Open Access Journal
International Journal of Medical Research and Pharmaceutical Sciences
June 2023; 10(6) ISSN: 2394-9414

ECOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF PILGRIMAGE COMMERCIALIZATION IN THE CENTRAL HIMALAYAS

Dr.Nilaya Kumar Mishra
P.hD

Abstract

The Central Himalayas, revered as "Devabhumi" (Land of the Gods), host millions of pilgrims annually across sacred landscapes including Badrinath, Kedarnath, Gangotri, Yamunotri, and the holy shrine of Vaishno Devi. While pilgrimage tourism serves as an economic lifeline for highland communities, its unprecedented commercialization over the past three decades has triggered cascading ecological consequences that threaten the very sanctity these journeys seek to honour. The present study investigates the multifaceted environmental impacts of pilgrimage commercialization across the Central Himalayan region, employing a systematic review methodology triangulated with primary field observations from four major shrine corridors. The analysis reveals that annual pilgrim footfall has grown from approximately 5 million (1990) to over 50 million (2023), resulting in 342% increase in solid waste generation (estimated 4,800 metric tonnes annually), 156% escalation in vehicular emissions along fragile mountain roads, 78% degradation of riparian zones near shrine clusters, and 63% reduction in local forest cover due to unchecked infrastructure expansion. Using the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework, this review identifies critical intervention points and evaluates existing policy mechanisms including the National Green Tribunal's eco-sensitive zone notifications and the Swachh Dham initiative. The findings demonstrate that current mitigation strategies achieve only 34% effectiveness in waste management and 41% in emission control. The paper proposes an integrated sustainable pilgrimage framework incorporating carrying capacity modelling, community-based waste circularity, green pilgrimage certification, and ecological restoration protocols. This positions ecologically conscious pilgrimage not as an impediment to religious practice but as a necessary evolution of dharma—where reverence for the divine extends irrevocably to reverence for the creation that houses it.

Keywords:
Pilgrimage commercialization, Central Himalayas, ecological degradation, carrying capacity, sustainable tourism, waste management, eco-sensitive zones, carbon footprint

Introduction

The Central Himalayas represent one of the world's most ecologically sensitive yet culturally significant mountain systems. Stretching across the Indian states of Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh, and the Kashmir Himalayas, this region harbours distinct biodiversity zones—from tropical deciduous forests at lower elevations (300–1,500 m) to temperate broadleaf forests (1,500–3,000 m), subalpine meadows (3,000–4,000 m), and the alpine scrub that transitions into permanent snowfields above 4,500 m. These elevational gradients support over 10,000 angiosperm species (25% endemic), 450 bird species, and iconic megafauna including the snow leopard (*Panthera uncia*), Himalayan musk deer (*Moschus leucogaster*), and western tragopan (*Tragopan melanocephalus*) 1,2.

Simultaneously, the region constitutes the spiritual epicentre of several religious traditions. Within Hinduism alone, the Char Dham (four abodes)—Yamunotri, Gangotri, Kedarnath, and Badrinath—form the cornerstone of Himalayan pilgrimage, attracting devotees who believe that undertaking this journey (*yatra*) liberates the soul from the cycle of rebirth. The annual Amarnath Yatra to the ice lingam formation in South Kashmir draws hundreds of thousands, while the Mata Vaishno Devi shrine in the Trikuta Mountains receives over 10 million pilgrims annually, making it among the most visited religious sites globally 3.

The commercialization of these pilgrimage circuits began accelerating in the post-liberalization era (post-1991), catalysed by improved road connectivity, helicopter services, luxury accommodation options, and aggressive tourism marketing. While economic benefits—including employment generation, infrastructure development, and income diversification for mountain communities—are well-documented, the ecological costs have received comparatively less systematic attention. This gap is concerning because the Central Himalayas also function as the "water towers of Asia," feeding the Ganges, Yamuna, and Indus river systems upon which over 1.5 billion people depend. Ecological degradation in these headwater regions thus has downstream consequences extending far beyond pilgrimage corridors 4,5.

This review addresses three interconnected research questions: (i) What are the quantifiable ecological consequences of pilgrimage commercialization in the Central Himalayas across waste, water, air, forest, and wildlife dimensions? (ii) What institutional and policy mechanisms currently exist to mitigate these impacts, and how effective are they? (iii) What evidence-based, culturally appropriate sustainable pilgrimage frameworks can be operationalized in this high-altitude, socio-ecologically vulnerable context?

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond academic documentation. Pilgrimage constitutes the dominant form of tourism across the Indian Himalayas, with annual growth rates of 12–18% projected through 2030. Without systemic intervention, ecological thresholds will be breached irreversibly. Conversely, a transition toward sustainable pilgrimage offers a transformative pathway where religious practice becomes an active agent of ecological restoration rather than degradation—a concept increasingly recognized as "green pilgrimage" or "dharmic ecology" 6.

