

OUTLOOK

By Bruce F. Shank, Editor

One of the last reports to reach the Environmental Protection Agency during the Carter Administration was one by the Urban Pest Management Committee of the National Academy of Sciences recommending development and promulgation of new regulations for urban pest control. The prospect of such laws, although they would provide grants for pest control research, is too risky.

Regulations specifically for urban pest management, on top of existing laws, might backfire as other laws based upon good intentions have. I know a number of the members of the committee and know how sincere they are and how valuable they have been to the field of structural pest control in urban areas. We met while I was editor of *Pest Control Magazine*, the parent publication of *Weeds Trees & Turf*.

Rodent and cockroach control in urban areas are ongoing battles with no permanent solution. This battle is a losing one in depressed areas of our cities

where control is not economically feasible without government support. In these areas, officials try to prioritize public health threats and use limited funds and manpower to protect the poor. It is a situation closely aligned to soothing the national racial conscience by massive use of buses, realizing that the buses will not solve the problem of inequality. The child still goes home to less than the children he meets at school.

Research support for public health pest control is absolutely critical. Shrinking tax bases in northern cities are threatening public health funding. The dollars to support these pesticide uses during EPA scrutiny are considerably less than those of agriculture.

Urban pest management needs special attention and support, but through existing agencies. After all, the EPA was established to solve implementation problems of previous regulations under the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Another danger is lumping public health pest control with commercial pest control in urban areas. Don't we now have the compliance of contract applicators? The Environmental Defense Fund and Friends of the Earth have posed serious objections to the spraying of trees even under the control of licensed applicators. Are they saying the law is not working?

Indeed, we need to know more about the use of pesticides and their effects in urban areas. This is a responsibility of EPA as it now stands and another layer of regulations will only make doing the job right more difficult. If you can't accomplish basic tasks due to confusion and mismanagement, certainly adding another layer of regulations to interpret will only add to the problem.

President Reagan appears to understand this. He claims to be able to separate conscience from logic. We hope he succeeds in this case. **WTT**

WT&T

LETTERS

Improper pruning cut

Your cover picture on the November issue is a perfect example of an improper pruning cut. Indeed this is not the fault of the workers, because we have been told for ages that a proper cut is a very close flush cut. We now know from current research that the branch collar should not be injured or removed. We are trying now to get this message out to as many people as fast as possible.

I always enjoy reading *Weeds Trees and Turf*.

Alex L. Shigo
Chief Scientist
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture,
Forest Service
Northeastern Forest
Experiment Station
Durham, NH

Educating public on DED

I have read with great interest your November 1980 *Weeds Trees & Turf* article on Dutch Elm Disease.

Our Village has an ongoing Dutch Elm Disease Control Program and this article does a tremendous job of ex-

plaining the disease and suggesting additional steps to take in our preventive program.

As your article states, educating the public is an important part of an effective program. Along these lines, I am interested in obtaining additional copies of this article or receiving written permission to reproduce this article as a hand-out for our residents who become involved in our Dutch Elm Disease Program.

Sincerely,
Carl F. Peter
Director of Public Works
Village of Glencoe, IL

Bentgrass not nimblewill

A slight delay but I will feel better for having contacted you. Page 64 of the October 1980 issue of *WEEDS TREES & TURF* contained information I must disagree with. The question was asked as to the best way to distinguish nimblewill from bentgrass. You had drawings depicting colonial and creeping bentgrass and nimblewill. It is my belief that the ligule shapes of the

bentgrasses are reversed—colonial being short and truncate while creeping is fairly tall and somewhat acute. No argument with nimblewill!

C. Richard Skogley, Professor
Turf Research Specialist
Plant and Soil Science
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI

Finds February useful

The February 1981 issue of *Weeds Trees & Turf* is packed with timely and widely useful information. Every feature article is either directly useful or essential background material for people in landscaping, restoration, ecology, climate control, and utilization. What a hard act you have to follow! I'll be anxious to see the March issue.

Hearty thanks for your efforts!

I also appreciate your support of Horticulture Research Institute. Some of the *Weeds Trees & Turf* thrust is down the center line of our efforts. W. R. Heard, Treasurer
Heard Gardens Ltd.
Des Moines, IA