

California Bird Records Committee (CBRC) Annual Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting, CA – 14–15 January 2022

14 January 2022

Meeting called to order at 1:28 pm (Chair presiding). Members: Justyn Stahl (Chair), Ryan Terrill (Vice Chair), Tom Benson (non-voting Secretary), Rob Fowler, Debbie House, Chris Howard, Guy McCaskie, Alex Rinkert, Adam Searcy, Susan Steele.

Welcome and introductory comments by Stahl.

1. Review of Minutes of 2021 Meeting.

The minutes from the annual meeting held 15–16 January 2021 (on-line) had been previously approved via email (28 December 2021). No one requested any changes at the 2022 meeting.

2. Minute Keeping for the 2022 Meeting.

Chair requested taking minutes be a share responsibility. A recording of the meeting by Secretary increased the ease of minute-keeping. Minutes were kept in ~three-hour shifts, with Stahl, Benson, and Searcy agreeing to take minutes.

--CLOSED SESSION--

3. Election of New Members

- a. Election of members (three-year terms). The terms of Alex Rinkert, Adam Searcy, and Susan Steele expire after the 2022 meeting.

Nominations:

Jon L. Dunn

Jonathan Feenstra

Gary Nunn

Jamie McConachie

Marky Mutchler

Daniel Cooper

Steve Tucker

Jonathan Feenstra, Gary Nunn, and Steve Tucker were elected.

Nominators agreed to notify nominees whether or not they were elected by Monday, 16 January. A formal email will be sent to each nominee by the Secretary informing them of the election results. Precise wording 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: Justyn Stahl (Terrill/McCaskie). Stahl elected 8-0.
- c. Election of Vice-Chair (one-year term) – nomination: Ryan Terrill (McCaskie/Fowler). Terrill elected 8-0.
- d. Election of Secretary (one-year term) – nomination: Tom Benson (Stahl/McCaskie). Benson elected 9-0.
- e. Discussion of member nomination and selection process – Stahl led a discussion of general considerations of potential Committee members. Each member should consider candidates based on their own priorities, but general considerations are:
 - i. Regional balance
 - ii. Age balance
 - iii. Experience balance (new members vs returning members with institutional knowledge)
 - iv. Diversity balance
 - v. Support of the CBRC, both by submission of records and by general support of the CBRC's mission. They need not agree with all CBRC decisions, but are supportive of the process.

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

1. A widely acknowledged expertise in ID
2. Proven reliability in the field
3. A track record of high-quality submissions to local records committee
4. Experience with record assessment
5. Regional credibility
6. Capacity to handle large volume of record review
7. Capacity to work quickly and efficiently
8. Easy access to the internet

—OPEN SESSION—

4. Bylaw Proposals

No bylaw changes were made initially, but see changes to Review List, below.

5. Procedural Issues

- a. A motion was made to make written endorsements for nominees a permanent procedure to help the Secretary when sending out election results to nominees but also to facilitate discussion during the election process. (This was done for virtual meetings in 2021 and 2022.) Motion passed 9-0 (Terrill/Steele).
- b. A brief discussion was had regarding the physical meeting location, and the rotation of NorCal/SoCal/NorCal versus SoCal/NorCal/SoCal, and how this related to nominees' preferences for one rotation or the other due to travel time/costs. No motion made.

6. Expedited Review

- a. Two batches (21Gx and 21Nx) were circulated via Expedited Review procedures since the 2021 meeting. These batches contained 67 records and no records were pulled from either batch for recirculation.
- b. No changes were suggested for the Expedited Review process, but everyone agrees it was a good system and efficient. A brief discussion of web-based voting, and record-based versus batch-based system. No motions made.
- c. No species were added to the Expedited Review List.

