APPLIED PROBLEMS OF ARID LANDS DEVELOPMENT

Specific Features of Content and Mobility of Heavy Metals in Soils of Floodplain of the Don River

T. M. Minkina, Yu. A. Fedorov, D. G. Nevidomskaya, S. S. Mandzhieva, and M. N. Kozlova

Southern Federal University, pr. Stachki 194/*1, Rostov-on-Don, 344090 Russia e-mail: tminkina@mail.ru, dnevidomskaya@mail.ru* Received April, 30, 2015

Abstract—The gross heavy metal contents were studied in the main soil types of the floodplain of the estuarine segment of the Don River. The ratio of elements strongly bound to soil components to those that are weakly bound was determined for the first time. It was established that geochemical features of the fixation and distribution of elements in compound forms in the studied soils are determined by the soil buffering capacity, the chemical properties of the elements themselves, and their association with sources of anthropo genic emission.

Keywords: heavy metals, soils, gross content, weakly bound compounds, mobility, pollution **DOI:** 10.1134/S2079096115040095

INTRODUCTION

The floodplain of the estuarine region of the Don River is located in a semiarid climate. It is unique for the productivity of the territory, which is characterized by extremely favorable natural conditions. The high soil fertility and hydrological regimen of Don River have resulted in the formation of a highly productive meadow biocenosis of the floodplain and deltaic land scapes that serve as spawning areas for valuable fish breeds. At present, this territory is affected by active technogenic influences. The mostly important, in terms of its consequences, was the overregulation of the Don River runoff. The estuarine ecosystems serve as natural barriers, accumulating substances carried by the water, including contaminants. The cities of Ros tov-on-Don, Novocherkassk, Azov, and Bataisk are located in the Don River estuarine region, as are large industrial establishments that emit large amounts of contaminant substances to the atmosphere. Emissions by a JSC OGK-2 affiliate, the Novocherkassk power station (NPS), make up to 1% of the total emission of polluting substances into the Russian air and up to 99% of the aerosol emissions in Rostovskaya oblast (*Ekologiya*...,, 2001). As a result of the location of the main sources of air pollution and the dominant wind direction, a substantial portion of the fallout precipitates within the floodplain of river estuarine region (Fedorov et al., 2012).

Research on the concentration and migration of chemical elements in the floodplain soils and their influence on crop capacity has been conducted in the past and is being conducted at present. A substantial number of works is dedicated to the geochemistry of heavy metals (HMs) in the studied region (Alekseenko, 2002; Minkina et al., 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2013; Fedorov et al., 2012; etc.). Despite the collected material, many questions on the accumulation, dis persion, and transformation of HMs in soil cover of the Don River estuarine region remain unsolved. Thus, this work is relevant.

The purpose of this work was to study specific fea tures of the accumulation and distribution of the gross content and mobile forms of HMs in soils of the estu arine ecosystems of the floodplain and deltaic land scapes of the Don River.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

From the viewpoint of geomorphology, the studied territory is confined to the Don River floodplain; as for hydrology, it is situated within its present estuarine region, the upper limit of which passes in range of Razdorskaya stanitsa (Gar'kusha and Fedorov, 2010). In turn, the delta is a part of the Don River estuarine region; the soil studies were mainly conducted in the floodplain of this region.

Monitor stations were installed to study specific features of the geochemical condition of the soil cover in landscapes of the estuarine region floodplain (Fig. 1). The soil cover on the examined ground is rep resented by meadow, alluvial-meadow, saturated, and alluvial-stratified soils underlaid with alluvial sediments. Soil samples were taken from a depth of 0–20 cm. According to the guidelines (*Agrokhimicheskie*…, 1975) the main physico-chemical attributes of soils were estimated: granulometric soil compound, organic matter content, carbonates, exchangeable Ca^{2+} and Mg2+, pH, and dense water extract residue.

Fig. 1. Location of monitoring stations in the floodplain and delta of the River Don. The structure of the soil covers on the test stations: 1—low-humus, light loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 2—low-humus, light loamy, sat urated, meadow, reclaimed alluvial soil on alluvial deposits (L); 3—low-humus, clay, loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 4—low-humus, light sandy, saturated, alluvial-stratified soil on alluvial deposits (AS); 5—low-humus, sandy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 5a—low-humus, light loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 5b—low-humus, light loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 6—low humus, light loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 7—low-humus, sandy, loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 8—low-humus light loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 8a—low-humus, sandy, loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL); 9—low-humus, light loamy, saturated, alluvial, meadow soil on alluvial deposits (AL).

The condition of the examined soils was assessed by the value of the gross content of chemical elements in soils and by indices of the soil retention strength of metals and metalloids. The gross content of Mn, Cr, Ni, Cu, Zn, Pb, Cd, and As in soils was determined by X-ray–fluorescent technique and expressed in mg/kg.

