

Draft Summary (revised – 20 August 2010)
North Pacific Research Board
Teleconference
June 18, 2010

Call to Order/Roll Call/Approve Agenda

The North Pacific Research Board met via teleconference on June 18, 2010 to discuss the Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program. Board members in attendance (at the NPRB office) were Ian Dutton (Chairman), Steve MacLean, and Pete Hagen (NOAA alternate for Doug DeMaster). Joining by phone were Nancy Bird, CAPT Michael Cerne, John Gauvin, John Hilsinger, Leslie Holland-Bartels, Howard Horton, John Iani, Paul MacGregor, Heather McCarty, Gerry Merrigan, and Eric Olson. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Nora Deans and Katie Blake. Attending the meeting as visitors were Phil Mundy, Jeff Stephan, Chris Oliver, Pete Jones, Mike Castellini, Doug DeMaster, Jamal Moss, and Shannon Atkinson.

Chairman Dutton called the meeting to order at 9:05a.m. He noted that only Board members would be allowed to speak, unless specific information was requested from others on the line. He asked for comments on the agenda or a motion to approve it. McCarty requested confirmation that while not specifically noted on the agenda, other discussion pertaining to the GOAIERP, specifically that dealing with a marine mammal component, would not be precluded. Chairman Dutton confirmed that was the case. It was suggested that approval of the May 2010 meeting summary (Item 1) should be moved to the end of the current meeting or to the September meeting, because the actions taken in May would be discussed further today.

MacLean moved to approve the agenda. This was seconded by Olson. Attention was drawn to the email sent out by DeMaster late on June 17. The question was raised whether this item should be added to the agenda, particularly because it stated: "...given the tone of [Pautzke's] response and given the recusal to vote by Ian on the GOAIERP, [DeMaster] recommended that the vice-Chair, Eric Olson, chair the call tomorrow." Olson respectfully declined the invitation to chair the meeting, stating that he did not believe it was necessary and that he did not attend the May meeting and thus would not be in the best position to be chair. Chairman Dutton concurred that he did not believe it was necessary for him to relinquish the chair for this meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to move approval of the May meeting summary to the end of the meeting. This passed with no objections. With this change the agenda was approved with no objections.

Conflict of Interest

The Executive Director reviewed conflict of interest procedures, noting NPRB's desire to adhere to the strictest standards, passing the "Washington Post/cynical journalist" test. All Board members involved, including federal employees, must adhere to high standards of impartiality.

Each Board member then was asked to state if they had any conflict of interest, and if so, the nature of it. With the exceptions listed below Board members had no known conflicts:

1. MacGregor and McCarty stated that they are on the advisory panel for the PCCRC which is connected with the University of Alaska Fairbanks, however, neither believed this to be a conflict of interest and there were no objections.

- 52 2. McCarty was asked if she perceived there being any inherent conflict of interest because of her
53 past representation of SFOS at the September 2008 Board meeting as an alternate for former
54 member Denis Wiesenburg. McCarty indicated that she sat in as a non-voting member mainly to
55 convey back to Wiesenburg what happened at the meeting, and therefore, there was no conflict of
56 interest in acting upon UAF-related proposals.
- 57 3. Olson, Dutton and McCarty all disclosed that they sit of the School of Fishery and Ocean Science
58 advisory panel at the University of Alaska Fairbanks but did not believe this to be a conflict of
59 interest and there were no objections.
- 60 4. Chairman Dutton also disclosed that there is a historical connection to a personnel action between
61 one of the UTL PIs and the Alaska SeaLife Center of which he is the current CEO. As a result,
62 he plans to recuse himself from any vote involving that PI.

63
64 Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

65
66 1. Review of Board actions in May 2010

67
68 Pautzke reviewed the Board's actions in May 2010, which basically resulted in passage (with one
69 objection) of the GOAIERP, retaining seabirds upon further justification from the PIs, removing the
70 Steller sea lion component and associated funding.

71
72 Board members asked for a reminder of the Science Panel's (SP) recommendation regarding the
73 GOAIERP prior to the Board's May meeting and how the Board's actions corresponded to those
74 recommendations. Staff clarified that the Board's first motion on May 5th adopted the SP
75 recommendation, but the reconsidered and revised motion passed on May 6th departed from the SP
76 recommendation because it removed SSL work rather than just ask for further justification.

