

THE

CANCER LETTER

Vol. 23 No. 30

Aug. 1, 1997

© Copyright 1997 The Cancer Letter Inc.
All rights reserved.
Price \$265 Per Year US
\$285 Per Year Elsewhere

Breast Cancer Action Plan Committee Outraged By Plans For \$14M In NCI Funds

Last November, a committee of breast cancer activists and government scientists decided that the federal government was excessively generous to their organization, the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer.

After determining the Action Plan's needs, the committee kept only \$750,000 of the \$14.75 million in funds earmarked for the plan in the NCI budget for fiscal 1997. The untapped funds were to be channeled to peer-reviewed research in breast cancer, the steering committee decided.

The committee's vote was unanimous, and its authority to determine the needs of the Action Plan has never been challenged. The plan's

(Continued to page 2)

In Brief

Ring Appointed Associate Dean At UCSF; Univ. of Utah Forms Cell Signaling Center

ERNEST RING has been appointed associate dean of the University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine. Part of his responsibilities as dean will be to oversee the expansion of the UCSF Cancer Center at Mount Zion Medical Center. Ring will remain as chief of radiology at UCSF Mount Zion Medical Center. . . . **UNIVERSITY OF UTAH** has formed the Center for Cell Signaling. The center is part of the Utah State Center of Excellence Program, designed to encourage the commercialization of technologies developed at the state's colleges and universities. The new center plans to develop technologies for the treatment of cancer, allergy, asthma, and inflammation. . . . **NCI** has established the **Charles Harkin** Award for Research in Thyroid Cancer, in memory of the brother of **Sen. Tom Harkin** (D-IO). The Division of Basic Sciences will oversee the three-year \$180,000 grant to be awarded to tenured and tenure-track investigators. . . . **BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION** received the Public Relations Society of America's Certificate of Merit for crisis management after the cloning of Dolly the sheep by Scotland's Roslin Institute earlier this year. . . . **KIMBERLY MILLER**, former aide to Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA), has joined Capitol Associates Inc. Miller was Boxer's key staff member working with the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee. Capitol Associates, based in Washington, D.C., is a government relations firm.

Cancer Advocacy:

Deal Returns \$3M
To Office Of Women's
Health, Spends \$3.5M
On Workshops

. . . Page 4

In Congress:

Senate Committee
Provides Increase
To DOD Program

. . . Page 6

Funding Opportunities:

ACS Calif. Division
Calls For Applications

. . . Page 8

NCI Contract Award

. . . Page 8

**URGENT: Please deliver this FAX edition to the person named on the cover sheet.
For transmission problems or information, call 202-362-1809.**

Blumenthal Says Committee Did Not Specify Use For Funds

(Continued from page 1)

administrator appeared to understand what the committee wanted.

"We are hearing what you are saying," Susan Blumenthal, director of the PHS Office on Women's Health, said at the steering committee meeting Nov. 7, 1996, following the committee's 13-0 vote to leave the excess funds at NCI (**The Cancer Letter**, Nov. 15, 1996).

Uninitiated observers were tempted to conclude that there was no chance that anything could possibly go wrong, and that all the funds would reach investigators.

Eight-and-a-half months later, on July 28, Blumenthal stunned the steering committee by announcing that at least \$3 million of the disputed funds would go into an inter-agency grant program administered by her office, and that a substantial part of the remaining funds would be spent on educational materials, workshops, and conferences co-sponsored by her office, NCI, and other agencies.

Blumenthal declined to present a detailed report of the plan, which has been presented to HHS Secretary Donna Shalala.

"The agreement has gone up to the Secretary for the final sign-off," Blumenthal said to the steering committee. "I just feel that we would like to have

her sign off on that, and then we would be very happy to distribute the list."

Responding to protests from the activists, Blumenthal said the committee wanted to return the money to NCI, but did not seek a seat at the table in determining how the funds would be spent.

