Step 3: Second Level Unit Review and Ranking (Deans/Directors/Department Heads)
Using the Program review results posted on the Prioritization Process webpage, please complete the below
information and submit to ovcafo@hawaii.edu as a word doc or pdf file by **March 15, 2009**. Please ensure the
e-mail subject heading reflects the Department/School/College name followed by “Second Level Review.” For
example: SOEST – Second Level Review.

Department/School/College: ______Laboratory Animal Service (LAS)

The department would fall under which of the following Vice Chancellor’s offices?

___ Academic Affairs  
**X** Research and Graduate Education  
___ Student Services  
___ Administration, Finance, and Operations

Advisory Committee Members (list names and titles):
Dr. Douglas Vincent, Special Director Grants and Contracts, CTAHR  
Dr. Marilyn Dunlap, Interim Director, Pacific Biomedical Research Center  
Dr. James O. Stevens, University Veterinarian, University of Colorado Denver  
Dr. Scott Lozanoff, Professor and Chair, Anatomy, Biochemistry & Physiology Department
Administrative Unit (e.g. College) Prioritization Summary

This form is to be used to provide a summary of Program priorities within an administrative unit (e.g. college). Please list each Program identified in the Summary Matrix forms and Optional Guides in a priority category. This Prioritization Summary form should be forwarded, along with all self-review materials, to ovcafo@hawaii.edu for posting on the Prioritization Process webpage by March 15th for the next level of review to take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New/In Transition</th>
<th>Target for Growth or Investment</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Reorganize/Restructure/Merge/Consolidate</th>
<th>Reduce in Size or Scope</th>
<th>Phase Out Close Eliminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations of the Animal Biomedical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-wide Vertebrate Animal Care &amp; Use Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief Summary (no more than 2 pages)
Please include a brief narrative with an overview of the rationale for placement of the components on the Prioritization Summary form and any supportive or explanatory text or data that will assist higher levels of review in determining the relative priority of each Program. You may wish to comment on the Program self-reviews.

Program 1: Operations of the Animal Biomedical Facilities is a target for growth of investment. Program 1 is a subset of the System-wide animal care and use Program 2 described below, representing 23.4% of the facilities that are reviewed by the IACUC, 56.5% of the protocols reviewed by the IACUC, and 40% of contracts and grants involving vertebrate animals. It provided the infrastructure to support $10-million dollars in animal biomedical research, in support of an average daily census of 6,000 animals, in Fiscal Year 08 (FY08). There has been a steady upward trend over the past decade in this area. It is mission critical for researchers to have facilities to house and use animals that meet regulatory requirements, as well as operated efficiently by properly trained and experienced staff. The Biomedical Sciences Building (Biomed) on the Manoa campus was built in 1971 and is in need of major renovations. In particular the current cage wash facility has not been improved since 1989, and is plagued with unsafe conditions for its workers, and equipment that is regularly in need of repair due to age and constant use. The majority of the Manoa facilities use old technology which decreases the efficiency of operations, and is plagued by boiler and elevator deficiencies, not to mention regularly scheduled power outages. It is best to replace the obsolete animal facility in Biomed because dollar for dollar on a square footage basis, replacement may be more cost effective then attempting to renovate it. This lesson was brought home during our last unsuccessful attempt to renovate the Biomed cage wash facility. What began as LAS being awarded a much coveted NIH grant of $698,236 to renovate the cage wash facility, turned into a $1.85-million dollar fiasco (Construction bid $1.498,400, Fixed Equipment $200,000, ...
Design/Consulting Costs $154,000). The existing boiler in Biomed which runs the current cage wash facility is 38 years old and often down or in need of repair. Both the Manoa and Kakaako facilities require very complex and specialized air handling systems, adequate steam to run their cage wash equipment, lighting systems, security, biocontainment to protect their valuable research animals as well as to ensure that potential hazards are not released into the environment, caging systems which sometimes require additional filtration, etc. These items require constant upkeep and replacement on a regular schedule to remain in regulatory compliance and to provide environments that are conducive for the research endeavors. Regulatory requirements have steadily increased over the years, many involving biosafety concerns in vertebrate animals, including but not limited to: NIH Appendix Q involving transgenic animals, tracking of animal numbers from acquisition to disposal, chemical dosing policies in animals, IACUC policies, etc. In addition, research projects are becoming much more complex requiring a higher level of care to ensure proper containment, as well as increased oversight for animal welfare concerns. These require training of researchers and animal care staff to remain in compliance with regulatory requirements. The care staff and veterinarians are constantly vigilant, and the first line of defense to ensure that research is being conducted in compliance with these requirements. The Program is overseen by two Federal agencies and by the State Department of Agriculture (DOA). The USDA and DOA do a physical inspection at least annually. A written review of documents by the Public Health Service (PHS) Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) provided by the IACUC, which has oversight responsibility for the Program, is conducted at least semi-annually for facilities in Programs 1 and 2. Failure to remain in compliance could result in loss or suspension of extramural contracts and grants to the UH, fines, citations, closure of facilities, and negative publicity to the institution.

