was no evidence of a nest (nor of the characteristic discolored semicircle marking the attachment place of a former nest—Fischer 1958) on the bricks above the bird from which this twig may have fallen, it seems likely that the bird was engaged in nest-building at the time it was trapped. The possibility of catching a leg between bricks seems more plausible as the swift perched on the wall rather than flying by the site of entrapment. The body was too dehydrated to determine its sex; both sexes are known to be involved in nest construction.

This Chimney Swift was originally banded on 15 Sep 1977 from a staging roost of several hundred swifts using a large chimney at the Baldwin Junior High (3.4 km ESE of the nesting chimney). It was then molting its outer primaries and recorded as an AHY-U (Johnston 1958). Given that many of the banded breeding Chimney Swifts in Baldwin City and surrounding farmsteads used this chimney for staging before the fall migration, it is quite likely that this bird had nested in the area at least the previous summer. This would mean it was at least six years old at death and possibly seven years old, since the majority of birds breed for the first time during their second summer. However, the highly mummified condition of the body (even with the plumage in good shape) might be an indication that it died in an earlier nesting season.

Such entrapment by a band must be a rare event for a Chimney Swift. The recommended 1B band measures 4.5 mm in outside diameter, which easily slides through the average 10 mm mortared cleft between bricks in a chimney. The fact that this chimney was nearly 80 years old and that the powdered, crumbling mortar and shifted bricks were the reasons for its removal, surely contributed to conditions that increased risks for catching the band. Conversations and correspondence with other swift banders and a review of the literature suggest that this is the first reported case of such mortality.

My thanks to Katharine Kelley for bringing this specimen to my attention.

LITERATURE CITED

Cink, C.L. and C.T. Collins. 2002. Chimney Swift *(Chaetura pelagica). In* The birds of North America, No. 646 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Dexter, R.W. 1969. Banding and nesting studies of the Chimney Swift. *Ohio J. Sci.* 69:193-213.

Fischer, R.B. 1958. The breeding biology of the Chimney Swift *Chaetura pelagica* (Linnaeus). *New York State Mus. Sci. Serv. Bull.* 368:1-139.

Johnston, D.W. 1958. Sex and age characters and salivary glands of the Chimney Swift. *Condor* 60:73-84.

Tyler, W.M. 1940. Chimney Swift. Pp. 271-293 *In* Life histories of North American cuckoos, goatsuckers, hummingbirds, and their allies (A. C. Bent, ed.). US *Natl. Mus. Bull.* 176.

Calvin L. Cink
Biology Dept.,Baker Univ.
P.O. Box 65
Baldwin City, KS 66006

Recommended Band Size for Spotted Towhees: A Suggested Revision

Based on recent observations, I propose that Spotted Towhees *(Pipilo maculatus)* be assigned a band size based on sex and wing length. During my fall banding operations near San Jose, CA, I frequently capture Spotted Towhees. I use an AFO leg gauge on almost all birds captured to determine the proper band size for each individual. The first recommended band size (Pyle 1997) for this species, 1A, is too small for some individuals, and the second recommended size, 2, is a better fit. Conversely, the size 2 band is too big for certain birds and size 1A a better fit. After reviewing my data, I noticed that the wing length of the bird was a good indicator of which size would probably fit best. The birds with shorter wings generally took the smaller band size while the birds with longer wings took the larger band size. There was an area of overlap in wing length in which individuals could use either band size.

In addition to wing length, I noticed that the sex of the bird frequently indicated which size would be preferable. Spotted Towhees in adult plumage show moderate sexual dichromatism (Greenlaw

1996). The females generally have a slate-gray hood, dorsum, tail, and wings suffused with a brownish wash, while the males are black in these areas. Birds in juvenal plumage show less dichromatism. Most young birds are "yellowish-brown to buffy brown above, dull bronzy buff below; dorsum and breast are broadly streaked with dusky brown to blackish feathers"(Greenlaw 1996). Birds in complete juvenal plumage I usually do not sex; I do so only when the first pre-basic molt is underway and a recognizable amount of basic plumage is present. So, to band them, I commonly rely on the fit according to the leg gauge. I found that just as with the adult birds, juveniles tend to use a band size predicted by their wing length; i.e., shorter-winged birds used the smaller band size while longer-winged birds used the larger band size.

Table 1. Birds Sized and Banded with Band Size 2.

Band No.	Sex	Wing (mm)	Weight (g)
661	F	78	41.4
662	F	78	38.4
667	M	78	41.2
613	F	79	40.8
646	M	79	41.3
654	M	79	40.5
640	M	80	37.8
648	M	80	41.4
650	M	80	43.7
625	M	81	42.5
647	M	81	40.7
657	M	81	43.0
658	M	81	43.5
659	M	81	37.8
660	M	81	43.8
642	M	82	40.3
643	F	82	38.6
649	M	82	42.7
653	M	82	38.4
674	M	82	40.2
617	M	83	42.8
630	M	83	39.9
626	M	84	41.7
670	M	84	40.8
672	M	86	35.6

Table 2. Birds Sized and Banded with Band Size 1A.

