

**Department of Health and Human Services
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
National Cancer Institute**

**Minutes of the Research Translation, Dissemination, and Policy Implications
Subcommittee of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research
Coordinating Committee**

November 8, 2011

The Research Translation, Dissemination, and Policy Implications (RTDPI) Subcommittee of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee (IBCERCC) was convened for a meeting on November 8, 2011 at 3:00 PM EST via conference call. The Chair of the subcommittee was Jeanne Rizzo, R.N. of the Breast Cancer Fund.

Subcommittee Members Present

Beverly Canin
Ysabel Duron
Ronda Henry-Tillman, M.D.
Karen Miller
Marcus Plescia, M.D., M.P.H.
Jeanne Rizzo, R.N.
Shelia Zahm, Sc.D.

NIH Staff Present

Jennifer Collins, M.R. (NIEHS)
Christie Kaefer, M.B.A., R.D. (NCI)

Guests

Kathy Brown-Haumeni (SCG)

I. BACKGROUND

The Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee (IBCERCC) is a congressionally mandated body established by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), in collaboration with the National Cancer Institute (NCI). This Committee is comprised of 19 voting members, including representatives of Federal agencies; non-federal scientists, physicians, and other health professionals from clinical, basic, and public health sciences; and advocates for individuals with breast cancer.

The Committee's primary mission is to facilitate the efficient and effective exchange of information on breast cancer research activities among the member agencies, and to advise the NIH and other Federal agencies in the solicitation of proposals for collaborative, multidisciplinary research, including proposals to further evaluate environmental and genomic factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer. The Committee serves as a forum and assists in increasing public understanding of the member agencies' activities, programs, policies, and research, and in bringing important matters of interest forward for discussion.

The objectives of the RTDPI Subcommittee of the IBCERCC are integrated and dependent on the objectives and activities of the other Subcommittees of the IBCERCC and include the following: to identify successful models as well as gaps in research translation and dissemination, to make recommendations to improve both with an emphasis on breast cancer and the environment; to make policy recommendations to that end; to address areas in which the scientific evidence on breast cancer and the environment supports precautionary public health policy; and to identify methods to expand public participation in the research translation and dissemination processes to more effectively involve patient advocacy and community organizations, environmental health, environmental justice as well as practitioners in public health and health care delivery.

The tenth meeting (conference call) of the RTDPI Subcommittee took place on November 8, 2011. During this meeting, the IBCERCC report timeline and the Subcommittee's draft chapters for the IBCERCC report were discussed, along with additional meetings to be added to the calendar on November 29, December 13, and December 14. The previously scheduled meeting on December 6 will be cancelled.

II. DISCUSSION

IBCERCC Report Timeline and Format

The IBCERCC Subcommittees will submit their draft chapters to the Chairs on December 5. The RTDPI Subcommittee members inquired what the deadline was for sidebar stories, the desired length, and preferred format. Christie agreed to raise this question with NIH staff and ask that it be added to the document containing guidance for the report authors. NIH needs to have some additional discussions with SCG about the overall timeline, including issues related to the report review process.

Beverly said that what she thinks the RTDPI members want to describe about advocate involvement in research related to breast cancer and the environment is longer than a sidebar story would be, so this information should be contained in the introduction to the RTDPI section of the report instead. Jeanne reminded the RTDPI members that this should not just focus on advocates, but should also include "implementers" as well, based on a point Marcus raised during discussion about this at the September in-person meeting.

The group talked about reviewing the themes for the Executive Summary discussed at the in-person meeting to make sure that anything the RTDPI members deemed to be important is carried through the RTDPI chapters. For example, the precautionary principle is definitely

included in the RTDPI section, but interagency collaboration may not be adequately covered. Karen said she has been adding the word “prevention” but she still thinks the theme needs to be infused more throughout the report. Beverly doesn’t think huge changes are needed to achieve the desired results. Jeanne suggested that if there are places in the draft chapters where RTDPI members are struggling, maybe SCG and/or NIH staff supporting the IBCERCC could offer suggestions.

