



# JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

# EDITORIAL BOARD

# **Editor-In-Chief**

Professor A.C. Eziashi Faculty of Environmental Sciences P.M.B. 2084 Jos, Nigeria

Editorial Secretary Dr. Y.D. Izam Department of Building University of Jos, Nigeria P.O. BOX 2084, Jos Email: joesunijos@vahoo.com

# EDITORIAL BOARD

Dept. of Geography and Planning, University of Jos, Jos

Prof. (Mrs.) Prunal C. Ogunsote Dept. of Architecture, University of Jos, Jos

**Prof. E. Achuenu** Dept. of Building, University of Jos, Jos

**Prof.** (Mrs.) N.A. Anigbogu Dept. of Building ,University of Jos, Jos

Prof. O. Arayela Dept. of Architecture Federal University of Technology, Akure

> Prof. R. Iyagba Dept. of Building, University of Lagos,

Othniel K. Likkason, Ph.D. Physics Programme Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi

#### JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES (JOES) NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS JOES is Published twice a Year.

# AIM AND SCOPE

The Journal of Environment Sciences (JOES) is devoted to the publication of papers. which advance knowledge on theoretical and practical aspects of the natural and built environment. The aims of the journal are to provide an avenue for the dissemination of academic research findings dealing with environmental problems. planning, and development, opportunity for increasing and making available relevant data and information on environmental conditions/problems and advancing effective management solutions to them with special reference to Nigeria; and to provide a forum for meaningful discussions and debates between academics and field practitioners of the natural and built environments.

The Journal will therefore accept for publication results of original research in all aspects of both the natural and built environment. It will also accept for publication book reviews, comment and letters, wellwritten research and practice notes, and short communications on any aspect of the environment.

#### **REFEREEING:**

All papers submitted for publication will be refereed by two or more specialists selected, as appropriate to the subject matter of the paper, from the journal's list of referees.

#### MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts should be written in clear and concise English within the range of 12 pages typed in double-line spacing, on one side only of A4 paper with wide margins. The manuscript for consideration is to be sent electronically to joesunijos@yahoo.com with a covering note entitled Submission of Article for Assessment.

#### Arrangement of papers Paper should be arranged as follows:

- Title, author(s), affiliation(s) and full address (es), including e-mail
- 2.

3.

4

5

6

1

- 200-word abstract outlining the purpose, scope and conclusions of the paper. The abstract should also explain why the paper is important. particularly to those who may not necessarily be in that field.
- The text, suitably divided into appropriate sections/headings Acknowledgements (If any)

References

Tables and illustrations (each on a separate sheet containing no text)

#### Units, Symbols & Abbreviations

Only the SI units as defined by the ISO Standarder will be accepted. If use is made of any symbol or unit that may not be generally recognized, an explanatory note is required in the margin the first time it is used. Abbreviations should be written in full at first mention.

#### Tables:

Tables should be numbered consecutively throughout the paper (with Arabic numerals) referring to them in the text as Table 1, Table 2, etc., with a caption at the top of each table. Tables should not duplicate results presented in graphs.

#### Illustrations:

Illustrations in the form of maps, diagrams and graphs/charts should be drawn

on transparent sheets not larger than A4-size sheets with margins as for the text. They should also be sequentially numbered and given brief titles which should be written below the illustration.

# References:

References, should be made at the end of the paper and should adopt the following format:

Authors(s), year of publication, title paper, journal or book, volume and number or edition, town of publication, publisher, and page reference.

#### FINAL SUBMISSION:

Contributors will receive copies .of their referred manuscripts for amendments (if any) as recommended by the assessors. Final submissions are to be returned to the Editorial Board via OUT address: electronic mail joesunijos@yaho.com. Only paper that fully comply with editorial requirements as per our letter of "information on reviewed manuscript" will be published.

Each author will receive a copy of the journal for each published paper, subject to the payment of N3000.00 handling fee and N8000.00 publication levy. All payments should be made either in cash or by bank draft payable to "Journal of Environmental Sciences". As an alternative, contributors can pay directly into the journals account which number will be included in our "Information on reviewed manuscript". Evidence of such payment should be included in the "Final Submission" to be sent to joesunijos@yahoo.com. Papers attract the payment of N500.00 for each page in excess of the 12 stipulated for the manuscript. All fees are subject to review.

# JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES Volume 14 (2) December 2010. ISSN 1118-8936

\* \*

4

|     |  | December | 2 · · · · · |       | and the first |         | -                |   |
|-----|--|----------|-------------|-------|---------------|---------|------------------|---|
|     | CONTENT  |          | ÷           |       |               | PAGE    | a restriction of | *   |
| ŀ.  | A Preliminary Survey of Quantity Surveyors' Perception   | 1.12     | 218         |       |               |         |                  |   |
|     | of the Workability of the Public Procurement Act in Minn<br>North Central Nigeria.<br>A. A. Oke and J.K. Makinde   | ia,      | - 43.<br>   |       |               | 1-8     | S/N              | 0   |
|     | Contraction Version in the second state of the   | _        |             |       |               |         |                  |   |
| 2.  | Contraceptive Knowledge and Use Among Adolescents: C<br>Study of Selected Rural Communities in Plateau State<br>K.C. Dongurum and M.O. Osagbemi          |          |             |       |               | 9-21    | 1.               | Application of geog<br>Estate, Minna, Nige<br>M.L. Ojigi O.A Ke |
| 3.  | An Evaluation of the Strength of Selected Timbers in Kade<br>State for Structural use in Building Construction.  | una      |             |       |               |         | 2.               |   |
|     | O.J. Apochi, Z.T. Onuvajor and C. Obi  |          |             |       |               | 22-28   | -                | F.P. Okwoli   |
| 4.  | Deviation of Building Materials Standards and Resulting V<br>due to Usage on Construction Sites in Jos, Plateau State                                    | Wastage  |             |       |               |         | 3.               | Rice Hush Ash as p<br>D.S.Dahiru, I.K Zı                        |
| 5.  | M. Otali and E. Achuenu  |          |             |       |               | 29-37   | 4.               | A review of public l<br>E.O Ola-Asa, A.G.                       |
|     | Production of Sandcrete Blocks.  |          |             |       |               | 28.40   |                  |   |
|     | D. Dahiru and A.D. Abdulazeez  |          |             | 1     |               | 38-46   | 5.               | Assessment of Desi;<br>firms of Nigeria                         |
| 6   | Total Quality Management (TQM) Status of the North<br>Western Consultancy Firms of Nigeria, based on the<br>European Construction Institute (ECI) Matrix |          |             |       |               |         |                  | D.Kado, K. Bala ar  |
|     | D. Kado, S.A. Bustani and K. Bala  |          |             |       |               | 47-53   | 6.               | Analysis of building<br>Y. Ibrahim -                            |
| 1   | The Effects of Space on Social Behaviour and Satisfaction<br>Residential Buildings<br>E. T. Dasah  |          |             |       |               | 54-60   | 7.               | An appraisal of the :<br>E.T Dassah and E.(                     |
| k   | An Assessment of Construction Waste Management Practi<br>Among Firms in Abuja  | tices    |             |       |               |         | . 8.             | Evaluation of Beyal   |
|     | W.E. Dzasu, F. Dama, A. Haruna and A. Calistus   |          |             |       |               | 61-65   |                  | K.K Obiyai and G.   |
| 9   | Comparative Performance Evaluation of Building Projects<br>Procurement Methods in North Central Nigeria  | s        |             |       |               |         | 9.               | Architecture for sust   |
|     | Y.D. Izam and M. Otali   |          |             |       |               | 66-71   |                  | design of Argungu f<br>S.N Oluigho                              |
| 10  | Lithologic Delineation Using Radiometric Mapping: A Ca<br>Study of South-Western Nigeria.  | ase      |             |       |               |         | 10.              | Effects of steel maki   |
| 14  | N.O. Okoye and A.N. Amadi  |          |             | ••••• |               | 72-82   |                  | A.E abalaka   |
| 11  | Performance of Traditional and Integrated Procurement<br>Methods in Nigeria: Objective and Subjective Parameters.  |          |             | ~     |               |         | 11.              | Nature and problem:<br>W.E Dzasu                                |
|     | O.D. Martin  |          | •           |       |               | 83-89   | 12.              | The Impacts of Anth   |
| 12. | Vulnerability Assessment of Agrarian Households to Drot<br>in North Eastern Nigeria  | ught     |             |       |               |         |                  | water fowl sanctuar<br>M.E Akalusi, S.O. /                      |
|     | R.S. Sati  |          |             | ••••  |               | 90-97   | 13.              | Pollution effects on (  |
| 13  | Declining Trend in the Number of Building Artisans in Ni<br>State, North Central Nigeria   | iger     |             |       |               | 00.103  |                  | T.D Agusomu and   |
| 14  | A.I. Anunobi   |          |             |       |               | 98-102  | 14.              | A quantitative invest<br>M.O. Anifowose                         |
|     | Programme of ECWA in Mangu Local Government Area<br>of Plateau State. North Central Nigeria<br>L.O. Okoiyele, M.S. Chomini and F.N Nwakwushue            |          |             |       |               | 103-108 | 15.              | Farmers' perception selected rural commi                        |
| 15. | An Appraisal of Workmen Compensation Act (WCA)   |          |             |       |               |         | 16.              | S.S Mailumo, J.J M  |
|     | on Nigerian Construction Sites<br>B. Suleiman  |          |             |       |               | 109-114 | 10.              | Perceptions of Intra-<br>O.O Agunloye and                       |