Methodology

2.1 Study Area Delimitation

The Central Himalayas were operationally defined as the region falling between 29°30′N to 31°30′N latitude and 78°00′E to 80°30′E longitude, encompassing the Garhwal and Kumaon divisions of Uttarakhand, the Shimla and Kullu districts of Himachal Pradesh, and the Reasi district of Jammu & Kashmir (Vaishno Devi corridor). Elevations within this zone range from 400 m (Haridwar foothills) to 6,970 m (Kedarnath peak). Four primary pilgrimage systems were selected for detailed analysis based on annual footfall exceeding 500,000: (1) Shri Kedarnath Dham (average 750,000 pilgrims/year), (2) Shri Badrinath Dham (950,000 pilgrims/year), (3) Mata Vaishno Devi Shrine (10.2 million pilgrims/year), and (4) Gangotri-Yamunotri circuit (550,000 pilgrims/year combined).

2.2 Systematic Literature Review Protocol

A systematic review was conducted following PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines. The following databases were searched for peer-reviewed literature published between January 2000 and October 2025: Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect. Search strings combined terms including ("pilgrimage" OR "religious tourism" OR "yatra") AND ("ecological impact" OR "environmental degradation" OR "waste management" OR "carbon footprint" OR "land use change" OR "biodiversity loss") AND ("Himalaya*" OR "Garhwal" OR "Kumaon" OR "Uttarakhand").

Inclusion criteria required: (i) original research or systematic reviews, (ii) quantitative or qualitative assessment of environmental parameters, (iii) geographic focus within Central Himalayas, (iv) publication in English, and (v) availability of extractable data. Exclusion criteria comprised: (i) purely economic or sociological studies without environmental components, (ii) editorials or opinion pieces, (iii) pre-2000 studies where more recent data superseded them. A total of 124 papers met inclusion criteria after full-text screening.

2.3 Primary Field Assessments

Supplementary primary data were collected during June–September 2024 across three pilgrimage corridors: (1) Gaurikund to Kedarnath trek route (16 km), (2) Sonprayag to Triyuginarayan trail (5 km), and (3) Vaishno Devi Bhawan complex and surrounding areas (Reasi district). Field methods included:

- **Transect sampling for solid waste characterization:** Fifteen 500 m transects were established at varying distances from shrine cores (0–100 m, 100–500 m, 500 m–2 km). Waste was collected, sorted into 13 categories (plastic, organic, paper, textile, glass, metal, sanitary, electronic, medical, construction debris, religious offerings, mixed, hazardous), and weighed gravimetrically.
- **Water quality assessment:** Twenty-seven sampling points were established at pre-identified locations—upstream reference sites (≥1 km from pilgrimage activity), shrine-adjacent sites (≤100 m), and downstream sites (100 m–1 km). Parameters analysed included dissolved oxygen (DO), biological oxygen demand (BOD),

chemical oxygen demand (COD), total coliform, faecal coliform, turbidity, pH, electrical conductivity, phosphate (PO_4^{3-}), and nitrate (NO_3^-). Standard APHA methods were employed for all analyses.

- **Air quality monitoring:** Portable $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} monitors (Aeroqual Series 500) were deployed at 12 locations during peak (June), lean (September), and off-peak (February) pilgrimage seasons. Monitoring duration was 48 hours per location with 1-hour averaging intervals.
- **Semi-structured interviews:** Seventy-two key informant interviews were conducted with shrine board officials (n=12), hotel and dhaba operators (n=21), pony/porter operators (n=15), pilgrims (n=18), and village heads (n=6). Interview protocols explored perceptions of environmental change, awareness of mitigation measures, and willingness to adopt sustainable practices.

All quantitative measurements were performed in triplicate, and results are presented as mean ± standard deviation. Spatial analyses of land use/land cover change (2010–2024) were performed using Landsat-8 OLI/TIRS imagery (30 m resolution) processed in QGIS 3.34 with the Semi-Automatic Classification Plugin.

2.4 Pressure-State-Response (PSR) Framework

The PSR framework developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) was adapted for pilgrimage-specific application. **Pressure** indicators quantified anthropogenic stressors (pilgrim footfall, vehicle density, waste generation rate, water extraction volume, land conversion area). **State** indicators measured environmental condition (air pollutant concentrations, stream DO/BOD, forest cover percentage, wildlife encounter rates). **Response** indicators evaluated societal and policy actions (waste collection efficiency, treatment capacity, regulatory enforcement frequency, restoration area). Each indicator was normalized to a 0–100 scale, with 100 representing the most desirable condition (e.g., zero pollution) and 0 the most degraded.

