



April 11, 2024

The Honorable Christi A. Grimm
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Via e-mail: christi.grimm@oig.hhs.gov

Dear Inspector General Grimm:

Thank you in advance for your time. I'm writing on behalf of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals—PETA entities have more than 9 million members and supporters worldwide—regarding the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare's (OLAW) repeated deficient investigations into numerous institutions that appear to violate the Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals ("PHS Policy").

Based on the information presented below, a number of institutions that use animals in experiments have a documented inability to abide by the most fundamental regulations in place that give bare-minimum protections to animals used in laboratories, yet OLAW continues to demonstrate a lack of diligence as a steward of taxpayer-funded oversight of the use of animals in experiments. **We urge you to conduct a thorough investigation into the issues we raise and take all steps necessary to ensure that the program is administered in a way that promotes economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in alignment with your mission.**

This letter sets forth several examples of the lack of appropriate oversight by OLAW in response to serious violations of the PHS Policy. PETA stands ready to provide additional examples and to assist in any other manner, at your request.

OLAW Fails to Properly Investigate 'Critical' Violations at JHU

As an illustration of the problem, PETA recently submitted complaints to OLAW concerning "critical" citations for federal Animal Welfare Act (AWA) violations issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU), yet OLAW failed to apply any sanctions for the corresponding violations of the PHS Policy. Other examples of OLAW's inaction relating to institutions are provided herein.

PEOPLE FOR
THE ETHICAL
TREATMENT
OF ANIMALS

Washington

1536 16th St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202-483-PETA

Los Angeles

2154 W. Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90026
323-644-PETA

Norfolk

501 Front St.
Norfolk, VA 23510
757-622-PETA

Info@peta.org
PETA.org

Entities

- PETA Asia
- PETA India
- PETA France
- PETA Australia
- PETA Germany
- PETA Switzerland
- PETA Netherlands
- PETA Foundation (U.K.)

On April 10, 2023, PETA submitted a complaint to OLAW¹ regarding an incident at JHU concerning a dog who had died after being administered potassium chloride (KCl) via a route that hadn't been outlined in the experimental protocol. A USDA inspector documented this AWA violation in a citation issued to JHU on February 28, 2023.² As a result, OLAW opened "Animal Welfare Assurance #A3272-01, OLAW Case 2Z" and on April 20, 2023, it wrote to JHU requesting a report of the incident, stating, "It is possible that the incident involving potassium chloride administration to a dog should have been reported directly to our office as required by PHS Policy per your commitment to do so in your Animal Welfare Assurance."³

JHU replied to OLAW on May 9, 2023, referencing its February 13, 2023, and March 8, 2023, reports to OLAW and stating in the latter, "The subcommittee voted unanimously that no protocol deviations were apparent but that human error directly contributed to the death of one animal (bolus KCl administration instead of slow infusion to correct cardiac rhythm)."⁴ The corrective actions taken by JHU appear to fail to address the USDA's explicit citation for violating the AWA based on the university's failure to specify the route of KCl administration in the protocol. OLAW's response to JHU on May 16, 2023, stating, "The case will be administratively closed,"⁵ without any directive to correct the issue identified by the USDA, further diminishes the violation cited by the USDA and the life of the dog who died.

A separate complaint to OLAW from PETA, dated November 10, 2022, concerned the death of a rabbit at JHU,⁶ which resulted in a citation from the USDA on September 27, 2022, for a "critical" AWA violation. The violation involved failing to properly monitor and report how ill the rabbit had become after enduring a tumor-implantation surgery. The animal received no veterinary care and had to be euthanized as a result.⁷ OLAW opened an investigation, "Animal Welfare Assurance #A3272-01, OLAW Case 2V," and, in response, JHU submitted a report to OLAW on March 9, 2023, referencing the aforementioned March 8, 2023, final report that JHU said it had sent to OLAW about this matter.⁸ However, this report from JHU pertained to the violation investigated in OLAW Case 2Z, involving the dog discussed above, *not* the violation regarding the rabbit in OLAW Case 2V.

