

Meeting Date: August 16, 2007

Members Present:	L. Hajar	D. Fitts	I. Washington
	N. Phillips	T. Brabb	R. Murnane
	S. Cunningham	D. Lee	V. Batterson
	S. Skerrett	S. Kelley	C. Baker
Members Absent:	G. McLean	P. Fink	M. Slosberg
	W. Dickhoff	J. Kauffman	K. Waddell

### Opening Business:

Dr. Cunningham called the meeting to order at 2:41 pm.

Dr. Cunningham called for the approval of the July 19, 2007 IACUC meeting minutes. Dr. Fitts moved to approve the minutes and Dr. Batterson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with 12 members voting in favor.

### Attending Veterinarian's Report

Attending Veterinarian's Report, August 16, 2007

Dr. Brabb reported the following noncompliance:

#### ❖ IACUC #2185-35 "Effects of Low-Level Chemical Cocktails on Pre-Spawn Mortality in Hatchery Coho" - Dr. Grue

Dr. Brabb informed the Committee of a situation involving mortality in a group of Coho Salmon. Dr. Brabb explained that Dr. Grue contacted Dr. Sanders to report unusually high mortality on his project. On June 25, 2007 Dr. Sanders examined the fish and attempted to contact Dr. Grue in order to request that he reduce the stocking density of his school to prevent further mortality. Dr. Grue did not return phone calls or a subsequent e-mail. In addition, members of his staff did not return e-mails from a different staff veterinarian regarding the same problem. One month later, on July 25, 2007, Dr. Grue again contacted Dr. Sanders and indicated the mortality was continuing. A discussion then ensued regarding causes and prevention measures for the mortality. Following this conversation Dr. Sanders performed a necropsy on some of the fish to rule out infectious causes. Following the necropsy he informed Dr. Grue that the fish needed to be more evenly stocked between the six tanks, the smaller fish should be culled, and other husbandry-related issues need to be addressed. Dr. Brabb informed the Committee that this incident has been reported to OLAW as a failure to follow veterinary orders. The Committee was also notified that the PI met with Drs. Brabb, Phillips, and Cunningham to discuss the need for better communication. At this meeting Dr. Grue stated that he did not receive the veterinarian's e-mail or a voice mail left on his cell phone. In order to ensure appropriate communication in the future, Dr. Grue identified a contact person to field veterinary questions and he provided his home and cell phone numbers for contact purposes.

Dr. Batterson commented that it seemed to her that this PI has a persistent communication problem. Dr. Cunningham asked if there is documentation to support repeated attempts to contact him. Dr. Brabb confirmed that there is documentation. Ms. Baker asked if there was a lab manager that could be contacted instead of the PI. Dr. Brabb explained that the PI did not want to turn that type of duty over to the lab manager but a contact person has been established. Dr. Cunningham commented that this is the PI's second problem in the last 2 months and he has already been sent a letter of counsel.

Dr. Batterson asked about the cause of the fish mortality. Dr. Brabb explained that the mortality may be due to the fact that the fish should have been released but the hatchery can only release a certain amount of Coho at a time because they are a state regulated species. Dr. Fitts asked what the expected mortality should be. Dr. Brabb replied that she understands it to be very low, approximately 1% or less. Dr. Brabb further explained that the PI was left with two choices; either keep the fish because only a certain amount could be released, or euthanize them. Dr. Skerrett asked if the issue was the event itself, or the difficulty of contacting the PI. Dr. Brabb explained that the issue was chronic failure to communicate and disregard for the veterinarians instructions. Dr. Cunningham commented that the issue is also the well-being of the animals. Dr. Brabb clarified that if the PI had properly communicated the mortality, the veterinary recommendation would have been to euthanize the animals rather than keeping them. Dr. Fitts asked if this situation was concurrent with the last problem. Dr. Brabb explained that this was a subsequent incident.

Dr. Washington asked when his last letter was sent. Dr. Fitts asked who was notified in addition to the PI. Dr. Phillips explained that the last letter regarding the hazing incident was sent on June 21, 2007 and the Director of the School of Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences (SAFS) received a copy. Dr. Phillips was informed that the PI is paid by United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the Director of USGS has asked to be notified of any further incidents, and has also asked for a copy of the previous letter regarding the hazing incident. Dr. Fitts asked if there was a level above the Director at the SAFS that would be appropriate to notify. Dr. Phillips explained that she has not seen a Dean listed, for this organization but would double check. Dr. Phillips explained that the next step would be to send the PI a letter of reprimand and suggested that it indicate that another non-compliance will result in suspension of research activities.

