

**North Pacific Research Board Meeting Minutes
September 16 - 20, 2013
Nome, Alaska**

The North Pacific Research Board met on September 16-20 in Nome, Alaska. In attendance were: Eric Olson, Sue Aspelund, Tara Riemer Jones, Mike Castellini, Dorothy Childers, Howard Horton, Gerry Merrigan, Paul MacGregor, Dave Benson, Caryn Rae, John Gauvin, and Katrina Hoffman. Leslie Holland-Bartels, Phil Thorne, Mike Miller, and Dave Benton participated via phone on Monday. Phil Thorne, Brad Smith, Mike Miller, and Dave Benton arrived in Nome Monday evening and were present for the rest of the meeting. Doug Mecum was absent. The chairs of the Science (SP) and Advisory (AP) panels, Tom Royer and Jeff Stephan, were present. Additionally, representing the Science Panel, Seth Macinko was present on Monday and Tuesday morning; Cheryl Rosa was present on Wednesday and Thursday; and Pat Tester was present for the duration of the meeting. The meeting was staffed by John Hilsinger, Danielle Dickson, Carrie Eischens, Abigail Enghirst, and Susan Dixon.

Visitors included: Vera Metcalf and Gay Sheffield from the Advisory Panel, both live in Nome; Simon Kineen, who lives in Nome and works with Norton Sound Economic Development Corporation; and Sarah Trainer, a social scientist with the University of Alaska who was visiting Nome. Diana Haecker of the Nome Nugget also stopped by for an interview about the Board's activities.

Monday, September 16, 2013

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 pm. A quorum was established with four Executive Committee members and 11 regular Board members. The first order of business was to review and approve the agenda for the meeting.

MOTION: Approve the agenda.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objection.

Staff provided a safety briefing. Staff members were introduced and an update on staffing changes was provided.

It was noted that Caryn Rea's name was misspelled on page 7 of the May Board meeting summary. Note: this error was eliminated when the motion passed to remove names of motion makers and seconds.

MOTION: Approve the May meeting minutes (pending the correction above).

The Board had a brief discussion of whether or not the individuals who make or second a motion should be identified in the meeting minutes, particularly with respect to proposal review. The Board decided that names should be removed from the May meeting minutes and should not be included henceforth.

Amendment 1

MOTION: Approve the May meeting minutes subject to removing the names of the individuals who made or seconded motions.

ACTION: Motion to amend passed with no objection.

FINAL ACTION: Motion passed as amended with no objection.

2. Executive Session

The Board went into Executive Session at 1:30 PM. Besides those Board members present in Nome, Dave Benton, Phil Thorne, and Mike Miller attended by teleconference. The Executive Session was adjourned at 4:20 PM.

3. Conflict of Interest (deferred until Tues.)

Staff summarized the recommendations of the COI working group and the chairs of the Science and Advisory panels summarized the recommendations of the panels.

Some Board members were not comfortable with allowing Board members with institutional conflicts to remain in the room during proposal discussion. Perception on the part of the public is a concern. The point was raised that the Board could have different organizational definitions for disclosure/recusal from the SP and AP.

MOTION: Adopt the modified COI policy recommended by the working group and the panels and apply it to the AP.

ACTION: Motion passed without objection.

MOTION: Adopt the modified COI policy recommended by the working group and the panels and apply it to the SP.

ACTION: Motion passed without objection.

MOTION: revise the organizational units for recusal for the AP & SP only as follows:

ADFG: Divisions (Comm. Fish, Sport Fish, Wildlife Conservation, Subsistence, Habitat)

ASLC: single unit

DOC: NOAA Fisheries Science Center (AFSC, PMEL, & NWFSC)

DOI: NPS, USFWS, USGS, BLM, BOEM

OSU: College level

PWSSC: single unit

UAF: School level

UAA: single unit

UAS: single unit

UC: Each campus at the College or School level

UW: College level

Amendment 1

MOTION: Amend the motion to change the units for UAA and UAS to the school level.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objection.

FINAL ACTION: Motion passed as amended with no objection.

One Board member suggested that, with respect to the Board, language changes to the COI policy be accepted *except* that members would be required to leave the room when recused.

MOTION: Adopt revised Board COI policy to include the typographical changes and other minor changes that do not change the recusal protocol. The exception is that at the top of page 4 NPRB should accept the change in the top three lines regarding letters of support.

Page 1 – no change to parenthetical regarding categories 1 and 4 (i.e., proposed new language not accepted).

Page 2 – accept all changes

Page 3 – no changes to top half (stricken language restored and proposed new language not accepted), confidentiality change as proposed, no changes to bottom of page 3

Page 4 – change top three lines, no changes to institutional except to retain the qualifying phrase “as determined by the Board for each organization” (strike bullet: “Current employment at institution or agency outside of same division, unit, school, department, institute, or equivalent, but the larger organization has taken a position on the proposal”)

Page 5 – accept changes

[i.e., do not add language specific to LTM proposals or language related to Board member having been directed how to vote].

