GENERAL NOTES

Familial Longevity in Ospreys.—Although several reports have indicated that the Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) family unit remains intact for several days after the young fledge (e.g., Bent, 1937; Meinertzhagen, 1954; Stinson, 1976a), the only published report dealing with the actual longevity of the Osprey family unit (i.e., adults and fledglings still dependent on the adults for food) seems to be Beebe's (1974) comment that a postfledging association of young and adults might last up to 60 days after fledging. Brown and Amadon (1968) state that young Ospreys may remain near the nest for up to two months after fledging, but do not comment on the longevity of the family unit. This note reports on the apparent length of the postfledging dependency period of Ospreys in southeastern Virginia (Mathews and York counties); it is based on observations at 11 nests in 1975 and at 1 nest in 1976.

Stotts and Henny (1975) found that Osprey chicks made their first flights when 48-59 days old (mean = 54 days); similarly, chicks fledged at the 11 nests in this study in 1975 when they were 44-59 days old (mean = 51 days). The fledged young in a particular family unit were identified by unique combinations of aluminum and plastic color bands on their legs; the adults in a particular family unit were identified by certain behaviorisms (e.g., feeding a color-banded fledgling). Further details concerning methodology and descriptions of the nest sites can be found in Stinson (1976b).

Not all family units centered their activities in the immediate vicinity of the nest after the chick(s) had fledged. At nest 24, the family unit was still intact, but had moved from the vicinity of the nest within 2 days of the chicks' fledging. At two other nests (4 and 62), the family units apparently left the vicinity of their nests within 10 days of the chicks' fledging. At nest 65, the family unit was intact at the nest site when the single chick was 78 days old, but 4 days later the family was gone from the area. It is not known how long the family units remained intact after the birds left the nest areas.

The family units at the other seven nests in 1975 were intact in the immediate vicinity of their nest sites at least until the chicks were 65-93 days old, at which time (19 August 1975) my observations ended. At nest 35, the chicks were fed regularly by their parents at least until the young were 75-79 days old. At nest 65, the single chick was being fed by its parents when it was 78 days old. At nest 25, the young were being fed by their parents at least until they were 80-89 days old. When the young were 84-93 days old, the family unit was present at the nest, but was not observed for long enough to determine whether or not the young were still being fed by their parents. I did not observe the young at any of the above nests catch their own fish.

At nest 16, the adults were absent from the area and the two young (103 days old) were catching their own fish. These young were active in the vicinity of their nest at least until they were 108 days old, at which time (19 August 1975) my observations terminated. The adults were never seen during those 6 days. At nest 16 in 1976, the single young was feeding independently (and the adults were absent from the area) when the young bird was 113 days old (19 August 1976).

In summary, the Osprey family units that I observed were intact *at least* until the young were 65-93 days old. However, at nest 16 in 1975, the young were independent of their parents when the young were 103 days old. Additionally, at nest 16 in 1976, the single young was independent of its parents by the time it was 113 days old. If these observations are indicative of Virginia Ospreys in general, the period of postfledging dependency ends by the time the young are about 93-103 days old. The disappearance of the family unit at nest 65 after the single young was 78 days old may represent a relatively short fledgling dependency period. At any rate, the Osprey family unit apparently breaks up before fall migration begins. That conclusion is consistent with both Beebe's (1974, p. 41) statement, and with the fact that migrating Ospreys are usually seen alone or in pairs (Brown and Amadon, 1968, p. 188).

I sincerely thank Mitchell A. Byrd for his guidance and assistance during this study, and for critically reading an earlier draft of this note.

LITERATURE CITED

BEEBE, F. 1974. Field studies of the Falconiformes of British Columbia. *Occas. Papers Brit. Col. Prov. Mus.*, No. 17.

BENT, A. C. 1937. Life histories of North American birds of prey, part one. *U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull.* 167.

BROWN, L. H. AND D. AMADON. 1968. Eagles, Hawks, and Falcons of the World. New York, McGraw-Hill.

MEINERTZHAGEN, R. 1954. The education of young Ospreys. *Ibis*, **96:** 153-155.

STINSON, C. H. 1976a. On the recognition of offspring by raptors. *Raptor Res.*, **10:** 30-32.

———. 1976b. The evolutionary and ecological significance of the clutch-size of the osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*). M.A. thesis, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

STOTTS, V. D., AND C. J. HENNY. 1975. The age at first flight for young American Ospreys. *Wilson Bull.*, **87:** 277-278.

—CHRISTOPHER H. STINSON, *Department of Biology, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 23185.* (Present address: *Department of Zoology NJ-15, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 98195.*) Received 30 June 1976, accepted 5 October 1976.

Instances of Disease and Abnormalities in American Kestrels.—During the winter 1975–76 we trapped American Kestrels (*Falco sparverius*) for banding and weighing. During this study we noted some birds that had handicaps caused by disease, injury, or possibly genetic abnormalities. These individuals were as follows:

1. Male with all toes missing on the right foot, and the front middle toe missing on the left foot. This bird appeared healthy although its weight of 97 g was smaller than most other kestrels that we caught. This small bird was caught in southern Alabama and may belong to the subspecies *F. s. paulus* which would explain its small size.
2. Female with right rear talon missing. This bird appeared healthy and weighed 141 g.
3. Female with right rear talon very short and straight. This bird appeared healthy and weighed 125 g.
4. Male with infected foot (bumble foot). The bird was unusually small for a northern Alabama kestrel with a weight of 97 g.

The total number of birds handled was 57. Thus, diseases or abnormalities were noted on about 7% of the kestrels.—DAVID T. ROGERS, JR. AND MARK DAUBER, *Department of Biology, The University of Alabama, University, Alabama 35486.* Received 7 September 1976, accepted 18 October 1976.

Synopsis of the 1976 Season for Chimney Swifts at Kent State University.—Following is a brief résumé of banding activities and observations of Chimney Swifts (*Chaetura pelagica*) on the campus of Kent State University, Kent, Ohio for the 33rd consecutive year of operation. Chimney Swifts returned to our campus 16 April 1976, one day earlier than the previous first date (the median date is 21 April). By the end of the season, 51 returns were captured which came from the following banding-year classes: 1966 (2), 1968 (1), 1969 (2), 1970 (5), 1971 (7), 1972 (4), 1973 (4), 1974 (9), 1975 (17).

Eventually, 14 pairs, one 3-some and one 4-some, nested in 16 of the air shafts in two adjacent buildings (Kent Hall and the Administration Building). Six pairs were mated the same and nested in the same shaft (A1, D1, M1, M7, N9, Q2) as in the previous year. Another pair remained mated as they were for the previous three years in the same airshaft (J1), but in 1976 they had an all-season visitor with them forming a 3-some. (For location of shafts see Dexter, *Ohio J. Sci.*, **69,** 194. 1969.) Another pair remained the same as in the previous two years, but acquired two seasonal visitors comprising a 4-some in shaft C3 (for study of helpers at the nest, see Dexter, *Wilson Bull.*, **64,** 133-139, 1952.) Only one nesting swift changed its nesting location from the previous year. A bird that nested in shaft A5 during 1972–1975 returned to its former nesting site on 13 May, but soon moved into shaft E1, where it had been a temporary visitor in 1975, and obtained a new mate for that season after its former mate failed to return. Its new mate had nested there during 1971–75, but its mate also failed