



GATE-TO-GATE LIFE CYCLE INVENTORY ANALYSIS OF BRIQUETTING POST-HARVEST LOGGING RESIDUES

Waste to Wisdom: Subtask 4.7.3

Prepared By:

Sevda Alanya-Rosenbaum¹ and Richard D. Bergman²

¹ Bioenergy LCA Researcher

² Project Leader

Both are at the USDA Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory, One Gifford Pinchot Drive, Madison, WI 53726-2398

Corresponding author: Sevda Alanya-Rosenbaum, USDA Forest Service, One Gifford Pinchot Drive, Madison, WI 53726-2398; e-mail: salaryrosenbaum@fs.fed.us

2016

This material is based upon work supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy under the Biomass Research and Development Initiative program: Award Number DE-EE0006297.

This Page Blank



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY



HUMBOLDT
STATE UNIVERSITY

12 **USING ORGANIC AMENDMENTS TO RESTORE SOIL**
13 **PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF A MINE SITE IN**
14 **NORTHEASTERN OREGON, USA**

15 **D.S. Page-Dumroese, M.R. Ott, D.G. Strawn, J.M. Tirocke**

16 The authors are **Deborah S. Page-Dumroese**, Research Soil Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station,
17 Moscow, ID, USA, **Monica R. Ott**, Graduate student, Plant, Soil, and Entomological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID,
18 USA, **Daniel G. Strawn**, Professor of Soil Chemistry, Plant, Soil, and Entomological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID,
19 USA, and **Joanne M. Tirocke**, Biological Sciences Technician, USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Moscow,
20 ID, USA. **Corresponding author:** Deborah S. Page-Dumroese, USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, 1221 S.
21 Main, Moscow, ID 83843; phone: 208-883-2339; e-mail: ddumroese@fs.fed.us.

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 *To reclaim soils disturbed from mining activity on National Forests new cost-effective strategies*
24 *are needed. In addition, disposal of waste wood from local timber harvest operations or biosolids from*
25 *waste water treatment plants can be expensive. Therefore, using organic byproducts for soil reclamation*
26 *activities on National Forests may provide an opportunity to increase soil cover and productivity, and*
27 *decrease restoration costs. To test the effectiveness of these amendments for reclamation, a field study was*
28 *established using organic amendments applied to gold dredgings capped with 10 cm of loam and with little*
29 *regenerating vegetation within the Umatilla National Forest in northeastern Oregon. Study plots had*
30 *biochar (11 Mg/ha), biosolids (17 Mg/ha), or wood chips (22 Mg/ha) applied singly or in combination.*
31 *Each plot was divided in half. One half of the plot was seeded with native grasses and forb and the other*
32 *half was planted with a combination of California brome (*Bromus carinatus* Hook & Am.) and Jepson's*
33 *blue wildrye (*Elymus glaucus* Buckl.). After two growing seasons, there were no significant differences in*
34 *plant cover between the planted or seeded plots. Biosolids, biosolid + biochar + wood chips, and biosolid*
35 *+ wood chips had greater grass and forb planted cover after two years; seeded plots on the biosolid +*
36 *biochar + wood chips and biosolid + wood chip treatments had the greatest grass and forb cover. Soil*
37 *properties were significantly altered by individual treatments; combination treatments improved nutrient*
38 *availability and soil moisture, resulting in up to twice as much plant cover than in the control plots. Forest*
39 *managers can produce biochar and wood chips from the abundant forest waste generated during harvest*
40 *operations, and class "A" biosolids are available in Oregon from local municipalities. Using these three*
41 *amendments in combination to restore disturbed mine soils can provide an affordable and effective*
42 *strategy.*

43 **Keywords.** *Biochar, Biosolids, Bromus carinatus, Elymus glaucus, Wood chips*

44 INTRODUCTION

45

46 Within the last decade, reclamation of abandoned mine land (AML) in the United States has gained
47 government attention and public concern. In the 12 Western states, over 161,000 abandoned mines exist. In
48 2011, the Office of Accountability estimated the cost of reclaiming abandoned mines on public land in the
49 12 Western states was in the range of \$10-\$21 billion dollars. Often, unproductive AMLs are in forested
50 areas, reducing overall forest productivity and timber harvest potential. In the Pacific Northwest,
51 abandoned mine sites are usually located in rural areas with rugged terrain and limited access. Eighty
52 percent of AML on public lands contain physical hazards, but no environmental hazard or contamination
53 (AGI, 2011). Physical hazards include waste rock piles and disturbed landscapes that often lack vegetation
54 and create inhospitable environmental conditions. Combined costs of equipment, transportation, and re-
55 application of needed nutrients rules out many common reclamation strategies. Surface applied
56 amendments, with minimal soil disturbance, are an inexpensive solution to increase soil function and
57 accelerate re-vegetation. Three possible amendments that have shown some success in soil restoration are
58 biochar, municipal biosolids, and wood chips.

59 Biochar, a solid product from the pyrolysis of biomass, can be used as a soil amendment on agriculture,
60 range, and forest soils (Atkinson et al., 2010; Beesley et al., 2010, 2011; Jeffery et al., 2011; Peltz and
61 Harley, 2016; Page-Dumroese et al. 2017). It may also be suitable for restoring vegetation on pulverized
62 rock piles produced by historic mining activities (Kelly et al., 2014) because it can increase nutrient and
63 water availability by improving the physical, chemical, and biological properties of rocky or coarse-
64 textured growing matrices (Glaser et al., 2002). Proposed uses of biochar applied to the soil are to increase
65 agricultural yield (Major et al., 2010; Sinclair et al., 2008), reduce risks at polluted sites (Fellet et al., 2011;
66 Murano et al., 2009), sequester C (Galinato et al., 2011; Steinbeiss et al., 2009), and restore organic matter
67 content in degraded soils or rocky substrates (Anawar et al., 2015; Stavi, 2012).

68 Biochar has been shown to influence soil chemical and physical properties, resulting in increased
69 available nutrients and plant survival (Lehmann et al., 2003; Tammeorg et al., 2014), water-holding
70 capacity, and decreasing availability of soil contaminants such as heavy metals (Uchimiya et al., 2010;
71 Rodriguez-Vila et al., 2014; Ojeda et al., 2015). It is also known to increase cation exchange capacity

72 (CEC) and retention of cationic nutrients (namely potassium (K^+), magnesium (Mg^{2+}), calcium (Ca^{2+}), and
73 ammonium-N (NH_4^+)) (Liang, 2006; Lehman, 2007), increase total organic carbon (C) (Unger et al. 2011;
74 Tammeorg et al., 2014), and raise soil pH (Chan et al., 2009). Biochar properties are determined by
75 feedstock and pyrolysis temperatures (Gundale and DeLuca, 2006; Uchimiya et al., 2010), and therefore
76 their effects on soil parameters vary. For example, at the Hope Mine reclamation project in the White River
77 National Forest in Colorado, biochar was applied at varying rates in combination with compost, erosion
78 control webbing, and hydromulching to re-vegetate contaminated mine soil (arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd),
79 lead (Pb), and zinc (Zn)) and prevent erosion on a steep hillside (ACES, 2011). Due to the slope,
80 amendments were not incorporated into the mine overburden. Within the first year, the combined
81 amendments increased soil moisture and native grass growth. The success of the revegetation, however,
82 was not only due to the biochar since compost, applied in quantities of up to 95% of total amendments,
83 provided nutrients and organic matter (USDA Forest Service, 2012). Other recent studies have also found
84 adverse effects of biochar on soil health and plant growth, such as hindering N mineralization and
85 increasing N immobilization (Kookana et al., 2011), absorbing P (Yao et al., 2012), and clogging pore
86 spaces over time, which decreases its surface area and therefore sorption properties (Hammes and Schmidt,
87 2012).

88 The vast majority of studies conducted with biochar on mine sites have been for the purpose of
89 remediation by reducing toxic metal uptake and immobilization of contaminants (Fellet et al., 2011, Bakshi
90 et al., 2014, Strawn et al., 2015; Ippolito et al., 2017). Although biochar has been used as a soil amendment
91 on degraded agricultural soils (Lehmann et al., 2012, Atkinson et al., 2010), and recently on rangeland soils
92 (Stavi, 2012), it has not been widely used to alter soil function on degraded mine lands that are not
93 contaminated.

