

## **CALIFORNIA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE (CBRC) ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES**

**Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA – 25-26 January 2019**

### **25 JANUARY 2019**

Meeting called to order at 13:10 (Chair presiding). Members: Steve Rottenborn (Chair), Dan Singer (Vice-Chair), Tom Benson (non-voting Secretary), Jon Dunn, Jonathan Feenstra, Rob Fowler, Guy McCaskie, Jim Pike, Peter Pyle, Justyn Stahl.

Welcome and introductory comments by Rottenborn.

#### **1. REVIEW OF MINUTES OF 2018 MEETING**

The minutes from the annual meeting held on 19-20 January 2018 in Los Gatos, California had been previously approved via email (11 May 2018). No one requested any changes at the 2019 meeting.

**--CLOSED SESSION--**

#### **2. ELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS**

- a. Election of members** (three-year terms). The terms of Jon Feenstra, Guy McCaskie, and Steve Rottenborn expire after the 2019 meeting.

Nominations:

Dan Cooper

Blake Matheson

Gary Nunn

Alex Rinkert

Adam Searcy

Susan Steele

Ryan Terrill

Alex Rinkert, Adam Searcy, and Susan Steele were elected.

A formal letter or note will be sent to each nominee by the Secretary informing them of the election results. Precise wording of this will be at the Secretary's discretion, but at a minimum should include an introductory comment, a list of all nominees, and those elected. Voting details shall not be included.

- b. **Election of Chair** (one-year term) – nomination: Dan Singer (Rottenborn/Dunn). Singer elected 8-0.
- c. **Election of Vice-Chair** (one-year term) – nomination: Justyn Stahl (McCaskie/Feenstra). Stahl elected 8-0.

Dunn suggested that potential Vice Chair candidates be discussed with the nominee(s) for Chair before a meeting. There was little general support for this approach.

- d. **Election of the Secretary** (one-year term) – nomination: Tom Benson (Rottenborn/McCaskie). Benson elected 9-0.
- e. **Discussion of member nomination and selection process** – Rottenborn led a brief Committee discussion of general considerations of potential Committee members. Each member should consider candidates based on his/her own priorities, but general considerations are:
  - 1) Regional balance
  - 2) Age balance
  - 3) Experience balance (new blood plus old timers, those with institutional memory of how things worked in the past and our past decisions and philosophies)
  - 4) Gender balance
  - 5) Support of the CBRC, both in submitting records and in being fully supportive of the CBRC. This does not mean that they agree with all of the CBRC's decisions, but they are supportive of the process and of the Committee.

For the sake of discussion, the Committee reviewed the following criteria for Committee membership considered by the British Birds Records Committee (as published in *British Birds* in April 2017):

- 1) A widely acknowledged expertise in identification
- 2) Proven reliability in the field
- 3) A track record of high-quality submissions of descriptions of scarce and rare birds to county records committees and BBRC

- 4) Experience of record assessment
- 5) Regional credibility
- 6) The capacity to handle the volume of work involved in assessing upwards of 700 records per year
- 7) The capacity to work quickly and efficiently
- 8) Easy access to the internet

**f. Discussion of Potential Future Members** - A number of potential future members were discussed. Once again, there was consensus that the Committee is fortunate to have a very strong field of potential qualified candidates that are willing to serve on the Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 14:35 to tour Moore Laboratory of Zoology collections; James Maley showed members a number of interesting and significant specimens.

Meeting called back to order at 15:27, with all members present.

**--OPEN SESSION--**

### **3. BYLAW PROPOSALS**

Aside from proposed changes related to Expedited Review, discussed below, no changes to any bylaws were proposed or discussed.

### **4. EXPEDITED REVIEW**

Three batches (18Ex, 18Mx, and 18Nx) were circulated via Expedited Review procedures since the 2018 meeting. These batches contained 99 records. None were requested to be removed and evaluated per normal procedures, but two were discussed at this 2019 annual meeting per a member's request, and several others (all Red-footed Boobies) were discussed with regard to same-bird issues.

#### **Potential Changes to Expedited Review Species List**

[By vote of at least seven members, the Committee may, as it sees fit, add species to or remove species from this list.]

Criteria for inclusion: at least 20 accepted records and whose identification is relatively straightforward, given high-quality physical documentation

There was discussion of the rule of thumb for determining that the "identification is relatively straightforward". Species with an acceptance rate of about 60% or higher are considered "relatively

straightforward” identifications, though the Secretary has discretion regarding “high-quality physical documentation” and can decide to circulate any record via standard procedures.

Dunn – if a record is highly significant (e.g., seasonally or geographically), even if identification is straightforward, Secretary should consider circulating it via standard procedures. This suggestion was discussed, and although it was agreed that the Secretary (and Chair, who reviews batches) would continue to consider the significance of a record in determining whether to circulate via expedited vs. standard procedures, it was also pointed out that all members have the prerogative to request that any record in an Expedited Review batch be removed from the batch and circulated via standard procedures.

The following table was discussed, including discussion of whether White-rumped Sandpiper, Nazca Booby, and Masked/Nazca Booby should be added to the Expedited Review species list.

Species	Number of Accepted Records (Jan 2017)	Percent of Records Accepted (Jan 2017)	Number of Accepted Records (Jan 2019)	Percent of Records Accepted (Jan 2019)
Emperor Goose	93	79	96	79
King Eider	45	90	45	88
Ruddy Ground-Dove	109	88	112	88
Broad-billed Hummingbird	87	89	109	91
Wilson’s Plover	26	72	25	71
Upland Sandpiper	31	86	34	87
Bar-tailed Godwit	44	63	50	66
Hudsonian Godwit	52	81	55	82
Curlew Sandpiper	46	55	51	57
White-rumped Sandpiper			30	64
Black-headed Gull	26	72	29	74
Red-tailed Tropicbird	43	96	44	96
Yellow-billed Loon	99	66	103	65
Short-tailed Albatross	40	83	41	84
Masked Booby	22	81	31	84
Nazca Booby			28	88

Masked/Nazca Booby			31	94
Red-footed Booby	21	78	46	88
Tricolored Heron	62	93	74	94
Roseate Spoonbill	138	98	146	98
Mississippi Kite	50	75	53	76
Snowy Owl	61	82	62	83
Greater Pewee	41	84	43	84
Dusky-capped Flycatcher	103	88	115	89
Thick-billed Kingbird	23	85	24	86
White-eyed Vireo	76	97	85	98
Wood Thrush	30	97	35	97
Rufous-backed Robin	20	91	25	93
Curve-billed Thrasher	31	76	36	78
White Wagtail	29	74	37	79
Common Redpoll	174	87	179	87
Snow Bunting	131	88	139	89
Cassin's Sparrow	53	95	55	95
LeConte's Sparrow	36	86	40	85
Rusty Blackbird	46	88	64	90
Common Grackle	95	68	100	68
Worm-eating Warbler	126	93	135	93
Golden-winged Warbler	75	96	81	96
Blue-winged Warbler	50	78	54	79
Connecticut Warbler	121	85	122	85
Cape May Warbler	63	90	48	89
Grace's Warbler	70	89	78	90
Red-faced Warbler	25	76	25	76

- a. Deletion of species from the Expedited Review list
  - Cassin's Sparrow (Dunn moved to delete, no second)
  - Common Grackle (Dunn moved to delete, no second)
- b. Species that now meet the criteria for inclusion on the Expedited Review species list – do we want to add these?
  - White-rumped Sandpiper – motion to add (McCaskie/Singer) – 4 votes, not added (relatively few records, identification can be problematic)
  - Nazca Booby – motion to add (Stahl/Singer) – 8-0, so this species was added to the list; Dunn abstained, citing problems related to differences of opinion on bill color, but others indicated that problematic records could circulate via standard procedures based on the Secretary's/Chair's discretion or at the request of any member
  - Masked/Nazca Booby – motion to add (Stahl/Pyle) – 7-2, so this species was added to the list; this may facilitate review of records of birds that were not accepted as Masked or Nazca

The revised Expedited Review list therefore consists of all the species in the table above, plus Kentucky Warbler (which was added to the Review List at the meeting, as described in Section 10 below), except for White-rumped Sandpiper.

