

June, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The President's Page 17

Alabama's First Breeding Bird Survey. Tom Imhof 18

Habitat Association and Population Density of Some Birds
of the Coastal Plain. David T. Rogers 22

Observations on a Captive Chuck-Will's-Widow
James C. and Margaret L. Robinson 24

Minutes of the 15th Annual Meeting, Alabama Ornithological
Society 28

ALABAMA BIRDLIFE

Published periodically by the Alabama Ornithological Society at Auburn, Alabama 36830. It is sent to all members, or it may be obtained by subscription in the United States for \$1.00 per year or \$.50 per issue.

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

I wish to express my appreciation for the great honor of being president of our organization for the coming year and I intend to uphold the tradition of our past presidents in contributing to the continued progress and success of the AOS.

I have been a member of the Society for some nine years and I have witnessed a steady growth in membership and stature. The mounting list of contributions of AOS and its members to the science of ornithology and to the cause of conservation should be a great source of pride for all of us.

In the past few years there have been signs of an awakening in the minds of many people to the fact that our natural resources are worthwhile and, perhaps, worth saving, even at the risk of some economic loss. I feel that this heartening trend has come about largely because of the efforts of organizations such as ours and the individual efforts of the members.

Some will question our involvement because they might expect an Ornithological Society to watch and study birds, gather data, and do nothing more. But a group such as ours is not made up of detached seekers of information only; most of us love the creatures we enjoy studying and observing, and we will not sit on the sidelines and allow their decimation or extinction without doing whatever we can to prevent it.

These are my feelings about AOS and conservation, but lest you get the impression that I advocate abandonment of all other aspects of the Society that we may go into fulltime conservation work, I assure you it is not true.

I should like to see greater participation by all our members in AOS activities. Each of us should support his Regional Director by furnishing information for the Newsletter. I should like to see more data sent to the Editor of ALABAMA BIRDLIFE.

I look forward to a much improved Breeding Bird Survey program this year through greater participation of our members. With all the competent observers we have throughout the state, one or two people should not have to run three or four survey routes.

Another activity which I feel whould be supported fully is the Nesting Survey being promoted by Dr. Julian Dusi.

In addition, I have a pet project. I should like very much to see the beginning of a systematic, statewide birdbanding program which could be used, eventually, to determine yearly migration and resident status of most areas of the state.

I was very happy to see all our members and guests at our spring meeting which must have been the greatest ever, and I look forward to a year of continuing growth and accomplishment of AOS.

James C. Robinson

ALABAMA'S FIRST BREEDING BIRD SURVEY
1966

Tom Imhof

In June, 1966, 22 observers and 15 assistants manned 40 survey routes in Alabama. Observers are listed below and marked with an asterisk for each route covered. *Richard Ambrose, ****Maurice Baker, Naomi Banks, *Raymond Bates, Sara Bates, **Fairly Chandler, *Blanche Chapman, Lynn Childers, *Jerome Couch, *Walter Coxe, Tommy Creel, *Blanche Dean, *Rev. J. L. Dorn, **Julian Dusi, Rosemary Dusi, Mary Gaillard, *Wilson Gaillard, **Dan Holliman, **Thomas Imhof, James Imhof, *Helen Kittinger, W. D. McDaniel, *Clustie McTyeire, Margaret Miller, Ross Partridge, Margarete Persons, Elberta Reid, ***Robert Reid, James Robinson, ***Margaret Robinson, Joe Schlatter, ***Robert Skinner, Idalene Snead, **C. W. Summerour, **David Turpin, **Robert E. Waters, *Harriett Wright.

On these 40, 25-mile routes, the observers covered 1000 miles, made 2000 stops, and counted 32,281 birds of 123 species. This averaged 16 birds per stop, 807 birds per route, and 51 species per route. All the birds along these routes were not counted; some were between stops, some just didn't show themselves, and others could not be identified. The problem of identification especially by song is a tough one, and becoming an expert on bird identification is not easy.