94 A second type of organic amendment available to rehabilitate AMLs are biosolids. These are
95 commonly used for mine land reclamation, especially after the establishment of the Surface Mine
96 Reclamation Act of 1977 (Sopper, 1992; Haering et al., 2000; <https://www.osmre.gov/lrg.shtm>). Mine soil
97 deficiencies that can be improved by biosolids are low organic matter, CEC, pH, and nutrients (Forsberg
98 and Ledin, 2006; Ojeda et al., 2010). Biosolids contain between 1-6% N, depending on the source and
99 processing (Center for Urban Horticulture, 2002). Recent mine land reclamation research with biosolids

100 and sewage sludge show they can be used as a manufactured topsoil (Brown et al., 2003) or incorporated
101 into unproductive soils to increase vegetation growth.

102 Wood chips are another frequently used surface-applied amendment on mine sites. Wood chips add few
103 soil nutrients, but they promote biological activity during decomposition, thereby having the potential to
104 increase soil organic matter content and increasing soil water holding capacity by changing soil structure
105 (Edwards et al., 1992; Walsh and Redente, 2011). Organic C can also change water retention because it
106 forms polysaccharides that bind soil particles together, causing aggregation and allowing infiltration. Wood
107 chips also reduce surface evapotranspiration. In a reclamation project on mine land in North Idaho, Walsh
108 and Redente (2010) found wood chips increase organic matter, ammonium-N and nitrate-N after 4 years.
109 Wood chips on the soil surface also block direct sunlight, keeping the soil cool and reducing evaporation
110 (Schoenholtz et al., 1992).

111 The United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS), in cooperation with the City of
112 Bend, Oregon, initiated a mine tailing reclamation project in the Umatilla National Forest in northeastern
113 Oregon to determine the benefits of surface applied organic amendments, and to determine if AML
114 reclamation would be a beneficial utilization option for biosolids, wood chips, or biochar. For this study,
115 the USFS worked with Biochar Solutions Inc. (Anderson et al., 2013) to produce biochar near forest sites
116 where biomass waste has either become a fire hazard or is left over from logging activity (USDA Forest
117 Service, 2012; Page-Dumroese et al., 2017). To help restore AML productivity, we conducted a field study
118 using surface applied organic amendments. Surface applications are likely to be used more often on
119 abandoned hardrock mine tailings since mixing the organics into the rocks is not feasible. In addition,
120 AMLs on National Forests are generally remote; making it difficult and costly to move in large equipment
121 to mix amendments into soil caps, if present. Other concerns are that mixing tailing piles can expose more
122 contaminants or pollutants and hazardous elements to air and water and disrupt plant and soil structure,
123 leading to increased erosion and loss of nutrients. Thus, to develop effective and economical reclamation
124 strategies for forest soils, research into surface applied amendments on AML soils in field settings
125 (application rates, and overall effectiveness to develop ground cover) is necessary.

126 Our objectives were to: 1) determine if surface applied soil amendments affect soil water holding capacity,
127 plant available nutrients, pH, CEC, and C; and 2) determine if surface applied soil amendments affect seeded

128 or planted grasses or forb survival and areal extent of ground cover.

129 **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

130 **EXPERIMENTAL SITE AND SOIL CHARACTERISTICS**

131 The study site is in the Granite mining district of Grant County, Oregon and is part of the larger “Oregon
132 Gold District,” which produced gold throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Clear Creek is a dredged creek
133 located approximately three miles west/southwest of Granite, Oregon (44.780541,-118.459623; fig.1). The
134 site is a flattened tailings pile left over from dredging activities dating as far back as 1862, lining the north
135 side of Clear Creek (EOMA, 1999). The tailings pile was capped in the 1970’s with roughly 10 cm of loam.
136 Between 2001 and 2007, the Umatilla National Forest planted ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa* Lawson &
137 C. Lawson) and seeded with native grasses and forbs. These re-vegetation attempts had limited success,
138 resulting in <10% ground cover of grasses and forbs and less than 1% survival based on personal observation.



139

140 Figure 1. Map of the Clear Creek reclamation project in northeastern Oregon.

141

142 The site is located in Climate Division 8 (NOAA) with an average annual precipitation of 62.8 cm per
143 year. According to the Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) the site is in a region of moderate drought

144 (NIDIS) and in a region of severe to extreme drought during 6 months of the year (July-Oct)
 145 (<https://www.drought.gov/drought/dews/pacific-northwest>). Since the soil cap was applied in the 1970's the
 146 surface loam material has become embedded with rocks from the subsurface. Rock fragment content of the
 147 soil ranges from 28% to 52%, increasing from the surface down to 20 cm (table 1.). Before applying the
 148 amendments, soil samples were collected and physicochemical properties determined (table 1). Analysis
 149 methods are described under Laboratory Methods.

150 **Table 1. Initial characterization of the fine-fraction and rock content of the topsoil cap (n=6).**

Property	Amount
Rock fragment content	28-52 %
Sand	47 ± 5 %
Silt	35 ± 3 %
Clay	18 ± 2 %
Textural class (USDA)	Loam
Total soil bulk density	1.8 Mg/m ³
pH	5.5 ± 0.4
Total carbon	3.8 ± 0.4 %
Total nitrogen (N)	<0.01 %

151

152

153 **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

154 In October 2014, experimental plots were constructed in a completely randomized design. The plots
 155 were 3 x 3 meters in size, with three replicates of each single amendment and combinations, plus an
 156 untreated control in each replicate (8 treatments x 3 replicates = 24 plots). Biochar, biosolids, wood chips
 157 and their 2- and 3-way combinations were surface applied. Application rates were as follows: biochar- 11
 158 Mg/ha, biosolids- 17 Mg/ha and woodchips- 22 Mg/ha. The application rates were chosen in an attempt to
 159 standardize the amount of C applied. Amendments were applied as close to this rate of C as possible. C:N
 160 ratio of these biosolids was 5.9. Table 2 provides a summary of the chemical and physical properties of the
 161 Class A biosolids (BioVir Laboratories, Benicia, CA), wood chips, and biochar, as applied.

162

163

Table 2. Average physical and chemical properties of applied biochar, biosolids and wood chips

Applied material	Total N	Total C	Ca	Mg	K	P	pH	EC	Particle size range
	percent		mg/kg					μS/cm	mm
Biosolid	56	38	9500	1450	2900	30,250	7.1	160	1-2
Biochar	0.26	89	6700	990	3900	490	7.2	103	0.5-5
Wood chips	0.12	47	1590	240	770	0.47	na*	na	1-25

164

*na indicates these properties were not analyzed.

165

Biosolids were obtained from the Bend Water Reclamation facility in Bend, OR. Biosolids were anaerobically digested and dewatered using a belt filter press prior to drying on 12 acres of asphalt drying beds. Because our study plots were near two fish-bearing streams, we applied Class A biosolids (pathogen-free). Biochar was made from mill and forest residues, which contained little bark or foliage. Biochar Solutions, Inc. (Carbondale, CO) used a two-stage reactor and carbonized the feedstock in a controlled aerobic environment with limited oxygen and temperatures between 700 and 750 °C for less than one minute before it passed into the second reactor and held there for ten to fifteen minutes at temperatures between 400 and 550 °C (See Anderson et al., 2013 for details on the biochar). Final C:N ratio of the biochar was 342. Wood chips were created from ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *glauca* Beissn. Franco) at a local sawmill and had a C:N ratio of 392. All amendments were evenly applied to the soil surface. Combination treatments had biochar applied first, then wood chips, then biosolids.

177

Immediately after applying the organic amendments to each plot, a native grass and forb seed mixture was applied to half of the plot and lightly raked into the soil and amendments, if present (table 3). This seed mix contains local, native species and is commonly used by the USFS on restoration sites in this area. The other half of each plot was planted in April 2015 with greenhouse-grown seedlings of California brome (*Bromus carinatus* Hook. & Arn.) and Jepson's blue wildrye (*Elymus glaucus* Buckl). Twenty-five seedlings of each species were planted. Seedlings were grown from seed collected near the study plots and grown at the Rocky Mountain Research Station, Moscow, ID. Seedlings were grown in RootMaker containers (model RM105T, 105 cavities/tray; cavities were 2.0 x 2.5 x 5 cm (25 ml volume)) with 710

185 cavities/m² (Steuwe and Sons, Inc., Tangent, OR). Seedlings were grown for 6 weeks and refrigerated until
 186 the snow left the field site.

