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ABSTRACT
A broad selection of recent literature on the effects of oil on marine ecosystems is reviewed. The focus is on studies on crude oil, and the results are discussed with the purpose of providing a summary of findings that will be a useful reference for administrators and policy makers involved in decisions concerning petroleum developments and related activities. The characteristics of crude oil and factors modifying its impact on the marine environment are discussed. Most research on the toxicity of oil has dealt with acute effects and data on long-term impacts at the community level are inconclusive. It is concluded that chronic low-level pollution is potentially more damaging to ecosystems than isolated catastrophic spills. Decision makers are forced to rely on interpretative judgments rather than conclusive data.

Much of the material in this report was gathered as background material for use in preparing the marine section of the final environmental impact statement on the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline system (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1972). Some of the statements are essentially unchanged from the way they were presented in the appendix to volume IV of the impact statement. The impact statement made it clear that not enough data are available to analyze conclusively all of the potential environmental impacts of operation of the pipeline marine terminal facilities at Port Valdez, Alaska, and the transshipment of crude oil by tankers to west coast ports. A conclusion that can be drawn, however, and a message of the impact statement, is that oil poses a significant hazard to marine ecosystems, and a good deal of intensive research is necessary if these hazards are to be quantified and fully understood.

Research on oil pollution published since the impact statement on the pipeline was issued reveals that scant progress has been made, particularly with regard to the effects of chronic low-level oil pollution. Current and projected demands for energy in the United States are prompting accelerated development of offshore petroleum reserves, expanded oil tanker traffic, and proposals for construction of deepwater port facilities to handle the increasing number of supertankers. These developments will not wait for conclusive answers to questions on oil pollution. Recognizing this, we feel it is important that public administrators and policy makers be made aware of the inferences and trends evident in the research findings to date. These findings present a persuasive case that decisions regarding the handling of crude oil and petroleum products should be conservative and in favor of protecting the natural environment. While this report is by no means a complete review of the literature, it is sufficient to illustrate the potential danger of oil pollution to marine ecosystems and provide some guidance for policy decisions.

History is replete with examples of man's scientific and technological advances carrying him into situations he did not fully comprehend and with consequences he could not evaluate. Bella (1970) noted that "our ability to change this world is going to increase faster than our ability to predict what that change is going to be." He concludes that our management procedures must recognize the degree of ignorance we have about this world in which we live.

Pollution of the ocean by oil is a worldwide problem of growing concern to many nations. Spills like the Torrey Canyon, the Arrow, the Santa Barbara Channel blowout, and other spectacular incidents have helped stimulate international organizations of governments and industry to react to the problem. Viewed pragmatically, international response has been at least as adequate as domestic programs. Predicting the impact of an oil spill on the environment requires an understanding of the complex interactions involved. What
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appears to be universally lacking is the difficult research leading to an understanding of chronic and sublethal effects of oil at the biological community level. The following discussion outlines these complexities and points out how they make most generalizations invalid and the extrapolation of most data dangerous.

**DESCRIPTION OF OIL**

Crude oil is a complex mixture of many different specific hydrocarbons and a variety of compounds containing sulfur, oxygen, nitrogen, and some trace metals. Hydrocarbons make up the bulk of crude oil and can roughly be placed into one of three classes: paraffinic, naphthenic, and aromatic. From one area to another, crude oils vary in their composition and in density, volatility, and solubility. Their relative toxicity will vary (Ottway, 1971) but is roughly proportional to their aromatic content.

Paraffinic (or aliphatic) hydrocarbons are straight or branched carbon chains and are saturated (thus no carbon-carbon double bonds) with hydrogen or other groups. These hydrocarbons are the least toxic, although they may have an anesthetic or narcotic effect if concentrations are great enough.

Naphthenic compounds (cycloparaffins) contain at least one ring structure that is saturated. With this base, more rings or chains may be attached to form a variety of complex molecules.

Aromatic hydrocarbons also contain a ringed structure, but the ring is unsaturated with hydrogen and contains carbon-carbon double bonds (benzene ring). The simplest aromatic is benzene, which is very toxic and relatively water soluble in comparison to most hydrocarbons found in crude oil. Benzene and other low-boiling aromatics are the most toxic petroleum fractions. High-boiling aromatics act as slower poisons than low-boiling aromatics, but they are equally severe in their effect. In addition, some are known to induce cancer; 3,4-benzpyrene, 1,2-benzanthracene, and some alkylbenzanthracenes have been isolated from crude oil, and their carcinogenic effects on animals and man have been demonstrated (Blumer, 1970).

Olefinic hydrocarbons (paraffinlike but unsaturated and containing reactive carbon-carbon double bonds) are not generally found in crude oils but are plentiful in certain gasolines and other refined products. The fate of olefins in the marine environment is poorly understood, but this class of compounds may be quite reactive under certain conditions and may combine readily with hydrogen, oxygen, chlorine, sulfur, and other elements to produce toxic substances. Once incorporated into organisms, olefins may remain intact for surprisingly long times (Blumer, 1967). The full range of olefinic hydrocarbons probably interferes with the reception of chemical messengers, or odors, in the sea by certain marine organisms (Blumer, 1970, see footnote 3).

