

1 conducted on the effects of fire on water quality (both prescribed fire and wildfire), little research
2 has been conducted on the effects of mechanical treatments on water quality. Other fuels
3 management approaches such as chemical (e.g. herbicide applications) and biological treatments
4 (e.g. grazing) are also utilized in the East, but again little relevant research has been conducted to
5 assess impacts to surface waters.

6

7 **FIRE**

8 Although wildfires tend to burn more extensive areas, burn hotter and consume more fuel than
9 prescribed fires, the effects on surface waters can be analogous to prescribed fire. Even within
10 the category of prescribed fire, many prescribed fires, especially in the South, are intended for
11 site preparation as opposed to fuels reduction. All prescribed fire, independent of intent, and
12 wildfire effects on surface water quality will be reviewed.

13

14 **Fire Effects on Water Yield and Sediment Production**

15 Either because of increased flows resulting from lower interception and transpiration or because
16 of soil hydrophobicity following fire, the potential exists for higher surface and subsurface
17 runoff. With increased surface runoff and higher instream flows following fire, the potential for
18 higher sediment production exists. Flows are expected to increase following fire, depending on
19 the severity of the fire and the extent in the watershed (Baker, 1988; Gresswell, 1999) however,
20 little research has been conducted in the East addressing fire effects on water yield or sediment
21 production.

22

23 Water Yield

1 Studies in South Carolina indicated no increases in streamflow following low-intensity
2 prescribed fire (Van Lear et al., 1985), but other studies in South Carolina (Robichaud and
3 Waldrop, 1994) and studies in Louisiana (Ursic, 1970), Georgia (Battle and Golliday, 2003),
4 Minnesota (McColl and Grigal, 1975; Wright, 1976) and Ontario (Schindler et al., 1980) indicate
5 increases in runoff (Ursic, 1970; Schindler et al., 1980), wetland stage (Battle and Golliday,
6 2003) and lake stage (McColl and Grigal, 1975; Wright, 1976) following prescribed fire
7 (Louisiana and Georgia) or wildfire (Minnesota and Ontario). The study in Minnesota estimated
8 a 60% increase in water yield following wildfire (Wright, 1976) while the study in Ontario
9 indicated similar increases of 60-80% (Schindler et al., 1980) and remained above normal for up
10 to five years following fire.

11
12 Studies on hydrophobic soils are not common in the East although they have been assessed in
13 Wisconsin (Richardson and Hole, 1978), the Upper Peninsula of Michigan (Reeder and
14 Jurgensen, 1979) and on the Georgia Piedmont (Shahlaee et al., 1991). In the Michigan study,
15 the authors concluded that water repellency following fire was not an important long-term
16 management issue in the region (Reeder and Jurgensen, 1979) although studies in Georgia
17 indicated slight hydrophobicity following prescribed fire.

18
19 In general it appears that low-intensity prescribed fires lead to little or no additional increases in
20 flows but as prescribed fires intensify and consume more forest floor and vegetation layers,
21 possibly including the canopy, effects would be comparable to wildfires or forest harvesting
22 (Baker, 1988).

23

1 Sediment Production

2 As noted above, little work has been done in the East on the effects of fire on sediment
3 production or total suspended sediment (TSS). From the few studies that do exist, it appears that
4 prescribed fire (or wildfire in the case of Neary and Currier, 1982) in the East doesn't alter
5 infiltration or percolation rates, doesn't lead to significant increases in surface runoff and, hence,
6 does not lead to higher sediment transport or greater TSS in surface waters (Knighton, 1977; Van
7 Lear et al., 1985; Van Lear and Danielovich, 1988; Swift et al., 1993; Elliot and Vose, 2005).
8 Studies in Louisiana that have prescribed burned on a biennial basis for 20 years indicate short-
9 term increases in sediment produced through interrill erosion on irrigated runoff plots
10 (Dobrowolski et al., 1992). The caveat is that all of these studies are results from prescribed
11 burns which tend to be less destructive to upper soil layers, forest floor and vegetation than
12 wildfires. Studies of a wildfire in Ontario indicate that bedload sediment production increased
13 20X with those increases persisting for 5-6 years (Beaty, 1994). A high severity prescribed fire
14 (similar in impact to a wildfire) in South Carolina led to 40X the sediment production than a low
15 severity prescribed fire (Robichaud and Waldrop, 1994). Similarly, a high severity prescribed
16 fire on the Georgia Piedmont led to high losses of sediment the first year following fire (Van
17 Lear and Kapeluck, 1989). Other studies in the West indicate that fire, especially severe fires,
18 can have dramatic impacts on sediment production (see Gresswell, 1999 for review).

19

20 **Fire Effects on Nutrients**

21 A number of studies in the East have assessed the effect of fire on nitrogen, phosphorus and
22 cation concentrations in surface waters. Fewer have assessed the effect of fire on nutrient fluxes.

