



## EFFECT OF CHARCOAL EARTH KILNS CONSTRUCTION AND FIRING ON SOIL CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS

**Kingiri, S., Emmanuel, E., Volga, L., Balozi, K.K., Lazare, E., Benard, O.**

Department of Forestry & Wood Science, Moi University, Po Box 3900-30100, Eldoret, Kenya  
Jokshan Kaheeru Katigo

Department of Teacher Education, Kyambogo University, PO Box 1, Kyambogo, Uganda  
Lucy M. Mboma

Department of Marketing, University of Dar es Salaam, P.O Box 35046, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

\* Corresponding author: Email: [ksenelwas@mu.ac.ke](mailto:ksenelwas@mu.ac.ke) or [ksenelwas@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:ksenelwas@yahoo.co.uk)

### ABSTRACT

Assessments of localized ecological and environmental impacts of charcoal production including effects on soils at kiln sites is seldom undertaken, with more emphasis being placed on the global effects of the practice such as deforestation. A study was undertaken in Narok, Eldoret, Moiben and Turbo on known charcoaling sites to investigate the impact of charcoal production on the soil chemical characteristics. Composite soil samples from 12 sampling points for all study sites were taken randomly at a depth of 0-15 cm. The samples were conditioned and analyzed for pH, particle size, Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC), extractable phosphorus, organic carbon, nitrogen and exchangeable bases. A comparison of the soil properties between undisturbed sites and charcoaling sites showed significant differences for all chemical properties except CEC, Mg and K. For the Moiben site, only the pH showed no significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ). The observed high carbon content reduced with time for the one year following charcoaling activity and was attributed to soil erosion since charcoal production activities reduced the sites vegetation cover. Most chemical changes positively enhanced the nutrients content and availability, but were short lived probably due to soil erosion. These results demonstrate the need to adopt technologies with minimum impact on the soil, or a shift to centralized production sites outside forest ecosystems or farmlands.

Keywords: Charcoal, earth kilns, soil chemical properties, erosion.

### INTRODUCTION

Charcoal, with a national mean utilization rate of 47% of households, representing 82% and 34% of urban and rural households respectively, occupies a unique position in the region's energy mix, being used by both low and high income groups (Kituyi 2002; MoE 2002; Kituyi *et al.* 2001; Senelwa and Hall 1993; Nyoike and Okech 1992; Okeefe *et al.* 1984). The use of charcoal in average-sized towns and rural areas in Africa is becoming increasingly evident. Indeed, the charcoal sector has acquired considerable economic weight because of increasing urbanization, sometimes accounting for an annual turnover of several million dollars for a number of African countries (Girard, 2002). In Kenya for instance, the total annual charcoal production and consumption is estimated at 1.6 - 2.4 million tonnes, in a KShs 23 - 32 billion industry (EAA 2003). About a quarter of household income in Kenya is spent on wood fuel, usually regarded as the poor person's energy source, since alternative energy sources including kerosene and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) are beyond the means of most Kenyans (Kituyi 2002).

Recent investigations by Glaser *et al.* (2001) showed that carbonized materials from the incomplete combustion of organic material are responsible for



maintaining high levels of soil organic matter and available nutrients in anthropogenic soils. During burning of the above-ground biomass, the nutrients are rapidly released into the soil. These nutrient additions have positive effects on soil fertility only for a short period (Kleinman *et al.* 1995). Chidumayo (1994) reported that the process of charcoal burning might increase soil pH by up to 2 units; mineral phosphorous may more than double while other nutrients do not significantly change. Charcoal may not only change soil chemical properties, but also affect soil physical properties such as soil water retention and aggregation (Piccolo and Mbagwu 1990; Piccolo *et al.* 1996).

Almost 100% of Kenyan's charcoal, and indeed for the entire East African region is produced using earth kilns, characterised by poor operation practices e.g. poor loading, use of green wood, poor control and premature harvesting of charcoal before full carbonisation (Ekakoro *et al.* 2006). As a result, the processes are very inefficient with typical efficiencies in the range of 10-15% (MoE 2002). Traditional carbonisation methods consist of either pit kilns or earth mound kilns (ILO 1985). These kilns are cheap and simple to construct where the raw material is located, involve no relocation cost, and require low capital investment for the operators (MoE 2002). Despite these advantages, they are considered to be very wasteful.

