

Print ISSN 0255-965X; Electronic 1842-4309 Not Bot Hort Agrobot Cluj, 2011, 39(1):119-125



# Influence of the Management on the Phytocoenotic Biodiversity of Some Romanian Representative Grassland Types

Vasile VÎNTU<sup>1</sup>, Costel SAMUIL<sup>1</sup>, Ioan ROTAR<sup>2</sup>, Alexandru MOISUC<sup>3</sup>, Iosif RAZEC<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Iasi, 3 M. Sadoveanu Aleea, 700490, Romania; vvintu@uaiasi.ro, csamuil@uaiasi.ro
 <sup>2</sup>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Cluj-Napoca, 3-5 Mănăştur, 400372, Romania; rotarioan52@yahoo.fr
 <sup>3</sup>Banat University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Timisoara, 119 Aradului Calea, 300645, Romania; alex\_moisuc@yahoo.de
 <sup>4</sup>Institute of Research-Development for Grasslands, Brasov, 5 Cucului, 500128, Romania; razeci@yahoo.com

# Abstract

The pastoral area of Romania, covering of over 4.8 million ha, has been influenced, over the last decades, by natural and human factors, which affect the normal functioning of the grassland ecosystem. The aim of this paper is to point out the dynamics of phytocoenotic biodiversity, as a result of applying grassland technical measures, in order to improve the yield and quality of grassland ecosystems with minimum effects on the environment. Therefore, the main aim of our study is to establish a positive relationship between biodiversity and the optimum quantity of organic fertilizers, which would improve the quality and quantity of the yield, without diminishing the floristic biodiversity. In the case of the studied grasslands, the phytocenotic biodiversity is influenced by the type of fertilization, the used rates and by the soil and climatic conditions. These grasslands may be improved by manure fertilization and reasonable usage, if proper management is applied. In Gradinari, Caras-Severin county, the dominant species are *Festuca rupicola* and *Calamagrostis epigeios*, in Magurele, Brasov county, *Agrostis capillaris, Festuca pratensis, Poa pratensis* and *Trifolium repens*, and in Pojorata, Suceava county, *Agrostis capillaris, Trisetum flavescens, Trifolium repens* and *T. pratense* species. The highest number of identified species (43) has been recorded by the meadow made up of *Agrostis capillaris* and *Festuca rubra*, from Pojorata, Suceava county.

Keywords: forbs, grasses, legumes, organic fertilization, vegetal canopy

## Introduction

Biodiversity has become one of the main concerns of our world, because modern farming, forestry and meadow culture focussed, in these latter years, on developing methods and proceedings for achieving high productions, without being interested in the quality of produces or environment health. Among the factors threatening biodiversity, one enlists human activities, high pressures on natural resources, division, change or even destruction of habitats, excessive use of pesticides, chemical fertilizers etc. (Weigelt et al., 2009). Nowadays, many specialists are concerned with adapting the technologies of fodder production to the new economic and ecological requirements, whilst the maintaining of biodiversity occupies an important place (Belesky et al. 2002; Duelli, 1997; Elsaesser et al., 2008; Hopkins et al., 1999; Jeangros, 2002; Nilsson, 2009; Peeters et al., 2004; Rotar et al., 2010; Vîntu et al. 2003; 2008). Previous research, done in different climatic and managerial conditions proved that there is a relationship between biodiversity and pastures productivity. The latter is influenced by the soils fertility, chemical reaction, and usage, intensity of grazing, altitude, amount and distribution rainfalls (Dolek and Gezer, 2002; Dumont et al., 2007; Hector and Loreau, 2005; Isselstein et al., 2007; Kopec *et al.*, 2010; Metera *et al.*, 2010; Mosquera-Losada *et al.*, 2009; Soder *et al.*, 2007; Tilman *et al.*, 1996).

The objectifs of this paper are to establish the influence of the management on the rate of species in the structure of vegetation, and dominant species in the vegetal canopy; to establish the influence of the type of fertilization on the dynamics of biodiversity and to establish the best dose of fertilization in order to improve the production on the permanent grassland.

For attaining the paper's objectives, the main meadow ecosystems assessed have been qualitatively and quantitatively and the evolution of vegetal canopy has been diagnosed according to the management of some meadow types found under different ecological conditions.

### Materials and methods

For the study of the meadows' vegetation, we have used the geo-botanical method (Braun Blanquet, 1964) by carrying out observations on experimental variants and replicates during the first cycle of vegetation.

