- 2650 miles of trail
- Accommodates hikers and equestrians
- 3 nations
- 3 states
- 45 counties
- 26 National Forests
- 3 California State Parks
- 2 BLM Districts
Pacific Crest Trail History

- 1930’s – exploration began
- 1935 – 1938 – YMCA relays
- 1940’s – work halted due to WWII
- 1950’s – advocacy work continues
- 1968 – designated as National Scenic Trail
- 1993 – completion ceremony
Mission:
Protect, preserve and promote
the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail
as an internationally significant resource
for the enjoyment of hikers and equestrians,
and for the value that wild and scenic lands
provide to all people
Project Goals

- Address problem areas threatening the trail route or experience
- Quantify for partners and potential funders what it will take to fully protect the trail
Project Objectives

1. Inventory parcels needing acquisition or an easement to:
   - accommodate the trail (priority 1);
   - protect the trail experience (priority 2 – viewshed or proximity – within ½ mile)

2. Provide detailed maps and tables to support further trail protection and funding

3. Estimate the acquisition cost/value
Study Team

Pacific Crest Trail Association:

- Liz Bergeron, Executive Director
- Mike Dawson, Trail Operations Director
- Dana Berthold, Regional Representative
- Ian Nelson, Regional Representative
- Justin Kooymans, Regional Representative
- Suzanne Wilson, Regional Representative

U.S. Forest Service

- Beth Boyst, Pacific Crest Trail Program Manager
Methodology - Approach

Use GIS (Geographic Information System) to map and analyze:

- The only way to organize such vast geographic data;
- Allowed project to build on and integrate with USFS GIS PCT database (essential to make the project feasible and useful);
- Allows relatively easy standardization of map format;
- Tables linked to map data – updating one can update the other.
Study Team

Consultants:

- Alta/LandPeople
  Randy Anderson, Landscape Architect, Principal

- Alta/LandPeople
  Roy Harju, GIS Analyst

- Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc
  Ann Van Leer
Methodology – Start Up

- Alta collected and reviewed existing Forest Service GIS data for PCT
- Gathered parcel data from/for relevant counties (GIS or best available). Trail passes through 47 counties, on or near private parcels in 27 counties
- Mapped all private parcels within ½ mile of trail corridor
- Created an initial series of maps and tables identifying parcels of interest
- Internal team review and revisions
Regional Field Meetings

- PCTA Trail Operations Director, Regional Representatives, relevant agency staff, and consultants met
- Reviewed maps, specific parcels for visibility from the trail, threat to trail experience, and general development of area
- Parcels in highly developed areas given a lower priority to parcels in undeveloped areas.
- Local knowledge comments added to database – e.g. “parcel recently logged” or “owner put up No Trespassing signs despite easement” or “John Doe wants to sell his land”
Regional Field Meetings

**Washington/Northern Oregon** (Dana Berthold, PCTA Rep)
- Mt. Hood Ranger District (Sandy), Mt Hood National Forest
- Vancouver-Gifford Pinchot NF, Mt. Adams Ranger District

**Southern Oregon/Northern California** (Ian Nelson, PCTA Rep)
- Klamath National Forest
- Bureau of Land Management, Medford Office
- Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest
- Shasta-Trinity National Forest
- Castle Crags State Park
Regional Field Meetings

**Central California** (Justin Kooyman, PCTA Regional Rep)
- Lassen National Forest, Susanville
- Plumas National Forest, Quincy
- Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest
- El Dorado National Forest and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
- Tahoe National Forest

**Southern California** (Suzanne Wilson, PCTA Regional Rep)
- Anza Borrego State Park
- Cleveland National Forest
- BLM, Desert District
- Los Angeles River Recreation District
- Sequoia National Forest
Maps evolve through review

