

MARYLAND ORNITHOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC.



**Maryland/District of Columbia Records Committee
2010 Annual Meeting
Saturday, March 13, 2010**

Meeting Minutes and Annual Business Report

The 2010 Annual Meeting of the Maryland/District of Columbia Records Committee (MD/DCRC) was called to order on 13 March 2010 at 10:20 am at the home of the Secretary, Phil Davis, in Davidsonville, MD. All members were present, including Paul O'Brien (Chair, Montgomery), Phil Davis (Secretary, Anne Arundel), Stan Arnold (Anne Arundel), Mike Bowen (Montgomery), Gwen Brewer (Charles), Paul DeAnna (DC), Bill Hubick (Anne Arundel), Mikey Lutmerding (Prince George's), Fred Shaffer (Anne Arundel), Leo Weigant (Anne Arundel), and Dave Ziolkowski (Harford). MOS Vice-President, Mark Johnson (Harford), also attended.



The 2009-2010 term Maryland/District of Columbia Records Committee. Back row (l-r): Bill Hubick; Stan Arnold; Leo Weigant, Ph.D.; Mikey Lutmerding; Mike Bowen, Ph.D.; Phil Davis (Secretary). Front row: Paul DeAnna, Ph.D.; Gwen Brewer, Ph.D.; Paul O'Brien, Ph.D. (Chair); Fred Shaffer; Dave Ziolkowski. Photo by Barbara Davis.

1. Secretary's Report. The Secretary's report follows.

1.1 Official Lists Changes and Status. Figure 1.1-1 presents the recent year annual additions of taxa to the Official List of the Birds of Maryland and the Official List of the Birds of the District of Columbia. No new taxa were added to either the Maryland or the DC Official Lists over the past year since the last Annual Meeting.

State	As of Annual Meeting:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
MD	MD List Total	424	429	432	435	435
	Species/Groups Added	(none)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Neotropic Cormorant •Northern Lapwing •Calliope Hummingbird •Cave Swallow •Townsend's Warbler 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Inca Dove •Anna's Hummingbird •Tropical Kingbird 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Cape Verde Shearwater •Say's Phoebe •Western Meadowlark 	(none)
	Subspecies or Forms Added	(none)	(none)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •"European" Whimbrel 		(none)
	Questionable Origins Added	(none)	(none)	(none)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Southern Lapwing •Great Tit 	(none)
	Exotic Origins Added	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)
DC	DC List Total	325	326	328	330	330
	Species/Groups Added	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Black-chinned Hummingbird 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Dusky Flycatcher •(Rufous Hummingbird upgraded from <i>Selasphorus</i>, sp.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Cackling Goose •Bullock's Oriole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Long-tailed Jaeger •Le Conte's Sparrow 	(none)
	Subspecies/Forms Added	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)
	Questionable Origins Added	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)
	Exotics Added	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)

Figure 1.1-1. Annual Additions to the Official Lists of Maryland and the District of Columbia.

1.2 Review Package Status.

1.2.1 Package Statistics. Figure 1.2.1-1 presents a summary, by calendar year, of completed review packages. The table shows the yearly total and average number of reports circulated, the total and average number of new reports, and the total and average number of decisions reached. Decisions categories include: "Accepted," "Accepted-Group," "Accepted-Form," "ID OK/Questionable Origin," "ID OK/Exotic Origin," and "Not Accepted."

Year	Pkgs	Weeks	#Items	#New	#Decisions	Dec%	Avg#Items	Avg#New	Avg#Decs
1985	3	72.0	40	40	13	33%	13	13	4
1986	7	21.0	61	35	35	57%	9	5	5
1987	6	17.6	59	27	43	73%	10	5	7
1988	4	15.0	33	25	20	61%	8	6	5
1989	4	26.6	35	20	17	49%	9	5	4
1990	3	35.1	30	15	12	40%	10	5	4
1991	7	18.9	65	35	36	55%	9	5	5
1992	9	18.3	75	43	39	52%	8	5	4
1993	4	13.3	41	22	27	66%	10	6	7
1994	4	25.6	39	20	28	72%	10	5	7
1995	4	25.8	63	50	33	52%	16	13	8
1996	4	25.2	51	37	33	65%	13	9	8
1997	5	21.1	68	47	49	72%	14	9	10
1998	7	19.3	107	84	81	76%	15	12	12
1999	6	17.8	84	61	50	60%	14	10	8
2000	3	15.2	27	15	20	74%	9	5	7
2001	3	25.8	44	30	27	61%	15	10	9
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	8	37.6	79	69	45	57%	10	9	6
2004	7	45.9	90	63	52	58%	17	10	14
2005	5	26.3	95	63	70	74%	19	13	14
2006	7	22.6	110	66	85	77%	16	9	12
2007	9	21.9	124	80	78	63%	14	9	9
2008	9	13.3	146	79	82	56%	16	9	9
2009	6	15.0	83	37	49	59%	14	6	8
2010	1	22.0	16	13	9	56%	16	13	9
Total	135	24.7	1665	1076	1033	62%	12	8	8

Figure 1.2.1-1. Package Statistics Summary

1.2.2 Packages in Circulation. Figure 1.2.2-1 summarizes the contents of the packages that are currently in circulation at the time of this Annual Meeting.

Year Started	Pkg	Start Date	# Items	# New
2009	130	10/25/2009	18	10
	131	12/30/2009	14	14
		Totals (2)	32	24
		Averages	16	12
	Grand	Totals	32	24
	Grand	Averages	16	12

Figure 1.2.2-1. Packages Currently in Circulation

1.2.3 Acceptance Rate. From last year's Annual Meeting to this year's, the committee's cumulative acceptance rate was 79.4 percent. This rate, shown in Figure 1.2.3-1, is determined by dividing the total number of accepted decisions (which includes "Accepted", "Accepted-Group", "Accepted-Form", "ID OK/?? Origin", and "ID OK/Exotic Origin") by the total number of decisions--which includes the "Not Accepted" decisions).

Decision/Status	Cumulative Data					
	AM 2005 #Decisions	AM 2006 # Decisions	AM 2007 # Decisions	AM 2008 # Decisions	AM 2009 # Decisions	AM 2010 # Decisions
Accepted	499	521	610	665	723	760
Accepted-Group	13	19	25	28	31	33
Accepted-Form	10	11	13	15	16	16
ID OK/?? Origin	8	8	8	9	10	10
ID OK/Exotic Origin	2	2	2	2	2	2
Not Accepted	150	152	165	180	203	211
Cumulative Decisions Grand Totals:	682	723	823	899	985	1032
Cumulative Acceptance Rate:	78%	79%	80%	80%	79.4%	79.6%

Figure 1.2.3-1. MD/DCRC Acceptance Rate

1.2.4 Member Package Review Performance. The Secretary compiled and summarized the length of time each member retained each review package. A handout was provided that provided the average turnaround time of all MD/DCRC members. Individual members were also provided with specifics of their package-by-package review performance.

1.3 Database Contents Status Report.

1.3.1 Database Categories. Figure 1.3.1-1 presents a glossary of the status/decision categories currently used in the MD/DCRC database.

Decision	Decision / Status Description
S&R	Sight records from the committee's baseline document: Stewart & Robbins, The Birds of Maryland and the District of Columbia, 1958.
DCRC	Records from the (defunct) DC Records Committee baseline.
Accepted	Reports accepted by the committee.
Accepted-Group	Reports accepted only as to a species group or genus--where all other species of this group are reviewable at the observed location.
Accepted-Form	Reports accepted as an unusual subspecies or form.
ID OK/?? Origin	Reports accepted for the species/group reported, however, the committee questioned whether the bird was a "natural" vagrant or a "wild" bird.
ID OK/Exotic Origin	Reports accepted for the species/group reported, however, a majority of the committee felt the bird was of exotic (i.e., captive) origin.
Not Accepted	Reports not accepted by the committee.
Circulating	Reports currently in circulation and under review by the committee.
Recirculate	Reports where no committee decision was reached during the latest circulation. The report will be circulated again.
Ready	Reports ready for circulation. All relevant reports, or a sufficient number of reports, have been submitted.
Reviewable	Reports of a species/location that meets the committee's Review List criteria. Additional observer data is believed to be outstanding.
USNM	Reports of specimens in the US Museum of Natural History that have not otherwise been published. Specimens are to be verified and reviewed by the committee.
Unreviewable	Reports with insufficient descriptive identification details to permit a review by the committee. Typical for many older published sight records.
Non-Review Species	Reports submitted for a species that does not meet the committee's Review List criteria.
Reopened	Reports reopened for consideration by the committee. Reopened reports are "removed" from the committee's database statistics and replaced by the reopened report.
Research	Apparently unpublished reports - investigation in process to determine if documentation exists.
Withdrawn	Reports withdrawn by the original observer(s).
Retracted	Published reports - subsequently retracted by the observer(s).

