Hans-Heinrich Voßhenrich, Joachim Brunotte and Berthold Ortmeier, Brunswick

Grid Screen Scanning Method with Straw Index for Assessing Straw Incorporation

With grid screen scanning the quality of straw incorporation of a cultivator can be rated. However, an exact comparison needs homogeneous initial straw distribution conditions. To compare ratings, which were gathered from different straw masses per unit of area, the straw index was developed and included in the evaluation. In the future it will be possible to assess the straw incorporation quality with a single value, the "implement index" of a stubble cultivation implement.

Berthold Ortmeier, PD Dr. Hans-Heinrich Voßhenrich and Dr. Joachim Brunotte are scientists at the Institute of Production Engineering and Building Research of the FAL, Bundesallee 50, 38116 Brunswick; e-mail: *hans.vosshenrich@fal.de*

Keywords

Amount of straw, incorporation of straw, soil tillage

Literature

- Voßhenrich, H.H., J. Brunotte und B. Ortmeier. Methoden zur Bewertung der Strohverteilung und Einarbeitung. Landtechnik 58 (2003), H. 2, S. 92-93
- [2] DLG-Focustest 2003: www.DLG-Test.de/Prüfberichte 2003, Stroheinarbeitung Grubber

The grid method for evaluating straw tillage was already introduced in the Landtechnik 2/2003 [1]. The method presented here has been expanded with a straw index, among other things. This index allows for comparing ratings, which can be calculated at various sites with different straw yields. Thus the different site inputî conditions for soil tillage equipment in agricultural practice, caused by different yield levels between and within the sites, are taken into consideration.

Method

The single steps of the grid method were extensively described in the Landtechnik [1].

Supplementary, in the expanded method presented here, the straw coverage on the soil surface is also evaluated. For this purpose the grid is laid directly along the edge of the profile on the tilled soil. In contrast to the evaluation in the profile wall, the straw coverage level in each individual grid section is not rated, but rather a composite is made of each five sections in the working direction in a rectangular grid of $4.5 \text{ cm} \cdot 22.5 \text{ cm}$. Thus, for the surface coverage, 40 ratings were established for 180 cm working breadth.

The rating values between 0 and 100 percent were placed into an Excel table and provide an understandable overall picture. The values are additionally coloured, the higher the rating, the more intensive the colour. The more even the adjacent values and colours are, the more evenly the straw was incorporated into the soil. In order to describe zones, where straw was concentrated, the vertical and adjacent ratings were added up.

The sum of all rating values is called the Straw Index. It does not reflect directly the amount of straw lying on the surface of the soil after the harvest, and thus before the tillage, but is closely related to it. As accompanying surveys on the straw deposition on the soil surface show, a straw index of 1500 means about 500 g straw/m², an index of 3000 indicates about 1000 g/m² and an index of 4500 means about 1500 g/m². Here 1000 g/m² signify 100 dt straw/hectare.

Results

Straw incorporation with a multi-beam and a wing tine cultivator

The following presentation (*Fig. 1*) shows the straw incorporation quality of a multi row cultivator, evaluated on the basis of the grid method with Straw Index. The coverage of the soil surface with straw (CSS %) is presented and the coverage of the opened profile wall through incorporate straw (CIS %). The cultivator was used in the first shallow working phase with 10 cm wide shares and in the second deep working phase with 6 cm wide shares. The rating took place during the second deep working phase at a working depth of 15 to 20 cm.

Although we have the same eight-beam cultivator (*Fig. 1*) at the same location, two single measurements show different results. The high ratings of the straw incorporated into the soil (CIS %) and the accordingly dark coloured sections of measurement 1 make the impression that the straw was

more intensively incorporated as in measurement 2. Actually, the decisive difference here is in the different straw masses, which had to be incorporated at the two sites measured. The summed values of the straw covering the surface (sum CSS %) at the location of the first measurement with the index 1450 and straw rated in the profile wall, with the index 1805, show that here significantly more straw lay at the location of the second measurement with the values 450 and 1040. The Straw Index with 3255 in the first measurement and 1490 in the second makes these differing starting points evident in a single figure.

