

**Summary
North Pacific Research Board
September 11-13, 2012
Anchorage, Alaska**

1. Call to Order, Approve Agenda and Meeting Summaries

The Board convened at 8:30 AM on Tuesday, September 11. Present were Eric Olson (Chair), Sue Aspelund (Vice Chair), David Benson, David Benton, Michael Castellini, Dorothy Childers, John Gauvin, Peter Hagen (for Doug Mecum), Katrina Hoffman (absent Wed, Thurs), Leslie Holland-Bartels (absent Thurs), Howard Horton, Tara Jones (absent Tues), Lt. Anthony Kenne, Paul MacGregor, Gerry Merrigan, and Michael Miller. Science Panel (SP) Chair Tom Royer and Vice-Chair Cheryl Rosa, and Advisory Panel (AP) Chair Jeff Stephan were present to give reports from their respective panels. Crystal Benson-Carlough, Nora Deans, Danielle Dickson, Carrie Eischens, Cynthia Suchman, Tom Van Pelt, and Francis Wiese staffed the meeting. Kris Holderied (NOAA NOS), Molly McCammon (AOOS), Chris Oliver (NPFMC), Jim Steward (DOI ONRR), and Mary Yonts (DOI ONRR) attended as visitors.

Board members Caryn Rea and Brad Smith were absent. Doug Mecum was absent, but Peter Hagen attended as NOAA representative.

A **motion to approve the agenda** was introduced and seconded (passed with no objections).

Approval of the prior meeting summary was deferred until Thursday morning, at which time a **motion was made and seconded to approve the May 2012 meeting summary** (passed with no objections).

Staff provided a safety briefing.

New Board members David Benson (fishing industry representative on the Executive Committee) and Dave Benton (USARC) were introduced. Tara Riemer Jones (ASLC) was also introduced in absentia.

A summary of upcoming changes to NPRB staff was presented. Thomas Van Pelt (Bering Sea Project), Nora Deans (Communication, Education & Outreach), and Crystal Benson-Carlough (Alaska Marine Science Symposium) will be transitioning to part-time contract work in the coming months. NPRB is advertising for positions for a full-time communications manager and an executive assistant.

Staff provided a summary of the major points of the conflict of interest policy adopted in May 2012, with emphasis on RFP development, and requested that each Board member sign a statement to be retained in NPRB offices indicating that he/she has read and agrees to abide by the policy.

2. Social Science Working Group

Staff and Board member Dorothy Childers presented a history of the rationale for, and formation of, the social science working group. They also shared a history on the working group's actions to date, including the workshop held during AMSS 2012 and the report stemming from that workshop, and how the language in the Focus Section of the draft 2013 Request for Proposals (RFP) was developed. The working group chose to focus on fisheries-related topics within the 2013 RFP, but longer-term planning efforts will encompass a broader range of topics. The working group intends, with Board input as desired, to contract out a series of scoping papers to summarize the state of knowledge in specific areas yet to be determined.

The SP noted that it had received an overview on the activities of the working group from Polly Wheeler.

The panel noted a need for a longer-term strategy for funding social science projects. The AP Chair Jeff Stephan noted that Board member Dorothy Childers attended its meeting to provide information about the social science working group and 2013 RFP Focus Section.

The Board requested that the scoping papers be completed by its Spring 2013 meeting to aid in development of the 2014 RFP. A Board member suggested that workshops might provide an appealing parallel path to engaging a broader social science community, but deferred to the working group on determining the best approaches and topics.

A motion was made and seconded to endorse a minimum of \$10,000 and a maximum of \$15,000 in funding for the scoping papers. The Board tasked the working group with defining the terms of reference for the contracts, which should include at least one paper on long-term recommendations for the revised NPRB science plan and one paper on short-term input into the annual RFP. These two scoping papers should be viewed as the minimum product from the Board investment. Scoping papers should be completed by the Spring 2013 Board meeting. The Board encourages the staff and working group members to take advantage of various forums for input from the social science community, including workshops, council meetings, etc. (motion passed with no objections).

Dave Benton and Paul MacGregor volunteered to participate in the social science working group. Former Board member Ian Dutton will continue as an advisory member of the group. Former Board member Heather McCarty will be asked about her interest in continuing to participate in an advisory capacity.

