

# THE EFFICACY OF THREE TECHNIQUES TO ALLEVIATE SOIL COMPACTION AT A RESTORED SAND AND GRAVEL QUARRY

Danielle Sinnett\*, Jane Poole and Tony Hutchings

Forest Research, Alice Holt Lodge, Wrecclesham, Farnham, Surrey, GU10 4LH, UK.

\*Corresponding author.

Fax: +441420 520180. E-mail: [danielle.sinnett@forestry.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:danielle.sinnett@forestry.gsi.gov.uk)

1    **ABSTRACT**

2    Reinstated soil at restored sites often suffers from severe compaction which can significantly impede root  
3    development. Several methods, such as ripping and complete cultivation, are available to alleviate  
4    compaction that may occur as a result of soil reinstatement. This paper examines the effectiveness of the  
5    industry standard industrial ripper and a prototype modern ripper, the Mega-Lift, in comparison with the  
6    recommended best practice method of complete cultivation. An investigation of the penetration resistance of  
7    the soil at a restored sand and gravel quarry was carried out using a cone penetrometer and a 'lifting driving  
8    tool' (dropping weight penetrometer) three years following cultivation. All the cultivation treatments reduced  
9    soil compaction to some degree compared to the untreated control plot. However, the penetration resistance  
10   values suggest that rooting would be restricted at relatively shallow depths in the plots cultivated using the  
11   industrial and Mega-Lift ripper; penetration resistance exceeded 2 MPa within the first 0.33 m. Complete  
12   cultivation maintained penetration resistance values of less than 2 MPa within the depth limit of the  
13   penetrometer of 0.42 m. In addition, the results from the 'lifting driving tool' indicate that soils treated using  
14   complete cultivation remained significantly looser than those treated with the ripper to a depth of at least 0.80  
15   m. The results demonstrate that complete cultivation remains the most effective method of alleviating soil  
16   compaction on restored sites, although it is recognised that its relatively high cost may restrict the uptake of  
17   the technique.

18  
19    **Keywords:** soil compaction, industrial ripper, complete cultivation, restored soils

20

## INTRODUCTION

Soil compaction is a common problem on restored sites and often occurs during soil stripping, storage and reinstatement as part of the excavation, restoration and after-care stages of mineral extraction. The risk of soil compaction can be minimised by following best practice guidance at all of these stages, such as that detailed in Moffat and McNeill (1994). Despite these guidelines, many restored sites still suffer from severe soil compaction that will require alleviation prior to vegetation establishment.

Current UK (Moffat and McNeill, 1994) guidance for woodland establishment on restored sites recommends a rootable soil depth of at least 1 m. A 'rootable soil' is defined as having a bulk density of less than 1.5 g cm<sup>-3</sup> to at least 0.5 m depth, and less than 1.7 g cm<sup>-3</sup> to 1.0 m depth (Bending *et al.*, 1999). Similarly, a soil depth of 1.2 m is recommended for agricultural soils (Defra, 2005) with a bulk density of less than 1.3 g cm<sup>-3</sup> to 0.25 m depth and less than 1.5 g cm<sup>-3</sup> for the remaining profile (Bending *et al.*, 1999). To achieve this thickness of rootable soil, the recommended method for soil reinstatement in forestry is loose tipping (Moffat and McNeill, 1994). However, where soils have either been poorly restored, or already replaced but have suffered from subsequent compaction, 'complete cultivation' to 1 m depth is recommended. Complete cultivation uses an excavator to progressively remove and replace the soil without trafficking over the cultivated soil surface. However, this procedure is labour intensive, making it much more expensive than the industrial ripping technique normally favoured by developers. Industrial ripping uses a winged tine cultivator pulled by a prime mover to break up compacted soil. Previous studies have shown that ripping can achieve soil loosening to about 0.6 m, although the effects are reported to be short-lived with recompaction often taking place within the first year (Moffat and Boswell, 1997).

In recent years, research on ripping has improved the process, and evidence of relatively prolonged loosening has been published for soils restored to grassland and arable farming (Foot and Spoor, 2003). As part of these developments in ripping technology, a newly developed prototype ripper, the Mega-Lift, was developed by Tim Howard Engineering Services ([www.maxi-lift.co.uk](http://www.maxi-lift.co.uk)) to be tested for its applicability for land restoration primarily to a woodland end-use. The equipment design was based on the principles outlined in Spoor (1998) in order to loosen soil materials to a depth of 1 m in multiple passes. The design aimed to meet the bulk density standard required of soils used in land restoration to woodland and overcome recompaction problems associated with conventional industrial ripping techniques. If successful, the Mega-Lift could offer an improved ripping technology without significantly increasing the cost of the standard

52 industrial ripping operation. However, although it has been demonstrated at different sites, including at  
53 Bramshill Forest in Hampshire in terms of practicability, handling and cost-effectiveness (Jones, 2001), no  
54 evaluation of its effect on ground conditions has previously been reported.

55  
56 This paper presents the results of an investigation to compare the effectiveness of complete cultivation,  
57 standard industrial ripping and the Mega-Lift ripper at achieving sustained soil loosening on restored sand  
58 and gravel workings, based on a fully replicated field experiment.

## 59 **SITE DETAILS**

60 The study site is located at the Warren Heath Plantation in Bramshill Forest, Hampshire, UK (National Grid  
61 Reference SU783594, 51°19'N,0°52'W). The site is a working sand and gravel extraction quarry that has  
62 been subjected to phased excavation and restoration over the past forty years. A 2-4 m deep layer of flint  
63 gravel overlies the Tertiary (Eocene) Bagshot Formation (Curry *et al.*, 1978; Sumbler, 1996) in extensive  
64 plateau deposits. These gravels are overlain by a stony sandy loam drift (Jarvis *et al.*, 1984). Prior to gravel  
65 extraction the regional slope was almost level at an altitude of 100 m above sea level (Moffat and Boswell,  
66 1997). Average annual rainfall is 657 mm (Meteorological Office, 2005).

