



# Ecoregional Gap Analysis of the Southwestern United States



The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project *Final Report* 

December 2007

# **Ecoregional Gap Analysis of the Southwestern United States** The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project Final Report

Edited by Julie S. Prior-Magee Kenneth G. Boykin David F. Bradford William G. Kepner John H. Lowry Donald L. Schrupp Kathryn A. Thomas Bruce C. Thompson

Colorado Division of Wildlife, Wildlife Conservation Section, Denver, CO, USA Cooperative Agreement No. 01HQAG0184

NatureServe, Boulder, CO, USA

US EPA, National Exposure Laboratory – ESD/LEB, Las Vegas, NV, USA Interagency Agreement No. 1434-00HQPG-0062

USGS Southwest Biological Science Center, Colorado Plateau Research Station, Flagstaff, AZ, USA

USGS Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Unit, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, USA Cooperative Agreeement No. 1434-HQ-97-RU-01572 Research Work Order No. 40

Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory, College of Natural Resources, Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA Cooperative Agreeement No. 1434-HQ-97-RU-01555 Research Work Order No. 33



December 2007



#### **Recommended Citations:**

#### Entire report:

Prior-Magee, J.S., K.G. Boykin, D.F. Bradford, W.G. Kepner, J.H. Lowry, D.L. Schrupp, K.A. Thomas, and B.C. Thompson, Editors. 2007. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 1 (Introduction):

Prior-Magee, J.S. 2007. Introduction. Chapter 1 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 2 (Land cover):

Lowry, J. H, Jr., R. D. Ramsey, K. A. Thomas, D.L. Schrupp, W. G. Kepner, T. Sajwaj, J. Kirby, E. Waller, S. Schrader, S. Falzarano, L. Langs Stoner, G. Manis, C. Wallace, K. Schulz, P. Comer, K. Pohs, W. Rieth, C. Velasquez, B. Wolk, K.G., Boykin, L. O'Brien, J. Prior-Magee, D. Bradford and B. Thompson. 2007. Land cover classification and mapping. Chapter 2 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 3 (Animal habitat dist):

Boykin, K. G., B. C. Thompson, R. A. Deitner, D. Schrupp, D. Bradford, L. O'Brien, C. Drost, S. Propeck-Gray, W. Rieth, K. A. Thomas, W. Kepner, J. Lowry, C. Cross, B. Jones, T. Hamer, C. Mettenbrink, K.J. Oakes, J. Prior-Magee, K. Schulz, J. J.Wynne, C. King, J. Puttere, S. Schrader, and Z. Schwenke. 2007. Predicted animal habitat distributions and species richness. Chapter 3 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 4 (Land stewardship):

Ernst, A. E., T. Schrader, V. Lopez, J. Prior-Magee, K.G. Boykin, D. Schrupp, L. O'Brien, W. Kepner, K.A. Thomas, J. Lowry, and B. Thompson. 2007. Land stewardship. Chapter 4 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 5 (Analysis):

Boykin, K.G., L. Langs Stoner, J. H. Lowry, D.L. Schrupp, D.F. Bradford, L. O'Brien, K.A. Thomas, C. Drost, A.E. Ernst, W. G. Kepner, J. S. Prior-Magee, R.D. Ramsey, W. Rieth, T. Sajwaj, K. Schulz, B. C. Thompson. 2007. Analysis based on stewardship and management status. Chapter 5 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 6 (Conclusions & mgt. implications):

Langs Stoner, L., K.G. Boykin, J. L.Lowry, A.E. Ernst, D.F. Bradford, W.G. Kepner, J.S. Prior-Magee, K. Schulz, D.L. Schrupp, K. A.Thomas. 2007. Conclusions and management implications. Chapter 6 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

#### Chapter 7 (Product use & availability):

Prior-Magee, J.S. 2007. Product use and availability. Chapter 7 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

# DEDICATION

This report is dedicated to the people and wild resources of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah.



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Gap Analysis Program is a national program with the mission of developing key datasets needed to assess biological diversity across the nation. The primary objectives of the Gap Analysis Program are: (1) Land Cover Mapping – to map the distributions of natural communities; (2) Animal Habitat Modeling and Mapping – to map the predicted habitat of native animal species; (3) Stewardship Mapping – to map the degree of management for biodiversity maintenance of land tracts focusing on intent; (4) Gap Analysis – to analyze the representation of biotic elements in the conservation network to identify "gaps" in long-term security; and (5) Data Distribution – to provide this information to the public and those entities charged with land use research, policy, planning, and management.

The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project (SWReGAP) was a mapping and assessment of biodiversity for the five-state region encompassing Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. The area comprises approximately 150 million hectares (560,000 square miles) representing 1/5 the coterminous United States. The primary objective of the project was to use a coordinated approach to create detailed, seamless maps of the land cover, habitat for native terrestrial vertebrate species, land stewardship, and management status for the Southwest region. This information was analyzed to identify animal species habitats and natural land cover types that are underrepresented on land managed for their long term conservation. SWReGAP was a multi-institutional effort with scientists based in all five southwest states. Regional land cover mapping activities were coordinated by the Remote Sensing/GIS Lab at Utah State University. Animal habitat modeling, stewardship mapping, and gap analysis activities were coordinated for the region by the U.S. Geological Survey's New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit at New Mexico State University. Other institutional partners included: U.S. Geological Survey's Southwest Biological Science Center/Colorado Plateau Research Station, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management/National Science and Technology Center, Natural Resource Ecology Lab at Colorado State University, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency/National Exposure Research Laboratory, and NatureServe.

### **Data Development**

### Land Cover

The land cover map for the five-state region was developed using Landsat Enhanced Thematic Mapper (ETM+) imagery selected from 1999-2001 for three seasons: spring, summer, and fall. A total of 237 scenes were selected for the region focusing on optimal representation of seasonal phenology and minimal cloud cover. Approximately 93,000 field samples were collected to train the land cover modeling effort. This "ground truth" data was collected over the course of three field seasons from 2001-2003. The region was divided into 20 ecologically and spectrally similar mapping zones that provided a functional working area for project management, data collection, and modeling. The focus of the mapping effort was on natural and semi-natural systems. The basic thematic mapping unit was the ecological system concept developed by NatureServe (Comer et al. 2003). Ecological systems represent recurring groups of biological communities that are found in similar physical environments and are influenced by similar dynamic ecological processes. They are intended to provide a thematic mapping unit mappable at a meso-scale level from remotely sensed imagery. Altered and disturbed land cover and land use classes were incorporated into the SWReGAP legend using descriptions adopted from either the National Land Cover Dataset 2001 legend (e.g. Agriculture, Developed-Medium-High Intensity) (Homer et al. 2004) or were given a special "altered or disturbed" designation within the SWReGAP legend (e.g. recently burned, invasive annual grassland, etc).

Several avenues for image classification were investigated before choosing the decision tree classifier. An important consideration was the need to develop a common methodology that could be applied by each state land cover team to create a regionally consistent product. The majority of natural and semi-natural land cover classes were modeled using a decision tree classifier. However, recognizing that the classifier had difficulty discriminating certain classes adequately, other methods were employed to map these classes.

The final SWReGAP land cover map contains 125 land cover classes, 109 of which are ecological systems. The data set retains the 30 meter pixel resolution of the core data sets with a minimum mapping unit of 1 acre (0.40 hectares). The natural land cover of the region is largely dominated by shrub/scrub ecological systems (37% of the region), followed by grassland/herbaceous systems (23%), evergreen forests (22%), barren lands (5%), woody wetlands (3%), deciduous forest (2%), mixed forest (<1%) and emergent herbaceous wetlands (<1%). Agricultural areas compose 5.6% of the region, altered or disturbed areas (1.5%), developed areas (1.1%), and open water (0.8%).

Assessing land cover map quality is an important concern for land cover mapping projects. We consider our approach an internal validation: "validation" in the sense that our purpose is to validate the quality of the map, and "internal" because we use data collected for, and used within, the modeling process (Shtatland et al. 2004). The internal validation involved randomly selecting 20 percent of available samples stratified by land cover class, and withholding them from the decision tree model generation. The intermediate map (generated with 80 percent of the available samples) was assessed with the 20 percent withheld dataset, producing an error matrix and kappa statistic. Of the 125 land cover classes mapped, 40 classes were not assessed regionally because of limited validation plots or they were non-natural classes and not the primary focus of the mapping effort. These 40 classes comprise approximately 9.5% of the region.

The 85 classes that were validated represent 91% of the region and overall correct classification for these classes was 61% (KHAT statistic = 0.60; n = 17, 030). It is important to recognize that validation results vary by land cover class and by mapping zone. Lastly it is important to note that the validation results are based on the

intermediate land cover map using the 20% withheld dataset. Since the final map was produced using the withheld samples, we assume the final map is an improvement over the intermediate map that was validated.

### Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions and Species Richness

SWReGAP developed models for a total of 819 terrestrial vertebrate species, including 37 species of amphibians, 130 species of reptiles, 437 species of birds, and 215 species of mammals. Taxa inclusion decision rules were developed to identify this final list of 819 species for modeling. These rules described circumstances under which a species would not be modeled. For instance, taxa with only incidental or vagrant occurrence in the region would not be modeled. Taxa allocation decision rules were developed to help in distributing the lead modeling responsibilities among the states. These rules focused on the overall distribution of the species and attempted to capitalize on previous modeling experience and expertise. For instance, if a species occurred in only one state then that state would be assigned lead modeling responsibility for that species.

The Sub-basin hydrological units (8-digit HUC) were used to delineate ranges for each species. A three-character coding system was used to label the HUCs for species ranges. These characters corresponded to distribution, reproduction, and seasonal use. The coding for historic/recent distribution was known (K), potential (P), or extirpated (X). Absence is implied for all polygons not attributed. This base coding system was modified based on reproductive use (breeding, non-breeding, both) and seasonal use (migratory, wintering, summering, year-round). A wide variety of sources were used for species range delineation, emphasizing the most recent published literature.

Wildlife Habitat Relationships (WHRs) are statements describing resources and conditions present in areas where a species persists and reproduces or otherwise occurs. Relationships can be modeled to predict habitat composition. WHRs were developed from a variety of sources including previous state GAP efforts. Project personnel identified a set of standard state and regional references to use as a starting point for the modeling effort. This information, along with online databases such as the NatureServe Explorer database, Biota Information System of New Mexico, and internal databases such as the Colorado Wildlife Species Database was reviewed. WHRs were constructed following a standard protocol that provided a user interface / template, automated tools, and associated reference information for defining range limits and compiling habitat associations for each species. Regional vegetation alliances were one of the primary components of the WHR models. The core set of data layers that were addressed for each WHR model included land cover (SWReGAP land cover map), elevation, slope, aspect, hydrology (distance to hydrologic features), and soils. Other layers addressed in the habitat-modeling protocol were mountain ranges, temperature, precipitation, and landform.

To facilitate habitat modeling a set of Microsoft Access<sup>tm</sup> databases were created based on the recommendations of Deitner et al (1999). The resulting databases are a tool for modeling and for end-users. The FrontEndArc9 database provided a series of forms or wizards that guide the modeler through the habitat model. The draft models and associated data (report, range, model) were then submitted for expert review. Reviewers included staff from Federal and State agencies (such as State wildlife and natural resources agencies), university scientists, and private individuals and groups familiar with species occurrence and natural history in the Southwest (e.g. the Great Basin Bird Observatory in Nevada). The reviewers were asked to identify their level of confidence in the overall model, the range limits, the report content, and the individual datasets used in modeling. SWReGAP received more than 1,000 reviews covering most of the species that were modeled.

The standard Gap Analysis assessment is a measure of agreement to describe the degree of concurrence between habitat model predictions, and species occurrences as documented by inventory studies. We obtained 14 species lists from the National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring (I&M) program for the Northern Colorado Plateau network and have identified data from the southern Colorado Plateau Parks (including northern Arizona and Northern New Mexico), and the Sonoran Desert network of National Parks (including southern Arizona and southern New Mexico). We conducted an initial assessment on species lists for the Northern Colorado Plateau NPS network. This assessment, however, identified a bias in the outcome because accidental, rare, and occasional species were included with the species lists. Our protocol for identifying species and mapping habitat eliminated these species based on these factors. Thus, omission error is significantly increased by using this data. We have omitted that analysis from this report in an effort to further refine the assessment and provide more accurate analysis.

GAP has often been associated with the mapping of species-rich areas or "hotspots." Richness maps identify where the same numbers of elements co-occur in the same geographic locations. Total species richness is highest in southwestern New Mexico and southeastern Arizona (438-492 species). This area includes the Madrean Archipelago and is influenced by species ranging north from Mexico. In New Mexico, relatively high richness (391-437 species) occurs throughout the Rio Grande Valley. The Front Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado is identified as having relatively high species richness. This is due in part to the presence of Great Plains species and Rocky Mountains species. The Colorado River including the Lake Mead area is also relatively high in species richness. It is important to note that overall richness is weighted heavily by the number of bird species within the project area.

To our knowledge these models represent the first regional habitat models for vertebrate species at this resolution for the American Southwest. We anticipate that as these models are used the end-users will identify needed modifications. The intent of the dataset and associated GIS tools is to provide the ability for model modification and end-user functionality. The maps of species habitat distributions may be used to answer a wide variety of management, planning, and research questions on individual species or groups of species. In addition to the maps, great utility may be found in the literature references that are assembled into the databases used to produce the maps.

### Land Stewardship and Management

The term "stewardship" is used to describe the quality of land management that is collectively the land ownership of a parcel and the legal and administrative mandates that guide the management of the parcel as it affects the long-term maintenance of biodiversity. Land stewardship was mapped in two phases: (1) documentation of land ownership; and (2) assignment of biodiversity management status codes.

Existing digital ownership datasets provided a baseline of ownership boundaries for each state in the region. Base ownership data came from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for the states of Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. The Arizona ownership data coverage is published by the Arizona State Land Department and Arizona Land Resource Information System. The Colorado ownership data was gathered in coordination with the Colorado Ownership, Management, and Protection (COMaP) project at the Natural Resource Ecology Lab (NREL), Colorado State University. These base ownership data layers distinguished general administrative land ownership by private, state, and federal categories. In most cases, federal and state lands were then further divided by managing entity such as BLM, National Park Service (NPS), or State Trust Lands. Special management areas, such as wilderness, and other internal management units were often not delineated in these baseline ownership datasets. Additional boundary information for special management units or other internal boundaries was also collected via the Internet or from agency GIS personnel.

Base data layers for each state were then converted to a common projection system and loaded into the SWReGAP geographic database (geodatabase). The geodatabase was structured to meet GAP standards and included domains described by the GAP Management Coding System. This Coding System assigns a four-digit code to each land management descriptor. For example, a BLM National Monument would be assigned a code of 1104. Additional attributes such as the GAP biodiversity management status code, individual parcel name, and source of the digital data were added to the geodatabase attribute table for each parcel.

Each stewardship parcel was assigned a GAP management status code using a scale of 1 to 4 to denote relative degree of maintenance of biodiversity for each tract. Status 1 and 2 represent permanently protected lands that are managed for biological diversity, Status 3 lands are those lands under a management plan that prevents conversion to non-natural cover types but are subject to extractive uses of either a broad, low-intensity type or localized intense type, and Status 4 represents those lands that are not managed for biodiversity or are not under a management plan. Status codes were determined by consulting management plans if they existed or interviewing agency personnel using a standardized questionnaire. To minimize variability in assigning management status codes a dichotomous key was used to ensure consistent assignment of codes. The dichotomous key guides users through a series of questions related to management documentation, legal protection, percentage of land in anthropogenic use, and management for natural processes.

External review meetings were held in each state to allow agency experts to review and comment on the stewardship data layer for that state. Attendees were able to provide their comments on the accuracy of boundary and ownership information, as well as the management status codes that were assigned to land parcels.

In the Southwest region, federal agencies account for the largest land steward category managing over 51% of the landscape. BLM is the largest federal land steward accounting for over 30% of the total land area. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is the second largest federal land steward accounting for 14% of the area. Private lands are the second largest land steward category in the region comprising 30% of the region's lands. Tribal lands and State managed lands account for 9% and 8% respectively. Regional and local government lands, non-governmental organization lands, and water bodies comprise the smallest proportion of land stewards each contributing less than 1% to the overall area.

A review of the protection status of lands in the region shows that Status 1 lands comprise 3% of the region. Stewards managing these lands include 40% managed by National Park Service, 33% managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 21% by USFS, and 7% by BLM. State lands and non-governmental organizations account for less than 1% of Status 1 lands. Status 2 lands comprise 9% of the region. The largest land steward in this category is the BLM which manages 57% of these lands. Other land stewards include 26% managed by USFS, 5% managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and 4% managed by state wildlife agencies. Status 3 lands comprise 50% of the region. BLM manages 51% of Status 3 lands, USFS manages 23%, and Native Americans manage 17%. Status 4 lands comprise 38% of the region. Private land stewards manage over 80% of these lands, with State Land Board lands managing 17%.

### Analyses

By intersecting the land stewardship and management status maps with the land cover and animal-habitat species distribution maps, estimates were produced of the total area and percent of the mapped distributions for every land cover class and animal species within each land stewardship and management status category. Calculations were generated for the entire 5-state region as well as for each state individually. As a coarse indicator of the conservation status of the elements, we identify for every land cover type and animal species, the proportion of its distribution that falls within Status 1 and 2 lands according to five levels of representation: 0 < 1%, 1 < 10%, 10 < 20%, 20 < 50%, and >=50%.

### Land Cover

Approximately 11.5% (160,183 km<sup>2</sup>) of the 5-state region falls within GAP Status 1 or 2. In general, land cover classes at higher elevations are more likely to have a larger proportion of their total distribution within GAP Management Status 1 and 2 than lower elevation land cover classes, because much of the higher elevation land is under government stewardship with a mandate to protect biodiversity (e.g. Wilderness Areas).

Six ecological systems in the region have less than 1% of their distribution within Status 1 and 2 lands. These include: one barren type, one shrub/scrub type, one emergent herbaceous wetland system, and three grassland/herbaceous systems. With one exception (Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie) they are mostly rare, small patch types or peripheral types that occur on the edge of their range within the SWReGAP project area. Thirty-four ecological systems have between 1 and <10% of their distribution within Status 1 or 2 lands. Twenty-one of these ecological systems are relatively uncommon (<10,000 km<sup>2</sup> mapped in the region) and all but one (*Inter-Mountain Basins Wash*) of the 6 rarest types ( $<200 \text{ km}^2$  mapped), are peripheral to the region. Twenty-seven ecological systems have between 10 and <20% of their distribution in Status 1 or 2 lands. These ecological systems occur in a wide variety of environmental settings, from areas of high elevation with subalpine forests and wetlands to playas and salt desert scrub. Types of ecological systems include: 4 riparian systems, 1 aspen and 1 aspen-mixed conifer system, 2 montane grassland systems, 2 dune systems, and 1 badland system. Thirty-five ecological systems have between 20 and <50% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. Many of these ecological systems include lower- to mid-elevation forests and rock outcrops (e.g. barren lands). Seven ecological systems have greater than 50% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. With the exception of one somewhat rare system (Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral), all occur in higher elevation (alpine and subalpine) zones.

#### Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions

Twenty-five species (3% of those modeled) have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands within the region. These include 18 bird species, 4 reptiles, 2 mammals, and 1 amphibian. Several of these species, such as the lesser prairie-chicken, are already the subject of conservation planning. There are 288 species (35% of modeled species) with predicted habitat of between 1 and less than 10% on status 1 and 2 lands. These include 14 amphibian species, 144 bird species, 78 mammal species, and 52 reptile species. There are 385 species (47% of modeled species) with 10-<20% of their predicted habitat on status 1 and 2 lands within the entire region. These include 18 amphibian species, 219 bird species, 107 mammals, and 41 reptiles. There are 108 species (13 % of those modeled) with 20-<50% of their predicted habitat on status 1 and 2 lands. These 108 species include 4 amphibian species, 47 bird species, 26 mammal species, and 31 reptile species. Eleven species (1% of those modeled) have predicted habitat occurring on status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50%. These species include 7 birds, 2 mammals, and 2 reptiles. Birds include Clapper rail, dunlin, black tern, sedge wren, tricolored blackbird, brown-capped rosy-finch, and Mexican chickadee. Mammals include Palmer's chipmunk and mountain goat. Reptiles include Sonoran shovel-nosed snake and ridgenosed rattlesnake.

### Conclusions

The Southwest is home to a diverse assemblage of plant and animal species largely, due to the complex topography, geology, soils, and climate patterns that occur throughout the region. This area faces many threats that affect not only biological resources, but the human populations that may directly or indirectly depend on their sustainability. Adverse factors include prolonged drought, invasive plant and animal species, over-utilization by livestock, altered fire regimes, increased land development and recreational demands, soil erosion, stream channelization, consumptive water use, oil and gas exploration, habitat fragmentation and conversion, over-harvesting of certain plants and animals, population isolation, and disease.

Throughout the 5-state region, 11.5% of the total land base has been identified as providing protection for biodiversity in Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this (46%) is managed by BLM (largely associated with National Monuments), followed by U.S. Forest Service (25%), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (11%), and National Park Service (11%). Forty ecological systems and 309 terrestrial vertebrate species have less than 10% of their regional distribution within Status 1 and 2 lands. An additional 36 ecological systems and 107 terrestrial vertebrate species have greater than 10% of their distribution, but less than 500 km<sup>2</sup> total area within Status 1 and 2 lands. Ecological systems and terrestrial vertebrate species that have less than 10% of their distribution or less than 500 km<sup>2</sup> absolute areal coverage in Status 1 and 2 lands may be underrepresented and point to "gaps" in their conservation (Schrupp et al. 2000). Although other major land stewards in the region (e.g. private (comprising 30% of the 5-state area). tribal (9%), and state land board (7%)) may not always achieve the legal mandate for conservation management, their lands may in fact provide protection for certain species and land cover types. It is important to consider the potential that each land steward may provide as a partner in conservation, particularly at local and ecoregional scales.

As a separate effort, but in parallel with SWReGAP, each of the five states recently completed their State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP). These strategies identify species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) and key habitats specific to each state. Also included in these reports is detailed information about the threats facing the different habitat types. The SWAP is a useful companion to SWReGAP for prioritizing ecological systems and species that require focused conservation efforts both within and between the Southwest states.

We identified three categories of management concern to prioritize ecological systems and terrestrial vertebrate species that may require additional attention. The criteria used for these categories are the following: first priorities are ecological systems and predicted animal habitats with distributions of <1% within Status 1 and 2 lands; second priorities are those with between 1 and 10% in Status 1 or 2 lands; and third priorities are those with >10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> in Status 1 or 2 lands. We applied these criteria to the region and each state to enumerate their respective priority conservation concerns. Within the region, six ecological systems and 25 terrestrial vertebrate species were identified as first priority management concern. Of the 25 vertebrate species identified as priorities, 11 species were also identified as SGCN by the State Wildlife Action Plans.

Application of SWReGAP data into conservation planning has already occurred at varying levels within state and federal agencies. An outreach effort has been initiated to provide agencies with help in understanding and implementing SWReGAP data in their conservation activities. These efforts further enhance the SWReGAP data set, providing an even greater foundation for future work by other agencies. For example, state wildlife agency use of SWReGAP animal habitat models should extend beyond the wildlife action plans to planning efforts of state land offices, parks, and other state agencies. SWReGAP data provides another tool for land managers to use in conservation planning and application in concert with current and future data sets (e.g., TNC Ecoregion Analysis, State Wildlife Action Plans). These and other tools when combined with human intellect have the capacity to provide for long term conservation in the Southwest.



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Data Development	iv
Land Cover	iv
Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions and Species Richness	vi
Land Stewardship and Management	viii
Analyses	ix
Land Cover	ix
Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions	x
Conclusions	xi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	vvii
LIST OF FIGURES	
LIST OF APPENDICES	
ACKNOWI EDGEMENTS	
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
How This Report is Organized	2
The Gan Analysis Program Mission	2
Regional objectives for GAP	3
The Gap Analysis Concept	
General Limitations	5
The Study Area	
Columbia Plateau and Sierra Nevada	
Basin and Range	
Colorado Plateau	
Rocky Mountains	
Great Plains	
Land Management and Human Impacts to the Landscape	
CHARTER 2 JAND COVER OF ASSIELCATION AND MADDING	14
Introduction	
Methods	
Land Cover Man Development	
Background	
Land Cover Manning Methods	
Data Sources	
Land Cover Modeling Using Decision Tree Classifiers	,
SWP aGAP Manning Process	
I and Cover Man Begulta	
Land Cover Man Validation	
Introduction	
Land Cover Man Validation Methods	
Quantitative Assessment using Fuzzy Sets	
Qualitative Assessment	

Land Cover Map Validation Results	31
Mapping Zone Assessments	31
Regional Assessment	31
Discussion	34
Land Cover Mapping Methods	34
Map Validation	36
Project Coordination	36
Conclusion	37
CHAPTER 3 PREDICTED ANIMAL HABITAT DISTRIBUTIONS AND SPECIES	
RICHNESS	39
Introduction	40
Methods	42
Taxa Inclusion Decision Rules	44
Taxa Allocation Decision Rules	44
Mapping Standards and Data Sources	45
Mapping Range Extent	47
Wildlife Habitat Relationships	50
State Modeling Methods .	52
Distribution Modeling	54
Mammals	56
Birds	56
Reptiles	56
Amphibians	56
Model Review	57
Final Models	58
Accuracy Assessment	58
Results	60
Mammals	61
Birds	62
Reptiles	63
Amphibians	64
Species Richness	65
Mammal Richness	68
Bird Richness	68
Reptile Richness	71
Amphibian Richness	72
Discussion	73
Modeling Process	73
Expert Review	74
Accuracy Assessment	74
Limitations of the Models	75
Suggestions for Future Work	76
Conclusions	78
CHAPTER 4 LAND STEWARDSHIP	79
Introduction	80
Methods	81
Land Stewardship	81
Biodiversity Management Status Categorization	84
External Review.	87

Regionalization	. 87
Results	. 88
Land Stewards	. 88
Biodiversity Management Status	. 89
Limitations and Discussion	110
CHAPTER 5 ANALYSIS BASED ON STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT STATUS	112
Introduction	113
Methods	114
Results	114
Land Cover - Regional Analysis	115
Land Cover - State-based Analyses	121
Arizona	121
Colorado	127
New Mexico	133
Nevada	139
Utah	145
Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions - Regional Analysis	151
Analysis of State Endemics	158
Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions – State-based Analyses	159
Arizona	159
Colorado	161
New Mexico	163
Nevada	165
Utah	167
Discussion	169
Limitations and Discussion	169
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS	172
Introduction	173
Management Implications of SWReGAP Analysis	174
Priority Conservation Concerns By State	176
Arizona	1/6
	1//
New Mexico	1//
Nevada	1/8
Utan	1/9
Additional Data Needs and Analyses	180
Dradiated Animal Habitat Distributions	101
L and Stawardshin	101
Can Analyza	102
Cap Analyses	103
	104
CHAPTER 7 PRODUCT LISE AND AVAILABILITY	186
How to Obtain the Products	187
Disclaimer	187
Metadata	188
Appropriate and Inappropriate Use of These Data	180
Appropriate and mappropriate Ose of These Data	107

LITERATURE CITED	
GLOSSARY	
GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS	
APPENDICES	

# LIST OF TABLES

Table Page
Table 2-1. Hierarchical structure of the U.S. National Vegetation Classification and the linkage with ecological systems.       18
Table 3-1. Project staff involved in development of animal-habitat distribution models for theSWReGAP program, and their affiliations
Table 3-2. Number of taxa allocated to individual projects for lead responsibility for theSouthwestern Regional Gap Analysis Project.45
Table 3-3. GIS coverages used in the animal species modeling process
Table 3-4. Definitions and coding system identified for use in range delineation for the SouthwestRegional Gap Analysis Project.48
Table 3-5. List of standard references used for animal-habitat distribution models     49
Table 4-1. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for the Region.     92
Table 4-2. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Arizona
Table 4-3. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Colorado
Table 4-4. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Nevada
Table 4-5. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for New Mexico
Table 4-6. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Utah.     97
Table 4-7. Documentation of Biodiversity Management Status 1 lands in Arizona.       98
Table 4-8. Documentation of Status 1 lands in Colorado
Table 4-9. Documentation of Status 1 lands in Nevada.  103
Table 4-10. Documentation of Status 1 lands in New Mexico.  105
Table 4-11. Documentation of Status 1 lands in Utah
Table 5-1. Representation of each land cover type in the SWReGAP project area within Status 1& 2 Lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, and 20-<50%;
Table 5-2. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands,summarized by conservation thresholds of $0-<1\%$ , $1-<10\%$ , $10-<20\%$ , $20-<50\%$ , and $>=50\%$ inthe state of Arizona.124
Table 5-3. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of $0-<1\%$ , $1-<10\%$ , $10-<20\%$ , $20-<50\%$ , and $>50\%$ in the state of Colorado
Table 5-4. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of $0-<1\%$ , $1-<10\%$ , $10-<20\%$ , $20-<50\%$ , and $>50\%$ in the state of New Mexico

Table 5-5. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands,summarized by conservation thresholds of $0-<1\%$ , $1-<10\%$ , $10-<20\%$ , $20-<50\%$ , and $>50\%$ inthe state of Nevada.142
Table 5-6: Percent distribution of each Land Cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 Lands,summarized by conservation thresholds of $0 - <1\%$ , $1 - <10\%$ , $10 - <20\%$ , $20 - <50\%$ , and $>=50\%$ inthe state of Utah.148
Table 5-7. Number of species by Gap Status thresholds for each taxa group within region/state asmapped by the Southwestern Regional Gap Analysis Project
Table 5-8. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP ManagementStatus 1 or 2 for Region as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.155
Table 5-9. Number of Terrestrial Vertebrate Species by threshold category for each state bythreshold category for the region
Table 5-10. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP ManagementStatus 1 or 2 for Arizona as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project
Table 5-11. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 forColorado as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.162
Table 5-12. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 forNew Mexico as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project
Table 5-13. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 forNevada as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.166
Table 5-14. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 forUtah as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project
Table 6-1. Number of Ecological Systems of priority conservation concern identified within the SWReGAP project area and by state. (See Chapter 5, Table 5-1 for the list of relevant ecological systems.)
Table 6-2. Number of modeled terrestrial vertebrate species in Southwest Regional Gap AnalysisProject and Species of Greatest Conservation Need identified by each state in ComprehensiveWildlife Conservation Strategies by priority of concern.176

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	
riguit	

Figure 1-1 SWReGAP area map showing major municipalities and roads	6
Figure 1-2 Physiographic provinces and major rivers in the SWReGAP area	7
Figure 2-1. Mapping zone boundaries for SWReGAP land cover mapping effort 1	7
Figure 2-2. SWReGAP area showing Landsat ETM+ scenes	0
Figure 2-3. Overview of the SWReGAP Mapping Process	6
Figure 2-4. Final land cover map showing a subset of land cover classes in the legend	7
Figure 2-5. Overview of the SWReGAP fuzzy assessment process	0
Figure 2-6. Example of edge-matching between UT-4 and CO-1	5
Figure 3-1. Example Wildlife Habitat Relationship Graphical Model for Couch's spadefoot ( <i>Scaphiopus couchii</i> ) ITIS # 173429 for Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project	5
Figure 3-2. Potential Habitat Model for Northern Flying Squirrel (Glaucomys sabrinus)	1
Figure 3-3. Potential habitat model for Gunnison sage-grouse (Centrocercus minimus)	2
Figure 3-4. Eastern (top) and western (bottom) habitat models for greater short-horned lizard ( <i>Phrynosoma hernandesi</i> ). Two models were created to reflect an elevation break between the two geographic areas. 6	53
Figure 3-5. Habitat model for Sacramento mountain salamander (Aneides hardii) produced in the	) 4
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project	
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.     6       Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.     6	6
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.     6       Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.     6       Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.     6	6
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.     6       Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.     6       Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.     6       Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.     6	6 6 7
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6	i6 i6 i7
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6	56 56 57 58 59
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-11. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for modeled breeding bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7	56 56 57 57 58 59
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-11. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for modeled breeding bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-12. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 130 modeled reptiles in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7	56 56 57 58 59 70
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-11. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 130 modeled breeding bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-12. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 130 modeled reptiles in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-13. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-13. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7	56 56 57 58 59 70 71 72
Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus <i>Crotalus</i> ) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.6Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.6Figure 3-11. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for modeled breeding bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-12. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 130 modeled reptiles in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-13. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-14. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 130 modeled reptiles in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-14. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-15. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-15. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.7Figure 3-16. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit	56 56 57 58 59 59 59 50 51 52 3

Figure 4-4. Final GAP management status map for the Southwestern U.S
Figure 5-1. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) and summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the SWReGAP project area
Figure 5-2. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Arizona. 123
Figure 5-3. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Colorado
Figure 5-4. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of New Mexico
Figure 5-5. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Nevada
Figure 5-6. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Utah
Figure 5-7. Percentage of species by taxon (amphibian, bird, mammal, reptile) occurring on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands within the 5 threshold categories (<1, 1-<10, 10-<20, 20-<50, >50) for animals modeled within the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project
Figure 5-8. Total number of species by taxon by state or region on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands for the 5 threshold categories (<1, 1-<10, 10-<20, 20-<50, >50) for animal habitats modeled within the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project

# LIST OF APPENDICES

\_

Appendix	Page
Appendix 1-1. List of Personnel	211
Appendix 2-1. Distribution of all samples used for mapping in the SWReGAP region	214
Appendix 2-2. Total land cover mapped in square kilometers summarized by land cover clas state political boundaries.	s and 218
Appendix 2-3. Ecological similarity codes, types, and descriptions for four major types of ecological similarity recognized within the region	222
Appendix 2-4. Example of an original error matrix for mapping zone UT-5.	223
Appendix 2-5. Example for UT-5 of ecological type similarity matrix showing the application recognized similarity codes (Appendix 2-3) to off-diagonal (misclassification) cells from the original error matrix (Appendix 2-4).	on of 224
Appendix 2-6. Relative similarity scoring system based on four major ecological similarity t (Appendix 2-3).	ypes 225
Appendix 2-7. Example for UT-5 relative similarity scoring matrix showing the application relative similarity scores to off-diagonal (misclassification) cells of the ecological similarity matrix (Appendix 2-4).	of 226
Appendix 2-8. Revised error matrix: Correct and very similar are considered "correct" (i.e. scores 4 moved to diagonal).	227
Appendix 2-9. Revised error matrix: Correct, very similar, and moderately similar are considerer (i.e. scores 4 and 3 moved to diagonal).	dered 228
Appendix 2-10. Revised error matrix: Correct, very similar, moderately similar, and somew similar are considered "correct" (i.e. scores 4, 3 and 2 moved to diagonal).	hat 229
Appendix 2-11. Example for UT-5. Summary of user's accuracy for all levels of fuzzy assessment and the original error matrix.	230
Appendix 2-12. Example for UT-5. Summary of producer's accuracy for all levels of fuzzy assessment and the original error matrix.	231
Appendix 2-13. Regional summary of land cover area and validation results sorted into 5 validation groups and organized by NLCD land cover classes.	232
Appendix 3-1. List of species reviewed and modeled in Southwest Regional Gap Analysis P (* Indicates species not modeled in effort).	roject 237
Appendix 3-2. Decision Rules for Taxa inclusion	255
Appendix 3-3. Habitat Modeling Protocol	256
Appendix 3-4. Example habitat modeling data form	258
Appendix 3-5. Complete list of references used in creating habitat models.	258
Appendix 3-6. List of Animal Habitat Model external reviewers.	259
Appendix 3-7. Examples of model documents including Model Report, Range, and Model	261
Appendix 3-8. Review Documentation for Habitat Models	261

Appendix 3-9. Example Vertebrate Habitat Distribution Metadata	. 262
Appendix 3-10. Database Description	. 277
Appendix 3-11. Species Richness by Land Cover Type	. 278
Appendix 4-1. Management coding system for land stewardship	. 282
Appendix 4-2. Standardized questionnaire used to interview land mangers to guide determina of biodiversity management state codes.	ition . 287
Appendix 4-3. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Arizona.	. 289
Appendix 4-4. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Colorado	. 296
Appendix 4-5. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Nevada	. 305
Appendix 4-6. Documentation of Status 2 lands in New Mexico.	. 309
Appendix 4-7. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Utah.	. 314
Appendix 5-1. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the SWReGAP project area.	. 320
Appendix 5-2. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the f levels of GAP Management Status in the SWReGAP project area	our . 325
Appendix 5-3: Area (in square kilometers) of each land cover type summarized by land stew and GAP Management Status in the SWReGAP project area	ard . 330
Appendix 5-4. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the sta of Arizona.	ate . 351
Appendix 5-5. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the f levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Arizona.	our . 355
Appendix 5-6. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the sta of Colorado.	ate . 359
Appendix 5-7. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the f levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Colorado.	our . 363
Appendix 5-8. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the sta of New Mexico.	ate . 367
Appendix 5-9. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the f levels of GAP Management Status in the state of New Mexico	our . 371
Appendix 5-10. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the s of Nevada.	tate . 375
Appendix 5-11. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Nevada.	four . 378
Appendix 5-12. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the s of Utah.	tate . 382
Appendix 5-13. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Utah.	four . 386
Appendix 5-14A. Percent distribution of each modeled species within 22 Land Stewardship categories by state and region.	. 390

Appendix 5-14B. Area distribution of each modeled species within 22 Land Stewardship	200
categories by state and region	390
Appendix 5-15. Area and percent distribution of each modeled species represented within the	
four levels of GAP Management Status by state and region.	391
Appendix 7-1. List of Example GAP Applications	392

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals and organizations contributed to the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project (SWReGAP). Appendix 1-1 lists over 120 individuals who participated in various components of SWReGAP on behalf of each southwestern state.

The regional land cover mapping lab would like to acknowledge the following individuals and organizations for their assistance. Foremost we would like to thank Collin Homer, Bruce Wylie, and Mike Coan at USGS EROS for their help with decision tree classifiers and the NLCD mapping tool. We would like to recognize both monetary and in-kind support provided by the Bureau of Land Management and in particular thank Diane Osborne formerly with the BLM National Science and Technology Center in Denver, CO for her contributions to the project. Other agencies and people we would like to recognize for their support include: Utah Division of Wildlife, U.S. Forest Service Region 4 (Ogden, UT), Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Salt Lake Field Office, BLM Nevada State Office (Reno, NV), BLM Ely Field Office (Ely, NV), Steve Knick and the SageMap Program at the USGS Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center, Snake River Field Station (Boise, ID), and Northern Arizona University.

On behalf of the habitat modelers, the regional habitat modeling lab would like to thank the species biologists who provided time and expertise in the review and modification of the SWReGAP habitat models. These individuals are listed in Appendix 3-6. We thank these and all others who have provided insight and thoughts in regard to regional habitat modeling.

Greg Magee provided assistance in developing the description of the SWReGAP study area found in the Introduction chapter of this report.

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the USGS BRD, Gap Analysis Program, without which completion of this project could not have been possible. And finally, although we are many successive generations removed, where we are today is due in large part to the vision of J. Michael Scott, whose leadership in the early days of GAP fostered an intellectual climate still being realized today.

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

Julie Prior-Magee



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

Recommended Citation:

Prior-Magee, J.S. 2007. Introduction. Chapter 1 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding author: J. Prior-Magee is to be contacted at jpmagee@nmsu.edu Tel. 575- 646-1084

# HOW THIS REPORT IS ORGANIZED

This report is a summation of a scientific project. While we endeavor to make it understandable for as general an audience as practicable, it reflects the complexity of the project it describes. A glossary of terms is provided to aid the reader in understanding the report; and for those seeking a detailed understanding of the subjects, the cited literature should be helpful. The organization of this report follows the general chronology of project development, beginning with the production of the individual data layers and concluding with analysis of the data. It diverges from standard scientific reporting by embedding results and discussion sections within individual chapters. This was done to allow the individual data products to stand on their own as testable hypotheses and provide data users with a concise and complete report for each data and analysis product.

We begin with an overview of the Gap Analysis Program mission, concept, and limitations. We then present a synopsis of how the current biodiversity condition of the project area came to be, followed by chapters describing data development for land cover mapping, predicted animal habitat distribution, species richness, and land stewardship mapping and categorization. Data development leads to the Analysis chapter, which reports on the status of the elements of biodiversity (land cover and animal species), for the Southwest region. Finally, we describe the management implications of the analysis results and provide information on how to acquire and use the data.

## The Gap Analysis Program Mission

The mission of the Gap Analysis Program (GAP) is to prevent conservation crises by providing conservation assessments of biotic elements (plant communities and native animal species) and to facilitate the application of this information to land management activities. This is accomplished through the following five objectives:

- 1) map actual land cover as closely as possible to the alliance level (FGDC 1997).
- 2) map the predicted distribution of habitat for those terrestrial vertebrates and selected other taxa that spend any important part of their life history in the project area and for which adequate distributional habitats, associations, and mapped habitat variables are available.
- 3) document the representation of natural vegetation communities and animal species in areas managed for the long-term maintenance of biodiversity.
- 4) make all GAP project information available to the public and those charged with land use research, policy, planning, and management.
- 5) build institutional cooperation in the application of this information to state and regional management activities.

To meet these objectives, it is necessary that GAP be operated at the regional or state level, but maintain consistency with national standards. Within the region, participation by a wide variety of cooperators is necessary and desirable to ensure understanding and acceptance of the data and forge relationships that will lead to cooperative conservation planning.

### Regional objectives for GAP

The lack of regional datasets and the problems of edge-matching existing state GAP data sets led GAP to initiate regional Gap Analysis Projects. The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project is a mapping and assessment of biodiversity for the five-state region encompassing Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. The primary objective of the project is to use a coordinated approach to create detailed, seamless maps of the land cover, habitat for native terrestrial vertebrate species, land stewardship, and management status for the entire region.

## The Gap Analysis Concept

GAP brings together the problem-solving capabilities of federal, state, and private scientists to tackle the difficult issues of land cover mapping, animal habitat characterization, and biodiversity conservation assessment at the state, regional, and national levels. The program seeks to facilitate cooperative development and use of information. Throughout this report we use the terms "GAP" to describe the national program, "GAP Project" to refer to an individual state or regional project, and "gap analysis" to refer to the gap analysis process or methodology.

Much of the following discussion was taken verbatim from Edwards et al. 1995, Scott et al. 1993, and Davis et al. 1995. The gap analysis process provides an overview of the distribution and conservation status of several components of biodiversity. It uses the distribution of actual vegetation and predicted distribution of terrestrial vertebrates and, when available, invertebrate taxa. Digital map overlays in a GIS are used to identify individual species, species-rich areas, and vegetation types that are unrepresented or underrepresented in existing management areas. It functions as a preliminary step to the more detailed studies needed to establish actual boundaries for planning and management of biological resources on the ground. These data and results are then made available to the public so that institutions as well as individual landowners and management status of these elements of biodiversity. GAP, by focusing on higher levels of biological organization, is likely to be both cheaper and more likely to succeed than conservation programs focused on single species or populations (Scott et al.1993).

Biodiversity inventories can be visualized as "filters" designed to capture elements of biodiversity at various levels of organization. The filter concept has been applied by The Nature Conservancy, which established Natural Heritage Programs in all 50 states. The Nature Conservancy employs a fine filter of rare species inventory and protection and a coarse filter of community inventory and protection (Jenkins 1985, Noss 1987). It is postulated that 85-90% of species can be protected by the coarse filter without having to inventory or plan reserves for those species individually. A fine filter is then applied to the remaining 15-10% of species to ensure their protection. Gap analysis is a coarse-filter method because it can be used to quickly and cheaply assess the other 85-90% of species. GAP is not designed to identify and aid protection of elements that are rare or of very

restricted distribution; rather it is designed to help "keep common species common" by identifying risk far in advance of actual population decline. These concepts are further developed below.

The intuitively appealing idea of conserving most biodiversity by maintaining examples of all natural community types has never been applied, although numerous approaches to the spatial identification of biodiversity have been described (Kirkpatrick 1983, Margules et al. 1988, Pressey and Nicholls 1989, Nicholls and Margules 1993). Furthermore, the spatial scale at which organisms use the environment differs tremendously among species and depends on body size, food habits, mobility, and other factors. Hence, no coarse filter will be a complete assessment of biodiversity protection status and needs. However, species that fall through the pores of the coarse filter, such as narrow endemics and wide-ranging mammals, can be captured by the safety net of the fine filter. Community-level (coarse-filter) protection is a complement to, not a substitute for, protection of individual rare species.

Gap analysis is essentially an expanded coarse-filter approach (Noss 1987) to biodiversity protection. The land cover types mapped in GAP serve directly as a coarse filter, the goal being to assure adequate representation of all native vegetation community types in biodiversity management areas. Landscapes with great vegetation diversity often are those with high edaphic variety or topographic relief. When elevational diversity is very great, a nearly complete spectrum of vegetation types known from a biological region may occur within a relatively small area. Such areas provide habitat for many species, including those that depend on multiple habitat types to meet life history needs (Diamond 1986, Noss 1987). By using landscape-sized samples (Forman and Godron 1986) as an expanded coarse filter, gap analysis searches for and identifies biological regions where unprotected or underrepresented vegetation types and animal species occur.

More detailed analyses were not part of this project but are areas of research that GAP as a national program is pursuing. For example, a second filter could combine species distribution information to identify a set of areas in which all, or nearly all, mapped species are represented. There is a major difference between identifying the richest areas in a region (many of which are likely to be neighbors and share essentially the same list of species) and identifying areas in which all species are represented. The latter task is most efficiently accomplished by selecting areas whose species lists are most different or complementary. Areas with different environments tend to also have the most different species lists for a variety of taxa. As a result, a set of areas with complementary sets of species for one higher taxon (e.g., mammals) often will also do a good job representing most species of other higher taxa (e.g., trees, butterflies). Species with large home ranges, such as large carnivores, or species with very local distributions may require individual attention. Additional data layers can be used for a more holistic conservation evaluation. These include indicators of stress or risk (e.g., human population growth, road density, rate of habitat fragmentation, distribution of pollutants) and the locations of habitat corridors between wildlands that allow for natural movement of wide-ranging animals and the migration of species in response to climate change.

## **General Limitations**

Limitations must be recognized so that additional studies can be implemented to supplement GAP. The following are general project limitations; specific limitations for the data are described in the respective sections:

- 1. GAP data are derived from remote sensing and modeling to make general assessments about conservation status. Any decisions based on the data must be supported by ground-truthing and more detailed analyses.
- 2. GAP is not a substitute for threatened and endangered species listing and recovery efforts. A primary argument in favor of gap analysis is that it is proactive: it seeks to recognize and manage sites of high biodiversity value for the long-term maintenance of populations of native species and communities before they become critically rare. Thus, it should help to reduce the rate at which species require listing as threatened or endangered. Those species that are already greatly imperiled, however, still require individual efforts to assure their recovery.
- 3. GAP data products and assessments represent a snapshot in time generally representing the date of the satellite imagery. Updates are planned on a 5-10 year cycle, but users of the data must be aware of the static nature of the products.
- 4. GAP is not a substitute for a thorough national biological inventory. As a response to rapid habitat loss, gap analysis provides a quick assessment of the distribution of vegetation and associated species before they are lost, and provides focus and direction for local, regional, and national efforts to maintain biodiversity. The process of improving knowledge in systematics, taxonomy, and species distributions is lengthy and expensive. That process must be continued and expedited, however, in order to provide the detailed information needed for a comprehensive assessment of our nation's biodiversity. Vegetation and species distribution maps developed for GAP can be used to make such surveys more cost-effective by stratifying sampling areas according to expected variation in biological attributes.

## The Study Area

The following sources were used in preparing this description of the SWReGAP study area: DesertUSA 2006, Halvorson et al. 2002, Nevada Department of Wildlife 2005, Schrupp et al. 2000, The Official Website of the State of Utah 2005, Thompson et al. 1996, United States Geological Survey 2006, and West and Young 2000.

The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project (SWReGAP) area encompasses approximately 150 million hectares (560,000 square miles) and covers the states of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah (see Figure 1-1). The region is 93% of the size of Alaska and approximately 20% of the area of the contiguous United States. With elevations ranging from 21 meters along the Colorado River near Yuma, Arizona to 4,399 meters at Mount Elbert in the state of Colorado, the project area comprises an incredible diversity of landforms and ecosystems in four major physiographic provinces: the Basin and Range, Colorado Plateau, Rocky Mountains, and Great Plains (see Figure 1-2). Small portions of the Columbia Plateau and Sierra Nevada ecoregions are also included in the northwest part of the project area.



Figure 1-1 SWReGAP area map showing major municipalities and roads



Figure 1-2 Physiographic provinces and major rivers in the SWReGAP area

### Columbia Plateau and Sierra Nevada

These two ecoregions barely cross into the project area in Nevada, with the Columbia Plateau in the extreme northeast part of the state, and the Sierra Nevada in the extreme western. The Columbia Plateau is a broad expanse of semi-arid sagebrush covered volcanic plains and valleys and lies mostly north of Nevada.

Slopes on the east side of the Sierra Nevada partially descend upon Nevada along its western border. Vegetation here is characterized by conifer communities mixed with sagebrush and pinyon-juniper in the lower elevations and an alpine zone characterized by bare rock, permanent snow fields, and few grass or forb species, including the Hidden Forest of the Sheep Range, home of the Hidden Forest Uinta chipmunk. Though Sierra Nevada barely comes into the project area, its physical presence dominates the western portion of the project area by dictating rainfall patterns and vegetation patterns, which in turn strongly influences the distribution of wildlife.

### Basin and Range

The Basin and Range of central and southern Nevada, eastern Utah, southern and western Arizona, and southwestern New Mexico comprises the largest portion of the project area and includes the great deserts of the southwest: the Great Basin, Mojave, Sonoran, and Chihuahuan. The major landforms in this province are a series of discrete, fault-block, north-south trending mountains interrupted by lower lying valleys or basins. This topography is the product of crustal stretching between the Sierra Nevada to the west and the Rocky Mountains to the east. Over time, erosion has steadily chipped away at the higher elevations, filling the basins between the ranges with sediments that are typically thousands of meters thick. Many of the valleys in the Basin and Range are closed drainage basins and at various times in geologic history, extensive lakes filled the basins. Because of the arid to semi-arid climate that exists today, most of the undrained basins now contain dry lakebeds or "playas." Yet some lakes still exist in the province as evidenced by the Great Salt Lake, a remnant of the much larger ancient Lake Bonneville.

Climate within the Basin and Range is quite varied. While the province as a whole is generally in a rain shadow created by the Sierra Nevada to the west, individual mountain ranges within the region can lift air masses, wringing out whatever moisture is left in them and creating precipitation at higher elevations. This local orographic effect creates a rainfall gradient, with mountains receiving noticeably more precipitation than adjacent basins. This climatic effect has been cited as contributing to the biotic diversity in the province, resulting in a "sky island and desert sea" aspect to the landscape. This condition also contributes to the high level of endemism found within the region. Since the crustal stretching and faulting are not uniform across the Basin and Range, the elevations of the mountains and basins vary considerably across the province. These regional differences have strongly influenced the flora and fauna communities and this large province can be further divided into different ecoregions.

The Great Basin ecoregion includes much of central Nevada and eastern Utah, from the eastern slopes of the Sierra Nevada near Reno, Nevada to the western slopes of the Wasatch Range near Salt Lake City, Utah. The entire region is a closed drainage basin with no outlet to the sea. Nevada is the most mountainous state in the U.S. with over 300 mountain ranges separated by long, broad valleys. The Great Basin is characterized by large expanses of salt desert scrub and sagebrush shrublands. Mountainous areas include pinyon-juniper woodlands, mountain sagebrush, open coniferous forests, and alpine areas in the highest elevations. Remote mountaintops, isolated aquatic habitats in valley bottoms, weathered badlands, and sand dunes highlight the Great Basin's unique biological diversity. While winters in the Great Basin are cold, summers are conversely hot and dry. A temperature swing of 40 degrees in any given summer day is not unusual. On average, the Great Basin receives between 18 and 30 centimeters of precipitation per year. Much of this falls as snow in the winter; while summer rains are often brief torrents that runoff before much moisture can soak into the soil.

The Mojave Desert occupies southern Nevada, extreme southwestern Utah, northwestern Arizona, and southeastern California. Creosotebush, succulents, and yucca-blackbrush community types dominate the ecoregion. Joshua tree, a yucca species, is considered the

indicator plant of the Mojave. As in other areas of the Basin and Range, upper elevation mountain communities also exist where there is a more mesic environment. This is where some of the ecoregion's most isolated communities and species are found. About 200 plant species are endemic to this desert. The Mojave is hotter and drier than the Great Basin, yet cooler than the Sonoran Desert. Precipitation here averages less than 13 centimeters per year and falls more typically as rain in the winter.

The Sonoran Desert of northwest Mexico, southwestern Arizona, and southeastern California is the hottest of the Southwest's deserts. Freezing temperatures occur only for a few nights in the winter, while summers are extremely hot. Rainy periods occur in both winter and summer and produce a high biodiversity and a higher occurrence of trees than any of the adjacent deserts. Palo verde, ironwood, catclaw, and saguaro are some of the trees that dominate the landscape, while cholla cactus, saltbush, creosotebush, and bursages are common shrubs. Mesquite bosques, or woodlands, are found in areas where the water table is high. The Sonoran Desert is also the only ecoregion in the Basin and Range where thru-flowing streams and rivers are more common than undrained basins. The Gila River, a tributary of the Colorado crosses the Sonoran Desert from east to west and collects runoff from several side streams. Where water is not diverted for irrigation or other human uses, the streamside vegetation consists of Fremont cottonwood, Arizona ash, Arizona walnut, and willow species. The fauna of the Sonora is rich as well with many species derived from tropical and subtropical areas.

Covering over 500,000 square kilometers, the Chihuahuan Desert is the largest desert in North America. Though most of this desert lies in Mexico, its northern limits extend into west Texas, southern New Mexico, and extreme southeast Arizona. This is shrub desert of creosotebush, mesquite, yuccas, agaves, prickly pear cactus, Mormon tea, and tarbush. Though historically more prevalent than today, grasslands are also an important vegetational component of this desert. With cool winters and hot summers, most of the area receives less than 25 centimeters of rainfall per year, most of which falls in torrential summer storms. Though most drainage basins here are closed as in the Great Basin, two major rivers do traverse the project area in New Mexico: the Rio Grande and Pecos River. Though severely impacted by human activities, these riparian systems do maintain limited areas of woodland comprised of cottonwood, willow, and ash trees.

Another ecoregion found in the Basin and Range portion of the project area is the transitional area between the Sonoran and Chihuahuan Desert in southeast Arizona and southwest New Mexico. Here, components of the Sierra Madrean ecoregion extend into the U.S. from Mexico. An exceptionally large diversity of vegetation types is found from desert basin to mountaintop. Mammal diversity in this area is among the highest in the U.S., with influences from the Sierra Madre to the south, Rocky Mountains to the north, Sonoran Desert to the west, and Chihuahuan Desert to the east.

The Basin and Range formation also includes the transitional areas of central and southern New Mexico where tall mountain ranges rise more than a 1,000 meters above the Chihuahuan Desert. The San Mateo, Magdalena, Sandia, Manzano, and Sacramento Mountain ranges exemplify this transitional area between the Basin and Range and

adjacent provinces to the north and east. These ranges have peaks over 3,000 meters in elevation and biologically are in stark contrast to the desert environs below. Here the flora and fauna is more closely associated with the Rocky Mountains to the north with coniferous forests and woodlands, lush mountain meadows and grasslands, and permanent streams and springs.

### Colorado Plateau

The Colorado Plateau occupies the Four Corners region of the project area: southeast Utah, northern Arizona, northwest New Mexico, and southwest Colorado. It is the only physiographic province that lies totally within the project area.

The sculptured beauty and brilliant colors of the Colorado Plateau's sedimentary rock layers have captured the imaginations of countless geologists. This is a vast region of plateaus, mesas, and deep canyons whose walls expose rocks ranging in age from billions to just a few hundred years old. In addition, volcanic cones dot the landscape and large volcanic mountains rise from the plateau to over 3,500 meters elevation. San Francisco Peaks of northern Arizona, the Abajo and La Sal Mountains of southeast Utah, and Mount Taylor of northwest New Mexico are examples of these volcanic highlands.

One of the most geologically intriguing features of the Colorado Plateau is its remarkable stability. Relatively little faulting and folding has affected this high, thick crustal block within the last 600 million years or so. Although the Basin and Range and Colorado Plateau may seem to have little in common, their geological stories are intimately intertwined. In the early part of the Cenozoic Era, both regions had low elevations of probably less than 1 kilometer. Although geologists are still debating what came next, it is theorized that beginning about 20 million years ago, both the Basin and Range and Colorado Plateau regions were uplifted as much as 3 kilometers. Great tension developed in the crust, probably related to changing plate motions far to the west. As the crust stretched, the Basin and Range Province broke up into a multitude of down-dropped valleys and elongate mountains. Yet for some reason not fully understood, the neighboring Colorado Plateau was able to preserve its structural integrity and remained a single tectonic block. Eventually, the great block of Colorado Plateau crust rose a kilometer higher than the Basin and Range.

As the land rose, the streams responded by cutting ever-deeper stream channels. The most well known of these watercourses, the Colorado River, began to carve the Grand Canyon less than 6 million years ago. Other major tributaries of the Colorado River in the Plateau include the Green River of eastern Utah, the Gunnison and Dolores Rivers of southwest Colorado, the San Juan River of northwest New Mexico and southeast Utah, and the Little Colorado River of northeast Arizona. With the exception of the Little Colorado, most of the major rivers of the Plateau have their headwaters high in the Rocky Mountains to the north and east. Millions of years of down cutting by these and other rivers have created a maze of brilliantly colored canyons exposing the plateau's rich geologic history.

