

International Research Journal of Biological Sciences _ Vol. **3(1)**, 49-56, January (**2014**)

Influence of Forest Fire on Floral Diversity of the Degraded Shola Forest Ecosystem

Saravanan V.¹*, Santhi R.², Kumar P.¹, Balasubramanian A.³ and Abhilash Damodaran⁴

¹Department of Tree Breeding, Forest College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Mettupalayam - 641301, TN, INDIA ²Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Agricultural College and Research Institute, TN Agri. Uni., Coimbatore, TN, INDIA ³Dept. of Forest Ecology and Envi., Forest College & Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agri. Uni., Mettupalayam - 641301, Tamil Nadu, INDIA ⁴Renuka Forest Division, Himachal Pradesh, INDIA

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 16th September 2013, revised 21st October 2013, accepted 19th November 2013

Abstract

Forest Fire is an important component in the development and sustainability of many forest ecosystems. With regard to the environmental aspect, the fire is known to alter the soil physical, chemical and biological properties besides influencing the vegetation pattern. However, information available on the nature and magnitude of changes brought out by forest fire on vegetation under degraded shola forest ecosystem is scanty. Keeping these points in view, the present investigation was carried out in the degraded shola forest ecosystem of the Nilgiris Eastern Slope Range situated in the Nilgiris North Division, Tamil Nadu, India to evaluate the effect of fire on the plant diversity of the area at two different periods (immediately after fire and after the monsoon). The effect of forest fire on the vegetational parameters and diversity indices. The study showed that the fire had severely affected the tree components in the vegetation when compared to herbs and shrubs. The research results also revealed that regeneration of herbs and shrubs occurred in the burned area after monsoon. The vegetation was already a degraded shola, regular occurrence of the fire is seriously damaging the vegetational composition enabling the further degradation of the vegetation. A good management plan for fire management will help to regain the vegetation through retrogression.

Keywords: Forest fire, vegetation, degradation, burned and unburned area.

Introduction

Fires have influenced the character of the forest ecosystem throughout the world. In fact, many forest communities around the world persist only under the influence of periodic wildfires. Forest fires caused ecological, social and economical damages to a greater extent. In tropical regions, fires are common in seasonally dry environments and rare in perennially moist areas. Even the wettest tropical rain forests may burn at a time scale of thousands of years and the annual extent of fire may be greater in tropical and sub-tropical regions than in the rest of the world¹. On the basis of the place of their action, forest fires are classified into four types. They are creeping fire, ground fire, surface fire, and crown fire and among which, ground fire influences soil properties to the maximum. It burns the ground cover only, the carpet of herbaceous plants and low shrubs, which covers the soil. In other words, it refers to any fire that consumes the organic materials of the forest floor and also burns into the underlying soil itself². Repeated low-intensity fires may shape the forest by killing small trees, rejuvenating fire-tolerant grasses and accelerating the cycling of nutrients. High-intensity fires kill the majority of trees, oxidize large quantities of nutrients such as nitrogen and disturb soil - plant interactions for decades. This great pressure on forest fire has resulted in the loss of biodiversity disturbing the eco-system dynamics³. In India, the inventories carried out by the Forest Survey of India⁴

cent forest area has no regeneration. It is also estimated that the proportion of forest area prone to forest fires annually ranges from 33 to 90 per cent. About 90 per cent forest fires in India are man-made. Out of 3,53,782 km² forest area in the country, 47.17 per cent (1.40,818 km²) is annually affected by fire⁵. A characteristic feature of the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve is the occurrence of 'sholas' (Montane forests) above 1,500 m. They are found in patches, in hollows and sheltered folds surrounded by rolling downs in the Anamalais, Nilgiri and Palani hills and the high ranges of Kerala and Karnataka. Montane evergreen forests have thick undergrowth; the trees are short bolded and attain a low height of 15-20 m. The shola forest community had wider distribution in the past which has been established through pollen analytical investigations. Forest fire occurs in one or the other part of Nilgiri Biosphere (approximately 1,000 ha area annually under heavy intentional fires), which not only retards the growth of existing vegetation but also not allowing new recruits to emerge out on the forest floor⁶. In the process, many endemic species of the area disappeared from their native habitat. Exotics such as Wattle, Eucalyptus, Eupatorium, Cestrum, Eulex species which were introduced long back in the Nilgiri plateau are invading the burnt areas very fast. The ill effects of this are well known and spread of alien weeds can be

showed that on an average 54.7 per cent of the forest is affected

by the fire, 77.6 per cent area has grazing incidence and 72.1 per

destructive to native species. More importantly, species like Lantana camara and recently Eupatorium odoratum, Mikania cordata, Parthenium hysterophorus, Eulex europeans, Cestrum nigrum, Cassia tora have invaded the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve and tend to smother the natural vegetation. Wattle, introduced long back, has now become a weed. Srivastva⁷ found that the major cause for the depletion and loss of biodiversity in the Nilgiris is the fire originating from human causes. The recurrent fire set by grazers during the summer dealt a severe blow to the floristic composition. Though the incidence of forest fire is not a frequent phenomenon in the shola forest ecosystem which is known for its rich floristic diversity, it is frequent in the degraded sholas due to severe biotic interference. Hence, systematic experimental studies are needed to understand the effect of fire on the vegetation during different seasons. Keeping the above points in view, the present investigation was undertaken in the degraded shola forest ecosystem of Nilgiris Eastern Slope Range, Nilgiris North Division, Tamil Nadu, India with the following objective to study the effect of forest fire on the diversity status of vegetation.

