Final Summary
North Pacific Research Board
Hotel Captain Cook
Anchorage, AK
January 27-28, 2004

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda/Election of Officers

The Board convened at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, January 27, 2004. Present were Tylan Schrock, Jim Balsiger, Lawson Brigham (for Garry Brass), Howard Horton, Earl Krygier (for Kevin Duffy), Stephanie Madsen, Trevor McCabe, Phil Mundy, Walter Parker, Pamela Pope, Capt. Rich Preston, John Roos, Robin Samuelsen, Bill Seitz, Jack Tagart, and John White. Robert Gisiner, Stetson Tinkham, John Gauvin, and Jev Shelton were absent. Clarence Pautzke and Misty Ott staffed the meeting.

The agenda was approved with the addition under agenda tab 3 of a discussion of the $3 million appropriation for the Board in the omnibus budget bill. Tylan Schrock and Jim Balsiger were elected unanimously to serve as chairman and vice-chairman, respectively, for one-year terms. The Board meeting summary for October 1-2, 2003, was approved.

2. National Research Council Interim Report

Dr. Lynda Shapiro, Chairman of the NRC Committee that drafted the interim report titled "*Elements of a Science Plan for the North Pacific Research Board*," presented an overview of the report to the Board. The Board was scheduled to receive the overview, ask any clarifying questions, and then give direction on how to respond in drafting the science plan. Discussion that followed centered on the use of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), and partnerships and/or collaborations with universities and coastal communities. Review and recusal processes were discussed including whether proposals should be voted on as a package or discussed individually, and the roles of the Science Panel and the Board in reviewing and approving proposals. Sample storage was also discussed.

The Board also received comments from its Science Panel which had reviewed the NRC interim report on January 15-16, 2004. Vera Alexander, Science Panel vice chairman, presented the panel's comments, pointing out the need for solid objectives, metrics for performance evaluation, predictive models and public support. The science plan will determine the success of the NPRB. The Science Panel also recommended that the science plan be brief and concise rather than a lengthy synthesis. The panel's full comments are available in their meeting summary.

Heather McCarty, Advisory Panel chairman, presented the Advisory Panel's comments regarding the NRC Interim Report. Highlighted points included the need for local scientific communities to be involved in TEK, and their agreement with the Science Panel to focus on geographic core areas including the BSAI, Arctic and Western GOA. The panel's full comments are available in the summary of its meeting on January 26, 2004.

Board members proceeded to discuss the issues and recommendations in the interim report and made the observations shown below.

Dr. Tagart:

1. Formation of a Proposal Selection Committee is unnecessary, though the Science Panel may wish to invite needed experts to join them in the review of proposals on an ad hoc basis.
2. Need to be proactive in integrating TEK into the science plan. Board should fund an inventory of TEK-based hypotheses, i.e., the conversion of TEK observations and beliefs into the western science equivalent of hypothesis that can be tested through NPRB-funded research. RFP's would be designed to request proposals to address those hypotheses. A panel should be appointed to help in doing this, possibly including an anthropologist, physical and biological scientists, Native expert, etc.
3. If the Board decides to set-aside a certain amount of funding for long-term monitoring, then it needs to decide whether that would be a fixed dollar amount or a percentage of the total amount available for research each year.
4. When developing programs that the Board should fund outside of research, such as education and outreach and data management, etc., the Board needs to ensure that administrative type costs remain within the 15% administrative cap imposed by the legislation.
5. The science plan should address procedures for proposal ranking and review, i.e., the plan needs to address the concerns raised in Chapter 4 of the NRC interim report.

Dr. Brigham:

1. Agrees with TEK approach and that a team should be active in developing the approach as the science plan is being developed.
2. Issues in Chapter 4 of the NRC report should be set aside for now. The NPRB is a stakeholder-driven organization and different from NSF. Operating procedures are in place.
3. Agrees with schedule of trying to wind up science plan by September.
4. Will contribute to describing current science/research initiatives in Arctic and Chukchi Sea.