Motion: Dr. Batterson moved that the PI be sent a letter of reprimand expressing the Committee's concern about the repeated communication problem, and indicate that future non-compliances may lead to a suspension of research activities. The letter should also request that the PI provide a plan for correction as well as a summary of the agreed upon communication plan. A time-line for the response should be indicated in the letter. Dr. Hajar seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: Dr. Phillips said that she felt the Committee should reject the response if it was written by the manager rather than the PI.

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 12 members in favor.

#### **Veterinary Monitoring:**

No report for August, 2007.

#### **Executive Secretary's Report**

##### **Report on packets sent:**

Dr. Phillips reported that 2 packets were mailed since the meeting on July 19, 2007. The packets included 4 new protocols, 26 renewals, of which 13 were three-year renewals requiring a complete Project Review Form. The other 13 renewals were annual renewals with morbidity or mortality reported. There were also 65 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 EHS approval, OH review or signatures, or revisions from PIs.

## **Kincaid Roof**

During the October 2006 semi-annual IACUC site visit the visitors noted, as an observation, that the flooring under the aviaries on the Kincaid roof would need to be re-sealed at the next opportunity. This issue was not specifically cited as a deficiency because the condition of the floor was only beginning to show some wear spots that would eventually require re-sealing. In the reply to the IACUC regarding the site visit report, the IACUC was informed of the Department's intent to re-seal the floor within a year, depending on occupancy of the aviaries. The PI using the aviaries is leaving the university so initial plans were made to re-seal the floor summer 2007. However, another researcher requested use of this space for several months in the fall in order to quarantine newly arrived birds. This would be an important use of the facility. Dr. Phillips reported that she and Dr. Brabb visited the facility on August 8, 2007 to re-inspect the floor. They judged that the floor of this outdoor sheltered facility was in adequate condition to warrant a delay in re-sealing in order to accommodate the quarantine needs. The Biology Department is seeking approval from the IACUC to permit the quarantine housing and then to re-seal the floor prior to any further housing of birds in the facility.

Motion: Dr. Phillips moved to inform the Biology Department that the roof aviary can be used this fall, but after completion of the quarantine period additional birds cannot be housed until the floor has been re-sealed. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: None

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Brabb was not present for the vote.

## **Previous non-compliance issues -- update:**

Dr. Phillips provided the IACUC with updates on issues reported at the July 2007 IACUC meeting. She informed the Committee that responses had been received as required.

- Dr. Ribel re-iterated the actions he had already taken to assure oversight within his laboratory.
- Dr. Farr responded and requested that one of his staff members be copied on correspondence regarding urgent issues in order to help avoid any lapses in the event of some unforeseen emergency that prevents him from seeing the correspondence immediately. Dr. Phillips explained that there was a family emergency that resulted in a delay in submission of his IACUC renewal.
- Drs. Chavkin and Byers responded with the funding information that was requested. Dr. Xu met with Dr. Phillips to further discuss funding issues related to the non-compliant pilot study.

## **Noncompliance issues:**

### ❖ IACUC #3055-07 "Sensitization to Brain Antigens following Stroke" -- Dr. Becker

Dr. Phillips reported that Dr. Becker used the anesthetic isoflurane instead of halothane without prior IACUC review and approval. The change was made owing to the fact that halothane is no longer manufactured as an anesthetic in the US.

She also informed the IACUC that the issue of the availability of halothane was sent to researchers by the UW Office of Animal Welfare on August 14, 2006. Researchers were instructed to submit Significant Changes if they were using halothane because they would need to find an alternative anesthetic and this type of change requires IACUC approval. The researcher did not remember to submit, and obtain approval for, the change of anesthetic.

Dr. Phillips informed the IACUC that she had interacted with the PI regarding this issue. Fifty-five animals were operated since November 2006 using isoflurane. A Significant Change was submitted and is currently under review. In addition, the PI has already provided the funding information so that all appropriate parties can be informed of the non-compliance. It is funded by NIH so the appropriate grants official will be notified. The non-compliance was reported to OLAW by phone.

