

behavior, as this species is strictly nocturnal and difficult to observe. Glue and Hammond (1974, *Br. Birds* 67:361–369) report Long-eared Owls “hovering” seconds before making a kill of a small mammal, but not otherwise. During nocturnal owl and bat surveys, we were frequently able to observe the behavior of several owl species. Here, we report observations of a hovering/hawking approach to aerial feeding by a Long-eared Owl, not previously reported in this species.

Observations took place in the boreal forest of northern Ontario, Canada, south of the municipality of Ear Falls. The topography of the area is highly variable, with many lakes, and is dominated by stands of black spruce (*Picea mariana*) and to a lesser extent jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*).

On 25 June 2001, between 2220–2240 H, we first observed a Long-eared Owl perched on an aspen tree (*Populus tremuloides*) on the roadside. We confirmed the owl’s identification with a flashlight and a pair of binoculars. We were able to approach the bird three times to within 10 m as it perched on various trees. As we tried to find the bird a fourth time, it flew out from the side of the road and began to hover, slowly sweeping back and forth across the road ca 2 m off the ground within 5 m of our vehicle. In the headlights, we were able to observe the owl as it “hawked” moths over a large water puddle in the middle of the road. The moths were large enough to be clearly visible (ca 5.7–6.3 cm wingspan), and were later confirmed to be moths of the genus *Actius* or *Smerinthus* (Ross 1873, *The butterflies and moths of Canada*. Rowsell and Hutchison, Toronto, Canada), which had previously been observed in the area. While we watched, the owl captured at least three moths, which were apparently consumed whole. The owl then flew back into the woods in the direction from which it came, and was not seen again that night.

Comments on this observation from M.C. Drever and T.D. Nudds were greatly appreciated. We wish to thank the Sustainable Forest Management Network of Centres of Excellence and The University of Guelph for funding, and for cooperation from Weyerhaeuser Inc., all of whom contributed to our presence in the field during the summer of 2001.—**Darren J.H. Sleep** (e-mail address: [dsleep@uoguelph.ca](mailto:dsleep@uoguelph.ca)) and **Rowan D.H. Barrett**, Department of Organismal Biology, Ecology and Evolution, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1, Canada.

Received 27 December 2003; accepted 19 July 2004  
Associate Editor: Ian G. Warkentin

*J. Raptor Res.* 38(4):380–381  
© 2004 The Raptor Research Foundation, Inc.

#### OSPREY SCAVENGES COMMON MURRE CARCASS IN COASTAL WASHINGTON

Ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*) feed almost exclusively on fish (Poole et al. 2002, *In* A. Poole and F. Gill [Eds.], *The birds of North America*, No. 683. The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA U.S.A.). They rarely capture non-fish items or scavenge non-fish carcasses. Poole et al. (2002) provided no records of Ospreys scavenging bird carcasses.

On 9 September 2002, I observed an Osprey in immature plumage scavenging a Common Murre (*Uria aalge*) carcass on northern Grayland Beach, Grays Harbor County, WA. The carcass was one of >15 on the beach during my visit. Grayland Beach is a relatively flat, sandy beach situated between the mouths of Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay on Washington’s outer coast. At 1304 H, I saw an Osprey on the beach; it faced south and used its bill to twice tear at the flesh of a carcass that I later identified as a Common Murre. The Osprey then turned, apparently saw me (ca. 100 m away), and flew south and out of view. I approached the carcass, which lay on its back, and noted the pectoral muscles were exposed and had been partially removed. I did not see the Osprey again, but at 1314 H saw another Osprey fly over heading south above the beach.

It is possible that the Osprey I observed was merely investigating an unusual item, a behavior that has been noted in post-fledging juveniles (L. Gilson pers. comm.), and that scavenging was not its initial intent. However, it seems reasonable that most scavenging is preceded by investigation, particularly in juveniles. Consequently, regardless of the original intent, the outcome was that the Osprey extracted flesh from the carcass of a dead bird.