When crude oil is processed ("cracked"), olefins and other compounds for gasoline and fuel oils may be formed or separated. Fuel oils, commonly involved in spills, are rated from 1 to 6. Those rated 1 are the lightest, most volatile, and most toxic and have the greatest aromatic concentrations; those rated 6 are the least volatile, least soluble, and least toxic and are asphaltic (tarlike).

Hydrocarbons are not foreign to the marine environment; normal paraffins are synthesized by most, if not all, living organisms. Blumer, Guillard, and Chase (1971) characterized the natural hydrocarbon content of 22 species of phytoplankton and cited literature for zooplankton. There are certain characteristic differences, however, between hydrocarbons native to organisms and the hydrocarbons in petroleum, particularly in the relative distribution of the various hydrocarbons. Crude oils and certain petroleum products are complex mixtures that contain molecules of different sizes in ratios not found in any one species of organism. Certain specific paraffins, and some naphthenic and aromatic compounds, are rarely found in organisms not exposed to oil pollution. These characteristic differences have been the basis for several scientific papers (Blumer, Souza, and Sass, 1970; Ehrhardt, 1972; Clark and Finley, 1973; and others).

**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPACT OF OIL**

The impact of oil on the marine environment is governed by several factors—physical, chemical, and biological—in addition to the inherent complexity of crude oil and refined products. The behavior, effects, and fate of an oil spill involve all of
these factors; and because they are interdependent, the reliability of our predictions concerning the impact of a spill is limited by our knowledge of the least understood variable.

Straughan (1972) noted our general inability to predict the environmental impact of a spill because of the complexity of the matter, and identified several factors that govern biological damage caused by a spill: 1) type of oil spilled, 2) dose of oil, 3) physiography of the area of the spill, 4) weather conditions at the time of the spill, 5) biota of the area, 6) season of the spill, 7) previous exposure of the area to oil, 8) exposure to other pollutants, and 9) treatment of the spill. Several of these factors are touched upon below.

**Natural Physical Processes Affecting Oil in the Water Column**

Once oil is spilled, it is dissipated by evaporation, dissolution, and mixing or dilution in the water column. The natural processes are speeded by wind action and by waves and currents that increase spreading and vertical mixing. Various fractions respond differently to these processes, and the weathered residue behaves differently than the material originally spilled. A contaminated bay may be flushed by freshets, tidal action, or longshore currents. Some oil sinks directly to the bottom, especially in fresh water, where some oil fractions have densities approaching that of fresh water, and in water with high sediment loads. Certain fractions may undergo autoxidation.

Conover (1971) reported that sedimentation of fecal-bound oil that had been ingested by zooplankton may have accounted for up to 20% of the spilled oil entering the water column at Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia. Oil can also be removed from the water column by absorption within organisms and accumulation within the food chain. Suspended sediments carried by runoff from a major flood entered the Santa Barbara Channel area immediately before and after the well blowout (Kolpack, 1971). Kolpack noted that adsorption of oil on the flocculated suspended particles followed by decomposition was a major factor in carrying much of the oil to the sea floor. Kinney et al. (1970) reported, however, that in Cook Inlet, Alaska, glacial silt from the inlet had no apparent effect on the emulsion properties or the sinking of the type of crude oil found in that area.

Forrester (1971) noted the extensive distribution of oil particles stirred into the water by wave action after a bunker C oil spill in Chedabucto Bay. Oil particles were found to a depth of 80 m inside the bay and to depths of 45 m at a distance of 65 km outside the bay. Near-surface distribution of particles extended 250 km southwest along Nova Scotia in a band extending up to 25 km offshore. Berridge, Thew, and Loriston-Clark (1969) indicated that the stabilization of emulsions like those observed at Chedabucto Bay and elsewhere was caused by complex chemical components in the nonvolatile residues and not by bacterial activity, marine organisms, or suspended solid matter.

**Environmental Differences**

The fate and effects of oil spilled in the marine environment are difficult to generalize because several types of environments may be involved. Some extreme comparisons are tropics versus arctic, open ocean versus estuaries, and the differences between the intertidal and subtidal zones. Within these environments are several diverse physical conditions such as temperature, salinity, oxygen, and nutrient concentrations, as well as biological differences such as species composition, diversity and density, and community metabolic rate. The prediction or assessment of pollution effects on the basis of observations extrapolated from one environment to another is seldom supported by adequate data. Unfortunately, however, few data on pollution effects exist for most areas and species, which has led to the use of information from areas that may be dissimilar in critical respects.

There are arguments as to which environment is the most stable and capable of withstanding attacks by additional pollution stresses. Copeland (1970), discussing the response of ecological systems to stress, suggested the principle that "...those systems already subjected to energy-requiring stresses are more likely to resist the changes than those (such as tropical systems) adapted to relatively constant environments." He concluded that estuarine ecosystems composed of organisms capable of wide adaptations and generalizations, such as north temperate systems, would be relatively unaffected by the same magnitude of disturbance that would drastically alter
a tropical system. Odum (1970) noted, however, that many estuarine species are living near the limit of their tolerance range and that any alteration in the environment, such as additional stresses caused by low levels of pollution, could exclude these animals permanently from the estuary.

All healthy balanced ecosystems are generally functioning at or near some critical tolerance limit. In an ecosystem with a variable environment, such as a north temperate estuary, responses to additional stress might not always be the same. For example, even though factors surrounding an oil pollution incident might be outwardly similar in most respects to another spill in a comparable area, the biological impacts may differ. The ability of the local community to absorb the additional stress will be influenced by the coincidence of seasonal variability of natural stresses, the differences in vulnerability of stages in an organism's life cycle, and many other dynamic features of the ecosystem.

