

Summary
North Pacific Research Board
NPRB Conference Room
Anchorage, AK
May 4-6, 2010

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The Board convened at 9:37 a.m. on Tuesday, May 4, 2010. Present were Ian Dutton (Chairman), Dorothy Childers, CDR Shane Montoya (for CAPT Cerne), Phil Mundy (for Douglas DeMaster), Michele Eder, John Gauvin, John Hilsinger, Leslie Holland-Bartels, Howard Horton, Paul MacGregor, Steve MacLean, Heather McCarty, Gerry Merrigan, Chris Oliver (for Eric Olson), Pam Pope, CDR Benjamin Reeder, and Denis Wiesenburg. CAPT Michael Cerne was present starting Wednesday. Nancy Bird, John Iani, Eric Olson, and Douglas DeMaster were absent for the entire meeting. Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Tom Van Pelt, Nora Deans, and Carolyn Rosner staffed the meeting.

After welcoming remarks by Chairman Dutton, three members of the committee of visitors doing the NPRB program review (Item 7) were introduced: Robin Anderson (DFO Canada), Hal Batchelder (GLOBEC), and Bruce Leaman (IPHC). Board members introduced themselves to the COV members.

The agenda was approved after bringing Item 7 on program review up to the beginning of the agenda and postponing Item 2 on budget review until Thursday and discussion of an Arctic strategy for NPRB.

A safety briefing was given by the executive director and then the election of officers was held. Ian Dutton was elected Chairman and Eric Olson was elected Vice Chairman for one-year terms.

The final version of the *The Foundational Years: 2001-2008* was distributed to Board members.

The Board approved the summary of their January 2010 meeting.

2. Budget Review

KPMG Audit

The executive director reported that the KPMG audit of the Board's finances for the year ending on September 30, 2009, passed without any problems due to the good work of financial program managers, Carl Stevens, Tara Reimer Jones, and Kellee Weaver, at the Alaska SeaLife Center. The latest audit was posted on the Board's website.

Grants status and approve Part 2 of Grant 4

Grant 2 covered FY 2007-08 and will close out on September 30, 2010. Various legitimate charges are being made to spend down residuals by the time the grant closes out this fall.

Grant 3 for \$16,489,294 covers all administrative expenses during 2009-10, as well as panels and committees, other expenditures, and meetings. It also covered about \$4.9 million of the total \$16 million BSIERP cost, plus about \$8.3 million for 800 and 900 series projects. The remaining \$320,000 will cover new projects approved under the 2010 RFP at this meeting.

Grant 4 covers field research costs for 2010 and 2011, and admin, panels and committees, other expenditures, and meetings for 2011. The first installment to Grant 4 was for \$9,321,804. A budget request was submitted to NOAA for Part 2 of Grant 4, for \$9,641,063 on March 3, 2010. Though submitted earlier, the budget needed to be approved formally by the Board at this meeting. The Board did so unanimously.

The executive director also presented budget projections out through 2019 and explained how funds could be set aside for a prospective Arctic research program at a level of about \$3 million. More discussion of the strategy and possible funding is available under Item 8 of the agenda.

3. Proposal Review for 2010

Overview of current research funded by NPRB

Since 2002, NPRB has funded 228 regular projects, for a total of \$37.3M. To date, 160 (\$26.3) of these have been completed. Tables were provided to the Board showing how projects have been assigned to a primary ecosystem priority, recognizing that many projects may be relevant to multiple ecosystem components. A status report also was provided on transfer of metadata and data to NPRB, and the number of publications resulting from NPRB's research. To date, there are a total of 168 published papers and another 60 in press. Publications are being made available via the NPRB Publication Library webpage (<http://publication.nprb.org/list.jsf>).

Overview of 2010 Request for Proposals and proposals received

The 2010 RFP was released on October 2, 2009 with a funding target of \$3.8 million for marine research in the NPRB study area commencing in 2010. One hundred and twelve proposals were successfully submitted by the December 4, 2009 deadline, requesting \$21.4 million. One proposal (#8 – Seward Line) was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant given the Board's January 2010 decision to contribute to the Seward Line project through a consortium. As in past years, NPRB staff conducted an initial evaluation on the remaining 111 proposals to determine compliance with 2010 RFP guidelines and whether proposals were responsive to the chosen research priority. No proposals were rejected by staff based on non-compliance with formatting guidelines.

