNIA AGENCY. EVERY ONE OF THOSE  
3 GRANTS WAS APPROVED BY A PANEL OF SCIENTISTS FROM  
4 OUT-OF-STATE IN A MANNER VERY SIMILAR TO THAT WHICH  
5 YOU HAVE EMPLOYED HERE.

6 OUR GRANT'S RELATIVELY SMALL COMPARED TO  
7 THE CIRM, BUT IT ADDED UP TO OVER HALF A MILLION  
8 DOLLARS FOR ACCOMPLISHED AND SUCCESSFUL SCIENTISTS.  
9 NOW THE FUNDING IS GONE, THIS IMPORTANT AREA OF  
10 PROGRESS HAS BEEN CUT OFF. AND NOW WITH DR. HAVTON,  
11 THE CIRM PROPOSAL INVOLVING EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS  
12 COULD VERY WELL BE HELPFUL TO OUR OVERALL CAUSE IN  
13 TURNING STEM CELLS INTO CURES, IF HIS RESEARCH IS  
14 ALLOWED TO GO FORWARD, WITH VITAL FUNDING THE  
15 CRUCIAL RESEARCH ENABLING GRANTS THAT CAN BE GIVEN  
16 BY CIRM. BUT WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO ME AND ALL  
17 MY FRIENDS SITTING IN WHEELCHAIRS FOR TOO LONG IS  
18 THIS NEW PROJECT ATTACKS CHRONIC SPINAL CORD INJURY.

19 THE MAJORITY OF SPINAL CORD INJURY  
20 EXPERIMENTS INVOLVE THE NEW ACUTE STAGE ONLY TWO  
21 WEEKS AFTER SPINAL CORD INJURY. THAT LEAVES OUT  
22 NEARLY EVERYBODY, INCLUDING MYSELF SITTING HERE IN A  
23 WHEELCHAIR TODAY. LOOK, WE ALL KNOW THAT SCIENCE IS  
24 THE WAY TO CURES, BUT IT IS NOT THE REASON FOR  
25 CURES. THE REASON FOR CURES IS TO HELP THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 SUFFERING, TO HELP THE CHRONICALLY INJURED.

2 MY FATHER AND I ARE HERE TODAY TO GET ME  
3 OUT OF THIS WHEELCHAIR AND STAND UP AND WALK AWAY  
4 FROM WHEELCHAIRS FOREVER, AS CHRISTOPHER REEVE ONCE  
5 TOLD ME, TO BEAT BACK CHRONIC SPINAL CORD INJURY  
6 PARALYSIS. SO PLEASE THIS IS A VITAL NECESSITY FOR  
7 HELPING OUR CHRONICALLY INJURED. THE URGENCY AND  
8 THE NEED FOR BOWEL AND BLADDER TREATMENTS AND NEW  
9 THERAPIES THAT WILL COME FROM HIS EXPERIMENT, IT  
10 WILL BE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF SPINAL CORD RELATED  
11 CONDITIONS. I URGE YOU TO APPROVE, TAKE A STAND FOR  
12 THE CHRONICALLY INJURED. THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE ADDITIONAL  
14 PUBLIC COMMENT?

15 MS. KING: WE HAVE ONE MORE HERE IN SAN  
16 FRANCISCO.

17 MR. REED: THIS IS DON REED. I THINK THAT  
18 THIS IS -- FIRST OF ALL, I'VE SEEN DR. HAVTON IN  
19 ACTION FOR MANY YEARS, SINCE 2001, I BELIEVE. AND  
20 HE ALWAYS SETS A TARGET AND SINGLEMINDEDLY GOES  
21 FORWARD AND WORKS AND ACHIEVES IT. I THINK IF HE  
22 SAYS THIS CAN BE DONE, PERSONALLY I BELIEVE HIM.

23 SINCE MY SON'S INJURY, DOCTORS HAVE TOLD  
24 US THERE WAS NO HOPE. NOW THERE'S A POSSIBILITY OF  
25 SOME HOPE. EVEN IF THIS IS ONLY A PIECE OF THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 PUZZLE, IT ADVANCES THE CAUSE OF CURES, AND I URGE  
2 YOUR ACCEPTANCE. THANK YOU.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. IS THERE  
4 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT AT THE OTHER SITES?  
5 HEARING NONE, MELISSA, COULD YOU CALL THE ROLL  
6 UNLESS MR. HARRISON HAS A POINT TO MAKE.

7 MR. HARRISON: WE'RE READY FOR THE ROLL  
8 CALL.

9 MS. KING: JUST BEFORE I DO THAT, VERY  
10 QUICKLY I WANT TO CHECK AND SEE. HAS DR. DAVID  
11 BRENNER JOINED THE CALL?

12 DR. BRENNER: YES, I HAVE.

13 MS. KING: HAS JON SHESTACK JOINED THE  
14 CALL? OKAY. JUST AS A REMINDER, THERE ARE A NUMBER  
15 OF MEMBERS WHO ARE IN CONFLICT ON THIS GRANT. YOU  
16 HAVE YOUR LIST IN FRONT OF YOU TO TELL YOU WHETHER  
17 OR NOT YOU ARE ONE OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS. AND I WILL  
18 NOT CALL YOUR NAME IF YOU ARE IN CONFLICT. SO I'M  
19 NOT FORGETTING YOU. I'M JUST NOT CALLING YOU ON  
20 PURPOSE SINCE YOU'RE IN CONFLICT.