7. Review List

- a. **Proposed change to review criteria** Benson proposed changes to the review criteria, via changes to the bylaws and the Review List, to increase the efficiency of the Committee, and ultimately reduce the amount of redundant text devoted to simply date, location, and observer in the Annual Report. This limited, expensive space in *Western Birds*, could be better utilized for more contextual information, expanding on commentary regarding age, sex, and finer-scale local status (e.g., first county record). Terrill suggested that in the future we could also consider treating subspecies (no motion). Vote for change to Review List suspended until following day to allow members to review document Benson had prepared.
- b. **Records from prior to review period** How to treat historical records of California rarities that were initially (briefly) on the review list in the early 1970s following the inception of the CBRC? A report of Bay-breasted Warbler was submitted to eBird by Gene Cardiff from Imperial County of a bird observed in 1953. McCaskie felt it should be up to the CBRC to decide whether the documentation was sufficient as this record would be the earliest reported in the state. A discussion was had regarding whether the CBRC should review this record, given it would be the first state record, retroactively, yet falls outside (prior to) the review period. An email from Joe Morlan basically said that the Committee formed in 1970 and at that point no BBWA were known, so the review period began with the, at that time, first record in 1972. Morlan's opinion was that all records prior to removal are reviewable if/when they are submitted, no matter the date. Searcy volunteered to come up with some solutions, review the bylaws language, etc. Discussion was tabled until the following day. (See second section of 15 January 2022, below, where a motion was made to extend review period for BBWA to all records through 1975 [Terrill/Stahl] passed 7-2. Howard/Steele opposed. Record will circulate as 1953-101)

- c. **Northern Cardinal** The Northern Cardinal is not currently on the Review List, given the situation of small isolated breeding pairs of escapee-origin birds along the coastal slope of Southern California. However, cardinals along the Colorado River and in the deserts likely pertain to wild individuals from their native range (with about 5 reports of potentially naturally occurring vagrants in the last 20 years – well below the threshold for inclusion on the Review List). The Committee discussed various possibilities of reviewing only those reports of desert birds, or all birds, or getting swamped with established introduced pairs. The Committee agreed it was probably impossible to differentiate between wild vs. escapee in many/most situations. Motion to add Northern Cardinal to the Review List failed, 4-5 (Stahl/Terrill).
- d. **Glossy Ibis** Tabled until discussion of GLIB records later in meeting (see Fourth and Final Records, below).
- e. **Black Vulture** Steele mentioned Black Vulture as a potential species to remove from the Review List, but most records are of a long-staying bird, and only ~11 state records. No motion made.

Break from 16:17pm–16:25pm

8. Fourth & Final Records

- a. 2020-080 Ruby-throated Hummingbird, Cesar E. Chavez Park, ALA, 29 Aug 2020. The third round vote went 7-2. Two (Searcy and Howard) members felt the photos were too blurry to corroborate points made by hummingbird expert Sheri Williamson. Stahl mentioned the optics of dismissing expert opinion, especially when a lengthy opinion is given. Record will go out for fourth and final vote in post-meeting batch.
- b. Nazca Booby records. A brief general discussion of Nazca and Masked Booby ID, bill shape, how color is perceived differently depending on angle/lighting/monitor, presence/absence of collar, and color of central retrices.
- c. 2008-070A Nazca Booby, 16 mi NW of San Clemente Island LA, 1 Nov 2007. An immature bird in flight. Voted 6-3 in third round.
- d. 2013-287A Nazca Booby, near Long Beach Harbor LA, 6-27 Oct 2013. A subadult with an adult Masked Booby on a buoy. The Committee discussed the nice comparison of bill shape with the two birds in profile in the same photo in the same light, allowing comparison of color, etc.
- e. 2018-059B Nazca Booby, 27 km W of Point Loma SD, 10 Jun 2018. A subadult in flight, 6-3 in the third round.
- f. 2018-099B Nazca Booby, Thirty Mile Bank SD, 19 Aug 2018, 5-4 in the third round. A subadult in flight.

