

**Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes  
May 8 – 10, 2013  
NPRB Board Room  
Anchorage, AK**

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on May 8 – 10 in Anchorage, Alaska. In attendance were Jeff Stephan, Phillip Zavadil, Edward Poulsen, Gary Freitag, Helen Aderman, Steve Reifensstuhl, Rex Snyder, and Michael Macrander. Gay Sheffield attended on May 9 & 10. Not in attendance: Vera Metcalf and Dan Falvey. The meeting was staffed by John Hilsinger, Francis Wiese, Carrie Eischens, Danielle Dickson, and Susan Dixon.

**Wednesday, May 8, 2013**

The meeting was called to order at 08:34 a.m., Wednesday, May 8, 2013. The first order of business was the review and approval of the agenda for the current meeting.

**MOTION: Approve the agenda**  
**Motion passed.**

The Advisory Panel was given a safety briefing.

John Hilsinger was introduced as the NPRB Interim Executive Director and Susan Dixon was introduced as the Executive Assistant.

Jeff Stephen was elected Chair and Gary Freitag was elected Vice Chair. The meeting summary from the Spring 2012 meeting was approved.

**MOTION: Accept minutes from September 2012 AP meeting**  
**Motion passed.**

Staff called attention to the AP attendance list that appeared in the meeting materials. The Board requires that AP members have a minimum 80% attendance record in order to be eligible for reappointment. The Board plans to discuss this in greater detail during their meeting next week.

AP members requested that participation via teleconference be acceptable as a contingency plan only in the case that inclement weather prevents travel.

2. Hiring Committee Report

Staff explained that six applications were received in response to a call for a new Executive Director and the Board decided to continue the search. The hiring committee expects to decide on a new strategy during the Board meeting next week. Interim Executive Director, John Hilsinger, has agreed to stay as long as up to two years in order to ensure that the new Executive Director will be a good fit for the organization long-term.

3. Budget Review

The annual audit is underway but is not yet completed, therefore there was nothing to report at this time.

The Grant 6 budget proposal was submitted in time for the May 1 deadline with the approval of the NPRB Executive Committee. Staff summarized the budget, which includes money for the new Arctic and long-term monitoring programs.

#### 4. NPRB Conflict of Interest Policy

Staff reviewed the conflict of interest policy and requested that each AP member sign a statement asserting that he/she has read, understands, and agrees to abide by the policy.

The AP questioned the use of a single COI policy by the Board and panels and suggested that a working group be formed to review the policy and process, with participation by members of the Board, Science and Advisory Panels.

#### 5. Social Science Working Group (Action item)

Staff explained that the social science working group commissioned a report on how NPRB might better fund social science projects. Polly Wheeler, Science Panel member and co-Chair of the Social Science working group, attended this part of the AP meeting to provide a summary of the report. Two intended applications of this report include informing the development of the annual RFP and providing information that would allow NPRB to better include social science when the NPRB Science Plan is updated.

Polly suggested that in the 2014 annual RFP NPRB could request proposals that explicitly integrate social science into a natural resource management project.

One main point to take from the report that Polly highlighted is the fact that social science is not predictive, but rather, it provides the social context for natural resource management. The qualitative nature of social science makes it challenging to integrate with the more quantitative nature of natural science research. She further noted that the Science Plan would benefit from a more rich discussion of the human dimension.

One AP member criticized the global nature of the case studies cited in the report and noted that there are diverse examples in Alaska statewide that would have been more relevant to NPRB. It was recommended that in the future RFPs for such work include a requirement for Alaska-based case studies. Polly Wheeler clarified that the scope of work requested international case studies specifically and noted that members of the social science working group already possessed knowledge of Alaska-based projects.

The group agreed that the report would benefit from the inclusion of an Executive Summary written for a non-technical audience. The working group plans to request this when they send comments to the authors.

One AP member suggested that NPRB (staff or the social science working group) write a preamble to the report noting the value of this report to NPRB and its intended use. This AP member also suggested that examples should be drawn from the report that highlight the importance of the consideration of local and traditional knowledge as well as the consequences of natural resource management decisions. It was further suggested that the preamble should include a definition of the term "social scientist". Staff noted that the comments of the SP, AP, and Board during the Spring 2013 meetings will best serve the purpose of articulating the intended use of this report.