21 ROBERT PRICE.

22 DR. PRICE: YES.

23 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER.

24 DR. BRENNER: NO.

25 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
3 MR. GOLDBERG: NO.  
4 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
5 DR. HAWGOOD: NO.  
6 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
8 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
9 DR. LOVE: YES.  
10 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
11 DR. PIZZO: NO.  
12 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
13 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
14 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
15 DR. PRIETO: AYE.  
16 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
17 DR. FINI: NO.  
18 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
19 DR. QUINT: YES.  
20 MS. KING: JOHN REED.  
21 DR. REED: YES.  
22 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
23 MR. ROTH: NO.  
24 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
25 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

2 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

3 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

4 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

5 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

6 MR. TORRES: AYE.

7 MS. KING: AND I AM GOING TO DEFER TO  
8 COUNSEL, JAMES HARRISON AND SCOTT TOCHER, FOR THE  
9 VOTE TALLY. IF YOU COULD GIVE THEM JUST A MOMENT,  
10 TALK AMONGST YOURSELVES.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET IT NEVER BE SAID THAT  
12 THIS GROUP RUBBER STAMPS ANYTHING.

13 DR. REED: CAN I MAKE A COMMENT WHILE  
14 WE'RE WAITING FOR THE TALLY? I THINK IT WOULD BE  
15 VERY USEFUL, GIVEN THE BOARD'S TENDENCY TO GET  
16 INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS, TO COMPARE OVER TIME SOME  
17 MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF THE GRANTS THAT COME FORWARD  
18 IN THE USUAL MANNER, MAKING THE PAYLINE, VERSUS  
19 THOSE THAT WE AS A BOARD DECIDE TO FUND BY  
20 EXCEPTION. IT WOULD BE VERY INTERESTING TO HAVE  
21 DATA ON THAT A COUPLE YEARS FROM NOW AND KNOW  
22 WHETHER OUR DECISIONS WERE WISE OR NOT.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT WOULD BE  
24 VERY HELPFUL. AND I'M GOING TO REFER THAT TO THE  
25 SCIENTIFIC STAFF AND ASK THEM COME UP WITH A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TIMETABLE WHEN THEY THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO  
2 DO IT AND THEY HAVE A LARGE ENOUGH DISTRIBUTION AND  
3 ENOUGH TIME TO FOLLOW THESE GRANTS TO STATISTICALLY  
4 GIVE US FEEDBACK, BUT I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY  
5 VALUABLE.

6 MS. KING: DR. OLSON HAS A COMMENT AS  
7 WELL.

8 DR. OLSON: DR. REED, I WANT TO THANK YOU  
9 FOR MAKING THAT SUGGESTION. I WAS THINKING THE SAME  
10 THING DURING THE DISCUSSION, SPEAKING TO BOTH YOURS  
11 AND CHAIRMAN KLEIN'S COMMENT. I WOULD NOTE THAT AS  
12 I THINK, YOU KNOW, THE DATASET PROBABLY A FEW YEARS  
13 DOWN THE ROAD WOULD BE A LOT MORE USEFUL THAN NOW  
14 BECAUSE THERE ARE SO FEW AWARDS THAT WE HAVE CLOSED  
15 OUT AT THIS POINT.

16 MR. HARRISON: THAT MOTION PASSES WITH 12  
17 YES VOTES AND SIX NO VOTES.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE  
19 ARE GOING TO MOVE TO THE NEXT ITEM.

20 MS. KING: DR. HAVTON, THANK YOU VERY MUCH  
21 FOR JOINING US. AS YOU JUST HEARD, YOUR APPLICATION  
22 HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR FUNDING. I'M SURE STAFF WILL  
23 BE IN TOUCH WITH YOU. AND I JUST WANTED TO THANK  
24 YOU AND LET YOU KNOW THAT YOU ARE WELCOME TO STAY,  
25 BUT YOU CAN ALSO GO AT THIS POINT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. HAVTON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WOULD  
2 LIKE TO THANK THE BOARD FOR ALL THE INPUT AND FOR  
3 YOUR SUPPORT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. SO COULD WE  
5 GO TO THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA, WHICH I BELIEVE  
6 IS APPLICATION 1857.

7 MS. KING: CORRECT. AND IT'S ITEM NO. 5.  
8 AND THE BOARD SHOULD HAVE TWO DOCUMENTS FOR THIS.  
9 ONE IS A MEMO FROM DR. GILL SAMBRANO. IT'S ABOUT A  
10 THREE-QUARTER PAGE MEMO. AND THE OTHER IS THE  
11 PUBLIC SUMMARY FOR THE GRANT. AND SORRY I'M  
12 CORRECTING MYSELF HERE. THERE'S ALSO A TRANSCRIPT  
13 EXCERPT THAT WE SENT YOU FROM THE OCTOBER MEETING AS  
14 WELL. BUT I WOULD SAY YOU DEFINITELY WANT TO HAVE  
15 THE MEMO FROM STAFF IN FRONT OF YOU BECAUSE THAT IS  
16 THE CRUX OF THE MATTER FOR THIS.

17 DR. PIZZO: MELISSA, JUST A PRACTICAL  
18 QUESTION. DO WE HAVE, ASIDE FROM THIS, OTHER AREAS  
19 WHERE VOTES ARE NEEDED?

