Appendix H. Root Uptake Factors

H.1 Introduction

Root uptake factors for crops have been estimated for toxic metals in the "Hot Spots" program. These toxic metals are subject to soil deposition and subsequent uptake by the roots of home raised produce. A root uptake factor is necessary to estimate a concentration in the plant from the concentration in the soil. An estimate of produce consumption can be applied to estimate dose to the residential receptor (Chapter 7). The soil-to-plant uptake factor (UF) is the ratio of the fresh weight contaminant concentration in the edible plant or plant part over the total concentration of the contaminant in wet weight soil:

$$
UF = C_{f.w.plant}/C_{wet.w. soil}
$$

(Eq. H-1)

where: $C_{f,w,\text{plant}} = \text{ fresh weight concentration in the plant (mg/kg)}$

 $C_{\text{wet.w. soil}}$ = wet weight concentration in soil (mg/kg)

In the last 25 years, a large number of studies have been published that investigated metal concentrations in edible plants grown in contaminated soils. Although most of these studies did not calculate the UF, data were often presented from which a UF could be calculated. OEHHA assembled the data from these studies into a database from which basic statistical analyses for chemical UFs were determined. The volume of studies that could be included in the database is quite large for some inorganic metals, with new studies frequently published. Our database is not an exhaustive compilation of all plant uptake studies published, however, enough data were found to reasonably estimate default UFs for most of the toxic metals and metalloids of concern.

The UFs calculated by OEHHA are based on the total metal concentration in soil and reflect the fact that most crop uptake studies estimate total metal soil concentration, usually by extraction with strong or moderately strong acids (e.g., 4 N sulfuric acid). A smaller body of uptake studies uses various mild soil extraction processes (e.g., extraction with diethyltriaminopentaacetic acid) to estimate plant bioaccessible metal concentrations in soil. Once more studies become available using an established method for estimating bioaccessible metals in contaminated soil, OEHHA may also consider developing an algorithm that incorporates a bioaccessible metal uptake factor.

The ability for crops to accumulate and translocate toxic inorganic metals and metalloids to edible parts depends to a large extent on soil and climatic factors, plant genotype and agronomic management (McLaughlin et al., 1999). In order to be most applicable to Hot Spots risk analysis, a set of criteria was applied for the selection of data used in developing soil-to-plant uptake factors.

Data used to determine root uptake factors were limited to studies that estimated contaminant concentrations in edible portions of crops raised and harvested at maturity

for human consumption. Crops that are commonly grown in backyard gardens in California were considered most relevant. For example, plant uptake studies in crops grown in tropical climates were not included in the database. Grain crops such as wheat and rice were also not included in the database because these crops are unlikely to be grown in backyard gardens. In most field studies background soil contaminant levels were unknown or not presented. However, field studies were included in the database if the study indicated that the soil was contaminated due to human causes, or that the soil contaminant concentration was considered above background levels.

Another data selection factor was soil pH because soil pH is a major influence on root uptake. Most agricultural soils in California are near neutral, with a geometric mean pH=7.2 (Holmgren et al., 1993). The range of pHs for most agricultural soils in California are roughly estimated at between 5.5 and 7.6. Thus, plant uptake studies that investigated soils with pH values within this range were considered most useful for estimating soil-to-crop uptake factors. Acidic soils tend to increase the bioavailability of divalent cationic metals such as cadmium, lead, and mercury. UFs based on acidic soils may overestimate metal uptake from pH neutral soils.

A distinction is made in the database for contaminant source between freshly added inorganic salts and other forms of the chemicals. In general, fresh addition of metal salts to soil in laboratory experiments will represent the most available form of the metal to plants. UFs developed from these studies likely represent an upper limit for plant accumulation. Where possible, UFs were calculated based on field studies that estimated plant uptake due to human-caused contamination of soils. These sources primarily included mine waste, smelter deposits, vehicle and other urban emissions, other industrial sources, wastewater effluent, compost, fertilizer, dredged material, sewage sludge, fly ash and flue dust. Ideally, UFs would be based on airborne deposition of contaminants due to emissions from nearby industrial facilities. However, uptake data from these sources were often very limited.

Most of the plant uptake studies summarized in the database presented their contaminant concentration results on a dry weight basis for both the plants and the soil. However, the soil-to-plant UF in Eq. 7.6 (Chapter 7) is expressed as a ratio of fresh weight crop concentration per wet weight soil concentration. To adjust the soil-to-plant UFs to a fresh weight crop basis, dry-to-wet weight fractions of edible portions of crops were applied using literature sources containing water content data of raw fruits and vegetables (Watt and Merrill, 1975; Baes et al., 1984; USDA, 2009). A default value of 0.8 was applied to all UFs for the dry-to-wet weight adjustment of soil, unless water content data of soil was presented in the study (Clement Associates, 1988).

As a result, two types of soil-to-plant UFs can be generated for each metal contaminant: one based on the dry weight plant over dry weight soil, and the other based on fresh weight plant over wet weight soil. A UF based on dry weights of plant and soil may be beneficial because the ratio avoids the naturally wide variations in water content of the crops and the soil. On the other hand, estimates of fruit and vegetable consumption are based on fresh weight values for the crops, which were grown in irrigated soils. This

type of UF is most applicable for contaminant exposure via the crop consumption pathway (Eq. 7.6).

Finally, some studies also presented uptake data for reference soils. This information was also entered into the database to estimate crop uptake based on control soils as well as crop uptake specifically due to deposited contaminants (i.e., contaminated soil minus control soil metal concentration). Metals of concern naturally present in soils may be largely present in the mineral fraction of the soil and not available for uptake by plants. However, it may be beneficial to know what the background soil-to-plant UF is for toxic metals to estimate the impact of anthropogenic sources of the same metals is on the soils and plants.

The database of the studies used in the analysis is presented at the end of this appendix. Studies were grouped according to each metal/metalloid for comparison purposes.

H.2 Arsenic

Arsenic can be present in well-drained soil as $H_2ASO_4^{-1}$ if the soil is acidic or as $HASO_4^{-2}$ if the soil is alkaline (Bhumbla and Keefer, 1994). Arsenite (As(III)), the reduced state of inorganic arsenic, is a toxic pollutant in natural environments. It is much more toxic and more soluble and mobile in soil than the oxidized state of inorganic arsenic, arsenate (As(V)). Under flooded conditions, As(III) would dominate, whereas aerobic conditions would favor the oxidation of As(III) to As(V). Arsenic accumulates in roots of plants grown on soils contaminated by arsenic pesticides. However, arsenic is not readily translocated to above-ground parts.

Although background mean levels of arsenic in U.S. agricultural soils could not be located, a review by Wiersma et al. (1986) showed mean levels of arsenic in European and Canadian agricultural soils to be in the range of 5 to 12 mg/kg dry soil. Kloke et al. (1984) reports that the range of arsenic in arable land to be 0.1 to 20 mg/kg dry soil. The typical dry weight concentration of arsenic in plants has been listed as 0.1 to 5 mg/kg (Vecera et al., 1999). In this document, all crops grown in As-polluted soils had an overall average dry weight arsenic concentration of about 2.5 mg/kg, which is within the range of typical plant concentrations.

Table H.1 Distribution Parameters for Arsenic Fresh Weight Soil-toplant Uptake Factors

It was observed that lower UFs were recorded in plants growing in high As-polluted soils compared to plants growing in low-level As-polluted soils. This finding, in part, led to the large range in UF values shown in Table H.1 for some types of crops. For example, in soils with low-level As contamination of < 12 mg/kg, a UF of 0.01 was calculated for both exposed and leafy crops. In exposed and leafy crops grown in soils with >12 to 745 mg/kg As (mean: 343 mg/kg), calculated UFs were 0.0002 and 0.002, respectively. This seems to suggest that many crops have the ability to resist uptake, or have a high excretion rate, of excessive amounts of As in highly polluted soils. The crop UFs in Table H.1 are based on the arithmetic mean value for low- to high-level As polluted soils.