23

1 Nitrogen

2 Total nitrogen, organic nitrogen, nitrate and ammonium have been measured on a number of
3 studies to assess the effects of fire on nitrogen cycling and fluxes to surface waters. In stream
4 systems, studies in western South Carolina found no change in either nitrate or ammonium
5 concentration or flux following prescribed burning (Douglas and Van Lear, 1983). In other
6 South Carolina studies, Lewis (1974) also found no difference in surface runoff nitrate between
7 burned and control areas and Richter et al. (1982) found no change in volume weighted
8 concentrations of total N, nitrate and ammonium following prescribed fires. Similarly, Elliot and
9 Vose (2005) found no differences in stream nitrate and ammonium concentrations following
10 prescribed fires in southeastern Tennessee and northern Georgia. However, in another western
11 South Carolina study, Neary and Currier (1982) found elevated nitrate (3X) but similar
12 ammonium concentrations in streams the first year following wildfire. Vose et al. (2005) found
13 that two streams with prescribed burning conducted in the fall had increases in nitrate
14 concentrations with increases persisting for <1 year, while two streams with spring burns showed
15 no increases. Similarly, Knoepp and Swank (1993) indicated about a 3X increase in stream
16 nitrate for about 6 months following prescribed burning in western North Carolina. McColl and
17 Grigal (1977) found no differences in surface runoff total nitrogen or nitrate but did see increases
18 in fluxes (~1.5-2X) of both the first two years following wildfire in Minnesota. Bayley et al.
19 (1992a) found that nitrate (~3-8X), ammonium (~1.5-2X), suspended nitrogen (~1.5-2X), total
20 dissolved nitrogen (~1.5-2X) and total nitrogen concentrations (~1.5-2X) increased following
21 two wildfires in the same watershed (6 years apart) and following the second fire remained
22 elevated nine years after fire in northwestern Ontario. Fluxes in this study followed similar
23 patterns (Bayley et al., 1992a). Lamontagne et al. (2000) estimated that watershed export rates

1 to lakes of total nitrogen and nitrate were elevated the first year following wildfire and were still
2 elevated three years later in southwestern Quebec.

3
4 Nitrogen concentrations in northern Minnesota lakes gave no indication of elevated fluxes
5 following prescribed fire (Wright, 1976; Tarapchak and Wright, 1986). In southwestern Quebec,
6 Carignan et al. (2000) found total organic nitrogen increases of 2X, nitrate concentrations up to
7 60X higher, and ammonium concentrations of 2X higher in lakes present in watersheds with
8 wildfire compared to lakes in watersheds that were unburned. The increases persisted for up to
9 three years. Studies in depressional wetlands in southwestern Georgia indicate increases in
10 ammonium but not for nitrate the first two years following prescribed fire (Battle and Golladay,
11 2003).

12
13 The solubility of nitrogen species and volatilization of nitrogen from both the consumed plants
14 and soils during fire could explain why nitrogen species generally do not respond or respond
15 only shortly after fire. Although considerable nitrogen is lost to volatilization during fire
16 (McRae et al., 2001), the ash left behind is also concentrated in nitrogen which is quickly subject
17 to nitrification processes and available to leaching through forest soils (Knighton, 1975).
18 Overall, the preponderance of the data suggests little influence of fire on nitrogen and where
19 differences exist, they usually do not persist more than 1-3 years unless on shallow soils like
20 those found on the Boreal Shield (Bayley et al., 1992a).

21
22 Phosphorus

1 Phosphorus is generally the limiting nutrient in surface waters and excess phosphorus can lead to
2 eutrophication of lakes, wetlands and streams (Smith, 2003). Typically, the largest fraction of
3 phosphorus entering surface waters following disturbance such as fire is associated with upland
4 sediment sources (Prepas et al., 2003). Total phosphorus is typically measured on unfiltered
5 samples and represents phosphorus associated with both suspended sediment and that which is
6 dissolved. Soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP) and ortho-phosphorus are generally considered the
7 same measure and is the inorganic phosphorus that passes through a filter, usually 0.45 micron.
8 SRP and ortho-phosphorus are considered the active form of phosphorus available for uptake.
9
10 Total phosphorus, ortho-phosphorus and SRP have been measured in streams, lakes and wetlands
11 following fire in the East. Because phosphorus is generally bound to particulates, similar results
12 exist for the transport of total phosphorus as that of sediment. Numerous studies have found no
13 stream response of phosphorus to prescribed fire (or wildfire, Neary and Currier, 1982),
14 including those in southeastern Tennessee and northern Georgia (Elliot and Vose, 2005), western
15 South Carolina (Douglass and Van Lear, 1983; Van Lear et al., 1985), and eastern South
16 Carolina (Richter et al., 1982). Lewis (1974) also found no increases in phosphorus in surface
17 runoff following prescribed fire in South Carolina. McColl and Grigal (1975) found no increases
18 in stream phosphorus following wildfire in Minnesota but did see a 3X increase in phosphorus in
19 surface runoff the first year following fire. Total, suspended and dissolved phosphorus
20 concentrations and fluxes in streams did increase 1.4-3.2X the first two years following wildfire
21 in northwestern Ontario (Schindler et al., 1980), but these increases did not persist even after a
22 second wildfire in the same area (Bayley et al., 1992a).
23

