NUREG/CR-1939 Vol. 4

# Ecological Studies of Wood-Boring Bivalves in the Vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station

Progress Report June - August 1981

Prepared by K. E. Hoagland, L. Crocket

Wetlands Institute Lehigh University

Prepared for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory **Commission** 

### **NOTICE**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, or any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any third party's use, or the results of such use, of any information, apparatus product or process disclosed in this report, or represents that its use by such third party would not infringe privately owned rights.

#### Available from

Division of Technical Information and Document Control U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission GPO Sales Program Washington, D. C. 20555

Printed copy price: **\$3.25**

and

National Technical Information Service Springfield, Virginia 22161

# Ecological Studies of Wood-Boring Bivalves in the Vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station

Progress Report June - August 1981

Manuscript Completed: November 1981 Date Published: January 1982

Prepared by K. E. Hoagland, L. Crocket

Wetlands Institute Lehigh University Stone Harbor, NJ 08247

Prepared for Division of Health, Siting and Waste Management Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 NRC FIN B5744

#### PREVIOUS REPORTS

Twelve reports have been prepared under Contract AT(49-24)-0347 (=NRC-04-76-347) during three years of funding from the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1976-1979, under the title:

Analysis of Populations of boring and fouling organisms in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station with discussion of relevant physical parameters.

Those reports with NTIS numbers are:

NUREG/CR-0223 Dec. 1977-Feb. 28, 1978 NUREG/CR-0380 Mar. 1, 1978-May 31, 1978 NUREG/CR-0634 Sept. 1, 1977-Aug. 31, 1978 NUREG/CR-0812 Sept. 1, 1978-Nov. 30, 1978 NUREG/CR-0896 Dec. 1, 1978-Feb. 28, 1979 NUREG/CR-1015 Mar. 1, 1979-May 31, 1979 NUREG/CR-1209 June I, 1979-Aug. 31, 1979

Five reports have been published in this current series:

Ecological studies of wood-boring bivalves in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station.



#### ABSTRACT

The species composition, distribution, and population dynamics of wood-boring bivalves are being studied in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Barnegat Bay, New Jersey. Untreated wood test panels are used to collect organisms at 12 stations. Physiological tolerances of 3 species are also under investigation in the laboratory. Competition among the species is being analyzed. In the summer of 1981, Teredo bartschi occurred in large numbers at one station in Oyster Creek, but did not appear in significant numbers in Forked River. The AT in Oyster Creek was about  $+4^{\circ}$  C. Both Teredo bartschi and T. navalis settled, matured, and produced offspring in less than 3 months in Oyster Creek. Specimens of T. navalis brooding young were more frequent in Oyster Creek than at control stations. Laboratory experiments indicated that T. bartschi pediveligers do not prefer to settle on wood containing adults.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$  $\label{eq:1.1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2}d\mu_{\rm{eff}}\,d\mu_{\rm{eff}}\,.$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac$  $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}d\mu_{\rm{max}}^{2}d\mu_{\rm{max}}^{2}$  $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{$ 

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this investigation is to understand the population dynamics and competitive interactions of shipworms in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (OCNGS) and at control stations outside the influence of the station. The relative importance of the introduced species Teredo bartschi in causing damage, and physiological tolerances of all species, are being assessed. On a monthly basis, wood panels are added and removed for analysis of population dynamics and to obtain live animals for the lab studies. We also record temperature, salinity, and we estimate siltation levels at each station.

- **1.** The generating station was operating during most of the period of this report, except for the last two weeks of August.
- 2. The AT was about +4 to 4.5° C in Oyster Creek during these summer months. The salinity in Oyster Creek and Forked River was similar to that of nearby portions of Barnegat Bay. It was more stable than that of Stout's Creek, which dropped to 7  $\degree/$ <sub>00</sub> during part of the summer, explaining the lack of shipworms there.
- 3. Teredo bartschi was found only at stations 4 (Forked River), **11,** and 12 (Oyster Creek).
- 4. Adult T. bartschi suffered very heavy mortality in June, 1981.
- 5. Heavy shipworm attack occurred at station 12 (Oyster Creek). Teredo bartschi was the most numerous shipworm found in the panels at station 12, by an order of magnitude. Attack at all other stations was light.
- 6. New shipworms were found to settle on the monthly panels during July and August. Teredo navalis settled earlier than T. bartschi and Bankia gouldi.
- 7. Teredo bartschi and Teredo navalis suffered more mortality than Bankia gouldi in panels of the same age.
- 8. Mature specimens of both Teredo species produced larvae after less than 3 months in the wood.
- 9. All three species were found at no single station, although all three were found in Oyster Creek as a whole.

v

- **10.** In several panels, all of the specimens of Teredo bartschi were females brooding young.
- **11.** Shipworm larvae were found in Oyster Creek, Forked River, and Holly Park on July 2, 1981.
- 12. Teredo bartschi withdraws its siphons in turbid water, but re-extends them while the water is still turbid.
- 13. Pediveligers of Teredo bartschi seem to prefer to bore into fresh wood rather than wood containing adults.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

 $\mathcal{L}$ 



 $\sim$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 

vii

 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

#### LIST OF TABLES

 $\cdot$ 



 $\bar{\alpha}$ 

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the many residents of Oyster Creek who have cooperated in our field work. James Selman provided technical assistance. Eugenia Böhlke of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia served as X-ray technologist. J.C.P. & L. Co. provided data on the operation of the Generating Station.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,d\mathcal{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\frac{1$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