Material and Methods

The present study was carried out to investigate the effect of forest fire on the vegetation status of the fire affected area. The details of the field studies conducted and the methods followed are presented in this chapter.

Location: The Niligiris North Forest Division is located between the latitudes 11° 14' North and 11° 36' North and the longitudes 76° 31' East and 77° 1' East. The geographical area of this division is situated in Udhagamandalam, Coonoor, Gudalur and Kotagiri taluks of Nilgiris revenue district. Nilgiris North Forest Division falls under the Coimbatore Circle. The headquarters of this division is Udhagamandalam. The total forest area of this division is 54,722.806 ha with forest boundary of 138 kilometers. The present study area is located between the latitudes 11° 26.272' North and 11° 26.516' North and the longitudes 76° 55.073' East and 76° 55.112' East of Kotagiri taluk in the Paravakkadavu Reserve Forest (271.387 ha) of the Kengarai beat which comes under the administration of Sholur Mattam section of the Nilgiris Eastern Slopes Range. Its headquarters is located at Sholur Mattam.

Vegetation: The forest types occurring in the Nilgiris North Forest Division generally falls within the following groups as shown in table 1^8 . These broad groups exhibit certain distinct types of vegetation along with its seral and transitional stages as well as their edaphic variations. The line of distinction between two types is not very clear in few cases, one type merge almost imperceptibly into another. The extensive artificial plantations of *Eucalyptus globules, E. grandis, Acacia mearnsii* and *Pinus* species have transformed the vegetational map of the division greatly.

Champion and Seth⁸ have classified two more forest types under the sub group 11A (Southern montane wet temperate forest). They are i. Degraded stage of sholas (i.e. Southern montane wet scrub-type 11A/DS1) and ii. Degraded stage of grasslands (i.e. Southern Montane wet grasslands-type 11A/DS2).

| Table-1 |
|--|
| Forest types of the Nilgiris North Forest Division |

| SI. | Forest type | Sub |
|-----|--|-------|
| No. | Forest type | group |
| 1 | Southern montane wet temperate forest | 11A |
| 2 | Southern tropical broad leaved hill forest | 8A |
| 3 | Southern moist deciduous forest | 3B |
| 4 | Southern tropical dry deciduous forest | 5A |
| 5 | Southern tropical thorn forest | 6A |

Since the present study area comes under the degraded stage of sholas, it is classified into the forest type of Southern montane wet scrub-type $(11A/DS1)^9$.

Methods: The present study involves the vegetation analysis in the forest fire affected and unaffected areas of degraded shola forest ecosystem of the Nilgiris Eastern Slope Range, Nilgiris North Division, Tamil Nadu, India.

Assessment of floral diversity: The vegetation analysis was carried out twice (i.e.) immediately after fire and after monsoon period in the unburnt and burnt areas of degraded shola forest ecosystem. The following parameters were assessed. A variety of approaches exists to aid in the inventory and analysis of vegetation. All the methods of data analysis can be regarded as explicit forms of mathematical modeling. The most familiar models are equations, which specify the functional relationship between one or more controlling factors^{10,11}. Floral diversity assessment was done using standard method established by Daniels et al.¹². In the study site simple random sampling method was followed in laying the sample plots. The trees diversity was measured in 10 m x 10 m sample plot, smaller plots of 5 m x 5 m for shrubs and 1 m x 1 m for herbs were demarcated. In order to determine the quantitative relationship between the plant species, the following parameters were determined.

Density: Density is defined as the number of plants per unit area. Total absolute density of species is commonly measured per hectare.

Density =

Total number of quadrates sampled

Relative density: Relative density is used to express the contribution of individuals of one species in relation to the total number of individuals of all species and is determined as follows:

Relative density = $\frac{\text{Total number of individuals of a species}}{\text{Total number of individuals of all species}} \times 100$

Abundance =

Total no. of individuals of the species

No. of quadrates of occurrence

Frequency: It is the measure of commonness and distribution of a species within a study area. Frequency is defined as the change of finding a species in a particular trial sample and expressed as a percentage of sample plots in which a species occurs¹³.

Number of sample plots in which a species occurs Frequency of a species = - x 100Total number of sample plots

Relative frequency: Frequency can also be expressed in relative terms.

