

**CBRC Annual Meeting Minutes  
Los Gatos, CA 29-30 January 2016**

**29 JANUARY 2016**

Meeting called to order at 1:20 pm, 29 January 2016 (Chair presiding). Members Joseph Morlan (Chair), Dan Singer (Vice-Chair), Tom Benson (non-voting Secretary), Lauren Harter, Kristie Nelson, John Garrett, Brian Daniels, Adam Searcy, Jim Tietz, and Scott Terrill, and non-member Steve Rottenborn, present.

Welcome and introductory remarks by Morlan.

2015 Minutes. No approval needed; approved on 5 October 2015.

**1. ELECTION OF MEMBERS**

**a. Election of Members** (three-year terms). The terms of Morlan, Searcy, and Singer expire after the 2015 meeting.

Nominations:

Jon Feenstra  
Catherine Hamilton  
Guy McCaskie  
Jim Pike  
Peter Pyle  
Alex Rinkert  
Steve Rottenborn  
Justyn Stahl

Jon Feenstra, Guy McCaskie, and Steve Rottenborn elected.

**b. Election of Chair** (one-year term) – nomination: Steve Rottenborn (Singer). Rottenborn elected.

**c. Election of Vice-Chair** (one-year term) – nomination: Scott Terrill (Daniels). Terrill elected.

**d. Election of the Secretary** (one-year term) – nomination: Tom Benson (Morlan). Benson elected.

**e. Discussion of Potential Future Members** – Several potential future members were discussed. There was a consensus that the committee is fortunate to have such a strong field of potential qualified candidates who are willing to serve.

**2. BYLAW PROPOSALS**

**a. Amend Article I Section B** to: “**Affiliation.** This is a ~~standing~~ committee of the Organization known as the “Western Field Ornithologists.” The proposal to add the word “standing” was approved unanimously at the last meeting but not implemented at the request of the WFO president who pointed out an apparent conflict with WFO bylaws which allow for two kinds of committees: standing committees and records committees. The last three published annual reports referred to the CBRC as a “standing committee.” Motion to rescind last year’s change, removing the word “standing” (Singer, Terrill); passed 9-0. Committee agreed that there is no need to publish a retraction.

**b. Amend Article VI Section B (4)** to add the underlined text: “Records based on specimens or bandings will be treated in the same manner as other records. Records based solely on eggs (or egg specimens) will be treated as a record of one individual (a single female that laid a clutch of infertile eggs). If the eggs hatch, the number of individuals in the record will be determined as two adults plus the number of hatched eggs.” When eggs hatch, the young are each considered a new bird/record. Some caution is warranted to ensure that the young are of the species in question. For example, a female Blue-throated Hummingbird laid eggs and they hatched, but they were thought to have an Anna’s Hummingbird father, so the young should not be accepted as pure Blue-throated Hummingbirds. Motion to adopt this text as written (Searcy, Tietz); passed 9-0.

**c. Add Article VI Section B (9).** “An introduced species on the state list that subsequently becomes extirpated shall be annotated as Extirpated (E) on the official state list while also maintaining its Introduced (I) annotation. Recommendations for designation as Extirpated on the official checklist shall be made by the Introduced Birds Subcommittee when the population of an introduced species has become demonstrably extirpated. Such recommendations will be implemented if ratified by a vote of all or all but one members at a meeting.” This may apply to Gray Partridge and “Ringed Turtle-Dove” if those species were ever actually established in the state, and it could apply to Spotted Dove (still extant on Catalina Is., a few in Bakersfield and central LA) if that species is extirpated. Motion to add this section as indicated above (Garrett, Singer); passed 9-0.

**d. Add Article VI Section D (4).** “A record thought to possibly be the same individual as another record, but occurring at a substantially different locality or time-frame is not a returning or continuing bird. Unless there is clear and substantial evidence that it is the same, and seven or more voting members agree it is the same, it shall be treated as a different bird for statistical purposes.” During discussion, most members thought the “clear and substantial” requirement, and the requirement for a 7-2 vote, set the bar too high for this “same bird” issue, and much higher than under the current bylaws. There was no motion to adopt this change.

**e. Amend Article VI Section F (3) (c).** “A record that has not received a final decision after three circulations shall be discussed at a meeting of the Committee. ~~No final decision shall be made at the meeting. Instead,~~ The record shall receive a final vote (see VI G (11)) during a fourth and final circulation to those Voting Members on the Committee at the start of said meeting.” The purpose of this change is to allow a final decision on such records to be reached at a meeting, after discussion of the records. Motion to make this change (Terrill, Tietz); passed 9-0.

