

## LETTERS

**Let Bergland Know!**

I am very pleased with the support of the Cooperative Extension Service you espoused in your editorial in the June issue of WTT. It is right on the mark!

Being a Horticulturist myself, and having my staff responsible for the educational aspects of the very successful GREEN INDUSTRY Seminars in the Detroit area, as well as being involved in educational programming with the metropolitan Detroit Landscapers Association, the Michigan Association of Nurserymen, the Michigan Turf Foundation, the Sod Growers Association of Michigan, the Metropolitan Detroit Flower Growers Association, Michigan Forestry and Parks Association, and others, most of which we were instrumental in forming, I can appreciate your sentiments exactly.

Keep up the good work. The Appropriations Bills, from both the House and Senate, have still to be acted upon. The House Appropriations Committee reported out a requested increase, above the President's Executive Budget, of \$16 million for Extension and \$11.5 million for agricultural teaching. Obviously this \$16 million is considerably short of the \$41.5 million we thought was conservatively needed, using only a 7% inflation factor.

This week the Senate Appropriations Committee will deliberate and we are attempting to have them add another \$4.5 million to the Extension budget. This is a tight budget year, and well it should be, but when we have a proven winner, such as the Cooperative Extension Service, in helping American citizens it doesn't make much sense to cut so deeply we find it extremely difficult to effectively function.

It might do a lot of good, for the FY 81 Budget, to let the Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland know how WTT feels about the Extension budget. The allocations of dollars within the USDA budget may well be where we can make the most gain and the time is NOW!

Thanks for your concern and help.

Donald D. Juchartz  
President  
National Association County Agricultural Agents

As a County Agent who works closely with the turf and ornamental horticultural industry, I appreciate your "Viewpoint" on Extension in the June 1979 issue of "Weeds, Trees and Turf."

While Extension may not be the purveyor of all information, many people do not realize that research findings often are passed on indirectly by Extension Agents or Specialists.

I hope the Green Industry will respond to your editorial.

E. V. Chadwick  
Extension Director  
Pennsylvania State University  
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18702

We heartily endorse your opinion expressed in "Viewpoint" in the June issue of Weeds, Trees and Turf. We need all of the help we can get if we are going to be able to continue receiving appropriations from the Congress to fund the important areas you point out in your "Viewpoint."

We are particularly pleased that you will be publishing news about Association efforts in Washington. We have been on this firing line for a long, long time and have been trying to stimulate grass roots' assistance with varying degrees of success over the years.

Actually, in view of budget limitations, overall we have been quite successful in getting money for horticultural programs. As of right now it looks like we will not suffer the budget cuts you were aware of when you wrote your "Viewpoint." Congressman Whitten, who is Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and is a very strong individual indeed, is insisting that all research cuts be restored in Conference. We are strongly supporting his effort.

For whatever interest it may be, I have enclosed a copy of the American Association of Nurserymen testimony on the subject of agricultural appropriations. You will find that we dwelled at some length on the problem facing State Experiment Station Research.

One other point which involves terminology. In your "Viewpoint" you used the term "ornamental and turf" several times. I would like to suggest your consideration of using the term "environmental" in place of ornamental. We have been trying to spread this word for several years and have made some progress. I have enclosed an excerpt from testimony before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee given some years ago. This is proof enough of the need for getting away from the term "ornamental." I think environmental plants is an all encompassing term that you may consider. It would include turf also. Turf too, has its image problem when it comes to getting money for research from the Federal government. The less we get specific, the better off we are.

We are most anxious to work with you and will welcome any contacts your reporters would like to make with us, either personally or over the telephone. We try to keep abreast of all legislative matters affecting the industry, and when we cannot give an answer right away, we will surely chase it down and get back to you as soon as possible.

Robert F. Lederer  
Executive Vice President  
American Association of Nurserymen, Inc.  
Washington, D.C.

I've delayed over-long in writing to commend you on the editorial concerning the loss of experiment station personnel to industry — mostly turf oriented. It is a grave situation! In pirating good turf people away from the universities, industry realizes that they are getting highly trained individuals. The industrial people can outbid univer-

sity administration because the very people they are hiring have helped them to make the kind of money by which they can raise the bid.