**Potential Bylaw Changes – Expedited Review** [Changing bylaws requires at least eight votes]

1. The bylaws do not specify any actions for records in an Expedited Review batch other than tacit approval by members or request by a member to remove a record from an Expedited Review batch. The bylaws state:

*“If any member does not agree that a record in the expedited review batch should be accepted or wishes to request a standard review of a record for any reason, that member will communicate this to the Secretary within two weeks of receipt of the expedited review batch. The record will then be circulated under the standard review process as a new (first circulation) record without consideration of any votes cast by other members during the review of that record in the expedited review batch.”*

Dunn raised the question – if a member questions a component of an Expedited Batch record other than identification, such as a “same bird” issue or the date span, and the record requires additional circulation to resolve the issue, does the record necessarily have to undergo review per normal procedures as a first-round record, or can it circulate per normal procedures as a second-round record? The Committee discussed this and agreed it would be desirable to address this issue on the second round, but it would complicate the issue of Expedited Review, so no motion was made. The problem is that most members will not have thought to provide written

comments on such records, so if one person does, moving it to a second round via normal procedures would be odd.

We have the ability to bring such records to meetings to discuss any issue, so same-bird issues could be resolved by a vote at a meeting.

2. Does the Committee want to consider allowing members more than two weeks to review Expedited Review batches? What happens if a member cannot respond to the Secretary within 2 weeks (e.g., illness, traveling) but would otherwise have requested that a record in an Expedited Review batch be removed from the expedited process? (Dunn)

The intent is for review of these records to be “expedited”, so we don’t want to prolong the process or leave the review period open-ended. The Secretary will send out “intended expedited review batch” as Tom currently does, indicating when the batch will be circulated. It is then the responsibility of the member to indicate (in writing) whether s/he will be unable to review it in the 2-week period, and if that occurs, the Secretary will delay issuing the batch.

If a member requests additional time after the batch has been issued, the Secretary will consider granting an extension, but whether to do so is at the discretion of the Secretary. If a member is not able to review Expedited Review batches in a timely manner but wants to discuss a particular record after it has been tacitly approved via Expedited Review procedures, that member can request that the record be brought to the next meeting for discussion.

3. Regarding Expedited review, the bylaws state, “The Secretary will confirm that members have received the Expedited Review batch”, but it doesn’t specify that all members need to notify the Secretary – do we want to change that? (Rottenborn)

This gets to Dunn’s issue about not having time to review the batch or being away when it is circulated. It was decided that all members should look at the batch and reply within 2 weeks that they received the batch.

No changes to the bylaws regarding Expedited Review were made at the meeting.

#### **Procedural Issues – Expedited Review** [Changing procedures is by majority vote]

1. In addition to the potential bylaw changes noted above, a question was raised regarding the Expedited Review process - should we establish a procedure by which members can provide more lengthy comments on a record in an Expedited Review batch, without having to request that the record be removed from the batch and circulated via normal procedures? Some members may want to provide more comments regarding age, sex, or the significance of a record (e.g., for use in the annual report). (Dunn)

If a member needs more than 64 characters to provide a brief comment, use a standard voting sheet to provide additional comments. Members should try to avoid doing this on too many records. Members should also try to avoid providing any comments after the 2-week period (again, that conflicts with the desired “expedited” nature of the Expedited Review process), but comments for the record or annual report (e.g., on age/sex) can be provided later.

## 5. OTHER PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- a. How should the Committee deal with submitted records of exotic species with respect to the following:
  - i. Does the Secretary have sole authority to decide whether a record of a potential exotic should be circulated for review (e.g., Pink-backed Pelican, Ruddy Shelduck) or not (e.g., Green Jay, Pin-tailed Whydah, Sudan Golden Sparrow)?

The status quo is currently based on a decision at the 2004 meeting: it was decided that records of obvious escapes would not be circulated but rather sent to the Introduced Birds Subcommittee (IBS), which would review reports of exotics of all kinds (including Darter, House Crow, and Great Tit reports reviewed at that 2004 meeting).

McCaskie – have Vice Chair determine whether to circulate a record of a species like Ruddy Shelduck?

Stahl, Dunn – any record that is formally submitted to the CBRC should be circulated

Singer – such records should be brought to a meeting

Motion to circulate any record that is submitted unless dealing with a species that is on the IBS Watch List (Dunn/Stahl) – passed 8-1. Therefore, any record formally submitted to the CBRC will be circulated, even if it is an obvious escapee or release. For records that are not formally submitted (e.g., those found by the Secretary in eBird checklists), the decision whether to circulate or not is at the Secretary’s discretion.



- ii. If the Secretary decides that a submitted record is clearly of an exotic (escaped/released) bird, does he/she have to archive the record; should it be provided to the Chair of the Introduced Birds Subcommittee; or can it be discarded? At the 2004 meeting it was decided that records of obvious escapes would not be circulated but rather would be sent to the IBS. (Rottenborn, at the suggestion of Joe Morlan)

Motion to have the Secretary send submitted records of species on the IBS Watch List to the IBS Chair (Rottenborn/Singer) – passed 9-0.

## **6. PLUMAGE AND MOLT TERMINOLOGY**

Steve Howell commented that recent CBRC reports have been using incorrect and inconsistent age/molt/plumage terminology, but correspondence between Howell and Peter Pyle suggests that even these plumage/molt experts may not necessary agree on the appropriate terminology.

Pyle briefly advised the Committee on the age/molt/plumage terminology we should be using and agreed to create a style sheet for terminology. He would get Phil Unitt's comments on it and ask Phil if he wanted to adopt it for Western Birds. Following is the guidance provided by Peter and Phil following the meeting:

### **Use of age and plumage terminology in California Bird Records Committee reports**

At the 2019 annual meeting of the California Bird Records Committee (CBRC) it was decided that we would adhere to Humphrey-Parkes (1959; H-P) molt and plumage terminology in annual reports. Prior to 2019 we were using the terminology that was agreed to for Rare Birds of California (CBRC 2007), which consisted primarily of cycle-seasonal terms such as "first-fall," "second-winter," etc. At the time this decision was made, the H-P system had not or had only recently been modified by Howell et al (2003), and it was decided that H-P terminology was not established or understood well enough to be appropriately used by the CBRC. However, the modifications of Howell et al. (including use of preformative in lieu of "first prebasic" molt) have greatly improved the comprehensibility of the system, such that it is rapidly gaining usage, and, once learned, it is undoubtedly the clearest and most cohesive molt, plumage, and age terminology to use throughout the world.

The following plumage terms are proposed for use in CBRC reports and it is suggested that members also use these terms in comments on records for clarity there, and to gain familiarity of use. Molts into each of these plumages will be termed with the prefix "pre," e.g., preformative molt results in formative plumage, second prebasic molt results in second basic plumage, etc.

