

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Massey University Library. Thesis Copyright Form

Title of thesis: An investigation of selected soil properties influencing the management and playability of N.Z. cricket pitches

(1) (a) I give permission for my thesis to be made available to readers in the Massey University Library under conditions determined by the Librarian.

(b) ~~I do not wish my thesis to be made available to readers without my written consent for _____ months.~~

(2) (a) I agree that my thesis, or a copy, may be sent to another institution under conditions determined by the Librarian.

(b) ~~I do not wish my thesis, or a copy, to be sent to another institution without my written consent for _____ months.~~

(3) (a) I agree that my thesis may be copied for Library use.

(b) ~~I do not wish my thesis to be copied for Library use for _____ months.~~

Signed

S. Cameron

Date

12/9/88

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author. Readers must sign their name in the space below to show that they recognise this. They are asked to add their permanent address.

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE

AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED SOIL PROPERTIES
INFLUENCING THE MANAGEMENT AND PLAYABILITY OF
NEW ZEALAND CRICKET PITCHES

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Horticultural Science in Soil Science
Massey University

Stuart Paul Cameron-Lee

1988

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

The 1980's has been a period of growth for New Zealand cricket. The advent of the one day game plus international success has developed spectator interest and support to an unprecedented level.

Cricket is certainly one game where player performance is very much dependent on the surface provided. It is perhaps fair to say that the standard of many New Zealand first class pitches has not allowed the development of entertaining cricket. As a result, pitches have been the target of increasing criticism from spectators, administrators, and players alike.

Cricket pitch preparation has been said to be an 'art'. But the groundsman has limited scope to practice the art if the suitability of the soil used for pitch preparation is wanting.

In an attempt to gain an understanding of the contribution of soil properties to good pitch preparation, the New Zealand Cricket Council and Soil Bureau of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) provided funding for a research programme. It was hoped that improved playability and pitch performance could be achieved by combining the 'art' of pitch preparation with sound scientific principles.

The objectives of the research programme were:

1. To develop and standardise a set of laboratory procedures aimed at selecting soils and characterizing their suitability for cricket pitches.
2. To establish a comprehensive inventory of physical and chemical soil properties for a number of current pitch soils which can be used as a reference for selection of new pitch soils.
3. To relate sound scientific principles to field management techniques and pitch performance in an attempt to assist the groundsman with pitch preparation.

4. To investigate the contributions of management factors to pitch playability, and their interactions with soil properties.
5. To elucidate the value of the nuclear moisture-density method for in situ measurement of pitch soil water content and bulk density.
6. To develop and implement a soil monitoring system for groundsmen who can then use it to evaluate changes in soil properties during pitch preparation. This would allow the development of specific management programmes for individual venues.
7. To suggest areas for future research.

To meet these objectives a preliminary study (Cameron-Lee, 1984) was carried out to identify three soil parameters, namely clay content, clay type, and pitch soil profile, which affect pitch performance. An expansion of the findings of the preliminary study form the basis of this research programme.

This investigation incorporated a field trial using four soils commonly known as the Palmerston North¹, St John, Ward, and Kakanui. The soils have different chemical and physical properties. They are all currently in use throughout New Zealand on first class pitches. In addition, three pitch soils, namely the Marton, Redhill and Naike were evaluated, along with the field trial soils in the laboratory to provide a greater comparative analysis of pitch soil properties.

¹ A mixture of the Marton soil and unidentified local fine sandy loam.

The soils studied can be described as follows:

Pitch Soil

Soil Classification

1. Palmerston North¹

2. Marton

A central yellow grey earth described by Campbell (1979).

3. Kakanui

Known as the Waiareka clay, this soil is a southern brown granular clay (an intergrade between rendzina - like soil and brown granular clay) described by N.Z. Soil Bulletin 26 (3), (1968).

4. Ward

A central yellow grey earth described by N.Z. Soil Bureau Bulletin 27 (1968).

5. St John

No classification available.

6. Naike

A brown granular loam described by Bruce (1978).

7. Redhill

A Whatitiri clay loam (Red loam) hill soil described in N.Z. Soil Bureau Bulletin 5 (1954).

¹ A mixture of the Marton soil and a local soil (unclassified).

