

# 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](mailto:zoiseaux@lusfiber.net)> .

1. English and Scientific names: Masked Duck *Nomonyx dominicus*

2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage):

1 presumed female in alternate plumage. Apparently, according to Reeber and BNA, it's also possibly a male in first alternate plumage.

3. Parish: Caddo Parish

Specific Locality: Tar Slough off Leonard Road in Shreveport, private managed wetland of Paul Dickson

4. Date(s) when observed: 28 June, 2018. Found by Dickson Tuesday, 26 June, 2018.

5. Time(s) of day when observed: Seen at 6:00pm; present for duration of 1 hour survey.

6. Reporting observer and address: John Dillon, 183 Dance Road, Athens, LA 71003

7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s): Paul Dickson, Gerry Click, Larry Raymond, Rosemary Seidler, Willie Matthews, Janine Robin, Devin Bosler, Justin Bosler, David Booth, et al.

8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): Van Remsen, Paul Conover, Oscar Johnson, Rob Dobbs, Mac Myers, Jay Huner.

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

10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): Alpen Rainier 8x42 binoculars in very good condition. Alpen 40-60x scope in good condition. Canon SX530HS digital camera in new condition.

11. Distance to bird(s): 50 yards.

12. Duration of observation: 1 hour.

13. Habitat: managed wetland; freshwater slough with levee.

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): Sitting in open water, fairly close (30 feet?) from 2 pair of Ruddy Ducks. Swam closer to low cover after most of the crowd got to the closest viewing spot. Stayed put for 50 minutes, remainder of survey.

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*): Stifftail duck with gray bill, dark eye. Two similarly sized black stripes on face; one as an eyestripe, the other arched across cheek. Also dark crown stripe. Buffy coloration between dark stripes. Nape, rear of head/face, most of neck, and lower throat all rusty. White/buffy chin bordering lowest black stripe at top and rusty neck at bottom. Body plumage not well seen or photographed, but it was overall brownish mottled, maybe tilting toward the reddish brown end but not as rusty as the neck. Wings remained closed during entire observation.

16. Voice: Silent.

17. Similar species (include how they were eliminated by your observation): Male and female Ruddy Duck present for close comparison. Female RUDU eliminated by presence of distinctive eyestripe and general face-stripe pattern and rusty coloration on neck and rear of head/face. No other ducks similar.

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): Yes. Mine are attached.

19. Previous experience with this species: None.

20. Identification aids: (list books, illustrations, other birders, etc. used in identification): Identified as MADU by others before my observation.

a. at time of observation:

b. after observation: to study details of plumage and sex: Reeber, BNA, Nat Geo, and Sibley.

21. This description is written from:

memory  
study of images

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

Yes. The only question I have is the sex and plumage of the bird. It was generally considered to be a female in alternate plumage, which matches well with the color plate of Reeber. But other observers produced photos showing the bird is molting primaries and consequently entering a prebasic molt. Male MADU's first alternate plumage is extremely similar to female's alternate plumage, and this bird could be a male in its first alternate plumage molting into basic plumage.

23. Date: 2 July, 2018

Time: 11:30 am.

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 \_\_\_\_\_