Staff identified seven proposals as potentially non-responsive to the RFP category the applicants chose to compete under, and an ad-hoc committee of the Science Panel helped evaluate their scientific responsiveness. The group concluded that four proposals were non-responsive to the RFP research priority chosen by the applicants and therefore should not be processed further. The four proposals were returned to the applicants without further processing. The remaining 107 proposals were sent out for anonymous review. The goal was to obtain at least two but ideally three high quality technical reviews for each proposal. A total of 557 invitations to review were sent out by NPRB staff resulting in 229 completed peer reviews by March 30th, 2010. Completed reviews were distributed such that 22 proposals received only one review, 50 proposals received two reviews, 33 proposals had 3 reviews and two proposals had 4 reviews.

Review Conflict of Interest Procedures

The Board reviewed its conflict of interest procedures, and members disclosed their affiliations and conflicts as proposals were discussed in detail.

Science Panel Recommendations

Science Panel Chairman Doug Woodby provided the panel's recommendations based on their meeting on April 13-15, 2010 in Seattle, Washington. Of the 107 viable proposals, the panel recommended 22 for Tier 1 funding, totaling \$3.753M. The panel also created a second tier of 37 proposals, totaling roughly \$6.88M, which were considered scientifically sound, but perhaps of lower priority OR that deserved consideration if specific concerns regarding the scientific integrity of the proposals could be clarified and satisfactorily adjusted by the PIs. Forty-eight proposals were placed in Tier 3 indicating they had substantial scientific flaws and should not be funded. Chairman Woodby also noted that the Science Panel was extremely pressed for time at their April meeting to get everything done, and that the Board may want to consider revising future RFPs to be more focused and thus the responses more manageable.

Public comments

There were no public comments.

Develop funding recommendations for Secretarial approval

The Board considered the proposals and the recommendations of the Science Panel for the rest of the day, Tuesday, and then on Wednesday morning, a framework motion was made to adopt the following proposals, listed by proposal number for tiers 1 and 2 as developed by the Science Panel:

Tier 1: 4, 6, 7, 34, 40, 72, 83, 86, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 106, 108, 112

Tier 2: 24, 25, 29, 55, 65, 66, 75,

An amendment was made to the main motion to delete proposal 7 for \$393,734, regarding ocean acidification and crustose coralline algae, delete proposal 75 for \$89,574, regarding diet and body condition of nesting loons, and add proposal 32 for \$393,449, regarding salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock fishery.

An amendment to the above amendment was made to remove proposal 32 and add proposal 28 for \$373,681, regarding population genetics and spatial structure of Aleutian Island blackspotted and northern rockfish. The amendment to the amendment failed (excom 0-3; other 1-9; Mundy, Hilsinger, Wiesenburg recusing; Reeder abstaining)

The first amendment then passed with Hilsinger, Holland-Bartels, Mundy and Wiesenburg recusing.

An amendment was made to the main motion to add proposal 75. It failed (excom 1-4; other 6-4; Holland-Bartels recusing; Reeder abstaining)

The main motion then passed unanimously at 11:36 am, Wednesday, May 5, resulting in 22 proposals recommended to the Secretary of Commerce for funding totaling \$3,927,532, based largely on the recommendations of the Science Panel.

Funding Revisions and Stipulations

Three out of the 22 proposals recommended to the Secretary of Commerce received conditional funding as follows:

Proposal 29: The Board revised the funding level for this project, decreasing the total budget to \$350,000. Investigators must provide revised budget narratives and summary sheets to staff before proceeding.

Proposal 55: Revise statement of work to address Science Panel and technical reviewer comments. Specifically, investigators must provide detailed information on the statistical power of the proposed number of tags, likely tag attrition (non-recovery of data) and the consequences for inter-annual or regional differences in actual mortality data. Additionally, supporting information needed to assess the potential cost/benefit for tagging another 12 animals as part of this project is needed.

Proposal 65: Revised statement of work to address Science Panel and technical reviewer comments. Specifically, the revised proposal should include more detailed hypotheses, including more information on how resource selection in relation to resource availability will be tested and the identification of project personnel responsible for experimental design and data analysis.

4. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff provided a status report on the Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program, with particular focus on the 2010 field season, data management, modeling projects, and program integration. Mike Sigler (NOAA Alaska Fisheries Science Center and co-chair of the BEST-BSIERP Science Advisory Board) summarized initial findings of the program for the Board.

5. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Overview of the current situation

In May 2009, the Board selected the Moss et al. proposal for the upper trophic level (UTL) component for the GOAIERP program, and approved the release of an RFP for the other three components. The Board met again in January 2010 to review and discuss the proposals received in response to the GOAIERP RFP for the Mid-trophic level (MTL), Lower-trophic level (LTL) and Ecosystem Modeling components.

At the January 2010 meeting, the Board accepted the Science Panel's recommendation to conditionally approve funding for the Ormseth et al. proposal (MTL) and for the Hopcroft et al. proposal (LTL). The Board indicated that full approval of those two field proposals would depend on the addition of spring sampling in the MTL proposal and a second full year of sampling in the LTL proposal. In addition, the Board asked the PIs in the UTL component to take another close look at the seabird and Steller sea lion parts of the project to ensure they were properly linked with the rest of the program and to demonstrate the importance and relevance of the proposed seabird and Steller sea lion research to establish potential top-down impacts on larval fish survival, and if necessary make the appropriate modifications to the UTL proposal. All field components must also be integrated before final approval of the MTL and LTL components. As a result of the Board's motion, all three field components were required to submit revised proposals by March 31, 2010 so that the Science Panel could review the revised documents at their April meeting and make recommendations to the Board regarding final approval.

Regarding the Ecosystem modeling component, the Board accepted the Science Panel's recommendation to reject both proposals received and to ask both applicants to re-submit revised proposals focusing on factors up to and including recruitment of YOY fish. These proposals were due March 22, 2010 and were reviewed by the Ecosystem Modeling Committee and the Science Panel.

Science Panel recommendations of April 2010

The Science Panel discussed the three revised field component proposals and the two modeling

component proposals at their April 2010 meeting. The Science Panel recommendations on the field components were as follows:

Upper Trophic Level component:

1. *Provide clear justification of the sea lion and seabird diet studies. Specifically the PIs must provide data showing why they believe SSL and seabirds account for a significant portion of the predation on YOY fish that are recruiting into the population.*

If clear justification cannot be, or is not, provided, the Science Panel questions the inclusion of the SSL and seabird portions of this proposal *and recommends that it be removed.* The Science Panel would like to review the justification received for the inclusion of the seabird and marine mammal portions of the UTL component before giving final approval of these sections of the program.

2. *The Science Panel noted that the 2012 work planned for seabirds should be removed as there is no other field work occurring in 2012.*

3. *Regarding data management, originally planned to be incorporated into the UTL scope of work, the Science Panel agreed that it would be in the best interest of the program to have NPRB hold back \$350,000 - \$400,000 and deal with data management through a separate RFP process.*

Mid-trophic Level Component:

4. *Give final approval to the revised Ormseth et al. proposal for the Mid-trophic level component of the GOAIERP.*

Lower Trophic Level component:

5. *Give final approval to the revised Hopcroft et al. proposal for the Lower trophic level component of the GOAIERP.*

All three field components have smaller budgetary issues that still need to be addressed before contracts can be finalized. Staff should negotiate these during and subsequent to the May PI meeting

Modeling Component

As noted on page 6 of the Science Panel meeting minutes, although the EMC, in the context of their evaluation criteria, recommended neither modeling proposal for funding, the SP felt that a modeling component is needed to carry out the intent of the GOAIERP and that to re-compete the component would not result in different or better proposals. As a result, the SP recommended that:

Modeling component:

- 1) Staff should attempt to merge the two modeling groups – using the 4D ROMS data assimilation physical modelers from the Fiechter et al. group and the biological modelers from the Gibson et al. group.
- 2) If a merger is not possible, the SP recommends approving the Gibson group.
- 3) Whether merger or not, the NPRB Ecosystem Modeling Committee must be involved in further development of the modeling scope of work to ensure proper validation of the models.
- 4) Funds should be allocated for a modeling manager who will oversee and ensure that the modeling effort stays on track and encompasses the broader questions asked by the GOA IERP program. This should not be added to the workload of current NPRB staff.