**First cycle, second cycle, third cycle, definitive cycle.** In general, H-P terminology is based on the concept of the cycle to describe molts, plumages, and age. The “first cycle” includes the juvenile, formative, and first alternate plumages of birds less than 1 year of age, the “second cycle” includes the second basic and second alternate plumages of birds 1–2 years of age, etc., while “definitive cycle” is used for birds in definitive basic and alternate plumages, by which time plumage maturation has generally ceased (see also “Adult” below). Cycles end and the next one begins when a prebasic molt commences, usually with the dropping of the innermost primary (p1). For example, the first cycle progresses to the second cycle when the second prebasic molt commences. The minimum age of birds in the definitive cycle varies from 2 years in most passerines to 3 years in loons, 3–5 years in gulls and some other large waterbirds, and 7–10 or more years in albatrosses and frigatebirds. In CBRC reports, the above, more general cycle terms will be used in cases where birds have been recorded through more than one inserted plumage, for birds in which inserted plumage state is unknown or not clear (including many large gulls from October to February), and when multiple birds in the same cycle but potentially in different plumages are discussed simultaneously.

**Juvenile.** A bird in juvenile plumage, within the first cycle, that has not yet initiated the preformative molt. Among CBRC records these will primarily be used for vagrant shorebirds in late summer and fall, plus a few other hawks, falcons, tubenoses, and waterbirds. We will use the term “juvenile” as both a noun and an adjective, dispensing with use of “juvenal” as a modifier (e.g., “juvenal plumage”), following Howell and Pyle (2015). Juvenile is now synonymous with “first basic” plumage as redefined by Howell et al. (2003).

**Formative.** A first-cycle bird that has completed or is well along in its preformative molt but has not begun the next (first prealternate or second prebasic) molt. Many CBRC records (especially of waterfowl and passerines) involve birds in formative plumage in their first fall, winter, or (for species lacking first alternate plumages) spring. Formative replaces H-P’s former use of “first-basic” plumage.

**First alternate, second alternate, third alternate, definitive alternate.** Used for birds in alternate plumage during each of these cycles. In CBRC reports alternate plumages will be referred to most frequently among passerines, shorebirds, gulls, and loons, among species that undergo a prealternate molt. Fourth and later alternate plumages may also be specified in occasional cases for gulls.

**Second basic, third basic, fourth basic, definitive basic.** Used for birds in basic plumage during each of these cycles. In CBRC reports, reference to the second basic plumage will be made primarily for waterbirds and some hawks in which the second basic plumage is not yet the definitive plumage. Reference to third and fourth basic plumages will be most frequent for gulls. Fifth and later basic plumages may rarely be mentioned for slow-maturing waterbirds such as albatrosses, frigatebirds, and the Masked and Nazca boobies. In species remaining in a predefinitive plumage for several or more years, phrases like “third or fourth basic plumage” for gulls and boobies or “fifth to seventh basic plumage” for frigatebirds and albatrosses may need to be used, due to plumage characters beginning to overlap between cycles.

**Adult.** An acceptable, alternative term frequently used in CBRC reports for a bird in a definitive plumage. Generally “adult” will be used in lieu of “in definitive plumage,” but the latter may be used more often

referring to a cycle, a particular plumage (e.g., definitive alternate plumage) or the molt producing a particular plumage (definitive prealternate molt).

### **Syntax and usage**

Use of cycle-based and plumage terms may be used with feathers, e.g., “formative feathers,” but not for birds in cases such as “second basic individual” or “first alternate male.” Use instead such terms as “male in first alternate plumage”.

Hyphens are not needed for these terms; e.g., “second basic plumage” as opposed to “second-basic plumage); “first alternate feather” as opposed to “first-alternate feather.” The hyphen is not needed because “second,” for example, modifies the entire expression “basic plumage,” not the word “basic” alone.

Peter Pyle and Philip Unitt

11 February 2019

### **Literature Cited**

California Bird Records Committee (CBRC; R. A. Hamilton, M. A. Patten, and R. A. Erickson, eds.). 2007. Rare Birds of California. W. Field Ornithol., Camarillo, CA

Howell, S.N.G., and P. Pyle. 2015. Use of ‘definitive’ and other terms in molt nomenclature: A response to Wolfe et al. (2014). *Auk* 132:365-369.

Howell, S. N. G., Corben, C, Pyle, P, and Rogers, D. I. 2003. The first basic problem: a review of molt and plumage homologies. *Condor* 105: 635-653.

Humphrey, P. S., and K. C. Parkes (1959). An approach to the study of molts and plumages. *The Auk* 76:1–31.

## **7. SHIP ASSISTANCE AND ACCEPTABILITY OF RECORDS**

The issue of ship assistance and acceptability of birds that may have been ship assisted has come up several times in recent years (e.g., Hawfinch on a ship from South Korea, White-tipped Dove on a cruise ship from Mexico, multiple Nazca Boobies in south San Diego Bay). Although the Nazca Boobies were unanimously accepted as being naturally occurring, a former member lobbied some Committee members (in his submitted documentation and separately) as to why those birds should not have been accepted, and the issue of ship assistance comes up fairly frequently in questions from non-Committee members. At the 2010 meeting, the Committee decided not to codify anything, but rather to allow members to have/express differences of opinion regarding what type and level of use of a ship (or what probability of ship assistance) was considered acceptable.

We briefly discussed the Committee’s general approach to such records to calibrate and see where members stand on these issues.

Rottenborn provided his opinion that if a bird is restrained, or relies heavily/solely on a ship for food or rest, so that it would not have made it into California [including California waters] in the absence of the ship, the bird should not be considered to be naturally occurring. However, if a bird rides a ship at times, or follows a ship because of food from the ship (e.g., a seabird following a fishing boat) but is unrestrained and can obtain food from natural sources, it is generally considered naturally occurring.

Dunn – agrees with status quo (leave decisions to each member, don't try to codify)

Pike – the Nazca Boobies in south San Diego Bay probably spent time on a ship. Pike indicated that the Nazca Booby records from south San Diego Bay was more acceptable in the context of an incursion year than if these birds had occurred in a year without so many other records.

The Committee decided to maintain the status quo, allowing members to express their opinions during the voting process rather than trying to codify a unified approach or set of criteria to establish when records of birds associating with ships are or are not acceptable.

Meeting adjourned at 20:13 on 25 January.

## **26 JANUARY 2019**

Meeting called back to order at 09:20, with all members present.

### **8. FOURTH AND FINAL RECORDS**

Several identification issues were discussed with regard to Masked/Nazca Booby identification:

- Steve Howell had provided some helpful ID comments to Dan Singer – on presumed Nazca, 1st-cycle birds average heavier dark underwing margins/markings, vs. mostly white underwings on Masked, and 2nd-cycle Nazca often retain a dark neck patch that seems rare on Masked. Bill color changes at a highly variable rate, as some 2nd-cycle Nazca are obviously peach-pink-orange, whereas others are more of an ambiguous orange-yellow (but Masked at that age is rarely (?) so bright yellow, more of a greenish yellow). Howell has seen some (presumed pure) adult Masked with bright/rich yellow bills called Nazca in Baja, and has also seen similar bright bills in Oman, where Nazca is not a concern. It seems that obvious white on the base of tail, especially r1, which can be renewed well before bill color changes and even show some white as juv, is really good (possibly diagnostic, though this has not yet been quantified) for Nazca. In an upcoming book, Howell & Zufelt say that Nazca "averages" more white on the central tail, but Howell has never seen a Masked with obvious white on the central tail.
- Pyle suggested that nonbreeding Masked and Nazca boobies likely have duller bills than breeding-condition individuals. If birds are in active molt, they may not be in breeding condition, and bill color may be duller than in breeding condition.

- There is still some uncertainty regarding when immature Masked and Nazca boobies show bill color that allows them to be identifiable (e.g., how long an immature Nazca can lack orange or pink tones). Pitman and Jehl indicate that the bill of Nazca can start to tinge orange or pink when 4-8 months old; Pitman told us last year that by 12 months of age, the bill should start to change color. Accurately ageing birds is important when determining whether the bill should be showing orange or pink tones if the bird is a Nazca.
- These boobies keep juvenile plumage for 8-10 months (when they drop their first primary); every 12 months thereafter, they begin a new wave of primary molt.

