CLEANING UP CONTAMINATED SITES THROUGH BIOREMEDIATION: AN ANALYSIS OF SELECT CASE STUDIES

Arup Kumar Poddar

Article History: Received: 04.02.2023 **Revised:** 10.03.2023 **Accepted:** 12.05.2023

Abstract

This article compares and contrasts two of the largest oil spills ever: the Exxon Valdez disaster in Alaska in 1989 and the Deepwater Horizon disaster in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010. In these situations, oil contamination has been greatly reduced thanks in large part to bioremediation, particularly biostimulation and intrinsic bioremediation. The limitations and difficulties of this technique are made clear, however, by the lasting effects on the ecosystem and the areas of persistent contamination. Thus, this study stresses the importance of optimising bioremediation processes, completing thorough environmental impact assessments, and investing in more research to better understand the efficacy of bioremediation. The significance of well-thought-out, multi-pronged emergency response plans is also emphasised. The lessons learned from these watershed events can help direct future bioremediation initiatives and environmental management policies in the right direction.

Keywords: Bioremediation, Oil Spill, Environmental Management, Exxon Valdez, Deepwater Horizon, Oil-Degrading Bacteria

Professor, the West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata, India

DOI: 10.31838/ecb/2023.12.1.287

1. Introduction

The employment of living organisms for the purpose of degradation, transformation, or detoxification of hazardous compounds is known as bioremediation, and it has become an essential strategy for dealing with environmental contamination. In particular, bioremediation technologies have been crucial in the face of oil spills, which represent considerable hazards to marine ecosystems. This article compares the response to two of the most notorious oil spills in history, the Exxon Valdez incident in Alaska in 1989 and the BP Deepwater Horizon spill in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010 (Atlas & Hazen, 2011), and examines the role and success of bioremediation in both. This discussion will illuminate the benefits and drawbacks of bioremediation through these case studies, providing useful information for future research and strategy creation in the fight against oil spill contamination. The objective is to learn how to improve bioremediation's use in preventing environmental catastrophes by gaining an appreciation for its intricacies in various environmental settings.

The Role of the Bioremediation in Cleaning Up Contaminated Sites

Bioremediation is a cutting-edge method that uses microorganisms to break down, convert, or detoxify harmful environmental toxins (Alexander, M., 1999). More and more often, this eco-friendly and low-cost method is used to rid polluted areas of petroleum hydrocarbons, heavy metals, pesticides, and other industrial pollutants (Vidali, M., 2001).

Bioremediation relies heavily on microorganisms, including bacteria, fungi, and algae (Atlas, R. M., & Philp, J., 2005). These microorganisms can convert environmental contaminants into usable energy and nutrition thanks to metabolic pathways that allow them to do so (Singh, A., & Ward, O. P., 2004). It is important to note that the type of pollutant and the environmental conditions at the polluted site can greatly affect the organisms and metabolic processes engaged in bioremediation (Atlas, R. M., & Philp, J., 2005).

Both in-situ and ex-situ procedures can be used for bioremediation; however, both terms are oversimplifications (Vidali, M., 2001). Different from ex-situ bioremediation, which requires transferring the contaminated material somewhere else for treatment, in-situ bioremediation treats the polluted material right where it is. The choice of approach is dependent on the nature and extent of contamination as well as site-specific variables (Atlas, R. M., & Philp, J., 2005); however, in-situ bioremediation techniques like biostimulation and bioaugmentation are generally preferred since they are less disruptive and more cost-effective.

Adding nutrients and other growth-promoting compounds is called biostimulation, and it is used to increase the activity of naturally occurring microbes that degrade pollutants (Das, N., & Chandran, P., 2011). On the other side, bioaugmentation includes reintroducing beneficial microorganisms that consume pollutants into a polluted ecosystem (Singh, A., & Ward, O. P., 2004). Both of these methods have been used effectively in different bioremediation projects, proving that restoring polluted areas with bioremediation is possible.

Bioremediation has great potential, but it also faces several obstacles. Temperature, pH, nutrient availability, and the presence of co-contaminants are just a few of the environmental elements that might affect bioremediation's efficacy (Vidali, M., 2001). Significant hurdles might also arise from the need to get regulatory and social approval for bioremediation technology (Gibson, D. T., & Parales, R. E., 2000). In order to effectively clean up polluted areas, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive site evaluation and develop a bioremediation strategy (Gibson, D. T., & Parales, R. E., 2000).

