

Sacramento River Science Partnership Charter

This Charter constitutes a general agreement, understanding, and framework for the establishment and implementation of the Sacramento River Science Partnership. The Charter does not represent a legally binding agreement; but it does constitute a commitment on behalf of its signatories to participate and contribute to its mission.

Official Designation: Sacramento River Science Partnership (“Partnership”).

Initial Members: The Partnership consists of the following initial Members

Sacramento River Settlement Contractors
Bureau of Reclamation
National Marine Fisheries Service West Coast Region
National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of Water Resources

Member Authorities: The Partnership includes certain federal and state agencies with diverse authorities under federal and state law that will inform the scope of their participation in the Partnership. This section includes any language provided by an agency describing its relevant authorities. Submission of these descriptions is optional for a member agency.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation: Reclamation is a federal agency within the U.S. Department of Interior charged with the management and operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP). Reclamation manages and operates the CVP pursuant to the Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended and supplemented,, including the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1937, which brought the CVP under Reclamation Law, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) of 1992, which added fish and wildlife mitigation, protection, restoration, and enhancement as project purposes of the CVP. Reclamation is seeking to: understand the scope and purpose of member activities as they relate to improving the scientific basis for the operation of Shasta Dam or the selection of projects and studies under the CVPIA; update and communicate Reclamation priorities for investing in activities; and establish partnerships with members willing to provide additional or complementary resources.

Mission Statement: To establish and maintain a science enterprise for voluntary collaborative research, modeling, monitoring, and synthesis relevant to salmonid and other in-river species recovery and water management on the main stem Sacramento River to facilitate joint learning and fact-finding between and among scientists and managers.

Objectives: The Partnership will achieve its Mission by pursuing the following objectives:

- Disclose and discuss ongoing and planned monitoring, biological and physical modeling, and analysis and synthesis related to voluntary species recovery and water management

goals. Provided, that disclosure or discussions on issues involving pending or active litigation may be limited.

- Disclose and discuss priorities for reducing uncertainty regarding the conditions necessary to achieve desired fishery and water management goals by developing and applying one or more conceptual models linking actions to expected outcomes to provide for transparency in the scientific basis for decision making and priorities.
- Identify and pursue opportunities to consolidate the number of collaborative forums addressing fishery needs in the upper Sacramento River watershed and support a regional structured decision-making process (that includes structured decision making under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and Life Cycle Model).
- Coordinate a Science and Monitoring Plan for the upper Sacramento River that is integrated with other science and monitoring efforts addressing Central Valley salmon stocks.
- Develop and undertake experimental actions to test hypotheses and address shared priority management questions.
- Facilitate and establish protocols for collaboration among the scientific and stakeholder community for the discussion of findings, prior to publication, and the shared synthesis of new science into decision support models.
- Identify and understand the trade-offs of decisions between different species and water uses

Scope: The scope of the Partnership includes investigating and communicating those areas of voluntary scientific inquiry most relevant to species recovery and water management goals in the Sacramento River watershed. The current list of research efforts and priorities includes:

- Understanding temperature tolerances and other conditions necessary for salmonid egg incubation and early life stages;
- Understanding non-temperature sources of mortality including, pathogens, predation, lack of suitable spawning habitat, and redd de-watering, among others;
- Understanding conditions necessary for juvenile spring-run survival;
- Assessing the quantity, condition and habitat needs of emerging juvenile fry and smolts, including synthesizing information from existing monitoring and advances in genetics and otolith research, and exploring management relevance;
- Developing decision support tools for species recovery including physical and biological modeling and exploring integration with management questions including understanding effects between species;
- Understanding research needs associated with reintroductions of winter run Chinook Salmon;
- Understanding the fishery needs within the Sacramento Mainstem with a focus on salmonids and concern for other species of interest as well; and
- Understanding key physical and engineering constraints associated with operations and diversions.

Decision Making: The Partnership is primarily intended to encourage the sharing of information to support perspectives and priorities of the Members on the Sacramento River and to promote collaboration in a voluntary science enterprise. It is the sole discretion of individual agencies whether to disclose activities or to subject an action under their authority to discussion under this Charter or to continue discussions under this Charter. Members shall not subject activities outside of their authority to the processes in this Charter.

