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National Parks are the “crown jewels” of America. However, in recent years they have become subject to rampant overcrowding and overuse, so much so that they are being loved to death. The 1916 National Park Service (“NPS”) Organic Act calls for the conservation of “the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life . . . and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave [park sites] unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” Due to increased visitation, one of the mandates of the NPS is being trampled. Some parks have taken steps to mitigate the impacts and even limited park access, but more action is needed to ensure parks are protected for future generations.

During the last decade, fueled partially by the NPS’s Centennial “Find Your Park” campaign in 2015 and 2016, park visitation has drastically increased. Parks were again inundated with visitors in 2020 as a result of Americans being “stuck” at home for months during the COVID-19 pandemic. Consequently, finding a balance between conservation of park resources and visitor use is a tension that must continuously be assessed, especially in light of the rapidly-changing climate.

NPS Management Policies have declared a non-impairment principle, which courts have upheld, endorsing conservation as the “predominant facet.” Park decisionmakers are required to prepare non-impairment determinations for final agency actions to ensure activity “will not lead to an impairment of park resources or values” including “the park’s scenery, natural and historic objects, and wildlife, and the processes and conditions that sustain them . . . .” The catch is that visitation, which is key to the mission, is causing impairment. Managers must take steps to address overcrowding and its adverse effects.

There are several potential actions that NPS decisionmakers could take to address the overuse problem. First, though there are 423 park sites, most of the visitation happens at just six percent of parks. It is clear that with the right resources the NPS can reach large numbers of people and incentivize them to change their behavior through marketing, as was exemplified by its successful Centennial “Find Your Park” campaign that encouraged new visitation. While it may require congressional appropriation to fund another such campaign, the NPS should recreate the enthusiasm behind the centennial campaign and focus on (1) educating park visitors on how to visit—i.e., Leave No Trace— and respectful visitation ethics—and (2) highlight parks that have the capacity to receive more of the visitation burden. Implementing a “hidden gems” campaign would need to be carefully crafted as not to incidentally cause an influx to already popular parks, but instead drive visitors to visit less-frequented parks. This system-wide approach has the potential to reshape how parkgoers think about, and plan visits to parks in the future.

Second, and more directly tied to protecting park resources, parks need to implement visitation restrictions. Options include park reservation systems (i.e., timed entry), increasing shuttle bus services, and implementing permit systems for popular trails. These are solutions that can be taken at the individual park level. Many of them will require managers to consider conservation benefits over “enjoyment,” exposing managers to potential public outcry. To permanently implement these types of actions will require months, if not years, of planning, but the more managers make these hard decisions in favor of “non-impairment,” the easier such decisions will become because there will be precedent and procedures in place for making them.

Time and place-based restrictions are not completely novel. Muir Woods National Monument was the first park site to implement a timed reservation system to address visitation problems in January 2018. Further, many parks in response to the pandemic implemented reservations, and many are keeping them for the 2022 season in response to unpleasant conditions left by the masses of visitors. Additionally, electrifying park-provided transportation will help further mitigate the impacts of visitation. To compel park managers to implement these types of restrictions, the NPS could implement new policy guidance, or promulgate rules requiring the implementation of impairment-limiting visitation practices.

A third option could be to change entry pricing schemes. Increasing park entry fees is never popular. This proposal is not to increase the price of admission and make access prohibitive to disadvantaged groups, but rather to lower prices during the “shoulder” and “off” seasons to distribute visitors throughout the year. This type of solution would likely need to go through notice-and-comment, and need to be studied to determine if it would help with the overuse problem or if it would just spread it out or even cause it to worsen.

These solutions are a few of the potential ways to address overcrowding and its impacts. There is no one-size-fits-all answer, and it will likely take a comprehensive approach, combining these types of solutions—promoting hidden gems, time and manner restrictions, and alternative pricing schemes—to keep parks from being loved to death.
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