Published in final edited form as:

J Vet Behav. 2017 ; 21: 53–58. doi:10.1016/j.jveb.2017.07.008.

An evaluation of current working canine decontamination procedures and methods for improvement

Erin Venable^{*,1}, Dakota Discepolo¹, Ellie Powell¹, and Stephen Y. Liang²

¹Southern Illinois University, Department of Animal Science, Food & Nutrition, 1205 Lincoln Drive, Carbondale, IL 62901

²Washington University School of Medicine, Divisions of Emergency Medicine and Infectious Diseases, 4523 Clayton Avenue, Campus Box 8051, St. Louis, Missouri 63110

INTRODUCTION

Working canines are frequently deployed into contaminated environments as part of search, rescue, and recovery operations (Fox et al., 2008, Otto et al., 2010, Slensky et al., 2004). Compromised infrastructure and sanitation can expose canine responders to a wide range of chemical, biological, and/or radiological hazards resulting in significant morbidity and mortality. Hazards that canines may be exposed to include aerosolized or dust particles that may cause eye irritation; standing water that may include antifreeze, gasoline, oil or other chemical agents; protozoal or bacterial organisms including, *Giardia* sp, *Leptospira* spp, and coliform bacteria as well as other hazards that may not be known at the time of the response (Gordon, 2015). Agents readily transmitted through direct contact with a contaminated canine may in turn impact human responders, increasing the scope of the exposure.

Decontamination is the process of removing and/or neutralizing the spread of a contaminating agent (FEMA, 2012). Gross decontamination may be classified as either technical or gross. Gross decontamination is the immediate reduction of potentially life-threatening contaminants in the field. This may simply involve rinsing an exposed body site with copious amounts of water. In contrast, technical decontamination involves the construction of an elaborate decontamination corridor. This corridor must be staffed by hazardous materials technicians and includes scrub stations, double rinse systems, showers, and an area to doff contaminated personal protective equipment (PPE). This facilitates the

* denotes corresponding author: evenable@siu.edu

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimersthat apply to the journal pertain.

ETHICAL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

All work described was approved by the Southern Illinois University Animal Care and Use Committee.

DISCLAIMER

The findings and conclusions in the manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No relevant conflicts of interest are declared.

systematic removal of contaminating agents by physical and/or chemical means. As working canines cannot doff a contaminated coat nor presently be outfitted in full PPE, canine decontamination focuses primarily on diluting and washing away any contaminating agents. Surprisingly, little evidence exists to support best practices for the technical decontamination of working canines. Although a standard decontamination protocol for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) working canines has been adapted from human processes (DHS, 2012), the effectiveness of this protocol has never been formally investigated using live animals operating under real-world working conditions. We sought to assess the effectiveness of the existing FEMA canine decontamination protocol as implemented in real-world operations scenarios and compare it against that of modified protocol.

Materials and Methods

Animals—The research study was approved by the Southern Illinois University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. Twelve FEMA-certified canines (FEMA, 2008) from Florida Task Force One (FL-TF1) and Florida Task Force Two (FL-TF2) urban search and rescue teams were separated into two groups for participation in this blinded two day prospective study. Breeds included Labrador retrievers, Golden retrievers, and Belgian Malinois. Each dog was randomly assigned to one of the two decontamination protocols with two dogs participating on both days of the study. For dogs participating on both days, pre-application scanning confirmed the lack of any residual agent from the prior day. Standards for animal care were adopted from previously published recommendations (Prescott et al., 2004). Animals were fed commercially-available complete and balanced dry kibble diets twice daily at approximately 0600 and 1700. Canines were transported to the training facility and housed in individual kennels for the duration of the scenario.

Simulated contamination—A commercially-available pseudo-contaminant (Glo Germ®, Moab, Utah) powder was used to simulate environmental contamination of canines. The powder was mixed with mineral oil at a ratio of 6:10 to create an oil-based contaminant based on manufacturer's recommendations. This pseudo-contaminant was invisible to the naked eye, but readily visible under ultraviolet (UV) illumination. Approximately 10 ml of the pseudo-contaminant was applied using a small round paint applicator (Momenta®, Portsmouth, UT) in a single touch over an approximately 4×4cm area at four anatomical sites on each canine: 1) the throat latch, 2) between the shoulder blades, 3) the inner aspect of the right hind leg, and (4) the left hind paw (Figure 1). These areas were selected based on their relatively large surface area and perceived likelihood of direct contact with environmental contaminants during standard FEMA operations. Following contamination, each canine participated in an urban search and rescue scenario (approximately 60 minutes of rubble search with no water exposure) as part of a scheduled training exercise. The search time was included to allow time for the contaminant to saturate the surrounding areas and because when operating under real-world conditions, it is unlikely that the canine would be decontaminated right away during search operations. Without evidence that there was a high concern for chemical agent exposure or some other type of life-threatening hazard, it is far more likely that the canine would be decontaminated at the completion of their shift.