77
78 2. Review of activities since May meeting

79
80 The Executive Director outlined the series of events and communications that occurred since the May
81 2010 meeting.

- 82
83 a. A letter (Item 2) was sent to the lead PI of the UTL component, Jamal Moss, on May 10th
84 informing him of the Board's decision and asking for further justification of the seabird work by
85 May 17th.
- 86
87 b. On May 13th, DeMaster, representing the Secretary of Commerce as the NOAA representative on
88 the Board, based on a designation by the Regional Administrator, sent a letter (Item 3) to the
89 Board's Chairman and Executive Director suggesting *inter alia* that the Board had been
90 misinformed regarding the impact on the fisheries research of the 24% reduction in the award.

91
92 The Executive Director asked the Board to determine if they also feel they were misinformed and if
93 so, appoint a 3-member committee to look into the issue further, talk with staff and report back to the
94 Board. Chairman Dutton asked the Board if they had concerns regarding information they received at
95 the May meeting and whether they felt they were misinformed. All Board members stated that they
96 did not feel they were intentionally misinformed by staff and that the information that was presented
97 to the Board by staff was the information that was in the proposal submitted. However, it was noted
98 that, based on what has come to light since the meeting, that information was incomplete, and some
99 Board members stated that they might have made a different decision if they had had complete
100 information at the time they voted. The Board agreed that despite this feeling, no 3-member
101 committee would be formed to do a forensic review of the materials that were provided at the May
102 2010 Board meeting that led to the motions and decisions regarding the GOAIERP.

- 103
104 c. Mundy sent a response (Item 4) on May 13th in lieu of Moss who was on leave, asking for extra
105 time to respond (i.e. May 21st instead of May 17th). Among other things, Mundy noted that the
106 amount of funds removed was incorrect because some was required for the fish and
107 oceanographic studies. The Executive Director responded to Mundy's letter asking that Moss
108 respond specifically to the seabird justification issue and clarify the cost of the non-SSL work that
109 had been inadvertently impacted by the Board's decision.
110
111 d. Moss's letter responding to the Executive Director's May 10 letter was received on May 21st
112 (Item 5).
113

114 Wiese reviewed the contents of the letter with the Board stating that the justification for the seabird
115 work in paragraphs 6 and 7 provided new information and citations that had not been provided in the
116 revised statement of work. This portion of the letter provided estimates of the biomass of juvenile
117 forage fish removed by seabirds and stated that seabirds are an integral and relevant part of the GOA
118 ecosystem. It also provided more detail on how the marine mammal component of the UTL would
119 be integrated into the overall GOA IERP. Board members questioned if this was the type of
120 information that the Science Panel and staff had asked to be included in the revised proposal. Staff
121 confirmed that was indeed the case.
122

123 With respect to the \$576,838 that was removed with the SSL component, Wiese noted that the
124 amount was based on the annotated budget in the revised proposal submitted at the end of March.
125 The letter from Moss noted that this number did not take into account the labor needed to include fish
126 work. As a result, the PIs felt that the removal of that money from the UTL project would have a
127 negative impact on the entire program because it would affect non-SSL work also.
128

129 The letter stated that total funding for non-SSL work that needed to be reinstated was \$282,610
130 (approximately half of the total amount removed). Staff noted that it was not possible to glean any
131 such number from the documents provided by the UTL team at the time of the May Board meeting.
132

133 Wiese further noted that \$282,610 number had been further revised after the May 2010 PI meeting in
134 Seattle. PIs were asked to provide a breakdown of this amount so that staff could understand how it
135 was calculated so they could accurately present it to the Board. Franz Mueter (UAF PI) provided an
136 updated figure of \$270k for the non-SSL part of the \$577K, and indicated these funds would pay for
137 administration/coordination efforts for overall project, a post-doc for the retrospective work, and
138 travel.
139

140 Much of the remainder of the letter dealt with the UTL PIs not agreeing with the removal of the SSL
141 portion of the proposal and justifying why the SSL section should be included. The PIs also opined
142 that they believed the Board was inconsistent between their decisions regarding SSL and seabirds,
143 and wanting proof of linkage before actually doing the necessary research.
144

