Acknowledgements

A special thanks to Steven Spitzer for taking additional photographs of this rare shorebird with me. Also, I must thank Adam Sell for questioning the original Willet identification and a great deal of thanks must go to Greg Neise who first identified this rare shorebird and to the Illinois Birder's Forum participants who weighed in on the identification of the Wandering Tattler.

Literature Cited

Gill, Robert E., B. J. Mccaffery and P.S. Tomkovich. 2002. Wandering Tattler (Tringa incana), The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online: http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/642doi:10.2173/bna.642.

Neise, Greg. 2012. ABArare – Wandering Tattler – Chicago, Illinois.

Retrieved from http://blog.aba.org/2012/08/abarare-wandering-tattler-chicago-illinois.html.

O'Brien, Michael, R. Crossley and K. Karlson. 2006. The Shorebird Guide. Houghton Mifflin. Harcourt, Boston. 477 pp.

— Matthew Ligas 18 W 68th St, Apt 4A New York, NY 1002 mligas@gmail.com

Eighteenth Report of the Illinois Ornithological Records Committee

BY PAUL SWEET

Evaluations by the Illinois Ornithological Records Committee (IORC or "the Committee") are reported here for a total of 31 records, including 29 accepted records of 20 species, one unaccepted record of one species, and one unaccepted historical record, resubmitted after two observers examined the specimen. A total of 51 observers contributed reports, including descriptions and photographs documenting these records. We continue to follow the conventions used in the first seventeen reports of the Committee (Stotz 2012). The records below are divided into two groups: Accepted and Unaccepted. The Accepted group is further divided into First State Records, Review List Records and Other Records. Nomenclature, English names and sequence of species conform to that of the seventh edition of the American Ornithologist's Union checklist, (1998) and its supplements, through the 53rd (Chesser et al. 2012).

Accepted records are entered with the locality, including county, the date, the IORC record number (in parentheses, the year of initial observation followed by a serial number), and the initials of the primary observer(s) who contributed specimens, descriptions, and/or photographs. Similar

information is provided for unaccepted records, except the observers remain anonymous, and a brief explanation of why the record was not accepted is given. The initials of a contributor without any further modification indicate that they contributed solely written documentation. When additional information was provided, a colon follows the observer's initials with the following codes: ph for photographic evidence, v for video, s for sound recording, and sp for a specimen. Many contributing photographers also submitted written documentation, a practice that the Committee strongly encourages. If the observer who first discovered the bird is known to the committee, their initials are set off from the initials of other contributors by a semicolon. Initial observers who did not submit documentation are not always listed. For specimen records, a # follows an abbreviation for the institution holding the specimen, along with that institution's catalog number of the specimen if available.

The Committee continues to encourage all observers of rare birds to submit documentation, even when multiple observers are involved in a sighting. Some records are deemed unacceptable due to incomplete information, which can often be resolved

by additional documentation. Photos are of course invaluable resources for the Committee, but there are times when a tricky ID can be resolved from written details not depicted in photos. Additionally, submitting documentation directly to the Committee, even if it involves strictly photos, resolves some ambiguity regarding copyright issues, etc. and is appreciated. It only takes a few moments to attach photos to an e-mail, and is greatly appreciated. Photos won't be republished without express permission, although there is hope to have any evidence submitted available in a searchable format eventually. Please see the field notes section of this issue for more photos of some of the entries below.

The Committee does not always take a position on the age or sex of a bird, and any such information given may be the observer's opinion, rather than the Committee's. All other remarks are the author's, although most of the information comes from the Committee files, which are now stored in Chicago, Illinois, in the Bird Division of the Field Museum.

In those cases where there are discrepancies between the details presented here and other published records, the data provided here represent the Committee's best assessment of all

Volume 22, Number 2 53