187 **Table 3. Species and percentages in the seed mix sown in each treatment.**

Common name	Scientific name	Relative percentage
Western yarrow	<i>Achillea millefolium</i> L.	1.2%
Mountain brome	<i>Bromus marginatus</i> Nees es Steud.	35%
Bottlebrush squirreltail	<i>Elymus elymoides</i> (Raf.) Swezey	9.4%
Jepson's blue wildrye	<i>Elymus glaucus</i> Buckley	25.9%
Idaho fescue	<i>Festuca idahoensis</i> Elmer	4.7%
Prairie junegrass	<i>Koeleria macrantha</i> (Ledeb.) Schult.	7.1%
Sandberg's bluegrass	<i>Poa secunda</i> J. Presl	4.7%
Bluebunch wheatgrass	<i>Pseudoroegneria spicata</i> (Pursh) A. Love	11.8%

188

189 **SOIL SAMPLING**

190 Post-treatment soil samples were collected in May 2016, 19 months after amendment application, from
 191 the 0 to 3 cm and 3 to 12 cm depths. The soil surface was brushed free of amendments in order to sample
 192 only the mineral soil. Samples were placed in zip-type plastic bags, placed in a cooler to minimize
 193 biological nutrient cycling, and transported to the lab where they were kept refrigerated until processing.
 194 Bulk density was measured using excavation and polyurethane foam method on site (Page-Dumroese et al.,
 195 1999). Excavated soil was weighed for total soil mass then sieved through a 2-mm sieve. The foam cores
 196 were removed, transported to the lab, and volume determined by water displacement.

197 **RESIN CAPSULES AND SOIL MOISTURE MEASUREMENTS**

198 In fall 2015, Unibest resin capsules (Unibest International LLC, Walla Walla, WA) were installed in each
 199 plot at 10 cm. Capsules remained in situ for a six month period. These capsules absorb bioavailable
 200 cations and anions from soil solution and concentrations reflect plant available nutrients (Schoenau and
 201 Huang, 1991, Qian et al., 1992, Drohan et al., 2005). The resin capsules were returned to Unibest to obtain
 202 total N, Ca, Mg, K, phosphorus (P), and sulfur (S) concentrations reported as mg/L.

203 Soil moisture was logged at 2 hour intervals in one plot of every treatment from plot install through
 204 September of the following year with Onset Hobo loggers and 5 cm soil moisture sensors (Onset Computer
 205 Corp., Bourne, MA).

206 **LABORATORY METHODS**

207 The collected soil samples were kept cold until reaching the lab, at which time ammonium-N and
208 nitrate-N extractions (Keeney and Nelson, 1982) were performed (within 24 hrs). Extracts were frozen until
209 analysis by flow injection (FIA2500, FIALab Instrument; Bellevue, WA). To measure potentially
210 mineralizable N (PMN), an anaerobic digestion of soil samples was conducted with field-wet soil (Powers,
211 1980) and analyzed by FIA2500 flow injection analyzer. Soil moisture content of the field-wet samples was
212 measured on a mass basis by oven drying the subsamples at 105 °C for 24 hrs. The remaining samples were
213 allowed to air dry at room temperature (~20 °C). Pre- and post-treatment soil pH and electrical conductivity
214 (EC) was determined on a 2:1 water:soil slurry (Orion Star A215; Research, Inc., Boston, MA). Total C
215 and N were measured by dry combustion at 950 °C on a CN analyzer (Leco TruSpec, St. Joseph, MI,
216 USA). Soil texture was determined by the hydrometer method. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) was
217 measured only on soil from the single amendment plots using the ammonium acetate method (Miller and
218 Sumner, 1996). Extracts were analyzed for ammonium-N with an NH₃ gas-sensing ion selective probe
219 (Banwart et al., 1972, Mulvaney, 1996). Accuracy and quality control for all samples were checked using
220 standards and reference soil.

221 **SOIL WATER RETENTION**

222 Initial soil moisture content was measured by oven-dry method using subsamples of 10-15 g. Field
223 capacity and permanent wilting point were measured as water retention by pressure plate extraction (Klute,
224 1986). Water retention at 0.3 MPa and 1.5 MPa was determined for each pressure and this was used to
225 calculate plant available water (PAW).

226 **PLANT COVER AND SURVIVAL**

227 In May 2016, survival of all planted grasses was determined. In addition, a 0.33 m plot frame was placed
228 on the soil surface and a digital photo taken in each half of each plot. Cover was determined from the digital
229 photo by using the Cover Monitoring Assistant (Steinfeld et al., 2011), which randomly assigns analysis
230 points within the defined photo area. Proportion of the following cover classes was assessed: bare soil,
231 biochar, biosolids, wood chip, grass, forb, coarse wood, litter, rock, and undetermined.

232

233 **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

234 Results from all soil and plant measurements were analyzed using SAS (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). The
235 data was first analyzed by univariate tests to choose appropriate transformations if necessary to normalize
236 the distributions. A pooled generalized linear mixed model using log, beta, and Poisson transformations, in
237 accordance with data distributions, was used for analysis of variance tests between treatments (Stroup,
238 2015). P-values less than 0.05 were considered significant.

239 **RESULTS**

240 All soil amendments provided additional C to the soil surface. Nitrogen in the biosolids was much higher
241 than in the biochar or wood chips, but all three amendments had higher total N and other nutrients than the
242 native soil (tables 1 and 2). In addition, both the biochar and biosolid amendments had a higher pH than the
243 mineral soil.

244 **SOIL PROPERTIES**

245 Nineteen months after applying soil amendments significant differences in pH, EC, CEC, and total C
246 were observed between treatments, primarily in the surface soil (0-3 cm; table 4). Both biosolids and
247 biochar significantly increased soil pH as compared to the 2- and 3-way amendment combination
248 treatments. All amendments containing biosolids had significantly increased EC, but the other soil
249 amendments did not affect it. Biosolids increased total C concentration of the surface soil more than the
250 biochar and wood chip amendments. All of the single amendment treatments increased CEC of the surface
251 soil, but only biosolids treatment produced a statistically significant increase.

252

253
254
255
256

Table 4. Mean (standard deviation) soil pH, electrical conductivity, total carbon, and cation exchange capacity of the surface (0-3 cm) and subsurface (3-12 cm) soil 19 months after soil amendment application.

Treatment	Soil Depth	pH	Electrical conductivity	Total carbon	Cation exchange capacity
Control	0-3	5.6 (0.2) abcd	40.5 (2.4) a	3.6 (0.2) a	22.2 (1.7) a
	3-12	5.7 (0.2) ABC	32.3 (4.3) ACD	3.8 (0.2) A	20.9 (0.9) A
Biosolids	0-3	5.9 (0.1) a	254.5 (64.8) c	5.6 (0.6) bc	27.1 (2.2) b
	3-12	5.3 (0.1) ACD	120.8 (23.0) B	3.7 (0.2) A	24.4 (1.3) AB
Biochar	0-3	6.0 (0.1) a	40.8 (6.7) a	4.3 (0.3) ad	24.8 (1.2) ab
	3-12	5.8 (0.2) B	27.0 (1.6) AD	3.8 (0.2) A	25.95 (2.8) B
Wood chips	0-3	5.9 (0.1) ab	38.5 (6.9) a	4.3 (0.2) abd	23.8 (1.6) ab
	3-12	5.8 (0.1) AB	25.2 (2.5) A	3.7 (0.2) A	27.9 (1.0) B
Biosolids + Wood chips	0-3	5.6 (0.1) bcd	133.8 (14.3) bc	5.6 (0.2) c	
	3-12	5.1 (0.1) CD	75.0 (15.8) BC	3.6 (0.6) A	
Biosolid + Biochar	0-3	5.6 (0.1) bcd	188.1 (23.7) bc	5.5 (0.2) bc	
	3-12	5.0 (0.1) D	143.2 (11.1) B	3.9 (0.02) A	
Biochar + Wood chips	0-3	5.4 (0.1) dc	32.5 (3.9) a	4.7(0.23) bcd	
	3-12	5.2 (0.1) CD	23.8 (0.8) A	3.7 (0.2) A	
Biosolids + Biochar + Wood chips	0-3	5.3 (0.2) d	127.7 (43.3) b	5.4 (0.6) bc	
	3-12	5.1 (0.1) CD	69.3 (15.9) DB	3.7 (0.2) A	

257 ^a Small letters indicate significant differences among soil amendments at the 0-3 cm depth ($p \leq 0.5$) using
258 Tukey's multiple comparison test.

259 ^b Capital letters indicate significant differences among soil amendments at the 3-12 cm depth ($p \leq 0.5$) using
260 Tukey's multiple comparison test.

261

262 In the subsurface (3-12 cm depth) the amendments did not alter soil properties as much as they did in the
263 surface (table 4). However, the trends in pH, EC and CEC in the subsurface soils were similar to the surface
264 soils. Thus, it appears that after 19 months, soil amendments are slowly moving into the subsurface, but
265 subsurface total C concentrations were similar for all treatments.

