
FISH BIODIVERSITY OF MANDAVI WATER RESERVOIR OF DISTRICT CHHINDWARA (M.P.) INDIA

Vandana Khandate(2), Dr. Sukhdev Dongre(1),

1. Dept. of Zoology J.H. Govt. P.G. College Betul(M.P.)

2. Dept. of Zoology Govt. Sc. College Pandhurna(M.P.)

ABSTRACT: The Fish diversity of water reservoir essentially represents the fish faunal diversity and their abundance. Water reservoirs also play an important role to conserve a rich variety of fish species which supports the commercial fisheries. The country is rich in diversity of such important group of animals. Keeping in the view, the diversity of fish fauna of the Mandavi water reservoir, Chhindwara District, Madhya Pradesh, Central India has been studied from the period January 2018 to December 2018. The present study was conducted to explore the fish fauna of Mandavi water reservoir. In the study 29 fish species were recorded under 8 orders and 12 families, 19 genus. 10 species of Cypriniformes, 8 species of Siluriformes, 1 species of Perciformes, 2 species of Mastacembeliformes, 1 species of Clupeiformes, 2 species of Osteoglossiformes, 4 species of Periformes, 1 species of Ciprinodontiformes have been recorded. The Cyprinidae family is dominant. The pollution is the major threat for fish diversity of the Mandavi water reservoir. According to the study 5 species are under lower risk near threatened its conservation steps of fish fauna in the Mandavi water reservoir have also been suggested.

Key words: Fish Diversity, Fresh Water Fishes, oligotrophic, water reservoir

Correspondence author: E-mail: khandatevandana@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION:

Fish diversity depends on geographical position, varied aquatic ecological condition, health of aquatic bodies, optimum exploitation of the commercial fish species, enforcement of laws, rules and regulations, and their implementation and fish habitat restoration programs. Rich biodiversity of any ecosystem is absolutely essential in order to maintain their stability for proper functioning of their food chains. Fish constitute almost half of the total number of vertebrates in the world 21,723 living species of fish out of 39,900 species of vertebrates are so far recorded. Day (1889) described 1418 species of fish under 342 genera from the British India. The Indian fish population represents 11.72% of species, 23.96% of genera, 57% of families and 80% of the global fishes. Out of the 2500 species so far listed, 73 (3.32%) belong to the cold freshwater regime, 544 (24.73%) to the warm fresh waters domain, 143 (6.50%) to the brackish waters and 1440 (65.45%) to the marine ecosystem. There are about 2,500 species of fishes, of which 930 freshwater and 1,570 marine, are estimated. Fishes have been found to exhibit enormous diversity in their morphology, habitat and their biology. India is one of the mega-biodiversity countries in the world and occupying ninth position in term of freshwater biodiversity. Fish diversity of undivided India and various Indian states has been described by many scientists. According to Zoological survey of India, fresh water fish resources are rivers, and ponds, lakes, streams, canals, reservoirs & paddy culture field of

Madhya Pradesh, reported 172 different species of fishes. The north eastern region of India was identified as a biodiversity hotspot by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC, 1998).

Mandavi dam is constructed in 2001, for irrigation purpose on the local river Jam by WRD, Govt. of M. P. in Pandhurna tehsil of Chhindwara Distt., located at 21° 39' 53" N latitude and 78° 24' 45" E longitude with the catchment area of 10.24 km². Maximum depth of the pond was found to be 16.5 m, whereas average depth was 16.50±1.08 m during the period of study. The Mandavi water reservoir is being slightly used for fisheries and irrigation through many canals. The peoples are catching, selling and feeding the fishes from the pond. The fish diversity of the reservoir is still unexplored and not documented. A total of 29 species were recorded belonging to 19 genera, 12 families and 8 orders.

Very rich agricultural activities have been situated in surround areas of water reservoir and all agricultural wastes including Pesticidal residues, organic wastes and other pollutants were disposed by man and runoff water in rainy season and during irrigation in the reservoir.

MATERIAL AND METHOD:

The Mandavi water reservoir situated at Mandavi village, district Chhindwara (M.P.) has been selected for the study. The studies were conducted during January 2014 to December 2015. The Fish species were collected twice in every session using hand-net, hooks, hook net, automatic rod, dragon nets, cast net, gill net, and drag net taking the help of fishermen. Fishes after collection were euthanized kindly and preserved with 10% dilute formalin solution. The larger fishes were injected with formalin in their abdomen and other parts of the body to avoid bacterial contamination. The fish species were identified up to species level by using the provided by Day F. (1889), The fauna of a British India, Jayaram K.C. (1999), The fresh water fishes of India, Talwar, P.K. & Jhingran, A.G. (1991), Inland fishes of India and Adjacent countries, Mishra, K.S. (1962), An aid to the identification of the common commercial fishes of India and Pakistan.

