Foreword and acknowledgment

This pdf-file is the English version of an article which is published with three other articles dealing with species and biotope protection for the freshwater pearl mussel *Margaritifera margaritifera* in Lower Saxony, North Germany

(see: <u>http://www.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/master/C35794242_N14750639_L20_D0_I5231158.html</u>). With this pdf-file we want to give our non-German speaking colleagues an opportunity to read about the chance to do something for this endangered mussel species in Europe.

To get a good readable English text we are very glad to have our Irish friends and colleagues EVELYN MOORKENS and IAN KILLEEN on our side in our efforts to help *Margaritifera*, and we are very thankful to them for helping us in bringing our "Denglish" to a readable English version.

Successful species protection measures for the Freshwater Pearl Mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*) through the reduction of unnaturally high loading of silt and sand in running waters

- Experiences within the scope of the Lutterproject -

by Reinhard Altmüller and Rainer Dettmer

Contents

1 Introduction and Objectives	1
2 Study of sediment levels entering the Lutter - an example from the Endeholz Ditch	
3 Reduction of unnaturally high sand load through installation of sediment traps and monitoring to	зу
photo documentation	
4 Accelerated reduction of fine sediment load by the use of a mill pond as a sediment trap	10
5 Successes for the biocoenosis of the brook	11
5.1 Example minnows (<i>Phoxinus phoxinus</i>)	11
5.2 Example of the Freshwater Pearl Mussel	15
6 Conclusion and outlook on the future	17
7 Table of the colleagues involved in the species protection measures for the freshwater pearl m	ussel
	18
8 Summary	19
9 Literature:	19

1 Introduction and Objectives

The conservation of freshwater pearl mussels [FPM] (*Margaritifera margaritifera*) and thickshelled river mussels (*Unio crassus*) is a task of european importance (Habitats Directive, Water Framework Directive). This task can only be solved by cooperative efforts of all groups and institutions that are involved with running waters.

All conservation efforts in the past for these two mussel species were focused on maintaining high water quality. For the FPM it is a requirement as all known populations of FPM live only in running waters with the highest water quality. For the thick-shelled river mussel this requirement is as well documented by the fundamental investigations from HOCHWALD (1997). But the question does arise as to whether there are more important factors for the survival of the thick-shelled river mussel than water quality alone. This species was widely distributed in Lower Saxony, for example the river Weser from the city Hannoversch-Münden

(in the south of Lower Saxony) to the city of Bremen (367 km to the north) in very different ecological conditions.

For the FPM, we have been able to clearly demonstrate that in addition to the best water quality, a naturally very low level of fine sediments is characteristic to an intact, recruiting FPM environment After leaving their host fish the young Freshwater Pearl mussels (only 0.5 mm long) live in the hollow system (=Interstitium) between gravel and stones, well protected against water current. The present day high amounts of input and load of fine materials in running waters resulting from current landuse clog up the interstitium and suffocate the typical freshwater organisms living there, including, the young FPM. Because of the failure of young mussels to survive, the FPM was threatened with extinction in the Lutter river and is threatened with extinction all over Europe in human populated regions. If the load of fine material is reduced to naturally occurring amounts, even brooks with overaged FPM populations can recover and numerous young mussels can survive and grow. This has been successfully demonstrated within the lutterproject (ABENDROTH 1993, ALTMÜLLER & DETTMER 2000, ALTMÜLLER 2005). The lutterproject is situated at the south edge of the Lüneburg Heath (Germany, Lower Saxony). It is a nature conservation project led by the counties of Celle and Gifhorn to restore the heather brook Lutter. The reason and main target organism is the freshwater pearl mussel. This very successful nature conservation project was made possible through the financial support of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation within the scope of its programme concerning riparian land (SCHERFOSE et al. 1996) by the Ministry for Environment of Lower Saxony and of the financial and manpower support of the counties of Celle and Gifhorn.

For successful measures to be taken to reduce unnaturally high sediment load it is necessary to know the origin of the sediment. Apart from the necessity to analyse the specific sediment origin throughout the catchment there are some general experiances and information knowledge. The experiences of unnaturally high loading in the Lutter catchment was reported by ALTMÜLLER & DETTMER (1996). The experiences of unnaturally high loading in the Lutter catchment was reported by ALTMÜLLER & DETTMER (1996). This paper showed that soil erosion and fish pond waste were important contributers to the high loading of fine sediments in running waters.

Since 1996 more knowledge and experience has been gained about the reasons for the unnaturally high load of fine material, which are described herein. All observations and measurements have been carried out to determine the reasons of the extreme sediment input to running waters and to find workable countermeasures.