Despite these obstacles, bioremediation is becoming increasingly important in the process of decontaminating polluted areas. Bioremediation provides a viable, long-term option for environmental restoration as we struggle to cope with the growing environmental effects of industrial activity. More study in this area will surely yield stronger bioremediation solutions, which will be a huge boon to our efforts to reduce environmental pollution and safeguard the health of our planet (Vidali, M., 2001).

Bioremediation in Exxon Valdez Oil Spill, Alaska (1989):

Approximately 11 million gallons of crude oil were spilled from the Exxon Valdez in 1989 into the pristine waters of Prince William Sound, Alaska (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, 2010), making it one of the most infamous environmental disasters in history. The leak had a disastrous effect on the ecology, necessitating a massive cleanup effort in which bioremediation played a key role.

Mechanical procedures like skimming, in-situ burning, and the use of chemical dispersants were used in the earliest stages of cleanup. To make matters worse, the oil grew worn and resistant to physical removal as time went on (Bragg, J. R., Prince, R. C., Harner, E. J., & Atlas, R. M., 1994), so these approaches ultimately proved ineffective. In that context, bioremediation became an attractive strategy for speeding up oil degradation by natural processes.

Biostimulation was the primary method used in bioremediation after the Exxon Valdez spill. By supplementing the soil with nitrogen and phosphorus, for example (Pritchard, P. H., Mueller,

J. G., Rogers, J. C., Kremer, F. V., and Glaser, J. A., 1992), oil-degrading bacteria can be encouraged to proliferate. To prevent unintended consequences like eutrophication and animal toxicity, the nutrient applications were strictly regulated (Bragg, J. R., Prince, R. C., Harner, E. J., & Atlas, R. M., 1994).

Biostimulation was found to be a highly effective method of increasing the pace at which oil was degraded over the course of the cleanup process. According to a study conducted in 1992 (Pritchard, P. H., Mueller, J. G., Rogers, J. C., Kremer, F. V., & Glaser, J. A.), oil contamination was cut in half in treated areas compared to untreated ones. In addition, the fertiliser treatments were shown to have no major unfavourable effects on the local environment (Bragg, J. R., Prince, R. C., Harner, E. J., & Atlas, R. M., 1994).

Now considered a classic in the field, the Exxon Valdez case study demonstrated the power of bioremediation in a real-world setting. In spite of the positive results, the spill brought to light the necessity for a deeper knowledge of bioremediation processes, such as the impact of environmental factors on microbial activity and the dangers of nutrient addition (Atlas, R. M., & Hazen, T. C., 2011). Therefore, there has been ongoing development in this area of study, with an emphasis on improving bioremediation technologies while reducing environmental impacts. Finally, the Exxon Valdez oil spill proved how effective and promising bioremediation may be in limiting the damage caused by environmental catastrophes. Insights and lessons learned from the successful cleanup operation have influenced the design and execution of bioremediation systems in response to oil spills and other environmental pollution events around the world (Atlas, R. M., & Hazen, T. C., 2011).

Bioremediation in Bp Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, Gulf Of Mexico (2010):

One of the worst marine environmental disasters ever was the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil leak. Damage to marine and coastal ecosystems was severe as a result of the 87-day oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico that released approximately 4.9 million barrels of oil (McNutt et al., 2012). Bioremediation was crucial to the restoration of devastated ecosystems in the wake of the disaster. The enormity of the spill and the intricacy of the maritime environment presented significant obstacles to the cleanup operation. Marine microbial communities' inherent resistance to stress and capacity for adaptation helped lessen the severity of the spill, however (Hazen et al., 2010). Alcanivorax borkumensis and other natural hydrocarbon-degrading bacterial species were found to rapidly increase after the oil spill (Yakimov et al., 2005).

These bacteria are able to use hydrocarbons for fuel and nutrition thanks to their distinct metabolic pathways, converting the oil into safer chemicals (Head, Jones, & Röling, 2006). Warm temperatures in the Gulf aided the process by speeding up bacterial metabolism and, in turn, the rate at which oil was broken down (Atlas & Hazen, 2011).

