

LOUISIANA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

REPORT FORM

This form is intended as a convenience in reporting observations of species on the Louisiana Bird Records Committee (LBRC) Review List. The LBRC recommends the use of this form or a similar format when submitting records for review to assure that all pertinent information is accounted for. Attach additional pages or files as necessary. Please print or type for hard copy. For electronic copy, be sure to save this file to your computer before entering text. Attach field notes, drawings, photographs, or tape recordings, if available. Include all photos for more obscurely marked species. When completed (if hard copy), mail to Secretary, Louisiana Bird Records Committee, c/o Museum of Natural Science, 119 Foster Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3216, or e-mail electronic copy as an attachment to Paul Edward Conover at <zoiseaux@lusfiber.net> .

1. English and Scientific names: Kelp Gull (*Larus dominicanus*)

2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): two adult females (sex determined by relative size to mate).

3. Parish: St. Bernard

Specific Locality: Delta-Breton NWR, Chandeleur Islands, Curlew Island

4. Date(s) when observed: 10 June 1998 and 13 July 1998

5. Time(s) of day when observed: Survey on 10 June one female observed during each of the two Curlew Island surveys: 1) survey of south end Curlew Island from 0830-1230 hours; and survey of north end Curlew Island from 1300-1800 hours. Both individuals present again on surveys on 13 July: survey of south end Curlew Island from 1030-1300 hours and survey of north end Curlew Island 1330-1530 hours.

6. Reporting observer and city/state address

Reporting observer: Donna L. Dittmann and Steven W. Cardiff
City: 435 Pecan Drive
State: Louisiana

7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s): Refuge Biologist Jim Graham accompanied the observers.

8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): none.

9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): On 10 June survey weather was good: during AM survey was clear, with a slight breeze and seas fairly calm; during PM clear, light east wind, some white caps on gulf on east side. On both of the July surveys weather was good and recorded as clear.

10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): 10 X 40 Leica binoculars

11. Distance to bird(s): Close – we were looking for nests and chicks and the gulls were in flight over us and landing nearby because they were agitated by our presence.

12. Duration of observation: We probably spent several minutes in the vicinity of each pair so was able to watch adult as well as look for nest/chicks.

13. Habitat: barrier islands

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): Birds were breeding and agitated by our presence. The female #1 Kelp on Curlew Island (south end) was paired to a classic F1 hybrid and had two small chicks. On the July trip we found the Kelp-F1 pair in the same area now guarding 3 chicks (1 larger – so we are not sure if we missed one chick on previous trip in June or a chick was adopted; all three chicks were banded). The female #2 Kelp on Curlew Island (north end) was paired to Herring Gull and had nest with 3 eggs (1 egg hatching). This pair was in the same location on the July trip. Unfortunately, as we approached that pair the chicks ran off into the brush. We banded one chick when it returned to the female Kelp but the others were separated from the parents, and there were other gull pairs in the vicinity and we couldn't be sure which chicks went with which gull pair!

15. Description (include only what was actually seen, *not what "should" have been seen*; include if possible: total length/relative size compared to other familiar species; body bulk, shape, proportions; bill, eye, leg, and plumage characteristics. Stress features that separate it from similar species, *or for species that are known to hybridize frequently, stress features that help eliminate possible hybrids*): Both females are generally Herring Gull-sized gulls – but obviously smaller than associated mates. Mantle blackish-gray, notably darker than nearby Laughing Gulls. The mantle shade was nearly blackish-gray and when more distant or in glary light, the birds appeared black and white. The head, underparts, and tail were immaculate white. In flight the primaries from above contrasted little with the dark gray wing. Both female Kelps had one mirror on primary #10 and a broad white trailing edge to the secondaries. The undersurface of the wings in flight were reminiscent of a Laughing Gull with black primaries that graded into dark gray on the inner primaries and continued down the secondaries, forming a distinct dark secondary bar. The head looked fairly large in relationship to the rest of the body in flight, as did the legs and feet. The bill was on the hefty side with a pronounced gonydeal angle, deep yellow with a large red gonydeal patch. Iris was pale yellow and the orbital ring was red. The legs and feet were greenish-yellow.

16. Voice: Notes say Curlew Island (south end) female was giving a “eeeeooo” defense call near the nest in June. In general the breeding gulls were quite vocal.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation): No other large black-backed gull has the combination of greenish-yellow legs, a red orbital ring, and a single mirror on primary #10. No hybrid combination shows these characters.

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): yes – some attached.

19. Previous experience with this species: Visited the Chandeluers in 1994 and saw the original pair of Kelps first discovered in 1989 by Dan Purrington and Larry O’Mealie. Saw DLD saw Kelps on Chandeleurs during a preliminary survey with USFWS in 1996 (DLD with Dan Lane).

20. Identification aids: (list books, illustrations, other birders, etc. used in identification): None.

a. at time of observation: None.

b. after observation: None

21. This description is written from:

<input type="checkbox"/>	notes made during the observation.	Are notes attached?	Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	notes made after the observation.	At what date?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	memory		
<input type="checkbox"/>	study of images		

22. Are you positive of your identification? If not, explain: Yes.

23. Date: 27 February 2020 <compilation of Kelp records for LBRC>

Time:

24. May the LBRC have permission to display in whole or in part this report and accompanying photos on the LOS-LBRC website and LBRC Facebook page?

__yes_____

If yes, may we include your name with the report? __yes_____