Upon completion of the exercise, each canine reported to the decontamination station. Canines participating on Day 1 of the study were decontaminated utilizing Protocol A; those participating on day 2 were decontaminated utilizing Protocol B. Different hazardous materials technicians (n=6/day) performed decontamination on Days 1 and 2 in an effort to prevent bias that may result following conversations that may occur following the exercise. All technicians were trained according to the FEMA standard and were blinded to the type of cleanser used and the locations of contamination.

Canines assigned to Protocol A (n = 7) were decontaminated using stiff bristle brushes (Figure 2a) and a generic pet shampoo as part of a multi-step process recommended by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS, 2012). This multi-step process utilizes an initial gross decontamination step (Figure 3a) followed by a second wash using a double rinse system (Figure 3b). Protocol A is the currently accepted FEMA standard for working canine decontamination.

Canines assigned to Protocol B (n = 7) were decontaminated using a soft rubber grooming brush with long rubber bristles (Figure 2b) and Johnson & Johnson's ® Head-To-Toe Body Wash (Johnson and Johnson Consumer Products Company, Skillman New Jersey) with the addition of a grated floor (Figure 3c) to facilitate drainage of gray water during the same multi-step process used in Protocol A. Protocol B was developed following discussions with experienced hazardous materials technicians (n=6) and their expert opinion of effective canine decontamination. Cleanser used for Protocol B was selected based upon results from a smaller validation study conducted prior to this study (Supplemental Appendix)

Pre- and post-decontamination images of each of the four anatomical sites were captured digitally using a Nikon 1 j1 (Nikon Corporation Minato-ku, Tokyo) camera while a LED UV flashlight (The Bramton Company LLC, Dallas, Texas) was held approximately 18" away from the contaminated site. Reduction in contamination (fluorescence) was scored on a scale of 0 – 3 as previously described (Lee and Lee, 2014) (Figure 4) based on a later review of the images. Digital image scores were assigned by two blinded reviewers with 94% agreement. None of the score discrepancies between reviewers were > 1. A score of 0 denoted <25% contamination reduction; a score of 1 denoted 25–50% contaminant reduction; a score of 2 denoted 51–75% contaminant reduction; and a score of 3 denoted >75% contaminant reduction.

Data entry was performed using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Corp., Redmond, WA) and data were analyzed using SAS, version 9.4 (Cary, NC). Categorical variables were compared using χ^2 test. *P* values <0.05 were considered significant. Effective decontamination was defined as a reduction in fluorescent marker contamination by 50% or greater, or a contaminant reduction score of 2 or greater.

RESULTS

Significant differences in contamination reduction scores were identified by protocol and anatomical site. Canines that underwent Protocol A were less effectively decontaminated compared to those that underwent Protocol B (*P* = 0.01). When differences in contamination

reduction were examined by anatomical site for working canines participating in Protocol A, the throat latch (location 1) and hind leg (location 3) remained significantly more contaminated than the hind paw (location 4) and between the shoulder blades (location 2) ($P = 0.02$) (Figure 5). In contrast, only the throat latch remained significantly more contaminated compared to the other three sites among working canines participating in Protocol B ($P = 0.04$). Protocol B was more effective at overall decontamination (>50% contaminant reduction) ($P < 0.05$) compared to Protocol A (Figure 6).

DISCUSSION

Our study describes the use of an oil-based fluorescent marker to simulate exposure to a contaminant during urban search and rescue operations and evaluate the effectiveness of two working canine decontamination protocols. Little if any data exists to support or validate current decontamination practices on live animals under real-world conditions.