67  
68 During sand and gravel extraction the soil material is removed and stored on site. The gravel is then  
69 removed to the top of the Bagshot Formation. During restoration, a series of ridges were constructed 30 m  
70 wide and 1.5 m high according to Forestry Commission recommendations (Wilson, 1985). The ridge and  
71 furrow landform was used at Bramshill to minimise the risk of waterlogging as the site has a relatively high  
72 watertable. The ridges were then cross ripped to 0.5 m at a tine spacing of approximately 1.1 m using a  
73 winged tine ripper during August 2000. No further operations had been carried out prior to this study. Signs  
74 of original ripping were still present with some subsequent soil erosion and resettlement. Natural  
75 regeneration of grasses, *Juncus* Spp., heather (*Calluna vulgaris*), gorse (*Ulex europeaus*) and Scots pine  
76 (*Pinus sylvestris*) had taken place across the site.

## 77 **METHODS**

### 78 *Study area*

79 To allow for soil heterogeneity across the study area, experimental treatment plots were grouped into blocks  
80 with similar soil properties. The study area was divided into three blocks (0.4 ha each) with each further  
81 divided into five plots of dimensions 55 m x 14 m.

82

83 The cultivation treatments took place in June 2001 following a dry period when soil conditions were suitable  
84 for cultivation. No further mechanical trafficking over the treatment plots occurred in the three years following  
85 cultivation. The soil is an anthropic Regosol (FAO, 1998) which has been created following sand and gravel  
86 extraction. The soil properties, sampled four years after cultivation, are shown in Table 1. The soil is  
87 relatively homogeneous across the site.

### 88 *Cultivation treatments*

89 The study consisted of five treatments:

- 90 – standard industrial ripping using one pass to 0.9 m measured in loosened soil;
- 91 – deep ripping using two passes of the Mega-lift ripper to 0.75 m measured in loosened soil;
- 92 – deep ripping using four passes of the Mega-lift ripper to 0.9 measured in loosened soil.
- 93 – complete cultivation to 1.1 m;
- 94 – an unloosened control;

95

96 Treatment type was randomised within each block giving three replicates of each cultivation method,  
97 including the control. As an additional experiment to study the long-term impacts of the different cultivation  
98 methods on tree rooting and growth, four tree species were planted in equal sized sub-plots within each plot.

99

100 *Industrial ripper.* The industrial ripping was achieved with a Mark 7 Simba™ rooter with a Mark 6 tool carrier.  
101 The rooter is a winged three tine ripper designed for alleviating compaction to 0.9 m on restored quarries and  
102 opencast coal sites (Simba Machinery Limited, 2005). The tines are positioned in a triangular formation with  
103 a central tine at the front with two tines set behind at a wider working width. The leg length is 0.95 m, the leg  
104 width 7.5 cm and the effective leg spacing 1.1 m. The tine point width is tapered from 6 cm (rounded) to 11  
105 cm, the lift height of the wing is 15 cm and the wing starts 16 cm up the leg, reducing the effective breakout  
106 depth from 0.95 m to 0.79 m, with a total working width of 3.0 m. The crawler used was a 336 kW 45t Fiat  
107 Alliss FD31. The crawler made the first cultivating run, turning at the headland to make the second run,  
108 turning again to run three and so on until the desired area was cultivated. Only one pass was made.

109

110 *Mega-Lift ripper.* The Mega-Lift consists of a five tine ripper mounted onto a tractor / crawler by means of a  
111 trailed drawbar, with hydraulic rams to control the depth of the legs and transporting wheels. Tines are  
112 positioned in a triangular formation with a central tine at the front. A rear packer leaves the soil surface level

113 and firm. The length of each of tine leg is 1.05 m, leg width is 2.5 cm and the effective leg spacing 0.7 m.  
114 The tine point width is 3 cm and the lift height of the wing 5 cm. The wing, with a width of 28.5 cm, starts at  
115 the base of the leg and 1 cm above the tine point, and the total working width is 3.5 m. The crawler used  
116 was a 336 kW 45 t Fiat Alliss FD31.

117

118 The effectiveness of the Mega-lift ripper at alleviating soil compaction was trialled in both two and four  
119 passes, aiming loosening to 1.0 m in both cases. Previous field trials (Jones, 2001) found that the Mega-Lift  
120 failed to achieve loosening to 1.0 m in two passes, but achieved this depth successfully after four passes.  
121 The crawler made the first cultivation run, turning at the headland to make the second run, turning again to  
122 run three and so on until the desired area was cultivated. At the end of the final run, the crawler turned back  
123 to the first run and started the second pass, running deeper than the first pass to ensure further loosening of  
124 the soil. This process was repeated for the third and fourth passes. During the two pass operation, the  
125 depths of loosening were aimed at 0.5 and 1.0 m in the first and second pass respectively. During the four  
126 pass operation the progressive depths of loosening were intended to reach 0.35, 0.50, 0.75 and 0.9 m from  
127 the unloosened soil surface.

128

129 *Complete cultivation.* A 99 kW 21 t Komatsu PC210 LC excavator, fitted with 700 mm tracks, was used for  
130 the complete cultivation treatment. The Komatsu PC210 LC has a boom length of 12.8 m. The bucket width  
131 is 0.95 m and the capacity 1 m<sup>3</sup>, with teeth 4 x 10 cm spaced at 19 cm intervals. This loosening followed the  
132 Profiled Strip Method as shown in Figure 1.

