# Distribution of Unionid Mussels in Tributaries of the Lower Flint River, Southwestern Georgia: An Examination of Current and Historical Trends.

Charlotte A. Chastain <sup>1</sup>, Stephen W. Golladay <sup>1</sup>, and Tara K. Muenz <sup>1</sup>

AUTHORS: <sup>1</sup> J.W. Jones Ecological Research Center, Route 2, Box 2324, Newton, GA 39870

*REFERENCE: Proceedings of the 2005 Georgia Water Resources Conference*, held April 25-27 at the University of Georgia. Kathryn J. Hatcher, editor, Institute Ecology, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Abstract. The historically diverse assemblage of freshwater mussels in the Flint River Basin (FRB) has shown declines in abundance and distribution. The midreaches of the major tributaries of the Flint River contained one of the richest assemblages of mussels in the southeastern Coastal Plain. Declines assemblages were accelerated by the recent drought that occurred during 1999-2001. Following the drought, we surveyed mussel populations at selected sites in the major tributaries of the Flint River to determine if declines in abundance and distribution were continuing. Many populations of common, rare, and endangered species were stable in their distribution but exhibited declines in numbers. One survey site in particular, on Spring Creek, contains a rich assemblage of mussels unique to this basin, and surveys from this site also suggest population declines. Possible explanations for declines include poor water quality, loss or degradation of instream habitat, competition from the exotic Asiatic clam, and inadequate instream flows.

## INTRODUCTION

The Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint (ACF) river basin is thought to be a major center of unionid species origin (Brim Box and Williams, 2000). The Flint River Basin (FRB) in southwestern Georgia contains some of the richest mussel assemblages in the southeastern United States. Historically, the Flint River system contained 29 known species including 7 endemic species. Surveys from 1991-93 found that 22 of the 29 species continued to occur in the Flint River Basin (FRB), but numbers were declining. Historically, several tributaries within the lower FRB harbored rich mussel assemblages numbering from 9 to 16 species. Creeks containing the most abundant and diverse mussel assemblages, with the greatest concentration of endangered species, included the Kinchafoonee. Muckalee, Chickasawhatchee, and Spring Creeks (Brim Box and Williams, 2000).

From 1999-2001, southwest Georgia experienced a record drought. Drought conditions were most severe during the summer of 2000 and resulted in stressful habitat conditions for mussels. Perennial streams went dry throughout the region, while other stream segments became intermittent with aquatic habitat limited to isolated pools. Headwater sections in some locations sustained flow, while downstream sections stagnated (Johnson et al., 2001, Golladay et al., 2002). In other locations, primarily larger streams, flowing water persisted throughout the drought, but water levels dropped to unprecedented lows (USGS 2000). Mussel mortality throughout the lower FRB was linked to stream drying (Golladay et al., 2003).

Surveys prior to the drought were conducted in 1999 and 21 stream locations that were historically known to have substantial or diverse mussel assemblages were resurveyed in 2001 and 2002. During the summer and fall of 2002, 6 of the 21 sites surveyed in 2001 were resurveyed to ascertain the extent and nature of ongoing change in mussel populations. A survey reach on Spring Creek, adjacent to Spring Creek Park in Colquitt, GA, has been surveyed on 5 occasions since 2001 due to its variety of taxa and numbers of mussels. The channel is well shaded, moderately incised, and surrounded by cypress-dominated riparian wetlands for hundreds of meters on both banks (Johnson, 2001).

This paper reports on the status of the remaining mussel populations from 6 selected survey sites, in the major tributaries of the Flint River, southwest, Georgia, to determine if mussel declines are continuing. We summarize what is currently known about the distribution and abundance of 6 common, 3 threatened, and 3 endangered species. Spring Creek is presented as a case study on population change.

## SITE DESCRIPTION AND METHODS

Survey sites were dispersed across the major tributaries of the lower FRB. Sites were selected that supported diverse or abundant mussel populations in 1999 and continued to support abundant assemblages following the drought.

At each site, the streambed extending from 100 to 200 m upstream from access points was searched for mussels. In small streams, this included the entire bed surface within the 100 m survey reach (i.e., surface sediments were sieved with fingers to a depth of 5 cm or visually searched for live and dead unionids). In large streams (4<sup>th</sup> order or larger; greater than 12 m wide), visual and tactile searches for live and dead mussels were conducted along six transects oriented parallel to stream flow along the width of the stream reach. Transects were 2 m wide and evenly spaced across the width of the stream, with one transect on each bank. Surveys were conducted in the main channel of the stream; backwater areas were not searched.

