Vertical Distribution of Cadmium and Lead on Soils Affected by Metropolitan Refuse Disposal in Owerri, Southeastern Nigeria

E.U. Onweremadu, J.U. Amaechi and B.N. Ndukwu

Department of Soil Science and Technology, Federal University of Technology, P.M.B. 1526 Owerri, Nigeria

(Received: May 4, 2010; January 25, 2011)

Abstract: The authors investigated distribution of cadmium (Cd) and lead (Pb) in soil profile pits affected by municipal solid wastes in Avu dumpsite in Owerri, Southeastern Nigeria in 2010. Transect soil survey technique was used in aligning profile pits for field studies and sampling. Standard procedures were used in digging, describing and sampling from profile pits. Sieved soil samples were subjected to laboratory analyses and data were analyzed statistically using coefficient of variation measured in percentages. Results showed higher values of % CV in silt and clay contents. Variability of clay increased from dumpsite (CV=43.77 %) to moderately dumped site (CV=62.73%) decreased in slightly dumped side (20.98%). Highest mean values of organic matter (26.8 g/kg) and pH water (5.7) were reported in heavily dumped site. Organic Matter showed very significant positive relationship with Cd (r = 0.92; p = 0.01) and Pb (r=0.97; P = 0.97). There is need to include more soil attributes; results of which should be subjected to multi-variate techniques for more reliability and confidence especially in field applications.

Key words: Biotoxicity % Profile pit % Urban wastes % Waste disposal % Tropical soils

INTRODUCTION

Soil properties vary in space and time [1] as well as with depth. Variability in pedon characteristics is both continuous and scale-dependent and this understanding helps in the development of vertically and spatially distributed models on a range of environmental issues [2]. Extensive changes on soils and soil-related natural resources are common today in the environment resulting from anthropogenic activities which are intensified with urbanization and attendant waste accumulation. High rates of soil erosion, loss of organic matter, reduction in soil fertility and productivity, chemical and heavy metal contamination, degradation of waste and air quality have sparked interest in soil quality and its assessment [3]. Soil quality denotes the capacity of a soil to function [4], including buffering and filtering of potentially toxic materials [5]. Thus, concept of soil quality is often used in taxonomy as a foundation [6].

Owerri is a metropolitan city generating all forms of wastes, with refuse dumped principally at Avu lying at the

outskirts of the city. Solid waste is heterogeneous compressing plastics, metals, old clothes, syringes, needles, papers and organic materials. The assumption is that these refuse types influence agriculture, air and water quality. It is on the background that solid wastes reduce bulk density, promotes aeration and infiltration, reduces crusting, erosion and nutrient loss by leaching; although over application can increase potential for leaching [7]. Refuse increases soil organic matter content [8], soil nutrients [9], influences soil pH [10], increase or decrease metal mobility in soils [11]; and has profound effect on microbial and enzymatic activities [12].

Solid wastes when transformed to organic matter may absorb heavy metals in dumpsites by complexation [13] although metals concentration vary with season [14,15].

Owerri is the capital of Imo State and is associated with teeming population and increasing human activity leading varying forms of wastes. Wastes are dumped on open sites including waterways. The municipal solid wastes are burnt as typical in most megacities of using air pollution via particulates [16]. Soils receiving these

Corresponding Author: E.U. Onweremadu, Department of Soil Science and Technology, Federal University of Technology, P.M.B 1526 Owerri Nigeria, E-mail: uzomaonweremadu@yahoo.com.

