

DT-75
 30 25
 45 35
 % 19 % 22
 %14
 1L 2L

The Iraqi Journal of Agricultural Sciences 41 (3):124-129,2010

Al-Ani & Al-Ani.

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRACTOR PRACTICAL VELOCITY AND
 DIFFERENT MOISTURE CONTENT ON PLOWING SOIL LAYER**

Abdullah.N.Al-Ani

**Arab Sudanese Blue Nile Company
 Sudan.**

Firas.S.Al-Ani

**Dept. of Agric. Mechanization
 College of Agriculture
 University of Baghdad**

ABSTRACT

Plow soil packed layer consisting of soil (induced hardpan) or (plow sole) is generally the result of the frequent passage of farm machinery and heavy machinery to carry out operations involving the preparation of agricultural land, cultivating, spraying, harvesting, transport and others. The emergence of this class, usually to reduce the productivity of the land because of the growth roots, proliferation and movement of air and water in that class. This study involved the performance of the DT-75 Crawler tractor with Moldboard Plow in a silt clay loam soil under three moisture levels and two practical speed and depth of tillage between 25 and 30 cm. one of the objectives of this study is to determine the impact on the characteristics of the soil layer between 35 and 45 cm. To have been measuring the bulk density, porosity and soil penetration resistance before and after the operations study. Results of the study showed that there are a significant differences happened under three moisture levels and two practical speed, the reduction in soil moisture content from 22 to 19 % increased soil bulk density and soil penetration resistance but reduced soil porosity .Further reduction in moisture content from 19 to 14% increased soil porosity and soil penetration resistance but decreased soil bulk density. The increasing of practical speed from 1L to 2L decreased soil bulk density and soil penetration resistance but increased porosity, its recommend &confirmed to use subsoil plow to break the packed layers and to reduce the impact of increased density and the apparent resistance to penetration and increase the porosity to improve the physical characteristics and make them more susceptible to the exploitation of agriculture.

:

. (11)

(4) .(2)

.%19

Voorhees

(16)

. (5)

Benites .(15)

(8) Michele

.(6)

.(3)

(17) Wolkowski

10

60

(13) Mckenzie

. (3)

(9) Lipiec Hakansson

.(1)

Hossain .(13)

(12)

.(15)

DT-75

) (plow sole)

$$SBulk = \frac{M_s}{V_{Tot}} \text{----- (17)}$$

(SBulk) =

(gm) = MS

(Cm3) = VTot

$$TPOR\% = 1 - \left(\frac{SBulk}{Pds} \right) \times 100 \text{----- (18)}$$

(7) ASTM

(TPOR)=

(%15-13) (%20-18) (%23-21) :

(2.65) = Pds

(%14 19 22)

\ 3.71) 1L

(/ 6.37) 3L (

PL N4-35

25-30

720 kg

140

45-35)

35

15

41 C A

DT-75

4.35

106

()

:

: -1

(1)

(

(%23-21)

1.64 1L

³ / 1.72

)

%19 22

(

%14

³ / 1.66

-13)

(%20-18)

2L

(%15

1.65 1.68

/ 6.37 3.71 14 19 1.62
 1.64 %22
³ / 1.68 1.72 ³ / 1.62
 19 22 ³ / 1.65 1.66
 %14

(11 4) (1) .(5 2)

.(3 \) .1

	(\)		22
	2 L	1 L	
1.63	1.62	1.64	22
1.70	1.68	1.72	19
1.66	1.65	1.66	14
0.012			%5 . . .
	1.65	1.67	
	0.016		%5 . . .

%37.8 37.3 : -2
 .%14 (2)

1L %32.2 % 38.1
 2L %36.5 %38.8
 .(14 2) %19 22

. (%) .2

	(\)		22
	2 L	1 L	
38.45	38.8	38.1	22
34.35	36.5	32.2	19
37.55	37.8	37.3	14
0.62			%5 . . .
	37.7	35.87	
	0.50		%5 . . .

19 22 3L : -3
%14 (3)

.(13 4) . 2 \ 51 48 41
48 46 38 1L
.() .3

	(\)		22
	2 L	1 L	
39.5	38	41	22
47.0	46	48	19
49.5	48	51	14
1.62			%5 . . .
	44.0	46.67	
			1.44 %5 . . .

41
48 51 2 \ 46 48 38
19 22 2 \
%14

.(10 5)

. 2000. :_____ :_____
-1

(% 20 18)

.2000 . -2

MF 399

- 10- Hakansson, I., W.B. Varhees and H. Riley. 1988. Vehicle and wheel factors influencing soil compaction and crop response in different traffic regimes. *Soil and Tillage Rec.* 11: 239-282. 592003. -3
- 11- Hetz,E.J.2001.Soil compaction potential of tractors and other heavy agricultural machines used in Chile. *AMA* 32 (3):38-42. .43 36. (2003)(2000) . - 4
- 12- Hossain, M., J.Mulandi, L.Keach, M.Hunt and S.Romanoschi.2006. Intelligent compaction control . *Proceedings of the 2006 Airfield and Highway Pavement specialty Conference.*Vol2006 :304-316 DT-75 .692000 . -5
- 13- Mckenzie, B.M., S.Kuhner., K.Mackenzie, S. Peth and R.Horn.2009. Soil compaction by uniaxial loading and the survival of the earthworm *Aporrectodea caliginosa*.*Soil and Tillage Reseach* .104:320-323. MF4260 134
- 14 Panayiotopoulos, K.P. 1996. The penetration resistance of soils from four soil orders. *Agric Eng. Paper No. 96c-007.* Madrid, Spain. .592000. -6 MF4260
- 15- Upadhyaya,S.K. 1992.Deterring compaction of soil by heavy machinery. *California agriculture.*46(4):19-20. .58
- 16 -Vorhees, W.B., W.W. Nelson and G.W. Randall. 1986. Extend and persistence of sub soil compaction caused by heavy axle loads. *Soil Sci.Soc.Am.*J.50:428-4-33.
- 17-wolowski, D.2007. Managing soil compaction following the heavy rains of 2007, *Agriculture and natural resources* .University of Wisconsin. Extension respond August 2007.
- 7 -American Society for Testing and Materials. 1986. *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, 04-08.Copyright by ASTM. USA, PP.19 21.
- 8- Benites, J and P.Michele.2003. Conservation of Natural resources for sustainable Agriculture (Soil Compaction).FAO and university of Teramo. Des McGarry, Queensland Government. 1 2. www.fao.org.
- 9- Hakansson, I. and J. Lipiec. 1999. The degree of compactness; review of its usefulness in soil compaction studies. Paper accepted for publication in *Soil and Tillage Res.*