133

134 *Control.* The control plots received no ground disturbance following the initial restoration in 2000.

135 *Assessments*

136 *Penetration resistance.* Unfortunately, no measurements of penetration resistance were taken at the time of  
137 cultivation. Penetration resistance was recorded three years after cultivation, using a modified Bush  
138 recording cone penetrometer (Anderson *et al.*, 1980). The assessments were carried out when the soil was  
139 at field capacity (November 2004) in an attempt to standardise the effects of soil moisture on penetration  
140 resistance values; soil samples were taken and analysed for moisture content and there was found to be no  
141 significant difference between the treatments. A board with holes at 0.1 m intervals was laid alongside two  
142 adjacent trees in each of the four species sub-plots. Twenty measurements were taken every 0.1 m along a  
143 2 m transect from 0.2 m to the left of a planted tree 1 to 0.2 m to the right of planted tree 2, giving a profile

144 size of 1.90 x 0.45 m (0.855 m<sup>2</sup>). The penetrometer recorded the soil resistance at 0.03 m depth intervals  
145 down to a total depth of 0.45 m. It is possible that some soil loosening may have occurred following  
146 cultivation during the tree planting undertaken as part of the wider study into rooting, but this would have  
147 been localised to the immediate positions around each tree, and relatively uniform across the treatments.

148

149 All of the cultivation treatments used were designed to achieve soil loosening to a depth greater than the  
150 0.45 m recorded by the penetrometer. A method using an ELE 'lifting driving tool' reported by Baker (1990)  
151 was therefore employed to ascertain the degree of soil loosening to a depth of 1.1 m. This work was carried  
152 out in February 2005, when the soil was at field capacity. This tool consists of a driving point 15 cm in  
153 length, with a maximum diameter of 2.6 cm tapering to 2.3 cm after 11.5 cm, the remaining 3.5 cm reducing  
154 to a cone with an angle of 30°. This is screwed onto a cylindrical rod of 1.0 m length and 1.2 cm diameter.  
155 The point was driven into the ground using a 3 kg drop hammer which attaches to the top of the rod. The  
156 drop hammer was raised and allowed to drop repeatedly under gravity and the number of impacts required to  
157 drive the point into the soil to a depth of 0.1 m recorded. This was repeated for each 0.1 m increment down  
158 to a depth of 1.1 m. The board was again laid alongside two adjacent trees in two of the species sub-plots  
159 from 0.2 m to the left of tree 1 to 0.2 m to the right of tree 2. The 'lifting driving tool' was used at 0.2 m  
160 intervals along a 2 m transect.

#### 161 *Statistical analysis*

162 The penetrometer measurements were averaged across each 2 m transect at each 3 cm depth increment.  
163 These mean values were then subjected to a square root transformation to equalise the variance. The 0 m,  
164 0.03 m and 0.45 m penetrometer values were discarded as there were very small variations between them.

165

166 The 'lifting driving tool' measurements were averaged across the 2 m transect taken alongside each tree at  
167 each 10 cm increment. The mean values were then subjected to a log transformation to satisfy the analysis  
168 assumptions.

169

170 Repeated measures analysis using the method of residual maximum likelihood (REML) in Genstat version  
171 8.1 (Genstat, 2005) was employed to analyse both the penetrometer and 'lifting driving tool' data. The layout  
172 factors (i.e. block, plot, sub-plot) were input as random effects with depth, cultivation treatment and species  
173 as fixed effects. A Wald statistic divided by its degrees of freedom was used to evaluate the significance of  
174 differences among cultivation methods, tree species and soil depths. This value has an approximate F-

175 distribution with  $m$ ,  $n$  degrees of freedom, where  $m$  is the degrees of freedom for the fixed effect and  $n$  is the  
176 number of residual degrees of freedom for that effect. An approximate value for  $n$  was chosen by taking into  
177 account the size of the variance components of the random effects and the residual variation. The REML  
178 analysis was used to ascertain whether there was a significant difference in the soil penetration resistance  
179 between the different tree species. It was found that there was not and therefore the effect of species was  
180 removed from the analysis ( $P=0.91$  for penetrometer and  $P=0.31$  for 'lifting driving tool').

181  
182 Several alternative REML Repeated Measures models were tested (Genstat, 2005). An auto-regressive  
183 order 1 model for the correlations between depths with heterogeneity of variance (to allow for unequal  
184 variances) was accepted for both the penetrometer and the 'lifting driving tool' measurements. T-tests were  
185 used to evaluate the depths at which the penetration resistances differed significantly among the cultivation  
186 treatments.

187  
188 An auto-regressive Order 1 model was applied to the penetrometer data measured at the 0.03 m soil depth  
189 increments. This assumed that at adjacent depths penetration resistance values will be more highly  
190 correlated than those further away in the profile. An auto-regressive Order 1 model was also applied to the  
191 repeated measures (by depth) data obtained using the 'lifting driving tool'. This assumed that the number of  
192 impacts of the drop hammer at adjacent depths will be more highly correlated than depths further away in the  
193 profile.

## 194 **RESULTS**

### 195 *Penetrometer*

196 As expected the penetration resistance increased with increasing depth across all treatments ( $P<0.001$ ).  
197 The penetration resistance was significantly different between the cultivation treatments ( $P=0.013$ ) as was  
198 the interaction between depth and cultivation treatment ( $P<0.001$ ). The depths at which significant  
199 differences were observed between treatments are shown in Table 2.