"You very adamantly said you wanted the money to go back to NIH for research, and really did not specify how that would be spent," Blumenthal said to the steering committee.

Asked how much of the money would go into peer reviewed research, Blumenthal declined to provide the numbers.

"Some will support peer reviewed research," she said. "Some will support outreach and education."

Had the earmarked funds been left at NCI, their impact would not be traceable, Blumenthal said, defending her deal with the Institute. "If NIH had put the investment into whatever, you would not know where they went—it would just go back into the pool of NIH resources," she said.

Grants—Not Glory

The advocates were seeking the optimal use for the \$14 million, not glory for the Action Plan, objected Amy Langer, a member of the steering committee and executive director of the National Alliance of Breast Cancer Organizations.

"Our vision was that the \$14 million would join a pool, and therefore will be used like any other NCI breast cancer research funds," Langer said, describing her motivation during the Nov. 7 vote.

"I just want to say that I am officially protesting, because outreach is exactly what we were saying we didn't want to spend the money on, because other people are doing that," said surgeon Susan Love, a member of the steering committee.

Fran Visco, who, along with Blumenthal, is a co-chair of the Action Plan, said she was never officially briefed about the plan for reallocating the funds. Visco is a member of the President's Cancer Panel and president of the National Breast Cancer Coalition, the advocacy group whose petition led the Clinton Administration to start the Action Plan.

"I think we have to let the Secretary—if not the President—know what is going on and how unhappy we are," Visco said at the meeting.

In an interview following the meeting, Visco said the steering committee's wishes to channel the funds to peer reviewed research were stated clearly.



Editor & Publisher: Kirsten Boyd Goldberg

Editor: Paul Goldberg

Staff Writer: Catherine Fiore

Circulation: Rena Guseynova

P.O. Box 9905, Washington, DC 20016

Tel. (202) 362-1809 Fax: (202) 362-1681

Editorial e-mail: kirsten@www.cancerletter.com

Customer service: subscrib@www.cancerletter.com

World Wide Web URL: <http://www.cancerletter.com>

Subscription \$265 per year US, \$285 elsewhere. ISSN 0096-3917. Published 48 times a year by The Cancer Letter Inc. Beyond "fair use" as specified by U.S. copyright law, none of the content of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, facsimile, or otherwise) without prior written permission of the publisher. Violators risk criminal penalties and \$100,000 damages.

Founded Dec. 21, 1973 by Jerry D. Boyd

“There is absolutely no chance that the steering committee was vague, or that we gave someone a message that could be misinterpreted,” Visco said to **The Cancer Letter**. “The intent of the steering committee was that the money should stay at NCI to fund peer-reviewed breast cancer research.”

Faced with the prospect of seeing precious research resources being spent by the government agencies in an end-of-fiscal-year rush, the steering committee appointed a subcommittee of three activists and two government officials to review Blumenthal’s plan and to present the committee’s side of the story to Shalala.

On July 31, Blumenthal was scheduled to turn over the detailed agreement with NCI to the subcommittee, and the subcommittee was scheduled to discuss the agreement in a telephone conference Aug. 1.

A copy of the 16-point agreement between Klausner and Blumenthal was obtained by **The Cancer Letter**. The agreement returns \$3 million to a program administered by Blumenthal’s office, and channels at least another \$3.5 million to workshops, conferences, and working groups. The document does not specify what portion of the remaining funds would support peer reviewed research (story on page 4).

Delicate Choices

Straightforward as it may sound, the steering committee’s original decision to turn over the funds to NCI placed HHS Secretary Shalala in a delicate political situation.

On one hand, Shalala had the decision of a committee that is unchallenged in its assertion that it is more than an advisory board and that its decisions are binding.

On the other hand, Shalala had to contend with legislative language that in effect gave Blumenthal’s office authority to circumvent the advisory committee.

The language was inserted by Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA) chairman of the Labor, HHS & Education Appropriations Subcommittee, whose support for Blumenthal was not diminished by the action of the steering committee.

