2002 Annual Report

Horticulture Section

Dickinson Research Extension Center 1089 State Avenue Dickinson, ND 58601

Xeriscape Ornamental Perennial Grass Trial for Low Water Use Landscaping

Llewellyn L. Manske and Jerry C. Larson

Range Scientist, NDSU, Dickinson Research Extension Center Extension Agent, NDSU, Extension Service, Stark-Billings County

Western North America has increasing difficulty in providing adequate quantities of clean water for domestic use. A large portion of western municipalities' water supply is used for watering lawns, gardens, and landscape plants. Traditional landscaping frequently selects Kentucky bluegrass lawns and ornamental plants that require large amounts of water to remain beautiful. Several agencies and institutions joined Denver Water and the Associated Landscape Contractors of Colorado in 1981 to develop the concept of "Xeriscape" gardening. Alternatives to traditional techniques are being examined to develop landscapes that are harmonious with the local environmental conditions and use less water. Homeowners in western North Dakota have experienced the high costs of using domestic water for traditional landscape plants and have become aware of the need for alternative landscaping plants. Grass species in this trial are being tested and examined for use as plant material in low water use landscaping.

The purpose of Xeriscape gardening, or low water use landscaping, is to conserve expensive, precious domestic water by following seven simple commonsense principles.

- Use plants native to the region or plants adapted from areas with very similar environments, and arrange the plants in zones with similar water, sun, and soil needs.
- Design the plants in arrangements that match family needs and lifestyle, and select plants that provide color, texture, shade, and wind protection for all four seasons.

- Consider limitations of the soil's water-holding characteristics and organic content, and make improvements by amending the soil
 with composted plant material or aged manure.
- Limit turf grass lawns to areas actually used as "outdoor carpets", and select low water use grasses like blue grama, buffalo grass, crested wheatgrass, or tall fescue.
- Mulch with organic matter like wood or bark chips between plants to reduce evaporation and erosion, and resist the use of plastic beneath decorator rock.
- Install water-wise irrigation systems, and adjust them for maximum water savings with seasonal changes.
- Minimize maintenance to proper seasonal pruning and weed pulling, and reduce fertilizer and pesticide applications.

Low water use landscaping achieves the desired goal of conserving water, money, leisure time, and precious resources while providing healthy, beautiful landscapes that add value to property. Xeriscape gardening combines landscaping with conservation.

Methods

This multi-year trial was designed to test and evaluate native grasses and adopted horticultural grasses as low water use ornamental landscape plants in western North Dakota. Thirteen native grasses and eleven horticultural domesticated grasses (<u>Table 1</u>) were included in this study. The research plots are located at the Dickinson Research Extension Center. These plots are managed with minimum maintenance, little supplemental irrigation water, no fertilizer, no herbicides after plot establishment, and hand roguing of weeds when necessary. The study consisted of three replications (<u>Table 2</u>). The grass plants were evaluated for vigor, ornamental value, seedhead aesthetics, color, and height. Vigor, ornamental value, and seedhead aesthetics were rated on a scale of 0-5 (<u>Table 3</u>). Color was recorded as one of twelve colors (<u>Table 3</u>). Total plant height was recorded as one of three height categories (<u>Table 3</u>). The twenty-four grass entries were randomly placed in plots in three replications (<u>Table 4</u>). Two evaluators rated each grass replication during initiation, early, mid-1, mid-2, late, and post growing-season periods.

Results

Mean evaluation ratings of grass entries are shown in <u>Tables 5-9</u> for initiation, early, mid-1, mid-2, and late growing-season periods for 2001, respectively. Plants on replication plots of little bluestem, buffalo grass, Indiangrass, Canada wildrye, and sweetgrass died during

the first year of the trial as a result of weakened condition caused by the plants' being covered by wood chips for several days and not receiving additional attention to assist the plants' recovery. These plants were replaced in the spring of 1999. Plants that expired from environmental conditions or natural causes were not replaced. The mean values of the evaluation ratings were determined for each growing-season period. Some ratings are reported with two mean values. The first value includes data from all three replications, and the second value includes data from only the active replications.

