underway or planned by researchers to measure the influence of tree vigor on insect pest populations and determine how cultural manipulation changes insect host-tree relationships.

I hope the recent interest in nature and coincident growth in urban forestry have created an environment conducive to significant and long-term governmental support for this kind of research. I also recommend that institutional researchers and arborists begin planning more research together, as a team, to take advantage of the field staff that is both familiar with tree problems and in a position to apply treatments and collect data to measure their impact. By working together in this way, we can make the art and science of arboriculture more responsive to the needs of trees and people.

Anonymous. 1904. Arboriculture. 3 (3): inside front cover. Anonymous. 1907a. Arboriculture. 6 (6): 381. J.P. Brown, ed. Connersville, Ind.

Anonymous. 1907b. Arboriculture. 6 (6): 354. J.P. Brown, ed. Connersville, Ind.

Bartenstein, F. 1981. Urban tree management-survival in the 1980's. The Green Leaf Flyer 3:1.

Greeves-Carpenter, C.F. 1928. The care of ornamental trees in planting, fertilizing, pruning, tree surgery, and spraying. The Macmillan Co., N.Y., N.Y. 70 pp.

James, N.D.G. 1972. The arboriculturist's companion. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 237 pp.

Sievert, R., R. Heiligmann, and T. Mitchell. 1982. *Urban forestry in selected midwest cities*. J. Arboric. 8:136-139.

Literature Cited

Ablett, W.H. (1888). Arboriculture for amateurs. London: "The Bazaar" Office 170, Strand, W.C. 120 pp.

Department of Entomology OARDC Wooster, Ohio

ABSTRACT

Hoy, M.A. 1982. The gypsy moth — here again. California Agriculture 36(7): 4-6.

During 1981, 41 male gypsy moths were trapped in Santa Barbara County. Lesser numbers were trapped in other southern and northern California counties — Los Angeles (3 months), Marlin (7), San Diego (3), Santa Cruz (2), and Ventura (2). Capture of male moths in traps does not prove that the gypsy moth has become established; those found may have developed from eggs or pupae brought into the state on vehicles and camping equipment from infested areas in the eastern United States. However, intensive surveys in Santa Barbara during the fall and winter revealed four egg masses, indicating that a breeding population of the gypsy moth exists there. Surveys for egg masses at the other locations have been negative to date, so it is unclear if those trap catches indicate establishment. The gypsy moth, Lymantria dispar, is not new to California. Over 400 egg masses were found in Santa Clara County in 1976, and the California Department of Food and Agriculture mounted an apparently successful eradication program against that infestation using two aerial applications of the insect growth regulator diflubenzuron (Dimilin). The impact the gypsy moth might have had upon California's forest and shade trees, if not eradicated from Santa Barbara or elsewhere in the state, can't be predicted precisely, because our climate and vegetation are different from those in the northeastern United States, where this pest has occurred for over a century. However, the gypsy moth is likely to be a serious pest in California.