Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: Josh Engel

Date of review: 5 January 2016

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-S(1)

<u>Comments</u>: I'm swayed to change my vote to acceptance by the combination of the description eliminating all swallows except Cliff and Cave and the high probably that of those two species on the date of the sighting, Cave is far more likely.

Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: Dan Kassebaum

Date of review: 7 January 2016

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-S

Comments:

Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: Greg Lambeth

Date of review: January 14, 2016

Circulation number: 2nd

<u>Vote</u>: A –E <u>Comments</u>:

I voted to accept in the first round despite the fact that the written documentation did not include all field marks that would separate these birds from Cliff Swallow. I agree with Doug Stotz's reasoning quoted below:

"This is not an ideal report, but I think we have had enough records now to establish the fact that a November bird of the Cliff/Cave complex is almost certain to be Cave. The fact that the description does not have anything in it that seems more suggestive of Cliff than Cave (even if the description doesn't clinch Cave) means that I will vote for it."

Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: McMullen

<u>Date of review</u>: 1-26-2016 <u>Circulation number</u>: 2nd

Vote: U-I

Comments:

I agree with Josh – description doesn't eliminate CLIFF. For 1st state record, I believe we need a definitive photo and/or a better description in order for a slam dunk ID of CAVE.

Until we have a 1st state record and have an established precedence of all late, palerumped swallows being CAVES, I don't feel we can safely state that all late, palerumped swallows are indeed CAVES and not rule out tardy CLIFFS.

Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: Douglas Stotz

Date of review: 25 January 2016

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-S(1)

Comments: This record is all about how much uncertainty you are willing to tolerate. The description rules out everything except Cliff or Cave, with square tail and pale rump. The pale throat, and failure to note white on the forehead are consistent with this being a Cave Swallow rather than a Cliff Swallow. Given that the things seen are consistent with Cave Swallow, and not with Cliff, and given the 8 November date (almost a month later than the latest area Cliff Swallows), I am willing to accept this as a Cave Swallow. If you look at Nov swallows in e-bird, you'll notice a large number of November Cave Swallows around the Great Lakes (although admittedly fewer at Lake Michigan than farther east. There is not a single Cliff Swallow this far north. The only Cliff Swallows from Illinois are from Crab Orchard in 2013. Frankly the description for them is not adequate to rule out Cave Swallow. I think that Cave Swallow is clearly far more likely at this time of year than Cliff Swallow.

Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: Paul Sweet

<u>Date of review</u>: 1/17/2016 <u>Circulation number</u>: 2nd

Vote: A-S(1)

Comments: Given the date and the increasing prevalence of this species, the

description seems sufficient.

Record #: 2012.049

Name of bird form: Cave Swallow

Committee member name: Geoffrey A. Williamson

Date of review: 28 December 2015

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-S(1)
Comments:

In the Illinois journals (*Illinois Birds & Birding* and *Meadowlark*) through Fall 2013 and in Bohlen's *The Birds of Illinois*, the latest available dates for Cliff Swallow are 1 Nov 2013 (Sangamon County), 21 Oct 1988 (Springfield), and 20 Oct 2002 (Carlyle Lake). I think it likely that we will be seeing more late dates for Cliff Swallow, but for the moment a date of 10 Nov would be really late for that species. For instance there is only one October date (4 Oct 2014) among eBird reports from Fall 2014.

The date falls nicely in the expected pattern for Cave and outside the expected pattern for Cliff. Given that, I am okay about accepting this record on the basis of the description of the throat favoring Cave and not good for Cliff, despite the fact that no other discriminating features were observed. Also, there is nothing in the description that is problematic for Cave.