¹Swaminathan S. Complaint to OLAW re dog at JHU. November 10, 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/2023-04-10-complaint-to-olaw-re-jhu-awa-violation-dog.pdf>

²USDA. Inspection report. February 28, 2023. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/2023-02-28-jhu-usda-ir-dog.pdf>

³OLAW. Letter from OLAW to JHU. Case-2Z. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/olaw-to-jhu-case-2z.pdf>

⁴OLAW. Correspondence JHU and OLAW. Case-2Z. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/jhu-to-olaw-case-2z.pdf>

⁵OLAW. OLAW to JHU to close Case-2Z. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/closed-case-2z.pdf>

⁶Swaminathan S. Complaint to OLAW re rabbit at JHU. November 10, 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/2022-11-10-complaint-to-olaw-re-jhu-awa-violations.pdf>

⁷USDA. Inspection report. September 27, 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/2022-09-27-jhu-usda-ir-rabbit.pdf>

⁸OLAW. Correspondence JHU and OLAW. Case-2V. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/case-2v.pdf>

Based on public records that PETA received from NIH, it appears that JHU *did not* send a report to OLAW regarding the incident involving the rabbit, OLAW Case 2V. *Nonetheless, OLAW closed the case, apparently without ensuring that the documents provided by JHU were related to the appropriate species or the facts of the case, given that OLAW issued a memorandum regarding OLAW Case 2V on March 30, 2023, stating, in relevant part, that “[t]he incident [described in PETA’s November 10, 2022 letter] was properly reported to OLAW; therefore, an additional investigation is not required. This case is thereby administratively closed as of this date.”*⁹

It’s deeply concerning that OLAW apparently failed to corroborate that the requested documentation related to the “critical” violations at JHU was accurate and relevant to the respective cases. This reflects an apparent inability to ensure that the most fundamental regulations in place affording bare-minimum protections to animals being used in experiments are enforced and enables institutions like JHU to continue jeopardizing the well-being of animals who are used in or assigned to experiments, without facing any consequences.

JHU’s History of PHS Noncompliance and USDA-Reported Violations and Citations Warrants Enforcement Action by OLAW

OLAW has a history of failing to take action to sanction JHU for apparent PHS Policy violations, including the following:

- Rabbits assigned to NIH-funded traumatic brain injury experiments at JHU¹⁰ experienced postoperative complications after a surgical procedure. The incision on one of the rabbits had burst open at the skull, a second rabbit was found with an infection at the surgical site, and a third was found with neurological issues, which required a “humane endpoint” (i.e., euthanasia).¹¹ Further investigation by the attending veterinarians suggested “poor aseptic technique during surgeries and inadequate monitoring after intervention.”¹² Yet OLAW failed to apply any penalties, simply noting that it “recommends continuing post-approval monitoring to ensure adequacy of the corrective actions.”¹³
- At JHU, between February 7, 2017, and November 8, 2018, 19 dogs were subjected to surgeries during gastroparesis experiments. Nine of them were euthanized due to “unexpected complications,” and the matter was reported to JHU’s Animal Care and Use Committee (ACUC) on January 21, 2019. The protocol was then suspended and the incident was reported to OLAW.¹⁴ OLAW resolved the issue by stating, “The

⁹OLAW. Case-2V.

¹⁰NIH RePORTER. Grant # R01NS113140. Accessed January 11, 2024.

