

# Heavy Metal Concentration and Physiochemical Parameters in Soil and Plants near Unengineered Dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Eseyin, Olushola O. <sup>2</sup>Udom G. J., <sup>3</sup>Osu Charles I.

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Natural Resources, Environment and Sustainable Development, University of Port- Harcourt. Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Geology, Faculty of Science, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup>Department of Pure and Industrial Chemistry, Faculty of Science, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

Cross sectional study was conducted around two unengineered dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria on heavy metal concentrations and physicochemical parameters in soil and plants. Physicochemical parameters studied include pH, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), Electrical Conductivity (EC), Nitrite ion, Phosphate ion, Sulphate ion, Chloride ion and heavy metals (Cd, Pb, Zn, Fe, and Cu). The result shows that edible plants were observed to have recorded one variety of metal or the other; and a relatively higher concentration of metals were found in the soil than in plant which indicates possible gradual movement of metals from the soil samples into the plants. Chloride ion concentration was negligible in all edible plants, but traces of other anions were recorded in both plants. Both dumpsites have contamination factor (CF) ranging from low to very highly polluted for different metals. Contamination degree (CD) at the dumpsites showed that both sites have very high degree of contamination. Pollution Load Index (PLI) of 4.64 in S1 (Soil sample from Choba dumpsite) and 4.19 in S2 (Soil sample from Ada-George dumpsite) show that there is progressive deterioration of the two sites. Index of geoaccumulation ( $I_{geo}$ ) values obtained show that Zn was the only metal that did not enrich the soil with Zero (0) values ( $S1 = -0.04$ , and  $S2 = -2.00$ ); which indicate that it originated from natural processes or crustal materials alone, and not from anthropogenic sources. Other metal concentrations ranged from unpolluted to moderately polluted and to extremely polluted. Bioaccumulation Factor (BAF) showed that all the dumpsites are excluders and are not effective accumulators of metals and anions from the soil into the plants. Urgent attention has to be given to the dumpsites to prevent further degradation of the soil and possible bioaccumulation of metals in edible plants.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In developed countries, the disposal of most wastes in landfills is done after proper waste management processes such as recycling, reuse; sources reduction and treatment operation have been completed [1]. Cunningham *et al.*, [2] reported that the practices mentioned above are not common in developing countries. This results to the development of unengineered dumpsites of different materials ranging from perishable food wastes to hazardous chemicals which pollute the environment. Landfilling is one of the less expensive methods of disposal of solid waste playing an important role in integrated solid waste management [3]. It is reported that about 90% of municipal solid waste (MSW) is disposed in open dumps and landfills in a crude manner creating problems to public health and the environment [4]. The emitted liquid known as 'Leachate' may contain several organic and inorganic contaminants which have detrimental effects on water, and soil environment [5].

Rapid population growth and development in Nigerian states has resulted in environmental health hazards [6]. Wastes are generated from human activities and in most cases not properly managed in most Nigerian cities [6; 7]. This leads to low environmental quality which accounts for 25% of all preventable ill health in the world [8]. In most cases, wastes are collected and disposed in uncontrolled or unengineered dumpsite sites near residential buildings. These wastes are heaped up

and/or burnt, polluting the environment [9; 10]. Waste generally leads to proliferation of pathogenic microbes and heavy metals which can transfer significantly to the environment [11]. Leachates from dumpsites constitute a source of heavy metal pollution to both soil and aquatic environments [12]. This may have serious effects on soils, crop and human health [13].

Many unengineered dumpsites located in various parts of Port Harcourt and its environment are located at or close to streams, valleys, open fields, water lands and in abandoned 'borro' pits. In Port Harcourt today, wastes generated and gathered at source are disposed of in communal bins or communal collection points stipulated by the Government. Most of these wastes appear to come from domestic sources and are characterized mostly by household waste. Generally, the practices in the unengineered dumpsites are unrestricted to different sources of wastes. Dumpers do have access to the site at any time of the day, which increase dumping of restricted materials, such as car batteries and metals. Scavengers have free access to the dump, and they scatter the waste to recover valuable material. Some scavengers even pitch their tent in and around the unengineered dumpsites.

