

## Species Status Assessment

**Class:** Bivalvia  
**Family:** Unionidae  
**Scientific Name:** *Lampsilis abrupta*  
**Common Name:** Pink mucket

### Species synopsis:

*Lampsilis abrupta* not been seen in New York for over 100 years and is thought to be extirpated in the state. A single New York State specimen was taken from the Niagara River in 1906. Although removed from the accepted range of this species, Strayer & Jirka (1997) tentatively accept this record as legitimate.

*L. abrupta* belongs to the subfamily Ambleminae and the tribe Lampsilini, which includes 17 extant and 6 likely extirpated New York species of the genera *Actinonaias*, *Epioblasma*, *Lampsilis*, *Leptodea*, *Ligumia*, *Obovaria*, *Potamilus*, *Ptychobranhus*, *Toxolasma*, *Truncilla*, and *Villosa* (Haag 2012; Graf and Cummings 2011). This species is listed as state and federally endangered and is ranked by The Natural Heritage Program as historic in New York and as imperiled throughout its range. According to recent trends *L. abrupta* populations are a steep decline (NatureServe 2013).

### Status

#### a. Current and Legal Protected Status

- i. Federal      \_\_\_Endangered\_\_\_\_\_Candidate? \_\_\_\_\_
- ii. New York      Endangered

#### b. Natural Heritage Program Rank

- i. Global      G2- Imperiled
- ii. New York      SH- Historic      Tracked by NYNHP? Yes

### Other Rank:

U.S. Endangered Species Act (USESA): Listed endangered (1976)

IUCN Red List Category: Endangered

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species Protection Status (CITES):

**Status Discussion:**

The overall range of this once very widespread species has diminished, but this species has always been considered rare and it seems to be surviving and reproducing in sections of river that have been altered by impoundments. More dramatic has been the decline in area of occupancy (probably greater than 30%) as it continues to be found in historical sites but often only in very low numbers. Although currently known from a few dozen localities, most are represented by very few individuals and have poor viability. If populations west of the Mississippi River prove to be a different species, the conservation status will need to be reevaluated (NatureServe 2013).

**II. Abundance and Distribution Trends**

**a. North America**

**i. Abundance**

declining    increasing    stable    unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

declining    increasing    stable    unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

**b. Regional**

**i. Abundance**

declining    increasing    stable    unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

declining    increasing    stable    unknown

Regional Unit Considered: Northeast

Time Frame Considered: \_\_\_\_\_

**c. Adjacent States and Provinces**

**CONNECTICUT**                      Not Present   X      No data \_\_\_\_\_

**i. Abundance**

\_\_\_\_ declining    \_\_\_\_increasing            \_\_\_\_stable        \_\_\_\_unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

\_\_\_\_ declining    \_\_\_\_increasing            \_\_\_\_stable        \_\_\_\_unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status: \_\_\_\_\_ SGCN? \_\_\_\_\_

**MASSACHUSETTS**                      Not Present   X                        No data \_\_\_\_\_

**i. Abundance**

\_\_\_\_ declining    \_\_\_\_increasing            \_\_\_\_stable        \_\_\_\_unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

\_\_\_\_ declining    \_\_\_\_increasing            \_\_\_\_stable        \_\_\_\_unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status: \_\_\_\_\_ SGCN? \_\_\_\_\_

**NEW JERSEY**                      Not Present   X      No data \_\_\_\_\_

**i. Abundance**

\_\_\_\_ declining    \_\_\_\_increasing            \_\_\_\_stable        \_\_\_\_unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

\_\_\_\_ declining    \_\_\_\_increasing            \_\_\_\_stable        \_\_\_\_unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status: \_\_\_\_\_ SGCN? \_\_\_\_\_

**ONTARIO**

Not Present   X   No data \_\_\_\_\_

**i. Abundance**

\_\_\_ declining \_\_\_ increasing \_\_\_ stable \_\_\_ unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

\_\_\_ declining \_\_\_ increasing \_\_\_ stable \_\_\_ unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status: \_\_\_\_\_

**PENNSYLVANIA**

Not Present \_\_\_

No data \_\_\_\_\_

**i. Abundance**

\_\_\_ declining \_\_\_ increasing \_\_\_ stable \_\_\_ unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