1 Although lake phosphorus concentration in northern Minnesota didn't differ in lakes in burned
2 watersheds when compared to a lake in an unburned watershed (McColl and Grigal, 1975;
3 Tarapchak and Wright, 1986), estimated fluxes to burned lakes increased by 93% the first year
4 following fire (Wright, 1976). In Quebec, lakes in burned watersheds had 2-3X higher total
5 phosphorus concentrations and 1.5-2X higher flux rates to the lakes than lakes that were in
6 unburned watersheds, with the increases persisting for at least three years (Carignan et al., 2000;
7 Lamontagne et al., 2000). Studies in depressional wetlands in southwestern Georgia indicate no
8 differences in SRP concentration the first two years following prescribed fire (Battle and
9 Golladay, 2003).

10

11 Similar to nitrogen, phosphorus does not appear to be a major water quality concern following
12 fire (prescribed or wildfire) in the East unless located on shallow soils such as those found on the
13 Boreal Shield. Even where shallow soils exist, the bulk of the data suggests that impacts are
14 relatively short-term.

15

16 Cations

17 Cations (calcium, magnesium, sodium and potassium) are concentrated in ash (Raison et al.,
18 1985), therefore the potential exists for these nutrients to be transported via surface runoff or
19 easily leached through soils following fire. Studies in the Southeastern U.S. indicate no
20 differences in surface runoff or stream cation concentration following fire (Elliot and Vose,
21 2005; Van Lear et al., 1985; Richter et al., 1982; Douglas and Van Lear, 1983; Neary and
22 Currier, 1982; Lewis, 1974). Wildfires in northern Minnesota, Ontario and Quebec indicate
23 short term increases in cation concentrations and fluxes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

In northern Minnesota, lake concentrations of calcium and potassium increased following wildfire (Tarapchak and Wright, 1986). For the same fire, Wright (1976) showed up to a 265% increase for potassium in runoff following fire while McColl and Grigial (1977) showed increases in calcium, magnesium and potassium in surface runoff the first two years following fire but only found increases in stream concentrations of potassium. Similarly, potassium fluxes in streams following wildfire in northwestern Ontario were 1.4-2.9X than those prior to fire (Schindler et al., 1980) with calcium (1.9X), magnesium (1.9X) and sodium (1.7X) increasing as well (Bayley et al., 1992b). In Quebec, potassium concentrations increased up to 6X in lakes embedded in burned watersheds while calcium and magnesium concentrations increased 2-4X (Carignan et al., 2000) and stayed elevated for at least the first three years following wildfire. In the same set of watersheds exports rates estimated for potassium (3X-7X), calcium (2X-3X) and magnesium (2X-3X) were higher in burned watersheds than unburned watersheds the first three years following wildfire, steadily decreasing with time (Lamontagne et al., 2000).

15
16
17
18
19

Similar as nitrogen and phosphorus, it does not appear that prescribed fires dramatically influence concentrations and transport of cations in the Southeastern US. However, for wildfires in the North, some cation concentrations and fluxes (especially potassium) increase in streams and lakes following fire and those increases can persist for three years or more.

20

21 Fire Effects on Carbon

22
23

Interest in effects on ecosystem carbon has increased over the past 15-20 years because of the implications for climate change. Fires have been shown to be large sources of carbon dioxide

1 (e.g. Amiro et al., 2001) because vegetation (~50% carbon), leaf litter (~50% carbon), surface
2 mineral soils (~1-8% carbon) and organic soils (~20-95% carbon) contain significant carbon.
3 Little work has been done assessing the effects of fire on the concentration or transport of water
4 soluble carbon otherwise known as dissolved organic carbon (DOC). DOC is operationally
5 defined as the carbon that passes through a filter, usually 0.45 or 0.7 micron, and is considered
6 mobile in water. Research in Quebec showed no effect of wildfire on lake DOC concentrations
7 (Carignan et al., 2000) or export rates to those lakes (Lamontagne et al., 2000) following fire.
8 Similarly, Battle and Golladay (2003) found no difference in DOC the first month following
9 prescribed fire in Georgia wetlands in 2000, but did find significantly higher DOC following
10 prescribed fires conducted in 2001. They suggest that field conditions are very important in
11 determining fire's effect on the generation of DOC (Battle and Golladay, 2003). No other studies
12 from Eastern North America were found that assessed the effect of fire on DOC transport.
13 Because of the paucity of data of fire effects on DOC it is difficult to generalize responses, but
14 based on these few studies, it appears that fire does not dramatically affect DOC concentration or
15 transport.

