

1                   **Injecting Bio Solids into Grass and Arable Crops,**  
2                   **Part II: Development of a Shallow Application Technique for Injecting**  
3                   **into Combinable Arable Crops**

4  
5                   D W M Pullen; R J Godwin; P Grundon

6  
7                   Cranfield University at Silsoe, Silsoe, Bedfordshire MK45 4DT, UK:  
8                   e-mail of corresponding author: d.pullen@cranfield.ac.uk

9  
10                  **Abstract**

11                  Digested sludge contains valuable crop nutrients but these are largely lost because current  
12                  application techniques limit where and when it can be applied. Soil injection to depths in excess  
13                  of 150 mm to reduce odour problems can only be used on fallow land or grass because of the  
14                  damage it can cause. This leads to applications at high rates being applied with increased  
15                  environmental risk. The aim of this study was to determine the benefits and limitations of  
16                  injecting digested sewage sludge into land growing arable crops using shallow, less than 100 mm  
17                  deep, injection techniques. Agronomic trials conducted over two years with winter wheat and  
18                  rape showed the crops were surprisingly resistant to mechanical damage during the growing  
19                  season. Crop yields were not effected by injecting sludge into the crop up to March, equivalent  
20                  to growth stage 30 in winter wheat, using a conventional tractor based system working. Injection  
21                  is possible later in the growing season based on systems with the tractor operating along  
22                  “tramlines” for field traffic control.

23  
24                  **1. Introduction**

25  
26                  The nutrient value as a crop fertiliser of bio-solids such as digested sludge and slurry is  
27                  well known (Bowden, 1997). However, this fertilising value is rarely fully utilised because  
28                  current application methods are inefficient and/or can have a high environmental impact. Deep  
29                  injection techniques, ie injecting 150 to 450 mm below the soil surface, are not used in the spring  
30                  in arable crops because of the damage caused by the injection tine (Hann *et al.*, 1992). This  
31                  restricts the area and time where it can be used and as such, applications rates tend to be high  
32                  with consequent pollution risks. Also it has a relatively high draught force requirement, whereas  
33                  surface application techniques have virtually no draught force requirements, cause little crop  
34                  damage but do not contain the odour problem, Moseley *et al.* (1998) and Pahl *et al.* (2001).

35  
36                  Shallow injection 50 to 70 mm below the soil surface in grass is a recent development.  
37                  Here, application rates are much lower 50 m<sup>3</sup>/ha. Using this technique for injecting sludge into

1 the soil in arable crops at rates and times when its nutrient value could be used by the crop would  
2 have many advantages, namely it would:

- 3
- 4 (1) reduce the environmental impact;
- 5 (2) replace some of the inorganic fertiliser needs;
- 6 (3) improve the opportunity for injection and reduce haulage distances as more land would  
7 become available; and
- 8 (4) extend the time during which sludge could be applied.
- 9

10 For successful injection into growing crops it is important the application vehicle causes no  
11 long-term damage and the sludge can be supplied at high rates. Currently, sludge is often  
12 supplied to injection equipment by trailing an umbilical hose behind the tractor. This has the  
13 advantage of continuous supply without the concentrated wheel loadings caused when using the  
14 alternative tanker supply system. The umbilical hose causes little damage on grass (Godwin *et*  
15 *al.*, 1990) but its effect in combinable crops is unknown.

