

RICHARD J. NEVES

*Dist
For your
information
Dist*

ROUTING	
BPC	NAM
RGB	JAR
	HV
	NC
	LR
	G SMNP

*Robert
Quinn
1996*

QUARTERLY REPORT

October 1 - December 31, 1995

DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY FOR LONG-TERM HOLDING OF MUSSELS
IN CAPTIVITY

JAMES B. LAYZER and ROBERT QUINN
Tennessee Cooperative Fishery Research Unit
Tennessee Technological University
PO Box 5114
Cookeville, TN 38505

RECEIVED

FEB 14 1996

USFWS - ASHEVILLE NC

QUARTERLY REPORT

DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY FOR LONG-TERM HOLDING OF MUSSELS IN CAPTIVITY

On November 30, we collected a total of 852 mussels of 15 species from Kentucky Lake. All mussels were hand-scrubbed with wire brushes and then placed into eight plastic stock tanks containing 200 gallons of water from Center Hill Lake for a 30-day quarantine. The seven most abundant species were distributed among seven tanks at varying density (Table 1). The remaining mussels were held in the eighth tank. After the 30-day quarantine, survival of mussels in all tanks was about 99%. Thus survival was not affected by the densities we used. Throughout the study, a number of water quality variables were monitored. Because water chemistry began to change near the end of the 30-day period, we kept the mussels in quarantine for an additional 2 week period. We are planning additional density experiments and more intensive monitoring of water quality. The high survival of mussels in this experiment was significantly greater than our first two attempts to quarantine mussels which resulted in about 80% survival.

Table 1. Species and numbers of mussels held in quarantine at varying densities.

Species	Tank-1	Tank-2	Tank-3	Tank-4	Tank-5	Tank-6	Tank-7
<i>Amblema plicata</i>	14	30	46	59	74	88	104
<i>Potamilus alatus</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Megalonaias nervosa</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Fusconaia ebena</i>	2	4	6	8	10	12	14
<i>Quadrula quadrula</i>	4	8	12	16	20	24	28
<i>Fuconaia flava</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Quadrula apiculata</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TOTAL	24	50	76	99	124	148	174

QUARTERLY REPORT

October 1 - December 31, 1995

REESTABLISH POPULATIONS OF ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES
IN SHOAL CREEK

JAMES B. LAYZER, ANNETTE MORGAN, and NATHAN WELKER
Tennessee Cooperative Fishery Research Unit
Tennessee Technological University
PO Box 5114
Cookeville, TN 38505

QUARTERLY REPORT

REESTABLISH POPULATIONS OF ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES IN SHOAL CREEK

In 1995, fish were collected at 83 sites located throughout the Shoal Creek drainage. During this quarter, all specimens were identified. In all, 78 species belonging to 15 families were collected (Table 1). Many of the species collected are known hosts for the common mussels introduced into Shoal Creek. Some of the species are also known hosts of the endangered mussels that are being considered for reintroduction. The fish distributional data is being analyzed to determine additional potential sites for mussel reintroductions.

Table 1. List of all fish species and the number of sites where they were collected in the Shoal Creek drainage.

ORDER	FAMILY	Scientific name	Number of sites
PETROMYZONTIFORMES			
	PETROMYZONTIDAE		
		<u>Ichthyomyzon bdellium</u>	12
		<u>Ichthyomyzon castenatus</u>	7
		<u>Lamptera aepytera</u>	1
LEPISOSTEIFORMES			
	LEPISOSTEIDAE		
		<u>Lepisosteus osseus</u>	2
CLUPEIFORMES			
	CLUPEIDAE		
		<u>Dorosoma cepedianum</u>	11
CYPRINIFORMES			
	CYPRINIDAE		
		<u>Campostoma anomalum</u>	76
		<u>Clinostomus funduloides</u>	53
		<u>Cyprinella galactura</u>	29
		<u>Cyprinella spiloptera</u>	6
		<u>Erimystax dissimilis</u>	3
		<u>Erimystax insignis</u>	10
		<u>Erimyzon oblongus</u>	2
		<u>Hemitrema flamea</u>	2
		<u>Hybopsis amblops</u>	29
		<u>Luxilus chrysocephalus</u>	62
		<u>Luxilus coccogenis</u>	47
		<u>Lythrurus ardens</u>	18
		<u>Lythrurus lirus</u>	13
		<u>Nocomis micropogon</u>	13
		<u>Notemigonus crysoleucus</u>	3
		<u>Notropis antherinoides</u>	4
		<u>Notropis boops</u>	9
		<u>Notropis leucoides</u>	34
		<u>Notropis rubellus</u>	8
		<u>Notropis telescopus</u>	33
		<u>Notropis volucellus</u>	15
		<u>Notropis sp. "sawfin shiner"</u>	4

Table 1. Continued.