16

17 **Fire Effects on Mercury**

18 Mercury is of great concern in the environment because it biomagnifies up the food chain in
19 aquatic ecosystems (EPA, 2002). Although we are beginning to understand the cycling of total-
20 mercury and methyl-mercury (bioaccumulative form) in forested watersheds (e.g. Hintelmann et
21 al., 2002; Kolka et al., 2001), little work has been done understanding the role of fire in mercury
22 cycling. Nearly 100% of mercury stored in plant-derived fuels is emitted to the atmosphere with
23 85% of that emitted as elemental mercury and particulate mercury accounting for the remainder

1 (Friedli et al., 2003). Newly released elemental mercury enters the global cycle whereas the
2 remaining 15% that is emitted as particulate mercury has the potential to be re-deposited locally
3 during a fire event. Soils are also sources of mercury during fires. Studies indicate that upper
4 soil layers experience significant decreases in mercury following fire (e.g. Dicosy et al., 2006;
5 Amirbahman et al., 2004). While mercury is a contaminant of major concern, few have assessed
6 aquatic mercury dynamics following fire. In Quebec, lakes in burned watersheds showed no
7 significant difference in zooplankton or northern pike (*Esox lucius*) mercury concentrations
8 when compared to lakes in undisturbed watersheds, although mean fish concentrations were
9 about 1.6X higher in burned lakes (Garcia and Carnignan, 2000; Garcia and Carnignan, 1999).
10 While slightly outside the geographic scope of this review, a study of a wildfire in Alberta,
11 Canada did find elevated methyl mercury in lake water and stream water following fire (Kelly et
12 al., 2006). Although this study indicates there are complex dynamics related to nutrient
13 increases following fire, and that effect on the food chain, Kelly et al. (2006) did find higher
14 mercury (5X) in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in burned watersheds than in unburned
15 watersheds. In a different study in Alberta, few differences were found in aquatic biota when
16 comparing lakes in burned watersheds to ones in unburned watersheds, with even short-term
17 (three month) decreases in mercury content of aquatic biota following fire (Allen et al., 2005).
18 Based on what little data we have, it does appear that fire could have effects on mercury cycling
19 and bioaccumulation in the aquatic food web but further investigation is needed.

20

21 **Fire Effects on Other Water Constituents**

22 Some of the studies discussed above have measured other various ions such as sulfate, chloride,
23 dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), pH, alkalinity, conductivity and chlorophyll-a. Richter et al.

1 (1982) found no differences in sulfate, chloride or alkalinity concentrations following prescribed
2 fire in South Carolina. Similarly, no differences were found in pH or sulfate concentrations in
3 northern Georgia and southeastern Tennessee following prescribed fire (Elliot and Vose, 2005).
4 After one month, water in depressional wetlands in burned watersheds had higher pH and
5 alkalinity that those in unburned watersheds in Georgia (Battle and Golladay, 2003). Studies in
6 northern Minnesota indicate little to no differences in lake pH, alkalinity and conductance
7 following wildfire but did see an apparent decrease in chlorophyll-a (Tarapchak and Wright,
8 1986). Studies in Ontario indicate decreases in stream pH and concomitant increases in
9 concentrations and fluxes of sulfate and chloride, leading to lower acid-neutralizing capacity for
10 two years following wildfire (Bayley et al., 1992b). Research on lakes in Quebec indicated no
11 difference in lake alkalinity but considerably higher sulfate, chloride, chlorophyll-a
12 concentrations persisting three years after wildfire (Carignan et al., 2000). Not surprisingly,
13 export rates from drainage areas for these lakes in Quebec were also high for sulfate and chloride
14 (Lamontagne et al., 2000).

15

16 **MECHANICAL, CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL FUELS TREATMENT**

17

18 Although mechanical, chemical and biological fuels treatment are used in Eastern North
19 America, a through the review of the literature indicates that no studies have specifically
20 addressed mechanical, chemical or biological fuel treatment effects on water quality. However,
21 numerous studies have examined mechanical, chemical and biological approaches for vegetation
22 management and a number of reviews have been conducted on these topics.

23

1 Certainly mechanical fuels treatment is similar to other types of vegetation management or site
2 preparation techniques. A number of papers have assessed and reviewed the effect of vegetation
3 management or site preparation on water quality and should be consulted if planning on
4 mechanical approaches to fuels treatment (e.g. Grace, 2005; Dissmeyer, 2000; Thornton et al.,
5 2000; Shepard, 1994; Binkley and Brown, 1993).

6
7 Chemical treatments, herbicides in this case, are typically used to control competing vegetation.
8 Chemical approaches to fuels management would likely have similarly impacts on water quality
9 as those used for vegetation management. Several papers have reviewed the effect of chemical
10 application on water quality and should be referred to if using chemical approaches to fuels
11 management (e.g. Dissmeyer, 2000; Larson et al., 1997; Micheal and Neary, 1993; Neary et al.,
12 1993).