We found that a modified protocol (Protocol B) was more effective than the current FEMA canine decontamination procedure (Protocol A) in removing an oil-based pseudo-contaminant. Use of a soft rubber grooming brush in Protocol B may have provided greater comfort and ability to lift the working canine's fur to remove contaminants in comparison to the stiff bristled brush utilized in Protocol A. The stiff-bristled brush that was utilized during Protocol A is an item that is part of the decontamination equipment but is not designed for use with canines. Use of a mild body cleanser (Johnson & Johnson's ® Head-To-Toe Body Wash) in Protocol B that was perceived as less irritating (particularly to the eyes and face) than generic pet shampoo and may have facilitated more thorough washing of the working canine by hazardous material technicians. Finally, the addition of a grated floor in Protocol B to physically separate the working canine from pooling gray water and facilitate its drainage may have reduced the risk of recontamination of the working canine as the multi-step decontamination process proceeded.

Significant differences in contaminant reduction were observed by anatomic site across protocols. Both protocols scored poorly when it came to reducing contamination of the throat latch. This may be explained by the fact that working canines are often fitted with highly individualized collars and leashes made from nylon, leather, or other porous materials capable of absorbing and retaining contaminants. This equipment was not removed during decontamination and may serve to reintroduce contaminants to the throat latch. Although it is likely that failure to remove this equipment contributed to persistent contamination, it is important to note that this error was committed across both days with two independent sets of technicians conducting decontamination. Although having two sets of technicians could be viewed as a limitation to the study, it also confirmed a lack of compliance with current recommendations since both sets of technicians failed to remove equipment prior to decontamination. Therefore, as one of our study objectives was to assess the effectiveness of the current FEMA protocol as implemented in the field, we chose not to interfere in their professional capacities. Clearly, this indicates a need for specialized training specific to canine decontamination. Furthermore, future investigations should include complete removal of all equipment and a separate process to decontaminate these items if they are to be reused.

A major limitation of our study was its small sample size and the variability in working canine breeds recruited to participate. It is possible that certain types and lengths of canine hair could retain the pseudo-contaminant more readily than others. Apart from training exercise duration, we did not strictly control for physical activity undertaken by the working canine that could have removed pseudo-contaminant prior to formal decontamination (e.g., crawling through confined spaces, rolling in the grass). Contaminant reduction was scored based on a qualitative rather than quantitative inspection, which could have been influenced by observer bias. Finally, as Protocol B introduced several new simultaneous modifications to the current FEMA standard (use of a soft rubber grooming brush, mild body cleanser, and grated floor), we were unable to determine whether any one specific component could have accounted for the majority of the improvement in contaminant reduction observed.

Ineffective decontamination of working canines following exposure to a disaster environment with unknown chemical and biological hazards can pose a considerable threat to canine health. Solid and liquid toxicants encountered in urban disasters involving collapsed structures can include a wide range of organic compounds (e.g., hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, glycols, phenols, other solvents), acids, alkalis, oxidants, and heavy metals (Gwaltney-Brandt et al., 2003). Floods can disperse toxicants concentrated in the environment, including pesticide residues in sewage drainage, canals, and rivers (Euripidou 2004). While most dermal chemical exposures result in direct injury or irritation to intact skin, lipophilic agents can be absorbed through the skin leading to systemic toxicity. Canine self-grooming behavior can result in ingestion or inhalation of toxicants following skin surface and hair contamination. In the setting of flooding and poor sanitation, waterborne pathogens including *Salmonella*, *Shigella* spp, *Giardia lamblia*, and *Leptospira* can cause disease in canines through ingestion of contaminated water; it is conceivable that self-grooming behaviors could contribute to infection as well. Working canines share close contact with human disaster responders and could potentially spread a chemical contaminant or biological pathogen if not adequately decontaminated after operations in a disaster setting. In view of these considerations, effective working canine decontamination must remain a priority in maintaining the health and safety of the canine disaster responder. Unfortunately, construction of the decontamination corridor is time and labor intensive. Portable field decontamination kits would be beneficial and could contain emergency decontamination supplies in order to facilitate quick removal of identified contaminants without the need for elaborate decontamination structures. This may help to maximize the removal of environmental contaminants and minimize cross-contamination to human teammates. FEMA canines may be deployed for up to fourteen days with repeated field exposure to contaminants, further studies analyzing the long-term effects of repeated washings with different shampoos need to be conducted in order to evaluate the impact on the acid mantle of the canine dermal layer which has a lower pH than that of humans (Matousek & Campbell, 2002).

