Members Present: T. Brabb  C. Goodwin  J. Muster
M. Byers  P. Lang  M. Newman
E. Clark  M. Lucas  J. Stoloff
S. Cunningham  R. Murnane  J. Sullivan
D. Fitts

Members Absent: S. Brockerhoff  C. Grue  L. Kinman
A. Burich  M. Hamner  A. Leache
C. Carrier  C. Hotchkiss  G. McLean
J. Clark

Opening Business:

Dr. Cunningham called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

Dr. Cunningham introduced Sally Thompson-Iritani, the new Director of the Office of Animal Welfare.

Approval of the July 18, 2013 IACUC Meeting Minutes

Dr. Cunningham called for a review of the July 18, 2013 Meeting Minutes.

Motion: Dr. Sullivan moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Lang seconded the motion.

Discussion: none

Vote on the Motion: The minutes were approved unanimously with 12 members voting in favor. Ms. Cashman was not present for the vote.

Attending Veterinarians Report

Facility Issues:

Out of Range Temperatures:
There were no out of range temperatures to report.

Adverse Events:

• 4249-01 – Dr. Brabb explained that a cohort of mice were used in a complicated series of behavioral experiments utilizing limit feeding and then food rewards for tasks. As part of these experiments, different individual animals/cages were removed from limit feeding at different times during the experiment.

  On July 9, 2013, the post-doctoral fellow running the experiment made a mistake when removing one cage from limit feeding, such that the sign saying, “Investigator Will Feed” was left on the cage and the cage was not given food. Six days later, one mouse was reported
dead and the other sick. When the post-doc examined his records, he realized he had made a mistake with this cage and had not removed it from limit feeding as intended.

Dr. Brabb spoke to the post-doc, the PI, and the facility manager regarding additional safeguards to put in place to prevent a reoccurrence of this type of event. Specifically, one member of the lab group will review the weights (which are taken daily on limit-fed animals, and were stopped on July 9, 2013 for this cage) and will also look at the feed status listed on the cages on a regular basis to detect discrepancies (that would have been successful in this case). In addition, the different feed/weight charts will be color coded with sticky dots with the cage cards to help the animal technicians pair the paperwork and the cage, and the investigative group will be leaving the weight charts in the room to allow better monitoring of the weights by all individuals involved.

This event was reported to OLAW.

Motion: Dr. Brabb moved to send this Investigator a letter of counsel asking for a reply addressing how they will prevent a reoccurrence of this type of event. Dr. Fitts seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote on the Motion: The motion was approved unanimously with 12 in favor. Ms. Cashman was not present for the vote.

• 4040-01 - Dr. Brabb explained that this research involves the study of how the brain responds to stress utilizing a rat model. At the time of the three-year renewal (June 2012), the investigator left off an experiment that had been in the previous three-year renewal. Both the investigator and student involved did not recognize this omission and 32 rats were utilized in this experiment. This event was reported to OLAW.

Motion: Dr. Brabb moved to send this Investigator a letter of reprimand instead of a letter of council because it is a serious issue and in her opinion these animals have been wasted since the data cannot be used. Dr. E Clark seconded the motion.

Discussion: Dr. Brabb explained that many of the individual components of the experiments were approved as part of the current protocol but not all of them. Dr. Murnane asked how the issue was reported. Dr. Brabb replied that the Post Approval Monitor discovered it. Dr. Brabb explained that data from unapproved experiments couldn’t be used therefore it was fortunate this was caught when it was.

Mr. Lang asked for clarification about the error and Dr. Brabb explained the experiment was added to the protocol in the previous approval period as a Significant Change, which was inadvertently left off the current 3-year renewal.

Dr. E. Clark asked if this type of event had happened previously on this protocol. Dr. Brabb replied that this had not, but this investigator has had previous non-compliances. The prior issues were related to animal care and were not protocol related.

