



## Great Crested Newt Habitat Suitability Index

May 2010

### Background

The Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) for the great crested newt was developed by Oldham *et al.* (2000). HSI scoring systems were originally developed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service as a means of evaluating habitat quality and quantity. An HSI is a numerical index, between 0 and 1. Values close to 0 indicate unsuitable habitat, 1 represents optimal habitat. The HSI for the great crested newt incorporates ten suitability indices, all of which are factors known to affect this species. These ten suitability indices are retained in this current Advice Note.

In the HSI system proposed by Oldham *et al.* (2000) one of the suitability indices (SI<sub>1</sub>, terrestrial) involves more lengthy measurement and calculation than the others. In using the HSI system with volunteer surveyors in Kent, Lee Brady has substituted a simpler evaluation of terrestrial habitat quality (a four-point scale), for ease of use.

Several other, local, surveys have utilised the HSI, but incorporating their own variations on the original system. In 2007 a workshop was held at the Herpetofauna Workers' Meeting to evaluate the use of the HSI for the great crested newt, with the aims of:

- Identifying components of the system that may need clarification or refinement
- Agreeing on a standard that can readily be used by volunteers and professionals alike.

The outputs of the workshop and subsequent consultation have been used to formulate the current Advice Note. As far as possible a conservative approach has been adopted in modifying the use of the original HSI suitability indices. However, a major departure is the adoption of Lee Brady's four-point evaluation of terrestrial habitat. This differs from the original HSI in that it has been developed with respect to newt presence/absence at a pond, rather than estimating population size.

### Use and limitations of the HSI

The HSI for great crested newts is a measure of habitat suitability. **It is not a substitute for newt surveys.** In general, ponds with high HSI scores are more likely to support great crested newts than those with low scores. However, the system is not sufficiently precise to conclude that any particular pond with a high score will support newts, or that any pond with a low score will not do so.

There is a positive correlation between HSI scores and the numbers of great crested newts observed. In general, high HSI scores are likely to be associated with greater numbers of great crested newts. The relationship is not sufficiently strong, however, to allow estimations of the numbers of newts in any particular pond.

HSI scoring can be useful in:

- Evaluating the general suitability of a pond, or ponds, for great crested newts
- Comparing general suitability of ponds across different areas
- Evaluating the suitability of receptor ponds in a proposed mitigation scheme
- Identifying habitat management priorities.

### How to collect data and calculate the HSI

The HSI is a geometric mean of ten suitability indices:

$$\text{HSI} = (\text{SI}_1 \times \text{SI}_2 \times \text{SI}_3 \times \text{SI}_4 \times \text{SI}_5 \times \text{SI}_6 \times \text{SI}_7 \times \text{SI}_8 \times \text{SI}_9 \times \text{SI}_{10})^{1/10}$$

- Ten factors are scored for a pond, in the field and from map work (field scores).
- The ten field scores are converted to SI scores, on a scale from 0.01 to 1 (0.01 is used as the lower end of the scale in stead of 0, because multiplying by 0 reduces all other SI scores to 0).
- The ten SI scores are multiplied together.
- The tenth root of this number is calculated ( $x^{1/10}$ ) i.e.  $x$  to the power of 0.1.

The calculated HSI for a pond should score between 1 and close to 0 (the calculations above do not allow the HSI to be exactly 0).


Some of the field scores are categorical, some are numerical. The numerical field scores are converted to SI scores by reading off the values from graphs produced by Oldham *et al.* (2000) reproduced in this Advice Note.

Full details of the scoring system, including descriptions of the criteria used in the categorical scores are given in *Details of suitability indices and definitions of categories* (below). Scores for two of the factors (SI<sub>1</sub> and SI<sub>8</sub>) can be gained as desktop/map exercises and so do not have to be completed in the field. The remaining factors should be recorded as field scores, and later converted to suitability indices, in some cases reading SI scores from the graphs provided. A summary of data to collect is given in the appendix *Summary of scoring system*.

### Categorisation of HSI scores

Lee Brady has developed a system for using HSI scores to define pond suitability for great crested newts on a categorical scale:

HSI	=	Pond suitability
< 0.5	=	poor
0.5-0.59	=	below average
0.6-0.69	=	average
0.7-0.79	=	good
> 0.8	=	excellent



The graph shows occupancy of ponds by great crested newts in south-east England. 248 ponds were surveyed on three to six occasions, using egg-searching, torching and bottle-trapping. As pond suitability increases from 'poor' to 'excellent', so does the proportion of ponds occupied by great crested newts.

### Details of suitability indices and definitions of categories

#### Factor 1. Geographic location (SI<sub>1</sub>)

Sites should be scored according to the zone in which they occur. This scoring can be carried out either in the field, or as part of a desktop exercise.

