BEFORE THE LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT

REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 2010

4:30 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 86832

INDEX

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO 0	RDER	3
ROLL CALL		3
CONSIDERA	TION OF SB 1064 (ALQUIST)	32
CONSIDERA	TION OF AB 52 (PORTANTINO)	3
PUBLIC CO	MMENT	NONE

2

1	LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE, THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 2010
2	4:30 P.M.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN TORRES: LET ME CALL THE
5	SUBCOMMITTEE TO ORDER AND WE'LL CALL THE ROLL.
6	MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN FOR SUSAN BRYANT.
7	DR. LEVIN: HERE.
8	MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG. BOB KLEIN.
9	MR. KLEIN: HERE.
10	MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
11	DR. POMEROY: HERE.
12	MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO. JOHN REED.
13	DUANE ROTH.
14	MR. ROTH: HERE.
15	MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
16	MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.
17	MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
18	MR. SHEEHY: HERE.
19	MS. KING: ART TORRES.
20	CHAIRMAN TORRES: HERE.
21	MS. KING: WE DO HAVE A QUORUM.
22	CHAIRMAN TORRES: FINE. EXCELLENT. WE'RE
23	GOING TO PROCEED, THEN, ON THE AGENDA WITHOUT ANY
24	OBJECTION TO ITEM NO. 4, WHICH WE'LL CONSIDER
25	ASSEMBLYMEMBER ANTHONY PORTANTINO'S LEGISLATION,
	3

1072 BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626 1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM

1	ASSEMBLY BILL 52.
2	WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO FIRST, ASSEMBLYMEMBER,
3	IS TO HAVE OUR LEGAL COUNSEL, JAMES HARRISON, GIVE
4	US A QUICK OVERVIEW AND THEN TURN IT OVER TO YOU.
5	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: FANTASTIC.
6	MR. HARRISON: GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYONE.
7	WE'RE GLAD TO HAVE THE AUTHOR OF THE BILL,
8	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO, ON THE CALL WITH US TODAY
9	SO THAT IF I MISSPEAK, HE CAN CORRECT ME.
10	EXISTING LAW REQUIRES THE DEPARTMENT OF
11	PUBLIC HEALTH TO ESTABLISH AN UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD
12	COLLECTION PROGRAM, AND IT AUTHORIZES DPH TO
13	CONTRACT WITH BLOOD BANKS IN CALIFORNIA TO PROVIDE
14	UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD BANKING SERVICES.
15	AB 52 WOULD ESTABLISH AN OVERSIGHT BOARD,
16	THE UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD COLLECTION BOARD, TO
17	ADMINISTER THE PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM WOULD BE FUNDED
18	BY RAISING THE FEE FOR CERTIFIED COPIES OF BIRTH
19	CERTIFICATES FROM \$7 TO \$9. THE DELTA THERE, THE
20	\$2, WOULD GO TOWARDS THE UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD
21	COLLECTION PROGRAM FUND.
22	THE AUTHOR, IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO
23	CHAIRMAN TORRES, HAS EXPRESSED CONCERNS ABOUT THE
24	DESIRE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH TO
25	ADMINISTER THE PROGRAM GIVEN THE FACT THAT IT
	,

1	CURRENTLY ADMINISTERS OVER 300 OTHER PROGRAMS AND
2	HAS EXPRESSED INTEREST IN CONSIDERING WHETHER CIRM
3	COULD HOUSE THE UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD PROGRAM.
4	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
5	MR. HARRISON. ASSEMBLYMEMBER, YOU WANT TO PROCEED
6	TO PRESENT THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF YOUR
7	LEGISLATION AND THE RATIONALE.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN PORTANTINO: THANK YOU VERY
9	MUCH, SENATOR, AND THANK YOU, BOARD MEMBERS, FOR
10	LETTING ME PRESENT THIS IDEA TO YOU. MANY OF YOU
11	KNOW THAT THIS IS A PASSION FOR ME PERSONALLY. ONE
12	OF MY NEIGHBOR'S SON, WHO'S NOW A SENIOR AT LOYOLA
13	MARYMOUNT, WHEN HE WAS TODDLER I BELIEVE WAS ONE OF
14	CALIFORNIA'S FIRST CORD BLOOD RECIPIENTS AS A
15	TODDLER, AND IT SAVED HIS LIFE BY CURING HIS
16	LEUKEMIA. AND SO I'VE BEEN PASSIONATE ABOUT THIS
17	ISSUE FOR A LONG TIME. AND WHEN MY OWN DAUGHTER
18	GAVE BIRTH OR MY WIFE GAVE BIRTH TO MY SECOND
19	DAUGHTER, WE ENDEAVORED TO DONATE HER CORD BLOOD AND
20	WAS QUITE CONCERNED THAT THERE WAS NO PUBLIC
21	OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO DO THAT. AND SO THAT'S THE
22	GENESIS OF THE PERSONAL SIDE.
23	ON THE POLICY SIDE, WE FEEL, BECAUSE
24	CALIFORNIA HAS THE MOST DIVERSE BLOOD SUPPLY IN THE
25	WORLD WITH THE 500,000 BIRTHS A YEAR AND THE FASTEST

1	GROWING SEGMENT ONE OF THE FASTEST GROWING
2	SEGMENTS IS THE INTERRACIAL COMPONENT OF OUR BLOOD
3	SUPPLY, THE DIVERSITY OF OUR BLOOD SUPPLY, AND GIVEN
4	THE DEFICIENCY IN NATIONAL AVAILABILITY OF A DIVERSE
5	BLOOD SUPPLY, WE THINK CALIFORNIA IS THE PERFECT
6	PLACE TO CREATE A PROGRAM. AND THE ESTIMATES THAT
7	WE'VE GONE THROUGH WITH THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS AND
8	ESTIMATES ARE THE NUMBER OF LIVES WE COULD SAVE BY
9	HAVING A PUBLICLY AVAILABLE CORD BLOOD SYSTEM IN
10	CALIFORNIA IS SIGNIFICANT AND SOMETHING WORTH
11	STRIVING FOR.
12	TO THAT END, OUR EFFORTS TO SET IT UP
13	WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT HAVE NOT BEEN MET WARMLY, SO
14	TO SPEAK, EVEN TO THE POINT WHEN WE GOT FEDERAL
15	GRANT MONEY TO HELP START THIS PROGRAM, THE
16	DEPARTMENT STILL WAS NOT WELL RECEIVING THAT MONEY
17	FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR WAS GOING TO TAKE IT
18	FOR OTHER PURPOSES.
19	SO THE EXCITING THING FOR US WAS TO LOOK
20	AT WHAT YOU'RE DOING AND AUGMENT AND BROADEN WHAT
21	CIRM IS DOING IN THE FIELD OF UMBILICAL CORD AND PUT
22	BOTH RESEARCH AND DONATIONS INTO ONE UMBRELLA WITHIN
23	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
24	SO WHAT WE HAVE BEEN OPEN TO AND
25	SUGGESTING IS THAT WE AMEND OUR LEGISLATION TO HOUSE

1	THE PROGRAM UNDER YOUR UMBRELLA AND HAVE YOU HOUSE
2	AND IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAM. WE ALSO SEE AN ECONOMIC
3	FACTOR THAT MAKES IT EXCITING AS WELL. AS WE
4	COLLECT THE INVENTORY AND WE MAKE IT AVAILABLE TO
5	THE GENERAL PUBLIC, WHEN A DOCTOR WOULD PRESCRIBE A
6	DONOR MATCH, YOU WOULD GET REIMBURSED FOR THE COST
7	OF COLLECTION. SO WE SEE THIS AS A SELF-SUSTAINING
8	PROJECT THAT WOULD NOT ONLY SAVE LIVES, BUT CONTINUE
9	TO PAY FOR ITSELF ONCE THE INVENTORY WOULD BE
10	SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH.
11	I'M A FAN OF WHAT YOU'RE DOING AND SEEING
12	HOW, YOU KNOW, CERTAINLY WITH EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
13	RESEARCH AND AVAILABILITY, THERE'S LOTS OF
14	EXCITEMENT, BUT WITH CORD BLOOD, THE IMPLEMENTATION
15	CAN BE QUICK, IT CAN BE UP AND GOING RELATIVELY
16	EASILY WITH EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE, AND HAVE THE
17	ABILITY TO NOT ONLY SAVE LIVES, BUT PRECIOUS
18	HEALTHCARE DOLLARS BECAUSE, AS OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE
19	DONE COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF CORD BLOOD, THEY SEE
20	THE CURE VERSUS THE LIFETIME TREATMENT COST AND THE
21	MYRIAD OF DISEASES THAT HAS BEEN KNOWN HAD SUCCESS
22	IN CURING AS A POSITIVE BENEFIT ON THE FINANCIAL
23	SIDE.
24	SO WE ARE VERY EXCITED ABOUT THE
25	OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT TO YOU THIS IDEA OF HOUSING

1	THE PROGRAM AT CIRM. AND SO THAT'S WHAT WE'RE OPEN
2	TO DO WITH THE LEGISLATION, TO HAVE A DEDICATED
3	REVENUE SOURCE OF THE BIRTH CERTIFICATE FEE THEN
4	WHATEVER FEDERAL RESOURCES WE CAN CONTINUE TO BRING
5	TO THE TABLE TO FUND THIS PROJECT AND HAVE IT BE
6	SELF-SUSTAINING. AND, AGAIN, I GO TO THE 500,000
7	BIRTHS A YEAR IN CALIFORNIA, MANY OF THEM IN OUR
8	URBAN HOSPITALS THAT HAVE A DIVERSE BLOOD SUPPLY
9	THAT WE NEED IN THE REGISTRY, THE MATHEMATICAL
10	ADVANTAGES TO CORD BLOOD VERSUS BONE MARROW, THE
11	EASIER IT IS TO MATCH, THE EASIER IT IS TO SAVE A
12	LIFE. WE THINK CALIFORNIA HAS THE BLOOD SUPPLY THAT
13	WE NEED, THE BIRTHS THAT WE NEED, THE MINORITY
14	POPULATION THAT IS IN NEED OF DONORS, AND WE JUST
15	SEE A WIN-WIN-WIN FOR EVERYBODY.
16	SO THAT'S THE SHORT PROPOSAL, AND I'M
17	EXCITED TO PRESENT IT TO YOU.
18	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU. TWO THINGS
19	FIRST, ASSEMBLYMEMBER. FIRST OF ALL, YOU KNOW THAT
20	I ADMIRE THE WORK THAT YOU'VE BEEN DOING IN THE
21	LEGISLATURE AND YOU'VE BEEN A VERY PERSISTENT
22	ADVOCATE, NOT ONLY ON THIS ISSUE, BUT ON SO MANY
23	OTHER ISSUES. AND YOUR ADVOCACY FOR YOUR
24	CONSTITUENTS ESPECIALLY DURING THESE MUDSLIDES AND
25	RAINSTORMS, I KNOW, HAVE BEEN A CHALLENGE FOR YOU

1	AND THE PEOPLE THAT YOU REPRESENT. LET ME PUT THAT
2	OUT FRONT FIRST.
3	SECONDLY, FOR THE PURPOSES OF OUR
4	DISCUSSION, I REALLY DON'T WANT TO HAVE THE
5	SUBCOMMITTEE TAKE A POSITION OF OPPOSITION OR IN
6	SUPPORT OF THIS LEGISLATION, BUT TO SUPPORT THE
7	CONCEPT. AND LET ME EXPLAIN HOW I'D LIKE TO SEE
8	THAT HAPPEN WITH THE HELP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND
9	THEN THE REACTIONS FROM YOUR GUESTS THAT ARE THERE,
10	ANTHONY, I'M SURE, AT DR. POMEROY'S OFFICE. RATHER,
11	WE INSTRUCT THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF, THE LEADERSHIP OF
12	DR. TROUNSON, TO EXAMINE WHAT OTHER ALTERNATIVES
13	THERE MIGHT BE THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO POTENTIALLY
14	FUND THAT WOULD NOT BE HOUSED WITHIN CIRM, BUT WOULD
15	BE AN RFP OR AN RFA, I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY THE LEGAL
16	TERM FOR IT, THAT WOULD ALLOW US TO EXPLORE THAT
17	WITH SCIENTIFIC STAFF, NO. 1. ALSO TO EXPLORE IT
18	WITH SCIENTIFIC STAFF NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT IN
19	OTHER STATES AND IN THE FEDERAL EXPERIENCE.
20	THIRDLY, THERE'S SOMETHING THAT THE OTHER
21	VICE CHAIR OF THIS ORGANIZATION, MY COLLEAGUE DUANE
22	ROTH, EDUCATED ME ABOUT TOO, AND THAT IS THE NUMBER
23	OF LIABILITY ISSUES THAT WE NEED TO LOOK AT AS WELL.
24	SO I'D LIKE TO PROFFER TO THIS
25	SUBCOMMITTEE A MOTION TO REFER THIS TO THE

1	SCIENTIFIC STAFF AND TO COME UP WITH ALTERNATIVES
2	THAT WE MIGHT CONSIDER AND THAT WE MIGHT EVENTUALLY
3	PROVIDE DO EXACTLY WHAT YOU WANT TO DO, BUT IN A
4	DIFFERENT FORM RATHER THAN HOUSING IT WITH CIRM.
5	I SPOKE ABOUT THIS POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE
6	TO THE ASSEMBLYMEMBER, AND I KNOW HE WAS GOING TO
7	GIVE IT SOME THOUGHT. BUT I'D LIKE TO RECEIVE A
8	SECOND ON THAT MOTION SO WE PUT IT FORWARD.
9	MR. KLEIN: SECOND.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRES: NOW COMMENTS.
11	MS. KING: THE SECOND, FOR THE RECORD, IS
12	BY ROBERT KLEIN.
13	MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. AND
14	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO, I TOO HAVE A DAUGHTER
15	YOURS WAS A NEIGHBOR. MY DAUGHTER RECENTLY GAVE
16	BIRTH, AND WE VERY MUCH ARE A BELIEVER IN THE VALUE
17	OF MAINTAINING THE CORD BLOOD SUPPLY AND WITH THE
18	POTENTIAL FOR LEUKEMIA AND RECENT RESEARCH IS GOING
19	INTO AREAS SUCH AS EPILEPSY WHERE THERE ARE CLINICAL
20	TRIALS GOING ON WITH POTENTIALLY VERY IMPORTANT
21	RESULTS. SO I THINK THIS IS GOING TO BE A GROWING
22	AREA OF IMPORTANCE THROUGH MANY AREAS OF DISEASE.
23	AND IT'S A UNIQUE POSITIONING FOR
24	CALIFORNIA, AS YOU MENTION, BECAUSE OF OUR
25	DIVERSITY, TO HAVE A NATIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLE HERE.
	10