Dr. Murnane asked what the next degree of severity was after a letter of reprimand. Dr. Brabb replied that there were other possibilities, such as suspending the use of animals.
Dr. Brabb commented that this was a very complex protocol and wasn’t in very good shape when it was submitted to the IACUC for review. Dr. Brabb assured the Committee that the Investigator did accept full responsibility for the error.

Vote on the Motion: The motion passed with 12 members voting in favor and 1 abstention.

- Protocol #2850-11. This protocol uses dogs as members of the research team to find scat as part of numerous studies involving ecology and conservation of wild species. The investigators can then test the scat for numerous metabolites as well as track individual animal territories without the use of traps or radio collars. In rare instances, the dogs are used to find the animals themselves.

This protocol was recently approved to house two salamanders from New Mexico that had been caught by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The salamanders were to be returned to the US Fish and Wildlife Service at the end of the month of training. Unfortunately, while being placed in a training receptacle, one salamander escaped. This was early in the training process and the dog could not find the salamander. This has been reported to the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dr. Brabb felt no action was needed at this point but wanted to report the incident to the Committee.

Dr. Brabb explained their habitat in New Mexico is similar to the habitat where the salamander escaped. The other salamander had been returned to New Mexico without incident. In the future it was recommended that the salamanders be kept at a lower temperature before the trainings so they are more lethargic and not so fast.

Veterinary Monitoring:

There are 9 active protocols on protocol monitoring this month and all are progressing normally.

OAW Director’s Report:

Report on packets sent

Dr. Thompson-Iritani reported that 2 packets and 4 e-mailed items had been sent to the IACUC since the last report at the July 18, 2013 meeting. There was 1 new protocol. There were 48 renewals, of which 12 were three-year renewals requiring a complete Project Review Form. There were 36 annual renewals. There were also 64 Significant and Minor Changes. The IACUC has completed its approval process for many of these items, though some are awaiting final approval due to holds for items such as EH&S approval, OHR review, signatures, or revisions from PIs.

Reply from Researcher Regarding Non-compliance Previously Reported:

None
Protocol Review:

Dr. Horwitz, IACUC #4167-01 “Neurophysiology of Vision”

Dr. Newman explained that this research group is studying the neurophysiology of vision. The experimental procedures include the implantation of a head-post for stabilizing the animal’s head, recording chambers and eye coils.

There are two Significant Changes for this protocol, both requests for a banked repair.

- **Animal #A12027, Version #58**
  Dr. Newman explained that this animal is a 5 years old, female Macaque that came into the UW colony in February 2012. She was assigned to the protocol in May or June of that year and started the experimental surgeries later in September of that year. Dr. Newman summarized the surgical history of this monkey.

  Dr. Newman explained that the previous banked repair was used for a chamber repair in July 2013 and the group is asking for a banked repair surgery in case another repair becomes necessary in the future.

  **Motion:** Dr. Newman moved to approve the Significant Change. Dr. Byers seconded the motion.

  **Discussion:** None

  **Vote on the Motion:** The Significant Change was approved unanimously with 13 members voting in favor.

- **Animal #A08062, Version #59**
  Dr. Newman explained that this animal is an 8 year-old male that came to the colony in December 2008 and started experimental surgeries on September 30, 2009. This animal has had 8 surgeries, two of which were clinical. This particular monkey was discussed at the May 2013 IACUC meeting (a recording device implant and a banked repair was approved at that time) and some committee members expressed concern about the number of surgeries this animal has had. Dr. Newman reminded the Committee that this is the monkey that had all of its cranial hardware removed because there was an infection beneath the implant. That situation resolved and the animal started the re-instrumentation process in March 2013. The animal’s clinical status appears to be stable and unremarkable since the infection resolved.

  This monkey has been trained to perform the chromatic detection task and the size discrimination tasks that are critical elements of the groups’ research program. Dr. Newman summarized the surgical history of this monkey.

  **Motion:** Dr. Newman moved to approve the Significant Change. Dr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

  **Discussion:** Dr. Lucas commented that in the case of this monkey, she thought an eye coil repair was OK but she was not supportive of the approval of another major surgery for this animal. The Committee had a detailed discussion about the clinical status of the animal, as well as the ethical considerations of approving another major surgery.

