

MINUTES FOR THE 2009 CBRC ANNUAL MEETING

Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, California

1. Call to order, 2:20pm, 16 January 2009 (Chair presiding). Members present: Dave Compton (Chair), Jon Dunn (Vice-Chair), Guy McCaskie (non-voting Secretary), Al Jaramillo, Jim Tietz, Kristie Nelson, Jim Pike, Peter Pyle, Scott Terrill. Not present: Brian Sullivan.

2008 Minutes. No approval needed. Approved in October 2008.

Broad topics/general discussion

ON-LINE VOTING/RECORD AND BATCH PROCESSING BY SECRETARY

An experiment with Batch 08G did not go particularly well. Votes took many months to come in, so that the batch actually took longer than other batches. Also, McCaskie found that the batch required more work of him than do batches that circulate by mail. He *has* begun including electronic versions of descriptions and other documentation besides photographs in the record folders for batches, which at least is a step in the right direction.

In 2008, it was suggested that forming a subcommittee might be the best way to handle this issue. Tasks that would be taken on by such a committee are listed in the 2008 minutes. However, it was agreed this year that as long as we had a Secretary who was comfortable with the current system, there was no urgency to changing to a new system. Thus, no progress is expected on this issue in 2009.

WEBSITE

Eric Preston has served as the Web master, although Joe Morlan has stepped up to do many of the duties involving our Website. The Website has been moved to a new server; our new host is Go Daddy. One of the best features of this move is that Go Daddy can accommodate our MS Access database. Morlan has loaded the database onto the server. [As of March 2009, Morlan has also made the database accessible online]. Doing so could eventually allow members to write to the database and would be an important step toward establishing an efficient online voting system.

McCaskie added here that we need to have a backup of the database, in addition to the copy he holds. Tietz volunteered to accept copies of the database, so McCaskie will regularly send updated versions to him.

Morlan will resume his duties of uploading photos on the CBRC Website. However, there was some discussion of the importance of this job, given the new photo feature on the Western Field Ornithologists' Website and the immediate availability of photos of rarities on the Web these days. General opinion seemed to favor continuing to post photos, particularly since the WFO photo gallery was viewed as not filling the role of posting photos of CBRC rarities, instead posting photos of a greater variety of birds recorded over a larger geographic area. Tietz

suggested that all members be allowed to add photos to the Website, but members generally agreed that this would result in inconsistency in the rationale for posting photos, and that any member could suggest a photo for posting, anyway.

One new feature of the Website will be the provision of updates to the CBRC book, in the format of the record tables in the book. McCaskie has begun a file that follows the format of the book in listing records. Tietz has agreed to help out with this task, but it was agreed that anyone can contribute to this effort.

RARE BIRDS OF CALIFORNIA

Sales have not yet exceeded expenditures on the book, but overall revenues have. More positive reviews were published in 2008, including an extremely positive one by David Fix in *Western Birds*.

COMMITTEE AND THE COMMUNITY

We had better attendance at the WFO annual meeting this year (at least six voting members). Compton moderated a panel on rare bird committees, and Dunn was one of the panelists. This went fairly well, since we had four great panelists from different states who had a lot of information to impart, and the audience was able to ask questions of the panelists. The presentations were more about recent news, such as additions to state lists, and a bit less about committee philosophies. WFO is enthusiastic about making such panels a regular feature of their meetings, and the state composition of the panel could be different every year. If these panels do continue, the CBRC should regularly have a panelist involved, since the panels are a good way of reaching out to the community. But we don't necessarily need to provide the moderator or organize the panel.

Other types of presentations at WFO meetings were also discussed, including something along the lines of Matt Heindel's presentation at WFO in 2005, a one-person presentation specifically covering the CBRC and its workings. A version of Matt's presentation is still floating around (Dan Singer has a copy, as Matt presumably does), and such presentations could also be given at local Audubon chapters.

RELATIONSHIP WITH WFO

Dunn updated the Committee on WFO's efforts to rewrite the section of its bylaws dealing with its relationship with the CBRC and other state committees. Some in WFO believe that the CBRC gets special treatment and would like to change this situation. Gjon Hazard, WFO board member, is tasked with preparing new wording in the bylaws to address this issue. Dunn pointed out that the histories of the two organizations are intertwined, but argued that the Committee does not want special rights over other state records committees. Any Western state committee should be able to publish reports in *Western Birds* (as the Alaska and Arizona committees have done on occasion), should be able to receive the type of minimal funding that the CBRC receives, and should have any other

advantages the CBRC might enjoy. CBRC members were encouraged to offer suggestions to Hazard in rewording the WFO bylaws so that the CBRC does not receive any special treatment therein.