1	SO I DO THINK YOU'VE BEEN A GREAT CHAMPION OF THIS
2	IDEA, AND IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE SEE WHAT WE CAN DO
3	SIDE BY SIDE TO WORK WITH YOU TO MOVE THIS FORWARD.
4	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: THAT'S VERY
5	EXCITING. MY GOAL IS TO KEEP MOVING THIS TO THE
6	POINT WHERE WE'RE ACTUALLY, YOU KNOW, HAVING AN
7	INVENTORY TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF THIS DIVERSE STATE
8	AND IMPLEMENT. OBVIOUSLY WE KNOW THAT THE UC'S IN
9	THE PAST, UCLA HAD A PUBLIC SYSTEM THAT WAS UP AND
10	GOING, BUT NO LONGER EXISTS. WE'RE LOOKING FOR A
11	CREATIVE WAY TO KEEP THIS MOVING AND COME UP WE
12	THINK WE'VE COME UP WITH A DEDICATED REVENUE SOURCE.
13	SO I'M DEFINITELY OPEN TO HAVING YOU FIGURE OUT A
14	WAY TO ADMINISTER AND SEE THAT WE CAN USE THE
15	EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE OUT THERE.
16	IT'S ALWAYS BEEN OUR HOPE THAT WE'RE NOT
17	CREATING SOMETHING KNEW, THAT WE'RE USING THE
18	EXISTING SYSTEM OUT THERE BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY WE DON'T
19	HAVE A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF MONEY, BUT IT'S ALSO AN
20	AREA WHERE YOU CAN THE COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF
21	USING THE INFRASTRUCTURE, BROADENING THE INVENTORY
22	HAS TREMENDOUS BENEFIT. SO I'M DEFINITELY OPEN TO
23	GETTING FURTHER INPUT FROM YOU AND TO SEE WHAT
24	CREATIVE IDEAS YOU COME UP WITH.
25	CHAIRMAN TORRES: DR. TROUNSON AND
	11

	-
1	MR. SHEEHY.
2	DR. TROUNSON: IT'S ALAN TROUNSON,
3	PRESIDENT OF CIRM. YOU KNOW, THERE ARE SEVERAL
4	ISSUES THAT WE REALLY HAVE TO DEAL WITH. SO I
5	APPRECIATE HAVING SOME TIME TO WORK THROUGH THESE
6	THINGS. CIRM, AS YOU KNOW, MAY NOT EXIST BEYOND A
7	CERTAIN POINT IN TIME, AND THAT MAY BE A PROBLEM FOR
8	SETTING UP A FACILITY IF WE DON'T HAVE A RUN-ON
9	OPTION FOR THAT.
10	WE ALSO DON'T HAVE SUITABLE FACILITIES
11	PRESENTLY TO DO ANY LABORATORY WORK, SO WE WOULD
12	HAVE TO CONSIDER WHERE THOSE FACILITIES WERE AND HOW
13	MUCH THEY WOULD COST AND HOW MUCH THAT PROGRAM WOULD
14	TAKE.
15	SO I ACTUALLY HAVE SPOKEN TO PROBABLY THE
16	LEADING PERSON IN THE AREA IN THE WORLD, IRV
17	WEISSMAN, TODAY. AND I ASKED HIM TO, IN THINKING
18	ABOUT THIS, JOIN US AND PUT TOGETHER A SCIENTIFIC
19	GROUP TO TRY AND START TO THINK THROUGH THIS IN A
20	REALLY LOGICAL WAY SO THAT IF WE DO SAY YES TO IT,
21	THAT'S IT'S REALLY GOT SOME SENSE ABOUT IT AND WE
22	CAN SEE THAT IT HAS A SUSTAINABLE COMPONENT THAT
23	WOULD ALLOW US TO CONTINUE, AND WE DO DEAL WITH THE
24	VERY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES OF LIABILITY, OF COURSE,
25	THAT EXIST IN SUCH AREAS.

1	SO I THINK I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THE TIME
2	TO DO A PROPER STUDY OF IT, HAVE SOME SENIOR PEOPLE
3	FROM AROUND THE U.S. MEET AND WORK WITH US TO GET A
4	REASONABLE REPORT BACK TO YOU, CHAIR, AS TO HOW IT
5	MIGHT BE ACCOMMODATED. IF IT'S NOT THAT WE'RE ABLE
6	TO ACCOMMODATE IT, I THINK WE SHOULD BE VERY CLEAR
7	ABOUT THAT IN THE REPORT TO YOU. BUT IF WE'RE ABLE
8	TO FIGURE OUT A WAY WHICH IT COULD BE ACCOMMODATED,
9	THEN I WANT TO BE CLEAR ABOUT THAT.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I JUST WANTED TO THANK
11	YOU, DR. TROUNSON. I WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT THE
12	ASSEMBLYMEMBER HEARD YOUR REMARKS TO LET HIM KNOW
13	HOW SERIOUSLY WE HAVE TAKEN YOUR IDEA,
14	ASSEMBLYMEMBER, AND THE FACT THAT THERE'S BEEN
15	OUTREACH, NOT ONLY TO POLICYMAKERS, BUT ALSO TO
16	SCIENTIFIC ADVISORS BEFORE WE PROCEEDED TO MAKE A
17	DECISION REGARDING YOUR LEGISLATION.
18	MR. SHEEHY: FIRST I WANT TO THANK
19	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO FOR THINKING OF US. I AM
20	INCREDIBLY GRATEFUL FOR THE REGARD THAT YOU HOLD US.
21	AND WE'VE BEEN WORKING HARD, AND I THINK WE'VE
22	ACCOMPLISHED A LOT. AND THE FACT THAT YOU LOOK AT
23	US AS BEING ABLE TO FULFILL THIS ROLE IS EXTREMELY
24	COMPLIMENTARY TO ME. AND I THINK MY COLLEAGUES AND
25	ALL OF US HAVE BEEN WORKING OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS

1	TO GET THIS UP AND RUNNING.
2	I WANT TO SAY I'M VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THIS
3	GOING FORWARD. WE'VE TALKED ABOUT CORD BLOOD
4	BEFORE. PAUL BERG, NOBEL PRIZE WINNER FROM
5	STANFORD, URGED US DURING OUR STRATEGIC PLANNING
6	SESSIONS AT THE OUTSET OF THIS AGENCY TO GET
7	INVOLVED IN CORD BLOOD WORK. I HOPE THAT WE'LL LOOK
8	TO PEOPLE UP HERE THAT ARE NEARBY LIKE BURT LUBIN,
9	WHO HAS A CORD BLOOD BANK AT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL.
10	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: ABSOLUTELY.
11	MR. SHEEHY: MAYBE NOT NECESSARILY I
12	KNOW DR. WEISSMAN IS AN ESTEEMED RESEARCHER, BUT
13	WE'RE NOT TALKING NECESSARILY ABOUT RESEARCH PER SE.
14	AND THAT, YOU KNOW, LET'S TALK TO PEOPLE WHO ARE
15	WORKING IN THE CORD BLOOD FIELD, FIGURE OUT A WAY TO
16	MAKE THIS WORK BECAUSE WE'RE ABOUT REGENERATIVE
17	MEDICINE, AND THAT GOES ALL THE WAY FROM EMBRYONIC
18	STEM CELLS AND INDUCED PLURIPOTENT CELLS TO THE
19	VARIOUS TYPES OF ADULT CELLS, AND WE SHOULD BE ABLE
20	TO COVER THE WHOLE SPECTRUM FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF
21	CALIFORNIA WORKING WITH ALL DIFFERENT CELL TYPES.
22	AND I THINK THIS IS JUST AN AMAZING OPPORTUNITY FOR
23	US TO BE MORE PRESENT, MORE INVOLVED IN TRYING TO
24	GET RESEARCH AND CURES TO PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA. AND
25	I AM INCREDIBLY GRATEFUL TO YOU FOR BRINGING THIS TO

1	US.
2	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM
3	MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE?
4	DR. PRIETO: MR. CHAIRMAN, FRANCISCO
5	PRIETO HERE FROM SACRAMENTO. I JUST I ALSO WANT
6	TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND APPRECIATE WHAT JEFF JUST SAID,
7	BUT I HAD SOME OF THE SAME THOUGHTS WHEN I SAW THIS
8	PROPOSAL THAT ALAN TROUNSON BROUGHT UP, THAT WHAT
9	HAPPENS WHEN CIRM IS NO LONGER AROUND. AND I
10	THOUGHT THAT YOUR SUGGESTION OF DOING THIS AS AN RFA
11	OR AN RFP TO PUT A PROGRAM IN PLACE IN THE WAY WE
12	USUALLY DO, SEND OUT A REQUEST FOR PEOPLE'S IDEAS,
13	HAVE THEM COME BACK WITH HOW CAN WE GET THIS DONE,
14	AND THEN BASICALLY GET IT STARTED IN A WAY THAT
15	WOULD BE SUSTAINABLE AFTER WE'RE GONE. I THINK THIS
16	SOUNDS LIKE AN EXCELLENT IDEA TO ME.
17	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ANYONE ELSE?
18	MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S DUANE ROTH.
19	SO I WOULD LIKE TO AGAIN ALSO THANK THE
20	ASSEMBLYMEMBER FOR BRINGING THIS TO OUR ATTENTION.
21	AND I WANT TO SUPPORT THE MOTION THAT'S ON THE
22	FLOOR, THAT WE DO OUR SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION
23	INTERNALLY AND MAKE SURE WE UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS WE
24	WOULD BE GETTING OURSELVES INTO AND MAKE SURE THAT
25	WE, IN FACT, DELIVER ON THE REQUEST THAT'S BEING
	15

1	MADE.
2	SO IN ADDITION TO THE SCIENCE, I HOPE THAT
3	WE WILL HAVE A LOOK AT THE SORT OF OPERATIONAL
4	IMPACT, THE REVENUE VERSUS WHAT THE COST MIGHT BE,
5	LIABILITY, AND SO ON.
6	BUT THE FINAL COMMENT I WANT TO MAKE, AND
7	THIS GOES TO THE FACT THAT I DON'T WANT TO ARGUE
8	WHETHER IT'S AN IMPORTANT ASPECT OF WHAT WE DO AND
9	FITS WITHIN IT. I THINK THAT'S VALID ON THE
10	SURFACE. HOWEVER, I THINK ALSO THE FACT THAT WE ARE
11	REALLY A GRANT AGENCY AS OPPOSED TO AN OPERATIONAL
12	AGENCY. WE DON'T REALLY HAVE THE KINDS OF EXPERTISE
13	TODAY THAT, IF WE WERE TO TAKE THIS ON, THAT ARE
14	EVEN CLOSELY ALIGNED WITH THE KIND OF EXPERTISE WE'D
15	HAVE TO ADD TO OVERSEE SOMETHING LIKE THIS. SO WE
16	NEED TO CONSIDER THAT AS WELL TO THE OTHER THINGS
17	THAT HAVE BEEN MENTIONED IN TERMS OF TIMING AND SO
18	ON.
19	BUT TODAY WE WOULD NOT HAVE THIS TYPE OF
20	EXPERTISE, ANYTHING CLOSE TO THIS TYPE OF EXPERTISE.
21	THE THING WE SHARE IN COMMON IS STEM CELLS, AND
22	THAT'S KIND OF WHERE COMMONALITY WOULD END. SO WE'D
23	HAVE TO REALLY ASSESS THAT, I THINK, VERY CAREFULLY
24	BECAUSE THE WORST THING WE COULD DO FOR YOU IS,
25	ASSEMBLYMEMBER, TAKE THIS RESPONSIBILITY AND NOT

1	DELIVER.
2	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU, DUANE.
3	AGAIN, I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE, ANTHONY, YOU KNOW
4	THAT DUANE ROTH HAS BEEN EXTREMELY HELPFUL TO ME IN
5	EDUCATING ME ABOUT THIS ISSUE. HE'S HAD SOME
6	EXPERIENCES THERE WITH THE SAN DIEGO BLOOD BANK.
7	MR. ROTH: ACTUALLY THERE'S SOME GOOD
8	NEWS. WE HAD A RATHER BAD EXPERIENCE HERE A FEW
9	YEARS AGO. AND THE GOOD NEWS IS THEY'RE ACTUALLY
10	HAVING A DISCUSSION ABOUT REINSTATING THE PROGRAM
11	THAT THEY HAD TO GET OUT OF. SO UNDERSTANDING ALL
12	OF THOSE ISSUES FROM PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN THERE,
13	DONE THAT, I THINK, IS VERY IMPORTANT AS WELL.
14	SO I THINK THERE'S BETTER NEWS AHEAD. THE
15	QUESTION IS WHO ARE THE RIGHT PEOPLE TO OVERSEE THIS
16	AND TO GET IT GOING AGAIN.
17	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM
18	MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE?
19	MS. SAMUELSON: JOAN SAMUELSON. ALL OF MY
20	THOUGHTS AND COMMENTS HAVE BEEN STATED QUITE ABLY BY
21	MY COLLEAGUES, SO I WON'T REPEAT THEM. BUT I WANT
22	TO JOIN IN THANKING THE ASSEMBLYMEMBER FOR BRINGING
23	THIS TO OUR ATTENTION. CLEARLY WE SHARE AN
24	OVERARCHING, STRONG CONCERN ABOUT A MISSION OF
25	URGENT DEVELOPMENT OF CURES.
	4-7