One AP member noted the importance of this issue and applauded the efforts of the working group in furthering the inclusion of social science in the work that NPRB funds.

Polly clarified the SP's recommendation that the Board have a candid discussion about what is possible in terms of incorporating social science, and in particular LTK, into projects that NPRB funds. She made the point that the social science aspect of a project needs to be integrated during the project design phase and

not added after the fact. NPRB also needs to be strategic and articulate clearly in the annual RFP the types of social science work the Board intends to fund.

One AP member asked if there will be an opportunity for the public, including other organizations with experience with this issue, to have input into this process. The AP Chairman noted that the Board probably intends to make progress on this during the development of the 2014 RFP and suggested that AP members provide staff with input sooner rather than later.

**MOTION: With respect to making the report publicly available on the NPRB website, the AP endorsed the recommendations of the Science Panel and added the recommendation that a preamble be added to the report articulating its relevance to NPRB and further recommended that the Executive Summary be revised to use language more clear to a non- technical audience.**

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION: The AP recommends that the social science working group continues and that the 2014 RFP include a section that addresses the integration of social science into natural science research. The AP does not feel that the social science framework articulated in this report is yet at a point that it could be incorporated into the Science Plan or 2014 RFP, but it can help inform the social science working group's process. The AP recognizes that there is good content in the report and endorses the continued work of the social science working group to use the content to develop the 2014 RFP and Science Plan. The AP further endorses the inclusion in the 2014 RFP of a pilot project (as per the Science Panel meeting summary). In addition, a case study of how social science and LTK have been integrated with natural science in Alaska to date would be another topic to consider for the 2014 RFP.**

**Motion passed.**

#### 6. Overview for current research funded and 2013 proposals

Staff provided a summary of current research funded by NPRB.

The AP was given an update on project 815, which has now been cancelled. Staff expects a final report from the PIs by the end of this week which will include recommendations for developing cooperative research with industry.

Staff provided an overview of the 2013 Request for Proposals and proposals received. The 2013 RFP was released with a funding target of \$4 million. One hundred and thirty proposals were successfully submitted requesting \$23.5 million. Twenty-two proposals were rejected due to responsiveness, formatting issues or lack of signature pages.

#### 7. Proposal Review Process

Staff provided a review of the proposal review process and the role of the AP. Staff referred the AP to the criteria that were defined to judge stakeholder relevance the previous year. Last year the AP highlighted proposals as noteworthy or significant. This year the Board has instructed the AP to highlight proposals only as significant. The AP is required to provide 2 - 4 sentences of explanation for each proposal that is highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

As a first cut staff summarized very briefly each proposal and AP members flagged proposals that they were interested in learning more about and potentially championing. Staff clarified that AP members could not flag a proposal on which they were recused. Staff provided more detail about proposals that

were flagged initially and AP members who decided to champion a given proposal were tasked with taking the lead on writing the explanation. The AP reviewed the explanation for each highlighted proposal as a group before they were finalized.

The review of proposals began on May 8 and continued on May 9.

#### **Thursday, May 9, 2013**

##### 8. Proposal Review for 2013 (**Action item**)

The AP flagged 31 proposals for discussion and then highlighted 20 proposals for stakeholder relevance as noted below.

Oceanography and Lower Trophic Level Productivity (RFP section 1a – **Funding cap: \$500,000**): No proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Fish and Invertebrates (RFP section 1b – **Funding cap: \$1.2M**, individual proposals capped at \$500,000): Eight proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Marine Mammals (RFP section 1c – **Funding cap: \$800,000**): Two proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Seabirds (RFP section 1d – **Funding cap: \$100,000**): No proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Other Prominent Issues (RFP section 1f – **Funding cap: \$100,000**): Three proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

LTK and Community Involvement (RFP section 2 – **Funding cap: \$200,000**): Two proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance. Cooperative Research with Industry (RFP section 4 – **Funding cap: \$400,000**): Two proposals in this category were highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Technology Development (RFP section 5 – **Funding cap: \$200,000**): One proposal in this category was highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Data Rescue (RFP section 6 – **Funding cap: \$100,000**): One proposal in this category was highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

Social Science Focus (**Funding cap: \$400,000**): One proposal in this category was highlighted for stakeholder relevance.