H.3 Beryllium

Very little data could be found regarding plant uptake of beryllium from the soil. Measurable amounts of beryllium in plants are rarely observed and the toxicity of this metal to plants is reported to be high (Shacklette et al., 1978; Baes et al., 1984). Kloke et al. (1984) estimates that a general dry weight plant/soil transfer coefficient for Be is in the range of 0.01 - 0.1, similar to that found for lead and mercury.

Single soil-to-plant data points from Baes et al. (1984) for leafy and protected crops were used in Table 7-6 to represent these particular crop types. These were the only UFs that could be located in the literature. Due to expected similarities in soil-to-plant transfer, the lead UFs for root and exposed crops were used to represent the root and exposed UFs for beryllium.

H.4 Cadmium

Cadmium has the most extensive literature on root uptake of any of the toxic metals Compared to Pb, Cd is readily taken up by plants, but unlike the other heavy metals, Cd is not phytotoxic at low plant concentrations that pose a concern to human health (McLaughlin et al., 1999). Cadmium exists in solution mostly as the divalent cation, $Cd²⁺$. Plant uptake of Cd is governed by a number of factors that include soil pH, organic matter, cation exchange capacity, clay type and amount, hydrous metal oxides, carbonates, and other inorganic compounds (Mahler et al., 1987; McLaughlin et al., 1996). Acidic soils, and soils with lower clay and humus content will increase availability of Cd to plants.

The mean concentration of Cd in uncontaminated U.S. agricultural soils is 0.27 mg/kg d.w., with $5th$ and $95th$ percentiles of 0.036 and 0.78 mg/kg d.w., respectively (Holmgren et al., 1993). The mean concentration of Cd for field-contaminated soils reviewed in this document was about 8 to 9 mg/kg d.w., with a range of 0.16 to 106.5 mg/kg d.w. Typical dry weight levels of Cd in plants are expected to be between 0.1 and 1 mg/kg (Vecera et al., 1999). In this document, the overall Cd concentration in crops grown in Cd-polluted soil was about 6 mg/kg.

Table H.2 presents the UF distributions from field data only. UFs calculated from laboratory studies in which Cd salts were added to soils were not included in Table H.2, although there are a considerable number of these types of studies. Comparison of UFs calculated from field and Cd salt studies showed significantly greater UFs were obtained in crops grown in Cd salt-contaminated soil. For example, the mean leafy UF from Cd salt studies was 0.5 (n=27), which was significantly greater (p<0.0001) than the leafy UF of 0.1 based on field studies (Table H.2). The field studies were chosen to calculate the UFs because they are likely more relevant for "Hot Spots" facility soil contamination.

H.5 Chromium VI

Exposure to hexavalent chromium (Cr(VI)) as a contaminant in soil has been a contentious and complex risk assessment issue that has never been satisfactorily resolved. In both industrial and environmental situations Cr(III) and Cr(VI) can interconvert, with reduction of Cr(VI) to Cr(III) generally being favored in most soils and sediments. Rapid oxidation of a portion of Cr(III) salts or hydroxides added to almost any soil with a pH above 5 was found to occur readily, provided the soil sample was fresh and kept moist and directly from the field (Bartlett and James, 1988). However, oxidation of Cr(III) to Cr(VI) in field soils is slow compared to well mixed soils in laboratory studies, and given opportunities for its reduction, accumulated Cr(VI) from inorganic sources may rarely be measurable.

Cr(VI) added to soils may be reduced, or absorbed, or may remain in solution depending on the organic matter content, pH, and texture of the soil (Cary, 1982). In neutral to basic soil, chromium will be more available to growing plants than in acidic soil probably due to the increased stability and presence of Cr(VI) in the basic pH range.

For example, when Cr(VI) was added to near-neutral pH soil (6.65) under field conditions, most of the Cr(VI) was extracted from the soil unchanged three weeks later (Bloomfield and Pruden, 1980). Under the same field conditions, most of the added Cr(VI) to an acidic soil (pH 4.20) was reduced three weeks later. These results suggest that in some neutral pH agricultural soils, such as those found in California, constant deposition of Cr(VI) may result in accumulation of Cr(VI) in the soil and ground water.

As a soluble anion, Cr(VI) readily penetrates cell membranes, whereas Cr(III) is soluble at biological pHs only when organically complexed in low molecular weight organic complexes and, therefore, soil forms probably do not penetrate membranes (Bartlett and James, 1988). The difficulty for risk assessors is attempting to estimate what proportion of chromium deposited as Cr(VI) to soil will be available for plant uptake, presumably as Cr(VI). This problem is compounded by the difficulty of estimating the actual speciation of chromium in biological tissues during analysis. As a result, most studies only measure total chromium contents of plant parts.

Cr(III) in soil probably does not penetrate plant cell membranes as such, but is thought to undergo enhanced solubility in soil due to organic acids exuded by roots (James and Bartlett, 1984; Bartlett and James, 1988). This in turn leads to an increased oxidation of Cr(III) to Cr(VI) by soil manganese oxides. The oxidation of Cr(III) to anionic Cr(VI) enables its absorption by the roots. However, once absorbed by root tissues, it appears that most of the Cr(VI) is reduced again to Cr(III) and retained by the roots in a tightly bound or insoluble form or in a soluble complex (e.g., trioxalato chromate(III)) that is not translocated to the above-ground plant parts.

Evidence for the low translocation of chromium from roots has been observed by Lahouti (1979), in which crops that accumulated chromium from nutrient solutions labeled with either $51Cr(H)$ or $51Cr(V)$ retained about 98% of the elements in the roots. Of nine species of crops examined, the roots supplied with ⁵¹Cr(III) contained more chromium than those supplied with ${}^{51}Cr(VI)$, but chromium added as ${}^{51}Cr(VI)$ was slightly better translocated to the shoots. In another study, onion plants were grown in soil after equivalent doses (total dose not provided) of either Cr(III) or Cr(VI) added to the soil (Srivastava et al., 1994). At the lower levels that did not injure the onion plants, the chromium concentration in the plants with Cr(VI) added to soil was only marginally higher than those with Cr(III) added to soil, with most of the chromium retained in the roots and bulb.

This finding seems to suggest that much of the chromium, either added as Cr(VI) or Cr(III), had reached an equilibrium in the soil prior to uptake by the roots.Field studies in which soils were contaminated by anthropogenic sources of Cr(VI) were difficult to come by. Soils contaminated with chromium, generally from sewage sludge, tannery waste, inorganic native chromium in mine waste, are mainly present as Cr(III). Often, the contaminated soils did not exhibit concentrations above the range of typical soil chromium levels of 2 to 50 mg/kg (Kloke et al., 1984), and no chromium control level was provided in the study. Quantitative data for plant uptake of chromium added as Cr(VI) in greenhouse studies are also limited. Cary et al. (1977a, 1977b) added Cr(VI) as K_2CrO_4 to soil over the first 29-40 days after seeding several crop varieties in pots,

and then harvested the crops at maturity 70-110 days after seeding. From these data, leafy, exposed and protected crop UFs for total chromium were estimated (Table H.3). For the root UF, it was observed that roughly 10% of the chromium added as Cr(VI) to soil was incorporated in the above-ground plant parts, with the remainder incorporated into roots and bulbs (Srivastava et al., 1994). The difference between above-ground and root chromium was also reflected by a 10-fold greater concentration of chromium in roots compared to above-ground plant parts. Thus, the root UF is 10-fold greater than the leafy UF. It is currently unknown what proportion of chromium as Cr(VI) will be found in edible crops following absorption and translocation from the roots (Cary, 1982; Kimbrough et al., 1999). Bartlett and James (1988) surmised that if Cr(III) were to be translocated to above-ground plant parts, it is not unreasonable to think that if it enters the chloroplasts it might be oxidized to Cr(VI) in the powerful oxidative environment within the chloroplasts where water is oxidized to O^2 . Skeffington (1976) showed that 0.5% of the Cr(III) mixed with ground fresh barley roots was oxidized to Cr(VI). These data would suggest that a fraction of the chromium in roots is present as Cr(VI). Until further characterization of the form of chromium found in edible crops is determined, the health protective assumption is that the chromium found in crops due to root uptake is in the form of Cr(VI).