Figure 1.3.1-1. MD/DCRC Database Status/Decision Definitions

1.3.2 Database Contents. Figure 1.3.2-1 summarizes the current contents of the MD/DCRC database by status/decision category and indicates the changes (“deltas”) in totals from the previous year. During 2009, only 19 “historical” reports were added to the database, largely from the data uncovered by the Secretary from historical journal research with inputs from Bob Ringler and his *Maryland Birdlife* database. The completion of this phase of canvassing old records, in order to bring the committee’s historical database up-to-date, is mostly complete except for a few known tasks, described further below.

State	Category / Status	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Delta
MD	Stewart & Robbins	9	9	100	85	83	81	82	81	87	87	90	116	116	26
	Accepted	258	332	362	377	381	380	424	464	486	560	609	661	667	58
	Accepted-Group	2	2	9	9	10	10	10	11	15	21	24	26	28	4
	Accepted-Form	-	1	3	3	3	6	7	10	11	13	15	16	16	1
	ID OK/?? Origin	5	5	5	5	6	7	8	8	8	8	9	10	10	1
	ID OK/Exotic Origin	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
	Not Accepted	119	124	127	132	133	132	140	147	149	161	174	193	200	26
	Circulating	45	28	9	15	49	78	29	13	84	57	33	35	32	-1
	Recirculate	22	21	27	25	23	18	49	54	34	25	38	19	26	-12
	Ready	102	49	64	61	69	78	77	112	82	126	163	162	172	9
	Reviewable	35	45	36	35	42	44	66	249	520	679	694	757	764	70
	Unreviewable	221	224	238	246	248	255	257	287	291	307	306	309	324	18
	USNM	-	-	6	26	21	14	14	11	10	9	0	1	1	1
	Hold	11	11	16	15	15	15	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Report	0	3	5	0	0	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Reopened	-	-	5	5	6	7	4	8	8	8	8	8	9	1
	Research	-	-	-	-	-	-	361	46	41	-	13	9	11	-2
	Non-Review Species	109	112	119	136	139	140	139	357	164	174	176	185	185	9
	Withdrawn	4	5	7	7	8	9	9	11	11	13	10	9	11	1
	Retracted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	5	4
MD Totals		942	970	1135	1179	1233	1275	1693	1871	2003	2289	2365	2523	2607	242
DC	Stewart & Robbins	-	-	25	8	8	8	7	9	9	10	12	24	23	11
	DCRC	-	-	-	-	-	-	75	10	10	10	10	10	10	0
	Accepted	14	16	19	20	20	20	25	35	45	50	56	62	63	7
	Accepted-Group	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	5	5	1
	Not Accepted	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	6	10	11	5
	Circulating	1	4	1	2	7	13	4	5	6	2	5	2	0	-5
	Recirculate	1	2	4	4	5	2	9	3	4	4	3	-	1	-
	Ready	6	2	3	7	14	21	15	19	8	11	10	11	12	2
	Reviewable	1	7	9	5	6	4	10	45	62	71	80	75	75	-5
	Unreviewable	8	13	17	16	28	30	27	37	33	33	34	32	33	-1
	USNM	-	-	4	26	27	15	14	31	32	32	-	1	2	-
	Report	0	10	10	2	2	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Research	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	6
	Non-Review Species	3	3	3	6	7	7	11	26	20	20	30	39	42	12
	Withdrawn	-	-	-	-	0	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	0
	DC Totals		34	57	95	98	126	125	206	228	240	261	260	283	283
??	Stewart & Robbins	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	2	-1
	USNM	-	-	-	2	3	5	7	3	3	3	-	-	-	-
	Reviewable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	5	4	-6
	Unreviewable	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	4	8	7	7	-1
	Research	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	4	-	-	-	-
	DCRC	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Withdrawn	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
?? Totals	0	0	0	2	3	7	17	7	7	11	21	15	13	-8	
DE	Total						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	
VA	Total						1	4	6	6	7	7	11	11	4
NY	Total						1	1	5	1	1	1	1	0	
Grand Totals		976	1029	1234	1283	1369	1409	1922	2126	2270	2559	2655	2834	2924	269

Figure 1.3.2-2. MD/DCRC Database Summary as of 03/11/2010 and Changes from Previous Annual Meetings. The questionable jurisdiction data records (“??”) typically deal with historical records, mostly from the Potomac River, which cannot be determined to be MD, DC, or VA. [DE, VA, and NY data entries will be deleted in future tabulations.]

1.3.3 Reports Received Per Year. Figure 1.3.3-1 indicates the number of reports the MD/DCRC receives each year. The table separates “current” reports (defined as initial documentation received within six months after the first sighting date) and “historical” reports (documentation received more than six months after the first sighting date). The committee’s emphasis in locating and obtaining old published historical reports during the period from 1995 through 2009 can be easily seen from the numbers of historical reports received during this period. From 1994 through 2009, the number of “current” (i.e., contemporary) reports received per year has averaged approximately 54, up from 47 the previous year. The committee suggested that it might be more accurate to change the six months parameter to two years for future reports.

Year	Reports Received	Historical Reports	"Current" Reports
1966	1	1	0
1979	2	0	2
1980	1	0	1
1981	1	0	1
1982	1	0	1
1983	1	0	1
1984	3	0	3
1985	4	0	4
1986	2	0	2
1988	2	2	0
1989	2	0	2
1990	3	0	3
1991	25	0	25
1992	13	1	12
1993	26	2	24
1994	58	11	47
1995	186	141	45
1996	103	56	47
1997	264	221	43
1998	44	14	30
1999	201	156	45
2000	55	6	49
2001	81	39	42
2002	42	12	30
2003	448	401	47
2004	193	121	72
2005	148	87	61
2006	272	188	84
2007	140	63	77
2008	173	109	64
2009	103	19	84
2010	14	2	12
Totals	2614	1650	964
Average (1994 - 2009)		n/a	54

Figure 1.3.3-1. MD/DCRC Reports Received per Year

1.3.4 ID Articles and Index. The committee now has 741 identification and reference articles in its files. This information is summarized in Figure 1.3.4-1. During the next year, the Secretary plans to inventory, sort, and better organize these files.

Annual Meeting	Number of ID and Reference Articles Indexed	# Taxa
2006	445	n/a
2007	574	81
2008	639	93
2009	681	100
2010	741	104

Figure 1.3.4-1. MD/DCRC Identification and Reference Article Index Status

1.4 Communications Report.

1.4.1 Acknowledgements. Since last year's Annual Meeting, 133 acknowledgements were mailed to observers as shown in Figure 1.4.2-1.

1.4.2 Decision Reports. Since last year's Annual Meeting, notices for 47 decisions were sent to 104 observers for Packages 124-129 as also shown in Figure 1.4.2-1.

Annual Meeting	# Acknowledgements	# Decisions	# Decision Observers Notices
2006	124	84	211
2007	127	100	239
2008	144	72	181
2009	112	83	154
2010	133	47	104

Figure 1.4.2-1. Acknowledgements and Decision Notices Mailed.

1.4.3 External Communications Status Report. Figure 1.4.3-1 presents a summary of significant communications with people or organizations outside of the committee's routine annual MD and DC sighting report communications.

Month	Year	Contact	St	Topic
Nov	2009	Russell, Will	AZ	Status of Maryland rare bird records
Jan	2010	Beaton, Giff	GA	Status of Virginia's Warbler records in the east
Mar	2010	Iliff, Marshall	MA	Status of MD Flamingo records
Mar	2010	Barton, Jim	MA	Status of MD Mew Gull records
Mar	2010	Graves, Gary	DC	Requests re singing Swainson's Warbler reports (Smithsonian Institution)

Figure 1.4.3-1. Summary of Prior Year's MD/DCRC Non-Routine External Communications.

