

DRAFT Summary

**NPRB Advisory Panel
September 9-10, 2008
NPRB Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska**

The Advisory Panel met on September 9-10, 2008 in Anchorage. In attendance were Helen Chythlook, Gary Freitag, Ron Hegge, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, Vera Metcalf, Mike Miller, Cheryl Rosa, Jeff Stephan, Arni Thomson, Gale Vick and Kim Williams. Justine Gundersen was absent. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Nora Deans, Carolyn Rosner and Tom van Pelt.

Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9am by Advisory Panel chair Gale Vick.

MOTION: Approve agenda as amended

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Frank Kelty

Discussion: Helen Chythlook requested that the agenda be amended to add an item to discuss on regional areas of concern in Other Matters. Amendment was accepted as a friendly.

Motion Passed

The AP was given a safety briefing before they started working through the approved agenda.

Approval of the minutes from the AP April 2008 meeting was postponed until the group had time to review the document.

Budget Review

Clarence Pautzke provided a brief budget review indicating that the current projections for earnings from the EIRF were higher than the projections presented at the April meeting. As a result the budgets were in good shape and the 2009RFP should have a target funding level of \$3.7 million.

Frank Kelty inquired as to whether there was any wiggle room in the budget to increase the 2009 RFP funding level. Clarence responded that it was a little too early to tell and that such decision could be made by the Board during the proposal selection in April 2009. As a starting point Clarence recommended the AP work with \$3.7M.

2009 Request for Proposals

Prior to reviewing the Science Panels draft of the 2009 RFP, staff provided a brief review of the new projects approved by the Board in April 2008. A broad overview of all 200 projects funded since 2002 (111 completed, 89 active) was also provided including an update on the transfer of metadata and data from completed projects and publications resulting from NPRB funded projects.

The AP reviewed the list of past project PIs who had not completed the process of metadata and data transfer and agreed to contact those they knew to encourage them to transfer the data and metadata from their projects as soon as possible. The AP inquired as to where NPRB data was stored and how it could be made available. Staff responded indicating that this information would be available on the NPRB website and through the Alaska Marine Information System (AMIS). The AP suggested that the AMIS system be better promoted and felt that this was a good resource for industry. Gale Vick suggested that it might also be helpful if there was a place in the AMIS system where people could add comments and suggestions of other data sources that could be included. Several AP members indicated that they knew of such datasets (e.g., North Pacific Salmon Commission).

Advisory Panel members also asked if the NPRB was coordinating with other agencies and communities (e.g., MMS, US Army Core of Engineers, North Slope Borough) in identifying Arctic projects that need to be conducted and to avoid overlap. Arni Thomson noted that MMS – Minerals Management Service – had \$10 million for research related to marine mammals and climate change. Thomson also mentioned that MMS was promoting studies on nearshore larval settlement of crab in the Aleutian Basin. Staff confirmed that this was so and also mentioned the Arctic Science Workshop to be held in January 2009.

Following the review of current projects, Science Director Francis Wiese explained the process and resources used to draft the 2009 RFP and explained the NPRB Science Panels role in reviewing and revising the draft. Francis then provided an overview of the topics and funding levels for each of the RFP research priorities as revised by the Science Panel.

Gale Vick inquired why Ecosystem Indicators was a separate category and not under the General Research Priorities. Staff responded that this topic could apply to all categories and rather having it separate would prevent having to include it under each ecosystem component.

Jeff Stephen asked how the priorities from the Ecosystem Modeling Committee were incorporated into the RFP. Staff responded that those priorities, which are relevant to the current Bering Sea IERP, were fairly specific and not competitive. As a result they were not included in the RFP but should be considered for direct funding under the BSIERP agenda item.

Frank Kelty inquired why Electronic monitoring was included under Co-operative research with Industry and not Technology Development. Staff explained the Science Panels reasoning that this research priority included more than just technology development and if Industry was going to buy into this monitoring methodology they needed to be involved in its development. Arni Thomson commented that there appeared to be tremendous interest in Electronic monitoring by industry and its placement in the Co-operative Research with Industry was appropriate. Staff briefly discussed the 2-day electronic monitoring workshop in Seattle in August.