The Partnership will not seek or provide consensus advice or recommendations to its Members. By openly discussing science from their individual perspectives, the Members anticipate that opportunities to promote effective and efficient science may emerge. Members will seek to understand the interests and priorities of other Members and may from time to time test support for different approaches or courses of action. Members are anticipated to independently evaluate information obtained through the partnership and shall make decisions independent of the partnership. Members agree to manage procedural needs, such as meeting scheduling and agenda development, informally and in a way that encourages mutual participation.

This Partnership is not a decision-making body, and does not supplant existing federal or state decision-making processes, or management or regulatory authorities.

Process: The Partnership will pursue its objectives using a variety of processes, tools, methods, and approaches consistent with Decision Making (above). These may include, without limitation:

- Developing metrics for the biological objectives that would measure success towards desired fishery and water management goals.
- Identifying the management actions under consideration for the desired fishery and water management goals to identify the relevant decisions under consideration.
- Developing conceptual and quantitative models for linking management actions to the objectives and list the relevant management questions.
- Using the quantitative models to assess the value of different actions and prioritize where answering management questions and reducing uncertainty would change decisions.
- Updating and refining management action, models, and priorities as activities are implemented and/or membership changes.
- Conducting periodic open forums and public workshops to inform others of the activities undertaken within the Partnership.
- Conducting peer review of science, results, and other products of the Partnership.

The Partnership will be transparent, flexible, and results-focused in utilizing different processes, and will regularly evaluate progress and consider adjustments or modifications to improve prospects for achieving objectives. In addition to familiar approaches to promoting effective collaboration, the Partnership will explore a variety of formal or structured processes demonstrated to be effective in achieving similar objectives.

Additional Membership: The Partnership is not fixed and additional Members are anticipated. Member representatives must be in a senior position with their respective agency, organization, group, or tribe, with knowledge of water management and restoration activities in the Sacramento River. The addition of new members will not affect the purpose of this Partnership to promote mutual understanding of interests and priorities, and in particular, will not require or result in consensus advice or recommendations to any federal agency. Any new Member will be required to sign this Charter, indicating its agreement to its terms.

Officers: The Partnership may agree on a Chair, Co-Chairs, or an alternate structure to best implement this Charter.

Facilitation: The Partnership recognizes the value of third-party facilitation assistance to promote efficiency, understanding of interests and priorities, and clarity about opportunities to promote science, as well as reliable records of meetings. The Partnership will seek to have all meetings and efforts facilitated, and for the facilitator to coordinate with Members and Officers, if any, to carry out the goals and objectives of the Charter. Agendas will reflect input from all Members and will not be controlled or managed by any single Member. Financial support for facilitation may be provided by one or more Members. Such support does not constitute management or control.

Members shall agree upon a facilitator by consensus of the members participating in this Charter at the time of selection. The facilitator shall have responsibility for structuring meetings and products under this Charter and may seek input from members. The authority of the facilitator will be adapted to specific procedures or methods adopted by the Partnership. The group will follow the norms for interagency collaboration (i.e. data sharing, work planning, etc.) established by the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) (see Attachment A).

Meetings and Sub-groups: Meetings will be convened at such times as designated by the Members. Subcommittees may be formed for the purposes of compiling information or conducting research. Subcommittees will not provide advice or work products to a Member directly but rather report to the Partnership with this information. Subcommittees will meet as necessary to accomplish assignments, subject to the approval of the Partnership and the availability of resources.

Relationship to other processes: The Partnership is exploring relationships to other existing efforts including the Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management Program/Collaborative Adaptive Management Team, Science Integration Team, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and Interagency Ecological Program. Efficient and effective integration with those efforts is provided for under the terms of this Charter. In addition, formal regulatory and administrative processes are underway in the Sacramento River Mainstem concerning water and fish, including Endangered Species Act Section 7 processes, National Environmental Policy Act processes, California State Water Resources Control Board processes, and research permit processes. Nothing in this Charter is intended to alter or substitute for those processes,

provide for consensus advice to those processes, or effectuate participation in those processes beyond what is provided for by statute, regulation, or prior agreement. Where activities are mandated by such formal regulatory and administrative processes, such activities shall be addressed outside of this Charter.

General Provisions

Non-binding Nature: This Charter is legally nonbinding and in no way: **(i)** impairs any Member from continuing its own planning or project implementation; **(ii)** limits a Member from exercising its regulatory authority in any matter; **(iii)** infers that a Member’s governing body or management will act in any particular manner on a project; or **(iv)** gives any of the Members any authority over matters within the jurisdiction of any other Member. Nothing in this Charter affects or creates any legal rights, obligations, benefits, or trust responsibilities, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity, by a Member against any other Member, a Member’s officers, or any person.

