Draft Summary
North Pacific Research Board
Hotel Captain Cook
Anchorage, Alaska
March 18-20, 2003

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda/Election of Officers

The Board convened at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 18, 2003. Present were David Benton (chairman), Jim Balsiger, Garry Brass, Earl Krygier (for Kevin Duffy), John Gauvin, Howard Horton, Trevor McCabe, Phil Mundy, Walter Parker, Capt. Rich Preston, John Roos, Robin Samuelsen, Tylan Schrock, Bill Seitz, Jev Shelton, Jack Tagart, and John White. Pamela Pope arrived at 1:43 p.m. on March 18. Steve Ramberg and Stetson Tinkham were absent. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke and Paula Banks.

The agenda was approved after adding the office space lease agreement for consideration under Agenda Item 7. David Benton and Tylan Schrock were elected unanimously to another 1-year term as chairman and vice-chairman, respectively. The meeting summary for October 30-31, 2002, was approved.

2. Conflict of Interest and Recusal

Science Panel Member Conflict of Interest. In October the Board decided that Science Panel members could receive research funding from the Board, but must follow conflict of interest and recusal procedures to be established by the Board. A draft conflict of interest policy, based mainly on NOAA and NSF procedures, was circulated to Science Panel and Board members for comment in January. Comments ranged from the policy being suitably restrictive to overly restrictive. A revised, more flexible policy was presented to the Science Panel for additional comment at the beginning of their meeting on March 3-4, and panel members adopted it. During the meeting, panel members identified proposals with which they had a potential conflict and did not participate in discussions of those proposals. Panel members left the room during discussion and decision if listed as a principal investigator, or listed as a collaborator and their curriculum vitae was included in the proposal.

The Board was scheduled at this meeting to consider approving the revised policy for the Science Panel. The Board adopted the conflict of interest procedures included as agenda item 2(a) (under Tab 2 in the meeting notebooks), applying it also to independent technical reviewers. Discussion centered on the third bullet under section #2, regarding past or present association as the major thesis/dissertation advisor or thesis/dissertation student to one of the principal investigators. Some Board members interpreted this provision to mean that if a principal investigator had ever been a student of a Science Panel member, then that would be a cause for recusal. They argued that the word "past" should be removed because it would be overly restrictive. After it was pointed out that this restriction only applied to the very special, and thus less frequent situation, where a panel member was the major thesis/dissertation advisor for the PI, the provision remained unchanged. The Board approved the Science Panel policy as shown in attachment 1 to this summary.

Board Members Conflict of Interest. In October, the Board deferred action on conflict of interest and recusal provisions. After consideration of policies used by several other organizations, the Board adopted the following policy:

Board members must refrain from voting under three circumstances: (1) on approval of funding for a research project if the Board member is listed as a principal investigator or collaborator whose

curriculum vitae is included in the proposal, (2) if the decision would have a significant and predictable effect on their financial interest, or (3) if the Board member believes he/she has a conflict of interest.

Examples of instances covered under (3) include:

- *Current employment in the specific department of the applicant for research funds*
- *Ownership of the institution's securities or other evidences of debt*
- *Known family or marriage relationship, if relationship is with a principal investigator or collaborator whose curriculum vitae is included in the proposal*
- *Business or professional partnership with a principal investigator or collaborator whose curriculum vitae is included in the proposal*

3. Approve Proposals for 2003

Funding Status. The Board discussed newly released information on its funding status before considering which proposals to fund. The Board's funding for research and administration derives from interest earned on the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund, managed by the Minerals Management Service within the U.S. Department of Interior. A week before the meeting, the Board was made aware that fund earnings through investments in 1-year Treasury notes had declined precipitously from over 6% in November 2000 to about 1.2% as of early March 2003. The EIRF account is now invested at 1.175% for the period February 20 – August 21, 2003. This will result in the $11-12 million, predicted to be available annually to the Board for research and administration, declining to less than $3.2 million for FY 2004 and beyond, unless interest rates rebound. This shortfall will severely impact the availability of research funds, and also administrative funds, even though the 5% cap on such use was raised to 15% in legislation passed in February 2003. The Board considered this new information and its ramifications and took several actions to mitigate the shortfalls:

1. The Board passed a motion to make maximum use of the 15% cap on administration funding, applying it as broadly as possible to current and future grants.

