

DIGEST OF THE MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETINGS

of the

CALIFORNIA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

1973 - 1995

The following is a digest of the minutes of the Annual Meetings of the California Bird Records Committee from 1973 through 1995. Included are all motions passed or defeated, decisions by consensus, and major discussions without obvious agreement, together with the date of action and other pertinent comments. These actions are divided into topics and subtopics, as indicated in the table of contents on the following page.

Within each topic or subtopic, actions are listed chronologically.

Those actions that were defeated or otherwise not adopted are enclosed in square brackets [].

For clarity, we have reworded some of the statements that appeared in the minutes.

The purpose of this digest is to inform Committee members of those actions and decisions that are not reflected in the Bylaws. For completeness, however, we have also included decisions that resulted in substantive Bylaw amendments. Bylaw amendments for the purpose of improving language, eliminating duplication, or technical conformation with California laws are not included. Organization of the actions into topics should give the reader some sense of history and may result in future actions to improve the workings of the Committee. Conversely, it may help avoid needless repetition in the process of debating and altering rules and procedures, and especially repetition of changes that were later reversed as mistakes.

Laurence C. Binford and Stephen F. Bailey
Vice Secretaries, 1982-85 and 1987
Matt T. Heindel
Vice-Secretary, 1993-1995

CONTENTS

- A. Annual Meeting
 - 1. General Procedures
 - 2. Elections

- B. Review List
 - 1. Criteria for rarity
 - 2. Subspecies
 - 3. Species complexes
 - 4. Procedures for change

- C. Records
 - 1. Submission
 - a. Specimen records
 - b. Obtaining records
 - c. Records not identified to species; species complexes
 - d. Returning and continuing birds
 - e. Flocks and aggregations
 - f. Offshore boundaries

 - 2. Evidence
 - a. Additional evidence
 - b. Criteria for new and substantial evidence

 - 3. Circulation Procedures
 - a. General procedures
 - b. Annual Meeting and final circulation

 - 4. Voting (see also "State List, Voting")
 - a. Personal judgment of records
 - b. Categories
 - c. Abstention
 - d. Secretary as Voting Member
 - e. Acceptance of natural occurrence
 - f. Forms
 - g. Reversal of records

 - 5. Retraction

 - 6. Archiving

- D. Annual Report
 - 1. Publishing "obvious escapes"
 - 2. Publishing voting rules
 - 3. Contents
 - 4. Retractions
 - 5. Authorship and publishing

- E. State List
 - 1. Voting (see also, "Records, Voting")
 - 2. Nomenclature
 - 3. Introduced Species (see also, "State List, Supplemental Lists")
 - 4. Supplemental Lists (see also, "State List, Introduced Species")

F. Ethics

A. ANNUAL MEETINGS

1. General Procedures

The Annual Meeting should be called when possible on long weekends because of logistics, but not on Thanksgiving or Christmas, when avoidable.

24 November 1973. Consensus

Minutes of meetings must be sent (by mail) to Committee Members.

29 November 1975. Motion passed.

All Committee meetings shall be closed to all non-Committee Members.

14 January 1978. Consensus; but 1978 Bylaws allow for seating of Members- elect.

18 February 1984. Reconfirmed by consensus.

2. Elections

The election of the Secretary should precede the election of Members.

27 November 1976. Consensus.

Election information (voting, etc./) must be kept confidential, with only Secretary (Jon Winter) knowing the details of the vote and with no written record kept.

27 November 1975. Motion passed; but only a one-meeting decision.

Two considerations in choosing Committee Members should be their speed of circulation of records and their record of submission of observations to the Committee.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

The election of the Secretary shall precede those of the Members and Vice-Secretary and shall be conducted by the Vice-Secretary; the votes shall be counted by the Vice-Secretary and one other Member, who has not been nominated, appointed by the Vice-Secretary. The election of Members shall immediately follow that of the Secretary and shall be conducted by the Secretary; the votes shall be counted by the Secretary and one other Member who has not been nominated, appointed by the Secretary. The election of the Vice-Secretary shall be conducted by the Secretary; the votes shall be counted by the Secretary and one other Member who has not been nominated, appointed by the Secretary. Details of all three elections shall be kept confidential, with only those people counting the votes knowing the counts. The only written record of elections shall be in the minutes and shall consist of only the names of the nominees and the winners.

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

[Membership on the Committee was discussed with a view toward wider involvement.]

18 February 1984. No action.

Amend the Bylaws such that Member retiring after serving two consecutive terms becomes eligible for re-election at the next Annual Meeting, not after "one year" of retirement.

31 January 1987. Motion passed. Bylaws amended accordingly.

The Secretary must notify all Members by mail at least three weeks in advance of the Annual Meeting of a willingness to continue in office or an intention to retire.

21 January 1988 Motion passed.

Nominations for Secretary shall be made only by Members (not the Secretary or other persons) and at any time prior to, or at the annual meeting, either in person or by letter to an attending member.

21 January 1989 Motion passed.

A vacancy resulting from the election of a Member, whose term is unexpired, to the position of Secretary at an annual meeting, shall be filled by special election held during the Annual Meeting. Nominations to fill such vacancy may be made at any time prior to, or at the Special Election.

