

**AP Meeting summary
Anchorage 20-21, 2005 September**

The Advisory Panel meeting was held on 20-21 September 2005 at the NPRB in Anchorage. Present were Heather McCarty, Patricia Cochran, John Gerster, Ron Hegge, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, Steve MacLean, and Arni Thomson. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese and Ramona Brown.

1. Call to Order

- a. New members to the AP, Ron Hegge, Frank Kelty, and Steve MacLean were welcomed.
- b. Approve Agenda: MacLean motion to approve agenda, Cochran second; PASSED. McCarty states main goal is to approve 2006 RFP, set the research priorities, and make decisions for the next funding cycle. LTK, outreach and education, and community involvement need to be considered as well by the AP.
- c. Election of officers was deferred to the end of the meeting.
- d. Approve summary of March meeting: the March meeting was not an official quorum meeting, but notes were approved as is.

2. Review of NPRB Planning Documents

- a. Status report on science plan: The Executive Director presented status report and distributed draft Science Plan to AP members for reference.
- b. Implementation Plan: The Executive Director presented overview and presented an overview.
- c. Status report on budget and appropriations: The Executive Director presented a summary and indicated that \$2M for appropriations remain undecided.

3. Other Bases for 2006 Research Priorities

COLLABORATION WITH OSRI: Gerster expressed concern about committing long-term dedicated funding as suggested for this collaboration. The AP recommends to the Board to send a letter to OSRI to look beyond the GOA, specifically to look at potential risks and impacts of oil spills in the Aleutian Islands and along the Great Circle Route.

BSIERP: Motion by Cochran, second by MacLean, to add an indigenous and an industry representative to the BSIERP working group. PASSED unanimously.

IPY: AP suggests working in collaboration with the Institute of the North (Ben Ellis). Also, it would be appropriate to invite participation by/at the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, whose chairmanship is coming to Alaska in 2006 and has a conference planned for June 2006 in Barrow.

AOOS: AP asked about funding for AOOS and the issue that ocean monitoring aspects should ultimately be the responsibility of AOOS and not necessarily a focus of the NPRB. Motion by Gerster and second by Kelty to provide support for the 3 ocean

monitoring projects suggested by the SP as earmarks. PASSED unanimously. Cochran commented on the community outreach component of AOOS and the importance of getting data back to the community. Also mentioned the Indigenous Knowledge Observation Network IKON that should be linked to AOOS or NPRB.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH: Illenberg gave a presentation on the outreach and education efforts conducted so far. The AP commended these efforts and suggested submitting some of the videos being produced to the Northern Research Forum which sponsors a Film Festival in Sweden or Norway. It was also suggested that these films be shown to native communities through the TV show "Heartbeat Alaska". Kelty asked staff whether they could give outreach presentations at different meetings such as SWAMC, etc. Finally, the Panel was given a copy of the Outreach Plan and their comments were:

AP members asked to add the Alaska Native Science Commission as a collaborator conducting outreach activities and as a resource to bring information to communities. It was suggested that Illenberg occasionally attend Council meetings to develop industry links. In addition, it would be useful to have NPRB staff participate in Industry Association Meetings. Board members could also give presentations at their organizations. Other organizations should be contacted as well, for example CDQ groups, Marine Conservation Alliance, SWAMC, United Fisherman of Alaska, Alaska Board of Fisheries, APA, PSPA, NWFA, ACC, Arctic Council, Alaska Forum on the Environment, and RDC.

AP agreed with SP recommendation to identify \$100K and \$50K for E&O activities and products as stated in the Implementation Plan.

LTK: Henry Huntington and MacLean presented the report from the LTK committee and the Executive Director asked for direction from the AP on the current LTK provisions in the draft RFP, as well as on the nature and location of the suggested workshops. Finally, the AP was asked to provide guidance on the future role of the LTK committee.

The report and the recommendation by the SP as drafted were discussed in detail. Several questions were raised, specifically who reviews projects, who will monitor them, how will LTK be quantified, how are results presented back to communities, will it be community research or collaboration? Should we have an external review panel made up of community members? The AP understands the focus on Science in the NPRB program and is seeking a way to adequately review proposals that require LTK expertise.

Motion by Kelty, second by MacLean, to accept the draft RFP language in 4b to "address one or more of the research priorities addressed elsewhere in the RFP and engage LTK" for \$150,000 as recommended by the LTK committee and the SP. MOTION was PASSED unanimously.

Motion by MacLean, second by Cochran to establish a permanent LTK seat on the SP and establish an ad hoc review group of three to four native scientists to review LTK and Community Involvement proposals and make recommendations to the SP and the Board. These appointments should be made in time for the 2006 RFP review cycle.

Motion amendment by Cochran, second by Kelly, to require the seat on the SP to be indigenous. Motion FAILED 6:1.

The main motion as worded above PASSED with 1 opposed.

Motion by Thomson, second by MacLean, to accept the draft RFP language in 4a “Pilot Project for Community-based Observation System” for \$150,000 as recommended by SP and LTK committee. MOTION PASSED unanimously.

Discussion took place on recommended approach regarding workshops to identify hypotheses for annual RFPs. The idea was supported, adding the importance of having the right people from communities, agencies, CDQs, etc. that really know the issues. These workshops should be on nodal communities and focused on 2-3 research priorities of interest to the Board.

Motion by Cochran, second by Kelty, to support focal workshops to develop 3-4 research topics to guide the 2007 RFP at a funding level not to exceed \$80K. MOTION PASSED unanimously.

NPFMC: AP agreed that most of the six topics forward by the Council are included in current RFP draft, with the exception of “analysis to support the development of adaptive management experiments to address SSL protection issues”.

