Seasons in the Field: Reflections from a Career Studying the Consequences of Catastrophe





Gary Shigenaka Emergency Response Division U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 21 June, 2018

My Standard Disclaimer...

The views, opinions, alternative facts, and blatant lies portrayed herein, are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the U.S. Department of Commerce. And certainly no one higher up the food chain. #plausibledeniability #fakenews



Whatcom Creek pipeline, 1999

And in case of the local division of the loc

SELENDANG AYU

Selendang Ayu, 2004



Atlantic right whale carcass, 2007

Murphy Oil, 2005

88°30'W

88°40'W

88°20'W 88°10'W 88°0'W 87°5



Thoughts & Lessons... ...from Post-Incident Monitoring of/Research on Major U.S. Spills

- Incident overviews
- Spill-response-focused monitoring
- Impact assessment monitoring
- Broader lessons learned
- Closing thoughts and apologies



Torrey Canyon – March 1967

Recolonization of Rocky Shores in Cornwall After Use of Toxic Dispersants to Clean Up the *Torrey Canyon* Spill¹

A. J. SOUTHWARD AND EVE C. SOUTHWARD Marine Biological Association, Citadel Hill, Plymouth, U.K.

SOUTHWARD, A. J., AND E. C. SOUTHWARD. 1978. Recolonization of rocky shores in Cornwall after use of toxic dispersants to clean up the *Torrey Canyon* spill. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 35: 682-706.

Fourteen thousand tons of Kuwait crude oil, reduced from 18 000 tons by weathering at sea, was stranded along 150 km of the coast of West Cornwall, England, in March 1967. The oil was treated with 10 000 tons of toxic dispersants during cleaning operations. By itself the oil was not very toxic, although it killed some limpets and barnacles, and most of the mortalities that followed cleaning were due to the dispersants. There was a graded effect. Most animals and some algae were killed on the shores treated heavily with dispersants, while a few animals and most algae survived in places less heavily treated. However, long stretches of coast were contaminated to some extent by drifting of patches of oil and dispersants along the shore and by indiscriminate dispersant use in remote coves. The general sequence of recolonization was similar to that which has been found after small-scale experiments, where the rocks were scraped clean, or where limpets were removed, but took longer to complete. There was first a rapid "greening" by the alga Enteromorpha; then a heavy settlement and growth of perennial brown algae (Fucus species), leading to loss of surviving barnacles. A settlement of limpets and other grazing animals followed, with eventual removal or loss of the brown algae. The final phases were a reduction in the limpet population and a resettlement of barnacles. Lightly oiled, wavebeaten rocks that received light dispersant treatment showed the most complete return to normal, taking about 5-8 yr; heavily oiled places that received repeated application of dispersants have taken 9-10 yr and may not be completely normal yet. Most common species returned within 10 yr, but one rare hermit crab is still missing from places directly treated with dispersants. The early recolonization by algae resulted in a raising of the upper limit of Laminaria digitata and Himanthalia elongata by as much as 2 m in wavebeaten places, demonstrating that grazing pressure by limpets must be one of the factors controlling the zonation of these plants. Later, other species of plants and animals were found higher up the shore than usual, under the shade and shelter provided by the dense canopy of Fucus. Fluctuations in the populations of algae and herbivorous animals during the course of the recolonization illustrate the importance of biological interactions in controlling the structure of intertidal communities. Pollution disturbance affects the herbivores more than plants, hence the point of stability of the community is shifted towards the sheltered shore condition of low species richness and greater biomass.

Key words: petroleum, dispersant, rocky shore, Torrey Canyon, recolonization, coastal ecology, pollution

Fifty years after the wreck of the Torrey Canyon

The work of the Marine Biological Association of the UK on acute impacts and subsequent recovery

The Torrey Compose was wrecked on 18th March 1967 on the Pollard Rock of the Seven Stones reef, 15 miles (25 km) from Land's End, Comwall, UK (Figure 1). The 970 foot (300 m) tanker was bound for oil refineries at Milford Haven with 117,000 tons of Kuwait crude oil. She struck the rocks at 17 knots, tearing open six of her 18 storage tanks and less severely damaging the others. Salvage attempts failed. The ship progressively broke up over the next six weeks due to storm damage and bombing on the 28th, 29th and 30th March in an attempt to burn up the oil. She finished a submarged, broken wreck, being officially declared to contain no more oil towards the end of April 1967.

