

tevens. 1989.
ism of fishers
urnal of Mam-

s. 2006. Over-
ukon: starva-
Animal Ecol-

-324 in Trans-
serve. Edited
ian Wildlife

illips, and H.
all patterns in
ad-scale dis-
es. Pages 115-
uman-altered
Edited by D.
pringer, New-

ence of snow
iology affect

the relationship
al snow con-
high footload?

e, and V. O.
ctic felid and
al Behaviour

in deer in late

ology and be-
a Press, Min-

Snow depths
nal of Mam-

tion of some
val in snow.

Eastern Coyotes, *Canis latrans*, Observed Feeding on Periodical Cicadas, *Magicicada septendecim*

JONATHAN G. WAY^{1,2}

¹ Science Department, Barnstable High School, 744 West Main Street, Hyannis, Massachusetts 02601 USA; e-mail: jw9802@yahoo.com

² Eastern Coyote Research, 89 Ebenezer Road, Osterville, Massachusetts 02655 USA

Way, Jonathan G. 2008. Eastern Coyotes, *Canis latrans*, observed feeding on periodical Cicadas, *Magicicada septendecim*. Canadian Field-Naturalist 122(3): 271-272.

Eastern Coyotes (*Canis latrans*) were observed feeding on Periodical Cicadas (*Magicicada septendecim*) during their once every 17 year emergence (for three weeks) in June 2008.

Key Words: Eastern Coyote, *Canis latrans*, Periodical Cicada, *Magicicada septendecim*, predation, Massachusetts.

Coyotes (*Canis latrans*) eat a variety of prey including fruits/berries, small mammals, deer (*Odocoileus* spp.), phocids, and livestock (see Harrison and Harrison 1984; Andelt 1985; Parker 1995; Gese et al. 1996; Sacks et al. 1999; Patterson and Messier 2000; Way and Horton 2004), and feed mostly on medium to large-sized prey in northeastern North America (see Parker 1995 for a review). There is little known on the importance of insects in Coyote diets except that they appear in scats (especially seasonally) but usually in non-significant amounts, especially in terms of biomass (Nellis and Keith 1976; Litvaitis and Shaw 1980; Andelt 1985; Cypher 1993). Cypher et al. (1994), quoting Cypher (1991), noted that Coyotes consumed 13-year Cicadas (*Magicicada tredecassini*) when in abundance, indicating that insects can be an important food source when abundant. This might not be surprising, however, given that insects contribute significantly to the diets of smaller canids, such as the many species of foxes, including Bat-eared Foxes (*Otocyon megalotis*) in Africa (see Macdonald and Sillero-Zubiri 2004) and Red Foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) in Canada (Henry 1986: 64-66). Although Eastern Coyotes are bigger than all species of foxes, it is probable that Coyotes also use insects as an important food source either seasonally or when abundant. As part of a long-term ecological study on Cape Cod, Massachusetts (Way et al. 2001, 2002, 2004; Way 2007), Eastern Coyotes were opportunistically observed foraging for Periodical Cicadas (*Magicicada septendecim*; Brood XIV, Bunker 2008*) and Cicada remains were found inside fresh scat.

I observed Cicadas first emerging during a 3-day heat wave (~32°C) starting on 8 June 2008. A couple of days later they were extremely loud in fragmented patches within my study area, within the town of Barnstable, Massachusetts (J. Way, unpublished data).

On 18 June 2008, I observed radio-collared Coyote #0801 (Way 2008a*, b*) at 0154 h under a street light on Concord Street in the village of Osterville. He walked onto the neighborhood road between two houses. On the front lawn of one of those houses he walked, sniffed, and bit at something on the ground,

then chewed it up. He did this 6 – 7 times in the 1 – 1.5 min that I observed him under the street light. This area was very close (<100 m) to a powerline right of way, a known hot spot of Cicada activity (J. Way, unpublished data). The chewing that I heard from #0801 sounded like the cracked bodies of the Cicada's exoskeletons. I monitored the Coyote until 0205. He was out of sight but his signal indicated that he was foraging in the same neighborhood, possibly on Cicadas.