2 Study of sediment levels entering the Lutter - an example from the Endeholz Ditch

Within the scope of the measurement program "quantifying load of sand and mud in heather creeks" a sediment trap was installed in the Endeholz Ditch. The Endeholz Ditch is a small tributary of the Lutter river which has a catchment size of about 2.38 km² (HEUER-JUNGEMANN i. lit). Originally it was a small creek which has been extended to form a drainage ditch. About 10 m above it's confluence with the Lutter river a wooden box was installed in the river bottom (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1: Sediment trap in the Endeholz Ditch to quantify the load of fine sediments. The wooden box (Size: 2 m long, 1 m wide, 0.5 m deep) is open on the top. The sandy material which is mostly transported by rolling over the substrate, along with organic material is deposited in and caught by the box. The sand ripples which are seen in Fig. 1 on the left are typical of an unnaturally high sandy load and are more characteristic of a beach than the bottom of a natural heather creek.

From the end of 1991 to mid 2002 the sediment trap was emptied every week by young men who were doing their civilian service¹ (Zivildienstleistende = ZDL) in the nature conservation specialist agency of Lower Saxony. The amount of deposited material was measured as exactly as possible (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Sediment trap in the Endeholz Ditch just before the confluence with the Lutter river (background) with the mound of sandy and organic material which was taken out of the trap from 1991 to 03. April 1998. The size of the mound shows the large amount of material carried by this small ditch.

¹ The sample collection within the measurement program "quantifying load of sand and mud in heather creeks" has been done by the ZDL of the nature conservation agency. The following ZDL beared the main responsibility: Carsten Brauns (1991), Gundolf Reichert (1991/92), Gerrit Grannas (1992/93), Dierk Rischbieter (1993/94), Moritz Haupt (1994/95), Niels Ubbelohde (1995/96), Tobias Polch (1996/97), Michael Koslowski (1997/98), Gunther May (1998/99), Bernhard Schwarz (1999/2000) Arnold Ziesche (2000/01) und Michael. Herbst (2001/02).



Fig 3: Annual sum of sediment load in the Endeholz Ditch. The change in the method of ditch management from hand clearance to machine clearance from the end of 1997 had a damaging effect on the ditch bottom and its banks, and the sediment load increased significantly. The amount of load after the maintenance of the ditch by machines was much higher than is shown in the figure as the sediment trap overflowed in the first weeks after that occasion.

In Fig 3 the result of weekly emptying the sediment trap is shown as annual sums. The change of load amount from about 3.2 m³ in the year 1997 to about 12.9 m³ in the year 1998. Up to 1997 management of the Endeholz Ditch was carried out by hand but from autumn 1997 it was was done using an excavator. The effect of the excavator was to loosen the sand from the banks and bed of the ditch and to transport it downstream. The authors only heard of this change from the young men who were doing their civilian service, who suddenly every week had to remove more than one m³ out of the sediment trap. The figures 4 to 6 show the effect of this change.



Fig. 4: The Endeholz Ditch in spring of 1998 after management by machines. On the right side the excavated material can be seen. The river bottom is exclusively sand. The ripples are characteristic of the moving sand.



Fig. 5: Mouth of the Endeholz Ditch to the Lutter river in April 1994. At this time very little sand was transported into the Lutter river.



Fig. 6: Mouth of the Endeholz Ditch to the Lutter river on 03.04.1998. The large mass of sand which has been transported into the Lutter river after management of the ditch by machines is clearly seen. The sand which is seen here wasn't caught in the sediment trap 10 m upstream, because the trap was full. Therefore, the amount of load shown in Figure 3 for 1998 is an underestimate.

3 Reduction of unnaturally high sand load through installation of sediment traps and monitoring by photo documentation

The input of unnaturally high load of fine sediments in running waters can arise from several different sources depending on the type of land use. Therefore different measures are required to reduce the input. Erosion from farmland results in a considerable loss of valuable soil, therefore it makes sense for farmers to increase their efforts to minimize this loss. In spite of the efforts of the farmers, there will be soil conditions (for example directly after

ploughing) when heavy rainfall will bring high amounts of erosion. There needs to be methods utilised that will reliably prevent harmful input of fine sediments in all situations.

Once it was recognised that the unnaturally high sand load from drainage ditches which flow into the Lutter and its tributaries was the essential reason for the absence of FPM reproduction, sediment traps and plant beds were designed to stop the problem. Sediment traps are created by widening and deepening the drainage ditches. This causes the flow velocity in the area to be reduced so that the sand, silt and coarse organic material is deposited and can be excavated with ease. The function can be demonstrated by taking the sediment trap near the village of Bargfeld as an example. A photo series shows the origin of the sandy load and the successful disposal of these pollutants by the use of the sediment trap.



