

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.

# **Improving Granular Fertiliser Aerial Application for Hill Country Farming**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**  
**In**  
**Agricultural Engineering**

At Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand



Sue Chok  
**2017**



## **Abstract**

Soil fertility and pasture productivity varies significantly over hill country farms. Therefore conventional aerial fertiliser application of a single application rate is inefficient. Automation of the aircraft hopper door increases control of fertiliser application. This includes the ability to achieve variable rate application, where multiple application rates can be applied over the farm. Ravensdown Limited has installed variable rate application technology (VRAT) on their Pacific Aerospace Cresco (PAC) 600 aircraft to improve the aerial application of granular fertiliser to hill country farms. The objective of this study was to measure and improve the performance of the VRAT system. Various aspects of the system's performance were examined; including hopper flow dynamics, control of the hopper door, estimation of a fertiliser particle's landing position from a known release point, collection of field data, and prediction of wind effects on the ground fertiliser distribution.

Performance trials, bench testing and static hopper flow tests were used to improve the VRAT system. Three performance trials were carried out. Each had a different sampling configuration: grid, nested grid and line. Sampling configuration varied because the objective of each trial differed, and there were advantages and disadvantages to each configuration. Accuracy, precision, level of off-target application, and capability of the VRAT system to vary application rate was measured. The trials observed accurate application rates, and improved precision when compared to pilot operated hopper doors. Off-target application occurred because the buffer was insufficiently sized, and did not consider the forward motion of particles, wind effects, and the mechanical/hydraulic limitations of the VRAT system. Bench testing, modelling and field trials can be used to improve the sizing of buffers under varying field conditions. Statistical tests showed the VRAT system was capable of applying different application rates to application zones.

While some parts of aerial topdressing can be controlled, there are other factors that cannot be controlled and are a source of variation. Several factors are discussed. Particle bounce out of the collectors was observed after the second performance trial. This issue under-estimated the field application rate in the first two performance trials. Additional trials were completed to improve the capture efficiency by 38% for superphosphate, and provided correction factors for DAP and urea.

Wind contributes to variability in aerial applications, and automation of the hopper door is unlikely to significantly mitigate its effects. Ravensdown Limited wished to develop a wind

displacement calculator tool. The calculator uses a single particle granular fertiliser ballistics model to predict the displacement of the transverse spread pattern and swath width by wind. To achieve this, the ballistics model was validated for superphosphate, urea, di-ammonium phosphate (DAP), and a 70% superphosphate/30% Flexi-N blend.

The model was validated from two data sets for each fertiliser type. From the first data set, the propeller wash component was excluded because fertiliser particles leave the hopper door in a mass flow. Therefore in the initial time steps, the particles are not singular and the propeller wash does not significantly influence their motion. There was good agreement between the field and modelled transverse spread patterns. Additionally, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistically showed that the two distributions were similar. The development of the wind displacement calculator tool and production of wind displacement look up tables is described. From a limited number of inputs, the calculator predicts the displacement of the peak mass in a transverse spread pattern. To decrease modelling time, wind displacement look up tables were created from the tool for superphosphate, urea and DAP.

In conclusion, the VRAT system will improve fertiliser application to hill country. However, aerial topdressing is highly variable and some factors cannot be controlled. Ballistics modelling can be used to minimise these factors and improve understanding of the variability. The model and wind displacement calculator should be used with care, as they are based on assumptions, which may not be completely representative of field conditions.

## **Acknowledgements**

Many people contributed to the success of this project. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors Professor Ian Yule and Dr. Miles Grafton for their advice and guidance throughout this project. I am grateful to them for giving me the opportunity to complete this PhD.

Next, I would like to thank the incredible team at the New Zealand Centre of Precision Agriculture, who helped me with my trials and provided sound advice in troubled times. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Kate Saxton for her work in organising staff and the logistics of the trials. I have also enjoyed my time with my fellow PhD students. They have not only provided entertainment and encouragement, but also voluntarily participated in my trials. Additionally, I would like to thank John Edwards for his years of advice and kindness in the lab, and Ray Watson (Comtel Limited) for being an amazing problem solver.