The broad conclusions that can be drawn from this study are:

1. The interaction between clay type and clay content has a major influence on pitch performance.
2. For the preparation programmes used, swelling clay soils were found to be more difficult to manage and produced inferior playability results when compared to non swelling soils.
3. The performance ranking (from best to worst) of the trial soils used was consistently Palmerston North, St John, Ward and Kakanui.
4. The nature of the pitch profile construction was found to influence performance. For example, a shallow clay soil layer over a sand base produced significantly faster drying within the surface 75 mm.
5. Subsurface (25-75 mm) water content was the single most important factor that influenced pitch playability. Complex interactions, however, occur between water content, soil chemical and physical properties, and management factors (e.g. the ability of the grass plant to remove water from depth) and these contribute to the performance of the pitch soil.
6. Soil properties characterize the potential of a pitch soil but pitch management determines the development of that potential.
7. Soil binding strength which is commonly used as a guide to pitch soil selection may not necessarily be a reliable index of soil performance. A standardised testing procedure was developed for pitch soil selection.
8. In order to guide groundsmen during pitch preparation, standard monitoring techniques have been developed.

The study identified areas for future research. These include:

1. A study of the influence of different levels of soil compaction (bulk density) on the water retention characteristics (field capacity; stress point; permanent wilting point) of pitch soils.
2. A more comprehensive study of plant-soil interactions to quantitatively determine the role of the grass plant in pitch soil drying and performance of the cricket pitch.
3. An investigation of different mowing management programmes on the rate and extent of pitch soil water loss.
4. A study of the use and effects of different physical treatments during pitch renovation.
5. A study of the modification of swelling soils with compatible non swelling types to moderate undesirable soil properties and improve management and playability.
6. An investigation of the design of pitch soil irrigation systems for different levels of cricket.
7. An investigation of the feasibility for greenhouse structures at Test venues.
8. An evaluation and calibration of the Clegg impact hammer for replacement of the bounce test as the objective method of playability assessment for New Zealand pitch soils.
9. The development of a standardized soil monitoring kit for use by groundsmen at venues throughout New Zealand.
10. Ongoing investigation and evaluation of potential pitch soils for improvement of existing soils and pitches.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many people whose support, guidance and friendship have helped make this thesis possible.

Special thanks to my Supervisors Mr Keith McAuliffe, Dr John Kirkman and Mr Mike Tuohy.

To Mr Ken Timms for sharing his experience and invaluable knowledge; very special thanks to Ann Rouse for her patience and support in the compilation and presentation of this thesis.

Soil Bureau, (DSIR) and New Zealand Cricket Council for funding this research project.

The valuable assistance received from staff in the Department of Soil Science, Massey University.

And to Carolyn and my family for their encouragement and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <u>INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY</u> | (i) |
| <u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u> | (vi) |
| <u>LIST OF TABLES</u> | (vii) |
| <u>LIST OF FIGURES</u> | (xi) |
| <u>LIST OF PLATES</u> | (xiii) |
| <u>LIST OF EQUATIONS</u> | (xv) |
| <u>LIST OF APPENDICES</u> | (xvi) |
| | |
| CHAPTER 1: <u>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</u> | 1 |
| | |
| 1.1 <u>Desirable Pitch Characteristics</u> | 1 |
| (i) Players' requirements..... | 1 |
| (ii) Soil requirements..... | 1 |
| | |
| 1.2 <u>Methods For Measuring Pitch Performance</u> | 2 |
| (i) The Bounce Test..... | 2 |
| (ii) The Terry Keeling(T.K.) Pitch Tester..... | 5 |
| (iii) The Friction Test..... | 5 |
| (iv) The Adams Stewart Soil Binding Test (A.S.S.B. test)..... | 7 |
| (v) The Clegg Impact Hammer..... | 11 |

