Vol. 9. No. 1. 2019. ©Copyright by CRDEEP Journals. All Rights Reserved.

Contents available at:

www.crdeepjournal.org

International Journal of Life Sciences (ISSN: 2277-193x) SJIF: 5.79



<u>Full Length Research Paper</u> Rarity and Prioritization of Species for Conservation and Management in alpine meadows of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve, West Himalaya, India

S.C. Arya¹ * and S.S. Samant²

¹G.B. Pant National Institute of Himalayan Environment and Sustainable Development, Kosi-Katarmal- 263 643, Almora, Uttarakhand, India

²Himalayan Forest Research Institute, Conifer Campus, Panthaghati, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Corresponding Author: S. C . Arya	Alpine meadows of Indian Himalayan Region are well known for its rich species diversity. These meadows are the home for many native and endemic species. Due to the anthropogenic activities and extraction, population of some of these species is decreasing. Over exploitation and habitat degradation
Article history: Received: 27-12-2019 Accepted: 31-12-2019 Revised: 05-01-2020 Published: 13-01-2020	are the two major factors responsible for decrease in the population of the species. The present study was conducted between the year 1998-2000 to find out the diversity, distribution, habitat preference and threat types of rare and endangered plant species in alpine meadows of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve, West Himalaya, India. A total of 102 species (8 shrubs, 94 herbs including 10 pteridophytes) belonging to 65 genera and 35 families have been identified as threatened from Pindari, Latakharak, Malari and Milam alpine meadows of NDBR. In the present study, 5 species i.e., Athyrium duthiei and
<i>Key words:</i> Himalaya, Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve, Alpine Meadows, Rarity, Prioritization of species	Cypripedium cordigerum (Rare)and Allium stracheyi, Picrorhiza kurrooa and Nardostachys grandiflora (Vulnerable) have been recorded in the Red Data Book of Indian Plants (Nayar & Sastry 1987, 1988, 1990). Using new IUCN criteria, these species along with others have also been categorized as Critically Rare, Endangered, Vulnerable and Low Risk Near Threatened. Promotion of mass scale propagation through conventional and in vitro methods, rehabilitation in the in situ conditions or akin habitats have been suggested for the conservation and management of rare-endangered species. The study suggests that there is a need of population assessment, habitat monitoring using standard ecological methods and use of standard formats for the population biology study, to develop an appropriate strategy for the conservation and management of rare-endangered species and their habitats.

Introduction

The alpine meadows of the Indian Himalavan Region (IHR) are known for the unique species diversity. Due to heavy biotic pressures along with the physical and strategic factors, this unique plant diversity is facing severe threats. The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) has estimated about 10% of the vascular plants of the globe under threat. In the IHR, over exploitation and habitat degradation are the two major factors responsible for decrease in the population of the species (Samant et al., 1998a&b). Studies have been carried out to explore and identify the threatened plants of the protected areas of IHR (Pangtey & Samant, 1988; Samant et al., 1993, 1996a&b, 1998a; Samant, 1994a; Pandey & Well, 1997 and Kala et al., 1998). These studies also included the rare-endangered plants of alpine region. The floristic studies carried out in the Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve have also mentioned the status of species as common, rare, occasional, not common, etc. (Naithani, 1984 & 85; Hajra & Balodi, 1995). However, using different attributes of rarity *i.e.*, habitat preference, population size, distribution range and anthropogenic pressure, only few studies have been carried out in some selected pockets of the Biosphere Reserve (Samant et al., 1996b, 2001; Rawal & Dhar, 1997; Joshi et al., 1999, 2001; Samant, 1999).

Therefore, present attempt has been made to study the rarity of species of alpine meadows and, prioritize them for conservation.

Materials and methods

The Study Area

Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve (NDBR) (30°05'-31°02'N to 79°12'-80°19'E) covering a total of 6,407.03 km² (Core zone 712.12 km²; Buffer zone 5,148.57 km² and Transition zone 546.34 km²), is situated in the northern part of west Himalaya (Fig. 1) and is among the World Heritage Sites. The reserve includes parts of Bageshwar and Pithoragarh districts in Kumaun region, and Chamoli district in Garhwal region. The buffer and transition zones are inhabited by over 100 villages. Most of the inhabitants belong to two main ethnic groups namely Indo-Mongoloid (Bhotia) and Indo-Aryans. They have been using plants as medicine, edible/food, fodder, fuel, timber, agricultural tools and various other purposes (Samant, 1996b; Joshi et al., 1999, 2001). Geologically, the area falls within the Greater Himalaya or Himadri System and Zanskar range. Climatically, the area is dry with low annual precipitation. The core zone of the reserve remains snow covered almost throughout the year except mid May to October. Present study has been conducted in the alpine meadows of Pindari Catchment of the NDBR. It is

Arya & Samant /IJLS/ 9(1) 2019 33-40

located in the northern part of Bageshwar district. The area is inhabited by two buffer zone villages i.e., Khati and Leh Bagar. The major river is Pindar that originates from the Pindari Glacier.

The main tributaries of the river Pindar are Sunderdhunga, Pindar and Kaphni Pindar.