Although Ospreys rarely capture or consume non-fish prey, Wiley and Lohrer (1973, *Wilson Bull.* 85:468–470) identified a number of factors to explain the occasional use of non-fish food. Among these factors were: (1) the presence of easily-captured prey and (2) an abundant alternate food source. The coastal beaches of Washington often have abundant dead birds (e.g., Northern Fulmar [*Fulmarus glacialis*], scoters [*Melanitta* spp.], gulls [*Larus*

spp.], and Common Murres) that wash ashore and are deposited at or above the high-tide line. These carcasses are occasionally scavenged by Peregrine Falcons (*Falco peregrinus*; Buchanan 1991, *Northwest. Nat.* 72:28–29), Bald Eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), and Northern Harriers (*Circus cyaneus*; J. Buchanan unpubl. data). The presence of numerous carcasses on the beach during my visit represented an easily accessible and abundant source of food, two of the conditions proposed to explain use of non-fish food by Ospreys (Wiley and Lohrer 1973). Ospreys that use coastal habitats, especially during migration, have access to an easily obtained food source in some areas. I suggest that scavenging, although apparently rare, may be more likely in this coastal habitat than in other areas.

I thank Tracy Fleming for providing literature citations. Lauren Gilson, Jim Belthoff, and an anonymous reviewer provided comments that improved the manuscript.—**Joseph B. Buchanan (e-mail address: buchajbb@dfw.wa.gov), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, WA 98501 U.S.A.**

Received 24 February 2004; accepted 2 September 2004  
Associate Editor: James R. Belthoff

*J. Raptor Res.* 38(4):381–382  
© 2004 The Raptor Research Foundation, Inc.

### HOW LONG IS TOO LONG? A CASE OF FOSTERING NESTLING BONELLI'S EAGLES (*HIERAAETUS FASCIATUS*)

After monitoring eight nests of Bonelli's Eagle (*Hieraaetus fasciatus*) for more than 11 yr in the state of Maharashtra, India, we recorded two incidents wherein eaglets were either found to have fallen out of nests due to human disturbance or removed by local children. In the two incidents, we replaced the previously-removed eaglets into the nest immediately upon discovery and then verified continued parental care.

To help ensure the continued survival of raptors in the wild, a wide range of techniques have been developed and applied to maximize the survival of the brood (see Cade et al. 1988, Peregrine Falcon populations: their management and recovery. The Peregrine Fund, Boise, ID U.S.A.) including "add-on" techniques (an abandoned nestling is introduced into a wild brood of similar age); guarding of nests during the breeding season; relocation of nests away from sources of mortality; presentation of alternative, artificial nest platforms or sites; translocation; hacking in natural or artificial nests; and inter- or intra-specific fostering by parents with young of the same age (Allen 1982, Pages 5–19 in T.N. Ingram [Ed.], Proceedings of the Bald Eagle conference on Bald Eagle restoration. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Rochester, NY U.S.A.). All of these techniques are very costly, do not always ensure success, and many are employed in human-modified environments. Here, we present a method that has not been previously employed in a natural environment with Bonelli's Eagles, though similar experiments have been conducted for the Spanish Imperial Eagle (*Aquila adalberti*; Gonzalez et al. 1986, *J. Raptor Res.* 20:77–78; Ferrer 1993, *J. Ornithol.* 134:335–337).

Our experiment was conducted unintentionally on 14 March 2003 when we discovered that local children had removed an eaglet from a Bonelli's Eagle nest in Jejuri, Pune district (18°31'N, 73°55'E), India. The eaglet was 40–42 d old and it was returned to the nest. We noted that there were no green branches on the nest, which was unusual because in previous seasons parents were observed to layer the nest with new leaves and branches almost on a daily basis. Moreover, the parents continuously evicted the eaglet over the next 3 d by pushing it out of the nest with their wings. Therefore, we decided to foster the eaglet into the nest of another pair. This foster pair nested ca. 250 km away at Pawangad, Kolhapur district (16°42'N, 74°16'E), and on 5 March had two chicks in the nest.

Upon arrival on 18 March, we found the nest empty and the eagle family soaring over the nest tree. Nevertheless, we decided to place the eaglet into the vacant nest. Based on previous observations, we knew that eaglets and parents roosted at the nest for at least 2 wk after the young had fledged and that the young at this stage were still dependent on their parents for food (pers. obs.). After almost 2 hr the family was observed to land on the branches adjacent to the nest to roost for the night. Neither the young nor the parents displayed any signs of aggression toward the foster eaglet.

Initially, the family ignored the eaglet but in the evening one of the adults dropped an un-plucked chicken by the eaglet and after observing the inability of the foster eaglet to feed upon the chicken, one of the fledglings, which were ca. 60 d of age, then plucked the chicken and consumed a small portion of it. The foster eaglet observed the actions of the fledgling and imitated its movements of plucking the chicken and swallowing, and when the fledgling