

## Recent biological invasion may hasten invasional meltdown by accelerating historical introductions

Edwin D. Grosholz

*PNAS* 2005;102;1088-1091; originally published online Jan 18, 2005;  
doi:10.1073/pnas.0308547102

**This information is current as of March 2007.**

<b>Online Information &amp; Services</b>	High-resolution figures, a citation map, links to PubMed and Google Scholar, etc., can be found at: <a href="http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/4/1088">www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/4/1088</a>
<b>References</b>	This article cites 6 articles, 2 of which you can access for free at: <a href="http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/4/1088#BIBL">www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/4/1088#BIBL</a>  This article has been cited by other articles: <a href="http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/4/1088#otherarticles">www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/4/1088#otherarticles</a>
<b>E-mail Alerts</b>	Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article or <a href="#">click here</a> .
<b>Rights &amp; Permissions</b>	To reproduce this article in part (figures, tables) or in entirety, see: <a href="http://www.pnas.org/misc/rightperm.shtml">www.pnas.org/misc/rightperm.shtml</a>
<b>Reprints</b>	To order reprints, see: <a href="http://www.pnas.org/misc/reprints.shtml">www.pnas.org/misc/reprints.shtml</a>

Notes:

# Recent biological invasion may hasten invasional meltdown by accelerating historical introductions

Edwin D. Grosholz\*

Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

Edited by G. David Tilman, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, and approved December 7, 2004 (received for review December 22, 2003)

**Biological invasions are rapidly producing planet-wide changes in biodiversity and ecosystem function. In coastal waters of the U.S., >500 invaders have become established, and new introductions continue at an increasing rate. Although most species have little impact on native communities, some initially benign introductions may occasionally turn into damaging invasions, although such introductions are rarely documented. Here, I demonstrate that a recently introduced crab has resulted in the rapid spread and increase of an introduced bivalve that had been rare in the system for nearly 50 yr. This increase has occurred through the positive indirect effects of predation by the introduced crab on native bivalves. I used field and laboratory experiments to show that the mechanism is size-specific predation interacting with the different reproductive life histories of the native (protandrous hermaphrodite) and the introduced (dioecious) bivalves. These results suggest that positive interactions among the hundreds of introduced species that are accumulating in coastal systems could result in the rapid transformation of previously benign introductions into aggressively expanding invasions. Even if future management efforts reduce the number of new introductions, given the large number of species already present, there is a high potential for positive interactions to produce many future management problems. Given that invasional meltdown is now being documented in natural systems, I suggest that coastal systems may be closer to this threshold than currently believed.**

nonindigenous | predation | indirect effects | green crabs

The impacts of biological invasions now rank among the most pervasive threats to native ecosystems and human economies (1–5). Nonnative introduced species are accumulating in coastal systems worldwide at an increasing rate, and >500 species have become established in the coastal waters of the U.S. (6–9). The majority of these introduced species are believed to have minimal impact on native species and ecosystem processes (10); however, some species may change from a low-impact introduction to an acute management threat. The rates at which these transformations occur and how they take place have been almost entirely unknown for any system until now. In this study, I demonstrate that transformation from a benign introduction to an expanding invasion can result from positive interactions among invaders. Given the large number of introduced species in coastal systems, there is an increasing likelihood that such transformations due to positive interactions among invaders could produce a positive feedback cycle similar to the invasional meltdown scenario now being documented in other natural systems (11–13).

Unlike early models of biological invasions that emphasized the deterrent effects of species diversity on subsequent invasions (14), modern views of invasion now include positive interactions as a force influencing invasion success (11–13, 15). This view parallels the increasing recognition of the importance of positive interactions, particularly in marine habitats, where the emphasis had been on negative interactions such as predation and competition (16, 17). Most models that discuss positive interactions among introduced species typically fall into one of three categories (12, 15). The first category suggests

that, as the number of introduced species increases, this disturbance destabilizes native populations and makes the system more easily invaded. A second category, which is the most widely discussed, posits that early invaders produce a qualitative change in the system that facilitates the establishment and spread of subsequent invaders. A third category contends that more recent invaders can produce changes in the system that can result in the acceleration and expansion of an earlier invasion. This third category typically focuses on the direct effects of a new introduction, such as the introduction of a new specialist pollinator, but rarely have the direct effects of recent introductions on older introductions been investigated at the population level. What has not been seriously discussed is the potential for the indirect effects of positive interactions among invaders. The increasing number of new invaders and the large number of older introductions strongly suggest that positive indirect interactions among invaders are likely to become increasingly common.

