

National Elm Trial: Initial Report from Northern California

October 6, 2008

by

Greg McPherson¹

Larry Costello²

James Harding³

Steve Dreistadt⁴

Mary Louise Flint⁵

Skip Mezger⁶

¹ Director, US Forest Service, Center for Urban Forest Research, Davis, CA

² Environmental Horticulture Advisor, University of California Cooperative Extension

³ Professor, Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis

⁴ Principal Editor, UC Statewide IPM Program, Davis, CA

⁵ Associate Director, UC Statewide IPM Program, and Extension Entomologist,
Department of Entomology, Davis, CA

⁶

In early May, 2005 14 cultivars of elm trees were planted at the Bowley Plant Science Teaching Center, UC Davis. The planting was part of the National Elm Trial, with trees provided by J.F. Schmidt & Son and Princeton nurseries to 18 locations across the US. The purpose of the study is to determine the growth and horticultural performance of commercially available Dutch Elm Disease resistant cultivars in various climate regimes. This initial report summarizes data collected on tree growth, habit, pruning requirements, and pest and disease resistance. A second report will update these results in 2011.

Methods

The 0.75-1.5 inch (1.9-3.8 cm) caliper bare root stock from J.F. Schmidt & Son were planted May 5, 2005 (Table 1). Five trees from each of the 14 cultivars were planted, or 70 total. Trees were spaced every 20-ft (6m) in a four-row random block design. The trees were planted into a relatively flat, sandy loam soil. Vertebrate chewing on bark was minimized by trunk guards. During the first year trees were irrigated from a single drip emitter. They received approximately 13 gals per tree twice a week during the summer, and reduced amounts during spring and fall. The trees received no irrigation from November through March, although weather dictated exact stop and start times. When the second emitter was added trees received about 50 gals each per watering during summer. In 2007 this amount increased to about 100 gals per watering. Trees were pruned each spring and measured each fall. In fall 2010 the best performing cultivars will be transplanted to various sites on campus and monitored for another five years.

Ten new trees from Princeton nursery were planted in May 2006, five *Ulmus* 'New Harmony' and five *U.* 'Princeton' (Table 1). Because these cultivars have two growing seasons and the others have three seasons, it is difficult to compare growth across all cultivars. To reduce the bias of initial slow growth after planting, average annual growth

data are presented. Only 2007 growth data are shown for the 2006 transplants, while 2005 to 2007 data are averaged for the 2005 transplants.

Tree measurements included diameter at breast height (dbh) (to nearest 0.1 cm by tape), tree height (to nearest 0.1 m by range pole), and crown diameter in two directions (to nearest 0.1 m by tape). Observations of the presence of pests and diseases were made each spring and fall.

In August 2008, all trees were subjectively evaluated for pruning requirement. Pruning requirement ratings were based on visual assessments of growth rate and structural characteristics. Structural characteristics evaluated included central leader development, branch size relative to the trunk, and branch attachment characteristics. Cultivars viewed as needing a considerable amount of pruning to develop strong structure were assigned a high score (5), while those needing less pruning were given a lower score (1). All evaluations were conducted without prior knowledge of cultivar identification (blind ratings). Trees had completed only two pruning cycles prior to these evaluations, except for New Harmony which had been pruned once.

Results

Mortality and New Plantings

During the first growing season one *Ulmus* 'Frontier' and all five of the *Ulmus parvifolia* 'Emer II' (Allee elm) died. No other trees died during 2006 and 2007.

Growth

Elms are widely regarded as robust growers. This is certainly the case for the trees in our plot. During the first growing season there was little change in tree size (Figure 1). However, most cultivars exhibited rapid growth after the first growing season.

The mean size of all trees at planting in spring 2005 was 0.9-in caliper (2.4 cm), 9.4-ft tall (2.9 m), and 2.7-ft average crown diameter (0.8m). In fall 2007 their mean size increased to 3.0-in caliper (7.5 cm), 16.4-ft tall (5.0 m), and 9.8-ft average crown diameter (3.0 m). The increase in size for the three year period averaged 2.0-in caliper (5.1 cm), 7.0-ft tree height (2.1 m), and 7.1-ft crown diameter (2.2 m). This growth is surprisingly rapid, primarily because most trees were well established after only one growing season.

