DOI: <http://doi.org/10.4038/ucr.v2i2.47>

University of Colombo Review (Series III),
Vol. 2, No. 2, 2021

Towards Sustainable Tourism in Wildlife Protected Areas: Estimating Carrying Capacities for the Udawalawe National Park, Sri Lanka

Gihani K. Hettiarachchi¹, M.S.L.Ranjan P Marasinghe², Sumith Pilapitiya³
& Mayuri R. Wijesinghe⁴

1. Graduate, Department of Zoology and Environment Sciences, University of Colombo
2. Director (Operations), Department of Wildlife Conservation, Battaramulla
3. Former Director General, Department of Wildlife Conservation, Battaramulla
4. Professor, Department of Zoology and Environment Sciences, University of Colombo

ABSTRACT

Wildlife Protected Areas (PAs) are set aside with the primary objective of conserving native species and their habitats. The increasing use of such PAs for wildlife-related tourism has the potential to adversely impact the biota they seek to conserve. The main challenge for sustainable tourism is, therefore, to balance the flow of visitors while conserving the wildlife resources within the PAs. The concept of “carrying capacity” has been used to guide sustainable tourism strategies, through the generation of information on how many visitors can be accommodated within a given PA without inflicting damage. In this article, we report on the physical and real carrying capacity values calculated for the Udawalawe National Park, Sri Lanka, one of the most visited PAs in the island by both local and foreign travelers. Calculations are based on standard formulae modified to include a set of variables that are locally appropriate. The disturbance caused to the elephants, the main attraction of the Udawalawe National Park, by visitors was also factored in when calculating the carrying capacity values. Based on the generated values it is seen that the current mean vehicle and visitor loads are within acceptable ranges, although there is still a risk of over visitation, particularly during the peak periods and when guidelines are not met. Challenges of using this approach for setting visitation limits are also discussed.

KEYWORDS:

Physical Carrying Capacity, Real Carrying Capacity, visitor impacts, wildlife-tourism

Suggested Citation: Hettiarachchi, G. K., Marasinghe, M. S. L. R. P., Pilapitiya, S. & Wijesinghe, M. R. (2021). Towards Sustainable Tourism in Wildlife Protected Areas: Estimating Carrying Capacities for the Udawalawe National Park, Sri Lanka. *University of Colombo Review* (New Series III), 2(2), 55 - 69.

© 2021 The Authors. This work is licenced under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

✉ gihanikah@gmail.com ranjandwc@gmail.com sumithcpilapitiya@gmail.com mayuri@sci.cmb.ac.lk

Introduction

Tourism, which is the largest service-sector industry in the global economy, accounts for roughly 10% of GDP worldwide. In 2018 alone, a total of 1.4 billion international tourist arrivals were recorded globally, with 55% being travel for leisure and recreation. For developing countries in the tropics, which are also highly populous, income generated from tourism assumes great importance (Balmford et al., 2009; Senevirathna & Perera, 2013).

Globally, protected areas (PAs), which are set aside primarily to conserve wildlife species and their habitats, are popular tourist attractions. Sri Lanka, being a tropical island nation, supports a wide range of natural ecosystems, offering many opportunities for wildlife-related tourism. In 2018, wildlife parks were among the top three contributors to the national revenue of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority, 2018). Despite this positive impact on the local economy, over visitation has been shown to impose many adverse impacts, threatening the species and habitats that are targets of conservation (Belsoy et al., 2012). Some of the recorded negative environmental impacts include the consumption of land, water and energy, clearance of natural vegetation, accumulation of waste, and acceleration of the spread of invasive species – all of which could directly or indirectly lead to the progressive decline in the quality of wildlife habitats (Belsoy et al., 2012; Cunha, 2010). Visitor activities also cause disturbance to wildlife leading to changes in their natural behavior, most often inducing stress responses which over the long-term have detrimental impacts on their survival (Tarlow & Blumstei, 2007; Tisdell, 2003). The nature and degree of adverse environmental impacts depends on the intensity and frequency of visitation, behavior of visitors, type of recreational activity, and site-specific biotic and abiotic factors such as the type of ecosystem and biotic community (Sun & Walsh, 1998).

