

- PETERSON, R. T. AND E. L. CHALIF. 1973. A field guide to Mexican birds and adjacent Central America. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts.
- RIDGELY, R. S. 1976. A guide of the birds of Panama. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- SLUD, P. 1964. The birds of Costa Rica: distribution and ecology. *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.* 128:1-430.
- WETMORE, A. 1972. Birds of the Republic of Panama. Vol. 2, *Smithson. Misc. Coll.* 150.

JUAN FRANCISCO ORNELAS, *Colección Ornitológica, Departamento de Zoología. Instituto de Biología, UNAM, Apartado Postal 70-153. México, D. F., CP 04510. Received 10 Dec. 1986, accepted 29 Apr. 1987.*

Wilson Bull., 99(4), 1987, pp. 721-722

Abnormally colored juvenile Black-capped Chickadee molts to normal basic plumage.— On 29 July 1986, at Aberdeen, Brown County, South Dakota, I netted, banded, and photographed (VIREO accession numbers V06-2-003, V06-2-004) an aberrantly plumaged Black-capped Chickadee (*Parus atricapillus*). In general appearance, the bird was brown where normal birds are gray, a condition known as "leucism" (see discussion in Campbell and Lack, eds., *A dictionary of birds*. Buteo Books, Vermillion, South Dakota, 1985). The bird resembled a Boreal Chickadee (*P. hudsonicus*), but its throat was not black and its back was pale mouse-brown, characteristics that are typical of "leucistic" plumage. Close examination of the crown and throat, which were chestnut, revealed a few scattered black feathers molting into the plumage. The underparts were white except for some buff just below the bend of the wing (similar to that found in Black-capped Chickadees). The lower flanks were white. The remiges and rectrices were pale mouse-brown with white edges; the bases of these feathers were gray (the gray area was longest on the tail, comprising 37 mm of the 64 mm tail; and on the primaries, where 34 mm of the 68 mm were brown). The lesser secondary coverts were gray. The cheeks were completely white. The eyes and other softparts were typical for Black-capped Chickadees. The bird's skull was incompletely ossified, indicating a first-year bird. The bird appeared to be in the company of several normally plumaged Black-capped Chickadees that I banded during that week.

The bird was subsequently trapped and released 5 times. On 24 August 1986, the bird was well into prebasic molt. At this time, the crown and throat were largely black, with only a broad chestnut superciliary stripe and postocular region. The brown stripes nearly, but not quite, met at the back of the crown. Scattered brown feathers remained at the edges of the black throat. The bird's flanks were buffy. The back was a normal gray, as were all the secondary coverts (although the alula, primary coverts, and tail were as before). The flight feathers remained unmolted, except for the secondary nearest the body on each side, which were now normally colored. No remiges or rectrices appeared to be missing. On 14 September, all that remained of the chestnut on the head were postocular spots and a few preocular feathers. On the right wing, a gray second secondary to the body was appearing. The corresponding secondary on the left side was still brown and seemed exceptionally worn; otherwise the bird was similar to its August appearance. On 8 October, the 3 inner right secondaries and the innermost left secondary had been molted and were normally colored. By 18 January 1987, the wing molt situation had not changed. The left third and fourth secondary to the body were now becoming excessively worn, as were the 2 left outer tail feathers. The third to the outside left rectrix, however, was a newly molted and normally colored feather.

The first basic plumage in the Black-capped Chickadee is acquired by a partial prebasic molt, which involves the body plumage and wing coverts, but not the rest of the wings or tail (Dwight, The sequence of plumages and moults of the passerine birds of New York. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 13:73–360, 1900). This chickadee's molting of a few flight feathers at an uncharacteristic time may be due to geographical irregularity in molt pattern or replacement of individual lost feathers.

DAN A. TALLMAN, *Northern State College, Aberdeen, South Dakota 57401. Received 12 Feb. 1987, accepted 4 May 1987.*

Wilson Bull., 99(4), 1987, pp. 722–723

A circular “ring-angel” movement by field-feeding waterfowl.—The pattern of dispersal of birds from communal roosts has been termed “ring-angel” because of the images that the flocks produce on radar screens (Harper 1959, Eastwood et al. 1962). This pattern of movement from roosts has been discussed in relation to central place foraging and food competition avoidance (cf. Hamilton and Watt 1970), but it has not been examined in terms of flock movements of feeding birds. In this paper, we describe a “ring-angel” distribution, along with the movements and amounts of grain eaten by feeding Mallards (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and Greater White-fronted Geese (*Anser albifrons*) near Last Mountain Lake, Saskatchewan.

Observations.—The events reported here occurred between 17:20 and 20:00 h on 22 September 1982 in a 125-ha harvested barley field (six-row variety). Observations of feeding Mallards and geese were made with binoculars and a spotting scope from 4 m up in a tree at distances of from 50 to 200 m from the flock. The birds' landing locations and subsequent movements could be determined accurately. Thirty-four Greater White-fronted Geese had been feeding in the field for 20 to 30 min before most Mallards began arriving at 18:00 h. As flocks of Mallards arrived they landed centrally within the flock rather than at its edges. They then gradually dispersed outward from these central positions, producing a very clear, circular “ring-angel” pattern (cf. Harper 1959, Eastwood et al. 1962). During the next hour, Mallards, and smaller numbers of geese and Northern Pintails (*Anas acuta*), continued to land inside the ring-angel and then walked outward to join feeding birds. Approximately 5600 ducks and 300 geese were involved in the ring-angel which was estimated to be about 200 m in diameter when they left the field.

It was not possible to observe feeding birds the next morning (23 Sept.) because of hunting in the field. However, we sampled several parts of the field, including where ducks and geese had fed the previous evening and adjacent areas that had not been used. A 0.29-m² hoop was tossed >5 m ahead as we walked through these areas. The ground was searched for feathers and droppings to ensure that the proper areas were sampled. The number of grain heads, number of plant stems, and height of the stem nearest the center of the hoop were recorded for each toss. The number of heads/toss was then assigned to one of the following categories: 0, 1, 2, 3, >3. The number of kernels inside the hoop was estimated and was categorized as follows: <5, 5–15, 16–50, and >50.

Results and discussion.—The amount of grain missed by harvest machinery (waste grain) and plant (stubble) characteristics in the two areas differed. First, the average number of grain heads/toss was significantly lower inside the ring-angel (1.3 ± 1.7 [SD], N = 36 hoop tosses) than outside (5.3 ± 10.9 , N = 67) (*G*-test, $P < 0.01$), and there were fewer loose kernels inside the ring-angel than outside (*G*-test, $P < 0.05$). Waterfowl ate about 75% of the barley. In lure crop studies (R. G. Clark and H. Greenwood, unpubl. data), we found that ducks “gave up” feeding in swaths (windrows) of cut grain when 75–80% of the grain