

relative wound sprout growth inhibition are depicted in Figure 1. Norway maple wound regrowth is positively correlated with crown removal in the presence of Atrinal, while wound growth of plane tree and red maple are negatively correlated. The negative correlations determined for plane tree and red maple could be due to less Atrinal being translocated in a tree that has been pruned heavily. Consequently, less growth inhibition by Atrinal occurs in severely pruned trees. The positive correlation of Norway maple between crown removal and Atrinal treatment could be a reflection of the greater sensitivity of this species to Atrinal, coupled with the resumption of normal uptake in succeeding years. This is by no means the only interpretation but the analysis indicates that crown removal can significantly alter the effectiveness of Atrinal treatment among different species.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Consolidated Edison Company of New York for supporting this investigation, and the able services of Jeanne Triol, Doug Wade, and Ron Lubin of Alpine Environmental Services for their efforts in the collection of data.

Literature Citations

1. Anonymous. 1979. Field manual for injection of chemicals to retard tree regrowth. USDA, ARS, Delaware, Ohio.
2. Domir, S.C. 1978. *Chemical control of tree height*. J.Arboric. 4:145-153.

3. Domir, S.C. 1982. *Influence of canopy size on regrowth of dikegulac-injected American sycamore seedlings* HortScience 17:204-205.
4. Domir, S.C. 1982. New methods and chemicals to control regrowth in trees. EPRI Publication EL-2569, 110p.
5. Domir, S.C. and B.R. Roberts. 1981. *Trunk injection of plant growth regulators to control tree regrowth*. J.Arboric. 7:141-144.
6. Domir, S.C. and B.R. Roberts. 1983. *Tree growth retardation by injection of chemicals*. J. Arboric. 9:217-224.
7. Hield, H., R.M. Sachs, and S. Hemstreet. 1978. *Foliar spray and bark banding with dikegulac for ornamental tree growth inhibition*. HortScience 13:440-442.
8. Roberts, B.R., D.E. Wuertz, G.K. Brown, and W.F. Kwolek. 1979. *Controlling sprout growth in shade trees by trunk injection*. J.Amer.Soc.Hort.Sci. 104:883-887.
9. Sachs, R.M., H. Hield, and J. DeBie. 1975. *Dikegulac: A promising new foliar-applied growth regulator for woody species*. HortScience 10:367-369.
10. Sanderson, K.C., W.C. Martin. 1977. *Effect of dikegulac as a post-shearing shoot-inducing agent on Azaleas, Rhododendron spp.* HortScience 12:337-338.
11. Shu, L-J, and K.C. Sanderson. 1980. *Dikegulac sodium influences shoot growth of greenhouse azaleas*. HortScience 15:813-814.
12. Shu, L-J, K.C. Sanderson, and J.C. Williams. 1981. *Comparison of several chemical pinching agents on greenhouse forcing azaleas, Rhododendron cv.* J.Amer.Soc.Hort.Sci. 106:557-561.

Brooklyn Botanic Garden Research Center
712 Kitchawan Rd.
Ossining, New York 10562
and
Alpine Environmental Services, Inc.
275 Knollwood Road
White Plains, New York 10607

Abstract

ESPOSITO, CHRISTINE. 1987. **A sampling of objectionable or misused ornamentals.** Am. Nurserymen 165(9): 167-172, 174, 176-180, 182, 184-185, 188.

The setting in which people use plants affect the attractiveness, appropriateness, usefulness, and hardness of a species. The following article is a collection of plant professionals' suggestions of plants nurserymen should use less often, use differently, use elsewhere or avoid altogether. As many of those contributing their opinions pointed out, plant undesirability is certainly in the eye of the beholder. A common problem that results in plant unworthiness is scale incompatibility. Some landscape plants are simply too large for their surroundings. Frequently these plants are evergreens. Not understanding the habits and scales of the plants, people eventually end up needing to remove them.