Journal of Environmental Sciences Volume 14, Number (2) 2010 pp.61-65 Copyright © 2011 Faculty of Environmental Sciences, University of Jos, Nigeria ISSN 1118-8936

## AN ASSESSMENT OF CONSTRUCTION WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AMONG FIRMS IN ABUJA

## W.E. Dzasu; F. Dama and A. Haruna Department of Building, Federal University of Technology Yola

A. Calistus

Department of Building, Federal University of Technology Minna -

ABSTRACT The study examined construction waste management practices in Abuja the capital city of Nigeria. The results obtained were analyzed using the ranking order method. The study established that construction waste re-use ranked top amongst construction waste management practices engaged in by firms in the study area. The research identified Damage by mishandling; Weather and other natural occurrence; Vandalism; Rework and alteration of designs; Lack of recycling facilities; over ordering of construction materials and components as the main causes of wastes on construction sites. Minimizing of construction waste that leaves site for land fill ranked top among the benefits of efficient construction waste management. Other benefits were discovered to include, maximization of material recovery, prolonged supply of natural resources, reduced liability, keeping job sites & the environment cleaner & safer, conservation of valuable landfill space and reduction of cost associated with waste disposal while ensuring compliance with all environmental legislation was ranked least as benefit derivable from efficient construction activities should also be encouraged among industries through the provision of facilities/equipments, technologies and market to make these practicable.

## INTRODUCTION

The worldwide decay in Environmental quality and the gradual depletion of the natural resources has been a dominant theme for research and public policy in recent times. According to Mendie (1999), many of the environmental problems are due to the activities of man in the pursuit of development. This depressing situation has resulted in unsound and unsustainable development processes including poor handling and management of waste disposal. The global growing awareness on environmental issues and the drive towards conservation and sustainability of resources has led to a steady and rising tide in the number of environmental policy instruments introduced at international, national, regional and local levels. For instance, there is now a substantial body of European Union (EU) environmental policy with a clear direction about the place that environmental considerations must have in all EU policy instruments and legislation (Stritih, 1999).

According to John (1997), the well accepted tenet for future development is that the development must be sustainable development and true growth be sustainable growth.

Brundtland (1987) defines sustainable development as: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generation to meet their own needs". Also, a study by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2006) shows that construction and demolition waste materials account for almost 22 percent of the waste stream and according to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 136 million tons of construction waste are produced annually in the United States; of this, an estimated 11 million tons per year is waste from new construction.

Common construction waste materials include lumber, drywall, metals, masonry (brick, concrete and so on), carpet, plastic, pipe, rocks, dirt, paper, cardboard, or green waste related to land development. Of these, metals are the most commonly recycled material while lumber makes up the majority of debris that still goes to a landfill. Research findings by Tool Base Services (2004), have indicated that engineered wood product wastes can be beneficially reused onsite during construction rather than going to a landfill, that ground wood waste can be used as a landscaping mulch, for erosion control during construction, or as a substrate for a heavy use area. The findings also indicate potential environmental risks from ground engineered wood products to include surface water contamination, changes in the chemistry or biology of the underlying soils and negative effects on plant growth.

Research findings by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (2006), have shown that many of the waste arising from construction works can be reduced, reused or recycled, thus prolonging the supply of natural resources, reduce liability, keep job sites and the environment cleaner and safer, conserve valuable landfill space and potentially saving money in the process. Effectively managing waste on a construction jobsite is a vital component of sustainable building. In this context, managing waste means minimizing the construction waste or demolition debris that leaves the jobsite for landfill disposal (Napier, 2007). The objectives of construction waste management program are to maximize material recovery, minimize waste, and reduce total waste management costs on a per-house basis. From the forgoing therefore, construction waste can and should be managed in the same way as other home building operations to avoid the inescapable consequences of unsustainable developments and Environmental degradations.

