

**Summary
NPRB Advisory Panel
September 13-14, 2011
NPRB Conference Room, Anchorage, Alaska**

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on September 13-14 in Anchorage, Alaska. In attendance were Jeff Stephan, Dan Falvey, Vera Metcalf, Phillip Zavadil, Mark Gleason, Edward Poulsen, Gary Freitag, and Mike Macrander. Mike Miller and Rex Snyder joined the meeting on 14 September. Not in attendance: Helen Chythlook (Aderman), and Gay Sheffield. The meeting was staffed by Cynthia Suchman, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Nora Deans, Tom Van Pelt, Crystal Benson, and Danielle Dickson.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 08:18 a.m., Tuesday, September 13, 2011. Members introduced themselves. New AP members Edward Poulsen and Phillip Zavadil were welcomed. The first order of business was the review and approval of the agenda for the current meeting.

MOTION: Agenda Approved

**Maker: Dan Falvey
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion passed unanimously.**

The Advisory Panel was given a safety briefing. The Advisory Panel discussed the logistics for participating in the joint luncheon with the Regional Advisory Board (the steering committee for BEST-BSIERP LTK/Subsistence projects).

MOTION: Table approval of previous meeting's minutes to Wednesday morning.

**Maker: Mark Gleason
Second: Mike Macrander
Motion passed unanimously.**

2. Perkins Coie (Tab 2)

Staff reviewed the Statement of Work and explained the process and timeline. This item was for informational purposes only.

3. Budget Review (Tab 3)

Staff presented information under Item 3, describing budget status and forecasts. The AP discussed the balance between setting aside funding for future IERPs and funding current RFPs, noting the large impact that RFP funds can make, for example, in cooperative research projects. AP members spoke to the value of maintaining a relatively stable "planning horizon" for RFP funding to help potential applicants anticipate funding availability.

MOTION: For planning purposes, the AP recommends maintaining the projected 2013, 2014, 2015 RFP funding levels at the 2012 level (i.e., \$4M), noting that the availability of actual out-year amounts are contingent on external factors e.g. interest rates.

Maker: Phil Zavadil

Second: Dan Falvey
Motion passed unanimously, with one abstention (Mike Macrander).

The AP asked that a discussion of the 2013 RFP funding levels be added to the agenda for the April 2012 AP meeting.

4. Conflict of Interest Policy (Tab 4)

Staff reviewed the working group report, framework, and Science Panel recommendations.

It was suggested that more input and clarification from Perkins Coie on conflict of interest procedure at other organizations would be helpful. AP members were concerned about the bullets in the framework that could trigger recusal and noted that if adopted as is, a subsequent recusal policy could prohibit future involvement of the AP in the proposal process (if the Advisory Panel were allotted a role in proposal review as currently suggested).

MOTION: The AP supports components #1-3 & 5 of the Draft Framework for an NPRB Conflict of Interest Policy as presented in Item 4a. With respect to component #1, the AP recommends that “should” be changed to “will” (i.e., “Board, Panel and staff members [WILL] participate . . .”

The AP does not support Component 4 as presented at this time as it applies to the Advisory Panel. However, in the interest of transparency and accountability, the Advisory Panel agrees that the NPRB should have a well-defined recusal policy in place that is appropriate to each panel’s role (i.e., the Board, the Science Panel and the Advisory Panel) in the decision making process

To develop such a policy, it would be useful to have additional discussion among advisory & science panelists and Board members, in addition to input from attorneys at Perkins Coie. The AP is concerned with implementing a Conflict of Interest framework/policy that may prevent input from the stakeholders that the AP represents. The financial conflict is clearly defined and supported. However, the AP recommends further work on the categories of conflict (Institutional, Collaborative & Personal) and the thresholds that would trigger recusal to the point of impacting the AP’s functionality.

Considering that most Board and panel members will be at the Alaska Marine Science Symposium in January, it would be useful to have a half day workshop/policy drafting session with the attorney. The goal of this drafting working session would be development of a draft policy which could be voted on by the Board at their April meeting.

Additionally, the advisory panel respectfully request that two members of the Advisory Panel be added to the CoI working group.

Maker: Mark Gleason
Second: Michael Macrander
Motion passed unanimously.

5. Proposal review process (Tab 5)

Francis presented an overview of the proposal review process. Jeff, as the AP representative on the Proposal Review Working Group, reviewed the activities and outcomes of this Working Group. The Working Group recommendation that addresses the manner in which the AP will provide input to the Proposal Review process is found on page 5 of the Working Group report (i.e. Item 5a, “Advisory Panel input”).

MOTION: The AP endorses the role of the AP in the proposal review process as laid out in Item 5a.

Maker: Dan Falvey
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion passes unanimously.

Under further discussion on this topic:

Dan noted that SP members wear two hats-- one that is objective review, another is as a science ‘stakeholder’, similar to AP role. It was suggested that it would be helpful if the review process clearly defined when which criteria is applied. This discussion was resolved in closer reading of the workgroup recommendations.

