Global Research Journal of Fishery Science and Aquaculture, Vol. 8(6): pp 005-012, August, 2020.

Copyright © 2019, Spring Journals.

Full Length Research Paper

# Impact of Nonpoint Source Pollutant Loadings From Irrigation Sites on River Ngadda, Maiduguri – Borno State

#### Mathias Nzitiri Bwala and Kanadi Bitrus Tarfa

National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency, (NESREA), Borno State Field Office, Maiduguri, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author's E-mail:mathias.bwala@nesrea.gov.ng

Department of Biological Sciences, Gombe State University, Nigeria

# Accepted 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2020.

The study was aimed at examining the impact of nonpoint source pollutant loadings from irrigation sites on the physico – chemical water quality and biodiversity of river Ngadda, Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria. Water samples was collected biweekly for the period of six months from four sampling stations. The physico – chemical qualities (total nitrogen (TN), ammonium (NH4<sup>+</sup>), total phosphorus (TP), total organic carbon (TOC), total dissolved solids (TDS), turbidity (Tur) and total suspended solids (TSS)) were determined using standard methods described by APHA, (2005); Gwamna et al, (2017) with slight modification. A 40µm mesh size standard plankton net was used to filter 20I (4L x 5) of kicked and grabbed sample of water for phytoplankton examination which was preserved with 4% formalin and transported to the laboratory for determination of phytoplankton using drop and count method with the aid of key. Capture and recapture method was employed to determined the relative abundance of fish species using Lincoln index. Total Nitrogen (TN) ranges from 5.02 mg/L - 8.31mg/L, ammonium (NH4<sup>+</sup>) ranges from 0.93mg/L - 2.01, Total phosphorous (TP) ranges from 0.07mg/L -1.81mg/L. Total Organic Carbon (TOC) ranges 5.87mg/L - 7.45mg/L, Turbidity (Tur) ranges from 27mg/L – 31mg/L, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) ranges 198NTU – 298NTU, Total Suspended Solids ranges from 34mg/L – 47mg/L and Temperature ranges from 26°C – 28°C. A total of seven (7) classes and sixteen (16) species of phytoplankton were identified in all the four (4) different sampling stations. A total of four (4) families and ten (10) species of fishes were identified in the sampling stations. The study revealed that irrigation runoff adversely impact fish community of river Ngadda, hence the need for period monitoring to ensure the safety and health standard of this aquatic ecosystem.

Keywords: Non-Point Pollution, Irrigation, River Ngadda

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Agricultural runoffs as a whole is one of the major nonpoint sources of pollution into surface waterbodies causing the deterioration of water quality and affecting the aquatic biodiversity, (Verma and Agarwal, 2008; Shunsuke *et al*, 2009; Harris, 2012). The nonpoint pollution from irrigational sites involves runoff

water into streams, rivers and lakes together with chemicals, such as pesticides and fertilizers which changes the physico – chemical parameters of such aquatic environment thereby influencing the abundance and distribution of the aquatic bio – resource, (Bwala, 2019; Govind, 2012; Verma and Agarwal 2008)

Surface runoff is a hydrological process at the origin of phenomena such as soil erosion, floods out of rivers, mudflows, debris flows and can cause major damage, (Lilly-Rose *et al*, 2016; Harris,2012; Verma and Agarwal 2008; Ingjerd *et al*, 2006). Runoff is the movement of water and with any contaminants on soil surface which occurs when irrigation, rain or snow melt adds water to a surface faster than it can percolate into the soil (Lilly-Rose *et al*, 2016; Luke and Fleming, 2010; Shunsuke *et al*, 2009; Ingjerd *et al*, 2006).

Soil characteristic such as soil moisture content, soil texture, topography (slope or grade of the site) and vegetation cover affect rates and durations of runoff, (Ron, 2012). Land use and physico – chemical characteristics of a site influences the quantity and quality of runoff of that site (Ron, 2012; Syed, 2011; Luke and Fleming, 2010; Verma and Agarwal 2008).

