Dear Californians,

This is the fourth iteration of California’s comprehensive cancer control plan issued by the California Dialogue on Cancer (CDOC). This plan was developed by cancer control stakeholders that represent the racial, ethnic, gender, economic and geographic diversity of our state. In addition, we engaged all National Cancer Institute designated and emerging Comprehensive Cancer Centers in California, in the development of cancer plan strategies informed by research conducted at these centers. This plan presents an assessment of the cancer burden, goals, objectives, and strategies for this four-year period (2021-2025) and will serve as an essential guide for cancer control efforts in California.

The death rate from cancer in the U.S. declined by 29% from 1991 to 2017, including a 2.2% drop from 2016 to 2017, the largest single-year drop ever recorded, according to a report released by the American Cancer Society in 2020. More people are surviving cancer than ever before, and California has measured consistent success in reducing cancer death rates since the last three cancer plans were implemented. Overall, incidence and mortality rates of most cancers have declined; and we credit the many successful collaborations created through this process, that led to effective prevention, increased screening rates, and better survivorship outcomes. Community and health organizations have incorporated evidence-based cancer control into their policies that have made a significant difference. Furthermore, culturally tailored strategies made inclusion of underrepresented Californians in cancer control possible, thereby making equity achievable.

In 1983, a focused effort in California’s Tobacco Control Program resulted in dramatic decreases in smoking rates and tobacco-related cancers. In hopes of duplicating this model of success, CDOC aims to increase colorectal cancer screening. Similarly, we are committed to increasing HPV vaccinations to prevent cancers that significantly contribute to California’s cancer burden. CDOC will prioritize opportunities for systems change in order to achieve significant outcomes in both of these cancer prevention areas.

The exemplarily cooperative process of developing this plan is a model for the kind of collaboration needed to accomplish our goals to further reduce California’s cancer burden. In all aspects of plan development, our stakeholders have remained focused on ensuring that the plan also describes effective strategies to reduce cancer health disparities among sexual, gender, racial and ethnic minorities in order to achieve health equity in our state. I want to thank all of the experts who generously contributed their time, effort, and expertise to create this plan.

Chair, California Dialogue On Cancer
Director, Community Outreach & Engagement, Cedars Sinai-Cancer
This cancer control plan is dedicated to all Californians whose lives have been affected by cancer, with a special dedication to Dr. Antronette Yancey.

DEDICATION

Dr. Antronette “Toni” Yancey, M.D., M.P.H., was a cancer prevention champion. A never-smoker, she died from lung cancer at age 55 in 2013. Dr. Yancey’s passion was to help vulnerable populations improve their health, especially through exercise. She demonstrated a commitment to social justice by working to ensure that research findings would be translated to community programs and policy, to transform lives. Her urgency to achieve health equity yielded a career full of achievements, including membership on the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Fielding School of Public Health faculty, membership on the advisory committee for Michelle Obama’s “Let’s Move” campaign, co-founding of the UCLA-Kaiser Permanente Health Equity Center, and mentorship of hundreds of students, particularly students of color. Dr. Yancey received many awards, including the Pioneering Innovation Award from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Association of African American Physicians, and many more.

Dr. Yancey’s signature career achievement was the creation of the Instant Recess™ concept, which focused on integrating brief bouts of physical activity into daily routine, where people live, play, work, or worship. As Director of Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion for the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, she created a ten-minute exercise video for out-of-shape workers. The success of this video led her to develop culturally flavored ten-minute dance movement videos, featuring salsa, gospel music, Filipino music, and American Indian rhythms, as well as her public health manifesto, Instant Recess: Building a Fit Nation 10 Minutes at a Time (2010). Dr. Yancey persuaded diverse stakeholders to embrace the Instant Recess concept, including the San Diego Padres, the United Church of Christ, the Washington Post, and Kaiser Permanente’s employee wellness plan.

Dr. Yancey believed that involving people in periodic ten-minute bouts of physical activity was a practical approach to protecting vulnerable populations from obesity-related diseases, including cancer. Brief exercise breaks do not require special equipment, a change of clothes, gym membership, or prior physical conditioning. Dr. Yancey made it her mission to persuade employers, schools, churches, and community-based organizations everywhere to sponsor short exercise breaks during the workday. By example and by persuasion, Dr. Yancey induced countless thousands of workers, students, worshippers, and executives to incorporate enough daily physical activity to protect them from obesity-related diseases. To recognize her contributions to the California Dialogue on Cancer (CDOC), the CDOC Obesity Prevention Working Group continues to recommend incorporating physical activity into school classrooms. We therefore consider it fitting to dedicate this comprehensive cancer control plan to her.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREFACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTER FROM CDOC CHAIR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS SUMMARY</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 1</strong> THE CANCER BURDEN IN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPION OF CANCER CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina (Jennie) Cook</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 2</strong> SURVEILLANCE</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 3</strong> EMERGING CANCER TRENDS</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Story: Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) Attributable Cancers</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4</strong> CANCER CENTERS AND PROGRAMS</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 5</strong> CANCER RELATED HEALTH DISPARITIES</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer and Sexual and Gender Minorities</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer and American Indian Alaskan Natives</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California’s Tribal Cancer Plan</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 6</strong> EQUITABLE ACCESS</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 7</strong> PRIMARY PREVENTION</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Papilloma Virus (HPV)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Story: Human Papilloma Virus (HPV)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity Prevention</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Use</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultraviolet (UV) Light Exposure</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 8</strong> EARLY DETECTION AND SCREENING</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Story: Breast Cancer</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical Cancer</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal Cancer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Story: Lung Cancer</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanoma</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate Cancer</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Story: Prostate Cancer</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 9</strong> TREATMENT &amp; SURVIVORSHIP</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivorship</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 10</strong> RESEARCH</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based participatory research (CBPR)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I: ACRONYM LIST</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX II: RESOURCES FOR EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTION AND POLICY, SYSTEMS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE INTERVENTIONS</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX III: CANCER RELATED DATA SOURCES</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX IV: DEFINITION OF TECHNICAL TERMS</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX V: CDOC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ROSTER</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX VI: CANCER PLAN CONTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX VII: A CALL TO ACTION WHAT CAN YOU DO?</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX VIII: GET INVOLVED</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX IX: REFERENCES</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgments

The California Dialogue on Cancer (CDOC) and the Cancer Plan Advisory Committee wish to acknowledge all of the volunteers who collaboratively developed this critical roadmap for cancer control in California. Over 90 individuals representing state and federal agencies, academic institutions, and community-based and nonprofit organizations worked tirelessly and diligently over many months to produce this blueprint for addressing cancer control in California. We recognize the expertise, commitment, and dedication it took to produce this plan.
CDOC Stakeholder Meeting, April 2019, Sacramento, CA

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS CALIFORNIA’S COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CONTROL PLAN?

California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2021–2025 (the state cancer plan) is a blueprint to reduce the cancer burden in the state. It is designed to provide guidance to individuals and organizations spanning health and social disciplines that have a role in impacting cancer control. Aspects of the cancer continuum, including primary prevention, early detection and screening, and survivorship are addressed, as well as cross-cutting issues, such as equitable access to care, cancer-related health disparities, and surveillance.

The plan’s strategies are intended to direct collective efforts toward specific and measurable objectives, which are targeted at reducing the cancer burden. Many of the outcomes will also have health benefits extending beyond cancer to other leading causes of death, such as heart disease and diabetes.

WHO IMPLEMENTS THE STATE CANCER PLAN?

The implementation of the plan is the responsibility of all cancer control stakeholders, including community members, health care providers, community-based organizations, institutions, and others. The Comprehensive Cancer Control Program (CCCP) (https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CDSRB/Pages/California%20Comprehensive%20Cancer%20Control%20Program.aspx), under the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) (https://www.cdph.ca.gov/), is charged with leading the development, distribution, and coordination of implementation of the plan through the state cancer coalition—the California Dialogue on Cancer (CDOC) (https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CDSRB/Pages/California-Discussion-on-Cancer-(CDOC).aspx). Ultimately, statewide cancer control stakeholders and community members are the driving force behind achieving the plan’s goals and objectives. Only through collective action will California succeed in reducing the burden of cancer.

CALIFORNIA DIALOGUE ON CANCER

CDOC is a coalition of statewide cancer control stakeholders. Stakeholders represent a variety of organizations and interest areas, including state and local government, private and nonprofit organizations, health, medical, and business communities, academic institutions, researchers, cancer survivors, caregivers, and advocates. The vision of CDOC is to reduce cancer suffering and mortality in California.

CDOC was created in 2003 specifically to develop and implement California’s comprehensive cancer control plan. Workgroups have been established based on objectives and strategies identified in the cancer plan, by coalition priorities, and via other relevant issues in cancer control. Each year, the workgroups prioritize and conduct activities that align with the plan.

CDOC offers many opportunities for individuals and organizations to be a part of comprehensive cancer control. A Call to Action What Can You Do? (Appendix VII) and Get Involved (Appendix VIII) provides suggestions and activities in support of implementing California’s state cancer plan.
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CALIFORNIA’S COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CONTROL PROGRAM

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) created the National Comprehensive Cancer Control Program (NCCCP) to help states, tribes, and territories form coalitions to conduct comprehensive cancer control. CDC defines comprehensive cancer control as a collaborative process through which a community and its partners pool financial and nonfinancial resources to reduce the burden of cancer.\(^1\)

CDPH received funding from CDC in 2002 to establish California’s comprehensive cancer control infrastructure. The CCCP is housed in the Chronic Disease Surveillance and Research Branch of CDPH. The purpose of CCCP is to administer the statewide comprehensive cancer control coalition (CDOC); a group which helps: determine state priorities related to cancer; coordinate implementation of California’s comprehensive cancer control plan; and evaluate the activities being implemented.

The California comprehensive cancer control steering committee was organized on June 7, 2002 and initiated the process to develop California’s first cancer plan, *Comprehensive Cancer Control in California, 2004*. This distinguished committee included over 200 diverse representatives from academia, corporations, health care organizations, insurance groups, institutions, consumer and advocacy groups, and others with an interest in cancer control. The committee examined the science of cancer control, evaluating its practice, funding and assets, and barriers and gaps in cancer control efforts. After careful analysis, the committee identified key strategies and tactics to overcome barriers and to produce successful cancer control outcomes.

Since implementing the first cancer plan in 2004, there have been two revisions, one in 2010 and one in 2014. The 2014 revision produced a draft of *California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2016-2020*. Over 100 stakeholders worked over a year and a half to produce this plan that included measurable goals and objectives to be achieved by 2020. Progress achieved toward objectives in the 2016-2020 state cancer plan is detailed on page 19.

COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CONTROL PLAN REVISION

Under the leadership of CCCP and CDOC, the fourth iteration of California’s state cancer plan is the result of a process that began in the fall of 2018. This process included 15 committees and over 90 individuals on behalf of more than 40 institutions representing state and federal agencies, academic institutions, and community-based and nonprofit organizations. California cancer centers and programs were also convened to help inform the development of the plan (read more in chapter four). Goals and measurable objectives to support continued cancer control efforts through 2025 were developed. This plan builds on the hard work and collaborations that have made comprehensive cancer control a success in California. To read more about major successes, see the overview on page 19. The revision process was principally guided by national cancer control priorities set by CDC. The development of objectives and strategies was informed by *Healthy People 2020*, *Let’s Get Healthy California* and aligned with state goals and objectives set for cancer control and cross cutting topics, such as tobacco control and obesity prevention.

EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTIONS

To achieve the goals and objectives listed in *California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2021–2025* strategies, practices, interventions, and/or programs must be grounded in evidence. Appendix II lists resources in which you can find examples and more information about using evidence-based programs.

**Goals and objectives were aligned with CDC’s National Priorities for Cancer Control:**

- Emphasizing the primary prevention of cancer
- Coordinating early detection and treatment activities
- Addressing the public health needs of cancer survivors
- Using policies, systems, and environmental changes to guide sustainable cancer control
- Promoting health equity as it relates to cancer control
- Demonstrating outcomes through evaluation

**CDOC PRIORITIES:**

- Increase colorectal cancer screening
- Reduce the prevalence of obesity
- Accelerate uptake of the human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine
- Address survivorship needs
- Reduce health disparities

---

CDOC Stakeholder Meeting, April 2019, Los Angeles
Left to Right: CDOC Leadership, Raquel Arias, Shauntay Davis-Patterson, Zul Surani
POLICY, SYSTEMS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE INTERVENTIONS

California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2021–2025 is focused on encouraging cancer control and prevention efforts to prioritize policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) change approaches for a community-wide impact.

PSE changes include approaches that can address how to effectively improve health in a community. They prioritize creating or changing infrastructure to support healthy behaviors across populations. They focus on modifying the context in which people live through changing policies, systems, and/or the environment to make healthy choices available and easy for everyone to access. PSE change approaches in cancer control include interventions that impact whole populations instead of individuals and are applicable to all stages of the cancer continuum.

PSE OVERLAP

PSE change interventions can overlap with other health sectors or programs, including programs focusing on diabetes prevention, tobacco use, heart disease, environmental and occupational health, nutrition, and physical activity. Many of the same social and behavioral risks apply to multiple diseases.

Appendix II lists several PSE interventions and resources.

POLICY CHANGE

Policy change interventions are those which drive incremental changes to procedures, rules, ordinances, laws, and regulations. Policy change can occur at macro levels, such as high levels of government, but often occur at micro or lower levels with which we all interface every day, such as health care settings, worksites, companies, organizations, government administrations, etc. Examples of health policy change include taxing tobacco products, implementing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA or ACA), establishing company policies, banning junk food at schools, enforcing age restrictions for tanning salons, and labeling menus at restaurants.

SYSTEMS CHANGE

Systems change interventions are changes that impact all elements of an organization, institution, or system. Settings in which systems change can take place include health care, insurance, worksite, education, transportation, etc. These types of intervention usually result in changes made to the policies or procedures of an organization. An example of a systems change is cancer screening facilities modifying their hours of operation to make it more convenient for patients to access and/or utilize screening services.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Environmental change strategies are those that promote healthy behaviors and lifestyles through changes to the physical environment. Settings for environmental change include the location of health clinics or offices, recreational spaces, community planning in neighborhoods, etc. Examples of environmental change are: installing sidewalks and bike lanes, creating recreational space in communities to promote physical activity, making healthy food options available in neighborhoods, worksites, and schools.

PSE change strategies may overlap across all three categories: policies, systems, and the environment. For example, California’s smoking ban in public places is a policy change that led to a systems change for workplaces and restaurants. Prohibiting smoking in these locations created an environmental change that allowed for a more general smoke-free environment, turning it into a social norm.

INTEGRATION AND COORDINATION ACROSS CHRONIC DISEASE PROGRAM AREAS

Cancer control stakeholders, including public health departments, state and federal agencies, public/private organizations, and community partners are increasingly working together to prevent future cancers and to address underlying chronic conditions. Many leading chronic diseases, including cardiovascular disease, colon cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and type 2 diabetes, share common and preventable risk factors. Addressing chronic disease and health inequities requires integrated and coordinated public health responses. California’s state, federal, and privately-funded efforts to prevent and control chronic disease have adopted collaborative approaches, and an increasing number of partnerships and interventions have been successfully implemented. For more information on CDPH’s chronic disease prevention and management programs, visit the Chronic Disease Control Branch webpage.

EVALUATION

CCCP is responsible for developing and implementing an evaluation plan that will assess California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2021–2025. The definitive measure of the plan’s success will be the reduction of cancer mortality rates in California. However, since long term outcomes take years to materialize, short-term impacts will be assessed through progress on measurable objectives in the plan.

Quantitative data obtained from the California Cancer Registry (CCR) will be used to measure improvements in cancer incidence, stage at diagnosis, survival, and mortality. Survey data such as the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) and the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), will be used to measure progress on objectives related to screening and risk factors. Additionally, a statewide survey of CDOC stakeholders will be conducted annually by CCCP to collect both quantitative and qualitative data on cancer control activities.

There are 43 measures that have been identified to assess progress on objectives in this plan. All of the measurable objectives will be addressed in progress reports utilizing the most reliable data sources to assess cancer control progress, impacts, and outcomes in California. To review a list of data sources that will be used in the evaluation, please see Appendix III.

While CCCP is responsible for evaluating the plan, stakeholders throughout California will also participate in monitoring progress and utilizing data from available data sources to guide their own specific cancer control activities. Challenges are expected during the implementation and evaluation phases of the plan as a result of changes in science, health care, economy, environment, and political climate. Accordingly, it is acknowledged that the plan is a document that will evolve with time, new information, varying resources, and changing needs.
CALIFORNIA’S COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CONTROL PLAN, 2016–2020

PROGRESS SUMMARY

California has made progress towards achieving the objectives set forth in California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2016–2020. The CCCP program, CDOC stakeholders, and other cancer control partners collaborated on a few objectives from the 2016-2020 state cancer plan. Implementation by cancer control stakeholders throughout California has contributed to progress made towards important objectives. The progress reported in this section is toward those measurable objectives for which current data is available. Select interventions targeting multiple objectives initiated by CDOC are also summarized. A final evaluation of the plan will be conducted when data for 2020 is available.

Objectives toward which progress is being made are highlighted in blue. Objectives highlighted in green, have met or exceeded their targets. Most notably, our targets for objectives aiming to reduce cancer incidence and mortality have already been surpassed.
### Table 1. Progress of the cancer burden cancer plan objectives that include baseline year, most recent data and the target year for 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer Burden</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Burden: Objective 1</td>
<td>Decrease the rate of combined cancer incidence in California</td>
<td>2012 405.5</td>
<td>2017 390</td>
<td>400.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Burden: Objective 2</td>
<td>Decrease the rate of combined cancer mortality in California</td>
<td>2012 150.6</td>
<td>2017 136.9</td>
<td>140.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Progress of the access to care cancer plan objectives that include baseline year, most recent data and the target year for 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Care</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Care: Objective 2</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of Californians covered by health insurance</td>
<td>2011-2012 85.3%</td>
<td>2018 93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CHIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Care: Objective 4</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of Californians who report having regular access to a primary care provider</td>
<td>2013 65.2%</td>
<td>2018 65.1%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CDC BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Progress of the cancer related health disparities cancer plan objectives that include baseline year, most recent data and the target year for 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer Related Health Disparities</th>
<th>Proportion of late-stage* cancers by race/ethnic group</th>
<th>Data Source: CCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Baseline CCR 2012</td>
<td>Most recent available data CCR 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Related Health Disparities: Objective 3</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of late-stage diagnosis for colorectal, breast, and cervical cancer among California's racial/ethnic minority populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Late-stage is defined as regional and distant disease (SEER Summary Stage).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### African American
- Colorectal: 52.9% 62.6% 40%
- Breast Female: 31.8% 31.2% 25%
- Cervical: 58.1% 66.2% 43%

#### Hispanic
- Colorectal: 55.7% 62.6% 50.0%
- Breast Female: 33.7% 31.2% 28.7%
- Cervical: 56.7% 55.1% 40.0%

#### Asian/ Pacific Islander
- Colorectal Female: 51.2% 63.1% 43.0%
- Breast: 24.3% 26.0% 19.0%
- Cervical: 48.1% 53.5% 28.1%

#### American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Colorectal: 54.8% 62.2% 49.8%
- Breast Female: 27.0% 26.7% 22.0%
- Cervical: 61.5% 54.5% 55.0%

### Table 4. Progress of the primary prevention cancer plan objectives that include baseline year, most recent data and the target year for 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Prevention</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis B: Objective 2</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of infants in California born to hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg)-positive mothers who have received post-vaccination serologic testing within recommended timeframes.</td>
<td>2013 60.8%</td>
<td>2018 53.5%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CDPH Immunization Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PROGRESS SUMMARY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPV: Objective 1</strong></td>
<td>2013 16.6%</td>
<td>2018 41.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the proportion of boys 13–17 years old who complete the HPV vaccine series</td>
<td>Data Source: NIS-Teen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPV: Objective 2</strong></td>
<td>2013 45.8%</td>
<td>2018 36.3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the proportion of girls 13–17 years old who have completed the HPV vaccine series</td>
<td>Data Source: NIS-Teen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity: Objective 1</strong></td>
<td>2013 24.6%</td>
<td>2018 26.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the prevalence of adult obesity (body mass index (BMI) &gt; 30)</td>
<td>Data Source: CA BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity: Objective 2</strong></td>
<td>2013 11.2%</td>
<td>2017 20.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of California adults who consume fruits and vegetables five or more times per day</td>
<td>Data Source: CA BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity: Objective 3</strong></td>
<td>2013 56.3%</td>
<td>2017 57.3%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of California adults who participate in moderate or vigorous physical activities</td>
<td>Data Source: CA BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity: Objective 4</strong></td>
<td>Children 2013 31.0%</td>
<td>Children 2018 27.0%</td>
<td>Children 34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentages of California children who consume fruits and vegetables five or more servings per day.</td>
<td>Data Source: CHIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obesity: Objective 5</strong></td>
<td>Children 2013 46.1%</td>
<td>Children 2016 45.8%</td>
<td>Children 50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentages of California children and teens who engage in a minimum of 60 minutes of physical activity per day at least five days each week by 10%.</td>
<td>Data Source: CHIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tobacco Use: Objective 1:</strong></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the prevalence rates of adult cigarette smoking among California’s priority populations by 10%.</td>
<td>Data Source: CHIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Population</strong></td>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Natives</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics/Latinos</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-socioeconomic status (0–100 FPL*)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT**</td>
<td>21.6% (BRFSS, 2013)</td>
<td>16.6% (BRFSS, 2018)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural residents***</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the military</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Federal Poverty Level (FPL) **The data source for the LGBT population is BRFSS, not CHIS **CHIS is the available data source for this population; however, “rural” counties can have significant metropolitan populations (e.g., Humboldt), and metropolitan counties (e.g., Sacramento) can have significant rural areas. Estimates for homogeneously rural counties are imprecise because of few respondents. County-based estimates for “rural” respondents therefore have more imprecision than other demographic categories (i.e., sex, age, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tobacco Use: Objective 2 | 2012 12.7% | 2018 11.2% | 10.0% |
| Decrease the prevalence of cigarette smoking among California adults | Data Source: CHIS |
### Table 5. Progress of the early detection and screening cancer plan objectives that include baseline year, most recent data and the target year for 2020.