IDENTIFICATION ISSUES, STATUS ISSUES

Dark-rumped Petrel. Pyle presented a slide show illustrating his work examining ID characters listed in Force et al., "Identification at Sea of Hawaiian and Galapagos Petrels," *Western Birds* 2007, 38(3): 242–247. Pyle's examination of specimens supported the use of head pattern to separate Hawaiian from Galapagos Petrels. Secondary characters were bill size, contrast between cap and mantle, thickness of the trailing edge on the secondaries, overall sleekness, and the presence of a black spot on the axillars. Pyle and Jaramillo will form a subcommittee to look at old records of these species and make recommendations to the Committee on which should be accepted to species. McCaskie will identify records that should be pulled from the Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology (WFVZ), and Compton will pull these records when he visits WFVZ.

American Oystercatcher. Tietz sought clarification on the application of the Jehl scale in CBRC voting on records of this species, including how important the scale is in our evaluations of oystercatcher records and how the CBRC handles situations when several of the features discussed in Jehl were not seen or photographed. Jaramillo and others commented that each member uses the scale as he/she sees fit, and that there is no requirement that members be consistent in their use of the scale.

Discussion of this species prompted a proposal by Dunn to remove this species from the Review List [Note: Dunn offered this proposal as an agenda item in advance of the meeting, but it was inadvertently omitted from the agenda]. Although the number of accepted records is still well below the threshold of 100 often required for considering removal of a species from the list, he argued (1) that we're not doing anything productive by reviewing records of this species, and (2) there is probably a small resident population in southern California of birds that move between the Channel Islands and the mainland. Dunn made a motion to remove American Oystercatcher from the Review List and Jaramillo seconded. The motion passed 6-2. Since the Committee has accepted fewer than 50 records of this species to date, an official justification for this action was recorded, as follows: "Formerly the Committee had used the Jehl scale for assessing records of this species. However, for no other species do we use a hybrid scale in assessing purity in terms of a record's acceptability. Furthermore, there is a real difference in determining what new records of 'acceptable' American Oystercatchers pertain to new individuals or those already accepted, as these birds may move back and forth between the Channel Islands and the coast, including Baja California."

Iceland Gull. As reports of this species are a continual source of difficulty for the Committee, Dunn presented slides of many Iceland Gulls from Newfoundland.

Some discussion of the slides related to the possibility of the *kumlieni* subspecies of Iceland Gull being a hybrid swarm between Iceland and Thayer's Gulls.

Crested Caracara. The Committee decided to continue looking at records of this species together, on a yearly basis. Given the possibility that some birds may be responsible for multiple records, it is beneficial to view groups of records to gain a broader picture of what is happening with this species. However, the need was reiterated to have one person go through all existing records and make recommendations to the Committee on which records should be considered to pertain to the same bird. Compton and McCaskie raised the issue that three records from early 2007 (2007-083, 2007-027, and 2007-101) should all be considered the same bird. Pyle provided analysis of photos from the three records showing that the pattern of wear on the primaries was identical in all three. The Committee voted 8-0 to accept all three reports as a single record.

2. Election of Members

2a. Discussion of Future Members

Members discussed California birders who they considered good candidates for future membership on the Committee. Members expressed the Committee's commitment to finding new people to serve on the CBRC.

2b. Election. The terms of Compton, Jaramillo, and Terrill expire

Nominations:

Matt Brady (Tietz, Compton)

Paul Lehman (Compton, Dunn, Terrill)

Joe Morlan (Dunn, Terrill)

Dan Singer (Dunn, Compton, Terrill)

Dunn expressed concern that not enough members had placed names in nomination, but others argued that in some cases, such as when a strong but short list of candidates exists (as was the case this year), there wasn't a great reason for everyone to nominate someone. All four candidates were considered strong this year, and members elected Lehman, Morlan, and Singer.

3. **Election of the Secretary** (one-year term) – nomination: Guy McCaskie (Compton). Elected 8-0.
4. **Election of Chair** (one-year term) – nomination: Paul Lehman (Pike, Nelson). Elected 8-0.
5. **Election of Vice-chair** (one-year term) – nomination: Singer (Dunn, Pike). Elected 8-0.

**The Committee adjourned for the evening at approximately 7pm.
The Committee was called to order on 17 January 2009 at approximately 9am. All members except Sullivan present.**

6. State of the Committee

6a. Annual Reports

2007 records: Singer and Terrill. Terrill asked whether the mid-20th-century Yellow Rail egg sets from the Bridgeport area of Mono County, to be covered in this report, should be treated as records of one or multiple individuals. It was decided that egg sets were evidence of only one individual, thus each set would count as such.

2008 records: Pike, Compton, and Dunn (advisory role)

2009 records: volunteers?

1) *Format of reports.* The new format accepted at the 2008 annual meeting will be implemented beginning with the 33rd annual report. Under this format, accepted and not accepted records will no longer be split into different sections of the report. All records of a species brought to a conclusive vote, whether accepted or not, will now be discussed under a single entry for that species. Members expressed satisfaction with this format, but Pyle asked whether we might be able to trim down our report further, and make it easier for readers to peruse, if we adopted a more tabular format, such as used in *Rare Birds of California*. Although we should not eliminate narrative text altogether, we should trim the report down by leaving out text on species about which there is nothing to say beyond listing the records. It was agreed that we would still need to include observer initials, as this is important to many members of the birding community. Pyle agreed to work on a suitable format with Phil Unitt, editor of *Western Birds*. Any change would not be implemented until at least the 35th annual report.

