

the

# Colorado Field Ornithologist



## CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
COLORADO FIELD ORNITHOLOGISTS OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE--MINUTES OF THE FIRST GENERAL MEETING	Jack Reddall	2
BYLAWS OF THE COLORADO FIELD ORNITHOLOGISTS OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE	William A. Davis	4
REPORTS FROM THE CFO OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE	Jack Reddall	9
RARE AND UNUSUAL RECORDS ACCEPTED BY THE CFO OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE	Jack Reddall	21
CFO MEMBERSHIP LIST -- ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	David W. Lupton	22
A CENSUS OF THE BREEDING BIRDS OF THE ROARING FORK WATERSHED	Jerry Wooding	23
NOTES	David W. Lupton	38

COVER PHOTO: The Roaring Fork Watershed photographed from a topographic map of the Leadville quad: 1:250,000 (Sheet NJ 13-1, Series V502) prepared by the U.S. Army Map Service.

## COLORADO FIELD ORNITHOLOGISTS OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE

## MINUTES OF THE FIRST GENERAL MEETING

Jack Reddall, Chairman  
CFO Official Records Committee  
4450 South Alton Street  
Englewood, Colorado 80110

The first general meeting of the Colorado Field Ornithologists - Official Records Committee was held on May 18, 1973 at the Strater Hotel, Durango, Colorado in conjunction with the Eleventh Annual CFO Convention. Committee Members present at this meeting were: Jack Reddall, Chairman (Englewood); David A. Griffiths (Pueblo); Dr. William A. Davis (Tucson, Arizona); Hugh Kingery (Denver); Richard Stransky (Durango) and Dr. Paul Julian (Boulder). Dr. Thompson G. Marsh (Denver) was unable to attend.

The Committee addressed itself to the following business:

CRITERIA

The Committee established the following criteria as a framework under which to review and accept or reject records (Sight Reports and Recognizable Photographs):

1. A first state record must be accepted unanimously.
2. All subsequent records (rare or unusual reports) will be accepted with but one member dissenting.
3. "One-observer" reports will be considered for first state records as well as for subsequent records of rare or unusual species. This represents a departure from the "two-observer" requirement originally instituted by the Committee.

OFFICIAL STATE LIST OF THE BIRDS OF COLORADO

The Committee established the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado comprising 426 species and authorized the Committee Chairman to prepare it for publication in the Colorado Field Ornithologist. The Committee is still in the process of deliberating the status of thirteen species included in the initial list.

HYPOTHETICAL LIST

The Committee voted not to establish a Hypothetical List for Colorado since most of the Members were of the opinion that such a list would serve little if any purpose.

RARE OR UNUSUAL LIST

The Committee screened the original list of 119 species which occur casually or accidentally in Colorado and for which documentation is required, and approved a revised list composed of 97 species which will be earmarked on the Official State List.

BYLAWS

The Committee discussed the Bylaws as prepared by Dr. William Davis, made some minor suggestions and requested Dr. Davis to present them to the CFO Board of Directors for approval. These Bylaws are published in their entirety on pp. 4-8 of this issue of the Colorado Field Ornithologist. The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to Dr. Davis for developing its Bylaws.

OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. William Davis announced his resignation from the Committee effective with the close of the first general meeting since he no longer resides in the state.

The Committee decided not to adopt the numerous changes in nomenclature and arrangement of species as announced in the 32nd Supplement to the Fifth Edition of the A.O.U. Check-list for the present time.

June 12, 1973

X X X X X X X X X X X

A BIRDER'S GUIDE TO DENVER AND EASTERN COLORADO

by

James A. Lane and Harold R. Holt

L & P Photography

Box 19401

Denver, Colorado 80219

\$3.00

BYLAWS  
OF THE  
COLORADO FIELD ORNITHOLOGISTS OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE

William A. Davis  
1155 West Giaconda Way  
Tucson, Arizona 85704

The need for an official records committee to judge the validity of reports of birds in Colorado and to maintain records of these reports has become increasingly evident. With increasing knowledge and better equipment, the basis for sight records has improved; at the same time, the increasing number of birders in the field has made the acceptability of their many reports more perplexing. The only feasible documentation for the great majority of field observations is a meticulous description made at the time of observation.

Recognizing the need to evaluate these records, the directors of the Colorado Field Ornithologists created a records committee at the annual meeting held on May 20, 1972.

I. Name

The name of the committee is the Colorado Field Ornithologists Official Records Committee, hereinafter referred to as "the Committee".

II. Duties

The duties of the Committee are:

- a) to establish criteria for records of birds in Colorado, including a standard form for reporting sight records.
- b) to draw up a Colorado State Bird List based on these criteria, and publish it.
- c) to review reports of species new to the state or of rarity and decide on the acceptability of the records.
- d) to maintain records.

III. Responsibility

1. The Committee is responsible to the Officers and Directors of the Colorado Field Ornithologists, through the President, for the proper performance of its duties.

2. The Committee will publish the results of its work in the Colorado Field Ornithologist.

#### IV. Members

1. The Committee will consist of seven or more members, appointed by the President of the Colorado Field Ornithologists.

2. The members are permanent, that is, they remain as members until removed by illness, resignation or request of the President.

3. In case a member appears to be either unwilling or incapable of carrying out their part of the committee work, the President shall consult with the Directors of the CFO as to what action to take. In case the decision is to remove the member from the Committee, the President will request the resignation of the member. Such request constitutes removal from the Committee.

4. When a new member is to be appointed to the Committee, the present members of the Committee will confer as to their choice or choices. The Chairman of the Committee will inform the President of the Committee's suggestions. If these are satisfactory, the President will appoint the Committee's choice or make a choice from several suggestions. In deciding on this, the President should bear in mind the following qualifications in the prospective member:

- a) general knowledge of ornithology, particularly of Colorado birds.
- b) experience and care in field identification.
- c) place of residence, so that the Committee may have members with special knowledge of the different parts of the state, insofar as possible.
- d) acquaintance with other birders, so as to know or find out about the ability and integrity of persons making a report.
- e) personal integrity and willingness to serve.

#### V. Chairman

1. The Committee will have a Chairman chosen by the members, who will serve as Secretary General and coordinator.

2. The Chairman will be a member of the Colorado Field Ornithologists, with ex-officio attendance at the annual meeting of the Board of Directors.

3. The Chairman or a designate will report to the Officers and Directors of the Colorado Field Ornithologists at its annual meeting on the work of the Committee.

4. In case of illness, prolonged absence or other temporary incapacity of the Chairman, the Committee members will select another member to act as temporary Chairman or Secretary.

5. In case the Chairman finds it too difficult to perform the secretarial aspects of the committee work, a non-voting Secretary may be appointed to receive reports, send them on to the Committee members, compile the opinions and do such other work as seems appropriate.

#### VI. Meetings

1. The Committee will ordinarily hold one face-to-face meeting a year, at the annual meeting of the Colorado Field Ornithologists. Four members will constitute a quorum.

2. Other meetings may be held, if such seem indicated, on call of the Chairman. In calling such meetings, the Chairman will give the members adequate notice.

#### VII. Correspondence and Rendering of Opinions

1. The majority of the work of the Committee will be done by correspondence.

2. Administrative matters may be brought up by any member of the Committee, who should send copies of the same to all members. Correspondence should be continued until there is general agreement on the subject. If no agreement is reached, the matter should be brought up at the annual meeting for face-to-face discussion.

3. Requests for opinions as to the validity of reports should originate with the Chairman or his designate, who should receive all reports.

4. Opinions as to the validity of a report should be rendered only to the Chairman or his designate on request. Members should not discuss the record nor their opinion of it with other members of the Committee or the reporters at least until after they have rendered their first opinion. They may however, consult other persons who may have special knowledge of either the bird or the person making a report.