**Biological Differences**

The effects of oil pollution on many different organisms in various habitats may vary from no effect to responses of avoidance and decreased activity, to nonadaptive responses of panic and physiological stress. What kills one species may have little or no effect on another. Affected organisms vary from single cells, to sedentary clams, to highly mobile predators, each of which has different behavioral and physiological interactions with the environment.

Just as different species are affected differently, so may individuals within a species be affected differently. In particular, different life stages such as eggs, hatched larvae, and newly molted individuals may have different sensitivity to the same level of pollution. Mironov (1968), for example, reported that prelarval stages of barnacle, *Balanus* sp., were 100 times more sensitive to oil pollution than the adult form. This contrasts with the relative lack of sensitivity to crude oil by pink salmon eggs and sac fry, which were 10 times more tolerant than older fry (Stanley D. Rice and Adam Moles, Auke Bay Fisheries Laboratory, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), NOAA, Auke Bay, AK 99821, pers. commun.).

Renzoni (1973) conducted a series of experiments on the toxicity of several crude oils and petroleum products to the sperm, eggs, and larvae of the oysters *Crassostrea angulata* and *C. gigas* and the mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis*. He found a relatively high degree of tolerance by eggs and larvae but reported that the fertilizing capacity of sperm was markedly affected by similar exposures.

**Biodegradation**

Quantitative data describing the biodegradation of various components of crude oil, especially in arctic and subarctic areas, are limited. ZoBell (1973a) briefly reviewed the current understanding of microbial degradation of oil, including interactions, limiting factors, problems, and perspectives. Ahearn (1973) stated that research on microbial utilization of hydrocarbons for treatment of oily pollutants in the environment, though more intensive in recent times, is still in an early stage of development. It is known that microorganisms can degrade much of a crude oil, particularly the less toxic paraffinic compounds. No single species can degrade all the compounds, but many different species together can metabolize a large number of the compounds, if not all. The rate of microbial degradation, which is principally aerobic, decreases with a decrease in temperature. Large quantities of oxygen are needed. It has been estimated, for instance, that complete oxidation of 1 gallon of crude oil would require all of the dissolved oxygen in 320,000 gallons of water. This comparison may be unrealistic because most oil is at the surface of water in contact with air and only the outer surfaces of oil can be attacked at any one time. It is reasonable to assume, however, that an oxygen-deficient environment may well occur under some oil slicks and in oil-contaminated sediments.

Glaeser and Vance (1971) studied the behavior of Prudhoe Bay crude oil in controlled spills in the Chukchi Sea but were not able to isolate any microorganisms which could degrade hydrocarbons at the ambient temperatures of the Arctic, although some emulsification of the crude oil was observed. However, ZoBell and Agosti (1972) collected oil-oxidizing bacteria near natural oil seeps from the Alaska North Slope and observed oxidation rates of mineral oil at -1°C and above. They noted that the solid surfaces of the ice crystals appeared to facilitate bacterial growth, because the rate at -1°C was substantial and near the 4°C rate.

The apparent contradiction between the studies is probably best explained by ZoBell's (1973b) continued observations with North Slope bacteria. He
found that the nine different crude oils were not degraded as rapidly as purified mineral oil. Glaeser and Vance's studies were with microorganisms from the surface water of the Chukchi where small numbers of bacteria may have been present. Furthermore, the observations of Straughan (1971), who noted the apparent lack of biological damage by the Santa Barbara blowout, may apply here. She discussed the possibility that the fauna had an unusually high tolerance for oil, probably because of adaptation from chronic low-level oil exposures from local natural seepages. The observations of ZoBell and Agosti (1972) on the oxidation rates of oil at -1°C may be an example of similar adaptive response by the North Slope bacteria collected near natural seeps. These oxidation rates and other adaptive responses might not occur from organisms that have not been preacclimated to chronic low-level exposures of oil and may explain why Glaeser and Vance obtained reports of negligible oxidation rates at 0°C from microorganisms from surface water of the Chukchi Sea. Robertson et al. (1973) estimated hydrocarbon-oxidizing bacteria populations were in the order of 1/ml in Cook Inlet and Port Valdez, but less in the Arctic Ocean. Numbers decreased with salinity in Cook Inlet and with depth in Port Valdez.

ZoBell (1963) reported that oil is readily absorbed by clay and silt and suggests that although adsorption of oil by solids renders the oil more susceptible to autobial and microbial oxidation, almost no bacterial decomposition occurs after burial in the bottom sediments, probably because the environment is anaerobic. Blumer and Sass (1972) found that some paraffinic hydrocarbons remained in bottom sediments 2 yr after the West Falmouth oil spill and aromatic hydrocarbons were prominent, which suggests that these more toxic compounds are utilized by bacteria to a minimum degree.