| | | |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.3 | <u>Factors Affecting Pitch Performance</u> | 11 |
| (i) | Clay Type..... | 11 |
| | (a) Structure of Clay Minerals..... | 12 |
| | (b) Short Range Order Materials..... | 20 |
| | (c) Clay Minerals and the Cricket Pitch..... | |
| | - An Introduction..... | 20 |
| | (d) Cracking and Playability..... | 22 |
| | (e) Cracking and Regeneration of Structure..... | 23 |
| | (f) Water-holding Capacity and Water Movement..... | 24 |
| | (g) Soil Consistence..... | 25 |
| (ii) | Exchangeable Cations and Soil pH..... | 26 |
| | (a) Cation Adsorption and Exchange..... | 26 |
| | (b) Exchangeable Cations and Soil Fertility..... | 28 |
| | (c) Exchangeable Cations and Soil Physical Condition..... | 28 |
| | (d) Soil pH | 29 |
| | (e) Assessment of the Status of Exchangeable Cations in the Soil..... | 31 |
| (iii) | Soil Texture..... | 31 |
| | (a) Clay Content..... | 31 |
| | (b) Other Particles..... | 35 |
| (iv) | Soil Compaction and Density..... | 36 |
| (v) | Grass and the Cricket Pitch..... | 41 |
| (vi) | Loss of Water from the Pitch..... | 44 |
| | (a) Drying by Grass..... | 44 |
| | (b) Consolidation..... | 44 |
| | (c) Evaporation From a Bare Soil..... | 44 |
| | (d) Sweating and Under Soil Heating..... | 45 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| (vii) Pitch Profile Construction..... | 46 |
| (a) Clay soil Layer..... | 46 |
| (b) Intermediate Layer..... | 47 |
| (c) Drainage Layer..... | 48 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 2: <u>CLAY MINERALOGY</u> | 51 |
| | |
| 2.1 <u>Methods for Clay Mineralogy Determination</u> | 51 |
| (i) X-ray Diffraction (XRD)..... | 51 |
| (ii) Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM)..... | 51 |
| | |
| 2.2 <u>Clay Mineralogy of Pitch Soils</u> | 52 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 3: <u>SOIL CHEMICAL PROPERTIES</u> | 61 |
| | |
| 3.1 <u>Methods for determination of soil chemical properties</u> | 61 |
| (i) Soil pH..... | 61 |
| (ii) Soil Organic Matter..... | 61 |
| (iii) Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC), Exchangeable Cations, and Olsen Phosphate..... | 62 |
| | |
| 3.2 <u>Soil pH</u> | 62 |
| | |
| 3.3 <u>Soil Organic Matter</u> | 67 |
| | |
| 3.4 <u>Soil Fertility</u> | 68 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 4: <u>SOIL ENGINEERING PROPERTIES</u> | 74 |
| | |
| 4.1 <u>Methods for determination of soil engineering properties</u> | 74 |
| (i) Particle size analysis..... | 74 |
| (ii) Soil water retention characteristics..... | 74 |
| (iii) Soil plasticity..... | 75 |
| (iv) Soil Compaction..... | 76 |
| (v) Empirical Tests..... | 76 |

| | | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.2 | <u>Particle Size Analysis</u> | 80 |
| 4.3 | <u>Pitch Soil Water Retention</u> | 87 |
| 4.4 | <u>Soil Plasticity</u> | 93 |
| 4.5 | <u>Proctor Compaction</u> | 96 |
| 4.6 | <u>Empirical Tests</u> | 102 |
| 4.7 | <u>Shrinkage of Pitch Soils on Drying</u> | 103 |
| | | |
| CHAPTER 5: | <u>SOIL BINDING STRENGTH - THE ADAMS STEWART SOIL BINDING TEST</u> <u>(A.S.S.B. TEST)</u> | 108 |
| 5.1 | <u>Method - Practical procedure for A.S.S.B. Test</u> | 108 |
| | (i) Standard A.S.S.B. Test..... | 108 |
| | (ii) Modified A.S.S.B. Test..... | 110 |
| 5.2 | <u>A.S.S.B. (Motty) Test Values</u> | 110 |
| 5.3 | <u>Motty Size</u> | 116 |
| 5.4 | <u>Rate and Extent of Motty Drying</u> | 124 |
| 5.5 | <u>Assessing Soil Compatibility for Topdressing and Mixing</u> | 129 |
| 5.6 | <u>Relative Humidity and Motty Drying</u> | 134 |
| 5.7 | <u>Changes in Motty Volume</u> | 134 |

CHAPTER 6: PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES.....137

6.1 Analytical techniques used to evaluate soil properties and pitch performance in the field.....137

- (i) Gravimetric Water Content.....137
- (ii) Penetration Resistance.....137
- (iii) Bounce Test.....139
- (iv) Soil Bulk Density.....139
- (v) Video Monitoring of Ball Trajectory.....141
- (vii) Infiltration.....141

