

**Summary
North Pacific Research Board
September 19-21, 2011
BASC
Barrow, Alaska**

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda and Meeting Summaries

Call to Order: The Board convened at 8 a.m. on Monday, September 19, 2011. Present were Ian Dutton (Chair), Eric Olson (Vice-Chair), Sue Aspelund, Nancy Bird (via teleconference), Dorothy Childers, John Gauvin, Peter Hagen (for Doug DeMaster), Leslie Holland-Bartels, Howard Horton, Lt. Anthony Kenne, Heather McCarty, Paul MacGregor, Gerry Merrigan, Caryn Rea, Cheryl Rosa (for Michele Longo Eder), Bradley Smith. Science Panel Chair Doug Woodby and Advisory Panel Chair Jeff Stephan (via teleconference) were present to give reports from their respective panels. Crystal Benson-Carlough, Nora Deans, Danielle Dickson, Carrie Eischens, Francis Wiese, and Cynthia Suchman staffed the meeting. Visitors present were Tara Riemer Jones (ASLC) and Glenn Sheehan (BASC).

Introduction of New Staff Members: This was the first Board meeting since Executive Director Cynthia Suchman, Gulf of Alaska and Arctic Program Manager Danielle Dickson, and Executive Assistant Crystal Benson-Carlough began work at NPRB. Suchman distributed her performance measures for 2011-2012 and requested that feedback be provided to Dutton by the end of September.

Safety Briefing: Glenn Sheehan (BASC) provided a safety briefing.

Agenda and Meeting Summary: The Board was given an overview of the community event scheduled for Monday evening.

Motions to approve the agenda and April 2011 minutes passed unanimously.

2. Perkins Coie Update

Dutton provided background on the Board's decision to hire an attorney from Perkins Coie, LLP to provide advice on renewal or modification of an MOU signed by NPRB, NOAA, and ASLC in 2001. An initial meeting with the attorney was held in Anchorage in August. Recommendations are expected by the end of the year. McCarty requested that the Executive Committee be involved in the next meeting.

3. Budget Review

Suchman provided an update on the status of EIRF funds and the consequences for NPRB budgets. Interest rates are at 40-year lows and if they remain below average, will have implications for NPRB funding and in the medium term. Updated scenarios will be presented at the next Board meeting.

4. Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy

Dutton provided an overview of formation of the COI working group and need to clarify NPRB's COI policy following recommendations from the Committee of Visitors. The working group has developed a framework for discussion and will present a new policy for Board consideration at the spring meeting. Suchman walked the Board through the framework. Stephan and Woodby provided comments from the AP and SP, respectively.

Topics the Board discussed following presentation of the framework included: possible need for annual training; whether a COI policy for the Advisory Panel would be necessary; distinction between disclosing possible conflict and recusing from participation in discussion and decision; and the need for clear distinction between general and direct benefit.

Dutton requested that Board members having comments, in addition to discussion points raised during the meeting, should send them to the Executive Director within the next 30 days.

The Board requested that during AMSS in January 2012 an informal meeting be scheduled with the attorney from Perkins Coie present to give the Board and Panels the opportunity to discuss the draft policy.

Motion to add up to two representatives from the AP and SP to the conflict of interest working group passed unanimously.

5. Proposal Review Process

In response to the report from the CoV, at its last meeting the Board formed a working group to clarify the proposal review process to encompass peer review, advice from the Science and Advisory panels, and criteria for Board decisions. The Board discussed the document produced by the working group, including the tier ranking process and the “conditional” tag, as well as the request from the AP that they have a formal role in providing input to the Board on proposals. One Board member suggested that scientists be given an incentive to provide written reviews for NPRB proposals. There was discussion of a possible role for the Board to have input into resolution of problems encountered during Board-funded projects underway.

A motion was introduced to ask the AP to consider proposals with a Tier 1 or Tier 2 ranking and advise the Board as to which would have particular stakeholder, community, or other societal relevance. The recommendation should include a short statement for each proposal forwarded to the Board, stating the AP’s rationale. An amendment was introduced to limit the number of proposals to be recommended by the AP to 20 failed after a roll call vote. The original motion, without amendment, passed unanimously.

Several changes to the text describing proposal review were proposed:

- In Tier 1 description, change “Tier 1 conditional” to “Tier 1a and Tier 1B conditional.”
- In Tier 2 description, change “minor science issues” to “minor science, or both minor science and non-science issues.”
- In section on Advisory Panel input, replace “identify” with “highlight a subset,” delete “(i.e., Tier 1 proposals),” add “and Tier 2” to other references to “Tier 1.”