#### ECOLOGICAL STUDIES OF WOOD-BORING BIVALVES

#### IN THE VICINITY OF THE OYSTER CREEK

#### NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

June 1 - August 31, 1981

#### INTRODUCTION

Previous studies have shown a direct causal relationship between the effluent of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station and the proliferation of shipworms (Teredinidae) in Oyster Creek and adjacent portions of Barnegat Bay, New Jersey (Turner, 1974; Hoagland et al., 1977; Hoagland et al., 1978; Hoagland and Crocket, 1979; Hoagland and Turner, 1980; Hoagland et al., 1980). The effluent adds heat to the receiving waters, which extends the breeding season of teredinids, increases their growth rates, and reduces their winter mortality rates. It has allowed the establishment of a tropical-subtropical shipworm, Teredo bartschi, in Oyster Creek and Forked River. The design of the generating station's cooling system, taking salt water from Barnegat Bay up Forked River, through the plant, and out into Oyster Creek, has increased the salinity of these two creeks. Shipworms now can reside in these creeks, which previously were unsuitable in salinity level and constancy for the establishment of actively breeding shipworm populations.

The populations of Teredo bartschi compared with the native species in Oyster Creek and Forked River are the focus of current studies. This report summarizes an ongoing collection of data on physical parameters of Barnegat Bay, as well as species composition, distribution, growth, mortality, and reproduction of teredinids. We assess the degree of shipworm damage occurring at each station. We also report on physiological studies comparing the native and introduced shipworms with regard to temperature and salinity tolerances.

We summarize the conclusions from work accompiished between Sept. 1, 1980, and August 31, 1981, and compare our results with those of the Battelle laboratories and others working on the relationship of thermal effluents to bivalve population biology.

#### METHODS

#### Stations

Over the first three years of our study, 20 stations were established in Barnegat Bay to monitor boring and fouling organisms. In September, 1979, the number was reduced to 12. The stations are shown in Hoagland and Turner, 1980, and are listed in the appendix. The station numbers are not contiguous because some have been discontinued.

Station **I** is a northern control station on Barnegat Bay outside the influence of the heated effluent. Some shipworms, primarily Bankia gouldi, are traditionally found there. Station 3 is a control station in a tidal creek outside the influence of the effluent. Shipworms are rarely found there. Stations 4, 5, and 6 are in Forked River, influenced by the plant's water intake system. There is some recirculation of heated water that affects these stations, but the main influence is that the salinity is essentially that of the bay. Station 6 is sampled on a reduced schedule, only 4 times a year.

Station 8 is on the bay between Oyster Creek and Forked River. Stations 10-12 are in Oyster Creek, influenced directly by heat, increased (and constant) salinity, and other components of the effluent (heavy metals, silt, increased flow rate, etc.). Since JCP & L calculates average values of heavy metal input per month, exact data necessary to characterize the effluent completely are not available.

Stations 14 and 15 are at or near the southern limit of the thermal plume, on Barnegat Bay. Station 15, like Station 6, is being sampled on a reduced schedule. Station 18 on Long Beach Island is being used only as a reliable source of Teredo navalis for laboratory experiments.

#### Field Work

Once each month, the water temperature and salinity are measured at each station. Air temperature and time of day are also recorded. The amount of silt settling on wood panels submerged for one month is estimated as trace, light, moderate, or heavy. At stations **1,** 5, **11,** and 14, records of temperature and salinity are kept by means of constant recording instruments that are serviced once a month.

White pine panels, approximately  $3/4$ " x  $4$ " x  $8$ ", are used to obtain shipworms for study. There are three panel series: **1)** Each month, a panel that has been in the water for **1** month is removed and replaced. In this way data on monthly settlement and early growth of borers are obtained. 2) Each month, a panel that has been in the water for 12 months is

removed and replaced. It provides data on timing of reproduction, species and age structure of established borer communities, and other population data. 3) Each May, a series of 12 panels is deployed. These panels are removed one per month. They provide information on the cumulative growth and maturation of individual borers as well as development of the boring and fouling communities. The cumulative development of the boring and fouling communities. The cumulative<br>monthly amount of wood destruction can be evaluated. These three panel monthly amount of wood destruction can be evaluated. series are called M, Y, and C, respectively. The Y and C series are replicated at some stations, as indicated in the data tables to follow. Replication is not possible at all stations because of limited space where the water is deep enough to submerge a series of shipworm panels.

Panels are presoaked for 2 weeks, then set on aluminum frame racks against bulkheading or off finger docks. They rest about 6" above the water-sediment interface.

On July 2, plankton tows were taken to look for shipworm larvae in the vicinity of the test stations.

#### Laboratory Work

Panels are examined for pediveliger shipworm larvae and boring isopods, scraped, and X-rayed to locate the shipworms and provide a permanent record of damage. It is possible to count and often to identify shipworms from the X-rays in uncrowded panels, but X-rays do not provide quantitative data in most cases. Therefore, using the X-rays as guides, the panels are dissected. All the shipworms are removed, identified, examined for larvae in the gills, and measured (length only). They are preserved in 75% buffered alcohol. Identifications are first made by technicians, but all Teredo spp. are checked by one of the senior investigators.

Wood fragments from the dissected panels are saved. Calcareous tubes and other debris left by the shipworms are removed with HC2. The wood is washed in fresh water, then dried to constant weight, allowed to cool to room temperature, and weighed. The panels are also weighed before going into the water. The weight difference is a measure of wood destruction due to boring organisms.

