

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: [MacGillivray's Warbler](#) (*Geothlypis tolmiei*)

2. Number of individuals, sexes, ages, general plumage (e.g., 2 in alternate plumage): [1, unknown age/sex](#)

3. Parish: [Cameron](#)

Specific Locality: [Baton Rouge Audubon Society's Peveto Woods Bird and Butterfly Sanctuary, southeastern block](#)

4. Date(s) when observed: [21 April 2023](#)

5. Time(s) of day when observed: [5:40 pm](#)

6. Reporting observer and city/state address

Reporting observer: Erik I. Johnson
City: Sunset
State: LA

7. Other observers accompanying reporter who also *identified* the bird(s): [None](#).

8. Other observers who independently identified the bird(s): [The bird was apparently seen that day, with almost daily reports going back a week, and scattered reports before that \(maybe involving the same over-wintering bird\).](#)

9. Light conditions (position of bird in relation to shade and to direction and amount of light): [Clear blue sky, afternoon light sprinkled through canopy.](#)

10. Optical equipment (type, power, condition): [Vortex 10 x 42 Razor binoculars, Samsung A52 smartphone recorder. Both in good condition.](#)

11. Distance to bird(s): about 30 feet

12. Duration of observation: on and off for about 15 minutes

13. Habitat: coastal chenier forest understory

14. Behavior of bird / circumstances of observation (flying, feeding, resting; include and stress habits used in identification; relate events surrounding observation): The bird was extremely hard to get eyes on – I found it by the “spit” contact call and followed the sound. I could see movement in the dense bushes and vines at just below eye level several times. At one point, it flew across the trail and briefly posed in the open atop a vine-covered bush, only long enough to get naked-eye-only views at about 30 feet away. It was calling on and off for much of the observation, as the bird furtively moved roughly east, eventually disappearing and becoming quiet. I gave up after another 5 minutes of searching.

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*):

Views were brief (see above), and naked-eye-only. I saw an olive-backed bird with no wing bars and a bright yellow belly with a gray hood. The bird was basically eye level at that point, about 30 feet away. As I lifted my binoculars, it flew away. I did not get a detailed view of the facial pattern.

16. Voice: Found by call and frequently calling during the observation.

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

By sight, I wouldn't be able to rule out Mourning, Connecticut, or maybe even Nashville. The chip to me sounded best for Mourning/MacGillivray's, although I would have a hard time telling the two apart in the field. The recording gives the impression of being a little sharper and less “squishy” than Mourning. April 21 is on the early side for Mourning, plus I found the bird apparently in the general area where it had been found regularly over the last couple weeks.

18. Photographs or tape recordings obtained? (by whom? attached?): Recording of chip notes attached.

19. Previous experience with this species: Very little. I've seen two in Louisiana previously, and a few times out west.

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

a. at time of observation: [none](#)

b. after observation: [Dunn Warbler Guide \(Peterson Series\)](#); [Sibley N.A. Field Guide 2nd Ed.](#), [Cornell's All About Birds website](#) (to compare chip calls).

21. This description is written from:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	notes made during the observation.	Are notes attached?	Typed into eBird at the time: https://ebird.org/checklist/S134541586
<input type="checkbox"/>	notes made after the observation.	At what date?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	memory		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	study of RECORDINGS		

22. Are you positive of your identification? If not, explain: [Fairly sure. Between the recording and circumstances/date, I feel good eliminating Mourning.](#)

23. Date: [30 June 2020](#)

Time: [6:10 pm](#)

24. May the LBRC have permission to display in whole or in part this report and accompanying photos on the LOS-LBRC website and LBRC Facebook page? [Yes](#)

If yes, may we include your name with the report? [Yes](#)