Here, I demonstrate at the population level that a recent invader has rapidly turned a historically benign introduction into a quickly expanding invasion. This transformation has resulted from the positive indirect effects of predation mediated through the presence of a third prey species. A recently introduced crab, by preferentially consuming native clams, has rapidly accelerated the invasion of a clam that was introduced nearly 50 yr earlier and had for decades maintained a very restricted and nearly static distribution. These results demonstrate an important mechanism by which recent introductions can rapidly transform older, benign introductions into aggressive invaders.

## Methods

**Site and Invasion History.** I have documented a dramatic increase in the distribution and abundance of introduced eastern gem clams *Gemma gemma*, which are native to the eastern U.S., in Bodega Harbor, CA (38° 19' N, 123° 04' W), where they have been established since at least the 1960s and likely earlier (18–20). Bodega Harbor is a largely marine embayment with mostly coarse, sandy mud substrate and limited, seasonal freshwater input that influences salinity only during winter storm events. Estimated flushing times are on the order of days (J. Largier, personal communication), and water temperatures within the bay are typically within 5–10° of ocean surface waters. *G. gemma* was first introduced to the western U.S. in the late 1800s by means of the oyster trade and is now established at several sites between Humboldt Bay and Monterey Bay in central California, including the current study site (20). I show that the rapid increase in *G. gemma* is the result of the introduction of the European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*), which was first introduced to the western U.S. in San Francisco Bay around 1989. It became established outside of San Francisco Bay in nearby estuaries including Bodega Harbor in 1994 and is now common

This paper was submitted directly (Track II) to the PNAS office.

\*E-mail: tedgrosholz@ucdavis.edu.

© 2005 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA






Fig. 2. Plot of the abundance of *Nutricola* spp. (*N. confusa* and *N. tantilla*) vs. *G. gemma* vs. sample year (1995–2002) for all study sites. Each point represents the mean clam abundance for each site and year measured at the upper tidal height where the highest densities of both natives and invaders cooccurred. Circle, Reserve; triangle, Gaffney; square, Westside; inverted triangle, Marsh; diamond, Doran.

at higher densities at sites where *Nutricola* spp. densities are lower (Fig. 2). Sites that are farthest from the Marsh Site (Gaffney and Reserve; see Fig. 2) have been colonized by *G. gemma* more recently, so densities there are lower for both *Nutricola* spp. and *G. gemma*. There is also unexplained variation in the time series (including significant declines in 2001 for both *Nutricola* spp. and *C. maenas* that are currently unaccounted for). These declines were unrelated to weather or other measured variables; however, the consequences of this atypical year were apparently short-lived.

**Predation Experiments.** In laboratory trials, I verified that green crabs strongly prefer to consume *Nutricola* spp. Green crabs ate *Nutricola* spp. (mean survival =  $25.6 \pm 6.5\%$  SE) at more than twice the rate they consumed introduced *G. gemma* (mean survival  $60 \pm 6.6\%$  SE), and this difference was highly significant ( $F = 14.1$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.002$ ). This preference for *G. gemma* was largely driven by size differences, as demonstrated in other lab trials. Green crabs consumed larger adult *Nutricola* spp. at roughly three times the rate they consumed smaller juvenile *Nutricola* spp. that were the same size as adult *G. gemma* ( $P < 0.01$ ).

**Competition Experiments.** The results from the first field competition experiment demonstrated that currently reduced densities of *Nutricola* spp. (typically now 1,000 per  $m^2$ ) due to bay-wide predation by introduced green crabs no longer provide a competitive obstacle to expansion by *G. gemma*. At these lower densities, I found no evidence of interspecific competitive effects of *N. confusa* on *G. gemma* growth ( $F = 0.78$ ,  $df = 4,35$ ,  $P > 0.54$ ) or *G. gemma* survival ( $F = 1.17$ ,  $df = 4,34$ ,  $P > 0.33$ ) (Fig. 3A). *N. confusa* had much greater growth rates than *G. gemma* in all treatment combinations.