With the exception of the higher and colder mountains, most areas of the plateau have cold winters, yet hot summers. Large tracts of the province receive less than 25 cm of precipitation annually. Moisture comes primarily as rain during mid to late summer months, often associated with convection currents rising from the Gulf of California or the Gulf of Mexico. However, snow is not uncommon in winter, especially in the higher mountains. Significant year-to-year variation occurs more often than not, and severe drought and flooding are not uncommon occurrences. This variation has a profound effect on plant and animal life.

Vegetation types in the Colorado Plateau include alpine tundra, subalpine and montane forests, lush mountain meadows, and montane grasslands in the high elevation mountains. However, more area is covered in pinyon-juniper woodland and shrubland, including sagebrush and semi-desert shrubland. Riparian habitats are associated with the river systems of the plateau.

### Rocky Mountains

The Rockies form a majestic mountain barrier on the west side of the Great Plains that stretches from Canada to northern New Mexico. Though not obvious to the casual observer, the Rockies are actually a discontinuous series of mountain ranges with distinct geological origins. Within the project area, north-central New Mexico and central Colorado are associated with the Southern Rockies, northwest Colorado with the Wyoming Basin, and northeast Utah with the Middle Rockies.

The Rocky Mountains took shape during a period of intense plate tectonic activity from about 170 to 40 million years ago. The last mountain building event during this time was the Laramide orogeny (about 70 to 40 million years ago) and is responsible for raising the Rocky Mountains. Before the Laramide orogeny, western North America suffered the effects of repeated collisions as slabs of ocean crust, carried along by subducting ocean plates, were swept into the subduction zone and onto North America's edge. Inland from the coast, magma above the subducting slab rose into the North America continental crust and created great arc-shaped volcanic mountain ranges as lava and ash spewed out of dozens of volcanoes. Beneath the surface, great masses of molten rock were injected and hardened in place. Initially the effects of these plate collisions focused near the edge of the continent, but about 70 million years ago, the mountain building reached further inland where the present-day Rocky Mountains are found.

The tallest peaks within the project area are found in the Rocky Mountains, with many ranges exceeding 4,000 meters in elevation. Though there is climatic variation within the province, much of the area is considered to be humid with some areas receiving over 100 cm of rain annually. Winters are long and very cold with permanent snowfields found in the higher elevations. Summers are short and cool and afternoon rain showers are common during the warmer months. The extremes of elevation and relief are reflected in its diversity of habitats, ranging from alpine tundra, through sub-alpine, and montane forests, to montane grasslands and shrublands, and pinyon-juniper woodlands. Riparian habitats are dispersed throughout the area. The Rockies are the source of most of the major rivers in the intermountain West and the Great Plains to the east.
#### Great Plains

The Interior Plains is a vast region that spreads across the stable core of North America. This area formed when several small continents collided well over a billion years ago. Most of this region remained relatively unaffected by mountain building episodes and it has low relief, reflecting more than 500 million years of relative tectonic stability. During its long geologic history, the plains were periodically inundated by shallow seas that deposited marine sediments. The flatness of the plains is a reflection of the platform of mostly flat-lying marine and stream deposits laid down in the Mesozoic and Cenozoic Eras. In east New Mexico and west Texas, the Llano Estacado is considered one of the flattest, most featureless landscapes in the United States. Most of the western portion of the Interior Plains is referred to as the Great Plains and these high plains of eastern Colorado and New Mexico are included within the project area. This portion of the province also received deposits from the eroding Rocky Mountains to the west. Though nearly flat, the landscape is occasionally interrupted by sand hills and erosion along stream coursed to form canyons, cliffs, and escarpments.

Ranging in elevation from over 1,500 meters in the north to less than 1,000 meters in the south, the high plains portion of the project area exhibit quite a variation in climate and ecology. Though still considered semi-arid, northern areas are wetter and have longer and colder winters. Southern areas have short, mild winters and extremely hot summers. Eastern Colorado and northeast New Mexico are primarily covered in plains grasslands, while southeast New Mexico is actually considered part of the Chihuahuan Desert (previously described in the Basin and Range section). Rivers that originate in the Rocky Mountains to the west traverse the plains, the major ones being the South Platte, Arkansas, Canadian, and Pecos Rivers.

#### Land Management and Human Impacts to the Landscape

There is evidence of human habitation within the project area that dates back nearly 13,000 years. Lifestyles of the native peoples evolved from nomadic hunter-gathering to more sedentary as the climate became drier and subsistence farming became important. Until the time of European immigration, human influence on the vegetation was relatively slight. Contrasted with the 300-150 yrs of occupation by Euro-Americans, dramatic changes in the landscape and vegetation have since occurred (West and Young 2000). Human influences are now seen as significant drivers of change on the landscape.

Currently, federal agencies account for the largest land steward category managing over 51% of the landscape. BLM is the largest federal land steward accounting for over 30% of the total land area. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is the second largest federal land steward accounting for 14% of the area. Private lands are the second largest land steward category in the region comprising 30% of the region's lands. Private lands have particularly been impacted with direct conversion of large areas of wildland to agriculture and urban areas. Some regions within the project area are among the fastest growing in the nation and this pressure will only continue to increase. Most public lands are managed under multiple use and sustained yield policies, which requires the federal agencies to manage its resources for a combination of diverse uses while balancing long-term needs for renewable and non-renewable resources. Much of the federal lands are

managed for recreation, livestock grazing, mining, logging, and energy development. These uses have and continue to alter the natural character of the land. In addition, desertification as related to water extraction and diversion projects, suppression of wild fire, and introduction of exotic weeds are ongoing threats to biodiversity of the landscape. There are some who suggest that human's heaviest imprint may come from seemingly indirect consequences of developed infrastructures (roads, pipelines) within and between habitats.

## CHAPTER 2

## LAND COVER CLASSIFICATION AND MAPPING

John H. Lowry, Jr., R. Douglas Ramsey, Kathryn A. Thomas, Donald Schrupp, William Kepner, Todd Sajwaj, Jessica Kirby, Eric Waller, Scott Schrader, Sarah Falzarano, Lisa Langs Stoner, Gerald Manis, Cynthia Wallace, Keith Schulz, Patrick Comer, Keith Pohs, Wendy Rieth, Cristian Velasquez', Brett Wolk, Kenneth G. Boykin, Lee O'Brien, Julie Prior-Magee, David Bradford, and Bruce C. Thompson.



Recommended Citation:

Lowry, J. H, Jr., R. D. Ramsey, K. A. Thomas, D. Schrupp, W. Kepner, T. Sajwaj, J. Kirby, E. Waller, S. Schrader, S. Falzarano, L. Langs Stoner, G. Manis, C. Wallace, K. Schulz, P. Comer, K. Pohs, W. Rieth, C. Velasquez, B. Wolk, K.G., Boykin, L. O'Brien, J. Prior-Magee, D. Bradford and B. Thompson. 2007. Land cover classification and mapping. Chapter 2 *in* J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding authors: J. Lowry is to be contacted at <u>ilowry@gis.usu.edu</u>, Tel. 435-797-0653, and R. D. Ramsey is to be contacted at <u>dougr@gis.usu.edu</u>, Tel. 435-797-3783.

## INTRODUCTION

In its "coarse filter" approach to conservation biology (Jenkins 1985, Noss 1987) gap analysis relies on maps of dominant land cover as the most fundamental spatial component of the analysis for terrestrial environments (Scott et al. 1993). For the purposes of GAP, most of the land cover of interest can be characterized as natural or semi-natural vegetation defined by the dominant plant species.

Vegetation patterns are an integrated reflection of physical and chemical factors that shape the environment of a given land area (Whittaker 1965). Often vegetation patterns are determinants for overall biological diversity patterns (Franklin 1993, Levin 1981, Noss 1990) which can be used to delineate habitat types in conservation evaluations (Specht 1975, Austin 1991). As such, dominant vegetation types need to be recognized over their entire range of distribution (Bourgeron et al. 1994) for beta-scale analysis (*sensu* Whittaker 1960, 1977). Various methods may be used to map vegetation patterns on the landscape, the appropriate method depending on the scale and scope of the project. Projects focusing on smaller regions, such as national parks, may rely on aerial photo interpretation (USGS-NPS 1994). Mapping vegetation over larger regions has commonly been done using digital imagery obtained from satellites, and may be referred to as land cover mapping (Lins and Kleckner 1996).

Generally, land cover mapping is done by segmenting the landscape into areas of relative homogeneity that correspond to land cover classes from an adopted or developed land cover legend. Technical methods to partition the landscape using digital imagery-based methods vary. Unsupervised approaches involve computer-assisted delineation of homogeneity in the imagery and ancillary data, followed by the analyst assigning land cover labels to the homogenous clusters of pixels (Jensen 2005). Supervised approaches utilize representative samples of each land cover class to partition the imagery and ancillary data into clusters of pixels representing each land cover class. Supervised clustering algorithms assign membership of each pixel to a land cover class based on some rule of highest likelihood (Jensen 2005). Supervised-unsupervised hybrid approaches are common and often offer advantages over both approaches (Lillesand and Kieffer 2000).

It is important to point out that a land cover map is never considered a perfect representation of the landscape. Improvements to land cover maps can, and should be made as additional "ground truth" information about actual land cover components and spatial patterns is acquired through time. These improvements should be based on independent assessments of the map's quality (Stoms 1994).

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section discusses land cover map development. It begins by providing background information on the regional division of labor and the regional land cover legend. It then focuses on our land cover mapping methods, including a description of data sources, the land cover modeling approach, and the general flow of the mapping process. It concludes with a description of the resulting land cover map product. The second section describes the process of validating the land cover product. Background information on our approach is presented along with descriptions of the methods and results of the land cover product validation. The final section provides a discussion of the land cover mapping experience in general. In this section we discuss some of the "lessons learned" from the regional mapping effort with hopes that future mapping efforts of this nature will benefit from our experience.

### METHODS

#### Land Cover Map Development

#### Background

#### Division of Regional Responsibilities

The use of "spectro-physiographic" mapping areas has proven useful for satellite-based land cover mapping by maximizing spectral differentiation between areas with relatively uniform ecological characteristics (Bauer et al. 1994, Homer et al. 1997, Lillesand 1996, Reese et al. 2002). Dividing the 1.4 million square kilometer region into spectrophysiographic "mapping zones" provided working units distributed among the five collaborating states. With the diversity of biogeographic divisions across the region, we recognized the importance of leveraging local knowledge of the biota in each sub-region. We consequently determined that a geographical approach, assigning state teams to work in their local landscapes was the most appropriate means for distributing regional mapping responsibilities. Overall project tracking and management was conducted by the regional land cover lab at Utah State University.

Ecoregions defined by Bailey et al. (1994) and Omernik (1987) provided a starting point for determining the project mapping zone boundaries. These boundaries were refined by screen digitizing at a scale of approximately 1:500,000 using a regional mosaic of Landsat TM imagery resampled to 90 meters. Initial efforts yielded 73 mapping zones for the region. Through a process of iterative and collaborative steps involving all land cover mapping teams and NatureServe, the final number of mapping zones was reduced to 25 (Figure 2-1). A more detailed explanation of mapping zone development is found in Manis et al. (2000).

Each state was responsible for between four and six mapping zones roughly corresponding to state jurisdictional boundaries. Initial field data collection protocols were established at a workshop in Las Vegas, Nevada in the spring of 2001. Field data collection occurred during 2002 and 2003. Land cover workshops dedicated to ensuring regionally consistent mapping methods were conducted during the winters of 2002 and 2003. Yearly meetings and monthly teleconferences involving key land cover mapping personnel from all five states and NatureServe ecologists proved invaluable throughout the collaborative mapping process. Mapping efforts were completed on a mapping zone by mapping zone basis by individual states, with the final integration of all mapping



zones performed by the regional land cover lab. The seamless land cover map was completed and made available to the public in September 2004.

Figure 2-1. Mapping zone boundaries for SWReGAP land cover mapping effort.

#### Land Cover Legend

The US National Vegetation Classification System (US-NVCS) has been adopted by the Federal Geographic Data Committee as the classification standard for all federal mapping projects (FGDC 1997)<sup>1</sup>. A nested hierarchical structure of the US-NVCS defines classification units at the highest levels as heterogeneous units based solely on vegetative physiognomy and at the lower levels as more narrow and homogenous floristic units

<sup>1</sup> The FGDC set standards and policy for vegetation classification and map products to enable agencies to collect, report and map vegetation information in a standard format (FGDC 1997). Although the policy for applying the standard is only through the formation level (physiognomy only), agencies are encouraged to aid in the development of the floristic alliance and the association levels (FGDC 1997, pg. 4, 7). FGDC recognized that mapping applications need to be based on the requirement of the project, "The specific application of this standard to any mapping activities is dependent on the goals and objectives of the mapping activities...the classification standard merely sets a hierarchical list of classes that should be intelligently employed by the user based on the specifications and limitations of their particular mapping program" (FGDC 1997, pg. 9). Thus, the current FGDC standard is primarily for describing and classifying vegetation, whereas mapping units will reflect (1) the needs of the mapping project, (2) the technical tools, methods, and data available for mapping, and (3) the interactions of those factors with the vegetation classification concepts. The nested hierarchical level. Because of difficulties in mapping at all levels, 'compliance' with the FGDC standard almost always requires some sort of crosswalk between resultant mapping units and classification units from one or more levels of the current FGDC hierarchy.

(Table 2-1). The upper physiognomic levels of the NVCS framework are adapted from the World Physiognomic Classification of Vegetation (UNESCO 1973) and later modified for application to the United States by Driscoll et al. (1983, 1984). The lower floristic levels (e.g. Alliance and Association) are based on both structural and compositional characteristics of vegetation derived by Mueller-Dombois and Ellenberg (1974). The Nature Conservancy, and now NatureServe—along with the network of Natural Heritage Programs—have worked with others since 1985 on the systematic development, documentation, and description of vegetation types across the United States (Grossman et al. 1994, 1998). NatureServe and the Natural Heritage Network have been improving upon this system in recent years with significant funding supplied by GAP. Products from this on-going effort include a hierarchical vegetation classification standard (FGDC 1997) and the description of vegetation Alliances for the United States (Drake and Faber-Langendoen 1997, Reid et al. 1999, Sneddon et al. 1994, Weakley et al. 1996). An alliance is a physiognomically uniform group of Associations sharing one or more dominant or diagnostic species, that as a rule are found in the uppermost strata of the vegetation (see Mueller-Dombois and Ellenberg (1974). The basic assumptions and definitions for this system have been described by Jennings (1993) and Grossman et al. (1998).

Link to FGDC standard	Hierarchy level	U.S. National Vegetation Classification	Ecological systems
Included		Division Order	
Included	Physiognomic levels	Formation Class Formation Subclass Formation Group Formation Subgroup Formation	
Hierarchically linked			Ecological systems
Proposed	Floristic levels	Alliance Association	

 Table 2-1. Hierarchical structure of the U.S. National Vegetation Classification and the linkage with ecological systems.

When the SWReGAP project began in 1999 the intended thematic mapping unit was the NVC alliance. However, recognizing that over 500 alliances occur in the project area and that many alliances would be difficult to map as they do not occur in large and distinctive patches, we anticipated the need for a "meso" scale thematic mapping unit. In response to this need for a regionally consistent meso-scale land cover legend, NatureServe developed the Terrestrial Ecological Systems Classification framework for the conterminous United States (Comer et al. 2003). Ecological systems are defined as "groups of plant community types that tend to co-occur within landscapes with similar ecological processes, substrates and/or environmental gradients" (Comer et al. 2003).

Although distinct from the US-NVC, the vegetation component of an ecological system is described by one or more NVC alliances or associations, though this relationship is not strictly hierarchical. While the ecological system concept emphasizes existing dominant vegetation types, it also incorporates physical components such as landform position, substrates, hydrology, and climate. In this manner, ecological system descriptions are modular, having multiple diagnostic classifiers used to identify several ecological dimensions of the mapping unit (Di Gregorio and Jansen 2000). Diagnostic classifiers include environmental and biogeographic characteristics, which are incorporated in the ecological system name thus providing descriptive information about the system through a standardized naming convention. More detailed information about the Terrestrial Ecological Systems Classification for the United States is available at http://www.natureserve.org/publications/usEcologicalsystems.jsp.

NatureServe Terrestrial Ecological Systems present one approach for mapping efforts to comply with Federal Geographic Data Committee standards. They are defined in terms of the base units (alliances and associations) of the US-NVC, and may be readily attributed to the upper-most levels of the FGDC hierarchy (e.g., Division, Order, Class, Subclass). We follow this approach by attributing all mapping units to NLCD land cover classes 1 and 2 (Appendix 2-3 and 2-13) which closely follow these upper FGDC levels. This approach facilitates application of these mapped data to these hierarchical levels.

The initial SWReGAP target legend developed by NatureServe and the mapping teams identified approximately 110 potentially mappable ecological systems from the 140 that occur in the five-state region. Omitted ecological systems were mostly small patch (below minimum mapping unit) or peripheral to the region and lacked adequate training sites. The Terrestrial Ecological Systems Classification focuses on natural and semi-natural ecological communities. For SWReGAP, altered and disturbed land cover and land use classes were considered separately. These classes were incorporated into the SWReGAP legend using descriptions adopted from either the National Land Cover Dataset 2001 legend (e.g. Agriculture, Developed-Medium-High Intensity) (Homer et al. 2004) or were given a special "altered or disturbed" designation within the SWReGAP legend (e.g. recently burned, recently logged areas, invasive annual grassland, etc.).

### Land Cover Mapping Methods

#### Data Sources

Seventy-nine Landsat Enhanced Thematic Mapper Plus (ETM+) scenes (Figure 2-2) provided complete coverage of the five-state region, and were acquired from the USGS National Center for Earth Resources Observation and Science (EROS) through the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC). Spring, summer, and fall images were provided, raising the total number of images to 237 for the region. Optimal imagery dates varied across the region and were selected for peak phenological differences as well as clarity and low cloud cover. Image acquisition dates ranged from 1999 to 2001. All ETM+ scenes were terrain-corrected and provided to Utah State University in NLAPS (National Landsat Archive Processing System) format.



Figure 2-2. SWReGAP area showing Landsat ETM+ scenes

Our approach involved modeling image mosaics for each mapping zone (see Figure 2-1) including a 2 kilometer buffer (i.e. a 4 kilometer overlap between mapping zones). To improve image matching, image standardization for solar angle illumination, instrument calibration, and atmospheric haze (i.e. path radiance) was necessary. We determined the most practical approach was to use an image-based method as described by Chavez (1996). Standard protocol was to use a modified COST method (Chavez 1996). We found that using Chavez' COST method over-corrected atmospheric transmittance, particularly for scenes in the arid Southwest. To address this over-correction, we used COST without TAU<sub>z</sub> (approximate atmospheric transmittance component of the COST equation). To facilitate image standardization, web-based scripts were developed to automate the process of generating corrected images on a scene-by-scene basis.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Scripts for image standardization were web-enabled making it possible for each land cover team to standardize their own images (see <u>http://www.gis.usu.edu/docs/projects/swgap/ImageStandardization.htm</u>). Users upload the image header file from which the script extracts the gain and bias coefficients, the solar zenith angle, and Julian date to produce an Imagine model (.gmd) file populated with extracted values for the specified correction equation. Because dark object brightness values were sometimes unavailable, or their selection was ambiguous in some mapping zones, an alternative script was available that converted brightness values to at-sensor reflectance. A single method, either the modified COST or at-sensor reflectance, was used within any given mapping zone (i.e. the standardization method was consistent within mapping zone mosaics).

Spatial data layer preparation included both image-derived and ancillary data sets. Core image-derived data sets included individual ETM+ bands, the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI), and brightness, greenness and wetness bands created using Landsat ETM+ coefficients from Huang et al. (2002). Ancillary data sets were derived from 30 meter digital elevation models (DEM) obtained from the USGS National Elevation Dataset. Digital elevation model-derived data sets were created for each mapping zone and included elevation, slope (in degrees), a 9-class aspect data set, and a 10-class landform data set (Manis et al. 2001). Other ancillary data sets prepared for the region, but not used, included a "stitch map" of 1:500,000 scale state geology digital maps, a soil data set (STATSGO), and 1 kilometer resolution meteorological data (DAYMET). These data sets were not used because their scale was determined to be incompatible with the core Landsat ETM+ and 30 meter DEM-derived data sets.

"Ground truth" data were collected primarily through ground-based field work. Field samples were collected by traversing navigable roads in a mapping zone and opportunistically selecting plots that met criteria of appropriate size (1-hectare minimum) and composition (stand homogeneity).<sup>3</sup> Plot data were collected using ocular estimates of biotic and abiotic land cover elements, including percent cover of dominant species by life form (i.e. trees, shrubs, grasses, and forbs) and physical data such as elevation, slope, aspect and landform. Laptop computers using ArcView® software, Landsat imagery, digital orthophoto quads, and other ancillary information were also used for navigation and plot identification whenever possible. Each plot was identified with a paired UTM coordinate using a GPS and a visually interpreted polygon representing the survey plot.<sup>4</sup> Generally two digital photos were taken at each plot. Field data were recorded onto hardcopy field forms and subsequently entered into a database. Sufficient data were collected to assign a NVC alliance (Grossman et al. 1998) and/or ecological system (Comer et al. 2003) label to each plot. Of an approximate total of 93,000 samples obtained for the project, roughly 45,000 were collected via ground surveys during the course of the two field seasons (Appendix 2-1).

In addition to the SWReGAP ground-truthed samples as described above, these data were supplemented with sample plot data obtained from other projects roughly contemporary with the time period of our imagery (1999-2001), and via visual interpretation of aerial photography, digital orthophoto quads, or other remotely sensed imagery. Samples obtained from visual interpretation of remotely sensed imagery were given only a label identifying the land cover class. Appendix 2-1 presents the distribution of samples used in the land cover modeling process.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The ability to traverse all navigable roads varied by state and subsequently Colorado relied heavily on obtaining sample data from existing databases and visual image interpretation. In Arizona, navigable roads were sampled using a distance criteria coupled with assessment of vegetation homogeneity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Arizona collected field samples as point features (GPS x/y location) with an estimate of the radius of vegetation type, which were subsequently polygonized using an appropriately sized buffer for each sample plot.

#### Land Cover Modeling Using Decision Tree Classifiers

At the onset of the project Utah State University investigated several avenues for image classification. In particular, we experimented with methods similar to those used in previous large landscape mapping efforts such as the 1995 Utah GAP land cover project (Homer et al. 1997) and the WISCLAND project (Reese et al. 2002). Supervised-unsupervised hybrid approaches, such as those used in the Utah Gap Analysis Project and WISCLAND Project have proven effective for the groups that have used them. However, an important consideration for our project was the need to develop a common methodology that could be applied by five separate land cover teams to create a regionally consistent product.

Classification and regression trees (CART) were developed by Breiman et al. (1984) and were quickly recognized as a valuable tool for discriminating complex relationships among environmental variables (Verbyla 1987). Early spatial applications of decision trees for remote sensing-based land cover classification focused on continental and global scale mapping using coarse resolution imagery (Hansen et al. 1996, Friedl and Brodley 1997, DeFries et al. 1998, Friedl et al. 1999, Hansen et al. 2000, Friedl et al. 2002). More recently, decision tree classifiers have produced repeatable, accurate results in meso-scale mapping with Landsat Thematic Mapper imagery (Lawrence and Wright 2001, Brown de Colstoun et al. 2003, Pal and Mather 2003, Lawrence et al. 2004).

Decision tree classifiers are well suited for land cover mapping. First, as a nonparametric classifier, decision trees require no prior assumptions of normally distributed training data, which is useful as many land cover classes do not exhibit a normal distribution in spectral feature space. Second, while incorporating ancillary data sets can improve land cover class discrimination (Hutchingson 1982, Homer et al. 1997, Ricchetti 2000, Treitz and Howarth 2000), traditional parametric classifiers have difficulty dealing with differences in spectral and ancillary measurement scales. Decision trees readily accept a variety of measurement scales in addition to categorical variables. Decision tree classifiers have demonstrated improved accuracies over the use of traditional classifiers (Hansen et al. 1996, Pal and Mather 2003). Finally, decision tree software is readily available, computationally efficient, and by using a hierarchical approach to define decision rules, is intuitive to a variety of users.

Decision tree classifiers are considered an exploratory technique used to uncover structure in data (Breiman et al. 1984, Clark and Pregibon 1992). Decision trees use a binary partitioning algorithm to successively split a multidimensional "cloud" of explanatory data into increasingly homogenous subsets. Each binary split is considered a single rule in a chain of rules defining the characteristics of the response variable. Chains of rules can also be thought of as branches, with the final decision represented by a "leaf" or terminal node. For land cover mapping, explanatory variables are the spectral and ancillary data sets and the response variable is the land cover classes. Typically, decision trees recursively split the explanatory data set until no further splits are possible. Overfitting the decision tree model in this manner usually requires "pruning" the tree, otherwise rules are generated for individual plots rather than groups of plots representing land cover classes. The challenge with pruning is to establish optimal criteria so the final decision tree is neither too precise nor so general as to be meaningless.

As an alternative to pruning, "ensemble techniques" can be used to produce optimal trees. Ensemble techniques involve generating multiple trees to improve model accuracy and include "bagging" and "boosting" methods. With bagging, multiple trees are generated from randomly selected subsets of the data, where the final tree is produced from a majority "vote" by all the trees. Boosting similarly subsets the data, but generates multiple trees in succession focusing on branches of the tree that are most difficult to classify (based on misclassification rates). In this sense, boosting provides a way for an optimal tree to be generated by "learning" from previous tree models. This is an important benefit considering each split in a single, non-boosted decision tree determines all subsequent splits in the branch, some of which may be sub-optimal. Boosting, rather than bagging, has been more often employed for land cover mapping applications and has produced improved accuracies relative to non-boosted approaches (Pal and Mather 2003, Brown de Colstoun 2003, Lawrence et al. 2004).

A significant technical challenge with using decision trees for land cover mapping lies in the need to spatially apply the decision tree rules within a geographic information system. To successfully implement a boosted decision tree approach for such a large area among five separate teams, an effective tool for applying the decision trees in a spatially explicit context was imperative. Concurrent with our project, the USGS National Center for Earth Resources Observation and Science (EROS) began developing a land cover mapping tool capable of integrating the decision tree software See5/C5.0 (Quinlan 1993) with ERDAS Imagine. The tool, developed for the National Land cover Dataset 2001 (Homer et al. 2004) project (hereafter "NLCD mapping tool") provided the ideal solution to our need for an efficient integration of the decision tree software within a spatially explicit modeling environment.

#### SWReGAP Mapping Process

Land cover modeling was performed on a mapping zone by mapping zone basis with each mapping zone overlapping its adjacent mapping zone(s) with a 2 kilometer buffer (4 km overlap). The project's primary objective was to produce the most accurate and complete map possible. To accomplish this, our mapping procedures required steps we determined made best use of all available training samples. In general, this meant two things:

First, we would rely on the decision tree classifier to discriminate the bulk of the land cover classes. However, recognizing that the classifier had difficulty discriminating certain classes adequately, other methods were employed to map these classes. Natural land cover classes such as lava flows and sand dunes, which are relatively rare and/or isolated on the landscape, were typically not modeled with the decision tree, nor were

anthropogenic classes such as recently chained areas, agriculture, or developed land uses.<sup>5</sup>

Second, we conducted our assessment of map quality on an intermediate land cover map generated with a subset of samples rather than the final land cover map which was generated from 100 percent of the samples. We refer to this approach as an internal validation, which should not be confused with an accuracy assessment of the final map. The internal validation involved randomly selecting 20 percent of available samples stratified by land cover class, and withholding them from the decision tree model generation. The intermediate map (generated with 80 percent of the available samples) was assessed with the 20 percent withheld dataset, producing an error matrix and kappa statistic. The land cover modeling process concluded with the generation of the final map using 100 percent of the available data. Validation results therefore represent an assessment of land cover maps created using 80 percent of the data was made. Details of our validation approach are presented in the validation section of this chapter.

The following steps correspond with Figure 2-3 and describe the general mapping process in greater detail:<sup>6</sup>

- Delineate non-modeled classes: Delineate land cover classes anticipated to not be modeled with the decision tree classifier. These may include agriculture, developed, water, recently logged, chained, mined, etc. If GIS data exist, particularly for agriculture and developed classes, these may be used. Alternative methods for mapping these classes include screen digitizing and unsupervised clustering.
- 2) **Prepare explanatory data sets:** Explanatory data sets may be a combination of imageand DEM-derived data sets (see Data Sources). The choice of explanatory data sets may vary by mapping zone and is determined by the land cover analyst.
- 3) **Prepare sample data:** Sample data may be obtained from a number of sources (see Data Sources). All sample polygons are randomly divided into a training data set (80%) and validation data set (20%) using ArcView. The NLCD mapping tool requires individual pixels for sample observations. While each sample polygon is recognized as an independent observation, we use sub-samples (i.e. cluster sampling) within each polygon to account for spectral and environmental variability within the sample polygon. Sub-samples are randomly selected from each polygon with a maximum of 20 sub-samples per sample polygon using the Randpts extension (Jenness Enterprises 2005) in ArcView.
- 4) Model land cover classes with decision tree classifier using 80% of sample data: Using the NLCD mapping tool, explanatory variables are queried by the response variable data set to produce input files required by See5/C5.0. The decision tree model is created using the boosting option with 10 iterations in See5/C5.0. Output files from See5/C5.0 are spatially

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The adequacy of the decision tree classifier for mapping any given land cover class was driven primarily by availability of sample data. Our field data collection protocol focused on natural and semi-natural classes with the assumption that many anthropogenic classes could be mapped from existing GIS data, or could be more easily delineated via screen digitizing. Given the abundance of anthropogenic classes in eastern Colorado, the Colorado team used the decision tree to discriminate developed and agriculture land cover classes using a substantial amount of image interpreted sample plots.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Steps 1-10 outline the general mapping process as established by the regional land cover lab. Steps taken by state mapping teams may have diverted slightly from this general process.

applied in Imagine using the NLCD mapping tool. Modeling is an iterative process. After model evaluation (see step 5 below) a different combination of explanatory data sets, or additional samples may be tried to improve the model. At this time the analyst decides which land cover classes are "mappable" given the availability of training data and the discriminating capabilities of the model. When model improvement reaches a point of diminishing returns, proceed to step 6.

- 5) Internal validation of intermediate land cover map using 20% withheld sample data: Model validation is only for those land cover classes being modeled with the decision tree. Using the 20% withheld sample polygons, use the ArcView Kappa extension (Garrard 2003) to create an error matrix and calculate the kappa statistic (Congalton 1991). The Kappa extension intersects the validation sample polygons through the completed map. When the mode (i.e. most frequent) value of pixels in the land cover map agree with the validation polygon label, the reference site is considered correctly mapped.
- 6) Create final decision tree model and map using 100% of sample data: This procedure is the same as step 4 with the exception that 100% of the sample data are used to generate the decision tree.
- 7) Map refinement: The land cover map produced in step 6 is carefully examined to determine where errors exist through a combination of visual examination and evaluation of the error matrix. The decision tree classifier may not have produced good decision rules for a number of possible reasons, such as not having an adequate number of samples for a given land cover class, not having sufficient samples in a given geographic region, or limitations of the explanatory data (spectral and/or ancillary) to discriminate between land cover classes. Known geographic errors can be fixed using Imagine's Recode utility and an \*.aoi file. Known environmental errors (e.g. mapping on incorrect slope, elevation or aspect) can be fixed using a conditional statement in a post-classification model (e.g. Imagine \*.gmd file). If possible additional sample plots for a geographic area or land cover class are added and the preceding steps repeated.

At this step, it is also possible to correct errors associated with clouds. For example, where clouds exist in one date of imagery but not in others, separate models can be run (see step 4) to correctly classify the land cover classes in the cloud covered areas. Using a conditional post-classification model replace the cloud covered pixels in the final map with those from an alternate decision tree model/map that was not as good overall, but was not impaired by cloud cover (e.g. model using imagery from one season rather than two).

- 8) **Overlay non-modeled classes onto final land cover map:** Non-modeled classes retained from step 1 are converted to an Imagine file format, given the proper integer value, and combined (i.e. overlaid) with the map from step 7. This can be done with a conditional statement in an Imagine \*.gmd model.
- **9) Convert to minimum mapping unit:** Use Imagine's Clump and Eliminate functions to generalize the image to the minimum mapping unit (i.e. 1 acre). Parameters are set to use 4 connected neighbors for Clump and a minimum of 1 acre for Eliminate. When used together these steps eliminate clumps of 3 pixels or less, where the eliminated pixels assume the majority value of adjacent pixels.
- 10) Edge-match to adjacent mapping zones: Edge-matching requires that the integer values for land cover classes be standardized in accordance with SWReGAP Handbook guidelines (e.g. S001 has value 1, S112 has value 112, D05 has value 305, etc.). Once standardized, adjacent images are mosaiced using Imagine's Mosaic tool with cutline and overlap functions. Cutlines can be drawn as needed within the 4 km overlap area using an \*.aoi file.



Figure 2-3. Overview of the SWReGAP Mapping Process

### Land Cover Map Results

State land cover mapping teams were responsible for all steps in the mapping process and edge-matched adjacent mapping zones within their responsibility area. Utah State University assembled the state mosaics to create the final regional mosaic. The final map product (Figure 2-4) contains 125 land cover classes, 109 of which are ecological systems. The data set retains the 30 meter pixel resolution of the core data sets with a minimum mapping unit of 1 acre (0.40 hectares). The representative fraction scale of the data set is considered to be 1:100,000. Appendix 2-2 provides a table showing land cover classes mapped for the 5-state region, their mapped area in individual states, and their total area in the region. The final land cover map is presented in Figure 2-4.



Figure 2-4. Final land cover map showing a subset of land cover classes in the legend.

## LAND COVER MAP VALIDATION

#### Introduction

Assessing land cover map quality is an important concern for land cover mapping projects. Map quality assessment provides useful information to map users about the reliability of the map product. Various approaches to map quality assessment are recognized (Foody 2002), however, making the assessment helpful to the map user should be of primary importance (Smits et al. 1999). Typically the quality of land cover maps are assessed using a probability based sampling design (Stehman and Czaplewski 1998) with relatively large sample sizes per class (Congalton and Green 1999). These probability based approaches utilize data collected specifically for map quality assessment, and are commonly referred to as "map accuracy assessments."

We consider our approach an internal validation; "validation" in the sense that our purpose is to validate the quality of the map, and "internal" because we use data collected for, and used within, the modeling process (Shtatland et al. 2004). The approach may be viewed as a "split sample" or "hold out" method. This type of validation is not as accurate as a k-fold cross-validation (Goutte 1997) or as robust as an external validation (Shtatland et al. 2004). However, given the size and scope of our project, we determined it to be the most feasible approach providing a useful quantitative measure of map quality.

#### Land Cover Map Validation Methods

Quantitative validation methods were described briefly in the previous section dealing with the mapping process. Here we provide a more detailed explanation about the quantitative validation process used by SWReGAP, focusing on our use of fuzzy set analysis. We also describe our approach to performing a qualitative assessment of the map product.

#### Quantitative Assessment using Fuzzy Sets

The Gap Analysis Handbook recommends the use of "fuzzy set" analysis as a means of providing map users additional information about the quality of the map product (Crist and Deitner 2000). Our approach to fuzzy set assessment is based on the work of Gopal and Woodcock (1994) and described by Congalton and Green (1999). Using fuzzy set analysis for map quality assessment has proven useful in various land cover mapping efforts (Falzarano and Thomas 2004, Laba et al. 2002, Woodcock and Gopal 1992, Reiners et al. 2000). The premise behind fuzzy set theory for thematic map assessment is that thematic mapping involves placing a continuum of land cover into (somewhat artificially) discrete land cover classes. This continuum suggests that there can be different magnitudes of error between/among classes. The objective of using fuzzy sets for thematic map assessment is to provide map users with information about the frequency *and* magnitude of map error. In other words, a reference site may have been

mapped incorrectly, but how incorrect was it? An answer to this question can be provided by re-evaluating the error matrix within the context of recognized similarities among land cover classes.

The essence of fuzzy set assessment lies in the construction of a "linguistic measurement scale" to assign degrees of correctness to misclassification errors. Gopal and Woodcock (1994) suggest five levels of linguistic values ranging from "absolutely wrong" to "absolutely right" which experts to use when evaluating a map product relative to the reference sample plots. Determining the appropriate linguistic class, or error type, for any given reference plot is subject to the judgment of the error assessment "expert." Establishing objective criteria for assigning the level of error, therefore, is an important component to a fuzzy set assessment. Criteria for error assignment type may be based on seriousness of the error for its intended application (Reiners et al. 2000) or on some aspect of similarity among land cover classes.

Establishing criteria for defining error assessment types was particularly important for a collaborative project such as SWReGAP. For our project, each land cover team acted as the "expert" responsible for error type assignment. For the fuzzy assessment to be as regionally consistent as possible, establishing a regional framework for error assessment was critical. Our approach focused on criteria based on "ecological similarity." Fuzzy assessments were created for each mapping zone independent of other mapping zones rather than the region as a whole. Typically, fuzzy assessments are conducted as part of an accuracy assessment after map completion. Our approach however used the error matrices produced from the internal validation (see *SWReGAP Mapping Process*). Figure 2-5 provides an overview of the process describing the steps in greater detail.

- Regionally recognized criteria for ecological similarity types. Four major types of ecological similarity form the criteria from which similarity among land cover classes are recognized: physiognomic structure, dominant species, juxtaposition of ecological systems, and special substrates. Appendix 2-3 presents the regionally recognized ecological similarity types.
- 2) Evaluate original error matrix for ecological similarity types to create ecological similarity type matrix. The analyst evaluates each pair of land cover classes for every off-diagonal error (misclassification) cell in the original error matrix within the context of the regionally recognized ecological similarity types. While the ecological similarity types are regionally recognized, it is incumbent upon the analyst to assign ecological similarity codes. This is done based on the analyst's knowledge of the mapped ecological systems, and familiarity with the particular mapping zone being analyzed. An ecologist from NatureServe reviewed the state analysts' assignment of ecological similarity codes to ensure a regionally consistent application of the ecological criteria. Appendix 2-4 provides an example of the original error matrix for UT-5 and Appendix 2-5 presents the resulting ecological similarity type matrix.



Figure 2-5. Overview of the SWReGAP fuzzy assessment process.

- **3)** Regionally recognized relative similarity scoring system based on ecological similarity types. Based on the ecological similarity type or combination thereof, each cell that is misclassified in the original error matrix must be ranked with a numeric relative similarity score. A regionally recognized scoring system (Appendix 2-6) provides a consistent method for the numeric scoring and ranking of ecological similarities between land cover classes.
- 4) Assign relative similarity scores (numeric) to off-diagonal cells to create *relative similarity scoring matrix*. The analyst uses the regional similarity scoring system (Appendix 2-6) to assign a relative similarity score to each off-diagonal error cell (Appendix 2-7).
- 5) Produce revised measure of agreement matrices: The original error matrix (Appendix 2-4) is re-evaluated in conjunction with the matrix of relative similarity scores (Appendix 2-7) to produce revised "measure of agreement" matrices (i.e. fuzzy set assessment) for each mapping zone. Three revised error matrices are produced including: revision recognizing land cover classes that are correctly mapped, or are incorrect, but are "very similar" (scores of 4 and 5) (Appendix 2-8); revision recognizing land cover classes that are correctly mapped, or are incorrect, but are "very similar" (scores of 4 and 5) (Appendix 2-8); revision recognizing land cover classes that are correctly mapped, or are incorrect, but "very similar" or "moderately similar" (scores of 3, 4 and 5) (Appendix 2-9); and revision recognizing land cover classes that are correctly mapped, or are incorrect, but "very similar," or "somewhat similar" (scores of 2, 3, 4 and 5) (see Appendix 2-10). Revised error matrices (Appendices 2-8, 2-9 and 2-10) can be summarized for both errors of commission and errors of omission to show overall improvement as well as by-class improvement given the recognized ecological similarities among mapped classes. Appendices 2-11 and 2-12 present summaries of fuzzy set assessments for all levels for user's and producer's accuracy respectively.

#### Qualitative Assessment

It is important to recall that some land cover classes were not modeled with the decision tree classifier but were instead incorporated into the map as a post-modeling step. In addition, for some classes, withholding 20% of the available samples resulted in very few reference samples. Because of these shortfalls with the quantitative assessment, and because we believe there is value in a qualitative summary, we provide qualitative assessment summaries for each land cover class by mapping zone.

Land cover qualitative summaries are brief descriptions provided by the teams involved in the mapping process for each mapping zone. They are intended to provide a qualitative evaluation from the perspective of the land cover mapping analyst of how well the land cover class appeared to be mapped, taking into consideration the number of training and reference samples available for the cover class and the team's knowledge or familiarity with the mapping area. Often, the summary provides a narrative interpretation of the error matrix, identifying in qualitative terms where a particular land cover class is being misclassified geographically and with which land cover classes it is being confused.

### Land Cover Map Validation Results

#### Mapping Zone Assessments

Model validation as described above was performed for each mapping zone separately. While reporting kappa statistics and presenting error matrices for all 25 mapping zones is beyond the scope of this paper, these data are available to the public at <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</u>. The website provides errors of omission, errors of commission, overall percent correctly modeled, as well as the kappa statistic for each mapping zone. Since our validation approach involved withholding 20 % of available sample plots proportionally stratified across the land cover classes, few reference plots for several rare land cover classes were available for validation. Rather than exclude the rare, or non-modeled classes (e.g. anthropogenic classes) in our final product, we chose to include them without validation.

In addition to these quantitative data on model validation, the website also provides the qualitative evaluations provided by each state's land cover mapping team for every land cover class by mapping zone. The qualitative evaluations provide brief narratives summarizing perceived strengths and weaknesses of the mapped class. These evaluations are provided for all land cover classes regardless of whether they were quantitatively validated or not.

#### Regional Assessment

To provide a regional validation by land cover class, all mapping zone error matrices were combined and summarized. Appendix 2-13 presents all 125 land cover classes sorted into 5 validation groups and organized hierarchically into NLCD land cover classes. The first validation group contains classes that were not assessed regionally

because of limited validation plots (n < 20 for the region) or were non-natural classes and not the primary focus of our mapping effort. These 40 classes comprise approximately 9.5% of the total land area for the region, with more than half (5.5%) as agriculture.

The second validation group contains land cover classes with validation results from a user's perspective less than 30%. These three classes comprise less than 0.5% of the total land area for the region. All of the classes in this group are difficult to discriminate ecologically and spectrally (i.e. a grassland, steppe and savanna). For example, the error matrices for these classes reveal that the Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland was most confused with the Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe class, and the Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe class was most often confused with the Basins Big Sagebrush class.

The next validation group contains classes where agreement between the validation samples and the map was between 30 and 49% from a user's perspective. These 17 classes represent approximately 9.5% of the land area. Most comprise very small portions of the region (less than 0.5%) with the exception of three classes. Two scrub/shrub classes (Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub, Chihuhuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub) and one grassland/herbaceous class (Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland) represent substantial portions of the land area, covering approximately 30,000 square kilometers each. The two desert scrub classes are confused with the Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe class, and with each other. The Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland is mostly confused with the Intermountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub Steppe, and the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland class. The obvious trend with these poorly and very poorly mapped classes is high confusion among classes that are ecologically very similar, sparsely vegetated, or both.

The largest number of mapped classes (50) comprising the greatest proportion of land area (56.5%) are presented in the next validation group. Here agreement between the validation samples and the map was between 50 and 70%. The most notable classes for relative abundance on the landscape are the Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (7% land area) and Inter-Mountain Basins Big Basin Sagebrush Shrubland (8% land area) classes, with user validation rates of 69% and 59% respectively (producer's rates of 81% and 77%).

Fifteen classes were validated with results greater than 70% agreement between the validation samples and the map. These 15 classes represent approximately 24% of the total land area. The 85 classes that were validated represent 91% of the total land area. Overall correct classification for these 85 classes was 61% (KHAT statistic = 0.60; n = 17,030).

The overall figure of 61% provides a summary measurement for the region of the decision tree classifier's performance relative to the reference samples used for validation. It is important to recognize that validation results vary by land cover class (Appendix 2-13) and by mapping zone. For example, matrix-forming land cover classes

(i.e. "extensive and contiguous...with wide ecological tolerances typically ranging in size from 2,000 to 100,000 ha" (Comer 2003)) such as certain forests, shrublands and grasslands typically represent a larger portion of the landscape and typically had a larger number of training and validation samples. These classes typically had better validation results than small or linear patch types with relatively few training and reference samples. Land cover classes on the fringe of their geographic range in some mapping zones may be more poorly mapped than elsewhere because the size and distribution of samples (both for training and validation) was limited. Lastly, it is important to note that the validation results are based on the intermediate land cover map using the 20% withheld dataset. Since the final map was produced using the withheld samples, we assume that the final map is an improvement over the intermediate map that was validated.

## DISCUSSION

### Land Cover Mapping Methods

A primary objective of our land cover mapping process was to develop a methodology that was repeatable and could be consistently applied by multiple land cover mapping teams. In this regard we believe the decision tree classifier method was successful. The intuitive nature of the decision tree classifier and the easy-to-use software met this objective very well. Compared to hybrid supervised-unsupervised image classification approaches used in large land cover mapping efforts (Homer et al. 1997, Reese et al. 2002, Ma et al. 2001) we found the decision tree classifier considerably more time-efficient. Whether decision tree classifiers are a more effective tool for discriminating land cover classes was not specifically researched by our project. However Hansen et al. (1996) and Pal and Mather (2003) observed a measure of superiority over traditional parametric image classification techniques.

The use of spectro-physiographic mapping zones appeared to be a successful strategy for dividing the region into manageable working units and an effective means of constraining spectrally and environmentally similar land cover classes to logical geographic boundaries. Production of multi-scene mosaics for each mapping zone appeared successful as well. While image standardization did not result in seamless mosaics, satellite scene boundaries that were apparent generally were not problematic.<sup>7</sup> This may be due to the slight effects of atmospheric attenuation in the arid southwest, and may be of greater concern in other environments.

Identifying the optimal combination of predictor data sets for the decision tree classifier was a major focus in our efforts to develop a regional mapping methodology. Initially, we considered establishing a regional set of standard predictor data sets for all mapping zones in the region. Our concern was that adjacent land cover maps would not edgematch adequately if different sets of predictors were used for model development. Eventually, it was decided that each land cover analyst would choose the predictor data sets they determined worked best for a given mapping zone. As expected, the availability of multiseason imagery did improve image classification in most areas. However, use of imagery from a single season occasionally produced better results. The suite of core predictor data sets to choose from was consistent throughout the region, namely three seasons of ETM+ imagery with the analyst's choice of image transformations, and any combination of DEM derivatives (slope, aspect, landform, etc.). Concerns about edgematching adjacent land cover maps proved negligible in most instances. In fact, successful matching of adjacent land cover maps could indicate accurate land cover mapping since completely different models converged upon similar predictions of vegetation distribution (see Figure 2-6). Good edge-matching was also facilitated by frequent communication and coordination between the land cover mapping teams and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Given highly seasonal spectral variability in Colorado, it seemed that scene boundaries needed to be accounted for. Therefore, scene boundaries were included as a predictor layer in Colorado.



NatureServe ecologist who assisted in decision-making in order to maintain regionally consistent application of the ecological systems concepts across the project.

Figure 2-6. Example of edge-matching between UT-4 and CO-1

With the exception of work by Pal and Mather (2003), we found little published literature testing the training data requirements of decision tree classifiers for land cover mapping. Pal and Mather (2003) tested increasing training dataset size and found that classification accuracy increased linearly with size until reaching approximately 300 samples per class, whereupon additional training samples added little benefit. While not tested specifically, it is reasonable to assume that this is a general guideline and that the optimal number of samples for a given land cover class will vary with the spectral and environmental distinctiveness of each class, as well as the rarity of the class on the landscape. Identifying the optimal number of training samples per land cover class per mapping zone remained an elusive objective throughout the project and is certainly fertile ground for further study. We did discover, however, that sampling proportionally to the expected spatial abundance of land cover classes on the landscape produced superior results over using a roughly equal number of samples per class, which tended to over-map spatially rare classes. These findings are similar to those of McIver and Friedl (2002).

Given the importance of proportional sampling, the role of an adequate stratification strategy presents itself as another area where improvements could be made. As mentioned, our ground-truth collection strategy aimed primarily at obtaining as many samples as possible across the landscape via the road network. Some attempts were made to collect data in proportion to expected spatial abundance of land cover, and a minority of samples was collected via remote sources (e.g. aerial photography and digital orthophoto quads). While we were pleased with the number of samples collected for the region (approximately 93,000), in hindsight we recognize that more samples, more adequately stratified across the landscape within each mapping zone, could have been obtained using a more formal sampling design strategy combining ground based collection with a stronger effort at collecting remotely obtained samples.

### **Map Validation**

Throughout the course of the project we recognized the importance of providing a measure of map quality to users of the land cover map. While limitations of time, money and logistics prohibited a formal accuracy assessment (i.e. external validation with probability-based sample design), we believe the methods we employed provide useful information to map users. Our regional framework establishing criteria for fuzzy assessment helped standardize the process among the five mapping teams. However, in hindsight the criteria for the 'moderate' and 'somewhat' similar categories may be more liberal than advisable, and as such validation results at these levels of the fuzzy assessment are more optimistic than is warranted. The 'very similar' category we feel provides a reasonable assessment of map quality given the assumptions and rational of fuzzy set theory for map quality assessment. We recognize that not all land cover classes were quantitatively assessed throughout the region, but are satisfied that our assessment provided some measure of quantitative assessment for 85 of the 125 classes representing 91 percent of the land area.

### **Project Coordination**

Project coordination relied heavily on frequent communication between the regional land cover lab, the five land cover mapping teams, and the NatureServe ecologist who were familiar with the ecological systems for the project area. Correspondence via email especially a project listserve—was critical for dissemination of information related to mapping methodologies and protocols. Also invaluable to project coordination were monthly teleconferences involving all land cover mapping personnel and the NatureServe ecologist. Face-to-face meetings (yearly) and hands-on workshops (three over five years) throughout the course of the project were essential not only for conveying important methodological techniques, but also as a means of fostering interpersonal relationships among team members. While the focus of this paper has been primarily on technical and methodological aspects of the land cover mapping effort, the importance of interpersonal relationships in a project of this nature should not be underestimated. Differing opinions regarding methodological and philosophical approaches to the effort were not uncommon. However, there was also a spirit of dedication to the work, and ultimately an understanding that in order to successfully complete the project, teamwork was essential.

From a project coordination standpoint, an important consideration was the recurring theme of how much autonomy each state would have in making decisions independent of group consensus. Perhaps the most difficult decision land cover analysts faced was deciding if a given land cover class should be mapped. Decisions to model a given land cover class were primarily driven by adequate representation within the training samples of a particular land cover class for a given mapping zone. Thus, the adequacy of the sample training set was a critical deciding factor for the land cover analyst. State analysts decided which classes to map based on their knowledge of the landscape or the perceived importance of the land cover class in the mapping zone. For example, riparian areas and invasive annual grasses, though difficult to map, may have been included if the analyst felt they were important features on the landscape. Also, when compiling the regional map some classes that were determined to be mappable in one state were aggregated or eliminated in the regional product to maintain regional consistency.<sup>8</sup>

In hindsight, more objective procedures could have been established to determine land cover class mappability. The ecological system classification as a regional target legend was developed by NatureServe during the course of the project, and must be recognized as a "working classification" (Comer et al. 2003). As such, the mappability of many classes using meso scale satellite imagery and ancillary data is not fully known. Developing better methods to determine land cover class mappability over large geographic areas is another area ripe for future research. Lastly, other regional, national and local projects such as LANDFIRE, SAGEMAP, several NPS Vegetation Mapping Program and USFWS refuge mapping projects are already benefiting from the great amount of effort that was involved on behalf of the SWReGAP and NatureServe in developing a stable legend suitable for a project of this scope.

## CONCLUSION

The goal of this project was to produce a land cover map that would not only be used for gap analysis, but would also be a useful product for individuals, agencies, and organizations. The methods outlined in this paper aimed at developing a land cover map using objective and replicable methods. We found the spatial and radiometric characteristics of the Landsat ETM+ sensor effective for mapping the vegetation of the Southwest into ecologically meaningful classes with reasonable accuracy. The decision tree classifier offered considerable benefits to the mapping process, and allowed us to map many land cover classes to our satisfaction. However, in addition to the sophistication of decision tree classifiers, the adequacy of training data, the establishment of objective criteria, and regional standards for consistency, we must recognize the importance of human reason in the mapping process.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For example not all states distinguished irrigated and non-irrigated agriculture and in the regional product these were combined into a single agriculture class. Also, Colorado mapped several land cover classes at the alliance level and mapped Conservation Reserve Program lands as a separate class. These have relevance for Colorado but were not included in the regional product.

One may ask whether we met our objectives of producing a map that improves upon the state-based, first generation GAP land cover maps for the region. A rigorous comparison between the SWReGAP map and previous maps would be time consuming but might prove useful. Another approach would be to design a statistically rigorous accuracy assessment of our product. One measure of the quality of this map relative to first generation state-based land cover maps, worth noting, is that more than ten times the number of training samples were used for the SWReGAP map than the previous maps combined. Furthermore, an important accomplishment of our effort is that instead of five different legends, there is now one to represent the region seamlessly. Ultimately, the value of the map will be determined by how frequently and how well the map is used. For that, only time will tell.



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

## CHAPTER 3

## PREDICTED ANIMAL HABITAT DISTRIBUTIONS AND SPECIES RICHNESS

Kenneth G. Boykin, Bruce C. Thompson, Robert A. Deitner, Don Schrupp, David Bradford, Lee O'Brien, Charles Drost, Suzanne Propeck-Gray, Wendy Rieth, Kathryn Thomas, William Kepner, John Lowry, Chad Cross, Bruce Jones, Tammy Hamer, Chris Mettenbrink, Katy Jo Oakes, Julie Prior-Magee, Keith Schulz, J. Judson Wynne, Cynthia King, Jennifer Puttere, Scott Schrader, and Zach Schwenke.



#### Recommended Citation:

Boykin, K. G., B. C. Thompson, R. A. Deitner, D. Schrupp, D. Bradford, L. O'Brien, C. Drost, S.
Propeck-Gray, W. Rieth, K. Thomas, W. Kepner, J. Lowry, C. Cross, B. Jones, T. Hamer, C.
Mettenbrink, K.J. Oakes, J. Prior-Magee, K. Schulz, J. J. Wynne, C. King, J. Puttere, S. Schrader, and Z. Schwenke. 2007. Predicted animal habitat distributions and species richness. Chapter 3 *in* J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding author: K.G. Boykin is to be contacted at kboykin@nmsu.edu, Tel. 575-646-6303

## INTRODUCTION

All species range maps are predictions about the occurrence of those species within a particular area (Csuti 1994). Traditionally, the predicted occurrences of most species begin with samples from collections made at individual point locations. Most species range maps are small-scale (e.g., >1:10,000,000) and derived primarily from point data to construct field guides which are suitable, at best, for approximating distribution at the regional level or counties for example. The purpose of the GAP vertebrate species maps is to provide more precise information about the current predicted distribution of individual native species' habitats according to actual habitat characteristics within their general ranges and to allow calculation of predicted area of distributions and associations to specific habitat characteristics.

GAP maps are produced at a nominal scale of 1:100,000 and are intended for applications at the landscape or "gamma" scale (heterogeneous areas generally covering 1,000 to 1,000,000 hectares and made up of more than one kind of natural community). Applications of these data to site- or stand-level analyses (site--a microhabitat, generally 10 to 100 square meters; stand--a single habitat type, generally 0.1 to 1,000 ha; Whittaker 1977, see also Stoms and Estes 1993) will likely reveal the limitations of this process to incorporate differences in habitat quality (e.g., understory condition) or necessary microhabitat features such as standing dead trees.

Gap analysis uses the predicted distributions of animal species habitat to evaluate their conservation status relative to existing land management (Scott et al. 1993). However, the maps of species distributions may be used to answer a wide variety of management, planning, and research questions relating to individual species or groups of species. In addition to the maps, great utility may be found in the literature that is assembled into databases used to produce the maps. Perhaps most importantly, as a first effort in developing such detailed distributions, they should be viewed as testable hypotheses to be confirmed or refuted in the field. We encourage biologists and naturalists to conduct such tests and report their findings in the appropriate literature and to the Gap Analysis Program such that new data may improve future iterations.

Previous to this regional effort there were five individual state-based projects in the Southwestern U.S., describing the likely present-day distribution of species by habitat type across their ranges. Ordinary species (i.e., those not threatened with extinction or not managed as game animals) are generally not given sufficient consideration in land-use decisions in the context of large geographic regions or in relation to their actual habitats. Their decline, because of incremental habitat loss can, and does, result in one threatened or endangered species "surprise" after another. The distribution and habitat information that exists for most of these species is also frequently truncated by state boundaries. Effective management of such wide ranging species requires a regional approach. Simply creating a consistent spatial framework for storing, retrieving, manipulating, analyzing, and updating the totality of our knowledge about the status of each animal species is one of the most necessary and basic elements for preventing further erosion of biological resources.

Spatial models are an important tool for understanding wildlife-habitat relationships and for guiding natural resource management decisions (Stoms et al 1992, Pearce and Ferrier 2000, Penhollow and Stauffer 2000, Brugnach et al. 2003). For predictive models to be useful tools in the decision making process, they must be accurate, general, and easy to apply (Van Horne and Weins 1991). Bolger et al. (1997) have suggested modeling wildlife-habitat relationships at the landscape scale because management decisions are often best applied at this coarse level, and the Gap Analysis Program takes this approach to conservation.