The inflow of visitors is expected to increase in the future, but many PAs worldwide are not equipped to handle this increased load (Belsoy et al., 2012; Eagles, 2002). In a bid to achieve sustainability in wildlife tourism, attempts have been made to set limits to visitation using a variety of measures and indices. One such measure through which the need to restrict tourism might be understood is the Touristic Ecological Footprint (TEF), which has in recent times, gained popularity as a tool to measure human impacts on nature (Nakajima & Ortega, 2016). TEF is associated with individual tourism products, throughout the product's life cycle, i.e., the origin to destination (Li & Yang, 2011; Luo & Wu, 2011). Another index is the ecotourism-related Environmental Carrying Capacity, which is a measure of the acceptable number of tourists that an area can potentially support given the condition that the needs of tourists are met, and that the environment is unharmed (Tran et al., 2007). Phumalee et al. (2018) have described this index in terms of the demand on the forest area needed for the absorption of CO₂ released owing to tourist activities.

Studies have also determined carrying capacities in terms of the number of vehicles, based on visitor experiences gathered through surveys (Park Studies Laboratory, 2002). For instance, Blue Ridge Parkway, USA, generated a value of 56 cars per mile as the maximum acceptable level of use that would avoid vehicular congestion that results in poor visitor experience. Data from a visitor survey in the Acadia National Park was used to arrive at a value of 40 cars per mile which would provide satisfactory visitor experience (Manning et

al., 2002). Similarly, in Sri Lanka, Rathnayake and Gunawardena (2013), in a study based on visitor acceptability and vehicle crowding levels within the Kaudulla National Park, estimated the Social Carrying Capacity (SCC) in terms of vehicle crowding as 9 vehicles within a 25m radius in the tank area of the park. A study in the Horton Plains National Park also estimated the Social Carrying Capacity (SCC) based on the impact of crowding on visitor satisfaction at specific viewpoints (Rathnayake & Gunawardena, 2014).

Two other indices, namely, the Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) and the Real Carrying Capacity (RCC), have been used to calculate the potential number of visitors an area can accommodate without inflicting harm on the destination habitats. The PCC is defined as the maximum number of visitors that can physically fit into a defined space over a particular time (Maldonado & Montagnini, 2005; Mashayekhan *et al.*, 2014; Sayan & Atik, 2011). RCC, which is based on the PCC value, is defined as the maximum permissible number of visitors which can be accommodated, once selected limiting factors (known as corrective factors) have been considered. The limiting factors may comprise site-specific bio-physical, environmental, ecological, social, and management variables (Maldonado & Montagnini, 2005; Sayan & Atik, 2011). PCC and RCC values have been used previously by others in different parts of the world using a diversity of corrective factors which have some bearing on visitation. For instance, rainfall and excessive heat limit visitation during certain periods of the year. Accordingly, Maldonado and Montagnini (2005) calculated PCC and RCC values for five hiking trails in the La Tigra National Park, Honduras, in Central America, incorporating limiting factors related to accessibility and erodibility of the trails due to precipitation. They also considering the closures of the park for maintenance activities. Mashayekhan *et al.* (2014) generated values for a hiking trail in the Telar Forest Park in northern Iran, using rainfall, strong winds, and frost as corrective factors. These studies provide a ceiling to the numbers of visitors per day for hiking trails.

More importantly, the disturbance to wildlife has been considered by a few studies when setting limits to visitation. Sayan and Atik (2011) used excessive sunshine, rainfall, storm, erosion, accessibility, and disturbance to wildlife as corrective factors for setting limits for hikers in the Termessos National Park in Turkey. Interestingly, there are two examples from India that also considered the negative impacts on wildlife. The comprehensive guidelines by the National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA) (2012), India, specified an inter-vehicle spacing of 500m as suitable for tiger reserves. A study on ecotourism by Kanoje (2006) in the Van Vihar National Park, India, considered the disturbance caused to migratory birds when calculating the maximum number of visitors/groups that can be permitted, and recommended a distance of 50m between individuals or groups on a hiking trail.

Although Sri Lanka has an extensive protected area network locally, no estimates based on inter-group/vehicle spacing or impacts on wildlife are currently available. The objective of our study was, therefore, to determine the carrying capacity of the Udawalawe National Park, a wildlife protected area in Sri Lanka. We used as the basis of the study, the formula set out in Ceballos-Lascurain (1996), with a set of variables that are locally appropriate. Challenges of using this approach are also discussed in detail.