Fig 1. Location of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve. (Prepared by Lead Office, GBPIHED, Kosi-Katarmal, Almora)

Methods

Four transacts were selected along the trails for identification and selection of sites and habitats. Attempts have been made to select sites on each and every accessible aspect along transacts between the range 3000-4270m. In each site, habitat type, altitude, aspect, slope, boulder percentage and dominant species were noted. Habitats were identified on the basis of physical characters (Samant et al., 1998a). The sites having >50% boulders of the ground cover have been identified as bouldery habitat. The field surveys and samplings were carried out during 1998-2000 within selected sites along transacts. For the sampling of vegetation 20x20m plot was marked in each site and 20 quadrats (1x1m) in each plot were laid by stratified method. Sampling was done in the peak season i.e., August and September. For the collection of data from these quadrats standard ecological methods (Grieg-Smith, 1957; Kersaw, 1973; Muller-Dombois & Ellenberge, 1974; Dhar et al., 1997a) were followed. In each quadrat phytosociological data were collected for herbaceous species. Shrubs present in each site were noted to update the species composition. Shrubs were considered as the woody species having several branches arising from their base (Saxena & Singh, 1982) and herbs are those plants aerial parts of which survive only one season however, may survive by underground roots/rhizomes/bulbs, etc. From each site, samples of each species were collected and identified in the Institute with the help of florulas and research papers (Naithani, 1984 & 1985; Polunin & Stainton, 1984; Rawat, 1984; Samant 1993, 1999; Pangtey et al.; 1990 and Hajra & Balodi, 1995). Data analysis has been done following standard ecological methods (Grieg-Smith, 1957; Kersaw, 1973; Muller-Dombois & Ellenberge, 1974; and Dhar et al., 1997a). The abundance data of different sites were pooled to get community average in terms of density. Rarity of the species has been identified based on habitat specificity, population size, distribution range and anthropogenic pressure (Samant et al., 1996b) and also, categorization of these species as Critically Rare, Endangered, Vulnerable, etc., has been done following (Samant et al., 1998b). Based on the status and values, these species have been prioritized for conservation and management.

The species, which occurred in the area but not cited in the sampling sites have been also considered for the rarity.

Results

Species diversity

A total of 102 species (8 shrubs, 94 herbs including 10 pteridophytes) belonging to 65 genera and 35 families have been identified as threatened from Pindari, Latakharak, Malari and Milam alpine meadows, of which 62 species, belonging to 45 genera and 27 families were recorded from Pindari area, 38 species belonging to 32 genera and 21 families were recorded from Latakharak area, 30 species belonging to 26 genera and 17 families were recorded from Malari area and 42 species belonging to 30 genera and 22 families were recorded from Milam area (Annexure 1)

Distribution pattern

Altitudinal distribution

In general along an altitudinal gradient, the maximum rare endangered species were distributed in between 3000-3800m, and this was followed by >3800m (Fig. 2.)

Considering the area wise altitudinal distribution of these species, the maximum rare endangered species were distributed between 3000-3800m zone in all the alpine meadows (*i.e.*, Pindari: 57 spp.; Latakharak: 30 spp.; Malari: 30 spp.; and Milam: 30 spp.) whereas the richness of these species was comparatively low above 3800m (*i.e.*, Pindari: 17 spp.; Latakharak: 23 spp.; Malari: 6 spp.; and Milam: 24 spp.).

Site wise distribution

In general, site wise distribution of the species indicated that 25 species were represented in one site only, 20 species in two sites whereas 54 species in 3 or >3 sites. Three species have not been represented in any of the sampling sites. Among the species, *Rheum australe* (23 sites), *Artemisia maritima* and *Rhododendron anthopogon* (21 sites, each), *Gentiana kurroo* and *Nardostachys grandiflora* (20 sites, each), *Jurinella macrocephala* (15 sites), *Caragana nubigena* (14 sites),

Polygonum polystachyum and Rheum webbianum (13 sites, each), Bergenia stracheyi (12 sites), Polygonum wilsonii (11 sites), and Dactylorhiza hatagirea, Morina longifolia and Lonicera asperifolia (10 sites, each) represented the maximum number of sites.

species have not been found in any of the sampling sites. Among the species *Polygonatum verticillatum*, *Ponerorchis chusua*, *Primula elliptica* and *Artemisia maritima*, (6 sites, each), *Primula reidii*, *Thylacospermum caespitosum*, *Rheum webbianum* and *Gentiana kurrooa* (5 sites, each) represented the maximum number of sites.

In Pindari area, 23 species were distributed in one site only, 11 species in two sites whereas 26 species in 3 or >3 sites. Two



Fig. 2. Altitudinal distribution ofrare endangered plants in NDBR

In Latakharak area, 11 species were distributed in one site only, 7 species distributed in two sites whereas 18 species distributed in 3 or >3 sites. Two species were not found in any of the sampling sites. Among the species *Rheum australe* (18 sites), *Nardostachys grandiflora* (16 sites), *Rhododendron anthopogon* (11 sites), *Gentiana kurroo and Bergenia stracheyi* (10 sites, each), *and Jurinella macrocephala* (9 sites) represented the maximum number of sites.

