| Written Answers to | [11 DEC., 2012] | | Unstarred Questions 123 | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------|-------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Karnataka | 12 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 32 |
| Kerala | 12 | - | 12 | 4 | 28 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 12 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 44 |
| Maharashtra | 22 | 33 | 32 | 18 | 105 |
| Manipur | 1 | - | s = | 0 | 1 |
| Meghalaya | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| Mizoram | 1 | - | 177 | 0 | 1 |
| Nagaland | 21 | = | := | 1 | 1 |
| Odisha | 5 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 25 |
| Puducherry | 21 | 121 | - | 0 | 0 |
| Punjab | 12 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 24 |
| Rajasthan | 20 | 27 | 16 | 24 | 87 |
| Sikkim | 3 | = | 12 | 0 | 3 |
| Tamil Nadu | 8 | 28 | 08 | 8 | 52 |
| Tripura | =: | 6 | := | 0 | 6 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 16 | 21 | 28 | 15 | 80 |
| Uttarakhand | 8 | = | 8 | 0 | 16 |
| West Bengal | 33 | 29 | 36 | 16 | 144 |
| Goa | <u>~</u>) | 설 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Delhi | # i | = | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 248 | 258 | 265 | 147 | 918 |

Reduction in tiger and leopard population

1901. SHRI RAMA CHANDRA KHUNTIA: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that lion population in Gir Forests have increased from 180 in 1974 to 411 in 2010; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons for decrease in tiger and leopard population in spite of declaration of several forests as tiger reserves?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) The country level tiger population has shown an increasing trend with a population estimate of 1706, lower and upper limits being 1520 and 1909 respectively in the recent all India tiger estimation (2010), as compared to the last country level estimation of 2006, with an estimate of 1411, lower and upper limits being 1165 and 1657 respectively. The estimation of leopard population has not been done at the country level. However, details of spatial occupancy of leopards during 2006 and 2010 in the seventeen tiger range States in the country are given in Statement I (See below). The general causative factors affecting wild carnivores, leading to their decline, are given in Statement II (See below).

Statement I

Details of spatial occupancy of leopards during 2006 and 2010

| 2 | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| State | Leopa | Increase/ | |
| | 2006 | 2010 | Decrease/Stable |
| 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| Shivalik-Gangetic Plain Landscape | e Complex | | |
| Uttarakhand | 3683 | 8769 | Increase |
| Uttar Pradesh | 2936 | 4234 | Increase |
| Bihar | 552 | 735 | Increase |
| Central Indian Landscape Complex | x and Eastern | Ghats Lands | cape Complex |
| Andhra Pradesh | 37609 | 10374 | Decrease |
| Chhattisgarh | 14939 | 23188 | Increase |
| Madhya Pradesh | 34736 | 24308 | Decrease |

Statement II

General causative factors affecting wild carnivores, leading to their decline

- 1. Mortality of wild animals due to poaching.
- Degradation of forest status outside Protected Areas/Tiger Reserves owing to human pressure, livestock pressure, and ecologically unsustainable land uses.
- 3. Fragmentation leading to loss of gene.flow from source populations.
- 4. Mortality of wild animals due to man-animal conflicts.
- Loss of reproduction owing to disturbance on account of heavily used infrastructure like highways, etc.
- 6. Lack of adequate protection in outside areas.
- 7. Loss of forest quality in terms of prey biomass to support large carnivores like tiger and leopard.
- Insurgency/law and order problems in some tiger reserves/protected areas/forest areas.