

**Final Summary**  
**North Pacific Research Board**  
**NPRB Conference Room**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**September 15-17, 2008**

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda and Meeting Summary

The Board convened at 10:10 a.m. on Monday, September 15, 2008. Present were David Benton (Chairman), Nancy Bird, Dorothy Childers, Michele Eder, John Gauvin, John Hilsinger, Howard Horton, John Iani, Steve Maclean, Paul MacGregor, Gary Matlock (alternate for Douglas DeMaster), Gerry Merrigan, Eric Olson (Vice Chairman), Pam Pope, Robert Spies (alternate for Alaska SeaLife Center), and Dennis Wiesenburg (Heather McCarty as non-voting alternate on Tuesday afternoon). Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Tom Van Pelt, Nora Deans, and Carolyn Rosner staffed the meeting. The agenda was approved and a safety briefing given. The Board approved the summary of the April 2008 Board meeting, with one caveat – to not give name of person who objected to a vote. Those members that recused themselves would be identified.

2. Budget Review

The Board was provided a status report on the budget and informed that Minerals Management Service transferred \$9,321,805 to the Department of Commerce for NPRB the week of August 18, based on earnings during FY2008. It will be used starting in 2010. Projections of budget income and outflow through 2019 were provided and it was noted by the Executive Director that Grant 4 would include the recent release, plus the anticipated \$9.6 million of earnings from the EIRF in 2009. Grant 4 would cover administrative expenses only for 2011, as well as science expense categories of panels and committees, other expenditures, and meetings for 2011. It also will cover two years of expenses on the BSIERP and GOAIERP as well as two annual requests for proposals. By only covering administrative expenses through 2011, this is a change in the Board's normal budgeting practice of covering such expenses two years out. This change will free up funds for the GOAIERP and still give sufficient protection to the administrative process of the Board to wind up its business in case funding should stop for one reason or another. The Board did not object to this new budget approach.

3. 2009 Request for Proposals

Overview of Research Projects

The Board received an overview of current research projects and compliance with data, metadata, and reporting requirements. Staff summarized the number of projects approved and their affiliation with ecosystem component and region. In general, since 2002 NPRB has received 693 proposals in response to seven annual requests for proposals, and funded 200 regular projects (\$33.4M; competed and direct funding), and an additional 27 projects under BSIERP (\$15.9M). Seventy agencies and institutions have been awarded funds by NPRB, with 20.3% and 19.8% of the total funds being distributed to the University of Alaska Fairbanks and the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, respectively. To date, there is a total of 125 published papers and an additional 45 in press.

Basis for Research Priorities for 2009 RFP

The Board received an overview of a draft 2009 Request for Proposals (RFP) developed by staff. The research priorities were based on priorities identified by various organizations and institutions over the previous six months, research priorities and funded projects in past RFPs, and the Board's 2005 Science

Plan. Research priorities also were informed by a variety of special working groups and workshops concerning shark ecology, Bering Sea canyons, and electronic monitoring. The draft 2009 RFP was reviewed by the Science and Advisory panels which provided their recommendations. Their reports are available at <http://www.nprb.org/meetings/index.html>

A main motion was made based on the draft RFP, based largely on Science Panel discussions, that was available as item 3j in the meeting notebooks. The main motion included various revisions to funding targets by category, and major revisions in wording for the following priorities of the draft RFP: fish habitat, fish and invertebrates, contaminants and disease and cooperative research with industry. This revised language (and modified funding amounts) was used as the starting point for a series of approved amendments as follows:

- a. Include four research priorities for cooperative research with the oil and gas industry, including polar bear research, species of special concern, shoreline change, and invertebrate distribution.
- b. Include 1.a.iii on changing Arctic food webs, as originally stated in draft RFP and leave the category cap the same at \$300,000.
- c. Add “rugosity” to list of features to be studied for Bering Sea canyons under priority 1.b.i Fish Habitat.
- d. Add “including, but not limited to...” to the list of features in the last phrase under 1.b.i. Fish Habitat.
- e. Add “and stock structure as related to management boundaries” under Fish movement category (1.b.iii) of Fish and Invertebrates section. Make “marine disease” its own category (f) under 1. General Research Priorities on Ecosystem Components, with target of \$100,000.
- f. Change 1.d.ii from “small declining populations” to “small or declining populations”.
- g. Change 1.e.iii from “small declining populations” to “small or declining populations”.
- h. Add regulatory compliance and effectiveness of fishery enforcement services under 4.i. Cooperative Research – Fishing Industry and increase target level from \$500,000 to \$600,000, by taking \$100,000 from data rescue.
- i. To the bycatch reduction priority under 4.i.e, add the need to study the implications on economic costs of bycatch controls on fishery participants and efficiency.
- j. Remove ecosystem monitoring from section 4 on cooperative research.
- k. Move ecosystem indicators from Aleutian Island category to revised section 8 entitled “ecosystem indicators and data rescue”, and transfer \$100,000 of the target with it to category 8.

The main motion, as revised above, passed unanimously.

#### 4. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

At its April 2008 meeting, the Board requested staff to further flesh out the Gulf of Alaska integrated ecosystem research program, including an implementation plan and a draft special request for pre-proposals for the upper trophic level (UTL) component. Staff came back at this meeting with a more fleshed out version of four modular approaches (dubbed eco-eggs, palm tree, RAMPS, and MULDUNE), and described the pros and cons as well as potential short and long-term implementation timelines. Draft RFP language was provided for each of the modular approaches.

Recommendations of the science and advisory panels were provided. The Science Panel in general recommended a combination of the Palm Tree and MULDUNE approaches, but instead of having sequential modules to fill in the entire ecosystem study from top to bottom, the program should be implemented synoptically as one larger program, with two or three field seasons and at least one-year synthesis at the end. The time frame for the study would be fall 2009 to December 2013 or 2014. The

Advisory Panel concurred, but added that the RFP language should encourage a comparative study between the broad regions of the Gulf of Alaska, for example, the western vs. central/eastern regions.

The Board considered these recommendations and then moved to endorse the Science Panel recommendations, but increase the overall target amount of the program to \$9 million, with \$500,000 for the first year for planning and preparation for the field seasons.

An amendment was made to have two alternative funding limits, \$7 and \$9 million, for proposals to address. Specific needs for ship time must be identified in the proposals. It failed (excom 1-4; others 1-9).

An amendment was made to fund the program at \$8 million with an additional \$1 million reserved for unanticipated costs for the GOA IERP, including ship time. The pre-proposal for the UTL would be limited to \$2.8 million. The amendment passed unanimously.

An amendment was made to identify a prospective schedule that would include 1 year of planning, 2 or 3 field season years, and 1 year to wind down the program. Field seasons would be subject to a funding limit of \$3 million per year. The initial planning year and wrap-up year would be supported with \$500,000 each. The intent was added that there be a clear management application, and a regional comparison was encouraged per the Advisory Panel recommendation. The amendment passed unanimously.

An amendment was made that there be at least one fish species of commercial importance. It passed unanimously.

The main motion, as amended, passed unanimously.

Long-term monitoring in regards to the GOAIERP was to be discussed during the February/March 2009 special Board meeting at which pre-proposals for this program will be selected.

##### 5. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

The Board received a status report on the 2008 field season of the BSIERP and planning for the fall meeting of the principal investigators involved on both the NPRB and NSF sides of the program. The only two actions before the Board were to review formation of a special science advisory group and a request from the ecosystem modeling committee for additional funding support for modeling and retrospective studies.

The staff presented the advisory group terms of reference that was drafted with input from the Board's science panel and the Scientific Advisory Board which provides leadership and oversight for the BSIERP-BEST combined program. There was consensus that a Bering Sea Project Advisory Group should be formed, made up of not more than six people from the EMC and the Science Panel. The Advisory Group's first formal meeting with the SAB will take place in conjunction with Alaska Marine Science Symposium in January 2009. It also would be invited to attend the October 2008 PI meeting in Girdwood.

A motion was made to endorse the concept of the advisory group, and it passed unanimously after being amended to include two NPRB Advisory Panel members of the AP's choosing.