266

267 **NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY**

268 The highest N concentrations occurred in the soils amended with biosolids (table 5). Ammonium-N and

269 nitrate-N concentrations were combined to determine the total, plant available, inorganic nitrogen content
270 for each treatment (fig. 2). The subsurface (3-12 cm depth) had less total N than the surface (0-3 cm depth).
271 Subsurface N was relatively unaffected by the soil amendments after 19 months. As expected, biosolids
272 had the greatest impact on inorganic-N content while wood chips generally had significantly less N (fig. 2).
273 Biosolids + wood chips had less inorganic-N than biosolids alone and at both soil depths, wood chips and
274 biochar + wood chip had lower inorganic-N concentrations than the control plots.

275

276

277
278
279

Table 5. Mean (standard deviation) total nitrogen, ammonium-N, nitrate-N, and potentially mineralizable nitrogen (PMN) in the surface (0-3 cm) and subsurface (3-12 cm) soil 19 months after amendment application.

Treatment	Depth	Total nitrogen	Ammonium-N	Nitrate-N	Potentially mineralizable nitrogen
		cm	percent		mg/kg
Control	0-3	0.03 (0.02) a ^a	7.9 (1.8) bc	5.6 (0.7) bc	40.5 (2.4) ac
	3-12	0.04 (0.03) A ^b	0.7 (0.1) B	2.9 (0.3) DC	24.9 (6.2) A
Biosolids	0-3	0.31 (0.07) b	56.2 (25.4) a	62.0 (28.0) a	156.0 (49.5) b
	3-12	0.04 (0.02) A	33.3 (16.2) A	17.1 (4.9) AB	17.4 (1.6) AB
Biochar	0-3	0.02 (0.02) a	3.9 (0.5) bc	6.2 (1.1) bc	37.1 (3.5) a
	3-12	0.03 (0.02) A	1.0 (0.1) B	3.1 (0.7) DC	19.2 (0.4) AB
Wood chips	0-3	0.01 (0.01) a	1.2 (0.4) c	1.3 (0.5) c	51.7 (2.4) ac
	3-12	0.02 (0.02) A	0.6 (0.1) B	0.8 (0.2) D	19.3 (0.3) AB
Biosolids + Wood chips	0-3	0.28 (0.03) b	34.4 (10.7) ab	20.3 (5.4) bc	139.0 (12.0) b
	3-12	0.08 (0.08) A	5.6 (8.1) B	12.1(3.7) ABC	19.5 (4.2) AB
Biosolids + Biochar	0-3	0.27 (0.01) b	11.4 (3.0) bc	39.2 (8.2) ab	119.0 (45.6) b
	3-12	0.02 (0.01) A	31.9 (2.1) A	19.5 (6.2) A	8.6 (1.9) B
Biochar + Wood chips	0-3	0.03 (0.01) a	1.04 (0.3) c	2.1 (0.1) c	59.3 (8.4) ac
	3-12	0.03 (0.02) A	0.7 (0.1) B	1.1 (0.2) D	21.4 (1.9) AB
Biosolids + Biochar + Wood chips	0-3	0.19 (0.07) ab	6.37 (2.1) bc	23.0 (8.1) bc	97.7 (28.7) bc
	3-12	0.02 (0.01) A	1.6 (0.2) B	9.3 (1.7) BCD	5.1 (2.5) B


280
281

^a Small letters indicate significant differences among soil amendments at the 0-3 cm depth ($p \leq 0.5$) using Tukey's multiple comparison test.

282
283

^b Capital letters indicate significant differences among soil amendments at the 3-12 cm depth ($p \leq 0.5$) using Tukey's multiple comparison test.

284



285

286 **Figure 2. Extractable inorganic nitrogen concentration in the surface (0-3 cm) soil. Error bars**
 287 **indicate standard deviations. Soil amendment treatments are BS- Biosolid, BC-Biochar, W-wood**
 288 **chips and their 2- and 3-way combinations.**

289

290 Similar to the other measures of N, PMN was highest in the biosolids amended soil. In the biochar and
 291 woodchips treatments, along with their combinations, PMN was not statistically different from the control
 292 (table 5). However the 3-way combination and biosolids + biochar amendments resulted in a significant
 293 decrease in PMN in the subsurface soil.

294 **RESIN CAPSULES**

295 Nutrient data from the *in-situ* ion resin capsules were used to indicate nutrient release into the soil
 296 solution within a six month time period (Qian, 1992). Similar to plant roots, concentrations of ions on the
 297 resin capsules are dependent on diffusion rates for nutrient capture, and diffusion rates increase with soil
 298 moisture (Blank et al., 2007). The highest nutrient concentrations of N, P, K, Ca, and Mg were found in the
 299 biosolid plots (table 6), while nutrient recovery on the resin capsules in the biochar and woodchip amended

300 plots were low. The ion resin capsule results have high standard deviations, which reflects the inherent
301 variability present in field settings, and has been documented in previous studies using resin capsules
302 (Gundale and DeLuca, 2006).

303

Table 6. Mean nutrient recovery (standard deviation) from resin capsules placed in the soils at 10 cm from date to date, n=3.

Treatment	Total nitrogen	Calcium	Potassium	Magnesium	Phosphorus	Sulphur
	mg/kg/month					
Control	0.12 (0.06) b ^a	5.60 (2.13) b	0.84 (0.30) a	2.73 (1.06) c	0.31 (0.05) b	0.67 (0.55) b
Biosolid	19.02 (8.54) a	30.82 (16.39) a	2.58 (2.63) a	12.88 (4.59) a	9.83 (2.62) ab	6.73 (3.66) a
Biochar	0.75 (1.0) b	4.91 (3.22) b	1.83 (2.53) a	2.53 (1.87) c	0.30 (0.31) b	0.68 (0.61) b
Wood chips	0.14 (0.02) b	4.73 (1.19) b	1.07 (0.53) a	2.26 (0.69) c	0.15 (0.15) b	1.19 (0.85) b
Biosolids + biochar	15.95 (6.15) a	18.09 (7.26) b	3.24 (1.11) a	9.17 (2.17) ab	12.03 (4.06) a	1.78 (1.02) b
Biosolids + wood chips	12.52 (2.79) a	15.09 (2.24) b	2.29 (0.55) a	8.01 (1.56) b	4.92 (5.37) ab	2.13 (0.53) b
Biochar + wood chips	0.14 (0.03) b	4.46 (1.56) b	0.86 (0.24) a	2.14 (0.80) c	0.30 (0.22) b	0.33 (0.09) b
Biosolids + biochar + wood chips	15.01 (4.00) a	17.3 (7.44) b	1.82 (1.28) a	9.56 (4.42) ab	8.05 (12.07) ab	3.10 (2.13) b

304 ^a For each element, different letters indicate significant differences among soil amendments ($p \leq 0.5$) using Tukey's multiple comparison test.

306 **PLANT AVAILABLE WATER AND SOIL MOISTURE**


307 Soil amendment was a significant factor in both the surface and subsurface soils for plant available water (PAW; the
 308 difference between field capacity and permanent wilting point) (table 7). Plant available water was significantly greater in the
 309 biosolids amended soil in the surface 0-3 cm (table 7). The lowest PAW occurred in the biochar + wood chips plots. In the
 310 subsurface soil, the control, single, and biosolids + biochar + wood chips amendments had significantly higher PAW than the
 311 paired amendment treatments. Average yearly soil moisture measure *in situ* also indicates that soil under biosolids had more
 312 moisture throughout the year (fig. 3). All the other amendments and control plots had lower soil moisture levels. Monthly
 313 averages of soil moisture indicate that the control plot had the lowest soil moisture in August whereas the biochar and wood
 314 chip plots had the lowest soil moisture in November (fig. 4). The biosolid plots maintained more soil moisture as compared
 315 to the other single amendment plots beginning in June and continuing through the rest of the year.

316 **Table 7. Plant available water (standard deviation) at each soil depth for all treatments.**

Treatment	0-3 cm depth	3-12 cm depth
Control	14.0 (1.4) a ^a	13.2 (0.9) a
Biosolids	16.9 (1.9) b	13.2 (0.3) a
Biochar	15.1 (1.0) ab	13.5 (1.7) a
Wood chips	15.4 (0.1) ab	12.7 (0.9) a
Biosolid + biochar	15.4 (1.1) ab	10.4 (2.1) b
Biosolid + wood chips	15.2 (1.5) ab	10.8 (0.3) b
Biochar + wood chips	13.7 (0.8) a	10.6 (0.6) b
Biosolids + biochar + wood chips	15.9 (1.8) ab	13.6 (1.7) a

317 ^a Within each soil depth, letters with different letters are significantly different among soil amendments ($p \leq 0.5$) using
 318 Tukey's multiple comparison test

319



320

321

322

323

324

325

Figure 3. Average annual soil moisture in each soil single soil amendment and 3 amendment combination. Error bars represent the standard deviation. Soil amendment treatments are BS- Biosolid, BC-Biochar, W-wood chips and the 3-way combinations.