I am thankful for the funding provided by Callaghan Innovation and Ravensdown Limited. This project could not have been completed without the support of Ravensdown and their staff. I want to thank Michael White and Michael Manning for mentoring me and giving me the opportunity to learn more about Ravensdown. I would like to acknowledge Grant Lennox and Mark Tocher, who operated their aircraft for my trials and co-operated with my ideas.

Lastly, I would have not made it without the love and support of my family and friends. My parents have continued to support all my endeavours, and I am eternally grateful for their encouragement and advice.



# Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	3
Table of Contents.....	5
List of Tables .....	9
List of Figures .....	11
Chapter 1 – Introduction.....	17
1.1. Introduction .....	17
1.2. Specific Objectives .....	18
1.3. Aerial Topdressing.....	19
1.4. Variability in Aerial Topdressing .....	22
1.4.1. Fertiliser Characteristics.....	23
1.4.2. Fertiliser Transportation and Storage .....	28
1.4.3. Wind.....	29
1.4.4. Altitude.....	30
1.4.5. Topography .....	31
1.4.6. Aircraft Velocity .....	31
1.4.7. Spreaders .....	31
1.4.8. Swath width .....	32
1.5. Variable Rate Application Technology .....	33
1.6. Ballistics Modelling for Aerial Topdressing.....	37
1.6.1. Mass Flow Prediction .....	40
1.7. Sampling Methods .....	42
1.7.1. Geo-statistics.....	44
1.8. Main Points .....	47
1.9. Structure of Thesis .....	48
Chapter 2 - Ballistics Modelling for Aerial Topdressing of Granular Fertiliser.....	49
2.1. Introduction .....	49
2.2. Method .....	51
2.2.1. Validation Trial 1 .....	51
2.2.2. Validation Trial 2 .....	54
2.2.3. Validation Trial 3 .....	56
2.2.4. Pre – Processing .....	57
2.3. Initial Model Program Set Up.....	61

2.3.1. Particle Size Distribution.....	61
2.3.2. Wind Power Law.....	64
2.3.3. Particle Sphericity.....	65
2.3.4. Initial Discharge Variables .....	65
2.4. Validation Results and Discussion .....	67
2.4.1. Trial 1 .....	68
2.4.2. Trial 2 .....	74
2.4.3. Trial 3 .....	79
2.4.4. Model Accuracy .....	82
2.5. Wind Displacement Calculator .....	86
2.5.1. Python script.....	87
2.5.2. GIS Tool.....	87
2.5.3. Wind Displacement Look Up Tables.....	90
2.6. Conclusion .....	94
Chapter 3 - Methods and Evaluation of Sampling for Aerial Topdressing Performance Trials...	97
3.1. Introduction.....	97
3.2. Trial 4 – Grid Sampling.....	98
3.3. Trial 5 – Nested Grid Sampling .....	101
3.4. Trial 6 – Pickwick Trial.....	103
3.4.1. Objective 1.....	105
3.4.2. Objective 2.....	116
3.4.3. Objective 3.....	117
3.4.4. Objective 4.....	118
3.5. Collector Improvement .....	119
3.5.1. Initial Collector Study .....	119
3.5.2. Trial 7 – Collector Trial.....	123
3.6. Trial 8 – Line Sampling.....	126
3.7. Conclusion .....	131
Chapter 4 - Performance of an Aerial Variable Rate Application System .....	133
4.1. Introduction.....	133
4.2. Results and Discussion of Performance Trials .....	134
4.2.1. Accuracy.....	134
4.2.2. Precision .....	135
4.2.3. Capability.....	137