1	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: RIGHT.
2	MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S ALL TO THE GOOD THAT
3	WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HOW WE CAN DO THIS MOST
4	EFFECTIVELY AND WHERE WE CAN BE JOINING IN AND
5	MAKING IT MORE CONGRUENT ALL THE BETTER. OBVIOUSLY
6	THERE WILL NEED TO BE SOME MECHANISM, IF THIS WORKS
7	AND ALL THE CONCERNS ARE SATISFIED, THAT WOULD
8	ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WE'RE A RESEARCH FUNDING ENTERPRISE
9	ESSENTIALLY. BUT THAT SHARED MISSION, THE MORE
10	WE'RE WORKING TOGETHER, THE MORE EFFECTIVELY WE'RE
11	GOING TO DO THAT. SO I WANT TO THANK YOU, AND WE'LL
12	DO A GOOD DUE DILIGENCE ON IT FROM OUR STANDPOINT
13	AND THEN TALK MORE.
14	CHAIRMAN TORRES: MR. KLEIN.
15	MR. KLEIN: SO THIS IS BOB KLEIN AGAIN.
16	EVEN ON A CONTRACTED-OUT BASIS, I WANT TO EMPHASIZE
17	THAT THE STAFF REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND
18	OVERSIGHT WOULD HAVE TO BE OUTSIDE OF OUR EXISTING
19	CAP BECAUSE OUR EXISTING CAP IS MORE THAN EXHAUSTED
20	WITH OUR EXISTING RESPONSIBILITIES. SO WHEN WE
21	ADDRESS THIS, WE HAVE TO LOOK RESPONSIBLY AT WHAT
22	STAFFING IT WOULD TAKE THAT HAS TO BE OUTSIDE OF OUR
23	EXISTING CAP TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN PERFORM ON THE
24	ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT, WHICH IS CRITICAL TO
25	THE PATIENTS THAT BENEFIT FROM THIS RESOURCE, IT'S
	10

1	CRITICAL FOR THE CONFIDENCE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
3	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ANY OTHER COMMENTS VERY
4	BRIEFLY BECAUSE WE NEED TO MOVE ON?
5	MR. SHEEHY: I'LL MAKE IT REAL QUICK. I
6	JUST WANT TO ELABORATE A LITTLE BIT ON WHAT JOAN
7	SAID. WE ARE A RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, BUT WE'RE
8	ALSO, AS WE GET CLOSER TO THE CLINIC, ARE GOING TO
9	BE A RESOURCE FUNDING ORGANIZATION. WE'VE TALKED
10	ABOUT FUNDING GMP FACILITIES FOR STEM CELL
11	PRODUCTION. SO IN SOME WAY WE WILL BE INVOLVED, NOT
12	DIRECTLY RUNNING A STEM CELL MANUFACTURING PLANT,
13	BUT WE WILL BE INVOLVED MAKING SURE THAT THE CELLS
14	WE GET ARE HIGH QUALITY FDA APPROVED.
15	I THINK AS WE MATURE AND WE START DOING
16	CLINICAL TRIALS, WE'LL HAVE A DIFFERENT SET OF
17	PERSONNEL AVAILABLE TO US IN ORDER TO DO CLINICAL
18	WORK, AND WE WILL BE DOING SOME SORT OF VALIDATION
19	OF RESOURCES IN ORDER TO MAKE THE RESEARCH GO FORTH.
20	SO I THINK THIS IS VERY CONGRUENT. I DO THINK IT
21	WILL BE A TOUGH FIX TO WE'LL HAVE TO FIGURE ALL
22	THESE PIECES OUT, BUT I'M VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THIS
23	MOTION.
24	CHAIRMAN TORRES: WELL, IT WILL ALSO
25	REQUIRE LESS TIME FOR THE ASSEMBLYMEMBER PUTTING
	19

THIS BILL TO THE LEGISLATURE TO WORK WITH US.
MOVE TO
DR. POMEROY: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT.
CHAIRMAN TORRES: DR. POMEROY.
DR. POMEROY: AS I THINK EVERYBODY WHO HAS
ATTENDED THESE COMMITTEE MEETINGS KNOWS, I'VE LONG
BEEN A SUPPORTER OF US ADVANCING THE ENTIRE SPECTRUM
OF STEM CELL WORK FROM EMBRYONIC THROUGH ADULT, AND
THAT INCLUDES CORD BLOOD, OF COURSE. I DO THINK
THAT WE HAVE TAKEN ON MORE THAN JUST A RESEARCH
GRANT FUNDING ROLE. WE VERY MUCH ARE INTO
ADVOCATING.
SO I THINK THAT THE CONCERN THAT I WOULD
HAVE AROUND THIS IS THAT I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE
BUSINESS PLAN, THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS, AND THAT'S
THE OPERATIONAL NEED THAT THIS WOULD COME WITH. SO
I WOULD ASK IF THERE WAS INTEREST IN A FRIENDLY
AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION, THAT THIS GROUP WOULD
ENDORSE THE CONCEPT OF ADVANCING THE CALIFORNIA
UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD COLLECTION PROGRAM AND COMMIT
TO SCORING THE BEST AND MAKING A RECOMMENDATION
ABOUT THE BEST WAY TO MAKE THAT HAPPEN.
I PERSONALLY DON'T THINK THAT THIS IS
REALLY A SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION AS MUCH AS IT IS A
BUSINESS AND OPERATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE AND
20

1	LEGAL DISCUSSION.
2	CHAIRMAN TORRES: RIGHT. THOSE ARE THE
3	ISSUES THAT DUANE AND I TALKED ABOUT AND I MENTIONED
4	AT THE OUTSET, THE LIABILITY ISSUES, RIGHT.
5	DR. POMEROY: SO I WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO
6	ENSURE THAT THE MOTION MAKES IT CLEAR THAT THAT'S
7	THE KIND OF EXPERTISE THAT WE WOULD WANT TO HAVE ON
8	THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ABOUT THE BEST WAY TO
9	ACCOMPLISH THIS.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ALL RIGHT. I ACCEPT
11	THAT AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.
12	MR. KLEIN: AS A SECOND, I WOULD ACCEPT
13	THAT.
14	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ALL RIGHT. NOW WE'RE
15	GOING TO MOVE THANK YOU, DR. POMEROY, AS ALWAYS.
16	I'D LIKE TO MOVE NOW TO PUBLIC COMMENTS TO CIRM. IS
17	THERE ANYONE THERE, JENNA, THAT WOULD LIKE TO
18	COMMENT? NO.
19	MS. HARWELL: WE HAVE NO PUBLIC COMMENT.
20	MS. KING: NO PUBLIC COMMENT?
21	MS. HARWELL: NO PUBLIC COMMENT.
22	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU. CONNECT,
23	DUANE, ANYONE THERE WITH YOU?
24	MR. ROTH: THERE'S NO ONE HERE.
25	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I'M SORRY TO HEAR THAT.

21

1	MR. ROTH: JUST ME. I'M SORRY TOO. I'M
2	LONELY.
3	CHAIRMAN TORRES: DR. POMEROY, I KNOW YOU
4	HAVE SOME PEOPLE THERE. ARE THEY WISHING TO
5	COMMENT?
6	DR. POMEROY: YES.
7	CHAIRMAN TORRES: PLEASE IDENTIFY YOURSELF
8	AND WHO YOU REPRESENT AND PROCEED.
9	MR. COEHLO: MY NAME IS PHIL COEHLO. I
10	REPRESENT MYSELF, SO I'M A CEO OF A MEDICAL
11	EQUIPMENT COMPANY. I'VE BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH CORD
12	BLOOD FOR A CONSIDERABLE PERIOD OF TIME. I AM THE
13	INDIVIDUAL WHO INITIATED THE LOBBYING EFFORT FOR THE
14	NATIONAL LEGISLATION, THE GOAL OF WHICH WAS TO
15	PROVIDE ALL OF OUR CITIZENS AN EQUAL PROBABILITY,
16	DESPITE THEIR ETHNICITY, OF GETTING AN ACCEPTABLE
17	MATCH, WHICH AT THE TIME WAS DEFINED AS A FIVE OF
18	SIX MATCH WHICH IS ACCEPTABLE WITH CORD BLOOD AND AN
19	ACCEPTABLE CELL DOSE.
20	YOU'RE REFERRING THIS TO THIS RESEARCH
21	COMMITTEE. YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT WORLDWIDE EXPERTS.
22	YOU ACTUALLY HAVE A FEW PEOPLE THAT KNOW QUITE A BIT
23	ABOUT CORD BLOOD THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH CIRM. ONE
24	IS DR. PABLO RUBENSTEIN. WHOEVER ELSE YOU MAY HAVE
25	HAD IN YOUR MIND, I CAN PRETTY MUCH GUARANTEE YOU
	22

1	THEY HAVE LESS KNOWLEDGE ABOUT CORD BLOOD BANKING
2	THAN DR. RUBENSTEIN. I SUGGEST YOU CONSIDER PUTTING
3	HIM ON ANY SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BOARD THAT CONSIDERS
4	THIS.
5	THE SECOND THING, YOU HAVE A TRANSPLANTER
6	YOU OFTEN CONSULT WITH BY THE NAME OF DR. KURTZBURG,
7	JOANNE KURTZBURG. I RECOMMEND YOU CONSIDER HER AS
8	WELL BECAUSE SHE KNOWS A FAIR AMOUNT ABOUT THE
9	TRANSPLANTATION. AND IN BETWEEN THE TWO OF THEM,
10	THEY SHOULD PROVIDE QUITE ACCURATE, CONCISE ADVICE.
11	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
12	MR. COEHLO.
13	MR. COEHLO: THE SECOND THING IS WHAT
14	ESPECIALLY CALIFORNIA NEEDS OR CAN CONTRIBUTE IS, OF
15	COURSE, ITS ETHNIC DIVERSITY. THE OVERHEAD WHICH
16	YOU DESCRIBE AS BEING ONEROUS IS CERTAINLY AN ISSUE,
17	BUT THE REALITY IS THAT THERE ARE MANY BANKS RIGHT
18	NOW THAT HAVE BEEN APPROVED AND ARE ACCEPTING AND
19	PROCESSING UNITS AND RECEIVING HRSA REIMBURSEMENT
20	FUNDS. WHAT CALIFORNIA IS ESPECIALLY ABLE TO
21	PROVIDE IS THE COLLECTED UNITS. THE HOSPITALS HERE
22	CAN ADD VERY, VERY SUBSTANTIALLY TO THE NATIONAL
23	GOALS AND TO THE ABILITY OF CALIFORNIA CITIZENS,
24	ESPECIALLY THOSE OF MIXED RACE, TO GET ACCEPTABLE
25	MATCHES.
	22

1	REINVENTING THE WHEEL.
2	PROBABLY THE BIGGEST ISSUE IS HAVING THE
3	ABILITY TO HONE DOWN ON WHAT UNITS WE WANT BECAUSE
4	WE'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO TAKE EVERY UNIT IN THE
5	STATE. WE DON'T THAT'S GOING TO COST TOO MUCH.
6	SO FIGURING OUT, FOR INSTANCE, WHAT GENETIC
7	POPULATION DO WE WANT, WHICH AREAS HAVE THEM, DO WE
8	GO WITH ALL UC BIRTHING HOSPITALS, WHAT DO WE DO.
9	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I THINK THAT WOULD BE
10	ALL PART OF A REVIEW OF ANY APPLICATIONS WE WOULD
11	RECEIVE ONCE AN RFP IS ISSUED, SO YOU'RE RIGHT ON
12	TARGET.
13	MS. SMITH-CROWLEY: AND THAT WE HAVE
14	AGAIN, WE'RE LOOKING FOR JUST THE OPERATIONS I'M
15	SORRY WE'RE LOOKING FOR JUST THE ADMINISTRATION
16	OF THE GRANT.
17	OH, THE OTHER THING IS THAT IF WE
18	COLLECTED JUST 10 PERCENT OF THE BLOOD IN THE STATE,
19	THE PROGRAM WITHIN A FEW YEARS WILL BE
20	SELF-SUFFICIENT AND SELF-FUNDING. AND SO THERE
21	SHOULD BE ENOUGH UNITS THAT WOULD GO INTO THE
22	INVENTORY AND PLENTY OF UNITS FOR RESEARCH. SO THIS
23	ISN'T NECESSARILY A PROGRAM THAT NEEDS TO GO ON FOR
24	10, 15, 20 YEARS.
25	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THAT WAS A SIMILAR

1	CONVERSATION I HAD WITH THE SAN DIEGO BLOOD BANK
2	PERSON THAT MR. ROTH REFERRED ME TO. AND THAT IS,
3	WE'RE LOOKING PROBABLY AT A SELF-SUSTAINING
4	OPERATION WHEN THE INITIAL GRANT MONEY IS PROVIDED.
5	ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, DOCTOR.
6	NEXT? ANYONE ELSE THERE, DR. POMEROY?
7	ALL RIGHT. I'M MOVING TO HYATT REGENCY EMBARCADERO
8	BOARDROOM B. ANYONE HERE THAT WISHES TO MAKE A
9	COMMENT? DON REED.
10	MR. REED: YES. MY SISTER DIED OF
11	LEUKEMIA. ANYTHING THAT CAN BRING US CLOSER TO THE
12	CURE, I'M FOR THAT. BUT I ALSO REMEMBER WHEN THE
13	ICOC AND CIRM WAS SUED AND OUR PROGRAM WAS BASICALLY
14	DENIED FUNDING FOR TWO YEARS. IF SOMETHING WENT
15	WRONG AND WE'RE SUED FOR THIS, IT CAN TIE UP A LOT
16	OF RESOURCES AND A LOT OF LEGAL TIME. THAT WOULD
17	REALLY CONCERN ME. I THINK THIS TAKES IN A WHOLE
18	DIFFERENT REALM OF EXPERTISE WE'RE NOT READY FOR.
19	THAT'S MY THOUGHTS.
20	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU, DON. YOU
21	REALLY NEED TO MAKE A COMMENT?
22	MR. KLEIN: VERY SHORT. I'D LIKE TO POINT
23	OUT THAT WE CAN'T JUST BE A PASS-THROUGH FOR GRANT
24	FUNDS. THERE'S POLICIES ON DIVERSITY. THERE'S A
25	LOT OF STANDARDS AND ACCOUNTABILITY. JUST BECAUSE