200  
201 When averaged across depth the cultivation treatments all significantly reduced the penetration resistance of  
202 the soil compared to the control. There was no significant difference in the average penetration resistance  
203 between the soils treated with the two pass Mega-lift and either the industrial rip or the four pass Mega-lift.  
204 However, four pass Mega-lift treated soils had a significantly greater penetration resistance than those



205 cultivated with the industrial ripper above 0.12 m, but below this there was no significant difference. The  
206 penetration resistance values for the industrial and Mega-Lift ripped soils were significantly higher than those  
207 subjected to the complete cultivation below 0.18 and 0.21 m respectively. Table 3 and Figure 2 show the  
208 mean penetration resistance values that were recorded for each cultivation treatment at each depth.

#### 209 *Lifting Driving Tool*

210 As expected, soil resistance increased with increasing depth across all treatments ( $P<0.001$ ). Soil  
211 resistance was also significantly different between the cultivation treatments ( $P<0.001$ ) as was the interaction  
212 between depth and cultivation treatment ( $p<0.001$ ). The depths at which significant differences were  
213 observed between treatments are shown in Table 5.

214

215 Soil penetration resistance values in the control plots were significantly larger than those for the treated plots  
216 at relatively shallow depths (between 0.10 and 0.30 m), although these differences were not apparent below  
217 0.70 m and 0.80 m in the industrial rip and Mega-Lift plots. This suggests that these methods of soil  
218 loosening are not effective below these depths. Penetration resistance of the soils treated with the two pass  
219 Mega-Lift were not significantly different from those for the industrially ripped plots. Contrary to the results  
220 presented using the penetrometer there was a significant difference between two and four pass Mega-lift  
221 treatment; the penetration resistance for the two pass treated soil being significantly larger between 0.20 and  
222 0.50 m soil depth. The penetration resistance values for the industrial and Mega-Lift ripped soils were  
223 significantly greater than those under complete cultivation below 0.20 and 0.50 m respectively.

224

225 Table 6 and Figure 3 show the mean number of impacts taken to force the 'lifting driving tool' each 0.1 m  
226 depth increment for each cultivation treatment at each depth. These values demonstrate the large treatment  
227 differences in the number of impacts required to drive the point into the soil. The control plot required  
228 approximately 20 impacts to penetrate one 0.10 m increment at a relatively shallow depth (0.20 – 0.30 m)  
229 compared to the other treatments (0.60 – 0.8 m).

230

## DISCUSSION

231 Comparison of the different cultivation treatments at Bramshill suggests that complete cultivation is the most  
232 technically effective method for alleviating soil compaction. All of the tested cultivation treatments resulted in  
233 some degree of soil loosening compared to the control. Previous studies have reported that both tree and  
234 crop root growth is significantly impeded in soils with penetration resistance values in excess of 1.3 MPa and

235 1.5 MPa (Zou *et al.*, 2001 and Boone and Veen, 1994, respectively) and effectively ceases in those with  
236 values above 2 MPa (Taylor and Ratcliff, 1969) or 3 MPa (Greacen and Sands, 1980; Boone and Veen,  
237 1994). On the basis of previous studies, a value of 2 MPa was selected as likely to indicate a significant  
238 reduction in root growth. Using such a threshold allows a comparison of potential rooting across the  
239 treatments, although it is recognised that its use assumes that there are no continuous pores or fissures  
240 present within the profile that would allow root growth. The data from both the penetrometer and the 'lifting  
241 driving tool' suggests that the control plots reached the 2 MPa threshold value at an average depth of 0.20  
242 m. This has important implications when it is considered that this was not a true control plot, as it had been  
243 subjected to industrial cross-ripping to 0.50 m in 2000 prior to this study. It infers that either a significant  
244 amount of recompaction has taken place on the site following its restoration or that the original cross-ripping  
245 had been ineffective at reaching depths greater than 0.20 m. Moffat and Boswell (1997) also found that after  
246 four years there was very little difference in the depth at which a penetration resistance of 2 MPa was  
247 attained between ripped and unripped soils.

248

249 The industrial and Mega-Lift rippers both achieved sustained soil loosening at Bramshill compared to the  
250 control. However, these treatments only achieved a penetration resistance value of less than 2 MPa to a  
251 depth of approximately 0.23 under industrial rip, and 0.24 and 0.33 m under the two and four pass Mega-Lift  
252 ripper respectively. This suggests that rooting may be impeded below these depths and well above the 1.2  
253 m rootable depth currently recommended by UK guidance (Bending *et al.*, 1999, Defra, 2005). The degree  
254 of rooting suggested by the penetration resistance data is not sufficient for sustainable tree growth as mature  
255 trees are expected to draw water from a depth of 1.5 to 2.0 m during summer months at this Bramshill site  
256 (Fourt and Hinson, 1970). Similarly, minimum soil depths for woodland establishment on this site are  
257 estimated as between 1.5 and 2.0 m (Moffat, 1995). Whilst the results suggest that successful woodland  
258 establishment may not be achieved using these treatments, the soil loosening observed here may be  
259 adequate for amenity grassland, which may only require a soil depth of 0.5 m (Bending *et al.*, 1999). The  
260 industrial and Mega-lift rippers may also provide sufficient soil loosening for shallow rooting crops such as  
261 potatoes. However, the planting of shallow rooting crops, those that require late harvesting or that would  
262 result in bare soil over winter months is not recommended for newly restored mineral sites as they do little to  
263 improve soil structure in the long-term (Defra, 2005).

264

265 The soil penetration resistance values achieved on the industrial ripped plots were significantly less than the  
266 control to a depth of 0.45 m. The data from the 'lifting driving tool' suggest that industrial ripper achieved

267 significantly greater soil loosening compared to the control to a depth of 0.70 m, which is shallower than the  
268 target 0.9 m depth of loosening. The high penetration resistance values recorded in this treatment are  
269 probably the result of recompaction over the three years following cultivation that has previously been  
270 reported for this site under industrial ripping (Moffat and Boswell, 1997). The results support the suggestion  
271 by Moffat and Boswell (1997) that the industrial ripper may not be the most appropriate choice of method for  
272 achieving sustainable soil loosening on sites suffering from severe compaction.