5. Opinions rendered by each member should be frank and unbiased, based on that member's best judgment with an open but rigorous mind. As a help toward maintaining this standard, individual decisions are to be confidential within the Committee. The Chairman will report decisions of the Committee as a whole.

#### VIII. Photographic or Sight Records

1. All reports of species of birds new to Colorado, of rarity, or of decidedly unusual nature as to time or place should be submitted to the Chairman of the Committee. (Since definition of these terms will be part of the criteria to be decided later, all reports which appear to be of new species, rarity or decidedly unusual nature should be submitted to the Chairman.)

2. The Chairman of the Committee will decide whether the report should be submitted to the Committee as a whole. Reports which are obviously inadequate will not be processed further. Reports which are of interest but are not species new to the state nor of rarity, nor controversial will be screened by the Chairman and referred to an appropriate Committee member for confirmation.

3. Reports of new species, rare species or of a controversial matter will be referred to all members of the Committee in the form they were received. The first member of the Committee will study the report, arrive at a conclusion as to the validity of the report, and send this opinion with reasons for the decision back to the Chairman. The first member then sends the report on to the next member of the Committee who goes through the same steps until the last member returns both a personal opinion and the report to the Chairman. The Chairman, unlike the other members of the Committee, may arrive at an opinion after seeing the comments of all other members, if so desired.

4. Should members of the Committee submit a report they will not render an opinion since it is assumed they consider their own report valid.

5. Should a Committee member feel unable or unwilling to render an opinion, that member may state "no opinion". Such a reply is not considered as either favorable or unfavorable. If, however, a member states "no opinion due to inadequate data", this is considered as a vote against accepting the record.

6. For species new to the state, if all members of the Committee agree that the bird was correctly identified, the record is accepted. For rare species or species of a controversial nature, if all members or all but one of the members agree that the bird was correctly identified, the record is accepted.

7. If a majority of the members feel the bird was incorrectly identified or the report as submitted is not adequate for definite identification, the report is rejected.

8. In other cases, the report along with the comments received on the first round is again circulated to the Committee members for a second judgment. If neither accepted nor rejected on the second round, the report is to be brought up for discussion at the annual meeting.

#### IX. Collected Specimens

1. Records based on collected specimens will be those published by a recognized ornithologist, or seen by at least one Committee member or a designate. Attention will be paid both to the adequacy of identification of the specimen and to its documentation as a specimen taken in Colorado.

2. A designate need not be in Colorado, i.e., if a skin is in a museum outside the state, a recognized ornithologist at that museum may be the designate.



3. In case of doubt as to the identification of a collected specimen, the matter will be brought to the entire Committee for decision.

#### X. Records

The records of the Committee should be maintained on standard forms. Such forms should be made available for reporters to use in the submission of records.

#### XI. Procedures

1. The Committee will follow the usual rules of order.
2. These bylaws should be reviewed as seems appropriate, at least yearly, and amended as needed for the Committee to carry out its duties to the Colorado Field Ornithologists.
3. The bylaws may be amended by the Directors of the Colorado Field Ornithologists at any meeting at which a majority of the Officers or Directors are present, or by correspondence in which a majority of the Officers and Directors express their opinion to the President, by a two-thirds vote.

Adopted at Durango, May 19, 1973.

X X X X X X X X X X X

BIRDS OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK

by

Allegra Collister

Publications Department  
Denver Museum of Natural History  
Denver, Colorado 80206

\$1.00

## REPORTS FROM THE CFO OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE

Jack Reddall, Chairman  
CFO Official Records Committee  
4450 South Alton Street  
Englewood, Colorado 80110

RUFF/REEVE - - - - Philomachus pugnax

The CFO Official Records Committee has thoroughly reviewed the documentation submitted with regard to the reported occurrence (Colorado Field Ornithologist, Number 9, July 1971, page 22) of a Reeve at the Cherry Creek Reservoir on September 13, 1964. In addition to the submitted written documentation by the observer, the Committee was able to examine four good color photographs, also submitted by the observer. Following an exhaustive study, the Committee ruled to reject this report feeling that the bird in question most probably was an immature Buff-breasted Sandpiper. Therefore, the Ruff/Reeve remains an invalid species for the state of Colorado.

## Chairman's comment:

The CFO Official Records Committee spent more than nine months researching this report before rendering its decision since field separation of immature Buff-breasted Sandpipers and Reeves is extremely tricky unless the conspicuous white oval patches on either side of the base of the tail of the Reeve is observed. Normally, the Reeve must be flushed in order to see these oval patches clearly. Unfortunately the four color photographs do not show these patches since the bird was standing in all pictures. The written documentation made no mention of the presence of oval tail patches. The Chairman discussed the report extensively with the observer on several occasions and the observer was uncertain as to whether he noticed any oval patches. Nevertheless, the Committee felt that the pictures were of good enough quality to pursue the matter further. The four photographs were submitted to John Bull, Department of Ornithology, American Museum of Natural History, New York City who was kind enough to compare them with the skin collection at the Museum along with Mr. Harold Wellander of Oakdale, New York. Mr. Bull felt convinced that the pictures in question depicted a Buff-breasted Sandpiper. Mr. Wellander also requested Dr. Phil Buckley, Head, Ornithology Department, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York to examine the pictures. Dr. Buckley concurred with John Bull's identification, stating further that he felt the bird was most likely an immature. The Chairman next forwarded the photographs to Van Remsen, Department of Zoology, University of California (Berkeley) who passed them on to Guy McCaskie. Mr. McCaskie stated unequivocally that the bird was a Buff-breasted Sandpiper. Dr. Joseph Jehl, San Diego Natural History Museum, agreed with Mr. McCaskie's opinion.

The Chairman (who saw exactly a bird in the same plumage at Cherry Creek Reservoir, August 28, 1971--a Buff-breasted Sandpiper without white oval tail patches) and Van Remsen examined the skin collection at the University of California (Berkeley) of both species. While there are a few subtle differences in coloration, fall Reeves and immature (or fall) Buff-breasted Sandpipers bore a remarkable resemblance although there were many size differences among the Reeves. The only evidence speaking in favor of the bird being a Reeve came from Mr. Alan Baldrige of Pacific Grove, California who had considerable experience with Ruffs/Reeves in Great Britain. However, the Committee felt that the evidence was overwhelming in favor of the bird being a Buff-breasted Sandpiper and so rendered its final decision. All documentation, photographs (including a set taken by Van Remsen comparing skins of the two species in question from the Berkeley collection) and correspondence are on file with the Official Records Committee for all to inspect should they so desire. In closing, it should be pointed out that there is a good lesson for all of us as field observers to learn from this report--always attempt to see all field marks for any species suspected of being as rare as a Reeve would be in Colorado. All the observer had to do was flush the bird for positive identification at the time.

June 30, 1973

X X X X X X X X X X X

VAUX'S SWIFT - - - - Chaetura vauxi

The CFO Official Records Committee has investigated the report of a sighting of a Vaux's Swift five miles west of Delta, Delta County on October 29, 1972. Following a review of the documentation presented to substantiate this report, the Committee voted to reject it as being too sketchy and unconvincing. Therefore, the Vaux's Swift is considered invalid as a species for inclusion on the Official State List at this time.