On 19 June 2008, Coyote 0801 and his group (consisting of at least two or three pups and his uncollared mate) moved their rendezvous site (Way et al. 2001) > 1 km to the powerline corridor mentioned above, but > 1 km west of the 18 June sighting. On 21 June 2008, I walked the powerlines from 0542 – 0605 h and saw two pups foraging under the powerlines, around sapling trees (powerline vegetation was cleared ~5 yr before). They were doing considerable amounts of sniffing and biting at plants and I could see Cicadas jumping around them. Judging from that observation, I had no doubt that they had already learned to (and/or were taught how to) hunt for Cicadas.

During that same time frame (mid-June 2008) I also found two Coyote scats in Coyote 0801's territory that were completely full of Cicada exoskeletons. I suspect that I would have found more if I had looked more thoroughly but other field priorities at the time prevented that.

Finally, circumstantial evidence of a long-time radio-collared female Coyote (#0204: tracked from 2002 – 2008) during June 2008 indicated that her pack (two or three other adults and an unknown number of pups) may have situated their pups near a concentration of Cicadas. Her pack resided to the immediate east of 0801's pack. In my conversations with local landscapers, that area contained "an amazing number of Cicadas", where, in fact, they were so abundant the landscapers sometimes could not even mow their clients' lawns. I managed to observe #0204 in that immediate residential area (1 km from where her pups were moved to) but did not make any extensive observations partly due to the lack of streetlights in the area to observe her at night. However, her group's sudden

shift to that portion of their territory about 4 km from where she gave birth is noteworthy.

The Cicadas quieted down in early July 2008 and Coyotes resumed their normal foraging habits of traveling many kilometers per night in search of prey within their territories (Way et al. 2004). Coyote use of a periodically abundant (once every 17 years for about 3 weeks) food supply such as Cicadas might not come as a surprise, given their famous adaptability and catholic feeding habits (see Parker 1995 and sources within). Similarly, Grizzly Bears (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) feed heavily on Army Cutworm Moths (*Euxoa auxiliaris*) when seasonally abundant and gain many calories from those insects (White et al. 1998). However, it is noteworthy that Eastern Coyotes quickly learned to use this novel and rarely found food source that had not been available in that area since 1991.

Acknowledgments

This study would not be possible without the support of the Way family, especially my wife Tara, Doreen Maddox, and Eric Strauss. Barnstable High School employed me during the academic year, and my business, Eastern Coyote Research, supported my travel expenses. Two anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments.

Documents Cited (marked * in text)

- Bunker, G.** 2008. Massachusetts Cicadas. <http://www.mechaworx.com/Cicada/broodXIV.asp>. Retrieved 17 July 2008.
- Way, J. G.** 2008a. Field Update February 24, 2008 – Lots of happenings: Capture of 2 more coyotes. <http://www.easterncoyoteresearch.com/update2008-02-24.html>. Retrieved 17 July 2008.
- Way, J. G.** 2008b. Field Update April 25, 2008. Jaws is released and has gained 2 lbs. <http://www.easterncoyoteresearch.com/update2008-04-25.html>. Retrieved 17 July 2008.

