

Predicting the intensity and impact of *Dreissena* infestation on native unionid bivalves from *Dreissena* field density

A. Ricciardi, F.G. Whoriskey, and J.B. Rasmussen

Abstract: Introduced dreissenid mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha* and *Dreissena bugensis*) foul native unionid bivalves by attaching to their shells in large clusters and may critically impair many North American unionids that are already threatened by habitat degradation. Using literature and new field data, we examined patterns of *Dreissena* infestation on unionids, and the relationships between *Dreissena* field density, infestation intensity, and unionid mortality. Linear regression models showed that *Dreissena* field density strongly predicts (i) the proportion of unionids colonized by dreissenids ($r^2 = 0.90$, $p < 0.0001$) and (ii) the mean number of dreissenids attached to unionids ($r^2 = 0.81$, $p < 0.0001$). We fitted a compound Poisson model that accounts for dreissenid clustering and predicts both the proportion of colonized unionids and the mean infestation intensity as effectively as our empirically derived models. The proportion of unionids colonized by *Dreissena* follows a saturation curve, increasing rapidly with *Dreissena* densities up to 200/m², and reaching a plateau at 70–80% colonization. Unionid mortality (reflected by the proportion of dead unionids) is strongly correlated with *Dreissena* field density ($r^2 = 0.82$, $p < 0.002$) at densities above 1000/m². Our models predict that severe unionid mortality (>90%) occurs when *Dreissena* density and mean infestation intensity reach 6000/m² and 100 dreissenids/unionid.

Résumé : Les moules introduites de la famille des Dreissenidés (*Dreissena polymorpha* et *Dreissena bugensis*) nuisent aux bivalves unionidés indigènes, en se fixant en gros paquets sur les coquilles de ces derniers, et peuvent compromettre la survie de nombreux unionidés d'Amérique du Nord qui sont déjà menacés par la dégradation des habitats. À partir des données publiées et de nouvelles données recueillies sur le terrain, nous avons examiné les profils d'infestation des unionidés par les *Dreissena* et les relations entre la densité des *Dreissena* sur le terrain, l'intensité de l'infestation et la mortalité des unionidés. Les modèles de régression linéaire ont montré que la densité sur le terrain des *Dreissena* constitue un fort prédicteur (i) de la proportion des unionidés colonisés par les dreissenidés ($r^2 = 0,90$, $p < 0,0001$) et (ii) du nombre moyen de dreissenidés fixés sur les unionidés ($r^2 = 0,80$, $p < 0,0001$). Nous avons mis au point un modèle composé de Poisson qui rend compte de l'agrégation des dreissenidés et prédit aussi efficacement que nos modèles empiriques la proportion d'unionidés colonisés et l'intensité moyenne d'infestation. La proportion des unionidés colonisés par *Dreissena* suit une courbe de saturation, augmentant rapidement avec la densité des *Dreissena* jusqu'à environ 200/m² et atteignant un plateau à 70–80% de colonisation. La mortalité des unionidés (indiquée par la proportion d'unionidés morts) est fortement corrélée avec la densité des *Dreissena* sur le terrain ($r^2 = 0,82$, $p < 0,002$) aux densités supérieures à 1000/m². Nos modèles prédisent qu'une forte mortalité des unionidés (>90%) se produit quand la densité des *Dreissena* et l'intensité moyenne d'infestation atteignent 6000/m² et 100 dreissenidés/unionid.

[Traduit par la Rédaction]

Received September 1, 1994. Accepted February 16, 1995.
J12557

A. Ricciardi,¹ and J.B. Rasmussen. Department of Biology, McGill University, Montréal, QC H3A 1B1, Canada.
F.G. Whoriskey. Department of Natural Resources Sciences, Macdonald Campus of McGill University,
Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, QC H9X 3V9, Canada.

¹ Author to whom all correspondence should be addressed.

Introduction

Freshwater bivalves of the family Unionidae play an important role in nutrient recycling in aquatic systems (Lewandowski and Stanczykowska 1975; Kasprzak 1986; Nalepa et al. 1991a) and are potentially valuable indicators of water quality (Imlay 1982; Green et al. 1989). North America has the richest freshwater mussel fauna in the world, with close to 300 described species and subspecies (Williams et al. 1993). However, over the past few decades, unionid abundance and species diversity have severely declined throughout North America, largely because of habitat degradation (Fuller 1974; Nalepa et al. 1991b; Williams et al. 1993); 70% of our native unionids are currently considered to be endangered, threatened, or of special concern (Williams et al. 1993).

A new, potentially fatal stress on North American unionid populations has been caused by the introduction of the European zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha* (Hebert et al. 1989). Using their adhesive byssal threads, zebra mussels may attach to any solid substrate, including the shells of other molluscs (e.g., Lewandowski 1976; Mackie 1990). Evidence from field and laboratory studies suggests that zebra mussels preferentially colonize living unionids (Biryukov et al. 1964; Wolff 1969; Lewandowski 1976; Mackie 1990; Ricciardi 1994). Unionids are fouled by byssally attached zebra mussels wherever they are sympatric in Europe (Wagner 1936; Sebestyen 1938; Zhadin and Gerd 1961; Wiktor 1963; Biryukov et al. 1964; Kuchina 1964; Wolff 1969; Lewandowski 1976; Arter 1989) and North America (Hebert et al. 1989, 1991; Mackie 1990; Schloesser and Kovalak 1991; Hunter and Bailey 1992; Tucker 1994; Ricciardi 1994; Gillis and Mackie 1994). The infestation intensity varies by several orders of magnitude among these habitats; in extreme cases, zebra mussels settling on unionid shells may form encrusting colonies of more than 10 000 individuals, and weigh 3–4 times as much as the unionid (Hebert et al. 1991; Schloesser and Kovalak 1991). The more recently introduced quagga mussel (*Dreissena bugensis*) may also contribute to unionid fouling, but probably to a much lesser extent than the zebra mussel because it does not show a preference for unionids as substrates (Conn and Conn 1993). Dreissenid infestations are believed to negatively affect unionids primarily by smothering siphons, preventing valve opening and closure, and interfering with normal feeding and burrowing activity (Mackie 1990; Schloesser and Kovalak 1991; Haag et al. 1993). Heavy infestations of *Dreissena* may cause reduced glycogen reserves (Haag et al. 1993), significant depletion of biomass and total energy stores (A. Ricciardi, in preparation), and shell deformation in unionids (Wolff 1969; Lewandowski 1976; Mackie 1990; Hunter and Bailey 1992). These impacts may have major consequences for unionid populations, as indicated by the significant mortality and loss of species richness that have often followed *Dreissena* invasions (Sebestyen 1938; Arter 1989; Hunter and Bailey 1992; Gillis and Mackie 1994; Haag et al. 1993; Ohnesorg et al. 1993; Maleski and Masteller 1994; A. Ricciardi, in preparation).