4.3. Bench Testing.....	142
4.3.1. Method .....	143
4.3.2. Results and Discussion .....	146
4.4. Static Hopper Flow Calibration .....	155
4.5. Trial 8 .....	163
4.6. Static Hopper Flow Calibration Re-test.....	168
4.7. Conclusion.....	172
Chapter 5 - Variability in Aerial Topdressing .....	175
5.1. Introduction .....	175
5.2. Part 1: Release of Fertiliser Particle from Aircraft .....	179
5.2.1. Hopper Flow Characteristics .....	179
5.2.2. Future Work .....	181
5.3. Part 2: Fertiliser Particle Motion through Air .....	183
5.3.1. Wind and topography .....	183
5.3.2. Future Work .....	185
5.4. Part 3: Fertiliser Placement and Measurement.....	185
5.4.1. Data Collection.....	185
5.4.2. Collector Efficiency.....	185
5.4.3. Collector Placement.....	187
5.4.4. Future Work .....	190
5.5. Implications of Research.....	192
5.6. Improvements to Research Methodology .....	194
5.7. Conclusion.....	196
Chapter 6 - Summary .....	199
6.1. Summary .....	199
6.2. Concluding Remarks.....	202
6.3. Publications.....	204
References .....	205
Appendix .....	213



## List of Tables

Table 1.1: Standard SGN and UI values set by Spreadmark (NZFQC, 2016b). .....	25
Table 2.1: Target application rate, swath width and hopper door opening for Trial 1. ....	54
Table 2.2: Target application rate, swath width and hopper door opening for Trial 2. ....	56
Table 2.3: Particle size distribution from the bulk pile for Trial 1.....	58
Table 2.4: Particle density, size guide number (SGN) and uniformity index (UI) of particles from the bulk pile of Trial 1. ....	58
Table 2.5: Particle size distribution from the bulk pile for Trial 2.....	58
Table 2.6: Particle density, size guide number (SGN) and uniformity index (UI) of particles from the bulk pile of Trial 2. ....	59
Table 2.7: Particle size distribution from the bulk pile for Trial 3.....	59
Table 2.8: Inputs for the Beverloo equation.....	60
Table 2.9: Image analysed particle size distribution from Trial 1 for DAP and urea. ....	63
Table 2.10: Air velocity in a nine duct spreader at an aircraft velocity of $62 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ .....	66
Table 2.11: Pacific Aerospace Cresco 600 aircraft parameters. ....	66
Table 2.12: Input values for the hopper door when a spreader is not attached for the application. ....	66
Table 2.13: Input values for a Transland spreader. ....	67
Table 2.14: Input values for a FarmAir spreader. ....	67
Table 2.15: Application rates and swath widths from Trial 1 for each collector row.....	70
Table 2.16: Application rates and swath widths from Trial 2 for each collector row.....	76
Table 2.17: Image analysed particle size distribution from Trial 2 for urea. ....	78
Table 2.18: Application rates and swath widths from Trial 3 for each collector row.....	79
Table 2.19: Comparison of ballistics model and Beverloo flow rates for Trial 1 and 2. ....	82
Table 2.20: Comparison of ballistics model and Beverloo flow rates for Trial 3. ....	83
Table 2.21: Comparison of intended, trial and model application rate and swath width for Trial 1-3. The difference (%) is between the trial and model application rate.....	84
Table 2.22: P and D values from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for Trial 1 and 2. ....	84
Table 2.23: P and D values from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for Trial 3 for a 70% Superphosphate and 30% Flexi-N fertiliser blend. ....	85
Table 2.24: The wind velocity, wind angle and flow required to produce a transverse spread pattern for DAP in Trial 2 that rejected the null hypothesis when tested with the K-S test. ....	86
Table 3.1: Level settings for swath width, intended application rate and aircraft groundspeed for Trial 6.....	106
Table 3.2: ANOVA and interaction test results for urea in Trial 6. ....	107
Table 3.3: Using Figure 3.7, Figure 3.8 and Figure 3.9 equations to predict field application rate from Longview validation trials (Trial 1 and 2). ....	110
Table 3.4: Percentage of particles bouncing out of a collector and their average particle strength.....	119
Table 3.5: Height required to reach terminal velocity for three fertiliser types. ....	120
Table 3.6: Average masses collected from the three fertiliser collectors in Trial 7. ....	126
Table 3.7: Percentage difference in masses between collector types in Trial 7.....	126
Table 4.1: Summary of collector data for Trial 4 (Limestone Downs) and Trial 5 (Longview)..	135
Table 4.2: ANOVA test for collector distance and application rate from Trial 5. ....	136