Policy Update

Discussion points identified by Jeanne included:

- Should the words “precautionary principle” be used and if so, is a definition needed?
- Is there cross-agency communication regarding the issue of “weight of the evidence”?
- How does the IBCERCC definition of the environment affect/relate to the topics being addressed by the RTDPI Subcommittee?
- For the [*2002 International Summit on Breast Cancer and the Environment report*](#), there was virtually no effort to distribute the report. The IBCERCC has come up with many of the same recommendations without any discussion of this prior report. Some recommendations from the 2002 report may have been implemented, but probably not that many.

Shelia thought many elements from the *2002 International Summit* report took hold in California, but not necessarily elsewhere in the country. Marcus agreed to ask around at the CDC, particularly in the environmental health section, if there is any information available about the impact of the 2002 International Summit report and lessons learned. Jeanne thought the RTDPI policy chapter should cite the *2002 International Summit* report.

Shelia thanked RTDPI members for their suggested changes to the draft policy chapter. She raised a few questions for discussion:

- Do we want to limit the text to chemicals or do we want to include other topics, such as radiation?
- Do we want to specifically call out the “precautionary principle” or describe the concept in broader language?

Shelia thought radiation could be added as an example of interagency collaboration. Jeanne thought we should since the State-of-the-Science Subcommittee agreed to add discussion of radiation. She also believed there was a policy implication raised in the *2002 International Summit* regarding radiation. The RTDPI members discussed different types of radiation (ionizing and non-ionizing) and only ionizing radiation is a known carcinogen. Marcus suggested revisiting the discussion of radiation in the President’s Cancer Panel report. He also mentioned that CDC is convening some panels to look at some of these issues, but they are still in the early planning stages. HHS has a lot of clout over clinics, CDC focuses more on environmental health, and the FDA oversees medical devices. Ronda added that from a clinician’s standpoint, there is a lot of information that they do not receive about radiation, so the topic of radiation should probably be incorporated into the draft text on communication and dissemination.

Regarding the term “precautionary principle,” Shelia thought most readers would agree with the general idea behind the precautionary principle, but she is concerned that we may lose some readers if we specifically call out the term “precautionary principle” in the report.

- Beverly thought use of “precautionary approach” might get around this, although she thinks the term “precautionary” itself sounds rigid.
- Ysabel felt people will hear the word “precaution” before they hear “principle” and may misinterpret the meaning.
- Shelia thought even the word “precautionary” may be a red flag to readers, especially after the President’s Cancer Panel report.
- Karen said she understands the concerns related to the term “precautionary principle” and she is neutral on the issue.
- Jeanne suggested adding a definition at the beginning of the chapter for precautionary principle, along with hazard assessment, risk assessment, etc.

Jeanne asked if anyone was aware of other reports that refer to a precautionary approach and whether there have been any problems with this term? Shelia thought it would be important to get feedback on terminology from the full IBCERCC.

Karen really likes the policy implications chapter but thinks we haven’t gotten anywhere in terms of promoting the idea of prevention because of concerns of turning people off. She asked if the group could explore reasons why there hasn’t been any progress made? Karen feels that there hasn’t been a fully funded “roadmap” for breast cancer prevention.

As for the issue of “weight of the evidence,” Shelia said this topic is not currently discussed in the RTDPI policy section, just the National Toxicology Program’s Report on Carcinogens and reports from the International Agency for Research on Cancer. Shelia is seeking guidance on what should be contained in a discussion on this topic, e.g. interagency collaboration, the research process, state of the science.

- Jeanne commented that maybe some of the discussion in the paper by Woodruff et al on decision making might be relevant, as well as the work by Rudell and Brody.
- Use of animal models are relevant, but likely underutilized in terms of weight of the evidence.
- Maybe health tracking in terms of data collection would be relevant?

Shelia said she will re-visit this topic with Marcus after the call.

The appendix for the policy section currently lists all reports that the team has reviewed. All reports are cited in the RTDPI policy chapter; however, the appendix actually includes some of the recommendations from the original reports. Does the RTDPI Subcommittee want to keep this appendix or drop it from the IBCERCC report? Or scale it back by removing the recommendations? Shelia suggested keeping it and if there is a concern that the report is too long, the appendix could be available online as supplemental materials to the report. Connie said that the appendix will need to be edited if it is to be published.

