

estimate that about 1/4th of their 35-40 year-old tuliptrees have caused sidewalk damage averaging about \$400 in repair costs per tree. The longterm costs of aphid honeydew management, pruning, and sidewalk repairs compared to the costs of tuliptree removal and replacement with a better adapted species indicate that gradual replacement of problem tuliptrees can be a more economical alternative. The temporary loss in aesthetic value from the replacement of mature (but problem prone) street trees must be weighted against the long-term benefits of a more attractive and less bothersome species.

Acknowledgments. Kenneth S. Hagen, Carlton S. Koehler, and Gordon W. Frankie of the University of California, Berkeley, provided helpful comments on this paper or during our research. Funding by the Elvenia J. Slosson Endowment Fund for Ornamental Horticulture is greatly appreciated.

Literature Cited

1. Dreistadt, S.H. 1987. *Monitoring of honeydew excretion*

- in the field as a method of sampling Illinoia liriodendri (Homoptera: Aphididae) infesting Liriodendron tulipifera.* J. Econ. Entomol. 80:380-383.
2. Dreistadt, S.H. and D.L. Dahlsten. 1986. *Replacing a problem prone street tree saves money; a case study of the tuliptree in Berkeley, California.* J. Arboric. 12(6): 146-149.
 3. Dreistadt, S.H., K.S. Hagen and D.L. Dahlsten. 1986. *Predation by Iridomyrmex humilis (Hym.: Formicidae) on eggs of Chrysoperla carnea (Neu.: Chrysopidae) released for inundative control of Illinoia liriodendri (Hom.: Aphididae) infesting Liriodendron tulipifera.* Entomophaga 31(4): 397-400.
 4. Kielbaso, J.J. and M.K. Kennedy. 1983. *Urban forestry and entomology: a current appraisal.* pp. 423-440 In *Urban Entomology: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, G.W. Frankie and C.S. Koehler (eds.), Praeger, New York.
 5. Koehler, C.S. 1987. *Insect pest management guidelines for California landscape ornamentals.* Cooperative Extension. University of California. Division of Agricultural and Natural Resources. 6701 San Pablo Ave. Oakland, CA. 94608 Publication 3317 (\$10.00) 82 pp.

*Division of Biological Control
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720*

Abstract

BYFORD, J.L. 1987. **Combat wildlife damage with common sense control methods.** Am. Nurseryman 165(8): 91-94, 96, 98, 100.

Wildlife damage control is the opposite of wildlife management. If you have unwanted animals around your nursery, it's a sure bet that there is already enough food, water and cover for them. The solution is to remove at least one of these elements—and if you can remove two, it's better. First, is there some way you can keep the animals from getting to the problem site. If you can't build them out, can you repel them from the problem site? If you can't put up an effective barrier or repel the animals from the problem site, the last step is to remove the animals that are causing your problems. However, when considering this alternative, you should check with your county wildlife officer to get approval—unless the animals are unprotected. Deer probably cause nursery managers more headaches than any other wildlife species. Rabbits are valuable from a recreational and food standpoint, but they can cause severe nursery damage. If your trees are suffering from girdled bark, the damage is probably caused by beavers, muskrats, rabbits or voles. Woodchucks, commonly called groundhogs, cause no harm at all in many cases. But they can sometimes forage on nursery crops and dig dens that pose a menace to machinery.