Dominance: Dominance is a measure of the size, bulk or weight of the vegetation. Three characteristics of the vegetation are commonly evaluated as a measure of dominance; they are weight or biomass, basal cover or basal area and canopy cover or canopy area. Total absolute dominance is equal to the total of all dominance values for all species divided by the total number of samples.

Dominance = _____

Area sampled

Relative dominance: Dominance is a measure of the size, bulk or weight of the vegetation. Three characteristics of the vegetation are commonly evaluated as a measure of dominance; weight or biomass, basal cover or basal area and canopy cover or canopy area. Canopy or basal cover of a species expressed as a percentage of canopy or basal cover for all species, gives the relative dominance.

Relative dominance = $\frac{\text{Dominance of a species}}{\text{Dominance of all species}} \times 100$

Important value index: Girth, height and canopy cover of all the trees were measured. Girth class distribution of trees and Important Value Index (IVI) was calculated as

 $IVI = Relative dominance + Relative density + Relative frequency^{14}$.

Relative Important Value Index: RIVI = IVI / 3

Study of Diversity indices: Species richness: The species richness was calculated using Margalef's and Menhinick's Index. Margalef's $Index^{15} D_{Mg} = (S-1) / LnN$

Menhinick's Index : D $_{Mn} = S / \sqrt{N}$

Where N = Total number of individual, S = Total number of species in this plot

a **Biodiversity indices:** Measure of diversity is frequently seen as indicators of the well being of any ecosystem. They also serve as a measure of the species diversity in the ecosystem. The following indices were worked out to assess and compare the diversity and distribution of plant species in different types of forests and at different altitudes. The species diversity was calculated using Shannon-Wiener Index and Simpson's Index^{12,16,17}.

Shannon-Wienner Index (1963) H' = - Σ (Pi x Ln Pi)

where, H' - the measure of diversity, Pi - the proportion of the i^{th} species in the landscape element, Ln Pi - natural logarithm of the proportion of each species.

Modified Simpson's Index (Simpson, 1949)

$$S = \frac{1}{\sum Pi^2}$$

Where, S - the measure of diversity, Pi - the proportion of i^{th} species sampled.

The above diversity indices take into account not only the number of species but also their relative abundance.

Evenness using Shannon – Wiener Index: The evenness of the species was calculated using Shannon-Wiener Index. It was worked out as follows: E=H' / Ln S

Where, H = Shannon index, S = Total number of species

 β Diversity: β Diversity estimates the species turnover. Jaccard's index of similarity assesses comparative species turnover.

Where, j = number of species common to both plots, a = number of species in plot A, b = number of species in plot B

Results and Discussion

Effect of fire on diversity status of vegetation: The overall density of plants in the unburnt area was 3,55,610 plants ha⁻¹ prior to monsoon. Of this there were 3,370 trees ha⁻¹ (0.96 %), 10,240 shrubs ha⁻¹ (2.86 %) and 3,42,000 herbs ha⁻¹ (96.18 %). Among the trees *T. asiatica* had highest density of 2,600 stems ha⁻¹, among shrubs *Pteridium aquilinium* had highest density of 5,200 plants ha⁻¹ and among the herbs *Cyonotis* sp. had highest density of 2,30,000 plants ha⁻¹. The result revealed that, among the different plant communities, trees were heavily affected by fire because it accounted only at 66 stems ha⁻¹, which is very low compared to the unburnt study area. The total plant density of fire affected area was 2,27,620 plants ha⁻¹ which is lower than the unburnt site. The trees contribute a very meager, i.e.

0.026 per cent to the total density compared to 0.095 per cent in the unburnt plot. Shrubs had a density of 23,560 plants ha⁻¹ (Relative density 10.35), while herbs contributed 89.64 per cent (Relative density) with a density of 20,400 plants ha⁻¹. Though, fire decreased the density of trees and overall plant density, it increased the density of shrubs and herbs. These results help to conclude that the forest fire in the study area was primarily the crown fire, which totally consumed the crown cover and the trees were worst affected compared to shrubs and herbs. After monsoon, overall density of vegetation in unburnt and burnt sites increased drastically. This is primarily due to the regeneration of herbs and shrubs favoured by fire and rain.