Dumpsite leachate is a major source of soil contamination which is caused by the presence of chemicals or other alteration in the natural soil environment. Concern over soil contamination stems primarily from health risks from direct contact with the contaminated soil, vapours from the contaminants, and from secondary contamination of water supplies within the soil [14]. High potential risk may result from infiltration of hazardous chemicals in the soil into groundwater aquifers used for human consumption. Agriculture in these areas faces major problems when pollutants and heavy metal are transferred into crops and subsequently into the food chain.


Several metals are essential at low concentrations for normal growth and development in either plants or animals, but become toxic at higher cellular concentrations [15, 16, 17]. Other trace metals (e.g. lead, mercury) are apparently never required and must be regarded as only having potentially negative effects. Trace metal uptake by plants is generally limited and usually shows saturation characteristics. However, phytotoxicity thresholds (lowest concentration at which decreased plant growth occurs) are generally higher than tissue toxicity thresholds for those animals consuming them. Risks for plants are therefore of lower order than for animals, thus facilitating bioaccumulation and exacerbating problems of trace metal transfer along the food chain.

A key route for entry of metals into the food chain is via uptake by plants from the soil or as a result of accumulation in fish tissues. Uptake by plants is affected by soil pH and salinity, with cadmium and lead uptake being enhanced by chloride complexation of the metals in materials such as leachate [18]. General toxicity effects of contamination on plant physiology are depressed root growth (with consequent drought symptoms) and foliar discolouration (chlorosis) resulting from membrane damage and enzyme inhibition [19]. However, major interactions occur between different trace metals [20], with many metals inducing copper deficiency symptoms.

This study is therefore set to assess heavy metal concentration and physiochemical parameters in soil and plants near unengineered dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

## **2. METHODS**

Cross-sectional study of selected unengineered dumpsite was conducted to assess the concentrations of heavy metal and physiochemical parameters in the soil and plants near unengineered dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Port Harcourt is the capital and largest city in Rivers State, Nigeria. It is located in the Niger-Delta region; and at the southernmost part of Nigeria between longitude  $7^{\circ} 00'$  and  $7^{\circ} 15'$  East of the Greenwich meridian and Latitude of  $4^{\circ} 30'$  and  $4^{\circ} 47'$  North of the equator (See figure 1). The average temperature throughout the year in the city is relatively constant, showing little variation throughout the year. Its average temperature is between  $25^{\circ}\text{C}$  –  $28^{\circ}\text{C}$ .



**Figure 1: Map of study Area**

Cross-sectional study was conducted to assess Heavy Metal Concentration and Physiochemical Parameters in Soil and Plants near Unengineered Dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study covered two major open unengineered dumpsites; Ada George Road and Choba. Samples of soil and plants were collected around two unengineered dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Rivers State Nigeria for laboratory analysis. Parameters tested include Nitrite ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ), Phosphate ( $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$ ), Chloride ( $\text{Cl}^-$ ), Sulphate ( $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ), Cadmium (Cd), Lead (Pb), Zinc (Zn), Iron (Fe), Copper (Cu). Geomorphological study of the region indicates that most of the area where the unengineered dumpsites were located was found to have deep pediments, with shallow and buried pediments in other parts.

Four samples of soil and edible plants (Pawpaw and Potatoes) each were collected around two unengineered dumpsites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria for laboratory analysis. Attempts were made to minimize changes in the chemistry of the samples. Preservation methods such as refrigeration and protection from light were adopted to assist in maintaining the natural chemistry of the samples. These conditions were maintained until the samples were received at the laboratory. Samples are stored in refrigerator at  $4^\circ\text{C}$ . Sampling plan was coordinated with the laboratory so that appropriate sample receipt, storage, analysis, and custody arrangements were provided.

