

Report of the Ohio Records Committee

The following is a summary of those documentations received and reviewed by the committee for Summer 1981, which were not accepted by the majority (3) of the committee. Please recall that the committee only decides the sufficiency of the description received and not whether the bird was actually seen. It is entirely possible that the bird was seen but not described adequately.

The committee with regret accepted the resignation of Worth S. Randle. The time requirements of a new job prevent him from devoting the necessary time to reviewing documentations. We thank him for his efforts and opinions and wish him well in his new position. He did not participate in the reviews of the Summer 1982 documentations. The committee is currently seeking a new member from southwestern Ohio.

Cinnamon Teal. One OWR, Ottawa Co., 18 July 1981. Description given of adult male in breeding plumage but in mid-July it would be quite unusual for a male duck of any species to be in full breeding plumage. Most male ducks have entered into eclipse plumage during June and do not attain their breeding plumage again until autumn. This species generally does not return to breeding plumage until late autumn. Although some "rusty" feathers may start appearing in August or September. Even if the bird were the rare one (1/20,000) that does not undergo a normal molt pattern the description given has details that are inconsistent with this species: bill: "dark or bluish all over" (this species does not have a bluish bill); eye: "dark" (should be red); back: "brown/gray (should be brown without any gray). Although there is a July record for this species for Ohio (Ohio Cardinal, Vol. 2, No. 4, Pg. 43). This description has insufficient details for such a rare, in such unusual plumage to permit verification. bird

Merlin. One, Magee Marsh Wildlife Area, 17 July 1981. This description of an immature bird does not eliminate a female kestrel. Many female kestrels are not very reddish dorsally and often appear just plain brown. Unprecedented for date at least in modern times. Size description too vague. (Should have been compared to shore birds in area.) Body shape (much more bulky than a kestrel) and flight pattern not described. Insufficient details to permit verification.

The following is a summary of those documentations received and reviewed by the committee for Summer 1982, which were not accepted by the majority (3) of the committee.

Western Kingbird. One, northern Wood Co., 6 July 1982. This observation of eight seconds at a distance of seventy-five yards and without binoculars, while driving forty miles per hour is not sufficient for verification of such an unusual bird. It is certainly entirely possible that this bird was present in this area but unfortunately regardless of the skill of the observer the observation circumstances were not good.

Blue Grosbeak. One, Oak Openings Metro Park, Lucas Co., 26 July 1982. This description of a female does not mention the brown wingbars and describes the bird as "about robin size". In the field, the species appears noticeably smaller than a robin. Peterson, R.T., 1980, in A Field Guide to the Birds states that the range of blue grosbeak body length is 6-7½ " while that of a robin is 9-11 ". The observer had not seen this species before this time and the observation lasted five seconds. Under these circumstances without a description of the wingbars this record cannot be verified.