Very few studies have been undertaken in Eastern Africa to assess the ecological or environmental impacts associated with charcoal production. For instance, the extent of de-vegetation and deforestation in Kenya due to inefficient charcoal production and utilization technologies is not known. Similarly, the effects of earth kiln construction and firing on soil properties has not been investigated. This study therefore investigated the impact of

charcoal production using earth kilns on soil chemical characteristics.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was based in Uasin Gishu and Narok districts in Rift Valley province. Uasin Gishu District is a highland plateau located between longitudes 34°50" and 0°37" east and latitudes 0°03" and 0°55" north and has a total area of 3327.8 km<sup>2</sup>. Altitudes fall gently from 2700m at Timboroa in the East to 1500m at Kipkaren in the West. The district has an average annual rainfall ranging between 900-1200 mm. The rains occur between March and September, with two distinct peaks in May and August. Temperatures range between 18-26°C. The major soil types include red loam, red clay, brown clay and brown loam. Overall, the main energy source in the whole district is firewood (84.1%) and charcoal (9.7%). Paraffin comes a distant third with 5.35% of the population using it and others including electricity, LPG and solar in different forms such as photovoltaic systems (PVs) coming with a paltry 0.9% (RoK 2002a).

Narok District is situated in the southern part of the Rift Valley Province. It lies between latitudes 0°50' and 2°05' south and longitudes 35°58' and 36°0' east and occupies a total area of 15,087.8 km<sup>2</sup>. The temperatures range from 5° in July to 28° in November to February. The area has poor quality soils and rains are unreliable. Almost 100% of the population used firewood and / or charcoal for cooking. About 70% used kerosene for lighting, 2% had PV systems while 2% used LPG.

The experiment employed simple random sampling method, in which composite soil samples from 12 sampling points in Eldoret, Moiben, Turbo, Kapsaret in Uasin Gishu and Nkareta and Nkobon in Narok were taken randomly at a depth of 0-15 cm. The samples were conditioned and



analyzed for pH, particle size, Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC), extractable phosphorus, organic carbon, nitrogen and exchangeable bases. The soil was air-dried and sieved through a 2 mm sieve; soil pH was determined by the water method (1:2.5 soil: water), Particle size analysis was done by hydrometer method, while exchangeable acidity was undertaken by Walkely-Black method (Okalebo *et al.* 2002). The CEC was done using Kjeldhal distillation and Exchangeable cations determined using atomic absorption spectrometry (Okalebo *et al.*, 2002). Extractable Olsen P was determined after extraction with 0.5M NaHCO<sub>3</sub> followed by colorimetric determination of P (Okalebo *et al.* 2002).

For each site, sampling was undertaken at four different times – before the site was disturbed, i.e. before charcoaling activities; immediately after charcoal production; six

months following charcoal production; and one year after charcoal production. Comparisons were made over time, and between the different sites.

## RESULTS

Results for soil chemical analysis for Moiben (Table 1) showed that there were significant differences between the treatments for all the chemicals except pH. After DMRT, results showed that Carbon, CEC, Mg, K and P were significantly affected by the charcoal production ( $p < 0.05$ ). Though Calcium and Nitrogen treatments were significantly different, the differences in the undisturbed sites and the fresh kilning sites were more after some time. Although there were apparent variations in the pH between the treatments, they were not significant  $p$  value  $\leq 0.05$ .