Motion by Cochran, second by Gerster, AP recommends to the Board to consider a plan to develop a SSL adaptive management program with NMFS and the Council for the 2007 RFP. Motion PASSED unanimously.

SE Alaska Synthesis:

AP agreed with SP recommendation to set aside \$100K for IERP planning for the GOA.

Evaluation of Ocean Circulation Models

Motion by Kelty, second by Hegge, to agree with SP recommendation that a modeling oversight group be established to develop conceptual models to support BSIERP component at a level of \$200,000. Motion PASSED unanimously.

SALMON RESEARCH:

Motion by Kelly, second by Thomson, to agree with SP to not include salmon component in the 2006 RFP and to wait until the results of the salmon research and analysis project are available. Motion PASSED unanimously.

4. Development of 2006 Draft RFP

Continuing Funding

AP agreed with the SP recommendation to identify \$1.4M for continuing projects in the context of the item 3 action memo above.

Working from the table 2 on page 2 of the draft RFP: unless otherwise indicated the AP agreed with the recommendations of the Draft as is.

BSIERP

Motion by Cochran, second by Kelty, to reduce the proposed amount from \$1.2M to \$1M and to move the difference to Other Prominent Issues to fund research on Contaminants (see below).

Fish and Invertebrates

Motion by Kelty, second by Thomson, to include a new research priority on crabs: *Research on stock assessment of BSAI king and Tanner Crabs:* King and Tanner crab are a major resource in the Bering Sea yet there is much uncertainty about their current stock assessment. The NPRB is looking for proposals to develop and improve current stock assessment methodologies for crab that will lead to more accurate assessments. Individual proposals should not exceed \$300,000. Motion PASSED unanimously.

The importance and status of crabs in the BSAI were discussed in detail. The AP highlighted importance of this fishery to many communities, especially St. Paul, Dutch Harbor and Kodiak, and the need to go beyond abundance but understand ecological processes, habitat use and the relationship between crab and groundfish stocks.

Also, the AP was concerned that bycatch was not sufficiently highlighted in the current draft RFP. Motion by Gerster, second by Thomson to include another research priority in this category and to remove bycatch of unwanted species from the other category: *Research on reduction of bycatch:* Bycatch is the single most deciding factor on caps in current fisheries. Despite recent advances, research is needed to develop techniques to reduce bycatch of unwanted species in commercial fisheries. Individual proposals should not exceed \$300,000. Motion PASSED unanimously.

The AP commented that adding these two categories may imply having to increase the total amount of funds currently allotted to Fish and Invertebrates. The AP recommends to the Board that if additional money is available it should be added to this category.

Humans

McCarty indicated that the effects of crab rationalization on communities is one of the priorities of the Pribilof Island Collaborative (PIC). There was also some discussion on the amount allotted to this category and whether it should be merged with LTK or whether to remove the language on climate change given the focus in the BSIERP. In the end, it was decided to accept this category as is.

OSRI

AP recommends to only engage in this collaboration one year at a time.

Other Prominent Issues

Contaminants

The AP discussed the importance of contaminants to native communities in detail and highlighted that there is currently no place in the RFP to address this issue, which is on the top of research priorities for most native communities in Alaska. As a result, there was a motion by Cochran, second by Kelty to take 200K from BSIERP section, and create a contaminant category under 'Other Prominent Issues', using the same wording as last year but removing the salmon portion in it: "Studies of sources, transport, effects, and accumulation of contaminants in subsistence, recreational, and commercial species, and other ecosystem components". Motion PASSED unanimously.

5. Future Science Planning

AI research planning

AP made a recommendation that the Board be responsive to the Councils focus on Ecosystem Based Management in the AI and any associated research needs.

Cooperative Research

AP discussed collaborating with the Bering Sea Fisheries Research Foundation on crab stock assessment, and with industry on Right Whale critical habitat in the BS.

Motion by Thomson, second by MacLean to include in the RFP Boiler Plate some language to encourage Cooperative Research. Motion PASSED unanimously

Motion by Thomson, second by Kelty recommending meetings/workshops to identify issues, develop hypothesis, and determine ways to partner with industry and/or ways to further develop the Cooperative Research program of the NPRB. Motion PASSED unanimously. No money was designated for these workshops.

Community Involvement

AP asked for funding for this in the March meeting and now needs to decide what to do with these funds. Several possibilities for community involvement were discussed: - grants (under 10K) which helps bring scientists/specialists together with children and provide liaisons; Youth Grants available to Science Teachers to enhance high school activities, student interns.

Motion was made by Gerster, second by Kelly to revive the Community Involvement Sub-committee, which will help in the detailed development of the Community Involvement Program of the NPRB. It was also suggested to keep the funding level at \$100K and not to reduce it to \$50K as recommended by the SP. Motion PASSED unanimously.

Committee members were designated: Kelly (chair), MacLean, McCarty and Cochran.

Finally, the AP discussed how to review Community Involvement proposals (see inclusion in LTK motion).

Data management

Igor gave a presentation on status of project and metadata database and website.

AP commended him on his efforts and stated the following:

Submissions from villages are often difficult and unreliable online, thus we need to ensure some language in RFP to encourage online submission whenever possible, but that paper copies will be accepted where this option is not available.

6. Other Matters

NPRB annual report

Recaps 2001-2005 NPRB research initiatives into first NPRB annual report. This report will be initiated this year.

MSS January 2006:

AP was informed about the Marine Science Symposium in January and the fact the Board would pay for members of the AP to come to the meeting

Letter of support for Research Vessel

AP supports the letter presented.

Meeting schedule for 2006

Next AP meeting scheduled for late March 2006.

Elect officers

Chair: current Heather McCarty____re-elected

Vice-Chair: current Patricia Cochran__re-elected.