<https://reporter.nih.gov/search/NfsqgXATqkGPZJCvWOpAPg/projects>

¹¹USDA. Inspection report. December 6, 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2022-12-06-jhu-usda-ir-rabbit-baboon.pdf>

¹²JHU and OLAW. Animal Welfare Assurance #A3272-01, OLAW Case 2U. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/2022-12-14-case-2u.pdf>

¹³*Id.*

¹⁴Animal Research Laboratory Overview. Responsive records. Rise for Animals. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/2019-03-27-Case-2I.pdf>

prompt consideration of this matter by Johns Hopkins University was consistent with the philosophy of institutional self-regulation.”¹⁵ However, given that the surgeries began on February 7, 2017, there was documented premature euthanasia as early as “5 days after surgery,” and the matter was not reported to JHU’s ACUC or OLAW until January 2019,¹⁶ it appears the reporting and “consideration” may not have been “prompt.” Furthermore, JHU experimenters published data from the protocol in the *Journal of Neurogastroenterology and Motility* in 2020—long after the protocol had been suspended—and the published study wasn’t retracted until three years later, in 2023.¹⁷

The PHS Policy states, “Compliance with applicable USDA regulations is an absolute requirement of this Policy,”¹⁸ and the USDA has cited JHU for a growing list of other alarming AWA violations.¹⁹ The following are examples of AWA violations at JHU that PETA has also reported to OLAW^{20,21} and for which OLAW has failed to take action^{22, 23}:

- A JHU principal investigator deviated from a protocol approved by the university’s ACUC by failing to provide pigs with analgesia, claiming that recovery from anesthesia was better without the use of analgesics. JHU veterinary staff were also not consulted on this matter.²⁴
- A pig used in a JHU cardiac experiment had a difficult recovery from anesthesia and was later found to be severely injured. A subsequent necropsy revealed that this animal had sustained two broken elbows, which occurred while the pig was being moved from a transport cage to another location. A JHU senior laboratory technician failed to report the injuries to the university’s veterinary staff.²⁵
- A JHU laboratory displayed a significant lack of aseptic technique and failed to maintain a sterile workspace—nearly 50% of cranial implants embedded in rhesus macaques by one JHU experimenter resulted in contamination and chronic antibiotic-resistant infections in these monkeys. As a result, the experimenter euthanized the animals.²⁶

¹⁵*Id.*

¹⁶*Id.*

¹⁷Kim HJ. RETRACTION NOTICE [retraction of: *J Neurogastroenterol Motil.* 26:147.]. *J Neurogastroenterol Motil.* 2023;29(2):266. doi:10.5056/jnm19101R

¹⁸OLAW. PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://olaw.nih.gov/policies-laws/phs-policy.htm#AnimalWelfareAssurance>

¹⁹PETA. USDA finds agony for monkeys at Johns Hopkins. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://headlines.peta.org/photos-violations-agony-monkeys-johns-hopkins/#violations>

²⁰Swaminathan S. Complaint to OLAW re JHU. October 12, 2021. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/OLAW-complaint-re-JHU-USDA-violations.pdf>

²¹Swaminathan S. Complaint to OLAW re JHU. January 13, 2023. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2023-01-13-complaint-to-olaw-re-jhu.pdf>

²²OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 2O. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/2022-02-14-case-report.pdf> (Pages 1-3)

²³OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 2W. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://c/www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/olaw-to-jhu-case-2w.pdf>

²⁴USDA. Inspection report. August 23, 2021. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/210823-jhu-ir-pig-monkeys.pdf>

²⁵*Id.*

²⁶*Id.*

- Experimenters in JHU’s Traylor Laboratory used compounds during experiments on rabbits in 2021 that had expired several years earlier. Two bottles of heparin—one that had expired in 2017 and the other in 2018—and one bottle of sodium chloride that had expired in 2019 were used in these experiments.²⁷
- A female baboon at JHU appeared to have a sizeable wound on her left heel, likely resulting in significant discomfort. Even though laboratory staff noticed “bilateral pressure ulcers” on her heels, they failed to report this condition to veterinary staff until a scheduled inspection later. A veterinarian subsequently noticed ulceration on both of the baboon’s hind feet.²⁸ Failure to provide timely, necessary veterinary care may have caused prolonged, needless pain and suffering. OLAW’s reply to JHU seemingly disregards the importance of timely reporting of an animal’s health to veterinary staff as appropriate care. OLAW stated, “[T]he USDA citation was issued regarding failure to report the problem to RAR [Research Animal Resources] veterinary staff in timely manner and seek treatment recommendations, and not for inappropriate care of the animal.”²⁹

