Call to Order/Roll Call/Approve Agenda

The North Pacific Research Board met via teleconference on June 18, 2010 to discuss the Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program. Board members in attendance (at the NPRB office) were Ian Dutton (Chairman), Steve MacLean, and Pete Hagen (NOAA alternate for Doug DeMaster). Joining by phone were Nancy Bird, CAPT Michael Cerne, John Gauvin, John Hilsinger, Leslie Holland-Bartels, Howard Horton, John Iani, Paul MacGregor, Heather McCarty, Gerry Merrigan, and Eric Olson. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Nora Deans and Katie Blake. Attending the meeting as visitors were Phil Mundy, Jeff Stephan, Chris Oliver, Pete Jones, Mike Castellini, Doug DeMaster, Jamal Moss, and Shannon Atkinson.

Chairman Dutton called the meeting to order at 9:05a.m. He noted that only Board members would be allowed to speak, unless specific information was requested from others on the line. He asked for comments on the agenda or a motion to approve it. McCarty requested confirmation that while not specifically noted on the agenda, other discussion pertaining to the GOAIERP, specifically that dealing with a marine mammal component, would not be precluded. Chairman Dutton confirmed that was the case. It was suggested that approval of the May 2010 meeting summary (Item 1) should be moved to the end of the current meeting or to the September meeting, because the actions taken in May would be discussed further today.

MacLean moved to approve the agenda. This was seconded by Olson. Attention was drawn to the email sent out by DeMaster late on June 17. The question was raised whether this item should be added to the agenda, particularly because it stated: “…given the tone of [Pautzke’s] response and given the recusal to vote by Ian on the GOAIERP, [DeMaster] recommended that the vice-Chair, Eric Olson, chair the call tomorrow.” Olson respectfully declined the invitation to chair the meeting, stating that he did not believe it was necessary and that he did not attend the May meeting and thus would not be in the best position to be chair. Chairman Dutton concurred that he did not believe it was necessary for him to relinquish the chair for this meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to move approval of the May meeting summary to the end of the meeting. This passed with no objections. With this change the agenda was approved with no objections.

Conflict of Interest

The Executive Director reviewed conflict of interest procedures, noting NPRB’s desire to adhere to the strictest standards, passing the “Washington Post/cynical journalist” test. All Board members involved, including federal employees, must adhere to high standards of impartiality.

Each Board member then was asked to state if they had any conflict of interest, and if so, the nature of it. With the exceptions listed below Board members had no known conflicts:

1. MacGregor and McCarty stated that they are on the advisory panel for the PCCRC which is connected with the University of Alaska Fairbanks, however, neither believed this to be a conflict of interest and there were no objections.
2. McCarty was asked if she perceived there being any inherent conflict of interest because of her past representation of SFOS at the September 2008 Board meeting as an alternate for former member Denis Wiesenburg. McCarty indicated that she sat in as a non-voting member mainly to convey back to Wiesenburg what happened at the meeting, and therefore, there was no conflict of interest in acting upon UAF-related proposals.

3. Olson, Dutton and McCarty all disclosed that they sit on the School of Fishery and Ocean Science advisory panel at the University of Alaska Fairbanks but did not believe this to be a conflict of interest and there were no objections.

4. Chairman Dutton also disclosed that there is a historical connection to a personnel action between one of the UTL PIs and the Alaska SeaLife Center of which he is the current CEO. As a result, he plans to recuse himself from any vote involving that PI.

Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

1. Review of Board actions in May 2010

Pautzke reviewed the Board’s actions in May 2010, which basically resulted in passage (with one objection) of the GOAIERP, retaining seabirds upon further justification from the PIs, removing the Steller sea lion component and associated funding.

Board members asked for a reminder of the Science Panel’s (SP) recommendation regarding the GOAIERP prior to the Board’s May meeting and how the Board’s actions corresponded to those recommendations. Staff clarified that the Board’s first motion on May 5th adopted the SP recommendation, but the reconsidered and revised motion passed on May 6th departed from the SP recommendation because it removed SSL work rather than just ask for further justification.

2. Review of activities since May meeting

The Executive Director outlined the series of events and communications that occurred since the May 2010 meeting.

a. A letter (Item 2) was sent to the lead PI of the UTL component, Jamal Moss, on May 10th informing him of the Board’s decision and asking for further justification of the seabird work by May 17th.

b. On May 13th, DeMaster, representing the Secretary of Commerce as the NOAA representative on the Board, based on a designation by the Regional Administrator, sent a letter (Item 3) to the Board’s Chairman and Executive Director suggesting inter alia that the Board had been misinformed regarding the impact on the fisheries research of the 24% reduction in the award.