Authors can split the list of species for the annual report however they want. The important thing is that they let the Secretary know as soon as possible how it will be split so he can begin to forward the records.

2) *Corrigenda.* Dan Singer has the corrigenda for the 32nd annual report. The Secretary and the Chair request that members provide more input for this. Comparing reports with the Access database is one way of checking for errors.

3) *Publication in Western Birds.* To get into issue 2, we have to have a draft to Unitt in January. Deadline this year is 23 January. Members must get comments into authors promptly after the first draft of the report is sent to them.

4) *Photos.* As requested by Phil Unitt, authors were asked to include photos and illustrations with the draft report. Authors were also asked to be sure that photo resolution is adequate. Go to the photographer to get the original version. Also, authors need to decide on photos early on so they can contact the photographer for permission and to obtain higher resolution versions.

5) *Published records for which the CBRC has no documentation.* McCaskie discussed records published in the northern California report in *North American Birds* although no details were submitted. These are treated as “not submitted” in the annual reports.

6) Other reminders. Authors were reminded to return all records from their section of the report to WFVZ when done; they were also reminded to acknowledge all outside contributors.

6b. First State Records and Potential Publication in Western Birds.

Last year, there was considerable sentiment (1) that accounts of many of these records would never be written and (2) that the need for writing them has been lessened because of the immediacy of information spread over the Internet. Although some sentiment still existed that the immediate availability of photos on the Web made the accounts unnecessary, several members expressed the desire to continue seeking authors for them and getting them published. It was noted that the CBRC should always be acknowledged in these accounts, regardless of who writes them. Also, CBRC members should always review these accounts. Members who write these accounts should send drafts to the entire Committee. Suggestions for publication of specific records were as follows:

- Falcated Duck (Sterling originally assigned, but no one has proprietary right)
- Cory's Shearwater (do “Cory's in the Pacific”? Sadowski? Carter?)
- Crested Caracara
- Oriental Turtle-Dove (Dunn)
- Magnificent Hummingbird (possibly done with Green Violetear)
- Green Violetear (Dunn, Cardiff)
- Swallow-tailed Kite (Fish – Pyle will contact)
- Slaty-backed Gull (Jaramillo – overall summary for California)
- Taiga Flycatcher (Terrill)
- Bluethroat (Justyn Stahl)
- Eyebrowed Thrush (Terill)
- Common Rosefinch (Brady)

Accounts in process include Lesser Frigatebird and Wood Sandpiper. The progress on this issue should be checked in one year.

6c. Circulation

To avoid bottlenecks, Compton urged members who are unable to finish a batch right away to copy all material they need to vote and mail the batch to the next person on the routing. Since nearly all information is now in electronic form in batches (except in the case of recirculated records, which do not include electronic versions of member comments), this will usually be relatively easy to do. Just copy all the information electronically and pass it along.

Members were also asked to notify the *entire Committee* of absence dates when they are planning to be away. It does relatively little good to tell only the Secretary or the Chair, when various members usually have batches. If those holding the batches don't know when someone is away, they can't route the batches around them.

6d. Budget. McCaskie put in a request to WFO for their annual contribution for a post office box to handle CBRC mailings. This contribution, slightly more than \$100 a year in recent years, is a fraction of what is spent on Committee business. McCaskie's expenses for normal CBRC business not funded by WFO were \$375 in 2008. Members handled more than 20 batches apiece during the year and spent approximately \$5 to mail each batch to the next person on the routing sheet. Members take on further expenses to travel to annual meetings. Some members volunteer to take on further expenses associated with annual meetings, such as providing the occasional meal. [Note: According to Linnea Hall, WFVZ makes occasion minimal requests for reimbursement from WFO of costs related to archiving CBRC materials.]

6e. Comments of Secretary, Chair, and Vice-chair

- 1) do not add documentation to a record during circulation without checking—this has been a problem in the past, but not this year.
- 2) The Secretary may attempt to discourage reports of “obviously misidentified” birds, but if reporters persist, the record will circulate.
- 3) If you ask for recirculation on “same bird/different bird” grounds, please make an argument one way or the other for the Committee to consider.
- 4) Please always read the cover sheet so you'll know exactly what questions you are being asked! In particular, make sure you address same bird issues when you are asked to.
- 5) Like everyone else, the Secretary and Chair are very busy. So when you make suggestions please bring with them an offer of help. For the most part, people did well on this point this year.
- 6) If the Secretary sends you a revised cover sheet for a record in your possession, please replace the “old” cover, as it no longer matches the database. This mostly applies to people doing the annual report, when the end date for a record is added after circulation.
- 7) As a matter of procedure, it would be helpful for members to comment on info provided to new members: what's helpful and what's not.