In the analysis of the metal compound composi tion, the focus was on the ratio of metal compounds that were strongly bound to soil components to those weakly bound. This determines the ecological conse quences of the metal pollution of soils and leads to prac tical interest in the development of different mecha nisms for metal detoxication in soils, because certain solid mineral and organic soil phases have a high buffer ing capacity for a wide range of soil contaminants, thus providing a protective function for soil.

Weakly bound metal compounds include external sphere metal complexes accompanied by a variety of functional groups of solid soil phases. Strongly bound metal compounds, which result from the formation of internal-sphere complexes with solid phases, are non ventilated, original minerals. We propose the use of the content of weakly bound HM compounds in soil as an integral indicator of metal mobility and the capability to participate in mass transfer processes (Mandzhieva et al., 2014).

Weakly bound HM compounds in soils include exchangeable, complex, and specifically sorbed com pounds, the content of which in soil is tightly associ ated with their content in plants (Minkina et al., 2014). HM compounds labeled as weakly bound are transferred into a solution by parallel extractions by reagents (Minkina at al., 2013).

(1) 1 N ammonium-acetate buffer (NH₄Ac) with a pH of 4.8 (soil-to-solution ratio of 1 : 10 and extraction time of 18 h), able to transfer exchangeable metal forms into a solution, which characterizes their "actual" mobility.

(2) 1% EDTA NH₄Ac solution with a pH of 4.8 (soil-to-solution ratio of 1 : 10 and extraction time of 18 h), which allegedly, along with exchangeable metal forms, transfers their complex compounds into a solution.

By the difference between the metal content in EDTA extract in $NH₄AC$ and $NH₄AC$, we calculated the metal content found in the composition of com plex compounds (Nosovskaya et al., 2001, Protasova and Gorbunova, 2006).

(3) acid-soluble metal forms derived with 1 N HCl solution (soil-to-solution ratio of 1:10 and extraction time of 18 h), which characterizes the potential reserve of mobile compounds in soil. They are supposedly rep resented by exchange-capable metal ions and specifi cally retained compounds, including those retained by amorphous Fe and Mn oxides and carbonates.

We calculated the number of specifically retained metal compounds from the difference between the metal compounds in HCl and $NH₄AC$ extracts. The additivity of extracts is experimentally proven (Minkina et al. 2014). The metal content in extracts is

Station No.	Soil	Humus, %	pH	CaCO ₃ , %	Dense res- idue, %	Exchangeable bases, mmol $(+)/100$ g		Size (mm) and contents $(\%)$ of organic fractions		
						Ca^{2+}	Mg^{2+}	< 0.001	< 0.01	name by granulo- metric content
	AL	3.03	7.78	2.80	0.045	27.1	2.1	9.71	29.02	Light loam
2	L	1.88	7.67	4.43	0.086	16.0	3.0	13.90	26.40	Light loam
3	AL	2.30	7.93	0.18	0.035	33.0	6.0	27.00	47.70	Heavy loam
4	AS	0.22	8.00	0.18	0.002	1.00	0.5	0.10	0.30	Loose sand
5	AL	1.23	7.60	8.70	0.184	17.0	3.0	0.20	6.30	Cohesive sand
6	AL	0.43	7.42	0.32	0.138	30.0	6.0	10.90	23.40	Light loam
7	AL	1.30	7.76	0.02	0.034	17.0	3.0	7.60	14.00	Sandy loam
8	AL	1.66	7.25	0.43	0.040	27.0	2.0	11.00	24.70	Light loam
8a	AL	0.40	8.06	0.64	0.081	34.0	7.1	7.40	14.00	Sandy loam
9	AL	2.14	8.91	0.47	0.075	18.0	3.0	21.50	29.10	Light loam

Table 1. Physicochemical soil properties of monitoring stations of the estuarine ecosystem of the floodplain and delta of the river Don (0–20 cm layer)

AL—alluvial-meadow soil, L—meadow soil, AS—alluvial-stratified soil.

estimated by atomic absorption spectrophotometry (AAC).

The HM content in the composition of strongly bound compounds was estimated by the difference between the gross metal content in the soil and the content of their weakly bound compounds.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparison of the results of chemical analyses of meadow, alluvial-meadow, and alluvial-stratified satu rated soils from the examined monitor stations (Table 1) demonstrates that the granulometric compound of the soil is rather mixed and is re presented mainly by sandy, sabulous, and light-loamy species. Fractions of fine and medium sand are predominant. The exam ined soils have neutral, alkalescent, or strongly alka line medium reactions (7.3–8.9) and a low humus content of 0.2–3.7, which was mainly determined by the qualitative content of the infused and redeposited material composing the inwashed and buried hori zons. The overwhelming majority of the examined soils are not saline (the value of dense residue does not exceed 0.15%). The high carbonate content from soil covers in some stations is associated with the presence of biogenic calcite in deposited horizons. Calcium predominates in the composition of the absorbent complex (Table 1).