	Leafy	Exposed	Protected	Root
N	3		3	b
Minimum	0.18	$\overline{}$	0.0034	-
Maximum	0.42		0.19	
Mean $\overline{}$	0.3	0.02 0.07		З

Table H.3: Crop uptake factors for total chromium, added originally as chromium(VI) to the soil^a

^a Data were too limited to determine percentiles.
^{*b*} No quantitative data could be found for a root UF. The general finding that root levels of chromium are 10-fold greater than above-ground plant parts was to devise a root UF.

H.6 Fluoride

Fluoride (F) is strongly sorbed to soil when added as a salt, much stronger than the other halide salts of iodine, bromine and chlorine (Sheppard et al., 1993). The generally low soluble F in most soils coupled with the fact that the root endodermis acts as a barrier means that transport from root to shoot will be limited (Davison, 1982). The lack of soil-to-plant field data for fluoride resulted in a reliance on laboratory studies which added fluoride salts to the soils. The resulting UFs are shown in Table H.4.

The most important F exposure route for plants is uptake via airborne deposition of soluble fluorides of HF and particulate fluoride salts on leaf surfaces. Fluoride that deposits on leaf surfaces can be taken up through stomata of leaves once it deposits on

the surface. Uptake of F into plant leaves occurs by passive permeation of the undissociated HF molecule across the plasmalemma (Kronberger, 1987). Thus, HF behaves like a weak acid ($pKa = 3.4$) when dissolved in water, where the ionic species becomes trapped within membrane-surrounded compartments after nonionic diffusion. Little fluoride moves downward in plants to roots, from leaf to leaf or from leaves to fruits. Assessing fluoride UFs for leafy crops near airborne industrial emissions of fluoride compounds may eventually require a different algorithm to estimate airborne fluoride accumulation in leafy crops.

Tea plants (*Camellia sinensis*) are known to accumulate high concentrations of F in their leaves from soil containing elevated levels of F, resulting in considerable amounts of F in tea beverages (Davison, 1983). However, it is not known if significant cultivation of tea plants occurs in California. There is also some evidence spinach can accumulate F from soil to a greater degree than other leafy crops (Kumpulainen and Koivistoinen, 1977). The maximum fluoride UF for leafy crops shown in Table H.4 is for spinach.

	Leafy	Exposed	Protected	Root
N	5	b_{r}		റ
Minimum	0.0006	\blacksquare		0.003
Maximum	0.16	-	-	0.014
Mean	0.036	0.004	0.004	0.009

Table H.4: Fresh weight soil-to-plant uptake factors for fluoride^a

^a Data were too limited to determine percentiles.

^b No quantitative data could be found for an exposed crop UF, so the protected crop UF was used

H.7 Lead

Deposited lead (Pb) is strongly retained by most soils, resulting in lower plant concentrations (and lower UFs) relative to more bioaccessible metals such as cadmium and nickel (McLaughlin et al., 1999). Because of the usually low soil-to-root uptake, the above-ground plant parts are likely predominantly contaminated by airborne deposition of lead-containing dust or aerosols onto the plant surface (McBride, 1998). This finding emphasizes the importance of selecting studies in which the leafy plant samples are thoroughly washed prior to assessing root uptake and translocation of lead. Because inorganic lead most often exists as a divalent cation, maintaining alkaline soil conditions will reduce lead mobility in soil, while acidic soil conditions has been shown in some cases to increase soil mobility and uptake of lead through plant roots.

The mean concentration of Pb in uncontaminated U.S. agricultural soils is 12.3 mg/kg, with $5th$ and $95th$ percentiles of 4.0 and 23.0 mg/kg, respectively (Holmgren et al., 1993). The range of Pb concentrations in field-contaminated soils reviewed in this document

was large, ranging from 11 mg/kg dry soil to nearly 5500 mg/kg dry soil. Typical dry weight concentrations of Pb in plants are reported to be 0.1 to 5 mg/kg (Vecera et al., 1999), whereas the overall average Pb concentration in crops grown in Pb-polluted soil reviewed in this document was about 9.5 mg/kg.

	Leafy	Exposed	Protected	Root	
n	77	38	24	57	
minimum	0.0000375	0.00002	0.000075	0.0000425	
maximum	0.0413	0.0475	0.0278	0.0375	
mean	0.00770	0.00693	0.00282	0.00403	
median	0.00298	0.00228	0.000912	0.00125	
90 th percentile	0.0248	0.0214	0.00465	0.00962	
95 th percentile	0.0308	0.0406	0.00711	0.015	

Table H.5: Percentile distribution for lead fresh weight soil-to-plant uptake factors

H.8 Mercury

Determining the crop uptake of inorganic mercury (Hg) from soil can be problematic. (Caille et al., 2005) found that following application of radiolabeled 203 HgCl₂ to sediment in a pot experiment, 33-73% of the leaf content in cabbage, rapeseed and pasture grass was due to volatilized Hg absorbed into the leaves. Presumably, the applied inorganic Ha^{2+} was emitted from the soil after reduction to Hg^{0} in the soil whereupon it was absorbed by the leaves. Lindberg et al. (1979) observed the same phenomena in alfalfa grown in a chamber, in that above-ground plant parts primarily absorbed Hg vapor released from the soil originally contaminated with mercury mine waste including cinnabar (mercury(II) sulfide). However, the root levels of mercury were determined by direct uptake from contaminated soil and reflected the total Hg concentrations in the soil. Significantly, any Hg vapor emitted by a facility could also be absorbed directly onto leafy crops.

Nearly all studies examined by OEHHA for crop Hg uptake from soil measured total Hg content and did not account for potential volatilization of elemental Hg from soil. Therefore, the soil-to-plant UF for mercury in above-ground plant parts (primarily leafy) includes both root uptake from soil and leaf uptake through volatilization from soil. It is unclear what portion of Hg oxidizes to inorganic Hg once absorbed by leaves, although mercury in food stuffs are mainly in the inorganic form (WHO, 1991). Therefore, a health protective assumption is that the Hg in crops is all in the inorganic form.

Another possible factor to consider is the uptake of methyl mercury (MeHg) by plants. Although it is not expected that Hot Spots facilities would emit MeHg, a fraction of total Hg emitted and deposited to soil could be converted to MeHg in soil. Generally, this may not be a concern in cropland soils, as the content of MeHg would be very low. Nevertheless, results by Gnamus et al. (2001) observed MeHg to be approximately 10 times more phytoavailable then total Hg in an ecotoxicology field study of an Hgpolluted region. Phytoavailability of both total Hg and MeHg increases with decreasing soil pH below 7 and decreased soil content of organic matter.

In rice paddies exposed to Hg smelting and mining facilities, it was found that the percent of total Hg in soil that was MeHg ranged from 0.092 to 0.003 percent (Horvat et al., 2003). However, the percent of total Hg that was MeHg in brown rice grown in the contaminated region ranged from 5 to 84 percent, indicating preferential uptake of MeHg from soil. The resulting UFs for rice ranged from 550 to 6000, suggesting rice may be a high accumulator of MeHg. However, the risk assessment conducted by Horvat et al. (2003) could not establish a clear correlation between total Hg and MeHg in soil and in rice, indicating that uptake and retention of Hg in rice is influenced by a number of factors other than total Hg in soil. Although background mean levels of Hg in U.S. agricultural soils could not be located, a review by Wiersma et al. (1986) showed mean levels of Hg in European and Canadian agricultural soils to be in the range of 0.06 to 0.2 mg/kg dry soil. On average, the concentration of Hg in polluted soils reported in studies reviewed for this document was about 3.6 mg/kg. Typical dry weight plant concentrations of Hg are listed as 0.001 to 0.3 mg/kg (Vecera et al., 1999). In this document, the overall Hg concentration in crops grown in Hg-polluted soils was about 0.2 mg/kg.