Chairman's comment:

Differentiating Chimney Swifts from Vaux's Swifts in the field is a most challenging task at best and even in good light under ideal conditions, it can be quite tricky. In a letter dated October 2, 1971 from Guy McCaskie of Imperial Beach, California to Dr. William A. Davis (then of Grand Junction), Mr. McCaskie, discussing field identification of these two species, writes:

"The Chimney Swift most closely resembles the Vaux's Swift, but it is a slightly larger and darker bird. A Vaux's Swift, when seen in good light, is a dusky brown bird; it has a very pale

throat, cheeks and upper breast, with this paleness often extending well down towards the belly; the top of the head is darkest (sometimes appears to have a cap); the rump is always noticeably pale, and contrasts sharply with the blackish tail. The Vaux's Swift flies with a very rapid wing-beat and does very little gliding. One rarely hears the Vaux's Swift calling, for the voice is less intense than that of the Chimney Swift, the notes are all run together, and it is on a higher pitch. The Chimney Swift appears blackish, and the pale chin and throat area contrasts sharply with the blackish upper breast (I have never seen such sharp contrast on a Vaux's Swift); the rump area is only slightly paler than the rest of the back, and there is never the conspicuous pale rump present on most Vaux's Swifts. In flight the Chimney Swift does much gliding on wings that appear curved backward and downward in 'bow shape', and the wing-beats are much less rapid than those of the Vaux's Swift. The call of the Chimney Swift is quite loud; it is a series of clearly detached 'pwi - pwi - pwi - pwi' notes, and frequently heard when the birds are present."

Mr. McCaskie concludes by saying:

"Here in California we see many hundreds of Vaux's Swifts in April and May, and therefore become very familiar with them; their manner of flight, flight silhouette, calls and general plumage patterns and colors are deeply entrenched in our minds by late May. When a Chimney Swift puts in an appearance, it looks larger and flies with less hurried mannerisms. However, positive identification of a Chimney Swift requires caution and care, and there are still small unidentified dark swifts seen in southern California during the summer months. There is always the danger of a soiled Vaux's Swift (one roosting in chimneys) looking like a Chimney Swift as far as plumage characters go, but flight mannerisms and call notes should be diagnostic."

Dr. Davis, in his Birds in Western Colorado (1969), makes reference (page 21) to Chimney and Vaux's Swifts as follows:

". . . status and identification by sight uncertain; short gray swifts seen migrating with White-throated Swifts on three occasions could be either species."

Certainly all Colorado field observers should be on the alert for small Chaetura swifts in the western part of the state. It is not impossible that both Chimney and Vaux's Swifts occur here. Hopefully it will not be too long until the Committee receives a well-documented sighting which will validate the occurrence of the Vaux's Swift in our state.

July 4, 1973

BLACK-EARED BUSHTIT - - - - Psaltriparus melanotis

The CFO Official Records Committee has examined all documentation submitted in connection with the reported occurrence of a Black-eared Bushtit in the Canon City area (Fremont County) during July of 1971. An account of the occurrence of this species was published in the Colorado Field Ornithologist, Number 10, November 1971, page 19. Following two rounds of voting and direct discussion at its meeting in Durango on May 18, 1973, the Committee decided not to accept this report on the basis of the confusion surrounding this being a distinct and separate species from the Common Bushtit (Psaltriparus minimus). Therefore, the Black-eared Bushtit is not considered as valid for inclusion on the Official State Bird List.

## Chairman's comment:

This was a most difficult decision for the Committee as evidenced by the voting. Obviously the Committee can not establish what is and what is not a legitimate species. This is left for the professional ornithologists to wrestle with. Currently the Black-eared Bushtit enjoys the distinction as a full and separate species on the A.O.U. Check-List of North American Birds, Fifth Edition (1957). However, there is a good deal of controversy as to its exact status among some of the professionals with some claiming it to be conspecific with P. minimus. The next edition (or possibly a future supplement) to the North American Check-List probably will settle this issue. Based on the detailed documentation submitted by and the experience of the observer involved, the Committee readily accepted the fact that a "black-eared" variety was indeed seen. However, until more is learned about these varieties and conclusions are made to determine its exact status, the Committee felt obligated not to accept the Black-eared Bushtit at this time. Probably the taking of a specimen some time in the future will be necessary to provide the answer as to the status of "black-eared" forms in our state. The Official Records Committee encourages and welcomes further documentation being submitted regarding this matter.

July 4, 1973

CACTUS WREN - - - - Campylorhynchus brunneicapillum

The CFO Official Records Committee has investigated the reported sighting of a single Cactus Wren from near Campo, Baca County on June 11, 1968 (Colorado Field Ornithologist, No. 6, Summer 1969, page 26). During the course of its investigations the Committee contacted the two observers involved and subsequently received reports in writing from both. Unfortunately, neither observer kept any notes at the time of the sighting and thus were unable to provide adequate documentation to substantiate their report. Therefore, the Committee was forced to reject this report due to the lack of sufficient supporting details. The Cactus Wren remains to be added to the Official State List for the time being.

## Chairman's comment:

This is a classical example of an age old problem of not recording good field notes at the time of an observation. There is a strong possibility that both observers saw a Cactus Wren in the Campo area (certainly the habitat was good), but in view of the lack of timely and adequate details, the Committee had no choice but to find as it did. The Cactus Wren should be looked for and expected in the drier areas of the southern part of our state and it should be only a matter of time before good records are presented to the Committee for consideration. For those field observers who are uncertain as to what is rare or unusual in our state, they should refer to the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado as published in issue No. 17 of the Colorado Field Ornithologist. All species earmarked with a double asterisk \*\* have been designated as rare or unusual and for which the Committee is interested in receiving written (and photographic) documentation. Anything not on the list obviously would be new for the state. In both cases, any sightings should be well documented with good and timely details.

July 8, 1973

"LAWRENCE'S" WARBLER - - - - Vermivora "lawrencei"

The reported sighting of a hybrid "Lawrence's" Warbler in the Golden (Jefferson County) area on May 14, 1963 has been reviewed by the Official Records Committee. Based upon the documentation submitted, the Committee has ruled to reject this report and as such should not be included on the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado.

Chairman's comment:

Hybrid warblers (Vermivora chrysoptera x pinus) resulting in "Brewster's" Warbler (Vermivora "leucobronchialis") and "Lawrence's" Warbler (Vermivora "lawrencei") pose a very complex situation and considerably more work is required into the intricate relationship of these forms. The subject is discussed in some detail by John Bull in his Birds of the New York Area (1964) pages 365-368 and by Richard H. Pough, Audubon Land Bird Guide (1946) pages 152-155. Both Blue-winged Warblers and Golden-winged Warblers are quite rare and irregular migrants in the western United States and as such the occurrence of either of the extremely rare hybrids in our state most certainly would be a noteworthy record. To emphasize this point, consider these sets of statistics (Bull, 1964):

During an 18-year breeding census (1916-1933) at Wyanokie-Wanaque (Passaic County, New Jersey), a hilly region averaging 500 feet with elevations up to 1200 feet, the Golden-winged Warbler outnumbered the Blue-winged Warbler by more than 2 to 1 and the "Brewster's" Warbler (dominant) outnumbered the "Lawrence's" Warbler (recessive) by more than 3 to 1. The following figures represent "total" breeding adults during the 18-year period: Golden-wing, 948; Blue-wing, 445; "Brewster's", 13; and "Lawrence's", 4.

October 16, 1973

OLIVE WARBLER - - - - Peucedramus taeniatus

The CFO Official Records Committee has reviewed documentation submitted to support the sighting of an Olive Warbler from the vicinity of McCoy, Eagle County on May 23, 1970 (Colorado Field Ornithologist, No. 9, July 1971, p. 32). Based on the documentation supplied, the Committee has ruled to reject this report. The Olive Warbler, therefore, is not included on the Official State List for Colorado.