Methodology

Study Site

The Udawalawe National Park (UWNP) is located in the dry zone of Sri Lanka at 6°30'14.06 N and 80°54'28.12 E (Figure 1) and falls within the two administrative districts of Ratnapura and Moneragala. The Park covers an area of 323.15km² and encompasses two reservoirs for storing water for irrigation – the Udawalawe reservoir, and the much smaller Mau Ara reservoir (Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWC), 2008). The average annual rainfall in the park is 1329mm, the mean annual temperature is about 32°C, and the relative humidity ranges between 70–82% in the daytime. The major natural ecosystems of the park are dry-mixed evergreen forests and its successional stages, riverine forests along the Walawe river and other water courses, savanna, scrub, and forest plantations (mainly comprising *Eucalyptus* (*Eucalyptus*) and teak (*Tectona grandis*)). The national park harbors a rich faunal assemblage including 21 fish species, 12 amphibians, 33 reptiles, 184 birds of which 33 are migratory, and 43 mammals. The primary objectives of declaring the UWNP a protected area were to protect the immediate catchment of the Udawalawe reservoir and to provide refuge for herds of displaced elephants threatened due to development projects and human settlements (DWC, 2008). The free ranging elephants are the major attraction of the Udawalawe National Park. Its proximity to Colombo, the commercial capital of the country, and the presence of elephants throughout the year are two of the major reasons for its high tourist potential. In 2018, a total of 409,925 local and foreign tourists visited the Park. It was also ranked as the second most visited wildlife park in Sri Lanka in 2018 (Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority, 2018).

Figure 1

The Udawalawe National Park

Note: Map of Sri Lanka showing the park's location and map of the two safari trails (Udawalawe and Handagiriya) considered for the purpose of generating carrying capacity values in the study (above).

Calculation of PCC and RCC values

For determining the Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) we were guided by the formula introduced by Ceballos-Lascurain (1996) where the PCC is calculated using $PCC = A \times (V/a) \times Rf$. Here A is the available area for public use; V/a – when V is a single visitor/group of visitors, a is equal to the area recommended per visitor/group; and Rf (rotation factor) is the number of times the park can be visited by the same person or group of persons within a single day. The variables used in our study were modified to suit safari trails – those applicable to the protected area under study (UWNP). Accordingly, our formula reads $PCC = L \times Lu \times Rf$, where L is the length of a motorable safari trail, Lu is what is considered to be the minimum distance to be maintained between any two safari vehicles as they traverse the trail so that disturbance to wildlife will not exceed acceptable levels, and Rf is the number of times a vehicle carrying visitors can complete a circuit within the park in a single day. Real Carrying Capacity (RCC) is calculated using the formula $RCC = PCC \times (100 - Cf1) / 100 \times (100 - Cf2) / 100 \times \dots \times (100 - Cfn) / 100$, where Cf are the corrective factors. RCC for a particular site is generally lower than its PCC.

PCC and RCC values were calculated separately for the two safari trails in the Udawalawe National Park, one commencing from the main entrance of the park (hereinafter known as the Udawalawe trail), and the other commencing from Handagiriya (hereinafter known as the Handagiriya trail). The length of trail denoted by L was taken to be the total length of motorable tracks in each trail available for visitor use. This was determined using a digital map and confirmed by a drive along the trails. For inter-vehicle spacing (Lu) we used the recommended inter-vehicle distance of 500m (i.e., one vehicle per 500 m) as used for the Kanha National Park in India, as a conservative approach applicable to the UWNP. At present, there are no local guidelines available with respect to inter-vehicle distances for visitors. The park is not particularly popular for any elusive animals. Hence, we considered that calculating visitor loads for two lower inter-vehicle distances – 300 and 400m – would be also useful. For determining the rotation factor, we took into consideration the time during which the park remains open for visitors – from 0600 to 1800 hours (12 hours) – and the average time required to complete one safari tour, including the estimated average times spent on spotting and observing wildlife. Based on preliminary observations, it was noted that a safari circuit would take approximately four hours. Although the park remains open for 12 hours, the majority of visitors (over 90%) engage in safari tours early in the morning (0600–1000h) or afternoon (1400–1800h), as these are the best times for animal viewing (Buultjens et al., 2005). Considering these facts, we used the factor two (2) as the Rf .