Most of the grass entries increased in vigor and ornamental value from initiation of growing-season, through mid-, and to late-season periods (Table 5-9). Several grass entries had medium to high vigor and ornamental value ratings during the initiation of growing-season period, and one entry--sweetgrass--had seedheads present in mid May (Table 5). Vigor and ornamental value decreased for most grass entries after the late growing-season period (Table 9). Several grass entries--blue grama, little bluestem, buffalo grass, sideoats grama, big bluestem, sand bluestem, prairie sandreed, Indiangrass, switchgrass, prairie cordgrass, sweetgrass, feather reed grass, ribbon grass, blue lyme grass, red switchgrass, autumn red, Altai wildrye, and pampas grass--had medium to high vigor and ornamental value ratings during the late growing-season period (Table 9). Most of the grass entries tended to have high seedhead aesthetics value ratings during the period from head-emergence to seed-development stages (Table 5-9). Several grass entries--blue grama, little bluestem, buffalo grass, sideoats grama, big bluestem, sand bluestem, prairie sandreed, Indiangrass, switchgrass, prairie cordgrass, Canada wildrye, feather reed grass, blue lyme grass, red switchgrass, autumn red, Altai wildrye, and pampas grass--had medium or high attractiveness of seedheads after reaching full maturity and during the late growing-season period (Table 9).

A few grass entries--sand love grass, giant silver banner grass, and zebra grass--had three or more sample periods with low vigor ratings and low ornamental values (<u>Table 5-9</u>). Several grass entries--blue grama, little bluestem, buffalo grass, big bluestem, sand bluestem, prairie sandreed, Indiangrass, switchgrass, prairie cordgrass, sweetgrass, feather reed grass, ribbon grass, blue lyme grass, red switchgrass, autumn red, Altai wildrye, and pampas grass--had three or more sample periods with high vigor ratings and high ornamental values (<u>Table 5-9</u>).

Most of the grass entries had distinctive attractive shades of green during the early, mid, and late growing-season periods (<u>Tables 5-9</u>). Many of the grass entries completed senescence during the late and post growing-season periods, displaying attractive shades of red, purple, or yellow before turning tan (<u>Table 9</u>).

The height categories for the grass entries (<u>Table 10</u>) were determined when the plants were mature and the seedheads had reached maximum height. Some of the grass entries grew relatively tall during the growing season of 2001. The grasses with seed heads taller than 6 feet were big bluestem, sand bluestem, prairie sandreed, prairie cordgrass, and pampas grass. Mature height of a plant is important in landscape design. The trial included three short-grass, thirteen mid-grass, and eight tall-grass entries.

Discussion

This is the fourth year of a multi-year trial designed to test and evaluate grass entries for use as ornamental plants for low water use landscaping. Most of the grass entries show positive potential for use as low water use landscaping plants. A few grass entries had one or

more sample periods with low ratings, but these grasses should not be dismissed as landscape plants yet because the plants may improve. Some of the other grass entries may not maintain their moderate or high value ratings for the long run under these low maintenance and low supplemental water conditions.

Low water use landscaping, which uses native and/or adopted horticultural plants, is an important alternative to traditional landscaping, which uses plants that require large amounts of supplemental domestic water to remain beautiful. The results of this trial will assist homeowners in selecting ornamental perennial grass plants for use in their low water use landscaping.

The ornamental grass research plot at the Dickinson Research Extension Center has attracted lots of public interest. It is evident that the use of ornamental grasses in southwest North Dakota is steadily increasing. Local greenhouses and nurseries document this interest through increased sales of ornamental grasses. This acceptance is also evident through a windshield survey driving through Dickinson and surrounding areas.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Ron Smith, NDSU Extension Horticulturist, Fargo, for providing plugs of horticultural adopted grass species plant material #13 to 20, for assisting with plot establishment, and for providing consultation during the development of this research project. We thank Craig Armstrong for providing plugs of horticultural adopted grass species plant material #22 and 23 and for providing advice on plot management. We thank USDA Plant Materials Center, Bismarck, for providing plugs of native species plant material #1 to 12. We thank Mike Knutson, USDA Plant Materials Center, Bismarck, for selection, collection, and delivery of native species plant material plugs and for assistance with plot establishment. We thank Jon Stika, NRCS, Area Agronomist, Dickinson, for making arrangements for native species plant material and for assistance with plot establishment. We thank James Nelson, DREC Animal Scientist, Dickinson, for preliminary preparation of plot area and for providing and spreading wood chips. We are grateful to Sheri Schneider for assistance in production of this manuscript. We are grateful to Amy M. Kraus and Naomi J. Thorson for assistance in preparation of this manuscript.

Reference Literature

Barondeau, D., R. Smith, J. Larson, C. Miller, J. Dohrmann, T. Becker, R. Gaebe, B. Schmidt, J. Buckley, and L. Manske. 1997. Xeriscape plant selection. NDSU Extension Service, Fargo, ND. 22 min. Video tape.

Denver Botanic Gardens. No date. Water-smart gardening. Brochure. Denver Parks and Recreation Department, Denver, CO.

Denver Water. 1996. Xeriscape plant guide. American Water Works Association. Fulcrum Publishing, Denver, CO.