The following records without a decision after three rounds of voting were discussed at the meeting, and then voted upon at the meeting:

- a. 2015-126 Masked Booby (26 Oct 2015, Sutil Rock off Santa Barbara Island SBA) and same bird issue with 2015-103 (27-28 Sep 2015, Sutil Rock off Santa Barbara Island SBA)
  - The vote on 2015-126 was 6-3 (for-against) accepting as a Masked Booby after 3rd round. Record 2015-103 had been accepted as MABO/NABO and accepted as the same bird as 2015-126.
  - Is age “progression” from 2015-103 to 2015-126 consistent with the same individual? Could it have replaced so much brown on the neck in one month?
  - Pyle first indicated that he thought 2015-126 was between 15 and 30 months old, starting its 3rd pre-basic molt, and that the two birds are too different in age/appearance/molting state to be the same bird. This contradicted an earlier assessment he had made for the observers prior to record circulation. At the request of the committee, Pyle re-analyzed the two records and concluded that they were the same bird after all, and provided documentation to this effect.
  - Motion – if 2015-126 is accepted as MABO and the same bird as 2015-103, then recirculate 2015-103 as MABO. If 2015-126 is not accepted as MABO, then it will circulate as slash, and 2015-103 does not need to be recirculated (Rottenborn/Singer) – passed 9-0.
  
- b. 2016-141 Nazca Booby (14 Nov 2016, Point Pinos MTY) – this record will be circulated for a 4<sup>th</sup> and final round

## 9. RECORDS BROUGHT TO MEETING BY REQUEST

[For records with a final decision, majority vote needed to re-review]

- a. **Records held for/brought to meeting**

- 2018-008 King Eider (4 Jan 2018, Sutro Baths SF) (Dunn)

This record received a 4-5 vote on its first round. McCaskie requested in his first-round comments that it be recirculated, so it will be sent around for a second circulation.

- 2016-148A Glossy Ibis (14-19 Jul 2016, Prado Basin RIV) (Stahl – identification)

This record received an 8-1 vote in the third round, but Stahl requested that it be discussed at the meeting. The issue of photos showing a slight red tinge to the eye on birds that otherwise look like pure Glossy Ibis is something we continue to run into. Photos on the web of eastern Glossy Ibis don't show this red tinge, suggesting the possibility that this feature reflects hybridization with White-faced. However, it is unusual that the Committee has reviewed several records where a slight red tinge, visible in photos but not seen by field observers, is the only feature that is not appropriate for a pure Glossy Ibis, so it's not clear what is going on. Members will continue to evaluate this on a record-by-record basis. There was no motion to re-evaluate this accepted record.

- 2017-032 Little Stint (28 Apr 017, Moss Landing MTY) & 2017-090 Little Stint (16-19 Sep 2017, Moss Landing MTY) (Pyle – same bird)

Record 2017-032 was accepted (9-0) in the third round, whereas 2017-090 received a 5-4 vote on the second round. Record 2017-090 will continue to circulate; members who accept it should indicate whether they consider it the same bird as 2017-032. There is a possibility that the same bird was involved because a single bird may be wintering at this location (and may have done so for multiple years).

- 2017-159 White-winged Crossbill (17-18 Dec 2017, Smith River mouth DN) (Benson)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record was accepted 9-0, but with five members accepting only the first date and four members accepting the 2-day span. Members expressed differences of opinions regarding the acceptability of documentation for the second date, but there was no motion, so the record remains accepted only on 17 Dec.

- 2017-171 White-winged Crossbill (28 Dec 2017, Crescent City DN) (Fowler)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record was not accepted 1-8. There was some discussion of the record, but there was no motion, so the record remains not accepted.

- 2017-175 Arctic Loon (16 Dec 2017, Pt. Pinos MTY) (Dunn – identification)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record received a 5-4 vote. There was discussion of the flank pattern of Arctic vs. Pacific Loon in flight, with Dunn indicating that the extent of white on this bird is typical of Arctic Loons identified in flight in Alaska. The record will continue to circulate.

- 2018-021 Arctic Loon (2 Feb 2018, Steamer Lane SCZ) (Dunn – identification)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record received a 4-5 vote. There was discussion of the impression by some that the bill is too thin for an Arctic Loon and that in one photo, it is angled upward like a Red-throated Loon. Others suggested that a Red-throated should have grayer/paler back and that the white spots in the wing coverts match Arctic but not Red-throated. Motion to continue for a third round (Dunn/Singer<sup>1</sup>), so this record will be circulated for a third round.

- 2017-139 Garganey (25 Nov 2017 – 11 Mar 2018, Waller Park SBA)  
(Rottenborn/Singer – identification/origin)

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record received a 7-2 vote, with two “not accept” votes based on natural occurrence. There was discussion by Pyle of potential abnormalities in the bird’s

---

<sup>1</sup>From the bylaws: A record that has received a “final” decision after its 2nd or 3rd circulation, shall nevertheless be brought to a Committee meeting upon request of any present or immediately past Voting Member (if they had voted on that record in its last circulation) within one month of the Secretary announcing the decision and shall be discussed. Once discussion has been completed and after submission of a motion for continued circulation to either a third or fourth and final found only a second is needed to continue the circulation.

plumage, making it difficult to age and sex the bird. However, there was no motion, so the record remains accepted. Authors of the report discussing this record should consider mentioning the plumage issues raised in Pyle's first-round comments.

- 2018-053 White-eyed Vireo (1-6 Jun 2018, Oceano Campground SLO) (Dunn – date span)

This record was accepted 9-0 in the first round (in an Expedited Review batch), but there was some discussion of the date span given the lack of physical documentation after 4 June, and some desire for re-evaluation. There was also discussion regarding whether this record should circulate as a first-round record or a second-round record, given that it was first circulated in an Expedited Review batch. Motion to circulate as second-round record (Dunn/Singer), so it will circulate for a second round.

- 2018-120 Greater Pewee (2-3 Sep 2018, Ft. Rosecrans National Cemetery SD) (Dunn – age/plumage)

This record was accepted 9-0 in the first round (in an Expedited Review batch), but Dunn pointed out that this record was significant due to the early date. All agreed that the record was acceptable, and there was no motion to re-evaluate it.

- 2018-057 Eastern Meadowlark (10 Jun – 30 Jul 2018, Day MOD) (Feenstra) – question about final date

This record was accepted 9-0 in the first round, but there was some discussion regarding the basis for the final date. The last documented observation in eBird was 25 July, but there was a brief physical description of the bird from 30 July by a solid observer, thus establishing the end of the accepted date span. There was no motion to re-evaluate the record or the date span.

- 2000-073, 2001-074, 2002-020 (Black-backed Oriole, Tijuana R. Valley SD) (Pyle)



This species has been accepted by the ABA Checklist Committee based on a PA record (same bird appeared in Massachusetts). Does the CBRC want to reconsider the San Diego record? Does the appearance of a bird in PA and MA constitute new and substantial evidence? There was no motion to re-evaluate the San Diego record.

**b. Date corrections**

[As established at the 2015 meeting – after a record is published in an annual report, a super majority (9-0 or 8-1) is required to modify a date range]

- Change date of 1986-002 Yellow-throated Vireo (Pt. Loma SD) from 13-20 Nov 1985 to 13-23 Nov 1985 based on documentation from McCaskie, and publish correction in annual report.

Motion to extend date (Dunn/Stahl), passed 9-0.