Fig.7: The sediment trap of Bargfeld (in the picture top on the left side). The sediment trap is situated near a road and, therefore it is within easy and cost-effective reach by machines to empty it.

The sediment trap of Bargfeld (Fig. 7) (WIDRINKA in litt.) receives material from a catchment of about 2 km², of which about 50 % is farmland. This area is almost completely drained and the drainage ditches are cleaned out by machines every year as part of the obligations of water maintenance. The sandy soils are very thin and lay on impervious glacial till. Because of this they can hold and store only small amounts of water. So the drainage ditches are constantly water-bearing only in wet years. In "normal" years they dry out in summertime.

As with all other cases within the Lutterproject, this sediment trap is situated for ecological reasons directly downstream of the part of the drainage ditch that is under periodic maintenance. So the total sand load of the entire stretch upstream can be caught. The riverbed downstream is not under water maintenance - only the vegetation above water level is cut, in exceptional circumstances. Being permanently water-bearing, the strech downstream of the sediment trap is free of unnatural sediment loads and can develop in a near-natural way.

For economic reasons the sediment trap is built near a road in order to reach it easily with machines for excavation. The system of water management is shown in Fig. 7 and 8. The water which comes from the farmland flows into ditches near the road, crosses the road (red arrow) and flows to the north north-west (nnw) into the little creek called "Köttelbeck" in the

region of "Langenfeld". In this ditch a sediment trap was built near the road in the winter of 1998/99.



Fig. 8: The complete system, comprising the sediment trap and the plant-bed situated at the lower end of the catchment. The water from the drainage ditches first enters the the sediment trap and then flows through the plant filtration bed. This is a secondary system to absorb the fine particles, which are so small that they do not settle in the sediment trap.



Fig. 9: View in flow direction of the "Sediment trap Bargfeld" in summer of 1999 about one year after completion and after the first time of excavation. In front of the left side the mouth of the drainage ditch can be seen. At the far end on the left of the sediment trap the drainage ditch continues its flow through dense vegetation.

In winter 2004/2005 the function of this sediment trap was documented photographically. It should be pointed out that there is a time difference between "cause of the unnaturally high load" (this means: ditch management) and "occurrence of the sand downstream" (this means: in the sediment trap).

The following photo series clearly show the effect of ditch management by machines, the successive transport of sand and the function of the sediment trap.

Photo series 1 (Fig. 10a-d)

The position of the photographer is about at the top of the red arrow in Fig. 8. For an illustration of the situation in autumn, a picture was taken in autumn of 2005. (Fig. 10a).



Fig. 10: Drainage ditch running parallel to the farm road. For position of the photographer see Fig. 8, top of the red arrow, view direction: sw.

Fig. 10a: Situation before the annual ditch maintenance (12.11.2005).

Fig. 10b: directly after maintenance by machines (21.11.2004).

Fig 10c: More than one month after maintenance at 30.12.2004 . Additional sand is transported in this stretch.

Fig. 10d: At 16. 03. 2005, most of the sand which was loosened during clearance is washed away. It remains a stony and gravely river bed as is typical for natural creeks in this region.

Photo series 2, Fig. 11a – 11 d: Position of the photographer the same as in fig. 9, south of the sediment trap. View direction: north in flow direction of the drainage ditch.



Fig. 11: Sediment trap "Bargfeld".

Fig. 11a: the sediment trap on 30 12. 2004. No sand has reached the sediment trap, more than five weeks after the ditch clearance and only 30 m downstream of position fig. 9 and 10. Only after two months (fig.: 11b, 22.01.2005), the amount of transported sand becomes more visible and then more evident two weeks later (fig. 11c, 06.02.2005). One month later (fig. 11d, at 16. 03. 2005) the sand transportation in the drainage ditch has been completed and the sand has reached the sediment trap. The plant has done its job. The sediment trap is approximately one third full, equivalent to about 50 m³. At this time the drainage ditch is already washed free of sandy material (see fig. 10d). Without the sediment trap the mass of sand would have been transported downstream to the Lutter River where it would have infiltrated and overlayed the naturally stony and gravely river bed similar to the situation visible in fig. 10b and 10c. Also, without the sediment trap there would be no evidence of the quantity of sand that was mobilised by only one episode of ditch management by machine.