In 26 states east of the Mississippi and 4 Canadian provinces, 518,176 birds of 274 species were counted on 586 routes. This averaged out at 17,272.5 birds and 19.5 routes per state, and 884 birds per route and 17.7 birds per stop.

We now have increased considerably our knowledge of our breeding birds, particularly relative abundance, frequency, and distribution statewide. The following list in decreasing order of abundance portrays this numerically. The first figure is the total number of individuals recorded, a measure of abundance. The second is the number of stops at which the species was recorded, the frequency with which the bird was met. The third figure is the number of routes on which the species was recorded, and it tells us how widely distributed the bird is in Alabama.

Look at the Barn and Rough-winged Swallows for instance. These figures tell us that these two swallows are about equal in abundance, but the Barn Swallow was found on $\frac{1}{2}$ of the routes and was more frequently met with in its range. The Rough-winged Swallow was found on more than half the routes but only $\frac{2}{3}$ (32/48) as often. The Carolina Wren, 18th in abundance but 13th in frequency averaged 1.3 (537/416) birds per stop. On the contrary, the House Sparrow, 4th in abundance was only 18th in frequency. An average of 5.4 (1710/316) was seen per stop.

A word of caution: these figures represent a sample of the breeding birds of Alabama. Birds easy to see and easy to identify along roads are represented by higher figures in relation to their true abundance. Birds of the deeper woods and swamps (many warblers), those not conspicuous at the time of the survey (such as those more active earlier in the season or late in the day, hawks, Pine Warblers, Com. Nighthawk) do not

have their true abundance reflected in these figures either. Nevertheless these data have plenty of meaning and are well worth the effort. In later years, counting will be under these same conditions, and we can tell which species are increasing or decreasing in abundance and which ones are expanding or contracting their ranges.

In the following tabulation of birds recorded by Alabama observers, the bird species are listed in descending order of their recorded abundance. For each species the number of individuals reported, the number of stops are which the species was recorded, and the number of routes on which the species was recorded, are listed.

Common Name	No. of Individuals	No. of stops	No. of routes
Bobwhite	2399	1153	40
Cardinal	2062	1013	40
Mockingbird	1934	1030	40
House Sparrow	1710	316	38
Com. Grackle	1671	452	40
Com. Crow	1543	673	40
Mourning Dove	1511	736	40
Blue Jay	1471	778	40
Red-winged Bl.	1390	439	40
Indigo Bunting	1142	677	37
Ruf-s. Towhee	1106	679	38
E. Meadowlark	1067	499	39
Starling	1010	329	39
Yell-br. Chat	831	555	38
Purple Martin	795	218	34
Chimney Swift	701	290	39
Wood Thrush	556	340	35
Carolina Wren	537	416	40
Orchard Oriole	494	345	38
Field Sparrow	493	330	30
Yellow-b Cuckoo	380	306	38
White-e Vireo	357	254	38
Red-bell. Woodp.	368	309	38
E. Kingbird	351	247	39
Yellowthroat	315	242	30
Tufted Titmouse	314	216	37
Brown Thrasher	304	247	38
Robin	287	180	17
Blue Grosbeak	287	220	38
Carolina Chickadee	287	154	34
Red-eyed Vireo	287	199	32
Br.-hd. Cowbird	258	155	33
Fish Crow	253	68	11
Gt. Crested Flyc.	231	178	38
E. Bluebird	228	134	25
E. Wood Pewee	226	171	29
Summer Tanager	226	183	33
Chipping Sparrow	216	143	25
Prairie Warbler	212	148	24

