

Thank you for submitting your sighting to the Oregon Bird Records Committee! Below is the information you submitted. The OBRC secretary will contact you shortly.

YOUR NAME	Bruce Dugger
YOUR EMAIL	bruce.dugger@gmail.com
BIRD IDENTIFICATION	lesser black backed gull
DATE(S) OF OBSERVATION	Feb 27th 2021
TIME OF DAY	3:00 PM
LOCATION	mouth of Yachats River
LIGHTING AND WEATHER CONDITIONS	excellent lighting, the bird was standing on rocks 25 yards away, and was viewed for 5 minutes until it flew off
DETAILS	<p>I was asked by the county Ebird person to submit this observation. It was a second year bird, all dark bill with small white tip, smoky iris, with "smudge" around eye. all dark primaries, mantle slate gray with some brownish, first year feathers in coverts. Slight build relative to herring, westerns and glaucous-wings in the same flock of birds. I have no picture, but a photo of the bird was taken by Logan Kahle on Feb 25th and posted to the Lincoln county WhatsAp group. My look at the bird was under better lighting and bird orientation conditions than what's displayed in the photo.</p>
DO YOU HAVE ANY PRIOR EXPERIENCE WITH THIS SPECIES?	I've never seen the species before, but I spend a lot of time gull watching, know the local species well, and I spend considerable time studying reference material of gulls.
SIMILAR SPECIES	the combination of characteristics described above rule out other possibilities.
DO YOU HAVE PHOTOS?	No

LBBG-2021-24 (Lesser Black-backed Gull)
1st round vote – September 24, 2021

Accepted: 4
Not Accepted: 5

ACCEPTED, sight record, single report

The smaller size of this bird would seemingly eliminate Slaty-backed Gull. It would be nice if we had Logan Kahle's photo to help provide confirmation of this report.

While I would likely be on the fence for accepting this report based on the observer's notes, I checked ebird and found the ebird report of Logan Kahle who originally found the bird. The report can be found at: <https://ebird.org/checklist/S82351280>. It contains many photos that show the bird to be a 2nd-winter Lesser Black-backed Gull. The flight shot with the combination of relatively featureless, smudgy, slate-gray upperwing white rump and base of tail and broad black terminal tail band are diagnostic for this species at this age. The observer's notes appear sufficient to corroborate the fact that he saw the same bird.

I also utilized photos by Logan Kahle that were posted to his eBird report.

Would like to have heard about wing length, leg color, slim or big bill, and underparts. But the slate grey back, bill description and size get me across line.

Well described and fits with the putative species-- LBBG and its life stage (2nd cycle). Report is bolstered significantly by the reference to Logan Kahle's photos of, reportedly, the same individual bird. Those photos show a LBBG.

NOT ACCEPTED

The description, while suggestive, does not rule out other gull species such as California Gull or a hybrid. Leg color is not mentioned. The description appears to depend a lot on a "WhatsAp" photo that the Committee doesn't have access to.

Description doesn't compare the bird to other species, so it's hard to judge what is meant by "mantle slate gray" and whatnot.

Describing second year gulls is a challenging task. Although I want to be a believer, and feel that the observer probably did see a LBBG, I just don't feel the description provided can conclusively point to a 2nd winter LBBG. The mostly dark bill (at that age), description of a slate gray mantle, and overall description of the build and size do seem pretty suggestive of a LBBG. However, the description alone does not eliminate similarly aged HERG, SBGU, Thayer's ICGU, or GWGU hybrid types unfortunately. At that age, incoming mantle feathers can appear darker than they would be on, say, an adult. The amount of dark coloration in a gull's bill at that age can be variable in each of the species that I mentioned as well. Furthermore, gull size can be variable in each of the species I mentioned, and females can look especially small and dainty at times. All this being said, maybe I'm being too nit-picky here, but this is my initial take on the description provided.

The description is suggestive, and a LBBG was photographed there a couple days earlier, but the description is too incomplete to fully convince me.

I would suggest that we request of Logan Kahle to add his eBird list to this submission, so that we have the benefits of his photos. His list is: <https://ebird.org/checklist/S82351280>. This is a tough species and plumage to vote on based only on a written description, but I expect I would vote to accept the record

with Kahle's photos included. I therefore suggest we defer voting on this record and redo first-round voting with Kahle's list as part of the record.