3. Long-term Monitoring

Staff provided a history of NPRB's support for projects involving long-term monitoring (LTM) and formation of a working group tasked with developing a more strategic approach to funding these types of activities. The working group recommendations include a requirement for a consortium approach to funding and a definition of LTM that includes an interdisciplinary focus, understanding of variability at appropriate spatial and temporal scales, and links to subsistence and commercial marine resources. At its May meeting, the Board agreed that \$400,000 per year would be an appropriate level of investment outside of the regular, annual RFP. The intent would be to fund multiple projects with that amount. A suggested timeline would involve release of the LTM RFP in early June 2013 with pre-proposals due six weeks later. Pre-proposals would be selected during the fall meeting, with full proposals due in February 2014 and reviewed and recommended for funding in the spring of 2014.

The SP Chair Tom Royer discussed the need for appropriate duration, periodicity, and spatial extent of sampling. He summarized the panel discussion, including recommendation for a pre-proposal stage in any LTM program and also allowing for a longer time the RFP to be open to facilitate development of funding partners. The AP discussion included concern over possible disqualification of LTM-type proposals from the annual RFP process. The panel requested that if the Board decides to exclude such projects, clear guidelines first be developed.

The Board discussed the consortium approach, including the need to reconsider NPRB support if funding partners do not meet their financial commitments and how the number, level, and durability of funding partnerships should be evaluated within the proposal review process. The Board recommended that the definition of LTM be modified to specify subsistence "and/or" commercial marine resources to align with NPRB's mission, and also voiced support for an interdisciplinary approach that would provide data of interest to multiple entities rather than be specific to one agency's management mandate. The Board discussed its intent not to fund new LTM-like projects within the 2013 RFP, but also recognized that some ongoing projects may apply for additional funding to continue operations in the coming year under the "other" category in the 2013 RFP.

A motion was introduced and seconded to endorse the pre-proposal process described by the SP and the draft timeline developed by staff. The Board endorses a \$400,000 annual budget for LTM. The Board suggests that the LTM RFP clearly state that it reserves the right to re-evaluate projects and withhold funding if scientific integrity is compromised due to withdrawal of funds by other consortium members. The Board states that no monitoring projects will be undertaken to prove a hypothesis. The Board further recommends that the LTM RFP clearly state within the evaluation criteria that highly-leveraged proposals will be viewed more favorably. The Board recommends that the LTM working group address whether to stipulate a proposal funding cap for each proposal and the amount, and recommends a proposal cap of \$200,000, recognizing the desire to fund more than one project. The Board endorses a five-year timeline for each project with evaluation criteria for re-evaluation to be defined by the LTM working group. (Passed with no objections.)

A motion was introduced and seconded that the 2013 RFP should not include a long-term monitoring component. Notice of the upcoming LTM RFP and its timeline should be included in the 2013 RFP. (Passed without objection.)

An amendment was introduced and seconded to fill the gap years for three LTM projects currently funded. (Withdrawn.)

Gerry Merrigan signaled his intent to remain on the LTM working group. If other Board members are interested in serving on this working group, they should notify the Chair.

4. Summary of Previously Funded Projects

Staff provided status of 2012 projects, concordance of Board with SP recommendations since 2002, and overall summary of ongoing research projects. Board members suggested that staff include BSIERP and GOAIERP projects in future analyses, as appropriate.

5. 2013 Request for Proposals

Staff led a review of the RFP format and discussion of the cyclical approach the Board implemented for 2013 and 2014. The Board received a summary of funding requested versus awarded for each research priority category. A detailed overview of the draft 2013 RFP was presented. 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 SP and AP Chairs, Tom Royer and Jeff Stephan, provided summaries of panel comments on the draft RFP. The SP recommended the Board consider a technology development Focus Section in 2014.

A motion was introduced and seconded to form a working group to explore the possibility of developing a small grants program to encourage community involvement. Tara Jones will represent the Board and other working group members are identified in panel meeting notes. (Passed with no objection.)

Staff will work with Oil Spill Recovery Institute to finalize the list of collaborative subsections in the RFP. Staff will also notify International Pacific Halibut Commission about inclusion of a halibut subsection.