- g. 2019-206 Curve-billed Thrasher, Black Meadow Landing SBE “November” 2019–30 Jan 2020. This record went 5-4 in 3rd round. Date issues discussed. “November 2019” was stated in the documentation, then in January it was seen “all the time”. Stahl suggested 30 November seemed to be an acceptable date, which Benson had already used. This location is a regular location for this species.
- h. 2020-165 White Wagtail, Pudding Creek Beach, MEN, 7 Nov 2020. Poor video but most felt it seemed fine for White Wagtail. Members (Searcy, McCaskie) stated that American Pipits do not run and lunge like this, but wagtails do. Rinkert suggested the tail was too short and the bird didn’t appear white below.
- i. 2020-125 Connecticut Warbler, SE Farallon Island, SF, 7 Oct 2020. The bird was seen distantly, and the time of observation was apparently short but unstated. During discussion, it was pointed out that just because it is on SEFI it does not mean it should automatically be considered to be the rarest option.

Break for dinner from 5:09-5:49pm

8. Fourth & Final Records (continued)

Glossy Ibis records

Began with a broader discussion of GLIB. House had previously asked “How can we move towards more consistency on how we judge Glossy Ibis records?” A discussion was had about issues with distant birds perhaps being accepted but closer birds with better photos being rejected due to small details being more apparent. Is there a more recent increase in rejection rate with better photos? Can the committee come up with some sort of consistent ID criteria? The Committee acknowledged that hybrids/backcrosses could appear like normal Glossy (or White-faced) Ibis, and we may be accepting hybrids without knowing it. There was no real resolution to House’s question, or consensus achieved, other than that members should continue to vote their own mind.

2020-038 Glossy Ibis, Cosumnes River Preserve SAC, 5-7 May 2020. The third round vote was 7-2.

2019-211 Glossy Ibis, San Diego Safari Park SD, 7 Mar 2019. The third round vote was 6-3.

2020-066 Glossy Ibis, San Diego Safari Park SD, 22 Jun-11 Jul 2020. The third round vote was 7-2.

9. Records Brought to Meeting by Request

a. Records held for/brought to meeting

- i. 2020-160 Willow Warbler, Neary Lagoon SCZ, 8 Oct 2020. Soundly rejected in the first round with vote of 1-8. Written opinion from experts was supportive of Dusky Warbler, however. A motion was made to re-evaluate this as a Dusky Warbler, after soliciting further expert opinion (Stahl/McCaskie), motion passed 9-0.
- ii. 1987-174/A Xantus's Hummingbird, Yaqui Well SD, 27 Dec 1986 (M. Iliff). The record was initially rejected as a sight record from an unknown observer. Following the photographed bird in Ventura, the committee re-evaluated this record and accepted it (apparently 7-3 in the 3rd round). Discussion of whether to re-evaluate in light of new evidence provided by Marshall Iliff? Motion to re-evaluate (Stahl/McCaskie), passed 9-0.
- iii. 1996-158 Arctic/Kamchatka Leaf Warbler, Oceano SLO, 28 Sep-1 Oct 1996 (M. Brady). Previously accepted, prior to split of Arctic Warbler. Following the split, the Committee bulk converted all "Arctic Warblers" (*sensu lato*) to Arctic/Kamchatka Leaf Warbler. Matt Brady, in reviewing eBird records of this taxon, note that this record contained a description of the call, and suggested the Committee consider it as an Arctic Warbler (*sensu stricto*). The original record was apparently lost, but Benson has Curtis A. Marantz's original description and notes in eBird from Brian Daniels. Motion to re-evaluate as Arctic Warbler (Terrill/Howard) passed 9-0.
- iv. 2017-006 Slaty-backed Gull, Lower Otay Reservoir SD, 16-21 Jan 2017. This record was rejected in a 1-8 vote on its prior circulation. Prompted by a recent series of photos of first-cycle gulls taken by Alvaro Jaramillo in Japan and a discussion on Facebook, Jim Pawlicki requested the CBRC re-consider this record which had been generally supported in written commentary, despite the 1-8 vote, with the main issue being concerns about the tail pattern, particularly the whitish rump. Motion to re-evaluate given better ID criteria (Terrill/Fowler) passed 9-0.
- v. 2021-025 Glossy Ibis, San Diego Safari Park, 25 Mar-5 May 2021 – see Glossy Ibis discussion above in Fourth and Final, will recirculate automatically for 4th and Final.
- vi. 2021-070 Sandwich Tern, Limantour Estuary MRN, 5 Aug 2021. The Committee discussed the quality of the photos submitted with the record (but also noted additional photos in eBird) and the difficulty ascertaining the bill color pattern. Stahl mentioned that better photos from Southern California are frequently rejected due to subtle issues with bill color pattern (Sandwich x Elegant hybrids). This record would be a first for Northern California. House questioned whether a full black cap and crest is normal for this time of year in Sandwich Tern. Record will recirculate, no motion needed.