The key attraction of Udawalawe National Park for tourists is the presence of herds of elephants (*Elephas maximus*). A previous study on Udawalawe (Hettiarachchi et al., 2021) reported that proximity to visitor vehicles caused elephants to devote 34.5% less time on feeding than they would if away from visitors. Hence, for deriving the Real Carrying Capacity (RCC) value from the PCC value, we used 34.5% as the corrective factor to indicate disturbance caused to wildlife.

At Udawalawe, nearly all the visitor vehicles are safari jeeps, and each jeep can comfortably accommodate six persons. This value was used to convert the number of visitor vehicles into the number of visitors in order to derive the value for the allowable number of visitors per day. Monthly data on actual visitor turnout for 2018 was obtained from the Department of Wildlife Conservation office at the Udawalawe National Park and used for comparison with the generated PCC and RCC values.

Results

The Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) and Real Carrying Capacity (RCC) values generated for the two trails, namely, the Udawalawe trail and the Handagiriya trail, applying three inter-vehicle distances are shown in Table 1. Reading from the table, taking the Udawalawe trail at an inter-vehicle distance of 300m and with no limitation factors being applied, the estimated maximum number of vehicles per day would be 825 and the visitor load 4950. These values reduce by 34% when applying the limiting factor (relating to disturbance to wildlife). There is a progressive reduction in the carrying capacity values (both PCC and RCC) by 25% and 40% when the inter-vehicle spacing increases to 400m and to 500m, respectively.

Table 1

Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) and Real Carrying Capacity (RCC) for Vehicles and Visitors

Entrance	Trail length (m)	Inter-vehicle distance	Vehicles per day		Visitors per day	
			PCC	RCC	PCC	RCC
Udawalawa	123,780	300 m	825	545	4950	3270
		400 m	619	409	3714	2454
		500 m	495	327	2970	1962
Handagiriya	20,380	300 m	136	90	816	540
		400 m	102	67	612	402
		500 m	82	54	492	324

Note: The table shows PCC and RCC values in terms of vehicles and visitors per day for the two entrances to the Udawalawe National Park, calculated considering three scenarios on inter vehicle distance. A Rotation factor of two (2) and Corrective factor of 34.5% were used in the calculations.

We then made comparisons between the generated PCC and RCC values in this study (Table 1) with the loads of vehicles and visitors patronizing the park in 2018, shown in Tables 2 and 3. Comparing the two safari trails, it is seen that around 99% of the safari vehicles have used the main Udawalawe entrance and the trail associated with it, whereas only 38 safari vehicles have used the Handagiriya entrance. Examining monthly trends

with respect to the total vehicle loads for the extensively used Udawalawe trail, the total vehicles (10,232) and visitors (54,751) was highest in December. Nevertheless, when the means were considered, the highest for vehicles was in February (340.4) and for visitors was in December (330.1). Such discrepancies may arise given the variation in the number of travelers carried by a single safari vehicle. Visitors and vehicles were low in the month of June.

Table 2

Vehicle Loads to the Udawalawe National Park in 2018 via the Udawalawe Entrance and Handagiriya Entrance (within parenthesis).

Month	No. of vehicles			Total vehicles	Number of vehicles per day
	Jeep	Bus	Car		
January	9318 (6)	3	0	9321 (6)	300.7 (0.2)
February	9527 (2)	3	2	9532 (2)	340.4 (0.1)
March	9776 (5)	0	0	9776 (5)	315.4 (0.2)
April	7322 (2)	1	0	7323 (2)	244.1 (0.1)
May	3015 (0)	0	0	3015 (0)	97.3 (0)
June	2639 (3)	1	1	2641 (3)	88.0 (0.1)
July	5811 (2)	1	0	5812 (2)	187.5 (0.1)
August	8514 (5)	2	0	8516 (5)	274.7 (0.2)
September	6986 (7)	0	0	6986 (7)	232.9 (0.2)
October	5905 (0)	0	2	5907 (0)	190.5 (0)
November	6607 (0)	0	3	6610 (0)	220.3 (0)
December	10229 (6)	3	0	10232 (6)	330.1 (0.2)
Total				85671 (38)	234.7 (0.1)