The species included in the floristic catalogues of the areas under study have been classified into several categories, according to their dominance: *dominant* species (coverage degree of 60-100%), *co-dominant* species (coverage degree of 25-40%) and *indicator* species, with a low presence in

Variants	Gradinari, Caras-Severin county	Magurele, Brasov county	Pojorata, Suceava county
1	unfertilized control	unfertilized control	unfertilized control
2	10 t/ha manure, applied once in 3 years	20 t/ha manure every 2 years, application in autumn and usage as hayfield	10 t/ha manure every year
3	20 t/ha manure, applied once in 3 years	20 t/ha manure every 2 years, application in autumn and usage by simulation grazing	20 t/ha manure every 2 years
4	30 t/ha manure, applied once in 3 years	20 t/ha manure every 2 years, application in spring and usage as hayfield	30 t/ha manure every 3 years
5	40 t/ha manure, applied once in 3 years	20 t/ha manure every 2 years, application in spring and usage by simulation grazing	20 t/ha manure in the first year+10 t/ha manure in the second year+0 t/ha manure in the third year
6	10 t/ha manure, applied each year	40 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in autumn and usage as hayfield	20 t/ha manure in the first year+0 t/ha in the second year+10 t/ ha manure in the third year
7	20 t/ha manure, applied each year	40 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in autumn and usage by simulation grazing	20 t/ha manure in the first year+10 t/ha manure in the second year+10 t/ha manure in the third year
8	30 t/ha manure, applied each year	40 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in spring and usage as hayfield	10 t/ha manure in the first year+20 t/ha manure in the second year+10 t/ha manure in the third year
9	40 t/ha manure, applied each year	40 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in spring and usage by simulation grazing	-
10	40 t/ha manure, applied every 3 year +10 t/ha manure, applied each year	60 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in autumn and usage as hayfield	-
11	-	60 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in autumn and usage by simulation grazing	-
12	-	60 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in spring and usage as hayfield	-
13	-	60 t/ha manure every 4 years, application in spring and usage by simulation grazing	-

120 Tab. 1. Experimental variants in the studied sites

the vegetal canopy, still expressing the specific features of the ecological factors (acid or alkaline soils, fertile or poor soils in nutrients, moist or dry soils etc.).

The studies have been carried out in Gradinari, Caras-Severin county, Magurele, Brasov country and Pojorata, Suceava county (Romania), and they have been organized in monofactorial experiments, in randomized blocks with four replicates, as presented in Tab. 1. The manure was applied manually in very early spring, in March, at the beginning of grass growth.

The experimental variants were differed from location to location according to the variation of the manure dosis used in order to fertilize the natural pastures of the area by the animal growers.

In Gradinari and Pojorata, the meadows was mowed in haystacks, at the level of inflorescences formation at the dominant grasses, while, in Magurele, half of the experimental variants have been harvested by mowing, as haystacks, as if by simulating grazing, mowed at a height of 15-18 cm of dominant plants.

# **Results and discussion**

The experiments presented in this paper have been conducted on representative meadows, found under di-

verse ecological conditions from three sites and spread in two vegetation zones: the forest-steppe zone/level with one site (Gradinari, Caras-Severin county), the nemoral level with two sites (Magurele, Brasov county, Pojorata, Suceava county) (Fig. 1).

The data presented in Tab. 2 have shown that the mean multiannual temperatures recorded values that vary between 6.5 and 10.4°C, and the rainfall regime that influenced greatly the productivity and composition of the vegetal canopy registred mean annual values comprised between 700 and 836.0 mm. The analysed meadow ecosystems are located at average heights varying between 195 and 707 m.

Tab. 2. Soil and ecological characteristics of the studied sites

Site	Mean temperature (°C)	Mean rainfall (mm)	Average altitude (m)	Soil type
Gradinari- Caras- Severin	10.4	836	195	Moderately eroded cambic chernozem
Magurele- Brasov	7.2	700	600	Dark eu- mesobasic
Pojorata- Suceava	6.5	708.7	707	Dark eu- mesobasic



Fig. 1. Location of the three sites on Romanian territory

The meadow vegetation from the Gradinari area presented a 100% coverage degree; the dominant species in the vegetal canopy was Festuca rupicola with a specific coverage of 16-66% when fertilised, compared with 33% in the unfertilized control. The *co-dominant* species in the Gradinari area is Calamagrostis epigeios, with a specific coverage of up to 49% at a fertilization rate of 20 t/ha manure, applied once in 3 years. The grass species had a significant contribution to the vegetal canopy, varying between 63-89%. Data analysis recorded a diminishing of the share of the Calamagrostis epigeios species, with low fodder value, in the majority of fertilised variants. The legums species presented very low participation in the vegetal canopy, with a 1-2% coverage degree, but the forbs contributed at the vegetal canopy formation with 11-36%, of major importance being Filipendula vulgaris and Achillea millefolium (Tab. 3). Manure fertilisation, under the terrain and climatic conditions of the Gradinari area brought no important changes in the legumes share, but determined a rise in weeds presence in five of the fertilised variants and a diminishing of their presence in only two of the studied variants (from 22% to 11% in V7, respectively 12% in V9). The chemical reaction of the vegetal canopy at fertilisation depends, among others, on the soil type and climatic conditions (Hector, 2005; Kopec, 2010). The vegetal canopy of this meadow was made up of 31 species, of which 29% belong to the grass family, 6% to Cyperaceae and Juncaceae and 10% to legumes, the rest of 55% being represented by the species belonging to other botanical families.