## Chairman's comment:

This report unquestionably was the most difficult for the Committee to handle since its inception. After two rounds of consideration and voting, unanimous agreement from all seven Committee Members could not be attained. As a result the Olive Warbler report was discussed in detail at the Committee's first meeting in Durango on May 18, 1973. Since unanimous agreement (a basic criteria for acceptance of a species new to the state) still could not be attained following this discussion, the report had to be rejected. The primary stumbling blocks connected with acceptance centered around the following facts:

- 1) This is a species of the open coniferous forests of the mountains of the southwestern United States, and so far as can be determined has never before been observed or recorded outside of its normal range. As such, one of the members (the Chairman) felt that all basic and diagnostic field marks should have been observed and recorded. Unfortunately, if observed, the following key marks were not reported:
  - a) No mention made whether there were any flank markings or not (the Olive Warbler has none).
  - b) No mention made of the decidedly forked tail.
  - c) No mention made as to whether the back was marked with striping or not (it is unmarked in the Olive Warbler).
  - d) No mention made of whether the rather conspicuous white areas in the end of the tail (not at all unlike that displayed by the Hooded Warbler) were seen or not.
- 2) Neither of the observers had had previous experience with the bird.
- 3) The observers did not provide any basis for eliminating any other closely appearing species or discuss what other species it might have been.

The Committee recognized the observers involved as reliable and experienced. It is regrettable more clearly defined details were not submitted on such a rare bird.

July 8, 1973



TRICOLORED BLACKBIRD - - - - Agelaius tricolor

The CFO Official Records Committee has reviewed documentation presented to support the sighting of one male Tricolored Blackbird present in the Colorado Springs area from April 18 through April 20, 1969. The Committee voted to reject this report as far too unconvincing to establish the occurrence within Colorado of a species with such a restricted range. Therefore, the Tricolored Blackbird is not acceptable for inclusion on the Official State List based on this report.

## Chairman's comment:

A verified occurrence of such a colonial and restrictive species within the boundaries of our state would be truly astonishing. With the exception of the white borders to the red epaulets, other differences between A. tricolor and A. phoeniceus are minor and quite subtle -- tricolor having a glossy blue-black plumage with a silky luster, dark red epaulets, shorter bill and primaries. Several experts also feel that the color range of the area bordering below the red epaulets within phoeniceus is large enough to encompass that of tricolor thus making the collection of a specimen almost a must in order to satisfactorily accept the occurrence of the Tricolored Blackbird anywhere outside of its normal range.

July 8, 1973

BOAT-TAILED GRACKLE - - - - Cassidix mexicanus

The Official Records Committee has completed investigation of documentation (written and photographic) submitted to substantiate the observation of a Boat-tailed Grackle from Gunnison, Gunnison County (specifically on and near the campus of Western State College) commencing with the summer of 1970 and each subsequent summer through 1973. Based on the documentation submitted, the Committee has ruled to accept this record and include it on the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado. An adult male of this species was first observed and reported on May 16, 1970 by Dr. A. Sidney Hyde, Mr. Don Radovich and Dr. R. E. Marquardt, all of Gunnison. The bird remained in the Gunnison area until about mid-August of 1970 when it disappeared. It, or another bird, reappeared in May of 1971 and took up residency in the same general area, remaining throughout the summer (specific details not available). The bird again summered in the same place in 1972 (specific details again not provided). During the two years, 1971 and 1972, there is some question, as yet unanswered, as to whether or not a female was also present. On April 18, 1973, probably the same bird took up residency almost in the exact same locale as in previous years. This time, Mr. David Galinat of Palisade, Colorado, was able to secure a number of excellent color photographs which were forwarded to the Committee to enhance the reports already received from the three Gunnison observers.

## Chairman's comment:

The Official Records Committee wishes to express its deep appreciation to the three original observers, Dr. A. Sidney Hyde, Mr. Don Radovich and Dr. R. E. Marquardt for their patience and understanding in dealing with the Committee on this report. Unquestionably the Chairman pestered these three gentlemen unmercifully for supporting documentation of this first record of a Boat-tailed Grackle in Colorado. The Committee is grateful for their endurance and cooperation. The Committee is also appreciative of the efforts of one of its charter members, Dr. William A. Davis now of Tucson, Arizona, for his perseverance and assistance in pursuing this report with the Gunnison observers.

For those who like to be up-to-date, the Gunnison bird is now listed as the Great-tailed Grackle (Cassidix mexicanus) in accordance with the "Thirty-second Supplement to the A.O.U. Check-List of North American Birds". This species can be differentiated from the Boat-tailed Grackle (Cassidix major) by at least one reliable field mark - its yellow eye (C. major has a brown or dark eye).

October 2, 1973

HOARY REDPOLL - - - - Acanthis hornemanni

The Official Records Committee has reviewed written documentation surrounding the reported sighting of three Hoary Redpolls in the Golden area of Jefferson County on February 21, 1964. Based upon the documentation presented, the Committee has ruled not to accept this record as a new species to be added to the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado.

## Chairman's comment:

This is another one of those extremely tricky observations - field separation of "look-alike" (Common Redpoll vs. Hoary Redpoll) species. Although these two species are not impossible to distinguish in the field, it requires a most careful and critical examination under excellent viewing conditions in order to segregate the two, even when both species are present in the same flock. In rejecting this report, the Committee was not necessarily questioning the observers' abilities; rather the Committee was simply not convinced of the accuracy of this sighting based on the details submitted. It should be noted that the Committee has set a high standard for itself in order to accept a new species for Colorado where the area of doubt has been reduced to a bare minimum (acceptance requires a unanimous vote). It is felt that it is far better to reject a Sight Report where there is an element of doubt than to grant acceptance for the sake of building an impressive State List. In this way, and only in this way, can the credibility of the Colorado State List be ensured. This may appear very arbitrary to many, but nevertheless this is the posture the Official Records Committee has established for itself. In conclusion, the Chairman would like to point out once again that convincing documentation must be submitted for all Sight Reports as acceptance hinges on this contingency. Hoary Redpolls should be expected in Colorado. Unquestionably a convincing report of a sighting within our boundaries will be forthcoming in the future.

September 27, 1973

SMITH'S LONGSPUR - - - - Calcarius pictus

The Official Records Committee has completed its review of the reported sighting of "several" Smith's Longspurs along U.S. Highway #385 near the crossing of the Republican River in Yuma County on April 29 and 30, 1966. Based upon the documentation submitted, the Committee has ruled to reject this report thus excluding it from the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado.

## Chairman's comment:

This is a clear case of good probability of a species occurring in the right place and at the right time, but unfortunately only very meager documentation to substantiate the sighting was presented to the Committee. Key field marks either went unnoticed or were noted but went unreported. The Committee had no alternative but to turn down the report.

October 2, 1973

X X X X X X X X X X X

WAXBILL - - - - Estrilda sp.

The CFO Official Records Committee has examined documentation presented to support the presence of an apparent pair of Waxbills (genus Estrilda) in the Colorado Springs area from about May 1, 1970 to about July 20, 1970. The birds were observed and reported by Mr. and Mrs. Dominic A. Bartol, Jr. in the vicinity of their home at 2718 North Prospect in Colorado Springs. Mr. Bartol was able to obtain several excellent color photographs of these birds which frequented his feeders periodically during the summer of 1970. Mr. Bartol also reported that both birds exhibited brood patches indicating that they nested in the area. However, from the pictures supplied by Mr. Bartol, brood patches were not readily apparent to the Committee. Regarding the birds' habits, Mr. Bartol reported, "It may be that these birds (2) were escapees from an unknown importation. However, may it be mentioned that during the month or so of fairly regular daily observations, the birds were not tame and a blind was set up to get them used to it and to enable me to get somewhat close to them. Communal feeding with House Finches was compatible, but arrival of any other species such as Robin, Grackle, Scrub Jay, Starling and House Sparrow triggered the Waxbills to flee. They ate solely white millet and disregarded sunflower seeds, peanut butter mix and suet. A nearby bird bath was frequently used for drinking and vigorous

bathing when unmolested. The birds were about two inches shorter (tip of beak to end of tail) than a House Finch."