Term: This Charter will become effective upon signature of the Initial Members and shall remain in effect for three years unless terminated by mutual agreement of the Members. Upon the expiration, the Charter may be renewed or extended through written agreement of all current Members. A Member may withdraw from this Charter at any time by notifying all other Members in writing.

Amendments: Modifications or amendments to the terms of this Charter shall be in writing and executed by all Members.

Relationship of Members: Execution of this Charter does not create a new legal entity with a separate existence from the individual Members. This Charter also does not result in the joint exercise of powers as set forth in California Government Code section 6500 et seq. Nothing in this Charter creates an agency relationship between any of the Parties. This Charter neither expands nor is in derogation of those powers and authorities vested in the Members, or any of them, by applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or Executive Orders, nor does it modify or supersede any other applicable interagency agreements existing as of the date of this Charter.

Funding and Availability of Funds: The Partnership is not intended to be a funding program. Members will proactively facilitate coordination between project proponents to connect projects with appropriate funding programs to meet the Partnership’s priorities. Through a process of science prioritization, the Partnership will organize, integrate, advance, and support science activities across agencies and programs to address decision-makers’ needs in a collaborative manner.

Any funding by any Member toward a science priority under the Charter is subject to the requirements of any and all applicable laws, regulations, and procedures. Nothing in this Charter is intended or shall be construed to authorize or require the obligation, appropriation, reprogramming, or expenditure of any funds by any Member. Pursuant to the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. 1341, 1342, and 1517, all commitments made by Federal signatories to this

Charter are subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Any funding commitment or services, if pursued, will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures.

Approval/Signatories


In furtherance of the mission, goals, objectives, and other matters described above, the duly authorized representatives of the organizations below, hereby agree to the provisions of this Charter. This Charter may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which when executed and delivered shall constitute a duplicate original, but all counterparts together shall constitute a single agreement.



Barry A. Thom
Regional Administrator, West Coast Region
National Marine Fisheries Service

June 26, 2020

Date



Charlton H. Bonham
Director
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

July 17, 2020

Date



Ernest Conant
Regional Director, California-Great Basin
Region
United States Bureau of Reclamation

July 27, 2020

Date

Karla A. Nemeth

Karla Nemeth
Director
California Department of Water Resources

7/16/2020

Date

KOCH.KRISTEN
CLARE.136589
2284

Digitally signed by
KOCH.KRISTEN.CLARE.136
5892284
Date: 2020.07.02 13:38:45
-07'00'

Kristen Koch
Science and Research Director
National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center

7/2/2020

Date



Paul Souza
Regional Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Date 08-15-20



Roger Cornwell
Chairman
Sacramento River Settlement Contractors

June 18, 2020

Date

Interagency Ecology Program for the San Francisco Estuary Journal Publication Policy Revised XX-XX-2010

I. Policy Statement

The Interagency Ecology Program (IEP) Journal Publication Policy applies to IEP publications in independently peer-reviewed scientific journals (journal publications). High-quality, relevant, and timely IEP journal publications are critical to fulfilling the mission of the IEP.

IEP journal publications describe and interpret the results of scientific projects in the San Francisco Estuary that fall into at least one of the following two categories: 1) project funded all or in part by the IEP and/or received Endangered Species Act (ESA) incidental take coverage via the IEP; 2) project used substantial amounts of data and information collected by the IEP.

The requirements for IEP journal publications are in addition to the publication requirements by the employer of the journal publication's author(s). If permitted by the employer, IEP review may occur simultaneously with any review required by the employer.

All IEP journal publications must acknowledge IEP support (funding, data, and/or ESA take permit coverage). All IEP journal publications must also include a disclaimer stating that the findings and conclusions in the publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the view of the IEP member agencies. The full journal publication reference, reprint or electronic file, and internet journal article link should be provided to the IEP as soon as possible and no later than the publication date, along with a 1 to 3 sentence NON-TECHNICAL statement about the most important "key points" or "take-home messages" of this publication. The key points statement is required for IEP journal publications in the first category and requested as a courtesy from authors of IEP journal publications in the second category.

Initial informal scientific peer review of all IEP journal publication manuscripts by members of an appropriate IEP Project Work Team is desirable, but not required. Manuscripts for IEP journal publications first-authored by IEP staff (IEP first author) must undergo a formal three-week IEP review process before submission to a scientific journal. All other authors of IEP journal publications are highly encouraged, but not required, to submit manuscripts for IEP review.