Our study was limited to the investigation of decontamination effectiveness associated with oil-based contaminants. Due to the lack of published evidence associated with canine decontamination, it was an important step forward as petroleum based compounds are hazards that working canines are frequently exposed to. Future studies should investigate methods associated with decontamination for microbiological agents as well other types of

chemical compounds (non oil-based). Additionally, this study provided an important measure of the effectiveness of the current recommendations as applied in the field. Clearly, there is a need for improved training for canine related decontamination.

In summary, simple modifications to the existing FEMA decontamination protocol including the use of a soft rubber grooming brush, mild body cleanser, and grated floor significantly improved the overall effectiveness of contaminant reduction as applied in a field scenario. Removal of all equipment (including the collar and leash) followed by a systematic “top-down, front-to-back” approach to washing and rinsing may further enhance effectiveness. Future research and innovation are needed to optimize canine decontamination processes and develop protocols for improved decontamination in the field. In addition, standardized training to improve the application of decontamination protocols for working canines is needed to maintain the consistency of results.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like express their gratitude to the handlers of Florida Task Force One and Florida Task Force Two. Additionally, the authors would like to thank Chief Dave Downey, Chief Alan Perry, Captain Anthony Trimm and Lieutenant Alvaro Tonanez of Miami-Dade Fire Rescue for their advice and support of this work.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES

EV was supported by funding from Purina Animal Nutrition® and Canidae Pet Foods®. SL was supported by the KM1 Comparative Effectiveness Research Career Development Award (grant number KM1CA156708-01); the Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) program (grant number UL1RR024992) of the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS); and the Barnes-Jewish Patient Safety & Quality Career Development Program, which is funded by the Foundation for Barnes-Jewish Hospital.

The authors would also like to thank Dr. Lori Gordon for her preliminary review of this manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- DHS, FEMA. National urban search and rescue response system enhanced operations in the contaminated environment. 2012. <http://www.usarcd.org/femawmd.php> (Accessed 8 September 2016)
- DHS, FEMA. National response framework. 2008. <https://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf> (Accessed 1 November 2016)
- Meshalkina D, Kaleuff A. Commentary: ethological evaluation of the effects of social defeat stress in mice: beyond the social interaction ratio. *Front Behav Neuro*. 2016; 10(155):1–4. DOI: 10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00155
- Euripidou E, Virginia Murray. Public health impacts of floods and chemical contamination. *J Pub Health*. 2004; 26:376–383.
- Fitzgerald SD, Rumbelha WK, Braselton WE, Downend AB, Otto CM. Pathology and toxicology findings for search-and-rescue dogs deployed to the September 11 2001, terrorist attack sites: initial five-year surveillance. *J Vet Diag Invest*. 2008; 20:477–484.
- Fox PR, Puschner B, Ebel JG. Assessment of acute injuries, exposure to environmental toxins, and five year health surveillance of New York Police department working dogs following the september 11, 2001 World Trade Center terrorist attack. *J Am Vet Med Assoc*. 2008; 233(1):48–59. [PubMed: 18593312]