273

274 The soil penetration resistance values recorded following the Mega-Lift ripper are significantly less than the  
275 control to a depth of 0.42 m. The values obtained using the 'lifting driving tool' demonstrated that this greater  
276 loosening is maintained to a depth of 0.80 m. This depth is comparable with the target loosening depth of  
277 0.75 m in two passes, but shallower than the 0.9 m target for four passes. Qualitative work carried out on  
278 the soil profile immediately following cultivation suggested that the use of the Mega-Lift ripper had resulted in  
279 relatively uniform soil loosening to a depth of 1.0 m, from the loosened soil surface, under the four pass  
280 treatment (Jones, 2001). It is therefore likely that the soils treated with the Mega-Lift ripper also suffered  
281 from recompaction in the three years following cultivation. Depending on growth rate, it is possible that tree  
282 roots could have developed sufficiently before recompaction occurred. However, data on early rooting from  
283 this site suggest that this is not the case as the mean maximum rooting depth in the plots treated by  
284 complete cultivation were 0.53 and 0.74 m after 1 and 3 years growth respectively (Sinnott, unpublished  
285 data). On similar sites it may prove beneficial to plant deep rooting crops such as lucerne or winter cereals  
286 following restoration as they can contribute to the longevity of loosening operations if planted prior to  
287 recompaction taking place (Greacen and Sands, 1980; Defra, 2005). In addition, the soils at Bramshill have  
288 a high sand content which may have resulted in a greater degree of recompaction taking place following  
289 cultivation using either the industrial or Mega-lift rippers than would be expected on heavier textured soils  
290 (Greacen and Sands, 1980). It is also possible that in the future recompaction may occur on plots treated  
291 with complete cultivation.

292

293 The greater penetration resistance observed at depths above 0.12 m in the four pass Mega-Lift treated plots  
294 compared with those treated with the industrial ripper may be explained by the presence of the rear packer  
295 on the Mega-Lift that firms the upper surface of the soil (Jones, 2001). When assessing penetration  
296 resistance using the 'lifting driving tool' the four pass Mega-lift ripper gave greater soil loosening than the  
297 industrial ripper between 0.20 and 0.70 m. Similarly, the soil treated using the four pass Mega-lift had a  
298 smaller penetration resistance than the two pass alternative between 0.20 and 0.50 m. This suggests that

299 whilst the Mega-Lift may have failed to maintain a 'rootable' profile to 1.0 m depth it still resulted in  
300 significantly more soil loosening than the industrial ripper when the four pass method was employed.

301

302 It may be more appropriate to compare the Mega-lift ripper with complete cultivation, as this is the current  
303 best practice methodology where soil material has already been placed. The penetrometer data for the  
304 complete cultivation suggests that on average the soil depth at which 2 MPa is exceeded is not reached at  
305 the maximum depth of 0.42 m. Complete cultivation resulted in significantly smaller penetration resistance  
306 values than any of the other cultivation treatments tested, although the penetrometer readings suggest that  
307 this difference is not apparent below 0.36 m and 0.39 m when compared to the Mega-lift or industrial ripper  
308 treatments respectively. When the 'lifting driving tool' was used to assess penetration resistance the soils  
309 subjected to complete cultivation appeared significantly looser than control soils below 0.30 m. These  
310 results suggest that complete cultivation is capable of providing a suitable 'rootable' medium to a depth of at  
311 least 0.42 m. Unfortunately, it is not possible to give penetration resistance values in MPa below the reach  
312 of the penetrometer. However, complete cultivation resulted in soils that were significantly looser than either  
313 control soils or those cultivated using the alternative treatments to a depth of 1.10 m. This maintains the  
314 premise that complete cultivation is currently the most effective method of alleviating compaction where soil  
315 or soil-forming materials are already present on the site in their final position.

316

317 The Mega-lift ripper was not as effective at alleviating soil compaction as complete cultivation. The  
318 differences between these treatments are apparent below 0.21 m using the penetrometer and 0.50 m using  
319 the 'lifting driving tool'. The operational cost of the Mega-lift ripper is comparable to that of an industrial  
320 ripper (£744 per ha and £700 per ha respectively), making it substantially cheaper than complete cultivation  
321 (£1500 per ha) (Jones, 2001). However, in these trials the Mega-lift ripper performed relatively poorly  
322 compared to complete cultivation, failing to achieve equivalent soil loosening below, at best, 0.50 m  
323 regardless of the number of passes used. This may have been due to the lift height of the wing; the greater  
324 the lift height the greater the degree of soil disturbance (Spoor, 2006). The Mega-lift has a lift wing height of  
325 5 cm which is less than the 10-12 cm recommended by Spoor (1998) for deep ripping. A further limitation to  
326 the use of this equipment is that trials conducted on a clay soil by Forest Research Technical Development  
327 Branch on the handling of the machinery found that when a 316 kW 23 t John Deere 9400T and 250 kW 37 t  
328 D8 Caterpillar were used as the prime mover, they struggled to pull the Mega-Lift (Jones, 2001), although  
329 they may be adequate in soils with a lower clay content. These tractors are often more readily available to  
330 site developers than the powerful Fiat Alliss FD31 (or equivalent) used in this study.