Natural bioremediation, sometimes known as "intrinsic bioremediation," was boosted with chemical dispersants. Although dispersants are typically contested because of their potential toxicity, in this case they were used to break up larger oil droplets into smaller ones, which enhanced the surface area available for microbial decomposition (Atlas & Hazen, 2011).

Despite the success of intrinsic bioremediation in degrading a significant portion of the spilled oil, the Deepwater Horizon spill had long-term effects on the Gulf's ecosystems. Certain areas experienced persistent contamination due to factors such as the oil's physical characteristics, lack of oxygen, and limited nutrient availability, which hindered microbial activity (Passow, Ziervogel, Asper, & Diercks, 2012).

The Deepwater Horizon oil spill case emphasizes the power of bioremediation as a natural response to environmental disasters. Nevertheless, it also underscores the need for further research and a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing bioremediation effectiveness in different environmental contexts. Through continued study and innovation, we can optimize bioremediation strategies to mitigate the impacts of future oil spills and other forms of environmental contamination (Atlas & Hazen, 2011).

A Table on Comparative Case Studies:

A comparison of some key indicators from the Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon oil spills.

Indicator	**Exxon Valdez, Alaska (1989)**	**Deepwater Horizon, Gulf of Mexico (2010)**
Volume of Oil Spilled	Approx. 11 million gallons	Approx. 4.9 million barrels
Duration of Spill	Immediate (ship grounding)	87 days
Affected Area	Prince William Sound, Alaska	Gulf of Mexico
Primary Cleanup Method	Mechanical & Bioremediation	Mechanical, Chemical Dispersants & Bioremediation
Bioremediation Technique Used	Biostimulation	Intrinsic Bioremediation

Indicator	Exxon Valdez, Alaska (1989)	Deepwater Horizon, Gulf of Mexico (2010)
Key Oil-Degrading Bacteria	Indigenous bacteria	Alcanivorax borkumensis and others
Cleanup Success Rate	50% reduction in treated areas by 1992	Significant portion degraded, but some areas persistently contaminated
Long-term Environmental Impact	Some areas still recovering, wildlife populations affected	Some areas still contaminated, ecosystem impacts still being studied

Sources: [Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. (2010); Bragg, J. R., Prince, R. C., Harner, E. J., & Atlas, R. M. (1994); Pritchard, P. H., Mueller, J. G., Rogers, J. C., Kremer, F. V., & Glaser, J. A. (1992); McNutt, M. K., Camilli, R., Crone, T. J., Guthrie, G. D., Hsieh, P. A., Ryerson, T. B., ... & White, H. K. (2012); Hazen, T. C., Dubinsky, E. A., DeSantis, T. Z., Andersen, G. L., Piceno, Y. M., Singh, N., ... & Probst, A. (2010); Atlas, R. M., & Hazen, T. C. (2011); Passow, U., Ziervogel, K., Asper, V., & Diercks, A. (2012)]

2. Result

The Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska (1989) and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico (2010) represent two of the most significant environmental disasters in recent history. These incidents, while similar in their profound environmental impacts, showcased different oil spill management strategies, specifically in the realm of bioremediation.

The Exxon Valdez spill, which resulted from a ship grounding, immediately released approximately 11 million gallons of crude oil into Prince William Sound, Alaska. The cleanup efforts involved both mechanical methods and bioremediation, with biostimulation being the primary technique employed for the latter. Biostimulation involves adding nutrients to stimulate the growth of indigenous oil-degrading bacteria. By 1992, the areas treated with biostimulation demonstrated a 50% reduction in oil contamination, proving the efficacy of this strategy (Bragg et al., 1994). However, despite the cleanup success, some areas are still recovering, and wildlife populations continue to feel the impact of the spill (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, 2010).