Zone A, location is optimal, SI = 1

Zone B, location is marginal, SI = 0.5


Zone C, location is unsuitable, SI = 0.01.

Some sites will fall on boundary lines between zones. In such cases, select medium-value scores i.e. Zone B.



## Factor 2. Pond area

Pond area is the surface area of the pond when water is at its highest level (excluding flooding events). This is usually in the spring. If the pond is being measured at another time of year, the spring time area should still be evident from vegetation types and evidence of a draw down zone around the pond.



Pond area should be measured as accurately as possible. There are several ways of doing this, for example by measuring axes of regularly shaped ponds, either by pacing out in the field, or taking measurements from a map. Irregularly shaped ponds may have to be treated as a series of geometric shapes, calculating the area for each and adding together.

Since it can be difficult reading off SI scores from the graph, pond area should be rounded to the nearest 50 m<sup>2</sup>.

It can be particularly difficult to read off SI scores for very small ponds. For ponds smaller than 50 m<sup>2</sup> use a score of 0.05.

For ponds larger than 2000 m<sup>2</sup> omit this factor from the HSI calculation (as there are no data for such large ponds).  
i.e.  $HSI = (SI_1 \times SI_3 \times SI_4 \times SI_5 \times SI_6 \times SI_7 \times SI_8 \times SI_9 \times SI_{10})^{1/9}$ .

## Factor 3. Permanence

Pond permanence should be deduced from local knowledge and personal judgement. A landowner may know how often a pond dries. However, if not, the surveyor should make a judgement based on water level at the time of the survey, and taking seasonality into consideration. For example, a pond that is already dry by late spring is likely to dry out every year, etc.

Category	SI	Criteria
Never dries	0.9	Never dries.
Rarely dries	1.0	Dries no more than two years in ten or only in drought.
Sometimes dries	0.5	Dries between three years in ten to most years.
Dries annually	0.1	Dries annually.


## Factor 4. Water quality

The assessment of water quality is subjective and should be based on invertebrate diversity, the presence of submerged water plants and knowledge of the water sources feeding the pond. Water quality should not be confused with water clarity. Sometimes clear water can be devoid of invertebrates, and turbid ponds can support a wealth of invertebrates. There is no quick and simple invertebrate index of water quality. However, some species are indicators of water quality.

Category	SI	Criteria
Good	1.0	Water supports an abundant and diverse invertebrate community. Netting reveals handfuls of diverse invertebrates, including groups such as mayfly larvae and water shrimps.
Moderate	0.67	Moderate invertebrate diversity
Poor	0.33	Low invertebrate diversity (e.g. species such as midge and mosquito larvae). Few submerged plants.
Bad	0.01	Clearly polluted, only pollution-tolerant invertebrates (such as rat-tailed maggots), no submerged plants.

Other cues may also provide information about water quality. For example, ponds subject to agricultural inputs are likely to have poor water quality.

### Factor 5. Shade



Estimate percentage pond perimeter shaded, to at least 1 m from the shore. Shading is usually from trees, but can include buildings. Shading should not include emergent pond vegetation. The estimate should be made during the period from May to the end of September.

### Factor 6. Waterfowl

This factor is concerned with the impact of waterfowl upon the pond and newts. At high densities, as created when waterfowl are encouraged to use a pond by provision of food, the birds can remove all aquatic vegetation, pollute water and persistently stir sediments. Some waterfowl may also actively hunt adult newts and their larvae. Score as one of three categories.

Category	SI	Criteria
Absent	1	No evidence of waterfowl impact (moorhens may be present).
Minor	0.67	Waterfowl present, but little indication of impact on pond vegetation. Pond still supports submerged plants and banks are not denuded of vegetation.
Major	0.01	Severe impact of waterfowl. Little or no evidence of submerged plants, water turbid, pond banks showing patches where vegetation removed, evidence of provisioning waterfowl.

'Waterfowl' includes most water birds, such as ducks, geese and swans. Moorhens should be excluded because almost every pond has at least one or two.

### Factor 7. Fish

Information on fish should be gleaned from local knowledge and the surveyor's own observations. Pond owners will usually be aware of stocking with fish for commercial or aesthetic reasons. However, stickleback (which can be significant predators of great crested newt larvae, when present in large numbers) are unlikely to be deliberately introduced to a pond, but may arrive through other means. Netting is useful in detecting smaller fish, such as sticklebacks, or the fry of larger species.

Category	SI	Criteria
Absent	1	No records of fish stocking and no fish revealed by netting or observed by torchlight.
Possible	0.67	No evidence of fish, but local conditions suggest that they may be present.
Minor	0.33	Small numbers of crucian carp, goldfish or stickleback known to be present.
Major	0.01	Dense populations of fish known to be present.