## 2.1 ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Five quality tools/indices were applied for interpretations of data. These are:

- Contamination Factor (CF)
- Contamination Degree (CD)
- Pollution Load Index (PLI)
- Index of Geoaccumulation ( $I_{\text{geo}}$ )
- Bioaccumulation Factor (BAF)

### 2.1.1 CONTAMINATION FACTOR (CF)

Contamination factor is used to determine the concentration status of the sediment in the present study. Contamination factor was calculated by comparing the mean of trace metal concentration with average shale or background concentration given by [21], which is used as global standard reference for unpolluted sediment. The CF is the single element index. CF for each metal was determined according to [22] by the following equation:

$$\text{Contamination Factor (CF)} = \frac{\text{Mean Metal Concentration at Contaminated Site}}{\text{Metal Average Shale Concentration}}$$

[23] classified CF values into four grades, i.e.,

- a)  $CF < 1$  = low CF,
- b)  $1 \leq CF < 3$  = moderate CF,
- c)  $3 \leq CF < 6$  = considerable CF and
- d)  $CF > 6$  = very high CF.

### 2.1.2 CONTAMINATION DEGREE (CD)

Contamination degree is used to determine the degree of overall contamination or concentration status in the sampling site. CD is the sum of all CF values of a particular sampling site [23 and 24].

$$CD = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} (CF)$$

Where n is the number of analysed elements and CF is the contamination factor.

[25] classified CD in terms of four grade ratings of sediments, i.e.

$CD < 6$  shows low CD,

$6 \leq CD < 12$  shows moderate CD,

$12 \leq CD < 24$  shows considerable CD and

$CD \geq 24$  shows very high CD.

### 2.1.3 POLLUTION LOAD INDEX (PLI)

Pollution severity and its variation were determined with the use of pollution load index. Pollution load index for each site was determined by the method proposed by [22]. It is used for detecting pollution which permits a comparison of pollution levels between sites and at different times. The PLI was obtained as a concentration factor of each heavy metal with respect to the background value in the soil. The PLI for a single site is the nth root of n number multiplying the factors (CF values) together. PLI for each site was determined by the following equation:

$$PLI = (n\sqrt{CF_1 \times CF_2 \times CF_3 \times \dots \times CF_n})$$

Where

**CF** is the contamination factor and

**n** is the number of parameters.

**Table 1: Categories of the sediment quality according to PLI**

Pollution Load Index	Categories
$PLI < 1$	Perfection
$PLI = 1$	indicate only baseline levels of pollutants present and
$PLI > 1$	indicate progressive deterioration of sites

(After [26])

### 2.1.4 INDEX OF GEO-ACCUMULATION ( $I_{geo}$ )

A common approach to estimating the enrichment of metal concentrations above background or baseline concentrations is to calculate the index of geoaccumulation ( $I_{geo}$ ) as proposed by [27]; [28].  $I_{geo}$  is used to quantify the extent of heavy metal contamination associated with soils. This index is basically a single metal approach to quantify metal pollution in sediments when the concentration of toxic heavy metal is 1.5 or more times greater than their lithogenic background values [29]. Geo-accumulation index is calculated using the following equation:

$$I_{geo} = \log 2 \frac{C_n}{1.5B_n}$$

Where

**C<sub>n</sub>** is the measured concentration of the element n in the soil tested,

**B<sub>n</sub>** is the geochemical background value of the element n in average crust (average shale concentration has been given by [21]; [30]; and [31].

**1.5** is the factor used to compensate possible variations in background data (correction factor), which may be attributed to lithogenic effect (30).

A geochemical background value of Fe was taken from [21]. The others were taken from [24] and [32]; as: Cu: 17 ppm, Zn: 65 ppm, Pb: 8.5 ppm Cd: 0.003 ppm

The  $I_{geo}$  factor is not comparable to other indices of metal enrichment due to the nature of the  $I_{geo}$  calculation; it involves a log function and a background multiplication of 1.5. It is composed of seven grades (0–6) indicating various degrees of metal enrichment above the average shale value ranging from unpolluted to very high polluted sediment quality. Table 2.