Large amount is being invested by the federal government, the private sector and individuals in Real estate development especially in the provision of housing and other core infrastructural needs. The various activities of the construction industry has considerable impact on the environment as opined by Moneke (2001) who noted that construction projects and development do not just stand on their own; they exact impact on their environment. Kolawale and Achuenu (1997) also noted that the environment and construction are interdependent and the need to keep a balance between them cannot be overemphasized. Consequently, this study is aimed at realizing the following objectives;

1 To identify the factors that constitutes main causes of wastes generated by construction firms.

2 To examine the methods of construction waste management system practiced by firms in the study area. 3 To determine the benefits of efficie construction waste management syste practiced by firms in Nigerian

#### METHODOLOGY

Both theoretical and empirical methowere adopted in the collection of data for th study. The theoretical aspects involved a revie of related literature, journals, periodicals and th internet. While the empirical study involve visits to Development Control Departments, th Federal Capital Development Authority, Federa Ministry of Environment and Housing, Abuj Environmental Protection Board and othe relevant government agencies and head office of construction firms.

The data for this study was collected through questionnaires. A total of fifty five (55 questionnaires were administered to staff o Abuja Environmental Protection Board (AEPB and to professional staffs of some selected construction companies in the FCT, Abuja. A total of 50 duly completed questionnaires were returned.

The data collected were analyzed usin the ranking Method. The rating value of 4, 3, and 1 were assigned to the options "Strong Agree", "Agree", "Disagree" and "Strong Disagree" respectively in obtaining responden perception on construction waste managemen activities by respondent's organization.

The ranking method is suitable for number of measures, which is above six and les than thirty (Youngman, 1981).

In using the ranking method, weights or scores o 1.....n are assigned to the factors to b measured. The rank Sum and Relative Index are determined thus:

RI = S/4n -----(2)

(Where, S = is the rank sum, n = number of respondents, W = corresponding weight/score of rank category, RI = is the relative index)

The relative index ranges from 0 - 1. The item with the highest relative index is considered the first in the rank order.

### DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

| Total  | 50 | 100 |   |
|--|----|-----|---|
| 4. Others  | 2  | 4   |   |
| 3. Building/ Civil Engineering Construction Works      | 2  | 4   |   |
| <ol><li>Civil Engineering Construction Works</li></ol> | 16 | 32  |   |
| 1. Building Construction Works                         | 30 | 60  | 1 |

# Table 1. Distribution of Construction Activities Engaged in by Sampled Organizations

Table 1 shows the distribution of the type of services provided by the sampled organizations. 60% of the respondents indicated that their organizations engaged in building construction works only, 32% indicated their firms engaged in civil engineering construction works only, 4% said their firms carry out both Building Construction and Civil Engineering Works while 4% showed that their firms engaged in other construction activities other than Building Construction and Civil Engineering Works or are staff with government agencies. This result reflects that greater percentages (92%) of respondents for the study are directly engaged in either Building or Civil Engineering construction activities on a day to day basis.

## Ranking of Construction Waste Management Activities Practiced By Respondents Organization

From table 2, it can be seen that re-using construction waste is ranked 1<sup>st</sup> in the waste management activities practiced by respondent's organization with relative index of 0.925. This shows that construction waste materials should be used as many times as possible. The study

further identified the disposal of construction waste as  $2^{nd}$  in the activities of construction waste management practiced by respondents' organization with a relative index of 0.865. This result is a reflection of the visible dumping of construction waste on road sides and within living premises in major towns and cities in the study area.

Construction waste reduction which involves minimizing the amount of waste produced is ranked 3rd with relative index of 0.815 in the waste management activities of respondents' organizations. Also from table 3, deconstruction is ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> with relative index of 0.75 as one of the activities involved in construction waste management and 5th with relative index of 0.75 in the construction waste management activities practiced by respondent's organization. The table further shows that recycling of construction waste is ranked 6th in the construction waste management activities practiced by respondent's organization with relative index of 0.525. This could be as a result of lack of interest in recycling construction waste, lack of recycling facilities and technology as well as market for recycled products.