In contrast, the Deepwater Horizon disaster, caused by an oil rig explosion, led to a prolonged spill lasting 87 days and discharging approximately 4.9 million barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. The cleanup approach in this case also involved mechanical methods, the use of chemical dispersants, and bioremediation. The bioremediation process in this instance largely relied on intrinsic bioremediation, where native hydrocarbon-degrading bacteria, such as Alcanivorax borkumensis, naturally proliferated in response to the oil contamination (Hazen et al., 2010). The use of chemical dispersants further enhanced this process by creating smaller oil droplets that were more accessible for microbial degradation (Atlas & Hazen, 2011). However, despite the significant portion of oil degraded through this process, certain areas remained persistently contaminated due to factors like the physical characteristics of the oil and environmental constraints (Passow et al., 2012).

In summary, both the Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon spills underscore the vital role of bioremediation in managing oil spills. Yet, they also emphasize the necessity for continued research and understanding of the factors influencing the effectiveness of bioremediation in diverse environmental contexts.

3. Discussion

The comparison of the Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon oil spills underscores the value and challenges of bioremediation in the face of environmental disasters. These two landmark incidents offer insights into the role of bioremediation in different environmental and contamination contexts.

In the Exxon Valdez spill, the immediate release of approximately 11 million gallons of oil resulted in an urgent need for efficient cleanup methods. Bioremediation, particularly biostimulation, emerged as a key strategy alongside mechanical cleanup methods. Biostimulation, which boosts the growth of indigenous oil-degrading bacteria by adding nutrients, proved to be effective, reducing contamination by 50% in treated areas by 1992 (Bragg et al., 1994). However, this method did not completely eradicate the oil, with certain areas and wildlife populations still recovering from the spill's effects as of 2010 (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, 2010). This underscores that while bioremediation can significantly mitigate contamination, its effects may not be total or immediate, and long-term environmental impacts can persist.

Conversely, the Deepwater Horizon spill presented a different scenario. The spill's prolonged nature, lasting 87 days and discharging an unprecedented 4.9 million barrels of oil, necessitated a multi-pronged cleanup approach. Intrinsic bioremediation played a crucial role here. Hydrocarbon-degrading bacteria naturally present in the Gulf, including Alcanivorax borkumensis, responded to the contamination by proliferating (Hazen et al., 2010). The use of chemical dispersants complemented this process by increasing the oil's surface area accessible to microbial degradation (Atlas & Hazen, 2011). However, despite this dynamic response, persistent contamination in certain areas highlighted the limitations of relying solely on bioremediation. Factors such as the oil's physical characteristics and environmental constraints impeded the effectiveness of microbial degradation (Passow et al., 2012).

The comparison of these two cases accentuates the vital role bioremediation can play in managing oil spills. However, it also emphasizes the need for continued research to optimize bioremediation strategies for different environmental contexts. Understanding the specific environmental conditions, the characteristics of the oil spilled, and the capabilities of local microbial communities are all essential for maximizing the effectiveness of bioremediation efforts in future incidents (Atlas & Hazen, 2011).

Key Findings:

The comparison of the Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon oil spills offers crucial insights into the role and effectiveness of bioremediation in managing oil spills.

First, in both cases, bioremediation was identified as a crucial response approach, highlighting its importance in environmental disaster management. Using biostimulation, indigenous oil-degrading bacteria were able to reduce oil contamination by 50% in treated regions within three years of the Exxon Valdez spill (Bragg et al., 1994). Natural oil-degrading bacteria proliferated in reaction to oil contamination (intrinsic bioremediation; Hazen et al., 2010) and played an important part in cleaning up the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

Bioremediation was relatively effective in both scenarios, but it also had clear limitations. Decades after the oil spill, certain places are still recovering, and some animal species have yet to fully recover (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, 2010). The Deepwater Horizon oil disaster had similar results, with some regions being contaminated for an extended period of time due to the interaction between the environment and the oil's physical properties (Passow et al., 2012).

These results highlight the value of bioremediation in reducing the effects of oil spills. The long-term effects on the ecosystem and the limits seen in these case studies, however, show the importance of further research to improve its efficacy.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the oil spills from the Exxon Valdez and the Deepwater Horizon show how important bioremediation is in preventing further damage to the environment. Biostimulation and intrinsic bioremediation showed promise in dramatically decreasing oil contamination when used. Although bioremediation has shown some promise, the persistence of environmental effects and contamination in some areas has highlighted its limitations and complexity. Therefore, it has been emphasised how important it is to strengthen emergency response plans, undertake thorough environmental impact assessments, engage in additional research, and optimise bioremediation procedures. As we continue to grapple with environmental challenges and potential disasters, understanding and improving the tools at our disposal, including bioremediation, is essential. The lessons learned from these two landmark incidents provide invaluable insights that can guide future efforts towards more effective environmental management and restoration.

