## Post-Soberanes Fire Water Quality Monitoring of the Big Sur and Carmel River Watersheds

### Introduction

The Soberanes Fire located in the Ventana Wilderness along the Big Sur Coast of Central California began on July 22, 2016 as the result of an illegal campfire left unattended in Garrapata State Park. The fire burned through fire-dependent maritime chaparral, consuming 132,127 acres of vegetation for nearly 3 months before complete containment was accomplished on October 13, 2016 (CALFIRE 2016). The fire has since been ranked as the most costly wildfire in United States history, totaling over \$208.4 million to control (Thomas 2016).

The Ventana Wilderness is dominated by coastal prairie and chaparral (Greenlee and Langenheim 1990), both of which are dependent on periodic fires to replenish nutrients in the soil. Decades of fire suppression in the area allowed for the accumulation of fuel for the Soberanes Fire, resulting in exceptionally hot flames capable of denuding the land of vegetation and causing significant soil burn (WER 2016). Hydrophobic soils are common after moderate-to-severe soil burns, and result in exaggerated runoff and soil erosion (Smith 2008, Richmond 2008).

The Big Sur River Watershed encompasses a drainage area of 151 square kilometers, with a hydraulic length of 27 kilometers, while the Carmel River Watershed encompasses a drainage area of 660 square kilometers with a hydraulic length of 58 kilometers (Smith et al. 2008). Both watersheds are geologically characterized by steep hill slopes and deeply weathered, pervasively fractured bedrock, resulting in high erosion potentials (Christensen and Geisler 2009, Richmond 2008, Smith et al. 2008). In addition to increased sediment flow and associated turbidity, wildfires have been shown to increase concentrations of water quality parameters such as phosphate and nitrate. Increases in turbidity and nutrient levels may result in alterations to the ecological structure of the watersheds, including shifts toward increased algal biomass and decreases in macroinvertebrate assemblages (Earl and Blinn 2003). pH of rivers and streams may also be affected by transported ash and soil from burned areas, causing increases in pH of as much as two to three units (Ranalli 2004). All changes in water quality parameters may place stress on both fish and macroinvertebrate populations.

### **Expected Changes in Water Quality**

As a result of the Soberanes Fire, measurable water quality parameters such as turbidity, temperature, pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen (DO), and phosphate and nitrate concentrations will vary from pre-fire and historically observed values, corresponding with increased water discharge after precipitation events over the course of the next two years. We hypothesize the duration of high turbidity levels will increase thus water temperature will be higher than pre-fire conditions. We also expect to observe a rise in pH after a precipitation event. Likewise, we predict phosphate and nitrate concentrations will be higher after precipitation events and a general decrease in DO will be observed between precipitation events, after turbulence associated with high water flows and hydrologically increased oxygenation has ceased.

