# PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

# Soil amelioration using steel slag in drained peatland under oil palm plantation increases CO<sub>2</sub> emission

To cite this article: Setiari Marwanto 2021 IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. 648 012132

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

# You may also like

- Improvement of soybean yields using amendments on dryland soils of Aceh Besar, Indonesia
  S Sufardi, S Syakur, M Mislia et al.
- Application of ameliorants for of ex-tin mining soil improvement and increasing corn (*Zea mays*) yield A P W Ethika, B Mulyanto, Asmarhansyah et al.
- <u>Tropic soil properties and productivity of</u> <u>Shallot Lembah Palu variety</u> A R Thaha, B E Somba, M Anshar et al.





DISCOVER how sustainability intersects with electrochemistry & solid state science research



This content was downloaded from IP address 3.147.103.202 on 12/05/2024 at 06:56

# Soil amelioration using steel slag in drained peatland under oil palm plantation increases CO<sub>2</sub> emission

#### Setiari Marwanto

Indonesian Soil Research Institute, Bogor, Indonesia

E-mail: setiari mr@yahoo.com

Abstract. Increasing the productivity of tropical peatland can be achieved by soil ameliorations using steel slag and lateritic soil. However, the effect of such ameliorants on the peat decomposition is not well understood. This study was aimed to evaluate the influence of soil ameliorants of steel slag and lateritic soil to peat decomposition as reflected by CO<sub>2</sub> emission. A year study was conducted in smallholder oil palm plantation in Jambi Province, Indonesia to monitor  $CO_2$  emission from treatments plots of control (T1), steel slag 600 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T2), lateritic soil 600 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T3) and a combination of T2 and T3 (T4), which each treatment had 5 replications. CO<sub>2</sub> emission was measured every three months by a closed chamber method. Results showed that CO<sub>2</sub> emission were followed the order of T4>T2>T1≥T3. CO<sub>2</sub> emission from T4 ( $49 \pm 20$  t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) was 20% higher than T1 ( $40 \pm 23$  t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>), while T2 ( $44 \pm 17$ t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) was 9% higher than T1. CO<sub>2</sub> emission from T3 ( $40 \pm 14$  t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) was similar to T1. This study showed that steel slag accelerates peat organic matter decomposition which is indicated by higher CO<sub>2</sub> emission of steel slag treatments compare to other treatments.

#### 1. Introduction

The oil palm plantation area in Indonesia was expanded over time on both mineral and peat soils, addressing the increased global demand of vegetable oil, fats, and biodiesel [1-3]. Although peatland was considered unsuitable for agricultural purposes, the limited areas of mineral soil caused the peatland conversion was unavoidable. The total peatland area in Indonesia is 13.4 million ha [4] which is mainly distributed over three big islands of Sumatra, Kalimantan, and Papua. Around 1.7 million ha of Indonesian peatland is used for oil palm plantation [5].

Oil palm cultivation in peatland always started with land clearing and subsequently followed by water drainage for providing convenient access to the land and favoring the root to grow well. However, drainage leads the increased organic matter, which releasing huge CO<sub>2</sub> gas into the atmosphere and worsening global warming [6].

Peatland had soil physicochemical problems, which caused the low productivity of crops cultivated there [7-9]. However, ameliorations together with fertilization have been applied to increase the productivity of peatland [10]. These inputs' quantity and quality depend on the capital, where estate companies are mostly having big access to these inputs while smallholders are lack. This situation explains why smallholders have lower productivity compare to companies. Steel slag and lateritic soils are ameliorants materials used to increase oil palm productivity in tropical peatland.

Steel slag is a metal material, which generated as a by-product of steel manufacturing [11]. Steel slag contains Si, Ca, Fe, Al and Mn [12,13], which are widely used as soil ameliorant to reduce soil acidity and improve crop productivity [14-16]. However, the effect of steel slag in agriculture soils to suppress



greenhouse gas emission is still in argument due to the widely variation of environmental factors [17,18]. Moreover, the published report regarding the greenhouse effect on steel slag used in tropical agriculture peatland is limited.

