Geochemical and Hydrological Dynamics in the Malibu Creek Watershed Following the 2018 Woolsey Fire

Scott Hauswirth, Michael F. Kushner, Christian L. Hoover, Kyle Ikeda, Alfredo Estrada, Badhia Yunes Katz, Greg S. Jesmok, Priya M. Ganguli Department of Geological Sciences, California State University Northridge

Wildfires are getting worse and potentially impacting water quality

•As more area burns, greater potential for impacts to water quality:

- \bullet Increased erosion \Box increased sediment load
- Geochemical changes
- Generation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)

- Mutagenic, **carcinogenic**, reproductive defects
- **• Toxic to aquatic organisms**
- Potentially persistent in the environment

benzo(a) pyrene

Study Site: Malibu Creek Watershed

- 2018 Woolsey Fire burned ~2/3 of the Malibu Creek watershed
- Ecologically sensitive: ~50 endangered and threatened species
- Varying land use, terrain, vegetation, burn intensity

Study Site: Malibu Creek Watershed

• Question: **How did Woolsey Fire impact water quality in watershed?**

Study Site: Malibu Creek Watershed

- Soil samples collected throughout watershed shortly after fire
- Periodically thereafter at two sampling locations (Sites 2+3)
- 11 water sampling locations established

Surface Water Sampling Plan

- Samples collected during/after significant rain events Dec. 2018-Dec. 2021
- •Approx. monthly during dry season
- Sampling paused March – November 2020 due to COVID-19

Methods

- Soil/sediment and water samples extracted (via Soxhlet + LLE)
- •GC-MS analysis for:
	- 16 EPA + alkylated + other PAHs
	- C_{12} C_{38} *n*-alkanes
	- 200+ compounds total
- SPM filtration/gravimetric
- •Anions by ion chromatography
- Streamflow and precipitation data obtained from Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works
- Metal/Hg, DOC analyses pending

Soil PAH concentrations decline rapidly after fire

…but larger PAHs persist longer

Smaller PAHs (2-3 ring) largely lost within first year

Larger PAHs (5-6 ring) show limited loses or even increasing concentrations

5-6 ring PAHs are the toxic/carcinogenic compounds!

Water PAH concentrations elevated in first wet season, decline in dry season, then spikes during later rain events at some sites.

 $10⁴$

Water PAH concentrations elevated in first wet season, decline in dry season, then spikes during later rain events at some sites.

 $10⁴$

PAH concentrations in water below U.S. drinking water maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)

…but numerous exceedances of US EPA "*Human Health Criteria for Ambient Waters*"

Up to 1000x criteria!

Also, some exceedances of CA PHG for BaP and many exceedances of Canadian "Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life" values

Other compounds likely contribute to toxicity in unknown ways

• Alkylated PAHs understudied but may be drivers of toxicity

• Photodegradation of PAHs greatly INCREASES toxicity: formation of quinones and other compounds

C2-naphthalene

C3-naphthalene

C4-naphthalene

naphthalen

C1-naphthalene

• Metals synergistic in terms of toxic effects

Spikes in PAH concentrations correlate with rain events when SPM also spikes

During first rainy season, higher SPM per unit precipitation than later years

PAH-SPM relationship reasonably well fit by Power law

Slope decreases from first rainy season to second, then relatively constant

Consistent with:

- 1. Lower soil PAH concentrations
- 2. Less erosion of burned soil into streams

Streamflow appears much higher in first post-fire wet season for a given amount of precipitation

(But confounding factors)

Are PAHs from the fire? Can we use them as a tool?

- PAHs may come from fire vs road runoff (oil) vs fossil fuel combustion
- Simple molecular ratio approach \Box imperfect, but gives some indication
- Other molecular ratio approaches and potentially isotopic methods in progress

Why differences between sites?

What does this look like over time?

Conclusions

- Soil PAH concentrations decrease relatively quickly, but more toxic compounds show less decline
- PAHs exceed water quality criteria (but not drinking water MCLs) during/after rain events
- PAH concentrations in water decreasing due to combined affects of:
	- Soil PAH losses
	- Lower SPM generated during rain events
	- Lower stream flows
- PAH ratios allow tracking of fire inputs: declining, but continued contributions into 2nd rainy season (depending on location), fire "signal" mostly lost by third year

Continuing Work

- Continue analyzing samples for metals, Hg, DOC
- Further assessment of spatial variation + impact of fire intensity, land use, other factors
- Other source differentiation+biomarker approaches being applied (other PAH ratios, ADPI, alkanes-based approaches, isotopes)
- Applying similar methods for investigating fire history in paleosols with Dr. Jen Cotton
- Lots more data available now (alkanes, detailed PAH data, nutrients) or coming soon (metals) – contact me for more information (**scott.hauswirth@csun.edu**)!

Thanks to all the students and others who have worked on this project!

Dr. Priya Ganguli, Michael Kushner, Christian Hoover, Kyle Ikeda, Georgina Campos, Danielle Bram, Peter Nahas, Greg Jesmok, Rachel Hohn, Alfredo Estrada, Emily Honn, Cindy de Jesus Bartolo, Oscar Martinez

PAH Ratios for Soils: Background vs Wildfire

a Petroleum Pet. Coal/BM Comb. $b \cdot$ **Vehicle Emissions** BM Comb. All Woolsev Mixed D All Woolsey 0.9 Comb. \Box Other Fires 0.9 \Box **Other Fires** 8 \Box Pyrogenic $+$ Background \Box Background \bullet BG1+2 BG1+2 0.8 0.8 BG1+2PF BG1+2PF 0.7 $\overline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{u}}$ PAH Alkylation Index
PAH Alkylation Index
0.3
0.3 п ANT/(ANT+PHE)
C 0.5
C 0.4 Other ratios \Box ōQe Mixed \blacksquare п may better п \Box distinguish 0.3 Petrogenic \Box ÷ 0.2 0.2 o between 100 0.1 п 0.1 \Box п Petroleum Ω $\mathbf{0}$ wildfire and 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.9 $\overline{0}$ 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.7 0.8 0.9 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.8 $\overline{0}$ FLU/(FLU+PYR) 1,7DMP/(1,7DMP+2,6DMP) C. $|d.$ non-wildfire Pet. All Woolsey **Vehicle Emissions** Mixed Combustion Mixed BM Comb. \Box All Woolsey 0.9 \Box Other Fires 0.9 \Box **Other Fires** BM/Coal Comb. ÷ Background Background ٠ 0.8 \bullet BG1+2 **BG1+2** 0.8 O \bullet BG1+2PF \bigcirc BG1+2PF 0.7 0.7 \Box \Box ANT/(ANT+PHE)
0.6 0.5 0.4 Pyrogenic. P₀ 0.6

MD/(IND+BgP)

MD/(IND 4 Comb. ō Ð 0.3 Pet. 0.3 п \Box \Box 0.2 0.2 \Box - at 0.1 0.1 \vec{e} ñ. Ω 0 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.9 0.1 0.7 0.8 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 $\mathbf{0}$ $\overline{0}$ 1,7DMP/(1,7DMP+2,6DMP) **BaA/228**

sources

Do n-alkanes tell us anything? Maybe…

- Carbon preference index (CPI) is measure of odd over even n-alkanes
	- Odds (n-C29, n-C31) indicative of higher plant waxes
	- Evens indicative of petroleum (or Ā other things)
- CPI shows increasing trend, indicating increasing plant input