145 Board members inquired if the information provided in the letter was some of what the Science Panel
146 had been looking for. Staff responded that this was true. Board members asked if there had been a
147 page limit on the revised proposal that would have limited the PIs from providing this
148 information/justification before. Staff indicated that there was no page limit on the revised proposal
149 although perhaps this had not been clearly stated to the PIs. However, it was made very clear and
150 reiterated several times that justification for both the seabird and SSL work should be included in the
151 revised statement of work. Board members asked about the inclusion of top down vs. bottom up
152 control on the gauntlet recruitment question. Staff indicated that the only way to explore this
153 currently would be through the modeling component. However, the motion made at the January 2010

154 Board meeting limited the modeling effort for this IERP to go just through recruitment and not onto
155 older age-class fish or the effect on top-level predators such as seabirds and Steller sea lions, and the
156 multi-species model that is included (free of charge to NPRB) is for the Western GOA only. With no
157 Eastern GOA multispecies model there will be no comparison of the two regions at the highest
158 trophic level and no investigation of bottom-up controls on SSL. The only way to include top down
159 predation effects is either through direct predation of larval and YOY as a mortality factor in the
160 individual based models or indirectly by estimating the removal of competitors (forage fish) in the
161 nearshore and modeling its subsequent impact on survival of YOY.
162

163 The Board members also asked about the retrospective analysis and how that would fit into all the
164 components. Staff stated that the retrospective work was very important and included all trophic
165 levels. The two field years were investigating the survival of the five focal fish species through the
166 first year and then there was a gap between settlement and when these fish are picked up in the
167 NOAA surveys at 2 or 3 years of age. The retrospective analysis would try to fill in some of these
168 gaps but also provide important information for the IBM models relating to the trajectory of the
169 larvae, growth rates, physical properties, etc. All components of the IERP have retrospective
170 analyses planned and will be looking at existing work to help fill in the gaps. Board members asked
171 if this included food analysis and if the SSL information would be included. Staff indicated that food
172 analysis is included and is already available.
173

174 Board members asked if previous studies of scat analysis for SSL had not reported YOY otoliths or
175 had just not looked for them in the scat. Staff answered that most papers available on this topic did
176 not specify age-class of the fish species consumed so it was difficult to answer that question. In the
177 few papers that do address size of fish consumed, they only pertain to pollock and it appears that the
178 smallest age classes (i.e., YOY) are present in very small numbers. Other papers that staff is aware of
179 that deal with consumption of the five focal fish species by SSL do not give a breakdown by age or
180 size class. Mundy was invited to speak and stated that the basic principle is that the chances of finding
181 an otolith in scat is size-related, with small otoliths being harder to find than larger otoliths, but that
182 the main issue here is not whether you can find YOY otoliths in scat but whether you can afford to
183 look for them in order to properly inform the models.
184

- 185 e. A three member ad hoc subgroup of the Science Panel evaluated the justification for seabirds
186 provided in Dr. Moss's letter from May 21st. The subgroup paid specific attention to the two
187 paragraphs on page 6 & 7.
188

189 Staff summarized the subgroup's findings (Item 6): The SP subgroup felt PIs did a good job with
190 justification. There was concern about the estimates regarding the amount of biomass removed, but
191 the Panel felt that even if these numbers were off by an order of magnitude and included other prey
192 species than those of interest in the IERP, this level of predation by birds is significant and including
193 seabirds in the IERP would be an important and valuable part of the program. The subgroup of the
194 Science Panel concluded that this was a good justification, a good step forward and seabirds should
195 be included. The subgroup also noted that the seabird and mammal observers should be put on ships
196 and added back into the program (\$30K).
197

198 Board members asked why there was such a small group of the SP included in this subgroup and if
199 the members present were the seabird experts in the SP. Staff answered that the subgroup had been
200 somewhat larger when the justification was expected to arrive on May 17, but due to scheduling
201 conflicts, the group had grown smaller when the letter was not received until May 21. The SP
202 members forming the subgroup were not the seabird experts per se but had been involved in the
203 GOA IERP process all along, were familiar with all of the issues, and were able to make informed
204 judgments on the justification provided. Board members then asked why the SSL information

205 provided in Moss's letter had not been considered by the SP subgroup. Staff answered that the
206 subgroup was following the instructions of the Board (May meeting motion) which had already
207 removed SSL and directed them to review the seabird justification only, although it was noted that the
208 subgroup did comment on the merits of funding seabird and marine mammal observers (see previous
209 paragraph).