\_\_\_ declining \_\_\_ increasing \_\_\_ stable \_\_\_ unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status:   SX   SGCN?   No  

**QUEBEC**

Not Present   X  

No data \_\_\_\_\_

**i. Abundance**

\_\_\_ declining \_\_\_ increasing \_\_\_ stable \_\_\_ unknown

**ii. Distribution:**

\_\_\_ declining \_\_\_ increasing \_\_\_ stable \_\_\_ unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status: \_\_\_\_\_

VERMONT Not Present  No data

i. Abundance

declining  increasing  stable  unknown

ii. Distribution:

declining  increasing  stable  unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Listing Status: \_\_\_\_\_ SGCN? \_\_\_\_\_

d. NEW YORK

No data

i. Abundance

declining  increasing  stable  unknown

ii. Distribution:

declining  increasing  stable  unknown

Time frame considered: \_\_\_\_\_

**Monitoring in New York.**

As part of a State Wildlife Grant, NYSDEC Region 8 Fisheries and Wildlife staff is conducting a baseline survey of tributaries in central and western New York for native freshwater mussels 2009 – 2017.

**Trends Discussion:**

Species has declined in numbers between 30% - 50% over the short and long term. These trends are expected to continue since very few populations are currently reproductively viable (NatureServe 2013).




Figure 1. Range wide distribution of *L. abrupta* in North America (NatureServe 2013).

III. New York Rarity, if known:

Historic	<u># of Animals</u>	<u># of Occurrences</u>	<u>% of State</u>
prior to 1970	_____	1	1 of 56 HUC 8 watersheds
prior to 1980	_____	_____	_____
prior to 1990	_____	_____	_____

Details of historic occurrence:

Only a single specimen of this species has been found in NYS; from the Niagara River in 1906. Although removed from the accepted range of this species, Strayer & Jirka (1997) tentatively accept this record as legitimate.

Current	<u># of Animals</u>	<u># of Occurrences</u>	<u>% of State</u>
	0	0	0

**Details of current occurrence:** Despite recent survey efforts, this species has not been found in New York in over 100 years (Strayer & Jirka 1997, Mahar and Landry 2013, New York Natural Heritage Program 2013, The Nature Conservancy 2009, Harman and Lord 2010, White et al. 2011, NatureServe 2013). Strayer and Jirka (1997) speculate that if it still lives in New York, it may be found in the Niagara River above the falls.

**New York's Contribution to Species North American Range:**

% of NA Range in New York	Classification of New York Range
<input type="checkbox"/> 100 (endemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Core
<input type="checkbox"/> 76-99	<input type="checkbox"/> Peripheral
<input type="checkbox"/> 51-75	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disjunct
<input type="checkbox"/> 26-50	Distance to core population:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1-25	<u>700 miles</u>

**IV. Primary Habitat or Community Type:**

1. N/A

**Habitat or Community Type Trend in New York:**

Declining       Stable       Increasing       Unknown

Time frame of decline/increase: \_\_\_\_\_

Habitat Specialist?                       Yes       No

Indicator Species?                       Yes       No

**Habitat Discussion:**

Found in waters with strong currents, rocky or boulder substrates, with depths up to about 1 m, but is also found in deeper waters with slower currents and sand and gravel substrates (Gordon & Layzer 1989; USFWS 1985; NatureServe 2013).

*L. abrupta* is found in medium to large rivers (Watters et al. 2009, McMurray et al. 2012), although is occasionally reported from large creeks and small rivers (Williams et al. 2008). It has been able to survive and reproduce in impoundments with river-lake conditions but never in standing pools of water (USFWS 1985). It occurs in swift current in sandy mud, sand, gravel, cobble substrates (Parmalee and Bogan 1998, Cummings and Mayer 1992, Watters et al. 2009, McMurray et al. 2012), but has also been found in rocky substrates (NatureServe 2013).

