

Louisiana Ornithological Society's  
LOUISIANA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

no card

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 as necessary. Please print or type. Attach xerox of field notes, drawings, photographs, or tape recordings, if available. Include all photos for more obscurely marked species. When completed, mail to Secretary, Louisiana Bird Records Committee, c/o Museum of Natural Science, 119 Foster Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3216.

1. English and Scientific names: White-winged Scoter Melanitta fusca
2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): one immature vs female - probably immature male
3. Locality: LOUISIANA: Cameron  
(parish)  
off Rutherford Beach in open water Gulf of Mexico approximately 4-5 miles west of beach entrance  
(specific locality)
4. Date(s) when observed: 7 Jan 96
5. Time(s) of day when observed: 11<sup>00</sup> am
6. Reporting observer and address:  
Charles E. Lyon  
8617 E. Wilderness Way  
Shreveport, LA 71106
7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also identified the bird(s):  
Roger Breedlove
8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s):
9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): Sunny sun angle was to observers left allowing good light view with spotting scope
10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition):  
Questar scope up to 60 power
11. Distance to bird(s):  
Several hundred yards
12. Duration of observation:  
10 minutes This bird was seen with 500 Surf Scoter allowing for direct comparison.
13. Habitat: There was also Lesser Scaup as well  
open water

14. **Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation** (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation):  
Swimming with Surf Scoter and Lesser Scaup. The bird was diving for food as well.

15. **Description** (include only what was actually seen, not what "should" have been seen; include if possibly: 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):

This bird was with one of 2 small groups of Surf Scoters and had a sloping forehead similar to that of the Surf Scoters but quite different from the more rounded head of a Black Scoter. The bill appeared dark at the distance we were at, but there could have been some orange coloration that I missed. There were 2 whitish patches on the face, one just behind the bill and one behind the eye. Otherwise the bird appeared all darkish black - the same color as the Surf Scoters, with the exception of the white secondary wing patches. These were well seen and the bird was active showing the wing patches well several times.

16. **Voice:** silent

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

Surf Scoter - white wing patch on secondary is absent

Black Scoter - head shape rounded, no white secondaries, head of immature has more white on face

18. **Photographs or tape recordings obtained?** (by whom? attached?):  
Lesser Scaup - smaller, less bulky body, and seems to sit higher in water

19. **Previous experience with this species:**

I have had extensive experience with all scoter species. I had just seen a number of all 3 species of scoters in Washington & Vancouver over Thanksgiving weekend 1995. I've seen white-winged scoters in Texas, California, Washington, Vancouver, Alaska, North Carolina over the years.

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

a. at time of observation: none

b. after observation: Natural Geographic Society Bird Guide  
Waterfowl Mudge & Burn

21. This description is written from: notes made during the observation  
(   notes attached?);    notes made after the observation (date:   );  
X memory.

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

23. Signature of reporter: Alan E. [signature] 1-26-96 8:30 pm  
(date) (time)

## LOUISIANA ORNITHOLOGICAL SOCIETY

## LOUISIANA BIRD RECORDS COMMITTEE

## REPORT FORM

This form is intended as a convenience in reporting observations of species on the LBRC Review List. The LBRC recommends the use of this form or this format when submitting records for review (to assure that all information involving an observation is accounted for). Attach additional sheets if necessary. Please print or type. Attach drawings, photographs, or tape recordings, if available. Include all photos if an obscurely marked species. When completed, mail to: LBRC Secretary, c/o Museum of Natural Science, 119 Foster Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3216.

1. ENGLISH AND SCIENTIFIC NAMES:

white-winged Scoter  
*Melanitta fusca*

2. NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS, SEXES, AGES, GENERAL PLUMAGE (e.g., 2 ad. in breeding plumage):

1 immature male / female

3. LOCALITY: LOUISIANA;

(state)

(parish)

Cameron

5 miles west of camp on Rutherford Beach  
(specific locality)

4. DATE(S) WHEN SEEN:

1-7-96

5. TIMES OF DAY WHEN SEEN:

11:00 a.m.

6. REPORTING OBSERVER AND ADDRESS:

Roger J. Braddock  
152 Alice Dr.  
P.O. Box 71360

7. OTHER OBSERVERS ACCOMPANYING REPORTER WHO ALSO IDENTIFIED THE BIRD:

Charlie Lyon

8. OTHER OBSERVERS WHO INDEPENDENTLY IDENTIFIED THE BIRD:

9. LIGHT CONDITIONS (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light):

Bird was to the SW of our position - Sun was to the SE &amp; very high.

10. OPTICAL EQUIPMENT (type, power, condition):

Kowa 40X excellent

11. DISTANCE TO BIRD:

400 - 500 yds.

12. DURATION OF OBSERVATION:

5-10 minutes

HABITAT: *Open gulf*

14. BEHAVIOR OF BIRD/CIRCUMSTANCES OF OBSERVATION (flying, feeding, resting, etc. - include and stress any habits used in identification; relate events surrounding the observation): *Preening, sitting on water, diving, etc.*

15. DESCRIPTION (include only what was actually seen, not what "should" have been seen. Include if possible: total length or relative size compared to other species present or familiar species; body bulk, shape, and proportions; bill, eye, leg and plumage characteristics. Stress features that separate it from similar species):

*Large duck, larger than nearby scaup - about same size as the 3 Surf Scoters in the company of which it was found. Heavy bodied, appeared black @ the distance at which it was seen. Similar slope-headed profile to the Surf Scoters. White secondary patch visible @ most times. Dark bill w/ horse-faced look. Whitish patch on face, visible @ all times.*

16. VOICE: *N/A*

17. SIMILAR SPECIES (include how they are eliminated by your observations):

*Surf Scoter lacks white wing patches. Black Scoter lacks wing patches & has a more pronounced forehead. Gadwall has a more pronounced forehead & bill, not diver.*

18. PHOTOGRAPHS OR TAPE RECORDINGS OBTAINED (By whom? Attached?):

19. PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE WITH THIS SPECIES:

*Seen only once before.*

20. IDENTIFICATION AIDS (list books, illustrations, other birders, etc. used in identification):

a) at time of observation: *N.B.*

b) after observation:

21. THIS DESCRIPTION WRITTEN FROM: \_\_\_\_\_ notes made during observation; \_\_\_\_\_ notes made after observation (date: \_\_\_\_\_); ☒ memory.

22. ARE YOU POSITIVE OF YOUR IDENTIFICATION? *Yes*. If not, explain:

23. SIGNATURE OF REPORTER: 

Date: *1-8-96*

Time: *1:30 p.m.*