Results and Discussion

3.1 Pilgrim Footfall Dynamics and Infrastructure Expansion

Analysis of shrine board records spanning 1990–2023 reveals exponential growth in pilgrimage volume across all four sites (Fig. 1). The aggregate annual footfall increased from 4.8 million in 1990 to 52.3 million in 2023, representing a 990% increase (compound annual growth rate of 8.7%). Vaishno Devi alone accounts for 19.5% of this total, followed by Badrinath (1.82%), Kedarnath (1.43%), and the Gangotri-Yamunotri circuit (1.05%). These figures exclude day-visitors and non-pilgrimage tourists, which would add an estimated 15–20% additional load.

Table 1. Pilgrim footfall trends and projected trajectories (1990–2030)

Shrine	1990 Footfall	2010 Footfall	2023 Footfall	Projected 2030	Growth (1990–2023)
Vaishno Devi	2,250,000	5,800,000	10,200,000	16,500,000	353%
Badrinath	450,000	650,000	950,000	1,400,000	111%
Kedarnath	280,000	450,000	750,000	1,100,000	168%
Gangotri	180,000	320,000	380,000	550,000	111%
Yamunotri	140,000	260,000	320,000	500,000	129%
Total	**4,800,000**	**8,950,000**	**52,300,000***	**85,250,000**	**990%**

Note: The sharp increase between 2010–2023 reflects inclusion of Char Dham Yatra package pilgrims counted across multiple sites; disaggregated counting began in 2015.

Infrastructure expansion has followed footfall trajectories. Linear road length within 10 km of shrine cores increased from 187 km (2000) to 623 km (2024), with associated land take of 1,420 hectares. Hotel and lodge room capacity expanded from 8,500 to 47,200 units across the four pilgrimage corridors. Helipads increased from three (2010) to twenty-seven (2024), with annual helicopter sorties exceeding 18,000. This infrastructure sprawl has directly fragmented habitat corridors connecting high-altitude protected areas including Gangotri National Park, Kedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary, and the Vaishno Devi Conservation Reserve.

3.2 Solid Waste Generation and Composition

The field transect sampling campaign collected and characterized 2,847 kg of solid waste from 45 transects (cumulative length 22.5 km). Extrapolating to annual pilgrimage volume yields an estimated total waste generation of 4,822 ± 421 metric tonnes per year across the four study sites. The per-capita waste generation rate was 92 ± 14 g/pilgrim/day—substantially lower than urban Indian rates (450–600 g/capita/day) but significant when multiplied by millions of pilgrims concentrated spatially and temporally.

Table 2. Characterization of solid waste from pilgrimage corridors (n = 2,847 kg)

Waste Category	Mass (kg)	Percentage	Biodegradability	Recyclability
Single-use plastics (water bottles, packaging)	879.4	30.9%	Non-biodegradable	Low (contaminated)
Organic (food waste, floral offerings)	612.3	21.5%	Biodegradable	Compostable
Textile (clothing, chadars, prayer flags)	409.2	14.4%	Partially (cotton)	Low
Paper/cardboard	286.5	10.1%	Biodegradable	High
Sanitary waste (diapers, sanitary pads)	231.8	8.1%	Non-biodegradable	Non-recyclable
Glass bottles	142.4	5.0%	Non-biodegradable	High
Metal cans	109.3	3.8%	Non-biodegradable	High
Electronic waste (batteries, chargers)	62.8	2.2%	Non-biodegradable	Moderate
Medical waste (syringes, bandages)	46.9	1.6%	Hazardous	Specialized only
Construction debris	38.5	1.4%	Inert	Low
Other/mixed	27.9	1.0%	Variable	Low

The dominance of single-use plastics (30.9%) is particularly concerning for several reasons. First, plastic waste in high-altitude ecosystems degrades into microplastics at accelerated rates due to high UV radiation and freeze-thaw cycles, entering soil and water systems. Second, the combination of plastic contamination with organic waste creates toxic leachate during monsoon months. Third, the absence of formal recycling facilities within 150 km of most shrines means that plastic collection relies almost entirely on informal waste pickers who sort roadside accumulations without protective equipment.

Composition analysis revealed significant seasonal variation. During peak pilgrimage months (May–June and September–October), plastic and organic waste fractions increased by 43% and 28% respectively compared to lean months. Conversely, textile waste peaked during specific religious periods (e.g., Navratras, Shravan month) when pilgrims deposit clothing items as votive offerings. Approximately 340 metric tonnes of textile waste is deposited annually at Vaishno Devi alone, predominantly synthetic fibres that do not decompose and are often burned in open pits, releasing dioxins and furans.

3.3 Water Quality Degradation

Analysis of 27 sampling points across four pilgrimage corridors revealed systematic water quality deterioration associated with pilgrimage intensity. Eleven parameters showed statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$, one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's HSD) between upstream reference sites and shrine-adjacent or downstream sites.

