Surprising Abundant Mussel Beds in the Center of Boston Harbor in the Midst of a Regional Die-Back

Jarrett E.K. Byrnes[*1,2], Laura Dissly[2], Kirk Bosma[3]

1 - Department of Biology. University of Massachusetts Boston. Boston, MA 02125

2 - School for the Environment. University of Massachusetts Boston. Boston, MA 02125

3 - Woods Hole Group. 107 Waterhouse Road. Bourne, MA 02532

* - jarrett.byrnes@umb.edu

All data and code for this manuscript are available at http://github.com/jebyrnes/harbor_mussels

The rocky intertidal of the Gulf of Maine has long served as a petri dish for the generation and testing of Ecological Theory (Menge 1976, 1983, Lubchenco 1978, Bertness et al. 1999, 2002, Petraitis and Dudgeon 2004, Bryson et al. 2014). Perhaps most importantly, it has been used to show that physical forces have not only direct effects - setting limits to zonation, regulating predator abundances, etc. - but also a cascade of indirect effects. By reducing predation and predator abundances, high wave energy enables dense beds of mussels to escape consumption and achieve dominance. The resulting community stands in contrast to low wave energy sites favoring dominance by algae as consumers reduce mussel abundance. This paradigm has been shattered over the past few decades, however, as mussels throughout the Gulf of Maine have witnessed a precipitous >60% decline since the 1970s (Sorte et al. 2017, Petraitis and Dudgeon 2020) for still poorly understood reasons. Despite this loss, mussel recruitment remains strong in some years - although declining on average (Petraitis and Dudgeon 2015). These larvae must be coming from somewhere.

In the summer of 2021, the Stone Living Lab (SLL) began an intensive study of Rainsford Island in Boston Harbor, MA. The purpose of these surveys was to establish a baseline before members of the lab began working on implementing experimental nature-based engineering approaches to evaluate potential mitigation under changing climate conditions (e.g., sea level rise and increasing storm and wave intensity). The results of these larger scale *in situ* experiments are intended to provide transferable

knowledge and serve as a model for Boston and other urban waterfronts throughout the world. Alongside whole-island surveys of substrates, the lab conducted detailed quadrat-based sampling of the intertidal and subtidal ROV surveys of mobile fauna on both Rainsford and three surrounding islands - Georges, Peddocks, and Gallops Island. These latter three were to serve as control sites in monitoring community change after large-scale installations of structures on the north and northeast shorelines of Rainsford Island. Together, these surveys showed that, despite region-wide declines in mussels, the rocky areas of these inner islands had large dense intertidal mussel beds.

Figure 1. Mussel beds around Rainsford Island. A) A photograph taken along the edge of the northern bed in the mid-intertidal. B) Survey results from transects in the intertidal recording the presence of absence of mussel beds under survey points.

Briefly, to survey the extent of beds around Rainsford, in October of 2020, we walked 51 transects perpendicular to shore starting at the low tide mark, taking samples with a clam rake every 5m as far as was safe in waders in order to determine substrate type and mussel presence. To determine mussel density, we conducted intertidal surveys during spring tides in June 2021. We divided a 30m stretch of

49   intertidal on the northeast side of each island into high, mid, and low zones and recorded percent cover of

50   all sessile species in six 0.25m^2 quadrats per zone, with quadrats randomly placed within three 10m

51   horizontal blocks to ensure even sampling (i.e., each zone-block receiving 2 randomly placed quadrats).

52   To assess the abundance of predators that could move in with the tide, we conducted subtidal video

53   surveys using a Blue Robotics BlueROV2. The ROV ran along 120m of chain marked in 5m intervals

54   sunk at the 10m isobath offshore of intertidal sites. We recorded *Cancer* crab, green crab (*Carcinus*

55   *maenas*), sea star, lobster (*Homarus americanus*), fish, and moon snail abundance in each interval,

56   limiting field of view to 1m on either side of the transect, creating six 5x2m belt transects.

57

58   **Figure 2.** Map of the Boston Harbor islands highlighting A) sites surveyed and B) the percent cover of

59   mussels in each zone on each island. Points indicate medians with the thick and thin bars highlighting the

60   interval covering 66% and 95% of the data respectively

61

62   In our spatial survey, we found mussels around the entire east side of the island, wrapping from the north

63   shore, around the end of the island, and covering the south shore as well (Fig. 1). Further, we found more

64   beds on the rocky intertidal on the extreme east end. These were not areas of sparse mussels. Our quadrat

65   surveys on Rainsford found plots with a median cover of 30% and up to ~87% cover in the mid-intertidal

66   (Fig. 2). Other islands were similar. While not quantified, on the northern end of Lovells Island, just to

67   the east of surveyed islands but protected by the outer harbor islands, we walked the edge of a mussel bed

68   during low tide that covered roughly 30,000 m². None of these sites were low in predator abundance (Fig.

