

CALIFORNIA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE (CBRC) ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES

H.T. Harvey & Associates, Los Gatos, CA – 17-18 January 2020

17 JANUARY 2020

Meeting called to order at 13:05 (Chair presiding). Members: Dan Singer (Chair), Justyn Stahl (Vice-Chair), Tom Benson (non-voting Secretary), Jon Dunn, Rob Fowler, Jim Pike, Peter Pyle, Alex Rinkert, Adam Searcy, Susan Steele.

Welcome and introductory comments by Singer.

1. REVIEW OF MINUTES OF 2019 MEETING

The minutes from the annual meeting held on 25-25 January 2019 in Los Angeles, California had been previously approved via email (20 June 2019). No one requested any changes at the 2020 meeting.

2. MINUTE KEEPING FOR 2020 MEETING

Chair requested taking minutes be a shared responsibility and proposed each member take a two-hour shift of minute-taking. No objections and a discussion of format and specifics followed. Rinkert and Steele were exempted as this was their first meeting. All in favor.

--CLOSED SESSION--

3. ELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS

- a. Election of members (three-year terms). The terms of Jon Dunn, Rob Fowler, and Justyn Stahl expire after the 2020 meeting.

Nominations:

Jon Feenstra

John Garrett

Debbie House

Lisa Hug

Logan Kahle

Guy McCaskie

Ryan Terrill

Debbie House, Guy McCaskie, and Ryan Terrill 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 (Dunn/Stahl). Singer elected 8-0.

- c. Election of Vice-Chair (one-year term) – nomination: Alex Rinkert (Dunn/Stahl). Rinkert elected 8-0.

- d. Election of the Secretary (one-year term) – nomination: Tom Benson (Singer/Dunn). Benson elected 9-0.

- e. Discussion of member nomination and selection process – Singer led a 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) Diversity 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.

--OPEN SESSION--

4. DATABASE AND WEBSITE UPDATE AND DISCUSSION

Former member and Committee webmaster, Joe Morlan, joined the meeting to discuss and demonstrate important updates to the Committee's database and website. Thanks to the efforts of Tom Benson, who maintains the CBRC database, all historic data has now been entered. Database searches made through the CBRC website now produce a complete list of species records submitted to the committee. The website is now fully searchable using any character string via the search tool on the homepage or under the Menu. Improvements to search-result reports include roll-over popups for status codes and county names. Searches do not include the book "Rare Birds of California" since it is currently hosted on a different site. There was strong member support for having "Rare Birds" hosted on the CBRC site.

5. THE CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE OF RECORDS COMMITTEES

A discussion on bird records committees covered a wide range of topics from origin and history, current status and relevance in the birding community, methodologies employed, and considerations for the future. No action resulted.

6. ENDORSEMENT OF RECORDS BASED SOLELY ON SUBMITTED DOCUMENTATION

The Chair and Secretary discussed criteria members use for evaluating records. In addition to written descriptions, photographs, and audio recording that are submitted for each record, members are free to use whatever criteria they consider relevant in arriving at decisions. This may include factors not included in the submitted documentation. Date spans are based on eBird reports since information from NAB reviewers is usually no longer available. It is at the Secretary's discretion to establish date spans but members can (and should) dispute date spans if they have reason to believe it is incorrect or not supported by adequate documentation.

7. BYLAW PROPOSALS [Changing bylaws requires at least eight votes]

a. Add language to VI. D. 3. that requires that two records must be accepted as the same species before they can be considered the same individual: "1. Accepted records of individual birds returning or continuing through subsequent years, or of individual birds at widely separated locations within the same year, shall be treated the same as any other resubmission of an accepted record. Two or more records must be accepted as the same species in order to be considered a resubmission. A majority vote determines whether a record is to be treated as a resubmission of a returning or continuing bird." (Benson)

Motion to amend bylaw per above passed 9-0 (Pyle/Searcy).

b. A proposal to reduce the number of voting rounds from four to three was discussed. Under this scenario, any record that did not receive a decision after two rounds of voting would be brought to the meeting for discussion, and then a third and final vote. The approximate breakdown of rounds (since 2015) in which records received a final decision is: 1st – 88%, 2nd – 8%, 3rd – 2%, and 4th – 1%. (Benson)

No motion was made.