	Leafy	Exposed	Protected	Root		
n	33	23	15	18		
minimum	0.00021	0.000248	0.000106	0.00111		
maximum	0.0813	0.0938	0.0363	0.0588		
mean	0.0163	0.00855	0.00804	0.0119		
median	0.00875	0.00225	0.00514	0.00553		
90th percentile	0.0478	0.0175	0.016	0.0274		
95th percentile	0.06	0.0198	0.0223	0.0545		

Table H.6: Percentile distribution for mercury fresh weight soil-to-plant uptake factors

H.9 Nickel

Nickel (Ni) is considered to be one of the more mobile heavy metals in soils (Sauerbeck and Hein, 1991). However, in contrast to Cd, the toxicity of Ni in mammals is lower and phytotoxicity occurs at lower concentrations. Similar to other divalent, cationic metals, acidification of soil increases bioavailability, and liming of soil decreases bioavailability, of Ni to plants. The UF data presented in Table H.7 are based on field-contaminated studies. One study that added Ni salts to soil can be found in the database, but appeared to result in increased plant uptake compared to the field data and was, thus, not included for the UF calculations.

The mean concentration of Ni in uncontaminated U.S. agricultural soils is 23.9 mg/kg, with $5th$ and $95th$ percentiles of 4.1 and 56.8 mg/kg, respectively (Holmgren et al., 1993). The mean concentration of Ni for field-contaminated soils reviewed in this document was about 70 mg/kg d.w., with a range of 13 to 122 mg/kg d.w. Typical Ni levels in plants are expected to be in the range of 0.1 to 5 mg/kg dry weight (Vecera et al., 1999). In this report, the overall mean dry weight concentration of Ni in crops was about 9 mg/kg.

	Leafy	Protected Exposed				
n	11	13	9	11		
minimum	0.00135	0.00025	0.00875	0.00163		
maximum	0.0375	0.00625	0.075	0.0175		
mean	0.0145	0.00293	0.0305	0.00638		
median	0.00888	0.00224	0.025	0.00463		
90 th percentile	0.0250	0.00610	0.055	0.0125		
95 th percentile	0.0313	0.00618	0.065	0.0150		

Table H.7 Percentile distribution for nickel fresh weight soil-to-plant uptake factors

H.10 Selenium

The major inorganic species of selenium (Se) in plant sources is selenate, which is translocated directly from the soil and is less readily bound to soil components than selenite (McLaughlin et al., 1999; Rayman, 2008) .The more reduced forms, selenide and elemental Se, are virtually insoluble and do not contribute directly to plant uptake. Other major Se species in plants are biosynthesized, including selenomethionine, smaller amounts of selenocysteine, and Se-containing proteins. At pH values around 7.0 or greater, oxidation to the more soluble selenate ion is favored. Thus, endemic vegetation in alkaline, seleniferous soil of the western U.S. has evolved that is highly tolerant and can hyperaccumulate Se (McLaughlin et al., 1999).

However, potential Se-accumulators that are food sources for humans are largely limited to Brazil nuts, a tree crop that is not grown in California (Rayman et al., 2008). Crops of the Brassica (e.g., broccoli, cabbage) and Allium (e.g., onions, garlic, leeks, chives) families appear to more readily accumulate Se than other crops, and form the Se detoxification products Se-methyl-selenocysteine and gamma-glutamyl-Se-methylselenocysteine. Se-enriched plants have been shown in animals to have potent antitumor effects that are attributed to these Se detoxification products (Rayman et al., 2008).

Though there is no direct evidence in humans, it is generally accepted on the basis of animal studies that inorganic forms of Se are more acutely toxic than organic species, selenite being slightly more toxic than selenate (Rayman et al., 2008). In chronic studies of humans, lower toxicity is seen with organically bound Se, although there are limited data on the toxicity of individual compounds.

Selenomethionine is known to be the main Se species present in the diet of Chinese who developed chronic selenosis from consumption of high-Se-containing maize and rice. Based on these Chinese studies, 1540 and 819 µg/day were established as the LOAEL and NOAEL, respectively, for total daily Se intake (Rayman, 2008). However, the levels found in crops rarely accumulate greater than 25-30 µg/g even in seleniferous areas suggesting other sources of Se are also contributors to chronic Se toxicity.

Although the UF data for Se were limited, an overall mean dry weight crop Se concentration of about 4 mg/kg was calculated from the reviewed studies, with a maximum crop concentration of 19 mg/kg. Kloke et al. (1984) observed a general dry weight UF for Se in plants would be 0.1 to 10. Based on the studies examined in this document, an overall dry weight uptake factor of 0.9 was calculated for crops grown in Se-polluted soils, which was within the range predicted. Field contamination studies were the primary source of the UF distribution data in Table H.8. The Se pollution sources included mainly fly ash, smelters and compost.

Table H.8: Percentile distribution for selenium fresh weight soil-to-plant uptake factors

H.11 Summary and Recommendations

OEHHA recommends the root uptake factors in Table H.16 for metals and metalloids.

^a Soil-to-plant UFs represent the fresh weight concentration of a contaminant in the plant part over the wet weight concentration of contaminant in the soil.

H.12 Database

The database that lists all of the studies, values, with references is presented as Table H.9-1 through Table H.15-4 in the following pages.

Abbreviations in these tables:

soil conc bckd: the concentration of the chemical in the control soil samples

soil conc contam: the concentration of the chemical in the soil treated with the chemical

tissue conc bckg: the concentration of the chemical in the control tissue samples of the crop

tissue conc contam: the concentration of the chemical in the tissue of the crop grown in the soil treated with the chemical

contam: the related sample treated with the chemical

wt: weight

dw: dry weight

wet w: wet weight

ww: wet weight

Calculation:

Uptake factor (contam) wet wt plant/dw soil = Uptake factor (contam) dry wt \times dry-to-wet wt conversion factor

Uptake factor (contam) wet wt plant/dw soil

Uptake factor (contam) ww plant/wet w soil =------dry-to-wet weight fraction for soil (0.8)

Table H.9-1 Arsenic field studies on leafy crops.

Table H.9-1 Arsenic field studies on leafy crops.

Average Arsenic uptake factor in leafy crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00666±0.00982

Table H.9-2 Arsenic field studies on exposed crops.

Average Arsenic uptake factor in exposed crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0158±0.0313

Table H.9-3 Arsenic field studies on protected crops.

Average Arsenic uptake factor in protected crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0664±0.0962

Table H.9-4 Arsenic field studies on root crops.

Average Arsenic uptake factor in root crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00828±0.0129

Average cadmium uptake factor in leafy crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.139±0.214

Table H.10-2 Cadmium field studies on exposed crops.

Table H.10-2 Cadmium field studies on exposed crops.

Average cadmium uptake factor in exposed crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0216±0.0304

Average cadmium uptake factor in protected crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0134±0.0175

Table H.10-4 Cadmium field studies on root crops.

Table H.10-4 Cadmium field studies on root crops.

Table H.10-4 Cadmium field studies on root crops.

Average cadmium uptake factor in root crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0683±0.144

Average lead uptake factor in leafy crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0077±0.0104

Table H.11-2 Lead field studies on exposed crops.

Table H.11-2 Lead field studies on exposed crops.

Average lead uptake factor in exposed crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00693±0.0124

Table H.11-3 Lead field studies on protected crops.