Literature Cited

- Andelt, W. F.** 1985. Behavioral ecology of coyotes in south Texas. *Wildlife Monographs* 49: 1-45.
- Cypher, B. L.** 1991. Coyote foraging dynamics, space use, and activity relative to resource variation at Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge, Illinois. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, USA.
- Cypher, B. L.** 1993. Food item use by three sympatric canids in southern Illinois. *Transactions of the Illinois Academy of Science* 86: 139-144.
- Cypher, B. L., K. A. Spencer, and J. H. Scrivner.** 1994. Food-item use by coyotes at the naval petroleum reserves in California. *Southwestern Naturalist* 39: 91-95.
- Gese, E. M., R. L. Ruff, and R. L. Crabtree.** 1996. Foraging ecology of coyotes (*Canis latrans*): the influence of extrinsic factors and a dominance hierarchy. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 74: 769-783.
- Harrison, D. J., and J. A. Harrison.** 1984. Foods of adult Maine coyotes and their known-age pups. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 48: 922-926.
- Henry, J. D.** 1986. Red fox: the catlike canine. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C., USA. 174 pages.
- Litvaitis, J. A., and J. H. Shaw.** 1980. Coyote movements, habitat use, and food habits in southwestern Oklahoma. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 44: 62-68.
- Macdonald, D. W., and C. Sillero-Zubiri.** Editors. 2004. The biology and conservation of wild canids. Oxford University Press, New York, USA. 450 pages.
- Nellis, C. H., and L. B. Keith.** 1976. Population dynamics of Coyotes in central Alberta, 1964-1968. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 40: 389-399.
- Parker, G. R.** 1995. Eastern coyote: the story of its success. Nimbus Publishing Halifax, Nova Scotia. 254 pages.
- Patterson, B. R., and F. Messier.** 2000. Factors influencing killing rates of white-tailed deer by coyotes in eastern Canada. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 64: 721-732.
- Sacks, B. N., M. M. Jaeger, J. C. C. Neale, and D. R. McCullough.** 1999. Territoriality and breeding status of coyotes relative to sheep predation. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 63: 593-605.
- Way, J. G.** 2007. Suburban Howls: Tracking the Eastern Coyote in Urban Massachusetts. Dog Ear Publishing, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA. 338 pages.
- Way, J. G., P. J. Auger, I. M. Ortega, and E. G. Strauss.** 2001. Eastern coyote denning behavior in an anthropogenic environment. *Northeast Wildlife* 56: 18-30.
- Way, J. G., and J. Horton.** 2004. Coyote kills harp seal. *Canid News* 7.1 [online]: 1-4. URL: http://www.canids.org/canidnews/7/Coyote_kills_harp_seal.pdf.
- Way, J. G., I. M. Ortega, and P. J. Auger.** 2002. Eastern coyote home range, territoriality and sociality on urbanized Cape Cod, Massachusetts. *Northeast Wildlife* 57: 1-18.
- Way, J. G., I. M. Ortega, and E. G. Strauss.** 2004. Movement and activity patterns of eastern coyotes in a coastal-suburban environment. *Northeastern Naturalist* 11: 237-254.
- White, D., K. C. Kendall, and H. D. Picton.** 1998. Grizzly bear feeding activity at alpine army cutworm moth aggregation sites in northwest Montana. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 76: 221-227.

Received 26 July 2008

Accepted 16 May 2009

Precision of Described Deer, *Odocoileus virginianus*

L. DAVID MECH^{1,2}

¹U.S. Geological Survey, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, 7317 USA

²Mailing Address: The Raptor Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA

Mech, L. David. 2008. Precision of described fat content in white-tailed deer. *Canadian Field-Naturalist* 122(2): 272-276.

Based on 168 records of both measured and estimated fat content, the percentage of fat measured later was 56% and the percentage of distinguished fat > 56%.

Key Words: White-tailed Deer, precision, fat content.

Marrow-fat content has been used as an index of nutritional condition, especially in the fawn (Hartman 1949). Although marrow fat is one-way test capable of indicating nutritional condition but not necessarily the quality of nutrition (Mech and DelGiudice 1987), it is a simple method of measuring marrow fat content. After removing the marrow from the femur, the bone is weighed again. The dry weight indicates the percentage of marrow fat.

However, it is not always possible to remove all the marrow from the bone. For example, if a coyote eats a dead animal unprepared for the field, it may eat the marrow from the femur, leaving the bone marrow intact. Then only a visual estimate of the amount of marrow remaining in the bone is possible. The amount of marrow remaining in the bone after removing the marrow from the femur is called the "distinguished fat." The weight of the bone after removing the marrow is called the "dry weight." The difference between the dry weight and the weight of the bone with the marrow removed is the "marrow fat content."

Volunteer technicians described the amount of marrow fat in the femur of White-tailed Deer (Odocoileus virginianus) and measured the fat content (percentage of marrow fat). The correlation between the actual fat measurement and the described fat measurement was determined. The data were collected from 168 deer killed by wolves (*Canis lupus*) in eastern Minnesota from 1995 to 2004. The technicians were involved in the preparation of the deer for the field. The technicians described the amount of marrow fat in the femur on a form and included "pasty," "waxy," "greasy," and "gelatinous."

I sorted the data file by date and found that the only descriptions that were reasonably well correlated with the actual fat content were "gelatinous" in 15 (5%) cases, and only 5 (4%) of 139 cases were "pasty," "waxy," "greasy," and "gelatinous."