Table 4.3: Percentage of correct hopper door openings for bench tested prescription maps of different sizes. ....	151
Table 4.4: Two-way ANOVA test comparing hopper door opening and the aircraft velocity to the distance the hopper door closes in relation to the application zone boundary.....	152
Table 4.5: Comparison of parameters determined by linear regression for Beverloo equation and original coefficients. ....	162
Table 4.6: Comparison of field results with calculated clam shell door openings. Linear and Beverloo equation application rates were calculated using an aircraft velocity of 59 m s <sup>-1</sup> . ...	163
Table 4.7: Summary of collector data for Trial 8. ....	166
Table 4.8: One way ANOVA test comparing the applications rates in the 250 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> and 500 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> application zones at a 95% confidence interval. ....	166
Table 4.9: Comparison of field results with calculated cantilever door openings for superphosphate. Linear and Beverloo equation application rates were calculated using an aircraft velocity of 59 m s <sup>-1</sup> . ....	172
Table 5.1: Summary of trials undertaken in this study.....	176
Table 5.2: Original results from Trial 4 and 5. The samples were not adjusted for bounce out of the collectors. ....	186

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Example of Spreadmark calculating the average field mass from the transverse spread pattern and set swath width (i.e. 15 m). The blue line represents the distribution created from a racecourse (round and round) flight path, and the purple is for a to and fro flying pattern.....	21
Figure 1.2: Factors that affect the transverse spread pattern in aerial granular fertiliser application. ....	24
Figure 1.3: Examples of the relationship between UI and SGN sourced from NZFQC (2016b). The images represent fertiliser in a sieve box, where the x axis is the mesh size in mm.....	26
Figure 1.4: Chemical compatibility of common New Zealand fertilisers (Fertiliser Association, 2007). ....	27
Figure 1.5: Port side image of an 11 duct spreader that is attached to the hopper door on an aircraft.....	32
Figure 1.6: Predicted field scale application on a 25 ha site where the hopper door is pilot operated and there is no GPS guidance (Murray, 2007). The application rates were modelled using Jones et al. (2008) and recorded aircraft data. ....	35
Figure 1.7: Predicted field scale application using an automated GPS guided hopper door. Murray (2007) produced this image from Figure 1.6 by removing all points outside the application area except when it was within 45 m of an application area. ....	35
Figure 1.8: Collector developed by Laslett (1994). ....	43
Figure 1.9: Collectors used by the New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association. ....	43
Figure 1.10: Example of a semi-variogram adapted from Bohling (2005). ....	45
Figure 2.1: Pacific Aerospace Cresco 600. ....	49
Figure 2.2: Pre-determined location of collectors for Trial 1 in ArcGIS 10.1. ....	52
Figure 2.3: Trial 1 set up.....	52
Figure 2.4: Wind anemometer that records wind velocity and direction. ....	53
Figure 2.5: The wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 1. True north is denoted by 0 degrees. ....	53
Figure 2.6: Pre-determined location of collectors for Trial 2 in ArcGIS 10.1. ....	54
Figure 2.7: Trial 2 set up.....	55
Figure 2.8: The wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 2. True north is denoted by 0 degrees. ....	55
Figure 2.9: Trial 3 set up.....	56
Figure 2.10: The wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 3. True north is denoted by 0 degrees. ....	57
Figure 2.11: A riffler used to equally divide a fertiliser sample. ....	58
Figure 2.12: Example of Mapstar 8 output for Trial 2. The green outline represents the application area. Blue lines are flight lines, where the hopper is closed, and the red rectangles are the flight lines where the hopper door is open. The width of each individual rectangle represents the set swath width. ....	60
Figure 2.13: Image analysis of a collected DAP sample using a New Zealand 50 cent coin as a size reference. ....	62
Figure 2.14: Cumulative particle size distribution of bulk and collected samples for DAP in Trial 1. ....	63