Both photo series demonstrate and explain one origin of unnaturally high sand load in a small drainage ditch in a low gradient area. It is a stark demonstration of the ecological problem present for the FPM. They also show that the chances to minimize this source of threat for the biocoenosis of running waters is relatively easy when located at the right place. Additionally they show that one needs a sediment trap to demonstrate the huge amounts of sand which can be contributed to a natural creek by one small drainage ditch. At the same point on the drainage ditch the situation can look stable for a long time (Fig. 10b and 10c). However, the sand passes over this area and, therefore one is unable to formulate an impression of the quantity of the sand that has passed through.

The sediment trap Bargfeld is an example of how unnatural sand input is prevented from entering natural running waters within the Lutterproject. Installation of sediment traps in each of the numerous drainage ditches within the catchment of the Lutter River was reliant on the fact that the areas were purchased by the project management. Then a procedure was developed to get permission to install the sediment traps. The realization of all the necessary projects took a very long time - from 1989 up to the present (2006). Therefore the input of sand could only be reduced in successive stages. The effect to the biocoenoses of all these measures therefore could only arise after the gradual improvement of the ecological conditions.

4 Accelerated reduction of fine sediment load by the use of a mill pond as a sediment trap

The reduction of fine sediment load in the lower reaches of the Lutter River got an important boost through purchasing the rights to an old Mill in the village of Eldingen by the lutterproject management. The remaining semi natural streches of the river Lutter lie downstream of this mill. In the summer of 1989 the owner of the mill was informed about the problems the pearlmussels had with mobilized sediments coming from the mill pond. After this he kindly agreed not to drain off the mill pond. Previously, the mill weir had been raised during flood events to preserve the buildings. The effect or success of not raising the weir is shown in figure 12. After purchasing the watermill in 1992, the water level of the mill pond has been permanently lowered as far as it was possible, so that the water could pass the mill even in flood without damaging the buildings (See 12b). Since then the mill pond has never been emptied and it acts as a very large sediment trap. The accumulated sand and mud has been taken out by the use of a suction dredge. To date, about 6,800 m³ of sand and mud have been pumped out (personal communication: government of the county of Celle and engineering office HEIDT & PETERS, Celle).



Fig. 12: Back water of the mill of Eldingen just before (left) and just after (right) the notary certification of the contract of sale. Prior to 1992, large quantities of sediments had already accumulated in the backwater of the mill (right picture).

As these pumped out masses of sediments are not washed downstream, they have not covered the natural river bottom and killed the typical biocoenosis. On the contrary, the sand masses which covered the stony and gravely river bottom up to this time were successively washed away so that gravel and stones appeared again at the surface. Fig. 13 shows how much the quantity of sediment drift has been reduced by this action. In the year 1968 under leadership of BISCHOFF a small bypass was built in a narrow curve of the Lutter about seven kilometres downstream of the mill of Eldingen. About 5 - 10 % of the Lutter water runs through this bypass. In January of 1991 a sediment trap like the one shown in fig. 1 was built in this bypass. This sediment trap has been emptied weekly since then. Fig. 13 shows the annual sum of the sediment drift from 1991 to 2006. The sum of rainfall has been measured in the private "weather station" of the first author, which is located about 5 km from the sediment trap. The high rainfall in winter 1993/94 gave rise to a corresponding high flow in

the Lutter, and produced very high sediment drift. In 1994 up to 19 m^3 sand was removed from the sediment trap. This equates to about $190 - 380 \text{ m}^3$ sand transport in the Lutter. As with the trap in the Endeholz ditch, this sediment trap also overflows in the weeks with the highest sand transport. As the fine sand fraction doesn't deposit, the real amount of transported material is even higher than has been measured.



Fig. 13: Trend of sediment transportation in the Lutter. The amount has been measured in a sediment trap as shown in fig. 1. The success of the sediment trap "mill pond" and of the sediment traps in the drainage ditches is clearly seen.

Initially the upper reaches of the c. seven kilometre long stretch downstream of the mill were washed free from overlaying sand. The stony and gravely substrate emerged again and could be colonized by the typical Flora and Fauna. The typical inhabitants of a natural brook reacted immediately to this naturally recovered structure of the river bottom. An example of this phenomenon was the new high reproduction of minnows (*Phoxinus phoxinus*).

5 Successes for the biocoenosis of the brook 5.1 Example minnows (*Phoxinus phoxinus*)

Minnows are typical and numerous inhabitants of waters with stony gravely bottom and / or shores. In the lower reaches of the river Lutter downstream of the mill of Eldingen they had only seldom been caught by annual electro fishing, which had been carried out since 1985. This changed after the transport of fine sediments was stopped in summer 1992. The winter flood in 1993/94 then washed out the sand, which had previously covered the stony gravely river bottom (ALTMÜLLER & DETTMER 1996). The minnows reacted immediately to this and reproduced very successfully. Given their former rareness the sudden appearance of breeding minnows was very surprising. It was also confirmation that the large amounts of sand were the greatest remaining problem for the river ecosystem.

