



Figure 4. The limestone mulch surrounding a red maple (*Acer rubrum*) will slowly alkalize the soil, creating conditions unfavorable to the root system of the maple.

places and proper selection of trees (calciphytes) are definite near-term possibilities for improvement of urban landscapes. For example, in downtown areas greater use of large planter boxes (Fig. 3) would permit utilization of non-alkaline soil and the use of groups of appropriate woody calciphytes. Finding, selecting, and development of additional trees tolerant of soil alkalinity are urgent needs for improvement of urban landscapes.

An overall perspective for handling urban tree problems is presented by Tattar (9), in which he uses the "natural forest" ecosystem as an ideal model. He notes that the natural processes of forest trees are largely ignored in many urban tree situations (Fig. 4). His list of things that work toward a forest-like environment includes: use of mulches, avoidance of soil alkalinity and salinity, protection of trees from bark damage, and better

use of fertilizer. His view is that environmental extremes and people-pressures must be moderated. He adds that an important consideration is the selection and development of urban trees that can tolerate urban stresses.

Literature Cited

1. Berrang, P. and D.F. Karnosky. 1983. Street trees for metropolitan New York. New York Botanical Garden Institute of Urban Horticulture. Publication No. 1. 179 pp.
2. Hightshoe, G.L. 1978. Native trees for urban and rural America. Iowa State University Research Foundation.
3. Lincoln, R.J., G.A. Boxshall, and P.F. Clark. 1982. A Dictionary of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 298 pp.
4. Messenger, S. 1984. *Treatment of chlorotic oaks and red maples by soil acidification*. J. Arboric. 10 (4):122-128.
5. Messenger, S. 1986. *Alkaline runoff, soil pH and white oak manganese deficiency*. Tree Physiology 2:317-325.
6. Neely, D. 1976. *Iron deficiency chlorosis of shade trees*. J. Arboric. 2(7):128-130.
7. Patterson, J.C., J.J. Murray, and J.R. Short. 1980. *The impact of urban soils on vegetation*. Metropolitan Tree Improvement Alliance (METRIA) Proceedings 3:33-56.
8. Smiley, E.T. 1985. *Manganese deficiency and nutrition of urban Acer saccharum and Acer rubrum*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University. 130 pp.
9. Tattar, T.A. 1983. *Stress management for trees*. J. Arboric. 9(1):25-27.
10. Ware, G.H. 1984. *Coping with clay: trees to suit sites, sites to suit trees*. J. Arboric. 10(4):108-112.
11. Ware, G.H. 1989. *Trees for restricted spaces*. Metropolitan Tree Improvement Alliance (METRIA) Proceedings 6:80-85.
12. Whitlow, T.H. and N.L. Bassuk. 1987. *Trees in difficult sites*. J. Arboric. 13(1):10-17.

The Morton Arboretum
Lisle, Illinois 60532

Abstract

CRANSHAW, W. AND E. HART. 1988. **Rouge's gallery**. Am. Nurseryman 168(7):68-71, 74-75.

Honeylocust has become an increasingly popular shade tree. Honeylocust has had a reputation as a relatively "pest-free" tree. Unfortunately, numerous insect and mite problems, as well as various canker fungi, have become increasingly important on honeylocusts as the tree has grown in landscape popularity. Insects and mites that plague honeylocust include mimosa webworm, honeylocust plant bug, honeylocust podgall midge, leafhopper, treehopper, honeylocust spider mite, eriophyid (rust) mites, cottony maple scale, blister beetle and honeylocust borer.