

SUMMARY OF MINUTES
RRF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Held Wed. September 21, 2010
Fort Collins, CO

The meeting opened at 0802

Attendees

Board of Directors: Laurie Goodrich, Mike Kochert, Mike Collopy, Clint Boal, Torgier Nygard, Carol McIntyre, Gary Santolo, Miguel Sagesse, Jim Bednarz, Petra Wood

Officers and committee chairs: President Ruth Tingay, Vice President Ted Swem, Secretary Joan Morrison, Treasurer Angela Matz, Journal Editor Cheryl Dykstra, Wingspan editor Petra Wood, Scientific Program Chair James Dwyer, ECRR chair Travis Booms, Webmaster Libby Mojica, Education Co-Chair, Jemima Parry-Jones

Absent Directors: Marc Ruddock, Fabrizio Sergio

- I. **Welcome.** President Ruth Tingay gave call to order and welcome
- II. **Election Results - Joan Morrison.** 135 members voted in the election.

PRESIDENT-ELECT

Ruth Tingay

VICE-PRESIDENT

Ted Swem

DIRECTOR, North America #1

John Smallwood

DIRECTOR, Southern Hemisphere

Munir Virani

DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE #1 and #4

Carol McIntyre, Miguel Sagesse

Discussion regarding recent election (Ted Swem, moderator)

- Carol McIntyre couldn't be chair of the Nominations Committee in 2010 because she was running for a position. Thus, [Secretary Joan Morrison] agreed to assemble the slate and work with OSNA to carry out the election.
- Joan and Ruth worked together assembling the slate. They contacted many members with the goal of going outside the regular group of members who often run for positions and try and get some new people to run. Candidates were placed in a category for each open position based on their qualifications for each respective position and their interest in that position.
- The election recall was initiated because two candidates Carol McIntyre & Jim Bednarz from North America were placed in the category for the one North American Director seat, instead of the two At Large seats. Both candidates had indicated their preference prior to the election and these preferences were mistakenly overlooked by the election coordinators Joan Morrison & Ruth Tingay. As a result, some Board members McIntyre, Bednarz, Collopy, Kochert, Santolo & Boal felt that the following statement in the by-laws had not been followed: "Voting rules and procedures to be promulgated by the Board of Directors shall insure that elections are conducted in a fair and equitable manner."
- A formal request was made by several Board members McIntyre, Bednarz, Collopy, Kochert, Santolo & Boal to Secretary Joan Morrison to halt the election, re-position the two candidates McIntyre & Bednarz and re-start a revised election.
- Some board members Saggese, Anderson, Nygard, Sergio, Goodrich felt they had been excluded from this discussion and decision to recall the election; others indicated the request was only procedural and never was intended to be personal or exclusive.

- Because some board members were in the field at the time of this discussion, they might not have seen the messages therefore could not contribute to the discussions in the short time frame needed for the response.
- Those who brought the issue forward felt the most serious aspect was that the bylaws had not been followed, thus the decision to recall the election was put forward.
- Ruth Tingay indicated that she felt the Board's response was disproportionate to the issue in hand, and was also offensive in parts.
- Outcome: The By-laws committee was resurrected and Mike Kochert agreed to chair.
- For each election, each open seat must have at least 2 candidates. During development of the slate, the Nominations chair should determine
 - 1) who is interested in which position
 - 2) if the incumbent is interested in re-standing for the same position or running for another position
 - 3) how to encourage new people to run when someone is not well known by the general membership.
- How are new board members recruited? Should we try and get more international board members? Some board members felt that members who wish to get more involved with RRF should get on committees first, that way they get to know the people and process before coming onto the Board. The Board should represent membership since the membership elects them. We need a membership committee that is passionate about getting international members. Our membership currently is 1/3 international.
- Other board members felt that any member who is passionate about raptors and about the goals and missions of the organization should be able to become board members.
- Overall the board agreed that the board seats should be proportioned according to the membership. If board members are to represent the organization, all candidates should be able to obtain information about expectations of a board member, and what the respective seats represent. Also, candidates should indicate to the Nominations Chair what seat they wish to run for.

Action Items for Nominations and Elections

- How do we court membership to run for positions?
- How do we encourage voting since only about 14 % of members voted in this recent election?
- The By-laws committee will review the By-laws and identify sections that need to be updated or changed. The committee will report to the Board and membership in future e-agendas before next year's annual meeting. Ultimately, the membership votes on changes to the by-laws.
- The Nominations Committee chair should prepare a document in which the processes for recruiting members to run for open positions and for allocating candidates to these positions are clearly described. Ultimately this document will be made available on the website.

III. Treasurers Report - Angela Matz

Highlights of Income FY10

- We are taking in thousands of \$\$ from BioOne in royalties. 2010 income from BioOne so far is about \$1700. Thanks to Cheryl for this.
- Income thus far from the Techniques Manual has only been about \$200
- Profit from 2009 annual meeting in Pitlochry was around \$2200 despite the meeting's high expenses

Highlights of Expenses FY10

- Higher costs of postage in 2009 were associated with shipping all the materials from Jim Fitzpatrick to Angela in Alaska. We also paid for a storage unit for several months for these materials; this is included in these expenses.

- All these materials have been sorted, catalogued, and recycled as necessary. Some materials have been sent out to conservation organizations in developing countries and to board members or other members outside North America.
- As directed by board in 2009, Angela moved \$20K from the checking account into higher interest rate treasury index fund.
- \$500 annual payment was made to Ornithological Council
- Accounting and legal fees - we will have to pay for an audit in 2011
- We still pay 4% to process credit card orders for membership, payment for journal page charges, etc. But without a credit card option for payments, we would probably not recover many costs for our journal etc, so these processing charges are worth it.
- A suggestion was made to look into using PayPal for payments, but Ruth said it was a nightmare when used for Pitlochry meeting so suggestion was dropped.
- Our lawyer reviewed the officers insurance and it is definitely worth the \$1100 per year cost as it protects board members from being sued if someone hurts themselves at a conference.

Other Highlights of FY 10

- The Board unanimously recognized and thanked Angela for all her hard work dealing with these old materials, from start to finish. Also deserving of recognition are Carol McIntyre and her husband Ray, and Angela's husband Dave. Ray was awarded a free RRF membership for a year; Carol asked if he can donate it to a student. No outcome was provided
- Petra will include a note in the spring issue of Wingspan naming the organizations that received the past journal issues. Also included will be an acknowledgement and thank you to Angela for all her hard work dealing with the materials from Jim Fitzpatrick.
- Angela indicated that we finished 2009 \$13K in the red because a contribution of \$20K was made to the endowment as noted above. This decision was made at the 2009 board meeting.
- Membership income thus far is similar to last year. All society memberships are not declining as much as expected given the global recession.
- Our annual conference has made a profit since 2003; typically we give seed money of \$1500 each year. Because a conference outcome of profit or loss is highly variable, we can't depend on it for budget purposes. Typically, profit or loss for a conference depends on the venue.
- Libby indicated that profit estimate for the 2010 conference is between \$5 and \$10K.
- Angela continues to sell Raptor Research reports, Jim Fitzpatrick is no longer involved. As hard copies are depleted, she is getting high quality pdfs made and she will continue to sell these. Most orders for old journals are still being used to build libraries.
- Cheryl and Angela no longer have to process orders for reprints of JRR articles, often these were ordered and not paid for. Now reprint orders go directly through Allen Press. This significantly reduces time and costs associated with reprints.

Discussion regarding endowment and awards

- In 2009 the Board directed Lenny's contribution from 2009 of \$3K board to go into the endowment; this was done.
- Awards are typically made out of operating funds because if we took awards monies directly from the endowment we would be charged. Every few years we move appropriate funds from the endowment to operating budget to recoup funds spent on these awards. We haven't made such a transfer since 2007.
- We were reminded that the Morley Nelson award is managed by Bill Mattox and is not an RRF award, even though it is advertised in Wingspan. This award is not reflected in our budget.
- Clint reminded the board that in 2009 it had decided that Anderson poster and paper were \$100 each. Also, the Koplín travel award is now \$500.
- Funds used from operating budget for awards include funds for plaques and wire transfer fee

- Petra indicated that in the past, all expenses associated with awards have come out of the endowment, including student memberships and banquet tickets, given at the annual meeting.
- Mike Collopy suggested that if there are sufficient funds in the operating budget we should keep using it for awards and let the endowment grow. If operating budget needs more funds, we can move funds from endowment to operating. But not needed at this point.
- 4.5% is limit to what we can get paid back from endowment for awards, this has been agreed upon for many years
- Dan's Varland's contribution of \$400, given in 2009, will be used to support travel costs and registration fee of Sergio Lambertucci, whom Miguel is hosting at this conference. Sergio will be local chair of the Argentina conference.

Action items identified for Treasurer

- I did not find notes about resolution of the issue brought forward (see below) that we need to pay Spanish translators for translation of the Spanish version of the Techniques Manual

IV. Journal of Raptor Research -- Cheryl Dykstra

- Manuscript submissions and acceptance rates in 2009 were similar to other years, submissions are high so far for 2010. Submission to acceptance is approximately 12-12.5 months, currently.
- Cheryl has recently appointed 3 new Associate Editors, total 11 now
- Banding issue is planned for December 2012 after this conference, she is also soliciting papers on banding that were not presented at this meeting's symposium. Deadline for submissions is end of 2010.
- Cheryl is waiving more charges than usual due to economic situation. Many are for foreign authors. Recovery rate drops when makeup of issue is more international authors. She asked if this needed to be handled differently since we in the US are subsidizing authors in developing countries who cannot pay. No suggestions were made at this time.
- Recovery rates for Vol. 43 (93% overall): issue 43-4 (52%, printed more copies and waived more charges but this doesn't include reimbursements not yet received); issue 44-1 (81%); issue 44-2 (51%).
- BioOne - Full text downloads of JRR articles are now available from 2006 forward.
- Currently, there is no information available as to whether people are letting their RRF membership lapse if they are able to access BioOne through their work, for example a university.
- Currently, page charges are the same for members or not members because trying to keep these separate would not be worth the time or cost.
- Editor's budget - Angela will look into setting up separate accounting for paying the Spanish translators so this process may be made more efficient.
- 2011 proposed JRR budget includes a small increase in editor's compensation. The Board unanimously agreed. Cheryl reminded the Board that the Bylaws say the editor serves for 3 years, she has served for 4.5 thus far.
- Ads in JRR: Auk and Condor asked for a new ad because of size limitations, Mike Collopy's lab group produced a terrific new ad. Our journal will be advertised in these other journals.
- Cheryl asked board members and associate editors to encourage and thank our proofreader Joan ?? since she works very hard for little recognition.
- Petra suggested we put a short article in Wingspan about the workings of JRR, proofreading, etc.
- AEs are able to get the RRF membership list. Angela pointed out that OSNA rents our list anyway and we get income from it, so this request is not a problem as long as personal information is not released.

Online peer review system (Peer track)

- Cheryl indicated that we will probably need to consider this next year
 - 1) will speed up time to acceptance
 - 2) will make reviewing tasks easier for editor and AEs
 - 3) will approve our appearance as professional organization
 - 4) one issue is security of data.
 - 5) A main issue is cost, \$30 per submitted ms whether a feature article or a note. Since submissions are averaging 100 per year, this would add \$3000 to our annual budget.
- We need to ask Allen Press if they will publish online as well as this might add additional cost.
- We need to be sure this process will work for our lower volume journal, compared to large volume journals.
- Speed of publication is a major consideration, so this would especially help young researchers.

V. Wingspan -- Petra Wood

- Wingspan is published the 1st week of March and September. The call for material is in the middle of February and middle of August.
- Most people don't send anything. Board members are encouraged to submit information. Every committee chair should prepare a report for at least 1 issue each year.
- Wingspan should be a way in which we communicate with membership, so we need more information.
- Several Board members commented on the excellent and professional appearance and content of the most recent issue of Wingspan, and Petra was thanked for her efforts.

VI. RRF Website Revamp - Libby Mojica, Miguel Sagesse

- At 2009 annual meeting we agreed to undertake a total website overhaul. Committee members along with Libby and Miguel include Travis, John Smallwood, and Dan Varland
- Miguel reminded the Board that the outline for new website focusing on enhancing its visual appearance and providing more information to visitors was approved in a past e-agenda
- Libby indicated that we must determine how our website is being used now, and this will guide how we want to address rebuilding it. Marketing specialists indicate that typically, a website has 5 sec to grab someone's attention. What do we want them to do? Buy the journal? Come to our conference? Become members? Who are audiences in future? Students? Researchers?
- Libby provided some statistics from our webhosting server. Our current webhosting server costs about \$100/yr. Our website receives 1500 - 2000 hits from new IP addresses per month. Most people who get to our website come from search engines or mostly from other ornithology-related websites. Many people are accessing information about our annual meeting.
- Regarding relevant search phrases, we have no competition for 'raptor research' so that is beneficial.
- RRF does have a Facebook site – (currently 750+ 'friends') - many of our Facebook friends are international as well as from North America

Ideas for new website:

- We need to make information accessible quickly with not too many clicks or scrolls required.
- We need to be able to obtain information about from which page visitors enter our website, if they stayed there, and what they looked at.
- We should include information that will trigger membership. Can we provide member benefits, but some were concerned that this would involve running a web store.
- Laurie reminded us that we need to be sure RRF web managers can access and manipulate and maintain the site as needed and not get locked into a structure that will not allow that. We might go with a fancy website; the constant updating for this would be done by the support group but our own

web managers would do the updating of essential RRF information. For example, individual privileges would be given as needed for updating committees, Wingspan, etc.

- Jemima suggested that if a goal is to promote education and conservation we must think flash for our new website.

Discussion regarding proposed expenditure for website overhaul.

- Most board members agreed that we need a marketing person to do this job, for the website to be most effective.
- Jim Bednarz reminded us that potential members are probably those already engaged in raptor activities, so they need a functional rather than a flashy website.
- Ruth suggested that most people would come to website to get information about raptors. We are not necessarily drawing people in just to become members -- they want reliable information.
- Libby recommended that committee chairs should be responsible for their own web page content.
- Libby indicated that for the proposed cost (\$5K - \$9K) mostly we will get improved marketing. She recommended a budget for the website overhaul of \$8K

Motion by Clint Boal -- to provide the web committee with the operational framework to solicit website development based on Angela's recommendation that our operating budget can provide up to \$8K
Gary Santolo 2nd.

Vote was deferred until we examine the proposed 2011 budget later in the meeting

VII. RRF Communications

A. Video Conferencing -- Miguel Sagesse

- Miguel outlined what this is and does and indicated that many organizations, including his, use video conferencing today because it allows face to face contact during discussions. Perhaps the election issues would have been resolved more satisfactorily if we had done this.
- Cost would be \$225 per month when we use the service; if we don't use it for a month we keep our account on hold for \$15 per month. Calls could include all board and officers, up to 16 people.
- Ruth was concerned regarding issues with people living in different time zones. What happens if a director can't make the call time and there is a vote, that director misses out. This would be unfair for a person who can't make meeting. Bylaws said we should have provision for directors who can't make a meeting to vote, and we currently don't have this.
- Gary Santolo suggested this type of conferencing can be used to discuss issues and not necessarily just for voting.
- Apparently we could bring people in who cannot attend board meeting, on a computer, with this service? This type of conferencing would be helpful for our annual meeting, if people can dial up even for part of the day.
- An advantage of using video conferencing over Skype is that Skype cannot load documents or PowerPoint presentations. Skype also has limitations on the number of people participating, maybe 9.
- A Straw poll vote was taken to gauge interest: Those interested in pursuing further information 8 or 9; Against 3. The Board recommended that if we identify a need we can revisit this issue.

B. Google Groups -- Libby Mojica

- Libby suggested we investigate using Google Groups, which would be good for e-mail blasts, uploading and storing files, although she is not willing to be the support person for this. However this service is free and easy to use.
- Ruth expressed concern regarding confidentiality - it is likely that some information on this Group would have to be sanitized to remove sensitive material or names or issues.
- Libby indicated the Group could include separate lists for officers, directors, committee members, etc.

- Ruth supported the idea and agreed to administer a Group for the initial period then in the future we nominate someone specifically for the role of Group moderator.
- No vote was needed, everybody supported establishing a Group; Libby and Ruth agreed to talk about setting up a Group after this meeting.

C. Membership -- Joan Morrison

- During the past year there have been issues regarding how to find people who have out of date e-mail or other contact information, or who don't get copies of OSNA or RRF material, including the journal
- Everyone must be sure their contact information is updated and they should do this when they renew their annual membership
- Cheryl said we can put a paper insert into the Journal once a year to remind people to update their contact information and that they can opt out of receiving the hardcopy of the Journal, if they wish.

VIII. Early Career Raptor Researchers -- Travis Booms

- This group indicated they want to explore ways in which ECRR can obtain more resources, mostly funding to be used at the annual conference. The following options were brought up:
 - 1) Fundraiser at conference - auction, etc.
 - 2) Solicit donations from businesses
 - 3) Annual conference registrants check off a box and contribute during the conference registration process
 - 4) Assess a specific fee as part of conference registration cost
 - 5) The Board can provide money from the operating budget each year as additional dollars for student support at the conference.
- The ECRR proposed increasing student travel award funds. Funds provided by RRF to students to defray conference expenses is 23-25%; this is low compared to other OSNA societies. Of most concern to students was disparity of RRF compared to other OSNA organizations in terms of travel awards. RRF gives \$500 for travel, and other societies provide up to \$5K
- Mainly the group wants guidance and direction on ways to raise funds and to obtain support for students at conferences, mostly travel support to conferences. One way to get more students to annual meeting is offer more awards. Students apparently listed travel grants as a priority for additional funding. We should make our Koplín award better known and it should offer more money.
- Some board members felt that additional funds provided to ECRR should be used for education and training. Workshops would be a good way to expose students to techniques for capturing and handling raptors, thus extra funds might be better spent on a workshop that would reach more students. However, if we want to get more students to come to meetings and retain them as members, we should try to increase the number of students who come to meetings.
- Mainly we could increase the amount available for the Koplín award, or make more than 1 Koplín award. There are really no options for creating new awards.
- Angela indicated that we could increase the Koplín award by \$1000. This is conservative but it can be done given how endowment has performed lately.
- Travis indicated that more students would apply for the travel awards if they know there are more of them, so 2 more at \$500 each would be preferred.
- Other options for fundraising: students could have a single item in the auction that would benefit ECRR, however this would take legwork by the conference committee to find an item and to coordinate the flow of funding.
- Perhaps we should put a check off box on the annual membership form so people could contribute directly to ECRR.
- Mike Collopy suggested we increase the number of Koplín awards from 1 to 3 per year, at \$500 each, and make this permanent.

- Angela said that if we follow the rule indicating that we spend annually no more than 4.5% of the endowment, the extra \$1000 will be available since we don't quite use all of it year after year. If we have a bad year and we are unable to take the 4.5%, awards won't be given out anyway.

Action Items for ECRR

- write a piece for Wingspan about the Koplín awards.
- If students think a workshop at the next annual meeting is a good idea, they can present additional funding ideas to the board. Board members agreed these ideas should be creative professional activities and not just social events, and these activities should be directly tied to the meeting activities.

IX. Awards Committee -- Clint Boal

Winners of the 2010 awards:

2010 Stephen R. Tully Memorial Grant

Recipient: Scolasticah Ndegwa

Project: Distribution and population size of Martial Eagle *Polemaetus bellicosus* in Kakamega Forest-Kenya.

2010 Dean Amadon Grant

Recipient: Todd Whiklo

Project: Nest structure and breeding habitat characteristics of Barred Owls (*Strix varia*) in Manitoba.

2010 James R. Koplín Student Travel Award

Recipient: Romeo Tinajero

Project: Raptors in desert scrub

2010 Fran & Frederick Hamerstrom Award

Recipient: Keith Bildstein

2010 Leslie Brown Memorial Grant

Recipient: Allai Orimba

Project: The distribution and abundance of the locally threatened Banded Snake Eagle *Circaetus cinerascens* in Lake Victoria region.

2010 William C. Anderson Student Poster Award

Recipient: Elizabeth Wommack

Poster: Examination of clinal patterns of black and white tail coloration for male American Kestrels (*Falco sparverius*) across the North American Continent.

Honorable mention: Chris Briggs and Matthew Boggie

2010 William C. Anderson Student Paper Award

Recipient: Joseph Barnes

Project: Call-broadcast surveys as an effective tool for detecting breeding Peregrine Falcons (*Falco peregrinus*).

Honorable mention: Joseph Barnes and Jessi Brown.

- Jeff Marks contacted Clint about establishing a memorial award for Carl Marti. There has been no decision reached.
- Clint advocates changing the submission deadline for all awards to be the abstract deadline for our annual conference. Standardization would streamline management of our awards.

- Jim Bednarz proposed a change in the Anderson paper award that he feels would make it more prestigious for the money. After the plenary talk, students who have applied for the Anderson award all present their papers sequentially in the same session. Thus, the entire RRF membership watches these papers. A change in requirements would be that students would have to submit a more extended abstract with their application, which makes the award more prestigious.
- Jim said he doesn't think there needs to be board action on this, that the scientific program chair can just make the changes.
- Clint said we should be consistent with the proposal and how we carry out the change. If there are a lot of student applicants only the cream of the crop gets to present in that limited time period.
- Annually, 15 or 16 students contribute abstracts but most are not suitable for the award. This change would require us to be more selective in how we choose papers to compete for this award. Awards committee would examine the extended abstracts and decide which papers would be presented in that special session.
- Item of discussion -- should only RRF members be on the awards committee? Currently this is not the case. Many directors agreed but Clint requested a Board vote since this would change the Awards committee policy. There was some discussion about whether this should be policy for all standing committees.

Motion by Jim Bednarz -- For any standing committee, all committee members must be RRF members.

Mike Kochert second

For 9

Against 1

Abstain 0

Motion passed.

X. Conference committee -- Libby Mojica

- 2010 conference will be really good; over 250 people are registered already. Great local committee should be acknowledged for all their hard work
- 2011 - Duluth, MN. co-sponsors are Hawkridge Bird Observatory, Univ. of Minnesota at Duluth, and the local Audubon society. Local committee chair has already hosted a HMANA meeting this year so our conference should be easy for her.
- 2011 Finland conference has been cancelled.
- 2012 - NAOC Vancouver. Big drive by big groups. There is some concern about RRF participation and how much involvement will we get. We want to be sure RRF has strong presence. The meeting will be on the UBC campus so we will be in dorms so the meeting must be held before school starts.
 - So far, RRF is not able to participate on the scientific program committee. Libby was assigned to the student committee, by the overall steering committee.
 - 2 items of leverage - One item that improves our leverage to request participation is the \$10K that we contribute and also the fact that RRF has so far participated in the Strengthening Ornithology initiative.
 - If RRF has a good presence at the meeting it is not so important to have presence on the scientific committee. But symposia are different, RRF should put on a symposium to attract interest and further entice our members to attend the conference.
 - Jim Bednarz suggested that RRF should present our awards separately, although at these combined meetings awards are usually combined. He also recommended that we make another appeal to get someone on the scientific committee.

- 2013 - Bariloche, Argentina. Miguel. Proposed dates of Oct 22-25 but not finalized.
 - This time is not a high season for tourism so should be good for our meeting.
 - The host organization is the local university. We might also work with the Neotropical raptor network, and the World Working Group
 - Final proposal should be submitted for Board approval by the end of 2010.
 - We might need to provide a larger amount for seed money for this meeting.
 - Angela reminded us that if seed money needs to be over \$2000, then the Board needs to know and maybe vote on this proposal. This information should be available by the board meeting of 2012.
- Some members have complained that RRF's annual meetings conflict with migration research. But this conversation has occurred for many years, it will always conflict with someone's research. Complainers should volunteer to host a meeting.

XI. Membership Committee -- Ted Swem

- Ted present a figure showing our membership trend over past 15 years. Compared to NAOC, our membership has decreased similar to that of other organizations. Our 2010 membership will end up about same as last year.
- Membership turnover is high, so we have to pick up 120-130 new members each year. But that is just to break even.
- This past year we were able to coordinate much better with OSNA, and some problems were resolved. They are now sending a monthly membership list to Ruth and Joan (or new secretary); this list can be sorted by country so we can evaluate our membership composition. Board members should personally lobby people who are not members and get them to join
- We need to include a section on member benefits on our website. This includes providing an option for members to get only an electronic copy of journal
- Board members agreed that the membership committee needs to be reactivated, particularly to tap international members, where most of our growth potential exists.

XII. Finance Committee -- Mike Collopy

- The revised investment principles were accepted via e-agenda #2 for 2010.

XIII. Conservation Committee -- Ruth Tingay, Joan Morrison

- Discussions as to how to restructure this committee began at the 2009 meeting. An identified goal was to make the committee more global.
- This committee has had important influence in the past, for example related to delisting of the Peregrine Falcon and Bald Eagle. RRF's input to the responsible agencies was valuable and respected by the agencies and others involved. Our role is to provide scientifically based input during comment periods.
- Following discussions with Ruth, Rick Watson and Joan Morrison agreed to co-chair this committee. Joan will step down as Secretary and also as an Associate Editor, to assume this new responsibility.

Subsequent discussion of what RRF's role in conservation issues should be included:

- What type of decision space is there and can we really have a place in commenting on an issue?
- How are issues prioritized and how are they evaluated as to whether our input might have an impact.
- Who identifies issues that are important in a particular region? Who would bring these issues to the table?
- Proactive approaches are needed and science must be the driving focus of our input.
- A proposed model would include regional working groups with respective representatives
- Board members should also keep an ear to the ground and bring issues to the co-chairs.
- Should subcommittees or regional members be RRF members given what was said earlier about membership of committee members?

- We should publicize conservation programs that are ongoing now. Libby said these programs can be posted on the website
- Committee members must not to go outside the committee and off on their own, responding to issues.
- Since RRF is not well known outside of North America, we should identify contacts with other international groups
- CC guidelines, which currently are dated 2004, must be revisited and likely revised.
- Care must be given as to whether we recommend action or provide scientific information. Most important would be to identify data gaps. For example, recommendations were made regarding Bald Eagle monitoring, during the delisting process, because data gaps were identified.
- We need a transition plan for secretary if Joan takes over as CC co-chair.