Amendment 1

MOTION: Amend the main motion to establish the units for recusal for the Board as follows: ADFG, DOC, DOI, ASLC, PWSSC, OSU, UW, UC, UAF, UAA, and UAS.

ACTION: Amendment passed.

Amendment 2

MOTION: Amend the amendment to change the units for universities to the whole university (UA as opposed to UAF/UAA/UAS).

ACTION: Amendment passed.

FINAL ACTION: Main motion passed as amended with no objection.

The Board agreed to direct the new ED to examine personnel policies to address staff recusal but henceforth staff will not be required to recuse from discussion of proposals during panel or Board meetings.

The SP Chair described the discussion the panel had about whether SP members should be allowed to submit proposals. The Board agreed with the SP assessment that there is no need to restrict SP members from submitting proposals because the RFP categories should be broad enough so as not to give any one proposal an advantage over others.

4. Social Science Working Group

Seth Macinko, social scientist on the Science Panel and co-chair of the Social Science Working Group (SSWG), provided a report summarizing the main points of the IFM “white paper” (Global Review of Social Science Integration with Natural Resource Management) that the Board commissioned last year. Dr. Macinko stated that social science as it applies to resource management tends to be under-funded, ill-timed, and is assessed from a biased perspective in that the natural sciences tend to expect quantitative as opposed to qualitative products. Some of the skepticism about social science may come from a fear that it is being used for “stealth advocacy.” He noted that the role of (all) science in policy ought to be that of an “honest broker”, seeking to expand policy choices, rather than narrow them. He used the analogy that science is a flashlight that should illuminate the possible choices to inform policy makers in deciding on a course of action. Social science should analyze a proposed policy to understand winners & losers and how they view their situation *in their own terms*.

He noted there is room to be critical about the jargon in the IFM report, but the Board should understand that there is some use of the language of the science, just as there is in biology or economics. The report talks about the challenges of integrating social and natural science, which is part of the exploration of the

field right now. NPRB could be part of this cutting-edge process. One problem NPRB faces is how to evaluate social science proposals. No one has the expertise to evaluate all the proposals. The Board has to rely on technical reviews and the Science Panel, but there remains some bias on the Science Panel, so it might be necessary to develop more staff expertise if NPRB is going to address social science.

Dr. Macinko recommended that NPRB challenge the social science community to produce high quality qualitative science to address the NPRB mission (“...if you want better social science, ask for it...”). He said there is currently a quite pronounced effort in the US to make social science quantitative. As he said, “social science is aping economics, which is aping physics.” He pointed out that NMFS is investing in quantitative studies and NPRB could contribute by funding qualitative social science. NPRB could contribute by funding studies to improve methods of using both Western science and LTK in management.

The SP and AP chairs summarized the discussions of the panels on the subject. The panels recommended that additional staff/contract services should be allocated to addressing social science. The panels supported the suggestion of the social science working group that a workshop be held to address social science at the 2014 AMSS.

The working group envisions a full-day (or half-day) workshop in which the lead author of the white paper would participate. The aim of the workshop would be to make recommendations to NPRB about how to better address social science in the NPRB Science Plan and future RFPs. Perhaps the SSWG could draft an agenda for the workshop.

MOTION: Move forward with a social science workshop at the 2014 AMSS. NPRB should invite the lead author of the white paper to the workshop to give a presentation. The aim of the workshop should be to review the role of social science in the NPRB Science Plan.

ACTION: Motion passed without objection.

Discussion: NPRB should not limit social science research to fisheries-related issues. The Board preferred not to determine the budget for the workshop or dictate that a contractor should be hired.

In terms of the brief introduction to the white paper prepared by the SSWG, the Board expressed some concerns. The introduction seemed too focused on fisheries issues. The introduction should not assert that the case studies are useful examples for Alaska (it should be more neutral). Dave Benton volunteered to work with Dorothy Childers and staff to recommend edits to the introduction that would address these comments.

On Wednesday, the Board reviewed revised language from Dave Benton, Dorothy Childers, and staff.

MOTION: Approve the introduction as drafted and authorize staff to post it on the NPRB website.

ACTION: Motion passed without objection.

The Board went back into Executive Session at 8:30 AM on Tuesday September 17, and adjourned the Executive Session at 9:40 AM. Following the Executive Session, the following motion was considered:

MOTION: Offer the position of Executive Director to Denby Lloyd with the Executive Committee in charge of negotiating terms.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objections and one abstention.

5. **Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program**

Staff provided a status report on BSIERP, noting good progress on project close-out.

NPRB was awarded \$325K from the National Science Foundation (NSF) for project close-out and outreach activities. Staff announced plans for a Bering Sea Open Science meeting prior to, and a Bering Sea special session during, the Ocean Sciences meeting in February. A Bering Sea magazine will be produced based on “headlines” articles that the Principal Investigators (PIs) are writing. Francis Wiese and Nora Deans will write the text on contract and Abby Enghirst will edit it.