STUDY SITE:

The estimate terrain elevation above sea level is 481 m. Pandhurna town (Nagerpalika) District Chhindwara occupying almost half of Satpura plateau. The fishes were collected from Mandavi water reservoir. Total water body was divided into four sampling zones covering all representative habitats of the reservoir.

OBSERVATION:

In every session we find the fish species from every site in the water reservoir. The fish species we have collected are as followed in the table showing IUCN Red List categories of identified fishes. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), established in 1963, set a standard for global species listing and conservation assessment efforts.

S.N	Order	Family	Genus	Species	IUCN Cat.
I	Clupeiformes	Clupeidae	Gudusia Flower	1. <i>Gudusia chapra</i> (Hum.)	LC
II	Osteoglossiformes	Notopteridae	Notopterus	1. <i>Notopterus notopterus</i> (Pallas)	LC
				2. <i>Notopterus chitala</i>	NT
III	Cypriniformes	Cyprinidae	Cyprinus	1. <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> (Linnaeus)	VU
			Ctenopharyngodon	1. <i>Ctenopharyngodon idella</i>	NE
			Catla Valenciennes	1. <i>Catla catla</i> (Ham)	LC
			Cirrhinus Oken	1. <i>Cirrhinus mrigala</i> (Ham)	LC
			Labeo Cuvier (Ham)	1. <i>Labeo rohita</i> (Ham)	LC
				2. <i>Labeo calbasu</i> (Ham)	LC
				3. <i>Labeo bata</i>	LC
				4. <i>Labeo gonius</i>	LC
			Puntius Hemilton Buchanan	1. <i>Puntius ticto</i> (Ham)	LC
			Chelanemintin	1. <i>Chela</i>	LC
IV	Siluriformes	Siluridae	Hypophthalmichthys	1. <i>Hypophthalmichthys molitrix</i>	NT
			Ompok Lelepe de	1. <i>Ompok bimaculatus</i> (Bloch)	NT
				2. <i>Ompok pabda</i>	NT
		Bagridae	Mystus Scopoli	1. <i>Mystus aor</i>	LC
				2. <i>Mystus seenghala</i>	LC
				3. <i>Mystus tengara</i>	LC
		Claridae	Clarias Gronovius	1. <i>Clarias batrachus</i> (Linnaeus)	LC
		Sisoridae	Bagarius Bleeker	1. <i>Bagarius bagarius</i>	NT
V	Cyprinodontiformes	Belontiidae	Xenentodon regan	1. <i>Xenentodon cancila</i>	LC
VI	Periiformes	Ophiocephalidae	Channa Gronovius	1. <i>Channa punctatus</i> (Bloch)	LC
				2. <i>Channa striatus</i>	LC
				3. <i>Channa morulius</i>	LC
		Ambassidae	Chanda (Hemilton)	1. <i>Chanda ranga</i>	LC
VII	Perciformes	Cichlidae	Tilapia	1. <i>Tilapia mojerindica</i>	CR/VU
VIII	Mastacembeliformes	Mastacembeliformes	Mastacembelus Gronovius	1. <i>Mastacembelus pancalus</i> (Ham)	LC
				2. <i>Mastacembelus armatus</i>	LC

The following five criteria were considered in categorizing the status of population of a species by The Conservation Assessment Criteria followed at NBFGR, Lucknow. These are in conformity with Wildlife Institute of India categorization (2007) and IUCN (version 3.1).

- A. Declining population (past, present and/or projected)
- B. Geographic range size, and fragmentation, decline or fluctuations
- C. Small population size and fragmentation, decline, or fluctuations
- D. Very small population or very restricted distribution
- E. Quantitative analysis of extinction risk (e.g., Population Viability Analysis).

A taxon is Endangered(EN) when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the criteria A to E for Endangered, and it is therefore considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild. A taxon is Vulnerable (VU) when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the criteria A to E for Vulnerable, and it is therefore considered to be facing a high risk of extinction in the wild. A taxon is Near Threatened (NT) when it has been evaluated against the criteria but does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable now, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future. A taxon is Least Concern (LC) when it has been evaluated against the criteria and does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened. Abundant taxa are included in this category. A taxon is Data Deficient (DD) when there is inadequate information to make a direct, or indirect, assessment of its risk of extinction based on its distribution and/or population status. When A is has not yet been evaluated against the criteria it is Not Evaluated (NE).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