- vii. 2021-116 and 2021-149, Red-masked Parakeet and Nanday Parakeet (Benson). Benson reiterated a few points from the proposal, mainly that although neither species has been confirmed to breed for 15 consecutive years, it can be inferred, and also, with regard to population size, Red-masked is not smaller than Mitred (accepted), and Nanday Parakeet not much smaller than Red-whiskered Bulbul (accepted). Further, it would be confusing to have Mitred on the state list and not Red-masked, as birders may ignore the latter when considering the ID. Both records will recirculate automatically.

Meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm

15 January 2022

Meeting opened at 09:02 am

10. Rare Birds Online

- a. Joe Morlan and Dan Singer were present to discuss what needs to be done to move the *Rare Birds of California* from the WFO site to the CBRC site. Morlan said that Tim Britain, WFO webmaster, needs to be contacted to initiate the process. There have been concerns from WFO about the copyright (taking/modifying a document that WFO and/or the original authors hold the copyright to). The Committee reviewed the 19 May 2021 WFO minutes that stated, “the pubs committee recommends CBRC be allowed to make changes.” Is WFO waiting for the CBRC to submit a proposal? House and Howard willing to help with editing. Benson contact Kimball Garrett and Jon Dunn to move forward with this process.
- b. Goals: to get corrections made to original, to make it a living document with new records, and a distant third goal to rewrite the accounts entirely. Terrill suggested he could easily update maps and charts.
- c. Subcommittee: Dan Singer, Tom Benson, Debbie House, and Ryan Terrill will work on proposal.

11. Review List (Continued) – the 1953 Bay-breasted Warbler

How to treat historical records of California rarities that were initially (briefly) on the review list in the early 1970s?

Following is a summary of Adam Searcy's review of the issue with respect to the CBRC's history and bylaws for reviewing records. The committee voted on and approved option 1 as the best resolution to this issue, and extended the review period for records of Bay-breasted Warbler (BBWA).

"A specimen record of BBWA (from 1956) is currently the earliest record published in CBRC 2007 and it was also never reviewed. There are many other examples of early records that are de facto accepted but were never *officially* reviewed by the CBRC (e.g., the first record of Laysan Albatross is an unreviewed specimen from 1909: the CBRC review period was 1971-1983). CBRC 2007 states quite clearly under Bay-breasted Warbler: "CBRC Review: records from 1972 through 1975". Given that many first state records are based on specimens that were never reviewed, what is stopping us from deciding to officially review all specimen records that predate the published review periods in CBRC 2007? I don't know that that's a *bad* idea but I also don't think that it's necessary.

The inaugural issue of California Birds included the founding of the CBRC and publication of an updated list of birds of California through 1969, based on Grinnell and Miller and with additional records since 1944. The first report of the CBRC was published in December of 1973 (<https://www.californiabirds.org/reports/1.pdf>) and includes the following (emphases mine):

"At a meeting in Death Valley on 24 November 1973, the committee members deleted a number of species *previously acceptable for review* and added a few others. It was agreed that if any species on the rarities list had a total of twenty established records in California it would be deleted from the list. The following species meet the aforementioned criteria and will *no longer be accepted for review by the committee*: Blue-footed Booby [...etc...]."

This language clearly states that these species (some of which ended up back on the list after review criteria changed) were (at that time) **to no longer be accepted for review**. There is no caveat of "no longer be accepted for review *except* if the record comes from before 1970, *or* within the review period", etc.