Live native mussels were identified and immediately returned to the stream bottom. If more than 1000 individuals of any species were found before reaching the end of the survey reach, the density of the species in the completed portion of the survey reach was estimated and additional specimens of that species in the remaining survey stretch were not counted. Unionids were identified

to species level, except *Elliptio complanata* and *Elliptio icterina*, which were grouped together as *Elliptio complanata/icterina* because of the difficulty of distinguishing between the two species in the field.

#### RESULTS

Freshwater mussel abundance summed over all species appeared to decline at four of the six sites surveyed (range 14-49%, Table 1), between the summer of 2001 and 2002. Most mussel species exhibited declines in total numbers collected at all sites. (Table 1). Common species, which are found in Table 1, were widely distributed although numbers showed declines ranging from 5.6 to 66.7% (Table 1). Elliptio crassidens, a larger stream specialist, showed the greatest declines which were probably due to inadequate representation in the sites selected. Species of special concern (Table 1) exhibited declines ranging from 20.8 to 100% (Table 1). L.s. claibornensis and V. villosa have also shown declines in distributions across the lower FRB. S.subvexus is not widely distributed. Endangered species, Pleurobema pyriforme and Medionidus penicillatus, exhibited declines ranging from 11.8 to

Table 1. Comparison of 2001 and 2002 Mussel Surveys by Species. Six Sites Were Surveyed each Year. Habitat Associations were Designated by Johnson (2001) (n.s. = non-specialist).

Status	Habitat	Sites	Sites	Total	Total	% Change in Total
Species	Association	Found 2001	Found 2002	Found 2001	Found 2002	
<b>Common Species</b>						
Elliptio complanata/icterina	n.s. common	6	6	3631	3428	-5.6
Elliptio crassidens	riffle	1	1	3	1	-66.7
Toxolasma paulus	n.s. common	4	4	358	190	-46.9
Uniomerus carolinianus	n.s. common	4	4	41	28	-31.7
Villosa lienosa	n.s. common	6	6	923	620	-32.8
Villosa vibex	n.s. common	6	6	483	244	-49.5
Total (Average)				5439	4511	(-17.1)
Special Concern Species						
Elliptio purpurella	n.s. rare	5	4	155	23	-85.2
Lampsilis straminea claibornensis	n.s. rare	2	2	22	14	-36.4
Quincuncina infucata	n.s. rare	4	4	399	316	-20.8
Strophitus subvexus	n.s. rare	1	0	5	0	-100.0
Villosa villosa	pool	0	1	0	2	-
Total (Average)				581	355	(-38.9)
<b>Endangered Species</b>						
Lampsilis subangulata	n.s. rare	3	4	50	55	10.0
Medionidus penicillatus	n.s. rare	1	1	17	8	-52.9
Pleurobema pyriforme	n.s. rare	3	3	254	224	-11.8
Total (Average)				321	287	(-10.6)

52.9% (Table 1). *M. pencilillatus* was found in only one location, Chickasawhatchee Creek, of the 6 sites surveyed. Lampsilis subangulata, an endangered species, showed a slight increase of 10% (Table 1). Overall, the sites surveyed in 2001 and 2002 had a comparable number of taxa present.

## Spring Creek: a case study

One of the reaches surveyed was on Spring Creek adjacent to Spring Creek Park in Colquitt, GA. This site has a rich assemblage of mussels and has been monitored on 5 occasions since 2001. There appears to be a general pattern of decline (Table 2) in mussel abundance at this site. One of the largest populations of *Pleurobema pyriforme*, an endangered species in the FRB, is found in this stretch of Spring Creek. Results from the latest survey in August of 2004 show a substantial decline in numbers of *P. pyriforme* observed. From 2001 to 2004, most species of mussels found at this site have shown declines in numbers except for *L. subangulata* which exhibited a slight increase in numbers observed.

## **DISCUSSION**

The surveys conducted in the summer of 2001 and 2002 contribute to an ongoing picture of decline in freshwater mussel assemblage composition in the FRB. All classifications of mussels, from common species to endangered species, appear to exhibit declines in abundance. While diminishing numbers in mussel

populations during the 1999-2001 drought were attributed to unusual climatic conditions and increased rates of water usage, subsequent declines point to additional stressors on regional mussel populations. Possible stressors include poor water quality, loss or degradation of instream habitat, inadequate instream flows, and competition from the exotic Asiatic clam (Corbicula fluminea) (Brim Box and Williams, 2000). Efforts to determine requirements, metapopulation dynamics, and continued long term monitoring of freshwater mussels are needed in the lower FRB to ensure viability of freshwater unionid mussels (Strayer and Smith, 2004).