- Change date of 2015-169 Blue Jay (Quincy PLU) from 18 Nov 2015-23 Apr 2016 to 31 Oct 2015-9 May 2016 based on information provided by Colin Dillingham (Paul Hardy was the initial observer on October 31, 2015 and Gary Rotta was the last observer on May 9, 2016) and publish correction in annual report.

Motion to extend date (Feenstra/Dunn), passed 9-0.

**c. Jouanin's & Bulwer's Petrels records (Pyle)**

- 2015-176 Jouanin's Petrel (12 Sep 2015, 16 km SSW of Strawberry Beach SCZ) (accepted 3<sup>rd</sup> round but ID questioned)

The CBRC publicly announced that this record had been accepted, but Steve Howell and others outside the Committee questioned the bird's identity, and one of the original "experts" consulted by the Committee changed his mind and no longer supported an identification of Jouanin's. This record was brought to the meeting at Rottenborn's request. At the meeting, Pyle provided some information and comparison photos, and members discussed the existence of some large-billed Bulwer's Petrels from Japan. To some members, the Santa Cruz bird appears to have been intermediate between the smallest-billed Jouanin's and largest-billed Bulwer's (which are close in bill size), complicating resolution of the bird's identity. This record will move to a 4<sup>th</sup> round.

- 2007-243/A Bulwer's Petrel (5 Sep 2007, Santa Barbara Channel VEN) (suspend 243A and re-evaluate as Jouanin's Petrel based on new documentation from JPS?)

The CBRC did not accept this as a Bulwer's during its prior evaluation, but the primary observer did not submit documentation directly, so documentation during that initial review was incomplete. The Committee recently decided to evaluate this record as a Jouanin's/Bulwer's Petrel. The primary observer has now submitted additional documentation asking that it be considered as a Jouanin's Petrel.

Motion to circulate as Jouanin's Petrel based on new and substantial evidence (Rottenborn/Feenstra) – passed 9-0, so this record will be circulated as a first-round record of Jouanin's Petrel.

- 2016-058 Jouanin's Petrel (1 Jun 2016, Arch Point, Santa Barbara Island SBA), 2003-169 Bulwer's Petrel (4 Sep 2003, 30 mi S of San Clemente Island LA), 1998-119 Bulwer's Petrel (26 July 1998, 16 nmi W of Pt. Pinos MTY), & 1993-118 Bulwer's Petrel (10 Jul-1 Aug 1993, N. end of Salton Sea RIV) (for discussion)

These records were discussed, but there was no motion to do anything with any of them at this time. If, in the future, records 2015-176, 2007-243A, or other records are accepted as "Jouanin's/Bulwer's Petrel), then the Committee may consider whether to re-evaluate 2003-169 and/or 1993-118 in that "slash" category.

**d. Masked/Nazca Boobies (identification/natural occurrence issues were discussed)**

- 2017-112 MABO (22 Sep 2017, La Jolla Cove SD) (Dunn) – No action, record remains accepted
- 2018-040 MABO (1 May 2018, San Diego Harbor SD) (Rottenborn – identification) – In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record received a 7-2 vote. The issue is that bill color looks warmer on some monitors than others. This is not an issue that we can necessarily resolve, as it's not clear which monitors show the color correctly. Members will continue to vote as they see fit. Good written descriptions regarding what observers see in the field continue to be important. Pyle suggested that if birds are in

active molt, they may not be in breeding condition, and bill color may be duller than in breeding condition. The record will continue to the 3<sup>rd</sup> round.

- 2018-052 MABO (31 May 2018, 8.5 km WSW of Dana Point ORA) (Rottenborn/Pyle –identification) – In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record received a 7-2 vote. Evaluation of this record is influenced by the same issue as for 2018-040. The record will continue to the 3<sup>rd</sup> round.
- 2018-063 MABO (11 Jun 2018, Catalina Is. LA) (identification) – In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record received a 7-2 vote. Evaluation of this record is influenced by the same issue as for 2018-040. The record will continue to the 3<sup>rd</sup> round.
- 2018-098 MABO (17 Aug 2018, 43 km W of Pt. Loma SD) (Rottenborn – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 6-3 vote. The bill looks orangish at the base on some monitors and to some members, and the bird has considerable white on the central rectrices, suggesting Nazca. However, an excellent observer described the bill well and specifically looked for warm color, but did not see it in the field (which suggests that the bird was a Masked). The record will continue to the 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
- 2018-099 MABO (19 Aug 2018, Thirtymile Bank SD) (Rottenborn/Pyle – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 8-1 vote. Observers on the boat saw no warm tones, but they are evident on some monitors. The record will continue to the 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
- 2018-107 MABO (24 Aug 2018, 4 km WNW of Pt. Pinos MTY) (Rottenborn – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 6-3 vote. Is bill color definitive for MABO, or is the bird too young for bill color to be definitive? The record will continue to the 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
- 2018-106 MA-NABO (22 Aug 2018, 4 km S of Pt. Fermin LA) (Dunn/Pyle – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 9-0 vote, but the record was brought to the meeting to discuss whether this immature bird is identifiable to species. The bill is greenish at the base; does this eliminate NABO at this young age? There was no motion to circulate as a MABO because the bird is less than 8 months old, so bill color may not be definitive. The record remains accepted.
- 2018-117 MA-NABO (31 Aug 2018, Santa Monica Bay LA) (Dunn/Pyle – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 9-0 vote, but the record was brought to the meeting to discuss whether this immature bird is identifiable to species. The issues were the same as for 2018-106. There was no motion to circulate as a MABO because the bird is less than 8 months old, so bill color may not be definitive. The record remains accepted.

- 2018-149 MA-NABO (13 Sep 2018, Platform Eureka ORA) (Dunn/Pyle – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 9-0 vote, but the record was brought to the meeting to discuss whether this immature bird is identifiable to species. Because the photos are so distant, so that bill color on this older subadult cannot be adequately assessed, there was no action, and the record remains accepted as a slash.
- 2017-155 NABO (4 birds, 11 Dec 2017 – 6 Apr 2018, San Diego Bay SD) (Rottenborn – origin/number) – In the 2<sup>nd</sup> round, this record was accepted 9-0, with six members accepting only three birds. Natural occurrence was discussed, as a non-member had raised the possibility that these birds rode a ship into San Diego Bay, but members either thought that there was a strong possibility that they arrived (in California waters, at least) under their own power or were not concerned whether or not the birds had ridden a ship. Because three birds were well photographed/seen, motion to accept 3 birds as NABO (Rottenborn/Dunn) – passed 9-0. Because a fourth bird was not well seen or photographed, motion to accept 4th bird as MA/NABO (Rottenborn/Dunn) – passed 9-0.
- 2018-100 NABO (19-23 Aug 2018, Los Angeles Harbor LA) (Pyle – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 7-2 vote. Bill color was not strongly greenish-yellow or warm, and members have different opinions regarding whether the bill color supports NABO or whether it is ambiguous and the record should be considered MA/NABO. Do “horn” (chalky) colored bills indicate NABO rather than MABO? This is something worthy of further investigation. This record will continue to the 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
- 2018-114 NABO (29 Aug-4 Sep 2018, Sutil Rock, Santa Barbara Island SBA) (Dunn – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 8-1 vote. Dunn saw the bird in the field and thought the base of the bill was more olive-colored. The interpretation of bill color by members varies somewhat, but other members were satisfied that the photos consistently showed bill color consistent with NABO. Pyle indicated that the bird was about 18-20 months old, so bill color should be definitive. The bird also had extensively white central rectrices, consistent with NABO. Per Dunn’s 1<sup>st</sup>-round request, the record will circulate to a 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
- 2018-116 NABO (28 Aug 2018, 12 km off San Diego SD) (Dunn – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 8-1 vote. This bird’s bill had the same “chalky-orange” color, lacking olive/green, as on some other subadults. There was some difference in opinion regarding whether this indicates NABO or not. Per Dunn’s 1<sup>st</sup>-round request, the record will circulate to a 2<sup>nd</sup> round.
- 2018-181 NABO (6 Oct 2018, Platform Ellen ORA) (Dunn – identification) – In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, this record received a 8-1 vote. The bird had extensive white in the central rectrices, and most members thought the bill has some orange at the base. Per Dunn’s 1<sup>st</sup>-round request, the record will circulate to a 2<sup>nd</sup> round.