**Table 1: Soil chemical characteristics for Moiben kiln site**

Treatment	PH	CEC (me/100g)	Carbon (%)	Mg (Me/100g)	K (Mgkg-1)	Ca (Me/100g)	% N	% P
Undisturbed	6.18	7.6 <sup>a</sup>	3.21 <sup>a</sup>	15 <sup>a</sup>	32.5 <sup>a</sup>	59.8 <sup>ab</sup>	0.208 <sup>b</sup>	0.043 <sup>a</sup>
Fresh kiln site	7.25	18.7 <sup>a</sup>	9.03 <sup>c</sup>	28 <sup>b</sup>	80 <sup>b</sup>	58.7 <sup>ab</sup>	0.270 <sup>c</sup>	0.083 <sup>c</sup>
After 6 months	6.67	12.8 <sup>ab</sup>	7.05 <sup>b</sup>	23.5 <sup>b</sup>	47.5 <sup>a</sup>	76 <sup>b</sup>	0.114 <sup>a</sup>	0.124 <sup>d</sup>
After 1 year	6.37	6.3 <sup>c</sup>	5.67 <sup>b</sup>	11.1 <sup>a</sup>	25 <sup>a</sup>	33.5 <sup>a</sup>	0.113 <sup>a</sup>	0.073 <sup>b</sup>

NB: For any characteristic, values with the same letter in each column are not significantly different from each other.

In Turbo there were significant difference between the treatments for all the chemicals except K (Table 2). pH, carbon, Ca, Nitrogen and P were significantly affected by the charcoal production on this

site ( $p < 0.05$ ), whereas CEC and Mg were significantly different but there were no differences between the undisturbed site and the freshly used sites

**Table 2: Soil chemical characteristics for Turbo kiln site**

Treatment	PH	CEC (me/100g)	Carbon (%)	Mg (Me/100g)	K (Mgkg-1)	Ca (Me/100g)	% N	% P
Undisturbed	4.55 <sup>a</sup>	29.4 <sup>ab</sup>	2.53 <sup>a</sup>	17.5 <sup>bc</sup>	17.5	25.4 <sup>a</sup>	0.067 <sup>a</sup>	0.026 <sup>a</sup>
Fresh kiln site	6.51 <sup>b</sup>	35 <sup>b</sup>	10.38 <sup>c</sup>	21.6 <sup>c</sup>	35	52.3 <sup>b</sup>	0.157 <sup>b</sup>	0.055 <sup>b</sup>
After 6 months	6.97 <sup>b</sup>	20.1 <sup>a</sup>	7.11 <sup>bc</sup>	8.4 <sup>ab</sup>	42.5	69.7 <sup>b</sup>	0.116 <sup>b</sup>	0.042 <sup>c</sup>
After 1 year	7.23 <sup>c</sup>	25.7 <sup>ab</sup>	4.32 <sup>ab</sup>	9 <sup>a</sup>	45	54.8 <sup>b</sup>	0.120 <sup>c</sup>	0.053 <sup>c</sup>

NB For any characteristic, values with the same letter in each column are not significantly different from each other.



In Eldoret there were significant difference between the treatments for all the chemicals except Mg, CEC and K (Table 3). pH, Carbon, Nitrogen and P were significantly affected by the charcoal

production on this site ( $p < 0.05$ ). Whereas Ca was significantly different, there were no differences between the undisturbed sites and the freshly used sites.

**Table 3: Soil chemical characteristics for Eldoret kiln site**

Treatment	PH	CEC (me/100g)	Carbon (%)	Mg (Me/100g)	K (Mgkg-1)	Ca (Me/100g)	% N	% P
Undisturbed	4.44 <sup>a</sup>	31.3	1.98 <sup>a</sup>	10.7	40	27.6 <sup>b</sup>	0.140 <sup>a</sup>	0.033 <sup>a</sup>
Fresh kiln site	7.42 <sup>c</sup>	27.9	9.39 <sup>c</sup>	13.3	70	16.9 <sup>a</sup>	0.304 <sup>d</sup>	0.083 <sup>c</sup>
After 6 months	6.10 <sup>b</sup>	33.5	5.58 <sup>b</sup>	19.7	65	27.9 <sup>b</sup>	0.283 <sup>c</sup>	0.091 <sup>d</sup>
After 1 year	6.49 <sup>b</sup>	25.7	2.52 <sup>ab</sup>	14	27.5	23.2 <sup>ab</sup>	0.254 <sup>b</sup>	0.070 <sup>b</sup>

NB: For any characteristic, values with the same letter in each column are not significantly different from each other.