A motion to endorse the review criteria presented by the working group, with the text edits above, passed unanimously. The edited text will be included as part of the boilerplate language of the annual Request for Proposals.

Hagen raised some questions about the wording of the section entitled “Secretary of Commerce Review” and staff will follow up with him to clarify it.

6. Summary of Previously Funded Projects

Eischens provided an update on projects the Board selected during the April 2011 meeting (all are underway), as well as a summary of ongoing research projects. Board members suggested making the

statistics presented available on the website, perhaps as a synthesis document representing the first 10 years of the program.

7. 2012 Request for Proposals

Wiese led a review of the RFP format and discussion of the cyclical approach the Board has implemented for 2011 and 2012. Eischens presented data showing a summary of funding requested versus awarded for each category. The Board then received a detailed overview of a draft 2012 Request for Proposals developed by staff, with recommendations for amendments from the Science and Advisory Panels. The research priorities were based on those identified by various organizations and institutions over the previous six months, research priorities and funded projects in past RFPs, input received from individuals through the NPRB website or via email, and the Board's 2005 Science Plan.

The Board set the cap for the 2012 RFP at \$4 million, retained the cyclical approach for the 2011-2012 time period, and included \$400,000 for a Focus Section.

A framework motion was introduced and seconded to accept the RFP as presented by the Science Panel, subject to amendment.

In the categories listed below, the following amendments were offered, seconded, and accepted as friendly amendments unless otherwise noted:

- Accept the Advisory Panel recommendation to change “overlap” to “duplication” throughout the document.

1.b. General Research Priorities: Fish and Invertebrates

- Move the section on Discard and handling mortality from 4.i.2. Cooperative Research to 1.b. Fish and Invertebrates, and amend it to read “skates, sharks, octopus, and other species without discard mortality rates.” Carried by voice vote (one objection).
- Delete section 1.b.iii. Fisheries interaction.
- Edit 1.b.iv. Biodiversity and implications for fisheries management section to emphasize hypothesis testing. Specifically, change “it is believed” to “it is hypothesized,” and “NPRB is seeking proposals that explore this concept” to “NPRB is seeking proposals that test this hypothesis.”
- Amend the title of 1.b.v.1) in Fish Habitat section to “Effects of fishing closures on benthic habitat and managed species” per Advisory Panel suggestion.
- Amend the title of 1.b.v.2) in Fish Habitat section to “Essential habitats for forage fish and demersal spawning fishes and invertebrates” per Advisory Panel suggestion.
- In 1.b.v.3) Cumulative impacts, delete “marine” before “mining.”
- Accept Advisory Panel suggestion to add section 1.b.v.5) Impacts of climate change on crab stocks.

1.c. General Research Priorities: Marine Mammals

- Accept substitute language in 1.c.ii. Adaptive Management Experiment Design.
- Add section in 1.c. entitled Population status, dynamics, distribution and foraging ecology of Steller sea lions in the Commander Islands.

1.e. Humans

- Change the title of the category Humans to Socio-economic and Policy Issues with subcategory 1.e.v. Other Humans changed to Other Socio-economic and Policy Issues.

- In 1.e.iv., change “limited access privilege program, LAPPs” to “limited access programs.”

1.f. Other Prominent Issues

- In 1.f.i., change title from “Food security” to “Food safety”.
- In 1.f.ii., move second sentence to the end of the paragraph.
- In 1.f.iii., “Invasive species” edit to include “research into effectiveness of eradication and control.”

4. Cooperative Research

- In 4.i.1., modify to include “fish and invertebrates” in the first sentence and add the following last sentence: “Studies in this area could also include modification of pot gear to minimize non-target bycatch mortality of halibut and octopus as well as improved techniques (handling and gear) to minimize non-target crab mortality in pot fisheries.”
- Add section to 4.i. entitled Fisher’s knowledge to evaluate how it might be used to identify and delineate areas with aggregations of deep-water corals vulnerable to damage from fishing.
- In 4.ii.1. and 2., include Cook Inlet.
- Delete 4.ii.3. Carried by voice vote (two objections).

5. Technology Development

- Accept the Advisory Panel recommendation to add section (as written by the Advisory Panel) entitled Energy efficiency technology development.