e. **Red-footed Booby (same bird issues)** [a simple majority governs same-bird issues]

- 2018-085 (23 Jul 2018 (6 km WSW of Dana Pt. ORA), 2018-090 (9-10 Aug 2018, Mission Bay SD), 2018-091 (9 Aug 2018, San Diego River mouth SD), 2018-125 (5-6 Sep 2018, SE Farallon Is. SF) – Records 2018-090 and 2018-091 have different tail patterns; there was no action on these four records
- 2018-095 (17 Aug 2018, 48 km W of La Jolla SD), 2018-111 (25 Aug 2018, 4.4 km WNW of Castle Rock, San Clemente Island LA), 2018-178 (6 Oct 2018, near Anacapa Island VEN); there was no action on these records
- 2018-096 (18-21 Aug 2018, Pt. Loma SD), 2018-133 (1-9 Sep 2018, Oceanside Pier SD); there was no action on these records
- 2018-113 (29 Aug 2018, 15 km NNW of Santa Barbara Island SBA), 2018-126 (3 Sep 2018, 19 km SW of Huntington Beach pier ORA), 2018-150 (17 Sep 2018, Los Angeles Harbor LA), 2018-189 (11 Oct 2018, Santa Barbara Island SBA); there was no action on these records
- 2018-180 (6 Oct 2018, Platform Eureka ORA), 2018-191 (15 Oct 2018, Los Angeles Harbor LA), 2018-209 (9 Nov 2018, Huntington Beach Pier ORA) – Members voted 8-1 at the meeting to consider 2018-191 and 2018-209 definitely or probably the same bird; no action was taken with regard to 2018-180 being the same bird as any other.
- 2018-168 (30 Sep 2018, 30 km SSW of Four Mile Beach SCZ), 2018-195 (21 Oct 2018, 10 km S of Younger Lagoon SCZ), 2018-206 (1 Nov 2018 – 3 Jan 2019, Seacliff State Beach SCZ) – The vote at the meeting on whether to consider 2018-168 and 2018-195 the same bird was 1-8, so they are considered different birds; no action was taken with regard to 2018-206 being the same bird as any other.

In Batch 18L, five members (a majority) voted to accept Santa Cruz County Red-footed Booby records 2018-195 (21 Oct 2018, 10 km S of Younger Lagoon) and 2018-206 (1 Nov 2018-3 Jan 2018, Seacliff State Beach) as the same bird, and this same bird determination was reflected in the batch results. At the meeting we looked at 2018-168 (30 Sep 2018, 30 km SSW of Four Mile Beach), 2018-195, and 2018-206 together, and the members thought that none of these were the same bird. We voted that 2018-168 and 2018-195 were not the same bird, but made no motion for 2018-195 and 2018-206. Thus, these two birds were still considered the same bird based on the results of Batch 18L. To resolve this, a vote was taken by email on 2 February 2019 on whether to reverse the previous decision. Rottenborn moved, and Singer seconded, to re-consider the same bird issue for 2018-195 and 2018-206. The Committee voted 8-1 (McCaskie

dissenting) that 2018-195 and 2018-206 were possibly the same or not the same individual. Therefore these records are considered not the same individual, reversing the decision in Batch 18L.

**f. Masked Booby (same bird issues)**

- 2018-059 MABO (10 Jun 2018, 27 km W of Pt. Loma SD), 2018-071 MABO (1 Jul 2018, 12 km SW of Bolsa Chica ORA), 2018-099 MABO (19 Aug 2018, Thirty Mile Bank SD) – Members voted 8-1 at the meeting to consider 2018-059 and 2018-099 definitely or probably the same bird. Based on Pyle’s analysis of upperwing coverts, it was thought that 2018-071 could possibly be the same as those other two records, but no vote was taken on this because members generally expressed that they would not conclude that they were definitely or probably the same bird.
- 2018-052 MABO (31 May 2018, 8.5 km WSW of Dana Point ORA), 2018-058 MABO (9 Jun 2018, Pt. La Jolla SD), 2018-064 MABO (7 Jun 2018, 5-8 km off Manhattan Beach LA), 2018-100 NABO LA (19-23 Aug 2018, Los Angeles Harbor LA) – The vote at the meeting on whether to consider 2018-052 and 2018-064 the same bird was 1-8, so they are considered different birds; no action was taken with regard to 2018-058 or 2018-100 being the same bird as any other.

**g. Nazca Booby (same bird issues)**

- 2018-077 NABO (15 Jul 2018, Anacapa Island – Arch Rock VEN), 2018-116 NABO (28 Aug 2018, 12 km off San Diego SD), 2018-196 MA-NABO (10 Jun 2018, off Mission Bay SD) – Members voted 6-3 at the meeting to consider 2018-077 and 2018-196 definitely or probably the same bird; no action was taken with regard to 2018-116 being the same bird as any other.

However, in order for these to be considered the same bird, they both need to be accepted as the same species, and we did not vote at the meeting to re-evaluate 2018-196 as a Nazca Booby. To resolve this, a vote was taken by email on 2 February 2019 (Rottenborn moved, and Singer seconded), on whether to re-evaluate record 2018-196 as a Nazca Booby. The Committee voted 7-2 (Dunn, Feenstra dissenting) to re-evaluate 2018-196 as a Nazca Booby. It then circulated as 2018-196A in Batch 18O.

- 2018-069 NABO (24-26 Jun 2018, Monterey Bay MTY), 2018-104 MA-NABO (29 Jun 2018, Estero Bay SLO), 2018-114 NABO (29 Aug-4 Sep 2018, Sutil Rock, Santa

Barbara Island SBA), 2018-137 NABO (5 Sep 2018, Rodriguez Dome SBA), 2018-177 NABO (6 Oct 2018, near Santa Barbara Island SBA) – Members voted 8-0 (Dunn abstaining) at the meeting to consider 2018-069 and 2018-104 definitely or probably the same bird. Motion to re-evaluate 2018-104 as a NABO (Rottenborn/Fowler) passed 8-0, Dunn abstained; it then circulated as 2018-104A in Batch 180. Members voted 8-1 at the meeting to consider 2018-177 definitely or probably the same as 2018-069 and 2018-104. No action was taken with regard to 2018-114 or 2018-137 being the same bird as any other.

- 2018-149 MA-NABO (13 Sep 2018, Platform Eureka ORA), 2018-181 NABO (6 Oct 2018, Platform Ellen ORA) – The vote at the meeting on whether to consider 2018-181 the same bird as one of the two involved in 2018-149 was 3-6, so they are considered different birds. However, all members thought that there was a high likelihood that 2018-181 was one of those two, but the images of 2018-149 were not clear enough to confirm that the same bird was likely involved.

#### **h. Other issues**

- 1982-057 White-collared Swift (21 May 1982, Pt. Saint George DN) – This is the only species on the state list not supported by a specimen, photo, or audio recording. Should it remain on the official list? Should the CBRC create a Presumptive List (a list of species for which there is at least one accepted record but for which there is no physical documentation) as is done by some other states (e.g., Texas)? (McCaskie) – A straw poll was taken to gauge interest in creating a Presumptive List, but only three members were willing to support that approach. Stahl indicated that he would support creating a higher standard for similar records (first state records with no physical documentation) moving forward.