Relocation of unionid populations has been advocated as a conservation measure to protect them from *Dreissena*

infestation (Waller et al. 1993; Havlik 1994), but since *Dreissena* is expected to successfully invade most North American water bodies (Strayer 1991; Ramcharan et al. 1992), massive relocation of unionids into refugia that are inaccessible to *Dreissena* may be both futile and impractical. Future conservation practices, whatever form they may take, will likely involve decisions regarding levels of *Dreissena* infestation that are tolerable to particular unionid populations. Such decisions will require a method of predicting the level of infestation on unionids prior to a *Dreissena* invasion.

Dreissena population densities are highly variable among different aquatic habitats (Stanczykowska 1977). There has been some recent success in developing predictive models of *Dreissena* abundance from environmental variables (Ramcharan et al. 1992; Mellina and Rasmussen 1994), and more refined models may be available in the future. Therefore, it may be possible to predict the infestation intensity (and correlated impacts) of *Dreissena* on unionids from environmental variables if infestation can be quantitatively related to local *Dreissena* abundance. This would permit us to identify habitats and unionid populations that are at great risk, in advance of a *Dreissena* invasion. The first step in developing these larger predictive models, and the main objective of our investigation, is to quantify relationships between the infestation intensity of *Dreissena* on unionids and *Dreissena* density. Secondly, we examine whether *Dreissena* density and infestation intensity can be used to predict unionid mortality.

Methods

We examined patterns of unionid infestation across a range of habitats and geographic regions, using data obtained from the literature combined with our own field data collected from the St. Lawrence River. The primary data set consisted of 36 records, including 13 from the Laurentian Great Lakes (Hebert et al. 1989, 1991; Schloesser and Kovalak 1991; Gillis and Mackie 1994; Masteller and Schloesser 1992; Haag et al. 1993), 9 from the St. Lawrence River (this study), 8 from the upper Mississippi River Basin (Tucker et al. 1993; Tucker 1994), and 6 from the Mazurian lakes of northeastern Poland (Lewandowski 1976). Data on infestation intensity included (i) the percentage of unionids colonized by *Dreissena*, (ii) the mean number of dreissenids per unionid (= mean infestation intensity), and (iii) the maximum number of dreissenids found on a unionid (= maximum infestation intensity). These data were coupled with estimates of *Dreissena* field density for each site, wherever possible (Table 1); when more than one literature source was required to obtain these data, only data collected within the same year were used. The mean number of dreissenids per unionid includes all unionids (including those not colonized by *Dreissena*) in a given population. The Mississippi River studies (Tucker et al. 1993; Tucker 1994) gave mean infestation intensities for colonized unionids only, and therefore were multiplied by the proportion of colonized unionids to obtain the mean infestation for the entire population.

Data collected from St. Lawrence River sites

Unionids were collected from six sites on the upper St. Lawrence River in Quebec: two sites on Lake St. Louis (near Lachine), one site on Lake St. François (near Les Cèdres), one site at the Port of Montréal, and two sections of the Soulanges Canal at Pointe-des-Cascades (approx. 45°20'N, 73°58'W). Collections at the Soulanges Canal sites were made monthly during the summers (June–August) of 1992–1994. Lake St. François was sampled once in July 1992. Two sites in Lake St. Louis were sampled in September 1992; one of these sites was revisited in June 1994. The Port of Montréal site was sampled once in July 1994. All unionids, including empty shells, were removed by hand from a 1-m² polyvinyl chloride (PVC) quadrat randomly placed on the bottom substrate using self-contained underwater breathing apparatus (SCUBA). The upper 10 cm of sediment within the quadrat was probed by hand to locate living and recently dead individuals buried immediately beneath the surface. An underwater light was used to aid collections in areas of low visibility. We decided a priori to use five replicated quadrats at each site, since this was expected to yield a precision of approximately 20% when sampling unionid densities of 10–30 mussels/m² (Downing and Downing 1992). The sole exception to our sampling protocol was the Port of Montréal, where unionid and dreissenid densities were not sampled; living and recently dead unionids were randomly collected by SCUBA and provided by a local environmental consulting firm (Subdev Canada Inc.).

Dreissena became established in the upper St. Lawrence River ca. 1990 (Griffiths et al. 1991); settled mussels, including adults, were present in Lake St. Louis and Lake St. François in the spring of 1991 (A. Ricciardi, personal observation). Dreissenid densities were estimated using SCUBA and randomly placed 1-m² quadrats (at least five replicates) at the Lake St. Louis and Lake St. François sites, since preliminary surveys (in 1992) showed that these sites had relatively small *Dreissena* populations (10²/m²). Smaller (25 × 25 cm, or 0.0625-m²) quadrats were used at the Soulanges Canal sites, where dreissenid densities were on the order of 10³/m². Objects with attached mussels were removed from quadrats placed at sites in Lake St. Louis, Lake St. François, and the west section of the Soulanges Canal. In the east section of the Soulanges Canal, where the bottom substrate is predominantly mud, quadrats were placed on the concrete canal walls at 3–5 m depths and dreissenids were scraped into bags by a SCUBA diver using a knife. In the laboratory, dreissenids were removed from unionids and other substrates, using a knife and a bristle brush (for small specimens). All dreissenids were washed through a 1-mm mesh sieve and counted under a dissecting microscope. Data from sites that were sampled more than once during a year were averaged for that year.

Development of predictive models

Our analysis consisted of modelling the relationships between *Dreissena* density and infestation variables by three approaches. We first analyzed these relationships empirically with simple linear regression models using SAS procedures (SAS Institute Inc. 1988). Proportion data

(i.e., colonized unionids; unionid mortality) were transformed as $\sin^{-1}(\text{proportion}^{0.5})$ to achieve a better linear fit. The remaining variables spanned two to four orders of magnitude in range (Table 2), and thus were \log_{10} -transformed to stabilize their variances and reduce the influence of extreme values (Zar 1984). Our second approach investigated the possibility that the colonization of unionids by dreissenids is a simple space-occupancy problem controlled by stochastic processes. We thus derived a model to predict unionid colonization on the basis of the Poisson distribution and fitted it to the percent colonization data using a nonlinear iterative regression technique (Wilkinson 1989). We verified this model by testing (i) its ability to predict the proportion of unionids colonized by *Dreissena*, and the mean infestation intensity, and (ii) the expected 1:1 correspondence between mean infestation and variance required for a simple Poisson distribution (Zar 1984). Our analysis led us to consider a third approach in which we fitted a compound Poisson model (Thomas 1949) that accounted for the tendency of dreissenid mussels to aggregate and form clusters on unionid shells.

