

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Fraker

Date of review: 08/01/19

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-E(ph)

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation]

The date and the lack of evidence of captivity keeps me in the “accept” camp.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Davida Kalina

Date of review: 18 July 2019

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-E(photos) and A-S(5)

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation]

All photos clearly support the ID of Barnacle Goose. No submitter mentions the halluces (although the hallux on the left foot can be seen in Photo #8) nor leg bands (although no bands can be seen on the legs in any of the photos).

No submitter saw the bird in flight, although other birders reported on eBird seeing it take flight when it departed the DuPage location for good the next day, 26 February 2019. Assuming the bird that was sighted in Kendall County on 28 February 2019 was the same bird that was in DuPage County, then the bird probably could fly pretty well.

The late-winter sighting date supports wild vagrant status.

I also observed this bird on the morning of 26 February 2019 at the same location in DuPage County. The only information I can add is that it was in the presence of at least 15 Cackling Geese, 2 Snow Geese, and many Canada Geese.

Submitters at the Kendall County location indicate at least 25 CACK, 200 GWFG, and around 2000 CANG were also present there.

I again am voting to accept the record.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Walter Marcisz

Date of review: 7-17-19

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: U-O

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation]

Echoing a couple of other reviewers during the 1st circulation, the submitters' photos clearly support the ID of Barnacle Goose. Identification is straightforward based on photos.

Beyond that, four different reviewers expressed reservations about this bird's origins & provenance during the first circulation (although one of the four did vote to accept). For me, four out of seven is way too much and I again vote to reject.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Adam Sell

Date of review: 7/19/19

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-E (photo) A-S (2)

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation]

I still think this one fits the criteria for me to accept. Right time of year, no obvious signs of captivity, and association with species that could be from a similar range, especially the one documentation that cites it being with hundreds of white-fronted geese. Of the records, this one gives me the most pause.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Douglas Stotz

Date of review: 27 July 2019

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: A-E(photo)

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation] I voted for this record first time through. Nothing about this record gives me pause. It is clearly a Barnacle Goose, is free-flying moving across multiple counties and at least at some locations associating with some individuals of Arctic breeding geese.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Paul Sweet

Date of review: 7/13/19

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: U-O

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation] Davida's comments on possible associated birds at another location is encouraging, but the fact that it doesn't appear to be with anything notable at this location still makes it difficult to accept.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Geoffrey A. Williamson

Date of review: 4 July 2019

Circulation number: 2nd

Vote: U-O

Comments: [required as this is a 2nd circulation]

In the first circulation, I expressed doubts about origin because there was not any real argument presented in the documentation that this was a wild bird. The comments of other Members in the first circulation have increased my comfort with this vote.