

LOUISIANA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

REPORT FORM

1. English and Scientific names: Glaucous Gull, *Larus hyperboreus*

2. Number of individuals: 1

3. Locality: LOUISIANA: (parish) Cameron

Specific Locality: Recreational boat landing near the end of Davis Road, town of Cameron.

4. Date(s) when observed: 10/21/2018

5. Time(s) of day when observed: mid-morning

6. Reporting observer and address:

Paul Conover

Lafayette, LA

7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s):

8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): The bird was originally found by Thomas Morris.

9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): Good light

10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): Zeiss 10s, Nikon D3300 with 200 mm lens

11. Distance to bird(s): At its closest, the bird was about one meter from me.

12. Duration of observation: About 15 minutes

13. Habitat: Boat landing and wharf

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation: I noticed the bird as I was driving by, and remembered it had been reported there. I took photos from my car, then got out and approached the bird. It let me get within a meter, then walked about another meter way. I approached, and it reluctantly retreated but maintained a distance of about 1 meter at minimum. Wondering if it was injured, I walked to the end of the wharf, at which point it ran out of room and flew across

the slip to the other wharf. I did so again, and it flew to the rocks next to a parked camper, where a man was walking around. The bird showed no fear of humans. The bird spent a lot of the time I was with it opening and closing its mouth, as if it had eaten a too-large meal that it was trying to position in its gullet. I was afraid that it might have eaten an artificial bait or something.

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):

A very large, very pale dark-eyed gull with pale pink legs and pink bill with defined dark tip. The gape of the bird was extensive. The white feathering of the bird was filigreed pale mocha in the form of internal chevrons or vermiculation. The head and underparts were finely streaked or mottled pale mocha. The primaries were white with a fine mocha shaft streak and a fine mocha submarginal line forming a fine anchor pattern. Most mantle feathers were finely barred with wavy bars. The darkest or most heavily marked area was the undertail coverts, which were more thickly barred so that this area was about half and half white and mocha.





The spread wing presented a three-toned effect: the remiges were palest, with a whitish ground color; the greater coverts were of a pale mocha ground color and were largely unmarked except

for mocha terminal or marginal markings; the lesser and median coverts were pale mocha in ground color, but more densely marked with subterminal mocha chevrons and finer barring.



The rump was evenly marked with wavy mocha bars on whitish feathers. The rectrices appeared solidly pale gray from a distance, but closer examination shows a watery pale brownish pattern throughout, with more mottled appearance on outer webs and at least on the inner webs of the outermost 3 rectrix pairs.



16. Voice: The bird made typical gull sounds that didn't seem particularly diagnostic for species.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation):

Large size and bill color eliminate Iceland, overall pattern seems typical of Glaucous rather than hybrids of that species or of other pale-winged species such as Glaucous-winged.

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): Photos, attached.

19. Previous experience with this species: Annual or nearly so experience here in LA.

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

a. at time of observation:

b. after observation:

21. This description is written from: memory, photos

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

23. Date: 11/7/2018