16

17 The aim of this project was to develop a system to incorporate digested sludge into the soil  
18 at 50 m<sup>3</sup>/ha through combinable arable crops during the growing season and to determine the  
19 best application times. The project is documented in two parts. The first describes an  
20 investigation into the design of shallow injection tines (Pullen *et al.*, 2004) and the second, this  
21 paper, describes the agronomic trials undertaken as part of this study. These trials were designed  
22 to determine the long term physical damage to the crop at different times during the growing  
23 season times caused by:

- 24
- 25 (1) the injector;
- 26 (2) the umbilical hose; and
- 27 (3) the tractor wheels.
- 28

## 29 **2. Materials & Methods**

### 30 *2.1. Experimentation*

31

32

33 All work took place on Cranfield University Farm, Silsoe, Bedford over a two year period.  
34 In the first year commercially available equipment was used to apply the sludge (*Fig. 1*). For  
35 the second, a single piece tine with profile III and 40 mm wing (S5), hence forth known in this  
36 paper as the single piece tine (*Fig. 2*), that had been developed in a parallel study (Pullen *et al.*,  
37 2004) evaluated alongside existing commercial designs. All agronomic management decisions

1 not described in the following sections were similar across each trial and undertaken as part of  
2 the normal commercial farm operations.

#### 3 4 2.1.1. *Year one trials*

5 Two trial sites were used, one on a clay soil sown with winter wheat and the other on a sandy  
6 loam soil planted with winter rape. Two identical experiments were set up on each site. One  
7 was designed to find out the physical damage caused to the crop by different application  
8 techniques carried out at different times over the growing season. The other experiment was  
9 designed to determine if supplying sludge by dragging a hose across the ground behind the  
10 injector would cause any lasting crop damage.

11  
12 A replicated block design with split plots was used for the main experiments. Each had three  
13 replications with 20 treatments each at two sludge application levels. The treatments included  
14 three application techniques, one dribbling the sludge on to the soil surface below the crop  
15 canopy and the other two applying the sludge below the ground surface at a depth of about 50  
16 mm. For the subsurface techniques two different machines were used (*Fig. 1*). The three  
17 different application techniques were used at six different times during the crop growing season.  
18 These were spread over the period from just after crop emergence to mid or late flowering (*i.e.*  
19 May - early July).

20  
21 Each plot was split into two equal parts. On one-half digested sludge was applied at the rate  
22 of 50 m<sup>3</sup>/ha. In the other half the applicator was used but no sludge was applied. The purpose  
23 of which was to determine the effect of the physical disturbance caused by the tines alone. On  
24 all plots the quantity of granular nitrogen fertiliser was reduced by 35 kg/ha. This being  
25 equivalent to the estimated fertiliser value of the digested sludge (Bowden, 1997).

26  
27 Two control treatments were included. One control in the winter wheat was given no  
28 nitrogen. In the rape the equivalent control was given a small quantity of nitrogen at the rate of  
29 26 kg/ha as part of an application of ammonia sulphate. The second control as with the sludge  
30 application treatments was split into halves. One-half received the same quantity of granular  
31 fertiliser as the other plots, that is 35 kg/ha less than the recommended rate. On the other half  
32 of this control granular fertiliser was applied at the recommended rate for the crop, *i.e.* winter  
33 wheat 190 kg/ha and rape 155 kg/ha.

34  
35 The nominal gross plot length and width were 45 m and 4.0 m respectively and the net split  
36 plot size was 18 m by 2.2 m, see *Fig. 3*.

1 For the umbilical hose trial a separate replicated experiment was set up using the same  
2 application treatments as the crop damage experiment. Each replicate was positioned at the end  
3 of each plot on the main experiment, see *Fig 3*. This permitted the applicator to be drawn  
4 straight out from the crop damage plots and across the area used for the hose tests. On the area  
5 used for the hose trails the sludge supply to the applicator was switched off. Granular nitrogen  
6 was applied at 35 kg/ha less than the recommended rate. The nominal gross plot size was 4.0  
7 m wide by 20 m long. Net plot size was 2.2 m by 2.0 m.

