

DRAFT Summary

NPRB Advisory Panel September 15-16, 2009 NPRB Conference Room, Anchorage, Alaska

The Advisory Panel met on September 15-16, 2009 in Anchorage. In attendance were Helen Chythlook, Gary Freitag, Ronald Hegge, Jeff Stephan, Arni Thomson, and Gale Vick. Kim Williams joined by teleconference. Absent were Shirley Kelly, Vera Metcalf, Mike Miller and Frank Kelty. The meeting was staffed by Nora Deans, Clarence Pautzke, Tom Van Pelt, and Francis Wiese.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 am, Tuesday September 15th. The first order of business was the review and approval of the agenda for the current meeting.

MOTION: Approve agenda with no amendments
Maker: Ron Hegge
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion Passed unanimously

The Advisory Panel (AP) was given a safety briefing.

2. Budget review

Clarence Pautzke reviewed the status of EIRF funds and NPRB budgets, and presented information on funding projections and the completed FY2008 audit.

3. n/a

4. Summary of Previously Funded Projects

Francis Wiese gave a status report regarding the 25 projects funded through the 2009 RFP. Applicants of the five conditionally approved projects were asked to address all issues raised by the Science Panel and technical reviewers prior to receiving final project approval. All projects addressed these comments satisfactorily and received final approval. Information was also presented that summarized all previously funded projects (2002-2009) in terms of institutional, LME, and research theme distribution. Staff noted that the rate of data and metadata submissions is improving, thanks in part to the new collaboration with USGS data experts. Staff added they have continued to track and catalog peer-reviewed publications that have resulted from NPRB-funded projects; the catalog currently includes a total of 157 published papers and another 56 in press.

The request by Dr. Wiesenburg to reconsider long-term monitoring support outside IERP's was presented to the AP and discussed. Gary Freitag stated any long term monitoring should be

critically evaluated to ensure that monitoring supported by NPRB generates important and useful information.

5. 2010 Request for Proposals

Francis Wiese reviewed the documents that were used as the basis for developing research priorities for the 2010 RFP, and the overall process that leads to the RFP. Research priorities identified by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, the State of Alaska, NOAA Alaska Fisheries Science Center, US Coast Guard, Bristol Bay Marine Mammal Council, EPA Mercury Contaminants Strategy, Alaska SeaLife Center, North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission, and the NPRB Science Plan, in addition to information gathered through meetings, literature, and staff contacts, all served as the basis for the research priorities in the draft 2010 RFP. The draft RFP also considers the evolution of past NPRB RFPs. The AP compared the 2009 Science Panel, Advisory Panel category funding recommendations and Board decisions to the 2010 proposal. The AP felt this provided continuity to the process and reminded AP members of previous discussions.

Francis Wiese presented background on alternative approaches to the RFP that were extensively discussed during the Science Panel meeting in August. There was some concern that the RFP is overly prescriptive, and also that the individual category funding levels may be limiting the incoming proposals, particularly for ship-based and Arctic projects which tend to be very expensive. Overall, however, the AP felt the categories reflected past discussions and were appropriate to most anticipated need.

Kim Williams asked whether there was a preconception of whether a thematic or cyclical RFP should be implemented. Staff responded that the AP can make their own recommendation for consideration by the Board. Gale Vick reminded the group that the AP represented stakeholders and therefore the AP should express its understanding of stakeholder need.

In their discussion of a thematic or traditional approach, the AP considered that the RFP reflected some hard work over the last few years to define specific research categories. The AP favors retaining all the categories to enable flexibility and potential seeding of collaborative projects funded in part by other organizations. Gary Freitag suggested that a modified "cyclical" approach could be managed through the recommendations for funding for each category. Arni Thompson noted that the RFP process has already gone through considerable vetting and felt the categories are well defined and reflective of the Science Plan. Kim Williams favored surveying PI's before a significant change. Ron Hegge thought a consistent format was necessary.

The AP asked Staff specific questions on what had been funded in the previous years and what categories seemed to have the highest number of successful applications. The AP was interested in figuring out if funding levels inhibit certain applications. Helen Chythlook noted that the \$100,000 for community involvement was insufficient because associated costs of travel, as example, had risen dramatically. Kim Williams felt that the Human Category was neglected by zero funding in 2009 and spoke strongly to supporting this category, as well as industry cooperation, in 2010.

The AP voiced their support for the idea proposed by the Science Panel to solicit information from the PI community on the need for thematic or focused RFPs, via raising the issue at the AMSS and/or seeking relevant input in other ways, e.g. surveys.

The AP broke for lunch at 12:00 noon and regrouped at 1:10pm.

MOTION: The AP voted to increase category 1f (Humans) in the 2010 RFP to \$400,000, to specifically support impacts of bycatch and regulatory actions on coastal communities and other stakeholders. In 2009, the AP had recommended \$200,000 for this category in 2009 but the Board had eliminated funding for this category. The AP recommended the following substitution of language in the comments in support of their recommendation.

