

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

Procedia Environmental Sciences 2 (2010) 1966–1969

---

**Procedia**  
Environmental Sciences

---

International Society for Environmental Information Sciences 2010 Annual Conference (ISEIS)

## The construction of Grassland Degradation Index for Alpine Meadow in Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau

L. Wen<sup>a</sup>, S.K. Dong<sup>a</sup> \*, L. Zhu<sup>a</sup>, X.Y. Li<sup>a</sup>, J. J. Shi<sup>b</sup>, Y. L. Wang<sup>b</sup>, Y. S. Ma<sup>b</sup>*a* State Key Laboratory of Water Environment Simulation, Environmental School of Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China*b* Qinghai Academy of Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine, Xining, 810003, China

---

### Abstract

Diagnosing the degradation degree of grassland ecosystem is the basis for ecological restoration. However, there is no literature documenting how to quantify the grassland degradation degree by using visible indicators. In this study, an integrated degradation index was developed to assess the grassland condition on the basis of applicability and certainty analysis through a cases study from degraded alpine grassland on Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau of China.

© 2009 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

**Keywords:** Grassland Degradation Index (GDI); Alpine grassland; Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau (QTP).

---

### 1. Introduction

Qinghai-Tibet Plateau, the “roof” of the world, is an important eco-region in both China and the world. It is the source regions of Yangtze, Yellow and Mekong Rivers and is called “China Water Tower”. Alpine grasslands covers more than 85% of the total land in this area, which is regarded as one of major natural pastures in China, and provide great ecosystem function and services<sup>[1]</sup>. However, alpine grasslands in this area have suffered from severe degradation driven by coupled effects of climate change, population growth, livestock overgrazing and rodent damage etc., alpine meadow has suffered from quite severe degradation<sup>[2-3]</sup>. Moreover, degraded grassland is expanding with the increase rate of 1.2-7.44% annually<sup>[4]</sup>. Under such circumstances, the restoration of degraded alpine grasslands is urgently needed. To design the restoration strategies properly, reliable diagnosis of grassland degradation should be implemented. In this context, the present study was conducted to quantify the degradation degree of the alpine grassland through developing an integrated grassland degradation index (GDI) on the basis of visible indicators.

Diagnosis of degradation degree of grassland ecosystem is the basis and the precondition of ecological restoration<sup>[5]</sup>. Estimates of the area variously categorized as degraded throughout China generally and on the QTP specifically

---

\* Corresponding author: Tel: +86-010-58802029.

E-mail address: [dongshikui@sina.com](mailto:dongshikui@sina.com).

have been published <sup>[6-9]</sup>. In these literatures, grassland degradation was defined by some visible indicators such as species diversity, plant height, vegetation cover and plant productivity <sup>[10]</sup>. These classification criteria are all qualitative or semiquantitative. So far, there is no literature documents discussed how to quantify the grassland degradation degree by visible indicators. In addition, there is no way to assess the degraded degree, if the data collected from survey can not completely suit the classification criteria. In this paper, our aims are to quantifying the degradation degree of the alpine meadow by visible indicators, construct the Grassland Degradation Index (GDI) based on the classification criteria for alpine grassland in QTP from Ma et al(2002), and evaluate the condition of the grassland degradation degree in Maqin country in Qinghai Province.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Study area

The study was conducted in Dawu village, Maqin county of Guoluo Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Qinghai Province. The average elevation of this area is 4200m with typical continental climate. The annually average temperature is -0.6°C, the lowest temperature is -34.9°C, annual accumulated temperatures above 0°C and 5°C are 1202.6°C and 865.0°C respectively. Annual precipitation is 513mm, occurring mainly from May to September. Annual evaporation is 1459mm. Annual sunshine hours are 2571h. There is no absolutely frost-free period. The soil is silt-clay, which is classified as alpine meadow soil according to Chinese Soil Classification System. The primary vegetation of alpine grassland was dominated by alpine meadows composed mainly of *Kobresia* spps. *Polygonum* spp. and *Poa* spp. <sup>[11]</sup>.

### 2.2. Field survey and sampling

The vegetation composition and cover were surveyed with four 100cm×100cm quadrats in each site of alpine grassland at different degradation degrees to testify the feasibility of grassland degradation classification in present study. Plant biomass (primary production) in differently degraded grasslands was measured by clipping vegetation samples from these quadrats.