Denver Water. No date. Discover xeriscape. Pamphlet. Xeriscape Colorado Inc., Denver, CO.

Denver Water. No date. Efficient irrigation systems at work. Pamphlet. Office of Water Conservation, Denver, CO.

Hill, L., and N. Hill. 1995. Lawns, grasses and ground covers. Rodale Press, Emmaus, PA.

Plant Materials Center. 1997. Native grasses for prairie landscaping in the Northern Great Plains. Brochure. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Bismarck, ND.

Report Tables

	Table 1. Experiment identification number, common name, and scientific name of grasses included in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial for low water use landscaping.						
1	Blue grama	'Bad River'	Bouteloua gracilis				
2	Little bluestem	'Badlands'	Schizachyrium scoparium				
3	Buffalo grass	'Bismarck'	Buchloe dactyloides				
4	Sideoats grama	'Pierre'	Bouteloua curtipendula				
5	Big bluestem	'Bison'	Andropogon gerardi				
6	Sand bluestem	'Garden'	Andropogon hallii				
7	Prairie sandreed	'Gosher'	Calamovilfa longifolia				
8	Indiangrass	'Holt'	Sorghastrum nutans				
9	Switchgrass	'Dacotah'	Panicum virgatum				
10	Prairie cordgrass	'Red River'	Spartina pectinata				
11	Canada wildrye	'Mandan'	Elymus canadensis				
12	Sweetgrass		Hierochloe odorata				
13	Feather reed grass	'Karl Foerster'	Calamagrostis acutiflora				
14	Ribbon grass	'Feesey'	Phalaris arundinacea				
15	Blue lyme grass		Elymus arenarius				
16	Sand love grass		Eragrostis trichodes				
17	Giant silver banner grass	'Robustus'	Miscanthus sacchariflorus				

18	Zebra grass	'Zebrinus'	Miscanthus sinensis
19	Red switchgrass	'Rehbraum'	Panicum virgatum
20	Autumn red	'Purpurascens'	Miscanthus sinensis
21	Altai wildrye		Elymus angustus
22	Pampas grass		Miscanthus sacchariflorus
23	Blue fescue		Festuca cinerea
24	Green needlegrass		Stipa viridula

Table 2. Experi	mental plot description for xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial for low water use landscaping.
Location:	Dickinson Research Extension Center, Dickinson, ND latitude 46 53'N, longitude 102 49'W, elevation 2,500ft.
Replications:	Three; Rep #1 West, Rep #2 Middle, Rep #3 East Randomized Block Design
Study size:	18' x 36'
Plot size:	3' x 3'
Perimeter border:	3'
Plot arrangement:	2 columns with numbers 1-12 on west side and numbers 13-24 on east side of each replication.
Grass samples:	24 types x 3 reps. = 72 plants
Plug planting date:	5 May 1998 holes 12" diameter, 8" deep, planted as plugs.
Soil:	Morton silt loam
Mulch:	Wood chips applied at 4" to 6" thickness between plants.
Herbicide treatment:	Roundup applied to previously existing grass cover 30 April 1998. No other herbicides applied.
Fertilizer treatment:	No fertilizer applied.
n in heaven DDO	Are your a developer? Thy out the HTML to PDE ARI

Soil amendments:	No soil amendments applied.
Water:	1.0 to 1.5 gallons water applied to each plot within 3.0 hours of planting. Minimum amount of irrigation water applied during growing season.
Weed control:	Wood chips used between plants to help prevent weed growth. Weeds will be hand rogued when necessary.
Pruning:	Previous year senescent growth trimmed in early spring prior to rapid growth. Fall leaves of cool-season grasses not trimmed.

Table 3. Ratings scales used in the evaluation methods of this trial.								
	Plant Vigor Ratings Scale							
5	5 4 3 2 1 0							
robust vigor				low vigor	dead			
		Ornamental Value Ratin	gs Scale					
5	4	3	2	1	0			
high value		medium value		low value	zero value			
		Seedhead Aesthetic Rati	ngs Scale					
5	4	3	2	1	0			
high attractiveness				low attractiveness	not present			
		Color Ratings						
1. Drying	. Drying 5. Bluegreen 9. Yellow Green							
2. Dark Green 6. Light Blue 10. Light Red								
3. Green	7. Dark Blue	7. Dark Blue		11. Purple				
4. Light Green		8. Gold yellow		12. Tan				

Height Ratings Categories				
Short grass	0.5 to 2.0 feet			
Mid grass	2.0 to 3.0 feet			
Tall grass	3.0 to 7.0 feet			

