

JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

Barnes, Matthew Gavin (2008) *Development of a single drum chopper concept for a sugarcane harvester.* Masters (Research) thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/17529>



Development of a Single Drum Chopper Concept for a Sugarcane Harvester

Thesis submitted by

Matthew Gavin Barnes

Bachelor of Engineering (Mechanical) with Honours
James Cook University, Townsville

in December 2008

for the degree of Master of Engineering Science
in the School of Engineering (Mechanical Engineering)
James Cook University

Statement of Access

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make it available for use within the University Library and, by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries. All users consulting with this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without written consent of the author; and to make proper public written acknowledgement for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this thesis.

Matthew Gavin Barnes

10/05/2009

Sources Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledge in the text and a list of references is given.

Matthew Gavin Barnes

10/05/2009

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the following persons for the valuable help given to me during this study:

My supervisor; Professor Jeffrey Loughran, of James Cook University, for your guidance, support and motivation throughout the course of this research.

Doctor Bruce Lamb, of New South Wales Sugar Cooperative, for creating this project and for your support throughout the course of this work.

Rockfield Technologies for the detailed design and construction of the prototype chopper rig.

The James Cook University workshop staff, for your assistance with the installation and maintenance of the prototype chopper rig.

Mr. Cam Whiteing, of BSES Limited, for your assistance with the prototype testing.

The Sugar Research and Development Corporation for the sponsorship of this project.

My family for their ongoing support and encouragement throughout my studies.

Abstract

A global push towards renewable energy has seen the birth of cogeneration in Australian sugar mills. To maximise the amount of energy extracted from the material, whole crop harvesting has been introduced, where a higher proportion of total biomass is sent to the mill. The adverse affect of this is a significant reduction in bulk density of the harvested material. Transport costs to harvester owners and millers significantly increase as bin weights are reduced, and therefore there is a case for developing a harvester chopper system which maintains bin weight as the amount of trash sent to the mill increases. The single knife slicing of sugarcane stalks against a stationary anvil was investigated in this study and from the findings a single drum chopper system was developed. An explicit finite element model of the proposed concept was constructed for assessment of billet trajectories through the system. Positive results from these models gave confidence for the construction of a prototype for experimental assessment of the performance of the system. Cane and juice losses and billet quality were measured for a range of operational conditions which included varying the chopper drum speed, pour rate and chopper drum geometry. The cutting process was captured by high speed photography for analysis into the causes of damage and losses. Speeding up the chopper drum and therefore shortening the billet length proved to have the most detrimental effect on system performance, where a reduction in the target billet length from 200 mm to 100 mm resulted in over three times the overall losses. An increase in pour rate did not have a significant effect on losses or billet quality. The high speed footage provided invaluable insight into the behaviour of the stalks as they were cut by the single drum system. For the set of trial conditions most closely representing those previously done with differential choppers, the single drum system produced similar efficiency results. However, the advantages of this system are most prominent in whole crop harvesting where shorter billets are required to maintain bin weights.

Contents

Statement of access	ii
Sources declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Contents	vi
Tables	ix
Figures	xii
Symbols	xiv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background and motivation	2
1.2 Research context	3
1.3 Aim	3
1.4 Scope.....	3
1.5 Thesis outline.....	4
2. Literature Review	6
2.1 The mechanical sugarcane harvester	7
2.1.1. The history of chopper systems in sugarcane harvesters	9
2.1.2. Chopper losses	11
2.2 Chopper systems used in similar industries	13
2.2.1. The forage harvester chopper system	13
2.2.2. The use of forage harvesters for cutting sugarcane.....	17
2.3 The physical structure of sugarcane.....	18
2.4 The mechanical properties of sugarcane.....	20
2.5 Cutting sugarcane	22
2.6 Predicting the bulk density of a cane and trash mixture	23
2.7 Conclusions from the literature review.....	26
3. Laboratory billeting experiments	27
3.1 Aims.....	28
3.2 Apparatus.....	28
3.2.1. Instrumentation and recording devices	30
3.3 Description of the experiment.....	30
3.3.1. Variables	30

3.3.2.	Experimental procedure	32
3.3.3.	Experimental design	33
3.3.4.	Quantitative experimental outputs	35
3.4	Results.....	35
3.4.1.	Cane and juice losses	35
3.4.2.	High speed photography	38
3.5	Discussion.....	39
3.5.1.	Descriptive model of the mechanisms present during the cut.....	39
3.5.2.	Implications to the design of the chopper system	40
3.6	Conclusions from the laboratory billeting experiments.....	40
4.	Development of the single drum chopper concept	41
4.1	Aims.....	42
4.2	System requirements.....	42
4.3	Component conceptualisation.....	42
4.3.1.	Drum	43
4.3.2.	Knife	45
4.3.3.	Shear bar	46
4.3.4.	Deflector plate.....	47
4.3.5.	Sharpening system	47
4.4	Conclusions from the concept design	47
5.	Dynamic modelling	48
5.1	Aims.....	49
5.2	Finite element modelling	49
5.3	Description of the experiment.....	49
5.3.1.	Variables	49
5.3.2.	Experimental design	50
5.4	Model design.....	51
5.4.1.	Geometry	51
5.4.2.	Material properties.....	53
5.4.3.	Mesh	53
5.4.4.	Loads.....	54
5.4.5.	Constraints	55
5.4.6.	Control data.....	55
5.4.7.	Element deactivation.....	56
5.4.8.	Analysis	56