#### **Protocol Review:**

##### **❖ IACUC # 4165-01 "Experimental Model for Chorioamnionitis and Preterm Labor" – Dr. Adams**

Dr. Fitts presented the following report:

Dr. Fitts explained that the significant change request was for the approval of a 1x1 cm choriodecidual biopsy in addition to the previously approved myometrial biopsy from the fundus and lower uterine segment at the time of the catheterization surgery and again at the time of delivery. The Significant Change also included a request to sedate the animals one additional time, for a total of 7 times.

Dr. Gunderson asked for clarification that 1x1 cm is not a biopsy, it's a swab. Dr. Kelley clarified the procedure. Dr. Brabb said that there is a discrepancy between the sample frequency that is listed in paragraph two of the Significant Change and the IACUC protocol. The Committee determined that the sample frequency was not clear.

**Motion:** Dr. Brabb moved that Dr. Kelley be assigned as designated reviewer and that Dr. Washington be assigned as the back up reviewer to approve the protocol under the Designated Reviewer Method once adequate clarification regarding the number of sedations has been received. Dr. Phillips seconded the motion.

**Discussion Regarding the Motion:** None

**Vote on the Motion:** This motion was approved unanimously with 12 in favor.

##### **❖ IACUC # 2877-01 "Gene Expression in Regenerating and Neoplastic Livers and Pathogenesis of HCC" – Dr. Fausto**

Dr. Brabb presented the following report:

Dr. Brabb explained that a Significant Change was requested for performance of a partial hepatectomy without administration of post-operative analgesics. Dr. Brabb further explained that liver regeneration secondary to 2/3 hepatectomy is clinically important due to drug-induced liver damage or neoplasia and resection. Dr. Brabb explained that she called for a Full Committee Review because the group proposes to use isoflurane as an anesthetic for the 10 minute surgical procedures, but proposed to withhold administration of post-operative analgesics because all analgesics will modify the enzyme pathways they are studying. Dr. Brabb further explained that the monitoring protocol and description of surgical procedures as detailed in the Significant Change request are well written and adequate. Members of Dr. Fausto's lab were in attendance in order to address the Committee's questions.

Dr. Cunningham asked if topical analgesics could be used. Dr. Brabb explained that Lidocaine is metabolized by the liver so it cannot be used. Dr. Cunningham asked if it was possible to reduce the

animal's body temperature or to reduce the body temperature at the surgical site as an analgesic measure. Dr. Brabb explained that this method would not be practical or possible in mice.

Motion: Dr. Brabb moved to approve the Significant Change as written. Dr. Skerrett seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: Dr. Skerrett asked about the disposition of the animals after the surgery. Dr. Jean Campbell from the research group explained that following surgery the animals are individually housed and maintained on a heating pad. Generally they do not groom or eat for a while after surgery, but usually resume normal behavior after approximately 30 minutes at which time they can be returned to their home cage with their litter mates. Dr. Gunderson asked about the age of the animals. Dr. Brabb confirmed that they are 8-12 weeks old. Dr. Phillips confirmed that the animals seem to do well, as there have not been any sick animal reports filed for animals that have undergone this procedure so far as she or Dr. Brabb could recall. Dr. Campbell confirmed that the mortality is less than 5% and that they monitor the animals very closely for recovery. Dr. Washington asked how much bleeding the animals have following surgery. Dr. Campbell explained that there is very little bleeding but this can vary depending on the experience of the surgeon. Dr. Campbell further explained that if animals were noted to be in pain based on their monitoring and scoring system, the animal would be euthanized or veterinary services would be contacted. Dr. Batterson suggested that the project be re-classified at a Category III and Dr. Brabb concurred.

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved with 11 members voting in favor and 1 member opposed.

❖ IACUC # 2070-06 "Metabolism, Cellular Physiology" – Dr. Beavo

Dr. Batterson presented the following report:

Dr. Gunderson explained that the Significant Change request was for the addition of MR Imaging procedures and for the administration of Evan's Blue Dye (EBD). Dr. Batterson explained that she called for a Full Committee Review because the Significant Change request was inadvertently left out of the last "copy to committee" packet and the group is eager to get started. Dr. Brabb commented that the location for the MRI has already been approved by the IACUC.