The insurgency in North eastern, Nigeria and particularly Borno State has displaced more than one million persons and Maiduguri, the Borno State capital being a major city of refuge to the displaced individuals with over six (6) major Internally Displaced Person's (IDP) camps has witnessed a rapid change in population, land use and economic activities resulting intense irrigational activities along the bank of river Ngadda.

Various activities which takes place along the river bank such as farming, fishing, forestry, construction, urban development and land pollution (indiscriminate solid waste disposal) may result to water quality problems, adversely changing the physico – chemical parameters of aquatic ecosystem and this dynamism may disrupt the aquatic bio resource, leading to migration, reduction in productivity and subsequently death (Syed, 2011; Akan *et al*, 2013)

This paper is aimed at examining the impact of the intense irrigational activities on the physico – chemical parameters of River Ngadda and its biodiversity.

#### II. STUDY AREA

Maiduguri is the capital and the largest city in Borno State, Nigeria which is located on latitude  $11^{\circ}$  51' 42"N and longitude  $013^{\circ}$  09" 35E and lies within the northern Sudan Savannah with a distinct dry and wet (rainy) seasons. The town has an annual mean temperature of  $37^{\circ}$ C. The town has two (2) main river systems (Nggadabul and Nggada Rivers) which met and continues to flow as River Nggada; both rivers are freshwater bodies which are remarkable for their circular shape, (Bukar *et* al, 2016; Bwala, 2019).

Water from the river is used for irrigation, human consumption, domestic purposes and various industrial activities and the river receives runoff from the irrigated sites and effluent from Maiduguri Water Treatment plant, abattoir and dyeing industries located beside the river bank which calls for systematic environmental monitoring to ensure the safety and health of the aquatic environment, (Adeniyi and Yusuf, 2007; Haruna and Anthony, 2011 Syed, 2011).



**Figure 1**: Map of Maiduguri Metropolis showing the sampling Stations **Source:** Sharah, (2020)

#### III. SAMPLING

The river was sampled into four (4) different stations based on the irrigational activities along the bank of the river.

| S/N | STATION | LOCATION                | GPS COORDINATE               | ACTIVITIES/REMARK                      |
|-----|---------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 4   | Α       | Up Stream Close to Alau | N11 <sup>0</sup> 44' 11.8"   | ✓ Non-Irrigated Site.                  |
|     |         | Dam                     | E013 11 38.0                 |  |
| 1   | В       | Beside Water Treatment  | N11 <sup>°</sup> 47' 28.1"   | <ul> <li>✓ Irrigation sites</li> </ul> |
|     |         | Plant                   | E013 <sup>0</sup> 11' 33.8"  | ✓ Topography: Sloppy                   |
| 2   | С       | Fori ward               | N11 <sup>0</sup> 48' 10.2"   | ✓ Domestic uses                        |
|     |         |                         | E013 <sup>0</sup> 10' 18.9'' | <ul> <li>Irrigation sites</li> </ul>   |
|     |         |                         |                              | ✓ Topography: Sloppy                   |
| 3   | D       | Custom Area             | N11 <sup>°</sup> 51' 29.8"   | <ul> <li>Irrigation sites</li> </ul>   |
|     |         |                         | E013 <sup>0</sup> 11' 01.0"  | ✓ Topography: flat                     |
|     |         |                         |                              | ✓ Wastewater from abattoir             |

#### Table 1.1 Sampling Stations

## **IV. EXPERIMENTATION**

#### **Drainage Flow Monitoring**

During irrigation events, pumping machine was used to irrigate the farmlands and some return to the river again as surface irrigation runoff with observable minor rill erosion. At Sampling Station B - D a monitoring station was established at the edge of the rill erosion at the entering point to the river.