CAPT Preston:

1. The process of integrating TEK with science plan needs to be continuous, not just one time.
2. Advisory Panel and Science Panel representatives should be on the plan writing team.
3. Need to address education and outreach in the plan as well as building partnerships with other science programs.

Mr. Roos:

1. A new Proposal Selection Committee is not a good idea.
2. Funding should be requested from the Secretary of Commerce as per the implementing legislation to help in administering the Board.

Ms. Madsen:

The science plan needs to address the issues raised in Chapter 4 so that policy issues can be settled in reviewing the plan.

Mr. Krygier:

1. Gathering TEK involves cultural issues and sensitivities and needs to be approached very carefully. There is a wealth of experience and knowledge in the Subsistence Division of ADFG and Mary Peet should be contacted for guidance.

2. Long-term monitoring is desirable and necessary, but the Board also needs to have funds available to address more immediate and shorter term issues facing managers. Thus sustained long-term funding will need to be reevaluated periodically to ensure that inflation in costs does not inhibit the Board's ability to address current needs.
3. Need to ensure that the long-term monitoring program that is developed is the right one and that there is sufficient flexibility to ensure data streams reflect current objectives and needs of the Board.
4. Also need to develop linkages to AKFIN and its commercial fisheries database. AKFIN may serve as a data management and storage center for Board research, rather than starting up a duplicative program.

Dr. Mundy:

1. The proposed schedule for developing the science plan is very optimistic. The big questions still need to be defined and the products determined.
2. The plan cannot be cast completely in stone; there should be an annual process for review.
3. Work products should be circulated to the Board, Advisory Panel, and Science Panel as soon and as often as possible to get feedback; it needs to be an open process.
4. The TEK approaches proposed by Dr. Tagart need to be incorporated in the plan at the outset.
5. Need to determine how to inflation proof the various components of research, particularly long-term funding.

Dr. White:

1. TEK approach by Dr. Tagart should be given to the Advisory Panel and request recommendations for its further development for the drafting team to consider.
2. Agrees that Board should ask for additional administrative funding from SOC out of newly appropriated money.
3. Need to institutionalize a capacity building initiative to enhance the ability of organizations in rural communities to respond to requests for proposals and be competitive.
4. Believes that science plan should include some way or metric of measuring success, e.g., a performance indicator based on how many objectives were met, so the Board would know if and when to stop funding for a particular program or line of research.

Ms. Pope:

1. Powerpoint slides should be available on website.
2. Science plan is a living document and should be revisited annually, as proposed by Dr. Mundy.
3. Need to determine how to share and leverage resources of other programs and agencies, and build synergisms with other groups.
4. BP and other industry components have supported extensive research, including TEK collections, and these should be mined and archived for useful information.
5. BP can also provide an example of outreach and education activities on the North Slope.

Dr. Parker:

1. Need investment in long term data sets, but also need to be aware of short-term needs and ensure funding is available to address them. Needs to be cooperation with ocean observing systems and SEARCH programs.

2. TEK is essential and the Board should explore the State of Alaska network to bridge into rural communities. It is underutilized. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also has extensive networks.
3. Agrees with Dr. Mundy that the timeframe for writing the plan may be too optimistic.
4. Noted that an Arctic Impact Assessment is due to report out this summer, which is the work of many scientists.

Dr. Balsiger:

1. TEK collection should be incorporated in science plan, and this does not mean just telling their stories, but helping provide observations that could lead to testable hypotheses.

Mr. Samuelsen:

1. Science plan should incorporate as many NRC recommendations as possible.
2. Needs to be collaboration between agencies and mechanisms for leveraging funds.
3. TEK traditions vary throughout Alaska and the Board needs to consider those differences in approaching communities in different regions. ADFG Subsistence provides a good starting point for developing a strategy. The division has a good trust relationship with communities. NPRB could work with 12 non-profit organizations in Alaska.
4. Need more outreach now, such as newsletters.
5. Many young people in rural want to go into biology and mechanisms should be developed for them to do so, such as scholarships, mentoring, and helping in research projects.
6. Salmon research is very important and should be included as an important topic in addition to groundfish.