8. PROCEDURAL ISSUES [requires majority vote]

Pyle requested the Marin/Sonoma Black Vulture be treated as a continuously present bird that does not require review every time it moves to a new location and compared this bird's presence to the Northern Gannet and the Sonoma County Common Black Hawk, two other records involving long-staying individuals. Arguments against this included the more widespread and regular occurrence of Black Vulture elsewhere in the state and the long absences between sightings of the Marin/Sonoma bird. No motion was made and records will continue to be reviewed.

9. EXPEDITED REVIEW

Three batches (19Hx, 19Lx, and 19Ox) were circulated via Expedited Review procedures since the 2019 meeting. These batches contained 73 records. One record in 19Hx and two records from 19Lx were requested to be removed and evaluated per normal procedures.

[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

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of Expedited Review with the majority of members expressing strong support for the procedure. The expedited review process was re-reviewed. The importance of batch receipt acknowledgement was emphasized. This acknowledgement represents two separate factors: 1) the batch has been received and 2) the member has reviewed each record in the batch and votes to accept all records therein.

Two species were considered for deletion from the Expedited Review list [requires seven yes votes to add or delete species]:

Ruddy Ground (Dunn/Singer moved to delete, 2-7 motion failed)

Greater Pewee (Dunn/Steele moved to delete, 2-7 motion failed)

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

1. Pyle proposed (Fowler seconded) that an expedited batch be considered as round one and any record pulled from an expedited batch at the request of a member moves to a second round. Motion passed 9-0.

Benson made changes to VI. H.4(a) and VI. H.6 to accommodate a member who requests a record's removal from an expedited batch and adds comments that will be treated as first round comments. The expedited review batch will be considered as a first circulation. Members accepting records in this batch will be recorded as having "accepted without comment" and members who have requested removal will have to enter comments in a standard voting form.

Changes were made as follows:

VI.H.4(a) If any member wishes to request a record in an expedited review batch be recirculated for any reason, that member will provide detailed comments to the Secretary on a voting form within two weeks of distribution of the expedited review batch. The Secretary will record the vote as indicated by the member(s), with the votes of all other members recorded as "accept without comment" during the first round of circulation. The record will then continue circulation in the second round as described in Sections VI. F and G.

VI.H.6. Each record will be considered accepted if, after the two-week review period, the Secretary has not received a request for recirculation.

Motion to adopt such language change made by Stahl and seconded by Dunn passed 9-0.

10. REVIEW LIST

[Requires seven 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 Review List."]

Potential Additions:

- **Wood Stork:** Average of 7.2 per year over the last ten years and declining rapidly. Five-year average is 1.2 birds per year, with no sightings in 2019. Motion to add to the Review List passed 9-0 (Dunn/Searcy) and add to the Expedited Review List passed 9-0 (Stahl/Searcy).

- **Blue-footed Booby:** Excluding the major invasion year of 2013, the 10-year average is 3.3 birds per year. A motion to add this species to the Review List failed 0-9 (Stahl/Pike).

Potential Deletions:

- **Nazca Booby:** Numbers remain similar to 2018 and there is an increasing trend overall for the past 5-7 years. Seven-year average since the species was first recorded in the state (2013) is 8.0 birds per year. Based on pending paper by Pyle these numbers may well go up. Benson noted occurrence may prove to be cyclical but numbers are unlikely to decrease to zero given climatic conditions.

Motion to remove Nazca Booby passed 8-1 (Pyle/Searcy).

- **Masked/Nazca Booby:** Members agreed the increasing frequency of these two species was cause to remove it from the Review List. The combined 10-year average of Masked, Nazca, and slashes is 12.birds per year.

Motion to remove Masked/Nazca Booby passed 8-1 (Pyle, Dunn).

- **Masked Booby:** The 10-year average is approximately 3.5 per year with some uncertainty due to the potential revision of some identifications based on Pyle's review.

