

GENERAL DISCUSSION: PART 2

W. J. Garmhausen, Moderator
Chief Landscape Architect
Ohio Department of Highways

This discussion followed the reading of two papers by J. L. Wright and Mark H. Astrup.

DEAKIN: Have you had any experience in the effect of wood chips on weed growth?

WRIGHT: We have had no previous experience, but results thus far seem to be very good with very few weeds showing.

BRANT: How does one spell Alanap?

WRIGHT: A - L - A - N - A - P.

BRANT: What is the effect of sterilants on nearby trees?

WRIGHT: Even though a few trees were killed, the results were worthwhile. The use of sterilants costs about one-half that of mowing. An asphalt sterilant costs about \$117 per mile.

ASTRUP: What kind of wood chips were used?

WRIGHT: We used green hardwood chips. With these there is a lower fire hazard.

SLACK: In Louisiana, we allow backslopes to regenerate. By reducing acreages for mowing, maintenance costs are lowered.

ASTRUP: Soil sterilants not dangerous to trees and shrubs have been used effectively. In Oregon nurseries, for instance, Simazine is used.

GORDON: It is important to overcome the fear of a number of state highway departments of the high cost of maintenance because of increased acreages being required for roadsides. An understanding of ecology, the use of proper plants and some re-vegetation can cut down on mowing costs. Some selective cutting may be necessary. Broadcasting of chemical sprays means larger mowing areas at the expense of a loss of woody materials.

BRANT: In consideration of all factors, it is important to retain the character of the adjacent land.

PARKER: In Massachusetts, much of the mowing is done by contract. Lawns are mowed about 11 times each year. Roadsides are mowed 5 times each year, this is for a strip 15 ft wide plus 5 ft on the backslope. All other areas are mowed once a year. In 1958, we let 25 contracts, totaling 500 mi, and reduced our mowing costs by 50 percent.

ASTRUP: How is a contract set up for contract mowing in Massachusetts?

PARKER: Contracts are set up by areas on a lump sum cost per cutting for lawns and other broad areas, and on a cost per mile for roadsides.

This discussion followed the reading of a paper by Earl A. Disque.

GARMHAUSEN: We have been using land-use plans in Ohio. On the plans we show the type of maintenance that is to be given, the limits of areas that are to be mowed, areas that are to be maintained through the use of herbicides with no mowing, and the areas that are to be allowed to regenerate.

SIMONSON: Does the National Park Service use aerial photos showing existing conditions as a part of its land-use plans in order to reduce drafting costs?

DISQUE: Our land-use plans were started about 25 years ago and much of the basic information was obtained before the use of aerial photos became popular. However, I believe that such photos have great value and should be used in conjunction with land-use plans as much as possible.

ASTRUP: What is the time limit of a special use permit?

DISQUE: The time limit may vary, depending on circumstances. If an area is intended for some quite temporary use, a permit may be issued for one year, with or without a privilege of renewal. If an area is being used for agricultural purposes and may repeat its use for a number of years, then a renewable permit may be issued for two or three years. Where the land will be occupied by some utility or other device that may be expensive to install and may be used for many years, a special use permit may be issued for 10 years, but not more than 20 years, with the privilege of renewal.

SLACK: Suppose a holder of a scenic easement wants to sell or subdivide?

DISQUE: Scenic easements along the National Parkways occur almost without exception in agricultural or forest areas where the subdivision problem is remote. The holder of a scenic easement may sell his property subject to the conditions of the easement. I can well understand that scenic easements could be difficult to negotiate in urban areas where changes in the pattern of land use may work a hardship on a property owner.

BRANT: Do you have much trouble policing areas for which special use permits or scenic easements have been contracted?

DISQUE: We have not had much trouble in this respect. The improper use of a permit or an easement may be noticed by one of our maintenance men or rangers, for example. The infraction is reported to the field administrative office which then decides on a course of action. The problem usually is resolved by having a personal, man-to-man talk with the permittee. If the trouble persists, as a last resort the special use permit may be cancelled by the National Park Service and we may resume the maintenance of the area. Scenic easements are negotiated on land beyond the right-of-way, and can be more difficult to administer. In a very few instances, some violations have been argued in Federal courts.