Common Name	No. of Individuals	No. of stops	No. of routes
Loggerhead Shrike	172	130	36
Barn Swallow	159	48	10
Rough-winged Swallow	157	32	22
Chuck-wills-widow	134	83	26
Blue-gr. Gnatcatcher	110	59	24
Red-hd Woodpecker	93	73	22
Pine Warbler	92	71	23
Yell-s Flicker	89	81	33
Little Blue Heron	87	32	15
Downy Woodpecker	86	76	28
Catbird	85	68	25
Brown-hd Nuthatch	76	41	18
Killdeer	74	41	25
E. Phoebe	62	42	13
Am Goldfinch	59	15	9
Kentucky Warbler	56	50	20
Prothonotary Warb.	56	42	19
Pileated Woodpecker	52	46	24
Least Tern	51	5	1
Com. Nighthawk	48	30	10
Turkey Vulture	44	30	14
Hooded Warbler	40	33	15
Acadian Flyc.	37	31	16
Rock Dove	36	12	10
Black Vulture	35	17	12
Yellow-thr. Vireo	34	31	14
Green Heron	31	25	16
Black & White Warb.	27	22	8
Belted Kingfisher	24	18	12
Am. Redstart	23	15	12
Yellow-throated W.	20	17	9
Parula Warbler	19	14	7
Ovenbird	19	13	1
Cattle Egret	17	5	4
Hairy Woodpecker	15	14	10
Bachman's Sparrow	15	12	7
Black-thr. Green W.	13	8	2
Sparrow Hawk	11	11	4
Ruby-thr. Hummingbird	11	10	10
Red-shouldered Hk.	11	9	7
Wood Duck	11	4	4
Yellow Warbler	10	9	7
Ground Dove	10	9	4
Whip-poor-will	10	6	4
Brown Pelican	10	4	2
Broad-winged Hawk	9	9	7
Com. Egret	9	4	2
Seaside Sparrow	8	4	1
Red-tailed Hawk	7	5	5
Dickcissel	7	5	3
Turkey	7	2	2
Great Blue Heron	6	6	4

Common Name	No. of Individuals	No. of stops	No. of routes
Barred Owl	6	5	5
Willet	6	3	2
Boat-tailed Grackle	6	3	1
Worm-eating Warbler	5	5	3
Black Skimmer	5	3	1
Blue-winged Warbler	4	4	4
Grasshopper Sparrow	4	4	3
Yellow-cr. Night Heron	4	3	3
Canada Goose	4	1	1
White-br. Nuthatch	3	3	2
Scarlet Tanager	3	3	1
Screech Owl	3	2	2
Louisiana W. thrush	3	2	2
Miss. Kite	2	2	2
Horned Lark	2	2	2
White Ibis	2	2	1
Louisiana Heron	2	1	1
Least Bittern	2	1	1
Cooper's Hawk	2	1	1
Clapper Rail	2	1	1
Forster's Tern	2	1	1
Red-cockaded w. p.	2	1	1
Baltimore Oriole	2	1	1
Sora	1	1	1
Purple Gallinule	1	1	1
Com. Gallinule	1	1	1
Am. Coot	1	1	1
Herring Gull	1	1	1
Black Tern	1	1	1
Gr. Horned Owl	1	1	1
Long-b. Marsh Wren	1	1	1
Bobolink	1	1	1

1036 Pike Road
Birmingham, Alabama 35218

HABITAT ASSOCIATION AND POPULATION DENSITY
OF SOME BIRDS OF THE ALABAMA COASTAL PLAIN

David T. Rogers

Studies of bird populations in different habitats of the southeastern U. S. have lagged behind similar studies from other parts of the country. This is particularly true with respect to quantitative studies of avian populations. During the early part of the summer of 1966, a study of bird populations and habitat associations was initiated at the University of Alabama Biological Station in Hale County. This investigation was part of a series of studies to be done at that Station.

The initial problem was to find uniform vegetational communities which were large enough to give meaningful estimates of avian population density. Only two such communities could be found in the general area. One of the communities was a late stage in the development of climax Oak-Hickory forest which is characteristic of the region. The present overstory is composed largely of pine, sweetgum, and oak with dogwood forming much of the understory (referred to hereafter as a hardwood community). This area was bordered on one side by the pine-sweetgum community described below, and on the other sides by extensions of the hardwood community. Two small areas within the hardwood community contained small streams which had different vegetation associated with them. These small areas contained bay trees and beech.

The other community which was large enough for quantitative bird study was a field which was covered largely with broomsedge, ragweed and large patches of pokeweed. This field was bordered on one side by a highway and on three sides by a mature oak-hickory forest.