### 8 9 2.1.2. *Year two trials*

10 In the second year two identical replicated experiments were set up, one on clay and the other  
11 on sandy loam soils. Both were planted with winter wheat. The purpose of these experiments  
12 was to gain further evidence of the effect of injecting sludge into growing crops and to compare  
13 the single piece tine (S5) (Pullen *et al.*, 2004) with the existing commercial slipperfoot (C1).  
14

15 The design used for both experiments was the same. Each was a randomised block design  
16 with three replications. The gross plot size was 20 m long by 4.0 m wide. The net size was 18  
17 m long by 1.6 m wide. The net width kept the wheels of the tractor pulling the injector outside  
18 the harvested area (*Fig. 4*).  
19

20 Ten treatments were undertaken. Seven treatments received a single application of sludge  
21 during the growing season but at different times. This included three with the slipperfoot (C1),  
22 that is December, March and May, and four with the single piece tine (S5), that is December,  
23 February, March and May. The eighth treatment received two sludge applications, one in  
24 February and the second in March, applied with the single piece tine (S5). The granular  
25 fertiliser rate was reduced by 35 kg/ha on all the plots where sludge was applied. Two controls  
26 were used, one where the recommended granular fertiliser rate was applied and the other  
27 received no fertiliser.  
28

## 29 2.2. *Equipment & procedures*

### 30 31 2.2.1. *Year one trials*

32 Two machines were used to inject the sludge. These were the shallow I (C2) and the  
33 slipperfoot (C1). Both machines were designed to inject animal slurry into grassland, neither  
34 being specifically designed to work in arable crops. The shallow I was also used to provide a  
35 surface application by simulating the dribble bar application technique (C2D). For this the  
36 individual arms were locked parallel to the travel direction and pulled across the plot with the  
37 tines just clear of the ground surface but below the crop cover.

1 The general layout of the implement onto which the shallow tines (C2) were attached is  
2 shown in *Fig. 5*. It consists of a rotary distribution valve and twelve injection units. The  
3 injection units are grouped in pairs. Each pair being attached to the mainframe on a pivot that  
4 allows it to swing sideways. They were also spring-loaded. In work the height of the main  
5 toolbar was approximately 450 mm from the ground, whilst, the clearance under the frame  
6 connecting two injectors was only 120 mm. Each injector consisted of an opening disc and a  
7 blade to form a slot into which the sludge was placed. The shape of the foot (*Fig. 1 a*) is similar  
8 in design to a Suffolk Coulter and had a negative rake angle, that is trailing backwards and  
9 downwards from the front. Spacing between individual injectors was 250 mm and the overall  
10 machine working width was 3.0 m.

11  
12 The overall design of the distribution system, frame and weight transfer system used on the  
13 implement which the slipperfoot were fitted was similar to that used for the shallow tines. The  
14 main difference being each injection blade was independently mounted on the frame allowing  
15 each to freely swing sideways. Soil engaging parts were also mounted on a spring-loaded  
16 parallel linkage. These consisted of a small opening disc followed by the opening tine, the  
17 slipperfoot (*Fig. 1 b*). The machine used in the trials had an overall working width of 3.6 m with  
18 tines spaced at 200 mm.

19  
20 For all the tests the application equipment was mounted on a 93 kW 4WD tractor. Flotation  
21 tyres were fitted for applications early in the growing season. Later, as soil conditions improved  
22 these were replaced with standard tyres. The rear wheel centres used with the different tyre  
23 arrangements were 2.0 and 1.8 m respectively. All applications were undertaken at a forward  
24 speed of 0.56 m/s (2.0 km/hr) and parallel with crop rows.

25  
26 Sludge was delivered to site on the day of application and loaded in small quantities to a  
27 tanker drawn by a tractor. This was used to transfer sludge to the applicator working in the field.  
28 To minimise crop damage the tractor and tanker ran down existing tramlines alongside the  
29 applicator. The sludge was transferred between the two vehicles through a flexible pipe. The  
30 tractor working the supply tanker was driven at a set engine speed to provide a given discharge  
31 rate to the applicator. Two engine speeds were used to cater for the different working widths of  
32 the applicators. For the shallow injector the calibrated flow rate was 500 l/min and for the  
33 slipperfoot 600 l/min.