Detailed Review of 2009 RFP: The Advisory Panel proceeded with a detailed review of the 2009 RFP.

1. General Research Priorities

- a) **Oceanography and Lower Trophic level productivity**

Shirley Kelly inquired if the \$300,000 cap was for the category or for individual projects in that category. Staff clarified that the \$300,000 cap was both of those things and that it was conceivable that only one project for the full \$300,000 would be funded under the category.

Regarding topic ii) Freshwater, Mike Miller asked if this would include the impact of removing freshwater from the system through industrial or commercial activities. Staff indicated that this was not the intent of this section as written and this topic was more to understand the important of

freshwater input on the currents in GOA. Mike Miller noted that this was probably the important first step but the potential impact of a water industry or water removal from the ecosystem is something that should be thought of for future RFPs.

Regarding topic iii) Changing Arctic Food webs, Gale Vick asked if current efforts in the Arctic are being considered when drafting these RFP priorities. Staff responded that this was the case. Shirley Kelly asked if international collaboration was permitted in NPRB proposals. Staff indicated that there was nothing to preclude international proposals to the RFP. Gary Freitag asked if invasive species into the arctic would be included under this research priority or was this category dealing with traditional arctic species. Staff responded that invasive species moving in through natural pathways (i.e. a northward range expansion) would fit under here, but that other mechanisms of invasive species introduction such as through ballast exchange would not. Currently there is no home for an assessment of invasive species introduced through ballast exchange in the 2009 RFP. Shirley Kelly suggested that an invasive species category be included. Cheryl Rosa noted that this was an important issue for the North Slope Borough that is currently not well addressed. Vick suggested that invasive species could also be added under community involvement, noting a number of applications that communities and schools could assist with.

MOTION: Broaden the section 1g Contaminants and Marine Diseases to include Invasive Species

Maker: Kim Williams
Second: Gary Freitag

Discussion: Cheryl Rosa suggested there may not be enough money in that category as it currently stands. Gale Vick noted that if we get the topic included in the RFP this year it would be a good start and over the years we may be able to get more money allocated to it. Frank Kelty noted that Contaminants have also not been a high priority for the Board but would likely become increasingly important. Cheryl Rosa indicated that Marine Diseases was also a big issue and perhaps should have its own category. Staff noted that the more categories included in the RFP meant that the funding levels became more limited in each category. Shirley Kelly stated that including Invasive Species with Contaminants and Marine Diseases highlights that this category is underfunded.

MOTION PASSED

Gary Freitag and Cheryl Rosa agreed to draft Invasive species language to include in the 2009 RFP. This language reads:

Concern over impacts on Alaska's native species and fisheries by marine invasive species is increasing. Climate change, increased aquaculture and mari- culture activities, species range extensions and increases in ship traffic and development all contribute to this concern. The NPRB is seeking proposals to investigate the potential threat to Alaskan marine species of interest to the NPRB by invasive species. Projects could include baseline monitoring projects for invasive species, native-invasive species interaction studies, and effects of climate change on growth rates and range extensions of non-indigenous species.

b) Fish Habitat

Regarding topic ii) Essential habitats for groundfish and forage fish, Frank Kelty suggested this was too open-ended. Was the focus towards forage fish? Staff noted that this was specific to “managed groundfish species” and the forage species they depend on.

c) Fish and Invertebrates

Regarding i) Study design for quantifying indirect local effects of fisheries on upper trophic predators, Shirley Kelly asked for clarification on the funding limit which was provided by staff. Mike Miller suggested this category maybe applicable to the herring egg fishery and its impact on halibut and salmon populations. Kim Williams asked how you quantify the effect and staff indicated that this workshop would hopefully result in an answer for that question.