The animal habitat modeling component of SWReGAP provides this kind of regional perspective on the distribution of vertebrate species in the Southwest. Prior to this effort, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah all had existing GAP vertebrate habitat distribution models, but these earlier state-based projects used varied modeling approaches, different model datasets, and different methods (Edwards et al. 1995, Homer and Edwards 1996, Thompson et al. 1996, Schrupp et al. 2000, Halvorson et al. 2002). In addition, no effort was made to extrapolate range or habitat information across state boundaries. The data and documentation from these original efforts were not equally available and not all terrestrial vertebrate species were modeled by all states. Significant advancements in knowledge of species ecology and computer modeling technology have taken place since completion of these earlier efforts. Species habitat modeling for this project was directed at providing regional habitat models that spanned the five southwestern states. Our objective was to provide end users with a dynamic mapping solution that met Gap Analysis objectives, as well as uses and objectives suggested by potential end users (Deitner et al. 1999). We recognized the importance of documenting model attributes, and providing the capability to modify models so they could be updated as better information became available. We addressed these objectives for a list of over 800 terrestrial vertebrate species (Appendix 3-1).

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section details the methods used to create animal habitat distribution models and to evaluate their completeness and accuracy. In the second section, we present results of the modeling process. The third section presents summary information on species richness, based on the animal-habitat distribution models. In the fourth section, we evaluate the accuracy of the models using standard GAP protocols. Finally we discuss the overall process, strengths and weaknesses of the models, potential uses of the models and associated data, and recommendations for further work.

## METHODS

Project staff for the animal-habitat distribution modeling component of the SWReGAP project represented a broad range of expertise and were drawn from a variety of State, Federal, and university sources for each of the five states in the project area (Table 3-1). Personnel from the five states helped design the modeling approach, gathered literature sources, reviewed and synthesized habitat information, and developed and reviewed the corresponding models. The workload for the project was divided among the five states, with New Mexico also serving in a coordination role as the regional laboratory. Each state was allocated a list of species for which they had lead responsibility for creating, reviewing, and modifying models. To support the collaborative effort, we held four workshops, had regional breakout sessions at National GAP meetings, conducted monthly conference calls, and communicated through email and a listserv.

	Name	Affiliation	
Arizona	Charles Drost	USGS SBSC	
	Trevor Persons	USGS SBSC	
	Jut Wynne	USGS SBSC	
Colorado	Tammy Hamer	NREL/CSU	
Colorado	Chris Mettenbrink	NREL/CSU	
	Lee O'Brien	NREL/CSU	
	Katy Oakes	NREL/CSU	
	Don Schrupp	Colorado Division of Wildlife	
Novodo	David Bradford	EPA	
Inevaua	Chad Cross	EPA	
	Bruce Jones	EPA	
	Melanie Luna	EPA	
NT N <i>T</i>	Ken Boykin	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
New Mexico	Bob Deitner	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
(Regional Lab)	Thomas Kamienski	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
	Cindy King	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
	Suzanne Propeck-Gray	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
	Jennifer Puttere	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
	Zachary Schwenke	NMCFWRU/NMSU	
Utah	Wendy Rieth	USU	

 Table 3-1. Project staff involved in development of animal-habitat distribution models for the SWReGAP program, and their affiliations.

The regional laboratory, with State inputs, created a habitat modeling protocol and databases (<u>http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/SWReGAP</u>) to ensure regional consistency. GIS datasets to be used in regional modeling were identified by the entire project team, and were obtained or created by the regional lab. Model iterations were run at the regional

and Colorado lab and provided through a website and through remote networking to lead states. States focused on literature review, species model creation, preliminary model review, and model modification. The draft models and associated data (report, range, and model) were submitted to expert review, and were revised as needed, based on the reviews.

We explored a variety of cartographic modeling techniques to represent habitat relationships in SWReGAP. These included the standard overlay method employed by Gap Analysis projects and three variations (index overlay, Bayesian methods and fuzzy sets) that incorporate uncertainty into the habitat representations. Index overlay offers a subjective consideration of the relative value of habitat variables, Bayesian methods can incorporate the uncertainty of knowledge-based habitat associations and base layer inaccuracies into the models (O'Brien 2005), and fuzzy sets allows for the inclusion of ambiguity at the habitat boundaries (Bonham-Carter 1994, Burrough and McDonnell 1998, Hill and Binford 2002). For simplicity, we produced the standard GAP binary representations (suitable or not suitable) with embedded range information (see range coding below), but still see the utility of producing non-binary representations incorporating uncertainty.

We defined Wildlife-Habitat Relationships (WHR) as a statement describing resources and conditions present in areas where a species persists and reproduces or otherwise occurs. Relationships can be modeled to predict habitat composition, and if the relationships are represented in a cartographic plane they can predict the presence of habitat spatially. A more detailed definition is:

A wildlife-habitat relationship (WHR) is a statement, mathematical or textual, about a demonstrated or inferred association of an animal with observable and describable physical or biotic features on the horizontal and vertical landscape. The relationship need not be directly cause-effect; it can involve a correlative association of the direct habitat component with a feature that is more readily observed or detected.

A WHR model is a textual, mathematical, graphical, or combination statement that predicts abstractly or directly what conditions are considered necessary for a taxon's habitat to exist and where it likely exists on a landscape. All models are inherently inaccurate to lesser or greater degrees depending on background knowledge of the taxon and the resolution of constituent spatial data used in the model. To be usable in a WHR model that predicts a mappable distribution of habitat for a taxon, an association must be able to be stated or measured in terms of an information metric (directly or remotely sensed) that can be defined in a coordinate system.

The following sections describe the major steps in developing a species list for the fivestate area, gathering and synthesizing habitat information, developing WHR models, and translating these into GIS models.

### **Taxa Inclusion Decision Rules**

A preliminary species list for the five-state area was prepared by combining species lists from each state (based on the state GAP projects, plus other state and regional references). This list was then reviewed for errors and taxonomic changes. Taxonomy and scientific and common names were updated and standardized following the Integrated Taxonomic Information System (ITIS, http://www.itis.usda.gov). Familiar synonyms and common names were retained to avoid confusion and improve the usefulness of the resulting information.

We then developed "taxa inclusion decision rules" to identify the final list of species for modeling (Appendix 3-2). These rules are effectively "exclusion" rules, insofar as they identify circumstances under which we elected not to develop models. In summary, species-level taxa were excluded from consideration for modeling when any of the following were true:

- Taxa with only incidental, accidental, or vagrant occurrence in the five-state area;
- Taxa for which authoritative taxonomic sources have eliminated species standing;
- Taxa that have been extirpated from the Southwest for 20 years or over five demographic generations (whichever is a greater time span). Taxa extirpated from one or more states, but still present elsewhere in the region were modeled across the region.
- Taxa representing unsuccessful introductions or re-establishment in the area subject to distribution modeling;
- Exotic (non-native), primarily urban-dwelling taxa;
- Exotic taxa with restricted occurrence, associated with specialized or ephemeral landscapes or only under human manipulation such that the taxon cannot be modeled effectively.

We initially identified a total of 849 species-level taxa for modeling. Individual states reviewed this list and made further suggestions regarding additions and deletions. As species modeling progressed, 30 species were excluded from the final modeling list, based on the taxa inclusion rules. This resulted in a total of 819 species for which we developed distribution models

### Taxa Allocation Decision Rules

We developed taxa allocation decision rules to distribute the lead modeling responsibilities among all projects (Table 3-2). The decision rules focused on the overall distribution of the species, and also attempted to capitalize on previous modeling experience, and expertise within the modeling team on different taxonomic groups (Appendix 3-2). All projects had opportunity for input on the modeling approach and results for all taxa, regardless of the lead assignment. The taxa allocation decision rules were as follows:

• Occurring in 1 state only: assigned to that state project;

- Occurring in 2 states: assigned to the state that accounts for the majority of the species range;
- Occurring in 3 or 4 states: assigned to the state that accounts for the greatest part of the species range OR to New Mexico if widely distributed across all of the states;
- Occurring in all 5 states = assigned to New Mexico.

Table 3-2. Number of taxa allocated to individual projects for lead responsibility for theSouthwestern Regional Gap Analysis Project. There were 30 species removed from final modelingdue to decision rules.

Project	Number of Species	
Arizona	188	
Colorado	158	
New Mexico	389	
Nevada	73	
Utah	41	
Total	849	

### Mapping Standards and Data Sources

The minimum mapping unit (MMU) of the habitat models is 0.4 hectares (1 –acre) because this is the minimum for land cover mapping (see Land Cover Mapping Chapter). We used a set of core data layers that were addressed for each wildlife habitat relationship model. These core data layers included land cover (SWReGAP land cover map), elevation, aspect, slope, hydrology (distance to hydrologic features), and soils (soil texture, depth, and percent rock outcrop; see Table 3-3). Other layers specifically addressed in the habitat-modeling protocol were mountain ranges, temperature (mean annual minimum and maximum), precipitation, and landform (Manis et al. 2001).

GIS coverages for surface waters are from the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD). Each type of water (lakes, perennial streams, etc.) is selected from the USGS NHD and a grid is created where each pixel is defined as the (integer) Euclidean distance (in meters) to nearest water type. Pixels are selected if they are less than the specified distance.

All soils coverages were derived from the STATSGO database (State Soil Geographic database, available from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/statsgo/). Soils coverages include soil depth, texture (clay, loam, silt, cobble, etc.), and rock outcrops. Each MUID (STATSGO polygon ID) was reclassified to SWReGAP soil attributes (see Table 3-3).

Through the process of compiling habitat information, several other datasets were identified as potentially useful (e.g. mines/caves), but because of a lack of regional datasets or completeness we did not use these. For range delineation we used the 8-digit hydrologic units (See Range Delineation). We also used two mountain range coverages.

Ivallie	Source	Description
uggawatarahada	NHD	8 digit Hydrologia Unit Codes (HUCs)
usgswatersneuss		
regional_dem	National Elevation Dataset	Elevation
disttolake	NHD	Distance (in m) to lakes without Great Salt Lake
disttolakeGSL	NHD	Distance to lakes (in m) with Great Salt Lake
Disttoperrflow	NHD	Distance (in m) to perennial streams
disttosprings	NHD	Distance (in m) to Springs
disttowetlands	NHD	Distance (in m) to Wetlands
distTointerFlow	NHD	Distance (in m) to Intermittent Springs
disttointerstill	NHD	Distance (in m) to intermittent lakes, playas, etc.
swlandcover	this project	The SWReGAP land cover map
swregapstatsgo	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of clay.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of loam.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of stone.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of silt.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of gravel.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of boulder.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of sand.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of cobble.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of rocky.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of shallow.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of pan soils.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons containing greater than 50% of deep soils.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons with rock outcrop up to 15%.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons with rock outcrop 16-30%.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons with rock outcrop 31-65%.
	STATSGO	Soils polygons with rock outcrop greater then 65%.
landform	this project	Same as used by SW GAP land cover (Manis et al. 2001)
gapmtn	Regional DEM	Mountain range data set created by using a roughness coefficient algorithm on DEM
StateBoundary	USGS DLG	For display
MajorRoads	USGS DLG	For display
Rivers	USGS DLG	For display
aspect	Regional DEM	Derived from regional DEM. Aspect (in degrees) was reclassed to SWReGAP categories (See Handbook).
slope	Regional DEM	Derived from regional DEM. Value is (integer) slope in degrees.
Mountains	Regional DEM GAP land cover	Screen digitized mountain ranges based on DEM and previous Gap Analysis land cover dataset.

# Table 3-3. GIS coverages used in the animal species modeling process. Refer to the metadataaccompanying the digital data for more complete descriptions.NameSourceDescription

One coverage was derived using a roughness coefficient based on the DEM and the other was a screen-digitized layer based on elevation and previous land cover maps. The default for modeling was the roughness coefficient, but the screen digitized dataset was used in specific models.

To facilitate modeling, all datasets were converted to ERDAS Imagine .img files (See Distribution Modeling). For modeling purposes two sets of data were created: 1) 240 m resolution for model review and testing; and 2) 30 m resolution for final model production.

### Mapping Range Extent

We used the Sub-basin hydrological cataloguing units (8-digit HUC: USGS/Office of Water Data Coordination) to delineate ranges for each species and used a coding system to label each polygon. Species ranges can be readily described by HUCs and HUCs are tractable for GIS. The 8-digit HUCs provided polygon units to create range maps for each species.

We used a 3-character coding system to label HUCs for species ranges (Table 3-4). The coding for historic/recent distribution was known (K), potential (P), or extirpated (X). Absence is implied for all polygons not attributed. This base coding system was modified based on reproductive use (breeding, non-breeding, both) and seasonal use (migratory, wintering, summering, year-round). For example, a species that is known in the HUC, and breeds and summers in the watershed was labeled K13. We used a wide variety of sources for species range delineation, emphasizing the most recent published literature. Previous Colorado GAP and New Mexico GAP data were also incorporated, as was a dataset of element occurrence within watershed obtained from NatureServe. To ensure consistency, all states consulted and reviewed a set of regional and national references for range depiction (Table 3-5).
Species Kange Defineation		Code
Occurrence Known	<b>Description</b> Species is known or probably occurs within the watershed. Species may have been repatriated recently	1 <sup>st</sup> Character K
Potential <sup>1</sup>	in a portion of the historical range. No known locations, but species could be within the watershed based on proximity and habitat characteristics.	Р
Extirpated	Species with historical occurrence that have been chosen to be modeled.	Х
Reproductive Use		2 <sup>nd</sup> Character
Breeding <sup>2</sup>	Species is known to breed within the watershed.	1
Non-Breeding*	Species is known to occur within the watershed when non-breeding.	2
Both*	Species is known to occur within the watershed throughout the year.	3
Seasonal Use		3 <sup>rd</sup> Character
Migratory	Species is known to occur within the watershed during its regular migration in Spring and/or Fall.	1
Wintering	Species in known to winter within the watershed.	2
Summering	Species in known to summer within the watershed.	3
Winter and Summer	Species uses watershed during summer and winter	4

Table 3-4. Definitions and coding system identified for use in range delineation for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project. The code consists of three characters, corresponding to (in order) distribution, reproduction, and seasonal use (e.g. K14). Species Range Delineation Code

<sup>1</sup> Potential was identified in the model process but was largely included within the K code with the addition of "probable" in the definition. <sup>2</sup>Breeding and non-breeding habitat may apply to bird species, bats, and some other mammal species.

#### Table 3-5. List of standard references used for animal-habitat distribution models

#### **Amphibians and Reptiles**

- Degenhardt, William G., Charles W. Painter, and Andrew H. Price. 1996. Amphibians and Reptiles of New Mexico. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Hammerson, Geoffrey, A. 1999. Amphibians and Reptiles in Colorado, 2nd ed. University Press of Colorado and Colorado Division of Wildlife, Niwot, Colorado.
- Lannoo, M.J., ed. 2005. Amphibian Declines: Status and Conservation of United States Species. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Lowe, C.H. 1964. The amphibians and reptiles of Arizona. Pages 153-174 In C.H. Lowe (editor). The Vertebrates of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Lowe, C.H., C.R. Schwalbe, and T.B. Johnson. 1986. The venomous reptiles of Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix
- Schwin, M.A., and L. Minden. 1979. Utah reptile and amphibian latilong distribution. Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City. Publication No. 80-1.
- Stebbins, R.C. 1985. A Field Guide to Western Reptiles and Amphibians. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts.

#### Birds

Alcorn, J.R. 1988. Birds of Nevada. Fairview West Publishers, Fallon, Nevada. 418 pp.

- American Ornithologists' Union. 1998. Check-list of North American Birds. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.
- Andrews, R., and R. Righter. 1992. Colorado Birds. Denver Museum of Natural History, Denver, Colorado. 442 pp.
- Hayward, C.L., C. Cottam, A.M. Woodbury, and H.H. Frost. 1976. Birds of Utah. Brigham Young University Press, Provo, Utah.
- Kingery, H.E (Editor). 1998. Colorado Breeding Bird Atlas. Colorado Bird Atlas Partnership and Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, Colorado. 636 pp.
- Ligon, J.S. 1961. New Mexico Birds and Where to Find Them. The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 360 pp.
- Monson, G., and A.R. Phillips. 1981. Annotated checklist of the birds of Arizona. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Phillips, A.R., J. Marshall, and G. Monson. 1983. The Birds of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona. 220 pp.
- Poole, A.F., P. Stettenheim, and F.B. Gill (Editors). 1992. The Birds of North America. The American Ornithologists' Union and the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Walters, R.E., and E. Sorenson, editors. 1983. Utah bird distribution: latilong study. Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City. Publication 83-10.

#### Mammals

- Cockrum, E.L. 1960. The Recent Mammals of Arizona Their Taxonomy and Distribution. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona. 276 pp.
- Durrant, S.D. 1952. Mammals of Utah Taxonomy and Distribution. University of Kansas Publications, Museum of Natural History 6:1-549.
- Feldhamer, G.A., B.C. Thompson, and J.A. Chapman (Editors). 2003. Wild Mammals of North America Biology, Management, and Conservation. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland. 1216 pp.
- Findley, James S. 1987. The Natural History of New Mexican Mammals. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 164 pp.
- Findley, James S., Arthur H. Harris, Don E. Wilson, and Clyde Jones. 1975. Mammals of New Mexico. The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 360 pages
- Fitzgerald, James P., Carren A. Meaney, and David M. Armstrong. 1994. Mammals of Colorado. University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado. 467 pp.
- Hall, E.R. 1981. The Mammals of North America, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Wiley Interscience, New York, N.Y.
- Hall, E.R. 1946. Mammals of Nevada. University of Nevada Press, Las Vegas, Nevada. 710 pages [1995 is a reprinting].
- Hoffmeister, D.F. 1986. Mammals of Arizona. University of Arizona Press and the Arizona Game and Fish Department, Tucson. 602 pp.
- Wilson, D.E., and D.M. Reeder, editors. 1993. Mammal Species of the World: a Taxonomic and Geographic Reference. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Wassink, Jan L. 1993. Mammals of the Central Rockies. Mountain Press Publishing Company, Missoula, Montana. 161 pp.

## Wildlife Habitat Relationships

WHRs were developed from a variety of sources including previous GAP efforts in the 5state region (Edwards et al. 1995, Thompson et al. 1996, Schrupp et al. 2000). Where possible, we used "legacy" information from the past state-based GAP modeling efforts. However, most of this information was more than 10 years old, and differences in land cover legends necessitated comparing the original information and current information to associate species with the SWReGAP land cover legend. Because of differences in methods and datasets, much of this information could not be used. Project personnel identified a set of standard state and regional references to use as a starting point for the modeling effort (Table 3-5). We began by reviewing this information, along with online databases including the NatureServe Explorer database (http://www.natureserve.org/explorer/), Biota Information System of New Mexico

(<u>http://fwie.fw.vt.edu/states/nm.htm</u>), Colorado GAP Analysis (<u>http://ndis1.nrel.colostate.edu/cogap/gapframe.html</u>), and internal database such as the Colorado Wildlife Species Database. These sources were considered the minimum for habitat information, and habitat modelers used a variety of sources to search for additional habitat references as time allowed.

WHRs were constructed following a standard protocol (Appendix 3-3). The protocol provides a user interface / template, automated tools, and associated reference information for defining range limits and compiling habitat associations for each species. The template could also be printed for use as a hard copy form for recording habitat association information (Appendix 3-4). Appendix 3-3 lists the main habitat components included in the WHR database and protocol, and provides a link to the full protocol.

Regional vegetation alliances were one of the primary components of the WHR models. We modified vegetation alliance data to fit with the final SWReGAP legend of 125 ecological systems, national land cover dataset classes, and disturbed classes. Modelers selected vegetation / land cover classes that were most similar to habitat descriptions in published accounts for each species. This process was aided by a cross-walk of familiar habitat classes frequently used in habitat descriptions (e.g. Merriam's life zones) to the GAP vegetation classes (see Land Cover chapter). Many references list one or more individual plant species (e.g. creosote bush or juniper) in describing species habitats. In these cases, we attempted to match the plant species to the corresponding vegetation class (or classes), or ecological system. Alliances were subsequently cross-walked into the appropriate ecological systems.

We identified elevation attribute parameters based on regional elevation ranges. In some cases state elevation limits were combined to get a range for the entire SWReGAP area, and in other cases we had to extract elevation data from sources that covered a broader area. In these latter cases, we frequently had to trim the elevation range to values that reflect the five-state Southwest project area (e.g. by eliminating low-elevation records for a species, when those low elevations are from the species' range in Mexico). Species experts and field location points were also queried when data were available. Separate models were created if elevation extremes for one or two states were very different from the rest, for example, greater short-horned lizard (*Phrynosoma hernandesi*).

We did not use slope for the majority of the species habitat models. This attribute was selected only if a species account indicated it was important. Aspect was also not included for the majority of the species habitat models. This was due to lack of information for these parameters for most species in published accounts.

Proximity to hydrological features was an important modeling component. We created different data layers for perennial streams, perennial lakes, intermittent streams, intermittent lakes, wetlands, and springs/seeps. In many cases the perennial stream coverage provided a surrogate for riparian vegetation that is often difficult to map with TM imagery (See land cover chapter). We used distance categories for modeling (0-50m 0-100m, 0m-500m, 0-1000m, or if >1000m the explicit number). If explicit data were available we used that information. For species that have a hydrologic association but do not occur within the hydrologic feature itself we modified the model to exclude the water body (e.g. many species occur near lakes but not in the lake itself).

For soil identification we used the STATSGO dataset and identified 3 modeling components of soil texture, soil depth class, and percent rock outcrop (Thompson et al. 1996). Because of the scale of the STATSGO dataset (1:250,000) this layer was considered a constraining layer. Soil polygons were identified in STATSGO as possessing that soil texture if the polygon contained >50% of that soil type. Rock outcrops were identified based on the percentage of outcrop within the polygon (see Table 3-3).

Mountains were included in a model only if the species was limited to mountainous areas. Once the species' overall range limits had been delineated, it was constrained to all mountains within the selected watersheds, using as a mask the regional mountain range coverage based on roughness coefficient. Some species are known (based on literature and/or museum records) to occur only in specific mountain ranges. In these cases, we used a separate polygonal coverage to limit the model to those specific mountain ranges.

We compiled bibliographic references for each model to document model attributes used (Appendix 3-5). We did not limit references by a specific time frame and inclusion of information was based on current applicability to each species modeled and was at the judgment of the teams compiling the WHRs.

We were not able to model some species using the above WHRM procedure. Several species required multiple models because of differences in habitat over the range of the species or variation in elevational range due to latitudinal differences over the study area. For these species, two models were created. Several species models (Amargosa toad, *Bufo nelsoni*; Jemez Mountains Salamander, *Plethodon neomexicanus*) had to be modified and run after creation of the model file to fit specific life history or distribution traits of the species.

#### State Modeling Methods

The availability of distribution and habitat data for vertebrate species varied among states. This included both published material (e.g. Nevada has a dearth of recent published compilations on vertebrate species in the state) and also information from previous modeling efforts. For this reason, details of the modeling work varied somewhat among the five state teams. These differences are described below.

#### Arizona

Arizona completed models for 170 species. Habitat and distributional range narratives for each species were developed from exhaustive literature reviews. The approach of the Arizona team was as follows: first, five on-line abstract services (Science Direct, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts Internet Database Service, Kluwer Online, Springer Online, and Blackwell Publishing Synergy Online) were searched for each species. Then, the literature cited section of each published and unpublished report that was obtained was reviewed for additional relevant literature sources. Also, all literature cited within a given literature source was verified. For example, if Strong and Bock (1990) stated "acorn woodpeckers select for cottonwood granary trees (Phillips et al. 1964)," this statement was confirmed within Phillips et al. (1964). For each species, a literature-cited summary and an assessment of the literature used was written. Arizona used a set of decision rules for model parameterization.

#### Colorado

Colorado completed models for 153 species. Colorado produced two models for the two subspecies of sharp-tailed grouse, and also produced two separate models for browncapped rosy-finch and sandhill crane, for a total of 155 models. Colorado used the habitat affinity data from the Colorado Wildlife Species Database (CWSD) along with other state databases (breeding bird atlas, amphibian surveys, etc.) to derive habitat relationships for the original Colorado Gap Analysis Project (COGAP). This COGAP database was used as the starting point for compiling habitat relationships for the SWReGAP project. Colorado cross-walked the Anderson Level II land cover types used in COGAP to the National Vegetation Classification System (NVCS) types used in SWReGAP. These land cover associations were combined with other parameters from CWSD (hydrology, elevation, soils, etc.) to pre-populate the SWReGAP WHR database. Literature and database searches were then conducted to incorporate more recent information and to extend the models beyond Colorado's borders. Much of the information gathered was from recent taxa accounts, local studies, and on-line databases such as the Cumulative Index for Mammalian Species and NatureServe. CWSD is a thoroughly referenced database created by species experts citing original studies and literature. When habitat association information was gleaned from this data source, "CWSD" was cited as the source instead of citing the original references. Land cover assignments were made by cross-walking habitat relationship data from other classification systems or by interpreting descriptions in species accounts in the literature. Most references used dominant plant species to describe habitat type, but in a few cases, there were direct matches to community descriptions to NVCS Ecological Systems. All relevant land cover associations were included, anticipating that range, elevation, and

other limits would effectively trim the modeled habitats. New references were captured during the species expert review workshops if they supported substantial modifications to the current modeling variables.

#### Nevada

Nevada completed models for 69 species. The Nevada group produced two models for the greater short-horned lizard, so the state produced a total of 70 models. Nevada used literature that was pertinent to the data layers available to build models. First, general sources were reviewed that likely had habitat information for a species (e.g., field guides, and state and regional references on taxonomic groups), and sources that compiled information from original sources (NatureServe Explorer, Mammalian Species Accounts, Catalog of American Amphibians and Reptiles, state wildlife databases). From these and other sources, additional references were identified that were likely to provide information particularly pertinent to the available model parameters, such as studies on habitat conducted within the 5-state area. The Nevada team did not do an extensive search of the primary literature and cited only literature that was sufficient to justify the parameters selected for the model.

#### New Mexico

New Mexico completed models for 387 species. New Mexico produced two models for Virginia rail, so the state produced a total of 388 models. As the regional laboratory, New Mexico modeled those species that occurred throughout the region. NM-GAP (1996) data were used as the initial starting point to identify habitat associations and references. Other online data sources such as NatureServe Explorer and Biotic Information System of New Mexico (BISON-M) were also used. From this starting point, combined with standard state and regional references, further literature was sought through reference search engines including SciSEARCH, BIOSYS, and Wildlife Worldwide. Every attempt was made to obtain original citations to ensure proper synthesis. Literature cited within the models was focused on those sources either directly related to the model parameters or those that identified potential future modeling modifications.

#### Utah

Utah completed habitat models for 39 species. Utah produced two models for the black rosy-finch, so the state produced a total of 40 models. First, a variety of databases were searched for primary literature on species' habitat and range, including Biological and Agricultural Abstracts, BIOSIS Previews, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, CABDirect, Geobase, and Wildlife Worldwide. If there were many publications available for a particular species, as with many game and sensitive species, only those studies that were from or near the SWReGAP region were reviewed. Government documents and the Utah State University library database were also searched for potentially relevant books and theses. The state and regional references identified by the project were always consulted and cited if a species occurred in the particular state (e.g., Mammals of Utah by Durrant) and these were typically the best sources for initial generalizations and range delineations by state. Tertiary sources and internet databases (including Utah-GAP, CA-WHR, CWSD, BISON-M, and NatureServe Explorer) were used to check for missed references

but Utah avoided citing these sources in most cases. The primary literature provided the most detailed and rigorous information on habitat, particularly when the study specifically addressed habitat issues or was conducted in the SWReGAP region. In addition, primary literature was important in gathering the most up-to-date information, given that some of the state references are decades old and even the internet databases were at least a few years out of date. Once literature was collected, notes were compiled and summaries were written for each species to assess the state of knowledge about a species range and habitat, as well as to aid in generating an overall concept of a species' habitat. Utah originally composed lengthy species accounts but these were later edited to fit within the 500 word limit imposed by the database, and to include only relevant information that would justify the range map and selection of model attributes.

### **Distribution Modeling**

To facilitate habitat modeling we created a set of Microsoft Access<sup>tm</sup> databases based on the recommendations of Deitner et al. (1999). The intent was to create a database that could be used to manage information and construct each species' wildlife habitat relationships model. The resulting databases are a tool for modeling and for end-users. Included within the database is a user-friendly method to define range limits using the 8digit HUCs (drainage sub-basins). The FrontEndArc9 database provides a series of forms or wizards that guide the modeler through the habitat model. Data are stored in the WHRDataStore database. This structure allows more than one user to access and work on any given model. All previously discussed model attributes were available for use in modeling including DEM derived datasets (slope, aspect, elevation, landform), hydrology datasets (distance to streams, lakes, wetlands, intermittent streams, and intermittent lakes), mountain ranges, and soil (see Table 3-3). WHRDataStore stores the data in clauses defining model attributes for each species.

The FrontEndArc9 database gives modelers the ability to select model attributes in plain text, to provide references to document the model development, and to update model background information,. The database also allows the modeler to compile an ERDAS Imagine script to facilitate modeling (Figure 3-1). The script can either be run immediately or sent to a queue that can batch process the models. Scripts are then queued in a third database (GISEngine.mdb) that manages the Imagine Graphical model Files (.gmd) and runs the models in batch mode. Figure 3-1 shows a sample model equation for Couch's spadefoot with the database code defined as:

SmartOverlay(\$[And matrix], \$[SWReGAP 173429 Watersheds], \$[SWReGAP 173429 Elevation], \$[SWReGAP 173429 EcolSystems], \$[SWReGAP 173429 LandForm])



Figure 3-1. Example Wildlife Habitat Relationship Graphical Model for Couch's spadefoot (*Scaphiopus couchii*) ITIS # 173429 for Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project. The model depicts (from top down) the watershed relationship, the elevation association, the ecological system associations, and the landform associations. End-users can modify these as needed.

We created two regional datasets for use in the modeling. A 240 m resolution dataset was used to test models and provide models quickly to experts for review. A 30 m resolution dataset was created for the final model. Because of the size of the region and physical size of the model datasets, the 240m models took 2-5 minutes to complete, while the 30m resolution models could take 1 - 3 hours.

We created a fourth database to help in model development and internal and external review (SWReGAP-VSA.mdb). This database was linked to ArcGIS and provided habitat modelers a real time visual sensitivity analysis (VSA). Though not a quantifiable process like Gonzales-Rebeles et al. (2002), this tool gave habitat modelers the ability to add layers to the model in sequence to observe the sensitivity of the model to each data set. This process also allowed verification of models created through scripting.

After draft models were completed for all species, the models were reviewed (See Model Review). Comments from the reviews were provided to the lead state for each species to make adjustments to the models. Model modification was an iterative process, as modelers reviewed and incorporated expert information. Once modified models were reviewed we compiled and ran the final models.

There was some variation in development of models among the different taxonomic groups, due to differences in life history and the habitat components that were generally most important. Some examples of these differences are noted below.

#### Mammals

Modification of distance to water for mammals occurring near lakes but not in lakes was done post model file (.gmd) creation. This was particularly useful in rodent species that are riparian obligates but not aquatic species. For some species (e.g. bats), large distanceto-water associations were used with an "and" statement of land cover. Bats were modeled with varying range codes to account for their seasonal life history (e.g. migratory species with distinct summer and winter ranges).

#### Birds

We modeled all bird habitats including breeding, migratory, and wintering. There is increasing recognition of the importance of managing and protecting habitat used throughout a species' life cycle. This is true for birds, in particular, which may have critical needs for migratory stopover habitats and winter habitats, in addition to their breeding habitats. Habitat modelers had the ability to separate breeding, migration, and winter habitat by land cover type or by range. For most species (those whose breeding and winter distributions do not overlap), range was sufficient to distinguish between these categories.

### Reptiles

Soils attributes were used for many reptiles, from the STATSGO soils dataset. Soil characteristics are frequently important for reptiles, particularly burrowing species, however the coarse scale of this dataset limited its usefulness. Many reptile models had to be modified to allow the distance to water dataset to model species near lakes but not in lakes. This was completed after creation of the model gmd file.

### <u>Amphibians</u>

Most amphibian models were based on our hydrology datasets to a greater or lesser extent. We had to modify our model procedures to create maps for species such as the Amargosa toad (*Bufo nelsoni*), which has such a limited range that we had to create a polygon specifically to limit the model extent to the species' small known range. We recognized the need to separate lakes by size for modeling some amphibians, but did not include this step in our current effort because of dataset complexity.

## **Model Review**

Each state reviewed all of the models for the species for which they were responsible. We conducted an additional internal review by having each state review the models created by other states. Finally, we had an external review that used outside experts to review the range information, habitat data, and resulting models for the species included in the SWReGAP area. Consistency in modeling effort was a considerable task given the number of habitat modelers (Table 3-1), the number of species, and the broad spectrum of data available for each species. Our internal review was intended primarily to ensure an adequate degree of consistency across all species included in the modeling effort. The purpose of the external review was to evaluate model correctness. The internal review included dividing species by taxonomic groups and reviewing the basic modeling attributes of the models (e.g. use of vegetation types vs. hydrology vs. soils or other habitat characteristics). We also reviewed the extent of literature available for each species, how that literature was used to select habitat parameters, and which habitat parameters went in to each species model.

The external review process was undertaken once the internal review was completed. External reviews were solicited from individuals and groups who had expertise with particular species or taxonomic groups. Reviewers included staff from Federal and State agencies (such as State wildlife and natural resources agencies), university scientists, and private individuals and groups familiar with species occurrence and natural history in the Southwest (e.g. the Great Basin Bird Observatory in Nevada) (Appendix 3-6). We provided the external reviewers with a standard briefing about the GAP animal-habitat distribution models, along with an explanation of the type of critique and comments we were looking for in the model review. Workshops for purposes of external review were held in Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. These workshops discussed the process of modeling, the limitations of the process, and the intent of the habitat models. We asked reviewers to look at three review documents including the species report, range, and model (Examples in Appendix 3-7). The report contained all the information that was used in the model in plain text. The range map depicted the range limits of the species including our range coding scheme. The habitat distribution model was the spatial depiction (including overall range and habitat) of our final model. All were provided via the web or through paper copy. We asked reviewers to identify their level of confidence in the overall model, the range limits, and the report content, and also the individual datasets used in modeling (Appendix 3-8). We also provided areas for the reviewer to include comments and suggest additions to the map and/or model. We asked that they provide references when possible; otherwise comments were cited as personal communication.

In Colorado, three centralized introductory workshops were held in February 2005, and follow-on workshops in Grand Junction in March 2005. Some expert review meetings were design to leverage work being done for development of Colorado's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Subsequent workshops were held on an individual basis with taxa experts as necessary. In Nevada, the external review consisted of two workshops held in Las Vegas in April 2005. The Great Basin Bird Observatory was

contracted to complete reviews for all bird species. In Utah, one workshop was held in March 2005 and a subsequent workshop was held in July 2005. In New Mexico, we began working with the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) in August 2004. In conjunction with the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy we worked with NMDGF biologists identifying suitable habitat for each species of greatest conservation concern (SGCN). Several subsequent workshops were held with other experts specifically for bats and small mammals. In Arizona, the external review consisted of online document reviews. Experts were contacted by phone and briefed on the process for the review.

### **Final Models**

Model reviews generated wide interest throughout the region. We received more than 1000 external reviews covering most of the species that were modeled. Comments and suggestions from both the internal and external reviews were directed to the modeling team responsible for each species. The lead team then reviewed and evaluated the comments. Although all comments were recorded, not all were incorporated into the models. Recommended changes that were not supported by references or verifiable data, for example, were not included in the final models. Model modification was an iterative process as modelers reviewed and incorporated expert information, as it was received. Although models were frequently modified based on information from species experts, any errors in modeling remain the responsibility of the SWReGAP team. Habitat modelers made final judgments regarding model attributes.

Once model review and modification was completed, all model information was submitted to the regional lab in New Mexico. The New Mexico lab, in turn, compiled and ran the final models with assistance from the Colorado Team.

### Accuracy Assessment

Assessing the accuracy of the predicted animal-habitat distributions is subject to many of the same problems as assessing land cover maps, as well as a host of more serious challenges related to variability in habitat use over extensive ranges, year-to-year variations in abundance, and the difficulty of detecting many species at low numbers. These are described further in the Background section of the Vertebrate Distribution Assessment chapter of the GAP Handbook available from "Conducting a Gap Analysis" page at the website http://gapanalysis.nbii.gov. It is useful to provide some measure of confidence in the results of the gap analysis for species collectively, if not individually or by taxonomic group (comparison to stewardship and management status), and to allow users to judge the suitability of the distribution maps for their own uses. We feel it is important to provide users with a statement about the accuracy of GAP-predicted animalhabitat distributions but were limited by available resources and practicalities of such an endeavor. We acknowledge that habitat distribution maps are never finished products but are continually updated as new information is gathered. This reflects not only an improvement over the modeling process, but also the opportunity to map true changes in species habitat distributions over time. Assessing the accuracy of the current maps would be useful to potential users.

Our goal was to produce maps that predict distribution of terrestrial vertebrate habitats and from that, derive total species richness and species habitat extent with an accuracy of 80% or higher. There is an effort in the GAP process, however, to err on the side of commission. In other words, to attribute species as possibly present when they are not. There are two primary reasons for doing so: first, few species have systematic, unbiased known ranges and we believe science is best served by identifying a greater potential for sampling and investigation than a conservative approach that may miss such opportunities; second, in conducting the analysis of conservation representation (see the Analysis Chapter), we believe it most appropriate to identify a species that may need additional conservation attention that is then refuted by further investigation rather than identifying a species as sufficiently protected that is discovered not to be by its subsequent loss.

The standard Gap Analysis assessment is a measure of agreement to describe the degree of concurrence between habitat model predictions, and species occurrences as documented by inventory studies. We obtained 14 species lists from the National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring (I&M) program for the Northern Colorado Plateau network and have identified data from the southern Colorado Plateau Parks (including northern Arizona and Northern New Mexico), and the Sonoran Desert network of National Parks (including southern Arizona and southern New Mexico). These species lists are contemporary with the SWReGAP land cover mapping and animal-habitat modeling effort. Each dataset identifies species that occur or probably occur within the park. We conducted an initial assessment on species lists for the Northern Colorado Plateau NPS network. This assessment, however, identified a bias in the outcome because accidental, rare, and occasional species were included with the species lists. Our protocol for identifying species and mapping habitat eliminated these species based on these factors. Thus, omission error is significantly increased by using this data. We have omitted that analysis from this report in an effort to further refine the assessment and provide more accurate analysis. Further research is warranted to understand the nature of the omission and commission errors. GAP prefers to err on the side of commission errors and these types of errors may be due to error in selecting model parameters, error in model input datasets, or the detectability of the species in the field. Omission errors may be the result of model parameters, model datasets, or may be related to listing species that probably occur within the park but actually do not or listing species with accidental or transitory occurrence. Our models excluded ranges where the species was identified as transitory or accidental.

## RESULTS

We reviewed information on a total of 849 species listed as occurring in the five-state SWReGAP region. Of these, 30 were not modeled, primarily because they were vagrants, or had very few records of occurrence in the SWReGAP region. Out of the total of 849 species on our preliminary list, then, we developed models for a total of 819 species. This included 215 species of mammals, 437 species of birds, 130 species of reptiles, and 37 species of amphibians. We were also able to map seasonal distribution of bird habitat and some mammal habitat when data were available.

In addition, we developed two different models for five species that had disjunct ranges, or otherwise had range characteristics that warranted splitting the range into separate models. These species were the greater short-horned lizard, Virginia rail, sandhill crane, black rosy-finch, and brown-capped rosy-finch. Also, we produced two models for the sharp-tailed grouse, for the two subspecies that occur in the study region (the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse and the plains sharp-tailed grouse; *Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus* and *T. p. jamesi*, respectively). Hence, considering the extra models produced for these six species, we developed a total of 825 different models.

Land cover and elevation were the most used habitat associations. The detail of the land cover map provided ecoregional differences needed to differentiate between species habitat use throughout the range. The use of landform proved to be useful in some instances but was not as widely applicable as we initially anticipated. Soil characteristics are an important aspect of habitat for many species, but the soils datasets are not of sufficient detail to be used in most models. When SSURGO data (Soil Survey Geographic database, being developed by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service) become available for the 5-state area, the finer scale of those data may allow significant enhancement for habitat models using soil characteristics.



Least Chipmunk (*Tamias minimus*) Photographer: John J. Mosesso, NBII Digital Image Library

#### Mammals

We mapped habitat for 215 mammal species in the five-state region of SWReGAP (e.g. Figure 3-2). An additional six species were initially included on the list but were not modeled, either because they have very marginal occurrence in the five-state area (e.g. ocelot, *Leopardus pardalis*), or because of taxonomic changes that resulted in a species that was originally on our list being excluded from the area (e.g. Townsend's ground squirrel, *Spermophilus townsendii*, was originally on our list; this group has recently been split, and the species now bearing the name *S. townsendii* is restricted to southern Washington state). Bats were difficult to model because of the relative lack of information on foraging habitat, and the relatively poor understanding of the life history of the group. Much sampling for bats is focused around water and thus biases available habitat information. As with many of our bird models, we included seasonal range within bat models when appropriate.

Some rodent species (e.g. chipmunks and squirrels) presented a challenge in modeling because of their requirements for microhabitat features that are not mappable on a regional scale, and also because of the paucity of habitat information for other species. Many of these models could use further modification.



Figure 3-2. Potential Habitat Model for Northern Flying Squirrel (Glaucomys sabrinus).

## Birds

We created 437 bird species habitat models for the SWReGAP region (e.g. Figure 3-3). We initially included an additional 17 species on our working list, but did not produce models for them. Almost all of these species had very limited occurrence within the five-state project area (most of these were eastern vagrants, or Mexican species that rarely stray north into southern Arizona and New Mexico). We were able to model most species' habitat with just one model, based on varying range and land cover associations. Four species had to have two models created to separate breeding and non-breeding habitat (Virginia Rail, Sandhill Crane, Black Rosy-finch, and Brown-capped Rosy-finch).



Figure 3-3. Potential habitat model for Gunnison sage-grouse (Centrocercus minimus)

## Reptiles

We mapped habitat for 130 reptile species in the five state region. Five additional species originally on our working list were not modeled because they were introduced species restricted to a few urban areas (Mediterranean house gecko, *Hemidactylus turcicus*, and black spiny-tailed iguana, *Ctenosaura hemilopha*), or because they were modeled as part of another species due to taxonomic changes (variable skink, *Eumeces gaigeae*, Big Bend patch-nosed snake, *Salvadora deserticola* – modeled as part of *S. hexalepis*, and *Tantilla planiceps* – split from what is now called the southwestern black-headed snake, *T. hobartsmithi* in our area). One species (*Phrynosoma hernandesi*) was modeled using two models based on differing elevations (Figure 3-4). Soil type was often used for this taxonomic group. The availability of finer scaled soils data (SSURGO) would likely enhance models.



Figure 3-4. Eastern (top) and western (bottom) habitat models for greater short-horned lizard (*Phrynosoma hernandesi*). Two models were created to reflect an elevation break between the two geographic areas.

## Amphibians

We mapped habitat for 37 amphibian species within the five states (Figure 3-5). An additional five species were researched but were not modeled because of taxonomic changes, loss of the species from our area, or because of marginal occurrence. The western chorus frog, *Pseudacris triseriata*, and spotted frog, *Rana pretiosa*, are no longer considered to occur in our area; we modeled the boreal chorus frog, *P. maculata*, and the Columbia spotted frog, *R. luteiventris*, instead. The Ramsey Canyon leopard frog, *Rana subaquavocalis*, is now considered conspecific with the Chiricahua leopard frog, *R. chiricahuensis*. The Tarahumara frog, *R. tarahumarae*, has been extirpated from its limited U.S. range for over 20 years (though a reintroduction program is underway). The African clawed frog, *Xenopus laevis* is an introduced species limited to a few artificial ponds in the Tucson area. Hydrology was an important component in modeling amphibians. The models for most frog species incorporated hydrology or riparian land cover types. Toads were modeled over broader expanses because of their ability to use intermittent ponds that are often not adequately included within hydrography data sets.



Figure 3-5. Habitat model for Sacramento mountain salamander (*Aneides hardii*) produced in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

# SPECIES RICHNESS

GAP has often been associated with the mapping of species-rich areas or "hotspots." Richness maps identify where the same numbers of elements co-occur in the same geographic locations. (In the case of our data, the total numbers of animal species per drainage area or smaller geographic unit, across the five-state Southwest area.) These are color coded or shaded in intensity from the highest numbers of known or possible cooccurrence (richness) to the lowest. Richness is only one of many pattern metrics that may be derived using the data. Richest areas may or may not indicate best conservation opportunities. They may occur in already protected areas or may represent mostly already protected species or those not at risk. Still, they are often a useful starting point to examine conservation opportunities in combination with other analyses described in this report's Introduction and in the Analysis section. We also feel they may be useful for other rewarding applications such as identifying places of interest for wildlife observation and study.

We believe the individual species models are of greater value than just the richness summaries. Having distribution models for all species allows more detailed analysis of species habitat overlap by looking at the complementarity of different species' ranges. Aggregating individual models offers the opportunity to evaluate the spatial assemblages of species and to compare and contrast habitat values across the landscape. We present species richness maps for selected taxonomic groups to illustrate potential use of the data. Because of the dataset size, we did not complete an evaluation of richness for all species. Figure 3-6 displays species richness of bats throughout the five-state region, and Figure 3-7 shows species richness of rattlesnakes in the genus *Crotalus* in the region.

The individual species models contributing to richness metrics should be considered in the different spatial locales that have similar richness values, in that those locales may support predominantly different assemblages of species.



Figure 3-6. Bat species richness for the entire Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.



Figure 3-7. Species richness for rattlesnakes (genus *Crotalus*) for the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project study area.

Richness is depicted for all mapped taxa (Figure 3-8), and by taxonomic groups (Figures 3-9 to 3-13). Richness is presented by HUC and by 1-km grid cell with ramped colors from cool (low richness) to hot (high richness). Natural breaks within the data are used to provide classification within these maps. Seasonality and reproductive use are not included.

Total species richness is highest in southwestern New Mexico and southeastern Arizona (Figure 3-8). This area includes the Madrean Archipelago and is influenced by species ranging north from Mexico. Species richness in southern New Mexico is also augmented by Chihuahuan desert species. In New Mexico, relatively high richness (391-437 species) occurs throughout the Rio Grande Valley. The Front Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado is identified as having relatively high species richness. This is due in part to the presence of Great Plains species and Rocky Mountains species. The Colorado River including the Lake Mead area is also relatively high in species richness. It is important to note that overall richness is weighted heavily by the number of bird species within the project area and both spatial depictions are similar (cf. Figure 3-10).



Figure 3-8. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 819 species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

### **Mammal Richness**

Species richness within the mammals exhibited an east west pattern following many of the mountainous areas of the region. (Figure 3-9). Southwestern New Mexico and southeastern Arizona are high in species richness (85-96 species). The Rio Grande Valley is also an area of higher richness as are the mountainous regions of northern New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah. Richness is also high along the Mogollon Rim in Central Arizona.

Areas in Utah and Nevada with high mammalian species richness are associated with mountains such as the Wasatch in Utah and the Sierra Nevada in western Nevada. In southern Utah, the richness is associated with several desert ecosystems occurring within a transition zone from the Great Basin desert. The area of high richness in southwestern New Mexico and southeastern Arizona comprises the Madrean Archipelago and is influenced by species extending north from Mexico.



Figure 3-9. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 215 modeled mammal species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

### **Bird Richness**

Bird species richness follows a roughly similar pattern to that shown by mammals, with the Madrean ecosystem highest in species richness (Figure 3-10). The Rio Grande corridor is also an area of high bird species richness as is the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado. Areas of lowest species diversity are desert areas within Nevada, Arizona, and Utah and some of the Great Plains grasslands of Colorado and New Mexico.

Breeding bird richness (Figure 3-11) shows a decidedly different pattern from year-round richness. The number of species by HUCs transitions into a broader pattern with large portions of Colorado, Nevada, and Utah identified as having high species numbers, along with southeastern and central Arizona, and southwestern, central, and northern New Mexico. The deserts of southwestern Arizona, the plains of eastern Colorado, and the eastern New Mexico border area have relatively low numbers of breeding species.



Figure 3-10. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 437 modeled bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.



Figure 3-11. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for modeled breeding bird species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project. Breeding Birds data includes hydrologic units with specific breeding and year round residents.

### **Reptile Richness**

The greatest reptile richness occurs in the southern part of the SWReGAP project area (Figure 3-12) in New Mexico and Arizona. Similar to amphibian richness, this may be due to the confluence of the Madrean, Chihuahuan, Rocky Mountains and Great Plains ecoregions. Additional ecoregion influences are the Sonoran and Mojave deserts. The lowest richness is found primarily in the mountainous regions of Utah and Colorado (3-17 species). Reptile species richness shows a pronounced north to south cline in increasing species numbers. This pattern is obviously modified by elevation, particularly in the Rocky Mountains and the mountains of north-central Utah.



Figure 3-12. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 130 modeled reptiles in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

### **Amphibian Richness**

Amphibian richness is highest in the south and southeastern portions of the SWReGAP study area (Figure 3-13). This includes a large portion of New Mexico and southeastern Arizona. This is likely a factor of many ecoregions combining in these areas including the Great Plains, Madrean, Rocky Mountains and Chihuahuan Desert. The majority of Nevada and the western deserts of Utah have relatively few amphibians, as do most of the higher Rocky Mountain HUCS (2-5 species).



Figure 3-13. Species Richness by 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit for 37 amphibian species in the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

# DISCUSSION

### **Modeling Process**

We modeled 819 species with varying degrees of confidence. We focused our efforts at the species level except for one species, the sage-grouse. Sage-grouse populations in the region show distinct habitat differences, and the species is of special conservation concern in the areas where it occurs. The models were based on detailed literature review to develop Wildlife Habitat Relationships. Literature information included data for delineating species ranges and categorical and classification variable requirements for animal-habitat modeling. The WHR protocol and related MS Access database user interface served as a general guideline for model development, but we recognized that each species was different and could not always be modeled the same way.

The resulting models predict habitat for vertebrates of the Southwest within the known distribution range of each species. Regional habitat modeling is subject to several assumptions:

- 1. The models are based on suitable habitat for each species;
- 2. The models do not depict different degrees of habitat quality;
- 3. The models do not attempt to project species abundance; and
- 4. The models show habitat where the species may occur at some point in its life history.

Range limits depicted in the SWReGAP habitat models are defined in terms of watershed units (HUCs). Defining range limits in this way tends to overpredict species ranges to a greater or lesser extent. Finer scale HUCs (14-digit) or topologically derived watersheds may provide a truer range delineation but difficulty in delineation may be significantly increased. These finer scale partitions would better approximate distributions. Ranges for species varied and because of the regionalization we may have over -generalized these ranges. We suggest end-users take our models as a baseline and modify them based on the needs of the region in which they are working.

Vegetation structure is an important component in habitat selection. The land cover map provided partial structure given the ecological system definition (woodland, forest, etc.), however smaller structure changes and successional states are not available. Microhabitat features are also important particularly to the smaller and less vagile species. These features are difficult to model at local scales much less at the regional level.

Our modeling effort did not take into account a number of potentially important factors affecting habitat suitability, including prey sources, competition with other species, or predation. Competitive exclusion was mentioned by reviewers in several workshops and further research regarding this may be useful. Similarly, we initially considered temperature and precipitation as potential habitat components within the models, but ended up excluding these data also because of the general lack of information available for each species and the scale of the dataset.

Biogeographical factors such as patch size, distance to habitat patches and habitat edge were also not included in the modeling effort. In general, it was not possible to include these factors because of limitations on our knowledge of species ecology, or because we lacked adequate capabilities for depicting these factors within GIS models of this scale. We did include patch size (the size of habitat area needed for a species to successfully persist over time) in our review of habitat modeling literature. However, we found little specific data to model patch size for any species in the region. This is an important species specific modeling consideration and one in that would help elucidate metapopulation dynamics. We considered using home range size to estimate patch size, but home-range size is not necessarily directly related to patch size. Information on maximum distance between occupied patches would also be needed to successfully model patch size effects. Patch size was not included in the final models, but information is available within the database to post-process the final SWReGAP models.

### **Expert Review**

Review of draft models by state and regional experts was an important part of the modeling process for SWReGAP. Experts ranged from personnel with state and Federal wildlife agencies, to university biologists, NGOs, and biological consultants. Overall, more than 80 reviewers took part in the review, evaluating the model information and range depictions for 680 of the 819 species that were modeled. There were a total of 1023 reviews, including species that were reviewed more than once. Our original goal was to have each model reviewed by an expert in each state inhabited by the species. However this was not possible given limited time and available reviewers. Instead, we modified our approach to attempt to have each species reviewed at least once.

Reviews ranged from corroboration of species range to reviews of the entire model. These reviews helped to identify errors within models and provided additional references and data to enhance models. The overall impressions of reviewers concerning draft models ranged from good to poor. With some models, the experts were more pleased with the models than were our habitat modelers. The review identified several concerns with literature derived modeling efforts. Our literature review was necessarily brief given the scale and scope of the project. Reviewers were able to provide more detailed specific information and provided specific references that were not identified in our initial data-gathering.

#### Accuracy Assessment

Assessment of accuracy is useful but should be an iterative process. Withholding data that may improve a model may not provide an assessment as much as ensure a model will suffer from either omission or commission errors. Further assessment of the habitat models is warranted and we encourage these efforts. There are species occurrence datasets from the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, NatureServe, natural heritage programs, and others that can be used in that endeavor. These datasets would provide another metric for measuring agreement with habitat models. As good inventory data becomes available, this data should also be used to analyze the distribution models

throughout the region. We encourage land managers to assess these models and provide feedback.

## **Limitations of the Models**

Several limitations were noted through the modeling process. The first limitation is limited available habitat information for many species – a limitation that has been consistently identified in past GAP efforts. We had a broad array of species to deal with and extreme variability in the data available for use in the modeling. Another limitation was the size of the region that we modeled. We may have very precise information in one area of the range but very limited knowledge in other parts of the range. Another limitation was the lack of structural data that we could incorporate into the modeling aspect. Habitat information may be specific to a seral stage or age class of dominant plant species but the land cover map did not provide that depth of detail. This is not a new problem with deductive modeling as the limitations of modeling microhabitat at large landscape scales is well documented (Van Horne and Wiens 1991, Gonzales-Rebeles et al. 2002).

Depicting detailed species distribution models over a large biogeographic region was one of the main motivations for the SWReGAP project, but the regional aspect of the project was limited in many cases by the lack of availability (or poor quality) of regional datasets. For example, a comprehensive GIS layer showing mines and caves would be useful in modeling bat habitat, but regional datasets were considered incomplete. Because many important reference sources are based on state boundaries, there were other inconsistencies exhibited at a state level. There were also some major regional features that required special treatment. For example, the Great Salt Lake provided a major issue in modeling. We created two data layers, one to remove the Great Salt Lake from fresh water lakes, and one including the Great Salt Lake with all other lakes. Prior to this, we identified errors in habitat models such as the Boreal Toad (*Bufo boreas*) and Beaver (*Castor canadensis*).

There were also limitations in terms of available literature to develop models. State based references range from detailed, authoritative compilations to very general works, and the usefulness of these references for our purposes was correspondingly quite variable. For example, published reptile and amphibian data sources are available for New Mexico (Degenhardt et al. 1996) and Colorado (Hammerson 1999), but are lacking or are outdated in the other 3 project states. These provided excellent resources and this effort would have benefited by similar works in the other states. Similarly, references for mammals (Fitzgerald et al. 1994) and birds (Andrews and Righter 1992) were also dated except for the recent work for Colorado.

Different states also took a more or less extensive approach to reviewing species / habitat literature. A few states conducted a relatively exhaustive review of available literature, while others focused on the major references that pertained to particular species and their state or region. The expert review process did identify references we were unaware of and in some cases substantially added to the models. We encourage identification of

other references that may enhance these models. Habitat studies have become more popular and published more often. The SWReGAP models should be viewed as dynamic, and should be modified to reflect changing knowledge as it becomes available.

We took an approach that put state modelers in the lead for developing individual models. This created a focus of habitat modelers on "their" species and inadvertently resulted in less communication among states than would have been desirable for wide-ranging species. We did include a step after draft models were produced, in which each state reviewed models from other states of all species that occurred within that state (we referred to this as "internal review;" e.g. Arizona reviewed and commented on all models of species occurring in Arizona, regardless of which state produced the model). This step improved the quality and regional consistency of the final models. Local datasets and knowledge could be incorporated in this way, and the step would also facilitate expert review.

The completeness of the hydrography dataset was questionable but did prove useful on a regional basis. Modification of this dataset has been occurring on a state by state basis and further updates would improve our models. We used the medium resolution data (1:100,000), and our modeling effort would likely be enhanced by using the finer scale (1:24,000) dataset, if appropriately attributed.

In a project such as this, timing can also play a limiting role. Our database was a work in progress through much of the project. The final product is a useful and efficient tool to collect and maintain wildlife habitat relationship data, but our habitat modelers and database programmer learned an extensive amount as we progressed to the current stage. Insofar as possible, a better approach would be to have the database created prior to initiating the habitat modeling phase.

Over the course of the SWReGAP project, our modelers came up with some novel approaches to modeling species. However, the need for regional consistency and to complete the project on time sometimes took precedence over this creative thinking. We had to choose between what was best for the regional product versus what would make 1 or 2 species models better. We endeavored to capture this information in the database so that it might be used in the future. We did model several species with specific, non-standard modifications, including the Amaragosa toad, Jemez Mountains salamander, and the spotted bat. Amargosa toad and Jemez Mountains salamander both used individual range limits. The spotted bat model incorporated a distance to cliffs dataset created toward the end of the project specifically for this species.