A motion was introduced and seconded to endorse the draft 2013 RFP with the following amendments (Main motion passed without objection; all changes adopted by friendly amendment unless

otherwise noted.):

- 1.a.i. Staff to broaden language and add a clear topic sentence describing the need for investigating interannual variability in cross-isobath flow and the magnitude of effects associated with it; 1.a.iii. Remove bold highlighting in text.
- 1.a.iii. Remove reference to specific NPRB project (1016) since all proposals are instructed not to duplicate past or ongoing NPRB projects;
- 1.a. Add a new subcategory with the title Coldwater Corals, to read “NPRB is interested in studies cataloging coldwater coral species and distribution in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Alaska using NMFS surveys or other long-term time series data that is publicly available and evaluating utility of that time series for estimating coldwater coral abundance trends or changes in species composition and/or distribution”;
- 1.a.iv. Second sentence - change original: “...and use of nearshore environment by marine and anadromous/amphidromous species as well as local residents...” to revised “...and use of nearshore environment by fish, marine mammals and birds, as well as local residents...”;
- 1.a.v. Remove “retrospective studies” from the subheading title to make consistent with other sections, without editing the text describing the topic;
- 1.b.i. Identify examples of Tier 5 & 6 stocks parenthetically (Aleutian golden king crab, etc.);
- 1.b.iii. Include two complete sentences to capture determining handling mortality rates for species without established rates and developing techniques to reduce discard & handling mortality. New language reads: “NPRB is seeking proposals that will conduct fieldwork to determine handling mortality rates for species without established rates. In addition, NPRB is seeking proposals to develop and assess techniques to reduce discard and handling mortality in Alaska shellfish and groundfish fisheries. Proposals should identify the application of project outcomes to incidental mortality catch estimates and thus stock assessment and catch limits”;
- 1.b.iv. Delete the last sentence and insert the following as the first sentence: “NPRB is seeking proposals to test the hypothesis that marine biodiversity and ecosystem resilience affect the stability of commercial fish stocks in Alaska.” Add a sentence stating: “Proposals should identify objective measurable criteria that can be evaluated to assess effects on fisheries.”;
- 1.b.iv. Amendment to remove the subsection introduced and seconded. (Failed on roll call vote.);
- 1.b.vi. Amendment to delete “...that are not commercial or otherwise well-studied taxa (such as herring or juvenile pollock)” and insert “herring” in front of “etc.” (Passed with no objection.);
- 1.b.vi. Add special emphasis on forage species in the Aleutian Islands and Southeast Alaska.
- 1.b.vii. Delete reference to Bering Sea and salmon species returning to Western Alaska from c); delete “(800 million/year in AK)” from b); insert text to read “Based on the findings detailed in the report, emerging management concerns, and other considerations, NPRB is interested....”;
- 1.b.viii. Amendment to add phrase in italics: “reduction in prey availability, *exploitation strategy*, environmental changes...” (Passed with no objection.);
- 1.b.ix. Amendment to remove the subsection introduced and seconded. Passed with two objections;
- 1.c.i. Add a sentence stating “Studies should include comparison of harbor seal population trends to other marine mammal population in the area (e.g., Steller sea lions, sea otters, etc.)” and strike “if Steller sea lions are the only species declining in these areas, or if multiple species are continuing to be negatively affected”;
- 1.c.ii. Accept changes suggested by the AP to add “or expanding in range” to the title. Second sentence to read “Some populations, such as sea otters or whales in the Gulf of Alaska have increased...” and third to read “to investigate the ecology of increasing or expanding populations...” Edit text to encourage a focus of research on how increasing marine mammal populations affect human activities;
- 1.c.iii. Replace draft text with “NPRB is interested in supporting research that addresses data gaps/information needs identified in the Center for Independent Experts’ (CIE) review and the

Independent Scientific Review Panel of the States of Alaska and Washington of the 2010 Biological Opinion released in September 2012 and 2011, respectively. NPRB also continues to be interested in supporting research that examines Steller sea lion and commercial fishery interactions, in the western stock of Steller sea lions in the central and western Aleutian Islands”;

