

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: fraker

Date of review: 1/1/20

Circulation number: 3rd

Vote: A-E(ph)

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation]

I continue to feel that after the acceptance of this species to the state checklist, the appropriate timing of the sighting, and no outward evidence of captivity all leads me to vote to accept.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Davida Kalina

Date of review: 3 January 2020

Circulation number: 3rd

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

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation]

I am repeating my comments from the 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.”

With the recent acceptance of 3 other Barnacle Goose records in IL as precedent, I am again voting to accept this record.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Walter Marcisz

Date of review: 1-24-20

Circulation number: 3rd

Vote: U-O

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation]

Based on the photos, the bird is clearly a Barnacle Goose. I don't think any of us disagree with that assessment.

The bigger question for me is origin. The photos show at least 1 hallux, and an absence of leg bands. The bird was free-flying, and it associated to some extent with wild Cackling Geese and Greater White-fronted Geese. All of this suggests (but does not prove) a wild origin. I don't believe that the possibility of captive origin has been conclusively eliminated, and therefore I am again voting to reject based on origin.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Adam Sell

Date of review: 1/19/20

Circulation number: 3rd

Vote: A-E(photo)

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation] Still choosing to accept this species. Nothing about this record proves to me that it couldn't be wild, although it doesn't tick my subjective "with other Greenland geese" box as darkly as I would like. As Geoff had mentioned in a prior circulation, I'm just glad to see these records being voted on and that the records will be archived. Perhaps we will be able to return to these records in future years when more evidence/information is available regarding the vagrancy of this species.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Douglas Stotz

Date of review: 27 January 2020

Circulation number: 3rd

Vote: A-E(photo)

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation]

Bird was free-flying and associating with at least some Arctic breeding geese. Timing of record is good for a wild bird. I will acknowledge that there is nothing about this bird that demonstrates that it is a wild bird, but I am not sure what that would be. There is certainly nothing that demonstrates that it is not a wild bird. I think once we have made the jump to accept any Barnacle Goose, a record like this has to be accepted.

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Paul Sweet

Date of review: 1/10/20

Circulation number: 3rd

Vote: U-O

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation] I'm still hung up on the lack of consideration of the origin by the observers. Also, while one foot clearly has a hallux, the same photo makes it seem that the other foot doesn't...

IORC EVALUATION FORM

Record #: 2019-002

Name of bird form: Barnacle Goose

Committee member name: Geoffrey A. Williamson

Date of review: 28 December 2019

Circulation number: 3rd

Vote: U-O

Comments: [required as this is a 3rd circulation]

Again, I am voting against on the basis of origin. The evidence cited for wild origin in this case all comes from interpretation of photos and from time of year, rather than from firsthand observation at the time with the intention of addressing the question. I am myself uncomfortable with accepting the record on that basis.

The origin is in question. The time of year is good for a bird of wild origin, but ALL times are good for a bird of captive origin. There is no evidence of captivity visible in the photographs, but it is much more thorough to have a first hand observer take the time to examine for any evidence (bands, clipped halluces, behavioral cues, and so on) than to assess this only from still photographs.

I think that if we accept this bird, we will be adopting a standard that amounts to accepting as wild anything that shows up in a November to February time span (as long as cursory examinations reveal no bands) and rejecting anything that appears during March to October. I don't believe such a criterion is going to be helpful to understanding the true picture.

I remain unsure of the spectrum of behaviors one may expect from birds of captive origin. My working hypothesis is that some waterfowl of captive origin join flocks of wild birds and move about with them, even over some distances. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that this is not possible or probable.