As for the number of species, which form the vegetal canopy of the Gradinari meadow, we have identified 31 species, 9 of them belonging to the grass family, 3 to legumes, 2 to *Cyperaceae* and *Juncaceae* and 19 species to other botanical families (forbs).

In Magurele, Brasov county, the organic fertilization has especially influenced the floristic composition, 20-31 species being found on average in the vegetal canopy. The grass species participated in the vegetal canopy with 61-72%, the legumes, with 13-29% and the forbs, with 7-18%. Tab. 4 shows the increase in the presence of Poa pratensis species by 15-30% and of Festuca pratensis species, by 15-20%, according to different manners of usage. An increase in the presence of valuable grasses was also found: Dactylis glomerata (until up to 10% in V10) and Arrhenatherum elatius, in some fertilization variants (2-3% in V2-V4), as well as Festuca pratensis and Poa pratensis, to the prejudice of Festuca rubra and Agrostis capillaris species, whose contribution to the composition of the vegetal canopy decreased visibly. Therefore, the increase of soil fertility determined a change of meadow dominance and also an increase in valuable species share, with high productivity, aspects that have also been identified by Mosquera-Losada (2009), Tilman (1996).

Within the species of legumes, we have noticed their increased presence in the vegetal canopy, until 13-29%. Among all the variants, the dominant species, was *Trifolium repens*, with a growth of 12-22% at fertilization rates, compared with only 2% at the unfertilized control, followed by *Trifolium pratense* 2-5%, *Lotus corniculatus* 1-3% and *Medicago lupulina* 2-7%.

Under the eco-climatic conditions of Magurele, manure fertilization has determined an important growth 122

Tab. 3. Dynamics of phytocoenotic biodiversity on *Festuca rupicola* grassland from Gradinari, Caras-Severin county (%)

		-	-						-	
Species	V <sub>1</sub>	V.,	V <sub>3</sub>	$V_4$	V <sub>5</sub>	V <sub>6</sub>	$V_7$	V <sub>8</sub>	V <sub>9</sub>	V <sub>10</sub>
Festuca rupicola	33	32	16	49	66	47	46	15	49	47
Poa pratensis	15	+	+	+		+	+	+		+
Calamagrostis epigeios	30	46	49	16	15	32	14	45	+	29
Anthoxanthum odoratum	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	1	+
Bromus inermis			+	+		+	29	3	15	
Briza media			+			+				
Brachypodium pinnatum			+		+			+	+	+
Alopecurus pratensis		+		12			+		13	
Bromus mollis					+	+				+
Grasses	78	78	65	77	81	79	89	63	78	76
Trifolium repens				+	+			1	+	
Lotus corniculatus	1	+	2	+	+	1	+	+	+	1
Genista tinctoria			+				+			+
Legumes	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
Luzula luzuloides	+					+				
Carex praecox				+			+		+	+
Filipendula vulgaris	1	15	29	5	14	16	5	15	5	14
Plantago media	1	+	2	+	1	1	1	+	+	1
Cichorium intybus	+	+								+
Agrimonia eupatoria	+	2	+	7	+	+	2	+	+	1
Achillea millefolium	16	2	+	2	1			14	3	4
Rosa gallica	+	+		+		1	1			+
Ranunculus acris	+		+	+	+			+	1	
Thymus serpyllum	1	1		+	1	1		1	1	1
Crataegus monogyna		+					+			
Galium molugo	1	+	+			+		+		1
Euphorbia cyparissias			1	9	1		+	1	1	+
Hieracium pilosella		1			+			+		
Linaria genistifolia			1		+	1	1		+	1
Pastinaca sativa			+			+				+
Origanum vulgare						+				
Prunella vulgaris	1	1		+	1		1	2	1	+
Scabiosa ochroleuca			+							+
Forbs	21	22	33	33	19	20	11	36	12	23
Species number	16	17	20	17	17	18	17	18	18	22

of legumes rate within the vegetal canopy, improving the quality of fodder, in all of the studied variants, confirming thus the hypothesis of a strong link between plants and the environmental conditions (Kopec, 2010; Hopkins, 1999; Metera, 2010).

The forbs are of reduced importance in the formation of biomass; still, they include a relatively high number of species (10-14), some of which can be used as fodder: *Achillea millefolium, Bellis perennis, Plantago lanceolata, Taraxacum officinale, Convolvulus arvensis*, whereas other are harmful to meadows: *Cirsium arvense, Colchicum autumnale* and *Ranunculus acris*.