Focus section

- Amendment to change the focus section to a social science emphasis (replaced by substitute amendment below).
- Substitute amendment to change the focus section to “Arctic,” removing the last two categories (v. and vi.), move 1.b.v.4) Arctic habitat section to the Arctic Focus.

The framework motion to approve the 2012 RFP as amended carried by voice vote.

During discussion of the Focus section, a motion was introduced to prioritize social science issues as a Focus Section next year. Carried by voice vote.

8. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Program

Van Pelt provided a status report on the Bering Sea IERP, including: a summary of recent meetings and activities; publication of peer reviewed manuscripts as a special issue of a scientific journal; synthesis efforts underway, called the “Road Map;” data management through the NCAR/EOL facility in Boulder, Colorado; and an upcoming workshop in Seattle in October 2011 to incorporate management strategies evaluation into modeling efforts. In addition, NSF plans to fund five synthesis proposals for the Bering Sea Project and these will be incorporated into Bering Sea program management. The Bering Sea Project Principal Investigators will hold a meeting in March or April 2012. Outreach and communications activities under development include ecosystem visualization tools with UW, a new “headlines” brochure summarizing important findings of the program, and new Encounters radio broadcasts.

9. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Program

Danielle Dickson has been hired as a Program Manager, with responsibility for the Gulf of Alaska Program, as well as Arctic activities. Dickson provided a status report on Gulf of Alaska program management, addition of a new iron project approved by the Board in April 2011 to fill gaps in the program, initial results from and logistical challenges during the 2011 field season, and planning for a PI

meeting early in 2012. Educational activities included a teacher workshop held in Anchorage and Kasitsna Bay laboratories in July 2011.

The next agenda item concerned proposals received in response to a special RFP for Data Management for the Gulf of Alaska Program. However, before any background was presented, NPRB Chair Dutton disclosed an institutional conflict of interest with the proposal that was submitted, recused himself, and left the room. Vice-Chair Eric Olson took over to lead the Board's discussion. In addition, McCarty and Hagen disclosed affiliation with NOAA, and Rosa and Suchman disclosed participation on the Board of one of the organizations involved with the proposal.

Wiese provided background on the special RFP and proposal review. A special review panel, comprised of both Science Panel and data management specialists, evaluated the one proposal submitted and provided individual written reviews as well as a summary of the panel discussion.

A motion was introduced to release a new RFP, with the same funding available and with clarification of expectations for contents of proposals based upon the review panel recommendations.

A substitute motion was introduced to ask the PIs to respond in writing to the panel's recommendations in their review, to be followed by Board approval of the response. No funding beyond the amount listed in the original RFP would be provided. If the PIs chose not to respond to the panel review and recommendation, the RFP would be rereleased. The substitute failed in a roll call vote.

The original motion failed on a roll call vote.

A motion was introduced to re-release the RFP with an additional \$100,000 added to the available amount, for a total of \$500,000. The re-released RFP should also include additional detail regarding contents of proposals based upon the comments and recommendations of the review panel. Passed after roll call vote.

A special Board call will be scheduled early in 2012 to decide on a proposal following re-release of the RFP, receipt of proposals, and technical review.

10. Graduate Student Research Awards

The Board received several recommendations from the GSRA working group, which was charged with assessing various aspects of the program. The working group found the current structure of the award program appropriate and did not recommend changing the one-time award to a multi-year means for longer-term support for graduate students. The group also recommended: increasing the number of awards to 6 per year (3 MS and 3 PhD); increasing the amount of awards to \$25,000 each; not giving preferential consideration to students attending universities in Alaska; not considering overlap with other awards students have received when making decisions; and continuing the practice of reserving two awards for students conducting stock assessment research. The group asked the Science Panel to weigh in on the annual timing of review of awards. The Science Panel recommended maintaining the current annual timeline.

A motion was introduced to approve the recommendations of the GSRA working group. An amendment was introduced to give special consideration to students who attended high school in Alaska, all other things being equal. It carried by voice vote with two objections. The main motion carried by voice vote.

The Board discussed the definition of stakeholder relevance. They agreed to discuss GSRA priorities and other aspects of the program on a regular basis, at least once every five years.