## Suggestions for Future Work

Our SWReGAP models are based on a deductive modeling approach and should be useful in providing the sampling frame for field efforts and conservation planning. Deductive modeling approaches such as we used for the regional animal habitat distribution models provide a variety of useful information to land managers and conservation planning. We provide species habitat models for 819 terrestrial vertebrate species at a coarse scale. In general, models are useful when they provide more information then previously available (Johnson 2001). However, there are alternatives to the approach we used, and there are many additions and improvements that can be made in future efforts.

Peterson (2005) compares and contrasts GAP methods to the Genetic Approach to Rulebased Production (GARP) approach The arguments made by Peterson do highlight the differences between a deductive modeling approach such as GAP and an inductive modeling approach such as GARP. The SWReGAP process allows end users to modify models to be either more specific to their area of interest or to include newer information or correct information in the existing model. This is something that an inductive approach may have a more difficult time doing. If adequate field observations are available for some species, classification-tree based models should be developed. For example, we explored the use of datasets such as precipitation and temperature data in our modeling approaches, but these are more suited for an inductive modeling approach such as GARP or Maximum Entropy (Phillips et al. 2006). Inductive modeling techniques provide a way to get past the lack of information within the literature to include these types of datasets.

Modeling approaches such as those used in SWReGAP provide general habitat suitability models in a binary fashion (though this binary model has been extended for some State GAP efforts). Regional maps show areas as either suitable or unsuitable for a given species, and it would obviously be more useful to have models with more information that show varying degrees of habitat quality. Such models represent a further step up in complexity, particularly given our limited knowledge of many species, and the computing power required to produce models at large scales like the Southwest region. Although quantitative models may not always be possible on such a large scale for so many species, models focusing on habitat quality may be possible at least on a number of the species within the region. O'Brien (2005) provides a description of such a quantitative deductive modeling approach.

Other suggestions for future habitat modeling efforts include incorporation of additional regional datasets such as the Level IV Ecoregions. HUCs provide a range constraint as do mountain ranges, but the inclusion of this dataset may provide additional constraining power to those models predicting habitat on the edges. To help in land cover review, it would be useful to develop a list of land cover types by hydrologic unit. This would allow reviewers and modelers to ensure land cover within the range of the species was not omitted. Our review process allowed commission errors to be identified, but not necessarily omission error.

The Visual Sensitivity Analysis provides for the use of gradient or weighted information within the modeling process. During the creation and modification of individual models, we used visual sensitivity analysis to evaluate the contribution of the STATSGO soils dataset as a modeling layer. This on-the-fly pseudo-modeling effort would also be useful in an expert workshop effort to identify optimum or marginal habitat. O'Brien's (2005) Bayesian methodologies provide another rationale for weighted models.

# CONCLUSIONS

To our knowledge these models represent the first regional habitat models for vertebrate species at this resolution for the American Southwest. We anticipate that as these models are used, errors will be identified. Our database and the production of graphical models provides the foundation for these model modifications. The intent of the dataset and associated GIS tools is to provide end-users functionality and the ability for model modification. We hope some provision is made for maintaining and evolving these into the future.

The maps of species habitat distributions may be used to answer a wide variety of management, planning, and research questions on individual species or groups of species. In addition to the maps, great utility may be found in the literature references that are assembled into databases used to produce the maps.

Habitat distribution maps are never finished products but should be continually updated as new information is gathered. This reflects not only improvements in the modeling process, but also the opportunity to map true changes in species habitat distributions over time. Perhaps most importantly, as a first effort in developing such detailed distributions, they should be viewed as testable hypotheses to be confirmed or refuted in the field. We encourage biologists and naturalists to conduct such tests and report their findings in the appropriate literature and to the Gap Analysis Program such that new data may improve future versions of these models. Ultimately, the validation of these models will come from those that use them.



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

## CHAPTER 4

## LAND STEWARDSHIP

Ernst, Andrea E., Scott Schrader, Veronica Lopez, Julie Prior-Magee, Kenneth G. Boykin, Don Schrupp, Lee O'Brien, William Kepner, Kathryn Thomas, John Lowry, and Bruce Thompson.



Recommended Citation:

Ernst, A. E., S. Schrader, V. Lopez, J. Prior-Magee, K.G. Boykin, D. Schrupp, L. O'Brien, W. Kepner, K. Thomas, J. Lowry, and B. Thompson. 2007. Land stewardship. Chapter 4 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding author: A E. Ernst is to be contacted at ernstae@nmsu.edu, Tel. 575-646-3355

# INTRODUCTION

The analytical mission of GAP is to compare the mapped distribution of biota with their representation in different categories of stewardship. These comparisons do not measure viability, but are a start to assessing the likelihood of future threats to biota through habitat conversion--the primary cause of biodiversity decline. We have utilized "stewardship" to describe the quality of land management that is collectively the land ownership of a parcel and the legal and administrative mandates that guide the management of the parcel as it effects the long-term maintenance of biodiversity. Legal ownership does not necessarily equate to the entity charged with management of the resource; hence we refer to 'land stewards' as those entities that are actually charged with management of biotic resources. The mix of owners and managers is a complex and rapidly changing condition. A single land owner, such as a national forest, may be subject to several different legal and/or administrative mandates for management of land cover and vertebrate species.

The purpose of comparing natural land cover and vertebrate distributions with stewardship is to allow land stewards to assess their relative contribution to the overall management of the distribution of a vertebrate or plant community and identify other stewards sharing that responsibility. This information can reveal opportunities for cooperative management that directly supports the primary mission of GAP to provide objective, scientific information to decision makers and managers to make informed decisions regarding biodiversity. It also is not unlikely that a steward that has previously borne the major responsibility for managing a species may, through such analyses, identify a more equitable distribution of that responsibility. We emphasize, however, that GAP only identifies private land as a single category and does not differentiate individual tracts or owners, unless the information was provided voluntarily to recognize a long-term commitment to biodiversity maintenance.

After comparison to stewardship, it is also necessary to compare biotic distributions to biodiversity management status categories. This comparison can identify species or plant communities that are underrepresented in lands managed for biodiversity maintenance. GAP currently uses a scale of 1 to 4 to denote relative degree of maintenance of biodiversity for each tract. A status of "1" denotes the highest, most permanent level of maintenance, and "4" represents the lowest level of biodiversity management, or unknown status where information is not available to assign a potentially higher rating. We recognize a variety of limitations in our approach, although we maintain certain principles in assigning the status level. Our first principle is that land stewardship is not the primary determinant in assigning status. The second principle is that the legal and administrative mandates informing management of a parcel also reflect management intent. In other words, if a land steward institutes a program backed by legal and institutional arrangements that are intended for permanent biodiversity maintenance, we use that as the guide for assigning status.

The characteristics used to determine status are as follows:

- Permanence of legal or administrative protection from conversion of natural land cover to unnatural (human-induced barren, exotic-dominated, arrested succession).
- Relative amount of the tract managed for natural cover.
- Inclusiveness of the management, i.e., single feature such as a historical, geological, or archeological site or a single species versus all biota.
- Type of management and degree that it is mandated through legal and institutional arrangements.

The four status categories are defined by GAP as follows (after Scott et al. 1993, Edwards et al. 1995, Crist et al. 1996):

Status 1: An area having permanent protection from conversion of natural land cover and a mandated management plan in operation to maintain a natural state within which disturbance events (of natural type, frequency, and intensity) are allowed to proceed without interference or are mimicked through management.

Status 2: An area having permanent protection from conversion of natural land cover and a mandated management plan in operation to maintain a primarily natural state, but which may receive use or management practices that degrade the quality of existing natural communities.

Status 3: An area having permanent protection from conversion of natural land cover for the majority of the area, but subject to extractive uses of either a broad, low-intensity type or localized intense type. It also confers protection to federally listed endangered and threatened species throughout the area.

Status 4: Lack of irrevocable easement or mandate to prevent conversion of natural habitat types to anthropogenic habitat types. Allows for intensive anthropogenic use throughout the tract, including those tracts for which the existence of such restrictions or sufficient information to establish a higher status is unknown.

## METHODS

Land stewardship data was developed in two phases: (1) documentation of land ownership; and (2) assignment of biodiversity management status codes.

## Land Stewardship

We began by collecting existing digital ownership datasets to provide a baseline of ownership boundaries for each state in the region. These data distinguished general administrative land ownership by private, state, and federal categories. In most cases, federal and state lands were then further divided by managing entity such as Bureau of Land Management (BLM), National Park Service (NPS), or State Trust Lands. Special management areas, such as wilderness, and other internal management units were often not delineated in these baseline datasets.

Sources of base ownership data for each state include the following:

**Arizona** –The Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) and Arizona Land Resource Information System (ALRIS) publish the state-wide surface ownership coverage. Three agencies update this dataset: federal boundaries are updated by BLM, Indian reservation boundaries are updated by Bureau of Indian Affairs, and State Land boundaries are updated by ASLD. The data used included the last full BLM update from 1994 with partial updates in January 2001, the BIA update from 1997, and the ASLD lands which are updated on a weekly basis.

**Colorado** – The Colorado Ownership, Management, and Protection (COMaP) project at the Natural Resource Ecology Lab (NREL) of Colorado State University began mapping status and trends of Colorado's protected areas to build a statewide protected areas map (Wilcox et al. 2006). NREL and the SWReGAP stewardship lab coordinated the acquisition of base information to be used for the SWReGAP and COMaP products. Data represented in COMaP v2-SWReGAP were last updated August 2004.

**Nevada** – The Mapping Sciences Division of the Nevada State Office of BLM updates and manages the polygon layer representing and identifying land ownership status and boundaries of BLM, private, and other public land throughout Nevada. The polygon layer was updated in September 2003 using BLM field office data.

**New Mexico** - The New Mexico State Office of BLM coordinated ownership data collection from various BLM field offices and the New Mexico State Land Office. Surface ownership data was generally digitized from 1:24,000 USGS quads or on-screen digitized using the BLM's Master Title Plats as the original data source. The version used by SWReGAP reflected the latest updates contained in the 64 100k ownership tiles for New Mexico from June 2004.

**Utah** – BLM produced and maintains the Utah Land Status/Administrative Ownership Data Layer in collaboration with regional partners. The information for federal ownership is derived from a number of sources, but primarily from the BLM's Master Title Plats maintained by the Utah BLM Lands and Realty program and from the BLM's LR2000 database. Information is also incorporated from the State and Institutional Trust Lands agency (SITLA), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), counties, and other government agencies. The data layer used was version 1.2, last updated April 2005. Base data layers acquired for each state were then converted to a common projection system and loaded into the SWReGAP geographic database (geodatabase). The geodatabase, a more modern GIS data model, was structured to meet GAP Standards and included domains described by the GAP Management Coding System (see Appendix 4-1). Additional attributes such as the GAP biodiversity management code, individual parcel name, alternative name, and source of the digital data were added to the geodatabase attribute table (see Figure 4-1).

GAP_Status	1,2,3,or 4
Class_Desc	Federal Lands, State Lands, Tribal Lands, etc.
Owner_Desc	BLM, USFS, BOR, TNC, State Wildlife Reserve
Manager_Desc	ACEC, RNA, Wilderness Area, Recreation Area
Division	BLM Field Office, Regional Offices
Parcel_Name	Gunnison Gorge NCA, Dinosaur NM
Alt_Name	Important Bird Area, Name of Management Area
Source_SWReGAP	Colorado State BLM Office, Gila National Forest

Figure 4-1. Example of the attribute domains based on GAP Management Coding System. On the left are the geodatabase domain and attribute titles and on the right are possible, but not all inclusive, attributes for a parcel delineated in the SWReGAP dataset.

The next step in stewardship mapping involved separating source data for individual land ownership categories (e.g., Nevada BLM lands) from the larger state-wide dataset. Each individual land ownership category was then attributed according to the standard GAP Management Coding System. Additional boundary information for special management units or other internal boundaries was also collected via the internet or from agency GIS personnel. For example, the statewide data layer depicting Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) was received from individual state BLM offices. These datasets were also individually loaded into the geodatabase and attributed with the GAP Management Coding System and additional geodatabase attributes. Other individual digital data sources included The Nature Conservancy (TNC) preserves and easement boundaries collected from state TNC offices, National Forest GIS and ownership data collected from each individual forest, and other agencies such as State Wildlife Agencies, Division of State Parks, and several county and city GIS programs. In addition, throughout the region over 100 local land trusts were contacted for potential data acquisition.

Once all boundary files for a major ownership category (e.g., BLM) were imported into the geodatabase and appropriately attributed, the dataset was merged into one, continuous feature dataset. Spatial integrity between the datasets was built and maintained by using geodatabase topology. Topologies contain rules about how features share geometry. The rules SWReGAP used to define the behavior of the features were 'must not have gaps' and 'must not have overlaps.' The process of validation was then used to show areas where the dataset broke the topology rules. Edits to the line work geometry were then executed to features that share common polygon boundaries. Once validation and errors in the topology were addressed for a particular ownership category, new internal
management data layers were combined in the same manner until the entire individual state dataset was complete. Water boundaries extracted from the National Hydrography Dataset (Medium Resolution) were the last dataset to be attributed and merged.

### **Biodiversity Management Status Categorization**

To reduce conflicting information about management of a particular parcel every attempt was made to collect the most current management plan describing management actions for each land tract. These management plans provide the overall guiding principal for management of the land tract. Federal resource management plans are usually developed for compliance with federal laws such as the National Forest Management Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and usually span a 10-15 year management timeframe. Collection of management plans included National Park Service General Management Plans or Statements of Management, BLM Field Office Resource Management Plans with corresponding Records of Decisions, Forest Service Forest Plans and Amendments, Bureau of Reclamation Management Plans, and Fish and Wildlife Service Comprehensive Conservation Plans.

In previous GAP efforts, land management units were added to the stewardship map if the land unit was likely to be categorized in a GAP management status higher than the status of surrounding land. For example, most multiple use land receives a management status of 3, with internal units having a potential to receive a status 2 or higher. Although SWReGAP attempted to create a detailed map including all parcels regardless of management status, we used this general rule of thumb when delineating management status. For example, if general information indicated that a parcel might receive a higher status code (i.e. a status 1 instead of a status 4) more effort was made to obtain management information. The goal was to make a seamless stewardship map for the region, not to just distinguish the management status 1 or 2 lands. When management plans were received they were individually reviewed to evaluate the potential management status on a site by site basis. In other words, parcels of the same management type were not given a blanket status code and status coding was evaluated on an individual parcel by parcel basis. For example, there are instances of Pristine or Primitive management techniques within the same wilderness. These different management techniques may receive different management status codes. Another example, BLM Areas of Critical Environmental Concern may be managed differently between field offices and/or among different states, and thus needed to be evaluated independently.

Not all land parcels had management plans available to be used for management status categorization. For example, most parcels not under federal jurisdiction do not have existing written management plans. State Lands are not required by law to have a management plan supported by written documentation. Therefore, in certain cases, the guiding management document is the state constitution or master plans. When plans were not available, an Internet search often provided information that could lead to an appropriate assignment of a biodiversity management status category to a land parcel. In other cases, telephone interviews were conducted with agency personnel to determine

management practices. A standardized questionnaire was used in conducting these interviews (see Appendix 4-2). Lands tracts such as state parks or private lands received a uniform management status category. Non-governmental lands status assignments were based on telephone interviews and information obtained from the Internet. TNC preserves were one example of a land parcel where adequate information was obtained via the Internet to make the determination of management category for most preserves.

To minimize variability in the categorization of any one land tract GAP developed a dichotomous key (see Figure 4-2) to ensure consistent assignment of management categories (Crist et al. 1995). This key was applied throughout the assignment of biodiversity management status categories for SWReGAP. To further remove variability all biodiversity management status codes for biodiversity were assigned by one person, the regional stewardship coordinator. The decisions made were documented and saved in Excel spreadsheets and were indexed to the dichotomous key.

A-1:	If the management intent can be determined through agency or institutional documentation GO TO A-2, if not, GO TO A-5
A-2:	If the land unit is subject to statutory or legally enforceable protection from conversion to anthropogenic use of all or selected biological features by state or federal legislation, regulation, private deed restriction, or conservation easement intended for permanent status, GO TO B-1; if not, GO TO A-3
A-3:	If ecological protection is not legally enforceable, temporary, or lacking but managed by a plan intended for permanent status, GO TO A-4; if not, GO TO A-5
A-4:	Management to benefit biological diversity is provided by a written plan in place or in process under an institutional policy requiring such management - <b>Status 3</b>
A-5:	Not subject to an adopted management plan or regulation that promotes biological diversity, or management intent is unknown - <b>Status 4</b>
B-1:	If the total system in the land unit is conserved for natural ecological function with no more than 5% of the land unit in anthropogenic use, GO TO B-4; if conservation provisions apply only to selected features or species, GO TO B-2
B-2:	If management emphasizes natural processes including allowing or mimicking natural ecological disturbance events, but also allows low anthropogenic disturbance, renewable resource use, or high levels of human visitation on more than 5% of the land unit - <b>Status 2</b> ; if not, GO TO B-3
B-3:	Management allows intensive, anthropogenic disturbance such as resource extraction, military exercises, or developed or motorized recreation on more than 5% of the land unit, but includes ecological management for select features - <b>Status 3</b>
B-4:	If management strives for natural processes including allowing or mimicking natural ecological disturbance events - <b>Status 1</b> ; if not, GO TO B-5
B-5:	Managed for natural processes, but some or all disturbance events are suppressed or modified - <b>Status 2</b>

Figure 4-2. A dichotomous key for categorization of biodiversity management status of land units. In using the terms "permanent" and "legally enforceable" we recognize that all conditions are subject to change, even in wilderness and national parks, but the intent is for the condition to be long term extending over 10 years time.

### **External Review**

Because the processes described above are interpretive in both editing of source boundary information and the assigning of biodiversity management status codes, a variety of end users were asked to review and quality check the preliminary stewardship products. To do so, each state project coordinator helped host, organize, and facilitate a one-day conservation review meeting.

These review meetings consisted of a presentation by the state project coordinator offering an overview of SWReGAP methods, products, and project objectives. This was followed by a more detailed presentation focused specifically on the stewardship aspect of GAP. These meetings were held in one or two key locations in each state and a variety of agency experts were invited to attend. During these meetings questions and concerns were addressed and copies of the state draft stewardship maps were provided. After the initial meeting attendees had one month to examine the draft maps and provide their overall review, comments, and suggestions for data quality and improvements. Occasionally new boundary files were provided and incorporated into the overall dataset. Status codes were changed if sufficient documentation was provided by the land steward for a parcel of land. The stewardship product greatly benefited from this examination by providing a variety of agencies with differing management strategies the ability to review and comment on the stewardship dataset as part of the development process.

### Regionalization

Changes to the draft maps were incorporated based on comments provided during the external review. Once complete, each state dataset was imported into the final regional stewardship geodatabase. Parcel boundaries that extended across state boundaries were sometimes moved to ensure alignment across state lines. An additional topological rule of "must be covered by" was used to expand or contract parcels along the edge of the state. This rule was used to precisely fit the stewardship map into the pre-existing state boundaries. Some information in the attribute table was updated or changed for regional consistency.

# RESULTS

The stewardship geodatabase, consisting of records and fields, is described in the accompanying metadata for this data set. We extracted summary statistics from the stewardship database to develop a summary of land stewardship and biodiversity management conservation status by region and by each state. We also developed cross tabulation statistics of stewardship and management conservation status (Tables 4-1 through 4-6), again by region and for each state. When read by row, these tables show the area and proportion of each biodiversity management status category for each stewardship type. When read by columns, the tables show the area and proportion of stewardship types comprising each of the four management status categories. Tables 4-7 through 4-11 present a summary of documentation and management plans that specifically provided sufficient information to assign a management status category of 1 for land tracts in each state. Appendices 4-3 thru 4-7 summarize documentation and management plans that provided information for Status 2 lands.

### Land Stewards

In the region, federal agencies account for the largest land steward category managing over 51% of the landscape (Figure 4-3). BLM is the largest federal land steward accounting for over 30% of the total land area. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is the second largest federal land steward accounting for 14% of the area. Private lands are the second largest land steward category in the region comprising 30% of the region's lands. Tribal lands and State managed lands account for 9% and 8% respectively. Regional and local government lands, non-governmental organization lands, and water bodies comprise the smallest proportion of land stewards each contributing less than 1% to the overall area.

Federal land stewards manage 42% of Arizona (Figure 4-3) with the BLM and USFS managing 17% and 15% respectively. Arizona contains a higher percentage of tribal lands than any other state in the region with approximately 28% of the state in this category. Private lands and State-managed lands account for 17% and 13% respectively. Regional and local government lands, non-governmental organization lands, and water bodies comprise less than 1% of the state.

Colorado has the largest proportion of private lands in the region with over 57% under private stewardship (Figure 4-3). Federal land stewards manage 36% of the state, with the USFS being the largest land management agency, managing over 21% and the BLM managing over 12% of the state. State-managed lands comprise 5% of the state, and Tribal lands, regional and local government lands, non-governmental lands, and water represent slightly more than 2% of the area in Colorado.

Within the region, Nevada has the highest proportion of land area under federal stewardship with 85% (Figure 4-3). The majority, or 67%, of these lands are managed by BLM. Other federal stewards include USFS and Department of Defense/Department of Energy managing 8% and 5% respectively. Private land comprises 13% of Nevada.

Tribal lands, regional and local government lands, State-managed lands, nongovernmental organizations, and water bodies make up less than 3% of Nevada lands combined.

New Mexico has 43% of the area under private land stewardship (Figure 4-3). Federal lands are the second largest land steward managing 34% with BLM managing 17% as the largest federal land steward in the state, and USFS the second largest federal land steward with 12%. State-managed lands including State Land Board lands, State Parks, and State Wildlife Areas, make up 12% of New Mexico. Tribal lands comprise 10% of the state, with regional and local government lands, non-governmental organization lands, and water bodies combined accounting for less than 1%.

Federal land stewards manage 64% of Utah lands (Figure 4-3). BLM manages 42% of those federal lands while USFS manages 15%. Private lands in Utah comprise 21% of the state. State-managed lands and Tribal lands account for 8% and 5% respectively. Other lands such as regional and local government lands, non-governmental organization lands, and water bodies are less than 4% of the state combined.

### **Biodiversity Management Status**

Status 4 lands comprise 38% of the region (Figure 4-4). Private land stewards manage over 80% of these lands, with State Land Board lands managing 17%. Status 4 lands account for 31% of Arizona, 58% of Colorado, 13% of Nevada, 57% of New Mexico, and 28% of Utah.

Status 3 lands comprise 50% of the region. BLM manages 51% of these lands, USFS manages 23%, and Native Americans manage 17%. Status 3 lands comprise 55% of Arizona, 32% of Colorado, 72% of Nevada, 37% of New Mexico, and 56% of Utah.

Status 2 lands comprise 9% of the region. The largest land steward in this category is the BLM which manages 57% of these lands. Other land stewards include 26% managed by USFS, 5% managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and 4% managed by state wildlife agencies. Status 2 lands include 9% of Arizona, 8% of Colorado, 12% of Nevada, 6% of New Mexico, and 12% of Utah.

Status 1 lands comprise 3% of the region. Stewards managing these lands include 40% managed by National Park Service, 33% managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 21% by USFS, and 7% by BLM. State lands and non-governmental organizations account for less than 1% of these lands. Status 1 lands include 5% of Arizona, 3% of both Colorado and Nevada, 2% of Utah, and less than 1% of New Mexico. The majority of the Status 1 lands are small, isolated tracts.



Protection Level Category GAP Status 1 GAP Status 2 GAP Status 3 GAP Status 4 0 50 100 400 200 300 Water Kilometers 

Figure 4-3. Final stewardship map for the Southwestern U.S.

Figure 4-4. Final GAP management status map for the Southwestern U.S.

	Total Lar	nd Area	Statu	ıs 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	is 3	Statu	s 4
Steward Category	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%
Bureau of Land Management	423,009	30.52	2,541	6.93	70,381	56.99	350,087	50.82		
Bureau of Reclamation	1,767	0.13			375	0.30	943	0.14	448	0.09
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	18,363	1.32	11,912	32.47	6,133	4.97	318	0.05		
U.S. Forest Service	197,519	14.25	7,568	20.63	31,788	25.74	158,163	22.96		
Department of Defense &/or Department of Energy	44,413	3.20			1,244	1.01	41,433	6.02	1,736	0.33
National Park Service	24,181	1.74	14,573	39.72	3,391	2.75	6,217	0.90		
Agricultural Research Service	952	0.07			293	0.24	659	0.10		
Department of Commerce	7	0.00							7	0.00
Tribal Land	131,047	9.45			1,038	0.84	116,416	16.90	13,593	2.58
State Parks & Recreation	2,223	0.16			172	0.14	2,051	0.30	0	0.00
State Land Board	98,045	7.07			1,538	1.25	9,831	1.43	86,676	16.47
State Wildlife Reserves	5,216	0.38	2	0.01	5,169	4.19	39	0.01	6	0.00
Other State Land	529	0.04			5	0.00	518	0.08	6	0.00
Regional Government Land	534	0.04							534	0.10
City Land	509	0.04							509	0.10
County Land	655	0.05					55	0.01	600	0.11
Audubon Society	5	0.00	4	0.01	0	0.00	334	0.05		
Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement	1,268	0.09			934	0.76				
The Nature Conservancy	2,306	0.17	89	0.24	1,032	0.84	1,185	0.17		
Private Conservation Easement/ Conservation Deed Restriction										
Private Institution Managed for Biodiversity	4,604	0.33							4,604	0.87
Private Land Unrestricted for Development/ No Known Restriction	418,213	30.17					567	0.08	417,647	79.35
Water*	10,707	0.77								
TOTAL	1,386,072	100.00	36,690	100.00	123,493	100.00	688,816	100.00	526,366	100.00

Table 4-1.	Total A	rea bv l	Land S	Steward	and I	Protection	Level	Category	for the	Region.
1 4010 1 11	TO COMPANY AND		LIGHTLE K	Juchana			10,01	CHUCEDI		Tron to the

	Total La	nd Area	Statu	ıs 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	ıs 3	Statu	ıs 4
Steward Category	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%
Bureau of Land Management	50,251	17.01	156	1.11	14,928	58.49	35,167	21.60		
Bureau of Reclamation	432	0.15							432	0.47
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	6,865	2.32	6,106	43.20	759	2.97				
U.S. Forest Service	45,068	15.26	706	5.00	6,990	27.38	37,372	22.95		
Department of Defense &/or Department of Energy	11,151	3.78			1,244	4.87	9,907	6.08		
National Park Service	9,336	3.16	7,153	50.60	409	1.60	1,774	1.09		
Agricultural Research Service	217	0.07					217	0.13		
Department of Commerce										
Tribal Land	81,298	27.53			353	1.38	77,613	47.66	3,333	3.62
State Parks & Recreation	289	0.10			28	0.11	261	0.16		
State Land Board	37,265	12.62			544	2.13	100	0.06	36,622	39.74
State Wildlife Reserves	211	0.07			189	0.74	16	0.01	5	0.01
Other State Land										
Regional Government Land	488	0.17							488	0.53
City Land	191	0.06							191	0.21
County Land	202	0.07					2	0.00	200	0.22
Audubon Society	4	0.00	4	0.03						
Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement	154	0.05			3	0.01	151	0.09		
The Nature Conservancy	337	0.11	9	0.06	78	0.30	250	0.15		
Private Conservation Easement/ Conservation Deed Restriction										
Private Institution Managed for Biodiversity										
Private Land Unrestricted for Development/ No Known Restriction	50,892	17.23							50,892	55.22
Water*	695	0.24								
TOTAL	295,349	100.00	14,135	100.00	25,524	100.00	162,830	100.00	92,164	100.00

#### Table 4-2. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Arizona.

	Total Lar	nd Area	Statu	ıs 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	IS 3	Statu	ıs 4
Steward Category	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%
Bureau of Land Management	33,786	12.53	40	0.59	5,654	27.32	28,092	32.99		
Bureau of Reclamation	5	0.00							5	0.00
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	353	0.13	118	1.72	142	0.69	93	0.11		
U.S. Forest Service	58,482	21.68	4,299	62.87	10,156	49.08	44,027	51.71		
Department of Defense &/or Department of Energy	1,771	0.66					1,623	1.91	148	0.09
National Park Service	2,787	1.03	2,358	34.49	236	1.14	193	0.23		
Agricultural Research Service	68	0.03			68	0.33				
Department of Commerce	7	0.00							7	0.00
Tribal Land	3,093	1.15			643	3.11			2,450	1.57
State Parks & Recreation	784	0.29			15	0.07	769	0.90		
State Land Board	10,722	3.97			990	4.78	9,732	11.43		
State Wildlife Reserves	2,111	0.78			2,106	10.18	5	0.01		
Other State Land	5	0.00					5	0.01		
Regional Government Land	36	0.01							36	0.02
City Land	286	0.11							286	0.18
County Land	344	0.13					2	0.00	342	0.22
Audubon Society										
Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement	5	0.00					5	0.01		
The Nature Conservancy	1,304	0.48	23	0.33	682	3.30	599	0.70		
Private Conservation Easement/ Conservation Deed Restriction										
Private Institution Managed for Biodiversity	140	0.05							140	0.09
Private Land Unrestricted for Development/ No Known Restriction	152,675	56.60							152,675	97.81
Water*	975	0.36								
TOTAL	269,738	100.00	6,838	100.00	20,692	100.00	85,145	100.00	156,089	100.00

#### Table 4-3. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Colorado.

	Total Lar	nd Area	Statu	s 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	ıs 3	Statu	ıs 4
Steward Category	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km²)	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%
Bureau of Land Management	192,438	67.22	1,516	17.08	23,514	70.53	167,407	82.04		
Bureau of Reclamation	1,040	0.36			375	1.13	665	0.33		
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	9,367	3.27	5,461	61.52	3,685	11.05	222	0.11		
U.S. Forest Service	23,600	8.24	387	4.36	4,374	13.12	18,840	9.23		
Department of Defense &/or Department of Energy	13,846	4.84					12,480	6.12	1,366	3.58
National Park Service	2,592	0.91	1,508	16.99	1,085	3.25				
Agricultural Research Service										
Department of Commerce										
Tribal Land	4,149	1.45					3,959	1.94	191	0.50
State Parks & Recreation	389	0.14					389	0.19		
State Land Board	32	0.01							32	0.08
State Wildlife Reserves	303	0.11			303	0.91				
Other State Land	17	0.01					11	0.01	6	0.02
Regional Government Land	10	0.00							10	0.03
City Land	12	0.00							12	0.03
County Land	91	0.03					51	0.03	40	0.10
Audubon Society										
Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement										
The Nature Conservancy	22	0.01	5	0.05	6	0.02	11	0.01		
Private Conservation Easement/ Conservation Deed Restriction										
Private Institution Managed for Biodiversity										
Private Land Unrestricted for Development/ No Known Restriction	36,476	12.74					11	0.01	36,465	95.66
Water*	1,900	0.66								
TOTAL	286,284	100.00	8,876	100.00	33,341	100.00	204,046	100.00	38,121	100.00

#### Table 4-4. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Nevada.

	Total Lar	nd Area	Statu	ıs 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	ıs 3	Statu	ıs 4
Steward Category	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km²)	%	Area (km²)	%	Area (km²)	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%
Bureau of Land Management	54,453	17.29	206	7.70	6,596	38.29	47,650	41.54		
Bureau of Reclamation	290	0.09					278	0.24	11	0.01
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	1,532	0.49	169	6.31	1,360	7.90	3	0.00		
U.S. Forest Service	37,703	11.97	1,363	50.92	6,752	39.19	29,588	25.79		
Department of Defense &/or Department of Energy	10,373	3.29					10,332	9.01	41	0.02
National Park Service	1,563	0.50	896	33.46	664	3.85	3	0.00		
Agricultural Research Service	442	0.14					442	0.39		
Department of Commerce										
Tribal Land	32,618	10.36					25,195	21.97	7,423	4.13
State Parks & Recreation	336	0.11			25	0.14	311	0.27		
State Land Board	36,024	11.44							36,024	20.06
State Wildlife Reserves	676	0.21			670	3.89	6	0.01		
Other State Land										
Regional Government Land										
City Land	12	0.00							12	0.01
County Land	1	0.00							1	0.00
Audubon Society	0	0.00			0	0.00				
Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement	1,108	0.35			930	5.40	177	0.15		
The Nature Conservancy	438	0.14	43	1.61	230	1.33	165	0.14		
Private Conservation Easement/ Conservation Deed Restriction										
Private Institution Managed for Biodiversity	4,465	1.42							4,465	2.49
Private Land Unrestricted for Development/ No Known Restriction	132,118	41.96					556	0.48	131,562	73.28
Water*	721	0.23								
TOTAL	314,873	100.00	2,678	100.00	17,228	100.00	114,707	100.00	179,539	100.00

#### Table 4-5. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for New Mexico.

	Total Lar	nd Area	Statu	is 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	s 3	Statu	s 4
Steward Category	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	%
Bureau of Land Management	92,081	41.89	623	14.95	19,689	73.72	71,770	58.78		
Bureau of Reclamation										
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	246	0.11	58	1.40	187	0.70	1	0.00		
U.S. Forest Service	32,666	14.86	813	19.53	3,517	13.17	28,336	23.21		
Department of Defense &/or Department of Energy	7,272	3.31					7,091	5.81	181	0.30
National Park Service	7,904	3.60	2,659	63.85	997	3.73	4,247	3.48		
Agricultural Research Service	225	0.10			225	0.84				
Department of Commerce										
Tribal Land	9,888	4.50			42	0.16	9,649	7.90	197	0.33
State Parks & Recreation	425	0.19			104	0.39	321	0.26	0	0.00
State Land Board	14,002	6.37			5	0.02			13,998	23.15
State Wildlife Reserves	1,916	0.87	2	0.05	1,902	7.12	11	0.01	0	0.00
Other State Land	507	0.23			5	0.02	502	0.41		
Regional Government Land	0	0.00							0	0.00
City Land	8	0.00							8	0.01
County Land	18	0.01							18	0.03
Audubon Society										
Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement										
The Nature Conservancy	207	0.09	9	0.22	36	0.14	161	0.13		
Private Conservation Easement/ Conservation Deed Restriction										
Private Institution Managed for Biodiversity										
Private Land Unrestricted for Development/ No Known Restriction	46,052	20.95							46,052	76.18
Water*	6,415	2.92								
TOTAL	219,831	100.00	4,165	100.00	26,708	100.00	122,090	100.00	60,453	100.00

#### Table 4-6. Total Area by Land Steward and Protection Level Category for Utah.

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan				
Bureau of Land Management	Desert Grasslands ACEC/RNA; San Pedro River ACEC/RNA; Swamp Springs-Hot Springs Watershed ACEC	Final Safford District Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement 08/1991				
Bureau of Land Management	East Cactus Plain Wilderness	East Cactus Plain Wilderness Management Plan, Environmental Assessment, and Decision Record 09/1994				
Bureau of Land Management	Larry Canyon ACEC	Draft Phoenix Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement 12/1987				
Bureau of Land Management	Clay Hills ACEC/RNA	Record of Decision for the Approval of the Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan 03/1995; Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 01/1992				
Bureau of Land Management	Appleton-Whittell ACEC	Approved Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 07/2003				
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Bill Williams River NWR; Cibola NWR, Havasu NWR & Wilderness Area; Imperial NWR & Wilderness Area	Final Lower Colorado River National Wildlife Refuges Comprehensive Management Plan 1994-2014				
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Kofa NWR & Wilderness Area	Kofa National Wildlife Refuge & Wilderness and New Water Mountains Wilderness Interagency Management Plan and Environmental Assessment 10/1996				
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Leslie Canyon NWR; San Bernardino NWR	San Bernardino and Leslie Canyon National Wildlife Refuges Comprehensive Management Plan 1995-2015				
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Cabeza Prieta Wilderness	URL: http://www.fws.gov/southwest/ref uges/ arizona/cabeza.html				
U.S. Forest Service	Bear Wallow Wilderness; Escudilla Mountain RNA; Mount Baldy Wilderness; Thomas Creek RNA	Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest Plan 1987; Amendment No. 6. 07/1996				

Table 4-7. Documentation of Biodiversity Management Status 1 lands in Arizona.

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan				
U.S. Forest Service	Casner Canyon RNA; Fern Mountain Botanical Area; Fossil Springs Botanical Area; Mogollon Rim Botanical Area; Rocky Gulch Proposed RNA; Strawberry Crater Wilderness; Verde Valley Botanical Area	Coconino National Forest Plan 08/1987; Amendment No. 17. 12/2002				
U.S. Forest Service	Butterfly Peak RNA; Elgin RNA; Goodding RNA; Goudy Canyon RNA; Pole Bridge RNA; Santa Catalina RNA	Coronado National Forest Plan 1986; Forest Plan Change Notice No. 3 06/1999				
U.S. Forest Service	Garland Prairie RNA; Kanab Creek Wilderness	Kaibab National Forest Land Management Plan 04/1988; Amendment No. 5. 02/2003				
U.S. Forest Service	Apache Creek Wilderness; Castle Creek Wilderness; Cedar Bench Wilderness; Juniper Mesa Wilderness; Woodchute Wilderness	Prescott National Forest Plan 11/1986; Amendment No. 11. 03/2000				
U.S. Forest Service	Buckhorn Mountain RNA; Bush Highway RNA; Haufer Wash RNA; Mazatzal Wilderness; Picket Post Mountain RNA; Upper Forks Parker Creek RNA	Tonto National Forest Plan 10/1985; Amendment No. 22. 06/1996				
National Park Service	Chiricahua NM Wilderness Area	Draft Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan Chiricahua National Monument 1999				
National Park Service	Grand Canyon NP	General Management Plan Grand Canyon National Park 08/1995				
National Park Service	Hohokam Pima NM	URL: http://www.nps.gov/pima/; c/o Casa Grande Ruins National Monument				
National Park Service	Organ Pipe Cactus NM & Wilderness Area	Final General Management Plan Development Concept Plans Environmental Impact Statement Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument 07/1997				
National Park Service	Petrified Forest NP & Wilderness Area	Final General Management Plan Development Concept Plans Environmental Impact Statement Petrified Forest National Park 1992				
National Park Service	Saguaro NP & Wilderness Area	Statement for Management Saguaro National Park 12/1991				
National Park Service	Sunset Crater Volcano NM	General Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument 11/2002				

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan
National Park Service	Tonto NM	Final Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan Tonto National Monument 12/2003
National Park Service	Walnut Canyon NM	Draft Environmental Impact Statement Draft General Management Plan Walnut Canyon National Monument 09/2001
National Park Service	Wupatki NM	Final Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan Wupatki National Monument 11/2002
Audubon Society	Appleton-Whittell Research Ranch	Appleton-Whittell Research Ranch National Audubon Society Santa Cruz County Elgin, AZ 85611
The Nature Conservancy	Chiricahua Cave Creek; Hassayampa River Preserve; Patagonia-Sonoita Creek Preserve; Ramsey Canyon Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherewewo rk/northamerica/states/arizona/pres erves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Thompson Creek ACEC/NEA	Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan Glenwood Springs Resource Area (Revised 1988)
Bureau of Land Management	Fruita Paleontological Site ACEC/RNA; Pyramid Rock ACEC/RNA; Rabbit Valley Paleontological Site ACEC/RNA	Grand Junction Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 01/1987
Bureau of Land Management	Fairview ACEC/RNA	Gunnison Gorge NCA Approved Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 01/2004
Bureau of Land Management	Ammonite Site ACEC/RNA; North Park Phaceila Site ACEC/RNA	Kremmling Resource Area Resource Management Plan Record of Decision 01/1984
Bureau of Land Management	Mosquito Pass ACEC	Royal Gorge Resource Area Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan 05/1996
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Alamosa NWR; Monte Vista NWR	Alamosa-Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge Complex Comprehensive Conservation Plan 09/2003
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Baca NWR	Interviewed Refuge Manager: Mike Blenden - 07/26/04
U.S. Forest Service	Boston Peak Fen RNA; Daves Draw RNA; Indian Caves RNA; Keota RNA; Little Owl Creek RNA; Lone Pine RNA; Mount Goliath RNA; Sheep Creek RNA	1997 Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland
U.S. Forest Service	Escalante Creek RNA; Gothic RNA; La Garita Wilderness; Powderhorn Wilderness; Unknown; West Elk Wilderness	Amended Land and Resource Management Plan Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests 1991
U.S. Forest Service	Campo RNA; Hurricane Canyon RNA; Saddle Mountain RNA	Land and Resource Management Plan Pike and San Isabel National Forest; Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands 1984; Amendment No. 24. 04/1992
U.S. Forest Service	Deadman Creek RNA; Finger Mesa RNA; Hot Creek RNA; Mill Creek RNA; North Zapata RNA; Sangre de Cristo Wilderness; South San Juan Wilderness; Spring Branch RNA	Revised Land and Resource Management Plan Rio Grande National Forest 11/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Kettle Lakes RNA; Mad Creek RNA; Mount Zirkel Wilderness; Never Summer Wilderness; Sarvis Creek Wilderness; Silver Creek RNA	Revised Forest Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Routt National Forest 2001
U.S. Forest Service	Lizard Head Wilderness; Narraguinnep RNA; Piedra Area; Weminuche Wilderness; Williams Creek RNA	Amended Land and Resource Management Plan San Juan National Forest 04/1992; Amendment No. 20 08/1998

 Table 4-8. Documentation of Status 1 lands in Colorado.

U.S. Forest Service	Assignation Creek RNA; Collegiate Peaks Wilderness; Eagles Nest Wilderness; East Lake and West Cross Creeks RNA; Flat Tops Wilderness; Gift and Kline Creeks RNA; Holy Cross Wilderness; Hoosier Ridge NRA; Hunter-Fryingpan Wilderness; Lower Battlement Mesa RNA; Main Elk Creek RNA; Maroon Bells- Snowmass Wilderness; Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness; Raggeds Wilderness	2002 Revision for Land and Resource Management Plan White River National Forest
National Park Service	Black Canyon of the Gunnison Wilderness	General Management Plan Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and Curecanti National Recreation Area 09/1996
National Park Service	Colorado NM	Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement Colorado National Monument 01/2004
National Park Service	Dinosaur NM	General Management Plan Development Concept Plans Land Protection Plan Environmental Assessment Dinosaur National Monument 07/1988; Amended 04/1991
National Park Service	Florissant Fossil Beds NM	Final General Management Plan and Development Concept Plan Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument 09/1985
National Park Service	Great Sand Dunes NP & Wilderness Area	Statement for Management Great Sand Dunes National Monument 02/1988
National Park Service	Hovenweep NM	Statement for Management Hovenweep National Monument 04/1992
National Park Service	Mesa Verde NP & Wilderness Area; Park Mesa RNA	Statement for Management Mesa Verde National Park 10/1986
National Park Service	Rocky Mountain NP; Indian Peaks Wilderness; Paradise Park RNA; Specimen Mountain RNA; West Creek RNA	Statement for Management Rocky Mountain National Park 09/1988
National Park Service	Yucca House NM	Statement for Management Yucca House National Monument 06/1987
The Nature Conservancy	High Creek Fen Preserve; Mexican Cut Preserve; Mishak Lakes Preserve; Yampa River Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherewew ork/northamerica/states/colorado/ preserves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Nevada	Source of Management
		Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Ash Meadows ACEC; Pine Creek RNA	Record of Decision for the Approved Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 10/1998
Bureau of Land Management	Black Rock Desert Wilderness	Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area (NCA) and Associated Wilderness, and Other Contiguous Lands in Nevada 09/2003
Bureau of Land Management	Stewart Valley Fossil Site ACEC	Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan 05/2001
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Anaho Island NWR; Stillwater NWR	Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge Complex Comprehensive Conservation Plan 06/2003
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Ash Meadows NWR; Desert National Wildlife Range; Moapa Valley NWR; Pahranagat NWR	URL: http://www.fws.gov/desertcomple x/
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Charles Sheldon NWR	Interviewed Deputy Project Leader of Hart-Sheldon Complex: Dave Johnson - 10/2004
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Ruby Lake NWR	Interviewed Refuge Manager: Martha Collins -10/04
U.S. Forest Service	Fall Creek RNA; Hole-in-the-Mountain RNA; Mount Moriah Table RNA; North-South Schell Peaks RNA; Pearl Peak RNA; Seitz Canyon/Echo Lake RNA; Troy Peak RNA; White Pine Peak RNA	Humboldt National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 1996
U.S. Forest Service	Bald Mountain Wash RNA; Jacks Spring Pinyon RNA; Mount Jefferson RNA	Land and Resource Management Plan Toiyabe National Forest 1987
U.S. Forest Service	Carpenter Canyon RNA; La Madre Mountain Wilderness; Mount Charleston Wilderness; Rainbow Mountain Wilderness	General Management Plan for the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area: An Amendment to the Land and Resource Management Plan Toiyabe National Forest 1996
National Park Service	Black Canyon Wilderness; Bridge Canyon Wilderness; Eldorado Wilderness; Ireteba Peaks Wilderness; Jimbilnan Wilderness; Muddy Mountains Wilderness; Nellis Wash Wilderness; Pinto Valley Wilderness; Spirit Mountain Wilderness	Revised Draft Environmental Statement Preliminary Wilderness Proposal Lake Mead National Recreation Area & Interagency Wilderness Strategic Plan (1995)
National Park Service	Death Valley NP & Wilderness Area	General Management Plan Death Valley National Park 04/2002

Table 4-9. Documentation of Status 1 lands in Nevada.

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Nevada	Source of Management Plan
National Park Service	Great Basin NP	Final General Management Plan Development Concept Plans Environmental Impact Statement Great Basin National Park 09/1992
The Nature Conservancy	Alamo; Anderson; Bugbee; Elbow/NLRC; Feretto; Henrie; Nye County; Parker; Shelton; Shirley Perkins; Torrance	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherewew ork/northamerica/states/nevada/pr eserves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Aden Lava Flow RNA; Antelope Pass RNA; Bear Creek ACEC; Gila Middle Box ACEC; Lordsburg Playa RNA; Paleozoic Trackways RNA	Las Cruces District Office- Mimbres Resource Area - Mimbres Resource Management Plan 12/1993
Bureau of Land Management	Ah-shi-sle-pah Road ACEC; Albert Mesa ACEC; Andrews Ranch ACEC; Bee Burrow ACEC; Bis sa'ani ACEC; Casamero Community ACEC; Church Rock Outlier ACEC; Cottonwood Divide ACEC; Dogie Canyon School ACEC; East Side Rincon ACEC; Farmer's Arroyo ACEC; Fossil Forest RNA; Four Ye'i ACEC; Gonzalez Canyon- Senon S. Vigil Homestead ACEC; Halfway House ACEC; Haynes Trading Post ACEC; Headcut Prehistoric Community; Holmes Group ACEC; Indian Creek ACEC; Jacques Chacoan Community ACEC; Kin Nizhoni ACEC; Margarita Martinez Homestead ACEC; Martin Apodaco Homestead ACEC; Morris 41 ACEC; Pierre's Site ACEC; Reese Canyon RNA; Rock House-Nestor Martin Homestead ACEC; Simon Ruin ACEC; Toh-la-kai ACEC; Twin Angels ACEC; Upper Kin Klizhin ACEC	Record of Decision Farmington Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 09/2003
Bureau of Land Management	Little McKittrick Draw Habitat Management RNA; South Texas Hill Canyon RNA; Yeso Hills RNA; Pecos River/Canyons Complex RNA	Approved Carlsbad Resource Management Plan 09/1988
Bureau of Land Management	Mathers RNA/ISA	Special Status Species Resource Management Plan Amendment Analysis of Management Situation 01/2005
Bureau of Land Management	McGregor Black Grama Grassland ACEC	Draft McGregor Range Resource Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement 01/2005; Resource Management Plan Amendment McGregor Range 09/1990
Bureau of Land Management	Roswell Cave Complex ACEC	Record of Decision Proposed Roswell Resource Management Plan 10/1997
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Bosque del Apache Wilderness	URL: http://www.fws.gov/southwest /refuges/newmex/bosque/
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Salt Creek Wilderness	Bitter Lake National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan 09/1998

 Table 4-10. Documentation of Status 1 lands in New Mexico.

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	Aldo Leopold Wilderness; Gila River RNA; Gila Wilderness	Gila National Forest Plan 09/1986; Amendment No. 9 11/2002
U.S. Forest Service	Bernalillo RNA	Cibola National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 07/1985; Amendment No. 8. 11/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Canada Bonito RNA; Mesita de las Ladrones RNA; Monument Canyon RNA	Santa Fe National Forest Plan 07/1987; Amendment Change Notice No. 1. 09/1994
U.S. Forest Service	Haynes Canyon RNA; Upper McKittrick RNA; William G. Telfer RNA	Lincoln National Forest Plan 1986; Amendment No. 9. 06/1996
National Park Service	Bandelier NM & Wilderness Area	Resources Management Plan Bandelier National Monument 01/1995
National Park Service	Capulin Volcano NM	Statement for Management Capulin Volcano National Monument 10/1989
National Park Service	Carlsbad Caverns NP & Wilderness Area	General Management Plan Carlsbad Caverns National Park 10/1996
National Park Service	Gila Cliff Dwellings NM	Interviewed Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument Superintendent: Steve Riley - 06/04
National Park Service	White Sands NM	Final Master Plan in Conjunction with the Resource Management Plan for White Sands National Monument 01/1995
The Nature Conservancy	Gila Riparian Preserve; Gila River Farm; Lama Canyon Preserve; Milnesand Prairie Preserve; Mimbres River Preserve; Rattlesnake Spring Preserve; Rio Nutria Preserve; Santa Fe Canyon Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherew ework/northamerica/states/new mexico/preserves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Utah	Source of Management			
		Plan			
Bureau of Land Management	Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC; North Caineville Mesa ACEC; South Caineville Mesa ACEC	Henry Mountain Parker Mountain and Mountain Valley Management Framework Plans Approved Amendments and Record of Decision 1982			
Bureau of Land Management	Big Flat Tops ACEC; Bowknot Bend ACEC; Pictographs ACEC; San Rafael Reef North ACEC	San Rafael Final Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary 05/1991			
Bureau of Land Management	Dark Canyon ACEC; Lavender Mesa ACEC	San Juan/San Miguel Planning Area Resource Management Plan 09/1985			
Bureau of Land Management	Lears Canyon ACEC	Diamond Mountain Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision Fall 1994			
Bureau of Land Management	Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC	Vermillion Management Framework Plan 12/1986			
Bureau of Land Management	Dance Hall Rock Historic Site; Devils Garden ISA; Escalante Canyons ONA; No Mans Mesa RNA; North Escalante Canyon ONA; The Gulch ONA; Phipps-Death Hollow ISA; Wolverine Petrified Wood Natural Area	Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Management Plan 02/2000			
Bureau of Land Management	Wah Wah Mountains RNA	Warm Springs Resource Area Management Plan, Record of Decision and Rangeland Program Summary 1987			
Bureau of Land Management	Bridger Jack Mesa WSA/ACEC	Resource Management Plan Record of Decision and Rangeland Program Summary for the San Juan Resource Area 03/1991			
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Fish Springs NWR	Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment 07/2004			
U.S. Forest Service	Gunsight Peak RNA	Caribou Revised Forest Plan Caribou-Targhee National Forest 2003			
U.S. Forest Service	Browse RNA; Red Canyon RNA; Table Cliff RNA; Timbered Cinder Cone RNA; Upper Sand Creek RNA	Land and Resource Management Plan for the Dixie National Forest 09/1986			
U.S. Forest Service	Bullion Canyon RNA; Partridge Mountain RNA; Upper Fish Creek RNA	Land and Resource Management Plan Fishlake National Forest 1986			

Table 4-11, Documentation of Status 1 lands in Otal	<b>Table 4-11.</b>	<b>Documentation</b>	of Status 1	lands	in Utah
---	--------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------	---------

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	Gates of Birch Creek RNA; Pollen Lake RNA; Sims Peak Potholes RNA; Timber-Cow Ridge RNA; Uinta Shale Creek RNA; Lance Canyon RNA; Ashley Gorge RNA	Land and Resource Management Plan for Ashley National Forest 10/1986
U.S. Forest Service	Cliff Dwellers Pasture RNA; Elk Knoll RNA; Great Basin Experimental Range; Hammond Canyon; Hideout Mesa RNA; Mill Creek Gorge RNA; Mount Peale RNA; Nelson Mountain RNA; Pinhook Battleground Historical Site; Scad Valley Botanical Area; The Grove of Aspen Giants Area; World Record Pinyon Pine	Land and Resource Management Plan for Manti- La Sal National Forest; Amendment No. 2. 09/1990
U.S. Forest Service	Jumpoff RNA	2003 Land and Resource Management Plan Revision Unita National Forest 05/2003
U.S. Forest Service	Deseret Peak Wilderness; High Uintas Wilderness; Lone Peak Wilderness; Mollens Hollow RNA; Morris Creek RNA; Mount Naomi Wilderness; Mount Olympus Wilderness; Red Butte Canyon RNA; Twin Peaks Wilderness; Wellsville Mountain Wilderness	Revised Forest Plan Wasatch- Cache National Forest 02/2003
National Park Service	Arches NP	General Management Plan Development Concept Plan Environmental Assessment Arches National Park 07/1989
National Park Service	Bryce Canyon NP	Statement for Management Bryce Canyon National Park 02/1993
National Park Service	Canyonlands NP	Statement for Management Canyonlands National Park 07/1988
National Park Service	Cedar Breaks NM	Environmental Assessment, General Management Plan, and Development Concept Plan for Cedar Breaks National Monument 09/1983
National Park Service	Dinosaur NM	General Management Plan Development Concept Plans Land Protection Plan Environmental Assessment Dinosaur National Monument 07/1988; Amended 04/1991
National Park Service	Hovenweep NM	Statement for Management Hovenweep National Monument 04/1992

Land Steward	Name of Status 1 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
National Park Service	Natural Bridges NM	General Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement Development Concept Plan Natural Bridges National Monument 02/1997
National Park Service	Zion National Park; Crazy Quilt Mesa RNA; Goose Creek RNA; Hanging Garden RNA; Isolated Mesa Tops RNA; Kolob Mesas RNA; Parunuweap RNA; Shunes Creek RNA; Slickrock RNA; Southeast Pinyon Juniper RNA	General Management Plan Zion National Park 08/2001
The Nature Conservancy	Autumn Buttercup Preserve; Clay Phacalia Preserve; Dwarf Bear Claw Poppy Preserve; Great Salt Lake Shorelands; Mayberry Preserve; Red Cliffs Desert Preserve; Scott M. Matheson Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherew ework/northamerica/states/uta h/preserves/

# LIMITATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The SWReGAP stewardship dataset reflects a compilation of datasets provided by a variety of data stewards that are individually responsible for the accuracy of their own datasets. No single source could provide a map of all managed areas within a state or for the region. Numerous difficulties arose when combining information from a large number of data sources and compiling the disparate data into a single comprehensive dataset. Some of these difficulties were caused by digital sources using different map projections, different scales, different production quality, and varying dates of production. In addition, some sources only had paper versions of the map and therefore, boundaries were on-screen digitized at the SWReGAP stewardship laboratory, introducing the possibility of additional errors. Due to the wide range and variety of source data sets, existing boundary discrepancies between two contributed datasets frequently occurred. In order to compile the region-wide dataset, the errors in boundaries were adjusted, usually to the more detailed or larger scale dataset, but on occasion without knowing which source of data was correct. Because of this uncertainty, boundaries represented in the stewardship dataset should not be considered cadastral, meaning they are not an official register to the division of land parcels for surveying. taxation or administrative purposes. Although some parcel-level data was used to produce the stewardship dataset, the SWReGAP geodatabase does not, and should not be considered to, provide legal representation of land ownership boundaries.

The regional stewardship mapping laboratory attempted to maintain consistency when compiling the dataset, however, absolute mapping standards were difficult to establish and many decisions were made on a case by case basis. Some simple rules were maintained throughout the dataset during topology editing. These rules usually related to size of the particular parcels. For example, if an ACEC was smaller than a wilderness area the ACEC was usually embedded on top of the wilderness area. Many parcels have dual designations, which complicates the task of creating a standard parcel editing methodology. When this occurred, the regional stewardship coordinator attempted to attribute the parcel to the more legally binding land management descriptor.

Other considerations pertain to the lack of detailed geospatial data that correspond with the written management plans. For example, individual parcels such as National Parks are usually not under one management mandate; some parks have recreation zones, development zones, and natural zones. Often the park management plan describes various management zones but no digital data representing the various zones in the park exist. For the most part, the available digital data only represented the proclamation (outer and generalized) boundary of the park. Because of this some parcels had an oversimplification of management levels because the entire parcel (a park in this example) was assigned the same biodiversity management status code. This approach could cause estimates of the area actually being managed in each management status code to be over or under estimated. This lack of internal management boundary detail most commonly occurred in National Park Service lands, some U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lands and most of the Tribal Lands.

The stewardship data is a dynamic GAP product. Lands are regularly changing ownership and new management directions are continually being applied. This creates an on-going need to add or revise parcel information. At this time there is no organization tasked with the continual upkeep and maintenance of the stewardship dataset especially at a regional or national scale. Tasking an organization with the maintenance and upkeep of this type of regionally consistent data could prove to be very beneficial in the development of multi-state, landscape scale perspectives of biodiversity management. These considerations could help identify new or additional opportunities for biodiversity planning across political boundaries from local visions to national efforts. Continual updates to these data would also provide a unique visual representation for individual land stewards to identify other land stewards in different geographic regions who share similar biodiversity management responsibilities.