**Table 2: Classification of Sediment Grade based on  $I_{geo}$  Index [27].**

$I_{geo}$ value	Class	Category
$I_{geo} \leq 0$	0	Unpolluted
$0 < I_{geo} \leq 1$	1	From unpolluted to moderately polluted
$1 < I_{geo} \leq 2$	2	Moderately polluted
$2 < I_{geo} \leq 3$	3	From moderately to strongly polluted
$3 < I_{geo} \leq 4$	4	strongly polluted
$4 < I_{geo} \leq 5$	5	From strongly to extremely polluted
$I_{geo} > 5$	6	extremely polluted

### 2.1.5 BIOACCUMULATION FACTOR

BAF was calculated by:

$$BAF = \frac{C_{plant}}{C_{soil}}$$

$C_{plant}$  and  $C_{soil}$  are metals concentration in the plant shoot (mg/kg) and soil (mg/kg), respectively. [33]; and [34] categorized BAF further as

Excluder =  $BAF < 1$

Effective Accumulator =  $BAF = 1$

Hyperaccumulators =  $BAF > 1$

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The average result of physicochemical parameters and heavy metals obtained in the soil and edible plants are recorded in table 3.

### 3.1 CONCENTRATION OF METALS IN SOIL AND EDIBLE PLANTS (in mg/kg)

Concentrations of metals obtained from the two dumpsites include S1 (Cd=14.60, Pb=21.30, Zn=94.70, Fe=154.20, Cu=66.60), and S2 (Cd=1.80, Pb=0.9, Zn=24.30, Fe=103.30, Cu=43.30). This result shows that soil at Choba dumpsite (S1) receives more metallic waste than Ada-George dumpsite (S2). Cd and Pb are lower in the soil samples than other metals which indicate that there are fewer dumping of batteries, fluorescent lamps, photographic materials and petroleum compounds than other metallic sources.


Tables 3 and 4; shows that all the plants have taken up one form of metal or the other. Zn and Fe are the most absorbed metals with 21.20 mg/kg and 18.70 mg/kg respectively. Edible plants at Ada-George dumpsite were free of Cd and Pb, while edible plants at Choba dumpsites have absorbed all the forms of metal analysed. This can be linked to the fact that Ada-George dumpsite is relatively free

of any source of Cd and Pb like batteries, radiographic materials etc. The result also shows a gradual transition of concentration from the soil samples to the two edible plants. Chlorine was negligible in the edible plants sampled, but traces of metals were found in them, which indicate possible absorption from the soil and leachate.

**Table 3: Average Sampling Result (in mg/kg)**

Parameter	S1	S2	Paw 1	Paw 2	Pot 1	Pot 2
<b>Cd</b>	14.60	1.80	1.08	<0.001	1.00	<0.001
<b>Pb</b>	21.30	0.90	2.10	<0.001	2.90	<0.001
<b>Zn</b>	94.70	24.30	8.10	21.20	13.70	10.50
<b>Fe</b>	154.20	103.30	18.70	6.90	4.00	1.60
<b>Cu</b>	66.60	43.30	4.30	1.90	5.60	0.80
<b>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup></b>	410.30	16.30	2.10	0.10	0.98	0.30
<b>PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup></b>	21.80	4.30	2.20	0.30	1.40	0.80
<b>Cl<sup>-</sup></b>	146.50	42.60	<0.01	<0.01	<0.001	0.002
<b>SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup></b>	110.60	69.30	0.90	1.20	3.60	1.90

**Where:** **S1** = Soil sample from Choba dumpsite, **S2** = Soil sample from Ada-George dumpsite, **Paw 1** = Pawpaw plant from Choba dumpsite, **Paw 2** = Pawpaw plant from Ada-George dumpsite, **Pot 1** = Potato plant from Choba dumpsite, **Pot 2** = Potato plant from Ada-George dumpsite.



