

than some north Florida species included on the record. Including the calls of these rare and local species would help naturalists detect any possible range extension. Two conspicuous omissions are the Eastern spadefoot (*Scaphiopus holbrooki*) and the greenhouse frog (*Eleutherodactylus planirostris*). The latter is probably as common a frog call in central Florida as any other on the record. In the narrative, brief description of a species range and the scientific names would have been helpful.

The individual species segments are of adequate length for identification, the narration is brief and informative, and a portion of the second side is devoted to winter, spring and summer choruses with usually four or more species calling together—a typical field situation and a desirable feature that enhances the identification value of the record.

Recommend this record to your local Public Library, buy one for a budding naturalist or try it out yourself if you want to increase your knowledge of Florida's natural world. I look forward to other phonograph records devoted to Florida's natural sounds from the Bioacoustics Archive of the Florida State Museum.—FRED E. LOHRER.

**Colonial bird use and plant succession on dredged material islands in Florida. Vol. 1: Sea and wading bird colonies.**—Ralph W. Schreiber and Elizabeth A. Schreiber. 1978. Technical Report D-78-14, Dredged Material Research Program, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experimental Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi. 63 pp., 2 appendices.—The first part of this volume is a 26 page, very simplified summary based on two surveys of 255 spoil islands along Corps maintained waterways including the Indian River from Oak Hill to Wabasso (Florida East Coast), Tampa Bay, mouth of the Cross Florida Barge Canal, the Pithlacasotee River and the Caloosahatchee River at Ft. Myers (Florida West Coast). In 1977, these areas were surveyed by two visits to each island (late April-early May, late May-early June) by the Schreibers in accordance with contract stipulations. Aerial surveys (also performed) proved useless in locating tern, skimmer and Laughing Gull nest sites and for determining species composition of heronries. The summary was actually written by Mary Landin of the W.E.S. program and is a drastic shortening of the original submitted by the Schreibers. The bulk of the volume is appendices containing a thorough literature review (why are these required by all government contracts when the data are not integrated into the report itself?) and species accounts documenting use of the islands by birds. Good information on the nesting seasons, nesting associates, specific island use and vegetational successional stages used as nest sites are included. Tables 3 and 6-10 seem especially useful. The data on wintering and roosting/loafing use of the islands by birds are intriguing and further studies of this use in Florida should have been carried out.

It is incredible in this time of high printing cost that 22 pages of figures and much of the vegetational data should be duplicated in Volume 2 of this report, which contains only the vegetational studies of the islands, with scattered reference to bird use. To have had the whole report under one cover would have been much more valuable scientifically and would have cost considerably less. Volume 1 of this report should prove useful in future years as the baseline information of bird use of dredged material islands in these portions of Florida.—FRED E. LOHRER.

**Fish and Wildlife Inventory of the Seven-county Region Included in the Central Florida Phosphate Industry Areawide Environmental Impact Study.**—James N. Layne, Jerre A. Stallcup, Glen E. Woolfenden, Melinda N. McCauley and David J. Worley. 1977. National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. x + 1279 pp + appendices A-G. \$40.00, order No. PB-278 455 set.—Environmental impact studies are a mixed bag and frequently the biological inventory portion is given low priority. Fortunately for central Florida, this inventory is a noteworthy exception. Although the contract included almost no provision for fieldwork, virtually no other sources of information about the animals of central Florida were left untapped, including published records, museum specimens and unpublished data of naturalists and professional biologists from all specialities.

The principal objectives of the study were to compile available information on the animals of the seven Florida counties (Charlotte, DeSoto, Hardee, Hillsborough, Polk, Manatee and Sarasota) where the phosphate industry presently is concentrated and where future expansion will occur, and to assess the potential effects of mining on these animals, to make recommendations related to mining methods that would minimize adverse effects and to identify information gaps and needs for additional studies.

The introductory chapters include a physical description of the area, an inventory of the important natural areas and a detailed description of the major habitats.

The bulk of the study is the faunal inventory. For each vertebrate group and selected invertebrate groups there is an introduction and a list of all species recorded from the seven-county area, and for each species a tabular summary of county records, habitat distribution and relative abundance. For "priority species", individual accounts include detailed information on distribution, habitat, population status, basis for priority status, potential impacts of mining, selected references and a map of all distributional records. A "priority species" is one that may appear on rare and endangered species lists, be of commercial or sport value or be of particular interest because of its scientific importance or usefulness as an indicator of environmental conditions. Thus, of the 370 native and exotic species of birds recorded from the seven-county area, 147 (37%) are given priority status, including most ducks, raptors, wading birds, gruiforms and terns but excluding many passerines, especially migrants. Also, all available quantitative data for the area such as Christmas Bird Counts, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Breeding Birds Surveys, Archbold Biological Station Roadside Bird Censuses and Tampa Summer Bird Counts are analysed for the priority species.

At \$40.00, this report may be too expensive for most personal libraries. However, it is probably the single most important source of wildlife information, not only for the seven Florida counties, but for the rest of central Florida, and therefore belongs in every library in the region worth its salt. It is up to the readers of this journal to bring this publication to the attention of their own local librarian.—FRED E. LOHRER.

### ALSO RECEIVED

**Everglades National Park Project. Wildlife Reconnaissance.**—Daniel B. Beard. 1976. Washington, D.C., U.S. National Park Service. 106 pp., illus., base map.—A 1976 facimile reprint of a 1938 report available from The Chief Naturalist, Everglades National Park, Homestead, FL 33030. This report is based on field work in south Florida from November 1937 to September 1938 and includes a history of the Everglades Park idea, climate and physiographic regions, effects of human use, status of bird rookeries and feeding grounds, status of rare flora and fauna and recommendations for the park plan.

### NOTES AND NEWS

**Spring 1980 Meeting.**—St. Petersburg, Florida, April. For information write Brooks and Lyn Atherton, 4619 Woodmere Drive, Tampa, Florida 33609.

**Florida Ornithological Society, Membership List, April 1979,** compiled by Caroline H. Coleman. 11 pp, mimeo. Price \$1.00 prepaid, *order from Treasurer (see inside front cover).*

**Acknowledgement.**—I am grateful to the following 25 people for their help in refereeing manuscripts that appeared in volume 7 of the *FFN*; W. W. Baker, G. T. Bancroft, W. D. Courser, R. L. Crawford, J. B. Edscorn, J. W. Fitzpatrick, F. T. Hames, J. W. Hardy, D. W. Johnston, H. W. Kale, II, J. A. Kushlan, J. N. Layne, M. C. McKittrick, A. J. Meyerriecks, J. C. Ogden, W. B. Robertson, Jr., J. A. Rogers, Jr., R. W. Schreiber, G. Shugart, A. Sprunt, IV, H. M. Stevenson, P. W. Sykes, Jr., T. A. Webber, S. C. White-Schuler, G. E. Woolfenden.