5.4.9.	Post-processor	56
5.5	Results and discussion	57
5.6	Conclusions from the dynamic modelling	60
6.	Prototype testing.....	61
6.1	Aims.....	62
6.2	Apparatus	62
6.2.1.	Instrumentation and recording devices	67
6.3	Description of the experiment.....	68
6.3.1.	Variables	68
6.3.2.	Experimental procedure	72
6.3.3.	Experimental design	73
6.3.4.	Quantitative experimental outputs	74
6.4	Results.....	77
6.4.1.	Total cane and juice losses.....	78
6.4.2.	Cane and juice loss per cut per metre	80
6.4.3.	Billet quality	83
6.4.4.	Billet length distribution	86
6.4.5.	High speed footage of the cutting process	87
6.4.6.	Material trajectory.....	89
6.5	Experimental errors.....	91
6.6	Discussion.....	92
6.6.1.	Causes of stalk damage.....	92
6.6.2.	Comparisons to current chopper systems	97
6.7	Conclusions from the prototype testing	98
7.	Conclusions.....	99
7.1	Outcomes	100
7.2	Recommendations for further development of the chopper concept	101
	References	103

Tables

Table 1	Harvester production data (Jakeway, 2003).....	17
Table 2	Mechanical properties of sugarcane (Keenlside, 1985).....	21
Table 3	Levels selected for each independent variable.....	31
Table 4	Experimental plan for the laboratory experiments.....	34
Table 5	Analysis of variance for mass loss under the independent input variables.....	37
Table 6	Comparison amongst anvil angle levels for which significantly affected mass loss	37
Table 7	Levels selected for each independent variable.....	50
Table 8	Target billet lengths and corresponding chopper drum speeds used in the modelling	50
Table 9	Finite element modelling plan	51
Table 10	Material properties: linear elastic parameters and density.....	53
Table 11	Global contact properties	55
Table 12	Billet velocities upon contact with extraction chamber wall (m/s).....	60
Table 13	Levels selected for each independent variable.....	69
Table 14	Pour Rates and Corresponding Target Bundle Weights	70
Table 15	Target billet lengths and corresponding chopper drum speeds used in the testing	71
Table 16	Prototype testing experimental plan	74
Table 17	Quantitative experimental results	77
Table 18	Analysis of variance for total mass loss under drum speed and pour rate factors	79
Table 19	Comparisons amongst levels for chopper drum speed on mass loss	80
Table 20	Analysis of variance for mass loss per cut under drum speed and pour rate factors	82
Table 21	Comparisons amongst levels for chopper drum speed on mass loss per cut per metre	82
Table 22	ANOVA for percentage of sound billets under drum speed and pour rate factors	84
Table 23	ANOVA for percentage of damaged billets under drum speed and pour rate factors	84

Table 24	ANOVA for percentage of mutilated billets under drum speed and pour rate factors	84
Table 25	Comparisons amongst levels for chopper drum speed on percentage of sound billets.....	85
Table 26	Comparisons amongst levels for chopper drum speed on percentage of mutilated billets	85

Figures

Figure 1	Most recent model John Deere track driven sugarcane chopper harvester	7
Figure 2	Fundamental components of a modern mechanical sugarcane harvester (BSES, 2002).....	8
Figure 3	Rotary pinch chop system configurations (Hockings and Davis, 1999).....	11
Figure 4	Chopper system in a 1998 model Cameco harvester	11
Figure 5	Chopper test rig used in the BSES trials (Hockings and Davis, 1999).....	12
Figure 6	Schematic of a Claas Jaguar 830 forage harvester chopper drum (Claas, 2002)	15
Figure 7	Schematic of a Claas Jaguar 830 forage harvester shear bar and pivot assembly (Claas, 2002).....	15
Figure 8	Schematic of a Claas Jaguar 830 forage harvester sharpening stone and holder assembly (Claas, 2002).....	16
Figure 9	Claas Jaguar 830 forage harvester chopper knife	16
Figure 10	Mature crop of sugarcane prior to harvest	18
Figure 11	Cross section through a sugarcane stalk inter-node. 1, Epidermis; 2, thick-walled cells forming the rind; 3&4, vascular bundles of different sizes; 5, sclerenchyma; 6, pith tissue. (Van Dillewijn, 1952).....	19
Figure 12	Typical stress-strain curve for sugarcane in bending (Keenlside, 1985).....	21
Figure 13	Behaviour of timothy grass during cutting with knife and counter-shear (Persson, 1987)	22
Figure 14	Screenshot of (a) input panel, and (b) results panel for trash layer calculator (Lewis, 2006).....	24
Figure 15	Predicted bin weights for 200 mm billets	24
Figure 16	Predicted bin weights for 150 mm billets	25
Figure 17	Predicted bin weights for 100 mm billets	25
Figure 18	Laboratory cutting experiment apparatus	29
Figure 19	Anvil frame showing the mounts for the different angle settings.....	29
Figure 20	Schematic of the cutting process studied in this set of experiments.....	30
Figure 21	Cutting edge width of the new and blunt knife.....	32
Figure 22a	The effect of each variable on the mean value of mass loss	376
Figure 22b	The effect of each variable on the percentage of cane and juice loss per cut per metre of stalk	37