In Malari area, 13 species were distributed in one site only, 11 species distributed in two sites whereas 6 species distributed in 3 or >3 sites. Among the species Artemisia maritima (7 sites), Caragana versicolor (4 sites), Morina longifolia, Rheum webbianum, Polystichum wilsonii and Rhododendron anthopogon (3 sites, each) represented the maximum number of sites.

In Milam area, 16 species were distributed in one site only, 10 species distributed in two sites whereas 16 species distributed in 3 or >3 sites. Among the species *Caragana nubigena* (12 sites), *Lonicera asperifolia* (9 sites), *Artemisia maritima* (8 sites), *Gentiana kurroo* (5 sites) and *Allium stracheyi*, *Saxifraga sibirica* and *Rhododendron anthopogon* (4 sites, each) represented the maximum number of sites.

Habitat wise distribution

Habitat wise distribution of the species in all the alpine meadows, together indicated that 39 species were distributed in 1 habitat only, 25 species were distributed in two habitats whereas 38 were species distributed in 3 or >3 habitats. Among the species Artemisia maritima (8 habitats), Polystichum wisonii and Rhododendron anthopogon (7 habitats, each), Nardostachys grandiflora, Rheum australe, Rheum webbianum and Saussurea obvallata (6 habitats, each), Bergenia stracheyi, Caragana nubigena, Dactylorhiza hatagirea, Gentiana kurrooa, Jurinella macrocephala, Polygonatum verticillatum and Primula atrodentata (5 habitats, each), represented the maximum number of habitats (Annexure 1).

International Journal of Life Sciences

In Pindari area, habitat wise distribution of the species indicated that 33 species were distributed in 1 habitat only, 14 species were distributed in two habitats whereas 15 species were distributed in 3 or >3 habitats. Among the species Artemisia maritima, Gentiana kurroo, Pleurospermum angelicoides, Polygonatum verticillatum, Rheum australe and Athyrium rubricaule (4 habitats, each), Delphinium vestitum, Gymnadenia orchidis, Jurinella macrocephala, Malaxis muscifera, Primula elliptica, Rheum webbianum, Saxifraga sibirica, Thylacospermum caespitosum and*Rhododendron anthopogon* (3 habitats, each)represented the maximum number of habitats (Annexure 1). In Latakharak area, 16 species were distributed in 1 habitat only, 9 species were distributed in two habitats whereas 13 species were distributed in 3 or >3 habitats. Among the species Nardostachys grandiflora, Rheum australe (6 habitats, each), Gentiana kurroo, Saussurea obvallata. Rhododendron anthopogon (5 habitats, each), Bergenia strachevi (4 habitats), Allium humile, Dactylorhiza hatagirea, Jurinella macrocephala, Meconopsis aculeata, Primula atrodentata, Phymatopteris strachevi and Polystichum wilsonii (3 habitats, each)represented the maximum number of habitats (Annexure 1). In Malari area, 15 species were distributed in 1 habitat only, 9 species were distributed in two habitats whereas 6 species were distributed in 3 or >3 habitats. Among the species Artemisia maritima, Morina longifolia, Rheum webbianum, Polystichum wilsonii, Caragana versicolor and Rhododendron anthopogon(3 habitats, each), Bergenia stracheyi, Heracleum thomsonii, Hyssopus officinalis, Jurinella macrocephala, Polygonatum verticillatum, Primula atrodentata, Salvia hians, Saxifraga asarifolia and Dryopteris barbigera (2 habitats, each) represented the maximum number of habitats (Annexure 1).

In Milam area, 23 species were distributed in 1 habitat only, 10 species were distributed in two habitats whereas 9 species were distributed in 3 or >3 habitats. Among the species Artemisia maritima and Caragana nubigena (5 habitats, each), Allium stracheyi and Lonicera asperifolia (4 habitats, each), Astragalus rhizanthus, Dactylorhiza hatagirea, Morina longifolia, Potentilla

Arya & Samant /IJLS/ 9(1) 2019 33-40

eriocarpa and *Rhododendron anthopogon* (3 habitats, each) represented the maximum number of habitats (Annexure 1).

Community wise distribution

In general community wise distribution of rare species ranged from 1-24. In Pindari area maximum rare species were distributed in Danthonia cachemyriana community (24 spp.), Carex strachevi-Poa pratensisfollowed by Carex haematostoma-Aconitum balfourii mixed (14 spp.) and Carex nubigena-Carex stracheyi mixed (11 spp.), communities.The least rare species were distributed in Circaea alpina-Kobresia duthiei-Cortia depressa-Poa alpina mixed and Rumex nepalensis-Polygonum polystachyum-Poa alpina-Galium elegans mixed community (1 spp., each only). In Cortia depressa-Kobresia duthiei mixed and Rumex nepalensis-Cardamine *impatiens* mixed, communities rare species were absent.

In Latakharak area maximum rare species were distributed in *Carex stracheyi* community (24 spp.), followed by *Danthonia cachemyriana- Carex stracheyi* mixed (18 spp.) and *Danthonia cachemyriana* mixed (10 spp.), communities.The least rare species were distributed in *Fragaria nubicola-Galium acutum-Viola biflora-Cardamine impatiens* mixed community (1 spp. only). In *Polygonum polystachyum* community the rare species were absent.