GARMHAUSEN: Disque and F. W. Cron, of the Bureau of Public Roads, have been furnishing advisory service to a number of state highway departments in connection with the Great River Road. Perhaps he will tell us something of the right-of-way problems in connection with this project.

DISQUE: The project now known as the Great River Road had its inception as far back as 1938. In 1950 and '51, the Bureau of Public Roads and the National Park Service studied road conditions on both sides of the 2,500-mi Mississippi River from its beginning at Lake Itasca, Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico in Louisiana. A 1951 report to the Congress of the United States recommended that the project be

considered as a sort of Federal-Aid Parkway to be built and administered by the ten Mississippi River states with some assistance from the Federal Government. Several routes were suggested along both banks of the river. The routes utilized existing highway systems for the most part, and it was advocated that the roadsides be improved to parkway-like character by various methods, such as the partial or complete control of access both by number and by use, the regulation of commercial traffic where possible, the use of scenic easements for land use control to provide an adequate protective scenic corridor, and the development of special areas and facilities along the routes to interpret and utilize the scenic, recreational, historic, cultural, and other factors of the river country. Where new road locations are possible, many of the above improvements are not difficult to "build in" at the time of location, design, and construction. Along existing roads, such improvements pose real problems. The use of scenic easements is still not well understood or appreciated by many states. A number of eastern states have scenic easement laws that relate to specific roads, such as Virginia and North Carolina for the Blue Ridge Parkway; and Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi for the Natchez Trace Parkway. So far as I know, only one state has a scenic easement law that is general in character—the state is Wisconsin. Since 1954, both Federal agencies have been giving advisory service to the Mississippi River states when requested by the respective highway departments. Each state report recommends a specific location for the Great River Road through that state.

This discussion followed the reading of a paper by J. E. Clark.

GARMHAUSEN: Ohio has had an anti-litter campaign under way for a number of years. It has been quite successful. Some interest has been stimulated through the use of our slogans, such as "Annie Doesn't Litter Any More," "Don't Be A Strew-ball," and others of a similarly amusing nature.

SLACK: Louisiana has long recognized highway litter as a statewide problem. Our anti-litter campaign is developed along three themes; education; persuasion; and prosecution. The campaign is directed by seven clubs, organized into highway districts, under the sponsorship of the state. Literature is printed and furnished by the state and distributed by the clubs. The cost to the state is about \$125,000 per year, but is considered to be very well worthwhile.

PARKER: I should like to suggest that automobile manufacturers be asked to design and equip cars for a litter bag or other similar device. Massachusetts requires that all local businesses keep their premises clean.

CLARK: "Keep America Beautiful" has been working with General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and others on the idea of providing a trash receptacle with each car. We hope that some good will come of it. Local groups of citizens can do a lot of good by working on business establishments to keep premises clean.

MRS. HOOD: I have been very much interested in Mr. Clark's talk and the discussions that have followed. I believe that much progress has been made in educating the public about the litter problem. A number of years ago, we asked Chrysler to design a place in its cars for a litter bag. I am glad to learn that "Keep America Beautiful" is continuing to work along this line.

CLARK: We believe that the old "litterbug" figure and idea doesn't do the job for us in Maryland. Many people resent being told not to do this and not to do that. We prefer to use the positive approach and point out to the public the many benefits and advantages of roadside and picnic area cleanliness. By developing pride in individuals in the appearance and condition of facilities and other values which are theirs to enjoy and protect, we achieve cleanliness. One of our best propaganda

areas for good results is in the schools, through children taking the message home.

SIMONSON: What is the relationship of litter in well-landscaped areas and roads to litter in general conditions? For instance, Rye Beach, New York, has very heavy and intensive public use, yet there doesn't seem to be much litter.

CLARK: It has been our observation that there is very much less litter where there have been conscious efforts to beautify. Lack of organization contributes to disorder. Litter attracts litter.