Other issues for the Conservation Committee

- Jim Bednarz provided update on the Barred Owl proposed experimental removal that had been brought up in DFV#1_November 2009. Rocky Gutierrez had been the representative from AOU, but communications stopped and no further information is available. The issue is on hold for now.
- Carol McIntyre and Travis Booms brought forward a proposal from the Alaska Raptor Group regarding the status of the Short-eared Owl (SEOW).
 - Alaska Raptor Group is a sub-group of Boreal Partners in Flight. This letter from them expresses concern about status of the owl, stating that survey data indicate a decline. The letter asked the RRF to provide guidance on this issue.
 - Travis reminded the Board that there was a special symposium on SEOW at the 2008 meeting in Missoula, papers were presented in the morning session on Friday Sept. 26, 2008. Apparently there are ongoing projects focused on the species and it seems to be declining, but its status is unclear. Is there a problem and if so, what should be done.
 - Carol and Travis sit on the board of the ARG. They suggested formation of an ad hoc committee to prepare a white paper or other report on situation of this owl to help publicize the issue.
 - What should be done given that at this time we have no CC? The Board felt we should go back to Travis and others to gather further information and perhaps eventually write a white paper.
 - Torgier pointed out that the SEOW is circumpolar and asked whether anyone has been in touch with others working on the species outside of North America. He said that problems of the owl alluded to in the letter seem similar to apparent problems with the Snowy Owl, which has also been declining.
- Ruth said we should wait until we have a functional CC in place to deal with such issues, but suggested that the Board might designate someone to chair a subgroup to deal with North American issues like this one in the interim.
- Jim Bednarz offered to serve as interim CC chair on North American issues but no action was taken
- Travis said he would be willing to wait for a CC to be formed before this SEOW issue is dealt with.
- Mike Collopy also supported the idea of waiting until the CC is reformed before addressing this issue, as it is not really all that old. He supports the idea of preparing a white paper on this issue, indicating that RRF had prepared such papers before and they had impacts.
- Angela reminded the Board that addressing these issues takes a lot of time, so if people ask for conservation issues to be addressed, those people should be willing to contribute their time as well to efforts associated with an RRF response. This will save committee time. Also, people who bring forth issues should convince the CC as to why an issue is important. We should not expect the CC to do research to determine whether or not it is appropriate for RRF to respond.
- Mike Collopy said that in the past, the CC chair approached people who had expertise in a related area to write the letters and white papers.

XIV. OSNA business -- Ruth Tingay

- We had much better communication with them this year, which included Joan's participation in quarterly conference calls with members of all other societies.
- Jim Bednarz and Miguel Sagesse reported on the meeting they attended as part of the Strengthening Ornithology initiative
 - Focus: Should all ornithological organizations combine or remain separate? What are areas in which we can work together as societies? Only Cooper Ornithological Society is really pushing combining all societies.
 - Consensus is that all organizations could have joint committees to address particular topics; for example, standardizing journal formats. Most attendees felt that all groups would be involved in decisions. Committees would address conferences, publications, membership decline.
 - Given this interest in society cooperation, it is disturbing that NAOC has thus far rejected our participation on the scientific committee for the 2012 meeting.
 - Contribution to this initiative should be proportional to each society's membership.
- How does the proposed federation (combined societies) differ from OSNA? Currently, OSNA is just for maintaining membership. The new federation would have more joint initiatives. OSNA cannot deal with the low membership problem, for example, but the federation would.
- Ruth indicated that the Board needed to agree to an amount to contribute to this initiative. She reminded the board that the Strengthening Ornithology organizing committee suggested each society provide support equaling \$400/yr over 2 yrs. Also we need to identify members who can participate on the steering committee, the publications committee, and on the meetings committee as these committees will be meeting in the near future.

Motion by Jim Bednarz -- to participate further in this exercise and to give the steering committee \$400 per year for 2 years.

For 7

Against 0

Abstain 0

Motion passed

- Jim Bednarz and Miguel Sagesse agreed to represent RRF on the steering committee
- Cheryl said she would be willing to participate on the publications committee, but might need travel funds
- Libby would participate on the meetings committee. Libby was nominated in her absence – she has since declined and we are seeking another volunteer.
- Mike Collopy indicated that this is an important planning exercise so we would be advised to participate.

