

INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE (IACUC)
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, CA 93311-1099

MINUTES OF MEETING, Friday, September 9th, 2016
DDH A-108

Members Present:

Scientific Concerns: Amy Gancarz-Kausch, David Germano, Matt Leon [after 2 PM]

Non-Scientific Concerns: Steve Gamboa, Andrew Troup

Safety and Risk Management: Tim Ridley

Community Concerns: Laramie Lyda-Craft

Members Absent:

Community Concerns: Larry Saslaw

Consulting Veterinarian: Mylon Filkins

Visitors Present: Moriah Cobb

Others Present: Gwen Parnell, GRaSP

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Steve Gamboa at 1:00 PM.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- a. The old RERC is now Acting RERC until Dr. Sumaya's sabbatical leave concludes in January 2017.
- b. Laramie Lyda-Craft was introduced as the new community member. A brief history of GRaSP, and her role in it, followed, concluding with a round of introductions.
- c. Amy Gancarz-Kausch was introduced as the new scientific concerns member, replacing Todd McBride, who is now an administrator and cannot serve.
- d. The latest Semi-Annual Report to the Provost was noted. There was no discussion except the Acting RERC suggested that the IACUC clarify whether there was, indeed, any such thing as an "annual report".

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the Summer 2016 meeting had already been approved by the IACUC members via email in preparation for the Semi-Annual Report to the Provost.

4. OLD BUSINESS:

- a. **Animal Welfare Assurance [AWA] Document.** The circumstances of the creation of this document were explained by Acting RERC. The IACUC members believed that, if it has not been done already, it would be very wise if the RERC would “get it in writing” from the responsible federal officials that the AWA does not need to be submitted at this time in connection with her grant. It was noted that in preparing the AWA document, the RERC worked from the 2003 CSUB IACUC Policy and Procedures document, revising it. This would be a working document to achieve a complete revision, as needed, of the CSUB IACUC Policy and Procedures document. The Acting RERC mentioned that RERC intended to extract this part of the AWA document, add an appropriate title, and provide it to the Committee. It was moved that she do so and that the Committee pursue these revisions when the RERC returns from sabbatical in January 2017. **Germano moved/Troup seconded, 6-0.**

- b. **Renewal of McBride Protocols [98-07, 01-01, 01-04].** The high drama of these renewals was reviewed. A member wondered whether IACUC teaching protocols are being impacted by the shift from quarter to semester academic terms? It seems not. **There was a motion to renew McBride’s protocols without modification. Germano moved/Troup seconded, 6-0.**

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. **Proposed CITI Training to Replace HCUAS.** The Committee was asked to consider replacing the existing, “homemade” Humane Care and Use of Animal Subjects” [HCUAS] with a set of training materials produced by the “Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative” or CITI. This is used by many universities. CSUB already subscribes to the CITI package. Persons not certified would be required to take a basic and then a refresher course every 3 to 5 years. Major advantages over our HCUAS include that CITI: [a] is revised regularly, [b] appears easy to mine for reports, [c] automatically provides evidence of certification and reminder emails for re-training. Some issues would be how to phase out our present HCUAS training, which presently lasts forever, and how long the CITI training would be good before requiring a refresher course. IRB members were asked to do the CITI training and provide feedback to Gwen on content and time requirements. Spring semester 2017 is a goal for adoption.

Discussion followed. How much does it cost? About \$3k per year, but CSUB already pays for CITI in order to cover compliance training requirements associated with NSF and NIH grants.

There was concern about the possible increase in training time with CITI. Acting RERC reported that the RERC supports moving to CITI and that she was prepared to modify the CSUB Institutional Animal Occupational Health and Safety Program as needed to accommodate the shift. Gwen referred members to the packet for information about who would take which “module” or “course”, in particular “Working with the IACUC”. It was suggested that members explore the CITI materials and provide feedback to the IACUC Chair. **There was a motion to “Move forward on possible CITI adoption by sampling the modules and providing feedback to the IACUC Chair, who would summarize and bring updates to the next meeting.” Gancarz-Kausch moved/Troup seconded, 6-0.**

b. Proposed IACUC Closure Letter. In present use is an “impending closure” letter, indicating that authorization will soon end, along with renewal and modification instructions. However, there is no letter that states that authorization for use of animal subjects has ended. This appears to be needed. There were suggested revisions of the draft letter, including several to be adopted from the discussion at the IRB meeting earlier in the day. **There was a motion to implement the proposed IACUC final closure letter, as revised. Germano moved/Troup seconded, 6-0.**

c. Protocol Closures. Formal closure of **Protocol 14-02** was noted. The PI has videotaped the activities carried out under this protocol and will use the videotape going forward.