The Executive Director asked the Board to determine if they also feel they were misinformed and if so, appoint a 3-member committee to look into the issue further, talk with staff and report back to the Board. Chairman Dutton asked the Board if they had concerns regarding information they received at the May meeting and whether they felt they were misinformed. All Board members stated that they did not feel they were intentionally misinformed by staff and that the information that was presented to the Board by staff was the information that was in the proposal submitted. However, it was noted that, based on what has come to light since the meeting, that information was incomplete, and some Board members stated that they might have made a different decision if they had had complete information at the time they voted. The Board agreed that despite this feeling, no 3-member committee would be formed to do a forensic review of the materials that were provided at the May 2010 Board meeting that led to the motions and decisions regarding the GOAIERP.
c. Mundy sent a response (Item 4) on May 13\textsuperscript{th} in lieu of Moss who was on leave, asking for extra time to respond (i.e. May 21\textsuperscript{st} instead of May 17\textsuperscript{th}). Among other things, Mundy noted that the amount of funds removed was incorrect because some was required for the fish and oceanographic studies. The Executive Director responded to Mundy’s letter asking that Moss respond specifically to the seabird justification issue and clarify the cost of the non-SSL work that had been inadvertently impacted by the Board’s decision.

d. Moss’s letter responding to the Executive Director’s May 10 letter was received on May 21\textsuperscript{st} (Item 5).

Wiese reviewed the contents of the letter with the Board stating that the justification for the seabird work in paragraphs 6 and 7 provided new information and citations that had not been provided in the revised statement of work. This portion of the letter provided estimates of the biomass of juvenile forage fish removed by seabirds and stated that seabirds are an integral and relevant part of the GOA ecosystem. It also provided more detail on how the marine mammal component of the UTL would be integrated into the overall GOAERP. Board members questioned if this was the type of information that the Science Panel and staff had asked to be included in the revised proposal. Staff confirmed that was indeed the case.

With respect to the $576,838 that was removed with the SSL component, Wiese noted that the amount was based on the annotated budget in the revised proposal submitted at the end of March. The letter from Moss noted that this number did not take into account the labor needed to include fish work. As a result, the PIs felt that the removal of that money from the UTL project would have a negative impact on the entire program because it would affect non-SSL work also.

The letter stated that total funding for non-SSL work that needed to be reinstated was $282,610 (approximately half of the total amount removed). Staff noted that it was not possible to glean any such number from the documents provided by the UTL team at the time of the May Board meeting.

Wiese further noted that $282,610 number had been further revised after the May 2010 PI meeting in Seattle. PIs were asked to provide a breakdown of this amount so that staff could understand how it was calculated so they could accurately present it to the Board. Franz Mueter (UAF PI) provided an updated figure of $270k for the non-SSL part of the $577K, and indicated these funds would pay for administration/coordination efforts for overall project, a post-doc for the retrospective work, and travel.

Much of the remainder of the letter dealt with the UTL PIs not agreeing with the removal of the SSL portion of the proposal and justifying why the SSL section should be included. The PIs also opined that they believed the Board was inconsistent between their decisions regarding SSL and seabirds, and wanting proof of linkage before actually doing the necessary research.

Board members inquired if the information provided in the letter was some of what the Science Panel had been looking for. Staff responded that this was true. Board members asked if there had been a page limit on the revised proposal that would have limited the PIs from providing this information/justification before. Staff indicated that there was no page limit on the revised proposal although perhaps this had not been clearly stated to the PIs. However, it was made very clear and reiterated several times that justification for both the seabird and SSL work should be included in the revised statement of work. Board members asked about the inclusion of top down vs. bottom up control on the gauntlet recruitment question. Staff indicated that the only way to explore this currently would be through the modeling component. However, the motion made at the January 2010
Board meeting limited the modeling effort for this IERP to go just through recruitment and not onto older age-class fish or the effect on top-level predators such as seabirds and Steller sea lions, and the multi-species model that is included (free of charge to NPRB) is for the Western GOA only. With no Eastern GOA multispecies model there will be no comparison of the two regions at the highest trophic level and no investigation of bottom-up controls on SSL. The only way to include top down predation effects is either through direct predation of larval and YOY as a mortality factor in the individual based models or indirectly by estimating the removal of competitors (forage fish) in the nearshore and modeling its subsequent impact on survival of YOY.