- 2015-074 Gray Thrasher (2 Aug 2015, Famosa Slough SD) – Should this species be placed on the Supplemental List? The CBRC voted at the 2017 meeting not to add it to the Supplemental List, but does the Committee want to reconsider? (McCaskie) – Motion to add Gray Thrasher to Supplemental List (Dunn/Pyle) passed 8-1.

- 2006-093 Yellow Grosbeak (31 Jul – 2 Aug 2006, Keough Hot Springs INY) – Should this species be placed on the Supplemental List? The CBRC considered this at the 2017 meeting, but no motion to place it on the Supplemental List was made; does

the Committee want to reconsider? (Rottenborn) – No interest in doing this and no action taken as the bird showed substantial signs of prior captivity.

- 2008-161 Oriental Greenfinch (11 Oct 2008, SE Farallon Island) – In light of acceptance of the 1986-87 Arcata record, does the CBRC want to reconsider the SEFI sight record? (Rottenborn) – No interest in doing this, no action taken.
  
- Short-tailed Albatross/Sharp-tailed Grouse – Should the CBRC consider listing all 19th century specimens in institutions? (Dunn) – Members asked if they're already archived, or if information on them is available on the web, then what would be gained by compiling records? The CBRC reviewed and accepted Sharp-tailed Grouse records in the past; are there other extant specimens? Dunn will ask Kimball Garrett about the feasibility of finding specimen records and obtaining documentation.

## 10. REVIEW LIST

[Requires 7 votes to add or remove – “In general, the Review List will consist of species that have occurred within California and adjacent ocean on an average of four or fewer times per year during the ten-year period immediately preceding revision of the Review List.”]

### Potential Additions:

- a) **Kentucky Warbler:** Average of 3.15 birds per year over the last 13 years. (Stahl) Motion to add (Dunn/Feenstra) passed 9-0. Motion to add to expedited review list (Stahl/Feenstra) passed 9-0.
- b) **Wood Stork:** Average of 11.7 per year over last 10 years, 3.2 per year over last 5 years (mangroves in which they nest in Mexico being destroyed, so numbers at Salton Sea have been low for last 5 years). Motion to add to review list (Dunn/Pike) failed 4-5; the Committee will keep an eye on numbers over the coming years.

### Potential Deletions:

- a) **Broad-billed Hummingbird:** Average of 3.6 birds per year over the last 10 years, with 109 total records to date. No action taken.
- b) **Cape May Warbler:** Average of 5 birds per year over the last 8 years (placed on review list in 2011). Numbers highly variable from year to year, but no years with 0 records in that time span. No action taken.



- c) **Rusty Blackbird:** Average of 5 bird per year over the last 10 years. Numbers variable from year to year, but only one year with no records since being placed on review list in 2006. Motion to remove (Pike/Dunn) – 6-3 (species was not removed).
- d) **Red-footed Booby, Nazca Booby, and Masked Booby:** Of these three species, only Red-footed Booby has a 10-year average greater than or equal to 4 (it is somewhere between 4-5, depending on same bird issues and a few uncirculated records). All three species, however, were recorded in double digit numbers in California in 2018 with at least 80 booby records total. No action taken.

## 11. REVIEW OF SPECIES PRESENT CONTINUOUSLY

The Committee discussed whether birds present continuously should be reviewed every year. The bylaws state: “Accepted records of individual birds returning or continuing through subsequent years shall be treated the same as any other resubmission of an accepted record. A majority vote determines whether a record is to be treated as a resubmission of a returning or continuing bird.” However, two approaches, annually reviewing birds believed to have remained continuously under separate record numbers, and simply extending the date span for the record without multiple reviews, have been used by the Committee.

For example, the long-staying Northern Gannet has not received any additional review, or new record numbers, since it was first accepted. Additional dates have just been tacked on to the existing accepted record for the last five years. The same is true for the Inyo Curve-billed Thrasher for a four-year period. In recent years the Committee has just been adding a paragraph at the end of the CBRC's reports indicating which long-staying birds remained during the year covered by the report, and until when.

Other records have been treated differently. For example, the Santa Rosa Common Black Hawk was reviewed the first year under 2007-080, but during years 2008-2016 it was reviewed again under a new record number, possibly because it was thought to be returning rather than resident. Another example was the 1984 Crescent City Barred Owl, which never left its territory but got new record numbers and new reviews in 1986 and 1987. An even more pertinent case was the Black-backed Oriole found in the Tijuana R. Valley, San Diego, in the spring of 2000 and "returning" the following year. Both years were assigned new record numbers and votes, and the records were accepted. After the voting was complete, but before the result was published, the bird showed up in the winter of 2002, suggesting that it never actually left. The final winter record was assigned a new record number and all three records (all of the same bird) were ultimately rejected on grounds of questionable natural occurrence, largely because this bird was now thought to be resident rather than returning.

The Committee discussed these alternative approaches with respect to some additional contemporary records including, for example, the Black Vulture records in the North Bay counties. It has been voted on as one bird under many different record numbers. We know about the Common

Black Hawk nesting near Santa Rosa, but we know very little if anything about what it does when not on its nesting territory. Part of the reason is that the winery is closed to the public for half the year, in fall and winter. The bird is generally now considered resident, but a record (2008-055) submitted from San Benito County was considered the same bird as the Santa Rosa bird.

In general, the approach of treating a bird that remains continuously as a single record, but reviewing birds that appear to leave and return to a site in subsequent years as separate records, seems like a good approach. It was noted that some records may be difficult to interpret and treatment of such records should depend on particular aspects of those records. Committee members can request that such records be re-evaluated or discussed at a meeting.

General conclusions regarding these issues discussed at the 2019 meeting were:

- For Black Vulture records, Benson extracts records from eBird and assigns a new record number, and CBRC members vote on whether to accept those records as the same as some previously accepted record. Committee members thought that this was a good approach. Long-staying Black Vultures seem to move around quite a bit, and they don't have a single reliable roost site, so the Committee should continue to track all records and consider same-bird issues.
- For the Santa Rosa Common Black-Hawk and the Northern Gannet, there is no need to continue to review records annually.
- For birds that leave seasonally and return, continue to review with a new record every year.
- Singer will look into the Santa Rosa, San Benito County, and Tiburon Common Black Hawk records to determine whether the CBRC should re-evaluate its prior decisions on these records with respect to the same bird issue.

## 12. RARE BIRDS ONLINE

h...a) Corrections to online CBRC book and errata list (Benson)

h...b) Discrepancies between online book and database or published reports (Benson)

Benson compiled a list of necessary corrections and discrepancies. Rottenborn will look into all this and discuss with Ken Able, Chair of the WFO Publications Committee.

- i. Identify which were errors the WFO made in translating the hard copy into the online version; get those changes made.
- ii. Any other issues – see if WFO will make those changes; if not, include in online corrigendum.
- iii. Determine which issues/discrepancies cannot be resolved without looking at original (hard-copy) records.

The WFO wants the CBRC to vote on these changes first. Rottenborn will add errors in figure captions to the list Benson created and send the complete list of corrections to Singer and Benson. The CBRC will then have a vote by email to approve the corrections. Rottenborn will then present these to the WFO Publications Committee and coordinate to have the corrections made.

### 13. eBIRD

A non-member suggested that Bird Records Committees should lobby eBird staff to give eBird users the option of clicking a button to submit a record to the relevant Bird Records Committee.  
(Rottenborn)

This was briefly discussed but determined to be infeasible because eBird would need to build review lists into its programming for a given area.