- 1.c.iv. Change “unexplained” to “unusual” and remove reference to “disease,” replace “transmission” with “connection,” add “or other species” at the end of the last line and remove parenthetical reference to humans. Change title to “Northern Pinniped Unusual Mortality Event and potential effects on other species.” New language reads: “Currently, federal, state, and local researchers are investigating the Unusual Mortality Event (UME) that occurred in ice seals and Pacific walrus in 2011-2012. To date, no causative agent has been identified. Recent research has documented a number of captured polar bears with hair loss and/or skin lesions. Samples have been collected from affected and unaffected polar bears and are currently being analyzed, but a direct connection between these disease states has yet to be made. NPRB is interested in projects investigating the etiology of the UME, with specific emphasis on research on potential connection to polar bears or other species.”
- 1.c. Add a subsection for retrospective analyses of scat and tissue samples with a proposal cap of \$100,000 for this subsection only. Remove “Note that retrospective studies are especially encouraged” from “Other marine mammal” section;
- 1.e.ii. Add words (italicized) to clarify the sentence “NPRB is seeking studies of the bioeffects of contaminants in *marine mammals*, *subsistence species*, or *commercially harvested species*”;
- 1.e.iii. Add “cytochrome” before “P450” and change “P” to “p”;
- 1.e.iv. Add italicized phrase to read “especially in light of changing ocean conditions, *transport of marine debris* (e.g., *tsunami debris*), and increasing ship traffic” and staff should investigate whether NPRB can fund research on passenger vessels before drafting the 2014 RFP;
- 3. Amendment to delete this section and move it to the front matter of the RFP below the table explaining category caps and the cyclical approach; and modify the BOEM description to be clear that the opportunity is to leverage funds within any category in the 2013 RFP. (Passed with no objection.);
- 4. and 5. Amendment to delete “Energy efficiency technology” subsection from Section 5 and insert as 4.i.5.; and increase category cap for Section 4 from \$300,000 to \$400,000, and decrease category cap for Section 5 from \$300,000 to \$200,000. (Passed with no objection.);
- 4.i.1. Amendment to replace draft language with “Areas of interest include modifications to fishing gear and techniques to reduce habitat impacts, gear loss, interactions with non-target species of fish and invertebrates, avoidance or minimization of interactions with marine mammal or seabirds, improvements for catchability and selectivity, and reductions in discard mortality. Studies in this category could include:
 - Further development of seabird bycatch avoidance techniques and gear to address the impact of increasing short-tailed albatross populations or other potential species of concern;
 - 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;
 - Studies to evaluate and reduce scallop-handling incidental mortality;
 - Modifications of gear and handling practices to reduce wastage in the directed commercial and sport halibut fisheries;
 - Evaluation of the efficacy of low frequency acoustic pingers to reduce potential whale entanglements in salmon net fisheries; or
 - Marine mammal disentanglement tools: Development of improved tools and devices for efficiency and safety for use in disentangling whales and other marine mammals from fishing gear or other potential sources of entanglement.”(Passed with no objection.);
- 4.i.2. Amendment to add to end of final sentence “...and should take into account the cost associated

- with enforcement of electronic monitoring technology.” (Passed with no objection.);
- 4.i.3. Amendment to modify first sentence to read, “identification by observers or improved identification based on data collected by Electronic Monitoring (EM) systems in both shoreside and offshore processors and vessels...” (Passed with no objection.);
- Add language to the RFP preamble, as recommended by the AP, to note that cooperative research with industry is welcome in any category;
- 4.ii.2. Delete sentence mentioning BOEM ANIMIDA program;
- 5. Add “and novel applications” to the preamble sentence;
- 5.i. Revise the first sentence to clarify “The Board is seeking proposals to develop new molecular technologies or apply modern molecular technologies to existing management problems in novel ways”;
- 5.ii. Remove the final sentence, “NPRB funding should not be a substitute for small business development grants”;
- 6. Edit the first sentence, changing “a lot” to “a wealth”;
- Focus section preamble. Add final sentence to second paragraph of preamble to read, “Similarly, management of marine mammals authorized under the Marine Mammal Protection Act includes both resource conservation and cultural components.” Modify final sentence of preamble to read “...as they relate to fisheries or marine mammal harvest in Alaskan waters...”;
- Focus section i. Modify title to “economic impact of management decisions for fisheries or marine mammal harvest” as suggested by the AP;
- Focus section ii. Separate into fisheries and marine mammal subsections as below:
 - Subsection 1: “Fishery policy makers would benefit from the assessment of management decisions to help inform future actions and to support improvements over time. Management decisions are made with certain expectations for results. NPRB is seeking proposals that catalogue (and/or build upon existing catalogues) catch-share or limited-entry programs that have been implemented in fisheries globally. As part of this inventory, NPRB is interested in an evaluation of these programs that identifies whether or not clear and explicit social and economic objectives or performance criteria were identified as part of program implementation and whether periodic re-evaluation occurs. Researchers should provide an analysis of how limited entry and/or rationalization management approaches in Alaska compare with other approaches taken around the world.” (Passed on a roll call vote.)
 - Subsection 2: “Policy makers and marine mammal management bodies would benefit from the assessment of management decisions to help inform future actions and to support improvements over time. Management decisions are made with certain expectations for results. NPRB is seeking proposals that explore the extent to which management decisions have achieved anticipated social and economic outcomes and whether or not there are impediments to evaluating such outcomes. This could include: How have marine mammal management policies affected community or tribal interests and demographics in villages in Alaska?”
- Focus section iii. Replace draft text with “Many fishermen with limited access permits or catch-share privileges for state and federal fisheries are retiring. The succession of valuable fishing privileges and seafood business opportunities within coastal or fishing communities are a concern for such communities and young people wanting to build fishing businesses. NPRB is seeking proposals that explore barriers to entry, implications to coastal and fishing communities, and review potential public policy responses.”