Table 4. Location of grass entries in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial for low water use landscaping.						
Rep. #1	West	Rep. #2	Middle	Rep. #3 East		
1	3	23	8	18	16	
Blue grama	Buffalo grass	Blue fescue	Indiangrass	Zebra grass	Sand love grass	
4	12	11	9	21	20	
Sideoats grama	Sweetgrass	Canada wildrye	Switchgrass	Altai wildrye	Autumn red	
14	15	24	7	6	23	
Ribbon grass	Blue lyme grass	Green needlegrass	Prairie sandreed	Sand bluestem	Blue fescue	
2	11	17	14	3	5	
Little bluestem	Canada wildrye	Giant silver banner grass	Ribbon grass	Buffalo grass	Big bluestem	
5	6	4	22	19	2	
Big bluestem	Sand bluestem	Sideoats grama	Pampas grass	Red switchgrass	Little bluestem	
7	8	16	10	22	17	
Prairie	Indiangrass	Sand	Prairie	Pampas	Giant silver	

sandreed		love grass	cordgrass	grass	banner grass
13	16	2	19	10	13
Feather reed grass	Sand love grass	Little bluestem	Red switchgrass	Prairie cordgrass	Feather reed grass
9	10	12	5	8	4
Switchgrass	Prairie cordgrass	Sweetgrass	Big bluestem	Indiangrass	Sideoats grama
17	18	15	21	1	15
Giant silver banner grass	Zebra grass	Blue lyme grass	Altai wildrye	Blue grama	Blue lyme grass
19	20	13	1	7	12
Red switchgrass	Autumn red	Feather reed grass	Blue grama	Prairie sandreed	Sweetgrass
21	23	18	3	9	11
Altai wildrye	Blue fescue	Zebra grass	Buffalo grass	Switchgrass	Canada wildrye
22	24	20	6	24	14
Pampas grass	Green needlegrass	Autumn red	Sand bluestem	Green needlegrass	Ribbon grass

Table 5. Mean evaluation ratings of grass entries in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial during the initiation growingseason period, mid May 2001.

	Vigor	Ornamental Value	Seedhead aesthetics	Color
1	2.3	2.7	0	Bluegreen

2	2.5	2.0	0	Green
3	3.3	2.7	0	Bluegreen
4	2.5	2.0	0	Green
5	3.0	3.0	0	Green
6	2.3	1.3	0	Green
7	2.3	3.3	0	Dk Green
8	2.3	2.7	0	Green
9	2.3	2.0	0	Green
10	3.7	4.0	0	Green
11	2.0	2.0	0	Lt Green
12	5.0	5.0	3.5	Lt Green
13	5.0	5.0	0	Dk Green
14	5.0	5.0	0	Lt Green with Cream
15	4.0	3.7	0	Blue
16	0	0	0	
17	2.0	1.0	0	Dk Green with white line
18	0	0	0	
19	1.7	1.7	0	Yellow Green
20	4.0	3.7	0	Green
21	4.3	4.7	0	Blue
22	4.3	4.0	0	Green
23	1.3	1.0	0	Blue
24	5.0	5.0	0	Dk Green

Evaluation

vigor: Low 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23 High 3, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22

Ornamental value: Low 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23

High 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22

Table 6. Mean evaluation ratings of grass entries in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial during the early growingseason period, mid June 2001.

	period, inia dune 2	Ornamental		
	Vigor	Value	Seedhead aesthetics	Color
1	3.3	4.0	0	Green
2	3.0	3.0	0	Green
3	4.0	3.0	3.0	Green
4	3.0	3.5	0	Green
5	5.0	4.7	0	Green
6	4.3	4.3	0	Green
7	4.0	4.0	0	Green
8	4.0	4.0	0	Green
9	5.0	4.3	0	Green
10	5.0	5.0	0	Dk Green
11	2.5	2.0	0	Green
12	5.0	5.0	3.0	Lt Green
13	5.0	5.0	0	Dk Green
14	5.0	5.0	5.0	Lt Green with Cream
15	4.7	5.0	5.0	Blue
16	0	0	0	
17	2.0	2.0	0	Dk Green with white line
18	0	0	0	
19	3.7	4.7	0	Green
20	5.0	5.0	0	Green
21	4.7	5.0	5.0	Bluegreen
22	5.0	5.0	0	Green

23	2.3	1.7	3.0	Blue
24	5.0	5.0	5.0	Green

Evaluation

vigor: Low 16, 17, 18

High 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Ornamental value: Low 11, 16, 17, 18, 23

High 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Table 7. Mean evaluation ratings of grass entries in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial during the mid-1 growingseason period, mid July 2001.