Based upon the written documentation and color photographs (which are on file with the Official Records Committee) submitted by the Bartols, the Committee has accepted this report and has ruled that the Waxbill be listed as an "Escape". It is however, not acceptable for inclusion on the Official State List of the Birds of Colorado.

Chairman's comment:

This is an interesting record supported by good photographic and written evidence. Mr. Bartol reported that Mrs. Julia Wagner had the birds identified by Chandler Robbins who stated they were "St. Helena Waxbills" (no genus or specific names supplied). Based upon a cursory check made by the Chairman, the birds were probably Red-eared Waxbills (Estrilda astrild) which are small (4 1/2") finch-like birds and which are "resident, often abundant, throughout the greater part of Ethiopian Region, including East and Central Africa. Occurs in flocks in neglected cultivation, lush grasslands and in rank grass and bush, often near water".<sup>(1)</sup> Another reference to this species relates to its appearance in Great Britain, "a small finch-like cage bird from Africa with whitish breast, pink belly, wax-red bill and conspicuous red eyestripe, frequently escaping but not establishing itself".<sup>(2)</sup> Although a check of local pet shops in the area by Mr. Bartol revealed that none of them handled this particular species, it is highly probable that it could have escaped from nearby Fort Carson with its highly mobile population. The treatment of escapes poses a very perplexing problem when compiling a list of birds. For those interested in a brief dissertation on the subject, it is suggested that they refer to the Birds of the New York Area by John Bull (1964) pages 468-474.

October 14, 1973

- 
- (1) A Field Guide to the Birds of East and Central Africa by John G. Williams (first American Edition, 1964) pages 257 and 266.
- (2) Collin's Pocket Guide to British Birds by R. S. R. Fitter and R. A. Richardson (1952) page 31.

RARE AND UNUSUAL RECORDS ACCEPTED BY  
THE CFO OFFICIAL RECORDS COMMITTEE

Jack Reddall, Chairman  
CFO Official Records Committee  
4450 South Alton Street  
Englewood, Colorado 80110

WHIMBREL - Numenius phaeopus

One, observed at CF&I Lakes, Pueblo County, May 14 through 16, 1972 by Van Truan, who submitted written documentation which is on file with the Committee. (File No. 19-72-15)

WHIMBREL - Numenius phaeopus

Four, observed at CF&I Lakes, Pueblo County, September 3 through 5, 1971 by Van Truan, Lois Schultz and Mike Schultz. Written documentation along with color photographs submitted by Van Truan and on file with the Committee. (File No. 19-72-13)

Chairman's comment: Fall records for this species are very few; thus the sighting and photographing of four at one location is noteworthy.

WHIMBREL - Numenius phaeopus

Two, observed at CF&I Lakes, Pueblo County, May 18, 1971 by Van Truan. Written documentation provided by Van Truan and on file with the Committee. (File No. 19-72-14)

FLAMMULATED OWL - Otus flammeolus

One female, a road-kill, from the Montrose area, Montrose County about November 1, 1972 reported by Dr. A. Sidney Hyde of Gunnison. The skin is in the collection of Western State College. (File No. 28-72-23)

PHILADELPHIA VIREO - Vireo philadelphicus

One, observed near the Gunnison River about five miles northeast of Gunnison, Gunnison County by Dr. A. Sidney Hyde. Written documentation supplied by Dr. Hyde which is on file with the Committee. Observed on August 18, 1972. (File No. 51-72-24)

CORRECTION

This is a correction to the article "Rare and Unusual Records Reviewed by the CFO Official Records Committee", published in the Colorado Field Ornithologist, No. 16, June 1973, p. 24.

CURVE-BILLED THRASHER - Toxostoma curvirostre

Under "Chairman's comment", the Chairman erred in reporting that there are no specimens for the State of Colorado. Indeed, there is one specimen, an adult male collected two miles southwest of Granada, Prowers County, by L. Turner on March 25, 1951 which is in the collection of Western State College. (File No. 43-72-19)

June 30, 1973

X X X X X X X X X X X

## CFO MEMBERSHIP LIST -- ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

compiled by

David W. Lupton  
Colorado State University Libraries  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

## NEW MEMBERS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS

## CORRECTIONS

General Membership

- Blomberg, Goren - change of address to: Central Plains Experimental Range, Nunn, Colorado 80648.  
Creighton, Dr. Phillip D. - change of address to: Dept. of Biology, Towson State College, Baltimore, Maryland 21204.  
Hendricks, Mrs. Philip - change of address to: 305 East Maplewood Avenue, Littleton, Colorado 80121.  
Porter, David K. - change of address to: Box 43A, Star Route, Willow, Alaska 99688.  
Whorton, Mrs. Helen - change of address to: 1020 Green St., Apt. 809, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.

A CENSUS OF THE BREEDING BIRDS OF  
THE ROARING FORK WATERSHED

Jerry Wooding  
Colorado Rocky Mountain School  
Carbondale, Colorado 81623

Introduction

The land drained by the Roaring Fork River is a typical drainage system west of the Rocky Mountains. The Roaring Fork Watershed (hereafter RFW) is a basin tipped westward, down about 6,000 feet from the Continental Divide, to the point where it spills out into the Colorado River. Within this area, five life zones are stacked altitudinally, each life zone containing various "habitats" (Bailey and Niedrach, 1965, page 45: ". . . the broad area where the species may be found . . .").

The distance from the origin of the Roaring Fork River at Independence Pass to its confluence with the Colorado River at Glenwood Springs is approximately seventy miles by car along Route 82. The width of the oval bowl averages about forty miles. All of Pitkin County lies in the RFW along with parts of Eagle and Garfield Counties.

It seemed worthwhile to study the breeding birds in the RFW to provide a basis for future scientific work, to begin a study of the changes which will occur using birds as biological indicators, and to provide a checklist for birdwatchers.

The Study Area

At an altitude of 5,876 feet, the Roaring Fork River flows into the Colorado River. From that point, moving upward, the hills and parks are covered with Sagebrush (habitat I on Table 1) - occupying the more level ground with porous soil; Scrub Oak (II) - on the dry foothills and above 7,000 feet on south-facing slopes, and Pinyon Pine-Juniper (III) - the dominant vegetation below 7,000 feet and on dry areas above that altitude. Along the watercourses are found cottonwoods and willows: the Low-altitude Riparian (IX) habitat.

At about 8,000 feet, a point marked along the Roaring Fork River by the town of Aspen, the scene changes dramatically. Here altitude becomes the critical factor and the mature forest is Engelmann spruce - subalpine fir. Disturbances by man and by nature complicate the pattern by allowing seral stands of Douglas Fir (IV) - on dry, very steep slopes from 7,500 feet to 9,000 feet, and Aspen (V) - on moist slopes. In some places, aspen and lodgepole pine penetrate up to almost 10,500 feet. Basically, however, the



vegetation from 8,000 feet to 10,500 feet is Engelmann Spruce-Lodgepole Pine and from 10,500 feet to 11,500 feet is Engelmann Spruce-Subalpine Fir (together, VI). Above 11,500 feet the wind-timber or Hudsonian Zone blends into the Arctic-Alpine Zone (together, VII).

In many high places, the dominant vegetation sweeps over the streams with no real break which might be called riparian. However, especially at higher altitudes (above 8,500 feet), wet areas are occupied by willows to form a High-altitude Riparian (X) habitat. Ponds, small lakes, and reservoirs are found in all life zones but only at lower altitudes (below 8,000 feet) are they "typical" Pond Communities (VIII). The lower parks and the Floors of the Valleys (XI) below 8,000 feet have been much modified by man's activities. This area is a crazy quilt of roads, fields, ditches, buildings, and several vegetation types within which almost any bird may be found.