1	THE STANDARDS ARE IN PLACE DOESN'T MEAN THAT THEY'RE
2	BEING CARRIED OUT ACCOUNTABLY.
3	IF WE TAKE RESPONSIBILITY HERE, WE'VE GOT
4	RESPONSIBILITY FOR A VERY PRECIOUS RESOURCE THAT WE
5	HAVE TO HAVE PROPER OVERSIGHT. SO IN THE SPIRIT OF
6	THIS, I'M VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTIVE.
7	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU, BOB. GOOD
8	POINT. JOAN, IS THERE ANYONE THERE IN HEALDSBURG?
9	MS. SAMUELSON: THERE IS NOT.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THAT'S TOO BAD, BUT NICE
11	AREA.
12	MS. SAMUELSON: INDEED. WE'RE ALL AT THE
13	WINERY.
14	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THE CHAIR WILL ENTERTAIN
15	A ROLL CALL.
16	DR. POMEROY: ART, CAN YOU REPEAT THE
17	MOTION THAT WE'RE VOTING ON?
18	CHAIRMAN TORRES: YES. THE MOTION IS TO
19	REFER THE ISSUE FOR REVIEW TO DR. TROUNSON AND THE
20	SCIENTIFIC STAFF, BUT ALSO TO INCLUDE OPERATIONAL
21	AND LEGAL ISSUES, INSURANCE AS WELL, THAT DR.
22	POMEROY MENTIONED IN HER REMARKS.
23	DR. POMEROY: AND WILL THIS COME BACK AT
24	SOME POINT?
25	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I WOULD THINK WITHIN 90
	27
	<u> </u>

1	DAYS.
2	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: SENATOR, AFTER
3	THE VOTE, MAY I MAKE A CLOSING COMMENT?
4	CHAIRMAN TORRES: YOU CERTAINLY CAN, OR
5	YOU WANT TO MAKE THE CLOSING COMMENT NOW AND LOSE
6	THE VOTE?
7	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: NO. I'D
8	RATHER HAVE THE VOTE GO FIRST. I'M A SMART
9	POLITICIAN.
10	CHAIRMAN TORRES: YOU DARN RIGHT ARE.
11	MR. KLEIN: WHY DON'T WE GIVE HIM A RANGE?
12	WHY DON'T WE ASK THE PRESIDENT WHAT KIND OF
13	TIMEFRAME HE NEEDS BECAUSE HE'S GOT A LOT OF THINGS
14	THAT ARE CHALLENGES RIGHT NOW. WHY DON'T WE ASK THE
15	PRESIDENT WHAT KIND OF TIMEFRAME WOULD BE REASONABLE
16	BECAUSE THERE'S A BUSINESS AND OPERATIONAL SIDE TO
17	THIS.
18	CHAIRMAN TORRES: RIGHT.
19	DR. TROUNSON: I THINK YOU NEED TO GIVE
20	PEOPLE TIME TO GET TOGETHER BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A
21	SIMPLE MATTER. WE WANT TO DO IT THOROUGHLY, AS I
22	SAID, SO THAT WHEN WE RETURN A RECOMMENDATION TO
23	YOU, IT'S WELL REASONED AND WE'VE SCOPED IT OUT
24	CORRECTLY. SO IF IT DOES TAKE IT ALSO REQUIRES
25	US TO RECOMMEND AN RFA, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO

1	CONSIDER ALL OF THOSE THINGS AS PART OF THE
2	RECOMMENDATION.
3	SO WE'VE GOT SOME VERY HEAVY TIME IN FRONT
4	OF US RIGHT NOW. SO I THINK IF WE CAN GIVE YOU
5	THREE MONTHS AND HOPEFULLY GIVE YOU SOME IDEA
6	WHETHER IT WOULD BE SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THREE AND
7	FIVE MONTHS, BUT I WOULD HOPE IT'S CLOSER TO THREE
8	MONTHS. BUT I DO KNOW THAT THERE ARE SOME VERY
9	SIGNIFICANT THINGS WE'RE DEALING WITH RIGHT NOW THAT
10	HAVE GOT OUR STAFF TOTALLY
11	CHAIRMAN TORRES: DR. POMEROY, IS THAT
12	COMFORTABLE FOR YOU?
13	DR. POMEROY: I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE SAY
14	THREE TO FIVE MONTHS WITH AN AGENDIZED ITEM TO THIS
15	COMMITTEE AT THREE MONTHS FOR AN UPDATE.
16	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ALL RIGHT. YOU GOT IT.
17	THE MOTION HAS BEEN AMENDED AGAIN.
18	MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND IF IT NEEDS ONES.
19	MR. KLEIN: SECOND ACCEPTS THE AMENDMENT.
20	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ALL RIGHT. CALL THE
21	ROLL, PLEASE.
22	MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.
23	DR. LEVIN: YES.
24	MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
25	MR. KLEIN: YES.
	30
	29

1072 BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626 1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM

ı	
1	MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
2	DR. POMEROY: YES.
3	MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
4	DR. PRIETO: YES.
5	MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.
6	MR. ROTH: YES.
7	MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
8	MS. SAMUELSON: YES.
9	MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
10	MR. SHEEHY: YES.
11	MS. KING: ART TORRES.
12	CHAIRMAN TORRES: AYE.
13	MS. KING: FOR THE RECORD, THAT MOTION
14	CARRIES.
15	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ALL RIGHT. MR.
16	PORTANTINO WANTED TO MAKE A FINAL REMARK.
17	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: THANK YOU VERY
18	MUCH, BOARD MEMBERS. I APPRECIATE THE VOTE OF
19	CONFIDENCE AND KEEPING US MOVING. YOU KNOW, AS I
20	SAID IN THE BEGINNING, IT'S A PASSION. AND TO KNOW
21	THAT WE SHARE THAT GOAL, I JUST LOOK AT THE NUMBER
22	OF BIRTHS WE HAVE A YEAR IN CALIFORNIA AND THE
23	AMOUNT OF STEM CELLS THAT ARE DISCARDED AS MEDICAL
24	WASTE WHEN WE HAVE THE MATH ON OUR SIDE TO CURE
25	PEOPLE OF DISEASES THAT ARE FATAL. AND SO I
	30
	30

1072 BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626 1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM

1	APPRECIATE YOU EMBRACING THAT MISSION AND TRYING TO
2	KEEP IT MOVING. AND SO I LOOK FORWARD TO GETTING
3	YOUR REPORT BACK.
4	OBVIOUSLY, SENATOR, YOU KNOW THE
5	LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR AND WE'VE GOT THIS BILL IN THE
6	SENATE AS WE SPEAK. AND WE HAVE A PRACTICAL
7	DEADLINE OF THE LEGISLATIVE CYCLE. I THINK WE CAN
8	MEET IT UNDER YOUR TIMEFRAME. OBVIOUSLY BE MINDFUL
9	OF THAT AND THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT
10	AND YOUR SUPPORT.
11	CHAIRMAN TORRES: WELL, THE POINT HERE IS
12	THAT YOU WON'T NEED LEGISLATION. THAT'S MY POINT.
13	WE CAN GET THIS RESOLVED ADMINISTRATIVELY WORKING
14	TOGETHER.
15	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: I JUST DIDN'T
16	KNOW. THE FUNDING PIECE, THE \$2 BIRTH CERTIFICATE
17	FEE PIECE, THAT'S PART OF IT. THAT PIECE WOULD NEED
18	LEGISLATION.
19	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I WILL GET BACK TO YOU
20	NEXT WEEK AND WE'LL HAVE A PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION ON
21	THAT AND SEE WHERE WE GO BECAUSE THE DEADLINE, I
22	THINK, FOR POLICY COMMITTEES IS APRIL 23D, CORRECT?
23	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: THE SENATE
24	SIDE I'M NOT SURE.
25	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THE SENATE SIDE IS APRIL
	31

1	23D FOR POLICY COMMITTEES TO FISCAL COMMITTEES, BUT
2	THOSE ARE SENATE BILLS, SO THEY MAY APPLY
3	DIFFERENTLY. SO WE'LL TALK NEXT WEEK AND WE'LL WORK
4	OUT THE SCHEDULE.
5	ASSEMBLYMEMBER PORTANTINO: THANK YOU,
6	SIR. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
7	CHAIRMAN TORRES: BE SAFE ON THOSE
8	HIGHWAYS.
9	MEMBERS, WE'RE GOING TO MOVE NOW TO SENATE
10	BILL 1064, ITEM NO. 3, SENATOR ELAINE ALQUIST'S
11	LEGISLATION ON OUR AGENCY. AND I WILL NOW ASK FOR
12	OUR COUNSEL, MR. HARRISON, TO GIVE US AN OVERVIEW OF
13	LEGISLATION.
14	MR. HARRISON: THANK YOU, CHAIR. SB 1064
15	WOULD MAKE A VARIETY OF CHANGES TO PROP 71. WE'VE
16	OUTLINED THOSE PROVISIONS IN ATTACHMENT 3 B TO THE
17	AGENDA. SO I'LL JUST BRIEFLY TAKE YOU THROUGH THEM.
18	FIRST, THE BILL WOULD PROPOSE TO REDUCE
19	THE TERMS OF THE CHAIR AND THE VICE CHAIR FROM SIX
20	YEARS TO FOUR YEARS, AND IT WOULD REQUIRE THAT THOSE
21	TERMS BE STAGGERED. HOWEVER, BECAUSE THE CHAIR AND
22	THE VICE CHAIR CURRENTLY SERVE CONSECUTIVE TERMS,
23	IT'S UNCLEAR HOW THE MEASURE WOULD PROPOSE TO
24	ACCOMPLISH STAGGERED TERMS.
25	SECONDLY, PROPOSITION 71 WAS DESIGNED WITH

1	LONGER TERMS IN MIND IN LIGHT OF THE COMPLEX ISSUES
2	THAT THE AGENCY HAS TO DEAL WITH, INCLUDING THE
3	PANOPLY OF LAWS RANGING FROM CONFLICT OF INTEREST TO
4	OPEN MEETING LAWS, SCIENTIFIC ISSUES, THE PEER
5	REVIEW PROCEDURES. AND THE NOTION WAS THAT IN ORDER
6	TO COME UP TO SPEED ON THOSE COMPLEX ISSUES AND BE
7	ABLE TO LEAD THE BOARD, THAT IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE
8	TO HAVE A LONGER TERM THAN FOUR YEARS, AND THAT SIX
9	YEARS WAS THE RIGHT BALANCE.
LO	THE BILL WOULD ALSO EXPAND THE
L1	JURISDICTION OF THE CITIZENS FINANCIAL
L2	ACCOUNTABILITY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, WHICH IS CHAIRED
L3	BY THE CONTROLLER. CURRENTLY THE CFAOC IS
L4	RESPONSIBLE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS FOR REVIEWING CIRM'S
L5	FINANCIAL PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCE. THE BILL WOULD
L6	REQUIRE THE CFAOC TO ANNUALLY COMMISSION AN
L7	INDEPENDENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE AGENCY THAT
L8	WOULD INCLUDE A REVIEW OF THE AGENCY'S POLICIES AND
L9	PROCEDURES TO DETERMINE WHETHER THOSE POLICIES AND
20	PROCEDURES WERE SUITABLE FOR ADMINISTERING THE
21	AGENCY, WHETHER THEY COMPLIED WITH OTHER LAWS, AND
22	WHETHER CIRM, IN FACT, COMPLIED WITH ITS OWN
23	POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.
24	THIS WOULD SPAN THE SCOPE OF POLICIES FROM
25	SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC PLAN TO CONTRACTING POLICIES TO

1	GRANT ADMINISTRATION POLICIES. AND IT WOULD REQUIRE
2	THAT THE CONTROLLER WOULD, UPON RECEIVING THE
3	PERFORMANCE REVIEW, DO HIS OWN ANALYSIS OF IT AND
4	INCLUDE THAT IN THE CONTROLLERS' ANNUAL REPORT.
5	AND, FINALLY, THE BILL WOULD REQUIRE THAT
6	CIRM PAY ALL THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS AUDIT.
7	JUST A COUPLE OF QUICK NOTES. FIRST, CIRM
8	IS, AS YOU ALL KNOW, ALREADY SUBJECT TO AUDIT BOTH
9	BY THE BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS AND BY THE CONTROLLER,
10	BOTH OF WHICH HAVE ALREADY CONDUCTED EXTENSIVE
11	AUDITS OF CIRM. MANY OF YOU MAY REMEMBER THAT THE
12	BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS CONDUCTED A REVIEW OF CIRM
13	BEGINNING IN 2007. AND THAT REVIEW TOOK
14	APPROXIMATELY FOUR MONTHS AND COST THE BUREAU OF
15	STATE AUDITS APPROXIMATELY 200,000. CIRM SPENT
16	LITERALLY HUNDREDS OF HOURS OF STAFF TIME AND ALSO
17	EXPENDED ABOUT \$200,000 IN CONNECTION WITH THAT
18	AUDIT.
19	THE OTHER THING THAT IS WORTH NOTING IS
20	THAT PURSUANT TO THE SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC PLAN,
21	WHICH WAS APPROVED IN 2006, CIRM IS IN THE PROCESS
22	OF PLANNING FOR AN EXTERNAL SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OF THE
23	AGENCY'S PERFORMANCE, WHICH WILL BE COMPLETE
24	HOPEFULLY BY THE END OF THIS YEAR, SO THAT IS
25	ALREADY UNDER WAY.
	24

1	THE NEXT ISSUE THAT SB 1064 ADDRESSES IS
2	ONE THAT WE HAVE ACTUALLY ALREADY ACCOMPLISHED, AND
3	THAT IS THAT IT WOULD REQUIRE CIRM TO INCLUDE IN THE
4	MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETINGS A TALLY OF THE
5	MEMBERS' VOTES AND RECUSALS. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT
6	WE ARE CURRENTLY DOING AND HAVE DONE BACK TO JANUARY
7	1, 2008. THE ONLY DIFFERENCE WITH THE LEGISLATION
8	IS THAT IT WOULD REQUIRE US TO GO BACK TO DAY ONE TO
9	AMEND THE BOARD MINUTES TO INCLUDE SUCH TALLIES FOR
10	THE MEETINGS.
11	I SHOULD ADD, MELISSA IS REMINDING ME,
12	THAT FROM THE VERY OUTSET, CIRM HAS HAD EACH OF ITS
13	BOARD MEETINGS AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS
14	TRANSCRIBED. ALL THAT INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE ON
15	CIRM'S WEB SITE ALTHOUGH NOT IN A CONDENSED FORM.
16	WITH RESPECT TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY,
17	THERE ARE A COUPLE PROVISIONS, ONE OF WHICH WOULD
18	REQUIRE THAT ALL REVENUES RECEIVED THROUGH
19	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AGREEMENTS BE DEPOSITED INTO
20	THE STATE'S GENERAL FUND. UNDER CIRM'S EXISTING
21	REGULATIONS, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVENUES ARISING
22	FROM CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH ARE ALREADY REQUIRED TO BE
23	DEPOSITED TO THE GENERAL FUND. SO IT'S UNCLEAR
24	WHETHER THIS PROVISION WOULD ADD ANYTHING TO OUR
25	EXISTING REGULATIONS.

