

NET HOURS: MUCH ADO ABOUT NETTING
By Mabel Warburton

In answer to Chandler S. Robbins' paper "Net Hours: A Common Denominator for the Study of Bird Populations by Banders" (EBBA News Vol. 31, No. 1 pp. 31-35) which was in turn, an answer to mine entitled "Net Hours: The Myth of Their Importance" (EBBA News Vol. 30, No. 4 pp. 158-160), I should like to comment briefly as follows:

Mr. Robbins refers to his answering article as a "rebuttal" but rather than disprove my charges that net hours are an unreliable basis of comparison, he admits that many of the weaknesses exist.

While admitting that these problems are here today, Mr. Robbins suggests remedies, and says that "we are just entering the computer age in the analysis of banding records". While Mr. Robbins is looking hopefully to the future, and rightly so, my paper was written of the problem as it exists now.

Mr. Robbins states that I inferred that "the principal use of mist net hours is to compare gross seasonal totals between stations, or over a period of years at the same station". The last paragraph of my paper states that I was indeed referring to "net hours as a basis of comparison between operation recovery stations" and it was to this end that the paper was directed. My conclusion is the same as before, that the practice of using mist net hours and birds per net hour as a basis of comparison between O.R. stations is so dependent upon outside and often unknown factors as to be meaningless.

300 W. Trenton Ave., Morrisville, Pa. 19067

(Lest we receive a paper entitled "More Ado About Netting", it might be helpful to mention that we agree with both authors without contradiction, and that Mr. Robbins' paper was devoted to showing the usefulness of net hours without, as we understood it, including comparison between different banding stations. -Ed.)



Having problems? With nets? . . . or with record keeping?
. . . or with anything else? Maybe there's a solution at the meeting.