Minnows spawn in gravel material and prefer a grain size of 2 cm in diameter (BLESS 1992), and they spawn in sections with high current. While spawning the Minnow -♀ inject their eggs between the gravel (Fig. 14). The eggs cling on to the gravel because of their adhesive surface. Here they are protected against voracious individuals of the same species and are supplied by a circulation of oxygen rich water. After about a one week's embryonic development the hatched out fish larvae migrate as deep as possible into the substrate, most likely to escape the suction from the turbulent water above them. They are supported by a yolk sac and are not able to swim (benthic phase). They hide in narrow niches between stones where the current is at its lowest (Fig. 15). Here they are most protected. However,

these are also the parts of the river bed that are first clogged if sediments are brought into the river - which is fatal for the inhabitants. After development within the substrate the minnow larvae migrate upwards through the interstitium into the open water (pelagic phase, free swimming larvae).



Fig. 14: Time table (Tage = days) of the space used by juvenile stages of minnows at 15 °C water temperature (after experiments in an aquarium). The aquarium is filled with a 30 cm thick gravel layer in a size which minnow- prefer. For explanation see text (Figure adapted slightly from BLESS 1992).



Fig. 15: Minnow larvae hide into narrow niches made by the gravel, probably to protect themselves against upward suction by the current. Here (as deep as possible in the bottom in the narrow niches formed by the gravel) the suction power is lowest and so is the danger of washout (after BLESS 1992).

The following graphs (Fig. 16a-e) show the minnow population in the lower reaches of the river Lutter downstream the mill of Eldingen. In the graphs the number of minnows per 100

metres is shown within each of the randomly selected fishing sectors. The sectors which have not been fished are marked. It can be clearly seen that the minnows - starting in the upper reaches - successively colonized (or re colonized) the river Lutter. Minnows are now (in 2006) again the typical and most numerous inhabitants of the river, and always accompany the author during the snorkelling surveys to investigate the pearl mussel population.



Fig. 16a-e: Development of the minnow population in the natural lower reaches of the river Lutter in the years 1992 - 1998. Sectors which were not investigated by electro fishing are shown by a line. Abschnitt = stretch; nicht befischte = not fished.

5.2 Example of the Freshwater Pearl Mussel

As the rate of growth of the FPM is very slow and the young mussels spend at least the first 5 years of their life hidden in the river bed substrate, the success of the measures for the species and biotope protection for the FPM (the target species), could only be shown after several years.

In the river Lutter the young FPM need to reach the age of about seven years before they are big enough to emerge from the gravel into the flowing water to get more water through their gills for better oxygen and food supply. It is only then that they can be seen by the investigator without destroying their habitat by dredging.



Fig. 17: River bottom of the Lutter with an adult FPM and three young mussels which are not easily seen between the gravel.

The first shells of young mussels were found in 1997, and the mussel population has been investigated by snorkelling annually since 2000.

The results of these investigations are shown in figure 18. In 2006 more than 83 % of the total of about 7,400 FPM in the river Lutter are younger than 20 years. This success is in great contrast to the fact that all other european freshwater pearl mussel populations in human settled regions are without successful reproduction and therefore they are threatened with extinction (GEIST 2005).



Fig. 18: Population development of the Freshwater Pearlmussels in the river Lutter. This positive trend is due to the reduction of the anthropogenic sand load since the upstream mill pond has not been drained off and therefore the sediments are no longer washed out of the mill pond.

The long term survival of the FPM population in the river Lutter was given additional hope with the verification of the presence of young brown trout (*Salmo trutta f. fario*) in 2005 and 2006, which were naturally infected with FPM glochidia. (Fig. 19). Since the year 2003 no brown trout have been artificially infected with larva (glochidia) of the FPM in the natural lower reaches of the river Lutter. Furthermore, given that the oldest of the young FPM came to mature age and in view of such a large number of young mussels, natural infection of brown trout should be possible. However, to be certain of this, the artificial infection of brown trout with FPM glochidia must be stopped. The young infected brown trout which were found in 2005 and 2006 live in reaches of the river Lutter where only a few old FPM can be found. These few individuals produce too few glochida to successfully infect brown trout. The high number of glochida necessary for an intensive infection can only come from the high number of young mussels which are maturing at present.

The age composition of the infected brown trout is very interesting. Most of the infected fish examined in May of 2006 were born the previous year. They had been infected at an age of only a few months old. During the periods of artificial infection, fish this young were not utilised as they are very sensitive and easily damaged.