During dissection of the wood panels, we estimate the percentage of empty tubes, which indicate mortality. If pallets are still present in the empty tubes, we can record the species of the dead shipworm.

Shipworms from the replicate 12-month panels are not preserved but are kept alive and allowed to spawn in tanks containing filtered sea water (22% salinity) and new pine panels. In this way, we have established pure laboratory populations of Teredo bartschi. Individuals of B. gouldi and T. navalis from the field are being maintained in the laboratory. These stocks are used for temperature and salinity tolerance experiments. Attempts are underway to establish breeding colonies of Teredo navalis.,

Larvae are being fed cultures of Monochrysis lutheri and Isochrysis galbana. Both algae and larvae are maintained in an incubator at 22 Both algae and larvae are maintained in an incubator at 22° C. The procedures for culturing shipworm larvae are those of Culliney, Boyle and Turner (1975) and Turner and Johnson (1971).

#### Physiological Ecology

Pediveliger larvae released from animals that had themselves been raised in the laboratory were collected from an aquarium maintained at about  $18^{\circ}$  C. Ten pediveligers were placed in each of 6 finger bowls containing artificial seawater at  $20-22^{\circ}$  C and salinity of  $22^{\circ}/_{\circ}$ .

A sliver of fresh white pine presoaked for 7 days in filtered seawater was placed in each of two bowls. Two bowls contained slivers of white pine that had been in the field for several months but contained no shipworms. The last two bowls contained slivers of white pine containing adult labreared Teredo bartschi. The purpose of the experiment was to see if the pediveligers had a preference for settlement on wood containing organisms. The behavior of the pediveligers was observed over a period of 8 days, then the experiment was repeated over a period of 5 days.

The behavioral categories included actively swimming with velum extended, actively crawling on wood with foot extended, attached to surface film, probing the wood as if to begin burrowing, crawling on the glass bottom, swimming slowly with foot extended near the bottom, lying open on the bottom, and lying closed on the bottom. The temperature was kept at **20-21.50** C.

#### Turbidity

To test the theory that teredinids are unable to filter in turbid water, observations were made on a panel containing over **100** adult Teredo bartschi in a finger bowl with 22 **0/o0** ocean water, to which enough suspended fine silt was then added for the water to become distinctly turbid. In a second finger bowl was a panel also containing adult T. bartschi, to which clear seawater without silt was added. The two panels were observed for 30 minutes at room temperature and light aeration on June 17, 1981.

The experiment was repeated two months later with 2 test panels. Once the animals were filtering actively in water of 22 **0/o0,** silt was added.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Physical Factors

The temperature elevation in Oyster Creek was about 4 to 4.5° C during the summer of 1981 (Tables **1** and 2). The temperature exceeded **310** C at station **11** in parts of July and August. The maximum temperature elsewhere was 30.2° C, briefly in July, at station 14 (Waretown). indication of the presence of heated water in Forked River during early August (Table **1).** The plant was not operating at the end of June and during the last half of August (Table 5), hence the lack of evidence of a thermal effluent on July 2 (Table **1)** and during much of August (Table 2). Some problems with the instruments are noted in footnotes to Table 2.

The instability of the salinity in small tidal creeks is shown by the July reading of only 7 **%/00** at Stout's Creek, station 3 (Table 3). This periodic low salinity explains the rarity of shipworms at that station. The salinity in Oyster Creek is less than or equal to that in Forked River, indicating that some fresh water does enter Oyster Creek. The salinity in Forked River (stations 4 and 5) is equal to that along the inner bay, e.g., station 14 (Tables 3 and 4).

The circulation of water into Forked River and Oyster Creek from Barnegat Bay depends on the operation level of the plant. Because there was a 2-week outage in August, much less water circulated (Table 5). This event reduced the likelihood of pediveligers of Teredo bartschi being transported from Oyster Creek to Forked River in late August, when pediveligers were being released. The other factors involved in the transport of larvae are the surface-water currents, controlled in part by the winds, and the presence of wooden boats. Our laboratory studies show that Teredo bartschi can successfully penetrate wood after as long as 3 weeks in the pediveliger state at 20-22° C.

Table 6 shows that there was no ongoing severe drought during the summer of 1981 that would affect the salinity and hence the survival of shipworms in tidal creeks.

#### Shipworm Populations

The first shipworms to settle on monthly panels in 1981 were found in early July. Teredo navalis occurred at station 8, between Oyster Creek and Forked River, and a teredinid sp. was found at several other stations (Table 7). In all likelihood, these were T. navalis (compare Table **11).** In early August, a panel containing Teredo bartschi was found in Oyster Creek, and Bankia gouldi joined T. navalis at station **8.** As has been the pattern over several years, T. bartschi first appeared at station 12. There was some mortality of the settling shipworms, particularly at stations 8 and **11,** as can be seen in Tables 8 and 9. The largest of the settling shipworms was the specimen of Teredo bartschi in Oyster Creek, which grew **10** mm in less than one month (Table 10).