##### 9. Arctic Program

###### a) Update and status report on PacMARS

Staff provided an update on the PacMARS project. Highlights included the system developed for compiling data and metadata for Arctic data, the most recent progress report from the PacMARS PIs and the hub community meetings held in February 2013. The PacMARS update also included information on the PacMARS Advisory Committee and their review of recent progress reports by the researchers.

AP members had questions regarding the composition and role of the Advisory committee, particularly as it related to community representation. Staff explained that the advisory committee was not designed to include representation by region but rather, the committee members represent data holders.

AP supports further advancement of this effort and appreciates the work done to date.

b) Update on PAGES

Phase 2 of the Arctic program - staff directed the AP to the most recent PAGES science plan and noted that it is a working document that continues to be developed as new partners are established and brought into the program. Current partners include NSF, ONR, BOEM, the North Slope Borough - Shell Baseline Studies program, and AOOS. NOAA and the Arctic LLC program have also been approached and may be interested in joining the effort, although how that might be formalized is unclear.

AP members inquired about how, or if, information regarding the Russian side of the Arctic will be incorporated into the PAGES program. Staff noted that there was recognition of that problem, and at a minimum information from the RUSALCA and DBO programs would be incorporated with the PAGES work. It is hoped that folks responding to the PAGES RFP will bring in Russian collaborators.

Staff also outlined a broader planning effort for Arctic research coordination. Staff have been working with the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee on the implementation of the IARPC 5-year plan. Staff described their participation in organizing a workshop in Washington, D.C. in late April that aimed to develop a common intellectual framework for the types of research needed in the Arctic.

Staff noted that the AP can expect to see a draft RFP for the Arctic program in the fall 2013 meetings.

c) Arctic Legislation introduced by Senator Begich

Staff provided an on the Arctic legislation introduced by Senator Begich in February. An earlier bill was sponsored by both Senators Begich and Murkowski, however this new bill was not supported by Senator Murkowski. Due to the current political situation in Washington, D.C., it is considered unlikely that this bill will progress through the legislature.

**MOTION: The AP endorses the Science Panel's recommendation on the Arctic program and looks forward to seeing the Arctic plan further developed and the draft RFP in the fall.  
Motion passed.**

10. Bering Sea Project

Staff updated the AP on the progress of the Bering Sea Project and the close-out plans for this project. Final products from the project were outlined, including special issue publications (2 complete, another 2 planned), non-technical dissemination of information through a headline/synopsis publication, a magazine-style publication which presents a story of the Bering Sea ecosystem, and a Bering Sea Project Calendar for 2014.

The AP asked that these products be widely distributed to the communities of the Bering Sea. Public radio and local newspapers were also suggested as way to distribute information. The suggestion was made that

the headline documents go out to the local newspapers on a rolling basis - perhaps as a series to the newspaper.

Staff provided updates on data and metadata products. The modeling component of the project was also discussed and revised expectations were explained.

11. Gulf of Alaska Project

a) Status Report on GOAIERP

Staff gave an update on the GOAIERP, highlighting the new CEO project, the data management process, ongoing field season.

12. Communications, Education, and Outreach Report

Staff informed the AP that Abigail Enghirst has been hired as the new Director of Communication, Education and Outreach for NPRB. She will begin full time May 24 and will start by reviewing the CEO aspects of the projects that the Board funds next week.

Interim Executive Director, John Hilsinger, recognized the work that Executive Assistant, Susan Dixon, has been doing to maintain CEO activities since the departure of the previous CEO Director, Nora Deans. Staff updated the AP on CEO products that have been generated since September, including the 2011-12 Biennial Report, several synopses for regular projects, and the 2013 calendar.

Staff distributed the 2011-12 Biennial Report and noted the inclusion of new sections that note the application of NPRB-funded work to resource management and the impact of the Graduate Student Research Awards.

**Friday, May 10, 2013**

13. Graduate Student Research Awards (**Action item**)

Staff summarized the number of proposals received and reminded the AP of the review process. The AP discussed the five M.S. proposals and the seven Ph.D. proposals that were ranked highest by the Science Panel based on scientific merit and student qualifications.

