

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** Josh Engel

**Date of review:** 12/21/17

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** A-S

**Comments:**

A tremendous documentation of a non-photographed bird leaves little doubt that Paul was correct in his assessment of the identification of this bird.

**IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** Fraker

**Date of review:** 12/10/17

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** A-S

**Comments:**

## IORC EVALUATION FORM

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** Walter Marcisz

**Date of review:** 1-12-18

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-I

**Comments:**

Two things bother me about this record:

- 1) The date of the observation (4 September) is not at all in line with the usual period of vagrancy occurrence for this species in the eastern United States, which begins around mid-October and peaks in late November.
- 2) Per Paul Clyne's 12/14/94 cover letter: "Since Dave Mandell was reticent to vouch for the identification to species, his initials should not be included in the citation of observers for this record." From my personal experience, Dave Mandell was already a highly skilled, experienced observer at the time of observation, and per Clyne's documentation Mandell apparently had excellent views of the bird. Mandell's reluctance to commit to an identification to species casts doubt on the ID of Ash-throated Flycatcher, at least for me.

I vote to reject.

## IORC EVALUATION FORM

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** McMullen

**Date of review:** 12-20-17

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-I

**Comments:** Observer has gone to great detail to prove the argument for Ash-throated vs Great Crested. Seems plausible but I hesitate to accept this record. This much detail in a documentation raises red flags for me in that some of these points (mouth linings) simply are very judgement calls and something generally only a person banding would note. The fact other good birders would not agree with the ID leaves me to believe this should be left as a Myiarchus sp.

**IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** Douglas Stotz

**Date of review:** 2 January 2018

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** A-S(1)

**Comments:**

## IORC EVALUATION FORM

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** Paul Sweet

**Date of review:** 12/4/17

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** A-S(1)

**Comments:**

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 1994-037

**Name of bird form:** Ash-throated Flycatcher

**Committee member name:** Geoffrey A. Williamson

**Date of review:** 26 November 2017

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** A-S(1)

**Comments:**

Okay, first, this is an old record being evaluated 23 years after the original sighting. However, the description was written within a couple of months of the observation, and the observer is an individual who at the time, and still, is patient and painstaking with observational detail.

The description includes specific and carefully observed details regarding bill coloration coloration of the underside of the tail, and color of the mouth lining. The submitted material provides a detailed analysis of these features with respect to the full range of species in the genus; the conclusion of identification as an Ash-throated Flycatcher appears valid based on these details.

Though the documentation notes that “aspects of wing patterning and wear were among the details noted under the scope,” the description and analysis fail to noted anything about the comparative widths of the pale edging to the tertials. Remarking upon this would have provided valuable information.