The three-week IEP review process consists of a scientific peer review by designated IEP staff and may also include a policy briefing for IEP Agency Coordinators, managers and policy makers on policy-relevant scientific findings. The scientific review is intended to help assure consistent high quality of IEP publications. It is in addition to and does in no way replace the independent scientific peer review conducted by scientific journals. A policy briefing is intended as an early informational heads-up for resource managers and policy makers on policy-relevant scientific findings.

All authors, including IEP first authors, are free to accept or reject changes recommended by IEP reviewers to their manuscripts based on their best professional judgment. IEP first authors must,

however, briefly describe in writing if and how IEP review comments received during the three-week IEP review period were addressed. If IEP review comments are not adequately addressed, IEP first authors must add a disclaimer to the manuscript that states that the findings and conclusions do not represent the views of the IEP.

All manuscripts for journal publication sent to the IEP for review will be treated as confidential and circulated only to official members of the IEP Management Team and the IEP Central Valley Fish Facilities Review Team for scientific peer review and policy briefings. The IEP Agency Coordinators may request manuscripts from these two teams for their own review and policy briefings, but may NOT circulate them further, unless permission to do so has been obtained from the first author of the publication manuscript.

II. Policy Implementation:

The IEP Journal Publication Policy is implemented through a series of ten steps involving the publication author(s) and the IEP Lead Scientist, IEP Management Team, IEP Central Valley Fish Facilities Review Team, and IEP Agency Coordinators. As stated above, all manuscripts for journal publication sent to the IEP will be treated as confidential and not shared with others unless specifically authorized by the author(s).

The following three steps (1.to 3.) are mandatory for all IEP journal publications.

1. Include a statement acknowledging that the IEP supported the published work by providing funding, ESA take coverage, and/or data and information.
2. Include a disclaimer stating: “The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the view of the member agencies of the Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary.” (See also step 8.)
3. Provide the full journal publication reference, reprint or electronic file, and internet journal article link to the IEP Lead Scientist (send to amueller@deltacouncil.ca.gov) and the IEP Management Team (send to ksouza@dfg.ca.gov) as soon as possible and no later than the publication date. For publications related to fish facilities research, also provide a copy to the IEP Central Valley Fish Facilities Review Team (CVFFRT, send to DPortz@usbr.gov). Citations and electronic internet links will be posted on the IEP website by IEP personnel.

The following two steps (4. and 5.) are mandatory for all IEP category 1 journal publications (funded all or in part by the IEP and/or received ESA take coverage via the IEP). Authors of IEP category 2 journal publications (use IEP data or information) are requested to follow these steps as a courtesy.

4. Provide a 1 to 3 sentence NON-TECHNICAL statement about the most important “key points” or “take-home messages” of this publication for a general audience to the IEP Lead Scientist (send to amueller@deltacouncil.ca.gov). These key points are primarily used to brief the IEP agency directors, policy makers, stakeholders, and agency staff about the publication content.

5. Submit all data collected for this work to the IEP agency contract manager if/as contractually required.

First authors of IEP journal publications who are staff of IEP member agencies AND wrote the article while on official IEP duty (during work hours, salary paid by IEP – “IEP first authors”) are also required to follow several IEP review steps (6. to 10.) before submitting a manuscript to a scientific journal. All other IEP journal publication authors are highly encouraged, but not required, to follow these steps as well. In addition to following these formal IEP review steps, all authors of IEP journal publications are also encouraged, but not required, to circulate publication manuscripts to other colleagues for informal scientific peer review. This can include review by members of an appropriate IEP Project Work Team.