During the study a total 29 species of primary Fresh water fishes belonging to 8 orders, 12 families and 17 genera were recorded from the study sites. Number of species, their distribution in different study sites, and in the assemblage structure, cyprinid constituted the dominant group and the cyprinids represented in all study sites. The family Cyprinidae dominated with 10 species besides other families as Clupeidae with 1 species, Notopteridae with 2 species, Siluridae with 3 species, Bagridae with 3 species, Clariidae with 1 species, Sisoridae with 1 species, .. Belonidae with 1 species, Ophiocephalidae with 3 species, Ambassidae with 1 species, Cichlidae with 1 species Mastacembelidae with 2 species. Mastacembelus armatus is an endangered and highly prized and much preferred food fish. Tilapia mojezdica, Labeobata and Mystus is abundant in all the study sites. Out of the 29 species, 2 species is vulnerable, 21 species are least concern, 5 species are near threatened, one is not evaluated categories (Molur and Walker). The oligotrophic quality of reservoir is much favourable for increasing variety of fish populations.

The Mandavi water reservoir is situated at Mandavi village increasing much possibilities of pollution in the water of the pond and causes severe threats to fish diversity. The study revealed that many species in the study area are being threatened by various human activities, invasive alien species and destructive fishing. Here an excessive type of pollution is noise pollution could affect the behaviour of aquatic life. Special attention is to be given for conservation of these fish diversity. The observations recorded in the present study may prove valuable as a reference for assessing the changes due to the environmental conditions in the locality, in future. The findings of the present study underline the importance of Mandavi water reservoir in providing preferred

abode for fishes. Many factors contribute to the loss of fish species and the degradation of their habitat.

CONCLUSION:

The information provided in this publication will serve as base line information on current status of freshwater fishes of India. The respective conservation authorities may initiate developing species and region specific strategies for conservation and sustainable utilization of fish genetic resources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

We are thankful to Principal, J.H. Govt P G College, Betul and Head Department of Zoology, J. H. Govt. P. G. College Betul for providing all necessary facilities for research work.

REFERENCE

1. Kar, D.A., C. Kumar, Bohra and L.K. Sigh, (Eds), 2003. Fishes of Barak drainage, Mizoram and Tripura; In: Environment, pollution and management, APHA publishing corporation, New Delhi, pp: 604: 203-211.
2. Jayaram, K.C., 2010. The freshwater fishes of the Indian region. Narendra Publishing House, Delhi, pp: 614.
3. Molur, S. and S. Walker, 1998. Report of the Conservation Assessment and Management Plan. Workshop on freshwater fishes of India. Zoo Outreach Organization/ CBSG, Coimbatore, India, pp: 156.
4. Daniels, R.J., 2001. Endemic fishes of the Western Ghats and the Satpura Hypothesis. Current Science, 81(3): 240-244.
5. Hora, S.L., 1938. Notes on fishes in the Indian Museum. On a collection of fish Bailadila range, Bastar State, Central Provinces, Record of Indian Museum, 40(3): 237-241.
6. Hora, S.L., 1940. On a collection of fish from the head waters of the Mahanadi River, Raipur district, C.P. Record of Indian Museum, 42(2): 365-375.
7. Hora, S.L. and K.K. Nair, 1941. Fishes of the Satpura Range, Hoshangabad District, Central Provinces. Record of Indian Museum, 43(3): 361-373.
8. Swarup, H., 1953. Fish fauna of Sagar Lake. Sagar University Journal, 1(2): 239-244.
9. Dubey, G.P. and R.K. Mehra, 1959. Fish and fisheries of Chambal River. Proc. First All India Congress in Zoology, pp: 647-664.
10. Soni, D.D., 1959. Fish fauna of Bhopal Lower Lake. Proc. First All India Congress in Zoology, pp: 639-641.
11. Soni, D.D., 1960. Fish fauna of Bhopal Upper Lake. Proc. Indian Science, 47(3): 477.
12. Malviya, R.B., 1961. A list of fishes from Jabalpur, M.P. Proc. National Academy of Science India Section B, 31(3): 349-354.
13. Dubey G.P. and M.N. Verma, 1965. A preliminary study of the fish fauna of Madhya Pradesh. The Vikram, Journal of Vikram University, 8(4): 1-8.
14. Mathur, D.S. and S.K. Mishra, 1976. Addition to the fish fauna of Jabalpur district (M.P.). Newsletter of Zoological Survey of India, 2(4): 156-158.
15. Tilak, R. and N.K. Sinha, 1979. A checklist of fishes from Madhya Pradesh (India). Zoological of Systematic, 106: 175-196. *World J. Fish & Marine Sci.*, 4 (4): 356-359, 2012, 359.