Broad areas are covered by the eleven habitats blending together at their edges. Thus, sage and scrub oak, scrub oak and pinyon-juniper, scrub oak and aspen, etc. are found together. The result is an incomplete mixture of bird species from each component.

#### Methods

Reading studies of census taking techniques (such as Bond, 1957 or Kendeigh, 1944) is both thought-provoking and disconcerting. The degree of error built into all such work is alarming. My method was designed to produce the maximum number of individuals of the maximum number of species which were truly breeding birds.

Basically, my method involved living in a plot of four to ten acres for about eighteen hours. I decided that the RFW could be characterized by the eleven major habitats described above, and I chose places scattered throughout it to represent these habitats. The plots were chosen to sample each habitat at different altitudes and to achieve geographic spread. Although no quantitative analysis of vegetation was made, I attempted to work in mature and thus relatively "pure" stands of each type. I tried to avoid ecotones. Thus, for example, aspen groves (V) having a solid canopy and consisting mostly of trees eight inches or more in diameter at elevations of 8,320 feet, 8,810 feet, and 9,850 feet were chosen.

I would usually arrive on the sites in the early afternoon and make camp. The specific study area was paced-off using a compass, and a gridded spot map showing key landmarks was prepared. From then on, any bird seen or heard (more birds were identified by song than by sight) was fair game. I would remain on location until midmorning of the next day and thus was present at all times except midday. After breakfast, at the height of the early morning activity, I would spend two or three hours systematically *patrolling the entire plot by counting the birds found in strips 20 to 35*

yards wide (depending on visibility). This would usually conclude the census, and I would move on to the next site.

Fractional territories were not taken into account. I simply did not have time to estimate them. The thirty one counts were run between June 14 and July 20, 1973 taking advantage of Colorado's "long spring" by working lower elevations first and higher elevations later.

The censuses for habitats I thru VII were done on an area basis; however, as no areas can really be computed for ponds and streams, birds in these areas were counted from transects along the bank. The valley floors are such a hodge-podge that I made no effort to be systematic and simply spent two days "birdwatching" there.

#### Explanation of Table 1

Table 1 records the 124 species of birds actually seen while census work was going on. The number of quadrants or transects studied and the total acreage of the quadrants or approximate length of the transects is given. The following symbols are used to indicate the status of birds found in the habitats:

- N Nesting - as indicated by singing males, nests, courtship, carrying food to young, etc.
- F Foraging - with no evidence of nesting but coming into the habitat for food.
- ? Status Uncertain - insufficient evidence regarding nesting; could be passing through, accidental, etc.
- N? Possible Nesting - when used for waterfowl this indicates the presence of pairs but no nests or young were found. For other birds, this indicates that pairs were seen briefly but their status was not established.
- 12 Density - The upper number (12) indicates the number of pairs actually found on the quadrants. The lower number projects the number that would be found on 100 acres. Density figures were calculated when two criteria were met: at least two pairs were found on all quadrants of the particular habitat and territory size would appear to permit two or more pairs to occupy quadrants of the size studied.

Table 1. Bird species found in censuses of the Roaring Fork Watershed.

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
No. of Censuses -	3	3	3	4	3	4	2	2	3	2	2
Total Acreage -	19	18	24	18	17	25	16	2mi	1 1/2mi	2mi	x
1. Eared Grebe								N?			
2. Pied-billed Grebe								N			
3. Great Blue Heron								F	N		
4. Canada Goose								N			
5. Mallard								N			
6. Gadwall								N			
7. Green-winged Teal								N?			
8. Blue-winged Teal								N?			
9. Cinnamon Teal								N			
10. American Widgeon								?			
11. Shoveler								N?			
12. Redhead								N?			
13. Ring-necked Duck								N			
14. Lesser Scaup								N?			
15. Common Goldeneye								?			
16. Ruddy Duck								N?			
17. Turkey Vulture		F	F		F			F	F		
18. Goshawk								?			
19. Sharp-shinned Hawk								?			
20. Red-tailed Hawk		F	F	F		F		F	F		

Table 1. (Continued)

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
21. Swainson's Hawk	F						F				
22. Golden Eagle		F					F				
23. Sparrow Hawk		?						N			N
24. Blue Grouse				N		N					
25. White-tailed Ptarmigan							N				
26. Sora								N			
27. American Coot								N			
28. Killdeer								N	N		N
29. Common Snipe								N	N		
30. Spotted Sandpiper								N	N		
31. Band-tailed Pigeon											F
32. Rock Dove											N
33. Mourning Dove	?	N	N	N?							N
34. Great Horned Owl					N	N					
35. Common Nighthawk	F	F	N	N				F	F		F
36. White-throated Swift			F								
37. Broad-tailed Hummingbird	F	N	N	N	N	N	F		N		N
38. Belted Kingfisher									N		
39. Red-shafted Flicker	F	F		N	N	N		N	N		N
40. Lewis' Woodpecker											N

Table 1. (Continued)

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
41. Yellow-bellied Sapsucker					N						
42. Williamson's Sapsucker						N					
43. Hairy Woodpecker			N		N				N		
44. Downy Woodpecker									N		
45. Western Kingbird									N		N
46. Cassin's Kingbird					N?						
47. Ash-throated Flycatcher			N								
48. Say's Phoebe											N
49. Traill's Flycatcher								N	N		
50. Western Flycatcher									N		
50a. Unidentified <u>Empidonax</u> sp.		N	N	N	N	N		N	N		
51. Western Wood Pewee				N	N	N			N		
52. Olive-sided Flycatcher				N		N		F			
53. Horned Lark							4 (24)				
54. Violet-green Swallow			F	F	N	F		F	N		N
55. Tree Swallow			F		N			F	N		
56. Bank Swallow											N
57. Rough-winged Swallow			F						F		?
58. Barn Swallow									F		N
59. Cliff Swallow								F			N

Table 1. (Continued)

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
60. Gray Jay				N		N					
61. Steller's Jay				N	N	N					N
62. Scrub Jay		N	N								
63. Black-billed Magpie	F	N	F					N	N		N
64. Common Raven		F				F					
65. Pinyon Jay			N								
66. Clark's Nutcracker							N				
67. Black-capped Chickadee		N			N				N		N
68. Mountain Chickadee			N	N		N					
69. Plain Titmouse			N								
70. White-breasted Nuthatch			N						N		
71. Red-breasted Nuthatch				N		N					
72. Brown Creeper						N					
73. Dipper									N		
74. House Wren					6 (36)			N	N		N
75. Catbird									N		
76. Robin	?	N	N	N	N	N	N?	N	N	F	N
77. Hermit Thrush				N		N					
78. Swainson's Thrush				N	N				N		
79. Veery					N						
80. Mountain Bluebird		N	N?		N						
81. Townsend's Solitaire				N	N						

Table 1. (Continued)

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
82. Blue-gray Gnatcatcher		N	N								
83. Golden-crowned Kinglet						N					
84. Ruby-crowned Kinglet				N	12 (48)						
85. Water Pipit						9 (54)					
86. Starling								N			N
87. Solitary Vireo		N	N								
88. Warbling Vireo		8 (44)		N?	12 (72)			N			N
89. Orange-crowned Warbler		N		?							
90. Virginia's Warbler		6 (33)									
91. Yellow Warbler								N	N		N
92. Myrtle Warbler					N						
93. Audubon's Warbler		?		N	N	10 (40)					
94. Black-throated Gray Warbler			8 (32)								
95. MacGillivray's Warbler	N?									N	
96. Yellowthroat								N			
97. Wilson's Warbler										N	
98. House Sparrow											N
99. Western Meadowlark	N?								N		N

Table 1. (Continued)