20 MS. KING: WE DO. WE NEED TO VOTE ON THIS  
21 ITEM AND ITEM NO. 6 AND THEN ALSO ITEM NO. 7.

22 DR. PIZZO: DO WE HAVE A QUORUM BECAUSE  
23 I'M GOING TO BE IN A CONFLICT VERY SOON?

24 DR. PRIETO: I WILL ALSO HAVE TO LEAVE AT  
25 ABOUT ONE O'CLOCK.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: WE HAVE ABOUT 15 MINUTES THEN  
2 TO TRY AND GET THROUGH THE REMAINING ITEMS, I  
3 BELIEVE. I BELIEVE BY LOSING BOTH OF YOU, UNLESS  
4 I'M MISSING SOMETHING, WE WILL BE BELOW A QUORUM.

5 DR. PIZZO: I CAN STAY FOR JUST THAT  
6 AMOUNT OF TIME UNFORTUNATELY UNLESS I CAN PICK UP A  
7 CELL PHONE. I GUESS I CAN'T DO THAT.

8 MS. KING: NO. I'M SORRY THAT YOU HAVE TO  
9 PARTICIPATE FROM A NOTICED LOCATION.

10 DR. PIZZO: THAT'S WHERE I'M AT NOW.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S DO THIS, DR. PIZZO,  
12 WITH YOUR COMMENT IN MIND AND DR. PRIETO'S COMMENT  
13 IN MIND, WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THIS  
14 ITEM, WHICH IS CERTAINLY A BENEFIT. COULD DR. OLSON  
15 AND DR. SAMBRANO -- IS DR. SAMBRANO GOING TO MAKE  
16 THE PRESENTATION?

17 MS. KING: DR. SAMBRANO IS NOT HERE, SO  
18 DR. OLSON IS SIGNALING THAT SHE WILL MAKE THE  
19 PRESENTATION.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. AND EVERYONE,  
21 THIS IS A PUBLIC MEMO THAT'S AVAILABLE DATED  
22 NOVEMBER 2D AS THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION.

23 MS. KING: CORRECT. IT'S POSTED ON OUR  
24 WEB SITE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. OLSON.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. OLSON: OKAY. SO I'M TALKING NOW  
2 ABOUT AGENDA ITEM NO. 5. AND I WANT JUST TO REMIND  
3 THE BOARD THAT THEY ESSENTIALLY APPROVED THIS  
4 APPLICATION FOR FUNDING BASED ON THE GRANTS WORKING  
5 GROUP RECOMMENDATION. AND WHAT THAT ENTAILED WAS  
6 ELIMINATING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES. AND THE RELEVANT  
7 ONE THAT WE WANT TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT IS CHANGING IT  
8 FROM A DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE AWARD TO A DEVELOPMENT  
9 CANDIDATE FEASIBILITY AWARD.

10 WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST THE BOARD TO  
11 DO IS GIVE STAFF THE FLEXIBILITY TO DETERMINE WHICH  
12 IT IS BECAUSE THE DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE AWARD  
13 ALLOWED A CO-PI, AND THIS APPLICATION HAS A CO-PI,  
14 MANY OF THE REMAINING ACTIVITIES WILL BE CONDUCTED  
15 BY THE CO-PI. AND, THEREFORE, WE WANT THE  
16 FLEXIBILITY TO ENSURE THAT THE PROJECT CAN BE RUN IN  
17 THE BEST WAY POSSIBLE OBVIOUSLY WITH NOT THE FULL  
18 FUNDING CONTEMPLATED BY THE DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE  
19 AWARD, BUT POSSIBLY FUNDING THAT ACTUALLY COULD GET  
20 THE JOB DONE AND COULD ADDRESS, PERHAPS EVEN GET US  
21 TO A DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE BECAUSE MANY OF THE  
22 ACTIVITIES THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDED  
23 NOT BE INCLUDED WERE ONES THAT WOULD ACTUALLY  
24 INCLUDE AFTER DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE NOMINATION.

25 SO STAFF WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND WE HAVE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE FLEXIBILITY TO STILL CALL IT A DEVELOPMENT  
2 CANDIDATE AWARD, BUT AGREE WITH YOUR APPROVAL AS THE  
3 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF THE GRANTS WORKING  
4 GROUP AS TO THE ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD BE CUT OUT  
5 YOU'VE ALREADY AGREED TO.

6 MS. KING: CHAIRMAN KLEIN, AS WE MOVE  
7 SWIFTLY THROUGH THIS, I'D LIKE TO ASK JAMES HARRISON  
8 TO READ THE MOTION THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED HERE GIVEN  
9 THAT IT IS TWOFOLD AND RATHER COMPLICATED.

10 MR. HARRISON: BECAUSE THE BOARD  
11 PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED A MOTION ON THE SUBJECT, THE  
12 REQUIRED MOTION WILL HAVE TO AMEND THE PREVIOUS  
13 MOTION. SO IF A MEMBER WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION,  
14 I WOULD PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING: THAT THE MEMBER MOVE  
15 TO AMEND THE BOARD'S MOTION ADOPTED AT THE BOARD'S  
16 OCTOBER 21, 2010, MEETING REGARDING EARLY  
17 TRANSLATION II APPLICATION 1857, TO APPROVE FUNDING  
18 AT THE REQUESTED AMOUNT OF \$5,199,767 WITH THE  
19 CONDITION THAT THE PRECLINICAL MODEL GMP CELL BANK  
20 AND RELATED ACTIVITIES BE REMOVED, THAT THE BUDGET  
21 BE ADJUSTED DOWNWARD TO REFLECT THESE CHANGES, AND  
22 THE DESIGNATION OF DC OR DCF BE DELEGATED TO CIRM  
23 STAFF.