Cultivars exhibiting the greatest average annual growth were Princeton, Homestead, and Vanguard (Table 2). DBH growth was rapid for New Horizon, but tree height and crown diameter growth were relatively slow. The slowest growing cultivars were Frontier, Accolade, Emerald Sunshine, and Prospector.

Usually relatively rapid and slow growth was expressed in several variables, such as DBH and height. All three growth variables were among the fastest for Homestead and the slowest for Frontier. Exceptions were relatively rapid and slow annual tree height growth for New Harmony and Valley Forge, respectively.

Annual growth for the fastest cultivars was on the order of two to three times greater than for the slowest ones. For example, average annual tree height growth ranged from 1.7 ft (0.5 m) for Frontier to 5.6 ft (1.7 m) for New Harmony. Average annual DBH and crown diameter growth ranged from 0.47 inches (Frontier, 1.2 cm) to 1.14 inches (Princeton, 2.9 cm) and 1.8 ft (Frontier, 0.55 m) to 4.4 ft (Vanguard, 1.35 m), respectively.

Rapid growth may confer some advantages, such as improved visibility in the landscape, increased benefits associated with leaf surface area, and reduced damage from vandalism, rodents, and other threats. However, rampant growth can be problematic when associated with sprawling habit. Such trees are more susceptible to wind throw and require more frequent inspection and pruning. The next section describes impacts of growth rate and habit on the pruning requirements of these cultivars.

Pruning Requirements

Cultivars assessed as having a high growth rate and poor structure were evaluated as having a high pruning requirement. Generally, cultivars evaluated as having a high pruning requirement, Valley Forge, Vanguard, Pioneer, and Princeton, (Table 3) also had relatively rapid growth rates (Table 2). Cultivars assessed as having poor structure included Valley Forge, Vanguard, and Pioneer. Conversely, cultivars with the lowest pruning requirement (Frontier, Emerald Sunshine, and Accolade) had relatively slow growth rates and good structure.

From a management perspective, pruning requirement is an important selection consideration, and early assessments indicate that Frontier, Emerald Sunshine, and Accolade exhibit desirable traits in this regard. On the other end of the spectrum, Valley Forge, Vanguard, Pioneer, and Princeton likely will require greater pruning inputs relative to other cultivars. Several cultivars exhibited intermediary traits relative to the evaluation categories. Keep in mind that as the cultivars continue to develop, growth rates and structural characteristics likely will change, and pruning requirement may increase or decline accordingly.

Pests, Disease, and Abiotic Disorders

The commonly managed pests of elms in California are elm leaf beetle (*Xanthogaleruca luteola*) and honeydew-producing aphids and scale insects. Dutch elm disease (*Ophiostoma* spp.) and the bark beetles (*Scolytus* spp.) that vector these fungi are problems in the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento Valley. Several thousand elms have been killed or removed there because of Dutch elm disease since it was found in California in the 1970s.

We observed no Dutch elm disease or bark beetle boring damage on any cultivars at the Davis site from 2005 through spring 2007. Elm leaf beetle (ELB) has been the only significant invertebrate problem. About one-half of the study cultivars experienced 30% or greater leaf-chewing damage by September 2005 (Figure 2).

ELB damage was lower during 2006 and 2007, with the least damage during those years occurring on the same cultivars as in 2005.

Leaf curling aphids (*Eriosoma* sp.) have infested only the American elm selections Princeton and Valley Forge. They have not occurred on New Harmony (also an *U. americana*) and other cultivars. Because they produce abundant sticky honeydew, these aphids are sometimes treated in California landscapes. A pouch gall aphid (probably *Tetraneura nigriabdominalis*) occurs during spring on leaves of elms with Asian and European parentage. The green, pink, or brown eruptions it causes on elm leaves are a curiosity, not a pest problem. Also called the Oriental grassroot aphid, this species alternates between elms and its many hosts in the grass family (Poaceae). The aphid is from Asia where it is a pest on rice. It has become widely established in the eastern U.S., but we found no published reports of this aphid's occurrence in California.