In Pojorata, Suceava county, the organic fertilization had a positive influence on the floristic composition, were 33-40 species have been found in the vegetal canopy; the percentage of grasses was of 32-43%, legumes, 27-36% and that of plants belonging to the diverse group, varied between 21-32%. Data from Tab. 5 show the increased presence of legume species, from 19% (control) to 27-36% (V6, respectively V4 si V8), especially *Trifolium repens, T. pratense* and *Lotus corniculatus*. The group of forbs was largely present in the formation of the biomass (20 -29 species), some of them having fodder value (*Achillea millefolium, Plantago media P. lanceolata, Taraxacum officinale*) and others without fodder value (*Chrysanthemum leucanthemum Filipendula hexapetala, Prunella vulgaris*), or even being toxic (*Colchicum autumnale*).

## Conclusions

The management of permanent grasslands, in terms of usage, type and intensity of fertilization and method of control has a great influence on phytocoenotic biodiversity, on the rate of species in the structure of vegetation,

Tab. 4. Dynamics of phytoc	oenotic biodiversity or	n Agrostis capillaris	grassland from M	lagurele, Brasov	county (%
		A	A	,	

		•	0	-	-			0		-			
Species	V <sub>1</sub>	V.,	V <sub>3</sub>	$V_4$	V <sub>5</sub>	V <sub>6</sub>	$V_7$	V <sub>8</sub>	V <sub>9</sub>	V <sub>10</sub>	V <sub>11</sub>	V <sub>12</sub>	V <sub>13</sub>
Agrostis capillaris	38	13	15	15	30	20	25	24	20	19	15	15	20
Festuca rubra	5	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
Festuca pratensis	6	15	15	15	15	14	20	15	20	20	15	20	15
Dactylis glomerata	3	4	5	5	2	5	2	+	2	10	5	5	4
Cynosurus cristatus	8	-	1	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Holcus lanatus	2	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	2	-	-
Arrhenatherum elatius	+	3	2	2	+	+	+	+	1	-	-	-	-
Phleum pratense	5	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
Bromus mollis	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	5	5	+	3	3	2
Anthoxanthum odoratum	1	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+
Poa pratensis	4	25	30	25	20	25	25	20	15	15	25	20	20
Grasses	72	60	68	62	67	69	62	64	63	64	65	63	61
Trifolium repens	2	22	20	15	15	15	20	15	20	15	20	12	18
Trifolium pratense	7	+	2	5	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3
Lotus corniculatus	3	1	+	+	2	1	2	+	2	1	3	2	1
Medicago lupulina	1	7	3	7	5	3	2	4	5	+	-	2	2
Lathyrus sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
Vicia cracca	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	1	-	+	-	2	+
Legumes	13	30	25	27	24	21	27	22	29	18	26	20	24
Achillea millefolium	4	2	1	2	2	4	2	2	2	5	2	3	3
Chrysanthemum sp.	+	+	-	1	1	+	+	1	-	1	+	1	+
Stellaria graminea	+	+	1	+	1	+	+	1	1	1	1	1	+
Veronica chamaedris	2	+	1	1	+	+	2	2	-	2	1	2	1
Cirsium arvense	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cichorium intybus	-	1	+	1	-	+	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Prunella vulgaris	1	-	1	+	+	+	1	1	-	1	+	1	1
Colchicum autumnale	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-
Alchemilla ternata	1	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	1	1
Leontodon autumnalis	-	+	-	+	1	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	1
Galium aparine	2	+	+	2	1	+	+	-	+	3	1	2	2
Rumex crispus	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	
Taraxacum officinalis	3	3	+	2	3	4	3	2	2	3	1	1	3
Bellis perennis	+	1	+	+	+	+	1	1	1	+	+	+	+
Planatago lanceolata	1	2	2	1	+	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2
Convolvulus arvensis	+	1	-	+	+	+	-	2	-	-	1	2	-
Ranunculus acris	+	+	+	1	+	+	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Arctium lappa	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	
Hyeracium pilosella	1	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	
Matricaria inodora	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	+	-	-	1	1
Forbs	15	10	7	11	9	10	11	14	8	18	9	17	15
Species number	27	25	28	28	31	25	27	26	20	23	20	24	23

and dominant species in the vegetal canopy. In the three experimental sites, three representative types of natural grasslands with a very various floristic composition have been studied. In Gradinari, Caras-Severin county, *Festuca rupicola* and *Calamagrostis epigeios* are the dominant species, in Magurele, Brasov county, *Agrostis capillaris, Festuca pratensis, Poa pratensis* and *Trifolium repens*, and in Pojorata, Suceava county, our study has identified the *Agrostis capillaris, Trisetum flavescens, Trifolium repens* and *T. pratense* species. The highest number of identified species (43) has been recorded by meadow made up of *Agrostis capillaris* and *Festuca rubra*, from Pojorata, Suceava county. The high dynamics of biodiversity is influenced by the type of fertilization, the quantities of fertilizers and by soil and climatic conditions. These grasslands may be improved by manure fertilization and the reasonable utilization, if and only proper management is applied. From the point of view of the biodiversity index, the studied meadows have high phytocoenotic diversity, the dominant species being the ones with closely related population stocks.