The gross soil analysis makes it possible to trace changes in the chemical composition of the most sta ble part of soils, the minerals. A macroelement analy sis of soils showed that the $SiO₂$ content at stations 1, 4, 5, 7, 8a, which have a lite granulometric composi tion, is increased relative to the amount of R_2O_3 and

other oxides, which contain primary nutritional ele ments: CaO, MgO, and K_2O (Fig. 2).

The accumulation and distribution of HM in soils is determined by external and internal factors. The external factors are conditioned by physico-chemical properties of soils, the geomorphological features of the examined territory, and the association with sources of technogenic emission. The internal factors are related to the atomic properties of chemical ele ments and their compounds (Minkina et al, 2003; Violante et al., 2007). A complex of physico-chemical parameters directly performs soil-protector functions. To reveal them, it is necessary to assess the soil protec tive abilities (buffering capacity) for HMs.

The buffering capacity of the examined soils in the Don River floodplain was assessed according to tech nique of V.B. Ilyin (1995), which is based on an accounting of the inactivation capability of soil char acteristics: humus, physical clay, carbonates, sesqui oxides, and pH.

Assessment of the soil buffering capacity has shown that it is somewhat different in the studied soils (Fig. 3). The major factors in the formation of the buffer value of the studied soils for HMs are physical clay, carbon ates, and humus. The contribution of pH and sesqui oxides is practically constant for the studied objects. According to the buffering capacity gradation for HMs, alluvial-stratified, sandy soil (station 4) and alluvial-meadow, sandy-loam soils (stations 7 and 8a) have a medium degree of this parameter, while the highest buffering capacity index characterizes meadow, light-loamy soil (station 2). The soils can be arranged by the buffering capacity value for HMs in descending order: meadow alluvial-deposited light-

Fig. 2. Concentration of macroelement oxides in test station soils in the floodplain and delta of the river Don.

Fig. 3. Buffering capacity of floodplain soils of the river Don in relation to heavy metals. Points obtained by *1*—humus, *2*—pH, *3*—physical clay, *4*—R₂O₃, *5*—CO₃².

loamy ≥ alluvial-meadow light-loamy > alluvial meadow heavy-loamy > alluvial-meadow sandy and sandy-loam > alluvial-stratified sandy.

The intensity of the accumulation and distribution of HMs in soils is directly determined by the ecologi-

cal conditions of their formation and buffering capac ities. High values for the soil content of humus and clay particles facilitate active metal accumulation (sta tions 1, 3, 8, 9). In sandy-loam and sandy, alluvial meadow, saturated, and alluvial-stratified saturated

ARID ECOSYSTEMS Vol. 6 No. 1 2016

soils (stations 4, 5, 7, 8a), hydrogenic accumulation processes take primary importance, but the HM con tent in such soils is low because of the low soil humus content and the low content of absorbed cations, clay particles, and other factors (Table 1, Fig. 3).

Below, let us consider the distribution of gross HM content in the soils of the monitor stations, which is presented in Fig. 4.

Manganese. In the soils of the monitor stations, the manganese content changes from 469.8 to 1910.0 mg/kg (Fig. 4). In work of Cherkashina et.al (1998), it was established that the manganese content in pedogenic species and floodplain and delta soils varies within wider limits, from 100 to 2000 mg/kg. Meanwhile, the maximum manganese content is associated with soils with predominance of a 0.005–0.05 mm fraction and a high organic matter content. A distinct connection between the manganese concentration and landscape relief also appears—the relatively low contents (200– 300 mg/kg) are associated with "sandy" ridges, while the concentration increases to 600–800 mg/kg in interridge depressions. On average, the manganese contents in pedogenic species of the floodplain and delta is 300 and 400 mg/kg (Luk'yanchenko at al., 2001). The highest manganese concentration is asso ciated with the meadow soil of the floodplain (station 2). Moreover, an excess of manganese clarke and MPC, constituting 850 mg/kg and 1500 mg/kg, respectively, is observed (Vinogradov, 1857).

Chromium. The chromium content varies from 51.2 to 121.4 mg/kg of soil. In pedogenic species of the Don River floodplain and delta, the chromium con tent is 69 mg/kg and 97 mg/kg, respectively. On many grounds, an excess is observed not just in background values but also in the MPC of this element (Fig. 4). In the soil, chromium is multivalent with a predomi nance of poorly soluble compounds. Most of the chro mium is present in the form of Cr^{3+} as a part of minerals or in the formation of different oxides, displaying an affinity with iron-containing phases in soils. Sider ite (38–76%) and ferric hydroxides (15–25%) account for a significant part of the heavy fraction content of the Don River floodplain and delta soils (Luk'yanchenko et al., 2001).

