

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

**Committee member name:** Davida Kalina

**Date of review:** 5 July 2022

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record]

The scant written description of the target bird (mentioning only that the color of the back and neck was observed and that the bird lacked the white coloration of a COLO) is inadequate to rule out immature COLO and PALO, as well as adult and immature RTLO. The documentation section about eliminating other species is blank. I am voting to reject this record.

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

**Committee member name:** Walter Marcisz

**Date of review:** 6-29-22

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record]

Details provided are inadequate for acceptance. The observer mentions that the Peterson bird book was consulted, so I suspect he used the 1980 edition of the Peterson Field Guide, which was published before Pacific Loon was split off (as the expected North American form) from Arctic Loon. Regardless, even if the observer intended to identify the bird as Pacific Loon, the details provided are inadequate for acceptance as that species, or perhaps any type of loon. At least for me, 2021-118 remains an unidentified water-associated bird species of some sort.

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

**Committee member name:** Adam Sell

**Date of review:** 7/26/22

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record]

The written description lacks the detail needed to rule out all expected loons in our region.

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

**Committee member name:** Paul Sweet

**Date of review:** 7/4/22

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record] The description does nothing to rule out any other loon. Given that the observer didn't provide a full reference for her field guide, might it be old enough that Arctic and Pacific Loons were still lumped?

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

**Committee member name:** Terry Walsh

**Date of review:** 7/12/22

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record]

The brief description does not include any features that are diagnostic of Arctic Loon (or any other loon species). It is also not clear if this bird may have been a Common Loon in basic or molting into alternate plumage that might the brief description.

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

**Committee member name:** Kyle Wiktor

**Date of review:** 7/12/2022

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record]

No features that would be diagnostic of this species were described in the document.

## **IORC EVALUATION FORM**

**Record #:** 2021-118

**Name of bird form:** Arctic Loon

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

**Date of review:** 22 June 2022

**Circulation number:** 1st

**Vote:** U-ID

**Comments:** [required as this is a potential first state record]

There is hardly any description of the bird. With no description, and especially in a case such as this where we have a potentially difficult separation between Pacific Loon and Arctic Loon, I must vote against acceptance.