1fi: Replace with:

Research is needed on methods for assessing the economic and social costs of bycatch and bycatch reduction efforts. This includes studies that evaluate the performance of bycatch control methods, the costs borne by fishery participants who must implement bycatch control mechanisms, and the social, economic, or other costs borne by economic and cultural stakeholders who depend on species that are affected by bycatch removals.

1fii: Add text:

Research is needed on the “cumulative” impacts on fishing communities of regulatory management decisions. Specific questions to be addressed by proposals could include: (1) How are fisheries regulatory action impacts on communities evaluated in terms of meeting stated goals of the fisheries action.(2) How are fisheries regulatory action impacts on communities evaluated in conjunction with other actions? (3) What indices are used in pre- and post-evaluations? (4) What longitudinal studies are conducted, by whom, and what are the conclusions?

1fiii: Change title to *Community adaptability* (not resilience). Add text:

Applicants should clearly describe their collaboration with local communities in framing the proposal and carrying out the proposed research.

Moved: Gary Freitag

Seconded: Helen Chythlook

MOTION PASSESⁱ

At 2:30 pm, the AP discussed at length the need to further support king crab research, specifically habitat, larval settlement and rehabilitation for blue king crab in the St. Paul area depleted stocks and red king crab in the Gulf of Alaska. The group felt that crab production in Alaska was inherently and significantly important to both industry and communities in Alaska and that more specific research needed to be conducted to help facilitate king crab rehabilitation in specific areas.

Arni Thompson, Jeff Stephen and Gale Vick were particularly concerned with supporting hatchery production research and noted that an ad hoc group of scientists, agency, industry and communities have worked together for some years and have identified and conducted research in

a collaborative effort. They noted that previous studies have advanced the knowledge of crab rehabilitation but that critical research has been halted for lack of funding. In addition, Arni Thompson noted this was a priority discussion of the NPFMC Crab Plan Team, currently meeting in Seattle.

The AP asked Staff to identify crab research funded by NPRB in recent years and surmised from that list that some of the crab research has been building toward a better understanding of crab rehabilitation but had not reached the level of greatest need.

The AP recommended adding a new section under 4i4 (Cooperative Research with Industry) to read: *Research that would enhance the development of cultivation techniques for red and blue king crab, including genetic identification and marking, nutritional needs, larval settlement and survival, and habitat requirements.*

After much deliberation and consideration of previous funding and projects, the AP made the following recommendations for funding in the 2010 RFP,(compared to 2009 recommendations) along with the recommended language changes (above) in specific categories:

CATEGORY	2010 AP	2009 SP	2009 AP	2009 BOARD	2009 ACTUAL
1a Oceanography ---	350,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	250,000
1b Fish Habitat	350,000	250,000	150,000	350,000	230,000
1c Fish & Invertebrates	800,000	800,000	900,000	800,000	
1d Marine Mammals	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	
1e Seabirds	350,000	350,000	300,000	350,000	390,000
1f Humans	400,000	200,000	200,000	0	0
1g Other prominent +	200,000	100,000	150,000	100,000	100,000
2 LTK	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
3 Collarborate with OSRI	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
4 Cooperative w/ Industry	400,000	300,000	350,000	600,000	
5 Community Involvement	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	
6 Technology Development	150,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	
7 Ecosystems	100,000	200,000	150,000	100,000	
TOTAL	3,800,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	

Helen Chythlook was concerned about not increasing the LTK or Community Involvement categories but recognized that the offset was the recommendation to fund “Humans” at a the AP’s recommended level. She again reference an email communication from AP member Vera Metcalfe, who was traveling in Russia, that recommended increasing the LTK component by another \$50,000, Chythlook further noted that collaborative research should be encouraged. Kim Williams supported increasing the Humans category because of the extreme need to address Chinook and chum bycatch impacts on Bering Sea and in-river communities. Vick spoke to the need to address cumulative regulatory impacts that have not been addressed by other research funding mechanisms.

In a separate note, Helen Chythlook referenced a resolution (09-04) of the Qayassiq Walrus Commissio (QWC) urging several agencies to address long-term research on the impacts of climate change and the impacts of industry fishing effort on walrus in Bristol Bay and the Bering Sea.

6. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Francis Wiese presented an update on the GOA IERP process. The first informational webinar was held on 17 July and was attended by over 30 people. The webinar proved to be very helpful in clarifying process as well as science questions. One of the main outcomes was a clarification on the boundary between lower and mid-trophic levels and a subsequent change in budget allocation between these two components, making them now even at \$1.75M per component. A second webinar is scheduled for 2 September. A new website for this new program has been developed by Carolyn Rosner – <http://goaierp.nprb.org/>.

Full proposals for the remaining three components of this IERP are due October 12 and will be sent out for external review.

The Board has scheduled their GOAIERP decision meeting for January 14-15, 2010, which means that focal meetings with the winning 4 teams that will make up the full Gulf Project will take place between February and May 2010.

7. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Tom Van Pelt led presentation of a status report on the Bering Sea Project integrated program, including highlights of fieldwork and other activities in 2009.