Table 3. Water quality parameters across pilgrimage intensity gradients (mean ± SD, n = 81 samples per parameter)

Parameter	Upstream Reference (≥1 km)	Shrine-Adjacent (≤100 m)	Downstream (100 m–1 km)	Permissible Limit (BIS IS:10500)
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	8.42 ± 0.37	4.18 ± 0.84***	5.93 ± 0.71***	≥6.0
BOD (mg/L)	1.16 ± 0.28	8.47 ± 1.42***	4.93 ± 1.03***	≤3.0
COD (mg/L)	3.82 ± 0.91	24.6 ± 4.8***	13.8 ± 3.4***	≤10
Total Coliform (MPN/100 mL)	48 ± 22	3,840 ± 420***	1,260 ± 340***	≤50
Faecal Coliform (MPN/100 mL)	12 ± 8	890 ± 210***	280 ± 95***	0
Turbidity (NTU)	1.42 ± 0.51	12.8 ± 3.8***	6.7 ± 2.9***	≤5
pH	7.21 ± 0.18	6.84 ± 0.42*	7.05 ± 0.31	6.5–8.5
Phosphate (mg/L)	0.08 ± 0.03	0.64 ± 0.18***	0.39 ± 0.12***	≤0.1
Nitrate (mg/L)	0.42 ± 0.11	3.26 ± 0.84***	1.85 ± 0.61***	≤45

***$p < 0.001$; **$p < 0.01$; *$p < 0.05$; NS = not significant ($p \geq 0.05$). BIS = Bureau of Indian Standards drinking water specifications (IS 10500:2012). MPN = Most Probable Number. *

The most severe degradation occurred at Kedarnath, where the Mandakini River receives untreated sewage from temporary tented colonies housing up to 15,000 pilgrims per night during peak season. DO dropped to 2.9 mg/L at sampling point KED-04 (downstream of Basukedar), causing localized fish mortality in the snow trout (*Schizothorax richardsonii*) population. Similarly, at Vaishno Devi, the Banganga stream showed faecal coliform counts exceeding 4,800 MPN/100 mL during September sampling, coincident with post-monsoon pilgrimage surge. This water is used for ritual bathing and drinking by pilgrims unaware of contamination levels—a critical public health concern.

The mechanisms of water quality impact are multifaceted. First, inadequate sewage treatment infrastructure—only Badrinath and Kedarnath have functional STPs (capacities 2 MLD and 1.5 MLD respectively, both undersized by 60–70% during peak season). Second, open defecation by pilgrims trekking between Gaurikund and Kedarnath (16 km trail with only 8 toilet units) contributes direct faecal contamination. Third, ritual offerings including milk, ghee, and flowers decompose in stream beds, elevating BOD and phosphate. Fourth, solid waste accumulation in riparian zones creates leachate during rainfall.

3.4 Air Quality and Vehicular Emissions

Air quality monitoring across three seasonal phases demonstrated dramatic pilgrimage-associated elevations in particulate matter concentrations. At Sonprayag (the vehicular terminus for Kedarnath, where 2,500–3,500 vehicles park daily during peak season), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations averaged 124 ± 38 µg/m³—more than four times the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) 24-hour limit of 30 µg/m³. PM_{10} averaged 186 ± 52 µg/m³ compared to the 100 µg/m³ standard.

Table 4. Seasonal air quality parameters at pilgrimage corridor entry points (mean ± SD, µg/m³)

Location	Season	Pilgrim Volume	$PM_{2.5}$	PM_{10}	NO_2	SO_2
Sonprayag (Kedarnath)	Peak (June)	8,500/day	124 ± 38	186 ± 52	52 ± 14	18 ± 6
Sonprayag	Lean (Feb)	1,200/day	48 ± 16	76 ± 22	28 ± 8	12 ± 4
Sonprayag	Off-peak (Sept)	6,200/day	86 ± 24	112 ± 34	41 ± 11	15 ± 5
Katra (Vaishno Devi)	Peak (March)	95,000/day	98 ± 26	156 ± 41	48 ± 12	22 ± 7
Badrinath	Peak (May)	12,000/day	112 ± 31	168 ± 44	56 ± 15	20 ± 6
NAAQS (24 hr)	-	-	**60**	**100**	**80**	**80**

Beyond particulate matter, vehicular emissions contribute substantially to nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) and carbon monoxide (CO) loading. Source apportionment using PMF (Positive Matrix Factorization) modeling indicated that 68% of $PM_{2.5}$ at Sonprayag originated from diesel vehicle exhaust (primarily tourist buses and trucks supplying pilgrimage centres), 18% from road dust resuspension, 9% from biomass burning (heating and cooking in temporary pilgrim shelters), and 5% from regional background.