Nickel. The amount of nickel in the soils of deltaic landscapes is below the clarke values of the lithosphere, 41.8 mg/kg and MPC. However, in floodplain landscape soils, the nickel content reaches 45.6–60.9 mg/kg, which exceeds the nickel concentration in pedogenic species of the floodplain (16 mg/kg) and delta (37 mg/kg). Nickel is mainly retained by hydroxides and ferric and manganese oxides (Minkina et al., 2013).

Copper. Copper is characterized by high organo philic qualities and is related to strong complexing agents, being fixated in the soil in the form of strong organic chelates. The amount of copper in the organ ogenic layer of the examined soils varies from 12.3 to 60.9 mg/kg (Fig. 4). Pedogenic species of Don River floodplain and delta contain 21 mg/kg and 41 mg/kg of this element. The copper content in the Don River floodplain soils is notable for its quite high values, in some cases exceeding the MPC (Fig.4).

Zinc. In pedogenic species of the floodplain and delta, the zinc content is 49 mg/kg and 84 mg/kg, which corresponds to the lithosphere clarke (according to Vino gradov (1957), the Zn clarke equals 50.0 mg/kg of spe cies), background (72 mg/kg), and MPC (100 mg/kg). The high zinc content characterizes the soils with the most humus, those of stations 6, 1 and 3, which repre sent the biogenic accumulation of metal in the humus horizons.

Lead. In pedogenic species of the floodplain, lead is 14.0 mg/kg on average and 35.0 mg/kg in deltaic species, which is higher than lead clarke (10 mg/kg). In the soils of the examined objects, the lead contribu tion varies widely, ranging from 2.5 to 33.0 mg/kg. The maximum metal concentrations are registered in monitor stations 1, 3, 5, and 5a.

Cadmium. In nature, cadmium appears in the form of small particles near smelting plants, and from there they travel into the atmosphere, soil, and water. Cadmium is not found in pedogenic species (Luk'yanchenko et al., 2001). A small amount (0.4 mg/kg on average) is regis tered in the upper soil layer. Apparently, this can be explained by aerogenic pollution of the floodplain and deltaic landscapes by cadmium.

Arsenic. The main contribution of arsenic in the Don River floodplain and deltaic landscape ecosys tems is associated with coal combustion products, waste products of the metallurgy industry, and the usage of arsenic-containing pesticides. The arsenic contribution in the soil ranges from $6.2-11.6$ mg/kg, which is several times that of the MPC and back ground values (Fig. 4). The degree of arsenic pollution in the soils fluctuates from weak to strong. Meanwhile, arsenic accumulation, in addition to external factors (the presence of pollution sources), can be caused by its chemical properties and the ability to change its allotropic form in fluctuations of redox conditions. The background content (4.8 mg/kg) and arsenic clarke (5.0 mg/kg) in soil is 2.5 times higher than the MPC.

The studied HMs can be represented in sequen tially descending order by their gross content in the soils of the monitoring stations in the floodplain and deltaic landscapes of Don River estuarine ecosystems: $Mn > Cr > Z > Ni > Cu > Bb > As > Cd.$

The assessment of soil pollution by the gross metal content does not allow a determination of mobility or the ability to transfer to adjacent media, primarily, into plants and natural waters. The content of weakly bound HM compounds in the soil is more informative (Minkina et al., 2013). The amount of weakly bound HM forms varies from 18% in meadow soil to 81% in alluvial-stratified soil, depending on the metal (Fig. 5). In floodplain landscape soils, the content of weakly bound compounds is 30–83% of the total content, on

Fig. 4. Total content of heavy metals in the soils of monitoring stations for the estuarine ecosystem floodplain of the River Don by layers, mg/kg.

ARID ECOSYSTEMS Vol. 6 No. 1 2016

Fig. 5. Content of loosely bound compounds (exchangeable, complex, specifically sorbed) and strongly bound compounds Mn, Zn, and Pb in soils of the floodplain and delta of the river Don, % of the total: I—meadow soil (station no. 2); II—alluvial-stratified soil (station no. 4); III—alluvial meadow soil (station no. 6). 1—exchangeable forms, 2—complex forms, 3—specifically sorbed forms, 4—strongly bound forms.

average, which strongly distinguishes them from zonal common chernozem soils, in which weakly bound compounds constitute only 10–20% (Table 3). The contribution of weakly bound HM compounds is highest on the sandy soils of ground 4, which is linked with a low content of humus and clay particles, which are capable of retaining HMs (Fig. 5, Table 1). Thus, with a decrease in the soil buffering capacity, the con tribution of weakly bound compounds increases, i.e. their mobility grows.

The contribution of strongly bound HM com pounds varies greatly (from 18 to 82%) depending on examined soils of monitor stations (Fig. 5) and is mainly limited by the content of the fine-dispersed fraction. Of the total reserve of strongly bound HM compounds in soils, 69–74% are metals in silicate structures. The pollution level increases the amount weakly bound metal compounds, because the forma tion of extra amounts of mobile metal forms is observed in polluted soils (Mandzhieva et al. 2014).