21 January 1989 Motion passed.

[Various discussion took place with regard to dealing with delinquent Members, specifically those holding numerous batches for months, and failing to adequately remedy the situation. In the end, members were not ready to force withdrawal based on pre-determined steps and instead will try to apply pressure and hope for common sense and responsible behavior.]

12 January 1991 Motion defeated.

[Should any member change their permanent residence to a locale outside of California, that member's term shall automatically terminate at the next annual meeting.]

12 January 1991 Motion defeated.

B. REVIEW LIST

1. Criteria for Rarity

The criteria for a rare bird to be placed on the Review List shall be based on 20 records or less.

24 November 1973. Consensus.

The criteria of rarity for inclusion on the Review List will be an average of four or less records per year based on a 10-year average.

29 November 1975. Motion passed.

Use the same general criteria as stated previously, an average of four or fewer acceptable occurrences per year over a period of 10-years.

14 January 1978. Consensus.

Change the criteria for inclusion on the Review List to two accepted records per year average for the last 10 years, and 20 or fewer published specimen records or sight records accepted by the Committee.

7 March 1981. Consensus.

18 January 1986. Reconfirmed by consensus.

[The issue of expanding CBRC coverage to include geographic {within the state} or seasonal rarities was discussed pursuant to an outside request. The consensus was that the Committee had sufficient workload presently and that defining the scope of such expanded coverage would be very difficult. There was some interest expressed in having the CBRC review selected records which might be submitted for a CBRC opinion by the compiler of a county or regional work.]

31 January 1987. No action taken.

[A discussion regarding the value of adding temporal and distributional restrictions took place. A majority were concerned that observers would not know what to submit and that it would increase work load. Supporters argued only AB or AFN regional editors would *need* to know so they could forward relevant information. Also, the increase would at least be partially offset by no longer reviewing some of the higher level rarities.]

16 January 1993. No action taken

2. Subspecies

The Review List shall contain only full species, not subspecies.

27 November 1976. Motion passed; but 1978 Bylaws allow for the listing of subspecies if the Committee desires.

[Further discussion took place on reviewing subspecies, and was again defeated. Those in favor feel they are already being claimed and published as such, so we might as well deal with them. Those opposed point to the complexity and uncertainty when dealing at this level.]

15 January 1994 Motion failed.

[Continued discussion on subspecies review with no changes.]

14 January 1995. Consensus.

3. Species Complexes

[The Review List shall include "slash" species (species pairs).]

18 February 1984. Motion not seconded.

Specific species pairs shall be included on the Review List.

18 February 1984. Consensus. (Two species pairs were added to the Review List. The above two actions mean that the Committee will add only specific species pairs. Both pairs added are superspecies, suggesting that the Committee is more inclined to add superspecies than just any pair of birds.--L.C.B. Since that time, superspecies with more than a pair of species have been considered for the Review List as species complexes.--S.F.B.)

30 January 1988 [A motion to review records of any bird identified to an observer-defined species complex, as long as all species in that complex would be review-listed species. Motion failed 3-6 with one abstention]

[The Committee will review only records of birds identified to species (and thus no species-pairs).]

30 January 1988. Motion failed 3-7.]

[There was also discussion on the need to discuss hybrids. In at least one case (Golden X Blue-winged Warbler) there is an obvious need. They are readily identifiable and are both Review List species. Otherwise, the Committee is not disposed to review hybrids.]

15 January 1994. No action taken.

4. Procedures for Change

Any Committee Member thinking a species should be removed or added to the Review List should bring the justification to an Annual Meeting.

14 January 1978. Consensus.

[To add or delete a species from the Review List shall require all or all but one affirmative votes.]

19 February 1983. Motion defeated.

[To add or delete a species from the Review List shall require all or all but one or two affirmative votes.]

19 February 1983. Motion defeated.

To add or delete a species from the Review List shall require all or all but one, two, or three affirmative votes.

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

C. RECORDS

1. Submission

a. Specimen Records

Specimen records should not be reviewed by the Committee. They should go into the Annual report as "A specimen of...has been collected and can be seen at...but has not been reviewed by the Committee."

24 November 1973. Motion passed; later revised in the 1978 Bylaws.

Specimen records are to be submitted at the decision of a Committee Member; we should not worry about pre-Grinnell and Miller (1944) records.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

{By consensus at the 1982, 1984 and 1986 Annual Meetings it has been decided to attempt to review every past record of each species presently on the Review List. See the following section.}

[All tideline corpses found on California beaches shall be reviewed in a manner like other records, excepting that any accepted records shall not be added to the statistical total of state records. Any tideline corpses of species not yet on the California State List shall not be admitted on the State List, but instead shall be placed on the Supplemental List.]

18 January 1992. No second to the motion.

b. Obtaining Records

[The few people submit records other than a select few is a problem.]

24 November 1973 and 29 November 1975. Discussion.

Any Member of the Committee has the right to submit any record he feels should be submitted whether or not it is his, if he has first attempted to obtain details from the observer.

29 November 1975. Motion passed.

Any Committee Member aware of an uncirculated record may at his discretion submit the record to the Secretary, but the Secretary is not directed to search out and submit all such records.

1 October 1977. Consensus.

The Secretary will ask the American Birds editors to keep a copy of the Review List and submit to the Secretary the name and address of the observer(s) of said birds.

17 March 1979. Consensus.

The Secretary will send a form card to the observer asking for details on any submitted record; the Secretary will not pursue if there is no response.

17 March 1979. Consensus.

Committee Members should feel obligated to turn in descriptions of all species seen that are on the Review List, including going back through old records.

16 March 1980. Motion passed.

The Secretary should make information request cards and distribute them to the Committee Members with description forms. The Members should distribute these to the observer when they are aware of a rare species being seen.

16 March 1987. Consensus.

Ideally, the Committee would like to review every past record of each species presently on the Review List.

13 February 1982. Consensus.

18 February 1984. Reconfirmed by Consensus.

18 January 1986. Reconfirmed by Consensus.

The Committee shall attempt to submit for validation and acceptance at least one record for each species on the current Review List.

18 February 1984. Motion passed.

The Committee would like to review all Review List birds published in American Birds.

9 February 1985. Consensus.

The Committee will advise Regional Editors of American Birds that henceforth all records of birds on the CBRC Review List appearing in American Birds will be considered for possible review by the Committee.

18 January 1986. Consensus.

The Committee will advise observers, other than Committee Members, by mail of receipt of his/her report. The Committee will also advise the observer, by mail, as soon as voting on that record has been completed by the Committee.

18 January 1986. Motion passed.

The CBRC must review all records published by American Birds or its predecessors, but there is no need to review records which were not published by American Birds and are simply found in the files (unless, of course, the observer submits them). Also there is no need to search out and review records published only in local Audubon Society or bird club newsletters.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

The phrase "published records" was discussed and agreed took the definition of published in American Birds, Audubon Field Notes or formal ornithological journals but does not include publication in local Audubon or bird club newsletters.

21 January 1989. Consensus

c. Records Not Identified to Species; Species Complexes

Records identified as either one or another species (e.g., Black-tailed or Hudsonian Godwit) may be submitted; it is then up to each Committee Member to vote as he desires.

17 March 1979. Consensus.

In the treatment of superspecies, the Committee felt that no one taxonomic list should be adopted, but instead taxonomic problems should be treated on an individual basis as they arise.

13 February 1982. Consensus.

Taxonomic problems involving specific limits shall be handled individually as they arise. The Committee shall make a firm decision as to what taxonomy will be used before

circulating a record involving a taxonomic problem. Such a record may be held by the Secretary until a taxonomic decision is made at a meeting of the Committee.

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

A record not submitted as a single identified species shall not be judged immediately by the Committee but shall be placed in the "Suspense File" until the Secretary feels that a specific name can be applied to it; the Secretary must inform the reporter(s) of the action. (Note: the reporter has the right to retract such a record before circulation or to resubmit it under a single specific name.)

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

31 January 1987. Reconfirmed by consensus.

Although a record not submitted as a single identified species is relegated to the Suspense File until a submitter or the Secretary places a specific name on the report, nonetheless the information may circulate attached to another record when it is used not for a vote but for information relating to another circulating record. Such cases will be clearly marked by the Secretary.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

d. Returning and Continuing Birds

Concerning records of individual birds that return to the same site on an annual basis, the additional date of observation should be added to the Committee's Annual Report and the file card should be updated to reflect additional dates.

13 February 1982. Consensus.

A record involving what might be the same individual bird(s) submitted previously (e.g., with one or more seasons or other substantial time period intervening) (a) shall, for the purposes of validation, be treated as if it were a separate record involving a different individual(s); (b) the Secretary shall give each such record a different Committee number cross-referenced to the previous record(s), and (c) attach to it a note referring (by Committee number, date, locality, and observer) to the previous record(s). (d) If the Secretary does not know whether or not a record represents the same bird reported previously, he may accomplish (b) and (c) after one or more circulations. (e) When voting, each Member shall indicate whether or not he thinks the same individual bird(s) is involved or does not know.

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

18 February 1984. Reconfirmed by consensus.

19 February 1985. Reconfirmed by consensus.

When voting on records involving what might be the same individual bird(s) returning for additional years, Members should indicate whether or not they believe this to be the case. If the bird is thought to be "undoubtedly" or "probably" the same individual returning, then for statistical purposes this series is considered a single record. A bird thought to be only "possibly" the same is generally considered to be a separate record for statistical purposes.

9 February 1985. Consensus.

e. Flocks and Aggregations

Birds in obvious flocks (e.g. a family group of swans) or pairs (e.g. nesting pyrrhuloxias, including any offspring) are all considered to constitute a single record; but birds which happen to arrive at the same spot on the same day, but not generally thought to be

"flocking together" and traveling together are considered to be separate records (e.g. 2 Philadelphia Vireos on the coast in Fall). 9 February 1985. *Consensus*.
A majority vote is sufficient to determine the number of birds in a flock or involving a single record.

31 January 1987. *Consensus*.

f. Offshore Boundaries

[The offshore limit for records shall be changed from 100 miles to the U.S. legal limit of 200 miles.]

18 February 1984. *Motion defeated*.

The off-shore limit within which the Committee shall treat records shall be 200 instead of 100 statute miles; Bylaw II.A. shall be changed accordingly.

9 February 1985. *Motion passed*.

The Bylaws should be amended such that the Northern and Southern boundaries of the adjacent ocean of California are "lines drawn as extensions of the border with Mexico and the border with Oregon", rather than as "latitudinal lines drawn westward from the two western corners of the State".

31 January 1987. *Motion passes. Bylaws amended accordingly*.

{This affects only the boundary with Mexican waters, as the boundary with Oregon waters is the same under both systems.}

For the offshore limit, replace 200 statute miles with 200 nautical miles.

31 January 1987. *Motion passed*.

[CBRC coverage should extend out to 200 nautical miles from the offshore islands, not 200 nautical miles from the mainland.]

31 January 1987. *Motion failed*.

Adjacent ocean is herein defined as that area within the US Fisheries Conservation Zone which lies south of 42° N latitude (a line drawn west from the Oregon border). This area is within 200 nautical miles of the nearest point of land in California, except to the extent the southern boundary is truncated by areas under the jurisdiction of Mexico pursuant to international law.

12 January 1991 *Motion passed*

g. Photographs

Slides should be submitted and circulated in archival holders.

31 January 1987. *Consensus*.

Photographs of specimens should show a ruler with the bird, in at least the views showing critical dimensions.

31 January 1987. *Consensus*.

If duplicate slides are submitted, it should be made clear what film type was used for the original slide. (This is because different films vary widely in color balance.)

31 January 1987. *Consensus*.

2. EVIDENCE

a. Additional Evidence

Additional information on any record to be discussed at an Annual Meeting should be solicited from the observer prior to the meeting.

29 November 1975. Motion Passed.

The Secretary should obtain as much information as possible for records submitted with "insufficient" support.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

Every effort should be made to obtain photos to accompany written records submitted to the Committee.

13 February 1982. Consensus.

Records that seem correct but for which insufficient evidence is submitted were discussed. The Committee felt that each record must be considered on its own merits and each Member must decide individually the value of the evidence.

13 February 1982. Consensus.

Any Member having information on a record, which is not attached to the record at the time such Member receives the record for voting, shall send that information to the Secretary (may be attached to the Member's voting form if desired). The Member shall not add the information to the record directly during a circulation.

31 January 1987. Motion passed.

Members may obtain additional comments and information on their own, to be forwarded to the Secretary, rather than requesting that such work be done by the Secretary. On the other hand, the Members should discuss the situation with the Secretary prior to requesting such outside review if it seems logical that the reviewer may need or benefit by receiving a copy of the entire file.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

b. Criteria for New and Substantial Evidence

The 1978 Bylaws adequately define the term "new evidence" for resubmitted records.

13 February 1982. Consensus.

The determination of what constitutes "new and substantial documentary evidence" shall be left up the Secretary.

9 February 1985. Consensus.

If a question arises as to whether new evidence is "new and substantial", the matter should be decided at the next Annual Meeting. A majority vote is needed to accept the evidence as "new and substantial".

18 January 1986. Consensus.

[Various revisions of "new and substantial" were discussed, prompted by what some felt was a rather lax and ambiguous nature to this term. The intent was to allow for easier re-review of records and not need to hide behind this term.]

18 January 1993 Motions failed.

For previously accepted records, any member may bring the record to an annual meeting and request that it be re-reviewed. A simple majority vote is then required to re-review the

record. Previously rejected records continue to require new and substantial documentary evidence for re-review.

18 January 1993. Motion passed.

3. CIRCULATION

a. General Procedures

Records to be discussed at an Annual Meeting should be recirculated just before the meeting so that they will be fresh in everyone's mind.

27 November 1975. Consensus; but later discarded as impractical.

A record will not be recirculated if it receives a 10-0 vote on the first round, unless there are specific comments by Members to recirculate it or the Secretary believes it should be recirculated; a record with a 9-1 vote will be recirculated if the reject vote has pertinent comments.

7 March 1981. Motion passed; amendment to the 1978 Bylaws.

The Secretary shall add to each record at the top of the first page, using a stamp, the following information: name of species, reporting observer, date, locality.

7 March 1981. Consensus.

[Circulations of a record will be limited to two rounds following addition of new evidence.]

13 February 1982. Motion defeated.

There should be no change in our current procedure in regard to recirculation of records receiving a 10-0 or 9-1 vote on the first round. According to the Bylaws, the Secretary has the right to recirculate such a record if he feels that Committee comments so warrant. A Member may ask for a recirculation on his first-round voting form.

19 February 1983. Consensus.

Concerning first state records, the Secretary should be certain that all good reports have been submitted before circulation.

19 February 1983. Consensus.

Members should keep circulating records no more than two weeks and preferably much less time.

9 February 1985. Consensus.

Members should package circulating record batches in sturdy envelopes for mailing.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

Members should not use third-class mail as the US Post Office does not forward third-class mail and this will lead to delays or lost batches.

16 January 1993

The Committee may adopt additional methods of dealing with published records of review-listed species for which documentation was not available. Such record may be statistically accepted or rejected without circulating through the Committee. Decisions of this nature may be made at the Annual Meeting. Records without sufficient details may be formally rejected by majority vote. Any record accepted by this procedure must receive all (or all but one added in 1990) of the votes of the members present at such meeting. Any use or publication of such accepted records by the CBRC shall be

accompanied by a clear indication that the record was not accepted under normal procedures; such records are considered statistically accepted or rejected only.

30 Jan 1988. Motion passed.

Given the electronic age there is a growing interest in submitting votes and comments via electronic means. It was agreed that if the current Secretary has the ability to receive correspondence in this manner, it is acceptable for Members to do so.

18 January 1992. Consensus.

b. Annual Meeting and Final Circulation

The Bylaws shall be revised to the following effect. A record brought to an Annual Meeting because it has not received a final decision after three circulations shall be discussed. No final decision shall be made at the Annual Meeting. Instead, the record shall receive a final vote during a fourth and final circulation to those Members on the Committee at the start of said Annual Meeting. The record shall be accepted if it receives all or all but one "accept" votes and rejected if it receives two or more "reject" votes.

18 February 1984. Motion Passed. Bylaws revised accordingly.

The Bylaws shall be revised to the following effect: A record that has received a decision during its regular three circulations but is brought to a Committee meeting at the request of a Member shall be discussed. If the original decision was made on the first or second rounds, the Committee shall decide by vote whether to (1) uphold the original decision or to (2) continue the interrupted series of circulations. An affirmative vote of at least two Members shall be needed to cause recirculation. A lesser vote shall result in the original decision being finalized. If the original decision was made in the third circulation, a final decision shall be reached in the same manner as for a record brought to the meeting because no final decision was reached during three circulations.

18 February 1984. Motion passed. Bylaws revised accordingly.

Records substantively discussed at a meeting should circulate next to that same Committee, even if the record was not going on its fourth round (i.e., brought to the meeting at the request of a member after first or second round).

30 Jan 1988. Consensus.

4. VOTING

a. Personal Judgment of Records

Members should place less emphasis on the observer's qualifications and more on the evidence.

24 November 1973. Consensus.

Individual Members may use the British Rarities Committee method to arrive at a personal decision regarding records of possible escapees, but the Committee as a whole should not be bound to that system.

9 February 1985. Consensus.

b. Categories

The categories of voting will be: Acceptable; Acceptable identification, but questionable origin (majority agrees); Not acceptable; Not acceptable due to obvious escape (majority agrees).

24 November 1973. *Consensus; now treated in the 1978 Bylaws.*

{The 1978 Bylaws listed the categories of voting as: Accept; Reject, identification questionable; Reject, origin questionable; Reject, viable status of population questionable.}

Replace "origin questionable" with "natural occurrence questionable".

31 January 1987. *Motion passed. Bylaws amended accordingly.*

Replace "viable status of population questionable" with "establishment of introduced population questionable".

31 January 1987. *Motion passed. Bylaws amended accordingly.*

c. Abstention

[The voting form should include a category of abstention from opinion due to lack of knowledge. An abstention vote is removed from the voting total until the 6-vote minimum is reached. If this should happen, the record in question will be brought up at the Annual Meeting.]

29 November 1975. *Motion defeated.*

d. Secretary as Voting Member

The Secretary should be a Voting Member.

27 November 1976. *Consensus.*

The Committee agreed to investigate and report on the possibility of changing the Bylaws to make the Secretary a non-voting Member.

16 March 1980. *Motion passed; but proposal defeated on 7 March 1981.*

[The Secretary should be a non-voting Member.]

7 March 1981. *Motion defeated; the 1978 Bylaws remain the same.*

e. Acceptance of Natural Occurrence

[If a record is accepted unanimously on the basis of identification, it shall require only a majority vote for acceptance on the basis of origin {now natural occurrence} (rather than the usual all or all but on "accept" votes).]

19 February 1983. *Motion defeated.*

[The minimum vote for acceptance of a possible escapee should be 7:3 rather than 9:1.]

9 February 1985. *Discussion.*

[A record receiving a fourth and final circulation shall have its votes evaluated in the following manner: a record receiving all or all but one "accept" votes shall be accepted. A record receiving two or more "reject" votes in the categories "identification questionable" or "establishment of introduced population questionable" shall be rejected. A record receiving five or more "reject" votes in the category "natural occurrence questionable" shall be rejected; otherwise the record shall be accepted.]

31 January 1987. *Motion defeated.*

[A record receiving a fourth and final circulation shall have its votes evaluated in the following manner: a record receiving all or all but one "accept" votes shall be accepted. A record receiving two or more "reject" votes in the categories "identification questionable"

or "establishment of introduced population questionable" shall be rejected. A record receiving five or more "reject" votes in the category "natural" occurrence questionable" shall be rejected; otherwise the record shall be accepted on some as-yet-undefined supplemental list.]

31 January 1987. Motion defeated.

Two motions discussed decisions during the fourth circulation: a record shall have its votes evaluated in the following manner: a record receiving all or all but one accept votes shall be accepted. A record receiving two or more reject votes in the categories "identification questionable" or "establishment of introduced population questionable" shall be rejected. A record receiving three or more reject votes in the category natural occurrence questionable shall be rejected; otherwise the record shall be accepted.

30 Jan 1988 Motion passed.

f. Forms

Votes on records at a meeting shall be recorded on a regular voting form listing each Member's name and vote and attached to the record's documentation. If an individual Member desires, he may submit his meeting comments in writing to the Secretary, who shall attach them to the record.

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

To cut down on the amount of paper being circulated, Members should limit their comments to significant information.

9 February 1985. Consensus.

It is felt that our validation form needs a column labeled "voting without comment". This will dispel the idea that pages have been lost from the record when future students review the record.

18 January 1986. Consensus.

The Secretary noted his preference for receiving votes without comment on a single sheet for a single batch, and that such a sheet could have comments limited to the "same bird" or "juvenile"-type of simple comment. Any reasoning for such comments, though, should be on the voting form sheet.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

g. Reversing decisions

Records previously receiving a final rejected decision must receive all or all but one accept votes to reverse that decision and become accepted. Records previously receiving a final accepted decision must receive a majority of reject votes to reverse the previous decision and become rejected; otherwise they remain accepted. Any such re-review or previously final decisions should be discussed in an appropriate annual report.

30 Jan 1988. Motion passed.

h. Miscellaneous

When a record would otherwise be accepted, but has between 2 and 5 dissenting votes relating to the issues of the date span or number of individuals within the record, then the record should be recirculated at least once more for comments on the issue. If there are then 5 or more dissenting votes regarding an identified date of occurrence or number of birds, the disputed dates or higher number will not be accepted. A final approval of at least all but one dissenting commentator is necessary to accept the expanded date span or the higher number of individuals.

21 January 1989 Motion passed.

Bylaws prohibit discussion of a record prior to each member voting on it. By consensus, it was agreed that the intent of the language was to avoid lobbying or influencing a record on the first round and did not preclude discussions between observers, commentators, or AB/AFN editors about the validity of the sighting and its possible publication.

21 January 1989 Consensus.

5. **RETRACTION**

If a record is retracted by an observer before it is circulated, it should be returned to the observer.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

The Bylaws shall be reviewed to the following effect: A record submitted to the Committee by the observer(s) involved may not be retracted after circulation has begun. The observer(s) may submit opinions or additional data that totally or partially negate the record. Such new information shall be treated as "new and substantial documentary evidence" and the record shall have its first submission terminated at the end of the then current circulation and be resubmitted under the same record number, except that if the record has already received a final "reject" vote, no further circulations need take place.

18 February 1984. Motion passed. Bylaws revised accordingly. See also Annual Report, Retracted Records.

6. **ARCHIVING**

The California Academy of Sciences in San Francisco {Department of Ornithology and Mammalogy} will be the repository of sound tapes for the CBRC. A copy of a sonogram, provided by C.A.S., is to be sent to the Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology to be stored with the record.

9 February 1985. Motion passed.

The Committee would like to have VIREO consider storing the Committee's slides. The Committee wishes to have one copy of each slide stored by VIREO kept with our records at the Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology.

18 January 1986. Consensus. Contact person appointed.

The Committee's photos should be stored in archival quality conditions as much as possible; at a minimum we should work with the Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology in replacing non-archival slide holders with archival holders.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

D. **ANNUAL REPORT**

1. **Publishing "Obvious Escapes"**

Rejections of "obvious escapes" should not be published in the Annual Report.

24 November 1973. Motion passed; but later reversed.

2. **Publishing Voting Rules**

It is a good idea to publish a summary of the rules of voting in Western Birds as an editorial.

29 November 1975. Consensus.

3. Contents

In the Annual Report, record years should be indicated, i.e., 1973 Annual Report, Records for 1972..., Records for 1973...

29 November 1975. Consensus: later found to be disadvantageous.

Similar discussion where it was agreed that we should include the year most of the records pertain to as well as the CBRC report number, e.g., 18th Report of the CBRC, Records for 1992.

14 January 1995. Consensus

If an accepted record is older than the previous ("first") state record, notation should be made to that effect in the Annual Report.

27 November 1976. Consensus.

Comments after the species are to be at the discretion of the Secretary (or author). It is desirable to publish all the dates on which the bird was present and to publish a photo, if not previously published, after submitting it to the photo editor if possible.

17 March 1979. Consensus.

The authors of Committee reports shall make every effort to acknowledge in print those persons who have acted as consultants on submitted records.

18 February 1984. Motion passed.

The inclusion of vote totals for rejected records will be left to the discretion of the author.

18 February 1984. Consensus.

The author of the Annual Report should include as many data on age and sex of reported birds is reasonably possible with accuracy.

18 February 1984. Consensus.

The author of the Annual Report should try to include all dates but may include a notation in the introduction concerning the source of dates.

18 February 1984. Consensus.

It would be appropriate for authors of the Annual Report to include a modified British Birds-style annotation following the species name that would indicate the number of previously accepted records and the number of records accepted in this report; e.g., Golden-winged Warbler (20, 3) would mean there were (a) 20 records accepted by the CBRC prior to this report and (b) 3 records accepted in this report (the sum of (a)+(b) would be the number of accepted records of the species to date).

9 February 1985. Consensus.

The names of observers that submitted records that were rejected will be listed in the Annual Report, but not with the rejected records.

31 January 1987. Motion passed. Bylaws amended accordingly to reflect current practice.

[Records offshore should be attributed to the county having the nearest mainland, unless within the mean lower low tide line of an offshore island.]

31 January 1987. Motion failed.

Authors of CBRC reports should assign bird records offshore, generally to either (a) the nearest point of mainland or (b) the nearest offshore island, if the sighting is within about 3 miles of that island.

31 January 1987. Motion passed.

Authors should assign bird records offshore, generally, to the nearest point of land (mainland or significant islands).

20 January 1990. Motion passed.

The Committee adopted a standardized 3-capital-letter abbreviations for the California counties.

31 January 1987. Motion passed.

Discussion on the question of who should have authority over the content. The consensus was the author(s) with input from the CBRC, should have final control over content, but that the editor of *Western Birds* had final control over style.

21 January 1989. Consensus.

It was agreed that we could correct mistakes made in publications where birds on the CBRC Review List were erroneously reported. For example, an Emperor Goose was printed on a San Diego Christmas Bird Count as the result of a typographical error (it should have been typed in as a Snow Goose). There was no need to vote on the record and authors have the ability to correct such mistakes.

14 January 1995. Consensus.

We discussed whether reports submitted to AB or AFN editors and others but were never published. It was agreed that these could be published as "acquired through indirect means." Further, there is no need to review them unless we receive further information.

14 January 1995. Consensus.

4. RETRACTIONS

If a record is retracted by an observer before it is circulated, it should be returned to the observer. But if it has been published somewhere it should be published in the Annual Report, but as a retraction if so requested.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

5. AUTHORSHIP and PUBLISHING

Bylaw VI.G.(1) shall be changed to allow for publication of the Committee report by a person or persons not including the Secretary. The word "and" is to be changed to "and/or".

9 February 1985. Motion passed.

The Committee will continue its present policy of having the Annual Report done by a Committee Member other than the Secretary.

18 January 1986. Consensus.

It was generally agreed that an attempt would be made to publish the next few Annual Reports more often than once a year in hopes of catching up on the backlog and to keep abreast of the old records review project.

31 January 1987. Consensus.

6. OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The criteria for resubmission of species in the unresolved category of the State List shall be the same as for all other records.

7 March 1981. Motion passed; amendment to 1978 Bylaws.

A discussion took place to place symbols next to those species which are only supported by details (i.e., sight records). An alternate proposal was made to annotate species supported only by sight records and those supported by identifiable photographs, video, or voice recording.

15 January 1994. Motion passed

2. NOMENCLATURE

Use A.O.U. {Check-list of North American Birds} (1957 plus supplements) in preparing a State List.

27 November 1976. Motion passed.

Use A.B.A. {Check-list of North American Birds} common names, with each exception voted upon, and A.O.U. {Check-list} (1957 plus supplements plus recent proposals) for scientific names and sequence.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

The Committee shall revise the official State List according to the nomenclature and sequence in the 1983 Sixth Edition of the A.O.U. Check-list and attempt to publish it in Western Birds.

18 February 1984. Motion passed. Subcommittee formed.

3. INTRODUCED SPECIES

[All introduced-established species should be placed at the end of the main list, if on the State List at all, or listed in a sublist ("regular established introduced" of the main list.)]

27 November 1976. Motion defeated.

[Introduced-established species should be placed within the regular State List but set apart either with an "I" (meaning introduced) following the species name or by indentation or other method (annotation etc.)]

27 November 1976. Motion defeated.

All well-established exotics should be included in the main State List and indicated as such. These would be introduced species with a viable population breeding in the wild for at least 10 years.

17 March 1979. Motion passed.

[The main list should be divided into separate sublists for native and introduced species.]

16 March 1980. Motion defeated.

Instead of having a separate list for introduced species, symbols (in the main list) will be used: "I" for introduced; "E" for extirpated.

16 March 1980. Consensus.

A permanent subcommittee on introduced birds is established.

18 January 1986. Motion passed.

The Introduced Birds Subcommittee shall seek information on any introduced species it desires and when it has enough information then it shall submit this information to the entire CBRC for consideration and voting. No other person may submit records concerning introduced birds to the CBRC. All such material submitted will be referred to the Subcommittee.

18 January 1986. Motion passed.

The Subcommittee will be comprised of three persons, Chair and two {other} members, all of whom shall be Members of the CBRC at the time of their appointment, to be appointed by the CBRC Secretary with the consent of the entire membership. Each such member shall have a vote in the Subcommittee. The Chair of the Subcommittee may appoint other members, none of whom shall be a voting member of the Subcommittee.

18 January 1986. Motion passed.

When a record submitted by the Subcommittee comes to the CBRC for consideration, the usual rules of voting and circulation are in effect.

18 January 1986. Motion passed.

The point at which a species data file will be considered complete enough for treatment by the CBRC will be determined by the Subcommittee.

18 January 1986. Motion passed.

Criteria adopted by the CBRC for its review of these records, and to which the Subcommittee should determine to have been met prior to submissions, are found in the following guideline(s):

The Committee will also review records of breeding populations of introduced species not on the State List, but only if evidence is submitted that attempts to prove (A) the correct identification of the species and (B) the viability of the population. To be judged viable, (1) a population must have bred in the state for 15 consecutive years, (2) in general, the population is increasing or stabilized after an initial period of increase, (3) {it should be} judged to have occupied all geographically contiguous suitable habitat to such a degree as to sustain the population and thought unlikely to significantly diminish, and (4) {it should} occupy an environment judged similar enough in ecological factors (e.g. climate, vegetation, food, shelter, competitors, predators) to the species' natural habitat, or to {that of} other successful introductions, that permanent establishment seems likely. A population maintained primarily by recurrent releases, either intentional or accidental, or {that} requires intense management for survival, shall not be considered viable.