6.2 Trial Plot Management during Preparation.....143

- (i) Trial Plot Construction.....143
- (ii) Management Programmes.....143
- (iii) Cover System.....143
- (iv) Irrigation.....148
- (v) Rolling.....148
- (vi) Mowing.....148

6.3 Weather and the Cricket Pitch.....149

6.4 Pitch playability results from the trial plots.....153

- (i) Determinants of Bounce.....153
- (ii) Clay Soil Depth.....154
- (iii) Base Material.....155
- (iv) Differences Between Soils.....156

6.5 Evaluation of soil monitoring techniques and their potential as management tools for the groundsman.....157

- (i) Soil Water Content Determination.....157
- (ii) Penetration Resistance.....159
- (iii) Bounce Test.....159
- (iv) Speed Test (Video Analysis of Ball Trajectory).....161

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 6.6 | <u>Soil Bulk Density and Compaction in the Field</u> | 163 |
| | (i) 1986/87 Preparations..... | 163 |
| | (ii) 1987/88 Preparation..... | 164 |
| | (iii) 1986/87 vs 1987/88 Preparation..... | 167 |
| | (iv) Trial Plots vs Fitzherbert Park Pitch..... | 167 |
| | (v) Surface Preparation..... | 168 |
| 6.7 | <u>Pitch Soil Cracking and Grass Cover</u> | 169 |
| 6.8 | <u>Comparison of Palmerston North and St John trial plots with pitches prepared for 1st class cricket during 1987/88 season</u> | 176 |
| 6.9 | <u>Pitch Soil Infiltration and Irrigation Scheduling</u> | 181 |
| 6.10 | <u>Off-season Management</u> | 186 |
| 6.11 | <u>A Greenhouse Structure for Test Cricket</u> | 188 |
| | <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u> | 213 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Table 1.1 | Relationship of rebound bounce to pitch pace..... | 4 |
| Table 1.2 | Relationship of ball rebound bounce, expressed in percentage terms, to pitch pace..... | 4 |
| Table 1.3 | Relationship of ball rebound bounce to pitch pace for New Zealand pitches..... | 6 |
| Table 1.4 | Pitch pace rating scale..... | 6 |
| Table 1.5 | Standards of playing characteristics for New Zealand first class pitches..... | 8 |
| Table 1.6 | Particle size distribution for the intermediate layer of a pitch profile..... | 32 |
| Table 1.7 | Particle size distribution for the intermediate layer of a pitch profile..... | 49 |
| Table 1.8 | Particle size distribution for the drainage layer of a pitch profile..... | 49 |
| Table 2.1 | Types and relative amounts of minerals present in the clay (<2 μ m) fractions of the pitch soils..... | 53 |
| Table 2.2 | Properties of clay minerals..... | 60 |
| Table 3.1 | pH of air dried pitch soils and modified soils used at the Fitzherbert Park trial site..... | 63 |
| Table 3.2 | Organic matter levels in air dried samples of pitch soils..... | 63 |

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 3.3 | Soil pH, Olsen phosphate, MAFTech Quick Test categories and the probability of obtaining a fertiliser response for the pitch soils studied..... | 69 |
| Table 3.4 | Cation exchange capacities, percentage base saturations, total exchangeable bases and the level of exchangeable acidity for the pitch soils studied..... | 71 |
| Table 4.1 | The percentages of sand, silt and clay-sized particles in the pitch soils studied..... | 81 |
| Table 4.2 | A comparison of match day trial plot water content with average gravimetric water content values for the pitch study soils at -0.1 bar and -15 bar matric potentials, field capacity, and optimum rolling point..... | 88 |
| Table 4.3 | Volumetric water content at field capacity (FC), stresspoint (SP) and permanent wilting point (PWP), calculated total available water (TAW) and readily available water (RAW), and estimated time to depletion for the trial plots..... | 91 |
| Table 4.4 | Upper and lower plastic limits and plasticity indices for the pitch soils studied..... | 95 |
| Table 4.5 | Plastic limit water content together with optimum rolling water contents, water content ranges and corresponding maximum bulk density values for Proctor compaction of the pitch soils..... | 97 |
| Table 4.6 | Volumetric water content at field capacity, and optimal optimal rolling and the estimated time to reach optimal rolling following irrigation..... | 99 |
| Table 4.7 | A comparison of free swell values with measured pitch cracking on drying in the field..... | 104 |
| Table 4.8 | Percentage soil shrinkage on drying as measured by free swell, change in volume, and linear shrinkage..... | 106 |