Estimating unionid surface area

In the process of developing our simple Poisson model, we needed to determine the allometric relationship between unionid shell length (cm) and surface area (cm²). To do this, we randomly selected 50 unionids from the Lake St. Louis and Soulanges Canal collections. The surface area of each unionid was estimated by spreading a sheet of aluminum foil over the entire shell, subsequently weighing the foil, and multiplying this weight by an area-to-weight ratio determined from sample masses of foil. The maximum length of the shell was measured to the nearest millimetre, using dial callipers. The \log_{10} -transformed shell length and surface area variables were related by linear regression (SAS Institute Inc. 1988). This equation permitted us to estimate the surface area available for colonization by *Dreissena*, using data from unionids in the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence River system.

An indicator of mortality: the proportion of dead unionids in a population

Data on the proportion of dead unionids in populations within the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence River system comprised a second data set (Table 3) that was used to determine if *Dreissena* density and infestation intensity are significant predictors of unionid mortality. We considered a high proportion of recently dead unionids in a population to indicate relatively high mortality, since we found few studies that provided a direct measure of mortality. A similar measure, the ratio of live to dead unionids, was used in other studies as an indicator of increased mortality as a result of *Dreissena* fouling in Lake St. Clair (Hunter and Bailey 1992), western Lake Erie (Haag et al. 1993), and the Detroit River (Ohnesorg et al. 1993). An increase in the proportion of dead unionids was correlated with both a decrease in living unionid density and an increase in *Dreissena* density across sites in Lake St. Clair (Hunter and Bailey 1992). Therefore, we chose to use this proportion as an indicator of unionid mortality to investigate

Table 1. Field data used in the analysis.

Site	<i>Dreissena</i> density (no./m ²)	Unionid density (no./m ²)	% of unionids colonized	Mean no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	Max. no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	Sources of data
St. Lawrence River						
Soulanges Canal						
East site, 1992	1 990 (384)	21.0 (3.4)	74	3.1 (0.6)	12	This study; Ricciardi 1994
East site, 1993	1 819 (283)	15.0 (4.7)	95	9.9 (0.9)	75	This study; Ricciardi 1994
East site, 1994	3 712 (247)	3.0 (1.7)	100	19.6 (6.0)	61	This study
West site, 1994	2 944 (539)	5.3 (3.4)	100	43.8 (9.2)	134	This study
Lake St. Louis-1, 1992	101 (21)	19.2 (4.0)	58	0.8 (0.2)	4	This study
Lake St. Louis-2, 1992	123 (28)	48.0 (9.2)	59	1.3 (0.4)	6	This study
Lake St. Louis-2, 1994	851 (307)	48.6 (16.0)	62	8.7 (3.8)	92	This study
Lake St. François, 1992	165 (39)	120.5 (16.0)	55	1.2 (0.04)	9	This study
Port of Montréal, 1994			100	23.1 (2.8)	42	This study
Laurentian Great Lakes						
Lake St. Clair-2	48.0	5.7	70	2.3		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-3			87	4.3		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-4			47	1.4		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-5			60	1.9		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-7	195.0	11.3	90	8.2	38	Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-8			92	17.1		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-9			73	1.7		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-10			93	3.9		Hebert et al. 1989
Lake St. Clair-13	6 000.0			5496.0	10 520	Griffiths 1993; Hebert et al. 1991
Lake St. Clair-Puce	5 000.0	1.7	100	642.0	1 991	Griffiths 1993; Gillis and Mackie 1994
Lake Erie-Presque Ile			100	234.0		Mastellar and Schloesser 1992
Western L. Erie	15 000.0		100	216.0		Haag et al. 1993; Garton and Haag 1993; J.R. Hageman ^d
Monroe Canal	700 000.0			6777.0	10 732	Schloesser and Kovalak 1991
Mississippi River Basin						
Peoria	1.2	12.0	10	0.1		Tucker et al. 1993
LaGrange	1.2	6.4	6	0.1		Tucker et al. 1993
Alton	7.3	8.2	27	0.6		Tucker et al. 1993
Lake Swan-outflow	0.3	12.9	2			Tucker et al. 1993
Lake Swan-interior	2.7	8.7	20			Tucker et al. 1993
Grafton	1.5	4.9	27	0.3		Tucker et al. 1993
Piasa Creek	1.1	2.3	18	0.3		Tucker et al. 1993
Mile 217			100	37.3	219	Tucker 1994

Table 1 (continued).

Site	<i>Dreissena</i> density (no./m ²)	Unionid density (no./m ²)	% of unionids colonized	Mean no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	Max. no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	Sources of data
Mazurian Lakes, Poland Lake Mikołajskie, 1972	700.0	0.4	85	20.0	99	Lewandowski 1976; Stanczykowska 1975; Stanczykowska et al. 1976
Lake Mikołajskie, 1974	1 000.0		92	52.0	132	Lewandowski 1976
Lake Beldany	25.0				40	Lewandowski 1976
Lake Jagodne	125.0				80	Lewandowski 1976
Lake Sniardwy	425.0				85	Lewandowski 1976
Lake Niegocin	1 300.0				186	Lewandowski 1976

Note: Values in parentheses for St. Lawrence River sites are standard errors.
*J.R. Hageman, F.T. Stone Laboratory, Put-in-Bay, Ohio, personal communication.

its correlation with *Dreissena* abundance and infestation across a number of different habitats. Living and recently dead unionids (distinguished from older dead shells by the presence of mussel tissue or an intact ligament, and by the absence of severe shell erosion) were obtained from five sites on the St. Lawrence River (Lake St. Louis, Lake St. François, two sections of the Soulanges Canal, and the Port of Montréal), and these data were supplemented by similar data from the North American literature (Hebert et al. 1991; Hunter and Bailey 1992; Haag et al. 1993; Gillis and Mackie 1994) (Table 3).

We recognize that a simple measure of the proportion of recently dead unionids in a population is not as meaningful an indicator of mortality as the change in unionid density over time, but there is a paucity of data concerning these density changes in the literature. Our previous experiences in sampling unionid populations in rivers and inland lakes throughout southwestern Quebec suggested that the proportion of dead unionids in populations occupying relatively pristine habitats (e.g., many southwestern Quebec lakes), or even habitats that are subject to some perturbation (e.g., the lower Ottawa River), is usually well below 10%. This is considerably lower than the proportions recorded in habitats invaded by *Dreissena* (Table 3). Therefore, we assumed that if *Dreissena* density and infestation were strong correlates of unionid mortality, then we would be able to detect these relationships using our surrogate variable.