  Dr. Brabb said she thought there were 2 concerns being expressed: one is that the head might not be stable enough to continue ongoing research and the other is that this animal has had too many major surgeries.
Dr. Sullivan stated that if the IACUC approves one more repair the PI should be made aware of the Committee’s reservations about more surgeries for this animal so that all repairs can be combined into one surgical session.

Dr. Sullivan asked if anyone knows how long the micro arrays last. Dr. Brabb replied that they are too new to be able to give an accurate estimate.

Ms. Stoloff asked what happens if the motion if not approved. Dr. Brabb explained the animal would be used until the equipment was no longer functional and then the group would either ask for another repair or animal would be euthanized. Dr. Cunningham emphasized that if the repair was not approved, it did not mean the animal would be euthanized by default; the group could always come back to the Committee with another request for a repair.

**Vote on the Motion:** The Significant Change was not approved with 6 members voting in favor and 7 opposed.

**Revised Motion:** Dr. Newman moved to approve a banked repair excluding the implantation of a micro-array or recording chamber. Dr. Fitts seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Ms. Goodwin asked for clarification as to what the implication of the new motion were. It was explained that it meant that they could do a repair for an eye coil but nothing more unless they came back to the Committee with a new request.

**Vote on the Motion:** The motion was approved unanimously with 13 voting in favor.

**Standard Operating Procedures, Policies and Guidelines:**

Dr. Brabb explained there she has revised two polices, “Significant Changes to Approved Protocols” and “Permissible Weight Loss”. Dr. Brabb explained that she has made some changes and suggestions that were highlighted in gray. Dr. Brabb allowed the Committee time to read the policies.

- **Significant Changes to Approved Protocols**
  Dr. Brabb explained that most of these changes were made to bring the policy in line with what OLAW considers to be Significant Changes.

  **Motion:** Dr. Brabb moved to approve the revised policy. Dr. E. Clark seconded the motion.

  **Discussion:** Mr. Lang asked how this policy applies to a change in chemical agents. Dr. Brabb replied that a change in agent would be a Significant Change if it resulted in any of these effects that were summarized in the policy.

  Dr. Cunningham asked if the sentence “results in increased morbidity and pain” should also include “distress”. Dr. Brabb replied that she had considered adding that and would accept that suggestion as a friendly amendment, which Dr. E. Clark seconded.

  **Vote on the Motion:** The policy was approved unanimously with 13 members voting in favor.
• **Permissible Weight Loss**
  
  Dr. Brabb explained that this policy was last updated in 2001. Most of the current changes had to do with formatting and updates to reflect current terminology. For example, the policy referred to the “ACC” for the Animal Care Committee instead of the IACUC, which is how the Committee is currently referred to.

  The Committee had several questions about inclusion of body condition scoring, a statement about weight loss not being the appropriate indicator for tumor development, and consideration of special criteria for issues like rapidly growing animals (obesity). There was also discussion about whether fish should be included in the policy.

  Due to the number of questions and suggestions, it was decided that Dr. Brabb would re-draft the policy and bring it back to the Committee for review.

**Facility Extension Requests**

**Site Visit Deficiency Completion Deadline Extension Request:**

Dr. Clark informed the IACUC that there was one extension request as follows:

- **Site:** WaNPRC Western: 228, 233, 235, 236, 241/242  
  **Deficiency:** Chipped floor in multiple rooms need repair.

  Original Citation: 9/7/12  
  Original Deadline: 3/14/13  
  Extension Deadline: 8/31/13  
  **Second Extension Deadline: 2/28/14**

  Reason for request: The floors in animal rooms 228, 233, and 235 have been completely resurfaced, as of 2/20/13. There was a meeting with the architects on 2/13/13 to discuss renovation of the cage wash area (241/242), which would also involve 236 (which is currently an animal room). Dr. Hotchkiss of the Primate Center is requesting an extension for resurfacing the floors in 241/242 and 236 until the area is renovated. The renovation is expected to be an extended process, and she cannot estimate a completion date at this time. Therefore, Dr. Hotchkiss is requesting an extension to 8/31/13.