Dr. Seitz:

1. Science plans should cover elements of successful science plan noted in NRC report.
2. Education and outreach and data management need to be included, and the research themes need to be addressed.
3. TEK needs to be integrated in each research theme, rather than as a stand alone issue.
4. Concerning long-term monitoring, the best we should expect in the science plan is a strategy to establish such a plan, not the specifics of the long-term monitoring itself.
5. Need mentoring by scientists working in the field to show rural residents how to write proposals. National Park Service does this.

Mr. Schrock:

1. Not ready yet to discard any of the ideas and suggestions raised in Chapter 4, however, the Board will maintain its current adopted procedures in developing funding recommendations in the 2004 RFP.
2. Developing the appropriate conceptual model will be extremely important and should be a focus of the March Board meeting. The conceptual foundation should derive from and relate to the Board's mission and goals as shown on p. 3 of the report.
3. Advisory and Science Panels should be able to obtain needed expertise on an ad hoc basis.
4. Need to leverage our funding and science initiatives by working with other organizations, programs and agencies.
5. Team should provide as many intermediate documents as possible for review and comment during development of the plan. The schedule should be pushed as much as possible, i.e.,

have a final plan by October 1st if at all possible so this does not become a long drawn-out process. Concentrate on providing a concise 50 pp document, not a voluminous tome.

6. Advisory Panel should take on the task of developing the TEK approach and also work on communications issues.
7. Also need to start developing policies on protecting intellectual property rights.

The staff will establish a writing team and prepare a preliminary outline for Board review in March. It will strive to incorporate as much of the guidance from the Board as possible in structuring the outline and the composition of the plan, as well as fully take into account the recommendations of the NRC committee. The anticipated schedule is to have a rough draft available by late May or early June, and a final draft ready for approval this fall.

3. Request for Proposals for 2004

Overview of Proposals Received

The Board received an overview of the 87 proposals received in response to its 2004 Request for Proposals. Twenty-three of the 87 proposals responded to Component 1 on specific project needs. Within that component, only the ecosystems indicators category did not receive a response. The 64 proposals responding to Component 2 general research priorities responded to all categories, though ecosystems, marine mammals and seabirds, and stock assessment/recruitment received the most hits. Applicant principal investigators came from 16 states and a diverse array of federal, state, private, and foreign organizations. All proposals were sent out for anonymous technical review through mid-February. The Science Panel will meet on March 2-4 to develop funding recommendations, and the Board will meet March 17-19 to make funding recommendations for review of the Secretary of Commerce.

Advisory Panel Role in Proposal Review

In October 2003, the Board revisited the issue of Advisory Panel review of proposals. A motion was made and seconded to change Advisory Panel policy to allow the panel to review proposals that are judged to be scientifically meritorious by the Science Panel. The Board tabled the motion until the January 2004 meeting so it could be placed on the agenda as a policy discussion for resolution.

The chairman of Advisory Panel reported that the panel believes it should have a role in the review of scientifically meritorious proposals and give comments on the applicability of the proposals to the goals and mission of the Board. The panel would not rank proposals, but would comment on how proposals fit into the Board's program.

Following the Advisory Panel report, a motion was made and seconded to change Board policy to provide a role for the Advisory Panel in reviewing and commenting on scientifically meritorious proposals. The Board then debated the role the panel might have in reviewing proposals, especially in light of the strong recommendation by the NRC committee that the panel should not be involved in reviewing proposals. Some members of the Board believe that the membership of the Board provides adequate representation of stakeholder groups for the purpose of reviewing proposals and ensuring that the approved proposals are responsive to the goals and objectives of the Board. Others commented that the panel's input would be helpful to the Board as expressions of stakeholder needs, especially as they pertain to pressing fisheries management issues.

A friendly amendment was offered to restrict the Advisory Panel's review to being very prescriptive, in effect, simply stating whether a proposal was consistent or inconsistent with the Boards goals and objectives. This amendment was ruled out of order as being significantly different from the motion on the floor.