At the time, the *Torrey Conyon* oil spill attracted much media attention and political intervention. The Prime Minister at the time, Harold Wilson, took a personal interest. He had a holiday home on the Isles of Scilly, seven miles to the southwest of the wreck. It was also the first spill involving the first generation of super-tankers. Furthermore, it was treated - excessively in many instances - by the first generation of dispersants. These were in effect industrial cleaning agents - outpermistically called detergents at the time (e.g. Smith 1968). More damage was done by the dispersant applied (10,000 tons) than by the oil itself (14,000 tons) that came ashore in west Cornwall.

All the staff of the Marine Biological Association of the UK (MBA) were mobilised to deal with the environmental impacts of the spill for six weeks (Smith 1968). The MBA's research vessel *Survia* was on the scene within a week or so after the wreck. MBA staff members Alan and Eve Southward were subsequently involved in longterm studies of recovery of rocky shores for the next ten years or so (Southward 1979, Southward and Southward 1978), continued in concert with Steve Hawkins since 1980 at one of the worst affected shores – Porthleven (Hawkins et al. 1983, Hawkins et al. 2002, Hawkins and Southward 1992, Hawkins et al. in press, in prep.) and more recently (since 2002) with Nova Miezekowska.

A network of shores had been studied in the southwest of England for over a decade before the spill (Southward 1967), primarily to understand the influence of climatic fluctuations on intertidal species, particularly barnacles (Southward and Crisp 1954, 1956). These observations were subsequently maintained by the Southwards (e.g. Southward 1991, Southward et al. 1995) and continued by Steve Hawkins, Nova Mieszkowska and co-workers (e.g., Hawkins et al. 2003, 2008, 2009, Mieszkowska et al. 2006, 2014a,b, Mieszkowska and Sugden 2016) (Fig. 1). The trajectory of recovery following the *Torrey Canyon* oil spill was determined by interaction with climate fluctuations and other sources of chronic pollution such as Tributyltin from anti-fouling paints (Bryan et al. 1986, Spence et al. 1990).

Smith (1968)

Some Facts About Exxon Valdez.



- Tanker grounded March 24, 1989
- Alaskan crude oil en route from Valdez, Alaska, to Long Beach, California
- Vessel turned to avoid ice in shipping lanes and struck Bligh Reef
- 40.8 42.2 million litres spilled
- Resulted in major changes to U.S. spill preparation and response

What I'll Discuss re: *Exxon Valdez*.



- Long-term shoreline monitoring program focused on response impacts
- Pictures are worth...a lot
- Follow-on experiment based on monitoring results
- Marine mammal impacts inferred from long-term monitoring

T/V Exxon Valdez: 24 March, 1989

-



Exxon Valdez Shoreline Cleanup

Exxon Valdez Shoreline Cleanup

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council

PUNC

Exxon Valdez Shoreline Cleanup



Exxon Valdez: Recovery from Cleanup



Initially: a greater degree of recovery was necessary at washed sites, but little difference could be discerned between washed & unwashed sites after around three years.

Torrey Canyon: Smith (1968)

Exxon Valdez: The Legacy of Mearns Rock



Oil Spill Response Tradeoffs: Idealized Recovery



Time

Recovery from Spills: *Exxon Valdez* "Parallelism"

Oil spill impact





Time

"Recovered" condition when the natural biota have been re-established and show trends of response similar to that at reference sites

Difference between communities when "recovered"



Lower Herring Bay Experiment: 2000-2012

Lower Herring Bay Experiment: 2000-2012



Lessons Learned from Exxon Valdez Response Monitoring



- Short-term intertidal damage from cleanup diminished within 2-3 years
- Recovery from physical disturbance precedes biological recovery
- Drivers of change unrelated to spill can complicate impact assessment
- Utility & criticality of "set aside" sites



Footnote: *Exxon Valdez* Lingering Oil Disc Island, Prince William Sound, 4 June 2018...



Exxon Valdez 1989

Timeline of Recovery from Exxon Valdez Spill



** USGS determination

Pre-Exxon Valdez Assumptions about Cetaceans & Oil

"On the whole, it is quite improbable that a species or population of cetaceans will be disabled by a spill at sea, whatever the likelihood that one or a few animals might be affected or even killed."

J.R. Geraci, in Sea Mammals and Oil: Confronting the Risks

"An assessment of the toxicological literature and of the available empirical data on EVOS leads to the conclusion that direct, long-term sublethal toxic effects on wildlife appear to be very unlikely."