Regarding ii) Sharks, Gary Freitag asked about the specific identification of Cook Inlet and Yakutat Bay dogfish. Frank Kelty suggested adding an item on shark predation on marine mammals. Gale Vick suggested that abundance and distribution of sharks as it relates to bycatch was a higher priority than the predatory impact on sharks. Staff indicated that the intent of this section was to focus on the sharks not marine mammals. Jeff Stephen suggested including the following language ‘including the reliance on endangered or threatened species’ after “diet” in the current language. The AP in general were concerned about population assessment methodology and the affect of shark predation on forage and directed fisheries.

MOTION: To include suggested language by Jeff Stephen (above) in the 2009 RFP

Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Kim Williams

MOTION PASSED

Regarding iii) Stock assessment support, Arni Thomson stated that it was not just natural mortality that should be considered here, there is also a concern about the handling mortality; suggest adding language to clarify and add that item.

MOTION: To include the words “handling” between “ 1) Improved estimation of natural”...and “mortality for use....”

Maker: Arni Thomson
Second: Frank Kelty

Discussion: Kim Williams inquired if this should be a separate category and this was discussed by the group. Kim Williams then put forth a friendly amendment to change the wording to “and/or handling” so that either could be done since it investigation into natural or handling would be very different study designs. Friend amendment was accepted.

MOTION PASSED

d) Marine Mammals

Regarding topic i) Small or declining populations, Kim Williams asked if the projects to study the fresh water harbor seal population in Lake Iliamna would fit into this category. Staff indicated they would. Mike Miller asked how “population” would be defined given that there is currently an effort underway to further divide what is called the harbor seal population in Southeast Alaska. Staff noted that the current language identifies the Glacier Bay harbor seal population, so a specific location population level seemed to be implied.

Regarding topic ii) Arctic-associated marine mammals, Vera Metcalf asked about walrus studies. Staff pointed out that walrus were mentioned in the language of this section and also pointed to the current walrus studies funded by NPRB. It was also noted by staff that these categories were intentionally more issues specific than species specific.

e) Seabirds

Regarding item i) Influence of non-breeding season conditions on population dynamics, Frank Kelty commented that this had been in previous RFPs. Staff confirmed that it was in the 2006 RFP but that no proposals were funded in that category. Vera Metcalf noted that this was a very important topic.

Regarding item ii) Seabirds – forage fish ecosystem relationships, Staff indicated that seabirds could be used as an indicator of the food chain. Mike Miller asked if herring was considered a forage fish. Staff responded yes. Helen Chythlook noted that the FWS refuge does seabird counts and could they do diet as well? Francis Wiese indicated that it perhaps could be a community involvement project to work with the refuge to conduct a diet study. Gale Vick further suggested that hunters could freeze the stomachs of their bird and waterfowl prey for study.

f) Humans

Regarding i) Fisheries Management strategies, Shirley Kelly indicated that she didn’t feel that evaluations of fishery management strategies is something NPRB should be spending their funds on. She indicated that these were good topics but that the Council or other management agencies that impose management regulations should be the ones paying for the evaluation of the impacts of those regulations on humans. Gale Vick indicated that the NPMFC had few specific funds for this and that if they conducted the study there may be the perception that the results are biased. Frank Kelty asked if these types of studies were already being done as part of NPRB Project 640. Gale Vick and Francis Wiese indicated that was not the case and that Project 640 was a community baseline study. Shirley Kelly restated her belief that NPRB was not the organization that should be paying for this type of study. Jeff Stephen felt that this topic is important and reasonable to include. Ron Hegge also felt this was an important issue to include in the RFP and made the distinction that agencies look into what the potential impact might be and that the RFP is asking for investigation of the real impacts. Cheryl Rosa indicated that the potential bias if the agency imposing the regulation conducted the study was a good reason why NPRB should have it in this RFP. Mike Miller concurred. Shirley Kelly agreed regarding the need for independent study but still felt the agencies should pay for the evaluation of impacts of their regulations.

MOTION: Make change in RFP so that i) reads “Assessment of economic and social effects...” rather than “Evaluation of economics....”