The 1975 report (covering 1973 records; <https://www.californiabirds.org/reports/2.pdf>) had similar language and notes confusion about what was/wasn't acceptable for review by the CBRC. A list was provided of birds that the CBRC deemed "acceptable for review". Species that had been removed from that list and thus became "previously acceptable for review."

Current by-laws (all emphases mine):

VI.B.2 clearly states the case for birds that will qualify for review: either on the "*most recent list*" or "*for which there is no accepted record*" rather than "*that could establish a new earliest known record for the state*".

I thought that bylaw VI.B.5 could cover the BBWA case as it allows any **record** to be submitted BUT it still must be "acceptable for review", per by-laws above-- example: I could submit the recent Scarlet Tanager ("any record") that I saw in SLO, but Tom would tell me "Adam, that's not on the review list, we can't vote on it." I think the same applies to a BBWA record from outside of the published review list date range.

Options:

(I think that this is the simplest and best option I think option 2 is workable but option 3 I think is a bad idea--but I include it in case others disagree.)

OPTION 1: NO BYLAW CHANGE. Vote to change review periods on a case by case basis (which I believe could be accomplished with the same procedure for addition/removal outlined in VI.B.2 by a 7-2 vote. E.g., Vote to change the review period (period on which BBWA is on the review list and thus reviewable) from 1972-1975 records to "All records through 1975."

OR change to "All records from 1953 to 1975" (but then Gene might email Guy a record from 1949)

OPTION 2: BYLAW CHANGE:

Change language in VI.B.2

Current language: "Records of species not on the Review List, **but for which there is no accepted record** for California, will be treated."

Added language (blue): "Records of species not on the Review List, **but for which there is no accepted record for California or which would establish the earliest record for California**, will be treated."

OPTION 3: NO BYLAW CHANGE. Simply Vote on the BBWA with no by-law change and no vote to change review range. As I outline above I think that this would cause confusion and I do think it is a voting case that is not clearly defined in the bylaws. CBRC 2007 clearly published ranges within which species were considered "Acceptable for review" and if we start reviewing records outside of those ranges then we'll need to amend those dates (e.g., for BBWA to be consistent with other accounts, it would need to change to "CBRC Review: records from 1972 through 1975")."

The committee then discussed the matter, and voted 7-2 (Terrill/Stahl motioned, with Howard and Steele dissenting) to adopt Searcy's "Option 1," thereby changing the review period for BBWA to "all records prior to 1975."

12. Review List changes

- a. Changes to review criteria proposed by Benson.
 - i. Proposed bylaw change:
The forms treated will be determined from time to time by the Committee. In general, the Review List will consist of species that have occurred within California and the adjacent ocean 50 or fewer times in total, or an average of two ~~four~~ or fewer times per year during the ten-year period immediately preceding revision of the Review List. By vote of at least seven members at a meeting or by other voting procedure, the Committee may, as it sees fit, add other species (such as those whose identification is difficult) or forms (such as superspecies, subspecies, or hybrid combinations) to the Review List. To add or delete a form to/from the Review List shall require at least seven votes. Records of species not on the Review List, but for which there is no accepted record for California, will be treated.
Changes to bylaw (Stahl/McCaskie) approved 9-0.
- b. Given the change to the bylaws and data presented on their frequency of occurrence, the following species were removed, without individual discussion, by a unanimous vote (Stahl/McCaskie) of 9-0.
 - i. Ruddy Ground Dove
 - ii. Hudsonian Godwit
 - iii. Masked Booby
 - iv. Tricolored Heron
 - v. White-eyed Vireo
 - vi. Common Redpoll
 - vii. Snow Bunting
 - viii. Worm-eating Warbler
 - ix. Connecticut Warbler
 - x. Mourning Warbler
 - xi. Kentucky Warbler
 - xii. Cape May Warbler
 - xiii. Grace's Warbler
- c. The following species were removed after individual discussion
 - i. Bar-tailed Godwit (Stahl/Howard 9-0)
 - ii. Yellow-billed Loon (Howard/Terrill 9-0)
 - iii. Blue-headed Vireo (Terrill/Stahl 9-0)
 - iv. Common Grackle (Stahl/Fowler 9-0)
- d. The following species were *not* removed after individual discussion
 - i. Curlew Sandpiper (McCaskie/Stahl 3-6, Stahl/McCaskie/Rinkert supporting)
 - ii. Slaty-backed Gull (no motion, Committee needs to self-educate about 1st cycle birds)
 - iii. Roseate Spoonbill (no motion)

- iv. Mississippi Kite (no motion)
- v. Blue-winged Warbler (no motion)

Break from 10:40-10:50 am

13. Date Issues with Unpublished Records

- a. 2021-009 Curve-billed Thrasher, Palo Verde Ecol. Res. RIV, 20 Jan–14 Feb 2021. Motion to restrict the date range to 20 January given poor documentation on 14 Feb (Stahl/Searcy) passed 8-1 (McCaskie dissenting).
- b. 2021-086 Common Ringed Plover, Lake Tolowa DN, 5–11 Sep 2021. Motion to amend the date range to 5–10 September given poor documentation on 11 September (Fowler/McCaskie) passed 8-1 (Searcy dissenting).
- c. 2020-195 Elf Owl (2), Indio RIV, 10 Dec 2020–5 Mar 2021. A brief discussion regarding this unusual winter record from a yard in Indio. No motion made, but the Committee should make sure the Southwestern Naturalist Elf Owl publication is cited in the CBRC report.

14. Date Corrections to Published Records

2014-031 Crested Caracara, Catalina Island, LA. Stahl pointed out that documentation by competent observer in eBird (<https://ebird.org/checklist/S27561175>) exceeds the published date range. Motion to extend record to 13 Feb 2016 (Searcy/McCaskie) passed 9-0.

15. Same Bird Issues

- a. Pt Mugu, VEN, Tricolored Herons (Searcy)
 - 2017-102, 5-6 Oct 2017. A checklist from Navy Biologist (<https://ebird.org/checklist/S41216085>) suggests this bird remained through 16 Oct 2017. Motion to extend date range to 16 Oct 2016 (Howard/McCaskie) passed 9-0.
 - 2018-205, 18 Oct 2018-25 Jan 2019
 - 2019-216, 4 Nov 2019-24 Feb 2020
 - 2020-190, 25 Nov 2020-16 Mar 2021
 - 2021-141, 8 Nov 2021-4 Jan 2022 (not yet circulated)
 - Committee voted to treat all accepted records 2018-2021 as same bird (Howard/McCaskie) 9-0.
- b. 2020-2021 Wood Storks (Benson)
 - 2020-043 San Diego Safari Park, 13-15 May 2020
 - 2020-070 Perris, Lake Elsinore, Mystic Lake, 18 Jul-25 Sep 2020 (same)
 - 2020-116 San Diego Safari Park, 3-15 Oct 2020 (not same?)
 - 2021-032 San Diego Safari Park, 4 May-28 Jun 2021 (same)

2021-055 Lake Elsinore, 1 Jul 2021 (same)
2021-058 Prado Basin, 15 Jul-8 Oct 2021 (same)
2021-123 San Diego Safari Park, 12-18 Oct 2021 (not circulated)

Although Pyle had suggested that 2020-116 was a different bird, given the presence of only (apparently) 1 Wood Stork in Southern California during 2020-2021, the Committee voted to consider all as same individual (Howard/McCaskie), 9-0.

Break from 12:10-12:15 pm

16. Other Issues

Taiga/Tundra Bean Goose records – there are five Bean Goose records since 2015 that have been sitting in the record queue, in part due to rumors that the two species should/would be lumped (but per Jon Dunn there is no pending proposal), and in part because at least two of the records are not clearly assignable to one species or the other. Benson proposes that all records be initially circulated as a slash. If a majority of members feel that a record is identifiable as one species or the other, they may indicate so in their voting comments (preferably with a detailed explanation) and we can re-evaluate it as such. If only a minority support identification to species level, then the record will not be re-evaluated. Committee discussed and agreed that Secretary will solicit expert opinion and circulate as Taiga, Tundra, or slash, based on consensus of experts.