#### Water Quality Assessment

Samples for water quality assessment were taken at the sampling stations from the point where the pumping machine was used to drain water and a representative sample from the monitoring station. Water surface Temperature was determined using mercury thermometer at the sampling stations. Water samples were collected for analysis of total nitrogen (TN), ammonium (NH4<sup>+</sup>), total phosphorus (TP), total organic carbon (TOC), total dissolved solids (TDS), turbidity (Tur) and total suspended solids (TSS). A composite auto sampler was installed at each sampling station to collect samples at intervals (biweekly) during irrigation seasons (November, 2018 - April, 2019). Samples collected were transported in ice to the laboratory for further water quality analysis by standard methods (APHA 2005); (Usman et al, 2016; Gwana et al, 2017) with slight modification.

#### **Determination of Phytoplankton Relative Abundance**

Water sample for the phytoplankton were collected at each sampling station using kick and then grab sampling techniques. Kick Sampling technique involves stirring a body of water which creates disturbance to the benthos periphyton community, thereby making them to come-up to the surface for easy collection with grab sample collection technique.

A 40 $\mu$ m mesh size standard plankton net was used to filter 20I (4L x 5) of the grab sample, and then filled into air tight 120ml well labeled sampling bottles at each station and preserved with 4% formalin within two (2) minutes of collection and then taken to the laboratory for analyses using the drop-count method with microscope and plankton identification manual and keys, (NIO, 2004).

Relative abundance (%Ra) was determined using the formula

$$\%$$
Ra =  $\frac{n(100)}{N}$ 

, cited in (George et al, 2012).

Where **n** = total number of plankton under consideration

 $\mathbf{N}$  = total number of all the species of the plankton group

#### **Determination of Fish Relative Abundance**

Capture and recapture method was employed to determine the relative abundance of fish. A

#### 008. Glob. Res. J. Fish. Sci. Aquacult.

representative sample was preserved with 40% alcohol and transported to the laboratory for species identification, (Portt *et al*, 2016). The Lincoln Index was used to estimate the fish population size. Population =

Total number of fish in 1st Sample X Total number of fish in 2nd sample

Number of marked fish in 2nd sample Cited in FSC, (2016)

#### V. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

## Mean Physico – chemical parameters









| Station | TN (mg/L) | NH4⁺ (mg/L) | TP (mg/L) | TOC (mg/L) | Tur (mg/L) | TDS (NTU) | TSS (mg/L) | Temperature ( <sup>o</sup> C) |
|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|
| Α       | 5.12      | 0.93        | 0.07      | 5.87       | 29         | 203       | 34         | 27                            |
| В       | 8.31      | 2.01        | 1.81      | 7.45       | 27         | 238       | 47         | 28                            |
| С       | 5.87      | 1.09        | 0.92      | 6.69       | 31         | 198       | 35         | 26                            |
| D       | 5.02      | 1.72        | 1.01      | 5.98       | 29         | 298       | 41         | 27                            |

 Table 2: Mean Physico – chemical parameters

Total Nitrogen (TN) ranges from 5.02 mg/L – 8.31mg/L, ammonium (NH4<sup>+</sup>) ranges from 0.93mg/L – 2.01, Total phosphorous (TP) ranges from 0.07mg/L – 1.81mg/L. Total Organic Carbon (TOC) ranges 5.87mg/L – 7.45mg/L, Turbidity (Tur) ranges from 27mg/L – 31mg/L, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) ranges 198NTU – 298NTU, Total Suspended Solids ranges from 34mg/L – 47mg/L and Temperature ranges from 26<sup>o</sup>C – 28<sup>o</sup>C.

Station Å been an unirrigated zone has the lowest NH4<sup>+</sup> (0.93mg/L). TP (0.07mg/L) and TSS (34mg/L). Station B is a sloppy irrigated zone with observable rill erosion as a result of surface runoff and has the highest TN (8.31mg/L), NH4<sup>+</sup> (2.01mg/L), TP (1.81mg/L), TOC (7.45mg/L), TSS (47mg/L) and Temperature (28<sup>o</sup>C), it is worthy of note that this station

is also receive a point source pollutant from Maiduguri Water Treatment Plant (sludge discharge) coupled with nonpoint source pollutant from the densely irrigated sites along the river bank affects the water chemistry, this agrees with (Bwala, 2019; Gwana *et al*, 2017; Akan *et al*, 2013).