# Mikaela Bogdan<sup>1</sup> and John Silveus<sup>2</sup>

### <sup>1</sup> CSUMB Undergraduate Student Researcher, <sup>2</sup>CSUMB Instructor and Researcher

	standard deviation, minni Average	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Parameter Nater Temp (°C)	12.17	1.58	9.00	15.00	6.00
Air Temp (°C)	17.04	4.96	10.20	33.00	22.80
Discharge (cfs)	395.48	463.82	14.00	1560.00	1546.00
DO (ppm)	14.23	3.12	10.50	20.00	9.50
be (ppin) bH	7.78	0.21	7.40	8.20	0.80
Furbidity (FAU)	95.38	252.90	0.00	1000.00	1000.00
Phosphate (mg/L)	0.65	0.72	0.00	2.63	2.45
Nitrate (mg/L)	0.03	0.72	0.00	3.00	3.00
Salinity (ppt)	0.23	0.74	0.00	2.00	2.00
Conductivity (ppm)	185.96	40.88	92.10	236.00	143.90
	standard deviation, minni	Standard Deviation	Minimum		
Parameter	Average			Maximum	Range
Vater Temp (oC)	11.96 15.00	2.96	5.00 5.20	18.00 24.00	13.00 18.80
Air Temp (oC)	15.09 131.46	4.94 584 09			
Discharge (cfs)	431.46	584.09	5.30	1650.00	1644.70
Ю (ppm) ப	13.22	3.32	9.30	20.00	10.70
H Turbidity (EALI)	7.51	0.29	6.42	8.10 579.00	1.68
urbidity (FAU)	47.82	122.78	0.00	578.00	578.00
hosphate (mg/L)	0.72	0.67	0.11	2.32	2.21
litrate (mg/L)	0.14	0.53	0.00	2.50	2.50
Salinity (ppt)	0.26	0.54	0.00	2.00	2.00
Conductivity (ppm)	152.10	48.18	80.80	211.80	131.00
00 -					- 400
00 - 00 - 0 - <b>8 - 8 - 8</b> 161014 161021 1610	D28 161031 161104 161111 161118 1	61120 161125 161127 161202 161209	9 161216 161231 170113 170	120 170127 170203 170210 17021	7 170224 170303 170310 - 400 - 200 0
00 - 0 - <b>2 - 2</b> 161014 161021 1610	28 161031 161104 161111 161118 1 Celationship between cha State Pa	61120 161125 161127 161202 161209 Date nges in turbidity and dis rk and the Carmel River	-	-	7 170224 170303 170310 200 7 170224 170303 170310
00 - 0 - <b>2 - 2</b> 161014 161021 1610	State Pa	nges in turbidity and dis ork and the Carmel River	at Garland Ranch S	tate Park	- 200 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R	State Pa	nges in turbidity and dis	at Garland Ranch S	tate Park	- 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310
00 - 0 - 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R	State Pa Phospl	nges in turbidity and dis ork and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the	at Garland Ranch S	tate Park	- 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1400
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 - 2.00	State Pa Phospl	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm	tate Park	- 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 - 1600 - 1400 - 1200
00 - 0 - 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R	State Pa Phospl	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm	tate Park	- 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1400
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 - 2.00	State Pa Phospl	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm	tate Park	Feiffer Big Sur   170224 170303 170310   Feiffer Big Sur   1800   1600   1400   1200   1000
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50	State Pa Phospl	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm	tate Park	- 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 - 200 0 - 170224 170303 170310 - 1800 - 1600 - 1400 - 1000 - 800 - 600 - 400
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.00 0.50	State Pa Phospl	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm	tate Park	<ul> <li>200</li> <li>7</li> <li>170224</li> <li>170303</li> <li>170310</li> <li>Feiffer Big Sur</li> <li>1800</li> <li>1600</li> <li>1400</li> <li>1200</li> <li>1000</li> <li>800</li> <li>600</li> </ul>
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 0.50 0.00	State Pa	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm	tate Park	Feiffer Big Sur          170224       170303       170310         Feiffer Big Sur       1800         1400       1200         1000       800         600       400         200       0
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 161	State Pa Phosp Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Carm Game 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time	el Rivers	200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1400 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 161	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Garm 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel Rive	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch	tate Park el Rivers	200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1400 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 161	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Carm Game 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch	tate Park el Rivers	Feiffer Big Sur Feiffer Big Sur 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1600 1600 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 800 1000 1000 800 1000 <p< td=""></p<>
<sup>00</sup> 161014 161021 1610 <b>Figure 1. R</b> <b>Figure 1. R</b> <b>Figure 2. I</b> <b>Figure 2. I</b>	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Carm Big Sur Discharge Carm 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch h the Big Sur and Ca	tate Park el Rivers	200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1400 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.00 1.50 1.61014 161021 163 Figure 2. I	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Big Sur Discharge 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in Big Sur Do	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch the Big Sur and Ca Carmel River DO	tate Park el Rivers	Feiffer Big Sur Feiffer Big Sur 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1600 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big 1800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000
<sup>00</sup> 161014 161021 1610 <b>Figure 1. R</b> <b>Figure 1. R</b> <b>Figure 2. I</b> <b>Figure 2. I</b>	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Big Sur Discharge 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in Big Sur Do	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch the Big Sur and Ca Carmel River DO	tate Park el Rivers	200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1600 1600 1600 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 t Pfeiffer Big 1800 1600 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1800 1600 1800 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 1600 100
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 161 Figure 2. I 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Big Sur Discharge 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in Big Sur Do	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch the Big Sur and Ca Carmel River DO	tate Park el Rivers	Feiffer Big Sur Feiffer Big Sur 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1400 1200 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big 1800 600 1800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000 800 600 1000
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 161 Figure 2. I 22 20 18 16 14	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Big Sur Discharge 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in Big Sur Do	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch the Big Sur and Ca Carmel River DO	tate Park el Rivers	Feiffer Big Sur Feiffer Big Sur 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1600 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big 1800 600 400 200 0 170224 170303 170310 1800 600 400 200 0 1800 600 400 200 0 170224 170303 170310 1800 600 400 800 600 600 400 800 600 800 600 400 800 600 800 800 600 800 800 600 800<
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 161 Figure 2. I 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0	State Pa Phosp 1028 161031 161104 161111 161118 Relationship between ch Sur State	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Big Sur Discharge 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in Big Sur Do	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch the Big Sur and Ca Carmel River DO	tate Park el Rivers	Feiffer Big Sur For the second sec
00 0 161014 161021 1610 Figure 1. R 3.00 2.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.61014 161021 163 Figure 2. I 1.51 Figure 2. I	State Pa Phosp Pho	nges in turbidity and dis ark and the Carmel River hate vs. Discharge in the Big Sur Phosphate Big Sur Discharge Big Sur Discharge 161120 161125 161127 161202 16120 Date anges in phosphate and Park and the Carmel River Oxygen vs. Discharge in Big Sur Do	at Garland Ranch S e Big Sur and Carm el River Phosphate el River Discharge 9 161216 161231 170113 170 discharge over time er at Garland Ranch the Big Sur and Carmel River DO Carmel River DO Carmel River DO 9 161216 161231 170113 170	tate Park el Rivers	Feiffer Big Sur Feiffer Big Sur 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big Sur 1800 1600 1000 800 600 400 200 0 7 170224 170303 170310 Feiffer Big 1800 600 400 200 0 1800 600 400 200 0 1800 600 400 200 0 1800 600 400 200 0 1800 600 400 200 0 1800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000 800 600 400 200 0 1000