34  
35 For the umbilical hose trials a 10.5 m long and 100 mm diameter piece of semi-rigid plastic  
36 pipe filled with water was utilised. This was pulled with either one or two vehicles (*Fig. 6*)  
37 immediately after injection to simulate field operations. Hose tests were conducted

1 perpendicular to the applicator path and crop rows.

### 2 3 2.2.2. *Year two trials*

4 A standard slipperfoot distribution valve and frame were used as the application platform for  
5 the trials. As a result of observations from the first year trials, spacing brackets were made to  
6 fit between the mainframe and individual parallel linkages. These were fitted to alternate  
7 linkages to stagger the tines by 200 mm reducing the interaction between adjacent tines. Also,  
8 to allow the mainframe to work at 700 mm above the ground, extension brackets were fitted  
9 between the tines and the bottom of each parallel linkage.

10  
11 Both the slipperfoot (C1) and the single piece tine (S5) (*Fig. 1*) Pullen *et al.* 2004, were  
12 attached to the frame. A 93 kW tractor was used for all the tests with the wheel centres, set at  
13 2.2 m, leaving 1.6 m clear between the tyres. Standard tyres were used throughout as the  
14 application tractor did not run on the crop (*Fig. 4*). Sludge was again supplied to the applicator  
15 from a tanker towed along the normal tramlines with a ‘flying’ umbilical hose to the injectors.

### 16 17 2.3. *Data collection and analysis*

18  
19 During both trial years the rainfall and evaporation were recorded daily. In addition a  
20 chemical analysis of the digested sludge was undertaken immediately after each application.

#### 21 22 2.3.1. *Year one trials*

23 The soil conditions and damage caused by the tractor tyres was recorded at each application.  
24 Measurements taken included resistance to a drop cone test (Godwin *et al.*, 1991), soil strength  
25 using a shear vane, the depth of the impression caused by the tractor tyre lugs and the soil  
26 moisture content.

27  
28 At harvest two data sets were collected for both main experiments. Firstly quadrat samples  
29 were taken to assess the relative damage caused by the injector only and the injector and tractor  
30 tyre. All samples were taken on the non-sludge area of the plots treated with the slipperfoot  
31 (C1). For the rape trial the total biomass yield was recorded while, on the wheat trials the clean  
32 grain yield was recorded. For both data sets an analysis of variance was undertaken and where  
33 appropriate a least significant difference ( $lsd_{(5\%)}$ ) calculated at the 5 per cent level to show real  
34 differences between treatment means.

35  
36 Secondly, for the main yield data, each plot was harvested with a plot combine driven along  
37 the plot centre. All grain/seed yields were standardised at 15 per cent moisture content. For the

1 analysis the results of individual treatments were grouped to identify any overall trends. For  
2 example, the effect of application technique was examined by conducting an analysis on the  
3 combined yields of all the plots treated with the shallow I (C2), the slipperfoot (C1) and dribble  
4 techniques (C2D). In total nine such comparisons were examined. For those results that were  
5 significant an  $l_{sd(5\%)}$  was calculated.

6  
7 For both umbilical hose trials a photographic record was made for each treatment. The  
8 condition of the crop immediately after the passage of the applicator and then a second taken  
9 immediately after the hose had been dragged across the plot. At harvest a quadrat sample was  
10 taken to indicate the possible effect on the final crop yield of both the applicator and the hose  
11 damage. In the rape crop the total biomass on each plot was recorded because of the difficulties  
12 collecting the seed when the crop was ripe. On the wheat trial the clean grain yield was  
13 recorded. For both data sets a simple analysis of variance was undertaken and where appropriate  
14 an  $l_{sd(5\%)}$  calculated at the 5 per cent level to show real differences between treatment means.

#### 15 16 2.3.2. *Year two trials*

17 On these experiments the plots were harvested with a plot combine and grain yield  
18 standardised at 15 per cent moisture content. An analysis of variance was undertaken and where  
19 appropriate, an  $l_{sd(5\%)}$  at the 5 per cent level calculated.