Industry has a moral responsibility, an obligation, to help finance the graduate students who must be trained to replace the people who have been hired away from the colleges. Every industrial firm engaged in "turf-for-profit" (equipment, irrigation, seed, sod, chemicals, fertilizer, etc.) could afford to budget a given amount each year to donate (tax-free) to the industry foundations to help train these replacements.

Fred V. Grau  
President  
Musser International Turfgrass Foundation  
College Park, MD

I serve as head of a department that is primarily horticulture, but with some forestry, and my own background is in physiology and culture of vegetable crops. I am very supportive of work in the area of ornamental horticulture or the "green industry" as you call it, and I especially appreciated your "Viewpoint" in the June 1979 issue. I think you are right in believing that only continuous pressure from the industry and its consumers will get a fair share of research and extension effort devoted to this area. The picture today is quite in contrast to that of the late sixties and early seventies when everyone was wanting to ride the "environmental horse" to greater support for their pet area. I certainly wish you success in your efforts.

I have tried to gain a broad viewpoint and some knowledge of all areas of horticulture since becoming department head. Your June 1979 issue of Weeds, Trees and Turf was full of information that I have digested. In fact, I don't know when I've seen a trade magazine with more information in it. Congratulations.

George Bradley  
Professor and Head, Horticulture  
University of Arkansas  
Fayetteville, AR

## Don't Meddle With Intrusion.

As a practicing urban forester, I feel compelled to reply to an article in the June, 1979 issue of WT&T, "Urban Forestry Suspected as Intrusion".

I work for the Virginia Division of Forestry, a state agency, as a Forester-Planner. As the title implies, I spend a good deal of my time working with state, regional, and county planning organizations to conserve the forest resource of Virginia. The rest of my time, however, is spent practicing urban and community forestry.

My job responsibilities include all the technical assistance programs mentioned in the article plus some others, including:

- promotion of all Division of Forestry programs, including forest management and forest fire protection,
- providing technical assistance to individual's or groups wishing to undertake environmental projects; eg. greenbelts, wildlife areas, parks, soil

erosion and sedimentation prevention, watersheds, etc.

- review and comment on all Environmental Impact Statements concerning the forest resource in rural and urban areas
- education of the public in complying with State Water Quality guidelines known as Best Management Practices (BMP's) in accordance with Federal legislation 92-500, the Clean Water Act.

What do these have to do with this magazine article? You have assumed that we "urban foresters" are meddling in the affairs of practicing arborists. We are, first of all, foresters; and as such most of our concern is placed on the forest resource as a whole. We have no intention of interfering with private enterprise, especially arboriculture, which concerns itself with the care and maintenance of urban trees. Rather, it has been my experience that our work promotes the work of arborists. Any tree ordinances that we may help to write and implement for communities encourage tree care and thus provide work for tree care firms. Whenever we provide any insect and disease control recommendations to the public, we also recommend the use of arborists (we are not allowed to suggest specific companies or individuals) to implement these controls. Finally, any municipally-owned forest land that we develop management plans for usually belongs to a municipality that requests our assistance or cannot afford a municipal arborist of its own.

Mr. Felix has suggested, according to your article, that the moneys provided for urban forestry under the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act may lead to the formation of a federal agency to regulate the "urban forest" industry. In these times of federal budget cuts and government penny-pinching, do you think this argument is valid? Five pages previous to this article, you are encouraging action to stop the loss of Agricultural Extension personnel. Why then are you "biting the hand that feeds you" in this article? Foresters should not be "suspected", as you put it, of intruding into the world of arboriculture. We are an information source, as extension personnel are, and can work together with arborists to provide a valuable service to our urbanizing population.

Matthew J. Simons  
Forestry-Planner  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
Sandston, VA

*Take a good look at OSHA, EPA, HEW. Good intentions in every case, but tremendously harmful implementation at the cost of American business. Mr. Felix wasn't implying that the person, the urban forester, is the intruding party. Rather, he rightly projected past bungling in Washington, D.C. to arboriculture in cities. He warned of the possibility of poor implementation. He is saying, look before you leap bureaucrats.*

*Please don't confuse our stand on urban forestry with extension horticulture. They are separate issues despite overlap. In fact, it is the same bungling that is threatening to seriously reduce extension help to Green Industries, that can derail good intentions to restore forests to our cities. The Editor*