**Early Detection & Screening**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer: Objective 1</td>
<td>2013 78.8%</td>
<td>2018 72.2%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the prevalence of women aged 40 years and older who report having had a mammogram within the prior two years by 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source: CA BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer: Objective 2</td>
<td>2012 21.0</td>
<td>2017 19.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the mortality rate of female breast cancer by 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer: Objective 3</td>
<td>2012 71.0%</td>
<td>2017 72.9%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the proportion at which women diagnosed with breast cancer are diagnosed at an early stage by 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Early stage defined as in situ &amp; localized stages (SEER Summary Stage).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Prevention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the prevalence rates of high school youth tobacco use* among the following priority populations by 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native – 21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: California Student Tobacco Survey, CDPH, California Tobacco Control Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian Americans – 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* past 30-day cigarette use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latinos – 9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Progress on this objective is based on results of the Statewide 2017-18 California Student Tobacco Survey. These data are not a direct comparison due to the changes in survey methodology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer: Objective 4:</td>
<td>2015 113</td>
<td>2020 81</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of accredited radiology facilities in California that achieve voluntary designation by the American College of Radiology as a Breast Imaging Center of Excellence (BICOE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source: American College of Radiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical Cancer: Objective 3</td>
<td>2012 10.4%</td>
<td>2018 16.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the percentage of women 21–65 years without a hysterectomy who have not received a Pap test ever or in the past five years by 24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CA BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal Cancer: Objective 1</td>
<td>2013 64.4%</td>
<td>2018 68.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase colorectal cancer screening rates among Californians aged 50 years and older using one of the screening options recommended in the current U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) screening guidelines (2015) by 24.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CA BRFSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal Cancer: Objective 2</td>
<td>2012 45.1%</td>
<td>2017 50.4%</td>
<td>40.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the proportion of late-stage diagnoses of colorectal cancer among all Californians by 10% <em>Late stage defined as Stages III and IV, Stage_SEER AJCC Combined</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanoma: Objective 1</td>
<td>2012 7.8%</td>
<td>2017 12.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the proportion of late stage diagnoses of melanoma among all Californians by 15% <em>Late stage defined as Stages III and IV, Stage_SEER AJCC Combined</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanoma: Objective 2</td>
<td>2012 2.0%</td>
<td>2017 1.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow the projected annual increase of melanoma incidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Early Detection & Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melanoma: Objective 3</td>
<td>2012 2.5</td>
<td>2017 1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian Cancer: Objective 1</td>
<td>2012 35%</td>
<td>2017 31.9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian Cancer: Objective 2</td>
<td>2008-2012 50.2</td>
<td>2008-2017 49.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: CCR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivorship: Objective 1</td>
<td>2014 11.0%</td>
<td>2017 9.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: CA BRFSS

### Survivorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Most recent available data</th>
<th>Target for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivorship: Objective 1</td>
<td>2014 11.0%</td>
<td>2017 9.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: CA BRFSS

### Improving Cancer Survivorship Outcomes

Most of CDOC’s cancer survivorship efforts have focused on educating cancer survivors, health care providers, caregivers, and the public through various approaches. Triage Cancer has been a long-standing partner in this endeavor and has developed and delivered several trainings, webinars, animated videos and educational materials. These services and trainings reached thousands of Californians in their collaboration with CDOC since the 2016 cancer plan implementation. CDOC’s Treatment and Survivorship workgroup efforts to collect accurate data related to survivorship aftercare planning continued through 2017. Part of the Survivorship Aftercare Plan Utilization Project implemented in 2014, aimed to increase the use of cancer aftercare plans among health care systems treating cancer patients in California. A component of this project included the development of a new cancer survivorship survey module in the California Behavioral Risk Factor Survey to better understand and evaluate cancer survivorship issues in the state. Data from this module was utilized to develop a cancer survivorship baseline and target for the 2016 plan. Webinars and trainings can be accessed from Triage Cancer’s website at [https://triagecancer.org](https://triagecancer.org).
Increasing HPV Vaccination Rates

CDOC’s efforts to increase HPV vaccination were formalized in 2017 when CDOC and the American Cancer Society (ACS) convened key stakeholders from across the state to discuss effective ways to increase vaccination rates. The group consensus was that there would be great benefit in establishing a coalition to accelerate HPV vaccine uptake in the state (modeled after the successful ACS National HPV Vaccination Roundtable(https://hpvroundtable.org/)). The California HPV Vaccination Roundtable(https://www.ca HPV roundtable.org/) was established in October of 2018. It includes diverse stakeholders with a mission to work together to prevent HPV-associated cancers and pre-cancers by increasing the California HPV vaccination rate to 80% by 2026. Successful projects of this group include the establishment of California HPV Vaccine Week, provider trainings, and development of a data report that describes HPV vaccination rates at the county level to help guide local and regional action. Find more information on HPV Vaccine Week and the report; Assessment of Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Attributable Cancers and Vaccination Rates in California: Report of Findings of the California HPV Vaccination Roundtable at http://ca hpvroundtable.org.

Tobacco Use Prevention

In 2016, CDOC’s Tobacco Stakeholder Advisory Group published a Call to Action document that highlights gaps in cessation services from a national and California perspective for California Cancer Centers and providers. It also identifies opportunities and resources for improving tobacco treatment and cessation services in oncology settings. This document was disseminated widely to cancer control stakeholders and cancer centers. It was also presented on the National Cancer Institute (NCI)’s Research 2 Reality webinar. California’s capacity to address tobacco and cancer prevention and treatment continues to grow. To date, three NCI-designated Comprehensive Cancer Centers are funded by the NCI Cancer Center Cessation Initiative to integrate tobacco treatment into cancer care. They are in California, including Davis, UC San Francisco, and Stanford. Other cancer centers may be funded in future funding cycles. Furthermore, the California Cancer Registry is producing its first-ever report on the 12 tobacco-related cancers, in collaboration with the California Tobacco Control Program. Access Tobacco Cessation in Cancer Prevention and Treatment: A Call to Action for California Cancer Centers at https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CDSRB/CDPH%20Document%20Library/CDOC/TobaccoCessation_CaliToAction-ADA.pdf.

Increasing Colorectal Cancer Screening

The California Colorectal Cancer Coalition (C4) is a liaison workgroup of CDOC. C4 leads many efforts in California that contribute to progress on the colorectal cancer objectives in the plan. Past efforts included, among others, collaborative projects that increased screening rates in several clinics in California, as well as the administration of a mini-grant program that funded several clinics organizations to implement projects focusing on systems change, education and awareness, and survivorship issues related to colorectal cancer. C4 has also worked with CDOC in a collaborative effort with CDPH’s former colorectal cancer screening program (California Colon Cancer Control Program) and the American Cancer Society (ACS) to guide federally qualified health centers to implement evidenced-based interventions. This project resulted in 19 clinic sites across four health systems reporting increased colorectal screening rates since the program was implemented in 2017. Find more about C4 at: https://www.cacoloncancer.org/.
CHAPTER 1
THE CANCER BURDEN IN CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER GOAL
To reduce the number of new cancer cases and deaths due to cancer.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
California has achieved considerable success in cancer prevention and control over the previous decades. The overall cancer incidence and mortality rates have declined for men and women since statewide cancer reporting became mandatory in 1988. However, cancer continues to be a major public health priority and the second leading cause of death in California, exceeded only by heart disease. Absolute numbers of cancer cases and cancer-related deaths are expected to increase as California’s population grows and ages. These statistics may be impacted by changing rates of modifiable risk factors such as tobacco use, excess body mass, alcohol use, and physical inactivity, in addition to comorbidities with other diseases and health determinants.

Despite improvements in incidence and mortality rates, nearly one out of every two Californians born today will develop cancer at some point in his or her life, and nearly one in five Californians will die of the disease. Unfortunately, the cancer burden is not borne equally by all racial/ethnic groups. This chapter highlights some of the cancer burden in California, including: a description of the leading causes of cancer diagnoses and deaths, the distribution and disparities of the disease among racial/ethnic groups, the impact of the disease among children, and survival rates for selected cancer sites.

In order to identify areas of focus for this plan, pertinent data from the California Cancer Registry (CCR) are presented in this section. CCR is recognized as one of the leading cancer registries in the world and has been the cornerstone of a substantial amount of research on cancer in the California population.

Understanding Surveillance Data Terms (National Cancer Institute, 2019)

- Incidence: The number of newly diagnosed cases of cancer during a specific time period.
- Incidence Rate: The ratio of the number of new cancers of a specific site/type occurring in a specified population during a year to the number of individuals who were at risk for the given cancer, generally expressed as the number of cancers per 100,000 persons.
- Mortality: The number of deaths from cancer during a specific time period.
- Mortality Rate: The number of deaths, with cancer as the underlying cause, occurring in a specific population during a year. Cancer mortality is usually expressed as the number of deaths due to cancer per 100,000 persons.
- Percent Change: The percent change (PC) in a statistic over a given time interval: Percent change = (Final value – Initial value) / Initial value X 100. A positive PC corresponds to an increasing trend, a negative PC to a decreasing trend.
CANCER BURDEN OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: By 2025, decrease the rate of combined cancer incidence in California by 3.6%, from the current baseline of 390.6 to 376.5 cancer cases per 100,000 persons.

Objective 2: By 2025, decrease the rate of combined cancer mortality in California by 6.5%, from the current baseline of 136.9 to 128.0 cancer cases per 100,000 persons. Data source: CCR, 2017

Table 1. California Cancer Burden
Table 1 shows the ten leading causes of cancer incidence and mortality for males, females, and both sexes combined. Prostate, lung, and colorectal cancers are the most commonly diagnosed cancers and the leading causes of cancer-related death among males. Similarly, breast, lung, and colorectal cancers are the most commonly diagnosed cancers and the leading causes of cancer-related death among females. For both sexes combined, melanoma of the skin is the fifth most commonly diagnosed cancer, and pancreatic cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer-related death.

(See Table 1: Top 10 Incidence and Mortality)
Cancer Disparities among Major Racial/Ethnic and Asian Ethnic Groups

The burden of cancer impacts Californians disproportionately, with the risk of developing cancer varying considerably by race/ethnicity. Among both males and females, non-Hispanic whites have the highest incidence of cancer overall, followed by non-Hispanic blacks, Hispanics, and Asian and Pacific Islanders. Overall, persons of Asian and Pacific Islander and Hispanic origin show cancer incidence rates ranging from 30 to 40% lower than those of non-Hispanic whites. However, incidence rates for liver and stomach cancers among Asian and Pacific Islanders and Hispanics are 60% higher compared to rates for non-Hispanic whites. Hispanic females also have a 29% higher incidence rate of invasive cervical cancer compared to non-Hispanic white females. Non-Hispanic blacks have the highest cancer mortality among both males and females, followed by non-Hispanic whites, Hispanics, and Asian and Pacific Islanders. The mortality rate for colorectal cancer among non-Hispanic blacks is 50% higher than the rate for Asian and Pacific Islanders, and 39% higher than the rates for non-Hispanic whites and Hispanics.

(Figures 1 and 2: AAIR and AAMR 2013-2017 by race/ethnicity and sex)

**Figures 1 and 2: Cancer Disparities**

| Figure 1. Five-year, age-adjusted incidence rates by race/ethnicity and sex, all cancers, 2013 - 2017, CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Male** | **Female** | **Male** | **Female** |
| Rate | Count | Rate | Count |
| Non-Hispanic white | 470.4 | 249,806 | 427.0 | 242,797 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 469.9 | 26,240 | 388.4 | 25,668 |
| Hispanic | 341.9 | 77,253 | 317.3 | 90,461 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 290.6 | 41,706 | 301.4 | 54,586 |

*Rates are per 100,000 and age-adjusted to the 2000 US Std Population (19 age groups - Census P25-1130) standard.
~ Statistic could not be calculated.
^ Statistic not displayed due to fewer than 15 cases.
Tables 2A-2D: Cancer Disparities among California’s Major Racial/Ethnic Groups

Tables 2A-2D show the five leading causes of cancer incidence and mortality among four of California’s major racial/ethnic groups by sex. For each of the racial/ethnic groups, prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among males, while breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among females. Lung and colorectal cancers rank among the top three most common cancers diagnosed among both males and females of the represented racial/ethnic groups. Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related death among both males and females in each racial/ethnic group, apart from breast cancer among Hispanic females.

(see Tables 2A-2D)

### Tables 2A-2D: Cancer Disparities among California’s Major Racial/Ethnic Groups

#### 2A: Top five common cancers by incidence for males, by racial/ethnic group, as compared with the state’s male population overall, California, 2013-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All California Males</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>Melanoma of the Skin</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanoma of the Skin</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>Kidney and Renal Pelvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary Bladder</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>Urinary Bladder</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2B: Top five common cancers by incidence for females, by racial/ethnic group, as compared with the state’s female population overall, California, 2013-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All California Females</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>138.8</td>
<td>Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>Melanoma of the Skin</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2C: Top five common cancers by mortality for males, by racial/ethnic group, as compared with the state’s male population overall, California, 2013-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All California Males</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 1: The Cancer Burden in California

### 2D: Top five common cancers by mortality for females, by racial/ethnic group, as compared with the state’s female population overall, California, 2013-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>All California Females</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lung and Bronchus</strong></td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus 30.9</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus 32.5</td>
<td>Breast 15.6</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breast</strong></td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Breast 21.4</td>
<td>Breast 30.3</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus 13.6</td>
<td>Breast 13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colon and Rectum</strong></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum 11.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum 15.9</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum 9.5</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pancreas</strong></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Pancreas 9.2</td>
<td>Pancreas 11.7</td>
<td>Pancreas 8.9</td>
<td>Pancreas 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ovary</strong></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Ovary 7.8</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS 9.0</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct 7.1</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct 6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates are per 100,000 and age-adjusted to the 2000 US Std Population (19 age groups - Census P25-1130) standard.

Source: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health.

### Cancer Disparities among American Indian/Alaskan Natives

Among males and females combined, age-adjusted rates from 2013 to 2017 indicate that American Indian/Alaskan Natives have the second highest incidence of cancer after non-Hispanic whites. The overall incidence rate for cancer among American Indian/Alaskan Native males in comparison to American Indian/Alaskan Native females is similar (431.4 per 100,000 versus 427.4 per 100,000, respectively). Prostate, lung, and colorectal cancers are the top three most common cancers diagnosed among American Indian/Alaskan Native males, while breast, lung, and colorectal cancers are the top three most common cancers diagnosed among American Indian/Alaskan Native females. Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related death among both American Indian/Alaskan Native males and females. Liver, colorectal, and pancreatic cancers rank among the top five common cancer-related deaths among both male and female American Indian/Alaskan Natives.

*(Table 3A-3B: Top 5 AIAN Incidence & Mortality)*

### Tables 3A-3B: Cancer Disparities among American Indian/Alaskan Natives


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Females Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>Breast 119.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus 48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum 38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS 33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney and Renal Pelvis</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>Kidney and Renal Pelvis 19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Females Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus 32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>Breast 17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum 13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Pancreas 9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates are per 100,000 and age-adjusted to the 2000 US Std Population (19 age groups - Census P25-1130) standard.

Source: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health.

Corpus and Uterus, Not Otherwise Specified
Tables 4A-4D: Cancer Disparities Among California’s Asian Ethnic Groups

Tables 4A-4D show the five most common cancers for Asian ethnic groups by sex. Although Asian and Pacific Islanders as a collective group have lower rates of cancer incidence and mortality compared to non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, and Hispanics, the burden of cancer varies greatly among the individual Asian subgroups. Prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, and South Asian males. Lung cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among Korean, Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian males. Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among females in each of the Asian subgroups. Lung cancer is the most common cause of cancer-related death among males and females in each of the Asian subgroups, except for breast cancer being the most common cause of cancer-related death among Filipina and South Asian females.

(see Tables 4A-4D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Urinary Bladder</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Asian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Laotian</th>
<th>Cambodian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary Bladder</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4B Top five common cancers by incidence for Asian ethnic groups, females, California, 2011-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Asian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Laotian</th>
<th>Cambodian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHAPTER 1: THE CANCER BURDEN IN CALIFORNIA

#### 4C Top five common cancers by mortality for Asian ethnic groups, males, California, 2011-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### South Asian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Laosian</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cambodian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note 1: Population estimates were created using linear interpolation and extrapolation of 1990 (adjusted), and 2020 Census counts.

#### Note 2: NOS= Not Otherwise Specified

#### Rates are per 100,000 and age-adjusted to the 2000 US Std Population (19 age groups - Census P25-1130) standard.

Source: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health.

*Rates are based on counts less than 15 cases.

### 4D Top five common cancers by mortality for Asian ethnic groups, females, California, 2011-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### South Asian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Laosian</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cambodian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung and Bronchus</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Colon and Rectum</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Liver and Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovary</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>11.2*</td>
<td>Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>9.7*</td>
<td>Leukemia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rates are per 100,000 and age-adjusted to the 2000 US Std Population (19 age groups - Census P25-1130) standard.

Source: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health.

*Rates are based on counts less than 15 cases.

Note 1: Population estimates were created using linear interpolation and extrapolation of 1990 (adjusted), and 2020 Census counts.

Note 2: NOS= Not Otherwise Specified
# Childhood Cancer

Among children across the U.S., overall cancer incidence rates increased an average of 0.8% per year during 2012 to 2016. The most common cancer types among children were leukemia, brain and other nervous system cancers, and lymphoma, with increasing incidence trends for each of these cancers during 2012 to 2016. Among adolescents and young adults, overall cancer incidence rates increased an average of 0.9% per year from 2012 to 2016. This table presents the incidence rates and counts of International Classification for Childhood Cancer (ICCC) groups among children 0 to 19 years of age in California. In the last decade over 1,700 children and young adults under the age of 20 were diagnosed with cancer each year. Among these, over two-thirds are between 0 to 14 years of age. The top three most common types of cancer diagnosed in children under the age of one are leukemias, followed by neuroblastoma, and central nervous system (CNS) tumors. Leukemia is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among children between 1 and 14 years of age, followed by CNS tumors, and lymphomas. Among children and young adults between 15 and 19 years of age, the top three most commonly diagnosed cancers are other malignant epithelial neoplasms and melanomas, closely followed by lymphomas, and leukemias.

(See Table 5: Incidence Rates and Counts of ICCC Cancer Groups Among 0-19 YOs)

---

**Risks are per 1,000,000 and age-adjusted to the 2000 US Std Population (19 age groups - Census P25-1130) standard.**


# Count suppressed due to fewer than 5 cases.

^ Statistic not displayed due to fewer than 15 cases.

Data Source: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health.