Any final resolution had to have Specter’s agreement, sources said.

When Shalala directed Blumenthal and NCI Director Richard Klausner to work out an agreement, Klausner was placed in a weak negotiating position,

sources said. Blumenthal was negotiating aggressively, while the HHS Secretary and a senator who happens to be a key NCI supporter were awaiting the outcome.

With these pressures upon him, Klausner could do little more than offer advice to Blumenthal and keep the process confidential, sources said.

NCI spokesman Paul Van Nevel declined to comment on the Institute’s role in deciding how the funds would be spent.

“The list of projects is, first of all, incredibly vague, second, it looks as though it was something that was thrown together to appease Susan Blumenthal, and perhaps Senator Specter,” said Visco after reviewing the document obtained by **The Cancer Letter**. “It is clearly not the intent of the steering committee that the money be used this way.

“What has happened is that the Office on Women’s Health has circumvented the clear message and intent of the steering committee of the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer,” Visco said. “This really gives them the opportunity to do what the steering committee did not want to see done, and that is expand the plan beyond what it was meant to be.”

Visco said she is disturbed by the fact that the agreement has been kept secret for so long. “I have no idea why this list was kept secret from the co-chair from the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer or from the other members of the steering committee,” she said.

Whether the distribution of the \$14 million was a spectacular misunderstanding or a blatant act of bureaucratic empire-building, one thing is certain: All earmarked funds not claimed by the Office on Women’s Health will revert to NCI control before Sept. 31, the last day of the fiscal year.

In fiscal 1996, the Action Plan made no claim to about \$5.3 million of its earmark, in effect allowing the funds to revert to the Institute.

NCI officials said the funds were awarded to programs they deemed consistent with the goals of the Action Plan (**The Cancer Letter**, Oct. 24, 1996).

An Issue of Public Trust

“Anyone who isn’t accountable in an open manner should not be involved in disbursement of public funds,” said Donald Coffey, president of the American Association for Cancer Research and a scientist at Johns Hopkins University.

“Research funds come from taxpayers, and we have to be responsive to advocates and the public

needs,” Coffey said to **The Cancer Letter**. “We don’t need the complications that come with the pursuit of power and control.”

The idea that Blumenthal’s office will be faced with having to spend the money quickly is troubling, Coffey said.

“Rapid dumping of research funds without adequate time for review is something we must guard against,” Coffey said. “The funds for scientific research are precious, and \$14 million would be vital for supporting young researchers.”

Robert Mayer, president of the American Society for Clinical Oncology, said Blumenthal should have followed the directive of the steering committee.

“It is unfortunate that the co-chair of the steering committee of the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer appears to have discarded the sage advice of the committee members who are among the most informed advocates and advisors in the breast cancer area,” Mayer, a professor at Dana-Farber Cancer Institute and Harvard Medical School, said to **The Cancer Letter**.

“It is also unfortunate that the model that has been proven so successful with the peer reviewed breast cancer research program at the Department of Defense was not followed in this instance,” Mayer said.

“NAPBC still has the opportunity to create a win-win situation by directing the money where it would be put to best use, and I hope that this will be possible,” he said.

Meanwhile, Specter appears to be unwavering in his support for Blumenthal.

The report that accompanies the Senate Appropriations Committee bill for fiscal 1998 gives her office the mandate that could make the steering committee irrelevant.

In addition to the mandate to “carry out a breast cancer initiative with a strong focus on prevention,” the Committee urged Blumenthal’s office to “coordinate and catalyze activities across [HHS] and other federal agencies to identify critical areas in research, early detection, prevention, and education to address the variety of cancers that women face.”

The report said NCI funds had once again been earmarked for supporting the Action Plan, but did not specify the amount of the earmark. The Administration’s budget proposal, too, does not specify the amount of the earmark, in effect leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary.

While some observers interpret this as a sign of the erosion of Blumenthal’s influence, others point out that the earmark could be specified in the form of an amendment on the House or Senate floor, or in conference reconciling the House and Senate bills.