1	SB 1064 WOULD ALSO REQUIRE CIRM AND THE
2	BOARD TO ENGAGE IN SUCCESSION PLANNING. AND THIS
3	WOULD INCLUDE AN EXAMINATION OF THE LEADERSHIP
4	QUALITIES NECESSARY FOR THE AGENCY, AN OUTLINE OF
5	SUCCESSION PROCEDURES, INCLUDING PROVISION FOR
6	MAKING INTERIM APPOINTMENTS. THE BOARD BEGAN
7	DISCUSSING SUCCESSION PLANNING IN 2009, AND THE
8	EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE INTENDS TO DISCUSS THE TOPIC
9	AT ITS UPCOMING MEETING, INCLUDING THE IDEAL
10	QUALITIES FOR THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.
11	THE BILL IS ALSO A LITTLE BIT UNCLEAR AS
12	TO WHAT IT MEANS BY DEVELOPING A TIMEFRAME FOR
13	INTERIM APPOINTMENTS. THE BOARD ITSELF DOES NOT
14	MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD. THOSE APPOINTMENTS
15	ARE MADE BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, THE
16	SPEAKER, AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM. THE ONLY THING
17	THE BOARD DOES WITH RESPECT TO APPOINTMENTS IS THAT
18	IT REVIEWS THE NOMINATIONS FOR CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
19	MADE BY THE FOUR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS AND ELECTS
20	THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR, BUT THE BOARD IS NOT
21	ITSELF RESPONSIBLE FOR APPOINTMENTS. SO IT'S
22	UNCLEAR HOW THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SUCCESSION
23	PLANNING PROVISIONS IN 1064 WOULD APPLY.
24	THE MEASURE WOULD ALSO PROPOSE TO LIFT THE
25	50-EMPLOYEE CAP. THAT'S AN ISSUE THAT WE'VE

1	DISCUSSED BEFORE. THE AGENCY IS COMMITTED TO
2	REMAINING WITHIN THE 6-PERCENT CAP ON ADMINISTRATIVE
3	EXPENSES. AS WE'VE SAID BEFORE, THE AGENCY IS IN
4	THE PROCESS OF EXPLORING ALTERNATIVES TO THE
5	CHALLENGES IMPOSED BY THE 50-EMPLOYEE CAP.
6	MOVING ON, 1064 WOULD ALSO ADDRESS THE
7	DUTIES OF THE CHAIR. SPECIFICALLY IT WOULD
8	ELIMINATE THE CHAIR'S CURRENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR
9	SUPERVISING THE ANNUAL REPORT AND PUBLIC
10	ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS, WHICH IN PROP 71
11	INCLUDE THINGS LIKE CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS,
12	PUBLIC MEETING LAWS, PUBLIC RECORD LAWS, COMPETITIVE
13	BIDDING LAWS, AND THE AGENCY'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
14	REGULATIONS. THAT PROVISION WAS DESIGNED TO ENSURE
15	THAT THE BOARD, ACTING UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE
16	CHAIR, WOULD BE IN A POSITION FOR REVIEWING AND
17	PROVIDING OVERSIGHT OF THE AGENCY'S COMPLIANCE WITH
18	THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS IN THE LAW.
19	THE OTHER CHANGE IT WOULD MAKE IS TO
20	ASSIGN THE CHAIR'S CURRENT ROLE FOR LEADING
21	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATION TO THE PRESIDENT,
22	WHO WOULD BOTH LEAD THE NEGOTIATIONS AS WELL AS
23	EXECUTE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CONTRACTS. AGAIN, THE
24	ORIGINAL DESIGN ENVISIONED THAT THOSE TWO FUNCTIONS
25	WOULD BE SEPARATED; THAT IS, THAT LEADING

1	NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE IN THE CHAIR'S HANDS AND
2	EXECUTING THE CONTRACTS WOULD BE IN THE PRESIDENT'S
3	HANDS, SO YOU HAVE A DUAL LEVEL OF REVIEW TO AFFORD
4	EXTRA PROTECTION TO THE PUBLIC.
5	NEXT, THE BILL WOULD PURPORT TO ELIMINATE
6	THE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBER CAP ON THE GRANTS REVIEW
7	COMMITTEE, ALTHOUGH THE LANGUAGE IS DRAFTED IN SUCH
8	A WAY THAT THE CAP ACTUALLY REMAINS, BUT APPARENTLY
9	IT IS THE AUTHOR'S INTENT TO LIFT IT. WE'VE
10	DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE BEFORE AS WELL IN THE CONTEXT
11	OF THE LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS.
12	AND STAFF HAVE MADE CLEAR THAT THEY DO NOT VIEW THE
13	15-SCIENTIST CAP AS A LIMITING FACTOR ON THE
14	AGENCY'S ABILITY TO REVIEW GRANT APPLICATIONS. IN
15	FACT, STAFF HAS NOTED IN THE PAST THAT ADDING
16	ADDITIONAL MEMBERS MIGHT ACTUALLY SLOW THE RATE OF
17	REVIEW BECAUSE OF THE NEED TO ACCOMMODATE ADDITIONAL
18	DISCUSSION.
19	THE BILL WOULD ALSO ADDRESS THE
20	PREAPPLICATION PROCESS AND REQUIRE THAT ALL
21	APPLICATIONS BE SENT TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
22	PRIOR TO ANY OTHER REVIEW PROCESS. SO IT WOULD
23	EFFECTIVELY ELIMINATE THE PREAPPLICATION PROCESS.
24	A COUPLE OF NOTES THERE. FIRST, THE
25	PREAPPLICATION PROCESS HAS ONLY APPLIED TO REPEATING
	2.0

1	REQUESTS FOR APPLICATIONS SO THAT IF SOMEONE SUBMITS
2	A PREAPPLICATION AND THE APPLICATION REQUEST IS
3	DEFERRED, THE INDIVIDUAL CAN APPLY FOR A SUBSEQUENT
4	RFA ON THE SAME TOPIC OR FOR ANOTHER RFA.
5	ALSO, THE AGENCY CONDUCTED AN EXTENSIVE
6	REVIEW OF THE STEM CELL PROGRAM LEADERS AND
7	REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE STEM CELL INDUSTRY AND
8	ASKED THEM THEIR VIEW OF THE PREAPPLICATION PROCESS.
9	AMONG THE STEM CELL PROGRAM LEADERS, THERE WAS
10	UNANIMOUS SUPPORT FOR THE PREAPPLICATION PROCESS AS
11	OPPOSED TO OTHER ALTERNATIVES.
12	AND THE FINAL POINT I'LL MAKE IS THAT THE
13	BOARD AT ITS LAST MEETING HAS ADDRESSED THIS ISSUE
14	AND INTENDS TO CONSIDER IT IN THE CONTEXT OF A
15	SCIENTIFIC ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE TO DETERMINE WHETHER
16	OR NOT THERE ARE IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD BE MADE OR
17	OTHER ALTERNATIVES.
18	THIS BILL ALSO INCORPORATES THE
19	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS THAT MANY OF YOU
20	WILL RECALL FROM SB 1565. AND THOSE ARE
21	REQUIREMENTS REGARDING ACCESS PLANS FOR THE
22	UNINSURED, AS WELL AS PROVIDING THAT CALIFORNIA
23	STATE AND LOCAL FUNDED PROGRAMS WOULD RECEIVE ANY
24	THERAPIES ARISING OUT OF CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH AT ONE
25	OF THREE CALRX PRICES. THESE ARE BOTH PROVISIONS
	30

1	THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN OUR REGULATIONS. HOWEVER, AS
2	WITH 1565, WE DO HAVE SOME CONCERNS ABOUT THESE
3	PROVISIONS.
4	FIRST, AS WE DISCUSSED THE LAST TIME THIS
5	ISSUE CAME UP, IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO MAINTAIN
6	FLEXIBILITY IN ADDRESSING THESE REGULATIONS AND
7	MODIFYING THEM AS CIRCUMSTANCES CHANGE. OBVIOUSLY
8	WE'RE IN THE MIDST OF A NATIONAL DEBATE OVER OUR
9	HEALTHCARE SYSTEM, AND THERE COULD VERY WELL BE
10	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE FUTURE THAT WOULD AFFECT
11	THESE PROGRAMS. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT MEASURE
12	WOULD DO WOULD BE TO LOCK IN THE CALRX PROGRAM AS IN
13	EXISTENCE ON DECEMBER 31, 2010. SO THAT EVEN IF THE
14	LEGISLATURE WERE TO MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE PROGRAM
15	IN THE FUTURE, THOSE AMENDMENTS WOULD NOT APPLY TO
16	CIRM. WE HAVE INCLUDED INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
17	REGARDING SB 1565. MANY OF THE ISSUES ARE THE SAME.
18	FINALLY, THE BILL WOULD REQUIRE THAT CIRM
19	ENGAGE IN WHAT IT REFERS TO AS TRANSITION PLANNING.
20	WHAT THE AUTHOR INTENDS IS THAT CIRM WOULD CONSIDER
21	ITS STRATEGIES RELATING TO THE EXPIRATION OF BOND
22	FUNDING. THIS IS A PROCESS THAT THE AGENCY HAS
23	ALREADY BEEN ENGAGED IN. WE HAVE EXPLORED, FOR
24	EXAMPLE, THE POTENTIAL OF A LOAN PROGRAM OR A
25	FEDERAL LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM TO PROVIDE EXTENDED
	40

1	FUNDING FOR THE AGENCY.
2	THE PROPOSAL ALSO APPEARS TO MISCONSTRUE
3	THE BOND PROVISIONS OF PROP 71. IT SUGGESTS THAT
4	BOND FUNDING WILL EXPIRE ON JANUARY 1, 2014. IT'S
5	IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THE WAY PROP 71 WAS WRITTEN,
6	EVEN THOUGH IT AUTHORIZES THE ISSUANCE OF UP TO 350
7	MILLION IN BONDS EACH YEAR, IT PROVIDES THAT TO THE
8	EXTENT THAT CAPACITY IS NOT USED IN ANY PARTICULAR
9	YEAR, IT ROLLS OVER AND CAN BE USED IN SUBSEQUENT
10	YEARS. SO THERE IS NO EXPIRATION ON THE TIME WITHIN
11	WHICH THE AGENCY HAS TO ISSUE BONDS OR EXPEND ITS
12	FUNDS. AGAIN, THAT WAS BY DESIGN IN RECOGNITION OF
13	THE POSSIBILITY OF DELAYS SUCH AS LITIGATION AND THE
14	NEED TO ENSURE THAT THE AGENCY WAS MAKING DECISIONS
15	BASED ON SCIENTIFIC MERIT AND NOT MERELY SPENDING
16	THE FUNDS BECAUSE OF AN ARTIFICIAL DEADLINE.
17	SO THAT'S A MORE EXTENDED SUMMARY THAN I
18	INTENDED OF 1064.
19	CHAIRMAN TORRES: LET ME GO OVER SOME
20	QUICK HISTORY HERE. I'VE KNOWN ELAINE ALQUIST SINCE
21	SHE MARRIED THEN SENATOR ALFRED ALQUIST, SO ABOUT 28
22	YEARS. I MET WITH HER LAST YEAR IN THE FALL TO
23	INTRODUCE HER TO THE NUMBER OF ISSUES THAT WE WERE
24	FACING AS AN AGENCY SO THAT WE WOULD BEGIN THE
25	EDUCATION OF LEGISLATORS WHICH IS ALWAYS IMPORTANT

1	WHEN THERE ISN'T A PARTICULAR EXPERTISE THAT THEY
2	HAVE ACQUIRED.
3	WHEN SHE BECAME CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE
4	HEALTH COMMITTEE PRIOR TO THAT, SHE INHERITED A
5	STAFF WHICH CAME WITH THE COMMITTEE, WHICH IS
6	APPROPRIATE. AND SOMETIMES THAT STAFF HAS BEEN, AT
7	LEAST IN MY EXPERIENCE, THEY REALLY HAVEN'T DONE
8	THEIR HOMEWORK IN TERMS OF WHAT WE'VE DONE, NO. 1,
9	AND WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES THAT WE'VE DONE AND HOW
10	WE'VE COMPLIED WITH THAT.
11	SO DR. TROUNSON, BOB KLEIN, MYSELF, JAMES
12	HARRISON, ELONA BAUM MET WITH ELAINE AND HER THREE
13	STAFF PEOPLE, LISA CHAN, JEAN-PAUL BUCHANAN, WHO IS
14	BRITISH, AND HER FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF, SAILAJA. WE
15	HAD A TWO-AND-A-HALF-HOUR MEETING WHERE WE DISCUSSED
16	THE ISSUES WITH THEM THAT THEY HAD RAISED WITH US.
17	IT WAS CLEAR IN THOSE DISCUSSIONS, AT LEAST TO ME,
18	AND ANYONE CAN PROFFER THEIR OWN OPINION, THAT THE
19	STAFF DID NOT UNDERSTAND A LOT OF THE ISSUES THAT WE
20	WERE TALKING ABOUT OR HOW WE IMPLEMENTED THEM.
21	WE FOLLOWED THAT UP WITH A LUNCH, WHICH
22	WAS MORE SOCIAL THAN SUBSTANTIVE, BUT AT NO TIME WAS
23	IT ADDRESSED THAT THERE WAS GOING TO BE IMMINENT
24	LEGISLATION INTRODUCED UNTIL I RECEIVED A COPY OF A
25	PRESS RELEASE THAT ACCUSED CIRM OF BEING ACCOUNTABLE