ORDER	FAMILY	Scientific name	Number of sites
		<u>Phenacobius uranops</u>	10
		<u>Phoxinus erythrogaster</u>	18
		<u>Pimephales notatus</u>	29
		<u>Pimephales promelas</u>	1
		<u>Rhinichthys atractulus</u>	27
		<u>Semotilus atromactulatus</u>	69
	CATOSTOMIDAE		
		<u>Catostomus commersoni</u>	6
		<u>Hypentilium nigricans</u>	68
		<u>Minytrema melanops</u>	9
		<u>Moxostoma duquesnei</u>	21
		<u>Moxostoma erythrurum</u>	18
SILURIFORMES			
	ICTALURIDAE		
		<u>Amieurus melas</u>	4
		<u>Ameiurus natalis</u>	15
		<u>Ictalurus punctatus</u>	6
		<u>Noturus exilis</u>	9
		<u>Noturus flavus</u>	1
SALMONIFORMES			
	ESOCIDAE		
		<u>Esox niger</u>	5
	SALMONIDAE		
		<u>Oncorhynchus mykiss</u>	3
CYPRINODONTIFORMES			
	FUNDULIDAE		
		<u>Fundulus catenatus</u>	44
		<u>Fundulus olivaceus</u>	33
	POECILIDAE		
		<u>Gambusia affinis</u>	8
ATHERINIFORMES			
	ATHERINIDAE		
		<u>Labidesthes sicculus</u>	1

Table 1. Continued.

ORDER	FAMILY	Scientific name	Number of sites
SCORPAENIFORMES	COTTIDAE	<u>Cottus carolinae</u>	71
PERCIFORMES	MORONIDAE	<u>Morone chrysops</u>	1
	CENTRARCHIDAE	<u>Ambloplites rupestris</u>	50
		<u>Lepomis cyanellus</u>	69
		<u>Lepomis gulosus</u>	10
		<u>Lepomis macrochirus</u>	58
		<u>Lepomis megalotis</u>	47
		<u>Lepomis microlophus</u>	1
		<u>Micropterus dolomieu</u>	21
		<u>Micropterus punctulatus</u>	27
		<u>Micropterus salmoides</u>	19
		<u>Pomoxis annularis</u>	2
		<u>Pomoxis nigromaculatus</u>	2
	PERCIDAE	<u>Etheostoma blennioides</u>	46
		<u>Etheostoma blennius</u>	20
		<u>Etheostoma boschungii</u>	1
		<u>Etheostoma caeruleum</u>	63
		<u>Etheostoma crossopterum</u> (or <u>Etheostoma nigripinne</u>)	31
		<u>Etheostoma duryi</u>	54
		<u>Etheostoma flabellare</u>	39
		<u>Etheostoma neopterum</u>	13
		<u>Etheostoma rufilineatum</u>	49
		<u>Etheostoma simoterum</u>	52
		<u>Etheostoma stigameum</u>	6
		<u>Etheostoma zonale</u>	11
		<u>Percina caprodes</u>	22
		<u>Percina evides</u>	22
		<u>Percina sciera</u>	2
	SCIAENDAE	<u>Aplodinotus grunniens</u>	4

QUARTERLY REPORT

October 1 - December 31, 1995

ZEBRA MUSSEL IMPACTS ON ENDANGERED UNIONIDS

JAMES B. LAYZER and CURTIS DUNN
Tennessee Cooperative Fishery Research Unit
Tennessee Technological University
PO Box 5114
Cookeville, TN 38505

QUARTERLY REPORT

ZEBRA MUSSEL IMPACTS ON ENDANGERED UNIONIDS

With the exception of the Frankfort Fish Hatchery, little mortality has occurred among mussels held at the other three facilities (species, numbers, and locations held are in our Annual Report for 1995). Because of the low survival of all species at the Frankfort Hatchery, we do not intend to hold mussels there beyond this spring. Only 1 *Pleurobema pyramidatum* has died out of the 218 *Pleurobema* spp. brought to the Minor Clark Hatchery in September.

On July 21, 1995, we began using the Normandy Fish Hatchery for holding mussels in a raceway and pond. The three most abundant species were divided into two equal groups; one group was suspended in pocket nets and the other group was broadcast throughout the pond (Table 1). On December 7, the pond was drained to harvest fish. At that time, survival of mussels was slightly higher for two of the mussel species on the pond bottom and considerably higher for *Amblema plicata* (Table 1). After the fish were harvested, the pond was refilled. Because the water supply to the hatchery was being turned off for the winter, all mussels were removed from the raceway and placed in pocket nets in the ponds.

When we collected 852 mussels from Kentucky Lake near the Duck River on November 30, 1995, two zebra mussels (17 mm and 19 mm) were attached to two unionids indicating a very low density and infestation at this location.

Table 1. Species, numbers, and percent survival (in parenthesis) held in a pond at the Normandy Hatchery.

Species	Numbers and % Survival	
	Pocket Nets	Pond Bottom
<i>Amblema plicata</i>	50 (50%)	50 (74%)
<i>Cyclonaias tuberculata</i>	99 (92%)	100 (97%)
<i>Quadrula pustulosa</i>	51 (71%)	50 (78%)
<i>Truncilla truncata</i>	16 (19%)	--
<i>Obliquaria reflexa</i>	6 (83%)	--
TOTAL	222	200