# Temperature Profiles in **'C** June-August 1981

a highest value

b lowest value

Continuous Temperature Recorder Data (°C) for June 8-Sept. 3, 1981



 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\pm$  1.00 PM

## Table 2, continued



# III. Minimum Daily Temperature

# IV. Daily Temperature Range



a Technical difficulties

b Range of machine not adequate to complete calculations

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

c Last 22 days of cycle

d First **11** days of cycle





# Salinity Profiles in **0/** June-August 1981

a highest value

b lowest value



# Continuously Recording Salinometer Data<sup>a</sup> in **0/00,** May 7-August 4, 1981

a<br>
<sup>a</sup> Data represent readings taken at 12:00 Noon, EST

 $^{\text{b}}$  N, Number of days recorded, indicates extent of missing data.

 $\bar{x}$  = Mean;  $S_{\bf{v}}$  = Standard deviation.

### Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Outages Circulation and Dilution Flow in gal. x **10** for June-August, 1981



Table 6

 $\bar{z}$ 

Average Temperature and Precipitation in New Jersey, Deviation from Normal. June-August, 1981





#### Numbers of Living Shipworms in Monthly Panels



- a probably T. navalis
- $B.g. = Bankia$  gouldi
- $\underline{\texttt{T}}\cdot \underline{\texttt{n}}$ . = Teredo navalis
- T.b. = Teredo bartschi
- T.sp.= Teredo unidentified species

 $\overline{z}$ 



# Numbers of Living Shipworms Plus Empty Tubes in Monthly Panels



 $\overline{5}$ 



Percentage of Specimens that were Alive when Collected, Monthly Panels

# Table **10**

Length Ranges of Shipworms in mm, Monthly Panels



\* Largest specimen each species, each month



Numbers of Living Shipworms in Cumulative Panels Submerged May 7, 1981

Rep. = Replicate panel

a probably T. navalis

The cumulative panels, submerged in May, began to harbor shipworms by early July. The most interesting find was one Teredo bartschi in July at the mouth of Forked River (station 4), although no T. bartschi have been found there since. Teredo navalis was the dominant species settling prior to July 2. It was most abundant between Oyster Creek and Forked River (station 8). A comparison of the data from **i-** and 2-month panels removed on July 2 (Tables 7 and **11)** shows that there were more specimens infecting more stations in the 2-month data set. We attribute this to earlier settlement on the panels submerged in May, even though that settlement probably did not begin until June. The replicate pairs of panels at stations **1,** 4, 8, and **11** were in agreement with one another.

By August 4, Bankia gouldi had begun to settle. It was most abundant at Holly Park (station **1),** although it also settled in the Forked River area (stations 4 and 8). Teredo navalis occurred at the greatest number of stations, while T. bartschi was restricted to stations **11** and 12 in Oyster Creek. The heaviest attack at any station was that of T. bartschi at station 12. This is consistent with the pattern established in past years, as we have reported in past progress reports.

Tables 12 and 13 show that there was considerable shipworm mortality in the cumulative panels. Because of their small size, most of the dead shipworms fell out of their tubes, hence the species could not be determined. In those cases wherean identification could be made, the dead specimens were Teredo navalis or T. bartschi. There was no pattern detected relative to the stations at which mortality occurred, nor was mortality related to the degree of crowding of the young shipworms.

The growth of the shipworms in the cumulative panels can be deduced from data in Table 14. One Bankia gouldi reached a length of 79 mm in less than 3 months, while one T. navalis reached **III** mm. Because no shipworms were observed to settle in May, these lengths were probably attained in closer to 2 months. In the panels removed in July, by far the largest shipworm was found in Oyster Creek. It either settled earlier or grew faster than those settling elsewhere.

The yearly panels (Table 15) approach the composition of a natural assemblage of shipworms. Table 15 is important because it shows the availability of spawning adults from which the next generation is produced. There is a striking difference between June and July, 1981 in Oyster Creek (Table 15). The number of living specimens of Teredo bartschi declined precipitously. Examination of Tables 16 (total number of tubes) and 17 (percent living specimens) clearly shows that significant mortality occurred between June 8 and July 2. A wave of mortality also occurred in Forked River at the same time, but to a lesser extent. The numbers of living specimens in the July and August panels were similar; Teredo navalis was twice as abundant as the other two species. Living specimens

of all 3 species were found at no single station. In past summers, all three did occur in Oyster Creek and at the mouth of Forked River. A comparison of Table 15 with Tables 7 and **11** (monthly and cumulative panels) confirms the presence of only 2 species at any one station. For example, there were no Bankia gouldi in Oyster Creek except at station **10,** where Teredo bartschi was absent. Ninety-two of the 146 shipworms alive in the yearly panels (63%) were Teredo bartschi.

The impact of the introduced species Teredo bartschi can best be seen in Table 16 where dead as well as living specimens were counted. T. bartschi dominated at station 12 in Oyster Creek, but was absent a few meters away at station **11** (Appendix). This patchiness is due to the type of larval development: T. bartschi releases pediveligers that are competent to settle adjacent to the parent. But the pattern of species abundance at the various stations was similar in panels deployed in June, July, and August of 1980.

Only station 12 had a heavy attack of shipworms in the summer of 1981, although the Forked River area (stations 5 and 8) and Waretown (station 14) consistently had two species present that became large enough (Table 18) to cause considerable damage. Bankia gouldi and Teredo navalis were both scattered over all stations except station 3, the creek control station that had no shipworms.

Mortality was 16% of the specimens of Bankia gouldi settling in the yearly panels, while 26% of the Teredo navalis and 62% of the T. bartschi in the same panels died (Tables  $15$  and  $16$ ).