1.4.4 Email Traffic. Figure 1.4.4-1 summarizes the Secretary's outgoing MD/DCRC-related email message communications over the past years, reflecting an increase in relevant email, listserver messages, digital documentation communications, and efforts to track down historical documentation. There was an unusual spike in 2008 email communications due to the Secretary's efforts to capture all published citations dealing with albatrosses in the western North Atlantic region.

Calendar Year	# MD/DCRC Email Messages Sent
1997	64
1998	66
1999	307
2000	128
2001	287
2002	570
2003	731
2004	610
2005	1212
2006	1472
2007	1647
2008	1981
2009	1562

Figure 1.4.4-1. Secretary Email Messages Sent by Calendar Year

1.5 Storage Status Report. A summary of the amount of MD/DCRC storage, both hardcopy/paper and electronic, is shown in Figure 1.5-1. The committee's files currently fill the equivalent of approximately 45 document boxes. Additional committee reference material is not boxed, but is on bookshelves. These items include a journal library of *Maryland Birdlife* and *American Birds/Field Notes/North American Birds*. Other non-boxed reference material includes baseline publications such as Stewart and Robbins (1958), the *Maryland Breeding Bird Atlas*, and historical publications such as Kirkwood (1895), Coues and Prentiss (1863 and 1883), etc. The committee's electronic data files currently consume over 12.5GBs of

data storage. Currently, all electronic data is periodically duplicated and stored both on-site (in the Secretary's home in a fire-retardant safe) and off-site, typically with the Chair. The Secretary plans to implement web-based external storage within the next year.

Media	Contents	Amount of Storage
Paper/Hardcopy	Reports/records/packages files	30 document boxes
	Video/audio tapes	1 document box
	Identification/reference files	6 document boxes
	Correspondence/miscellaneous files	12 document boxes
	Supplies	3 document boxes
	Maryland Birdlife journals	2 feet of shelf space
	American Birds journals	2 feet of shelf space
	Historical references (S&R, AOU, etc.)	3 feet of shelf space
Electronic	Documents and databases, etc.	6.2 GB
	Electronic sighting documentation	6.3 GB

Figure 1.5-1. MD/DCRC Storage Status

1.6 MD/DCRC Resource Summary. The Secretary has summarized in Figure 1.6-1, the various office and information technology resources that are required to operate and support the committee.

Type	Resources
Communications Services	Postage, internet, email
Reproduction Services	Bulk copying, film duplication
Office Supplies	File folders, file jackets, storage boxes, envelopes (letter size and flat), mailing labels, CD labels, file labels, photo marking pens, highlighters, ink pens, staplers
Consumables	Printer/copier paper, staples, copier/printer toner cartridges, copier/printer drum, laser toner cartridges, print heads, blank CDs, blank DVDs
Hardware	Desktop computer, black & white laser printer, color laser printer, duplex copier, flatbed scanner, film scanner, CD/DVD burner, external backup disks, video capture interface
Software	Operating system (MS Windows Vista), office suites (MS Office 2007, Office Perfect X4), browsers (IE and others), geobrowser (Google Earth), database (Paradox 11), report writer (R&R 12.5), file manager (Power Desk Pro 7), email client (Eudora 7.1), PDF application (Adobe Acrobat Standard 8), Photo processing (Adobe Photoshop Essentials 7), Screen capture (SnagIt 8), CD/DVD burner (HP SmartMedia), CD/DVD Labeling (exPressit SE 2.1), Media players (Windows Media Player, WinDVD), Video editor (Pinnacle Studio 11), Scanning software (HP Director), OCR programs (Readiris Pro, OmniPage Professional)

Figure 1.6-1. MD/DCRC Office and Information Technology Resources

1.7 MOS MD/DCRC Web Pages.

Updates. The Secretary has continued to update and publish MD/DCRC data products to the committee's web pages on the MOS web site. The latest major update to the MD/DCRC data products was on 28 Jun 2009. Technical and management difficulties delayed new material from being posted. John Christy of the Frederick Chapter is now serving as temporary Webmaster. The Secretary occasionally reminds the local birding community via e-mail messages on the local birding listserver (MD Osprey) that MD/DCRC web site information is available for reference. The link to the committee's web pages is:

<http://www.mdbirds.org/mddcrc/rcindex.html>

MD/DCRC Web Page Redesign. The Secretary has marked up the design of the current MD/DCRC web page, providing new links and information; however, the update is currently on hold until the current MOS web page support situation is resolved.

New Data Products. The following MD/DCRC new data products have been posted on an unofficial MD/DCRC blog site at the URLs indicated:

- **Bibliography.** A complete bibliography of all published articles that reference MD or DC rarities. This data is presented in two formats: chronologically and sorted by author. The hope is that most or all of these articles can eventually be linked to as on-line PDF documents. Many are already available online.

<http://mddcrc-resources.posterous.com/mddcrc-bibliography>

- **Historical Checklists.** A master bibliography was compiled of historical checklists that encompass Maryland and/or DC. The hope is that most or all of these checklists can eventually be linked to as PDF documents. Some are already available online.

<http://mddcrc-resources.posterous.com/md-and-dc-historical-checklists>

MD/DCRC Blog site. The Secretary has established a MD/DCRC blog site for casual use:

<http://mddcrc-blog.posterous.com/>

MD/DCRC Intranet Site. The Secretary has also established a private Intranet site that can be used in the future for document sharing, including future electronic reviews (e.g., reference material, eReviews).

Future Projects:

- **Master Historical Checklist.** The Secretary plans to generate an integrated master checklist to indicate when and by which authority each species was added to “official” state checklist.
- **MD Pelagic Web Page.** To help stimulate participation in Maryland water pelagic trips, the Secretary has suggested that the MOS web site include a section related to pelagic birding featuring the species that can be expected and the rarities that are possible on Maryland waters pelagic trips. The recommendation included that a link be provided to the only operator who currently runs Maryland water pelagic trips (usual disclaimers). The intent of this suggestion is to provide information to new birders and encourage more pelagic birding participation. After two years of trying to get someone to take on this task, the Secretary will drop this item from the Annual Meeting minutes.

1.8 Projects Status Report.

AOU Check-List 49th and 50th Supplement Update. AOU Checklist supplements are now issued annually, each July, therefore updates are now required annually. The MD/DCRC database was last modified to conform to the latest AOU Checklist supplements, through Supplement 48. The 49th supplement was issued in July 2008 and the 50th Supplement was issued in July 2009. The Secretary still has to implement changes to conform to these updates. **Open.**

Historical Canvass. A number of related initiatives are still underway to capture all historical “reviewable” reports. Overall, this project is approximately 98 percent complete and should be completely finished by next year’s Annual Meeting. Continuing data capture initiatives include:

- **Museum Collection Specimens.** A final summary of missing/outstanding reviewable specimen leads is being prepared to be provided to Roger Clapp at the USNM for final investigation and closure. **Open**
- **Other Museums MD and DC Canvass.** Other North American museum datasets have been obtained and these still need to be analyzed for any reviewable taxa for MD and DC. A few

reviewable specimens have already been located at other museums and will be tracked down and photographs and/or measurements will be requested. **Open.**

- **Bird Banding Laboratory Data.** This historical canvass project involves mining the Bird Banding Laboratory (BBL) database for band numbers, banding schedules, and photo or documentation reports of reviewable species. The Secretary has worked this project over the past year and has made good progress. An "open issue" and final actions summary is in preparation to coordinate with Danny Bystrak at the BBL. **Open.**
- **Maryland Birdlife Outstanding Documentation Status.** It is now thought that virtually all outstanding published citations, including CBC citations, have been captured, copied, and filed for each MD/DCRC sighting report. The next phase is to coordinate and double check the MD/DCRC data against Bob Ringler's Maryland Birdlife seasonal database. Bob Ringler has 19-years of the Maryland Birdlife "The Season" sightings in his database. The Secretary and Bob have already work closely on locating documentation for "Reviewable" reports. Bob also has many years of CBC rare bird reports in his files in case we are looking for any missing write-ups. At some point this year, the Secretary will coordinate with Bob on all of the outstanding "unreviewable" and "reviewable" reports. Likewise, Chan Robbins has hardcopy archives at PWRC that will need to be reviewed for any extant reviewable report documentation. After all historical analysis and research is complete, the committee may publish a request for information in *The Maryland Yellowthroat* for sightings for which no documentation was located. **Open.**
- **eBird.** eBird is becoming another source for historical records as observers are entering their old day lists. Most reviewable sightings are not producing reviewable documentation, but some may and other observer eBird reports are tying-in to and providing supportive information for published "Unreviewable" reports. In the reverse direction, the committee still supports uploading the MD/DCRC record data to eBird, however, the Secretary has not had a chance to engage on this project due to other related priorities.