331

332 The higher standard deviations at depths below 0.70 m suggest that there is considerable variation between  
333 the soil loosening achieved by the industrial and Mega-Lift rippers at depth. This may be explained by the  
334 presence of undisturbed soil between the tines of both rippers, and a greater degree of soil loosening at the  
335 tine locations. However, this is likely to have been minimised during the Mega-lift treatments by the use of  
336 multiple passes, and the breakout profiles carried out after cultivation on the Mega-lift treatments showed  
337 that the loosening was relatively uniform. The high degree of variability in these profiles is likely to result in  
338 some areas of soil that can be penetrated by roots, even though the mean penetration resistance  
339 measurements suggest that the soil is too compact. Additionally, where subsoil compaction exists, it is  
340 possible that crop roots may grow laterally or restrict themselves to the lower density areas of soil without a  
341 significant reduction in productivity (Hamza and Anderson, 2005). It has been reported that penetrometers  
342 may overestimate the soil resistance by two to eight times compared to that which may be the encountered  
343 by the root (Bengough and Mullins, 1991; Whiteley *et al.*, 1981). This is primarily due to the increased  
344 frictional resistance on the metal probe of the penetrometer. In addition, the metal probe is forced vertically  
345 into the soil profile, whereas roots will develop around compacted areas (Bengough and Mullins, 1990). A  
346 study is currently underway to assess the effects of these cultivation treatments on tree rooting and this will  
347 provide further information on the reliability of the penetrometer and 'lifting driving tool' to estimate the rooting  
348 potential of restored soil materials.

349

350 Our study suggests that when restoring soils following mineral extraction the risk of compaction can be  
351 significantly minimised by following current best practice. Loose tipping of replaced soil materials can  
352 prevent compaction from occurring, thus avoiding the need for any additional cultivation treatments (Moffat  
353 and McNeill, 1994; Bending *et al.* 1999).

354

## CONCLUSION

355 The study at the former sand and gravel pit at Bramshill Forest has demonstrated that new ripping  
356 technologies using the Mega-lift ripper are effective at alleviating a degree of soil compaction to a depth of  
357 approximately 0.80 m using either two or four passes. However, the soil penetration resistance was greater  
358 than 2 MPa at relatively shallow depths, indicating that the level of alleviation may be insufficient, to avoid  
359 restriction in depth of tree root penetration. Three years after treatment, complete cultivation remains the  
360 most effective method of alleviating soil compaction. The relative failure of ripping to produce a soil profile  
361 which met satisfactory conditions for tree development, combined with the comparatively high cost of

362 complete cultivation emphasises that prevention of soil compaction is better than cure. In order to eliminate  
363 the need for cultivation, soil should be replaced using loose tipping at the restoration stage.  
364

365

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

366 We are grateful to Kirsten Foot for initial experimental design and set up, and the Forest Research Technical  
367 Support Unit staff at Alice Holt for assisting with experimental set up and maintenance. We also thank Matt  
368 Williams and Tom Ormesher for conducting field measurements, Andy Moffat for technical guidance and Ian  
369 Willoughby for reviewing the paper.  
370

371

## REFERENCES

- 372 Anderson, G., Pidgeon, J.D., Spencer, H.B. & Parks, R. 1980. A new hand-held recording penetrometer for  
373 soil studies. *Journal of Soil Science* 31, 279-296.
- 374 Baker, R.M. 1990. Investigations into selected properties of open-cast spoil related to tree growth.  
375 *Arboricultural Journal* 14, 129-137.
- 376 Bending, N.A.D., McRae, S.G. & Moffat, A.J. 1999. *Soil-forming materials: Their use in land reclamation*.  
377 The Stationery Office, 123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ.
- 378 Bengough, A.G. & Mullins, C.E. 1990. Mechanical impedance to root growth: a review of experimental  
379 techniques and root growth responses. *Journal of Soil Science* 41, 341-358.
- 380 Bengough, A.G. & Mullins, C.E. 1991. Penetrometer resistance, root penetration resistance and root  
381 elongation rate in two sandy loam soils. *Plant and Soil* 131, 59-66.
- 382 Boone, F.R. & Veen, B.W. 1994. Mechanisms of crop responses to soil compaction. In: Soil compaction in  
383 crop production (eds B.D. Soane & C. van Ouwerkerk), *Developments in Agricultural Engineering* 11,  
384 Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp 237-264.
- 385 Curry, D., Adams, C.G., Boulter, M.C., Dilley, F.C., Eames, F.E., Funnell, B.M. & Wells, M.K. 1978. A  
386 correlation of Tertiary rocks in the British Isles. Spec. Rep. 12, Geological Society of London, pp 72.
- 387 Defra 2005. *Guidance for Successful Reclamation of Mineral and Waste Sites*. Defra, London.
- 388 FAO 1998. World reference base for soil resources. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United  
389 Nations, Rome.
- 390 Foot, K.J. & Spoor, G. 2003. Breaking restored ground – ripping really works. *Mineral Planning* 94, 6-9.
- 391 Fourt, D.F. & Hinson, W.H. 1970. Water relations of tree crops. A comparison between Corsican pine and  
392 Douglas fir in south-east England. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 7, 295-309.
- 393 GenStat. 2005. *The Guide to GenStat Release 8.1 Part 2: Statistics* (ed R.W. Payne). Lawes Agricultural  
394 Trust (Rothamstead Experimental Station). Oxford: VSN International.
- 395 Greacen, E.L. & Sands, R. 1980. Compaction of forest soils. A Review. *Australian Journal of Soil Science*  
396 18, 163-89.
- 397 Hamza, M.A. & Anderson, W.K. 2005. Soil compaction in cropping systems: A review of the nature, causes  
398 and possible solutions. *Soil and Tillage Research* 82, 121-145.
- 399 Jarvis, M.G., Allen, R.H., Fordham, S.J., Hazelden, J., Moffat, A.J. & Sturdy, R.G. 1984. *Soils and their use*  
400 *in south-east England*. Bulletin of the Soil Survey of England Wales 15, Harpenden, UK.