Intensive upland agricultural development, deforestation, river impoundments, and declines in native fish species have adversely affected mussel diversity and abundance in the FRB (Brim Box and Williams, 2000). Natural occurrences such as droughts may contribute to declines in mussel populations' health due to physiological stress or death by exacerbating already stressful habitat conditions.

Removal of woody debris in streams is also a factor that appears to adversely impact mussels as it provides habitat during low-flow. Johnson et al. (2001) observed that, as streams dried, mussels tended to congregate in small shaded depressions on the downstream side of woody debris in the streambed. The contribution of woody debris to the health of Coastal Plain streams has been widely noted (e.g., Wallace and Benke, 1984), but the potential for woody debris to act as a refuge for freshwater mussels has not been recognized previously (Golladay, 2004). Woody debris removal from streams was a common

Table 2. Number density of unionid mussels from a 100 m reach adjacent to Spring Creek Park in Colquitt, Georgia. On the date of each survey the entire wetted stream bottom was visually and manually searched for live mussels.

	June	September	June	August 2004
Conservation Status	2001	2001	2002	
Spec	cies			
Stable				
Elliptio complanata/icterina	102	59	178	96
Villosa vibex	33	23	13	18
Villosa lienosa	49	50	54	46
Toxolasma paulus	16	59	93	19
Uniomerus carolinianus	1	4	4	0
Elliptio crassidens	0	2	1	0
Special Concern				
Lampsilis straminea claibornensis				
	18	14	10	9
Elliptio purpurella	1	4	1	2
Endangered				
Pleurobema pyriforme	129	187	182	84
Lampsilis subangulata	23	23	23	31

practice that provided wood products, facilitated navigation and recreation, and provided flood control (Wallace and Benke, 1984) and is still practiced in the southeastern coastal plain (SWG, personal observation). Until the significance of woody debris for freshwater mussels has been further studied, wood removal should be avoided in areas where freshwater mussel conservation is a priority (Golladay, 2004).

Examination of historical freshwater mussel distribution and abundance in the FRB points to a pattern of decline. Once the distribution of a species is confined to smaller tributaries, isolation ensues, eventually leading to extirpation or extinction of the species. Recolonization of downstream areas from smaller tributaries does not seem to occur or occurs infrequently. Very little is known about the metapopulation dynamics of many freshwater mussels and that is an area in need of further study.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Jan Battle, Margaret Kearns, Paula Gagnon, Brian Clayton, Raynie Bambarger, Sean Kelley, and Lee Anne Bledsoe provided technical support for this project; we appreciate their tireless enthusiasm for mussel research and conservation. The Georgia Environmental Protection Division, the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, and the Joseph W. Jones Ecological Research Center provided financial support.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Brim Box, J. and J.D. Williams, 2000. Unionid mollusks of the Appalachicola Basin in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. *Alabama Museum of Natural History Bulletin 21*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Golladay, S.W., P. Gagnon, M. Kearns, J.M. Battle, and D.W. Hicks, 2004. Response of freshwater mussel assemblages (Bivalvia:Unionidae) to a record drought in the Gulf Coastal Plain of southwestern Georgia. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 23: 494-506.
- Golladay, S.W., and D.W. Hicks, 2003. Mussel Population Surveys and Estimation of Potential Stream Withdrawals at Selected sites in the Lower Flint River Basin. *Report: Georgia Department of Natural Resources*.
- Johnson, P.M., 2001. Habitat associations and drought responses of freshwater mussels in the lower Flint River Basin. MSc Thesis, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.
- Strayer, D.L. and D.R. Smith,2004. A guide to sampling freshwater mussel populations. American Fisheries Society Monograph 8. Bethesda, Maryland.

- USGS (United States Geological Survey), 2000. Georgia drought watch website. Summary of hydrologic conditions: September 2000 and earlier. Accessed October 2000. http://ga.water.usgs.gov/news/drought99.
- Wallace, J.B. and A.C. Benke, 1984. Quantification of wood habitat in subtropical Coastal Plain streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*41:1643-1652