## V. New York Species Demographics and Life History

**N/A Breeder in New York**

**N/A Summer Resident**

**N/A Winter Resident**

**Anadromous**

**Non-breeder in New York**

**Summer Resident**

**Winter Resident**

**Catadromous**

**Migratory only**

**Unknown**

### Species Demographics and Life History Discussion:

Upstream males release sperm into the water. Females downstream take up the sperm with incoming water. Fertilization success may be related to population density, with a threshold density required for any reproductive success to occur. Eggs are fertilized within the female. Like nearly all North American mussels, this species must parasitize an often specific vertebrate host to complete its life cycle. It is suspected that some mussel populations are not recruiting because their hosts no longer occur with them. Once released by the female, glochidia must acquire a suitable host or die, usually within 24-48 hours. *L. abrupta* females possess a mantle flap with an eyespot which may serve to attract host fish (USFWS 1985; NatureServe 2013). After attaching to a suitable host, glochidia encyst, usually at the fish's gills or fins and receive food and dispersal. Once the glochidia metamorphose into juveniles, they drop from the host. If they land in suitable substrate, they will burrow into the substrate, where they may remain for several years (Watters et al. 2009).



In the adult form, freshwater mussels are basically sessile; movement is limited to a few meters of the lake or river bottom. The only time that significant dispersal can take place is during the parasitic phase. Infected host fishes can transport the larval unionids into new habitats, and can replenish depleted populations with new individuals. Dispersal is particularly important for genetic exchange between populations. Dispersal is likely to be a slow process for mussels which use resident fishes with limited home ranges as their hosts (COSEWIC as cited in NatureServe 2013).

This species is a long-term breeder (bradyctictic) becoming gravid in August. Glochidia are found in females in September, and are discharged the following June (Ortmann 1912; 1919). Glochidial transformation has been confirmed on largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), smallmouth bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*), spotted bass (*Micropterus punctulatus*) and walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum*) (Watters et al. 2009). Additional potential hosts may be sauger (*Stizostedion canadense*) and freshwater drum (*Aplodinotus grunniens*) (Fuller 1974). Individuals may live for 25 years (Watters et al. 2009).

## **VI. Threats:**

No threats were identified because *L. abrupta* hasn't been observed in New York in nearly a century. However, threats that would restrict the re-colonizing of New York habitats include:

### **Impoundments**

Range wide, impoundments likely contributed to the reduced distribution of mussels that we see today. Vaughn and Taylor (1999) observed a mussel extinction gradient with a gradual, linear increase in mussel species richness and abundance with increasing distance downstream from impoundments. Species and their hosts that require shallow, oxygenated, fast-flowing water quickly are eliminated. Continuously cold water from both increased water depth upstream of the dam and dam discharges downstream of the dam may prevent reproduction. Impoundment increases silt load and eutrophication, resulting in changes in the fish fauna, and therefore the availability of hosts. Dams represent distributional barriers to fish hosts, and therefore to the mussels themselves. The zoogeographic patterns of several species suggest a dam-limited range. Dams also act as sediment traps, often having many feet of silt and debris caught on their upstream side. These areas generally are without mussels. Below the dam, the tailwaters often have dense mussel beds, as these reaches are the only areas left that still have oxygenated, fast moving water. This is exemplified by the distribution of beds in the lower Muskingum River, Ohio (Stansbery & King 1983; ESI 1993c).

In addition, improperly sized and poorly installed or poorly maintained culverts have impacts similar to dams in that they fragment habitat, preventing the movement by host fish, and effectively isolating mussel populations. And because culverts are located at nearly every road-stream intersection, there is the potential for landscape level fragmentation of mussel habitat.

### **Agricultural Runoff**

Aquatic habitats lacking vegetated buffers of adequate width are threatened by runoff from urban areas, roads, lawns, and agricultural land (Gillis 2012). If best management practices are not closely adhered to, mussel habitat adjacent to wood harvest or agricultural land is subjected to pesticide, fertilizer, and silt/sediment runoff. During recent mussel surveys in Western and Central New York, it has been documented that sufficient vegetated riparian buffers are often lacking along known mussel streams (Mahar & Landry 2013), indicating that runoff is a major threat to resident mussel populations.

Species such as *L. abrupta* that have a mantle modified to attract host fish are thought to rely on the visual acuity of their fish hosts to facilitate transfer of glochidia from the female to the host. For such species, this indicates that increases in turbidity associated with runoff may interfere with reproduction and be especially detrimental to the species (Nedeau 2008).