124

Tab. 5. Dynamics of phytocoenotic biodiversity on Agrostis capillaris and Festuca rubra meadow from Pojorata, Suceava county (%)

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Species	V	V	V	V.	V	V.	V	V
Restaue rubra73432222Restaue rubration111++111Darylu glomenta3+2217+1Genosme crititis410554535Holae lands1+1-+++Arbrashleron datus34569524Breakypolium pinnatum+211++++Auboxanihum obaran21211++++Auboxanihum obaran21211116128Tristom flavescus43373443363232162517106128Lance consolutine57784943334943334403336323627323636273236362732363626444444444444444444444444444444444444444 <t< td=""><td>Aorostis capillaris</td><td>19</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>11</td><td>10</td><td>10</td><td>13</td><td>12</td></t<>	Aorostis capillaris	19	13	14	11	10	10	13	12
Feature partensis       1       1       1       +       +       1       1       1         Dardyle glowerata       3       +       2       2       1       7       +       1         Genosarus cristitus       4       10       5       5       4       5       3       5         Holes loantau       1       +       1       -       +	Festuca rubra	7	3	4	3	2	2	2	2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Festuca pratensis	1	1	1	+	+	1	1	1
Gynamic erititatur         4         10         5         5         4         5         3         5           Hoike loardse         1         +         1         -         + <t< td=""><td>Dactylis glomerata</td><td>3</td><td>+</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>7</td><td>+</td><td>1</td></t<>	Dactylis glomerata	3	+	2	2	1	7	+	1
Holkus lanatus       1       +       1       -       +       +         Arrboukhoran leitius       3       4       5       6       9       5       2       4         Brackyopolium pinnatum       +       2       1       1       +       +       +         Arbioxathlum observes       2       1       2       1       +       +       +         Arbioxathlum observes       3       3       2       2       1       2       +       +         Arbioxathlum observes       5       9       7       7       10       6       12       8         Irrighum pretense       5       9       7       7       8       4       9       4       3         Medickogi hipilina       +       3       +       -	Cynosurus cristatus	4	10	5	5	4	5	3	5
Arrbonatherum clatius       3       4       5       6       9       5       2       4         Backryodum prinatum       +       2       1       1       +       +       2       1         Anthosonthism obstain       2       1       2       1       +       4       2       1         Tripicum proces       3       3       2       2       1       2       +       +         Grasses       47       39       43       37       34       43       36       32         Tripicum proces       9       7       7       8       4       9       4       3         Medicago lopulna       +       3       +       -       1       2       -       8         Ipicilium promatim       1       2       1       2       1       2       8         Medicago lopulna       +       3       3       32       36       27       32       36         Christa tincoria       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +	Holcus lanatus	1	+	1	-		-	+	+
Brackspoling pinnatum       +       2       1       1       +       +       +         Authoconthum obstation       2       1       2       1       +       2       2       1       +       2       2       1       1       + <td< td=""><td>Arrhenatherum elatius</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>4</td></td<>	Arrhenatherum elatius	3	4	5	6	9	5	2	4
Anthonumber       2       1       2       1       +       2       2       1         Irriction flaveceus       4       2       6       6       7       9       13       6         Brits media       3       3       2       1       2       1       2       +       +         Grasses       47       39       43       37       34       43       36       32         Trifolum repeus       9       12       15       17       20       12       16       25         Trifolum repeus       5       7       7       8       4       9       4       3         Medicage lopulma       +       3       +       -       1       2       1       2       1       2       1         Grass at findem nontanum       1       2       1       2       1       2       3       30       32       36       27       32       36         Grass at findem nontanum       1       2       1       2       3       30       32       36       27       32       36         Grass at findem nontanu       1       1       1       1	Brachypodium pinnatum	+	2	1	1	+	+	+	
Tristim flarencin       4       2       6       6       7       9       13       6         Brisa media       3       3       2       2       1       2       +       +         Grasses       47       39       43       37       34       43       36       32         Trifolium protons       9       12       15       17       20       12       16       25         Trifolium protons       5       9       7       7       10       6       12       8         Latis corritolitis       5       7       7       8       4       9       4       3         Medicage lopulma       +       3       +       -       2       -<	Anthoxanthum odoratum	2	1	2	1	+	2	2	1
Brias modal       3       3       2       2       1       2       +       +         Grasses       47       39       43       37       34       43       36       52         Trifolium report       9       12       15       17       20       12       16       25         Trifolium report       5       7       7       8       4       9       4       3         Medicage lipplica       +       3       +       -       2       -	Trisetum flavescens	4	2	6	6	7	9	13	6