Sampling Station C, has the highest mean turbidity (31mg/L) with a relatively high TN (5.87mg/L), TOC (6.69mg/L) was sloppy irrigated zone while Sampling Station D was a flat irrigated zone which recorded the highest TDS 298NTU and receive wastewater from Maiduguri abattoir. The values are slightly above NESREA permissible limits, (NESREA, 2011)

| S/N | CLASS         | Α  | В  | С  | D  | TOTAL |
|-----|---------------|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Α   | CHLOROPHYCEAE |    |    |    |    |       |
| 1   | Pteromonas    | 1  | 5  | 2  | 1  | 9     |
| 2   | Ankistrodemus | -  | -  | 2  | 1  | 3     |
| 3   | Batryococcus  | 7  | 3  | 5  | -  | 15    |
| 4   | Spirogyra     | 19 | 29 | 24 | 17 | 89    |
| 5   | Ulothrix      | -  | 1  | 1  | 4  | 6     |
| 6   | Microspora    | -  | 11 | -  | 1  | 12    |
| 7   | Cladophora    | -  | -  | -  | 4  | 4     |
|     | TOTAL         | 27 | 49 | 34 | 28 | 138   |
|     |               |    |    |    |    |       |
| В   | CRYPTOPHYCEAE |    |    |    |    |       |
| 8   | Crytomonas    | 7  | 9  | 1  | 3  | 20    |
|     | TOTAL         | 7  | 9  | 1  | 3  | 20    |
|     |               |    |    |    |    |       |
| С   | CHRYSOPHYCEAE |    |    |    |    |       |
| 9   | Synura        | -  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 3     |
| 10  | Uroglena      | 1  | -  | 1  | 21 | 23    |
|     | TOTAL         | 1  | 1  | 2  | 22 | 26    |
|     |               |    |    |    |    |       |
| D   | CYANOPHYCEAE  |    |    |    |    |       |
| 11  | Chroococcus   | 14 | 6  | -  | 1  | 21    |
|     | TOTAL         | 14 | 6  | 0  | 1  | 21    |

#### **Table 3: Distribution of Phytoplankton**

| Table 3: Continue |                   |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------------------|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| E                 | EUGLENOPHYCEAE    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 12                | Euglena           | 11 | 13 | 15 | 2  | 41 |
|                   |                   |    |    |    |    |    |
| 13                | Phacus            | 7  | 12 | -  | 9  | 28 |
|                   | TOTAL             | 18 | 25 | 15 | 11 | 69 |
|                   |                   |    |    |    |    |    |
| F                 | RHODOPHYCEAE      |    |    |    |    |    |
| 14                | Asterocytis       | 7  | 11 | 7  | 10 | 35 |
|                   | TOTAL             | 7  | 11 | 7  | 10 | 35 |
|                   |                   |    |    |    |    |    |
| G                 | BACILLARIOPHYCEAE |    |    |    |    |    |
| 15                | Melosira          | 6  | 9  | -  | -  | 15 |
| 16                | Pinnularia        | -  | -  | 1  | 3  | 4  |
|                   | TOTAL             | 6  | 9  | 1  | 3  | 19 |

Table 3 above revealed a total of seven (7) classes and sixteen (16) species of phytoplankton which were identified in all the four (4) different sampling stations.

| Table 4: %Ra of class of phytoplankton |                   |      |      |      |      |       |
|--|-------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| S/N                                    | CLASS             | Α    | В    | С    | D    | TOTAL |
| Α                                      | CHLOROPHYCEAE     | 19.6 | 35.5 | 24.6 | 20.3 | 100   |
| В                                      | CRYPTOPHYCEAE     | 35.0 | 45.0 | 5.0  | 15.0 | 100   |
| С                                      | CHRYSOPHYCEAE     | 3.85 | 3.85 | 7.7  | 84.6 | 100   |
| D                                      | CYANOPHYCEAE      | 66.6 | 28.6 | 0    | 4.8  | 100   |
| E                                      | EUGLENOPHYCEAE    | 26.1 | 36.2 | 21.7 | 16   | 100   |
| F                                      | RHODOPHYCEAE      | 20   | 31.4 | 20   | 28.6 | 100   |
| G                                      | BACILLARIOPHYCEAE | 31.6 | 47.3 | 5.3  | 15.8 | 100   |
|  | TOTAL             | 24.7 | 34.1 | 18.6 | 22.6 | 100   |