13
14 Few studies have assessed biological approaches to forest vegetation management, especially in
15 Eastern North America. The cost common biological controls are either through insect or fungi
16 predation on plants or by grazing by domesticated ungulates such as cows or goats. Although
17 considerable research has been conducted on the biological control of weeds, Markin and
18 Gardner (1993) indicate that little research has been conducted in forest systems for the purpose
19 of vegetation management and no studies were found that assessed biological control in the
20 context of water quality. Numerous studies have assessed or summarized grazing impacts on
21 water quality (e.g. Patric and Helvey, 1986) but again, none in the context of fuels or vegetation
22 management in forest systems.

23

1 **CONCLUSION**

2

3 In general, it appears that prescribed fire or other fuels management approaches have little
4 impact on water quality in Eastern North America. When soils are deep and the fire severity is
5 low, few water quality changes have been observed, and those that have been reported are
6 generally short-lived (<1 year). The most dramatic impacts have occurred where soils are
7 shallow and fires are severe with some water quality parameters remaining elevated for 3 or
8 more years.

9

10 Certainly more research on the general topic of the effects of fire and other approaches to fuels
11 management (mechanical, chemical and biological) on surface water quality in Eastern North
12 America are needed. Although considerable work has been accomplished on various forest types
13 in the Southeast, little has been done in the rest of Eastern North America, even in places, where
14 prescribed fire is being used a tool for fuels management (e.g. red and jack pine management in
15 the Lakes States). Also, considering the growing importance of carbon, carbon cycling, and its
16 importance in aquatic food webs, little has been done assessing the influence of fire on dissolved
17 organic carbon. Finally, mercury is the number one contaminant in surface waters (i.e. more
18 EPA advisories for mercury than any other substance), and we know little about how fire affects
19 mercury transport and accumulation in the food chain.

20

21 **LITERATURE CITED**

- 1 Allen, E.W., E.E. Prepas, S. Gabos, W.M.J. Strachan, and W. Zhang. 2005. Methyl mercury
2 concentrations in macroinvertebrates and fish from burned and undisturbed lakes on the
3 Boreal Plain. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science*, 62: 1963-1977.
- 4 Amirbahman, A., P.L. Ruck, I.J. Fernandez, T.A. Haines, and J.S. Kahl. 2004. The effect of fire
5 on mercury cycling in the soils of forested watersheds: Acadia National Park, Maine,
6 U.S.A. *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*, 152(1-4): 313-331.
- 7 Amiro, B.D., J.B. Todd, B.M. Wotton, K.A. Logan, M.D. Flannigan, B.J. Stocks, J.A. Mason,
8 D.L. Martell and K.G. Hirsch. 2001. Direct carbon emissions from Canadian forest fires,
9 1959 to 1999. *Can. J. For. Res.* 31: 512–525.
- 10 Baker, M.B. Jr. 1988. Hydrologic and water quality effects of fire. In: *Effects of Fire in*
11 *Management of Southwestern Natural Resources*. Tucson, AZ.
- 12 Battle, J. and S.W. Golladay. 2003. Prescribed fire's impact on water quality of depression
13 wetlands in Southwestern Georgia. *Am. Midl. Nat.* 150: 15-25.
- 14 Bayley, S.E., D.W. Schindler, K.G. Beaty, B.R. Parker, and M.P. Stainton. 1992a. Effects of
15 multiple fires on nutrient yields from streams draining forest and fen watersheds: nitrogen
16 and phosphorus. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 49: 584-596.
- 17 Bayley, S.E., D.W. Schindler, B.R. Parker, M.P. Stainton, and K.G. Beaty. 1992b. Effects of
18 forest fire and drought on acidity of a base-poor boreal forest stream: similarities between
19 climatic warming and acidic precipitation. *Biogeochemistry*, 17: 191-204.
- 20 Beaty, K.G. 1994. Sediment transport in a small stream following two successive forest fires.
21 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 51: 2723-2733.
- 22 Binkley, D. and T.C. Brown. 1993. Forest practices as nonpoint sources of pollution in North
23 America. *Water Resources Bulletin*, 29: 729-740.

