

Summary

**NPRB Advisory Panel  
May 3, 2010  
NPRB Conference Room  
Anchorage, Alaska**

The Advisory Panel met on 3 May 2010 in Anchorage. In attendance were Helen Chythlook, Gary Freitag, Ronald Hegge, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, Vera Metcalf, Mike Miller, Jeff Stephan, Arni Thomson, and Gale Vick. . The meeting was staffed by Nora Deans, Carrie Eischens, Clarence Pautzke, Tom Van Pelt, and Francis Wiese.

Introduction of Hal Batchelder, University of Oregon, as a member of the NPRB COV (Committee of Visitors) working on a review of the NPRB.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 am. The first order of business was the election of a chair and vice chair for the Advisory Panel.

MOTION: Continue with Gale Vick as Chair and Shirley Kelly as Vice-chair for this meeting and the next meeting in September.

Maker: Frank Kelty

Second: Jeff Stephan

Motion passed unanimously.

The AP noted that five members of the current AP will be term limited as of March 2011. The AP will be considering options for the rotation schedule of the new AP before the September 2010 meeting.

MOTION: Approve agenda with no amendments

Maker: Mike Miller

Second: Jeff Stephan

Motion passed unanimously.

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

The AP reviewed minutes from the September 2009 meeting.

MOTION: Approve minutes from September 16, 2009 meeting, noting that the Board decision on AP terms should be added as a footnote, and the spelling mistake on page 5 will be corrected.

Maker: Gary Freitag

Second: Shirley Kelly

Motion passed unanimously; Frank abstained since he was not present at the meeting.

### 3. Proposal Review for 2010 (for information only)

#### a. Overview of current research funded by NPRB.

Staff provided a brief review on the status of previous and current projects funded by NPRB. There was discussion about metadata and data transferred from the PIs of completed projects; staff highlighted the improved status of metadata and data, with new functionality on NPRB project browser (<http://project.nprb.org/>).

#### b. Overview of 2010 Request for Proposals and proposals received.

Carrie Eischens noted that this year's RFP received a high response; incoming proposals totaled around seven times the \$3.7 million target funding level. Carrie Eischens described the standard review process that incoming proposals undergo, culminating in "Tier 1", "Tier 2", or "Tier 3" summary ranking by the Science Panel.

Francis Wiese then provided a description of each of the "Tier 1" proposals received

A question was raised in regard to proposal #95: AP is disappointed that it didn't receive Tier 1; it relates to a major issue facing the crab planning team regarding opilio crab in the BSAI. Staff noted that the proposal had problems, e.g. question whether the survey is representative, and also that NPRB has previously funded projects 625 and 825 on this topic. Ron Hegge raised a question about Proposal #94, relating to acoustics, suggesting that this project could have real importance to the black cod (sablefish) industry. Staff explained that proposal did not meet criteria.

Gale Vick asked for a breakdown per category and staff related each of the recommended proposals to the category of approved expenditures.

Arni Thompson asked what the Science Panel's thoughts were on proposal 92, assessing the windchill on bycatch of mortality in commercial fisheries and why it received Tier 3. Thompson said this has been an on-going data need for years. Staff replied that the Panel wanted an earlier project to be finished first; that proposal 92 is costly and not well justified. Frank Kelty was concerned that there were no successful Steller sea lion proposals and that Proposal #55 had not be funded. Staff reported that the tagging component of the proposal was poorly articulated. Frank re-emphasized previous concerns that SSL research was still needed given the long-term emphasis on threatened and endangered herds and the subsequent impacts on the fishing industry because of lack of data.

There was some discussion about how the AP 's ability to have influence on the project awards. Gale Vick reminded the AP that the AP does not review proposals but can always ask questions and express concerns.

### 4. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Francis Wiese gave a presentation of preliminary results from the BEST-BSIERP program. Gale Vick requested that Henry Huntington come to a future AP meeting to give a presentation on LTK project progress. Helen Chythlook asked whether Fish & Game is accounting for seasonal

use in subsistence and sharing; noted that more accurate data may be available from Tribal Councils. Shirley Kelly asked whether change in subsistence foods in Emmonak was due to fish, and Jeff Stephan asked for a definition of reproductive success for birds and fur seals. Shirley Kelly asked whether warming and cooling is part of the modeling effort; staff responded that yes, varying climate scenarios drive the models. Mike Miller asked whether fur seals going into different regions are affected by different climate scenarios; staff responded that only one scenario at a time drives the overall Bering Sea (i.e. scenarios do not vary by species). Gale Vick asked about the northern extent of BSIERP-- St. Lawrence Island. Shirley Kelly asked about comparison studies in the southern hemisphere, and was referred to Southern GLOBEC program. Arni Thomson asked about how BSIERP results and progress are being communicated to the fishing and other stakeholder communities; staff referred AP members to website reports by BSIERP scientists visiting communities and attending regional conferences e.g. the Western Alaska Interdisciplinary Science Conference held in Dutch Harbor/Unalaska.. Staff also encouraged the AP members to help the communication effort by bringing relevant opportunities for BSIERP presentations to our attention. Gale Vick suggested that a press release should go out to communities encouraging people to apply to the Advisory Panel next Spring. This was an information only item; no motions were brought forward.