Figure 4. Monthly soil moisture (percent) in the control and single amendment plots.

PLOT COVER AND PLANT SURVIVAL

The soil amendments were evenly applied on the plots and resulted in 100% ground coverage at year 1. After 2 years, bare ground ranged from 0% (biochar + biosolids + wood chip) to 69% (control). There was less ground cover when biochar and biosolids were applied singly, (bare, 23% and 17% respectively). Vegetative debris (litter) was slightly greater in the planted side of the plots than in the seeded side (data not shown).

Many of the planted seedlings had been pulled from the ground due to ungulate browsing, which accounted for approximately 30% mortality. In both planted and seeded plots, cover by grasses and forbs was lowest in the control plots (Table 8). On the planted side of the plots, forbs were beginning to grow within the planted seedlings, comprising at least ½ of the plant cover on all plots except the control and biosolids + biochar + wood chip. Since one forb species was included in

338 the seed mix, it was expected it to be more prevalent on the seeded rather than on the planted side. In fact, forb presence on
 339 the seeded site was equal to or more than the grass cover for all treatments except the single applications of biosolids and
 340 biochar indicating that some seed likely was in the seed bank or was blown in since the forbs noted in many plots was not
 341 western yarrow. For planted seedlings, survival of California brome was significantly higher in the control, biochar, wood
 342 chip and combined biochar + wood chip plots. Jepson's blue wildrye seedlings had significantly higher survival in the
 343 biochar and biochar + wood chip plots.

344 **Table 8. Overall average grass and forb cover (standard deviation) in planted and seeded plots and two year**
 345 **survival of California brome and Jepson's blue wildrye in each treatment.**
 346

Treatment	Planted	Seeded	California brome	Jepson's blue wildrye
	Cover (%)		Survival (%)	
Control	8 (1) c	9 (2) b	28 (4) a	18 (7) ab
Biosolid	29 (3) a	17 (2) ab	13 (4) ab	17 (6) ab
Biochar	14 (2) b	12 (3) ab	24 (4) a	24 (4) a
Wood chips	10 (1) b	17 (2) ab	26 (5) a	18 (7) ab
Biosolid + wood chips	21 (2) ab	28 (2) a	12 (2) ab	18 (1) ab
Biosolid + biochar	10 (2) b	18 (3) ab	7 (5) c	12 (3) b
Biochar + wood chips	9 (2) b	13 (3) ab	26 (2) a	24 (4) a
Biosolid + biochar + wood chip	31 (2) a	27 (2) a	14 (3) ab	12 (2) b

347 ^a Within each column, letters with different letters are significantly different among soil amendments ($p \leq 0.5$) using
 348 Tukey's multiple comparison test

349

350 DISCUSSION

351 SOIL PROPERTIES

352 Mining causes significant land disturbances which often results in areas with little or no vegetation, erosion, or invasion
 353 by undesirable weeds for a long period of time (Peltz and Harley, 2016). Using local organic material as amendments can be
 354 cost-effective, can mitigate other environmental impacts, such as forest residue slash pile burning and facilitate suitable
 355 disposal of biosolids from waste water treatment facilities. These organic materials can be particularly effective on sites with
 356 low available water (Fellet et al. 2011). In addition, we expect that over time these amendments will add a significant amount
 357 of C to the surface mineral soil.

358 Often soil acidity is the largest problem to remediate at AML, and several studies have shown soil pH generally increases
 359 after biochar amendment (Fellet et al. 2011, Hardie et al., 2014). However, Mukherjee et al. (2014) conducted a two-year
 360 study with 0.5% biochar by weight as a soil amendment and observed no significant increase in soil pH. In addition, Kelly et

361 al. (2014) conducted a 65-day column study on hardrock mine tailings with biochar application rates of 10%, 20%, and 30%
362 biochar by weight; the maximum change in pH was observed in the 30% application rate, but was only a 0.3 pH unit
363 increase. The pH of the biosolids was 6.4 while the biochar was 7.2, while the control soil pH was only 5.5, thus the
364 amendment caused a slight increase in pH by the end of the second growing season. However, when biosolids were
365 combined with wood chips, soil pH went down. This is likely from soluble organic chemicals in the wood which leaches into
366 the soil and buffered the pH change (Larney et al., 2008). Over time, exchangeable acidity and buffering capacities of soils is
367 expected to cause the pH of amended soils to return to its original value. Nutrient uptake by plant roots also contributes to pH
368 buffering because as the roots absorb cation nutrients, they release protons to maintain electrical neutrality, thereby
369 decreasing the surrounding soil pH (Marschner, 1995, Hedley et al., 1982).

370 Electrical conductivity is one indicator of changes in soil physical and chemical properties such as salinity, CEC, pore
371 space, and soil moisture content. In our amended plots, EC was affected by both biosolids and biochar amendments.
372 Agricultural land application of biosolids has increased in the last several decades (Goldstein and Steuteville, 1996), but it is
373 rarely used to amend forest soils or mine sites. After two years on the soil surface, the biosolid amendment plots had the
374 highest EC as compared to the other treatments. This was likely caused by the addition of soluble salts in the biosolids
375 amendments. Sidhu et al. (2016) found similar increases in EC from applying biosolids to copper mine tailings at application
376 rates of 2.5%, 5%, 10%, and 20% of the dry weight, where maximum EC occurred in the 20% amendment rate. In contrast,
377 biochar plots had the lowest EC values, which may be a result of adsorption of soluble salts on the charged surface. Contrary
378 to this study, Fellet et al. (2011; 2014) noted that biochar increased EC in proportion to increasing application rates of 1%,
379 5%, and 10% by dry weight in the laboratory. It has been noted that biochar can also have a neutral effect on EC in field
380 studies (Mukherjee et al. 2014).

381 An important soil property for reclamation of disturbed soils is C content. Since amendments in this study were only
382 applied once, treatments that sustained elevated C over time would be beneficial for improving soil properties, which would
383 subsequently improve water holding capacity and plant cover. After 2 years, all treatments containing biosolids had similar
384 total C amounts, but all amended plots had higher C as compared to the control, indicating that all of the soil amendments
385 would be useful for increasing soil C.

386 Biosolid materials are small and can be readily decomposed because of their large available surface area, whereas the
387 woodchips and biochar are more durable and have larger particle sizes. Biosolids have a C:N ratio of approximately 14-40
388 (depending on the source material; Wu et al., 2000), which is much lower than the wood chips (392) or biochar (342;

389 Anderson et al. 2013). The biosolids contained 55,000 mg/kg N, which continued to provide N, as indicated with the ion
390 resin capsules, through the second growing season. In fact, compared to the initial total N values (0.01%), all post-
391 amendment N concentrations were higher (table 6).

392 **NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY**

393 Biosolids significantly increased plant available N and P. The biosolids applied were 5.5% N by weight. At the biosolids
394 amendment application rate of 17 Mg/ha, 920 kg of total N were applied per hectare or 0.9 kg-N/plot. Ninety-seven percent
395 of the total N was organic-N, requiring mineralization for plant use, and three percent, equaling 11.22 kg N, was plant
396 available at the time of application (table 5). California brome and Jepson's blue wildrye have fertilization requirements of
397 34-55 kg of N/hectare and 22-33 kg of N/hectare, respectively, when planted on infertile soils (USDA, 2012; USDA-NRCS,
398 2013). The immediately available-N portion of the biosolids at the time of application met nearly all N requirements for
399 growth. During the growing season, as plants uptake nutrients for new growth, soil N decreases (Schroth and Sinclair, 2003).
400 The loss of total-N and available-N may be attributed to the large amount of plant cover (uptake), as well as possible nitrate-
401 N leaching or N use by soil organisms.