Consideration of revised UTL, MTL, and LTL components

Late Wednesday, May 5th, at 4:14 p.m., a motion was made and seconded paraphrasing the Science Panel recommendation 1 on p. 5 of their meeting summary. Although the Board recognized the importance of seabirds and marine mammals in the GOA ecosystem, there was much discussion about the lack of demonstrated, connectivity between these top predators and predation on YOY fish in the UTL proposal. The Board discussion focused on the Science Panel's concern about the absence of clear justification for including the proposed seabird and sea lion work in the UTL proposal, and the fact that PIs had already been asked before to provide such information. Following this extensive discussion, a formal written motion, paraphrasing the Science Panel's first field component recommendation, was made late Wednesday as follows:

“Regarding the UTL proposal, the Board determined that the PIs must provide justification that Steller sea lions and seabirds account for a significant portion of predation of YOY fish. If they do not satisfactorily provide such a justification by May 17th, the Board will consider removing those components and their budgets from the UTL proposal. The Science Panel will review the justification and make a recommendation to the Board through the Executive Director.”

This initial GOA main motion passed unamended and unanimously, with Wiesenburg, Dutton, and Mundy recusing.

A second GOA main motion then was made and seconded to accept the Science Panel recommendations #2 and #3 of the UTL recommendation and to accept the Science Panel recommendations on the MTL and LTL revised proposals as stated on p. 5 of the Science Panel meeting summary and extracted above

This motion was not acted on until Thursday morning when it passed unanimously, with Mundy and Wiesenburg recusing.

The Board then revisited the initial GOA main motion, passed late Wednesday afternoon, concerning the seabird and SSL components of the UTL proposal.

A motion was made and seconded at 8:59 a.m. on Thursday morning to reconsider the initial GOA main motion that requested further justification regarding the seabird and SSL components. The motion to reconsider was passed with McCarty objecting, and Wiesenburg, Dutton, and Mundy recusing.

The initial GOA main motion was therefore back on the table for a second vote. There was extensive discussion, again focusing on the Science Panel concerns regarding justification of the necessity to include seabird and sea lion work in the UTL proposal. The Board referred back to the Science Panel

comments that the UTL PIs “had still not done a sufficient job in explaining the linkage between the Steller sea lion and seabird work and the recruitment question for the five focal fish species (walleye pollock, pacific cod, arrowtooth flounder, Pacific ocean perch, and sablefish)” and that “the mortality to YOY fish caused by seabirds and marine mammals was tiny compared to the mortality caused through predation by adult fish”. As a result of the discussion, the initial GOA main motion was revised and extended to read as follows:

“The Board agrees with the Science Panel that the Steller sea lion (SSL) and seabird portions of the UTL proposal are not responsive to the main recruitment questions of the UTL proposal, noting that the mortality to YOY fish caused by seabirds and marine mammals is less significant compared to the mortality caused through predation by adult fish. Based on the inability to detect YOY otoliths in SSL scat, as well as due to budgetary considerations, the Board has removed the SSL portion of the UTL proposal. Regarding seabirds, PIs must provide justification that they account for a significant portion of predation of YOY fish. If they do not satisfactorily provide such a justification by May 17th, the Board will consider removing the seabird component and its budgets from the UTL proposal. The Science Panel will review the justification and make a recommendation to the Board through the Executive Director.”

The reconsidered motion as revised passed at 9:38 a.m. with MacLean objecting, and Dutton, Mundy and Wiesenburg recusing.

Approve modeling proposals

A motion was made and seconded, based on the Science Panel recommendations 2 and 3 on p. 6 of their summary, and extracted above, to approve the Gibson group for modeling with the expectation that they would work with the EMC in further development of the modeling scope of work to ensure proper validation of the models.

The motion passed unanimously with Mundy and Wiesenburg recusing.

A motion based on Science Panel recommendation 4 on p. 6 of their meeting summary, and extracted above, was made and seconded to authorize hiring, via a personal services contract, an independent modeling manager, with the intent that the cost would come out of the \$9M cap placed on the GOA IERP.

The motion passed unanimously.

Update on Seward Line Consortium

Within the LTL proposal, the Seward Line was funded during the field years of the GOA IERP program (2011 and 2013). Since the January 2010, a consortium was developed to fund the line in non-IERP years. NPRB, AOOS, and NOAA each will provide \$100,000 for sampling in 2010 and 2012 as long as funding lasts.