6f. Assignments/Volunteers

- Public relations on the Internet. Garrett continued to do this in 2008 and has volunteered to continue in 2009.
- Maintaining the CBRC photo gallery. Sullivan in 2008. Joe Morlan will resume duties in 2009.

- Archival of CBRC records and photos. A long and lively discussion touched on several issues on this critical topic:
 - 1) Digital photos for each record still need to be burned to individual CDs for archival purposes. Presently, Guy has scads of CDs with digital photos, most of which are grouped by batch, the way they are circulated to members.
 - 2) Also, nondigital photos need to be scanned and put on CDs or some other storage device. The deterioration of slides is a major concern. Most pre-1980 slides have apparently been scanned.
 - 3) Finishing work begun by David Vander Pluym several years ago to have electronic copies made of all information relating to records. Vander Pluym scanned all pre-1980 material up to the flycatchers several years ago. He also scanned records for some other species through to about 2003.
 - 4) Archiving of votes. As a side to issue 3, we are currently only archiving hard copies of member's votes. McCaskie has electronic votes for recent records, but these are all grouped by batch, and it would take a tremendous effort to separate them out and put them with the records.

Members agreed that the goal should be to have electronic versions of all material, in addition to what is stored at WFVZ. Jaramillo raised the possibility that all this material eventually will be archived on the CBRC Website, which the Committee also agreed was desirable. The high level of expense and effort was seen as the major obstacle to accomplishing this. The possibility of raising funds to hire someone to perform the above tasks was discussed. Dunn agreed to discuss with Kimball Garrett, also on the board of WFO, the possibility of WFO holding annual fund raisers, potentially to fund an intern. Compton and Dunn agreed to approach Cat Waters about this possibility as well, particularly with regard to the issue of WFO favoritism toward the CBRC, discussed above (1. Broad Topics/General Discussion: Relationship with WFO).

Other actions/comments related to these issues were:

- (a) Compton will go to the Western Foundation in the first part of the year to investigate the problem with deteriorating slides and hopefully get many of the older ones scanned.
 - (b) Ask Joe Morlan whether our site will have the capability of archiving our records. SmugMug was mentioned as a site that may be able to archive photos.
- Updating the *Rare Birds of California* for the web site. We will publish a table on the website that will include records since 2003, in the format used in the book. We need help to do this. And once we get the table ready and up on the website, we need to have a process in place by which it is

updated. We may have to assign a volunteer or volunteers to do this work each year. (The old Roberson/Patten master list has been removed from the site.)

- More additions to the website. Tietz has suggested that we provide links to ID articles on the website. Another suggestion made in a review is that we put the essay in *Rare Birds of California* on “Documenting and Reporting Records” on the website. Joe Morlan should be approached about how much effort will be required to do both of these. Members agreed that they were good ideas, and that any member could suggest an ID article to go on the Website.

6g. Bylaws

No changes proposed this year.

7. Introduced Bird Subcommittee

7a. Report

Kimball Garrett’s report was passed out to members (see attached). In his report, Garrett volunteered to continue as Chair of the subcommittee in 2009 and promised more progress by the subcommittee in the coming year. The report noted that work will focus on identifying species that are candidates for inclusion on the state list, and base this work on research, writing, and analysis published in peer-reviewed journals; that Nutmeg Mannikin (*Lonchura punctulata*) and several Psittacids appeared to be worth consideration for inclusion on the list; and that “a well thought-out and coherent policy about how we deal with populations of introduced species as regards the state list” was warranted.

7b. Appointment of 2009 subcommittee

Garrett will continue as Chair of the subcommittee, and Jaramillo and Morlan will continue as a members.

8. Proposed Review List changes

Additions:

No additions were proposed in advance of the meeting.

Magnificent Frigatebird. The possibility of adding this species was raised by Dunn during the meeting. No statistics were presented on recent occurrence of the species in the state, but it was noted that very few had been reported in the past ten years. [Note: Totals from *North American Birds* show that approximately one per year have been reported since 2000, in addition to approximately one “frigatebird sp.”] Furthermore, the difficulty of distinguishing between species of frigatebirds was considered further reason for adding this species to the Review List. A motion to add Magnificent Frigatebird (Nelson, Compton) passed 6-2.

Deletions:

Mottled Petrel. In addition to totals of birds already accepted by the Committee, Pyle presented evidence supporting removal from the list based on a research cruise in California waters in the fall of 2008, when 24 individuals were observed

within 200 nm of the coast, and many more were observed further out. This species feeds on pelagic shrimp in the eastern Pacific every year and appears closer to shore in years when the shrimp are closer to shore. Therefore, Pyle argued, this species' occurrence off California should not be considered extralimital, although only 59 individuals have been accepted to date. That this species is relatively easy to ID was considered another reason to remove it from the review list. A motion to remove (Dunn, Pyle) was approved 7-1.