Metals form the following ascending series by the soil content of weakly bound (% of total content): $Cd > Pb > Mn > Zn > Cu > Ni$. The contribution of weakly bound HM compounds is highest at monitor stations 1, 4, 5, and 6. As Mazhaysky et al. (2003) noticed, with large waste capabilities, the degree of mobility can reach 73–83%. Regional characteristics of HM behavior in Lower Don floodplain and delta soils include the weakly bound compounds Cd, Pb, Mn, Cu, Ni, which are represented mainly by specifi cally absorbed forms on carbonates and Fe–Mn (hydr)oxides.

The content of the most mobile exchangeable forms is practically heterogeneous, from 1 to 63%, in the studied soils and directly depends on their buffer ing capacities and properties of chemical elements (Table 2, Fig. 5)

A wide range in the content of exchangeable zinc forms is registered in the examined station soils (up to 30-fold). Mobile (exchangeable) Zn compounds slightly exceed the MPC in the soils of monitor sta tions 1 and 6 (Table 2, Fig. 5).

The amount of exchangeable Cu forms is also insignificant and does not exceed the MPC, except for the most polluted monitor station (1), which is located

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF CONTENT AND MOBILITY OF HEAVY METALS 77

0.06 0.12 0.09 0.07 0.07 0.02 0.04 paqros 0.01 0.04 3 AL 118.3 33.6 121.8 1.7 4.1 5.6 0.8 3.6 9.5 5.8 2.1 13.9 2.1 3.7 4.1 **0.09** 0.02 0.09 5a AL 34.7 56.0 143.4 0.7 0.9 2.9 1.3 3.8 5.9 2.4 6.6 13.0 1.2 1.9 3.6 0.01 0.01 0.04 5b AL 1 40.0 1 51.5 | 63.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.9 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.07 7 AL 34.5 56.7 99.0 1.0 1.9 5.2 0.4 2.7 9.3 3.0 2.1 11.0 1.9 3.0 3.32 **0.07** 0.05 0.07 8 | AL | 48.5 | 54.2 | 123.9 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 3.2 | 8.7 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.06 8a | AL | 65.9 | 67.3 | 156.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 10.1 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 15.1 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 9 AL 67.0 76.9 120.4 2.0 3.3 4.3 0.6 2.8 4.6 3.7 5.1 10.1 1.0 3.8 4.1 0.04 0.07 0.12 4.0 3.5 4.5 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.9 19 0.2 0.2 0.4 0.3 0.05 0.01 0.3 0.4 4 | AS | 13.6 | 2.5 | 32.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 0.2 $\overline{0}$. $\overline{0.1}$ $\overline{0}$. 1 AL 133.8 165.0 231.4 1.7 5.3 12.4 **3.2** 4.6 10.7 **23.6** 3.9 23.7 3.1 3.6 5.7 **0.09** 0.08 0.2 2 L 106.3 265.5 341.7 1.1 2.3 5.3 0.6 2.2 8.1 1.2 0.6 7.5 0.8 2.4 4.5 **0.08** 0.02 0.1 5 AL 90.2 72.0 147.7 1.2 0.8 1.7 0.8 2.6 7.8 13.0 7.9 17.8 1.6 2.5 4.7 **0.18** 0.01 0.1 6 AL 113.6 88.8 139.1 1.0 1.8 3.9 1.0 9.5 14.2 **37.6** 20.0 49.2 0.8 2.9 3.0 **0.38** 0.02 0.1 specifically 0.05 0.08 0.02 0.02 0.04 0.02 0.03 0.02 0.07 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 \mathcal{C} version of the contract of the complex 0.18 0.03 0.04 0.05 0.05 0.09 0.08 0.09 0.38 0.07 0.01 0.04 0.04 0.01 700.0 4.0 3.0 23.0 6.0 0.05 exchangeable 3.32 paqios 3.6 3.0 4.5 5.7 4.5 2.0 4.7 3.9 0.2 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ specifically 3.6 2.4 0.2 $\ddot{1}$ 2.9 3.0 3.9 3.8 3.8 3.7 2.5 2.5 0.4 £ complex ∞ \ddot{c} $\overline{9}$. 0.8 0.8 $\overline{0}$ 2.5 $\overline{0}$ 0.2 6.0 $\overline{12}$ $\ddot{3}$ $\overline{3.1}$ exchangeable $\ddot{\Omega}$ 6 sorbed 23.7 7.5 13.9 17.8 49.2 11.0 2.9 13.0 7.8 $\overline{ }$ $15.$ $\overline{10}$. ∞ $\overline{19}$ specifically 20.0 3.9 0.6 $\overline{1.0}$ 7.9 6.6 2.3 3.7 0.9 3.2 \overline{z} complex \overline{c} \overline{c} \overrightarrow{a} 23.6 37.6 23.0 13.0 1.2 5.8 2.3 2.4 5.7 3.0 5.6 3.7 $0.\overline{8}$ $\overline{51}$ exchangeable paqios 10.7 7.8 5.9 5.8 14.2 4.6 Ċ 5.2 9.3 0.3 4 10.1 ∞ $\dot{\infty}$ σ specifically 3.8 0.5 1.0 5.2 9.5 $\overline{1}$ 4.3 4.6 $\mathbf{\Omega}$ \bullet 2.6 2.7 ∞ ් complex $\overline{\sim}$ $\dot{\mathfrak{c}}$ \sim 3.2 0.6 0.8 0.4 $0.\overline{8}$ $\overline{1}$ $\overline{1.0}$ 0.4 0.7 0.7 0.6 3.0 Ξ \overline{c} exchangeable sorbed 12.4 $\overline{1.0}$ 3 5.6 2.9 $4\cdot$ 3.9 5.2 4.7 $4.\overline{3}$ 0.2 $\overline{1}$. $\ddot{\cdot}$ s. specifically 5.3 $0.\overline{8}$ 0.9 0.9 1.8 1.9 2.3 0.4 3.3 0.2 $\overline{1.0}$ 1.2 Ž $\frac{1}{4}$ complex 1.7 1.7 0.9 $1.0\,$ 1.0 2.0 4.0 0.7 \overline{c} 0.7 \tilde{c} 1.2 Ξ $\overline{0}$. exchangeable paqros 4 341.7 ∞ 32.2 147.7 143.4 63.9 Q σ 156.2 120.4 4.5 139. 99. <u>123.</u> 231 $\overline{121}$ specifically 67.3 165.0 2.5 72.0 56.0 76.9 3.5 $\mathbf{\hat{c}}$ ج Ċ. ∞ \overline{C} \overline{C} $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$ 265. 33. 88. 56. র্ম. complex $\overline{5}$ 133.8 106.3 118.3 13.6 90.2 34.7 40.0 113.6 34.5 48.5 65.9 \cup 4.0 700.0 exchangeable 67 MPC (maximum MPC (maximum river Don mg/kg river Don mg/kg o
N noitsich No. Soil and No. Soil and No. Soil and No. Soil and
 $\begin{minipage}{0.9\linewidth} \centering \begin{tabular}{ccccc} \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} \\ \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} \\ \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} \\ \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{} & \$ **AS** \mathbf{H} \mathbf{r} Δ \mathbf{H} $\overline{}$ N K K 것 K \mathbf{N} $LSD_{0.5}$ (least $\mathrm{LSD}_{0.5}$ (least difference) significant significant difference) 99 5a $8\mathrm{a}$ $\overline{5}$ \circ \circ $\mathbf{\Omega}$ 4 $\overline{ }$ ∞ $\tilde{5}$