Fig. 19: Young brown trout of 2005 with nearly ripe young freshwater pearl mussels in the gills (light points) (result of electro fishing for monitoring - 07.05.2006). The glochidia are derived from young mussels which have matured after successful species and biotope protection measures. They will build up the F2 generation, but any success cannot be proven for another 5 – 7 years.

6 Conclusion and outlook on the future

Unnaturally high sediment load, produced by human land use and other activities, considerably affects running waters and their biocoenosis. Most of the running waters of the northern german lowland are in this damaged condition.

Taking the example of the river Lutter and its ecologically very demanding resident population of freshwater pearl mussel, it has been shown that there are indeed opportunities for restoration and, within this, chances of survival even for very demanding species which once were typical and abundant. This is dependent upon water quality not being reduced by waste water or unnaturally high input of nutrients, that there is still the original or a nearnatural river bottom, and no unnatural sediment input.

The nature conservation measures for the freshwater pearl mussel in the catchment of the river Lutter were only made possible by the considerable funds made available for the Lutter Project, and by the goodwill, trust and cooperation of everyone involved in the project (ALTMÜLLER 2005).

The experiences and knowledge from the Lutter Project should be used not only for freshwater pearl mussel conservation measures in other catchments, they should be used in general for river conservation, development and restoration measures.

Anthropogenically derived high sediment load clogs the lattice system (Interstitium) between sand, gravel and stones so that the typical animals living there die. Furthermore, sediment covers continously, in a rolling movement – like shifting sand dunes – even in a river bottom that was originally stable.

Each river bottom that is mainly stable is colonized by organisms almost on the surface. Where there is light and nutrient, algae may grow, but even small animals colonise a stable bottom in huge numbers or they live burrowed by themselves in the upper film. Even these less demanding surface organisms are suffocated by shifting sediment dunes, as well as those that live in the deeper interstitium.

As with the reduction of nutrient load, the reduction of fine sediment load must become a general requirement within running water restoration and protection work and a common goal of water and nature conservation.

In every case the place for reducing the unnaturally high load should be located as close as possible to the source of the problem. Erosion is harmful to a farmer's business and, therefore, it is in every farmer's interest to take all known and possible steps to reduce erosion and preserve economic viability. The most important measure is to have as complete a soil cover as possible. However in the course of a year their may be a phase without soil cover for arable farmland. For this period of time it is necessary to take precautionary measures on all sites which are at risk from erosion. For some farmers this precaution may seem to be excessive, because incidents of erosion are relatively few in number and with long periods between, and may even discourage some farmers from taking precautionary measures because of economic impact. However, even a single high erosion incident can bring major sediment input which can severely damage running waters and their very long lived biocoenosis.

Within the sphere of the Lutter project with maintenance of waters, especially management of drainage ditches, and the resultant sediment load, from an economic point of view it is indispensable to install sediment catchers in all drain ditches. In time it is possible to take out of the waters both the sediments which are mobilized by ditch management and those which are coming from erosion and/or other origins. The excavation of the sediment traps can be done within the yearly maintenance of waters without any significant increase in cost, provided that the sediment trap is located where it will have maximum effect and its dimensions are big enough. However, the emptying of the sediment traps has to be done with care or else they will refill very quickly and then overflow. Special responsibility for the correct management of the sediment traps has to be taken by the association that also maintains the waters and manages the ditches.

The measures of nature and water protection that are described in this article especially apply to the preservation and recovery of the freshwater pearl mussel. But all measures together already contribute towards fulfilling targets set within several Directives of the European Parliament. So the restoration work on the lower reaches of the river Lutter are very successfull species and habitat conservation projects within the European Habitats Directive but also within the European Water Framework Directive to achieve good ecological conditions:

- Within the European Habitats Directive the habitat 3260 "Water courses of plain to montane levels with the *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion* vegetation " have been brought into favourable conservation status (Annex I, Directive 92/43/EWG)
- the populations of the freshwater pearl mussel, the Green Club-tailed Dragonfly (*Ophiogomphus cecilia*) and the Bullhead (*Cottus gobio*) has been brought into favourable conservation status (Annex II, Directive 92/43/EWG).

Within the European Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC) the recovered stretch of the river Lutter, or rather the condition of it, was brought into a good status, i.e. the hydromorphological characteristics and the physico-chemical quality elements.

In addition to the above, the special feature of this water protection, water conservation and nature conservation project is that there are only small follow-up costs and also no costs to manage a specific state of cultural landscape.