The largest specimens Bankia gouldi were at station **11** in all three months. The largest specimens of Teredo navalis were at stations 8 and 14. No newly-settled shipworms appeared on the yearly panels in June, except for numerous T. bartschi at station 12. Even on the July and August panels, there was no evidence of recruitment at stations 4, **10,** and **11.**



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

Numbers of Living Shipworms Plus Empty Tubes, Cumulative Panels



Rep. = Replicate panel



Percentage of Specimens that were Alive when Collected, Cumulative Panels

Rep. - Replicate panel

 $\overline{ }$ 



Length Ranges of Shipworms, in mm, Cumulative Panels Submerged May 7, 1981

**\*** Largest specimen each species, each month

Rep. = Replicate panel



 $\sim$ 

 $\Delta$ 

# Numbers of Living Shipworms in Yearly Panels

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10^7$ 



**r'.** 14

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 



# Numbers of Living Shipworms Plus Empty Tubes in Yearly Panels

Table 16

N.)

 $\alpha$ 

 $\bar{1}$ 

 $\Lambda$ 

 $\lambda$ 

![](_page_34_Picture_248.jpeg)

# Percentage of Specimens that were Alive when Collected, Yearly Panels

![](_page_35_Picture_204.jpeg)

Length Ranges of Shipworms in Yearly Panels

Table 18

**\*** Largest specimen each species, each month

 $\bullet$ 

Tables 19 and 20 reveal that damage of wood due to borers was not greatest<br>at station 12, as might have been expected. The relatively small Teredo at station 12, as might have been expected. bartschi did not consume as much wood as the larger species. At station **10,** 2 specimens of Bankia gouldi and one T. navalis consumed almost 24% of the wood of the August, 1981, yearly panel. The percent destruction of the yearly panels was less than in other summers we have reported upon. All of the panels with the greatest damage for a particular month were from Oyster Creek or Forked River.

The 18 adult specimens of Teredo bartschi collected in August were all brooding larvae (Table 21). The smallest of these specimens was 9 mm in length. However, the one adult of T. bartschi collected in the July yearly panels, and only 2 of 20 collected in the June yearly panels, carried larvae. Compared with Teredo bartschi, a lower percentage of adult Teredo navalis from any one panel were brooding larvae. None were brooding in June. From the size range of the animals not brooding, it is clear that many were large enough to be females. The population appears to be less synchronized than that of T. bartschi. Histological examination of gonadal material has been initiated to determine if these two presumed protandrous species of shipworms might have different sequences of sexuality. There is an obvious difference in the minimum size of brooding females of the two species, shown in Table 21 and in similar tables in our previous reports. There seems to be no correlation of station or type of panel (cumulative or yearly) with the percentage of adult T. navalis that were brooding larvae.

It is important to observe that the cumulative panels submerged in May and retrieved in August already contained brooding adults of T. navalis at the Oyster Creek and Forked River stations where T. navalis settled. However, T. navalis from control stations (stations **1** and 14) did not contain larvae, although specimens at station **1** were certainly large enough (Table 14). No breeding at all was observed at station **1.** 'Teredo bartschi, like T. navalis, reached female maturity by August, although data from monthly panels indicate that it began boring into test panels later in the summer than T. navalis.

Although our monthly and cumulative panels revealed relatively few shipworms that had successfully penetrated the wood by July, our plankton tows taken on July 2, 1981, did yield shipworm larvae (Table 22). Also extremely abundant were ctenophores, which can eat shipworm larvae and other zooplankton, and have been thought to be capable of reducing shipworm populations (Nelson, 1923). Although our plankton tows were not quantitative, the ctenophores were clearly most abundant at stations **<sup>11</sup>**and 12 in Oyster Creek.

![](_page_37_Picture_159.jpeg)

 $\overline{a}$ 

Percentage of Wood Weight Lost by Cumulative Panels Submerged May 7, 1981

![](_page_37_Picture_160.jpeg)

\* Greatest damage for the month

Rep. = Replicate panel

![](_page_38_Picture_184.jpeg)

# Percentage of Wood Weight Lost by Yearly Panels

\* Greatest damage for the month

Rep. = Replicate panel

# Percentage of Living Teredo Carrying Larvae in the Gills

![](_page_39_Picture_409.jpeg)

**<sup>C</sup>**Teredo navalis

#### Contents of Plankton Samples Collected July 2, 1981

#### Station **1**

Teredo navalis pediveligers. Common Straight-hinge larvae, teredinid sp., probably Bankia gouldi. Abundant Barnacle nauplii Harpacticoid copepods

#### Station 4

Straight-hinge larvae, teredinid sp. Barnacle nauplii Ctenophores Marine mite Nematodes Harpacticoid copepods Bryozoans Fragments of Enteromorpha Wood fragments Rare

#### Station 8

Barnacle nauplii Idotea (isopod) Several species of copepods (mostly harpacticoids)

#### Station **<sup>11</sup>**

Teredo bartschi pediveligers. Abundant Juvenile polychaetes Harpacticoid copepods Chironomid midges Hydroid medusae Nematodes Ctenophores. Abundant Idotea (isopod) Crab zoea Crustacean nauplii Gastropod veliger (probably Anachris avera) Wood fragments

#### Station 12

Gastropod veliger (probably Anachris avera) Harpacticoid copepods Barnacle nauplii Ctenophores. Abundant Chaetognath eggs Juvenile copepods - Calanoid Juvenile polychaetes

Nematodes Idotea (isopod) Wood fragments

#### Shipworm Physiological Ecology

The experiment which tested the behavior of Teredo bartschi pediveligers on three types of substrates gave surprising results. We predicted, on the basis of field results, that the pediveligers would prefer to settle on "old" wood containing bacteria and other biological material, and especially on wood already containing adults. However, the pediveligers in the bowl with the new wood were the earliest and most active burrowers (Table 23). It was not realistic to give the same animals a simultaneous choice of wood types, because any chemical from one piece would diffuse into the surrounding water. But the pediveligers used in the experiment were all of the same age and genetic stock.