210
211
212 f. The first GOAIERP PI meeting was held in Seattle on May 25-27th. Francis Wiese provided a
213 summary of the meeting to the Board, noting that the meeting went well and the PIs were eager to
214 get the program up and running.

215
216 Board members noted that it did not appear that the SSL issue was raised during the discussions at the
217 PI meeting. Wiese commented that other than informing the group of the Board's May meeting
218 decision, staff did not bring up the SSL issue and no other meeting participant ever raised this
219 particular issue. The only general comment that was made came from the modeling group, noting
220 that according to their food web models for the central and western Gulf, pinnipeds consume a very
221 small portion of the juvenile focal species biomass. Also, a request from the PIs was made that the
222 seabird and marine mammal observers be reinstated.

223
224 3a. Consider retaining seabird component

225
226 The Board needed to determine if they accepted the SP subgroups recommendation to retain the seabird
227 portion of the UTL proposal. Based on phrasing of the May meeting motion, no action would result in
228 retaining the seabird component.

229
230 Although no action was necessary, the Board requested that it be noted in the minutes that the Board
231 received the justification that seabirds have a significant effect on recruitment of the focal fish species in
232 certain areas of the Gulf of Alaska, and thus the seabird component would be retained within the
233 GOAIERP. This was agreed with no objections.

234
235 3b. Consider revised budget

236
237 The Board next needed to determine how to revise the budget to re-instate the funds inadvertently
238 removed that would impact the non-SSL portion of the UTL.

239
240 Wiese reviewed the current budget for the GOAIERP (Item 8) and how reinstating the \$270K + \$30K for
241 observers would impact the overall budget. With these additions and a reduction in the Program
242 Management/Education and outreach budget from \$700K to \$500K, the total cost of the GOAIERP
243 would be \$9,027,429. Board members then discussed concerns raised by Mundy in his June 10 email.

244
245 4. Phil Mundy's letter of June 10, 2010

246
247 Board members considered the June 10 email from Mundy (Item 9) and asked him to clarify his statement
248 that adding these funds (the \$270K) back in would "...not be enough and that reducing the funding and
249 removing the Steller Sea Lion from the project left it incapable of functioning as an integrated ecosystem
250 research project."

251
252 Mundy indicated that although the issues were not raised by the UTL PIs or others at the May 2010 PI
253 meeting in Seattle, the PIs were still uncomfortable with moving forward without a marine mammal
254 component and felt that the UTL team had been broken apart by the Board's decision. The UTL group
255 requests that the entire allocated funds be reinstated and that it be acknowledged that SSLs are a

256 legitimate subject for the study and ask that staff and the Science Panel be allowed to work with the UTL
257 PIs to make this work. He expressed confidence in the Science Panel and NPRB staff to succeed in
258 working the issues out as they have in the past with other programs. He further stated that the Auke Bay
259 Lab needs to ensure that the over \$3 million contribution they are making to this partnership is worth it
260 and supports a project that will succeed in achieving the goals of the IERP.

261
262 Chairman Dutton noted his appreciation for the partnership and stated that the task at hand was to decide
263 between approving the \$9.027M budget and possibly adding a marine mammal component later or adding
264 the SSL component back in.

265
266 Mundy stated that he did not want to see a special RFP for a new marine mammal component, but felt
267 that the Board should work with the UTL PI's as originally selected by the Science Panel to develop a
268 marine mammal component that could include SSL for an amount not to exceed the total amount of funds
269 initially approved (Approx. \$600K).

270
271 Board members asked for clarification regarding whether Mundy was suggesting \$600K in addition to the
272 \$270K currently on the table. Mundy stated he was not, and that the \$600K would be inclusive of the
273 \$270K.

274
275 Chairman Dutton clarified that one option would be to add the \$270K to make the non-SSL part whole,
276 plus allocate ~ \$306K for staff to work with current PIs to fix/develop the SSL-directed aspect of the
277 program.

278
279 MacGregor had to leave the meeting at this point but requested that it be on the record that he supported
280 Mundy's request, and recommended that the Board find funding to put the SSL component back in the
281 program, which could be in terms of a more fleshed out proposal at some future time.