Lateritic soil is a highly weathered soil, which had low nutrient content, high clay mineral content, low cation exchange capacity and high Al and Fe oxides [19, 20]. Lateritic soils were distributed across Indonesian islands and commonly found as Ultisols and Alfisols in terms of soil taxonomy [21]. Lateritic soils have the potential to be used as soil ameliorant in peatland due to their function to stabilized organic acid [22]. However, the published report on greenhouse gas emission as the response of incorporation of lateritic soil with peat soil is difficult to find.

The used of steel slag and lateritic soil to increase oil palm productivity in tropical peatland is growing. However, the effect of steel slag and lateritic soils on  $CO_2$  released from soils are not being fully understood. This issue should be recognized to address the sustainable management practices of peatland agriculture. This study was aimed to evaluate the effect of steel slag and lateritic soil used in peatland to on the peat decomposition as reflected by  $CO_2$  emission.

# 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Site description

This field experiment was established in smallholder oil palm plantation in Sumber Agung Village, Sungai Gelam Sub District, Muaro Jambi District, Jambi Province, Indonesia, at the geographic coordinate of 103°52′E and 1°43′S in the period of July 2010 to July 2011. The detailed land characteristic including the land and crop management of this study site, at the time of this study, was already reported comprehensively in a published article [23].

### 2.2. Treatment design

Twenty study plots were established each located in the middle distance of trees, in frond pile rows, where human traffic along these rows was very limited. Four treatments of soil ameliorants were established i.e. T1: no soil ameliorant application; T2: steel slag 600 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; T3: lateritic soil 600 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; and T4: T2+T3. Each treatment had five replications, which all were distributed according to Randomized Block Design.

Before treatment application in early July 2010, composite peat samples from three depths of 0 to 15, 15 to 30 and 30 to 50 cm were collected each plot using a special peat auger (Eijkelkamp, Netherland). Lateritic soil was collected from the nearest Ultisols, while steel slag was brought from the waste steel industry in Java Island Peat samples together with soil ameliorants of steel slag and lateritic soil were then analyzed in a laboratory. Chemical properties of peat, steel slag, and lateritic soil were available in table 1.

Items	Units	Peat (cm depth)					
		0-15	15-30	30-50	Steel slag	Lateritic soil	
$P_2O_5$	%	31	22	10	0.01	nt	
$K_2O$	%	0.03	0.03	0.03	nt	nt	
CaO	%	0.33	0.23	0.13	27.8	0.08	
MgO	%	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.05	0.08	
Fe	%	0.02	0.02	0.01	13.5	6.5	
Cu	ppm	23	15	18	60.7	53	
Zn	ppm	22	18	18	718	64	
В	ppm	nm	nm	nm	373	218	
Mn	ppm	38	18	12	nm	nm	

Table 1. Chemical properties of peat, steel slag, and lateritic soil used in this study

All the data are given on an oven-dried basis; nm=not measured; nt=not traceable.

Plots area of 3 m x 3 m was cleared from weed, roots, litter, remaining wood log and subsequently leveled. Perforated PVC pipes were installed in each plot for monitoring water table depth. About 3 cm depth of peat was removed and placed in the bucket then incorporated with ameliorants. The mixed peat and ameliorants were then returned on the plot.

### 2.3. CO<sub>2</sub> measurement

Once treatments already were applied,  $CO_2$  emission from the middle of the plot was measured by a closed chamber method using an infrared gas analyzer (IRGA Li-820). PVC chamber with a diameter of 25 cm and height of 25 cm, which the cap equipped with a gas inlet, outlet, and glass thermometer, was used to trap and measure the  $CO_2$  gas concentration inside the chamber. Gas chambers were installed on each plot 24 hours before  $CO_2$  measurement to minimize the effects of soil disturbance on microbial activity.  $CO_2$  measurement was conducted one day after treatments application in the morning and calculated based on of the following equation [24]:

$$fc = \frac{Ph}{RT} \times \frac{dC_c}{dt} \qquad (1)$$

Where fc is CO<sub>2</sub> flux, P represents atmospheric pressure, h is the chamber height, R is a gas constant, and T is the temperature inside the chamber, dCc/dt is the changes of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration by time.