**Figure 2: Average Concentration of Metals in the Soil and Edible Plants**

**Table 4: Average Concentration of Metals in the Soil and Edible Plants (in mg/kg)**

	Cd	Pb	Zn	Fe	Cu
S1	14.6	21.3	94.7	154.2	66.6
S2	1.8	0.9	24.3	103.3	43.3
Paw 1	1.08	2.1	8.1	18.7	4.3
Paw 2	0.001	0.001	21.2	6.9	1.9
Pot 1	1	2.9	13.7	4	5.6
Pot 2	0.001	0.001	10.5	1.6	0.8


### 3.2 CONCENTRATION OF ANION IN SOIL AND EDIBLE PLANTS

Table 5 and figure 3 shows the concentration of anions in the soil at the unengineered dumpsites. As in other parameters, S1 recorded relatively highest concentrations than S2. (S1:  $\text{NO}_3^- = 410.30$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-} = 21.80$ ,  $\text{Cl}^- = 146.50$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-} = 110.60$ ; and S2:  $\text{NO}_3^- = 16.30$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-} = 4.30$ ,  $\text{Cl}^- = 42.60$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-} = 69.30$ ).  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was highest in S1 indicating that the dumpsite at Choba contains components that are organic in nature.

Chloride ion concentration was negligible in all edible plants as it was hardly absorbed by them. Traces of other anions were however recorded in both Pawpaw and Potatoes. (**Paw 1**:  $\text{NO}_3^- = 2.10$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-} = 2.20$ ,  $\text{Cl}^- < 0.01$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-} = 0.90$ ; and **Paw 2**:  $\text{NO}_3^- = 0.10$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-} = 0.30$ ,  $\text{Cl}^- < 0.01$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-} = 1.20$ . **Pot 1**:  $\text{NO}_3^- = 0.98$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-} = 1.40$ ,  $\text{Cl}^- < 0.01$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-} = 3.60$ , and **Pot 2**:  $\text{NO}_3^- = 0.30$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-} = 0.80$ ,  $\text{Cl}^- < 0.01$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-} = 1.90$ ). The result shows a relatively higher concentration in the soil than in the plant. This might be as a result of addition of cation to the anion forming compound before they are absorbed by the root of those edible plants. It shows that the higher the concentrations in the soil, the more likely it is the plants will absorb the anions.

**Table 5: Average Concentration of Anion in Soil and Edible Plants (in mg/kg)**

	$\text{NO}_3^-$	$\text{PO}_4^{3-}$	$\text{Cl}^-$	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}$
S1	410.3	21.8	146.5	110.6
S2	16.3	4.3	42.6	69.3
Paw 1	2.1	2.2	0.01	0.9
Paw 2	0.1	0.3	0.01	1.2
Pot 1	0.98	1.4	0.001	3.6
Pot 2	0.3	0.8	0.002	1.9



**Figure 3: Average Concentration of Anion in Soil and Edible Plants**

### 3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

The tools for the analysis of data are

1. Contamination Factor (CF)
2. Contamination Degree (CD)

3. Pollution Load Index (PLI)
4. Index of Geoaccumulation ( $I_{geo}$ )
5. Bioaccumulation Factor (BAF)

The result in table 6 shows that Zn having the lowest CF with 1.46 in S1; and the highest was recorded in Cd with 4,866.67. Others in descending order are Fe (30.84), Cu (3.92) and Pb (2.51). This shows that the soil in S1 is from moderately polluted to very highly polluted (i.e low CF to high CF). S2 however has lowest CF in Pb and Zn with 0.11 and 0.37 respectively. Others in ascending order are Cu (2.55 – moderate CF), Fe (20.66 – very high CF) and Cd (600.00 – very high CF). CF for Cd and Fe are very high in the two dumpsites. This shows that there is increase in the quantity of batteries and metallic products dumped into the unengineered dumpsites. S1 also recorded relatively higher CF than S2. CD at S1 was **4,905.4**, and S2 was **623.69**; which shows that both sites have very high degree of contamination. Pollution Load Index of **4.64** was recorded in S1 and S2 has **4.19** for PLI, which shows that there is progressive deterioration of the two sites.  $I_{geo}$  obtained for S1 include the following in order of decreasing values: Cd (11.66), Fe (4.36), Cu (1.38), Pb (0.74) and Zn (-0.04). The result shows that the most polluted metal in S1 is Cd (extremely polluted), and the least polluted metal is Zn (which indicates unpolluted). S2 has the same order with the highest at Cd (8.64, indicating extremely polluted), followed by Pb (3.84), Fe (3.78), Cu and Zn (with 0.77 and -2.00 falling in the range of unpolluted).