282
283 Other Board members stated that they also may be in support of this but would like to know what the
284 Science Panel thinks of the SSL justification provided in the Moss letter of May 21. Staff agreed that
285 there was some further justification in that letter, but also asked for clarification from the Board whether
286 they were discussing a "marine mammal" or specifically a "Steller sea lion" component be added back in.
287 There was some concern expressed by staff that the SP may remain unconvinced that a SSL component
288 (and modeling being conducted) would get at the questions being asked regarding fish recruitment and a
289 regional comparison. Staff noted that if a marine mammal component is to be included in the IERP, it
290 should first be determined which marine mammal species makes the most sense and the Board should
291 clarify for staff and the Science Panel whether they are including a marine mammal component relevant
292 to the gauntlet or for the sake of having a marine mammal component as part of the IERP.

293
294 Mundy responded that the UTL group is open to the generic "marine mammal" option but would like an
295 explicit statement that SSL could be included.

296
297 Board members asked the Executive Director what the implications of adding approximately \$600K back
298 to the GOAIERP (\$577K had been removed in the May 10 letter to Moss) would mean to other NPRB
299 programs. He responded that the money would have to come from somewhere – either through
300 diminishing the regular annual RFP, delaying future IERPs or reducing or delaying an Arctic strategy, etc.

301
302 Regarding Mundy's point about the study not being complete without SSL, the Executive Director
303 reminded the group that the Moss et al. pre-proposal only dealt with recruitment and the gauntlet, and at
304 the time, the Board felt it was worthy of an invitation to full proposal on its own without a marine
305 mammal component. If the Board now feels that a marine mammal component is necessary, he has
306 proposed a 10-step process to get a separate RFP out for a marine mammal component that would be

307 based on a NMML-led assessment/whitepaper identifying which marine mammal(s) need to be included
308 to link to recruitment of the five focal fish species. Such a process would lead to an open competition to
309 get the best possible marine mammal component for the GOA program.

310
311 DeMaster was invited to speak to this by Hagen. With respect to the idea that NMML would be involved
312 and/or take the lead in drafting a whitepaper, DeMaster stated he had serious reservations about this
313 approach and was not supportive for a number of reasons. In particular, the Director of NMML, John
314 Bengtson, had expressed his concern that if NMML PI's were involved in drafting the whitepaper, they
315 may be restricted from responding to a competitive RFP on marine mammals if one were issued. It also
316 should be noted that one of the NMML PIs (i.e., Tom Gelatt) was a collaborator on the UTL proposal.

317
318 The Executive Director responded that he believed that NMML PIs could take the lead, but should be
319 augmented with other marine mammal experts from outside NMML (e.g., other federal employees and
320 academics). He did not believe there would be any problem with the authors of the whitepaper applying
321 to any potential RFP. DeMaster reiterated that because of the concerns raised, NMML would not be
322 contributing to this effort. The Board took no action on this proposal for NMML to lead the development
323 of a whitepaper.

324
325 **Overall Budget Revisions for UTL Component**

326
327 Chairman Dutton stated that the matter at hand was to decide on adding the \$270K (for non-SSL work
328 impacted by May motion) plus \$30K for observers. This would also in effect reverse the Board's motion
329 to not exceed \$9M for the GOAIERP program (as it would go \$27,000 over). Some Board members felt
330 that more discussion was needed regarding additional funds for marine mammals, either by reinstating the
331 entire \$577K to the UTL or by going the route the Executive Director had just proposed. However, other
332 members felt the \$270k + \$30K issue should be dealt with first. Mundy clarified that he was not
333 explicitly asking for an additional \$306K for marine mammals, but that a process be started whereby the
334 NPRB staff and the Science Panel work with the UTL PIs to determine what marine mammal component
335 should be supported by the Board. He emphasized that the Executive Director's suggestion of going
336 outside the existing group would break the partnership that the UTL PIs have entered into; his suggested
337 course of action would leave the partnership intact. He further stated his understanding of the
338 NPRB/AFSC UTL partnership by reading a quote from the NPRB web site dated July 17, 2009:

339
340 "Jamal Moss, Kalei Shotwell, Franz Mueter and Shannon Atkinson presented an overview of their
341 funded upper trophic level proposal, "Surviving the gauntlet: an integrated study of the pelagic,
342 demersal, and spatial linkages that determine groundfish recruitment and diversity in the Gulf of
343 Alaska ecosystem".