Figure 3: Distribution and Abundance of Phytoplanton

Table 4 and Figure 3 revealed that Sampling Station A recorded the highest relative abundance of class Cyanophyceae (66.6%), Sampling Station B has the highest relative abundance of Chlorophyceae (35.5%), Cryptophyceae (45.0%), Euglenophyceae (36.2%), Rhodophyceae (31.4%) and Bacillariophyceae (47.3%). This suggests that the irrigation runoff and physico - chemical characteristics of Station B favours

the abundance and distribution of phytoplankton (George et al, 2012) as the station has the highest TN (8.31mg/L), NH4<sup>+</sup> (2.01mg/L), TP (1.81mg/L), TOC (7.45mg/L), TSS (47 mg/L) and Temperature  $(28^{\circ} \text{C})$ .

Surprisingly, sampling station C, recorded the lowest relative abundance of phytoplankton (18.6%) although it has the highest mean turbidity (31mg/L) with

a relatively high TN (5.87mg/L), TOC (6.69mg/L) and also a sloppy heavily irrigated zone. This can be

attributed to turbidity as it does not favour phytoplankton due to the fact adversely affect light penetration.

| S/N   | FAMILY                       | Α     | В    | С    | D  | TOTAL |
|-------|------------------------------|-------|------|------|----|-------|
| Α     | CICHLIDAE                    |       |      |      |    |       |
| 1     | Tillipia zillii              | 34.6  | 25.1 | 12   | 2  | 73.7  |
| 2     | Oreochromis niloticus        | 2.1   | 2    | 0    | 0  | 4.1   |
| 3     | Himechromis bimaculatus      | 2     | 1    | 1    | 0  | 4     |
|       |                              |       |      |      |    |       |
| В     | CLARIDAE                     |       |      |      |    |       |
| 4     | Clarias gariepinus           | 12    | 2    | 5.2  | 1  | 20.2  |
| 5     | Clarias ngularis             | 4.2   | 3.2  | 18.6 | 4  | 30    |
|       |                              |       |      |      |    |       |
| C     | CYPRINIDAE<br>OSTEOGLOSSIDAE |       |      |      |    |       |
| 6     | Labeo sengalensis            | 0     | 2    | 2.1  | 2  | 6.1   |
| 7     | Heterotis niloticus          | 0     | 0    | 3    | 2  | 5     |
|       |                              |       |      |      |    |       |
| D     | CHARACIDAE MOCHOKIDAE        |       |      |      |    |       |
| 8     | Synodontis nigrita           | 1.2   | 2    | 3.1  | 0  | 6.3   |
| 9     | Synodontis eupterus          | 2     | 2.4  | 4.1  | 1  | 9.5   |
| 10    | Alestes nurse                | 25.2  | 23   | 21   | 12 | 81.2  |
|       |                              |       |      |      |    |       |
| E     | OTHER FAMILY                 |       |      |      |    |       |
| 11    | Other Species                | 32    | 24.2 | 23   | 10 | 89.2  |
| TOTAL |                              | 115.3 | 86.9 | 93.1 | 34 | 329.3 |

## Table 4: Relative Abundance of Fish (Lincoln Index)

Table 4 revealed a total of four (4) families and ten (10) species of fishes identified in the sampling stations.