- 1 Carignan, R., P. D'Arcy, and S. Lemontagne. 2000. Comparative impacts of fire and forest
2 harvesting on water quality in Boreal Shield lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 57(supl
3 2):105-117.
- 4 Dicosty, R.J., M.A. Callaham, and J.A. Stanturf. 2006. Atmospheric deposition and re-emission
5 of mercury estimated in a prescribed forest-fire experiment in Florida, USA. *Water, Air,
6 and Soil Pollution*, 176(1-4): 77-91.
- 7 Dissmeyer, G. E. 2000. Drinking water from forests and grasslands: a synthesis of the scientific
8 literature. General Technical Report - Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service,
9 SRS-39.
- 10 Dobrowolski, J.P., W.H. Blackburn, and H.A. Pearson. 1992. Changes to infiltration and interrill
11 erosion from long-term prescribed burning in Louisiana. *Water Resources Bulletin*. 28:
12 287-298.
- 13 Douglass, J.E. and D.H. Van Lear. 1983. Prescribed burning and water quality of ephemeral
14 streams in the Piedmont of South Carolina. *Forest Sci.* 29: 181-189.
- 15 Elliot, K.J. and J.M. Vose. 2005. Initial effects of prescribed fire on quality of soil solution and
16 streamwater in the Southern Appalachian Mountains. *S. J. Applied. For.* 29: 5-15.
- 17 EPA – ORD. 2002. Workshop on the fate, transport, and transformation of mercury in aquatic
18 and terrestrial environments. EPA-625/R-02/005, June 2002
- 19 Friedli, H. R., L.F. Radke, J.Y. Lu, C.M. Banic, W.R. Leitch, and J.I. MacPherson. 2003.
20 Mercury emission from burning of biomass from temperate North American forests:
21 laboratory and airborne measurements. *Atmospheric Environment*, 37(2): 253-267.

- 1 Garcia, E. and R. Carignan. 2000. Mercury concentrations in northern pike (*esox lucius*) from
2 boreal lakes with logged, burned, or undisturbed catchments. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*
3 57(supl 2):129-135.
- 4 Garcia, E. and R. Carignan. 1999. Impact of wildfire and clearcutting in the Boreal forest on
5 methyl mercury in zooplankton. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 56: 339-345.
- 6 Grace, J.M. III. 2005. Forest operations and water quality in the South. *Trans. ASAE*, 48(2):
7 871-880.
- 8 Gresswell, R. E. 1999. Fire and aquatic ecosystems in forested biomes of North America.
9 *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 128:193-221.
- 10 Hintelmann, H., R. Harris, A. Heyes, J.P. Hurley, C.A. Kelly, D.P. Krabbenhoft, S. Lindberg,
11 J.W.M. Rudd, K.J. Scott, and V.L. St. Louis. 2002. Reactivity and mobility of new and
12 old mercury deposition in a boreal forest ecosystem during the first year of the
13 METAALICUS study. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36:5034-5040
- 14 Kelly, E.N., D.W. Schindler, V.L. St. Louis, D.B. Donald, and K.E. Vladicka. 2006. Forest fire
15 increases mercury accumulation by fishes via food web restructuring and increased
16 mercury inputs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
17 *America*, 103(51): 19380-19385.
- 18 Knighton, M.D. 1977. Hydrologic response and nutrient concentrations following spring burns
19 in an oak-hickory forest. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 41: 627-632.
- 20 Knoepp, J. D., and W. T. Swank. 1993. Site preparation burning to improve southern
21 Appalachian pine-hardwood stands: nitrogen responses in soil, soil water, and streams.
22 *Can. J. For. Res.*, 23: 2263-2270.

- 1 Kolka, R.K., D.F. Grigal, E.A. Nater, and E.S. Verry. 2001. Hydrologic cycling of mercury and
2 organic carbon in a forested upland-bog watershed . *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 65:897-905.
- 3 Lamontagne, S., R. Carignan, P. D'Arcy, Y.T. Prairie, and D. Pare. 2000. Element export in
4 runoff from eastern Canadian Boreal Shield drainage basins following forest harvesting
5 and wildfires. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 57(supl 2):118-128.
- 6 Larson, S.J., P.D. Capel, and M.S. Majewski. 1997. *Pesticides in Surface Water: Distribution,*
7 *Trends and Governing Factors. Series 5.3: Pesticides in the Hydrologic System.*
8 *Chelsea, MI, Ann Arbor Press. 373 p.*
- 9 Lewis, W.M. Jr. 1974. Effect of fire on nutrient movement in a South Carolina pine forest.
10 *Ecology*, 55: 1120-1127.
- 11 Markin, G.P. and D.E. Gardner. 1993. Status of biological control in vegetation management in
12 forestry. *Can. J. For. Res.*, 23: 2023-2031.
- 13 McColl, J.G. and D.F. Grigal. 1975. Forest fire: effects on phosphorus movement to lakes.
14 *Science*, 188: 1109-1111.
- 15 McColl, J.G. and D.F. Grigal. 1977. Nutrient changes following a forest wildfire in Minnesota:
16 Effects in watersheds with differing soils. *Oikos*: 28(1): 105-112.
- 17 McRae, D.J., L.C. Duchesne, B. Freedman, T.J. Lynham, and S. Woodley. 2001. Comparisons
18 between wildfire and forest harvesting and their implications in forest management.
19 *Environ. Rev.* 9: 223-260.
- 20 Michael, J.L. and D.G. Neary. 1993. Herbicide dissipation studies in southern forest
21 ecosystems. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 12: 405-410.

1 Neary, D.G., P.B. Bush, and J.L. Michael. 1993. Fate, dissipation and environmental effects of
2 pesticides in southern forests: a review of a decade of research progress. *Environmental*
3 *Toxicology and Chemistry*, 12: 411-428.