The second of four planned special issues in Deep Sea Research II has been published. Thus far 105 papers have been produced by BEST-BSIERP PIs.

The modeling component of the program was very ambitious. The hindcast model will be achieved, but the forecast and MSE goal will not. IPCC scenarios have been incorporated into the forecast model and the PIs have built the lower trophic levels through zooplankton into the model, but they will not be able to incorporate fish and upper trophic levels (validation of fish is an issue.) NOAA intends to continue supporting work on model development.

The Board would like to see a “lessons learned” document, particularly with respect to modeling and the design of IERPs.

6. **GOA Integrated Ecosystem Research Program**

Last field year is wrapping up. PI meeting planned for late-March. Modeling effort now has contract with Andre Punt to fill void left with Francis’ departure. Papers are due by January for first special issue to be published January 2015. Papers will be published electronically as they are accepted. Plan for final communications products will be developed soon. SP is also interested in seeing lessons learned; the board concurs.

7. **Long-term Monitoring**

Staff explained that thirty-six pre-proposals for long-term monitoring (LTM) were received requesting \$26 million. The SP reviewed the proposals and placed 5 pre-proposals in Tier 1 (requesting \$3.3M), 6 pre-proposals in Tier 2 (\$4.9M) and the remaining 25 pre-proposals in Tier 3.

The SP Chair summarized the Tier 1 pre-proposals and the three Tier 2 pre-proposals that the AP highlighted for stakeholder relevance. The AP Chair reported the comments of the AP on the three Tier 2 pre-proposals that the AP highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

The Board reviewed the LTM pre-proposals according to the conflict of interest policy as it was in effect prior to this meeting when Board members completed the disclosure/recusal form.

The Board discussed the pre-proposals ranked Tier 1 by the SP. There was also a discussion of the Tier 2 pre-proposals. A Board member noted that it was worthwhile to consider pre-proposal #7, which was ranked Tier 2 and highlighted by the AP for stakeholder relevance.

MOTION: Invite all Tier 1 pre-proposals to come back with a full proposal.

Amendment 1

MOTION: Amend the main motion to also invite pre-proposal #7.

ACTION: Amendment passed without objection.

FINAL ACTION: Motion passed as amended with no objections and one abstention.

Staff presented the invitational RFP for full proposals for LTM. The Board recommended the addition of a general statement about the intent of the Board to maximize the projects funded and advise PIs to maximize efficiencies. The Board suggests that the RFP instruct PIs to explain in their budget narrative any significant changes in budget between the pre-proposal and the full proposal.

One Board member suggested that the invitational RFP language is too committal about the intent to renew the funding for successful LTM projects. The language should clearly state that there is no guarantee that funding will be renewed beyond the initial five years. The language should also include the clause “if funding permits” and note that the Board retains the option to discontinue funding long-term monitoring programs.

8. Budget Review

Staff provided an update on the NPRB budget and projections for future years. Staff noted the influence of federal interest rates on budget projections and presented projections through 2021 based on varying assumptions about interest rates.

A Board member stated their interpretation of the language in the enabling legislation and in the Arctic legislation introduced by Senator Begich is that the 15% administrative cap only applies to the EIRF funds.

There was a discussion about the unobligated balance and how to use it. One Board member suggested increasing the funding for the Annual RFP by 5% per year for planning purposes. It was further suggested that if the Board did that, it should be done at the time of the RFP. One Board member expressed concern over raising the amount allocated to the Annual RFP without further analysis of the effects on the funds available for IERPs and other activities. With respect to the Annual RFP, staff pointed out that if the Annual RFP amount is to vary, the Board should reconsider the cyclical approach.

9. Previously Funded Projects

Staff gave a status report regarding the 23 projects totaling \$4.2M that were approved or conditionally approved for funding by the Board at their May 2013 meeting. Applicants of the three conditionally approved projects were asked to address all issues raised by the Science Panel and technical reviewers prior to receiving final project approval. All projects addressed these comments satisfactorily and received final approval.

Staff also reviewed the concordance between Science Panel recommendations and Board decisions since 2002. Since that time, the Board has funded 327 projects, 93.2% of which have been ranked as Tier 1 or Tier 2 by the Science Panel. It was noted that the Board has not funded any Tier 3 proposals since 2008.

Information was also presented that summarized all previously funded projects in terms of institutional, large marine ecosystem, and research theme distribution. Staff also noted that the rate of data and metadata submissions is improving, thanks in part to the collaboration with USGS data experts and the hiring of a metadata specialist to help with the backlog of metadata review. The metadata specialist shall also assist the Data Systems Manager with publishing metadata and data records on the NPRB website.

Publications from NPRB-funded projects continue to be tracked with a total of 448 known publications and another 9 in press.