Water quality was tested each week from October through March at a total of eleven locations on six rivers and streams in Monterey County, including three locations along the Carmel River and three locations along the Big Sur River. The two rivers are close in size and length, and have had similar discharge during the rains this winter (Fig. 1). Because the Carmel River Watershed was only slightly impacted by the Soberanes Fire while the Big Sur Watershed was highly impacted, water quality of the Carmel River is being used as a control during the duration of this study.

Assessing such parameters as phosphate, nitrate and dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations, as well as turbidity provides information on ecological health of aquatic systems. Post-fire soils result in increased sediment runoff (Smith 2008, Richmond 2008) which can lead to higher turbidity levels in aquatic systems. The lag time between high discharge and corresponding high turbidity levels (Fig. 1) is likely a result of the time needed for precipitation to mobilize sediment to water. Increases in turbidity can not only directly affect aquatic predators by reducing visibility, clogging gills, and suffocating eggs, but may also reduce the depth of the photosynthetic zone in an aquatic ecosystem, creating a large aphotic zone which decreases primary productivity (Bruton 1985).

Phosphate appears to increase as discharge increases (Fig. 2). This is likely a correlation to increases in turbidity, as phosphate is transported by clinging to sediments (Grayson etal. 1996). Excess nitrate and phosphate can increase aquatic plant growth and lead to anthropogenic eutrophication of the water body, reducing DO (Jensen and Anderson 1992). Nitrate data is not graphically shown due to lack of space and the tendency for phosphate be the limiting factor necessary to drastically increase plant growth with the potential to create eutrophic conditions (Dillon and Rigler 1974). DO appears to increase when discharge increases (Fig. 3). This is likely caused by increased aeration of fast-moving turbulent water. Water quality parameter data will continue to be collected through October 2017 for all eleven locations to provide a full

Wate through year of includin Environ courses also be River C



Figure 4. Samples collected after heavy precipitation. Carmel River at Garland Ranch State Park is shown in vial 1 and Big Sur at Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park is shown in vial 10. Vials 5-6 show high turbidity levels at Soberanes Creek, Garapatta Creek, and Mill Creek all of which are sites closest to the location of the fire.

We would like to thank the CSU Monterey Bay School of Natural Sciences Dean's Office for their financial support, California State Parks for their cooperation, Megan Pentecost and the CSUMB ENVS\_195 students who assisted with sampling during both ideal and inclement conditions.

California State University MONTEREY BAY

### Discussion

year of water quality data to be used by CSUMB classes including but not limited to Environmental Science,

Environmental Biology, Aquatic Ecology, and Statistics courses. Data collected and analyzed during the course will also be presented to and be made available to the Carmel River Conservancy and California State Parks.



#### Acknowledgements