

DRAFT

Summary

North Pacific Research Board
Captain Cook Hotel
Anchorage, Alaska
October 30-31, 2002

1. Call to Order/Approval of Agenda/Minutes

The Board convened at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 30, 2002. Present were Dave Benton (chairman), Garry Brass, Howard Horton, Trevor McCabe, Phil Mundy, Walter Parker, John Roos, Frank Rue, Tylan Schrock, Bill Seitz, Jack Tagart, and John White. Robin Samuelsen arrived shortly after the call to order. Jim Balsiger, John Gauvin, Pamela Pope, Capt. Rich Preston, Steve Ramberg, Jev Shelton and Stetson Tinkham were absent, although Dr. Balsiger was in attendance on Thursday, October 30. Dr. White was unable to attend on Thursday, and Robin Samuelsen and Tylan Schrock left the meeting by 3:00 p.m. on Thursday. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke and Helen Allen.

The agenda was approved with the addition of three presentations from Tuesday's joint meeting with EVOS, the Northern Fund of the Salmon Commission, and the University of Alaska: the Integrated and Sustained Ocean Observing System (provided by Dr. Phil Mundy), the Coastal Alaska Observatory System (provided by Dr. Jim Schumacher--Two Crow), and the AYK Sustainable Salmon Initiative (provided by Dr. Joe Spaeder).

The Board approved the June 2-3, 2002 meeting summary.

2. National Research Council Science Planning

Dr. Terry Schaefer briefed the Board on NRC's progress. The timing has been somewhat delayed because of paperwork requirements, but Dr. Schaefer indicated that NRC should be able to follow the schedule described in the meeting notebooks, assuming there are no major roadblocks. Committee membership should be announced by early November. The first committee meeting will be by video-conference in late November, and the second will be held in conjunction with the joint science symposium scheduled for January 2003 in Anchorage.

Board members had a lengthy discussion regarding site visits and public hearings and how they could be carried out within the current schedule while assuring that critical regions are included and local input well represented. Dr. Schaefer indicated that adding sites would depend on funding, timing, and availability of committee members. He indicated that if the site visit schedule shifts much more than a couple of weeks, the schedule for completion of the project would likely be delayed.

Board members suggested that NRC conduct site visits in 'hub' communities with public hearings in related communities utilizing a subset of committee members, as occurred during the community development quota program assessment by NRC. Dr. Schaefer indicated this may be possible if committee members are available, but may require additional NRC staff to accompany members to the public hearings. Dr. White suggested that regional non-profit entities could be asked to provide funding to support additional hearings. Dr. Schaefer advised that the NRC cannot accept direct funding, but would be appreciative of other support such as providing facilities, coordinating logistics, and other meeting necessities.

The Board suggested the following site/public hearing locations assuming funding and staff availability: Kodiak (with hearing in Homer); Sitka (with hearings in Juneau or Ketchikan); Dillingham; Bethel; Nome and/or Kotzebue (with hearings in Barrow, Unalakleet, and possibly other communities in north and south Norton Sound), and Anchorage. It was suggested that an Anchorage hearing could be well publicized so that residents of other communities could participate if desired. Members also discussed a

DRAFT

possible hearing in Seattle. The Anchorage workshop would be used to gather scientific input, while the other hearings and site visits would focus on non-scientific advice.

After considerable discussion, the Board requested the Executive Director and Terry Shaefer to work on the details for the site visits and public hearings, based on the Board's discussion at this meeting. They will report back with cost estimates and a proposed list of site visits. Board members were amenable to additional funds being expended for added site visits, but did not wish to push the NRC final report past the January 2005 deadline. It was noted that any additional site visits would each cost approximately \$10,000. Four such visits are now included in the current work plan for \$474,000.

3. Board Operating Procedures

Standard meeting procedures. Chairman Benton suggested the Board follow standard procedures during meetings. Agenda items and times will be posted. Each agenda issue will be taken up in the following sequence: the Board will hear staff reports and ask any clarifying questions, and then, committee and/or work group reports will be presented. These will be followed by public comments. Five minutes will be allowed for each person to provide comment. Board members may ask up to two clarification questions per commenter. Sign-up sheets will be made available for persons to register to give public comment. After the close of the public comment session, the Board will discuss the issue and take action as necessary. Notebook materials should clearly identify the actions required. Board members did not object to this arrangement.