24 MS. KING: THAT'S THE MOTION REQUIRED. WE  
25 STILL NEED SOMEONE TO MAKE IT AND SOMEONE TO SECOND

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 IT.

2 DR. PIZZO: I PROPOSE THAT MOTION.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO IS MAKING THE  
4 MOTION. IS THERE A SECOND?

5 DR. LOVE: SECOND.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. MOTION HAS BEEN  
7 MADE AND SECONDED. IS THERE BOARD COMMENT? IS  
8 THERE PUBLIC COMMENT?

9 DR. POMEROY: YES, THERE IS IN SACRAMENTO.

10 DR. MEYERS: THIS IS FRED MEYERS. I'M THE  
11 EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATE DEAN AT THE UC DAVIS SCHOOL OF  
12 MEDICINE. I'M NEEDING A LOT MORE DETAIL BEFORE I  
13 COULD NOT OBJECT TO WHY THIS APPROVED PROPOSAL WOULD  
14 BE SO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY  
15 PARTICULARLY THE ELEGANT GMP WORK WOULD BE DELETED  
16 FROM AN ALREADY APPROVED GRANT.

17 MS. KING: BOB, I HAVE IAN SWEEDLER HERE  
18 IN SAN FRANCISCO THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT  
19 IN RESPONSE.

20 MR. SWEEDLER: THIS IS JUST A REMINDER OF  
21 PROCESS. WHAT THE BOARD DID AT ITS LAST MEETING IS  
22 MAKE ALL OF THOSE REDUCTIONS. IT'S BEEN REDUCED TO  
23 A HALF-SIZE AWARD. SO THE STAFF REQUEST IS TO RAISE  
24 THE AMOUNT OF THE AWARD.

25 THE REASONS FOR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP'S



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RECOMMENDATION TO REMOVE CERTAIN ACTIVITIES WERE  
2 PRESENTED AT THE LAST BOARD MEETING, AND THAT WAS IN  
3 THE SUMMARY THAT I'M SURE DR. OLSON COULD ADDRESS  
4 THAT. BUT THE MOTION RIGHT NOW IS TO INCREASE THE  
5 SIZE OF THE AWARD.

6 DR. OLSON: IT'S TO GIVE STAFF THE  
7 FLEXIBILITY TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF THE AWARD IN  
8 DISCUSSION WITH THE PI, RESPECTING THE  
9 RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE DECISION BY THE BOARD AT THE  
10 OCTOBER MEETING.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO SPECIFICALLY, DR.  
12 OLSON, IT'S TO APPROVE THE WHOLE FIVE MILLION ONE  
13 NINETY-NINE AND LET THE BOARD WORK OUT WITH THE  
14 SCIENTIST WHAT SORT OF VALUE WILL BE DERIVED. THE  
15 STAFF TO WORK OUT WITH THE SCIENTISTS WHERE THE  
16 VALUE WILL BE DERIVED.

17 DR. OLSON: WELL, ACCEPTING THE  
18 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT  
19 WERE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE BOARD. SO SOME  
20 ACTIVITIES WILL BE LIMITED.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXACTLY. BUT WITHIN THE  
22 REMAINING ACTIVITIES, ALLOWING THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF  
23 TO WORK OUT THE BUDGET WITH THE APPLICANT.

24 DR. OLSON: RIGHT. BECAUSE THE APPLICANT  
25 ORGANIZATION WOULD HAVE BEEN LIMITED UNDER A DCF

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 AWARD TO 1.15 MILLION IN DIRECT PROJECT COSTS, AND  
2 WE WANT A LITTLE BIT MORE FLEXIBILITY THAN THAT.

3 DR. MEYERS: THANK YOU SO MUCH. I DIDN'T  
4 REALLY UNDERSTAND INITIALLY, AND YOU'VE REALLY DONE  
5 A GREAT JOB OF CLARIFYING FOR ME. IF I CAN  
6 PARTICIPATE IN THAT WITH THE PI AND HELP YOU WITH  
7 THAT PROCESS, I'M HAPPY TO DO SO.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
9 APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENTS. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC  
10 COMMENT?

11 MR. HARRISON, I THINK WE UNDERSTAND THE  
12 MOTION. IS IT APPROPRIATE TO CALL THE ROLL?

13 MR. HARRISON: YES, IT IS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MELISSA.

15 MS. KING: AGAIN, FOR THE BOARD MEMBERS,  
16 YOU HAVE A SHEET IN FRONT OF YOU LETTING YOU KNOW  
17 WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAVE A CONFLICT. I WILL NOT CALL  
18 THOSE OF YOU IN CONFLICT. IF I MISS ANYONE  
19 OTHERWISE, PLEASE DO SAY -- LET ME KNOW, BUT I WILL  
20 NOT CALL YOU IF YOU HAVE A CONFLICT.

21 ROBERT PRICE.

22 DR. PRICE: YES.

23 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER.