2. The Board reaffirmed its forward funding policy, i.e. that interest earned from EIRF for a fiscal year will be used to support administration and research one year out. For example, the approximately $4.9 million in interest earned for FY02 will be applied to FY04, and current FY03 earnings will be used in FY05.

3. The Board agreed to limit new research funding for FY2003 (the most recent RFP) to a range of $6-7 million, reduced from the $14 million originally contemplated. This will allow the Board to consider funding up to about $5.6 million in new research starting in FY2004. This will help to mitigate the otherwise large reductions in research funding that would have occurred in the next fiscal year due to continued poor interest earnings from the EIRF. It also will allow the Board to be more responsive to interim and final findings of the National Research Council committee tasked with helping the Board develop a comprehensive, long-range science program.

4. The Executive Director was requested to report back to the Board in May on the status of the EIRF and its interest earnings after contacting the Minerals Management Service.

Overview of Proposals. The deadline for research proposals under the 2003 RFP was January 10, 2003 and 156 were received requesting a total of $70 million. They responded to each of the seven research categories identified in the request for proposals. The marine ecosystems and stressed/endangered species categories received the most proposals. Applications came from a wide variety of agencies and

institutions across the U.S., but most were from the University of Alaska, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and several federal agencies such as USGS and NOAA with a strong presence in Alaska.

All proposals were sent out for technical evaluation; 441 evaluations were completed. Most proposals received 3 evaluations or more. Larger dollar proposals were assigned more evaluations. Proposals were sorted by technical score and then color coded. Forty-one proposals with a score of 86 or above were coded green and placed in the high category; they summed to roughly $14 million (the total funding available as advertised in the RFP). Thirty-two proposals with scores of 80-85 were placed in the middle or yellow category, summing to another $13 million. The remaining 83 proposals fell into the low or red category with average scores of 79 or less. The technical reviews and scores and associated color categories were presented to the Science Panel for their consideration in ranking proposals.

Science Panel Recommendations. The 14-member Science Panel reviewed proposals at their meeting on March 3-4 in Seattle. Each panel member was assigned 11-12 primary and 11-12 secondary proposals for review. The panel focused mainly on proposals in the green and yellow bins for each research priority category, but also considered whether any of those should be downgraded, or proposals in the red bin upgraded. The Science Panel chairman, Dr. Richard Marasco, presented the panel report to the Board, along with the list of 44 proposals recommended for $14 million in funding, though some had been combined or otherwise revised by the panel. Science Panel recommendations and comments on all 156 proposals were available in the meeting notebooks for the Board. The Board went into executive session to seek clarifications on the Science Panel review of individual proposals, because Science Panel comments on individual proposals were determined to be proprietary in nature. The Board also decided to make it clear in future requests for proposals that proposal summary pages would no longer be considered confidential information.

Public Comments. Two public comments were received. Mark Buckley, Digital Observer LLC, testified on his proposal #141. The work previously had been supported by the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation funds, which were no longer available. He also indicated that he could reduce his proposed budget down to $165,000 from the $224,000 requested, and that there would be a significant funding match from industry. Heather McCarty also commented. She is a co-PI on proposal #55, but commented that the Board needs to develop a science plan that is coordinated with other science programs and that in effect the Board now is creating an ad hoc science plan through the specific proposals it funds. She encouraged the Board to address the research issues that will be of most impact and have greatest benefit to the ecosystem and fisheries of the North Pacific.

Board Decision on Proposals. Having made the decision to fund up to $7 million in new research, the Board proceeded to develop a set of approved proposals, using as a starting point the $14 million worth of proposals recommended by the Science Panel. Through a series of motions and amendments, the Board approved $7 million worth of projects as shown in Table 1 to this summary. The Board decided not to fund any Steller sea lion proposals. This decision was made based on the high levels of funding that have been made available to sea lion research over the past three years and the fact that current funding available for Board-sponsored research was much less than anticipated. Because of the reduced funding, the Board also decided to focus on its legislated mandates to address pressing fishery management issues and ecosystems information concerns. Consequently, the Board decided not to fund contaminants, though there were several excellent proposals submitted.

Attachment 2 to this meeting summary has a description of the proposals approved for funding. The Board requested changes in certain proposals and their funding amounts. For those specific proposals, approval is contingent on revisions as indicated below. These revisions were made to allow more projects to be approved or as a result of comments by the Science Panel. In addition, the Board's recommendations for funding must be approved formally by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

Proposal 14 - Continuous Plankton Recorder: Provide $180,000 for 2 years, a reduction from requested $285,550 for 3 years.

