

Three appendices enhance the value of this publication. The first lists scientific names of non-avian organisms, the second lists Grady County voucher specimens, museum catalog numbers, and date of collection and the third includes results of Christmas Bird Counts conducted by Stoddard at Sherwood Plantation for 29 consecutive years (1937-1965).

This is a publication you will want to keep close at hand to dip into whenever you have the chance. Open it anywhere and start reading; you will quickly find something of interest. Ornithologists in the southeast are indebted to the editors and to Tall Timbers for publishing the work.—FRED E. LOHRER.

**Papers of the symposium on the eastern population of the Greater Sandhill Crane.**—Robert D. Feldt, compiler. 1977 (1978). Indianapolis, Indiana, Indiana Chapter of the Wildlife Society. 123 pp. \$5.00 c/o Duane L. Shroufe, Division of Fish & Wildlife, 607 State Office Bldg., Indianapolis, IN 46204.—The eastern population of the Greater Sandhill Crane, *Crus canadensis tabida*, breeds in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ontario and Manitoba, and so far as is known all or most of these birds winter in Florida and southern Georgia. Greater Sandhills reached a low ebb in 1944 when Walkinshaw (1949, The Sandhill Crane. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan. Cranbrook Inst. Sci. Bull. 29) estimated that the total population in the Lake states was less than 260 birds. Today the Lake states population is more than 15× that number.

This recent increase has been matched by a renewed interest in the study of this migratory population, as the 18 papers in this symposium (held 24-26 October 1977) indicate. Half of the papers are concerned with the status of Greater Sandhills in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana and Florida. Other subjects include migration, ecology, parasites and diseases, growth and development, behavior, management and future outlook. Unfortunately, little information exists on Eastern Greater Sandhills in Canada where about 70% of the population summers. Hopefully, future conferences on Eastern Greater Sandhills will include information about Canadian populations.

Of special interest to Floridians is Stephen A. Nesbitt's article on the current status and future of the birds in Florida. The current wintering population of Greater Sandhills in Florida is estimated at probably between 12,000 and 15,000, and cranes color-marked in Florida have been reported summering in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Manitoba. Nesbitt suggests that if wintering cranes continue to increase their reliance on agricultural areas corn depredation problems may increase.

Lawrence H. Walkinshaw addresses an important problem, namely what should naturalists eventually do with their unpublished data? Deposit them in a regional institution where they will be protected and still be accessible is his solution.

For those interested in cranes this is an important publication. Much can be learned about these birds, and the papers in this symposium point the way. Florida birders can make an important contribution to our knowledge of Greater Sandhill Cranes in Florida by noting areas of winter concentrations and by being alert for color-marked birds. Finally, share your records with Stephen A. Nesbitt.—FRED E. LOHRER.

**Florida frog calls.**—Richard A. Bradley, producer. 1978. Gainesville, Florida State Museum Associates, Inc. one phonograph disc. \$4.50, (Fla. residents include sales tax.).—A good birder can identify many species of birds by their vocalizations alone, even down to the barely audible "tsuck" of the winter-time Brown Thrasher. Once tuned in to natural sounds, the field naturalist may wish to master identification of frog calls.

This record is "a guide to the commonly heard frogs and toads" of Florida. Although 20 species are included, some important omissions exist that will force the Florida field naturalist to consult other sources. Some species missing from the record, the endangered Pine Barrens treefrog (*Hyla andersoni*) and the river frog (*Rana heckscheri*) of north Florida and the exotic Cuban treefrog (*Osteopilus (Hyla) septentrionalis*) of south Florida, are perhaps hardly more local in Florida

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.