Vegetational study: The vegetational analysis of the present study includes assessment of density, relative density, dominance, relative dominance, frequency, relative frequency, important value index, species richness indices and the α diversity indices using Shannon-Wiener index and Simpson's index (table 3, 4, 5 and 6). The evenness was assessed using Shannon's-Wiener index and the β diversity was assessed using Jaccard's index of similarity. In the present study, the estimation of the above parameters in the unburnt area revealed that the shrubs and herbs dominated more in the vegetational composition. The results also explained that number of trees was very less and they were scantly and unevenly distributed. This result clearly confirms that the study area is a degraded forest and also it invites regular fire. It is also interesting to note that the vegetation composition study of the unburnt area immediately after fire as well as in the monsoon seasons revealed that there was no significant difference in the vegetational composition. Hence, this also helps to conclude that this forest is a degraded shola forest which has been regularly affected by fire and their retrogression is being deeply promoted. The study of the burnt area revealed that immediately after fire, trees are the worst affected component in the vegetational community which is observed interms of their lower density, frequency, dominance and abundance values compared to the unburnt area. The result also revealed that herbs and shrubs were comparatively less affected than trees. The vegetational analysis after fire showed comparatively higher vegetation value for shrubs and herbs. However, the study revealed that there was no significant change in the vegetational composition value for trees. The increase in composition of herbs and shrubs in the burnt area after monsoon favoured for their high regeneration with added advantage of increased N and K availability. This situation might have also favoured the regeneration of the tree species Todalia asiatica, Rhodomyrtus tomentosa, Symplocos spicata and syzygium cumini. Similar increase in herbaceous population after fire was also reported by Srivastava¹⁸ in shola-grass land ecotone of Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve. Calvo *et al.*¹⁹ also observed increase in herbaceous population after fire under Pinus pinaster and Quercus pyrenaica dominated forest. The observations drive to conclude that increase in herb and shrub population is helpful for protection of regenerated tree species and to tide over the

ensuing summer season. Since the fire is the regular phenomenon in the study area and was seriously affecting the regeneration of tree species this study assuming importance on a larger perspective.

Diversity indices: The diversity indices of burnt and unburnt areas were analyzed and the results were presented in the table 2. The Simpson's index and Shannon-Wienner index, Simpson dominance index showed that high diversity was accounted in unburnt areas in both the seasons of study. It is important to note that high diversity status in terms of all the above indices was reflected in the burnt area after monsoon. This clearly shows that though the site is continuously disturbed, it is having the potential to recover its original vegetation. Unless the regular occurrence of fire is not stopped, the forest may develop into pre-climax vegetation and the vegetation composition may also end with fire hardy species alone.

The evenness indices showed very low evenness in the burnt area and very high evenness in the unburnt area reflecting that the species composition of the vegetation is totally affected between unburnt and burnt area. These indices help to predict that the vegetation composition is under serious threat of degradation. The Margalef's, Menhinick's and Jaccard's indices also revealed the similar trend like that of evenness index. The present findings are in accordance with the results of Swarupanandan *et al.*²⁰ and Thomas²¹.

The vegetation analysis and diversity indices estimation repeatedly emphasized that the forest fire is totally changing the vegetation composition in the study site. They also indicated that forest fire is seriously promoting the retrogression, as the result the present state of the forest in the study site has developed into secondary and degraded forest. Serious efforts are needed to prevent fire occurrence in the study site to help the retrogression to be stopped, so as to enable the vegetation to regain its original status.

Table-2Diversity indices for the unburnt and burnt areas

| Diversity indices | Immediate fire | • | After monsoon | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------|---------------|-------|--|--|
| Diversity mulces | Unburnt | Burnt | Unburnt | Burnt | | |
| | area | area | area | area | | |
| Simpson's Index | 0.831 | 0.530 | 0.863 | 0.86 | | |
| Simpson's dominance Index | 0.169 | 0.470 | 0.136 | 0.14 | | |
| Shannon –Wiener Index | 3.195 | 1.637 | 3.715 | 3.617 | | |
| H max | 4.755 | 3.907 | 5.209 | 5.426 | | |
| Evenness Index | 0.672 | 0.419 | 0.713 | 0.667 | | |
| Maralef's Index | 4.456 | 2.633 | 5.115 | 3.383 | | |
| Menhinicks Index | 1.465 | 1.050 | 1.096 | 0.075 | | |
| Jaccard's Index | 0.315 | 0.315 | 0.455 | 0.455 | | |

| Table-3 | |
|--|-----------------|
| Density and relative density for the unburnt | and burnt areas |
| | |