Table 3
Information on Visitors to the Udawalawe National Park in 2018

Month	Udawalawe entrance	Handagiriya entrance	Total Visitors	Visitors per day
January	42665	40	42705	1377.6
February	43530	17	43547	1555.3
March	43195	27	43222	1394.3
April	33572	23	33595	1119.8
May	14321	0	14321	462.0
June	13037	19	13056	435.2
July	28642	10	28652	924.3
August	44395	31	44426	1433.1
September	33817	80	33897	1129.9
October	28264	0	28264	911.7
November	29489	0	29489	983.0
December	54727	24	54751	1766.2
Total	409654	271	409925	

Comparing the estimated PCC values with those recorded for the Udawalawe National Park in 2018 (Figure 2), it is evident that the current vehicle loads are well within the PCC values generated through this study even for the lowest inter-vehicle spacing of 300m. However, when the RCC value is considered, it is seen that the current vehicle loads have exceeded the RCC values at 500m inter-vehicle spacing in the two months of February and December. In the case of visitor loads in 2018, the generated values have not exceeded the estimated RCC value for the 500m inter-vehicle distance in any month. The loads of vehicles that are at present recorded from Handagiriya are well below the values for PCC and RCC as estimated by the present study.

Figure 2
Mean Values for Vehicles (a) and Visitors (b) per day in the Udawalawe Trail across 12 Months in 2018

Note: The PCC and RCC generated through this study for inter-vehicle spacing of 300 and 500m are also shown for comparison.

Discussion

The study generated carrying capacity values for the Udawalawe National Park, a popular protected area in Sri Lanka in terms of visitation. The results are novel with respect to two aspects: Firstly, this is the first attempt in Sri Lanka to generate Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) and Real Carrying Capacity (RCC) values for any of the local PAs which takes into consideration the potential adverse impacts to wildlife; and secondly, we present our results of PCC and RCC in terms of both recommended vehicle and visitor loads.

Separate PCC and RCC values were generated for the two entrances used by visitors to the Udawalawe National Park. The PCC values generated for the popularly used Udawalawe trail increased from 495 to 825 vehicles per day when the inter-vehicle spacing was reduced from 500 to 300m, whereas the RCC rose from 327 to 545 vehicles per day. The corresponding values for visitors were PCC – 2970 and 4950 visitors per day, and RCC – 1962 and 3270 visitors per day, at the inter-vehicle spacing of 500 and 300m. In comparing the generated values with the vehicle and visitor loads recorded in 2018, it is seen that the values in 2018 do not exceed the PCC values generated for the main Udawalawe trail, even during the peak month for visitation in December. However, the load of vehicles exceeded the generated RCC value in the months of February and December at 500m vehicle spacing, whereas the loads of visitors were below the generated RCC value throughout the year. Discrepancies between vehicle and visitor loads arise because some vehicles carry fewer passengers than six (assumed maximum number of passengers per safari jeep for RCC calculation). There is also a sharp contrast between the Udawalawe trail, and the Handagiriya trail, the latter being under-utilized with only 38 vehicles (0.04%) and 271 visitors (0.06%) entering the Park from this entrance. This is, however, very likely driven by the differences in the visibility of wildlife between the two trails – the Handagiriya trail being less intensely used by visitors in view of the lower frequency of animals in it. Hence, improving this route may not bring about the envisaged benefits in terms of distributing vehicles/visitor loads and providing a satisfactory visitor experience.

In using the generated values for managing visitation in PAs, it is more prudent to use RCC values than PCC values, as the former directly takes into consideration possible adverse impacts on wildlife. The corrective factors used for each PA are location specific. In the Kanha Tiger Reserve, the calculation of carrying capacity explicitly used an inter-vehicle distance of 500m for safari vehicles, while also considering a relatively high corrective factor (55%) based on issues related to the presence of three species – the courtship period of swamp deer (*Rucervus duvaucelii*), a near-extinct endangered species restricted to the Kanha National Park; the peak courtship period of spotted deer (*Axis cervicolor*); and the period when newborn tiger cubs (*Panthera tigris*) are present. In extending this approach to other Pas, one could use the presence of endemic, rare, threatened, or migratory species to decide on specific corrective factors that could be used to reduce visitor loads. It should also be noted that one could incorporate additional corrective factors progressively, even for the

Udawalawe National Park which supports populations of other important species such as the leopard (*Panthera pardus*) and other wild cats.