6. Budget Review

James Steward and Mary Yonts, visiting from DOI’s Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) in Denver, provided an overview of EIRF fund management, as well as investment constraints and options

in a time of low interest rates. The Board discussed the fact that there is a lag between the transfer of funds from ONRR to DoC in August and NOAA award to NPRB with those funds in July the following year. There is a desire to explore the possibility of investing those funds in short-term Treasury notes before transfer to DoC to maximize return. The Board also discussed the possibility that other agencies named in NPRB's enabling legislation could request interest, which would impact NPRB budgets.

Staff provided an overview of current NPRB funding in the form of NOAA five-year awards and presented funding projections assuming continued low interest rates. The projections included analysis of a new \$400,000 per year LTM program and a possible Arctic research program, with \$3 million or \$6 million options. If historically low rates on 10-year Treasury notes continue, they will lead to declining annual budgets beginning in FY2015. Timing and scope of future IERPs (e.g., BSIERP 2) will be affected. In addition, the 15% cap on administration may be reached as soon as FY2015, although this time frame can be extended several years by spending to the cap on existing awards. The Board expressed support for this approach.

The Board discussed the directors' and officers' insurance held by the organization and asked staff to determine how the \$1million compared with that held by organizations of similar size.

The AP Chair Jeff Stephen presented the Panel's request that annual RFP budgets be increased to account for inflation, and the Board shared concern for effects of inflation on budgets for future IERPs. The SP Chair Tom Royer conveyed the Panel's discussion about NPRB support for AMSS and the SP view that it is important to keep the symposium free for registrants for as long as possible.

A motion was introduced and seconded for the Executive Committee to work with the Executive Director and EIRF fund managers at ONRR to develop an investment strategy to maximize returns in the short and long term. This group will also investigate the issue of lag time between receipt of funds by DoC and delivery to NPRB.

7. RFP Boilerplate

Stakeholder engagement. Staff presented the question raised by the AP of how best to assist investigators interested in developing projects that involve stakeholders in meaningful ways. To that end, staff presented modifications to the boilerplate to clarify the language related to stakeholder involvement, based upon suggestions from staff and SP members.

A motion was introduced and seconded to form a stakeholder engagement working group comprised of panel members and Board members Dorothy Childers and John Gauvin. The working group will bring recommendations to the Board for consideration in time to be included in the next RFP. (Passed with no objection.)

Policy on proposal responsiveness to priority category choice. Staff provided an overview of the proportion of proposals received that are rejected without review because they do not respond to the category or subcategory in which they were submitted. Both the AP and SP discussed the issue and are comfortable with the current policy, although the AP recommended adding a prompt or flag to the online submission system. Board members noted that they were also comfortable with the current policy regarding proposal responsiveness.

A motion was introduced and seconded to add a prompt during the online proposal submission process to ask proposers to verify that they have selected the correct subcategory and warning them that proposals will be returned without review if submitted incorrectly. (Passed with no objection.)

Policy on proposals with formatting errors. A small number of proposals are rejected prior to review because of formatting errors, specifically for exceeding the 12-page limit once the submission is checked by staff for compliance with formatting requirements as specified in the RFP. The Board discussed this issue and recommended that formatting requirements and consequences for noncompliance be highlighted in the boilerplate language, but did not recommend a change in policy or process.

A motion was introduced and seconded to add additional information in the boilerplate language to warn proposers that a percentage of proposals are rejected every year due to formatting errors and emphasize the importance of submitting proposals that exactly follow formatting requirements. (Passed with no objection.)

