

Cancer Research Endowment Authority Board Meeting – Minutes

Board Attendees (Quorum Attained):

Frederick Appelbaum, Leslie Alexandre, Thomas Brown, David Byrd, Carol Dahl, Steve Harr, James Hendricks, Eunice Hostetter

By phone: Weihang Chai, Jennifer Kampsula Wong

Board Members Absent: Elaine Albert

Guest Attendees:

Thomas Bates, Allegra Calder (minutes recorder), Maura Little, Vivien Savath

**Board Meeting and Public Hearing | February 10, 2017 | 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
2001 6th Avenue, Suite 2600, Seattle, WA | Dept. of Commerce**

3:00pm Call to Order **Fred A.**

3:05pm Introductions **All**

3:10pm Executive Committee Elections **All**

- Eunice Hostetter nominated as Secretary by Leslie Alexandre, seconded by Thomas Brown
- Steve Harr nominated as Treasurer by Eunice Hostetter and seconded by Leslie Alexandre
- Unanimous vote of approval on both nominations

3:20pm Discussion: 2017 Legislative Session **Thomas B.**

Discussion included:

- Renaming of CARE to Andy Hill Cancer Research Endowment. Bill introduced by Sen. Joe Fein, heard on Tuesday. Thomas spoke on behalf of the CARE Board along with the Cancer Action Network. Questions at hearing around how to leverage Moonshot. Thomas drafted language for Sen. Fein that expands the definition of a match to encompass federal funding. Expect it to pass.
- Issue of when money is appropriated versus matched. Fred and Thomas had several meetings in Olympia asking for full funding (\$10M) in supplemental and biennium budgets. We don't have to address what constitutes a match and when state money come in, if the money comes in at once. If money can be appropriated before private money, then there is no need for a legislative fix. The preceding interpretation of the WSOS model may be a challenge.
- Proof of a match is the goal for what constitutes a match similar to Rep. Jeff Morris' bill from last year.
- Fred Appelbaum noted that for recruitment several entities could apply, some number would be chosen, then the CARE Fund would assign the dollars. The entity would write a check to the fund and get two times the amount back.

- Other discussion included that this model could be more challenging for raising private dollars, especially if proof of receipt really means money in the bank, and if payment would only come at completion of work as with the Life Sciences Discovery Fund.
- Fred Appelbaum called for a motion to request a written opinion from the Assistant Attorney General on this issue and on whether federal money constitutes non-state dollars.
 - Carol Dahl moved for a vote
 - Thomas Brown seconded.
 - Unanimous approval

3:45 Public Hearing on Plan

A request was made for public comment. There was none.

3:50 Committee Discussion of Inaugural Plan

Fred A. /Vivien S.



(double click to access document)

CARE Distinguished Researchers

The first discussion item focused on whether the statement “have demonstrated commitment to translation to product” was too narrow.

The group proposed adding a preference for applicants that “Articulate how the proposed researcher’s experience and research focus will impact the field of cancer”

- There was also a suggestion to look at the language used in programs in Georgia and Texas and Washington State’s former STARS program

Cancer Breakthrough Fund

Fred Appelbaum opened up the discussion noting that we have little experience doing this and do not know what kind of projects might show up. Some trepidation to committing state dollars to 4-5 years of funding at \$1M/year so the concept was to put in a grant for first year funding, after which we would evaluate again. Planning is used but is not the right word.

- The question of how to measure impact was resolved by putting the responsibility on the applicant and noting that they will be evaluated on their milestones to ensure they are ambitious enough.
- For all applications it would be a two-step process. An initial period of time within which they will set their own milestones. Grants will have a limited amount of funding – if they reach the

milestones and it's still compelling, we keep funding. It could be that there are no compelling applications or we have twenty that are all compelling and either way we may have to rethink our process.

- Hopefully we are building the fund over time. We can reseed each year with new funds and funds that fall away. Always layering. By year four, we should have steady state.
- De-risking the money would make it attractive to other funders.
- Concerns were raised around the level of work and knowledge needed related to grants management and follow up, which would fall to either the scientific review panel, the administrator, or both.
- It was decided that "benefit to the State" was preferable language to "tie to the Washington economy."
- Leslie Alexandre moved to approve the Plan with the edits discussed, Steve Harr seconded
- Unanimously approved.

4:45 pm Discussion: CARE Fund Administrator RFP

Thomas B.



20170206 CARE
Program Administratc

(double click to access document)

Discussion included:

- Thomas discussed the core responsibilities, primarily management of the grants, which is a significant task. This could require subject matter expertise, and necessitate hiring a program officer, which could get expensive.
- It was noted that you also need someone who is paying attention to the program and promoting how the state's money is being spent along with outcomes.
- Sandra Adix clarified that there is no expressed reporting requirement but there is an audit. State Auditor will want to know you have mechanisms in place to track the money and make sure the match was there along with individual contracts. Did you follow your own contract and did you ensure the grantee met it?
- For the RFP we need to explicitly state there will be some tracking to meet audit expectations and to monitor fund outcomes. Thomas will augment RFP to cover tracking and monitoring.
- There was a question about individual liability of the Board if someone feels the money is misspent. LSDF board members were covered by the State. This should hold here so long as the board acts in accordance with the statute.
- There was a request to change lobbying to public engagement.
- There was discussion about whether and how to communicate the available budget. It was decided to insert "at least \$200,000, but no more than \$500,000 into the RFP."

- Hope to approve an administrator by April 13.
- Jim Hendricks, Leslie Alexandre, Thomas Brown, and Carol Dahl volunteered to serve on the RFP review committee
- Carol Dahl made a motion to approve the RFP, Leslie Alexandre seconded.
- Unanimous approval.

5:15pm Dates for upcoming meetings

Thomas B.

Next dates are April 13, July 13, and October 25 from 3-5pm

Dated: 1/18/2019

DocuSigned by:
Eunice Hostetter
5840701D4508455...

Eunice Hostetter
CARE Board Secretary