### **3. PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

**a. Records treated as multiple taxa and resubmitted records.** How should records that have been re-submitted under a new record number be treated in the database and the online update form? As it currently stands, both the previous record and the new record have valid numbers with decisions. As an example, 2001-143 is accepted as a Shy Albatross while 2001-228 is accepted as a Chatham Albatross, but both records refer to the same individual. There is the potential for two records of the same individual to have two different decisions, or for the appearance of an inflated number of records in the database and in the table. How to handle rejected Magnificent Frigatebirds later accepted as Magnificent/Great/Lesser? Also how to handle records accepted as Dark-rumped Petrel but later accepted as Hawaiian? Propose adding “T – Record re-submitted under new number”. Current bylaws require independent tracking by record number and publication of all decisions. Bylaw change not

needed for new status codes. Motion on adding “T” code (Tietz, Searcy); passed 9-0. A policy was also discussed involving numbering of recirculated or resubmitted records to avoid changing the record number. If a record is recirculated or resubmitted, either as a different species or the same, a letter (“A”, “B”, etc.) will be appended to the existing record number. Motion to confirm this change (Searcy, Harter); passed 9-0.

**b. Date and/or location uncertain.** This category was added to the voting form, but no such category exists in the database. Motion to add the code “D – Not Accepted – Date and/or location uncertain” (Singer, Nelson); passed 9-0.

**c. Returning and continuing birds.** See proposed bylaw “d” above. Morlan suggested that the “majority vote bylaw” VI D (3) was intended for birds returning to the same place in successive years or continuing at a particular location over a period of more than a year (“...A majority vote determines whether a record is to be treated as a resubmission of a returning or continuing bird.”). Only recently has this rule been applied to records thought to be the same individual as another record, but occurring at a substantially different locality or time-frame. Morlan suggested that such records be treated as different birds unless the criteria described in proposed bylaw “d” above were met. The majority of members did not agree with these criteria or that a change should be made, and there was no motion to make a procedural change, consistent with the lack of a motion to implement proposed bylaw “d”.

**d. “Slash species.** The minutes of the committee’s 2002 meeting include:

*“Garrett moved, Erickson seconded, a motion to limit ‘slash’ species on the review list to species pairs or groups which have been considered conspecific in recent times; the effect of this wording would be to add Masked/Nazca Booby, White/Black-backed Wagtail, and (following pending split by A.O.U.), Hawaiian/Galapagos Petrel. Motion passed 8-1, Morlan dissenting. Similar species such as sand-plovers and wheatears do not fall into this category, but Gray-cheeked/Bicknell’s Thrush remains a potential addition to this group as Bicknell’s cannot be excluded as a possibility in most California records.”*

Because the committee contradicted this prior procedural decision by adding Magnificent/Great/Lesser frigatebird to the review list, the committee discussed whether to rescind, revise, or reaffirm this guideline. Members did not want to revert to the 2002 procedure but agreed that it was appropriate to adopt new procedural guidelines to reflect the need to limit “slash” additions to the review list while allowing more flexibility. The issue was tabled on 29 January, and Searcy proposed the following on 30 January: “The committee recommends a conservative approach when adding “slash” categories to the review list. This will replace procedural language that limited “slash” species to pairs or groups which have been considered conspecific in recent times (2002).” Motion to adopt this procedural guideline (Searcy/Nelson); passed 9-0.

#### **4. ANNUAL REPORTS**

**a. Do authors need paper copies of everything?** Some members prefer electronic files only, some prefer paper copies. Leave it up to individual authors to request paper copies if they want them.

**b. 39<sup>th</sup> report** (2013 records) authored by Rottenborn, Daniels, McCaskie, and J. Garrett was submitted 3 August 2015. It was peer reviewed by Doug Faulkner, Jack Withrow and Bill Tweit. It is scheduled for publication in 47(1) of *Western Birds*.

**c. 40<sup>th</sup> report** (2014 records) will be authored by Singer, Dunn, Harter, and McCaskie. It is in preparation.

d. 41<sup>st</sup> report (2015 records) will be authored by Searcy, Tietz, Daniels, and Feenstra

## 5. REVIEW LIST

**a. Review the criteria for inclusion on the Review List as required every five years (per bylaw VI. B. (3)).** There was some discussion of the criteria. Members agreed that it would be good to reduce the number of records reviewed, but no one thought that changing the criteria was warranted. The committee clarified that the criteria for inclusion remain four or fewer “occurrences” per year for the prior decade rather than four or fewer “records.” A flock is an occurrence but contains multiple records.