If, as can be seen in the second profile, at some locations little or no straw was incorporated, both the rating value and the colour contrast differ only a little and the Straw Index is low at 1490, nonetheless a good working quality by the equipment can be assumed, in this case due to the low total amount of straw. At the same time, with

Stroh	ind	ex:	Su	mm	ne (Bdl	E +	Bo	10)	-	32	55								N	les	sur	ng '	I																				Mittel	Summe
BdO	%	75	75	50	07	75 7	75	25	25	10	10	10	10	10	10	50) 5	0 2	51	0 1	10	10	25	75	75	75	25	25	50	50	75	25	25	25	50	50	50	25	10	25	25	25	25	36	1450
BdE	% [25	25	10	0 2	5 2	25	25	25	25	10	10	10	25		10) 1	0 10) 1	0	25	25	10		25	25	25	25	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	25	25	25	25	10	10	10	19	740
	Γ	10	10	2:	5 2	5 1	10	25				10					1	0 0		1	10	25	25		25	10	10	10	25	25	0	0	10	0	25	0			10	25	10	0	10	23	930
	ſ	0	0	25	5 1	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	1	0 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	135
	Ī	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ī	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0) 0	(0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		25	35	60	0 6	50 3	35	60	110	85	70	30	60	75	100	35	5 30	0 20) 6	i0 3	35	50	35	100	50	35	35	35	45	35	10	10	20	10	45	10	75	75	35	50	20	10	20	45	1805
Strohi					ne (Bdl			10)	=	149	90								N	les	sur	ng 2	2																				Mittel	Summe
	ind	ex:	Su	mm	•		E +						50	25	10	0	10	0 10) 1		Aes	sur 10	ng 2 0	2 0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	25	25	0	0	10	25	10	10		Summe 450
BdO	inde %	ex: 10	Su 25	mm	•		E + 25	B d			25	25				-	1			0 1	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10				-				0					11	450
BdO	inde %	ex:	Su 25	mm	、 D 1	02	E + 25	Bo		10	25	25	50 25			-	1) 1	0 1		10	ng 2 0 10	0	0	0	0	10 10	0	0	10 0			10 25	-		25 10		0	10 10		10 25		11	
BdO	inde %	ex: 10	Su 25	mm	、 D 1	0 2	E + 25	B d	10	10	25 25	25	25	10		10	0	10	> 2	0 1	10 25	10	0	0	0	0	0	10 10 0	0 10 10	0		10		25	10		10		0		10			11 17	450
Strohi BdO BdE 4	inde %	ex: 10	Su 25	mm 10 28	5 2	02	E + 25	10 25	10 10	10 10 10	25 25 10	25	25	10	10	10	0	0 10	0 2	0 1 5 2 5 2	10 25	10 25	0	0							0	10	25	25	10	10	10	0	-	10	10	25	10	11 17	450
BdO	inde %	ex: 10 25 10	Su 25 25 10	mm 10 20 0	5 2	0 2 5	E + 25	10 25	10 10 0	10 10 10	25 25 10	25 10	25 10	10 0	10 0	10 10 0	0	0 10	2	0 1 15 2 15 2	10 25 25	10 25 10	0 10 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10 10	25 25	25 10	10 0	10 10	10 0	0	0	10 10	10 0	25 0	10 10	11 17 8	450 660 335
BdO	inde %	ex: 10 25 10 0	Su 25 25 10 0	mm 10 25 0 0	5 2 0 (0 2 5 0 1	E + 25	Bc 10 25 10 10	10 10 0 25	10 10 10	25 25 10 0	25 10 0	25 10 0	10 0 0	10 0 0	10 10 0	0) 1(0 0) 0	2	0 1 15 2 15 2 0 1	10 25 25 0	10 25 10 0	0 10 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0 0	10 0	0 0	0 0 0	10 10 0	25 25 0	25 10 0	10 0 0	10 10 0	10 0 0	0 0	0	10 10 0	10 0 0	25 0	10 10 0	11 17 8 1	660 335 45

Fig. 1: Soil profile with a good incorporation of straw (eight row cultivator)

higher Index values, the darker colours can be seen in the top profile.

Figure 2, in contrast, shows uneven straw incorporation. Here a two beam wing tine cultivator was used successively in the first working process shallow, and in the second working process at a depth between 15 and 20 cm. The zones of different straw concentrations can be clearly seen in both measurements. Low rating values from 0 and 10 percent are again next to high values of 75 and 100 percent. These sudden changes are not only rated direct on the soil surface in the first grid, but also beneath in the second and third grids.

Evaluation of the Method

With the grid method, the quality of straw incorporation by cultivators can be assessed.

