The South African Scoring System (SASS) Version 5 Rapid Bioassessment Method for Rivers

CWS Dickens* and PM Graham

Hydrobiology, Umgeni Water, PO Box 9, Pietermaritzburg 3200, South Africa * Corresponding author, e-mail: chris.dickens@umgeni.co.za

Received 26 March 2002, accepted 12 April 2002

The assessment of biota in rivers is a widely recognised means of determining the condition or 'health' of rivers. Benthic macroinvertebrates, in particular, are recognised as valuable organisms for bioassessments, due largely to their visibility to the naked eye, ease of identification, rapid life cycle often based on the seasons and their largely sedentary habits. Numerous bioassessment techniques have been developed over the last three decades, varying in complexity and region of implementation. South Africa has an exemplary history in this field, culminating in the refinement of invertebrate and other techniques and their application in a National River Health Programme. The method presented here is a refinement of the highly successful SASS (South African Scoring System) method developed by Chutter (1994), which forms the backbone of this programme. This paper takes the method to a level where it can, and has been, accredited to ISO standards. The principal changes made include the tighter definition of the technique and the sampling and analytical methods, as well as the introduction of quality control procedures. Some changes have also been made to the list of invertebrates used in this method.

Field trials were conducted to test the variability of the method. Of the various indices available to the method, the Average Score per Taxon (ASPT) is the most consistent over all biotopes (lowest CV%). On the other hand, of the biotopes examined the Gravel/Sand/Mud (GSM) combination is the most variable with respect to the SASS Score and number of taxa encountered. The spatial variability on a reach of river with similar water quality characteristics was found to be statistically negligible. However, one generally finds that statistically significant differences occur between the SASS Scores and the number of taxa counted by different operators. The ASPT, on the other hand, is a more consistent and repeatable measure of river health assessment and, within a given reach of river and considering all biotopes, the differences in results produced by different operators were statistically negligible. The results highlight the need for appropriate competency-based training and consistent application of the method.

Keywords: bioassessment, aquatic invertebrates, biotic index, method, health, water quality, rivers, South Africa