$I_{geo}$  test was conducted to estimate the enrichment of metal concentrations above background or baseline concentrations. The result in table 6 shows that Zn was the only metal that did not enrich the soil with values less than 0 (S1 = -0.04, and S2 = -2.00). However, S2 recorded a Pb value less than 0 (-3.84). Other results range from unpolluted to moderately polluted, and to extremely polluted. S1 = Cd (11.66), Pb (0.74), Zn (-0.004), Fe (4.36) and Cu (1.38). S2 = Cd (8.64), Pb (-3.84), Zn (-2.00), Fe (3.78) and Cu (0.77). Generally, Index of Geoaccumulation showed that Zn and Pb may have originated from natural processes or crustal materials alone, and not from anthropogenic sources. However, moderate pollution of Pb was recorded for Choba dumpsites. There is gradation from strongly polluted with Fe to extremely polluted with Cd in both dumpsites. This shows that they may have originated from anthropogenic sources and not natural processes or crustal materials alone. This implies that urgent attention has to be given to the dumpsites to avoid or prevent further degradation of the soil.

Tables 9 and 10 shows that all the dumpsites did not have BAF up to 1, i.e all BAF are less than 1, it shows that all are excluders and are not effective accumulators of metals and anions from the soil into the plants.

**Table 6: CF, PLI, CD,  $I_{geo}$  of Metals for Soil**

Parameter n = 5	S1				S2			
	Data	Conc. (Bn)	CF	I <sub>geo</sub>	Data	Conc. (Bn)	CF	I <sub>geo</sub>
Cd	14.60	0.003	4,866.67	11.66	1.80	0.003	600.00	8.64
Pb	21.30	8.5	2.51	0.74	0.90	8.5	0.11	-3.84
Zn	94.70	65.0	1.46	-0.04	24.30	65.0	0.37	-2.00
Fe	154.20	5.0	30.84	4.36	103.30	5.0	20.66	3.78
Cu	66.60	17.0	3.92	1.38	43.30	17.0	2.55	0.77
CD			4,905.4					
PLI			4.64					



<b>Pb</b>	21.30	8.5	<b>0.74</b>	From unpolluted to moderately polluted
<b>Zn</b>	94.70	65.0	<b>-0.04</b>	No pollution
<b>Fe</b>	154.20	5.0	<b>4.36</b>	Strongly to extremely polluted
<b>Cu</b>	66.60	17.0	<b>1.38</b>	Moderately polluted

**Table 8: Analysis of  $I_{geo}$  for Soil at Ada-George Dumpsite**

Parameters	Conc. in Soil	Bn	$I_{geo}$	Remark
<b>Cd</b>	1.80	0.003	<b>8.64</b>	Extremely polluted
<b>Pb</b>	0.90	8.5	<b>-3.84</b>	No pollution
<b>Zn</b>	24.30	65.0	<b>-2.00</b>	No pollution
<b>Fe</b>	103.30	5.0	<b>3.78</b>	Strongly polluted
<b>Cu</b>	43.30	17.0	<b>0.77</b>	From unpolluted to moderately polluted

**Table 9: Bioaccumulation Factors at Choba dumpsites**

Parameter	S1	Paw 1	BAF	Pot 1	BAF
<b>Cd</b>	14.60	1.08	0.07	1.00	0.07
<b>Pb</b>	21.30	2.10	0.10	2.90	0.14
<b>Zn</b>	94.70	8.10	0.09	13.70	0.14
<b>Fe</b>	154.20	18.70	0.12	4.00	0.03
<b>Cu</b>	66.60	4.30	0.06	5.60	0.08
<b>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup></b>	410.30	2.10	0.01	0.98	0.00
<b>PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup></b>	21.80	2.20	0.10	1.40	0.06
<b>Cl<sup>-</sup></b>	146.50	<0.01	0.00	<0.001	0.00
<b>SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup></b>	110.60	0.90	0.01	3.60	0.03