Motion: Dr. Batterson moved to approve the request as written. Dr. Murane seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: Dr. Lee recused himself from the vote since he will be working on the study.

Vote on the Motion: The motion was approved with 10 members in favor and 1 abstention. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

❖ IACUC # 4167-01 "Neurophysiology of Vision" – Dr. Horwitz

Dr. Washington presented the following report:

Dr. Washington explained that the Significant Change request was for the approval of one clinical surgery or repair as required. Dr. Washington explained that the provision for a repair or clinical surgery as required was not included in the submission of his protocol which received IACUC approval on 5/2/07.

Motion: Dr. Washington moved to approve the request as written. Dr. Brabb seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: None

Vote on the Motion: The motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

❖ IACUC # 2340-01 "Role of Cerebellar Nuclei in Eye Movement Control and Adaptation" -- Dr. Robinson

Dr. Washington presented the following report:

Dr. Washington explained that the Significant Change request was for approval to repair the eye coil or recording chamber for animal #A03076 in the event that either stops functioning correctly. Dr. Kelley confirmed that the animal's last surgical procedure was in November 2004. Dr. Washington explained that this request was submitted without the clinical record and did not include a veterinary statement from the Washington National Primate Research Center (WaNPRC) veterinarian. Dr. Brabb summarized for the Committee the surgical summary that was compiled from clinical records. Dr. Brabb commented that the animal has not had a recent veterinary exam, so would need one before IACUC approval could be granted.

Motion: Dr. Brabb moved to assign Dr. Washington as the designated reviewer and that Dr. Brabb would be assigned as the back up reviewer to approve the protocol under the Designated Reviewer system. Dr. Batterson seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: Dr. Kelley said that veterinary exams are sometimes not being completed because the PIs do not tell the veterinarians that they are submitting a request that would require a review. Dr. Washington confirmed that it is the PI's responsibility to get all the proper paperwork to the Committee. Dr. Phillips suggested that the paperwork should be within two weeks of the IACUC meeting. Dr. Phillips suggested that in the future the OAW could send an email to the PIs and the veterinarians to let them know when the request is going to the Committee for review. General discussion followed and some members felt that it was the PI's job to notify those involved. It was decided that a process could be determined at a later date.

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

❖ IACUC # 2062-01 "Saccadic Eye Movement Studies" -- Dr. Kaneko

Dr. Washington presented the following report:

Dr. Washington explained that the significant change request was for an additional clinical or repair surgery for animal #A06010. Dr. Phillips commented that there should be a correction made to the animal's surgical history regarding the second surgery performed on 5/16/07, which is listed as an eye coil repair, but according to the PI was actually a clinical procedure to remove excess conjunctival tissue in the left eye. Dr. Phillips confirmed that this animal has only had 2 experimental surgeries. Dr. Cunningham asked if it would be possible to have the animal's surgical record corrected. Dr. Brabb said that she thought that the clinical record had been corrected but the surgical history had not been updated to reflect the nature of the surgery.

Motion: Dr. Washington moved to approve the animal for an additional clinical or repair surgery as required. Dr. Brabb seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: Dr. Cunningham asked how the Committee could be sure that the surgical history record was corrected. Dr. Kelley agreed to review the clinical record, consult with the PI, and make sure that the information is correct. Dr. Kelley asked the Committee if a change in the nature of the 5/16/07 surgery would change how the Committee votes on the pending clinical/repair surgery. The Committee confirmed that it would not, but the importance of correction of records was emphasized.

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

### Review of Neuroscience Animals

Dr. Phillips explained that following 4 animals are being re-reviewed for approval of an additional repair or clinical surgery because the surgical summary reports previously reviewed by the IACUC were incomplete.