The Board members also asked about the retrospective analysis and how that would fit into all the components. Staff stated that the retrospective work was very important and included all trophic levels. The two field years were investigating the survival of the five focal fish species through the first year and then there was a gap between settlement and when these fish are picked up in the NOAA surveys at 2 or 3 years of age. The retrospective analysis would try to fill in some of these gaps but also provide important information for the IBM models relating to the trajectory of the larvae, growth rates, physical properties, etc. All components of the IERP have retrospective analyses planned and will be looking at existing work to help fill in the gaps. Board members asked if this included food analysis and if the SSL information would be included. Staff indicated that food analysis is included and is already available.

Board members asked if previous studies of scat analysis for SSL had not reported YOY otoliths or had just not looked for them in the scat. Staff answered that most papers available on this topic did not specify age-class of the fish species consumed so it was difficult to answer that question. In the few papers that do address size of fish consumed, they only pertain to pollock and it appears that the smallest age classes (i.e., YOY) are present in very small numbers. Other papers that staff is aware of that deal with consumption of the five focal fish species by SSL do not give a breakdown by age or size class. Mundy was invited to speak and stated that the basic principle is that the chances of finding an otolith in scat is size-related, with small otoliths being harder to find than larger otoliths, but that the main issue here is not whether you can find YOY otoliths in scat but whether you can afford to look for them in order to properly inform the models.

c. A three member ad hoc subgroup of the Science Panel evaluated the justification for seabirds provided in Dr. Moss’s letter from May 21st. The subgroup paid specific attention to the two paragraphs on page 6 & 7.

Staff summarized the subgroup’s findings (Item 6): The SP subgroup felt PIs did a good job with justification. There was concern about the estimates regarding the amount of biomass removed, but the Panel felt that even if these numbers were off by an order of magnitude and included other prey species than those of interest in the IERP, this level of predation by birds is significant and including seabirds in the IERP would be an important and valuable part of the program. The subgroup of the Science Panel concluded that this was a good justification, a good step forward and seabirds should be included. The subgroup also noted that the seabird and mammal observers should be put on ships and added back into the program ($30K).

Board members asked why there was such a small group of the SP included in this subgroup and if the members present were the seabird experts in the SP. Staff answered that the subgroup had been somewhat larger when the justification was expected to arrive on May 17, but due to scheduling conflicts, the group had grown smaller when the letter was not received until May 21. The SP members forming the subgroup were not the seabird experts per se but had been involved in the GOAIERP process all along, were familiar with all of the issues, and were able to make informed judgments on the justification provided. Board members then asked why the SSL information
provided in Moss’s letter had not been considered by the SP subgroup. Staff answered that the subgroup was following the instructions of the Board (May meeting motion) which had already removed SSL and directed them to review the seabird justification only, although it was noted that the subgroup did comment on the merits of funding seabird and marine mammal observers (see previous paragraph).

f. The first GOAIERP PI meeting was held in Seattle on May 25-27th. Francis Wiese provided a summary of the meeting to the Board, noting that the meeting went well and the PIs were eager to get the program up and running.

Board members noted that it did not appear that the SSL issue was raised during the discussions at the PI meeting. Wiese commented that other than informing the group of the Board’s May meeting decision, staff did not bring up the SSL issue and no other meeting participant ever raised this particular issue. The only general comment that was made came from the modeling group, noting that according to their food web models for the central and western Gulf, pinnipeds consume a very small portion of the juvenile focal species biomass. Also, a request from the PIs was made that the seabird and marine mammal observers be reinstated.

3a. Consider retaining seabird component

The Board needed to determine if they accepted the SP subgroups recommendation to retain the seabird portion of the UTL proposal. Based on phrasing of the May meeting motion, no action would result in retaining the seabird component.

Although no action was necessary, the Board requested that it be noted in the minutes that the Board received the justification that seabirds have a significant effect on recruitment of the focal fish species in certain areas of the Gulf of Alaska, and thus the seabird component would be retained within the GOAIERP. This was agreed with no objections.

3b. Consider revised budget

The Board next needed to determine how to revise the budget to re-instate the funds inadvertently removed that would impact the non-SSL portion of the UTL.

Wiese reviewed the current budget for the GOAIERP (Item 8) and how reinstating the $270K + $30K for observers would impact the overall budget. With these additions and a reduction in the Program Management/Education and outreach budget from $700K to $500K, the total cost of the GOAIERP would be $9,027,429. Board members then discussed concerns raised by Mundy in his June 10 email.