Database Review and Validation Projects. The following projects focus on completion and validation of the MD/DCRC database:

- **Observer Reports.** With our database capabilities, the MD/DCRC can, "with the push of a button," generate a complete detailed report of records and reports for any given observer. The Secretary plans to offer such reports to observers with large numbers of database entries as a means to help detect and correct any errors and to stimulate the submission of outstanding documentation. **Open.**
- **County Reports.** The Secretary has previously provided county-specific MD/DCRC database reports to support the efforts of counties with active county listing committees, specifically Howard and Harford. With the current database capabilities, a goal is to identify a single point of contact for each county who can review and comment on the local records. Hopefully, this may lead to the capture of additional reviewable documentation. **Open.**
- **Gazetteer.** This project involves generation of an automated, database-driven gazetteer. The report generation phase is—**Closed**; however, a data validation phase, using county points-of-contacts, remains—**Open.**

Pending Database Project. The following projects are in the Secretary's queue:

- **Revised Database Categories.** The Secretary intends to expand the current database categories to include "Unpublished" for public reports (e.g., from listservers and web pages) that were not published or submitted to the committee. Also, the Secretary is entertaining splitting out the current "Non-Review Species" category into several additional categories that more accurately describe some historical reports, including: "Non-Reviewable Range" for species that are reviewable in

certain ranges but not from where the report occurred, and “Non-Reviewable Date,” for earlier reports that were submitted for an out of season review, which the committee no longer reviews. **Open.**

- **Observer Names and Initials.** As we move toward publishing *The Rare Birds of Maryland and District of Columbia*, we will plan to coordinate with active field birders to standardize the full names and initials that will be used for each observer. **Open.**
- **Chronology of Species Added to the Official Lists.** An earlier suggestion was to add the year of sighting to the MD/DCRC “chronology” reports, in addition to the year each species was added to the official list. The Secretary has now implemented this function.

A related action is to integrate into the MD/DCRC database the first observation dates for records that were added to the MD and DC official lists via other than MD/DCRC accepted records, which includes the records the committee accepted “via proclamation” for sight records that were recognized since the publication of our baseline, Stewart & Robbins (1958), and the formation of the MD/DCRC in the early 1980s. **Open.**

An additional related task is to locate and create a data record for the “first record” for each species, including historical species. The Secretary will pursue this task. One issue deals with “hypothetical” species to regional checklists which were then “replaced” or “upgraded” with photographed birds or specimens; in such cases, we will need to determine which should be used as the “first” observation: the first hypothetical report, or a later report based on physical evidence? This task relates to the “Historical Checklist” project, above. **Open.**

- **Loss Prevention.** The Secretary plans to implement an on-line web-based backup service for MD/DCRC data. This capability is expected to be implemented within months. **Open.**
- **Species Review Status Change History - Database.** The MD/DCRC species Review List status change history information will be converted from an esoteric spreadsheet into a format more conducive to automation, publication, and capture of annual updates. **Open.**

2. Subcommittee/Special Project Reports

Outreach Subcommittee Activities. A few years ago, the MD/DCRC Outreach Subcommittee was decommissioned after compiling and presenting a slide presentation on Maryland records to many of the MOS local chapters. However, the following continuing outreach-related topics were discussed at the meeting:

- **Maryland’s Next Species.** The Secretary developed a presentation that focuses on “Maryland’s Next Species,” based on *The Maryland Yellowthroat* survey of 2001 and the attending article published by Marshall Iliff in 2002. This presentation is easily adaptable to the new MD “Next Species” poll and analysis that was completed in 2009 by Bill Hubick and Matt Hafner (http://www.billhubick.com/docs/Marylands_Next_Ten.pdf). **Ongoing.**
- **Managing Rarities.** The Secretary is planning to produce an article on “managing rarities,” encompassing lessons-learned from recent private property rarity events. However, this project is currently not very high on the priority list. **Open.**
- **Dastardly Duos.** The Secretary still advocates that someone undertaking this project, modeled on the Tucson Audubon Society newsletter column, of focusing on regional identity challenges. The Secretary does not envision this as a MD/DCRC function, but hopes that someone will undertake the task as a service to the birding community. This idea will be deleted from the minutes for next year’s Annual Meeting. **Dead.**

- **Regional Rarity Weekly Summary/Roundup.** Bill Hubick supports the idea of someone volunteering to compile a periodic summary report of regionally rare and other birds of interest. Such a report could be based on inputs from other regional Rare Bird Alerts, regional listservers, and eBird to provide information to MD/DC birders of notable regional events, for example, regional rarities seen in nearby states, regional sightings of locally rare Red Crossbills, arrival of Purple Martins, and other information movements, irruptions, and incursions. Bill does not envision this as a MD/DCRC functions, but hopes that someone will undertake the task as a service to the birding community. **Open.**

MD/DCRC Decision Reports and *The Rare Birds of Maryland and the District of Columbia* (RBMDC) Publication. At the 2008 Annual Meeting, the committee affirmed that, since it is highly backlogged, it abandon periodic publication of MD/DCRC decision reports in the *Maryland Birdlife* and instead move forward with the publication of a book, *The Rare Birds of Maryland and the District of Columbia*. A discussion was held on whether there would be a species account for all species, whether rare or not. The Secretary indicated that he envisioned that the current official checklist for MD and DC would be shown, including all species, but species accounts would not included for non-MD/DCRC species. It was agreed that the committee be sure to define and address the intended audience and scope as part of the general planning. All agreed that this makes sense and that there is plenty of time to look at this in more depth before we get into detailed planning of the book. **Open.**

3. Committee Procedures and Processes

3.1 Policy Issues:

Postage Reimbursement for Committee Members. Members are reminded to submit their expenses to the MOS Treasurer in April.

Origin vote error [MD/2006-042, Black-bellied Whistling Duck, Gaithersburg]. *Background:* The Secretary made an error in processing the results for this item, using the split vote rule for "Groups" instead of the split vote rule for "Origin." ***Status:*** At last year's Annual Meeting, the committee discussed this issue and decided to change the status of this record from "Accept" to "Recirculate" and then recirculate the report so that the current members can cast a third, and if necessary, a fourth-round set of ballots to either affirm or change the existing decision and reach a final resolution. The Secretary has not yet changed the status of this report, but will do so shortly. **Open.**

Official Lists Non-Reviewable Documentation Status Changes. The MD/DCRC Official Lists for MD and DC include an indication of the type of documentation that is available for each species; for example, specimen, photograph or video, audio recording, or written report. Occasionally a different level of documentation becomes available for species that are no longer on the Review Lists. The committee decided at the 2008 Annual Meeting that these updates to the Official List documentation types will be considered as editorial changes and can be implemented by the Secretary. Changes to documentation status during the past year include the following additions for DC photographic documentation:

Redhead
Lesser Black-headed Gull
Great Black-backed Gull
Glaucous Gull

Photo documentation policy. As more field birders undertake digital imagery and digiscoping, records committees now must consider digital imagery policies and guidance. After the 2007 Annual Meeting, George Jett and Tyler Bell drafted a photography policy for the MD/DCRC based on a policy from the AZ Field Ornithologists. The Secretary revised the first draft and circulated it to the members before the Annual Meeting for review and comments. Bill Hubick made a major edit of this document and a revised copy is provided for the members to review as an attachment to these minutes **Open.**

Subspecies Discussions. Dave Ziolkowski lead a detailed discussion and exchange of information on the topic of subspecies and the AOU Checklist.