Ysabel is concerned that there are no specific recommendations that look at the impact of the environment in minorities and breast cancer. She would like a bold, strong recommendation for the policy section on this topic. Shelia offered to review the document section by section to incorporate Ysabel’s feedback.

RTDPI members asked if there have been any additional changes to the IBCERCC definition of the environment. NIH staff will check on this.

Research Translation, Communication, and Dissemination Update

The merged chapter was discussed by RTDPI members. Jeanne will follow up with Liam O’Fallon and Galen Cole to see if they have any comments to share on the latest version of the chapter. Beverly sent some suggested changes to the opening paragraph just prior to the start of today’s call. Ysabel likes Beverly’s feedback and suggested there is a good opportunity here for a story to connect with readers.

Beverly had some questions about the definitions, specifically for “public health practices” and whether this is about more than just hazardous chemicals? She also questioned the definition for “environmental justice”.

Connie said she needs help, especially with the features of existing programs and characteristics. She needs clear examples of programs and projects that very clearly exhibit the characteristics. Connie is looking for descriptions of 3-4 sentences, e.g. one example for each characteristic, such as bi-directional communication. Beverly thought this already existed. Connie clarified that she needed more help with concise descriptions and she has inserted some questions into the draft chapter with specific areas she would like assistance with. Jeanne thought the current paragraphs are a bit too passive. Ysabel said she is struggling with specific examples. For example, what is the impact on communities? A story may help. Jeanne suggested a story about the NIEHS funded program with Silent Spring Institute in Richmond, CA that looked at fence-line communities near a Chevron plant and the household exposures. Other possible stories could be the BCERC project in Cincinnati which informed parents of unexpected environmental exposures observed in the girls participating in the study.

Karen thought the description of the California Breast Cancer Research Program (CBCRP) is strong and asked that if all RTDPI members agree, this wording should be used at the beginning of the chapter. The opening section should include some of this strong language, especially regarding prevention. Ronda asked Karen if she has anything specific in mind regarding prevention.

Jeanne mentioned the schematic on page 9. Connie modified the pathways for basic science and population and clinical sciences. Christie asked if the wording in the schematic could be modified, particularly “RFP” because of its specific meaning in Federal government referring to contracts. “Funding opportunities” might be more appropriate term. Christie also questioned the use of the term “toxic” since not all exposures relevant to IBCERCC are considered toxic. Jeanne said she will need to check with the original authors who developed the graphic. If “toxic” is kept, the caption could include more explanation of how this was developed and how it could apply more broadly to other areas. Kathy said it would be helpful if RTDPI members could provide background information about graphics, e.g. this is a combined source.

RTDPI Subcommittee members liked the merge of the previously separate chapters on research translation with the chapter on communication and dissemination. Connie said the comments provided were fantastic and asked that any future comments be added to the version saved on SharePoint. Beverly asked that when others add comments to SharePoint, please let other

RTDPI members know so they can review the changes. Connie also said it is best to add comments to the existing document rather than create a new document. Jeanne requested additional comments by Monday.

Ysabel asked for feedback on the toolkit appendix information. Christie thought it was great, and the only change suggested was the addition of the NIEHS metrics manual as a reference/resource.

Action Items:

- NIH staff to inquire about deadline for sidebar stories and whether there have been any modifications to the IBCERCC definition of the environment following the September in-person meeting. Additional clarification also needed on introductions to each section.
- Marcus to check with CDC staff familiar with the 2002 International Summit on Breast Cancer and the Environment report to ask whether any information is available regarding the report's impact and/or lessons learned.
- All were asked to provide additional examples for the research translation, communication, and dissemination chapter of existing programs and characteristics. Connie needs clear examples of programs and projects that very clearly exhibit the characteristics (3-4 sentences).

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes and attachments are accurate and complete.

/Jeanne Rizzo/

Jeanne Rizzo, RN

Chairperson

Research Translation, Dissemination, and Policy Implications Subcommittee

Interagency Breast Cancer & Environmental Research Coordinating Committee

/Gwen W. Collman/

Gwen W. Collman, PhD

Executive Secretary

Research Process Subcommittee

Interagency Breast Cancer & Environmental Research Coordinating Committee

Proper signatures

Treat as signed, § 1.4(d)(2)