R. Hartung, in *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill: Fate and Effects in Alaskan Waters



CAGE THR: 0 DPT: 4829' HDG: 094 TRN: 0.5 Some Facts About *Deepwater Horizon* ...(aka Macondo, MC252) ROV DPT: 4936' ALT: 48 ' BTY: 4984'

Mobile Offshore Drilling Unit working BP lease, Mississippi Canyon
 252, 80 km off Louisiana coast

37

• Exploded 20 April 2010, 11 fatalities

- Sank 21 April, mostly uncontrolled flow for 87 days
- 515 million 779 million litres South Louisiana crude
- 42.8% liquid petroleum, 57.2% gas at source (21 June)
- Maximum personnel 47,282 (8 July)

• Closed fisheries maximum 229,271 sq. km (2 June)

Post-Deepwater Horizon Research & Monitoring



CAGE THR: 0 DPT: 4829 HDG: 094 TRN: 0.5 What I'll Discuss re: *Deepwater Horizon* ...(aka Macondo, MC252)

ROV DPT: 4936' ALT: 48 ' BTY: 4984'

 Intensive studies of marine mammal (dolphin) impacts in heavily oiled location

Consistency & "constellation" of impacts across species

 Marsh impact, cleanup, and remediation studies during and after response

37











Deepwater Horizon Bottlenose Dolphin Assessments

Live health assessments

Physical exams
Blood panels
Ultrasound
Pregnancy assessment
Fecal and blowhole
Weight & length
Tooth aging
Infectious diagnostics

2. Observational & remote biopsies

- Genetics
- Hormones (pregnancy)
- Persistent organics
- Survival rates
- Reproductive outcomes

3. Stranded & dead dolphin tissues

- Demographics
- Weight & length
- Gross observations
- Full histology set (tissues)
- Infectious & biotoxin diagnostics

NMFS Permit No. 932-1905/MA-009526

Marine Mammal (Cetacean) Routes of Exposure

• Inhalation

• Dermal & ocular contact



Conceptual Model of Oiled Dolphin Health Effects



Deepwater Horizon Dolphin Injury Assessment Findings



Mammal exposure to DWH oil contributed to the largest, longest lasting marine mammal Unusual Mortality Event (UME) recorded in the northern Gulf of Mexico (>1000 stranded)

DWH Physiological Oil Response "Constellation"



Deepwater Horizon Natural Resource Damage Assessment Trustees (2016)

Amoco Cadiz, Ile Grande Marsh 1978

Los Angeles Times/Carolyn Cole

Deepwater Horizon, Bay Jimmy 2010

A DATA A DATA A DATA A DATA A DATA A

Deepwater Horizon: Bay Jimmy (Barataria Bay), Louisiana Test Plots





Response/Restoration

Planted

Not Planted

Deepwater Horizon Marsh Monitoring Conclusions

Did <u>shoreline treatment improve oiling conditions</u> and recovery?
 <u>Yes, over first few years especially</u>, but with some negative side effects in some cases.

Did <u>planting after treatment</u> help even more?

<u>Yes, to a large degree, especially for vegetation recovery, invertebrates have</u> been slower to recover but still improved; no downsides observed.

What would we do next time in similar situation?

Recommendation: carefully tailor treatment type and intensity, and follow immediately with planting.

Some General Findings... ...from Monitoring/Research on *Exxon Valdez & Deepwater Horizon*

- Long-term monitoring of impact and recovery from major oil spills has shown that marine habitats are resilient...
- ...but not invulnerable
 - Marine mammals and other long-lived, slow-reproducing organisms are sensitive
- The case for leaving (some) sites oiled and untreated
- Post-incident monitoring should begin during the incident; in some cases, restoration should begin early as well

F/V Deep Sea, Penn Cove, WA, 2012

...or, not all interesting monitoring takes place at huge spills...

Kasia Pierzga/Whidbey Examiner



C. Andersen/Washington Department of Ecology

Call of

F/V Deep Sea – Penn Cove WA Our "Small Science" Hypotheses

- Oil would be at the surface and not contaminate submerged (>1 m) mussels;
- If they were contaminated, depuration half-life of PAHs would be several days to several weeks following completion of the response



F/V Deep Sea – Penn Cove WA Our "Small Science" Hypotheses

We were wrong.

tPAHs in Penn Cove Float Mussels







Final Thoughts... Why Post-Incident Monitoring?

"What is past is prologue."

William Shakespeare, The Tempest, Act II Scene I

"Life can only be understood backwards; but it must be lived forwards."

Søren Kierkegaard, Journals, 1843

"Those who ignore the past are condemned to repeat it."

George Santayana, The Life of Reason, 1905