1	TO NO ONE WAS THE HEADLINE. WELL, YOU MIGHT IMAGINE
2	HOW A CONVERSATION EMERGED BETWEEN MYSELF AND HER
3	CHIEF OF STAFF ON HOW THAT IF THE RULES OF
4	ENGAGEMENT ARE NOT KNOWN AHEAD OF TIME, AT LEAST
5	TELL ME NOW HOW YOU'RE GOING TO DEAL WITH THIS ISSUE
6	BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THAT WAS FAIR BECAUSE FOR THE
7	PREVIOUS WEEK I HAD BEEN PLEADING FOR A FOLLOW-UP
8	MEETING TO OUR FEBRUARY 8TH MEETING ON ALL OF THE
9	ISSUES WHERE THERE WAS NO CLARITY BY THE STAFF IN
10	THAT REGARD. SHE APOLOGIZED. AND I INDICATED WHO
11	WILL BE THE POINT PERSON TO TALK TO, AND SHE
12	INDICATED IT WOULD NOT BE PETER HANSEL, BUT IT WOULD
13	BE JEAN-PAUL BUCHANAN.
14	I OFFERED THEN FOR SENATOR ALQUIST OR ANY
15	MEMBER OF HER STAFF TO ADDRESS THIS SUBCOMMITTEE VIA
16	
	PHONE OR IN PERSON. THAT REQUEST WAS REFUSED. AND
17	PHONE OR IN PERSON. THAT REQUEST WAS REFUSED. AND I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO
17	·
17 18	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO
17 18 19	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO SEE IF SHE WOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GIVE
	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO SEE IF SHE WOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GIVE US HER OPINIONS AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR THIS
17 18 19 20	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO SEE IF SHE WOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GIVE US HER OPINIONS AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION. SHE FELT THAT OUR TWO-HOUR MEETING WAS
17 18 19 20 21	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO SEE IF SHE WOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GIVE US HER OPINIONS AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION. SHE FELT THAT OUR TWO-HOUR MEETING WAS SUFFICIENT FOR HER TO EXPRESS HER VIEWS ON THE
17 18 19 20 21	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO SEE IF SHE WOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GIVE US HER OPINIONS AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION. SHE FELT THAT OUR TWO-HOUR MEETING WAS SUFFICIENT FOR HER TO EXPRESS HER VIEWS ON THE LEGISLATION AND DID NOT WANT TO SPEAK TO THE BOARD
17 18 19 20 21 22	I ALSO ASKED SENATOR ALQUIST IN A PERSONAL LETTER TO SEE IF SHE WOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GIVE US HER OPINIONS AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION. SHE FELT THAT OUR TWO-HOUR MEETING WAS SUFFICIENT FOR HER TO EXPRESS HER VIEWS ON THE LEGISLATION AND DID NOT WANT TO SPEAK TO THE BOARD AS A WHOLE, WHICH I FOUND UNUSUAL. ANTHONY

1	NOTWITHSTANDING THAT AND GIVEN THAT
2	HISTORY, I DO NOT THINK THAT THIS SUBCOMMITTEE
3	SHOULD TAKE A POSITION ON THIS LEGISLATION EITHER
4	FOR OR AGAINST. BUT RATHER, THERE IS A THIRD OPTION
5	WHICH I WOULD LIKE TO PROFFER TO THIS SUBCOMMITTEE.
6	AND THAT IS THAT WE RECOMMEND THAT THIS BILL GO TO
7	INTERIM STUDY. AND THAT'S A THIRD OPTION ALWAYS
8	AVAILABLE TO A COMMITTEE AND CLEARLY TO A LEGISLATOR
9	TO ASSUME. THERE ARE SOME WHO ARGUE THAT A MOVE TO
LO	INTERIM STUDY KILLS THE BILL. WELL, IT DOESN'T KILL
L1	THE CONCEPT. IT ALLOWS A SUBSTANTIVE POLICY
L2	COMMITTEE WITH SENATOR ALQUIST AT THE HELM TO REALLY
L3	DO AN IN-DEPTH OVERSIGHT REVIEW ALL OF THESE ISSUES
L4	THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED BY THE LITTLE HOOVER
L5	COMMISSION, BY THE CONTROLLER'S AUDIT, AND REALLY GO
L6	THROUGH EXACTLY WHAT WE'VE COMPLIED WITH WITH THE
L7	STAFF AT EVERY LEVEL.
L8	AND THERE ARE SOME ISSUES THAT I THINK ARE
L9	NOT IN THE BILL NOW, AND THAT IS THIS BILL DOES
20	REQUIRE A FISCAL APPROPRIATION OUTSIDE OF MANDATING
21	THAT CIRM'S COFFERS PAY FOR EVERYTHING THAT IS
22	INDICATED IN THE LEGISLATION. THERE ARE SOME ISSUES
23	THAT ARE TO BE PAID BY THE STATE BOARD OF AUDIT, AT
24	LEAST 200,000. THERE ARE OTHER ISSUES THAT WE DON'T
25	KNOW WHAT KIND OF EXPENSES THE CONTROLLER WILL INCUR

1	BY HAVING TO DO A PERFORMANCE AUDIT AND SEEKING THE
2	OPINIONS OF WORLDWIDE SCIENTISTS TO DETERMINE
3	WHETHER WE'RE DOING THE RIGHT JOB OR NOT. IT'S
4	GOING TO TAKE TIME AND A LOT OF EXPENDITURE. IS
5	THAT AN APPROPRIATE USE OF GENERAL FUND MONIES WHEN
6	WE HAVE CLEARLY COMPLIED WITH THE BUREAU OF STATE
7	AUDITS, WITH THE ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARDS BY THE
8	STATE CONTROLLER, WITH FIVE YEARS OF A CLEAN
9	FINANCIAL AUDIT BY INDEPENDENT PUBLIC ACCOUNTING
LO	FIRMS, AND EACH OF THOSE AUDITS HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY
L1	THE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, GIVING US AN ANNUAL STAMP
L2	OF APPROVAL.
L3	IN ADDITION, THE CITIZENS FINANCIAL
L4	ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CREATED BY
L5	THE VOTERS AND CHAIRED BY JOHN CHIANG, MY VERY DEAR
L6	FRIEND, AT LEAST FOR NOW, HAS REVIEWED EACH
L7	FINANCIAL AUDIT WITHOUT ANY EXCEPTION. AND THE
L8	VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA SPECIFICALLY CREATED A
L9	GOVERNING BOARD TO PROVIDE ACCOUNTABILITY.
20	SO IT REALLY GETS MY CRAW WHEN A PRESS
21	RELEASE COMES OUT SAYING THAT THIS AGENCY IS
22	ACCOUNTABLE TO NO ONE. THAT IS JUST BALDERDASH. WE
23	ARE ACCOUNTABLE IN EVERY SHAPE AND FORM IN TERMS OF
24	THE TRANSPARENCY ISSUES THAT THE BOARD MEMBERS THAT
25	I'VE PERSONALLY WITNESSED HAVE TO RECUSE THEMSELVES

1	AT THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS IN TERMS OF WORKING
2	GROUPS, THAT HAVE TO SIGN CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
3	PROVISIONS, THE FORM 700 THAT WE HAVE TO COMPLY WITH
4	AS MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD OF OUR ECONOMIC INTEREST.
5	I THINK THAT WHAT HAS HAPPENED HERE, AS SOME MEMBERS
6	OF LEGISLATURE HAVE TOLD ME, THAT THIS LEGISLATION
7	APPEARS TO BE STAFF DRIVEN AND NOT LEGISLATIVELY
8	DRIVEN.
9	IF THAT'S THE CASE, THAT'S FINE. THAT'S
10	THE NATURE OF THE PROCESS. I ACCEPT IT. BUT I DO
11	BELIEVE THAT A MOTION TO MOVE THIS LEGISLATION TO
12	INTERIM STUDY BY THE SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE WOULD
13	BEHOOVE THE INTERESTS OF THE TAXPAYERS SO THAT
14	SENATOR ALQUIST CAN TAKE A LEGITIMATE ROLE IN
15	PROVIDING OVERSIGHT, WHICH, QUITE FRANKLY, SHE COULD
16	DO NOW IF SHE WANTED TO. SHE HAS CHOSEN NOT TO.
17	WHEN I WAS CHAIR OF THE SENATE TOXICS COMMITTEE, THE
18	SENATE INSURANCE COMMITTEE, I TOOK IT UPON MYSELF TO
19	TAKE AGENCIES TO TASK AND BRING THEM UNDER A HEARING
20	TO DETERMINE WHERE THEIR FAULTS WERE, WHERE THEIR
21	POSITIVES AND STRENGTHS WERE.
22	I BELIEVE THAT AN INTERIM STUDY MOTION
23	WOULD HELP HER DO THAT AND THE LEGISLATURE DO THAT
24	SO THE PEOPLE BECOME EDUCATED AS TO WHAT THIS
25	PRESIDENT HAS BEEN DOING, WHAT THIS STAFF HAS BEEN

1	DOING, WHAT THIS CHAIRMAN AND BOARD HAVE BEEN DOING
2	IN JUDICIOUSLY COMPLYING WITH MANY OF THE ISSUES
3	THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED BY THE LITTLE HOOVER
4	COMMISSION, WHO THEIR OWN DIRECTOR SAID BEFORE THE
5	FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE BY THE CONTROLLER
6	ABOUT HOW WELL WE WERE DOING AND HOW TRANSPARENT WE
7	WERE IN TERMS OF OUR PROCESSES.
8	SO I THINK A LOT OF EDUCATION STILL NEEDS
9	TO TAKE PLACE, AND I'M WILLING TO DO THAT WITH
10	MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, BUT I DO THINK THAT THIS
11	WOULD GIVE HER AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE AN
12	OVERSIGHT OF THIS AGENCY IN A MUCH CLEARER WAY AND
13	MUCH MORE TRANSPARENT WAY THAN HAVING LEGISLATION
14	WRITTEN IN A BACK ROOM THAT DOESN'T TAKE INTO
15	ACCOUNT THE ISSUES AND THE PROGRESS THAT WE'VE MADE
16	AS AN AGENCY. AT LEAST IN THE SHORT TIME I'VE BEEN
17	HERE, I'VE NOTICED THAT.
18	SO I WOULD PROFFER A MOTION TO MOVE THIS
19	BILL TO INTERIM STUDY WITHOUT OPPOSING OR SUPPORTING
20	IT AND LET THE LEGISLATURE CONTINUE TO OVERSIGHT US
21	IN A SUBSTANTIVE WAY. IS THERE A SECOND?
22	MR. SHEEHY: I'LL SECOND.
23	CHAIRMAN TORRES: DISCUSSION.
24	MS. SAMUELSON: THANK YOU, ART. I
25	COMPLETELY AGREE. WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO DO SOMETHING

1	AS DIRECTED BY THE VOTERS IN THE INITIATIVE OF PROP
2	71 THAT ISN'T BEING DONE ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE WORLD.
3	NO ONE ELSE, AS FAR AS I KNOW, NO ENTERPRISE HAS
4	BEEN GIVEN SO MUCH MONEY WITH SUCH AN AMBITIOUS
5	MISSION. IT'S AN INCREDIBLY COMPLICATED EFFORT.
6	JUST AS ONE TINY EXAMPLE, THE INTELLECTUAL
7	PROPERTY PROVISIONS, AT SEVERAL MEETINGS I'VE BEEN
8	INVOLVED IN IN THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS HAVE HAD
9	TESTIMONY THAT THE ACCESS PROVISIONS THAT ARE
10	PROVIDED IN OUR LAW COULD GO A LONG WAY TO
11	PREVENTING THE BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY, BUSINESS
12	COMMUNITY FROM BEING FINANCIALLY ABLE TO MAKE THE
13	PRODUCTS THAT WOULD MAKE OUR MISSION SUCCEED. AND
14	I'VE HEARD THAT OVER AND OVER.
15	SO WE ALREADY HAVE A HUGE, HUGE CHALLENGE
16	IN THAT ARENA TO BOTH HAVE LOW PRICES AND ACCESS TO
17	LOW-INCOME CALIFORNIANS AND SUCCEED IN OUR MISSION.
18	TO MAKE THAT MORE DIFFICULT WILL JUST MAKE OUR
19	MISSION THAT MUCH MORE POTENTIALLY IMPOSSIBLE.
20	THAT'S JUST ONE OF MYRIAD OTHER INCREDIBLY
21	COMPLICATED ISSUES THAT WE HAVE BEEN ADDRESSING. IF
22	NOTHING ELSE, ON BEHALF OF THE VOTERS OR THE
23	LEGISLATURE, WHO WOULD HAVE TO COME UP WITH, I
24	GUESS, 70-PERCENT APPROVAL OF THIS OR TAKE IT BACK
25	TO THE VOTERS, THIS HAD BETTER BE WORTH THE TIME AND

1	THE EFFORT AND THE MONEY IT WILL TAKE TO REEXAMINE
2	EVERYTHING THAT WE'RE DOING. SO I THINK IT DESERVES
3	VERY CAREFUL STUDY. THAT'S IT.
4	DR. LEVIN: IT'S JACOB LEVIN IN IRVINE.
5	ART, I THINK IT'S A WONDERFUL AND VERY DIPLOMATIC
6	SOLUTION. YOU SHOULD BE IN POLITICS. I FULLY
7	BELIEVE THAT IF SENATOR ALQUIST AND THE COMMITTEE
8	ARE BROUGHT IN AND REALLY UNDERSTAND ALL THAT CIRM
9	HAS ACCOMPLISHED AND ALL OF THE OVERSIGHT THAT WE
10	REALLY HAVE BEEN SUBJECT TO AND BEEN ACCOUNTABLE
11	FOR, THEY WILL ALL COME TO THAT SAME CONCLUSION,
12	THAT WE'RE DOING AN AWFULLY GOOD JOB AND JUST WHAT
13	THE PEOPLE WANT.
14	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU. MR. KLEIN.
15	MR. KLEIN: SO I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THE
16	FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPT OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SOME
17	OF THESE PROPOSALS. IT IS CRITICAL TO UNDERSTAND
18	THAT IF YOU WERE TO SUGGEST THAT YOU COULD
19	CONSTITUTIONALLY TAKE AWAY WHAT THE INITIATIVE HAS
20	ESTABLISHED AS THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY
21	RESPONSIBILITY AT THE BOARD LEVEL FOR THE
22	BAGLEY-KEENE LAW, FOR CONFLICTS AT BOARD LEVELS AND
23	MEMBERS AND TRANSFER THAT TO THE PRESIDENT, THEN YOU
24	COULD THEORETICALLY CHANGE THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS,
25	YOU COULD CHANGE OUR STANDARDS PROCESS, YOU COULD