When the experiment was repeated, there was no pattern in boring activity. The majority of the pediveligers in each bowl were inactive. The aeration of the tanks was intermittent overnight due to a faulty pump; our data were probably affected by loss of vitality of the pediveligers.

#### Observations on the Effect of Turbidity

When silt was added to the water, the adult Teredo bartschi withdrew their siphons until only the tips were extended. However, some filtration appeared to occur. After 15 minutes, the siphons were partially extended, about half as long.as the siphons of the control experiment.

When the experiment was repeated, similar results were obtained. The siphons were initially withdrawn. After 7 minutes, they had re-extended, although the water was still so turbid that one could not see from one side of the finger bowl to the other. After 15 minutes, the water was stirred up, and the siphons retracted again, reappearing after 5 minutes. The animals appeared oblivious to a thick (~3 mm) layer of silt that settled on the panels.

Control panels containing Teredo bartschi in filtered seawater extended their siphons throughout the period of observation.

#### Other Laboratory Observations

In September, 1979, pediveligers of Teredo bartschi were induced to settle on fresh wood in the laboratory. These specimens were used as breeding stock and for physiological experiments in the following months. We also observed the growth and mortality of some of the original individuals. The lifespan of these individuals can now be described. In the spring of 1981, many of the original animals were dead. The last of them were dead by the end of August, 1981. Hence the lifespan of these specimens, kept at 22-24 **0/00** salinity and approximately 200 (winter) - **30'** C (summer), was

![](_page_42_Picture_439.jpeg)

# Behavior of Pediveligers of Teredo bartsch: Exposed to three Treatments of Wood

\* Adults in the wood released pediveligers. The original **10** pediveligers could not be identified. about 24 months or less. These animals produced pediveligers almost continuously during their lives, although production of the pediveligers tended to peak in one 2 or 3 week period, followed by an equal period in which few offspring were released.

Studies of the freshwater clam Corbicula (Dreier and Tranquilli, 1980) showed that caged specimens grew significantly more in a thermal discharge than in a plant intake area. The season of growth was extended. These results are in accordance with ours for the teredinid clams.

In prior reports for 1980-81, we did not include full data on the per-<br>centage of adult Teredo sp. carrying larvae in the gills. These data centage of adult Teredo sp. carrying larvae in the gills. are now reported (Table 24) in order to compare with the data from the current quarter (Table 21). It is evident that very little reproductive activity occurred after December in Teredo bartschi. T. navalis showed no sign of brooding from December to April, with the exception of one specimen in March. We can conclude that while neither species bred all year, T. bartschi was active for a longer period.

![](_page_44_Picture_306.jpeg)

# Presence of Brooded Larvae in Specimens Removed in Winter and Spring, 1980-81

 $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$ 

Table 24

င္ပ

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}))\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}))\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ 

#### GENERAL DISCUSSION

The elevation of temperature caused by the operation of the plant was within tolerable biological limits for most of the summer of 1981. A AT of 4 to **50** C in July and August does occasionally cause the temperature to exceed **30°** C by several degrees, and hence to cause stress and even mortality in some local species. The AT is lower than it was prior to 1974 when fewer dilution pumps were operated. It appears that the reduced AT could have been one of the factors in reducing the breeding of Teredo bartschi. However, it has not eliminated the introduced species, and outbreaks still occur.

There has been some controversy about the salinity of Oyster Creek prior to the operation of the plant. It is clear from the data in 1980-1981 that the present salinity from the bay to the plant is close to that of Barnegat Bay. We asked NOAA for all available climatic data for the Oyster Creek-Barnegat Bay region prior to the operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. The computer printout that we received shows that, for the period May 10, 1967 - April **10,** 1968, salinity in the lower portion of Oyster Creek ranged from 9.2 to 27.5 in G/L (conductivity). For comparison, stations in Barnegat Bay over the period never recorded a salinity lower than 17 G/L. The salinity in Forked River varied between 16.2 and 25.6 G/L conductivity from May **10,** 1967 - April **10,** 1968. Therefore it seems that the salinity in Oyster Creek was at times much lower than that in the bay. However, we cannot be sure exactly where the conductivity was measured in all cases. The values of G/L conductivity are approximately the same in  $^{\circ}/_{\circ}$  salinity.

Our data for 1980-81 continue to show greater individual shipworm growth in Oyster Creek and Forked River than at other stations, although the data are confounded by the effects of crowding. The greater growth may be due to higher and more constant salinity than at station **1** (Holly Park). Discounting this argument is the fact that station 14 (Waretown) does have constant salinity yet usually has slower growth than the Oyster Creek stations.