---

## Table 5. Incidence Rates and Counts of ICCC Cancer Groups Among 0-19 Year Olds, California, 1988-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer ICCC Group</th>
<th>&lt;1 year</th>
<th>1-14 years</th>
<th>15-19 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Cancer Types</td>
<td>214.6</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Leukemias, myeloproliferative &amp; myelodysplastic diseases</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoid leukemias</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>9.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute myeloid leukemias</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Lymphomas and reticuloendothelial neoplasms</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgkin lymphomas</td>
<td>^ #</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin lymphomas (except Burkitt lymphoma)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS and misc intracranial and intraspinal neoplasms</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ependymomas and choroid plexus tumors</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrocytomas</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracranial and intraspinal embryonal tumors</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other gliomas</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Neuroblastoma and other peripheral nervous cell tumors</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinoblastoma</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Renal tumors</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Hepatic tumors</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Malignant bone tumors</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteosarcomas</td>
<td>^ #</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing tumor and related sarcomas of bone</td>
<td>^ #</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Soft tissue and other extrasosseous sarcomas</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhabdomyosarcomas</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrosarcomas, peripheral nerve &amp; other fibrous</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Germ cell &amp; trophoblastic tumors &amp; neoplasms of gonads</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracranial &amp; extragonadal germ cell tumors</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignant gonadal germ cell tumors</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Other malignant epithelial neoplasms and melanomas</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Other and unspecified malignant neoplasms</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Cancer Five-year Survivorship

This table describes the five-year relative survival for selected cancer types by stage at diagnosis. At all stages of the disease, female breast, prostate, testis, and melanoma of the skin cancers each have five-year relative survival rates of over 90%. Cancers that are diagnosed at a localized, or early stage of the disease, have higher survival rates than those diagnosed at the regional and distant stages of the disease. Cancers such as female breast cancer and prostate cancer, if diagnosed at a localized stage, have relative survival rates close to 100%. However, pancreatic and liver cancers, if diagnosed at the distant stage, have five-year relative survival rates of only around three percent. Pancreatic cancer is one of the leading causes of cancer-related deaths because there are no detection tools to diagnose the disease in its early stages when surgical removal of the tumor is still possible. Nearly half of all pancreatic cancers in California are diagnosed at the distant stage.

Table 6.: 5-year survival by stage of diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer Type</th>
<th>All Stages</th>
<th>Localized</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Distant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Breast</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervix Uteri</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus and Uterus, NOS</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovary</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testis</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Cavity &amp; Pharynx</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon &amp; Rectum</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver &amp; Intrahepatic Bile Duct</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung &amp; Bronchus</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanoma of the Skin</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukemia</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood (0-14 years)</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult (15 - 19 years)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (20+ years)</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All leukemias are staged at distant disease; thus survival cannot be calculated for other stages.

Note: Follow-up is through December 2017. Cancers that were unstaged at time of diagnosis are excluded.

Source: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health.

Prepared by the California Department of Public Health, California Cancer Registry.
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Cancer Facts and Figures 2017

California Health Maps
https://www.CaliforniaHealthMaps.org

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - National Center for Health Statistics
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/statements/california/california.htm

National Cancer Institute - Cancer Trends Progress Report
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CHAMPION OF CANCER CONTROL

REGINA (JENNIE) COOK

If you have been involved in cancer control in any capacity over the past 50 years, you probably know Jennie Cook. She has been a champion of cancer control in California, serving in a wide array of roles from being a volunteer to being one of the first women to hold a major leadership post in the nation’s most prominent organization dedicated to cancer, the ACS. Jennie is tough; she is a cancer survivor, winning her own fight against the disease, and, shortly after regaining her health, beginning her lifetime volunteer commitment to cancer prevention and control.

Jennie Cook joined the fight against cancer in 1964 by volunteering to help others in the local unit of ACS in Marin County. She served on the Unit Public Education Committee and was elected President of the Marin Unit. She was invited to serve on the Public Education Committee and helped frame some of the Division’s most notable programs, including the first-in-nation Cancer Education Week. The National Office of ACS acknowledged the California Division each year for these programs and adapted some of Jennie’s ideas for nationwide use. Jennie served on the Board of Directors of the Division and was elected Chair of the Board in 1987. These were exciting times for cancer control in California. Jennie helped on several of the most important programs, including legislative efforts to support development and expansion of the CCR, and the sponsorship and passage of the historic tobacco tax measure, Proposition 99. In the 1970s, Jennie helped in the formation of the California Interagency Council on Smoking and Health—the first in the nation—and served on its Executive Committee. Her efforts in advocating for cancer control brought her often to Sacramento, where she met with many key legislators and top government officials.

Jennie was invited to serve on the National Public Education Committee for ACS and also served on its National Board of Directors. In 1999, Jennie was elected Chair of the National Board, helping to lead this important volunteer health agency in its nationwide fight against cancer. She was the second woman to ever hold such a prominent, national leadership position.

Jennie’s passion for tobacco control and access to cancer care is well-known with her work on tobacco issues serving as chair for both the Smoke-Free Marin Coalition and CDOC Tobacco Prevention Committee. She served on California’s Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee (TEROC) from its inception and as its chair for eight years. In 2003, Jennie was a founding member of CDOC and was part of the special effort to develop the first iteration of this comprehensive plan for cancer control for the state. Stressing the importance of diversity, access to care, and early detection for cancer, she chaired the Disparities, Access to Care, and Early Detection Team for CDOC. Jennie is always willing to contribute her knowledge, wisdom, and passion, and her warm, welcoming spirit is felt by all who work with her. We take this opportunity to recognize her tireless work as a champion of cancer control.

Jennie was always willing to contribute her knowledge, wisdom, and passion, and her warm, welcoming spirit was felt by all who worked with her. Jennie passed on January 8, 2021 and will forever be remembered as someone who dedicated her life to making change. We take this opportunity to recognize her tireless work as a champion of cancer control.
CHAPTER 2: SURVEILLANCE

CHAPTER GOAL
To ensure the collection, dissemination, and utilization of comprehensive and understandable cancer-related surveillance data for cancer control evaluation, planning, and monitoring in California.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
Cancer surveillance, conducted under the auspices of the California Cancer Registry, is based on comprehensive collection, analysis, and reporting of population-based cancer incidence and survival. These data are critical for cancer prevention and control efforts in the state, and serve as the foundation for research, planning, and policy targeting reduction in cancer-related morbidity and mortality.

While existing cancer surveillance data are useful for evaluating cancer risk, improving early detection, and monitoring treatment efficacy, there is a growing need to enrich surveillance data to further identify disparate communities, as well as enhance precision medicine efforts for personalized care. Linkage of cancer registry data with other population databases augments cancer surveillance and research efforts at little added cost. Value is further added through improved medical informatics and deeper annotation of data obtained through the electronic health record. This includes demographics and clinical information that support the identification and surveillance of cancer patterns in biomedically underserved populations.

Given that CCR is a principal resource for the development and evaluation of California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, the following objectives and strategies have been developed to strengthen its capacity to collect, process, analyze, and disseminate statewide cancer surveillance data.

Objective 1: By 2025, expand CCR data dictionary requirements of gender identity categories, establishing a statewide data standard, in alignment with national gender minority initiatives.

Data source: CCR, 2020

Strategies
1. Align CCR requirements by filing an application to add a non-binary gender identity category to the current data dictionary with the goal to enhance data capture as well as to incorporate California State identification Laws.

2. Assemble a working group, for data governance, to identify and align categories including local registrars, Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) representatives and national and state representatives from the National Institute of Health (NIH) and CDPH to ensure the categories are achievable before updating CCR requirements and conduct a risk analysis of data alignment with national repositories from which the CCR sends data. Also include others who have worked on a similar initiative such as New York State Data Collection Project.
3. Launch an education initiative for cancer tumor registrars (CTRs) and send notification to cancer registries about this update in CCR requirements.

4. Utilize relevant geographic indicators in cancer data analysis to understand reporting numbers by location for gender minority status including non-binary cancer patient categories and use this information in the CCR standard quality review process to monitor year over year progress, and to understand barriers in areas not meeting targets.

5. Integrate census-derived measures of gender minority status categories into the analysis of CCR data to produce reports and maps characterizing and evaluating disparities in cancer risk, access and barriers to screening and proper cancer care, treatment and outcomes for gender non-binary cancer patients.

Objective 2: By 2025, enhance the capacity of cancer surveillance systems to produce and disseminate user-friendly cancer information and data reports that meet the needs of the general public, public health-based organizations, research-based institutions, and other stakeholders.

Data sources: CDPH and CCR

Strategies

1. Utilize relevant socio-demographic and geographic indicators in cancer data analysis to highlight disparities in cancer incidence, detection, and outcomes.

2. Incorporate health survey data collected from the California Behavioral Risk Factor Survey (BRFSS), CHIS, and the California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS) to expand the analysis of trends in cancer incidence, mortality, and survival as they correlate with health behaviors, prevalence of cancer risk factors, and adherence to cancer screening guidelines in California.

3. Integrate census-derived measures of socioeconomic status into the analysis of CCR data to produce reports and maps characterizing and evaluating disparities in cancer risk, access and barriers to screening and proper cancer care, treatment and outcomes.

4. Promote the availability and accessibility of de-identified cancer data from CCR and statewide surveys through a variety of media, including more user-friendly web applications to graphically display measures of cancer risk, mortality, detection, and outcomes at statewide and smaller geographic areas.

5. Ensure wider dissemination of cancer data by producing culturally and linguistically appropriate cancer reports.

Objective 3: By 2025, enhance the value and use of CCR data to improve population health through the expansion of existing linkages with other population registries, repositories, and relevant data sets from the baseline of 6 to 9.

Data source: CCR, 2020

Strategies

1. Support efforts to enhance CCR data through linkages with administrative medical claims databases to obtain more detailed information on cancer treatment and recurrence. Strive for an All Payer-All Claims database for CCR linkage.

2. Identify sources of environmental data that can be linked with the CCR database to expand population-based studies of the cancer risk in California.

3. Establish a workgroup with the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to develop processes and goals for utilization of a linked CCR–Medi-Cal data set for improving the health of the Medi-Cal population in California. Set a timeline for linking all Medi-Cal enrollment data with CCR data.

4. Expand usage of hospital discharge data from the Office of Statewide Hospital Planning and Development (OSHPD) to assess quality of care and to complement case finding of incident cancer diagnoses not captured by the CCR reporting system.

5. Obtain approval from the Vital Statistics Advisory Committee (VSAC) to perform annual linkages of birth files and death files with CCR data to assess vital status, evaluate pregnancy outcomes, and obtain blood spots for research and surveillance from the California Neonatal Biobank.

6. Leverage the National Cancer Institute’s collaborations with external commercial and public partners through participation in demonstration projects to link cancer registry data with pharmacy claims and biomarkers/genomic databases to capture new data items relevant for evaluating cancer care outcomes for patients outside of clinical trials.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

American Cancer Society
https://www.cancer.org/

California Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)
https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CDSRB/Pages/BRFSS.aspx

California Cancer Registry
https://www.cancerreg.org/

California Health Maps
https://www.CaliforniaHealthMaps.org

National Cancer Institute – Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program (SEER)
https://seer.cancer.gov/

National Institutes of Health – Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
https://www.edi.nih.gov/people/sep/lgbti/research

The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law - LGBT Data & Demographics
https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/visualization/lgbt-stats/?topic=LGBT&area=4#density
CHAPTER 3: EMERGING CANCER TRENDS

EARLY ONSET COLORECTAL CANCER (EO-CRC)

Early onset colorectal cancer (EO-CRC) has variable definitions based on age, but a general guideline is that this refers to patients presenting with colorectal cancer before the age of 50. Approximately 10% of all colorectal cancer cases are diagnosed in patients under 50 and the rates of EO-CRC are predicted to increase by 90% for colon cancer and 140% for rectal cancer by 2030 reflecting a predicted annual increase of two percent per year. In California, 1,906 cases of EO-CRC were diagnosed in 2017, and 372 people died from their disease. In addition, these cases were diagnosed at a higher rate of late stage disease, with 67.6% late stage compared to 60.1% for those aged 50-64 and 63.4% for those 65+. Nationally, one in four EO-CRC patients (26%) is diagnosed with metastatic disease compared to 19% of those 65 and older. To reduce the incidence and stage at diagnosis in EO-CRC, we need to appropriately identify people who are at increased risk for developing the disease. Unfortunately, risk stratification efforts for this group suggest there is much work to be done before identification of those who might develop EO-CRC. Some of the challenges with diagnosing patients at risk include understanding the root causes for early presentation of disease, albeit genetic or familial risk, inflammatory bowel disease, lifestyle, environment, microbiome disruption, or other causes yet to be determined. Understanding who might be at increased risk is important for patient advocacy efforts and efficient utilization of limited resources within health systems, such as access to screening colonoscopies at more frequent intervals than is currently recommended for normal risk patients who are 50 years old or older.

Overall, the increase in cases and resulting mortality are a growing public health concern that needs to be addressed to improve the colorectal cancer care continuum for all impacted Californians. The colorectal cancer section includes an objective and strategies that aim to reduce the number of EO-CRC patients diagnosed with late stage CRC.

HPV ATTRIBUTABLE CANCERS

The human papillomavirus (HPV) is a common virus that can cause six types of cancer (cervical, vaginal, vulvar, anal, penile, and oropharyngeal). In the U.S., 80% of people will contract HPV and 10% will develop chronicity, putting them at high risk for HPV-associated cancers. HPV infection causes 34,800 cases of cancer in U.S. men and women annually. Approximately 10% of these cancers occur among California residents. In 2016, oropharyngeal cancer was the most common HPV-associated cancer nationally and in California, where there were 1875 new cases compared to 1495 new cervical cancer cases. Of particular note is oropharyngeal cancer in men, which has steadily increased by an average of 1.9% per year over the past nine years (2008-2017) in California. Currently, cervical cancer is the only HPV-associated cancer for which screening is recommended.
Fortunately, the HPV vaccine prevents over 90% of HPV-associated cancers. This safe and effective vaccine was first introduced in the U.S. in 2006, but HPV vaccination rates still lag behind those of other pre-teen vaccines. California ranks number 13 in HPV vaccination rates among U.S. states, according to the National Immunization Survey - Teen (2018). There is still much room for improvement as 73% of California adolescents have started the series, but only 53% have completed it. Thus, over one million California teens are unprotected against future HPV-associated cancers.

Increasing HPV vaccination is essential to decreasing HPV-associated cancer incidence. Evidence-based approaches to HPV vaccination uptake include presumptive recommendations from health care providers, patient reminders, and systems strategies such as electronic health record alerts, standing orders, and tracking HPV vaccination rates at the provider level. The California HPV Vaccination Roundtable (https://www.cahpvroundtable.org) was launched in October 2018 to catalyze the implementation of these approaches across the state. Co-founded by the ACS and CDOCS, this coalition of diverse stakeholders is working to increase the California HPV Vaccination rate to 80% by 2026.

LIVER CANCER
Liver cancer incidence and mortality are among the most rapidly increasing of all cancer trends in the U.S. Over the most recent decades, incidence and mortality rates decreased in Asian populations who have historically had the highest rates, while rates rose dramatically in all non Asian groups.1, 2

In 2016, the highest mortality rates were observed among American Indian/Alaskan Native and Hispanic populations, and the lowest among non-Hispanic Whites. Liver cancer is the sixth most common cause of cancer-related death in the U.S. California has liver cancer incidence and mortality rates that are among the highest in the nation.3 Liver cancer is largely preventable. Prevention and early detection efforts are critical as advanced liver cancer is essentially untreatable; most patients survive less than six months (five year survival=2%).4 Currently, only 44% of liver cancers are detected at a localized stage. Identification of precise blood-based biomarkers and improving imaging surveillance are active areas of research in the field of liver cancer early detection.

Obesity, diabetes and their related complications are currently the leading risk factors for liver cancer, with a population attributable fraction of nearly 40%.5 Growing evidence suggests that a healthy diet and regular physical activity may reverse the hepatic manifestations of obesity and diabetes (non-alcoholic fatty liver disease) and reduce liver cancer risk. Alcohol is also responsible for a growing fraction of liver cancer cases. After stopping alcohol intake the risk of liver cancer decreases by 6-7% a year.

Hepatitis B (HBV) infection causes the vast majority of liver cancers among Asians. Universal HBV vaccination in infants, which began in the U.S. in 1991 and several years earlier in some Asian counties, has resulted in a decrease in HBV infection rates. For individuals who are already infected, antiviral therapy can reduce liver cancer risk. Hepatitis C (HCV) remains a top cause of liver cancer in non-Asian U.S. populations. Treatment with a highly effective direct acting antiviral therapy can eradicate HCV infection and reduce liver cancer risk. Screening high risk populations for HCV, followed by eradication prior to development of cirrhosis, has the potential to dramatically reduce future liver cancer incidence.

PANCREATIC CANCER
Pancreatic cancer has poor prognosis with fewer than 10% of patients surviving five years after diagnosis.1 Pancreatic cancer is also one of the few cancers for which incidence is increasing in California, with more than 4,500 annual cases, killing more than 4,000 people per year.2 These trends persist despite the fact that prevalence of smoking, a well-established risk factor for pancreatic cancer, has been decreasing in California. A suspected risk factor for the increasing rate of pancreatic cancer is the rising burden of obesity, in particular, visceral adiposity and associated organ-specific fat.3, 5 Obese individuals face 20-50% increased risk of pancreatic cancer compared to individuals of normal weight.6, 7 As such, preventing and controlling obesity is a priority for pancreatic cancer, as for other obesity-associated cancers.

Early detection is key to improving pancreatic cancer outcomes, but we lack early detection guidelines for the general U.S. population.8 Endoscopic screening is currently approved for persons with a family history of pancreatic cancer and patients with cystic lesions.9 However, these comprise a small minority of patients who are ultimately diagnosed with pancreatic cancer. New-onset hyperglycemia and diabetes are common features among pancreatic cancer patients and may signal a growing tumor in the pancreas.6, 10 Nationally and internationally, active research is underway to identify specific features among patients with new-onset diabetes that may indicate a need for pancreatic cancer screening and surveillance. These include development and validation biomarkers and imaging modalities for early detection, and clinical prediction models to identify persons at very high-risk for pancreatic cancer.

THYROID CANCER
The number of people diagnosed with thyroid cancer has nearly doubled over the past 20 years with 52,070 estimated cases in the U.S. for 2019. In California, 5,243 new cases of thyroid cancer were diagnosed in 2017. Thyroid cancer incidence is increasing in both U.S., and worldwide.

The increasing incidence trends are largely due to improvements in and widespread use of neck ultrasounds and other imaging tests, which has led to greater numbers of incidentally diagnosed small cancers.1 Fortunately since 2009, the five-year survival rate for thyroid cancer has remained very high, between 98.2% to 99.9%, depending on the location of the cancer at diagnosis. A number of factors, however, are associated with greater mortality risk, including the development of distant metastasis, age over 55, and medullary or anaplastic subtypes of the disease.

The mainstay of treatment is surgery to remove the thyroid gland followed by medication, to restore the body’s supply of thyroid hormone while suppressing the pituitary gland’s production of thyroid stimulating hormone. Radioactive iodine treatments and other forms or radiation therapy are often incorporated into treatment for patients with high-risk features. The last decade has brought about several key advances in the treatment of thyroid cancer. Chief among these, is the recognition that inhibitors of the VEGF, RET, and BRAF proteins, which are important in the growth of thyroid cancer, can be effective treatment for those patients with advanced cancer.
UTERINE CANCER

Uterine cancer is the most common gynecologic cancer in the U.S.; in 2020 there will be an estimated 65,620 new cases and 12,590 deaths. In California, 6,336 women were diagnosed with uterine cancer and 1,204 died from it in 2017. Over the last ten years, rates of new uterine cancer cases have been rising 1% each year, on average. Obesity is a known risk factor for uterine cancer. For a woman who is 50 pounds overweight, evidence indicates she is ten times more likely than a woman with a normal BMI to get endometrial cancer. As the rate of obesity in the U.S. increases, so does the rate of endometrial cancer.

Approximately 80% of uterine cancer is diagnosed at an early stage, due to the common symptom of abnormal uterine bleeding which leads to biopsy and eventual diagnosis. For patients with early stage disease, minimally invasive surgery with laparoscopic hysterectomy and staging is the mainstay of treatment. Technological advances now allow surgeons to identify and biopsy the first node (sentinel lymph node) to which a tumor drains, negating the morbidity of performing a complete lymphadenectomy. For advanced endometrial cancer, combination chemotherapy and radiation is the standard treatment.