The results of the second field competition experiment, which included high densities equivalent to those before the green crab invasion, showed strong interspecific competitive effects of native *N. confusa* on growth of the introduced *G. gemma*. Growth of *G. gemma* was 52% less in the high interspecific




Fig. 3. The results of field experiments measuring interspecific competitive effects of *N. confusa* on growth and survival of *G. gemma*. (A) Plot of first field experiment examining interspecific competitive effects of *N. confusa* on *G. gemma* (see Methods) at low and medium densities. There were no significant differences in the growth of *G. gemma* when comparing low-density treatments with 20 *G. gemma* (20G) vs. 10 *G. gemma* and 10 *N. confusa* (10G plus 10N) or medium-density treatments with 40 *G. gemma* (40G) vs. 20 *G. gemma* and 20 *N. confusa* (20G plus 20N) (see Competition Experiments for statistical results). (B) Plot of second field experiment examining interspecific competitive effects of *N. confusa* on *G. gemma* (see Methods) at medium and higher densities. There was a significant decline (52%) in the growth of *G. gemma* at the high-density treatment with 40 *G. gemma* together with 40 *N. confusa* (40G plus 40N) relative to medium-density treatment with 40 *G. gemma* (40G) or high conspecific densities 80 *G. gemma* (80G) (see Competition Experiments for statistical results).

competition treatments with *N. confusa*, compared with the medium density or high density conspecific treatments ( $F = 11.55$ ,  $df = 2,21$ ,  $P < 0.0005$ ) (Fig. 3B). Survival was also slightly lower in the high-density treatment, but not significantly so ( $P > 0.50$ ).

**Extrinsic Factors.** I found no significant relationship between the distribution of *G. gemma* or *Nutricola* spp. and ocean and atmospheric variables including minimum, maximum, and mean sea surface temperatures, mean and minimum daily low air temperature, mean and maximum daily high air temperatures, and annual total, monthly mean, and monthly maximum rainfall. Of these variables, only mean ( $P = 0.026$ ) and minimum ( $P = 0.029$ ) daily low air temperatures showed any association with *G. gemma* density, and paradoxically high clam densities were associated with low temperatures, making this an unlikely mechanism.

## Discussion

The results presented here are among the first to demonstrate the population level consequences of a new invader rapidly

transforming a historically benign introduction into an aggressively expanding invasion. This study shows that this transformation can be the result of positive indirect interactions among invaders. Examples of positive interactions among invaders have been known or suspected in several other systems. For example, the introduction of new specialist pollinators can greatly increase seed production through direct effects on previously introduced plants (15). In coastal systems, a recent study has shown positive indirect interactions among two new invaders, an introduced alga (*Codium fragile* ssp. *tomentosoides*) and a bryozoan (*Membranipora membranacea*), that are simultaneously invading the Gulf of Maine (29). However, the population level consequences of either direct or indirect effects of new invaders on older invasions have not been demonstrated for most systems.

The disproportionately greater impact of green crab predation on the native clams is the result of differences in both adult size and life history between the native and introduced species. The experiments described above show that green crabs strongly prefer larger clams; and native *Nutricola* spp. are significantly larger (means of 5–6 mm, maximum >7 mm) than the introduced *G. gemma* (means of 3–4 mm, maximum <5 mm). Also, both *Nutricola* species are protandrous hermaphrodites; thus, all individuals >4 mm are reproductive females (24, 26). Therefore, as the green crabs selectively prey on larger *Nutricola* spp., they disproportionately consume large, reproductive females. The introduced *G. gemma* is dioecious with no external sexual dimorphism (27, 28), so green crabs consume approximately equal numbers of males and females. Consequently, the per capita impact of green crab predation on population growth is much greater for the native clams. It might be expected that, as the number of *Nutricola* spp. eventually declined, green crabs would have rapidly increased their consumption of *G. gemma*. Although this switch may have occurred to some degree, the

observed increase in *G. gemma* abundance suggests that the generalist green crabs switched to other prey including polychaetes and small crustaceans, which they readily consume in the native range (30).

In the competition experiments, the results from the lower density treatments demonstrate the absence of competition at current densities and support the idea that *Nutricola* spp. are not now an obstacle to the spread of *G. gemma*. However, the results from higher density treatments suggest that the historically high densities of native *Nutricola* spp. likely competitively suppressed *G. gemma* by substantially reducing growth and, as a consequence, also reducing size-dependent reproduction. This result suggests that the distribution of *G. gemma* was restricted for many decades until the release from competition with *Nutricola* spp. after the green crab invasion.

In conclusion, the data presented suggest that it is possible for a new invader to transform an older invader into a serious new management problem by means of positive indirect interactions that may produce an invasional meltdown. In areas that have already been heavily invaded, simply reducing the numbers of new introductions may not be a sufficient strategy for management. Rather, in addition to preventing future introductions, it may be necessary to mitigate the impacts of exotic species that have already become established, while realizing that such mitigations may, themselves, have unexpected impacts because of indirect interactions.

