

DRAFT Summary

**NPRB Advisory Panel
April 28-29, 2008
NPRB Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska**

The Advisory Panel met on April 28-29, 2008 in Anchorage. In attendance were Helen Chythlook, Gary Freitag, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, Vera Metcalf, Mike Miller, Arni Thomson, Gale Vick and Kim Williams. Absent were Justine Gundersen, Ronald Hegge and Jeff Stephan. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens and Carolyn Rosner.

Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9am. The first order of business was the selection of a chair and vice chair for the Advisory Panel.

Frank Kelty nominated Gale Vick as Chair and Shirley Kelly as Vice-chair. This nomination was seconded by Arni Thomson. The nominations were passed unanimously.

The AP then discussed the timing of their next meeting and decided on September 9-10, 2008 for their fall meeting to review the 2009 RFP.

The agenda for the current meeting was reviewed.

MOTION: Approve agenda with no amendments.

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion Passed

The AP was given a safety briefing before they started working through the approved agenda.

Proposal Review for 2008 (for information only)

- a. Overview of current research funded by NPRB.

Staff provided a brief review on the status of previous and current projects funded by NPRB. There was discussion on the current issue of getting metadata and data transferred from the PIs of completed projects. The AP felt it was critical that data transfer occur in a timely manner.

MOTION: AP supports specific action to get timely data and metadata from PIs upon completion of a project. Any PI in non-compliance with this policy should be subject to some type of punitive action.

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Arni Thomson
Motion PASSED

Discussion on the motion: Vera Metcalf and Helen Chythlook both commented that, in addition to the need for metadata and data to be transferred, PIs or the NPRB need to ensure that communities receive final reports for projects associated or impacting the community. The AP did not discuss the geographical parameters of how close to the community a project needs to be for this requirement.

Additionally, LTK needs to be in the boiler plate of the RFP. Staff assured the AP that this is already part of the RFP boiler plate.

Vera Metcalf suggested that publications' resulting from NPRB projects that impact communities could potentially go through a community peer review process. Clarence Pautzke stated that for most projects of this kind the peer review is done by the journal and that PIs do not have to address community comments but that NPRB staff will forward any community concerns to the PIs if brought to our attention. Gary Freitag commented that communities need to be able to comment on how data is used as it could be misused to the detriment of the community. Gale Vick suggested a poster be created by NPRB staff to be posted in community and tribal offices in order to let the public know how to use the NPRB website and access the information there.

b. Overview of 2008 Request for Proposals and proposals received.

Francis Wiese overview of the 2008 RFP and the proposals received. This was an information only item.

Frank Kelty noted that the AP should review the full science proposal. Discussion by the AP followed and it was concluded that the AP had raised this issue in the past but the Board had not approved the review of proposals by the AP. Given that this issue had already been dealt with, albeit unsatisfactorily in the eyes of the AP, it was time to move forward. The group was concerned that the AP did not see what was approved until after it become public. As a result there was no way to match AP priorities with the research priorities and received proposals. After general discussion on this issue there was consensus that a community impact statement and general geographical location of the project could be added to the summary page of each proposal, which the AP gets to see, helping order to address this concern.

Gale Vick stated that general regional offices (community, tribal, etc) should have notification of any projects funded by NPRB in their area. Helen Chythlook recommended that PIs look at the Bristol Bay Native Association research protocols when creating proposals that involve communities. Mike Miller and Kim Williams stated that summary of reports of projects should be translated into lay terms. Staff pointed to the project synopsis created for completed projects as an attempt to do this.

Francis Wiese asked if the AP would like to stipulate in the RFP a process that would help the PIs find out what is important to the community. Gale Vick suggested the use of web links to let the PIs know how to make contact with the communities and how the community could make contact with the PIs. Vera Metcalf suggested that her office may have a model that could be used for this purpose.

Budget Review

Clarence Pautzke gave overview of the enabling legislation for the NPRB and the current budget status. This was an information only item.

Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff gave overview of the current status of BSIERP for informational purposes.

General discussion by the AP followed this presentation. Gale Vick and Arni Thomson asked questions about Blue King Crab research in the Bering Sea and why it wasn't included in BSIERP as there is a strong need for this type of research. Francis Wiese answered that there were a number of species that could be included in the BSIERP and that crab had been in one of the original proposals but that due to funding constraints some had to be dropped and crab just fell out as one of the focal species. Gale and Arni were concerned about support for research of blue crab enhancement in the BSAI AND red king crab enhancement for the GOA.

The AP then had a brief discussion about the local and traditional knowledge component of BSIERP and noted that the LTK component included in the overall program is a huge improvement in the process and

they appreciate the Boards support on this matter. The AP also asked staff to notify them when the Community Advisory Boards within the BSIERP communities were set up.

Concerning the Education and Outreach component of BSIERP, Kim Williams recommended that the E&O PI as well as the research PIs contact the school principals in the five BSIERP communities to determine the best way to involve students and teachers in the program. Since much of the field work for this program occurs when school is out of session there needs to be a way to incorporate what is going on into the schools in the fall. While they were supportive of the Polar Trec teacher involved in the cruises the AP felt it was important to have teachers from the BSIERP communities involved on the cruises. Mike Miller recommended that NPRB could contact Glen Seamen at the NOAA tribal affairs office for information about the 2+2 program.

