

Meeting Summary

**NPRB Advisory Panel
April 27-28, 2009
NPRB Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska**

The Advisory Panel met on April 27-28, 2009 in Anchorage. In attendance were Gary Freitag, Ronald Hegge, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, Jeff Stephan, Arni Thomson, Gale Vick and Kim Williams. Absent were Helen Chythlook, Justine Gundersen, Vera Metcalf, and Mike Miller. The meeting was staffed by Nora Deans, Carrie Eischens, Clarence Pautzke, Carolyn Rosner, Tom Van Pelt, and Francis Wiese.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm. The first order of business was the election of a chair and vice chair for the Advisory Panel.

MOTION Election of officers: Gale Vick as Chair, Shirley Kelly as Vice-Chair.
Maker: Kim Williams
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion Passed unanimously

The agenda for the current meeting was reviewed.

MOTION: Approve agenda with no amendments except to consider September minutes at end of meeting
Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Shirley Kelley
Motion Passed unanimously

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

2. Proposal Review for 2009 (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 about metadata and data transferred from the PIs of completed projects. Staff informed the AP of a new collaborative effort with USGS in supporting metadata standards, and also about the metadata workshop held at the Alaska Marine Science Symposium.

b. Overview of 2009 Request for Proposals and proposals received.

Carrie Eischens noted that this year's RFP received a typical response; incoming proposals totaled around four times the \$3.7 million target funding level. Carrie Eischens described the standard review process

that incoming proposals undergo, culminating in “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” summary ranking by the Science Panel. Gale Vick asked about available dollars versus total of Tier 1 rated proposal funding requests; Clarence Pautzke responded that this is the first year with Tier 1 total under the target dollars available.

Francis Wiese then provided a description of each of the “Tier 1” proposals received.

A question was raised in regard to proposal #24- Is the Pacific Cod stock assessment related to the Bering Sea/AI split? Staff answered that new proposed data collection was to take place in the GOA but that the analysis appears to include previous sampled for the BS/AI.

Frank Kelty asked why overall proposal numbers are low- problem with the RFP? Clarence answered no, it is just an anomalous year; also noted that the Science Panel is keeping its standards high, and many PIs are tied up in BSIERP and GOAIERP.

Arni Thompson, Jeff Stephan, Gary Freitag and Gale Vick expressed concern over the lack of crab proposals, especially given the current emphasis on king crab enhancement.

Ron Hegge asked about conflicts of interest- Clarence noted that NPRB meets NSF standards in avoiding conflicts of interest; affiliated people do not participate in judging proposals.

There was discussion about proposal 53; Kim Williams, Frank Kelty, and Gale Vick wanted to know why it focuses on Unalaska when there is no subsistence harvest of Chinook salmon in Unalaska. There was discussion about a statement to the Board asking that if this proposal gets funded, they should ask for clarification of why Unalaska is targeted in the proposal. No motion was made.

3. Budget Review

Clarence Pautzke walked the AP through the budget review documents. This was an information only item.

4. Integrated Ecosystem Research Programs

Bering Sea: Tom Van Pelt gave an overview of the BEST-BSIERP program activities since the previous AP meeting. Frank Kelty asked about crab research included in the program; staff responded that crabs are not a focal species for upper-trophic level study, but that much information about crab habitat is being collected and also that the NOAA bottom trawl component of BEST-BSIERP will collect information about crabs that will feed into the integrated modeling part of BEST-BSIERP.

Ron Hegge asked about big results coming from the project so far; staff responded that it’s too early in the program for major conclusions, but referred the AP to the “headlines” that are available in summary form on the BEST-BSIERP website for interim results: <http://bsierp.nprb.org/results/headlines.html>

Staff also updated the AP regarding the BSIERP Advisory Group (AG), and noted that AG members should all attend the October PI meeting in Girdwood so that they can be informed about the project, interact with the BEST/BSIERP Science Advisory Board, and prepare a report for the Board.

GOA: Carrie Eischens gave an overview of the current status of GOA IERP development process, including a review of the three UTL proposals currently under review.

5. Graduate Student Research Awards

Carrie Eischens gave an overview of the GSRA applications, with a brief summary of each of the applications and an explanation of the Science Panel's ratings.

There was discussion about the merits and faults of individual projects. Staff emphasized that the core purpose of the GSRA program is to foster up-and-coming young scientists, so review of the applications should focus on the student's qualifications in the first instance and the quality of the project to a lesser extent. It was noted, however, that the AP could provide another degree of input, namely project relevance to communities, and discussed whether this should be a formal criteria for consideration in the future.

Gale Vick noted that AP members can bring general insights from the GSRA process back to their communities and networks as a way to help bring new student applications forward. Vick re-emphasized the importance of confidentiality, however.

Frank Kelty suggested that the AP could make recommendations to the Board for extra GSRA support, considering that the RFP is currently under budget.