Motion by Dunn to remove Masked Booby from the Review List did not receive a second.

- **Red-footed Booby:** An overall increasing trend in the past 5-7 years; 10-year average of 5.7 birds per year.

Motion to remove Red-footed Booby passed 8-1 (Dunn/Stahl).

- **Rusty Blackbird:** Average of 5.7 birds per year during the past 10 years with only one year with no records since added to the Review List in 2006.

Motion to remove Rusty Blackbird passed 9-0 (Dunn/Stahl).

Meeting adjourned at 20:22 on January 17.

18 January 2020

Meeting called back to order at 0910 with all members present.

10. REVIEW LIST continued

The Committee resumed discussion of removals and additions to the Review List. Common Redpoll, Worm-eating Warbler, Mourning Warbler, and Connecticut Warbler were discussed for possible removal based largely on the large number of accepted records, but no motions to remove were made. The primary criteria for removal remains four records or less per year during most recent 10-year period. The total number of accepted records is also considered, but to date has been of secondary concern. Other issues such as identification difficulty or continued advancement of our understanding of status and distribution were discussed.

Dunn suggested establishing criteria that are able to be applied consistently to different species; Searcy volunteered to try and come up with some criteria for discussion at the 2021 meeting.

11. HYBRIDIZATION IN PLEGADIS IBIS

Discussion on characters or field marks that may be indicative of hybridization between Glossy and White-faced Ibis, and which are within range of variation of each species.

Opinions differed on some key characters that determine “pure” Glossy Ibis. Pike has seen and photographed multiple birds that superficially appear “good” for Glossy Ibis but upon closer inspection have multiple characters that suggest hybridization. This can only be done with high quality photos that show eye color and facial skin.

A suggestion was made to examine past accepted records and potentially pull out for re-review any that may be hybrids. It was noted a publication with updated criteria on hybridization and identification criteria would be welcome. Searcy agreed to compile recent GLIB/WFIB publications to be distributed to committee members.

The following characters have been discussed and used to accept and reject records:

Iris color – we have discussed this in the past, some red may be photo artifact.

Blue/white border to facial skin – narrow and complete vs. blurry and discontinuous

Color of interior facial skin – gray vs. pink/purple

Color of tarsal joints – dark vs. pink

Color of bill and tertiaries?

The following records still in review were discussed:

2018-072, Big Valley LAS/MOD, 16 Jun 2018 (4th & final)

2019-027, near Bakersfield KER, 23 Apr 2019

2019-036, Woodland WTP YOL, 19-22 May 2019

2019-078, Prado Basin RIV, 1 Apr-21 May 2019

12. MASKED AND NAZCA BOOBY IDENTIFICATION AND BOOBY DISCUSSION – Pyle

Pyle discussed his upcoming publication on Masked and Nazca Boobies. Bill color, collars, tail feathers, identification criteria were discussed. Pyle will continue his review of previous records and will suggest re-review of some at the 2021 meeting. Fourth and final records of these species were discussed here.

2017-155/2017-155A Nazca Booby – Pyle's analysis suggested the documentation supported four birds. The fourth and final vote was tabled until next year's meeting and re-reviewed with a batch of records Pyle will be re-submitting.

2015-103A Masked Booby (Dunn, Searcy) – Pyle's analysis of this rejected record (accepted as Masked/Nazca 2015-103) suggested it was the same as an accepted Masked Booby, but members at the meeting agreed the evidence was marginal and would vote “not same bird” upon a recirculation.

The following two records were tabled until the next annual meeting in 2021:

2018-098A Masked/Nazca Booby (Pyle)

2019-094 Masked/Nazca Booby (Pyle)

Masked Booby (same bird issues)

2018-204 SEFI (Dunn/Pyle) – This bird was accepted as the same as 2018-024 by multiple members. A motion by Dunn/Stahl to consider these different birds failed 7-2 and the records remain treated as the same bird.

2018-082 Dockweiler LA (9 Aug 2019), 2018-086 Oxnard, VEN (12 Aug 2019), 2018-093 San Pedro Channel LA (25 Aug 2019) – these birds were voted as the same by eight members in an expedited branch. One member voted “not same” and requested meeting review. Majority decided to maintain as same bird and no motion was made to re-vote.