6. Prior to submission to a scientific journal, provide an electronic copy of the publication manuscript in MS Word format to the IEP Management Team (send to ksouza@dfg.ca.gov) and the “key points” statement (see step 4) for IEP scientific peer review and policy briefings. For publications related to fish facilities research, also provide a copy to the IEP CVFFRT (send to DPortz@usbr.gov). The IEP Agency Coordinators are immediately notified by these two teams when a manuscript has been received and may request the manuscript for their own review and policy briefings. Authors may receive review comments from the IEP within three weeks of submission of the manuscript to the IEP. Do not submit the manuscript to a scientific journal during this three-week IEP review period. If no IEP review comments are received by the end of the three-week IEP review period, proceed to step 9.
7. Accept or reject changes to the manuscript recommended by IEP reviewers and address IEP review comments received within the three-week IEP review period, using best professional judgment. In addition, briefly describe in writing if and how IEP suggestions and comments were addressed. Provide this description and the revised manuscript to the IEP Management Team and, if applicable, CVFFRT.
8. Within one week of receiving the revised manuscript, the IEP Management Team or CVFFRT and possibly IEP Agency Coordinators evaluate whether the IEP review comments were adequately addressed. If they were adequately addressed, the author will be given permission to submit the manuscript to a scientific journal. If the IEP review comments were not adequately addressed, the author will be provided with an additional set of review comments and given the choice to
 - a) repeat the IEP review process starting with step 6 OR
 - b) modify the disclaimer in step 2 to read “The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the author(s). They do not represent the views of the Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary (IEP) and may not represent the views of individual IEP member agencies.”
9. If the manuscript receives approval for journal submission, if the IEP review or approval deadlines have passed without notice from the IEP, or if option b) in step 8 (modified disclaimer) is chosen, proceed with submission of the manuscript to an independently peer reviewed scientific journal.
10. Notify the IEP Management Team and, if applicable, CVFFRT about acceptance or rejection of the manuscript by the scientific journal(s), and about the completed publication (see step 3).

III. Additional Information

What is the purpose of the 2010 revision of the IEP publication policy?

The main goal of this revision of the IEP publication policy is to strongly encourage and empower IEP scientists to publish their results in scientific journals by clarifying the IEP publication process. It also introduces a disclaimer requirement similar to the disclaimer requirement recently adopted by the US FWS (Director's Order No. 196, 12-10-2008) that is intended to address concerns about the "policy review" required by some agencies.

Why do we encourage IEP journal publications?

The mission of the IEP is to produce and provide scientific "information on the factors that affect ecological resources in the Sacramento - San Joaquin Estuary that allows for more efficient management of the estuary" (<http://www.water.ca.gov/iep/about/aboutiep.cfm>). To be useful to IEP managers, stakeholders, other scientists, and the public, this scientific information has to be timely, relevant, reliable, and readily available (i.e. published). Most desirable are publications in independently peer-reviewed scientific journals, but other types of publications, such as IEP technical reports and IEP Newsletter articles, are also encouraged.

What is an IEP publication?

IEP publications are publicly available, text-based documents that describe and interpret the results of scientific projects in the San Francisco Estuary and fall into at least one of the following two categories:

Category 1 –Publications that are a) funded all or in part by the IEP and/or b) had Endangered Species Act (ESA) incidental take coverage via the IEP permit.

Category 2 –Publications that make extensive use of data and information collected by the IEP.

IEP journal publications are IEP publications in independently peer-reviewed scientific journals.

What types of IEP publications are covered by the IEP journal publication policy?

The IEP journal publication policy applies to IEP publications in independently peer-reviewed scientific journals.

It does NOT apply to IEP technical reports, final IEP project reports, IEP or other newsletter articles, or IEP web page content. It also does not apply to other types of IEP information products (numerical, graphical, cartographic, or audiovisual).

What is the relationship between IEP journal publication requirements and publication requirements of the author's employer?

The IEP publication requirements are in addition to the publication requirements by the employer (agency, university, non-profit or for-profit organization) of the first author and co-author(s). If permitted by the employer, IEP review may occur simultaneously with the review required by the employer.

What is the purpose of the IEP scientific peer review?

The scientific peer review of IEP journal publication manuscripts conducted by the IEP is intended to help assure consistent high quality of IEP publications. It is in addition to and does in no way replace the independent scientific peer review conducted by scientific journals. Members of the IEP Management Team and Central Valley Fish Facilities Review Team are generally very knowledgeable about the ecology of the San Francisco Estuary and can often help authors improve the content of their manuscripts pertaining to the estuary in ways independent peer reviewers for scientific journals may not. IEP review comments will be provided to the manuscript authors NO LATER than three weeks after receipt of the manuscript.

What is the purpose of IEP policy briefings, and what is the process?

A policy briefing is intended as an early informational heads-up for resource managers and policy makers on policy-relevant scientific findings included in a manuscript of an IEP journal publication. Members of the IEP Management Team and Central Valley Fish Facilities Review Team identify potential policy-relevant scientific findings described in IEP publication manuscripts and inform the IEP Agency Coordinators about these findings. IEP Agency Coordinators may request the full publication manuscript from the IEP Management Team or Central Valley Fish Facilities Review Team and may share the key findings, but NOT the full manuscript, with other agency personnel or the legislature. The full manuscript can only be shared with other individuals or groups after permission to do so is obtained from the first author of the publication manuscript. IEP Agency Coordinators may provide additional comments to the authors within the three-week IEP review period (see II, step 6, above). As with the scientific review comments, all authors should address the additional comments that may arise from policy briefings within the three-week IEP review period, but are not required to accept these comments and revise the manuscript.