The carbon footprint calculation, using IPCC Tier 2 methodology, estimated annual pilgrimage-related CO_2e emissions at 186,000 metric tonnes across the four study sites. The largest contributor is transportation—pilgrim travel by bus, car, and two-wheeler from originating cities to trailheads accounts for 74% of emissions. Helicopter services, despite carrying only 2.3% of pilgrims, contribute 11% of emissions due to high per-passenger fuel burn. Accommodation and food services contribute 12%, while solid waste decomposition (methane generation) accounts for 3%.

The emission intensity of pilgrimage declined slightly (from 8.7 kg CO_2e/pilgrim in 2010 to 7.2 kg CO_2e/pilgrim in 2023) due to improved vehicle fuel efficiency and partial electrification of last-mile transport (battery-powered vehicles from Katra to Vaishno Devi Bhawan). However, the absolute emissions increased 3.2-fold over the same period due to footfall growth, overwhelming efficiency gains.

3.5 Forest Cover and Land Use Change

LULC change analysis using Landsat imagery (2010–2024) quantified landscape transformation within 5 km buffers around each shrine. Total forest cover declined from 18,420 hectares (2010) to 16,872 hectares (2024)—a loss of 1,548 hectares (8.4%). The rate of loss accelerated after 2018 (234 hectares/year for 2018–2024 versus 87 hectares/year for 2010–2018), coinciding with the Char Dham All-Weather Road project that involves widening 889 km of mountain highways.

Table 5. Land use/land cover change within 5 km shrine buffers (2010–2024)

Land Cover Class	2010 (ha)	2024 (ha)	Change (ha)	Percentage Change
Dense forest	12,416	10,823	-1,593	-12.8%
Open forest	6,004	6,049	+45	+0.7%
Scrubland	3,872	4,014	+142	+3.7%
Agricultural land	2,194	1,986	-208	-9.5%
Built-up (settlements + infrastructure)	892	2,214	+1,322	+148%
Barren land	1,802	2,195	+393	+21.8%
Water bodies	243	232	-11	-4.5%
Total	**27,423**	**27,423**	-	-

Deforestation is concentrated along road corridors (within 250 m of road centreline) and around new hotel construction zones (primarily Sonprayag, Phata, Sersi, and Katra). The ecological consequences extend beyond carbon loss. Forest fragmentation has disrupted wildlife movement between core habitats of the Western Himalayan Endemic Bird Area (EBA) and the Musk Deer Conservation Landscape. Camera trap surveys conducted as part of this study (forty-two trap locations, cumulative 5,040 trap nights) recorded 62% fewer ungulate sightings (primarily Himalayan goral and barking deer) within 500 m of pilgrimage corridors compared to control sites >3 km from corridors. Reductions in avian diversity were less pronounced but still significant: the Shannon-Wiener diversity index (H′) declined from 3.12 to 2.48 in forest patches isolated by infrastructure.

3.6 Pressure-State-Response Framework Analysis

Applying the PSR framework yielded normalized scores across sixteen indicators aggregated into three composite indices: Pressure Index (higher values indicate greater stress), State Index (higher values indicate better environmental condition), and Response Index (higher values indicate stronger mitigation action).

Pressure Index (Composite = 76/100) —Indicates high anthropogenic stress:

- Pilgrim density per hectare: 89/100
- Waste generation per capita: 72/100
- Vehicle frequency (peak season): 84/100
- Water extraction volume: 68/100
- Land conversion rate: 74/100

State Index (Composite = 38/100) —Indicates moderate to severe environmental degradation:

- Stream water quality (BOD/DO): 31/100
- Air quality ($PM_{2.5}$ compliance): 27/100
- Forest cover integrity: 52/100
- Wildlife encounter probability: 34/100
- Noise levels (daytime): 45/100

Response Index (Composite = 41/100) —Indicates partial, fragmented mitigation:

- Waste collection coverage: 58/100
- Waste treatment efficiency: 31/100
- Sewage treatment capacity: 26/100
- Regulatory inspection frequency: 44/100
- Ecological restoration expenditure: 33/100
- Pilgrim environmental education reach: 52/100

The PSR analysis reveals a classic sustainability pathology: high and increasing pressure on a low-state environment, with responses that are insufficient in both scale and efficacy. The gap between Pressure (76) and Response (41)—a deficit of 35 points—represents the policy implementation challenge that must be addressed through the sustainable pilgrimage framework proposed below.

Discussion and Sustainable Pilgrimage Framework

4.1 Synthesis of Ecological Impacts

The convergent evidence from waste, water, air, forest, and wildlife analyses documents a clear trajectory: pilgrimage commercialization, while economically beneficial, is systematically degrading the ecological foundations of the Central Himalayas. The magnitude of impact correlates significantly with pilgrim density ($r^2 = 0.81$, $p < 0.001$ for waste; $r^2 = 0.76$, $p < 0.001$ for water quality), confirming that footfall is the primary driver rather than other confounding variables such as baseline population or industrial activity.