To Visco, the appropriations committee’s report indicates that her battle with Blumenthal is not over.

“In the language of the Senate report, there is no reason to have a steering committee of the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer, and no reason to have NCI look at women’s cancers,” Visco said.

Deal Returns \$3M To OWH, Spends \$3.5M On Workshops

The agreement in which NCI and the PHS Office on Women’s Health carved up the \$14 million budget of the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer is silent on one question:

What portion of the funds would be spent on peer reviewed research?

Last November, when the Action Plan’s steering committee voted to return the funds to NCI, the committee specified that the money should support peer-reviewed research in breast cancer.

The agreement between OWH and NCI, a copy of which was obtained by **The Cancer Letter**, accounts for \$13.4 million of the \$14 million in earmarked funds. Based on the document, it could not be determined what would be done with the remaining \$600,000.

The agreement hands over \$3 million to the PHS Office on Women’s Health to support the Federal Coordinating Committee on Breast Cancer to put breast cancer information on the Internet and identify “research, education, policy, and service delivery gaps.”

In addition to the transfer, the agreement channels at least \$3.5 million to activities built around workshops, conferences, and working groups, the document indicates.

A list of activities follows.

Activity 1: Cancer Genetics Network. Research projects will be funded to (1) develop and disseminate high quality information about genetic susceptibility and testing; (2) develop and assess approaches to informed decision-making, counseling, and laboratory testing procedures; (3) collect and pool data linking specific mutations with phenotypes; and (4) enhance participation in cancer genetics research. Funding: \$1 million. Lead Agency:

NCI.

Activity 2: Breast Cancer Genome Anatomy Project. Projects will be funded to prepare cDNA libraries from tumor cells and to develop sensitive, accurate, and economical high-throughput technologies for scanning tumors. Funding: \$1 million. Lead Agency: NCI.

Activity 3: Clinical Trials Partnership on the World Wide Web. Funds will be provided to enhance the NCI Physician Data Query system, making it a central repository of user-friendly cancer clinical trials information. Funding: \$200,000. Lead Agency: NCI.

Activity 4: New Approaches to Breast Cancer Imaging. Funds will be provided to explore the application of imaging technologies from the intelligence, defense and space fields to improve early detection and diagnosis of breast cancer. Funds will also be used to support breast imaging research, program development, and activities of the Federal Multi-agency Consortium on Imaging to Improve Women's Health. Funding: \$3.5 million. Lead Agency: NCI and PHS OWH.

Activity 5: Federal Coordinating Committee on Breast Cancer Supplement Program. FCCBC identifies areas of overlap and gaps in breast cancer research, and identifies areas in need of additional resources. Support will be provided to complete searchable, Internet-accessible gateway to information about federal breast cancer programs. FCCBC will identify research, education, policy, and service delivery gaps. Based on these gaps, support will be provided for cross-cutting projects on breast cancer, including an emphasis on private/public sector partnerships. Funding: \$3 million. Lead Agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 6: Minority Breast Cancer Initiative. A workshop and related scientific reviews will be conducted to assess current knowledge of potential differences in tumor biology among minority groups. Educational initiatives will be designed to target minority women to stimulate mammography screening. Finally, a workshop will be conducted to identify barriers to the effective translation of intervention research and to provide recommendations for actions to address these barriers. Funding: \$2 million. Lead agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 7: Communicating Risks and Benefits About Cancer and Cancer Control. Based on information from a literature review and market

research, a workshop will be conducted to formulate recommendations about communicating risks in the context of cancer treatment and control. Funding: \$500,000. Lead Agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 8: Collaborative Research on Hormones, Hormone Metabolism, and Breast Cancer. NCI, in a collaboration with the Centers for Disease Control, will address research needs identified at the NAPBC Etiology Working Group conference on hormones, hormone metabolism and breast cancer. Support will be provided for research to develop better analytic methods for measuring steroid hormones and their metabolites in body fluids and tissues which could be applied to large scale epidemiologic studies and validation studies of assays. Funding: \$500,000. Lead Agency: NCI.