Figure 2.15: Cumulative particle size distribution of bulk and collected samples for urea in Trial 1. ....	63
Figure 2.16: Trial 1 spread patterns collected from the nine rows for superphosphate. ....	68
Figure 2.17: Trial 1 spread patterns collected from the nine rows for DAP. ....	69
Figure 2.18: Trial 1 spread patterns collected from the nine rows for urea. ....	69
Figure 2.19: Comparison of Murray (2007) model and Trial 1 spread patterns for superphosphate. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 92°, aircraft velocity of 69 m s <sup>-1</sup> and an altitude of 34.2 m. The wind direction was 158.62° and wind speed was 0.1 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of superphosphate out of the hopper was 1261 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	71
Figure 2.20: Comparison of model and Trial 1 spread patterns for superphosphate. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 92°, aircraft velocity of 69 m s <sup>-1</sup> and an altitude of 34.2 m. The wind direction was 158.62° and wind speed was 0.1 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of superphosphate out of the hopper was 1261 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	72
Figure 2.21: Comparison of model and Trial 1 spread patterns for DAP. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 92°, aircraft velocity of 62 m s <sup>-1</sup> and an altitude of 32.5 m. The wind direction was 149.15° and wind velocity was 0.214 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow of DAP out of the hopper was 1300 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	72
Figure 2.22: Comparison of model and Trial 1 spread patterns for urea. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 92°, aircraft velocity of 65 m s <sup>-1</sup> and an altitude of 34.4 m. The wind direction was 178° and wind speed was 0.58 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of urea out of the hopper was 551 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	73
Figure 2.23: Trial 2 spread patterns collected from six rows for superphosphate. ....	74
Figure 2.24: Trial 2 spread patterns collected from six rows for DAP. ....	75
Figure 2.25: Trial 2 spread patterns collected from six rows for urea. ....	75
Figure 2.26: Comparison of model and Trial 2 spread patterns for superphosphate. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 273°, aircraft velocity of 59 m s <sup>-1</sup> and altitude of 33.3 m. The wind direction was 77° and wind speed was 1.6 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of superphosphate out of the hopper was 982 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	77
Figure 2.27: Comparison of model and Trial 2 spread patterns for DAP. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 273°, aircraft velocity of 58 m s <sup>-1</sup> and altitude of 32.5 m. The wind direction was 81° and wind velocity was 1.44 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of DAP out of the hopper was 1490 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	77
Figure 2.28: Cumulative particle size distribution of bulk and collected samples for urea in Trial 2. ....	78
Figure 2.29: Comparison of model and Trial 2 spread patterns for urea. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 273°, aircraft velocity of 63 m s <sup>-1</sup> and altitude of 41.8 m. The wind direction was 85° and wind velocity was 2.57 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of urea out of the hopper was 845 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	79
Figure 2.30: Trial 3 spread patterns collected from Flight 1 for the 70% superphosphate/30% Flexi-N blend. ....	80
Figure 2.31: Trial 3 spread patterns collected from Flight 2 for the 70% superphosphate/30% Flexi-N blend. ....	80
Figure 2.32: Comparison of model and Trial 3 spread pattern for Flight 1. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 251°, aircraft velocity of 67 m s <sup>-1</sup> and altitude	

