

## Draft Summary

North Pacific Research Board  
 Advisory Panel Meeting  
 Juneau, Alaska  
 July 27-28, 2004

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on July 27-28, 2004. Present were Michael Bradley, Patricia Cochran, Shirley Kelly, Heather McCarty (Chairman), Arni Thomson, Gale Vick; absent were John Gerster, Simon Kineen, Paul MacGregor and Jon Warrenchuk. Cora Crome has resigned. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke and Misty Ott. Science plan team members included David Fluharty and Jim Schumacher (Henry Huntington, Gordon Kruse, Loh-Lee Low, and Clarence Pautzke also are on the plan team).

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 11:15 a.m. The meeting agenda was approved. The March meeting minutes were approved and discussed, recognizing that a joint meeting with the Board – as the AP requested – did not fit within the time constraints of the July meetings. The AP received the written Alaska Ocean Observing System (AOOS) status report. The AP recommends continuation of support during the start up of AOOS, and points out that the AOOS Governance Committee presently lacks representation of Alaska Native communities, coastal communities, and industry.

2. Review Draft Science Plan

For each major chapter and section of the draft plan, the Advisory Panel received an overview from staff, as well as the comments from the Science Panel, and then asked clarifying questions, discussed the draft section and developed recommendations as listed below. They generally agreed with the recommendations in the plan, other than pointed out in these minutes.

The AP discussed the length of the plan and the pros and cons of leaving the background information on species and systems in the body of the plan, or shifting them to appendices. The group also discussed the possibility of using an Executive Summary.

**Chapter 2, Scientific Foundations**

Section 2.1. Introduction. Add a sentence on direct and indirect impacts on humans.

Section 2.2.2.1. Concepts of Energy Flow and Time-Space Scales. Revise line 9, p.19 to read “Commercial fishing, in the aggregate, is likely to be the most important direct human impact on a marine ecosystem, and management decisions should be supported by a comprehensive research program.”

Also, add the sentence “Sport fishing may have significant impacts in nearshore areas.”

Section 2.2.3. Human Dimensions. Line 29, p. 23, add a sentence on the impact of climate change.

Page 23, final paragraph, add more discussion on impacts on humans.

### Chapter 3, Research Themes

In Chapter 3, the AP approved of the use of the tables in structuring research themes.

Section 3.2. Lower Trophic Level Productivity. Keep the specific question bullets in the plan – they are helpful -- but make sure they are labeled as examples, and add enough examples so that one area doesn't appear favored over another.

Section 3.3. Fish Habitat. p. 35, Add a statement on the impact of sport fishing as well as commercial fishing. Also add a statement concerning potential marine reserves (i.e. Glacier Bay).

Section 3.3.6. Research Needs and Strategies. Line 38, p. 41, #4 Change to “Evaluate current fishing areas closures with respect to their efficacy.”

Table 3-2. p. 42, Fishing Effects, after “evaluation of current closed areas” - add “research on management, biological and socio-economic consequences of restricting some or all fishing.”

Also after “identification of potential refugia” add “as scientific reference areas.”

Section 3.4.4. Species of Special Concern. p. 58, This section should be left in the plan. Also add, in the introduction, criteria for identifying the species of special concern, for example, an “overfished” designation by the NMFS, or, in the case of crab, closed by the ADF&G for conservation and rebuilding.

Section 3.4.5.3. Research Needs and Strategies. Line 45, p. 62, add after “implementation of sablefish and halibut IFQ programs”, “other fisheries rationalization programs, and fishery closures to protect endangered species.” Conclude that sentence with “would be highly valuable.”

Section 3.6.4. Human Impacts on Seabirds. p. 89, Include ghost gear and ghost pots in paragraph 3.

Table 3-7. p. 92, Under Population Dynamics, add “Seabirds as indicators of ecosystem change.”

The AP discussed the expense and commitment an Integrated Ecosystem Research Program might take. They recognized the value of working with the NPFMC in moving toward ecosystem-based management.

The readability of the plan by laypeople and the integration of the Human Dimensions section into the plan were also discussed as a particular concern of the AP.

The AP recommends adding examples of issues raised by community members and stakeholders during the NRC site visits, how those issues evolved into sections of the plan, and a statement regarding ongoing community involvement, possibly in a forward to the plan.