11. Arctic Planning

Wiese presented an Arctic concept paper, which envisions NPRB efforts in the region divided into two phases. Phase 1, a large synthesis and gap-analysis project, would occur on a relatively short time frame in partnership with NSF and with funding from the oil and gas industry. Phase 2 would involve longer-term planning, multi-agency partnership development to leverage funding resources, and ultimately, field-based integrated ecosystem research. The intent would be for Phase 1 results to inform science planning for Phase 2 within a time frame allowing for field efforts to begin in 2014.

In discussions, it was clear the Board wanted to retain sufficient oversight of its programs that use any Board funds, including staff time. There was a request that the Arctic subcommittee have input into any Phase 1 draft RFP before it is presented to the Board. There was extended discussion on how best to solicit community input during development and implementation of Phase 1. In preparation for Phase 2, at the next Board meeting, staff will present different strategies for a coordinated IERP with potential partners.

A motion was introduced that the Board approve in general terms the Phase 1 plan for synthesis and gap analysis as described in the Arctic concept paper, but with a revised time line that allows for Board to approve the RFP and make funding decisions. An amendment was introduced to include Native communities in development of the RFP, in the synthesis activity, and in development of Phase 2. A substitute amendment would require involvement of key community organizations in the synthesis and gap analysis activity, as well as development of Phase 2. The substitute amendment failed on a roll call vote (one abstention). The amendment carried with a voice vote (one objection). The main motion as amended carried with a voice vote (one abstention).

After further discussion, the Board agreed to the following next steps and timeline: send key community members and organizations a letter letting them know that the Phase 1 RFP is under development and requesting input within 30 days (send by October 1); prepare a draft RFP to be ready for review by Dec. 1; hold Board teleconference in mid-December to approve the RFP; release of RFP by mid-January 2012; complete technical review in March; and make a decision at the spring Board meeting.

Staff will send the Board an email containing the motion and the time line.

12. Education and Outreach

Deans provided a summary of education and outreach activities since the spring Board meeting. She introduced Peggy Cowan, superintendent of the North Slope Borough School District. Ms. Cowan introduced Jana Harachaek. Ms. Harachaek gave the Board a presentation on the Inupiaq Literacy Framework, an effort to incorporate traditional knowledge into educational standards.

13. Long-term Monitoring

The Board formed a working group to make recommendations regarding planning for long-term monitoring as a result of the CoV report which stressed the importance of funding for these types of measurements. Board members wanted more information on funding history for monitoring-like projects, as well as long-term budgeting before moving forward with the working group's recommendation. Some wanted to make this discussion part of a longer-term science strategy planning efforts.

A motion was introduced asking the Executive Director to evaluate how long-term monitoring has had impact on the past or could impact the future funding base. An amendment was introduced requesting that the Board be given options to consider in the context of long-term monitoring. The amendment and the motion carried by voice vote.

14. Other Matters

Science Panel Membership. A motion was introduced to reappoint all Science Panel members with terms ending and implement a limit of two 4-year terms for Science Panel service. Members would be required to take a 2- year hiatus after reaching their term limit before being eligible to be reappointed. Motion carried by voice vote.

Panel nomination committee. A motion was introduced to name a nominating committee to provide recommendations to the Board from among the nominees received for open seats on the Science and Advisory panels. The nominations committee will be a standing committee comprised of one Executive Committee member, one other Board member, and the Chairs of the Advisory and Science Panels. The motion carried by voice vote. McCarty and Horton will be the Board's representatives on this standing committee. The Chairs of the Panels will be notified of their new responsibilities.

NPRB Project 815. The PI for this project encountered difficulties outside of his control, making it impossible to conduct the research as proposed. He requests additional funds, along with a plan to complete the project. The Board has not previously increased a budget after a project has started, but this topic is particularly important to stakeholder groups. A motion to provide an additional \$45,000 for Project 815, conditional upon the PI's ability to obtain remaining support to cover the full \$90,000 needed, carried by voice vote with one objection.

Requests for meeting and other support. The Board denied a request for bridge funding to support a sensor to measure carbon dioxide and pH on two buoys and also denied a request to increase financial support for a project that was recently funded. One Board member suggested that the Board develop a policy relating to supplemental funding requests. The Board approved (by voice vote) \$5,000 to the Aleut International Association to support the synthesis writing following a series of workshops for "Development of Community Based Monitoring Classification to Improve Standardization of Vocabularies." The funding will be contingent upon the organization securing the support required to hold at least one workshop.

Meeting Schedule for 2012. Staff will distribute an online poll to determine dates for the next Board meeting, to be held in Anchorage.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m., September 21, 2011.