7 Table of the colleagues involved in the species protection measures for the freshwater pearl mussel

The results of electrofishing and the success of the species protection measures that are described here has been achieved by enthusiastic friends of nature, generally in their free time. The spawning time of the FWP-♀ is not predictable. Therefore in summer from mid-July all private appointments had to be subordinate to the life history of the mussels. In the following all attendees of the species protection measures for the freshwater pearl mussel in Lower Saxony (also in the rivers Lachte and Bornbach) are listed in alphabetic order.

Reinhard Altmüller, Wolf-Dietrich Bischoff, Dietrich Blanke, Ulli Brandt, Rainer Dettmer, Frauke und Heiner Drögemüller, Christian Gietz, Otto Golze, Günter Grein, Roger Günsel, Stefan Heitz, Iris Herrmann, Thomas Herrmann, Matthias Holsten, Renate und Stefan Hölter, Lennart, Manuel und Norbert Horny, Gerd Hübner, Thomas Kaiser, Heinrich Klaholt, Andreas Knoop, Ernst und Ole Kohls, Henning Köneke, Gabi Kremming, Jens Kubitzki, Peter Lorz, Hans-Jürgen Löther, Sonja Lüßmann, Christian Makala, Anna, Hans und Moritz Menneking, Lars und Wolfgang Mosel, Annette Most, Dirk Mundt, Matthias Olthoff, Sören Ostermann, Ulrich Pittius, Gabriele Potabgy, Anke Preiß, Manfred Rasper, Günter, Ronja und Vigdis Ratzbor, Dierk Rischbieter, Thomas Schick, Gudrun Schmal, Daniel Schneider, Burkhard und Ulrich Schnepper, Peter Sellheim, Brigitte Steinhardt, Egon Steinkraus, Agnes Steinmann, Andreas Thiess, Frank, Hans-Hermann und Holger Trumann, Wieland Utermark, Günther Wilkens.

In addition to the young men listed an page 3 who made their civilian service (ZDL) were the following ZDL involved in the species protection measures and the surveys:

Thomas Clavier, Carsten Dettmann, Michael Friese, Thorben Fründt, Michael Geilke, Manfred Grenz, Günther Hansen, Horst Hildebrandt, Markus Kietz, Thomas Klug, Andreas Nitschke, Ulrich Söffker und Alexander Wiebe.

8 Summary

The freshwater pearl mussel was formerly abundant in running waters of the "Lüneburg Heath", a north eastern landscape in Lower Saxony in the North of Germany. Using the example of the remaining freshwater pearl mussel population in the river Lutter it has been shown that good water quality alone is not enough for its survival. The unnaturally high amounts of load (sand and silt) are harmful substances for the river biocoenosis. Only after the reduction of these high amounts of load could typical fish such as minnows (*Phoxinus phoxinus*) naturally reproduce. Also, it is only after the reduction of the huge load that the relief measures which focused on artificially infecting wild living brown trout (*Salmo trutta* f. *fario*) with glochidia became successful with young mussels surviving and growing. Currently the next mussel generation has started to grow up without any artificial help.

With the installation of sediment traps in all drainage ditches a method has been developed and used, which can help to reduce the problems with unnaturally high load of fine sediment and which may be applied across Europe.

Some targets of the European Habitats Directive and of the European Water Framework Directive are shown to be achievable.

9 Literature:

ABENDROTH, D. (1993): Errichtung und Sicherung schutzwürdiger Teile von Natur und Landschaft mit gesamtstaatlich repräsentativer Bedeutung. Projekt Lutter: Die Lutter - ein Heidefließgewässer in den Landkreisen Celle und Gifhorn, Niedersachsen. – Natur und Landschaft 66 (1): 24 - 28.

ALTMÜLLER, R. (2005): Erfolgskontrollen im Naturschutzgroßprojekt "Lutter" unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Flussperlmuschel und einiger Fischarten.– In: NICLAS, G. & V. SCHERFOSE (Hrsg.): Erfolgskontrollen in Naturschutzgroßvorhaben des Bundes. Teil I: Ökologische Bewertung. – Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt 22: 115 - 135.

ALTMÜLLER, R. & R. DETTMER (1996): Unnatürliche Sandfracht in Geestbächen – Ursachen, Probleme und Ansätze für Problemlösungen - am Beispiel der Lutter. – Inform.d. Naturschutz Niedersachs. 16, Nr. 5 (5/96): 222 -237.

ALTMÜLLER, R. & R. DETTMER (2000): Erste Erfolge beim Arten- und Biotopschutz für die Flussperlmuschel (*Margaritifera margaritifera* L.) in Niedersachsen. – Natur und Landschaft 75 (9/10): 384 -388.

BLESS, R. (1992): Einsichten in die Ökologie der Elritze *Phoxinus phoxinus* (L.). Praktische Grundlagen zum Schutz einer gefährdeten Fischart. – Schr.-Reihe für Landschaftspflege und Naturschutz 35, 68 S.; Bonn-Bad Godesberg.