| Immediately after fire After monsoon | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|--|
| Species | Unburnt | area | Burnt a | rea | Unburnt | area | Burnt a | area | |
| - | D | RD | D | RD | D | RD | D | RD | |
| TREES | | | | | | | | | |
| Todalia asiatica | 2600.00 | 0.73 | 10.00 | 0.004 | 2410.00 | 0.400 | 20.00 | 0.002 | |
| Rhodomyrtus tomentosa | 630.00 | 0.18 | 30.00 | 0.010 | 720.00 | 0.120 | 30.00 | 0.003 | |
| Symplocos spicata | 70.00 | 0.02 | 10.00 | 0.004 | 60.00 | 0.010 | 10.00 | 0.001 | |
| Syzygium cumini | 30.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 30.00 | 0.005 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Acacia sp. | 20.00 | 0.01 | 10.00 | 0.004 | 10.00 | 0.002 | 20.00 | 0.002 | |
| Glochidion malabaricum | 20.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 20.00 | 0.003 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Trees total | 3370.00 | 0.96 | 60.00 | 0.02 | 3250.00 | 0.54 | 80.00 | 0.01 | |
| SHRUBS | 10.10.00 | 0.00 | <00.00 | 0.040 | | 0.000 | 500.00 | 0.070 | |
| Dodonea viscosa | 1040.00 | 0.29 | 600.00 | 0.260 | 560.00 | 0.090 | 520.00 | 0.050 | |
| Osbeckia sp. | 1280.00 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 280.00 | 0.050 | 160.00 | 0.020 | |
| Berberis tinctorea | 120.00 | 0.03 | 1040.00 | 0.460 | 160.00 | 0.030 | 1120.00 | 0.110 | |
| Desmodium rufescens | 160.00 | 0.04 | 1120.00 | 0.490 | 480.00 | 0.080 | 760.00 | 0.070 | |
| Smilax zeylanica Pteridium aquilinum | 160.00 5200.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 20800.00 | 0.000 9.140 | 200.00 2600.00 | 0.030 0.440 | 0.00 15000.00 | 0.000 1.440 | |
| Myrsine sp. | 80.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 120.00 | 0.020 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Brachylepis nervosa | 120.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 280.00 | 0.020 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Rosa leschenaultii | 200.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 280.00 | 0.030 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Eupatorium glandulosa | 1520.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 200.00 | 0.030 | 1400.00 | 0.000 | |
| sclepiadaceae climber | 160.00 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 840.00 | 0.420 | 0.00 | 0.130 | |
| Lantana camara | 200.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 960.00 | 0.140 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Shrubs total | 10240.00 | 2.86 | 23560.00 | 10.350 | 8200.00 | 1.540 | 18960.00 | 1.820 | |
| HERBS | 10210.00 | 2.00 | 2000000 | 10.000 | 0200.00 | 110 10 | 10/0000 | 1020 | |
| Eragrostis nigra | 22000.00 | 6.19 | 177000.00 | 77.760 | 34000.00 | 5.690 | 210000.00 | 20.110 | |
| Rubus racemosus | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5000.00 | 2.200 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 5000.00 | 0.480 | |
| Vernonia cineraria | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5000.00 | 2.200 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 15000.00 | 1.440 | |
| Cyperus angulatus | 34000.00 | 9.56 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 41000.00 | 6.860 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Mimosa sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7000.00 | 3.080 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 14000.00 | 1.340 | |
| Anaphalis sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 5000.00 | 0.840 | 5000.00 | 0.480 | |
| Cyanotis sp. | 230000.00 | 64.68 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 310000.00 | 51.890 | 217000.00 | 20.780 | |
| Blumea hieracifolia | 5000.00 | 1.41 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 6000.00 | 1.004 | 3000.00 | 0.290 | |
| Emilia sonchifolia | 3000.00 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 3000.00 | 0.500 | 7000.00 | 0.670 | |
| Cyperus rotundus | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 31000.00 | 5.190 | 48000.00 | 4.600 | |
| Solanum sp. | 1000.00 | 0.28 | 4000.00 | 1.760 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 4000.00 | 0.380 | |
| <i>Commelina</i> sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 12000.00 | 2.010 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Centella asiatica | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 21000.00 | 2.520 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Isachne sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 19000.00 | 3.180 | 26000.00 | 2.490 | |
| Viola serpens | 5000.00 | 1.41 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 2000.00 | 0.330 | 10000.00 | 0.960 | |
| Impatiens sp. | 32000.00 | 9.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 56000.00 | 9.370 | 0.00 | 0.000 | |
| Impatiens tomentosa | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 4000.00 | 0.380 | |
| Polygala crotolaria | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 3000.00 | 0.500 | 7000.00 | 0.670 | |
| Oldenlandia heyni | 10000.00 | 2.81 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 7000.00 | 1.170 | 34000.00 | 3.260 | |
| Impatiens crenata | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 3000.00 | 0.500 | 7000.00 | 0.670 | |
| Justicia simplex | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 14000.00 | 2.340 | 15000.00 | 1.440 | |
| Fimbriostylis sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 4000.00 | 0.670 | 7000.00 265000.00 | 0.670 | |
| Oxalis corniculata | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | | 25.380 | |
| Rubus ellipticus | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5000.00 | 2.200 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 6000.00 | 0.570 | |
| Rosa leschenaultii Kyllinga sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1000.00 | 0.440 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 4000.00 17000.00 | 0.380 | |
| Kyllinga sp. Tripogon | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 3000.00 | 1.630 0.290 | |
| Pennisetum grandestimum | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 7000.00 | 0.290 | |
| Themeda sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 3000.00 | 0.870 | |
| Ulex europaeus | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 1000.00 | 0.290 | |
| Isachne kunthiana | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 6000.00 | 0.570 | |
| Setaria glauca | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 12000.00 | 1.150 | |
| Leucas aspera | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 13000.00 | 2.180 | 42000.00 | 4.020 | |
| Conyza ambigua | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 1000.00 | 0.095 | |
| Digitaria sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 12000.00 | 1.150 | |
| Amaranthus sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 5000.00 | 0.480 | |
| Anotis sp. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 1000.00 | 0.170 | 3000.00 | 0.290 | |
| Herbs total | 342000.00 | 96.18 | 204000.00 | 89.64 | 585000.00 | 96.91 | 1025000.00 | 98.17 | |
| Overall total | 355610.00 | 100.00 | 227620.00 | 100.00 | 596450.00 | 100.00 | 1044040.00 | 100.00 | |