Station A has the highest relative abundance of fish (115.3) and it was an unirrigated zone, less disturbed with anthropogenic activities and interference which may have favour the growth and development of the fish species in the sampling (Portt et al, 2006; Harris, 2012). Tillipia zillli (73.7), Alestes nurse (81.2) and Clarias gariepinus (20.2) are the most abundant species this agrees with Gwana et al, (2017); Mshelia et al, (2015); Akan et al, (2013). Table 3:3 suggest that irrigation runoff adversely impact fish community of river NgaddaSampling Station D although being a flat irrigated land, receives point source pollutants (effluent) from abattoir has the highest TDS 298NTU which may have adversely affected the abundance and distribution of fish species with only 34 fish recorded using the Lincoln index.

The abundance and distribution of fish species is adversely impacted with the changing physico – chemical characteristic of the river, as the data is slightly lower than the findings of

Mshelia *et al*, 2015; Gwamna *et al*, 2017. This suggests that fish population and community composition is gradually reducing over the years.

#### VI. CONCLUSION

Nonpoint source pollutants loadings into river Ngadda is an emerging environmental issue of concern with the increasing irrigational activities along the river bank. The Physico – chemical characteristic of the river is slightly above NESREA permissible limited, (NESREA, 2011) which slightly effects the phytoplankton and fish community hence the need to monitor this aquatic ecosystem periodically.

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

| NESREA:                                      | National            | Environmental |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Standards and regulations Enforcement Agency |                     |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| NAFDAC:                                      | National Agency     | for Food and  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drug Administration Control                  |                     |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| TN:  | Total Nitrogen      |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| TP:  | Total Phosphorus    |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOC:   | Total Organic Carl  | bon           |  |  |  |  |  |
| TDS:   | Total Dissolved So  | olids         |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tur:   | Turbidity           |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSS:   | Total Suspended     | Solids        |  |  |  |  |  |
| IDP  | Internally Displace | ed Persons    |  |  |  |  |  |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We could like to appreciate the staff and management of NESREA Borno for granting us permission to use some of its facilities and acknowledge Mr. Charles Joshua Sharah (Borno State Coordinator NESREA) for ensuring the quality of this study. We could like to acknowledge NAFDAC, Maiduguri for subsiding the cost of analysis and other logistics for us.

# V. REFERENCE

(I) Adeniyi, A. A. and Yusuf K. A. (2007): Environmental Monitoring Assessment 37 451-458.

(II) Akan J. C., Mohammed Z., Jafiya L. and. Ogugbuaja V. O (2013): Organochlorine Pesticide Residues in Fish Samples from Alau Dam, Borno State, North Eastern Nigeria. Journal of Environmental & Analytical Toxicology, ISSN: 2161-0525APHA (2005). Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 21st edition. American Public Health Association.

(I) Bukar P. H., Zakari I. Y., Oladipo M. O. A., Ibeanu I. G. E. (2016): Assessment and Distribution of Metal Pollutants in the Sediments of River Ngadda and Alau Dam in Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Research Communication, 2016, 4(4):} www.usajournals.com, ISSN: 2325-4076.* 

(II) Bwala Mathias Nzitiri (2016): The Effect of Physico-chemical Parameters on Phytoplankton and Ostracods of Some Selected Waterbodies in Maiduguri Metropolis, Borno State.

(III) Bwala Mathias Nzitiri (2019): The Abundance of Phytoplankton in River Nggada and River Ngadda-Bul, Maiduguri Metropolis, Borno State, Nigeria. *Global Educational Research Journal: ISSN-2360-7963: Vol.* 7(7): pp, 820-829, August, 2019, Spring Journals

*(IV)* Causapé, J., Quílez, D., & Aragüés, R. (2004). Assessment of irrigation and environmental quality at the

hydrological basin level II. Salt and nitrate loads in irrigation return flows. *Agricultural Water Management*, 70, 211 – 228.

(V) Field studies Council (FSC) (2016): 2016 Field Studies Council, a Limited Company, reg. England and Wales No.412621,

(VI) George E. E, Samuel I. U and Andem A. B (2012): – Composition and abundance of Phytoplankton of Adiabo River in Calaber River System, Southeast Nigeria. *European Journal of Zoological Research, 2012* Vol. 1 (4) 93 – 98.