The third community was almost pure pine but with a developing understory of sweetgum (referred to hereafter as a pine-sweetgum community), and was used to observe habitat association of birds but was not used for density estimates because it was too small. This community was bordered by a corn field on one side, and by the mixed hardwood community on the other sides.

Population density was estimated by the spot-mapping technique which entails determination of territories of singing males in a known area after several days observation. The number of males is then multiplied by two in order to include females. This figure is the population estimate. Table 1 gives a summary of the results of this six week study.

In a study of habitat association, any area will have birds visiting it from bordering areas. Thus surrounding habitats play an important role. A good example of this is the Bobwhite which was found in the field and the pine-sweetgum community. If the pine-sweetgum community had been bordered completely by hardwoods, it is unlikely that the Bobwhite would appear there. Also, the presence of Cardinals, Carolina Wrens and

towhees in the field can be explained by the presence of the bordering hardwood community.

Another consideration is that the size and shape of the area being censused will affect the density estimate. A smaller or more elongated area will have proportionally greater area of edge with surrounding communities. Both areas used for population density estimates in this paper were nearly square, thus minimizing the edge effect. The field was twelve acres and the hardwood community was twenty acres. Thus the total estimate of 268 birds per 100 acres for the field as opposed to 210 birds for the hardwood area may be slightly biased in favor of the field because of a greater relative edge in the field. However, in view of other uncertainties the effect is probably small.

This research was supported by the University of Alabama Research Committee, Project 517.

TABLE 1. Community association and population density of birds in Hale County, Alabama. An asterisk indicates that the bird was present but an accurate population estimate was not possible. Number per 100 acres.

	<u>Field</u>	<u>Pine-Sweetgum</u>	<u>Hardwood</u>
Indigo Bunting	117		
Blue Grosbeak	33		
Field Sparrow	*		
Song Sparrow	*		
Ruby-throated Hummingbird	*		
Orchard Oriole	*		
Yellowthroat	17		
Broad-Winged Hawk			*
Brown Thrasher	*		
Hooded Warbler			50
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher	*		
Pine Warbler		*	*
Kentucky Warbler			10
Bobwhite	50	*	
Summer Tanager		*	40
Blue Jay		*	*
Carolina Chickadee		*	*
Tufted Titmouse		*	*
Yellow-billed Cuckoo		*	*
Hairy Woodpecker		*	*
Wood Pewee	*	*	10
Cardinal	17	*	40
Carolina Wren	17	*	30
Rufous-sided Towhee	*	*	10
White-eyed Vireo			10
Louisiana Waterthrush			*
Worm-eating Warbler			*
Red-eyed Vireo			*
Yellow-throated Vireo			*
Yellow-breasted Chat	17		

Depart. of Biology
University, Alabama 35486

OBSERVATIONS ON A CAPTIVE CHUCK-WILL'S-WIDOW

James C. and Margaret L. Robinson

The Chuck-will's-widow (*Caprimulgus carolinensis* Gmelin) is a summer resident of the Brownsboro, Alabama area, usually arriving from the south the second week in April and departing by September 1st. Our records of arrival and departure dates include early arrivals on April 7, 1964 and 1965.

In our banding operations, we have learned that the Chuck-will's-widow is a very elusive bird. Although several spend the summer in our valley (sometimes as many as six may be heard at the same time) and often call from the fields adjacent to our nets, we have never caught one to band. This has been surprising to us, because in the early days of migration, when the Chucks and the Whip-poor-wills can be heard at the same time from approximately the same place, we have caught several Whip-poor-wills but never a Chuck-will's-widow.

The following account of our attempt to raise a young Chuck-will's-widow can hardly be termed a technical description of a scientific experiment, but it may prove to be of some interest to the reader, perhaps even to the serious student of bird life.

On June 28, 1966, a neighbor brought us a young Chuck-will's-widow which had been found at a house construction site outside Huntsville, Alabama.

When measurements were made on July 5, the wing chord was 133 mm (5.25 inches), and the total wing span was eighteen inches. The bird was not fully feathered at that time, and we estimate its age at time of capture as two or three weeks.