4 Neary, D.G., and J.B. Currier. 1982. Impacts of wildfire and watershed restoration on water
5 quality in South Carolina's Blue Ridge Mountains. *South. J. Appl. For.* 6(2): 81-90.

6 Patric, J.H. and J.D. Helvey. 1986. Some effects of grazing on soil and water in the eastern
7 forest. General Technical Report - Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, USDA Forest
8 Service, NE-115.

9 Prepas, E.E., J.M. Burke, D.S. Chanasyk, D.W. Smith, G. Putz, S. Gabos, W. Chen, D. Millions,
10 and M. Serediak. 2003. Impact of wildfire on discharge and phosphorus export from the
11 Sakwatamau watershed in the Swan Hills, Alberta during the first two years. *J. Environ.*
12 *Eng. Sci.* 2:S63-S72.

13 Reeder, C.J., Jurgensen, M.F., 1979. Fire-induced water repellency in forest soils of upper
14 Michigan. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 9: 363-373.

15 Richardson, J.L., Hole, F.D., 1978. Influence of vegetation on water repellency in selected
16 western Wisconsin soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 42: 465-467.

17 Richter, D.D., C.W. Ralston, and W.R. Harms. 1982. Prescribed fire: effects on water quality
18 and nutrient cycling. *Science*, 215: 661-663.

19 Robichaud, P.R. and T.A. Waldrop. 1994. A comparison of surface runoff and sediment yields
20 from low- and high-severity site preparation burns. *Water Resources Bulletin*, 30: 27-34.

21 Schindler, D.W., R.W. Newbury, K.G. Beaty, J. Prokopowich, T. Ruszczynski, and J.A. Dalton.
22 1980. Effects of a windstorm and forest fire on chemical losses from forested watersheds
23 and on the quality of receiving stream. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 37: 328-334.

- 1 Shahlaee, A.K, W.L. Nutter, E.R. Burroughs Jr., and L.A. Morris. 1991. Runoff and sediment
2 production from burned forest sites in the Georgia Piedmont. *Water Resources Bulletin*,
3 27: 485-493.
- 4 Shepard, J. P. 1994. Effects of forest management on surface water quality in wetland forests.
5 *Wetlands* 14: 18-26.
- 6 Smith, V.H. 2003. Eutrophication of freshwater and coastal marine ecosystems: A global
7 problem. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research: International*, 10(2): 126-139.
- 8 Stednick, J.D. 2006. Effects of Fuel Management Practices on Water Quality. In *Cumulative*
9 *Watershed Effects of Fuels Management: A Western Synthesis*.
- 10 Swift, L.W. Jr., K.J. Elliot, R.D. Ottmar, and R.E. Vihnanek. 1993. Site preparation burning to
11 improve southern Appalachian pine-hardwood stands: fire characteristics and soil
12 erosion, moisture and temperature. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 23, 2242-2254.
- 13 Tarapchak, S.J. and H.E. Wright, Jr. 1986. Effects of forest fire and other disturbances on
14 wilderness lakes in northeastern Minnesots, I. *Limnology. Arch. Hydrobiol.* 106(2): 177-
15 202.
- 16 Thornton, K.W., S.P. Holbrook, K.L Stolte, and R.B. Landy. 2000. Effects of forest
17 management practices on mid-Atlantic streams. *Environmental Monitoring and*
18 *Assessment*, 63: 31-41.
- 19 Ursic, S.J. 1970. Hydrologic effects of prescribed burning and deadening upland hardwoods in
20 northern Mississippi. Res. Pap. SO-54. New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of
21 Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. 15 p.
- 22 Van Lear, D.H., and S.J. Danielovich. 1988. Soil movement after broadcast burning in the
23 Southern Appalachians. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry*, 12: 49-53.

1 Van Lear, D.H., J.E. Douglass, S. Cox, and M.K. Ausspurger. 1985. Sediment and nutrient
2 export in runoff from burned and harvested pine watersheds in the South Carolina
3 Piedmont. *J. Environ. Qual.* 14(2): 169-174.

4 Van Lear, D.H. and P.R. Kapeluck. 1989. Fell and burn to regenerate mixed pine-hardwood
5 stands: an overview of effects on soil. In: *Proceedings, Pine-Hardwood Mixtures: A*
6 *Symposium on Management and Ecology of the Type.* General Technical Report -
7 Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, USDA Forest Service, SE-58.

8 Vose, J.M., C.D. Geron, J.T. Walker, and K. Rauland-Rasmussen. 2005. Restoration Effects on
9 N-Cycling Pools and Processes. Pp. 77-96 In *Restoration of Temperate and Boreal*
10 *Ecosystems*, J. Stanturf and P. Madsen, eds. CRC/Lewis Press, Boca Raton, FL.

11 Wright, R.F. 1976. The impact of forest fire on nutrient influxes to small lakes in Northeastern
12 Minnesota. *Ecology*, 57(4): 649-663.