Another important aspect related to maintenance and development of this dataset is an expanded geodatabase system. Beardsley and Stoms (1993) suggested three improvements pertaining to: delineation of sections within managed areas, encoding of additional attributes, and multi-scale representations of parcels. An enhanced system should facilitate revising and tracking ownership and protection modifications to the dataset. For the most part, improvements and updates should include both the coding and spatial representation of dually designated parcels. Other modifications could allow for non-spatial information to be dynamically linked to the parcel such as sources of management plans or alternative coding systems. By establishing a more formal data steward and a system for maintenance and upkeep of the stewardship dataset, the stewardship information produced by GAP could become an even more valuable data resource for natural resource managers throughout the Southwest United States.

## CHAPTER 5

# ANALYSIS BASED ON STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT STATUS

Kenneth G. Boykin, Lisa Langs Stoner, John Lowry, Don Schrupp, David Bradford, Lee O'Brien, Kathryn Thomas, Charles Drost, Andrea Ernst, William Kepner, Julie Prior-Magee, Doug Ramsey, Wendy Rieth, Todd Sajwaj, Keith Schulz, and Bruce C. Thompson.



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

Recommended Citation:

Boykin, K. G., L. Langs Stoner, J. Lowry, D. Schrupp, D. Bradford, L. O'Brien, K. Thomas, C. Drost, A. Ernst, W. Kepner, J. Prior-Magee, D. Ramsey, W. Rieth, T. Sajwaj, K. Schulz, B.C. Thompson. 2007. Analysis based on stewardship and management status. Chapter 5 *in* J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding author: K.G. Boykin is to be contacted at kboykin@nmsu.edu, Tel. 575-646-6303

# INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the methods and results of the gap analysis as conducted by the Gap Analysis Program. As described in the general introduction to this report, the primary objective of GAP is to provide information on the distribution and status of several elements of biological diversity. Here, we present gap analysis results for land cover and terrestrial vertebrate species for the southwestern region. Other components of biodiversity, such as aquatic organisms or selected groups of invertebrates may be incorporated into GAP distributional data sets, however they were not the focus of SWReGAP's mapping effort.

Although GAP "seeks to identify habitat types and species not adequately represented in the current network of biodiversity management areas" (GAP 2000), it is unrealistic to create a standard definition of "adequate representation" for either land cover types or individual species (Noss et al. 1995). A practical solution to this problem is to report both percentages and absolute area of each element in biodiversity management areas and allow the user to determine which types are adequately represented in natural areas. There are many other factors that should be considered in such determinations including:

- historic loss or gain in distribution;
- nature of the spatial distribution;
- immediate versus long term risk; and
- degree of local adaptation among populations of the biotic elements that are worthy of individual conservation consideration.

Such analyses are beyond the scope of this project, but we encourage their application coupled with field confirmation of the mapped distributions.

Where appropriate, GAP data may also be analyzed to identify the location of a set of areas in which most or all land cover types or animal species are predicted to be represented. The use of "complementarity" analysis, that is, an approach that additively identifies a selection of locations that may represent biodiversity rather than "hot spots of species richness" may prove most effective for guiding biodiversity maintenance efforts. Several quantitative techniques have been developed that facilitate this process (see Pressey et al. 1993, Williams et al. 1996, Csuti et al. 1997, for details). These areas become candidates for field validation and may be incorporated into a system of areas managed for the long-term maintenance of biological diversity.

State wildlife agencies maintain records on vertebrate species inventories. The network of Conservation Data Centers (CDCs) and Natural Heritage Programs (NHPs) established cooperatively by The Nature Conservancy and various state agencies maintain detailed databases on the locations of rare elements of biodiversity. GAP cooperatively uses these data to develop predicted distributions of potentially suitable habitat for these elements. These data may also be valuable for identifying additional research needs and preliminary considerations for restoration or reintroduction. Conservation of rare elements, however, is best accomplished through the fine-filter approach of the above organizations as

described in the general introduction. It is not the role of GAP to duplicate or disseminate state wildlife agency data or Natural Heritage Program or CDC Element Occurrence Records. Users interested in more specific information about the location, status, and ecology of populations of rare species are directed to their state wildlife agencies and state Heritage Program or CDC.

### **METHODS**

We conducted the gap analysis using ESRI ® ArcGIS Desktop 9 software and the Spatial Analyst extension. Gap analysis is accomplished by first producing maps of land cover (Chapter 2), predicted animal-habitat distributions (Chapter 3), land stewardship (Chapter 4), and GAP management status (Chapter 5). To facilitate the analysis, each data set was converted to grid format for use within ArcGIS' Model Builder. In Model Builder, a graphical model was designed to run a series of cross-tabulations employing the "Tabulate Area" tool. By intersecting the land stewardship and management status maps with the land cover and animal-habitat species distributions for every land cover class and animal species within each land stewardship and management status category. Calculations were generated for the entire 5-state region as well as for each state individually. We highlight the results of these analyses in the sections below and present detailed summaries in a series of appendices at the end of this chapter. Management implications of the results are provided in Chapter 6.

## RESULTS

Results from the gap analysis are provided in a series of appendices, tables, and figures that allow users to carry out inquiries about the representation of each element in different land stewardship and management status categories as appropriate to their own management objectives. This forms the basis of Gap's mission to provide land owners and managers with the information necessary to conduct informed policy development, planning, and management for biodiversity maintenance.

Recall from Chapter 4 (Land Stewardship), that each biodiversity management category recognized by GAP provides increasing levels of conservation based on the management objectives of the land steward. Lands managed according to GAP Status 1 and 2 criteria are assumed to have the highest amount of protection. As a coarse indicator of the conservation status of the elements, we identify for every land cover type and animal species, the proportion of its distribution that falls within Status 1 and 2 lands according to five levels of representation: 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >=50%. The <1% level indicates elements with essentially none of their distribution in a protected status while levels of 10%, 20%, and 50% have been recommended in the literature as necessary amounts of conservation (Noss and Cooperrider 1994, Odum and Odum 1972, Specht et al. 1974, Ride 1975, Miller 1984).

### Land Cover - Regional Analysis

A total of 125 land cover types are mapped within the SWReGAP area; of which 109 are natural or semi-natural ecological systems. The five most abundant land cover types in the region are: *Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie* (S088) (comprising 8.2% of the region), *Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland* (S054) (7.8% of the region), *Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S039) (7.1%), *Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub* (S065) (5.7%), and *Agriculture* (N80) (5.5%). *Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S040) and *Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland* (S036) are also quite extensive as well as several varieties of desert scrub, grassland, and shrub-steppe systems.

The proportional distribution (as a percent) for each land cover type by land steward in the 5-state region is provided in Appendix 5-1. The distribution of each land cover type by GAP Management Status is presented in Appendix 5-2. For example, from these appendices we note that *Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub* (S065), a land cover type that occurs in all 5 states, is managed predominantly by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (65.1%) (Appendix 5-1) and for the most part, falls within GAP Management Status 3 (Appendix 5-2).

Figure 5-2 presents a summary of ecological systems within GAP Management Status 1 and 2 for each of the five threshold categories of conservation. Ecological systems have been aggregated into National Land Cover Database (NLCD) classes to aid in presenting these data. For instance, from Figure 5-1 we note there are six ecological systems with less than 1% (0-<1% threshold category) of their distribution within Status 1 or 2 lands for the 5-state region. These include: one barren type, one shrub/scrub type, one emergent herbaceous wetland system, and three grassland/herbaceous systems. Table 5-1 presents similar, but more detailed information about the distribution of land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands for the 5-state region.

Approximately 11.5% (160,183 km<sup>2</sup>) of the 5-state region falls within GAP Status 1 or 2 (Appendix 5-2). In general, land cover classes at higher elevations are more likely to have a larger proportion of their total distribution within GAP Management Status 1 and 2 than lower elevation land cover classes, because much of the higher elevation land is under government stewardship with a mandate to protect biodiversity (e.g. Wilderness Areas). On the other hand, examining land cover types that exhibit low proportions (e.g. thresholds of 0-<1%, and 1%-<10%) of their distribution in GAP Management Status 1 and 2 is useful as it provides a measure of potentially threatened biodiversity (e.g. using a coarse filter approach), and may help prioritize land cover types in need of conservation action.



Figure 5-1. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) and summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the SWReGAP project area.

		Area in	Area in	~1	1-~10	10-	20-	<b>\50</b>
Code	Land Cover Type	region	Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	<20	<50	>30
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale	~1		0.0				
\$008	Grassland Western Great Plains Cliff and Outeron	<1 215	n/a 2	0.0				
S138	Western Great Plains Mescuite Woodland and Shruhland	1 898	3	0.9				
S108	Western Great Plains Soline Depression Wetland	41	<1	0.2				
S089	Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	n/a	0.0				
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	114,340	774	0.7				
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	32,060	1,671		5.2			
0077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and							
3077	Steppe	46,038	3,289		7.1			
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	123	3		2.7			
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	27,891	1,359		4.9			
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	4,448	306		6.9			
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	1,050	44		4.2			
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat	5 901	120		2.2			
\$061	Chibushuan Succulant Depart Saruh	3,891	138		2.3			
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shruhland	2 401	15		6.6			
3030	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Rinarian	2,401	156		0.0			
S118	Woodland and Shrubland	1.387	99		7.1			
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	109.699	7.553		6.9			
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,851	45		2.4			
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	23,842	1,728		7.2			
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	5,615	147		2.6			
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	4,155	271		6.5			
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	79,498	4,589		5.8			
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	41,190	3,831		9.3			
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	33,693	1,519		4.5			
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	47,668	3,453		7.2			
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	46	2		4.4			
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	995	54		5.5			
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	847	79		9.3			
S125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	18.0(0	<1		3.1			
S040 S047	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Snrubland	18,900	1,402		7.4			
S047	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	2,072	199		0.9			
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	7 021	244		4.5			
5150	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniner Woodland and	7,021	277		5.5			
S074	Savanna	11.968	179		1.5			
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	15,311	1,040		6.8			
S103	Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	3	<1		1.7			
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain	842	31		3.7			
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	5,096	121		2.4			
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,720	140		8.1			
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	14,088	368		2.6			
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	805	154			19.1		
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	97,894	13,618			13.9		
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	35,631	4,030			11.3		
8012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	3,103	383			12.3		ł
S042	Woodland	3,445	390			11.3		
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	17,586	1,891			10.8		
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	3,301	390			11.8		ļ
S051	Madrean Encinal	4,406	695			15.8		L
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	5,737	959			16.7		
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	21,930	2,547			11.6		
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	236	24			10.1		
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	11,518	2,153			18.7		

## Table 5-1. Representation of each land cover type in the SWReGAP project area within Status 1 & 2 Lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, and 20-<50%; >=50%.

Cada	Land Cover True	Area in	Area in Status	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
Code	Land Cover Type	region	1&2	<u> </u>		<20	<50	<u> </u>
		km²	km²	%	%	%	%	%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	2,845	526			18.5		
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	427	75			17.7		
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and	461	84			18.2		
\$020	North American Warm Desert Wash	657	04			14.4		
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	32	15			11.4		
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	21.050	2 675			12.7		
S023	Rocky Mountain Rigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	898	103			11.7		
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgenole Pine Forest	8 876	1 649			18.6		
5051	Rocky Mountain Lougepole Thie Forest	0,070	1,047			10.0		
S093	Shrubland	2 236	223			10.0		
\$083	Rocky Mountain Subalnine Mesic Meadow	2,230	392			18.0		
5005	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	2,170	51			17.5		
5072	Sierra Nevada Subalnine Lodgenole Pine Forest and	274	51			17.5		
S122	Woodland	21	4			19.1		
\$070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2 571	100			19.1		
5075	Southern Pocky Mountain Montane Subalnine Grassland	10.346	1 1 8 1			11.4		
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Dine Woodland	50 241	5.683			11.4		
\$117	Coshuilan Chanarral	06	3,085			11.5	40.7	
\$050	Colorado Platasu Plaakhrush Mormon tas Shruhland	12 210	2 6 6 0				20.1	
S039	Colorado Plateau Mixed Padroak Canyon and Tablaland	24 221	2,009				20.1	
5010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyoli and Tableland	11 526	/,410				26.2	
S032	Creat Dasin Dinyan Juniper Weedland	51 224	4,179				20.2	
5040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	51,234	10,351				20.2	
5055	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparrai	169	57				33.7	
5009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,889	/59				26.3	
S050	and Shrubland	2,569	726				28.3	
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	1 360	519				38.2	
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and	1,500	517				50.2	
5111	Woodland	811	163				20.1	
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	39	17				42.3	
\$022	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer							
5055	Forest and Woodland	2	1				32.0	
S121	Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland	114	24				20.6	
S105	Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	2	1				45.8	
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	16,864	7,220				42.8	
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	1,074	248				23.1	
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	113	53				46.7	
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	3,635	1,645				45.3	
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	399	99				24.8	
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	1,146	352				30.7	
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	995	347				34.9	
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	53	25				47.0	
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	1,962	622				31.7	
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	2,971	774				26.1	
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	8,970	2,073				23.1	
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	7.297	1.462				20.0	
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	14 846	4.941				33.3	
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and	10 365	3 3 75				37.6	
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone	10,303	207				25.0	
0001	Prine woodland	802	207				23.8	
5091	Kocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Kiparian Shrubland	5,240	1,124				54./	
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-white Bursage Desert	59,616	16,190				27.2	
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,395	1,240				23.0	
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	40,079	8,778				21.9	

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	<1				25.8	
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	54	13				23.7	
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	670	430					64.2
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	23	22					92.8
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	3,863	2,392					61.9
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	109	88					80.2
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	761	474					62.3
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,779	1,447					52.1
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	89	85					95.6
N80	Agriculture	77,813	639	0.8				
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	7,600	38	0.5				
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	7,463	19	0.3				
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	1,240	7	0.5				
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,437	65		4.5			
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	93	6		6.4			
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	52	1		1.7			
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	2,649	86		3.2			
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	8,347	274		3.3			
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,869	49		1.7			
N11	Open Water	11,220	322		2.9			
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	689	68		9.9			
D10	Recently Logged Areas	855	55		6.4			
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,666	267			16.0		
D02	Recently Burned	2,033	305			15.0		
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland	1	<1				31.0	

#### *Land cover classes with <1% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:*

Six ecological systems in the 5-state region have between 0 and <1% of their distribution in Gap Management Status 1 or 2 (Table 5-1). With one exception (*Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie* (S088)) they are mostly rare, small patch types or peripheral types that occur on the edge of their range within the SWReGAP project area. More research is needed to focus on conservation of biodiversity in these small patch types, and because the peripheral types mostly occur in adjacent regions, analysis needs to be expanded by mapping a fuller extent of the range-wide occurrence of the ecological system (i.e. beyond the SWReGAP study area).
### Land cover classes with 1-<10% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Thirty-four ecological systems have between 1 and <10% of their distribution within Status 1 or 2 (Table 5-1). Twenty-one ecological systems are relatively uncommon (<10,000 km<sup>2</sup> mapped in the region) and all but one (*Inter-Mountain Basins Wash* (S014)) of the 6 rarest types (<200 km<sup>2</sup> mapped), are peripheral to the region. The widespread *Inter-Mountain Basins Wash* (S014) often occurs as narrow, linear bands below the minimum mapping unit and with only 46 km<sup>2</sup> having been mapped. However, this system as well as all the other lower elevation riparian and wetland types have between 1 and <10% for their distributions within Status 1 or 2 lands. This is a concern because of the importance of riparian and wetland cover types for many upland wildlife species, and further supports their need to be targeted for biodiversity conservation and restoration.

There are several widespread ecological systems that are characteristic of the region, and some endemic or near-endemic types that are largely restricted to the 5-state study area. Protection is likely warranted for some of these widespread land cover types to conserve biodiversity within the southwestern U.S., and additional research might be needed to assess conservation status of these cover types in Mexico and neighboring U.S. states. These systems are: *Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe* (S077), *Chihuahuan Mixed Desert Scrub* (S116), *Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe* (S071), *Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland* (S054), and *Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland* (S090).

Endemic or near-endemic ecological systems with between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 or 2 are: *Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland* (S056), *Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland* (S136), *Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna* (S074), *Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland* (S048), *Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S038), and *Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland* (S046).

The remaining land cover types with between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 or 2 include several peripheral types that would require information from outside the SWReGAP project area to evaluate their range-wide protection status.

### Land cover classes with 10-<20% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Twenty-seven ecological systems have between 10 and <20% of their distribution in Status 1 or 2 lands (Table 5-1). These ecological systems occur in a wide variety of environmental settings, from areas of high elevation with subalpine forests and wetlands to playas and salt desert scrub. Types of ecological systems include: 4 riparian systems, 1 aspen and 1 aspen-mixed conifer system, 2 montane grassland systems, 2 dune systems, and 1 badland system. Four systems in this distribution category occur only marginally within the 5-state region.

#### Land cover classes with 20-<50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 35 ecological systems with between 20 and <50% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 5-1). Many of these ecological systems include lower- to midelevation forests and rock outcrops (e.g. barren lands).

#### Land cover classes with >50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Seven ecological systems have greater than 50% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. With the exception of one somewhat rare system (*Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral* (S114)), all occur in higher elevation (alpine and subalpine) zones.

In addition to the data provided in Appendices 5-1 and 5-2, Appendix 5-3 presents for each land cover type, a cross-tabulation of land stewardship by GAP Management Status. This effectively allows users of this report to assess relative biodiversity protection using thresholds other than those used by the Gap Analysis Program (i.e. 0 < 1%, 1 < 10%, 10 < 20%, 20 < 50%, and >50%).

## Land Cover - State-based Analyses

#### Arizona

Seventy-seven land cover types are mapped in Arizona; 70 of these are natural or seminatural ecological systems and constitute 95.4% of all land cover in the state (Appendix 5-4). Over half (54%) of the state consists of six ecological systems. Three of these ecological systems (*Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub* (S063), *Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub* (S069), and *Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S039)) cover more than 10% of the state and together comprise 37.7% of the state. Three other ecological systems *Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub* (S058); *Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland* (S036); and *Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe* (S079) occur with greater than 5% cover (and < 10% cover) and make up an additional 16.3% of the state land cover. Sixteen ecological systems have greater than 1% cover (and < 5%) and make up 36% of the total state land cover. Forty-eight ecological systems are limited in their distribution with less than 1% cover and form 5.3% of the state cover.

A summary of the percent distribution of each land cover type by land steward for Arizona is provided in Appendix 5-4. For example, in Arizona, tribal lands are responsible for approximately 27% of the land stewardship within the state (Appendix 5-4). Several ecological systems have greater than 80% of their total distribution within these areas, including 3 barren land types, 1 shrubland, 1 grassland, 2 woody wetlands, and 1 emergent herbaceous wetland. Appendix 5-5 summarizes the percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four GAP Management Status categories. Ecological systems such as *Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland* (S136) where 89% of its distribution occurs on tribal lands has nearly the same proportion of its distribution within Status 3 lands (Appendix 5-5).

Approximately 13.5% (39,659 km<sup>2</sup>) of Arizona lands are currently managed according to GAP Management Status 1 or 2 criteria. We summarize below the representation of ecological systems within these lands. Representation is categorized by the percent of the

aerial coverage of the ecological system occurring in Status 1 and 2 lands: <1%, 1 to < 10%, 10 to < 20%, 20 to < 50% and greater than 50%. Figure 5-2 presents an overview of the number of ecological systems by NLCD class with representation in Status 1 and 2 lands broken down by conservation threshold for the state of Arizona. Table 5-2 presents a more detailed version of this information by identifying the representation of individual land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands.

### Land cover classes with <1% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Seven ecological systems (Table 5-2) receive the least amount of protection, with less than 1% of their respective distributions within Status 1 or 2 lands. These ecological systems are: *Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub* (S068), *Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland* (S045), *Inter-Mountain Basins Playa* (S015), *North American Warm Desert Playa* (S022), *Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow* (S102), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow* (S083), and *Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland* (S091). Each of these has limited distribution within Arizona (4% or less of the regional distribution) and collectively the seven contribute 0.2% to the state's total land cover.

### Land cover classes with 1-<10% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Twenty-five ecological systems (Table 5-2) have between 1 and <10% of their respective areas within Status 1 and 2 lands in Arizona. Four of the most extensive ecological systems, *Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland* (S036), *Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S039), *Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub* (S058) and *Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe* (S079) are included in this group of 25. Collectively the 25 ecological systems contribute 46% to the state's total land cover.

### Land cover classes with 10-<20% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 14 ecological systems with distributions between 10 and <20% within Status 1 and 2 lands in Arizona (Table 5-2). These types collectively comprise 14.2% of the land cover in Arizona.

#### Land cover classes with 20-<50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Fifteen ecological systems have 20 to <50% of their distribution in conservation lands; they collectively contribute 33.7% to the state's total land cover.

#### Land cover classes with >50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Five ecological systems have distributions greater than 50% within Status 1 and 2 lands in Arizona: *Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral* (S053), *Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S040), *Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland* (S111), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree* (S002), and *Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland* (S025). The *Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* covers 1.15% of Arizona land cover, while the other four ecological systems .04% or less land cover. The *Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree* and *Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland* occur at the highest elevations in Arizona.



Figure 5-2. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Arizona.

Table 5-2. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0 < 1%, 1 < 10%, 10 < 20%, 20 < 50%, and >=50% in the state of Arizona.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1- <10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
F		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	187	2	0.9				
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	75	<1	0.1				
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	7	n/a	0.0				
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	48	<1	0.3				
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	<1	n/a	0.0				
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	<1	n/a	0.0				
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	<1	n/a	0.0				
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	16,539	1,369		8.3			
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	11.346	596		5.3			
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	6.318	215		3.4			
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,814	153		5.4			
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	16	<1		2.7			
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	109	6		5.7			
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	489	5		1.1			
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	353	23		6.4			
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	32,482	2,724		8.4			
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	350	19		5.6			
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	1,235	13		1.0			
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	3,998	57		1.4			
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	6,995	169		2.4			
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	11,245	298		2.7			
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	15,465	560		3.6			
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	729	42		5.7			
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	336	23		6.8			
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	795	69		8.6			
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	91	5		5.1			
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	24	<1		2.0			
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1 011	31		3.1			
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	6.073	188		3.1			
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	563	22		3.9			
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	1	<1		4.3			
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	16,233	1,328		8.2			
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon Tea Shrubland	4,033	583			14.4		
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	5,199	568			10.9		
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	573	98			17.2		

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1- <10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	4	1			14.9		
S051	Madrean Encinal	3,008	357			11.9		
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	4,008	796			19.9		
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	13,161	1,842			14.0		
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	9,636	1,683			17.5		
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	34	4			12.5		
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane	100	22			10.2		
\$021	Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	180	33			18.3		
S021	North American Warm Desert Valannia Deskland	45	5			12.1		
5019	North American warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	205	32			15.5		
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	439	74			16.8		
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	120	23			19.2		
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	6,965	1,459			17.2	20.9	
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	1	<1				26.9	
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	5,416	2,179				40.2	
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	24	8				31.6	
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,017	406				40.0	
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	760	301				39.6	
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	269	62				23.1	
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	152	31				20.5	
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	442	93				21.1	
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1.029	225				21.8	
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	128	30				23.6	
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	223	56				24.9	
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	38,909	7,935				20.4	
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,390	1,239				23.0	
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	39,773	8,778				22.1	
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	3,414	2,414					70.7
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	<1	<1					100.0
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	123	96					78.3
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	5	5					95.9
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	2	2					76.0
N80	Agriculture	5.620	2	0.4				70.2
	<b>U</b>	3,029	21	0.4		1		l

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1- <10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	4,046	12	0.3				
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1,710	3	0.2				
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	13	<1	0.0				
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	467	<1	0.1				
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,118	49		4.4			
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	127	10		7.5			
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	72	1		1.7			
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	473	80			16.9		
N11	Open Water	220	54				24.7	
D02	Recently Burned	168	91					54.5

### Colorado

A total of 82 land cover types are mapped in the state of Colorado, 66 of which are ecological systems (Appendix 5-6) and comprise 77% of the state's total area. With the exception of agricultural lands (N80), *Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie* (S088) is the most abundant land cover type, making up 16.9% of the state's area. *Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S039) (5.6%), *Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland* (S054) (5.0%), *Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland* (S023) (4.2%), and *Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland* (S036) (4.0%) are the next most abundant land cover types.

A summary of the percent distribution of each land cover type by land steward for Colorado is provided in Appendix 5-6, and the percent distribution of each land cover type by GAP Management Status is reported in Appendix 5-7. For example, the U.S. Forest Service is responsible for managing a substantial portion of two forest types, *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S028) (88.4%) and *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S030) (86.4%) (Appendix 5-6). Due to multiple resource management objectives of the Forest Service, representation of these land cover types is well distributed across each GAP Management Status, including: ~12% in Status 1, ~22% in Status 2, ~60% in Status 3, and ~6% in Status 4 (Appendix 5-7).

Figure 5-3 presents an overview of the number of ecological systems by NLCD class with representation in Status 1 and 2 lands broken down by conservation threshold for the state of Colorado. Table 5-3 presents a more detailed version of this information by identifying the representation of individual land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands.

A total area of 27,529 km<sup>2</sup> (10.2%) of Colorado's land cover is managed according to Status 1 and 2 criteria (Table 5-3); representing 6,837 km<sup>2</sup> Status 1 and 20,692 km<sup>2</sup> Status 2 lands, respectively. Figure 5-3 provides a condensed version of the information in Table 5-3 by aggregating the land cover types by NLCD class and showing the total number of ecological systems with representation in Status 1 and 2 lands according to the conservation thresholds.

#### Land cover classes with <1% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Colorado has 14 land cover types that occur less than 1% in GAP Status 1 and 2 lands. Ten of these systems (*Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop* (S008), *North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop* (S016), *North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune* (S018), *North American Warm Desert Wash* (S020), *North American Warm Desert Playa* (S022), *Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland* (S035), *Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub* (S062), *Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe* (S080), *Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S112), and *Madrean Juniper Savanna* (S115)) occur minimally within the state, and four of which are 'Chihuahuan' and 'Madrean' in nature, and are unlikely to occur in Colorado. One type, *Western Great Plains Sand Prairie* (S089), is not abundant, but was mapped, where modeled in northeastern Colorado. One type, *Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper*  *Woodland and Savanna* (S074), is mapped fairly abundantly in southeastern Colorado (2149 km<sup>2</sup>), where little protected lands exist (only 6 km<sup>2</sup> of it is attributed to Status 1 and 2 lands in Colorado). The last three of the land cover types occurring less than 1% in GAP Status 1 and 2 lands (N21, N22 and N80) are not natural communities, but human dominated landscapes of low intensity developed areas, medium to high intensity developed areas, and agricultural areas.

#### Land cover classes with 1-<10% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 29 land cover types that occur with 1-<10% of their distribution on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands. Of these, 22 are considered representative of natural communities, and 7 of 'disturbed' land cover classes. Of the 22 considered natural communities, 6 of those systems (27%) (Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon (S009), Inter-Mountain Basins Wash (S014), Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie (S088), Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland (S125), Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland (S136), and Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland (S138)) provided less than 150 square kilometers of habitat base across the 5-state region. Another 12 (55%) of these woodland, grassland and riparian communities (Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S038), Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland (S045), Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland (S047), Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland (S048), Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe (S071), Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna (S075), Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland (S085), Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland (S086), Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland (S090), Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S093), Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S095), and Western Great Plains Floodplain (S120)), provided more than 150 square kilometers, but less than 10,000 square kilometers of habitat base per type, across the 5-state region. There were 4 (18%) natural communities with greater than 10,000 square kilometers of habitat base per type (Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland (S036), Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland (S046), Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland (S054), and Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie (S088)) with 1-<10% of their distribution on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of these types are desert montane shrublands, pinyon-juniper woodlands, and shortgrass prairies of the eastern plains. These systems with greater areal extents for management consideration were ponderosa pine woodlands, gambel oak shrublands, big sagebrush shrublands, and shortgrass prairies. The 7 non-natural community cover types (Recently Mined or Ouarried (D03), Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (D04), Invasive Perennial Grassland (D06), Invasive Annual Grassland (D08), Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland (D09), Recently Logged Areas (D10), Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas (D11)) present more than 4,400 square kilometers of habitats with 'restoration potential,' with almost half of this amount being 'invasive annual grasslands. The next five most available (based on areal extent) for restoration possibilities, in descending order of square kilometers of habitat modified, were cover types currently labeled as invasive annual and biennial forblands, recently logged areas, invasive southwest riparian woodlands and shrublands, invasive annual grasslands, and recently chained pinyonjuniper areas. The logged and chained areas, may in fact represent already prescribed habitat manipulation treatments.

#### Land cover classes with 10-<20% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 16 land cover types with distributions of between 10-<20% on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands in Colorado; 15 of which are natural communities, and one 'disturbed' land cover class representing the 'disturbed, oil well' class, with less than 1 km<sup>2</sup> of this type mapped in Colorado. (This class was the focus of more mapping effort in the other four states). Of the 15 natural land cover types, Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland (S023) and Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S039) provide the most land base (11,432 km<sup>2</sup> and 15,134 km<sup>2</sup>, respectively, with potential for increasing the extent of protected habitat). Seven of the 15 natural land cover types (47%) represent a per type habitat base of between 1,504 km<sup>2</sup> and 6,938 km<sup>2</sup> to work with, from a management potential standpoint. The remaining 5 cover types (33%) (Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland (S011), Inter-Mountain Basins Playa (S015), Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland (S025), Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland (S056), and Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland (S092)) each afforded less than 500 km<sup>2</sup> of total base per type to work with, across the 5-stage region. These types represented mixed bedrock canyonlands, intermountain basin playas, limber/bristlecone pine woodlands, low sagebrush woodland, and sub-alpine/montane riparian woodlands.

#### Land cover classes with 20-<50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 16 land cover types with distributions of between 20-<50% on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands in Colorado. Two of these (12%) (Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland (S028) and Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland (S030)) represent high elevation conifer forest types, with  $>10,000 \text{ km}^2$  and  $>8,000 \text{ km}^2$ , respectively, of habitat base in our SWReGAP project area. Three of these 16 land cover types (Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland (S052), Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland (S091), Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow (S102)) (19%) provide per class habitat bases of >1,700, >2,800 and >1,300 km<sup>2</sup> respectively, representing pinyon-juniper woodlands, subalpine-montane riparian shrublands, and alpine-montane wet meadows. Seven of the 16 land cover types (44%) (Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland (S050), North American Arid West Emergent Marsh (S100), Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland (S128), Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie (S132), Barren Lands, Non-specific(N31), Disturbed, Non-specific (D01), and Recently Burned (D02)), with distributions between 20-<50% in Status 1 and 2 lands (44%) each afford less than 500 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat base across the 5-state project area. Three of these types represent either barren lands, or disturbed/burned land cover types, for which their minimal representation might be interpreted as a good thing, Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock (S006) and Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland (S010) represented 981 km<sup>2</sup> and 674 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat base, for which 20-<50% was found in GAP Status 1 and 2 lands.

#### Land cover classes with >50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 5 land cover types with distributions of greater than 50% on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands in Colorado. Four of these are 'alpine' systems (*North American Alpine Ice Field* (S001), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree* (S002), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field* (S004), and *Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra* (S081)), and fall within the greater than 50% GAP Status 1 and 2 lands, by virtue of the amount of these types falling within wilderness areas. The fifth type, *Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune* (S012), falls into this category given the substantial amount of its cover that occurs within the Great Sand Dunes National Monument.



Figure 5-3. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Colorado.

Table 5-3. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50% in the state of Colorado.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1- <10	10- <20	20-<50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	<1	n/a	0.0				
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	9	<1	0.1				
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	1	n/a	0.0				
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	<1	n/a	0.0				
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<1	n/a	0.0				
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	<1	n/a	0.0				
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	<1	n/a	0.0				
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	<1	n/a	0.0				
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	1	<1	0.7				
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Sayanna	2 149	6	03				
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	88	1	0.7				
S089	Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	n/a	0.0				
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	120	3		2.7			
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	13.378	1.024		7.7			
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	4	<1		8.5			
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	281	7		2.3			
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	1.019	72		7.1			
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	8,498	673		7.9			
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	862	69		8.0			
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	20	1		3.9			
S125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	6	<1		3.4			
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	10,226	618		6.0			
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	566	54		9.5			
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	2,303	176		7.6			
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	13	<1		2.3			
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	7,245	687		9.5			
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	4,834	386		8.0			
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	10,790	829		7.7			
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain	828	31		3.8			
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	4,362	102		2.3			
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	10	<1		2.8			
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	849	61		7.2			
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	8,679	259		3.0			
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	45,615	634		1.4			ļ
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	66	8			11.5		
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	15,134	3,014			19.9		
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,951	224			11.5		
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	2,276	337			14.8		
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,324	269			11.6		
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	44	7			16.3		

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1- <10	10- <20	20-<50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	3,350	540			16.1		
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	258	33			12.9		
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	11,432	1,337			11.7		
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,150	425			13.5		
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	6,939	1,302			18.8		
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,603	475			13.2		
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	1,504	251			16.7		
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	369	56			15.2		
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	215	24			11.4		
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	97	36				37.0	
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and	671	252				27.6	
\$052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	1 764	549				31.1	
S052	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	1,704	 <1				24.4	
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	44	19				44 5	
S100	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	1 327	488				36.8	
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	981	298				30.3	
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	10 179	3 563				35.0	
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	8.150	2.789				34.2	
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	2,812	1,073				38.1	
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	<1				27.7	
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	43	11				26.4	
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	129	111					85.5
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	2	2					78.8
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	2,878	1,734					60.3
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	584	354					60.7
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,446	1,328					54.3
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	2,010	3	0.1				
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,068	8	0.8				
N80	Agriculture	52,820	518		1.0			
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	633	20		3.2			
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	372	21		5.7			
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,079	25		1.2			
D04	Shrubland Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniner Areas	486	27		5.5			
D10	Recently Logged Areas	231	19		ð.4			
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	940 97	32		9.0			
D14	Disturbed Oil Well	0/ <1	4 <1		4./	1/1 8		
N11	Open Water	607	<1 87			13.5		
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	10	02 2			13.3	21.5	
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland	10	<1				31.0	
D02	Recently Burned	313	139				44.5	
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	2	1					50.4

### New Mexico

There are 89 land cover types mapped in New Mexico, 79 of which are natural or seminatural ecological systems (Appendix 5-8). Of the 89 land cover types, there are eight (9%) that were mapped most abundantly. These are: Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie (S088), Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe (S077), Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S039), Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland (S036), Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub (S062). Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland (S090), Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub (S058), and Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe (S079). These eight land cover types account for 228,258 square kilometers (73%) of New Mexico and each represent 5% or greater of the state. An additional six land cover types account for 1-4% each of the state's total area including: Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S038), Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna (S074), Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S112), Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub (S068), Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland (S048), Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland (S054), and Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub (S065).

A summary of the percent distribution of each land cover type by land steward for New Mexico is provided in Appendix 5-8, and the percent distribution of each land cover type by GAP Management Status is reported in Appendix 5-9. For instance, the distribution of a relatively sparse but localized (<1 km<sup>2</sup>) ecological system, *Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland* (S109), falls almost entirely within private lands (98%) with the other 2% in State School Trust lands (Appendix 5-8), where 100% of its total distribution is managed according to Status 4 criteria (Appendix 5-9).

Figure 5-4 presents an overview of the number of ecological systems by NLCD class with representation in Status 1 and 2 lands broken down by conservation threshold for the state of New Mexico. Table 5-4 presents a more detailed version of this information by identifying the representation of individual land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands.

Approximately 6.3% (19,908 km<sup>2</sup>) of New Mexico lands are currently managed according to GAP Management Status 1 or 2 criteria (Appendix 5-9). There are 36 land cover types (40%) that do not occur on Status 1 lands (10 of which are altered or disturbed). Fourteen (16%) of these land cover types do not occur on Status 2 lands either (four of which are altered or disturbed).

#### Land cover classes with <1% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Of the 89 land cover types, eight (9%) occur with less than 1% of their distribution on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands. Two types (*Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie* (S088), *Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland* (S138)) were mapped on the eastern part of New Mexico, an area primarily under private ownership. *Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie* was the dominant mapped system within New Mexico and accounts for greater than 20% of the mapped land cover type within the state. The other type (*Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland*) was mapped in the

northeastern part of the state, but still largely occurring on private lands. There are four systems (*Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree* (S002), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field* (S004), *Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra* (S081), *Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland* (S109)) that occur sparsely within the state and Inter-Mountain Basins Playa (S015) that was mapped only slightly more extensively in the state. One type (*Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub* (S069)) was mapped very sparsely and would not likely occur within the state as it is a type associated with the Sonoran and Mojave deserts.

### Land cover classes with 1-<10% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 39 land cover types that occur with 1-<10% of their distribution on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of these types are desert scrub, pinyon-juniper woodlands, and riparian types. The areas in which these land cover types occur are where the majority of private lands or multiple use lands (Status 3) occur. Historically, areas near to and surrounding riparian zones were settled first, and thus, are likely to be privately owned. Consequently, there are several riparian land cover types each with minimal protection of their distribution within Status 1 and 2 lands, including: *North American Arid West Emergent Marsh* (S100), *North American Warm Desert Wash* (S020), *Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat* (S096), *Inter-Mountain Basins Wash* (S014), *Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow* (S102), *Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland* (S093), *Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland* (S108).

#### Land cover classes with 10-<20% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 15 land cover types with distributions of between 10-<20% on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands in New Mexico. Many of the land cover types within this category are riparian areas and thus subject to management discussed above. These include: North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S094), North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S097), Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow (S083), Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland (S091), and Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland (S092). Also included within this category is Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland (S036) which is a dominant land cover type on forested Status 3 lands. One grassland type, *Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe* (S080), one forest type, Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland (S042), and one shrubland type, *Mogollon Chaparral* (S057) are also included within this threshold. There are two shrublands which include: Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland (S056) and Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub (S129). Four barren or sparse land cover types include: Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune (S012), Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland, (S011) North American Warm Desert Pavement (S021), and Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock (S006).

### Land cover classes with 20-<50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 12 land cover types with distributions of between 20-<50% on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands in New Mexico. Many of the land cover types within this category are high

elevation conifer and aspen forest types that occur within wildernesses in New Mexico. The high elevation land cover types include: *Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland* (S023), *Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland* (S032), *Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland* (S034), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S028), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S028), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S030), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland* (S025), and *Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland* (S085). Lower elevation land cover types include *Coahuilan Chaparral* (S117), *Madrean Encinal* (S051), *North American Warm Desert Playa* (S022), *North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque* (S098), and *North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland* (S019).

#### Land cover classes with >50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 3 land cover types with distributions of greater than 50% on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands in New Mexico. These include: *Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land* (S013), *Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland* (S024), and *Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub* (S063). The volcanic lands are largely within El Malpais National Park in central New Mexico. *Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland* (S024) was mapped sparsely within the southeastern part of the state within the Lincoln National Forest. *Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub* (S063) was mapped very sparsely in southwestern New Mexico. Although it is considered a Sonoran Desert land cover type, where it occurs in New Mexico, the actual vegetation is probably more closely associated with the Chihuahuan Desert.



Figure 5-4. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of New Mexico.

Table 5-4. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50% in the state of New Mexico.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland	<1	n/a	0.0				
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	2	n/a	0.0				
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	7	n/a	0.0				
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	<1	n/a	0.0				
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	19	n/a	0.0				
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	<1	n/a	0.0				
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	1,787	3	0.2				
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	67,399	140	0.2				
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	15,120	302		2.0			
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	34 343	2 694		78			
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	21.066	1.144		5.4			
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1.590	153		9.6			
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	969	44		4.5			
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	5,537	136		2.5			
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	78	7		8.5			
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	141	5		3.8			
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	2,465	225		9.1			
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	27,849	2,351		8.4			
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	3,929	118		3.0			
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	2,264	97		4.3			
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	1,297	82		6.3			
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	3,777	161		4.3			
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	282	24		8.6			
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	16,390	663		4.0			
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	14,466	574		4.0			
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	3	<1		1.1			
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	657	32		4.8			
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	1,725	163		9.5			
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	8,754	705		8.1			
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	672	66		9.9			
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	85	3		3.8			
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,695	113		6.7			
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	838	61		7.3			
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	197	10		5.1			
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	136	11		7.8			
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	1,888	147		7.8			
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	7	1		8.2			
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	783	43		5.5			
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	266	4		1.7			1
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	79	1		1.2			

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	9,803	173		1.8			
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	10,465	654		6.2			
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	221	2		1.0			
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	701	18		2.6			
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	851	78		9.2			
S108	Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	20	<1		1.0			
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	5,208	109		2.1			
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	803	154			19.1		
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	329	42			12.8		
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	735	89			12.1		
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	182	33			18 1		
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	481	79			16.5		
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	870	150			17.2		
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	191	31			16.1		
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	173	32			18.2		
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	122	21			16.8		
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff. Canyon and Massive Bedrock	417	77			18.4		
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	147	27	-		18.3		
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	103	15			14.9		
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	5	10			10.0		
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	2	<1			10.7		
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	21.160	3.297			15.6		
S117	Coahuilan Chaparral	93	39				41.7	
S051	Madrean Encinal	1,350	339				25.1	
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	515	171				33.2	
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	3	1				20.0	
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	700	264				37.6	
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	1 483	522				35.2	
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2 864	967				33.8	
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1 610	514				31.9	
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	982	359				36.6	
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	640	275				43.0	
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	376	129				34.4	
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	1,855	430				23.2	
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	470	414					88.1
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	<1	<1					62.6
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	<1	<1					66.3
N80	Agriculture	6,026	25	0.4				
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,107	3	0.3				
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	975	3	0.3				

		Area	Area in	<1	1-<10	10-	20-	>50
Code	Land Cover Type	in NM	Status 1&2			<20	<50	
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	29	<1	0.1				
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	<1	n/a	0.0				
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	177	n/a	0.0				
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	54	1		1.5			
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	48	3		6.5			
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	27	1		3.4			
N11	Open Water	438	36		8.3			
D02	Recently Burned	806	45		5.6			
D10	Recently Logged Areas	8	<1		2.6			

### Nevada

Seventy-four of the 125 land cover classes mapped within the 5-state region occur in Nevada. Of this total, nine cover classes are either altered and disturbed (e.g., invasive species, mineral extraction, or recently burned) or developed and agriculture, where the remainder are naturally occurring ecological systems (Appendix 5-10). Nearly 78% of the state is dominated by six land cover types: *Inter-mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland* (S054), *Inter-mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub* (S065), *Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S040), *Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland* (S055), *Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub* (S069), and *Intermountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe* (S071).

Remarkably, 62 mapped cover types in Nevada are limited in their distribution with less than 1% cover each and form less than 8% of the total state cover. Invasive species, such as *Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland* (D09), *Invasive Annual Grassland* (D08), *Invasive Perennial Grassland* (D06), and *Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland* (D04) represent slightly more than 2% of the total land cover for Nevada. Collectively, developed and agricultural land cover types in Nevada represent 2,914 km<sup>2</sup> or approximately only 1% of the areal extent of the state.

A summary of the percent distribution of each land cover type by land steward for Nevada is provided in Appendix 5-10. As an example, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management is responsible for 67% of the surface land management for the state of Nevada (Appendix 5-10). Consequently, it manages the majority of pinyon-juniper woodlands (~64%), basin big sagebrush and black sagebrush shrublands (76% and 78%, respectively) that occur throughout the state. Appendix 5-11 summarizes the percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status, where it can be seen that these three land cover types fall mostly within Status 3 lands (75%, 78.1%, and 79.5%, respectively).

Figure 5-5 presents an overview of the number of ecological systems by NLCD class with representation in Status 1 and 2 lands broken down by conservation threshold for the state of Nevada. Table 5-5 presents a more detailed version of this information by identifying the representation of individual land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands.

Approximately 14.8% (42,218 km<sup>2</sup>) of Nevada lands are currently managed according to GAP Management Status 1 or 2 criteria (Appendix 5-11); they represent 8,876 km<sup>2</sup> Status 1 and 33,342 km<sup>2</sup> Status 2 lands, respectively. The ecological systems receiving the least amount of protection in Nevada, i.e., where less than 10 % of their respective distributions occur within Status 1 or 2 lands, include the following: *Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland* (S118), *Inter-mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune* (S012), *Inter-mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland* (S054), *Inter-mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe* (S078), *Inter-mountain Basins Greasewood Flat* (S096), *Inter-mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub* (S065), *Inter-mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland* (S090), *Inter-Mountain Basins Wash* (S014), *Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland* (S024), *Sierra Nevada Cliff and* 

*Canyon* (S007), *Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland* (S085), and *Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow* (S103). Some of these ecological types, however, present the most opportunity to provide conservation measures. Many of the rarest Status 1 and 2 ecological systems predominantly occur in Status 3 areas such as U.S. Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service lands where the land is under permanent federal control and where public laws apply to conservation management. Status 3 lands in Nevada represent 71.8% of the aerial extent of the state or 204,049 km<sup>2</sup> (Appendix 5-11). Forty-one of the 74 land cover types in Nevada have greater than 50% of their areal extents classified as within the GAP Management Status 3 category (Appendix 5-11). Among the 12 ecological systems identified with low protection (less than 10% aerial extent in Status 1 or 2), all but three have >50 % of their areal extent in Nevada in Status 3 (*Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland* -S118, *Inter-mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland* -S090, and *Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland* -S024), and thus represent the greatest opportunity for future protective actions.

Lastly, under the Status 4 GAP management category there are no known public or private institutional mandates or legally recognized easements or deed restrictions to prevent conversion of natural habitat types to anthropogenic cover types, thus these are the least protected lands for biodiversity conservation in Nevada. Land cover types in this category are typically developed as high- or low-density urban or converted to agriculture and are held in private ownership. The total Status 4 lands in Nevada represent 13.4% of the areal extent of the state or 38,120 km<sup>2</sup> (Appendix 5-11). Nevertheless, eight natural ecological systems are well represented within Status 4 category lands in that they represent 35 - 89% of the areal extent for the ecological system as it is represented in Nevada. They include 1 deciduous forest type, 2 grassland /herbaceous types, 3 woody wetland types, and 2 emergent herbaceous wetland types. Specifically they include: Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland (S024), Inter-mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe (S078), Inter-mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland (S090), Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S118), North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S094), North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland (S097), North American Arid West Emergent Marsh (S100), and Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow (S103). These may represent management opportunities such as conservation easements for future consideration.



Figure 5-5. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Nevada.

Table 5-5. Percent distribution of each land cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50% in the state of Nevada.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,059	72		6.8			
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	79	3		4.1			
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	65,988	4,165		6.3			
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,274	37		2.9			
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	10,550	1,011		9.6			
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	50,604	3,090		6.1			
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	3,101	195		6.3			
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	18	1		3.4			
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	1	<1		1.0			
S007	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	123	6		4.9			
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	2	<1		6.7			
S103	Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	2	<1		2.4			
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	36,374	6,489			17.8		
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	31,792	3,724			11.7		
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	17,813	2,344			13.2		
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	5,973	1,030			17.2		
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	209	24			11.4		
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	5	1			18.1		
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	288	53			18.3		
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	27	4			13.3		
S122	Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland	20	4			19.5		
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	162	57				34.8	
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,486	642				25.8	
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	1	<1				35.4	
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	1.024	(2)(				22.5	
\$015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	1,924	020				32.5	
S033	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	6,082	1,475				24.3	
\$121	Maditarrangen California Bad Eir Forget and Woodland	2	1				32.7	
S121 S105	Mediterranean California Subalnina Montana Fan	106	24				22.4	
5105	Magallan Chanaral	2	1				47.4	
S057	Mogonon Chapartan Mojawa Mid Elavation Mixed Desart Saruh	425	133				31.3	
S100	North American Arid West Emergent March	10,521	4,952				47.1	
5100	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized	311	72				23.2	
S018	Dune	16	7				45.4	
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	30	8				26.9	
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	168	62				36.9	

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	526	180				34.3	
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	25	9				37.6	
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	10	5				47.9	
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	1,289	364				28.3	
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	108	39				35.8	
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	175	71				40.7	
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	14	6				43.3	
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	3	1				30.2	
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	67	25				37.3	
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	19,013	8,036				42.3	
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,528	467				30.6	
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	4	3					89.6
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	2	2					96.1
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	84	44					52.5
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	635	409					64.5
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	23	17					71.3
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	78	48					62.1
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	1,842	1,233					67.0
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	78	52					65.9
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	42	25					59.0
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	148	97					65.8
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	20	14					70.1
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	196	140					71.7
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	216	127					58.8
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	190	97					51.0
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	24	14					59.2
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	86	85					98.8
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	7	7					96.9
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	724	<1	0.0				
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	319	<1	0.0				
N80	Agriculture	2,222	33		1.5			
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	186	13		7.0			
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	210	5		2.5			
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	1,131	27		2.4			
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	4,610	118		2.6			

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	187	3		1.5			
D02	Recently Burned	574	28		4.9			
N11	Open Water	129	24			18.7		
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	126	37				29.6	

## Utah

Within the state of Utah a total of 80 land cover types are mapped, 65 of which are natural or semi-natural ecological systems (Appendix 5-12). The most abundant ecological systems mapped within the state of Utah are: Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S039), Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland (S054), Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub (S065), Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland (S010), Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe (S071), Inter-Mountain Basins Playa (S015), and Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland (S040). Of these more abundant land cover types, each represents 5% or more of the state's total area, and when combined represent nearly half ( $\sim 49\%$ ) of the state's area. There are nine ecological systems that represent between 1% and 5% of the state's area: Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland (S052), Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland (S059), Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe (S079), Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat (S096), Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland (S046), Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland (S023), Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland (S055), Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland (S028), and Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland (S045). Collectively these ecological systems comprise another quarter of the state's total area ( $\sim 26\%$ ). There are forty-nine ecological systems that are only sparsely distributed throughout the state, each contributing proportions smaller than 1% to the state's total area. Several ecological systems occur near the periphery of the state's borders and are sparsely distributed within the state (e.g. Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub (\$070), Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland (S128), North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque (S098), and Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral (S114)), or are naturally rare with very limited extents in Utah. Examples include: Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra (S081), Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland (S043), Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland (S036), Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna (S075), and Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland (S090).

A summary of the percent distribution of each land cover type by land steward for Utah is provided in Appendix 5-12, and the percent distribution of each land cover type by GAP Management Status is reported in Appendix 5-13. As an example, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management is responsible for 74% of the management of *Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland* (S011) (Appendix 5-12), and the majority of this land cover type falls within Status 3 lands (72.2%) (Appendix 5-13).

Figure 5-6 presents an overview of the number of ecological systems by NLCD class with representation in Status 1 and 2 broken down by conservation threshold. Table 5-6 presents a more detailed version of this information by identifying the representation of individual land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands.

### Land cover classes with <1% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Approximately 14.5% (30,874 km<sup>2</sup>) of Utah lands are currently managed according to GAP Management Status 1 or 2 criteria (Table 5-6). Of those ecological systems

receiving the least amount of protection (0-<1% of distribution in Status 1 or 2) are the following: *Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral* (S053), *Inter-Mountain Basins Wash* (S014), *Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna* (S075), *North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland* (S019), *North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque* (S098), and *Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral* (S114). It should be noted however, that each of their distributions are also quite limited within the state of Utah.

### Land cover classes with 1%-<10% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Twenty-three ecological systems have between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 or 2. This ranking comprises the most diverse set of ecological systems, including at the lower elevations a variety of desert scrub types, dunes, washes, playas, lower elevation riparian, and sagebrush-dominated systems. At higher elevations, pure aspen forests and woodlands, aspen-mixed coniferous forests, several shrubland types of the lower montane and foothill regions, and montane-subalpine grasslands are within this threshold category of biodiversity projection.

#### Land cover classes with 10%-<20% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 14 ecological systems with between 10 and <20% of their distribution within Status 1 or 2. Of those ecological systems, many are evergreen forest or woodland types occurring within montane and subalpine zones (e.g. *Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland* (S036), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S030), *Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland* (S032), *Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland* (S032), *Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland* (S032), *Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest* (S031). In a slightly lower elevation range are the extensive *Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S040), *IMB Mountain Mahogany Woodland & Shrubland* (S050), and *IMB Semi-desert Grassland* (S090). Additionally, there are three riparian types *Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland* (S091), *Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland* (S093), and *North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland* (S094), plus *IMB Shale Badlands* (S011) and one mixed desert scrub type *Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub* (S060) within this ranking.

#### Land cover classes with 20%-<50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Seventeen ecological systems have between 20 and <50% of their total distribution within Status 1 and 2 lands in Utah. This ranking includes systems that generally occur at higher elevations such as *Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow* (S102), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow* (S083), *Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra* (S081), *Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland* (S025), and *Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland* (S028). Several of these systems are characterized by having rugged terrain such as the cliff and canyon, massive bedrock types, making them less conducive for development or agricultural endeavors. Many of these systems also tend to occur within the southern part of the state where a greater proportion of the lands have a GAP Management Status of 2 due to their inclusion within National Parks and/or National Monuments (e.g. *Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland* (S039), *Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland* (S052), *Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland* (S059), *Sonora-Mojave* 

*Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub* (S069), *North American Arid West Emergent Marsh* (S100), *Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland* (S010)).

#### Land cover classes with >50% of mapped distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 5 ecological systems with greater than 50% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2, all of which occur at only the highest elevations within the state: *Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland* (S026), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field* (S004), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree* (S002), *Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland* (S043), and *North American Alpine Ice Field* (S001).



Figure 5-6. Total number of ecological systems (Y-axis) aggregated into NLCD classes (X-axis) summarized by conservation thresholds (<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >50%) of Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Utah.

Table 5-6: Percent distribution of each Land Cover type represented within Status 1 & 2 Lands, summarized by conservation thresholds of 0-<1%, 1-<10%, 10-<20%, 20-<50%, and >=50% in the state of Utah.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	<1	n/a	0.0				
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	9	<1	0.9				
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	1	n/a	0.0				
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	3	<1	0.7				
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	8	n/a	0.0				
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	3	n/a	0.0				
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	1,517	103		6.8			
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	283	27		9.5			
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	3,635	305		8.4			
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	1,804	160		8.9			
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,222	90		7.3			
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	19,935	1,678		8.4			
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	522	8		1.6			
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	7,280	270		3.7			
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	3,036	199		6.6			
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	15,499	901		5.8			
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	14,046	790		5.6			
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	10,998	408		3.7			
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	8,329	748		9.0			
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	316	7		2.1			
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	6	<1		6.3			
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	8	<1		5.9			
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	10	1		8.1			
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	6,334	359		5.7			
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	6,596	568		8.6			
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	252	18		7.3			
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	10	<1		2.7			
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	855	55		6.4			
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	593	42		7.1			
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	10,986	1,449			13.2		
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	626	100			15.9		
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	2,011	294			14.6		
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	1,827	235			12.9		
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	826	88			10.6		
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	20	4			19.3		
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	887	103			11.6		

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1.710	316			18.5		
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	1.815	346			19.1		
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	837	125			14.9		
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,427	272			19.1		
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	1,273	216			17.0		
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	298	35			11.7		
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	2,019	221			10.9		
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	9,021	2,042				22.6	
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	14,164	5,476				38.7	
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	9,414	3,607				38.3	
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	22,356	5,530				24.7	
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	382	117				30.6	
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	583	187				32.1	
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	409	146				35.7	
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	127	51				39.9	
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	472	118				25.1	
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	1,466	395				27.0	
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	293	105				35.8	
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	3 224	867				26.9	
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	499	101				20.2	
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	20	14				25.1	
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	4	14				28.6	
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	808	222				27.4	
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	4	1				34.0	
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	32	21					65.4
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	21	20					94.2
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	813	556					68.4
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	109	88					80.3
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	177	120					67.8
N80	Agriculture	9,183	42	0.5				
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	42	<1	0.1				
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,098	9	0.9				
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1,978	9	0.5				
D02	Recently Burned	172	<1	0.2				
D10	Recently Logged Areas	287	2	0.8				
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	90	5		5.3			
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	46	1		1.8			

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	Area in Status 1&2	<1	1-<10	10- <20	20- <50	>50
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	695	25		3.7			
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	3,231	134		4.1			
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	526	22		4.1			
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	171	2		1.1			
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	458	49			10.7		
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	450	122				27.2	

# **Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions - Regional Analysis**

A summary table is not provided due to the large number of species analyzed, but some generalizations and examples of species results by the various thresholds are provided below. The complete Predicted Animal Habitat Distribution Analyses Table, found in Appendix 5-14, provides the area in square kilometers (km<sup>2</sup>) of the species' mapped habitat distribution by management status and land steward, and the percent of the species' habitat total distribution in each management category. For example, Gunnison sage-grouse (*Centrocercus minimus*) has 12,526.1 km<sup>2</sup> of predicted habitat within the region and 1,212.5 km<sup>2</sup> (10%) of that area is within Status 1 and 2 lands.

There are 25 species within the region with less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands. Of these 25 species, 1 is an amphibian, 18 are birds, 2 are mammals and 4 are reptiles. The amphibian, lowland burrowing treefrog (*Pternohyla fodiens*), did not have any predicted habitat on Status 1 or 2 lands. Only 2.1 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat was mapped and 1.8 km<sup>2</sup> was on status 3 lands.

Of the 19 birds, the Neotropic cormorant (*Phalacrocorax brasilianus*) and lesser prairiechicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*) had no mapped habitat on Status 1 lands and no mapped habitat for Neotropic cormorant on Status 2 lands. Only 7 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat were mapped for the bronzed cowbird (*Molothrus aeneus*) within Status 1 and 2 lands and 49 km<sup>2</sup> for the inca dove (*Columbina inca*). Two species of mammals included the Plains pocket gopher (*Geomys bursarius*) and the swift fox (*Vulpes velox*). Only 55 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat were identified on Status 1 lands for Plains pocket gopher. Of the 4 reptiles, smooth softshell turtle (*Apalone mutica*) and Colorado Desert fringe-toed lizard (*Uma notata*) had no habitat mapped on status 1 and 2 lands. The Sand dune lizard (*Sceloporus arenicolus*) had less than 1 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped on Status 1 and 2 lands. Only 1,104 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat for Plains garter snake (*Thamnophis radix*) was mapped on status 1 and 2 lands.