Proposals 15, 43, and 113 - Salmon BASIS-related proposals: Combine 3 proposals for $500,000 total for 2003-2006. Revised statement of work must be within scope of 3 original proposals and must be developed and coordinated through Dr. Jack Helle at NOAA's Auke Bay Laboratory. It must be reviewed by the Science Panel and then by the Board at their May 20-21, 2003 meeting before funds can be released. No other outside technical reviews are required, other than the review by the Science Panel.

Proposal 16 - Deep sea coral distributions: Fund at $1,303,001, down from $1,482,149 requested. The Board commented that the budget submission was high and that the work likely could be completed for less funding.

Proposal 17 - Monitoring and modeling predator-prey relationships: Fund at $350,000, down from $380,400 requested.

Proposal 29 - Forage fishes in the western Gulf of Alaska: Fund at $320,000, down from $346,102 requested.

Proposal 42 - Estuaries as salmon habitat: Fund for 2 years at $400,000, down from $608,586 requested for 3 years.

Proposal 50 - Bering-Chukchi ice seal monitoring: Fund at $150,000, in anticipation that NOAA will fund additional $250,000. Original request was $403,511. Applicants will be requested to address issues raised in technical reviews, and NOAA will be requested to review and approve the revised proposal before funds are released.

Proposal 60 - Biophysical moorings 2 and 4 in Bering Sea: Fund for 2 years at $320,000, down from $1,358,000 for 3 years. This support is intended to focus mainly on data collection. The Board estimates it will require about $80,000 to maintain each buoy for one year, so this should allow for data collection at two sites for two years. Then the Board should have its science plan in place to help guide decisions and emphasis on long term oceanographic monitoring. The Board requested a longer term plan for ocean monitoring and how funds could be leveraged with under funding sources to support such a system.

Proposal 74 - Community profiles: Fund at $45,000. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has agreed to fund the other $47,747 requested.

Proposals 81 and 136 - Seabird energetics: Combine 2 proposals and fund at $900,000 based on Science Panel recommendation. Original request for both proposals combined was $1.65 million. A new combined statement of work would be required from the principal investigators before release of funds.

Proposal 107 - Assess trawl third-wire threat to seabirds: Fund at $100,000 as pilot project for 1 year, down from $386,980 requested for 2 years.

Proposal 141 - Video monitoring on factory trawlers: Fund at $165,000, down from $224,439 requested.

Proposal 145 - Regional Ocean Sciences Bowl: Fund at $100,000, down from $219,256 requested. Though this qualifies better as an education and outreach proposal, rather than direct research, the Board felt it was important to support the involvement of students in marine policy issues and education as a

lasting legacy. The Board will consider placing a separate category for education and outreach proposals in future requests for proposals.

Other issues that were raised during discussion of proposals include the following:

- Need to determine if proposers have submitted their proposals to other funding sources or if other funds are being used to support the research funded by the Board. This could be accomplished through a new requirement for such information in the next RFP or through a letter directed to the principal investigators seeking such information.
- Need to develop a comprehensive data management plan.
- Proposers need to submit publications record with proposals. The Board wants to ensure that information products from Board-funded research are widely available to other scientists and to the general public.
- Need to determine how to achieve the right mix of education and outreach activities. In the current RFP, these are a component of the proposed research. In developing the next RFP, the Board may wish to establish a separate category for proposals that primarily focus on education and outreach.
- For the next RFP, Science Panel conclusions need to be sent to the Board earlier than was done this year. This may be accomplished by releasing the RFP earlier in the fall, thus allowing more time for technical reviews and Science Panel review and reporting prior to the March 2004 Board meeting.
- The information that is released to the public for each proposal should be expanded beyond the current policy of divulging only the title, names of principal investigators, funding request, and duration, to include the proposal summary page which is generally limited to 250 words but more thoroughly describes the thrust of the proposed research.

4. Committees

Advisory Panel. The Board was scheduled to approve policies and procedures and membership for the Advisory Panel. The Board began developing draft policies and procedures for the Advisory Panel in October 2002. Suggestions to date were incorporated in the draft policy available as item 4(a) under this agenda tab. At this meeting, the Board made no changes to sections 1, 2, 5 or 6. In section 3 regarding the call for nominations, the word "appointments" was substituted for "nominations" in the first sentence of paragraph 2.

