

**Summary
NPRB Advisory Panel
September 20-21, 2010
NPRB Conference Room, Anchorage, Alaska**

The Advisory Panel met on September 20-21 in Anchorage, Alaska. In attendance were Ronald Hegge, Jeff Stephan, Arni Thomson, Shirley Kelly, Helen Chythlook, Vera Metcalf, Mike Miller, Frank Kelty and Gale Vick. Vick was delayed; Vera Metcalf stepped in to chair the meeting until 1:00pm on September 20. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Nora Deans, and Tom Van Pelt.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 08:45 am, Monday, September 20, 2010. The first order of business was the review and approval of the agenda for the current meeting.

MOTION: Approve agenda with no amendments
Maker: Jeff Stephan
Second: Mike Miller
Motion passed unanimously.

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

MOTION: Revise the May 2010 minutes under item 7 to delete all text except the first paragraph.
Maker: Jeff Stephan
Second: Mike Miller
Motion passed unanimously.

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. COV Program Review- no AP action.

COV won't be reporting until 22 November. Clarence outlined the idea of bringing AP, SP, and Board together with the COV for a focused meeting during the Alaska Marine Science Symposium, potentially on the afternoon of Tuesday, January 18, 2011.

4. 2011 Request for Proposals

Carrie Eischens gave a status report regarding the projects funded through the 2010 RFP. Twenty-two competed projects totaling \$3.9M were approved or conditionally approved for funding by the Board at their May 2010 meeting. Applicants of the three 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. Seventeen of the 2010 projects are currently underway. The remaining five projects are delayed until a fully executed memorandum of understanding is completed between NPRB and the Alaska Fisheries Science Center. A completed MOU is anticipated later this month.

Information was also presented that summarized all previously funded projects (2002-2010) 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 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 196 published papers and another 63 in press.

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. Also there is a new “suggest a research priority” channel available to anyone via the RFP section of the NPRB website; however, that channel was little-used this year (only three suggestions). The draft RFP also considers the evolution of past NPRB RFPs and outcomes of previously funded projects.

Francis Wiese presented background on alternative “cyclical” approaches to the RFP that were extensively discussed during the Science Panel meeting in August, and introduced the current comparison of non-cyclical and cyclical approaches (shown in Science Panel minutes).

Shirley Kelly noted that a meeting about oil and gas development was being conducted this week in Anchorage.

Frank Kelty initiated a brief discussion on the concerns of local community members in some areas regarding the impacts of trawl surveys. Vera Metcalf had submitted written testimony on the surveys conducted in walrus critical habitat areas. The AP discussed the general need for better communications and the need for tribal consultation when surveys were being planned and conducted. Shirley Kelly and Gave Vick reminded the group about requirements (by Presidential Order) for *agencies* to consult with tribes. The AP was satisfied with the various community consultation requirements in the NPRB RFP boiler plate.

Ron Hegge noted that lack of ice is seriously impacting walrus populations in the Arctic. Frank Kelty expressed continuing concern over available funding for fishery monitoring and stock assessments.

MOTION: The AP supports the traditional (full) RFP process.

Maker: Ron Hegge

Second: Frank Kelty

Motion defeated by show of hand votes

Ron spoke to the motion: In light of a rapidly changing environment, eliminating flexibility in ability to respond is not good. Also there is reluctance to zero out important and visible categories e.g. seabirds and marine mammals. Current system “may be clumsy but its working, and can be tweaked annually.”

Other AP members suggested that the AP follow SP guidance on developing the cyclical RFP. This referred to the SP minutes, page 3-4, detailing rationale for cyclical approach, and with the understanding that the Board has the flexibility to respond to emergency needs.

MOTION: The AP supports adoption of the cyclical approach as recommended by the Science Panel.
Maker: Mike Miller
Seconded: Shirley Kelly
Motion passes unanimously

The AP noted that it might be appropriate for the AP to recommend that, while going through cyclical approach, the Board consider a funding mechanism that provides for emergency contingencies. Clarence pointed out that the Board already has flexibility to produce a special RFP in reaction to an emergency, e.g. an oil spill. Helen Chythlook noted that project dollars can be stretched with more creativity, combining with other projects. Gale Vick noted that future Boards and/or AP and SP can always readdress this cyclical “experiment” and argue that it has succeeded or not. Various AP members noted that the cyclical approach had more impact on some categories than others.