The presence of pesticides and fertilizers in our rural watersheds is nearly ubiquitous (Haag 2012). And because pesticides and their associated surfactants adsorb onto sediment particles, sedimentation may act as a vector for their transport into the aquatic system (Haag 2012). Mussels are more sensitive to pesticides than many other animals (Watters et al. 2009). Although effects of pesticides are species-specific, sub-lethal levels of PCBs, DDT, malathion, and other compounds inhibit respiratory efficiency and accumulate in the tissues. Atrazine and permethrin at sublethal concentrations reduced juvenile growth (Bringolf et al. 2007a, 2007b) and environmental levels of atrazine altered mussel movement and aggregation behavior (Flynn and Spellman 2009). Pesticides can affect mussels in many ways, but the full range of long-term effects remains unknown (Haag 2012).

Fertilizer runoff is also a concern. High inputs of nitrogen from fertilizers can cause increases in ammonia in the water and the substrate, leading to direct toxicity for a wide range of mussel species. Mussels, especially in their early life stages, are more sensitive to un-ionized ammonia than other organisms, and high sensitivity is seen across a range of species and life histories (Haag 2012). In addition, ammonia adsorbs to sediment particles, resulting in higher nitrogen concentrations in the substrate than in the overlying water. The nitrogen present in the interstitial spaces in the substrate is thought to result in juvenile mortality and to prevent recruitment by some mussel species (Strayer and Malcom 2012). Studies have suggested decreasing sediment loads entering aquatic systems as the best way to decrease the impact of numerous stressors for mussels in general (Roley et al. 2012).

### **Treated and Untreated Waste Water**

Recent studies show that mussel richness and abundance decreases with increased proximity to sewage effluent (Wildenberg 2012). The input of biomaterial from waste water treatment plants depletes dissolved oxygen levels, negatively impacting mussels. Ammonia from wastewater

treatment plants has been found to be toxic to glochidia (Goudraeu et al. 1993) and at sub-lethal exposure, adult mussels exhibit decreased respiratory efficiency (Anderson et al. 1978). Endocrine disruptors from pharmaceuticals also originate from municipal sewage effluents and are increasing common in rivers and lakes (Haag 2012). In mussels, chronic exposure to estrogenic compounds in effluents caused feminization of male mussels, but these individuals did not produce eggs, suggesting major disruption of reproductive function (Gagne et al. 2011). The long term effects of these compounds on mussels are unknown (Haag 2012).

### **Runoff from Developed Land**

Developed lands are likely sources runoff containing metals and road salts.

Mussels are particularly sensitive to heavy metals, more so than many other animals used in toxicological tests (Keller & Zam 1991). Low levels of metals may interfere with the ability of glochidia to attach to the host (Huebner & Pynnonen 1992), suggesting that U.S. EPA ambient water quality criteria may not adequately protect mussels from toxic metals (Wang et al. 2011). In addition, increases in salinity from the runoff of salt used for clearing roads in winter may be lethal to glochidia and juvenile mussels (Keller & Zam 1991; Liquori & Insler 1985; Pandolfo et al. 2012). Based on these studies, the U.S. EPA's ambient water quality criterion for acute chloride exposures may not be protective of all freshwater mussels (Pandolfo et al. 2012).

### **Invasive Species**

Invasive zebra and quagga mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha* and *Dreissena bugenis*) have been repeatedly cited as a threat to native mussel populations (Strayer & Jirka 1997; Watters et al. 2009). En masse, Dreissenids outcompete native mussels by removing food and oxygen from the water. They can also reduce reproductive success by filtering native mussel male gametes from the water column. They can foul the shells of the native mussels to the point that their valves can no longer open. In heavily invested areas, they may transform a habitat by hardening the substrate, such that dislodged mussels are not able to rebury (USFWS 1994). In addition, ammonia from Asian clam die offs has been shown to be capable of exceeding acute effect levels of some mussel species (Cherry et al. 2005). Didymo (*Didymosphenia geminata*), a filamentous diatom, can form extensive mats that can smother stream bottom and occlude habitat for mussels (Spaulding & Elwell 2007)

### **Climate Change**

Global climate change is expected (among other disruptions) to cause an increase in surface water temperatures. Although many species are tolerant of warm water, higher water temperatures may be an added stress for some. Increased water temperatures may also increase algal growth, which could result in reductions in dissolved oxygen levels at night (Morris & Burrige 2006). Galbraith et al. (2010) recently showed how regional climate patterns coupled with changing local water regimes and management strategies have shifted mussel populations from thermally sensitive species to thermally tolerant species.