### **b. Potential additions:**

Harris’s Hawk - only seven records (five occurrences) since removed from review list in 2013. Some members suggested that it hasn’t been off review list long enough to add back on, and potential for escapees make situation messy. Easy ID, so reviews focus on origin and same bird issues, which are difficult to deal with objectively. This species is irruptive. Motion to add (Searcy, Garrett); failed 2-7.

Ruddy Ground-Dove - Calipatria population extirpated in 2007. Only 12 records away from Calipatria from 2007-2015. Numbers have gone down in AZ also. Doesn’t seem to be “irruptive” – the expansion was quick but didn’t seem to have any precedent. Motion to add (Daniels/Harter); passed 9-0.

Red-backed X Red-tailed Shrike or Red-backed X Turkestan Shrike - Purpose of adding this would be to weigh in on the very prominent Mendocino County record. Committee decided not to add this to review list and to leave this as a rejected Brown Shrike; annual report will discuss (no motions).

Gray-cheeked/Bicknell’s Thrush. We had Galapagos/Hawaiian Petrel on the review list and currently have Arctic/Kamchatka Leaf Warbler on the review list, but we don’t have Gray-cheeked/Bicknell’s Thrush or Eastern Yellow Wagtail/Western Yellow Wagtail on the review list, even though Bicknell’s and Western Yellow Wagtail aren’t eliminated in all records (indicating some inconsistency). But, the committee can publish records of GCTH with a disclaimer that Bicknell’s is not eliminated. No motion.

Northern Cardinal – 20 records since 1996. The average for the past 20 years is ~1/year and the last ten year’s average is ~0.7/year. Introduced population along coast (some eastern race, but some possibly also Mexican), but southwestern race native to CA has apparently been extirpated from state. Don’t want to be inundated with records from coastal slope. What info is not being collected (for NAB, eBird) because CBRC is not reviewing records? There was some discussion of reviewing just the southwestern race *superbus*, but there are also *superbus* records from odd places (e.g., Lancaster) that could also be releases. Motion to add the species (not just one subspecies) to the review list (Searcy/Singer); failed 5-4.

Common/Hoary Redpoll (Morlan) – One of the Modoc County birds was not accepted as a Common, and then was considered “not accepted” as a Common, but was then not circulated or formally voted against as a Hoary. Expect AOU to lump Common and Hoary, at which time the record would be revised to include 13 accepted birds. No motion.

### **c. Potential deletions:**

Magnificent Frigatebird – 58 records in five years since added in 2010 or 11.6/year. Ten records in two years (1972-73) or 5/year. Motion to remove (Daniels/Harter); failed 5-4.

Little Gull - 26 accepted records (plus three pending review) from 2006-2015, or 2.6-2.9/year. 116 accepted records total. No motion.

Dusky-capped Flycatcher - From 2006-2015 there were 34 records, or 3.4/year. If you take into account birds returning for multiple winters, there were 42 occurrences, or 4.2/year. Looking just at 2011-2015, those numbers increase to 4.6/year (records) and 5.6/year (occurrences); 115 accepted records total. No motion.

Cape May Warbler – 27 accepted records in four years since added in 2011 or 6.75/year. If we include four additional records from 2015 that are likely to pass, then 6.2/year. From approximately 1968 until 1980 there were 121 records; from 1980-1995 there were 88 records; from 1996-2009 there were 41 records. The period from 2000-2009 there was an average of 3.3 records per year but the most recent 15 year period had 68 records or 4.53/year. Motion to remove (Morlan, Terrill); failed 6-3.

Rusty Blackbird - 41 records from 2006-2015, or 4.1/year (Benson). Motion to remove (Harter, Daniels); failed 5-4.

Common Redpoll – 97 accepted records (25 occurrences) from 2005-2015 or 9.7/year. There are 174 total records. No motion.