Dan also raised the question of the possibility to revisit review criteria weightings. For example, the project costs criteria currently sits at 10% of the review. Staff noted that these can be revisited at any time but are designed to ensure that the quality of the science is the dominant factor.

MOTION: The advisory panel endorses the review process as recommended by the working group.

Maker: Mike Macrander
Second: Dan Falvey
Motion passes unanimously.

6. Summary of Previously Funded Projects (Tab 6)

Staff provided status of 2011 Projects, concordance of Board with SP recommendations since 2002, and overall summary of ongoing research projects.

7. 2012 Request for Proposals (Tab 7)

Staff provided a brief history of the RFP, including an overview of research themes and inputs for research priorities. Discussion ensued about the Humans category, noting that it may be helpful to increase interest in this category by promoting to the public the research opportunities that exist. The AP noted that they would like the Humans category to remain. Staff then provided a review of the draft 2012 RFP.

[note for 2013 RFP- link community involvement ‘seed money’ with LTM money... Dan Falvey]

Meeting Adjourned: 5:04 p.m.

Meeting called to order: 9/14/11 8:07 a.m.

7. 2012 Request for Proposals (Tab 7) continued . . .

MOTION: The AP recommends the Board consider the 2012 RFP as presented by the Science Panel (Item 7B) with the following modifications:

- **Opening paragraph of General Research Priorities** – change “overlap” to “duplication”
- **Sec 1, General Research Priorities and Ecosystem Components**
Section 1b, v, 2) change language to Fish Habitat/Essential habitats for forage fish and demersal spawning fishes to include invertebrates including crab species.
- **Sec1b, v, 3) Cumulative Impacts** – add sentence at end stating: Proposals could also incorporate considerations of interaction with climate change.
- **Sec 1b, add new section v) Impacts of climate change on crab stocks**
Climate change has been linked to the inability of certain crab stocks to rebuild, even in the face of minimal human removals. Important further research on this topic would consider how climate change affects the long-term success of these stocks. Climate change interactions such as changes in bottom temperatures, larvae survivability, predator-prey relationship changes, food scarcity, benefits to competitive species, ocean acidification and others should be considered. The research should also be conducted in the context of the historical and current fishing removals. A key question to address is if the stock can rebuild under expected future environmental conditions and minimal commercial removals.
- **Sec 1e (humans) iv. Community adaptability to ecosystem change**—replace the words “overlap with” in the last sentence with the word “duplicate” .
- **Sec 4i1)** add “ with non-target species of fish **and invertebrates**”
- **Sec 5 Technology Development**—Add a new section **iv. Energy efficiency technology development**
Research is needed into technology and programs which improve the energy efficiency of fishing gear and vessels used to harvest marine resources. Recent studies have documented that increasing fuel prices can lead to decreased harvest of fishery resources and concentrate effort on fishing grounds near communities. This in turn may contribute to localized depletion, increase near-shore habitat impacts, and increase allocation conflicts. Energetically inefficient vessels and fishing gear also unnecessarily contribute to green house gas emissions. Potential measures to address this research need will likely entail the collection of quantitative data on the energy efficiency of fishing vessel and gear modifications, the development and testing of new technologies and vessel/gear modifications, and the development of innovative methods to assist stakeholders in evaluating the implications of these potential changes to their operations.

- **Focus Section**—reduce funding of this section to \$300,000. Apply \$100,000 of savings to increase Cooperative Research to \$500,000—in making this recommendation, the AP notes:
 - No specific funding amount was specified in the 2011 RFP for the focus section in 2012.
 - Many of the topics under this section are related to Sec 1, General Research Priorities and Ecosystem Components, and will likely attract proposals from similar entities.
 - The funding for Sec 1 proposals is proposed to increase from \$2.3 million in the 2011 RFP to \$2.7 million in the 2012 RFP.
 - Ecosystem linkages have received considerable funding through the BSIERP, the GOAIERP, and the pending Arctic IERP.
 - The cooperative research line is level funded in the 2012 RFP at \$400,000 and represents only 10% of the RFP (less than 5% of the 2012 budget).
 - Many traditional sources of cooperative research funding have been reduced as part of the overall reduction in the federal budget

- **Focus section, v. -** change “overlap with” to “duplicate”

Maker: Dan Falvey

Second: Gary Freitag

at 10:12 am, having moved through Dan’s changes and all other opportunities for modifications, the group votes and the motion is unanimously passed.

The AP discussed the need to maximize the cost effectiveness of the funding of proposals for 2012 and future years.

MOTION: We recommend the Board consider incorporating mechanisms to limit the administrative costs associated with proposals that are submitted to the 2012 RFP cycle. This may include a cap on indirect and overhead.

Maker: Dan Falvey

Second: Mike Miller

passes with one objection

Discussion on this issue included deliberations on whether a cap on indirect and overhead is a good idea or not.