Improved understanding of the disease has led to molecular profiling and new discoveries of immunotherapy biomarkers. These have significantly impacted the treatment of endometrial cancer and played an important role in personalized medicine. In the recurrent and metastatic disease setting, for example, testing for actionable targets such as HER-neu, PTEN, PIK3CA and PDL-1 have identified specific therapies which may improve survival.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

American Cancer Society
Cancer Facts and Figures 2017

Cancer Facts and Figures 2020

CANCER STORY: HUMAN PAPILLOMA VIRUS (HPV) ATTRIBUTABLE CANCERS

My whole word stopped when I heard the dreaded words advising that I had cancer. Stage IV Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Throat (Primary Source Unknown) due to HPV Type 16 with lymph node involvement—who could survive that? I was only 49, felt great, and had so much life left to live with my wife and two kids. After surgery to remove my tonsils and small parts of my tongue/throat, I started a brutal journey involving chemotherapy and radiation over seven weeks. My body was ravaged from the cumulative effects of treatment, including loss of taste, dry mouth, nausea/fatigue, an inability to swallow, and excruciating pain. A feeding tube kept me alive at the end as I lost 70 lbs. I never thought I was strong enough to survive that challenge and would ever be able to get back to an enjoyable life, but you never know how strong you are until being strong is the only choice you have. My goal now is to live a life of service by sharing my story of survival with others, as well as promoting the HPV vaccine so that one day no one will ever have to lose their life or have it changed forever as a result of an HPV related cancer.

-Michael West, HPV-throat Cancer Survivor
CHAPTER 4

CANCER CENTERS AND PROGRAMS

THIS CHAPTER DESCRIBES THE VARIOUS TYPES OF CANCER CENTERS AND PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA, THEIR ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CANCER CONTROL ACTIVITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION TO ADDRESS THE STATEWIDE BURDEN OF CANCER.

DEFINITIONS & CERTIFICATION

A cancer center or program is a place or group of locations, with the capacity to provide a wide range of cancer care services, across the cancer continuum. California’s cancer centers and programs vary by operational structure and certification program participation. Some are physician-based practices with laboratory, infusion, and care coordination capacities; others are combinations of independent businesses (hospitals, laboratories, imaging centers and physician groups) engaged in strategic partnerships. Traditional academic and community-based cancer centers feature affiliated provider groups and participation in networked health systems. Certification programs acknowledge a center’s delivery of high-quality cancer care; and established care delivery standards and/or promote quality improvement (QI). Some cancer centers hold tumor specific or diagnostic/treatment specific certification, while larger centers may specialize in treating a variety of cancers. Table 1 summarizes the general requirements for certification.1-9

UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, Bakar Precision Medicine Building

Moores Cancer Center at UC San Diego Health
### Table 1. Summary of Cancer Certification Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Program</th>
<th>Certifying Body/Sponsor</th>
<th>General Requirements for Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Hospital Care Continuum Centers of Excellence (CCCOE) | GO2 Foundation for Lung Cancer | • Increase screening, early detection and treatment for lung cancer  
• Reduce stigma |
| Breast Imaging Centers of Excellence | American College of Radiology | • Full accreditation in four modalities of diagnostic breast imaging  
• Allows for partnerships to achieve accreditation in all four modalities |
| Quality Oncology Practice Initiative (QOPI) | American Society of Clinical Oncology | • Outpatient practice based  
• Identify, develop and implement quality improvement initiatives  
• Collect process quality metrics and measure outcomes |
| Commission on Cancer | American College of Surgeons | • Meet rigorous standards for cancer prevention, education, QI activities, and evidence-based care  
• Performance tracking and data submission to the National Cancer Database (NCDB)  
• Continuous quality improvement |
| National Cancer Institute (NCI) Cancer Centers Program | National Cancer Institute | • Rigorous standards for care delivery, translational research and cancer education and training  
• Research must reflect the needs of a defined catchment area, including addressing disparities |

### CATCHMENT AREAS, GAPS & OPPORTUNITIES

California has 113 Commission on Cancer Certified (CoC) programs and eight NCI designated comprehensive cancer centers (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Accreditation Status of Cancer Centers/Programs (California, 2020)

California is home to more than 10% of all Comprehensive Centers nationwide. Three out of the eight of these centers are in California. Some of these centers work collaboratively, share knowledge, and set evidence-based guidelines as members of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). However, neither CoC nor NCI strictly require partnership or sustained collaboration for certification.

NCI-designated cancer centers are required to define their geographic catchment area, based upon census tracts, zip codes, county or state lines or other geographically defined boundaries, must include the local area directly adjacent to the cancer center, and may extend beyond that. The Executive Committee of the CDOC convened cancer centers and programs from across California to provide input on the development of California’s cancer control plan (See Appendix V).
At the convening in February 2019, participants reported on: 1) center and program defined catchment areas; and 2) counties where the center/program have active community engagement or cancer control projects. In Figures 2 and 3, the darker color indicates overlap of catchment areas between centers (Figure 2) and overlapping areas where programs and centers have ongoing engagement activities (Figure 3).

Figure 2. Catchment Area Heat Map (Comprehensive Cancer Centers and Cancer Programs, California 2020)

The maps highlight overlap in catchment areas in southern, and parts of northern and central California. For example, Los Angeles, Fresno, Merced and San Joaquin counties are each served by three or more cancer centers. In contrast, select counties are not formally included in any cancer center or program’s official catchment area (e.g., Imperial and Ventura counties). These cancer centers are poised to share and disseminate best practices to improve cancer outcomes, reduce inequities and eliminate cancer disparities statewide.

Figure 3. Community Engagement/Cancer Control Activities Heat Map (Comprehensive Cancer Centers and Cancer Programs, California 2020)

EXISTING RESOURCES FOR INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION AT THE STATE AND NATIONAL LEVEL

CDOC coordinates, develops and implements California’s cancer control plan, and works to reduce the burden of cancer through policy, systems and environmental changes. The UC Cancer Consortium (UCCC) unites five of California’s largest NCI-designated comprehensive cancer centers (appendix). UC3 cares for nearly 16% of all Californians diagnosed with cancer and hosts over 1,000 clinical trials annually.

The Geographic Management of Cancer Disparities (GMaP) is an NCI supported program that convenes investigators, underrepresented students, trainees, community health educators in regional hubs to share cancer information, resources and tools; strengthens outreach and education; and enhances workforce diversity in cancer care and research. The NCI sponsored National Outreach Network (NON) develops, tests, and disseminates culturally appropriate, evidence-based cancer control interventions via a network of community health educators (CHE).
The Community Outreach and Engagement (COE) component of NCI-CCC provides infrastructure for collaboration. In 2016, NCI made the COE a requirement for comprehensive status. COEs build community capacity for partnership in research; translate and disseminate research findings; and promote inclusion of underrepresented groups in all cancer center activities and services. The Cancer Center Community Impact Forum (CCIF) is a national resource, established in 2019, to facilitate the development of institutional partnerships, linking cancer center COE and community-engaged staff for the exchange of strategies for cancer control.18

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION ACROSS THE CANCER CONTINUUM.

Prevention and education: Develop a statewide collaborative linking the work of community health educators, and using existing resources (e.g., NCI-NON).

Screening and early detection: Build a repository to hold cultural and linguistic adaptations of evidence-based materials for use with patients in clinical settings. Consider a centralized repository for county-level screening data.

Treatment and clinical trials: Leverage technology to increase efficient information sharing across centers and programs with inconsistent electronic health record and data reporting systems. Develop regional care teams and referral hubs including shared educators and navigators between centers/programs with overlapping catchment areas.

Survivorship: Expand and modify any developed statewide networks (e.g., for treatment and trials) to focus on survivorship, symptom management and support for families and caregivers. Centers and programs with successful interventions should share best practices and metrics for evaluation across the network. Working collectively across the continuum will position centers and programs to drive cancer care policy and advocacy, which is critical to ensure lasting and positive impact on the burden of cancer across the state.

CONCLUSION

Strategic collaboration across California’s cancer centers and programs promises improved state level cancer control. Coordinated communication, programming, and dissemination of materials and best practices across centers and programs will increase efficiency, extend reach, and enhance delivery of culturally and linguistically appropriate cancer control programming and care for the state’s large and exceptionally diverse population.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

American College of Surgeons - Commission on Cancer
https://www.facs.org/quality-programs/cancer/coc

Department of Health and Human Services- Cancer Center Support Grants for NCI Designated Cancer Centers

National Cancer Institute
- NCI Designated Cancer Centers https://www.cancer.gov/research/nci-role/cancer-centers

National Comprehensive Cancer Network- Patient and Caregiver Resources
https://www.nccn.org/patientresources/patient-resources/support-for-patients-caregivers

National Institutes of Health- National Cancer Institute (NCI)

University of California Cancer Consortium
https://www.uccancer.org/
CHAPTER 5
CANCER RELATED HEALTH DISPARITIES

The 2021-2025 cancer plan aims to drive the elimination of cancer-related disparities in California. Each topic in the plan identifies at least one objective addressing health disparities. The National Cancer Institute (NCI) defines cancer-related health disparities as harmful differences found in health risk, measures and outcomes when comparing groups. Health disparities include unequal access to timely, sufficient health resources, medical and supportive care; inadequate quality of care; and poor disease outcomes.

Causes of cancer disparities lie at both the individual and system levels. They include multiple factors such as access to care, provider bias, cultural barriers, inapplicable health models, systemic oppression, low socioeconomic status and other policy or environmental issues that compound on one another. The cancer burden is greater for socially marginalized and socioeconomically depressed communities, with greater loss of life, earlier death, and reduced enjoyment of healthy productive lives. These populations experience further disadvantage as they are understudied in biomedical research and therefore, often excluded from the benefits of new medical advances and improved treatments. The following section highlights some of the ways in which disparities persist.

Race and Ethnicity: Among our most vulnerable populations are racial and ethnic minorities. These groups suffer unequal premature cancer incidence, morbidity and mortality. Racial and ethnic disparities are associated with various factors such as genetics/biology, culture, and health care delays or barriers. As ethnic minorities become an increasing proportion of cancer survivors, greater attention to the ethnic and cultural aspects of cancer care, outcomes and survivorship is required.

Economic Status: Low-income populations experience unequal, premature morbidity and mortality. Low-income communities often struggle to meet basic needs and are at a disadvantage in obtaining necessary health services, quality care, and access to vital resources. They are likely to be uninsured or underinsured with limited capacity to pay for out-of-pocket expenses. This may hinder access to usual and trusted sources of care and/or discourage seeking care and medication adherence.

Sexual and Gender Minorities: Over 5% of the U.S. population identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or intersex (LGBTQI). LGBTQI communities remain invisible in critical cancer research data and knowledge, which includes understanding effective care and communication practices. Their unique health issues and needs often go unrecognized, and therefore are not met in many health care and support service environments. A Gallup Poll revealed that LGBTQI individuals delayed seeking medical attention due to fear...
of discrimination.18 Read more about cancer and Sexual and Gender Minorities (SGM) populations in the next section on page 59.

**Women:** Racial and ethnic minority women have higher mortality rates and poorer cancer survival compared to non-Hispanic white women.19,20 Current research reveals how cancer burdens are also shaped by intersecting life course factors such as socioeconomic status, identity, and subordination.21-24

**Geographic Locality:** Place of residence in California affects how individuals access and receive health resources and care. Rural communities in particular, often face greater challenges and fewer options for their health care.25 They can be at a disadvantage with respect to: seeking care close to home; acquiring specialist advice and care; receiving advanced health care services; and accessing clinical trials, supportive services, and end-of-life care.

Many minority and marginalized groups are excluded from pertinent health care resulting in increased cancer and overall disease burdens. There are several cross-cutting factors that impact cancer burdens, requiring policies and interventions unique to specific groups and the California social-geographic contexts. Targeted interventions must address a wide range of issues, including but not limited to, socio-political environment, social cohesion and assets, immigration status, and various system level factors-all critical for improving the overall well being of our diverse California.

The plan takes into account multiple factors influencing cancer-related disparities:

- The complex and interrelated social determinants of health that influence how people "are born, grow, live, work and age".26
- California’s residents include our society’s most diverse racial, ethnic, social, economic, cultural and geographic populations.
- The environmental, institutional, and structural barriers/obstacles exist across the cancer control and care continuum.
- Ethnic minority and diversity inclusion must be incorporated into federal and state health policies and practices.

Challenges to contend with include a widening knowledge gap as well as an inadequate infrastructure for data collection, mining, functionality, and use on marginalized populations. Insufficient inclusion of representative populations remains detrimental to both optimal scientific advancements and equitable care. To significantly reduce the burden of cancer in California, all groups must be represented in cancer data, science and medical care. While there is monumental importance to reduce statewide cancer incidence and mortality, it is essential to diminish persistent disparities towards sustaining a healthy, productive California.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

**National Cancer Institute- Cancer Disparities**
Cancer Disparities
https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/understanding/disparities

**Health Disparities Resources**
https://www.cancer.gov/about-nci/organization/crchd/about-health-disparities/resources

**World Health Organization- About Social Determinants of Health**
https://www.who.int/social_determinants/sdh_definition/en/

**California Department of Public Health Office of Health Equity**
https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/Pages/OfficeHealthEquity.aspx

**American Cancer Society**
Cancer Facts & Figures for Hispanics 2018-2020

Cancer Facts & Figures 2016, Special Report on Asian Americans

Cancer Facts & Figures for African Americans 2019-2021
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CANCER AND SEXUAL AND GENDER MINORITIES

SGM is defined as individuals “including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, gender non-conforming people, and other populations whose sexual orientation or gender identity and reproductive development is considered outside cultural, societal, or physiological norms.”

Compared to heterosexual and cisgender populations, SGM populations have a higher prevalence of selected health risk factors (smoking, alcohol consumption, substance use) and negative health outcomes (suicide, depression, selected cancers). They are also more likely to have poor access to health care and experience discrimination in health care settings. Regarding cancer disparities, the SGM population experiences higher cancer incidence, advanced stage of disease at diagnosis, and worse survival outcomes. Cancers that disproportionately affect this community include HPV-related cancers (such as anal cancer, cervical, head and neck cancers) and breast, colorectal cancer, and lung cancer.

A nationwide county-level study found that counties with higher density of LGBT populations tend to have higher incidence of colorectal cancer for both men and women. The SGM communities are at high-risk for cancer risk factors. Smoking in the LGBT and Queer community, also known as LGBTQ, is twice as high compared to heterosexuals, with rising rates among LGBT youth, which impacts lung cancer rates. In addition, this community experiences inequitable access to regular health services. Approximately 30% of LGBT adults do not seek health care services or lack a regular health care provider compared with 10% of age-matched heterosexuals. This has downstream effects on cancer prevention, early detection and post treatment follow-up care.

Current measures of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) to obtain an estimate of the size of the SGM population can and should be improved. Understanding the size of the SGM communities is a critical first step to develop public health policy and focus research questions that address health care disparities experienced by SGM populations. Challenges in getting an accurate size of the SGM population originate from differences in definitions of who should be included, lack of consistency in the survey methods and the SGM-status measures across time, and perception that SGM individuals are not willing to disclose SOGI.

STRATEGIES

Addressing the unique health challenges of SGM communities will require a comprehensive approach that consists of improving the collection of SOGI data and enhancing the provision of care for SGM patients through an intersectional lens that acknowledges multiple intersecting identities that are related to one’s sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, gender identity, and other identities that indicate the sociocultural power and privilege in the community. The following strategies are recommended to achieve broad gains in the health of the SGM communities:

1. Develop systematic and consistent methods of collecting SOGI information in health care settings and cancer registries (an objective in the Surveillance Chapter aims to include gender identity categories in order to enhance data capture in the California Cancer Registry).

2. Develop Continuing Medical Education courses that meet the Institute of Medicine’s Core Competency to “provide patient-centered care” focused on increasing awareness around cancer disparities in SGM populations, acknowledging the heterogeneity within the SGM populations, and recognizing the influence of multiple minority group identities on an individual’s health.

3. Create programs that provide free or low-cost prevention, screening, diagnostic and treatment services for the most significant cancers affecting SGM populations and design program evaluation to assess the impact of these programs.

4. Encourage the development of SGM-focused research programs within the University of California Office of the President.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

American Cancer Society- LGBTQ People With Cancer Fact Sheet

Lambda Legal
https://www.lambdalegal.org/

LGBT Cancer Network
www.cancer-network.org

The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law - LGBT Data & Demographics
https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/visualization/lgbtstats/?topic=LGBT&area=4#density
CANCER AND AMERICAN INDIAN ALASKAN NATIVES

Driven by CDPH’s CCR report, “Cancer Burden among Native Americans in California” (https://www.cccr.state.ca.us), this section includes an additional focus on the cancer experiences of the American Indian/Alaska Native (AIAN) population in California. The AIAN population is comprised of California-based Tribal people and AIANs who have relocated to California from other areas of the United States. It is a geographically, historically, and culturally diverse group. The beliefs of AIANs are deeply rooted in tradition and culture. However, due to the physical relocations, lack of trust of medical professionals, and the current/historical trauma experienced by AIAN communities, they now suffer from more significant health disparities compared to the general population. They are also more likely to be of lower socioeconomic status. Additionally, AIANs have much higher rates of tobacco use, obesity, diabetes, physical inactivity, heart disease, suicide, and many other chronic diseases compared to the general population. In addition to the health disparities they face, AIANs are profoundly impacted by cancer; it is the second leading cause of death after heart disease. Limited access to health care contributes to a more significant state-wide systemic problem in which a system of partners is necessary for assisting this particular group in accessing prompt health care services, more specifically, cancer-related services. Given their rural distribution, AIANs are typically required to travel long distances for screening and treatment services, which significantly deters the ability for timely diagnosis and treatment of life-threatening cancers and diseases.

When considering the cultural aspects of care for AIAN, the subject of cancer is often taboo, and speaking of or screening for cancer can be viewed as inviting it into the body. Many AIAN experience what is known as provider mistrust and hesitate to be screened or to talk about symptoms with their doctor. In both the short and long-term, these cultural, historical, and geographical disparities combined leave AIANs at an increased risk of late-stage cancer diagnoses, increased susceptibility to cancer-related deaths, and significantly lower cancer survival rates compared to other populations.

Results in Table 1 published from Cancer Burden Among Native Americans In California indicate that from 2000 through 2016, a total of 13,669 Native Americans were diagnosed with cancer in California. Compared with whites, a higher proportion of Native American patients were female and of younger age. They were also more likely to live in Purchased/Referred Care Delivery Area (PRCDA) counties, rural areas, and have low socioeconomic status; 39.7% of Native American patients had low socioeconomic status and only 19.6% were of high socioeconomic means (compared to 18% and 46.3% of white patients, respectively). The percent of Native Americans diagnosed at early stage was also significantly lower than the percentage among whites (44.8% vs. 52.1%). In terms of health insurance, 55.8% of Native American cancer patients had private/government health insurance, and 20.3% were covered by Medicaid or other public insurance (compared to 68.4% and 6.9% among white patients, respectively).

Table 1. Characteristics of Native American and White Cancer Patients in California, 2000–2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Patients</td>
<td>13,669</td>
<td>1,919,254</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>959,053</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,249</td>
<td>960,201</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–19</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>73,067</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–54</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>293,972</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–69</td>
<td>9,544</td>
<td>685,731</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>653,928</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Stage at Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Situ</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>202,625</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localized</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>796,992</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>343,530</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>404,453</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>171,654</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>345,464</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>684,587</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>889,203</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>1,585,155</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4,879</td>
<td>334,099</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCDA†</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>716,989</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PRCDA</td>
<td>5,608</td>
<td>1,202,265</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Government</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>1,312,589</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare, no Supplement</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>341,274</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/IHS/Public</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>132,621</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>20,401</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>112,369</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 PRCDA: purchased/Referred Care Delivery Area
Source of data: California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health. Prepared by the California Cancer Reporting and Epidemiologic Surveillance (CaCARES) Program, Institute for Population Health Improvement, UC Davis Health
In addition to the CCCP, CDC also funds comprehensive cancer control efforts targeting Tribal communities in California. The California Tribal Comprehensive Cancer Control Program (CTCCCP) (https://crihb.org/ctcccp/) housed within the California Rural Indian Health Board, Inc. has supported California Tribal communities in implementing cancer control, prevention, and survivorship activities since 2017. The CTCCCP strategically recruited members across California Tribal health programs, Tribes, Tribal organizations, and organizations serving Tribal communities to participate in the CTCCCP Coalition (Coalition). These members have a stake in improving the lives of AIANs across California. They have been especially important in identifying the most pressing needs of California Tribal communities and assessing the impact of cancer within tribal communities.

An important task of the Coalition is to develop and implement a tribal comprehensive cancer control plan (tribal cancer plan), formally The Cancer Control Plan. The tribal cancer plan includes objectives, evidence-based interventions, and activities that aim to meet the cancer prevention and survivorship needs of the AIAN communities in California. Like the state cancer plan, the goals are aligned with CDC’s NCCCP. The goals of the tribal cancer plan are to increase cancer prevention awareness among Tribal communities, increase prevention and screening efforts, improve cancer survivors’ quality of life, and increase health equity as it relates to cancer control.

