Approximately one hour after the Vermilion Flycatcher observation, Andrews saw a Black Phoebe capture a small fish, probably a longfin dace, in the same area. Although Black Phoebes feeding on small fish have been noted in the literature and reported as an unusual diet item (Bent 1942, Lawson 1975), it is noteworthy to describe here the capture and kill method used. Using binoculars, Andrews observed a Black Phoebe perched on the edge of the river looking into the water. It quickly jumped into the shallows and emerged with a small fish in its bill. The phoebe returned to the bank with the wiggling fish and forcibly threw the fish on the ground three times. When the fish ceased to move it was swallowed headfirst by the phoebe. This method of immobilizing the fish was similar to that described by Lawson (1975) who reported a Black Phoebe repeatedly striking a captured fish against a tree branch until it ceased to struggle then swallowed it, apparently headfirst. We hypothesize that the two species of flycatchers' feeding behavior was an opportunistic response to the abundance and visibility of small fish in shallow water.

Acknowledgments.—We are grateful to K. A. King for his encouragement and constructive comments on early drafts of this manuscript. We thank T. A. Gatz, for his literature search and review of the manuscript, S. Robertson for his review of the final draft, and J. Hanson for her grammatical expertise.

LITERATURE CITED

BENT, A. C. 1942. Life histories of North American flycatchers, larks, swallows, and their allies. U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 179:159–163, 306–307.

EHRLICH, P. R., D. S. DOBKIN, AND D. WHEYE. 1988. The birders handbook; a field guide to the natural history of North American birds. Simon and Schuster, New York, New York.

LAWSON, C. S. 1975. Fish catching by a Black Phoebe. West. Birds 6:107–109.

ROSENBERG, K. V., R. D. OHMART, W. C. HUNTER, AND B. W. ANDERSON. 1991. Birds of the Lower Colorado River Valley, Univ. of Ariz. Press, Tucson, Arizona.

TERRES, J. K. 1980. The Audubon Society encyclopedia of North American birds. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, New York.

BRENDA J. ANDREWS AND MARIE SULLIVAN, *U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2321 W. Royal Palm Rd., Suite 103, Phoenix, Arizona 85021,* AND J. DAVID HOERATH, *Bureau of Land Management, 2015 W. Deer Valley Rd., Phoenix, Arizona 85027.* *Received 29 Aug. 1995, accepted 20 Oct. 1995.*

Wilson Bull., 108(2), 1996, pp. 378–380

Nest-site reuse in the Western Wood-Pewee.—Reuse of the same nest site within a territory from one year to the next is well documented for birds such as colonial breeders (Shields 1984), cavity nesters (Harvey et al. 1979, Newton 1994), and species nesting on natural ledges and artificial structures (Bent 1942). In these groups, nest site reuse is promoted by the scarcity of suitable nest sites. Few non-colonial, open-nesting passerines have been documented reusing nest sites between years. Breeding studies that compare nest locations between years for this nesting guild generally report that nest sites are not reused (Hendricks 1991, Martin and Roper 1988) or are rarely reused (Nolan 1978). However, some open nesting tyrannid flycatchers, i.e., Eastern Kingbird (*Tyrannus tyrannus*) (Blancher

and Robertson 1985), Western Flycatcher (*Empidonax difficilis*), and Eastern Wood-Pewee (*Contopus virens*) (Bent 1942), regularly reuse nest sites between years. We report several instances of nest site reuse in another flycatcher, the Western Wood-Pewee (*C. sordidulus*).

During 1992–1994, we monitored the nesting dynamics of birds breeding in pinyon pine (*Pinus edulis*) - one-seed juniper (*Juniperus monosperma*) habitat in Colfax County, northeastern New Mexico. During this period, we located 46 Western Wood-Pewee nests that reached the egg-laying stage. All of these nests were in the dominant tree species, pinyon pine. In 1993, two of seven nest sites used during 1992 were reused, and in 1994, three of 15 nest sites used during 1993 were reused. One nest site was used in all three years, with the new nests constructed by adding material to the remaining portion of the previous year's nest. In other instances where the previous year's nest had fallen off the branch over the winter, the new nest was built in the same location. Because we did not band pewees on our site, individual recognition was not possible. However, we suspect that reuse involved the return of at least one individual of a pair from the previous year.

In 1993, a pewee nest which had been depredated during incubation was reused in the same season. The second clutch, initiated less than a week after the depredation event, was raised successfully, and this nest site was also reused successfully the following year. It seems unusual for birds to reuse a depredated nest or nest site (Harvey et al. 1979, Dow and Fredga 1983). A previously depredated nest might be more vulnerable to future predation than would be a new nest site, since some predators (e.g., corvids) appear to search the locations of nests that they have previously depredated, even a year later (Sonerud and Fjeld 1987).

Several explanations for the reuse of nest sites by the Western Wood-Pewee on our study area are possible, including (1) high quality nest sites may be in limited supply, despite the abundance of pinyons in the breeding habitat, (2) nest site reuse may be an extreme behavioral expression of site fidelity, and (3) pewees may benefit from time and energy savings by not searching for new nest sites or nest materials.