13
14

Table 1. Studies that have assessed the effect of fire (prescribed fire or wildfire) on water quality in Eastern North America.

| Study | Location | Fuels Mgm't | Aquatic System | Parameters | Findings |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Elliot and Vose, 2005 | Tennessee, Georgia | Prescribed Fire | Streams | Cations, Anions, TSS, pH | No differences found following fire |
| Vose et al., 2005 | W. North Carolina | Prescribed Fire | Streams | NO ₃ | 2 streams with fall burn showed increases in NO ₃ ⁻ with increases persisting for <1 year, 2 streams with spring burns showed no increase |
| Beaty, 1994 | NW Ontario | Wildfire | Streams | Bedload | Bedload increased 20X following fire recovery in 5-6 years |
| Knoepp and Swank, 1993 | W. North Carolina | Prescribed Fire | Streams | NO ₃ | Elevated in one burned stream for 6 months |
| Bayley et al., 1992a | NW Ontario | Wildfire | Streams | N and P species | Fluxes of most N species and fractions increased and remained elevated up to 9 years following fire. Only short-term effects on P flux |
| Bayley et al., 1992b | NW Ontario | Wildfire | Streams | Cations, Anions, DIC ANC, pH | Increases in concentrations and fluxes of anions and cations with an overall increase in stream acidity and decrease in pH two years following fire. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Van Lear et al., 1985 | W. South Carolina | Prescribed Fire | Streams | Sediment, Nutrients, Cations | No differences found following fire |
| Douglas and Van Lear, 1983 | W. South Carolina | Prescribed Fire | Streams | Nutrients, Cations | No differences found following fire |
| Richter et al., 1982 | E. South Carolina | Prescribed Fire | Streams | Cations, Anions | No differences found following fire |
| Neary and Currier, 1982 | W. South Carolina | Wildfire | Streams | Nutrients, Cations, TSS | Only difference was elevated NO ₃ in the first year |
| Schindler et al., 1980 | NW Ontario | Wildfire | Streams | N, P, K | Increases in concentrations and fluxes of N, P and K at at least 3 years following fire |
| McColl and Grigal, 1977 | Minnesota | Wildfire | Surface Runoff Streams/Lakes | Cations N, P, pH cond. | Differences in fluxes for 2 years following fire, no differences in concentrations |
| McColl and Grigal, 1975 | Minnesota | Wildfire | Surface Runoff Streams/Lakes | P | Increases in P flux in surface runoff 1 st year following fire, no other differences |
| Robichaud and Waldrop, 1994 | W. South Carolina | Prescribed Fire | Surface Runoff | Sediment | 40X increase in sediment production when comparing low severity and high severity burns for 1 year |
| Dobrowolski et al., | Louisiana | Prescribed Fire | Surface Runoff | Sediment | Small short-term effects on |

1992

interrill erosion following
biennial fires

Van Lear and
Kapeluck, 1989

W. South Carolina,
Georgia Piedmont

Prescribed Fire

Surface Runoff

Sediment

Low sediment production
from low severity burns but
high production from high
severity burns

Van Lear and
Danielovich, 1988

W. South Carolina

Prescribed Fire

Surface Runoff

Sediment

No differences found
between burned and
unburned clearcut plots

Knighton, 1977

Wisconsin

Prescribed Fire

Surface Runoff

Sediment

No differences found
following fire

Lewis, 1974

South Carolina

Prescribed Fire

Surface Runoff

Nutrients,
Cations

Few differences, “no
firm conclusions” following
prescribed fire

Carignan et al.,
2000

Quebec

Wildfire

Lakes

Nutrients,
Cations,
Anions
DOC, Alk.

Increases in concentrations of
NO₃, TP, Ca, K, SO₄, and Cl
first year following fire but
most were still above
reference after 3 years

Garcia and Carignan,
2000

Quebec

Wildfire

Lakes

Hg in fish,
TP, TN, Ca
SO₄, DOC
pH, Alk.,
Chl a

TP, TN concentrations higher
in burned lakes, Hg in fish,
Ca, and DOC no different

Lamontagne et al.,
2000

Quebec

Wildfire

Lakes

Nutrients,
Cations,

Increases in K, TN, TP, Mg,
NO₃, and SO₄ export rates

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | Anions DOC | following fire, rates highest first year following fire but were still above reference after 3 years |
| Tarapchak and Wright, 1986 | Minnesota | Wildfire | Lakes | Cations, Anions, Alk, pH, Cond., Chl-a | Small increases in Ca and K 1 st year following fire |
| Wright, 1976 | Minnesota | Wildfire | Lakes | Cations, P | Increases in P and K but “minimal impacts” following wildfire. |
| Battle and Golladay, 2003 | SW Georgia | Prescribed Fire | Wetlands | Nutrients, DOC, DIC Alk., pH | Increases in pH, alkalinity, DIC, DOC, and NH ₄ one month following fire |