Practical Issues when Using Carrying Capacity Guidelines for Setting Limits to Visitor Loads

In India, carrying capacity is used for regulating tourist visitation in tiger reserves. Based on carrying capacity, guidelines setting prescriptive standards for tourism activities were issued in 2012 by the National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA, 2012). Hence, using carrying capacity for regulating tourist visitation in wildlife PAs in Sri Lanka should not be considered impractical. The records for the UWNP in 2018 show that vehicle loads had not exceeded the Real Carrying Capacity calculated based on a conservative inter-vehicle distance of 500m, except for two months, and in these two months the excess was marginal. However, the occurrence of traffic congestions has been frequently reported in wildlife parks that follow much the same tourist admission procedure as the UWNP (Yala National Park – Buultjens et al., 2005; Kaudulla National Park – Rathnayake & Gunawardena, 2013). This points to the need for regulating visitor related activities at the entrance to the parks and within them. Locally, the concept of imposing restrictions on vehicle loads per day must be given serious thought. To regulate the number of vehicles and visitors, an online system which enables prior booking must be established. For instance, Bandhavgarh Tiger Reserve permits only 58 vehicles during the morning safari and 29 vehicles during the evening safari (Arakaki, 2013).

Regulatory measures would also include maintaining a registry of safari drivers authorized to carry visitors, and training of guides and drivers on ethics of wildlife tourism as a mandatory requirement. As the park administration is directly responsible for the supervision and management of visitor activities within the park, the administrative capacity (in terms of resources and personnel) must also be improved. Ceballos-Lascurain (1996) has calculated an index called the Effective Carrying Capacity which is the maximum number of visitors/visitor vehicles that a site can sustain, given the management capacity available with the current administration. This index is dependent on limitations in management capacity which often include inadequate number of personnel (guides, trackers), insufficient infrastructure, and inadequate measures taken to promote awareness for nature conservation (Kanoje, 2006).

In Sri Lanka, the usual practice is for tourists to hire a safari vehicle on arrival at a park entrance. Due consideration is not given to the required inter-vehicle spacing. Even if the total number of vehicles admitted to a park in a day falls within the limit specified in the RCC, a failure to adhere to the inter-vehicle spacing even at the point of admission would be a violation of a condition of the carrying capacity.

In our study, we used the entire length of the motorable safari trails to calculate carrying capacity. However, in practice, the majority of vehicles to the park take selected and preferred routes, leading to an uneven distribution of vehicles within the park itself. Safaris in the UWNP are limited to approximately a third of the park (Ranjeewa et al., 2018), probably due to the higher possibility of spotting animals in this area. A typical

safari tour commencing at the main gate would usually cover the central part of the park between the Udawalawe and Mau Ara reservoirs. In order to regulate movement of vehicles within the park and avoid breaching the inter-vehicle distance requirement, vehicles should be assigned to routes prior to entry, and their adherence to this route should be strictly monitored with stiff fines imposed on violators. Given the erosion of trails in certain parts of the park, some sections of the trails may not be motorable during rainy seasons. Maintaining the entire trail network in a motorable condition, even in wet weather, would help to maintain an even distribution of vehicles within the park. It would also allow for improved surveillance and patrolling activities (Hoette et al., 2016).

It has been observed that management options to control visitor impacts are frequently associated with the behavior of visitors rather than actual visitor numbers (Rathnayake & Gunawardena, 2013). Disturbance to wildlife can be considerably reduced by avoiding close encounters, maintaining a minimum distance between the animal and the vehicle, switching off the vehicle engine when observing an animal, and remaining silent during observation (Ranaweera et al., 2015). Strict enforcement of speed limits, establishing speed bumps, maintaining rugged (but motorable) roads (Glista et al., 2009), restricting durations at wildlife sightings (a maximum of 15 minutes, as per NTCA guidelines), and erecting signboards highlighting rules at regular intervals, would be useful additional measures.