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
100. Yellow-headed Blackbird								N			
101. Red-winged Blackbird	N?							N	N		N
102. Bullock's Oriole		N?							N		N
103. Brewer's Blackbird	N?	N?						N	N		N
104. Brown-headed Cowbird									?		N
105. Western Tanager				N							
106. Black-headed Grosbeak		N									
107. Lazuli Bunting		N									N
108. Evening Grosbeak											N
109. Cassin's Finch						N					
110. House Finch											N
111. Pine Grosbeak						N					
112. Brown-capped Rosy Finch							N				
113. Pine Siskin			N	N	N?	N	N				N
114. American Goldfinch									N		N
115. Green-tailed Towhee	N	N		N	N	?			N		N
116. Rufous-sided Towhee		N									



Table 1. (Continued)

	I. Sagebrush	II. Scrub Oak	III. Pinyon-Juniper	IV. Douglas Fir	V. Aspen	VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	VIII. Ponds	IX. Low Riparian	X. High Riparian	XI. Valley Floors
117. Vesper Sparrow	8 (40)										N
118. Gray-headed Junco			N	N	7 (42)	13 (52)					
119. Chipping Sparrow		8 (44)	9 (36)								
120. Brewer's Sparrow	20 (100)	?									
121. White-crowned Sparrow						N (42)	7			N	
122. Fox Sparrow									N		
123. Lincoln's Sparrow							N			N	
124. Song Sparrow								N	N		N
Total Number of Species:	13	29	26	26	25	29	12	40	42	5	42

Possible Additional Breeding Species

Although not found on my census, there is good evidence that the following thirteenth species are breeding in the RFW:

125. Cooper's Hawk - seen year-round in the woods, usually above 8,000 feet.
126. Sage Grouse - Rogers (1964) reports finding "sage chicken" in the RFW and small numbers probably persist.
127. Turkey - best seen in winter when they drop to the floor of the valley to feed.
128. Black Swift - a colony is reported by Davis (1969, page 56) and others may exist in rough country where waterfalls provide nest sites.
129. Black-chinned Hummingbird - this species has regularly visited my feeder through the last two summers.
130. Pileated Woodpecker - a nest was found near Aspen and is reported in Bailey and Niederach (1965).
131. Hammond's Flycatcher
132. Dusky Flycatcher
133. Gray Flycatcher - I am uncertain of my identification of this and the two previous species to attempt to census them but Bailey and Niederach (1965) report them as found throughout the state, and I have heard songs comparable with those on records.
134. Common Crow - found year-round in small numbers on the valley floor.
135. Cedar Waxwing - I found a nest on July 11, 1972 and again this summer occasionally saw these birds in riparian habitat at the lower end of the Roaring Fork Valley.
136. Yellow-breasted Chat - seen several times during the summer. I believe this bird to be an occasional breeder here.
137. Lesser Goldfinch - seen occasionally throughout the breeding season.

Discussion

I was very lucky to have as my prime resources Bailey and Niederach's (1965) magnificent volumes and Davis' (1969) knowledgeable paper. These works are the backbone of my thoughts which follow.

Further field work will soon expand the above list. Observers ought to be especially aware of the possibility of finding the following species:

Pintail	Yellow-billed Cuckoo	Long-eared Owl
Canvasback	Barn Owl	Saw-whet Owl
Prarie Falcon	Flammulated Owl	Poor-will
Solitary Sandpiper	Pygmy Owl	Northern Three-toed Woodpecker

Common Bushtit	Loggerhead Shrike
Bewick's Wren	Savannah Sparrow
Rock Wren	Sage Sparrow
Sage Thrasher	

It is understandable that I did not discover some of these birds. The owls are scarce and probably were not calling. Others such as the Poor-will, Northern Three-toed Woodpecker, and Savannah Sparrow are shy. The Prairie Falcon and Loggerhead Shrike are very rare in this area. Waterfowl are only opportunists in this area of little pond habitat. Some "regular" breeding species will be absent each year. Still there are some notable unexplained absences: the Common Bushtit, Bewick's Wren, Rock Wren, Sage Thrasher, and Sage Sparrow.

Given Colorado's geographic position and judging from its long state check-list, almost any bird might be found in the RFW. On the other hand, the RFW is on the periphery of the range of many species and these will be found only as rare or occasional breeders here. Thus, we are too far west for such birds as the Red-eyed Vireo, Blue Grosbeak, Lark Sparrow, and many others. Apparently we are too far east for the Western Bluebird. Although they are found in the Grand Junction area, the RFW is a bit too far north and too high for the Mockingbird, Gray Vireo, Ring-necked Pheasant, Gambel's Quail, and Sharp-tailed Grouse. Conversely, we are too far south for the Rufous Hummingbird and Townsend's Warbler.

There is little marsh or pond habitat in the RFW and so such species as the American Bittern, Snowy Egret, Marsh Hawk, and Long-billed Marsh Wren were not found. The absence of ponderosa pine (the original stands were burned-off) makes the appearance of the Pygmy Nuthatch, Grace's Warbler, and Red Crossbill unlikely.

Orange-crowned Warblers migrate through the valleys in good numbers. I mist-netted three in the spring of 1972 and eleven in the spring of 1973. Both Bailey and Niederach (1965) and Davis (1969) anticipated the discovery of nesting birds in Colorado, but I was surprised at the large number of territorial males, courtship chases, fighting, and other evidence that the birds were breeding here in abundance. These observations were made in oak scrub habitat at three separate sites ranging from about 6,000 feet to 8,000 feet, the last observation being July 7 after which I did not return to that habitat.

In the Grand Junction area the Gray Vireo occupies the pinyon-juniper habitat, and the Solitary Vireo is found in oak scrub (Davis, 1969). Davis, in fact, says (page 57) to locate the Gray Vireo by its song, listen for: ". . . the voice of a Solitary coming from the junipers". In the RFW this technique would not work. In the absence of the Gray Vireo, the Solitary

Vireo occupies both habitats and is especially abundant in the pinyon-junipers. No doubt an interesting tale of ecology and evolution lies behind these birds.

The Colorado birdwatcher must be aware of habitats and life zones if he is to find many birds. I was naturally very much interested in the birds' fidelity to my habitats. Table 2 shows the numbers and percent of birds restricted to each habitat. The floors of the valleys (XI) are excluded from consideration (because they are not a uniform habitat) together with the eight species found only in this habitat. For those birds who showed a ? (Status Uncertain) for a particular habitat, if they were found in no other habitat, they were considered residents of that habitat. If, however, they were definite residents of other habitats, the doubtful habitat was not counted. Thus the Goshawk (#18) is resident of one habitat. The Sparrow Hawk (#23) likewise is resident of one habitat--the question mark and the valley floors being excluded.

A great deal of discussion could be developed from this data, but briefly: sixty-two species or about 53% (62/116) were found in one habitat; 25% (29/116) were found in two habitats; 9% (10/116) were found in three habitats, and 12% (15/116) were found in more than three habitats. Thus 79% (91/116) of the species were found in one or two habitats suggesting remarkable habitat selection.

Another approach may be taken. Douglas fir is a poorly developed habitat in the RFW, and the one species found only in it (#105, Western Tanager) is not truly restricted to it. Ponds are special because of the obvious and severe restrictions to water imposed upon two grebe species, thirteen waterfowl and one "swimming rail" species. If these two extremes are removed, the range shows from 15% to 41% of the component bird species are unique to each of eight habitats. If the upper extreme habitat (Arctic-Alpine/Hudsonian) is removed, the range for the seven remaining habitats is 15% to 26%--an interestingly restricted range. Most species were selective but a small group, the Red-tailed Hawk, Broad-tailed Hummingbird, Red-shafted Flicker, Robin and a few others were fairly ubiquitous.

Analysis could go on, however, I hope that my main objective of discovering "what birds live where" during the breeding season in the Roaring Fork Watershed has been achieved.