- 401 Jones, B.J. 2001. *Deep cultivation trials*. Forest Research Technical Development Branch Internal Report  
402 600A/22/01. Unpublished. Forestry Commission, Ae Village, Dumfries, Scotland DG1 1QB.
- 403 Meteorological Office. 2005. *Average annual rainfall (mm) over the period 1971-2000 from Meteorological*  
404 *Office Integrated Data Archive System (MIDAS)*. Meteorological Office, Exeter, UK.
- 405 Moffat, A.J. 1995. Minimum soil depths for the establishment of woodland on disturbed ground.  
406 *Arboricultural Journal* 19, 19-27.
- 407 Moffat, A.J. & Boswell, R.C. 1997. The effectiveness of cultivation using the winged tine on restored sand  
408 and gravel workings. *Soil and Tillage Research* 40, 111-124.
- 409 Moffat, A.J. & McNeill, J.D. 1994. *Reclaiming disturbed land for forestry*. Forestry Commission Bulletin 110.  
410 HMSO, London.
- 411 Reynolds, C. 1999. *Total cultivation of compacted soils on reclamation sites*. Forest Research Technical  
412 Note 30/98, Forest Research Technical Development Branch, Ae Village, Dumfries, Scotland, DG1  
413 1QB.
- 414 Simba Machinery Limited. 2005. *Specification sheet for Simba: The World's best roter covering Marks 6, 7*  
415 *and 8*. Received from Simba International, Lincolnshire.
- 416 Spoor, G. 1998. *Loosening of compacted restored sites prior to tree crop establishment: Equipment and*  
417 *operational specifications*. Report to Forestry Commission Technical Development Branch, Rugeley.
- 418 Spoor, G. 2006. Alleviation of soil compaction: requirements, equipment and techniques. *Soil Use and*  
419 *Management* 22, 113-122.
- 420 Sumbler, M.G. 1996. *British Regional Geology: London and the Thames Valley*. British Geological Survey,  
421 HMSO, London.
- 422 Taylor, H.M. & Ratcliff, L.F. 1969. Root growth pressures of cotton, peas and peanuts. *Agronomy Journal*  
423 61, 398-402.
- 424 Whiteley, G.M., Utomo, W.H. & Dexter, A.R. 1981. A comparison of penetrometer pressures and the  
425 pressures exerted by roots. *Plant and Soil* 61, 351-364.
- 426 Wilson, K. 1985. *A guide to the reclamation of mineral workings for forestry*. Forestry Commission  
427 Research and Development Paper 141, Forestry Commission, Silvan House, 231 Corstorphine  
428 Road, Edinburgh EH12 7AT.
- 429 Zou, C., Penfold, C., Sands, R., Misra, R.K & Hudson, I. 2001. Effects of soil air-filled porosity, soil matric  
430 potential and soil strength on primary root growth of radiate pine seedlings. *Plant and Soil* 236, 105-  
431 115.

432

- 433 **Table 1: Mean physical soil properties at the Warren Heath Plantation**
- 434 **Table 2: Depths below which there was significant difference ( $P<0.05$ ) between two cultivation**  
435 **treatments (n=56)**
- 436 **Table 3: Mean penetration resistance values recorded for each cultivation treatment determined by a**  
437 **penetrometer (n=56)**
- 438 **Table 4: Predicted mean area of the profile where the penetration resistance was less than 2 MPa for**  
439 **each cultivation treatment (n=56)**
- 440 **Table 5: Depths below which there was significant difference ( $P<0.05$ ) between two cultivation**  
441 **treatments using the 'lifting driving tool' (n=37)**
- 442 **Table 6: Mean number of impacts recorded for each cultivation treatment (n=37)**
- 443

444 **Table 1: Mean physical soil properties at Warren Heath Plantation (n=56). Values in parenthesis**  
 445 **indicate standard deviation.**

<b>Depth (cm)</b>	<b>Organic matter content<sup>a</sup> (%)</b>	<b>Sand<sup>a</sup> (%)</b>	<b>Silt<sup>a</sup> (%)</b>	<b>Clay<sup>a</sup> (%)</b>	<b>Stoniness<sup>b</sup> (%)</b>	<b>Textural class<sup>c</sup></b>
0 – 20	7.8 (2.0)	73.5 (2.7)	20.3 (2.8)	6.3 (1.2)	10.5 (3.8)	Sandy loam
20 – 40	6.7 (2.0)	74.4 (2.5)	17.7 (3.4)	7.9 (1.7)	8.2 (3.1)	Sandy loam
60 – 80	6.4 (1.5)	73.8 (3.1)	18.8 (2.9)	7.4 (1.7)	10.0 (2.5)	Sandy loam
80 – 100	5.7 (1.5)	74.7 (2.2)	16.5 (2.7)	8.8 (1.3)	12.0 (2.8)	Sandy loam

446 <sup>a</sup> as a percentage of <2 mm fraction; <sup>b</sup> as a percentage of total soil, n=80; <sup>c</sup> USDA system

447 **Table 2: Depths below which there was significant difference ( $P<0.05$ ) between two cultivation**  
 448 **treatments using the penetrometer (n=56)**

Treatment	Significant differences between treatments (depths at which $P<0.05$ )
2 pass Mega-Lift	a (below 0.15 m)
Complete cultivation	a (below 0.18 m); b, c (between 0.21 and 0.36 m); d (between 0.18 and 0.39 m)
4 pass Mega-Lift	a (below 0.18 m)
Industrial ripper	a (below 0.18 m); c (above 0.12 m)

449 Letters indicate where penetration resistance is significantly less than control (a), 2 pass Mega-Lift (b), 4 pass Mega-Lift (c) and  
 450 industrial ripper (d)