In Malari area maximum rare species were distributed in *Danthonia cachemyriana* community (12 spp.), followed by *Carex setosa and Saxifraga pulvinaria* (7 spp., each), communities. The least rare species were distributed in *Rumex nepalensia-Agrostis munroana-Anemone rivularis mixed*, *Rumex nepalensis mixed and Saxifraga pulvinaria-Danthonia cachemyriana* mixed (1 spp., each), communities. In *Danthonia cachemyriana-Kobresia duthiei-Calamagrostis emodensis-Mentha longifolia* mixed community the rare species were absent.

In Milam area maximum rare species were distributed in Danthonia cachemyriana community (20 spp.), followed by Kobresia duthiei (11 spp.), Carex atrata (9 spp.) and Danthonia pulvinaria cachemyriana-Saxifraga mixed (8 spp.), communities. The least rare species were distributed in Rumex alpina-Calamagrostis nepalensis-Poa emodensis-Carex stracheyi mixed and Thymus linearis-Calamagrostis emodensis-Anaphalis contorta-Melica persica mixed (1 spp., each), communities. In Anaphalis contorta-Brachypodium sylvaticum-Thymus linearis mixed and Poa alpina-Carex nubigena-Epilobium latifolium mixed, communities the rare species were absent.

Status

In the present study, 5 species i.e., Athyrium duthiei and Cypripedium cordigerum (Rare) and Allium stracheyi, Picrorhiza kurrooa and Nardostachys grandiflora (Vulnerable) have been recorded in the Red Data Book of Indian Plants (Nayar & Sastry 1987, 1988, 1990). Using new IUCN criteria, these species along with others have also been categorized as Critically Rare (Aconitum balfourii, A. heterophyllum, A. violaceum, Angelica glauca, Arnebia benthamii, Dactylorhiza hatagirea, Fritillaria roylei, Gentiana kurroo, Meconopsis aculeata, Nardostachys grandiflora and Podophyllum hexandrum); Endangered (Picrorhiza kurrooa, Polygonatum verticillatum, Saussurea obvallata and Swertia angustifolia); Vulnerable (Bergenia Curculigo orchioides, Rheum ligulata, australe and Rhododendron anthopogon); and Low Risk Near Threatened (Jurinella macrocephala). Similarly, other species facing habitat International Journal of Life Sciences

degradation and over exploitation may be considered under vulnerable category whereas species presently not facing such problems may be considered under Low Risk Near Threatened category (Annexure 1).

Discussion

Various studies have been carried out to explore and identify the threatened plants of the protected areas of Indian Himalaya (Pangtey & Samant, 1988; Samant *et al.*, 1993, 1996a& b; 1998a&b, 2000a; Samant, 1994a; Pandey & Well, 1997 and Kala *et al.*, 1998). These studies also include threatened medicinal plants. In most of the studies, identification of threatened species has been carried out using qualitative attributes/observations, only. However, assessment of the status of species using standard format including qualitative as well as quantitative attributes has been suggested by few workers (Samant *et al.*, 1996b, and Airi *et al.*, 1997).

Habitat specificity, population size, distribution range and use pattern play an important role in identification of status of the species. In the present study, two factors i.e., overexploitation and habitat degradation have been causing decrease in the population of a species. Twenty three (23) species were severely affected by both the factors. Conservation of such species merit attention. Similarly, 62 species were suffering from habitat 17 degradation and species from over exploitation. Overexploitation of underground parts i.e., roots/rhizomes/tubers/bulbs of Aconitum balfourii, Α. heterophyllum, A. voilaceum, Angelica glauca, Arnebia benthamii, A. euchroma, Bergenia ligulata, B. stracheyi, Curculigo orchioides, Dactylorhiza hatagirea, Nardostachys grandiflora, Picrorhiza kurrooa, Pleurospermum angelicoides, Podophyllum hexandrum, Polygonatum verticillatum, Rheum australe, R. webbianum, etc., indicate their early extinction from their natural habitats.

Occurrence of 25 species in only one site and 20 species in two sites again indicates the early extinction of these species if the over exploitation and habitat degradation continue to operate (Annexure 1). Similarly, occurrence of 39 species only in one habitat and 25 species in two habitats indicate their habitat restriction in the area. Similar trend was also found separately in four different areas where most of the species were found in 1 or 2 sites/habitats. Such species have less chances of proliferation than the species with wide range of habitats (Samant et al., 1996b).

Though, Rheum australe (23 sites, 6 habitats), Artemisia maritima (21 sites, 8 habitats), Rhododendron anthopogon (21 sites, 7 habitats), Gentiana kurroo (20 sites, 5 habitats), Nardostachys grandiflora (20 sites, 6 habitats), Jurinella macrocephala (15 sites, 5 habitats), Caragana nubigena (14 sites, 5 habitats), Polygonatum verticillatum (13 sites, 5 habitats), Rheum webbianum (13 sites, 6 habitats), Bergenia stracheyi (12 sites, 5 habitats), Polystichum wilsonii (11 sites, 7 habitats), Dactylorhiza hatagirea (10 sites, 5 habitats), Morina longifolia (10 sites, 4 habitats), Lonicera asperifolia (10 sites, 4 habitats), etc., showed wide range of distribution and habitat preferences but due to over exploitation for various purposes, and also due to habitat degradation, these species are facing high degree of threats. Habitat and community wise distribution of rare species indicate that the species richness was maximum in bouldery, dry and shady moist habitats and in those communities where the tussock and cushion forming species were dominant i.e., cachemyriana, Danthonia Carex stracheyi, Carex haematostoma, Carex nubigena, Carex obscura, Carex setosa,

Carex atrata, Saxifraga pulvinaria, Kobresia duthiei, Cortia depressa, etc. These species/habitats/communities represent the maximum part of the alpine meadows, therefore, require much conservation measures. Altitudinal distribution of rare endangered species indicated that the maximum species were found between 3000-3800m zone in all four areas. This may be due to heavy biotic pressure on this zone leading to habitat degradation and ultimately to extinction of the species.