### 2.3. Data analysis

Data analyses were performed using the Excel 2007. The important value (IV) of each species is calculated by the formula.

$$IV = \frac{C_r + B_r + H_r}{n} \quad (1)$$

$$C_r = \frac{C_i}{\sum C_i} \quad (2)$$

$$B_r = \frac{B_i}{\sum B_i} \quad (3)$$

$$H_r = \frac{H_i}{\sum H_i} \quad (4)$$

Note:  $C_r$  represents relative coverage,  $B_r$  represents relative dry biomass,  $H_r$  represents relative height.  $C_i$  represents the coverage of specie  $i$ ;  $B_i$  represents the biomass of specie  $i$ ;  $H_i$  represents the height of specie  $i$ .

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Construction and assessment of the Grassland Degradation Index (GDI)

At present, scholars general use ecological methods to assess the condition of the degraded grassland, based on vegetation survey. They survey the vegetation composition, coverage, biomass and some other indicators, and compared to the non-degradation grassland then evaluate the degradation degree. On the foundation of the succession theory (monoclimax theory or polyclimax theory), they define the classification standard by some visible indicators. Table 1 shows the criterion of grassland degradation degree revised on the criterion form Ma et al (2002), and then as a basis for construct the GDI.

Table1 The indicator and criterion of degree of grassland degradation ( revised on the criterion from Ma)

| Degradation degree | coverage(%) | The proportion of the grassland productivity (%) | the proportion of the edible plants(%) | the height of the edible plants(cm) |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ND                 | 85-100      | 100                                              | 70                                     | >25                                 |
| LD                 | 70-85       | 50-75                                            | 50-70                                  | 20                                  |
| MD                 | 50-70       | 30-50                                            | 30-50                                  | 12                                  |
| HD                 | 30-50       | 15-30                                            | 15-30                                  | 2                                   |
| SD                 | <30         | <15                                              | almost 0                               | almost 0                            |

Note: ND, LD, MD, HD, SD represent non-degradation, light degradation, moderate degradation, heavy degradation and severe degradation, respectively.

The weight is calculated on the basis of the decrease amplitude of each indicators. Then multiply these indicators by their weight and summation. GDI is calculated in accordance with the following formula.

$$GDI = (100 - C) \times 28\% + (100 - P) \times 39\% + (70 - E) \times 26\% + (25 - H) \times 7\%$$

Note: C% represents coverage of the total; P% represents the proportion of the grassland productivity; E% represents the proportion of the edible plants; H (cm) represents the height of the edible plants.

According to the standard of classification, GDI of different degradation degree is given in the following table (Table 2).

Table 2 Grassland Degradation Index of different degradation degree

| Gradation degree | GDI       | Gradation degree | GDI       |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| ND               | <13.9     | LD               | 13.9-33.5 |
| MD               | 33.5-52.4 | HD               | 52.4-68.4 |
| SD               | 68.4-87   |                  |           |

Note: ND, LD, MD, HD, SD represent non-degradation, light degradation, moderate degradation, heavy degradation and severe degradation, respectively.

### 3.2. The case of the usage for GDI

Based on the method of calculation for GDI, we can qualify the degradation degree of alpine grassland by some visible factors. This index can solve the problem that the investigate data can not suit the criterion very well. Table 3 shows the evaluate results by using GDI for alpine grassland in Maqin Country. Form the result, in heavy degradation grassland, the dominant species are *Ligularia virgaurea*, the subdominant species are some other forbs like *Morina coulteriana*, *Leontopodium nanum*, *Frigida willd*. In moderate degradation, dominant species and subdominant species are *Ligularia virgaurea* and *Polygonum viviparum*. For light and non degradation grassland, the dominant species almost are Palatable *Polygonum macrophyllum*.