AP review process. After background information was provided by the AP Chair Jeff Stephan, the Board discussed the criteria the AP used to evaluate proposals for stakeholder relevance in May 2012, as well as the information the AP provided back to the Board. Because the AP has been charged with flagging proposals rather than reviewing them, the Board supported continuing the process followed in 2012, which is providing AP feedback on stakeholder relevance only for a subset of proposals. The Board agreed that the AP could continue its process of highlighting some proposals as either significant or noteworthy, but stressed that these would be internal designations rather than provided as feedback to investigators, and no change would be needed in the boilerplate language to describe the AP process. Criteria used by the AP, however, should be included in the boilerplate.

A motion was introduced and seconded to include in the boilerplate RFP language the criteria developed by the AP to identify stakeholder relevance. (Passed with no objection.) Criteria should be changed from an ordered list to bullets, with a statement that criteria are not presented in order of priority. (Adopted by friendly amendment.)

Other matters related to RFP boilerplate. The Board requested that staff examine the current subaward compliance policy to ensure it includes a statement about how education and outreach funds must be used for proposed purposes or otherwise retained by NPRB. If compliance language is not clear with respect to use of education and outreach funds, staff should propose draft language for an amendment to the policy for the Board to consider at its May meeting. The Board also discussed an appropriate time frame for investigators to submit letters of support for their proposals and decided that the deadline should be the same as for signature pages, one week beyond the proposal submission deadline. Finally, the Board discussed the section entitled “Consultation with Interested Parties” and whether it was necessary given the current review process.

A motion was introduced and seconded to remove the section entitled “Consultation with Interested Parties” from the RFP boilerplate. (Passed with no objection.)

8. Education and Outreach Report

Staff gave Board members an update on recent and planned communication, education, and outreach activities. A Board member suggested increasing the amount of the youth prize award for the annual photo contest to attract more entries.

9. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff provided an update on GoAIERP activities and progress, including 2012 field activities and planning for the 2013 field season.

Kris Holdereid, science lead for an EVOS-funded long-term monitoring project in Prince William Sound

and Cook Inlet (branded as “GulfWatch Alaska”) gave an overview of the GulfWatch project, and pointed out areas where linkages with NPRB’s GoAIERP are possible, including sampling on the GAK (Gulf of Alaska) line.

10. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff provided an update on the Bering Sea Project, including publication of a special issue of *Deep Sea Research II* containing scientific papers entirely dedicated to the project. Staff also presented a Bering Sea Project close-out plan to continue into 2014. NPRB and NSF are coordinating to support the close-out, including production of outreach materials for the public, organization of an open science meeting to be held in conjunction with the Ocean Sciences meeting in 2014, and publication of three additional special issues containing collections of scientific journal articles from Bering Sea project participants. The close-out plan also includes an assessment of lessons learned regarding managing large integrated ecosystem programs. A board member commented that Bering Sea Project results might be presented at the annual AAAS meeting, as it has recently included sessions related to fisheries management.

11. Strategic Planning

Staff presented an overview of strategic planning activities recommended over the next two years. Priorities included a facilitated strategic planning session with the Board and panels to discuss organizational goals and objectives, revision of the *2005 Science Plan*, and incorporation of assessment into biennial reporting to demonstrate the value of NPRB activities to science, management, and society.

The AP supported the activities outlined in the action memo and was particularly interested in assessment of impacts of NPRB to management and Alaska’s economy. The SP recommended a rewrite of the Science Plan to update emerging issues such as ocean acidification and technology development as themes. Panel members agreed to serve on working groups for this revision/rewrite and recommended that scientists outside of NPRB be included.

The Board discussed the priority areas in the overview document and suggested that AMSS or Board meetings would likely not be optimal times to schedule a strategic planning session. Board members felt that the Science Plan should be the highest priority. The Science Plan would not include the structure and administrative functions of the Board and panels, but remain focused on science and indicate NPRB’s scientific direction to the broad research community. One Board member suggested that the working group might consider using the National Research Council report process to determine the best way to revise the Science Plan. Some suggested that analysis of how other organizations implement cooperative research might strengthen NPRB’s efforts in this area. With respect to assessment, another Board member thought that gathering information on economic impact of funding organizations from universities should be straightforward. Within the strategic planning framework, the Board might consider developing a list of governance issues and policy updates to be addressed.