## **6. SPECIFIC RECORDS BROUGHT TO THE MEETING**

### **a. Fourth and Final:**

The following records without a decision after three rounds of voting were brought to the meeting and discussed before a final circulation, then voted upon at the meeting (voting results are indicated for each record):

2011-278 Magnificent/Great/Lesser Frigatebird at Ballona Creek LA 1 Sep 2011 (not accepted)  
2014-057 Masked/Nazca Booby off Point La Jolla SD 21 Jun 2014 (not accepted)  
2009-262 Yellow-bellied Flycatcher at Point Mugu NAS 2 Oct 2009 (not accepted)  
1994-209 Philadelphia Vireo at North Spit HUM 17-18 Sep 1984 (accepted)  
2014-096 Yellow-green Vireo at Half Moon Bay SM 25 Sep 2014 (accepted)

### **b. Records brought to meeting by request:**

2000-165 Chatham Albatross at Cordell Bank MRN 29 Jul-10 Sep 2000 (Same bird issue). This record has not been accepted, but by a 7-2 vote, members considered the accepted bird a year later (2001-228) to be the same as 2000-165. Procedural issues, such as whether 2000-165 is considered a “resubmission”, were discussed. There was a consensus that despite the 7-2 vote considering this bird to be the same as 2001-228, that it is not to be considered a resubmission of an accepted record. Instead it will have to meet the same criteria for acceptance as any other record. Morlan indicated that the ABA Checklist Committee will likely not accept record 2000-165 (Jon Dunn is Chair of that committee) and recommended that others evaluate 2000-165 on its own merits rather than tie an “accept” vote to the opinion that it is the same as 2001-228. Some pointed out that there is precedent for albatrosses to return to the same nonbreeding area in multiple years (e.g., the Pt. Arena Laysan Albatross). Each member will vote his/her opinion on the acceptability and same bird issues.

2001-228 Chatham Albatross at Bodega Canyon MRN 27 July 2001 (Same bird issue). This record has been accepted, with 7-2 vote that it's the same as 2000-165. As indicated above, record 2000-165 is being evaluated separately. Whether there is a discrepancy in voting between the two records (e.g., if 2000-165 is not accepted, or is not considered the same bird as 2001-228) will be determined after voting on 2000-165 has been completed. There was general agreement that a "not accept" vote or "not the same bird" vote on 2000-165 would supersede the "same bird" vote on 2001-228.

2009-016 Dark-rumped Petrel in OR waters 12 Aug 2008 – remove from our records? The 39th report discusses this record and why it was removed, so it doesn't matter whether it's still in our database or not. Has status of "Q". Keep physical record at WFVZ, leave in database with code of "Q".

2013-047 Magnificent Frigatebird at Malibu Lagoon LA 2 Apr 2013. This record was not accepted in its first round. A recirculation was requested, but that was overlooked and instead it was assigned a new record number (2013-242) and circulated as a Magnificent/Great/Lesser Frigatebird. Record 2013-242 was accepted in its second round 8-1 (Batch 14B), but at this meeting, the Committee decided to suspend the decision for 2013-242 and recirculate 2013-047 as was requested originally. This record will be recirculated for a second round as a Magnificent. If it does not pass, the acceptance as the "slash" will be instituted.

2014-074 Magnificent/Great/Lesser Frigatebird at Jacumba SD 11 Aug 2014. The record was circulated as a Magnificent/Great/Lesser Frigatebird even though the observer submitted it as a Magnificent. Voting on the "slash" category will be suspended, and the record will be circulated as a Magnificent Frigatebird. At the meeting, the committee voted on the record as a Magnificent, with one vote for acceptance and 8 for non-acceptance. The record will recirculate in its 3<sup>rd</sup> round as a "slash" to the 2015 committee.

2015-036 Nazca Booby at Anacapa Island VEN 20-21 May 2015. Daniels thought Nazca is supposed to have orange eyes, but online photos of some show yellow eyes like the Anacapa Island record. Terrill said eye color may vary depending on breeding condition (perhaps being more orange when breeding). No action. Record stands accepted.

2015-### Masked/Nazca Booby – taken from Newport Oregon to San Pedro California for rehab and release. Should the committee review this record? Released and seen twice off San Diego (identified as that individual by a band) within a week of being released. No action (CBRC will not review it).

2013-259,260,261 Blue-footed Boobies at SE Farallon Island SF 21-28 Sep 2013 – change number from 3 to 4, extend dates from 18 Sep-8 Oct 2013, and combine under single record number (2013-259) per new documentation from JRT. Motion to do so (Nelson, Daniels), passed 9-0. Will appear as a correction in the 40th CBRC report.

2012-193 Gray Hawk at Carpinteria SBA 11/25/2012-3/15/2013. Extend final date to 3/16/2013. Morlan confirmed that the Secretary has authority to fix a date span without input from the Chair or CBRC vote prior to publication. From the 2015 meeting minutes:

"After publication of a record in an annual report a super majority (9-0 or 8-1) is required to modify a date range. These records will be brought to a meeting and any accepted change will be published in the corrigenda of the next annual report. The Secretary has the discretion to accept date extensions prior to

a record being published in an annual report, but any member may object and request the record be brought to a meeting for discussion.”