1	CHANGE ANYTHING IN THIS INITIATIVE.
2	THE INITIATIVE, IT'S VERY CLEAR, IS TRYING
3	TO CREATE STABILITY IN THE STRUCTURE THAT IT'S
4	CREATED SO THAT OTHER COUNTRIES CAN COLLABORATE WITH
5	US, SO OTHER STATES CAN COLLABORATE WITH US AND KNOW
6	THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO CHANGE YEAR TO YEAR BASED
7	UPON POLITICAL DECISIONS AND APPOINTEES AND
8	STAFFING. WE ARE AN AGENCY THAT THEY CAN COUNT ON
9	THAT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY AN INITIATIVE THAT HAS
10	CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS ON THE STATUTORY
11	AUTHORITY.
12	AND THE ACCOUNTABILITY AT THE BOARD LEVEL
13	IS SOMETHING AND THE OVERSIGHT OF THAT BOARD IS
14	SOMETHING THAT I SPENT A LOT OF TIME WITH THE VOTERS
15	DURING THE CAMPAIGN ON GOING TO CHAMBERS OF
16	COMMERCE, GOING TO CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS, TALKING WITH
17	REPORTERS ABOUT THAT BOARD BEING APPOINTED BY
18	CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, AND THE CHAIR BEING
19	RESPONSIBLE AND ACCOUNTABLE TO HAVE A PERSON WITH
20	INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY TO BE ACCOUNTABLE FOR
21	WHETHER OR NOT THESE LAWS AND STANDARDS ARE
22	FOLLOWED, WHETHER OR NOT THE CONFLICTS OF THE BOARD
23	MEMBERS ARE RIGOROUSLY ENFORCED AND WHETHER OR NOT
24	THE BAGLEY-KEENE STATUTES ARE RIGOROUSLY ENFORCED.
25	IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THESE

1	ARE FUNDAMENTAL PARTS OF THIS INITIATIVE AS WELL AS
2	THE BASIC OVERSIGHT OF MAKING CERTAIN THAT THE
3	ETHICS OFFICERS REPORTS FROM THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF
4	ARE FOLLOWED UP ON. WE HAVE TWO LEGAL OPINIONS FROM
5	THE REMCHO FIRM AND FROM THE MERKSAMER FIRM THAT
6	WERE DELIVERED TO LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION. THEY
7	REFERRED TO THAT IN THEIR PUBLIC TESTIMONY. THOSE
8	HAVE NEVER BEEN DEALT WITH AND NEVER BEEN RESPONDED
9	TO, AND IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT BOTH OF THOSE TAKES
10	THE POSITION THAT YOU CAN'T GO CHANGING THINGS THAT
11	HAVE A FUNDAMENTAL ROOTING IN THIS INITIATIVE
12	BECAUSE IF YOU DO, THERE IS NO STABILITY TO THE
13	INITIATIVE PROCESS AND WHAT THE PUBLIC HAS MANDATED
14	THROUGH \$7 MILLION VOTES.
15	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ANY BOARD MEMBERS?
16	MR. SHEEHY.
17	MR. SHEEHY: WELL, FIRST, I'M VERY
18	SUPPORTIVE OF SENATOR TORRES' MOTION. AND I HAVE TO
19	SAY THAT THIS PARTICULAR BILL MAKES ME JUST FILLS
20	ME WITH SADNESS, TO BE HONEST. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE
21	EIGHT FACILITIES BUILT BY AUGUST 1ST OF THIS YEAR,
22	UP AND RUNNING. A BILLION DOLLARS IN WHAT IS TRUE
23	STIMULUS MONEY, ONLY 250 MILLION OF IT ACTUALLY
24	COMING FROM THE STATE. CONSTRUCTION WORKERS WHO
	COMING FROM THE STATE. CONSTRUCTION WORKERS WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN OUT OF WORK DOING JOBS, FEEDING

1	THEIR FAMILIES, CONTINUE TO BE EMPLOYED. WE'RE
2	GOING TO HAVE STATE-OF-THE-ART RESEARCH FACILITIES
3	THAT WILL SERVE THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA FOR A
4	GENERATION.
5	I SPENT THIS AFTERNOON TALKING WITH AIDS
6	ACTIVISTS WHO ARE INCREDIBLY EXCITED ABOUT TWO OF
7	THE DISEASE TEAM PROJECTS THAT WE FUNDED THIS YEAR.
8	AND THE HOPE THAT WE'RE OFFERING TO PATIENTS ALL
9	OVER CALIFORNIA AS WE GET CLOSER AND CLOSER TO THE
10	CLINIC WITH OUR RESEARCH, I JUST WONDER, WITH ALL
11	DUE RESPECT TO SENATOR ALQUIST, I WONDER IF HER
12	STAFF WHO HAS DRIVEN THIS BILL HAVE SPENT ANY TIME
13	WITH THE PATIENTS SUFFERING FROM A CHRONIC OR
14	LIFE-THREATENING DISEASE FOR WHOM WE HAVE GIVEN SUCH
15	HOPE, IF THEY REALLY HAVE SAT DOWN WITH ANY OF THE
16	PEOPLE WHO ARE COUNTING ON US TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE
17	IN THEIR LIVES. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THEY HAVE
18	BECAUSE THERE'S NO WAY THAT THIS BILL COULD HAVE
19	COME OUT IF THEY HAD.
20	I ALSO JUST WANT TO TALK TO THE SCIENTIFIC
21	RIGOR, WHICH IS ULTIMATELY THE GROUNDING FOR
22	EVERYTHING WE DO. GREAT BRITAIN, JAPAN, GERMANY,
23	SPAIN, AUSTRALIA, CANADA, THEY ALL DEFER TO GRANT
24	DECISIONS MADE BY THE ADVICE THAT'S MADE THROUGH OUR
25	PEER REVIEW GROUP, THEN RATIFIED BY THE ICOC IN

1	TERMS OF MAKING FUNDING ALLOCATION IN PARTNERSHIP
2	WITH US. THIS POINTS TO THE EXTREME RIGOR OF OUR
3	SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PROCESS, WHICH IS ULTIMATELY HOW
4	WE SPEND MONEY. IF GREAT BRITAIN, THE COUNSEL
5	GENERAL OF GREAT BRITAIN CAN STAND NEXT TO OUR
6	PRESIDENT AND THE COUNSEL GENERAL OF CANADA CAN
7	STAND NEXT TO OUR PRESIDENT IN ANNOUNCING DISEASE
8	TEAM GRANTS THAT ARE JOINTLY FUNDED AND REVIEWED
9	THROUGH THE CIRM PROCESS, I THINK THAT SPEAKS TO AN
10	INCREDIBLE LEVEL OF SCIENTIFIC RIGOR.
11	AND SO PERSONALLY I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE
12	LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY CALL. I WONDER IN THESE
13	TIMES WHERE YOU KNOW, MY KID STARTS PUBLIC SCHOOL
14	NEXT YEAR. I DON'T KNOW IF SHE'S GOING TO HAVE A
15	TEACHER, AND PEOPLE WANT TO SPEND MONEY ON MORE
16	AUDITS. YOU KNOW, PEOPLE WITH AIDS ARE LOSING
17	SERVICES IN THE STATE. HOME HEALTHCARE WORKERS ARE
18	BEING LAID OFF. SO THERE WILL BE PEOPLE WHO DIE,
19	AND YET HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, WHICH MAY
20	NOT SEEM MUCH IN THE GLOBAL THING, BUT IF THERE WERE
21	ONE MORE TEACHER WHO WAS HIRED OR TWO MORE TEACHERS
22	OR A FEW MORE HOME HEALTHCARE WORKERS, PEOPLE ALL
23	OVER CALIFORNIA ARE MARCHING FOR EDUCATION, AND WE
24	FUNDED A BRIDGES PROGRAM THAT'S KEEPING KIDS IN
25	SCHOOL AT THE SAN FRANCISCO STATE LEVEL, AT THE

1	COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEVEL THAT IS GETTING PEOPLE
2	INTERNSHIPS WITH COMPANIES THAT WILL BE THEIR FUTURE
3	AND THEIR CAREERS.
4	SO I REALLY FEEL LIKE THAT WE'RE DOING OUR
5	JOB. AND, AGAIN, NOT TO BE CRITICAL OF SENATOR
6	ALQUIST, BUT I WONDER IF THIS IS REALLY THE MOST
7	IMPORTANT THING FOR THE LEGISLATURE TO BE TAKING UP
8	THIS YEAR.
9	CHAIRMAN TORRES: DR. TROUNSON.
10	DR. TROUNSON: YOU KNOW, I'M VERY STRONGLY
11	IN SUPPORT OF YOUR MOTION, CHAIR. I REALLY BELIEVE
12	THE BILL AS IT IS WRITTEN DOES NOT SHOW A CLEAR
13	UNDERSTANDING HOW CIRM OPERATES, NOR COMPLETE GRASP
14	OF THE COMPLEXITY OF PROPOSITION 71. I THINK WE'VE
15	GOT AN EDUCATION JOB TO DO, AND I THINK THE WAY YOU
16	PROPOSE IS NECESSARY. I THINK WE HAVE TO REALLY
17	HELP OUT ON THIS.
18	AND I RECOGNIZE THAT WHILE SOME PROPOSED
19	CHANGES, SUCH AS LIFTING THE 50-PERSON CAP OR EVEN
20	CONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY, FIT
21	FOR THE NEW INCOMING CHAIR MIGHT BE HELPFUL, MOST OF
22	THE OTHERS WOULD MAKE IT ALMOST DIFFICULT, IF NOT
23	IMPOSSIBLE, TO COMPLETE ITS MISSION IN THE TIMEFRAME
24	THAT WE HAVE IN MIND. SO I REALLY DO THINK IT'S
25	TNDWELLING UPON US TO PURSUE THE EDUCATION FOR THE

1	LEGISLATORS IN ORDER FOR THEM TO BETTER UNDERSTAND
2	BECAUSE IT'S VERY CLEAR TO ME THAT THEY ARE NOT
3	UNDERSTANDING OR WANTING TO UNDERSTAND IN THIS
4	FRAME. AND IF WE CAN GET IT INTO THIS DISCUSSION
5	FORMAT, I THINK WE MAY DO A LOT OF GOOD.
6	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU, MR.
7	PRESIDENT. ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS?
8	DR. POMEROY: I ALSO WANT TO SPEAK IN
9	SUPPORT OF YOUR MOTION. I THINK THAT WE REALLY ARE
10	COMMITTED TO WORKING WITH THE LEGISLATURE. THAT'S
11	WHAT WE'VE SAID BACK IN OUR PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS
12	AROUND THIS TYPE OF ISSUE.
13	I WANT TO SAY THAT I PERSONALLY AM OPEN TO
14	THE FACT THAT WE MAY NOT BE PERFECT AND THERE MAY BE
15	THINGS WE CAN IMPROVE, BUT THIS BILL IS WRITTEN WITH
16	SO MANY FAR-REACHING, UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES THAT I
17	FEAR COULD DO MUCH MORE DAMAGE THAN GOOD. SO I
18	THINK YOURS IS A GREAT APPROACH TO IMPROVING MUTUAL
19	UNDERSTANDING AND LOOKING TO SEE IF THERE ARE SOME
20	MINOR THINGS THAT WE CAN DO, BUT FUNDAMENTALLY THE
21	PROGRESS THAT CIRM HAS MADE AND THE PEOPLE THAT IT'S
22	FUNDED HAVE MADE IS SO INSPIRING, THAT I AGREE WITH
23	JEFF. IT IS DISAPPOINTING THAT THIS IS HAPPENING IN
24	THIS WAY. THANK YOU.
25	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU, DR. POMEROY.
	r r

1	ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS?
2	MR. ROTH: SO I'M NOT DISAPPOINTED. I'M
3	FRUSTRATED AND ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU LISTEN TO THE WAY
4	THAT IT WAS LINED UP HERE VERSUS THE READ WE HAVE ON
5	IT AND WHERE THEY'RE COMING OUT. AND I THINK PART
6	OF WHAT I WOULD ENCOURAGE US TO DO IS TO TRY, IF
7	IT'S AT ALL POSSIBLE, AND I SUPPORT EXACTLY WHERE
8	YOU ARE GOING WITH THIS, ART, BUT GET JAMES, ME WITH
9	THE RIGHT COUNSEL OR THE RIGHT PEOPLE UP THERE TO GO
10	THROUGH WHAT HE WENT THROUGH WITH US. AND THEN
11	THERE WILL BE A FEW THINGS THAT ARE LEFT OVER THAT
12	WE REALLY DO HAVE TO AGREE TO DISAGREE ON.
13	BUT THE THINGS THAT SO MUCH OF WHAT YOU
14	WENT THROUGH, WE'RE LIKE TALKING TO A WALL. IF YOU
15	GO THROUGH IT AND YOU EXPLAIN EXACTLY WHAT WE'VE
16	DONE, THINGS ARE ALREADY DONE, AND THE AUDITS AND
17	THINGS LIKE THAT, AND TO ME IT'S JUST VERY
18	FRUSTRATING THAT WE CAN'T GET BEYOND THAT AND GET TO
19	THE REMAINING ISSUES THAT ACTUALLY WE'RE WILLING TO
20	DISCUSS WITH THEM. BUT THIS IS GETTING US NOWHERE,
21	AND THIS IS SO MUCH LOST TIME AND ENERGY FOR PEOPLE
22	THAT DON'T HAVE THE TIME AND ENERGY TO DO IT.
23	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I THINK YOUR SIDE OF THE
24	AISLE, DUANE, HAS BEEN MORE COOPERATIVE AND
25	SUPPORTIVE THAN MY SIDE.