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Table 5.1 | Binding strength (A.S.S.B.) values and end point gravimetric water contents for the pitch soil studied.111 |
| Table 5.2 | A preliminary investigation of the influence of increased motty diameter on motty compressive strength for the pitch soils studied.....120 |
| Table 5.3 | Comparison of soil spheres produced at Massey University and the New Zealand Turf Culture Institute (NZTCI) with regard to motty size, mass, compressive strength, and end point gravimetric water content on drying for the Naike soil.....123 |
| Table 5.4 | Plasticity indices, clay contents compressive strength values, and changes in volume on drying for a selection of individual pitch soils studied and combinations of these soils.....130 |
| Table 5.5 | The influence of different levels of relative humidity during drying of soil spheres on recorded soil binding strength values and end point gravimetric water contents for two pitch soils studied.....135 |
| Table 5.6 | Percentage changes in motty volume for the pitch soil studied on Day 5 of the A.S.S.B. test for soil spheres of increasing size.....135 |
| Table 6.1 | Total rainfall, and mean daily averages for a range of climatic inputs during the trial plot preparation periods of 1986/87 and 1987/88 at Fitzherbert Park, Palmerston North.....150 |
| Table 6.2 | A comparison of rebound bounce (cm) recorded for two different balls on the main pitch and trial plots at Fitzherbert Park during the 1986/87 preparation period.....160 |

| | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 6.3 | A comparison of mean rebound bounce heights recorded on the trial pitch soils for morning and afternoon sampling on match day of the second preparation of 1987/88..... | 160 |
| Table 6.4 | Mean values of bulk density recorded on the trial plots during the 1986/87 and 1987/88 preparation periods and the main pitch at Fitzherbert Park during the 1987/88 season..... | 165 |
| Table 6.5 | An assessment of playability for the St John and Palmerston North soils on in situ pitches prepared for first class cricket during the 1987/88 season..... | 177 |
| Table 6.6 | Mean infiltration rates (mm hr^{-1}) for pitch trial soils..... | 182 |
| Table 6.7 | The equivalent depths of water stored in the study soils at field capacity (FC), and the total available water (TAW), readily available water (RAW), and optimum rolling available water (ORAW)..... | 182 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Figure 1.1 | Diagrammatic sketch showing (a) a single silicon tetrahedron and (b) the sheet structure of silicon tetrahedra (Grim, 1968).....13 |
| Figure 1.2 | Diagrammatic sketch showing (a) a single octahedral unit and (b) the sheet structure of aluminium octahedra (Grim, 1968).....13 |
| Figure 1.3 | Diagrammatic sketch of the structure of the kaolinite layer (Grim, 1968).....14 |
| Figure 1.4 | Diagrammatic sketch of the structure of muscovite (Grim, 1968).....17 |
| Figure 1.5 | Diagrammatic sketch of the structure of smectite (Grim, 1968).....19 |
| Figure 1.6 | Schematic representation of the soil compaction process (Head, 1980).....37 |
| Figure 1.7 | Bulk density - water content curves for different compactive efforts (Craig, 1983).....39 |
| Figures 3.1a,b | Comparison of levels of base saturation and exchangeable acidity in a number of pitch soils....65 |
| Figure 4.1 | Schematic representation of the free swell test procedure (Head, 1980).....79 |
| Figure 5.1 | Comparison of rebound bounce predicted by the A.S.S.B. test with average bounce measured on the trial plots at Fitzherbert Park during the second preparations of 1986/87 and 1987/88.....115 |

| | |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Figure 5.2 | Comparison of motty binding strength values determined by McAuliffe <i>et al.</i> , (1987) with A.S.S.B. values measured during the 1987/88 testing period118. |
| Figure 5.3a | The influence of increasing motty diameter on motty binding strength.....121 |
| Figure 5.3b | The influence of increasing motty mass on motty binding strength.....121 |
| Figure 5.4a,b | The rate and extent of motty drying during the five day A.S.S.B. test for a standard air drying treatment.....125 |
| Figure 5.5a,b | The rate and extent of motty drying during the five day A.S.S.B. test for a rapid sun drying treatment.....126 |
| Figure 5.6a,b | A comparison of motty binding strength development during a five day A.S.S.B. test for standard air drying and sun drying treatments.....128 |
| Figure 5.7 | Motty binding strength values for varying ratios of Marton/St John soil mixes.....132 |
| Figure 5.8 | Motty binding strength values for varying ratios of St John/Redhill soil mixes.....132 |
| Figure 6.1 | Determination of (a) soil moisture content and (b) soil bulk density by the backscatter method using nuclear moisture-density equipment (McCarthy, 1977).....140 |