Average lead uptake factor in protected crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00282±0.00565

Table H.11-4 Lead field studies on root crops.

							dry-	Uptake	Uptake		
	soil			tissue	tissue		to-wet	factor	factor		
	conc	soil		conc	conc	Uptake	wt	(contam)	(contam)		
	bckd	conc		bckg	contam	factor	conve	wet wt	ww		
	(mg)	contam	Common	dry wt	dry wt	(contam)	r-sion	plant/dw	plant/wet		
Study Type	kg)	(mg/kg)	Name	(mg/kg)	(mg/kg)	dry wt	factor	soil	w soil	Reference	
field-ground water		28	potato		0.5	0.0179	0.222	0.003974	0.0049673	Alam et al. 2003	
salt	40.5	744.5	carrot	0.312	5.754	0.0077	0.118	0.000912	0.00114	Alexander et al. (2006)	
salt	40.5	744.5	Onion	1.418	7.458	0.0100	0.125	0.001252	0.0015652	Alexander et al. 2006	
smelter - field - home gardens		130	carrot		2.2	0.0169	0.118	0.002	0.0025	Chaney et al., 1988	
smelter - field - home gardens		48	potato		2.6	0.0542	0.202	0.01	0.0125	Chaney et al., 1988	
field		103	beetroot		0.4	0.0039	0.222	0.000862	0.0010777	Chumbley and Unwin 1982	
field		97	leeks		0.8	0.0082	0.2	0.001649	0.0020619	Chumbley and Unwin 1982	
field		176	potato		0.2	0.0011	0.222	0.000252	0.0003153	Chumbley and Unwin 1982	
field		110	radish		2.9	0.0264	0.222	0.005853	0.0073159	Chumbley and Unwin 1982	
field		107	onions		0.6	0.0056	0.125	0.000701	0.0008762	Chumbley and Unwin 1982	
25% mine waste - grnhs	60.9	3600	radish	$\mathbf 0$	92.4	0.0257	0.047	0.0012	0.0015	Cobb et al., 2000	
smelter flue-dust	6.8	146.3	potato	0.2	0.2	0.0014	0.222	0.000303	0.0003794	Dudka et al. (1996)	
smelter flue-dust	6.8	340	potato	0.2	0.4	0.0012	0.222	0.000261	0.0003265	Dudka et al. 1996	
smelter flue-dust	6.8	2202.5	potato	0.2	0.7	0.0003	0.222	7.06E-05	8.82E-05	Dudka et al. 1996	
smelter flue-dust	6.8	5452.5	potato	0.2	0.9	0.0002	0.222	3.66E-05	4.58E-05	Dudka et al. 1996	
urban gardens-field			carrot				0.118	0.0006	0.00075	Finster et al., (2004)	
urban gardens-field			onion				0.125	0.004	0.005	Finster et al., 2004	
urban gardens-field			radish				0.047	0.00094	0.001175	Finster et al., 2004	
indust. sewage-field-Egypt	ND	334	garlic		$\mathbf{1}$	0.0030	0.387	0.001	0.00125	Gorbunov et al., 2003	
indust. sewage-field-Egypt	ND	334	onion		$1.1\,$	0.0030	0.125	0.0004	0.0005	Gorbunov et al., 2003	
indust. sewage-field-Egypt	ND	334	radish		2.3	0.0070	0.047	0.0003	0.000375	Gorbunov et al., 2003	
sewage sludge-field	70	259	carrot	0.33	0.48	0.0040	0.118	0.0005	0.000625	Hooda et al., 1997	
Pb arsenate - grnhs	60.9	342.3	carrot	3.9	13.3	0.0400	0.118	0.005	0.00625	Hutchinson et al. (1974)	
Pb arsenate - grnhs	60.9	342.3	onion	10	75.4	0.2000	0.125	0.03	0.0375	Hutchinson et al. 1974	
Pb arsenate - grnhs	60.9	342.3	parsnip	7.8	14.8	0.0400	0.209	0.008	0.01	Hutchinson et al. 1974	
Pb arsenate - grnhs	60.9	342.3	radish	7.9	27.5	0.0800	0.047	0.004	0.005	Hutchinson et al. 1974	
field		14.49	carrot		0.92	0.0635	0.118	0.007492	0.0093651	Liu et al. 2006	
field		14.49	leek		0.92	0.0635	0.146	0.00927	0.0115873	Liu et al. 2006	
field		14.48	radish		0.47	0.0325	0.047	0.001526	0.0019069	Liu et al. 2006	
Env. contam. Soil (paint?) - potted - grnhs		2000	beet		19	0.0095	0.127	0.001	0.00125	Nicklow et al., 1983	

Table H.11-4 Lead field studies on root crops.

							dry-	Uptake factor	Uptake factor		
	soil conc	soil		tissue conc	tissue conc	Uptake	to-wet wt	(contam)	(contam)		
	bckd	conc		bckg	contam	factor	conve	wet wt	ww		
	(mg)	contam	Common	dry wt	dry wt	(contam)	r-sion	plant/dw	plant/wet		
Study Type	kg)	(mg/kg)	Name	(mg/kg)	(mg/kg)	dry wt	factor	soil	w soil	Reference	
Env. contam. Soil (paint?) - potted - grnhs		2000	carrot		34	0.0170	0.118	0.002	0.0025	Nicklow et al., 1983	
Env. contam. Soil (paint?) - potted - grnhs		2000	turnip		22	0.0110	0.085	0.0009	0.001125	Nicklow et al., 1983	
indust. Poll. Depo. - field		165.85	carrot		8.16	0.0490	0.118	0.0058	0.00725	Pandey and Pandey, 2009	
indust. Poll. Depo. - field		165.85	radish		11.7	0.0710	0.047	0.0033	0.004125	Pandey and Pandey, 2009	
smelter area - ag field	30	440	potato	0.099	0.099	0.0002	0.202	0.000045	5.625E-05	Pruvot et al., 2006	
smelter area - urban gardens - field	84	872	carrot	0.25	1.17	0.0013	0.118	0.00024	0.0003	Pruvot et al., 2006	
smelter area - urban gardens - field	84	872	leek	0.34	2.67	0.0031	0.146	0.00045	0.0005625	Pruvot et al., 2006	
smelter area - urban gardens - field	84	872	potato	0	0.15	0.0002	0.202	0.000034	0.0000425	Pruvot et al., 2006	
smelter area - urban gardens - field	84	872	radish	$\mathbf 0$	3.83	0.0044	0.047	0.00021	0.0002625	Pruvot et al., 2006	
landfill-field		1000	carrot unp		5.1	0.0051	0.104	0.00053	0.0006625	Samsoe-Petersen et al., 2002	
landfill-field		1000	potato unp		$\overline{2}$	0.0020	0.113	0.00023	0.0002875	Samsoe-Petersen et al., 2002	
landfill-field		1000	radish		7.4	0.0074	0.036	0.00027	0.0003375	Samsoe-Petersen et al., 2002	
moderate urban poll -field		130	carrot unp		0.93	0.0070	0.118	0.0009	0.001125	Samsoe-Petersen et al., 2002	
moderate urban poll -field		130	potato unp		0.18	0.0010	0.222	0.0003	0.000375	Samsoe-Petersen et al., 2002	
moderate urban poll -field		130	radish		1.65	0.0100	0.085	0.001	0.00125	Samsoe-Petersen et al., 2002	
sewage sludge-pot-field		154	carrots			0.0030	0.118	0.0004	0.0005	Sauerbeck, 1991	
sewage sludge-pot-field		154	radish			0.0200	0.05	0.0009	0.001125	Sauerbeck, 1991	
field-wastewater	0.32	2.04	onion	0.22	0.46	0.2300	0.125	0.028	0.035	Shariatpanahi and Anderson 1986	
field-wastewater	0.32	2.04	radish	0.28	0.73	0.3600	0.047	0.02	0.025	Shariatpanahi and Anderson 1986	
flooded gardens		85.2	carrot		0.81	0.0095	0.118	0.001122	0.0014023	Sipter et al. 2008	
flooded gardens		85.2	onion		1.06	0.0124	0.125	0.001555	0.001944	Sipter et al. 2008	
non-flooded gardens		27.8	carrot		0.278	0.0100	0.118	0.00118	0.001475	Sipter et al. 2008	
non-flooded gardens		27.8	onion		0.13	0.0047	0.125	0.000585	0.0007307	Sipter et al. 2008	
smelter contam - field	22	163	potato		2.95	0.0180	0.202	0.0037	0.004625	Tomov & Alandjiyski, 2006	
field - smelter	21.6	319.6	carrot			0.0320	0.108	0.003456	0.00432	Zheng et al. 2007a	
field - smelter	21.6	319.6	turnip			0.0270	0.088	0.002376	0.00297	Zheng et al. 2007a	
field - smelter		167	potato				0.11	0.001	0.001	Zheng et al. 2007b	

Average lead uptake factor in root crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00403±0.0075

Table H.12-1 Mercury field studies on leafy crops.