wastes are not characterized especially as it affects quality, yet they are used for vegetable, arable and tree crop production. It becomes necessary to investigate soils of Avu dumpsite in terms of concentration of biotoxic heavy metals, as they affect soil properties and human health. Based on this, the authors studied the distribution of cadmium and lead on soils of an open dumpsite proximal to Owerri municipality in central southeastern Nigeria.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area: We conducted the study at Avu Dumpsite Owerri Southeastern Nigeria, lying between latitude 5°10' and 5° 30' North and longitude 7° 15' to 7°45' East. Soils are acid sands and form over coastal plains sands (Benin formation). The plain is a dominant feature in the area and resulted from alternating denudational and aggradational activities [17]. The area lies within the humid tropics characterized by 9 months of rainfall and 3 months of dryness. Rainfall distribution is bimodal and averages about 2500 mm per annum, while the mean annual temperature ranges from 28 to 31°C. Otamiri River governs the hydrology of the study area but joins the lower course of the Imo River at Rivers State, Nigeria. Sand mining, gravel exploration, hunting, dry season vegetable production and arable farming are major socio-economic activities. Metropolitan services such as automobile activities, agro industries, food vending, packaging activities and others are prominent.

Field Studies: A transect soil survey technique was used to guide soil sampling. A transverse was cut from the centre (origin) of the dumpsite outwards. Four outstanding land units were identified for the study. They include dumpsite (heavily dumped), 10 metres away from dumpsite (moderately dumped), 20 metres away from dumpsite (slightly dumped) and 5 kilometres away from dumpsite (control). A soil profile pit was sunk in each land unit giving a total of four profile pits. Each profile pit was described according to FAO guidelines [18] and soil samples were collected based on horizon differentiation. Core samples were collected from each horizon for bulk density determination. Soil samples were air-dried and sieved using 2-mm sieve.

Laboratory Analysis: Particle size distribution was measured by hydrometer meter [19] while bulk density was determined by core procedure [20]. Soil pH was measured electrometrically in distilled water using soil: liquid ratio of 1:2.5. Soil organic carbon was estimated by wet digestion [21]. Soil organic matter, was derived using van Bermelen factor of 1.724. Available P was estimated by Bray 2 method [22].Total nitrogen was determined according to the procedure of Bremner and Mulvaney [23]. Exchangeable cations (Al, H,) and (Ca, Mg, K and Na) were determined titrimetrically. Calcium-magnesium ratios were calculated. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) were extracted with BaCl₂ 0.1M method [24] and this analyzed with atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Perkin Elmer Model 2280/2380). Cadmium and lead concentrations were determined using atomic absorption spectrophotometer after extraction of cations with dithionite-citrate carbonate according to Hesser [25].

Data Analysis: Soil data were subjected to coefficient of variation calculated in percentage while relationship between cadmium and lead was determined by correlation analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Physical properties of soil units are presented in Table 1, indicating weak argillic horizons in dumpsites compared with pronounced argillation in control soil unit. Soils were generally sandy which could be a result of combined interaction of geological material climate and land use history on soils.

Weak argillation in dumped sites could be attributed to interaction of heavy metals with colloidal clays which might have led to mobility and redistribution of clay-sized fractions within the pedon. Bulk density increased spatially and vertically with least values obtained at heavily dumped and surface horizons, respectively. This was in response to spatial and vertical organic matter distribution in the soil units (Table 2).

There was no clear trend in the distribution of soil pH and available phosphorus while highest mean value of ECEC was recorded in heavily dumped soil unit. Despite high organic matter content of heavily dumped soil, it recorded least Ca:Mg value of 1.78 while control soil unit had the highest value of 2.73. Calcium-magnesium ratio is an index of soil fertility [26], suggesting poor Ca:Mg interaction in dumped sites. The Ca:Mg ratio was more stable in control site (%CV = 10.06) compared to 33.92%, 32.35% and 39.99% obtained in heavily dumped, moderately dumped and slightly dumped soil units, respectively (Table 2).

