

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: Josh Engel

Date of review: May 14, 2018

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-S

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation]

I'm continuing to vote to accept.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: Matt Fraker

Date of review: 7 April 2018

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-S(1)

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation]. I remain comfortable with voting to accept this record for the aforementioned reasons.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: Walter Marcisz

Date of review: 4-14-18

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-S (1)

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation]

I again vote to accept, as per my previous comments. A first state record of a difficult to identify species with no photo, but this is an extremely detailed description by an experienced, credible observer.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: McMullen

Date of review: 4-10-18

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: U-I

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation]

I remain uncomfortable accepting this given that there is no physical evidence associated with the record. I, too, would prefer having both photographic and audio evidence, given that this is a potential first state record. With that said, this bird very well may have been a Cassin's, but as others have stated, this wasn't considered a big deal at that time, 1994, as the bird was not split into 3 separate species.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: Douglas Stotz

Date of review: 4 April 2018

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-S(2)

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation] I continue to believe that this is satisfactory documentation of a Cassin's Vireo. Paul has done an excellent job of providing information on what was seen and heard. The combination of a "dull" Solitary Vireo (especially a spring bird) and a song described as like a Yellow-throated Vireo fit perfectly for Cassin's, as do some of the specific details of the plumage. Yes, I would love to have a photo or audio recording, but I don't believe they are required in order to accept this record.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: Paul Sweet

Date of review: 4/26/18

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-S(1)

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation]

There doesn't seem to be any new information, either in terms of documentation or comments, so I don't see any reason to change my vote.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 1994-T-001

Name of bird form: Cassin's Vireo

Committee member name: Geoffrey A. Williamson

Date of review: 26 March 2018

Circulation number: 4th

Vote: A-S(1)

Comments: [required since this is a potential first state record and since this is a 4th circulation]

This is a difficult record for me. As I mentioned in previous rounds, my preference, maybe a strong preference, is for there to be physical evidence associated with the record to accept it. However, I find it difficult to view the specific identity of this bird as anything other than a Cassin's Vireo. The evidence is clear that it is either a Blue-headed or a Cassin's, and the witnessing by many persons of the bird singing consistently with Cassin's and problematically for Blue-headed strongly sways things to Cassin's. Should I vote to reject only because we have neither photographs or audio recordings? Right now, I feel the answer to this question is "no." In earlier rounds I answered "yes." Perhaps this makes the decision somewhat arbitrary. I trust nonetheless that anyone in the future will be able to make sense of the collective evidence and committee member opinions should such persons look into the archived material.

There is one other comment I would like to make. In several places within the comments, IORC members have remarked about the amount of time that has passed since the observation and have implied the impact that this has on making a judgment about the record. I feel that the passage of time here is immaterial because all the evidence that we are evaluating was prepared at or very shortly after the actual observation, so that the passage of time is a non-issue. Bob Hughes's remarks about the observation are an exception; his brief comments were written more than 20 years later. However, I can attest personally to the attitude of the observers at the time, as there was much discussion within the Chicago birding community about this specific bird and whether it could be considered a Cassin's Vireo. My recollection (now 24 years after the fact) is that there was a general feeling that this bird was quite consistent with Cassin's Vireo but that most/many were not willing to pull the trigger on the identification because of lack of detailed knowledge about the identification problem and because at the time it was a subspecific identification. But Paul Clyne's record of his observations were detailed, informed, and made all at the time of the observation.