Results and discussion

Empirical relationships between infestation and *Dreissena* field density

The proportion of unionids colonized by *Dreissena* at a given site is strongly dependent on the density of the *Dreissena* population at that site ($r^2 = 0.90$, $p < 0.0001$) and follows a saturation curve that increases rapidly with *Dreissena* density up to ca. 200/m², where it plateaus at 70–80% colonization (Fig. 1). Typically, over 90% of unionids are colonized when *Dreissena* densities reach 10³ mussels/m².

The mean number of dreissenids on each unionid (mean infestation intensity) is strongly correlated with *Dreissena* field density (Fig. 2; Table 4), which accounts for 81% of the variance. This relationship is equally applicable to lentic and lotic habitats (analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), $F = 1.85$, $p > 0.19$), although infestation intensities tended to be lower in lotic situations. The maximum number of *Dreissena* attached to a unionid (maximum infestation intensity) at a given site is also correlated with *Dreissena* field density ($r^2 = 0.58$, $p < 0.0001$), but is significantly lower in lotic situations (ANCOVA, $F = 11.27$, $p < 0.005$; Fig 3), which may reflect the greater availability of alternative hard substrates in running waters.

The mean infestation intensity remains low until the majority of unionids in a population is colonized (Fig. 4). Unionids are then subject to rapid increases in infestation (Table 5), possibly as a result of (i) the attraction of larvae and young-of-the-year to established mussel clusters on unionids (gregarious settlement), or (ii) self-recruitment by unionid-bound dreissenid populations. In both cases,

Table 2. Ranges and mean values of field data in Table 1.

Variable	Range	Mean \pm SE	Median	<i>n</i>
<i>Dreissena</i> field density	0.3 – 700 000	27 464 \pm 25 874	195.0	27
Unionid density	0.4 – 120.5	18.9 \pm 6.3	8.7	19
% unionids colonized	2.0 – 100	66.7 \pm 6.0	73.5	30
Mean no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	0.1 – 6777	454.3 \pm 285.6	6.3	30
Max. no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	4.0 – 10 732	1227.9 \pm 725.2	82.5	20

Table 3. Data on unionid mortality, with associated infestation intensity and zebra mussel density from sites in the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence River system.

Site	<i>Dreissena</i> density (no./m ²)	No. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	Proportion of dead unionids	Reference
Lake St. Clair (west)	152		3.8	Hunter and Bailey 1992
Lake St. Clair (central)	2 847		52.6	Hunter and Bailey 1992
Lake St. Clair (east)	11 655	c. 5500	98.0	Hunter and Bailey 1992; Hebert et al. 1991
Lake St. Clair (Puce)	5 000	642	98.4	Gillis and Mackie 1994
Lake Erie (Put-in-Bay)		216	32.4	Haag et al. 1993
Lake Erie (Kelley's Island)		216	43.2	Haag et al. 1993
Detroit River	c. 5 000		90.0	Ohnesorg et al. 1993
Lake St. François, 1992	165	1.2	14.7	This study
Lake St. Louis, 1992	123	1.3	27.3	This study
Port of Montréal, 1994		23.1	39.0	This study
Soulanges Canal (east), 1992	1 990	3.1	16.6	This study
Soulanges Canal (east), 1993	1 819	9.9	25.0	This study
Soulanges Canal (east), 1994	3 712	19.6	57.0	This study
Soulanges Canal (west), 1994	2 944	43.8	60.0	This study

larval settlement is enhanced by the increased surface area provided by dreissenid shells themselves (Mackie 1990); thus, the rate of infestation should increase over time. However, during initial colonization, the rate of infestation should be limited by the low abundance of larvae in the water column, i.e., infestation levels should be dependent on factors influencing larval settlement. The initial colonization of unionids by *Dreissena* in the Illinois and Mississippi rivers consisted primarily of single attachments, and larger unionids were more likely than smaller specimens to bear attached *Dreissena* (Tucker et al. 1993); during subsequent colonization, infestation varied exponentially with unionid shell length (Tucker 1994). At low infestation rates, unionid shell length explained 19% of the variance in the number of *Dreissena* attached to unionids in the upper St. Lawrence River (A. Ricciardi, in preparation), between 23% (Mackie 1990) and 43% (Hebert et al. 1989) for unionids in the Great Lakes, and as much as 97% for unionids in the upper Mississippi River (Tucker 1994).

Predicting infestation from a Poisson model

We attempted to fit a stochastic model to the data on the basis of the null hypothesis that the colonization of unionids by dreissenid mussels, both as settling larvae and as

migrating young-of-the-year mussels, is a process characterized by a large element of chance or randomness. We assumed that the exposed surface area on a unionid shell contains a large number (*n*) of locations that can be occupied by a byssally attached dreissenid, and that each of these locations has the same probability (*p*) of being occupied. The probability that exactly *r* of these locations will be occupied is described by the binomial distribution

$$[1] \quad P_{k=r} = (n!/(r!(n-r)!)) p^r (1-p)^{n-r}$$

Let us assume that *np* (the mean of the binomial distribution) can be represented as a linear function of the overall dreissenid density, *D* (number of mussels per square metre), in the environment containing the unionids. We can express this function as

$$[2] \quad np = \mu s D$$

where *s* is the mean colonizable space (in m²) available on each unionid, and μ is a measure of the preference of *Dreissena* for this space, relative to other available substrate in the surrounding habitat. Assuming also that *n* is very large, *p* is small, *np* is of moderate magnitude, and *r* is negligible compared with *n*, then the probability of

Table 4. Linear regression models used to predict infestation and impact on unionids.

	r^2	p	n	SE _{est}
$\log_{10}(\text{avginfest}) = 0.812 \log_{10}(\text{density}) - 1.073$	0.807	<0.0001	21	0.630
$\sin^{-1}(\text{pcol}^{0.5}) = 0.302 \log_{10}(\text{density}) + 0.332$	0.902	<0.0001	21	0.150
$\log_{10}(\text{maxinfest}) = 0.751 \log_{10}(\text{density})$	0.584	<0.0001	18	0.641
$\sin^{-1}(\text{pmort}^{0.5}) = 0.498 \log_{10}(\text{density})$	0.644	<0.0029	11	0.269
$\sin^{-1}(\text{pmort}^{0.5}) = 1.350 \log_{10}(\text{density}) - 3.858^a$	0.815	<0.0021	8	0.181
$\sin^{-1}(\text{pmort}^{0.5}) = 0.262 \log_{10}(\text{avginfest}) + 0.363$	0.692	<0.0015	11	0.213

Note: avginfest, mean no. of *Dreissena* per unionid; maxinfest, maximum no. of *Dreissena* per unionid; density, *Dreissena* field density (no./m³); pcol, proportion of unionids colonized by *Dreissena*; pmort, proportion of dead unionids in a population.