Excess over MPC is highlighted with bold. AL—alluvial-meadow soil, L—meadow soil, AS—alluvial-stratified soil. stratified soil.meadow soil, L—meadow soil, AS—alluvial-Excess over MPC is highlighted with bold. AL—alluvial-

permissible concentration)

permissible

concentration)

ARID ECOSYSTEMS Vol. 6 No. 1 2016

Table 2. Content of exchangeable, complex, and specifically sorbed forms of Mn, Ni, Cu, Zn, Pb, and Cd in the 0–20 cm soil layer of the floodplain and delta of the

Table 2. Content of exchangeable, complex, and specifically sorbed forms of Mn, Ni, Cu, Zn, Pb, and Cd in the 0-20 cm soil layer of the floodplain and delta of the

in the floodplain in the general direction of the NPS and is affected by waste products.

The amount of exchangeable Pb forms in station soils is 5–33% of the total content. The higher relative content of Pb^{2+} is linked with its ion radius. It is close to the ion radius of Ca^{2+} , which plays an important role in ion-exchange interactions (Minkina, 2008).

Exchangeable Cd forms, as well as their total con tent, exceed the MPC in the soils of many monitor stations (Table 2). The highest extractability of Cd by ammonium-acetate buffer has been confirmed in works of researchers (Plekhanova et al., 2001; Fateev et al., 2001; *Khimiya*…, 1985; etc.). The authors provide the share of Cd that transfers to this extract: it ranges from 22 to 60% of its total content.

By the content of exchangeable Mn forms, all of the studied grounds are not polluted (Table 2, Fig. 5), however, a 2.5- to 10-fold variation of the content of this metal is observed depending on soil properties (stations 1 and 2).

HMs in the studied soils form a series by the relative content of exchangeable forms (% of total amount): $Cd > Pb \ge Mn > Zn \ge Ni > Cu.$

The content of the studied HMs in complex forms is in most cases higher than in exchangeable ones (Table 2, Fig 5). HMs form a series by the content of complex forms in soils (% of total amount): Pb \geq Cu $>$ $Mn > Zn > Ni > Cu$.

