Scenery Management without Borders

Preserving the Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights National Historic Trail
Process

1) Data collection and evaluation
2) Model development
3) Model runs/assessment
4) Field Verification
5) Prioritization of land for conservation/protection
Model Development

Inputs:

1) Visibility/Viewshed

2) Distance Zones (US Forest Service Scenery Management System)
   a) Up to $\frac{1}{2}$-mile
   b) $\frac{1}{2}$-mile to 4 miles
   c) 4 miles to 10 miles (extent of boundary viewshed)

3) Landscape Integrity
   a) Historical Integrity of the Cultural Landscape (National Park Service)
   b) Existing Land Use (2007 aerials, National Land Cover Data Set)
   c) Historical aerials from the 1965 March
   d) Cell phone towers, antennas, transmission lines
Model Development

Inputs (continued):

4) Cultural Resources
   a) National Park Service (primary, secondary and commemorative sites)
   b) Original roadway sections
   c) Other landscape features (pecan grove)

5) Environmental Resources
   a) National Wetlands Inventory
   b) Nature Conservancy Conservation Interest Areas (Estuarine and Terrestrial Species)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Input/Layer</th>
<th>High (1)</th>
<th>Medium (2)</th>
<th>Low (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility*</td>
<td>Seen more than 3 times from corridor viewpoint locations (1)</td>
<td>Seen 2 to 3 times from corridor viewpoint locations (2)</td>
<td>Seen 1 time from corridor viewpoint locations (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Integrity</td>
<td>Land uses unchanged (1)</td>
<td>Land uses similar (2)</td>
<td>Land uses changed significantly (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Zones</td>
<td>Foreground (1)</td>
<td>Middleground (2)</td>
<td>Background (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>High potential primary sites (1)</td>
<td>High potential secondary sites (2)</td>
<td>High potential commemorative sites (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Resources</td>
<td>NWI wetlands and TNC Conservation Interest Areas (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Areas outside NWI wetlands and TNC Conservation Interest Areas (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Conservation Areas</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>11-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The scoring system follows the system established in the SEMO Cultural Landscape Inventory, NPS, April 2000 document, where a score of 1 = High, 2 = Medium, and 3 = Low. Note: Areas that are Not Visible (seen zero times) are not scored and are removed from consideration of potential conservation areas.
Original Analysis
Field Verification
Original Analysis
Revised Analysis (DEM – feet vs. meters; tree heights – 18m/60 ft; tree canopy vs. land cover)
Revised Analysis (Landscape Integrity, Historic Aerials)
Revised Analysis (Cultural Resources)
Revised Analysis (Environmental Resources)
Revised Analysis (Potential Conservation Priority Areas)
Approximately 4,000 parcels
Challenges/Threats to Viewshed
Policy and Planning

1) Alabama DOT – Access Management
2) National Park Service
3) US Army Corps of Engineers – Wildlife Management Areas
4) Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries - Alabama State Wildlife Action Plan
5) Alabama Historical Society - review
6) Nature Conservancy – easements
7) Local governments – Zoning/Land Use policy
Two Scales
1) Regional Analysis
2) Parcel-Specific (4,000+ parcels)

Parcel Matrix (Attributes)
1) Criteria found on each parcel
2) Mean of Criteria
3) Applicable Land Use Policies