The majority of all taxonomic groups occur with less than 20% of the predicted habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 288 species with predicted habitat 1-<10% on Status 1 and 2 lands and 385 species that have habitat between 10 and <20% on Status 1 and 2 lands. For amphibians 33 of 37 species fall within this threshold. Of the four species that have 20-<50% of their habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands, three are endemics with little predicted habitat including the Green Frog (*Rana clamitans*), Mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*), and Relict leopard frog (*Rana onca*). For the fourth species, Sonoran green toad (*Bufo retiformis*), habitat is found throughout southern Arizona. For birds, 54 of the 433 species modeled occur with 20% or greater predicted habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands. These figures include habitats for the entire life history of the species and are not limited to breeding habitat. There are 144 bird species with predicted habitat 1-<10% on Status 1 and 2 lands and 219 birds species with 10-<20%. There are 28 mammals that have 20% or greater of their predicted habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 78 mammal species with predicted habitat 1-<10% on Status 1 and 2 lands and 107 mammals species with 10-<20%. For reptiles, there are 33 that have 20% or greater of their predicted habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 52 reptile species with predicted habitat 1-<10% on Status 1 and 2 lands and 41 reptile species with 10-<20%.

State	Taxon	<1%	1-<10 %	10-<20 %	20-<50 %	>50 %
Region	Amphibian	1	14	18	4	0
	Birds	18	144	219	47	7
	Mammals	2	78	107	26	2
	Reptiles	4	52	41	31	2
	Total	25	288	385	108	11
Arizona	Amphibian	2	5	14	6	0
	Birds	15	91	181	76	7
	Mammals	8	45	80	20	1
	Reptiles	1	31	48	23	2
	Total	26	172	323	125	10
Colorado	Amphibian	3	10	4	1	0
	Birds	27	167	127	23	3
	Mammals	3	60	45	23	2
	Reptiles	13	31	9	7	0
	Total	46	268	185	54	5
Nevada	Amphibian	0	4	4	7	2
	Birds	12	45	138	102	22
	Mammals	2	17	69	27	16
	Reptiles	0	5	15	25	12
	Total	14	71	226	161	52
New Mexico	Amphibian	1	15	6	4	0
	Birds	28	227	103	26	1
	Mammals	8	98	43	13	0
	Reptiles	6	67	13	13	2
	Total	43	407	165	56	3
Utah	Amphibian	0	1	10	5	0
	Birds	11	85	135	92	3
	Mammals	1	26	74	28	4
	Reptiles	1	4	19	29	3
	Total	13	116	238	154	10

Table 5-7. Number of species by Gap Status thresholds for each taxa group within region/state as mapped by the Southwestern Regional Gap Analysis Project.

Analysis of relative percentage (Figure 5-7) reveals trends regarding both the status of species within each state and the region. This figure provides the relative percent of taxon by region and by state within the five threshold categories. Colorado and New Mexico have a higher percentage of species within the 1-<10% threshold than do Arizona, Nevada, and Utah. Regionally <40% of species occur within Status 1 and 2 lands. Few species in each state and the region occur with >50% of the habitat in Status 1 and Status 2 lands. However, Nevada has a higher percentage within this category than the other four states.

Cumulative numbers by taxon by state or region (Figure 5-8) provide between and within state comparisons. As expected, protection levels vary by state and taxon. Though New Mexico and Arizona have similar total species counts, more species are in Status 1 and 2 lands in Arizona. New Mexico has more species within the thresholds of <1% and 1-<10% than Arizona. Differences manifest themselves in the 1-<10% threshold in New Mexico (407 species) and the 10-<20% threshold in Arizona. A similar pattern is observed between Colorado and Nevada. Twice as many species are in 1-<10% threshold. These differences may be more pronounced because of the discrete thresholds used for analysis.



Figure 5-7. Percentage of species by taxon (amphibian, bird, mammal, reptile) occurring on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands within the 5 threshold categories (<1, 1-<10, 10-<20, 20-<50, >50) for animals modeled within the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.



Figure 5-8. Total number of species by taxon by state or region on GAP Status 1 and 2 lands for the 5 threshold categories (<1, 1-<10, 10-<20, 20-<50, >50) for animal habitats modeled within the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

Taxon	SWReGAP Common Name	SWReGAP Scientific Name
Amphibian	LOWLAND BURROWING TREEFROG	Pternohyla fodiens
Bird	UPLAND SANDPIPER	Bartramia longicauda
	CHIMNEY SWIFT	Chaetura pelagica
	INCA DOVE	Columbina inca
	BLUE JAY	Cyanocitta cristata
	GYRFALCON	Falco rusticolus
	WHOOPING CRANE	Grus americana
	RED-BELLIED WOODPECKER	Melanerpes carolinus
	RED-HEADED WOODPECKER	Melanerpes erythrocephalus
	BRONZED COWBIRD	Molothrus aeneus
	GREAT CRESTED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus crinitus
	EASTERN SCREECH-OWL	Otus asio
	HOUSE SPARROW	Passer domesticus
	NEOTROPIC CORMORANT	Phalacrocorax brasilianus
	DICKCISSEL	Spiza americana
	BROWN THRASHER	Toxostoma rufum
	LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN	Tympanuchus pallidicinctus
	SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER	Tyrannus forficatus
	TENNESSEE WARBLER	Vermivora peregrina
Mammal	PLAINS POCKET GOPHER	Geomys bursarius
	SWIFT FOX	Vulpes velox
Reptile	SMOOTH SOFTSHELL TURTLE	Apalone mutica
	SAND DUNE LIZARD	Sceloporus arenicolus
	PLAINS GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis radix
	COLORADO DESERT FRINGE-TOED	Uma notata
	LIZARD	

Table 5-8. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Management Status</th>1 or 2 for Region as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

### Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 25 species (3% of those modeled) that have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 5-8). There are 18 birds species (41%), 4 reptiles (3%), 2 mammals (1%) and 1 amphibian (3%). Several of these species, such as the lesser prairie-chicken, are already the subject of conservation planning.

#### Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 288 species (35% of modeled species) with predicted habitat of between 1 and less than 10% on status 1 and 2 lands within the entire region. This includes 14 amphibian species (38%), 144 bird species (33%), 78 mammal species (35%), and 52 reptile species (40%).

#### Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

385 species (47% of modeled species) have 10-<20% of their predicted habitat on status 1 and 2 lands within the entire region. This includes 18 amphibian species (49%), 219 bird species (50%), 107 mammals (49%), and 41 reptiles (30%).
## Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Within the SWReGAP region, there are 108 species (13 % of those modeled) with predicted habitat occurring on status 1 and 2 lands 20-<50% of the entire distribution of habitat. These 108 species include 4 amphibian species (11%), 47 bird species (11%), 26 mammal species (12%), and 31 reptile species (24%).

### Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2:

There are 11 species (1% of those modeled) with predicted habitat occurring on status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50%. These species include 7 birds (2%), 2 mammals (1%), and 2 reptiles (1%). Birds include Clapper rail, dunlin, black tern, sedge wren, tricolored blackbird, brown-capped rosy-finch, and Mexican chickadee. Mammals include Palmer's chipmunk and mountain goat. Reptiles include Sonoran shovel-nosed snake and ridge-nosed rattlesnake.

Comparison of protection by region compared to state, using threshold numbers to define the five representative groups, is another useful way to examine differences between species protection (Table 5-9). The thresholds were defined as:

Threshold	Description
1	Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2
2	Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2
3	Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2
4	Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2
5	Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2

In many cases the majority of species are equally well protected on the state level compared to the regional. There are differences, however, best illustrated where there is a difference of 10 or more species between state and regional protection numbers.

In Arizona, there are 4 differences (greater than 10 species) between regional protection and state protection. There are 53 species within Threshold 3 for Arizona, but within Threshold 2 for the region. There are also 52 species in Threshold 4 for Arizona, but within Threshold 3 for the region. These two groups have more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within Arizona than the region. There are two groups with more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the entire region than in Arizona. This includes 36 species within Threshold 2 for Arizona, but within threshold 3 for the region. There are 14 species within Threshold 4 for the region, but within Threshold 3 for Arizona.

In Colorado, there are 4 differences. There are 27 species in Threshold 4 within Colorado, but regionally within Threshold 3. This group has more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within Colorado than the region. There are 3 groups that have more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands in the region than in Colorado. There are 30 species in Threshold 1 in Colorado, but in Threshold 2 in the region; there are 89 species in Threshold 2 in Colorado but in Threshold 3 in the region. There are 13 species in Threshold 3 within Colorado and in Threshold 4 in the region.

In New Mexico, five groups comprise the major differences. There are 2 groups with more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state than within the region. There are 17 species in Threshold 3 for the state and Threshold 2 for the region and 24 species in Threshold 4 for the state and Threshold 3 for the region. There are 3 groups with more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the region than the state. These include 179 species within Threshold 3 in the region and within Threshold 2 in New Mexico. There are 18 species within Threshold 1 in New Mexico and in Threshold 2 within the region and 19 species within Threshold 3 in New Mexico and Threshold 4 in the region. There are an additional 17 species within Threshold 4.

In Nevada, there are 6 groups of species with a difference between the state and the region. Five of these groups have more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state then within the region. There are 104 species within Threshold 4 of Nevada, but in Threshold 3 for the region. There are 51 species in Threshold 3 in Nevada, but in Threshold 2 in the region. 25 species are in Threshold 5 within Nevada, but Threshold 3 within the region. There are 12 species within Threshold 4 within Nevada, but in Threshold 2 for the region. There are 19 species within Threshold 5 in Nevada and within Threshold 4 in the region. There is one group with more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the region than the state. This group has 13 species in Threshold 2 in Nevada and Threshold 3 regionwide.

In Utah there are five differences between the state and the region. There are three groups with more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state then within the region. There are 88 species within Threshold 4 in Utah, but in threshold 3 for the region. There are 16 species in Threshold 4 and 36 species in Threshold 3, but are in Threshold 2 for the region. There are two groups with more predicted habitat by percentage on Status 1 and 2 lands within the region than the state. There are 21 species in Threshold 2 for the state, but in Threshold 3 for the region. There are 15 species that are in Threshold 3 for the state, but Threshold 4 for the region.

Some of the identified differences within this comparison are likely due to using an absolute threshold value that may create more of a distinction in management than actually exists (for example, 9% vs. 12%). Each species should be reviewed individually where management decisions are to be made. Many species more protected in states than the region may be on the edges of the species range. This is particularly true for species in Nevada that are considered Sierra Nevada or California species or Great Plains species in Colorado or New Mexico.

				Region			
State	Threshold Categories	1	2	3	4	5	Total Species
AZ	1	6	9	8	2		25
AZ	2	1	125	36	5		167
AZ	3		53	255	14		322
AZ	4		6	52	67		125
AZ	5		3	1	1	5	10
CO	1	12	30	3		1	46
CO	2	6	164	89	3		262
CO	3		9	162	13		184
CO	4		5	27	20		52
CO	5				2	3	5
NM	1	17	18	4	2	1	42
NM	2	4	201	179	17		401
NM	3		17	127	19	1	164
NM	4		1	24	31		56
NM	5		1			2	3
NV	1	2	9	2			13
NV	2	1	53	13	3		70
NV	3		51	164	8		223
NV	4		12	104	44	2	162
NV	5		5	25	19	3	52
UT	1	2	5	5	1		13
UT	2	2	89	21	1		113
UT	3		36	186	15		237
UT	4	2	16	88	47		153
UT	5		1	2	4	3	10

 Table 5-9. Number of Terrestrial Vertebrate Species by threshold category for each state by threshold category for the region.

## **Analysis of State Endemics**

Only two endemic species were modeled for New Mexico (Jemez Mountain Salamander and Sacramento Mountain Salamander) and one endemic species was modeled in Utah (Utah Prairie dog).

## **Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions – State-based Analyses**

### Arizona

We mapped 649 species within Arizona. This includes 27 amphibians (73% of amphibians modeled for region), 368 birds (84% of birds modeled for region), 151 mammals (70% of mammals modeled for region), and 103 reptiles (79% of reptiles modeled for region).

The Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) identified species of conservation priority in the Arizona Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS) (AGFD 2005a). Four categories defined in Companion Document B (AGFD 2005b) were used to evaluate a species' status: Vulnerable Species, Responsibility Species, Focal Species and/or Economic Species. Five hundred sixty nine vertebrate species are considered to be "priority," that is, classified by one or more of the four evaluation categories under the AGFD CWCS evaluation. Of these, 113 species (19.9%) have less than 10% habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands. Two hundred eighty four vertebrate species are identified as vulnerable and 62 species (21.8%) have less than 10% habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands.

## Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Twenty-six species (4% of all mapped species) have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Arizona (Table 5-10). This includes 2 amphibians, 15 birds, 8 mammals, and 1 reptile. Fifteen species have less than 100 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped within Arizona and 4 other species have less than 1000 km<sup>2</sup> within the state. Seven of these species were considered conservation priorities by the ADGF. Red-Eyed Vireo, American Pipit, and Thirteen-lined Ground Squirrel were identified as Vulnerable and Focal. The Pine Grosbeak was identified as Vulnerable and Economic. Calliope Hummingbird and Bronzed Cowbird were identified as Focal and Economic. The Eastern Phoebe was identified as Focal. The Bronzed Cowbird is a brood parasite and is expanding its range; this species provides an example where low representation on Status 1 and 2 lands is not necessarily a problem.

### Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 172 species with 1-<10% predicted habitat within status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Arizona (Appendix 5-15). These species include 5 amphibians, 91 birds, 45 mammals, and 31 reptiles. Eight species have less than 100 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat within the state and 14 with between 100 to 1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat. Sixty (35%) of these species are identified as vulnerable in the Arizona CWCS.

## Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 323 species with 10-<20% of their predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within Arizona (Appendix 5-15). This includes 14 amphibians, 181 birds, 80 mammals, and 48 reptiles. Seven species have less than 100 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat within the state and 16 have between 100 and 1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat.

Taxon	SWReGAP Common Name	SWReGAP Scientific Name
Amphibian	BOREAL CHORUS FROG	Pseudacris maculata
	LOWLAND BURROWING TREEFROG	Pternohyla fodiens
Birds	AMERICAN PIPIT	Anthus rubescens
	BOHEMIAN WAXWING	Bombycilla garrulus
	CALIFORNIA QUAIL	Callipepla californica
	GRAY-CHEEKED THRUSH	Catharus minimus
	INCA DOVE	Columbina inca
	PALM WARBLER	Dendroica palmarum
	BRONZED COWBIRD	Molothrus aeneus
	HOUSE SPARROW	Passer domesticus
	RING-NECKED PHEASANT	Phasianus colchicus
	PINE GROSBEAK	Pinicola enucleator
	BLACK-CAPPED CHICKADEE	Poecile atricapilla
	EASTERN PHOEBE	Sayornis phoebe
	DICKCISSEL	Spiza americana
	CALLIOPE HUMMINGBIRD	Stellula calliope
	RED-EYED VIREO	Vireo olivaceus
Mammals	BARBARY SHEEP	Ammotragus lervia
	NORTHERN FLYING SQUIRREL	Glaucomys sabrinus
	MEADOW VOLE	Microtus pennsylvanicus
	MINK	Mustela vison
	AMERICAN PIKA	Ochotona princeps
	HEATHER VOLE	Phenacomys intermedius
	THIRTEEN-LINED GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus tridecemlineatus
	WESTERN JUMPING MOUSE	Zapus princeps
Reptiles	COLORADO DESERT FRINGE-TOED LIZARD	Uma notata

 Table 5-10. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Management Status</th>

 1 or 2 for Arizona as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

## Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Within Arizona, there are 125 species with 20-<50% of their predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands (Appendix 5-15). This includes 6 amphibians, 76 birds, 20 mammals, and 23 reptiles. Twenty-one species have less than 100 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat within the state and 42 between 100 and 1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat.

### Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2:

There are 10 species with predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50% (Appendix 5-15). These species include 7 birds, 1 mammal, and 2 reptiles. Eight species have less than 100 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat within the state and one has between 100 and 1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat. Only the Sonoran Shovel-nosed Snake is mapped with greater than 1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat in Arizona.

## Colorado

We mapped 549 species within Colorado. This includes 18 amphibians (49% of amphibians modeled for region), 343 birds (78% of birds modeled for region), 130 mammals (60% of mammals modeled for region), and 58 reptiles (45% of reptiles modeled for region).

### Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 46 species that have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Colorado (Table 5-11). This includes 2 amphibians, 27 birds, 3 mammals, and 13 reptiles. Of the 46, 9 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Colorado (CDOW 2005).

## Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 268 species with 1-<10% predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Colorado. This includes 10 amphibians, 167 birds, 60 mammals, and 31 reptiles. Of the 268, 63 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Colorado (CDOW 2005). Representative species include northern cricket frog, plains leopard frog, sandhill crane, scaled quail, greater sage-grouse, northern bobwhite, greater prairie-chicken, lesser prairie-chicken, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, Plains sharptailed grouse, sage sparrow, loggerhead shrike, golden eagle, ferruginous hawk, bald eagle, snowy plover, mountain plover, least tern, Forster's tern, northern pintail, redheaded woodpecker, Lewis's woodpecker, fringed Myotis, black-footed ferret, whitetailed prairie dog, black-tailed prairie dog, Botta's pocket gopher, northern pocket gopher, triploid checkered whiptail, and Texas horned lizard

### Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 185 species with 10-<20% of their predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands in Colorado. This includes 4 amphibians, 127 birds, 45 mammals, and 9 reptiles. Of the 183, 49 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Colorado (CDOW 2005). Representative species include northern leopard frog, wood frog, northern goshawk, western grebe, black-chinned hummingbird, Gunnison sage-grouse, yellow-billed cuckoo, band-tailed pigeon, olive-sided flycatcher, black swift, Grace's warbler, willow flycatcher, peregrine falcon, black rosy-finch, flammulated owl, osprey, purple martin, broad-tailed hummingbird, rufous hummingbird, pygmy nuthatch, rednaped sapsucker, spotted owl, Townsend's big-eared bat, Gunnison's prairie dog, spotted bat, Arizona Myotis, olive-backed pocket mouse, and dwarf shrew.

Taxon	SWReGAP Common Name	SWReGAP Scientific Name
Amphibian	GREEN TOAD	Bufo debilis
	COUCH'S SPADEFOOT	Scaphiopus couchii
	PLAINS SPADEFOOT	Spea bombifrons
Bird	WOOD DUCK	Aix sponsa
	SPRAGUE'S PIPIT	Anthus spragueii
	UPLAND SANDPIPER	Bartramia longicauda
	CHIMNEY SWIFT	Chaetura pelagica
	ROSS'S GOOSE	Chen rossii
	SEDGE WREN	Cistothorus platensis
	BLUE JAY	Cyanocitta cristata
	GYRFALCON	Falco rusticolus
	WHOOPING CRANE	Grus americana
	BLUE GROSBEAK	Guiraca caerulea
	FRANKLIN'S GULL	Larus pipixcan
	THAYER'S GULL	Larus thayeri
	RED-BELLIED WOODPECKER	Melanerpes carolinus
	GREAT CRESTED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus crinitus
	WHIMBREL	Numenius phaeopus
	EASTERN SCREECH-OWL	Otus asio
	HOUSE SPARROW	Passer domesticus
	RING-NECKED PHEASANT	Phasianus colchicus
	GREAT-TAILED GRACKLE	Quiscalus mexicanus
	COMMON GRACKLE	Quiscalus quiscula
	EASTERN BLUEBIRD	Sialia sialis
	FIELD SPARROW	Spizella pusilla
	EASTERN MEADOWLARK	Sturnella magna
	CURVE-BILLED THRASHER	Toxostoma curvirostre
	BROWN THRASHER	Toxostoma rufum
	SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER	Tyrannus forficatus
	TENNESSEE WARBLER	Vermivora peregrina
Mammal	SOUTHERN PLAINS WOODRAT	Neotoma micropus
	HISPID COTTON RAT	Sigmodon hispidus
	PREBLE'S SHREW	Sorex preblei
Reptile	CHECKERED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus tesselatus
	WESTERN DIAMONDBACK RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus atrox
	RING-NECKED SNAKE	Diadophis punctatus
	GREAT PLAINS SKINK	Eumeces obsoletus
	WESTERN HOOK-NOSED SNAKE	Gyalopion canum
	YELLOW MUD TURTLE	Kinosternon flavescens
	TEXAS BLIND SNAKE	Leptotyphlops dulcis
	PLAIN-BELLIED WATER SNAKE	Nerodia erythrogaster
	MASSASAUGA	Sistrurus catenatus
	GROUND SNAKE	Sonora semiannulata
	CHECKERED GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis marcianus
	COMMON SLIDER	Trachemys scripta
	LINED SNAKE	Tropidoclonion lineatum

Table 5-11. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 for Colorado as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

## Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Within Colorado, there are 52 species with 20-<50% of their predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands. This includes 1 amphibian, 21 birds, 23 mammals, and 7 reptiles. Of the 52, 12 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Colorado (CDOW 2005). These include: western toad, boreal owl, white-throated swift, evening grosbeak, white-tailed ptarmigan, red crossbill, wolverine, river otter, lynx, kit fox, long-nosed leopard lizard, and Southwestern black-headed snake.

## Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2:

There are 5 species with predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50%. These species include 3 birds and 2 mammals. Of the 5, 2 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Colorado (CDOW 2005). These are black tern and brown-capped rosy-finch.

### New Mexico

We mapped 667 species within New Mexico. We mapped 26 species of amphibians (70% of amphibians modeled for region), 383 birds species (88% of birds modeled for region), 159 mammal species (74% of mammals modeled for region), and 98 species of reptiles (75% of reptiles modeled for region).

## Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 43 species (6%) that have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of New Mexico (Table 5-12). Of the 43, 6 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in New Mexico (NMDGF 2005). This includes 1 amphibian (4% of mapped amphibians within the state), 28 birds (7% of mapped birds within the state), 8 mammals (5% of mapped mammals within the state), and 6 reptiles (5% of mapped reptiles within the state). Three of these species (bison, California condor, and whooping crane) are considered either extirpated or accidental within the state. Twelve of these species have a total amount of habitat mapped within the state of <100 km<sup>2</sup> and an additional 10 of these species have <1000 km<sup>2</sup> of mapped habitat within the state 1 and 2 lands in the state of New Mexico is provided below in Table 5-12.

### Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 407 species with predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within New Mexico. Of the 407, 64 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in New Mexico (NMDGF 2005). This includes 15 amphibians (58%), 227 birds (59%), 98 mammals (60%), and 67 reptiles (66%). There was 1 species that had little habitat mapped within the state ( $<100 \text{ km}^2$ ) and 9 species with between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of mapped habitat. Species include barking frog, Gila monster, Preble's shrew, ferruginous hawk, Gunnison's prairie dog, and sage thrasher.

Taxon	SWReGAP Common Name	SWReGAP Scientific Name
Amphibian	BOREAL CHORUS FROG	Pseudacris maculata
Bird	CHUKAR	Alectoris chukar
	AMERICAN PIPIT	Anthus rubescens
	GREATER SCAUP	Aythya marila
	UPLAND SANDPIPER	Bartramia longicauda
	WHITE-RUMPED SANDPIPER	Calidris fuscicollis
	CALIFORNIA QUAIL	Callipepla californica
	COMMON REDPOLL	Carduelis flammea
	CHIMNEY SWIFT	Chaetura pelagica
	SEMIPALMATED PLOVER	Charadrius semipalmatus
	NORTHERN BOBWHITE	Colinus virginianus
	INCA DOVE	Columbina inca
	BOBOLINK	Dolichonyx oryzivorus
	WHOOPING CRANE	Grus americana
	CALIFORNIA CONDOR	Gymnogyps californianus
	ORCHARD ORIOLE	Icterus spurious
	BLACK RAIL	Laterallus jamaicensis
	BROWN-CAPPED ROSY-FINCH	Leucosticte australis
	RED-HEADED WOODPECKER	Melanerpes erythrocephalus
	BRONZED COWBIRD	Molothrus aeneus
	GREAT CRESTED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus crinitus
	SNOWY OWL	Nyctea scandiaca
	HOUSE SPARROW	Passer domesticus
	NEOTROPIC CORMORANT	Phalacrocorax brasilianus
	RING-NECKED PHEASANT	Phasianus colchicus
	EASTERN PHOEBE	Sayornis phoebe
	DICKCISSEL	Spiza americana
	LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN	Tympanuchus pallidicinctus
	SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER	Tyrannus forficatus
Mammal	BISON	Bos bison
	LEAST SHREW	Cryptotis parva
	NINE-BANDED ARMADILLO	Dasypus novemcinctus
	PLAINS POCKET GOPHER	Geomys bursarius
	WYOMING GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus elegans
	ROUND-TAILED GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus tereticaudus
	COLORADO CHIPMUNK	Tamias quadrivittatus
	SWIFT FOX	Vulpes velox
Reptile	SMOOTH SOFTSHELL TURTLE	Apalone mutica
-	TRIPLOID CHECKERED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus neotesselatus
	SIX-LINED RACERUNNER	Cnemidophorus sexlineatus
	SAND DUNE LIZARD	Sceloporus arenicolus
	PLAINS GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis radix
Reptile	WYOMING GROUND SQUIRREL ROUND-TAILED GROUND SQUIRREL COLORADO CHIPMUNK SWIFT FOX SMOOTH SOFTSHELL TURTLE TRIPLOID CHECKERED WHIPTAIL SIX-LINED RACERUNNER SAND DUNE LIZARD PLAINS GARTER SNAKE	Spermophilus elegans Spermophilus tereticaudus Tamias quadrivittatus Vulpes velox Apalone mutica Cnemidophorus neotesselatus Cnemidophorus sexlineatus Sceloporus arenicolus Thamnophis radix

Table 5-12. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 for New Mexico as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

## Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 165 species (24%) with 10-<20% of their predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within New Mexico. Of these 165, 43 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in New Mexico (NMDGF 2005). This includes 6 amphibians (23%), 103 birds (26%), 43 mammals (27%), and 13 reptiles (13%). There are 12 species that have little habitat mapped within the state (<100 km<sup>2</sup>) and 24 species with between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of mapped habitat. Included among the species that fall within this gap status list are the Jemez Mountains Salamander, Sacramento Mountain salamander, elf owl, Baird's sparrow, and white-nosed coati.

## Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Within New Mexico, there are 56 species (8%) with 20-<50% of their predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands. Of the 56, 26 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in New Mexico (NMDGF 2005). This includes 4 amphibians (15%), 26 birds (7%), 13 mammals (8%), and 13 reptiles (13%). There were 4 species that had little habitat mapped within the state (<100 km<sup>2</sup>) and 8 species with between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of mapped habitat. Species include Chiricahua leopard frog, Madrean alligator lizard, marten, blue grouse, and northern goshawk.

## Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2:

There are 3 species (<1%) with predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50%. Of the 3, 2 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in New Mexico (NMDGF 2005). These species include sedge wren, and 2 reptiles (canyon spotted whiptail, and ridge-nosed rattlesnake). All three species have little habitat mapped within the state (<30 km<sup>2</sup>).

## Nevada

We mapped 520 species within Nevada including 17 amphibians (46% of amphibians modeled for region), 317 birds (73% of birds modeled for region), 129 mammals (60% of mammals modeled for region), and 57 reptiles (44% of reptiles modeled for region).

## Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 14 species that have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Nevada (Table 5-13). These include 12 birds and 2 mammals. Many of these species are on the periphery of their range in Nevada.

## Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 71 species with 1-<10% predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Nevada. These include 4 amphibians, 45 birds, 17 mammals, and 5 reptiles. There are 20 species identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) including sage sparrow, ferruginous hawk, greater sage-grouse, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, mountain beaver, pygmy rabbit, river otter, dark kangaroo mouse, pale kangaroo mouse, pygmy short-horned lizard, and greater short-horned lizard (NDOW 2005).

Taxon	SWReGAP Common Name	SWReGAP Scientific Name
Bird	BOHEMIAN WAXWING	Bombycilla garrulus
	BROAD-WINGED HAWK	Buteo platypterus
	COMMON REDPOLL	Carduelis flammea
	LAWRENCE'S GOLDFINCH	Carduelis lawrencei
	VEERY	Catharus fuscescens
	INCA DOVE	Columbina inca
	PALM WARBLER	Dendroica palmarum
	BRONZED COWBIRD	Molothrus aeneus
	BLACK-BELLIED PLOVER	Pluvialis squatarola
	EASTERN KINGBIRD	Tyrannus tyrannus
	WHITE-THROATED SPARROW	Zonotrichia albicollis
	HARRIS'S SPARROW	Zonotrichia querula
Mammal	UTAH PRAIRIE DOG	Cynomys parvidens
	UINTA GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus armatus

 Table 5-13. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 for</th>

 Nevada as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

## Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 226 species with 10-<20% of their predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within Nevada. These include 4 amphibians, 138 birds, 69 mammals, and 15 reptiles. There are 42 species that are identified as SGCNs including: desert horned lizard, American white pelican, white-faced ibis, canvasback, northern goshawk, snowy plover, rufous hummingbird, willow flycatcher, Virginia's warbler, Merriam's shrew, Inyo shrew, spotted bat, Allen's chipmunk, western jumping mouse, kit fox, Townsend's big-eared bat, and Columbia spotted frog (NDOW 2005).

### Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Within Nevada, there are 161 species with 20-<50% of their predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands. These include 7 amphibians, 102 birds, 27 mammals, and 25 reptiles. Of these 159, 54 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Nevada (NDOW 2005). These include southwestern toad, desert tortoise, desert night lizard, Gila monster, common loon, eared grebe, bald eagle, peregrine falcon, black tern, yellow-billed cuckoo, Costa's hummingbird, white-headed woodpecker, black phoebe, Bendire's thrasher, grace's warbler, bell's vireo, montane shrew, hoary bat, California leaf-nosed bat, northern flying squirrel, pocket gopher, and Mojave black-collared lizard (NDOW 2005).

### Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2:

There are 52 species with predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50%. These species include 2 amphibians, 22 birds, 16 mammals, and 12 reptiles. Of these 52, 14 have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Nevada (NDOW 2005). These include: relict leopard frog, western banded gecko, western lyre snake, least bittern, spotted owl, tricolored blackbird, gray-crowned rosy-finch, cave

Myotis, big free-tailed bat, American pika, Palmer's chipmunk, marten, desert pocket mouse, and common chuckwalla (NDOW 2005).

## <u>Utah</u>

We mapped 526 species within Utah including 16 amphibians (43% of amphibians modeled for region), 324 birds (74% of birds modeled for region), 130 mammals (60% of mammals modeled for region), and 56 reptiles (43% of reptiles modeled for region).

### Species with <1% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 13 species that have less than 1% of their habitat on Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Utah (Table 5-14). These species include 11 birds (3% of the birds mapped within the state), 1 mammal (<1% of the mammals mapped within the state), and 1 reptile (2% of the reptiles mapped within the state). Of the total habitat mapped within Utah, seven of these species have <100 km<sup>2</sup>. Two of the species have between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped within the state. A list of animal species whose predicted habitat distributions are <1% within Status 1 and 2 lands in the state of Utah is provided below in Table 5-14.

Taxon	SWReGAP Common Name	SWReGAP Scientific Name
Bird	RUDDY TURNSTONE	Aronaria interpres
Dird	CHESTNUT-COLLARED LONGSPUR	Calcarius ornatus
	LONG-TAILED DUCK	Clangula hvemalis
	PALM WARBLER	Dendroica palmarum
	WOOD THRUSH	Hylocichla mustelina
	ACORN WOODPECKER	Melanerpes formicivorus
	WHITE-WINGED SCOTER	Melanitta fusca
	HOUSE SPARROW	Passer domesticus
	RED-NECKED GREBE	Podiceps grisegena
	LEAST TERN	Sterna antillarum
	TENNESSEE WARBLER	Vermivora peregrina
Mammal	BELDING'S GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus beldingi
Reptile	PYGMY SHORT-HORNED LIZARD	Phrynosoma douglasii

 Table 5-14. Animal species with 0-<1% of predicted habitat distribution in GAP Status 1 or 2 for</th>

 Utah as mapped by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project.

## Species with 1-<10% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 116 species with 1-<10% predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within the state of Utah These include 1 amphibian (6% of those mapped in UT), 85 birds (26% of those mapped in UT), 26 mammals (19% of those mapped in UT), and 4 reptiles (7% of those mapped in UT). Of their total mapped distributions within Utah, three of these species have <100 km<sup>2</sup>. Twelve of the species have between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped within the state.

Twenty-five of these species are recognized as being Species of Greatest Conservation Need within the state of Utah (UDWR 2005). Included among the species within this GAP status threshold are the bobolink, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, Gunnison sagegrouse, greater sage-grouse, relict leopard frog, olive-backed pocket mouse, pygmy rabbit, Utah prairie dog, white-tailed prairie dog, and the smooth green snake.

## Species with 10-<20% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

There are 238 species with 10-<20% of their predicted habitat within Status 1 and 2 lands within Utah. These include 10 amphibians (63% of those mapped in UT), 135 birds (42% of those mapped in UT), 74 mammals (56% of those mapped in UT), and 19 reptiles (34% of those mapped in UT). Of their total mapped distributions within Utah, eight of these species have <100 km<sup>2</sup>. Sixteen of the species have between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped within the state.

Fifty-five of these species are recognized as being species of greatest conservation need within the state of Utah (UDWR 2005). Included among the species within this GAP status threshold are bighorn sheep, lynx, kit fox, spotted bat, Townsend's big-eared bat, silver-haired bat, river otter, sage sparrow, willow flycatcher, yellow-billed cuckoo, northern goshawk, burrowing owl, desert tortoise, northern leopard frog, and western toad,

## Species with 20 -<50% of predicted distribution in Status 1 or 2:

Within Utah, there are 154 species with 20-<50% of their predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands. These include 5 amphibians (31% of those mapped in UT), 92 birds (28% of those mapped in UT), 28 mammals (21% of those mapped in UT), and 29 reptiles (52% of those mapped in UT). Of their total mapped distributions within Utah, six of these species have <100 km<sup>2</sup>. Thirty-one of the species have between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped within the state.

Forty-one of these species are recognized as being species of greatest conservation need within the state of Utah (UDWR 2005). Included among the species within this GAP status threshold are the black-throated gray warbler, California condor, gray vireo, spotted owl, plateau striped whiptail, big free-tailed bat, desert shrew and silky pocket mouse.

## Species with at least 50% representation in GAP Status 1 and 2:

There are 10 species with predicted habitat occurring within Status 1 and 2 lands greater than 50%. These species include 3 birds (<1% of those mapped in UT), 4 mammals (3% of those mapped in UT), and 3 reptiles (5% of those mapped in UT). Of their total mapped distributions within Utah, one of these species has <100 km<sup>2</sup>. Six of the species have between 100-1000 km<sup>2</sup> of habitat mapped within the state.

Four of these species are recognized as being species of greatest conservation need within the state of Utah (UDWR 2005). Included among the species within this GAP status threshold are the Mogollon vole, Stephen's woodrat, desert night lizard and long-tailed brush lizard.

# DISCUSSION

## **Limitations and Discussion**

When applying the results of our analyses, it is critical that the following limitations are considered: 1) the limitations described for each of the component parts (land cover mapping, animal habitat mapping, stewardship mapping) of the gap analysis, 2) the spatial and thematic map accuracy of each component, and 3) the suitability of the results for the intended application (see Appropriate and Inappropriate Use of these data in Chapter 7).

Assessing the conservation status of natural land cover is limited by certain confounding factors. One challenge is to produce a land cover map that is ecologically and spatially accurate while adequately representing the habitat requirements for terrestrial animal species. Previous GAP efforts have found the accuracy of the mapped distributions of natural land cover to be substantially lower and more variable than that of predicted animal habitat distributions. Mapping at the ecological systems level provided an appropriate scale for a project of this size, which by reducing the variability in the land cover units, improved the accuracy of the land cover map and the delineation of wildlife habitat. An important assumption behind any aggregation of biotic units (e.g. above species) is that the aggregated unit serves as a surrogate for species or lower levels of biotic organization, which may under-represent actual conservation needs (Pressey and Logan 1995). Another challenge is that we cannot distinguish the degree of natural condition or value of the mapped units due to management manipulation, exotic invasion, or spatial configuration.

In addition to the general limitations of accuracy given a project of this scale, there are several considerations that must be acknowledged in regard to the land cover data set in particular. For example, the encroachment of invasive plants such as cheatgrass or tamarisk was not captured in the land cover data set, unless it occurred as a dominant presence, in relatively homogenous, well established sites. "Disturbed" land cover types represent what was present at the time of image acquisition and ground reconnaissance. Several of these cover types incorporate to some degree human management of the vegetation. However, recently burned areas, for instance, may not be represented in the land cover map if the fire took place since the time the imagery was acquired land cover types with restricted, highly specialized niches were either under the minimum map unit for mappability (1 acre) or had low numbers of training sites, and were not mapped. Ultimately, thematic mapping involves placing a *continuum* of land cover into *discrete* land cover classes. Distinctions between certain land cover types such as grassland, shrub-steppe, and shrubland, tend to be gradual and can be difficult to detect. Therefore, some land cover types are more similar than others. For more information on land cover map validation and fuzzy accuracy assessment of individual land cover types, see Chapter 2.

With regard to the relative distribution of land cover types in Status 1 and 2 lands, we found that ecological systems that occur at higher elevations such as in the alpine and sub-alpine zones, are typically afforded greater levels of protection. This is not unexpected as much of the region's federally protected lands are at higher elevations. On the other hand, ecological systems occurring at lower elevations such as the valley bottoms and footslopes, tend to have less protection. These lower slopes and valleys tend to be more accessible, and are often considered "managed" landscapes, supporting multiple human uses.

Similar to limitations provided for land cover there are limitations to the species habitat analysis. There are no established area criteria for adequate representation for each species. This is particularly true for conservation efforts on species because of life history differences. Even within genera, there can be a wide variance of needed habitat for species survival. We focused our attention within this chapter on species and GAP Management status analysis, but stewardship data are available for further analyses (Appendix 5-14). We also focused on total habitat for the species and not on seasonal aspects of species ecology (e.g. breeding), which is also available (Appendix 5-15). As mentioned in Chapter 3, all habitat modeled within this project does not constitute occupied habitat as factors such as fragmentation, condition, and microhabitat factors play a significant role in species occurrence.

Representation between states and within the region varied by species. Some differences may be the result of species on the periphery of their range. It is important to consider that some species with little identified habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands may have their biological needs met in existing Status 3 and 4 lands. Additionally, Status 3 and 4 lands may provide better habitat because of microhabitat or other non-modelable reasons.

We compared our analysis to the recent Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS) effort by each state. We found both similarity and dissimilarity between GAP and each state's CWCS. Species not identified by CWCS but that are identified as a "gap species" should minimally be reviewed by natural resource agencies. Species like bronzed cowbird should be excluded from conservation efforts but other, previously unidentified species may warrant review and possible inclusion into Species of Greatest Conservation Need. Providing this information to resource agencies engaged in conservation planning is one objective of GAP.

The analysis supports the need for regional projects such as SWReGAP. Species and land cover can be state protected (Status 1 and 2 lands >10%) and regionally unprotected (Status 1 and 2 lands <10%). The converse is also true. For both land cover types and animal-habitat conservation, the entirety of the range needs to be addressed. Regional efforts also allow ecoregion analyses to be completed. A separate gap analysis was recently completed for the Colorado Plateau ecoregion. A series of reports including analyses of land stewardship, land cover, and predicted animal habitat distributions are to be published in the upcoming Colorado Plateau III book.

Finally, as we stated in the introduction to this chapter, it is unrealistic to identify a standard measure constituting "adequate representation" of land cover or species distribution for biodiversity conservation. What gap analysis provides is a quantitative and systematic approach to assessing representation within a geographic framework. This framework provides data that can be used to focus attention on biota of concern within specific geographic regions. Determining which biota is of concern ultimately must be carried out by individual practitioners, agencies, and organizations with concerns about biodiversity in the region. The results in this chapter and the data provided by the SWReGAP project offer a starting point for further analysis, summary, and biological assessment.



Cactus Wren (*Camphlorhynchus brunneicapillus*) **Photographer:** John J. Mosesso, NBII Digital Image Library

## CHAPTER 6

# CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Lisa Langs Stoner, Kenneth G. Boykin, John Lowry, Andrea Ernst, David Bradford, William Kepner, Julie Prior-Magee, Keith Schulz, Don Schrupp, and Kathryn Thomas.



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

Recommended Citation:

Langs Stoner, L., K. G. Boykin, J. Lowry, A. Ernst, D. Bradford, W.G. Kepner, J. Prior-Magee, K. Schulz, D. Schrupp, K.A. Thomas. 2007. Conclusions and management implications. Chapter 6 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding author: K.G. Boykin is to be contacted at kboykin@nmsu.edu, Tel. 575-646-6303

## INTRODUCTION

The Southwest is home to a diverse assemblage of plant and animal species largely, due to the complex topography, geology, soils, and climate patterns that occur throughout the region. The unique combination of environmental factors and natural disturbance processes inherent to the Southwest make this area one of the most biologically rich regions in the U.S. (Morin 1995, Flather et al. 1997, Flather 1998, Bender et al. 2005). Fifteen distinct ecoregions are represented within the SWReGAP area, as defined by The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) Terrestrial Global Assessment Units, Ecoregions and Major Habitat Types (TNC 2005) which include modifications to original work done by Bailey (1995). These ecologically derived landscape units are: Columbia Plateau (southern edge), Sierra Nevada (eastern edge), Great Basin, Mojave Desert, Sonoran Desert, Utah-Wyoming Rocky Mountains, Wyoming Basins (southern edge), Utah High Plateau, Colorado Plateau, Southern Rocky Mountains, Apache Highlands, Arizona-New Mexico Mountains, Chihuahuan Desert, Central Shortgrass Prairie, and Southern Shortgrass Prairie. The natural land cover of the region is largely dominated by shrub/scrub ecological systems (37% of the region), followed by grassland/herbaceous systems (23%), evergreen forests (22%), barren lands (5%), woody wetlands (3%), deciduous forest (2%), mixed forest (<1%) and emergent herbaceous wetlands (<1%). Agricultural areas compose 5.6% of the region, altered or disturbed areas (1.5%), developed areas (1.1%), and open water (0.8%).

These natural systems, however, face many threats that affect not only the biological resources within them, but the human populations that may directly or indirectly depend on their sustainability. Adverse factors include prolonged drought, invasive plant and animal species (e.g., cheatgrass, Russian thistle, tamarisk, European starling), overutilization by livestock, altered fire regimes, increased land development and recreational demands, soil erosion, stream channelization, consumptive water use, oil and gas exploration, habitat fragmentation and conversion, over-harvesting of certain plants and animals, population isolation, and disease (e.g., bark beetles, Chronic Wasting Disease, West Nile Virus), all of which present significant management and ecological challenges encompassing range-wide to local scales. Not all of the stressors necessarily occur rangewide, and some may only affect local areas or have impacts within a specific state. Additionally, certain ecological systems and wildlife species may be more vulnerable to environmental disturbances than others. The seamless 5-state data sets created by SWReGAP provide a unique combination of information and a framework that can be used to identify some of these issues and assist with the implementation of conservation efforts at multiple scales.

# MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS OF SWREGAP ANALYSIS

The goal of GAP is to identify two elements of biodiversity - land cover types and terrestrial vertebrate species - that are in need of conservation, allowing for the appropriate conservation action to take place before they become the focus of regulatory authority. The analysis is a coarse filter approach that provides a tool and framework that may identify the need for finer scale studies. Using quantitative geographic criteria, this coarse filter approach provides for the delineation of species' habitat and ecological systems for use in conservation planning. A primary assumption with gap analysis is that Status 1 and 2 lands are preferred because of the level of protection afforded these areas. However, the ecological condition of these protected areas may be such that the full range of the region's biodiversity is not fully protected. Status 3 and 4 lands may provide the conditions necessary for certain species and may provide better habitat than that which occurs on Status 1 and 2 lands. Furthermore, individual species respond differently to management practices. We recognize that protection does not always equate to conservation success; for example recent global amphibian declines have occurred both within and outside protected areas (Green 2005). Gap analysis provides a preliminary indication of the long-term maintenance of these elements of biological diversity. Further analyses of area requirements, isolation, or disturbance regimes necessary for maintaining populations, can be used to supplement the results of gap analysis.

A criticism of past gap analyses has been the lack of regional data sets and the problem of edge-matching existing GAP data sets. SWReGAP provides the first formal effort to address these concerns through a regional gap analysis. We encourage each state to consider not only the conservation status of ecological systems and species within their respective states, but also from a regional context. Likewise, it is important to consider what this 5-state region contributes to an ecological system's or terrestrial vertebrate species' management and conservation status relative to other neighboring states and Mexico, as many of the species' ranges extend beyond the SWReGAP project area. Threshold values for conservation protection were used to identify ecological systems and animal habitat distributions with low representation in Status 1 and 2 lands. Low representation in conservation lands, however, includes some elements that are restricted to and are relatively rare within the 5-state region (or state), as well as those that are peripheral to the region (or state). Conservationists and managers are encouraged to consider both, because in some cases, the protection of elements at the edge of their range may capture important components of biodiversity (Channell and Lomolino 2000, Holt and Keitt 2005, Jaeger et al. 2005).

Throughout the 5-state region, 11.5% of the total land base has been identified as providing protection for biodiversity in Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this (46%) is managed by BLM (largely associated with National Monuments), followed by U.S. Forest Service (25%), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (11%), and National Park Service

(11%). Forty ecological systems and 309 terrestrial vertebrate species have less than 10% of their regional distribution within Status 1 and 2 lands (See Tables 6-1 and 6-2). See Chapter 5, Table 5-1 for the list of ecological systems and Appendix 5-15 for the list of terrestrial vertebrate species. An additional 36 ecological systems and 107 terrestrial vertebrate species have greater than 10% of their distribution, but less than 500 km<sup>2</sup> total area within Status 1 and 2 lands (Tables 6-1 and 6-2). See Table 5-1 and Appendix 5-15 in Chapter 5 for ecological system and terrestrial vertebrate species lists. Ecological systems and terrestrial vertebrate species that have less than 10% of their distribution or less than 500 km<sup>2</sup> absolute areal coverage in Status 1 and 2 lands may be underrepresented and point to "gaps" in their conservation (Schrupp et al. 2000). Although other major land stewards in the region (e.g. private (comprising 30% of the 5-state area), tribal (9%), and state land board (7%)) may not always achieve the legal mandate for conservation management, their lands may in fact provide protection for certain species and land cover types. It is important to consider the potential that each land steward may provide as a partner in conservation, particularly at local and ecoregional scales. Cooperation and collaboration among local, state, federal, and tribal governments, nongovernmental organizations, universities, and private individuals is encouraged to effectively sustain the species and ecological systems of this region.

As a separate effort, but in parallel with SWReGAP, each of the five states recently completed their State Wildlife Action Plans (SWAP) (AGFD 2005, CDOW 2005, NMDGF 2005, NDOW 2005, UDWR 2005). These strategies identify species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) and key habitats specific to each state. Also included in these reports is detailed information about the threats facing the different habitat types. The CWCS is a useful companion to SWReGAP for prioritizing ecological systems and species that require focused conservation efforts both within and between the Southwest states. The development of crosswalks between each state's key habitats and SWReGAP's land cover legend would be one way to maximize these two resources for future projects. It should be noted, however, that further review of the SGCNs is needed as each state identified their species using different methods.

We identified three categories of management concern to prioritize ecological systems and terrestrial vertebrate species that may require additional attention. The criteria used for these categories are the following: first priorities are ecological systems and predicted animal habitats with distributions of <1% within Status 1 and 2 lands; second priorities are those with between 1 and 10% in Status 1 or 2 lands; and third priorities are those with >10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> in Status 1 or 2 lands. We applied these criteria to each state to enumerate their respective priority conservation concerns (Tables 6-1 and 6-2).

systems.)							
Priority	Criteria	Region	AZ	CO	NV	NM	UT
	Ecological System Distribution in Status 1 & 2 Lands						
First	<1%	6	7	12	0	8	6
Second	Between 1-10%	34	25	22	12	39	23
Third	>10% and < 500 km <sup>2</sup>	36	23	22	41	26	29

 Table 6-1. Number of Ecological Systems of priority conservation concern identified within the

 SWReGAP project area and by state. (See Chapter 5, Table 5-1 for the list of relevant ecological systems.)

Table 6-2. Number of modeled **terrestrial vertebrate** species in Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project and Species of Greatest Conservation Need identified by each state in Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies by priority of concern. (See Chapter 5, Appendix 5-15 for the list of relevant animal species.)

Priority	Criteria	Reg	ion	AZ		CO		NV		NM		UT	
	Animal Species Habitat in Status 1 & 2 Lands	SWReGAP	SGCN	SWReGAP	SGCN	SWReGAP	SGCN	SWReGAP	SGCN	SWReGAP	SGCN	SWReGAP	SGCN
First	<1%	25	11	25	9	50	9	13	0	44	6	13	0
Second	Between 1-10%	284	190	168	11 6	260	62	72	20	400	63	115	25
Third	>10% and < 500 km <sup>2</sup>	107	84	133	10 9	63	13	141	41	96	34	123	28

## **Priority Conservation Concerns By State**

## <u>Arizona</u>

For Arizona, 13.4% of the state's total land base is categorized as Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this (38%) is managed by BLM, followed by U.S. Forest Service (19%), National Park Service (19%), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (17%), and Department of Defense and/or Department of Energy (3%). All other stewards manage approximately 1% or less of Arizona's Status 1 and 2 lands.

Arizona has 7 ecological systems with <1% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 6-1). Twenty-five ecological systems have between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. An additional 23 ecological systems have >10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> (<50,000 ha) of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands, 19 of these have <100 km<sup>2</sup> (<10,000ha).

For Arizona, there are 25 species with less than 1% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 6-2). Of these 25 species, 9 species were identified as SGCN. There are 168 species with less than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands, 116 of which are SGCN species. There are 133 species (109 SGCN) with more than 10% of

their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands and  $<500 \text{ km}^2$  (<50,000 ha), 87 of these have  $<100 \text{ km}^2$  (<10,000 ha).

The primary habitats identified in Arizona's CWCS are: Lower Colorado Sonoran Desert Scrub, Upland Sonoran Desert Scrub, Chihuahuan Desert Scrub, Mohave Desert Scrub, Semi-desert Grassland, Plains & Great Basin Grassland, Subalpine Grassland, Chaparral, Madrean Evergreen Forest, Great Basin Conifer Forest, Montane Conifer Forest, Subalpine Conifer Forest, Alpine Tundra, Wetlands/Springs, Streams/Rivers, Lakes/Reservoirs, and Human-dominated landscapes (AGFD 2005).

## <u>Colorado</u>

For Colorado, 10.2% of the state's total land base is categorized as Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this is managed by U.S. Forest Service (53%), followed by BLM (21%), National Park Service (9%), State Wildlife Areas (8%), State Land Board (4%), The Nature Conservancy (3%), and Native American Land (2%). All other stewards manage approximately 1% or less of Colorado's Status 1 and 2 lands.

Colorado has 12 ecological systems with less than 1% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 6-1), 8 of these have no representation at all in these areas. The three ecological systems of highest priority within the state are: *Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop* (S008), *Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna* (S074), and *Western Great Plains Sand Prairie* (S089). Twenty-two ecological systems have between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. An additional 22 ecological systems have more than 10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> (<50,000 ha) of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands, 11 of these have <100 km<sup>2</sup> (<10,000ha).

For Colorado, there are 50 species with less than 1% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands, 9 being identified as SGCN (Table 6-2). There are 260 species (62 SGCN) with less than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 63 species (13 SGCN) with more than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands and  $<500 \text{ km}^2$  (<50,000 ha), 32 of these have <100 km<sup>2</sup> (<10,000 ha).

Fourteen key habitats were identified in the Colorado Division of Wildlife's CWCS, which are the following: Aspen, Eastern Plains Rivers, Exposed Rock, Foothills/Mountain Grasslands, Grass-forb Dominated Wetlands, Midgrass Prairie, Open Water, Playas, Pinyon-Juniper, Ponderosa Pine, Sagebrush, Shortgrass Prairie, Shrub Dominated Wetlands, and Western Rivers (CDOW 2005).

## New Mexico

For New Mexico, 6.3% of the state's total land base is categorized as Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this (41%) is managed by U.S. Forest Service, followed by BLM (34%), National Park Service (8%), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (8%), Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement (5%), and State Wildlife Reserves (3%). All other stewards manage approximately 1% or less of New Mexico's Status 1 and 2 lands.

New Mexico has 8 ecological systems with <1% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 6-1). New Mexico has 39 ecological systems with between 1 and 10% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. An additional 26 ecological systems have >10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> (<50,000 ha) of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands, 16 of these have <100 km<sup>2</sup> (<10,000ha).

For New Mexico, there are 44 species with less than 1% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands, 6 being identified as SGCN (Table 6-2). There are 400 species (63 SGCN) with less than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 96 species (34 SGCN) with more than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands and  $<500 \text{ km}^2$  (<50,000 ha), 54 of these have  $<100 \text{ km}^2$  (<10,000 ha).

Nineteen key habitats were identified in New Mexico's CWCS effort with 9 terrestrial types identified (NMDFG 2005). New Mexico's CWCS relied on the SWReGAP land cover map for terrestrial habitat types and created its own aquatic habitat classification. NMDGF grouped several SWReGAP land cover types because of ecological similarity and ease of use. Key habitats identified within the CWCS are Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland, Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland, Madrean Encinal, Madrean Pine-Oak/Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland, Riparian, Western Great Plains Sand Sagebrush Shrubland, Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie, Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow, and Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland.

### <u>Nevada</u>

For Nevada, 14.7% of the state's total land base is categorized as Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this is managed by BLM (59%), followed by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (22%), U.S. Forest Service (11%), and National Park Service (6%). All other stewards manage approximately 1% or less of Nevada's Status 1 and 2 lands.

There are no ecological systems with <1% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands in Nevada (Table 6-1). Nevada has 12 ecological systems with between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. Nevada has 41 ecological systems with >10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> (<50,000 ha) of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands, 34 of these have <100 km<sup>2</sup> (<10,000 ha).

For Nevada, there are 13 species with less than 1% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands, none were identified as SGCN (Table 6-2). There are 72 species (20 SGCN) with less than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 141 species (41 SGCN) with more than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands and  $<500 \text{ km}^2$  (<50,000 ha), 32 of these have  $<100 \text{ km}^2$  (<10,000 ha).

Nevada's Department of Wildlife identified 27 key habitats in their SWAP: Intermountain Cold Desert Scrub, Mojave/Sonoran Warm Desert Scrub, Mojave/Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub, Sagebrush, Lower Montane Woodlands, Lower Montane Chaparral, Intermountain Conifer Forests and Woodlands, Sierra Conifer Forests and Woodlands, Grasslands and Meadows, Aspen Woodland, Alpine and Tundra, Intermountain Rivers and Streams, Sierra Rivers and Streams, Mojave Rivers and Streams, Wet Meadows, Springs and Springbrooks, Mesquite Bosques and Desert Washes, Marshes, Lakes and Reservoirs, Desert Playas and Ephemeral Pools, Sand Dunes and Badlands, Cliffs and Canyons, Caves and Mines (Subterranean Landscapes), Exotic Grasslands and Forblands, Developed Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, and Barren Landscapes (NDOW 2005).

Utah

For Utah, 14% of the state's total land base is categorized as Status 1 and 2 lands. The majority of this is managed by BLM (66%), followed by U.S. Forest Service (14%), National Park Service (12%), and State Wildlife Reserves (6%). All other stewards manage approximately 1% or less of Utah's Status 1 and 2 lands.

Six ecological systems have less than 1% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands (Table 6-1), four of these have no representation at all within these areas. Twenty-three ecological systems have between 1 and <10% of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands. An additional 29 ecological systems have >10% but <500 km<sup>2</sup> (<50,000 ha) of their distribution in Status 1 and 2 lands, 10 of which have <100 km<sup>2</sup> (<10,000 ha).

For Utah, there are 13 species with less than 1% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands, none being identified as SGCN (Table 6-2). There are 115 species (25 SGCN) with less than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands. There are 123 species (28 SGCN) with more than 10% of their predicted habitat in Status 1 and 2 lands and  $<500 \text{ km}^2$  (<50,000 ha), 35 of these have  $<100 \text{ km}^2$  (<10,000 ha).

Ten key habitats were identified in Utah's Division of Wildlife Resources CWCS: Aspen, Grassland, Lowland Riparian, Mountain Riparian, Mountain Shrub, Shrub-steppe, Water–Lentic (standing), Water–Lotic (flowing), Wet meadow, and Wetland (UDWR 2005).

# ADDITIONAL DATA NEEDS AND ANALYSES

## Land Cover

The SWReGAP land cover data set provides a seamless representation of land cover for the 5-state region based on satellite imagery from the time period of 1999-2001. The data set has many uses beyond the gap analysis conducted for SWReGAP. As noted in Chapter 2, no land cover map is perfect, and when possible land cover maps can and should be updated and improved. With this in mind, we suggest the following for future work related to the SWReGAP land cover data set:

## • Refined mapping of targeted land cover classes and/or regions.

The SWReGAP land cover data set was created based on the premise that there is value in landscape data covering large geographic regions. Some ecoregions and land cover classes within the 5-state region may have greater importance for conservation of biodiversity than others. We suggest that the SWReGAP land cover data set be refined by focusing additional attention on these select ecoregions and/or land cover classes. In other words, the SWReGAP land cover data set may be used as a stratifier for finer scale mapping of specific land cover classes (e.g. riparian classes), or updated to reflect additional information regarding the spatial distribution of land cover in the region. Furthermore, at finer scales it may be possible to include information pertaining to relative 'condition classes' within land cover types, which would greatly improve the overall utility of the land cover data set for species habitat modeling.

