

**PARK – PEOPLE CONFLICT AND ITS MANAGEMENT IN
AND AROUND SHIVAPURI NATIONAL PARK:
A Case Study of Sundarijal VDC**

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER’S DEGREE IN
ZOOLOGY (ECOLOGY)

**BY
SAMPA PURKAIT**

**TO
CENTRAL DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY
INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
KATHMANDU, NEPAL**

FEBRUARY, 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge my sincere gratitude to my respectable supervisor Associate Professor Dr. Mukesh Kumar Chalise, Central Department of Zoology for his noble guidance, regular supervision, encouragement and co-operation throughout the dissertation period.

I am grateful to Professor Dr. Vasanta Kumar Thapa, Head of the Central Department of Zoology, other respected professors and staffs of the department for providing me valuable academic support.

I am also thankful to T.U. Central library, DNPWC, ICIMOD. IUCN for providing me books, journals and thesis during the literature review. I would like to thank Mr. Megh Bahadur Pandey, Chief Warden and Mr. Buddhi Sagar Paudel of DNPWC for granting me permission to carry out this research. I would also like to thank other park rangers, staffs of Shivapuri National Park, the villagers of Sundarijal VDC, Narayan Shrestha, Purna Man Tamang, Sher Bahadur Lama and Dawa Gyalmu Sherpa for their local support and friendship. Hearty special thanks to my friends, Anup Dawadi, Aradhana Rai, Suchitra Shrestha, Bharati Gurung, Sarita Khadka and Basanta Ghimire who encouraged and helped me during my field visit.

Last but not the least, I solemnly appreciate the perseverance of my beloved parents and family members for their endless love, encouragement and every support.

Sampa Purkait

T.U. Reg. No. 5-1-37-184-98

Exam Roll No.1163

Batch No.2061/62

CONTENTS	Page
List of Tables	I
List of Figures	II
List of Plates	II
Acronyms	III
Abstract	IV
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Park - People	1
1.2. Research Hypothesis	3
1.3. Objectives	3
1.4. Justification and limitation	4
2. STUDY AREA	5
2.1. Location and Physiography	5
2.2. Physical Diversity	6
2.3. Biological Diversity	8
2.4. Water resources	9
2.5. Socio-culture and socio-economic status	10
2.6. Intensive study site (Sundarijal VDC)	11
3. LITERATURE REVIEW	14
4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	19
4.1. Site Selection	19
4.2. Methods of data collection	19
4.2.1. Direct Observation	19
4.2.2. Questionnaire survey	20
4.1.3. Group discussion	20
4.2.4. Statistical Analysis	20

5. RESULTS	22
5.1. Occurrence and identification of wild pests in and around the VDC	22
5.2. Impact of park and its animals	23
5.2.1. Magnitude of damage by wild animals	23
5.2.2. Crop preference by wild pests	25
5.2.3. Frequency	26
5.3. Estimation of economic loss by wild animals	28
5.3.1. Total crop loss	28
5.3.2. Actual crop production	30
5.3.3. Expected crop production and income in samples households	33
5.3.4. Livestock Loss	33
5.3.5. Impact on livelihood	39
5.4. Impact of locals on the park	39
5.4.1. Garbage accumulation and water pollution	39
5.4.2. Livestock grazing	39
5.4.3. Firewood, fodder collection and grass cutting	40
5.4.4. Trail and tourism	40
5.4.5. Other activities	41
5.4.6. Park-People's perception	41
5.5. Protection strategies and management	41
6. DISCUSSION	43
7. CONCLUSION	47
8. RECOMMENDATION	48
9. REFERENCES	49
10. ANNEXES	57

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Total population of Sundarijal VDC	12
Table 2: Households operating small scale non-agricultural economic activity by type of activity for VDC	12
Table 3: Major land use area of VDC	13
Table 4: Major wild pests of crops and livestock depredation with raiding time in different altitude of the VDC	22
Table 5: Total percentage of respondents selected from each site	23
Table 6: Nature of damage and trouble caused by wildlife	24
Table 7: Percentage of agricultural land in sampled households in the VDC	24
Table 8: The stages of different crops preferred by wild pests	25
Table 9: Percentage of different crop damage by wild pests	25
Table 10: Frequency of park animals visiting villages	27
Table 11: Annual quantity and amount lost in crop damage in Sundarijal VDC	28
Table 12: Crop loss in sampled households	29
Table 13: Annual crop produced and income in Sundarijal VDC	31
Table 14: Crop production in sampled households	32
Table 15: Expected Income of sampled households in Sundarijal VDC	33
Table 16: Varied diet preference of wild predators in Sundarijal VDC	34
Table 17: Presence of total livestock / avian stock in sampled households	34
Table 18: Total livestock / avian stock lost in Sundarijal VDC	35
Table 19: Amount lost in different categories of livestock / avian stock killed by wild animals in sampled households	36
Table 20: Average economic loss in each sampled household	38
Table 21: Persons charged for firewood and fodder collection	40