The Board asked if there was a plan for communicating with the public about the breadth of what NPRB has funded. Staff noted that much of the information is in the 2011-12 biennial report and on the website, and staff can strategize how to improve the distribution of that information. Staff noted the existence of the general NPRB brochure. Brad Smith suggested a press release for the broader public. Pat Tester noted the natural opportunity to disseminate general information when the new NPRB Executive Director is announced. One Board member suggested a presentation on NPRB's accomplishments at AMSS.

The Board took a report from AP member Gay Sheffield, who lives and works in Nome: Responding to shipping is the biggest current issue in Nome. Marine mammal harvest is the big issue in St. Lawrence Island area. Food security is also a big issue in the region. Hanasaki crab from the west is moving into the area more frequently (including gravid females). Steller sea lions are present until mid-Dec., and there was a possible great white shark attack on a Steller sea lion recently. Hunters don't want to eat Steller sea lions, and they are a nuisance when hunting bearded seal & walrus.

10. 2014 Request for Proposals

Staff provided a brief history of the Annual RFP, including an overview of research themes and inputs for research priorities and noted that 2014 represents the second year in the 2013-14 cycle.

Prior to addressing the 2014 RFP, the Board engaged in a wide ranging discussion about various aspects of the draft RFP.

One Board member asked to see an analysis of how much money is requested by individual proposals relative to the cap of the category under which they were proposed. The goal was to get some guidance about caps for proposals.

With respect to the focus section, one Board member noted that during the May meeting the Board asked that a focus section be developed for Chinook salmon. Staff explained that an analysis of the need for additional research on Chinook salmon was done as the Board requested and the advice of other organizations involved in Chinook research was that \$400 K would not be adequate to make a significant contribution relative to the work that is already planned. Another Board member pointed out that while significant money is planned for Chinook research, it is subject to appropriation and is not guaranteed to materialize. It was also pointed out that there was an additional Chinook salmon research plan developed after the RFP was drafted.

There was a general suggestion to consider a subcategory under Fishes & Invertebrates on Ocean acidification and its effects on fish stocks. It was noted that the field may not yet be mature enough at this time to assess effects on fish stocks well.

The Board discussed the Bering Sea slope cold-water canyons sub-category (under Habitat in Fishes and Invertebrates) and the desirability of not limiting field work to canyons and also allowing investigations on the slope. There was concern that the draft language would not encourage assessment of the physical characteristics of habitat or of the corals themselves and it was recommended that language be added to allow for that. The Board generally agreed with restricting field studies to the Eastern Bering Sea but thought comparison to existing data from other areas should be allowed. The Board noted that surveys of coral distribution in canyons that are not fished would be worthwhile.

The Board discussed the utility of the results of projects that might be proposed under the sub-category on tradeoffs in salmon use and whether such results would be broadly applicable or simply represent a snapshot that was not broad enough to be applied to management.

Under the invasive species sub-category under Other Prominent Issues, the Board discussed the language stating that “investigations focused on passenger vessels will not be supported” and suggested that staff check jurisdictional issues that may have led to the language originally.

The AP Chair presented comments from the AP report, which recommended changing “social science theory” to “social science analysis” under the Humans category. The report also suggested clarification of the introductory sentence: “The Board is interested in applications of social science that provide an understanding of assessments that attempt to understand how those affected by policy changes regard their new, changed circumstances *on their own terms*.” He further noted that the AP felt that the catch-share subcategory was too prescriptive, politically charged, and already well-studied.

The Board then discussed the issue of social science evaluation of catch-share programs. The Board considered the potential objectivity of proposals, whether sufficient funds had already been aimed at this topic, how the Boards should approach controversial issues in general, and how to best articulate the Board’s desires related to this topic.

The Board discussed the AP recommendation to strike the reference to cytochrome p450 under the sub-category Toxicity of oil, dispersants, and industry-associated discharges under the Other Prominent Issues category and whether p450 was an indicator of toxicity, or merely exposure.

With respect to cooperative research with industry, the Board discussed whether simply using industry platforms to collect data is adequate, or whether proposers must articulate plans to engage members of the industry to draw on their expertise.

The Board then discussed a potential focus section on Aleutian Islands synthesis, and how a simulation study might address the processes driving ecosystem dynamics. Staff noted the existence of simulation models that could elucidate areas that are very data-poor to inform future data collection. The Board then discussed whether a synthesis of the entire Aleutian Islands ecosystem would be possible for \$400 K and whether any start towards this end would be valuable. Discussion finished with the concept that the Board should refine any such request to make clear they are seeking a foundational approach that will provide guidance about where to focus future data collection in the region.

MOTION: Adopt the 2014 RFP as developed by staff and Science Panel.

Amendment 1

MOTION: Change language in Fish & Invertebrates section i. Stock assessment – focus on “non-target” species rather than “bycatch”.

ACTION: Amendment 1 passed with no objection.

Amendment 2

MOTION: Change wording in Fish & Invertebrates section ii. Tier 5 rockfish to include information on tier status (Tier 1 most information, Tier 6 least information); need for life history information to improve Tier status, etc.