	Vigor	Ornamental Value	Seedhead aesthetics	Color
1	3.3	3.3	4.0	Green
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	Green
3	4.0	3.7	4.7	Gray Green
4	3.0	3.5	4.0	Green
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	Green
6	5.0	5.0	4.0	Bluegreen
7	4.3	4.3	4.0	Green
8	4.0	4.3	0	Green
9	5.0	5.0	5.0	Green
10	4.7	4.7	4.0	Dk Green
11	3.7	3.7	4.3	Bluegreen
12	5.0	4.3	0	Yellow Green
13	5.0	5.0	5.0	Dk Green
14	5.0	5.0	4.7	Lt Green with Cream
15	4.7	4.0	4.0	Blue

16	0	0	0	
17	3.0	4.0	0	Dk Green with white line
18	0	0	0	
19	3.7	4.0	4.0	Green
20	5.0	5.0	0	Green
21	5.0	5.0	4.7	Bluegreen
22	5.0	5.0	0	Yellow Green
23	2.0	1.3	0	Blue
24	5.0	5.0	5.0	Green

Evaluation

vigor: Low 16, 18, 23

High 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Ornamental value: Low 16, 18, 23

High 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Table 8. Mean evaluation ratings of grass entries in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial during the mid-2 growingseason period, mid August 2001.

	Vigor	Ornamental Value	Seedhead aesthetics	Color
1	3.3	3.3	3.5	Green with Tan
2	3.7	4.3	4.3	Green and Red
3	4.0	3.3	3.0	Gray Green
4	3.0	3.0	4.0	Green
5	4.3	5.0	5.0	Green and Red
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	Bluegreen
7	4.0	4.0	5.0	Yellow Green
8	4.3	4.7	4.7	Dk Green
9	4.7	4.7	5.0	Lt Green

10	5.0	5.0	5.0	Dk Green
11	3.7	4.0	4.7	Green
12	5.0	5.0	0	Lt Green
13	4 .7	4.7	4.7	Dk Green
14	5.0	5.0	2.7	Lt Green with Cream
15	4.7	3.7	4.0	Blue
16	0	0	0	
17	4.0	4.0	0	Dk Green with white line
18	0	0	0	
19	4.3	4.3	4.7	Green
20	5.0	5.0	0	Green
21	5.0	5.0	3.7	Bluegreen
22	5.0	5.0	5.0	Lt Green
23	2.3	2.3	0	Blue
24	5.0	5.0	4.0	Green

Evaluation

vigor: Low 16, 18

High 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Ornamental value: Low 16, 18

High 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Table 9. Mean evaluation ratings of grass entries in xeriscape ornamental perennial grass trial during the late growingseason period, mid September 2001.

	Vigor	Ornamental Value	Seedhead aesthetics	Color
1	3.0	3.3	4.0	Lt Green and Tan
2	4.0	4.0	4.3	Purple and Lt Green
3	4.0	3.3	4.0	Gray Green

4	3.0	4.0	4.0	Lt Green and Red
5	4.7	5.0	4.7	Red and Lt Green
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	Yellow Bluegreen
7	4.3	3.7	4.3	Yellow Green
8	4.0	4.7	5.0	Yellow Green
9	4.7	4.7	5.0	Yellow
10	5.0	5.0	4.3	Lt Green
11	2.7	3.3	3.7	Green
12	5.0	3.3	0	Yellow Green
13	5.0	5.0	5.0	Green
14	5.0	5.0	0	Lt Green with Cream and Pink
15	4.7	4.3	3.5	Blue
16	0	0	0	
17	4.0	4.0	0	Dk Green with white line
18	0	0	0	
19	4.0	4.7	4.3	Yellow Green and Red
20	5.0	5.0	5.0	Lt Green and Red
21	5.0	5.0	5.0	Blue
22	5.0	5.0	5.0	Yellow and Lt Green
23	2.3	2.3	0	Blue
24	5.0	5.0	4.0	Green

Evaluation

vigor: Low 16, 18

High 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

Ornamental value: Low 16, 18

High 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22

trial.		
Height Category	Code	
1	S	Short grass 0.5-2.0 ft.
2	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
3	S	Short grass 0.5-2.0 ft.
4	M	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
5	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
6	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
7	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
8	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
9	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
10	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
11	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
12	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
13	M	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
14	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
15	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
16	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
17	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
18	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
19	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
20	М	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
21	M	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.
22	Т	Tall grass 3.0-7.0 ft.
23	S	Short grass 0.5-2.0 ft.
24	M	Mid grass 2.0-3.0 ft.

[Back to 2002 Annual Report Index] [Back to Horticulture Reports]

[DREC Home] [Contact DREC] [Top of Page]