In section 4 regarding terms of membership, the Board decided to accept 10 members now and add 10 more next fall. AP members will be requested to draw lots at their first meeting to determine which five members can be reappointed for a second two-year term, to allow for staggering of terms. The Board stated its intention to solicit further nominations for consideration at the October 2003 meeting. The executive director will send an email to Board members asking for suggestions on where to place announcements in a broad call for nominations during the summer. Likely candidates also may be identified during the National Research Council science planning committee workshops and site visits this spring.

The Board added a section 7 on conflict of interest procedures similar, but not identical, to those adopted for Board members. The Board deleted references to approval of funding for research projects because Advisory Panel members will not be requested to approve or disapprove research proposals. The Panel's main role in research will be in the planning phase and identification of research priorities. The following policy was adopted:

Advisory Panel members must refrain from voting if the decision would have a significant and predictable effect on their financial interest or if the member believes he/she has a conflict of interest.

Attachment 3 to this summary has the approved policy and procedures for the Advisory Panel.

Panel on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Since spring 2002, the Board has been considering its overall committee structure. Part of the discussion focused on whether to appoint a separate traditional ecological knowledge (also described as "local" knowledge) panel. In discussions at this meeting, the Board recognized the merits of having such a panel, but felt it would be better served by placing emphasis on achieving such representation on its single Advisory Panel so that all points of view could be expressed through one panel. After the science plan is available in early 2005, the Board may wish to revisit this issue if it believes that the Advisory Panel was not providing sufficient input representative of TEK or local knowledge. The decision to have a single Advisory Panel also will reduce costs, an important imperative given the current shortfall in earnings from the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund.

5. National Research Council

The Board received a progress report on activities of the National Research Council committee that is helping develop a science plan. The Board discussed the schedule for the Anchorage workshop in late March, and the site visits planned for April-June. The schedule now is firm and Board members in communities with site visits were requested to provide contacts and help facilitate the visits. No other action was taken on this agenda item.

6. Response to SJR44

This agenda item was postponed until the May 2003 meeting because Craig Dorman, main author of the report, was not able to attend this meeting.

7. Administrative Matters

The Board was informed of potential May 20-21, 2003 meeting agenda items. A draft agenda will be available in early May. In May the Board will set the fall meeting date for releasing the next request for proposals. The Board also will consider approving a policy on use of designees. The Executive Director will draft a policy. He stated that his intention was to allow ex-officio members, but not Secretarially-appointed members, to have a designee. The Board was notified that the staff will move into new office space in May, and authorized the Executive Director to sign the office lease agreement.

The Executive Director was requested to send a letter from the Chairman to each Science Panel member thanking them for their contributions to the review of proposals and development of funding recommendations.

(Board considerations of the funding situation and reduced yields from the Environmental Restoration and Improvement Fund are summarized under Agenda Item 3: 2003 Proposals, of this meeting summary.)

The Board adjourned at 8:44 a.m. on Thursday, March 20, 2003.

North Pacific Research Board
Conflict-of-Interest and Confidentiality Requirements
for
Science Panel Members and Independent Technical Reviewers

Conflict of Interest

The success of the North Pacific Research Board (Board) in performing its functions depends on the effectiveness and integrity of its decision-making processes. If Board decisions are tainted by conflicting interests, its integrity is severely compromised. The Board must earn the confidence of the scientific community, of the Congress, and of the general public in the integrity, effectiveness, and evenhandedness of its decision-making processes. It will not do so if these processes are seen to be compromised by conflicts of interests. Science Panel members and independent technical reviewers should consider potential conflict situations that may arise in their review of research proposals and in other activities related to the Board. The Board decided in October 2002 that an individual may serve on the Science Panel despite a personal conflict, but must recuse him/herself from voting under three broad affiliations characterized below. The member may remain in the meeting for discussion purposes for all affiliations except item 2, bullet 4, wherein the member must leave the room during discussions and voting. Independent technical reviewers should recuse themselves from evaluating proposals if any of the following circumstances apply.