Table 1: The SASS Version 5 scoring sheet

SASS Version 5 Score Sheet	Taxon		s	Veg	GSM	тот	Taxon		s	Veg	GSM	тот	Taxon		s	Veg	GSM	тот
	PORIFERA	5	1	1	+		HEMIPTERA		1	-	1		DIPTERA			1	1	
Date: / /200	COELENTERATA	1	1	1	+		Belostomatidae*	3				l	Athericidae	10	1			1
	TURBELLARIA	3	1	1			Corixidae*	3	1				Blepharoceridae	15		1	-	
Collector:	ANNELIDA		1	1	· · · ·		Gerridae*	5					Ceratopogonidae	5				
	Oligochaeta	1			1 1	1 '	Hydrometridae*	6					Chironomidae	2				
Grid Reference: WGS-84 Cape datum	Leeches	3	1	1	· · · ·		Naucoridae*	7					Culicidae*	1				
S: ° ' , " E: ° ' , "	CRUSTACEA	1	1	1			Nepidae*	3					Dixidae*	10				
	Amphipoda	13			1 1	1 '	Notonectidae*	3					Empididae	6		1		
Site code:	Potamonautidae*	3	1	1	· · · ·		Pleidae*	4					Ephydridae	3				
	Atyidae	8	1	1	1		Veliidae/Mveliidae*	5					Muscidae	1		1		
River:	Palaemonidae	10	1	1	1		MEGALOPTERA						Psychodidae	1		1		
	HYDRACARINA	8	1	1			Corydalidae	8				ĺ	Simuliidae	5		1	-	
Site description:	PLECOPTERA		1	1			Sialidae	6					Syrphidae*	1				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Notonemouridae	14				1 '	TRICHOPTERA						Tabanidae	5				
Weather Condition:	Perlidae	12	1	1	++		Dipseudopsidae	10				l	Tipulidae	5				— 1
	EPHEMEROPTERA						Ecnomidae	8					GASTROPODA	<u> </u>				
Temp:°C pH:	Baetidae 1sp	4				1 '	Hydropsychidae 1 sp	4					Ancvlidae	6				1 '
	Baetidae 2 sp	6	1	1	<u>├</u>		Hvdropsychidae 2 sp	6					Bulininae*	3				
DO:mg/l Cond:mS/m	Baetidae > 2 sp	12	1	1	++		Hvdropsvchidae > 2 sp	12					Hvdrobiidae*	3		<u> </u>		
	Caenidae	6	1	1	++		Philopotamidae	10					l vmnaeidae*	3		<u> </u>		
Biotopes sampled:	Ephemeridae	15	+	+		<u> </u>	Polycentropodidae	12					Physidae*	3				<u> </u>
SIC Timeminutes	Hentageniidae	13	1	1	++		Psychomyijdae/Xiphocen	8					Planorbinae*	3				
SOOC	Lentophlebiidae	9	1	1	++		Cased caddis:						Thiaridae*	3		<u> </u>		
Average size of stonescm	Oligoneuridae	15	1	1	++		Barbarochthonidae SWC	13	I		I		Viviparidae* ST	5		<u> </u>	<u>├</u>	
Bedrock	Polymitarcvidae	10	-	-	++		Calamoceratidae ST	11					PELECYPODA	ا ا				
Aquatic veg'n Dom sp	Prosopistomatidae	15	+	+		<u> </u>	Glossosomatidae SWC	11					Corbiculidae	5				1
MvedIC Dom. sp.	Teloganodidae SWC	12	+	+	+		Hydroptilidae	6					Sphaeriidae	3		<u> </u>	<u>├</u> ──	
MvegOOCDom. sp.	Tricorythidae	9	+	+	+	<u> </u>	Hydrosalpingidae SWC	15					Unionidae	6				<u> </u>
Gravel Sand	ODONATA	Ť	+	+		<u> </u>	Lepidostomatidae	10					SASS Score					<u> </u>
Mud	Calontervoidae ST T	10				1 '	Leptoceridae	6					No of Taxa					
Hand picking/Visual observation	Chlorocyphidae	10	+	+	+	<u> </u>	Petrothrincidae SWC	11					ASPT					l
Flow: Low/Medium/High/Flood	Chlorolestidae	8	+	+	├ ──	<u> </u>	Pisulijdae	10										
Turbidity: Low/Medium/High	Coenagrionidae	4	+	+		<u> </u>	Sericostomatidae SWC	13					Sample collection (offort	evceer	de meth	od2	
Rinarian land use:	Lestidae	8	+	+		<u> </u>		10					Gample Concourt	511011	EXCCCC	15 11:001	ou :	•
Ripanan and use.	Platycnemidae	10	+	+		<u> </u>	Dytiscidae*	5										
Disturbance in the river: eq. sandwinning	Protoneuridae	8	+	+		<u> </u>	Elmidae/Dr/opidae*	8					Other biota inclu	dina	iuwoni	loc ·		
cattle drinking point floods etc	Aeshnidae	8	+	+	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Cyrinidae*	5	<u> </u>					ung	Juvenn	165.		
calle drinking point, noods etc.	Corduliidae		+	+	+	t'	Uplinlidae*	5	-				4					
	Comphidae	6	+	+	—	<u>+</u> '		12	<u> </u>				4					
Observations: or small and calcur of	Gompriuae	4			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Heloqiuae	14										
Observations: eg. smen and colour of		4	+	+	↓ ′	└── '	Hydraenidae	8			ļ!		Comments:					
water, petroleum, dead fish, etc.	LEPIDOPIERA	10			'	1 '	Hydrophilidae	5			ļ!		-					
	Pyralidae	12			<u> </u>	 '	Limnichidae	10	Ļ				-					
						1 .	Psephenidae	10				1						

Procedure: 'Kick SIC & bedrock for 2 mins, max. 5 mins; Kick SOOC & bedrock for 1 min; Sweep marginal vegetation (IC & OOC) for 2m total and aquatic veg $1m^2$; Stir & sweep gravel, sand, mud for 1 min total; * = airbreathers; Hand picking & visual observation for 1 min — record in biotope where found; Score for 15 mins/biotope but stop if no new taxa seen after 5 mins; 'Estimate abundances: 1 = 1, A = 2–10, B = 10–100, C = 100–1 000, D = >1 000; S = Stone, rock & solid objects; Veg = All vegetation; GSM = Gravel, sand, mud; SWC = South Western Cape; T = Tropical; ST = Sub-tropical; Rate each biotope sampled: 1 = very poor (i.e. limited diversity), 5 = highly suitable (i.e. wide diversity)