

female was incubating on 3 July. Nest 2 remained active until at least 6 July but was empty when next visited on 9 July. Although Rose-breasted Grosbeaks are not thought to be double brooded in nature two pairs studied by Ivor (Wilson Bull., 56:91-104, 1944) under conditions of semicaptivity successfully raised two broods each. But the degree of overlap in nestings was minimal, with the building of the second nest not starting until a "short time" before the young of the first nest fledged. Davison (Auk, 6:191-192, 1889) described nests that may have been comparable to the ones I observed. He noted two nests a "few rods" (a rod equals five meters) apart and according to his estimation of the age of the young, the first egg in the second nest was laid when the young in the first nest were not more than a day old. Unfortunately, Davison did not determine whether both nests were from one pair. Dunham (Z. Tierpsychol., 23:438-451, 1966) described certain behaviors occurring during the breeding cycle but the actual nesting of the Rose-breasted Grosbeak has not been intensely studied in the field and possibly it quite commonly has two broods. It remains to be seen, however, whether the extreme degree of nest overlap observed by myself and possibly by Davison occurs with any regularity.

Nesting overlap by grosbeaks, especially if it is more extreme than in most birds, may explain the unusual behavior commonly shown by this species of singing while on the nest. Both sexes are known to engage in this practice (Bent, op. cit.:46) as is the closely related Black-headed Grosbeak (*Pheucticus melanocephalus*) (Bent, op. cit.:61). Possibly when stages of the nesting cycle normally accompanied by singing occur during the second nesting the demands of the first nest may also require the singing bird to incubate or brood. This interpretation imparts an overall adaptive value to singing on the nest even though such behavior may on occasion reveal the nest's location to a predator.

I thank Eugene S. Morton for his comments on this paper. The observations reported here occurred during field work supported by The Frank M. Chapman Memorial Fund, Yale University, and the University of Michigan. I gratefully acknowledge the University of Michigan Biological Station for the use of its facilities and Dr. Olin Sewall Pettingill, Jr. for his aid during my stay at the station.—STEPHEN I. ROTHSTEIN, *Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, Smithsonian Institution, Edgewater, Maryland (Present address: Department of Biological Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106.) 28 June 1972.*

First recorded specimens of the White-winged Crossbill from Utah.—On 2 August 1965 a flock of eight White-winged Crossbills (*Loxia leucoptera*) was observed by Everett C. Peck and me on a sidehill immediately south of Pioneer Ranger Station, 9,300 feet elevation, Pavant Mountains, Millard County, Utah (39° 00' N, 112° 08' W). The area is a moderately dense forest of predominantly Englemann spruce, *Picea engelmannii* (70 percent); alpine fir, *Abies lasiocarpa* (10 percent); and aspen, *Populus tremuloides* (20 percent) on an approximately 35° north facing slope. The flock moved largely as a unit, first feeding on cones in one tree and after several minutes flying to another tree to feed. While the birds were thus engaged, I collected three of them before the remainder of the flock was sufficiently alarmed to fly off across the valley. The three birds were prepared as study skins and are now in the University of Utah Museum of Zoology. The female (No. 19578) had heavy fat, the two males (Nos. 19577 and 19579) had relatively little fat, and none showed signs of molting.

Crossbills breed at odd times of the year reacting primarily to an abundant food supply rather than strictly to photoperiod (Tordoff and Dawson, Condor, 67:416-422, 1965). Presence during the summer months is, therefore, an insufficient criterion for breeding.

Short of actual nesting observation, only the presence of a brood patch offers conclusive evidence of reproductive activity in crossbills. Gonadal size is not as indicative but is still a moderately good indicator. The single female collected possessed no brood patch and her ovary was relatively small (5 mm), indicating that she was not in a reproductive state when collected. The two males, however, were mature and had testes of 5×4 and 6×5 mm. These approximate the testicular sizes of known breeding White-winged Crossbills from Canada and Alaska (6–7.5 [6.7 mm] $n = 4$). (These data were supplied by W. E. Godfrey, National Museum of Canada; and J. C. Barlow, Royal Ontario Museum).

In any event, this account reports the only specimens recorded for the species in Utah; the only other record being of three birds observed on a Christmas Bird Count on 21 December 1969 near Salt Lake City (Kashin, Audubon Field Notes, 24:416, 1970).—GARY L. WORTHEN, *Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044, 9 August 1972.*

A short method for treating avian breeding data in regional accounts.—The manner in which breeding evidence is presented in distributional surveys varies considerably. If little information is available or if space limitations do not preclude detailed treatment, all evidence may be given. In most cases, however, such data must be abbreviated. The classical method of abbreviation, the employment of a single symbol, usually an asterisk, to denote "breeding species" is inadequate for many types of surveys because a symbol cannot be defined to account for widely differing opinions as to what type of evidence constitutes proof of breeding.

The system proposed here allows the reader to make this decision according to his own concepts and at the same time satisfies the requirement of brevity. It is based on a scale that allows each of the major types of breeding evidence to be reported in a standardized *word phrase*. The sequence employed, a minimal modification of that occurring in nature, proceeds from the strongest to the weakest evidence.

In applying the system in faunal works, it is necessary only to determine the highest ranking datum known for a species and present a caption followed by the word phrase: "Breeding evidence: nest with young." When available data do not fully meet the requirements of the most similar entry on the scale, the next highest category for which there is evidence may be added. The breeding evidence section is included in a species account only if the data satisfy at least two of the last three points on the scale (range, habitat, and dates). The scale employed for breeding evidence is presented below, with the standardized word phrases listed first.

Prejuvenal.—The term *prejuvenal*, coined herein, denotes an individual that has left the nest but has not yet attained full growth of its first set of adult-sized remiges and rectrices. The possession of fully-grown flight feathers as the terminal point for this state is preferable to the cessation of the juvenal molt because of the difficulty of determining the presence or absence of molting body feathers in the field or in museum specimens, and because the completion of flight feather growth renders the young bird fully capable of traveling long distances from the nest site. This term has been coined because the only other word available, fledgling, has several nebulous definitions, is usually applied only to nidicolous species, and is restricted by some authors to the stage after completion of juvenal feather growth. When evaluating distributional breeding data, especially for very small areas, one must allow for highly mobile juvenals, such as precocious flyers (e.g., Galliformes), walkers (Charadriiformes), and swimmers (Anseriformes). Some species (e.g., certain hummingbirds and swifts) probably lack a