Grasses         47         39         43         37         54         43         36         32           Trifolium repors         9         12         15         17         20         12         16         25           Trifolium repors         5         9         7         7         10         6         12         8           Lotus carniculatus         5         7         7         8         4         9         4         3           Medicago lupulna         +         3         +         -         2         -	Briza media	3	3	2	2	1	2	+	+
Trifolum regens912151720121625Trifolum patense5977106128Latus concludatus57784943Medicago lapalina+3+Trifolium montanum1212Genist interia+Genist interia+-++++++++Chrysarbronum leacatheman655546688Stellaria gramina+++++++++++Taxascan officinale44+786644Chorisan introna222+++224Genisa introna1+++111	Grasses	47	39	43	37	34	43	36	32
Trifolion pratene       5       9       7       7       10       6       12       8         Lots corniculatus       5       7       7       8       4       9       4       3         Medicage lapulina       +       3       +       2       2       1       2         Anthyllic vulkeraria       +       -       -       2       -       -       -         Genits tinctoria       +       +       -	Trifolium repens	9	12	15	17	20	12	16	25
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Trifolium pratense	5	9	7	7	10	6	12	8
Medicago lapulina       1       2       1       2       1       2         Medicago lapulina       +       3       +       2       1       2         Autrylli vulnerata       +       +       2       1       2         Genita intetria       +       +       -       33       30       32       36       27       32       36         Correst intetria       +	Lotus corniculatus	5	7	7	8	4	9	4	3
Trifolium montanum       1       2       1       2         Anthyllis vulneraria       +       2       2       2         Anthyllis vulneraria       +       +       -       -         Genista tinctoria       +       +       -       -       -         Legures       19       33       30       32       36       27       32       56         Chrysandhemum leacandhemum       6       5       5       4       6       6       8         Selfaria graminea       +       1	Medicago lupulina	+	3	+			-		5
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Trifolium montanum	1	2	1		2			
Genitat intetoria       +         Legumes       19       33       30       32       36       27       32       36         Chrysanthenum leucanthemum       6       5       5       5       4       6       6       8         Sellaria gramina       +	Anthyllis vulneraria	-	+	-		_			
Legumes         19         33         30         32         36         27         32         36           Cbrysauthonun leucanthonum         6         5         5         4         6         6         8           Stellaria graninea         +	Genista tinctoria	+							
Corpsentidemum leacentifiemum       6       5       5       4       6       6       8         Stellaria grammaa       +	Legumes	19	33	30	32	36	27	32.	36
Stellaria gramma       +	Chrysanthemum leucanthemum	6	5	5	5	4	6	6	8
Defensition111111Taraxacum officinale44+78664Giborium nitybus2Prunella vulgaris33223553Golchicum autumnale1+++23+2Acbillea millefolium43331111Galiun veram222+++54Rumex sp.+-1+++++Campanula sp.++++++++Plantago media321111111Raunocolus polyanthemus++++++++++Filipendul becapetala54675434Knuuti arvensis++++++++++Carduus acaniboides+++<	Stellaria graminea	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Transaction officinale       4       4       4       7       8       6       6       4         Cicborium intybus       2 $      -$ Prunella culgaris       3 $3$ $2$ $2$ $3$ $5$ $5$ $3$ Colchicum automnale $1$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $2$ $2$ $2$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $2$ $2$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $2$ $2$ $+$	Veronica chamaedris	2.		+	+				+
Cichorian intylus       2 $i$ <td>Taraxacum officinale</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>+</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td>	Taraxacum officinale	4	4	+	7	8	6	6	4
Primella vulgaris       3       3       2       2       3       5       5       3         Colebicum autummale       1       +       +       +       2       3       +       2         Achillea millefolium       4       3       3       3       1       1       1       1         Galium verum       2       2       2       +       +       +       5       4         Rumex sp.       +       -       1       +       +       +       +       +         Campanula sp.       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Plantago media       3       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1         Ramuculus polyanthemus       +	Cichorium intybus	2	•		,	Ū	U	0	•
Colorison automade1+++23+2Achillea millefolium43331111Galiam verum222+++54Runex sp.+-1++++Canpanula sp.+++++++Plantago media3211111Ranucchis polyanthemas+++1+++Filipendula bexapetala54675434Knautia arvensis++++++++Cardnus acanthoides+++++++Tagopogon orientalis+++++++Tagopogon orientalis+++++++Mymus pamonicus+++++++Plantago lanceolata+1111111Ribinanthus rumelicus++++++++Hypericum perforatum111111111Potentilla reptans++++++++++Mysostis dhestris+++++++++ <td< td=""><td>Prunella vuloaris</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>3</td></td<>	Prunella vuloaris	3	3	2	2	3	5	5	3
Advillea millefolium       4       3       3       1       1       1       1         Galium verum       2       2       2       +       +       +       5       4         Rumex sp.       +       -       1       +       +       +       +       +         Campanula sp.       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Plantago media       3       2       1       1       1       1       1       1         Ramueculus polyambemus       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Filipendula bexapetala       5       4       6       7       5       4       3       4         Knautia arvensis       +	Colchicum autumnale	1	+	+	+	2	3	+	2