In addition, warmer stream temperatures due to the combined effects of land use, such as removal of shaded buffers, and climate change may contribute to the loss of coldwater fisheries and *mussel*

populations in some watersheds (Nedeau 2008). Temperature induced changes in fish communities could have a profound influence on the availability of hosts for freshwater mussels. Mussels that inhabit small streams and rivers and rely on fish adapted for cooler water might be most affected by climate change (Nedeau 2008).

### **Habitat Modifications**

Ecosystem modifications, such as in-stream work associated with canal, navigational channel, or flood control dredging, bridge replacements, gravel mining, and vegetation removal kill mussels and destroy their habitat. For example, dredging for vegetation removal has been shown to remove up to 23% of mussels in spoils (Aldridge 2000). Further evidence for disruption was provided by mussel surveys adjacent to approximately 20 river miles of Conewango Creek that had been channelized and straightened in the first half of the 20th century. The resulting “dredge” had no riffle or run habitat and sites just below and above this channelized section contained few or no mussels (The Nature Conservancy 2009). Although limited in geographic scope these habitat modification activities have long term impacts on mussels and their distribution (Aldridge 2000). Seasonal draw downs of water bodies have been shown to impact unionid age distributions (Richardson et al. 2002).

Levees and flood walls confine larger rivers, preventing the river from inundating its natural floodplains and wetlands to minimize flood damage. Additionally, many smaller streams have been channelized and bermed by landowners and highway departments to protect farm fields and other structures. Channelization and dredging associated with flood control projects are catastrophic to mussels and have been implicated in the decline of some populations (Watters et al. 2009). The result of these projects is altered seasonality of flow and temperature regimes, increased stream velocities, unstable substrates, changed patterns of sediment scour and deposition, including streambank erosion, altered transport of particulate organic matter (the food base for mussels), and a general degradation of stream habitat (Benke 1999; Yeager 1993; Nedeau 2008).

### **Are there regulatory mechanisms that protect the species or its habitat in New York?**

**No**       **Unknown**

**Yes**

New York State Environmental Conservation Law, § 11-0535. 6 NYCRR Part 182: Endangered and Threatened Species of Fish and Wildlife; Species of Special Concern; Incidental Take Permits.

Mussel habitats receive some generic protection under several New York State regulations (NYCRR) promulgated under the authority of the New York Environmental Conservation Law (ECL),

specifically Part 608 of the NYCRR: Use and Protection of Waters, and Part 617 of the NYCRR: State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR). Part 608 provides protection of some mussel habitats by regulating and requiring environmental review of the modification or disturbance of any “protected stream”, its bed or bank, and removal of sand, gravel or other material from its bed or banks (608.2 Disturbance of Protected Streams). This does not provide adequate protection of mussels and their habitats as it only protects streams or particular portions of a streams for which there has been adopted by NYSDEC or any of its predecessors any of the following classifications or standards: AA, AA(t), A, A(t), B, B(t) C(t), or Streams designated (t)(trout) also include those more specifically designated (ts)(trout spawning). Mussels habitats may also receive some additional protections as the construction, repair, breach or removals of dams, and the excavation and placement of fill in navigable waters are subject to regulation and environmental review under Part 608, 608.3 and 608.5 respectively. Under part 608, projects requiring a permit can be conditioned by NYSDEC to include best management practices, such as sediment and erosion protections. Through the review process, these projects can also be modified to reduce impacts in order to meet permit issuance standards.

Under Part 608, protection of unlisted species of mussels is general and relatively limited. More importantly, Class C and D waters with mussels do not receive protection under these regulations. A significant portion of the New York’s mussel resources occur within Class C and D waters. An additional but not insignificant gap in protection occurs because agricultural activities consisting of the crossing and re-crossing of a protected stream by livestock or wheeled farming equipment normally used for traditional agricultural purposes or of withdrawing irrigation water in a manner which does not otherwise alter the stream, are exempt from these regulations and environmental review.

