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. I: 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. × + 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.