Program integration highlights included a workshop in August that brought together the fish projects and modelers in Seattle. The 2009 PI meeting (13-15 October in Girdwood, Alaska) is designed to further strengthen the integration among program components. The Advisory Panel was given a preview of the PI meeting plan, and all panel members were cordially invited to attend.

Advisory Group: The Advisory Group's initial charge was to conduct an integration-focused annual review of the overall program, achieved by participating at the annual PI meeting and also interacting with the Science Advisory Board (SAB) at the January AMSS. Science Panel members of the AG are Vera Alexander, Seth Macinko, and John Piatt. The AG's first year was complicated by difficulties attending both meetings, so we simplified the process to focus on the PI meeting, without an AMSS follow-up. Seth Macinko has kindly agreed to serve as the first chairman of the AG.

The AP considered and discussed a memorandum jointly from the Marine Conservational Alliance (MCA) and the United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA) to maintain maximum funding levels for the annual NPRB annual RFP process and to avoid funding on-going agency projects that are the responsibility of a specific agency. The AP generally concurred with this and made the following motion:

Motion: The AP believes that the objectives of the NPRB are best met and achieved by maintaining maximum funding levels for the annual RFP process, and by avoiding, to the extent possible, the funding of ongoing agency and institutional programs that should otherwise be funding priorities of such agencies and institutions.

Moved: Jeff Stephan

Second: Arni Thompson

Motion carries.

The AP further concurred with MCA recommendations to support maximum research for stakeholder considerations.

8 Arctic Planning

Francis Wiese presented a review of the Arctic Research and Monitoring Workshop development and outcomes, and led a discussion on ways the Board could consider going forward with a program in the Arctic without impacting the amount committed to the regular RFP. The Panel discussed the growing interest in the Arctic and expressed strong support to both go ahead and develop an umbrella strategy and other partnerships as well as to follow up on some of the previous workshop recommendations. The Panel also recommended that the Board consider an Arctic focus in the 2011 RFP, but suggested that staff pursue additional funding support for Arctic research. The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, energy and fishing industry partners, NSF, the Office of Naval Research, Minerals Management Service, Department of Interior, and the North Slope Borough were all mentioned as possible partners.

The AP makes the following statement:

“There is increasing interest in the high Arctic Ocean and potential use of natural resources as the ice cover declines in coming years. Sustainable use of Arctic resources, both living and non-living, must be based on objective, scientific understanding. Multiple agencies and organizations are funding or planning to fund research in the Arctic and/or have strong interest in sustainable resource management.

A possible role for the NPRB could be to facilitate communication, collaboration, and coordination of research as appropriate in the Arctic environment, while seeking to determine its own role in funding Arctic research. In pursuing such a role, NPRB must be very careful to work closely with other agencies and organizations, both national and international, to build a positive working relationship, while fully recognizing their individual missions and goals.”

8. Long-term Planning

Staff presented background on NPRB Program Review and Long-term Planning. NPRB has been funding marine research off Alaska since 2002, and has funded 228 regular projects (\$37.3M; competed and direct funding) and an additional 27 projects under the BSIERP (\$16.1M). Eighty-two agencies and institutions have been awarded funds by NPRB. In addition, the Board is developing its integrated ecosystem research program for the Gulf of Alaska and will soon embark on development of its program in the high Arctic. Following guidance in the NPRB Science Plan of 2005, it is now time for a thorough

program review and long-term planning exercise to evaluate the performance of the Board and provide future directions.

Statement: The AP supports an initiative to develop and implement a thorough program review and long-term planning exercise to evaluate the performance of the Board in meeting its mission, goals, and objectives, and to provide recommendations that address the future direction of NPRB research and other activities as they comport with the NPRB mission.

Helen proposes that NPRB consider making a PI and co-PI survey a routine part of NPRB project close-out process; this would capture ongoing stakeholder feedback. This would not be specifically part of the focused Long-term Planning effort, but could provide additional input to the Long-term Planning effort.

9. Other matters

Clarence Pautzke briefed the Panel on an upcoming meeting: the International Arctic Fisheries meeting, October 19-21, 2009 in Anchorage.

Nora Deans and Carolyn Rosner presented an overview of Communication, Education, and Outreach activities.

The AP commends the North Pacific Research Board Outreach and Education Committee for its continual excellent work and dedication to providing quality marine science education on related NPRB projects and for providing new and innovative opportunities for Alaskan Science teachers to access quality teaching materials.

.....
Meeting schedule: The next AP meeting will be the last week of April 2010 or the first week of May 2010.

Additional comments:

Five members of the AP are currently term-limited. Arni Thompson, Frank Kelty, Ron Hegge, Gale Vick, Shirley Kelly. Two seats are open (the Arctic and Aleutians.) The AP Members represent important constituencies and feel they have a very good constructive synergy. The AP respectfully requests the Board to consider retaining the five term-limited members on the AP through the fall of 2010 to assist with the programmatic review and transition into the GOAIERP project. The AP further recommends that the currently vacant AP seats be filled as soon as possible.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.

ⁱ Ron Hegge voted \$200K only and Arni voted \$300K