### 20 21 3. Results

22  
23 General information about the experimental conditions existing during both trial years are  
24 given in Table 1. The rainfall and evaporation pattern (*Fig. 7*) shows over the trial period  
25 conditions were relatively drier than average. Only on six occasions did the monthly rainfall  
26 exceed the 25 year monthly average. Evaporation was also higher than the average.

#### 27 28 3.1. *Year one results*

##### 29 30 3.1.1. *General data*

31 Soil physical conditions occurring at each application rate are shown in *Fig. 8*. As expected  
32 using flotation tyres early in the season when the soil strength was low reduced soil damage.  
33 Later in the season at lower soil moisture contents the strength increased and the soil damage  
34 was reduced.

##### 35 36 3.1.2. *Relative damage behind applicator only and wheel & applicator*

37 Results of the quadrat data presented in *Fig. 9*, show that the relative wheat yield between

1 those parts of the slipperfoot plots treated with the injector only and the untreated control were  
2 not significantly different. For treatments conducted up to late February, there was also no  
3 significant difference between the yield behind the injector only and the area where the tractor  
4 wheels had passed. However, on applications conducted from April onwards the yield was  
5 significantly lower than the part of the plot treated with the injector only and the control. The  
6 wheels had no significant effect upon the yield for applications in the early part of the season but  
7 significantly reduced the yield in April, June and July.

8  
9 There was no significant difference between the yields of rape biomass on those parts of the  
10 plot treated only with the injector and the equivalent untreated control as shown in *Fig. 9 (b)*.  
11 However, the tractor wheels did cause damage and this was significantly different from that only  
12 effected by the injector for those applications conducted during November, December, April and  
13 May. On applications in February and March the difference between the growth behind the  
14 injector only and behind the wheel and injector was lower but not significantly different. The  
15 damage caused by the wheels was only significantly different from the control for the  
16 applications in December and May.

### 17 18 3.1.3. *Final plot yield*

19 A summary of the analysis of results of the combine yield data are given in *Figs. 10 & 11*  
20 and in Table 2. These show in the winter wheat only a very highly significant effect was caused  
21 by application technique and time. Whereas in the rape only application time had any significant  
22 effect. Each graph presents the results of one analysis giving the mean yield values, level of  
23 significance and appropriate  $l_{sd(5\%)}$ .

24  
25 *Figure 10* gives the interaction between application technique and time on the winter wheat.  
26 This shows there was no significant difference between the yield of any treatments conducted  
27 in November, December and February. These were also not significantly different from the  
28 fertilised control. However, they were significantly higher, except the surface treatment (C2D)  
29 in February and the shallow I (C2) treatment in March, than the unfertilised control. All  
30 treatments conducted in April, June and July produced yields that were significantly lower than  
31 the treatments conducted before April. Those treatments conducted in June and July were also  
32 significantly lower than the two controls.

33  
34 At the final application there was a significant difference caused by the application  
35 technique. The yield due to the shallow I injector (C2) was significantly lower than both the  
36 slipperfoot (C1) and dribble technique (C2D). In June there was no significant difference  
37 between the shallow and slipperfoot but both were significantly lower than the surface



1 application. There were no significant differences between the application techniques conducted  
2 at the same time for applications up to and including those conducted in March.

3  
4 *Figure 11 (a)* shows while rape yields at the application in May were much lower than those  
5 at other times they were not significantly different. Pooling the techniques in *Fig. 11 (b)* shows  
6 that the time effect was very highly significant. Overall, the last application significantly  
7 suppressed the yield in comparison with both the control and applications conducted at other  
8 times during the growing season.