On June 31, it was observed to be capable of short flights (four to five feet) when released from the hand, and on July 2, it arose from the floor and flew at head height approximately 21 feet before flying into a glass door. The flight was slow and noiseless.

The donor of the bird, having kept it for only half a day, had fed it generously on oatmeal and water, apparently with no ill effect. Not knowing what to feed it, we first tried live insects, including a katydid and some dismantled beetles, but it threw them violently from its beak. Then we tried ground beef rolled into small pellets and the bird swallowed those without hesitation. We fed it on ground beef for a few days and then decided to give it ground beef, baby food (Jr. beef), and high protein baby cereal--equal amounts of each, rolled into $\frac{1}{2}$ " pellets. We fed it two or three times a day until it hesitated to swallow or tried to throw the food from its mouth. When it appeared to have trouble swallowing a pellet, we put a small amount of water ($\frac{1}{8}$ teaspoonful) into its mouth. We began feeding about two ounces per day and increased the amount as the bird grew.

The behavior of the little "chuck" in captivity was very interesting. At first, it never took any food voluntarily. At each feeding its beak had to be pried open and food dropped in. It was not necessary to hold its mouth closed after inserting the food; it usually swallowed without protest. After several days of observation, we realized that the bird made two sounds: one somewhat like the growl of an angry cat, and the other a low-pitched, one-note whistle. The growl was uttered whenever anything approached, and we recognized it as a warning cry which the bird used with its display to frighten away would-be molesters. The single note call, we decided, was a food call with which the young bird announced its hunger. The hunger cry was given only two of three times during the day, usually in the morning before six o'clock and at night after eight o'clock. Sometimes, a few minutes after feeding, it would utter its food call again. This signified, to us, that we had not given it enough, so we fed it more.

When we first received the "chuck", it would utter its growl, rock from side to side, and open its large, white mouth. Later, it began to spread its wings and actually strike at anything coming close. Of course, it could not hurt anything at all, because its beak was soft and pliable, incapable of inflicting the slightest injury.

On July 3, our young bird developed a new sound and a new activity. The sound consisted of a series of low chucking notes as it sat with half-closed eyes in its daytime position. When Kim (our 10 year old daughter) approached with a gob of baby food on her finger, it lunged forward in typical manner with mouth open as if to frighten a predator, but it closed its mouth on her finger and raked off the food which it swallowed. It repeated this procedure until it would take no more food. From then on whenever we approached the bird and stayed nearby, it would begin its low clucking and eat, if offered food.

By the thirteenth of July, it was capable of short flights of from sixty to one-hundred feet, but would not fly up of its own volition. To get it to fly, we had to toss it in the air. Incidentally, by this time it had managed to lose all its tail feathers.

In a few days we learned that our bird was giving still another call. It was a low pitched trill which apparently was a more urgent call for food than the clucking call or the single note whistle described previously. Even though it then expected food from Kim and took it readily from her hand, it still registered its call of annoyance whenever anything approached its cage.

Around the first of August, our "chuck", after doing nicely for two weeks or more, suddenly developed an apparent nervous disorder or co-ordination problem. When approached for feeding or otherwise, the bird would go into its menacing posture, but would raise its head upward and backward with wings extended until it turned a complete somersault; sometimes several in rapid succession. We supposed that confinement in the gloomy room might have had some bearing on the problem, so we took the bird out into the yard for fresh air and exercise, but with no marked improvement. After a short normal flight, the bird, on alighting, would begin to flop

over and eventually would come to rest on its back. This condition lasted for almost a week during which time the bird took no food voluntarily, but did swallow when its mouth was pried open and food pellets were inserted.

Quite as suddenly as it appeared, the disorder vanished, leaving the Chuck in as good shape as it had been previously.

During the next two weeks our chuck ceased to be an object of study and became a pet. He became very insistent when calling for food, and when we arose in the mornings, he would begin calling with his single call note until someone brought him food. As we approached his cage he would fluff his feathers, waddle back and forth, and cluck and peep until someone reached into the cage. Then he would extend his wings and flutter up to one's hand with his mouth open and take the food from the finger. We observed that his waddling amounted to a ritual and was repeated consistently. He would extend his wings with tips down, stretch his neck with head down, and go into his dance which consisted of two steps to the right, four steps to the left, and two steps back to his original position. The dance did not always mean the bird was hungry.