**Table 10: Bioaccumulation Factors at Ada-George dumpsites**

Parameter	S2	Paw 2	BAF	Pot 2	BAF
<b>Cd</b>	1.80	<0.001	0.00	<0.001	0.00
<b>Pb</b>	0.90	<0.001	0.00	<0.001	0.00
<b>Zn</b>	24.30	21.20	0.87	10.50	0.43
<b>Fe</b>	103.30	6.90	0.07	1.60	0.02
<b>Cu</b>	43.30	1.90	0.04	0.80	0.02
<b>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup></b>	16.30	0.10	0.01	0.30	0.02
<b>PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup></b>	4.30	0.30	0.07	0.80	0.19
<b>Cl<sup>-</sup></b>	42.60	<0.01	0.00	0.002	0.00
<b>SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup></b>	69.30	3.60	0.05	1.90	0.03

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Heavy metal and physiochemical contamination on soil and plants around unengineered dumpsites was evaluated in this study using various indices. Most of the indices revealed that the study area was seriously affected by different metals and anions. Index of geoaccumulation results shows that metals with high concentrations in the studied soils may have originated from the dumpsites and leachates, and not from the natural environment/earth crust. The result also indicated that the dumpsite is producing many potent metal and anions to the environment. Proper treatment and safe disposal of Municipal solid waste are recommended, prior to construction of modern landfill system.

## REFERENCES

1. Edward, S. R. (2001). Introduction to Engineering and the Environment. McGraw Hill, Higher Education.
2. Cunningham, W. P., Cunningham, M. A. and Saijo, B. W., (2005). Environmental Science. "A Global CONCERN", McGraw Hill, Higher Education.
3. Peng Y (2013). Perspectives on Technology for Landfill Leachate Treatment. Arabian J. Chem. doi:10.1016/j.arabjc.2013.09.031
4. Sharholi M, Ahmad K, Mahmood G, Trivedi R (2008). Municipal Solid Waste Management in India cities- A review. Waste Manag. 28(20):459-467.
5. Kolsch F, Ziehmman G (2004). Landfill stability risk and challenges, Landfills, SARDINIA 93 Fourth International Landfill Symposium Proceedings, Vol. II, A decision making tool for dumpsite rehabilitation in developing countries, Proc. Sardinia, Tenth International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium. Cagliari, Italy, October 2005)
6. Adefemi, O. S., and Awokunmi, E. E. (2009). The impact of municipal solid waste disposal in Ado-Ekiti metropolis, Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Afri. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 3(8), 186-189.
7. Aurangabadkar, K., Swaminathan, S., Sandya, S., and Uma, T. S. (2001). Impact of municipal solid waste dumpsite on ground water quality at Chennai, *Environ. Poll. Control.*, 5, 41-44.
8. World Health Organization WHO (2004), Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality, Vol 1: Recommendations, 3rd edn, Geneva: World Health Organization. WHO (2011). Guidelines for Drinking-Water Quality. 4th ed. Geneva, Switzerland, pp 541.
9. Akpan, A. Y. (2004). Physico-chemical studies on the pollution potential of Itu River, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *World J. Agric. Sci.*, 5(1), 1-4.
10. Uffia, I. D., Ekpo, F. E., and Etim, D. E. (2013). Influence of heavy metals pollution in borehole water collected within abandoned battery industry, Essien Udim, Nigeria. *J. Environ. Sci. Water Resources*, 2(1), 022 – 026.
11. Adefehinti, O. A. (2001). Toxicity Testing of Stimulated Leachates of solids waste from Olusosun Landfill, Ojota, Lagos. M.Sc. Thesis, Chemistry Department, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp. 104-105
12. Ali, M. H., and Abdel-Satar, A. M. (2005). Studies of some heavy metals in water, sediment, fish and fish diets in some fish farms in El-Fayoum province. *Egypt. J. Aquat. Res.*, 31, 261-273.
13. Bahnasawy, M., Khidr A., and Dheina, N. (2011). Assessment of heavy metal concentrations in water, plankton, and fish of Lake Manzala, Egypt. *Turk. J. Zool.*, 35(2), 271-280.
14. Okafor CC, Onwuka SU (2013). Leachate Pollution of Soil of Enugu. *J. Environ. Sci. Toxicol. Food Technol.* 5(5): 41-47.
15. Oehme, F.W. (Ed.) (1979a) Toxicity of heavy metals in the environment: Part 1. Marcel Dekker: New York.
16. Oehme, F.W. (Ed.) (1979b) Toxicity of heavy metals in the environment: Part 2. Marcel Dekker: New York.
17. Paris, I. and Benton-Jones, J.Jr. (1997) The handbook of trace elements. St. Lucie Press: Boca Raton, Florida.
18. Alloway, B.J. (1995). *Heavy metals in soils*. 2nd edition. Chapman and Hall, London, UK.
19. Farago, M.E. (Ed.) (1994) Plants and the chemical elements: Biochemistry, uptake, tolerance and toxicity. VCH Publishers: Weinheim, Germany.
20. Lepp, N.W. (Ed.) (1981a) Effect of heavy metal pollution on plants-Volume 1: Effects of trace metals on plant function. Applied Science Publishers: London
21. Turekian KK, Wedepohl DH (1961) Distribution of the element in some major units of the earth's crust. *Bull Geol Soc Am* 72:175–192