EUROPÄISCHE UNION (23.10. 2000): Richtlinie 2000/60/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 23. Oktober 2000 zur Schaffung eines Ordnungsrahmens für Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft im Bereich der Wasserpolitik. – Amtsblatt der Europäischen Gemeinschaften DE: L 327/1 -L 327/72.

GEIST, J. (2005): Conservation Genetics and Ecology of European Freshwater Pearl Mussels (*Margaritifera margaritifera* L.). – Diss. Univ. München, Wiss.-Zentr. Weihenstephan für Ernährung, Landnutzung und Umwelt, 121 S. HOCHWALD, S. (1997): Das Beziehungsgefüge innerhalb der Größenwachstums- und Fortpflanzungsparameter bayerischer Bachmuschelpopulationen (*Unio crassus* Phil. 1788) und dessen Abhängigkeit von Umweltparametern. – Diss. Univ. Bayreuth, Bayreuther Forum Ökologie, Bd. 50, 163 S.

RAT DER EUROPÄISCHEN GEMEINSCHAFTEN (1992): Richtlinie92 / 43 / EWG Des Rates vom 21. Mai 1992 zur Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensräume sowie der wildlebenden Tiere und Pflanzen. – 1992: L 206/7 -L 206/50.

SCHERFOSE, V., A. HAGIUS, C. KLÄR, G. NICLAS, J. SAUERBORN, B. SCHWEPPE-KRAFT & U. STEER (1996): Förderprogramm zur Errichtung und Sicherung schutzwürdiger Teile von Natur und Landschaft mit gesamtstaatlich repräsentativer Bedeutung. Naturschutzgroßprojekte und Gewässerrandstreifenprogramm. – Natur und Landschaft 71 (7/8): 283 -286.

The authors



Dr. Reinhard Altmüller, born 1948, studied biology and read for his doctorate at the Georg-August-Universität at Göttingen. Since 1976 he has been responsible for Invertebrates at the Lower Saxony Specialist Agency for Nature Conservancy. One focus of his job has been to investigate the organisms of running waters, especially the freshwater pearl mussel, and the development of ways to improve their habitats.



Rainer Dettmer, born 1955, studied biology at Hanover. In his dissertation he investigated the biology of the freshwater pearl mussel (1982). Since then he has worked on the biology and conservation of naiads and other limnological questions, especially electro fishing, funded by different institutions (TiHo Hannover, Lower Saxony State Agency for Ecology, NLWKN, Nature Conservation Organisations, Nature Conservation Council).

Impressum

Editor:

Lower Saxony Water Management, Coastal Defence and Nature Conservation Agency [Niedersächsischer Landesbetrieb für Wasserwirtschaft, Küsten- und Naturschutz (NLWKN) – Fachbehörde für Naturschutz –]

The "Informationsdienst Naturschutz Niedersachsen" is published at least 4 x a year. ISSN 0934-7135 http://www.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/master/C14754742_N14750639_L20_D0_I5231158.html Reprints only with the permission of the editor.

The authors are responsible for the factual contents.

1. edition 2006, 1 - 3.000

Fotos: R. Altmüller ©.

Fig. 13 u. 14 (page 13) from "BLESS, R. (1992): Einsichten in die Ökologie der Elritze *Phoxinus phoxinus* (L.). Praktische Grundlagen zum Schutz einer gefährdeten Fischart. – Schr.-Reihe für Landschaftspflege und Naturschutz 35" kindly allowed by the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (Bundesamt für Naturschutz), Bonn.

Origin of the topographic maps:

Source: Extract from geospatial basic data of the Surveying and Cadastral Authority of Lower Saxony, Germany **BLGN**

Cartography: Peter Schader, NLWKN – Naturschutz – Editorship: Manfred Rasper, NLWKN – Naturschutz –

Authors address:

Dr. Reinhard Altmüller NLWKN, Betriebsstelle Hannover-Hildesheim Göttinger Chaussee 76 A, 30453 Hannover reinhard.altmueller@nlwkn-h.niedersachsen.de

Rainer Dettmer Giesener Str. 13 30519 Hannover

Order:

Niedersächsischer Landesbetrieb für Wasserwirtschaft, Küsten- und Naturschutz (NLWKN) – Naturschutzinformation –

Postfach 91 07 13, 30427 Hannover e-mail: naturschutzinformation@nlwkn-h.niedersachsen.de fon: 0511 / 3034-3305 fax: 0511 / 3034-3501 www.nlwkn.de > Naturschutz > Veröffentlichungen