

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: Great White Heron (*Ardea herodias occidentalis*)
2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): 1 bird, sex unknown, age unknown, all-white plumage
3. Parish: Jefferson
Specific Locality: Grand Isle, LA – at base of antenna tower at the intersection of Yacht Harbor Ave and Humble Rd, between Loma Linda Ave and Yacht Harbor Ave
4. Date(s) when observed: 4-18-16
5. Time(s) of day when observed: 5:30 p.m. through 6:49 p.m.
6. Reporting observer and address: Debbie and Pat Gallacher, 515 Hermitage Ct., Pearl River, LA 70452
7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s): none
8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): Casey Wright, Michael Seymour, Joan Garvey, David Muth, James V. Remsen, Dan Lane, Wendy Rihner
9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): Clear sky, sunny. We were due west of the bird for about the first 50 minutes (on Loma Linda Ave), with full afternoon sunlight on the bird. Then the bird moved behind a chainlink fence lined with low vegetation, and we moved to a road on the east side of the bird (Yacht Harbor Ave), so we could see it better.
10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): binoculars: brand-new Zeiss Victory SF 10 x 42 and perfect-condition Pentax 8 x 42 DCF SP. Cameras: brand-new iphones: 6S (with zoom and video). Better pictures obtained subsequently by several of the persons

listed above in #8.

11. Distance to bird(s): about 260 ft. west of the bird (from Loma Linda Ave), then about 80 ft. east of the bird (from Yacht Harbor Ave)

12. Duration of observation: approximately 1 hr. 20 min.

13. Habitat: grassy open field backed by chainlink fence, up against which was some low vegetation. Bird was in field, mostly in front of fence and vegetation.

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): Bird was standing in grassy field, neck stretched up high. We were struck by its very large size, long neck, heavy bill, and whitish legs. We watched while the bird alternately strode slowly around, stood motionless, and bent over to peck at things in the grass. It faced various directions, and we were able to see it from many angles and for a long period of time. It flew up onto the top of the fence twice, clearly showing the pure white wings and body, and nearly-white legs.

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*): Bird appeared larger than a great egret, and its neck, fully stretched up, was long. The bill was quite heavy and yellow. The feet and legs were very pale, nearly white along their whole length. Feathers appeared uniformly white over entire body. No plumes were visible.

16. Voice: Did not hear.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation): Eliminated great egret because of very thick bill, larger overall size, and nearly-white legs.

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): Photos and videos were obtained by us, using an iPhone 6S. White legs adequately show when photos are expanded. However, far better photos were obtained subsequently, by Michael Seymour, Joan Garvey, David Muth, James Van Remsen, and Daniel Lane.

19. Previous experience with this species: Only in online readings and guide books.

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

a. at time of observation: Already recognized bird from online readings but confirmed

with Sibley app on cellphone.

b. after observation: internet-website of Great White Heron NWR and <http://www.sibleyguides.com/2007/11/great-white-heron-not-just-a-color-morph/>

21. This description is written from:

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

22. Are you positive of your identification? If not, explain: We are positive of our identification.

23. Date: 4-28-16

Time: 10:30 p.m.

24. May the LBRC have permission to display this report or portions of this report on its website? yes

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