Red-tailed Tropicbird. In addition to previously accepted records (see attached), Pyle presented information on records from a fall 2008 research cruise offshore of California, when 6 were reported, all within 200 nm of shore. No motion was made.

Sprague's Pipit. No proposal to delete this species was made prior to the meeting and complete statistical information on this species was not available at the time of the meeting. However, it was noted that those records in circulation would bring the total to more than 100, if all were accepted. It was further noted that 5–10 of this species are found annually, mostly in the Imperial Valley. A motion to remove (Terrill, Pike) was approved 8-0.

American Oystercatcher. See "Identification Issues, Status Issues," under "Broad Topics, General Discussion," above.

Future changes to list:

Cape May Warbler and Bay-breasted Warbler were mentioned as species that should be considered for addition to the list in the future.

9. Miscellaneous items

9a. Group photo

9b. State List

State firsts since the last meeting: Tristram's Storm-Petrel, Swallow-tailed Kite, Eurasian Kestrel, Wood Sandpiper, and Common Rosefinch, bringing the State List to 640. Potential firsts in circulation are Great Black-backed Gull and Bluethroat. [Note: Bluethroat was later accepted, bringing the total to 641.]

9c. Records listed as "Not submitted" in Rare Birds of California.

For Blue-headed Vireo records for SLO and ORA that were listed as not submitted, we now have documentation. Should we circulate these records? It was decided that these records would be circulated in a batch voted on by the 2008 Committee. It was also determined that we would treat them as we did other older records that were circulated in recent years, meaning that they would not be held to the same standard as birds recorded since the vireo was given full species status by the American Ornithologists' Union and clearer ID criteria were established.

9d. Yellow-headed Caracara reports in HUM and DN.

A long-staying bird in Humboldt County is in circulation. One, presumably the same bird as seen in Humboldt, has been reported in Del Norte. Should we solicit documentation or just write in the annual report that they are the same bird? It was decided that we would not solicit documentation of the Del Norte report, but merely note in the annual report that they are the same bird.

9e. Use of the California State List by Others

We had a request from the BUBO listing website (<http://www.bubo.org/listing/>) to use our list on their site. We granted it. It was decided that we would continue to grant such requests when made.

9f. 2003-169 (Bulwer's Petrel's off San Clemente Island LA 4 Sep 2003). Dunn asked that we discuss this record, which failed, but barely. An experienced observer who was present when the bird in question was seen and did not submit documentation has subsequently stated strong opposition to the record. Should we solicit comments and include them with the record? Dunn will contact the observer to find out if she is willing to submit documentation. If so, this information will be added to the record.

9g. Veery specimen at University of California, Davis. Dunn asked that we investigate a report of this specimen, from a window kill in Davis, which has not been reviewed by the Committee. Pyle will contact Andy Engliss for more information on the specimen.

10. Records for which the Secretary/Chair need direction or assistance

2007-046 (Trumpeter Swan near Hilt SIS 27 Jan 1988) and 2007-045 (Trumpeter Swan at Tule Lake SIS 10 Nov 1930) – These were taken out of circulation because someone said they would look at the specimens, but no action has been taken. Dunn will contact Ralph Browning for information. If no new information can be gathered, the records will fail.

1997-137 (Wedge-rumped Storm-Petrel SW of San Miguel I. 6 Sep 1997) – Joe Morlan requested that the Committee consider whether or not to recirculate this record (see attached). The Committee viewed photos attached to the record, as well as many photos of this species provided by Dan Singer. No action was taken, and the record may be considered next year, when Morlan will be on the Committee and can argue his case.

1995-084 (Sandwich Tern at Pajaro R. mouth MTY 4–11 Jul 1995) Joe Morlan requested that this record be re-reviewed in conjunction with 2007-157, which passed. He believes that 1995-084, which was rejected over concerns of hybridization with Elegant Tern, looked very similar to the 2007 bird. However, Compton failed to track down the photos of the Pajaro River mouth bird before the meeting, so the Committee took no action.

1997-085 (Worm-eating Warbler in Ventura VEN 6-25 Jan 1997) - reconsider record because of new and substantial documentation? Yes. Compton will pull this record.

1984-210 (Reddish Egret in Anaheim ORA Oct 1984) – Howard King submitted information for a date range extension, but no documentation. Should we vote on this extension so as to avoid recirculating? The committee voted 8-0 to extend the date range.

0000-000 (Thick-billed Murre) – A specimen for this species is at the University of California, Santa Cruz. The exact date and location are not known, but the bird is apparently labeled as having been collected in California between Sonoma and Monterey counties. It was believed to have been collected in association with the 1988 Pt. Reyes Tarball Incident. Pyle will get information on the Tarball Incident, and Terrill will get a specimen number, prior to circulation of the record.

0000-000 (Shorebird) - video - Lucas Brug requests comments on ID of a bird he took video of in the fall of 2008 in northwestern California. After viewing the video of the bird, members unanimously agreed that it was probably a Least Sandpiper, perhaps an SY (Pyle).