Activity 9: Establishment of a Working Group on Environmental Clusters of Breast Cancer. Convene a working group to evaluate data concerning breast cancer clusters, to determine whether they are real or artificial, to examine potential causative factors, and to develop mechanisms for further investigation. Funding: \$250,000. Lead Agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 10: Alternative Medicine and Breast Cancer. A review of literature in the use of alternative medicine in breast cancer, followed by a workshop on the use and effectiveness of alternative medicine interventions. The workshop proceedings will provide the foundation for identifying further education and research initiatives. Funding: \$200,000. Lead Agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 11: Adiposity, Physical Activity and Breast Cancer Workshop. A workshop will be supported to set a research agenda on the role of diet, obesity, and physical activity in breast cancer etiology and recurrence. A special focus will be placed on Asian immigrant and Asian American women in considering the basis for variations. Funding: \$150,000. Lead Agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 12: Prophylactic Mastectomy and Prevention of Breast Cancer. A research workshop will be supported to review available data on the effectiveness of prophylactic mastectomy in the prevention of breast cancer and potential policy implications. Funding: \$150,000. Lead Agency: NCI.

Activity 13: Breast Cancer Risk in Female Flight Attendants. Ongoing studies at the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health of environmental exposures, including exposures to cosmic ionizing radiation, in airplane cabins and

disruption of circadian rhythms that may alter endogenous hormone levels, thereby influencing breast cancer risk in populations with high exposures will be supplemented. This supplement will assess increased breast cancer risk among female flight attendants to provide the foundation for follow up studies that will evaluate sources of risk and the impact of certain exposures on hormone levels, providing important clues about potential increased risk of breast cancer among flight attendants, female frequent fliers, radiation workers, and women who work nights or rotating shifts. Funding: \$250,000. Lead Agency: NIOSH.

Activity 14: Reproductive Status, Hormone Levels, and Breast Cancer Conference. Significant changes in reproductive patterns, such as delaying childbirth and having fewer children, as well as increasing use of hormone replacement therapy among the growing elderly population of women in the United States is raising a large number of unanswered questions about reproductive status, hormone levels, and breast cancer risk. These will be addressed at a research conference to assess what is known about the role of these factors in the development of breast cancer and the changing patterns of breast cancer incidence and mortality in the United States. Funding: \$250,000. Lead Agency: PHS OWH.

Activity 15: Silicone Breast Implant Rupture Study. Ongoing collaborative studies by the NCI and Food and Drug Administration are addressing problems of symptomatic rupture of silicone breast implants often used in reconstructive surgery for breast cancer patients. Rupture of silicone gel breast implants may be one of the most prevalent complications associated with breast implants, however, current prevalence estimates vary considerably across studies. This supplement will estimate the level of symptomatic rupture which has resulted in explant rupture of implants explanted for other reasons, and silent rupture of implants which may have occurred. This study will allow more accurate determination of the total rupture rate of silicone breast implants, both symptomatic and silent. Funding: \$200,000. Lead Agency: NCI.

Activity 16: Breast Cancer Survivorship Initiatives. The new NCI Office of Cancer Survivorship has held a series of planning activities and workshops to identify and prioritize future initiatives on the medical, psychosocial, and economic issues for cancer survivors and their

families. Support will be provided to further explore specific medical and psychological aspects of breast cancer survivorship and potential initiatives to address identified needs. Funding: \$250,000. Lead Agency: NCI.

In Congress

Senate Committee Increases DOD Breast Cancer Research

The funding bill for the Department of Defense approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee last week provides \$175 million for the peer reviewed program for breast cancer research in fiscal 1998, a \$69-million increase.

The Senate committee bill provides no funds for peer reviewed research in prostate cancer. Last year, the program received \$38 million.