402 The original biosolids contain 3.03% total P by weight. Unlike N, which is mobile in soils, P is less available, remaining in
403 the soil through a wet season (Stevenson, 1986). In previous biosolid application studies, available P remained in the surface
404 soil (0-10 cm; Maguire et al., 2000; Shober et al., 2003; Sidhu et al., 2016). In addition, Maguire et al. (2000) found at 11
405 different test sites of varying application rates, iron and aluminum-bound P was the dominant form of P below 10 cm, which
406 caused decreased plant available-P. Shober et al. (2003) found no increase in available P below 10 cm after up to 18 years of
407 annual biosolid application (53.71 Mg/ha). In the present study, the ion resin capsules were located at a depth of 10 cm,
408 meaning that all increases seen in biosolid treatments represented the soil at that depth, thus suggesting vertical movement of
409 available-P at this study site, which could be attributed to the skeletal nature of the soil.

410 The lack of significant effects of biochar on nutrient enhancement is consistent with other biochar field studies. Kelly et al.
411 (2014) found no increase in P for biochar at any application rate. However, we show that in combination plots of biochar with
412 biosolids, nutrients were released and we had higher concentrations of all measured nutrients (N, P, K, Ca and Mg) than
413 biochar alone (table 6). The rate of application of biosolids was the same in the single and mixed treatments, so the rate of
414 nutrient release from biosolid alone and biochar + biosolids should be similar. Although available nutrient concentrations
415 were higher in the biochar + biosolid treatment than in biochar alone, they were still lower than biosolids alone. This could be
416 indicative of adsorption of nutrients from solution to biochar surfaces, which are then available to plants through diffusion.

417 **AVAILABLE WATER AND SOIL MOISTURE**

418 In the surface 0-3 cm soil, all amendments raised the level of PAW as compared to the control. Soil amendments may
419 have differing effects on PAW, depending on soil and site conditions (Struebel et al. 2011). For example, Hardie et al. (2014)
420 incorporated 47 Mg/ha of biochar in a field study, and reported no significant effects on soil water retention. However
421 Mukherjee et al. (2014) found that in a one year field study on a silt loam amended at a rate of 7.5 Mg/ha oak wood biochar,
422 PAW increased by 63%. Any increases in PAW on AMLs sites will likely help improve revegetation since many of these sites
423 have skeletal soils or pulverized rock. In an agricultural study in southern Finland, biochar increased available soil water by
424 11% (Karhu et al. 2011). In our plots we saw an increase of PAW in the surface 0-3 cm of 8-12%, depending on the
425 amendment. Only the biosolid plots had significantly higher PAW as compared to the other amended plots and the control.
426 In addition, we detected a significant decrease in PAW deeper in the soil profile. This decline in available water deeper in the
427 profile may be attributed to water being absorbed by the amendments higher in the profile.

428 All soil amendments were very dry when applied to the plots, but with spring moisture they gained and retained more
429 moisture throughout the growing season as compared to the control (fig. 4). The biochar did not exhibit hydrophobicity as
430 noted by Page-Dumroese et al. (2015) likely because of the range of particle sizes. We expected that wood chips would act as
431 a barrier to evaporation in this dry environment and the monthly data shows a similar soil moisture trend as compared to the
432 biochar amended plots. As with the yearly average data (fig. 3), biosolids retained more soil moisture than the other plots.
433 Biosolids have been shown to increase water retention properties, particularly on coarse-textured soils (Gardner et al., 2010)
434 Soil water storage is often limiting for native vegetation and crops in the Inland Northwest (Novak et al., Page-Dumroese et
435 al. 2017) and biochar has been noted as one method to improve soil physical conditions and water retention (Glaser et al.,
436 2002). Biochar has been shown to modify soil pore size distribution and may provide a long-term benefit on degraded soils
437 (Novak et al. 2012). We noted in our fall sampling that plants in the all amended plots remained green into September
438 indicating that water was still available on these plots after the control plot vegetation had dried.

439 **PLANTED SEEDLING SURVIVAL AND SOIL COVER**

440 Soil amendments increased soil cover and seedling production. Since PAW was increased by soil amendment, this may be
441 a likely reason for more cover. Schoenholtz et al. (1992) measured PAW and tree growth after wood chip application on mine
442 soils and found that they were directly related to better survival and growth because of increased water. In the current study,
443 grass plugs planted on biochar or biochar + wood chips amendments had the greatest survival. However, survival of planted
444 grasses was low overall and may be attributed to the small size of the plugs at outplanting (a 25 ml root plug) and elk and

445 deer easily pulling up the grass. However, the small root plug was used because soil depth was limited and made planting
446 relatively easy in this rocky soil. The rates of the amendments both singly and in combination were effective in covering the
447 study areas. The larger size of the wood chips and the biochar led to more spotty application and more exposed mineral soil
448 than the finer amendments, which were distributed more evenly. While the seeded side of the plots had slightly more mean
449 plant cover, the planted side had more organic input in the form of dead plant material. For the development of soils, the
450 continued addition of organic material should be a consideration when choosing plantings over seeding for revegetating
451 AML. Biochar applications can have a high level of heterogeneity which subsequently affect both soil properties and seedling
452 response (Olmo et al. 2016). Our plots were relatively small and all soil amendments were applied in homogeneous layers.
453 However, as this work moves from plot to larger-scale restoration activities, the heterogeneity of application should be
454 assessed.

455

456 **CONCLUSIONS**

457 This study reports on the 2-year results of surface application of organic soil amendments to non-vegetated dredged
458 tailings with a loam soil cap on the Umatilla National Forest. Soil amendments were easy to apply, but when adding
459 combinations of amendments it would be better to mix them together prior to application to reduce wind erosion of small
460 biochar particles. Similarly, on areas with adequate soil depth and without rocky subsoil, amendments could be mixed into
461 the surface horizons. We used Class A biosolids for this study because of the proximity to water, however in areas without
462 nearby water, Class B biosolids could be used.

463 All soil amendments increased total ground cover and plant cover in both the planted and seeded sides of the plots. Many
464 forbs and native grasses were becoming established within the planted seedlings plots and, after two years, the seeded side of
465 the plot was also gaining more cover. Biochar and biochar + wood chips and the control plots had more California brome
466 and Jepson's wildrye survival than the other plots, some of this was likely due to greater PAW, but in the control plots we are
467 unsure why survival was greater than some of the soil amendment plots. We speculate that wood chips or other amendments
468 may have been mixed into the planting hole preventing proper root-soil contact. This may be one reason, but there could be
469 other amendment-related mortality that we did not account for in our study. Increased overall plant cover in all of the
470 amended plots confirm that single or multiple amendments will help restore soil function on AMLs with a soil cap. Other
471 research should evaluate the success of organic amendments on un-capped dredge material.

472 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

473 The authors wish to thank the Umatilla National Forest personnel for helping us install and maintain these plots and provide
474 seed. We also wish to thank Bob Brown and Sierra Larson from the Rocky Mountain Research Station for helping apply the
475 soil amendments and Kas Dumroese from the Rocky Mountain Research Station for growing the grass seedlings.

476

477 **REFERENCES**

478 Aspen Center for Environmental Studies (ACES). (2011). Hope Mine Biochar Project. July 2010–August 2011, Aspen, Colorado, USA.

479

480 AGI (American Geosciences Institute). 2011. House committee on natural resources subcommittee on energy and mineral resources oversight

481 hearing on “Mining in America: The Administrations use of Claim Maintenance Fees and Cleanup of Abandoned Mine Lands”. Available

482 at: [http://www.americangeosciences.org/policy/house-committee-natural-resources-subcommittee-energy-and-mineral-resources-oversight-](http://www.americangeosciences.org/policy/house-committee-natural-resources-subcommittee-energy-and-mineral-resources-oversight-hearing)

483 hearing.

484

485 Anawar, H. M., Akter, F., Solaiman, Z. M., and Strezov V. (2015). Biochar: An emerging panacea for remediation of soil contaminants from

486 mining, industry and sewage wastes. *Pedosphere*. 25(5):654–665.

487

488

489 Anderson, N., Jones, J.G., Page-Dumroese, D., McCollum, D., Baker, S., Loeffler, D., & Chung, W. (2013). A comparison of producer gas,

490 biochar, and activated carbon from two distributed scale thermochemical conversion systems used to process forest biomass. *Energies*, 6(1),

491 164-183.

492

493 Atkinson, C. J., Fitzgerald, J. D., & Hipps, N. A. (2010). Potential mechanisms for achieving agricultural benefits from biochar application to

494 temperate soils: a review. *Plant and Soil*, 337(1-2), 1-18.

495

496 Bakshi, S., He, Z. L., & Harris, W. G. (2014). Biochar amendment affects leaching potential of copper and nutrient release behavior in

497 contaminated sandy soils. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 43(6), 1894-1902.

498

499 Banwart, W. L., Tabatabai, M. A., & Bremner, J. M. (1972). Determination of ammonium in soil extracts and water samples by an ammonia

500 electrode 1. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 3(6), 449-458.