In anticipation of the AOU's upcoming checklist supplement, now a regular occurrence in July, the committee discussed the likely forthcoming Winter Wren split. Deep mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) divergence plus pronounced vocal differences indicate that eastern and western populations are not each others' closest relatives, suggesting a tenable split of western populations into a new species, the "Pacific Wren". Bimodal splits in Western Scrub-Jay and Red Crossbill were also recognized as possibilities in this upcoming supplement.

The discussion included a brief accounting of molecular methods commonly employed in phylogenetic studies as well as the changing way that the taxonomic community has come to regard subspecies. Contrary to a common critique in the birding world, researchers purposely avoid using genes that code for traits that are selected on (e.g., feather genes, bill genes, etc.) in lieu of those that serve as molecular measuring sticks (i.e., common to most birds and reflective of population divergence). Most phylogenetic work to date has used mtDNA rather than nuclear DNA (nuDNA) owing to mtDNA's more simplistic inheritance pattern and its ability to resolve divergence patterns from more recent time. Emerging work suggests that nuDNA is comparatively much less efficient at discovering bird taxa, however, extensive nuDNA sampling has been shown to add higher confidence to population genetic studies. For phylogeographic studies though, with the expense of sequencing work at its current level, it has yet to be established whether as much benefit occurs relative to the added cost.

Despite modern molecular tools, the challenge of describing subspecific variation remains. Many of our currently recognized subspecies were described in the mid to late 1800's, when ornithologists believed that bird types were immutable forms and did not change. The advent of population level thinking in the 1930s changed all that, laying a foundation for contemporary thoughts about gene flow, isolation, and ongoing population change. Today we know, for example, that populations can become isolated, diverge genetically, and then come back into contact only to reform into a single species with a much more diverse gene pool (potentially the case with Blue-winged and Golden-winged Warblers...how many others were like this?). Not surprisingly then, when submitted to modern scrutiny, the majority of traditionally held subspecies have shown to represent far more complex and less discrete entities than previously thought (and some just incorrect, like Yellow-throated Warblers). This has led to the adoption of more judicious reference to 'forms' or 'populations' in the taxonomic community, since these designations are regarded as less assuming about the real taxonomic ranking and genetic uniqueness of historically assigned 'subspecies'.

Out of Season Reviews. It was suggested to consider undertaking out-of-seasons reviews. When the MD/DCRC was first formed, it did review some out-of-season sightings, but shortly dropped seasonality as a review criteria. Factors in favor of reinstating this policy are that it will facilitate the capture of valuable data points; however, on the other hand, this review criteria expansion would create additional work for the Secretary and the committee, especially if the review criteria were to creep and expand greatly. Generally, it was felt that the *Maryland Birdlife* and *North America Birds* seasonal editors are the proper venues for vetting these types of records. However, after a detailed discussion, the committee decided on the following:

Bill Hubick will Chair a **Seasonal Rarities Subcommittee**. The subcommittee will monitor the local information sources (e.g., MD Osprey listserver, eBird) for notable out-of-season sightings and he will approach the observer and try to obtain any detailed sighting documentation (field notes, photos, etc.) and forward this documentation to the Secretary. The Secretary will open a MD/DCRC data record and store the documentation in the MD/DCRC archives for posterity. The subcommittee will report at each Annual Meeting on items of note. Recent examples of notable sightings include a May Snow Bunting and a winter Least Flycatcher.

Voting Approach. Dave Ziolkowski and Bill Hubick facilitated a very interesting discussion about the committee voting approach, particularly as oriented toward new members, who may need several packages to "get the feel" for the voting process and voting standards.

Dave manages the Breeding Bird Survey program, has a great deal of experience with and views on working with data quality and data standards. Dave submits that, outside of actual descriptions in reports, our review comments suggest that we evaluate the same types of information (probability of occurrence, skill level, etc.) but often end up at contrasting votes simply because we may have differing ideas of what the committee is looking for in terms of weighting and/or ordering this information. While the Goals and Procedures document advocates a "mix" approach, it does not address weighting considerations, and Dave suggests that doing so could improve the committee's long-term consistency and thus record quality, without adding reviewer work or additional scrutiny. Also, we frequently internally cite the "100 year rule" (will the documentation sustain the record 100 years from now, when all of the observer and committee personalities are no longer around?); however, this 100 year rule is not described in our [Goals and Procedures document](#). Another issue we continually wrestle with is whether a first state record is subject to a higher level of scrutiny than subsequent records. The other side of this issue is that the committee is comprised of nine voting members who do intentionally bring differing views and approaches to the voting process.

The committee suggested that Dave and Bill review the MD/DCRC governance documents and report back before next year's Annual Meeting with any recommended policy changes or perhaps develop some instructional material on the voting process for new members. Relevant documents are the MD/DCRC charter from the MOS [By-Laws and Manual of Operations](#), section 4.6.4.h of the committee [Goals and Policies document](#), and the MD/DCRC [background paper on Not Accepted Records](#) that was adopted from the [first MD/DCRC Decision Report \(Peterjohn and Davis, 1996\)](#).

Member's Ballot Feedback. The issue of providing access to members ballot and comment forms at the end of a round was discussed. When we eventually move to an electronic review process, this problem should resolve itself; however, implementation of this new process is lower on the Secretary's priority list. In the interim, the Secretary will look at other methods of providing this access, such as posting ballots on an Intranet link or by using XML technology.

3.2 Review List Changes. The following were discussed as potential changes to the MD and DC Review Lists.

3.2.1 MD List Changes.

Taxa Discussed Regarding Possible Review List Changes:

- **Brown-headed Nuthatch.** There was a bit of discussion and confusion about the status of this species; however, the committee had already moved it to MD Review List category 4C (reviewable west of the Coastal Plain) at the 2007 Annual Meeting and the committee agreed to leave it as is.
- **Loggerhead Shrike.** *Maryland Birdlife* seasonal editor Bob Ringler suggested that this species should not require reviews. Deleting this species from the MD Review List was discussed; however, the committee decided to leave it on the list. Dave Ziolkowski commented that it would be beneficial to band these birds to try and learn more about their movement and status. He will inquire about this with the Bird Banding Laboratory.

3.2.2 DC List Changes. No changes to the DC Review List were proposed.

4. Decision Issues.

4.1 Fourth Round Discussions. Two reports qualified for fourth round discussions before final fourth-round votes. Logistically, these reports will be processed in an Annual Meeting special follow-up package, Package 132. Discussion points included the following:

MD/2001-028 Le Conte's Sparrow, 11 Nov 2000, Worcester County (Pkg 128). The primary issue with this report was that the details were prepared approximately two years after the sighting; however, on the other hand, the observer is well-known for attention to and recall of details.

MD/2007-127 Cave Swallow, 15 Nov 2007, Harford County (Pkg 127). The primary issue with this report was that the report of this swallow did not include as much detail as the committee would prefer to clinch the identification; however, on the other hand, the sighting was consistent with the pattern of sightings for this species and the species has already, subsequent to this sighting, been taken off the review list.

Record Reopenings. The following items were discussed.

- **MD/2003-133 [Cave] Swallow, 06 Oct 2003, Westminster, Carroll County.** This report was originally not accepted; however, some committee members felt that the bird may have been a southwestern subspecies of Cliff Swallow. At last year's Annual Meeting, the committee decided that the Secretary would approach the observers to obtain their consent to reopen this as an unusual (southwestern) subspecies/form of Cliff Swallow for Maryland. The observers were asked for permission to reopen this report; however, they did not concur with the finding that the bird may have been a Cliff Swallow. Therefore, the status of the record will remain as is.
- **MD/1991-029 White-Tailed Kite, 26 Oct 1990, Town Hill, Allegany County.** More than five members requested that this previously Not Accepted record be reopened. This qualifies as a "consensus" reopening under MD/DCRC procedures. No new information has come to light; however, many members believe that the report may have merit and that a re-review is in order.

Records Splits. The following item is also related to records splits.

MS/2009-006 Barrow's Goldeye, female, 07-31 Jan 2009, Cambridge, Dorchester County. The accepted record indicates "possibly two" birds. The committee agreed that only one bird was documented and the record should reflect that. The Secretary will make that change.