USDA Sanctions JHU Following PETA Complaint

Following OLAW’s failure to take action against JHU in light of the various AWA violations presented by PETA, we filed a complaint with the USDA on May 5, 2023, outlining JHU’s track record, including the institution’s PHS Policy noncompliance, which appears to violate the AWA, as well as its other USDA-reported AWA violations and citations.³⁰ Following our complaint, on November 11, 2023, the USDA issued a “Citation and Notification of Penalty” to JHU, stating, “We believe that you violated the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. § 2131 et seq.),” and levied a fine of \$12,300 for various alleged violations of the AWA.³¹ In addition to the incidents that PETA had reported to OLAW, the USDA also cited JHU for violating 9 C.F.R. § 3.80(a)(2)(ii) on June 16, 2021. According to the citation notification, a macaque had been found dead and entrapped in an enclosure due to the improper positioning of a clasp.³² Furthermore, on July 31, 2021, JHU reportedly violated 9 C.F.R. § 2.131(b)(1) by failing to securely latch an enclosure, resulting in the escape of 10 rhesus macaques. One young macaque was later found dead in a drain.³³

OLAW Fails to Prevent Repeat Negligence at Other NIH-Funded Institutions

Federal case reports from 2020 to 2023 document *five* separate incidents at the University of Wisconsin–Madison (UW-Madison) in which mice were found without food or water,

²⁷*Id.*

²⁸USDA. Inspection report. December 6, 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2022-12-06-jhu-usda-ir-rabbit-baboon.pdf>

²⁹OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 2W. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://c/www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/olaw-to-jhu-case-2w.pdf> (Page 2)

³⁰Swaminathan S. Complaint to USDA re JHU. PETA. May 5, 2023. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/2023-05-11-usda-complaint-re-jhu-phs-violations.pdf>

³¹USDA. Citation and notification of penalty. November 11, 2023. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/2023-11-01-jhu-settlement-w-usda-12300.pdf>

³²*Id.*

³³*Id.*

resulting in agonizing deaths in some cases.^{34,35,36,37,38} In each case, the university assured OLAW that it had retrained employees to prevent the recurrence of such incidents, and each time, OLAW accepted this assurance. By failing to insist that the university implement additional measures to prevent recurrence of such incidents, OLAW enabled future incidents at UW-Madison in which mice died of starvation or dehydration.

In *more than 30* separate incidents between January 2020 and May 2022 at the University of Pittsburgh, mice were found without food or water, causing distressing deaths.^{39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50} In one incident, three cages confining eight adult mice were found without access to food.⁵¹ Seven of the mice were dead upon discovery, and the eighth mouse was in such poor condition that they had to be euthanized. For all these incidents, OLAW accepted the inadequate remedial actions taken by the university, which enabled further incidents of such extreme neglect that animals died by starvation and dehydration, further demonstrating that OLAW has completely failed at deterring repeat incidents of callous negligence.

³⁴OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 10C. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-10C.pdf>

³⁵OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 10J. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-10J.pdf>

³⁶OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 11N. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-11n.pdf>

³⁷OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 11S. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-11s.pdf>

³⁸OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 12M. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-12m.pdf>

³⁹OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 8T. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-8T.pdf>

⁴⁰OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 8Q. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2020-02-13-Case-8Q.pdf>

⁴¹OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 8Q. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2021-07-09-case-8q.pdf>

⁴²OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 8Q. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2020-10-09-case-8q.pdf>

⁴³OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 8W. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-8W.pdf>

⁴⁴OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 8W. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-8Y.pdf>

⁴⁵OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9M. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9m.pdf>

⁴⁶OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9N. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9n.pdf>

⁴⁷OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9P. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9p.pdf>

⁴⁸OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9Q. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9q.pdf>

⁴⁹OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9S. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9s.pdf>

⁵⁰OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9W. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9w.pdf>

⁵¹OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 9P. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/case-9p.pdf>