Occasionally we gave him water from a teaspoon. At first we had to pry his mouth open, but later, he would take water from the spoon of his own accord. Often he would take a food pellet and sling it onto the cage floor. This, we finally learned, meant he was thirsty and would take water from the spoon.

Sometimes, after feeding, the bird would settle down on the floor of his cage and cluck and peep very lowly. Margaret would then engage him in conversation by imitating his sounds. Often he would begin his conversational sounds when anyone entered the room.

During the period between the first and fifteenth of August, the bird would fly up from the floor to the window or across the room, but not strongly, and we fear he was not exercised enough.

He would not eat insects of any kind unless the wings and legs were removed. We suppose he became adapted to civilization too readily. In order to avoid any misunderstanding about Chuck's intelligence, it must be disclosed that when our cat approached the cage the bird would give his hunger call and open his mouth for food.

In all we observed nine different calls: (1) the whistle expressing hunger, (2) the clucking expressing hunger, (3) the trill expressing hunger, (4) the growl expressing annoyance or fear or given as a warning note, (5) the trill given when attacking, (6) soft clucks and peeps expressing satiation or contentment, (7) louder notes expressing satiation or contentment, (8) notes given during the "dance", and (9) a single note call for which there seemed no reason.

A characteristic of some interest was the bird's method of voiding. It would carefully back up three steps from its resting position, defecate, then waddle back into the original place.

In mid-August we had to leave home for a few days and had no choice but to take the chuck along in his cage. Whether from the exhaust fumes or the movement, the trip did him no good, and for three days while we were gone he would take no food; we had to force feed him and even so, he ate little.

Upon returning home to his familiar place in the den, he immediately changed back to his congenial ways which he maintained until near the end.

Around the first of September we became concerned because migration for Chuck-will's-widows was under way and our bird could not fly, would not eat insects, and had managed to lose tail feathers as fast as they grew in. We could not try to keep him alive through the winter.

After the first week in September, Chuck began to call less often and to refuse his food at regular feeding times. He became less active and made fewer sounds. On September 28th, he refused food, made no aggressive movements, seeming content to make low peeping noises when someone stroked or petted his head. On the morning of September 30th, we found him dead in the cage. We realized at that moment that we were not even slightly objective in our attitude.

The only reference we found on raising the young of the Chuck-will's-widow was the very interesting article of Mr. Albert F. Ganier in the December, 1964, issue of The Migrant, the journal of the Tennessee Ornithological Society.

In his article, Mr. Ganier described his experience in caring for a young Chuck-will's-widow estimated to be three or four weeks old at time of capture (7.85 inch wing chord). He was able to look after his bird for only thirteen days. We were fortunate to keep ours alive for three months and are thankful for the opportunity to observe its behavior in captivity, but we hope that no one brings us another to raise anytime soon. We had much rather witness its dancing and hear its calls by the light of the moon than in the glare of a 100W bulb!

Route 1, Box 91
Brownsboro, Alabama 35741

MINUTES OF 15th ANNUAL MEETING
ALABAMA ORNITHOLOGICAL SOCIETY
APRIL 21-23, 1967

The 15th Annual Spring Meeting of the Alabama Ornithological Society was held at Dauphin Island, Alabama, on April 21-23, 1967. The Holiday House Apartments were headquarters for the meeting, and 128 members and guests were registered, representing eight states -- Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Florida, Tennessee, Indiana and Texas.

Field Trips and Friday Evening Program

Informal field trips were conducted on the island Friday by members of the Mobile Bird Club and Tom and John Imhof. Other field trips to the Indian Shell Mounds, the eastern and western ends of the island, the bird sanctuary, causeway, and Bellingrath Gardens were conducted Saturday morning and afternoon and Sunday morning by Tuck Hayward, Tom Imhof, Fairly Chandler, Clara Caffey, Louise McKinstry, Lib Toenes, Ross Partridge and Blanche Dean. In addition, Jim and Margaret Robinson, Margaret Miller and Mike Bierly conducted netting and banding operations that were of much interest to the members and guests attending the meeting.

