## 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. <u>Attach additional pages or files as necessary</u>. 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 <<u>zoiseaux@lusfiber.net</u>.

1. English and Scientific names: California Gull (Larus californicus)

2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): one adult female in fresh definitive basic plumage

- Parish: Cameron Specific Locality: Rutherford Beach
- 4. Date(s) when observed: 20 October 2000
- 5. Time(s) of day when observed: approximately 6 PM
- 6. Reporting observer and address: Donna L. Dittmann & Steven W. Cardiff

7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also identified the bird(s): none

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): clear weather conditions; exact lighting/viewing angles during observation not recorded

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

11. Distance to bird(s): not recorded, but presumably within a couple hundred feet using vehicle as a blind

12. Duration of observation: notes say "a few moments," which we would interpret as probably a minute or two.

## 13. Habitat: gulf beach

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): Bird was standing among mixed flock of gulls and terns including various ages/plumages of Laughing, Ring-billed, and Herring gulls and Caspian and Royal terns. Once we locked-on to the California, we were briefly able to study it before it suddenly took flight and disappeared to the east. Otherwise, SWC would undoubtedly have attempted to collect the bird. NOTE that this bird was not seen the next day, but when we returned on 27 October we encountered a similar-looking individual and were able to collect it. That record was accepted by the LBRC but there was no reference to the 20 October bird. On a 3 x 5 card SWC indicated that these were possibly the same bird but that the 20 October observation would be treated separately. There was no follow through on that until now when SWC was entering old lists into eBird.

15. Description (include only what was actually seen, *not what "should" have been seen;* include if possible: see attached notes/sketch by DLD recorded that evening. We note that the California Gull bill pattern is not described in words but that the sketch could be interpreted as showing the red and black marks of an adult CAGU.

16. Voice: not heard.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation): Combination of size/proportions, dark iris, bill pattern, relatively dark mantle, and gray legs should eliminate other superficially similar species

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): none.

19. Previous experience with this species: Extensive experience in W. USA; we discovered the first CAGU for LA and subsequently have observed at least a couple dozen in LA with many of these supported by specimens and/or photos.

20. Identification aids: (list books, illustrations, other birders, etc. used in identification):

a. at time of observation: none.

b. after observation: none.

21. This description is written from:

	notes made during the observation.	Are notes attached?	
Х	notes made after the observation.	At what date?	10/20/2000
	memory		

study of images

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

23. Date: 6 February 2019 Time: 10:00 AM

FRI 10/20/00 SAT (9 2 ad 9 one slightly smaller and parter ( new att 32-col) 1-ord 3' parly large 1-2nd basic - 09 1-Jun/ Istunter-reg. 18 ad - mostly white headed - wollding of white/ creaming ad w/ toge w/ mirror on Pio gt that the de 6-7 prime 104 1 ad basic no wona had " - paterbackgronnel CABY 1 ad basic no wong mothy - 6 millioche rounded peteter head I won Runded & alls, / or calif e no cuer it ins bull snall a navalater ou -all white tail Kot so falls. I -grayish leges lepm - watche 69 fen monents inflock, left by they heading E