

## Final Summary

North Pacific Research Board  
Advisory Panel Meeting  
NPRB Conference Room  
Anchorage, Alaska  
September 29, 2003

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on September 29, 2003. Present were Michael Bradley, Patricia Cochran, John Gerster, Simon Kinneen, Paul MacGregor, Heather McCarty, Arni Thomson, and Gale Vick. Cora Crome and Shirley Kelly were absent. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke and Misty Ott. The Board meeting notebooks for October 1-2, 2003, were used as the basis for the Advisory Panel meeting.

### 1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m. Heather McCarty and Patricia Cochran were elected Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively. The meeting agenda was approved.

### 2. Projects Approved for 2003 and 2003

The AP reviewed the list of 47 projects already funded by the Board based on funds from the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund and by the North Pacific Marine Research Institute. This was an informational item and no action was required. The legal opinion on confidentiality of video/photographic information was not available at meeting time.

### 3. North Pacific Science Planning Report

The AP was given a brief overview of the science report drafted by Two Crow (AKA Jim Schumacher) under contract to the Board. The report presents an inventory of science programs in Alaska waters and a series of recommendations for setting research priorities and revising the draft 2004 Request for Proposals (RFP). This report was reviewed by the Board's Science Panel in August and their recommendations, incorporated in the draft RFP, were presented to the AP. Except for the three issues noted below, report recommendations were discussed under agenda item 4.

General recommendation 2: Establish a management advisory panel (MAP): The AP believes that pressing fishery management issues can be identified without formally establishing another group and layer in the Board committee structure. The executive director already has the ability to convene a meeting of agency representatives to discuss coordination and collaboration on research initiatives, find out what research projects are being funded by each entity, and determine the potential for synchronizing funding cycles. Adding another formal advisory body, such as a MAP, will only add to the Board infrastructure and bureaucracy and is unnecessary at this time.

General recommendation 3: Promote potential cooperative research programs. The AP discussed the need for a comprehensive list of research activities in Alaska waters. The AP is aware that creating such a list and tracking overlap with Board interests, will be an enormous task given the high levels of research funding and the many entities involved, but believes it is needed if the Board is to be in a position to coordinate and collaborate on research, and leverage its funds with those of other agencies. The Board needs to incorporate Alaska Native science activities, including sources such as Alaska Native Science Commission, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, Alaska Native Health Board, Alaska Native Harbor Seal Commission and others. The AP believes the Board should explore opportunities for joint research with Russia, recognizing that transferring funds to Russian scientists is not easy.

RFP recommendation 3: Co-sponsor State of Oceans Report 2004. AP recommends this should be re-titled “State of the Northeast Pacific Ocean”, and recognizes that more research may be needed before generating such a report and that it could be highly controversial.

#### 4. Request for Proposals for 2004

First, the AP discussed the funding situation and anticipated low yields from the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund. The Panel recommends that the Board proceed with developing alternative approaches for assuring a more stable funding environment. Second, the Panel reviewed the Science Panel recommendations as incorporated in the revised draft 2004 RFP, and developed the following recommendations, keyed to line numbers in item 4(d):

#### **Purpose**

Lines 40-41: Change italicized sentence to read: “*The Board interprets “adjacent waters” to include freshwater drainages for the purpose of salmon contaminants research.*”

#### **A. Component 1: Specific Project Needs**

Lines 88-90: Add a second synthesis project under Goal 3 to bring the scientific background up to date on the Southeast Alaska region, defined as south of Yakutat, for \$75k.

The AP reviewed the document titled “Examples of Responses to RFP Component 1: Specific Project Needs” which was a supplemental item under Tab 4(a). Discussion centered mainly on the data protocol workshop (p.2) and on the education and outreach component (p. 3).

Concerning the data protocol workshop, the AP passed a motion acknowledging the need for common protocols for sharing/storing samples/data and recommended developing a memorandum of agreement template that would facilitate access to data and sharing of samples, and stipulate restrictions on data access as necessary and appropriate.

Concerning education and outreach, discussion centered on whether \$100,000 would be sufficient to provide education and outreach materials for all the research projects that would require them. Videography, in particular, is very expensive and could exhaust the budget quickly, covering only a few projects. Potential contractors may want to emphasize development of Powerpoint presentations and slide shows that could be taken out to communities, and of written, easily-understood, pamphlets with descriptions of the research and its findings, tailored to local languages as appropriate. The AP suggests that the Board, when reviewing proposals responsive to this project need, pay close attention to whether the applicant has staff experts in creating such materials. This project should be reviewed annually to determine if it is effectively providing understandable products to communities. Two examples of successful information endeavors include the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment and the Canadian Northern Contaminants programs.

#### **B. Component 2: General Research Priorities**

##### **Preamble**

Line 100: Add a sentence that for purposes of the research priorities, the term “fish” includes finfish, mollusks, crustaceans, and all other forms of marine animal and plant life other than marine mammals and birds (defined as in the Magnuson Stevens Act, §3(12)).

**a. Marine Ecosystem structure and processes**

Lines 104-105: Add back in from 2003 RFP: “Origins and impacts of invasive species.”

**b. Marine mammals and seabirds**

Line 110: Change Note to read: “Research focused primarily on Steller sea lions will be *deferred to future RFPs* because of availability of other funds.”

**c. Fish habitat**

Lines 117-118: Change #2 to read: “Impacts of fisheries and other human influence on habitat and its capacity to support *managed species* and communities of organisms, including adaptive management research.” The Board may also want to include near-shore research from 1-10 miles to do studies on shellfish and halibut nursery areas.

**e. Stock assessment and recruitment processes**

The Science Panel recommended that salmon assessment work that was under this priority in the 2003 RFP be deleted from the 2004 RFP because of the large amount of funds already allocated, and the fact that NRC is now evaluating the AYK science and restoration plan and those results will guide future work. The Advisory Panel did not object to that change, but did note it should be phrased as being “deferred”, not “deleted”.

**f. Contaminants**

Line 135: Reinstate a major research category on contaminants that would read: “*Studies of sources, transport, effects, and accumulation of contaminants in subsistence, recreational, and commercial species, and other ecosystem components, including salmon throughout their life cycles.*”

**C. Research Program Structure**

Lines 154-156 under community involvement: Change last sentence to read: “Proposals for research on specific Alaska Native communities or health issues must have a letter of support from the appropriate community *and tribal* governing bodies.” Same language change needs to be made to line 457. The AP noted that there may be the need for a standard MOA template to guide research in coordination with tribal and city entities.

Line 160 under outreach and education: Include requirement to earmark a minimum of \$2,000 for outreach and education in each proposal budget, in addition to having to cooperate with the NPRB’s assigned education and outreach contractor.

Line 183-209 regarding independent technical evaluations. The AP passed a motion supporting the new scoring system and weightings.

**D. Proposal Review Process**

Lines 214-216: Regarding participation of the AP in the review of scientifically meritorious proposals, the Panel restated their unanimous request to be involved in proposal review as stated in the draft RFP.

5. National Research Council Science Plan

The AP received an update on NRC activities to help the Board in drafting a science plan. The AP looks forward to interacting with the NRC committee and the plan drafting team as appropriate in developing the details of the comprehensive plan.

The Advisory Panel adjourned at approximately 6:30 p.m. on September 29, 2003.