Water quality certifications required by Section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Title 33 United States Code 1341(see subdivision (c) of this Section)may provide protection for freshwater mussels and their habitats from some activities that would potentially have adverse impacts by regulating construction or operation of facilities that may result in any discharge into navigable waters. Water quality certifications set water quality-related effluent limitations, water quality standards, thermal discharge criteria, effluent prohibitions and pretreatment standards for projects on navigable waters.

The State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR, Part 617 NYCRR) may also protect mussels and their habitats by requiring the consideration of environmental factors into the existing planning, review and decision-making processes of state, regional and local government agencies for activities that require discretionary approval. SEQR requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement, including an alternatives analysis, for those activities that may result in a substantial adverse change in ground or surface water quality; a substantial increase in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems; the removal or destruction of large quantities of vegetation or fauna; substantial interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; impacts on a significant habitat area; substantial adverse impacts on a threatened or endangered species of animal or plant, or the habitat of such a species; other

significant adverse impacts to natural resources; or, a substantial change in the use, or intensity of use, of land including agricultural, open space or recreational resources, or in its capacity to support existing uses.

New York State has numerous laws and regulations that both directly or indirectly protect waters of the state (mussel habitats) including regulations governing direct discharges to surface and groundwater, storm water, agricultural activities, pesticides, flood control, and dams. Without these regulations, mussels would certainly be in worse shape; however, most of these generic protections are not adequate in scope or specific enough to mussel threats to protect the mussel resources of New York State.

**Describe knowledge of management/conservation actions that are needed for recovery/conservation, or to eliminate, minimize, or compensate for the identified threats:**

- Assess the need and opportunity for relocation/reintroduction efforts. Conduct relocation or reintroduction where adequate sources can be identified and appropriate stream conditions exist (water quality, habitat, host species etc).
- Evidence of historic occurrence of multiple New York State extirpated mussel species exists for the Niagara River. These species include: *Epioblasma triquetra*, *Lampsilis teres*, *Lampsilis abrupta*, *Obovaria olivaria*, *Potamilus capax*, *Quadrula pustulosa*, *Quadrula quadrula*, *Simpsonias ambigua*, and possibly *Truncilla donaciformis*. To assess the potential for future reintroduction efforts, a pilot program relocating common species to suitable sections of the Niagara River should be initiated and its results assessed to gauge the possible success of reintroduction efforts for extirpated species in this waterbody.
- Modify marine mussel regulations or the definition of protected wildlife in NYCRR to clarify that freshwater mussels are protected under ECL. Current regulations could be interpreted that freshwater mussels may only be protected as shellfish without a season within the Marine District.
- Through landowner incentive programs or regulation, riparian buffers, particularly those that also provide shade, should be added/maintained/widened, along agricultural fields, subdivisions, and along major roads to decrease the levels of nitrogen, pesticides, sediment, heavy metals, and salts from entering these aquatic systems, as well as to moderate water temperature. Studies have suggested decreasing sediment loads entering aquatic systems as the best way to decrease the impact of numerous stressors for mussels in general (Roley & Tank 2012).
- Require all state agencies to maintain appropriate vegetative buffers along streams, rivers and lakes on state-owned or state managed properties.
- Following any reintroduction efforts, develop and implement a comprehensive monitoring strategy that identifies protocols, including locations and specific intervals, for regular monitoring of known mussel populations to detect assess trends and detect dangerous declines.