#### 9 10 3.1.4. *Umbilical hose tests*

11 The mean yield results and analysis are summarised in *Fig. 12 (a)* for the winter wheat.  
12 These show that there is no significant difference between the winter wheat yields of any of the  
13 application techniques conducted at any application time except that conducted in July. Here,  
14 the yield following the shallow I (C2) was significantly lower than on the plot treated with the  
15 dribble technique. The yield on all the plots treated in April & June, and the dribble technique  
16 applied in February, were all significantly better than the yield from the control treatment which  
17 was not treated with the umbilical hose. All treatments conducted in July produced yields that  
18 were significantly lower than the control.

19  
20 Although the May treatment in the rape (*Fig. 12 b*) had a lower yield, the difference was not  
21 significantly different from any other application technique treated at any application time. All  
22 treatments were similar to the control.

#### 23 24 3.2. *Year two results*

25  
26 The soil moisture content at the different application times is given in Table 3. It is as would  
27 be expected.

28  
29 The yield results for both experiments are summarised in *Fig. 13*. These show there were  
30 no significant differences between any treatments on the sandy loam soil, Showground.  
31 However, on the clay soil, Home Close, the highest yield occurred on the granular fertilised  
32 control. This was significantly better than the unfertilised control and all treatments where the  
33 experimental tine (S5) was used except the plot that received two applications of sludge. There  
34 were no significant differences between any of the slipperfoot treatments and the fertilised  
35 control. All injection treatments were significantly better than the unfertilised control. Yields  
36 on plots treated in December and May with the single piece tine (S5) were significantly lower  
37 than the slipperfoot application in December. There were no significant differences between the

1 yields on any plots treated with the single piece tine (S5). Equally, plots treated at different  
2 times with the slipperfoot were not significantly different.

#### 4. Discussion

##### 4.1. Year one trials

7  
8 The control for the main experiment was treated at the recommended granular nitrogen rate  
9 and achieved a yield of 9476 kg/ha. The unfertilised control produced an equally good average  
10 yield, this being 9247 kg/ha. This is unexpected and could be attributed to the dry cold spring  
11 delayed mineralisation of soil nitrogen. The previous rape crop, a known source of nitrogen may  
12 also have contributed to the response.

13  
14 The oil-seed rape yields obtained in the experiment were as expected for this soil type. The  
15 control treatment with the recommended application of granular fertiliser achieved a mean yield  
16 of 3031 kg/ha. The unfertilised control performed equally well with a mean yield of 3068 kg/ha.  
17 This is similar to that found in the wheat trial but here the cold dry spring cannot fully explain  
18 this result and a combination of other reasons may have been the cause. First, the low rainfall  
19 may have resulted in the rape grown in 1993/94 contributing to the fertiliser reserve. Secondly,  
20 this control received nitrogen at the rate of 26 kg/ha as part of an application of ammonia  
21 sulphate. Finally, the yield of the untreated control on one block was exceptional high and this  
22 increased the overall mean. The plot was in the lowest part of the field and yielded 4545 kg/ha.  
23 Excluding these values the mean for the unfertilised control would have been 2675 kg/ha. The  
24 high coefficient of variation in this experiment was probably caused by unexpected variation in  
25 yields in this block.

26  
27 The time of application of sludge did not effect the wheat yield on any treatments conducted  
28 up to the end of February. A small suppression of yield followed the application in April and  
29 this became progressively worse on following applications. Wheel damage appears to have been  
30 a major cause in the suppression of final yields. At harvest the tractor wheel marks were not  
31 visible on any plots treated before the end of February. From April onwards damage caused by  
32 the wheels was increased. For plots treated in June the crop began to regrow and noticeable  
33 quantities of unripened green grain appeared in the samples. Those treated in July did not  
34 recover. The wheel damage was not visually different on those plots treated with different  
35 application techniques. The results from the study of the crop damage on the slipperfoot plots  
36 would suggest that if the vehicle wheels had been kept off the crop later in the season then the  
37 yield would have been similar at all application times.