The relative content of complex forms of Zn and Ni in the studied soils is only $1-12\%$ of the total content, which is explained by the weak complex-formation ability of Zn and Nu with organic matter (Piccolo and Stevenson, 1982). However, the contribution of com plex forms of Pb can reach one-third of the total metal content in the soil.

The highest content of mobile metal compounds is represented by their specifically sorbed forms, which makes a potential reserve of elements. In alluvial meadow saturated soils, which form on carbonate sed iments and have an alkalescent reaction in HM immo bilization, the role of ferric and manganese hydroxides increases, as well as that for carbonates in the specific sorption of metals.

In the studied soils, the contents of specifically sorbed metal forms are ordered in the following sequence (% of total content): $Mn \geq Cu > Pb > Zn >$ $Ni > Cd.$

CONCLUSION

The informativeness of the approach used in this work, which was based on a ranking of metal com pounds that are strongly or weakly bounded in the soil, was proven. The results allowed us to detect regional specific features in the formation of HM compounds in floodplain soils of the Don River estuarine region and the changes that occur with soil pollution and to detect the influence of different factors on the trans-

formation of metal compounds in the soils and esti mate them ecologically.

It was shown that the distribution of gross HM con tent in the investigated soils is determined primarily by their content in pedogenic species of the Don river floodplain, as well as by soil factors: the organic matter content and granulometric composition. The system of chemical element compounds forms a relationship of different compound groups, with strongly bound metal forms predominating. The soils can be ordered by their ability to strongly retain Cd, Pb, Mn, Zn, Cu, Ni: alluvial-meadow heavy-loam > alluvial meadow light-loam > meadow alluvial-deposited > alluvial meadow sandy and sandy-loam > alluvial-stratified sandy. This series completely corresponds to the decrease in their HM buffering capacity.

Among weakly bound metal compounds, specifi cally sorbed forms predominate. At some monitor sta tions, pollution by exchangeable forms of copper, zinc, and cadmium was found, which suggests techno genic HM accumulation. On the whole, the regulari ties in the distribution of mobile HM forms in the soil reproduce the regularities established for the distribu tion of their gross content.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was supported by the Russian Founda tion for Basic Research, project no. 14-05-00586 and the Russian Federation Ministry of Education and Science, project no. 5.885.2014/K.

REFERENCES

- Agafonov, E.V., Heavy metals in chernozems of Rostov oblast, in *Tyazhelye metally i radionukleidy v agroeko sistemakh* (Heavy Metals and Radionuclides in Agricul tural Ecosystems), Novocherkassk, 1994, pp. 22–26.
- *Agrokhimicheskie metody issledovaniya pochv* (Agrochemi cal Analysis of Soils), Moscow: Nauka, 1975.
- Alekseenko, V.A., Heavy metals in environment, in *Pochvy geokhimicheskikh landshaftov Rostovskoi oblasti* (Soils of Geochemical Landscapes of Rostov Oblast), Mos cow: Logos, 2002.
- Cherkashina, I.F., Dolzhenko, G.P., and Fedorov, Yu.A., Role of geomorphologic differentiation of a landscape in distribution of heavy metals in soils (by example of distribution of Mn in the Lower Don River floodplain), in *Bezopastnost' zhiznedeyatel'nosti. Okhrana truda i okruzhayushchei sredy* (Safety of Life Activities. Pro tection of Labor and Environment), Rostov-on-Don: Rostov. Gos. Akad. S-kh. Melioratsii, 2001, no. 2, pp. 74–76.
- *Ekologiya Novocherkasska. Problemy, puti reshsniya* (Ecol ogy of Novocherkassk: Problems and Their Solution), Belousova, N.V., Ed., Rostov-on-Don: Sev.-Kav. Nauch. Tsentr, Vysshei Shkoly, 2001.
- Fateev, A.I., Miroshnichenko, N.N., and Samokhvalova, V.L., Migration, translocation, and phytotoxicity of heavy

metals at polyelement pollution of soil, *Agrokhimiya*, 2001, no. 36, pp. 57–61.