Iranica J. Energ	y & Environ.,	2(1):	62-67,	2011
------------------	---------------	-------	--------	------

Table 1: Soil p							
	Depth	BD	S	and	Silt	Clay	
Horizon	Cm	Mg/m ³			g/kg		Texture
Heavily Dump	ed (Dumpsite)						
A	0-18	1.04		12	100	88	Loamy sand
AB	18-48	1.12		32	130	38	Loamy sand
Bt ₁	48-82	1.19		82	20	98	Loamy sand
Bt ₂	82-150	1.30	8	42	100	68	Loamy sand
Mean		1.16	8	42	99.5	61	Loamy sand
CV (%)		9.48	3	.50	47.41	43.37	-
Moderately Du	umped (10 metres a	away from Dumpsite)					
A	0-15	1.15		42	30	28	Sand
AB	15-50	1.14		50	28	22	Sand
Sand Bt ₁	50-95	1.18		38	14	48	Sand
Bt ₂	95-170	1.30		45	36	19	Sand
Mean		1.19		44	35.5	20.8	Sand
CV (%)		6.19	0	.54	26.22	62.73	-
Slightly Dump	ed (20 metres away	from Dumpsite)					
А	0-13	1.22		10	70	120	Loamy sand
AB	13-47	1.25		90	50	160	Sandy loam
Bt_1	47-89	1.32		00	10	150	Sandy loam
Bt ₂	89-148	1.35		80	20	200	Sandy loam
Mean		1.29	7	95	37.5	157.5	Sandy loam
CV (%)		4.69	1	.62	73.43	20.98	-
Control Site (5	km away from Du	mpsite)					
А	0-12	1.27	8	70	20	110	Loamy sand
AB	12-48	1.29	8	80	10	110	Loamy sand
Bt ₁	48-96	1.33		90	20	190	Sandy loam
Bt ₂	96-60	1.42		80	10	210	Sandy loam
Mean		1.33	8	30	15	155	Sandy loam
CV (%)		5.00	6	.30	38.49	33.93	
	sity, MC = moistur						
Table 2: Soil cl	hemical properties	of studied site pH	OM	TN	ECEC	Av.P	
Table 2: Soil cl	hemical properties Depth Cm	of studied site	OM g/kg	TN g/kg	ECEC cmol/kg	Av.P mg/kg	Ca:Mg
Table 2: Soil c Horizon Heavily Dump	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite)	of studied site pH Water	g/kg	g/kg	cmol/kg	mg/kg	
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18	of studied site pH Water 6.2	g/kg 35.3	<u>g/kg</u> 2.4	cmol/kg 5.67	mg/kg 13.21	2.2
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6	g/kg 35.3 30.9	g/kg 2.4 1.3	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35	mg/kg 13.21 12.82	2.2 2.3
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93	2.2 2.3 1.6
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9	5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5	5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%)	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9	5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean <u>CV (%)</u> Moderately Du	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres at	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite)	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean <u>CV (%)</u> Moderately Du A	hemical properties Depth Cm ded (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres at 0-15	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean <u>CV (%)</u> Moderately Du A AB	hemical properties Depth Cm ded (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean <u>CV (%)</u> Moderately Du A AB Bt ₁	hemical properties Depth Cm ded (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5 1.8
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Moderately Du A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Bt ₁ Bt ₂	hemical properties Depth Cm ded (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5 1.8 1.2
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Moderately Du A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Moderately Du A	hemical properties Depth Cm ded (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5 1.8 1.2 2.03
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpA Bt_1 Bt_2 Mean $CV (%)$ Moderately DuAAB Bt_1 Bt_2 Mean $CV (%)$	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 imped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5 1.8 1.2
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A AB Bt ₁ Mean CV (%) Moderately Du A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Slightly Dump	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 imped (10 metres ar 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite)	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5 1.8 1.2 2.03 32.35
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpA Bt_1 Bt_2 Mean $CV (%)$ Moderately DuA Bt_1 Bt_2 Mean $CV (\%)$ Slightly DumpA	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 imped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 (from Dumpsite) 5.8	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36	2.2 2.3 1.6 1.0 1.78 33.92 2.6 2.5 1.8 1.2 2.03 32.35 2.8