344
345 A motion was made by McCarty to add \$270K back into the UTL budget to make the non-SSL
346 components of the UTL project whole and to add in \$30K to pay for seabird and marine mammal
347 observers on the fishery cruises. This motion was seconded by Olson. The maker of the motion was
348 asked if this motion would prejudice the other aspect still to be discussed (i.e., marine mammals). Both
349 the maker of the motion and the second stated that this was not the intent. Staff asked for clarification if
350 this motion also included the reduction of the PM/EO budget from \$700K to \$500K. This was confirmed.

351
352 The question was called and the motion passed with no objections and no recusals. The result of this
353 motion was that NPRB would be committing \$9,027,429 to the GOAIERP.

354
355
356
357

358 **Marine Mammal Considerations**

359
360 Chairman Dutton next stated that the Board needed to determine how to deal with the marine mammal
361 issue: (1) provide up to \$300K and let the NPRB staff, Science Panel and UTL PIs work out how to
362 proceed as proposed by Mundy, or (2) go the route proposed by the Executive Director for a separate RFP
363 following his proposed 10-step process. Staff noted that clarification was still needed from the Board
364 whether the intention regarding a marine mammal component was to include one that informed the
365 recruitment question or just have a marine mammal component for the sake of itself. The Executive
366 Director stated that his main concern was the scientific linkages within the entire program.

367
368 Several Board members suggested that a middle ground between options 1 and 2 was necessary. After
369 further discussion, the following MAIN MOTION regarding marine mammals was made (Olson) and
370 seconded (McCarty):

371
372 *The NPRB should set out a process to scope out the potential inclusion of a marine mammal*
373 *component (for no more than \$300K, added by friendly amendment as shown below) within the*
374 *UTL portion of the GOAIERP through a group of experts under the auspices of the NPRB*
375 *Science Panel. The group would be tasked with answering the following questions:*

- 376
377 a) *Is a marine mammal component necessary within the context of the currently funded GOAIERP*
378 *program? If no, stop here. If yes, then*
379 b) *Is the marine mammal component proposed in the UTL revised proposal (dated March 31,*
380 *2010) the appropriate marine mammal component?*
381 • *If no, then the group should provide a recommendation to the Board on what an*
382 *appropriate marine mammal component for up to \$300K should consist of, and how*
383 *to go about getting the component, e.g., a special RFP;*
384 • *If yes, then the issue needs to come back to the Board.*

385
386 *The Board will review the recommendations of this expert group at their regular September*
387 *meeting and take the appropriate actions to bring this issue to completion.*

388
389 The maker of the motion clarified that this group of experts under the auspices of the SP should approach
390 this topic openly with no preconceived biases. It was hoped that the group would be candid about what is
391 really needed and not just try to make the current proposed SSL work “fit”. Staff asked for clarification
392 whether it was the Board’s intent that the marine mammal component be relevant to the recruitment
393 question. A Board member also questioned whether there had to be a direct link to the recruitment
394 question or if an indirect link was acceptable. Another point raised was whether this relevance of marine
395 mammals worked both ways.

396
397 An amendment was made by Steve MacLean (seconded by John Gauvin) to the main motion to state that:

398
399 *The group [under the auspices of the SP] should examine whether a marine mammal*
400 *component would contribute to the gauntlet AND whether the gauntlet contributed anything to*
401 *marine mammals.*

402
403 This amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.

404
405 Clarification was requested by Board members on what material would be given to the expert group, what
406 deliverables were expected, and if the current UTL PIs would be involved in working with this group of
407 experts. Would the group of experts be given the current proposal and asked to work with the current
408 UTL PIs? Would the expert group have to be familiar with the NPRB Science Plan and the GOAIERP

409 Science Plan? Pautzke stated that the expert group would be given all proposals and correspondence
410 regarding this matter, and then be asked to address the questions raised in the motion above. Some
411 members (e.g. MacGregor, Bird and Holland-Bartels) recommended that Mundy's approach be adopted,
412 where the UTL PIs would work closely with NPRB staff and the expert group under the auspices of the
413 SP. After some discussion it was agreed that it would be up to the expert group and Science Panel to
414 decide who they need to talk to in order to fully evaluate the need and scope of a marine mammal
415 component. And, that the expert group, under the auspices of the Science Panel, would bring their
416 findings to the Board at the September meeting with their recommendation on how to move forward.