An exact comparison of implements needs homogeneous conditions concerning the straw distribution. To be able to compare ratings, which are calculated on the basis of different straw masses per area unit, the Straw Index has been developed and included into the evaluation. With this, the reality of agricultural practice has been taken into consideration, to compare cultivators with each other, which have been tested under different working conditions. The examples of the results show clearly, that the same cultivator achieves under different working conditions a similar rating, while two different cultivators with different working qualities are differently assessed. Presently the grid method with a Straw Index is being further developed. It will be possible to describe with one value, the "index of implement", which is a measure of deviation, the quality of straw incorporation by a stubble tillage implement.

Fig. 2: Soil profile with a poor incorporation of straw (wing sweep cultivator)

Strohin	dex:	: Sı	umi	me	(Bo	IE +	Bo	10)	=	233	0								Me	ssu	ng '																					Mittel	Summ
BdO %	10) (0	0	10	10	10	10	10	25	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	25	50	25	10	10	25	50	50	75	10	10	0	0	10	10	10	10	25	10	15	600
BdE %	10		5 ·	10	0	10	10		0.0		10	10	10	10			25	10	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	0	25	25	25	0	10	25	10	60	25		25	25	0	0	18	725
	10		5 ·	10	0	10	10	25		25	0	0	0	0	0	25		25	20	25	25	0	0	10	0	0	25	25		10	0	0	10	0					10	0	0	21	855
	0	C	D	0	0	0	10	0	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	10		25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	150
	0	0	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	C	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
					•	~~	~~	76	450	110	10	10	10	10	50	85	##	60	60	25	25	10	10	20	10	0	25	50	75	35	0	10	35	10	100	100	135	125	35	0	0	43	1730
	20) (2	20	0	20	30	/5	150		10	10		10																							100						
Strohine		S	umi	me	(Bc			10)		320		0	0	10	10					ssu 25			10	10	25	10	10	25	50	25	10	25	10		25	100	100	0	0		0	Mittel	
	dex:	: S L	umi	me 50	(Bc 75	iE + 25	• B d	10)	= 10	320	10 10	0	0	10	10	10	10		Me	ssu	ng 2 10	!	10	10	25	10	10		50			25		25		10	10	0	0	10	0	17	Summ
3dO %	dex: 10	: Si 2!	umi 5 5	me 50	(Bc 75 26	IE + 25 10	• Bd	IO) 10	= 10 10	320 10	10 10	0	0	10	10	10	10	25	Me 25	ssu 25	ng 2 10 10	10	10 10	10	25		10					25	10 10	25	25 10	10	10	0	0	10	-	17	Summ 660
3dO %	dex: 10	: Si) 2:) 2:	umi 5 5	me 50	(Bc 75 26	IE + 25 10	• Bd	10) 10 25	= 10 10	320 10	10 10	0	0	10	10	10	10	25 10	Me 25	ssu 25 10	ng 2 10 10	10	10 10 10	10	25	10	10 10	0	0	0	10	25 10	10 10	25	25 10	10	10	0	0	10	10	17 16	Summ 660 630 765
3dO %	dex: 10 10 0	: Su 2: 0 2: 0 0	umi 5 5 5	me 50 25	(Bc 75 26	1E + 25 10 25	• Bd	10) 10 25	= 10 10 0	320 10 10 0	10 10 10 0	0	0 0 10	10	10	10	10 25	25 10	Me 25 80	ssu 25 10 10	ng 2 10 10 10	10 10 10	10 10 10	10	25	10	10 10 0	0	0	0	10 0	25 10	10 10	25	25 10	10 0 10	10 0 0	0	0	10 10 0	10 0	17 16 19	Summ 660 630 765
3dO %	dex: 10 10 0 0	: Su) 2!) 2 0 0 0	umi 55 \$ 50 0 50 0	me 50 26	(Bc 75 25 25	1E + 25 10 25 25	• Bo 10 25 25	10) 10 25 25	= 10 10 0 25	320 10 10 0	10 10 10 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 10 0	10	10	10 10 25	10 25 25	25 10 0	Me 25 10 0	ssu 25 10 10 0	ng 2 10 10 10 0	10 10 10 10	10 10 10 25	10	25 25	10	10 10 0 25	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	10 0 0	25 10 10	10 10 25	25 25	25 10	10 0 10 10	10 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	10 10 0 0	10 0 0	17 16 19 29	Summ 660 630 765 1145