5. Circulation/Species Issues and Concerns. General discussions was encouraged of any recirculating and pending reports.

5.1 Reports currently queued for recirculation. Figure 5-1 lists reports that are currently queued for recirculation. Members were welcome to discuss any of these reports.

State	Rec#	Species	Start	Co	Co2	Location	Observer	Observer2	Apkg	Vote1	Vote2	Vote3	Vote4	Decision
MD	2009-067	Swainson's Warbler	06/07/2009	ALGY		Green Ridge	Spears_A	Harris_K	129	4-5-0				Recirculate
MD	2008-068	Curlew Sandpiper	09/13/2008	BALT		Hart-Miller Islan	Haas_D	Collins_S	129	8-1-0	7-2-0			Recirculate
MD	2009-040	Wood Stork	04/11/2009	HWRD		Woodstock	Kinzer_J		129	2-7-0				Recirculate
MD	2009-063	Black-chinned Hummingbird	05/30/2009	P GEO		Bowie	Murawih_M		129	2-7-0				Recirculate
MD	2009-056	Black-bellied Whistling-Duck	05/31/2009	MONT		Germantown	Hamilton_K	Bukowski_RW	129	8-0-1				Recirculate
MD	2009-062	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	09/17/1960	DORC		Golden Hill	Armistead_HT		129	8-1-0				Recirculate
MD	2009-050	Tufted Duck	01/11/2009	DORC		Cambridge	Roberts_DD		129	3-6-0				Recirculate
MD	2008-078	Magnificent Frigatebird	09/19/2008	WASH		Hagerstown	Mitchell_A		128	2-5-2	2-3-4			Recirculate
MD	2001-028	Le Conte's Sparrow	11/11/2000	WORC		Bayview Farm	Iliff_MJ		128	7-2-0	7-2-0	7-2-0		Recirculate
MD	2007-127	Cave Swallow	11/15/2007	HARF		Have de Grace	McCandless_S		127	6-3-0	6-3-0	7-2-0		Recirculate
DC	2007-062	Seaside Sparrow	04/27/2007			Poplar Point	Milensky_C		127	5-4-0				Recirculate
MD	2008-079	*Audubon's Warbler	09/26/2008	CARR		Westminster	Boilinger_SM		125	6-3-0				Recirculate
MD	2008-094	*Audubon's Warbler	11/15/2008	WORC		West Ocean City	Hubick_B		125	8-1-0				Recirculate
MD	2005-066	Anhinga	05/09/2005	BALT		Loch Raven Reserv	Graff_K		112	4-5-0				Recirculate
MD	2005-057	Anhinga	09/17/2004	QUAN		Chino Farms	Gruher_J		112	2-7-0				Recirculate
MD	2004-152	Anhinga	04/12/1998	QUAN		Chino Farms	Gruher_J		112	3-6-0				Recirculate
MD	2004-017	Anhinga	04/16/2004	CLVT		Saint Leonard	Bell_T		112	7-2-0	8-1-0			Recirculate
MD	2005-036	Anhinga	04/20/2005	ANAR		Edgewater	Bell_T		112	6-3-0	6-3-0			Recirculate
MD	2000-033	Ruff	07/26/1997	BALT		Papermill Flats	Simon_SW		084	4-5-0				Recirculate
MD	2000-017	Chukar	03/24/2000	CECL		Port Deposit	Patton_H		082	0-2-7				Recirculate
MD	2002-026	*Gambel's Sparrow	11/08/1944	P GEO		Patuxent Research	Stewart_RE		082	8-1-0				Recirculate
MD	2000-061	*Gambel's Sparrow	11/11/2000	WORC		E.A. Vaughn WMA	Iliff_MJ		080	8-1-0				Recirculate
MD	2001-081	*Gambel's Sparrow	11/12/2001	MONT		Black Hill Region	Czaplak_DS		079	8-1-0				Recirculate
MD	1997-333	American White Pelican	07/11/1980	SMST		Cedar Island WMA	Maldeis_RW		076	5-1-3	5-0-4			Recirculate
MD	2000-020	Western Wood-Pewee	10/05/1992	P GEO		Laurel	Robbins_CS		076	6-3-0				Recirculate
MD	1995-024	*Oregon Junco	01/17/1971	BALT		Cockeysville	Pope_F		051	8-1-0				Recirculate
MD	1994-006	*Oregon Junco	03/28/1980	BALT		Baltimore City	Gedes_SH	Slaughter_E	051	3-6-0	0-9-0			Recirculate

Figure 5-1. Reports currently queued for recirculation.

Reports discussed included the following:

Swainson's Warbler MD/2009-067. 07 Jun 2009, Allegany County. Discussion on this "heard-only" report centered on the similarity of the song of Swainson's Warbler to Louisiana Waterthrush. Anecdotal, it was mentioned that Gary Graves of the Smithsonian, who is doing acoustical research on the Swainson's Warbler, contends that multiple commercial records of the Swainson's Warbler song are actually of Louisiana Waterthrushes. Several committee members noted the impressive thoroughness of the report.

Red-cockaded Woodpecker MD/2009-062. 17 Sep 1960, Dorchester County. Dave Ziolkowski has additional journal references on related sightings and he will provide them to the Secretary.

Magnificent Frigatebird MD/2008-078. 19 Sep 2008, Washington County. This report was discussed. The level of detail is the key issue, despite the hurricane-related timing of the report and supportive reports of other sightings north of our region.

Ruff MD/2000-033. 26 Jul 1997, Baltimore County. This Ruff report, in our recirculation queue, precedes the removal of the species from the MD Review List. This is a video clip report.

Seaside Sparrow DC/2007-062. 27 Apr 2007. This report was discussed. The level of detail reported is the key issue.

American White Pelican MD/1997-333, 11 Jul 1980, Somerset County et al. This report was in circulation when the species was taken off of the MD Review List. There are also many other reports of this species that had not yet begun a review prior to the species' removal from the MD Review List. The Secretary plans to send all of the reports of this species around at once in a single package, in accordance with the new review priorities that we are establishing. (See below.)

Western Wood-Pewee MD/2000-020, et al. See "Problem Taxa," below.

Oregon Juncos MD/1995-024 and MD/1994-006, et al. See "Problem Taxa," below.

5.2 "Problem Taxa." The following are the Secretary's "problem taxa" that require some additional workup and preparation prior to circulation:

Trumpeter Swan. The committee has a number of reports in its queue. The main issue will probably be of determining the status of the species. The species is currently on the MD Official List as a extirpated species. The Secretary needs to collect and package the latest information on the northern reintroduction programs and the decisions of other northeastern records committees before we are ready to circulate these reports

After last year's Annual Meeting, Bill Hubick drafted a MD/DCRC position paper on reviewing Trumpeter Swans. Bill and the committee welcome any feedback on this position, below. **Open.**

Status of the Trumpeter Swan in Maryland (DRAFT)

Questions of origin present significant challenges to bird record committees, and the status of the Trumpeter Swan in the eastern U.S. is an especially difficult example. Breeding programs have been releasing Trumpeter Swans since the late 1980s and early 1990s, but official labels of population status have historically been elusive. As Trumpeter Swans began appearing in Maryland with increasing frequency, questions about their status and "countability" have often been raised. Most Trumpeter Swans are not tagged or banded, which means few individuals can be traced back to a specific population. However, the majority of involved states and provinces, particularly in the Great Lakes region, now consider their populations established. These include Michigan, Minnesota, Ontario, Wisconsin, and Iowa. At the time of this writing, only New York and Ohio have yet to accept their populations as established, and it has been noted that the New York population has been supplemented by the expanding Ontario population. Because it is often impossible to confirm that an individual originates from an officially established population, the committee is faced with a question of "Innocent until proven guilty" or "Guilty until proven innocent."

The MD/DCRC intends to adopt an informal policy based on "Innocent until proven guilty." If a report establishes an identification as Trumpeter Swan, and if no details suggest provenance from a captive program or unestablished population, the record will be considered a baseline "Accepted." Note that each report will be carefully evaluated, and specific circumstances might result in a report being deemed "Not Accepted" or "Accepted with Questionable Origin." What matters most is that all Trumpeter Swan reports are recorded for future research and for monitoring the success of the re-introduction programs. Such a record will be maintained via the MD/DCRC database.

