Cancer Research Endowment Authority Board Meeting – Minutes

Board Attendees (Quorum Attained):
Elaine Albert, Frederick Appelbaum, Leslie Alexandre (arrived 3:30pm), Thomas Brown, Weihang Chai, Carol Dahl, Eunice Hostetter, Jennifer Kampsula Wong

Board Members Absent: David Byrd, Steve Harr, James Hendricks

Guest Attendees:
Vivien Savath (minutes recorder), Thomas Bates

Special Meeting | November 15, 2016 | 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
2001 6th Avenue, Suite 2600, Seattle, WA | Dept. of Commerce

3:00pm Call to Order
3:05pm Introductions
3:10pm Discussion: 2017 Legislative Session

(double click to access presentation)

- Discussion included:
  - The language contained in HB 2697 “up to a maximum” could mean zero dollars.
  - Is there a risk that non-state match dollars could be raised, available in the CARE fund, and then not matched by the state?
    - Yes – under the legislation “as is,” that is a risk
  - Fredrick Appelbaum calls for a motion to authorize Thomas Bates to work with the state legislature (i) to name the CARE fund in honor of the late Senator Andy Hill, (ii) to create legislative changes for the state commitment to pre-fund the CARE fund and, (iii) to create legislative changes for a broader definition of non-state contributions eligible for match.
    - Thomas Brown moves for a vote
    - Eunice Hostetter seconds.
    - Vote: 7 yeas, 0 nays

Eunice Hostetter offers support from herself and the Cancer Action Network (CAN) to Thomas Bates. CAN will have a lobby day on January 17, 2017. Jennifer Kampsula Wong offers additional support.
3:35pm Discussion: CARE Administrator Thomas B.

- Discussion included:
  - The decision regarding desired duties of a program administrator is largely determined by the grants the CARE Authority would like to create and fund.
  - The fund is unable to make grants until an administrator is in place to create the granting account.
  - The board should review the potential administrator duties and prepare to approve an administrator RFP at the next Board meeting.

3:48pm Discussion: CARE Fund Potential Investment Areas

- Discussion included:
  - Would Talent Recruitment grants be made one-time or multi-year? 
    - Recruiting organizations typically make the package a one-time commitment, though the recruited researcher can manage those funds over a multi-year time frame. The CARE fund would consider these funds expended in the year the grant is made.
  - Would retention of researchers also be considered in the Talent Recruitment funding area? 
    - It is possible.
    - The perceived impact of retention, as opposed to new talent, is smaller.
    - Objectively evaluating retention candidates along with new talent may be difficult.
  - Does the Board have a position on whether private companies should be included or excluded from applying in any category or across the portfolio? 
    - Including companies creates a broader case for impact
    - Supporting private company recruitment could be perceived poorly.
    - Funding areas ‘Grand Challenge’ and ‘Ecosystem’ could include private companies
    - The Board could encourage collaborations that include private companies
    - The Board could choose to not explicitly exclude private companies
The Grand Challenge fund could be used to seed cross-sector partnerships among CARE, research institutions (academic and non-profit), and private industry.

- This has potential to fund IT and big data companies
- A short pre-application could help identify demand and big ideas.
- Idea generation is incumbent on applicants.
- Payment tranches tied to milestones could incentivize progress.
- Strength and quality of the review committee will be critical.
- CARE’s funding ability is relatively small, but could seed new partnerships

- Would the Board consider a fourth category of bridge funding or proof-of-concept pre-proposal funding?
  - The potential areas currently do not create opportunities for individual investigators to apply.
  - This would be a relatively small amount of money and it could be up to the investigator to attract (non-government) matching funds.
  - Limited ability to demonstrate impact and return on investment to the legislature.
  - This is a common occurrence and demand for this type of money will be very high.

- Would the Board consider funding population science and research that contributes to behavioral health prevention?
  - Potential to focus on a particular population or high-need group.
  - Yes – a population science lens could be incorporated in any of these categories. The Board can choose to highlight a particular interest in these issues.

- The Board should evaluate the portfolio of funding areas based on the filter of having a state and legislative audience, to ensure CARE continues to get funded.
  - Ecosystem investments are not exciting and have too long a timeframe to demonstrate impact. Their value is known to researchers only.
  - Ecosystem investments may require ongoing funds to sustain.
  - Grand challenge will require active management to be successful.

4:58pm  Review, Amend, and Approve Job Descriptions (ACTION)  Fred A.

- Elaine Albert moves to approve the Secretary and Treasurer duties as proposed
  - Eunice Hostetter seconds
  - Vote: 7 yeas, 0 nay
• Board Secretary Election – **Delayed**
• Board Treasurer Election – **Delayed**

5:00pm  Dates for upcoming meetings  

Fred A.

_The Board is asked to contact Vivien Savath to provide additional comments on the potential investment areas._

_Thomas will follow-up on process for filing regular meetings with the Code Reviser._

Dated:  

1/18/2019  

Eunice Hostetter  
CARE Board Secretary