69   3). Our subtidal surveys, which likely undercounted crabs given that we could not actively search

70   crevices, showed an average of between 0.2-0.7 crabs per m². Curiously, in rocky intertidal surveys, the

71   abundance of the predatory dog whelk, *Nucella lapullis*, was low (8 found on all surveys). However, the

72   whelks we did find often measured 5-6cm in length - quite large relative to many populations studied

73   (Etter 1989). Initial site surveys outside of quadrats matched with our quadrat observations for these

74   important predators.

75

76   **Figure 3.** The abundance of crabs in the shallow subtidal from ROV data. Central points indicate medians

77   with the thick and thin bars highlighting the interval covering 66% and 95% of the data respectively.

78   Points above the bars are the raw data points themselves.

79

80   Given the decline of mussels throughout the Gulf of Maine, we were surprised to find such large

81   seemingly healthy mussel beds. More surprising, these beds were all in areas relatively 1) sheltered from

82 wave exposure and 2) had robust abundances of a major predator in the nearby subtidal - a predator that

83 migrates in on high tide to consume mussels, although a diminished assemblage of intertidal whelk

84 predators. Waves at these sites are reduced >70% in height relative to the outer harbor islands (calculated

85 from the Massachusetts Coastal Flood Risk model from Bosma et al. 2015). The dominant paradigm in

86 New England marine ecology is that these sites should be algal beds (Menge 1976, Lubchenco and

87 Menge 1978, Bertness et al. 2002). While the high intertidal was often replete with *Fucus* and the lower

88 often hosted a diverse mix of red algae, the presence of such large persistent mussel beds in these

89 locations was surprising. How have these beds survived in the midst of massive decline? High flow rates

90 are one potential answer. As any mariner will tell you, tidal currents between islands the inner Boston

91 Harbor Islands are extremely strong. NOAA tides and currents show current speeds of up to 80-90 cm/s

92 within certain constrictions within Boston Harbor during spring tides, while at the same time the nearby

93 open coastline has velocities less than half in magnitude ("NOAA Tides and Currents" 2022).

94 Additionally, highly detailed hydrodynamic modeling within Boston Harbor (Sustainable Solutions Lab,

95 UMass-Boston, 2018), indicates current magnitudes on the order of 40-60 cm/s in the vicinity of

96 Rainsford Island, compared to velocities at similar tidal cycles of 10-20 cm offshore of Boston Harbor.

97 This would enhance both food and larval delivery (Palardy and Witman 2014), can be very beneficial for

98 filter feeders such as mussels (Fréchette et al. 1989, Leichter and Witman 1997), and reduce efficacy of

99 predators (Leonard et al. 1998). It does not, however, explain why these beds have persisted while those

100 at the nearby monitored beds in Nahant have declined to 3-5% average cover (Sorte et al. 2016). Further,

101 we were able to obtain intertidal photo quadrat data from the National Park Service's Boston Harbor

102 monitoring program (Long and Mitchell 2015) on the more wave exposed outer harbor islands - Calf,

103 Green, and Outer Brewster. These areas fit the traditional profile of what should be a mussel dominated

104 habitat given their exposure to open ocean swell. On these transects, beds rarely get above 5% cover, save

105 for a brief pulse in 2016 with a maximum cover in one plot of 17%, far less than we observed. These

106 outer harbor island sites share a similar thermal and chemical environment to those we surveyed, at least

107 allowing us to rule out those mechanisms, although they do possess higher wave exposure.

