State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry

Institutional Biosafety Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Oct 7, 2025

Location: Microsoft Teams

In Attendance:

Committee Members in Attendance:

Names	Names	Names
☒ Hyatt Green	☐ Geoff Holm	
☒ Brian Leydet	☒ Emily Ledgerwood	
☒ Andrew Newhouse	☒ Paul Massa	
☐ Peter Vandemark		

Also in Attendance:

Names	Names	Names
☒ Tiffany Castor	☒ Shannon Richter	

Called to order at 1:00pm

Old Business: NA

New Business:

1. No new applications to review
2. Updates at the federal level regarding biosafety regulation
    a. Meeting Minutes
        i. It is now mandatory to post committee meeting minutes on the official website.
        ii. Full transcription of meetings is not required. IBC may opt to use AI-generated summaries instead.
        iii. This process must carefully balance transparency with the protection of reviewers.
        iv. Content deemed protected may be redacted, but publicly accessible information must remain available.
        v. Principal Investigators (PIs) must be identified in some cases.
        vi. NIH has clarified that reviewer comments do not need to be attributed to individuals.
        vii. Moving forward, all researcher names, including those of PIs, will be redacted. **Action item:** Follow-up is planned to clarify this issue.
        viii. Meetings will not be recorded. **Action item:** Follow-up is planned to clarify this issue.
3. Comments on revised IBC Policies and Procedures document
    a. Section 3.1.1: Federal Mandate
        i. Concerns were raised about the clarity of language regarding how Principal Investigators (PIs) should determine whether a technique poses a safety risk to end users.
        ii. It was emphasized that the definition is intentionally broad to promote campus-wide awareness, but ultimately, the responsibility for risk identification lies with the PI. More detailed guidance is available elsewhere in the manual.
        iii. Suggestions were made and adopted to rephrase the definition to emphasize techniques that "may" pose risks, though caution was advised to avoid unnecessary complexity.

iv. The committee reaffirmed that PIs are responsible for conducting thorough risk assessments and should engage deeply with NIH guidelines, revising assessments as needed.

b. Section 3.2: Limitations and Importance of The NIH and CDC Guidelines
   i. A concern was raised about the phrasing related to permits for non-native species, questioning why the language specifically targets non-native species when it appears in multiple sections.
   ii. Suggested that "non-native" simply be removed here and throughout. Suggested change adopted.

c. Section 4.1.5. Prohibition of RG3 & RG4 Activities
   i. **Action Item:** Changes to document, maybe here or elsewhere, to account for unexpected discovery of organisms in laboratories with insufficient containment procedures are needed.
   ii. Noted that this IBC may not have the expertise to properly review and approve procedures intended to contain RG3 or higher organisms.

d. Section 4.1.8. Training Requirements
   i. Section has undergone significant revision
   ii. Discussion regarding which training should be required.
      1. It was resolved that anyone working in a laboratory on campus take the Basic Laboratory Safety Training offered by ESF EHS.
      2. It was resolved that anyone working with biohazardous agents acceptable for BSL-1 containment on campus must also take the *Basic Introduction to Biosafety* training available in CITI.
      3. It was resolved that anyone working with biohazardous agents requiring BSL-2 containment on campus must also take the *Initial Biosafety* training available in CITI to be refreshed every two years with the *Biosafety Retraining*.
      4. **Action Item:** More investigation into other trainings available via CITI will be conducted before making them mandatory for specific activities.

e. Section 4.2.4.1 Application Review Process
   i. Noted that applications needing revision could just go back to the IBC chair instead of a designated committee member as written.

f. A modified version of the manual will be circulated for feedback. A vote on the updated manual will be scheduled.

4. Application and Training Administration
   a. Transition to PACs (digital system) will change procedures faculty will follow for IBC application and verification of training. IRBNet another option.
   b. Number of Application Review Requests
      i. Since February, only 2–3 applications have been submitted, all from the same Principal Investigator.
      ii. Campus-wide notifications were sent recently, but only a few individuals have responded. The need for researchers to register with the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) was emphasized in the message.
   c. The group agreed on the need for a mainstream process for training and documentation, with the research office serving as a central resource. Information should flow from the research office to the IBC. **Action Item:** Revisit training distribution procedure with an intent to streamline.
   d. **Action Item:** Follow up with IACUC Chair to determine which training is required for IACUC and how that's handled.
5. Duration of Approved Protocols
   a. A five-year approval term with annual reporting was adopted as a more practical and efficient policy aligning with practices at other institutions.
6. Next IBC Meeting
   a. Action Item: Another committee meeting will need to be scheduled in the spring.

Adjournment 2:00pm