Conclusion

Species like Rheum australe, Artemisia maritima, Rhododendron anthopogon, Gentiana kurroo, Nardostachys grandiflora Jurinella macrocephala Caragana nubigena Polygonatum verticillatum Rheum webbianum Bergenia stracheyi Polystichum wilsonii Dactylorhiza hatagirea Morina longifolia Lonicera asperifolia etc., showed wide range of distribution and habitat preferences. Due to over exploitation, habitat degradation and for various purposes these species are facing high degree of threats. Therefore, promotion of mass scale propagation through conventional and in vitro methods, rehabilitation in the in situ conditions or akin habitats may help in conservation and management of these species. Maximum species richness was found in bouldery, dry and shady moist habitats and in those communities where the tussock and cushion forming species were dominant i.e., Danthonia cachemyriana, Carex stracheyi, Carex haematostoma, Carex nubigena, Carex obscura, Carex setosa, Carex atrata, Saxifraga pulvinaria, Kobresia duthiei, Cortia depressa, etc. These species/habitats/communities represent the maximum part of the alpine meadows, therefore, require much conservation measures. To develop an appropriate strategy for the conservation and management of all these rareendangered species and their habitats, population assessment and habitat monitoring using standard ecological methods are urgently required. Further, population biology of all these species needs to be studied using standard format (Samant et al., 1996b, 2001a&b).

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the Director of the Institute for facilities and encouragement. Help received from Dr. H.C. Joshi during field surveys and preparation of the paper, Dr. K.K. Kothari, Mr. S. Pant and Mr. B.M. Joshi during the preparation of this paper is highly acknowledged. Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi and Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi, are greatly acknowledged for financial assistance.

References

- Airi, S., Rawal, R.S., Dhar, U. & Purohit, A.N. 1997. Population studies on *Podophyllum hexandrum* Royle - a dwindling medicinal plant of the Himalaya. *Plant Genetic Resources* 110: 29-34.
- Dhar, U., Samant, S.S., Rawal, R.S. & Sharma, S. 1997a. Studies on the biota and resource utilization pattern of the natives in Askot Wildlife Sanctuary of Kumaun in west Himalaya, India. *Tiger Paper* **24** (4): 12-18.
- Greig-Smith, P. 1957. *Quantitative plant ecology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Hajra, P.K. & Balodi, B. 1995. *Plant wealth of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve.* Botanical Survey of India, Calcutta.
- Joshi, H.C., Arya, S.C. & Samant, S.S. 1999. Diversity, distribution and indigenous uses of medicinal and edible plants in a part of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve I. *Himalayan Biosphere Reserves* 1(1&2): 49-65.
- Joshi, H.C., Arya, S.C. & Samant, S.S. 2001. Diversity, distribution and indigenous uses of plant species in International Journal of Life Sciences