Results for soil chemical analysis for Narok (Table 4) showed that there were significant difference between the treatments for all the chemicals except CEC, Mg and K. pH, carbon and calcium were significantly affected by the charcoal

production on this site ( $p < 0.05$ ). Whereas Nitrogen and P were significantly different, there were no differences between the undisturbed site and the freshly used sites.

**Table 4: Soil chemical characteristics for Narok kiln site**

Treatment	PH	CEC (me/100g)	Carbon (%)	Mg (Me/100g)	K (Mgkg-1)	Ca (Me/100g)	% N	% P
Undisturbed	6.76 <sup>a</sup>	13	1.77 <sup>a</sup>	30	37.5	18.9 <sup>a</sup>	0.270 <sup>c</sup>	0.028 <sup>c</sup>
Fresh kiln site	7.34 <sup>b</sup>	21.9	8.4 <sup>b</sup>	22.6	52.5	48.4 <sup>b</sup>	0.141 <sup>a</sup>	0.029 <sup>c</sup>
After 6 months	6.77 <sup>a</sup>	14.3	7.92 <sup>b</sup>	17.9	25	56.4 <sup>b</sup>	0.228 <sup>b</sup>	0.024 <sup>a</sup>
After 1 year	6.65 <sup>a</sup>	24.2	3.24 <sup>a</sup>	22.4	47.5	57.5 <sup>b</sup>	0.280 <sup>d</sup>	0.027 <sup>b</sup>

NB: For any characteristic, values with the same letter in each column are not significantly different from each other.

## DISCUSSION

The low to moderate pH values observed in the soils in the study area are typical of tropical soils (Sanchez 1976). Kiln operation affected soil chemical properties but the effect seemed to vary with site and therefore with the parent soil characteristics. In Moiben, CEC, Mg, K and P were influenced. In Turbo, Ca, N and Mg were affected while in Eldoret, only N and P were affected. In Narok, only Ca was affected. Although the productivity of the sites was not investigated *per se*, it would be expected that when the top soil is removed and used to cover a kiln, site productivity of the dug up areas would be

reduced, and that such nutrients may take years to replace. During burning of the aboveground biomass the nutrients are rapidly released into the soil. These nutrient additions have positive effects on soil fertility which are however, only short-lived (Kleinman *et al.* 1995).

In addition to the effects on the soil nutrients, there were significant differences in the pH values except for Moiben site. This showed that carbonisation at the sites had an effect on the pH. The addition of charcoal increased the pH of soils with various textures by up to 1.2 pH units from pH 5.4 to pH 6.6 (Mbagwu and Piccolo 1997). In similar studies elsewhere, this effect was still



detectable 3 years after charcoal application where the pH values were 5.8 and 6.3 in the control and the charcoal plots, respectively (Kishimoto and Sugiura 1985).

Another similar trend observed in all the sites was the low levels of carbon in the undisturbed sites than the sites where earth kilns had been operated (Tables 1-4). This clearly showed that charcoal production on any one site increased the carbon content of the soil on that particular site. However, this carbon content reduced with time for the period of one year following the kiln operation probably attributed to soil erosion since carbon loss due to erosion immediately after land clearing is normally alarmingly large.

In all the charcoaling sites there were high levels of soil nutrients as well as exchangeable cations, which may be attributed to the low leaching levels as well as high litter falls. The major recognized avenue for addition of organic matter (and hence nutrients) to the soil from the trees standing on it is through dead and falling leaves, twigs, branches, fruits and so on (Brinson *et al.*, 1980).

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results clearly demonstrate that charcoal earth kiln location and operation has an effect on the soil chemical properties. Although the effects were mostly positive, after some time the nutrients decreased due to soil erosion since the sites were usually left bare. Since it is desirable to maintain the productivity of soils, it is recommended that charcoal kilns be centralized to reduce the impact on soils. Within such a framework the charcoal would be generated from outside the forests therefore reducing the danger of additional forest destruction. Although this may require costs and labour in transporting the material to the kiln site,

the retention of soil productivity outweighs any such negative implications.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Part of this work was undertaken as part of the activities under the VICRES funded Project: "Innovation, User Participation and Training to Enhance Earth Kilns Charcoal Production Recoveries in Lake Victoria Basin". The Financial support is highly acknowledged.