108

109   The ubiquity of the mussel beds we found throughout the harbor suggests some hope for the story of

110   mussels in the Gulf of Maine. We need to better understand the role of hard substrate habitats in wave

111   protected environments in high flow sites that sit in the middle of estuaries. While these are not the

112   traditional sites ecologists have concentrated on, we suggest a greater need to understand their ecology for

113   mussels. Further, the data of mussel bed locations often exists - albeit in the gray literature. Many states'

114   marine resource management agencies have records of bed locations from environmental permitting (e.g.,

115   permit reports from Woods Hole Group show beds in Nauset Estuary(Woods Hole Group 2021) that are,

116   to our knowledge, unexamined by academic ecologists). These permitting reports represent an untapped

117   font of knowledge to understand when and where mussel beds have been able to remain resilient in the

118   face of whatever has caused their die-off throughout the Gulf. This understanding may well open up new

119   vistas in both the fundamental understanding of intertidal ecology in the Gulf of Maine and ecological

120   strategies to resist or adapt to global change.

121

122   **Acknowledgements**

123

128

129   **References**

130

131   Bertness, M. D., G. H. Leonard, J. M. Levine, P. R. Schmidt, and A. O. Ingraham. 1999. Testing the

132   relative contribution of positive and negative interactions in rocky intertidal communities.

133   Ecology 80:2711–2726.

134   Bertness, M. D., G. C. Trussell, P. J. Ewanchuk, and B. R. Silliman. 2002. Do Alternate Stable

135   Community States Exist in the Gulf of Maine Rocky Intertidal Zone? Ecology 83:3434–3448.

136   Bosma, K., E. Douglas, P. Kirshen, K. McArthur, S. Miller, and C. Watson. 2015. MassDOT-FHWA

137   pilot project report: Climate change and extreme weather vulnerability assessments and

138   adaptation options for the Central Artery.

139   Bryson, E. S., G. C. Trussell, and P. J. Ewanchuk. 2014. Broad-scale geographic variation in the

140   organization of rocky intertidal communities in the Gulf of Maine. Ecological Monographs

141   84:579–597.

142   Fréchette, M., C. A. Butman, and W. R. Geyer. 1989. The importance of boundary-layer flows in

143   supplying phytoplankton to the benthic suspension feeder, Mytilus edulis L. Limnology and

144   Oceanography 34:19–36.

145   Leichter, J. J., and J. D. Witman. 1997. Water flow over subtidal rock walls: relation to distributions and

146   growth rates of sessile suspension feeders in the Gulf of Maine Water flow and growth rates.

147   Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 209:293–307.

148   Leonard, G. H., J. M. Levine, P. R. Schmidt, and M. D. Bertness. 1998. Flow-driven variation in intertidal

149   community structure in a Maine estuary. Ecology 79:1395–1411.

150   Long, J. D., and B. R. Mitchell. 2015. Northeast Temperate Network Long-term Rocky Intertidal

151   Monitoring Protocol: 2015 revision. Natural Resource Report, National Park Service.

152   Lubchenco, J. 1978. Plant species diversity in a marine intertidal community: importance of herbivore

153   food preference and algal competitive abilities. American Naturalist 112:23–39.

154   Lubchenco, J., and B. Menge. 1978. Community Development and Persistence in a Low Rocky Intertidal

155   Zone. Ecological Monographs 48:67–94.

156   Menge, B. A. 1976. Organization of the New England rocky intertidal community: role of predation,

157   competition, and environmental heterogeneity. Ecological Monographs 46:355–393.

158   Menge, B. A. 1983. Components of Predation Intensity in the Low Zone of the New England Rocky

159   Intertidal Region. Oecologia 58:141–155.

160   NOAA Tides and Currents. 2022, February 8. . https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/.

161   Palardy, J. E., and J. D. Witman. 2014. Flow, recruitment limitation, and the maintenance of diversity in

162   marine benthic communities. Ecology 95:286–297.

163   Petraitis, P. S., and S. R. Dudgeon. 2004. Detection of alternative stable states in marine communities.

164   Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 300:343–371.

165   Petraitis, P. S., and S. R. Dudgeon. 2015. Variation in recruitment and the establishment of alternative

166   community states. Ecology 96:3186–3196.

167   Petraitis, P. S., and S. R. Dudgeon. 2020. Declines over the last two decades of five intertidal invertebrate

168   species in the western North Atlantic. Communications Biology 3:1–7.

169   Sorte, C. J. B., V. E. Davidson, M. C. Franklin, K. M. Benes, M. M. Doellman, R. J. Etter, R. E.

170   Hannigan, J. Lubchenco, and B. A. Menge. 2017. Long-term declines in an intertidal foundation

171   species parallel shifts in community composition. Global Change Biology 23:341–352.

172   Woods Hole Group. 2021. Expanded environmental notification form: Nauset estuary dredging project

173   for towns of Orleans & Eastham, MA.