11. Records brought to the meeting at the request of a member

2007-208 (Curlew Sandpiper at Owens Lake INY 16 Sep 07) Pyle withdrew his request to discuss this record.

2007-067 (Arctic Loon at Monterey MTY 3 Jan 07) Tietz asked that this record, which was rejected, be discussed. The bird showed white patches on both flanks, and he wondered whether a Pacific Loon could show this feature and, if not, why the bird wasn't an Arctic Loon. This record was discussed at the 2008 meeting, and members recounted some of the comments from then. Several members noted that it was unclear from the photos exactly where on the flanks the white was located and whether the location was correct for an Arctic Loon.

2006-153 (Brown Booby off Oceanside SD 11 Oct 2006)

This record was discussed at length at the request of Jim Tietz, although the record failed and there was no new documentation to review. Tietz raised the issue of whether someone coming onto the Committee after the first circulation could request a record be recirculated, but other members were not willing to amend the bylaws so that this could be done. Although Pyle, using extensive photo evidence supplied in part by Jaramillo, persuasively argued that the facial skin shape and bill color should eliminate Red-footed Booby, members initially voted 0-8 on a motion (Dunn, Jaramillo) to recirculate because of new and substantial evidence. However, confusion remained over whether a record could be recirculated after failing but before being published, without new and substantial information, as the bylaws were judged to be unclear on this matter. In

the end, it was determined that this record could be recirculated, since its resolution had not yet been published in an annual report.

2007-189 (Manx Shearwater off Monterey MTY 10 Sep 07) Terrill: "It appears to me that the bird clearly has dark tips to the lower upper tail coverts, which would indicate a Newell's (Townsend's). Further discussion seems warranted." The general feeling was that the face pattern was wrong for Newell's. Some felt that the blackish on the undertail coverts could be shadow. Dunn thought Townsend's would show more contrasting under wings.

2007-234 (Field Sparrow in Monterey MTY 24 Sep 2007) Tietz: "Although these photos are terrible, the rufous mantle with pencil-thin streaks and all pink bill appear to rule out everything but Field Sparrow. Pink legs eliminate Worthen's Sparrow." Members believed that not only were the photos bad, but that the date was completely wrong for this species, coming much earlier than previous records. A motion to recirculate the record (Tietz, Jaramillo), based on the same rationale as supported recirculating the Brown Booby (2006-153) above, failed 2-6.

2007-286 (Bar-tailed Godwit). This record went 8-1 in each of the first two rounds, but Dunn expressed concern over the possibility that the bird was a pale Marbled Godwit, arguing that no one argued the bird was dramatically smaller and that more people should've seen the bird over the two days it was present, given how small the area is where it was reported. Dunn's motion to recirculate was seconded by Compton, thus the record was automatically recirculated.

12. Records without a decision after completion of third circulation

Members discussed the merits of the following records. Discussions were led by members who opposed the records.

2007-031 (Mottled Petrel at Southeast Farallon Island SF 26 Nov 2006) Compton, Nelson

2007-011 (Great Black-backed Gull near Orick HUM 30 Dec 2006). Jaramillo showed slides on the previous night to inform the debate over this record. Pyle volunteered to examine specimens at the Smithsonian Institution to compare patterns on wings. He will make a report on his findings that will be included in the record for the final circulation and for archiving at WFVZ.

2006-215 (Common Grackle in Big Pine, INY 31 Aug 2006). Compton, Nelson

13. Supplemental List

No action.

14. Closing

14a. Site and date of next meeting (2010): Terrill will be out of the county and cannot serve as host. However, he volunteered to ask Steve Rottenborn to host the meeting through H. T. Harvey and Associates. Lehman will contact the 2009 Committee to set the dates.

14b. Appreciations:

Linnea Hall, Peg Stevens, Chrystal Klabunde, and WFVZ for ongoing support of archiving records;

Eric Preston for Web work

Jaramillo, Terrill, Compton for time served

Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, particularly Paul Collins and Rebecca Coulter, for hosting.

14c. Adjournment

6:30 pm, 17 January.

Summary of Crested Caracara Records

Uncirculated Records

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|----|---|
| 08 Oct 2006 | vic. Gilroy SCL | 2008-142 | | |
| 01 Feb–23 Jul 2008 | vic. Fort Dick DN | 2008-027 | ph | * |
| 14 Feb 2008 | Año Nuevo SM | 2008-043 | ph | |
| 19–28 Feb 2008 | Mojave Narrows R.P SBE | 2008-039 | ph | |
| 21 Mar 2008 | Santa Barbara SBA | 2008-080 | | |
| 25–27 Mar 2008 | vic. Weldon KER | 2008-047 | ph | |
| 15 Jul–16 Nov 2008 | Tijuana River Valley SD | 2008-093 | | * |

* Continuing/Returning individual

Accepted in 2008, but recirculation requested

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------|--|--|
| 29 Jan–1 Feb 2007 | Hansen Dam, LA | 2007-027 | | |
| 2–3 February 2007 | Goleta, SBA | 2007-083 | | |
| 25 Feb–1 Mar 2007 | Monterey, MTY | 2007-101 | | |

DMC requested these three records be considered for recirculation because of similar pattern of wear on flight feathers.