Meanwhile, the DOD appropriations bill, approved by the House Appropriations Committee July 22, provides \$100 million for the DOD peer reviewed program.

Mysteriously, the House bill, too, provides no funds for peer-reviewed research in prostate cancer.

Absence of Prostate Cancer Funds

The glaring absence of prostate cancer funds could have two explanations, observers say.

First, it is possible that the legislators were reluctant to give additional funds to a program that has yet to spend its last year's appropriation. The prostate cancer research program is expected to issue a Broad Agency Announcement later this week.

Another explanation is that the prostate cancer lobbyists deliberately sat out the initial stages of the appropriations process and are preparing to make their move either through a floor amendment or during conference that would reconcile the two bills.

Last year, a similar strategy allowed the prostate cancer lobbyists to avoid a public clash with the breast cancer advocates and, at least temporarily, foiled the DOD officials who would prefer to spend their funds on more traditional defense programs, sources said.

In the 104th Congress, the amendment that ultimately established the DOD prostate cancer program was introduced during the Senate Appropriations Committee markup by then Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-OR), chairman of the committee

(**The Cancer Letter**, July 12, 1996).

Hatfield's goal was to spend \$100 million on the disease.

However, subsequent objections from DOD resulted in reducing the program to \$38 million for peer reviewed research and \$7 million for the intramural research program at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and Walter Reed Army Medical Center, sources said.

After the funds were appropriated, CaP CURE, an organization founded by the financier and prostate cancer survivor Michael Milken said it had lobbied for the DOD funds (**The Cancer Letter**, Oct. 4, 1996).

DOD will be given until Sept. 30, 1998, to award the funds appropriated last year, officials said.

"The FY 1997 appropriations for breast, ovarian and prostate cancers are executed in the same way: DOD delegates the task of managing these programs to the US Army Medical Research and Materiel Command," said Chuck Dasey, public affairs officer at the command. "UAMRMC publishes a Broad Area Announcement for each program to solicit proposals, convenes peer review panels, and conducts program integration."

Though breast cancer funding, too, is spent over a two-year interval, new funds have been appropriated every year since 1992, Dasey said.

The BAA on prostate cancer is expected to be available on the UAMRMC World Wide Web site later this week. The address is <http://mrmc-rad6.army.mil/documents.html>.

A Dazzling Increase For Breast Cancer?

The Senate Appropriations Committee's recommendation to give a dazzling 75- percent increase for the breast cancer program next year was the result of aggressive lobbying by the National Breast Cancer Coalition, the program's founding constituency.

In recent weeks, the breast cancer activists garnered the support of 60 Senators, who urged the Appropriations Committee Chairman Sen. Ted Stevens (R-AK) to increase the DOD breast cancer funding.

"Over the past two years, there have been incredible discoveries at a very rapid rate that offer fascinating insights into the biology of breast cancer," the Senate members wrote in a June 3 letter to Stevens. "The recent discoveries led up to a renewed vision for the DOD peer-reviewed breast

cancer research program, especially the Innovative Developmental and Exploratory Awards.

"These types of grants are funded only through the DOD peer-reviewed program," the letter said.

An identical letter, to Chairman Bill Young (R-FL), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security, collected 180 signatures of House members.

Nonetheless, Young's subcommittee recommended a \$100 million appropriation for the program, and on July 22, the House Appropriations Committee signed off on that recommendation.

The Senate report language urged DOD to explore digital mobile mammography.

"This activity is an inextricable component of breast cancer research that serves the needs of active and retired military personnel and their beneficiaries," the Senate committee report said. "The Committee fully supports the Department's efforts in this area and strongly encourages its continuation."

The committee did not specify how much money should be devoted to the project, which is pursued in collaboration with the HHS Office of Women's Health as well as NCI.

Under the Senate plan, DOD was expected to fund the following cancer-related activities outside the peer reviewed research programs for breast and prostate cancer:

—Establish a "public/private research project" to improve prostate cancer diagnostic imaging. The committee provided \$5 million for the project, to be carried out within the Medical Advanced Technology Program.