501

502

503

504

505 Beesley, L., Moreno-Jiménez, E., & Gomez-Eyles, J. L. (2010). Effects of biochar and greenwaste compost amendments on mobility,

506 bioavailability and toxicity of inorganic and organic contaminants in a multi-element polluted soil. *Environmental Pollution*, 158(6), 2282-

507 2287.

508 Beesley, L., Moreno-Jiménez, E., Gomez-Eyles, J. L., Harris, E., Robinson, B., & Sizmur, T. (2011). A review of biochars' potential role in the
509 remediation, revegetation and restoration of contaminated soils. *Environmental Pollution*, 159(12), 3269-3282.
510

511 Blank, R. R., Chambers, J., Roundy, B., & Whittaker, A. (2007). Nutrient availability in rangeland soils: influence of prescribed burning,
512 herbaceous vegetation removal, overseeding with *Bromus tectorum*, season, and elevation. *Rangeland Ecology and Management*, 60(6),
513 644-655.
514
515
516

517 Brown, S. L., Henry, C. L., Chaney, R., Compton, H., & DeVolder, P. S. (2003). Using municipal biosolids in combination with other residuals
518 to restore metal-contaminated mining areas. *Plant and Soil*, 249(1), 203-215.
519

520 Center for Urban Horticulture, University of Washington. (2002). Using biosolids for reclamation and remediation of disturbed soils. Plant
521 Conservation Alliance, Bureau of Land Management, US Dept. of Interior.
522

523 Chan, K.Y., and Xu, Z. (2009). Biochar for environmental management. In *Biochar: Nutrient properties and their enhancement*. (pp.67-84).
524 Earthscan, London: Science and technology.
525

526 Drohan, P. J., Merkler, D. J., & Buck, B. J. (2005). Suitability of the plant root simulator probe for use in the Mojave Desert. *Soil Science*
527 *Society of America Journal*, 69(5), 1482-1491.
528

529 Eastern Oregon Mining Association (EOMA). (1999). Oregon gold mining: Grant county gold districts. Retrieved from
530 www.h2oaccess.com/articles.php/19991202
531

532 Edwards, J. H., Wood, C. W., Thurlow, D. L., & Ruf, M. E. (1992). Tillage and crop rotation effects on fertility status of a Hapludult soil. *Soil*
533 *Science Society of America Journal*, 56(5), 1577-1582.
534

535 Fellet, G., Marchiol, L., Delle Vedove, G., & Peressotti, A. (2011). Application of biochar on mine tailings: effects and perspectives for land
536 reclamation. *Chemosphere*, 83(9), 1262-1267.
537

538 Fellet, G., Marmiroli, M., & Marchiol, L. (2014). Elements uptake by metal accumulator species grown on mine tailings amended with three

539 types of biochar. *Science of the Total Environment* 468, 598-608.

540

541 Forsberg, L. S., & Ledin, S. (2006). Effects of sewage sludge on pH and plant availability of metals in oxidizing sulphide mine tailings. *Science*

542 *of the Total Environment*, 358(1), 21-35.

543

544 Galinato, S. P., Yoder, J. K., & Granatstein, D. (2011). The economic value of biochar in crop production and carbon sequestration. *Energy*

545 *Policy*, 39(10), 6344-6350.

546

547 Gardner, W.C., Broersma, K., Naeth A., Chanasyk D., & Jobson A. (2010). Influence of biosolids and fertilizer amendments on physical,

548 chemical, and microbiological properties of copper mine tailings. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science*, (90), 571-583.

549

550 Glaser, B., Lehmann, J. & Zech, W. (2002). Ameliorating physical and chemical properties of highly weathered soils in the tropics with

551 charcoal –A review, *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 35, 219–230.

552

553 Goldstein, N., & Steuteville, R. (1996). Steady climb for biosolids composting. *BioCycle (USA)*.

554

555 Gundale, M. J., & DeLuca, T. H. (2006). Temperature and source material influence ecological attributes of ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir

556 charcoal. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 231(1), 86-93.

557

558 Haering, K. C., Daniels, W. L., & Feagley, S. E. (2000). Reclaiming mined lands with biosolids, manures, and papermill sludges. *Reclamation*

559 *of Drastically Disturbed Lands*, 615-644.

560

561 Hammes, K., & Schmidt, M.W.I.. (2012). Changes in biochar in soil. In: *Biochar for Environmental Management* (pp 169-181). Hoboken NJ:

562 Taylor and Francis.

563

564 Hardie, M., Clothier, B., Bound, S., Oliver, G., & Close, D. (2014). Does biochar influence soil physical properties and soil water

565 availability?, *Plant and Soil*, 376(1-2), 347-361.

566

567 Hedley, M. J., White, R. E., & Nye, P. H. (1982). Plant induced changes in the rhizosphere of rape (*Brassica napus* var. Emerald)

568 seedlings. *New Phytologist*, 91(1), 45-56.

569

570 Ippolito, J.A., Berry, C.M., Strawn, D.G., Novak, J.M., Levine, J., & Harley A. (2017). Biochars reduce mine land soil bioavailable metals.
571 *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 46, 411-419.

572

573 Jeffery, S., Verheijen, F. G., Van Der Velde, M., & Bastos, A. C. (2011). A quantitative review of the effects of biochar application to soils on
574 crop productivity using meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems, & Environment*, 144(1), 175-187.

575

576

577 Karhu, K., Mattila, T., Bergström I., & Regina K. (2011). Biochar addition to agricultural soil increased CH₄ uptake and water holding capacity
578 – Results from a short-term pilot field study. *Agriculture, Ecosystems, & Environment*, 140(1-2), 309-313.

579

580 Keeney, D. R. A., & Nelson, D. W. (1982). Nitrogen—inorganic forms. *Methods of soil analysis. Part 2. Chemical and microbiological*
581 *properties*, (methodsofsoilan2), 643-698.

582

583 Kelly, C. N., Peltz, C. D., Stanton, M., Rutherford, D. W., & Rostad, C. E. (2014). Biochar application to hardrock mine tailings: soil quality,
584 microbial activity, and toxic element sorption. *Applied Geochemistry*, 43, 35-48.

585

586 Klute, A. (1986). Water retention: laboratory methods. *Methods of Soil Analysis: Part 1—Physical and Mineralogical Methods*,
587 (methodsofsoilan1), 635-662.

588

589 Kookana, R. S., Sarmah, A. K., Van Zwieten, L., Krull, E., & Singh, B. (2011). 3 biochar application to soil: agronomic and environmental
590 benefits and unintended consequences. *Advances in Agronomy*, 112(112), 103-143.

591

592 Larney, F. J., Olson, A. F., Miller, J. J., DeMaere, P. R., Zvomuya, F., & McAllister, T. A. (2008). Physical and chemical changes during
593 composting of wood chip-bedded and straw-bedded beef cattle feedlot manure. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 37(2), 725-735.

594

595 Lehman, B., Schröder, H.W., Wollenberg, R., & Repke, J U. (2012). Effect of Miscanthus addition and different grinding processes on the
596 quality of wood pellets. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 44, 150-159.

597

598 Lehmann, J. (2007). A handful of carbon. *Nature*, 447(7141), 143-144.

599

600 Lehmann, J., Pereira da Silva, J., Steiner, C., Nehls, T., Zech, W., & Glaser, B. (2003). Nutrient availability and leaching in an archaeological

601 Anthrosol and a Ferralsol of the Central Amazon basin: fertilizer, manure and charcoal amendments. *Plant and Soil*, 249(2), 343-357.

602

603 Liang, B., Lehmann, J., Solomon, D., Kinyangi, J., Grossman, J., O'Neill, B., Skmemstad, J., Thies, F.J., Luizão, Peterson, J., & Neves, E. G.

604 (2006). Black carbon increases cation exchange capacity in soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 70(5), 1719-1730.

605

606 Maguire R.O., Sims, J.T., & Coale, F.J. (2000). Phosphorus fractionation in biosolids-amended soils relationship to soluble and desorbable

607 phosphorus. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 64(6), 2018-2024.

608

609 Major, J., Rondon, M., Molina, D., Riha, S. J., & Lehmann, J. (2010). Maize yield and nutrition during 4 years after biochar application to a

610 Colombian savanna oxisol. *Plant and Soil*, 333(1-2), 117-128.

611

612 Marschner, H. (1995). *Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants*. (2nd ed. pp. 486) Elsevier Ltd.

613

614 Miller, W. P., Sumner, M. E. (1996). Cation exchange capacity and exchange coefficients. *Methods of Soil Analysis Part 3-Chemical methods*,

615 (methodsofsoilan3), 1201-1229.