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpA Bt_1 Bt_2 Mean $CV (%)$ Moderately DuA AB Bt_1 Bt_2 Mean $CV (%)$ Slightly DumpAAB	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 v from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2 \\ 2.3 \\ 1.6 \\ 1.0 \\ 1.78 \\ 33.92 \\ \hline 2.6 \\ 2.5 \\ 1.8 \\ 1.2 \\ 2.03 \\ 32.35 \\ \hline 2.8 \\ 2.6 \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Moderately DuAABBt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt1	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ \hline \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Moderately DuAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt1Bt2	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ \hline \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil cl Horizon Heavily Dump A Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Moderately Du A Bt ₂ Moderately Du A Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Slightly Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean CV (%) Slightly Dump A AB Bt ₁ Bt ₂ Mean	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Moderately DuAABBt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt2MeanCV (%)	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 umped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ \hline \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil clHorizonHeavily DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Moderately DuAABBt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt2MeanCV (%)Control Site (5)	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 mped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88 mpsite)	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4 54.52	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38 73.43	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40 4.98 19.18	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64 20.40	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ 39.99\\ \hline \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil ciHorizonHeavily DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Moderately DuAABBt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Control Site (5A	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 mped (10 metres a 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88 mpsite) 5.3	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4 54.52 12.9	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38 73.43 0.8	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40 4.98 19.18 7.62	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64 20.40 6.96	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ 39.99\\ \hline 2.4\\ \end{array}$
Table 2: Soil ciHorizonHeavily DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Moderately DuAABBt2MeanCV (%)Slightly DumpAABBt1Bt2MeanCV (%)Control Site (5)AAB	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 mped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88 mpsite) 5.3 5.1	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4 54.52 12.9 9.2	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38 73.43 0.8 0.5	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40 4.98 19.18 7.62 5.66	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64 20.40	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ 39.99\\ \hline 2.4\\ 3.0\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 mped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148 5 km away from Du 0-12 12-48 48-96	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88 mpsite) 5.3 5.1 5.0	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4 54.52 12.9 9.2 6.6	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38 73.43 0.8 0.5 0.3	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40 4.98 19.18 7.62 5.66 6.12	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64 20.40 6.96 7.01 6.36	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ 39.99\\ \hline 2.4\\ 3.0\\ 2.9\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 mped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88 mpsite) 5.3 5.1 5.0 4.8	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4 54.52 12.9 9.2 6.6 4.0	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38 73.43 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.1	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40 4.98 19.18 7.62 5.66 6.12 4.67	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64 20.40 6.96 7.01 6.36 5.55	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ \hline 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ \hline 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ 39.99\\ \hline 2.4\\ 3.0\\ 2.9\\ 2.6\\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	hemical properties Depth Cm ed (Dumpsite) 0-18 18-48 48-82 82-150 mped (10 metres at 0-15 15-50 50-95 95-170 ed (20 metres away 0-13 13-47 47-89 89-148 5 km away from Du 0-12 12-48 48-96	of studied site pH Water 6.2 5.6 5.9 5.1 5.7 8.23 way from Dumpsite) 6.2 4.7 4.6 4.6 5.03 15.62 / from Dumpsite) 5.8 4.9 4.7 4.3 4.93 12.88 mpsite) 5.3 5.1 5.0	g/kg 35.3 30.9 21.6 19.3 26.8 28.31 18.6 12.2 5.5 4.1 10.1 66.13 15.9 10.6 7.2 3.9 9.4 54.52 12.9 9.2 6.6	g/kg 2.4 1.3 1.2 0.9 1.5 45.22 0.8 0.5 0.3 0.2 0.45 58.79 0.7 0.5 0.2 0.1 0.38 73.43 0.8 0.5 0.3	cmol/kg 5.67 4.35 2.46 2.73 3.80 39.42 4.54 4.19 3.10 2.74 3.64 23.59 5.91 4.92 3.68 5.40 4.98 19.18 7.62 5.66 6.12	mg/kg 13.21 12.82 11.93 11.31 12.32 6.97 6.60 6.40 5.12 4.61 5.68 17.07 7.36 8.16 5.23 5.81 6.64 20.40 6.96 7.01 6.36	$\begin{array}{c} 2.2\\ 2.3\\ 1.6\\ 1.0\\ 1.78\\ 33.92\\ 2.6\\ 2.5\\ 1.8\\ 1.2\\ 2.03\\ 32.35\\ 2.8\\ 2.6\\ 1.6\\ 1.1\\ 2.03\\ 39.99\\ 2.4\\ 3.0\\ 2.9\end{array}$