Motion to extend the date to 3/16/2013 (Nelson, Daniels); passed 9-0. Will appear as a correction in the 40th CBRC report.

2015-001 Iceland Gull, 2 Jan 15, American River, SAC (same bird issue) - narrowly voted same as one in Davis in 2013 (and 2012). Don't need new and substantial information for same vote issue. Motion to re-evaluate same bird issue (Morlan, Nelson); passed 8-1. Members then voted, with 8 voting “possibly” same, 1 voting “probably” same (so consider different).

First day's meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

### **30 JANUARY 2016**

Second day's meeting called to order at 9:15 a.m., with all members present.

#### **b. Records brought to meeting by request (continued):**

2014-026 Crested Caracara at Borrego Springs SD – recirculate? Went 8-1 on two rounds, with one member rejecting on both rounds. Members reviewed the documentation and were satisfied with it. No action. Record stands accepted.

2015-019 Brown Shrike at Manchester SP MEN 5 Mar-22 Apr 2015 – should this record be circulated as something else; if so, what? Committee decided not to add this to review list and to leave this as a rejected Brown Shrike; annual report will discuss (no motions).

2015-074 Gray Thrasher at Famosa Slough SD 2 Aug 2015 – natural occurrence? Currently 6-3 in favor of acceptance, but patterns of wear, droppings on it, and other features are of concern to some members. Record is still in circulation.

2013-011 13 Common Redpolls near Alturas MOD 5 Jan 2013 – 12 of the 13 were accepted. The 13th was a Common/Hoary Redpoll and ultimately rejected as a Common Redpoll but does not appear in the updates. Should it be endorsed as a Common/Hoary? Expect AOU to lump Common and Hoary, at which time the record would be revised to include 13 accepted birds. No motion. The updates will be corrected to indicate this individual was not accepted.

Black-bellied Whistling-Ducks - Changing or inconsistent committee standards pertaining to natural occurrence in this species with reference to the following two July records from LA which received opposite decisions.

- 2015-058 2 July 2015 at Bonelli Regional Park, LA was endorsed 8-1, so is accepted.
- 2006-228 8 July 2006 at Lake Balboa LA was rejected 3-6 on grounds of questionable natural occurrence, so is not accepted.

The Riverside County Flyway Association has released banded whistling-ducks of both species (85 BBWD and 61 FUWD between 2000 and 2005) in Corona, about 50 miles from 2006-228 (whose legs were apparently not seen). Singer requested that the Bonelli record be recirculated, so it will be recirculated.

Iceland Gulls - Changing or inconsistent committee standards pertaining to what does or does not constitute an Iceland Gull, and therefore its acceptance/rejection of records of this species. The issue is primarily with first-cycle Kumlien's-type gulls. The following two records were accepted 8-1 after one round, even though they represent birds with characters similar to, or perhaps even less clearly Iceland-like, than a number of records that the committee has not accepted over the years:

- 2014-171 27-29 Dec 2014 Clear Lake LAK
- 2015-008 9-10 Jan 2015 Teapot Dome Landfill TUL

The committee discussed the traditionally conservative stance that the committee has taken on first-cycle Kumlien's-type gulls and the implications of changing that approach, in particular the need for justification regarding why there has been a change in approach. Singer requested that both records be recirculated, so they will be recirculated.

## 7. VOTING

Members should vote within four to six weeks of a batch distribution and preferably sooner. Morlan discussed delays in voting in 2015, reiterated need to vote more quickly.

## 8. BUDGET

a. The WFO budgeted \$200 for the CBRC in 2015 and 2016. Secretary costs (Benson) were \$48.85 for postage in 2015. There were no other costs to be reimbursed from the WFO's budget.

b. Page charges for annual reports. The 2014 report was 29 pages = \$725 @ \$25/page. Three donors contributed \$425. No annual report published in 2015 but two annual reports expected in 2016. Morlan has been contacted by someone who will match donations for CBRC page charges. Members who wish to donate should specify they are donating to cover CBRC report page charges. Donations were encouraged.