(VII) Govind Prasad (2012): - Handbook of Conservation Biology. *Discovery Publishing House PVT Ltd, New Delhi – 110 002. ISBN 978-93-5056-003-7* 

(VIII) Gwana Adamu Mohammed, Umaru Buba Wakil, Halima Mohammed Bala, Wanas Lalai Ndirmbita, (2017): Physico – Chemical Water Quality Analyses of Lake Alau, North – Eastern Nigeria, *Journal of Water Resources and Ocean Science. Vol. 6, No. 1, 2017, pp.* 14-22. doi: 10.11648/j.wros.20170601.12

(IX) Harris Frances (2012): - Global Environmental Issues. Wiley – Blackwell, A John Wiley & Sons Ltd Publications. ISBN 978-0-470-68470-2 (cloth) – ISBN 978-0-470-68469-6 (pbk)

(X) Haruna K. Ayuba and Anthony Dami (2011): -Environmental Sciences: An Introductory Text. Apani Publications. ISBN 978-978-088-927-2

(XI) Ingjerd Haddeland, Dennis P.Lettenmaier, ThomasSkaugen (2006): Effects of irrigation on the water and energy balances of the Colorado and Mekong river basins. *Journal of Hydrology Volume 324, Issues 1–4, 15 June 2006, Pages 210-22* 

(XII) Lilly-Rose Lagadec Pierre Patrice, Isabelle Braud, Blandine Chazelle, Loïc Moulin, Judicaël Dehotin, Emmanuel Hauchard, Pascal Breil (2016): Description and evaluation of a surface runoff susceptibility mapping method Journal of Hydrology Volume 541, Part A, October 2016, Pages 495-50 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.05.049

(XIII) Luke M. Mosley and Nigel Fleming (2010): Pollutant Loads Returned to the Lower Murray River from Flood-Irrigated Agriculture. *Water Air Soil Pollution* (2010) 211:475–487 DOI 10.1007/s11270-009-0316-

*(XIV)* Mshelia M. B, Manneer M. B, Garba U, Hassan M (2015):. A frame and catch assessment of fishes of lake Alau, Borno State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Studies 2015; 2(4S): 35-40* 

*(XV)* National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (2004): - Phytoplankton Identification Manual.

*(XVI)* NESREA (2011): - National Environmental (Surface and Groundwater Quality Control) Regulation, 2011.

*(XVII)* Portt C.B, Coker G.A., Ming D.L., and Randal R.G. (2006): A review of fish sampling methods

commonly used in Canadian freshwater habitats. Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2604

(XVIII) Ron Gardner (2012): The Problem of Runoff. *Pesticide Environmental Stewardship.* 

(XIX) Sharah Joshua Charles (2020): Assessment of Base Transceiver Stations Compliance to Environmental Standards in Maiduguri Metropolis, Borno State Nigeria. Unpublished MSc Thesis submitted to the Department of Geography, University of Maiduguri, Borno State – Nigeria.

(XX) Shunsuke Chonoi, Shigeya Maeda, Thbshihiko Kawachi, Koichi Unami and Junichiro Takeuchi (2009): Dynamics of Nonpoint Source Pollutant Loadings from Agricultural Watershed. *Journal of Rainwater Catchment Systems Vol. 14/No.2/pp. 21 -28* 

(XXI) Syed Aftab Iqbal (2011): - Pollution: The Ugly Face of Environment. *Discovery Publishing House PVT Ltd, New Delhi – 110 002. ISBN 978-81-8356-810-4* 

(XXII) Usman Y. M, Mohammed A., Ibrahim B. and Saleh B. A (2016): - Assessment of Groundwater Quality Status along River Nggada in Maiduguri, Nigeria. International Journal of Engineering and Sciences (IJES) Vol. 5(1) 08 – 14, 2016

(XXIII) Verma P. S and Agarwal V. K (2008): -Environmental Biology (Principles of Ecology). Chand & Company Limited Publishers. ISBN: 81-219-0859-0