Table 1: Soil physical properties of the study site

			·
Horizon	Depth (cm)	Cd	Pb
Heavily Dum	ped (Dumpsite)		
А	0-18	1.51	15.09
AB	18-48	1.60	14.27
Bt ₁	48-82	1.80	13.57
Bt_2	82-150	0.80	12.52
Mean		1.44	13.85
Moderately I	Dumped (10 metres awa	y from Dumpsite	
А	0-15	1.29	14.11
AB	15-50	1.11	15.10
Bt ₁	50-95	1.30	14.88
Bt_2	95-170	0.88	11.00
Mean		1.14	13.77
Slightly Dum	pped (20 metres away fi	rom Dumpsite)	
А	0-13	2.00	2.83
AB	13-47	0.99	3.11
Bt_1	47-89	0.89	2.68
Bt_2	89-148	0.26	3.09
Mean		1.03	2.93
Control Site	(5 km away from Dum	p Site)	
А	0-12	0.02	1.17
AB	12-48	0.01	0.75
Bt ₁	48-96	0.01	0.62
Bt_2	96-60	0.04	0.51
Mean		0.02	0.91
<u></u>			

Table 3: Cadmium and lead concentration (mg/kg) (N=16)

Cd = cadmium, Pb = lead

Table 4: Relationship between Cd and Pb with some soil properties (N=16)

Parameters correlated	R	\mathbb{R}^2	Level of significance
Cd vs OM	0.92	0.84	**
Cd vs ECEC	0.63	0.40	*
Cd vs Avail. P	0.88	0.77	_*
Cd vs pH	- 0.89	0.79	*
Cd vs sand	0.10	0.01	Ns
Cd vs silt	0.28	0.08	Ns
Cd vs clay	0.69	0.47	*
Pb vs OM	0.97	0.94	**
Pb vs ECEC	-0.56	0.31	Ns
Pb vs Avail. P	-0.79	0.62	*
Pb vs pH	-0.82	0.67	*
Pb vs sand	-0.08	0.06	Ns
Pb vs silt	0.16	0.02	Ns
Pb vs clay	0.61	0.37	*

Cd = Cadmium, Pb = Lead, OM = Organic Matter, ECEC = Effective Cation Exchange Capacity, Avail. P = Available Phosphorus

** = Significant at P = 0.01, * = significant at P = 0.05, ns = non significant

Concentrations of Cd and Pb generally decreased away from the dumpsite. Higher values of lead were recorded in all the soil units. Mean values of Cd (0.18 -1.44mg/kg) and Pb (0.91 - 3.85 mg/kg) were lower than reports of Onweremadu [15] on soils of an automobile dumpsite in Owerri, central southeastern Nigeria. This suggests that toxicity of dump sites depends on waste source. Concentrations of Cd and Pb exceeded critical limits of 0.01 mg/kg and 5.00 mg/kg, respectively using WHO [27]. In addition to this, values of Cd exceeded permissible limits in all dumped soil units while Pb had the same effect on only heavily and moderately dumped soil units using tolerance limits of 0.06 mg/kg (Cd) and 10 mg/kg (Pb) [28].

