

in seeking their budget:

1. Aesthetic/Historic approach
People like trees and we have always funded the tree budget
2. Environmental approach
This was used extensively in the '60s — pointing out the ecological benefits of trees
3. Economic/Practical approach
Increased tax base, safety.

While the first and second methods may have worked in the past, their efficiency in times of tightening budgets is questionable. A two-pronged approach is suggested consisting of outlining the city's tree assets and liabilities (Figure 4).

The first step in construction of a budget proposal is to know what you have. A survey of your city's trees listing both their assets and sites of potential problems must be recorded. You may wish to compare two similar neighborhoods — one with trees and the other without. Then evaluate the tax records. You should be able to show an increased tax base for the one with trees. Local governments are now evaluating the condition of infrastructure, making repair versus replacement decisions and choosing among competing alternatives (4). The municipal arborist must be part of this decision process.

Lastly, and most importantly, the survey results and budgeting request must be accompanied by

good public relations — good PR with both the persons making the budget decisions and good PR with the citizens. Show the city what you are doing and what you are trying to do.

In the decade of ever-shrinking budgets you as a public official have to sell your program; only by doing this will you be able to keep your cities green and healthy.

Literature Cited

1. DeChillo, S. 1984. Con Ed tests a pruning battle tactic. *N.Y. Times* June 3.
2. Dichter, E. 1976. *Use of plants as a communication vehicle*. *J. Arboric.* 2(6): 119-120.
3. French, P., Ryan, H.D., Diamond, M., Decesare, R., and Jerant, A. 1983. *Analysis of Forestry Operations*. Department of Parks, N.Y.C.
4. Hatry, H. 1981. *Maintaining the Existing Infrastructure: Current State-of-the-Art and Practice of Local Government Planning*. IB/81-904. Public Technology, Inc., Washington, D.C.
5. Lederer, R. 1983. *Plants: an answer to urban blight*. *ALI* 10(1): 6-10.
6. Payne, B. Trees could make a difference in the selling price of your home. U.S. Forest Service, North Eastern Forest Experiment Station, *Forestry Science Photo Story #26*.

Arborist

*Department of Landscape Architecture
and Regional Planning*

University of Massachusetts

Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

ABSTRACT

ORANS, M. 1984. **Trees that tolerate smog**. *Am. Nurseryman* 159(9): 111-113.

Smog and stress caused by carbon monoxide from motor vehicles can take a heavy toll on plants, particularly along streets and in parking lots. Yet an alert nurseryman should be able to find a few varieties in any locale that show superior resistance to these problems. Over the years, I have often noticed that certain plants appear to flourish in a diversity of growing conditions, despite attacks from man-made and natural enemies, while others go down or barely survive. Yet some of these stalwarts are not used broadly, especially where they might be most appropriate — new developments with population increases in what were rural areas. Among my selections are species of *Laburnum*, *Pyrus*, *Cryptomeria*, and *Metasequoia*.