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page	
Figure 1:	Map of Shivapuri National Park	5a
Figure 2:	Map of Sundarijal VDC	5b
Figure 3:	Average monthly maximum and minimum temperature (°C) of the three meteorological stations of ShNP (2005-2006)	7
Figure 4:	Average monthly morning and evening relative humidity of the three meteorological stations of ShNP (2005-2006)	7
Figure 5:	Average monthly rainfall of the three meteorological stations of ShNP (2005-2006)	7
Figure 6:	Status of tourist flow in ShNP (2001-2006)	11
Figure 7:	Reasons of animal visit to human settlements and percentage of respondents	26
Figure 8:	Percentage of crops and livestock depredation in the VDC	28
Figure 9:	Percentage of crop damage in Sundarijal VDC	30
Figure 10:	Percentage of crop production in Sundarijal VDC	31
Figure 11:	Percentage of total livestock in sampled households	35
Figure 12:	Percentage of livestock / avian stock killed by wild animals in Sundarijal VDC	37
Figure 13:	Livestock/avian stock mortality due to different reasons in Sundarijal VDC	37
Figure 14:	Percentage of depredators found in each sites	38
Figure 15:	Percentage of protective methods for depredation	42

LIST OF PLATES

- Plate 1. Entrance gate of Shivapuri National Park (Sundarijal area)
- Plate 2. Study area of Okhreni
- Plate 3. Study area of Mulkharka
- Plate 4. Interview with local farmers in Kune
- Plate 5. Interview with the villager of Mahankal
- Plate 6. Village women sowing millet plants
- Plate 7. Damaged area in maize field
- Plate 8. Pugmarks of wild boar in maize field
- Plate 9. Local villagers harvesting millet
- Plate 10. Farmers harvesting paddy in the field
- Plate 11. Livestock grazing inside the park area
- Plate 12. A guarding hut
- Plate 13. Dogs kept for guard
- Plate 14. Goats-Stall feeding
- Plate 15. Pig in a sty
- Plate 16. Rhesus monkey near the farm land
- Plate 17. Grass and fodder collection from the park
- Plate 18. Wood collected from the park for house construction

ACRONYMS

°C	:	Degree Celsius
CBS	:	Central Bureau of Statistics
CITES	:	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CNP	:	Chitwan National Park
DNPWC	:	Department of National Park and Wildlife Conservation
Fig.	:	Figure
ICIMOD	:	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development
INGO	:	International Non-Governmental Organization
IUCN	:	International Union for Conservation of Nature and natural resources
Kg.	:	Kilogram
KTWR	:	Koshi Tappu Wildlife Reserve
Km	:	Kilometer
m	:	Meter
mm	:	Millimeter
MBCA	:	Makalu Barun Conservation Area
NGO	:	Non-Governmental Organization
NTFP	:	Non Timber Forest Product
Rs.	:	Rupees
ShNP	:	Shivapuri National Park
Sp.	:	Species
SWWR	:	Shivapuri Watershed and Wildlife Reserve
Tab.	:	Table
T.U.	:	Tribhuvan University
VDC	:	Village Development Committee

ABSTRACT

The study entitled “**PARK – PEOPLE CONFLICT AND ITS MANAGEMENT IN AND AROUND SHIVAPURI NATIONAL PARK : A Case Study of Sundarijal VDC**” was carried out in the year 2007 for the wild pest identification and the park-people interaction along with their impacts in and around the Park. Nine wards of the VDC were divided into three sites as Site A (1-3 wards), Site B (4-6 wards) inside the park and Site C (7-9 wards) lying outside the park. 10 households from each wards i.e. 90 households were selected. Research methodology was conducted in all the wards by field observation, questionnaire survey and other statistical methods.

Human-wildlife conflicts were observed in the park. Crop and livestock depredation were the major problems found during the study period. Eight types of wild pests in the study area were identified. Wild boar (*Sus scrofa*), monkey (*Macaca mulatta*), porcupine (*Hystrix indica*), rat (*Rattus* sp.), and birds were crop raiders while leopard (*Panthera pardus*), jungle cat (*Felis chaus*) and black kite (*Milvus migrans*) were livestock depredators. Wild boar, monkey, leopard, jungle cat were major and common while others were minor and rare trouble causing animals. Wild boar was frequently found in site A i.e. 1, 2, 3 wards and seldom in other two sites. Monkey was very frequent in every site but abundant at high percentage in Site B. Leopards generally lifted cattle, goats, buffalo, pig and rarely chickens. Jungle cat and black kites were found lifting chickens, pigeons and other type of birds.

The total economic loss estimated was Rs. 3, 51,618.74 per annum and Rs. 3,906.87 per household in crop depredation in the VDC. The total economic loss in maize, millet, wheat, paddy and rooted plants (potato, arum and sweet potato) were Rs. 1,40,144.6, Rs. 70,896.8, Rs. 54,310.74, Rs. 72,375, Rs.8,664, Rs.3,360 and Rs.1, 867.6 respectively. Among the crops, maize caused maximum % of loss (43.37%). χ^2 -test showed that there was association between the crop loss and the wild pest and the t-test accepted the null hypothesis i.e. crop loss (value) inside and outside the park area differed significantly in the study sites. The total economic loss of Rs. 2, 36,000 per annum and Rs. 2,622.22 per household was estimated in livestock depredation. Site B (wards 4, 5, 6) was highly affected whereas Site C (wards 7, 8, 9) was the least affected by the wild animals. During the study period, no any human harassment recorded due to wildlife.

Local people on the other hand, were benefited by the utilization of natural resources, income generating from tourism and other facilities like water pipe supply, sand, soil, stone quarries. Similarly, livestock grazing by the locals in the forest area, polluting the water resources, causing disturbances to wild habitat by using the foot trails regularly, cutting firewood, collecting fodder and grass inside the forest were also recorded.

Local people were found applying some traditional protective and effective methods to protect and reduce the damage in their crop fields.