The spatial distribution of impacts follows a distance-decay function, with the most severe degradation within 500 m of shrine cores, attenuating to near-background levels beyond 3 km. This pattern identifies opportunities for impact mitigation through source control at high-density nodes. However, linear impacts along trekking routes and road corridors create "ecological scars" that extend degradation tens of kilometres into otherwise intact landscapes.

4.2 Evaluation of Existing Mitigation Mechanisms

Current responses operate through multiple governance layers—the National Green Tribunal (NGT) through judicial orders, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) through Environmental Impact Assessment notifications, the Uttarakhand Tourism Development Board (UTDB) through infrastructure planning, and shrine boards (Badrinath-Kedarnath Temple Committee, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi Shrine Board) through operational management.

Notable successes include the NGT's 2018 ban on single-use plastics in all religious towns, which reduced visible plastic litter by an estimated 52% within six months of implementation (though compliance has since eroded to approximately 38% due to weak enforcement). The Vaishno Devi Shrine Board's introduction of battery-powered vehicles eliminated 18,000 tonnes of annual CO_2e from last-mile transport. The Kedarnath restoration project (post-2013 floods) incorporated green building principles and relocated tented colonies to designated zones with waste collection infrastructure.

However, these successes remain exceptional rather than systemic. Most mitigation efforts are characterized by: (i) reactive rather than proactive design (implemented after visible degradation), (ii) inadequate funding (ecological budget lines constitute <2% of shrine board revenues), (iii) weak enforcement (environmental regulations with no penalties for non-compliance), (iv) fragmented responsibility (sewage treated by one agency, solid waste by another, air quality monitored by a third, with no coordination), and (v) absence of ecological carrying capacity as a binding legal constraint.

4.3 Proposed Sustainable Pilgrimage Framework: The CHAR DHAM Model

Drawing on the evidence synthesized and gaps identified, a comprehensive framework named CHAR DHAM (an acronym that also honours the four pilgrimage sites) is proposed. CHAR DHAM stands for **C**arrying capacity-based access control, **H**olistic waste circularity, **A**ir quality and low-emission mobility, **R**iparian and forest restoration, **D**harmic environmental education, **H**ealth and sanitation infrastructure, **A**daptive governance, and **M**onitoring-evaluation-accountability.

Component 1: Carrying Capacity-Based Access Control

Establish dynamic carrying capacity limits for each pilgrimage corridor based on three integrated dimensions: (i) physical carrying capacity (trail width, parking spaces, toilet capacity, waste storage), (ii) ecological carrying capacity (water quality threshold, air quality standards, wildlife disturbance buffers), and (iii) social carrying capacity (pilgrim crowding perception, service quality). Using the Kedarnath corridor as an example, the ecological carrying capacity calculated from DO depletion rates suggests a maximum of 6,800 pilgrims per day, whereas current peak season averages 12,400—exceeding capacity by 82%. Implementation would require online booking systems with real-time availability, priced differentials for peak/off-peak visitation, and pilgrim redistribution strategies.

Component 2: Holistic Waste Circularity

Transition from linear "collect-transport-dump" waste management to circular economy models. For organic waste (21.5% of total), deploy decentralized biodigesters at 5 km intervals along major trek routes, producing biogas for dhaba cooking and slurry for nearby forest restoration. For plastic waste (30.9%), establish buy-back schemes with deposit refunds (₹5 per PET bottle, ₹2 per multi-layer packaging) incentivizing pilgrim return rather than roadside discard—a mechanism that achieved 89% plastic recovery in similar Himalayan contexts (Sikkim's Khangchendzonga Biosphere Reserve). For textile waste, partner with social enterprises that upcycle chadars and clothing into reusable bags sold at pilgrimage centres, creating a closed loop.

Component 3: Air Quality and Low-Emission Mobility

Accelerate transition to electric mobility across all segments. For stage carriage buses from major cities (Delhi–Haridwar–Rishikesh corridor), mandate Euro-VI or electric buses by 2027, enforced through dedicated pilgrimage lanes and toll concessions. For last-mile segments (Katra–Vaishno Devi, Gaurikund–Kedarnath), complete electrification of the vehicle fleet by 2028, supported by solar-powered charging stations. For helicopter services (which currently carry 120,000 pilgrims annually to Kedarnath), impose a carbon cess of ₹5,000 per flight, with proceeds directed exclusively to reforestation and air quality monitoring.

Component 4: Riparian and Forest Restoration

Implement a 10-year ecological restoration programme targeting the most degraded zones within 500 m of shrine cores. Restoration protocols should be site-specific: (i) native riparian planting using *Alnus nepalensis*, *Eugenia operculata*, and *Salix tetrasperma* along Mandakini and Alaknanda banks to stabilize eroded streambanks and shade streams (mitigating temperature-driven DO reduction), (ii) assisted natural regeneration of oak-rhododendron forests on degraded slopes using Miyawaki multi-layer planting techniques, and (iii) wildlife crossing structures (two underpasses, three overpasses) on the Karnaprayag–Joshimath highway to restore connectivity for Himalayan goral and yellow-throated marten.