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Kim Williams

Discussion: Gary Freitag asked if it could be either or. Jeff Stephen requested to make a friendly amendment to change it to "Evaluation or Assessment...". Shirley Kelly indicated it would not be accepted as a friendly. Ron Hegge seconded the amendment. A vote was called and the amendment failed.

The main MOTION PASSED

It was noted that the definition of evaluate and assessment should appear in the minutes:

From Webster:

Evaluate: to determine the significance or worth of something by careful appraisal and study

Assess: to determine the importance, size, or value of something

Mike Miller made the recommendation that the Board should write a letter to the Council indicating the need for independence in this type of study but that the Council should be the one paying for it. Frank Kelly stated that he would not support a letter of that nature at this time and indicated that NPRB funds federal agencies all the time, for example to help do crab research. Jeff Stephen stated that he takes Shirley's point and there should be more funding in general to support the research needs of management. Gale Vick also agreed but stated that differentiating assessment and evaluation in the minutes should make the point clear.

g) Contaminants and Diseases

Regarding ii) Marine Diseases, Cheryl Rosa indicated that the language reads as though this is specific to fish diseases and that it should be broader. Ron Hegge stated that it was important to encourage investigation of marine diseases as they relate to aquaculture activities. Helen Chythlook stated that she would like to ensure that studies on harbor seal diseases could be included in the category.

MOTION: Broaden category to read "including diseases as a source of mortality for juvenile fishes (including pacific salmon), marine mammal diseases, and zoonotic transmission of diseases to humans..."

Maker: Cheryl Rosa
Second: Mike Miller

MOTION PASSES

As noted earlier, a third topic iii) invasive species was added to this category.

2. Local and Traditional Knowledge

MOTION: Research results must be brought back to the community/area where study took place.

Maker: Helen Chythlook
Second: Shirley Kelly

Discussion: Shirley Kelly stated that it was the responsibility of the PI to do this. Vera Metcalf noted that other agencies already have such policies in place. Frank Kelty asked how PIs were going to know who to talk to. Nora Deans, Outreach Manager for NPRB, asked what the Advisory Panel felt was the best way to help PIs meet this requirement. Helen Chythlook stated that community newspapers were one avenue to pursue. Cheryl Rosa indicated community meetings and 1 page summaries. Shirley Kelly indicated that perhaps the AP members representing different communities could help get information about NPRB research back to the communities and perhaps the AP could follow this up by providing stronger language for the boiler plate of the RFP to the Board.

MOTION PASSES

3. Collaboration with Oil Spill Recovery Institute

Shirley Kelly indicated that oil spills in the Arctic are an increasing concern and asked if this topic was included in this category. Staff indicated that this was not the focus of the research priority as the OSRI had a stronger focus on Prince William Sound and the GOA. It would therefore likely be hard to include Arctic projects under this topic.

At this point in the meeting, Staff suggested that the Advisory Panel take a break from their review of the 2009 RFP and pick it up again the next day. The AP agreed and proceeded with the presentation by staff of the Gulf of Alaska IERP which included an explanation of the different modular approaches that could be taken to launch a GOA IERP.

Following this presentation the Advisory Panel adjourned for the day and decided to reconvene at 8am the next day.

The Advisory Panel reconvened at 8am. to continue with their review of the 2009 RFP:

4. Cooperative Research with Industry

Regarding item ii) Electronic monitoring, Clarence Pautzke gave a summary of the electronic monitoring workshop held in July. Frank Kelty indicated that electronic monitoring is a good way to go but that the industry is not at the point where they should be removing observers from vessels. Helen Chythlook inquired if the electronic monitoring could include having cameras on land to detect vessels that are fishing in exclusion areas or to near to shore. Clarence explained that the issue here was using electronic monitoring to evaluate bycatch and would be on the actual vessel monitoring activity. Gary Freitag asked about the camera resolution and if the surface of the table (i.e., top layer of fish) was the sample area. Clarence responded that the electronic monitoring would not have the resolution for sample composition that having an actual observer on board would have. Arni Thomson indicated that the observer program was very important and that previous analysis of the video monitoring had indicated that cost was very high and it should

be considered a supplement for but not a replacement of observers. Clarence Pautzke asked if the AP wanted to see this topic in the RFP at this time. Jeff Stephen indicated that it seems like the technology needs to be better understood first while some of the other issues listed seemed premature. The first question that needed answering is “How good is the technology and what can that technology do for the industry?” Gary Freitag concurred with Jeff Stephen’s assessment.