California’s tribal cancer plan includes objectives that aim to strengthen Tribal communities with targets to be met by 2023. Although targets are to be met before set targets within this state cancer plan, interventions have already been initiated with opportunities for collaboration. The Coalition and its extended partners, the CCCP and CDOC, intend to continue supporting one another by sharing resources, services, and staff in order to meet the identified objectives, which were developed with the most common health disparities in mind. To review strategies for these objectives, other content, or to get involved with implementation of the tribal cancer plan, please visit: https://crihb.org/ctcccp/
CHAPTER GOAL
To assure that all Californians have access to resources that promote wellness, and to quality services that address preventive, diagnostic, treatment, survivorship, palliative, and end-of-life cancer care.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
In order to reduce the cancer burden in the state, all Californians must have opportunities for both healthy living and services to address issues across the cancer continuum. Access to cancer screening and treatment have been the focus of previous access to care narratives. While vitally important, the emphasis on downstream access neglects important interventions that could improve population health, prevent cancer, and mitigate disease consequences.

The issue of equity is at the core of wellness and access to cancer-related services. Equitable access requires that health and care resources exist, and that those in need have the knowledge and ability to avail themselves of those resources. This mandate encompasses financial, geographic, systemic, and cultural challenges that differentially affect certain segments of our population. Barriers to care exist, but vary by group, location, and the systems currently in place. A person’s race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, age/social generation, education, employment status, economic circumstances, geographic locality, and immigration status all impact both general wellness and care along the cancer continuum. For many, remaining uninsured or underinsured or not having a dedicated primary provider results in greater risk of later cancer diagnosis and early death.

The below objectives and strategies have been developed to ensure that every person has the opportunity to maintain their health and obtain quality services when needed. Key elements of the plan include assessments and data collection so that barriers can be clearly identified and improvement measured, collaborations with partners (including non-profits, health insurers, and care providers), connecting communities with existing resources, educating professionals on barriers to care, and health policy advocacy.

An umbrella recommendation to support the objectives and associated strategies contained in this chapter is the creation of a repository (likely online) of free and low-cost services, possibly listed by county. This would include federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) and similar clinics. This repository would need to be continually updated and widely publicized as a tool available to the public. Though this would entail costs associated with maintaining a website, such a repository would go a long way in supporting those with obstacles to identifying and receiving cancer-related care in California, leading to a reduction of the overall cancer burden in the state.
The following objectives do not currently have identified baseline measures and may be established as part of an implementation plan.

Objective 1: By 2025, increase equitable access to quality cancer-related preventive, diagnostic, treatment, palliative, and end of life care for the uninsured and underinsured.

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Establish or reinforce strategic partnerships with academic and community organizations to identify current barriers for under/uninsured to obtain care along the cancer continuum.
2. Work with community-based and non-profit organizations identified in strategy one to determine provider/systems-related barriers to providing screening and treatment for insured/uninsured.
3. Support network of FQHCs and Look-Alike clinics in increasing educational outreach to patients regarding no-cost screening.
4. Support advocacy efforts by Medical Associations at the local, regional and state level with regard to increasing access to screening and treatment services for under and uninsured.
5. Determine through Medicare and Medicaid databases how hospice is currently utilized by the under and uninsured and how to better capture this information.
6. Work with FQHCs and community organizations to identify patient-perceived cultural barriers to accessing end-of-life care that can be addressed through public health programs.

Objective 2: By 2025, reduce financial and geographical barriers to equitable cancer care for all Californians (insured and uninsured).

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Conduct an assessment to identify financial and geographic barriers to accessing cancer-related preventive, diagnostic, treatment, palliative care and end-of-life services.
2. Educate decision makers (legislators and healthcare plans) on the existing barriers to obtaining health plan coverage, including pharmacy benefits, to access cancer-care services.
3. Work with government agencies and health plans to identify those Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs) in greatest need of cancer care services.
4. Identify financial assistance programs, charity care programs or supportive service organizations to assist with basic needs and medical cost resources.
5. Collaborate with regional transportation/transit planning initiatives to address access to cancer-care services.
6. Work with community organizations to engage community health workers, patient navigators and care coordinators to assist patients with overcoming barriers.

Objective 3: By 2025, reduce systemic and cultural barriers to equitable cancer care for all Californians (insured and uninsured).

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Conduct an assessment to identify the systemic and cultural barriers to equitable cancer care for specific populations.
2. Develop cultural competency work plans (toolkits/roadmaps) to increase and improve the delivery of linguistically and culturally appropriate cancer care services.
3. Identify and work with stakeholders, government agencies and health plans to assist with cultural and language competencies in the cancer space and integrate cultural competencies.
4. Educate decision makers (legislators and health care plans) on how to reduce systemic and cultural barriers to cancer care for Californians.
5. Work with community organizations to engage community health workers, patient navigators and care coordinators to assist patients with overcoming systemic, cultural and language barriers.
6. Develop strategies to monitor and evaluate progress of reducing systematic and cultural barriers.
CHAPTER 7

PRIMARY PREVENTION

CHAPTER GOAL
To prevent cancer through risk-factor reduction by optimizing social and environmental support for recommended health behaviors. These behaviors include healthy eating, daily exercise, tobacco use avoidance, limiting alcohol consumption, Ultraviolet (UV) light protection, and recommended vaccination adherence.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
Primary prevention of cancer refers to actions taken by individuals, communities, or governments to protect against the occurrence of cancer. This includes empowering Californians to adopt healthy lifestyles and environments that support those healthy lifestyles. This chapter lists the major primary prevention strategies for cancer control. The strategies work collectively to minimize the risk of cancer for individuals and their communities. They include behaviors such as minimizing exposure to tobacco, maintaining a healthy diet, exercising regularly, avoiding overweight and obesity, and protecting against excess UV light exposure. More global strategies include implementing environmental regulations, promoting or requiring selected vaccinations, treatment of diseases that predispose one to cancer, and population-based pre-cancer screening.

Individual lifestyle behaviors such as minimizing exposure to nicotine, healthy eating and exercising regularly significantly prevent the major causes of cancer death. These lifestyle practices also reduce non-cancer deaths, such as heart disease, diabetes, and stroke, resulting in happier, higher-quality lives. Studies show that Americans would follow recommended lifestyle practices if their work and home environments made the healthy choice the easier choice. Not having these choices easily built into our spaces are the biggest barriers to adopting and sustaining these healthier lifestyle choices. Public policies can help nudge communities, workplaces, and homeowners to adopt environments and practices that make the healthier choice the easier choice. The development of policies and increasing population health efforts to support these choices are important options to explore at the local and statewide levels.

*Note. This risk factor, while important, was not included in the 2021-2025 California Comprehensive Cancer Plan

HUMAN PAPILLOMA VIRUS (HPV)
The HPV vaccine protects against HPV strains that cause six types of cancers, including cancers of the cervix, oropharynx (throat), penis, vagina, vulva, and anus. Estimates show upwards of 80% of the population will be infected by HPV. Given the widespread nature of the virus, vaccine series completion is recommended by age 13 for optimal cancer prevention. Currently, HPV vaccination lags behind other preteen vaccines. Implementation of best practices to increase HPV vaccination and reduce geographic disparities will ensure all young Californians benefit. Vaccination represents a key pillar for HPV-associated cervical cancer elimination efforts. Health systems are encouraged to increase utilization of the California Immunization Registry (CAIR) (https://cairweb.org/) so that state and local vaccination coverage data can be used to address community needs.
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Objective 1: By 2025, increase initiation of HPV vaccine among 13-year olds from the baseline of 57% to 90%.
Data source: California Immunization Registry, 2018

Objective 2: By 2025, increase series completion of the HPV vaccine among 13-year olds from the baseline of 35% to 80%.
Data source: California Immunization Registry, 2018

Objective 3: By 2025, reduce the geographic disparity gap in HPV vaccination rates for 13 year old Californians:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At least 1 dose HPV Vx by age 13</th>
<th>HPV series completion by age 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline 50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: California Immunization Registry, 2018

Strategies for Objectives 1, 2 and 3

1. Increase the number of clinicians strongly recommending the HPV vaccine at the same time they administer meningococcal conjugate and tetanus diphtheria-acellular pertussis (Tdap) vaccines.
2. Incorporate evidence-based strategies to improve HPV vaccination in clinics serving adolescents, including:
   - Issuing standing orders,
   - Using electronic health record (EHR) prompts for providers,
   - Scheduling next appointment, the same day as the first dose is given,
   - Offering vaccine-only appointments,
   - Implementing patient reminder/recall systems,
   - Ensuring a pro-vaccine office culture,
   - Making presumptive recommendations for HPV vaccine, and
   - Educating providers and staff on HPV disease and prevention through vaccination. Resources available to support interventions include Clinician and Health Systems Action Guides available through the American Cancer Society.
3. Partner with Medi-Cal Managed Care and commercial health plans to use available data to identify providers with low HPV vaccine coverage and provide support and assistance to them, including with implementation of strategies listed above.
4. Support improved access to HPV vaccine through school-based clinics, pharmacies, local health departments, and other vaccination clinics (e.g., vaccine only appointments).
5. Increase the number of medical facilities, clinicians, school health centers, and pharmacies contributing HPV immunization data to the CAIR. This can be done by promotion of CAIR to health systems and individual providers, education on the existing mandate for all Medi-Cal Managed Care plans to enter immunizations into CAIR, and education on the Vaccines for Children Program to policy makers.
6. (Objective 1 and 2): Encourage public and private health plans, health systems, and providers to assess HPV vaccination coverage of 13-year-old patients using available data (quality performance metrics, immunization registry, EHR, etc.).
7. (Objective 3): Pilot an HPV-focused learning collaborative following the ECHO model (Extension for Community Health Outcomes) with select rural providers to enable participants to learn from experts and each other, gain access to evidence-based and capacity-building resources, and receive guidance in applying quality improvement processes to address HPV vaccination in their practices.

CANCER STORY: HUMAN PAPILLOMA VIRUS (HPV)

My stirrup story begins in 2006. I was 27 and pregnant with my first child. I went for my first exam and had an abnormal pap smear. From 2006 to 2015 I had abnormal pap, colposcopies, and loop electrosurgical excision procedures (LEEP) many times.

In November 2016, I received results of another abnormal pap and scheduled yet another colposcopy. This time the results were malignant. I was diagnosed with Stage 2 Cervical Adenocarcinoma at age 36. At the time, I was a single mother, with two young children. I had laparoscopic surgery, weekly chemotherapy, and 28 rounds of external radiation. This continued for 6 weeks with 3 more rounds of internal radiation. I was subsequently diagnosed with residual cancer less than a year later and had a radical hysterectomy, after which I was told there was No Evidence of Disease.

After surgery, kidney pain led to a discovery of dam-aged ureters due to the radiation on both sides of my body. In January 2017 I had a major reconstructive surgery on my bladder and ureters. October 5th of 2017, was my first cancer-versary. With a clear PET/CT scan I was officially one year free from my fight with cancer. Unfortunately, my pap, done after the PET/CT showed precancerous cells on my vaginal wall, and I did a topical chemo for 6 weeks that result-ed in a clear pap. My battle is not over yet. I continue to get abnormal pap smears and am monitored every 6 months, and I still remain HPV positive.

~Ana Reyes, Cervical Cancer Survivor

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

California Department of Public Health – Sexually Transmitted Diseases Branch
https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/HPV.aspx#

California HPV Vaccination Roundtable
http://cahpvroundtable.org

California Immunization Registry (CAIR)
http://cairweb.org/

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - HPV and Cancer
https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/hpv/statistics/cases.htm

National HPV Vaccination Roundtable - Clinician and Health Systems Action Guides
https://hpvroundtable.org/action-guides/
OBESITY PREVENTION

Promoting environments and policies that optimize adherence to healthy eating and to daily physical activity are effective ways to prevent obesity-related cancers.1,2 Unfortunately, healthy eating, daily physical activity and avoidance of obesity are major public health challenges in California,3 especially for low-income, minority populations such as U.S. born, low-income Latinos who live in communities with poor access to fresh or frozen produce, minimally processed.4 The following objectives provide effective pathways to combat obesity-related cancers. Promoting environments and policies that optimize increased intake of whole fruits,5 whole vegetables, whole grains6 and fewer sugary beverages7 is an evidence-based approach to reduce risk of obesity-related cancers. Increasing adherence to federal physical activity guidelines will decrease colon cancer risk by reducing inflammation in the colon8 and will reduce postmenopausal breast cancer risk by reducing estrogen levels in the breast.9 Given the limited resources available for health promotion, the focus should be on establishing environments and policies involving children, adolescents and women of child-bearing age that maximize adherence to dietary and physical activity guidelines facilitative of cancer prevention benefit over the lifespan. In particular, school-based health promotion programs that encourage students to eat more fruits and vegetables,10 consume fewer sugary beverages,11 and to be less sedentary have been effective.12 Pregnancy is also a teachable moment13 that has been used to increase adherence to recommended daily food choices and physical activity.14,15

Objective 1: By 2025, increase the number of pregnant women and women of child-bearing age who limit sugary drink intake and consume the recommended servings of fresh or frozen fruit and vegetables, minimally processed, by 10%.

* < 10% increase because of ceiling effect but still a statistically significant increase at p < .05.

| Strategies |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Make it standard of care for gynecologists and obstetricians to remind their patients of child-bearing age that a diet rich in fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables, minimally processed, and limited added sugar reduces obesity for both her and her baby should she become pregnant. |
| 2. Encourage the providers of Women, Infant and Children (WIC) nutrition programs to increase their subsidies for fresh and frozen vegetables and fruit to make it possible for their low-income pregnant women clients to snack on fresh or frozen fruit and vegetables, minimally processed, every day. |
| 3. Encourage family members or friends to keep the pregnant woman’s refrigerator continually stocked with vegetable soup and with fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables, minimally processed. |
| 4. Encourage employers to provide a refrigerator at work in which employees can store fresh fruit and vegetables for lunch and workplace snacking. |
| 5. Work with prenatal and postnatal care providers to encourage pregnant women/recent mothers to consume fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables, minimally processed, regularly. |

| Objective 2: By 2025, increase the number of children and adolescents who report not drinking a sugary beverage and who consume the recommended daily servings of fresh or frozen fruit and vegetables, minimally processed by 10%. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline CHIS, 2017</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily fruit intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily fruit intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily fruit intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategies |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Encourage communities to promote children’s consumption of non-sugary beverages via health education and bans on the sale of sugary beverages in child-friendly community environments, especially schools and public parks. |
| 2. Encourage elementary school teachers to take students regularly on field trips to the local farmers market and local community garden to educate them about fruits and vegetables and good nutrition. |
3. Encourage elementary school teachers to include lessons on the nutritional benefits of regularly eating minimally processed fruits and vegetables and avoiding food products with added sugar, especially sugary drinks.

4. Encourage school food service directors to offer a vegetable or fruit that is NOT on the list of the ten most common vegetables or fruits in the school cafeteria at least once a month, to increase students’ exposure to a wider variety of fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables, which are minimally processed.

5. Encourage communities, with extra outreach to U.S. born Latino communities, to involve children and teens in community gardening, ideally at school.

6. Encourage communities to have enough sources of fresh/frozen vegetables so that 90% of residents reside within two miles of where they can buy a variety of fresh/frozen vegetables for their families.

Objective 3: By 2025, increase the number of children and adolescents who engage in a minimum of 60 minutes of structured and unstructured physical activity daily each week by 10%.

Data source: CHIS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of physical activity for a minimum of 60 minutes/day on at least five days/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies

1. Encourage parents to walk their children to school.

2. Encourage families to do fun, low-impact, in-home, short-bout exercises using YouTube.com videos such as the Walk at Home series of videos.

3. Encourage elementary school teachers to break up the school day with 10-minute exercise breaks in class.

4. Encourage school boards of education to partner with community organizations (e.g., YMCA) to ensure that their students are able to engage in 60+ minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per day.

5. Encourage municipalities to create more opportunities for active recreation, including parks with family recreation programs, biking paths and hiking trails, especially in low-income neighborhoods.

6. Support Safe Routes to Schools programs to make it safer for teens to walk, skateboard or bicycle to school.

TOBACCO USE

While tobacco use has declined in California over the past 30 years, there is currently an epidemic of youth and young adult use of new tobacco products such as vaping devices, which include electronic cigarettes and pod-based devices. As a result, the tobacco industry is hooking a new generation of users. In addition, disparities in tobacco use continue, especially with Medi-Cal members who comprise over 40% of California’s smokers. Cancer centers also are increasingly called upon to integrate tobacco treatment into cancer care, and the improvement of tobacco assessment and treatment is needed. The CCR, the California Smokers’ Helpline, cancer centers, schools, providers, and other statewide, regional and local private and public partners play a vital role in helping to: 1) assess the burden of tobacco use among these groups, 2) educate Californians about emerging tobacco products and its dangers, and 3) promote tobacco treatment practices to further reduce the prevalence of all tobacco products. The following objectives and strategies are designed to continue the progress California has made in reducing the morbidity and mortality associated with tobacco use, with special attention to youth and young adults, the Medi-Cal population, and cancer patients.

Data sources: California Student Tobacco Survey (CSTS), 2017-2018* and CHIS, 2018**

Objectives

1. Promote evidence-based curriculums in K-12 schools, such as the Stanford Tobacco Prevention Toolkit, and encourage the California Department of Education to provide Tobacco Use Prevention and Education funding to all schools.

2. Educate local communities about the health risks of emerging tobacco products, including vaping and nicotine salt products, policies such as California’s “Tobacco 21” law restricting tobacco product sales to persons under 21 years old, risks from dual use of tobacco products and other substances such as cannabis.

3. Educate school/college counselors and other clinical providers to assess and treat tobacco product use or exposure among youth and young adults, especially with vaping and for patients under 21 years of age, including the use of nicotine replacement therapy if indicated.

4. Promote the use of the California Smokers’ Helpline services, including quit vaping services, and other resources such as smokefree.gov, in school/college and clinical settings for youth and young adults with Ask Advise Connect protocols.

5. Decrease tobacco industry marketing on social media platforms and other online sources, which may target youth and young adults.
6. Support efforts that will reduce access and availability of tobacco products to persons under 21 years of age, secondhand smoke exposure to all nonsmokers, and increase enforcement of in-person or online sales restrictions to persons under 21 years old with coordination between California Department of Justice and other programs funded by CDPH and California Department of Education.

Objective 2: By 2025, reduce the prevalence of tobacco use among adults covered by Medi-Cal from the baseline of 17.4% to 11%.

Data source: CHIS, 2018

Strategies
1. Produce a report that tracks Medi-Cal tobacco assessment and treatment at a state and regional level, compared to the general population, and characterize populations and disparities; include secondhand smoke exposure among children and treatment of household smokers, as has been collected by the California Child Health and Disability Prevention program.

2. Track tobacco assessment and treatment in cancer screening programs, especially lung cancer screening which requires addressing tobacco use.

3. Encourage providers serving Medi-Cal populations to complete tobacco assessment and treatment training and engage in learning collaboratives or quality improvement initiatives for tobacco, such as that offered by CA Quits.

4. Integrate the California Smokers’ Helpline into safety net health systems that serve Medi-Cal members, from providers (including dentists, pharmacists, behavioral health, and cancer providers) and managed care plans to regional health information exchanges.

5. Encourage population-based health strategies with the California Smokers’ Helpline to provide FDA-approved tobacco cessation medications, outreach, and engagement including incentives (e.g., Medi-Cal Incentives to Quit Smoking project incentives included mailed nicotine patches and a $20 gift card).

6. Engage and highlight best practices of tobacco assessment and treatment among health and social service organizations that serve the Medi-Cal population such as children’s services, maternal health, and behavioral health.

Objective 3: By 2025, increase tobacco assessment rates among patients in the California Cancer Registry from the baseline of 56% to 80%.

Data source: CCR, 2012-2016

Strategies
1. Produce a report of statewide and regional tobacco assessment rates among all patients with cancer, focusing on the 12 tobacco-related cancers and include special populations (e.g., Medi-Cal).

2. Encourage and track California cancer clinics/centers to incorporate tobacco treatment as a program goal or quality improvement project (e.g., American Society of Clinical Oncology’s Quality Oncology Practice Initiative tobacco quality metric).

3. Train California cancer providers and registry abstractors/staff about documentation of tobacco status assessment, including e-cigarettes/vaping and secondhand smoke exposure.

4. Increase and track the number of California cancer centers that have tobacco treatment programs and/or electronic referrals to the California Smokers’ Helpline.

5. Encourage the adoption of the National Cancer Institute’s Tobacco Use Questionnaire, which is validated for cancer patients, but can also be used for clinical care.

6. Encourage CDC or CDPH to require data collection about tobacco treatment for cancer registries (not just tobacco assessment), as the Surgeon General concludes suggestive evidence that smoking cessation after a cancer diagnosis improves all cause mortality.