6. Graduate Student Research Awards

At their 2007 September meeting, the Board approved creation of the NPRB Graduate Student Research Awards. Annually, up to five awards of \$20,000 each will be awarded to qualified master and doctoral students for the opportunity to address scientific, technological, and socio-economic issues relating to the research themes identified in the 2005 NPRB Science Plan. Students are limited to one \$20,000 award per degree. Each year, two awards will be given to each degree level with the fifth award given to the next most outstanding applicant from either group. In September 2009, the Board further amended the

award criteria stating that 2 of the 5 awards be reserved for students pursuing quantitative stock assessment research, to help address the projected shortage of stock assessment scientists in the future.

The 2010 Graduate Student Research Awards were announced October 30, 2010 with online application submission available as of December 11, 2009 and an application deadline of February 12, 2010. Twenty-eight applications were received by the deadline, 14 from masters students and 14 from Ph.D. students. One application was subsequently rejected because their research topic was outside of the scope funded by the North Pacific Research Board. Each of the remaining 27 applications were assigned to 2 Science Panel members for review, and then reviewed by the full Science Panel as well as the Advisory Panel. The reviews and the recommendations from the Science and Advisory panels were provided to the Board, along with the full student applications.

A main motion was made to support the five graduate student proposals recommended by the Science Panel and supported by the Advisory Panel: Hannah Voorhees (#250-PhD), Julie Raymond-Yakoubian (#257-PhD), Janelle Mueller (#251-MS), Jory Stariwat (#265-MS), and Jonathan Richar (#270-MS).

An amendment to the main motion was made to add Matt Sexson's project (#249-PhD) as a sixth project. The amendment passed, with Wiesenburg objecting.

An amendment to the main motion was made to delete #257. It failed (excom 1-4; others 4-7; Wiesenburg recusing).

The main motion with six awardees passed at 11:04 a.m. on Thursday, May 6.

It was noted that in the next call for applications, there should be a requirement for applicants to verify that they are not receiving duplicate funding from other sources for the work proposed in applications for NPRB Graduate Student Research Awards. Staff was requested to develop a protocol for dealing with duplicative funding, not just other NPRB funding.

7. NPRB Program Review

The Board received a brief overview from the executive director on the status of the program review. The Board also received a copy of the terms of reference for the committee of visitors. The Board then went into executive session to meet privately with the three available members of the committee of visitors: Robin Anderson (DFO Canada), Hal Batchelder (GLOBEC), and Bruce Leaman (IPHC).

8. Arctic Strategy for NPRB

Dr. Sue Moore (NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory) provided a concept paper on a proposed distributed biological observatory ranging north from St. Lawrence Island to Barrow. This was followed by presentation of a draft Arctic strategy discussion paper developed by the executive director. The objective was to determine the scope and focus of a potential collaboration of funding agencies to develop a major research program in the high Arctic, and determine whether the Board wants to participate in such a program. Budget projections were presented indicating that it may be possible to identify roughly \$3M from the Board's budgets over the next six or so years for such an Arctic program.

After much discussion regarding how to define the Arctic and its boundaries, and the datasets and other information that should be examined in developing an Arctic program, the Board concluded that it was best to slow down a bit on developing the strategy and form a workgroup of Board members and staff to go through an exploratory planning exercise for the Arctic over the next 6 months and report back to the Board in September 2010, and then further develop the plan for the spring meeting in 2011.

The following volunteered to be on the workgroup: Michele Eder, John Gauvin, Dorothy Childers, Chris Oliver, Pam Pope, Ian Dutton, and Doug DeMaster (by Phil Mundy). They will work with the executive director in this planning activity.

CAPT Cerne noted that the Polar Star (Coast Guard icebreaker) will be coming back online around 2013 or 2014 and that the Coast Guard may have roughly \$60M set aside for Arctic initiatives. This should be kept in mind when the Board is planning its Arctic strategy.

9. Compliance Policy and NOAA MOU

The Board received a report on issues with the compliance policy and development of the next MOU with NOAA for newly funded projects. The Board took no action other than to request the executive director to work with NOAA in developing the next MOU, and then report if there are any remaining difficulties.

10. Other Matters

Ocean acidification report by Jeremy Mathis, UAF

Dr. Mathis provided an excellent report on ocean acidification and its potential impacts on Alaska's marine ecosystems.

Review Advisory Panel policy and confirm new members

In January 2010, the Board passed a motion to revise its Advisory Panel policy to allow for two consecutive terms for 3 years each and to split the membership into three groups with staggered terms so only one group would be refreshed each year, as is the practice of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. The Board requested policy revisions for their consideration at this meeting. The current Advisory Panel has six members whose terms expired on March 31, 2010, but were approved to attend the May 2010 Advisory Panel meeting for continuity purposes.

