1st Round Votes/Comments (5-4)

TLE: A

WRP: R; Despite the considerable experience of the observer, I'm sufficiently conservative to think that in 1968, and given the observer's unfamiliarity with the species at the time, that to accept this report would be tenuous. I'm changing my vote.

MF: A; More detail would be nice, but the description, context, and behavior sufficiently rules out other longspurs and potential lookalikes such as BOBO, SNBU, HOLA.

ID: A; Description sounds great to me, seen directly in comparison with LALO. Underpart coloration and white lesser and median coverts were most convincing marks.

TS: R; Insufficiently described. Does not rule out other longspurs, fails to describe key facial features, fails to describe tail adequately. Fails to separate from more mundane species.

SS: R; While the description seems good for Smith’s Longspur  
and from an experienced observer, I think the write up could have or needs to  
be more detail for a first state record. (Similar species considered and why  
they were eliminated etc)  Certainly Chris watched this bird for an hour, had it in the scope along with 50 Lapland Longspurs!  Vote to reject, but certainly willing to discuss.

RS: A; This description was very convincing to me. I remember when seeing a Smith's Longspur in 2011, I also noted how the streaking reminded me of Lincoln's Sparrow. I also feel that the observer would have noted white underparts if this had been a lapland.

BN: A; I see no reason to overturn the original decision on this report, on top of which it strikes me as a perfectly good description (and the fact that the very experienced and reliable observer still had no doubts about his identification years later carries considerable weight to my mind).

JRT: R

2nd Round Votes/Comments (5-4)

TLE: A; Nothing to make me change my vote for a good, detailed and carefully considered description.  Especially if Chris is still convinced after much experience with SMLO since this record.

WRP: R; My feelings and my rationale for rejecting this report remain unchanged even is spite of the recent MA record.

MF: A.

ID: A; I still think that this description is solid and in direct comparison with other longspurs. Worth discussion if there is still no consensus.

TS: R; No description of size, bill size and shape, legs, leg color, head pattern, etc. I can't tell from this description if the bird is, say, a juvenile Dark-eyed Junco, White-throated Sparrow, Horned Lark, American Pipit, etc. I am being difficult, I know, but this is a first state record and as such needs careful documentation.

SS: R.

RS: A; Opinion has not changed.

BN: A; No change.

JRT: R; This is certainly a difficult record to assess. On the one hand, we have a very experience observer. On the other, the observer had no experience with this species at the time. I would take the opposite stance of Blair on the later recollections of this bird and of recording of details so long after the fact. While the details are great as provided, time does warp everyone's memories and I would say that having seen many SMLO in the interim would likely have influenced the memory of the observer. It happens to everyone. I didn't originally recognize that these notes were recorded over a decade later.