Accepted, through 2008

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| 1. 13 Sep–16 Oct 1987 | Mono Lake, MNO | 1987-267A | ph | |
| 2. 21 Oct 1988–26 Mar 1989 | Shasta, SHA | 1989-045 | | |
| 3. 28–30 Apr 1989 | Fort Dick, DN | 1989-086A | | |
| 4. 14 Dec 1993 | Westmorland, IMP | 1993-196A | | |
| 5. 9 Feb 1995 | Chula Vista, SD | 1995-021A | ph | |
| 6. 20 Oct 2001 | Long Beach, LA | 2002-061 | ph | |
| 7. 30 Apr 2002 | Goleta, SBA | 2002-147 | | |
| and 14–23 Jul 2002 | V'berg AFB, SBA | 2002-192 | video | |
| and 8 Aug 2002 | nr Pt. Mugu, VEN | 2002-192 | | |
| and 9 Dec 2002–5 Jan 2003 | Saticoy, VEN | 2002-130 | ph | |
| 8. 4 Jul 2002 | nr Lakeview, RIV | 2002-130 | ph | |
| 9. 11–13 Aug 2002 | nr Marina, MTY | 2002-154 | video | |
| 10. 9 May 2004 | Owens Lake, INY | 2004-074 | | |
| 11. 16 Jul–1 Aug 2004 | 10.5 mi w of Petaluma, SON | 2004-118 | ph | |
| and 20–24 Aug 2004 | Manchester S. P., MEN | 2004-124 | ph | |
| 12. 4–6 Sep 2004 | nr Arcata, HUM | 2004-133 | ph | |
| 13. 1 Jan 2005 | Finney Lake, IMP | 2005-017 | | |
| 14. 2 May 2005 | nr Casper, MEN | 2005-057 | | |
| 15. 3–6 May 2005 | Pt. Reyes, MRN | 2005-070 | ph, video | |
| and 2–3 Aug 2005 | Rodeo Lagoon, MRN | 2005-097 | ph | |
| 16. 14 Jun–12 Jul 2005 | Fort Dick, DN | 2005-086 | ph | |
| 17. 19 Jul 2005 | Alton, HUM | 2005-089 | | |
| 18. 1–2 Jun 2005 | Morro Bay, SLO | 2005-071 | ph | |
| 19. 14 Aug 2005–10 Apr '06 | nr Davenport, SCZ | 2005-100 | vid | |
| 20. 5 Jan 2006 | Ventura, VEN | 2006-004 | ph | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|----|
| 21. 10 Jan 2006 | Bixby Ranch, SBA | 2006-042 | |
| 22. 28 Mar–20 Sep 2006 | Big Sur, MTY | 2006-047 | ph |
| and 10 Apr–13 May 2006 | Carmel, MTY | 2006-051 | ph |
| 23. 17–20 Jun 2006 | Pt. Reyes, MRN | 2006-078 | ph |
| 24. 13–14 Jul 2006 | Humboldt Bay, HUM | 2006-084 | ph |
| 25. 9 Sep 2006–12 Feb 2007 | Tijuana River Valley, SD | 2006-127 | |
| 26. 8 Dec 2006–28 Mar 2007 | Ferndale, HUM | 2007-076 | |
| 27. 22 Jun 2007–6 Jun 2008 | Tijuana River Valley, SD | 2007-144 | |

REPORT OF THE INTRODUCED BIRDS SUB-COMMITTEE

Prepared on 15 January 2009 by Kimball L. Garrett, Sub-Committee chair; other committee members (who, incidentally, have not previewed this report) are Alvaro Jaramillo and Joe Morlan.

The Introduced Birds Sub-Committee of the CBRC was largely inactive during 2008, apart from some degree of monitoring of the status of species that are potential additions to the California state list.

Should the CBRC wish to reappoint Garrett as sub-committee chair, he will make a much greater effort during 2009 to make progress, since he will not be burdened with other CBRC duties during that time.

General points to make covering the past year are:

(1) Work is ongoing to establish the status of several "candidate" species for inclusion on the state list. However, a desirable component of the discovery process involves the research, writing, and analysis of peer-reviewed publications involving the status, trends, geographical range, habitat usage, and reproductive behavior of non-native "candidate" species, and these are basically still lacking for nearly all such species. Data sources, including focused surveys, eBird submissions, county and regional reports for NAB, Christmas Bird Count data, BBS data (inapplicable for most candidates), and informed postings to listserves, all need to be mined in order to increase our knowledge and provide the basis of publications.