24 DR. BRENNER: YES.

25 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRYANT: YES.  
2 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
3 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
4 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
5 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
6 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
8 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
9 DR. LOVE: YES.  
10 MS. KING: SHLOMO MELMED.  
11 DR. MELMED: YOU SAID I HAVE A CONFLICT ON  
12 THIS.  
13 MS. KING: NO. YOU HAD A CONFLICT ON THE  
14 PREVIOUS ONE, DR. MELMED. I'M SORRY. WE'RE ON  
15 AGENDA ITEM NO. 5.  
16 DR. MELMED: I KNOW WHAT YOU'RE ON, BUT  
17 YOU E-MAILED ME AND SAID I HAVE A CONFLICT ON THIS.  
18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HE COULD ABSTAIN IF  
19 THERE'S A QUESTION.  
20 MS. KING: THERE'S NO QUESTION. WE  
21 APOLOGIZE. HE IS NOT ON THE LIST OF PEOPLE WITH  
22 CONFLICTS. THERE WAS A MISCOMMUNICATION AMONG THE  
23 STAFF, AND THE E-MAIL REFLECTED THAT HE DOES, BUT IN  
24 FACT HE DOES NOT. SORRY, DR. MELMED.  
25 DR. MELMED: THEN I VOTE YES.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
2 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
3 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
4 DR. FINI: YES.  
5 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
6 DR. QUINT: YES.  
7 MS. KING: JOHN REED. DUANE ROTH.  
8 MR. ROTH: YES.  
9 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
10 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
11 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
13 MS. KING: ART TORRES.  
14 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
15 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU.  
16 DR. ECONOMOU: YES.  
17 MS. KING: AND I'M GOING TO CIRCLE BACK  
18 WITH LEEZA GIBBONS.  
19 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
20 MS. KING: AGAIN, I AM DEFERRING TO  
21 COUNSEL.  
22 JUST TO CHECK, JOHN REED, ARE YOU PRESENT  
23 AND DO YOU HAVE A VOTE ON THIS?  
24 DR. REED: YES.  
25 MS. KING: IS YOUR VOTE YES?

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. REED: YES.

2 MS. KING: THANK YOU.

3 MR. HARRISON: THAT MOTION CARRIES WITH 17  
4 VOTES.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THE  
6 NEXT ITEM IS ONLY TO CORRECT A CLERICAL ERROR THAT  
7 WAS MADE IN THE APPLICATION. AND THE STAFF IS  
8 RECOMMENDING THAT THIS AWARD BE INCREASED BY 73,484.  
9 IS THERE A MOTION TO PUT THAT INTO DISCUSSION?

10 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.

11 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: PIZZO THE SECOND. BOARD  
13 DISCUSSION? PUBLIC DISCUSSION? MR. HARRISON, ARE  
14 WE IN A POSITION WE CAN CALL THE ROLL?

15 MR. HARRISON: YES, IF I COULD JUST  
16 CLARIFY THE MOTION BECAUSE, AGAIN, THIS IS A  
17 CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE THE BOARD IS AMENDING A  
18 PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED MOTION. AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE  
19 MOTION IS TO AMEND THE MOTION ADOPTED AT THE BOARD'S  
20 APRIL 29, 2010, MEETING REGARDING BASIC BIOLOGY  
21 APPLICATION 1496 TO INCREASE THE AWARD BY \$73,484 TO  
22 A TOTAL OF \$1,284,921 TO CORRECT A CLERICAL ERROR --  
23 EXCUSE ME -- TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT TO A TOTAL OF  
24 \$1,358,405.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HARRISON. WE ARE IN A POSITION TO CALL THE ROLL.  
2 MS. KING: OKAY. ROBERT PRICE.  
3 DR. PRICE: YES.  
4 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER.  
5 DR. BRENNER: YES.  
6 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.  
7 MS. GIBBONS: YES.  
8 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.  
9 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.  
10 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.  
11 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.  
12 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
14 MS. KING: TED LOVE.  
15 DR. LOVE: YES.  
16 MS. KING: SHLOMO MELMED.  
17 DR. MELMED: YES.  
18 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
19 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
20 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
21 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
22 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
23 DR. PRIETO: YES.  
24 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
25 DR. FINI: YES.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
2 DR. QUINT: YES.  
3 MS. KING: JOHN REED.  
4 DR. REED: YES.  
5 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
6 MR. ROTH: YES.  
7 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
8 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
9 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
10 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.  
11 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.  
12 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
13 MS. KING: ART TORRES.  
14 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
15 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU.  
16 DR. ECONOMOU: YES.  
17 MS. KING: I'M PRETTY SECURE IN SAYING  
18 THAT MOTION CARRIES.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE NEXT ITEM, BECAUSE WE  
20 ONLY HAVE A COUPLE MINUTES, IS ITEM NO. 7. AND I  
21 WILL DIRECT THE MEMBERS TO THEIR MATERIALS.  
22 SPECIFICALLY TWO POINTS. ONE, THAT THIS IS A BOARD  
23 OPTION TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS AS REFLECTED  
24 IN MATERIALS. THIS IS A PROPOSAL TO PERMIT THE  
25 BOARD TO REQUEST WHEN AN APPLICATION BE REFERRED FOR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS UNDER LIMITED CIRCUMSTANCES.

2 ON SEPTEMBER 29TH, A DRAFT OF THIS  
3 PROPOSAL PASSED THE SCIENTIFIC SUBCOMMITTEE BY A  
4 VOTE OF NINE TO ZERO AND IT RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD  
5 FOR A TRIAL PERIOD OF 18 MONTHS. UPON EXPIRATION OF  
6 THE TIME, THE POLICY WILL BE SUBJECT TO  
7 RECONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD.