| Table-4 |
|---|
| Abundance, frequency and relative frequency for unburnt and burnt areas |

| Abundance, frequency and relative frequency for unburnt and burnt areas | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------|-----------|--------------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|--------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| Species | U | nburnt ar | , | | Burnt ar | ea | Unburn | t area | Alul I | Burnt | area | |
| | Ab | F | RF | Ab | F | RF | Ab | F | RF | Ab | F | RF |
| TREES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Todalia asiatica | 26.00 | 100 | 8.13 | 1.00 | 10 | 1.47 | 24.10 | 100 | 5.41 | 2.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Rhodomyrtus tomentosa | 6.30 | 100 | 8.13 | 1.00 | 30 | 4.41 | 7.20 | 100 | 5.41 | 1.00 | 30 | 1.57 |
| Symplocos spicata | 1.75 | 40 | 3.25 | 1.00 | 10 | 1.47 | 1.50 | 40 | 2.16 | 1.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Syzygium cumini | 1.50 | 20 | 1.63 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 20 | 1.08 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Acacia sp. | 1.00 | 20 | 1.63 | 1.00 | 10 | 1.47 | 1.00 | 10 | 0.54 | 2.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Glochidion malabaricum | 2.00 | 10 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 10 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Trees total | 38.55 | 280 | 23.58 | 4.00 | 60 | 8.82 | 37.30 | 280 | 15.14 | 6.00 | 60 | 3.13 |
| SHRUBS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dodonea viscosa | 3.25 | 80 | 6.50 | 2.14 | 70 | 10.29 | 2.00 | 70 | 3.78 | 1.86 | 70 | 3.66 |
| Osbeckia sp. | 4.57 | 70 | 5.69 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.17 | 60 | 3.24 | 1.33 | 30 | 1.57 |
| Berberis tinctorea | 1.50 | 20 | 1.63 | 4.33 | 60 | 8.82 | 1.00 | 40 | 2.16 | 4.67 | 60 | 3.14 |
| Desmodium rufescens | 1.00 | 40 | 3.25 | 4.00 | 70 | 10.29 | 2.40 | 50 | 2.70 | 2.71 | 70 | 3.66 |
| Smilax zeylanica | 1.33 | 30 | 2.44 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.67 | 30 | 1.62 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Pteridium aquilinum | 13.00 | 100 | 8.13 | 52.00 | 100 | 14.71 | 6.50 | 100 | 5.41 | 37.50 | 100 | 5.24 |
| Myrsine sp. | 2.00 | 10 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 30 | 1.62 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Brachylepis nervosa | 1.00 | 30 | 2.44 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.40 | 50 | 2.70 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Rosa leschenaultii | 1.00 | 50 | 4.07 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 50 | 2.70 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Eupatorium glandulosa | 5.43 | 70 | 5.69 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 6.89 | 90 | 4.86 | 8.75 | 40 | 2.09 |
| Asclepiadaceae climber | 1.33 | 30 | 2.44 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 70 | 3.78 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Lantana camara | 2.50 | 20 | 1.63 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 4.80 | 50 | 2.70 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Shrubs total | 37.92 | 550 | 44.72 | 62.47 | 300 | 44.11 | 32.83 | 690 | 37.27 | 56.82 | 370 | 19.36 |
| HERBS | 0102 | 220 | | 02.11/ | 200 | 1011 | 02.00 | 070 | 01121 | 20102 | 570 | 17100 |
| Eragrostis nigra | 7.33 | 30 | 2.44 | 17.70 | 100 | 14.71 | 3.78 | 90 | 4.86 | 21.00 | 100 | 5.24 |
| Rubus racemosus | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 50 | 7.35 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.25 | 40 | 2.09 |
| Vernonia cineraria | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 40 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.88 | 80 | 4.19 |
| Cyperus angulatus | 6.80 | 50 | 4.07 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 4.10 | 100 | 5.41 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mimosa sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 70 | 10.29 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 70 | 3.66 |
| Anaphalis sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.66 | 30 | 1.62 | 2.50 | 20 | 1.05 |
| Cyanotis sp. | 28.75 | 80 | 6.50 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 44.29 | 70 | 3.78 | 27.13 | 80 | 4.19 |
| Blumea hieracifolia | 1.00 | 50 | 4.07 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.20 | 50 | 2.70 | 1.00 | 30 | 1.57 |
| Emilia sonchifolia | 1.50 | 20 | 1.63 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 30 | 1.62 | 1.40 | 50 | 2.62 |
| Cyperus rotundus | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 4.43 | 70 | 3.78 | 12.00 | 40 | 2.02 |
| Solanum sp. | 1.00 | 10 | 0.81 | 1.33 | 30 | 4.41 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 12.00 | 40 | 2.09 |
| Commelina sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 80 | 4.32 | 0.00 | 40 | 0.00 |
| Commetina sp. Centella asiatica | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 5.25 | 40 | 2.16 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Isachne sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.17 | 60 | 3.24 | 3.71 | 70 | 3.66 |
| Viola serpens | 1.25 | 40 | 3.25 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 10 | 0.54 | 1.67 | 60 | 3.14 |
| | 4.57 | 70 | 5.69 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 9.33 | 60 | 3.24 | 3.71 | 70 | 3.66 |
| Impatiens sp. | 0.00 | 0 | | 0.00 | 0 | | | | 1.62 | | | |
| Impatiens tomentosa | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | - | 0.00 | 1.00 | 30 | | 1.33 | 30 40 | 1.57 2.09 |
| Polygala crotolaria | 2.50 | 0 40 | 0.00 3.25 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 2.33 | 0 30 | 0.00 | 1.75 4.86 | 40 70 | 3.67 |
| Oldenlandia heyni | 0.00 | 40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 20 | 1.02 | 1.75 | 40 | 2.09 |
| Impatiens crenata | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | |
| Justicia simplex | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 70 | 3.78 | 3.00 | 50 | 2.62 |
| Fimbriostylis sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 10 0 | 0.54 | 1.75 | 40 80 | 2.09 4.19 |
| Oxalis corniculata | | - | 0.00 | | - | | | - | 0.00 | 33.13 | | |
| Rubus ellipticus | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 20 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.20 | 50 | 2.62 |
| Rosa leschenaultii | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 10 | 1.47 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 40 | 2.09 |
| <i>Kyllinga</i> sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 4.25 | 40 | 2.09 |
| Tripogon | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Pennisetum grandestimum | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.33 | 30 | 1.57 |
| Themeda sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Ulex europaeus | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Isachne kunthiana | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 20 | 1.05 |
| Setaria glauca | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.71 | 70 | 3.66 |
| Leucas aspera | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 6.50 | 20 | 1.08 | 8.40 | 50 | 2.62 |
| Conyza ambigua | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 10 | 0.52 |
| Digitaria sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.40 | 50 | 2.62 |
| Amaranthus sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.25 | 40 | 2.09 |
| Anotis sp. | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 10 | 0.54 | 1.50 | 20 | 1.05 |
| Herbs total | 54.70 | 390 | 31.71 | 25.78 | 320 | 47.05 | 100.04 | 880 | 47.53 | 162.86 | 1550 | 81.11 |
| Overall total | 131.17 | 1230 | 100.00 | 92.25 | 680 | 100.00 | 170.17 | 1850 | 100.00 | 225.68 | 1980 | 100.00 |