Barnacle Goose. The committee has a number of reports in its queue. The main issue will probably be of determining the status of the species. The species is currently on the MD Official List as a species of Questionable Origin. The Secretary will collect and package the latest population and vagrancy references and the related decisions of other northeastern records committees. **Open.**

Hoary Redpoll. Many reports of this species are in the committee's backlog. The Secretary intends to draft an identification key or checklist before circulating these reports to try and help standardize the member's review process in an attempt to minimize recirculations. (This is a carryover action from last year's Annual Meeting.) **Open.**

Western Wood-Pewee status. Some of the reports recount vocalizations, even though the vocalizations were not specifically described, which is problematic. However, before the committee reviews its backlog of reports, another check will be made with the Smithsonian Institution geneticists to try and determine why the DNA analysis did not work for one of the two MD USNM specimens. (This is a carryover action from last year's Annual Meeting.) It was suggested that Dave Ziolkowski might be the best person to move this forward due to his knowledge and contacts within the USGS and the Smithsonian. **Open.**

Junco subspecies. At last year's Annual Meeting, the committee decided to go ahead and circulate the Dark-eyed Junco subspecies reports that are in our queue. However, at this year's Skins Workshop at the Smithsonian, Dave Ziolkowski summarized the current state of junco taxonomy and showed some subspecies examples. As a result of this, the committee decided to hold off on reviewing these

subspecies reports until such time as something more definitive may be published to support subspecies separation. A summary of the status of the taxonomy and identification of this complex will be included in our 2010 Skins Workshop Minutes. **Open.**

Greater White-fronted Geese. The committee decided to hold off on reviewing "western" or "non-*flavirostris*" Greater White-fronted Geese until more reference material is published on this topic. **Closed.**

5.3 Species/Subspecies Priorities. There are currently approximately 184 "Ready" reports in the committee's queue. The Secretary proposes the following MD and DC review priorities in support of our future *The Rare Birds of Maryland and the District of Columbia* publication project:

1. New species
2. New possibly questionable origin species (e.g., Falcated Duck)
3. Formerly extirpated species (Trumpeter Swan)
4. Category 2 species (Hoary Redpoll, Pacific Loon, etc.)
5. Species that used to be reviewable, recently, but are no longer (American White Pelican, Anhinga)
6. Category 4 species (reviewable due to range)
7. Recurring possibly questionable origin species (e.g., Monk Parakeet)
8. (First) presumed exotics
9. (First) Category 3 subspecies (MD and DC) ("Black-backed American Robin, etc.)
10. (Subsequent) Category 3 subspecies (MD and DC)
11. (Subsequent) presumed exotics
12. Range-reviewable Category 3 subspecies (e.g., inland Ipswich Sparrows)
13. Questionable taxonomy Category 3 subspecies (e.g., juncos)
14. Historical firsts [to define the first record of species accepted prior to our MD/DCRC baseline (Stewart and Robbins, 1958)]
15. Species that used to be reviewable, quite a while ago, but are no longer (Brewer's Blackbird, Yellow-headed Blackbird, etc.)

6. Old Business:

Questionable and Exotic Origin/Introduced Species Review Policy. The committee does not currently have a formal policy to govern the submission and review of documentation of species that are presumed to be of questionable origin (e.g., Monk Parakeet) or presumed to be of exotic origin (e.g., Black Swans) and introduced species (e.g., African Collared-Doves).

At last year's Annual Meeting, the Secretary presented for comment and discussion a draft a policy based on the AOU Checklist and the ABA Checklist. Since last year, this draft was reworked again and a later version is being prepared but was not ready in time for the Annual Meeting for the members and their comments. Work on this draft will continue with the intent to have it completed and circulated for review and comment by the members prior to next year's Annual Meeting. The Secretary suggested that the committee establish a Subcommittee on Exotic and Introduced Species, similar to what has been done within some other state records committee. The Secretary, Phil Davis, volunteered to Chair this subcommittee. **Open.**

MD/DCRC Contribution Recognition Award. At last year's Annual Meeting, the committee established an MD/DCRC occasional award to recognize field birders that have supported the committee over the years with documentation (written and photographs) of review species in an effort to document the status and history of MD/DC birding. The permanent name of this award will be taken from the first recipient. The Secretary plans to submit a proposal to the committee for the first awardee. If accepted by the members, the Secretary will contact the MOS Awards Chair, John Malcom, regarding this details of presenting this award. The Secretary will suggest to the MOS Awards Chair that the MOS present award to the hosts of the recent Allen's Hummingbird and Lark Bunting. **Open.**

7. New Business / Open Discussion

None.

8. Skins Meeting. The 2010 Skins Workshop was held at the US National Museum of History (Smithsonian Institution) on 20 Feb 2010. Separate minutes will be prepared and distributed. Members who are preparing species accounts from last week's Skins Workshop should provide drafts to the Secretary by 21 Apr 2010. This list of species accounts and authors follows:

1. Brown Booby [vs. Northern Gannet ... or other boobies?] (Bill Hubick)
2. Pacific Loon [vs. COLO and ARLO] (Mikey Lutmerding)
3. Mew Gull [*L. c. c.*, *L. c. k.*, *L. c. b.* and RBGU] (Fred Shaffer)
4. Juvenal Swans [Trumpeter vs. Tundra] (Dave Ziolkowski)
5. Lesser White-fronted Goose (Leo Weigant)
6. Dark-eye Junco, subspecies [Oregon, Pink-sided, Cassiar, etc.] (Dave Ziolkowski)
7. California Gull subspecies [n nominate vs *albertaensis*] (Fred Shaffer)
8. Ivory Gull (Phil Davis) [The specific of the 1842 specimen only.]

9. Elections

New members. Members completing their voting terms are Stan Arnold, Paul DeAnna, and Leo Wiegant. The committee thanks them for all their efforts over the past years. The new members elected were: Walter Ellison (Kent), Ron Gutberlet (Wicomico), and Joe Hanfman (Howard).

Chair. Paul O'Brien was re-elected as the Chair.

Secretary. Phil Davis was re-elected as the Secretary.

10. Next Year's Meeting Dates

Annual Meeting: The date for the 2011 Annual Meeting is Saturday, 12 Mar 2011. This date, the second Saturday in March, should not conflict the MOS Board Meeting schedule. If a Lewes, DE pelagic into Maryland waters should be scheduled for this date, we will reschedule the meeting date.

Skins Workshop: A tentative date for our 2011 Skins Workshop is Saturday, 19 Feb 2011; however, the actual date will be subject to the availability of our USNM sponsor, Roger Clapp, and will be established/confirmed later.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Phil Davis
MD/DC Records Committee Secretary
2549 Vale Court
Davidsonville, MD 21035
Phone: (301) 261-0184
E-mail: pdavis@ix.netcom.com

Appendix

MD/DCRC Photographic Submission Guidelines



MD/DCRC Photographic Submission Guidelines

Version 3.03

4 May 2010

Scope. With the increasing popularity of digital photography and video, field observers now submit more digital images of rare birds to records committees. These guidelines are intended to help photographers prepare and submit images for review by the MD/DC Records Committee (MD/DCRC).

IMPORTANT: The following recommendations are only suggestions! Above all, the MD/DCRC is interested in receiving and archiving documentation of rare birds in our region. Therefore, WE ACCEPT ANY FORM OF DOCUMENTATION. If any of these guidelines seem overwhelming, please just send us what you have in any available format!

The MD/DCRC. The MD/DCRC is a deliberative body chartered by the Maryland Ornithological Society to review rare and unusual bird sighting reports and to add accepted records to the Official List of the Birds of Maryland and the Official List of the Birds of District of Columbia. General information on the MD/DCRC can be found on the committee's web page:

<http://www.mdbirds.org/mddcrc/rcindex.html>

Review Lists. The MD/DCRC maintains lists of "reviewable" rare bird species for which it would like to receive documentation. The review lists for MD and DC can be found here:

MD <http://www.mdbirds.org/mddcrc/pdf/mdreview.pdf>

DC <http://www.mdbirds.org/mddcrc/pdf/dcreview.pdf>

Submission Methods. Digital images are an excellent documentation format. They can be transmitted directly as e-mail attachments, downloaded from web sites, or mailed on CDs or DVDs.