417
418 Board members then asked how funding would be dealt with; was the Board going to stay silent on a
419 funding amount and let the expert group determine the amount needed for a relevant marine mammal
420 component? Board members were concerned about tasking the expert group with funding questions and a
421 friendly amendment was added to the main motion limiting funding for a marine mammal component to
422 \$300K.

423
424 One Board member (Merrigan) felt there should be a preamble to the motion and moved to amend the
425 main motion by adding at the beginning:

426
427 *The Board believes the GOAIERP should have a marine mammal component and Steller sea lions*
428 *may be the appropriate species to focus on whether there is a direct or indirect linkage.*

429
430 This was seconded (Gauvin). Discussion of this motion centered on the issue that the group of experts
431 should not be forced into making the currently proposed work fit. The group should be free to say
432 whether or not a marine mammal component is even necessary. Some members felt that this preamble
433 would bias the group. Several members stated that they would vote against this amendment. The
434 amendment was withdrawn.

435
436 A substitute amendment was then made (MacLean) and seconded (Gauvin) to add the following at the
437 beginning of the main motion:

438
439 *The Board believes a marine mammal component could contribute to the overall GOAIERP.*

440
441 Some members still felt this preamble should be specific to Steller sea lions while others did not and the
442 amendment was put to a roll call vote. The amendment failed. (excom 1-4; others 5-2)

443
444 More discussion followed regarding the main motion and the interaction of the group of experts with the
445 current UTL PIs. It was noted and agreed that dialogue between the group of experts and the UTL PIs
446 should be encouraged. Further, it was agreed that the group of experts should not be limited with respect
447 to the scientists with whom they consult or the species of mammals they consider. Chairman Dutton
448 made it clear that this was not a "make it fit" exercise.

449
450 The question was then called on the main motion after it was pointed out that it was generic to marine
451 mammals and not specific to Steller sea lions. The motion passed unanimously, with no recusals.

452
453 [Note: On a subsequent July 2, 2010 teleconference of the executive committee, it was clarified that the
454 Group of Experts should be directed, not just encouraged, to consult with the UTL PIs as one of many
455 groups to provide the best possible recommendation to the Board regarding a marine mammal component
456 for the GOAIERP.]

457
458
459

460 Finally, the Executive Director outlined the next steps:
461

- 462 1. The current UTL PIs would be asked to submit the revised proposal removing the SSL work, but
463 retaining the seabird work. The revised budget should include the \$270K for the non-SSL work
464 inadvertently impacted by the previous budget removal and the \$30K added to facilitate the
465 addition of seabird and marine mammal observers on the fishery cruises.
- 466 2. The complete GOAIERP package (revised UTL, and current MTL, LTL and modeling
467 components) would then be submitted for Secretary of Commerce review with a footnote
468 regarding the Board's current plan regarding a marine mammal component.
- 469 3. The Science Panel would be briefed about all these new developments and a group of experts
470 would be formed under the auspices of the Science Panel to address the questions outlined in the
471 main motion above. The group of experts would be encouraged to initiate dialog with the UTL
472 PIs.
- 473 4. The group of experts would provide their recommendations to the Science Panel in August and to
474 the Board at their September 2010 meeting.
475

476 To conclude this item, Chairman Dutton thanked the staff and the NOAA partners for all their work and
477 time on these issues over the past several weeks and stated that he was looking forward to seeing the
478 science get off the ground.
479

480 **Other Issues**

481
482 The Executive Director reminded the Board that the Committee of Visitors conducting a review of NPRB
483 would be in the office next week and encouraged Board members to get in touch with the COV to discuss
484 any issues they felt were relevant to how NPRB conducts business.
485

486 Approval of the May 2010 meeting summary was deferred until the September 2010 Board meeting.
487

488 A motion to adjourn was made (Gauvin) and seconded (Olson). No objections. Meeting adjourned at
489 1:19 p.m.
490