.

MOTION: Accept minutes from April 2011 AP meeting

Maker: Mark Gleason

Second: Philip Zavadil

Motion passes unanimously

8. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Program (Tab 8)

There was insufficient time to address this agenda item. Staff directed attention to the information on the Management Strategies Evaluation (MSE) workshop included in Tab 8.

9. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Program (Tab 9)

There was insufficient time to address this agenda item.

10. Graduate Student Research Awards (Tab 10)

Carrie provided the AP with an overview of the recommendations provided by the GSRA working group. After some discussion, the AP passed the following motion.

MOTION: The Advisory Panel wishes to note that its definition of “stakeholder relevance” is intended to be consistent with the definition provided to the Board at their April 2011 meeting. That is “proposals that have special stakeholder relevance, community and other societal relevance, and public interest value”. We also wish to note, this definition is currently being employed by the proposal review working group. We feel that this addresses bullet point #5 in the GSRA working group report and no other additional definition is necessary. With that, the AP endorses the GSRA working group recommendations.

Maker: Mark Gleason
Second: Mike Miller
Motion passes unanimously.

MOTION: In matters where a tie may exist, the AP suggests that a preference be given to Alaska high school graduates, regardless of the location of the university which they attend.

Maker: Mike Miller
Second: Phil Zavadil
Motion passes with one objection.

11. Arctic Planning (Tab 11)

Staff provided an overview of this item.

MOTION: The AP recommends that an Arctic IERP should begin geographically where the Bering Sea IERP ends.

Maker: Ed Poulsen
Second: Mike Miller
Motion passes unanimously.

Vera, Rex, and Tom Okleasik (guest) spoke about the importance of involving local communities from the outset and not just focusing on the financial partners. Phillip Zavadil noted that the Bering Sea Project provides ‘lessons-learned’ with respect to this matter. Staff noted that a parallel community outreach and involvement effort was planned and would go ahead in parallel with the broader Arctic partnership planning if the Board endorses the Arctic concept paper, and that this could be fleshed out in more detail in the document.

MOTION: Endorse the arctic strategy as presented in Item 11b, noting that it’s critical that the document be strengthened in engaging arctic communities in all phases.

Maker: Dan Falvey
Second: Mike Miller
Motion passes unanimously.

Rex Snyder suggested consideration of the establishment of an “Arctic Marine Research Board”. Such a Board could be established in legislation and could parallel the NPRB’s function, but with stronger Arctic representation.

12. Long-Term Monitoring (Tab 13)

Staff provided an overview of this item. Phillip Zavadil noted that LTM should strive to include LTK, community, or other observations that in some cases have been recorded for hundreds of years (hunters, fishermen, gatherers...). Vera Metcalf noted an example of monitoring sea ice movement in the Bering Strait. Dan Falvey inquired about the overlap with the LTK and Community Involvement section of the RFP, and staff noted that although an overlap may occur, one was not intended to substitute the other. Dan also noted that funding for a potential LTM category would ideally come from those existing categories that are already supporting LTM projects (i.e. should not come from categories such as Collaborative Research or Technology Development that in the past have not included LTM projects).

MOTION: The AP endorses (1) the definition of LTM as presented by the Long Term Monitoring Working Group in their 12 July meeting report; (2) the SPs recommendations; (3) LTM Working Group Point 1 (the Board needs to agree on whether or not it wants to implement a long-term monitoring strategy for LTM and thus cease funding these projects on an annual ad-hoc basis (this the recommendation of the working group); and Point 3 (decide how much annual funding . . . ball park estimate . . . the Board will dedicate to long-term monitoring programs). The AP expresses concern that LTM funding may impact the diversity of projects that are funded by NPRB, and therefore, the AP recommends that budget for LTM in the RFP should be similar in scale to what is currently allocated to LTM projects and is derived from budget categories that have traditionally supported LTM programs.

Maker: Dan Falvey
Second: Gary Freitag
Motion passes unanimously.

13. Education Outreach (Tab 12)

Staff gave a presentation on education, communication, and outreach activities.

14. Other Matters (Tab 14)

a. Science Panel Membership

This item was not addressed.

b. Panel nomination committee

This item was not addressed.

c. Requests for meeting support

This item was not addressed.

d. Meeting Schedule 2012-2013

The AP scheduled their spring meeting for April 30 and May 1, contingent on Board scheduling.

The autumn meeting is scheduled for 10-11 (or 11-12; would be preferred by Gary) of September, contingent on Board scheduling.

e. AMSS

Staff brought to the APs attention that abstracts for 2012 AMSS are due 3 October and highlighted the 'all-hands' NPRB meeting scheduled during the AMSS.

f. AK Marine Gala

This item was not addressed.

g. Other Matters

No other matters were addressed.

MOTION: To Adjourn at 3:47 p.m.

Maker: Mike Macrander

Second: Phillip Zavadil

Motion passes unanimously