# 2.4. Environmental factors

Environmental factors of soil temperature, air temperature, chamber temperature and water table level were selected based on their relationship with peat decomposition [6, 18, 23, 26]. During gas sampling, the temperature inside the chamber, 1 m above the chamber, and 5 cm inside the soil were recorded. Water table depth was also be monitored manually using a measuring stick.

### 2.5. Data analysis

The effect of soil amelioration to  $CO_2$  emission was analyzed using ANOVA and the difference among treatments was analyzed using Duncan Multiple Range Test with a 5% significant degree. The relationship between the two variables was analyzed using Pearson's correlation method.

# 3. Results

### 3.1. Averaged CO<sub>2</sub> emission

Averaged CO<sub>2</sub> emission has followed the order of T4>T2>T1 $\geq$ T3 (figure 1). The highest CO<sub>2</sub> emission was T4 (49 ± 20 t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>), 20% higher than T1 significantly (40 ± 23 t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>). T2 was the second with 44±17 t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> means 9% higher than T1 significantly. CO<sub>2</sub> emission from T3 (40 ± 14 t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) was similar to T1.

### 3.2. Temporal variation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission

The average  $CO_2$  emission at the beginning of this study was relatively similar among treatments, in the range of 37-42 t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> (figure 2). The pattern of T1 during the period of October 2010 to April 2011 was different compare to T2, T3 and T4.  $CO_2$  emission from the T1 plot was extremely increased in October 2010 then gradually decline. The rest of the treatments were also increased in October 2010 but not as high as T1. They increased consistently until April 2011 then decreased together with T1.

### 3.3. Averaged environmental factor

Correlation analysis was done between treatments and the environmental factors of soil temperature, air temperature, chamber temperature and water table level. Those environmental factors were selected based on their relationship with peat decomposition [6,18,23,26] and were collected coincident with  $CO_2$  measurement in the field. This analysis already neglected the outliers, which were determined by the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles. Table 2 shows no peat environmental factors had a significant correlation with  $CO_2$  emission (5% p-level).

IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 648 (2021) 012132 doi:10.1088/1755-1315/648/1/012132



Figure 1. Box-whisker plot showing the distribution of peat CO<sub>2</sub> emission and their mean (X) for different treatments of ameliorants under oil palm plantation at the study site. Outliers (hollow dots) were determined by the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles. Different alphabetical means were significantly different at 5% of DMRT.



Figure 2. Temporal variation of averaged CO<sub>2</sub> emission from for different treatments of ameliorants under oil palm plantation at study site.

Table 2. Pearson's correlation between CO<sub>2</sub> emission and peat environmental factors

Environmental factors	$CO_2$ emission (t ha <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )				
	T1	T2	T3	T4	
Soil temperature (°C)	-0.47	-0.32	0.12	0.06	
Air temperature (°C)	-0.43	-0.12	0.28	-0.02	
Chamber temperature (°C)	-0.41	-0.14	0.22	-0.03	
Water table depth (cm)	0.06	-0.29	-0.52	-0.32	

#### 4. Discussion

#### 4.1. Effects of treatments to peat CO<sub>2</sub> emission

Steel slag increases organic matter decomposition in peat, reflected by the higher CO<sub>2</sub> emission of T2 than T1 (figure 1). Steel slag contain high CaO (table 1) which could increase the soil pH, favors the microbial activity to decompose peat then releasing CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere. Moreover, nutrients were not available for crops such as phosphate (P) in the low pH circumstances of peat [22]. The transformation P into available form for roots, in the favorable soil pH, is very important to support the metabolism process in crop tissues. The high micronutrient content of Fe, Zn and Mn of steel slag (table 1) could also important for roots. The high activity of roots reflected in the high organic substrates production which those easily be consumed by microbes, lead to increased  $CO_2$  production [25]. Furthermore, the autotrophic respiration of roots was also high due to the high root activity [26].

Steel slag with additional lateritic soil in T4 had the highest CO<sub>2</sub> emission, indicates the increasing microbial activity due to the additional micronutrient from lateritic soil. However, the number of nutrients in lateritic soils alone was insufficient to increase the microbial activity in peat, proven by the similar CO<sub>2</sub> emission between T1 and T3. The low nutrient content and low active clay of lateritic soils of T3 have no contribution to enhance microbial activities.