616

617

618

619 Mukherjee, A., Lal, R., & Zimmerman, A. R. (2014). Impacts of 1.5-year field aging on biochar, humic acid, and water treatment residual

620 amended soil. *Soil Science*, 179(7), 333-339.

621

622 Mulvaney, R. L. (1996). Nitrogen—inorganic forms. *Methods of Soil Analysis part 3—Chemical methods*, (methodsofsoilan3), 1123-1184.

623

624 Murano, H., Otani, T., Makino, T., Seike, N., & Sakai, M. (2009). Effects of the application of carbonaceous adsorbents on pumpkin (*Cucurbita*

625 *maxima*) uptake of heptachlor epoxide in soil. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 55(2), 325-332.

626

627

628 Novak, J.M., Busscher W.J., Watts D.W., Amonette J.E., Ippolito, J.A., Lima, I.M., Gaskin J., Das, K.C., Steiner C., Ahmedna M., Rehrh D.,

629 & Schomberg, H. (2012). Biochars impact on soil-moisture storage in an Ultisol and two Aridisols. *Soil Science*, 177(5), 310-320.

630

631 Ojeda, G., Mattana, S., Alcañiz, J. M., Marando, G., Bonmatí, M., Woche, S. K., & Bachmann, J. (2010). Wetting process and soil water

632 retention of a minesoil amended with composted and thermally dried sludges. *Geoderma*, 156(3), 399-409.

633

634 Ojeda, G., Mattana, S., Àvila, A., Alcañiz, J. M., Volkmann, M., & Bachmann, J. (2015). Are soil–water functions affected by biochar
635 application? *Geoderma*, 249, 1-11.

636

637 Olmo, M., Lozano A.M., Barrón, V., & Villar R. (2016). Spatial heterogeneity of soil biochar content affects soil quality and wheat growth and
638 yield. *Science. of the Total Environment*, 562, 690-700.

639

640 Page-Dumroese, D. S., Brown, R. E., Jurgensen, M. F., & Mroz, G. D. (1999). Comparison of methods for determining bulk densities of rocky
641 forest soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 63(2), 379-383.

642

643 Page-Dumroese, D. S., Robichaud, P. R., Brown, R. E., & Tirocke, J. M. (2015). Water repellency of two forest soils after biochar
644 addition. *ASABE*, 58, 335-342.

645

646 Page-Dumroese D.S., Coleman, M., & Thomas, S.C. (2017). Chapter 15 Opportunities and uses of biochar on forest sites in North America. In:
647 *Biochar: a regional supply chain approach in view of climate change mitigation*. (pp. 315-330).Cambridge University Press.

648

649 Peltz, C. D., & Harley, A. (2016). Biochar Application for Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation. *Agricultural and Environmental Applications*
650 *of Biochar: Advances and Barriers*, (sssaspepub63), 325-340.

651

652 Powers, R. F. (1980). Mineralizable soil nitrogen as an index of nitrogen availability to forest trees. *Soil Science Society of America*
653 *Journal*, 44(6), 1314-1320.

654

655 Pribyl, D. W. (2010). A critical review of the conventional SOC to SOM conversion factor. *Geoderma*, 156(3), 75-83.

656

657 Qian, P., Schoenau, J. J., & Huang, W. Z. (1992). Use of ion exchange membranes in routine soil testing. *Communiications in Soil Science and*
658 *Plant Analysis*, 23(15-16), 1791-1804.

659

660 Rodríguez-Vila, A., Covelo, E. F., Forján, R., & Asensio, V. (2014). Phytoremediating a copper mine soil with *Brassica juncea* L., compost and
661 biochar. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 21(19), 11293-11304.

662

663 Schoenau, J. J., & Huang, W. Z. (1991). Anion-exchange membrane, water, and sodium bicarbonate extractions as soil tests for
664 phosphorus. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 22(5-6), 465-492.

665

666 Schoenholtz, S. H., Burger, J. A., & Kreh, R. E. (1992). Fertilizer and organic amendment effects on mine soil properties and revegetation
667 success. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 56(4), 1177-1184.

668

669 Schroth, G. & F. L. Sinclair. (2003). *Trees, Crops, and Soil Fertility: Concepts and Research Methods*. Wallingford, Oxon, UK: CABI
670 Publishing.

671

672 Shober, A. L., Stehouwer, R. C., & Macneal, K. E. (2003). On-farm assessment of biosolids effects on soil and crop tissue quality. *Journal of*
673 *Environmental Quality*, 32(5), 1873-1880.

674

675 Sidhu, V., Sarkar, D., & Datta, R. (2016). Effects of biosolids and compost amendment on chemistry of soils contaminated with copper from
676 mining activities. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 188(3), 1-9.

677

678

679 Sinclair, K., Slavich, P., Van Zwieten, L., & Downie, A. (2008). Productivity and nutrient availability on a Ferrosol: biochar, lime and fertiliser.
680 In *Proceedings of the Australian Society of Agronomy Conference* (pp. 21-25).

681

682 Sopper, W.E. 1992. Reclamation of mine land using municipal sludge. In: Rattan Lal and B.A. Stewart, (Eds.), *Soil restoration. Advances in*
683 *Soil Science volume 17* (pp. 351-431). Braun-Brumfield: Ann Arbor, MI

684

685 Stavi, I. (2012). The potential use of biochar in reclaiming degraded rangelands. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 55(5),
686 657-665.

687

688 Steinbeiss, S., Gleixner, G., & Antonietti, M. (2009). Effect of biochar amendment on soil carbon balance and soil microbial activity. *Soil*
689 *Biology and Biochemistry*, 41(6), 1301-1310.

690

691 Steinfeld, D., Kern, J., Gallant, G., & Riley, S. (2011). Monitoring roadside revegetation projects. *Native Plants Journal*, 12(3), 269-275.

692

693 Stevenson, F. J. (1986), *Cycles of soil: carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulfur, micronutrients*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

694

695 Streubel, J. D., Collins, H. P., Garcia-Perez, M., Tarara, J., Granatstein, D., & Kruger, C. E. (2011). Influence of contrasting biochar types on
696 five soils at increasing rates of application. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 75(4), 1402-1413.

697

698 Strawn, D. G., Bohn, H.L., & O'Conner, G. A. (2015). *Soil Chemistry*. John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex: UK.

699

700 Stroup, W. W. (2015). Rethinking the analysis of non-normal data in plant and soil science. *Agronomy Journal*, 107(2), 811-827.

701

702 Tammeorg, P., Simojoki, A., Mäkelä, P., Stoddard, F. L., Alakukku, L., & Helenius, J. (2014). Biochar application to a fertile sandy clay loam in
703 boreal conditions: effects on soil properties and yield formation of wheat, turnip rape and faba bean. *Plant and Soil*, 374(1-2), 89-107.

704

705 Uchimiya, M., Lima, I. M., Klasson, K. T., & Wartelle, L. H. (2010). Contaminant immobilization and nutrient release by biochar soil
706 amendment: Roles of natural organic matter. *Chemosphere*, 80(8), 935-940.

707

708 Unger, R., Killom, R., & Brewer, C. (2011). Effects of soil application of different biochars on selected soil chemical
709 properties. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis.*, 42(19), 2310-2321.

710

711 USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service. (2013). Release brochure for 'Elkton' blue wildrye (*Elymus glaucus* ssp. *jepsonii*). USDA-
712 Natural Resources Conservation Service, Corvallis Plant Materials Center, Corvallis: OR.

713

714 USDA United States Forest Service. (2012). Using Woody Biomass to Produce Bio-oil and BioChar. Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Air and Rare
715 Plants: Soil. Retrieved from <http://www.fs.fed.us/biology/soil/index.html>

716

717 Walsh, J. R., & Redente, E. F. (2011). Comparison of reclamation techniques to Re-establish western white pine on smelter-impacted hillsides
718 in Idaho. *Restoration Ecology*, 19(201), 141-150.

719

720 Wu, L., Ma, L.Q. & Martinez G.A. (2000). Comparison of methods for evaluating stability and maturity of biosolids compost. *Journal of*
721 *Environmental Quality*, 29(2), 424-429

722

723 Yao, Y., Gao, B., Zhang, M., Inyang, M., & Zimmerman, A. R. (2012). Effect of biochar amendment on sorption and leaching of nitrate,
724 ammonium, and phosphate in a sandy soil. *Chemosphere*, 89(11), 1467-1471.

725

726