1  
2 The wheel damage in the rape occurred both at the start and at the end of the growing season.  
3 For applications in November and December where the flotation tyres were used, the crop was  
4 very delicate and the passage of the wheels had a long-term effect on the crop biomass yield.  
5 Though this was visible at harvest (*Fig. 14*) the crop did compensate and the final seed yield was  
6 not affected. For those applications conducted in April and May using the standard tyres, this  
7 was not the case. Here, the crop did not recover once it had been run over by the wheels. This  
8 contributed to the reduction in yields on the plots treated in May during flowering. The results  
9 from biomass measurements would suggest this was the reason.

10  
11 Damage caused to the soil as shown by the tyre sinkage was small with the configurations  
12 examined. By the last application soil strength had become high and the wheels left no mark on  
13 the surface. There is evidence to suggest it would have been possible to replace the standard  
14 tyres with row crop wheels hence reducing the width of crop damage. This would have reduced  
15 the potential crop damage although the wheel marks would still have been visible.

16  
17 The soil engaging parts on the application equipment did not appear to cause any damage to  
18 the crop. However, their lack of ground clearance was a problem at the later growth stages. At  
19 most growth stages the crop recovered but at the last application on both crops the plots were  
20 flattened and did not recover (*Figs. 14 & 15*). This is not surprising as the clearance under parts  
21 of the implement used with the shallow I tines was only 120 mm.

22  
23 There was little difference in the way either commercial injector placed sludge into the soil.  
24 Both formed a trench or slot that was large enough to hold sludge at the rate of 50 m<sup>3</sup>/ha.  
25 However, it is unlikely that higher application rates could be applied unless the soil was dry.  
26 The sludge laid in the slot and it was clear there was a risk of run off. Penetration of both  
27 machines proved difficult in hard ground and applying weight through the transfer system did  
28 not always overcome this problem. However, neither caused any serious physical damage to the  
29 crop.

30  
31 There were no problems using the simulated dribble bar (C2D). However, later in the season  
32 at high air temperatures a strong smell was noticeable on these plots, while the odour from the  
33 injected plots was undetectable even though the sludge was not fully incorporated below the soil  
34 surface.

35  
36 The results for the hose tests showed that dragging an umbilical hose across the crop during  
37 treatment did not increase yield loss. It was surprising throughout the range of soil moisture

1 conditions how resilient the crop was to this treatment. Although there was some visual damage,  
2 at the beginning of the season where the hose smeared the plants with soil, the yield was not  
3 affected. At other times when the crop was taller it recovered almost immediately and the  
4 damage appeared to be little greater more than caused by the applicator. On a field scale, as  
5 reported by Pullen *et al.* (2004), the effect of dragging the hose across the crop had no effect on  
6 the yield.

#### 7 8 4.2. Year two trials

9  
10 Yields for both experiments were comparable with those on other farm fields. Coefficient  
11 of variations were both low, 5.1 and 6.0%, showing the uniformity of individual treatment yields  
12 on each experiment.

13  
14 On the sandy loam soil site, the yield on the unfertilised control was lower than the fertilised  
15 control, but not significant. This possibly was due to the dry growing season and a carry over  
16 of residual nitrogen from the previous rape crop. As expected significant yield differences  
17 occurred between the two controls on the clay site. Here, the crop followed winter wheat. On  
18 both sites the total nitrogen content was lower in the grain on the unfertilised plots.

19  
20 The autumn rainfall was small and this did little to compact the seedbed and this made  
21 injection more difficult than in the previous year for the first and second applications. On the  
22 sandy loam soil in Showground field the surface layers also included large quantities of hard rape  
23 trash. The clay soil, Home Close field, had been re-sown and this had produced a soft loose  
24 layer sitting on the plough tilth. The crop and sludge were placed in this zone. In these  
25 conditions both injectors pushed and sometimes dragged trash, rather than cutting it. On Home  
26 Close it was necessary to remove the opening discs from the slipperfoot on the first application  
27 to reduce soil movement. On both sites this left an uneven surface and parts of the crop covered  
28 with soil. The visual damage remained on both sites throughout the early part of the growing  
29 season. Some of the visual impact might have been reduced by rolling the site. This would also  
30 reduce the risk of any possible damage caused by frost or drying out of the soil. Although the  
31 finish after the two early applications had a poor appearance it did not effect yields, on any plots  
32 treated with the slipperfoot injector or plots treated on sandy loam soil, Showground, with the  
33 single piece tine (S5).