17. Annual Reports

- **46th report** (2020 records) – authored by Benson, House, McCaskie, Rinkert, and Terrill. To be published in *Western Birds*, vol 53, no. 2.
- **47th report** (2021 records) – the following volunteered to author this report: Searcy, House, Terrill (lead author), Fowler, Rinkert

18. Budget

- a. The 2020 WFO budget included \$200 for the CBRC's miscellaneous expenses (e.g., Dropbox, WFVZ costs). In 2021, the only CBRC expenditures (aside from page charges) were \$120 for Dropbox. WFVZ file maintenance costs are covered by WFO's annual donation of \$250.
- b. 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>. Please note to which report you are donating.
- c. On behalf of Dan Singer and Jon Dunn, the question of whether individual CBRC members should be acknowledged for contributing was discussed. Pro: it shows the public that members also support financially. Con: it highlights those that don't, and it is voluntary. An

agreement was made to simply state something along the lines of “...and donations from past and current CBRC members.”

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 Introduced Birds Subcommittee was more active than usual in 2021. The subcommittee researched and authored proposals that recommended adding four naturalized populations to the state list. Of these, Lilac-crowned Parrot and Mitred Parakeet were accepted during the first round of voting, while Nanday Parakeet and Red-masked Parakeet continue to be reviewed.

The subcommittee also provided feedback for implementation of eBird’s new exotic species protocols, which define observations of introduced species in eBird as being either naturalized, provisional, or escapee. The CBRC’s Watch List of introduced species was apparently also integral to the development of eBird’s exotic protocols.

The subcommittee/committee created the annotated version of the Watch List in 2019 to increase knowledge of populations of exotic species in California, summarize some basic baseline information on these potentially naturalizing populations, and also to provide to the birding public some rationale for why each of these species had not yet been added to the state list. Criteria for adding populations of introduced species to the state list are codified in the CBRC’s bylaws. Ultimately, however, the addition of these populations to the state list requires the willingness of an individual to take the time to research and write a proposal showing that the population meets these criteria. While the Watch List provides some guidance for which species have the highest potential, the selection of species for proposals is entirely at the discretion of whoever is willing to do the work. For the more recent proposals, species in urban southern California (and to a lesser extent the Bay Area) have benefitted greatly from substantial representation in eBird checklists and/or Christmas Bird Counts that make the task of estimating current and long-term population sizes and trends much easier.

20. Outreach/PR

The Committee discussed a Long-billed Murrelet record (2004-224) that had been reviewed based on an eBird submission and the observer thoughts that the record was incomplete, pending further research. The Committee felt that if new and substantial evidence is presented it can be re-evaluated, but because it was submitted to a public database (eBird) the Committee felt an obligation to review it on behalf of the Humboldt County eBird reviewer. In this specific instance, “murrelet sp.” would have been the advised course of action.

21. Secretary

Benson does not wish to be Secretary forever. Volunteers or recommendations for a potential replace would be appreciated. Chris Dean was suggested as one option.

22. Next Meetings

- a. The next annual Western Field Ornithologists meeting is scheduled to be held in Reno, Nevada, 8-11 September 2022. Terrill will present.
- b. The next CBRC annual meeting was tentatively scheduled for 13–14 January 2023 at the Moore Lab of Zoology, Occidental College.

23. Appreciations

- Alex Rinkert, Adam Searcy, and Susan Steele for their service to the CBRC
- Tom Benson for his critical work as Secretary
- Joe Morlan for his work updating the CBRC website
- Jim Tietz for maintaining updates to “Rare Birds” on our web site
- Moore Lab of Zoology at Occidental College for setting up an in-person meeting that we ultimately voted to hold virtually due to COVID-19
- WFVZ and Linnea Hall for their archiving services
- Phil Unitt and Western Birds reviewers for editing and publishing CBRC reports
- Cliff Hawley for operating our Facebook crowd-funding campaign
- Justyn Stahl for his work as Chair

Adjournment 1:08 pm on 15 January 2022.

Minutes prepared by Justyn Stahl (reviewed by Tom Benson), approved by CBRC 12 January 2023.