## 9. CBRC WEBSITE

a. **CBRC web site.** It is being redesigned as part of a City College class practicum on web design. A preliminary version is at: <http://www.californiabirds.org/CBRCPrototype/default2.asp>. Morlan has offered to coordinate and continue as CBRC webmaster, and the committee approved. Every photo posted should have copyright with photographer's name, location, and date.

b. **Proposed revised CBRC report form.** Members suggested revisions, Morlan will spearhead making them.

c. **Revised CBRC Logo.** Members agreed that an updated logo was needed, but there was no consensus regarding what it should look like. Morlan will advise the CCSF design team in developing a new logo, but this will be a low priority for CCSF for now.

d. Online update: Light or dark morph is included with each accepted Wedge-tailed Shearwater record in the "Rare Birds of California" book, but the updated table of records does not provide this information. Members agreed that this information does not need to be added.



## 10. RARE BIRDS OF CALIFORNIA ONLINE

a. At its May 2014 meeting, the WFO board agreed unanimously that *Rare Birds of California* online be corrected. At the January 2015 CBRC meeting, the CBRC members concurred that corrections needed to be made. WFO President Dave Quady assumed responsibility for working with the CBRC to implement the remaining corrections. Quady rejected two CBRC-approved corrections: Ringed Storm-Petrel and American Woodcock listed at: [http://www.californiabirds.org/cbrc\\_book/CORRBOC-online.htm](http://www.californiabirds.org/cbrc_book/CORRBOC-online.htm) (i & iv below). Quady also wrote a new section called "Corrections and Amplifications" which replaced the link to the print corrigenda on the CBRC web-site. Quady asked that new corrections be made only once each year and tasked Morlan to coordinate with Publications Committee co-chair Cat Waters about additional issues such as inconsistent page numbers on the main list and county pop-ups. Those issues have not yet been resolved.

b. Cat Waters has requested that the CBRC meeting minutes contain a clear record of voting (motions/seconds and votes) on each correction. All CBRC-approved recommendations are to be subsequently ratified by the Publications Committee before any requested changes will be implemented by the WFO.

i. Main List: Move **Ringed Storm-Petrel** to follow Fork-tailed Storm-Petrel in accordance with the AOU. This was wrong in the print version because the AOU had not yet determined where to add the species. Motion to request that the WFO make this change (Tietz, Daniels); passed 9-0.

ii. **Worm-eating Warbler**: Table of Records, record 50: change "19 Dec 1987–31 Jan 1988" to "19 Dec 1987–6 Feb 1988." This correction has been made in the online version, but the change needs to be added to "Corrections and Amplifications." It has been entered in the CBRC print version corrigenda. Motion to request that the WFO make this change (Singer, Searcy); passed 9-0.

iii. **Northern Cardinal**: Table of Records, record 2-3: change females to male & female." – This correction has now been made but the change needs to be added to "Corrections and Amplifications." It has been entered into the CBRC print version corrigenda. Motion to request that the WFO make this change (Nelson, Singer); passed 9-0.

iv. Appendix H: **American Woodcock**. Last sentence currently reads, "Both California records of the American Woodcock come from remote oases in the southern Mojave Desert during the first half of November." However, Desert Center is not in the Mojave Desert. Several options for revising this have been suggested, with the following suggested by Dave Quady: "Both California records of the American Woodcock come from southern desert oases during the first half of November." Cat Waters (and at one time, Joe Morlan) had suggested deleting that sentence entirely. Motion to request that the WFO adopt Quady's suggested revision (Terrill, Harter); passed 9-0. Anticipating the possibility that the WFO may not agree to that change, the committee moved to request that the WFO remove that sentence entirely if the WFO will not agree to Quady's suggested change (Terrill, Garrett); passed 9-0.

c. Page numbering. Some species in the main list of the online version have page numbers while others do not. The page numbers serve no purpose in the online version. Motion to request that the WFO remove all page numbers on main list online (Searcy, Tietz); passed 9-0.

d. The locality map had pop-ups identifying localities for only five counties (Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Lassen & Shasta). Instead these localities are available in the “Localities by County” links at the top. Morlan had recommended fixing the issue, and it has been fixed by the WFO by removing all pop-outs on the locality map. Motion to approve the WFO’s fix (Garrett, Nelson); passed 9-0.

e. Photo captions. Full review of photo captions for the online version is needed, as online images are not necessarily in the same position as indicated in the original text, which may lead to confusion and misinterpretation by users of the online version. It is possible that some photos are misidentified. Garrett, Searcy, Nelson, and Benson will review the captions as follows (page numbers referring to those in the print version):

Pages 49-224 Jim Tietz  
Pages 225-279 Adam Searcy  
Pages 281-481 Tom Benson  
Appendix H John Garrett