Two case reports dated June 30, 2020, and September 29, 2020, respectively, document three incidents at the University of California–Los Angeles (UCLA) wherein live mice and rats who had been improperly euthanized were placed in the freezer intended for dead rats.^{52,53} The mice and rats were gassed with carbon dioxide, which was to be followed by a secondary method of killing to ensure that the animals were dead before their bodies were placed in this freezer. However, staff failed to perform this secondary method and, as a result, on multiple occasions, live animals were found in the freezer with dead animals.^{54, 55} This likely caused prolonged distress and pain. OLAW’s failed oversight, as documented in its responses to the university,^{56, 57} presents another egregious example of its failure to deter institutions from violating bare-minimum animal welfare standards.

OLAW Fails to Adequately Investigate PHS Violations at Other NIH-Funded Institutions

OLAW’s recurring incompetence in enforcing the most basic protections for animals used in experimentation is evident over its years of failing to take action and hold institutions accountable for jeopardizing the well-being of the animals in their facilities.

Below are just a few examples:

- In October 2021, PETA wrote to the secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra, outlining systemic and egregious problems at the Washington National Primate Research Center (WaNPRC). The letter highlighted, among other things, biosecurity concerns and appalling death rates among infant monkeys.⁵⁸ This complaint was referred to OLAW’s director, Patricia Brown.⁵⁹ OLAW’s subpar investigation consisted only of asking WaNPRC about its standard operating procedures (SOPs) and practices—and then using these SOPs to incorrectly claim that at WaNPRC, “there is no evidence of animal welfare concerns or noncompliance with the PHS Policy.”⁶⁰
- Following an investigation of laboratories at the Cleveland Clinic, PETA filed a formal complaint with OLAW in May 2020, alleging noncompliance with the PHS Policy at the facility. PETA’s complaint documented, including on video, specific incidents in which animals were harmed due to Cleveland Clinic’s failure to comply

⁵²OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 6I. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-6I.pdf>

⁵³OLAW. Responsive records. Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 6J. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Case-6J.pdf>

⁵⁴Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 6I. Pages 2, 3, 5.

⁵⁵Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 6J. Pages 3, 4, 5.

⁵⁶Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 6I. Page 1.

⁵⁷Correspondence regarding OLAW Case 6J. Page 1.

⁵⁸Guillermo K. Letter to HHS. PETA. October 5, 2021. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/2021-10-05-peta-to-hhs.pdf>

⁵⁹OLAW and PETA. E-mail sub: Response to concerns. Accessed March 20, 2024.

https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/email-peta-olaw-re-wanprc_Redacted.pdf

⁶⁰Brown P. Reply to PETA re WaNPRC. OLAW. January 5, 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/response-from-olaw-re-WaNPRC.pdf>

with federal animal welfare guidelines.⁶¹ In response, OLAW conducted an “investigation” that involved reviewing background materials and merely questioning the Cleveland Clinic about the incidents. When the institution responded with a recitation of its SOPs,⁶² OLAW considered the case closed.⁶³

- In September 2020, PETA submitted a formal complaint to OLAW based on PETA’s investigation inside Wisconsin National Primate Research Center laboratories. The complaint presented detailed evidence, including video footage, of suffering endured by monkeys in the facility.⁶⁴ OLAW’s commonplace “investigation” involved requesting certain information from the institution and largely accepting its recitation of SOPs as an adequate response.⁶⁵
- In 2017, a whistleblower working at The Jackson Laboratory in Bar Harbor, Maine, contacted PETA with detailed information about specific incidents in which animals at the facility suffered and died due to noncompliance with PHS Policy. PETA wrote to OLAW about the matter⁶⁶ and, as in the cases cited above, OLAW’s response involved asking questions of The Jackson Laboratory—but taking the institution at its word that the whistleblower’s allegations could not be substantiated.⁶⁷