- Update wastewater treatment facilities in Buffalo to eliminate combined sewer outflows.
- Coordinate with local wastewater treatment facilities to improve ammonia removal of treated discharge. This has been documented as a threat to Unionids at multiple life stages, and therefore needs to be addressed (Gillis 2012).
- Mussel sensitivity to particular pollutants should be considered or addressed in the regulation of wastewater and stormwater discharges to groundwater and surface waters, State Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (SPDES). This should be reflected in effluent limitations for discharges, including discharges from P/C/I facilities (Private/Commercial/Industrial), CAFO facilities (Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations), High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Discharges, and Wastewater treatment plants, etc. Discharges whose receiving waters have mussels, particularly those with known populations of mussels listed as Endangered, Threatened, Special concern or SGCN, should be carefully reviewed for potential impacts to mussels. For example, deleterious levels of ammonia (a component of many types of discharges) and molluscicides (a commonly used water treatment chemical in discharged water) should not be permitted.
- Within the Great Lakes watersheds, lamprey control efforts should consider specific, potentially adverse, impacts to native freshwater mussels when determining methods, including selection of lampricide formulations and concentrations. Lampricide treatment managers should use caution when using the combination of TFM and niclosamide in streams with known mussel populations and every effort should be made to maintain lampricide concentrations at or near the MLC for sea lamprey to minimize the risk to this important faunal group (Boogaard 2006).
- NYSDEC should consider sensitivity of freshwater mussels to specific pollutants in the establishment and setting of water quality standards and TMDLs for waters containing freshwater mussels. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) specifies the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards. TMDLs account for all contributing sources (e.g. point & nonpoint sources, and natural background levels), seasonal variations in the pollutant load, and incorporate a margin of safety that accounts for unknown or unexpected sources of the pollutant. In essence, a TMDL defines the capacity of the waterbody to absorb a pollutant and still meet water quality standards. The Clean Water Act requires states to identify waterbodies that do not meet water quality standards after application of technology-based effluent limitations. For these "impaired waters," states must consider the development of alternative strategies, including TMDLs, for reducing the pollutants responsible for the failure to meet water quality standards.

The Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (NYSDEC 2006) includes recommendations for the following actions for freshwater mussels:

**Habitat management:**

- Manage areas of important mussel populations by controlling degradation factors (e.g.. Controlling livestock access, point source or non-point source pollution, flow alteration, etc.)
- Develop methods to improve and restore freshwater bivalve habitat.

**Habitat research:**

- Conduct research to determine habitat parameters necessary for good populations of each species of species-at-risk listed mussels.
- Research flow requirements of freshwater bivalves and model the effects of flow changes both in volume and timing.
- Research all parameters of mussel habitat requirements including temperature, substrate, fish, flow, food, etc.

**Habitat restoration:**

- Restore degraded habitat areas to allow for recolonization or reintroduction of listed mussels.

**Invasive species control:**

- Develop a monitoring/control plan that includes measures to detect invasive species problematic to freshwater bivalves in all New York watersheds and actions that will be taken to control them before they become threats.
- Conduct research on control of exotic bivalve species that compete with native mussels and exotic crustaceans or fish which may prey on them.

**Life history research:**

- Research effects of pesticides and other chemicals, including ammonia, on all life stages of freshwater bivalves: sperm/egg, glochidia, larva, adults.
- Research potential interbreeding between *Alasmidonta varicosa* and *Alasmidonta marginata* and, if occurring, evaluate the potential threat to *A. varicosa* population integrity.
- Determine fish hosts for species where this is not known for populations living in New York.
- Research population dynamics of listed mussel species including connectivity of populations or subpopulations and genetic distinctness of populations or subpopulations.
- Determine or confirm breeding phenology and habitat conditions necessary for successful breeding for listed mussels (e.g.. mussel density, pop. level of fish host, temp, flow).

**Modify regulation:**

- Modify marine mussel regulations to be clearer that freshwater mussels are protected under ECL.

**New regulation:**

- Ban the importation of fish that feed on freshwater mollusks (e.g.. black carp).
- Require inclusion of all stages of freshwater mussels in testing for approval of new pesticides in New York.

**Other action:**



- Develop an outreach program to private landowners through the Landowner Incentive Program to educate the public about freshwater mussel protection and initiate projects to prevent or repair impacts from land use on mussels.
- Increase regional permit control of development and highway projects that may impact native mussels.
- Develop standard monitoring/survey protocols for development projects in all watersheds in New York.
- Evaluate threats to mussels in each New York watershed and prioritize areas for actions to address the threats.
- Research the best survey methods both for detection of rare species and evaluation of population status and trends.
- Begin evaluation of members of the family Sphaeridae (fingernail clams) for inclusion into the species at risk list.

**Population monitoring:**

- Conduct population estimates of species-at-risk listed mussel species in NY
- Conduct surveys to determine distribution of species-at-risk listed mussel species in NY.

**Regional management plan:**

- Incorporate freshwater mussel goals and objectives into regional water quality and fish management plans and policies.

**Relocation/reintroduction:**

- Where appropriate, reintroduce listed mussels into appropriate habitat within their historic range.