Dr. Phillips presented the surgical summary reports to the IACUC for the following animals:

- 1) Animal #M02193, IACUC #2326-08 "Brain-Computer Interface for Primates" - Dr. Fetz

Motion: Dr. Phillips moved to re-approve the animal for an additional repair or clinical surgery if it is required. Dr. Fitts seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: None

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

- 2) Animal #A05014, IACUC # 2062-01 "Saccadic Eye Movement Studies" - Dr. Kaneko

Motion: Dr. Phillips moved to re-approve the animal for an additional repair or clinical surgery if it is required. Dr. Fitts seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: None

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

- 3) Animal #A99087, IACUC #3275-01 "Visual Object Perception and Learning in Extrastriate Cortex" - Dr. Jagadeesh

Motion: Dr. Phillips moved to re-approve the animal for an additional repair or clinical surgery if it is required. Dr. Brabb seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion:

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved with 10 members voting in favor and 1 member opposed. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

- 4) Animal #M03282, IACUC #2326-04 "Spinal Interneurons Controlling Voluntary Limb Movements"  
- Dr. Fetz

Motion: Dr. Phillips moved to re-approve the animal for an additional repair or clinical surgery if it is required. Dr. Batterson seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: None

Vote on the Motion: This motion was approved unanimously with 11 members voting in favor. Dr. Skerrett was not present for the vote.

#### Review of Non-human Primate Protocols Prior to IACUC Submission

Dr. Brabb explained that it would be more efficient to have the veterinarians review the non-human primate protocols before they are submitted to the IACUC.

Motion: Dr. Brabb moved that the Committee request that the primate center veterinarians review the protocols and Significant Changes prior to submission of the IACUC. Dr. Batterson seconded the motion.

Discussion Regarding the Motion: Dr. Kelly suggested that Dr. Brabb make a motion to request that the WaNPRC administration ask the veterinarians to review all protocols and Significant Changes involving non-human primates prior to submission to the IACUC. Dr. Washington asked if the Committee should consider doing the same thing with aquatic species. Discussion regarding Dr. Washington's suggestion was tabled until a later date. Dr. Brabb suggested that the motion indicate that a clinical veterinarian should review the protocol. Dr. Kelly replied that he thought that this decision should be left up to the WaNPRC administration.

Revised Motion: Dr. Brabb moved that the Committee request that the WaNPRC administration ask the WaNPRC veterinarians to review all non-human primate Significant Changes, new protocols, and three-year renewals prior to submission to the IACUC. Dr. Brabb further moved that the WaNPRC administration respond in writing to this request, prior to the next meeting.

Vote on the Motion: This motion was passed with a vote of 10 in favor and 1 abstention.

The meeting was brought to a close at 4:30pm.

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 by Dr. Cunningham to accommodate additional comments by Committee members.

#### IACUC Site Visit Documentation

Dr. Brabb reminded the Committee to be very careful when documenting deficiencies so that the deficiency is described in detail and defined as major, minor or significant. If the category of deficiency is not known, the site visitors should find out immediately in order to have accurate information turned in to the Office of Animal Welfare while it is still fresh in the site visitor's minds. Dr. Brabb further commented that a time-line for corrections should be determined at the time of the site visit and the PI and staff should be involved in order to develop a workable time-frame. Dr. Kelley commented that sometimes the site visitor and/or laboratory staff cannot determine a time-line for correction. Dr. Phillips commented that most of the facility inspection reports are being submitted with no time-line for

corrections at all and sometimes it's not clear what the deficiency was. Dr. Batterson said that sometimes it's difficult to determine a time-frame for correction, especially regarding facility issues and asked what is considered a reasonable time-frame for correction. Dr. Phillips replied that this varies, but if it's for a facility issue, you can require the research group to put in a work order and the Office of Animal Welfare can contact facility services to determine a time-frame for correction.

Dr. Phillips said that in acute situations the visitors can require an immediate correction. As an example, she related that when she was on a site visit and overcrowded cages were noted she called the lab group and the deficiency was corrected immediately instead of just including it in the report and waiting for correction.

### Composition of Protocol Review Questions

Dr. Fitts asked the Committee to refer to item and/or section numbers and not page numbers when writing questions or comments during protocol review. Dr. Fitts explained that because page numbers can change when the PRF is revised by the PI, it is sometimes difficult for the Designated Reviewer to review the PI's responses to the Committee's questions when only the page number is noted.

Dr. Cunningham commented that regarding animal numbers, she usually just puts 'animal numbers' but does not provide an explanation that the numbers are not justified. Dr. Phillips replied that it would be better to be more specific about what the issue is so that it can be properly addressed and does not get missed by the PI. Dr. Fitts confirmed that it is important to ask the specific questions that you want answered or to tell the PI the specific issue that needs to be changed.

The meeting was brought to a close at 4:42

The floor was opened to public comment.