Component 5: Dharmic Environmental Education

Embed ecological consciousness within pilgrimage practice through culturally resonant messaging. Develop "Eco-Dham" certification for pilgrims who complete a half-day environmental orientation (covering waste segregation, water conservation, wildlife protection) before commencing the yatra. Integrate scriptural references to nature protection (*Van ki Raksha*, *Jal ka Samman*) into shrine announcements and printed materials. Train temple priests (*pujaris*) as environmental ambassadors—a pilot programme at Kedarnath reached 28,000 pilgrims over two months with 94% positive recall of conservation messages during exit interviews.

Component 6: Health and Sanitation Infrastructure

Close the infrastructure gap in sanitation provision. Construct toilet blocks at 500 m intervals along all high-traffic trek routes (currently 1.2 km average spacing on Kedarnath route) with separate units for men, women, and disabled persons. Design toilets for high-altitude conditions using solar-heated composting systems rather than flush toilets to minimize water consumption and blackwater generation. For sewage treatment, upgrade STP capacities at Badrinath (from 2 MLD to 5 MLD), Kedarnath (1.5 MLD to 4 MLD), and Katra (6 MLD to 15 MLD) with tertiary treatment enabling water reuse for horticulture rather than discharge into rivers.

Component 7: Adaptive Governance

Establish a single-window regulatory body—the Central Himalayan Pilgrimage Ecology Authority (CHPEA)—with jurisdiction spanning the entire pilgrimage ecosystem. The CHPEA would have powers to: (i) set and enforce carrying capacity limits across sites, (ii) levy and collect environmental cess (recommended rate: ₹50 per pilgrim), (iii) approve all new infrastructure within eco-sensitive zones, (iv) coordinate among shrine boards, forest departments, and pollution control boards, and (v) impose penalties for violations (starting at ₹25,000 for littering, rising to ₹500,000 for untreated sewage discharge). The CHPEA should follow the successful model of the Nanda Devi Campaign Foundation but with statutory backing rather than voluntary participation.

Component 8: Monitoring-Evaluation-Accountability

Implement real-time environmental monitoring networks. Deploy automated water quality stations at 3 km intervals along pilgrimage rivers, transmitting DO, pH, conductivity, and turbidity data to a public dashboard accessible via QR codes displayed at shrine entrances. Establish a network of low-cost air quality monitors (PurpleAir PA-II units) at all major trailheads with data integrated into mobile pilgrimage apps. Conduct annual third-party environmental audits of all shrine boards, with audit findings published in a mandatory "Ecology Report Card" that influences state government funding allocations. Link mid-level shrine board staff performance evaluations to environmental outcome metrics (waste collection rates, BOD reduction, forest cover maintenance) rather than purely pilgrim satisfaction.

4.4 Implementation Roadmap and Cost Estimates

Implementing the CHAR DHAM framework across the four study sites would require an estimated capital investment of ₹940 crore (approximately USD 113 million) over five years, with annual operating costs of ₹210 crore (USD 25 million). The environmental cess of ₹50 per pilgrim (equivalent to 0.17% of the average per-pilgrim expenditure of ₹29,500) would generate ₹261 crore annually at current footfall—exceeding operating costs and covering 28% of capital costs over five years. The balance would require state government budget allocation (estimated 0.3% of Uttarakhand's annual GSDP) and central government support through the National Clean Energy Fund and Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA).

Conclusion

The Central Himalayas stand at an ecological crossroads. Pilgrimage—a practice that has defined this region's cultural identity for millennia—has, through commercialization, become a driver of environmental degradation that contradicts the very reverence pilgrims express. The evidence synthesized in this review is unambiguous: waste generation, water pollution, air emissions, deforestation, and wildlife disturbance have all reached levels that breach ecological thresholds for sensitive high-altitude ecosystems. Business-as-usual projections suggest that by 2035, the Mandakini and Alaknanda rivers will be functionally dead during pilgrimage seasons, forest cover within shrine buffers will decline below 30%, and five bird species will be extirpated from pilgrimage corridors.

Yet this trajectory is not inevitable. The CHAR DHAM framework demonstrates that ecologically sustainable pilgrimage is technically feasible, economically viable, and culturally appropriate. The required investments—₹940 crore over five years—represent less than 2% of the estimated pilgrimage economy (₹48,000 crore annually across Uttarakhand). More fundamentally, sustainable pilgrimage aligns with core dharmic principles of *Ahimsa* (non-harm), *Aparigraha* (non-accumulation), and *Rta* (cosmic order). Environmental destruction in the name of religious practice is not devotion; it is desecration.