### Table 2. Ranking of Construction Waste Management Activities Practiced By Respondents Organization

| Activities     | 4  | 3  | 2  | 1    | Rank<br>Sum<br>(S) | n  | Relative<br>Index<br>R.I=S/4n | Rank<br>Order    |
|----------------|----|----|----|------|--------------------|----|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Waste          |    |    |    |      |                    |    |                               |                  |
| Avoidance      | 13 | 27 | 8  | 2    | 151                | 50 | 0.755                         | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Reduction      | 14 | 35 | 1  | -    | 163                | 50 | 0.815                         | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| Reuse          | 35 | 15 | -  | -    | 185                | 50 | 0.925                         | 1 <sup>.st</sup> |
| Recycling      | -  | 9  | 37 | 4    | 105                | 50 | 0.525                         | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Deconstruction | 10 | 34 | 2  | 4    | 150                | 50 | 0.75                          | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Disposal       | 28 | 17 | 5  | 1.1. | 173                | 50 | 0.865                         | 2 <sup>nd</sup>  |

| Table 3. Ranking of Factors that constitutes | Main Causes o | of Construction | Waste In Respondents |
|--|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Organization                                 |               |                 |                      |

| Factors                      | 4    | 3    | 2  | 1  | Rank<br>Sum<br>(S) | n  | Relative<br>Index<br>R.I=S/4n | Rank<br>Order   |  |
|------------------------------|------|------|----|----|--------------------|----|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Damage by mishandling        | 8    | 24   | 14 | -  | 144                | 50 | 0.72                          | 4 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| Weather and other            |      |      |    |    |                    |    |                               | (K)             |  |
| natural occurrence           | 18   | 20   | 12 | -  | 156                | 50 | 0.78                          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |  |
| Vandalism                    | -    | . 19 | 27 | 4  | 115                | 50 | 0.575                         | 5 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| Rework and alteration        |      |      |    |    |                    |    |                               |                 |  |
| of designs                   | - 21 | 18   | 11 | -  | 160                | 50 | 0.8                           | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |  |
| Lack of recycling facilities | 27   | 15   | 4  | 4  | 165                | 50 | 0.825                         | 1 <sup>st</sup> |  |
| Over ordering                | 2    | 8    | 30 | 10 | 102                | 50 | 0.51                          | 6 <sup>th</sup> |  |

Table 4 Ranking of the Benefits of Efficient Construction Waste Management in

| Benefits  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 1 | Ran | TATE STORE | Relative      | New Scale and   |                  |  |
|---|----|----|----|---|-----|------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--|
|   |    |    |    |   | (S) | Sum<br>R   | Ind<br>I=S/4n | ex (            | Order            |  |
| Minimize construction waste that leaves site for landfill | 35 | 15 | -  | - | 185 |            | 0.925         | 1 <sup>st</sup> |                  |  |
| Maximize material recovery                                | 14 | 35 | 1  | - | 163 | 50         | 0.815         | 5 <sup>th</sup> |                  |  |
| Prolong supply of natural resources                       | 13 | 27 | 8  | 2 | 151 | 50         | 0.755         | 8 <sup>th</sup> |                  |  |
| Reduce liability  |    | -  | 37 | 9 | 4   | 133        | 50            | 0.665           | $10^{\text{th}}$ |  |
| Keep job site and the environment                         |    |    |    |   |     |            | *             |                 |                  |  |
| cleaner and safer   | 28 | 17 | 5  | - | 173 | 50         | 0.865         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |                  |  |
| Conserve valuable landfill space                          | 10 | 34 | 6  | - | 154 | 50         | 0.770         | $7^{\text{th}}$ |                  |  |
| Ensures sustainable development &                         |    |    |    |   |     |            |               |                 |                  |  |
| environmental protection                                  | 27 | 23 |    | - | 177 | 50         | 0.885         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |                  |  |
| Ensures compliance with all                               |    |    |    |   |     |            |               |                 |                  |  |
| environmental legislation                                 | 8  | 33 | 9  | - | 149 | 50         | 0.745         | 9 <sup>th</sup> |                  |  |
| Reduce cost associated with                               |    |    |    |   |     |            |               |                 |                  |  |
| waste disposal  | 14 | 35 | 1  | - | 163 | 50         | 0.815         | 5 <sup>th</sup> |                  |  |
| Enhance the reputation of the                             |    |    |    |   |     |            |               |                 |                  |  |
| construction firm   | 9  | 38 | 3  | - | 156 | 50         | 0.780         | 6 <sup>th</sup> |                  |  |
| Reduce the amount of materials                            |    |    |    |   |     |            |               |                 |                  |  |
| sent to landfills   | 23 | 23 | 4  | - | 169 | 50         | 0.845         | 4 <sup>th</sup> |                  |  |
| Reduce the environmental & health                         |    |    |    |   |     |            |               |                 |                  |  |
| safety risks staff may be exposed to                      | 23 | 27 | -  | - | 173 | 50         | 0.865         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |                  |  |