ACTION: Amendment 2 passed with no objection.

Amendment 3

MOTION: Change Fish & Invertebrates section iv. Forage species by adding Arctic cod to the list of examples.

ACTION: Amendment 3 passed with no objection.

Discussion of Chinook salmon: Concern was expressed that better understanding the status of AYK Chinook is important to the region and the management of one of the nation's largest Chinook salmon fisheries. There is uncertainty surrounding the biology of Chinook in the AYK region. NPRB should consider supporting research on this issue.

Amendment 4

MOTION: Add sub-section on AYK Chinook salmon under Fishes & Invertebrates with a funding level of \$750 K.

Amendment 4A

MOTION: Strike the Chinook salmon sub-section from the Fishes & Invertebrates category and move \$100 K from Fishes & Invertebrates (making that section \$1.2M) to the Focus section and also add \$250K to the Focus Section to allocate a total of \$750K to a Focus Section on AYK Chinook salmon.

ACTION: Amendment to the amendment passed with no objection.

FINAL ACTION: Amendment 4 as amended (4A) passed with no objection.

The point was made that the Arctic timeline is slipping so that additional money could be taken from the cumulative unobligated funds to augment the 2014 RFP without affecting the Arctic program.

There was discussion of the loss of the Aleutian Islands synthesis Focus Section and the intent to revisit it in the future. The Aleutian Islands synthesis would be valuable and should be revisited eventually, but AYK Chinook salmon is considered a more pressing issue.

The Board discussed whether or not to restrict the geographic scope of Chinook salmon research and decided that it should be restricted to the AYK Region.

There was discussion of whether the AYK Chinook salmon research should be restricted to marine issues and there was a suggestion to include near shore and upriver issues. Staff noted that the RFP needs to state that research in river systems is allowable under this category if that is the desire of the Board because NPRB does not generally fund projects that are beyond the marine and near shore environments.

Amendment 5

MOTION: Clarify that the Focus Section on AYK Chinook salmon includes both freshwater and marine areas.

ACTION: Passed without objection.

Amendment 6

MOTION: Establish a cap for proposals in the AYK Chinook salmon section at \$500 K.

ACTION: Motion withdrawn

Amendment 7

MOTION: Add language stating intent to fund more than one proposal and that proposals over \$500K must be collaborative and leveraged with funds from other sources.

ACTION: Following a discussion of the problems with using "leverage" to evaluate proposals, the amendment was moved to the "parking lot."

Amendment 8

MOTION: Add language to the focus section stating that the Board intends to fund more than one proposal in this Focus Section. Proposals over \$500 K must be collaborative.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment 9

MOTION: Change section b) Bering Sea slope cold-water corals in sub-category vi. Fish habitats under Fishes & Invertebrates to rename it Bering Sea deep-sea corals, to focus on slope areas (including canyons), add the study of the physical characteristics of corals, allow for the comparison to corals in other areas, and allow studies of gear modification.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

NOTE: During discussion it was noted that research in canyons would be allowed because the maker of the motion considers canyons part of the slope habitat.

Amendment 10

MOTION: Accept the changes to the retrospective studies sub-category of the Marine Mammals section suggested by the AP so proposals can address archived data or samples.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment 11

MOTION: Change the word “impacts” to “influences,” then change “threats” to “impacts” in sub-section iv. Anthropogenic impacts on seabirds under Seabirds.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objection.

A suggestion was made to strike the evaluation of catch-shares subsection of the Humans category and ask that the 2014 AMSS social science workshop specifically address how NPRB should approach politically-charged issues.

Amendment 12

MOTION: Under Humans, remove section i; change the sub-section on trade-offs in salmon use to better link to the AYK Chinook salmon Focus Section including changing the title to “values of salmon systems in the AYK region”. Also, remove the last sentence in the introduction of the Humans section that includes “on their own terms.” The language suggested to introduce the Focus Section should be repeated in the Humans section in the sub-section on Chinook salmon.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objections and one abstention.

The Board discussed the desire to focus on the examination of tradeoffs as suggested in the draft RFP. The point was made that if the language only focuses on CDQ economic issues it will ignore tradeoffs associated with other industries such as mining, etc. The language should include the opportunity to examine generational views.

Amendment 13

MOTION: Change social science “theory” to “analysis.”

ACTION: Motion withdrawn.

Amendment 14

MOTION: Stress in the introduction to the Humans category that NPRB will not prohibit studies with a quantitative approach, but the desire is to support qualitative research, and NPRB is not looking for a quantitative modeling exercise.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 15

MOTION: Strike the evaluation of catch-share subsection from the Humans category and ask that the 2014 AMSS social science workshop specifically address how NPRB should approach politically-charged issues.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment 16

MOTION: Accept the language changes recommended by the AP to the iii. Climate change and coastal communities subsection under the Humans category.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objection.