**Oil in Sediments**

The effect of oil in sediments is poorly understood, although several authors have quantitated oil concentrations and noted its persistence. Scarratt and Zitko (1972) observed little diminution of bunker C oil concentration from soft sediments 26 mo after the wreck of the tanker Arrow. The oil reached maximum concentrations in coarse sediments 1 yr after the spill, but the concentrations reduced thereafter. Chemical degradation can occur but is normally restricted to the surface layer of the bottom penetrated by ultraviolet light. Blumer and Sass (1972) noted that "The preservation of hydrocarbons in marine sediments for geologically long time spans is one of the accepted key facts in current thought on petroleum formation." However, in spite of the stability of hydrocarbons in marine sediments, there are characteristic differences between the hydrocarbons in polluted and unpolluted areas. Tissier and Oudin (1973) found that hydrocarbons in polluted sediments differed from those of unpolluted sediments by having lower percentages of heavy components, by not having an odd carbon dominance in the n-alkanes, and by having polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons with alkyl chains.

Oil residues were observed on sandy beaches by ZoBell (1963) and in marshes and in sediments of the deepest area (15.3 m) near the West Falmouth spill by Blumer, Sass, Souza, Sanders, Grassle, and Hampson (1970). About 2 wk after fuel oil was spilled at Resolute Bay, Northwest Territory, in August 1970, casual sampling revealed that oil penetrated into beach material to a depth of about 3 inches (7.6 cm) (Barber, 1971). Oil may be buried and stay intact for a considerable time, even at the higher temperature of the California coast (ZoBell, 1963). During laboratory experiments, Johnston (1970) determined oil decay rates in sand columns contaminated with various concentrations of oil. Ten percent of the oil was oxidized over a period of several months; the remaining 90% decayed much slower.

The West Falmouth spill provided a unique opportunity for a study of the immediate and long-term effects of an oil spill on an area where the previously existing environmental base was well known (Blumer, Sanders, Grassle, and Hampson, 1971). One effect of the oil was to reduce the cohesion of bottom sediments of tidal marshes and the estuary by killing the benthic plants and animals (Blumer, Sass, Souza, Sanders, Grassle, and Hampson, 1970, see footnote 4). The resulting erosion spread hydrocarbons to new areas, where the process was repeated. Because of the stability and persistence of the hydrocarbons in marine bottom sediments, Blumer, Souza, and Sass (1970) noted that hydrocarbons may be returned to the biosphere by organisms living and feeding in the sediments. This redistribution of hydrocarbons can be
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the source of a chronic pollution problem near that spill.

It is quite possible that normal functions of sediments will be disrupted when contaminated by oil. Changes in the sediments that are subtle and difficult to detect, such as decreased nutrient recycling and community metabolism, could result in the loss of significant contributions to the productivity and stability of an area. Although oil in sediments has been monitored and measured after several spills, other aspects of the oil-sediment relation have yet to be studied.

**BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF OIL POLLUTION**

Blumer (1970, see footnote 3) summarizes the potential damage to organisms from pollution by crude oil and oil fractions as follows:

1. Direct kill of organisms through coating and asphyxiation.
2. Direct kill through contact poisoning of organisms.
3. Direct kill through exposure to the watersoluble toxic components of oil at some distance in space and time from the accident.
4. Destruction of the generally more sensitive juvenile forms of organisms.
5. Destruction of the food sources of higher species.
6. Incorporation of sublethal amounts of oil and oil products into organisms (resulting in reduced resistance to infection and other stresses—the principal cause of death in birds surviving immediate exposure to oil).
7. Incorporation of carcinogenic and potentially mutagenic chemicals into marine organisms.
8. Low-level effects that may interrupt any of numerous events (such as prey location, predator avoidance, mate location or other sexual stimuli, and homing behavior) necessary for the propagation of marine species and for the survival of those species higher in the marine food web.

Some of the potential effects described by Blumer may be obvious, such as the direct deaths from acute exposures. Less obvious indirect deaths may occur from effects at either the individual or population level. Individual organisms subjected to sublethal exposures may undergo an “ecological death” if they are less capable of adjusting to and responding to natural changes (stresses) in their physical and biological environments. For example, postmolt Tanner (snow) crab, *Chionoecetes bairdi*, lost legs during short exposures to crude oil (Karinen and Rice, in press). Even though the crabs lived through the exposure, they probably could not have survived in the natural environment because some of them lost as many as seven legs, including both chelae. Moreover, crabs or other adversely but sublethally affected organisms would be more likely to be eliminated by natural selection.

Effects from chronic exposure may be adverse to a population over a period of time if exposed but normal-appearing adults have their ability to reproduce seriously impaired. This loss may be due to physiological changes such as reduced fecundity and delayed ovary development or to impaired behavioral mechanisms which could prevent mate location and identification or homing and timing of spawning. Although the effects at this level might not result in death of the adult, they could induce a trend of decreasing numbers that might eventually eliminate the population or race.

**Hydrocarbons in the Marine Food Web**

Blumer (1967, 1969) and Blumer, Guillard, and Chase (1971) studied the fate of organic compounds in the marine food web. They found that certain hydrocarbons, even highly unsaturated ones, are stable once they are incorporated into a particular marine organism and that they may pass through many members of the marine food web without alteration and may actually be concentrated in tissue. Most hydrocarbons are lipid soluble and thus may accumulate in food webs to the point where toxic levels are reached. This pathway is illustrated by the well-documented chlorinated hydrocarbon group of pesticides.