### • Map accuracy assessment.

Chapter 2 provides a detailed description of the map validation procedure used to assess the quality of the land cover data set. While we used an approach that provides a quantitative measure of map quality using withheld samples, and fuzzy set analysis, this is not an assessment of map accuracy. Assessing map accuracy is an expensive and time-consuming exercise and one of great importance. Map users will have greater confidence in the map product if a more robust assessment of map accuracy is performed. Such an assessment should be based on a design using sufficient and unbiased samples (Stehman and Czaplewski 1998, Congalton and Green 1999). The completion of a formal map accuracy assessment could be conducted as a separate and independent exercise if additional data and financial resources were made available.

### • Extend and edge-match land cover data to neighboring states.

While SWReGAP encompasses a large geographic area covering several ecoregions, it is nevertheless bounded by neighboring states - some of which have been recently mapped and edge-matched to the SWReGAP land cover data set with good success (see SHRUBMAP Project, available from: http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/). We believe that the degree to which the SWReGAP

land cover data set can be edge-matched to adjoining states and Mexico depends on using standardized mapping legends and mapping methods. We recommend further research in improving and standardizing the mapping legend (i.e. ecological systems) and mapping methodologies (i.e. decision trees) used by SWReGAP.

#### • Assessment of land cover change over time.

The SWReGAP land cover data set represents the status of land cover in the 5state region at one period in time. This provides a great deal of information about biodiversity in the region (see Chapter 5) and its implications for land management. An important methodological objective in SWReGAP was to make the procedures as transparent and readily interpretable as possible. We suggest further research in assessing and monitoring land cover change over time. This may involve additional research into "backcasting" land cover in time to assess changes that have occurred to date, and anticipating future mapping efforts that utilize SWReGAP data to monitor land cover into the future.

## **Predicted Animal Habitat Distributions**

The SWReGAP data set provides data and habitat models for the entire 5-state region. From a regional standpoint, the habitat modeling data sets provide the opportunity for a wide variety of stakeholders to look at species habitat conservation over wide expanses and entire ecoregions. Further work with this data set is suggested and includes:

• Habitat model refinement is needed to provide end-users information beyond the standard presence/absence level provided.

Habitat model refinement is needed as new information becomes available and as experts provide new information to the process. These refinements should also include the use of species occurrence points and an inductive modeling approach. Refinements in the modeling process could also lead to the extension of the current presence/absence models to include preferred habitat or to provide probabilities of occupancy for the suitable habitat. Additionally, models could be refined to address spatially explicit considerations related to contiguity and adjacency of habitat elements.

### • Accuracy assessment of the habitat models and end user validation.

Habitat models should be the subject of accuracy assessment and validation. A statistically driven accuracy assessment is warranted for this data set and would provide end-users information regarding the accuracy of the models and the potential errors within each model. Model validation will occur if and when these models are incorporated into the conservation planning and other natural resource planning efforts. Further, testing the habitat models will provide additional insight into the accuracy and usefulness of the models. Various data sets are available within and between states and we encourage the use of these data to provide an indication of the accuracy of the SWReGAP habitat models.

• Analysis of animal guilds determined necessary for conservation.

Guilds, focal species, and functional groups of species may provide a better surrogate to conservation in some parts of the region. USFWS Region 2 for example, has identified specific conservation targets that may serve as the functional groups. The Species of Greatest Conservation Need lists, already derived by state wildlife agencies, may also provide a starting point for this process. This concept needs to be further pursued and tested for application.

- Incorporation into the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy format. State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies provide a blueprint for state conservation. Gap data is well suited to assist state agencies in current and future planning. There is a need for further outreach to the agencies and to work collaboratively with them to incorporate GAP data within the agencies and to modify GAP data based on agency input.
- Further collaboration between GAP personnel and agencies charged with conservation of our natural resources.

There is a need for collaboration between land management agencies and natural resources agencies (state and federal) to better incorporate gap analysis data sets into the planning efforts of these agencies. This would also help facilitate the understanding of GAP personnel on specific needs and uses of spatial data sets by these land managers. Collaboration could include the identification of guilds or suites of species that better identify conservation opportunities or risks within a smaller landscape.

• Demonstrate successful use of the data sets in conservation applications and identify associated limitations or inaccuracies.

Gap analysis data sets provide a useful tool for obtaining information in the larger ecological context particularly for large land stewards and agencies responsible for the management of natural resources or developing multiple-species habitat conservation plans.

## Land Stewardship

The SWReGAP land stewardship data set provides stewardship and management status data for the entire 5-state region. This layer provides the context for conducting the final gap analysis. From a regional standpoint, the land stewardship data set provides the opportunity for stakeholders to look at stewardship and management status over large landscapes including entire ecoregions. Suggestions for further work related to this data set include the following:

• Incorporate changing stewardship and management goals within the region. Stewardship and management status are evolving constantly throughout the region. Management plans, such as the Region 3 forest management plan updates, change periodically, thus affecting that status of the stewardship data set and subsequent gap analyses. Changes such as these should be incorporated iteratively into the land stewardship data set to reflect the most current conditions. • Work with land stewards to incorporate actual land management beyond the intent identified within the GAP process.

Documentation and intent are not always the driving factor in actual parcel management. Additionally, there are efforts in place that may not meet GAP standards for long term maintenance but certainly affect the conservation landscape. Condition of the managed land has a significant effect on the conservation potential of that landscape.

• Institutionalize the stewardship data set with state or federal agencies for future modification.

The land stewardship data set evolves continuously as parcels change ownership and protection management mandates are updated. These changes may be most readily incorporated if the data set is institutionalized and becomes a standard for use by agencies at the regional or state level.

• Conduct outreach to provide context of the data set and potential uses and misuses.

Outreach is needed to work with agencies and organizations to use gap analysis data to identify conservation opportunities and pursue conservation objectives with all potential partners. For example, public outreach may help to identify opportunities for potential land swapping and boundary adjustments to maximize economic benefit while maintaining areas important for conservation.

• Provide a more detailed assessment of conservation status.

The definitions supporting the four biodiversity management status categories may benefit from re-evaluation. Because of the regional focus of this project we were not able to achieve this aspect though the need is stronger now than before. Individual species and land cover types behave differently and may need more focused individual attention. Additionally, there is a perception in some agencies that Status 3 lands are inferred to be in 'poor' condition, which is not necessarily true. Likewise, Status 1 and 2 lands may not be in 'good' condition.

## **Gap Analyses**

The gap analyses should be responsive to changes in the input data sets. When the land cover, habitat models, or land stewardship are modified substantially there should be a concerted effort to revise the input data sets and reanalyze for gaps in biodiversity conservation. A streamlined system to document, archive, and run the analyses would need to be maintained and developed to facilitate such updates.

It is important to recognize that many land cover types and terrestrial vertebrate species are relatively common throughout the region and are associated with many diverse land stewards. Having minimal representation in Status 1 and 2 lands does not necessarily mean there is currently a "gap" in protection, but that the long-term trends and conditions

of these land cover types and species should probably be monitored now and in the future.

# FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR GAP

Regional analyses are important for range-wide conservation of species. As more regional data sets become available through the Northwest GAP and Southeast GAP efforts, conservation partners will be provided a more complete picture on species conservation. Analysis will be possible within entire ecoregions, and such analyses will inform individual state efforts. Further utility in these data sets will be enhanced if topics such as ecosystem services, ecological economics, and adaptive management are included.

One objective of SWReGAP is to provide end users with data sets that can be used and modified to fit within user needs. Part of that objective is met by providing the majority of the source data used for these analyses on-line (<u>http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/</u> and <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/index.html</u>). Many of the tools created for this project are similarly available. The USGS GAP Portal will also provide internet access to SWReGAP data sets for viewing or downloading (<u>http://gapanalysis.nbii.gov</u>). All of these provide unique opportunities for both informative and research use of SWReGAP data.

Application of SWReGAP data into the conservation planning effort has already occurred at varying levels within state and federal agencies. An outreach effort has been initiated to provide agencies with help in understanding and implementing SWReGAP data in their conservation activities. The outreach provides background on the gap analysis project, assistance in implementing the data in other analyses, and cooperative identification of new projects in which SWReGAP data can be utilized. Current and future efforts that use or plan to use SWReGAP data include the development of multispecies habitat conservation plans at the county level (Clark County, Nevada and Pima County, Arizona), the Forest Stewardship Program's Spatial Analysis Project (Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands), and the development of the Region 2 Conservation Targets Database (USFWS). These efforts further enhance the SWReGAP data set, providing an even greater foundation for future work by other agencies. For example, state wildlife agency use of SWReGAP animal habitat models should extend beyond the comprehensive wildlife conservation strategies to planning efforts of state land offices, parks, and other state agencies. SWReGAP data is well suited to provide the foundation of meaningful conservation at many levels.

SWReGAP collaborators are pursuing further analyses and conservation applications using SWReGAP data for fire modeling, alternative future analyses, and historic habitat change analyses. Ecoregional gap analyses such as those completed for the Colorado Plateau Ecoregion (Boykin et al. 2008, Ernst and Prior-Magee 2008, Langs et al. 2008) and Sonoran Desert Ecoregion (Thomas et al. In Review) provide context for conservation at the ecoregional level. Maintaining updates to the current land cover data set over time may, with the cooperation of land management agencies, be managed by the Intermountain Region Digital Image Archive Center (IRDIAC).

SWReGAP data provides another tool for land managers to use in conservation planning and application in concert with current and future data sets (e.g., TNC Ecoregion Analysis, State Wildlife Action Plans). These and other tools when combined with human intellect have the capacity to provide for long term conservation in the Southwest.

## CHAPTER 7

## PRODUCT USE AND AVAILABILITY

Julie Prior-Magee



Photo from SWReGAP Training Site Image Library

**Recommended** Citation

Prior-Magee, J.S. 2007. Product use and availability. Chapter 7 in J.S. Prior-Magee, et al., eds. Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Final Report. U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, ID.

Corresponding author: J. Prior-Magee is to be contacted at jpmagee@nmsu.edu Tel. 575- 646-1084

# HOW TO OBTAIN THE PRODUCTS

It is the goal of the Gap Analysis Program and the USGS Biological Resources Discipline (BRD) to make the data and associated information as widely available as possible. Use of the data requires specialized software called geographic information systems (GIS) and substantial computing power. Additional information on how to use the data or obtain GIS services is provided below and on the GAP home page (URL below). While a DVD or CD-ROM of the data will be the most convenient way to obtain the data, it may also be downloaded via the Internet from the national GAP web site at:

http://gapanalysis.nbii.gov

The web site will also provide, over the long term, information on the status of our regional project, future updates, data availability, and contacts. Following this project's completion, DVD/CD-ROMs of the final report and data should be available at a nominal cost--the above home page will provide ordering information. To find information on this GAP project's status and data, follow the links to "Projects" and then to the particular region of interest.

The Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project (SWReGAP) data will also be available from the following sites: the SWReGAP website http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/ and the Utah State University Remote Sensing/GIS Lab website http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap.

Minimum GIS Required for Data Use: The regional data are provided as Arc/Info grids or Erdas Imagine (img) files for land cover, Erdas Imagine (img) for habitat models, and personal geodatabase or shapefile for land stewardship. This requires users to have access either to Spatial Analyst within ESRI's family of products, Erdas Imagine, or the ability to convert and view the data in another raster format. The complete datasets and the final report will require several terabytes of disk space (approximately 2.5 terabytes) for complete uncompressed datasets. This is comprised mostly of habitat models at 30-m resolution and 8-bit. These models can be converted to 4-bit to take up less space. Habitat models at 240-m resolution are smaller and will use approximately 37 gigabytes. Currently most computers can easily manage the functions necessary for display and navigating through the individual layers. Additional analysis may require tiling of the data or the use of more efficient algorithms.

## Disclaimer

Following is the official Biological Resources Discipline (BRD) disclaimer as of 29 January 1996, followed by additional disclaimers from GAP. Prior to using the data, you should consult the GAP home page (see How to Obtain the Products, above) for the current disclaimer. Although these data have been processed successfully on a computer system at the BRD, no warranty expressed or implied is made regarding the accuracy or utility of the data on any other system or for general or scientific purposes, nor shall the act of distribution constitute any such warranty. This disclaimer applies both to individual use of the data and aggregate use with other data. It is strongly recommended that these data are directly acquired from a BRD server [see above for approved data providers] and not indirectly through other sources which may have changed the data in some way. It is also strongly recommended that careful attention be paid to the content of the metadata file associated with these data. The Biological Resources Discipline shall not be held liable for improper or incorrect use of the data described and/or contained herein.

These data were compiled with regard to the following standards. Please be aware of the limitations of the data. These data are meant to be used at a scale of 1:100,000 or smaller (such as 1:250,000 or 1:500,000) for the purpose of assessing the conservation status of animals and vegetation types over large geographic regions. The data may or may not have been assessed for statistical accuracy. Data evaluation and improvement may be ongoing. The Biological Resources Discipline makes no claim as to the data's suitability for other purposes. This is writable data which may have been altered from the original product if not obtained from a designated data distributor identified above.

## Metadata

Proper documentation of information sources and processes used to assemble GAP data layers is central to the successful application of GAP data. Metadata is a description of the content, quality, lineage, contact, condition, and other characteristics of data. It is a valuable tool that preserves the usefulness of data over time by detailing methods for data collection and data set creation. It greatly minimizes duplication of effort in the collection of expensive digital data and fosters sharing of digital data resources. Metadata supports local data asset management such as local inventory and data catalogs, and external user communities such as Clearinghouses and websites. It provides adequate guidance for end-use application of data such as detailed lineage and context. Metadata makes it possible for data users to search, retrieve, and evaluate data set information by providing standardized descriptions of geospatial and biological data.

The Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) approved the Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (FGDC-STD-001-1998) in June 1998 and the National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII) <http://www.nbii.gov> approved the Biological Data Profile (BDP) in 1999. The BDP adds fields for biological information such as taxonomy, analytical tools, and methodology to the FGDC standard core set of elements. Visit <http://www.nbii.gov> – Metadata – FGDC Metadata – Standards for more information. Executive Order 12906 requires that any spatial data sets generated with federal dollars will have FGDC-compliant metadata.

Each spatial data layer submitted must be accompanied by its metadata (\*.html file) in the same directory. The data producer must also submit an additional directory (called "meta\_master") which will include each metadata file in four forms (\*.txt, \*.html, \*.xml, and \*.sgml). There are many tools available for metadata creation. For some examples,

see <http://www.nbii.gov> – Metadata – FGDC Metadata – Tools. Please note that some tools are free, and some are not. The redundancy in output format is to provide one file for error checking (\*.txt), one for presentation on the Internet (\*.html), and two for indexing elements for the spatial data clearinghouse (\*xml, \*.sgml). Remember, metadata describes the development of the spatial data set being documented. If there are companion files to the GIS data, use metadata to reference (reports, spreadsheet, another GIS layer).

USGS (NBII and FGDC) personnel conduct metadata training to meet FGDC standards and to include biological data. Metadata workshops provide an introduction to the metadata standard with hands-on practice producing documentation for a sample data set using appropriate software: Intergraph's "Spatial Metadata Management System" (SMMS) and USDA Forest Service North Central Research Station's "Metavist" are commonly used. The workshops provide an understanding of the FGDC metadata standard and also cover topics such as the metadata clearinghouse, metadata development tools, and strategies for metadata production. See <http://www.nbii.gov> – Metadata – FGDC Metadata – Training for more information and access to the training calendar.

## **Appropriate and Inappropriate Use of These Data**

All information is created with a specific end use or uses in mind. This is especially true for GIS data, which is expensive to produce and must be directed to meet the immediate program needs. For GAP, minimum standards were set (see A Handbook for Gap Analysis, Scott et al. 1993) to meet program objectives. These standards include: scale or resolution (1:100,000 or 100 hectare minimum mapping unit), accuracy (80% accurate at 95% confidence), and format (ARC/INFO coverage tiled to the 30' x 60' USGS quadrangle). For complete project standards, refer to the Gap Analysis Handbook available from the "Conducting a Gap Analysis" section of the National GAP web site http://gapanalysis.nbii.gov.

Recognizing, however, that GAP would be the first, and for many years likely the only, source of statewide biological GIS maps, the data were created with the expectation that they would be used for other applications. Therefore, we list below both appropriate and inappropriate uses. This list is in no way exhaustive but should serve as a guide to assess whether a proposed use can or cannot be supported by GAP data. For most uses, it is unlikely that GAP will provide the only data needed, and for uses with a regulatory outcome, field surveys should verify the result. In the end, it will be the responsibility of each data user to determine if GAP data can answer the question being asked, and if they are the best tool to answer that question.

<u>Scale:</u> First we must address the issue of appropriate scale to which these data may be applied. The data were produced with an intended application at the ecoregion level, that is, geographic areas from several hundred thousand to millions of hectares in size. The data provide a coarse-filter approach to analysis, meaning that not every occurrence of every plant community or animal species habitat is mapped, only larger, more generalized distributions. The data are also based on the USGS 1:100,000 scale of

mapping in both detail and precision. When determining whether to apply GAP data to a particular use, there are two primary questions: do you want to use the data as a map for the particular geographic area, or do you wish to use the data to provide context for a particular area? The distinction can be made with the following example: You could use GAP land cover to determine the approximate amount of oak woodland occurring in a county, or you could map oak woodland with aerial photography to determine the exact amount. You then could use GAP data to determine the approximate percentage of all oak woodland in the region or state that occurs in the county, and thus gain a sense of how important the county's distribution is to maintaining that plant community.

<u>Appropriate Uses</u>: The above example illustrates two appropriate uses of the data: as a coarse map for a large area such as a county, and to provide context for finer-level maps. Specific case-study examples are provided in Appendix 7-1, but following is a general list of applications:

- Statewide biodiversity planning
- Regional (Councils of Government) planning
- Regional habitat conservation planning
- County comprehensive planning
- Large-area resource management planning
- Coarse-filter evaluation of potential impacts or benefits of major projects or plan initiatives on biodiversity, such as utility or transportation corridors, wilderness proposals, regional open space and recreation proposals, etc.
- Determining relative amounts of management responsibility for specific biological resources among land stewards to facilitate cooperative management and planning.
- Basic research on regional distributions of plants and animals and to help target both specific species and geographic areas for needed research.
- Environmental impact assessment for large projects or military activities.
- Estimation of potential economic impacts from loss of biological resource-based activities.
- Education at all levels and for both students and citizens.

<u>Inappropriate Uses:</u> It is far easier to identify appropriate uses than inappropriate ones, however, there is a "fuzzy line" that is eventually crossed when the differences in resolution of the data, size of geographic area being analyzed, and precision of the answer required for the question are no longer compatible. Examples include:

- Using the data to map small areas (less than thousands of hectares), typically requiring mapping resolution at 1:24,000 scale and using aerial photographs or ground surveys.
- Combining GAP data with other data finer than 1:100,000 scale to produce new hybrid maps or answer queries.
- Generating specific areal measurements from the data finer than the nearest thousand hectares (minimum mapping unit size and accuracy affect this precision).
- Establishing exact boundaries for regulation or acquisition.

- Establishing definite occurrence or non-occurrence of any feature for an exact geographic area (for land cover, the percent accuracy will provide a measure of probability).
- Determining abundance, health, or condition of any feature.
- Establishing a measure of accuracy of any other data by comparison with GAP data.
- Altering the data in any way and redistributing them as a GAP data product.
- Using the data without acquiring and reviewing the metadata and this report.
#### LITERATURE CITED

Alcorn, J.R. 1988. Birds of Nevada. Fairview West Publishers, Fallon, Nevada.

American Ornithologists' Union. 1998. Check-list of North American birds. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

Andrews, R., and R. Righter. 1992. Colorado birds. Denver Museum of Natural History, Colorado.

- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2005a. Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: 2005-2015. Available on-line at: <u>http://www.gf.state.az.us/w\_c/cwcs.shtml</u>. Last accessed: April 2006.
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2005b. Arizona's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy: State of the State (Companion Document B). Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Austin, M.P. 1991. Vegetation: Data collection and analysis. Pages 37-41 in C.R. Margules and M.P. Austin, editors, Nature conservation: Cost effective biological surveys and data analysis. Australia CSIRO, East Melbourne.
- Bailey, R.G., P.E. Avers, T. King and W.H. McNab, 1994. Ecoregions and subregions of the United States (1:7,500,000 map). With supplementary table of map unit descriptions, compiled and edited by W.H. McNab and R.G. Bailey. USDA Forest Service, Washington D.C.
- Bailey, R.G. 1995. Descriptions of the ecoregions of the United States. U.S. Forest Service Miscellaneous Publication # 1391 (Revised), with Separate Map at a Scale of 1:7,500,000. U.S. Department of the Interior, Forest Service, Washington D.C.
- Bauer, M.E., T.E. Burk, A.R. Ek, P.R. Coppin, S.D. Lime, T.A. Walsh, D.K. Walters, W. Befort, and D.F. Heizen, 1994. Satellite inventory of Minnesota forest resources. *Photogrammetric Engineering* and Remote Sensing 60(3): 287-298.
- Beardsley, K., and D. Stroms. 1993. Compiling a digital map of areas managed for biodiversity in California. Natural Areas Journal 13(3): 177-190.
- Bender, D.J., C.H. Flather, K.R. Wilson, and C. Gordon. 2005. Regional data to support biodiversity assessments: terrestrial vertebrate and butterfly data from the Southwest. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-152. Fort Collins, CO, US. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 42 pp.
- Bolger, D.T., T.A. Scott, J.T. Rotenberry 1997. Breeding Bird Abundance in an Urbanizing Landscape in Coastal Southern California. Conservation Biology 11: 406–421.
- Bonham-Carter, G. F. 1994. Geographic information systems for geoscientists: modeling with GIS. Pergamon, Elsevier Science Inc., Tarrytown, NY, USA, pp.285-302.
- Bourgeron, P.S., H.C. Humphries, R.L. DeVelice, and M.E. Jensen. 1994. Ecological theory in relation to landscape and ecosystem characterization. Pages 58-72 in M.E. Jensen and P.S. Bourgeron, editors, Ecosystem management: Principles and applications, Volume II. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-318. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, Oregon. 376 pp.
- Boykin, K.G., C. Drost, and J.J. Wynne. 2007. A Gap Analysis of Terrestrial Vertebrate Species of the Colorado Plateau: Assessment from the Southwest Gap Analysis Project. In C. van Riper III and M. Sogge (eds). The Colorado Plateau III: Socioeconomic, Biological, and Cultural Research. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.
- Breiman, L., J.H. Friedman, R.A. Olshen, and C. J. Stone, 1984. Classification and regression trees. Wadsworth, Inc. Belmont, CA.
- Brown de Colstoun, E.C., M.H. Story, C. Thompson, K. Commisso, T.G. Smith, and J.R. Irons, 2003. National Park vegetation mapping using multi-temporal Landsat & data and a decision tree classifier. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 85, 316-327.
- Brugnach, M. J. Bolte, and G.A. Bradshaw. 2000. Determining the significance of threshold values uncertainty in rule-based classification models. Ecological Modelling 160:63-76.
- Burrough, P.A., and R.A. McDonnell. 1998. Principles of geographical information systems. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, pp.265 291.
- Channell, R. and M.V. Lomolino. 2000. Dynamic biogeography and conservation of endangered species. *Nature 403*: 84-86.

- Chavez, P.S. Jr. 1996. Image-based atmospheric corrections—Revisited and improved. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 62(9): 1025-1036.
- Clark, L.A. and D. Pregibon, Tree-based Models. *In* J.M. Chambers & T.J. Hastie (Eds.). Statistical Models in S. Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth and Brooks; 1992; pp. 377-420.
- Cockrum, E.L. 1960. The Recent Mammals of Arizona Their Taxonomy and Distribution. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona. 276 pp.
- Colorado Division of Wildlife. 2005. Colorado's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver Colorado. Available on-line at: <u>http://wildlife.state.co.us/WildlifeSpecies/ComprehensiveWildlifeConservationStrategy/</u>. Last accessed: April 2006.
- Comer, P., D. Faber-Langendoen, R. Evans, S. Gawler, C. Josse, G. Kittel, S. Menard, S. Pyne, M. Reid, K. Schulz, K. Snowand, and J. Teague. 2003. Ecological systems of the United States: A working classification of U.S. terrestrial systems. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. <u>http://www.natureserve.org/library/usEcologicalsystems.pdf</u>
- Congalton, R.G. 1991. A review of assessing the accuracy of classifications of remotely sensed data. *Remote Sensing of Environment 37*: 35-46.
- Congalton, R.G. and K. Green. 1999. Assessing the accuracy of remotely sensed data: principles and practices. Boca Raton: Lewis Publishers.
- Crist, P., B. Thompson, and J. Prior-Magee. 1995. A dichotomous key of land management categorization, unpublished. New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
- Crist, P., B. Thompson, and J. Prior-Magee. 1996. Land management status categorization for Gap Analysis: A potential enhancement. Gap Analysis Bulletin #5, U.S. Geological Survey, Moscow, ID.
- Crist, P., and R. Deitner, 2000. Assessing land cover map accuracy. Version 2.0.0. (16 February 2000). A handbook for conducting Gap Analysis.
- Csuti, B., S. Polasky, P.H. Williams, R.L. Pressey, J.D. Camm, M. Kershaw, A.R. Kiester, B. Downs, R. Hamilton, M. Huso, and K. Sahr. 1997. A comparison of reserve selection algorithms using data on terrestrial vertebrates in Oregon. *Biological Conservation* 80:83-97.
- Csuti, B. 1994. Methods for developing terrestrial vertebrate distribution maps for Gap Analysis (version 1). In J.M. Scott and M.D. Jennings, editors. A handbook for Gap Analysis. Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Idaho, Moscow.
- Davis, F.W., P.A. Stine, D.M. Stoms, M.I. Borchert, and A.D. Hollander. 1995. Gap Analysis of the actual vegetation of California - 1. The southwestern region. *Madroño* 42:40-78.
- DeFries, R.S., M. Hansen, J.R.G. Townshend and R. Sohlberg, 1998. Global land cover classifications at 8 km spatial resolution: the use of training data derived from Landsat imagery in decision tree classifiers. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 19: 3141-3168.
- Degenhardt, W.G., C.W. Painter, and A.H. Price. 1996. The amphibians and reptiles of New Mexico. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Deitner, R.A., B.C. Thompson, and J.S. Prior-Magee. 1999. Assessing Inter-project compatibility and information distribution for conservation planning using New Mexico Gap Analysis Data. Research Completion Report. New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit. 25 pp.
- DesertUSA(a). *Chihuahuan Desert*. Available on-line: <u>http://www.desertusa.com/du\_chihua.html</u> [January 2006].
- DesertUSA(b). *Great Basin Desert*. Available on-line: <u>http://www.desertusa.com/du\_basin.html</u> [January 2006].
- DesertUSA(c). *Mojave Desert*. Available on-line: <u>http://www.desertusa.com/du\_mojave.html</u> [January 2006].
- DesertUSA(d) Sonoran Desert. Available on-line: <u>http://www.desertusa.com/du\_sonoran.html</u> [January 2006].
- Diamond, J. 1986. The design of a nature reserve system for Indonesian New Guinea. Pages 485-503 in M.E. Soulé, editor. Conservation biology: The science of scarcity and diversity. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- Di Greogrio, A. and L.J.M. Jansen, 2000. Land cover classification system (LCCS): Classification concepts and user manual. Environment and Natural Resources Service, GCP/RAF/287/ITA

Africover – East Africa Project and Soil Resources, Management and Conservation Service. FAO, Rome.

- Drake, J., and D. Faber-Langendoen. 1997. An alliance-level classification of the vegetation of the Midwestern United States. A report prepared by The Nature Conservancy Midwest Conservation Science Department for the University of Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit. The Nature Conservancy Midwest Regional Office, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA.
- Driscoll, R.S., D.L. Merkel, J.S. Hagihara, and D.L. Radloff. 1983. A component land classification for the United States: Status report. Technical Note 360. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
- Driscoll, R.S., D.L. Merkel, D.L. Radloff, D.E. Snyder, and J.S. Hagihara. 1984. An ecological land classification framework for the United States. Miscellaneous Publication 1439. USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC.
- Durrant, S.D. 1952. Mammals of Utah taxonomy and distribution. University of Kansas Publications, Museum of Natural History 6:1-549.
- Edwards, T.C., Jr., C.H. Homer, S.D. Bassett, A. Falconer, R.D. Ramsey, and D.W. Wight. 1995. Utah Gap Analysis: An environmental information system. Technical Report 95-1, Utah Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.
- Ernst, A., and J. Prior-Magee. 2007. Conservation Assessment of the Colorado Plateau using Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Stewardship Data. In C. van Ripper III and M. Sogge (eds). The Colorado Plateau III: Socioeconomic, Biological, and Cultural Research. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.
- Falzarano, S. R. and K. A. Thomas. 2004. Fuzzy set and spatial analysis techniques for evaluating thematic accuracy of a land-cover map. In <u>Remote Sensing and GIS Accuracy Assessment</u> R. S. Lunetta and J. G. Lyon, editors. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC). 1994. Content standards for digital geospatial metadata. 8 June 1994. Federal Geographic Data Committee, Washington, DC.
- Federal Geographic Data Committee. 1995. Content standards for digital geospatial metadata workbook, FGDC, Washington, DC.
- Federal Geographic Data Committee, Vegetation Subcommittee. 1997. FGDC Vegetation Classification and Information Standards--June 3, 1996 Draft. FGDC Secretariat, Reston, Virginia. 35 pp.
- Feldhamer, G.A., B.C. Thompson, and J.A. Chapman (Editors). 2003. Wild Mammals of North America Biology, Management, and Conservation. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland. 1216 pp.
- Findley, J.S., A.H. Harris, D.E. Wilson, and C. Jones. 1975. Mammals of New Mexico. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Findley, James S. 1987. The Natural History of New Mexican Mammals. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 164 pp.
- Fitzgerald, J.P., C.A. Meaney, and D.M. Armstrong. 1994. Mammals of Colorado. Denver Museum of Natural History, Denver and University Press of Colorado, Niwot, Colorado.
- Flather, C.H., Knowles, M.S., Kendall, I.A. 1998. Threatened and endangered species geography: characteristics of hot spots in the conterminous United States. *BioScience* 48(5): 365-376.
- Flather, C.H., K.R. Wilson, D.J. Dean, and W.C. McComb. 1997. Identifying gaps in conservation networks: Of indicators and uncertainty in Geographic-based Analysis. *Ecological Applications* 7:531-542.
- Foody, G., 2002. Status of land cover classification accuracy assessment. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 80: 185-201.
- Forman, R.T.T., and M. Godron. 1986. Landscape ecology. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Franklin, J.F. 1993. Preserving biodiversity: Species, ecosystems, or landscapes? *Ecological Applications* 3(2):202-205.
- Friedl, M.A., and C.E. Brodley, 1997. Decision tree classification of land cover from remotely sensed data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 61:399-409.
- Friedl, M.A., C.E. Brodley, and A.H. Strahler, 1999. Maximizing land cover classification accuracies produced by decision trees at continental to global scales. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 37(2): 969-977.
- Friedl, M. A., D.K. McIver, J.C.F. Hodges, X.Y. Zhang, D. Muchoney, A.H. Strahler, C.E. Woodcock, S. Gopal, A. Schneider, A. Cooper, A. Baccini, F. Gao, and C. Schaaf, 2002. Global land cover

mapping from MODIS: algorithms and early results. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 83:287-302.

- Gap Analysis Program. 2000. A handbook for conducting Gap Analysis. USGS Gap Analysis Program, Moscow, Idaho. <u>http://www.gap.uidaho.edu/gap/handbook</u>.
- Garrard, C.M., 2003. Kappa tool user's guide. Unpublished document. RSGIS Laboratories, Utah State University. <u>http://bioweb.usu.edu/chrisg/download/</u>.
- Gonzalez-Rebeles, C., B.C. Thompson, and F.C. Bryant. 2002. Influence of selected environmental Variables on GIS-habitat models used for gap analysis. Pages 639-651 in J.M. Scott, P.J. Heglund, M.L. Morrison et al., editors. Predicting species occurrences: Issues of accuracy and scale. Island Press, Washington, D.C. 868 pp.
- Gopal, S. and C. Woodcock., 1994. Theory and methods for accuracy assessment of thematic maps using fuzzy sets. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* Vol. 60, No. 2: 181-188.
- Goutte, C., 1997. Note on free lunches and cross-validation, Neural Computation, 9, 1211-1215.
- Green, D.M. 2005. Biology of amphibian declines. In: Lannoo, M. (ed). Amphibian Declines: The conservation status of United States Species. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. Pages 28-33.
- Grossman, D., K.L. Goodin, X. Li, C. Wisnewski, D. Faber-Langendoen, M. Anderson, L. Sneddon, D. Allard, M. Gallyoun, and A. Weakley. 1994. Standardized national vegetation classification system. Report by The Nature Conservancy and Environmental Systems Research Institute for the NBS/NPS Vegetation Mapping Program. National Biological Service, Denver, Colorado.
- Grossman, D.H., D. Faber-Langendoen, A.S. Weakley, M. Anderson, P. Bourgeron, R. Crawford, K.
   Goodin, S. Landaal, K. Metzler, K.D. Patterson, M. Pyne, M. Reid, and L. Sneddon. 1998.
   International classification of ecological communities: terrestrial vegetation of the United States.
   Volume 1. The National Vegetation Classification System: development, status, and applications.
   The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia, USA.
- Hall, E.R. 1946. Mammals of Nevada. University of Nevada Press, Las Vegas, Nevada. 710 pp.
- Hall, E.R. 1981. The mammals of North America, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Wiley Interscience, New York, N.Y.
- Halvorson, W.L., K. Thomas, L. Graham, M.R. Kunzmann, P.S. Bennett, C. Van Riper, and C. Drost. 2002. The Arizona GAP analysis project final report. U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, Western Ecological Research Center, University of Arizona. Tucson, AZ. 166p.
- Hammerson, G.A. 1999. Amphibians and reptiles of Colorado. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. University Press of Colorado, Niwot and Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver.
- Hansen, M., R. Dubayah, and R. DeFries, 1996. Classification trees: An alternative to traditional land cover classifiers. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 17(5): 1075-1081.
- Hansen, M.C., R.S. DeFries, J.R.G. Townsend, and R. Sohlberg, 2000. Global land cover classification at 1 km spatial resolution using a classification tree approach. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 21(6,7): 1331-1364.
- Hayward, C.L., C. Cottam, A.M. Woodbury, and H.H. Frost. 1976. Birds of Utah. Brigham Young University Press, Provo, Utah.
- Hill, K.E. and M.W. Binford. 2002. The role of category definition in habitat models: practical and logical limitations of using Boolean, indexed, probabilistic, and fuzzy categories. In: Scott, J.M, P.J. Heglund, M.L. Morrison, J.B. Haufler, M.G. Raphael, W.A. Wall, and F.B. Samson. Predicting Species Occurrence: Issues of Accuracy and Scale. Island Press, Washington. 868 pp.
- Hoffmeister, D.R. 1986. Mammals of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Hollings, C.S. 1992. Cross-scale morphology, geometry, and dynamics of ecosystems. *Ecological Monographs* 62:447-502.
- Holt, R.D. and T.H. Keitt. 2005. Species' borders: A unifying theme in ecology. Oikos 108: 3-6.
- Homer, C., C. Huang, L. Yang, B. Wylie, and M. Coan. 2004. Development of a 2001 national land cover database for the United States. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 70(7):829-840.
- Homer, C.G., R.D. Ramsey, T.C. Edwards, Jr., and A. Falconer, 1997. Landscape cover-type modeling using a multi-scene Thematic Mapper mosaic. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 63(1): 59-67.
- Homer, Collin and Thomas Edwards. 1996. Nevada GAP vegetation data layer. Utah Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Utah State University, Logan Utah.

- Huang, C., B. Wylie, C. Homer, L. Yang, and G. Zylstra, 2002. Derivation of a Tasseled cap transformation based on Landsat 7 at-satellite reflectance. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 23(8): 1741-1748.
- Hutchingson, C. 1982. Techniques for combining Landsat and ancillary data for digital classification improvement. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 48:123-130.
- Jaeger, J.R., B.R. Riddle, and D.F. Bradford. 2005. Cryptic Neogene vicariance and Quaternary dispersal of the red-spotted toad (*Bufo punctatus*): insights on the evolution of North American warm desert biotas. *Molecular Ecology* 14(10): 3033-3048.
- Jenkins, R.E. 1985. Information methods: Why the Heritage Programs work. *The Nature Conservancy News* 35(6):21-23.
- Jenness Enterprises. 2005. Random Point Generator, v 1.3. ArcView Script. Internet WWW URL at <a href="http://www.jennessent.com/arcview/random\_points.htm">http://www.jennessent.com/arcview/random\_points.htm</a>.
- Jennings, M.D. 1993. Natural terrestrial cover classification: Assumptions and definitions. Gap Analysis Technical Bulletin 2. Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Idaho, Moscow.
- Jensen, J.R. 2005. Introductory Digital Image Processing.: A Remote Sensing Perspective. Third Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, D. 2001. Validating and Evaluating Models. In: Shenk, T.M. and A.B. Franklin Modeling in Natural Resource Management: Development, Interpretation and Application. Island Press.
- Kingery, H.E. editor. 1998. Colorado breeding bird atlas. Colorado Bird Atlas Partnership and Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver.
- Kirkpatrick, J.B. 1983. An iterative method for establishing priorities for the selection of nature reserves: An example from Tasmania. *Biological Conservation* 25:127-134.
- Küchler, A.W., and I.S. Zonneveld, editors. 1988. Vegetation mapping. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands. 635 pp.
- Laba, M., S.K. Gregory, J. Braden, D. Ogurcak, E. Hill, E. Fegraus, J. Fiore, and S.D. DeGloria. 2002. Conventional and fuzzy accuracy assessment of the New York Gap Analysis Project land cover map. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 81:443-455.
- Langs, L.A., K.A. Thomas, J.H. Lowry, and K.A. Schulz. 2007. A Gap analysis of land cover for the Colorado Plateau: Implications from the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project. In C. van Ripper III and M. Sogge (eds). The Colorado Plateau III: Socioeconomic, Biological, and Cultural Research. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.
- Lannoo, M.J., ed. 2005. Amphibian Declines: Status and Conservation of United States Species. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Lawrence, R.L. and A. Wright. 2001. A. Rule-based classification systems using classification and regression trees (CART) analysis. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 67(10):1137-1142.
- Lawrence, R., A. Bunn, S. Powell, S., and M. Zambon, M. 2004. Classification of remotely sensed imagery using stochastic gradient boosting as a refinement of classification tree analysis. *Remote Sensing* of Environment 90:331-336.
- Levin, S.A. 1981. The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology* 73:1942-1968.
- Ligon, J.S. 1961. New Mexico Birds and Where to Find Them. The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 360 pp.
- Lillesand, T.M. 1996. A protocol for satellite-based land cover classification in the Upper Midwest. Pages 103-118 in J.M. Scott, T.H. Tear, and F.W. Davis, editors. Gap Analysis: A Landscape Approach to Biodiversity Planning. ASPRS, 320 pp.
- Lillesand, T.M. and R.W. Kiefer. 2000. Remote Sensing and Image Interpretation. Fourth Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- Lins, K.S., and R.L. Kleckner. 1996. Land cover mapping: An overview and history of the concepts. Pages 57-65 in J.M. Scott, T.H. Tear, and F. Davis, editors, Gap Analysis: A landscape approach to biodiversity planning. American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Lowe, C.H. 1964. The vertebrates of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Lowe, C.H., C.R. Schwalbe, and T.B. Johnson. 1986. The venomous reptiles of Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix.

- Ma, Z., M.M. Hart, and R.L. Redmond. 2001. Mapping vegetation across large geographic areas: Integration of remote sensing and GIS to classify multisource data. *Photogrammetric Engineering* and Remote Sensing Vol. 67, No. 3, 295-307.
- Manis, G., C. Homer, R.D. Ramsey, J. Lowry, T. Sajwaj, and S. Graves. 2000. The development of mapping zones to assist in land cover mapping over large geographic areas: A case study of the Southwest ReGAP project. GAP Analysis Bulletin No. 9. U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division. <u>http://www.gap.uidaho.edu/Bulletins/9/bulletin9/default.html</u>
- Manis, G., J. Lowry, J. and R.D. Ramsey, 2001. Pre-classification: An ecologically predictive landform model. GAP Analysis Bulletin No. 10. U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division. <u>http://www.gap.uidaho.edu/Bulletins/10/preclassification.htm</u>
- Margules, C.R., A.O. Nicholls, and R.L. Pressey. 1988. Selecting networks of reserves to maximize biological diversity. *Biological Conservation* 43:63-76.
- McIver, D.K. and M.A. Friedl. 2002. Using prior probabilities in decision tree classification of remotely sensed data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 81: 253-261.
- Miller, K.R., 1984. The Bali Action plan: A framework for the future of protected areas. In National Parks, conservation, and development, edited by J.A. McNeely and K.R. Miller, 756-764. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Miller, K.R. 1994. In J.A. McNeely and K.R. Miller, editors. National parks conservation and development. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Monson, G., and A.R. Phillips. 1981. Annotated checklist of the birds of Arizona. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Morin, N. 1995. Vascular plants of the United States. In Our living resources: a report to the nation on the distribution, abundance, and health of U.S. plants, animals, and ecosystems, edited by E.T. LaRoe, G.S. Farris, C.E. Puckett, P.D. Doran, and M. J. Mac, 200-205. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service, Washington, D.C.
- Mueller-Dombois, D., and H. Ellenberg. 1974. Aims and methods of vegetation ecology. John Wiley & Sons, New York. 547 pp.
- Nevada Department of Wildlife. 2005. Nevada Wildlife Action Plan. Nevada Department of Wildlife. Reno, Nevada. Available on-line at: <u>http://www.ndow.org/wild/conservation/cwcs/</u>. Last accessed: April 2006.
- New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2005. Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Santa Fe, New Mexico. 526 pp + appendices. Available on-line at: http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/cwcs/. Last accessed: April 2006.
- Nicholls, A.O., and Margules. 1993. An upgraded reserve selection algorithm. *Biological Conservation* 64:165-169.
- Noss, R.F. 1987. From plant communities to landscapes in conservation inventories: A look at The Nature Conservancy (USA). *Biological Conservation* 41:11-37.
- Noss, R.F. 1990. Indicators for monitoring biodiversity: A hierarchical approach. *Conservation Biology* 4:355-364.
- Noss, R.F. 1991. Report to the Fund for Animals in Washington, DC.
- Noss, R.F., and A.Y. Cooperrider. 1994. Saving nature's legacy. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Noss, R.F., E.T. LaRoe III, and J.M. Scott. 1995. Endangered ecosystems of the United States: A preliminary assessment of loss and degradation. Biological Report 28, National Biological Service, Washington, DC.
- O'Brien, L.E. 2005. A method to quantify and depict uncertainty in wildlife habitat suitability models using Bayesian inference and expert opinion. M.S. Thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
- The Official Website of the State of Utah. Utah History to Go: The Land. Available online:http://historytogo.utah.gov/utah\_chapters/the\_land/index.html [September 2005].
- Odum, E.D., and H.T. Odum. 1972. Natural areas as necessary components of man's total environment. Proceeding of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. 39:178-189.
- Odum, E.D., and H.T. Odum. 1972. Proceedings of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference 39:178.
- Omernik, J.M. 1987. Ecoregions of the conterminous United States. Map (scale 1:7,500,000). Annals of the Association of American Geographers 77(1):118-125.
- Pal, M. and P.M. Mather. 2003. An assessment of the effectiveness of decision tree methods for land cover classification. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 86, 554-565.

- Pearce, J. and S. Ferrier. 2000. Evaluating the predictive performance of habitat models developed using logistic regression. *Ecological Modeling*. 133:225-245.
- Penhollow, M.E., and D.F.Stauffer. 2000. Large-scale habitat relationships of neotropical migratory birds in Virginia. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 64: 362-373.
- Peterson, A.T. 2005. Kansas Gap Analysis: the importance of validating distributional models before using them. *Southwestern Naturalist* 50:230-236.
- Phillips, A.R., J. Marshall, and G. Monson. 1964. The birds of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Phillips, A.R., J. Marshall, and G. Monson. 1983. The birds of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Phillips, S.J., R.P. Anderson, and R.E. Shapire. 2006. Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distribution. *Ecological Modeling* 190:231-259.
- Poole, A.F., P. Stettenheim, and F.B. Gill (Editors). 1992. The Birds of North America. The American Ornithologists' Union and the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Pressey, R.L., and A.O. Nicholls. 1989. Application of a numerical algorithm to the selection of reserves in semi-arid New South Wales. *Biological Conservation* 50:263-278.
- Pressey, R.L., C.J. Humphries, C.R. Margules, R.I. Vane-Wright, and P.H. Williams. 1993. Beyond opportunism: Key principles for systematic reserve selection. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 8:124-128.
- Pressey, R.L., and V.S. Logan. 1995. Reserve coverage and requirements in relation to partitioning and generalization of land classes: analyses for Western New South Wales. *Conservation Biology* 9(6):1506-1517.
- Quinlan, J.R. 1993. C4.5: programs for machine learning. San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- Reese, H.M., T.M. Lillesand, D.E. Nagel, J.S. Stewart, R.A. Goldmann, T.E. Simmons, J.W. Chipman, and P.A. Tessar, 2002. Statewide land cover derived from multiseasonal Landsat TM data: A retrospective of the WISCLAND project. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 82: 224-237.
- Reid, M.S., K.A. Schulz, P.J. Comer, M.H. Schindel, D.R. Culver, D.A. Sarr, and M.C. Damm. 1999. Descriptions of vegetation alliances of the coterminous United States. The Nature Conservancy, Boulder, Colorado, USA.
- Reiners, W.A., K.L. Driese, & D. Schrupp. 2000. Statistical evaluation of Wyoming and Colorado landcover map thematic accuracy using aerial videography techniques. Final Report. Department of Botany, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY. WWW page at URL: http://ndis1.nrel.colostate.edu/cogap/report/colandcov\_acc.pdf
- Ricchetti, E. 2000. Multispectral satellite image and ancillary data integration for geological classification. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 66(4):429-435.
- Ride, W.L.D. 1975. In F. Fenner, editor. A national system of ecological reserves in Australia. 64 pp.
- Schrupp, D.L., W.A. Reiners, T.G. Thompson, L.E. O'Brien, J.A. Kindler, M.B. Wunder, J.F. Lowsky, J.C. Buoy, L. Satcowitz, A.L. Cade, J.D. Stark, K.L. Driese, T.W. Owens, S.J. Russo, and F. D'Erchia. 2000. Colorado Gap Analysis Program: A Geographic Approach to Planning for Biological Diversity - Final Report, USGS Biological Resources Division, Gap Analysis Program and Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, CO.
- Schwin, M.A., and L. Minden. 1979. Utah reptile and amphibian latilong distribution. Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City. Publication No. 80-1.
- Scott, J.M., F. Davis, B. Csuti, R. Noss, B. Butterfield, C. Groves, H. Anderson, S. Caicco, F. D'Erchia, T.C. Edwards, Jr., J. Ulliman, and G. Wright. 1993. Gap analysis: A geographic approach to protection of biological diversity. *Wildlife Monographs* 123.
- Shtatland, E. S., K. Klienman and E.M. Cain. 2004. A new strategy of model building in PROC LOGISTIC with automatic variable selection, validation, shrinkage and model averaging. SUGI 29 Proceedings, paper 191-29. Montreal, Canada. WWW URL: http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi29/191-29.pdf
- Smits, P. C., S.G. Dellepiane and R.A. Schowengerdt. 1999. Quality assessment of image classification algorithms for land-cover mapping a review and a proposal for a cost-based approach. *International Journal of Remote Sensing 20* 1461-1486.
- Sneddon, L., M. Anderson, and K. Metzler. 1994. A classification and description of terrestrial community alliances in The Nature Conservancy's Eastern Region: First approximation. Unpublished report to

USDI Fish & Wildlife Service, Gap Analysis Program. The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Heritage Task Force, Boston, MA. 116 pp.

- Specht, R.L. 1975. The report and its recommendations. Pages 11-16 in: F. Fenner, editor, A national system of ecological reserves in Australia. Australian Academy of Sciences Report No. 19. Canberra, Australia.
- Specht, R.L., E.M. Roe, and V.H. Boughlon. 1974. Australian Journal of Botany Supplement Series. Supplement No. 7.
- Stebbins, R.C. 1985. A field guide to western reptiles and amphibians. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Stehman, S.V. and R.L. Czaplewski. 1998. Design and analysis for thematic map accuracy assessment: Fundamental principles. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 64:331-344.
- Stoms, D.M., F.W. Davis, C.B. Cogan. 1992. Sensitivity of wildlife habitat models to uncertainties in GIS data. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 58:843-850.
- Stoms, D., and J. Estes. 1993. A remote sensing research agenda for mapping and monitoring biodiversity. International Journal of Remote Sensing 14:1839-1860.
- Stoms, D.M. 1994. Actual vegetation layer. In J.M. Scott and M.D. Jennings, editors. A handbook for Gap Analysis. Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Idaho, Moscow.
- Strong, T.R. and C.E. Bock. 1990. Bird Species Distribution Patterns in Riparian Habitats in Southeastern Arizona. *The Condor* 92:866-885.
- The Nature Conservancy. 2005. TNC Terrestrial Global Assessment Units, Ecoregions and Major Habitat Types - July 2005. Available on-line at: <u>https://transfer.natureserve.org/download/longterm/Ecology/GIS\_BASE\_DATA</u>. or at: <u>http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/ecoregional.shapefile/</u>. Last accessed: January 2006.
- Thomas, K.A., K.A. Schulz, and K.G. Boykin. (In Review). A Gap perspective of the Sonoran Desert Ecoregion. Proceedings of the Sixth Conference on Research and Resource Management in the Southwestern Deserts: Borders, Boundaries, and Time Scales.
- Thompson, B.C., P.J. Crist, J.S. Prior-Magee, R.A. Deitner, D.L. Garber, and M.A. Hughes. 1996. Gap analysis of biological diversity conservation in New Mexico using geographic information systems. Research completion report, New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Las Cruces.
- Treitz, P. and P. Howarth. 2000. Integrating spectral, spatial, and terrain variables for forest ecosystem classification. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 66(3):305-317.
- UNESCO. 1973. International classification and mapping of vegetation. Paris.
- United States Geological Survey –National Park Service Vegetation Mapping Program. 1994. Field Methods for Vegetation Mapping. The Nature Conservancy and Environmental Systems Research Institute. December, 1994.
- United States Geological Survey(a). *Geologic Provinces of the United States: Colorado Plateau*. Available on-line: <u>http://wrgis.wr.usgs.gov/docs/usgsnps/province/coloplat.html</u> [January 2006].
- United States Geological Survey(b). *Geologic Provinces of the United States: Interior Plain Province.* Available on-line: <u>http://wrgis.wr.usgs.gov/docs/usgsnps/province/intplain.html</u> [January 2006].
- United States Geological Survey(c). *Geologic Provinces of the United States: Rocky Mountains*. Available on-line: <u>http://wrgis.wr.usgs.gov/docs/usgsnps/province/rockymtn.html</u> [January 2006].
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. 2005. Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS): 2005-2015. Publication Number 05-19. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City, Utah. Available on-line at: http://www.wildlife.utah.gov/cwcs/. Last accessed: April 2006.
- Van Horne, B. and J.A. Wiens. 1991. Forest Bird Habitat Suitability Models and the Development of General Habitat Models. Fish and Wildlife Research. Washington DC no. 8, 31 pp
- Verbyla, D.L. 1987. Classification trees: A new discrimination tool. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 17:1150-1152.
- Walters, R.E., and E. Sorenson, editors. 1983. Utah bird distribution: latilong study. Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City. Publication 83-10.
- Wassink, Jan L. 1993. Mammals of the Central Rockies. Mountain Press Publishing Company, Missoula, Montana. 161 pp.
- Weakley, A.S., K.D. Patterson, S. Landaal, M. Gallyoun, and others, compilers. 1996. International classification of ecological communities: Terrestrial vegetation of the Southeastern United States.

Working draft of April 1996. The Nature Conservancy, Southeast Regional Office, Southern Conservation Science Department, Community Ecology Group. Chapel Hill, NC.

- West, N.E. and J.A. Young, 2000. Intermountain Valleys and Lower Mountain Slopes (Chapter 7). in M.G. Barbour and W.D.Billings (eds.) North American Terrestrial Vegetation, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge Univ. Press, NY
- Whittaker, R.H. 1960. Vegetation of the Siskiyou mountains, Oregon and California. *Ecological Monographs* 30(3):279-338.
- Whittaker, R.H. 1965. Dominance and diversity in land plant communities. Science 147: 250-259.

Whittaker, R.H. 1977. Species diversity in land communities. Evolutionary Biology 10:1-67.

- Wilcox, G., D.M. Theobald, J. Whisman, and N. Peterson. 2006. COMaP: Mapping the status and trends of Colorado's protected areas. COMaP v.5 Technical Report. Natural Resource Ecology Lab, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Williams, P.H., D. Gibbons, C. Margules, A. Rebelo, C. Humphries, and R. Pressey. 1996. A comparison of richness hotspots, rarity hotspots, and complementary areas for conserving diversity of British birds. *Conservation Biology* 10:155-174.
- Wilson, D.E., and D.M. Reeder, editors. 1993. Mammal species of the world: a taxonomic and geographic reference. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Woodcock, C. and S. Gopal. 1992. Accuracy assessment of the Stanislaus Forest vegetation map using *fuzzy sets*. Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> Biennial Remote Sensing Applications Conference, Orlando FL.