MOTION: To include the electronic monitoring category in the 2009 RFP but to note that there should be a stronger focus on technology and amend the language in RFP to state that the top priority is to” improve the existing level of electronic monitoring technology and to address the deficiencies of electronic monitoring as compared to current management objectives”

Maker: Jeff Stephen
Second: Gary Freitag

MOTION PASSED

5. Community Involvement

Cheryl Rosa inquired if the NPRB staff could provide assistance to communities and applicants interested in proposing to this category. Staff explained that they were happy to address whether a particular project would fit into his category but that no help would be offered in terms of proposal writing as this would create false expectations. The AP suggested that a list of grant writing related resources could be placed on the website. The AP also noted that they would do a better job at promoting this particular section of the RFP to the communities in their regions and suggested that examples of projects funded under the category in the past be noted in the RFP.

6. Aleutian Islands

There was indication from the AP that there are not enough funds in this category and also that they very much favored the “Impacts of volcanic activity” section.

7. Technology Development

Shirley Kelly inquired if there was any plan on including alternative energy technology and its potential impacts on the marine environment into this section. Specifically there is concern about the effect of tidal turbines and what impact this would have on the ecosystem. Staff indicated that that is not currently the intent of this section.

In later consideration of the overall RFP the AP determined that the second item in this category ii) Fisheries technology development would be covered under Cooperative Research with industry and should be deleted from this category as it was covered under other sections in the RFP.

8. Ecosystem Indicators and Data Rescue

Cheryl Rosa indicated that within the North Slope Borough there is concern about cumulative effects and a need for analysis on this topic. Was it possible to include that topic with Ecosystem indicators?

Frank Kelty felt that we may not receive many proposals under the Data rescue topic. Arni Thomson asked whether this should be a direct funded project if staff had specific data in mind

rather than making this an item in the RFP. Staff stated that this wouldn't really be fair in terms of competitive research and there are likely lots of datasets out there that we are unaware of that could benefit from the category. Mike Miller asked if this should be more directed at the Gulf of Alaska to benefit the IERP. Staff stated that it would be limiting to put a geographic scope on this topic. Gary Freitag stated his support for this research priority and noted there were some extensive aquaculture plankton surveys that would benefit from this is proposed section.

The Advisory Panel completed its review of the RFP wording and then turned to the funding levels for individual categories. After much discussion

MAIN MOTION: Funding levels should be adjusted as follows:

- ~ Decrease Fish Habitat from \$250,000 to \$150,000 (reason: Canyon work may not go forward)
- ~ Increase Fish and Invertebrates from \$800,000 to \$900,000 (reason: very important topic and this way can fund 3 projects at \$300,000 each)
- ~ Decrease Seabirds from \$350,000 to \$250,000 (reason: have funded lots of seabird work in the past)
- ~ Increase Contaminants, Marine Diseases and Invasive Species from \$100,000 to \$200,000 (reason: included invasive species as a subcategory)
- ~ Increase Cooperative Research with Industry from \$300,000 to \$400,000 (reason: this section is very important and a subcategory on crab stock assessment work should be added)
- ~ Decrease Ecosystem Indicators and Data Rescue from \$200,000 to \$100,000.