- Fedorov, Yu.A., Mikhailenko, A.V., and Dotsenko, I.V., Biogeochemical conditions and their role in mass transfer of heavy metals in aquatic landscapes, in *Vse ross. nauch. konf. posvyshchennaya 100-letiyu M.A. Gla zovskoi "Geokhimiya landshaftov i geografiya pochv," Tezisy dokladov* (All-Russ. Sci. Conf. Dedicated to the 100th Anniversary of M.A. Glazovskaya "Geochemis try of Landscape and Geography of Soils," Abstracts of Papers), Moscow: Mosk. Gos. Univ., 2012, pp. 332– 334.
- Gar'kusha, D.N. and Fedorov, Yu.A., *Metan v ust'evoi oblasti reki Don* (Methane in Estuary of the Don River), Rostov-on-Don: Rostizdat, 2010.
- Il'in, V.B., Assessment of buffer capacity of soils in regard to heavy metals, *Agrokhimiya*, 1995, no. 10, pp. 109–113.
- *Khimiya tyazhelykh metallov, mysh'yaka i molibdena v poch vakh* (Chemistry of Heavy Metals, Arsenic, and Molybdenum in Soils), Moscow: Mosk. Gos. Univ., 1985.
- Luk'yanchenko, A.D., Fedorov, Yu.A., Khovanskii, A.D., and Ostroborod'ko, N.P., migration of some elements in soils of natural periodically moistening landscapes, in *Bezopastnost' zhiznedeyatel'nosti. Okhrana truda i okruzhayushchei sredy* (Safety of Life Activities. Protec tion of Labor and Environment), Rostov-on-Don: Ros tov. Gos. Akad. S-kh. Melioratsii, 2001, no. 5, pp. 31–32.
- Mandzhieva, S.S., Minkina, T.M., Motuzova, G.V., Golo vatyi, S.E., Miroshnichenko, N.N., Fateev, A.I., and Lukashenko, N.K., Fractional and group composition of zinc and lead compounds as an indicator of the envi ronmental status of soils, *Eurasian Soil Sci.,* 2014, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 511–518.
- Mazhaiskii, Yu.A., Tobratov, S.A., Dubenok, N.N., and Pozhogin, Yu.P., *Agroekologiya tekhnogenno zagryaznen nykh landshaftov* (Agricultural Ecology of Technogeni cally Polluted Landscapes), Smolensk: Manzhenta, 2003.
- Minkina, T.M., Kryshchenko, V.S., Mandzhieva, S.S., Motuzova, G.V., and Nazarenko, O.G., Forms of heavy metal compounds in soils of the steppe zone, *Eurasian Soil Sci.*, 2008a, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 708–716.
- Minkina, T.M., Kryshchenko, V.S., Mandzhieva, S.S., Motuzova, G.V., and Nazarenko, O.G., Combined approach for fractioning metal compounds in soils, *Eurasian Soil Sci.*, 2008b, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 1171– 1179.
- Minkina, T.M., Motuzova, G.V., and Nazarenko, O.G., *Sostav soedinenii tyazhelykh metallov vpochvakh* (Com-

position of Heavy Metal Compounds in Soils), Rostov on-Don: Everest, 2009.

- Minkina, T.M., Soldatov, A.V., Podkovyrina, Y.S., Motu zova, G.V., and Nevidomskaya, D.G., Molecular structural analysis of the Cu (II) ion in ordinary cher nozem: evidence from XANES spectroscopy and methods of molecular dynamics, *Dokl. Earth Sci.*, 2013, vol. 449, no. 2, pp. 418–421.
- Molodkin, P.F., *Antropogennaya geomorfologiya* (Anthropo genic Geomorphology), St. Petersburg, 1995.
- Nosovskaya, I.I., Solov'ev, G.A., and Egorov, V.S., Influ ence of prolonged systematic implementation of differ ent mineral fertilizers and manure on accumulation in soil and balance of Pb, Cd, Ni, and Cr, *Agrokhimiya*, 2001, no. 1, pp. 82–91.
- Plekhanova, I.O., Klenova, O.V., and Kutukova, Yu.D., The effect of sewage sludge on the content and frac tional composition of heavy metals in loamy-sandy soddy-podzolic soils, *Eurasian Soil Sci.*, 2001, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 440–446.
- *Praktikum po agrokhimii* (Practical Manual on Agrochemi cal Methods), Mineev, V.G., Ed., Moscow: Mosk. Gos. Univ., 1989.
- Protasova, N.A. and Gorbunova, N.S., Forms of nickel, lead, and cadmium compounds in chernozems of the Central chernozem region, *Agrokhimiya*, 2006, no. 8, pp. 68–76.
- Sparks, D.L., *Environmental Soil Chemistry*, New York: Academic, 2003, 2nd ed.
- Vinogradov, A.P., *Geokhimiya redkikh i rasseyanykh khimicheskikh elemenotv v pochvakh* (Geochemistry of Rare and Dispersed Chemical Elements in Soils), Mos cow: Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1957.
- Vladimirov, A.Kh. and Ushakov, I.I., Influence of microfer tilizers on crop yield of agricultural plants on southern chernozems of Rostov oblast, in *Mikroelementy i est estvennaya radioaktivnost' pochv* (Trace Elements and Natural Radiation of Soils), Rostov-on-Don: Rostov. Gos. Univ., 1962, pp. 72–75.
- Violante, A., Krishnamurti, G.S.R., and Pigna, M., Factors of effecting the sorption-desorption of trace elements in soil environments, in *Biophysico-Chemical Processes of Heavy Metals and Metalloids in Soil Environments*, IUPAC Ser. Biophys.-Chem. Process. Environ. Syst., Violante, A., Huang, P.M., and Gadd, G.M., Eds., New York: Wiley, 2007, pp. 169–214.

Translated by A. Khajtin