The entrance of oil-derived hydrocarbons into marine food webs has been observed several times at several trophic levels. Conover (1971) reported that 10% of the bunker C oil in the water column after the Chedabucto Bay spill was combined with zooplankton and that their feces contained up to 7% oil. Mironov (1968) also noted the ability of some zooplankters to accumulate hydrocarbons. The incorporation of hydrocarbons into the food web at these primary levels assures exposure at all higher trophic levels.

Blumer, Souza, and Sass (1970) and Ehrhardt (1972) reported pollution-derived hydrocarbons in shellfish. Uptake and retention of labeled hydrocarbons of several classes by a marine mussel,
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Mytilus edulis, was noted by Lee, Sauerheber, and Benson (1972). Smith (1968) reported the presence of oil and benzene-ring compounds in the feces of limpets browsing on an oily deposit, and in top shells, Monodonta, and limpets, Patella, living on oiled rocks. He reported that analysis of the gut indicated "the proportion of oil in material ingested by these animals was estimated as about 20-30 percent in Patella and 5-50 percent in Monodonta."

Organisms at the highest trophic levels may be affected directly by the oil itself or indirectly by hydrocarbons that have reached them through the food web. Horn, Teal, and Backus (1970) found large amounts of tar in the stomachs of three saury, Scomberesox saurus, from a sample of ten in the Mediterranean Sea near Gibraltar. Although saury are generally considered to be carnivorous, the occurrence of tar and also of "vegetable debris" in one of the stomachs examined by Horn et al. (1970) suggests that the species is not a very discriminate feeder. Although all ingested oil was obviously not incorporated into the tissues (some oil was found in feces), such feeding behavior does describe a pathway for hydrocarbons to be directly taken up into the tissues of the organism. Thus, oil ingested, absorbed, and even adsorbed may enter the food chain when contaminated organisms are eaten.

Carcinogenicity

Some doubt may remain as to the direct carcinogenicity to man of crude oil and crude oil residues in marine organisms (Blumer, 1969), but evidence pointing toward this is accumulating (Blumer, 1970, see footnote 3; 1972). A literature search and evaluation conducted for the U.S. Coast Guard by Battelle Memorial Institute (1967) noted that shellfish, although alive, may have been unfit for consumption because of the carcinogenic hydrocarbon 3,4-benzpyrene in their bodies. Oysters that were heavily polluted and contaminated with ship fuel oil were reported to contain 3,4-benzpyrene. The Battelle review also reported that barnacles attached to creosoted poles contained the same carcinogenic hydrocarbon (3,4-benzpyrene). Sarcomas were elicited when extracts from the barnacles were injected into mice. The endemic occurrence of papillary tumors around the rectal opening of soft-shell clam, Mya arenaria, was reported, but the author (Battelle Memorial Institute. 1967) did not feel these were due to oil pollution, even though the clams were taken from waters adjacent to areas highly polluted by ship fuel oil. Hyperplasia in reproductive cells of a bryozoan in response to coal tar derivatives was observed by Powell, Sayce, and Tufts (1970). They noted that similar abnormalities may also have occurred in coastal faunas exposed to spills such as the Torrey Canyon and the Santa Barbara blowout. However, most observations on these spills were concerned with gross mortality and may not have detected the sublethal effects.

ZoBell (1971) reported the natural synthesis and metabolism of carcinogenic hydrocarbons by several marine organisms. Thus, oil pollution is certainly not the only source for carcinogenic hydrocarbon introduction into marine food webs. Suess (1972) recognized that carcinogens were in seafoods but concluded that they would probably not be dangerous unless the foods contained an excess amount of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon carcinogens. Carcinogenesis from oil-contaminated marine organisms has not been proved, but Ehrhardt (1972) expressed a need for carcinogenic testing of hydrocarbon fractions extracted from marine organisms contaminated by exposure to oil.

Observed Toxic Effects

A study of the available information on potential toxic effects of oil pollution reveals more unknowns than proven conclusions. Only a decade ago, ZoBell (1963) reviewed the literature on the effects of oil on bacteria and higher organisms and concluded that oil pollution had no great adverse impact on fishery resources in general. He did point out, however, a few reports of toxic effects, tainting of flesh, and damage to vessels and fishing gear.

The quantity of literature on effects of oil spills has increased since the Torrey Canyon incident of 1967. Most of the recent work has depended on onsite visual surveys after occurrence of an oil spill rather than on experiments and detailed study. The surveys have been limited mostly to the effects of oil and of cleaning or dispersing agents on primarily adult intertidal organisms and populations. These observations on a restricted segment of the affected ecosystem include only a few of the factors that influence the total impact of oil. Wilson, Cowell, and Beynon (1973) noted that the absence of results from studies at the commu-
nity level make the interpretation, extrapolation, and use of many observations very difficult. Further, the differences between various crude oils and between the hundreds of petroleum products in their physical and biological effects must always be kept in mind. Comparative data generally are far too few to permit attaching any relative significance to production area or product formulation in this review.

Field Investigations

The utility of many “after-the-fact” studies is limited because of the lack of knowledge of prespill conditions. Data are often collected without proper controls for comparison, and knowledge of natural local fluctuations and species composition of animal populations is usually quite limited. For these reasons conclusions about the impact of a particular spill may vary.