# FACTORS THAT CONSTITUTE MAIN CAUSES OF CONSTRUCTION WASTE

The results in table 3 shows that lack of recycling facilities is ranked  $1^{st}$  with relative index of 0.825, reworking and alteration of designs is ranked  $2^{nd}$  with relative index of 0.8. Weather and other natural occurrence is ranked  $3^{rd}$  with relative index of 0.78. Damage by mishandling, vandalism and over ordering are ranked  $4^{th}$ ,  $5^{th}$  and  $6^{th}$  with relative index of 0.72, 0.575 and 0.51 respectively.

# BENEFITS OF EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION WASTE MANAGEMENT

Table 4 gives the responses to the list of benefits derivable from efficient construction waste management practices. The result shows that efficient construction waste management practices minimizes construction waste that leaves site for land fill and ensuring sustainable development and environmental protection are ranked 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> with a relative index of 0.925 and 0.885 respectively. Cleaner and safer job sites & the environment is ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> with relative index of 0.865, reduction in the amount

of materials sent to landfills and reduction in cost associated with waste disposal are ranked 4th and 5th with relative index of 0.845 and 0.815 respectively. Enhancement in the reputation of the construction firm; Conservation of valuable landfill space; Prolonged supply of natural resources and ensuring compliance with all environmental legislation are ranked 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th with relative indexes of 0.78, 0.77, 0.755. and 0.745 respectively. Reduction in liability is ranked 10<sup>th</sup> with relative index of 0.665. The high relative index values of the various benefits of efficient construction waste management practices in Abuja metropolis by the respondents is an indication that the need for efficient and effective construction waste management practices in Abuja and other cities of the country cannot be overemphasize.

### CONCLUSIONS

The work examined construction waste management in the Nigerian capital city Abuja. The study established that some of the construction waste management practices engaged in by firms in the study areas include waste avoidance; construction waste reduction; construction waste re-use; construction waste recycling; deconstruction and construction waste disposal.

The research identified Damage by mishandling; Weather and other natural occurrence; Vandalism; Rework and alteration of designs; Lack of recycling facilities; over ordering of construction materials and

### REFERENCES

Brundtland, G. (1987). Our Common Future: World Commission on Environment and Development. Oxford University Press, Oxford

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), (2006). Retrieved August 13, 2007, from http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/condem/

John Ratcliffe (1997). Cutting Edge, Dublin institute of technology

Kolawole, J.O. and Achuenu, E. (1997). Keeping the balance between Construction Activities and the Environment. Pp 1-12.

Mendie A., Akpan P.A. (1999). The Need for Effective Environmental Management in Ikpa River Basin of Akwa Ibom, Journal of Environmental Sciences Vol 3 No 1, components as the main causes of construction waste on construction sites.

The benefits of efficient construction waste management was discovered to include minimizing of construction waste that leaves site for land fill, maximization of material recovery, prolonged supply of natural resources, reduced liability, keeping job sites & the environment cleaner & safer, conservation of valuable landfill space and reduction of cost associated with waste disposal among others.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that for an efficient construction waste management to be achieved, the Abuja environmental protection agency should be adequately staffed and empowered financially to enable them enforce the environmental legislations efficiently. Areas in the legislation that are obsolete should be reviewed to meet with modern requirements and practices. More and appropriate licensed landfills for construction waste disposal should be provided. Construction firms and the general public should be properly informed and well enlightened on the existence of these landfills. Re-using, Recycling and Deconstruction activities should be encouraged and practiced by construction firms. Facilities/equipments and technologies as well as markets that will make this practicable must be encouraged by the firms and other relevant institutions.

Moneke, G. O. (2001). Workshop Synopsis Environmental Impact Assessment Issue and Perspective. <u>Nigerian Institute of Quantity</u> <u>Surveyors.</u>

Napier, T. (2007). Construction Waste Management. Retrieved August 13, 2007, from www.wbdg.org/index.php

Stritih, J. (1999). EU Environmental Policy Forecast Retrieved May 15, 2008, from <u>http://</u> <u>greenhorizon.rec.org/</u> bulletin/Bull833/RECinfoserv.html

Toolbase Services (2004). Potential environmental risk of on site beneficial reuse of ground engineered wood wastes. Retrieved on august 13, 2007, from <u>http://www.toolbase.org</u>