8 TO PUT IT INTO DISCUSSION, IS THERE A  
9 MOTION THAT WE ADOPT?

10 DR. PIZZO: SO MOVED.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE A SECOND?

12 MR. TORRES: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE DISCUSSED THIS  
14 MOTION BEFORE, BUT CERTAINLY IS THERE ANY BOARD  
15 MEMBER WHO WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS IT AGAIN?

16 MS. KING: I BELIEVE IT WAS DR. ECONOMOU  
17 THAT HAD SOME COMMENTS THAT WERE RELATED TO THE  
18 EXTRAORDINARY PETITION PROCESS.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL --

20 MS. KING: MAYBE NOT RELATED TO THIS, SO  
21 MAYBE WE WANT TO MOVE THROUGH THIS MORE QUICKLY.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO BRING UP  
23 DR. ECONOMOU'S COMMENT AFTER WE DON'T NEED A QUORUM.

24 MS. BAUM: BOB, I HATE TO DO THIS BECAUSE  
25 I KNOW THAT THE TIME IS SHORT. I JUST WANT TO NOTE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT THE 18-MONTH PROVISION MIGHT ACTUALLY UNDULY  
2 RESTRICT ALL OF OUR OPERATIONS IN THE EVENT THAT  
3 SOONER THAN THAT WE FIND THAT THE PROCESS IS  
4 BURDENSOME OR NOT WORKING.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, ELONA, IF IT'S NOT  
6 WORKING, IT CAN ALWAYS BE BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR  
7 RECONSIDERATION. IF IT'S NOT WORKING IN SIX MONTHS,  
8 WE CAN BRING IT UP AT THE BOARD.

9 MS. BAUM: OKAY. WITH THAT ON THE RECORD,  
10 I THINK THAT'S VERY HELPFUL.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IS THERE ANY PUBLIC  
12 COMMENT ON THIS? MR. HARRISON, ARE WE IN A POSITION  
13 TO CALL THE ROLL?

14 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE WE ARE.

15 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

16 DR. PRICE: YES.

17 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER.

18 DR. BRENNER: YES.

19 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

20 DR. BRYANT: YES.

21 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

22 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

24 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.

25 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.  
2 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.  
3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.  
4 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING. TED LOVE.  
5 DR. LOVE: YES.  
6 MS. KING: SHLOMO MELMED.  
7 DR. MELMED: YES.  
8 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
9 DR. PIZZO: YES.  
10 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
11 DR. POMEROY: YES.  
12 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.  
13 DR. PRIETO: AYE.  
14 MS. KING: ELIZABETH FINI.  
15 DR. FINI: YES.  
16 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.  
17 DR. QUINT: YES.  
18 MS. KING: JOHN REED.  
19 DR. REED: YES.  
20 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.  
21 MR. ROTH: YES.  
22 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.  
23 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.  
24 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.  
25 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

2 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

3 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

4 MR. TORRES: AYE.

5 MS. KING: JAMES ECONOMOU.

6 DR. ECONOMOU: YES.

7 MS. KING: AND THAT MOTION CARRIES FOR THE  
8 RECORD.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE, MR. HARRISON,  
10 THAT THAT COMPLETES THE ITEMS IN WHICH WE NEED A  
11 QUORUM.

12 MR. HARRISON: IT DOES INDEED.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO, WE HAVE TWO  
14 MINUTES TO SPARE.

15 DR. PIZZO: THANK YOU.

16 MS. KING: DR. PRIETO, IF YOU NEED TO GO  
17 AT THIS TIME, YOU CAN GO AS WELL, THOUGH IT SOUNDS  
18 LIKE THERE MAY BE SOMETHING ELSE TO DISCUSS.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO GET DR.  
20 ECONOMOU'S COMMENT, PLEASE.

21 DR. ECONOMOU: I'LL KEEP MY COMMENTS VERY  
22 SHORT. I THINK THE CONCERN THAT I HAVE ABOUT THESE  
23 EXTRAORDINARY PETITIONS IS THAT THE OVERSIGHT  
24 COMMITTEE IS BEING ASKED TO LOOK AT THESE PETITIONS  
25 AND TO REVIEW ASPECTS OF THE SCIENCE WHEN THEY

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HAVEN'T ACTUALLY READ THE APPLICATION, NOR WHEN MOST  
2 OF US ARE REALLY EVEN COMPETENT TO JUDGE THE  
3 SCIENCE.

4 SO I THINK THE ONLY COMMENT THAT I'D MAKE  
5 IS IT WOULD BE NICE IF THERE WERE SOME MECHANISM BY  
6 WHICH -- BY THE WAY, WE DON'T HAVE AN NIH STUDY  
7 SECTION MECHANISM, WHICH YOU CAN REVISE AN  
8 APPLICATION AND SEND IT BACK IN AND HAVE IT GO BACK  
9 TO THE SAME STUDY SECTION AND THEN HAVE THEM LOOK AT  
10 A REVISED APPLICATION WHERE THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN  
11 THINGS THAT THEY HAD OVERLOOKED. IT WOULD BE NICE  
12 IF THERE WERE SOME SORT OF MECHANISM TO WHICH  
13 SPECIFIC SCIENTIFIC ISSUES IN WHICH THERE MIGHT BE A  
14 DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND THE REVIEWERS  
15 COULD BE REREVIEWED BEFORE IT'S PRESENTED TO THIS  
16 COMMITTEE. AND THAT WAY WE DON'T HAVE TO BE PUT  
17 INTO AN UNCOMFORTABLE SITUATION OF EVALUATING THE  
18 SCIENCE AS OPPOSED TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH  
19 THEME IN THE CONTEXT OF CIRM. THAT'S THE ONLY  
20 COMMENT THAT I'D LIKE TO MAKE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. ECONOMOU, TO GO  
22 DIRECTLY TO THAT ISSUE, THIS LAST MOTION ON ITEM 7  
23 YOU ADOPTED PROVIDES FOR A BOARD OPTION TO REQUEST  
24 ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS AND FOR A PROCESS WHERE WE CAN  
25 HAVE A LIMITED RECONSIDERATION OF INFORMATION. SO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HOPEFULLY THAT IS DIRECTLY IN LINE WITH YOUR  
2 THINKING, AT LEAST AS AN EXPERIMENT.