Ehrsam (1972) reported substantial immediate kills of marine life from a fuel oil spill at Anacortes, Wash., and concluded that if larval and juvenile forms of certain organisms were killed, the full impact of the spill may not be known for some time. Katz (1972) observed intertidal transects of the same affected area and concluded that the effects were minor and long-term effects would be unlikely. Webber (1972) pointed out, however, that these after-the-fact studies observed only a small wedge of the total biota. Knowledge of subtidal and benthic organisms as well as larvae and juveniles was lacking.

Other large spills have been studied in greater detail and have contributed significantly to our understanding of the gross effects of oil. Yet, they have been unable to answer many important questions on the effect of pollutant hydrocarbons in the marine environment, and generalizations learned from one spill may not apply to another because each is different.

Field observations of behavior and effects of oil in Arctic ice environments are few. The U.S. Coast Guard investigations in the Arctic have primarily been directed toward gaining knowledge to improve cleanup methods (Glaeser and Vance, 1971; McMinn and Golden, 1973). Campbell and Martin (1973) discussed possible large-scale movements and persistence of oil spilled in the Beaufort Sea. They suggested that the surface waters of the Arctic Ocean and the winter waters of Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia, might be comparable, particularly with regard to the physical behavior of oil. Chedabucto Bay is the site of the grounding of the tanker Arrow in February 1970 with 2.8 million gallons of bunker C oil aboard. Campbell and Martin (1973) found that highly stable oil-water emulsions formed to a depth of 50 m throughout Chedabucto Bay. They described conditions by which oil reaching the edge of the pack ice could be distributed under the ice.

Thomas (1973) also suggested that results of the studies at Chedabucto Bay might in some respects be applicable to spills in the Arctic. He observed remobilization of oil from beneath the weathered surface of deposits during the summers following the Arrow spill and the subsequent re-oiling of some intertidal areas, adding a chronic pollution aspect to the spill. Extensive mortalities of soft-shell clams and salt marsh cord grass, Spartina alterniflora, resulted where this occurred. In other areas, clams were visibly contaminated with oil and clam fishing was closed, at least through the summer of 1972 (Thomas, 1973).

When the Torrey Canyon broke up near the southwest coast of England in 1967, 15 million gallons of Kuwait crude oil with a high aromatic content were released. Efforts to cope with this first super disaster depended principally upon 2 million gallons of toxic dispersant, which probably caused more damage than the oil, most of which had weathered at sea for a week or more before reaching the shores. Many techniques for oil containment and control on the seas were attempted during the time oil leaked from the tanker; the fact that they all failed reveals the inadequacies of our technology and preparedness for such emergencies.

Extensive investigations of the West Falmouth spill by Blumer and his associates at Woods Hole provide one of the best documentaries of an oil spill. A total of 185,000 gallons of no. 2 fuel oil (41% aromatic content) were spilled in 1969 from a ruptured barge. Intertidal and subtidal benthic organisms of all phyla were killed during the first few days (Blumer and Sass, 1972). Blumer, Souza, and Sass (1970) showed that the uptake of fuel oil hydrocarbons by shellfish left them unfit for human consumption. Later, Blumer and Sass (1972) reported the continued persistence of fuel oil hydrocarbons in the sediments after 2 yr. Although there had been some degradation, the boiling range and composition of the hydrocarbon mixture was basically unchanged.

The 1969 Santa Barbara blowout released an estimated 5,000 barrels of crude oil per day ini-
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tially (Foster, Charters, and Neushul, 1971), yet biological damage was not reported widespread and the area has started to recover. Foster, Neushul, and Zingmark (1971) observed that much of the damage to intertidal areas corresponded to sand movement, probably from storm damage. Cimberg, Mann, and Straughan (1973) concluded that the blowout had less effect on intertidal marine organisms than did sand movement and substrate stability. Straughan (1971), reporting on investigations at Santa Barbara, noted factors unique to that accident: 1) the long history of natural oil seepage in the Santa Barbara Channel and 2) the unusually heavy winter runoff at the time of the spill, which reduced salinities, increased sedimentation, and possibly increased pesticides in the channel. R. L. Kolpack (pers. commun., cited by Kanter, Straughan, and Jessee (1971)) noted that Santa Barbara crude oil is relatively insoluble in seawater and contains a very low percentage of the toxic aromatic compounds. Thus, information gathered on the effect of the Santa Barbara spill or any other is of limited utility in predicting the ecological effects of crude oil spills or of other oils in other areas.

Several studies have provided encouraging reports of varying degrees of recovery after some of the recent larger spills. Investigations about 1½ yr after the Torrey Canyon spill revealed that at least the affected shoreline areas were re-colonizing and recovering, although recovery was not yet complete at that time (Spooner, 1969). The areas affected by the 1969 Santa Barbara blowout were recently reported to be recovering (Cimberg et al., 1973), as was a reef affected by bunker C oil spilled from a tanker collision in San Francisco Bay in January 1971 (Chan, 1973).

Too few of the controlled field investigations have been designed to bridge the gap between field surveys after spills and simulative laboratory experiments. Perkins (1970) exposed periwinkles and other intertidal organisms to the oil dispersant BP1002 in the laboratory and then released marked individuals in the natural environment. After recapture of the individuals exposed, he found that survival from doses as low as one three-thousandth of the 24 h LC50 was lower than among the recaptured controls. Crapp (1971a) conducted field experiments by applying crude oil and oil emulsifiers to the intertidal zone.