ULTRAVIOLET (UV) LIGHT EXPOSURE

The incidence of melanoma and nonmelanoma skin cancers is increasing every year, with more people developing skin cancer from indoor tanning alone, than lung cancer because of smoking. Preventing the disease involves developing an understanding of the risks associated with UV radiation from the sun, as well as from other sources, including indoor tanning beds, and then making lifestyle choices to reduce one’s exposure. This process will need to involve partners in the health care system, education, advocacy, and government to develop and implement measures to ensure healthy habits that promote sun-safe behaviors. Communities also need to collaboratively address the social norms regarding tanned skin and the importance of developing policies that support UV radiation protection and warn the public about the dangers of excessive UV exposure from outdoor recreational activities and tanning devices.

The following objectives do not currently have identified baseline measures and may be established as part of an implementation plan.

Objective 1: By 2025, reduce UV exposure and the number of sunburns in outdoor occupational workers.

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Establish baseline data for outdoor occupational workers, including people working in construction and agricultural settings. Determine their associated melanoma incidence and mortality by county paired with UV exposure behaviors, number of sunburns, and existing diagnoses of skin cancer via the 2020 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) of skin cancer risk.

2. Engage employers of outdoor occupational workers to include sun-safety information in workplace wellness programs, encourage wearing of sun protection, schedule breaks in the shade, allow time to reapply...
sunscreen, increase the amount of shade available, decrease UV exposure by covering bright surfaces, promote telehealth dermatology educational strategies and outreach, and create work schedules that minimize sun exposure.

3. Develop a social media campaign to educate outdoor occupational workers about the risks of UV exposure, sunburns, and development of skin cancer. Promote adoption of sun safe behaviors with specific emphasis on those at highest risk, including white and Hispanic males using the CDC’s Sun Safety Tips for Men, the #SunSafeSelfie campaign, scheduling annual skin checks, and becoming role models for sun safety programs.

4. Reassess UV exposure by outdoor occupation (construction versus agricultural workers). Add 2020 NHIS skin cancer questions to the California Health Interview Survey in 2024 with additional questions on educational outreach (employers, social media, coordinated community interventions) to assess behavior changes that reduce UV exposure, the number of sunburns per year, and associated skin cancer diagnoses.

Objective 2: By 2025, reduce UV exposure and the number of sunburns in people participating in outdoor recreation.

Data Source: TBD

**Strategies**

1. Upon release of the 2020 NHIS skin cancer data, baseline measurements for UV exposure and the number of sunburns will be established per age-group and distribution in California counties.

2. Assist school districts in improving access to playground shade structures using CDC’s Shade Planning for American Schools.

3. Promote skin cancer educational resources (CDC and Wipe Out Melanoma – California Initiative) for use in elementary through junior high curriculums to illustrate the benefits of sun safe behaviors and ways to reduce UV exposure.

4. For outdoor recreational or tourism settings, promote increased use of shade in high use areas, move activities to shade structures, schedule activities during low UV times of day, and make sure plans for new outdoor recreational spaces include shade.

5. Promote staff and visitor sun safe behaviors through established programs, such as the Pool Cool, Sun Safe, and Promoting Sun Safety among Zoo Visitors. Encourage visitors and staff to use sun protection with policies for staff, having staff teach and model sun safety behaviors, posting signs to remind visitors to protect themselves, provide sunscreen dispensers, and allow activity breaks for application of sunscreen.

6. Promote other delivery methods for personal sun safety items, including selling hats with a wide brim, protective clothing, and umbrellas. Provide broad spectrum sunscreen with an SPF of 15 or higher, and post instructions for proper use.

Objective 3: By 2025, reduce indoor tanning use by sexual minority men (gay and bisexual men) in California.

Data Source: TBD

**Strategies**

1. Establish current baseline rates of tanning bed use throughout California by county, comparing specific demographics, including sexual minority men, using the California Health Interview Survey 2009 tanning bed use questions augmented with questions related to motivations for using tanning beds, distance to tanning beds, diagnosis of skin cancers, and potential skin cancer protection behaviors.

2. Establish a UV Exposure Advisory Board to guide selection of specific strategies and activities to reduce use of tanning beds and associated sunburns in the counties identified in the baseline assessment of exceeding tanning bed use and number of sunburns.

3. Conduct focus groups of sexual minority men who disproportionately use tanning beds to develop appropriate social media campaigns for reduction in UV exposure through use of tanning beds.

4. Develop and evaluate a social media campaign with the aid of the UV Advisory Board targeting sexual minority men, according to the CDC Community Guide for modifying behavior associated with tanning bed use.

**OTHER STATEWIDE PRIMARY PREVENTION EFFORTS**

**Paths to Prevention: The California Breast Cancer Primary Prevention Plan** (https://www.bcpp.org/our-work/policy-projects/breast-cancer-plan/) takes the unique approach of calling for systemic change, focusing on societal-level issues rather than individual behaviors, to reduce breast cancer risk at a population level. Developed by Breast Cancer Prevention Partners with input from a wide range of stakeholders, Paths to Prevention combines scientific research and community wisdom to create an action plan of local, regional, and statewide measures to reduce breast cancer risk. Including community wisdom in the development of Paths to Prevention gives voice to the experience of people typically under represented and under-valued in science and public policy. The plan addresses a total of 23 breast cancer risk factors, including topics such as exposures to toxic chemicals; exposure to ionizing radiation; structural barriers to a healthy diet and physical activity; workplace exposures; and the impact of racism and poverty on breast cancer risk. While the focus of Paths to Prevention is breast cancer, the policy recommendations can reduce risk for numerous other cancers and adverse health impacts.

**MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES**

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention – Skin Cancer

- https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/skin/index.htm
- https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/skin/tips-for-men.htm

The Community Guide - Skin Cancer


National Cancer Institute – Research-Tested Intervention Programs (RTIPs)

- https://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/programDetails.do?programId=288737
- https://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/programDetails.do?programId=289179
- https://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/programDetails.do?programId=560302
CHAPTER GOAL
To increase recommended population-based screening among Californians, for the purpose of increasing early detection of cancers, thereby increasing survivorship.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
Following recommended cancer screening guidelines can prevent many deaths from cancer if positive screens are followed up with prompt and appropriate treatment. Early detection is an effective way to reduce mortality rates. Some cancers, if caught early, have a survival rate in excess of 95% five years after diagnosis. This chapter outlines the strategies to increase screening rates for: lung cancer, breast cancer, cervical cancer, colorectal cancer, and melanoma. Further, informed decision making in discussions between patients and their physicians is emphasized in the objectives relating to prostate cancer.

BREAST CANCER
Breast cancer is the second leading cause of death in American women, only second to lung cancer.1 Screenings, increased awareness, and evolving treatment options have contributed to a decrease in the death rate of breast cancer.2-4 Identifying the biases and stigmas different minority groups experience may translate to increased early-stage breast cancer diagnosis and decreased late-stage diagnosis.5-9

The following objectives and strategies address the necessity of shifting the efforts of providers, payers, cancer registries, policy makers and patients to decreasing mortality in Non-Hispanic Black women, improved identification of women with a high risk genetic mutation, and increasing the number of breast cancers diagnosed at earlier stages. The support of educational approaches tailored to providers are especially important to address knowledge gaps and unconscious biases that contribute to poorer breast cancer related outcomes. Additionally, the support of integrative approaches to systems improvements in clinics and community-based organizations can lead to better screening completion rates and earlier stages at detection. Only by engaging and coordinating stakeholders from all levels of the health care system can necessary changes be made and successfully implemented, which will subsequently reduce the breast cancer burden in those women who are currently bearing the brunt of the suffering from this disease.

Objective 1: By 2025, increase the percentage of breast cancers diagnosed at Stage 0/1 by 20%, from the baseline of 60% to 80% of total breast cancers diagnosed.
Data Source: CCR, 2017

Strategies
1. In areas of the state known to have higher rates of late stage diagnosis, support clinic-based programs such as client reminders with mailers/text messaging, nurse navigators to educate on screening, and Electronic Medical Records (EMR)-based provider reminders, which are proven to increase screening rates in women.
2. Support culturally and linguistically tailored educational programs on the
benefits of screening in those populations with lower screening rates and higher rates of late stage of diagnosis.

3. Support efforts to ensure mammography screening is offered without a co-pay, share-of-cost, or deductible and that increase awareness of the Every Woman Counts (EWC) program.

**Objective 2:** By 2025, increase the percent of women who are referred for genetic assessment of a high risk for breast cancer due to hereditary/familial breast cancer syndromes from the baseline of 25% to 35%.

Data Source: NCI, PMID 30964716

**Strategies**

1. Using the CDC for Genomic Applications Toolkit for Public Health Departments as a guide, support programs to educate primary care providers and other clinic staff about hereditary and familial cancer syndromes, specifically about the importance of inclusion of a three-generation family history of cancer in each patient’s EMR, about the specific NCCN guidelines for appropriate referral for genetic testing and about updating this information on an ongoing basis.

2. Conduct investigations into referral patterns to genetic counselors for women with breast cancer and for women with family members with breast cancer who meet NCCN guidelines for testing, identifying specific culturally relevant barriers that contribute to limiting access to screening and treatment for breast cancer.

3. Engage community leaders in public service strategies to increase awareness of poorer breast cancer related outcomes for Non-Hispanic Black women.

4. Address root causes for racial/ethnic disparities in receipt of breast cancer treatment such as provider unconscious bias and develop educational programs to counteract this.

5. Support programs for the education of community sponsored patient navigators who are culturally aligned with racial/ethnic subgroups.

6. Identify strategies for team-based breast cancer care for inclusion of multiple levels of staff/providers and for care across the breast cancer continuum.

5. Conduct investigations into the geographic availability of high risk breast cancer surveillance programs, especially in those populations with lower rates of referral to such clinics.

**Objective 3:** By 2025, reduce breast cancer related mortality rates for Non-Hispanic Black women from the baseline of 17 to 12 per 100,000.

Data Source: CCR, 2017

**Strategies**

1. Increase access to breast cancer screening and treatment facilities for target populations which include identifying specific culturally relevant barriers that contribute to limiting access to screening and treatment for breast cancer.

2. Educate providers and target populations in FQHCs regarding EWC and current screening recommendations.

3. Engage community leaders in public service strategies to increase awareness of poorer breast cancer related outcomes for Non-Hispanic Black women.

4. Address root causes for racial/ethnic disparities in receipt of breast cancer treatment such as provider unconscious bias and develop educational programs to counteract this.

5. Support programs for the education of community sponsored patient navigators who are culturally aligned with racial/ethnic subgroups.

6. Identify strategies for team-based breast cancer care for inclusion of multiple levels of staff/providers and for care across the breast cancer continuum.

CANCER STORY: BREAST CANCER

My cancer journey began 39 years ago when I identified a lump in my left breast, I was 28. I spent 3 years requesting a mammogram or biopsy before a physician decided to perform these procedures. The biopsy showed breast cancer. My options were a lumpectomy or a modified radical mastectomy. I selected the mastectomy and requested to have both breasts removed. I was told that was a radical unnecessary approach. The surgery was the next morning. There was no consultation with a plastic surgeon and chemotherapy was outpatient, which my insurance did not cover. I muddled through, working and parenting two sons under ten, alone. This necessitated me selling my home and raiding my retirement fund. Ten years later I repeated this process on the right breast. In 2006 when advocating for removal of my ovaries and uterus after testing positive for BRCA2, I would have a similar experience.

The journey didn’t end with the surgery or treatment. It never ends. In the quiet corner of my mind lurks a watchdog ever vigilant to detect signs of cancer. Breast cancer is my back story, a story I do not want other women to live.

–Marion Harris, Breast Cancer Survivor
CERVICAL CANCER

Cancer screening has significantly reduced cervical cancer incidence and mortality during the past three decades. Between 1988-2016, California’s cervical cancer incidence decreased by 37% and mortality decreased 36%. Despite an array of risk reduction strategies, the burden of disease remains; cervical cancer ranks as the twelfth most common cancer among California women (7.3 new cases per 100,000 women) and the thirteenth most common cause of cancer death (2.2 deaths per 100,000 women).1 Large racial/ethnic disparities in cervical cancer incidence and mortality continue to exist in California. Among the four major racial/ethnic groups, Hispanic women have the highest incidence rate of 8.8 new cases per 100,000, African American women have the highest mortality rate with 3.0 deaths per 100,000 women.1-2 Asian/Pacific Islander women report the lowest rates of cervical cancer screening resulting in high cervical cancer incidence and mortality among some Asian/Pacific Islander populations.

Cervical cancer can be eliminated as a public health problem. This World Health Organization goal will be attained when cervical cancer incidence declines to fewer than 4 cases per 100,000 women. California’s cancer plan objectives for cervical cancer have been developed with this goal in mind.

Objective 1: By 2025, decrease the percentage of women from all racial/ethnic groups ages 21–65 without a hysterectomy, who have not received a Pap and/or HPV screening test in the past five years from the baseline of 16.4% to 12.5%.

Data source: BRFSS, 2018

Objective 2: By 2025, eliminate the disparity in cervical cancer incidence among non Hispanic Black and Hispanic women in California with known rates higher than non Hispanic white women and Asian/Pacific Islander, reducing cervical cancer incidence rates for all women to 6.5 per 100,000 women.

Data source: CCR, 2017

Objective 3: By 2025, eliminate the disparity in cervical cancer mortality among non-Black Hispanic, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander women in California with known rates higher than non-Hispanic white women, reducing all cervical cancer mortality rates to 1.8 per 100,000 women.

Data source: CCR, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>7.8*</td>
<td>6.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.8*</td>
<td>6.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6.6*</td>
<td>6.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>8.6*</td>
<td>6.5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CCR, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.1*</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CCR, 2017

5. Increase the use of evidence-based, provider-oriented interventions at every opportunity during patient care (provider assessment and feedback, and provider reminder and recall systems) to improve recommendation and delivery of cervical cancer screening services.

6. Support continued review of the efficacy of self-collected pap and HPV testing in women not being regularly screened, as well as primary HPV testing as a screening modality.

7. (Objective 3) For uninsured and underinsured women, particularly those with disparate cervical cancer mortality rates noted above, promote and advocate for programs that cover cervical cancer screening, diagnostic, and treatment services.
COLORECTAL CANCER

Colorectal cancer is the fourth most common cancer and second leading cause of cancer death among men and women combined in California. In 2020, an estimated 15,530 new cases of colorectal cancer will be diagnosed statewide, and 5,480 will succumb to the disease. Screening can prevent colorectal cancer through the detection and removal of precancerous growths and, importantly, detect cancer at an early stage when it is easier to treat, and outcomes are more favorable. Low-cost screening tests can prevent nearly half of all colorectal cancer cases diagnosed at a late stage. Despite being one of the most preventable types of cancer, one in four age-eligible adults have never been screened for colorectal cancer, with underutilization more common among the Medi-Cal insured, uninsured, racial and ethnic minorities. Additionally, there has been an increase in young-onset colorectal cancer (diagnosed under age 50). To address these disparities, the following objectives with accompanying strategies detail the steps that can be taken to reduce the morbidity and mortality from colorectal cancer.

Objective 1: By 2025, decrease the rate of late stage diagnosis of colorectal cancer among those who are covered by Medi-Cal and the uninsured from the baseline of 71% to 64%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CCR, 2017

Strategies

1. Explore adding colorectal cancer screening as a required reported quality measure for Medi-Cal Managed Care plans.

2. Implement FLU/FIT programs in California’s FQHCs.

3. Implement evidence-based strategies (EBS) in California’s FQHCs as outlined in Steps For Increasing Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates: A Manual For Community Health Centers and the National Cancer Institute’s Research-Tested Intervention Programs (RTIPS) website.

4. Clinics and health plans work with patient navigators/community health workers/promotors and implement other proven strategies to ensure appropriate follow-up of colonoscopies after a positive or abnormal Fecal Immunochemical Test (FIT).

Objective 2: By 2025, increase the colorectal cancer screening rate among all Californians from the baseline of 70.8% to 80%

Data source: BRFSS, 2018

Strategies

1. Implement Evidence-based strategies as outlined in “Steps For Increasing Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates: A Manual For Community Health Centers” and the National Cancer Institute’s Research-Tested Intervention Programs (RTIPS) website.

2. Explore requiring the California Health Care Quality Report Card to report colorectal cancer (CRC) screening for all health plans providing care in California. All health plans should report their CRC screening rate for posting on the quality report card listed above.

3. Develop a FLU/FIT program in every clinic with colorectal cancer screening rates below 60%.

4. Develop clinic navigation to ensure all abnormal stool-based tests receive the required colonoscopy. The percent of abnormal stool testing that receive the needed colonoscopy should be a required quality measure for all health plans using stool-based screening tests.

5. Remove structural barriers (e.g., inconvenient clinic hours, lack of transportation, out of pocket costs, etc.) to CRC screening through the use of patient navigators/community health workers/promotors services.

Objective 3: By 2025, decrease late stage diagnosis of colorectal cancer among all Californians between the ages of 40–49 years from the baseline of 69% to 57%.

Data source: CCR, 2017

Strategies

1. Family history of CRC should be routinely asked and recorded in all adults to provide opportunities for earlier identification and screening of high-risk individuals, including with genetic testing, when indicated.

2. Encourage colorectal cancer survivors in all health plans and clinics to promote screening within their families.

3. Screening for hereditary cancer syndromes in patients with CRC should be done and include at a minimum a review of personal and family histories of all cancers.

4. Explore requiring genetic testing of removed colorectal cancers for DNA mismatch repair deficiency and/or microsatellite instability with the results reported to the CCR.

5. Health care providers should follow the ACS’s recommendations for evaluation of genetic risk in patients with a family history of colorectal cancer.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

American Cancer Society - Colorectal Cancer, Causes, Risk Factors and Prevention

California Colorectal Cancer Coalition – Community Grants Program
https://www.cacoloncancer.org/community-grants/

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Screening for Colorectal Cancer: Optimizing Quality
https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/colorectal/quality/index.htm

FLU-FIT Programs
http://flufit.org

National Cancer Institute – Research-Tested Intervention Programs (RTIPs)
https://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/index.do

State of California - Office of the Patient Advocate
https://www.opa.ca.gov/reportcards/ Pages/default.aspx

The National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable

American Cancer Society - Colorectal Cancer: Optimizing Quality
https://www.cacoloncancer.org/coalition/grants

California Colorectal Cancer Coalition – Community Grants Program
https://www.cacoloncancer.org/community-grants/

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Screening for Colorectal Cancer: Optimizing Quality
https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/colorectal/quality/index.htm

FLU-FIT Programs
http://flufit.org

National Cancer Institute – Research-Tested Intervention Programs (RTIPs)
https://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/index.do

State of California - Office of the Patient Advocate
https://www.opa.ca.gov/reportcards/Pages/default.aspx

The National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable

American Cancer Society - Colorectal Cancer, Causes, Risk Factors and Prevention

California Colorectal Cancer Coalition – Community Grants Program
https://www.cacoloncancer.org/community-grants/

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Screening for Colorectal Cancer: Optimizing Quality
https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/colorectal/quality/index.htm

FLU-FIT Programs
http://flufit.org

National Cancer Institute – Research-Tested Intervention Programs (RTIPs)
https://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/index.do

State of California - Office of the Patient Advocate
https://www.opa.ca.gov/reportcards/Pages/default.aspx

The National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable
LUNG CANCER

Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer deaths in the U.S., killing approximately 142,670 people per year - more than colon, breast and prostate cancers combined. For California, the ACS projects 10,210 deaths from lung cancer in 2020 (with 135,720 deaths nationwide). Recent advances in lung cancer detection and treatment include the advent of annual screening with Low-Dose Computed Tomography (LDCT) in high risk individuals, shown to have a mortality benefit and now recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), and the development of targeted therapies. Meaningful attempts to reduce lung cancer mortality rates in California should focus on: (1) Increasing the overall number of Low-Dose Computed Tomography Lung Cancer Screening Scans performed (per the USPSTF criteria); (2) Increasing access to those Low-Dose Computed Tomography Lung Cancer Screening Scans (per the USPSTF criteria) by minority underserved communities; and (3) Performing universal genetic, molecular and comprehensive biomarker testing of all lung cancer tumors to determine best therapies for each patient.

Objective 1: By 2025, increase the number of lung cancer screening scans using low-dose computed tomography (LDCT) as indicated by the USPSTF from the baseline of 2,377 to 2,977.

Data source: American College of Radiology, 2018

Strategies

1. Estimate the rate of lung cancer screening in California by surveying health care organizations and using the CDC BRFSS lung cancer screening module.
2. Promote lung cancer screening through public outreach campaigns with state and local agencies and nonprofit organizations.
3. Implement physician and provider outreach on the importance of lung cancer screening and the need for accurate smoking history documentation to determine eligibility.
4. Decrease or eliminate copays for visits for initial lung cancer screening or follow-up procedures or tests.
5. Educate policy makers on the importance of including lung cancer screening as a metric for primary care providers.