They will then email Rottenborn the list of captions that need to be changed (and the proposed changes), and Rottenborn will coordinate with Quady regarding corrections. Morlan understands from Quady that these corrections don’t require a CBRC vote and that they can be made anytime.

f. Integrating Tietz’s updates into the online version. The CBRC does not expect that the WFO will want to add the updates to the online version of the book (e.g., adding records to the table of records in the online version). However, the CBRC can add Tietz’s updates to the tables from the book to provide one complete master database, and this could then be hosted on the CBRC’s website. Tietz will send a Word file of his updates to Terrill to start work on this.

g. The CBRC would like proposed future corrections to the online version to be made by the CBRC webmaster with approval of the CBRC chair and secretary on an as needed basis. Such corrections would be limited to mistakes, and would be more timely than having this done annually by presenting a list of corrections to the WFO Publications Committee. Having corrections made by a CBRC volunteer webmaster would also save WFO the cost of paying someone to make corrections. Motion to propose this to the WFO (Singer, Terrill); passed 9-0.

h. The “Dear Reader” page should be revised and reformatted so the citation is framed with space above and below and stands out (see below). Also, the last sentence on that page should be changed to “The digital format of *Rare Birds of California* incorporates corrections and amplifications, which can be accessed from the menu to the left.” to simplify and clarify it. Motion to request that the WFO make these changes (Nelson, Daniels); passed 9-0. The text, as proposed by the CBRC, would look as follows:

For those of you using the digital publication of *Rare Birds of California* for research and citation, the following citation format can be followed:

California Bird Records Committee [CBRC] (R. A. Hamilton, M. A. Patten, and R. A. Erickson, eds.). 2007. *Rare Birds of California*, Western Field Ornithologists, Camarillo, CA: Retrieved from Rare Birds of California Online:[wfopublications.org/Rare\\_Birds](http://wfopublications.org/Rare_Birds)).

The digital format of *Rare Birds of California* incorporates corrections and amplifications, which can be accessed from the menu to the left.

i. The CBRC recommends correction of the spelling of wfopublications.org registrant from “Tim Brittian” to “Tim Brittain” in accordance with ICANN requirements. See: <https://whois.icann.org/en/lookup?name=wfopublications.org>. Motion to request that the WFO make this change (Singer, Terrill); passed 9-0.

j. Move *Rare Birds of California* online to the CBRC website to facilitate CBRC search results and reduce costs. If on CBRC website, a search for a species would find all mentions of species on main CBRC website and in book. Would reduce costs if any changes are necessary, as costs would be made by a volunteer CBRC webmaster rather than a WFO contractor. The motion was - “The CBRC has an interest in hosting the online version on its website and directs Steve Rottenborn to engage the WFO Publications Committee and Board to start the transition process.” (Searcy, Daniels); passed 9-0.

k. Singer (2014) and Morlan (2015) negotiated with the WFO regarding corrections on behalf of the CBRC. Motion to appoint Rottenborn to represent CBRC interests going forward (Searcy, Singer); passed 9-0.

#### **11. CBRC ENTRY IN WIKIPEDIA**

The committee discussed whether the CBRC should have its own entry or be included in WFO’s entry. There was no strong support for the CBRC to prepare or have its own entry, so the CBRC will cooperate with WFO on inclusion of the CBRC in WFO’s entry.

#### **12. INTRODUCED BIRDS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

The IBSC’s report was reviewed. It is thought that Spotted Dove may be nearing extirpation in the state, and a bylaw addition was adopted to address the process for indicating an introduced species that has been on the state list as extirpated. The IBSC will determine whether there is evidence that Gray Partridge and/or the domesticated form of African Collared Dove was ever established and should therefore be added to the State List as Introduced, then Extirpated. The IBSC will also update its “watch list”.

#### **13. CBRC-EBIRD RELATIONSHIP AND POTENTIAL EXPEDITED REVIEW PROCESS**

Does the committee have an interest in creating an expedited review process for select records based on eBird reporting and records review? Marshall Iliff, representing eBird (and a former CBRC member) called in to answer questions about how this process has been implemented with other state records committees. The basic process would involve review of eBird submissions of certain species (to be determined by the CBRC based on ease of identification and/or degree of rarity) that are accompanied by photographic, audio, or video evidence by a smaller group than the entire committee (possibly some combination of the eBird reviewers, the CBRC secretary, and the CBRC chair). Periodically, the records that have been proposed for acceptance by this smaller group would be transmitted to the entire Committee, which would then have a certain period of time to review the records (or rely on the smaller

group's decision) and determine whether they have any objection to acceptance of certain records via this process. If an objection to acceptance of a certain record is raised, that record would circulate via the normal process. For records for which no objection is raised, a 9-0 accept vote would be recorded after the given period of review time has elapsed.