The strategic planning working group should bring recommendations to the Board for consideration at the May 2013 meeting. Sue Aspelund volunteered to be added to the strategic planning working group.

12. Arctic

Staff described NPRB’s current two-phased approach to Arctic research activities, providing background and current status of phase 1 synthesis, funded as the PacMARS project in partnership with NSF, Shell, and ConocoPhillips. Discussion included mechanisms to keep USARC up to date regarding the synthesis project, suggestions for a more precise name for the advisory group (such as the Data Advisory Committee), and recommendation to include Stefanie Moreland in the advisory group, as she will soon be

working with the Governor on Arctic issues.

Staff presented the draft phase 2 Arctic science plan, and outlined the timeline and approach to partnership building, collaboration options, and RFP development. Panel chairs summarized discussions held during their respective meetings. Potential NPRB financial investment in phase 2 was discussed, with a realistic minimum of \$3 million and a possible maximum of \$6 million.

A motion was introduced and seconded to direct staff to pursue partnerships for Arctic phase 2, with a \$3 million to \$6 million possible range for NPRB investment, but without guarantee of funding. The USARC is to be included in planning. The strategy will be revisited in May. (Passed with no objection.)

13. Graduate Student Research Awards

Staff provided an update on the work of the GSRA working group, which is ongoing to explore ways to find partnerships to increase funding available for student support.

The Board had a discussion about the role for and review criteria of the AP in reviewing student applications. Before 2012, the AP and SP recommendations were similar and based solely on academic and scientific merit, but in 2012, the AP considered stakeholder relevance. After discussion and consultation with AP Chair Jeff Stephan, the Board recommended against including the six criteria the AP uses for evaluating regular RFP proposals in GSRA guidelines. Board members noted that the community involvement section of existing evaluation criteria may address stakeholder relevance adequately and the Board will consider the AP's input in differentiating among high-quality GSRA proposals.

14. Other Matters

Panel memberships, attendance, and nominations committee. **A motion was made and seconded to reappoint Edward Poulsen to the AP** for a three-year term. (Passed with no objection.) The Board discussed the problem presented by AP terms ending at various times of the year. **A motion was made and seconded to have all AP appointments effective June 1, with current and future terms expiring May 31.** (Passed with no objection.) The Board also discussed the issue of having a large number of AP members with terms expiring in 2013, with some serving less than two full three-year terms, as term length was two years from 2005-2011. **A motion was made and seconded to indicate that two full three-year terms would be the maximum for AP members,** with one year's break required before becoming eligible for appointment again. If a member has served two terms, but not two full three-year terms, he or she may seek reappointment, but only within an open call for nominations. (Passed with no objection.)

A Board member suggested offering short terms to some of those requesting consideration for a third term under this new policy in order to stagger overall panel membership terms.

David Benson (representing the Executive Committee) and Gerry Merrigan agreed to serve on the nominations committee, joining Howard Horton, Jeff Stephan (AP Chair), and Tom Royer (SP Chair).

Arctic legislation. NPRB received draft legislation for comment on Thursday, September 13. Chair Eric Olson will send a letter to Senator Begich on behalf of the Board. Board members wishing to provide input should send comments to the Executive Director no later than Tuesday, September 18.

CoV response. Chair Eric Olson sent a letter to CoV members outlining action taken by NPRB in the past year in response to their three major recommendations. (Information only.)

Alaska Ocean Observing System. Molly McCammon provided an update on recent AOOS activities.

Alaska Marine Science Symposium. A Board member asked if donations of seafood from industry groups could be accepted for provided meals. Staff will follow up with the full organizing committee.

Outside funding requests. The Board considered three requests for funding for meetings. A **motion was introduced and seconded to approve funding** for 2013 PICES summer school on ocean observing and ecosystem monitoring to be held in Newport, OR, (\$5,000) and the 2012 Alaska Bird Conference to be held in Anchorage (\$1,000). (Passed with no objection.)

Meeting schedule for 2013-2014. The Board will meet next May 14-17, 2013, in Anchorage, beginning at 8 am on May 14 and ending mid-day on May 17. The fall meeting will be held the week of September 16, 2013, location to be determined. Staff will report back to the Executive Committee after researching logistics and costs for Homer, with Kasitsna Bay Lab field trip; Kodiak; and Nome.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM, September 13.