22. Thomilson, D. C.; Wilson, D. J.; Harris, C. R. and Jeffrey, D. W. (1980). "Problem in Heavy Metals in Estuaries and the Formation of Pollution Index," *Helgol. Wiss. Meere-sunlter*, Vol. 33, No. 1-4, , pp. 566-575.
23. Hakanson L (1980) An ecological risk index for aquatic pollution control, a sedimentological approach. *Water Res* 14(8):975–1001
24. Aksu, A.E., Yaşar, D. and Uslu, O. (1998). Assessment of marine pollution in Izmir Bay: Heavy metal and organic compound concentrations in surficial sediments. *Translations and Journal of Engineering and Environmental Science*, 22:387-415.
25. Ahdy HHH, Khaled A (2009) Heavy metals contamination in sediments of the western part of the Egyptian Mediterranean sea. *Aust J Basic Appl Sci* 3:3330–3336
26. Mohiuddin KM, Zakir HM, Otomo K, Sharmin S, Shikazono N (2010) Geochemical distribution of trace metal pollutants in water and sediments of downstream of an urban river. *Int J Environ Sci Technol* 7(1):17–28
27. Müller, G. 1969. Index of geoaccumulation in the sediments of the Rhine River. *Geojournal*, 2: 108-118.
28. Abraham, G.M.S. and Parker, R.J. 2008. Assessment of heavy metal enrihment factors and degree of contamination in marine sediments from Tamaki Estuary, Auckland, New Zealand. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 136: 227-238. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9678-2
29. Gaur, V.K., Sanjay, K.G., Pandey, S.D., Gopal, K. and Misra, V. (2005). Distribution of heavy metals in sediment and water of River Gomti. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 102: 419-433. doi: 10.1007/s10661-005-6395-6
30. Taylor, S. R. and McLennan, S. M. (1985). *The continental crust: its composition and evolution*. London, Blackwell.
31. Wedepohl, K. 1995. The composition of the continental crust. *Geochimica et Cosmocheimica Acta*, 59: 1217-1232. doi: 10.1016/0016-7037(95)00038-2
32. Reimann, C., Filzmoser, P. and Garrett, R.G., (2005). Background and threshold: critical comparison of methods of determination. *Science of the Total Environment*, 346: 1-16.
33. Ma LQ, Komar KM, Tu C, Zhang W, Cai Y, Kenelly ED (2001) A fern that hyper accumulates arsenic. *Nature* 409: 579-582
- Cluis, C. (2004) Junk-Greedy Greens: Phytoremediation as a New Option for Soil Decontamination. *BioTeach Journal*, 2, 61-67.
34. Cluis, C. (2004) Junk-Greedy Greens: Phytoremediation as a New Option for Soil Decontamination. *BioTeach Journal*, 2, 61-67.