Benson indicated that he does not think that such a process would increase his workload. However, given that he would still have to record and compile documentation (including documentation that is submitted to eBird and documentation submitted through traditional means) for each record and record votes, this expedited review would likely not reduce his workload either. Iliff suggested that there would be some time savings for the secretary if the CBRC relied on eBird to archive documentation, but because some documentation would still be submitted via traditional means for many such records, the CBRC is unlikely to stop archiving eBird documentation (to make sure that all documentation for a given record is kept together).

The main time savings would be for voting members, who could vote on an entire batch of straightforward records at once, without having to vote "accept without comment" on individual records or mix such votes with votes on records requiring comment.

There are two main issues that would need to be addressed – archiving of documentation and acceptance of record.

Archiving – eBird doesn't track individual birds or documentation for individual birds. All documentation on a bird would be contained in individual checklists. New search tool being developed would allow search for all records of a species at a location on a certain date or set of dates, and all photos, audio, etc. meeting the search criteria would be shown at once. However, the search tool would not distinguish among different individuals if multiple birds were present at a location on a certain date. Also, there is no single location within eBird for each record's documentation to be archived and available for review, and in a way that clearly attaches that documentation to a record.

Adopting a new evaluation approach using eBird may encourage submittal of photo-only documentation; any written documentation (e.g., even by email) would not be attached to the record. Iliff responded that this would require eBird reviewers and CBRC members to further encourage written details.

PDF files cannot be uploaded to eBird, but if they are converted to image files, they can be uploaded.

Iliff indicated that some people have submitted falsified documentation to eBird. The CBRC and eBird reviewers will have to be on their toes about this, especially with unknown observers.

If we move forward, Iliff would be the appropriate eBird team contact.

All members agreed that the CBRC has to continue to archive documentation – download photos from eBird, for example. So, if there are eBird records, and documentation is submitted to CBRC, Secretary will download eBird info and add it to CBRC documentation.

To identify eBird submissions of CBRC review species, the CBRC can set up an account to list all California birds that are not review birds as a filter, and the Secretary gets an alert every time a record is submitted to eBird that is not on that list.

CBRC can archive its data in eBird. Tom doesn't have time to do this. If volunteers can be found to do this, the data could be entered as an "incidental" checklist with one record

How to archive (and let general public see) rejected records? If an eBird record is officially rejected, it is still accessible to eBird reviewers and the submitter but not the public.

A steering committee to investigate implementation of expedited review and proposed revisions to the bylaws (as needed) will consist of Benson, Singer, Tietz, Searcy, and Rottenborn. They will review the sample bylaw regarding eBird review from the Massachusetts Avian Records Committee. Revisions to the bylaws can be voted on by email if necessary.

#### **14. CBRC ARCHIVES AT WFVZ**

Report from Adam Searcy. As members request records electronically, they are scanned by WFVZ. Electronic files are kept, but not stored in one central location. WFVZ has database programmer in mind who might be able to convert files via Access. Searcy will pursue.

#### **15. OUTREACH AND PUBLIC RELATIONS**

- a. All members agreed to ask Kimball Garrett to continue as CBRC spokesperson on Calbirds.
- b. Additional outreach and PR subcommittee? Frances Oliver maintains the WFO Facebook page and would probably welcome CBRC news. Harter will contact Oliver to determine how the CBRC can provide content.
- c. Morlan is willing to continue as CBRC Webmaster, and the committee approved.

#### **16. NEXT MEETINGS**

- a. Fortuna, California WFO conference, 28 Sep-2 Oct 2016. Rottenborn will present a CBRC update to the WFO membership.
- b. Next CBRC meeting will be held in Camarillo at the WFVZ on 27-28 Jan 2017.

#### **17. APPRECIATIONS**

- a. Morlan, Singer, and Searcy for their service, and in particular Morlan for his decades of service to the committee.
- b. Benson for his critical work as Secretary.
- c. Jim Tietz for maintaining updates to "Rare Birds" on our web site.
- d. Scott Terrill and H. T. Harvey & Associates for hosting the 2016 meeting.
- e. WFVZ, Linnea Hall, and Adam Searcy for archiving services.

#### **Adjournment**

4:50 pm, 30 January 2016

Minutes prepared by Steve Rottenborn, February 8, 2016