

Biohazard Committee Meeting Minutes

Time: 10:30 – 11:00 A.M.

Date: March 22, 2006

Place: Ag. Biotech 101

Agenda:

1. Review of Alexander MUA. The committee members present recommended that Alex revise his MUA to include the supplemental information that he has provided.
2. The committee would like additional clarification regarding the immune response to the antigen used. This information should appear within the body of the abstract portion of the MUA.
3. The committee recommended that since the AIMV is transmissible by aphids, mechanical transmission, and via seed or pollen, it might be a good idea to isolate the infected plants to minimize the chance of transmission or escape from the greenhouse.
4. The committee raised concerns about the security of the Greenhouse, particularly during the day time hours when it is very easy to gain access to the greenhouse, the individual bays within the greenhouse, the growth chambers and possibly other locations in the greenhouse. Holly will draft a memo to the PSES Department Head to address this issue.
5. There were not enough voting members present to vote on Alex's MUA.

Biosafety Committee Meeting
1/11/2006

Items of business:

A. MUA titled : Predicting success of genome placement of a herbicide resistance gene to minimize movement of the gene wheat to jointed goatgrass.

The committee voted to accept the MUA contingent after provided more specific information regarding

1. The names of the E. coli isolates and strains that are subject to this study need to be included in Section C.
2. The potential harm for each and every isolate and strain, or groups of isolates and strains, needs to be included in section C.
3. Just because they do not grow large quantities of potentially pathogenic organisms, the potential harm by the organisms is not reduced. In the case of enterohemorrhagic E. coli, only 1-5 cells can make many individuals sick. I would like to see the study being conducted with strains with sufficient amount of characterization.
4. The committee would like more specific information regarding the safety training that will be provided to laboratory personnel and students.
5. The committee wanted to know if open bench top techniques were to be used throughout the course of this work. They felt that it would be better to use biological safety cabinets.
6. This question is related to point number 3 in the list what is meant by small amount?
7. Students need to be advised on the precautions to take when handling O157. Exact procedures should be outlined
8. In Part F. of the MUA, what plasmids are going to be used?
9. Are you sure about shipping strategy?
10. What happens if lab personnel do not follow your guidelines and rules?
11. Do you have a way of verifying that personnel have been trained?

12. EHS offers Basic biosafety for laboratory personnel class that can address the general aspects of biosafety, while the PI can speak to the protocol specific training that is required.

B. MUA submitted by Scott

The committee voted to approve Scott's MUA.

1. Discussion regarding protocols in the BSL-3 Lab.

The committee asked if more than one protocol be allowed to run in the BSL-3 at the same time, and how will this be coordinated? At one time a BSL-3 Oversight Committee existed, and these were the types of issues that they handled. The committee membership has shrunk. It was decided that Holly and Fred would talk to Greg about bringing the BSL-3 Oversight committee back on line to deal with various BSL-3 related issues.

Biosafety Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: September 1, 2004

Location: Wellspring Room of the Idaho Commons

Members in attendance: Wesley Chun, Andrzej Paszczynski, Allan Caplan, Fred Hutchison, and Holly Gates-Mayer.

Members absent: Gulhan Yuksel, James Lorenzen, Bob Jahns, and Francisco Saavedra

Topics of Discussion:

I. Guy Knudsen's MUA—

A. There were several issues regarding Dr. Knudsen's MUA:

The committee would like to see clear separation of the different activities proposed in the abstract and specific descriptions of the actual work involved with each activity.

B.