The program Friday evening began with the showing of slides at the Alabama Marine Resources Laboratory. The members attending enjoyed excellent and most interesting slides by Jim Keeler of his Mexican Adventure and by Mr. Olan Dillon, our guest from Texas, of plants that would attract birds as well as some interesting birds and animals of the West. The President also showed a few slides on the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia and urged the members to write the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., promptly to support inclusion of the swamp in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Meeting of Executive Council

The Executive Council met at 12:00 noon April 22, 1967, at the LeMoyné Restaurant on Dauphin Island with the following members present: Mr. Robert R. Reid, Jr., President; Mr. James C. Robinson, Vice-President; Mr. Frank D. Huttlinger, Treasurer; Mrs. Hellen H. Kittinger, Secretary; Dr. Maurice F. Baker, Editor, ALABAMA BIRDLIFE; Dr. Dan C. Holliman, Director and Editor of Newsletter; Mr. Robert E. Waters, Immediate Past President; Mr. P. Fairly Chandler, Mrs. Harriett H. Wright, Mr. James E. Keeler, Dr. Wm. J. Calvert, Mr. Thomas A. Imhof and Mrs. Margaret L. Robinson, Directors.

The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since they had been previously printed in ALABAMA BIRDLIFE and were approved as printed. The President stated that the following had been appointed and were serving on the committee to audit the Treasurer's books: Mr. Waters, Chairman, and Mr. Keeler.

Dr. Baker reported that in 1966 ALABAMA BIRDLIFE was published in three issues totaling 47 pages. Total costs were: Printing, \$254.16; postage, \$25; and reprints of articles, \$17.70. Total: \$296.86. Total costs for the first issue of 1967 were \$117.12. Although printing charges continue to increase, total costs were held down by reducing the size of the run to about 100 more than the current mailing list. This leaves an adequate reserve for future orders. Reprints are distributed free of charge to authors to encourage the submission of articles.

Dr. Holliman reported that four issues of the Newsletter, consisting of a total of 40 pages, were published during the last year and expended the funds budgeted for that purpose. The issues contained five articles, eleven shorter notes of observations, summaries of certain Christmas, migration and meeting counts, programs for the meetings and other announcements.

Plans for future meetings were discussed -- the next Spring Meeting to be held at Dauphin Island, April 19-21, 1968.

The necessity of raising dues of the Society was then discussed, and it was pointed out that because of increased printing costs, the income of the Society is now only barely sufficient to finance its present activities and leaves no room for any additional publication expenses or additional activities. It was also noted that the Society's present dues are rather modest when compared to those of similar non-profit organizations and have not been increased since initially set in 1952. After discussion, it was determined that the annual dues of active members should be raised from \$2 to \$3 and associate (out-of-state) members from \$1.50 to \$2 with a comparable increase in life memberships. Dues for sustaining members and student members will remain at \$5 and \$1 per year, respectively, and there would naturally be no change in the provisions for honorary membership. Thereupon, it was, upon motion by Dr. Calvert, seconded by Mr. Waters and unanimously adopted, resolved that an amendment amending Article I, Section I, Subsections a, b and e of the By-laws of the Society to read as follows:

"Article I. Dues and Membership

Sec. 1. There shall be six classes of membership.

- a. Active Members. Entitled to all privileges of the Society upon payment of the annual dues ... \$3.00.
- b. Associate Members (out-of-state). Entitled to all of the privileges of the Society, except the privilege to hold office and vote, upon payment of the annual dues ... \$2.00.

* * *

- e. Life Members. Will be entitled to all the privileges of the Society, as a member desiring to pay his dues for the rest of his life in one sum. Memberships may be paid within a two-year period ... \$75.00."

be hereby approved to take effect beginning with the calendar year 1968 and that a resolution proposing such an amendment be presented for adoption at the business session of the 1967 fall meeting of the Society.

