

Breast Cancer Research Council Meeting Minutes
October 16, 2015: Council Meeting
1111 Franklin St. Room 5320, Oakland, CA

Members Present: Rose Marie Colbert, Jon Greif, Marjorie Kagawa-Singer, Dick Jackson, K. Alice Leung, Lori Marx-Rubiner, Janice Mathurin, Sharima Rasanayagam, Eileen Schnitger, Joan Venticinque, David Wellisch

Members Absent: Marjorie Green, David Hoon, Kristiina Vuori, Jeffrey Wasserman

Staff: Mary Croughan, Senaida Poole, Mhel Kavanaugh-Lynch, Carmela Lomonaco, Katie McKenzie, Nicole Mairena

Guests: none

I. Call to Order and Introductions of New Members: Sharima called the Council meeting to order at 8:35 am and initiated introductions.

II. Approval of Minutes: The council reviewed the Minutes from the June Council Meeting and the from the Occupational Chemical Exposures/Programmatic Review teleconference.

MOTION: Jon motioned to approve (Margie seconded). The motion passed unanimously

MOTION: Alice motioned to approve (Jon Seconded). The motion passed unanimously.

III. Renewal of Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement: Mhel briefly overviewed the RGPO Confidentiality/COI agreement and each member of the Council was given a copy to read and sign. All members need to renew the agreement annually.

IV. Core Funding Update: last year: Katie presented the funding report for Cycle 21. She also updated the Council on the timeline for 2015-2016 funding (cycle 22) and the work the Council will be asked to do. The IDEA & Translational LOIs due Oct 29, 2015 (Council scores by 12/7; reviews and decides who to invite on 12/10). The Conference Award applications are due Nov 5, 2015. CRC awards have no LOIs but applicants may submit research plans by Oct 26, 2015. On March 10, 2016 the CRC, IDEA, Translational applications are due. Programmatic review kicks off at the April meeting and it is completed by Council members outside of meetings. Council members will be notified of triaged apps by May 20th and the preliminary scores are due May 26th. Funding recommendations are made by Council at the June 2016 meeting. She also presented the Cycle 21 Draft Compendium.

V. LOI Review: Katie discussed the purpose of the Letter of Intent with the Council and reviewed LOI submission trends from 2006-2014. Jon asked if we want to raise the percentage we reject. The group discussed that CBCRP rejects a fair amount more than other RGPO funders

have historically rejected. Katie walked Council through LOI review process, and discussed the review criteria for IDEA and Translational LOIs. She also gave clarification to the Council of the distinction between advocate involvement in IDEA and Translational, and partnership in CRC awards. It's anticipated that one committee will cover Translational LOIs, and two committees for IDEA awards with approximately 25-30 LOIs each. Katie included a list of last year's LOIs, and examples of what might cause a high or low score on different criteria.

VI. CBCPI Update: Carmela provided an update to Council on the CBCPI. She re-capped that 15 initiatives were approved by Council, 4 initiatives are funded or in prefunding, and 11 initiatives will be rolled out in the next 2 years (½ in the first year; ½ in the second year). Three initiatives have come to Council in this meeting for their review.

VII. Review RFPs:

A. Chemicals Policy Impact/Effectiveness: The Council discussed this RFP, and confirmed that it has been through multiple levels of review. Dick noted that this initiative opens a path for scientists to contribute in a real way to the discussion around chemicals and health, a discussion currently dominated by chemicals companies and environmental health advocates. Council made no changes. Committee approved this to move forward.

MOTION: Jon moved (Margie seconded) to go forward with the Chemicals Policy Impact/Effectiveness RFP. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Biological Markers: The Council discussed methodological aspects of this RFP (clarifying invasive vs non-invasive techniques). The Council asked staff to check the links in this RFP. The group discussed changing 'non-invasive' language. The Invasive/Non-invasive language was included because the vision of the Steering Committee is that this could be used in the same way as a screening test. The Council asked staff to remove sentence: "Noninvasive biomarkers are preferred, although invasive biomarkers are not excluded."

MOTION: Jon moved (Alice seconded) to approve with edits and move forward with the Biological Markers RFP. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Risk Assessment: Council discussed the size and duration of these projects. The projects can be incremental, and these incremental changes could have a huge impact. Council discussed how 'high-risk' is defined, and staff clarified that investigators must define and provide justification for their definition. Discussed the example studies that are in the RFP. Council suggested that the number of references to genetic factors is sufficient. Could have excellent policy impacts by looking at distribution shifts. Council made no changes.

MOTION: Dick moved (Joan seconded) to approve with edits and move forward with the Risk Assessment RFP. The motion passed unanimously.

During lunch, Alice Leung gave her Meet-a-Member Presentation.

VIII. Committee Reports & 2015-16 Preview:

A. Advocacy Involvement: Senaida presented and gave an overview of what the committee has accomplished from 2011-2015 and what we will focus on in 2015-2016. David shared an idea to build understanding among investigators by creating short videos from Advocates and send them to investigators as well as to consider a video featuring an Advocate/Scientist pair that works together. Dick asked a question clarifying Advocates vs. Community. Lori noted that Research Advocates need training. The group discussed the Program's definition of advocates. Jon discussed whether advocates might approach a scientist to develop a study. Mhel noted that a few CRCs have grown this way; Sharima noted that the The Women's Firefighter grant is another example. Joan Venticinque, Eileen Schnitger volunteered to serve on the Committee. Jon discussed another meaning of advocacy, in terms of advocating for the program in the legislature. There are limits to what staff can do; however the Council can advocate on behalf of the Program, and can identify as CBCRC when doing so. Staff can support a committee and then the Council can act on the Committee's behalf.