The Board decided not to include an “Other Human Research” subcategory in the 2014 RFP.

Amendment 17

MOTION: Strike the last sentence from the invasive species sub-section of the Other Prominent Issues category.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 18

MOTION: Accept the change to section iii. Toxicity of oil, dispersants, and industry-associated discharges proposed by the AP in the Other Prominent Issues category and strike reference to cytochrome p450 (that is, put a period after species).

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 19

MOTION: Accept the change to the language in the LTK section suggested by the AP with the change of the word “note” to “describe”.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 20

MOTION: Change the sentence in the LTK section to state “NPRB is also interested in proposals that focus on best practices for collection and analysis of qualitative information to allow for its broad application”.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 21

MOTION: Add a bullet g) *studies to develop or evaluate ways to modify fishing gear to reduce potential effects on deep-sea corals* in the i. Gear modification sub-section under the Cooperative Research with Industry category.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 22

MOTION: Accept the language changes proposed by the AP under the ii. Fishery monitoring sub-section under the Cooperative Research with Industry category (strike “smaller” and add “commercial”)

ACTION: Amendment passed.

Amendment 23

MOTION: Add reference to crab to ii. Fishery monitoring and remove “small” from last sentence.

ACTION: Passed with no objection.

Amendment 24

MOTION: Reference “with deployment and enforcement of various forms of” EM technology in the last sentence of the ii. Fishery monitoring sub-section under the Cooperative Research with Industry category.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 25

MOTION: Substitute “fishing vessels and expertise of fishermen” for “platforms” in the ecosystem observations and research sub-section of the Cooperative Research with Industry category.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

Amendment 26

MOTION: Add reference to “chemical” variables in the marine environment in the first sentence under the marine measurement technology development sub-section of the Technology Development and Novel Applications category.

ACTION: Amendment passed with no objection.

It was suggested that the Board decide now if they intend not to fund any proposals in a given category. Last year the Board did not fund any Tier 1 proposals in the Technology Development category following Science Panel review. The Board discussed whether the category caps in the RFP indicate the intent of the Board to fund projects in those categories if there are Tier 1 proposals. Some people feel that in that case the Board should not decide to zero out the category. The Board suggested making a statement in the introduction to the RFP clarifying that the Board reserves the right to change allocations to RFP categories during the proposal review and decision process.

FINAL ACTION: Main motion as amended passed with no objections.

Discussion of the RFP “Boilerplate:”

In the stakeholder and community involvement language change “and” to “or” in the sentence referencing the need for letters of support from appropriate community and tribal governments. The Board accepted the proposed language.

The Board suggested adding a RED comment box in the RFP alerting proposers to review the formatting requirements in the boilerplate.

11. Communications and Outreach Report and Discussion (Photo contest)

Abigail Enghirst, the new Communications and Outreach Director, provided a summary of the communications activities since the last Board meeting, highlighting the annual and Bering Sea photo

contests, development of an image library for all of the amazing photos NPRB has accumulated over the years, synopses of completed annual projects, the production of the Bering Sea magazine, development of an outreach close-out plan for the Gulf of Alaska project and the overall NPRB website re-design.

It was also noted that relationship-building has been an important part of Abby's first few months with NPRB as she begins to meet with the various marine science organizations that NPRB partners or works in collaboration with. This included meeting with folks at the AFSC, the University of Washington Center for Environmental Visualization, and the International Pacific Halibut Commission, among others. A strategic communications plan for the NPRB is under development. Recent press and radio features on NPRB projects were also highlighted for Board members.

The Board suggested adding language to the photo contest announcement to reserve the right to use photographs in AMSS publications.

One Board member noted that the website is not as friendly to use on certain internet browsers. It was also noted that the Project Browser throws errors often because of the time necessary to refresh. The internet-based forms for submitting proposals are also not user-friendly.

One Board member suggested that staff consider targeted outreach about projects related to LTK and community involvement to organizations (particularly Alaska Native organizations) and communities to publicize the opportunity. There was a suggestion to send just the LTK and community involvement sections of the Annual RFP (or a press release) out to them as well. Staff provided an update on the small grants working group and noted plans to continue developing that program as time allows.

12. Arctic

An update on PacMARS was presented. A revised interim report will be done in early October. PIs are planning an in-person meeting in mid-October or early November. The Board recommended consideration of a drop-dead date (perhaps February) for the finalized report. A question was raised regarding whether microbials are included in the project; there is no focus area specifically on microbials.

Progress on planning for an integrated ecosystem study has brought to light various issues such as federal budget constraints, different personalities, and challenges coordinating different agency processes and procedures. IARPC Beaufort and Chukchi ecosystem implementation team is an avenue for moving forward and building partnerships for an Arctic IERP. Challenges seem to exist around timing and mechanics. Based on discussions at several IARPC meetings, it is apparent that a revised approach to developing an Arctic IERP is required. The Beaufort and Chukchi ecosystem implementation team agreed to a phased approach starting with creation of a framing document that will compile advice about research priorities/themes and identify common needs of the funding partners. This framing document will be based on the PacMARS Synthesis report, the SOAR (Synthesis of Arctic Research) report, IARPC Research Plan, USARC research priorities, results of industry supported research, and many other documents. Once the framing document is complete, it will be possible to see how all the existing research pieces fit together and what else needs to be done. Because of the extra effort, release of an RFP would be delayed by a year to the fall of 2014.