Maker: Frank Kelty

Second: Arni Thomson

Discussion: Cheryl Rosa stated that she appreciated the increase funding level for the Contaminants section but did not feel that the Ecosystem and Data Rescue system should be reduced. Mike Miller stated that \$150,000 in the Fish Habitat section was not enough and also that the increase in the Cooperative Research Section was not needed since these research priorities were suppose to be cooperative with industry and industry could chip in more to support this work. Mike also felt that the increase in the contaminants section was not necessary and that contaminant research was often misrepresented. Gary Freitag took Mike's point on contaminants but stated this research priority which now also included Marine Diseases and Invasive species is really underfunded for what it costs to do these kinds of projects.

Ron Hegge made the friendly amendment to move the molecular technology section to the Marine Diseases section and the fisheries technology section to Cooperative Research with industry thus reducing the funding level needed for the technology section. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Jeff Stephen did not feel this was a good idea and wanted to keep the molecular technology section where it was. Jeff moved to amend the motion to leave the Technology Development section at \$200,000 by take \$50,000 back from Cooperative research to technology. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The amended funding levels now included the following changes to the original SP funding levels:

- ~ Decrease Fish Habitat from \$250,000 to \$150,000
- ~ Increase Fish and Invertebrates from \$800,000 to \$900,000
- ~ Decrease Seabirds from \$350,000 to \$300,000
- ~ Increase Contaminants, Marine Diseases and Invasive Species from \$100,000 to \$150,000
- ~ Increase Cooperative Research with Industry from \$300,000 to \$350,000

~ Decrease Ecosystem Indicators and Data Rescue from \$200,000 to \$150,000

MOTION PASSED

Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff summarized the Science Panel's recommendations regarding the GOA IERP. Mike Miller stated that he concurred with the SP recommendations. Shirley Kelly asked for confirmation that retrospective analysis would be included in all approaches, this was confirmed by staff. Shirley was also concerned whether there were enough PIs to do the work if BSIERP and GOA IERP were running at the same time. Francis Wiese indicated that it was a good question but he felt that there is a much larger research community in the Gulf and that currently it did not appear that the field work years for the two projects would overlap, suggesting that even if PIs did overlap they would have time to do both sets of field projects. Gale Vick inquired to the long term plan for GOA IERP and the matter of replication. Staff explained the long-term vision of all IERPs is that they be repeated with a few years in between each one. The Advisory Panel was also concerned about the diversity of issues in the Gulf and the spatial comparison. Would the RFP specifically indicate which geographic areas of the Gulf should be included or compared? Staff indicated that the current RFP language as drafted by the SP encourages but does not require spatial comparisons and that specific locations are not indicated as that would be dependent of the subject matter of the IERP.

MOTION: the AP recommends including language in the RFP that both the broad regions of the Gulf (Western vs. Central/Eastern) must be addressed in the IERP and that a geographic comparison be an essential aspect in any funded proposal.

Maker: Gary Freitag
Second: Shirley Kelly

MOTION PASSES

MOTION: To go forward with the GOA IERP as designed and recommended by the SP but to request the geographic comparison aspect.

Maker: Mike Miller
Second: Kim Williams

MOTION PASSES

Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

- a) Staff presented a review and status report on BSIERP activities since April. There was much discussion regarding the LTK portion of this project and the AP members asked to be included on emails regarding organizing the PI visits to communities. Helen Chythlook noted that in Togiak emails do not always get through and encouraged staff to call the Togiak Tribal Council office (907-493-5003) with information. Helen also pointed out the many of the Togiak elders only speak Yupik and wanted to know if the LTK surveys were going to be translated. If so, time should be built into the plan to conduct these translations as they could be very time consuming. Helen also pointed out that it was important for the PIs who would be working in villages to make sure that the City and/or Tribal councils were aware of the fuel needs of the researchers otherwise there may not be enough fuel.

- b) When discussing the Science Panel Advisory Group, the Advisory Panel felt that they should have a presence on this group that annually evaluates the progress of BSIERP.

MOTION: That AP have representation on the BSIERP Science Advisory Group

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Mike Miller

Frank Kelty requested a friendly amendment to specify that two AP representatives be on this group and that two alternates be assigned. This was taken as a friendly amendment.

MOTION PASSES

MOTION: That Helen Chythlook and Vera Metcalf represent the AP on the SPAG.