Physical damage by the oil was observed, but toxicity damage was not great because the oil had previously been exposed to air; in contrast, the oil-emulsifier mixtures were toxic. Baker (1970) applied a crude oil to salt-marsh plots at different times of the year and monitored the effects on plants. Summer applications of oil severely affected annuals but not perennials.

Laboratory Studies

Experiments in the laboratory also do not provide all the answers about how an oil spill will affect a marine organism or its environment. Laboratory research has demonstrated the toxicity of various crude oils and petroleum products on several forms of marine life. Much of this research has focused on the planktonic life history stages of pelagic and benthic animals. Many of these planktonic larvae are phototactic at their earliest stages and concentrate in the surface layer of the sea. This community of the surface 5 cm, the neuston, is the first affected by most oil entering the water. Thus, many organisms are most sensitive to oil pollution at the time of their greatest likelihood of exposure.

Studies by Mironov (1968) on the development of fertilized eggs of the plaice, Rhombus macoticus, showed extreme sensitivity of the eggs to the influence of the oil products in seawater. He noted that injury to the eggs occurred at concentrations of $10^{-4}$ to $10^{-5}$ ml/liter (0.1 to 0.01 ppm). In these concentrations of oil products, 40 to 100% of the hatched prelarvae showed some signs of degeneration during development and perished. Mironov (1969a) also demonstrated that 0.001 ml of crude oil per liter was toxic to the eggs of anchovy, scorpionfish, and sea parrots from the Black Sea.

Newly set spat of Elinius modestus, an Australian barnacle introduced to Europe, were tolerant of 100 ppm crude oil but showed reduced cirral activity and retarded shell growth (Corner, Southward, and Southward, 1968). Adults of this species also showed reduced activity at 100 ppm (Corner et al., 1968).

Mironov (1969b) tested crude oil on several copepods and a cladoceran, and found that 0.001 ml/liter accelerated death in all forms and that 0.1 ml/liter caused death in less than 1 day. Acartia and Calanus died at 0.01 ml/liter oil in seawater in 72 to 96 h (Mironov, 1968). Larvae of crab and shrimp died at 1 ppm (Mironov, 1969c).

Little is known of the mechanisms of various biological effects of oil...
toxic effects. Damage to cell membranes and the cellular contents of planktonic larvae may occur. Goldacre (1968) demonstrated such cytological damage and death to the freshwater protozoan, *Amoeba proteus*, exposed to crude oil fractions. Brocksen and Bailey (1973) measured increased respiratory response of striped bass and chinook salmon to sublethal concentrations of benzene. The fish recovered to normal activity when they returned to noncontaminated water for several days. Rice and Short were unable to demonstrate changes in the enzyme activity of cholinesterase or Na-K stimulated ATPase in juvenile pink salmon, *Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*, after in vivo and in vitro exposures to Prudhoe Bay crude oil (Stanley D. Rice and Jeffrey Short, Auke Bay Fisheries Laboratory, NMFS, NOAA, Auke Bay, AK 99821, pers. commun.). This is somewhat surprising because various hydrocarbon pesticides have been shown to affect both enzymes.

Cellular membranes of phytoplankton are also damaged by the penetration of hydrocarbon molecules; the cellular contents are extruded, and oil penetrates into the cell. Detergents administered in a concentrated solution also penetrate the plant cells and cause the dissolution of cellular membranes and the extrusion of cellular fluid (Ruivo, 1972). The effects of oils on plant respiration are variable, but an increase of respiration is frequently observed, probably because of an alteration of the mitochondria. This could result in an uncoupling of the oxidative phosphorylation enzymes from the electron transport enzymes, and the energy release would be lost as heat.

All marine animals ultimately depend on the photosynthetic activity of phytoplankton and algae for the production of biomass. Baker (1971), reviewing the literature, noted that weathered *Torrey Canyon* oil had no apparent effect on the photosynthetic activity of green algae. He did find, however, that green algae treated with fresh crude oil died and that photosynthesis in kelp, *Macrocystis* sp., was reduced when the kelp was exposed to various petroleum products. Kauss et al. (1973) determined the effects of crude oil on several species of freshwater algae in both field and laboratory experiments. In their field studies, response of the algae to a spill varied from suppression of growth to its stimulation. In their laboratory studies, they noted depressed photosynthetic rates in one algal species after it had been exposed to aqueous crude oil and other selected aromatics.

Growth of phytoplankton from axenic cultures and mixed cultures of natural populations was inhibited by water-soluble extracts from no. 2 fuel oil in a laboratory study by Nuzzi (1973). Mironov and Lanskaya (1968) demonstrated that marine phytoplankton vary several orders of magnitude in sensitivity to crude oils and kerosene in oil concentrations ranging from 0.1 to 1,090 ppm. Of the 20 species tested, a diatom, *Ditylum brightwellii*, was the most sensitive. The wide variation in susceptibility may account for the statements in other reviews of low toxicity of crude oils to phytoplankton (Föyn, 1965; Nelson-Smith, 1970) and supports the premise that biological response will differ among species.

**Sublethal and Chronic Effects of Oil Pollution**

While data are scarce in some of the areas previously discussed, information on the ecological effects of chronic sublethal oil pollution is essentially nonexistent. Observing these effects is difficult because they are not dramatic and may pass unnoticed by the casual observer. A full description would require observations extending over a long period of time.