Because the IERP section as a strategy for integrating ecosystem components ties the other sections in Chapter 2 together, it should be moved to the end of the section, after Human Dimensions.

Section 3.7.3. Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. Add “How does fishing compare to not fishing” example.

Section 3.8. Contaminants. Add a line on the discovery that Alaska, with climate warming, has become a source of contaminants as well as a sink.

Section 3.9.3. Aquaculture. Add a few lines on hatcheries, the quality of the hatchery products and federal policy on offshore (EEZ) aquaculture.

Section 3.10. Human Dimensions. See the Alaska Native Health Board's Alaska Traditional Diet Study as an example – [www.anhb.org](http://www.anhb.org).

## **Chapter 4, Other Research Approaches and Partnerships**

Section 4.1. Local and Traditional Knowledge. This section was developed with the AP subcommittee on LTK, chaired by Patricia Cochran, and endorsed by the AP. The implementation plan is incorporated in this section of the Science Plan, although it will be expanded.

The AP recommends an integrated approach including community workshops. Also, the AP recommends increasing the funds budgeted for this section in the implementation spreadsheet by at least twice and perhaps three times. The AP's LTK subcommittee proposes to take on the task of creating a template for attaining Objective 1. The NPRB should defer to the Alaska Native Science Commission to facilitate between the Board and Regional Associations. The socio-economic portion of the budget should also be increased significantly after 2005.

Include the Alaska Coastal Community Observing System in the overview

Section 4.1.1. LTK and its Holders. Line 32, p. 119, add "Traditional Knowledge is dynamic, expanding from generation to generation."

Section 4.2.3. Implementation Strategies Add #7. Identify research needs of coastal Alaskan communities.

## **Chapter 5, Policies and Procedures**

Section 5.1.1. Proposal Review Process. The AP continues to believe it is to the advantage of the Board and the process for the AP to have a role in reviewing proposals, as the group has a significant knowledge base, and can help the NPRB respond to community constituents, and act as a buffer. After the peer review and Science Panel review, proposals deemed scientifically meritorious would be reviewed by the AP for their adherence to the NPRB mission and their potential contribution to addressing the needs and concerns of the constituents. Those reviews would be provided to the Board as they make funding decisions. The AP would of course be subject to the same conflict of interest policy, and other policies, as other proposal reviewers.

Section 5.2. Data Management and Quality Control: Data and Sample Policy. See University of Alaska Institutional Review Boards and Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Institutional Review Boards as examples of standards.

Section 5.3.3. Protection of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). Add bullets for University of Alaska Principle Investigators having the ability to have a percentage of profits and IPR workshop on ANKN website for community and cultural protection.

## Implementation

The AP was pleased with the Implementation Plan, approved of the use of workshops and conferences to help develop programs, and made the following comments and recommendations.

### Lower Trophic Level

AOOS program should be listed separately

### Fish Habitat

Next Steps.

1. Add an explanation of the determination of key commercial and forage species and targeted stocks.
8. Do not exclude mapping projects just for the purpose of identifying habitat; for example, some habitats are considered rare, but we may not know how rare until we have done considerable mapping.

### Contaminants

2. Coordinate with the Alaska Arctic Council Contaminants Working Group and the Center for Disease Control who are already addressing the issues described in #2 and are broader than a regulatory agency like EPA.

The Integrated Graduate Research and Education Training Program should be researched as a possible way to leverage funds.

Add a #5, Risk assessments – what do levels mean?

### Fish and Invertebrates

Next Steps

2. Bristol Bay Salmon. Other salmon should also be included. An experienced person/people should be hired to do a survey of salmon research, and enlist the help of regional elders.
5. Groundfish and Crab. The AP recommends something similar to the groundfish plan teams for crab. Industry needs to be included in the process of establishing research priorities. There are presently very little at-sea observations such as stock assessment, early life history and mapping of crab habitat. Also, need consideration of enhancement, augmentation or translocation of stocks. A workshop should be held by NPRB to be sure that relevant representatives are included in developing RFP's, and to consolidate knowledge of ongoing crab research.
6. Other Species. Central Bering Sea concern for halibut and crab declines should be included.

### Marine Mammals

Alaska Native researchers should be included in the coordination.

3. Other Matters: The Advisory Panel will meet next on September 27-28 in Anchorage.