

## Improving Moisture Retention Capacity of Pine Bark by Grinding and Blending with Recycled Rockwool

Jong Myung Choi, Hae Joon Chung, Jong Seung Choi  
*Division of Hort. & Landscape Architecture, Pai Chai University.*  
corresponding author

Wiley mill                      hammer mill

5.6 mm                      가                      86.5%                      , Wiley mill

hammer mill                      1 mm                      가                      , 1 mm

가                      , Wiley mill                      hammer mill                      가                      가

Wiley mill                      50%                      81.1%,                      67.7%,

13.4%,                      235 ml                      ,                      가

가                      가                      +                      가

The objective of this research was to improve moisture retention capacity of pine bark. To achieve this, barks were ground with Wiley mill or hammer mill and were blended with recycled rockwool. Then, changes of soil physical properties were determined. The percentage of particles larger than 5.6 mm was 86.5% in raw materials. The percentage of particles larger than 1 mm decreased and those of particles smaller than 1 mm increased by grinding with Wiley mill or hammer mill. Grinding with Wiley mill showed better effect than those of hammer mill in decreasing particle size distribution. Grinding resulted in decreased total porosity (TP) and air space (AS) and increased container capacity (CC) and residual water content (RW), indicating improved moisture retention capacity. The material ground with Wiley mill, then blended with 50% recycled rockwool had 81.1%, 67.7%, 13.5% and 235 ml in TP, CC, AS and RW, respectively. These results indicated that moisture retention capacity was improved by blending with recycled rockwool, but aeration of root media was much better than those of peat+vermiculite (1:1, v/v), which is commonly used in commercial production.

**Key words** : air space, container capacity, particle size distribution, total porosity



1 mm 가 98.1%  
 , Wiley mill 1  
 1 mm 가 76.9%, 2  
 65.0%, 3 56.2%  
 . 1 mm 가  
 1.9% 1  
 23.1%, 2 34.9%  
 3 43.8% Wiley mill  
 가

Table 2. Particle size distribution (%) of pine barks affected by grinding times with Wiley mill.

Particle size distribution	Raw materials	Grinding times		
		1	2	3
>5.6mm	86.51	9.76	0.01	0.04
5.6-4mm	6.03	9.28	2.92	0.19
4-2.8mm	2.70	17.32	13.52	1.75
2.8-2.0mm	1.43	17.17	18.62	14.41
2.0-1.4mm	0.91	13.86	17.39	22.67
1.4-1.0mm	0.52	9.5	12.56	17.12
> 1.0 mm	98.1	76.89	65.02	56.18
1.0-0.71mm	0.28	6.47	8.87	11.56
710-500 μm	0.23	4.43	6.33	7.91
500-355 μm	0.21	3.22	5.03	5.44
355-250 μm	0.24	2.65	4.39	4.50
250-180 μm	0.22	1.90	3.28	3.36
180-106 μm	0.33	2.03	3.51	4.00
<106 μm	0.39	2.41	3.57	7.05
< 1.0 mm	1.80	23.11	34.98	43.82

Table 3 hammer mill  
 1.0 mm 1  
 97.01%, 2 75.8% 3  
 74.3% . 1.0  
 mm 1, 2 3  
 2.99%, 24.2%, 25.7% 가 Wiley  
 mill 1 mm 가

Table 3. Particle size distribution (%) of pine barks affected by grinding times with hammer mill.

Particle size distribution	Raw materials	Grinding times		
		1	2	3
>5.6mm	86.5	52.54	15.85	11.45
5.6-4mm	6.03	17.46	13.22	13.40
4-2.8mm	2.70	12.49	14.26	15.50
2.8-2.0mm	1.43	7.76	12.98	13.87
2.0-1.4mm	0.91	4.56	11.10	11.41
1.4-1.0mm	0.52	2.20	8.38	8.66
> 1.0 mm	98.10	97.01	75.79	74.29
1.0-0.71mm	0.26	1.11	6.57	6.89
710-500 μm	0.23	0.60	5.02	5.21
500-355 μm	0.21	0.35	4.01	4.18
355-250 μm	0.24	0.23	3.13	3.30
250-180 μm	0.22	0.15	1.95	2.17
180-106 μm	0.33	0.20	1.89	1.95
<106 μm	0.39	0.33	1.64	2.02
< 1.0 mm	1.90	2.99	24.21	25.71

Table 4  
 + (1:1,v/v) 가 73.6%  
 80.73%  
 (Table 1). Wiley  
 mill 1, 2 3 70.82, 70.39  
 66.85% 가 가  
 . Hammer mill  
 Wiley mill  
 가 , (Table 2 3)  
 Wiley mill  
 가  
 가 . Verdonck  
 Penninck(1986)  
 가  
 .  
 (container capacity) 가  
 가  
 + 가 67.9%  
 (Table 1), Wiley mill 3  
 56.6%, hammer mill 3



가  
 + 3 (Nelson,  
 1991; Verdonck and Pennick, 1986).  
 가 가  
 . Nelson(1991) 가  
 가  
 + 가 0.20 g/cm<sup>3</sup> 가  
 (Table 1),  
 가  
 .  
 Wiley mill hammer  
 mill  
 가 , Wiley mill  
 hammer mill 가  
 가  
 가  
 +  
 .  
 .  
 Bilderback, T. E., W. C. Fonteno, and D. R. Johnson. 1982. Physical properties of media composed of peanut hulls, pine bark, and peat moss and their effect on azalea growth. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 107: 522-525.

Bilderback, T. E. and W. C. Fonteno. 1993. Improving nutrient and moisture retention in pine bark substrate with rockwool and compost combinations. *Acta Hort.*, 342: 265-272.  
 Bunt, A. C. 1988. Media and mixes for container grown plants. Unwin Hyman, London.  
 Choi, J. M., J. W. Ahn, J. H. Ku, and Y. B. Lee. 1997. Effect of medium composition on physical properties of soil and seedling growth of red-pepper in plug system. *J. Kor. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 38: 618-624.  
 Fonteno, W. C., D. K. Cassel, and R. A. Larson. 1981. Physical properties of three container media and their effect on poinsettia growth. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 106: 736-741.  
 Fonteno, W. C. and P. V. Nelson. 1990. Physical properties of and plant response to rockwool-amended media. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 115: 375-381.  
 Milks, R. R., W. C. Fonteno, and R. A. Larson. 1989. Hydrology of horticultural substrates III; Predicting air and water content of limited-volume plug cells. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 114: 57-61.  
 Nelson, P. V. Greenhouse operation and management. (4th ed.). prentice Hall. Englewood Cliff. N.J. pp. 189-226.  
 Prasad, D. and M. J. Maher. 1993. Physical and chemical properties of fractionated peat. *Acta Hort.*, 342: 257-264.  
 Verdonck, O. and R. Penninck. 1986. Air content in horticultural substrate. *Acta Hort.*, 178: 101-105.