**Statewide management plan:**

- Incorporate freshwater mussel goals and objectives into statewide water quality and fish management plans and policies.
- 

## VII. References

Aldridge, D. C. (2000). The impacts of dredging and weed cutting on a population of freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae). *Biological Conservation*, 95(3), 247-257

Barnhart, M.C., F.A. Riusech, and A.D. Roberts. (1997). Fish hosts of the federally endangered pink mucket, *Lampsilis abrupta*. Triannual Unionid Report, 13: 35.

Benke, A.C. (1990). A perspective on America's vanishing streams. *Journal of the N. American Benthological Society*: 9: 77-88

COSEWIC. (2003). COSEWIC assessment and status report on the kidneyshell *Ptychobranhus fasciolaris* in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa, Canada. 32 pp.

- Dennis, S.D. (1984). Distributional analysis of the freshwater mussel fauna of the Tennessee River system, with special reference to possible limiting effects of siltation. Ph.D. Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. 247 pp.
- Dodd, B.J., M.C. Barnhart, C.L. Rogers-Lowery, T.B. Fobian, and R.V. Dimock. (2005). Cross-resistance of largemouth bass to glochidia of unionid mussels. *Journal of Parasitology*, 91(5): 1064-1072.
- Fuller, S.L.H. (1974). Chapter 8: Clams and mussels (Mollusca: Bivalvia). Pages 215-273 in: C.W. Hart, Jr. and S.L.H. Fuller (eds.) *Pollution Ecology of Freshwater Invertebrates*. Academic Press: New York. 389 p
- Gordon, M.E. and J.B. Layzer. (1989). Mussels (Bivalvia: Unionoidea) of the Cumberland River review of life histories and ecological relationships. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report, 89(15): 1-99.
- Huebner, J. D., & Pynnönen, K. S. (1992). Viability of glochidia of two species of Anodonta exposed to low pH and selected metals. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 70(12), 2348-2355.
- Keller, A. E., & Zam, S. G. (1991). The acute toxicity of selected metals to the freshwater mussel, *Anodonta imbecilis*. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 10(4), 539-546.
- Kraemer, L.R. (1970). The mantle flap in three species of *Lampsilis* (Pelecypoda: Unionidae). *Malacologia* 10:255-282.
- Liquori, V. M., & Insler, G. D. (1985). Gill parasites of the white perch: Phenologies in the lower Hudson River. *New York Fish and Game Journal*, 32(1), 71-76.
- Mahar, A.M. & J.A. Landry. (2012). State Wildlife Grants Progress Report and Evaluation: Inventory of Freshwater Mussels in New York's Southeast and Southwest Lake Ontario Basins, 2008-2012. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Avon, NY. 12 pp.
- NatureServe. (2013). NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>. (Accessed: February 12, 2013).
- Ortmann, A.E. (1911). Monograph of the naiades of Pennsylvania. *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum*, 4: 279-347.
- Ortmann, A.E. (1912). Notes upon the families and genera of the najades. *Annals of the Carnegie Museum* 8(2):222-365.
- Ortmann, A. E. (1919). *Monograph of the Naiades of Pennsylvania..* (Vol. 8, No. 1). Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Institute.

Stansbery, D. H., & King, C. C. (1983). Management of Muskingum River mussel (unionid mollusk) populations. *Ohio State University Museum of Zoology Reports for*, 79.

Surber, T. (1913). *Notes on the natural hosts of fresh-water mussels*. US Government Printing Office.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). (1985e) Recovery plan for the pink mucket pearly mussel; *Lampsilis orbiculata* (Hildreth, 1828). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 4, Atlanta, Georgia. 47 pp.

Vaughn, C. C. and Taylor, C. M. (1999), Impoundments and the Decline of Freshwater Mussels: a Case Study of an Extinction Gradient. *Conservation Biology*, 13: 912–920.

Watters, G. T., Hoggarth, M. A., & Stansbery, D. H. (2009). *The freshwater mussels of Ohio*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Yeager, B. (1993). Dams. Pages 57-92 in C.F. Bryan and D. A Rutherford, editors. Impacts on warm water streams: guidelines for evaluation. *American Fisheries Society*, Little Rock, Arkansas.

**Date last revised:** \_\_\_\_\_ June 2013 \_\_\_\_\_