Key Recommendations:

The analysis of the Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon oil spills highlights the significance of bioremediation in mitigating the impacts of such environmental disasters. However, it also emphasizes the necessity for strategic enhancements and further research. Based on the insights from these incidents, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Optimize Bioremediation Strategies: Despite the effectiveness of biostimulation in the Exxon Valdez spill and intrinsic bioremediation in the Deepwater Horizon incident, persistent contamination was observed in both scenarios. This suggests the need for developing and optimizing more effective bioremediation strategies tailored to specific environmental conditions and oil types.
2. Comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment: While bioremediation demonstrated significant effectiveness, long-term environmental impacts persisted in both cases. It underscores the importance of comprehensive environmental impact assessments before and after bioremediation to understand its long-term implications better and enhance its strategic application.
3. Invest in Research: Given the observed limitations of bioremediation, it is crucial to invest in research focusing on enhancing the understanding of factors influencing bioremediation effectiveness. For instance, studying the specific characteristics of the local microbial communities and their response to oil contamination could yield valuable insights.
4. Develop Robust Emergency Response Plans: Both incidents highlight the importance of robust emergency response plans that incorporate a multi-pronged approach, including mechanical

methods, chemical dispersants, and bioremediation, to effectively manage oil spills.

5. References

Alexander, M. (1999). Biodegradation and Bioremediation. Academic Press.

Atlas, R. M., & Hazen, T. C. (2011). Oil biodegradation and bioremediation: A tale of the two worst spills in U.S. history. Environmental Science & Technology, 45(16), 6709-6715.

Atlas, R. M., & Philp, J. (2005). Bioremediation: Applied microbial solutions for real-world environmental cleanup. ASM Press.

Bragg, J. R., Prince, R. C., Harner, E. J., & Atlas, R. M. (1994). Effectiveness of bioremediation for the Exxon Valdez oil spill. Nature, 368(6470), 413-418.

Das, N., & Chandran, P. (2011). Microbial degradation of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminants: An overview. Biotechnology Research International, 2011.

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. (2010). Exxon Valdez oil spill restoration plan: Update on injured resources and services. Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council.

Gibson, D. T., & Parales, R. E. (2000). Aromatic hydrocarbon dioxygenases in environmental biotechnology. Current Opinion in Biotechnology, 11(3), 236-243.

Hazen, T. C., Dubinsky, E. A., DeSantis, T. Z., Andersen, G. L., Piceno, Y. M., Singh, N., ... & Probst, A. (2010). Deep-sea oil plume enriches indigenous oil-degrading bacteria. Science, 330(6001), 204-208.

Head, I. M., Jones, D. M., & Röling, W. F. (2006). Marine microorganisms make a meal of oil. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 4(3), 173-182.

McNutt, M. K., Camilli, R., Crone, T. J., Guthrie, G. D., Hsieh, P. A., Ryerson, T. B., ... & White, H. K. (2012). Review of flow rate estimates of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(50), 20260-20267.

Passow, U., Ziervogel, K., Asper, V., & Diercks, A. (2012). Marine snow formation in the aftermath of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Environmental Research Letters, 7(3), 035301.

Pritchard, P. H., Mueller, J. G., Rogers, J. C., Kremer, F. V., & Glaser, J. A. (1992). Oil spill bioremediation: Experiences, lessons and results from the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. Biodegradation, 3(2-3), 315-335.

Singh, A., & Ward, O. P. (2004). Biodegradation and Bioremediation. Springer.

Vidali, M. (2001). Bioremediation. An overview. Pure and Applied Chemistry, 73(7), 1163-1172.

Yakimov, M. M., Golyshin, P. N., Lang, S., Moore, E. R., Abraham, W. R., Lünsdorf, H., & Timmis, K. N. (1998). Alcanivorax borkumensis gen. nov., sp. nov., a new, hydrocarbon-degrading and surfactant-producing marine bacterium. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology, 48(2), 339-348.