

Diego County, California. As this hawk is seldom seen in coastal southern California, its occurrence caused many to visit the locality to make its acquaintance. Observers were able to approach the bird closely and study it through their binoculars. It was seen on November 1, 1942, by Mr. and Mrs. O. M. Stultz, Caroline Daugherty, Don Eckleberry, and Dorothy Groner. On November 6, 1942, it was seen by Alma Mason, Ruby Curry, Mrs. Kent, and the writer. The hawk was carefully identified as it stretched its wings, preened its feathers, and finally took flight after about twenty minutes.

Also worth reporting is a Glaucous Gull (*Larus hyperboreus*) in second-year plumage seen in the Los Angeles area. Careful study of specimens furnished by George Willett of the Los Angeles Museum verified the identification of this rare gull. It has been carefully studied several times in January and February of 1944 on the same fresh-water lake.—WYATT A. KENT, 815 South Irolo Street, Los Angeles, California, February 21, 1944.

**Specimens of the Pacific Golden Plover from California.**—In 1936 Grinnell (Condor, 38, 1936:219) reported the first specimen of the Pacific Golden Plover (*Pluvialis dominica fulva*) from California. This bird had been taken on January 15, 1922, at Bay Farm Island, Alameda County, but had remained unrecognized among a series of *Pluvialis dominica dominica* until noted by Allan Brooks. Grinnell reported in detail on this bird, pointing out that *fulva* in contrast to *dominica* shows (1) a well-defined dull brownish chest area set off rather sharply from the extensively clear white abdominal area, (2) a more extensive pervasion of clear apricot yellow throughout the dorsal surface, (3) an extension of yellow to the sides of the head and weakly to the pectoral area, and (4) a shorter wing.

Subsequently this bird was examined by Dr. R. A. Falla of New Zealand when he was visiting at the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology in February of 1939. He ventured the opinion that *fulva*, as known to us from this Californian specimen and from those from the Hawaiian Islands, is not the same as what he considers *fulva* in New Zealand. However, no direct comparison with material from New Zealand was then possible, nor has it yet been feasible to pursue this particular problem. There may indeed be a difference. Dr. Falla further suggested to Dr. Grinnell and to me that the California-taken specimen and our Hawaiian material represented adult *P. d. dominica* and that other Golden Plovers in winter plumage from the Pacific coast were immatures; thus one might explain the differences that were presumed to be racial. The breast markings of the bird from Bay Farm Island he accounted for particularly in this way.

This very proper and welcomed criticism lead me, as was intended, to review the identity and age of our material. It seems true generally that the under parts in immature Golden Plovers are more distinctly mottled than in adults, and that this mottling extends down over the belly to greater degree and without sharp delimitation. Birds of known immaturity from Alaska, some with remnants of natal down, invariably show extensive mottling. How infallible this distinction may be is not known, but most of our specimens seem to fall naturally into one of two categories compatible with this interpretation. But it is also equally clear that two races are involved in North America, as has long been agreed. Age for age, the characters of brilliance and extent of gold coloring and wing length hold up along the lines already reviewed above. From western Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, Fanning Islands, the Philippines, and Siam, there are at hand brightly colored *fulva* which contrast with dull *dominica*. *Fulva* seems to be more sharply mottled beneath in immature plumage and more distinctly banded across the breast in adult plumage. *Fulva* may not prove identical throughout the Pacific Basin, but at the moment, judging from scattered samples, it seems reasonably uniform in this vast area.

The first-reported Californian example of *fulva* still seems, on the basis of characters other than the mottling of the breast, to be of this race; I judge it to be an adult. But also at hand is another Californian example which, beyond all doubt, is a representative of the richly colored *fulva* as known from the Bering Sea area. It is a heavily mottled immature male, no. 5953 in the collection of Ralph Ellis, taken September 10, 1922, at Eureka, Humboldt County, by Franklin J. Smith. It is extensively marked with bright gold above and this color extends on to the sides of the head and breast and even as a dull wash on to the belly. Measurements: wing, 166.5 mm.; tail, 62.7; culmen, 21.7; tarsus, 43.5. For comparison of measurements, see Grinnell (*loc. cit.*) and Ridgway (Birds N. M. Amer., pt. 8, 1919:84, 89). This second specimen is, then, a strongly marked example of *fulva*, and it substantiates the occurrence of this form as an occasional migrant to California. I am indebted to Ralph Ellis for permission to report upon this bird.—ALDEN H. MILLER, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley, California, April 2, 1944.*