Table 3 Evaluate results by using GDI for alpine grassland in Maqin Country

| Sample plots | Dominant species       |      | Subdominant species    |      | GDI  | Degree of grassland degradation |
|--------------|------------------------|------|------------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|
|              | species                | IV   | species                | IV   |      |                                 |
| 1            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 16.0 | Morina coulteriana     | 11.8 | 61.5 | Heavy degradation               |
| 2            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 14.9 | Leontopodium nanum     | 14.6 | 66.1 | Heavy degradation               |
| 3            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 16.5 | Frigida willd          | 12.2 | 64.0 | Heavy degradation               |
| 4            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 26.4 | Polygonum viviparum    | 14.1 | 33.7 | Moderate degradation            |
| 5            | Polygonum viviparum    | 30.2 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 20.3 | 37.0 | Moderate degradation            |
| 6            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 22.8 | Polygonum viviparum    | 21.6 | 43.6 | Moderate degradation            |
| 7            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 15.9 | Polygonum viviparum    | 15.4 | 41.9 | Moderate degradation            |
| 8            | Polygonum macrophyllum | 21.2 | Lingua linn            | 11.2 | 29.1 | Light degradation               |
| 9            | Ligularia virgaurea    | 16.3 | Polygonum macrophyllum | 16.1 | 28.0 | Light degradation               |
| 10           | Polygonum macrophyllum | 23.1 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 19.0 | 29.1 | Light degradation               |
| 11           | Polygonum macrophyllum | 18.3 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 7.3  | 27.6 | Light degradation               |
| 12           | Polygonum macrophyllum | 26.2 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 12.7 | 1.2  | Non degradation                 |
| 13           | Polygonum viviparum    | 22.9 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 14.8 | 4.8  | Non degradation                 |
| 14           | Polygonum macrophyllum | 23.2 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 14.9 | 4.9  | Non degradation                 |
| 15           | Polygonum macrophyllum | 21.2 | Ligularia virgaurea    | 12.7 | 1.8  | Non degradation                 |

Note: IV represent important value.

## Acknowledgements

This research is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China projects (30870466, 50939001). The authors wish to express great thanks to reviewers and editors for their time and efforts.

## References

- [1] Dong SK, Wen L, Zhu L, and Li XY. Implication of coupled natural and human systems in sustainable rangeland ecosystem management in HKH region. *Frontiers of Earth Science in China* 2010;**4**: 42-50.
- [2] Li XG, Zhang ML, Li ZT, Shi XM, Ma QF, Long RJ. Dynamics of soil properties and organic carbon pool in topsoil of zokor-made mounds at an alpine site of the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau. *Biol Fertil Soils* 2009;**45**:865-872.
- [3] Feng RZ, Long RJ, Shang ZH, Ma YS, Dong SK, Wang YL. Establishment of *Elymus natans* improves soil quality of a heavily degraded alpine meadow in Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau, China. *Plant Soil* 2010;**327**:403-411.
- [4] Ma YS, Zhang ZH, Dong QM, Shi JJ, Wang YL, Sheng L. Application of restoration ecology in 'black soil type' degraded grassland rebuilding. *Journal of Gansu Agricultural University* 2007;**42**:91-97.
- [5] Du XJ, Gao XM, Ma KP. Diagnosis of the degree of degradation of an ecosystem: the basis and precondition of ecological restoration. *Acta Phytocologica Sinica* 2003;**27**:700-708.
- [6] Li B. Grassland degradation and suggestions for strategic prevention in North China. *Scientia Agricultura Sinica* 1997;**30**:1-9.
- [7] Chen ZZ. *Steppe ecosystem in China*. Beijing: Science Press; 2000, p. 307-315.
- [8] Liu ZL. Probes on the degeneration and recovery succession mechanisms of Inner Mongolia steppe. *Journal of Arid Land Resources and Environment* 2002;**26**:84-90.
- [9] Ma, YS, Lang BN, Li QY, Shi JJ, Dong QM. Study on rehabilitating and rebuilding technologies for degenerated alpine meadow in the Yangtze and Yellow River source region. *Pratacultural Science* 2002;**19**:1-5.
- [10] Han JG, Zhang YJ, Wang CJ, Bai WM, Wang YR, Han GD, Li LH. Rangeland degradation and restoration management in China. *The Rangeland Journal* 2008;**30**:233-239.
- [11] Wang QJ, Lai ZD, Jing ZC, Li SX, Shi HL. The resources, ecological environment and sustainable development in the source regions of the Yangtze, Huanghe and Yalu Tsangpo Rivers. *Journal of Lanzhou University (Natural Sciences)* 2005;**41**:50-55.