Department of Fish and Wildlife/Interagency Ecological Program Expectations for Researcher Care of Biological Samples and Subsequent Data (September 2014, revised January 2017)

This document describes Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) expectations of collaborating individuals or entities (researchers) for the care of and sharing of biological samples, sample components, data and information resulting from field collections by an IEP agency and subsequent to receipt of such samples. The IEP, through its agency's fieldwork, facilitates collection of biological samples for numerous other entities. Such samples are often valuable for purposes beyond their original use. This document focuses on care of whole fish samples, fish parts or other biological samples after collection and describes expectations for collaborating researchers to maintain fish samples and resulting data initially for themselves and subsequently for other researchers or the public. The expectations listed may not in whole or part represent those of all IEP agencies, but they were generally agreed upon by the IEP Management Team (now the Science Management Team) and are provided for general reference as best practices for sample and data handling and maintenance, and so that they might be used by IEP agencies when writing contracts or memoranda of understanding.

- 1) All samples collected by IEP Agencies or IEP funded entities are public trust resources and shall remain property of the IEP unless otherwise agreed upon.
 - a) Samples and genetic materials derived from them shall be preserved and maintained as per agreed upon protocols.
 - b) Sample processing will use generally accepted, well published methods that optimize the use samples and preserve materials for later replication where feasible; OR, when novel methodology is proposed, it's recognized in the review process as an important facet of the approved work, and again should preserve remaining materials for later replication where feasible.
 - c) The researcher shall: (1) properly maintain samples and sample remnants to protect their usefulness; (2) carefully track samples and maintain a sample identification convention including at least the following information on the samples and any resulting data sets: calendar year of collection (text, 4 characters), project name (collecting agency; text 3-4 characters) and sample identification number (text, 4 characters; include preceding zeroes: e.g., 0001); (3) maintain chain-of-custody form(s) to properly document sample exchanges among researchers and who made the exchange in case of questions.
- 2) The researcher will be granted exclusive access to the samples and resulting data for an agreed upon period of time, not to exceed 5 years commensurate with the scope of the study (i.e., less time for a small study).

- a) The IEP's lead-person (or their direct supervisor) for Department Survey collecting the samples shall become a default collaborator, at their discretion, and shall receive copies of all draft manuscripts prior to the submittal process.
 - b) The researcher shall provide regular updates on progress and may be requested to briefly participate in general discussions at IEP Project Work Team or Science Management Team meetings related the researcher's work with the samples in question.
 - c) The researcher shall invite the IEP lead-person to any discussion of preliminary or final results, and not limit IEP's access to data results or discussion of results during or after the exclusive period.
 - d) The researcher shall invite the IEP's lead-person to any discussion related to modifying the study scope, schedule or commitment to completion. A lack of progress on an agreed upon timeline or a failure to notify the designated IEP lead person of substantial changes may result in termination of the exclusive period and the immediate return of samples.
 - e) The IEP reserves the right of access to the samples for research purposes not related to the original intent and not conflicting with the current researcher's work during this otherwise exclusive period.
- 3) At the conclusion of the agreed upon exclusive access period:
- a) Collected samples, sample-remains and portions of derived genetic materials shall be returned to the designated IEP lead person for archiving or use by other studies.
 - b) All resulting data (completely and appropriately described [metadata] and annotated [methods]) from the processing of the samples shall be made public with electronic and hard copies provided to the IEP in commonly used formats.
 - c) Any draft or final presentations or manuscripts will be transmitted at the end of the agreed upon exclusive period.
 - d) The IEP will provide proper acknowledgement for any future use of these data or intellectual materials and the researcher will provide proper acknowledgement of sampling or other support by the IEP.

This completes the list of expectations IEP has when providing samples to researchers. These expectations can be interpreted as "best practices". Individual IEP agencies can reference these expectations as needed. In the case of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, these expectations will likely be incorporated into MOUs between the Department and researchers needing such MOUs to possess endangered or threatened species, whole or parts, under the California Endangered Species Act. Such MOUs are enforceable through the Department's Law Enforcement Division.