Galium verion       2       2       2 $+$ <	Achillea millefolium	4	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
Rumex sp.       +       1       +       +       +         Campanula sp.       +       +       +       +       +       +         Plantago media       3       2       1       1       1       1       1         Ramunculus polyanthemus       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Filipendula bexapetala       5       4       6       7       5       4       3       4         Knautia arvensis       +	Galium verum	2	2	2	+	+	+	5	4
Campanula sp.       +       <	Rumex sp.	+	_	_	1		+	+	+
Plantago media       3       2       1       1       1       1       1       1         Ranucalus polyanthemus       +       +       +       1       +       +       +       +         Ranucalus polyanthemus       +       +       +       1       +       +       +       +         Filipendula bexapetala       5       4       6       7       5       4       3       4         Carduus acanthoides       +	Campanula sp.	+	+		+		+	+	+
Ranuculus polyanthemus       + <td>Plantago media</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td>	Plantago media	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Filipendula bexapetala       5       4       6       7       5       4       3       4         Knautia arvensis       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Carduus acanthoides       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Carum carvi       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Tragopogon orientalis       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Thymus pannonicus       +	R anunculus polvanthemus	+	+	+	1	+	+	+	+
Knautia arvensis       +       +       +       +       +         Carduus acanthoides       +       +       +       +       +       +         Carum carvi       +       +       +       +       +       +         Tragopogo orientalis       +       +       +       +       +       +         Thymus pamonicus       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Carex sp.       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Plantago lanceolata       +       1       1       1       1       1       1       1         Rhinanthus rumelicus       +	Filipendula hexapetala	5	4	6	7	5	4	3	4
Carduus acanthoides       +       +       +         Carum carvi       +       +       +       +       +         Tragopogon orientalis       +       +       +       +       +         Thymus pannonicus       +       +       +       +       +         Thymus pannonicus       +       +       +       +       +         Carex sp.       +       +       +       +       +         Carex sp.       +       +       +       +       +         Plantago lanceolata       +       1       1       1       1       1         Rhinanthus rumelicus       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Alchemilla vulgaris       +       1       1       1       1       1       1         Potentilla reptans       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Myosotis alpestris       +       +       +       +       +       +       +         Myosotis alpestris       32       27       21       29       27       29       32       30	Knautia arvensis	+	+			-		5	
Carum carvi       + <th< td=""><td>Carduus acanthoides</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	Carduus acanthoides	+	+				+		
Tragopogon orientalis++++++ $Thymus pannonicus+++++++Carex sp.++++++++Carex sp.++++++++Plantago lanceolata+1111111Rhinanthus rumelicus+++++++Alchemilla vulgaris+111111Plantago major+111111Potentilla reptans++++++Hypericum perforatum111+++Myosotis alpestris++++++Forbs3227212927293230$	Carum carvi	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Thymus pannonicus       +	Tragopogon orientalis	+	+	+		+	+		+
Carex sp.       +       <	Thymus pannonicus	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
Plantago lanceolata       +       1	Carex sp.	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Rbinanthus rumelicus       +       +       +       +       1       1       3       1         Alchemilla vulgaris       +       1       + <td>Plantago lanceolata</td> <td>+</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td>	Plantago lanceolata	+	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Alchemilla vulgaris+1++++Plantago major+111111Potentilla reptans+++++Hypericum perforatum11+++Gimnadenia odoratissima++++Trollius europea++++Myosotis alpestris++++Forbs3227212927293230	Rhinanthus rumelicus	+	+	+	+	1	1	3	1
Plantago major       +       1       1       1       1       1       1       1         Potentilla reptans       +	Alchemilla vulgaris	+	1		+	+	+	+	+
Potentilla reptans++Hypericum perforatum11+Gimnadenia odoratissima++Trollius europea+Myosotis alpestris++Forbs3227212927293230	Plantago major	+	1		1	1	1	1	1
Hypericum perforatum11++Gimnadenia odoratissima+++Trollius europea++Myosotis alpestris++Forbs3227212927293230Social characteris42402227222425	Potentilla reptans	+			+		+		
Gimnadenia odoratissima++Trollius europea+Myosotis alpestris+Forbs3227212927293230	Hypericum perforatum		1	1	+			+	
Trollius europea     +       Myosotis alpestris     +     +       Forbs     32     27     21     29     27     29     32     30	Gimnadenia odoratissima		+	-	+				
Myosotis alpestris     +     +     +     +       Forbs     32     27     21     29     27     29     32     30	Trollius europea				+				
Forbs     32     27     21     29     27     29     32     30       5     1     1     1     1     1     1     1     1     1	Myosotis albestris				+	+	+		+
	Forbs	32	27	21	29	27	29	32	30
Species number $45 \ 40 \ 33 \ 37 \ 35 \ 36 \ 34 \ 35$	Species number	43	40	33	37	33	36	34	35