^aExcluding *Dreissena* densities < 1000/m².

Table 5. Percent increases in *Dreissena* infestation of unionids.

Site	Year	Percentage of unionids colonized	Mean no. of <i>Dreissena</i> per unionid	% increase in infestation	Reference
Lake Erie (east)	1990	100	121		Mastellar and Schloesser 1992
	1991	100	234	93	Mastellar and Schloesser 1992
Lake Mikolajskie (Poland)	1972	85	20		Lewandowski 1976
	1974	92	52	160	Lewandowski 1976
Soulanges Canal (east site)	1992	74	3.1		Ricciardi 1994
	1993	95	9.9	219	Ricciardi 1994
Lake St. Clair (Puce, Ont.)	1989	c.100	143		Gillis and Mackie 1994
	1990	c.100	642	349	Gillis and Mackie 1994

r locations being occupied (i.e., r dreissenids on a unionid) is given by

$$[3] \quad P_{k=r} = (1/r!) (\mu s D)^r (1 - \mu s D/n)^n \approx (1/r!) (\mu s D)^r e^{-\mu s D}$$

Equation 3 is the Poisson distribution (Zar 1984) with a mean and variance equal to $\mu s D$, which is the expected infestation per unionid. We estimated s using our allometric regression equation relating surface area to shell length for St. Lawrence River unionids:

$$[4] \quad \log_{10}(\text{surface area}) = 1.981 \log_{10}(\text{shell length})$$

$r^2 = 0.92, SE = 0.053$

Assuming a mean unionid shell length of 9.5 cm (on the basis of the combined data from Mackie 1990, Schloesser and Kovalak 1991, and this study), and correcting for back-transformation bias, eq. 4 gives us a mean surface area of 87.7 cm². In most cases, only the posterior region of a unionid (partially buried in sediment) is available for *Dreissena* colonization (Mackie 1990; Schloesser and Kovalak 1991; Hunter and Bailey 1992; Haag et al. 1993; A. Ricciardi, personal observation), hence we estimate an exposed surface area (s) of approximately 44 cm² (0.0044 m²). Our Poisson null model then predicts the proportion of uncolonized unionids ($P_{k=0}$) to be

$$[5] \quad e^{-0.0044\mu D}$$

and the proportion colonized to be

$$[6] \quad 1 - e^{-0.0044\mu D}$$


We tested the fit of this model by using nonlinear regression (Wilkinson 1989) and found it to be nearly as effective ($r^2 = 0.78$) as our previously determined empirical model (Table 3) at predicting the proportion of colonized unionids from *Dreissena* field density. The estimated value for the preference parameter (μ) obtained from this nonlinear fit was 2.2 (95% C.I. = 1.2–3.2), which suggests that *Dreissena* (primarily *D. polymorpha*) is about twice as likely to colonize unionids as other substrates in the surrounding habitat, and thus corroborates laboratory and field observations of the preferential colonization of unionids by *Dreissena* (Biryukov et al. 1964; Wolff 1969; Lewandowski 1976; Mackie 1990; Ricciardi 1994). The predicted mean infestation per unionid ($\mu s D$) becomes 0.0097 D , and we obtain the following relationship:

$$[7] \quad \text{Predicted colonization} = 1 - e^{-0.0097D}$$

$r^2 = 0.783, SE=0.032$

This model was further tested by comparing predicted and observed mean infestations for given values of *Dreissena* field density, D . We found that the model provides useful rough estimates, but it generally underestimates mean infestation intensities, probably because it does not account for the effect of contagious infestation. The relationship between the mean infestation and variance suggests that dreissenids are contagiously distributed on unionids (Fig. 5) and that our simple Poisson model, although useful as a basis for

Fig. 1. Proportion of unionids colonized by *Dreissena* versus *Dreissena* field density over the range 0–1000/m²; values greater than 1000/m² converge to 100% colonization (Table 1) and are omitted for clarity. Solid circles denote observed values; open circles denote values predicted by the compound Poisson model (eq. 14).



further modelling, is inappropriate in its current form to accurately describe infestation patterns.

Using a compound Poisson model to predict infestation

Analysis of variance-to-mean ratios for unionid-bound dreissenids in the St. Lawrence River indicated that young-of-the-year dreissenids are more contagiously distributed than adult dreissenids (Table 6). Furthermore, young-of-the-year dreissenids tend to aggregate around adult (1- and 2-year-old) dreissenids and thus form structured clusters on unionid shells (A. Ricciardi, personal observation). We therefore fitted a compound Poisson model (Thomas 1949) to account for this clustering tendency. The model is based on two parameters: λ , which describes the Poisson distribution of adult dreissenids on unionid shells, and β , which describes the distribution of young-of-the-year dreissenids around adults. The probability of k dreissenids on a unionid, $P(k)$, is given by the following equation adapted from Thomas (1949):

$$[8] \quad P(k) = \sum_{r=1}^k (\lambda^r e^{-\lambda} / r!) (r\beta)^{k-r} e^{-r\beta} / (k-r)!$$

The mean infestation per unionid is given by


$$[9] \quad \lambda(1 + \beta)$$

and the variance is given by

$$[10] \quad \lambda(1 + 3\beta + \beta^2)$$

We calculated λ and β for each record in our data set that contained mean and variance estimates ($n = 17$), \log_{10} -transformed both parameters, and then related them to *Dreissena* density (D) by linear regression.

Fig. 2. Mean infestation intensity versus *Dreissena* field density (both variables are \log_{10} -transformed). Curved line denotes infestation predicted by the compound Poisson model (eq. 14); straight line denotes infestation predicted by linear regression model (Table 4). Points represent observed values from Table 1.