Nazca Booby (same bird issues)

Accepted as same bird as 2019-071, record and photos re-examined. Dunn strongly disagreed with decision and other same bird decisions. No motion to re-vote.

Red-footed Booby (same bird issues)

2019-022 Huntington Beach Pier, OR – votes were insufficient to determine same bird questions during earlier rounds. During vote at meeting members rejected as same birds 6-3.

13. FOURTH AND FINAL RECORDS

The following records without a decision after three rounds of voting were discussed. Several members wanted more time to consider some of these records before voting on them and the committee agreed to include them in Batch 19P, which circulated after the meeting.

- a) 2018-107 Masked Booby, Monterey Bay MTY (24 Aug 2018)
- b) 2018-100 Nazca Booby, Los Angeles Harbor LA (19-23 Aug 2018)
- c) 2018-181 Nazca Booby, Platform Ellen ORA (6 Oct 2018)
- d) 2018-102 Masked/Nazca Booby, WSW of Bodega Head SON (8 Jul 2018)

- e) 2017-176 European Golden-Plover, Devereux Slough SBA (21-29 Jan 2017)
- f) 2018-054 Upland Sandpiper, Elings Park SBA (21 Sep 2018)
- g) 2018-072 Glossy Ibis, Big Valley LAS/MOD (16 Jul 2018)
- h) 2018-118 Alder Flycatcher, Chet Huffman Park SBE (30 Aug 2018)
- i) 2018-042 Grace's Warbler, Blue Ridge LA (5 May 2018)

14. RECORDS BROUGHT TO MEETING BY REQUEST

The following records were held for/brought to meeting for discussion:

2010-177 Veery HUM (Fowler) - Based on discussion led by Dunn a motion to re-review this previously accepted record passed 9-0 (Dunn/Pyle). Dunn suggested the documentation was inconsistent with known criteria for identifying this species.

2018-248 Baikal Teal MER (Stahl) – After discussion no decision was made to recirculate and the record stands as accepted.

2014-187 Stejneger's Scoter SCZ (Dunn) – A discussion on identification criteria was led by Dunn. Three members supported the record after the second round (Dunn, Pyle, Singer). A motion to circulate the record for another round passed 9-0 (Dunn/Singer).

2018-250 Snow Bunting HUM (Steele) – Based upon additional documentation by the observer, the record stands as accepted.

Date issues with unpublished records:

2019-057 White-eyed Vireo HUM (Fowler) – after discussion Fowler decided the date span was acceptable.

2018-047 Winter Wren VEN/SBA (Benson) – The initial accepted date span, based on documentation submitted by Dave Pereksta, was 21-26 Jan 2018. Based upon eBird reports brought to the Committee's attention by Benson, a motion to expand the date span to 21 Nov 2017 through 18 Feb 2018 passed 9-0 (Dunn/Stahl). During subsequent discussion Searcy expressed concern with the 21 Nov 2017 date after which Members reviewed the photographs submitted for the November date. A motion to strike the November date ensued and passed 8-1 (Searcy/Stahl). The accepted date range is therefore 21 Jan-18 Feb 2018.

Date corrections to published records:

1996-161 Wood Thrush, Mountain Home Village SBE (Published at 21-26 Dec 1996 in 22nd report, but no documentation later than 24 Dec., which was the end date published in FN 58:104. There is an eBird report on 29 Dec from H. King, but this report cannot be confirmed). A motion (Dunn/Stahl) to establish the date span as 21-24 Dec 1996 passed 9-0.

1996-177 Curve-billed Thrasher, Big River SBE (Published as 30-31 Oct 2006 in 32nd report, then corrected to 1 Nov in 33rd report. Record documentation, listserv post, and eBird report all indicate 30-31 Oct is the correct date span). A motion (Dunn/Singer) to establish date span as 30-31 Oct 2006 passed 9-0.