34  
35 On the clay soil, Home Close, the yield on all the plots treated with the single piece tine (S5)  
36 were slightly suppressed because an interaction between adjacent tines probably disturbed some  
37 of the crop roots. The effect occurred at all application times. The single piece tine (S5) was

1 designed to cause more loosening than the slipperfoot (C1) and moving them further apart would  
2 have prevented any interaction in these conditions. Increasing the spacing to 250 mm would be  
3 sufficient in all but extreme conditions. The tines performed better in the firm soil behind the  
4 tractor wheels. On the sandy loam soil the effect was less and did not affect final yields.

5  
6 Injecting the crop twice in the same season did not cause any more damage than a single  
7 injection on either site.

## 8 9 **5. Conclusions**

10  
11 The following conclusions are made:

12  
13 (1) It is possible by using the correct techniques, to inject sludge into winter wheat and rape over  
14 a wide time period (ie Nov to Mid July) without causing any loss in crop yield.

15  
16 (2) Operating the application vehicle, fitted with low ground pressure tyres, on the crop up to  
17 March would be possible, this matches growth stage 30 in winter wheat. Later applications  
18 should be conducted from tractors operating in tramlines for traffic control.

19  
20 (3) There was no long term residual yield damage caused by dragging an umbilical hose over  
21 the crop.

22  
23 (4) For combinable arable crops the tines should be placed at a spacing of 250 mm and the  
24 implement frame should be at least 500 mm above the ground to avoid damaging the crop later  
25 in the season.

## 26 27 **Acknowledgements**

28 The authors would like to thank Anglian Water Services Ltd who funded this work and  
29 Greentrac Ltd who kindly supplied the commercial equipment.

## 30 31 **References**

32  
33 **Bowden W B** (1997). The availability of nitrogen following digested sludge incorporation in  
34 arable land. Unpublished PhD Theses D/97/204 Cranfield University, Silsoe College

35  
36 **Godwin R J; Warner N L; Hann M J** (1990). Comparison of umbilical hose and conventional  
37 tanker mounted slurry injection systems. Agricultural Engineer, Incorporating Soil & Water

1 Vol. 45 No 2

2  
3 **Godwin R J; Warner N L; Smith D L O** (1991). The development of a dynamic drop-cone  
4 device for the assessment of soil strength and the effects of machinery traffic. Journal of  
5 Agricultural Engineering Research **48**, 123-131

6  
7 **King DW** (1969). Soils of Luton and Bedford District. A reconnaissance survey. Soil Survey  
8 of England and Wales. Harpenden

9  
10 **Hahn M J; Atkinson C J; Godwin R J** (1992) Crop Growth and Nitrogen recovery resulting  
11 from the injection of sludge. Silsoe College, Bedford

12  
13 **Moseley P J; Misselbrook T H; Pain B F; Earl R; Godwin R J** (1998). The effect of injector  
14 tine design on odour and ammonia emissions following injection of bio-solids into arable  
15 cropping. Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research **71** (4) p385-394

16  
17 **Pahl O; Godwin R J; Hann M J; Waine T W** (2001). Cost-effective pollution control by  
18 shallow injection of pig slurry into growing crops. Journal of Agricultural Engineering  
19 Research **80** (4), 381-390

20  
21 **Pullen D W M; Godwin R J; Grundon P; Moseley P J** (2004). Design and evaluation of a  
22 shallow injector tine suitable for injecting bio solids into grass and arable crops. Biosystems  
23 Engineering. ??????????