- Pindari area of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve-II. Indian Journal of Forestry 24 (1): **514-536.**
- Kala, C.P., Rawat, G.S. & Uniyal, V.K. 1998. Ecology and conservation of the Valley of Flowers National Park, Garhwal Himalaya. Report, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun.
- Kersaw, K.A. 1973. *Quantitative and dynamic plant ecology*. Second edition. Edward Arnold Limited, London.
- Mueller-Dombois, D. & Ellenberge, H. 1974. Aims and methods of vegetation ecology. John Willey and Sons, New York.
- Naithani, B.D. 1984 & 1985. *Flora of Chamoli district. Vol. I & II*. Botanical Survey of India, Howrah.
- Nayar, M.P. & Sastry, A.R.K. 1987,1988, 1990. *Red Data Book* of *Indian Plants. Vol. I-III.* Botanical Survey of India, Calcutta.
- Pandey, S. & Well, M.P. 1997. Eco-development planning at India's great Himalayan National Park for biodiversity conservation and participatory rural development. *Biodiversity & Conservation* 6: 1277-1292.
- Pangtey, Y.P.S. & Samant, S.S. 1988. Observations on the threatened, rare and endangered flowering plants and ferns in the flora of Kumaun Himalaya. *Advances in Forestry Research in India*. **3:** 65-74.
- Pangtey, Y.P.S., Rawal, R.S., Bankoti, N.S. & Samant, S.S. 1990. Phenology of high altitude plants of Kumaun in central Himalaya, India. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 34: 122-127.
- Polunin, O. & Stainton, A. 1984. *Flowers of the Himalaya*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rawal, R.S. & Dhar, U. 1997. Sensitivity of timberline flora in Kumaun Himalaya, India: Conservation implications. *Arctic and Alpine Research* 29 (1): 112-121.
- Rawat, G.S. 1984. *Studies on the high altitude flowering plants* of the Kumaun Himalaya. Ph.D. Thesis, Kumaun University, Nainital.
- Samant, S.S. 1993. Diversity and status of plants in Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve. In *Scientific and Ecological Expedition to Nanda Devi*. Report, Army Head Quarters, New Delhi. pp. 54-85.
- Samant, S.S. 1994a. An assessment on the diversity and status of alpine plants of the Himalaya. In Y.P.S. Pangtey & R.S. Rawal (eds.) *High Altitudes of the Himalaya*. Gyanodaya Prakashan, Nainital. pp. 115-127.
- Samant, S.S. 1999. Diversity, nativity and endemism of vascular plants in a part of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve in west Himalaya I. *Himalayan Biosphere Reserves* 1(1&2): 1-28.
- Samant, S.S. 1999. Diversity, nativity and endemism of vascular plants in a part of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve in west Himalaya I. *Himalayan Biosphere Reserves* 1(1&2): 1-28.
- Samant, S.S., Dhar, U. & Palni, L.M.S. 1998b. *Medicinal Plants* of Indian Himalaya: Diversity Distribution Potential Values. Gyanodaya Prakashan, Nainital.
- Samant, S.S., Dhar, U. & Palni, L.M.S. 2001b. Himalayan Medicinal plants: Potential and Prospects. Gyanodaya Prakashan, Nainital.
- Samant, S.S., Dhar, U. & Rawal, R.S. 1993. Botanical hot spots of Kumaun Himalaya: Conservation Perspectives. In U. Dhar (ed.) *Himalayan Biodiversity Conservation Strategies.* Gyanodaya Prakashan, Nainital. pp. 377-400.
- Samant, S.S., Dhar, U. & Rawal, R.S. 1996a. Natural resource use by some natives within Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve in west Himalaya. *Ethnobotany* **8:** 40-50.

- Samant, S.S., Dhar, U. & Rawal, R.S. 1996b. Conservation of rare endangered plants: The context of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve. In P.S. Ramakrishnan, A.N. Purohit, K.G. Saxena, K.S. Rao & R.K. Maikhuri (eds.) Conservation and Management of Biological Resources in Himalaya. Oxford & IBH Publishing Company Private Limited, New Delhi. pp. 521-545.
- Samant, S.S., Dhar, U. & Rawal, R.S. 1998a. Biodiversity status of a protected area of west Himalaya. 1-Askot Wildlife

Sanctuary. International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology 5: 194-203.

- Samant, S.S., Joshi, H.C. & Arya, S.C. 2000a. Diversity, nativity and endemism of vascular plants in Pindari area of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve-II. *Himalayan Biosphere Reserves* 2(1&2): 1-29.
- Saxena, A.K. & Singh, J.S. 1982. A phytosociological analysis of woody species in forest communities of a part of Kumaun Himalaya. *Vegetatio* 50: 3-22.

Annexure 1. Diversity, distribution, habitat preference and threat types of Rare and Endangered species of vascular plants in the alpine meadows of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve

Family/taxa	Altitudinal	LF	Location/s	SR	Habitat/s	Threat/s
	range (m)					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Acanthaceae						
Strobilanthes wallichii Nees	3300	Н	А	-	4	HD
Alliaceae	2200 4000		D			
Allium humile Kunth.	3300-4000	H	В	6	1, 3, 8	OE, HD
A. stracheyi Baker	3000-4200	H	D	4	3, 5, 6, 7	OE
A. wallichii Kunth.	3600-4000	Н	В	I	3	OE, HD
Apiaceae	2200 4000				2	0.5
Angelica glauca Edgew.	3200-4000	H	Р	1	8	OE
Heracleum thomsonu Cl. ex Hk. f.	3800-3810	H	C	2	1, 3	OE
Pleurospermum angelicoides (DC.)	3100-3700	Н	Р	4	1, 3, 4, 8	OE
	2540 4015			2	1.0	05
P. densiflorum (Lindl.) Cl.	3540-4015	Н	А, В, С	3	1, 3	OE
Asteraceae	2(00		a	1	2	
Arctium lappa L.	3600	H	C	1	3	OE, HD
Artemisia absinthium L.	3760	H	D	1	1	HD
A. gmelinii Web. ex Stechm.	3770-3830	H	D	3	2,3	HD
A. maritima L.	3200-4500	H	A, C, D	21	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	HD
<i>Jurinella macrocephala</i> (Royle) Aswal et Goel	3300-4500	Н	А, В, С	15	1, 3, 6, 8, 9	OE, HD
Lactuca violaefolia (Decne) Cl	3690	н	В	1	4	HD
Saussurea obvallata Wall	3500-4500	н	ABCD	9	136789	OE
<i>S taraxacifolia</i> Wall	3600	н	D	1	3	OE
A thyriaceae	2000		D	1	5	0L
Athyrium atkinsonii Bedd	3000-3200	Pt	А	2	3 4	HD
A duthiei (Bedd.) Bedd	3680-3685	Pt	B	2	3 8	HD
A rubricaule (Edgew) Bir	3100-3550	Pt	A	4	1468	HD
Cystopteris montana (Lam) Bernh	3675-4270	Pt	AB	3	1 7 9	HD
ex Desv	3073 1270	11	П, Д	5	1, 7, 9	ΠD
Boraginaceae						
Arnehia benthamii (Wall, ex G.	3300-3900	Н	A. B. D	8	1, 3, 8, 9	OE, HD
Don) John	2200 2700		11, 2, 2	Ũ	1, 0, 0, 7	02,112
A. euchroma (Royle) John	3600	Н	С	1	3	OE, HD
Onosma hispidum Wall.	3200-3360	Н	Ă	3	3.8	OE, HD
BRASSICACEAE	2200 2200			U	0,0	02,112
Megacarpaea polvandra Benth.	3500-4000	Н	А	1	8	OE, HD
Caprifoliaceae					-	- ,
Lonicera asperifolia (Decne.) Hk. f.	3340-3850	Sh	C, D	10	1, 3, 6, 9	HD
& Th.			,		, , , ,	
Carvophyllaceae						
Arenaria neelgherensis Wt. & Arn.	3550-3780	Н	D	3	3	HD
A. orbiculata Royle ex Hk.	3550-3820	Н	D	3	1, 3	HD
Thylacospermum caespitosum	3300-3600	Н	А	5	1, 3, 9	HD
(Camb.) Schisch.					, ,	
Dipsacaceae						
Morina longifolia Wall. ex DC.	3000-4000	Η	A, B, C, D	10	1, 3, 6, 9	HD
Dryopteridaceae						
Dryopteris barbigera (Hk.) Ktze.	3550-3790	Pt	A, C	3	1, 3, 7	HD
subsp. komarovii Fraser- Jenkins						
Polystichum bakerianum (Aitk. ex	3200	Pt	А	1	3	HD
Cl.) Diels.						