E-Mail Considerations. Some e-mail service providers limit the total size of an e-mail message, including attachments, to 10MB. Therefore, depending on image size, multiple images may have to be transmitted in separate email messages. Video clips may also frequently exceed this e-mail size limit.

File Name Format. Descriptive file names are highly recommended to associate the date, subject, location, and the photographer associated with a given image and to help avoid general image confusion and misplacements.

Descriptive File Name Elements. Recommended elements for constructing descriptive photographic file names include the following:

Species Abbreviation. The MD/DCRC uses the standard Bird Banding Laboratory (BBL) 4-letter code abbreviations; for example, Varied Thrush = VATH. The list of BBL codes can be found at the link below:

<http://www.pwrc.usgs.gov/bbl/manual/aspeclst.htm>

State. Indicate either MD or DC.

County. Currently, the MD/DCRC uses the following abbreviations for the 23 Maryland counties (the MD/DCRC currently includes Baltimore City with Baltimore County) and DC:

County	4-Letter
Allegany	ALGY
Anne Arundel	ANAR
Baltimore	BALT
Calvert	CLVT
Caroline	CRLN
Carroll	CARR
Cecil	CECL
Charles	CHAS

County	4-Letter
DC	DC
Dorchester	DORC
Frederick	FRDK
Garrett	GARR
Harford	HARF
Howard	HWRD
Kent	KENT
Montgomery	MONT

County	4-Letter
Prince George's	PGEO
Queen Anne's	QUAN
Saint Mary's	STMA
Somerset	SMST
Talbot	TLBT
Washington	WASH
Wicomico	WICO
Worcester	WORC

Date. The MD/DCRC recommends using the international standard date format *yyyymmdd*. This format avoids confusion with potentially ambiguous international date formats and sorts into chronological order.

Photographer's Name. The MD/DCRC recommends the following format: *Lastname_initials*. For example, "Davis_PC." (Note the underscore.)

File Name Length. To ensure software and hardware compatibility and interoperability, please limit file names to 200 characters.

Case. To ensure compatibility, exclusive use of lower case letters is recommended.

Special Characters. Characters used in file names should be limited to letters (A-Z), numbers (0-9), and underscores. Dashes are acceptable. Spaces should be avoided. The following special characters should also be avoided: ~ # % & * { } \ : < > ? / | "

Sequence Numbers. If multiple images are submitted, the addition of sequence number to the end of the file name is recommended to allow the committee to easily refer to specific images in their deliberations. If there are ten or more images in a sequence, using two-digit sequence numbers is recommended.

Extensions. File name extension should reflect the file format (e.g., .jpg or .psd).

Image Annotations. Individual images may highlight various viewing aspects (dorsal, ventral, side, underneath, etc.), or plumage or soft part characteristics of a bird that support identification (spread wings or tail, open gape, undertail coverts, iris color, leg color, etc.) Descriptions of aspects angles or characteristics can be incorporated into the file name (e.g., "dorsal_view"). If image file names are uniquely annotated then sequence numbers are not necessary.

Examples. The following are examples of meaningful file names:

vath_md_anar_20090224_davis_pc_03.jpg

The above file name decodes to: Varied Thrush, taken in Maryland, in Anne Arundel County, on 02/24/2009 by Phil C Davis. This is the third image in a sequence. The image is in JPEG format.

vath_md_anar_20090224_davis_pc_spread_tail.jpg

The example above uses an annotation instead of a sequence number:

Number of Images. Multiple copies of similar poses or conditions are usually not needed if the photographer selects the best, sharpest, etc. Typically, it is not necessary to submit scores of images; however, please indicate if you possess additional images in case the committee determines that some particular characteristic requires additional scrutiny. In such cases, the Secretary may contact the photographer to obtain copies of additional images. Generally, no more than five to ten images (if available), from different angles, are sufficient.

Technical Image Characteristics. The committee will accept any image format, but the preferences below will facilitate processing and storage:

Image Size: There are two primary methods of expressing the size of a digital image:

File Size. The image file size is typically expressed in kilobytes (KB) or megabytes (MB). Typically, an image in the range from 200KB to 1MB is adequate for most reviews.

Resolution. The resolution of an image is the number of pixels wide by number of pixels high (W x H) displayed on screen. A resolution of no more than 768 x 1200 is usually adequate.

Image Format: JPEG is currently preferred. RAW images are camera manufacturer dependent and are not desired.

Photographic Web Sites. Many photo sharing web sites allow photographers to easily post images for sharing with the public. These include Flickr, Picasa, Snugmug, among others. The MD/DCRC Secretary can download image files from most photographers' web sites, with their permission.

Image Data Rights. Copyrights are acceptable for MD/DCRC submission. However, permission for the MD/DCRC to use the image in its review is implied and permission to use the image in any non-profit MD/DCRC publications

(with photographer credit) is also implied. Again, the MD/DCRC will not download or use images from photographers' web sites without expressed permission.

Narratives/Image Captions. Accompanying narratives or detailed descriptive image captions are always helpful. Caption information may be provided via email or on a web page and should reference the descriptive file name.

Caption Information. Relevant photographic image caption information could include:

- Date and detailed location of sighting/image capture
- Full name of the photographer receiving credit for the image
- Species or subspecies and any known associated information such as age, sex, plumage, etc.
- Indications of any photo editing processes applied to images

Written Reports. Accompanying written reports are always encouraged. The [MD/DCRC web page](#) includes a section with helpful information, guidelines, and sample forms to help observers prepare written descriptions.

Video Clips. Video clips are a valuable and increasingly popular documentation format. Long video footage should be edited down into shorter clips that capture the relevant characteristics (including any vocalizations). Title captions are welcome enhancements. In addition to standard narrative comments, written narrations of time hacks of where to find specific viewing aspects, behaviors, vocalizations, etc. are encouraged. The MD/DCRC will accept video clips in any popular standard format, including .avi, .mpg, .wmv, etc.

Point of Contact. Sighting documentation, including photos and video, should be submitted to the MD/DCRC Secretary. Also, please contact the Secretary for questions about or help with these guidelines:

Phil Davis
MD/DCRC Secretary
2549 Vale Court
Davidsonville, MD 21035
pdavis@ix.netcom.com

Acknowledgements. These guidelines were inspired by a set of guidelines posted by the Arizona Field Ornithologists. Special thanks to MD/DCRC members George Jett and Tyler Bell for work on the first version and to Bill Hubick for work on the second version.

Advanced Image Editing Tips and Guidelines

Background. Images from contemporary digital cameras are typically large in size and can be difficult to e-mail, post to or view from the web. No photo processing is required for MD/DCRC submission; however, the basic techniques below can reduce the size of your files without lessening the quality of your images and may improve your images.

Processes and Workflow Suggestions. These photo manipulation processes are fairly typical workflow processes for digital photographers and should be available in most image processing applications. The processes are typically applied in the order shown:

1. Cropping/Rotation. Cropping is the first step in reducing the size of any image. Cropping selects the most relevant portion of an image and discards the rest. Use the cropping tool in your image processing application to make a selection from the image, tightening up the original to the most critical portion, and eliminating non essential surrounding areas.

2. Resizing. Once extraneous material has been eliminated by cropping, the overall dimensions of the image should be reduced by resizing (in one dimension only, maintaining the original image HxW perspective). An image (canvass) size of less than 8.5 x 11 inches is preferred, with an image in the range of about 6 inches, in either dimension, being adequate.

3. Other Photo Editing Processing. Typical editing enhancements or adjustments may include Histogram or Brightness/Lighting level; or Coloration adjustments. Please provide a statement of any photo editing processing applied.

4. Sharpening. Sharpening does as its name suggests and sharpens the image making it look crisper and making the edges in the image more distinct.

5. Compression. The final step in reducing the size of an image is jpeg compression. Images can be easily compressed by 10:1 or so without any significant visual loss to image detail. Compression happens when you perform a "Save As" action on a jpeg format file. Each time a jpeg image is saved, some information is lost, so it is best to save it only once, after all other processing has been performed.

Original Images. It is a good practice to save copies of your original images somewhere, intact, before any processing is performed.