Maker: Kim Williams
Second: Shirley Kelly

Frank Kelty requests to make a friendly amendment to specify Cheryl Rosa and Shirley Kelly as the alternates. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Helen Chythlook requests to make a friendly amendment to rotate the AP representatives on this group every two years. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

MOTION PASSES

- c) Regarding the consideration of EMC proposal for additional modeling support, Shirley Kelly wanted to know how much money was available to support these requests

MOTION: to support Yi Chao's work over the project by Mueter

Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Kim Williams

MOTION PASSES (7 for, 4 against)

Despite the above motion, Shirley felt strongly about the retrospective work and Gary Freitag agreed, pointing out that we would benefit more from the Mueter project than from the other one. Shirley asks to reconsider the motion to support both projects if possible.

MOTION: to reconsider the above motion

Maker: Cheryl Rosa
Second: Mike Miller

Vote, 8 to reconsider, 3 to not reconsider. Reconsider is accepted, above motion invalid.

Motion: Fund the two projects suggested by the EMC if funding is available

Maker: Ron Hegge

Second: Mike Miller

MOTION PASSES

Long-term Planning

Clarence Pautzke summarized this action item. There was discussion amongst the panel stating that the review of NPRB accomplishments to date should not just be conducted by the science community but also include community and other stakeholders. The American Evaluation Association was suggested as another alternative to pursue. Shirley Kelly noted that based on past experience the process of an evaluation would take longer than a year to accomplish.

MOTION: the AP recommends that the Board conduct an external review of the NPRB.

Maker: Shirley Kelly

Second: Mike Miller

MOTION PASSES

Long-term Monitoring

Francis Wiese summarized the history and current status of the long-term monitoring issue for the Advisory Panel and presented the letter asking for support of the PICES CPR consortium.

MOTION: The AP recommends that the NPRB join the PICES consortium by contributing \$50,000/year for the next five years.

Maker: Mike Miller

Second: Shirley Kelly

MOTION PASSES

Special Workshops

Staff updated the AP on workshops and symposia. It was noted that the 2009 Alaska Marine Science Symposium would be held January 19-22, 2009. AP members asked if NPRB would support their travel and attendance at the AMSS. Staff confirmed that NPRB supports attendance of the Science and Advisory Panels and the Board.

Other Matters

b) Nora Deans and Carolyn Rosner gave a review and update of all Education and Outreach activities. The AP was especially interested in the COSEE partnership. The AP made several comments and recommendations and also praised the web site development and the materials. Helen Chythlook recommended that the Education and Outreach staff present to rural communities and schools whenever possible.

d) Michael Dagg Funding request:

MOTION: AP recommends that the Board support this funding request

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Ron Hegge

MOTION PASSES

- e) Oil and Gas workshop funding request:

MOTION: to recommend supporting this effort

Maker: Frank Kelty
Second: Jeff Stephen

Discussion: Some AP members felt that given the focus on this workshop, support should come from industry not NPRB.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

- f) Science Panel membership:

The AP was given a review of Science Panel members and notified that Shannon Atkinson, Mary Pete and Mike Simpkins would not be returning to the Panel. The AP suggested that replacements be focused on marine mammal expertise and perhaps the Gulf of Alaska given the upcoming GOA IERP proposal phase.

- h) Meeting Schedule:

The AP set their April 2009 meeting for April 27th and 28th, 2009 in Anchorage.

- i) Other items:

MOTION: Approve the minutes of the April 2008 Advisory Panel meeting

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Gary Freitag

MOTION PASSES

Helen Chythlook noted that the other items of regional concern she had added to the original agenda had been dealt with during the course of the meeting and there was no need to discuss this further.

The AP thanked the NPRB Staff for their continued good work.

MOTION: To adjourn the September 2008 meeting of the NPRB Advisory Panel

Maker: Shirley Kelly
Second: Mike Miller

MOTION PASSES

Meeting adjourned at 4:06pm, September 10, 2008