Average mercury uptake factor in leafy crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0163±0.0202

Table H.12-2 Mercury field studies on exposed crops.

Average mercury uptake factor in exposed crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00855±0.0194

Table H.12-3 Mercury field studies on protected crops.

Average mercury uptake factor in protected crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00804±0.0096

Table H.12-4 Mercury field studies on root crops.

Average mercury uptake factor in root crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0119±0.0167

Table H.13-1 Nickel field studies on leafy crops

Average nickel uptake factor in leafy crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0145±0.0121

Table H.13-2 Nickel field studies on exposed crops

Average nickel uptake factor in exposed crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00293±0.00226

Table H.13-3 Nickel field studies on protected crops

Average nickel uptake factor in protected crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0306±0.0224

Table H.13-4 Nickel field studies on root crops

Average nickel uptake factor in root crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.00638±0.00516

Average selenium uptake factor in leafy crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0587±0.0713

Table H.15-2 Selenium field studies on exposed crops

Average selenium uptake factor in exposed crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0415±0.0776

Table H.15-3 Selenium field studies on protected crops

Average selenium uptake factor in protected crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.256±0.450

Study Type	soil conc bckd (mg/kg)	soil conc contam (mg/kg)	Crop Name	tissue conc bckg dry wt (mg/kg)	tissue conc contam dry wt (mg/kg)	Uptake factor (contam) dry wt	dry-to- wet wt conver- sion factor	Uptake factor (contam) wet wt plant/dw soil	Uptake factor (contam) ww plant/wet w soil	Reference
field-compost			Beet				0.164	0.0098107	0.0122634	Cappon 1987
field-fly ash-potted soil	0.3	1.2	carrot	0.015	1.5	1.3	0.118	0.1	0.125	Furr et al. 1979
field-compost			carrot				0.118	0.0082179	0.0102723	Cappon 1987
field-fly ash - pot	1.5	1.7	carrot (peeled)	0.02	0.06	0.04	0.118	0.004	0.005	Furr et al. 1978
field-compost			onion				0.125	0.0550223	0.0687779	Cappon 1987
field-fly ash - pot	1.5	1.7	Onion (peeled)	0.02	0.21	0.1	0.125	0.02	0.025	Furr et al. 1978
field-fly ash-potted soil	0.3	1.2	potato	0.025	1.8	1.5	0.222	0.3	0.375	Furr et al. 1979
field-fly ash - pot field-compost	1.5	1.7	Potato (peeled) radish	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.222 0.222	0.004 0.0391143	0.005 0.0488929	Furr et al. (1978b) Cappon 1987
field-compost			turnip				0.222	0.0112321	0.0140402	Cappon 1987

Table H.15-4 Selenium field studies on root crops

Average selenium uptake factor in root crops (fresh weight conc. in plant / wet weight conc. in soil) = 0.0689±0.114

H.13 References

Alam MGM, Snow ET and Tanaka A (2003). Arsenic and heavy metal contamination of vegetables grown in Samta village, Bangladesh. Sci Total Environ 308(1-3): 83-96.

Alexander PD, Alloway BJ and Dourado AM (2006). Genotypic variations in the accumulation of Cd, Cu, Pb and Zn exhibited by six commonly grown vegetables. Environ Pollut 144(3): 736-745.

BaÅŸar H and Aydinalp C (2005). Heavy metal contamination in peach trees irrigated with water from a heavily polluted creek. J Plant Nutr 28(11): 2049 - 2063.

Baes CFI, Sharp RD, Sjoreen AL and Shor RW. (1984). A review and analysis of parameters for assessing transport of environmentally released radionuclides through agriculture. ORNL-5786. U. S. Dept. of Energy. Oak Ridge, TN.

Bartlett RJ and James BR (1988). Mobility and bioavailability of chromium in soils. In: Chromium in the Natural and Human Environments. Nraigu J. O. and Nieborer E., eds Wiley. New York: 267-303.

Bhumbla D and Keefer R (1994). Arsenic mobilization and bioavailability in soils. In: Advances in Environmental Science and Technology. Nriagu J. O. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, New York, USA; Chichester, England, UK. : 26: 51-82.

Bi X, Feng X, Yang Y, Qiu G, Li G, Li F, Liu T, Fu Z and Jin Z (2006). Environmental contamination of heavy metals from zinc smelting areas in Hezhang County, western Guizhou, China. Environ Int 32(7): 883-890.

Bloomfield C and Pruden G (1980). The behaviour of Cr(VI) in soil under aerobic and anaerobic conditions. Environmental Pollution Series A, Ecological and Biological 23(2): 103-114.

Caille N, Vauleon C, Leyval C and Morel J-L (2005). Metal transfer to plants grown on a dredged sediment: use of radioactive isotope 203Hg and titanium. Sci Total Environ 341(1-3): 227-239.

Cambra K, MartÃ-nez T, Urzelai A and Alonso E (1999). Risk Analysis of a Farm Area Near a Lead- and Cadmium-Contaminated Industrial Site. J Soil Contamin 8(5): 527 - 540.

Cappon CJ (1987). Uptake and speciation of mercury and selenium in vegetable crops grown on compost-treated soil. Water Air Soil Pollut 34(4): 353-361.

Cary E (1982). Chromium in air, soil and natural waters. In: Biological and Environmental Aspects of Chromium, Langard S. ed., Elsevier. Amsterdam: 49-64.

Cary EE (1977a). Control of chromium concentrations in food plants. 1. Absorption and translocation of chromium by plants. J Agric Food Chem 25(2): 300-304.

Cary EE (1977b). Control of chromium concentrations in food plants. 2. Chemistry of chromium in soils and its availability to plants. Journal of agricultural and food chemistry 25(2): 305-309.

Chaney RL, Beyer WN, Gifford CH and Sileo L (1988). Effects of zinc smelter emissions on farms and gardens at Palmerton, PA. in: Trace Substances in Environmental Health - 22. Hemphill DD (ed), University of Missouri, Columbia, pp 263-280

Chumbley CG and Unwin RJ (1982). Cadmium and lead content of vegetable crops grown on land with a history of sewage sludge application. Environmental Pollution Series B, Chemical and Physical 4(3): 231-237.

Clement Associates I. (1988). Multi-pathway Health Risk Assessment Input Parameters Guidance Document. Prepared for the South Coast Air Quality Management District by Clement Associates, Inc. Fairfax, Virginia

Clemente R, Walker DJ and Bernal MP (2005). Uptake of heavy metals and As by Brassica juncea grown in a contaminated soil in Aznalcóllar (Spain): The effect of soil amendments. Environ Pollut 138(1): 46-58.

Cobb GP, Sands K, Waters M, Wixson BG and Dorward-King E (2000). Accumulation of heavy metals by vegetables grown in mine wastes. Environ Toxicol Chem 19(3): 600- 607.

Crews HM and Davies BE (1985). Heavy metal uptake from contaminated soils by six varieties of lettuce (Lactuca sativa L.). J Agric Sci 105(03): 591-595.

Davison A (1982). The effects of fluorides on plant growth and forage quality. In: Effects of Gaseous Pollutants in Agriculture and Horticulture. Unsworth M. and Ormrod D. University of Nottingham School of Agriculture Butterworth, London: 267-292.

Davison A (1983). Uptake, transport and accumulation of.soil and airborne fluorides by vegetation. In: Fluorides : Effects on Veftetation, Animals atid Humans. Shupe J., Peterson H. and Leone N.(eds) Paragon Press. Salt Lake City, Utah 61-82.

Dudka S, Piotrowska M and Terelak H (1996). Transfer of cadmium, lead, and zinc from industrially contaminated soil to crop plants: A field study. Environ Pollut 94(2): 181-188.

Feng X, Li G and Qiu G (2006). A preliminary study on mercury contamination to the environment from artisanal zinc smelting using indigenous methods in Hezhang County, Guizhou, China: Part 2. Mercury contaminations to soil and crop. Sci Total Environ 368(1): 47-55.