European elm scale (*Gossyparia spuria*) and European fruit lecanium scale (*Parthenolecanium corni*) are present at low densities on at least some cultivars. Because these scales have only one generation per year and their natural dispersal is limited, several more years of sampling or artificial inoculation studies are needed to assess any cultivar differences in susceptibility to scales.

Abiotic disorders do not appear to have threatened tree health or survival. These include leaf chlorosis and necrosis believed due to drought stress and poor water quality (e.g., alkalinity and salinity), sunburn, and tattering of leaves and breakage of young limbs by wind.

Table 1. Names, parentage and rootstock of sixteen cultivars tested at the UC Davis plot.

Variety & Trade Name	Parentage	Rootstock
<i>Ulmus propinqua</i> 'JFS-Bieberich' Emerald Sunshine™ Elm	<i>U. propinqua</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> 'Emer II' Allee® Elm	<i>U. parvifolia</i>	Own root, tissue culture
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Frontier' Frontier Elm	<i>U. carpinifolia</i> X <i>U. parvifolia</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Homestead' Homestead Elm	<i>U. glabra</i> X <i>U. carpinifolia</i> X <i>U.</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Morton Glossy' Triumph™ Elm	<i>U. pumila</i> X <i>U. japonica</i> X <i>U.</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Morton Plainsman' Vanguard™ Elm	<i>U. pumila</i> X <i>U. japonica</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Morton Red Tip' Danada Charm™ Elm	<i>U. japonica</i> X <i>U. wilsoniana</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Morton Stalwart' Commendation™ Elm	<i>U. carpinifolia</i> X <i>U. pumila</i> X <i>U.</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Morton' Accolade® Elm	<i>U. japonica</i> X <i>U. wilsoniana</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus</i> 'New Horizon' PP8684 New Horizon Elm	<i>U. pumila</i> X <i>U. japonica</i>	<i>U. pumila</i> rootstock, budded
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Patriot' Patriot Elm	(<i>U. glabra</i> X <i>U. carpinifolia</i> X <i>U. pumila</i>) X <i>U. wilsoniana</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Pioneer' Pioneer Elm	<i>U. glabra</i> X <i>U. carpinifolia</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus wilsoniana</i> 'Prospector' Prospector Elm	<i>U. wilsoniana</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus americana</i> 'Valley Forge' Valley Forge Elm	<i>U. Americana</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus</i> 'Princeton' Princeton Elm	<i>U. Americana</i>	Own root, softwood cutting
<i>Ulmus</i> 'New Harmony' New Harmony Elm	<i>U. Americana</i>	Own root, softwood cutting

Table 2. Average annual growth from spring 2005 through fall 2007 for fifteen cultivars.

Cultivar	DBH (in)	sd	Height (ft)	sd	Diameter (ft)	sd
Princeton ¹	1.14	0.33	5.35	2.26	3.05	1.21
Homestead	0.95	0.14	4.36	0.69	3.22	0.82
New Horizon	0.93	0.21	2.03	0.33	2.20	0.20
Vanguard	0.89	0.11	1.77	0.36	4.43	0.30
Commendation	0.81	0.06	3.08	0.46	3.25	0.95
Pioneer	0.80	0.25	2.53	0.52	2.40	0.36
Triumph	0.78	0.10	2.72	0.39	2.85	0.66
New Harmony ¹	0.78	0.23	5.58	2.99	2.89	0.92
Valley Forge	0.73	0.08	1.77	0.20	2.79	0.49
Patriot	0.71	0.06	3.02	0.82	2.72	0.43
Danada Charm	0.63	0.11	2.46	0.75	2.23	0.56
Prospector	0.57	0.09	1.80	0.46	1.80	0.85
Emerald Sunshine	0.53	0.04	2.95	1.15	1.94	0.33
Accolade	0.52	0.11	1.87	0.69	2.59	1.18
Frontier	0.47	0.13	1.67	0.59	1.80	0.59
¹ Mean annual growth for 2007 only						




Figure 1. Tree height data points plotted for the five Emerald Sunshine elms, along with mean height plus and minus the standard error.




Figure 2. Elm leaf beetle chewing damage to 15 elm cultivars at the UC Davis site of the National Elm Trial, September 2005. Damage does not differ significantly ($P = 0.05$) between cultivars with bars topped by a same letter according to ANOVA and Tukey's tests for all paired comparisons.