1. Affiliation with an Applicant Institution
   - Current employment at the applicant institution or agency within the specific department of the applicant, or being considered for employment in that department
   - Ownership of the institution's securities or other evidences of debt
   - Current membership on a visiting committee or similar body that directly relates to the proposal.
   - Current enrollment as a student at a department or school submitting a proposal if the proposed project will be of direct professional or financial benefit
   - Received and retained an honorarium or award related to work or activities in the specific department of the applicant within the last 12 months

2. Affiliation with an Investigator, Project Director, or Other Person with Personal Interest in the Proposal
   - Known family or marriage relationship, if relationship is with a principal investigator, collaborator (if curriculum vitae is included in proposal) or project director
   - Business or professional partnership
   - Past or present association as major thesis/dissertation advisor or thesis/dissertation student to one of the principal investigators
   - Panel member is a principal investigator on a proposal or is listed as a collaborator and a curriculum vitae is included in the proposal package (for this case only, the panel member must leave the room during discussion and voting on that particular proposal)

3. Other Affiliations or Relationships
   - Interests of the following persons must be treated as if they were that of the Science Panel member: any affiliation or relationship of member's spouse or minor child or sibling, of a relative living in the immediate household or of anyone who is legally a partner of the member, that would be covered by the affiliations listed above
   - Other relationship, such as a very close personal friendship or open antagonism that might tend to affect a member's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship

Confidentiality of Documents and Restriction on Contact

The NPRB adopted a policy on confidentiality of proposals in October 2002, agreeing that unfunded proposals will remain proprietary and confidential, though the title, author, requested funding amount, and performance period will be made available to the public. Science Panel members will be given access to the full text of proposals and associated technical reviews, but cannot use that information for personal benefit or make it available for the personal benefit of any other individual or organization. Proposals and materials from unfunded proposals must not be copied, quoted or otherwise disclosed outside official Science Panel meetings, or for purposes other than those related to NPRB. Panel members must not retain copies of proposals in full or part, after the review process is completed. They must not contact the originators of proposals under review concerning any aspect of the contents, without prior approval by NPRB.

Attachment 2
March 2003

North Pacific Research Board Recommendations for Environmental Improvement and Restoration Funds

NPRB approved on March 20, 2003
U.S. Secretary of Commerce approved on April 8, 2003

#	Title	Principal Investigators	Requested		Approved		
			Yrs	Amount	Yrs	Amount	Notes
13	Evaluation of emergent structure in low-relief benthic habitats as a criterion for defining the essential fish habitat of juvenile North Pacific flatfishes	C. Ryer (NOAA-HMSC), A. Abookire (NOAA), I. Fleming (OSU), A. Stoner (NOAA)	3	261,102	3	261,102	
14	A continuous plankton recorder survey of the North Pacific and southern Bering Sea	S. Batten (UK), D. Welch (DFO)	3	285,550	2	180,000	Provide only 2 years at reduced level
15	NPAFC Cooperative Research: salmon community structure and response to environmental change in the Bering Sea	J. Helle (ABL), K. Myers (UW), V. Kapenko (UR), O. Temnykh (UR), Azumaya (JA), H. Urawa (JA), Beamish (CA)	3	300,000	3	500,000	Combine #15, 43, and 113 for total of $500,000 for BASIS for 3 years. Revised statement of work must be within scope of 3 original proposals. Revised proposal will be vetted through Science Panel and then reviewed by NPRB in May.

16	Deep sea coral distribution and habitat in the Aleutian Archipelago	J. Heifetz (ABL), D. Woodby (ADFG), J. Reynolds (UAF)	3	1,482,149	3	1,303,001	Fund at reduced level
17	Monitoring and modeling predator-prey relationships	P. Livingston (AFSC)	1	380,400	1	350,000	Fund at reduced level
23	Species identity and life history of *Hematodinium*, the causitive agent of bitter crab syndrome in Northeast Pacific snow (*opilio*) and Tanner (*bairdi)* crabs	P. Jensen (AFSC), L. Hauser (UW), D. Woodby (ADFG), F. Morado (NOAA)	2	99,805	2	99,805	
28	Bering Sea right whales: ongoing research and public outreach	J. Hildebrand (Scripps)	1	56,117	1	56,117	
29	Forage fishes in the western Gulf of Alaska: variation in productivity	M. Wilson (AFSC), J. Paakkonen, K. Bailey, J. Duffy-Anderson, J. Napp	2	346,102	2	320,000	Fund at reduced level
31	Sperm whale and longline fisheries interactions in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska	J. Straley (UA), T. O'Connell (ADFG), L. Behnken (ALFA), G.	3	184,518	3	184,518	
42	Estuaries as essential fish habitat for salmonids: assessing residence time and habitat use of coho and sockeye salmon in Alaska estuaries	M. Bishop (PWSSS), S. Powers (PWSSS), G. Reeves (OSU)	3	608,586	2	400,000	Fund for 2 years at reduced level
43	NPAFC Cooperative research: genetic stock identification of chum salmon in the Bering Sea and adjacent waters	S. Urawa (JA), T. Azumaya (JA), S. Abe (JA)	3	300,000			See #15 above.
46	Establishing a statewide data warehouse of salmon size, age and growth records	B. Agler (ADFG)	1	43,066	1	43,066	