SOPP. The Board approved the draft Statement of Organization, Practices and Procedures under Tab 3A of the meeting notebook, with the following amendments and comments:

- Mission and Goals. Page 1, Section 1.B: the words "healthy, sustainable" were deleted from the second bulletized paragraph. It was suggested that, as drafted, it could be implied that the Board's goal would be to improve the ability to manage only healthy and sustainable fisheries.
- Non-voting Meeting Participants. Commissioner Rue suggested that the Board may want to include signatories to MOAs as non-voting participants at Board meetings. Some members felt this eventually could result in a very large body of non-voting participants. Members decided not to take any action on this issue.
- Officers and Terms of Office. Page 3, Section 3.B: A motion failed to rotate the offices of chairman and vice chairman annually between the executive committee and other members of the Board.
- Designees. Page 3, Section 3.C: The Board will consider the use of designees at a future meeting. Current policy would not permit members such as the designee of an agency head, e.g. the Secretary of Commerce, to have an alternate designee.
- Committees. Page 4, Section 3.E: It is the Board's intent that Ad hoc committees will have a specific purpose and timeline. The Executive Director was tasked with composing appropriate language for the SOPP.
- Cooperative Agreements. Page 4, added new section 3.G: The Board may as appropriate enter into cooperative arrangements with other groups of similar goals and responsibilities.
- Conduct of Meetings. Page 4, Section 4.B: Board members noted that once a meeting is started with a quorum present, it can continue and take action even if there no longer is a quorum present.
- Closed Meetings. Page 5, Section 4.D: Robert's Rules of Order will be waived during Executive Sessions with respect to voting on memberships to Board committees. It was clarified that normal voting procedures would remain in force for those votes.
- Conflicts of Interest and Recusal. Page 6, Section 4.H: The Board had considerable discussion on the section on conflict of interest and recusals. Although some members felt revisions were needed, no final decisions were made. The Board voted to approve the SOPP without section H--Conflict of Interest and Recusal--while a small committee works to re-draft the section for Board consideration at the next meeting.

DRAFT

- Confidentiality of Information. Page 7, Section 4.I: The Board agreed that unfunded proposals will remain proprietary and confidential, though the title, author, requested funding amount, and performance period will be made available to the public.

Decision Matrix. The Executive Director provided a Decision Matrix outlining responsibilities of the Executive Committee and the full Board. Members were asked to review it and consider approval at the next meeting. Dr. Brass commented that with regard to fiscal audits he assumes that the entire Board will be kept informed because of accountability issues.

Memorandum of Agreement. The Board was scheduled to approve the MOA between the NPRB and EVOS, the Northern Fund of the Pacific Salmon Commission, and the University of Alaska. However, as a result of discussions during an earlier joint meeting on October 29th, some drafting issues still need resolution. The Board instructed the Executive Director to work with the Executive Director of EVOSTC on the re-draft. Board members were asked to contact Clarence Pautzke with any concerns or issues they would like addressed. EVOSTC will consider the MOA first and any proposed changes will be circulated to Board members and considered at a future meeting of the Board.

4. Committee Structure

Science Panel

The Board reviewed draft standard operating procedures they had approved informally in September. The draft had served as the basis for the initial call for nominations for membership on the Science Panel. Several outstanding issues needed further consideration: the size of the panel, whether to pay a daily stipend to panel members, and how to handle conflicts of interest. The Board completed action on the standard operating procedures as follows, and then selected members for the first Science Panel. The final Science Panel statement of policy and procedures adopted is available at www.nprb.org.

Panel Size. A membership of 6-10 members was contemplated earlier for the size of the panel. The Board's nominating committee suggested that the Board consider two science panels, one with agency scientists and one with academic and non-agency scientists to achieve broader representation. The Board decided to establish a single, larger panel of up to 14 members in this first panel, with balanced representation from agencies, private organizations, and academia. The Board noted that it will work toward establishing a separate traditional ecological knowledge panel that will interact with the Science Panel, particularly in reviewing TEK-related proposals.

Daily Stipend. In order to increase the availability of funds for research, the Board decided not to pay a daily stipend for panel members.

