Members Present: J. Bales S. Cunningham M. Lucas
T. Brabb M. Gough J. Muster
A. Burich C. Hotchkiss M. Newman
C. Carrier P. Lang J. Sullivan
E. Clark S. Libby M. Tetrick

Members Absent: C. Goodwin S. Henderson J. Stoloff
C. Grue L. Kinman

**Opening Business**

The IACUC Chair called the meeting to order at 2:38pm.

**Site Visit Form:** The Chair requested that comments or suggestions regarding the new site visit form should be sent to the Office of Animal Welfare.

**Approval of the December 18, 2014 IACUC Meeting Minutes**

The IACUC Chair called for the approval of the minutes.

**Motion:** A motion to approve the minutes as written was made and seconded.

**Discussion:** None

**Vote on the Motion:** The meeting minutes were approved unanimously with 15 members voting in favor.

**Attending Veterinarian’s Report**

**Facility issues:**

- **Humidity:** Out of range humidity had been reported in most of the animal facilities and no clear signs of disease had been noted.

- **Temperature:** There was one decentralized rodent room where the temperature dropped to 63.1°F over the weekend of 12/20/14. Facility services had difficulty correcting the problem, but it was corrected by 12/22/14. This is part of the set of rooms that had been discussed before, due to problems with temperature many times a year.
There was one room that houses finches where the temperature variation was greater than 4 degrees in a 24 hour period due to shut down of the HVAC system and a low pressure steam issue. All animals were fine.

**Adverse events:**

- Protocol 4064-03, this event was reported as part of the Annual Renewal for this protocol. In September 2014, after capture in the field in Oregon, one Jay was injured during leg banding on this protocol. The bird was transported to the closest wildlife rehabilitation center where it died. The group has worked to improve their training on banding for all individuals on the protocol. This event was reported to OLAW. There was no action taken by the IACUC.

- On Dec. 23, 2014 two 6 week old mice were found dead in a cage in a centralized vivarium. There was no food available in the cage. The cage had been changed by the husbandry staff four days prior and presumably the mice were left without food at that time. The technicians involved were retrained following the incident. This event was reported to OLAW.

**Motion:** A motion was made and seconded to send a letter of counsel to the Department of Comparative Medicine, asking them to provide records of the retraining and verify that the employees involved did not have previous animal care issues. Additionally, the Facility Manager was asked come to an IACUC meeting to explain how this will be prevented as much as possible in the future.

**Discussion:** None

**Vote on the Motion:** The motion passed with 14 members voting in favor and 1 member opposed.

**Protocol Monitoring:**
There are 17 protocols on the veterinary monitoring program. No protocols have been added to protocol monitoring this month.

**Office of Animal Welfare Director’s Report**

**Copy To Committee**
Since the December 18, 2014 meeting there were 108 items that were sent to the IACUC. There were 3 that were urgent and were sent via email and the rest were posted on Catalyst. There were 2 new projects, 43 renewals of which, 12 were 3-year renewals requiring a complete Project Review Form. There were also 61 significant or minor changes. The IACUC has completed its approval process for
most of these items, although some are awaiting final approval due to holds for items such as EH&S approval, OH review or revisions from PI’s.

**Liaison Trend Report**
December – 50 meetings occurred out of 78 (28 didn’t occur because of non-responsiveness or postponement). 96% no issues; 11 administrative fixes and 4 amendments.

**Responses to Non-compliances:**
- Response to letter of reprimand regarding fish that died shortly after arrival. PI: We have no immediate plans to use animals. Should we have reason to request approval in the future, I will try to abide by any suggestions you may have. It’s in nobody’s best interest to have dead fish.

- Letter regarding the placement of water bottle cage on ventilated rack. Facility manager: In response to this letter, we have found a solution to finding a water bottle ventilated cage that has been erroneously placed on a ventilated rack. These cages are designed to work on a ventilated rack complete with the air valves however, water bottle ventilated caging does not have a lixit (water valve).

In answer to your three questions:

1. Date that all water bottle type cages have been correctly labeled with the red dot. This process started shortly after this incident occurred so we are well on our way to completion. We are requesting June 1, 2015 to get our current inventory of water bottle type cages correctly labeled with a red dot. Please understand that this will be an on-going process as new caging arrives, it will be labeled as it comes out of the box.

2. Our animal techs have been given a cursory training by the supervisors and we are also planning a facility by facility training conducted by our husbandry trainer. As far as the investigators training is concerned, this will be handled through an ‘All Users’ email in each facility.