18 January 1986. Consensus.

{The CBRC has changed "viable status of population" to "establishment of introduced population" in its voting categories. This change should also apply to the above guidelines.}

31 January 1987. Implied Consensus.

Non-CBRC Members may serve on the Introduced Birds Subcommittee {as voting members}.

31 January 1987. Consensus. {This allowed two Members that were leaving the Committee during 1987 to continue their service on the Subcommittee. It also represents no change in the procedure established originally, which requires only that the three voting members of the Subcommittee be Members of the CBRC at the time of their appointment.}

A consensus was reached so the words "15 consecutive years" regarding the establishment of a population, would not require actual documentation for each and every

year in the period, but rather evidence to support the consecutive nature of the period in question.

30 January 1988. Consensus.

The subcommittee will consider and, if appropriate, forward to the whole Committee for review, information regarding not only population of species which would be new to the State List, but populations of species which, although already appearing on the State List, have never had an introduced population accepted as established.

30 Jan 1988. Motion passed.

4. SUPPLEMENTAL LISTS

There should be no hypothetical list.

27 November 1976. Motion passed.

[There should be a category or second list or hypothetical list (or another title) of highly migratory birds to be used when origin is in question but the species seems correctly identified.]

27 November 1976. Discussion.

[There should be a hypothetical list which includes all species that have appeared in print but the Committee feels are not acceptable for whatever reason for the main list.]

27 November 1976. Discussion.

The State List should consist of a main list and a supplemental list that may or may not be categorized.

17 March 1979. Motion passed.

[The published State List should not include obvious unestablished escapes.]

17 March 1979. Motion defeated.

The supplemental list will include all species we as a Committee know have occurred in California unrestrained but not accepted for the main State List.

17 March 1979. Motion passed.

[There should be only a single supplemental list without categories.]

17 March 1979. Motion defeated.

The supplemental list to the State List will have the following categories:

A. Five or more Members vote to put the species on the main list or on supplemental list A.

(1) Identification uncertain.

(2) Origin uncertain.

B. Those species thought to be escapes or releases for sure. These would not be published in a field checklist but would be published with the State List in Western Birds.

17 March 1979. Motion passed.

Delete supplemental list B (species thought to be escapes or releases) from the published State List.

16 March 1980. Motion passed.

Add supplemental list category A3: Viable status uncertain; introduced species which have not been shown to have a viable breeding population continuously existing in the wild for 10 or more years.

16 March 1980. Motion passed.

There should be a separate list headed by the following words: "Records of the following species, not included on the main list, remain unresolved after full consideration by the Committee."

7 March 1981. Motion passed; amendment to the 1978 Bylaws.

Species in the "unresolved category" should be published along with the State List.

7 March 1981. Motion passed.

The "unresolved category" of the State List shall be eliminated and the Bylaws so amended.

19 February 1983. Motion passed.

[Discussion on establishing a hypothetical list for accepted species lacking records documented by specimen, photo, or voice recording.]

31 January 1987. No action.

[The issue of a supplemental list for records which have questions regarding natural occurrence was discussed.]

31 January 1987. No action.

[Discussed supplemental list: any member may propose, at a meeting, that any species previously rejected "natural occurrence questionable" be placed on such a list, no matter by what vote it had been rejected. Acceptance to this supplemental list shall be at a meeting only, and shall require all or all but one positive votes.]

30 Jan 1988. Motion failed.

All records which are not yet on the State List of those species "not accepted, natural occurrence questionable, shall be brought to the next annual meeting, where a majority vote will be needed to place the species on The Supplemental List.

18 January 1992. Motion Passed.

All records of species fitting this criteria which are not yet on the State List, and which a majority did not accept on a final vote, shall be brought to the next available annual meeting, where a majority vote will be needed to place the species on the Supplemental List. After such a record has been considered at one annual meeting, it shall be brought to additional meetings for further consideration under this paragraph only at the request of a member. A record of a species meeting the above criteria, and appearing on the Supplemental List herein described may be reconsidered at a meeting at the request of a member, but it shall require a two-thirds vote of the members at such a meeting to delete the record from the Supplemental List.

16 January 1993 Motion passed.

F. ETHICS

The Bylaws should be revised to the following effect: Neither the Secretary nor a Member may receive compensation for Committee work.

18 February 1984. Motion passed. {This does not mean that expenses may not be reimbursed.}

Committee Members shall follow all Committee decisions in all publications that they author, or annotate any deviations.

31 January 1987. Motion passed.

Members have the responsibility to not misrepresent the Committee and its decisions to others. This discussion arose because some members appeared to have used misleading statements to support personal positions even though these statements were not factually correct. It was agreed that public disagreement with Committee decisions by Members is fine, as long as Members do not misrepresent the facts.

14 January 1995. Consensus.