Gale Vick and Arni Thomson were also concerned about ocean currents. These comments were followed by a general discussion about collaborating with other researchers. Helen Chythlook mention that in Yupik there was no word for decline just time of scarcity. This statement raised questions on the natural cycle of fluctuations in populations and how scientists address that. Gary Freitag and Gale Vick recommended collaboration with local fishermen when ever possible.

Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Francis Wiese gave overview of modular approach to GOAIERP development.

Arni Thomson felt that this was moving in a good direction and staff should be encouraged to continue working on this. Frank Kelty supported the modular approach stating that the GOA was more complicated than the Bering Sea. Frank also stated that this was a new approach – not top-down or bottom up but from the center out. This new way of thinking about it was very intriguing and may indeed be the best way to approach a GOA IERP. Mile Miller stated that he supports the modular approach and referenced the herring ASA model. There is a lot of research out there but it is very fragmented and if the first step is to bring all the fragments together it would be very beneficial. Gary Freitag was very supportive of this approach and provided a way to go forward despite all the challenges noted. In SE there was concern about the balance of otter to crab and this type of approach maybe able to look at that issue. Gale Vick also supported the modular approach but was concerned about nearshore and shelf vs. offshelf comparisons. Additionally, the applicability of science to local community economics needs to be considered. Frank Kelty stated that they should go with the SP recommendation to have an RFP drafted to see in the fall.

6. Long-term Monitoring

Molly McCammon gave a presentation on the AOOS program. Francis Wiese followed this was an overview of the proposed long term monitoring policy issues and options supported by the Science Panel and to be presented to the Board later this week.

General Discussion on LTM: Vera Metcalf again observed that we need to include local observations in long term monitoring. There was general support for that notion by the whole AP. The group was concerned about invasive species.

MOTION: AP supports the SP recommendation on long term monitoring based on a dedicated percentage of funding (16-20% of funds with a base of \$700K/year) with a five-year limit on individual projects durations and a strong collaboration with communities as appropriate. In addition a strong collaboration with AOOS and/or other agencies is a requirement of a project.

Maker: Arni Thomson
Second: Mike Miller
Motion PASSED

During discussion of motion Frank Kelty commented that he was concerned about the Arctic Oceans increased traffic and population migrations in the BS and the impact on communities. Both these items need monitoring.

Helen Chythlook, in speaking to the motion, supports this so long as there is collaboration with communities. Frank Kelty supports this as long as there is no diversion from BSIERP. Gary Freitag also supports the long term monitoring and asked for clarification of LTM vs. long-term research programs. Staff provided that clarification to the satisfaction of the AP. Molly McCammon stated that more focus should be made on the biological changes over time not just the physical oceanography. Vera Metcalf stated that we need a strong community component to these monitoring programs. Arni Thomson supports LTM based on the criteria of close collaboration with AOOS. Mike Miller supported Arni's suggestion of collaboration with AOOS. Helen Chythlook, as stated above, will support as long as there is collaboration with community groups. Shirley Kelly stated that she supports this long term monitoring policy but has concerns that other agencies will stop using their own funds for this type of research because they think they can get NPRB to fund their agency monitoring projects. Molly McCammon stated that this issue had arisen at EVOS and they developed policy and criteria to distinguish between what was normal agency business/monitoring and what was above what the agency should and could fund within their own budgets.

Workshops and Symposiums

In the interest of time much of this agenda item was dropped from discussion as it was information only. The AP determined they could look over the material in their own time and contact staff if any questions arose concerning these items. Two exceptions were:

Workshop on habitat surveys in Bering Sea canyons: Frank Kelty asked for a brief overview of this agenda item. Francis Wiese provided the background history on this item and noted that the Board had already agreed to fund a workshop on this issue. Frank Kelty stated that he had concerns over this becoming a "dog-and-pony" show that was supporting the agenda of other agencies that the Board may not want to support. Francis assured the AP that the Board was aware of this aspect of the workshop and that was not the Board intent.

MOTION: AP supports concept of a workshop in this issue with presentations by various researchers, industry and agencies.

Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Mike Miller
Motion PASSED

Arctic Workshop: AP asked for a brief overview of this item which was then provided by staff. After the overview the AP requested that they be notified when that is going to happen. Helen Chythlook mentioned that BBNA had done a lot of work on water quality and contaminant analysis and had lots of people trained in that.

Other Matters: Only two of the items under this agenda category were discussed in the interest of time. Those were the Graduate Student Research Awards and the Education, Outreach and Communication status report.

Graduate Student Research Awards: After a brief overview of the program and the review process the AP had a general discussion about the candidates before making the following motion.

Motion: The AP supports the recommendations made by the Science Panel for the winners of the 2008 Graduate Student Research Awards.

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion PASSED

Education, Outreach and Communications: Status report: Carolyn Rosner gave a report on behalf of herself and Nora Deans on all the products and outreach activities undertaken by NPRB staff over the last year, the development of a Alaska COSEE program and the enhanced student support at all education levels. Photo contest winner based on AP voting was also revealed. The Board will also vote on the photo contest winners and the votes will be combined with the AP votes to determine the final winners.

Concluding remarks: The AP commended the staff on an excellent job both on meeting facilitation and on their work throughout the year.

MOTION: Motion to adjourn at 12:15
Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Helen Chythlook
Motion PASSED