MOTION: The AP recommends GSRA applications 96, 102, 111, 100, and 114 be supported by the Board.
Maker: Jeff Stephan
Second: Gary Freitag

Amendment to the motion: Replace application 102 with 109.
Maker: Kim Williams
Second: Ron Hegge
Amendment Passed.

Amendment to the motion: Add application 102 as a sixth GSRA for Board consideration
Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Jeff Stephan
Amendment Passed.

Amendment to the motion: Add application 97 as a seventh GSRA for Board consideration
Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Jeff Stephan
Amendment Passed.

Amendment to the motion: Add application 106 as an eighth GSRA for Board consideration
Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Gary Freitag
Amendment Failed.

Vote on the main motion, as amended:

The Advisory Panel asks the Board to consider funding GSRA application numbers 96, 109, 111, 100, and 114 as the top five applications, and considering two more applications, namely 102 in 6th place and 97 in 7th place. The motion passed unanimously.

Further discussion in re. crab larval transport questions resulted in a motion:

MOTION: The Advisory Panel respectfully recommends to the Board that the 2010 RFP include a solicitation for proposals that study the transport of crab with anticipated results that are reasonably applicable across Gulf of Alaska ecosystems.

Maker: Jeff Stephan

Seconded: Frank Kelty

The motion passed unanimously.

There was a lengthy discussion on how NPRB can encourage graduate student proposals that were more specific to the NPRB Science Plan, and, in particular, specific to issues of importance to communities and industry research needs in the North Pacific.

Additionally, the Advisory Panel expressed their support for student graduate work and the Science Panel's excellent reviews and deliberations.

Kim Williams noted that in her opinion many of the GSRA applications did not have enough detail about community involvement, or the community involvement descriptions were not realistic. The AP recognized the constraints of funding for GSRA's as well as the existing requirements but felt that there was a missing element, namely that students would benefit by understanding and incorporating more specific community involvement components in their work as a necessary part of marine research in Alaska.

Discussion about this issue culminated in a motion:

MOTION: The Advisory Panel respectfully recommends that the 2010 GSRA application guidelines ask for descriptions of community involvement in greater depth, and make community involvement a formal review and a third (in addition to student qualification and project merit) selection criteria.

Maker: Kim Williams

Seconded: Gary Freitag

The motion passed unanimously.

6. Workshops and Symposiums

- a. Molly McCammon gave an overview of the Arctic Research Workshop held in January 2009. The AP was especially interested in the preliminary discussions of a Marine Policy at the State level.
- b. Clarence Pautzke gave an introduction of the upcoming International Arctic Fisheries Management Symposium to be held in the third week of October.
- c. Clarence Pautzke also introduced the request for support for the upcoming PICES-ICES workshop on climate change effects on fisheries to be held in Japan in 2010
- d. Clarence Pautzke introduced another support request for a data workshop on "Fishery Dependent Information" to be held in Ireland in 2010.

These were information only items.

7. Other matters

Discussion about the pending shortage of stock assessment scientists evolved into a discussion about insufficient science and math education in primary and secondary schools. It was noted that NPRB already supports local and statewide Science Fairs in an effort to contribute to improving science

education, and that NPRB is considering support for outstanding science teachers. Clarence Pautzke also encouraged communities to apply for small grants under the “Community Involvement” category in future RFPs, noting that grants can be small (e.g. \$3-5K) and could provide support for special science projects. It was noted that this discussion should continue at the next AP meeting in September.

There was considerable discussion over the lack of funding for ADF&G and NMFS to attract sufficient scientists and the lack of funding at school districts to attract better teachers. In addition, local districts should encourage more science training for teachers. Kim Williams felt that science requirements for teacher certification at UAF, for example, were inadequate. Many of the AP members emphasized that encouragement for scientific inquiry begins at the elementary school level.

Kim Williams and Jeff Stephan are on their local school boards and Gary Freitag and Gale Vick and others participate with students in many arenas and were specifically concerned about the need to foster greater opportunities in general to have students participate in marine science.

Vick requested that the Education Outreach consider specific web links for parents. The AP was encouraged by the many specific projects and links the Education Outreach program was already conducting.

The AP felt all of these issues contributed directly to the lack of upcoming marine scientists, particularly with those who have good statistical backgrounds.

MOTION: The Advisory Panel suggests that the Board consider small grants for ocean science and math teachers in Alaska with an emphasis on elementary education.
Maker: Kim Williams
Seconded: Jeff Stephan
The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the minutes from the September 2008 Advisory Panel meeting.
Maker: Gary Freitag
Seconded: Frank Kelty
The motion passed unanimously.

Education, Outreach and Communications: Nora Deans and Carolyn Rosner gave a report 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:

There was a discussion over the need for the AP, the Science Panel and the NPRB to continue to explore ways to foster greater communications and projects between communities, schools, industry and science. The AP recognizes the uniqueness of the NPRB as a whole and the amount of effort since 2002 in incorporating many needs of the North Pacific.

The AP commended the staff for their meeting facilitation and on their work throughout the year.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm.