

Old-Growth Forests, Owls, and Conservation Paradigms by Jerry F. Franklin

As a child I spent many days and nights camping amongst the old-growth forests of Douglas fir and western red cedar in the Cascade Range of northwestern North America. Although I lacked both concepts and vocabulary, the scale, complexity, and beauty of these old-growth forests impressed themselves upon me while my sister and I swung from the vine maples and played hide-and-seek among the fallen logs. By age nine I had determined that a life working in these forests was for me.

Entering forestry school I learned that these forests were essentially unknown scientifically. Nor was any major research planned because most of the forests were scheduled for extirpation—replacement by plantations of young trees. Why not replace them? Wildlife biologists referred to old-growth forests as “biological deserts,” and some foresters even described them as “cellulose cemeteries.”

Fortunately, an opportunity for serious study of the northwestern old-growth forests emerged in 1968 with support from the U.S. International Biological Program. Subsequently a cascade of studies has taught us about the distinctive ecological attributes—compositional, functional, and structural—that characterize old-growth forests and distinguish them from younger forests.

My professional involvement with these old-growth forests has been a central theme of my career. First came scientific learning, which has continued to the present and has been a continuing source of discoveries, some leading to epiphanies. The ecological recognition of

see **Franklin**, page 18

Long-Term Commitment to Cranes and Conservation by Jim Harris and Rich Beilfuss

This past year has been busy for crane conservationists. We celebrated the tenth anniversary of Muraviovka Park—the first privately-managed protected area in Russia—a 40,000 acre wetland reserve that the International Crane Foundation (ICF) helped to establish and continues to support. After nine years of intensive effort by ICF staff, Mozambique declared the Zambezi Delta, a wetland vital for cranes and countless other species, its first Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention. We and our Vietnamese colleagues continued our efforts, begun in 1988, to protect and manage Tram Chim National Park, one of few remaining wetlands in the vast Mekong Delta that has become the breadbasket of Asia. Our work in the Korean Demilitarized Zone, initiated in 1974, has positioned us to engage in top-level conservation planning for the future of this unusual strip of wildland that

sustains one of the most important crane sites in Asia and separates two densely developed countries on the brink of reunification. Near our headquarters in rural Wisconsin, USA, ICF's studies of Sandhill Cranes in a typical midwestern landscape of farms and wetlands are now in their 15th year. Each of these efforts may be considered “long-term” in our quick-fix world of problem-solving, yet all are extraordinarily brief when measured against the evolutionary history of cranes.

ICF works worldwide to conserve the 15 species of cranes and the wetland, grassland, and other ecosystems on which the cranes depend. We are dedicated to providing experience, knowledge, and inspiration to involve people in resolving threats to these ecosystems.

Such work is not about safeguarding the cranes for an extra decade or two. Those of

see **Cranes**, page 17

Humphrey Honored for Distinguished Service

During the 2004 annual meeting, Stephen Humphrey was honored by the Board of Governors for his extraordinary 14 years of service to SCB as Chief Financial Officer (CFO). Steve served as SCB's second CFO (following Peter Brussard), and was a fantastic steward of our fledgling organization's finances. The first annual budget Steve prepared for SCB totaled US\$37,000; our budget for 2004 totals \$1.4 million. Even more impressive was the increase in SCB's endowment during Steve's tenure—from \$18,000 to more than \$800,000. Steve reflected, “It was important to ensure that we had strong finances behind the important work of the Society. I was glad to be part of building a strong future for SCB.”

As a modest token of appreciation for Steve's untiring contributions both to day-to-day financial management and governance of SCB and to sound investment of our endowment, the Board and membership presented him with a handsome nature photograph, the Sunrise Sentinel, by Florida photographer John Moran.

Although Steve has stepped down as CFO, he will continue to serve as a Trustee, helping us to wisely invest our financial assets. As Trustee, Steve serve as a member of our new Finance Committee to provide support to Treasurer David Johns and the Board of Governors.

Please join me in thanking Steve. We cannot overstate our appreciation for his extraordinary contributions of time and wisdom.

Deborah B. Jensen, SCB President

2005 ANNUAL MEETING • 15–19 July, Brasilia, Brazil

Call for proposals for symposia, workshops, and organized discussions

The 19th annual meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology, *Conservation Biology Capacity Building and Practice in a Globalized World*, will be held 15–19 July 2005 at the Universidade de Brasilia, Brasilia, Brazil. The Local Organizing Committee invites you to submit proposals for symposia, workshops, and organized discussions. All proposals must be submitted by **31 October 2004** to scb2005@unb.br. The Committee will complete the selection of symposia, workshops, and organized discussions by 15 December. Proposal authors will be notified by the end of 2004 so that organizers can acquire funding for their activity.

SYMPOSIUM

There will be opportunities for 2-hour (8 presentations), 4-hour (16 presentations), and 6-hour (24 presentations) symposia. The last 15 minutes may be left open for discussion, thereby reducing the number of presentations by one. Symposium presentations must be in multiples of 15 minutes so that the timing of the symposium can be coordinated with the contributed paper sessions. Symposia must either be related to the meeting theme or address newly emerging topics or significant syntheses. Symposium proposals should differ from those addressed at recent SCB annual meetings (see www.conbio.org/2005 for listings). All symposium organizers and speakers must register for the meeting.

Proposals should be as brief as possible and include the following explicit headings:

1. Symposium title
2. Organizer(s) complete contact information
3. Length (2, 4, or 6 hours)
4. Proposed theme and justification (why the topic is appropriate and significant for presentation at the SCB annual meeting)
5. A tentative list of speakers, presentation titles, and whether they have agreed to participate

WORKSHOPS AND ORGANIZED DISCUSSIONS

Workshops facilitate the presentation and application of new concepts or methods. Discussions allow audience participation for exploration of new or controversial issues. Proposals must include the following:

1. Workshop or discussion title (specify whether workshop or discussion)
2. Organizer(s) complete contact information
3. Length and location in schedule (lunch, evening, pre-meeting)
4. Proposed theme and justification (why the topic is appropriate and significant for presentation at the SCB annual meeting)
5. Format of workshop or discussion
6. Expected number of participants

Dates and times of workshops and organized discussions will be structured to have minimal conflict with paper sessions (evenings, days immediately before the meeting, and lunches are preferred). All workshop and discussion organizers and speakers must register for the meeting.

For more information, contact

SCB 2005 Local Organizing Committee
Departamento de Zoologia, IB
Universidade de Brasília
Brasília, DF, Brazil
70.910-900
Telefax + 55 61 3073366
2005@conbio.org
www.conbio.org/2005

2006 Annual Meeting

The 20th annual meeting, *Conservation Without Borders*, will be held 24–28 June 2006 at the San Jose McEnery Convention Center, San Jose, California.

The meeting will be hosted by the Society for Conservation Biology, with co-hosts including the North America Section of SCB and many academic, public, and private organizations in the greater San Jose / San Francisco area and beyond. The steering committee, chaired by Erica Fleishman of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, looks forward to welcoming the global community of conservation professionals to California. More information will appear in upcoming newsletters.

Request for Annual Meeting Proposals

The Board of Governors welcomes proposals from organizations that would like to host the 2007 and 2008 annual meetings of the Society for Conservation Biology. The Board is soliciting proposals for the 2007 meeting from outside of North America, especially Australasia, Asia, and Africa, and is soliciting proposals for the 2008 meeting from within North America. Proposals that have the explicit involvement of the relevant SCB Section (see www.conbio.org/Sections) and proposals sponsored by multiple sections (one of which may be the Marine Section) are especially encouraged.

To obtain a copy of the proposal format and instructions or for more information, please contact Bethany Woodworth, chair of the Conference Committee, at Bethany_Woodworth@usgs.gov. Proposals for 2007 (Australia, Asia, or Africa) will be due 15 January 2005 and proposals for 2008 (North America) will be due 15 April 2005. The locations of the 2007 and 2008 meetings will be announced at the 19th annual meeting in Brasilia, Brazil, 15–19 July 2005.

INTERNATIONAL SECTION NEWS

AUSTRAL AND NEOTROPICAL AMERICA

The second annual meeting of Board of Directors of the Austral and Neotropical America Section, supported by the generous contribution of the Christensen Fund [see SCB Newsletter 11(1)], was held in Antigua, Guatemala, from 22–25 April. The meeting was attended by seven Board members: J.A. Simonetti (President, Chile), L. Calvo (Secretary, Guatemala), C. Olivo (Nominations, Policy, and Audit, Bolivia), M. Vázquez (Communications, Ecuador), M. Acosta (Membership and Programs, Cuba), M.A. Marini (Education, Brazil) and A. Cuarón (Conservation, México). Past President J.P. Rodríguez (Venezuela), who was unable to attend, submitted a written report of the Section's activities. In accordance with the Section's Strategic Development Plan for 2002–2005, approved during the first Section Board meeting in La Habana, Cuba, the April meeting addressed four issues: SCB presence, increasing membership, fundraising, and capacity-building.

To foster both SCB and the Section's regional presence, Board members will give short talks using a standard PowerPoint presentation during meetings and other events. Board members will extend invitations to professionals and promising students to become members of SCB (the Section currently has 900 members); individuals who meet certain criteria will be eligible to benefit from a sponsored membership. Candidates must be residents of a developing country and have access to electronic mail. Instructions are at www.conbio.org/Membership/SponsorshipRequest.cfm.

To support capacity building, the Section decided to spend a small amount of funds on student subscriptions to scientific publications in electronic format. The Section also will sponsor short courses in conservation biology in the region, and will oversee the short courses committee for the 2005 annual meeting in Brasília. In addition, the Section took advantage of the presence and experience of the Board members attending the meeting in Guatemala to organize a set of eight lectures in association with the Mesoamerican Society for Biology and Conservation. These lectures, held on 23 April at the Universidad del Valle, were offered as direct contributions to increasing the capacity of a new generation of conservation professionals, and were attended by 66 students from Guatemala, El Salvador, and México. Based on this positive experience, the Section plans to sponsor and co-organize symposia, workshops, and other scientific meetings throughout the region in association with local and regional organizations to maximize SCB's presence and collaborative efforts.

The Section believes that access to information is important for developing strong conservation initiatives and facilitating the exchange of knowledge. As a contribution to information access, we are now linking to our Web site scientific magazines and regional training programs related to conservation. Furthermore, to promote publication of significant research in important international journals, the Section is soliciting volunteers to provide suggestions on English grammar and clarity of writing to authors whose native language is not

English. We seek volunteers with good English and Spanish, Portuguese, or French writing skills. To participate contact Miguel Vázquez, biodiversidad1@ecociencia.org.

The Section considers the 2005 annual meeting, organized by M.A. Marini, as a priority and a chance not only to promote SCB and to strengthen regional membership, but also to foster training and international conservation synergies. Section Board members will serve on various committees for the meeting: plenary speakers and symposia (M.A. Marini, J.P. Rodríguez, and J.A. Simonetti), oral and poster presentations (A. Cuarón), travel awards (L. Calvo), fundraising (A. Sánchez-Azofeifa), student activities (C. Olivo), and short courses (M. Acosta, L. Calvo, M.A. Vázquez, and C. Olivo).

Nominations were solicited and elections conducted for President Elect and two Director positions on the Section Board. The President Elect position became vacant as J.A. Simonetti assumed the Section's presidency. Congratulations to Marcelo Gonçalves de Lima, the new Director of Education, and Lorena Calvo, re-elected as Secretary. The President Elect position remains open.

Selection of a South American venue for the third annual meeting of the Section Board will depend on local support, travel costs, and opportunities to offer a series of lectures or a short course. Alternatively, the meeting may be postponed and held during SCB's annual meeting in Brasília.

Miguel Vázquez

AUSTRALASIA

It's a glorious time of year in this part of the world; in southeastern Australia, spring is heralded by the blooming of *Acacia dealbata* (silver wattle). Australasian Board members Menna Jones, Andy Mack, and Jean-Marc Hero recently returned from SCB's annual meeting. Australasian students and researchers, including two of the Section's former student award winners, Samantha Fox and Miriam Supuma, were well-represented. Congratulations to Tara Martin from the University of Queensland for winning the first-place student award for her presentation "Do experts know anything about birds and grazing? A Bayesian approach using expert opinion."

Harry Recher, ex officio Board member and editor of *Pacific Conservation Biology*, was appointed a Member of the Order of Australia (AM – Member General Division) in the Queen's birthday honors list in June. He received his award for "service to ecological science, particularly through the development of ecosystem management in Australia and as an educator, author and advocate for biodiversity." This is a significant honor and we congratulate Harry for the recognition of his work.

Membership of the Section currently stands at 341. About half of our members hail from countries within the region, including Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and the Pacific Islands (including Hawaii and Guam). Because we are one of the smallest Sections, it is imperative that we increase our membership to reach a critical mass.

New Board Members

Section elections were finalized in mid-April. We welcome two new Board members, Nicola Nelson and Tish Silberbauer, and returning members Rob Davis and Marc Hero. We also welcome two ex officio Board members, Harry Recher and Dick Frankham. Many thanks to our outgoing members, Angie Penn, Meg Montgomery, and Eric Dorfman, for their invaluable help in the challenging stages of initiating the Section.

The current Board is

Rob Davis, radavis@cyllene.uwa.edu.au
Karen Firestone, kfirestone@zoo.nsw.gov.au
Richard Frankham, rfrankha@rna.bio.mq.edu.au
Caroline Gross, cgross@metz.une.edu.au
Jean-Marc Hero, M.Hero@griffith.edu.au
Menna Jones (Acting President), menna.jones@utas.edu.au
Andy Mack, amack@global.net.pg
Nicola Nelson, Nicola.Nelson@vuw.ac.nz
Harry Recher, hjrecher@pacific.net.au
Tish Silberbauer, tsilberb@bio.mq.edu.au

Board of Directors Meeting

The Australasian Section's annual board meeting was held 2–3 September at Taronga Zoo in Sydney. The generous assistance of the Christensen Fund allowed all our Board members to meet face-to-face for the first time since the Ecological Society of Australia meeting in Cairns in December of 2002. This meeting gave us the opportunity to strategically plan the next few years of Section activities and focus on building the Section to its full potential. The Board will provide an update in the November issue of the newsletter. Please feel free to contact any of the Board members if you have ideas or suggestions for how you would like to see the Australasian Section develop.

Conference Activities and Student Awards

This year the Section is supporting two regional conferences, the 6th New Guinea Biology Conference and the XXII International Congress of Entomology.

Due to the great success of the 5th New Guinea Biology Conference in 2003, the Section decided to continue supporting this conference in 2004. The 6th conference, *Biological Conservation through Research and Education*, will be held 7–9 October at The University of Papua, Manokwari Campus in West Papua. For more information contact the organizers at biocon2004@yahoo.com. The Section is contributing funds to help students travel to the conference and to provide student awards. SCB support for conferences like this not only helps to foster conservation biology within our region but also helps to forge bridges between sometimes-isolated conservation biologists. Last year's student prize winners were so pleased and honored to be recognized. Our small contribution really makes a direct impact on these students.

We would like to extend support for student awards to conservation-related conferences in the Pacific Islands. If you know of any appropriate venues, please contact Rob Davis, radavis@cyllene.uwa.edu.au.

The XXII International Congress of Entomology, *Strength in Diversity*, was held 15–21 August in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. The winner of the student prize will be announced in the November newsletter.

Menna Jones

EUROPE

The Europe Section held its annual elections in November 2003. This year, there were openings for three ordinary Board members and for President Elect. Participation by the Section members in the nominations and voting was low. Andrew Pullin (University of Birmingham, United Kingdom) stood unopposed and was duly elected as President Elect. After serving one year on the Board, Martin Dieterich (db&p consultants, Kirchheim, Germany) was re-elected for a full three year term. Two new members, Isabel Sousa Pinto (University of Porto, Portugal) and Owen Nevin (University of Central Lancashire, United Kingdom), were also elected to the Board for three years. Our active secretary, Peter Pearman (Michigan State University, USA), was not re-elected and his dynamism and tireless efforts will be missed. Section members should note that nominations are open for three positions for the 2004 election. Nominations should be sent to europe@conservationbiology.org before the closing date of 15 October. A list of nominees will be circulated to the membership before the end of October with voting to be concluded by the end of November. The level of participation in the 2003 elections was disappointing and the Board encourages all members of the Section to become actively involved in the nominations and voting process.

The involvement of members in the activities of the Section is critical to the effective operation of the Section and the Board would like to thank the members of the Policy Committee for their input in drafting of *Resolution Advocating an Expanded Role for Scientists in Reviewing the Efficacy of the EU Nature Conservation Directives, CAP and CFP*. This Resolution is currently available for all members to view at www.conbio.org/Europe. European Union nature conservation directives, the CAP, and the CFP are highly complex. Their application has a tremendous impact on biodiversity preservation. Diversity in terms of implementation hardly allows approaching overall efficiency of these directives and policies in a pan-European context. However, the importance of science-based monitoring of nature conservation efforts is an overriding theme that applies to the situation in Europe in general. We consider such monitoring a basic prerequisite for optimization and for an exchange of ideas between

different national or state programs. If approved, this resolution will be distributed, under the direction of the Section's Policy and Communications Committees, to key legislators and media outlets across Europe.

The Section's Board met in the Doñana Biological Reserve, Spain in January 2004. It was decided that the Section would hold the First European Congress on Conservation Biology in 2006. A call for hosts of the congress was issued in the spring and the Board is pleased to announce that we have accepted a proposal from Eger, Hungary.

In addition to organizing the congress, efforts have been made to increase the profile and membership of the Section. These include the establishment of links with the British Ecological Society and German Ecological Society with the intent of having official representation at their 2005 meetings. The Section has been invited to take part in the 2004 meeting of the Italian Ecological Society (SIE), where we will be organizing a symposium. The Section also plans to host a symposium at the 2005 SCB annual meeting. It was agreed that the Section should give scientific sponsorship to events organized by groups whose goals are in agreement with ours unless a Board member objects; however, if an organization wishes to use the Section logo a Board or committee member must be on the event organizing committee.

A presentation at the Section Board meeting addressed potential cooperation between the European Platform of Biodiversity Research Strategy and the Section. The Board felt that cooperation would be beneficial to both parties and has established an ad hoc committee to promote cooperative efforts. It also was agreed that we should provide subsidized memberships for individuals willing to become actively involved in the Section, e.g. through committee membership. We aim to offer full support to 40 new members in 2004 and 50% support to 80 members in 2005.

During the Board meeting and subsequent discussions, much consideration was given to our role as a society within Europe. It is important to recognize the differences that exist between conservation biology in North America and Europe. Environmental awareness, activism, and conservation are well established in Europe and there are already many prominent players in the field. To be effective as a new and growing body the Section needs to offer something new and different. As a professional society of conservation biologists, both research academics and field practitioners, we are in fact different from the many groups promoting conservation issues throughout Europe. As a board we see the Society acting in the role of advisor rather than advocate within the framework of European government. As such we must strive to act at a high level within the administration, promoting rigorous research and science-based policy and management. A portfolio has been produced to aid in the efforts to become better known within the administration. Copies of this portfolio will soon be available on the Section's Web site. Distribution of the portfolio will be coordinated by the Communications Committee under its new chair, Isabel Sousa Pinto.

While promoting our advisory role at a legislative level we must not neglect our role in the dissemination of current

knowledge of conservation biology not only within the research community but also to practitioners and policy makers. English is the language of science, especially conservation science, and as such it is the language in which journals, proceedings, and textbooks are published. Yet those who carry out conservation and determine policies often do not conduct their work in English. If we are to have an impact on the practice of conservation in Europe we must act to provide up-to-date science in a diversity of languages. An electronic newsletter that includes a digest of current scientific papers has been proposed. Luigi Boitani, President of the Section, attended the March 2004 meeting of SCB's Board of Governors, a portion of which was devoted to the structure of *Conservation Biology*. The Section Board believes that internationalization of the journal should be approached not through a restructuring of the editorial board but rather through encouraging the submission of editorials and reviews from outside the United States. Having presented this as our position, the Board encourages Section members to submit original research, editorials, and reviews to the journal.

Once again the Board encourages members' active participation in Section activities. Please take the time to review our current resolution and consider nominations for the upcoming Board elections. To contact the Board with any questions or comments e-mail europa@conservationbiology.org.

Owen Nevin

MARINE

The Marine Section looks forward to working with the steering committee of the 2006 annual meeting in San Jose, California (see page 2) to include a substantial number of symposia and contributed sessions with marine and cross-cutting themes. We hope to take advantage of the region's large number of marine institutions as potential hosts of field trips and other events. We expect that marine attendance in 2006 will exceed attendance at the 2001 Marine Conservation Symposium in San Francisco, and our participation in the 2006 meeting is a step towards the Section's goal of increasing marine representation in SCB.

The Marine Section had a very successful annual meeting. Two excellent symposia were convened, bringing international researchers at the forefront of marine conservation to present their research: *The Sea of Cortez: Bi-National Science and Conservation in the Aquarium of the World* and *Designing Networks of Reserves: Theory, Tools and Case Studies*. Marine-oriented workshops also were convened, and two contributed sessions were dedicated to marine conservation. Attendees at a presentation by Scott Johnston (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) at the start of the Section's membership meeting were treated to a lively discussion of the potential impacts of offshore wind development. As always, our social event was well attended. Carolyn Lundquist represented the Marine Section at the Board of Governors Meeting. We look forward to the 2005 annual meeting, and hope to involve our many marine colleagues in Austral and Neotropical America in the development of proposals for marine-themed and cross-cutting symposia. Please contact marine@conbio.org if you have potential symposium ideas. The deadlines for symposium proposals is 31 October.

Updates on Marine Science and Policy

United States fish stocks are rebounding. The U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration released a 2003 report, *Status of Fisheries of the United States*, which shows continued progress toward reducing excessive fishing rates and rebuilding fish stocks to sustainable levels. In 2003, four fish stocks were fully rebuilt, a record ten species were removed from the list of overfished stocks, and overfishing practices were halted for five species.

Effectiveness guidebook for managers of marine protected areas. A new guidebook for managers of marine protected areas (MPAs) managers was published in August as a result of a four-year partnership among the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Ocean Service and its International Program Office, IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas–Marine, and the World Wide Fund for Nature. The book, *How is Your MPA Doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness*, aims to help improve MPA management by suggesting a framework that links the goals and objectives of MPAs with indicators that measure management effectiveness.

U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy report. On 22 July, the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy approved its Draft Final Report, which incorporated comments from the public review process. For updates see www.oceancommission.gov.

The **Blue Vision Conference** was held in July 2004 in Washington, D.C. More than 200 "Seaweed Rebels" joined forces to discuss U.S. national and international policies for protecting the oceans. Carolyn Lundquist and Alan Thornhill represented SCB. For more information see www.bluevizmeet.com. Shortly after the meeting, a bill drafted by Congressman Sam Farr and others, Oceans 21, was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Other news

Section events. As per our bylaws, two officers on the Section's Board of Directors will be retiring at the end of 2004. We are looking for motivated individuals with sufficient time to increase the role of marine conservation in SCB. The term of office is three years, beginning January 2005. If you are interested in running for these positions, please send a brief (maximum 300 word) statement describing your objectives in running for the Board and a brief summary of your experience in marine conservation biology to marine@conbio.org by 1 October. Nominations and self-nominations are welcome. We encourage scientists from all countries to run for these positions in order to further diversify our Board. Online elections will take place during November.

Journal subscriptions. Funds remain to subsidize SCB memberships and subscriptions to *Conservation Biology* and *Conservation In Practice* for marine conservationists who reside outside of North America. Contact marine@conbio.org if you know individuals who could benefit from these funds.

Communications. Please visit our Web site, new as of July 2004, www.conbio.org/Marine. The site includes links to

marine job announcements, funding, policy, science, and other marine conservation areas of interest. If you have suggestions that might improve the content of the site, please let us know.

Upcoming event. 23–27 October 2005 – First International Marine Protected Areas Congress, Geelong, Australia, www.impaccongress.org/.

Carolyn Lundquist and Elise Granek

NORTH AMERICA

At the 2004 annual meeting, the North America Section marked several transitions and launched a new set of initiatives to promote conservation in the region. First, as will occur every year, there was turnover on the Board of Directors. Karen Root (Bowling Green State University) and Andre DesRochers (Université Laval) completed terms on the Board; we owe them many thanks for participating in the organization of the Section during the past two years. Also, David Wilcove (Princeton University), who served as President of the Board for the past two years, stepped down as President. David will continue to serve as a member of the Board for the next year. New Board members are Reed Noss (University of Central Florida)—President Elect, Pam Krannitz (Environment Canada), Brian Czech (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), and Michael Reed (Tufts University). I (Middlebury College) changed roles, from Board member to Section President.

Of the new initiatives we will pursue in the coming year, I will discuss only one here, leaving others for future newsletters. The primary activity of the Section over the past two years has been to engage our community of conservation biologists—researchers, practitioners, and educators—more directly in the arena of conservation policy. Despite the overwhelming support the SCB membership has shown over the past 20 years for the society to engage actively in influencing conservation policy, the Section chose to approach this issue cautiously. Part of our caution resulted from a desire to ensure that we established a strong initial record from which to build during the coming years, and part, quite frankly, reflected insufficient resources. Ours is a volunteer Board, and the SCB Executive Office was (is) overworked and understaffed, unable to take on many new policy initiatives.

The results of our early efforts are noteworthy. Most importantly, we commissioned evaluations of proposed changes to the U.S. National Forest Management Act and proposed changes to the rules governing designation of critical habitat under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (see www.conbio.org/NAmerica for links to PDFs of these reports). Our contacts in the United States government have told us that both efforts were well received and highly influential, and that excerpts from both reports were read into the Congressional Record.

These results convince me that the long-standing debate about whether SCB can engage in the conservation policy arena without sacrificing our scientific objectivity is settled. The sky did not fall and we have not been transformed into an advocacy organization. We can participate in debates about conservation policy, and we can participate without abandoning our core principles as scientists. (If you still have doubts, I encourage

you to read both of the reports.) Furthermore, I believe deeply that we must participate in policy. If SCB's mission and goals are to have any meaning, we must continue on this course, expanding our efforts at a rapid pace.

Easily said, and for most readers, these statements are not especially controversial. The real question is how we will accomplish our goal of increased participation in policy. It is an immediate priority of this Board to determine how we can achieve our goal given the existing financial and personnel resources of the organization. We will explore several options, ranging from fundraising to hiring a policy director for the Section to finding a way to hire a policy director for SCB, part of whose responsibility would be directed toward North America. We have not yet identified the best solution, but I guarantee that we will find it. Furthermore, I guarantee that this "policy initiative" for the North America Section will not exclusively focus on the United States, but will include Canada.

Clearly, a long-term strategy for engagement in conservation policy must be well thought-out; thus, it cannot happen overnight. No one wants SCB to apply its scientific knowledge and skills to informing conservation policy more than me, but desire is no substitute for careful planning. Thus, our approach over the short term must remain the same: identify issues where knowledge of conservation science can constructively inform discussion about conservation policy (through our network of SCB members and friends), commission expert panels to write reports about these issues, and work to insert these reports into the policy debate. Ultimately, however, we will implement a comprehensive strategy that will allow us to be more effective in identifying issues and influencing the debate.

As always, I am interested in hearing your thoughts about this or any issue of importance to the North American membership.

One further news item to report: the proposed changes to our Section bylaws were approved by a margin of 456 to 7. My thanks to everyone who voted.

Steve Trombulak, trombulak@middlebury.edu

FRESHWATER WORKING GROUP

The Freshwater Working Group held its second annual meeting at the 2004 SCB annual meeting. Of the 38 attendees, 28 were new to the group. This turnout suggested that there remains strong interest in the working group, but there is high turnover between annual meetings and we need to find ways of including people regardless of whether they attend the annual meeting. At the same time, the group agreed that the annual meeting presents a good opportunity to build interest in

freshwater topics among individuals of all backgrounds and interests, and that consequently we should continue to sponsor symposia and other meeting events. Other points of consensus were a need to give the working group some structure in the form of roles and responsibilities and the value of liaising with other societies (e.g., North American Benthological Society, American Fisheries Society). We also decided to compile and disseminate a quarterly newsletter with information of interest to working group members.

Please visit our Web site (www.conbio.org/freshwater) for information on new committees and volunteer opportunities, as well as to subscribe to the freshwater listserv. The group is open to all interested people.

Robin Abell

Renewal Season Is Upon Us!

Last year we suggested that the best way to help the Executive Office during Renewal Season is to stop by and join us for coffee. This year, with more than 8000 members, we're thinking a few beers might be better . . .

The peak of Renewal Season occurs from October through December. Because SCB membership was linked to the calendar year until quite recently, more than 4000 members have renewal dates that fall at the end of the year.

There are three things you can do to help us during this hectic time.

- 1. Renew early.** Our membership system will extend your SCB membership and subscriptions appropriately if you renew before your anniversary date. Renewing early has the added benefit of reducing the number of members who may need help in December. You will receive early renewal reminders by e-mail and paper.

- 2. Use the Web-based renewal system.** Using the secure online renewal system <https://www.conbio.org/renew/> and paying with your credit card is the easiest way to maintain your affiliation with SCB and subscriptions. The technology allows us to process your requests automatically and manage the flow of information far more efficiently than by paper. The online system saves not only paper but also time and money. All you need to renew online is your SCB Member ID or SCB Username. You will find one or both in any e-mail you have received from the Executive Office or in the e-mail and paper renewal reminders arriving soon.

- 3. Stop by the Executive Office and join us for coffee beer!**

To check the status of your membership and subscriptions (which may have different renewal dates) at any time, use the tracking tool at www.conbio.org/status/.

2004 *Conservation Biology* Editor's Report

Gary K. Meffe, Editor

Overview

In 2003 six issues of *Conservation Biology* were published on time. The number of manuscripts submitted to the journal in 2003 increased from the previous year by 7.0%. A total of 1884 pages was published, an increase of 11.5% from 2002 and the second-largest volume in our history. Two Special Sections were published in 2003 (*Population Biology of Invasive Species* and *Human–Carnivore Conflict: Local Solutions with Global Applications*), totaling 128 pages. *Conservation Biology* continued to receive excellent national and international press coverage due to our media consultant, Robin Meadows, who provides news tips to the media of selected articles. Finally, the Editorial office provided information upon request to the review team conducting the first-ever review of the journal. We look forward to incorporating recommendations from the review that were received at the 2004 annual meeting.

Major Developments in 2003

Several major developments regarding the journal occurred in 2003.

1. The largest and most exciting development was the announcement in the December issue of a new electronic submittal option. This was in response to a call from the membership and the Board of Governors for the option to transmit manuscripts electronically, and is a historic change in how the journal conducts its business. It required several months of preparation, technological adjustments, and practice with mock submittals by the staff of the Editorial Office to be able to handle the challenges of this new procedure. It also required establishing new protocols for and training of Editorial Board members. This was all accomplished in the second half of 2003 in anticipation of the December announcement.

As of June 2004, an estimated 95% of manuscript submittals were electronic, indicating that indeed this is something appreciated and embraced by authors. The Editorial Office and Editorial Board handled the transition very well, though not without some bumps in the road. There were technological difficulties at the outset and the learning curve was steep (virtually every aspect of office life was affected), but the process generally has worked smoothly. Whether it effectively speeds the review and publication process remains to be seen, as the largest time bottlenecks continue to be due to human behavior and not physical transport of manuscripts. Assigning Editors and reviewers make or break the process, as do authors during revision. We continue to push for faster reviews and eliminate from the Board those individuals who are persistently slow; three Board members were removed in 2003 for this reason. We also ask authors to provide revisions within tight time limits.

2. In response to the Society's strong push toward internationalization, the journal made several major strides in 2003. First, I sent a letter in May 2003 to all Section presidents with important information about the journal relative to internationalization. This included a clear statement of the journal's intent to be more international, clarification of journal policies about acceptable papers, an open invitation for Editorials and Special Sections to be developed from outside the United States, and a strong encouragement for international scientists to submit their papers to *Conservation Biology*. I also asked each Section to suggest appropriate individuals from outside the United States to be considered for service on the Editorial Board. The presidents were encouraged to share that letter with their full membership in whatever form they desired.

Second, I wrote an Editorial in the October issue that addressed internationalization of the journal and repeated many of the issues that were covered in the letter to Section presidents. This Editorial also encouraged more submittals from outside the United States.

Third, after an extensive consideration of nominees, I appointed eight new Board members in 2003 from Australia, Hong Kong, Mexico, Singapore, Spain, South Africa, and Sweden (2), to add to the existing 10 non-

U.S. members. Thus far in 2004 I have added two more individuals from England and Wales to the Board of Editors, and am continually looking for further opportunities in this area.

3. In the June 2003 issue, an important Editorial on conservation and the social sciences heralded one of the next pushes by the journal, the stronger integration of the social sciences into effective conservation. A great deal of interest has spun off that Editorial and the journal has received noticeably more papers in the social sciences in recent months.

4. At the strong urging of the publisher, we switched to offshore typesetting (by Techbooks, in India) starting with the December 2003 issue. This gives us faster turnaround times, significant cost savings, and better-quality files for online publication. Techbooks' e-proofing system is more sophisticated than was that of Capital City Press, which allows us, for example, to place offprint order and page charge forms on a Web site along with article proofs for the authors to access, rather than sending them as attachments to the authors in e-mails. Techbooks' e-proofing also sends automatic reminder e-mails to authors if they have not downloaded their proofs within a certain amount of time. Turnaround time for typesetting (from edited manuscript to page proofs) went from about 10 days to 5 days. There are also large cost savings with Techbooks. We are no longer charged for corrections (correction costs with our domestic typesetter were approaching 50% of the typesetting costs) or for electronic files for the Web. Typesetting costs went from approximately \$35 per page to approximately \$10 per page. All of this will be passed on as cost savings to SCB.

5. The impact factor for *Conservation Biology* in 2003 was the highest ever for this journal: 3.279 (2002 was at 2.663). We are ranked among all journals as follows for the following categories: ecology, 11th; biodiversity conservation, 3rd (behind only *Global Change Biology* and *American Naturalist*); and environmental sciences, 4th (behind *Global Change Biology*, *Environmental Science and Technology*, and *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*). By comparison, the journals with most similar content to *Conservation Biology* are ranked as follows among all ecological journals: *Ecological Applications*, 18th (2.852); *Conservation Ecology*, 29th (2.101); *Biological Conservation*, 31st (2.056), *Animal Conservation*, 44th (1.481); *Oryx*, 52nd (1.253); *Biodiversity Conservation*, 60th (1.060).

Submissions

The submission rate for this journal year (613) increased from 2002 (573), indicating continued and growing interest in publishing here. The trend in submittal rate is as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of manuscripts</u>	<u>% change</u>
1993-94	302	
1994-95	378	25.2
1995-96	434	14.8
1996-97	540	24.4
1997-98	579	7.2
1998	614	6.0
1999	581	-5.3
2000	580	-0.17
2001	643	10.9
2002	573	-10.8
2003	613	7.0

We also received and processed 141 preliminary manuscript inquiries, an 11% decrease from the previous year's total of 159. Most of these consisted of an abstract and an inquiry as to its suitability for the journal. We try to respond to these within 1–2 days of receipt.

We used 58 ad hoc Assigning Editors this year, individuals who handled one or more manuscripts but are not on the Board. Ad hoc Editors were used when a manuscript did not fall within the expertise of existing

Editors, when they had special expertise in the area, or if the appropriate Assigning Editor was particularly busy with other manuscripts. This system has worked very well and will continue to be employed. Ad hoc Editors are acknowledged in the December issue of each year and are an integral part of this journal; I thank them for their contributions.

Decisions and Rejection Rates

Of the 613 papers received in 2003 (Table 1), 202 (33%) were rejected by the Editor without review, usually within three days of submittal and usually due to inappropriateness of subject matter or low quality; 411 (67%) were sent for review, most through Assigning Editors and a few directly by the Editor.

Of the 411 manuscripts sent for review, 213 (51.8%) were rejected, 134 (32.6%) were accepted, and no decision had yet been reached on 64 (15.6%), which are still in review or in revision with authors. Of the total number of papers submitted (613), 409 (66.7%) were rejected (slightly less than last year's 72.4%), 134 were accepted (21.8 %, up from 16.8% last year), and no decision was yet reached on 64 (or 10.4%, nearly identical to 10.6% last year) as of 31 May 2004. Of the 549 papers for which decisions have been made, 415 (74.5%) were rejected. However, some of the "no decision" papers are being revised and are likely to be accepted, so the overall rejection rate will be lower than this, probably near 70%.

Table 1. Journal-year statistics, 1 January – 31 December 2003

Month	NUMBER OF MANUSCRIPTS					
	Submitted	Rejected by editor	Sent for review	Total rejected	Accepted	No decision
January	33	8	25	20	11	1 (+1 changed to letter)
February	51	14	37	33	17	0 (+1 changed to letter)
March	60	24	36	45	14	1
April	49	14	35	29	16	4
May	48	21	27	33	12	2 (+1 withdrawn)
June	42	11	31	29	10	3
July	70	26	44	52	13	4 (+1 withdrawn)
August	33	11	22	20	5	7 (+1 closed)
September	53	19	34	36	11	6
October	58	14	44	38	13	7
November	45	18	27	28	8	9
December	71	22	49	46	4	20 (+1 closed)
TOTAL	613	202 (33%)	411 (67%)	409 (67%)	134 (22%)	61 (+6 misc. [see above]) (10%)

Turnaround Time

See last year's report for a discussion of how turnaround statistics are calculated (i.e., these are relative but not absolute times because they are right-truncated due to manuscripts still in process).

Mean turnaround time for manuscript review continues to fluctuate between 70 and 80 days; it was up slightly in 2003 by one day to 80 days (Figure 1). We continue to have a struggle with busy reviewers who do not complete the task in a reasonable amount of time (or never complete it), and we continue to replace Assigning Editors who are consistently slow. Time from acceptance to publication (Figure 2) decreased from 236 days in 2002 to 215 days in 2003 (-8.9%). Total time from submission to publication (Figure 3) decreased from 391 to 344 days (-12.0%), indicating greater efficiency in the overall process.

Region of Authorship

Region of authorship is determined by the address of the first author at the time the work was done, and only partially reflects sovereignty of contributions. International participation in authorship is actually higher than indicated by these statistics due to secondary authorships. Of the 134 papers submitted and accepted in 2003, the proportion that were first-authored by U.S. authors decreased from 67.7% in 2002 to 56.0% in 2003 (Figure 4). Regional changes from 2002 to 2003 are Asia (0% to 5.3%), Africa (4.2% to 1.5%), Australia (7.3% to 6.0%),

Canada (3.1% to 6.0%), Central / South America (4.2% to 4.1%), and Europe (13.5% to 21.1%). For the first three issues of 2004, 51.2% of papers are from the U.S. and 48.8% are non-U.S. papers (using the same criterion of first authorship). This indicates a positive trend toward greater representation of non-U.S. based authors.

Miscellaneous Information

Two final comments on journal business bear mentioning. First, the unsung heroes of a successful journal are the Editorial Board members. They perform their tasks voluntarily with little reward other than personal satisfaction and the knowledge that their scientific insights keep our standards high. The vast majority of Board members perform their jobs efficiently, and admirably.

Second, it is the strong opinion of this Editor that the logistic and support functions of the journal—the Editorial office, Blackwell Scientific, Techbooks, and Capital City Press—are working as smoothly and effectively as they ever have. In short, this is an extraordinary team that works very well together.

Margaret Flagg and Ellen Main of the Editorial Office are doing superior work in every aspect. Even with the increased workloads of a huge publishing year and a major transition to a new electronic submittal system, they have performed exceptionally well and in good spirits under, at times, a great deal of stress.

Likewise, realignment and new personnel at Blackwell have been entirely to our advantage. Robert Harington, Vice President and Publisher, Science Journals, has taken an extraordinary interest in *Conservation Biology* and SCB, is always responsive to our needs, and is eager to innovate. A new position—Senior Editor, Science Journals—held by Marjorie Spencer likewise helps when questions or problems arise. Perhaps most importantly, Production Editor Rosemary Farmer is nothing short of exceptional in her abilities and dedication to this journal. We have fullest confidence in her capabilities and always know that she is diligently working on our behalf. In short, this is an excellent publication team that works together extremely well.

Report on Student Affairs from the 2004 Annual Meeting

Of the record 1600 individuals who participated in this year's SCB meeting, an impressive 29% were students. Thanks to the efforts of our hosts, notably Eva Fearn and her staff, we were able to offer half a dozen student-oriented events. Two of the most popular events were the Board of Governors–student mixer and a publishing workshop offered by the editorial team of *Conservation Biology*. Many thanks to Gary Meffe (Editor), Ellen Main (Managing Editor), and Margaret Flagg (Editorial Assistant) for sharing their insights and experience with all of us. We hope to present additional practical workshops aimed at advancing student careers during future meetings.

The Student Affairs Committee is only one year old. The special touches at the 2004 meeting—including two pages describing student activities in the front of the printed meeting program—reflected the efforts of SCB's Executive Office, our local hosts, and the committee. However, we still have much work to do to build our capacity and expand our mission. Specifically, we are looking for members to assist with the following initiatives.

1. Developing a student-to-student mentoring program that will link students who speak English as a first language with students from around the world who need help editing or preparing manuscripts or gaining access to written materials. Another way for students, or student chapters with sufficient resources, to enhance the reach of conservation biology to students with inadequate financial resources is to sponsor SCB memberships for students in developing countries. Please contact me if you are a student interested in participating or represent a Section that wishes to work with us to identify students in need.

2. Raising funds to bring students to SCB's annual meetings. We must be more aggressive about defraying the costs of attending meetings.

Regardless of whether you are able to formally join the committee, I welcome your suggestions for making annual meetings a richer experience.

Aram Calhoun (calhoun@maine.edu), Chair

2004 STUDENT AWARDS

We received more than 80 student award abstracts in 2004. Abstracts were reviewed by Aram Calhoun, Carolyn Lundquist, Sandra Peters, and Jon Paul Rodríguez. Many thanks to these individuals for evaluating more than 300 pages of text.

Oral presentations by the 16 finalists were judged by Sarah Bekessy, Aram Calhoun, Mwangi Githiru, Carolyn Lundquist, Andy Mack, Jari Niemela, and Linda Olsvig-Whittaker.

All finalists received a cash award and a banquet ticket. The first- through fourth-place award winners also received gift certificates for books that were donated by Island Press, Oxford University Press, and Sinauer Associates.

First Place

Tara Martin
University of Queensland

Do experts know anything about birds and grazing? A Bayesian approach using expert opinion

Second Place

Sarah Greenleaf
Princeton University

Wild bees enhance pollination by honey bees

Third Place

Trond Larsen
Princeton University

Linking patterns, causes and functional consequences of changing biodiversity

Fourth Place

Noah Whiteman, University of Missouri
Princeton University

Host-parasite conservation genetics in the Galapagos Islands: pragmatic value of the forgotten bounty

FINALISTS

Alison Cameron—Extinction risk from climate change

Alan Clark—A double edge to environmental citizen suits

Samantha Fox—Understanding the demographics of a vulnerable flying-fox species

Thomas Gillespie—Forest fragmentation alters parasite dynamics in African primate populations

Patricia Harveson—Source-sink dynamics of Florida Key Deer on Big Pine Key

Mark Higgins—Rapid tropical forest inventory: a comparison of techniques from western Amazonia

Diego Martino—Temporary and mobile protected areas for the conservation of a palm tree landscape

Melanie Murphy—Landscape genetics: simulating multi-locus genetic to assess a novel spatial analysis technique

Meera Oommen—Woody plant richness across five spatial scales in the Indian western Himalaya: patterns and implications

Amber Pairis—Predicting California gnatcatcher distribution based on environmental variables

Tracy Turberville—Translocation as a conservation tool: repatriation of gopher tortoises to a formerly occupied site

Leonie Valentine—Responses of bird assemblages to management burning of riparian vegetation in grazed tropical savanna

Society for Conservation Biology Adopts a Code of Member Ethics

In an important milestone for SCB, the membership unanimously approved a Code of Member Ethics during the annual Members' Meeting on 1 August. This is a major step in our development as an organization and as individuals committed to scientific honesty, conservation, and fairness. Please clip the Code from this newsletter and post it in your office, distribute it in your classes, and discuss it with your colleagues.

Please consult the May 2004 newsletter for an earlier draft of the Code and details about the ad hoc committee and our process up to that point. In response to our invitation, 93 SCB members, including individuals from every continent, commented on the draft between April and June. All respondents supported the spirit and intent of the document. Most respondents also suggested thoughtful, constructive modifications. We were pleased with the large number of helpful criticisms, and substantially revised the document in light of the comments. A point-by-point compilation of comments, and the pre- and post-comment versions of each sentence in the Code, is available at www.conbio.org/SCB/Information/Ethics/Comments_and_revision.pdf.

In early July, the revised document was posted on the SCB Web site and sent to all SCB members with e-mail addresses in our directory. At its 29 July meeting, the Board of Governors made some small changes and forwarded the Code to the members for ratification. At the Members' Meeting, with only a small amount of additional discussion and a large amount of pride, the members approved the Code. Not a single "nay" vote was recorded.

The Code is not perfect. Doubtless some members were starting the process of revision even while casting their vote of approval—and that is good! Such a revisionist impulse is a healthy sign that we care about these issues and about our society.

Besides the inevitable revision, what are the next steps? Most immediately, the Code should help each SCB member be aware of, think

see **Ethics**, page 14

Society for Conservation Biology—Code of Member Ethics

The mission of the Society for Conservation Biology, a global community of conservation professionals, is to develop the scientific and technical means for the protection, maintenance, and restoration of life on Earth, including species, ecosystems, and the processes that sustain them. To meet this goal, we encourage all conservation scientists and practitioners to

1. Actively disseminate information to promote understanding of and appreciation for biodiversity and the science of conservation biology.
2. Advocate the use of reliable information, rigorous scientific methodology, and credible inference in management decisions affecting biodiversity.
3. Recognize that uncertainty is inherent in managing ecosystems and species and encourage application of the precautionary principle in management and policy decisions affecting biodiversity.
4. Recognize their responsibility to conservation and scientific honesty, and inform other scientists, the public, and prospective clients or employers of this responsibility.
5. Avoid actions or omissions that may compromise their responsibility to conservation and science.
6. Be willing to volunteer their services for the public good at a level appropriate to their financial abilities.
7. Perform professional services or peer reviews only in their areas of competence, cooperate with other professionals in the best interest of conservation, and refer clients to other professionals with appropriate expertise.
8. Refuse to allow personal interests, compensation, or personal relationships to interfere with their professional judgment or advice.
9. Scrupulously avoid plagiarism; acknowledge the limitations of their research design, data, and interpretation of results; disclose conflicts of interest; honestly discuss their findings; and attempt to correct misrepresentation of their research by others.
10. Claim authorship of a publication or report only when they have contributed substantially to the conception, design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation, or have helped draft or revise the article, and approve of the published version.
11. When working professionally, especially outside their region of residence, interact and collaborate with counterparts, present seminars, confer regularly with appropriate officials, share information, involve colleagues and students in professional activities, contribute to local capacity-building, and equitably share the benefits arising from the use of local knowledge, practices, and genetic resources.
12. Treat colleagues and professional contacts respectfully and support fair standards of employment and treatment for those engaged in the practice of conservation biology.
13. Work to ensure that no colleague is unjustly deprived of his or her job, reputation, ability to publish, or scientific freedom as a result of his or her conservation efforts.
14. Protect the rights and welfare of human subjects used in research and obtain the informed consent of those subjects.
15. Adhere to the highest standards for treatment of animals used in research in a way that contributes most positively to sustaining natural populations and ecosystems.

Ethics, from page 13

about, and discuss the responsibilities related to our professional work. These activities certainly engaged each person who commented on and drafted the Code—and each of us is a better person for the experience. We certainly hope that SCB members will turn to the Code when facing ethical dilemmas and that the Code will be taught in classes related to conservation biology around the world. I know it will be a topic of discussion among my research group in the first week of our next semester.

Another step for SCB will be development of specific policies to ensure that our behavior as an organization reflects the Code. SCB provides scientific expertise (sometimes for pay), publishes journals, accepts corporate sponsorships for annual meetings, and works around the globe. Our Code of Member Ethics contains statements relevant to each of these activities, and SCB must be an exemplar of the conduct our members have endorsed.

Another step advocated by many SCB members was to make the Code binding on individual members, complete with consequences for transgressions. Although most members of the ad hoc committee felt that such an approach could create more problems than it would solve, we expect that SCB will reconsider this issue after a few years of experience with the new Code. Doubtless many other steps will follow from our first Code of Member Ethics. Although some steps cannot be predicted, we are confident that we have taken a first big step in the correct direction.

Paul Beier, for the ad hoc committee

REMEMBER TO VOTE!

The ballot for the 2005 Society for Conservation Biology Election will appear in the November newsletter. An electronic voting option also will be available.

Donations to SCB promote the science of conservation biology and protect the diversity of life on Earth

- Donate appreciated stocks, bonds, or mutual funds. If you donate equities owned more than a year, you can avoid tax on the capital gains and reduce income tax by deducting the fair market value as a charitable contribution.
- Make a bequest to SCB in your will. A bequest may reduce taxes on your estate.

Please send donations to
Alan Thornhill
Executive Director, SCB
4245 N. Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203, USA
(703) 276-2384
athornhill@conbio.org

Implications of Biotechnology for Biodiversity Conservation

A combined symposium and discussion session, *Biodiversity and Biotechnology: Understanding the Potential Conservation Risks and Benefits of Genetic Engineering (GE)*, was held at the 2004 annual meeting. Participants educated themselves on the issues by attending 11 symposium presentations and discussing potential actions SCB might take to address the roles (positive and negative) of biotechnology in the conservation of biodiversity. Topics included the use of genetic engineering for conservation purposes (e.g., using GE carp to control non-native carp populations in Australia), the role and limitations of ecological risk assessment (e.g., how risk assessment might address impacts to non-targets and community dynamics), and how SCB members might become more involved in the conservation issues surrounding genetic engineering (e.g., commenting and advising on risk assessment initiatives and public policies).

The topic of risk assessment took center stage during both the symposium and the discussion. The intricacies of risk assessment reflected SCB's multidisciplinary membership: the science, policy, social consequences, limitations, and even philosophical underpinnings of risk assessment were discussed at length. One participant concluded the event with the observation that, by becoming more involved in defining scientific and ethical guidelines for adequate risk assessment, conservation biologists might be in a better position to advocate for the development and evaluation of biotechnologies that serve the public good.

Watch for a complete symposium summary, updates on the issues, and an opportunity to comment on this topic at www.ellenjay.net/SCB/Biotech.html.

Kelly Paulson and Erika Rivers
Conservation Biology Program,
University of Minnesota

Announcements

Funding

The Garden Club of America (GCA) offers an annual graduate fellowship in ecological restoration. The grant of US\$8000 supports specialized study at an accredited university in the United States. The fellowship is administered by the University of Wisconsin–Madison Arboretum and may be renewed pending review. GCA defines ecological restoration as “the process of assisting the recovery and management of ecological integrity. Ecological integrity includes a critical range of variability in biodiversity, ecological processes and structures, regional and historical context, and sustainable cultural practices.” Applicants must provide a cover letter, research proposal (maximum five pages), current resume, letter of endorsement from his or her graduate faculty advisor, which also certifies enrollment, and two additional recommendations. Applications must be received by 14 January 2005. Send applications to GCA Fellowship in Ecological Restoration, Mark Leach, University of Wisconsin–Madison Arboretum, 1207 Seminole Highway, Madison, WI 53711, USA, (608) 263-7344, FAX (608) 262-5209, mkleach@wisc.edu. Committee reviews will be completed early in March.

Bat Conservation International will offer approximately 15 student research scholarships ranging from US\$500 to \$2500 in 2005. Grants will be awarded to research that is directly related to bat conservation and documents roosting and feeding habitat requirements of bats, their ecological and economic roles, or their conservation needs. Students enrolled in any college or university worldwide are eligible to apply. Application deadline is 15 December 2004. Information and forms are available at www.batcon.org/schol/schol.html. For more information contact Sarah Keeton, (512) 327-9721, skeeton@batcon.org.

The Dennis Raveling Scholarship for Waterfowl Research is awarded annually to one or more students with a desire to pursue a career in waterfowl or wetlands ecology. In 2005, one scholarship of US\$2000 and one of US\$1000 will be offered. The scholarship is intended to provide field experience and training in the tools, methods, and concepts of waterfowl and wetlands research and management. Candidates must be pursuing an advanced degree in wildlife, zoology, botany, ecology, or other pertinent biological science. To apply, submit a resume, one-page research proposal, letter of support from a faculty member, and contact information for two references by 31 October 2004. Send applications to Nicole Berset, California Waterfowl Association, 4630 Northgate Blvd., Suite 150, Sacramento, CA 95834, USA. For more information contact Nicole Berset at (916) 648-1406, FAX (916) 648-1665.

Land Use Standards

The first set of standards certifying land use projects that reduce global warming while conserving the environment and alleviating poverty are available for peer review and comment by the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA). The standards address shortfalls in existing land-based climate

strategies, including the Kyoto protocol. They are intended to help public and private entities identify cost-effective greenhouse gas reduction projects that also have a positive impact on biodiversity and local communities. The standards primarily are designed for projects that mitigate or adapt to climate change. They also can be used to evaluate land management projects outside of the climate change arena. The standards will be operational in developing, developed, or emerging economies and can be used for projects with any type of investment. CCBA members include BP, Conservation International, GFA Terra Systems, the Hamburg Institute of International Economics, Intel, The Nature Conservancy, Pelangi, and SC Johnson & Son. To review and comment on the standards, see www.climate-standards.org. For more information contact Jason Anderson, Center for Environmental Leadership in Business, at Conservation International, (202) 912-1464, FAX (202) 912-1048.

Educational Opportunities

The International School of Ethology will offer a course on ungulate management in Europe from 12–17 November 2004 in Erice, Sicily. The course is sponsored by the Italian Ministry of University and Scientific Research, Italian National Research Council, Sicilian Regional Government, Italian Ministry of Environment, Tuscan Regional Government, and Provincial Government of Arezzo. For more information contact Danilo Mainardi, Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali, Università di Venezia, Campo della Celestia 2737 / B Castello, 30122 Venice, Italy, mainardi@unive.it. Please specify name, address, age, nationality, academic qualifications; present position and affiliation, and your specific interest in the course.

The United States Forest Service offers a series of international seminars, including protected area management, forest and natural resources administration and management, watershed management, and a field course on management of wildlands and protected areas, which is conducted in Spanish. For more information see www.fs.fed.us/global/is/welcome.htm or contact Mariam Bamizai, USDA Forest Service, 1099 14th St. NW, Suite 5500W, Washington, D.C. 20005, USA, (202) 219-9774, FAX 202-273-4750, mbamizai@fs.fed.us.

Publications

The Institute for Local Self Government, the research arm of the California League of Cities, recently published *Understanding the Habitat Conservation Planning Process in California: A Guidebook for Project and Regional Conservation Planning*. This document was published as an online book and is available for free at www.ilsg.org. The book serves as a resource to planners, local decision-makers, stakeholders, and scientists involved in developing and reviewing Habitat Conservation Plans. The book was written by Paul Cylinder, Ken Bogan, and David Zippin.

see **Announcements**, page 21

2004 Annual Meeting Update

The 2004 annual meeting was held in New York City, the largest urban area in the eastern United States and an appropriate gathering place for international conservation biologists, government representatives, academics, and others interested in the effects of increasing urbanization on the future of conservation biology.

The meeting was hosted by the Center for Environmental Research and Conservation (CERC) at the Earth Institute at Columbia University, and enjoyed great support from the CERC consortium members: the American Museum of Natural History, New York Botanical Garden, Wildlife Conservation Society, and Wildlife Trust.

There was an overwhelming turnout of more than 1590 participants, including exhibitors, press, volunteers, and one-day registrants. At least 52 countries were represented, covering a broad range of biodiversity research on all inhabited continents. Conservation organizations and resource agencies also were well-represented, including The Nature Conservancy, Conservation International, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as many universities around the world.

The meeting was launched on 29 July with workshops, small meetings, and an opening reception. At final count, the meeting included 20 field trips, 23 symposia, 19 workshops and discussions, 392 contributed presentations, and 251 posters. Major themes emphasized during the scientific sessions included ecological and human health links, data on wildlife trade, science and policy, invasive species, water provision, and designing conservation networks and estates. Plenary speakers addressed environmental history (John McNeill), water conservation (Marisa Mazari and Brian Richter), and designing sustainable human presence on earth (William McDonough).

International Sections met to discuss goals and accomplishments, and more than 300 individuals attended the Members' Meeting on 1 August. The Awards Ceremony honored sixteen student finalists and this year's LaRoe and Distinguished Service awardees, Jerry Franklin, Gerardo Ceballos, the International Crane Foundation, A.J.T. Johnsingh, and Bittu Saghal. Approximately 400 students enjoyed a mixer with the Board of Governors. A topic area networking lunch and a new women in science networking breakfast also were successful. The closing dinner highlighted foods produced using wildlife-friendly practices in New York's Hudson Valley.

We were delighted to work with so many excellent SCB members, scientists, government authorities, and students from around the world in coordinating the 2004 meeting. It was a pleasure to host you and we look forward to Brasília next July.

Eva Fearn

Call for 2005 Award Nominations

Edward T. LaRoe III Memorial Award

The Edward T. LaRoe III Memorial Award is given annually to an individual with a distinguished record of research and outstanding application of science to the conservation of our biological resources. The intention of the award is to recognize the innovative application of science to resource management and policy.

Although all scientists are eligible for the award, because of Edward LaRoe's distinguished career as a public servant, preference is given to employees of governmental resource management agencies or science agencies.

Past recipients of the LaRoe Award are

2003	Stephen Schneider
2002	John Lawton
2001	Robert Pressey
2000	Phil Pister
1999	Chandler Robbins
1998	J. Michael Scott
1997	Barry Noon
1996	Kathy Ralls
1995	Reed Noss

The 2004 LaRoe Award recipient is Jerry Franklin.

Please send nominations for the 2005 LaRoe Award to J. Michael Scott, Department of Fish and Wildlife, P.O. Box 44-1141, Room 103, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844-1141, USA, mScott@uidaho.edu (with copies to Sarah Martinez, sarahm@uidaho.edu).

Nominations should be in the form of a nominating letter with an accompanying resume of the nominee. Multiple letters of support for nominees are encouraged. Nominations must be received by **1 October 2004**.

Distinguished Service Awards

SCB annually presents awards for distinguished service in the field of conservation biology. For 2005, SCB is soliciting nominations from its members and other conservation professionals. Among the categories eligible for awards are

- Academia
- Government
- Outside academia and government

Nominations for individuals or institutions, including a nomination form and a minimum of two supporting letters, must be received by **1 October 2004**. The form is available at www.conbio.org/Awards. Letters and form must be submitted as a single document in Word. Separate letters will not be accepted. Please send nominations to sterling@amnh.org. If the nominator does not have electronic access, contact Eleanor Sterling, Center for Biodiversity and Conservation, American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th St., New York, NY 10024, USA, (212) 769-5742, FAX (212) 769-5292.

Cranes, from page 1

us involved with ICF have long-term hopes for, and commitments to, lasting conservation solutions. Our focused mission has given us the remarkable privilege to know these birds, the places where they live, and the people they live with. Along the lower Zambezi River in Mozambique, for example, we found that upstream dams have dramatically changed the ecology of these once-vast wetlands. Wattled Cranes, threatened throughout their range, now nest only on the western fringe of the delta, where runoff from the adjacent uplands supports dwindling patches of spike rush (*Eleocharis acutangula*), the main food for the cranes and their chicks. Further investigation revealed that other wildlife, as well as local fishers and farmers, have suffered similarly from altered flooding patterns. Conservation solutions here thus have evolved from a localized effort to protect Wattled Cranes to a basin-wide program to implement sustainable water management practices for the people and wildlife of the lower Zambezi River.

While each crane site, its specific threats, and the aspirations and needs of local people are unique, many of the challenges and solutions for crane conservation are common throughout the five continents where cranes occur. ICF works to develop local understanding and effective approaches that can be disseminated widely throughout the extended network of crane conservationists, which covers more than 80 nations. Indeed, the cranes have over the last three decades inspired many hundreds of people within a global conservation community. Working groups for cranes now thrive in North America, Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The high value that many cultures place on cranes energizes programs that link the conservation of these graceful birds to the complicated ecological and human issues integral to their well-being. ICF recognizes that to safeguard cranes in the long term, conservation action must occur at multiple, interdependent levels: mitigating threats facing individual cranes, bolstering wild populations through captive breeding and reintroduction, protecting and restoring the ecosystems where cranes live, promoting alternative land use practices in the watersheds and basins that sustain important crane sites, securing flyways through coordinated regional partnerships, and attending to the global, or ultimate, threats to crane survival such as human population growth or economic disparities.

The future of the Wattled Cranes, for example, depends on action at all these levels. In South Africa, breeding pairs have human guardians caring for them, and birds raised in captivity have been released to augment the tiny population. Programs to promote the sustainable management of threatened Wattled Crane sites are underway in some of the great floodplains of Africa—the Kafue Flats, Okavango Delta, and Bangweulu Swamps—as well as the isolated highland wetlands of South Africa, Malawi, and Ethiopia. We work with the communities living in and around these and other wetlands to adopt alternative land use practices that are compatible with wetlands and their inhabitants. The African Wattled Crane Program includes representatives from all 11 range countries where Wattled Cranes occur, enabling coordination of research and conservation strategies throughout the region.

ICF is a small organization, headquartered far from the places where most cranes occur. Thus, we must partner with diverse individuals and organizations if we are to secure a future for cranes. ICF focuses its efforts on long-term projects that demonstrate effective approaches at different scales, catalyze action through sharing information, and use the charisma of cranes to motivate others to act. Because cranes have such universal appeal, we seek approaches that bring together people who normally do not collaborate: poor farmers and wetland managers in southwestern China, for example, or conservationists from North and South Korea.

We have found that long-term solutions depend on supporting sustained effort, on learning through collaborations and multiple iterations, and on nurturing the leadership of people in the places where cranes live. Success relies in part on developing lasting relationships among the individuals and organizations with which we work. As we consider new projects and ways to assist others in addressing threats to populations or critical ecosystems, we seek out individuals with passion and technical skills as well as an awareness of and sensitivity to social needs. These individuals become local champions, teaching us about the places where we work and gradually, as roles evolve, taking on the major work.

As all conservation biologists know, the immense task of understanding and conserving the world's biodiversity can be daunting. Crane conservation likewise is a remarkably complex undertaking. We have found in our work that the 15 species of cranes offer an elegance and simplicity to which anyone can relate, and that cranes thus provide a tangible expression of (and approach to) long term and global-scale conservation. Through the interconnections among cranes, landscapes, and people, these majestic birds allow conservation practitioners of all backgrounds to address issues of great breadth and vital concern, while yielding great opportunities for direct and meaningful results in the special places where cranes occur.

Please visit our Web site, www.savingcranes.org, to learn more about ICF's long-term commitment to cranes and conservation around the globe.

The International Crane Foundation received a 2004 Distinguished Service Award from the Society for Conservation Biology for their worldwide work, including research and public education, to conserve cranes and the wetlands and grasslands on which they depend. Action by the International Crane Foundation has led to protection of millions of hectares that benefit thousands of species and helped bring cooperation to regions of prolonged human conflict.

Franklin, from page 1

the log on the forest floor, for example—an object previously viewed as a waste, impediment, and fire hazard, which in fact fulfills critical ecological functions.

My involvement continued with participation in the evolution of public policy regarding old-growth forests and their constituent species. What a slippery slope this policy stuff is—and what an opportunity for learning how science **can** influence policy! The activities ranged from the congressionally chartered “Gang of Four” to President Clinton’s Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team and, finally, development of the Northwestern Forest Plan.

These activities—and many others along the way and since—have provided me with many lessons. One of those has been the need to constantly re-examine my premises regarding conservation, including both the paradigms that underpin conservation and the social context within which conservation occurs. Such reassessments can be challenging because many premises are embedded deeply in our psyche, training, and experience. We tend to cling tightly to old paradigms no matter how limiting they have become—i.e., we fight the old fights when both the context and the challenge have changed.

The Northern Spotted Owl (NSO), *Strix occidentalis caurina*, provides a good example of the importance of reassessing premises. NSO has been the flagship species in the struggle for conservation of the primeval forests of the Pacific Northwest. We have learned a great deal about the owl during the 30 years since Eric Forsman began his graduate work, including long-term demography, home ranges, food habits, prey populations, and habitat preferences. NSO must now rank among the most-studied organisms in the world.

The Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) was devised and adopted in 1994 to conserve old-growth forests on federal lands in the Pacific Northwest and their associated species, including Northern Spotted Owls. This plan evolved through a series of assessments (Thomas Committee, Gang of Four, and the Forest Ecosystem Management Team or FEMAT) that were led and populated by scientists.

The NWFP was designed to meet the needs of the NSO by retaining habitat—most of the remaining mature and old forest—and to restore

contiguity where these forests had been fragmented by past logging. Near four million hectares of new reserves were created for conservation and added to an equal area of federal land already reserved by Congress (e.g., Wilderness and National Parks) and by resource management agencies (e.g., Research Natural Areas). Eventually, nearly 80% of the federal lands were reserved from commercial timber harvest.

The NWFP followed the fundamental premise of conservation biology—create a reserve system that protects existing habitat and restores additional suitable habitat for the species of interest. This was done on a grand scale, without even considering efforts to conserve NSO on private, tribal, and state trust lands.

A comprehensive review has just been completed of the scientific information that has emerged in the ten years since NSO was listed as Threatened under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. As a member of the review team I was dismayed by the findings. Overall the population of NSO is declining rapidly based on demographic studies currently in peer review for publication. Trends do vary within the geographic range of the NSO. Populations of NSO in Washington State appear particularly problematic; NSO have disappeared from many previously occupied sites, including prime undisturbed habitat in Olympic and Mount Rainier national parks.

The invading Barred Owl is implicated, although not yet convicted, in the decline and disappearances of the NSO. Barred Owls arrived in the Pacific Northwest a few decades ago from eastern North America after transiting Canada. Although the Barred Owl was present when the NSO was listed, many (most?) of us thought (hoped?) that it would prefer fragmented forests that were less suitable for NSO. Unfortunately, the Barred Owl appears attracted to the best of the intact old-growth forests, such as those found in low-elevation valley bottoms. When the larger, more aggressive Barred Owl appears near nest sites occupied by NSO, NSO typically leave. Barred Owl populations have increased dramatically in the last decade based on encounters during NSO surveys, which are the primary source of data on populations of Barred Owl.

Other significant threats to NSO have emerged in the last decade. The introduced West Nile Virus now occurs throughout the range of NSO. NSO is known to be susceptible to this disease. It is too early to know what role this pathogen eventually may play in NSO populations, although its role could be large.

Sudden Oak Death—the plant fungal pathogen *Phytophthora ramorum*—is another introduced species with potential for large impacts on the NSO. For at least seven years Sudden Oak Death repeatedly has been introduced repeatedly to the Pacific Coast on nursery stock imported from Europe. Sudden Oak Death is already known to infect more than 100 species of native herbs, shrubs, and trees, and I expect that hosts ultimately will number in the hundreds of species. Effects of Sudden Oak Death on infected species vary from foliar and twig infections to bark cankers, the most serious infections.

Among the species most lethally affected by Sudden Oak Death are several species of oak and tanoak (*Lithocarpus densiflorus*). Tanoak is an evergreen hardwood and dominant in the mixed evergreen forests of the Klamath–Siskiyou region of northern California and southwestern Oregon. In this region, tanoak is profoundly important as habitat for NSO and its prey. Complete mortality of tanoak has occurred in at least some native forests invaded by Sudden Oak Death; therefore, the potential may exist for significant modification of NSO habitat in the Klamath–Siskiyou region.

Stand-replacement fires also have caused extensive modification of habitat in portions of the NSO range. Uncharacteristic stand-replacement fires have removed forest on pine and mixed-conifer sites along the eastern margins of the NSO range; for example, 18 out of 24 NSO pairs on the Sisters District of the Deschutes National Forest have been impacted by such fires. Remaining forests of this type are in drastic need of fuel treatments to prevent further habitat loss.

So, what lessons emerge for me amongst this gloomy accounting of threats to the NSO? One lesson centers on the basic premise that preserving habitat is the key to conserving an endangered species. In the case of the NSO, protecting habitat—creating large ecological reserves—has not protected the conservation target from invasive species. Providing habitat is obviously an essential element of any conservation plan—but it may not be sufficient. Furthermore, active management is needed to sustain NSO habitat on sites with historically unnatural accumulations of forest fuels.

It also seems clear that during the twenty-first century we increasingly will face threats to biodiversity that cannot be addressed simply by preserving existing habitat. Foremost amongst these threats are invasive pests and pathogens, which I view as the greatest threats to native forest biodiversity—greater in their potential ecological impacts than clearcutting, for example, because they can literally extirpate native species.

Returning to my original point, habitat preservation has been the mantra of conservation biology. Experience with the Northern Spotted Owl makes clear that this may not always be sufficient. We need to constantly reexamine our premises and priorities, whether it is our traditional focus on species or ecological reserves as the primary tool for conservation. Conditions in the unreserved landscape—the matrix—are likely to be as important as the reserves themselves. And key events in

biodiversity conservation are likely to occur far from our beloved reserves . . . such as on the docks and in the airports!

Jerry F. Franklin received the 2004 Edward T. LaRoe III Memorial Award from the Society for Conservation Biology for his leadership in translating principles of conservation biology into real-world conservation. He has engaged actively at the interface between science and policy in the United States and in Chile. His efforts contributed to significant improvements in forest management practices across millions of acres.

LOCAL CHAPTERS: Activities, outreach, and resources

In the early months of 2004, Chapter Advisors Lisa Delissio, Fiona Nagle, and Cristian Olivio e-mailed a survey to the Board members of 16 SCB chapters, asking each to describe its most important activities, resources it could share with others, whether the chapter was interested in forming closer relationships with other chapters, and what types of assistance from SCB's Executive Office might benefit the chapter. We received responses from eight chapters (Berkeley, Bolivia, University of California–Davis, Minnesota, Missouri, New England, New Orleans, and Toronto) and Slovenia (not yet a chapter). This is an excellent response rate, especially considering that some e-mails probably went to dead addresses. If you are a chapter officer, please make sure that Paul Beier (Paul.Beier@nau.edu) has your current contact information.

Chapter-led Symposia, Meetings, and Seminars

The Bolivia Chapter offered a seminar, *Introduced Species in La Paz Valley*, with sessions on flora and fauna.

Colorado Plateau held a four-hour paper session devoted to conservation biology as part of the three-day *Biennial Conference for Research on the Colorado Plateau* in November 2003. They also held an independent annual meeting in April 2004 at Marble Canyon, Arizona, that featured 30-minute discussions on the practice of conservation [see SCB Newsletter 11(2)].

Davis hosted two conservation biologists (Devra Kleiman and Reed Noss) for major, campus-wide seminars, and co-sponsored an invasive species seminar series.

In January 2004, Davis and Berkeley co-hosted the 6th Annual Bay Area Conservation Biology Symposium. The 210 attendees included 170 students. The one-day event included 42 oral presentations, 24 posters, two plenary speakers, a wine and cheese social, and a banquet. The event was a major fundraiser for the chapters.

Minnesota held its first meeting jointly with the Minnesota Chapter of the American Fisheries Society and sponsored chapter socials.

Missouri held its 7th annual meeting at the Missouri Natural Resources Conference. The chapter sponsored a student poster competition at the conference, awarding the winner a membership to SCB and choice of *Conservation Biology* or *Conservation In Practice*.

New England held the seminar *Conservation and the Internet*.

New Orleans hosted a symposium on conservation biology, organized an eco-lunch series, *Pillars of Conservation Biology*, and held a brown-bag lunch discussion on applied conservation with The Nature Conservancy.

Educational Outreach, Web Sites, and Publications

Berkeley created a regional listserv to alert members and others to conservation news in the region.

Bolivia carried out an environmental education program at a school in La Paz to introduce nine-year-old children to principles and importance of conservation. They developed a hands-on program with five days of activities; each day focused on a different topic including wildlife trade, deforestation, and water and air contamination.

Bolivia also collaborated with other institutions (PROBONA, SBS, IGEDES) to commemorate Earth Day. The chapter offered videos to children and adolescents, a seminar about soil problems in Bolivia, panels about desertification in Bolivia, and a nature walk through La Paz Valley.

Davis visited six classes in two primary schools in Davis and Woodland, California, to teach students about the biology and conservation of California tiger salamanders and green sturgeon. The chapter members then exchanged educational programs with conservation biologists in other states and returned to the schools to present their partner schools' programs. For a copy of the program, visit <http://scb.ucdavis.edu/education.htm>.

Missouri is creating a one-hour program for school children that incorporates some of the main concepts of conservation biology. In addition, Missouri has produced *The Glade* twice a year since 1998. Each issue typically includes two or three research articles, announcements, and regular features such as "The Nature Corner," in which a local naturalist writes about a favorite Missouri natural area.

New England's Web site includes news, job listings, links to New England conservation sites, and the on-line journal *Conservation Perspectives*.

New Orleans is preparing to launch conservation education and outreach programs in local primary and secondary schools. They plan to involve middle and high school students in their service projects and also bring conservation education and activities into the classrooms of some local schools. Chapter members will mentor 11th grade students with independent conservation biology-related science projects as well.

Local service projects included New Orleans's weekend projects in conjunction with The Nature Conservancy, similar daylong activities by Berkeley, and Davis's oak tree planting in a university riparian reserve. Davis led the way on political action, writing position papers on management of vernal pools, the California Watershed Protection and Restoration Act, and three other issues. Davis also holds "proposition potlucks" to educate its membership about ballot measures.

Berkeley, Bolivia and New England, and Toronto expressed strong interest in a sister-chapter initiative that

might link North American chapters with chapters elsewhere in the world. Currently there is only one active chapter outside North America (Bolivia). However, groups considering formation of a chapter might be encouraged by the idea of pairing up with existing, successful chapters.

Several chapters offered to support other chapters on the following topics in which they have expertise or materials.

Berkeley: documentation on how to set up a conference

Bolivia: online forums, bulletin boards, and courses developed by chapters; books and magazines about biodiversity in Bolivia

Bolivia, Davis, Missouri, New Orleans: advice and curricula on education outreach programs

Bolivia, Davis, New England: conference and seminar planning and management

Davis: board-member productivity

Missouri: poster competitions and newsletter publication

New England: organizational establishment (legal and financial issues), online journals, and e-mail distribution systems

New England, Minnesota, and Missouri:

Web site development

New Orleans: starting a chapter

Most chapters reported that they struggle with low participation in chapter projects and events. Davis netted \$5000 from the 6th Annual Bay Area Conservation Biology Symposium, but most chapters have much less money. Most chapters set annual dues at levels believed to be affordable by students (who dominate their memberships); Missouri has never charged membership dues.

The chapters were grateful for support from SCB's Executive Office, Web site access, use of SCB's tax-exempt status, and assistance with fundraising.

Missouri was able to award an SCB membership with a subscription to an SCB journal (courtesy of the Executive Office) to the winner of their 2004 poster contest.

Chapters requested several types of assistance from the Executive Office; these requests were discussed with Executive Director Alan Thornhill at the annual meeting, and some progress was made. It is likely that a pilot program for seed grants to help establish new chapters will be initiated in 2005.

Chapters also may contact Kat Powers-Morris (kpm@conbio.org) to request donations of memberships or journal subscriptions as support or as prizes for competitions.

The Executive Office already provides services that allow chapters to run a local electronic bulletin board, and can provide SCB signs, logos, and similar publicity materials (contact Kat Powers-Morris for details). We will develop some materials to help chapters seek small grants—visit the chapters page on the SCB Web site for updates.

Lisa Delissio, Fiona Nagle, Cristian Olivio, and Paul Beier

Announcements, from page 15

Meetings

The conference *Mesopotamian Marshes and Modern Development: Practical Approaches for Sustaining Restored Ecological and Cultural Landscapes* will be held 28–30 October 2004 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. Pre-conference discussion panels will be held in New York City on 26 October and in Cambridge on 27 October. The Mesopotamian marshes of southern Iraq once provided habitat for millions of migrating birds and for thousands of people living on artificial islands of mud and reeds, who depended on sustainable fishing and farming. Since the early 1990s, a series of water manipulations have devastated the region. The conference will focus on designing and sustaining a restoration endeavor that will allow for both the preservation of traditional lifestyles and modern development. More information is available at (617) 495-0647, mesomarshes@gsd.harvard.edu, or www.gsd.harvard.edu/mesomarshes.

The Zoological Society of London and the Fisheries Conservation Foundation will co-host an international symposium on coral reef conservation on 16 and 17 December 2004. The symposium organizers are Isabelle Côté and John Reynolds, University of East Anglia, UK. The symposium will be held at the Meeting Rooms, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London. Full details, a program, and a registration form are available at www.zsl.org/press/pml_0000001642.html. For more information, contact Deborah Body, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, UK, 020 7449 6227, FAX 020 7586 5321, deborah.Body@zsl.org, www.zsl.org.

The workshop *Implications of Climate Change in British Columbia's Southern Interior Forests* will be held in Revelstoke, British Columbia, Canada 26–27 April 2005. A field trip will be offered on 28 April. Topics will include current information from climate models, projected geographical shifts in biogeoclimatic zones, implications for forest disturbance regimes and biodiversity, and strategies for developing climate change adaptation or risk management approaches to policy and management planning. This workshop is directed at forestry professionals and technicians, biologists, ecologists, protected area managers, and other managers and planners with an interest in how climate change may affect forest ecosystems and forestry. For more information, visit www.cmiae.org.

Society for Conservation Biology Newsletter is published quarterly. To submit materials or request permission to reprint articles contact the Editor: Erica Fleishman, Center for Conservation Biology, Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-5020, USA, (650) 725-9914, FAX (650) 723-5920, efleish@stanford.edu. Decisions concerning publication rest with the Editor.

© Society for Conservation Biology 2004

Conservation Education: Strategies for effective public presentations

Can non-scientists understand complex scientific data? Must statistics be weeded out of presentations to the public, popular writing, and introductory undergraduate courses? I think that most people can understand complexity if the speaker or writer understands his or her material and can explain it clearly either without technical language or by explaining technical terms. The danger of oversimplifying communications with the public is that the public then fails to understand the complexity of data, the uncertainty of results, and the process of synthesizing information that may be applied to public policy. Perhaps worse, the public receives a subtle, unstated message that science is too complicated for them and that they should leave the thinking to the experts. Which means the experts need not think at all.

Recently, a land trust asked me to present information on my study system for the second year in a row. This year, I decided to include slides on statistical results. Last year, when I gave a similar talk, I noticed that a stockbroker in the audience became animated when I showed a data slide. This year I included more tables and figures in my presentation. After my talk, a retired biochemistry professor offered me some pithy suggestions for improving one of the models I presented.

I also received many interesting questions from other members of the audience who were not academics, but understood the content of my presentation. The complexity I added apparently enhanced the quality of their experience; they felt they were participants in the process of discovery rather than merely recipients of inert facts.

It struck me that scientists often underestimate their audiences or overestimate the complexity of their data. When I think of the informative popular science writings of Lewis Thomas, E.O. Wilson, Stephen Jay Gould, and Richard Dawkins I realize that these writers must have had a high regard for their readers' intelligence. They tackled, deconstructed, and reconstructed complex biological systems to present the systems in

engaging and intelligible ways. In fact, the grandfather of these communicators was Charles Darwin, who had to communicate an entirely new, biologically-based paradigm of humanity to a skeptical public.

In the same way, teachers who underestimate their students do them a disservice. John Taylor Gatto, an influential New York City schoolteacher, suggested in his book *Dumbing us Down* that public education in general is pulling its punches. Likewise, scientists who need to communicate complex data to their client-public should take the time to communicate the deepest complexities in order to bring levels of public scientific literacy up to those of scientists. Citizen science projects actually engage the public in the process of discovery, and, if well-managed, produce both usable data and a more scientifically literate citizenry (see the citizen science projects at the Cornell Lab of Ornithology's Web site). Only in this way will the public develop skills that will help them critically evaluate the science behind legislation, public school curricula, and conservation initiatives presented by the broader community of conservation biologists. Graduate students who are encouraged to interact with the public, as I have been, will develop skills in interpreting even the most complex data for general audiences.

Rob Baldwin
Rob_Baldwin@umenfa.maine.edu.

The members of the Education Committee and of SCB thank Steve Trombulak for his tireless efforts in organizing, promoting, and guiding the Education Committee for the past six years. Steve recently stepped down as chair of the committee in order to focus more energy on his new role as President of the North America Section (see page 6).

INHERIT & CONSERVE Thanks You

Building conservation capacity,
recycling scientific resources

In the May 2004 newsletter, we asked whether your two-year old GPS had been abandoned or mist nest were decorating your lab wall. Our goal was to provide conservation professionals in developing countries with previously used equipment and supplies to aid in their conservation efforts. To achieve this goal we initiated a new SCB program, *Inherit & Conserve*, with the objective of strengthening conservation capacity worldwide by recycling scientific resources.

Our first round of *Inherit & Conserve* was a success. Many thanks to all who donated—ten individual items or sets of journals came from individuals and organizations in the United States and Canada. The eBay style Web page allowed donors to contribute easily by simply filling out an on-line form.

Potential recipients browsed available items and submitted requests via the same system. With donated items ranging from tents to scientific journals to spherical crown

densimeters, there was a wide range of resources from which to choose. Seven of the items were inherited by conservation workers in six different countries: Brazil, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran, Philippines, and Uzbekistan. The recipients were universally delighted with their inheritance. As one beneficiary said, “. . . the Biodiversity Laboratory staff is very happy and grateful to [the donor] and the Society for Conservation Biology.”

We hope to continue the *Inherit & Conserve* program for many more years. Look for more information from the Executive Office in the coming months.

Strategic Planning: A framework for achieving SCB's mission and goals

A Strategic Planning Committee was formed at the March 2004 Board of Governors' meeting in Orlando, Florida. The committee drafted a scope of work for developing a Strategic Plan for 2005–2010, which was approved by the Board at the 2004 annual meeting.

SCB has grown tremendously over its nineteen year history. Strategic planning has played a key role in that growth. For example, goals identified at the Board's 1999 strategic planning retreat led to three major and successful strategic initiatives: establishment of the Executive Office, creation of *Conservation In Practice*, and evolution into a truly international society.

The Board's motivation for initiating this new strategic planning effort is to build on recent success by seriously examining how we can maximize SCB's impact, create a common vision for our international organization, revise our goals to reflect current opportunities and constraints, and identify the general objectives we need to pursue to reach our revised goals.

The strategic plan will focus on our mission, goals, and objectives. The plan will help us communicate why we are taking certain actions and guide us in undertaking new actions over the next five years. The Board expects the strategic plan to provide the guidance necessary for the Executive Office and various committees to develop specific implementation plans or work plans to meet objectives described in the strategic plan.

We anticipate developing a moderately detailed plan of about ten pages that identifies and links together SCB's mission, values, vision for the future, goals, and objectives. In our plan, the mission provides a statement of SCB's purposes, goals

identify the long-term direction needed to accomplish SCB's mission, and objectives identify specific, measurable, time-bound targets that must be met in order to attain our goals. Everything SCB does should help it move toward attainment of one or more goals. More detailed activities will not be included in the strategic plan, but will be outlined subsequently in annual work plans or implementation plans.

To help guide the strategic planning process, we will undertake a survey of the membership in the closing months of 2004. The survey will be especially useful for developing and linking our mission, goals, and objectives. We strongly urge you to complete the survey and help us produce a strong, useful strategic plan that reflects the views and suggestions of members. The Strategic Planning Committee will also be seeking input from the Sections and other Board committees. We also encourage all members to provide comments on strategic planning to Section representatives so they can provide the committee with relevant input.

Committee members and their affiliations with SCB are

Luigi Boitani, President, Europe Section
David Johns, Treasurer
Devra Kleiman, Board Member at Large
Loyal Mehrhoff, Committee Chair
Reed Noss, Past President
John Robinson, President Elect
Jon Paul Rodríguez, President, Austral and Neotropical America Section
Kathryn Saterson, Secretary
Alan Thornhill, Executive Director
Deborah Jensen (ex officio), President

Center for Conservation Biology
Department of Biological Sciences
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305-5020
USA

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. Postage
-PAID-
Palo Alto, CA
Permit No. 28