# MECHANISATION TECHNOLOGY IN MEDIUM SOIL SACRIFICATION AT 35 CM

V.POP, R.NICULA, Anișoara DUMA COPCEA, Casiana MIHUŢ, R. ILEA

University of Agricultural Sciences Banat Veterninară "King Michael I of Romania"Timisoara, Arad Way, no. 119, Romania, Phone: +4025627475, Fax: +40256200296, Corresponding author: duma\_anisoara@yahoo.com,

Abstract. The mechanization technology in medium soil scarification at 35 cm was done with an aggregate made up of a Challenger MT 765B tractor and a Horsch Tiger 8 AS scarificator. Scarification is done by moving the aggregate after the swing method. Minimum parcel size should ensure working for at least one shift. Technical, technological, and economical performances of the agricultural aggregates are assessed through technical indicators (also called use indicators or operation indicators) such as cultivation depth, cultivation width, cultivation speed, traction force resistance, operation power, operation capacity, energy source load degree and fuel consumption. The mobile aggregate moves at a certain speed determined by the cultivation technology requirements of the cultivation quality and by the agricultural machine traction and operation possibilities. Real operation speed influences the quality of the cultivation. To achieve high quality cultivation, we need to observe specific operation speed (called technological speed). Soil specific resistance influences the operation capacity of the aggregates and fuel consumption per ha. On heavy soils, the operation capacity of the ploughing aggregates is 15÷30% lower than that on medium soils and 25÷30% lower than that on light soils. Scarificator coulter and chisel sharpness has a great influence on traction resistance force. Thus, changing coulter or chisel sharpness from 1 to 3.5 mm makes traction force resistance increase with up to 45%. Other factors also influence traction resistance in soil cultivation agricultural machines, such as technical state, proper assemblage of operating organs, tractor coupling, etc. Specific soil resistance influences the aggregate operation capacity and fuel consumption per ha. On heavy soils, the operation capacity of the ploughing aggregates is 15÷30% lower than that on medium soils and 25÷30% lower than that on light soils. Scarificator coulter and chisel sharpness has a great influence on traction resistance force. Thus, changing coulter or chisel sharpness from 1 to 3.5 mm makes traction force resistance increase with up to 45%. Scarification is done by moving the aggregate after the swing method. Minimum parcel size needs to ensure at least one shift. The land to be scarified needs to be divided into parcels.

Keywords: mechanization technology, tractor, scarificator

### INTRODUCTION

The Challenger MT-765B tractor with Challenger Powershift transmission has 16 speeds forwards ad 4 speeds backwards. Operation parameters of the Challenger MT-765B tractor are: nominal power  $P_m = 320$  CP = 238 Kw; nominal engine speed  $n_m = 2100$  rot/min  $(\omega_m = 220 \text{ rad/s})$ ; nominal engine moment  $M_e = 108$  daNm; hourly fuel consumption  $G_h = 46.4$  kg/h =54 l/ha; specific fuel consumption  $g_s = 195$  g/kWh; weight G = 11800 daN; engine wheel radius r = 0.762 m. The Horsch Tiger 8 AS scarificator is meant to aerate the soil up to 35 cm. It operates in aggregate with the Challenger MT-765B tractor. The technical features of the Horsch Tiger 8 AS scarificator are: cultivation width: 7.5 m; length: 7.95 m; maximum cultivation depth: 35 cm; weight: 7800 kg; number of aeration chisels: 33; chisel cultivation width: 23 cm; number of coulter rows: 4; coulter row distance: 23 cm; coulter distance per row: 91 cm; size of roller tire: 7.50-16; tire air pressure: 2,8 bar; pendulum traction bar; axle load: 5,100 kg; operation power: 275-385 CP.

## MATERIAL AND METHOD

Machine scarification resistance force is:

$$\begin{split} R_m &= K_0 \cdot a \cdot b \cdot n = 5 \cdot 10^3 \cdot 0, 2 \cdot 0, 23 \cdot 33 = 8250 \;\; \text{daN, where:} \;\; K_0 \text{ - soil resistance to scarification (on medium soil} \;\; K_0 = 5 \cdot 10^3 \;\; \text{daN/m}^2); \;\; a \;\; \text{- cultivation depth} \;\; (a = 0, 2 \; m); \\ b \;\; \text{- chisel cultivation width} \;\; (b = 23 \; \text{cm}); \;\; n \;\; \text{- number of scarificator chisels} \;\; (n = 33 \; \text{buc}). \\ \textit{Cultivation speed.} \;\; \text{Comparing aggregate resistance to scarification} \;\; R_m \;\; \text{and traction force} \;\; F_t \;\; \text{of the Challenger MT-765B tractor, we choose the 7th speed to scarify. Cultivation speed is: } \\ v_1 &= v_t \left(1 - \delta\right) = 2, 3\left(1 - 0, 1\right) = 2, 07 \;\; \text{m/s} = 7, 4 \;\; \text{km/h} \;\; . \;\; \textit{Operation capacity of the scarification aggregate.} \;\; \text{Real hourly operation capacity is calculated with the relation:} \;\; W_h^r = 0, 1 \cdot B_1 \cdot v_1 \cdot K_s = 0, 1 \cdot 7, 5 \cdot 7, 4 \cdot 0, 8 = 4, 44 \;\; \text{ha/h}; \;\; \text{where:} \;\; B_1 \;\; \text{- operation width} \;\; (B_1 = 7, 5 \; \text{m}) \;\; v_1 \;\; \text{- operation speed} \;\; (v_1 = 7, 4 \;\; \text{km/h}); \;\; K_s \;\; \text{- operation time use coefficient} \;\; (K_s = 0, 8). \;\; \text{Real operation capacity per shift is calculated with the relation:} \;\; W_{sch}^r = W_h^r \cdot T_s = 4, 44 \cdot 8 = 35, 5 \;\; \text{ha/sch} \;\; . \;\; The number of scarification aggregates} \;\; \text{is calculated with the relation:} \;\; N_s = \frac{S}{W_{sch}^r \cdot n_z \cdot n_s} = \frac{100}{35, 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 1} = 0,94 \;\; . \;\; \text{To cultivate in 3 days,} \;\; N_s = 1000 \;\; \text{- operation} \;\; N_s = 1000 \;\; \text{- operation}$$

we need to use a scarification aggregate. The area to be scarified (100 ha) is 1,000 m long and 1,000 m wide. Scarification is done by moving the aggregate after the swing method. Minimum parcel size needs to ensure at least one shift. The land to be scarified needs to be divided into parcels. The number of parcels  $n_p$  is calculated with the relation:

$$n_p = \frac{S}{W_{sch}^r} = \frac{100}{35.5} = 3$$
 parcels. The width of a parcel is:

 $1 = \frac{S}{L \cdot n_p} = \frac{1000000 m^2}{1000 \, m \cdot 3} = 333 \, m \; ; \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{where:} \; L \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \; \text{Width of turning} \; \text{- parcel length (1,000 m).} \;$ 

area E is calculated with the relation:  $E=3\cdot R=3\cdot 15=45\,\mathrm{m}$  where: R - aggregate turning radius. Medium length of useless move  $L_\mathrm{g}$  is calculated with the relation:  $L_g=3\cdot R=3\cdot 15+=45\,\mathrm{m}$ . Considering  $v_\mathrm{l}=v_\mathrm{g}$ , the duration of a cycle

is: 
$$T_c = \frac{L_1 \cdot n_1}{v_1} + \frac{L_g \cdot n_g}{v_g} = \frac{(910 + 45) \cdot 2}{2,07} = 922 \text{ sec.}$$
 Theoretical area cultivated after a

$$\text{cycle is calculated with the relation: } W_{c} = \frac{L_{l} \cdot n_{l} \cdot B_{l}}{10^{4}} = \frac{910 \cdot 2 \cdot 7.5}{10000} = 1,36 \text{ha} \, / \, \text{ciclu} \, .$$

Theoretical hourly operating capacity is:  $W_h = 3600 \cdot \frac{W_c}{T_c} = 3600 \cdot \frac{1,36}{922} = 5,3 \text{ ha/h}$  . Fuel

consumption per ha is: 
$$C_{ha}=\frac{C_h}{W_h}=\frac{54\,l/h}{5,3\;ha/h}=10\,litri/\,ha$$
 .

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Calculus of economic indicators*. Economic indicators suppose knowing both consumption per area unit and costs per ha per cost elements.

Consumption of h/aggregate is calculated with the relation: 
$$C_a = \frac{T_s}{W_{ath}^r} = \frac{8}{35.5} = 0.23$$

aggregate-h/ha. The coefficient  $\,C_{_{m}}\,$  is calculated depending on the coefficient  $\,C_{_{a}}\,$  and the number of labourers m, with the relation:  $C_m = C_a \cdot m = 0.23$  man-h/ha. Production costs of a mechanised operation consist in indirect and direct costs. Indirect costs are for several mechanised operations or in the general interest of the company. They are recorded separately and then, depending on certain criteria, they are divided per mechanised operation. Direct costs are determined directly and they are included in the cost of each mechanised operation. In assessing economic efficacy off an agricultural aggregate, we use only direct costs because it represents the reduction of labour and material costs necessary to use the agricultural aggregate. Direct costs are calculated in RON/ ha. Direct costs  $C_d$  is calculated with the relation:  $C_d = C_S + C_c + C_A + C_{dt}$ ; where:  $C_S$  - wage costs;  $C_c$  - fuel costs;  $C_A$  amortisation costs;  $C_{\text{dt}}$  - aggregate technical maintenance costs. Wage costs are calculated depending on the hourly wage tariff  $S_h$  and on the coefficient  $C_m$ . A mechanic's salary is about 2,000 RON/month for 22 weekdays/month (i.e., 176 h/month), which corresponds to an hourly tariff of 11 RON/h. Wage costs per ha are:  $C_S = C_m \cdot S = 0.23 \cdot 11 = 2.5$  RON/ha. Fuel costs  $\, {
m C}_{
m c} \,$  depend on fuel consumption  $\, G_{ha} \,$  (l/operation unit) and on fuel price  $\, {
m p}_{
m l} \,$ (RON/I):  $C_c = G_{ha} \cdot p_i = 10.6,5 = 65$  RON/ha. Costs for aggregate amortisation  $C_A$  are calculated for both the tractor and the scarificator taking into account the initial aggregate value  $V_i$  and the residual aggregate value  $V_r$ , de operation capacity per shift  $W_{sch}^r$ , the number of shifts  $n_s$ , the number of weekdays per year  $n_z$  and the operation duration D in years:

$$\begin{split} &C_{Atractor} = \frac{V_{i} - V_{r}}{W_{sch}^{r} \cdot n_{s} \cdot n_{z} \cdot D} = \frac{500000}{35,5 \cdot 250 \cdot 10} = 6 \, \text{RON/ha} \\ &C_{Aplug} = \frac{V_{i} - V_{r}}{W_{sch}^{r} \cdot n_{s} \cdot n_{z} \cdot D} = \frac{200000}{35,5 \cdot 250 \cdot 8} = 3 \, \, \text{RON/ha}; \, \, C_{A} = 6 + 3 = 9 \, \, \text{RON/ha}. \end{split}$$

Costs of technical maintenance of the aggregate  $C_{\text{dt}}$  are technical service costs, technical reviews costs, and repair costs. These costs are calculated for the entire service assistance for both tractors and aggregating machines.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Technical} & \text{service} & \text{per tractor} & \text{are calculated with the} \\ & \text{relatio} \ C_{\text{dttractor}} & = \frac{V_{\text{i}} \cdot G_{\text{ha}}}{C_{\text{n}}} = \frac{500000 \cdot 10}{900000} = 5, \\ & \text{Soliton} & \text{RON/ha where: } V_{\text{i}} \text{ - inventory value in} \end{aligned}$$

RON;  $C_n$  - standard consumption per operation in 1;  $C_{ha}$  - fuel consumption per ha in 1.

Technical service per plough are calculated with the relation:  $C_{dtplug} = \frac{V_i}{W_a} = \frac{200000}{70000} = 3$ 

RON/ha; where:  $V_i$  - inventory value in RON;  $W_n$  - volume of operations per shift in ha. The values  $G_n$  and  $W_n$  were calculated experimentally and they appear in maintenance technologies, reviews, and repairs of tractors and agricultural machines. Costs for aggregate technical service are:  $C_{dt} = 5.5 + 3 = 8.5$  RON/ha. Direct costs per scarified ha are:  $C_d = C_S + C_c + C_A + C_{dt} = 2.5 + 65 + 9 + 8.5 = 85$  RON/ha. Auxiliary costs  $C_{ac}$  are costs for main and auxiliary materials, costs for the storage and conservation of the tractors and agricultural machines. They represent percentages (15-20%)costs:  $C_{ac} = 0.2 \cdot 85 = 17$ RON/ha. **Total** of scarified costs are:  $C_T = C_d + C_{ac} = 85 + 17 = 102$  RON/ha.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

In practical operation calculus, traction force resistance of the plough and scarificator is calculated with the formula:  $R_{\rm plug} = K_0 \cdot a \cdot b \cdot n$ ; where:  $K_0$  - specific soil resistance to ploughing; a - cultivation depth; b - operation width of an operation organ; n - number of operating organs. Specific soil resistance to ploughing  $K_0$  is used as a basic criterion in the classification of soils depending on resistance, a classification necessary to organise agricultural operations, to purchase fuel and spare parts, etc. to avoid errors in the classification of soils, calculus need to be made according to rigorous methodologies with a standard plough ploughing 20 cm deep in the soil at an operating speed of 1.2-1.4 m/s (4.3-5.0 km/h), and on a land that has been cultivated for a longer period of time. Depending on their specific resistance  $K_0$ , soils on arable lands in Romania can be grouped into:Light soils, with specific resistance  $K_0 < 4 \cdot 10^3$  daN/m²;Medium soils, with specific resistance  $K_0 = 4 \cdot 10^3 \div 6 \cdot 10^3$  daN/m²;Heavy soils, with specific resistance  $K_0 = 6 \cdot 10^3 \div 9 \cdot 10^3$  daN/m²;Very heavy soils, with specific resistance  $K_0 > 9 \cdot 10^3$  daN/m².

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- 1. AUNGURENCE N., POPA D., CIODARU G., Formarea și utilizarea agregatelor agricole, 1997 Editura Mirton, Timișoara.
- 2. Duma Copcea Anișoara, Exploatarea agregatelor agricole, note de curs -2017, Timișoara.
- 3.ILEA R., Mașini agricole 2013, Curs IFR -, Editura Agroprint, Timișoara.
- 4.Toma D., 1981, Tractoare și mașini Agricole, E.D.P.București.
- 5. TONEA CORNELIA, 1996, Tractoare, Editura Marineasa, Timișoara.