

**ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT
HERITAGE DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

Invertebrate Abstract

Element Code: IMGASJ0390

Data Sensitivity: No

CLASSIFICATION, NOMENCLATURE, DESCRIPTION, RANGE

NAME: *Pyrgulopsis deserta*

COMMON NAME: Desert Springsnail, Virgin Springsnail, St. George Snail

SYNONYMS: *Amnicola deserta*

FAMILY: Hydrobiidae

AUTHOR, PLACE OF PUBLICATION: Pilsbry H.A. 1916. New Species of *Amnicola* from New Mexico and Utah. Nautilus 29:111-112.

TYPE LOCALITY: "Pilsbry (1916:111) gave the type-locality as 'Washington County, Utah.' We suspect that the spring in Middleton (USNM 847210) may actually be the type locality as specimens from the spring very closely resemble the holotype" (Hershler and Landye, 1988).

TYPE SPECIMEN: Holotype, ANSP 12112, USNM 847210. J.J. Landye. 21 February 1977.

TAXONOMIC UNIQUENESS:

DESCRIPTION: Small species. Shell height is 1.2 to 2.0 mm (0.05-0.08 in) with globose to ovate-conic shell. Shell with 3.25 to 4.25 whorls with well-rounded, unshouldered whorls. Shape variation evident not only among, but also within populations. Penis is of moderate size, with enlarged filament bearing (on dorsal surface) elongate glandular ridge; ventral penial surface with two to three additional ridges. Melanic pigmentation of head-foot varying from dark throughout (except for tentacle and snout tips and sole of foot) in some populations, to a light dusting on all surfaces or even absent in others. All hydrobioids have a foot with a rounded posterior end.

AIDS TO IDENTIFICATION: Due to the small size of this animal, it cannot be identified to species in the field but must be identified in a laboratory by a qualified authority. Therefore, to obtain specimens sift sand believed to contain the snail through an ordinary kitchen strainer. The rule of thumb, that springsnail species are specific to a particular location (i.e. a single spring or group of springs connected or close to each other), may be used as a means of preliminary identification.

ILLUSTRATIONS:

Line drawings (Hershler and Landye, 1988)

Photographs of shells (Hershler and Landye, 1988)

Scanning electronic microscope micrographs of radula (Hershler and Landye, 1988)

TOTAL RANGE: Springs along the Virgin River in southwestern Utah and northwestern Arizona.

RANGE WITHIN ARIZONA: Unidentified springs in the Littlefield area, Mohave County.

SPECIES BIOLOGY AND POPULATION TRENDS

BIOLOGY: The hydrobioid digestive system is typical of style-bearing neotaenioglossans. The mouth opens to a short oral area containing a pair of dorsolateral chitinous jaws composed of small, simple rodlets, immediately behind which is a well-developed buccal mass (situated within the snout). A pair of simple, unbranched, tubular salivary glands opens anterodorsally to the buccal cavity and (almost always) pass posteriorly over the nerve ring, rarely stopping short of the ring, but never passing through it in hydrobioids. Hydrobioids have a taenioglossate radula (i.e., seven teeth per row) comprising numerous rows of cusped teeth, each of which includes a typically squarish or trapezoidal central tooth flanked on each side by lateral, inner marginal, and outer marginal teeth. Teeth near the anterior end of the radula are often worn or broken, whereas the proximal portion of the ribbon has several to many rows of poorly differentiated or incompletely formed teeth. (Hershler and Ponder, 1998).

REPRODUCTION: Most hydrobioids are oviparous, with females depositing small egg capsules, either singly or (rarely) in strings, on the substrate. A small number of hydrobioids are ovoviviparous, in which female's brood shelled young in the pallial gonoduct. Hydrobioid egg capsules are typically hemispherical to spherical. Copulation in hydrobioids is usually via an anterior opening to the glandular oviduct. The ventral channel may be traversed at least in part by the penis, but it is more likely that the penis only enters the anterior most section. (Hershler and Ponder, 1998).

FOOD HABITS: Unknown

HABITAT: Unknown

ELEVATION: 1,870-1,900 (570-580 m) According to AGFD, HDMS unpublished records accessed 1-13-03.

PLANT COMMUNITY: Unknown

POPULATION TRENDS: Unknown

SPECIES PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT STATUS: None
STATE STATUS: 1 (AZGFD, AWCS 2022)
[1A (AGFD SWAP 2012)]

OTHER STATUS:

Not Forest Service Sensitive (USDA, FS Region 3 2007)
[Forest Service Sensitive (USDA, FS Region 3 1999)]
Bureau of Land Management Sensitive (USDI, BLM AZ 2000, 2005, 2008, 2010)

MANAGEMENT FACTORS: **Threats:** potential water projects such as spring capping and development; highway construction; land exchanges allowing development of habitat.
Management needs: protection of remaining spring sources; periodic monitoring of populations and their habitats; research on ecology and systematics.

PROTECTIVE MEASURES TAKEN: Unknown

SUGGESTED PROJECTS: A range-wide survey to determine the distribution is critically needed, as is basic information on ecology, life cycle, and population dynamics. Another important need is the development of a monitoring protocol to assess population size.

LAND MANAGEMENT/OWNERSHIP: Private

SOURCES OF FURTHER INFORMATION**REFERENCES:**

- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2012. Arizona's State Wildlife Action Plan 2012-2022. Phoenix, AZ.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2022. Arizona Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2022-2032. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona. 378 pages.
- Bequaert, J.C. and W.B. Miller. 1973. The mollusks of the arid southwest. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson Arizona. Pp. 220-223.
- Hershler, R. and J.J. Landye. 1988. Arizona Hydrobiidae (Prosobranchia: Rissoacea). Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology. Number 459:17-20.
- Hershler, R. and W.F. Ponder. 1998. A Review of Morphological Characters of Hydrobioid Snails. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2003. Version 1.6. Arlington, Virginia, USA: NatureServe. Available: <https://explorer.natureserve.org/>. (Accessed: January 13, 2004).
- State of Utah Natural Resources: Available:
<http://dwrcdc.nr.utah.gov/rsgis2/Search/Display.asp?F1Nm=pyrgdese>.
- USDA, Forest Service Region 3. 1999. Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List.
- USDA, Forest Service Region 3. 1999. Regional Forester's List of Sensitive Animals.
- USDI, Bureau of Land Management. 2000. Arizona BLM Sensitive Species List. Instruction Memorandum No. AZ-2000-018.
- USDI, Bureau of Land Management. 2005. Arizona BLM Sensitive Species List.

USDI, Bureau of Land Management Region 2. 2008. Arizona BLM Sensitive Species List.
USDI, Bureau of Land Management Region 2. 2010. Arizona BLM Sensitive Species List.

MAJOR KNOWLEDGEABLE INDIVIDUALS:

Bob Hershler, Department of Invertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
Jerry Landye - USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service, Pinetop, Arizona.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Revised: 1992-04-23 (DBI)
1992-08-25 (DBI)
1993-06-24 (DBI)
2001-10-31 (SMS)
2004-01-13 (AMS)
2023-01-12 (MBL)

To the user of this abstract: you may use the entire abstract or any part of it. We do request, however, that if you make use of this abstract in plans, reports, publications, etc. that you credit the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Please use the following citation:

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 20XX (= **year of last revision as indicated at end of abstract**). X...X (= **taxon of animal or plant**). Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. X pp.