Biosafety Committee Meeting
1/11/2006

Items of business:

A. MUA titled : Predicting success of genome placement of a herbicide resistance gene to minimize submitted by

The committee raised the following points or concerns:

1. The names of the E. coli isolates and strains that are subject to this study need to be included in Section C.
2. The potential harm for each and every isolate and strain, or groups of isolates and strains, needs to be included in section C.
3. Just because they do not grow large quantities of potentially pathogenic organisms, the potential harm by the organisms is not reduced. In the case of enterohemorrhagic E. coli, only 1-5 cells can make many individuals sick. I would like to see the study being conducted with strains with sufficient amount of characterization.
4. The committee would like more specific information regarding the safety training that will be provided to laboratory personnel and students.
5. The committee wanted to know if open bench top techniques were to be used throughout the course of this work. They felt that it would be better to use biological safety cabinets.
6. This question is related to point number 3 in the list what is meant by small amount?
7. Students need to be advised on the precautions to take when handling O157. Exact procedures should be outlined
8. In Part F. of the MUA, what plasmids are going to be used?
9. Are you sure about shipping strategy?
10. What happens if lab personnel do not follow your guidelines and rules?
11. Do you have a way of verifying that personnel have been trained?
12. EHS offers Basic biosafety for laboratory personnel class that can address the general aspects of biosafety, while the PI can speak to the protocol specific training that is required.

B. MUA submitted by Scott

The committee voted to approve Scott's MUA.

1. Discussion regarding protocols in the BSL-3 Lab.

The committee asked if more than one protocol be allowed to run in the BSL-3 at the same time, and how will this be coordinated? At one time a BSL-3 Oversight Committee existed, and these were the types of issues that they handled. The committee membership has shrunk. It was decided that Holly and Fred would talk to Greg about bringing the BSL-3 Oversight committee back on line to deal with various BSL-3 related issues.

Nw;fi)lvjoW
MMiAQ~±“|;4YV\$DBE
IHc;z%
Canon S900
6Times New Roman Regular
Gulhan
Gulhan
Yukesel
Yukesel
Lorenzen
Lorenzen
Hutchison
Hutchison
Ingerman
Ingerman
BioDefense

BioDefense

bioterrorism
bioterrorism
immunostimulated
immunostimulated
Psuedomallei
Psuedomallei
Saavedra
Saavedra
Bratspies
Bratspies
July 25,
2003-

Joint Meeting of the University of Idaho Animal Care and Use Committee

and the University of Idaho Biosafety Committee. U

Purpose U

: Discuss concerns regarding the recent research proposal submitted by Carolyn Bohach, Greg-

Title of

Research: U

Development and Assessment of Novel BioDefense Vaccine Technologies.-

Copies

of the Protocol distributed to everyone. Copies of the MUA distributed to the Biosafety-

committee. This research project was designed in response to the government's request for assistance-

in developing vaccines to counteract bioterrorism agents.-

The meeting was initiated in response to an inspection of existing facilities in LARF (Lab Animal Research Facility) that led to questions about where certain aspects of the research protocol were going to take place. The conclusion was that the animals involved in the project would be immunized and immunostimulated in LARF and that they would be challenged by the agents in the ABSL3 (Biosafety Level 3)

laboratory. There was some question about the actual duration of each trial. Each trial would last between 4-30 days, with 30 days being the absolute maximum. The plan is to have very few animals under going a trial at any one time. The estimated number of animals per trial is 8-16. Each chamber/micro isolator chamber can hold approximately 8 animals (mice). Discussion of good lab practices and the need for training for all of those who will be approved to enter the ABSL3 facility to work on this project, yielded agreement that training was absolutely required and those who will be involved in this protocol will receive the required training, provided by both the API

Environmental Health and Safety Office. Environmental Health and Safety will smoke test the Biological Safety cabinets that will contain the micro isolator cages and the mechanism to be used to expose the test animals to the agents to ascertain containment. The proposed setup at this time is to have one biosafety cabinet for housing the animals and the exposure chamber. The other biosafety cabinet will be used for other activities and essentially function as the

cabinet. The other issue discussed was how the animals would be cared for and who would be conducting those activities. It was determined that it would probably be the responsibility of Mike and Marilyn to take care of the animal husbandry issues. This will necessitate appropriate training for each of them with regard to working in the ABSL3 lab as well as approval to work around the agents involved. The other issue that needs to be addressed is the amendment of the registration to include

B. Pseudomallei.

The Animal Care and Use Committee will meet again to discuss issues that

—
are specific to their requirements. —