90:796–802, 1973; Sanger and Baird, pp. 372–417 *in* Environmental Assessment of the Alaskan Continental Shelf, Final Rep., Vol. 12, NOAA, Environ. Res. Lab, Boulder, Colorado, 1977); however, the collection of breeding adults usually results in the subsequent death of dependent chicks. To segregate food that adults eat from that which they feed to chicks is difficult, if not impossible, except in species that carry food to their chicks in their bills or neck pouches.

Although chicks of some species regurgitate their stomach contents readily, chicks of a number of species do not. For these chicks, other methods to obtain food are necessary. Some investigators have tied string loosely around the neck of the chick, obstructing the passage of food down the esophagus (Orians and Horn, Ecology 50:930–938, 1969), or have inserted a finger down the esophagus of the chick (Hunt, Ecology 53:1051–1060, 1972). In the above methods, regurgitated food is in various stages of digestion, and often whole prey are not involved.

Here, I describe a method to ascertain the prey delivered to Tufted Puffin chicks (*Fratercula cirrhata*). I tested this method on 30 puffin chicks on Kodiak Island, Alaska, in 1977–1978. The method may also be useful on other fish-eating species in which the parents bring back bill loads of prey and drop them on the floor of the burrow. The method consists of placing a bridle on the chick so that the chick cannot swallow food delivered by the adults (Fig. 1). The researcher visits the burrow periodically and removes all prey inside. Prey are usually quite fresh, even after 24 h, so that their weight, volume, and length are close to fresh values. A large sample of chicks should be used for this method, and if an individual is repeatedly sampled, I suggest supplementing its diet with additional food, preferably food that it normally eats.

The bridle may be constructed of plastic bandages or electrical tape for the first wrap and filament tape folded together or surveyor's tape for the harness. The neck harness must be loose enough so that it will not interfere with the chick's respiration. Similarly, the nares should not be taped. I advise checking the chick at 4-h intervals to ensure that the nares do not become clogged with mud. Bridles should be removed at the end of each day, at which time the chicks should be fed.

The method does not physically injure the chick, which can occur with esophageal constriction or the retrieval of food by finger insertion.

Acknowledgments.—I would like to thank the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for funding the study during which time I developed this method. The research was undertaken while I worked for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1977 and 1978. I also thank R. A. Moe for original ideas concerning the development of the bridle. Thanks go to J. Trapp, D. Derksen (USFWS), and G. L. Hunt, Jr. for helpful suggestions, and to referees D. Ainley, S. Sealy, D. Brown, and K. Bildstein for valuable comments in their review of the manuscript.—PAT BAIRD, *Kahiltna Research Group, "Summerhill," P.O. Box 91316, Anchorage, Alaska 99509.* (Present address: *Dept. Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Univ. Calif., Irvine, California 92717.*) *Received 24 Apr. 1985, accepted 1 Aug. 1985.*

Wilson Bull., 98(1), 1986, pp. 170–171

Laughing Gull nesting attempt on Lake Erie.—On 21 May 1984 we discovered a Laughing Gull (*Larus atricilla*) incubating a single egg in a Ring-billed Gull (*L. delawarensis*) colony on a dredge disposal dike in Maumee Bay, western Lake Erie (Lucas County, Ohio). The nest was at the edge of the dike-top road in the midst of a dense cluster of Ring-billed Gull nests. On 23 May the nest contained two eggs; their measurements were 52.4 × 36.3 mm

and 53.8 × 36.5 mm, respectively. These measurements agree with those given for the Laughing Gull in Bent (Life Histories of North American Gulls and Terns, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 113, 1921), and were less than those of all eight Ring-billed Gull eggs in three adjacent nests (range of egg lengths 54.0–57.2 mm; range of widths 39.5–41.3 mm). Thus we conclude the eggs were indeed those of the Laughing Gull.

On 23 May we also noticed a Ring-billed Gull standing next to the nest while the Laughing Gull incubated. Whenever the Laughing Gull left the nest, the Ring-billed Gull attempted to incubate the eggs. Observation totaling 55 minutes during 23 and 25 May revealed that the Laughing Gull incubated nearly 85% of the time and the Ring-billed Gull 15%, incubation being almost continuous. Although Ring-billed Gulls at surrounding nests occasionally postured threateningly at the Laughing Gull, its partner in incubation showed no such aggression. On 4 June the nest contained a third egg, apparently contributed by the Ring-billed Gull. It was visibly larger than the other two and similar in size (55.6 × 39.7 mm) to the eggs of Ring-billed Gulls in nearby nests. Both birds continued to share incubation until 11 June, when the eggs disappeared. The Laughing Gull did not attempt to renest, but remained in the colony until at least 5 July.

To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first recorded nesting attempt by a Laughing Gull on the Great Lakes.

Acknowledgment.—The senior author wishes to thank the Charles A. Lindbergh Fund for generously supporting his research.—ELLIOT J. TRAMER, *Dept. Biology, Univ. Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606*; AND LOUIS W. CAMPBELL, *4531 Walker Ave., Toledo, Ohio 43612.* *Received 19 Apr. 1985, accepted 9 July 1985.*

Wilson Bull., 98(1), 1986, pp. 171–172

Adult male Blue Grouse eats lizards.—Although adult Blue Grouse (*Dendragapus obscurus*) primarily eat vegetation, they often include some animal matter in their diets (Beer, J. Wildl. Manage. 7:32–44, 1943; Stewart, Condor 46:112–120, 1944; Boag, J. Wildl. Manage. 27:555–562, 1963; King and Bendell, Can. J. Zool. 60:3268–3281, 1982). Spiders, centipedes, millipedes, snails, and especially insects (i.e., short-horned grasshoppers [Acrididae], froghoppers [Cercopidae], beetles [Coleoptera], and ants [Formicidae]) are eaten by Blue Grouse (Beer 1943; Boag 1963; King, Syesis 6:121–125, 1973; King and Bendell 1982). Here I report what is apparently the first record of Blue Grouse eating a vertebrate.

On 25 September 1982, one male and one female Blue Grouse were shot together on the southwest slope of Mount Shasta about 8 km north of McCloud, Siskiyou County, California (elevation = 1500 m). No other grouse were examined. The area consisted of second growth white fir (*Abies concolor*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), with *Arctostaphylos patula* and *Ceanothus velutinus* occurring in dense stands. Bittercherry (*Prunus emarginata*) was less dense.

The crop of the male grouse contained two recently born northern alligator lizards (*Gerrhonotus coeruleus*) with total lengths of 85 and 90 mm including intact tails, 32 grasshoppers (Acrididae), 43 ripe bittercherry fruits, 4 bittercherry leaves, 28 white fir needles, and grit. The crop of the female contained 8 grasshoppers, 166 ripe bittercherry fruits, and 1 bittercherry leaf.

Blue Grouse may actively select animal food, or ingest it accidentally (see King and Bendell 1982). In this report, ingestion of two lizards and many grasshoppers suggests that animals were selected. Blue Grouse select invertebrates that are often fairly large (Beer 1943). Newborn alligator lizards weigh about 1 g; the lizards reported here were not much larger than the grasshoppers consumed. Young lizards are abundant in northern forests for only a short