It was announced by the Present that the hawk protection legislation will proceed as previously discussed by introduction of an appropriate bill at the coming session of the legislature.

There was a discussion on stream channelization, specifically the Swan Creek Project in Limestone County. After much discussion, it was decided to defer any official action pending resolution of the problems presented by the project through conferences among the State Department of Conservation, the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and that, if there were any significant developments prior to the fall meeting, to advise the membership of the pros and cons involved through the Newsletter and let the individual members take whatever action they might feel necessary. Dr. Clavert also moved that the incoming officers be given authority to act for the Society on this matter should they consider it advisable; the motion was seconded and adopted by all those voting. The meeting was duly adjourned at 1:40 P. M.

Business Meeting

The business meeting of the membership was called to order by the President at 1:45 P. M. at the Alabama Marine Resources Laboratory on Dauphin Island. The minutes of the fall business meeting held on November 19, 1966, at Jackson were read and approved. Mr. Waters, Chairman of the Auditing Committee, reported that the committee's examination indicated the treasurer's books to be in order, and the report was approved.

The President stated that under the By-laws of the Society, Mr. James C. Robinson, its present Vice-President, would succeed to the presidency for the coming year. In the absence of the Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Dr. Dan Holliman reported the following nominations for next year's officers: Helen H. Kittinger - Vice-President; and Louise N. McKinstry - Treasurer. The President opened the floor for any other nominations and, there being none, the nominations were closed. Upon motion duly made and seconded, the officers proposed by the nominating committee were unanimously elected. Following report of the Lawrence's Warbler netted in the bird sanctuary, the meeting was rapidly adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

Program and Banquet

The banquet and program were held Saturday night at the Dauphin Island Civic Building. A delicious seafood buffet was served by a civic group for the benefit of the Dauphin Island Volunteer Fire Department.

The President introduced the officers, directors and guests, and

Frank Huttlinger supervised the drawing of the door prizes. The main prize was BIRDS OF THE WORLD by Dr. Oliver L. Austin, Jr., former AOS President, and other prizes were A GATHERING OF SHOREBIRDS by Henry M. Hall, ALABAMA BIRDS by Tom Imhof, a beautiful painting of Pintails on wood by Margaret Robinson's mother, and sets of Audubon and Arthur Singer prints.

The highlight of the meeting was the transferring of the bird sanctuary from Dauphin Island Park and Beach Board to National Audubon Society, Dr. M. Wilson Gaillard, presiding, followed by a discussion of future plans for the bird sanctuary and benefits to be derived from it by Mr. John Anderson, Director of Sanctuaries, National Audubon Society. Then an excellent program of slides on wildlife sanctuaries in the Bahama Islands and some of the work being carried on there was presented by Mr. Alexander Sprunt, IV, Director of Research for the National Audubon Society.

Compilation

Following the field trips on Sunday morning, a compilation of birds observed during the meeting was held at the headquarters with Mr. Tom Imhof in charge. A total of 155 species was recorded. Highlight of the meeting was the extremely rare Lawrence's Warbler (the recessive hybrid of the Golden-winged and Blue-winged Warblers) netted and banded by Margaret Robinson and her crew of Lynn Childers and Max Harmon. This was the fifth record for Alabama and the first record for our Gulf Coast. Also noteworthy were the Glossy Ibis observed at Cedar Point (except for some wintering individuals, a near early record), the Red-throated Loon off the causeway (sixth record for the Gulf Coast and eighth for the state), the Black Turns (a near early record for the state), and the Canada Goose on Theodore Pond and Hermit Thrush (late records for the Gulf Coast). The 30 plus Brown Pelicans were encouraging on account of reduced numbers of that bird on the Gulf Coast in recent years. Also of particular interest to those attending the meeting were the Clapper Rail's nest containing ten eggs found on the west end of Dauphin Island, the pair of Mottled Ducks also observed in that area, the American Oystercatchers near the causeway and the Long-billed Marsh Wrens.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen H. Kittinger, Secretary