

Western Bird Banding Association (WBBA) meeting, Spokane House Hotel; Spokane Falls Community College.

September 21, 2001 2:00 pm

Present: Bob Altman, Tricia Campbell, Ken Burton, Stephanie Jones, Kay Loughman. Ken Voget arrived at 3:00pm.

Stephanie Jones, Secretary, taking notes.

Ken Burton chairing meeting in Jim Steele's absence.

Steph Jones handed out minutes from 2000, board members suggested changes, which were incorporated. Moved, seconded and passed minutes.

Treasurer's Report (Tricia Campbell): Some discussion of end of fiscal year and annual meeting costs, discussed moving fiscal year but decided it wasn't necessary. No grants for this year. Membership is going down; 263 (2001) down from 280 (2000). Moved, second, and passed report.

Endowment: Discussion on the pros and cons to placing the money in the Marin Community Foundation (MCF)(from Treasurers report). Moved, second, and passed to accept sending endowment money to MCF. Tricia Campbell will contact Geoff Geupel to arrange completing this..

Tricia Campbell will determine that the by-laws have been changed (formally) to allow the Treasurer's position to be on-going, as it has been by practice for many years.

Membership report (Ken Burton): Included in Treasurer's report. Tricia Campbell will contact Jim Steele about other membership issues and report to the board on e-mail.

Current Meeting Report (Tricia Campbell): Gary Blevins will provide more information on this meeting later; not available at this time. Tricia Campbell will inform the board on e-mail.

Annual Report (Kay Loughman): Referred back to 2001 minutes; reminded us that Jim Steele and Anne-Marie Benton were going to look into inter-active entry of annual report. No progress reported in 2001. Ken Burton suggested using e-mail and web posting to get the data corrected by each contributor, using an e-mail address list. Problems with data submission and e-mail attachments were discussed and web posting capabilities was the preferred method. Final: put reporting form and proofing ability on the web and use e-mail list for reminders; Ken Burton will follow up on this.

Web-page (Ken Burton): Sent letter to solicit e-mail addresses, permission to post on the web, and suggestions for the web site. Ken Burton did this with renewal notices and got ,not 100%, but a very high response. Web site remains the same as last year; with minor revisions. Plans to turn the NABC web site into a clearing site for molt limits and other banding data has not happened. Kay Loughman suggests getting a professional web-master and Steph Jones suggested mentioning this need at the business meeting. Tricia Campbell will approach Jim

Steele about his wanting to continue with this web page; and get some information about his time commitment. Tricia Campbell: offer a Life Membership for help with web.

Editor's report (Kay Loughman): Hand-out, with issues for discussion. Results of discussion:
1) Quality control: continue to do as best we can to improve quality control, Kay's efforts in this direction were appreciated and commended; 2) color photographs: authors pay for any in their publication, but no extra charge for publication; 3) web publication: discussion of the merits and policy. Very different opinions with very different spins. Ken Burton: money is an issue for him, that the web publication is free and membership pays for article, not comfortable with web posting of NABB publications; Ken Voget/Steph Jones: agreed with proposed policy from Jim Steele and accepting C.J. Ralph's publication; Tricia: Okay with web publication prior to acceptance by NABB after that it must come off the web; Bob Altman: Not satisfied with proposal, but not sure of what changes he would propose. Moved to table this until tomorrow.

Next meeting (Ken Burton): Informally board was offered Klamath Bird Observatory in Oregon; Ken Burton suggested contacting SE Arizona Bird Observatory; Steph may look into Denver/Estes Park, Colorado. Ken Burton will bring it up at the business meeting.

Board positions, new slate:

President: Jim Steele (2002)
Secretary: Stephanie Jones (2002)
Treasurer: Tricia Campbell (on-going)
1st Vice-President: Ken Burton (2002)
2nd Vice-President: Rhonda Milliken (2002)
Director-at-Large: Anne-Marie Benson (2002)
Director-at-Large: Gary Blevins (2003)
Regional Rep.: Ken Voget (2003)
Editor of NABB: Kay Loughman (ongoing)
Past-president: Bob Altman (2002)

Western Bird Banding Association (WBBA) meeting, Spokane House Hotel; Spokane Falls Community College, continued.

September 22, 2001 11:20 am

Present: Bob Altman, Tricia Campbell, Ken Burton, Stephanie Jones, Kay Loughman, Ken Voget

Stephanie Jones, Secretary, taking notes.

Ken Burton chairing meeting in Jim Steele's absence.

NABC (Ken Burton): NABC page will be published in NABB (article from Lucie Metras, CWS banding laboratory, NABC outreach coordinator) in next issue.

Certification session at Spokane: 6 Bander candidates, 2 went on to Trainer. 3 banders certified, and 1 certified as Trainer. Total of 5 trainers worked on the certification, working with Ken Burton. Rita Colwell will be coordinating next WBBA certification.

Anna-Marie Benson's (ABO) concerns about the 2 trainer rule was addressed but NABC was not willing to change the rules.

Need a new representative, Ken Burton is stepping down, and Rita Colwell will be the representative and we need an alternate. Duties include attending the NABC meetings and run certifications. Bob Altman has been suggested, as has Danielle O'Grady and Dan Froehlich. Ken Burton will approach Dani O'Grady and Dan Froehlich.

Grants (Ken Burton): None have been awarded last year. At least, two are proposed for this year; plus one more from the raffle. Ken would like more communication on this subject and a clear protocol for all this. Committee established to work on this, Bob Altman and Steph Jones will work with Geoff Geupel to set up grants, get announcements to NABB and Ornithological Newsletter, a multi-year schedule and continuing protocol. Bob Altman will contact Geoff Geupel, officially, and Steph Jones will begin nagging him.

Back Issues (Ken Burton): Tricia will now be taking over this task; leave the price at \$5.00.

Meeting Notice (Ken Burton): Should come out earlier, deadline 4-5 months before meeting. Steph Jones: Get 2002 meeting proposals, with descriptions on meeting facilities (block of rooms, etc.), banding potential, NABC certification. Ken Burton will announce at business meeting, proposals due Oct. 31.

Web publication (Ken Burton), continued: Ken Burton and Kay Loughman thought that it is acceptable for a ms. to be posted on the web in draft form before "acceptance or acceptance with revisions" stage before NABB publication; then must come off the web. Ken Voget and Steph Jones agreed with Jim Steele's policy, (clarification: where ms. okay to post on web until the manuscript has final acceptance by NABB; then will need the editors okay to post on web. Decision on C.J. Ralph's TabPyle publication will be the decision of the publication committee; board was still spilt on all these issues. Tabled.

Business meeting: September 22, 2001 4:40 pm

Ken Burton, presenting:

- 1) Thanks to Gary Blevins, his family, student and assistants, and to speakers for a great meeting and program.
- 2) Financial situation very good, and we will use the Marin Community Endowment fund for grants.
- 3) Several grants will be available this year, Geoff Geupel will have information and announcement.
- 4) Membership slowly declining, asked members to continue to assist and finding new members.
- 5) Web master may be needed, asked the membership to consider taking on this task.
- 6) Next years meeting location proposals should be sent to the board by 10/31. Should have information about lodging options, banding/birding opportunities (including number of birds likely to be caught per morning for the NABC certification).
- 7) NABC Certification: Jim DeStaebler, Sherry Kees, and Jackie Weicker received their Bander certification; Jackie Weicker also received her Trainer certification. Ken Burton coordinated, with assistance from trainers: Danielle O'Grady, C.J. Ralph, John Alexander, and Rita Colwell.
- 8) Ken Burton has completed his term as NABC representative; Rita Colwell is the new representative. The board is seeking an alternate.
- 9) Board member slate presented and accepted.

Leonard Peyton presented his proposed numerical color band coding for the BBL and asked for color banders to test it for him and get back to Mary Gustafson with comments. EXCEL file on disk available from Leonard at P.O. Box 60588, Fairbanks, AK, e-mail: lpeyton@ptlalaska.net

Submitted:

Stephanie L. Jones
USFWS, Region 6
Nongame Migratory Bird Coordinator
P.O. Box 25486 DFC
Denver, CO 80225
303-236-8145 ext. 608
FAX: 303-236-8680
E-mail: Stephanie_Jones@fws.gov

Other:

Raffle raised \$331.00 for another grant this year; money given to Tricia Campbell. Thank you notes from the board were sent out by Stephanie Jones. Grant Prizes were 2 Northern Goshawk etchings (Peregrine Fund) and a D. Sibley Field Guide (FWS).

AMENDMENTS TO MINUTES

FIRST UNDERTAKING: MOTION ON 2003 MEETING AND NABC ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE

11/02/2001 10:14 PM

E-mail from Ken Burton

To: "Kay Loughman" <kayloughman@attglobal.net>, "Anna-Marie Benson" <ambenson@alaskabird.org>, "Bob Altman" <alt8bird@aol.com>, "Gary Blevins" <blevins@spocom.com>, "Jim Steele" <jsteele@sfsu.edu>, "Ken Voget" <knmvoget@aol.com>, "Rhonda Millikin" <millikin-r@rmc.ca>, "Stephanie Jones" <stephanie_jones@fws.gov>, "Tricia Campbell" <triciacbc@earthlink.net> "Rita Colwell" <birding@attglobal.net>

Hello, everyone,

Jack Whetstone in Bisbee, AZ, has agreed to host the 2002 WBBA meeting! Our deadline for meeting proposals has passed and I haven't received any further proposals. On the assumption that no one else has, either, it seems we're heading south (for the meeting, at any rate).

The dates that Jack and I discussed are Sept. 6-8. He claims this should be near the height of migration and a reasonable time for both banding and birding. There are quite a few banding stations in the area and, as you know, lots of great birding spots.

Do we need a formal proposal from Jack outlining his plans? He says he can get a meeting facility for little or nothing; there's a wide range of lodging in Bisbee; and he expects the Park Service, the BLM, and SABO to participate in planning and hosting.

Kay, how are the guidelines for hosts coming? We need to circulate them for review soon.

Everyone, please circulate your thoughts on Bisbee as a meeting venue and what we need from Jack before we commit

Thanks.

Ken

11/03/2001 08:42 AM

E-mail from Kay Loughman

To: Anna-Marie Benson <ambenson@alaskabird.org>, Bob Altman <alt8bird@aol.com>, Gary Blevins <blevins@spocom.com>, Jim Steele <jsteele@sfsu.edu>, Ken Voget <knmvoget@aol.com>, Rhonda Millikin <millikin-r@rmc.ca>, Stephanie Jones <stephanie_jones@fws.gov>, Tricia Campbell <triciacbc@earthlink.net>, Rita Colwell <birding@attglobal.net>

Ken and all: That is good news! I've been working on some guidelines for putting on the annual meeting - to help hosts get organized. You'll find them appended to the bottom of this message. They're definitely a work-in-progress, so suggestions from each of you are solicited and appreciated. Ultimately, it might be desirable to post them on the WBBA web page so that people considering hosting a meeting can see what sorts of things they might want to mention in a proposal. Please let me know what you think. Kay

11/4/2001

E-mail from Stephanie Jones

To: WBBA BOARD: AnneMarie Benson (mbenson@alaskabird.org), Bob Altman (Alt8bird@aol.com), Gary Blevins (blevins@spocom.com), Jim Steele (jsteele3@ix.netcom.com, jsteele@sfsu.edu), Kay Loughman (kayloughman@attglobal.net), Ken Burton (kmburton@svn.net), Ken Voget (knmvoget@rabbitbrush.com), Rhonda Miliken (pshearing@sympatico.ca), Tricia Campbell (triciacbc@earthlink.net)

Hey WBBA board:

I have another meeting site proposed: western Montana, near Missoula MT. Our refuge up there, Lee Metcalf NWR will host it, along with Bitterroot Audubon, with participation from the Forest Service and the University of Montana. They propose the weeks of August 26-September 1 or September 2-8. They have lots of birds at that time, and are currently doing migration banding there. The meeting would be in Hamilton (about 50 miles from Missoula) and centered at the Teller NWR, a private refuge similar to the resort we stayed at in Boring. Also, CJ's offer of Klamath is still on the table, so we need a vote. Actually, I think it is cool to have choices!

We also need a vote on the NABC representative. At the PIF meeting in Fallon, Bob A. said he couldn't do it right now, but I have two other folks to nominate: Moe Flannery (PRBO), and John Alexander (Klamath). We haven't heard if any of the other folks suggested were going to be nominated.

CJ (at the WWG meeting) pointed out that the decisions and discussions of the board are open to the membership, and that this can't happen on e-mail, and therefore he thinks our votes on the web policy (and changes in meeting/hosting guidelines??) need to take place in an open discussion. I therefore think these, and other discussions and decisions need to be at the next meeting except for these two items that we left over.

SO...using Roberts rules I would like to call a vote on these two items (provided I get a second!). Should the votes come to me (as Secretary) or Jim (as President?). I would guess the secretary, so...

I move we vote on these items:

- 1. NABC representative
 - a. Moe Flannery
 - b. John Alexander
 - c. other?

- 2. Meeting time and place:
 - A. Bisbee, AZ
 - B. Missoula, MT
 - C. Klamath, OR

Seconds?

If seconded, I propose any further discussion end on 11/14, and all votes be sent to me by 11/15 (or after that until I get a quorum, which I believe is five correct?), and I then let you know the tally and amend the minutes.

Steph

Stephanie L. Jones

Monday, November 12, 2001 10:22 PM

E-mail from Stephanie Jones

To: AnneMarie Benson (mbenson@alaskabird.org), Bob Altman (Alt8bird@aol.com), Gary Blevins (blevins@spocom.com), Jim Steele (jsteele3@ix.netcom.com, jsteele@sfsu.edu), Kay Loughman (kayloughman@attglobal.net), Ken Burton (kmburton@svn.net), Ken Voget (knmvoget@rabbitbrush.com), Rhonda Miliken (pshearing@sympatico.ca), Tricia Campbell (triciacbc@earthlink.net)

Subject: meeting and Alternate NABC representative

Dear WBBA board:

Since I have moved and have received two seconds, I think we need to go ahead with this vote. Please take the time to participate! Also, I have received a quorum of 5 votes already and so the final voting should end on Friday, 11/16. If anyone who already voted wants to change their vote or add to it, I will be happy to make the change. Further discussion should be okay until 11/14, Wednesday (under my motion and second).

Further information on Missoula for the 2002 meeting: They are very excited about the chance to host this meeting and they have sent me further information. They got final cost estimates from Teller Refuge. They were able to get the room and per diem charges down to the government rate (\$55/night) by charging \$900 for the conference room. Also, a second smaller conference room (for the board meeting) is no problem at no extra charge. Twenty two folks could stay at the Teller. Four rooms are queen beds and the rest are two twin beds/room. The overflow would stay at Holiday Inn Express about 10 miles away. Also, Bitterroot Audubon board voted Monday night as a partner to host the conference. They are interested in helping with local publicity and some setup, etc. on the weekend. The Forest Service has also expressed interest in being a partner and John Ormiston has gotten the Bitterroot National Forest to agree to sponsor the Conference as well. They have even committed \$500 toward the project. From my point of view, this is the preferred location because Erick Greene and Dick Hutto at the University of Montana have expressed enthusiasm and the location of the UMT in the Bitterroot valley could enhance the scientific level of the meeting.

Eligible to vote:

Jim Steele, President (Jim: this motion was made before your resignation, and so I believe you could vote, if you wanted to)

Ken Burton, 1st VP

Rhonda Miliken, 2nd VP

Stephanie Jones, Secretary

Tricia Campbell, Treasurer

Ken Vogel, Regional Representative

Anne-Marie Benson, Director-at-large

Gary Blevis, Director-at-large

Bob Altman, Past president

Kay Loughman, NABB editor

Quorum - 5

Motions:

1. NABC Alternate representative

a. Moe Flannery

b. John Alexander

2. Meeting time and place:

A. Bisbee, AZ

B. Missoula, MT

C. Klamath, OR

Steph

Stephanie L. Jones

FINAL VOTE:

November 23, 2001

E-Mail from Stephanie Jones

To: ambenson@alaskabird.org, Alt8bird@aol.com, jsteele3@ix.netcom.com, jsteele@sfsu.edu, kayloughman@attglobal.net, knmburton@svn.net, triciacbc@earthlink.net, blevins@spocom.com, pshearing@sympatico.ca, knmvoget@rabbitbrush.com

cc: Rita Colwell <birding@attglobal.net>, Moe Flannery mflannery@prbo.org

Dear WBBA board:

Two items of business, and then I hope to leave you alone until our meeting in 2003!

First; here are the final votes:

1. NABC Alternate representative

- a. Moe Flannery 7 (Steph, Tricia, Ken V. , Jim, Anne-Marie, Kay, Gary)
- b. John Alexander 2 (Bob, Ken B.)

Abstaining: Rhonda

2. Meeting time and place:

- A. Bisbee, AZ 5 (Kay, Ken B., Rhonda, Tricia, Ken V.)
- B. Missoula, MT 5 (Steph, Jim, Anne-Marie, Bob, Gary)
- C. Klamath, OR

Since Bisbee was the first to complete the offer for 2002, Bisbee is selected. Ken, this is with you now. Given the tone of some of the e-mails I received when I mentioned the tie, I will let you know later if Montana is interested in hosting WBBA in 2003; I am not committed to this. More then one person suggested Klamath in 2004, maybe Ken should ask John Alexander if this would appeal to him?

Second:

Here are the revised note/minutes with all the things that have happened since the Spokane meeting appended (wbbanotes2001supplement). Please send me any changes or corrections and I will make these before our next meeting. Jim, could you please post these to the web page? I am concerned that the openness that usually attends WBBA business is being under-mined by e-mail actions. If not, could I ask C.J. to post them, with a connection from WBBA?

Thank you very very much,
 Steph
 Stephanie L. Jones
 USFWS, Region 6
 Nongame Migratory Bird Coordinator
 P.O. Box 25486 DFC
 Denver, CO 80225
 303-236-8155 ext. 253 ****NOTE NEW PHONE NUMBER****
 FAX: 303-236-8163
 E-mail: Stephanie_Jones@fws.gov

Second proceeding: WEB POSTING AND NABB

09/30/2001 10:37 PM

E-mail from Kay Loughman

To: Bob Altman <alt8bird@aol.com>, Jim Steele <jsteele@sfsu.edu>, Ken Burton <kmburton@svn.net>, Stephanie Jones <Stephanie_Jones@fws.gov>, Ken Voget <knmvoget@aol.com>, "Tricia A. Campbell" <triciacbc@earthlink.net>, Anna-Marie Benson <ambenson@alaskabird.org>, Rhonda Millikin <millikin-r@rmc.ca>, Gary and Laurie Blevins <blevins@spocom.com>

WBBA Board Members:

Here is my re-working of the NABB vs web issue, with some input from Ken Burton. We do need to move on this, so please read and respond to me no later than October 15. Once I have your comments, I will summarize, and offer as an addendum to the minutes of the meeting. Thanks.

Kay
9/30/01

The WBBA Board should make recommendations to me and Jim on two issues: a web publishing policy and specific guidance on publishing CJ's manuscript

Points for a web policy:

1. NABB does not want to publish anything that is already available in print or on the web.
2. NABB supports authors who wish to post drafts of their manuscripts on their own web pages in order to solicit comments and advice prior to submitting to a journal for publication. We advise authors to label these manuscripts as drafts which have not received peer review and cannot be cited.
3. All versions of the manuscript should be removed from the web when the manuscript is submitted to a journal.
4. At the time the manuscript is submitted to NABB, the authors should advise the editor of any prior posting to the web, and should affirm in writing that all versions have been removed from the web. In the same letter, the authors should state clearly the extent to which any data or portion of the manuscript has been used or is expected to be used in any other print or electronic publication.
5. Once the manuscript has been accepted for publication, it is under copyright of NABB. Any further publication or distribution of the manuscript (e.g. posting to a web site) requires the prior approval of the three NABB editors. Any such re-publication must advise readers of the original publication source, and state that the manuscript is reprinted with permission.

Points about C.J. Ralph's manuscript, "TabPyle":

I think this question can be decided either way. We can say that the guideline phrase "not previously published" is vague and therefore the author would have no way to know that we would consider posting on the web to be a form of publishing. Therefore, we should recommend publication in NABB. If we adopt this position, we need to propose it to the NABB Editorial Group. That group will decide whether to go ahead with publication.

Conversely, we can say that "not previously published" when not further modified by "print" or "electronic" must be assumed to cover all forms of distribution or dissemination. This was the choice I made, and it was the choice which was supported by other NABB editors. If WBBA confirms this choice, I think it is alright not to take it back to the NABB Editorial Group. We can advise CJ that the mss will not be published in NABB, which frees him to submit it to other journals. We can also make an announcement in the WBBA section of the journal to the effect that the mss. is available, and give the web address.

10/08/2001 08:57 AM

E-mail from Stephanie Jones

To: WBBA Board: Bob Altman <alt8bird@aol.com>, Anna-Marie Benson <ambenson@alaskabird.org>, Gary and Laurie Blevins <blevins@spocom.com>, Jim Steele <jsteele@sfsu.edu>, Ken Burton <kmburton@svn.net>, Ken Voget <knmvoget@aol.com>, "Tricia A. Campbell" <triciacbc@earthlink.net>, Rhonda Miliken (pshearing@sympatico.ca)

Hi Kay and Ken(WBBA board):

We are still a long way apart on this issue; I truly believe that this is a minor issue, and somewhat of a tempest in a teapot. Let me reiterate my point presented at the recent board meeting: there is no such thing as web "publishing" except for a few peer reviewed, subscription only, web-based journals. If the former were true, then the number of "published" authors in this country and elsewhere has just (according to NABB) grown exponentially. Rather, I think the appropriate term is web "posting", which you also use here, and is somewhat analogous to xeroxing 100-1000 copies and mailing them to your colleagues (something C.J. has always done in the past). Your message still does not represent my opinion on this issue, and is, I believe, more restrictive than the other journals that I checked. My specific comments below follow your points for a web policy:

1) No. I do not (and did not at the meeting) agree with this. "Available" in print or on the web implies that you would ban xeroxing copies of the draft and sending it out. This is so vague, I don't see how it is an improvement over the current policy. Also, keep in mind that many publications in journals stem from internal government-related administrative reports (open to the public), which according to this policy would not be allowed in NABB, but are still allowed elsewhere such as in JFO, AOU, COS, etc.

2) Okay, this is acceptable, without the "...prior to publication." which is also one of your points below.

3) I disagree. Submission to a journal in no manner implies acceptance; sometimes it can take a year or more from submission to a journal before a paper is conditionally accepted, the revisions completed, and the final acceptance. Why prevent the authors from sharing, discussing, and working on a paper during that period? I really believe that web posting is not much different from xeroxing and mailing!

4) Yes and no. I agree about notifying editors, but disagree about removing earlier versions from the web, as explained above.

5) Yes and no. No to everything except stating the original publication source and it is reprinted with permission. Why limit how it is distributed? Why is web posting any more a problem than xeroxing from the journal, and sending it out, for instance, to your sub-permitees?

On whether to go ahead with the publication of TabPyle, I think Kay's first argument makes the most sense. NABB is a journal that could use more publications. Why refuse one, that most of us think is helpful, because CJ got involved in a vague and confusing policy on web posting, now being changed?

I could support a compromise, such as the policy forwarded by Jim.

Steph

Stephanie L. Jones

01 Oct 2001 08:37:20

E-mail from Tricia A. Campbell

To: kayloughman@attglobal.net.

Subject: Re: NABB vs. Web

Hi Kay:

Here are my comments by point number.

1. I agree.

2. The only thing I am uncertain about is that it cannot be cited as a draft. As long as the citation states Draft I do not see the problem. I have cited papers in lit.

3. I am uncertain, see #4.

4. Do the authors receive proofs from NABB that they can distribute? It is customary with other formal journals to allow authors to distribute copies of their publication to other professionals, etc. In fact, a lot of journals are sending electronic copies of the author's paper instead of proofs. I realize that the NABB journal is copywritten, but we need to keep in mind that NABB is the coalition of authors that performed individual work for submission. I feel we need to allow authors some format for them to share their work with others in a professional setting that does not require full membership in the journal.

5. Fine.

As for CJ's ms I have no strong opinion. I can see both sides.

(7)

Sincerely,
Tricia
Tricia A. Campbell
Campbell BioConsulting, Inc.
40950 Via Media
Temecula, CA 92591-1722
(909) 506-4038

11/07/2001 10:11 PM

E-mail from Ken Burton

To: <jsteele3@ix.netcom.com>, <Stephanie_Jones@fws.gov>, <kayloughman@attglobal.net>, <alt8bird@aol.com>, <ambenson@alaskabird.org>, <blevins@spocom.com>, <knmvoget@aol.com>, <triciabc@earthlink.net>, <pshearing@sympatico.ca>

Dear Board,

I sent my previous message before reading Jim's comments on the Web issue. What he calls "Kay and Ken's policy" is, I believe, the majority opinion from the meeting; Kay and I happen to be, as far as I know, the only people involved in putting it into writing. I since have come around a bit more to Jim and Steph's point of view and have expressed to Kay, if not to others, that I, too, think we should publish CJ's paper, even if it remains on the Web. I still think we need a policy, but the last thing any of want to do is discourage communication.

Ken

11/08/2001 09:45 AM

E-mail from Kay Loughman

To Jim Steele <jsteele@sfsu.edu>, jsteele3@ix.netcom.com, Ken Burton <kmburton@svn.net>, "Tricia A. Campbell" <triciabc@earthlink.net>

Jim, Ken, Steph, Tricia:

Based on comments received from Tricia and Steph in response to my post-Board meeting e-mail, I started revising the suggested points for a policy. Given recent developments, I think it's appropriate to abandon that approach. Instead, I have taken the version posted on the WBBA website and revised it slightly. For your immediate reference, both versions are included in this message. I can live with this revision, and hope that you can too. Please let me know.

Kay

Proposed guidelines for web posting and NABB publication (as found on WBBA website on 8/25/01)

"NABB will only accept manuscripts that have not been previously published in journals that result in papers that can be cited, either electronically or in print. Manuscripts that have been posted to a web site for the purpose of providing broad access and public review, must clearly indicate that it is a preliminary draft and not for citation, provide links to any revisions, and clearly state that it has not been peer reviewed by a journal. In the manuscript, the author must indicate to what extent the data have been used, or will be used, in any other publication. All final draft manuscripts that have been accepted by NABB require the editor's permission to be posted to a web site, or other outlet, as they are, at that point, under copyright of NABB."

Loughman suggested revision 11/8/01:

"NABB will accept only manuscripts that have not been previously published in journals (electronic or print) that can be cited. A manuscript posted to a web site for the purpose of providing broad access and public review, must clearly indicate that it is a draft which has not been peer-reviewed by a journal, and provide links to any revisions. In submitting the manuscript, the author should advise the editor of the extent to which the data have been used, or are expected to be, in any other publication. Once the manuscript has been accepted for publication, it is under copyright of NABB. Any subsequent publication (electronic or print) or posting to a website requires the prior

8

approval of the editor. Any such re-publication must advise readers of the original publication source and state that the manuscript is reprinted with permission."

11/08/2001 08:53 PM

E-mail from Kay Loughman

To: Ken Burton <kmburton@svn.net>, "Tricia A. Campbell" <triciacbc@earthlink.net>, Stephanie Jones <Stephanie_Jones@fws.gov>

Thanks, Jim. Tricia, Steph, and Ken also thought it was acceptable, with three minor changes:

In the first sentence: remove "previously"

In the second sentence, "clearly indicate" should be "indicate clearly"

In the third sentence, "used" needs to be inserted after "expected to be"

I think these changes improve the readability without changing the intent, so I will incorporate them. The final version then, looks like this:

"NABB will accept only manuscripts that have not been published in journals (electronic or print) that can be cited. A manuscript posted to a web site for the purpose of providing broad access and public review, must indicate clearly that it is a draft which has not been peer-reviewed by a journal, and provide links to any revisions. In submitting the manuscript, the author should advise the editor of the extent to which the data have been used, or are expected to be used, in any other publication. Once the manuscript has been accepted for publication, it is under copyright of NABB. Any subsequent publication (electronic or print) or posting to a website requires the prior approval of the editor. Any such re-publication must advise readers of the original publication source and state that the manuscript is reprinted with permission."

My sense from those who have chosen to respond is that once a policy has been adopted by NABB, WBBA should recommend that CJ's paper be published.

I am not sure how the NABB editorial group is convened. But tomorrow morning I must telephone Bob Pantle to discuss a manuscript already in production, so I will ask him how to proceed, and will get back to you as soon as I have an answer.

Kay

Editor's Report to the WBBA Board, September 2001

Manuscripts received:

- Pyle, P. Revised Ageing and Sexing Criteria for the Blue-throated Hummingbird. Undergoing initial review when I assumed editor's position. Published in NABB 25:4. Accuracy has been challenged; but no rebuttal submitted to date.
- Hazlitt, S. Longevity of Plastic Leg Bands on Black Oystercatchers in British Columbia. Rec'd March 2001. Published in NABB 26:2
- Gilbert, W. Wilson's Warbler Male with Amputated Foot Successfully Forages and Raises Brood of Young. Rec'd. April 2001. To be published in NABB 26:3
- Bloom, P. Molt and Sequence of Plumages of Golden Eagles and a Technique for In-Hand Ageing. Rec'd. March 2001. Probably will be published in NABB 26:3
- Ebel, R. Accessing the Boreal Forest Canopy for Monitoring Avian Populations. Rec'd. March 2001. Initial review indicated desirable after major revisions. Authors have indicated they will work on this publication again after fall migration.
- Ralph, C. A Tabular Format of Pyle's Ageing and Sexing Methods for Landbirds. Rec'd. April 2001. Initial reviews favorable, and copy with final revisions is in hand. Disposition of this mss. is uncertain due to questions regarding web publication policy.
- Dieni, J. Constant-Effort Mist Netting Data: why exactly are we taking all of those measurements? Rec'd. May 2001. Rejected, with regret, based on comments by three reviewers.
- Burton, K. Primary-Covert Replacement in the Eastern Wood-Pewee. Rec'd. May 2001. Withdrawn at author's request, pending revisions.
- Mamone, M. Neotropical Migrant, Short-distance Migrant, and Permanent Resident Passerines in Urban, Rural, and Forest Riparian Habitats of Southwestern Oregon. Rec'd September 2001. In review process.

In March I received two additional inquiries, neither of which has yet to result in a manuscript.

News, Notes, Comments:

- 25:4 Announcement of Hummingbird Research Group Banders Conference
Note from R.Colwell: Second Year GCSP with Incomplete Skull

For the WBBA section:

- 25:4 Welcome to New Members
WBBA's website (J.Steele)
NABC Update (K.Burton)
Annual Meeting - 1st announcement
- 26:1 Western Station Reports. Solicitation for more reports received no response.

Annual Meeting announcement and details (G.Blevins)

26:2 Annual Report for 2000 (C.Othal)
Annual Meeting reminder
Obituary for Jennie Slater (K.Burton)

Anticipated in the coming months: In addition to the manuscripts described above, I have been promised papers from S. Bouricius, B. Carlson and S. Wethington. In the WBBA Section v.26:3, we will publish abstracts from both the Hummingbird Research Group conference and the WBBA 2001 Annual Meeting. Two bird research groups have promised items for the Western Station Reports.

Issues raised for discussion and resolution by the NABB editorial board (editors and association presidents):

Web publication. NABB needs a new policy to guide editors and authors in determining if and when it may be appropriate for an author to 'publish' a manuscript on the web. Please refer to Jim Steele's e-mail on this topic, dated July 13, 2001, appended to this report.

Quality control. On reviewing page proofs for 26:2, I strongly urged that one paper be eliminated due to bad writing and unsupported conclusions. Although the original fault lies with the authors, acceptance of this paper suggests inadequate review by both referees and the regional editor. Only a few weeks earlier I'd heard a complaint about manuscript published a year or so ago which my informant cited as being very poorly written. On re-reading that paper, I had to agree. NABB is unlikely ever to become a prestigious journal; but it is incumbent on the editors to keep it from becoming a 'garbage dump'. It has been suggested that we ask all editors to review and approve all manuscript submissions prior to final acceptance for NABB. I am reluctant to assume this additional responsibility, but am equally reluctant to discover bad writing (or bad science) at the page proof stage.

Color photographs. In a forthcoming issue we expect to publish in color several pages of photographs which accompany a lengthy manuscript. In this instance, the authors offered to pay the full cost of color reproduction. NABB Production Manager, Bob Pantle, writes "Since NABB does not have a policy for printing in color, and if this Ms goes through, I'm sure other authors will be eager to inquire about printing (publishing) in color. Perhaps this is a good time to start thinking about a costing policy." My suggestion is that the cost of color photographs always be borne by the authors.

Other: In preparation for the Annual Meeting in Spokane, I compiled a list of dates and places of previous annual meetings, going back to 1925, the year WBBA was founded. I also prepared a one-page insert for the registration packet with suggestions for help in preparing a paper for NABB.

Kay Loughman
September 15, 2001

DATE: July 13, 2001

TO: All Bird Banding Association board members, editors and friends,

FROM: Jim Steele, WBBA President

Recently among some WBBA members there has been discussion about North American Bird Bander (NABB) and its publishing policies. The discussion has centered on C.J. Ralph posting his "Tabular Pyle" manuscript (TabPyle) on the web at about the same time he submitted it for publication in NABB. It has brought to light a need to review and update our policies to account for the new medium created by the internet. From the inside cover of NABB the one line, "This journal welcomes papers, not previously published..." is the sole guideline. Although I personally feel that posting a first draft on the web is a positive use of the web, and that NABB should eventually publish TabPyle, I feel we can not do so until we determine that the current policy is no longer adequate, and adopt a new policy. I feel that we do a gross injustice to our editors (who volunteer their time) if we force them to rely on outdated policies. My understanding is that the boards of all three banding associations must agree on the policies that guide publication in NABB. My recommendation would be that we delay a final decision on whether to publish TabPyle until all three boards have a chance both to discuss publication policies and vote on their acceptance.

Instead of emails flying around, with authors trying to persuade the editors about how to interpret the guidelines, we should use the email process to provoke well thought out discussion. From this we can generate one or more well-defined policy statements on which board members can vote at their annual meeting. To insure that web posting policy is dealt with in a timely manner, I am sending this letter to all board members of each association, and to the three local editors. I have attached a list of their email addresses. Since it will be the current board members who need to vote on this issue, all opinions on this matter should be directed to board members of the appropriate association. I will create a web page for WBBA members to view the debate. I will post any emails I receive that pertain to this issue unless the author asks that their opinion be kept anonymous. I will try to update this list bi-weekly. I will try to synthesize the discussion into one or more policy statements. By the first of September I will circulate the proposed policy statements, so people have ample time to fine tune them or at least read them and think about them before voting at the meeting.

Since it is easier to get people to criticize than create, I would propose something like the following:

"NABB will only accept manuscripts that have not been previously published in journals that produce citations, either electronic or print. Manuscripts that have been posted to a web site for the purpose of providing broad access and public review, must clearly indicate that it is a rough draft, provide links to any revisions, clearly state that it has not been peer reviewed. The author must indicate to what extent the data has been used, or will be used, in any other publication. All final draft manuscripts that have been accepted by NABB require the editor's permission to be posted to a web site." [later revised; see below]

Please criticize this draft policy statement from every angle and/or offer your own policy statement.

I constructed that particular policy statement because I believe that posting drafts on the web and final versions in NABB can be mutually beneficial. The web allows greater access to review and this can be very positive. However the author is under no obligation to heed the reviewer's comments. NABB on the other hand is a peer-reviewed journal and thus confers greater quality control. We should generate policy that reaffirms the importance of those different roles.

Both the web and printed versions will reach many of the same people but each will also reach new and different readers. Web posting could stimulate others to subscribe as much as it may cause some to search for the free web manuscripts. Perhaps if most drafts are available free through the web, advertisers might be

concerned. However most of our advertisers have such a specific audience that NABB remains the best place to advertise.

The key concern would be the effect on circulation numbers. I suspect web posting would have minimal impact. The real factor affecting subscriptions would be the number and quality of articles in the NABB. Despite easy web posting most authors want their articles to be peer-reviewed and accepted into a publication of record. Also, web posting may help stimulate first time authors to submit articles.

Another concern arising from web posting of articles is that revisions may go unnoticed or readers may lose track of which version is the final. Therefore all rough drafts need to be clearly labeled as such, and web posting of the final (NABB) version needs special permission from NABB, and proper credit to NABB.

I think concerns over how transitory web publications may be do not really address the problem. With advances in information storage systems this may soon not be an argument. The problems are 1) how would web posting be beneficial or detrimental to NABB publications, and 2) how can we design a policy statement that makes it mutually beneficial.

I look forward to receiving your ideas.

Proposed guidelines for web posting and NABB publication (as found on WBBA website on 8/25/01)

"NABB will only accept manuscripts that have not been previously published in journals that result in papers that can be cited, either electronically or in print. Manuscripts that have been posted to a web site for the purpose of providing broad access and public review, must clearly indicate that it is a preliminary draft and not for citation, provide links to any revisions, and clearly state that it has not been peer reviewed by a journal. In the manuscript, the author must indicate to what extent the data have been used, or will be used, in any other publication. All final draft manuscripts that have been accepted by NABB require the editor's permission to be posted to a web site, or other outlet, as they are, at that point, under copyright of NABB."