Table 2. Species restricted to each habitat.\*

Habitat	No. Species in Habitat	No. Species Restricted to Habitat	Percent Restricted to Habitat
I. Sagebrush	13	2	15%
II. Scrub Oak	29	5	17%
III. Pinyon-Juniper	26	5	19%
IV. Douglas Fir	26	1	4%
V. Aspen	25	4	16%
VI. Spruce/Pine Spruce/Fir	29	7	24%
VII. Arctic-Alpine Hudsonian	12	5	41%
VIII. Ponds	40	20	50%
IX. Low Riparian	42	12	28%
X. High Riparian	5	1	20%

\* Excludes Valley Floors (XI) and the eight species found only in XI.

Bibliography

- Bailey, A. M. and R. J. Niedrach. 1965. Birds of Colorado. 2 Vols.  
Denver Museum of Natural History, Denver. 895 p.
- Bond, R. R. 1957. Ecological Distribution of Breeding Birds in the Upland  
Forests of Southern Wisconsin. Ecol. Monogr. 27:351-384.
- Davis, W. A. 1969. Birds in Western Colorado. Colorado Field Ornithologists,  
Fort Collins. 61 p.
- Kendeigh, S. C. 1944. Measurement of Bird Populations. Ecol. Monogr. 14:  
67-106.
- Rogers, G. E. 1964. Sage Grouse Investigations in Colorado. Colorado  
Department of Game, Fish and Parks Technical Publication No. 16.  
Colorado Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Denver. 132 p.

X X X X X X X X X X X

BIRDS IN WESTERN COLORADO

by

William A. Davis

Annotated field list and travel guides for finding  
the best birding spots. \$1.75.

Historical Museum and Institute of Western Colorado  
4th and Ute, Grand Junction, Colorado 81501.

## NOTES

Compiled by

David W. Lupton  
Colorado State University Libraries  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

Flammulated Owl -- At 3:00 P.M. on June 20, 1972 while making a fire break through Pinon Pine in Mesa Verde National Park, Montezuma County, a tree was inadvertently cut down which contained a Flammulated Owl nest with three young and one adult. Reported by William C. Shuster and Mike Martishang.

Broad-tailed Hummingbird -- Dominic A. Bartol, Jr., Colorado Springs, Colorado writes as follows: "I have been under the impression that Broad-tailed Hummingbirds do not return to precisely the same nest to rear another brood the successive year. Mrs. Bartol and I during June 16 - July 25, 1973 observed a Broad-tailed Hummer return to a nest we closely observed during June - July 1972; tear down and rebuild the old, rear and successfully fledge 2 young during the 16 June - 25 July 1973 period".

Western Wood Pewee -- Mildred O. Snyder, Aurora, Colorado writes as follows concerning the bathing habits of a Western Wood Pewee: "By 22 June (1973) I had not found the nest yet of a Western Wood Pewee in their territory. On this day I decided to don my rain suit and sit in the area during a rain shower, hoping to see the bird go to its nest immediately when it stopped raining. I have never seen a Western Wood Pewee at the ponds, either feeding or taking a bath, so I was interested in what I observed as I sat there in the rain. Most birds take cover during a rain, so I was interested when I saw this Western Wood Pewee sitting out on a branch, happily preening itself. This it did constantly for about 10 minutes of this rain, then the wind changed direction and the bird no longer was getting much rain, so it flew out onto a branch that was more out in the open and therefore got more rain, and again, for another 10 minutes, preened happily! That was the end of the rain then, and I am convinced that Western Wood Pewees prefer showers (rain, that is) to a bathtub (birdbath)".

Olive-sided Flycatcher -- "I was puzzled by this bird, first because it was so early, and then because it was so yellowish" writes Mildred O. Snyder, of Aurora, Colorado. "The Olive-sided Flycatcher usually is in full adult plumage when it arrives here in Denver area in spring but this spring a bird was here 10 days earlier than it has ever been reported here, April 27, 1973 (previous earliest was May 7, 1964). This was 15 days earlier than its average arrival date of May 12. It was quite yellow, like the picture of the immature on page 203 in Birds of North America by Robbins, Brunn, Zim, Singer (1966)."

Western Bluebird -- Concerning predation of Western Bluebird nest boxes, Mildred O. Snyder of Aurora, Colorado writes: "Of the Western Bluebird nests, one box had 6 eggs, nine had 5 eggs each, seven had 4 eggs each and two had 3 eggs each, making a total of 84 eggs. Of these, 35 fledged, there were 4 infertile eggs and predators got the others. A snake got one box of 5 young! I had my banding equipment and bands with me on 16 June 1973 and as I came up to Box #28 I saw this head sticking out the hole! (I thought "what a strange looking bird head!") There had been 5 young birds in this box the week before, that I thought would be ready for banding this week. This snake was circled around in the bottom of the box--it looked rather lumpy--I suppose it was those 5 young bluebirds!!! I took a long stick, reached in to disturb it, wondering if it would come out, but it just stayed there in the bottom of the box! Due to 2 extremely heavy rains one week, several of the nests were quite wet yet when I cleaned them out. While I was cleaning out one box, a Cooper's Hawk sailed into the tree above me, about 10 feet over my head, and watched while I cleaned out the box! The chipmunks are using 4 of the boxes for roosting this year, more than before. I keep cleaning out their dry oak leaves and grasses. One of the next-boxes turned out to be on the trunk of a Ponderosa Pine tree that was the dining table for a squirrel. The squirrel evidently got a parent bird, I found Western Bluebird feathers at the foot of the tree, and the 3 young birds then died of starvation, I suppose. They were about 2 days old when they died in the box."

Bobolink -- Warren D. Snyder, Wildlife Researcher, Colorado Division of Wildlife submits the following observations on Bobolinks nesting in northeast Colorado: "At least a dozen or more pairs were observed in June and early July (1972) in semi-marshy hay meadows adjacent to the South Platte in Northeast Colorado. The first observations were made immediately south of the town of Crook, across the river in the meadow to the east of state highway #55. Later observations were noted approximately one mile west of this location along the west Tamarack hunter access trail."

"I had previously seen this species in the sandhills of Nebraska but this is my first observation in Northeast Colorado."

Warren D. Snyder  
P. O. Box 322  
Holyoke, Colorado 80734



The Colorado Field Ornithologist is a quarterly journal devoted to the field study of birds in Colorado. Articles and notes of scientific or general interest, and reports of unusual observations are solicited. Send manuscripts, with photos and drawings, to David W. Lupton, Editor; Serials Section, Colorado State University Libraries; Fort Collins, Colorado 80521. Membership and subscription fees: Full member \$5.00; Library subscription fees \$5.00. Submit payments to Sadie Morrison, Treasurer; 1283 Elizabeth Street, Denver, Colorado 80206. Request for exchange or for back numbers should be addressed to the Editor. Numbers 1-10 are \$1.50 per issue; 11 and continuing are \$1.25 per issue. All exchange publications should likewise be sent to the Editor's address.

COLORADO FIELD ORNITHOLOGISTS

CURRENT OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

President . . . . .	Dave Griffiths, Pueblo
President-Elect . . . . .	Jack Reddall, Englewood
Executive Secretary . . . . .	Robbie Elliott, Boulder
Treasurer . . . . .	Sadie Morrison, Denver
Editor . . . . .	David Lupton, Fort Collins
Directors . . . . .	Thompson Marsh, Denver Meredith Morris, Fort Collins Jack Reddall, Englewood Helen Thurlow, Colorado Springs Howard Winkler, Durango
Official Records Committee . . . . .	Jack Reddall, Chairman; Englewood Ronald A. Ryder, Fort Collins Dave Griffiths, Pueblo Paul Julian, Boulder Hugh Kingery, Denver Thompson Marsh, Denver Richard Stransky, Durango