



# W · I · N · G · S · P · A · N

VOLUME 10 NO. 2

SEPTEMBER 2001

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Friends and Colleagues,

I find it hard to believe that this is my last President's message. When I reflect on the past four years, I see many strides made by the Raptor Research Foundation. Before I begin reminiscing, I wish to thank the officers, Board of Directors, committee members and you, the membership, for your commitment and support during my four years as President.

RRF continued to expand in professional standing and prominence. We are respected by our fellow professional organizations, much due to the quality of *The Journal of Raptor Research* and our approach to addressing conservation issues as a professional organization. We addressed conservation issues throughout the world in a proficient and informed manner, thanks to Jim Bednarz, former Conservation Chair, and concerned members who alerted us to issues. *The Journal of Raptor Research* continued to improve much due to the diligent efforts of out-going Editor-in-chief Marc Bechard and his editorial assistants Keleigh Hauge-Bechard and Joan Clark. The Journal took on a new and professional look in 2000, and the quality of papers steadily appreciates. It is truly an international journal with each issue featuring numerous articles from around the globe. We transferred editorship to Jim Bednarz with the 3rd issue of Volume 35 (2001). I am confident that Jim will continue the Journal's high standard of excellence. We grew and diversified globally. One of our more significant endeavors during the last four years was to establish a structure to formally organize RRF in Eurasia. The ad hoc committee charged to develop an approach for overseeing and managing RRF activities in Eurasia did a superb job of laying the foundation for RRF in Eurasia and weaving it into the RRF organizational structure. RRF has numerous energetic members in Eurasia, eager to organize RRF in that corner of the world. This enthusiasm was demonstrated at the first three Eurasian RRF conferences in Canterbury, England in 1993; Urbino, Italy in 1996; and Mikoluv, Czech Republic in 1999. This momentum will continue at the fourth Eurasian conference in Sevilla, Spain in late September. Interest is widespread throughout Eurasia in holding RRF meetings there at least biannually and perhaps annually. RRF also demonstrated its global nature by cosponsoring the Raptors 2000 conference with the World Working Group for Birds of Prey in Israel in 2000 and the Owls 2000 conference in Australia.

My term as President ends at the close of the year, and I will pass the gavel to Brian Millsap following our annual meeting in Winnipeg. As with many who leave office, I have not accomplished all my term goals. I intend not to be a stranger and to work closely with Brian as an active Past-president to achieve those goals. RRF has evolved substantially since its beginnings in 1966, and I am privileged to have been a part of that evolution during the past 30 years. RRF is truly a family; I am honored to be part of that family and to have known and worked with so many outstanding people. Thank you for the opportunity to have served as your President. I look forward to being actively involved with RRF for the next three decades and hope to see you in Winnipeg and at many future meetings.

Mike



## COURT UPHOLDS U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE DECISION NOT TO LIST NORTHERN GOSHAWK

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) decision not to list the Northern Goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) as a threatened or endangered species has been upheld by a federal judge, who found that USFWS's decision was not arbitrary and capricious. In a ruling issued June 28, 2001, U.S. District Court Judge Helen J. Frye said, "there is ample evidence in the administrative record" to support USFWS's decision that listing of the Northern Goshawk in the contiguous United States, west of the 100<sup>th</sup> meridian, is not warranted because available information does not indicate that this population is in danger of extinction or likely to become so in the foreseeable future. "This court has found that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service collected the available information, considered all relevant factors and made a reasoned decision based upon credible, substantial evidence in the record," Judge Frye wrote in her opinion. USFWS based its decision not to list the Northern Goshawk on a review of existing data and the findings of a status review team of nine biologists. The team sent its draft status review information to 99 state, tribal, and federal agency biologists, and to 13 goshawk researchers to review the analytical methods and approach used by USFWS. The status review team found that it was not possible to determine whether goshawk population numbers in the review area are stable, increasing, or decreasing, but concluded that the distribution of breeding goshawks in the West did not appear to have changed from the historical range. Based on available information, USFWS also found that the Northern Goshawk is a "forest habitat generalist" and is not dependent solely on old-growth forests. Judge Frye found "significant studies in the administrative record that support this finding." Judge Frye also ruled that it was not improper for USFWS to include two U.S. Forest Service employees on the status review team because national forest land accounts for much of the goshawk's habitat in the western United States. The case was brought against USFWS on Feb. 25, 1999 by the Center for Biological Diversity and 18 other organizations, which claimed that USFWS's decision not to list the Northern Goshawk was arbitrary and capricious. The plaintiffs had petitioned USFWS in 1991 to list the Northern Goshawk for protection under the Endangered Species Act. Judge Frye's opinion may be viewed at [http://pacific.fws.gov/news/pdf/Frye\\_SJ\\_opinion.pdf](http://pacific.fws.gov/news/pdf/Frye_SJ_opinion.pdf).

### THE RAPTOR RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

(FOUNDED 1966)

#### OFFICERS

PRESIDENT: Michael N. Kochert  
PRESIDENT-ELECT: Brian A. Millsap  
VICE-PRESIDENT: Keith L. Bildstein

SECRETARY: Patricia A. Hall  
TREASURER: Jim Fitzpatrick

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

INTERNATIONAL DIRECTOR #1: Eduardo Inigo-Elias  
INTERNATIONAL DIRECTOR #2: Ricardo Rodriguez Estrella  
INTERNATIONAL DIRECTOR #3: Beatriz Arroyo  
NORTH AMERICAN DIRECTOR #1: Phillip Detrich  
NORTH AMERICAN DIRECTOR #2: Laurie Goodrich  
NORTH AMERICAN DIRECTOR #3: Robert N. Lehman

DIRECTOR AT LARGE #1: Jemima Parry-Jones  
DIRECTOR AT LARGE #2: Petra Bohall Wood  
DIRECTOR AT LARGE #3: Michael W. Collopy  
DIRECTOR AT LARGE #4: Miguel Ferrer  
DIRECTOR AT LARGE #5: Robert Rosenfield  
DIRECTOR AT LARGE #6: Brian A. Millsap

*Wingspan* is distributed twice a year to all RRF members. It is also available to non-members for a subscription rate of \$10 per year. *The Journal of Raptor Research* (ISSN 0892-1016) is published quarterly and available to individuals for \$33 per year (\$18 per year for students) and to libraries and institutions for \$50 per year from: Ornithological Societies of North America, P.O. Box 1897, Lawrence, KS 66044 USA. Add \$5 for destinations outside of the continental United States. Individual and student memberships renewed before November 15 are \$30 and \$15, respectively. Persons interested in predatory birds are invited to join The Raptor Research Foundation, Inc. Send requests for information concerning membership, subscriptions, special publications, or change of address to: Ornithological Societies of North America, P.O. Box 1897, Lawrence, KS 66044 USA.

---

*(Editor's note: Following are RRF President Mike Kochert's Charge to the RRF ad hoc Eurasian Committee, and two reports the committee was charged to produce. For presentation in Wingspan, the reports have been edited to eliminate two areas of overlap: 1) recommendations on how travel funds should be allotted are removed from the end of the first report--these are repeated, almost verbatim, in the second report, and 2) restatement of Task 2 in the Charge is removed from the second report, as noted. Additionally, a graphic in the second report illustrating organizational relationships is omitted.)*

## THE CHARGE OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EURASIA

The ad hoc committee will develop procedures for expanding and managing activities of the Raptor Research Foundation, Inc. (RRF) in Eurasia. The committee will recommend short- and long-term approaches to accommodate the needs for achieving RRF's mission in Eurasia. The committee will address needs in at least four broad categories: conservation, meetings, information transfer (*The Journal of Raptor Research* and *Wingspan*), and membership. The committee will accomplish its goals through two major tasks.

*Task 1.* For the short-term, the ad hoc committee will recommend means that can be immediately implemented to accommodate RRF's needs in Eurasia. The committee will explore ways to accomplish this goal within RRF's committee structure. It will assess whether the short-term approach is best accomplished by co-chairs of existing committees, subcommittees of existing committees, separate standing committees, subcommittees under a Eurasian committee chair, or by other means. The ad hoc committee shall deliver by 30 April 2000 a brief interim report that recommends short-term approaches and names of individuals who could serve as committee or subcommittee chairs.

*Task 2.* The ad hoc Eurasian committee will recommend a permanent structure for RRF in Eurasia. It will recommend organization and protocol for administering RRF functions in Eurasia and will address the committee vs. chapter concept. The ad hoc committee will describe the functions of the group charged with administering and coordinating activities in Eurasia (hereafter called the Eurasian group), and it will recommend composition of the Eurasian group (e.g., chair, conferences coordinator, conservation coordinator, etc.). The committee will address the process of selection/election of individuals to serve on the Eurasian group and the tenure of those individuals. The ad hoc committee will recommend procedures for oversight of the Eurasian group and how this group will relate to and function with the RRF Board of Directors. The committee will recommend procedures for managing finances generated from Eurasian meetings and other activities in Eurasia and how this will relate to the RRF Treasurer. The ad hoc committee shall determine whether the new recommended structure will fit within the existing RRF organization or whether restructuring of the Board or any revisions of the RRF By Laws are necessary.

The ad hoc Eurasian committee will use its recommendations for Eurasia as a model for coordinating achieving RRF's mission in other global regions. It will recommend any other global regions where this concept may be applied. The committee will if possible deliver a report to the President by 30 August 2000. The report will be subsequently sent to the RRF Board and general membership. The report will recommend long-term approaches to managing RRF activities in Eurasia. It will also recommend any necessary restructuring of the Board or changes in the RRF By Laws.

## REPORT TO RRF PRESIDENT MIKE KOCHERT

30 April 2000

by the members of the Eurasian Ad Hoc Committee  
(Beatrice Arroyo; Keith Bildstein; Mike Collopy; Robert Kenward, co-chair;  
Brian Millsap, co-chair; and Jemima Parry-Jones)

### ***Task 1. Recommendation of means to immediately accommodate RRF's needs in Eurasia.***

The following constitutes the Eurasian ad hoc committee's submission with regard to task 1 of the committee's charge. This recommendation was formulated via several e-mail exchanges among all the committee members, and a committee meeting held 5 April 2000 in Eilat, Israel. Committee members Beatrice Arroyo, Keith Bildstein, Robert Kenward, and Jemima Parry-Jones attended the Eilat meeting.

1. It was decided that in the short term, the organizing group for Eurasia should be called the RRF Eurasian Committee (RRFEC).

2. There were concerns at the outset about the risk of a Eurasian group splitting RRF. No one wished that. Indeed, the task set by President Mike Kochert saw the establishment of a successful Eurasian group as a precursor to formation of other cohesive regional groups. To address this concern, we recommend three cohesion mechanisms:

(i) In the short term, the Eurasian chair (approved by the Board) would co-chair the RRFEC with a North American board member, who would provide guidance and transfer wisdom.

(ii) Introduce a regional structure into some existing RRF Committees, such as the RRF Conference Committee, Conservation Committee, Membership Committee, and possible similar committees to encourage global development of input to *Wingspan* and *The Journal of Raptor Research*. As well as operating within their regional committee (e.g., RRFEC), regional representatives would serve as liaison with the chair of the appropriate RRF Committee. The cross-regional links would also provide experience to regional representatives, and give the RRF committee chair knowledge of regional potential that might eventually be tapped centrally (further explanation at end)\*

(iii) If needed, all members of the RRF Board of Directors could apply for funding, up to a limit defined by the Board, for attending out-of-region AGMs (annual general business meetings). This would reduce the administration and embarrassment of individual applications to the board. This fund would contribute to travel costs but not cover them in full, and would apply equally to Eurasians going to North America and to North Americans if there were eventually AGMs elsewhere (further explanation at end). The need for added funding will make it important for future RRF meetings in Eurasia to be profitable for RRF and not just for local organizations.

3. A component of our charge under task 1 was to identify individuals that could serve as committee chairs, co-chairs, or liaisons with existing RRF committees. The following are our recommendations (who have agreed to serve if appointed):

(i) Conferences (solicit and coordinate conference planning and implementation, liaison with Conferences Committee chair) - Jemima Parry-Jones

- (ii) *Wingspan* (collect material, liaison with *Wingspan* Editor) - Eugene Potapov
- (iii) Eurasian Conservation issues (collect information and liaison with Conservation Committee chair, ideally as a member of the standing Conservation Committee) - Steven Redpath
- (iv) Membership (solicit new members, track membership and encourage renewals) - an eastern representative could encourage recruitment through a joint-membership system (up to four sharing a subscription, with equal validity for reduced meeting fees but only one vote), and keep an accurate Eurasian list (including only the one lead-member to receive TJRR and *Wingspan* for each joint-member-group) for transfer to OSNA. We are approaching Yevgeny Shergalin, with Mikael Romanov as reserve candidate. We envision that membership problems would be handled by the RRFEC chair.

4. Meetings. Although there were already offers for 2001 (Spain) and 2002 (Poland), there was recognition of concern that North American participation in Eurasian meetings might be reducing numbers at annual business meetings. Emphasis should be on quality Eurasian conferences, ideally at 2-year intervals. However, in view of the difficulty in getting to meetings in the west for our important recruits in the east, we should not turn down offers of eastern meetings that are likely to be well organized. There would continue to be only one annual business meeting, held in North America unless RRF members later voted to rotate between regions.

5. It is crucial that the meeting planned for September 2001 proceed smoothly. This meeting should be attractive enough to help prove that RRFEC is a useful creation, as well as to demonstrate the common points of interest between American and Eurasian members that encourage group cohesion.

6. At Keith Bildstein's suggestion, these proposals should be put to the RRF Board for a straw-vote (proceed/not) for the short-term development of RRFEC. The ad hoc committee will proceed to develop proposals for the medium term.

\*Further explanation of cross-regional committees - It is important to separate conceptually RRF's Board of Directors and existing committees from the proposed new regional committees such as, in this case, the potential RRFEC. Existing standing committees and sub-committees are usually (but not always) chaired by an RRF Board member, who answers to the RRF President. If you like, those committees are horizontal branches coming off a vertical main trunk, which is the Board. The "cross regional" suggestion is that some members of certain committees (e.g. membership, conservation) should be tied to the regions. A person would be appointed (later, regionally elected) to RRFEC to handle conservation, and thus automatically become part of the RRF Conservation Committee. The person then has dual loyalty and communications (1) to the Conservation Committee chair and hence to the main Board, and (2) to the RRFEC chair(s), and again the main Board. This cross-linkage should counter any tendency to split that results, say, from the RRFEC local chair diverging from the board. If you like, the regional committees serve as extra vertical supports tied to the branches that become extended through globalization. Such a structure can be formalized in the by-laws, or operated informally at least initially. It represents the sort of matrix management that is used by some international companies.

*(See the committee's second report, below, for recommendations on how travel funds should be allotted.)*

**SECOND REPORT OF THE RRF EURASIA AD HOC COMMITTEE**

In spring of 2000, the Raptor Research Foundation (RRF) President Mike Kochert asked Robert Kenward and Brian Millsap to chair an ad hoc committee to recommend a basis for establishing RRF activities in Europe. The committee consists of Beatrice Arroyo, Keith Bildstein, Mike Collopy, Robert Kenward, Brian Millsap and Jemima Parry-Jones. We completed a first task, of making recommendations for establishment of RRF activities in Eurasia in the short-term, including recommendation for an RRF Eurasian Standing Committee. We are now addressing the second task charged by Mike Kochert to the committee, namely:

*(see Task 2 in the Charge, above)*

The ad hoc Eurasian committee completed its report on the first task by 13 July 2000. The second task was delayed, which permitted a further meeting of committee members at the 2000 RRF meeting in Jonesboro, AR and enabled useful discussion with other Board members. The ad hoc Eurasian Committee decided that the Task 2 report should address an interim experimental approach, to be evaluated after 2 years. In addressing this second task, we also consulted the full potential membership of the Raptor Research Foundation Eurasian Committee (RRFEC), which includes continuing Board member Miguel Ferrer, plus Eugene Potapov (Eurasian information coordinator), Steven Redpath (conservation) and Jevgeni Shergalin (membership). Our aim throughout has been to tap the energy and enthusiasm in Eurasia, by building a structure that has enough autonomy for tasks that are best run by a local team in Eurasia, but remains a functioning part of RRF as a whole for tasks that are best run globally. The challenge is to develop a happy balance of autonomy and links with RRF. We looked at the first task on the basis of the need of RRF as a whole to achieve its main outputs, which are (i) conferences, (ii) *The Journal of Raptor Research*, (iii) *Wingspan* and (iv) expert conservation advice. To achieve these outputs RRF as a whole needs inputs from members (v) and finance (vi). These inputs and outputs are organised by a team of Officers and Board Members run by the President, aided by committees for conferences (i), conservation (iv) and membership (v), with a Treasurer (vi), and editors for TJRR (ii) and *Wingspan* (iii).

***Structure.***

Following acceptance of our Task 1 report by the Board, we have a structure that meets necessary responsibilities at continental level. Initially the RRF Eurasian Committee will be co-chaired by a person from Eurasia and a person from North America. The committee will consist of coordinators for conferences, membership, conservation and information transfer. These coordinators will also be, respectively, on the global standing committees for conferences, membership and conservation. A global information committee might be useful to combine *Wingspan* and web-site issues. The proposed organization creates a matrix structure, but should not hinder management if the role of coordinators is executive only at continental level and primarily consultative at global level. This means that coordinators for meetings, membership, conservation and information act in response to continental requirements and the regional standing committee, but provide an information-link with the global standing committees. This structure should enhance cohesion between continental groups, and also give the Board members who chair global standing committees a knowledge of continental conditions and capabilities (e.g., as future global committee chairs). We also see the continental chair or co-chairs as having a possible role on a committee to help the President with strategic development of RRF. The structure we propose does not require changes to By Laws, because it can be implemented

by appointment of chairs, coordinators and other members to a continental standing committee. This meets short-term need for a structure, with responsibilities allocated to named individuals.

### *Travel.*

We do not recommend provision of a continental treasurer because we do not see a need to complicate existing arrangements, with the proviso that a system is needed to assist funding for travel of regional Board members to Board meetings. If business meetings are held in North America, this benefits primarily Eurasians. However, a similar principle could be applied to all Board members meeting "out of continent," for example to North American Board members if business meetings are eventually held in other continents. We propose as a mechanism that the Board votes a sum for travel from a continental group each year, with the amount dependent on profitability of the previous meeting there, thus providing an incentive for continental groups to arrange profitable meetings. We propose that a maximum amount be stipulated for allocation to any one board member going to an out-of-region annual general business meeting (AGM). Applicants would be expected to take as little of the individual allocation as they can, and ideally none. If too much were requested, the maximum allocation claimable would be reduced to equal shares. All those drawing funds would be named in the accounts with the sum they received. Example: following a very profitable meeting with AGM in North America, which raised US\$9000, RRF members vote to hold the next AGM at a fascinating site in Eurasia. US\$1600 is allocated to the Board travel fund, with maximum allowable by an individual of US\$400. Five of the 10 non-Eurasian board members that will attend wish to claim, but one requires only US\$200. The remaining four claimants would be eligible to share the remaining US\$1400, receiving US\$350 each. We believe that cohesion will be aided (a) by helping continental Board members to attend business meetings and (b) by having continental coordinators on global standing committees for meetings, membership, conservation and news. However, the continental coordinators will only have funding assistance to business meetings if they also happen to be Board members. We assume that, as at present, most business of global standing committees will be done by e-mail.

### *Further development.*

The ad hoc committee did not consider it necessary to create a chapter, nor were we ready to recommend changes to the By Laws for a more permanent structure for RRF in Eurasia or elsewhere. We would like first to see how well RRFEC functions. We note that continental voting may be appropriate in, say 3 years, for non-Board members of continental committees, so the need for an appropriate elective mechanism will need to be addressed in phase 3. Otherwise, a lack of local democracy could be divisive. RRFEC should therefore be encouraged to develop proposals for voting structures that balance local aspirations and central cohesion, while encouraging participation. Cohesion may best be served if one or two continental members are elected globally, perhaps as a new category of Continental Director; however, this would require a By Law change. We therefore pass back the responsibility for recommending By Law changes, with the suggestion that this be addressed again in 2 years time, when the experimental RRFEC structure has been tested. We see no other region that yet has the membership resources appropriate for formation of a similar regional standing committee. We recommend that RRFEC be charged both to build RRF membership in Eurasia (noting the recruitment potential of the Seville meeting), and eventually also to define selection procedures for the RRFEC chair or co-chairs and for coordinators needed to handle meetings, membership, conservation, news and other tasks. We hope that the example of RRFEC will stimulate membership in other regions, at which point Board members might start to identify potential co-chairs and coordinators for appointment of groups like RRFEC in other continents.

---

## REPORT FROM THE ORNITHOLOGICAL COUNCIL TO THE RAPTOR RESEARCH FOUNDATION

### - HIGHLIGHTS -

by David E. Blockstein and Ellen Paul

The Ornithological Council (OC) is pleased to provide the Raptor Research Foundation with an overview of OC's activities over the past year. Presented below are highlights of our major activities and accomplishments. This report is not intended to be comprehensive, but rather to give you an idea of the types of things we do on behalf of ornithology and birds, and how we do it. More complete reports are given in our bimonthly activity summaries.

The activities reported below reflect a significant shift in OC's emphasis. In 1999, the American Ornithologists' Union (AOU) and Cooper Ornithological Society (COS) told OC that they would like to see OC direct more of its efforts to matters affecting ornithology (such as permits) and less time to providing scientific information relevant to bird management and conservation issues. OC has responded to these directives by developing a set of priorities that later developed into two action plans, detailed in our 2000 report to RRF. One focuses on permit issues, and the other on animal welfare issues. OC continues to devote the substantial majority of its resources to permitting and related issues, and to special projects.

OC would like to thank the Raptor Research Foundation for its continuing support. We also thank RRF's representatives on the OC Board--Steve Sheffield and Paul Napier--for their invaluable advice and guidance.

#### *Services to the ornithological community*

##### *Representing ornithology to decision makers - permit issues*

- OC asked the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Office of Migratory Bird Management, to use its new permit tracking system to track permit denials and the reasons for those denials in order to identify problems in policy interpretation or implementation.
- OC investigated the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)/Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service import/transport regulations pertaining to bird specimens and tissues to determine if they could be simplified and streamlined, and is working with USDA officials to discuss the many questions raised by museum-based ornithologists with regard to USDA policies and procedures.
- OC continued to press for completion of long-pending permit regulation revisions and changes in implementation of animal welfare regulations and is beginning to see responses from USFWS, USDA, and university animal care and use committees.
- OC has asked USFWS, Division of Refuges to treat research as a management activity rather than as a "use" of refuges--in most cases. This would exempt research from the very stringent requirements set out for refuge uses in the system's Appropriate Use Policy and Compatibility regulations.
- After consultation with OC Board members and leadership of the North American Banding Council, OC submitted comments to the U.S. Bird Banding Laboratory (BBL) on its proposed changes to banding permit policy and procedure. Further discussions were had with U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) officials and the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior (USDI) regarding the proposed changes.

##### *Representing ornithology to decision makers - animal welfare issues*

- OC provided information to the Canadian Council on Animal Care regarding *Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research*, along with permission to use excerpts from that publication.
- OC reviewed the draft text of the revised euthanasia guidelines developed by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) and submitted comments. We are pleased to announce that the revised



guidelines, released in March, list thoracic compression as a conditionally acceptable method of euthanasia and characterize the technique as rapid and apparently painless. OC also continued its efforts to arrange research into the physiological effects of thoracic compression in order to provide data requested by AVMA and many institutional animal care and use committees.

- OC brought together representatives of the federal agencies that implement the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) and those that issue permits for ornithological research to encourage them to explore how the laws they implement relate to one another and to avoid overlap and duplication in implementation of those laws.
- OC reviewed the proposed revised text of the ARENA Guidebook for Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees and submitted suggestions for changes and additions.
- OC Executive Director Ellen Paul addressed a meeting of institutional animal care and use committee chairs and members regarding *Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research*.
- OC's efforts to become the "voice of scientific ornithology" in dealing with regulatory agencies were rewarded when OC participated in a conference-call with Michael Dunn, USDA Undersecretary for Marketing, who stated that in developing regulations to implement the recent court settlement that would bring rats, mice, and birds under AWA implementation, USDA would likely incorporate professional standards such as OC's *Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research*.
- OC responded to USDA's proposal to develop a definition of the word "distress" as used in animal welfare regulations administered by USDA.

#### *Representing ornithology to decision makers - research capacity and funding issues*

- OC is leading an effort to persuade USGS to seek significant new funding for avian monitoring and research programs, and has worked with federal agencies and budget officials to garner support.
- OC assisted Breeding Biology Research and Monitoring (BBIRD) Director Tom Martin in arranging meetings with federal agencies and a congressional staffer regarding funding for the BBIRD program.
- OC met with USDA Forest Service (USFS), International Programs officials to provide information about various bird research and conservation programs that might benefit from partnership with USFS.
- As a member of the Coalition for Science-based Land Management (CSLM), OC Chair David Blockstein and Executive Director Ellen Paul attended budget briefings, submitted written testimony, and met with members of Congress to encourage increased appropriations for biological and ornithological research.
- David Blockstein and Ellen Paul are key members of an effort by CSLM to prepare an assessment of the scientific research needs of USDI natural resource and land management agencies.
- OC succeeded in helping to persuade Smithsonian Secretary Larry Small to reverse his decision to close the Smithsonian Conservation and Research Center.

#### *Information services to and communication with the ornithological community*

- OC disseminates information to the ornithological community via its website, BIRDNET, on a variety of listservs, and in *Ornithological Newsletter*.
- OC provides information about grants and awards information on BIRDNET, publishes notices about funding opportunities on ornithology listservs, and provides detailed information about specific funding programs to individual ornithologists.
- OC responds to many inquiries and requests for assistance from individual ornithologists, usually pertaining to problems with permits or institutional animal care and use committees, but also on a wide variety of subjects.

#### *Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research*

- Copies of the Spanish translation of *Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research* were provided to the Organization for Tropical Studies. OC has contracted for the translation of *Guidelines to the Use of Wild Birds in Research* into Portuguese; a French translation may soon follow.

#### *Workshops and symposia*

- A half-day symposium on recent litigation, legislation, and regulations affecting avian conservation and

the practice of ornithology, organized by the OC, was presented at the 2001 COS annual meeting.

*Facilitating the policy efforts of the OC member societies and individual ornithologists*

- At the request of COS Resolutions Committee Chair Mark Sogge, OC drafted two resolutions for consideration at the COS 2000 Annual Meeting.
- OC assisted AOU and Waterbird Society conservation committees in organizing a panel to review the Double-Crested Cormorant management plan, which USFWS plans to release for comment next spring.
- OC provided updates on condor releases to the AOU Conservation Committee, which is considering undertaking a scientific review of this program.
- OC worked with the Association for Parrot Conservation to organize a response from parrot biologists to a sustainable use proposal submitted under the Wild Bird Conservation Act.

*Other services to ornithologists and member societies*

- With a grant from USFWS, OC has undertaken a variety of small projects to help develop the capacity of CIPAMEX and the Society of Caribbean Ornithology (SCO) to train ornithologists and to engage in avian conservation activities. Helping to organize the SCO meeting, held in Cuba in July, was the primary project undertaken to date. OC also drafted articles of incorporation and bylaws for SCO, and reviewed bylaws of the Neotropical Ornithological Society.

*Providing scientific information about birds*

*To government agencies and other decision-makers*

- OC submitted comments to USFWS regarding the Bird Component of its Land Acquisition Priority System.
- OC provides peer review services to the Communications Tower Working Group and has also drafted a Request for Proposals for the group.
- OC pursued discussions with BBL on the subject of data release.
- Executive Director Ellen Paul participated in a workshop at the USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center that resulted in development of a comprehensive program of research for avian conservation, and subsequently helped to garner support from USDI for funding for this program.
- OC nominated Clait Braun to serve a second term on the USDA Wildlife Services Federal Advisory Committee.
- OC has nominated Mike Braun to serve on the USDA Import/Export Advisory Committee on Foreign Animal and Poultry Diseases.

*To conservation organizations and the general public*

- OC responds to numerous requests for information on a variety of issues.
- The OC Board approved a new Bird Issue Brief on endocrine disruptors; a Bird Issue Brief on West Nile Virus will be prepared on behalf of the OC.

*Peer review*

- Reviews of a USFS management plan for the Southwest Willow Flycatcher and a research proposal pertaining to the impact of telecommunications towers on birds were completed.

**Budget**

- OC has approved a \$35,000 annual budget to support its fiscal year 2001-2002 operations.

*(Editor's note: A 22-page report detailing the activities highlighted above is available from OC or the RRF Secretary.)*

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### UPCOMING MEETINGS

October 24-28, 2001

#### RAPTOR RESEARCH FOUNDATION Winnipeg, Manitoba

Contact: RRF Local Committee - Manitoba Conservation, Box 24, 200 Salteaux Crescent, Winnipeg MB R3J 3W3, Canada, phone: 204-945-7775, fax: 204-945-3077, e-mail: [wildlife@gov.mb.ca](mailto:wildlife@gov.mb.ca), web: <http://www.networkx.net/~sparrow/rrf2001.html>

September 24-30, 2002

#### RAPTOR RESEARCH FOUNDATION New Orleans, Louisiana

technician positions will be from 10 March to 29 June. Interested individuals contact: **Mike Kochert, USGS, Forest and Rangelands Ecosystem Science Center, Snake River Field Station 970 Lusk Street, Boise ID 83706, phone: 208-426-5201, fax: 208-426-5210, e-mail: [mkochert@eagle.boisestate.edu](mailto:mkochert@eagle.boisestate.edu).**

### NEWS OF MEMBERS

**Alvaro Camiña Cardenal** is the new coordinator of the Iberian Raptor Group from the Spanish Ornithological Society SEO/Birdlife. Alvaro may be contacted at: [acamia@airtel.net](mailto:acamia@airtel.net).

### POSITIONS AVAILABLE

**RAPTOR FIELD TECHNICIANS!** The Snake River Field Station of the USGS, Forest and Rangelands Ecosystem Science Center will be hiring a raptor field studies leader and up to 8 field technicians to conduct nesting surveys for Prairie Falcons and Golden Eagles in the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area. Work involves conducting point count surveys and productivity assessments. Some individuals conducting productivity work will be required to enter nests, and rock climbing experience will be required. The field studies leader position will be from late February through August 2002; field

### FOR SALE

**RRF ITEMS** Several items are available. Logo pins (\$5); decals (\$3); T-shirts from the 1995 (Duluth) and 1997 (Savannah--Swallow-tailed Kite on back) annual meetings (\$5); coffee mugs from the 1995 annual meeting (\$5); and abstract packets from all conferences except the 1996 annual meeting (\$10 each). To purchase, contact: **Jim Fitzpatrick, 12805 St. Croix Trail S, Hastings, MN 55033, phone: 612-437-4359, fax: 612-438-2908, e-mail: [jim@cnestcroix.com](mailto:jim@cnestcroix.com).** Payment may be via check or credit card; prices include shipping. For T-shirts, be sure to specify size (S, M, L, XL).

### WINGSPAN CONTRIBUTIONS

The Raptor Research Foundation, Inc. wishes to thank the following people who contributed material to this issue of *Wingspan*: **Alvaro Camiña Cardenal, John Klavitter, Mike Kochert, Ellen Paul, and Cheryl Quade.**

*Wingspan* welcomes contributions from RRF members and others interested in raptor biology and management. Articles and announcements should be sent, faxed, or e-mailed to the editor: Leonard Young, 1640 Oriole Lane NW, Olympia, WA 98502-4342 USA (phone/fax: 360-943-7394, e-mail: [wingspan@msn.com](mailto:wingspan@msn.com)). The deadline for the next issue is February 7, 2002.

**RECENT THESES ON RAPTORS**

**Klavitter, J. L. 2001. SURVEY METHODOLOGY, ABUNDANCE, AND DEMOGRAPHY OF THE ENDANGERED HAWAIIAN HAWK: IS DELISTING WARRANTED? M.S. Thesis, Univ. Washington, Seattle. 102pp.**

To provide the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) with updated information on the Hawaiian hawk ('io, *Buteo solitarius*) for reconsideration of its current status (endangered), I tested survey methodology, determined population size, distribution, habitat availability, survival, fecundity, and finite rate of increase ( $\lambda$ ) of 'io during 1998 and 1999 on the island of Hawai'i. I estimated the total population at 1,457 (SE = 176.3) hawks. Birds were distributed broadly around the island, but highest densities were found in mature native forest with a grass understory (0.0057 'io/ha). I calculated that 58.7% of the island (614,405 ha) is useable habitat for 'io. Of the useable habitat, 31.8% (195,350 ha) is currently protected by State and Federal forests, parks, and refuges. Based on an average density of  $0.0024 \pm 0.0008$  'io/ha in those areas, I calculated that protected areas currently support 469 'io (95% CI = 244-901). I determined that the maximum number of 'io found on the island prior to human occupation was 1,313 (95% CI = 857-2,013). In all habitats combined, first year and adult survival was 0.50 (SE = 0.0981) and 0.94 (SE = 0.0404), respectively. In all habitats combined, fecundity was 0.23 (SE = 0.04) female young/breeding female. Overall finite rate of increase ( $\lambda$ ) was 1.0324 (SE = 0.0428). Elasticity analyses showed adult survival as the most important parameter regulating finite growth of this population. Based on current 'io populations that are equal or larger in size to populations prior to human contact, high adult survival, the protection of substantial areas of habitat, a mean finite rate of increase  $\sim 1$ , resistance to avian diseases found on the island, no evidence of negative impacts of contaminants, and the birds ability to use human-altered landscapes and exotic prey, the population appears viable. However, because of the short duration of this study, the relatively low population size, the variance around my estimates, and environmental stochasticity, I feel delisting is not warranted. I feel downlisting would be appropriate for this species. Regardless of a change in listing, population size and especially adult survivorship should be routinely monitored.



**WINGSPAN**  
1640 Oriole Lane NW  
Olympia, WA 98502-4342 USA

Non-profit Organ.  
U.S.  
POSTAGE  
PAID  
Olympia, WA  
Permit No. 78