| InspectiUpper Midwest EnviroQuality As |  | Report SOP No. GEN 001.6 <br> ental Sciences Center Page 3 of 3 <br> rance Unit Form GEN 001.6 a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Distribution: study director, branch chief, center director |
| Study Number: AEH-09-MAS-02 |  | Inspection Date (s) June 29, 2012 |
| Location of Inspection: QAO and Maren Tuttle-Lau at UMESC; Sue Schleis and Mike Wellens at Spirit Lake National Fish Hatchery, Spirit Lake, Iowa |  | Inspection Type: Phone audit; field study |
| Item | Finding(s) and/or Actions Recommended | Comment (s) and/or Action Taken ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | The QAO conducted a phone audit on Friday June 29, 2012 at about 1:30 pm with Maren Tuttle-Lau, Sue Schleis and Mike Wellens. The QAO asked a series of questions based on the study protocol and schedule of events. The questions and answers are shown below. | Note: This study is a clinical trial for Investigation New Animal Drugs, which does not fall under the auspices of Good Laboratory Practice regulations. However, in clinical trials, there is a study monitor to "oversee" the work being conducted. The UMESC QAO was listed as the study monitor and asked to conduct a phone audit in lieu of an on-site visit and is issuing this report to document it. |
| 1. | Q: What study are you conducting? Do you have a copy of the protocol? <br> A: AEH-09-MAS-02 and title and yes, they have a copy of the protocol, which was locked up in the car with study records. | 1. NRN. Study was identified correctly and field staff had a copy of the protocol. |
| 2. | Q; When did you start the experimental treatment? <br> A: Monday, June 25 about 2:00 pm | 2. NRN. Experimental start was consistent with scheduled of events. |
| 3. | Q: How many treatments are you conducting? <br> A: 10 feedings with Aquaflor, Terramycin or control. | 3. NRN. Treatments were as stated in the protocol. |
| 4. | Q: What are the test chemicals? <br> A: Oxytetracycline and Florfenicol (Terramycin and Aquaflor) | 4. NRN. The test articles were correctly identified. |
| 5. | Q : What species of fish are in this trial? | 5. NRN. In accordance with protocol that the species would be identified after a natural outbreak of a |
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| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Report Issued: June 29, 2012 | Stady Director Signature: |  |
| Response Due Date: July 13,2012 | Management Approval/Date: |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ NRN $=$ No Response Needed | QAU Review/Date | Page 1 of 4 |
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| Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center Page 3 of 3 <br> Quality Assurance Unit Form GEN 001.6 a |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Director: Maren Tuttle-Lau | Distribution: study director, branch chief, center director |  |
|  | Number: AEH-09-MAS-02 | Inspection Date(s)Jun | , 2012 |
| Location of Inspection: QAO and Maren Tuttle-Lau at UMESC; Sue Schleis and Mike Wellens at Spirit Lake National Fish Hatchery, Spirit Lake, Iowa |  | Inspection Type: Pho study | dit; field |
|  | confirmation? <br> A: 34, but protocol said 30 <br> Recommendation: document this as deviation. |  |  |
| 20. | Q: Have you had any problems with equipment, water flow, aeration, etc. that could affect your results? <br> A: Before the start of dosing, the fish in one tank died when the water flow became clogged and water chemistry changed; the mortalities were removed and the tank refilled; fish were then taken from the remaining tanks to replace the fish that died <br> Recommendation: Document this as a deviation | 20. |  |


| Inspector: Jane Rivera | Date of Response: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Report Issued: June 29, 2012 | Study Director Signature: |
| Response Due Date: July 13, 2012 | Management Approval/Date: |
| ${ }^{\text {1 NRN }}$ N No Response Needed | QAU Review/Date |

Adverse event recording form

Adverse Drug Experience: Record any adverse event associated with the use of a new animal drug, whether or not considered to be drug related.

| TANK ID | STUDY DAY | DATE | EVENT DURATION | DESCRIPTION OF ADVERSE EVENT | DRUG RELATED <br> Yes/No/Unsure |  |  | OBSERVED BY: | STUDY MONITOR NOTIFIED? |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes/No/NA ${ }^{1}$ | BY: | DATE |
| $B 1$ | 9 | 4 JuLiz | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Drscovered } \\ & \text { @ } 1315 ; \text { okele } 1030 \end{aligned}$ | Water flow to tank reduced to drips $=15$ mortalities | Y[ | $N X$ | U[] |  | SMS/MPu |  | N | NA | Mpow | $7 / 4 / 12$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N[] | U[] |  |  | N | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N[] | U[] |  | Y | $N$ | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N[] | U[] |  | Y | $N$ | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N[] | U[] |  | Y | N | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N [] | U[] |  | Y | N | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N[] | U[] |  | Y | N | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y[ | N [] | U[] |  | $Y$ | N | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Y | N[] | U[] |  | $Y$ | N | NA |  |  |
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La Crosse, Wisconsin 54603

## MEMORANDUM

Date: 27Jun12
To: The Record Study Number AEH-09-MAS-02
Subject: Deviation 1 and 2 to the study AEH-09-MAS-02 "Field effectiveness of Aquaflor $®$ (florfenicol) and Terramycin 200 For Fish® (oxytetracycline dihydrate) to control mortality in coolwater and warmwater finfish due to Motile Aeromonad infections."

Deviation \#1 - Section 4.5 of the study protocol states that "Fish will be randomly distributed to the test tanks according to a completely random assignment code provided by the Supervisory Biologist. Groups of < 5 fish will be transferred from the appropriate source tank by UMESC study personnel into the assigned test tank according to the random distribution code until each tank has no less than 20 fish and no more than 100 fish per tank depending upon fish loading densities of the source tank. Fish in the source population will be crowded into an area and netted from that crowded population to ensure fish are indiscriminately collected". Approximately 10 fish were netted at a time to provide fish for test tanks.

When the fish were distributed to tanks, it was decided to stock the tanks at a much higher density than the density that the hatchery uses. The amount of fish required in each tank to create a high density situation caused concern for the number of times fish would be netted into and out of the tank. It was then decided to increase the number of fish to 10 instead of 5 per round. I expect no significant impact to the outcome of this study due to the increase from 5 fish to 10 fish per tank or increasing the density from the source tank. We increased the density of the tanks to help create more ideal conditions for the disease to break. Fish were exhibiting some clinical signs and mortality was slightly elevated. Increasing the density of the tanks would accelerate the disease process.

Deviation \#2 - Section 4.5 of the study protocol states that "Fish will be randomly distributed to the test tanks according to a completely random assignment code provided by the Supervisory Biologist. Groups of $<5$ fish will be transferred from the appropriate source tank by UMESC study personnel into the assigned test tank according to the random distribution code until each tank has no less than 20 fish and no more than 100 fish per tank depending upon fish loading densities of the source tank. Fish in the source population will be crowded into an area and netted from that crowded population to ensure fish are indiscriminately collected".

In anticipation for the study to start after fish were distributed to tanks, the disease did not break until over a week later. Fish were distributed to tanks on 15Jun12 and disease symptoms did not occur again until the week of 23 Jun 12 . On 25Jun12 a second pre-study inspection was complete and fish were redistributed to tanks. To account for the loss of one tank (BX), an appropriate number of fish were removed to leave 50 fish in each tank. The excess were placed in a common vessel to allow for redistribution. The excess were then randomly placed in each tank to have XX in each tank. I do not expect any significant impact of this deviation to the outcome of the study. The study requires an even amount of fish in each tank and redistributing fish allowed for the study to continue.