2006-145 Streak-backed Oriole, Zzyxx SBE (Published as 9-16 Oct 2006 in 32nd report, but no evidence other than RBA report to listserv to indicate the bird was present on 16 Oct. Last date of documentation in record is 14 Oct and there is a listserv post stating the bird was present 15 Oct. McGrath indicated missing the bird on 16 Oct, the only report from that date). After discussion a motion (Dunn/Singer) to establish the date span as 9-14 Oct 2006 passed 9-0.

2007-146 Red-faced Warbler, Green Canyon SBE (Published as 27 Jun-20 Jul 2007 in 33rd report. Record documentation, listserv posts, and eBird reports indicate the bird was found by Cardiff on 26 June). A motion (Dunn/Singer) to establish the date span as 26 Jun-20 Jul 2006 passed 9-0.

2008-011 (or 2008-012) Mourning Warbler, Southeast Farallon Island SF (Published in the 33rd report as occurring on 26 Sep 2005, but information from Tietz indicated one stayed until 27 Sep). A motion (Dunn/Singer) to change the date span for one of the records to 26-27 Sep 2005 passed 9-0). Thereafter the secretary established the date of 2008-011 to 26-27 Sep 2005.

Same bird issues:

2018-187 and 2017-098 Grace's Warbler, Villa La Jolla Park SD (14 Oct 2018-5 Apr 2019 and 28-29 April 2017). McCaskie requested these birds be considered the same bird. Initially considered separate individuals based, in part, on Pyle's age assessment of the 2018 bird. At the meeting he acknowledged lack of confidence in his original opinion and subsequently motioned the records be regarded as the same bird. The motion (Pyle/Pike) passed 9-0.

2018-183 and 2018-238 Blue-headed Vireo, Golden Gate Park SF (6 Oct 2018 and 9-11 Oct 2018). Pyle led discussion on same bird possibility. Accepted as different birds based on plumage. No motion made to consider same bird.

2019-052 and 2019-092 Cape May Warbler, Point Reyes NS MRN (11 Jun 2019 and 19 Jun 2019). Initially accepted as same bird. After discussion led by Singer a motion by Dunn/Fowler to consider them different birds passed 9-0.

2008-055, 2008-052 and 2008-053 Common Black Hawk, Aromas SBT (31 Mar 2008); Tiburon MRN (2 Apr 2008); and near Santa Rosa SON (14 Apr-31 Dec 2008). These records have been accepted as the same bird based on the continuing year-round presence of the bird in the Santa Rosa area. After a review of the documentation for the 2008 records, a Dunn/Stahl motion to consider the San Benito record as a different bird passed 7-2.

15. ENTERING CBRC DATA INTO EBIRD

Justyn Stahl set up an eBird account for entering CBRC records into the eBird database. The primary purpose is to enter significant records that are not already represented in eBird, but any accepted CBRC records can potentially be entered. Currently Stahl has entered at least one record for each species of CBRC records that were not previously entered into eBird, such that the entire CBRC state list is represented within the eBird state list (additional exotics in eBird are not currently endorsed by the CBRC); ~15 species were not captured in eBird prior to this project. Record numbers and links to the corresponding Annual Report for these records were included. It is hoped this may divert some traffic to the CBRC website.

16. RARE BIRDS ONLINE

Benson led a discussion on corrections to the online CBRC book and errata list, as well as discrepancies between the online book and the database or published reports. Dunn talked to Rottenborn about approaching the WFO board and Rottenborn agreed to continue these efforts.

17. ANNUAL REPORTS

43rd report (2017 records) – authored by Singer, Benson, McCaskie, and Stahl. Published in *Western Birds* vol 51, no 1.

44th report (2018 records) – authored by Benson, Fowler, McCaskie, and Stahl. To be published in *Western Birds*, vol 51, no 3.

45th report (2019 records) – to be authored by Benson, Rinkert, and Searcy.

18. BUDGET

The 2019 WFO budget included \$200 for the CBRC's miscellaneous expenses (e.g., Dropbox, WFVZ costs). In 2019, the only CBRC expenditures (aside from page charges) were \$99 for Dropbox. WFVZ file maintenance costs are covered by WFO's annual donation of \$250.