1	MR. ROTH: I'M ALWAYS WHERE IS THIS WHY
2	DOES THIS KEEP COMING UP? EITHER WE'RE NOT
3	EFFECTIVELY COMMUNICATING OR SOMEBODY DOESN'T WANT
4	TO LISTEN. THEY SIMPLY WANT TO HAVE A BILL.
5	CHAIRMAN TORRES: I THINK THAT'S CLEARLY
6	THE CASE. AND I THINK WHAT JAMES AND I HAVE TO DO
7	OBVIOUSLY IS TO SIT DOWN WITH THE COUNSELS TO THE
8	VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE
9	BECAUSE I DON'T SEE THAT WE CAN PURSUE ANY FURTHER
10	DISCUSSION, ALTHOUGH I'M ALWAYS OPEN IT TO AND HAVE
11	SAID SO TO SENATOR ALQUIST'S STAFF, BUT I DO THINK
12	WE NEED TO CONCENTRATE ON THE MEMBERS OF THE SENATE
13	HEALTH COMMITTEE BECAUSE I THINK WE'VE REACHED A
14	TEMPORARY, I ALWAYS SAY TEMPORARY, END TO
15	DISCUSSIONS WITH PEOPLE WE MAY DISAGREE WITH, BUT,
16	AGAIN, THE DOOR IS ALWAYS OPEN. AND I HAVE SAID SO
17	TO HER CHIEF OF STAFF AND CLEARLY TO ELAINE.
18	MR. ROTH: IT WOULD BE AWFULLY NICE IF
19	JAMES COULD MEET WITH THE COUNSEL THAT WILL TAKE A
20	LOOK JUST COUNSEL TO COUNSEL.
21	CHAIRMAN TORRES: RIGHT.
22	MR. ROTH: AND THEN REPORT BACK, YOU KNOW,
23	HERE'S THE WE'VE GIVEN OUR RATIONALE FOR EVERY
24	ONE OF THESE THINGS VERY SUCCINCTLY. CAN WE PLEASE
25	SIT DOWN WITH SOMEBODY TO GO THROUGH AND THEN GET

1	THE LIST OF THINGS THAT ARE REMAINING THAT WE HAVE
2	TO, IN FACT, DISCUSS.
3	CHAIRMAN TORRES: ALL RIGHT. ANY OTHER
4	COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS?
5	MS. SAMUELSON: A QUICK COMMENT AND
6	QUESTION. IT SEEMS TO ME WE ALWAYS COULD BE DOING
7	OUR JOB BETTER. WE'RE NOT PERFECT. AND PERHAPS IN
8	GOING TO THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, THE
9	STATE SENATE COMMITTEE, WE MIGHT SEEK THEIR INPUT
10	UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF WHAT IS THIS TRYING TO
11	ACCOMPLISH BECAUSE I'M JUST MYSTIFIED. IF THERE'S
12	SOMETHING THAT COULD BE DONE ALONG THE LINES OF NOT
13	A PERFORMANCE AUDIT, BUT ASKING THE UNDERLYING
14	QUESTION OF A PERFORMANCE AUDIT, IS THERE SOMETHING
15	WE COULD BE DOING BETTER, WE WOULD LOVE TO BE DOING
16	THAT, OF COURSE. WE ALWAYS WANT TO BE SMARTER AND
17	FASTER AT WHAT WE'RE DOING BECAUSE OUR MISSION IS SO
18	DIFFICULT.
19	BUT I DON'T SEE ANY WAY THAT ANY OF THE
20	PROVISIONS IN THIS LEGISLATION DO THAT.
21	CHAIRMAN TORRES: WE'LL BE GETTING I'LL
22	BE GOING DOWN THE LIST, AND I WILL CALL UPON BOARD
23	MEMBERS IN THOSE DISTRICTS WHERE I THINK YOU CAN BE
24	HELPFUL TO FOLLOW UP WITH SOME OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
25	HEALTH COMMITTEE.
	Ε 0

1	ANY OTHER MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER
2	COMMENTS? IF NOT, WE'LL MOVE TO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.
3	ANYONE AT CIRM, JENNA?
4	MS. PRYNE: THERE'S NO PUBLIC COMMENT AT
5	CIRM.
6	CHAIRMAN TORRES: DUANE, YOU'RE ALONE, SO
7	WE'RE DONE. DR. POMEROY.
8	DR. POMEROY: NO PUBLIC COMMENT.
9	CHAIRMAN TORRES: NO PUBLIC COMMENT.
10	EMBARCADERO, ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS HERE? DON REED.
11	MR. REED: I HAVE A QUESTION. DOES OUR
12	RECOMMENDING A STUDY IMPLY IN ANY WAY THAT WE'RE NOT
13	SURE IF THE BILL IS GOOD FOR US OR NOT?
14	CHAIRMAN TORRES: NO. I THINK WHAT WE'RE
15	IMPLYING WITH AN INTERIM STUDY IS TO TAKE A LOOK, AS
16	I SAID AT THE OUTSET, TO TAKE A REAL INVENTORY WITH
17	THIS HEARING, THAT SHE CAN DO LATER DOWN THE ROAD
18	AFTER THE LEGISLATURE IS OUT, A TRUE INVENTORY OF
19	WHAT THIS BILL CALLS FOR AND WHAT WE'VE ALREADY
20	COMPLIED WITH.
21	MR. REED: HAS SHE SHOWN ANY INCLINATION
22	OF INTEREST IN THIS LINE OF REASONING?
23	CHAIRMAN TORRES: NO.
24	MR. REED: SO I'M NOT CLEAR WHAT WE GAIN
25	BY RECOMMENDING IT. WE RECOMMEND IT FOR HER, BUT IT

1	SEEMS TO ME
2	CHAIRMAN TORRES: NO. NO. WE RECOMMEND
3	IT NO. THE WAY I WORK IT IS YOU HAVE AN AUTHOR.
4	IF THEY'RE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO OUR POSITION, THEN WE
5	WORK WITH THE OTHER MEMBERS WHO HAVE A VOTE, AND IT
6	COMES DOWN TO CALLING THE VOTE.
7	MR. REED: BECAUSE I HAVE READ THIS
8	CAREFULLY. I TYPED OUT LARGE PORTIONS OF IT TO TRY
9	AND GET IT INTO MY BRAIN WHAT IT'S ABOUT. THE GOOD
10	PARTS OF IT ARE THINGS THAT ARE ALREADY PART OF OUR
11	STRUCTURE, AND THE NEGATIVE THINGS ARE LEAPS INTO
12	THE UNKNOWN WITH UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES, AS CLAIRE
13	POMEROY POINTED OUT. I HAVE NO QUESTION IN MY MIND
14	ABOUT THIS BILL. I BOW TO YOUR SUPERIOR POLITICAL
15	ACUMEN.
16	CHAIRMAN TORRES: IT'S NOT SUPERIOR. IT'S
17	JUST AN ACUMEN. THE BOTTOM LINE, AS I SEE IT, IS
18	THIS, AND LET'S BE VERY CLEAR ABOUT IT. THE SENATOR
19	MAY DECIDE THAT SHE DOESN'T WANT TO BRING IT UP FOR
20	ANY KIND OF VOTE BECAUSE SHE DOESN'T OR WILL NOT
21	HAVE THE VOTES TO PASS IT. AND THAT MAY BE A WAY,
22	AN ALTERNATIVE. THE SECOND ALTERNATIVE MAY BE THAT
23	THE MEMBERS MAY DECIDE THEY WANT TO SUPPORT HER AS A
24	MEMBER AND THEN VOTE FOR INTERIM STUDY AS A WAY OF
2 5	NOT KILLING THE BILL AND ODDOCING HED DUDLIGLY

1	WHAT I'M TRYING TO AVOID IS A CONFRONTATION BECAUSE,
2	AS CLAIRE POMEROY APPROPRIATELY SAID, WE WANT TO
3	WORK WITH THE LEGISLATURE. AND I THINK THAT WE
4	CAN'T WORK WITH THE LEGISLATURE IF WE'RE ALWAYS
5	GOING TO BE THROWING BOMBS BACK AT THEIR BOMBS. IT
6	DOESN'T MAKE SENSE.
7	SO I THINK THAT THE FIRST ISSUE THAT WE
8	OUGHT TO DO IS TO TALK TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HEALTH
9	COMMITTEE, SENATOR STRICKLAND, WHO IS THE VICE CHAIR
10	AND A REPUBLICAN, AS YOU WELL KNOW, DUANE; SENATOR
11	SAMUEL AANESTAD, A REPUBLICAN; SENATOR GILBERT
12	CEDILLO, WHO REPRESENTS MY OLD SENATE DISTRICT;
13	SENATOR DAVE COX, A REPUBLICAN FROM NORTHERN
14	CALIFORNIA; MY CURRENT SENATOR, SENATOR MARK LENO;
15	SENATOR GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD, WHO REPRESENTS SAN
16	BERNARDINO/RIVERSIDE; SENATOR FRAN PAVLEY THAT
17	REPRESENTS SANTA MONICA, WEST SIDE OF L.A.; AND
18	SENATOR GLORIA ROMERO, WHO IS A STAUNCH SUPPORTER OF
19	CIRM WITH LEGISLATION THAT SHE AUTHORED ALONG WITH
20	ASSEMBLYMEMBER TORLICKSON ON CURRICULUM ISSUES.
21	SO WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE TALK TO
22	THESE FOLKS. AND IF THERE'S A WAY FOR SENATOR
23	ALQUIST IS A BRIGHT WOMAN AND SHE KNOWS HOW TO
24	COUNT, AND SO DO I. AND SO SHE NEEDS FIVE VOTES TO
25	GET A BILL OUT OF THE COMMITTEE, AND SHE MAY GET THE

1	VOTES FOR AN INTERIM STUDY, BUT I DON'T SEE, ONCE WE
2	MAKE OUR CASE, WHERE SHE CAN GET FIVE VOTES TO PUT
3	THIS BILL OUT OF COMMITTEE. SO WHY THAT'S MY
4	SUGGESTION IS TO MOVE TOWARD A MOTION FOR INTERIM
5	STUDY, WHICH ALLOWS EVERYBODY TO TAKE A BREATHER AND
6	GET A REAL SENSE OF WHAT WE'VE DONE AND WHAT WE
7	HAVEN'T DONE.
8	AS JOAN HAS SAID AND CLAIRE AS WELL, WE'RE
9	NOT PERFECT. AS JEFF SAID, WE'RE NOT PERFECT. AND
10	WE'RE NOT, BUT AT LEAST ARE WE COMPLYING WITH THE
11	ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED BY THE CONTROLLER'S
12	FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE AND THE LITTLE
13	HOOVER COMMISSION? MY RESPONSE IS, YES, WE HAVE.
14	DR. TROUNSON: IT GIVES US A CHANCE TO
15	ALSO EDUCATE THE PEOPLE DOWN IN SACRAMENTO. AND I
16	THINK IT'S TIME THAT WE TRIED TO DO IT. IT'S GOING
17	TO COST TIME, BUT IT WILL BE ABOUT LONG-TERM
18	BENEFIT. AND I THINK THERE ARE PEOPLE LIKE SENATOR
19	ALQUIST AND PROBABLY OTHERS WHO REALLY HAVEN'T
20	THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT IT. SO I THINK IT'S PART OF WHAT
21	WE NEED TO DO.
22	MR. KLEIN: THERE IS A VERY CONSTRUCTIVE
23	PROCESS WE WENT THROUGH WITH THE LEADERSHIP OF THE
24	SENATE AND THE ASSEMBLY IN 2005 AND 2006 WHERE WE
25	MET WITH THE LEGISLATORS, GOT IDEAS WHICH WERE GREAT

1	IDEAS. WE ACTUALLY I CREATED A KEY LIST OF WHAT
2	THEY WANTED, HAD THEIR COUNSEL AND THEIR CONSULTANTS
3	APPROVE LANGUAGE, AND THEN BROUGHT IT TO THE BOARD.
4	WE PASSED IT WITH A PROVISION THAT IF WE EVER
5	CHANGED THESE PROVISIONS, WE WOULD IN ADVANCE NOTIFY
6	THE LEGISLATURE THAT WE WERE CHANGING THOSE
7	PROVISIONS. SO NOT ONLY DID WE INCORPORATE THEIR
8	IDEAS, BUT TOLD THEM WE WOULD OBSERVE THEM AND WE
9	WOULDN'T CHANGE THEM WITHOUT GIVING THEM NOTICE SO
10	THEY COULD THEN DECIDE WHETHER THEY WANTED TO TAKE
11	SOME FUTURE ACTION.
12	SO WE'VE HAD A HISTORY OF VERY
13	PRODUCTIVELY TRYING TO LEARN FROM THE LEGISLATURE,
14	WHICH HAS A LOT OF KNOWLEDGE AND A LOT OF
15	EXPERIENCE, AND INCORPORATING THAT IN A WAY THAT
16	RESPECTED THE INITIATIVE AND THE PROCESS. SO
17	HOPEFULLY WE CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT WE HAVE COME TO
18	THAT TABLE BEFORE PRODUCTIVELY AND LIVED BY IT FOR
19	THREE OR FOUR YEARS ALREADY WITH REAL DISCIPLINE,
20	AND WE WOULD HOPE TO LEARN AND FOLLOW THAT MODEL TO
21	REALLY IMPROVE OURSELVES.
22	CHAIRMAN TORRES: RIGHT. THAT WAS AN
23	INFORMAL PROCESS. NOW WE'RE MOVING EVEN FURTHER TO
24	SUGGEST A MORE FORMAL PROCESS BY WHICH TO TAKE THE
25	INPUT AND BY WHICH TO EDUCATE EACH OTHER.

	Diministration in the service
1	ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS AT ANY VENUE?
2	ANY BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS BEFORE WE MOVE TO A VOTE?
3	YOU WANT TO RESTATE THE MOTION, MR. HARRISON?
4	MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION IS TO RECOMMEND
5	THAT SB 1064 BE MOVED TO INTERIM STUDY WITHOUT
6	ENDORSING OR OPPOSING THE BILL.
7	MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.
8	DR. LEVIN: YES.
9	MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
10	MR. KLEIN: YES.
11	MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
12	DR. POMEROY: YES.
13	MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
14	DR. PRIETO: YES.
15	MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.
16	MR. ROTH: YES.
17	MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
18	MS. SAMUELSON: YES.
19	MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
20	MR. SHEEHY: YES.
21	MS. KING: ART TORRES.
22	CHAIRMAN TORRES: AYE.
23	MS. KING: THAT MOTION CARRIES.
24	CHAIRMAN TORRES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
25	MEMBERS, FOR YOUR TIME AND WE'LL SEE YOU IN
	64

1072 BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626 1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM

1	SACRAMENTO AT OUR FIRST MEETING IN AN ACTUAL
2	LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER. ADJOURNED.
3	(THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT
4	05:52 P.M.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	65

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 LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR ON THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 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