#### 5. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff provided a summary of the GOAIERP status and reported on the outcomes of April's Science Panel meeting, as detailed under Tab 5 of the AP binder. This was an information only item; no motions were brought forward. (The AP Chair noted that this report was extremely brief due to the amount of items on the agenda and additional time needed for a discussion with COV members.)

The AP was frustrated by lack of time to discuss the GOAIERP in more detail and expressed a need to have more time at the September meeting.

#### 6. Graduate Student Research Awards

a. Carrie Eischens gave an overview of the GSRA applications, with a brief summary of each of the applications and an explanation of the Science Panel's ratings. The AP had a lengthy discussion about each of the proposals and then decided to support the SP recommendations. Gale Vick noted that none of the recommended projects were in the Gulf of Alaska and suggested that some geographical balance be considered in the future.

MOTION: Accept SP priorities (subset of 13 proposals) and limit discussion to the 13, then proceed through Masters first and PhD second.

Maker Ron

Second: Arni

Motion passes unanimously.

b. There was discussion about the merits and faults of individual projects. Staff emphasized that the core purpose of the GSRA program is to foster up-and-coming young scientists, so review of the applications should focus on the student's qualifications in the first instance and the quality

of the project to a lesser extent.

Motion: Approve the SP recommendations

Maker: Frank

Second: Ron

Discussion: Helen refers to proposal 273; student should work with ice seal committee and contact Ted Krieg. Recognizing that the emphasis is on building science capacity in students (and not so much on research topic), the AP feels comfortable supporting the SP selections  
Motion approved unanimously.

## 7. NPRB Program Review

Clarence Pautzke provided an overview and status report of this agenda item, and introduced Dr. Hal Batchelder, Dr. Bruce Leaman, and Dr. Robin Anderson who are members of the Committee of Visitors who are leading the program review. Drs. Batchelder, Leaman, and Anderson then met with the AP in a closed session (no staff members present) for 1.5 hours.

## 8. Arctic Strategy for NPRB

Clarence Pautzke provided an overview of his “PAGES” (Pacific-Arctic Gateway Ecosystem Study) concept approach to NPRB involvement and leadership in the Arctic. The AP generally concurred that the NPRB should establish a presence in Arctic research.

MOTION: Encourage staff to pursue the Arctic approach as outlined by Clarence Pautzke

Maker: Frank

Second: Shirley

Discussion: Mike Miller makes the point that cutting out Community Involvement line item could be replaced by taking a small percentage from the RFP.

Motion passed unanimously.

## 10. Other matters

Staff reviewed the Advisory Panel policy very briefly and confirmed the extended terms of five of the current members. The AP discussed the need to have a policy on staggered terms into the future.

MOTION: Have a subcommittee teleconference to discuss policy changes and prepare new language. Subcommittee to include, Gale Jeff, Shirley, Mike, Arni, Frank, and Vera. To meet after the Sitka Council meeting.

Maker: Shirley Kelly

Second: Mike Miller

Motion passed unanimously.

Update on the AOOS – Alaska Ocean Observing Systems – by Molly McCammon, was taken out of order to accommodate Molly’s immediate travel. Molly explained that AOOS RFPs would be going out soon, that AOOS, along with the international IOOS, was currently working on a five-year plan, that the USGS was focused more on marine issues, and that a current big

issue was Tribal Consultation, as mandated by an Executive Order under President Clinton.

This led to a discussion of NMFS on tribal consultations at many levels. Mike Miller suggested that NMFS should be contacting the Tribal Councils and not just the ANCSA corporations. The group briefly discussed concern over NMFS proposed marine spatial planning and the planned off-shore aquaculture. The State of Alaska and most constituents were opposing both. Relating this back to the AP, Shirley Kelley and Helen Chythlook suggested meeting with the tribal council environmental representatives.

f. The AP judged the annual Photo contest.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting

Maker: Mike Miller

Second: Shirley Kelly

Motion passed unanimously; meeting adjourned at 1705

AGENDA ITEMS NOT ADDRESSED BY THE AP: In the interest of time, the AP was unable to address the following:

KPMG audit report for FY2009

Grants status and

Conflict of interest procedures

Funding recommendations for Secretarial approval

Compliance Policy and NOAA MOU

Ocean acidification report

Personnel manual for NPRB

Education and Outreach status report

Office modifications

Funding request to support student travel