#### 4.2. Temporal fluctuation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission

The result of the first CO<sub>2</sub> measurement has not reflected the effect of soil ameliorations because it was carried out once after soil amelioration applied. CO2 emission is by-product of organic matter decomposition by microbes which the process needs time. The range  $CO_2$  emission of 37 to 42 t ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> indicates the high micro variation of peat characteristic and environmental factors affected peat decomposition (figure 2).

In the second CO<sub>2</sub> measurement, 3 months after treatment application, T1 was extremely high indicates the effect of soil disturbance occurred during the preparation of the study plot. The peat disturbance possibly enhances peat aeration and the more oxidic condition of peat accelerates labile organic matter decomposition. However, CO<sub>2</sub> emission from T2, T3 and T4 was not dramatically increased, although peat aeration increased, which possibly due to the increased bonding between labile organic matter with soil ameliorants [14]. The lower  $CO_2$  emission in the soil ameliorants treatment indicates that organic matter decomposition in the form of ligand occurs slower than labile organic matter decomposition.

In the third CO<sub>2</sub> measurement, 6 months after treatment application, T1 was decline continuously until the end of this study. It indicates the labile organic matter was decreased over time. Conversely, CO<sub>2</sub> emission tend to be increased on soil amelioration treatments, indicates the peat decomposition process increase simultaneously. This increased CO<sub>2</sub> emission occurred until the fourth measurement and subsequently decreased in the fifth measurement, which means 9 and 12 months after treatment application, respectively. Peat decomposition tends to be constant after one-year soil amelioration.

Temporal variation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission in this study revealed the importance of long-term measurement of soil amelioration study, at least one year, regarding its effect on peat decomposition. The long-term study showed the possibility, even without direct measurement, of the interconnection among organic matter quality, microbial activity, and soil ameliorant to CO<sub>2</sub> emission. However, in the short-term study below 3 months, which somehow using cash crop, soil amelioration may suppress CO<sub>2</sub> emission likewise this study.

#### 5. Conclusions

Based on this year field study, we found that steel slag amelioration increases peat decomposition, which possibly because of the favoring effect of additional steel slag to soil microbe activities. Soil lateritic ameliorant is not affecting CO<sub>2</sub> emission possible due to the low CaO and nutrient content.

IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science **648** (2021) 012132 doi:10.1088/1755-1315/648/1/012132

#### Acknowledgement

Author wish to thank Prof. Fahmuddin Agus for facilitating this study. Thank also to Mr. Atin Kurdiana for assisting the field activity.