Relationship existing between these biotoxic metals and some soil properties are shown in Table 4, indicating that both heavy and metals had very high significant (p = 0.01) with organic matter. The above results suggest possible use of organic matter sources for remediation of these soil toxicants. Serkar *et al.* [29] used an activated carbon from coconut shell and seed hull to adsorb 26.5mg/g of lead from aqueous solution at 65°C while vermicompost adsorbed 123.5 µg/g lead at 50°C [30]. These heavy metals correlated significantly (p=0.05) with pH, clay, available phosphorus and ECEC (Table 4).

Strong correlation between cadmium and soil variables (pH, total carbon and clay) were reported by Gray *et al.* [31] and they used these attributes to describe kinetic transfer of ions from soil solution to solid phase. These findings are necessary in modelling for the purpose of accurate predictions.

CONCLUSIONS

The study revealed differences in concentrations of Cd and lead in soil units leading to negative changes in some soil properties especially in Ca : Mg ratios. There were significant (P = 0.01, P = 0.05) differences in Cd and Pb relationships with some soil properties. Soil organic matter exhibited strongest relationship with Cd (r = 0.92; P = 0.01) and Pb (r = 0.97' r = 0.01) in the dumpsite .Further studies should include more soil parameters and results therefore should be subjected to multiple correlation, multiple regression, principal component analysis, cluster root mean error(RMSE) analysis and square determinations to increase reliability and confidence of soil predictors.

REFERENCES

- Stutter, M.I., L.E. Deeks and M.F. Billet, 2004. Spatial variability in soil ion exchange chemistry in a granitic upland catchment. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 68: 1304-1314.
- 2. Goovaerts, P., 2001. Geostatistical modeling of uncertainty in soil science. Geoderma, 103: 3-26.

- Karlen, D.L., S.S Andrews and J.W. Doran, 2001. Soil quality: Current concepts and applications. Adv. Agron., 74: 1-40.
- Karlen, D.L., M.J. Mausbach, J.W. Doran, R.G. Cline, R.F Harris and G.E. Schuman, 1997. Soil quality: A concept definition and framework for evaluation Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 61: 4-10.
- Daily, G.C., P.A. Matson and P.M. Vitousek, 1997. Ecosystem services supplied by soil pp: 113-132. In. G. C Daily (ed) nature services societal dependence on natural ecosystems. Island Press, Washington D.C.,
- Karlen, D.L., S.S. Andrews, J.W. Doran and B.J. Wienhold, 2003. Soil quality: Humankind's foundation for survival. J. Soil Water Conserv., 58: 171-179.
- Myungsu, P., S. Olayvanh, S. Wansik, F. Eunhee, C. Junnbae and S. Togmimin, 2006. Effects of longterm composted and fertilizer application in soil phosphorus status under paddy cropping system. Commun. Soil sci. Plant Anal., 33(11 and 12): 1635 - 2004.
- Hargreaves, J.C., M.S. and P.R. Warman, 2008. A review of the composted municipal solid waste in agriculture. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ, 123: 1-14.
- Wright, A.R., T.L. Provin, T.L. Hons, F.M. Zuberen and R.H. White, 200% compost source and rate effects on soil micronutrients availability under Saint Augustine grass and Bermuda furf. Compost Sci. Util., 15(1): 22-28.
- Claudio, P.J., C.C. Nascentes, R.L.F. Fontes, P.R. Cecon and J.L. Pereira, 2007. Effect of composted solid waste addition on yield and metal contents of lettuce. J. Brazilian Chem. Soc., 18(1): 347-361.
- Madrid, R., R. Lopez and P. Cabrera, 2006. Metal accumulation in soil after application of municipal solid waste compost under intensive farming conditions: Agric Ecosyst. and Environ, 119(3/4): 240-256.
- Acosta-Martinez, V. and R.D. Harmel, 2006. Soil microbiology communities and enzyme activities in various poultry litter applications. J. Environ. Qual., 35(4): 1209-1318.
- Abdel-Ghani, N.T., M. Hefny and G.A.F. El-Chaghaby, 2007. Removal of lead from aqueous solution using low cost abundantly available adsorbents. Int. J. Environ: Sci. Tech., 4(1): 67-73.
- Aiyesanmi, A.F., 2005. Assessment of heavy metals contamination of Robertkin oil fields soils. Niger .J. Soil. Sci., 15: 42-46.