50	Ice seal bio-monitoring in the Bering-Chukchi Sea region	L. Quakenbush (ADFG), G. Sheffield (ADFG)	3	403,511	3	150,000	NOAA will contribute another $250,000
51	Effects of prey availability and predation risk on the foraging ecology and demography of harbor seals in Prince William Sound: development and test of a dynamic state variable model	A. Frid (ADFG), G. Blundell (ADFG), L. Dill (SFU BC)	2	172,886	2	172,886	
55	Thermal habitat preferences of Pacific Halibut and the potential influence of hydrographic variability on a local coastal fishery	T. Loher (IPHC), H. McCarty (CBSFA)	2	92,920	2	92,920	
60	Continuation of long-term observations on the Bering Sea shelf: Biophysical moorings at sites 2 and 4	P. Stabeno (PMEL), J. Napp (AFSC), J. Overland (PMEL), T. Whitledge (UAF)	3	1,358,000	2	320,000	Should allow for 2 years of data collection
66	Essential fish habitat for blue king crab, Phase I: Development of cultivation techniques for blue king crab larvae	B. Stevens (AFSC-Kodiak)	1	85,561	1	85,561	
71	Pre-season forecast of Bristol Bay sockeye salmon migration timing based on oceanographic and	G. Ruggerone (NRC)	1	24,930	1	24,930	
74	Pilot project fo development of comprehensive baseline commercial fisihin community engagement and dependency profiles for the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands, and Western Gulf of Alaska regions	M. Downs (EDAW)	1	92,747	1	45,000	North Pacific Fishery Management Council will provide additional funds

77	Retrospective study of pigmented macrophage aggregates as markers of Pacific herring population health	G. Marty (UC Davis)	2	68,198	2	68,198	
81	Effects of inter-annual climate change on food availability, diet composition and productivity of planktivorous and piscivorous seabirds	A. Kitaysky (UAF)	3	923,236	3	900,000	combine #81 & 136 and reduce funding to $900,000 total
93	Evaluation of alternative hypotheses to explain the collapse of the Kvichak sockeye salmon: a project to catalyze a comprehensive, hypotheses-driven research program	M. Link (BBSRI), G. Ruggerone (NRC)	3	192,850	3	192,850	
95	Spatial and temporal interactions between endangered short-tailed albatrosses and North Pacific commercial fisheries	R. Suryan (OSU), G. Balogh (FWS)	2	99,321	2	99,321	
107	Assessment of trawl third wires as a threat to seabirds, including the endangered short-tailed albatross	S. Fitzgerald (AFSC)	2	386,980	1	100,000	Fund as pilot project fro 1 year
113	NPAFC cooperative research: Use of genetic stock identification to determine the distribution, migration, early marine survival, and relative stock abundance of sockeye, chinook, and chum salmon in the Bering Sea	R. Wilmot (ABL), J. Seeb (ADFG)	3	818,598			See #15 above.
118	Bering Sea wintering grounds of beluga whales	D. Litovka (RU), P. Richard (DFO), J. Orr (DFO), G. O'Corry-Crowe (SWFSC)	3	161,700	3	161,700	

136	Regime forcing and ecosystem response in the Bering Sea (ReFER): Phase II	A. Springer (UAF)	3	726,862	3		See #81 above.
141	Video monitoring aboard Bering Sea factory trawlers - a pilot study	M. Buckley (Digital Observer)	1	224,439	1	165,000	Fund at reduced level
145	Enhancing rural high school involvement in North Pacific resource issues through participation in Alaska Regional National Ocean Sciences Bowl	S. Sugai (AK Sea Grant)	3	219,256	3	100,000	Fund at reduced level
151	Early marine ecology of juvenile chum salmon in Kuskokwim Bay, Alaska	N. Hillgruber (UAF), C. Zimmerman (USGS), L. Haldorson (UAF)	3	624,025	3	624,025	
		Totals		**11,023,415**		**7,000,000**	

North Pacific Research Board Advisory Panel
Policy and Procedures

1. Purpose and Need

The overall mission of the North Pacific Research Board is to develop and maintain a comprehensive science program of the highest caliber that will provide better understanding of the North Pacific, Bering Sea, and Arctic Ocean ecosystems and their fisheries, and help to sustain and enhance the living marine resources. The Board strongly supports extensive science planning, coordination, and review to enhance its high quality research program, taking into account regional needs. The program will strive to produce scientific knowledge that provides a reference point for understanding the marine ecosystem and impacts of human activities and natural variability on that system.