3. The way we will assure that the labeling will continue is through a Working Guideline as well as signage which will be posted at the cage wash room level, room level and on our ‘Investigator Boards’ in each facility. If you would like a copy of the Working Guideline and sign, we will be happy to provide them.
• Avertin euthanasia in rat. PI: Thank you for the notification. The use of the wrong method of euthanasia referenced in your letter was due to our relative inexperience using rats and a breakdown in communication among our group. We did not expect to have to euthanize rats at this time, the NIA sent us the wrong strain and they were in much poorer health than expected. Everyone in the laboratory had read the protocol several weeks earlier when they were added to the protocol.

However, I had not thoroughly reviewed the procedures for euthanasia associated with working with rats with my laboratory team before this experiment. Immediately after the mistake was pointed out to me I met will all members involved in rat studies and discussed the mistake and the correct procedures. I am in the process of obtaining my DEA license so we can keep pentobarbital and Beuthanasia solutions in our laboratory to ensure that we have the correct anesthetic readily available for unexpected euthanasia events in the future.

• Letter regarding water bottle that ran out of water. PI: I am writing to confirm that we have established corrective procedures to ensure that no mouse cage in our decentralized facility will run out of water in the future. Since a leaking water bottle may have contributed to this unfortunate accident, we have rechecked all our water bottles for leaky bottles. This will now be done routinely on a weekly basis. In addition, I have assigned an additional individual to check our mouse cages every morning. Another individual checks the cages again in the afternoon giving double coverage for cage inspections Monday through Friday. Personnel routinely comes in on Saturday and Sunday to check our animal cages.

Non-compliances:
No non-compliances to report.

Housekeeping Items:
Training:
Feb. 23, 2015 – NWABR IACUC member training – registration is on-going.

Assessing electronic database options for protocol submission, review and storage – join the Users Advisory Group.

Centralization (DCM managed) site process: Would like to request that an IACUC subcommittee be formed to help with the assessment of prioritizing which lab managed facilities should be taking advantage of the recently available space within the DCM managed space. There are some housing areas that would be more optimal if they could move into other space.
Semiannual Program Review and Facility Review

The Director of the Office of Animal Welfare briefly summarized the report that had been previously sent to the Committee. The IACUC was reminded that Concurrence sheets were due by January 30, 2015.

There was one issue that needed to be resolved involving the classification of deficiencies associated with B Virus Exposure Kits. The deficiencies had been categorized as significant but a member of the IACUC felt that they should be classified as minor.

During the discussion regarding the B Virus Exposure Kits, it was suggested that the IACUC consider revising the definition of a significant deficiency as indicated on the site visit report form.

- **Revised Definition Significant Deficiency**
  The UW definition of Significant is listed as: “Moderate threat to health or safety of animals or personnel...).” The USDA definition is: “A significant deficiency is one which, with reference to Sub Chapter A, and, in the judgment of the IACUC and the Institutional Official, is or may be a threat to the health or safety of animals.”

  The issue up for discussion was the fact that the USDA definition only applied to animals and not humans, and it was proposed that the Committee adopt the USDA definition.

  **Motion:** A motion was made and seconded to use the USDA definition of significant.

  **Vote on the Motion:** The motion was approved with 12 members voting in favor and 3 members opposed.

- **Site Visit Deficiencies Related to B Virus Exposure Kits**
  The Committee reviewed the use of the B Virus Exposure Kits as part of the exposure SOP in order to determine whether or not the fact that they were expired or in one case not present should be considered a significant or minor deficiency.

  **Motion:** A motion was made and seconded to classify the site visit deficiencies associated with the B Virus Exposure Kits as minor rather than significant.
Vote on the Motion: The motion was approved unanimously with 15 members voting in favor.

- **Revision of the UW’s Animal Welfare Assurance to include OLAW’s Definition of Significant**
  The Committee discussed the pros and cons of revising the University’s Animal Welfare Assurance to indicate OLAW’s definition of significant. Some individuals felt strongly that the assurance should not be changed to remove the human aspect from the definition while others felt that it was a good idea to stick with OLAW’s definition.

  During this discussion, it was also suggested that when notifying researchers of deficiencies identified during site visits, the use of the term minor should not be used. The reason for this was because in some cases, the Committee didn’t want a deficiency to be thought of as minor, when it rose to a higher level of concern, but did not meet the definition of significant.

  **Motion**: motion was made and seconded to 1) revise the University’s Animal Welfare Assurance to include OLAW’s definition of a significant deficiency and 2) to omit the use of the word minor when notifying researchers of deficiencies that are not considered Significant.

  **Vote on the Motion**: The motion passed unanimously with 15 members voting in favor.

**Closing Business:**

The meeting was brought to a close at 3:51pm and the floor was opened to public comment.