Conflicts of Interest and Recusal. In September, the Board had considered whether or not to allow scientists to serve on the panel if they had interest in Board funding for research. The call for nominations was released with a proviso that nominees could not have an interest in Board funding to be considered for the Science Panel. A caveat was added to the announcement that the issue would not be resolved until the October Board meeting. Therefore, scientists were encouraged to submit their applications even if a conflict might exist. After much discussion of the pros and cons of allowing scientists with Board funding to participate on the panel, the Board decided to allow such participation, but to adopt recusal procedures patterned after those of the National Science Foundation. A Board work group will help in drafting the recusal procedures for consideration of the Board on a January teleconference.

DRAFT

Membership. The Board approved fourteen members for 1 or 2 year terms, assigned on a random basis within three categories – agency, private, and academia – to maintain balance. They may be reappointed on expiration of their term.

Dr. Vera Alexander, University of Alaska, Fairbanks (1)
Dr. Shannon Atkinson, Alaska SeaLife Center, Seward (2)
Dr. Richard Beamish, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, British Columbia (2)
Dr. James Berner, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, Anchorage (1)
Dr. Donald Bowen, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, Nova Scotia (1)
Dr. Daniel Goodman, Montana State University (2)
Dr. Ann Hollowed, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS, Seattle (1)
Dr. Edward Houde, University of Maryland, Solomons, MD (1)
Dr. Gordon Kruse, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Juneau Center (2)
Dr. Rich Marasco, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS, Seattle (2)
Dr. Thomas Royer, Old Dominion University, Virginia (1)
Dr. Patricia Tester, NOAA National Ocean Service, Beaufort, NC (1)
Mr. David Witherell, North Pacific Fishery Management Council, Anchorage (1)
Dr. Douglas Woodby, Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game, Juneau (2)

Stakeholder Committee

The Board discussed and approved committee recommendations for the Stakeholder Committee with the following revisions or clarifications:

- The committee will be re-named and referred to as the NPRB Advisory Panel.
- Terms will be for 2 years; members may serve two consecutive 2-year terms and then must stand down for at least one year before reappointment. Appointments will be staggered so that only one-half of the panel is up for reappointment at any time. Initial appointments will be made as follows: one-half of the appointments will be for two years and can be reappointed; one-half of the appointments will be for two years, but cannot be reappointed, in order to achieve the proper sequence for reappointments. Nominations would be called for every other year.
- The Executive Director will arrange meetings of the Advisory Panel in advance of Board meetings to allow sufficient time for the Panel to prepare recommendations for the Board. There is no set number of meetings prescribed during the year; rather, they will meet “as appropriate.”
- The Executive Director will work with the Committee on Committee Structure to define the role and responsibilities of the Panel for Board approval in January. (In later discussions of the January agenda, it is likely that the draft terms of reference will be handled by email for purposes of releasing the call for Advisory Panel nominations in January, and then the Board will consider final approval at their March 18-20, 2003 meeting.) The committee will also consider the annual cycle for the Advisory Panel, however, it is anticipated that nominations will be solicited beginning in January and appointments made in March. It is the desire of the Board to have the Panel appointed and available to meet in May to help in identifying draft research priorities that eventually will be considered for incorporation in the 2004 RFP.
- The committee on committee structure was also requested to consider further development of a panel on traditional ecological knowledge.

5. Research, Education and Demonstration Projects for 2002

Because of time constraints, the Board received only written status reports on research projects supported through the Environmental Restoration and Improvement Fund and the North Pacific Marine Research Institute. Concerning NPMRI education and demonstration projects, Amy Haddow, Education Director for the Alaska SeaLife Center, provided a Powerpoint presentation on the Center’s planned interactive

DRAFT

exhibit, "The Bering Sea: Abundance and Change." Ms. Haddow provided Board members with a draft of the text that will accompany the various portions of the exhibit and asked that any recommendations be forwarded to her as soon as possible.

6. Request for Proposals

The Board approved the draft Request for Proposals in the meeting notebook for release on November 8, 2002, with the following changes:

- There will be no formal grievance procedure. Submitters of rejected proposals will have the opportunity to re-submit rejected proposals in the next annual cycle with changes and/or responses to technical evaluations.
- Concerning applications that do not conform to the requirements of the RFP, their rejection remains discretionary on the part of the Executive Director since it is very difficult to identify a bright line where proposals would be rejected out-of-hand on the initial screening. The Executive Director will track proposals rejected for format or incompleteness and report back to the Board.
- Up to \$14 million may be made available for the 2003 RFP; target amounts will not be identified for research categories. Projects may run up to 3 years.
- Each proposal must identify at least \$1,500 for education and outreach (vice \$500 for 2002 RFP).
- Percentages assigned to proposal evaluation criteria review were amended as follows:
 - Project Responsiveness to NPRB Research Priorities - 15% (vs 10%)
 - Soundness of Project Design/Conceptual Approach - 40% (vs 45%)
 - Project Management, Experience/Qualifications of Personnel - 20% (vs 25%)
 - Project Costs - 15% (same)
 - Coordination and Collaboration - 10% (vs 5%)
- Under General Conditions, paragraph #3, the last sentence was deleted requiring any necessary permits to be granted before funding is awarded. Board members suggested this could be handled at the contract stage.
- Under Research Priorities, Section e. Bycatch: item 3 was revised to delete the phrase "including unobserved mortality."
- Under Research Priorities, Section f. Stock assessment and recruitment processes: an amendment failed that would have constrained salmon studies to marine and estuarine waters.
- Public comments received on draft research priorities will be made available in the science planning process and to the Advisory Panel and Board in developing next year's RFP.

7. Response to SJR 44

The Executive Director requested Board advice with regard to the report being prepared in response to the Alaska Legislature's resolution requesting development of a research and development plan to "help expand and diversify Alaska's economy, strengthen and maintain the health of state research institutions, and protect the health of Alaskans and their environment." The NPRB has been asked to provide the fisheries component of the plan. The need for public comment on this issue was well publicized but little response was received.

Board members indicated that in light of the fact that the NPRB is still in the early stages of developing its own research plans, it would be premature to provide any substantive information at this time. The Executive Director was given direction to respond to the request by providing information on the NPRB's mission, proposal process, and a description of where it is in that process. The Board's research priorities for 2003 and a description of the science planning activity of the National Research Council also should be provided. Board members would like the opportunity to review the full draft report before it is submitted to the Legislature because the NPRB is specifically listed in the resolution.

DRAFT

8. Administrative Matters

The Board was requested to approve a staffing plan and authorize the Executive Director to submit a grant request for the second release of EIRF funds from NMFS. Board members expressed some concern over the staffing plan in light of the five percent cap on administrative funds and were uncomfortable with the possibility of laying off staff within six months of hire. The Board authorized the Executive Director to fill the following four positions -- program officer, office manager, clerical/receptionist, and deputy director/science leader -- dependent on the ability to stay within the 5% administrative cap. The priority and timing of the hires would be at the discretion of the Executive Director.

The Board also authorized the Executive Director to expend funds, not to exceed the following amounts, for four science planning activities:

- Science Panel at \$130,000
- Advisory Panel at \$64,000
- Management Consultant at \$100,000
- January 13-17, 2003 science conference at \$20,000

Concerning the management consultant, this contract could not exceed six months, and when assigned to map out Native science activities, the consultant should first contact RuralCap representatives for their comments, knowledge, and experience in Native science in Alaska.

The Board authorized the Executive Director to submit a grant request for the second release of \$4.9 million in Environmental Improvement and Restoration Funds, with 95% specified for the 2003 RFP and the other 5% for general administrative expenses.

The Board also discussed future meeting dates. The consensus of the Board was not to have a January meeting in conjunction with the Science Symposium, but that interested Board members would be reimbursed for travel expenses if they wish to attend. The Board will meet by teleconference during the week of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council meeting in Seattle (January 27–February 4) to approve the recusal provisions for the Science Panel because that panel will be meeting ahead of the March Board meeting. Other issues that were to be on the January agenda (Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman; recusal policies for Board; and policy on designees) will be handled at the March meeting before the Board begins considering proposals. Draft terms of reference sufficient to enable a call for nominations to the Advisory Panel will be handled via email. They will be considered for final approval at the March 18-20 meeting of the Board.

The Board will meet March 18-20 and May 20-21 in Anchorage. Though the Board will meet only in Anchorage in 2003, it was noted in discussion that other communities in Alaska and in Washington or Oregon should be considered for future meetings.

Members were asked to provide the Executive Director with any suggestions or comments relating to the presentation of meeting materials via website, and meeting efficiency. Dr. Brass requested that there be a clear statement of action requested or required by the Board in action memos and reports, including committee reports. Most members approved of retrieving meeting materials from the website, and requested an e-mail notification when materials are available.

The Board also authorized the Executive Director to purchase a sound system similar to the one used at this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. on October 31, 2002.