### 14. ANNUAL REPORTS

- a) **43<sup>rd</sup> report** (2017 records) – to be authored by McCaskie, Stahl, Singer, and Benson. Draft will be circulated to the Committee for review in June 2019.
- b) **44<sup>th</sup> report** (2018 records) – Benson will be lead author, Fowler will be an author, they will recruit new members to assist; McCaskie offered to help if needed.

### 15. BUDGET

The 2018 WFO budget included \$200 for the CBRC's miscellaneous expenses (e.g., postage, WFVZ costs). Benson paid for various expenses and donated those costs to CBRC report page charges rather than being reimbursed, so in 2018, the only CBRC expenditure (aside from page charges) was for \$109 to WFVZ for file maintenance.

Two CBRC reports were published in 2018. Terrill, Benson, and Nelson donated \$257.71 toward the \$720 in page charges for the 41st report. Rottenborn and Benson donated \$573.69 toward the \$600 of page charges for the 42nd report.

Donations are strongly encouraged, no matter the amount. The simplest way to donate is to visit <https://www.westernfieldornithologists.org/pagecharges.php>. Indicate which report you are donating toward.

**Crowd-funding CBRC reports.** Gary Rosenberg created a "GoFundMe" campaign to raise the funds for the page costs for the Arizona Bird Records Committee report. It worked very well, as a number of Arizona birders contributed. At the 2018 meeting, Stahl volunteered to prepare text that could be

posted to advertise a GoFundMe campaign, and Rottenborn was going to look into what it took to get that campaign going and post the message (e.g., on Calbird). Stahl prepared the text. Rottenborn learned of the amount of contributions retained by GoFundMe and intended to look into other options but did not follow up.

An updated version of Stahl's text, incorporating members' comments made during the 2019 meeting, is as follows:

The California Bird Records Committee (CBRC) was established in 1969, and for 50 years, has maintained the official California State Bird List. We solicit and review documentation for those bird species that appear on the Review List and any first California records. We archive all documentation for the scientific record and publish the results annually in *Western Birds*, a publication of the Western Field Ornithologists. These reports are also available for public view at [www.californiabirds.org](http://www.californiabirds.org). In 2018 we published the 41<sup>st</sup> and 42<sup>nd</sup> Committee reports, and we will publish the 43<sup>rd</sup> report in 2019. These reports provide the CBRC's rationale and decisions for submitted records, as well as publication of important photographs of exceptional records. The CBRC authors, and/or Western Field Ornithologists, have historically covered the publication costs of the report at approximately \$700/report. However, following the example of the Arizona Bird Committee's successful GoFundMe campaign to cover costs of publishing its reports, the CBRC is requesting donations to help offset publication costs for CBRC reports in *Western Birds*. We hope that you support the work of the CBRC and that you will consider contributing any amount to help with the costs of publication. Thank you, on behalf of the California Bird Records Committee, Justyn Stahl.

- a) Does the Committee support making such a request? Yes, members agreed this was a good idea.
- b) GoFundMe keeps about 7.9 percent of each donation and 30 cents for every donation processed. There are other options (e.g., Facebook Fundraising) that do not retain any of the amount donated. Options were discussed. Rottenborn will reach out to the Arizona committee regarding why they chose GoFundMe and finalize (with Stahl) the text above, including mentioning that people can donate through the WFO website or the GoFundMe page.

This message will then be posted to Calbirds and local listservs and Facebook groups (Fowler is on Facebook and could promote; have WFO Facebook group post something also).

## **16. INTRODUCED BIRDS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Report from the Introduced Birds Subcommittee – Kimball Garrett, Adam Searcy, John Garrett, Kristie Nelson, Jon Feenstra, and Thomas Benson.

The IBSC is working on a proposal for Yellow-chevroned Parakeet (e.g., for the CBRC to consider adding it to the state list as an established exotic) and is considering other proposals (possibly Nanday Parakeet).

All current members will continue on IBSC.

## 17. NEW CALIFORNIA CHECKLIST

- a) The WFO Board requested that the CBRC compile a new state checklist. Rottenborn prepared the checklist; hard copies were available at the September WFO meeting and have been selling well. The WFO website gives three options for obtaining the checklist – purchasing hard copies (which are likely to be obsolete soon after publication), downloading a PDF that can be made into a hard copy (and that can be updated periodically), and visiting the CBRC’s website to see the most up-to-date version (though it cannot easily be converted to a portable field checklist). Morlan will continue to maintain the official version on the CBRC’s website, and Rottenborn will update the PDF on WFO’s website periodically.
  
- b) Some of the errors in the original hard copy that was printed pertained to indications of which species did and did not have specimen evidence. Correcting those errors led to discussions (Dunn, Rottenborn, and Morlan) regarding how/whether the CBRC makes official decisions regarding the evidence codes (photo, video, audio) that support a species’ occurrence in the state. For example, if a good photo, but a very poor/unidentifiable video, of a species exists, and there are no specimen records of that species in the state, would we only indicate that there is photographic (not video) evidence? How is that decision made, and should we consider a more formal process for establishing evidence codes? Morlan suggested having an evidence subcommittee review and determine the codes on our checklist (not individual records).

The Committee decided to have the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary determine the appropriate codes for new species.

There are four species without specimens which are NOT on the current CBRC Review List:

Trumpeter Swan  
Hawaiian Petrel  
Manx Shearwater  
Neotropic Cormorant

If a specimen of any of these four species is ever collected, that information should make its way to the CBRC.

## 18. OUTREACH AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

- a) Are there any public relations issues that have arisen over the past year that should be addressed?
- b) At least year's meeting, the Committee discussed giving more presentations about the Committee to local organizations and events in addition to the WFO annual meetings. Any interest/ideas for the coming year?
- c) CBRC members should feel free to discuss records with observers if the observers want input (e.g., regarding identification) from members, but members should refrain from "campaigning" against records publically, especially before records are submitted. Unless it is obvious that a record is not of a review species, we should be encouraging people to submit documentation, whether we agree with the identification or not.

## **19. CBRC'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

The year 2019 will mark the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the CBRC. McCaskie and Rottenborn will prepare a brief (2-3 page) article for *Western Birds* on this (targeting the first issue in 2020), including changes since 1969 (e.g., in state list, number of records evaluated/year, nature of submitted records, CBRC process, etc.). McCaskie has some info from his Powerpoint presentation that would help.

Rottenborn will ask Phil Unitt if he is interested in publishing this in *Western Birds*.

We need to double-check the date of establishment. The first CBRC meeting was in 1967 based on Table A in *Rare Birds of California*, but the Committee was officially formed in 1970 and announced in the first issue of *Western Birds* in 1970.

## **20. NEXT MEETINGS**

- a) WFO conference – Albuquerque, NM, 21-25 August 2019. Rottenborn will present a CBRC update to the WFO membership unless a current member wants to do it.
- b) CBRC annual meeting – 17-18 January 2020 at H. T. Harvey & Associates' offices in Los Gatos

## **21. APPRECIATIONS**

- a) James Maley, John McCormack, the Moore Laboratory of Zoology, and Occidental College for hosting our meeting and providing excellent meals

- b) Jon Feenstra, Guy McCaskie, and Steve Rottenborn for their service to the CBRC
- c) Benson for his critical work as Secretary
- d) Joe Morlan for his work updating the CBRC website
- e) Jim Tietz and Guy McCaskie for maintaining updates to “Rare Birds” on our web site
- f) WFVZ and Linnea Hall for their archiving services
- g) Phil Unitt and Western Birds reviewers for editing and publishing CBRC reports

**ADJOURNMENT 16:10 on 26 January 2019**

Minutes prepared by Steve Rottenborn (reviewed by Dan Singer and Tom Benson).