

Draft Summary

North Pacific Research Board  
Advisory Panel Meeting  
NPRB Conference Room  
Anchorage, Alaska  
March 27-28, 2006

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on March 27-28, 2006. Present were Heather McCarty (Chairman), Michael Bradley, Patricia Cochran, Ron Hegge, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, and Steve MacLean. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Carl Schoch, and Francis Wiese.

**1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. on Monday, March 27, 2006. The meeting agenda was approved with minor revisions of the schedule. The AP requested that meeting materials be sent to them ahead of the meeting in the future. The AP was given a safety briefing and also received a status report on potential funding of the new Alaska Regional Research Vessel still to be constructed and then homeported in Seward.

**2. Budget Review**

The AP received a brief overview of the NPRB budget. This was an informational item only, however, one member noted that they were happy to see the \$1 million identified in the implementation plan for FY2007 for a baseline survey in the Arctic LME.

**3. Implementation Activities in 2006**

The AP received a staff presentation on the general development of integrated ecosystem research plans for the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea regions. The staff is suggesting that a pre-proposal process be considered for the IERP this coming fall, instead of going straight to calling for full proposals. After much discussion of the pros and cons of spending the time and effort to review pre-proposals, the AP passed a motion (Kelty moved; Bradley seconded) to support the pre-proposal process for this one effort to establish an IERP for the Bering Sea and the Gulf of Alaska. It was noted that clear criteria for pre-proposal selection should be developed.

Regarding the appointment of a scientific steering committee (SSC), the AP passed a motion (Cochran moved; Kelly seconded) to add an AP member as liaison to the SSC for each IERP, which would complement the three science panel members that will provide liaison with each SSC.

The AP also passed a motion (Kelly moved; Bradley seconded) to advise the Board that at this time, the SSCs should only be involved in drafting RFP language for the IERPs, but should not be involved in review of pre-proposals or full proposals, which is the responsibility of the Science Panel. The AP, SP and SSCs would be involved in annual reviews of the IERPs.

Regarding funding for writing full proposals, the AP passed a motion (Cochran moved; Bradley seconded) the each invited proposal team may receive funding for proposal development of up to \$20,000, based on a written justification of need for such funding.

Regarding a potential requirement for the use of local and traditional knowledge (LTK) in the IERP process, the AP passed a motion (Cochran moved; Kelty seconded) to recommend that proposal writing teams be required to have a representative involved as a co-investigator from an Alaskan community in the respective Large Marine Ecosystem (LME).

The Panel also recommended (Kelty moved; Kelly seconded) that a minimum of 10% of the IERP funding in each LME be designated for an LTK component as those activities are defined in the Science Plan. It was noted that some additional language could be put into the RFP to offer up NPRB or related panel members to serve as intermediaries between scientists and Native communities, and not just to give out contact names and numbers. Concerns were expressed that the latter process would not result in fruitful collaborations.

The AP also noted the need to ensure that data from any IERP projects funded by NPRB must be provided timely to the Board so that it will be available to other researchers and stakeholders.

Views that were expressed during AP discussion of IERP planning were as follows.

General:

- The IERP should not single out one species or population but rather look at shifts in communities and the physical and/or biological mechanisms causing those shifts, i.e., should look at the big picture.
- SSC should consider ESA listed species such as fur seals, Steller sea lions, right whales, or depleted fish stocks such as crab, but the focus should not be on a particular species.
- NPRB should coordinate with other entities in developing and implementing its research program, but at the same time must ensure that those other agencies follow through on what they are planning to do in terms of research within their agency missions and that they actually have funding to do so. The IERP should not be used to support regular agency function such as stock assessments, surveys, or routine data analysis.
- People need to be placed on the SSCs that are familiar with all the research programs in a region and how they fit together. What other ecosystem studies are underway or been concluded? How successful have they been? How does NPRB's IERP fit with those other studies? We do not want other programs coming in for NPRB funds, just to keep their original programs supported.
- There is a need for a resource manager on the SSCs, defined as someone involved with management regulations. Both the science side and management side, state and federal, need to be represented on the SSCs. For the management side, choose someone that works at such a level that he/she is aware of broad breadth and scope of management issues and needs.
- Research priorities are available on the PIC website
- The IERP must take into consideration socio-economic aspects of resources.

Bering Sea:

- Northward movement of species (e.g. crab and fish stocks) and related resource management issues (where are they going, why are they going there, what are the conditions at these new locations, what is the ecological cost?).
- Ecosystem changes (temperature and decreased ice cover) effects on fish stocks.
- Focus on big picture, i.e. ecosystem dynamics, and not on details.

Arni Thomson, Steve MacLean or Frank Kelty were suggested as AP representatives on the BSIERP Steering Committee.

Gulf of Alaska:

- What are the drivers of change in the Gulf of Alaska? How will climate change impact commercial species abundance and distribution?
- To what extent will the IERP be able to examine decadal changes or cyclical patterns in abundance of certain species such as shrimp?

Ron Hegge volunteered to participate on the GOA Scientific Steering Committee.

The AP also received a briefing on the ongoing efforts regarding AMIS and was very supportive.

#### **4. Proposal Review for 2006**

This was an informational item only.

#### **5. Status Reports and Future Directions**

##### Community Involvement

The Panel received an update on Community Involvement activities to date, including a report from the Community Involvement committee, and discussed the need for a strategy to ensure capacity building.

As a result, the Advisory Panel passed the following motions regarding community involvement:

- The Board should provide \$10,000 for each of the five communities involved in the Bering Sea IERP for the development of student and teacher science programs (Kelly moved; MacLean seconded). This would start with Unalakleet, Hooper Bay, Pribilofs, Dillingham, and Nelson Lagoon, and then the next year would move onto five new communities and the following year onto another five communities, on a 3-year rotational basis. Applications would be requested from community schools and criteria would have to be developed for approving such grants.

Regarding Capacity building and in context with the Graduate Student Research Fellowships, the AP noted that the "Graduate" should be dropped from that name and passed the following motion (Cochran moved; MacLean seconded):

- The Board should provide student research fellowships/scholarships supported by \$100,000 per year for each of the three LMEs defined in the science plan, with at least one award reserved for an Alaska Native student. The annual support for a student would be \$25,000 and funding would be dedicated for the following periods: one year for undergraduates, two years for masters students, and three years for doctoral students. This would provide support for four students in each LME in the first year of the program. Studies by any student would need to relate to the marine sciences in one of the LMEs in the science plan.

The AP continues to be supportive of sponsoring community workshops in the same communities on a rotational basis to gather research ideas and present information on research in the region. It was further noted that LTK committee members should be asked to help arrange these workshops

and ensure participation. An AP or appropriate LTK member from that region should accompany the team that goes out to conduct these workshops.

#### Education and Outreach

The AP received a status report from Mike Illenberg on education and outreach activities for the Board. They wished him well in his new position with the Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association.

#### Cooperative Research

The AP passed a motion (Kelty moved; Hegge seconded) to identify a separate category for cooperative research projects in the 2007 RFP with a target funding level of \$300,000 - \$500,000, statewide. The Board should also explore opportunities to partner with industry organizations in funding research priorities of mutual interest.

### **6. Other Matters**

The AP scheduled their fall meeting for September 11-12, 2006.