Finster ME, Gray KA and Binns HJ (2004). Lead levels of edibles grown in contaminated residential soils: a field survey. Sci Total Environ 320(2-3): 245-257.

Furr AK (1978a). Elemental content of tissues and excreta of lambs, goats, and kids fed white sweet clover growing on fly ash. J Agric Food Chem 26(4): 847-851.

Furr AK (1978b). Elemental content of vegetables, grains, and forages field-grown on fly ash amended soil. J Agric Food Chem 26(2): 357-359.

Furr AK, Parkinson TF, Elfving DC, Gutenmann WH, Pakkala IS and Lisk DJ (1979). Elemental content of apple, millet, and vegetables grown in pots of neutral soil amended with fly ash. J Agric Food Chem 27(1): 135-138.

Giordano PM, Mays DA and Behel AD (1979). Soil temperature effects on uptake of cadmium and zinc by vegetables grown on sludge-amended soil. J Environ Qual 8(2): 233-236.

Gnamus A, Zupan M and Sajn R (2001). Mercury and methylmercury in soil and vegetation of various polluted areas in Slovenia. RMZ - Materials and Geoenvironment 48(1): 94-108.

Gorbunov AV, Frontasyeva MV, Kistanov AA, Lyapunov SM, Okina OI and Ramadan AB (2003). Heavy and Toxic Metals in Staple Foodstuffs and Agriproduct from Contaminated Soils. J Environ Sci Health B 38(2): 181 - 192.

He QB and Singh BR (1994). Crop uptake of cadmium from phosphorus fertilizers: I. Yield and cadmium content. Water Air Soil Pollut 74(3): 251-265.

Holmgren GGS, Meyer MW, Chaney RL and Daniels RB (1993). Cadmium, lead, zinc, copper, and nickel in agricultural soils of the United States of America. J Environ Qual 22(2): 335-348.

Hooda PS, McNulty D, Alloway BJ and Aitken MN (1997). Plant availability of heavy metals in soils previously amended with heavy applications of sewage sludge. J Sci Food Agric 73(4): 446-454.

Horvat M, Nolde N, Fajon V, Jereb V, Logar M, Lojen S, Jacimovic R, Falnoga I, Liya Q, Faganeli J and Drobne D (2003). Total mercury, methylmercury and selenium in mercury polluted areas in the province Guizhou, China. Sci Total Environ 304(1-3): 231- 256.

Hu X and Ding Z (2009). Lead/Cadmium Contamination and Lead Isotopic Ratios in Vegetables Grown in Peri-Urban and Mining/Smelting Contaminated Sites in Nanjing, China. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol 82(1): 80-84.

Huang B, Kuo S and Bembenek R (2003). Cadmium uptake by lettuce from soil amended with phosphorus and trace element fertilizers. Water Air Soil Pollut 147(1): 109-127.

Huang B, Kuo S and Bembenek R (2004). Availability of cadmium in some phosphorus fertilizers to field-grown lettuce. Water Air Soil Pollut 158(1): 37-51.

Huang M, Zhou S, Sun B and Zhao Q (2008). Heavy metals in wheat grain: Assessment of potential health risk for inhabitants in Kunshan, China. Sci Total Environ 405(1-3): 54- 61.

Huang R-Q, Gao S-F, Wang W-L, Staunton S and Wang G (2006). Soil arsenic availability and the transfer of soil arsenic to crops in suburban areas in Fujian Province, southeast China. Sci Total Environ 368(2-3): 531-541.

Huq SMI and Naidu R (2005). Arsenic in groundwater and contamination of the food chain: Bangladesh scenario. In: Natural Arsenic in Groundwater: Occurrence, Remediation and Management. Bundschuh J. (ed). Taylor & Francis Group. London: 95-101.

Hutchinson TC, Czuba M and Cunningham L (1974). Lead, cadmium, zinc, copper and nickel distributions in vegetables and soils of an intensely cultivated area and levels of copper, lead and zinc in the growers. in: Trace Substances in Environmental Health - 8, University of Missouri, Columbia, pp 81-93

Jackson AP and Alloway BJ (1991). The transfer of cadmium from sewage-sludge amended soils into the edible components of food crops. Water Air Soil Pollut 57-58(1): 873-881.

Jamali MK, Kazi TG, Arain MB, Afridi HI, Jalbani N and Memon AR (2007). Heavy metal contents of vegetables grown in soil, irrigated with mixtures of wastewater and sewage sludge in Pakistan, using ultrasonic-assisted pseudo-digestion. J Agron Crop Sci 193(3): 218-228.

James BR and Bartlett RJ (1984). Plant-soil interactions of chromium. J Environ Qual 13(1): 67.

Jansson G and \tilde{A} -born I (2000). Cadmium Content of Swedish Carrots and the Influence of Soil Factors. Acta Agric Scand B 50(2): 49 - 56.

John MK (1972). Mercury uptake from soil by various plant species. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol 8(2): 77-80.

Kimbrough DE, Cohen Y, Winer A, Creelman L and Mabuni C (1999). A critical assessment of chromium in the environment. Crit Rev Environ Sci Tech 29: 1.

Kloke A, Sauerbeck D and Vetter H (1984). The contamination of plants and soils with heavy metals and the transport of metals in terrestrial food chains. In: Changing Metal Cycles and Human Health: Report of the Dahlem Workshop on Changing Metal Cycles and Human Health. Nriagu J. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. Berlin, Germany: 113-141.

Kronberger W (1987). Kinetics of nonionic diffusion of hydrogen fluoride in plants I. Experimental and theoretical treatment of weak acid permeation. Phyton (Horn) 27(2): 241-265.

Kumar Sharma R, Agrawal M and Marshall F (2007). Heavy metal contamination of soil and vegetables in suburban areas of Varanasi, India. Ecotoxicol Environ Safety 66(2): 258-266.

Kumpulainen J and Koivistoinen P (1977). Fluorine in foods. Residue Rev 68: 37-57.

Lahouti M (1979). Chromium accumulation and distribution in crop plants. J Sci Food Agric 30(2): 136-142.

Larsen EH, Moseholm L and Nielsen MM (1992). Atmospheric deposition of trace elements around point sources and human health risk assessment. II: Uptake of arsenic and chromium by vegetables grown near a wood preservation factory. Sci Total Environ 126(3): 263-275.

Li G, Feng X, Qiu G, Bi X, Li Z, Zhang C, Wang D, Shang L and Guo Y (2008). Environmental mercury contamination of an artisanal zinc smelting area in Weining County, Guizhou, China. Environ Pollut 154(1): 21-31.

Li Y, Wang Y, Gou X, Su Y and Wang G (2006). Risk assessment of heavy metals in soils and vegetables around non-ferrous metals mining and smelting sties, Baiyin, China. J Environ Sci 18(1124-1134).

Lindberg SE, Jackson DR, Huckabee JW, Janzen SA, Levin MJ and Lund JR (1979). Atmospheric emission and plant uptake of mercury from agricultural soils near the Almaden mercury mine. J Environ Qual 8(4): 572-578.

Liu H, Probst A and Liao B (2005). Metal contamination of soils and crops affected by the Chenzhou lead/zinc mine spill (Hunan, China). Sci Total Environ 339(1-3): 153-166.

Liu WX, Li HH, Li SR and Wang YW (2006). Heavy Metal Accumulation of Edible Vegetables Cultivated in Agricultural Soil in the Suburb of Zhengzhou City, People's Republic of China. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol 76(1): 163-170.

Lokeshwari H (2006). Impact of heavy metal contamination of Bellandur Lake on soil and cultivated vegetation. Curr Science (Bangalore) 91(5): 622.

MacLean AJ (1974). Mercury in plants and retention of mercury by soils in relation to properties and added sulfur. Can J Soil Sci 54: 287.

Mahler RJ, Ryan JA and Reed T (1987). Cadmium sulfate application to sludgeamended soils I. Effect on yield and cadmium availability to plants. Sci Total Environ 67(2-3): 117-131.

Mathe-Gaspar G and Anton A (2002). Heavy metal uptake by two radish varieties. Acta Biol Szegediensis 46: 113-114.

