

Rough-legged Hawk catches fish.—On 29 May 1964 one of us (HCM) saw a Rough-legged Hawk (*Buteo lagopus*) sitting on the beach of Lake Michigan about 2.4 km east of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin. The hawk was sitting less than 2 m from the edge of the water and about 5 m from several sitting Herring Gulls (*Larus argentatus*). Upon closer approach the bird flushed, flew several hundred meters and again landed on the beach. The beach was littered with hundreds of dead alewives (*Pomolobus pseudoharengus*). Tracks in the sand indicated that the hawk had been walking about a great deal, picking at and eating portions of the dead fish. The bird was seen again on 30 May, perched approximately 3 m up in a willow (*Salix* sp.) about 50 m from the water. A bal-chatri trap (Berger, D., and F. Hamerstrom, 1962. *J. Wildl. Mgmt.*, 26:203-206), baited with a Starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), was placed on the beach. The bird was observed (by RWM) to glide over the bal-chatri, apparently ignoring the Starling, continue over the water and plunge into the water in the manner of an Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*). After a few seconds the bird rose easily from the water and returned to its perch. Considerable numbers of dying and dead alewives were floating on the surface of the lake. After a few minutes the bird again glided out over the lake, plunged, and rose with a fish. The lake was quite calm, with practically no surf. The depth of the water at the points where the hawk plunged was about 30 to 60 cm. Later in the day NSM observed the hawk wading into the water, 10 to 15 cm deep, and picking at dead or dying alewives.

Although the Rough-legged Hawk is known to eat fish, and appears to have less of an aversion to water than most hawks of the genus *Buteo* (Bent, 1937. *U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull.*, 167:275, 277), we know of no previous record of this species actually plunging into the water to obtain fish. This incidental observation was made while the senior author was engaged in a study of bird migration supported by National Science Foundation grant GB 175.—HELMUT C. MUELLER, NANCY S. MUELLER, *Department of Zoology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin* (Present address: *Department of Zoology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.*), AND ROBERT W. MUELLER, *Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, 7 October 1965.*

Osprey Nesting Survey.—In the summer of 1964, I worked as a "student assistant" at the Audubon Camp of Maine near Damariscotta, Maine. I did in my spare time a nesting survey of the local population of Ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*) whose population as a whole has been sharply decreasing in the past several years, supposedly as a result of the use of biocides. My project was to collect empirical data on the nesting success. The area covered by the survey is that area of land and water plotted on the Louds Island, Maine, quadrangle map of the U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute series. The survey was concluded 10 August 1964.

The data were as follows: 13 located nests; 8 occupied nests; 5 unoccupied nests, 3 of them within the territory of other occupied nests; 1 nest started at the end of the summer but not included in these figures; 3 young hatched and fledged. Ideally an Osprey pair will hatch 3 young a year. If it had been a fully successful season, 24 young might have been hatched. Only 12½% of that number were.

There are no regular great population decreases among Ospreys as there are among some other bird and mammal species. The weather in the area was not extreme in any way. Double-crested Cormorants which *may* feed on different species of fish were quite plentiful and were successful breeders. Why were the Ospreys apparently affected as the cormorants were not?—CHANNING R. KURY, 246 Arch Street, Sunbury, Pennsylvania, 13 October 1965.