  **Second extension request:** The WaNPRC is requesting an extension for re-doing the floors in 236, 241, 242. There are no animals housed in 236, and 241, 242 are the cage wash area. Construction to completely renovate the area is scheduled to start in November 2013. Generally, construction jobs take longer than expected; therefore Dr. Hotchkiss is requesting an extension to 2/28/14.

  **Motion:** Dr. E. Clark moved to approve the deadline extension request. Mr. Lang seconded the motion.

  **Discussion:** None

  **Vote on the Motion:** The deadline extension was approved unanimously with 13 members voting in favor.
Site Visit Guidance Document

Dr. Cunningham asked the IACUC for suggestions to make the document more useful for site visitors.

The Committee suggested topics that they would like included on the document. Dr. Cunningham asked for volunteers to serve on a subcommittee to revise the guidance document. The volunteers were: Dr. E. Clark, who will chair the sub-committee, Mr. Muster, Ms. Feldman, Ms. Heffernan, Mr. Lang, Dr. Thompson-Iritani, Dr. Newman, Mr. Van Hooser and Dr. Jane Sullivan. Dr. Cunningham suggested the other individuals be asked to join as appropriate. Dr. Cunningham asked the sub-committee to report back in about 2 months.

Analysis of Deficiencies:

Dr. Istvan summarized his analysis of the Drug and Chemical deficiencies that were reported at the last meeting. Dr. Istvan reported that the rise in deficiencies in this category were associated with expired drugs rather than cleaning chemicals. The period of time looked at was the last two years. It was not clear if deficiencies in this category were increasing because of intense scrutiny or if there was an increase in expired drugs.

Dr. Cunningham asked if anyone had ideas about how to help researchers with this issue. Dr. Byers suggested that researchers could be reminded when they get a notice about the site visit. The IACUC agreed that that was a good idea.

Mr. Lang asked if it was known if these expired drugs are actually being used. Dr. Brabb said that usually the drugs are not in use but it’s important to determine whether the drugs are in use because the use of out of date drugs is a significant deficiency.

The second category that Dr. Istvan analyzed was Sanitation. The largest number of deficiencies in this category were related to non-sanitizable surfaces; a little more than half of that category was related to paper postings adhered to a wall or a hood with the tape, also resulting in tape residue. The paper should be laminated or in a plastic sleeve. Dr. Brabb suggested that site visitors could provide information about where to go to get things laminated and/or carry plastic sleeves with them for the visits. Dr. Istvan said that he would continue to track this and see if there are any changes.

IACUC Training:

Dr. Brabb presented a training session of the use of tape in the lab.

- The use of tape, even lab tape should be a short-term solution;
- Tape should not be used to tape things to cages or to laminar flow hoods;
- Tape should not be used within an animal use enclosure;
- Tape can be used outside of animal use areas;
- Tape can be used if removed frequently and the area is sanitized;
- If tape is being used as a place reference, paint or a marker or some other method that is acceptable with Facilities should be used;
- When deciding whether or not the use of tape is OK, consider whether or not it can collect
Post-Approval Monitoring (PAM) and Drug Logs:

Mr. Van Hooser reported that the PAM group has been getting calls from researchers about drug log requirements. He thought this was a result of the inspections performed by the Washington State Department of Health Board of Pharmacy, Pharmacist Inspector who is very strict about labs having bound drug logs and other requirements related to drug storage.

The PAM group has samples of bound drug logs that they can share with the research groups to help them comply with the requirements imposed by the Pharmacist Inspector, even though they are not IACUC requirements.

The Committee discussed the IACUC requirements for drug logs and drug storage, and also discussed how they could help researchers address these additional requirements imposed by the Pharmacy Inspector. It was determined that the best solution was to refer groups to their Post Approval Monitor for guidance.

Closing Business:

The meeting was brought to a close at 4:05 pm. The floor was opened to public comment.