3 SECONDLY, I WOULD SAY THAT HOPEFULLY ON  
4 THE BOARD AND THE BOARD'S DESIGN IS INTENDED TO  
5 ACHIEVE A SITUATION WHERE SOME MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
6 WILL HAVE DIRECT EXPERIENCE RELATED TO EACH  
7 APPLICATION DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY; BUT GIVEN THE  
8 BROAD LEVEL OF EXPERTISE ON THE BOARD AND THE  
9 PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES THAT ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION, AS  
10 DR. REED SAYS, WE HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE IN  
11 STRATEGIC DISCUSSIONS WHICH WE ARE HIGHLY QUALIFIED  
12 TO PARTICIPATE IN. BUT IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, WITH  
13 THE BENEFIT OF SCIENTIFIC STAFF WHICH PARTICULARLY  
14 STUDIES THESE ISSUES, WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO GET A  
15 GROUP OF BOARD MEMBERS WITHOUT CONFLICTS TO REALLY  
16 GET INTO THE PROPRIETARY INFORMATION. AND  
17 CONSTITUTIONALLY THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO US SO THAT  
18 WE CAN PRESENT PROPERLY THE CASE THAT WHEN THERE IS  
19 A DISCUSSION THAT'S GOING TO DELVE DOWN TO THOSE  
20 LEVELS, THAT WE, WITH SCIENTIFIC STAFF SUPPORT, CAN  
21 APPROPRIATELY JUDGE THE MERIT BECAUSE WE HAVE TO BE  
22 CHARGED WITH THE FINAL DECISIONS ON BOTH SCIENTIFIC  
23 AND STRATEGIC OR PROGRAMMATIC GROUNDS.

24 BUT IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE AS A  
25 TELECONFERENCE, WE WERE NOT ABLE TO GO INTO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROPRIETARY SESSION, WHICH ENCUMBERED OUR ABILITY TO  
2 GET DOWN TO THE LEVEL OF SOME PROPRIETARY ISSUES AND  
3 CONFLICTS. IN ANY CASE, WE CONTINUALLY STRIVE TO  
4 IMPROVE THIS PROCESS. AND HOPEFULLY ITEM 7 WE  
5 ADOPTED TODAY, AS YOU QUITE PROPERLY OR MAYBE  
6 INTUITIVELY POINTED IN THAT DIRECTION, WILL HELP US  
7 GET ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK WHEN IT'S NECESSARY.

8 DR. ECONOMOU: I'M IN COMPLETE AGREEMENT.  
9 I JUST WANTED TO -- SINCE I SPOKE OUT AT THE WRONG  
10 TIME, I JUST WANTED TO GET MY FULL COMMENT ON THE  
11 RECORD EVEN THOUGH IT WAS MALPOSITIONED IN THE  
12 AGENDA. THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE THANK YOU SO MUCH.

14 MR. ROTH: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A SIMILAR  
15 COMMENT, BUT MUCH BROADER. I THINK WE'VE BEEN AT  
16 THIS NOW FIVE YEARS PLUS. AND I THINK IT'S TIME  
17 THAT WE STEP BACK AND HAVE A CAREFUL REVIEW OF HOW  
18 WE FORMULATE OUR REVIEW PROCESS. I THINK WE SHOULD  
19 BRING SOME OUTSIDE EXPERTS IN AND HAVE A COMMITTEE,  
20 THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE, REALLY STAND BACK AND SAY  
21 WHAT'S WORKING AND WHAT ISN'T BECAUSE I THINK  
22 THERE'S SOME THINGS THAT -- I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW  
23 WE GET THEM TO THE BOARD AND HOW WE GO INTO, QUOTE,  
24 PRESENTATIONS NOW FROM CERTAIN PEOPLE WHO, YOU KNOW,  
25 WANT THEIR GRANT FUNDED. AND THOSE SORT OF THINGS,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN ADDITION TO THE POINTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BY THE  
2 PATIENT ADVOCATES ABOUT HOW WE COMMUNICATE THAT, ALL  
3 OF THOSE SHOULD BE RELOOKED. AND IT SHOULD BE DONE  
4 IN A COMPREHENSIVE WAY SO THAT WE KEEP THE INTEGRITY  
5 OF THIS PROCESS. IT IS CORE TO WHAT WE DO.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I HEARTILY AGREE WITH  
7 YOU, DUANE. AND HOPEFULLY ON THE 8TH WHEN WE HAVE  
8 THE STRATEGIC SCIENTIFIC PLAN REVIEW, WE'LL GET SOME  
9 COMMENTS THAT WILL GO TO THE GENERAL SCOPE OF WHAT  
10 IS WORKING, WHAT NEW CHANGES WE CAN MAKE TO IMPROVE  
11 THE PROCESS. BUT I THINK THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE  
12 IS GOING TO HAVE TO HAVE SOME VIBRANT DISCUSSIONS ON  
13 THIS TOPIC AS WE CONTINUE TO TRY AND IMPROVE. AND I  
14 KNOW THAT YOU WILL BE A VERY ACTIVE PARTICIPANT IN  
15 THAT PROCESS, SO I'M GOING TO LOOK FORWARD TO THAT  
16 DISCUSSION.