d. Protocol Renewals

1. Protocol 15-03. There is a request to renew without modification. **Gancarz-Kausch moved/Troup seconded, 6-0.**

2. Protocol 15-04. There is a request to renew without modification. The RERC had not seen the Adverse Event Reports for the two mortalities during surgery. These had been submitted, were produced, and circulated among the Committee members. There was a motion to renewal, **Troup moved/Germano seconded, 5-0 [Gancarz-Kausch abstaining]**

e. Protocol 16-01. Gancarz-Kausch/Psychology. “Plasticity of Addictive Behaviors.” The PI summarized, pointing out that her research background is in biological psychology, particularly addictions using animal models. Her focus is now on neurons of the nucleus accumbens whose activity appears to be facilitated by cocaine. She is collaborating with her thesis advisor, Dietz. The particular focus is on how Activin-mediated neural circuits are involved in cocaine seeking, the intensity of which is defined as the “break point” of responding under progressively greater ratio reinforcement schedules to cocaine reinforcement delivered via catheter. The two critical manipulations involve administration of either chemicals or viruses to alter activity in Activin-mediated neural circuits, as

compared to appropriate controls, which are expected to produce discrete modifications in brain function and cocaine seeking. Discussion followed.

[Q: Question A: Answer C: Comment]

Q: Tell us about the effects of the virus. **A:** It's animal-specific; the effects persist for a few days.

Q: Are there control experiments included? **A:** Yes, sucrose and water reinforcement groups.

Q: Will you be observing other behaviors of the rats in the experimental chambers? **A:** No.

Q: How will the Animal Facility accommodate 360 animals? **A:** There will be far fewer at a time, at most 24.

Q: How will you measure the neural changes, which are hypothesized to mediate the behavioral effects? **A:** This will include cell cultures carried out by the collaborator at the other university.

C: We should have a clear description of the collaborator's role in the protocol.

Q: Could this research lead to better interventions for cocaine addiction? **A:** Yes, gene therapy or other manipulations that would alter neural function in Activin pathways.

Q: What does the virus do? **A:** Ultimately it acts on Activin.

Q: Has the brain morphology been worked out on the virus/gene mechanism? **A:** Yes, there are known effects on dendritic spines.

When there were no more questions, the PI and visitors were invited to leave and the Committee deliberated in executive session. **There was a motion to conditionally approve Protocol 16-01. Germano moved/Gamboia seconded, 6-0.** When the PI returned she was informed of the results. The conditions for authorization were:

1. Please describe the role of the collaborator, Dr. Dietz.
2. Concisely state [in a single paragraph]; [a] the manipulations of the Activin-mediated pathways that will be studied in the proposed research, [b] the anticipated direction of the effects of each manipulation on the Activin-mediated pathways, including how these effects will be measured in the brain, and [c] the anticipated direction of the effects of these manipulations on operant responding under the ratio reinforcement schedules for cocaine reinforcement as compared to the anticipated effects for the control reinforcement conditions. Note that Q12 asks for a summary of "what you propose to do"; the rationale for what you plan to do belongs in the response to Q28.
3. Define the meaning of the "target of interest" phrase used in this section. Define the meaning of the "gene of interest" phrase used in this section. Either explain how " . .

injected with GFP or gene of interest . ." will be carried out or, where this wording is used, refer to the part of the protocol where this is explained.

4. Correct the weight range given for the rats.

AREAS OF CONCERN [none]

ADJOURNMENT: There was a motion to adjourn, Germano moved/Gamboa seconded, 7-0.

[The next inspection of the Animal Facility will be after the November 2016 meeting.]