International Journal of Life Sciences

	Arya & Sami	ant /I	JLS/9(1) 2019	9 33-40		
P. wilsonii Christ.	3360-4060	Ý	A, B, C, D	11	1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9	HD
Elaeagnaceae						
<i>Hippophae tibetana</i> Schlecht. Ephedraceae	3880	Sh	D	1	1	HD
<i>Ephedra gerardiana</i> Wall. ex Stapf. Ericaceae	3900	Sh	D	1	9	OE
Rhododendron anthopogon <i>D. Don</i> Fabaceae	3000-4500	Sh	A, B, C, D	21	1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9	OE
Astragallus chlorostachys Lindl.	3740	Н	D	1	3	HD
<i>A. melanostachys</i> Benth. ex Bunge	3000-3100	Н	A	2	4	HD
A. <i>rhizanthus</i> Royle ex Benth.	3470-4270	Н	A, C, D	6	3, 7, 8, 9	HD
Caragana nubigena Bunge	3440-4140	Н	C, D	14	1, 3, 6, 8, 9	HD
C. versicolor (Wall.) Benth.	3220-3340	Sh	C	4	2, 7, 9	HD
Fumariaceae						
Corydalis flabellata Edgew.	3250	Η	С	1	9	HD
C. meifolia Wall.	3300-3630	Η	A, C	5	6, 9	HD
C. thyrsiflora Prain	3300-3685	Η	А, В	5	3, 6	HD
Gentianaceae	2240 4060			20	1 2 6 0 0	IID
Gentiana kurroo <i>Royle</i>	3340-4060	H	A, B, D	20	1, 3, 6, 8, 9	HD OF UD
Swertia angustifolia BuchHam.	3200-3800	H	A, B	2	1, 3	OE, HD
S. <i>ciliata</i> (D. Don) Buru.	3300-3923	н	А, В	4	5, 8	UE, HD
Hypoxidaceae	3200 3400	ц	^	2	2	OF UD
L'amiaceae	5200-5400	п	A	Z	5	UE, HD
Hyssopus officinalis I	3340-3440	н	C	2	3 9	HD
Salvia highs Royle ex Benth	3600-3830	Н	CD	3	1 2 3	HD
Liliaceae	2000 2020		0, 0	5	1, 2, 3	ne
<i>Clintonia udensis</i> Traut. & Mey.	3000-3100	Н	А	2	4	HD
<i>Fritillaria roylei</i> D. Don ex Hk.	3800	Н	В	-	3	OE, HD
Lloydia serotina (L.) Reichb.	3600-4270	Н	Α, Β	4	3, 8	HD
Nomocharis nana (Klotzsch) E. H.	3750-4075	Η	В	5	1, 3	HD
Wilson						
Polygonatum verticillatum (L.) All.	3000-4000	Η	A, B, C	13	1, 3, 4, 8, 9	OE, HD
Trillidium govanianum Kunth.	3000-3800	Η	А	1	4	OE, HD
Orchidaceae						
<i>Cypripedium cordigerum</i> D. Don	3600	Н	A	1	7	HD
<i>Dactylorhiza hatagirea</i> (D. Don) Soo	3000-4000	Н	A, B, D	10	3, 4, 5, 7, 8	OE, HD
Gymnadenia orchidis L.	3360-4010	Η	A, B, D	6	1, 3, 8, 9	HD
Malaxis muscifera (Lindl.) Ktz.	3100-3750	Η	A, B, C	7	1, 3, 4, 8	OE, HD
Ponerorchis chusua D. Don	3310-4270	Н	A, B, C	8	1, 3, 7	HD
Orobanchaceae Boschniachia himalaica Hk. & Th.	3640	Н	С	1	3	HD
ex Hk.t.						
Papaveraceae	2200 2620	тт		2	2.5	Ш
Macononsis aculata Poyle	3200-3030	п u	A, D	2	2, 5	HD OF
<i>M paniculata</i> (Don) Prain	3340-3600	H	A, D, D A	0 4	1, 0, 7	OE HD
Podonhyllaceae	5540 5000	11	11	т	1, 7	OL, IID
Podophyllum hexandrum Royle	3100-3700	Н	А	2	1.4	OE
Polygonaceae					-, .	
Rheum australe D. Don	3400-4300	Н	A, B, C	23	1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9	OE
R. moorcroftianum Royle	3510-4140	Н	D	2	7	OE
R. speciforme Royle	3500-4300	Η	A, D	5	7, 8	OE
R. webbianum Royle	3500-4300	Η	A, B, C, D	13	1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9	OE
Polypodiaceae						
Phymatopteris stracheyi (Ching) Pichi –Sermoli	3000-3750	Pt	Α, Β	4	1, 3, 4, 8	HD
Primulaceae						
Primula atrodentata Sm.	3440-4060	Η	B, C, D	6	1, 3, 6, 8, 9	HD
P. edgeworthii (Hk. f.) Pax.	3300-3540	Η	А	3	6	HD
<i>P. elliptica</i> Royle	3380-4270	Η	A, B, C	9	1, 3, 6, 8	HD
P. glomerata Pax.	3200-3750	H	A, B	2	1, 3	HD
<i>P. involucrata</i> Wall. ex Duby	3400-3560	H	A	2	5,6	HD
P. reidu Duthie	3550-4270	H	A	5	1, 7	HD
P. rotundifolia Wall. ex Roxb.	3300-4270	Н	А	2	6, 8	HD