4. Phil Mundy’s letter of June 10, 2010

Board members considered the June 10 email from Mundy (Item 9) and asked him to clarify his statement that adding these funds (the $270K) back in would “…not be enough and that reducing the funding and removing the Steller Sea Lion from the project left it incapable of functioning as an integrated ecosystem research project.”

Mundy indicated that although the issues were not raised by the UTL PIs or others at the May 2010 PI meeting in Seattle, the PIs were still uncomfortable with moving forward without a marine mammal component and felt that the UTL team had been broken apart by the Board’s decision. The UTL group requests that the entire allocated funds be reinstated and that it be acknowledged that SSLs are a
legitimate subject for the study and ask that staff and the Science Panel be allowed to work with the UTL PIs to make this work. He expressed confidence in the Science Panel and NPRB staff to succeed in working the issues out as they have in the past with other programs. He further stated that the Auke Bay Lab needs to ensure that the over $3 million contribution they are making to this partnership is worth it and supports a project that will succeed in achieving the goals of the IERP.

Chairman Dutton noted his appreciation for the partnership and stated that the task at hand was to decide between approving the $9.027M budget and possibly adding a marine mammal component later or adding the SSL component back in.

Mundy stated that he did not want to see a special RFP for a new marine mammal component, but felt that the Board should work with the UTL PI’s as originally selected by the Science Panel to develop a marine mammal component that could include SSL for an amount not to exceed the total amount of funds initially approved (Approx. $600K).

Board members asked for clarification regarding whether Mundy was suggesting $600K in addition to the $270K currently on the table. Mundy stated he was not, and that the $600K would be inclusive of the $270K.

Chairman Dutton clarified that one option would be to add the $270K to make the non-SSL part whole, plus allocate ~ $306K for staff to work with current PIs to fix/develop the SSL-directed aspect of the program.

MacGregor had to leave the meeting at this point but requested that it be on the record that he supported Mundy’s request, and recommended that the Board find funding to put the SSL component back in the program, which could be in terms of a more fleshed out proposal at some future time.

Other Board members stated that they also may be in support of this but would like to know what the Science Panel thinks of the SSL justification provided in the Moss letter of May 21. Staff agreed that there was some further justification in that letter, but also asked for clarification from the Board whether they were discussing a “marine mammal” or specifically a “Steller sea lion” component be added back in. There was some concern expressed by staff that the SP may remain unconvinced that a SSL component (and modeling being conducted) would get at the questions being asked regarding fish recruitment and a regional comparison. Staff noted that if a marine mammal component is to be included in the IERP, it should first be determined which marine mammal species makes the most sense and the Board should clarify for staff and the Science Panel whether they are including a marine mammal component relevant to the gauntlet or for the sake of having a marine mammal component as part of the IERP.

Mundy responded that the UTL group is open to the generic “marine mammal” option but would like an explicit statement that SSL could be included.

Board members asked the Executive Director what the implications of adding approximately $600K back to the GOAIERP ($577K had been removed in the May 10 letter to Moss) would mean to other NPRB programs. He responded that the money would have to come from somewhere – either through diminishing the regular annual RFP, delaying future IERPs or reducing or delaying an Arctic strategy, etc.

Regarding Mundy’s point about the study not being complete without SSL, the Executive Director reminded the group that the Moss et al. pre-proposal only dealt with recruitment and the gauntlet, and at the time, the Board felt it was worthy of an invitation to full proposal on its own without a marine mammal component. If the Board now feels that a marine mammal component is necessary, he has proposed a 10-step process to get a separate RFP out for a marine mammal component that would be
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based on a NMML-led assessment/whitepaper identifying which marine mammal(s) need to be included to link to recruitment of the five focal fish species. Such a process would lead to an open competition to get the best possible marine mammal component for the GOA program.

DeMaster was invited to speak to this by Hagen. With respect to the idea that NMML would be involved and/or take the lead in drafting a whitepaper, DeMaster stated he had serious reservations about this approach and was not supportive for a number of reasons. In particular, the Director of NMML, John Bengtson, had expressed his concern that if NMML PI’s were involved in drafting the whitepaper, they may be restricted from responding to a competitive RFP on marine mammals if one were issued. It also should be noted that one of the NMML PIs (i.e., Tom Gelatt) was a collaborator on the UTL proposal.