The Public Trust in Taxpayer-Funded Research Depends on Proper Oversight

In 1985, members of Congress from both sides of the aisle worked together to strengthen protections for animals in laboratories in order to address deep-seated ethical concerns held by the American public regarding the use of animals in experiments. Polling by the Pew Research Center found that more than 50% of U.S. adults oppose the use of animals in experiments,⁶⁸ and other surveys suggest that the support of the shrinking group that continues to accept animal experimentation is contingent on the existence and enforcement of stringent regulations aimed at protecting animals.⁶⁹

⁶¹Chandna A. Complaint to OLAW re Cleveland Clinic. PETA. May 7, 2020. Accessed March 20, 2024. https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/CCLCM_Complaint-to-OLAW-May-7-2020_REDACTED.pdf

⁶²OLAW. Responsive records: OLAW investigation of Cleveland Clinic. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/olaw-investigation-of-cleveland-clinic.pdf>

⁶³Morse B. Response to PETA. OLAW. December 21, 2020. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/response-from-olaw-re-cleveland-clinic.pdf>

⁶⁴Chandna A. Complaint to OLAW re WNPRC. PETA. September 2, 2020. Accessed March 20, 2024.

https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/WNPRC_Complaint-from-PETA-to-OLAW-September-2-2020_REDACTED.pdf

⁶⁵OLAW. Correspondence with UW-Madison and OLAW re case 10K. Accessed March 20, 2024.

<https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/2021-03-09-Case-10K.pdf>

⁶⁶Taylor I. Complaint to OLAW re The Jackson Laboratory. PETA. March 2, 2017. Accessed March 20, 2024. https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/JAX_Complaint-to-OLAW.pdf

⁶⁷Wolff A. Response to PETA. OLAW. April 7, 2017. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/olaw-response-re-jax-complaint.pdf>

⁶⁸Strauss M. Americans are divided over the use of animals in scientific research. Pew Research Center. August 16, 2018. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/08/16/americans-are-divided-over-the-use-of-animals-in-scientific-research/>

⁶⁹Ormandy EH, Schuppli CA. Public attitudes toward animal research: A review. *Animals* (Basel). 2014;4(3):391-408. June 30, 2014. doi:10.3390/ani4030391


In FY 2022, JHU received \$839,852,301 from NIH, and it has received \$842,956,584 from the agency in FY 2023.^{70,71} According to NIH, an estimated 47% of its funds support projects that involve experiments on animals.⁷² Institutions like JHU and others that receive funding from PHS agencies such as NIH are required to comply with the PHS Policy. Failure to do so violates not only federal animal welfare guidelines and policies but also public expectations that facilities receiving tax dollars to experiment on animals—who are capable of experiencing pain, distress, love, and companionship and value their lives just as we value ours—should at least observe minimal animal welfare standards.

As demonstrated by the aforementioned evidence, the system of animal laboratory oversight by OLAW is broken and fails to address the culture of noncompliance with the PHS Policy by JHU and other NIH-funded institutions.

Thank you for considering our request for an investigation into this troubling matter. You can contact me at ShriyaS@peta.org.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely yours,



Shriya Swaminathan
Science Policy Advisor, International Laboratory Methods
Laboratory Investigations Department

cc: Brent C. Morse, D.V.M., Director, Division of Compliance Oversight
OLAW, NIH (MorseB@mail.nih.gov)
Patricia Brown, V.M.D., M.S., DAFLAM, Director, OLAW, NIH
(brownp@od.nih.gov)

⁷⁰NIH. NIH awards by location & organization. JHU. Fiscal Year 2022. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://report.nih.gov/award/index.cfm?ot=&fy=2022&state=&ic=&fm=&orgid=4134401&distr=&rfa=&om=n&pid=&view=state>

⁷¹NIH. NIH awards by location & organization. JHU. Fiscal Year 2023. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://report.nih.gov/award/index.cfm?ot=&fy=2023&state=&ic=&fm=&orgid=4134401&distr=&rfa=&om=y&pid=&view=state>

⁷²National Library of Medicine. 3. Emerging legal trends impacting animal research. Accessed March 20, 2024. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK100123/>