Park visitation rates would undoubtedly increase in the future with the development of the tourism industry. Given this scenario, the concept of carrying capacity can be used as an important tool to decide on how much recreational use could be permitted (Mashayekhan et al., 2014). The intention of the index is not to limit visitation, but rather to ensure the protection and sustainable management of the park's resources and value through the prevention of overexploitation (Cessford & Muhar, 2003; Maldonado & Montagnini, 2005; McCool & Lime, 2001). Introducing regulations for controlling tourist visitation and movement within the park based on carrying capacity and undertaking concomitant management and surveillance activities would take time. Therefore, until vehicle loads can be maintained in accordance with the estimated RCC values, park management should take the initiative to reduce the number of vehicles permitted entry and swiftly implement some of the possible measures outlined in this article.

Conclusion

Our study proposes new carrying capacity values as an attempt to achieving sustainability in wildlife tourism in the Udawalawe National Park. The generated carrying capacity values are on par with the vehicle and visitor loads recorded for 2018. However, it must be emphasized that the carrying capacity values have been calculated on the premise that certain conditions such as maintaining stipulated inter-vehicle distances, are satisfied. If these conditions cannot be met, the permitted visitor loads should be far lower than both, the values generated through the present study and those presently experienced in the Udawalawe National Park.

References

- Arakaki, D. M. (2013). Wildlife protection law and tiger tourism in India. *Osaka University College of Law Studies*, 32(9), 181–210.
- Balmford, A., Beresford, J., Green, J., Naidoo, R., Walpole, M., & Manica, A. (2009). A global perspective on trends in nature-based tourism. *PLoS Biol*, 7(6), e1000144. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000144>
- Belsoy, J., Korir, J., & Yego, J. (2012). Environmental impacts of tourism in protected areas. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 2(10), 64–73.
- Buultjens, J., Ratnayake, I., Gnanapala, A., & Aslam, M. (2005). Tourism and its implications for management in Ruhuna National Park (Yala), Sri Lanka. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 733–742. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.03.014>
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H. (1996). *Tourism, ecotourism, and protected areas: The state of nature-based tourism around the world and guidelines for its development*. IUCN.
- Cessford, G., & Muhar, A. (2003). Monitoring options for visitor numbers in National Parks and Natural Areas. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 11(4), 240–250. <https://doi.org/10.1078/1617-1381-00055>
- Cunha, A. A. (2010). Negative effects of tourism in a Brazilian Atlantic forest National Park. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 18(4), 291–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2010.01.001>
- Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWC). (2008). Biodiversity baseline survey: Uda Walawe National Park. Department of Wildlife Conservation, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.
- Eagles, P. F. (2002). Trends in park tourism: Economics, finance and management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(2), 132–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580208667158>
- Glista, D. J., De Vault, T. L., & De Woody, J. A. (2009). A review of mitigation measures for reducing wildlife mortality on roadways. *Landscape and Urban planning*, 91(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2008.11.001>
- Hettiarachchi, G. K., Marasinghe, M. S. L. R. P., Pilapitiya, S., & Wijesinghe, M. R. (2021). Would quantitative assessments of adverse impacts of tourism signal the need for improved management? A case study from Sri Lanka. *Wildlanka*, 9(1), 36–46.
- Hoette, M. H., Kolodin, I. A., Bereznuk, S. L., Slaght, J. C., Kerley, L. L., Soutyrina, S. V., Salkina, G. P., Zaumyslova, O. Y., Stokes, E. J., & Miquelle, D. G. (2016). Indicators of success for smart law enforcement in protected areas: A case study for Russian Amur tiger (*Panthera tigris altaica*) reserves. *Integrative Zoology*, 11(1), 2–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1749-4877.12168>
- Kanoje, R. S. (2006). Managing Sustainable Eco-Tourism in Van Vihar National Park. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Monitoring and Management of Visitor Flows in Recreational and Protected Areas*. University of Applied Sciences Rapperswil, Switzerland.

