LOUISIANA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

REPORT FORM

- 1. English and Scientific names: Brown Booby, Sula leucogaster
- 2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): 34 adults mixed with subadults and immatures; unsexed
- 3. Parish: St. Tammany
 Specific Locality: Lake Pontchartrain (coordinates: N 30° 15.385' W 090° 06.802')
- 4. Date(s) when observed: 18 September 2016
- 5. Time(s) of day when observed: ca. 1040-1100
- 6. Reporting observer and address: James W. Beck, 5077 Highland Dr. Marrero, LA 70072
- 7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s): Steven and Olivia-Kate Liffmann
- 8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): Nancy L. Newfield, Jody Shugart, David Muth, Dave Patton, many obs.
- 9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): Great lighting conditions mostly sunny, lots of blue sky. Perched birds were viewed with the sun at our backs and high overhead.
- 10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): Vortex 8x42 Diamondbacks
- 11. Distance to bird(s): varying ca. 20 ft. to .25 mi.
- 12. Duration of observation: ca. 20 minutes
- 13. Habitat: Lake Pontchartrain (estuary) open water as well as many concrete pilings under bridge.
- 14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): Individuals were both flying (presumably hunting) over the lake as well as perched (mostly in twos) on the concrete piling structures that are part of the bridge structure. Many individuals flew directly over us in the boat.
- 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*): Body shape most reminiscent to that

of Northern Gannet, *Morus bassanus*, but slightly smaller. Long, pointed wings with a streamline body shape and pointed tail. Smaller than Brown Pelican, *Pelecanus occidentalis* with more pointed winged and "arrow-shaped" head and longer necks. Adults had clean, white bellies, chest and undertail coverts. Retrices, rumps, throat, neck and heads were chocolate brown. Wings – flight feathers brown with white in the underwing near the patagials. Feet and face yellow, bill a "horn" color with a "triangular" bluish marking before the eyes...eyes appeared to be light in color; maybe a light blue or grayish.

Immatures were colored similarly in overall color, but belly, chest and undertail coverts mottled white and brown; less of a clean demarcation between neck and chest.

16. Voice: Similar to Anhinga, *Anhinga anhinga*; a croaking-type call. Few individuals were vocal.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation): Northern Gannet, *Morus bassanus*, is slightly larger, adults mostly white on head, neck, back and tail. Gannet also only has black flight feathers on the outer tips of the wings. Immature gannets are more similar, but feet are blue-grayish instead of yellow, gannets also have a blue eye ring. Underwing pattern varies in that the leading edge is brown with the trailing edge being whitish – in Brown Booby immatures, the underwing pattern is brown on both the leading and trailing edges, with white in the central part of the wing, beneath the patagials. Smaller than Brown Pelican, *Pelecanus occidentalis* with more pointed winged and "arrow-shaped" head and longer necks.

- 18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): Yes, photos by J.W. Beck
- 19. Previous experience with this species: 3 individuals on Calcasieu Lake in 2013
- 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?
notes made after the observation. At what date?

x memory
x study of images

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

23. Date: 18 September 2016

Time: 1910