Staff recommended the Board consider a special meeting in February to: 1) review and hopefully endorse the framing document, 2) discuss possible implementation mechanisms, and 3) decide on the level of NPRB funding.

There was a general discussion of the issue. It was noted that there is a potential for international involvement (Canada, Russia, etc.) in joint research and synergy that could raise the visibility and funding

potential. SP recommended broadening effort by going to the Arctic Council. NPRB's role would still be the Chukchi/Beaufort but the bigger picture could be international. Discussion occurred regarding a strategy for US chairmanship of the Arctic Council; also, an international effort via joint projects with Russia through the Beringia Program.

AP Chair presented the AP report. The AP noted the slowing of timeline could be a good thing. In regard to PacMARS, appearance of lack of upper trophic levels in interim report was troubling, especially considering reliance on subsistence animals by local residents. Outreach is an important element of all of this—especially in coastal and NW communities. AP recognizes importance for Arctic Ocean IERP, endorses effort to work with partners (federal agencies, communities, NGOs) to establish collaborative effort/funding.

Staff pointed out that PacMARS was bringing the upper trophic levels in through its coordination with SOAR (Synthesis of Arctic Research).

Need to have a discussion regarding whether NPRB is opportunistic or directive in what the Board wants to learn through research.

Staff outlined the strategy to start with bigger players and get a funding mass and then look to other potential funding (such as NGOs) that might be able to fund a small piece. Synthesis and integration are planned to take place throughout. There is potential to have PI meetings or outreach trips funded on a one-off basis.

NOAA can bring ship time and salaries, and etc. to make significant contribution to project. Arctic is a priority for them, but they don't have a line item to contribute funds. Instead, they will likely respond to the RFP and bring leveraged resources.

MOTION: Endorse strategy outlined by staff and hold a special meeting in the first quarter of 2014.

Amendment 1

MOTION: Arctic working group (Caryn Rea, Dave Benton, Sue Aspelund, and Leslie Holland-Bartels) to coordinate with staff to ensure there are finalized products in time for a possible special board meeting during the first quarter of 2014.

ACTION: Passed with no objection.

FINAL ACTION: Motion passed as amended with no objection.

Following the original motion, there was the question of what the strategy is. There will be a PacMARS meeting this fall to continue to develop a product (likely a report) that identifies gaps and priorities. Concurrently, IARPC will develop the framing document (with Danielle's participation) by the end of 2013. The special first quarter meeting will be for presentation of these two products to the board for consideration of NPRB's role/future. This is not a commitment to a particular level of funding at this point.

This iterative process was developed to give the Board multiple opportunities to provide direction and input. The role of the board may be significantly different from the way it was originally envisioned; NPRB may need to adapt depending on how the effort shapes up. What is the obligation of spending Grant 6; how would funding (in particular the administrative cap) be affected by a special meeting? Staff stated that adequate travel funding exists; funding is set aside for up to four Board meetings annually if the need arises. Staff explained NOAA rules that require approval to move more than 10% of a grant

between line items and rules that require significant changes in scope of work to be approved. If the board decided not to use any of the funds currently earmarked for Arctic work, it might require NOAA approval (but it isn't anticipated that it would be a problem); the money could go to another IERP and/or Arctic research in other forms. Board members expressed a desire to have the Arctic working group work closely with staff and keep the chair informed to make a decision regarding when there are adequate products in time for a special meeting. The special meeting would have action items: 1) move forward with developing strategy (to be reviewed in spring), 2) direct staff on implementation mechanisms, 3) develop funding commitment. The discussion should revolve around: 1) do we proceed with an Arctic IERP; 2) if yes, then under what conditions; and 3) then, what's the strategy? Other questions include: who leads and administers the process and ensures quality (funding for program management, etc.) and who contributes to costs.

Staff suggested NPRB needs to commit at least by February or it may create a credibility issue, especially if we decide not to continue later on (February – April). That could affect future partnerships. Some Board members wanted to be clear we have not committed to a specific amount of money or a specific model up to this point. Given the uncertainties, the Board wants to have the flexibility to change strategy (even if the ecosystem focus remains the Arctic). Some Board members discussed a fear of shifting NPRB (and other agencies') focus away from what we do well with no new money to pay for it. Other Board members thought NPRB does have a responsibility to pay attention to the Arctic; with limited resources, it's a balance that needs to be made.

A special meeting would be reliant on whether: PacMARS report complete and IARPC framing document done. What happens if the timing slips into April? Is that too heavy a burden on the SP that is already tasked with regular RFP, GSRA, LTM, etc?