Concerning the EMC's request for additional funding for a modeling study by Yi Chao and enhanced retrospective study by Mueter, the Board passed a motion to provide an additional \$120,000 to the

BSIERP for those studies, subject to the determination by the EMC on how much would be spent on each study (Wiesenburg recused). The Board expressed its firm intent that no additional funds would be approved for the BSIERP.

#### 6. Long-term Monitoring

The Board received an overview of its past considerations on supporting long-term monitoring. The previous April, the Board had discussed this issue thoroughly and concluded, among other things, that special long-term monitoring needs in the Bering Sea were already being addressed in the BSIERP and that long-term monitoring in the GOA should be considered only under the GOAIERP and using the criteria already developed.

At this meeting, the Board focused its attention on an invitation from PICES to participate in a Pacific Continuous Plankton Recorder (CPR) Consortium. The NPRB already has supported the CPR for \$50K in 2008, and Canada has committed \$50K for the consortium. The combined \$100K would serve as seed money to encourage other funding sources in supporting CPR in the North Pacific. Staff requested direction from the Board on whether or not to support the proposed consortium with \$50k each year for the next five years, starting in 2009.

A motion was made to provide \$50,000 each year for the next five years.

An amendment was made to make the support contingent on PICES finding the remaining required funds elsewhere each year to support the overall program. The amendment passed with two objections.

The main motion, as amended, passed with one objection.

#### 7. Long-term Planning

The issue of long-term planning was raised initially in April 2008. The Board has been developing its programs and funding research since 2002 and should assess the overall program and determine future directions, much like NSF does periodically within its own organization. At this current meeting, the Board was provided information on how NSF performs evaluations using committees of visitors. The Foraker Group also was contacted for information about whether they engage in such reviews.

The Board considered how to go about such a review and concluded that Board members should be asked if they were interested in participating on an ad hoc committee of 3-5 members that would report back at the April 2009 meeting on further planning and development of this issue and how to proceed. We also would examine how annual RFPs could be cyclical in terms of thematic focus and possibly implement such cycles in September 2009 for the 2010 RFP. Some thematic areas could be on every RFP, while others could rotate on and off the RFP priority list in any given year. The Board also will discuss how to design a more coherent program for the high Arctic in the coming years.

#### 8. Special Workshops

The Board was provided a summary of various workshops that will be held in 2009. The only action taken was to identify several members to form a working group (David Benton, Eric Olson, Michele Eder, and CAPT Cerne) to advise on development of the international arctic fisheries management symposium scheduled for October 2009.

9. Other Matters

The Board received a status reports on the Alaska Ocean Observing System and NPRB education and outreach program.

The Board approved funding of \$15,701 for Michael Dagg to help with drafting the PICES ecosystem synthesis report.

The Board declined to provide support for an oil and gas workshop.

The Board received a report from Caryn Rae on Conoco-Phillips research initiatives in the Chukchi Sea and would like to be kept informed of their progress.

The Board approved Cheryl Rosa to a 2-year term on the Science Panel and requested staff to seek nominations for the remaining vacancies on the panel (for Shannon Atkinson, Mary Pete, and Michael Simpkins), particularly the need for marine mammal ecology. It also approved the reappointments of Richard Beamish, Michael Dagg, Richard Marasco, Seth Macinko, John Piatt, Andre Punt, and Douglas Woodby to 2-year terms on the Science Panel.

The Board requested staff to look for a North Slope stakeholder nominee for the Advisory Panel, since Cheryl Rosa, who initially applied for that panel, was approved for the Science Panel instead.

The Board adopted the following dates for meetings in 2009 and 2010:

February (week of 23 <sup>rd</sup> )	Special meeting to review GOAIERP pre-proposals
April 29-30/May1, 2009	Regular spring meeting to review 2009 RFP proposals
September 16-18, 2009	Regular fall meeting (GOAIERP proposals and 2010 RFP)
April 28-30, 2010	Regular spring meeting to review 2010 RFP proposals
September 22-24, 2010	Regular fall meeting to review 2011 RFP

The Board adjourned at 1:24 pm, Wednesday, September 17, 2008.