- Gordon, LE. Hospital decontamination system and decontamination methods for assistance dogs that accompany incoming disaster victims. 2014. [http://www.perrc.org/sites/default/files/\(11\)%20Hospital%20Decon%20for%20Service%20K9s%20Gordon.pdf](http://www.perrc.org/sites/default/files/(11)%20Hospital%20Decon%20for%20Service%20K9s%20Gordon.pdf). (Accessed 8 September 2015)
- Gordon LE. Injuries and illness among Federal Emergency Management Agency-certified search-and-recovery and search-and-rescue dogs deployed to Oso, Washington, following the March 22, 2014 State Route 530 landslide. *J Am Vet Med association*. 2015; 247(8):901–908.
- Gwaltney-Brant SM, Murphy LA, Wismer TA, Albretsen JC. General toxicologic hazards and risks for search-and-rescue dogs responding to urban disasters. *J Am Vet Med Assoc*. 2003; 222(3):292–295. [PubMed: 12564589]
- Lee RLT, Lee PH. To evaluate the effects of simplified hand washing improvement program in schoolchildren with mild intellectual disability: a pilot study. *Res in dev Disabilities*. 2014; 35:3017–3018. DOI: 10.1016/j.ridd.2014.07.016
- de Man H, van den Berg HHJL, Leenen EJTM, Schijven JF, Schets FM, van der Vliet JC, van Knapen F, de Roda Husman AM. Quantitative assessment of infection risk from exposure to waterborne pathogens in urban floodwater. *Water Res*. 2014; 48:90–99. DOI: 10.1016/j.watres.2013.09.022 [PubMed: 24095592]
- Matousek JL, Campbell KL. A comparative review of cutaneous pH. *Vet Derm*. 2002; 13(6):293–300. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-3164.2002.00312.x
- Morton JL, Schultz AA. Healthy hands: Use of alcohol gel as an adjunct to handwashing in elementary school children. *J School Nursing*. 2004; 20:161–167.
- Murphy LA, Gwaltney-Brant SM, Albretsen JC, Wismer TA. Toxicologic agents of concern for search-and-rescue dogs responding to urban disasters. *J am vet med association*. 2003; 222(3):296–301.
- Otto CM, Downend AB, Moore GE, Daggy JK, Ranivand DL, Reetz JA, Fitzgerald SD. Medical Surveillance of Search Dogs Deployed to the World Trade Center and Pentagon: 2001–2006. *J Environmental Health*. 2010; 73(2):12–21.
- Otto CM, Franz March A, Kellogg Barry, Lewis Rick, Murphy Lisa, Lauber Gerald. Field treatment of search dogs: lessons learned from the world trade center disaster. *J Vet Emerg Crit Care*. 2002; 12(1):33–42.
- Prescott M, Morton D, Anderson D, Buckwell A, Heath S, Hubrecht R, Jennings M, Robb D, Ruane B, Swallow J, Thompson P. Refining dog husbandry and Care. Eighth report of the BAAWF/FRAVE/RSPCA/UFAW joint working group on refinement. *Lab Anim*. 2004; 1:1–94.
- Slensky A, Drobatz KJ, Downend AB, Otto CM. Deployment morbidity among search-and-rescue dogs used after the september 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. *J am vet med association*. 2004; 225(6): 868–871.
- Wade TJ, Sandhu SK, Levy D, Lee S, LeChevallier MW, Katz L, Colford JM Jr. Did a severe flood in the midwest cause an increase in the incidence of gastrointestinal symptoms? *Am J Epid*. 2003; 159(4):398–405. DOI: 10.1093/aje/kwh050
- Wismer TA, Murphy LA, Gwaltney-Brant SM, Albretsen JC. Management and prevention of toxicoses in search-and-rescue dogs responding to urban disasters. *J am vet med association*. 2003; 222(3): 305–308.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Canine decontamination protocols are not well studied
- Current canine decontamination recommendations are not effective
- Effectiveness can be improved with simple modifications to existing protocols

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Figure 1. Anatomical sites on working canine where an oil-based pseudo-contaminant was applied to simulate contamination: throat latch (1), between the shoulder blades (2), inner aspect of the right hind leg (3), and the left hind paw (4).

Figure 2.

a: Stiff bristle brush utilized as part of current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) canine decontamination procedure (Protocol A).

b: Soft rubber grooming brush utilized as part of a modified decontamination process (Protocol B).

Figure 3.

a: Initial gross decontamination step utilized in current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) canine decontamination procedure.

b: Second wash step of gross decontamination for working canines utilizing a double rinse system.

c: Grated flooring used during Protocol B to physically separate the working canine from pooling gray water and facilitate its drainage.

Figure 4.

Pre- and post-decontamination images of the shoulder blades under ultraviolet illumination. Significant residual contamination at this site, as demonstrated by persistent areas of fluorescence despite decontamination of this working canine, resulted in a score of 0 (0–25% reduction in contamination).

a Pre-decontamination

b Post-decontamination

Figure 5. Contaminant reduction by anatomical site following decontamination with Protocol A vs. B. Effective decontamination was defined as a reduction of 50% or greater in residual contamination. Overall, Protocol A was less effective at contamination reduction across anatomical locations examined ($P = 0.0044$).

Figure 6.

Contaminant reduction scores following decontamination with Protocol A vs. B. Protocol B was associated with higher contamination reduction scores compared to Protocol A ($P=0.0166$).

Note: Contaminant reduction score of 0 = <25% contamination reduction; 1 = 25% – 50% contamination reduction; 2 = 51% – 75% contamination reduction; 3 = >75% contamination reduction