

**Acknowledgments.** This research was funded by a grant from Monsanto Agricultural Company. The authors are grateful for the assistance of the Jordan Sawmill in Attica, Indiana, in cutting logs; Mrs. Judy Santini, Statistical Computer Analyst, Department of Agronomy, in statistical analysis; and Dr. P. K. Ashokan, Dr. L. D. Koshta, Theri Buerger and Vern Sherry in data collection.

### Literature Cited

1. Anonymous. 1967. *Discoloration defect in sugar maple*. Research News, Canadian Department of Forestry and Rural Development 10(4):4.
2. Anonymous. 1989. *Tree growth regulators move into the mainstream*. Arbor Age 9(8):44-53.
3. Andersen, J. L., R. J. Campana, A. L. Shigo and W. C. Shortle. 1985. *Wound responses of Ulmus americana.1: Results of chemical injection in attempts to control Dutch elm disease*. J. Arboric. 11(5):137-142.
4. Breedlove, D. A., H. A. Holt and W. R. Chaney. 1989. *Tree Growth Regulators. An Annotated Bibliography*. Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN. 135 p.
5. Kimball, S. L. 1990. *The physiology of tree growth regulators*. J. Arboric. 16(2):39-41.
6. Neely, D. 1978. Tree wounds and wound closure, pp. 35-42. *In Proceedings of the Symposium on Systemic Chemical Treatments in Tree Culture*, (J. J. Kielbaso, ed.). Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Oct. 9-11, 1978. Braun-Brumfield, Inc., Ann Arbor, MI.
7. Reardon, R. C. and R. E. Webb. 1990. *Systemic treatment with acephate for gypsy moth management: population suppression and wound response*. J. Arboric. 16(7):174-178.
8. Rumbold, C. 1920. *Effect on chestnuts of substances injected into their trunks*. Am. J. Botany 7(2):45-58.
9. Shigo, A. L. and R. Campana. 1977. *Discolored and decayed wood associated with injection wounds in American elm*. J. Arboric. 3(12):230-235.
10. Shigo, A. L. 1986. *A New Tree Biology*. Shigo and Trees, Associates. Durham, NH. 618 p.

*Graduate Instructor, Professor of Tree Physiology, and Professor of Forestry, respectively  
Department of Forestry & Natural Resources  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN 47907*

---

CATHEY, H.M. AND J. HERITEAU. 1990. **Mapping it out**. Am. Nurseryman 171(5): 55-63.

The long-awaited revision of the US Department of Agriculture's hardiness zone map is complete \_ and it reveals some significant changes in North American weather patterns. The biggest alteration is a general southward drift of zone boundary lines, particularly in the Southeast and the Midwest. During the past 15 years or so, observations of local weather patterns made it clear to nurserymen and gardeners that the map's zone boundaries did not match reality. Thus many plants' hardiness zone classifications are no longer considered valid. A map revision was clearly needed. The new map is based on massive amounts of validated meteorological data from almost 8,000 government stations in the US, Canada and Mexico. The staff of Meteorological Evaluation Services was responsible for sorting through millions and millions of data pieces. The new map retains the familiar 10 zones, each of which represents an area of winter hardiness. Zones are separated by 10° increments. Each zone's temperature parameters are unchanged. In addition, the map introduces Zone 11, representing areas with average annual minimum temperatures above 40°.