It was noted that the role of the Advisory Panel has been debated extensively and that it does have a very meaningful role outside of proposal review as indicated in the panel's operating procedures. The issue would need to be resolved in development of the science plan, recognizing that the NRC committee was against such proposal review by the panel.

The motion to provide a role for the Advisory Panel in reviewing proposals failed.

A motion was made and seconded to evaluate and resolve the role of the AP in reviewing proposals within the context of the science plan that will be drafted over the next 6-9 months. After discussion, the motion failed.

Funding Level for 2004 RFP

The Board adopted a motion to cap the total funds available for research for new projects starting in 2004 to $3 million. Any additional funds made available for research through the appropriations process would be made available in the next or following years after the science plan was developed and approved.

4. Status Reports on Other Science Programs

The Board heard reports from Molly McCammon on the Alaska Ocean Observing System (AOOS), from Nancy Bird on the science program of the Prince William Sound Science Center (PWSSC), and from Phil Mundy on the Gulf Ecosystems Monitoring (GEM) program. AOOS is in the developmental phase as part of a larger national effort to integrate ocean observations, both nation- and world-wide. Ms. McCammon reported on the status of S. 1400, the authorizing legislation for a national Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS) and network of regional systems. The bill has passed the Senate and is awaiting action in the House Resources Committee. Significant funding for the overall program could be made available in FY07. Bridging funding will be needed in the interim if AOOS is to become operational in the next 2 years. Status reports on AOOS will be given to the Board at each meeting.

Nancy Bird reported on the various research projects that the PWSSC has in Prince William Sound. These include a nowcast-forecast biological modeling effort, meteorological data collection, tide data collection, and monitoring programs for zooplankton, herring and pollock, as well as various oilspill-related programs.

Phil Mundy reported on the GEM program and its upcoming FY2005 Invitation which will be released in mid-February. Nearshore activities identified in the invitation will include shore zone mapping and operating procedures for nearshore sampling. No new watershed proposals will be invited, nor will Alaska Coastal Current projects. Modeling and synthesis projects will be invited, but community involvement projects will not because the concepts for community involvement are being developed during FY2004-05, with a workshop slated for early March 2004.

5. Other Matters

Restructuring EIRF Investment

The EIRF investment has been restructured from six-month T-bills yielding 1% to laddered, 10-year notes that will yield about 3.2%. Because the Board forward funds a full fiscal year, earnings on the fund in FY04 would be used by the Board in FY06. Therefore, the $5.7 million earned in FY04 is new money for administration, science planning and research in FY06, $6.9 million for FY07, and $7.3 million for FY08. It is projected that the Board will be able to ramp up from the $3 million RFP for FY04, to $4.5 million for each of the next two years, and then $6 million annually in 2007 and beyond. These amounts could be augmented by additional appropriations. The Board stated their deep appreciation for the successful efforts of several individuals who were instrumental in initiating the restructuring of the EIRF, namely Garry Brass, John Gerster, Ed Rasmuson, Drue Pearce, and staff at Senator Stevens' office.

Legal Opinion on Confidentiality of Video/photographic Information

No legal opinion was available.

Sponsorship of Symposia

Board discussed how to address the many applications it receives to support workshops and symposia, as well as criteria for reviewing such applications. The Board decided to establish a committee to develop policy on the support of symposia, conferences and meetings, before approving funds for the requests in the Board notebooks. The committee would report back in March 2004 with policy recommendations. The Board may want to develop a draft form that requesters would need to fill out to describe their proposed conference and how it would address Board criteria.

Meeting Schedule for 2004

This was discussed earlier in the meeting under agenda tab 2 concerning the interim NRC report. Board members will let the staff know of their availability for meetings in early June and in the fall. The Board also noted that it is still interested in organizing a meeting of salmon program managers to identify funding sources for salmon research and that there will be a salmon workshop in Bristol Bay in Dillingham in late July that may be informative in that regard.

The Board noted that the 3-year terms of Governor-nominated members will expire on October 1, 2004, and requested the representative of the Secretary of Commerce, Dr. Jim Balsiger, to inquire about when and how the nomination process will be conducted to fill the expiring memberships.

The Board meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2004.