International Journal of Life Sciences

Arya & Samant /IJLS/ 9(1) 2019 33-40						
Ranunculaceae	U					
Aconitum balfouri Stapf.	3200-4500	Н	A, B	2	4,8	OE, HD
A. heterophyllum Wall. ex Royle	3200-3700	Н	A, D	3	3, 8	OE, HD
A. voilaceum Jacq.	3900-4000	Н	A, B	-	8	OE, HD
Anemone biflora DC.	3200-3600	Н	A	3	8	HD
Callianthemum pimpinelloides (D.	4060	Н	D	1	8	HD
Don) Hk.f.&Th.						
Delphinium vestitum Wall. ex	3200-4700	Η	А	4	1, 3, 8	HD
Royle						
Ranunculus natans Mey.	3740	Н	D	1	5	HD
R. pulchellus Mey.	3630-3740	Н	D	2	5	HD
R. trichophyllus Chaix	3540	Н	D	1	6	HD
R. tricuspis (Maxim.) HandMazz.	3740	Н	D	2	5	HD
Trollius acaulis Lindl.	4140	Н	D	1	9	HD
Rosaceae						
Potentilla bifurca L.	3770-3780	Н	D	2	3	HD
P. eriocarpa Wall. ex Lehm.	3750-3770	Sh	D	3	1, 3, 8	HD
Rosa webbiana Wall. ex Royle	3520-3540	Sh	D	2	6	HD
Saxifragaceae						
Bergenia ligulata (Wall.) Engl.	3100-3500	Η	А	1	4	OE, HD
B. stracheyi (Hk.f. & Th.) Engl.	3500-4500	Η	B, C	12	1, 3, 6, 7, 9	OE, HD
Saxifraga asarifolia Sternb.	3600-3790	Η	A, C	3	6, 7, 8	HD
S. flagellaris Willd. ex Sternb.	3780-3940	Η	D	2	3, 8	HD
S. sibirica L.	3340-4270	Η	A, B, D	9	1, 6, 7	HD
Scrophulariaceae						
Picrorhiza kurrooa Royle ex Benth.	3000-4500	Η	A, B, D	8	6, 7, 8, 9	OE
Solanaceae						
Hyoscyamus niger L	3200-3700	Η	С	1	2	OE, HD
Tamariaceae						
Myricaria elegans Royle	3000-3600	Sh	А	1	6	HD
Valerianaceae						
Nardostachys grandiflora DC.	3500-4200	Η	A, B, D	20	1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9	OE
Woodsiaceae						
Woodsia elongata Hk.	4270	Pt	А	1	7	HD
W. lanosa Hk.	3750	Pt	В	1	1	HD

Abbreviations used: A = Pindari alpine meadows; B = Latakharak alpine meadows; C = Malari alpine meadows; D = Milam alpine meadows; H = Herb; Sh = Shrub; P = Pteridophyte; LF = Life form; SR = Site representation; OE = Over Exploitation; HD = Habitat Degradation; I = Bouldery; 2 = Camping site; 3 = Dry; 4 = Forest edge; 5 = Marsh-wet land; 6 = Riverine; 7 = Rocky; 8 = Shady moist; and 9 = Shrubberries