Figure 23	High speed photography images showing billet end damage caused by the cutting process	38
Figure 24	Geometric restraints on a sugarcane harvester.....	43
Figure 25	Chopper drum geometry demonstrating replaceable inner curves.....	44
Figure 26	Knife end profile.....	45
Figure 27	Knife rake	46
Figure 28	Deflector plate geometry	47
Figure 29	Geometry of the dynamic model built in ELFEN.....	52
Figure 30	Three drum cutting arm profiles: (1)-D1; (2)-D2; (3)-D3.	52
Figure 31	Mesh applied to the model geometry.....	54
Figure 32	Mesh applied to the drum cutting arm and close-up of knife mesh.....	54
Figure 33	Billet trajectory results for the fast drum speed (438 rpm).....	57
Figure 34	Billet trajectory results for the medium drum speed (292 rpm).....	58
Figure 35	Billet trajectory results for the slow drum speed (219 rpm)	58
Figure 36	Desired location of billet contact on extraction chamber back wall	59
Figure 37	Geometric model and photograph of the prototype chopper system test rig	63
Figure 38	Prototype chopper drum.....	63
Figure 39	Replaceable inner drum curve plates (three different geometries)	64
Figure 40	Test rig shear bar and pivot.....	64
Figure 41	Test rig electric motor, gearbox, spider coupling and variable speed control ...	65
Figure 42	Test rig reduced width feed roller and cradle	65
Figure 43	Test rig feed train.....	66
Figure 44	Test rig hydraulic roller motors and power pack	67
Figure 45	Harvester separation chamber and test rig replicate	67
Figure 46	Cut out in the side of the ATR wall and high speed camera and halogen light setup.....	68
Figure 47	Large Bundle (300 t/hr equivalent).....	72
Figure 48	Sample after being sorted into billet quality categories.....	76
Figure 49	The effect of chopper drum speed on the mean value of total mass loss.....	78
Figure 50	The effect of pour rate on the mean value of total mass loss.....	79
Figure 51	The effect of chopper drum speed on mean mass loss per cut.....	81
Figure 52	The effect of pour rate on mean mass loss per cut per metre.....	81
Figure 53	The effect of drum speed and pour rate on billet quality (data means)	83
Figure 54	Histograms of the average billet length distribution for each target billet length	86
Figure 55	Still images of the high speed footage taken for test number 11	89

Figure 56	Still images of the high speed footage of the billet trajectory for a target billet length of 200 mm ($N_{\text{drum}} = 438$ rpm).....	90
Figure 57	Still image of the material trajectory recorded by the normal speed camera.....	91
Figure 58	Key velocities present during the cutting process.....	92
Figure 59	Knife tip velocities in the feed direction for the range of drum speeds	93
Figure 60	Stalk deformation and resulting splitting caused by the action of a fast knife ..	94
Figure 61	Stress state of an element at the knife tip for high drum speeds.....	95
Figure 62	Stalk deformation and resulting splitting caused by the action of a slow knife	96
Figure 63	Damage caused by geometry of the knife mounting plate.....	97

Symbols

D_{geom}	Drum inner curve geometry
D_{roller}	Feed roller diameter
E	Young's modulus of elasticity
K_f	Knife condition
K_s	Knife speed
L_{billet}	Billet length
$M_{damaged}$	Mass of damaged billets
M_{in}	Initial mass of specimen / test sample
$M_{mutilated}$	Mass of mutilated billets
M_{sound}	Mass of sound billets
M_{out}	Final mass of specimen
N	Number of stalks cut
N_{drum}	Chopper drum rotational speed
N_{roller}	Feed roller rotational speed
N_s	Number of tests
PR	Pour rate
R	Number of repeats
V	Cane variety
X_{drum}	Number of arms / knives on the drum
k	Number of levels
n	Number of factors
ν	Poisson's ratio
θ	Anvil angle
$\theta_{knifewidth}$	Angle of chopper knife arc
ρ	Density