to reveal the missing masses. TRC had last observed these masses on 24 February; at that time, both were intact and in Gosner Stage 17 (Gosner 1960. Herpetologica 16:183-190). Twenty-five other marked masses detected on the same initial date (10 February) were in Stages 13-17 on 24 February. Of these masses, 13 were in the process of hatching on 3 March, and eight had not yet begun to hatch, but even the hatching masses had remained mostly intact. Nutria commonly build platforms of compacted vegetation for resting, feeding, and grooming (Burt and Grossenheider 1980. A Field Guide to the Mammals, 2nd ed. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts. 289 pp.). We do not know the ultimate fate of the disturbed egg masses, but based on the chronology of nearby R. aurora egg masses that TRC first observed on the same date at the same developmental stage, hatching and total disintegration by 3 March was unlikely. During the first half of embryonic development, R. aurora egg masses are typically denser than the water in which they are laid, and they sink if detached from their brace (MPH, unpubl. data). Klaus Richter (pers. comm.) has experimentally shown that mortality increases in R. aurora egg masses artificially relocated to greater depth. Moreover, simply mechanically disturbing amphibian egg masses has been shown to decrease embryonic survival (Licht 1971. Ecology 52:116-124.; Garwood et al. 2007. Northwest. Nat. 88:95-97). In this study, R. aurora egg masses occasionally became detached from attachment vegetation on their own, but typically only as they aged and neared hatching, when they typically float. Moreover, in the absence of high wind or other substantial disturbance, such detached egg masses generally remained near the original oviposition site. Hence, M. coypus foraging has the potential to affect R. aurora reproduction both directly by displacement of egg masses, and indirectly by altering the availability of braces for attachment of eggs.

A grant from the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board helped support this fieldwork. TRC conducted the work under permit No. 040-05 from the ODFW. We thank S. Beilke, C. Corkran, and L. Roberts for assistance.

Submitted by **TIERRA R. CURRY**, Center for Biological Diversity, PO Box 11374, Portland, Oregon 97211, USA (email: tierra.curry@gmail.com); and **MARC P. HAYES**, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Habitat Program, 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, Washington 98501, USA (e-mail: hayesmph@dfw.wa.gov).

RANA CAPITO (Gopher Frog). **BURROW COHABITATION.** Gopher Frogs seek refuge in the burrows of Gopher Tortoises (*Gopherus polyphemus*), crayfish, and several species of small mammals, as well as in stump holes (Jensen and Richter 2005. *In* Lannoo [ed.], Amphibian Declines: The Conservation Status of United States Species, pp. 536–538. Univ. California Press, Berkeley). Although Gopher Frogs are difficult to locate and observe in terrestrial habitats because they spend much of their lives underground, adults are not thought to share burrows with conspecifics (Jensen and Richter 2005, *op. cit.*; Wright and Wright 1949. Handbook of Frogs and Toads of the United States and Canada. Comstock Publishing Co., Ithaca, New York. 640 pp.). Here we report observations of at least two, and possibly three, adult Gopher Frogs occupying a Gopher Tortoise burrow simultaneously.

During a radio-telemetry study on Gopher Frogs conducted in



FIG. 1. Two adult Gopher Frogs (*Rana capito*) observed at a Gopher Tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) burrow in the Ocala National Forest, Florida. One frog (left) was in the burrow entrance, while the other frog (right) was sitting beside the burrow.

the Ocala National Forest, Marion and Putnam counties, Florida, USA, we observed one transmitter-equipped adult Gopher Frog (Frog 1) sitting beside a large Gopher Tortoise burrow on 8 Oct 2007 at 2030 h. We also observed a second adult Gopher Frog (Frog 2), which was not equipped with a transmitter, sitting in the entrance to the same burrow (Fig. 1). Frog 1 had left a breeding pond within the previous 24 h, which was located 112 m from the burrow. Gopher Frogs can occasionally be observed sitting beside burrows at night and often create distinctive resting areas, consisting of soil cleared of vegetation (Richter et al. 2001. J. Herpetol. 35:316–321). Thus, although only one frog was actually inside the burrow, the two frogs probably shared the burrow diurnally.

On 11 Oct at 2100 h, following a prescribed fire earlier that day, Frog 1 and a second transmitter-equipped adult Gopher Frog (Frog 3) were both located inside the same Gopher Tortoise burrow described above. Frog 1 had remained in the burrow since 8 Oct, and Frog 3 was located in leaf litter 22 m from the burrow during the previous day. Although no frogs were visible, Frog 2 may have also remained in the burrow since 8 Oct and thus may have been a third frog occupying the burrow. The two frogs with transmitters (Frogs 1 and 3) cohabited this burrow for 11 days until 22 Oct when Frog 3 moved 30 m into a stump hole.

Although adult Gopher Frogs have not been previously reported to cohabit burrows with conspecifics, they may only share them temporarily during fires or migrations to and from breeding ponds, or cohabitation may be more common than previously thought, but rarely observed due to the difficulty in monitoring individuals at burrows.

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission provided funding for the radio-telemetry study on Gopher Frogs.

Submitted by ELIZABETH A. ROZNIK, Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA (e-mail: betsy.roznik@gmail.com); and STEVE A. JOHNSON, Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA, and Gulf Coast Research and Education Center, University of Florida—IFAS Plant City Campus, 1200 N. Park Road, Plant City, Florida 33563, USA.