The AP noted that the GSRA RFP should articulate the definitions of outreach versus community involvement.

**MOTION: The AP recommends proposals 777, 778, and 756 for funding at the Master's level. Proposal 756 was endorsed by the AP because of its importance to a broad range of stakeholders that include the seafood industry as well as consumers of Alaska salmon and because the technology developed by this project will be applicable to other fish species.**

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION: The AP endorses the SP recommendation to fund proposals 758, 798, and 787 at the Ph.D. level. Proposal 789 was also endorsed as a proposal worthy of funding based on its stakeholder relevance.**

**Two abstentions. Motion passed.**

14. Long-term monitoring (Action item)

Staff provided background on the evolution of the long-term monitoring program and presented a summary of the recent activities of the long-term monitoring working group, including the development of a request for pre-proposals that staff expects to release in June. The Board intends to allocate \$400,000 per year to this program.

One AP member noted the difficulty in securing two or more partner organizations that can commit to funding a project long-term. Staff noted that the Board has provided a challenge grant in the past (funding contingent on the commitment of an additional partner) and this approach could be used here if necessary.

**MOTION: The AP endorses the 2013 LTM pre-proposal RFP and approves moving forward with the program.**

**Motion passed.**

15. Other Matters

**Upcoming RFP development**

Staff noted that 2014 would be the second year in the 2013-14 cycle. The focus section with a cap of \$400,000 is still undefined and AP members are invited to suggest topics for this section. The AP is encouraged to provide suggestions for topics in any RFP category to the Science Director, Francis Wiese, during June-July.

Staff noted that the Board has tasked staff with several large projects, including developing the long-term monitoring program, the Arctic program, and updating the NPRB Science Plan. Staff plans to suggest to the Board that NPRB skips releasing an annual RFP (potentially in 2014). This idea was not presented to the Science Panel at their meeting in April.

The question was raised if the 2015 RFP funding level would be increased as a result. The Board could decide to increase the funding level of subsequent annual RFPs or they could bank the money for Integrated Ecosystem Research Programs.

The AP declines comment at this time.

**Perkins Coie/governance**

Staff provided an update on the status of the work of the law firm Perkins Coie on the MOU that establishes the relationship between NPRB, the Alaska SeaLife Center, and NOAA. Perkins Coie has not made progress since the fall meetings due in part to the change in the NPRB Executive Director. Therefore there is no update at this time.

**Updates on other working groups – GSRA, Small grants, Stakeholder Engagement**

*GSRA*

Industry was approached to suggest that they join NPRB in supporting GSRA awards and were met with a negative response. The working group plans to develop a new strategy. NPRB is also unsure how to accept money from industry without going through the NPMRI that will charge overhead. ASLC, if it is a 501c(3) it could create a 501c(4) for this purpose. Shell noted that NPRB should talk with them.

*Small grants*

Staff provided a summary of the activities of this working group as detailed in item 5a.

### *Stakeholder engagement*

Staff provided a summary of the activities of this working group.

### **Director's and officer's insurance**

Staff explained the purpose of Director's and officer's insurance and noted the Board's intent to review the NPRB policy.

### **Outside funding requests**

NPRB provides up to \$50,000 for outside meeting support each year. Staff summarized the outside meeting requests that NPRB supported in FY13, including the PISCES meeting, a Geophysical Sea Ice course, the Wakefield Symposium, the Marine Mammals of the Holarctic conference, and the Arctic Conceptual Model Workshop.

NPRB has committed to funding the following in FY14: Dan Goodman Symposium, Society for Marine Mammalogy Biennial conference, and Sitka WhaleFest.

### **Goodman Symposium**

The AP was informed of a symposium that will be held in Feb. or Mar. 2014 to honor late Science Panel member Dan Goodman and the panel was invited to express interest in attending. NPRB will consider providing support for travel for AP members who would like to attend.

### **Meeting Schedule and location for 2013 and 2014**

The AP decided to schedule their fall meeting on 10 - 12 September 2013. The AP is available to meet 22 - 24 April or 28 April - 1 May 2014 and will finalize the dates of the spring 2014 meeting after the Board sets the dates of their meeting.

**Motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 12:15 pm.**

**Motion passed, meeting adjourned.**