| | | Immediately after fire | | | | After monsoon | | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------|---------------|------------|-----|--|
| Species | Unburr | nt area | Burnt | area | Unburnt | area | Burnt area | | |
| Species | D | RD | D | RD | D | RD | D | RD | |
| | (m^2/ha) | (%) | (m ² /ha) | (%) | (m ² /ha) | (%) | (m^2/ha) | (%) | |
| Todalia asiatica | 0.00806 | 72.48 | 0.00003 | 17.65 | 0.00844 | 69.81 | 0.00006 | 24 | |
| Rhodomyrtus tomentosa | 0.00239 | 21.49 | 0.00008 | 47.06 | 0.00302 | 24.98 | 0.00010 | 40 | |
| Symplcos spicata | 0.00018 | 1.62 | 0.00004 | 23.53 | 0.00015 | 1.24 | 0.00003 | 12 | |
| Syzygium cumini | 0.00040 | 3.60 | - | - | 0.00040 | 3.31 | - | - | |
| Acacia sp. | 0.00004 | 0.36 | 0.00002 | 11.76 | 0.00002 | 0.17 | 0.00006 | 24 | |
| Glochidion malabaricum | 0.00005 | 0.45 | - | - | 0.00006 | 0.50 | - | - | |
| Total | 0.01112 | 100 | 0.00017 | 100 | 0.01209 | 100 | 0.00025 | 100 | |

| Table-5 |
|---|
| Dominance and relative dominance for the trees of unburnt and burnt areas |

 Table-6

 Importance value index for trees in burnt and unburnt areas

| | | Immediate | ly after fire | | After monsoon | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|---------------|--------|---------------|---------|------------|--------|--|
| Species | Unburnt area | | Burnt area | | Unburr | nt area | Burnt area | | |
| | IVI | RIVI | IVI | RIVI | IVI | RIVI | IVI | RIVI | |
| Todalia asiatica | 123.170 | 41.055 | 56.780 | 18.926 | 123.468 | 41.156 | 65.749 | 21.916 | |
| Rhodomyrtus tomentosus | 67.130 | 22.377 | 126.122 | 42.041 | 73.918 | 24.639 | 16.920 | 38.973 | |
| Symplcos spicatus | 25.211 | 8.404 | 65.244 | 21.748 | 25.681 | 8.560 | 58.586 | 19.529 | |
| Syzygium cumini | 56.247 | 18.749 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 55.129 | 18.376 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| Acacia sp. | 14.870 | 4.957 | 51.857 | 17.286 | 11.138 | 3.713 | 58.745 | 19.582 | |
| Glochidion neiloghirensis | 13.382 | 4.461 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 14.369 | 4.790 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| Total | 300.01 | 100.00 | 300.00 | 100.00 | 300.00 | 100.00 | 300.00 | 100.00 | |