—Spend \$4 million to establish Diagnostic Center of Excellence for Breast and Prostate Cancer at Fort Drum, in New York.

The report accompanying the House bill was less specific than the Senate report. A table in the House report indicated only that \$10 million would be spent on research in prostate cancer, and another \$10 million would be spent on research in ovarian cancer.

Several observers noted with surprise that neither the House nor the Senate report provided second-year funding for prostate cancer research at the Uniformed Services University and Walter Reed.

After all, many male members of Congress can be regarded as a constituency of Walter Reed, the institution that generally treats their prostate problems.

Funding Opportunities

ACS California Division Issues Program Announcements

The American Cancer Society, California Division, has issued program announcements for three research award programs in cancer control, clinical research, and social and behavioral sciences.

The program announcements are as follows:

Pilot Research Grants

ACS, California Division is issuing a Request for Applications to fund special pilot research grants that intend to study cancer control problems unique to California.

There will be \$75,000 set aside to fund three one-year grant projects at \$25,000 each. The projects are not restricted to new investigators.

The grants are intended to support research that will identify issues affecting citizens of California in the following categories:

—Epidemiological Research: Investigate the distribution and determinants of cancer in human populations, with the objective of identifying behavioral, environmental, genetic or other factors that affect the risk of cancer and may lead to cancer prevention and control efforts,

—Clinical Research: Investigates proposed career screening, diagnostic, treatment or rehabilitative modalities in human subjects or materials and is directly applicable to cancer control or care of cancer patients.

—Psychosocial & Behavioral Research: Involves the study of psychosocial, behavioral and social factors that can influence relevant cancer control outcomes such as preventive behaviors, screening/early detection, treatment decisions and quality of life after cancer.

—Public Policy Research: Involves the study of issues that influence legislative and governmental action.

A one page Letter of Intent will be required by Dec. 5. Application deadline is February 2, 1998.

Clinical Postdoctoral Fellowships

The division is also funding two-year clinical postdoctoral fellowships directed to the development of clinically oriented investigators in cancer research.

Clinical Research Fellowship applicants will be accepted for training in the areas mentioned above, as well as in preclinical research, which involves

investigating interventions not ready for widespread use, with high potential for the prevention, diagnosis or treatment of human cancer, or to rehabilitation of the cancer patient.

Each fellowship will provide two years of support. The maximum award for the first year is \$34,000, with a \$30,000 stipend and \$2,000 in additional funds. For the second year, the maximum award is \$32,000, with a \$32,000 stipend and \$2,000 additional funds.

Candidates must have obtained a medical or other doctoral degree by the time of the award, and must be sponsored by a California institution and an individual involved in research at the institution.

Candidates who would qualify as a principal investigator or who have an appointment equal to a faculty position are not eligible to apply.

Grant applications will not be accepted from not-for-profit institutions, federal government agencies, or those supported entirely by the federal government.

Applicants must submit a letter of intent to the California Division Research Fellowship Program by Oct. 3. Application deadline is Dec. 1.

Fellowship for Doctoral Dissertation Research

The division has established a fellowship for support of doctoral dissertation research, which is intended to encourage students to pursue research in the social and behavioral aspects of cancer.

Dissertation research undertaken may be an original investigation of the fellow's own design or a part of another ongoing project to which the fellow will make an independent, clearly definable research contribution.

The maximum research award is \$10,000, to provide support for travel, computer costs, supplies and materials, reproduction and typing, research personnel assistance or stipend support.

Applicants must be enrolled in a doctoral program at an accredited California institution. Application deadlines are March 15 and Oct. 15.

Contact Research Program, ACS, California Division, tel: 510/893-7900, fax: 510/835-8406.

NCI Contract Awards

Title: Analysis of Anti-Cancer and Anti-AIDS Chemical and Pharmaceutical Formulations. Contractor: Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, \$2,925,614.