of 18.6 m. The wind direction was 185° and wind speed was 0.4 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The flow rate of the blend out of the hopper was 684 kg min <sup>-1</sup> .....	81
Figure 2.33: Comparison of model and Trial 3 spread pattern for Flight 2. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 251°, aircraft velocity of 69 m s <sup>-1</sup> and altitude of 11.6 m. The wind direction was 184° and wind velocity was 0.215 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The flow rate of the blend out of the hopper was 822 kg min <sup>-1</sup> .....	82
Figure 2.34: Comparison of model and Trial 2 row 6 spread pattern for DAP. For this spread pattern, the aircraft was travelling at a heading of 273°, aircraft velocity of 58 m s <sup>-1</sup> and altitude of 32.5 m. The wind direction was 88.2° and wind speed was 1.8 m s <sup>-1</sup> . The modelled flow rate of superphosphate out of the hopper was 1090 kg min <sup>-1</sup> . ....	86
Figure 2.35: Example vector diagram of the wind offset calculated for a wind speed of 0.75 m s <sup>-1</sup> at 300°.....	89
Figure 2.36: Example of application area and its offset when the average wind speed is 0.75 m s <sup>-1</sup> , wind direction is 300° and aircraft heading is 10°. This was modelled for superphosphate.	89
Figure 2.37: Peak lateral mass displacement for wind direction of 180°, 270° and 340°, and wind velocity for superphosphate with no spreader.....	91
Figure 2.38: Swath width for wind direction of 180°, 270° and 340°, and wind velocity for superphosphate with no spreader.....	92
Figure 2.39: Peak lateral mass displacement for wind direction of 180°, 270° and 340°, and wind velocity for urea with an 11 duct spreader.....	93
Figure 2.40: Swath width for wind direction of 180°, 270° and 340°, and wind velocity for urea with an 11 duct spreader.....	93
Figure 3.1: Sampling configuration for Trial 4. ....	99
Figure 3.2: Sampling configuration for Trial 5. ....	102
Figure 3.3: Wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 5. True north is denoted by 0 degrees.....	103
Figure 3.4: Wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 6. True north is denoted by 0 degrees.....	105
Figure 3.5: Sample areas for Trial 6. ....	106
Figure 3.6: Trial set up in Area 3 in Trial 6. ....	107
Figure 3.7: The relationship between the measured field application rate and hopper door opening for urea in Trial 6. The dashed lines are the confidence interval (CI) of the linear equation.....	109
Figure 3.8: The relationship between the measured field application rate and hopper door opening for superphosphate in Trial 6. The dashed lines are the confidence interval (CI) of the linear equation.....	109
Figure 3.9: The relationship between the measured field application rate and hopper door opening for DAP in Trial 6. The dashed lines are the confidence interval (CI) of the linear equation.....	110
Figure 3.10: Relationship between intended and measured field application rate in Trial 6. Lines representing 1:1, 1:1.5 and 1:2 are included to illustrate the magnitude of difference between the two application rates.....	111
Figure 3.11: The relationship between the measured field application rate and swath width for urea in Trial 6. ....	112