The Advisory Panel will advise the Board on accomplishing its overall mission by providing a mechanism for meaningful community involvement throughout the science program from planning to oversight and review. The Advisory Panel will have a significant advice-giving role, with active involvement in setting research priorities, defining questions, and helping the Board field an effective and meaningful education and outreach program.

2. Membership

The Advisory Panel will have up to 20 members and will be representative of user groups and other interested parties from the various regions within the Board's purview. The Board will not identify specific areas of expertise for potential Panel members, but rather it will retain the flexibility needed to consider applicants in terms of current research priorities and requirements for balanced representation across regions and topical research areas. The Board intends to refresh and redirect committee membership as new research directions and issues emerge over time.

3. Call for Nominations

The Executive Director shall issue a public call for nominations to serve on the Advisory Panel. Nominations will be called for every other year, most likely in January, so that appointments may be made at the March Board meeting. It is the desire of the Board to have new members of the Advisory Panel appointed and available to meet in May or early June of each year to help in identifying draft research priorities that will be considered for incorporation in the request for proposals that normally will be released each fall. Any person (including oneself) or organization is free to make a nomination. A one to two page resume must be provided for each nominee. Letters of reference also may be submitted. The list of nominees will be reviewed by the Board in March for possible approval for membership. Additional nominations may be solicited by the Board at its discretion.

The Board will consider the following attributes when deciding on appointments to the Advisory Panel:

- Candidates should have a demonstrated ability to be objective in considering research activities and science planning;
- Candidates should be of top quality and caliber and be committed to full and active participation for each meeting during their term;
- Candidates should be considered because of the experience they bring to the Board rather than their political clout or connection;
- Candidates should be active, involved members of their community and business to ensure the best and most pertinent input into the Board and likewise should be responsible and diligent in reporting on Board activities back to their communities.

In selecting Panel members, the Board recognizes that constituencies from Washington, Oregon, and other areas may have direct interest in its activities, in addition to people throughout Alaska from Southeast to the Arctic Ocean. Various ad hoc working groups also may be appointed as needed to focus on specific issues.

4. Terms of Membership

Advisory Panel members serve for 2-year terms. A member may serve two consecutive 2-year terms, if reappointed by the Board, and then must sit out at least one year. Initial appointments will be staggered so that only one-half of the panel is up for reappointment at any time. Initial appointments will be made as follows: one-half of the initial appointments will be for two years and can be reappointed; one-half of the initial appointments will be for two years, but cannot be reappointed, in order to achieve the proper sequence for reappointments. Vacancies may be filled for the unexpired term. The Board, acting through its Chairman, may remove a member of the Advisory Panel for reasons of malfeasance, incompetence, or failure to attend to membership responsibilities.

5. Meetings

The Advisory Panel shall meet as a whole, or in part, at the request of the Chairman of the Panel, with the approval of the Chairman of the Board, as often as necessary to fulfill the Advisory Panel's responsibilities, taking into consideration time and budget constraints. There is no set number of meetings prescribed during the year; rather, the Panel will meet as required and appropriate. The Advisory Panel likely will meet in advance of Board meetings to allow sufficient time for the Panel to prepare recommendations for the Board. All meetings are open to the public.

6. Operations

The Advisory Panel Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected by the Panel from among its members for 1-year terms. Members may not designate alternates. The Panel shall attempt to operate by consensus, however, decisions will be made by majority vote in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order whenever necessary. Minutes shall be kept of each Advisory Panel meeting and shall be provided to the Board and the public. The Executive Director shall provide such staff and other support as the Board considers necessary for Panel activities, within budgetary limitations. Panel members will be paid their actual travel expenses in performing their duties in accordance with applicable law and Board travel policy.

7. Conflict of Interest and Recusal

Advisory Panel members must refrain from voting if the decision would have a significant and predictable effect on their financial interest or if the member believes he/she has a conflict of interest.

(Adopted March 19, 2003)