MOTION: Adopt the cyclical RFP language as approved by the Science Panel, with the following amendments:
1. Add Pribilof blue crab under 1bii8
2. Add under 1bii as item 9 (moving current item 9 to 10): *More research is needed to develop improved methodology for determining stock productivity and conducting stock assessments for GOA red king crab and bairdii tanner crab.*
Maker: Mike Miller
Second: Shirley Kelly
Motion as amended carries unanimously.

5. 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 2010. Program integration highlights include the upcoming Bering Sea Project special issue in Deep-Sea Research II; the next Principal Investigator Meeting to be held in Anchorage, 22-24 March 2011; long-term data needs to bridge between BSIERP I and any future BSIERP II; and the recent NSF “Dear Colleague” announcement welcoming proposals for BEST-BSIERP synthesis projects and modelers in Seattle. All Advisory Panel members were cordially invited to attend the PI meeting.

Shirley Kelly, Gale Vick, Helen Chythlook, Mike Miller and Vera Metcalfe, all expressed concern over finding ways to determine the economic value of subsistence activities in relation to other economic values. Tom Van Pelt noted that Henry Huntington is working with Jennifer Sepez (NOAA), Jim Fall (ADF&G) and others on the LTK (local and traditional knowledge) and subsistence harvest project that is part of the BSIERP. Tom and Francis noted that the Regional Advisory Board (RAB) will meet in Anchorage on October 18-20th and they would check with Henry about having some AP members attend that meeting. An important follow-up is the March 22-24, 2011, Bering Sea Project PI meeting. Tom noted that BSIERP was influencing the scientific culture in terms of better connections between PIs. Helen Chythlook noted that her experience working with the BSIERP PIs has been very positive and has encouraged greater interest in marine science in her community. Frank Kelty was concerned that the Aleutian chain was not receiving the attention that was necessary in relation to the Bering Sea ecosystem. Francis noted that a potential BSIERP II may have the funding to include a greater emphasis on the Aleutians.

Advisory Group: Staff presented the Advisory Group's report from the 2009 PI meeting, led by the group's chair, Seth Macinko. The AP appreciated the report and looks forward to continuing involvement.

6. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Francis Wiese presented background on the current status of the GOAIERP program. This was an informational item only.

7. Arctic Planning

Francis Wiese discussed recent developments in how the Board is approaching involvement in the Arctic. The collaborative "Distributed Biological Observatory" (see Eos article, vol. 91, no. 18, 4 May 2010) is one focus for NPRB involvement and planning, as is a continued role of coordination.

8. Other matters

8a. Nora Deans presented an overview of Communication, Education, and Outreach activities.

The AP received briefings on items b through f.

8e. AP membership

It was noted that the AP members must be able to consistently attend AP meetings.

It was emphasized that departing AP members can help the process by putting forward names for potential new members.

The AP concurs with staggered terms as listed and suggested the following:

- 1. That the NPRB review the attendance of the AP on an annual basis**
- 2. That the membership from communities/local government, industry, and the Native community always be considered in the nomination process**
- 3. That the AP and the NPRB be actively recruiting nominations for the AP now and that the nominations should measure the level of commitment of potential members to attend meetings**
- 4. That the NPRB forward to the AP the final version of AP Policies and Procedures**
- 5. That there be some mechanism to keep in mind the institutional memory of the AP**

8f. Graduate Student Research awards

MOTION: The AP supports continuing the GSRA policy of dedicating two of the awards to stock assessment students.

Maker: Shirley Kelly

Second: Ron Hegge

Motion carries

8g. Meeting schedule

Meeting with Board, Science Panel, and COV: January 18, 2011

Spring AP meeting: April 26-27, 2011

Fall AP meeting: September 13-14, 2011

The AP was informed about the Alaska Marine Science Symposium and the Alaska SeaLife Center Marine Gala.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 pm.

MOTION: **To adjourn the meeting at 12:05 pm**
 Motion: Jeff Stephens
 Second: Shirley Kelly
 Motion carries