The following objectives do not currently have identified baseline measures and may be established as part of an implementation plan.

Objective 2: By 2025, increase the number of lung cancer screening scans in minority underserved communities using LDCT as indicated by the USPSTF.

Data Source: TBD

Strategies

1. Identify and promote locations of hospitals and imaging centers that offer lung cancer screening LDCT within 20 miles of minority underserved communities.
2. Include transportation services, including ride-sharing companies (e.g. Uber, Lyft), to lung cancer screening appointments under Medi-Cal insurance coverage.
3. Support screening of underinsured and uninsured individuals; develop lung cancer screening programs within county health systems (e.g., Los Angeles County Department of Health Services); and support accreditation of screening centers in close proximity to minority underserved communities.
4. Eliminate of out-of-pocket costs for both screening LDCTs and follow-up LDCTs for all Medi-Cal insurance plans.
5. Explore requiring FQHCs to collect and record accurate smoking pack-year data and identify individuals eligible for lung cancer screening per USPSTF criteria.

CANCER STORY: LUNG CANCER

My name is Francis Spruit. I live in beautiful Northern California, just half an hour North-East of San Francisco. I was diagnosed with non-small cell lung cancer on December 13, 2007. I was staged 1B because the tumor was confined to my right upper lobe, size 6.1x6.8x6.5 cm (the size of an apple). My pulmonologist called me with the results of the biopsy taken and told me I had Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. I met with my thoracic surgeon a few days later and had surgery, a right upper lobectomy, the day before Christmas that year. I also went through four cycles of chemotherapy in the spring of 2008.

I am one of the few fortunate ones. Only 15% of lung cancer patients make it past five years. Over the years my wife and I have become very active Lung Cancer advocates and we regularly contact and visit our representatives on Capitol Hill as well as locally here in Northern California to ask for increased funding for Lung Cancer research. Lung Cancer claims roughly 400 deaths per day, every day of the year and is grossly underfunded. We are determined to change that for our children and grandchildren.

- Francis Spruit, Lung Cancer Survivor
6. Collaborate with state and local agencies to increase awareness of lung cancer screening and develop outreach programs and educational materials for both referring providers and the public, with a focus on addressing cultural/language/literacy barriers and stigmatization prevalent in minority underserved communities.

Objective 3: By 2025, reach universal genetic, molecular testing, and comprehensive biomarker testing of all lung cancer tumors to help determine the best selection of therapies for patients.

Data Source: TBD

Strategies

1. Advocate for genetic/molecular/biomarker testing in all stages of newly diagnosed lung cancer patients, not just patients who are late stage (IIIB or IV).

2. Encourage participation of more patients in clinical trials, through patient and provider education. For example, provide patient and provider resources to programs that will assist with matching the patient to appropriate clinical trials (e.g., LungMATCH - https://go2foundation.org/resources-and-support/general-support/lungmatch/).

3. Inform and educate policy makers on the importance of eliminating pre-authorization barriers currently tied to biomarker testing and delaying precision medicine to patients where time is critical and can be life-saving.

4. Advocate for national and local coverage determinations to expand comprehensive biomarker testing (e.g., next-generation sequencing) to all patients diagnosed with lung cancer including those of low socioeconomic and geographic location to identify common versus unique features to inform evidence-based interventions.

3. Develop a priority ranking and timeline for implementation of specific recommended evidence-based interventions using skin cancer outreach resources available through the NCI, the CDC, the Environmental Protection Agency, and those enacted through the novel Wipe Out Melanoma California initiative.

4. Develop a Melanoma Education and Planning document that will provide guidance for patients at the time of diagnosis on: 1) standard care for follow up; 2) recommended frequency of complete skin checks; 3) resources on the most up-to-date treatment options; and 4) discussion of melanoma risk and prevention measures for family members.

Objective 2: By 2025, decrease incidence of thicker cutaneous melanoma (T3-T4) in 15 California counties with rates exceeding the state average rate of 16.07 per 100,000.

Data source: CCR, 2017

Strategies

1. Establish a Melanoma Advisory Panel (MAP) with representation by academic, public and private dermatologists, county-based public health practitioners, and oncologists, primary care physicians (managing screening to referral), and survivor-advocate organizations. The MAP will guide selection of specific strategies and activities to reduce melanoma incidence and reduction in stage at diagnosis.

2. Establish baseline demographics of the identified 15 counties, based on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, insurance status, medical home, access to dermatology specialists, and geographic location to identify common versus unique features to inform evidence-based interventions.

Table: More Information and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Baseline CCR, 2017</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colusa - Glenn - Tehama</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen - Modoc - Plumas</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>23.06</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa - Tuolumne</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou - Trinity</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine - Amador - Calaveras</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies

1. Identify common versus unique features within the 15 counties to establish specific evidence-based interventions using available guidance on effective public health campaigns for reducing the incidence of melanoma, using culturally and linguistically relevant approaches for each region (using CCR/SEER data, OSHPD, CDC, HRSA).

2. Improve melanoma awareness and early detection among low socioeconomic and minority groups, focusing efforts on increased community engagement, education of health care providers and lay personnel, including implementing media campaigns tailored to reach the patients at highest risk of lethal melanoma, including older white men and those of lower socioeconomic class, across all racial-ethnic groups.

3. Increase access to tele-dermatology and other technologies to improve access to care for Californians with limited access to care due to socioeconomic or geographic limitations.

4. Conduct educational outreach to guide patients about standard of care for their stage of diagnosis, new treatment modalities to consider, resources available for melanoma patients through academic medical centers, and options for participating in clinical trials.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES


California Health Maps https://www.californiahealthmaps.org/?areatype=ctazone&address=&sex=Both&site=AllSite&race=&year=05yr&overlays=labels&choropleth=AIR


PROSTATE CANCER

In accordance with the USPSTF, this chapter aligns with the emphasis on informed discussions between men and their health care providers about whether and when to be screened for prostate cancer. Given that screening can only be useful when followed up appropriately, it must be offered in the context of the latest and best evidence on screening aggressiveness and intervals, and on risk-stratified approaches to diagnosis of elevated prostate-specific antigen (PSA) tests and the treatment of prostate cancer.1,3 The primary aim of screening must be to diagnose aggressive, life threatening prostate cancer early; and the aim of diagnosis and treatment must be to maximize benefits and minimize harm. Previous controversies over the PSA test centered on the diagnosis and over-treatment of non life threatening prostate cancers, led to declines in early detection and to under-treatment of high-risk men, particularly African Americans.4,5 More recent research charts a better course. Key examples include statistical modeling and evidence from long-term cohort studies indicating that early PSA screening (starting at age 45) can prevent more cancer deaths when subsequent screening frequency is tailored (and usually greatly reduced) based on an initial baseline test.2,7-8 Importantly, the combination of evidence of the effectiveness of active surveillance to reduce over-treatment and rigorous statistical modeling showing a mortality reduction associated with PSA tests in African Americans must inform discussions with these high-risk men.7,8 Together, these innovations point the way to smarter screening and smarter (risk-stratified) treatment for the benefit of all men.

Objective 1: By 2025, increase the proportion of average risk men ages 45 years and older who have had an informed discussion about both the advantages and disadvantages with their health care provider regarding prostate cancer testing by 5%.

Strategies

1. Educate men and their providers regarding the differences in prostate cancer risk. Those at higher risk include men of African ancestry, men exposed to Agent Orange, and those with blood relatives diagnosed with aggressive prostate cancer.

2. Work with primary care provider networks to encourage providers to obtain and act on the most recent data and tools that support how to best communicate with patients about their risk, the use of PSA testing, the importance of follow-up for elevated PSAs, and to prepare men in advance for the possibility of a low-risk prostate cancer diagnosis which would not require aggressive treatment and how to manage prostate cancer patients who are on active surveillance.

3. Encourage health care institutions to create, adopt, and implement practices and policies consistent with the latest best evidence on risk stratification in the diagnosis of PSA abnormalities and in the treatment of prostate cancer, and in the use of PSA testing including consideration of baseline tests.

4. Develop clear, concise, culturally competent and linguistically appropriate resources and useful facts regarding prostate cancer; make these available to all men and their families. Encourage men to have informed discussions to increase prostate cancer awareness.

5. Strive to unify the messages from cancer authorities using the latest best evidence on risk-based screening, diagnosis, and treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Baseline CCR, 2017</th>
<th>Target 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte - Humboldt</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROSTATE CANCER

Aim at Melanoma Foundation - Clinical Trials in Melanoma


American Academy of Dermatology - How to Perform a Skin Self-Exam

https://www.aad.org/public/diseases/skin-cancer/find/check-skin

California Health Maps

https://www.californiahealthmaps.org/?areatype=ctazone&address=&sex=Both&site=AllSite&race=&year=05yr&overlays=labels&choropleth=AIR

National Cancer Institute


National Comprehensive Cancer Network - Treatment Guidelines for Patients


Stanford Health Care - About Melanoma

https://stanfordhealthcare.org/medical-conditions/cancer/melanoma/about-this-condition/overview.html

Stanford Medicine - Wipe Out Melanoma - California

https://med.stanford.edu/cancer/community/projects/WOM.html

Objective 2: By 2025, increase the proportion of African American men 45 years and older who have had an informed discussion with their health care provider regarding both the advantages and disadvantages of prostate cancer testing from 56.6% to 61.6% and from 28.3% to 33.3%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2025 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussed Advantages</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed Disadvantages</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies

1. Educate African American men, their families, and their community that: 1) compared with other race/ethnic groups, they are more likely to have Prostate Cancer (PCa); 2) PCa strikes African Americans at younger ages and more aggressively; 3) once diagnosed, African Americans are more likely to die due to PCa unless it can be diagnosed at an early stage; and 4) diagnosed men can benefit from support groups, health care system navigation services, and support from other diagnosed men.

2. Work with primary care provider (PCP) networks to encourage providers to obtain and act on the most recent data and tools that support how to best communicate with African American patients about their increased risk of prostate cancer, all risks and benefits of PSA testing, the importance of being informed and empowered, and the nature and importance of follow-up. In addition, assist those who are unaffiliated to establish a medical home, and for others who have a primary care provider, to reconnect for ongoing preventive care.

3. Encourage health care institutions to create, adopt, and implement policies that require primary care providers to initiate discussions related to PSA testing to African American men, and for specialists to practice risk stratification in diagnosis and treatment, including active surveillance for patients with low-risk PCa. Inform safety net patients, providers, and programs about the state run and grant administered prostate cancer treatment program.

4. Develop clear, concise, culturally appropriate resources regarding prostate cancer and make these available to all African American men and their families to encourage men to have informed discussions to increase prostate cancer awareness.

5. Conduct events in the African American community that provide education about the high risk of prostate cancer for African Americans, the importance of being informed and empowered, and the nature and importance of follow-up. In addition, assist those who are unaffiliated to establish a medical home, and for others who have a primary care provider, to reconnect for ongoing preventive care.

6. Strive to unify the messages from cancer authorities using the latest best evidence specific to African Americans on risk-based screening, diagnosis and treatment.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

- California Prostate Cancer Coalition
  https://prostatecalif.org/
- Department of Health Care Services - Prostate Cancer Treatment Program
  https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/cancer/PCTP/Pages/default.aspx
- Prostate Cancer Foundation
  https://www.pcf.org/
- ZERO National Prostate Cancer Coalition
  https://zerocancer.org/

CANCER STORY: PROSTATE CANCER

A physical examination found that my prostate was enlarged. I was 46 at the time, and cancer wasn’t on my radar. I made an appointment with a urologist for a prostate biopsy. The results indicated prostate cancer. He instructed me to find a surgical oncologist to have the cancer removed. After doing some online research about prostate cancer, including how outcomes are worse for African American men, I scheduled the earliest surgical date I could get.

The cancer, although early stage, was aggressive. My oncologist recommended 37 rounds of adjuvant radiation therapy and injections of hormone therapy to reduce my levels of testosterone and decrease my risk of recurrence. The radiation therapy left me so fatigued that I was unable to work for a year.

I launched Men Actively Creating Healthy Outcomes (MACHO), an online resource to raise awareness about cancer risk and improve men’s overall health. Today, I visit churches and health fairs and speak to African American men about the cancers that are especially devastating for them, including prostate, colorectal, and lung cancers.

April of 2020, I celebrated two years of being cancer-free, and I’m living my best life.

-Bin McLaurin, Prostate Cancer Survivor
CHAPTER GOAL
To improve California cancer survivors’ quality of follow-up care and quality of life, and treatment outcomes through increased awareness, education, and access to survivorship and supportive treatment resources and services, including survivorship care plans that incorporate treatment objectives.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
Treatment and Survivorship focuses on enhancing the quality of life and treatment options from the time of diagnosis through the end of life. The following objectives and strategies address how those in treatment and survivorship can access more treatment options while receiving improved palliative and supportive care that lead to long-term improvements in patients’ physical and mental health. At the earliest stages of treatment, access to and education about available clinical trials is critical to addressing the treatment gap within diverse populations. All cancer patients should receive timely, clinically appropriate, diagnostic, and therapeutic care. Improved supportive care, particularly in the areas of exercise, sexual health and intimacy, and addressing fear of recurrence will provide improved outcomes for patients. Furthermore, increased support for patients facing financial distress due to rising health care costs will improve patient outcomes in treatment and survivorship. By bringing to the forefront these key issues for those in treatment and survivorship, we can begin to address the growing needs those living with and living beyond cancer.

TREATMENT
The following objectives do not currently have identified baseline measures and may be established as part of an implementation plan.

Objective 1: By 2025, increase enrollment of diverse populations in cancer clinical trials (therapeutic and non-therapeutic trials)
Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Create new funding incentives to develop new trials that focus on diverse populations and to increase diversity of patient pool that participates in existing clinical trials.
2. Promote a minimum percentage of diverse patient populations in clinical trials.
3. Increase patient, caregiver and clinician education on clinical trials which focuses on reducing stigma and misconceptions, as well as overall understanding, of clinical trials so that patients can make a more informed treatment choice regarding standard cancer care versus clinical trials available.
4. Increase awareness among auxiliary clinical trials staff about the importance of including diverse populations in clinical trials and the impact on study outcomes.
Objective 2: By 2025, increase the number of patients who receive supportive care during and after treatment addressing some of the most overlooked issues including sexual health, intimacy, and fear of recurrence.

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Create a standardized model of supportive care assessment to offer to patients as they complete treatment.
2. Assemble and distribute a comprehensive list of state-wide and national resources that are available for patients to address psychosocial impact of treatment.
3. Educate nurse navigators and hospital social workers about stigmatized issues in the survivorship community including sexual health, intimacy, fatigue and fear of recurrence.
4. Expand educational resources available to patients who experience challenges to long-term wellbeing during survivorship including sexual health, intimacy, and fear of recurrence.

Objective 3: By 2025, increase quality of care, improve standard of care in treatment, and increase clinical trial education with patients.

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Educate health care providers on the value of exercise for cancer patients and survivors.
2. Support CME courses, conferences, and education material for oncology providers.
3. Support the training of exercise trainers with oncology certification (i.e., through the American College of Sports Medicine [ACSM]).
4. Promote the Moving Through Cancer initiative (through the ACSM) which has developed a searchable registry to help health care providers, exercise professionals and patients find appropriately trained professionals and programs in their communities.
5. Encourage gyms and community centers to promote exercise programming for cancer survivors.
6. Promote the development of technology (such as web-based applications and application for smart-phones) to encourage cancer survivors to engage in activity and optimal exercise guidelines.

Objective 2: By 2025, decrease the number of patients with cancer who experience financial distress through health care costs during and after cancer treatment (including preventative screenings and post-treatment maintenance).

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Support efforts to reform health insurance by passing policies that help people affected by cancer, specifically, a definition of “medically necessary” treatments that treatments that also previously listed in the “experimental” classification.
2. Provide eligibility requirements and deadlines for California and national financial resources to health care providers to distribute to people diagnosed with cancer to help pay for treatment associated costs.
3. Educate financial navigators and encourage patients to meet with a financial navigator who will teach patients cost-savings programs and health insurance options.
4. Work with hospitals and medical centers to provide transparency related to prices so that both physicians and patients know the costs of medications, tests, and treatments before deciding what treatments and tests to choose.

More Information and Resources
American Cancer Society
Survivorship: During and After Treatment

Sex and the Adult Female with Cancer

American College of Sports Medicine
American Cancer Society - Certified Cancer Exercise Trainer Program https://www.acsm.org/get-stay-certified/get-certified/specialization/cet

National Cancer Institute - Cancer Treatment
• https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/questions
• https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/types
CHAPTER GOAL
To strengthen and support cancer research along the lifespan to reduce the cancer burden in California.

CHAPTER NARRATIVE
The purpose of this chapter is to raise awareness of, access to, and participation in cancer research, with special emphasis on minority and underserved populations.

Research is the process of conducting scientific inquiry to respond to specific questions about nature, health or disease. Research, especially as related to therapeutic clinical trials, is crucial as it provides evidence-based guidance regarding the prevention, early detection, regular screening, information on the latest treatments available, and hopefully, control of cancer.

Clinical studies address research questions to improve prevention, diagnosis and treatment of cancer. Participation by minority groups and underrepresented individuals is crucial if these populations are to benefit from the scientific advances and promises offered by precision medicine and other advances in cancer care. Significant challenges exist that need to be addressed. It is estimated that 20% of adults diagnosed with cancer may be eligible to participate in clinical trials. However, fewer than 5% enroll each year. Representation of minorities is even lower. Enrollment of ethnic/racial minorities in clinical trials has become even more urgent given the availability of new immunotherapies that could save lives. Concerns exist regarding the interpretation of trial results, as these may not necessarily reflect true tolerability or the potential efficacy of an agent that has not been tested among minority patients. Low participation could be due in part to factors that range from lack of awareness among community members and health care providers, health insurance, language and cultural differences, for transportation or childcare expenses to participate in the trial. Some patients may be suspicious and mistrust the motivations or intentions or the process or priorities of the researchers. Given several situations of abuses in research that have impacted minorities, this is no surprise.

COMMUNITY-BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH (CBPR):
CBPR ensures results of research studies will have a direct positive impact on the communities where the research is conducted. By involving community members in the process, researchers are able to design and conduct studies that are deeply relevant to the people who participate in the research studies. Whenever CBPR research is not a suitable method of inquiry, community engaged research may provide insights into the best ways to approach and recruit members. Community engaged research is a mechanism by which academic partners establish a meaningful and ongoing collaboration with the population of interest, to ensure that the research is relevant and needed in the community; and conducted in a responsible and respectful manner. It engages communities at different times during the research process.
APPENDICES

The following objectives do not currently have identified baseline measures and may be established as part of an implementation plan.

Objective 1: Encourage minority participation through community-based participatory research (CBPR) that involves community members and stakeholders from the beginning stages through all aspects of the research process, (i.e., study design, implementation, study completion and disseminating the research findings).

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Raise awareness about clinical trials and CBPR and monitor progress in inclusion of diverse populations in clinical trials and engagement in therapeutic trials in particular with implications for diverse populations related to precision medicine-oriented efforts.

2. Emphasize improving access to and participation in clinical trials by those disproportionately affected by cancer by focusing efforts on promoting the inclusion of diverse population groups in clinical trials/bio specimen studies.

3. Improve access to and participation in cancer clinical trials and CBPR, particularly for Californians disproportionately affected by cancer.

4. Provide cultural competency training to health care providers to address the needs of minority and underserved populations to increase their referral to cancer clinical trials.

Strengthen the cancer research infrastructure:
Stakeholders should address gaps in communication and coordination among cancer research programs, institutions, and other entities, as well as the limited availability of, and access to, statewide information on clinical trials and CBPR to strengthen its research infrastructure.

Objective 2: Establish the foundation for comprehensive, statewide cancer research efforts that will benefit all Californians through promoting collaboration, consolidating cancer research information, and making use of the latest technological developments (e.g., electronic medical record capability of community-based physicians).

Data Source: TBD

Strategies
1. Develop a comprehensive, community-friendly list of California-specific and national resources about cancer research and make it widely available.

2. Form a statewide cancer clinical trials advisory committee made up of cancer researchers, advocates, and representatives from cancer clinical trials entities to discuss the development of a comprehensive clinical trials database to collect California-specific screening and enrollment data, establish a baseline for clinical trials enrollment, and monitor progress in increasing clinical trials participation.

3. Improve translation of the basic research into public health initiatives and informed policy, which includes educating and informing community members, health care professionals, decision makers, policy makers and opinion leaders about cancer research through outreach, engagement and dissemination of most recent findings in cancer research.