Donations are strongly encouraged, no matter the amount. The simplest way to donate, if you'd like to do so, is to visit <https://www.westernfieldornithologists.org/pagecharges.php>. Indicate which report you're donating toward. Total donations by current and former committee members towards page charges for the 43rd report totaled \$999.00 (per Suzanne Carota).

Crowd-funding CBRC reports. The CBRC's first attempt at crowd-funding page charges for an annual report via WFO's facebook page was successful. In the first 24 hours, we received \$596 in donations toward our \$700 target for the 43rd report. We received only an additional \$50, however, via the facebook fundraiser over the next month, for a total of \$646. A final donation of \$54 was made on 27 October 2019 enabling us to reach our target amount.

Other issues

WFVZ record archival. The current location of CDs containing previously scanned records is unknown. Members discussed the need to explore an option for funding a project to digitize decades of historical records. No immediate action taken. Discussed providing WFVZ with dropbox access of CBRC records.

19. INTRODUCED BIRDS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Report from the Introduced Birds Subcommittee – Kimball Garrett, Adam Searcy, John Garrett, Kristie Nelson, Jon Feenstra, and Tom Benson. The committee submitted two proposals to add introduced populations to the state list: Yellow-chevrons Parakeet and Red-whiskered Bulbul. The voting members of the committee accepted both proposals. Additional species we are considering for proposals include Lilac-crowned Parrot, Red-masked Parakeet, Mitred Parakeet, Nanday Parakeet, Rose-ringed Parakeet, and Northern Red Bishop. The IBS is fully aware that the rapid explosion of populations of Pin-tailed Whydah and white-eye sp. (for which "Swinhoe's White-eye seems to be the placeholder in vogue) has put them on a trajectory to be considered for addition to the CBRC list, but that proof of breeding for 15+ years is lacking for both species. We will continue to monitor these

populations. Over the next year, we also need to come to grips with treatment of Indian Peafowl. It is currently not treated by the IBS since many or most populations consist of feral domestic birds, but some populations are directly descended from wild birds imported from India (though all populations are tainted by released domestics as well). Finally, the IBS revised the CBRC Watch List from a simple list of species to an annotated list, providing basic information on the status and distribution of each species in California. We hope that this will give the public a better background on these populations in the state, as well as some insight into the CBRC's rationale for excluding them from the official state list

The Committee reviewed the criteria for adding introduced species to the state list. Agreement was reached that item (iii) of Section IV, Paragraph B.8 was both too restrictive and inaccurate. A motion to modify the wording as below passed 9-0 (Dunn/Searcy).

Section IV, Paragraph B.8. - (iii) (introduced species) be judged to have occupied a significant portion of geographically contiguous suitable habitat to such a degree as to sustain the population and be thought unlikely to significantly diminish,...

20. OUTREACH AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

The Committee discussed for ideas for increasing public outreach and relations. More notices to listservs regarding record acceptance and quarterly reports of CBRC news to listservs were considered.

21. CBRC'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The year 2020 will mark the 50th anniversary of the CBRC. McCaskie and Rottenborn will prepare a brief (2-3 page) article for *Western Birds* on this, including changes since 1970 (e.g. in state list, number of records evaluated/year, nature of submitted records, CBRC process, etc.).

22. NEXT MEETINGS

- a) WFO conference – Reno, NV, 9-13 September 2020 was cancelled as a result of the Covid 19 pandemic.
- b) CBRC annual meeting – 15-16 January 2021 will be at either Occidental College in Los Angeles or Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology in Camarillo.

23. APPRECIATIONS

- a) H.T. Harvey & Associates for hosting our meeting and providing wonderful meals.
- b) Jon Dunn, Rob Fowler, and Justyn Stahl for their service to the CBRC
- c) Tom 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

h) Justyn Stahl and Cliff Hawley for organizing and monitoring our crowd-funding effort on FaceBook

ADJOURNMENT 16:10 on 26 January 2019

Minutes prepared by Dan Singer (reviewed by Tom Benson, Jon Dunn, Peter Pyle and Justyn Stahl).