# References

- [1] Carter C, Finley W, Fry J, Jackson D and Willis L 2007 Palm oil markets and future supply *Eur*. *J. Lipid Sci. Technol.* **109** 307–314.
- [2] Fargione J E, Plevin R J and Hill J D 2008 The ecological impact of biofuels *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **41** 351–77.
- [3] Zhou A and Thomson E 2009 The development of biofuels in Asia. *Applied Energy*, **86**, S11–S20.
- [4] BBSDLP (Balai Besar Sumberdaya Lahan Pertanian) 2019 *Peta Lahan Gambut Indonesia* 1:50,000 (in Bahasa) Badan Litbang Pertanian
- [5] Gunarso P, Hartoyo M E, Agus F and Killeen T J 2013 Oil palm and land use change in Indonesia, Malaysia and Papua New Guinea Reports from the technical panels of the 2<sup>nd</sup> greenhouse gas Working group of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO).
- [6] Carlson K M, Goodman L K and May-Tobin C C 2015 Modeling relationships between water table depth and peat soil carbon loss in Southeast Asian plantations. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 10:074006.
- [7] Agus F and Subikse I G M 2008 *Lahan gambut: Potensi untuk Pertanian dan Aspek Lingkungan* (in Bahasa) Balai Penelitian Tanah dan World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Bogor, Indonesia
- [8] Haraguchi A, Shimada S and Takahashi H 2000 Distribution of peat and its chemical properties around Lahei in the catchment of the Mangkutup River, Central Kalimantan. *Tropics*. 10 265-272.
- [9] Driessen P M 1978 Peat soils. In: IRRI (ed) Soils and Rice, pp 763-769. IRRI, Los Baños, Philippines.
- [10] Polak B 1952 Veen en veenontginning in Indonesia. MIAI, nrs 5 and 6. Vorkink, Bandung. In: Driessen PM, Supraptohardjo M 1974: Soil for Agricultural Expansion In Indonesia. Soil Research Institute. Bogor.
- [11] Shi C 2014 Steel slag-its production, processing, characteristics, and cementitious properties. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*. **16** (3):230–236.
- [12] Zhang T S, Liu F T, Liu S Q, Zhou Z H and Cheng X 2008 Factors infuencing the properties of a steel slag composite cement. *Advances in Cement Research*. **20**: 145–150.
- [13] Tufekci M, Demirbas A and Genc H 1997 Evaluation of steel furnace slags as cement additives. *Cement and Concrete Research.* 27: 1713–1717.
- [14] Das S, Kim G W, Hwang H H Y, Verma P P and Kim P J 2019 Cropping with slag to address soil, environment, and food security. *Front. Microbiol.* **10**:1320.
- [15] Deus A C F, Bertani R M A, Meirelles G C, Soares A A V L, Moreira L L Q, Büll L T and Fernandes D M 2018. The comprehensive utilization of steel slag in agricultural soils. *Recovery and Utilization of Metallurgical Solid Waste* DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.81440
- [16] Branca T A and Colla V 2012 Possible uses of steelmaking slag in agriculture: an overview in Material recycling–Trends and perspectives. ed. D. Achilias (InTech). http://cdn. intechopen.com/pdfs/32571/InTech-Possible\_uses\_of\_steelmaking\_slag\_in\_agriculture\_ an\_overview.pdf.
- [17] Gwon H S, Khan M I, Alam M A, Das S and Kim P J 2018 Environmental risk assessment of steel-making slags and the potential use of LD slag in mitigating methane emissions and the grain arsenic level in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Journal of Hazardous Materials*. 353: 236-243.
- [18] Susilawati H L, Setyanto P, Ariani M, Hervani A and Inubushi K 2016 Influence of water depth and soil amelioration on greenhouse gas emissions from peat soil columns. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr.* 62(1): 57-68.

IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 648 (2021) 012132 doi:10.1088/1755-1315/648/1/012132

- [19] Ko T H 2014 Nature and properties of lateritic soils derived from different parent materials in Taiwan. *The Scientific World Journal*. ID 247194, 4 pages. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014 /247194.
- [20] Shaw J N 2001 Iron and aluminum oxide characterization for highly-weathered Alabama Ultisols. *Communications in Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* **32**(1-2): 49–64.
- [21] Soil Survey Staff 2014 *Keys to Soil Taxonomy*, 12th-ed. USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, Washington, DC.
- [22] Hartatik W, Idris K, Sabiham S, Djuniwati S and Adiningsih J S 2003 Komposisi fraksi-fraksi P pada tanah gambut yang diberi bahan amelioran tanah mineral dan pemupukan P (*in Bahasa*). *Jurnal Tanah dan Iklim* No 21. ISSN 1410-7244.
- [23] Marwanto S and Agus Fahmuddin 2014 Is CO<sub>2</sub> flux from oil palm plantations on peatland controlled by soil moisture and/or soil and air temperatures? *Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Chang.* 19: 809–819.
- [24] Madsen R, Xu L, Claassen B *et al.* 2009 Surface monitoring method for carbon capture and storage projects. *Energy Procedia.* 1:2161–2168.
- [25] Rønn R, Ekelund F and Chritensen S 2003 Effect of elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> on protozoan abundance in soil planted with wheat and on decomposition of wheat roots. *Plant and Soil* 151:13-21.
- [26] Marwanto S, Sabiham S, Sudadi U and Agus F 2013 Pengaruh kerapatan akar, pupuk dan kedalaman muka air tanah terhadap emisi CO<sub>2</sub> dari tanah gambut pada perkebunan kelapa sawit (*in Bahasa*) Jurnal Tanah dan Iklim. **37** (1): 9-18.