## References

- Belesky DP, Feldhake CM, Boyer DG (2002). Herbage Productivity and Botanical Composition of Hill Pasture as a Function of Clipping and Site Features. Agronomy Journal 94:351-358.
- Braun-Blanquet (1964). Pflanzensoziologie, Grundzüge der Vegetationskunde. Springer-Verlag, Wien-New York, p. 865.
- Dolek M, Gezer A (2002). Conserving biodiversity on calcareous grasslands in the Franconian Jura by grazing: a comprehensive approach. Biological Conservation 104(3):351-360.
- Duelli P (1997). Biodiversity evaluation in agricultural landscapes: An approach at two different scales. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 62(2-3):81-91.
- Dumont B, Rook AJ, Coran Ch, Rover KU (2007). Effects of livestock breed and grazing intensity on biodiversity and production in grazing systems. Diet selection. Grass and Forage Science 62(2):159-171.
- Elsaesser M, Kunz HG, Briemle G (2008). Strategy of organic fertilizer use on permanent grassland – results of a 22-yearold experiment on meadow and mowing-pasture. Grassland Science in Europe 13:580-582.
- Hector A, Loreau M (2005). Relationships between biodiversity and production in grasslands at local and regional scales. Grassland: A Global Resource, Editor McGilloway DA, 295-304.
- Hopkins A, Pywell RF, Peel S, Johnson RH, Bowling PJ (1999). Enhancement of botanical diversity of permanent grassland and impact on hay production in Environmentally Sensitive Areas in the UK. Grass and Forage Science 54:163-173.
- Isselstein J, Griffith BA, Pradel P, Venerus S (2007). Effects of livestock breed and grazing intensity on biodiversity and production in grazing systems. Nutritive value of herbage and livestock performance. Grass and Forage Science 62(2):145-158
- Jeangros B (2002). Peut-on augmenter la diversité botanique d'une prairie permanente en supprimant la fumure?. Revue Suisse d'Agriculture 34(6):287-292.
- Kopec M, Zarzycki J, Gondek K (2010). Species diversity of submontane grasslands: effects of topographic and soil factors. Polish Journal of Ecology 58(2):285-295.

- Metera E, Sakowski T, Sloniewski K, Romanowicz B (2010). Grazing as a tool to maintain biodiversity of grassland-a review. Animal Science Papers and Reports 28(4):315-334.
- Mosquera-Losada MR, Rodriguez-Barreira S, Lopez-Diaz ML, Fernandez-Nunez E, Rigueiro-Rodriguez A (2009). Biodiversity and silvopastoral system use change in very acid soils. Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment 131(3-4):315-324.
- Nilsson FOL (2009). Biodiversity on Swedish pastures: Estimating biodiversity production costs. Journal of Environmental Management 90(1):131-143.
- Peeters A, Maljean JF, Biala K, Bouckaert V (2004). Les indicateurs de biodiversité pour les prairies: un outil d'évaluation de la durabilité des systèmes d'élevage. Fourrages 178:217-232.
- Rotar I, Păcurar F, Gârda N, Morea A (2010). The management of oligotrophic grasslands and the approach of new improvement methods. Romanian Journal of Grassland and Forage Crops 1:57-69.
- Soder KJ, Rook AJ, Sandersen MA, Goslee SC (2007). Interaction of plant species diversity on grazing behavior and performance of livestock grazing temperate region pastures. Crop Science 47(1):416-425.
- Tilman D, Wedin D, Knops J (1996). Productivity and sustainability influenced by biodiversity in grassland ecosystems. Nature 379(6567):718-720.
- Vîntu V, Avarvarei I, Iacob T, Dumitrescu N, Samuil C (2003). Improvement of the degraded rangelands of the Romanian forest steppe by organic and mineral fertilization. Proc. of the VII-th International Rangelands Congress, Durban, South Africa 1267-1269.
- Vîntu V, Samuil C, Sarbu C, Saghin Gh, Iacob T (2008). The influence of grassland management on biodiversity in the mountainous region of NE Romania. Proc of the 22<sup>-th</sup> General Meeting of the European Grassland Federation, Uppsala, Suedia, Grassland Science in Europe 13:183-185.
- Weigelt A, Weisser WW, Buchmann N, Scherer-Lorenzen M (2009). Biodiversity for multifunctional grasslands: equal productivity in high-diversity low-input and low-diversity high-input systems. Biogeosciences 6(8):1695-1706.

125