B. Outreach: Committee prioritizes CBCRP communication goals. Creates vision for Symposia and Conferences. Advises on tax check-off. Raises awareness of CBCRP funding strategies. On February 29, 2016 CBCRP will hold a regional conference that focuses on making connections between different groups (university or private institution Scientists, and community groups). The presenters are lined up. Mhel, Sharima and an advocate survivor will welcome people to the day. Bob Hiatt will give an overview of the model of BC causation. The panel: Dissecting BC causation that includes speakers Sarah Gehlert, Scarlett Gomez, Megan Schwartzman, which will be followed by a professionally facilitated networking session around BC causation (World Café will facilitate). In the afternoon there is a Panel on Resources for Understanding BC Causation that includes Laura Esserman, Kim Harley & Kimberly Parra, Rachel Morrello-Frosch, Heather Buren, and Tony Stefani. There will be a networking session, a report back, and closing. The networking session with poster presentations will be in the evening. The current item to finalize is Big data on BC. We are trying to get speaker from NIH Big Data to Knowledge Initiative, but having a hard time. A few names were suggested to Katie for follow-up: Claire Brindis, Allison Kurian. We are still searching for a pragmatic presenter, with experience in community and scientist connections, and have expertise with combining different kinds of data. Margie recommended an investigator who has pulled together disparate data sets to look at the relationship of pesticides and Parkinson's disease. Dick suggested Brenda Eskenazi. We are need moderators for the Opening, Session 1, Session 2 (Advocates to moderate). Jon suggested that staff send out save the dates as soon as possible. We are still considering three event sites. The committee needs to create lists of advocate groups in the community so that we can cultivate multiple dimensions of diversity within the attendee group. Dick asked

about investigating firms that do pro-bono work with non-profits. Rose Marie and Dick joined the Outreach Committee

C. Priority-Setting: Alice presented an update on the committee's Priority-Setting process, including the five steps of the process, the high level conclusions from the process, what we have accomplished in the past year; what we hope to accomplish in the next year. In December, the Committee will come to Council with a recommendation for when to hold the next Priority-Setting meeting. Alice spoke with Dick Jackson, and Dick agreed to join the Evaluation & PS Committee. Current membership: Alice, Sharima, Jon, Kristina, Dick.

D. Policy: Carmela presented an update reminding the Council of the structure and purpose of the Council Policy Committee. She also updated Council on the activities over the last year. In the upcoming year, the committee will review progress of first policy-related project, strategize improved outreach effort for topic nominations; oversee/review implementation and coordination of the policy initiative cycle, attend monthly Policy Committee meetings, and if schedule permits the PRAG will meet via conference call 1-2x/year.

A new committee, the Development Committee was formed. It will be staffed by Mhel and the two committee members are Jon Greif and Sharima Rasanayagam. The committee welcomes any other council members who'd like to join the committee. This new committee was formed to explore opportunities to add CBCRP as a recipient in the tobacco tax increase proposition.

IX. Policy Initiative Update: Policy Initiative Update: Carmela presented. Reviewed the purpose of the Policy Initiative. Summarized the definition of policy as it relates to this initiative. Main components of initiative: Topic nominations; peer-reviewed pool of on-call investigative teams; rapid response research. Discussed the current research idea that has received a bid: "What are the significant barriers or challenges to access breast cancer oncology care if you are uninsured, underinsured, on public or private insurance?" Upcoming activities: PRAG reviews bid at end of October, project begins in November, and project ends in May 2016.

X. Community Initiatives Update: Senaida updated the council that the CRC Technical Assistance and staff efforts will continue, in order to support potential applicants for the next cycle, with due date March 2016. She also briefly updated the group on the Outreach workshop for QuickStart that are taking place between September-November.

XI. PI-3 Update: Carmela reviewed the logic model with the Council, and provided update on activities that have been completed, are underway, and those that are upcoming.

XII. Director's Report: Mhel reviewed the current action items from March and June. We've reaffirmed a couple of items that are still in process: "Request updated publication and grant leverage information from grantees who apply for new grants. Include this request on the application forms." This was originally proposed as an item to address in the electronic grants management system. Given that the system is about 2 years away from implementation (e.g.

2017) we will address this item in our current cycle. Senaida & Katie will address the item in the current forms for Cycle 21. “Strengthen the advocate-scientist interface, including training and motivating researchers to work with advocates throughout the research process and to better formulate research questions & methods.” Senaida is working on a toolkit to project manage this process, which is due December 2015. “Hire fundraising consultant for an assessment and recommendations. Investigate and define models of sustainability for CBCRP, including co-funding between CBCRP and other organizations specific to CBCRP priorities.” Mhel is working on this, and may have something to share in December. The 5 year Legislative Report was also presented.

MOTION: Eileen moved (Lori seconded) to approve the Legislative Report pending staff successfully addressing any inputs/edits that council members send by 10/30/15The motion passed unanimously.

XIII. Announcements: none

Sharima adjourned meeting at 3:48 pm.