Conclusion

The effect of forest fire has heavily influenced the vegetation composition of the study site. The diversity indices and the vegetation study help to conclude that the type of fire occurring in the study site is crown fire and seriously damaging the tree strata in the vegetation, consequently ended with change in vegetation composition. The analysis in the burnt and unburnt area showed that the forest has good regeneration potential especially after the monsoon period. However, the regeneration potential has been seriously affected due to regular occurrence of forest fire in study site. The diversity indices and vegetational study helps to conclude that the regeneration potential of the study site is good enough to regain its original vegetation status if the fire is prevented through good forest management plan.

Reference

- 1. Goldammer J.G., Werner S., Berhold S., Anja A.H. and Hartmut A., Impacts of fire on Dipterocarp forest ecosystem in southeast Asia, In: Proc. 3rd Intern. Symp. Asian Trop. For. Manage., Samarinda (1999)
- Khanna L.S., Principles and practices of silviculture. 3rd Edition, Khanna Bandhu, Dehra Dun, 130-134 (1998)
- **3.** Srivastava R.K., Impact of forest fire on Indian biodiversity, In: Proceeding of XII Silviculture Conference, 143-145 (**2006**)

- 4. Anon, Forest Survey of India Report. Published by the Forest Survey of India, Govt. of India, Dehradun (2001)
- 5. Roy P.S., Assessment of forest fires in India through remote sensing. Asia-Pacific Regional Cooperation on the scientific dimensions of forest fires, Report of the Project Planning Meeting, COSTED Central Secretariat, Chennai, 51-77 (2000)
- 6. Srivastava R.K., Forest fire and its prevention by generating environmental awareness in the rural masses, World Forestry Congress, Turkey (1997)
- Srivastava R.K., Forest fire and biotic interference A great threat to Nilgiri Biosphere, *Indian Forester*: 667-673 (2002)
- 8. Champion H.G. and Seth S.K., A revised survey of forest types in India, Government of India, Publications Branch, New Delhi (1968)
- **9.** Somasundaram K., Working plan (Part I, II and II) for the Nilgiris North Forest Division, Tamil Nadu Forest Department (**2005**)
- 10. Carter R.N. and Prince S.D., Epidemic models used to explain biogeographical distribution limits, *Nature*, 293, 644-645 (1981)
- Prince S.D., Data analysis in methods in plant ecology (2nd Ed.) (Ed. P.D.Moore and S.B. Chapman), Blackwell, Oxford, 345-375 (1986)

- 12. Daniels R.J.R., Jayshree V. and Anuradha G., Biodiversity indexing in agriculture – landscapes to species, M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation, Chennai. FAO / UNDP. PER CENT, 43 (1996)
- 13. Smith F.D.M., May R.M., Pellow R., Johnson T.M. and Water K.R., Estimating extinction rate, *Nature*, **64**, 494-496 (**1983**)
- 14. Muller-Dombois S.D. and Ellenberg H., Aims and methods of vegetation ecology, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1975)
- Margalef R., Diversidad de especies enlas communicads naturals. Pulbines University Press, Princeton, N.J., 179 (1951)
- **16.** Simpson E.H., Measurement of diversity, *Nature*, **163**, 688 (**1949**)
- 17. Shannon C.E. and Wiener W., The mathematical theory of communication, University of Illionis Press, USA (1963)

- **18.** Srivastava R.K., Impact of forest fire on ecotone zone of shola-grassland ecosystem, *Ph.D. Thesis*, Forest Research Institute, Deemed University, Dehra Dun (**2001**)
- **19.** Calvo L., Santalla S., Marcos E., Valbuena L., Tarrega R. and Luis E., Regeneration after wildfire in communities dominated by *Pinus pinaster*, an obligate seeder, and in others dominated by *Quercus pyrenaica*, a typical resprouter, *Forest Ecology and management*, **184**, 209-223 (**2003**)
- **20.** Swarupanandan K., Sankaran K.V., Thomas T.P., Surendran T. and Menon A.R.R., Fire related ecosystem dynamics in the moist deciduous forest of Western Ghats, *KFRI Research Report No.* **223**, KFRI, Peechi, 69 (**2001**)
- **21.** Thomas T.P., Impact of fire on soil of moist deciduous forest in kerala, India **In**: proc. Int. Symp. Tropical Forestry Research: Challenges in the New Millennium, Peechi, India, 65-70 (**2001**)