The Board passed two motions regarding the Advisory Panel. They approved the new policy to allow for two consecutive terms for 3 years each, but will wait for a report from an Advisory Panel workgroup before determining exactly how to split the membership into three groups for purposes of having staggered terms. The second motion that passed was to extend the terms for one year to March 31, 2011, of six members including Helen Chythlook, Gary Freitag, Vera Metcalf, Mike Miller, Jeff Stephan, and Kim Williams. That action results in all current members having terms expiring March 31, 2011. No action was taken to fill two current vacancies (Aleutian and Arctic). They will be addressed in the next call for nominations.

There also was some discussion of whether the Advisory Panel should be involved in reviewing proposals. The current panel indicated their interest in doing so. The Board was reminded by the executive director that it had grappled with this issue several times in the past and that the history of decisions was available in the foundational report. He recommended that the Board review this policy and others after receiving the recommendations and report of the Committee of Visitors performing the overall program review of NPRB. That report, in draft form, will be available this coming September.

Alaska Ocean Observing System Report

Molly McCammon, Executive Director of AOOS, provided an update.

Personnel manual for NPRB staff

The executive director informed the Board that over the summer, he would be developing a personnel manual for our staff. The organization is mature enough, and the operations sufficiently different than those of the Alaska SeaLife Center, that it is time for staff to have its own distinct policy. It will be modeled after the one used by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, whose staff operates much the same way that NPRB's does. The Board's chair and executive committee will be consulted in developing the draft manual and it will be ready for review in September.

Education and Outreach

Nora Deans and Carolyn Rosner presented a report on our education and outreach activities.

Photo Contest

The Board received over 110 photos to compete in the 2010 NPRB Photo contest, including 10 in the youth category. These were narrowed by a panel of professional judges to 10 adult and 4 youth finalists. The Board voted to select first, second and third place winners in each category. In the adult category, first prize is \$1200, second is \$600 and third is \$300. For the youth category, first prize is \$600, second is \$400 and third place is \$200. The winners for 2010 are as follows:

Youth – all three by Sarah Donohue of Juneau

#1: \$600 Three walrus on Round Island, August 2009

#2: \$400 Fox on Round Island, August 2009

#3: \$200 Tufted and horned puffins on grassy cliff on Round Island, August 2009

Adults:

#1: \$1,200 Arctic fox with kittiwake chick, St. George Island July Nathan Banfield, Missouri

#2: \$600 Man in kayak retrieving seal 1.5 miles northwest of Barrow. Billy Adams, Barrow

#3: \$300 Puffin landing, Bogoslof Island. Ram Papish Oregon

Office Modifications

In January, Heather McCarty requested the executive director to look into expanding the conference room. A bid of \$13,269 was received to do the work, which would be offset by the \$11,255 still available for tenant improvements under the current 5-year lease agreement. The Board had no problems with moving ahead with the renovation this summer. The Board also indicated their preference for the fish tank to be removed.

Request for Student Travel Support

Alaska Sea Grant is planning an international symposium, titled "Ecosystems 2010: Global Progress on Ecosystem-based Fisheries Management" to be held November 8–11, 2010 in Anchorage, Alaska, USA. The Board was requested to consider sponsoring student travel awards to the symposium, to provide them the opportunity to meet world experts on EBFM, and to present their own work in oral or poster presentations. The Board approved \$10,000 to support 5-7 students.

Science Panel Membership

The Board approved membership of Bill Wilson to the Science Panel for a two-year term.

September 2010 Meeting Location

The Board requested the executive director to look into holding the fall Board meeting in Kotzebue or Nome.

Announcements of Personnel Changes

The Board lauded Denis Wiesenburg for his participation as a Board member, and Carolyn Rosner for her many contributions to the staff since 2006. Both are leaving for southern climes and they will be missed.

Clarence Pautzke announced that he will retire when his extended employment contract comes to an end on January 31, 2011.

Other Items

2011 RFP - It was decided that a conference call be held in July to consider a future more thematic RFP structure with the potential for cycling through research topics over several years beginning in 2011. This conference call would help staff structure the draft 2011 RFP and the topic would be further discussed at the August Science Panel and the September 2010 Board meetings.

The Board adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 6, 2010.