Band No.	Sex	Wing (mm)	Weight (g)
557	F	75	39.7
558	F	75	38.7
860	F	75	34.3
857	F	76	39.6
864	F	76	35.3
553	F	77	38.0
556	F	77	39.1
865	F	77	36.3
889	F	77	37.1
554	F	78	35.0
861	F	78	37.6
530	F	79	38.3
869	M	79	40.2
883	F	81	33.7

I compiled my data from these observations. Tables 1 and 2 show for each bird the sex, wing length, and weight. In order for a band to be a good fit, the cutout on the leg gauge designated for sizes 1A or 2 had to show that the sides did not touch the leg at any point along the tarsus, or allow too much space between the leg and sides of the opening. Sex of the birds was determined by appearance of plumage, which meant that the individual had to have some recognizable amount of basic plumage present. I did not include any bird in this study if it was in total juvenal plumage. All birds were banded at one site and, because of its geographical location, were presumed to be of the subspecies *P. m. falcifer.*

Wing length range for males (n=22) was 78 - 86 mm, with a mean of 81.3 mm. Wing length range for females (n=16) was 75 - 82 mm, with a mean of 77.3 mm. Most females were banded with size 1A but four birds used the larger band size. Most males took band size 2 and only one individual used the smaller size. The weight of each bird also was recorded. All birds were banded during the months of August and September and had no visible fat present. Weight range for males was 35.6 - 43.8 g with a mean of 40.9 g, and for females was 34.3 - 41.4 g with a mean of 38.0 g.

Based on the results of these data, I suggest a revision to the recommended band size for Spotted

Towhees which takes into account the sex of the bird. I recommend that the band size for Spotted Towhees be stated as it is for Eastern Towhees: Females: 1A - 2; Males: 2 - 1A. Since the sex of birds in juvenal plumage cannot always be ascertained, I advise that these birds be measured with a leg gauge and banded with the best fitting band size.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Mr. and Mrs. John C. Fell for their generosity in allowing the use of their property for bird-banding research.

LITERATURE CITED

Greenlaw, J.S. 1996. Spotted Towhee *(Pipilo maculatus). In* The birds of North America, No. 263 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Pyle, P. 1997. Identification guide to North American birds. Pt. 1: Columbidae to Ploceidae, Slate Creek Press, Bolinas, CA.

Rita R. Colwell
281 Margarita Court
Los Altos, CA 94022

Note on Second Oak Titmouse Brood

In *The Birds of North America,* Cicero (2000) reports "...some evidence that pairs *may* raise 2 broods on occasion." (My emphasis.)

Through our cavity-nesting dispersal banding study for the California Bluebird Recovery Program, we have confirmed an instance of an Oak Titmouse *(Baeolophus inornatus)* raising two broods in a single season.

A female Oak Titmouse (#930-99243) was banded 19 Apr 2000, while incubating in a nest box in an oak-pine woodland off Sand Ridge Road near Somerset, CA. Approximately a year later, on 12 Apr 2001, she was recaptured while incubating in another nest box 83 m NW of the original banding. The first location was on a wooden post; the second was a box mounted on a studded-T fence post.

On 29 Apr 2002, she had moved 5 m S to another nest box erected in late 2001 and attached to a large California black oak. She was recaptured while incubating four eggs. On 3 May, the four chicks were banded and subsequently fledged. On 9 Jun, she was again recaptured in the same nest box on the same nest. A small quantity of fur had been added but no major additions had been made to the nest. She had six eggs. On 18 Jun, the six chicks were banded and successfully fledged.

LITERATURE CITED

Cicero, C. 2000. Oak Titmouse *(Baeolophus inornatus)* and Juniper Titmouse *(Baeolophus ridgwayi). In* The birds of North America, No 485 (A.Poole and F. Gill,eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc.,Philadelphia, PA.

Hatch Graham
PO Box 39
Somerset, CA 95684
Assisted by Carol Willburn

TWO LONGEVITY RECORDS FOR ALDER FLYCATCHER *(Empidonas alnorum)*:

(1) 7 yr. 0 mo. at Alaska Bird Obsrvatory

The Alaska Bird Observatory (ABO) has been mist netting migratory landbirds at Creamer's Field Migration Station (CFMS [64°50' N, 147°50' W]) since 1992. Alder Flycatcher *(Empidonax alnorum)* is one of a number of species that regularly breed at Creamer's Field Migratory Waterfowl Refuge in Fairbanks, or use the area as a stopover site during migration. Thirteen Alder Flycatchers banded by ABO personnel have been recaptured in mist nets from 1993 to 2002. One of these birds was an adult female that was banded in 1993 and recaptured in 1999 (Table 1). Banding records indicate the presence of a brood patch during both data collection procedures, suggesting that the bird was still reproductively active when she was at least seven years old. The published longevity record for Alder Flycatcher is three years and two months of age (Clapp et al. 1983, Klimkiewicz 2002). This note updates the longevity record for this species.