NPRB might have the ability to budget more towards program management, maybe less towards an RFP. Our focus could be on the areas that often get left out (such as humans). Credibility might be an issue if we don't put funding into science. NPRB might be a less effective coordinator if we don't have an investment in funding the research. One Board member felt they should not underestimate the value of coordination. Board has an obligation that money spent must produce as good of a product as we have before. NPRB needs to identify the strong link to its mission. The vision must be compelling. Questions must be raised at special meeting: do we need SP review of all proposals? Would we participate in another process?

Update on Arctic legislation: Senate Bill 1344. There was discussion regarding the trade-offs in the funding changes that are possible as part of future/other bills/amendments. If the bill passes, the full board will likely need to grant the Executive Committee power to make personnel decisions and take care of other pressing issues between board meetings (or the language of the bill may be adjusted to make it clearer). Concerns were raised concerning Dept. of Commerce role in taking in non-federal funds for NPRB. Board members wondered if there is there an administrative reason why NPRB cannot directly receive funds? NPRB may consider writing a letter addressing concerns raised here; or possibility for the chair to work with staff to track legislation and voice board beliefs. Need to finish project of identifying what NPRB is to answer question of how funds can come in (grants, outside sources, etc.).

13. Other Matters

- a) Panel memberships, attendance, and nominations committee
Staff noted that the terms of several SP members are scheduled to expire concurrently without eligibility for reappointment.
- b) GSRA update
Staff noted that the GSRA award-winners expressed their gratitude to the Board.
- c) Outside funding requests

Staff provided an update on the status of outside funding requests that the Executive Director handled this summer as detailed in the action memo. To date NPRB has committed \$33K of \$50 K for outside meeting support. Staff suggested that the Board provide \$2500 to support the Pacific Ecology and Evolution Conference (PEEC) and the Board suggested supporting travel for U.S. students with NPRB awards. The Board asked if NPRB supports student travel to AMSS and staff noted that NPRB does support travel for GSRA winners only. A suggestion was made to grant some student travel awards to events like the Young Fishermen's Association meetings, however, the bulk of the funds should be reserved for meeting sponsorship. Staff noted that it is difficult to support foreign (and even domestic) travel for outside meetings using NPRB grants because of the Fly America Act.

MOTION: Allocate \$2500 to the PEEC conference specifying that it not be used for travel or the purchase of alcohol.

ACTION: Motion failed on a roll call vote (Ex-Comm: 1 yes, 3 no; Board: 9 yes, 2 no).

- d) Alaska Marine Science Symposium and associated events
Staff provided information about the 2014 AMSS and noted that travel will be supported by NPRB and Board members are strongly encouraged to attend. Staff announced that a \$100 registration fee will be assessed in 2014 (the fee will be waived for students).
- e) Goodman Symposium
The SP Chair noted that NPRB agreed to provide support for a symposium planned in honor of the late Dan Goodman, who was an NPRB science panel member and led the Ecosystem Modeling Committee. At the May meeting the Board approved travel funds for Andre Punt and Tom Royer, however, Andre's travel is covered and Tom Royer asked that two of the speakers (George Hunt, Ivonne Ortiz, or Kerim Aydin) be supported instead of himself.

MOTION: Support travel for George Hunt and Ivonne Ortiz to the Goodman Symposium.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objection.

- f) Meeting schedule for 2014
The Board decided to set their meeting schedule as follows:
 - Spring 2014: Apr. 28 – May 2
 - Fall 2014: Sep. 22 – 26
 - First quarter special meeting for Arctic program development: Doodle poll

The ASLC Board member recommended the Board be prepared to justify travel costs for meetings held outside of Anchorage or Seattle. The offer was extended to host the meeting at the Alaska SeaLife Center in Seward in Fall 2014. The Board noted that the Sikuliaq is scheduled to be in Seward in July 2014 and meeting in Seward may allow the opportunity to view it.

The Board noted that the National Ocean Science Bowl (Alaska) is scheduled for Feb. 28 – Mar. 2 in Seward. The ASLC gala is Sat. Feb. 15th in Anchorage.

The Board proposed moving the location of the Fall meetings back to Anchorage or Seward; moving the SP meeting from Nanaimo to Seattle; and completing a Doodle poll for the 1st quarter meeting.

- g) Sue Aspelund announced she was retiring and would no longer be on the Board. This leaves a vacancy for the Vice-Chair position. Election of NPRB Vice Chair:

MOTION: Nominate Tara Riemer Jones for Vice Chair.

ACTION: Passed with no objection.

The Board Chair will assign another Board member to serve on the Arctic working group in Sue's place.

The Board thanked the staff, and John Hilsinger in particular, for their hard work. The SP and AP chairs reiterated their thanks.

MOTION: To adjourn was entered at 4:53 PM, Thursday, September 20, 2013.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objection.