Figure 3.12: The relationship between the measured field application rate and swath width for superphosphate in Trial 6.....	113
Figure 3.13: The relationship between the measured field application rate and swath width for DAP in Trial 6. ....	113
Figure 3.14: Relationship between the measured field application rate and the recorded aircraft velocity for urea in Trial 6. ....	115
Figure 3.15: Relationship between the measured field application rate and the recorded aircraft velocity for superphosphate in Trial 6. ....	115
Figure 3.16: Relationship between the measured field application rate and the recorded aircraft velocity for DAP in Trial 6.....	116
Figure 3.17: Comparison of the field application rate and the field Beverloo equation for Trial 6. ....	116
Figure 3.18: Distance fertiliser particles were found from the boundary for different edge time settings in Trial 6. A positive distance from the boundary indicates the particle landed within the application area and vice versa.....	118
Figure 3.19: Image still of a video taken at 500 frames per second recorded at Pickwick farm of superphosphate taken at Trial 6.....	119
Figure 3.20: Set up for terminal velocity of 9 m height.....	120
Figure 3.21: Comparison of calculated and measured terminal velocities for various superphosphate particle sizes. Calculations were made using Haider and Levenspiel (1989). ....	121
Figure 3.22: Comparison of calculated and measured terminal velocities for various urea particle sizes. Calculations were made using Haider and Levenspiel (1989). ....	121
Figure 3.23: Comparison of calculated and measured terminal velocities for various DAP particle sizes. Calculations were made using Haider and Levenspiel (1989). ....	122
Figure 3.24: Sampling configuration for Trial 7. ....	124
Figure 3.25: Collector set up for Trial 7 on trial day. ....	124
Figure 3.26: Wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 7. True north is denoted by 0 degrees. ....	125
Figure 3.27: Collectors set up with the bubble wrap liner in Trial 8. ....	127
Figure 3.28: Collectors set up in a line with replicates in Trial 8. The collectors travel over one hill and up one hill. ....	128
Figure 3.29: Sample configuration and application zones for Trial 8.....	129
Figure 3.30: Wind velocity and direction over the trial period in Trial 8. True north is denoted by 0 degrees. ....	130
Figure 4.1: Comparison of application rate with the collector's proximity to the nearest treatment boundary line for Trial 4. A positive distance means the collector was in the 250 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> application zone. ....	137
Figure 4.2: Comparison of application rate to the collector's proximity to the nearest treatment boundary line for Trial 5. A positive distance means the collector was in the 162 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> application zone. ....	137
Figure 4.3: Semi-variogram of aircraft data from Trial 4 (A) and Trial 5 (B). The y-axis is the semi-variance and the x-axis is the lag distance (m). ....	138
Figure 4.4: Semi-variogram of collector data from Trial 4 (A) and Trial 5 (B). The y-axis is the semi-variance and the x-axis is the lag distance (m). ....	139
Figure 4.5: Proof of release (A) and placement (B) maps for Trial 4. ....	140

Figure 4.6: Proof of release (A) and placement (B) maps for Trial 5. ....	140
Figure 4.7: Error between predicted values and recorded aircraft values for Trial 4 (A) and Trial 5 (B). The y-axis is the predicted application rate ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) that was found using kriging, and the x-axis is the aircraft application rate ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ).....	141
Figure 4.8: Error between predicted values and collector data for Trial 4 (A) and Trial 5 (B). The y-axis is the predicted application rate ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) that was found using kriging, and the x-axis is the field application rate ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ).....	141
Figure 4.9: Prediction standard error maps for collector data for Trial 4 (A) and Trial 5 (B). ..	142
Figure 4.10: Aircraft hopper door in closed position. ....	144
Figure 4.11: Aircraft hopper door in the open position.....	144
Figure 4.12: Mechanical set up of variable rate bench testing unit. ....	145
Figure 4.13: Satloc user interface with simulated flight example. Blues lines represent a closed hopper and bold green lines are an open hopper. The red square is the application area. ....	145
Figure 4.14: Example of 1000 m by 1000 m application zone displayed in Mapstar 8. ....	147
Figure 4.15: Distance to/from boundary against the edge on/off setting for a dual accumulator. ....	147
Figure 4.16: An example of a prescription map and flight lines for Part 3 displayed in Mapstar 8. This shows a 50 m gap. The green line represents the application area. Flight lines are represented by the blue (fully closed hopper) and red lines (open hopper). ....	148
Figure 4.17: An example of a prescription map and flight lines from Part 4 displayed in Mapstar 8. This polygon is angled 20 degrees. ....	149
Figure 4.18: An example of a prescription map and flight lines for Part 5 displayed in Mapstar 8. This polygon has 100 vertices. ....	150
Figure 4.19: An example of a prescription map that consists of adjacent polygons (250 and 500 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), exclusion zones (0 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and different application rates (200, 350, 400 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ). This is displayed in Mapstar 8. ....	153
Figure 4.20: Two polygons separated by a gap of 50 m, where no application should occur. Application rates in the polygons are 200 and 400 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ . This is displayed in Mapstar 8. ....	153
Figure 4.21: Simulated response of Figure 4.20 from the bench VRAT system in Mapstar 8 based on 'edge on' setting of 0.5 s and 'edge off' of 1.6 s. Entry into the application zone is denoted by the black arrows. The system did not react as intended. ....	154
Figure 4.22: Large farm prescription map for variable rate application.....	154
Figure 4.23: Response from creating an exclusion application zone displayed in Mapstar 8. Entry into the application area is denoted by black arrows. The red strips represent an open hopper door. ....	155
Figure 4.24: Hopper door was manually opened using the lever and, in this case, the flow rate of superphosphate was being measured.....	157
Figure 4.25: Static PAC hopper with clamshell doors operated by a lever (on left). A Mettler Toledo display is fixed on the front (centre of picture). ....	157
Figure 4.26: Example of funnel flow regime for a powder, courtesy of John Maber (Grafton, 2010). The angle of the standard PAC hopper allowed the hopper to empty and ratholing did not occur. ....	158
Figure 4.27: Flow rate out of the clamshell hopper door against time for three door openings (0.025 m, 0.046 m and 0.075 m).....	159

