

PHOTOS, TABLES, AND FIGURES

Table 18. Average monthly quality ratings for *Miscanthus* ‘Little Zebra’ on 4 ET₀-based irrigation levels in 2014.

	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	AVG
Foliage									
80%	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.5	3.4	3.3	2.0	3.8
60%	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.5	3.8	3.5	2.2	4.2
40%	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0
20%	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.3	3.4	3.2	2.7	1.7	3.7
Flowering									
80%					1.8	3.8	4.8	4.7	3.7
60%			5.0	5.0	2.0	4.3	4.8	4.3	4.3
40%					1.0	4.2	4.8	3.5	3.4
20%		5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	3.3	3.8	2.8	3.7
Pest Tolerance									
80%	5.0	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.5	3.2	3.3	2.0	3.9
60%	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	3.8	3.8	2.0	4.3
40%	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.2	2.0	4.0
20%	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.2	1.8	3.9
Disease Resistance									
80%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
60%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
40%	5.0	5.0	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	5.0	5.0
Vigor									
80%	3.3	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.5	3.6	3.9
60%	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	3.8	4.4
40%	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.1
20%	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.0	3.5
Overall Appearance									
80%	3.3	4.0	3.6	4.1	4.5	3.5	4.5	3.0	3.8
60%	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.5	3.3	4.2
40%	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.3	4.0
20%	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.3	2.3	3.5

PHOTOS, TABLES, AND FIGURES

Figure 26a. Average monthly plant growth index of *Miscanthus* ‘Little Zebra’ in 2014 on 4 ET_o-based irrigation levels. Bars represent ± 1 SE. No significant differences using ANOVA and Tukey’s HSD at $p < 0.05$.





Figure 26b. Average monthly relative plant growth index of *Miscanthus* ‘Little Zebra’ in 2014 on 4 ET_o-based irrigation levels. Bars represent ± 1 SE. No significant differences using ANOVA and Tukey’s HSD at $p < 0.05$.