The Executive Director responded that he believed that NMML PIs could take the lead, but should be augmented with other marine mammal experts from outside NMML (e.g., other federal employees and academics). He did not believe there would be any problem with the authors of the whitepaper applying to any potential RFP. DeMaster reiterated that because of the concerns raised, NMML would not be contributing to this effort. The Board took no action on this proposal for NMML to lead the development of a whitepaper.

**Overall Budget Revisions for UTL Component**

Chairman Dutton stated that the matter at hand was to decide on adding the $270K (for non-SSL work impacted by May motion) plus $30K for observers. This would also in effect reverse the Board’s motion to not exceed $9M for the GOAIERP program (as it would go $27,000 over). Some Board members felt that more discussion was needed regarding additional funds for marine mammals, either by reinstating the entire $577K to the UTL or by going the route the Executive Director had just proposed. However, other members felt the $270k + $30K issue should be dealt with first. Mundy clarified that he was not explicitly asking for an additional $306K for marine mammals, but that a process be started whereby the NPRB staff and the Science Panel work with the UTL PIs to determine what marine mammal component should be supported by the Board. He emphasized that the Executive Director’s suggestion of going outside the existing group would break the partnership that the UTL PIs have entered into; his suggested course of action would leave the partnership intact. He further stated his understanding of the NPRB/AFSC UTL partnership by reading a quote from the NPRB web site dated July 17, 2009:

> “Jamal Moss, Kalei Shotwell, Franz Mueter and Shannon Atkinson presented an overview of their funded upper trophic level proposal, “Surviving the gauntlet: an integrated study of the pelagic, demersal, and spatial linkages that determine groundfish recruitment and diversity in the Gulf of Alaska ecosystem”.

A motion was made by McCarty to add $270K back into the UTL budget to make the non-SSL components of the UTL project whole and to add in $30K to pay for seabird and marine mammal observers on the fishery cruises. This motion was seconded by Olson. The maker of the motion was asked if this motion would prejudice the other aspect still to be discussed (i.e., marine mammals). Both the maker of the motion and the second stated that this was not the intent. Staff asked for clarification if this motion also included the reduction of the PM/EO budget from $700K to $500K. This was confirmed.

The question was called and the motion passed with no objections and no recusals. The result of this motion was that NPRB would be committing $9,027,429 to the GOAIERP.
Marine Mammal Considerations

Chairman Dutton next stated that the Board needed to determine how to deal with the marine mammal issue: (1) provide up to $300K and let the NPRB staff, Science Panel and UTL PIs work out how to proceed as proposed by Mundy, or (2) go the route proposed by the Executive Director for a separate RFP following his proposed 10-step process. Staff noted that clarification was still needed from the Board whether the intention regarding a marine mammal component was to include one that informed the recruitment question or just have a marine mammal component for the sake of itself. The Executive Director stated that his main concern was the scientific linkages within the entire program.

Several Board members suggested that a middle ground between options 1 and 2 was necessary. After further discussion, the following MAIN MOTION regarding marine mammals was made (Olson) and seconded (McCarty):

The NPRB should set out a process to scope out the potential inclusion of a marine mammal component (for no more than $300K, added by friendly amendment as shown below) within the UTL portion of the GOAIERP through a group of experts under the auspices of the NPRB Science Panel. The group would be tasked with answering the following questions:

a) Is a marine mammal component necessary within the context of the currently funded GOAIERP program? If no, stop here. If yes, then

b) Is the marine mammal component proposed in the UTL revised proposal (dated March 31, 2010) the appropriate marine mammal component?
   • If no, then the group should provide a recommendation to the Board on what an appropriate marine mammal component for up to $300K should consist of, and how to go about getting the component, e.g., a special RFP;
   • If yes, then the issue needs to come back to the Board.

The Board will review the recommendations of this expert group at their regular September meeting and take the appropriate actions to bring this issue to completion.

The maker of the motion clarified that this group of experts under the auspices of the SP should approach this topic openly with no preconceived biases. It was hoped that the group would be candid about what is really needed and not just try to make the current proposed SSL work “fit”. Staff asked for clarification whether it was the Board’s intent that the marine mammal component be relevant to the recruitment question. A Board member also questioned whether there had to be a direct link to the recruitment question or if an indirect link was acceptable. Another point raised was whether this relevance of marine mammals worked both ways.