First version maps for meetings

Final version maps after meetings
## Summary of Land Acquisition Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9,821</td>
<td>$5,473,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>$15,628,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>179,522</td>
<td>$127,945,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1554</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$149,247,801</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congressional District</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA #2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>$16,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA #3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>$3,213,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA #4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>$1,650,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA #9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>$600,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR #2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>$15,628,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #6</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>49,139</td>
<td>$7,604,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #7</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,383,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #8</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22,725</td>
<td>$11,114,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>$3,254,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #22</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>65,943</td>
<td>$43,752,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>$11,638,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA #26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>$2,807,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1554</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$149,247,801</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Units</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE NATIONAL SCENIC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>$7,16,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFFORD PINCHOT NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>$2,420,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT BAKER SNOQUAMIE NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>$12,23,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKANOGAN NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>$15,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>$12,020,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAKIMA BURN STATE FOREST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>$16,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE NATIONAL SCENIC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM - CASCADE SISKIYOU NATIONAL MONUMENT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>$8,378,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM - MEDFORD DISTRICT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>$189,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath National Forest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>$444,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Hood National Forest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>$380,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue River National Forest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>$14,420,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGELES NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>$14,073,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZA-BORREGO DESERT STATE PARK</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3,688</td>
<td>$5,754,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM BAKERSFIELD OFFICE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>$4,009,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM EL CENTRO FIELD OFFICE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>$4,514,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM PALM SPRINGS FIELD OFFICE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4,637</td>
<td>$8,120,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM REDWOODS FIELD OFFICE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>$8,667,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22,387</td>
<td>$16,113,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL DORADO NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>$180,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INYO NATIONAL FOREST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>$99,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath National Forest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>$1,024,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT (USFS)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$1,004,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen National Forest</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>$2,114,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumas National Forest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>$6,991,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue River National Forest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>$14,420,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino National Forest</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>$20,059,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia National Forest</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3,558</td>
<td>$4,964,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta-Trinity National Forest</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>$5,151,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe National Forest</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15,193</td>
<td>$7,998,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1554</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$149,247,801</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Id. “gap” parcels by type
- Acreages
- Assessed values
- Totals for each state
- Totals for each Congressional District
- Totals for each Management Unit
- Grand totals
Typical map produced for final product

Map Features

- Pacific Crest Trail
- ½ mile trail buffer each side
- Township/Range
- Parcels and ownerships
- Parcels identified for protection (pink)
- Other private parcels (grey)
- Inset map showing location along trail
- County boundaries
- Geographic features
- Topography
Methodology – Close Out

- Organized introduction, maps and tables into binders.
- Provided Inventory GIS back to Forest Service
Final Overview Map showing Gap Areas

Study Results

- Identified and categorized all gap areas
- Prepared an overview map keyed to detailed maps and tables
- Identified 1554 parcels/203,544 acres that need some form of protection
- $150 million assessed value
- Has increased ability to prioritize and coordinate with agencies
Lessons learned

- **Allow significant time for data gathering.** County parcel data quality varies from ready to download/email GIS to faxed paper assessor maps and rolls. Compiling ownership records from counties with little or no GIS data or services was time consuming.

- **Partner with/build on efforts of others.** Others may have collected and organized county data – inquire of agencies and organizations that deal with land and resources.
Lessons learned - Continued

- **Use real estate professionals.** A commercial property database service (LandAmerica) through Land Conservation Brokerage was helpful for filling in missing records.

- **Settle on a format early.** For the review meetings 3 versions of each map were produced: an aerial, a topo and a Township/Range, which was time consuming.
Lessons learned - Continued

- **Need someone knowledgeable in charge.** Having an experienced, decisive project manager (Mike Dawson) to make quick decisions about product format and methodology – SIMPLIFYING – was critical.

- **Consultant attendance at meetings is costly** – coordination by email works. The consultants could just provide the maps to field reps who would conduct the meetings and the field checks.

- **Experienced and resourceful GIS Analyst makes it possible.** Roy Harju’s experience, productivity, diligence and creativity made the project possible.
Wrap Up

- Questions?

- Comments?

- Thanks for listening!