Backtransformation of the regression equations produced the following power functions:

$$[11] \quad \lambda = 0.119D^{0.453} \quad r^2 = 0.69, \quad p < 0.002, \quad SE = 2.37$$

$$[12] \quad \beta = 0.103D^{0.5} \quad r^2 = 0.50, \quad p < 0.018, \quad SE = 26.7$$

The predicted proportion of colonized unionids is thus given by

$$[13] \quad 1 - e^{-\lambda}$$

where λ is derived from eq. 11. After fitting both eq. 11 and eq. 12 into eq. 9, we obtain the following:

$$[14] \quad \text{Predicted mean infestation} =$$

$$0.119D^{0.453}(1 + 0.103D^{0.5})$$

We tested eq. 13 and eq. 14 on our entire data set and found that they performed better than equations from the previous Poisson model and explained similar proportions of variance in percent colonization ($r^2 = 0.89$, $p < 0.0001$; Fig. 1) and infestation intensity ($r^2 = 0.82$, $p < 0.0001$; Fig. 2), respectively, as our empirical models. The compound Poisson model may also be used to predict the number of unionids having a given level of infestation using eq. 8; thus, the number of unionids with infestations exceeding a critical threshold, c , may be estimated by calculating $P(k \geq c)$.

Can dreissenid density and infestation be used to predict unionid mortality?

Some studies have linked an increase in the proportion of dead unionids and a decline in living unionid density with an increase in dreissenid density (Hunter and Bailey 1992;

Fig. 5. Variance versus mean infestation intensity (both variables are \log_{10} -transformed). Solid line represents 100% correspondence between mean and variance.




Table 6. Variance to mean ratios for young-of-the-year (YOY) and adult dreissenids attached to unionids ($n = 146$) in the upper St. Lawrence River.

	Mean number per unionid, m	Variance, s^2	s^2/m
YOY dreissenids	3.2	46.9	14.7
Adult dreissenids	4.9	18.3	3.7

Note: A contagious distribution is indicated by values of $s^2/m > 1$ (Elliott 1977).


were found on unionids in Lake Balaton, Hungary (Sebestyen 1935, cited in Lewandowski 1976), less than 2 years before the unionid population suffered a major decline (Wagner 1936; Sebestyen 1938). However, some evidence suggests that, at least for some unionid populations, the mortality threshold is much lower than that which has been observed for these large lentic habitats. Very few unionids from our upper St. Lawrence River sites were found alive with infestations exceeding 100 dreissenids/unionid, even though a large number of dead unionids were found with these infestation levels (A. Ricciardi, personal observation); a sharp increase in mortality among unionids in Soulanges Canal occurred when the mean infestation reached 20/unionid (Fig. 6), at a zebra mussel field density near 4000/m². Unionid mortality increased noticeably in a small inland lake when the mean infestation exceeded 70/unionid at a *Dreissena* density near 1000/m² (Garton 1994; D.W. Garton, Indiana University, Kokomo, Ind. 46904-9003, U.S.A., personal communication). When we excluded sites with densities less than 1000/m², we obtained a much stronger correlation ($r^2 = 0.815$, $p < 0.0021$) between mortality and *Dreissena* density (Fig. 7),

suggesting that mortality sharply increases at *Dreissena* densities above 1000/m². According to this model, unionid mortality greater than 90% is associated with *Dreissena* densities exceeding 6000/m². The mean and maximum infestation intensities are near 100/unionid and 700/unionid respectively, at these densities (Fig. 2). Therefore, *Dreissena* density of 1000/m² appears to be a critical threshold above which unionid mortality increases significantly with *Dreissena* density until the population becomes virtually extirpated at a density and mean infestation intensity of approximately 6000/m² and 100/unionid, respectively. These critical values probably vary according to the size structure of attached dreissenids and the species composition of the unionid population.

Unionid morphologies and behaviours (e.g., burrowing activity) that are intrinsic to gender or species may potentially enhance or reduce fouling, and thus cause differential impacts within a unionid population (Haag et al. 1993). In Europe, *Dreissena* occurs more frequently and in greater numbers on *Anodonta* shells than on *Unio* shells (Kuchir 1964; Lewandowski 1976; Arter 1989), probably because *Unio* is almost completely buried in its natural position in the substrate and thus provides little surface area for colonization, whereas *Anodonta* normally exposes a large portion of its shell (Arter 1989). In the Mississippi River unionids are differentially colonized; thick-shelled, ornamented species are more heavily colonized than thin-shelled, unornamented species (Tucker 1994). Species-specific and sex-specific differences in impacts and survival are likely to become significant after infestation levels rise (Haag et al. 1993). Differences in mortality among infested species have already been observed in Lake St. Clair (Hunter and Bailey 1992; Gillis and Mackie 1994) and Lake Erie (Haag et al. 1993).

In habitats that support *Dreissena* densities of at least 1000/m², virtually all unionids become infested in 2–3 years as found in Lake St. Clair (Gillis and Mackie 1994), the Detroit River (Ohnesorg et al. 1993), eastern Lake Erie (Masteller and Schloesser 1992), the upper Mississippi River (Tucker 1994), and the upper St. Lawrence River (Ricciardi 1994). High infestation and heavy mortality may occur shortly thereafter, if the local dreissenid density continues to rise. Large numbers of dead unionids were found washed up on shore, and unionid population declined noticeably, less than 5 years after *Dreissena* invaded Lake Balaton (Wagner 1936; Sebestyen 1938). Severe (90–100%) reductions in unionid density were recorded in Lake St. Clair (Gillis and Mackie 1994) and the Detroit River (Ohnesorg et al. 1993) approximately 4 years after *Dreissena* invaded these habitats. Similarly, an 83% decline in unionid density in Presque Isle Bay, Lake Erie occurred 3 years after the establishment of a *Dreissena* population (Maleski and Masteller 1994). The unionid population around Kelley's Island in western Lake Erie was virtually eliminated 5 years after *Dreissena* invaded the region (J. R. Hageman, F.T. Stone Laboratory, Put-in-Bay, Ohio, 43456-0119, U.S.A., personal communication). Unionid communities in the upper St. Lawrence River appear to be following the same pattern; in the Soulanges Canal, unionid density has varied inversely with *Dreissena* density over time and the population is on the verge of

Fig. 6. (A) Changes in the density of living unionids and the percentage of dead unionids in the population at the Soulanges Canal (east site), 1992–1994. (B) Changes in *Dreissena* infestation intensity on unionids over this same time period.



extirpation, 4 years after *Dreissena* became established in that section of the river (A. Ricciardi, in preparation). These data suggest that the extirpation of a unionid population will occur within 4–5 years of a *Dreissena* invasion, provided that the *Dreissena* population grows to sufficient levels (>6000/m²). Viable unionid populations in North America may ultimately be restricted to softwater habitats or geographic regions that are either invulnerable to *Dreissena* invasion or support very low densities of dreissenids (Strayer 1991; Ramcharan et al. 1992; Mellina and Rasmussen 1994).