Finally, re-accreditation of Program 1, by the Association for Assesment and Accreditation for Laboratory Animal Care, International (AAALAC) should be the goal of the UH. Accreditation establishes that the institution has achieved the highest standards for animal care and use, and opens up avenues to other funding agencies, e.g. Department of Defense (DOD), which presently does not fund non-accredited Programs.

Properly maintained animal facilities and trained and experienced staff to provide care and oversight of the animal biomedical research is an expensive venture. It is difficult to place the financial burden for maintaining these components of the Program solely upon the researchers. Doing so, would make the researcher’s per diem expenses so high that they will not be competitive with their peers nationwide. Most institutions nationwide provide subsidies for their animal care operations. It will require a partnership from UH Administration to provide adequate subsidies to contain costs for the researchers and to support much needed facilities improvements and maintenance. LAS for its part will continue to apply for grants for facilities improvement, if it can be assured of support from Administration. LAS was awarded an NIH facilities improvement grant for $700,000 in 2002, as described above. However most of the funds were returned to NIH in 2007 because UH did not receive a no cost extension past the end date for the grant to complete the project due to budget overruns and design concerns. The Program will also need budgets from Administration to ensure that it retains its trained and experienced staff that provide the oversight and care required for animal biomedical facilities. The subsidies would also be critical to assist the researchers to subsidize the costs of maintaining and operating the animal facilities. More staff is needed if the UH commits to expanding its animal biomedical and neuroscience activities by increasing the numbers of researchers at JABSOM, and engaging in the proposed Cancer Research Institute and the Pacific Regional Biocontainment Laboratory.

Program 2: **System-wide Vertebrate Animal Care & Use Program** is a target for growth of investment and for reorganization. The Program provided the infrastructure to support $25.3-million dollars in contracts and grants involving vertebrate animals in FY08, and currently provides oversight for approximately 47 facilities housing or using animals system-wide. This Program is also **mission critical** as it is required by Federal law in order for UH to be eligible to receive Federal grants and contracts involving vertebrate animals. Despite the steady upward trend in the past decade for use of the services provided by this Program, the **critical mass for staffing** has not increased in proportion. This leaves the UH vulnerable to loss or suspension of extramural contracts and grants involving vertebrate animals, fines, citations, closure of facilities, and negative publicity to the institution. If it were not for the current efforts of its small dedicated staff, the Program would not be as effective and successful as it has been in keeping the institution in compliance with Federal, State and Local regulatory requirements. The present staff (2 Compliance Officers, 2 shared Veterinarians who have concurrent duties for Program 1, and two shared Fiscal Officers who have concurrent responsibilities for Program 1) are stretched thin within their current capacities. The Compliance Officers and the Veterinarians annually review an average of 350 Institutional Animal Care and Use (IACUC) protocols, and inspect approximately 47 facilities on the average every 3-6 months, investigate IACUC concerns with the Program, and interface with the PIs on their animal care and use inquiries. One Compliance Officer and one of the Fiscal Officers administers the electronic protocol and census management software Program (Topaz), serving as co-Systems Administrators and providing basic technical and IT assistance to the user groups. One of the Fiscal Officers, maintains the budgets for the Compliance Office and UH IACUC, and processes travel and procurement documents for the Program. LAS has been lobbying Administration for at least five years for one more compliance officer to provide post-approval monitoring. This is especially critical to ensure compliance at sites outside of the biomedical facilities which are only reviewed at the most every three months. In addition, there are several animal users on the Island of Hawaii (some Manoa and some UH Hilo) that continue to expand in number and complexity and also require regulatory oversight as part of the Federal mandate. We have
been reliant upon an honor system in the past, but a new federal mandate to assure regulatory compliance must be achieved. In 2007 and 2008 annual inspection reports of the Program by the USDA has repeatedly recommended at least one post-approval monitoring person to be added to the Program. Continued failure to comply could result in penalties to the UH.

Currently there is an urgent need driven by regulations and funds toward centralization of the non-traditional animal care and use facilities which have multiplied across campus over the years. Centralizing would greatly reduce the number of sites overseen by the Compliance staff, IACUC, and Veterinarians, with greater assurance of compliance as these sites can be better monitored.

The Compliance component of Program 2 should also be reorganized to report directly to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and/or the Vice President for Research. Laboratory Animal Service (LAS) made its first attempt in 1995 to reorganize this portion of the Program, but was stopped short by the cumbersome administrative process. This would negate any conflict of interest between the Director of LAS and the Compliance Officers who are organized under this department. Though both Programs appear on the same organizational chart, in reality the Director for LAS and the Compliance Office have been reporting independently of each other to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research. If reorganized, there will still be a need for the veterinarians and fiscal support to be involved in compliance functions for the system-wide Program. A third veterinarian needs to be hired. The three veterinarians can provide better oversight of both Programs 1 and 2. In addition, the two Fiscal officers assigned to Program 1 could allot some of their time, as they already are, to assist with Program 2. The reorganization will take further thought as a number of functions and budgets overlap between the two Programs.