451

452 **Table 3: Mean penetration resistance values recorded for each cultivation treatment (n=56)**

		Mean penetration resistance values at each depth of measurement (MPa)														
Depth (m)		0.03	0.06	0.09	0.12	0.15	0.18	0.21	0.24	0.27	0.30	0.33	0.36	0.39	0.42	0.45
Control	Mean	0.04	0.23	0.68	1.20	1.58	1.90	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>5.09</b>
	SD	0.04	0.08	0.20	0.55	0.72	0.61	0.68	0.69	0.86	0.96	1.12	0.92	0.96	0.60	1.35
2 pass Mega-Lift	Mean	0.07	0.38	0.79	1.12	1.40	1.56	1.79	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>2.85</b>
	SD	0.07	0.21	0.31	0.34	0.35	0.31	0.34	0.32	0.30	0.29	0.26	0.32	0.53	0.51	1.14
Complete cultivation	Mean	0.05	0.25	0.66	0.92	1.14	1.23	1.33	1.43	1.55	1.63	1.71	1.82	1.78	1.87	1.97
	SD	0.05	0.12	0.19	0.21	0.32	0.34	0.41	0.45	0.43	0.45	0.40	0.51	0.41	0.33	0.96
4 pass Mega-Lift	Mean	0.12	0.48	0.94	1.20	1.26	1.43	1.69	1.79	1.86	1.99	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.31</b>
	SD	0.14	0.26	0.24	0.29	0.32	0.30	0.37	0.40	0.43	0.40	0.39	0.54	0.54	0.35	0.66
Industrial ripper	Mean	0.06	0.24	0.62	0.95	1.29	1.64	1.85	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>3.47</b>
	SD	0.08	0.18	0.26	0.36	0.39	0.50	0.55	0.58	0.60	0.64	0.58	0.69	0.60	0.87	1.26

453 Values in bold indicate where the critical rooting value of 2 MPa is exceeded.

454

455 **Table 4: Predicted mean area of the profile where the penetration resistance was less than 2 MPa for**  
 456 **each cultivation treatment (n=56)**

	Control	2 pass Mega-Lift	Complete cult.	4 pass Mega-Lift	Industrial ripper
Mean area (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.45	0.54	0.69	0.59	0.55
Mean area (%)	53.0	63.0	80.8	69.3	64.6

457 Mean area calculated from the depth at which 2 MPa value was not exceeded across the 1.90 m profile. The percentage area  
 458 calculated from the mean area available for rooting in the 1.90 x 0.45 m (0.855 m<sup>2</sup>) profile.

459 **Table 5: Depths below which there was significant difference ( $P<0.05$ ) between two cultivation**  
 460 **treatments using the 'lifting driving tool' (n=37)**

Treatment	Significant differences between treatments (depths at which $P<0.05$ )
2 pass Mega-Lift	a (between 0.20 and 0.80 m)
Complete cultivation	a (below 0.30 m); b, c (below 0.50 m); d (between 0.20 and 0.80 m)
4 pass Mega-Lift`	a (between 0.10 and 0.80 m); b (between 0.20 and 0.50 m); d (between 0.20 and 0.70 m)
Industrial ripper	a (between 0.10 and 0.80 m)

461 Letters indicate where penetration resistance is significantly lower than control (a), 2 pass Mega-Lift (b), 4 pass Mega-Lift (c) and  
 462 industrial ripper (d)

463

464 **Table 6: Mean number of impacts recorded for each cultivation treatment (n=37)**

		Mean number of impacts each depth increment (Number of impacts)										
	Depth (m)	0.0-0.1	0.1-0.2	0.2-0.3	0.3-0.4	0.4-0.5	0.5-0.6	0.6-0.7	0.7-0.8	0.8-0.9	0.9-1.0	1.0-1.1
Control	Mean	5.26	9.87	21.13	35.55	60.13	59.97	58.65	59.14	66.33	85.87	74.02
	SD	1.26	4.28	7.88	10.67	12.51	25.46	27.02	27.19	24.85	33.87	36.23
2 pass	Mean	4.66	6.80	11.54	11.74	13.99	13.53	13.69	23.31	43.85	65.49	57.55
Mega-Lift	SD	0.61	1.18	3.00	4.04	4.98	6.99	8.74	13.79	17.87	14.49	14.59
Complete cultivation	Mean	3.55	4.56	5.95	6.15	7.87	9.57	11.37	18.31	23.35	32.76	35.78
	SD	0.65	0.49	0.87	1.02	1.64	2.62	3.82	11.05	11.92	17.55	17.96
4 pass	Mean	4.72	5.39	7.64	7.98	8.87	9.75	12.39	27.37	49.85	68.82	55.62
	SD	1.00	0.99	1.25	1.58	2.33	2.31	4.24	23.96	22.58	26.34	26.91
Industrial ripper	Mean	4.33	6.17	10.01	13.40	24.51	32.70	31.24	32.99	45.58	61.73	61.29
	SD	0.71	2.10	3.64	9.31	16.29	16.12	9.34	16.89	25.22	31.91	32.25

465




466 **Figure 1: Profiled Strip Method (Reynolds, 1999)**

467 **Figure 2: Mean penetration resistance of soil under different cultivation treatments (n=56)**


468 **Figure 3: Mean number of impacts taken to penetrate soil under different cultivation treatments**  
469 **(n=37)**

470




471 **Figure 1: Profiled Strip Method (from Reynolds, 1999)**

472



473 **Figure 2: Mean penetration resistance of soil under different cultivation treatments (n=56)**

474



475 **Figure 3: Mean number of impacts taken to penetrate soil under different cultivation treatments**  
 476 **(n=37)**