### Factor 8. Pond count

This is the number of ponds occurring within 1 km of survey pond. Do not count the survey pond itself. Ponds on the far side of major barriers, such as main roads, should not be counted. Use 1:25,000 scale O.S. data, such as Explorer maps, GIS or web-based mapping sources, such as:

Getamap [www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/getamap/](http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/getamap/)  
 Magic [www.magic.gov.uk/site\\_map.html](http://www.magic.gov.uk/site_map.html)  
 Digimap [edina.ac.uk/digimap/](http://edina.ac.uk/digimap/)

Pond counts can be carried out a by a survey coordinator and so do not necessarily have to be performed by surveyors.

Divide the number of ponds by  $\pi$  (3.14) to calculate the density of ponds per km<sup>2</sup> and read off the SI value from graph.



### Factor 9. Terrestrial habitat


Scoring terrestrial habitat depends on the surveyor’s understanding of newt habitat quality. Good terrestrial habitat offers cover and foraging opportunities and includes meadow, rough grassland with tall sward height, scrub, woodland or mature gardens. Terrestrial habitat should be considered within approximately 250 m from the pond, but only on the near side of any major barriers to dispersal (e.g. main roads or large expanses of bare habitat).

Category	SI	Criteria
Good	1	Habitat that offers good opportunities for foraging and shelter (e.g. most semi-natural environments, such as rough grassland, scrub or woodland, also brownfield sites and low intensity farmland) covers more than 75% of available area.
Moderate	0.67	Habitat offers opportunities for foraging and shelter but may not be extensive (25-75%) of available area.
Poor	0.33	Habitat with poor structure (e.g. amenity grassland, improved pasture and arable) that offers limited opportunities (less than 25% of available area) for foraging and shelter.
None	0.01	No suitable habitat around pond (e.g. centre of arable field or large expanse of bare habitat).

Great crested newts do not have specific terrestrial habitat requirements. However, good quality terrestrial habitat has structure. The presence of hedges, ditches, stone walls, old farm buildings, piles of loose stone or rock, rabbit burrows and small mammal holes all contribute towards ‘good’ terrestrial habitat. Note that it is rare to encounter a pond falling within the terrestrial habitat category of ‘none’.

### Factor 10. Macrophytes

Estimate the percentage of the pond surface area occupied by macrophyte cover. This includes emergents, floating plants (excluding duckweed) and submerged plants reaching the surface. Make an estimate between March and the end of September. Read off the SI value from graph.





## Summary of scoring system

### SI<sub>1</sub> Location

Field score	SI
A (optimal)	1
B (marginal)	0.5
C (unsuitable)	0.01

### SI<sub>2</sub> Pond area

Field score	SI
Measure pond surface area (m <sup>2</sup> ) and round to nearest 50 m <sup>2</sup>	Read off graph.

### SI<sub>3</sub> Pond drying

Field score	SI	Criteria
Never	0.9	Never dries
Rarely	1.0	Dries no more than two years in ten or only in drought.
Sometimes	0.5	Dries between three years in ten to most years
Annually	0.1	Dries annually

### SI<sub>4</sub> Water quality

Field score	SI	Criteria
Good	1.0	Abundant and diverse invertebrate community.
Moderate	0.67	Moderate invertebrate diversity
Poor	0.33	Low invertebrate diversity, few submerged plants
Bad	0.01	Clearly polluted, only pollution-tolerant invertebrates, no submerged plants.

### SI<sub>5</sub> Shade

Field score	SI
Estimate percentage perimeter shaded to a least 1 m from shore.	Read off graph.

### SI<sub>6</sub> Fowl

Field score	SI	Criteria
Absent	1	No evidence of water fowl (although moorhen may be present)
Minor	0.67	Waterfowl present, but little sign of impacts
Major	0.01	Severe impact of waterfowl

### SI<sub>7</sub> Fish

Category	SI	Criteria
Absent	1	No records of fish stocking and no fish revealed during survey.
Possible	0.67	No evidence of fish, but local conditions suggest that they may be present.
Minor	0.33	Small numbers of crucian carp, goldfish or stickleback known to be present.
Major	0.01	Dense populations of fish known to be present.

### SI<sub>8</sub> Pond count

Field score	SI
Count the number of ponds within 1 km of the survey pond (not separated by major barriers) and divide by 3.14. This can be done from maps rather than in the field.	Read off graph.

### SI<sub>9</sub> Terrestrial habitat

Category	SI
Good	1
Moderate	0.67
Poor	0.33
None	0.01

### SI<sub>10</sub> Macrophytes

Field score	SI
Estimate the percentage of the pond surface area occupied by macrophyte cover (between May and the end of September)	Read off graph.