(2) Of all the up-and-coming species we need to deal with, I am hearing the most rumblings about Nutmeg Mannikin, *Lonchura punctulata*, although psittacid species such as Yellow-chevroned Parakeet, Lilac-crowned Parrot, Black-hooded Parakeet, Mitred Parakeet, Red-masked Parakeet, and others deserve detailed attention as well. It might, therefore, pay to focus some attention on Nutmeg Mannikins over the next year.

(3) Perhaps most fundamentally, we still need a well thought-out and coherent policy about how we deal with populations of introduced species as regards the state list. I think we all agree that we have "obviously" well-established non-native species (European Starling is a good example), we have borderline cases (some of which are on the state list, including White-tailed Ptarmigan and Red-crowned Parrot, and some of which [see point #2] are not on the state list), and then we have the gamut of additional naturalized or naturalizing bird species that may someday be considered established enough to be on the state list. We need to ask ourselves if we want to continue to make these sometimes arbitrary decisions or whether we need an entirely new policy regarding non-native species and the California list. The Sub-Committee welcomes constructive arguments and suggestions about our current and future policies here.

Proposal to remove Mottled Petrel from Review List (Pyle)

5 accepted records in the past 10 years (0.5 per year), with an additional record still in circulation. Since the first one was recorded in 1976, 59 individuals have been accepted in 25 records. Our own published record has stated on several occasions that this species is probably regular far offshore, but the number of reports submitted remains low.

Record totals by year

| | |
|-----------|----------------------|
| 2008 | 0 |
| 2007 | 0 (1 in circulation) |
| 2006 | 1 |
| 2005 | 3 |
| 2004 | 0 |
| 2003 | 1 |
| 1997–2002 | 0 |
| 1996 | 1 |
| 1994–1995 | 0 |
| 1993 | 1 |
| 1992 | 2 |
| 1991 | 2 (20 individuals) |
| 1990 | 1 (8 individuals) |
| 1989 | 2 |
| 1988 | 3 |

Proposal to remove Red-tailed Tropicbird from Review List (Pyle)

Ten were accepted in the ten-year period ending in 2008 (1.0 per year), and an additional 2008 record is in circulation. However, 38 were recorded outside the 200 nmi limit in 2005. Currently, 32 records have been accepted since the first record in 1979, not counting the one pending.

Record totals by year

| | |
|------|---------------------------------------|
| 2008 | 0 (1 in circulation) |
| 2007 | 0 |
| 2006 | 0 |
| 2005 | 7 (plus 38 outside the 200 nmi limit) |
| 2004 | 0 |
| 2003 | 2 |
| 2002 | 0 |
| 2001 | 0 |
| 2000 | 0 |
| 1999 | 1 |

**Record 1997-137 (Wedge-rumped Storm-Petrel S of San Miguel I. 6 Sep 1997).
Request to consider recirculation.**

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Morlan [mailto:jmorlan@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2008 9:34 AM

To: birds-pix@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Wedge-rumped Storm-Petrel (Oceanodroma tethys tethys)

31 July 2008, Prince Phillip's Steps, Genovesa Island, Galapagos, Ecuador.

This species was formerly known as "Galapagos Storm-Petrel." Two subspecies are recognized. These are nominate *O. t. tethys* which breed on the Galapagos and appear to be resident or short-distance migrants. A smaller race *O. t. kelsalli* breeds off Peru but migrates regularly to waters off Mexico.

Although we frequently encountered this species foraging over the ocean, the sight of literally thousands of birds going to and from nesting burrows on Genovesa was one of the highlights of our trip. Up to 200,000 pairs are said to breed here. Unlike most storm-petrels this species is active around its nesting burrows during the daytime.

I was particularly interested in the shape of the white rump patch in the field, having been a member of the California Bird Records Committee when a similar bird photographed off Southern California was not accepted.

<http://www.wfo-cbrc.org/cbrc/photos/wrsp.html>

Although there is a strong resemblance, the bottom photo of the unaccepted California record appears to show white wrapping down to the sides of the tail and even the undertail coverts. This may be photographic artifact, or not, but the birds I studied on Genovesa and elsewhere on the Galapagos did not show that feature in the field. Even with that discrepancy, I am hard pressed to justify the committee's decision to not accept that record.

A full analysis of this controversial record may be found at:

<http://www.wfo-cbrc.org/cbrc/99report/99report.pdf>

See pages 22-23.

After my recent experience with this species and comparing the attached photo, I am inclined to join those who believe the bird photographed off

California was a Wedge-rumped Storm-Petrel.

This is a crop of a larger image which shows many more birds.

Panasonic Lumix LZ5

--

Joseph Morlan, Pacifica, CA 94044 [jmorlan \(at\) ccsf.edu](mailto:jmorlan@ccsf.edu)

Birding Classes start Sep 9 in SF <http://fog.ccsf.edu/~jmorlan/>

California Bird Records Committee <http://www.wfo-cbrc.org/cbrc/>