I thank R. Tinsman, C. Sorte, and C. Juhasz for many hours of expert assistance in the laboratory and field. I thank two reviewers, and I also thank J. Carlton, J. Maron, G. Ruiz, and J. Stachowicz for discussions of the ideas and/or critical reviews of earlier drafts of the manuscript. I thank the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/Sea Grant Partnership Program (to E.D.G.) for partial support of this work.

- Chapin, F. S., Zavaleta, E. S., Eviner, V. T., Naylor, R. L., Vitousek, P. M., Reynolds, H. L., Hooper, D. U., Lavorel, S., Sala, O. E., Hobbie, S. E., *et al.* (2000) *Nature* **405**, 234–242.
- Sala, O. E., Chapin, F. S., Armesto, J. J., Berlow, E., Bloomfield, J., Dirzo, R., Huber-Sanwald, E., Huenneke, L. F., Jackson, R. B., Kinzig, A., *et al.* (2000) *Science* **287**, 1770–1774.
- Mooney, H. A. & Hobbs, R. J. (2000) *Invasive Species in a Changing World* (Island Press, Washington, DC).
- Mack, R. N., Simberloff, D., Lonsdale, W. M., Evans, H., Clout, M. & Bazzaz, F. A. (2000) *Ecol. Appl.* **10**, 689–710.
- Wilcove, D. S., Rothstein, D., Dubow, J., Phillips, A. & Losos, E. (1998) *Bioscience* **48**, 607–615.
- Cohen, A. N. & J. T. Carlton. (1998) *Science* **279**, 555–558.
- Ruiz, G. M., Rawlings, T. K., Dobbs, F. C., Drake, L. A., Mullady, T., Huq, A. & Colwell, R. R. (2000) *Nature* **408**, 49–50.
- Ruiz, G. M., Carlton, J. T., Grosholz, E. D. & Hines, A. H. (1997) *Am. Zool.* **37**, 619–630.
- Ruiz, G. M., Fofonoff, P. W., Carlton, J. T., Wonham, M. J. & Hines, A. H. (2000) *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **31**, 481–531.
- Williamson, M. H. (1996) *Biological Invasions* (Chapman & Hall, London).
- O'Dowd, D. J., Green, P. T. & Lake, P. S. (2003) *Ecol. Lett.* **6**, 812–817.
- Simberloff, D. S. & Von Holle, B. (1999) *Biol. Invasions* **1**, 21–32.
- Ricciardi, A. (2001) *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **58**, 2513–2525.
- Elton, C. S. (1958) *The Ecology of Invasions by Plants and Animals* (Methuen, London).
- Richardson, D. M., Allsopp, N., D'Antonio, C. M., Milton, S. J. & Rejmanek, M. (2000) *Biol. Rev.* **75**, 65–93.
- Bruno, J. F., Stachowicz, J. & Bertness, M. D. (2003) *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **18**, 119–125.
- Bertness, M. D., Hay, M. H. & Gaines, S. D. (2001) *Marine Community Ecology* (Sinauer, Sunderland, MA).
- Hanna, G. D. (1939) *Bull. Calif. Dep. Agric.* **28**, 298–321.
- Light, S. F. (1974) *Intertidal Invertebrates of the Central California Coast* (Univ. of California Press, Berkeley).
- Carlton, J. T. (1999) *Malacologia* **41**, 439–454.
- Grosholz, E. D., Ruiz, G. M., Dean, C. A., Shirley, K. A., Maron, J. L. & Connors, P. G. (2000) *Ecology* **81**, 1206–1224.
- Ruiz, G. M. (1987) Ph.D. dissertation (Univ. of California, Berkeley).
- Ronan, T. E. (1975) Ph.D. dissertation (Univ. of California, Davis).
- Ruiz, G. M., Connors, P. G., Griffin, S. E. & Pitelka, F. A. (1989) *Condor* **91**, 562–570.
- Asson-Batres, M. A. (1988) *Veliger* **30**, 257–267.
- Narchi, W. (1971) *Bull. Mar. Sci.* **21**, 866–885.
- Sellmer, G. P. (1967) *Malacologia* **5**, 137–223.
- Thompson, J. K. (1982) *Veliger* **24**, 281–290.
- Levin, P. S., Coyer, J. A., Petrik, R. & Good, T. P. (2002) *Ecology* **83**, 3182–3193.
- Scherer, B. & Reise, K. (1982) *Kiel. Meeresforsch. Sond.* **5**, 490–500.