

and professionalism. This may seem to be a minor point, but the minimal cost associated with logo design and usage will be an inexpensive investment with short- and long-term payoffs. Of course, the logo must be visible and applied only to equipment and clothing that is attractive and well-maintained. After all, a THC practice is patterned after the physician model. And we all know how scrubbed and clean doctors and nurses and their equipment are at all times. Arborists practicing THC need to project a similarly professional image.

In planning your THC practice, keep in mind the payoffs for your business, your customers, the resource (woody plants), environmental quality, and society. Your business needs to change and grow to maintain its competitive position. Customers are becoming more sophisticated and discriminating (Ball, 1986); many of them will be introduced to THC in the near future and will buy the service, from you or from one of your competitors. Our urban forest is a valuable and precious resource that has largely not been managed effectively. Environmental quality con-

tinues to occupy a central focus from neighborhoods to national institutions. There will be increasing pressure to reduce reliance on eradicated pesticide use to treat symptoms associated with tree decline. Our fast-paced, pressurized society needs the serenity and stability that trees add to our living, working, and playing spaces. As individual arborists embrace THC as a concept and develop practices to implement its precepts, the urban forest, its inhabitants, and the practitioner will all be richer.

Literature Cited

1. Ball, J. 1986. *Public perception of an integrated pest management program*. J. Arboric. 12(5):135-140.
2. Collins, T., and D. Pancoast. 1986. *Marketing: A vital key to success*. Arbor Age 6(3):30-31.
3. Nielsen, D. G. 1981. *Alternate strategy for arborists: treat the tree, not the customer*. Weeds, Trees and Turf 20(7):40-42.

Department of Entomology
Ohio Agricultural Research & Development Center
The Ohio State University
Wooster, OH 44691

Abstract

HERMS, D.A. 1986. **Pest-free honeylocust is a thing of the past**. Am. Nurseryman 163(10):73-78.

Once considered pest-free, honeylocust has been touted as a replacement for the diseased-ridden American elm. Now it is one of the most common components of the urban forest. But, with popularity, honeylocust has also acquired problems with pests. It gained wide acceptance during the past 35 years, following the development of thornless and fruitless cultivars. Claims that honeylocust transplants easily and is tolerant of a wide range of environmental conditions, including salt contamination and drought have undoubtedly contributed to its popularity. Despite its reputation of being pest-free, honeylocust developed problems with several serious native and introduced pests as it became common in the landscape. They include honeylocust plant bug (*Diaphnocoris chlorinonis*), mimosa webworm (*Homadula anisocentra*), honeylocust spider mite (*Eotetranychus multidigituli*), honeylocust pod gall midge (*Dasineura gleditschiae*), and honeylocust borer (*Agrilus difficilis*).