17 UNFORTUNATELY I WON'T GET TO PARTICIPATE  
18 IN ALL THOSE DISCUSSIONS, BUT I WANT TO SAY THAT THE  
19 STATE LAW, OF COURSE, MAKES CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF  
20 US IN TERMS OF WHAT OUR OPTIONS ARE AND EMPOWERS  
21 THIS BOARD, BUT ALSO PUTS A GREAT DEAL OF  
22 RESPONSIBILITY ON THIS BOARD TO MAKE DECISIONS  
23 REPRESENTING THE SEVEN MILLION VOTERS AND EVERYONE  
24 ELSE IN CALIFORNIA THAT WE HAVE A BOLD EXPERIMENT  
25 HERE THAT HAS PRODUCED A LOT OF GREAT SCIENTIFIC

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DECISIONS, BUT WE PROBABLY IN THE COURSE OF THIS  
2 PROCESS MAKE SOME THAT DON'T COME OUT AS WELL. AND  
3 I APPLAUD YOUR DIRECTION TO US TO COMMIT OURSELVES  
4 TO A FORMAL PROCESS HERE TO IMPROVE IT.

5 SO IS THERE ANY OTHER BOARD COMMENTS THAT  
6 WOULD LIKE TO BE MADE?

7 MS. SAMUELSON: NOT TO BELABOR THAT ISSUE,  
8 BUT I THINK IT'S MORE IMPORTANT THAT WE ADDRESS  
9 THIS. I'M GLAD WE'RE GOING TO SEND SOME OF THESE  
10 BACK TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE. I THINK SOME SORT  
11 OF EXTERNAL REVIEW, AS DUANE IS SAYING, IS  
12 NECESSARY.

13 AND I AGREE. WE'VE BEEN HEARING  
14 REPEATEDLY ABOUT IN THE EXTRAORDINARY PETITION  
15 PROCESS THAT I DON'T DISAGREE WITH THAT. I AGREE  
16 WITH A LOT OF IT.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I'D LIKE TO JUST  
18 REMIND EVERYONE, AND MAYBE MR. HARRISON CAN ALSO  
19 COMMENT, EVERY APPLICANT UNDER STATE LAW HAS THE  
20 RIGHT TO COME TO THIS BOARD. WE'VE TRIED TO CREATE  
21 A PROCESS THAT MAKES IT A MORE ORDERLY PROCESS WHERE  
22 WE CAN GET ENOUGH LEAD-TIME TO HAVE A GOOD  
23 SCIENTIFIC INPUT FROM OUR SCIENTIFIC STAFF. AND  
24 THAT PROCESS HOPEFULLY COMMUNICATES VERY CLEARLY  
25 THAT IF PEOPLE DON'T PERFORM WITHIN THE TIME LIMITS,



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEY SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THEIR OPPORTUNITY FOR  
2 APPROVAL. BUT IF WE DIDN'T HAVE AN EXTRAORDINARY  
3 PETITION PROCESS, PEOPLE COULD STILL MAKE A  
4 PRESENTATION.

5 SO WITHIN STATE LAW, WE'RE TRYING TO  
6 CREATE A PROCESS THAT HAS INTEGRITY AND ADDRESSES  
7 GIVING US AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE SCIENCE WHERE  
8 AN ISSUE CAN ARISE AND PROVIDES AN OPPORTUNITY FOR  
9 AN APPLICANT TO SUBMIT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, BUT  
10 WE CERTAINLY NEED A VIGOROUS REVIEW OF THIS.

11 MR. HARRISON, IS THAT A CORRECT STATEMENT,  
12 THAT THERE'S A LEGAL RIGHT UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW FOR  
13 THESE APPLICANTS TO APPEAR AND MAKE A PUBLIC  
14 COMMENT?

15 MR. HARRISON: YES, THAT'S RIGHT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO ANY  
17 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENT?

18 DR. PRIETO: WE'RE NOT VOTING ON ANYTHING  
19 ELSE NOW, ARE WE?

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. HARRISON, MY  
21 UNDERSTANDING IS WE'VE COVERED EVERYTHING THAT NEEDS  
22 A VOTE.

23 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S RIGHT. WE'VE  
24 COMPLETED ALL OUR AGENDA ITEMS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 FOR THOSE THAT CAN STAY AND ARE NOT BOUND BY TIME,  
2 AND, DR. PRIETO, WE RECOGNIZE THAT YOU ARE, I'D LIKE  
3 TO WELCOME ANY ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT. HEARING  
4 NO ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT, I'D LIKE TO ADJOURN  
5 THE MEETING AND THANK EVERYONE.

6 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT  
7 01:08 P.M.)

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
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 TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2010, 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  
(714) 444-4100