Figure 4.28: Relationship between flow rate and the clam shell hopper door opening with linear regression for superphosphate. ....	159
Figure 4.29: Relationship between flow rate and the clam shell hopper door opening with linear regression for DAP.....	160
Figure 4.30: Relationship between flow rate and the clam shell hopper door opening with linear regression for urea. ....	160
Figure 4.31: Relationship of flow rate to the 2/3 power and the clam shell hopper door opening with linear regression for superphosphate. ....	161
Figure 4.32: Relationship of flow rate to the 2/3 power and the clam shell hopper door opening with linear regression for DAP.....	161
Figure 4.33: Relationship of flow rate to the 2/3 power and the clam shell hopper door opening with linear regression for urea. ....	162
Figure 4.34: Flight points recorded every 0.2 s on VRAT system. Hopper door opening in 1/16 <sup>th</sup> inches are labelled.....	164
Figure 4.35: Field application rate across the line of bubble wrap lined collectors from the west to east direction. Replicate lines are included. The location of the replicate line is denoted in the legend as north or south of the main center line. AZ stands for application zone.....	165
Figure 4.36: Categorised application rate from collectors at each location. Yellow coloured points represent the target application rate range for the 250 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> zone and red is the target range of application rates for the 500 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> zone. ....	167
Figure 4.37: Particle size distribution comparison between the bulk and field samples for Trial 8. ....	168
Figure 4.38: Comparison of the intended hopper door opening and the measured hopper door opening. ....	169
Figure 4.39: Flow rate out of the cantilever hopper door against time for three door openings (0.032 m, 0.047 m and 0.066 m). ....	170
Figure 4.40: Open cantilever hopper door illustrating the main door opening and the smaller opening. ....	170
Figure 4.41: Relationship between average flow rate and the cantilever hopper door opening with linear regression for superphosphate. ....	171
Figure 4.42: Relationship of flow rate to the 2/3 power and the cantilever hopper door opening with linear regression for superphosphate. ....	172
Figure 5.1: Factors that affect the transverse spread pattern in aerial granular fertiliser application. ....	178
Figure 5.2: Top view of the cantilever hopper door with door hinges annotated. ....	179
Figure 5.3: Flow rate out of a 0.0254 m cantilever hopper door opening against time for superphosphate.....	180
Figure 5.4: Aircraft flight lines recorded every 0.2 s by the VRAT system for Trial 4.....	188