- Li, P., & Yang, F. (2011). Ecological footprint study on tourism itinerary products in Shangri-La, Yunnan province, China. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 27(7), 2954–2963. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1872-2032\(07\)60062-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1872-2032(07)60062-6)
- Luo, J., & Wu, Y. (2011). Application of TEF model to quantitative assessment of tourism sustainable development in Jiujiang. *Journal of Convergence Information Technology*, 6(8), 165–172.
- Maldonado, E., & Montagnini, F. (2005). Carrying capacity of La Tigra National Park, Honduras: Can the park be self-sustainable? *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 19(4), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1300/J091v19n04_03
- Manning, R., Lawson, S., Valliere, W., Bacon, J., & Laven, D. (2002). *Schoodic Peninsula, Acadia National Park Visitor Study 2000–2001*. University of Vermont, Parks Studies Laboratory.
- Mashayekhan, A., Calichi, M. M., Rassam, G. H., Hoseini, V., Jalilvand, H., & Mohalleh, S. M. M. S. (2014). Recreation Carrying Capacity estimations to support forest park management (case study: Telar Forest Park, Ghaemshahr, Iran). *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 29(3), 421–425.
- McCool, S. F., & Lime, D. W. (2001). Tourism carrying capacity: Tempting fantasy or useful reality? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(5), 372–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580108667409>
- Nakajima, E. S., & Ortega, E. (2016). Carrying capacity using emergy and a new calculation of the ecological footprint. *Ecological Indicators*, 60, 1200–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.08.054>
- National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA). (2012). *Comprehensive guidelines for tiger conservation and tourism. Section (1) (c) Wildlife Protection Act, 1972*.
- Park Studies Laboratory. (2002). *Blue Ridge Parkway visitor survey: Study completion report*. University of Vermont.
- Phumalee, U., Phongkhiao, N. T., Emphandhu, D., & Bejranonda, S. (2018). Touristic Ecological Footprint in Mu Ko Surin National Park. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2018.01.003>
- Ranaweera, E., Ranjeewa, A. D., & Sugimoto, K. (2015). Tourism-induced disturbance of wildlife in Protected Areas: A case study of free ranging elephants in Sri Lanka. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 4, 625–631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2015.10.013>
- Ranjeewa, A. D., Pastorini, J., Isler, K., Weerakoon, D. K., Kottage, H. D., & Fernando, P. (2018). Decreasing reservoir water levels improve habitat quality for Asian elephants. *Mammalian Biology*, 88(1), 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mambio.2017.10.002>
- Rathnayake, R. M. W., & Gunawardena, U. A. D. P. (2013). Enjoying elephant watching: A study on Social Carrying Capacity of Kaudulla National Park in Sri Lanka. *Sabaragamuwa University Journal*, 12(1), 23–39. <http://doi.org/10.4038/suslj.v12i1.6984>
- Rathnayake, R. M. W., & Gunawardena, U. A. D. P. (2014). Social carrying capacity of the Horton plains national park, Sri Lanka. *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences*, 35(1-2), 29–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4038/sljss.v35i1-2.7347>

- Sayan, M. S., & Atik, M. (2011). Recreation carrying capacity estimates for protected areas: A study of Termessos National Park. *Ekoloji*, 20(78), 66–74.
- Senevirathna, H. M. M. C., & Perera, P. K. P. (2013). Wildlife viewing preferences of visitors to Sri Lanka's National Parks: Implications for visitor management and sustainable tourism planning. *Journal of Tropical Forestry and Environment*, 3(2), 1–10.
- Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority (SLTDA). (2018). *Annual Statistical Report 2018*.
- Sun, D., & Walsh, D. (1998). Review of studies on environmental impacts of recreation and tourism in Australia. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 53(4), 323–338. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1998.0200>
- Tarlow, E. M., & Blumstein, D. T. (2007). Evaluating methods to quantify anthropogenic stressors on wild animals. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 102(3-4), 429–451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2006.05.040>
- Tisdell, C. (2003). Economic aspects of ecotourism: Wildlife-based tourism and its contribution to nature. *Sri Lankan Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 5(1), 83–95.
- Tran, N., Nguyen, T. L., Nguyen, D. T., Dang, M., & Dinh, X. T. (2007). Tourism carrying capacity assessment for Phong Nha-Ke Bang and Dong Hoi, Quang Binh Province. *VNU Journal of Science, Earth Sciences*, 23, 80–87.