Conclusions

Our study demonstrates that the infestation of unionids by *Dreissena* follows a very predictable pattern with increasing dreissenid density. The proportion of unionids colonized by *Dreissena* follows a saturation curve with rapid colonization at *Dreissena* densities up to 200/m². Dreissenids aggregate preferentially on unionids, forming a cluster

Fig. 7. Proportion of dead unionids in a population ($\sin^{-1}x^{0.5}$ transformed) versus *Dreissena* field density (\log_{10} -transformed). Line denotes $Y = 1.350X - 3.858$.





Fig. 8. Proportion of dead unionids in a population ($\sin^{-1}x^{0.5}$ transformed) versus infestation intensity (\log_{10} -transformed): $Y = 0.262X + 0.363$.



whose size is correlated with the total population density of *Dreissena* in the habitat. These infestations may be accurately described by a compound Poisson model that takes into account the clustering tendency of young-of-the-year dreissenids. Unionid mortality (reflected by the proportion of recently dead unionids in a population) associated with these infestations varies strongly with the local *Dreissena* density. We predict sharply accelerated mortality at *Dreissena* densities above 1000/m², and heavy (>90%) mortality of unionids when the *Dreissena* density and mean

infestation intensity reach 6000/m² and 100 dreissenids/unionid, respectively. Extirpation of unionid populations will occur within 4–5 years after the establishment of *Dreissena* in habitats that support dreissenid densities of at least 6000/m². The general significance of these thresholds can be further tested as the *Dreissena* invasion of North American drainages continues and densities increase.

Acknowledgements

We thank L. Lapierre (Centre St. Laurent, Environment Canada), C. Tessier, and Subdev Canada Inc. for providing unionids and data from two sites on the St. Lawrence River. The manuscript benefited from the comments of D. Schloesser and an anonymous referee. Funding was provided by grants from the ELBJ Foundation and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council to F.G.W. and J.B.R., and a Fonds pour la formation de chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche (Quebec) postgraduate scholarship to A.R.

References

- Arter, H.E. 1989. Effect of eutrophication on species composition and growth of freshwater mussels (Mollusca, Unionidae) in Lake Hallwil (Aargau, Switzerland). *Aquat. Sci.* 51: 87–99.
- Biryukov, I.N., M.Y. Kirpichenko, S.M. Lyakhov, and G.I. Segeeva. 1964. Living conditions of the mollusk *Dreissena polymorpha* Pallas in the Babinskii backwater of the Oka River. In B.K. Shtegman [ed.] *Biology and control of Dreissena*. Trudy Inst. Biol. Vnutr. Vod Akad. Nauk. SSSR, 7: 32–38.
- Conn, D.B., and D.A. Conn. 1993. Parasitism, predation and other biotic associations between dreissenid mussels and native animals in the St. Lawrence River. In *Proceedings of the Third International Zebra Mussel Conference*, Toronto, Ont., February 23–26, 1993. Edited by J.L. Tsou. Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, Calif.
- Downing, J.A., and W.L. Downing. 1992. Spatial aggregation, precision, and power in surveys of freshwater mussel populations. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 49: 985–991.
- Elliott, J.M. 1977. Some methods for the statistical analysis of samples of benthic invertebrates. *Freshwater Biol. Assoc. Sci. Publ.* No. 25.
- Fuller, S.L.H. 1974. Clams and mussels (Mollusca: Bivalvia), p. 215–273. In C.W. Hart and S.L.H. Fuller [ed.] *Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates*. Academic Press Inc., New York.
- Garton, D.W. 1994. Impact of fouling by *Dreissena polymorpha* on unionids of Lake Wawasee, Indiana. In *Abstracts of the Fourth International Zebra Mussel Conference*, Madison, Wis., March 7–10, 1994. University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Institute.
- Garton, D.W., and W.R. Haag. 1993. Seasonal reproductive cycles and settlement patterns of *Dreissena polymorpha* in western Lake Erie, p. 111–128. In T.F. Nalepa and D.W. Schloesser [ed.] *Zebra mussels: biology, impacts, and control*. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, Fla.
- Gillis, P.L., and G.L. Mackie. 1994. Impact of the zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, on populations of Unionidae (Bivalvia) in Lake St. Clair. *Can. J. Zool.* 72: 1260–1271.
- Great Lakes Water Quality Board. 1987. Report on Great Lakes water quality to the International Joint Commission. IJC Great Lakes Regional Office, Windsor, Ont.
- Green, R.H., R.C. Bailey, S.C. Hinch, J.L. Metcalfe, and V.H. Young. 1989. Use of freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae) to monitor the nearshore environment of lakes. *J. Great Lakes Res.* 15: 635–644.
- Griffiths, R.W. 1993. Effects of zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) on the benthic fauna of Lake St. Clair, p. 414–437. In T.F. Nalepa and D.W. Schloesser [ed.] *Zebra mussels: biology, impacts, and control*. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, Fla.
- Griffiths, R.W., D.W. Schloesser, J.H. Leach, and W.P. Kovalak. 1991. Distribution and dispersal of the zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) in the Great Lakes region. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 48: 1381–1388.
- Haag, W.R., D.J. Berg, D.W. Garton, and J.L. Farris. 1993. Reduced survival and fitness in native bivalves in response to fouling by the introduced zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) in western Lake Erie. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 50: 13–19.
- Havlik, M.E. 1994. Are unionid translocations a viable mitigation technique? The Wolf River experience, Shawano, WI, August 1992 and August 1993. In *Abstracts of the Fourth International Zebra Mussel Conference*, Madison, Wis., March 7–10, 1994. University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Institute.
- Hebert, P.D.N., B.W. Muncaster, and G.L. Mackie. 1989. Ecological and genetic studies on *Dreissena polymorpha* (Pallas): a new mollusc in the Great Lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 46: 1587–1591.
- Hebert, P.D.N., C.C. Wilson, M.H. Murdoch, and R. Lazar. 1991. Demography and ecological impacts of the invading mollusc, *Dreissena polymorpha*. *Can. J. Zool.* 69: 405–409.
- Hunter, R.D., and J.F. Bailey. 1992. *Dreissena polymorpha* (zebra mussel): colonization of soft substrata and some effects on unionid bivalves. *Nautilus*, 106: 60–67.
- Imlay, M.J. 1982. Use of shells of freshwater mussels in monitoring heavy metals and environmental stresses: a review. *Malacol. Rev.* 15: 1–4.
- Kasprzak, K. 1986. Role of Unionidae and Sphaeriidae (Mollusca, Bivalvia) in the eutrophic Lake Zbechy and its outflow. *Int. Rev. Gesamten Hydrobiol.* 71: 315–334.
- Kuchina, E.S. 1964. Distribution of the mollusk *Dreissena polymorpha* Pallas in the Northern Dvina River. In B.K. Shtegman [ed.] *Biology and control of Dreissena*. Trudy Inst. Biol. Vnutr. Vod Akad. Nauk. SSSR, 7: 25–31.
- Lewandowski, K. 1976. Unionidae as substratum for *Dreissena polymorpha*. *Pol. Arch. Hydrobiol.* 23: 409–420.
- Lewandowski, K., and A. Stanczykowska. 1975. The occurrence and role of bivalves of the family Unionidae in Mikolajskie Lake. *Ekol. Pol.* 23: 317–334.
- Mackie, G.L. 1990. Early biological and life history attributes of the zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha* (Bivalvia: Dreissenidae), and impacts on native bivalves in Lake St. Clair, p. 215–231. In *Proceedings of the Technology Transfer Conference*, Toronto, Ont., November 19–20, 1990.
- Maleski, K.R., and E.C. Masteller. 1994. The current status of the Unionidae of Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA. *Bull. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 11: 109. [Abstr.]
- Masteller, E.C., and D.W. Schloesser. 1992. Infestation and impact of zebra mussels on the native unionid population at Presque Isle State Park, Erie, PA. *J. Shellfish Res.* 11: 232. [Abstr.]
- Mellina, E., and J.B. Rasmussen. 1994. Patterns in the distribution and abundance of zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) in rivers and lakes in relation to substrate and other physico-chemical factors. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 51: 1024–1036.