- Onweremadu, E.U., E.T. Eshett and G.E. Osuji, 2007. Temporal variability of selected heavy metals in automobile soils. Int. J. Environ. Sci. Tech., 4(1): 35-41.
- Amnauylawjarurn, T., J. Kreasuwun, S. Towta and K. Siriwitayakom, 2010. Dispersion of particulate matter (PM10) from forest fires in Chiang Mai Province, Thailand. Chiang Mai. J. Sci., 37(1): 39-47.
- Ofomata, G.E.K., 1975. Landforms. In: G.E.K. Ofomata, (ed). Nigeria in maps: Eastern states, Ethiope Publishing House Benin City. pp: 31-34.
- FAO, (Food and Agriculture Organization). 1998. Guidelines for soil profile pit descriptions, 2nd edition FAO Rome. pp: 66
- Gee, G.W. and D. Or, 2002. Particle size analysis, part
 Physical methods. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Book Series No. 5, ASA and SSSA, Madison, W.I., pp: 255-293.
- Grossman, R.B and T.G. Reinsch, 2002. Bulk density and linear extensibility. In: Dane, J. H. and G. C. Topp (eds). Methods of soil analysis, Part 4, Physical methods. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Book Series No. 5 ASA and SSSA, Madison, WI., pp: 201-208.
- Nelson, D.W. and D.E. Sommers, 1982. Total carbon, organic carbon and organic matter. In: Page, A.L. R.H. Miller and D.R. Keeney, (eds). Methods of soil analysis, Part 2, No. 9 ASA, Madison WI. pp: 539-579.
- Olson, S.R. and L.E. Sommers, 1982. Phosphorus. In: Page, A.L. R.H. Mille and R. Keney, (eds). Methods of soil analysis, Part 2. No. 9 ASA, Madison, WI. pp: 803-830.
- Bremner, J.M. and C.S. Mulvaney, 1982. Nitrogen total. In: Page, A.L., R.H. Miller and D.R. Keeney, (eds). Methods of soil analysis, Part 2 No. 9, ASA, Madison, WI., pp: 595-624.
- Hendershot, W.H., H. Lalande and M. Duquette, 1993. Soil reaction and exchangeable acidity. In: Carter, M.R. (ed). Soil sampling and methods of soil analysis. Canadian Society of Soil Science, Lewis Publishers, London, pp: 141-145.
- 25. Hesser, G.F., 1997. Textbook of soil analysis. John Muira Ltd, Mew Jersey.
- 26. Landon, J.R., 1991. Booker tropical soil manual: A handbook for soil survey and agricultural land evaluation in the tropics and subtropics. Longman Scientific and Technical: John Wiley and Sons, New York. pp: 474.
- 27. WHO, (World Health Organization) 2006. World Reference Base for Heavy Metals Permissible Limits for Soil and Water Resou.,

- Isirimah, N.O., A.A. Dickson and C. Igwe, 2003. Introductory soil chemistry and biology for agriculture and biotechnology. OSA Int'L Publisher Ltd, Port. Harcourt. pp: 270.
- Serkar, M., V. Sakthos and S. Rengaraj, 2004. Kinetics and equilibrium adsorption study of lead (II) onto activated carbon prepared from coconut shell. J. Coll. Inter. Sci., 279(2): 307-317.
- Carrasqueros D.A., I. Flores, C. Perozo and S. Pernalete, 2006. Immobilization of lead by vermin compost and its effect on white bean (Vigna sinensis var Apure) uptake. Int. J. Environ Sci. Tech., 3(3): 203-212.
- Gray, C.W., R.G. McLaren, D. Gunther and S. Sinaj, 2004. An assessment of cadmium availability in cadmium-contaminated soil using isotope exchange kinetics. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 68: 1210-1217.