LIST OF PLATES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Plate 2.1 | Electron micrograph showing the haze of very fine smectite particles amongst the irregularly shaped mica flakes in the clay fraction of the Ward soil..54 |
| Plate 2.2 | Electron micrograph showing the haze of very fine smectite particles amongst the irregularly shaped mica flakes in the clay fraction of the Kakanui soil.....54 |
| Plate 2.3 | Electron micrograph showing the minor contribution of halloysite to the clay mineral assemblage of the Marton soil which is dominated by Mica and vermiculite.....56 |
| Plate 2.4 | Electron micrograph of the clay fraction of the St John A soil showing the dominance of vermiculite and the presence of minor amounts of halloysite together with iron oxides, represented as small black dots coating larger clay minerals. Smectite is not readily distinguishable in the micrograph.....56 |
| Plate 2.5 | Electron micrograph of the clay fraction of the Redhill soil showing halloysite as the dominant clay mineral present.....58 |
| Plate 2.6 | Electron micrograph of the clay fraction of the Redhill soil showing examples of the minor amounts of other minerals present including kaolinite.....58 |
| Plate 4.1 | Soil wear on the Palmerston North soil after the Central Districts vs Northern Districts fixture (February, 1988) at Fitzherbert Park, Palmerston North.....84 |

| | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Plate 4.2 | Minor to moderate (2-4 mm) cracking characteristic of the limited swelling St John soil and the development of soil crumbling at crack edges..... | 94 |
| Plate 5.1 | The Hounsfield Tensometer used to measure motty soil binding strength..... | 109 |
| Plate 5.2 | Surface deformation caused by ball impact with the pitch during the New Zealand vs England one-day match, March 19, 1988 at Eden Park, Auckland..... | 113 |
| Plate 5.3 | Four sizes of soil spheres used to determine the influence of motty size on binding strength and motty volume change on drying..... | 117 |
| Plate 6.1 | Penetrometer used to measure surface and subsurface soil hardness (penetration resistance) of the field trial soils during preparation..... | 138 |
| Page 6.2 | The modified clay pigeon shoot used for ball delivery during the speed test assessment of trial plot soils..... | 142 |
| Plate 6.3 | Construction of the field trial at Fitzherbert Park, Palmerston North in 1985..... | 144 |
| Plate 6.4 | Cloche system used to provide protection from rain during preparation..... | 146 |
| Plate 6.5 | Field trial irrigation system..... | 147 |
| Plate 6.6 | Minimal to minor (1-2 mm) cracking characteristic of the non swelling Palmerston North soil..... | 171 |
| Plate 6.7 | Excessive cracking developed on the 50 mm over sand plots for the Kakanui soil during the first preparation of 1986/87..... | 172 |
| Plate 6.8 | A well prepared pitch surface for the St John soil showing moderate cracking and the formation of large blocks between cracks..... | 178 |