XV. Techniques Manual -- David Bird

- David presented some history of the manual. It was published in 2008 by David Hancock using around \$40-\$50K of his personal funds plus \$5000 contributed by Swarovski. Approximately 5000 were printed but only about 1000 were sold, thus David Hancock's publishing company is in serious trouble now.
- David Hancock has 4000 books in his warehouse and wants to get rid of them; some will be available for sale at this meeting and Keith and David will sign some of these copies
- Spanish copy is ready to go, translation was guided by Miguel Sagesse and Miguel Ferrer, but nobody is available to publish a hard copy at this time. Apparently there is Japanese copy of the manual most likely prepared by Toru Yamazaki. No one knows who published it, however, or where it is available.
- David Hancock proposes selling hardcopies of the manual for \$30, via the web, which won't make any money for RRF. He also wishes to market the manual as an e-book and sell for \$10 on his website; people can purchase then download it. Carol said there are parts available for free on the web already

but this was not verified. David Hancock does want to support RRF so he sees his website as way to promote selling the manual. If people go to David Hancock's website they can download the manual as an e-book, along with other raptor books. This might help promote RRF and might even sell hard copies of the manual.

- David Bird suggested that David Hancock knows the publishing business well and he also knows raptor people, so we should just let him take care of this the way he wishes.
- Questions were raised regarding who is the holder of the manual's copyright? Apparently David Hancock does, so if a Japanese translation has been published and sold without RRF's logo, this is copyright issue.
- Mike Collopy said that linking the manual to our own website and making it available for purchase there would help energize our website, and expressed concern that sending people to David Hancock's website from the RRF site is counterproductive to our organization. Mike believes we should sell the manual from our own website.
- Some people suggested that single chapters should be available for download as not everyone wants the entire manual. Mike Collopy suggested we work with David Hancock so he can get what he needs, but we should also get something that will help us, on our own website. Both Spanish and English versions should be available for sale via download off the RRF website.
- Miguel indicated that the translation was a lot of work and we need to reimburse the people who did the translation. They also should be acknowledged on our website.
- Angela reminded the Board that everyone had agreed that 10% from each book sold should go to RRF; should we agree to continue this? Board members agreed we should continue to get the 10% as is possible, perhaps these monies can be used to fund more travel awards. There was no formal motion but David Bird received feedback indicating that we should let David Hancock do what he needs to do with the manual. He can establish the e-book and we can put the pdf of the manual on our website for free. But someone must look into copyright issues.
- Update – discussions followed the Board meeting between Ruth Tingay & David Hancock, with intermittent input from David Bird & Keith Bildstein (the book's editors). The upshot is that David Hancock has refused, under any circumstances, to allow RRF to post the free PDFs on the RRF website. As RRF apparently signed over the rights to Hancock several years ago, Hancock is entitled to take this position. The Board has since expressed its disappointment with this outcome.

XVI. Finalize and Approve 2011 Budget -- Angela Matz

Expenses:

- Budget endowment adjustment of \$6K to reimburse operating budget for awards
- Expenses from operating budget include \$400 for Strengthening Ornithology initiative plus \$500 to Ornithological Council, totaling \$900
- Dropped postage from \$500 to \$100
- Do we have funds for purchasing new RRF pins? Carol volunteers to contact Jim Fitzpatrick about pins; Jemima will look into getting new ones. Angela will e-mail Jim's contact information to Jemima so she can ask him where the pins have been obtained in the past

Motion: Jim Bednarz proposed supporting ECRR by including a \$500 budget line item to use each year.

Mike Collopy 2nd

Discussion - Clint said this sends a clear message to the group that the Board is willing to support them, now they need to give us their proposal about how the funds will be used.

Mike Collopy opposed giving them "fun" money. Money given to ECRR should be for a professional development activity not social activity. They should present a specific proposal to the Board prior to disbursement of funds. This proposal would be reviewed and voted on by the Board.

Ted - supporting this motion would send the message to the group that the Board heard their request, we responded by increasing the Koplin award amount (by \$1000 for 2 more awards), and we are responding in a second way: we will accept your proposal for the additional \$500.

For 10

Against 0

Abstain 0

Motion passed

Motion to approve 2011 budget - Mike Kochert

Gary 2nd

For 11

Against 0

Abstain 0

Motion passed.

XVII. Other Business -- Ruth Tingay

- NABC - Buzz Hall was not present at the board meeting but Laurie said he will be at the conference and he will meet with Jim Bednarz, who is the NABC alternate; there will be work upcoming on revising the banding manual. The original raptor banding manual was written by Pete Bloom and Buzz Hull several years ago.
- Suggested a new award, the President's award. This would not be a financial award but in the form of a certificate presented annually at the conference banquet to someone who has given exceptional service to RRF over the past year. This would begin at the 2010 conference.
- Mike Kochert reminded everyone that historically we have had this award; it is discretionary, at the will of the President. He fully supports the award.

Meeting adjourned 1650.

Respectfully submitted,
Joan L. Morrison, Secretary