Mattina MI, Lannucci-Berger W, Musante C and White JC (2003). Concurrent plant uptake of heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants from soil. Environ Pollut 124(3): 375-378.

McBride MB (1998). Growing food crops on sludge-amended soils: problems with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency method of estimating toxic metal transfer. Environ Toxicol Chem 17(11): 2274-2281.

McLaughlin MJ, Parker DR and Clarke JM (1999). Metals and micronutrients - food safety issues. Field Crops Res 60(1-2): 143-163.

McLaughlin MJ, Tiller KG, Naidu R and Stevens DP (1996). The behavior and environmental impact of contaminants in fertilizers. Austr J Soil Res 34(1): 1-54.

Mulla DJ, Page AL and Ganje TJ (1980). Cadmium accumulations and bioavailability in soils from long-term phosphorus fertilization. J Environ Qual 9(3): 408-412.

Muntau H, Crössmann G, Schramel P, Gallorini M and Orvini E (1987). Trace and nutrient element transfer from sewage sludge-amended soil to crop. Fresenius' J Anal Chem 326(7): 634-635.

Nan Z, Li J, Zhang J and Cheng G (2002). Cadmium and zinc interactions and their transfer in soil-crop system under actual field conditions. Sci Total Environ 285(1-3): 187-195.

Nelson DW, Liu SL and Sommers LE (1984). Extractability and plant uptake of trace elements from drilling fluids. J Environ Qual 13(4): 562-566.

Nicklow CW (1983). Influence of varying soil lead levels on lead uptake of leafy and root vegetables. J Am Soc Hortic Sci 108(2): 193.

Pandey J and Pandey U (2009). Accumulation of heavy metals in dietary vegetables and cultivated soil horizon in organic farming system in relation to atmospheric deposition in a seasonally dry tropical region of India. Environ Monit Assess 148(1): 61- 74.

Preer JR, Abdi AN, Sekhon HS and Murchison GB (1995). Metals in urban gardens effect of lime and sludge. J Environ Sci Health A 30(9): 2041 - 2056.

Pruvot C, Douay F, Hervé F and Waterlot C (2006). Heavy metals in soil, crops and grass as a source of human exposure in the former mining areas. J Soil Sed 6(4): 215- 220.

Rayman MP (2008). Food-chain selenium and human health: emphasis on intake. Br J Nutr 100(2): 254-268.

Rayman MP, Infante HG and Sargent M (2008). Food-chain selenium and human health: spotlight on speciation. Br J Nutr 100(2): 238-253.

Samsæ-Petersen L, Larsen EH, Larsen PB and Bruun P (2002). Uptake of trace elements and PAHs by fruit and vegetables from contaminated soils. Environ Sci Technol 36(14): 3057-3063.

Sauerbeck DR and Hein A (1991). The nickel uptake from different soils and its prediction by chemical extractions. Water Air Soil Pollut 57-58(1): 861-871.

Schroeder HA and Balassa JJ (1963). Cadmium: Uptake by vegetables from superphosphate in soil. Science 140(3568): 819-820.

Shacklette H, Erdman J and Harms T (1978). Trace elements in plant foodstuffs. In: Toxicity of Heavy Metals in the Environment, Part 1. Oehme F.(ed) New York: Marcel Dekker**:** 25-43.

Shariatpanahi M and Anderson AC (1986). Accumulation of cadmium, mercury and lead by vegetables following long-term land application of wastewater. Sci Total Environ 52(1-2): 41-47.

Sheppard SC, Evenden WG and Amiro BD (1993). Investigation of the soil-to-plant pathway for I, Br, Cl and F. J Environ Radioact 21(1): 9-32.

Sipter E, Rózsa E, Gruiz K, Tátrai E and Morvai V (2008). Site-specific risk assessment in contaminated vegetable gardens. Chemosphere 71(7): 1301-1307.

Skeffington RA (1976). Chromium uptake and transport in barley seedlings (Hordeum vulgare L.). Planta 132(3): 209-214.

Smith SR (1994). Effect of soil pH on availability to crops of metals in sewage sludgetreated soils. II. Cadmium uptake by crops and implications for human dietary intake. Environ Pollut 86(1): 5-13.

Sridhara Chary N, Kamala CT and Samuel Suman Raj D (2008). Assessing risk of heavy metals from consuming food grown on sewage irrigated soils and food chain transfer. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 69(3): 513-524.

Srikanth R and Reddy SRP (1991). Lead, cadmium and chromium levels in vegetables grown in urban sewage sludge--Hyderabad, India. Food Chem 40(2): 229-234.

Srivastava M, Juneja A, Dass S, Srivastava R, Srivastava S, Srivastava S, Mishra S, Singh V and Prakash S (1994). Studies on uptake of trivalent and hexavalent chromium in onion (Allium cepa). Chem Speciat Bioavail 6: 27-30.

Sterrett SB, Chaney RL, Gifford CH and Mielke HW (1996). Influence of fertilizer and sewage sludge compost on yield and heavy metal accumulation by lettuce grown in urban soils. Environ Geochem Health 18(4): 135-142.

Tomov A and Alandjiyski D (2006). Lead and cadmium in the system soil-plant in industrially polluted area. Field experiment. J Environ Protect Ecol 7(2): 313-318.

USDA. (2009). Website for water content of fruits and vegetables. from [http://www.nal.usda.gov/fnic/foodcomp/Data/SR21/nutrlist/sr21a255.pdf.](https://www.nal.usda.gov/fnic/foodcomp/Data/SR21/nutrlist/sr21a255.pdf)

Van Mantgem PJ, Wu L and Banuelos GS (1996). Bioextraction of selenium by forage and selected field legume species in selenium-laden soils under minimal field management conditions. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 34: 228-238.

Vecera Z, Mikuska P, Zdráhal Z, Docekal B, Buckova M, Tynova Z, Parizek P, Mosna J and Marek J. (1999). Additional comments about trace elements in crop plants. Analysis of plant, soil, water and chemical treatment samples, from [http://www.dsa.unipr.it/phytonet/fertilia/partners/vecera3.htm.](http://www.dsa.unipr.it/phytonet/fertilia/partners/vecera3.htm)

Wang G, Su M-Y, Chen Y-H, Lin F-F, Luo D and Gao S-F (2006). Transfer characteristics of cadmium and lead from soil to the edible parts of six vegetable species in southeastern China. Environ Pollut 144(1): 127-135.

Watt B and Merrill A (1975). Composition of Foods, Raw, Processed, Prepared. Agricultural Handbook No. 8. Washington D.C.: Consumer and Food Economics Institute, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture.

WHO. (1991). Inorganic Mercury. Environmental Health Criteria, Vol 118. World Health Organization. Geneva, Switzerland

Wiersma D (1986). Cadmium, lead, mercury and arsenic concentrations in crops and corresponding soils in the Netherlands. J Agric Food Chem 34(6): 1067-1074.

Yan S, Ling Q and Bao Z (2007). Metals contamination in soils and vegetables in metal smelter contaminated sites in Huangshi, China. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol 79(4): 361- 366.

Yang Y, Zhang F-S, Li H-F and Jiang R-F (2009). Accumulation of cadmium in the edible parts of six vegetable species grown in Cd-contaminated soils. J Environ Manage 90(2): 1117-1122.

Zheng N, Wang Q and Zheng D (2007a). Health risk of Hg, Pb, Cd, Zn, and Cu to the inhabitants around Huludao Zinc Plant in China via consumption of vegetables. Sci Total Environ 383(1-3): 81-89.

Zheng N, Wang QC, Zhang XW, Zheng DM, Zhang ZS and Zhang SQ (2007b). Population health risk due to dietary intake of heavy metals in the industrial area of Huludao city, China. Sci Total Environ 387(1-3): 96-104.

Zheng R-L, Li H-F, Jiang R-F and Zhang F-S (2008). Cadmium accumulation in the edible parts of different cultivars of radish, *Raphanus sativus* L., and carrot, *Daucus carota* var. sativa, grown in a Cd-contaminated soil. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol 81(1): 75-79.