LIST OF EQUATIONS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 | Rebound bounce (%) = $\frac{\text{Rebound height}}{\text{Drop height}} \times 100\%$3 |
| 1.2 | Pace rating = $\frac{\text{Ball bounce}}{\text{Friction}}$7 |
| 1.3 | Bounce height (inches) = 0.1 x A.S.S.B. rating + 9.0.....9 |
| 1.4 | Bounce height (inches) = 0.43 x % clay + 10.6.....33 |
| 3.1 | Carbon (mg) = Amount of Co ₂ (mg) x 0.2729.....61 |
| 3.2 | BS (pH 7) % = $\frac{\text{TEB (cmol kg}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{CEC (cmol kg}^{-1}\text{)}} \times 100$62 |
| 4.1 | Total available water (TAW) = $(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{PW})_z$75 |
| 4.2 | Readily available water (RAW) = $(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{SP})_z$75 |
| 4.3 | Optimum Rolling available water (ORAW) = $(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{ORP})_z$75 |
| 4.4 | Free swell (%) = $\frac{V - 10}{10} \times 100\%$78 |
| 4.5 | Linear Shrinkage (LS) (%) = $\left[1 - \frac{L_D}{L_o} \right] \times 100\%$78 |
| 4.6 | Volumetric Shrinkage (%) = $\left[1 - \frac{V_D}{V_o} \right] \times 100\%$80 |
| 6.1 | Bulk density (ρ_b) = $\frac{M^a}{V}$139 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Appendix 4.1 | Ordinary and heavy Proctor compaction curves determined for the Marton soil..... | 190 |
| Appendix 4.2 | Ordinary and heavy Proctor compaction curves determined for the St John soil..... | 190 |
| Appendix 4.3 | Ordinary and heavy Proctor compaction curves determined for the Palmerston North soil..... | 191 |
| Appendix 4.4 | Ordinary and heavy Proctor compaction curves determined for the Ward soil..... | 191 |
| Appendix 4.5 | Ordinary and heavy Proctor compaction curves determined for the Kakanui soil..... | 192 |
| Appendix 4.6 | Ordinary and heavy Proctor compaction curves determined for the Redhill soil..... | 192 |
| Appendix 4.7 | The relationship between compaction achieved by the Proctor test and the action of a roller in the field..... | 193 |
| Appendix 6.1 | Procedure and worksheet for gravimetric water content sampling and pitch soil water content determination..... | 194 |
| Appendix 6.2 | Trial plot management programme for the first preparation of 1986/87..... | 196 |
| Appendix 6.3 | Trial plot management programme for the second preparation of 1986/87..... | 197 |
| Appendix 6.4 | Trial plot management programme for the first preparation of 1987/88..... | 198 |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Appendix 6.5 | Trial plot management programme for the second preparation of 1987/88..... | 199 |
| Appendix 6.6 | Match day correlations for water content and bounce, and hardness and bounce for trial plot preparations of 1986/87 and 1987/88..... | 201 |
| Appendix 6.7 | The influence of soil water content at depth (50-75 mm) on the height of rebound bounce for the pitch soil depth-base treatment combinations on match day of the second preparation of 1986/87..... | 202 |
| Appendix 6.8 | The influence of soil water content at depth (50-75 mm) on the variability of rebound bounce for the pitch soil depth-base treatment combination on match day of the second preparation of 1986/87..... | 202 |
| Appendix 6.9 | The influence of soil hardness (0-25 mm) on the height of rebound bounce for the pitch soil depth-base treatment combinations on match day of the second preparation of 1986/87..... | 203 |
| Appendix 6.10 | The influence of soil hardness (25-50 mm) on the variability of rebound bounce for the pitch soil depth-base treatment combination on match day of the second preparation of 1987/88..... | 203 |
| Appendix 6.11 | Soil water content (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm), penetration resistance (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm) and rebound bounce for match day of the first preparation of 1986/87..... | 204 |
| Appendix 6.12 | Soil water content (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm, 50-75 mm), penetration resistance (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm) and rebound bounce for match day of the second preparation of 1986/87..... | 205 |

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Appendix 6.13 | Soil water content (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm, 50-75 mm), penetration resistance (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm) and rebound bounce for match day of the first preparation of 1987/88..... | 206 |
| Appendix 6.14 | Soil water content (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm, 50-75 mm), penetration resistance (0-25 mm, 25-50 mm) and rebound bounce for match day of the second preparation of 1987/88..... | 207 |
| Appendix 6.15 | Speed test assessment of the trial plot soils on match day of the second preparations of 1986/87 and 1987/88..... | 208 |
| Appendix 6.16 | A subjective match day of assessment of grass cover and soil cracking during the first preparation of 1986/87..... | 209 |
| Appendix 6.17 | A subjective march day of assessment of grass cover and soil cracking during the second preparation of 1986/87..... | 210 |
| Appendix 6.18 | A subjective match day of assessment of grass cover and soil cracking during the second preparation of 1987/88..... | 211 |
| Appendix 6.19 | Changes in trial plot infiltration (mm hr^{-1}) rates over time on day 5 of the first preparation of 1986/87..... | 212 |