Description too brief for a rare bird. The description is too brief to merit an "accepted" vote. It mentions a photo that was not included. We should have that before we approve or reject this record.

I cannot vote for a report of an immature gull that is a challenging ID anyway, knowing that photos exist but are not available to us.

Leg color not even described.

LBBG-2021-24 (Lesser Black-backed Gull) 2nd round vote – November 29, 2021

Accepted: 4
Not Accepted: 5

ACCEPTED, sight record, single report

The photographs (*from eBird*) by Logan Kahle help verify that a Lesser Black-backed Gull was seen. The bird that was photographed has dark gray upperwings and a white tail with a black terminal band. Bruce Dugger and Logan Kahle almost certainly observed the same bird.

This remains a close call and again raises the seemingly unresolved issue of whether we should or can rely on ebird reports by non-submitters to verify a submitted report if we are satisfied the same bird has been observed in each case. Here, I think there is sufficient evidence to conclude that Bruce observed the same bird photographed two days earlier by Logan Kahle, which I think we all agree is a LBBG (at least those of who have viewed the photos). The reporter's description is consistent with the bird photographed 2 days earlier (particularly the all dark bill with the light tip and smudge around the eye and description of the wings and mantle). He saw it from only 25 yards away in excellent lighting, so must have had excellent views. It is too bad he did not describe other parts of the bird particularly leg color, although that would likely have not been definitive anyway given the age of the bird and the fact that Logan Kahle's photos show the bird's legs appear to be pinkish. But overall, I feel his description is enough to substantiate he was viewing the same bird. A second-winter western or slaty-backed Gull could show the same bill pattern but would not likely be described as having a slight build relative to nearby western, glaucous-winged, and particularly herring gulls. A second-cycle Thayer's Gull would also fit the description of having a relatively slight build to the other species involved and could possibly be described as having a slate-gray mantle in certain light (perhaps unlikely in bright sunlight), but Thayer's would be quite unlikely to have an all-dark bill with a light tip at that age. Likewise, a California Gull in similar plumage would also not show a dark bill with a pale tip (should be vice versa).

I accept Logan's bird (<https://ebird.org/checklist/S82351280>) but not the one submitted to the committee.

I believe this to be the same bird as photographed by Logan Kahle.

NOT ACCEPTED

I still do not think that the report stands on its own - the description is much too incomplete, and too many issues (leg color, comparison to other species) are missing. Just because Logan Kahle photographed a genuine LBBG there a couple of days earlier is not enough evidence for me to accept this report.

Based on the information provided to the Committee, there is not enough to go on. I agree with Jay's suggestion to defer a vote until the Committee adds information from Logan Kahle to this record.

I still feel the same as I did in the first round. Although it sounds like Bruce saw the bird that was photographed by Logan Kahle a few days prior, his description unfortunately leaves some question marks and too much to be interpreted by the committee. I would definitely be willing to revisit this report if Logan decided to submit his own report to the committee at some point in the future.

I suggested in first-round comments that we defer voting until we could add Logan Kahle's eBird report to the record. However, perhaps it's procedurally more appropriate at this point to complete the voting on this record on the strength of its own documentation, without making any assumptions about whether or not it is the same bird as was found by Logan earlier — and then hopefully address Logan's as a separate submission in the near future. At any rate, I would vote not to accept the current record LBBG-2021-24 on its own documentation as it stands.

We would need the photos mentioned, but I agree just not enough info. Changing my mind.

I've reconsidered. As others have written, this written description, by itself, is insufficiently detailed. The observer references a photo posted on Whatsapp but not included here as evidentiary support. Looking at Logan Kahle's ebird checklist, the Whatsapp poster, we can indeed see a series of photos documenting a 2nd year LBBG; perhaps it's the same bird, but this written description doesn't cinch that conclusion.

Description not adequate to describe a Lesser Black-backed Gull.

LBBG-2021-24

3rd round voting – July 16, 2022

Accept: 9

Not Accept: 0

Record accepted with Logan Kahle's photos, available on eBird.

LINK: <https://ebird.org/checklist/S82351280>