## REFERENCES

- Brinson, M., Bradsaw, H.D., Homles, R.N. and Elkins, J.B., 1980. Litterfall, stemflow, and throughfall nutrient fluxes in an alluvial swamp forest. *Ecology* 61, 827-835.
- Chidumayo, E.N., 1994. Effects of wood carbonization on soil and initial development of seedlings in miombo woodland, Zambia. *For Ecol Manage* 70:353-357.
- EAA 2003. Sustainable Energy in Kenya Series. Policy Briefing No. 2. Energy Alternatives Africa Ltd. Nairobi, Kenya.
- Ekakoro, E.E., Senelwa, K. Etiegni, L. Okach, K., 2006. Evaluation of Charcoal Kiln Processes and Recoveries in Kenya. In Proceedings: World Renewable Energy Congress – IX 19-25 August 2006, Florence, Italy.
- Girard, P., 2002. Charcoal Production and Use in Africa: What Future? *Unasylva*. Vol. 53. No. 211. pp. 30-33.
- Glaser, B., Haumaier L., Guggenberger, G. and Zech, W., 2001. The Terra Preta phenomenon – a model for sustainable agriculture in the humid tropics. *Naturwissenschaften* 88:37-41.



- ILO 1985. Fuelwood and Charcoal Preparation: An Illustrated Training Manual on Simple Tools and Techniques for Small Scale Enterprises. International Labour Organisation Geneva, Switzerland.
- Kishimoto, S.S.G., 1985. Charcoal as a soil conditioner. In: Achieve the Future 5:12–23.
- Kituyi, E., 2002. *Lost Opportunities: Woodfuel Data and Policy Development Concerns in Kenya*. African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS). Nairobi, Kenya.
- Kituyi, E., Marufu, L., Jumba, I.O., Wandiga, S.O., Andreae, M.O. and Helas, G., 2001 *Biofuel consumption rates and patterns in Kenya, Biomass and Bioenergy* 20:83–99.
- Kleinman, P.J.A, Pimentel D. and Bryant, R.B., 1995. The ecological sustainability of slash-and-burn agriculture. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 52:235–249.
- MoE 2002. Study on Kenya's Energy Demand, Supply and Policy Strategy for Households, Small Scale Industries and Service Establishments. Final Report, May, Kamfor Company Ltd, Ministry of Energy, Nairobi.
- Nyoike, P.M. and Okech, B.A., 1992. "Energy Use Patterns in Kenya". In: *Energy Management in Africa*. Bhagavan, M.R. & S. Karekezi (eds.). Zed Books Ltd /AFREPREN.
- O'Keefe, P., Raskin, P. and Bernow, S., 1984. *Energy & Development in Kenya: Opportunities & Constraints*. Energy, Environment & Development in Africa Series No. 1. The Beijer Institute/SEI/Scandinavian Institute of African Studies. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Okalebo, J.R., Gathua, K.W. and Woomer, P.L., 2000. Laboratory Methods of Plant and Soil Analysis: A Working Manual; Second Edition (In press).
- Piccolo, A. and Mbagwu, J.S.C., 1990. Effects of different organic waste amendments on soil microaggregates stability and molecular sizes of humic substances. *Plant Soil* 123:27–37.
- Piccolo, A., Pietramellara, G. and Mbagwu, J.S.C., 1996. Effects of coal-derived humic substances on water retention and structural stability of Mediterranean soils. *Soil Use Manage* 12:209–213.
- RoK 2002a. Uasin Gishu District Development Plan 2002-2008. Republic of Kenya Government Printer, Nairobi.
- RoK 2002b. Narok District Development Plan 2002-2008. Republic of Kenya Government Printer, Nairobi.
- Sanchez P.A., 1979. Soil fertility and conservation considerations for agroforestry systems in the humid tropics of Latin america. In Mongi, H. O. and P. A. Huxley (eds), soils research in agroforestry, pp. 79-124. Nairobi: ICRAF Senelwa, K.A. & Hall D.O. 1993. *A Biomass Flowchart for Kenya*. Biomass and Bioenergy, 4 (1): 35-48.