Two other factors could account for the rapid growth: higher temperatures and greater food supply. For Bankia gouldi and Teredo navalis, which are thought to require plankton as well as wood during adult life, the greater currents in Oyster Creek and Forked River could contribute to better nutrition. For all shipworm species, currents improve access to micro-nutrients and remove toxic materials. Areas of moderate to fast currents have greater settlement of juveniles and much better survival of the juveniles as they begin boring into wood (see our earlier reports dealing with station 18 versus 19). An example of the effect of currents is the difference between station **10** in a lagoon with poor circulation off Oyster Creek, and station **11** nearby. Recruitment of shipworms to station **10** is poor. Yet shipworms do grow rapidly and reach large sizes at station **10,** suggesting that temperature is the most important growth factor.

Blake et al. (1981) of the Battelle Laboratories have made findings and drawn conclusions quite similar to ours. Their agreement with us is all the more significant because their study was commissioned by the operators of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. Their study operators of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. included gonad analysis that complements our own work.

M. Kennish of Jersey Central Power and Light Company estimated for Blake et al. (1981) that recirculation of the heated effluent into Forked River occurs as much as 22% of the time; this is in accord with our data in 1976-1981 on water temperatures at stations 4, 5, and 8 and with the Blake et al. data (1981, p. C-50). Shipworm damage was reported to be higher in 1979-80 than in 1980-81, and higher in Oyster Creek and at the mouth of Forked River than other inner Barnegat Bay stations. Teredo mouth of Forked River than other inner Barnegat Bay stations. bartschi was found only in areas influenced by the thermal effluent, that is, Oyster Creek, Forked River, and the portion of Barnegat Bay between the two creeks. This introduced species was responsible for most of the damage to the Battelle Laboratories panels.

The finding by Blake et al. (1981) of Teredo spp. with ripe gonads in winter is interesting but ambiguous. Neither Battelle Laboratories nor our research group has found larvae settling on newly deployed panels in winter. However, both research groups have found  $1-2$  mm specimens of Teredo bartschi in panels submerged during the previous spring and removed in winter. Either the pediveligers are attracted to old wood, or they fail to grow once they settle in November. We believe that both explanations are valid, but that the latter explanation is more important for Teredo navalis, based on our experience with both species in the laboratory. We have no evidence that T. navalis actually spawns in January, and neither does Battelle Laboratories.

Blake et al. (1981) contend that the nuclear generating station is not affecting the populations of Teredo navalis and Bankia gouldi. We agree that in 1980-81, the numbers of these species were not higher in Oyster Creek than at some other stations in Barnegat Bay. But this is the wrong comparison. There are two factors to consider: A) What would be the abundance of the two species in Oyster Creek and Forked River if the station didn't exist? In other words, we must compare the abundances not to Barnegat Bay populations but to tidal creek populations. The Battelle Laboratory has not disproven that populations of T. navalis and B. gouldi are enhanced by the thermal effluent. B) What would be the abundances of the two native species in Oyster Creek if Teredo bartschi was not competing for wood? Our results before and after T. bartschi was introduced suggest that indeed, the native populations are lower with the presence of the third species.

We agree with Blake et al. (1981) that Teredo bartschi probably reproduces throughout the year in its native state. Specimens collected in Florida in May, June, October, and November all contained larvae in the gills.

However, in Oyster Creek, most of the young are held in the gills during winter and not released.

Blake et al. (1981, p. A-17) agree with our finding of a delay in settlement of larvae in 1980 until August. Like us, they attributed the delay in settlement as well as the decline in Teredo bartschi to the outage of<br>the generating station that lasted from January to July, 1980. The the generating station that lasted from January to July, 1980. Battelle Laboratories research group also admits that the generating station influences the areas of Waretown and Forked River, due to the location of the thermal plume.

One other nuclear generating station is known to have mediated the introduction of Teredo bartschi. At the Millstone plant in Connecticut, T. bartschi occurs only at the test station within the discharge area. There, cumulative panels removed in November show little damage due to T. bartschi, but by February, the effluent panels have the greatest destruction of all the test panels (D. Morgan, undated and unpublished report). This can be explained by the fact that T. bartschi settles in the fall at Millstone, after the native species. Yet it continues to<br>grow in the effluent while native species become nearly inactive. The grow in the effluent while native species become nearly inactive. same phenomenon occurs in Oyster Creek and Barnegat Bay.

Hillman (1978) and Blake et al. (1981) believe that the parasite Minchinia could be a factor causing oscillations in numbers of Teredo species in Barnegat Bay. We concur in this possibility and believe that the theory should be tested in as rigorous a manner as possible. Predictions should be made of the effect of the parasite on populations of various densities and age compositions, based on the preliminary data. Future histological work should include data from enough individuals and months to test the theory. The observed correlation of the outages of the generating station and the population crashes and lags of Teredo bartschi remains, despite the Minchinia theory. Perhaps Minchinia is in some way correlated with plant operations.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The key factor controlling the size of shipworm populations in Oyster Creek is the success of recruitment of Teredo bartschi. It is not directly related to the number of adults surviving the winter. The best way to reduce the teredinid population in Oyster Creek and Forked River is to perform a thorough clean-up in the area of station 12, where a residual population has survived each winter. This cleanup should be performed in early April, 1982, before the 1982 release of pediveligers.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n\$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$  $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf$ 

#### REFERENCES

Blake, N. M., R. E. Hillman, P. I. Feder and C. I. Belmore. 1981. Annual Report for the period December **1,** 1979 to November 30, 1980 on Study of woodborer populations in relation to the Oyster Creek Generating Station. Report to Jersey Central Power and Light Co., Feb. 27, 1981. Report #15040, Battelle Labs.