- Nalepa, T.F., W.S. Gardner, and J.M. Malczyk. 1991a. Phosphorus cycling by mussels (Unionidae: Bivalvia) in Lake St. Clair. *Hydrobiologia*, 219: 239-250.
- Nalepa, T.F., B.A. Manny, J.C. Roth, S.C. Mozley, and D.W. Schloesser. 1991b. Long-term decline in freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae) of the western basin of Lake Erie. *J. Great Lakes Res.* 17: 214-219.
- Nicholls, K.H., and G.J. Hopkins. 1993. Recent changes in Lake Erie (North Shore) phytoplankton: cumulative impacts of phosphorus loading reductions and the zebra mussel introduction. *J. Great Lakes Res.* 19: 637-647.
- Ohnesorg, K.L., R.D. Smithee, G.D. Longton, W.P. Kovalak, and D.W. Schloesser. 1993. Impact of zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) on native mussels (Unionidae) in the Detroit River. In Abstracts of the Third International Zebra Mussel Conference, Toronto, Ont., February 23-26, 1993.
- Ramcharan, C.W., D.K. Padilla, and S.I. Dodson. 1992. Models to predict potential occurrence and density of the zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 49: 2611-2620.
- Ricciardi, A. 1994. Infestation and impacts of *Dreissena* on native unionids in the Upper St. Lawrence River. In Abstracts of the Fourth International Zebra Mussel Conference, Madison, Wis., March 7-10, 1994. University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Institute.
- SAS Institute Inc. 1988. SAS/STAT user's guide. Release 6.03 edition. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, N.C.
- Schloesser, D.W., and W. Kovalak. 1991. Infestation of unionids by *Dreissena polymorpha* in a power plant canal in Lake Erie. *J. Shellfish Res.* 10: 355-359.
- Sebestyen, O. 1938. Colonization of two new fauna-elements of Pontus-origin (*Dreissena polymorpha* Pall. and *Corophium curvispinum* G.O. Sars forma *devium* Wundsch) in Lake Balaton. *Verh. Int. Ver. Theor. Angew. Limnol.* 8: 169-182.
- Stanczykowska, A. 1975. Ecosystem of the Mikolajskie Lake. Regularities of the *Dreissena polymorpha* Pall. (Bivalvia) occurrence and its function in the lake. *Pol. Arch. Hydrobiol.* 22: 73-78.
- Stanczykowska, A. 1977. Ecology of *Dreissena polymorpha* (Pall.) (Bivalvia) in lakes. *Pol. Arch. Hydrobiol.* 24: 461-530.
- Stanczykowska, A., W. Lawacz, J. Mattice, and K. Lewandowski. 1976. Bivalves as a factor affecting circulation of matter in Lake Mikolajskie (Poland). *Limnologica*, 10: 347-352.
- Strayer, D.L. 1991. Projected distribution of the zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, in North America. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 48: 1389-1395.
- Thomas, M. 1949. A generalization of Poisson's binomial limit for use in ecology. *Biometrika*, 36: 18-25.
- Tucker, J.K. 1994. Colonization of unionid bivalves by the zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, in pool 26 of the Mississippi River. *J. Freshwater Ecol.* 8: 129-134.
- Tucker, J.K., C.H. Theiling, K.D. Blodgett, and P.A. Thiel. 1993. Initial occurrences of zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) on freshwater mussels (family Unionidae) in the upper Mississippi River system. *J. Freshwater Ecol.* 8: 245-251.
- Wagner, H. 1936. Die Wandermuschel (*Dreissensia*) erobert den Platten-See. *Nat. Volk*, 66: 37-41.
- Waller, D.L., J.J. Rach, W.G. Cope, and J.A. Luoma. 1993. A sampling method for conducting relocation studies with freshwater mussels. *J. Freshwater Ecol.* 8: 397-399.
- Wiktor, J. 1963. Research on the ecology of *Dreissena polymorpha* Pall. in the Szczecin Lagoon (Zalew Szczecinski). *Ekol. Pol. Ser. A*, 11: 275-280.
- Wilkinson, L. 1989. SYSTAT: the system for statistics. SYSTAT Inc., Evanston, Ill.
- Williams, J.D., M.L. Warren, Jr., K.S. Cummings, J.L. Harris, and R.J. Neves. 1993. Conservation status of freshwater mussels of the United States and Canada. *Fisheries*, 18: 6-22.
- Wolff, W.J. 1969. The Mollusca of the estuarine region of the rivers Rhine, Meuse and Scheldt in relation to the hydrography of the area. II. The Dreissenidae. *Basteria*, 33: 93-103.
- Zar, J.H. 1984. Biostatistical analysis. 2nd ed. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 718 p.
- Zhadin, V.I., and S.V. Gerd. 1961. Fauna and flora of the rivers, lakes and reservoirs of the U.S.S.R. (Translated by A. Mercado, Israel Program for Scientific Translations, Jerusalem, 1963.)