Lewis (1972), commenting on approaches to the study of chronic pollution, contends "... that without a massive expansion of ecological and reproductive data by simultaneous multidisciplinary studies not only will we be unable to detect the significant long-term changes, but we will even remain unaware of the most suitable or important species and methods to build into a monitoring program."

A few studies concerning sublethal effects on organisms have appeared in the literature. Wells (1972) reported deaths of lobster larvae to exposures of 0.1 ml of Venezuelan crude oil per liter, while larvae exposed to 0.01 ml/liter had poor survival rates and were unable to molt to the fourth stage. Decreased limb (cirral) activity of marine larvae exposed to oil has been reported (Smith, 1968). Kuhnhold (1972), while observing toxic effects of crude oils to eggs of cod and to larvae of cod, plaice, and herring noted that the larvae exposed to oil-contaminated water were unable to avoid well-defined milky clouds of toxic oil dispersions. Blanton and Robinson (1973) observed damage to the gills of specimens of seven species of fish that had apparently been exposed to an oil spill off the Louisiana coast.
Crapp (1971b) observed that fucoid algae replaced barnacle and limpet populations near an outfall where the effluent contained about 20-25 ppm oil from treated ballast water of tankers unloading at Milford Haven. Although the relative oil content was low, the cumulative volume discharged was large (20,000 gallons of oil per year), a situation similar to that which may occur at Port Valdez, Alaska, when the trans-Alaska pipeline is completed.

Blumer (1972) discussed how low-level chronic effects of oil may damage marine organisms because of their dependence on natural organic chemical clues for a variety of functions. Salmon and other fishes utilize organic chemical clues in migrations; predators are attracted to prey by organic compounds at the parts-per-billion level (Whittle and Blumer, 1970); and other organisms may use chemical clues for predator avoidance, selection of habitat, and sex attraction. Blumer (1972) discussed the fears that oil pollution may interfere with these fundamental biological processes by masking or blocking, or by mimicking natural stimuli (resulting in false responses). He cited literature discussing the attraction of lobsters to kerosene and to purified hydrocarbon fractions derived from kerosene and noted that many dead lobsters were washed ashore after the West Falmouth spill. Blumer's fears about interference with chemoreception are further substantiated by the observations of Takahashi and Kittredge (1973) on crab behavior. Crabs, Pachygrapsus crassipes, exposed to water-soluble extracts of crude oil failed to exhibit feeding behavior or mating behavior responses when given appropriate chemical stimuli. Inhibition of chemoreception of some motile marine bacteria by a crude oil and several other hydrocarbons has been demonstrated by Walsh and Mitchell (1973).

Rice (1973) performed laboratory tests of avoidance of pink salmon fry to Prudhoe Bay crude oil and observed avoidance of oil at concentrations as low as 1.6 mg/liter. He concluded that salmon fry had the capability of detecting sublethal concentrations of oil and that they might avoid areas contaminated with sublethal levels of oil, which would result in confused and nonadaptive migratory behavior. The effect of chronic low-level pollution in areas such as Port Valdez, the terminus of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline, could be as severe as the total loss of all salmon runs in the local area because of altered behavioral responses to sublethal oil pollution.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Although crude oil generally should be considered toxic to marine organisms and harmful to their environment, most ecosystems can tolerate some pollution because oil can be dissipated or removed by processes like evaporation, autoxidation, dilution, and biodegradation. However, each organism and environment has a limit to how much oil can be absorbed and metabolized. Catastrophic spills are obviously pollution at a level that ecosystems cannot tolerate without damage. However, if the spills are not continued, the oil will slowly be removed and recovery of the area, at least to some degree, will likely occur. There is some evidence for recovery of some affected individuals.

Assessments of the impact of oil pollution cannot depend solely on evaluation of immediate kills of organisms from acute exposures. Chronic low-level oil pollution can cause subtle changes in organisms and is potentially more dangerous to the ecosystem than dramatic catastrophic spills. For this reason, the effects of chronic pollution warrant intensive study so that they will not be underestimated. The cumulative impact of "ecological death" of individuals which have impaired functions may be quite significant, yet difficult to assess because the death is not tied directly to an acute oil exposure. Equally as dangerous is the potential impact on populations where reproductive processes, adversely affected through physiological or behavioral mechanisms, result in fewer progeny. Chronic pollution may eliminate a species from an area entirely, and once eliminated that species may remain suppressed and may not repopulate the area because of continuing pollution or because its niche has been filled by a more tolerant, possibly less desirable, species.

The adverse effects of oil on animal populations has been of wide concern when stocks of special interest, such as those providing the basis of a sport or commercial fishery, have been involved. It should be remembered that changes in populations of lesser apparent significance will also cause changes in the community because each species population interacts with and is dependent on the rest of the community.

The foregoing review of information does little to simplify or ease the problems of policy makers concerned with marine production and transportation of oil and petroleum products. The weight of
the evidence leaves little doubt that oil poses a serious hazard to living marine resources, that spills and chronic pollution have happened and will continue to occur, and that the interests of the marine environment are best preserved if marine transportation of oil and petroleum products is minimized. The continuing need for new sources and increased amounts of energy, however, limits many of the conservative and prudent alternatives to these hazards. Until research has provided conclusive data, policy makers must continue to rely on these interpretative judgments for much of their guidance in making decisions that can profoundly affect the well being of marine ecosystems.
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