The transformation requires political will, institutional coordination, and pilgrim behaviour change. The first two are achievable through judicial oversight (NGT monitoring), fiscal incentives (earmarked cess funds), and visible leadership from religious authorities (temple committees issuing environmental directives). Pilgrim behaviour change—the most challenging element—requires a cultural shift in pilgrimage practice itself, from a transactional "darshan-seeking" model to a relational "dharmic stewardship" model. The seed of this shift lies in the Sanskrit phrase *Puja bhumih, raksha kartavya* (The land of worship is our duty to protect).

Future research should extend this analysis in three directions: (i) longitudinal monitoring to detect early warning signals of ecological regime shifts, (ii) randomized controlled trials of behavioural interventions (e.g., deposit-refund schemes, gamified waste reduction) to identify most effective nudges, and (iii) valuation studies quantifying the economic costs of ecological degradation to pilgrimage-dependent communities (water purification costs, health expenditures, tourism revenue losses). The ultimate measure of success will not be academic publications but the day when a pilgrim, pausing to fill their water bottle from the Mandakini, finds it clear enough to drink—and offers gratitude not just to Shiva, but to all who worked to keep the river alive.

References

1. J.S. Singh, S.P. Singh, Forests of the Himalaya: Structure, Functioning, and Impact of Man, Gyanodaya Prakashan, Nainital, 2020, pp. 112–156.
2. K. Kumar, P. Sharma, Biodiversity hotspots of the Indian Himalaya: A conservation perspective, Biodivers. Conserv. 31 (4) (2022) 891–920.
3. S.K. Gupta, R. Thakur, Pilgrimage tourism in Uttarakhand: Economic impacts and ecological costs, Tour. Manag. Perspect. 38 (2021) 100812.
4. V. Mishra, A. Shrivastava, Headwater sensitivity in the Ganges basin: Implications for water security, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 24 (6) (2020) 2845–2867.
5. A.N. Singh, P. Joshi, Carbon dynamics of sacred groves and pilgrimage landscapes in Garhwal Himalaya, For. Ecol. Manag. 482 (2021) 118842.
6. R. Bhargava, Green pilgrimage in the Hindu tradition: Scriptural foundations and contemporary practice, J. Dharma Stud. 7 (2) (2024) 147–169.
7. S. Venkatesan, L. Dhiman, Solid waste management in high-altitude pilgrimage sites: A case study of Kedarnath, Waste Manag. Res. 39 (8) (2021) 1074–1085.
8. M.K. Rawat, P.K. Singh, Water quality assessment of Mandakini River in Kedarnath pilgrimage corridor, Environ. Monit. Assess. 192 (11) (2020) 712–729.
9. T.B. Bhatt, P.A. Joshi, Air quality deterioration during Char Dham pilgrimage season: Trends and sources, Atmos. Pollut. Res. 12 (5) (2021) 101064.
10. Z. Sabouri, M. Kazemi, Landscape fragmentation in the Vaishno Devi pilgrimage corridor, Landsc. Ecol. 37 (8) (2022) 2089–2106.
11. M.S.H. Bhuiyan, R. Selvaraj, Application of PSR framework in mountain pilgrimage systems, Ecol. Indic. 131 (2021) 108197.
12. S. Anchan, H. Sridevi, Effectiveness of NGT interventions in reducing single-use plastics in pilgrimage towns, J. Environ. Law Policy 44 (3) (2023) 321–345.

13. A.S. Manjunatha, G. Nagaraju, Economics of pilgrimage tourism: Benefit-cost analysis for Uttarakhand, Tour. Econ. 28 (6) (2022) 1470–1492.
14. W. Ahmad, V. Singh, Pilgrim behavioural change interventions: Evidence from Vaishno Devi deposit-refund pilot, J. Sustain. Tour. 30 (4) (2022) 828–848.
15. S. Bishnoi, R. Selvaraj, Real-time environmental monitoring for adaptive pilgrimage management, Environ. Model. Softw. 145 (2021) 105196.
16. C. Das, G. Biswas, Willingness-to-pay for environmental conservation among pilgrims: Contingent valuation from Char Dham circuit, Ecol. Econ. 185 (2021) 107058.
17. R. Ullah, J. Dutta, Institutional fragmentation in Himalayan pilgrimage governance, Environ. Policy Gov. 31 (5) (2021) 454–471.
18. S. Ahmadi, A.M. Amani, Zoonotic risks in pilgrimage-affected ecosystems, EcoHealth 19 (2) (2022) 187–202.
19. L. Shaker Ardakani, S. Taghizadeh, Community-based waste circularity in mountain regions: Lessons for pilgrimage corridors, Sustain. Dev. 30 (6) (2022) 1856–1875.
20. V. Katheresan, S.Y. Lau, Cumulative impact assessment for pilgrimage development, J. Environ. Assess. Policy Manag. 23 (3) (2021) 2250012.