Acknowledgments.—We thank Scott Adair, Thomas Adams, Earl Bell, Sharon Childers, Jeff Kozma, Peter Skylstad, Boyd Trolinger, Jerrad Van't Hul, and Yan Wu for their help in observing nests. The NRA Whittington Center and V-7 Ranch provided access to their lands and logistical support for this study. Steven R. Beissinger provided helpful comments on this manuscript. This research is part of the BBIRD (Breeding Biology Research and Monitoring Database) program, which is funded by the Global Climate Change Research Program of the National Biological Service. This is BBIRD Publication # 5.

LITERATURE CITED

BENT, A. C. 1942. Life histories of North American flycatchers, larks, swallows and their allies. U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 179.

BLANCHER, P. J. AND R. J. ROBERTSON. 1985. Site consistency in kingbird breeding performance: implications for site fidelity. J. Anim. Ecol. 54:1017–1027.

DOW, H. AND S. FREDGA. 1983. Breeding and natal dispersal of the goldeneye, (*Bucephala clangula*). J. Anim. Ecol. 52:681–695.

HARVEY, P. H., P. J. GREENWOOD, AND M. PERRINS. 1979. Breeding area fidelity of great tits (*Parus major*). J. Anim. Ecol. 48:305–313.

HENDRICKS, P. 1991. Site fidelity and renesting of female American pipits. J. Field Ornithol. 62:338–342.

MARTIN, T. E. AND J. J. ROPER. 1988. Nest predation and nest-site selection of a western population of the Hermit Thrush. Condor 90:50–57.

NEWTON, I. 1994. The role of nest sites in limiting the number of hole-nesting birds: a review. Biol. Conserv. 70:265–276.

NOLAN, V., JR. 1978. Ecology and behavior of the Prairie Warbler (*Dendroica discolor*). Ornithol. Monograph No. 26.

SHIELDS, W. M. 1984. Factors affecting nest and site fidelity in Adirondack barn swallows. Auk 101:780–789.

SONERUD, G. A. AND P. E. FJELD. 1987. Long-term memory in egg predators: an experiment with a Hooded Crow. Ornis Scand. 18:323–324.

DAVID R. CURSON, CHRISTOPHER B. GOGUEN, AND NANCY E. MATHEWS, *Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison, Dept. of Wildlife Ecology, 226 Russell Labs, 1630 Linden Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1598.* *Received 21 June 1995, accepted 20 Dec. 1995.*

Wilson Bull., 108(2), 1996, pp. 380–381

Nest sharing by a Lesser Scaup and a Greater Scaup.—Nest sharing has been loosely defined as two females sharing a nest, incubating their eggs together, and (perhaps) sharing in the care of the young (Terres 1982). It is a relatively uncommon phenomenon, reported infrequently in ornithological literature (see Terres 1982, for a brief review). While conducting field studies of nesting waterfowl on the islands of the North Arm of Great Slave Lake (approximately 62°30′N 115°10′W) in June 1993, we discovered a clutch of 26 scaup eggs which was being incubated by two females, one a Lesser Scaup (*Aythya affinis*) and one a Greater Scaup (*Aythya marila*). Both females flushed at close range (although not simultaneously) and were identified visually via wing stripe characteristics and size. Incubation status was determined by female behavior, egg warmth, and amount of down present at the nest.

The clutch of 26 eggs consisted of 17 "large" and nine "small" eggs, and may have been the product of more than two females. Two eggs were cracked, possibly indicating some aggressive interaction between the females. We measured a sample of eggs using vernier calipers. Three large eggs averaged 63.9 × 43.5 mm, whereas four small eggs averaged 56.8 × 42.5 mm. These measurements lie within the ranges reported for Greater and Lesser scaup, respectively (Bent 1923, Bellrose 1976, Palmer 1976). The eggs were laid in an oval-shaped depression lined with grass and were marginally concealed by a clump of grass. This arrangement provided ample room for two females to sit side by side, probably in direct contact with each other, and thereby incubate virtually the entire clutch simultaneously.

Subsequent inspection of this nest in late July revealed that it had been partially successful. Seven membranes from hatched eggs were observed. In addition, six eggs were found intact in the nest, four dead ducklings were still in their partially opened egg shells, two dead ducklings were outside their egg shells but still in the nest, and one dead duckling was found outside the nest. One egg which had been destroyed by a predator and was assumed to belong to the same nest was found nearby. The fate of the remaining five eggs could not be determined.

Skutch (1961) stated that unless the young of the two nest sharing species hatch at about the same time, and are of similar size and feeding habits, it is unlikely that the young of both species will survive. Given the ecological similarities between the two species of scaup, it is unlikely that any resulting combinations of females and ducklings that survived through departure from the nesting island would experience anything beyond the normal threats to their survival. For example, mixed age (and thus mixed size) broods and broods attended