2nd Round Votes: 6– 3 (Needs third round)

Accept

MJI: Everything about this bird fits except for the culmen measurement, which Sue attributes to head molt giving an atypically long measurement. This is a reasonable explanation for me. The notion that this is rufus x sedentarius is pretty implausible I would say, since the breeding ranges do not come close to overlapping and sedentarius is...sedentary. While pointing out the interesting inconsistency of the culmen measurement is important, I do not think it trumps the r5 measurement and molt consistent with Allen's.

ID: Despite the comments by Mitchell I still think that this bird looks fine for ALHU.

TS: Was fine with Allen's originally until I got swayed by an expert. I suspect we'll discuss this in person.

TLE: Agree with Blair that a discussion will be very useful. I have looked at enough ridges on Humm. bills and measured enough RTHU & RUHU (but not ALHU) to know that measurements are not always perfect for each spp. or age/sex class. I suggest we follow Mitchell and forget age/sex at first, just concentrate on species. Agree with everyone that narrow R5 is a good character and this one can only be ALHU. Also all agree that R2 shape is ALHU, and all the other measurements fit ALHU best. The problematical 19.3 mm culmen is long for RUHU by 0.3 mm and long for S. s. sasin by 0.5 mm. It is hard to be that accurate with a hummer, so theoretically Mitchell is correct that it could be a hybrid, but overall I am >95% convinced to vote ALHU. Marshall & Ian make good points about plumage & wear.

JRT

WRP

Reject

MF: Seems to be fairly obvious reasonable doubt in the expert opinion here. We lose nothing being conservative on these.

SS: Vote to reject-I didn't pick up on the comments by D.Mitchell in the first round. Should be discussed at meeting.

BN: I would have thought this an Allen's, based upon the very narrow R5, but if an authority on the species has doubts, then a cautious approach is warranted and I thus vote to reject (with hopes this one can be discussed at the meeting.

1st Round Votes: 6 - 3

Accept

TLE

MJI: Photos: measurements and unemarginate r2 confirm Allen's. I am not overly troubled by one inconsistent bill measurement, and this is explained in Sue's writeup. We might never know if this is a hybrid. Interesting that heavily worn birds like this are so consistently Allen's. It really is a good initial character.

JRT

WRP

SS

ID: Identified by rectrice shape plus seemingly characteristic worn buff color shown by ALHU in MA

Reject

MF: Well, this one is troubling. Sue's write-up looks like all of her others and makes it seem like a slam dunk, but the second analysis by Donald Mitchell calls all of it into question. What can we do beyond Rufous/Allen's?

TS: Needs discussion. Mitchell comments are interesting.

BN: I would have thought this an Allen's, based upon the very narrow R5, but if an authority on the species has doubts, then a cautious approach is warranted and I thus vote to reject (with hopes this one can be discussed at the meeting.