16. Karmakar, A.K. and A.K. Datta, 1988. On a collection 26. Shukla, A.N., A. Pandey and S. Shrivastaava, 2008. of fish from Bastar District, Madhya Pradesh. Record Observations on fish biodiversity variation inof Zoological Survey of India Occasional Paper, Gambhir Dam Ujjain (M.P.), India, Aquaculture,98: 1-50. 4(1): 15-21.
17. Saxena, R. M., 1988. A checklist of fishes of 27. Chandra, Kailash, Sharma, R.M. and Ojha, Praveen, Rewa District, Madhya Pradesh (India). Cheetal, 2010. A Compendium on the faunal resources of29(1): 40-50. Narmada River Basin in Madhya Pradesh. Rec. zool.
18. Desai, V.R., 1994. Endangered, vulnerable and rare Surv. India, Occ. Paper No., 310: 1-152 (Published byfishes of river systems (Western and Central) of the: Director, Zool. Surv. India, Kolkata).Madhya Pradesh. Threatened fishes of India. Nature
19. Desai, V.R., D. Kumar and N.P. Shrivastava, 1997. India, pp: 147-160. Fish fauna of Ravishankar Sagar Reservoir. Journal of 29. Thilak, J., 2011. On a collection of Fishes from Inland Fisheries Society of India, 29(2): 53-56. Singhori Wildlife Sanctuary, dist. Raisen, M.P.
21. Sen, T.K., 1995b. Fauna of Kanha Tiger Reserve, Pradesh. International Referred Research Journal, Conservation Area Series, Zoological Survey of 2: 1-25. India, 7: 41-45. 31. Solanki, P., S. Singh, I.V. Sharma and R. Mathur, 2011.
22. Sharma, H.S., 2007. Freshwater Fishes. In Fauna of Fish Fauna of Sanjay Sagar Reservoir of District Madhya Pradesh (including Chhattisgarh), State Guna (MP). Biological Forum -An International Fauna Series, 15(1): 147-244 (Published by Director, Journal, 3(1): 44-45. Zool. Surv. India, Kolkata.
23. Sharma, H.S., 2008. "Pisces" Faunal diversity of India and adjacent countries. Vols. I and II. Oxford Jabalpur district (M.P.). Zoological Survey of India, and IBH publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., pp: 1158. pp: 225-274. 33. Jayaram, K.C., 1991. Revision of the genus Puntius
24. Sharma, H.S., 2009. "Pisces" Fauna of Pachmarhi Hamilton from Indian region, Record of Zoological Biosphere Reserve (M.P.), Conservation Area Series, Survey of India Occasional Paper, 135: 1-178. Zoological Survey of India, 39: 135-173.
25. Dwivedi, R.K., M.A. Khan, H.P. Singh, D.N. Sing and R.K. Tyagi, 2000. Production dynamics and fisheries development in Naktara reservoir, Madhya Pradesh, India. Journal of Inland Fisheries Society of India. 32(2): 81.
26. Saxena P.K., 1997. Impact of pollution on the fisheries of river satluj. Environ. Manag. Int., 1(1):69.
27. Choudhary, D. K., 1977 case study of Gandhi sager reservoir Fisheries (M.P.) News letter, C. I. F. E. Bombay, July-Aug.
28. Narasimha Ramulu, K. and Benarjee, G. Fish Species Diversity of Nagaram Tank of Waranal, Andhra Pradesh.
29. Vaheedunnisha, Studies on Fish Diversity of Roop Sagar Talab, Distt. Satna (M.P.) India.
30. Dr. W.S. Lakra, Dr. U. K. Sarkar, Dr. A. Gopalakrishnan, Sh. A. Kathirvelpandian, (2010), Threatened Freshwater Fishes of India, NBFGR.
31. Nel, L.J.; J.D. Roux; R. Abell; J.P. Ashton; M.R. Cowling; V.J. Higgins; M. Thieme and H.J. Viers, (2008). Progress and challenges in freshwater conservation planning. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystem. DOI: 10. 1002/aqc.1010.
32. NBAP (National Biodiversity Action Plan), (2008). Govt. of India, Ministry of Environment and Forests, November 2008. F. No. J-22018/25/29/99-CS (BC)-Vol. (VI).
33. Wildlife Protection Act, (1972). With Rules up to 2003. Wildlife Trust of India, New Delhi.

34. Mace, G.M. and R. Lande, (1991). Assessment extinction threats: Towards a revaluation of IUCN Threatened species categories. *Conservation Biology*, 5(2): 148-157.
35. IUCN, (2009). IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2009.1. www.iucnredlist.org
36. ONEFIVENINE.com/India