An amendment was made by Steve MacLean (seconded by John Gauvin) to the main motion to state that:

The group [under the auspices of the SP] should examine whether a marine mammal component would contribute to the gauntlet AND whether the gauntlet contributed anything to marine mammals.

This amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Clarification was requested by Board members on what material would be given to the expert group, what deliverables were expected, and if the current UTL PIs would be involved in working with this group of experts. Would the group of experts be given the current proposal and asked to work with the current UTL PIs? Would the expert group have to be familiar with the NPRB Science Plan and the GOAIERP
Science Plan? Pautzke stated that the expert group would be given all proposals and correspondence regarding this matter, and then be asked to address the questions raised in the motion above. Some members (e.g. MacGregor, Bird and Holland-Bartels) recommended that Mundy’s approach be adopted, where the UTL PIs would work closely with NPRB staff and the expert group under the auspices of the SP. After some discussion it was agreed that it would be up to the expert group and Science Panel to decide who they need to talk to in order to fully evaluate the need and scope of a marine mammal component. And, that the expert group, under the auspices of the Science Panel, would bring their findings to the Board at the September meeting with their recommendation on how to move forward.

Board members then asked how funding would be dealt with; was the Board going to stay silent on a funding amount and let the expert group determine the amount needed for a relevant marine mammal component? Board members were concerned about tasking the expert group with funding questions and a friendly amendment was added to the main motion limiting funding for a marine mammal component to $300K.

One Board member (Merrigan) felt there should be a preamble to the motion and moved to amend the main motion by adding at the beginning:

The Board believes the GOAIERP should have a marine mammal component and Steller sea lions may be the appropriate species to focus on whether there is a direct or indirect linkage.

This was seconded (Gauvin). Discussion of this motion centered on the issue that the group of experts should not be forced into making the currently proposed work fit. The group should be free to say whether or not a marine mammal component is even necessary. Some members felt that this preamble would bias the group. Several members stated that they would vote against this amendment. The amendment was withdrawn.

A substitute amendment was then made (MacLean) and seconded (Gauvin) to add the following at the beginning of the main motion:

The Board believes a marine mammal component could contribute to the overall GOAIERP.

Some members still felt this preamble should be specific to Steller sea lions while others did not and the amendment was put to a roll call vote. The amendment failed. (excom 1-4; others 5-2)

More discussion followed regarding the main motion and the interaction of the group of experts with the current UTL PIs. It was noted and agreed that dialogue between the group of experts and the UTL PIs should be encouraged. Further, it was agreed that the group of experts should not be limited with respect to the scientists with whom they consult or the species of mammals they consider. Chairman Dutton made it clear that this was not a “make it fit” exercise.

The question was then called on the main motion after it was pointed out that it was generic to marine mammals and not specific to Steller sea lions. The motion passed unanimously, with no recusals.

[Note: On a subsequent July 2, 2010 teleconference of the executive committee, it was clarified that the Group of Experts should be directed, not just encouraged, to consult with the UTL PIs as one of many groups to provide the best possible recommendation to the Board regarding a marine mammal component for the GOAIERP.]
Finally, the Executive Director outlined the next steps:

1. The current UTL PIs would be asked to submit the revised proposal removing the SSL work, but retaining the seabird work. The revised budget should include the $270K for the non-SSL work inadvertently impacted by the previous budget removal and the $30K added to facilitate the addition of seabird and marine mammal observers on the fishery cruises.

2. The complete GOAIERP package (revised UTL, and current MTL, LTL and modeling components) would then be submitted for Secretary of Commerce review with a footnote regarding the Board’s current plan regarding a marine mammal component.

3. The Science Panel would be briefed about all these new developments and a group of experts would be formed under the auspices of the Science Panel to address the questions outlined in the main motion above. The group of experts would be encouraged to initiate dialog with the UTL PIs.

4. The group of experts would provide their recommendations to the Science Panel in August and to the Board at their September 2010 meeting.

To conclude this item, Chairman Dutton thanked the staff and the NOAA partners for all their work and time on these issues over the past several weeks and stated that he was looking forward to seeing the science get off the ground.

Other Issues

The Executive Director reminded the Board that the Committee of Visitors conducting a review of NPRB would be in the office next week and encouraged Board members to get in touch with the COV to discuss any issues they felt were relevant to how NPRB conducts business.

Approval of the May 2010 meeting summary was deferred until the September 2010 Board meeting.

A motion to adjourn was made (Gauvin) and seconded (Olson). No objections. Meeting adjourned at 1:19 p.m.