

## DATA 2018

Table 22a. *Ceanothus griseus* var. *horizontalis* 'MATCEA01' average monthly quality ratings on 3 ETo-based irrigation treatments in 2018.

Category	ETo%	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	AVG
Overall Appearance	80	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8	4.0	3.8
	50	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.9
	20	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.8
Foliage	80	4.9	5.0	4.6	3.8	3.9	5.0	4.5
	50	5.0	5.0	4.8	3.8	4.4	4.6	4.6
	20	4.9	5.0	4.7	3.6	4.2	4.3	4.4
Flower	80							
	50							
	20	3.0						3.0
Pest Resistance	80	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	50	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	20	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Disease Resistance	80	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	50	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	20	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Vigor	80	4.6	4.3	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.1
	50	4.6	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.2
	20	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.2

Table 22b. Open House participant ratings for *Ceanothus griseus* var. *horizontalis* 'MATCEA01' on 3 ETo-based irrigation treatments in May, July, and September 2018.

	ET <sub>o</sub> %	May			July			September		
		80	50	20	80	50	20	80	50	20
Overall Appearance	Max	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Mean	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	4.0
	Median	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Min	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	2
Foliage Quality	Max	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Mean	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.7	4.1
	Median	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Min	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	3
Floral Display	Max	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	3	5
	Mean	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
	Median	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Min	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DATA 2018




Figure 16a. *Ceanothus griseus* var. *horizontalis* 'MATCEA01' average monthly plant growth index on 3 ETo-based irrigation treatments in 2018. Bars represent ±1 SE. There were no significant differences between treatments.




Figure 16a. *Ceanothus griseus* var. *horizontalis* 'MATCEA01' average monthly relative plant growth index on 3 ETo-based irrigation treatments in 2018. Bars represent ±1 SE. There were no significant differences between treatments.