Culliney, J. L., P. J. Boyle and R. D. Turner. 1975. New Approaches and Techniques for Studying Bivalve Larvae. In Culture of Marine Invertebrate Animals, Smith, W. L. and Chanley, M. H., eds., Plenum Publishing Corporation, New York, pp. 257-271.

Dreier, H. and J. Tranquilli. 1980. Reproduction, growth, distribution, and abundance of Corbicula in an Illinois cooling lake. In: R. W. Larimore and J. A. Tranquilli (eds.), The Lake Sangchris Study: case history of an Illinois cooling lake. Illinois Natural History Survey Bull. 32(3): in press.

Hillman, R. E. 1978. The occurrence of Minchinia sp. (Haplosporida, Haplosporidiidae) in species of the molluscan borer, Teredo, from Barnegat Bay, New Jersey. J. Invert. Pathology 31: 265-266.

Hoagland, K. E. and L. Crocket. 1979. Analysis of populations of boring and fouling organisms in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. Annual Progress Report. Sept. **1,** 1977-Aug. 31, 1978. NUREG/CR-0634. 113 pp.\*

Hoagland, K. E. and R. D. Turner. 1980. Range extensions of teredinids (shipworms) and polychaetes in the vicinity of a temperate-zone nuclear generating station. Marine Biology 58:55-64.

Hoagland, K. E., L. Crocket and M. Rochester. 1978. Analysis of populations of boring and fouling organisms in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating-Station with discussion of relevant physical factors over the period: Dec. **1,** 1977-Feb. 28. 1978. NUREG/CR-0223. 44 pp. \*

Hoagland, K. E., L. Crocket and R. D. Turner. 1980. Ecological studies of wood-boring bivalves in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Sept. 1, 1979-Feb. 28, 1980. NUREG/CR-1517. 65 pp.\*

Hoagland, K. E., R. D. Turner and M. Rochester. 1977. Analysis of boring and fouling organisms in the vicinity of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station with discussion of relevant physical parameters over the period: April 30-November 30, 1976. Report to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Jan. **1,** 1977. 61 pp.

Nelson, T. C. 1923. Annual Report, New Jersey State Agriculture Experimental Station 43 (for 1922): 321-343.

Turner, R. D. 1974. In the path of a warm, saline effluent. American Malacol. Union Bull. for 1973. 39:36-41.

Turner, R. D. and A. C. Johnson. 1971. Biology of Marine Wood-Boring Molluscs. In: Marine Borers, Fungi and Fouling Organisms of Wood, Chapter 13. Jones, E. B. G., and Eltringham, S. K. (eds.), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, pp. 259-301.

\* Available for purchase from the NRC/GPO Sales Program, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, and the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161.

# APPENDIX: STATION LOCALITIES

![](_page_52_Picture_207.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_191.jpeg)

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$  .

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}d\theta\,d\theta.$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{$ 

#### Distribution Category: RE

#### Supplemental Distribution: Part A

Mr. Richard Baumgardt Dick's Landing Holly Park Bayville, New Jersey 08721

Mr. William Campbell P. **0.** Box 668 108 Long John Silver Way Waretown, New Jersey 08758

Mr. Stan Cottrell North Harbor Road Waretown, New Jersey 08758

Mr. Wilson T. Crisman 901 Hudson Street Hoboken, New Jersey 07030

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Gilmore 20 Dock Ave., Box 205 E, R.R.I. Waretown, New Jersey 08758

Mr. Walter Holzman 1915 Beach Blvd. Forked River Beach, New Jersey 08731

Mr. Charles Kochman Compass Road Waretown, New Jersey 08758

Mr. Ed Sheridan 1108 Leilani Drive Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Mr. Gustav Walters **100** Manhattan Avenue, Apt. 706 Union City, New Jersey 07087

Mr. Edward Wheiler 16 River View Drive P.O. Box 642 Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Battelle Columbus Laboratories Clapp Laboratories Duxbury, Massachusetts 02332

Mr. Michael Roche Supervisor of Environmental Science Jersey Central Power and Light Co. Madison Ave. at Punchbowl Road Morristown, New Jersey 07960

Dr. Glenn Paulson Asst. Commissioner for Science Dept. of Environmental Protection State of New Jersey P. **0.** Box 1390 Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Mr. Alan R. Hoffman Lynch, Brewer, Hoffman & Sands Ten Post Office Square Suite 329 Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Mr. John Makai Nacote Creek Research Station Star Route Absecon, New Jersey 08201

Mr. Steve Lubow NJDEP-Division of Water Resources P. **0.** Box CN-029 Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Dr. Harry L. Allen US EPA Region II 26 Federal Plaza Room 832 New York, New York 10007

Dr. John Strand Ecosystems Department Battelle Northwest Lab Richland, Washington 99352

Dr. D. Heyward Hamilton, Jr.  $EV-34$ ,  $GTN$ U. S. Dept. of Energy Washington, **D.** C. 20545

![](_page_56_Picture_253.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Federal Recycling Program

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{$ 

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}) \end{split}$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\$ 

**Co**

10

 $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ 

**z**

# NUREG/CR-1939, Vol. 4 ECOLOGICAL STUDIES OF WOOD-BORINGBIVALVES **iN** THE'VCINITYOF-THE OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

JANUARY-1982

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$  $\sim$ 

 $\Delta$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ ä,

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ **z 0**

 $\lambda$ 

**C,)** 元

**u-** $\bar{z}$ **0**