4. Develop an infrastructure of “on the ground” community advocates, patient advocates, community health workers and promotores de salud that represent local communities and train them to sit on advisory committees and engage in research projects and as reviewers of research.

MORE INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

National Institutes of Health
National Cancer Institute (NCI)
https://www.cancer.gov/

Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research
https://obsrr.od.nih.gov/

National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities
Community Based Participatory Research

Minority Health and Health Disparities Research Framework
https://nimhd.nih.gov/about/overview/research-framework/
# APPENDIX I: ACRONYM LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Affordable Care Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>American College of Radiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>American Cancer Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICOE</td>
<td>Breast Imaging Cancer of Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Body mass index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRCA</td>
<td>&quot;BR&quot; - Breast &quot;CA&quot; - Cancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRFSS</td>
<td>Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>California Colorectal Cancer Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIR</td>
<td>California Immunization Registry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATS</td>
<td>California Adult Tobacco Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Cancer Control Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCOE</td>
<td>Community Hospital Care Conunium Centers of Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Cancer Registry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDPH</td>
<td>California Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIS</td>
<td>California Health Interview Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>Children’s Oncology Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Computer Tomography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCCCP</td>
<td>California Tribal Comprehensive Cancer Control Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR</td>
<td>Cancer Tumor Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCS</td>
<td>California Department of Health Care Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>Electronic benefit transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>Extension for Community Health Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT</td>
<td>Fecal immunochemical test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPL</td>
<td>Federal poverty level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHCs</td>
<td>Federally qualified health centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBsAg</td>
<td>Hepatitis B surface antigen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBV</td>
<td>Hepatitis B virus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV</td>
<td>Hepatitis C virus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPSAs</td>
<td>Health Professional Shortage Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMOs</td>
<td>Health maintenance organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPV</td>
<td>Human papillomavirus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC</td>
<td>International Classification of Childhood Cancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCT</td>
<td>Low-dose computed tomography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCCP</td>
<td>National Comprehensive Cancer Control Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCN</td>
<td>National Comprehensive Cancer Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCRT</td>
<td>National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI</td>
<td>National Cancer Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHIS</td>
<td>National Health Interview Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>National Institute of Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCR</td>
<td>National Program of Cancer Registries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHPD</td>
<td>Office of Statewide Hospital Planning and Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Percent change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPACA</td>
<td>Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPoAs</td>
<td>Preferred provider organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Policy, systems, and environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOPI</td>
<td>Quality Oncology Practice Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER</td>
<td>Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGM</td>
<td>Sexual and gender minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>Sexually transmitted disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tdap</td>
<td>Tetanus-diphtheria-acellular Pertussis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEROC</td>
<td>Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THPs</td>
<td>Tribal Health Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPSTF</td>
<td>U.S. Preventive Services Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>Ultraviolet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSAC</td>
<td>Vital Statistics Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II: RESOURCES FOR EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTION AND POLICY, SYSTEMS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE INTERVENTIONS

AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY (AHRQ) INNOVATIONS EXCHANGE
The Innovations Exchange offers busy health professionals and researchers the opportunity to share, learn about, and ultimately adopt evidence-based innovations and tools suitable for a range of health care settings and populations. http://www.innovations.ahrq.gov/

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION (APHA)
APHA champions the health of all people and all communities. We are the only organization that influences federal policy, has a 140-plus year perspective and brings together members from all fields of public health. http://www.apha.org/

BEST PRACTICES FOR COMPREHENSIVE TOBACCO CONTROL

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES TOOLKIT
The purpose of this toolkit is to support health professionals to improve system-level interventions, and create healthier communities. https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CFH/DMCAH/NUPA/Pages/Systems-and-Environmental-Change.aspx

CALIFORNIA PAN-ETHNIC HEALTH NETWORK (CPEHN)
CPEHN is a multicultural statewide advocacy organization that works to improve the health of communities of color. http://cpehn.org

CANCER CONTROL P.L.A.N.E.T.
Cancer Control P.L.A.N.E.T. portal provides access to data and resources that can help planners, program staff, and researchers design, implement and evaluate evidence-based cancer control programs. http://cancercontrolplanet.cancer.gov/

CDC MAPPS INTERVENTIONS FOR COMMUNITIES
http://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/PDF/MAPPS Intervention Table.pdf

CHANGELAB SOLUTIONS
ChangeLab Solutions provides community-based solutions for America’s most common and preventable diseases like cancer, heart disease, diabetes, obesity, and asthma. Our solutions promote the common good by making healthier choices easier for everyone. http://changelabsolutions.org/

COCHRANE REVIEW
Cochrane Reviews are systematic reviews of primary research in human health care and health policy. They investigate the effects of interventions for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. http://www.cochrane.org/index.htm

THE COMMUNITY GUIDE
The Guide to Community Preventive Services is a free resource to help you choose programs and policies to improve health and prevent disease in your community. https://www.thecommunityguide.org/

HEALTHBEGINS
HealthBegins helps health care systems and community partners improve outcomes, control costs, and advance equity by addressing social determinants of health. How? Through hands-on training, great tools, deep expertise, and a team that knows how to make complex changes simple. Yes, you are ready to move health care upstream. http://www.healthbegins.org/

HEALTH IN ALL POLICIES: A GUIDE FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
Health in All Policies: A Guide for State and Local Governments was created by the Public Health Institute, the California Department of Public Health, and the American Public Health Association in response to growing interest in using collaborative approaches to improve population health by embedding health considerations into decision-making processes across a broad array of sectors. http://www.phi.org/resources?resource=hiapguide

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY AND CITY HEALTH OFFICIALS (NACCHO)
Model Practices Database
An online, searchable collection of innovative best practices across public health areas. http://www.naccho.org/topics/modelpractices/

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE (NCI)
The National Cancer Institute is the federal government’s principal agency for cancer research and training. http://www.cancer.gov/

POLICYLINK
PolicyLink is a national research and action institute advancing economic and social equity by Lifting Up What Works. http://www.policylink.org/
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STATE CANCER PROFILES-STATISTICS

State Cancer Profiles characterizes the cancer burden in a standardized manner to motivate action, integrate surveillance into cancer control planning, characterize areas and demographic groups, and expose health disparities. http://www.statecancerprofiles.cancer.gov/

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES, ENGINEERING, MEDICINE – ACCELERATING PROGRESS IN OBESITY PREVENTION: SOLVING THE WEIGHT OF THE NATION


U.S. PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE (USPSTF)

Created in 1984, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force is an independent group of national experts in prevention and evidence-based medicine that works to improve the health of all Americans by making evidence-based recommendations about clinical preventive services such as screenings, counseling services, or preventive medications. http://www.uspreventiontasksforce.org/

RESEARCH-TESTED INTERVENTION PROGRAMS (RTIPs)

RTIPs is a searchable database of evidence-based cancer control interventions and program materials and is designed to provide program planners and public health practitioners easy and immediate access to research-tested materials. http://rtips.cancer.gov/rtips/index.do

APPENDIX III: CANCER RELATED DATA SOURCES

- Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) is a state-based system of health surveys that generates information about health risk behaviors, clinical preventive practices, and health care access and use primarily related to chronic diseases and injury. (https://www.cdc.gov/programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CTCB/Pages/BRFSS.aspx)
- California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS) collects information on adults’ tobacco-related behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs. (https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CTCB/Pages/SurveyInstrument.aspx)
- California Cancer Registry (CCR) collects, compiles, and publishes statewide data that help inform cancer control priorities and strategies. (www.crcral.org)
- California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) is the nation’s largest state health survey and collects information on the health and health care needs of Californians. (www.chis.ucla.edu)
- The California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) is a comprehensive youth health risk behavior and resilience survey funded primarily by the California Department of Education (CDE). CHKS provides school districts with an instrument to assess an array of health indicated related to academic success and well-being. (https://www.wested.org/project/california-healthy-kids-survey-chks)
- California Student Tobacco Survey (CSTS) is a biennial student survey administered to middle (grades 6–8) and high school (grades 9–12) students on tobacco-use behavior, beliefs, and exposure. (https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CTCB/Pages/SurveyInstrument.aspx)
- The California Teacher’s Study (CTS) is a prospective study of 133,479 current and former public school teachers or administrators who participate in the California State Teachers Retirement System (STRS). (https://www.calteachersstudy.org/)
- The California Tribal Epidemiology Center (CTEC) is one of 12 Indian Health Service (HIS) Division of Epidemiology and Disease Prevention (DEDP)-funded Tribal Epidemiology Centers that provide epidemiologic support to each IHS region. CTEC collects and interprets health information for AIAN in California to help tribes and tribal health programs monitor the health status of Indian people in California and develop effective public health services that respect cultural values and traditions of tribal communities. (https://crihb.org/ctec/)

SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION (SOPHE)

Committed to chronic disease state policy, SOPHE members and partners, legislators, researchers, political leaders, and health officials can find information and resources on current chronic disease state policy, disparities associated with chronic disease, and collaborating health policy organizations. https://www.sophe.org/
Employer Health Benefits Survey is a project of the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation that conducts an annual survey of employers providing a detailed look at trends in employer sponsored health coverage including premiums, employee contributions, cost sharing provisions, offer rates, wellness programs, and employer practices. (https://www.kff.org/health-costs/report/2019-employer-health-benefits-survey/)

The National Cancer Data Base (NCDB) was established to serve as a comprehensive clinical surveillance resource for cancer care in the United States. The NCDB was the first national database used to track and compare the treatment of most types of cancers. (https://www.facs.org/quality-programs/cancer/ncdb).

National Immunization Survey (NIS) are conducted annually and used to obtain national, state, and selected local area estimates of vaccination coverage rates for U.S. children 19–35 months (NIS-Child) and for U.S. adolescents 13–17 years (NIS-Teen).

NIS-CHILD: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/imz-managers/nis/datasets.html
NIS-TEEN: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/imz-managers/nis/datasets-teen.html

State Health Facts is a project of the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation that provides state specific health data based on analysis of the Census Bureau’s Current Population Surveys. (http://www.statehealthfacts.org/)

The State of Health Insurance in California (SHIC) is a biennial report produced by the Health Insurance Studies Program at UCLA’s Center for Health Policy Research that tracks health insurance coverage nationwide and in California with particular attention to health and health care disparities resulting from lack of insurance. (http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/programs/health-insurance/Pages/california.aspx)

State Indicator Report on Fruits and Vegetables, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides national and state-specific information on fruit and vegetable consumption as well as policy and environmental indicators that measure a state’s ability to support the consumption of fruits and vegetables. 2018 Report: https://www.cdc.gov/nutrition/downloads/fruit-vegetables/2018-2018-fruit-vegetable-report-508.pdf
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APPENDIX IV: DEFINITION OF TECHNICAL TERMS

AGE-ADJUSTED RATE
A statistical method allowing comparisons of populations that takes into account age distribution differences between populations. Age-adjusting takes the 2000 U.S. population distribution and applies it to other time periods under consideration. This assures that such rates do not reflect any changes in the population age distribution. Rates can be adjusted for the distribution of other characteristics such as race/ethnicity.

CANCER BURDEN
An estimate of the financial, emotional, or social impact that cancer creates within the population. Different racial, ethnic, geographic, and age groups in the United States do not share the burden of disease equally.

FIVE-YEAR SURVIVAL RATE
The percentage of people in a study or treatment group who are alive five years after they were diagnosed with or treated for a disease, such as cancer. The disease may or may not have come back.

INCIDENCE
The number of newly diagnosed cases of cancer during a specific time period.

INCIDENCE RATE
The ratio of the number of new cancers of a specific site/type occurring in a specified population during a year to the number of individuals who were at risk for the given cancer, generally expressed as the number of cancers per 100,000 persons.

MORTALITY
The number of deaths from cancer during a specific time period.

MORTALITY RATE
The number of deaths, with cancer as the underlying cause, occurring in a specific population during a year. Cancer mortality is usually expressed as the number of deaths due to cancer per 100,000 persons. Mortality Rate = (cancer deaths per year/population) X 100,000
PERCENT CHANGE
The percent change (PC) in a statistic over a given time interval is
Percent change = (Final value - Initial value) / Initial value * 100.
A positive PC corresponds to an increasing trend, a negative PC to a decreasing trend.

CANCER PREVALENCE
The number or percent of people alive on a certain date in a population who previously had a diagnosis of the disease. It includes new (incidence) and pre-existing cases, and is a function of both past incidence and survival.

SEER REGISTRIES
Geographic areas that were selected for inclusion in the SEER Program based on their ability to operate and maintain a high quality population-based cancer reporting system and for their epidemiologically significant population subgroups.

STAGE
Stage provides a measure of disease progression, detailing the degree to which the cancer has advanced. Two methods commonly used to determine stage are AJCC and SEER historic. The AJCC method is more commonly used in the clinical settings, while SEER has standardized and simplified staging to ensure consistent definitions over time.

SEER describes cancers in five stages:
- **In situ cancer** is early cancer that is present only in the layer of cells in which it began.
- **Localized cancer** is cancer that is limited to the organ in which it began, without evidence of spread.
- **Regional cancer** is cancer that has spread beyond the original (primary) site to nearby lymph nodes or organs and tissues.
- **Distant cancer** is cancer that has spread from the primary site to distant organs or distant lymph nodes.
- **Unstaged cancer** is cancer for which there is not enough information to indicate a stage.

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT
Describes a mathematical measure of difference between groups. The difference is said to be statistically significant if it is greater than what might be expected to happen by chance alone 95% of the time. Although statistically significant usually refers to 95% confidence, sometimes other confidence levels such as 99% or 90% are specified.

SURVEILLANCE DATA (CANCER)
Data that is used to monitor changes in cancer in a population. Included are measures of cancer incidence, morbidity, survival, prevalence and mortality. Also included are the assessment of genetic predisposition, environmental and behavioral risk factors, screening practices, and the quality of care from prevention through palliation.

SURVIVAL, OBSERVED
An estimate of the probability of surviving all causes of death for a specified time interval calculated from the cohort of cancer cases. Observed survival does not consider cause of death, it simply looks at who is alive and who is not. Sometimes referred to as overall survival.

SURVIVAL, RELATIVE
A measure of net survival that is calculated by comparing observed (overall) survival with expected survival from a comparable set of people that do not have cancer to measure the excess mortality that is associated with a cancer diagnosis.

Glossary of Statistical Terms, NCI 2013, 2019
Glossary of Statistical Terms, SEER 2019
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APPENDIX VII: A CALL TO ACTION

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

California’s Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan, 2021–2025 lays out broad goals to reduce the burden of cancer among all Californians. In order to accomplish these goals, all Californians need to be involved in this effort. Please join CDOC and other stakeholders throughout the state to make our plan’s goals a reality. Below are a few examples of what you can do to help reduce the burden of cancer in our state.

IF YOU ARE A CALIFORNIAN
- Participate in cancer-related health surveys.
- Avoid overexposure to the sun and artificial tanning.
- Get cancer-preventive immunizations such as Hepatitis B and human papillomavirus (HPV).
- Know when to be screened and do it on schedule.
- Support smoke-free environments and avoid secondhand smoke.
- Consider enrolling in a cancer clinical trial.
- Volunteer to support cancer-related activities including joining CDOC efforts.

IF YOU ARE A LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT
- Provide cancer information and resources to the community.
- Collaborate in community health activities and awareness events.
- Work with physicians to promote screening programs and case reporting.
- Provide space for survivor support groups.

IF YOU ARE A COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION
- Provide cancer information and resources to clients.
- Promote cancer screening among clients.
- Encourage participation in cancer clinical trials.
- Collaborate to provide programs to the community on cancer prevention and screening.

IF YOU ARE A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION
- Provide cancer information and resources to constituents.
- Educate constituents on the importance of promoting cancer clinical trials.
- Support cancer awareness activities of local affiliates.
- Provide cancer control trainings.

IF YOU ARE AN EMPLOYER
- Provide healthy foods in vending machines and cafeterias.
- Collaborate with health care institutions to host screening events.
- Establish a worksite wellness committee.
- Offer employee benefits such as health insurance that covers smoking cessation aids and prevention screening.

IF YOU ARE A SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY
- Include cancer prevention messages in health classes.
- Provide healthy foods in vending machines and cafeterias.
- Increase physical education requirements.
- Make your entire campus a smoke-free environment.
- Encourage sun-safe behaviors.

IF YOU ARE A FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATION
- Provide cancer prevention information to members.
- Provide healthy foods at church activities.
- Provide indoor space for walking clubs when the weather is inappropriate.
- Make your events smoke-free.

IF YOU ARE A HOSPITAL
- Submit complete cancer case reports in a timely manner to the state registry.
- Collaborate to sponsor community screening programs.
- Acquire or maintain American College of Surgeons membership.
- Implement a patient navigation system.

IF YOU ARE A PHYSICIAN OR HEALTH INSURER
- Ensure patients are screened for cancer in accordance with the most current guidelines.
- Implement a cancer screening reminder system.
- Refer patients to smoking cessation classes and nutrition programs.
- Submit complete cancer case reports in a timely manner to the state registry.
- Refer patients to and encourage patients to enroll in cancer clinical trials.
APPENDIX VIII: GET INVOLVED

CDOC represents the infrastructure for coordinating the implementation of California’s state cancer plan; however, cancer control stakeholders and community members are ultimately the driving force behind the achievement of the plan’s goals and objectives. The implementation of the plan is the responsibility of all cancer control stakeholders. You can be a part of this important effort to reduce California’s cancer burden and GET INVOLVED! with CDOC. Visit our website at www.cdoconline.net to learn more.

There are many ways to GET INVOLVED! Below is a list of the many volunteer activities for you to choose from.

IF YOU ARE A CALIFORNIAN

■ Become a CDOC member and join our dynamic group of committed and dedicated stakeholders who work collaboratively to reduce the burden of cancer in California. Becoming a member allows you to stay abreast of cancer control activities in our state and participate in California’s discussion on cancer prevention and control.

■ Volunteer to support cancer-related activities in your community.

■ Help promote and disseminate the state cancer plan

IF YOU ARE A CDOC MEMBER

■ Help disseminate and promote this state cancer plan to your cancer control partners.

■ Join a CDOC Workgroup: CDOC Workgroups prioritize and conduct activities that address cancer plan objectives and strategies.

■ Attend a CDOC All Members webinar meeting to stay connected to CDOC as a whole and learn and/or share cancer related activities CDOC members are working on.

■ Contribute to CDOC newsletters and announcements as a way to help promote current cancer related activities of our partners, and to educate and update the cancer community about cancer control news and events.

■ Contribute to a CDOC Project Spotlight to showcase activities and/or projects you or your organization is working on, particularly those that address goals, objectives, or strategies in this cancer plan.

■ Communicate you or your organization’s viewpoints to CDOC.

■ Inform your community or organization about CDOC decisions and activities.

■ In-reach to CDOC for expertise, to leverage resources and other support for your cancer control activities. The CDOC membership is comprised of representatives from a variety of organizations, constituencies, and interest areas in cancer prevention and control. The diverse representation includes state and local governments; private and nonprofit organizations; health, medical, and business communities, and academic institutions; researchers; cancer survivors; caregivers and advocates. The CDOC membership serves as an invaluable resource to inform and support cancer control efforts.

■ Initiate a cancer plan implementation project.

■ If you or your organization is implementing a strategy or objective from this cancer plan, we want to hear about it! Please report back to CDOC so we may promote your work and/or offer assistance where possible.

■ Identify collaborative opportunities by joining others at the CDOC table who share similar concerns and desired outcomes.
APPENDIX IX: REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

References

CHAPTER 1: CANCER BURDEN

Additional references

CHAPTER 2: SURVEILLANCE

Additional references

CHAPTER 3 – EMERGING CANCER TRENDS

Early Onset Colorectal Cancer (EOCRC) References
3. UC Davis Health, California Cancer Reporting and Epidemiologic Surveillance (CalCARES). “California Cancer Registry - Statistics and Data.” Sacramento, 2020.[KLO2]

HPV Associated Cancers References

4. Liver Cancer References


Pancreatic Cancer References


Thyroide Cancer References


CHAPTER 4 – CALIFORNIA CANCER CENTERS

References


CHAPTER 5—CANCER RELATED HEALTH DISPARITIES

References


References


REFERENCES

American Indian / Alaskan Natives References


CHAPTER 6: EQUITABLE ACCESS ADDITIONAL REFERENCES


CHAPTER 7: PRIMARY PREVENTION REFERENCES


Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) References


Additional references


Obesity Prevention References


Additional References


15. Tobacco Use Additional References


Additional References


Cervical Cancer References


Colorectal Cancer: Additional References


Lung Cancer References


Additional References


Melanoma Additional References


Prostate Cancer References


Additional References


CHAPTER 9: TREATMENT AND SURVIVORSHIP

References


Additional References


CHAPTER 10: RESEARCH REFERENCES