#### GLOSSARY

aerial videography - video images of the land surface taken from an airplane

algorithm - a procedure to solve a problem or model a solution (In GAP typically refers to a GIS procedure used to model animal distributions.)

alliance level - a land unit made up of an "alliance" of natural communities that have the same dominant or co-dominant plant species or, in the absence of vegetation, by the dominant land cover typically described according to the Anderson land cover classification (see "Natural Community Alliance" in Grossman et al. 1995)

alpha diversity - a single within-habitat measure of species diversity regardless of internal pattern, generally over an area of 0.1 to 1,000 hectares (see Whittaker 1960, 1977) -

Anderson Level II - the second hierarchical level in the Anderson land cover classification system (see Anderson et al. 1976)

anthropogenic - caused by man

assemblages - a group of ecologically interrelated plant and animal species

at-sensor reflectance – Reflectance is the ratio of exiting solar radiation from the target divided by total incoming solar radiation. At-sensor reflectance, or apparent reflectance, is the combined reflectance from the earth's surface and atmosphere.

band, spectral - a segment of the electromagnetic spectrum defined by a range of wavelengths (e.g. blue, green, red, near infrared, far infrared) that comprise the Landsat TM imagery

beta diversity - the change in species diversity among different natural communities of a landscape; an index of between-habitat diversity (see Whittaker 1960, 1977)

biodiversity - generally, the variety of life and its interrelated processes

biogeographic - relating to the geographical distribution of plants and animals

biological diversity - see biodiversity

cartographic - pertaining to the art or technique of making maps or charts

classify - to assign objects, features, or areas on an image to spectral classes based upon their appearance as opposed to 'classification' referring to a scheme for describing the hierarchies of vegetation or animal species for an area

coarse filter - the general conservation activities that conserve the common elements of the landscape matrix, as opposed to the "fine filter" conservation activities that are aimed at special cases such as rare elements (see Jenkins 1985)

community - a group of interacting plants and animals

cover type - a non-technical higher-level floristic and structural description of vegetation cover

cross-walking - matching equivalent land cover categories between two or more classification systems

deductive modeling – modeling approach using general information over the range of the species often obtained from literature to model species habitat.

delineate - identifying the boundaries between more or less homogenous areas on remotely sensed images as visible from differences in tone and texture

delta diversity - the change in species diversity between landscapes along major climatic or physiographic gradients (see Whittaker 1977)

digitization - entering spatial data digitally into a Geographic Information System

ecoregion - a large region, usually spanning several million hectares, characterized by having similar biota, climate, and physiography (topography, hydrology, etc).

ecosystem - a biological community (ranging in scale from a single cave to millions of hectares), its physical environment, and the processes through which matter and energy are transferred among the components

edge-matching - the process of connecting polygons at the boundary between two independently created maps, either between TM scenes or between state GAP data sets

element - a plant community or animal species mapped by GAP. May also be referred to as "element of biodiversity".

error of commission - the occurrence of a species (or other map category) is erroneously predicted in an area where it is in fact absent

error of omission - when a model fails to predict the occurrence of a species that is actually present in an area

exact set coverage - a basic optimization problem to determine the best method for identifying general areas that, when selected sequentially, would have the greatest positive cumulative impact on attaining adequate representation of any or all biotic elements of interest

extinction - disappearance of a species throughout its entire range

extirpation - disappearance of a species from part of its range

fine filter - see "coarse filter"

floristic - pertaining to the plant species that make up the vegetation of a given area.

formation level - the level of land cover categorization between Group and Alliance describing the structural attributes of a land unit, for example, "Evergreen Coniferous Woodlands with Rounded Crowns" (see Jennings 1993b)

gamma diversity - the species diversity of a landscape, generally covering 1,000 to 1,000,000 hectares, made up of more than one kind of natural community (see Whittaker 1977)

gap analysis - a comparison of the distribution of elements of biodiversity with that of areas managed for their long-term viability to identify elements with inadequate representation

geographic information systems - computer hardware and software for storing, retrieving, manipulating, and analyzing spatial data

Global Positioning System (GPS) - an instrument that utilizes satellite signals to pinpoint its location on the earth's surface

greedy heuristic - an algorithm for exact set cover analysis (see Kiester et al., in press)

ground truthing - verifying maps by checking the actual occurrence of plant and animal species in the field at representative sample locations

habitat - the physical structure, vegetational composition, and physiognomy of an area, the characteristics of which determine its suitability for particular animal or plant species

hectare - a metric unit of area of 10,000 square meters and equal to 2.47 acres

hex/hexagon - typically refers to the EPA EMAP hexagonal grid of 635 square kilometer units

hyperclustering - a efficient, interactive method for accurately analyzing and classifying remotely-sensed data that reduces data size and computational requirements while retaining the integrity of the original data

inductive modeling – modeling approach using site specific information to model species habitat over the entire range. Data sources are often known point locations of species.

lentic – still, e.g., water in a lake or pond

lotic - flowing, e.g., water in a stream or river

measure of agreement – analysis using two or more different datasets to measure the similarity or "agreement" between datasets.

metadata - information about data, e.g., their source, lineage, content, structure, and availability

minimum mapping unit - the smallest area that is depicted on a map

neotropics - the zoo-geographic region stretching southward from the tropic of Cancer and including southern Mexico, Central and South America, and the West Indies

phenology - the study of periodic biological phenomena, such as flowering, breeding, and migration, especially as related to climate

phenotype - the environmentally and genetically determined observable appearance of an organism, especially as considered with respect to all possible genetically influenced expressions of one specific character

physiognomic - based on physical features

physiographic province - a region having a pattern of relief features or land forms that differ significantly from that of adjacent regions

pixel - the smallest spatial unit in a raster data structure

polygon - an area enclosed by lines in a vector-based Geographic Information System data layer or a region of contiguous homogeneous pixels in a raster system

preprocessing - those operations that prepare data for subsequent analysis, usually by attempts to correct or compensate for systematic, radiometric, and geometric errors

pro-active - acting in anticipation of an event as opposed to reacting after the fact

range - the geographic limit of the species

range unit - a spatial, geographic unit to record and display species geographic range.

raster format - a data structure that uses grid cells as fundamental units for analysis and manipulation in a Geographic Information System

reach - a stream or river segment between inflowing tributaries

registration, spatial - matching different images to each other by finding points on the images that can be matched to known points on the ground

remote sensing - deriving information about the earth's surface from images acquired at a distance, usually relying on measurement of electromagnetic radiation reflected or emitted from the feature of interest

resolution - the ability of a remote sensing system to record and display fine detail in a distinguishable manner or: the smallest feature that can be distinguished or resolved on a map or image, such as a TM pixel

scale, map - the ratio of distance on a map to distance in the real word, expressed as a fraction; the smaller the denominator, the larger the scale, e.g. 1:24,000 is larger than 1:100,000

sensitivity analysis - the consideration of a number of factors involved in the mathematical modeling of an ecosystem and its components. These include feedback and control, and the stability and sensitivity of the system as a whole to changes in some part of the system. Predictions can be made from the analysis..

simulated annealing - an algorithm used for set coverage analysis (see Kiester et al., in press)

species richness - the number of species of a particular interest group found in a given area

spectral cluster - a group of adjacent pixels that are uniform with respect to their brightness values

supervised classification - the process of classifying TM pixels of unknown identity by using samples of known identity (i.e., pixels already assigned to informational classes by ground truthing or registration with known land cover) as training data

synoptic - constituting a brief statement or outline of a subject; presenting a summary

tessellation - the division of a map into areas of equal and uniform shape such as the EPA- EMAP hexagon

Thematic Mapper - a sensor on LANDSAT 4 and 5 satellites that records information in seven spectral bands, has a spatial resolution of about 30 m x 30 m, and represents digital values in 256 levels of brightness per band

transect - a transversely cut line along which physical and biological observations are made

trophic structure - the various levels in a food chain, such as producers (plants), primary consumers (herbivores), and secondary consumers (carnivores)

Universal Transverse Mercator - one of several map projections or systems of transformations that enables locations on the spherical earth to be represented systematically on a flat map

Universal Transverse Mercator grid - a geographic reference system used as the basis for worldwide locational coding of information in a GIS or on a map

unsupervised classification - the definition, identification, labeling, and mapping of natural groups, or classes, of spectral values within a scene. These spectral classes are reasonably uniform in brightness in several spectral channels.

vector format - a data structure that uses polygons, arcs (lines), and points as fundamental units for analysis and manipulation in a Geographic Information System

virtual reality - a computer-generated simulation of reality with which users can interact using specialized peripherals such as data gloves and head-mounted computer graphic displays

visual sensitivity analysis – sensitivity analysis using geographic information systems and concepts of sensitivity analysis (see sensitivity analysis) to provide insight into datasets used in modeling habitat.

wildlife habitat relationship model - a method of linking patterns of known habitat use by animal species with maps of existing vegetation, thereby identifying the spatial extent of important habitat features for use in conservation and management.

#### GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ACEC Area of Critical Environmental Concern ACSM American Congress on Surveying and Mapping ADAMAS Aquatic Database Management System ADEM Alabama Department of Environmental Management AML ARC/INFO Macro Language ASPRS American Society for Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing AVHRR Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (satellite system) BEST Biomonitoring of Environmental Status and Trends BLM Bureau of Land Management CAFF Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna C-CAP Coastwatch Change Analysis Program (NOAA) CDC Conservation Data Center **CEC** Council on Environmental Cooperation CENR Committee on Environment and Natural Resources **CERES** California Environmental Resources Evaluation System CIESIN Consortium for Internat'l Earth Science Information Network CODA Conservation Options and Decision Analysis (software) **CRMP** Coordinated Resource Management Plan CRT Cathode ray tube (?) **CRUC** Cooperative Research Unit Center DLG-E Digital line graph - enhanced DOI Department of the Interior EDC EROS Data Center ECOMAP The National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units mapping project of the USDA Forest Service EMAP Environmental Monitoring & Assessment Program EMAP-LC EMAP-Landscape Characterization (USEPA) EMSL Environmental Monitoring & Systems Laboratory (USEPA) EMTC Environmental Management Technical Center (NBS) EOS Earth Observing System EOSAT Earth Observation Satellite Company (the commercial operator of the Landsat satellite system) EOSDIS EOS Data & Information System ERL Environmental Research Laboratory, Corvallis (USEPA) EROS Earth Resources Observation Systems (USGS) ESRI Environmental Systems Research Institute ETM+ Enhanced Thematic Mapper plus FGDC Federal Geographic Data Committee FTP file transfer protocol FY Fiscal Year GAO General Accounting Office (Congress) GAP Gap Analysis Program GCDIS Global Change Data and Information System

GLIS Global Land Information System (USGS) GLOBE Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment GPS Global Positioning System **GRASS** Geographic Resources Analysis Support System **GRIS** Geographic Resource Information Systems HRMSI High Resolution Multispectral Stereo Imager HUC Hydrologic Unit Code IALE International Association of Landscape Ecology IDRISI A GIS developed by Clark University LAPS Land Acquisition Priority System LC/LU Land Cover/Land Use (USGS) MIPS Map and Image Processing System MOU Memorandum of Understanding MMU Minimum mapping unit MRLC Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium MSS Multi-Spectral Scanner MTPE Mission to Planet Earth NAFTA North American Free Trade Agreement NALC North American Landscape Characterization (USEPA, USGS) NAWQA National Water Quality Assessment (USGS) NBII National Biological Information Infrastructure NBS National Biological Service NCCP Natural Communities Conservation Planning program (in CA) NDCDB National Digital Cartographic Data Base NERC National Ecology Research Center (Ft. Collins, CO) NMD National Mapping Division NPS National Park Service NSDI National Spatial Data Infrastructure NSTC National Science and Technology Council NVC National Vegetation Classification NWI National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS) OMB Office of Management and Budget (Administration) **OSIS** Oregon Species Information System PARC Public Access Resource Center PI Principal Investigator **RNA Research Natural Area** SAB Science Advisory Board (USEPA) SCICOLL Scientific Collections Permit Database SDTS Spatial Data Transfer Standard SGID State Geographic Information Database SNEP Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project SOFIA Southern Forest Inventory and Analysis SPOT Système Pour l'Observation de la Terre RMSE Root mean square error TIGER Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing system (used for U.S. census)

TM Thematic Mapper TNC The Nature Conservancy UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization URISA Urban and Regional Information Systems Association. URL Universal Resource Locator USFS US Forest Service USFWS US Fish & Wildlife Service US-NVC US National Vegetation Classification US-NVCS US National Vegetation Classification System UTM Universal Transverse Mercator UVM University of Vermont WHRM Wildlife/habitat relationship model WISCLAND Wisconsin Initiative for Statewide Cooperation on Landscape Analysis and Data

#### APPENDICES

State	Last Name	First	Affiliation			d			
		Name		er	50	-shi		Ч	
				COV	tat elin	ard	lysis	eac	•
				and	idai nod	Stew	Anal	Juti	Misc
				Γ		•1	4		-
AZ	Drost	Charles	USGS, Southwest Biological Science Center		Х		Х	Х	
AZ	Dvorak	Jennifer	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Falzarano	Sarah	USGS, Southwest Biological Science Center	Х				Х	
AZ	Hill	Mar-Elise	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Hunt	Rob	Northern Arizona University	Х		Х			
AZ	Kline	Chris	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Lubell	Eric	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Persons	Trevor	Northern Arizona University		Х				
AZ	Pohs	Keith	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Robinson	Don	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Thomas	Kathryn	USGS, Southwest Biological Science Center	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
AZ	Thompson	Kerry	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Turner	Matt	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Tweiten	Michael	Northern Arizona University	Х					
AZ	Wallace	Cynthia	USGS, Southwest Geographic Science Team	Х					
AZ	Wynne	J. Judson	USGS, Southwest Biological Science Center		Х			Х	
СО	Barringer	Debra	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Berggren	Scott	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Buechling	Arne	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Cooley	Casey	Bureau of Land Management	Х					
СО	Erickson	Ami	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Fugate	Steve	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Goralski	Elizabeth	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Hamer	Tammy	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory		Х			Х	
СО	Katers	Laura	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	McGaugh	Suzanne	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Mettenbrink	Chris	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory		х			Х	
СО	Musser	Amanda	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Nicholas	Paula	Colorado Division of Wildlife						Х
СО	Oakes	KatyJo	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory		Х			Х	
СО	O'Brien	Lee	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
СО	Osborne	Dianne	Bureau of Land Management	Х				Х	
СО	Peterson	Nate	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory			Х			
СО	Rondeau	Renee	CSU, Colorado Natural Heritage Program	Х					
СО	Schrupp	Don	Colorado Division of Wildlife	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	
СО	Siechrist	Jack	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Sinley	Jim	Colorado Division of Wildlife						Х
СО	Theobald	Dave	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory			Х			
СО	Velasquez	Cristian	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х		-			
CO	Waller	Eric	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	X				Х	
CO	Ward	Jesse	CSU. Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	x					
CO	Ward	Sarah	CSU. Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	x					
20	.,	Jului	coo, mataria resources beology babolatory	~ 1					

#### **Appendix 1-1. List of Personnel**

State	Last Name	First	Affiliation						
State	Last Maine	Name	mination	ы		ship		_	
				cove	at eling	ard-	ysis	eacł	
				and	node	tew	nal	Jutr	Aisc
				Γ	4 4		7	Ŭ	4
СО	Welch	Phillip	CSU, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
СО	Wolk	Brett	CSU. Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory	Х					
NM	Balanchandron	Nikhil	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Boykin	Kenneth	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
NM	Casados	Tommy	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				Х
NM	Chavez	Rachael	NMSU/NMCFWRU		х				
NM	Coble	Dave	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х					
NM	Deitner	Bob	NMSU/NMCFWRU		х			Х	
NM	DeLorenzo	Andrea	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Eckert	Nick	NMSU/NMCFWRU						Х
NM	Ernst	Andrea	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х	Х	Х	Х	
NM	Fort	Whitney	NMSU/NMCFWRU						Х
NM	Fort	Lindsey	NMSU/NMCFWRU						Х
NM	Fox	Jodi	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Godlewski	Chris	NMSU/NMCFWRU			Х			
NM	Kamienski	Tomas	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				Х
NM	King	Cynthia	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х	Х				
NM	La Sorte	Frank	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Lanser	Julie	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Lopez	Veronica	NMSU/NMCFWRU			Х			
NM	McNown	Brad	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х					
NM	Moore	Amy	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х					
NM	Prasad	Maritha	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Propeck-Gray	Suzanne	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х		Х	Х	
NM	Puttere	Jennifer	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х	Х				
NM	Rimbert	Celine	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Schwenke	Zach	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х				
NM	Shrader	Scott	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х	Х	Х		Х	
NM	Sizemore	Erin	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х					
NM	Thompson	Bruce	NMDGF	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
NM	Torrez	Steve	NMSU/NMCFWRU						Х
NM	Weber	Ed	NMSU/NMCFWRU	Х					
NM	Wu	Rob	NMSU/NMCFWRU						Х
NM	Young	Kendal	NMSU/NMCFWRU		Х	Х			
NM	Greenlee	Janet	NMSU/PSL	Х					
NV	Blair	Hank	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Bradford	Dave	EPA-Las Vegas	Х	Х		Х		
NV	Brost	Brian	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Cross	Chad	EPA-Las Vegas		Х				
NV	Darby	Melanie	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Dolans	Peter	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Ellis	Derrek	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Estep	Brittany	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Frakes	Neil	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Hahn	Lisa	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					

State	Last Name	First	Affiliation			d			
		Name		nd cover	abitat odeling	teward-shij	nalysis	utreach	lisc
				la	ц я	Ñ	¥	0	Z
NV	Harndon	Vristino		v	v				
IN V NIV	Inclident	Datriak	UNLV	A V	л				
IN V NIV	Jantz	Bruce	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coantion	Л	v				
IN V NIV	Vonnor	Diuce	EFA-Las Vegas	v	A V	v	v	v	
IN V NIV	Kreider	Christoph	ErA-Las Vegas Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	A V	л	л	л	л	
14 4	Kieldei	er	Eastern Nevada Eandscape Coantion	Λ					
NV	Luna	Melanie	UNLV	Х	Х				
NV	Sajwaj	Todd	Army Corps/ Lockheed/National Gap	Х			Х		
NV	Schrenk	Anna	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Semmands	Joey	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Sindihar	Sudamini	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
NV	Weiner	William	Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition	Х					
Regio	Prior-Magee	Julie	USGS/National Gap	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
UT	Adair	Bill	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Barfuss	Brad	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Chowdary	Vinod	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Cox	Steven	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Ducharme	Marie	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					
UT	Edgar	Jonathan	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Garrard	Chris	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Gilbert	Jarom	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Graves	Scott	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х				Х	
UT	Hurd	Wendy	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Johnson	Rob	USU, RSGIS Lab						Х
UT	Kirby	Jessica	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х				Х	Х
UT	Langs	Lisa	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х		Х	Х	Х	
UT	Lowry	John	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
UT	Luce	Alan	USU, RSGIS Lab						Х
UT	Manis	Gerald	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х				Х	
UT	McGinty	Chris	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					
UT	Plourde	Line	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х
UT	Ramsey	Doug	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
UT	Rieth	Wendy	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х	Х			Х	
UT	Sajwaj	Todd	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х				Х	
UT	Sant	Eric	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					
UT	Terletzky	Pat	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					
UT	Wolbrink	Mark	USU, RSGIS Lab	Х					Х

## Appendix 2-1. Distribution of all samples used for mapping in the SWReGAP region.

Samples collected via air photo interpretation (3 % of total) were collected exclusively by the Utah team. Samples collected via DOQ/Terra Server interpretation were collected by the Arizona and Utah teams (4%). Samples collected via image (Landsat) interpretation (12%) were collected exclusively by the Colorado team, often with interpretive cues from Terraserver. Samples obtained from existing databases (32%) and collected through SWReGAP fieldwork (49%) represent the collective efforts of the five mapping teams.

			Source			pui
	Air Photo Interpretation	Image (Landsat) Interpretation	DOQ/Terra Server Interpretation	Cooperator Databases	SWReGAP Fieldwork	Total Samples by La Cover Class
SPARSELY VEGETATED/BARREN CLASSES						
Barren Lands, Non-specific			45	55	222	322
Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	82	54	332	64	393	925
Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	1		38	27	161	227
Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	12	3	67	17	309	408
Inter-Mountain Basins Playa		3	43	59	306	411
Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland		13	86	53	117	269
Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	38	7	42	140	53	280
Inter-Mountain Basins Wash		66		32	56	154
Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree					5	5
North American Alpine Ice Field	4		25	2		31
North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune				137	30	167
North American Warm Desert Badland					12	12
North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop			2	9	204	215
North American Warm Desert Pavement			3	15	33	51
North American Warm Desert Playa				44	131	175
North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland				13	11	24
Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	117	6	27	236	83	469
Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	41			97	25	163
Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	180	34	94	244	108	660
Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon					22	22
Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop		22		14	9	45
Subtotal	475	208	804	1,258	2,290	5,035
DECIDUOUS FOREST CLASSES						
Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	358	59	328	1,040	893	2,678
Kocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	30	50	8/	10	46	1/9
EVERGREEN FOREST CLASSES	300	39	415	1,030	939	2,037
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	66	92	128	1 648	2 320	4 254
Great Basin Pinyon-Juniner Woodland	00	/2	36	424	1 753	2 213
Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland			50		121	121
Madrean Encinal				116	74	190
Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland				40	398	438
Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland				469	617	1,086
Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland				2	28	30
Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland					7	7
Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland					46	46

				Source			pue
		Air Photo Interpretation	Image (Landsat) Interpretation	DOQ/Terra Server Interpretation	Cooperator Databases	SWReGAP Fieldwork	Total Samples by L <sup>2</sup> Cover Class
Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland						33	33
Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland						26	26
Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodla	nd	44	51	4	895	752	1,746
Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland			12				12
Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest		136	23	7	590	218	974
Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland		92		37	76	243	448
Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland		92	19	75	1,187	480	1,853
Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland		158		12	108	203	481
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	1	21		1	90	45	157
Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland		20	126		140	17	17
Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland		39	136	20	449	227	2 702
Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	Subtatal	128	162	39	7 202	2,255	3,793
MIXED FOREST CLASS	Subiolai	//0	493	339	7,505	9,005	10,770
Inter Mountain Desing Agent Mixed Conifer Expect and Weedland		09	27	50	212	267	762
inter-mountain basins Aspen-mixed Conner Porest and woodiand	Subtotal	98	27	59 50	312	267	763
SCRUB/SHRUB CLASSES	Subiolui	20	27	57	512	207	705
Anacherian-Chibuahuan Mesquite Unland Scrub					228	816	1 044
Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub					601	475	1.076
Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub					104	104	208
Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub					216	78	294
Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub					15	15	30
Coahuilan Chaparral					43	6	49
Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland			2	6	36	450	494
Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland		11	4	39	46	162	262
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland		105	56	168	155	311	795
Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral			11		13	115	139
Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland					82	1,821	1,903
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland		28	107	156	1,622	4,524	6,437
Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland			18	16	141	151	326
Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub			60	36	613	3,313	4,022
Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland		32	8	30	62	284	416
Mogollon Chaparral				2	303	480	785
Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub					429	548	977
Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland		26		3	1	12	42
Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland		188	437	105	1,039	763	2,532
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland			124		221	26	371
Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub				74	821	736	1,631
Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub				2	67	147	216
Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral						65	65
Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub					15	133	148
Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub				106	520	687	1,313
Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland				44	34	316	394
Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland							0
Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland			554		145	153	852
Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	61	300	3	-	21	1	25
CDACCIAND/HEDDACEOUC CIACCES	SUDIOTAI	390	1,384	787	7,593	10,692	20,846
Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe					1,187	501	1,688

	Source					
	Air Photo Interpretation	Image (Landsat) Interpretation	DOQ/Terra Server Interpretation	Cooperator Databases	SWReGAP Fieldwork	Total Samples by L Cover Class
				_		
Central Mixedgrass Prairie		35		3	3	41
Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe				119	3	122
Chibuahuan Sanoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland		6		276	233	515
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Stepne	3	1		270	448	459
Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Sayanna	5	13		96	286	395
Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Stepne	228	118	260	1 405	1 869	3 880
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	220	24	18	389	1,505	1.936
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe		4	27	845	2.649	3,525
Madrean Juniper Savanna				30	100	130
North Pacific Montane Grassland					19	19
Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	66		1	219	68	354
Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	67	37	27	242	188	561
Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna		89		71	135	295
Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	31	29	45	791	497	1,393
Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland		436		360	44	840
Western Great Plains Sand Prairie		4		2		6
Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie		1,180		1,125	889	3,194
Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie						0
Subtotal	395	1,976	378	7,244	9,494	19,487
WOODY WETLAND CLASSES						
Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland			83	4	381	468
Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat		45	22	294	1,601	1,962
North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Rip. Woodland & Shrubland				101	118	219
North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque			33	22	33	88
North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland			4	113	42	159
North American Warm Desert Wash	72	27	155	282 282	207	224
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodand and Shrubland	/5	57	25	363 452	207	695
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	47	,	35	455	50	225
Western Great Plains Floodnlain	2	398		104	2	400
Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland		723		84	31	838
Subtotal	122	1,212	338	1,676	2,775	6,123
EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND CLASSES		,		,	ŕ	,
Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen					4	4
North American Arid West Emergent Marsh			42	104	194	340
Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	93	6	110	352	141	702
Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow					9	9
Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland					7	7
Subtotal	93	6	152	456	355	1,062
ALTERED OR DISTURBED CLASSES						
Disturbed, Non-specific		1		1	10	12
Disturbed, Oil well						0
Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland		50		209	483	742
Invasive Annual Grassland	6	57	4	275	528	870
Invasive Perennial Forbland				21	16	37
Invasive Perennial Grassland	1	194	33	330	217	775
Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	31	226	11	114	179	561
Recently Burned	21	27	1	15	35	99

				Source			nd
		Air Photo Interpretation	Image (Landsat) Interpretation	DOQ/Terra Server Interpretation	Cooperator Databases	SWReGAP Fieldwork	Total Samples by L <sup>2</sup> Cover Class
Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas		37	28	42	91	4	202
Recently Logged Areas		73	16	6	113	46	254
Recently Mined or Quarried			52		54	32	138
	Subtotal	169	651	97	1,223	1,550	3,690
OTHER CLASSES							
Agriculture		10	4,625		1,290	977	6,902
Developed, Medium - High Intensity			104		77	6	187
Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity			189		51	7	247
Barren Lands, Non-specific				45	55	222	322
Open Water		18	756		182	216	1,172
	Subtotal	28	5,674	45	1,655	1,428	8,830
	<b>Grand Total by Source</b>	2,934	11,692	3,414	29,776	45,653	93,469

		Land Cover	· in Square	Kilometers		
	Arizona	Colorado	Nevada	New Mexico	Utah	Region Wide
SDADSI EV VECETATED/RADDEN CI ASSES	1	1				
Barren Lands, Non-specific	1 1 1 0	11	105	54	42	1 421
Calarada Diataan Miyad Badraak Canyon and Tablaland	6.074	675	2	2 466	14 106	24 212
Inter Mountain Bacing Active and Stabilized Dune	352	130	70	2,400	1 807	3 103
Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Statinized Dune	552	150	2 /87	155	382	2 873
Inter-Mountain Basins Chri and Canyon	14	4	6 234	2	11 284	17 581
Inter-Mountain Basins Flaya	720	258	0,234	492	1 9 29	2 207
Inter Mountain Basins Shale Bauland	572	258		402	217	1 260
Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	575	20	19	4/0	517	1,500
Maditamanaan California Alning Daduash and Saraa	4	20	10	5	1	40
North American Alpine Jea Field		2	25		21	23
North American Worm Descrit Active and Stabilized Dune	1.016	2	16	1 605	21	25
North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,010		10	1,095		2,720
North American Warm Desert Badrack Cliff and Outgran	54 761		1 842	020	127	2 569
North American Warm Desert Bearock Chirl and Outcrop	/01		1,642	030	127	3,508
North American Warm Desert Playe	45		108	180	6	393
North American Warm Desert Valencia Dealder d	40		327	555	0	1,115
De des Manufain Alaine De des de and Serre	203	2 000	/0	700	0	992
Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	5	2,888	148	/	815	3,803
Rocky Mountain Alpine Feil-Field	02	284		417	1//	/01
Rocky Mountain Cliff, canyon and Massive Bedrock	92	989	122	41/	1,407	2,905
Sterra Nevada Chiri and Canyon		00	125	221		125
Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	11.072	88 5 (05	12 010	221	22 479	309
Sudioiai Deciduous eodest classes	11,972	5,095	12,018	8,805	32,478	70,969
		11.426	1 000	1 402	( 225	20.000
Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	443	11,436	1,289	1,483	6,335	20,986
Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine woodland	112	11 126	1 200	1 402	887	888 21.974
Subidial EVEDODEEN FODEST OF ASSES	445	11,450	1,290	1,405	7,222	21,074
Colorado Plateau Pinyon Junizar Woodland	22 405	15 126		27.864	22.260	07 855
Colorado Frateau Finyon-Juniper Woodland	2 414	15,150	26 276	27,804	10.086	50,776
Uter Mountain Paring Subalning Limber Pristlesone Pine Woodland	5,414		50,570		10,980	50,770
Madraan Enginel	2 008		035	1 350	32	4 259
Madreen Dine Ook Ferret and Weedland	3,008			1,550		4,550
Madreen Pinyen Juniper Woodland	4,008			8 754		21 017
Madreen Linner Montene Conjfer Ook Forest and Woodland	13,103			672		21,917
Maditerranean California Dry Macia Mixed Canifer Forest and Woodland	125		2	072		195
Mediterranean California Dogerosa, Jaffrey Dina Ecraet and Woodland			200			200
Mediterranean California Red Eir Forest and Woodland			106			209
Northern Pacific Mesic Subalnine Parkland			100			100
Rocky Mountain Dry Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Ecreat and Woodland	1.020	2 1 5 2	+2 106	2 965	1 710	9 052
Rocky Mountain Englisher Winnane Wixed Conner Polest and woodland	1,050	5,152	190	2,000	1,/10	6,955
Rocky Mountain Lodoenole Pine Forest		0 6 040		7	1 917	9 764
Rocky Mountain Lougepoie r nie rorest	420	2 602	216	1 610	1,01/	0,704
Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conffer Forest and Woodland	439	5,603	216	1,610	1,427	7,295

# Appendix 2-2. Total land cover mapped in square kilometers summarized by land cover class and state political boundaries.

Recky Monutin Subaptive Days Metric Sprace Fir Forst and Woodland Rocky Monutin Subaptive Metric Sprace Fir Forst and Woodland Rocky Monutin Subaptive Metric Structer Fir Forst and Woodland 102230.01891999923.2.2011.0.319Rocky Monutin Subaptive Metric Structer Fir Forst and Woodland Rocky Monutin Subaptive Monutin The Victorium Prev Woodland Structure Monutin Prov. Carly Woodland 1014.0.5110.1010.2010.		Land Cover in Square Kilometers					
Rocky Meentain Subalpine Day-Mesic Sprace Tri Forest and Woodland         223         10,119         9.952         3.220         14.814           Rocky Meentain Subalpine Mesic Sprace Tri Forest and Woodland         120         6.351         175         6.40         1.227           Rocky Meentain Subalpine Mores Direk-Hoticose Pres Woodland         20         3.90         14         376         90         81           Sumbern Rocky Meentain Ponderson Free Woodland         1         4.853         10,464         15.03           Sumbern Rocky Meentain Ponderson Free Woodland         1         4.853         10,464         15.02           MIXED FOREST CLASS         Subtotal         1.951         84         182         1,222         3,489           SIRUB/SCRUB CLASSES         1.951         84         182         1,222         3,489           SIRUB/SCRUB CLASSES         2.816         1.537         31,463         1,547         34,443           Chinkubam Moogue Optical Scrab         16,556         15,177         31,463         1,577         4,413           Chinkubam Schegen Microson Free Scrab         2.816         1,597         4,413         1,517         2,461           Chinkubam Schegen Microson Free Scrab         1,871         3,53         3,55         3,55		Arizona	Colorado	Nevada	New Mexico	Utah	Region Wide
Recky Monulan Shahpine Ness Yang-Ler Ir Yest and Woodland22310,13910,3090232,3011,31Recky Monulan Shahpine Mess Yung-Ler Ir Yest and Woodland23691437.69010.319Becky Monulan Shahpine Mess Yung-Lingyer Woodland14.83510.46815.005Sembern Recky Monulan Proderson Five Woodland14.83510.46879.21,16320.90Subbern Recky Monulan Proderson Five Woodland14.83510.46879.21,16320.90MIXED FOREST CLASSSabbern Proderson Five Woodland1.951841821.2223.439MIXED FOREST CLASSInter Monutan Insen Ayee Macel Confer Forest and Woodland1.951841821.2223.439MIXED COLSSESInter Monutan Messatic Updata Scub10.54615.1371.8631.863Chihanham Messatic Updata Scub10.54615.1371.8631.8751.875Chihanham Messatic Updata Scub10.9741.821.2233.414Chihanham Messatic Updata Scub1.0794.91.9311.310Chihanham Scab Dent Scup1.974.99.941.9311.310Chihanham Scab Dent Scup1.9749.911.310Chihanham Scaben Messatic Meren Scup1.974.99.911.310Chihanham Scaben Messatic Meren Scup1.971.9241.9311.931Chihanham Scaben Messatic Meren Scup1.9671.9291.9311.931Chihanham Scaben Messatic Meren Scup </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Incody>Manufan Shahignes Maues Spraes-Fir over and Woodland12031, 13117344.01.0.3910.39Rocky>Montain Shahignes Channes Ther Norden and Woodland20721,10320,109502211Southern Rocky Mountain Pourderona Pine Woodland16,24010,792721,10320,09502211Southern Rocky Mountain Pourderona Pine Woodland16,24010,792721,10320,09502211MIXED FOREST CLASSSubtorial1,951841821,2223,409SHUIKSCRUS CLASSES	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	223	10,189	190	982	3,230	14,814
Inter-Moniton Stanpart Moniton Lamber Arritector Proc Woodland−−0001Strin Needs Stabulan Lodges Part Frost and Woodland14,83510.468−13.305Sudnern Rocky Mountin Propor-Junger Woodland10.20017.42666.3.17338,18878,47544,893298,5998MIXED FOREST CLASSSubtoal74,2666.3.17338,18878,47544,893298,5998MIXED FOREST CLASSSubtoal1.9518.418.21.2223,439SIHURSCRUB CLASSTSSubtoal1.9518.418.21.2223,439Chinahaan Marda Deert and Woodland6.31992.10774.4143,143Chinahaan Marda Sha Deert Scrab6.31992.10774.4143,143Chinahaan Marda Sha Deert Scrab1875.385.73511.310Chinahaan Marda Sha Deert Scrab187-5.3811.310Cahnahaan Mardi Kola Orseg Monito Sharbhad4.09101.3201.311Cahnahaan Mardi Kola Orseg Monito Sharbhad4.091.13101.3101.310Cahnaham Sharbharban Marda Deert Scrab5.501.13446.60.203.7911.1351Gran Bain Marda Sharbharbad5.001.33446.60.203.7911.1537Gran Bain Marda Sharbharbad7.052.3248.96.403.7914.31Cahnahaan Marda Sharbharbad7.052.3248.063.7911.527Gran Bain Marda Marba Sharbhard7.052.3248.06 <td< td=""><td>Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland</td><td>120</td><td>8,151</td><td>175</td><td>640</td><td>1,273</td><td>10,359</td></td<>	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	120	8,151	175	640	1,273	10,359
Souther Review Shadquite Legacy Dev Frote and Vocalizad−1−1−1−1Souther Review Monatin Proceedings Woodland16.24010.792721.1632009Subtoal74.2666.3.17338.18878.47644.893208.998MIXED FOREST CLASS1.9518.41821.2223.349Subtoal	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	2	369	14	376	39	801
Southern Rocky andmin Prode Sam Row Wordland11.24012.30310.08310.303Southern Rocky Rowanin Prode Sam Row Wordland17.2666.3.1733.8.1887.8.77644.8332285.998Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Cenfer Forest and Woodland1.9518.411.21.2.223.439Sam Rowanin Basins Aspen-Mixed Cenfer Forest and Woodland1.9518.411.21.2.223.439Sam Rowanin Basins Aspen-Mixed Cenfer Forest and Woodland1.9518.411.21.2.223.439Sam Rowanin Basins Aspen-Mixed Cenfer Forest and Woodland1.9518.411.21.2.223.439Chain-Mank Moodland Devert and Them Stoch1.6.54	Sterra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland	1	4.025	20	10.469		21
Shore and PAL266         0.7.27         3.7.87         7.875         7.875         7.875         7.875           MINED FOREST CLASS         Inter-Mountin Basin Auge-Mixed Confer Forest and Woodland         1.951         8.4         1.82         2.22         3.439           Shrube Mixed Description Forest and Woodland         1.951         8.4         1.82         1.222         3.439           Shrube SCRUB CLASSES         Inter-Mountin Basin Auge-Mixed Confer Forest and Woodland         1.951         8.4         1.82         1.222         3.439           Shrube SCRUB CLASSES         Inter-Mountin Basin Auge-Mixed Confer Forest and Phon Sends         6.319         9         2.2107         1.441         1.831         1.831           Chhanham Mixed Desert Sends         1.87         1.87         1.837         1.837         1.837         1.837           Colorado Plateau Blackbruch-Morron Tree Shrubhand         4.037         9.7         4         1.41         9.031         1.3101           Colorado Plateau Blackbruch-Morron Tree Shrubhand         4.037         9.7         4         1.941         1.053         1.941         1.053           Great Bains Keni Desert Sends         7.05         1.019         1.024         1.0541         1.054         1.0541         1.0541         1.0541	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	16 240	4,835	7	10,468	2 0 1 0	15,305
MIXED FOREST CLASS         Juntability         Juntability <thjuntability< th=""></thjuntability<>	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	10,240 74 266	62 172	20 100	21,103 78 476	2,019	208.008
Inter-Montain Basin Auger-Model Onlife Forest and Woodland         1,551         84         182         1,222         3,439           Subtrand         1,551         84         182         1,222         3,439           Subtrand         1,557         84         182         1,222         3,439           Subtrand         1,517         1,517         1,517         22,407           Chubahana Mucch Divers trand From Serub         6,319         9         1,517         22,407           Chubahana Suchitzed Coprice Dare and Sand Flar Serub         137         .         5,538         .         5,725           Chubahana Suchitzed Coprice Dare and Sand Flar Serub         109         .	MIXED FOREST CLASS	74,200	03,175	30,100	/0,4/0	44,095	290,990
Subord1010101010101010Subord1.9571.9571.9571.9223.389SHEUSCICU CLASSES16.5461.5171.9571.957Apacherin-Chhunhum Mixed Istarbands16.54692.1,0791.94Chhunhum Mixed Salt Deert Scub2.8165.5384.91Chhunhum Succulent Desert Scub1095.5381.97Chhunhum Succulent Desert Scub1097.874.91Cohorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrach Shrubhand4896663.291.517Cohorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrach Shrubhand3541.7651.921.931Cohorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrach Shrubhand3501.34866.023.9341.941Cohorado Plateau Mixed Sagebrach Shrubhand7501.0193.0374.130Cohrado Plateau Mixed Sagebrach Shrubhand70052.32450.0463.79115.527Gratt Bains Keit Shrubhand70052.32450.0463.79115.52779.294Inter-Mountain Bains Mix Shrubhand70052.32450.0463.79115.52779.254Inter-Mountain Bains Mix Shrubhand70052.32450.0463.79115.52779.254Mogelior Chaparal70052.32450.0463.79115.52779.254Mogelior Chaparal70052.32450.0463.79115.52779.254Mogelior Chaparal70052.32450.041.0111.5281.011 <t< td=""><td>Inter-Mountain Bacing Agnen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland</td><td></td><td>1 951</td><td>84</td><td>182</td><td>1 222</td><td>3 / 30</td></t<>	Inter-Mountain Bacing Agnen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland		1 951	84	182	1 222	3 / 30
SHRUB/SCRUB CLASSESI. S. K.<	Subtotal		1 951	84	182	1 222	3 439
Appehrance16,54615,13715,13713,683Cihuhahan Mixed Desert and Tion Serub6,3199 $21,079$ 22,079Cihuhahan Stabilized Copite Due and Sauf Flat Serub187 $5,538$ 725Cihuhahan Stabilized Copite Due and Sauf Flat Serub187 $5,538$ 817Cohunahan Stabilized Copite Due and Sauf Flat Serub189 $6$ 32915,137Cohunahan Stabilized Copite Due and Sauf Flat Serub489 $66$ 3291,5172,401Cohunah Chaparal489 $66$ 3291,5172,401Colorado Plateau Blackhrush Mormon Tias Shrubhand489 $66$ 3291,5172,401Colorado Plateau Blackhrush Mormon Tias Shrubhand3541,7659,4172,401Colorado Plateau Blackhrush Shrubhand52,0013,384 $66$ 3291,5172,401Great Basin Seni-Sageshrush Shrubhand751,0193,0374,130108,800Inter-Mountai Basin Sut Statubah Shrubhand751,0193,0374,130Inter-Mountai Basin Markof Shrubhand751,0193,0374,130Inter-Mountai Basin Mount Malogany Woolind and Shrubhand101,2244,2652,550Mogolon Chaparal9,6374,2587058311,515Mojse Mic-Levation Mixed Desert Scrub3,89219,0108888,570Sonora-Mojve Kined Mating Shrubhand12810,221,024,02Sonora-Mojve Kined Shrubhand1384,073,993,534 <td>SHRUB/SCRUB CLASSES</td> <td></td> <td>1,951</td> <td>04</td> <td>102</td> <td>1,222</td> <td>3,437</td>	SHRUB/SCRUB CLASSES		1,951	04	102	1,222	3,437
Inter-Monitain Name and Same SameInter-Monitain Name Same SameInter-Monitain Name Same SameInter-Monitain Name Same Same SameInter-Monitain NameInter-Monitain NameInter-Monitai	Anacherian-Chibuahuan Mesquite Unland Scrub	16 546			15 137		31 683
Labor	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	6 319	9		21 079		27 407
Chiuahan Stabilized Copies Due and Sand Flat Scrub         n         5,735         5,725           Chiuahan Stuccient Dasert Scrub         109 $-5,738$ 187           Cohunahan Stuccient Dasert Scrub         109 $-7,8$ 187           Cohunahan Stuccient Dasert Scrub         4,037         97         4         141         9,031         13,310           Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrais Shrubland         489         66 $-329$ 15,17         2,401           Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrais Shrubland         354         1,765 $-162$ 161           Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrais Shrubland         5,200         13,384         666         3,791         15,527         79,204           Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub         7,005         2,324         50,646         3,791         15,527         79,204           Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub         7,005         2,324         50,646         3,791         15,527         79,204           Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub         5,416         10,520         2,56         2,552         2,523           Mogulon Chaparal         2,005         2,066         2,52         2,823         16,762           Mogu	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2.816			1.597		4.413
Chihanhan Sueculert Deer Scrub         109	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	187			5.538		5.725
Cohuilan ChaparalUJJJJJColorado Plateau Blackbush-Mormon Tees Shrubland40,0379741419,03113,310Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebush Shrubland4896637.011.5172.401Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebush Shrubland489663.7911.5172.401Great Basin Seni-Desert Chaparal11,76511,7995.6555.53.41Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Saltbush Shrubland5.20013,3845.0043.99410,941Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Saltbush Shrubland7.0052.3245.06,463.79115.5277.92.44Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Saltbush Shrubland7.0052.3245.06,463.79115.5277.92.44Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Saltbush Shrubland11.92.910.88.651.05.002.558Mogistor Chaparal9.6371.05.20 <td< td=""><td>Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub</td><td>109</td><td></td><td></td><td>78</td><td></td><td>187</td></td<>	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	109			78		187
Colorado Plateu Blackbrush-Mormon Tites Shrubland4,0379741419,03113,310Colorado Plateu Blackbrush-Mormon Tites Shrubland489663291,5172,401Colorado Plateu Pinyon-Junjer Shrubland3541,765329,41711,535Great Basin Serii-Chegnaral-162-3,63535,543Inter-Mountin Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland5,20013,38466,0203,941108,849Inter-Mountin Basins Mixed Salt Deert Scrub7,0052,32450,6463,79115,52779,294Inter-Mountin Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland-11,9246262,550Mogiolon Chaparal9,637-11,9246262,550Mogiolon Chaparal9,637-11,9246262,550Mogior Mixel Deert Scrub9,63710018,8886,67711,010Rocky Mountain Camber Oscibil Shrubland12810,22910,0018,8886,67718,890Rocky Mountain Camber Oscibil Shrubland12810,22910,0018,8963,99718,9521002,549Sonora-Mojave Crecosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub38,92219,0301,7873,9702,5273,970Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Graparal6,074137,98,557,0211,977Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub39,97018,2526,1827,0211,977Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub5,911,7	Coahuilan Chaparral				93		94
Colorado Plateau Piroya-Juniper Shrubland489663291,5172,401Colorado Plateau Piroya-Juniper Shrubland3541,765-9,41711,535Great Basin Xeric Mack Signebrush Shrubland5,20013,38466,0203,93419,941108,480Inter-Mountain Basins Mais Saltbash Shrubland5,20013,38466,0203,93419,941108,480Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub7,0052,32450,6463,99115,52779,294Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub9,637-11,92466,6010,52082616,762Mogiolon Chaparal9,637-11,92466,67610,52082616,76216,76316,76410,97315,97316,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,97616,976 <td< td=""><td>Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon Ttea Shrubland</td><td>4,037</td><td>97</td><td>4</td><td>141</td><td>9,031</td><td>13,310</td></td<>	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon Ttea Shrubland	4,037	97	4	141	9,031	13,310
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Janjer Shrubland         354         1,765         9,417         11,535           Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral         162         163           Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral         31,799         3,035         35,534           Inter-Mountian Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland         5,200         13,184         66,020         3,934         19,941         108,480           Inter-Mountian Basins Max Satbuash Shrubland         70         2,324         50,646         3,791         15,527         79,294           Inter-Mountian Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland         1         1,924         626         2,550           Mogalon Chaparral         9,637         425         870         583         11,515           Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub         9,637         425         870         883         16,752           Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland         128         10,229         108         1,888         6,597         18,595           Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland         2,305         2,204         10         2,549           Sonora-Mojave Shrubland         1,011         1,528         10         2,549           Sonora-Mojave Genit Jeans Sandhill Shrubland         3,9790	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	489	66		329	1,517	2,401
Great Basin Semi-Desert ChaparalIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	354	1,765			9,417	11,535
Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland3.17993.6353.54.44Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland5.20013.38466.0203.93419.941108.480Inter-Mountain Basins Matsaltbush Shrubland7.051.0193.0374.130Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub7.0052.2450.663.79115.527Mogollon Chaparral9.6374.258.705.8311.515Mojive Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub5.41610.5208.2516.762Rocky Mountain Gambel Gale-Mixed Montane Strubland1.810.22910.81.8886.597Rocky Mountain Gambel Gale-Mixed Montane Strubland2.3052.662.522.823Sonora-Mojave Kree Scrub38.92219.0308.0858,760Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral8.92219.0308.088,700Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub39.790213.979Southern Colorado Plateus Sand Shrubland6.0741.37.98.557.021Western Great Plains Medjuite Wordland Alshrubland6.0741.37.98.557.021Western Great Plains Medjuite Wordland Alshrubland4.071.01.7871.131.9784.504Western Great Plains Medjuite Wordland Alshrubland6.0741.33.4,3587.0211.384Western Great Plains Medjuite Wordland Alshrubland6.0741.01.8771.9771.977Western Great Plains Medjuite Wordland Alshrubland6.0	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral			162			163
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland5.20013.38466,0203.93419,941108,480Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland751.0193.0374.130Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub7,052.32450,6463.79115.52779.294Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodind and Shrubland9,6374.238705.8311.515Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub5,41610,52082616,76216,762Rocky Mountain Japine Dwarf-Shrubland12870,2291081.8886,59718,950Rocky Mountain Lover Montane-Foothill Shrubland2.3051081.8886,59718,950Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Burage Desert Scrub38,92219,0302.533.93389Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Burage Desert Scrub3,9393.9393.9393.9393.939Sonora-Mojave Since Chaparal6,0741.37.98.557.021Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland6,0741.37.98.557.021Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland6,0741.88.825.2121.3384Wyoning Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland6,0741.33.9,3947.2,785.06,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11.4533.9,3941.82,2526.1,8217.2,785.06,307Chilubahuan Sondy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe1.1,2153.4,3584.5,7111.2,089.050 <tr< td=""><td>Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland</td><td></td><td></td><td>31,799</td><td></td><td>3,635</td><td>35,434</td></tr<>	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland			31,799		3,635	35,434
Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbash Shrubland751,0193,0374,130Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub7,0052,32450,6463,79115,52779,294Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mhogany Woodland and Shrubland11,9246262,550Mogolon Chaparral9,63742587058311,515Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub5,41610,52082616,762Rocky Mountain Alpine Dvarf-Shrubland12810,2291081,8886,59718,950Rocky Mountain Cower Montane-Schubland12810,22910181,8886,59718,950Rocky Mountain Cower Montane-Schubland1,01180858,760Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub38,92219,03080858,760Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub3,9,7903,93739,791Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral101,78739,791Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub5,39125,333Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub5,3914,4747Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland8,6825,21213,894Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland120120Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland120120Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe11,35344,506Apacheriar-Chihuahuan Semi-D	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	5,200	13,384	66,020	3,934	19,941	108,480
Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub       7,005       2,324       50,646       3,791       15,527       79,294         Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub       9,637       425       870       626       2,550         Mogollon Chaparral       9,637       425       870       883       11,151         Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub       5,416       10,520       826       16,762         Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwart-Shrubland       128       10,229       108       1,888       6,597       18,950         Rocky Mountain Cambel Oat-Mixed Montane Shrubland       128       10,229       10,03       808       58,760         Sonora-Mojave Crosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub       38,922       19,030       808       58,760         Sonora-Mojave Gami-Desert Chaparral       86       3       10       2,549         Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral       5,391       2       5,393         Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub       39,790       39,791       39,791         Souter Corado Plateau Sand Shrubland       6,074       13       79       855       70,211         Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland       6,074       13       79,78       50,60,707         GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASS	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	75	1,019			3,037	4,130
Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland111,9246262,550Mogollon Chaparral9,63742587058311,515Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub5,41610,52082616,762Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland12810,2291081,8886,59718,950Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland2,3052662522,8232,833Sonora-Mojave Crosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub38,92219,03080858,760Sonora-Mojave Carub Sert Chaparral38,92319,0302,5493,89Sonora-Mojave Carub Sert Scrub5,3915,3912,663,89Sonoran Mojave Cacit Desert Scrub5,3912,6739,79039,790Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland6,0741,01,7871,797Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland6,0741,01,7871,797Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland6,0741,82,52261,82172,77850,607GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35339,947182,25261,82172,77850,607Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe11,35334,3584,57,111,10Central Mixedgrass Praire101,2755031,2099,865Chihuahuan Sondy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland1,69704,45,7111,10Central Mixedgrass Praire1,001,2751,2091,209	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	7,005	2,324	50,646	3,791	15,527	79,294
Mogollon Chaparral       9,637       425       870       583       11,515         Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub       5,416       10,520       2826       16,762         Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland       128       10,229       108       1,888       6,597       18,950         Rocky Mountain Cambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland       2,305       266       252       2,823         Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub       38,922       19,030       266       252       2,833         Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral       1,011       1,528       10       2,549         Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub       5,391       26       3       89         Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub       5,391       20       5,393       39,790       39,791         Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland       6,074       13       79       855       7,021         Western Great Plains Mequite Woodland and Shrubland       40,074       182,522       61,821       72,778       500         Subtoral       149,506       39,947       182,522       61,821       72,778       500         Greats LAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES       11,353       34,358       14       45,711         Ch	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland		1	1,924		626	2,550
Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub       5,416       10,520       826       16,762         Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland       128       10,229       108       1,888       6,597       18,950         Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland       128       10,229       108       1,888       6,597       18,950         Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland       2,305       266       252       2,823         Sonora-Mojave Crosostebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub       38,922       19,030       808       58,760         Sonora-Mojave Sixed Salt Desert Scrub       1,011       1,528       10       2,533         Sonora-Mojave Sixed Salt Desert Scrub       5,391       2       5,393       39,790         Sonora-Mojave Mixed Oath And Shrubland       6,074       13       79       855       7,021         Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland       8,682       5,212       13,894       19,997         Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland       8,682       5,212       13,894       19,997         Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland       149,506       39,977       182,252       61,821       72,78       506,307         GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES       11,49,506       39,947       182,252 </td <td>Mogollon Chaparral</td> <td>9,637</td> <td></td> <td>425</td> <td>870</td> <td>583</td> <td>11,515</td>	Mogollon Chaparral	9,637		425	870	583	11,515
Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland       128       10,229       108       1,888       6,597       18,950         Rocky Mountain Cower Montane-Foothill Shrubland       2,305       266       252       2,823         Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub       38,922       19,030       808       58,760         Sonora-Mojave Seni-Desert Chaparral       1,011       1,528       10       2,549         Sonora-Mojave Seni-Desert Chaparral       5,391       2       38,922       30,930         Sonora-Mojave Seni-Desert Chaparral       5,391       2       39,790       39,790         Sonora-Molaved Cacti Desert Scrub       6,074       13       79       855       7,021         Sonorar Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub       6,074       13       79       855       7,021         Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland       6,074       13       79       855       7,021         Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland       8,682       5,212       11,353       1,393         Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland       149,506       39,947       182,525       61,821       72,778       506,307         GRASSLAND/HERBACCOUS CLASSES       11,353       182,525       61,821       12,120       12,12	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	5,416		10,520		826	16,762
Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland         128         10,229         108         1,888         6,597         18,950           Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland         2,305         266         252         2,823           Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub         38,922         19,030         600         256         257           Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral         1,011         1,528         100         2,549           Sonora Moize Semi-Desert Scrub         5,391         2         30,393         36           Sonora Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub         5,391         2         5,393         30,790         39,790         39,791           Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland         6,074         13         79         855         7,021           Southern Great Plains Masquite Woodland and Shrubland         10         1,787         1,797         13,894           Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland         43         4         47           Subtotal         149,506         39,947         182,522         61,821         72,778           Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe         11,353         24         45,711           Central Mixedgrass Prairie         11,353         24	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland					109	110
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland         2,305         266         252         2,823           Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub         38,922         19,030         808         58,760           Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub         1,011         1,528         10         2,549           Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral         86         3         89           Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Scrub         5,391         2         5,393           Sonora Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub         39,790         2         5,393           Sonora-Mojave Sant Montane Montand Shrubland         6,074         13         79         855         7,021           Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland         6,074         10         1,787         1,797           Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland         8,682         5,212         4         47           Subtotal         149,506         39,947         182,252         61,821         72,778         506,307           GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES         11,353         149,506         39,947         182,252         61,821         72,778         506,307           Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe         11,353         34,358         45,711 <t< td=""><td>Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland</td><td>128</td><td>10,229</td><td>108</td><td>1,888</td><td>6,597</td><td>18,950</td></t<>	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	128	10,229	108	1,888	6,597	18,950
Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub38,92219,03080858,760Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub1,0111,528102,549Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral5,3918638Sonora Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub5,39125,393Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub39,79098557,021Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland6,07413798557,021Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland101,7871,7971,977Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland48,6825,21244,717Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland439,947182,25261,82172,778506,702Myoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland11,453120445,711120120120Chibuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe11,353120445,711120120Chibuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970909090Chibuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970120120120Chibuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland169705231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Juriper Savanna4,00228111,29895,593Inter-Mountain Basins Juriper Savanna4,00228111,29895,593	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland		2,305		266	252	2,823
Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub       1,011       1,528       10       2,549         Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral       86       3       89         Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub       5,391       2       5,393         Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub       39,790       39,791       39,791         Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland       6,074       13       79       855       7,021         Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland       10       1,787       1,797       13,894         Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland       43       43       44       47         Subtotal       149,506       39,947       182,522       61,821       72,778       506,307         GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES       11,353       34,358       45,711       120       120         Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe       11,353       34,358       45,711       120         Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe       16       970       986       120         Chihuahuan Sonora Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland       16       970       986       120         Chihuahuan Sangy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland       16       970       986       1798       1798	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	38,922		19,030		808	58,760
Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral5.3915.693889Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub5,39125,393Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub39,79039,79039,791Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland6,0741379855Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland101,7871,797Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland435,21213,894Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland4344747Subtotal149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35334,35845,711120120Central Mixedgrass Prairie11,353120120120Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe16970986986Chihuahuan Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland16970986Chihuahuan Bains Big Sagebrush Steppe1,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Bains Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,011		1,528		10	2,549
Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub $5,391$ $2$ $5,393$ Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub $39,790$ $39,790$ $39,791$ Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland $6,074$ $13$ $79$ $855$ $7,021$ Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland $10$ $1,787$ $1,797$ Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland $43$ $5,212$ $13,894$ Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland $43$ $43$ $447$ Subtotal149,506 $39,947$ $182,252$ $61,821$ $72,778$ GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES $11,353$ $34,358$ $45,711$ Central Mixedgrass Prairie $11,353$ $120$ $120$ $120$ Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe $16$ $970$ $986$ Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland $16$ $970$ $986$ Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe $1,275$ $523$ $1,798$ Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna $4,002$ $281$ $1$ $1.298$ $9$ $5.590$	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral			86		3	89
Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub39,79039,790Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland6,07413798557,021Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland101,7871,7971,797Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland8,6825,21213,89447Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland43494747Subtotal149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,353534,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie11,353120120120Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe1,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna4,00228111,29895,590	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,391			2		5,393
Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland6,07413798557,021Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland101,7871,797Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland8,6825,21213,894Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland434347Subtotal149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35334,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie11,353120120Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe1,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna4,00228111,29895,590	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	39,790					39,791
Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland101,7871,797Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland8,6825,21213,894Wyoning Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland434347Subtotal149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35334,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie11,353120120120Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	6,074	13		79	855	7,021
Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland8,6825,21213,894Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland434347Subtotal149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35334,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie11,353120120Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Beit Bottomland and Swale Grassland1,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland		10		1,787		1,797
Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland434447Subtotal149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35334,35845,711Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe11,35334,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie11,353120120Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe16970986Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe1,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna4,00228111,29895,590	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland		8,682		5,212		13,894
Subioidi149,50639,947182,25261,82172,778506,307GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES11,35334,35845,711Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe11,35334,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie120120120Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe804804Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland161,275523Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	1 40 507	43	102 252	(1.001	4	47
Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe11,35334,35845,711Central Mixedgrass Prairie120120Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe804804Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland11,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Subtotal GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS CLASSES	149,506	39,947	182,252	01,821	12,778	506,307
Central Mixedgrass Prairie120120Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe804804Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland11,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	11,353			34,358		45,711
Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe804804Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland11,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Central Mixedgrass Prairie		120				120
Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland16970986Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland11,2755231,798Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe4,00228111,29895,590	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe				804		804
Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland         1,275         523         1,798           Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna         4,002         281         1         1,298         9         5,590	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	16			970		986
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe         1,275         523         1,798           Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna         4,002         281         1         1,298         9         5,590	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland						
Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna 4,002 281 1 1,298 9 5,590	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe			1,275		523	1,798
	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	4,002	281	1	1,298	9	5,590

	Arizona	Colorado	Nevada	New Mexico	Utah	Region Wide
Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	1	8,504	17,817	283	14,049	40,654
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	11,250	863	3,114	16,400	2,014	33,640
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	15,474	3,354	5,974	14,486	8,330	47,618
Madrean Juniper Savanna	336	1		657		994
North Pacific Montane Grassland		2.445	27	10		27
Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra		2,447	20	19	293	2,779
Rocky Mountain Subaipine Mesic Meadow		1,507	24	14/	499	2,1//
Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	507	2,149	2	9,808	504	10,204
Western Great Plains Eacthill and Piedmant Greasland	387	1,252	2	701	594	5 066
Western Great Plains Footnin and Fredmont Grassiand		4,303		/01		3,000
Western Great Plains Shortorass Prairie		45 651		67 511		113 162
Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie		45,051		07,511		115,102
Subtotal	43.019	76.513	28.254	149.301	26.311	323.395
WOODY WETLAND CLASSES	- ,	- ,	., .		- /-	
Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland			1,068		293	1,360
Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	1,237	2,281	10,673	2,269	7,310	23,770
North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and	180		32	10/	20	426
North American Warm Desert Rinarian Mesquite Bosque	801		25	3	20	832
North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	283		5	125	10	422
North American Warm Desert Wash	153	1	288	199	10	652
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	24	569		787	847	2,226
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland		2,820	3	103	298	3,224
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland		215	68	5	4	292
Western Great Plains Floodplain		836				836
Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland		859		855		1,714
Subtotal	2,678	7,581	12,162	4,540	8,795	35,754
EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND CLASSES						
Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen			2			2
North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	32	45	409	86	482	1,053
Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow		1,331	10	136	479	1,956
Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow			2			2
Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland				41		41
Subtotal	32	1,376	423	263	961	3,054
ALTERED OR DISTURBED CLASSES						
Disturbed, Non-specific		2			90	93
Disturbed, Oil Well					46	46
Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	127	634	1,134	48	695	2,638
Invasive Annual Grassland	72	372	4,611		3,237	8,291
Invasive Perennial Forbland	12	1	107	20	526	1
Invasive Perennial Grassland	13	2,083	187	30	526	2,839
Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	484	493	149	27	456	1,609
Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Arcos	108	313	574	806	1/2	2,033
Recently Channet r myon-Jumper Areas		231		p	438	089
Recently Mined or Onarried	470	341 80	377	8 182	207	030 1 240
Subtatal	1 334	69 <b>1 750</b>	6 977	1 101	6 1 <i>44</i>	20 315
OTHER CLASSES	1,557		0,277	1,101	0,177	20,313
Agriculture	5 635	52 901	2 223	6.025	9 197	75 981
	5,055	52,701	2,223	0,025	>,177	15,701

		Land Cover in Square Kilometers					
	Arizona	Colorado	Nevada	New Mexico	Utah	Region Wide	
Developed, Medium - High Intensity	4,048	1,074	210	1,108	1,099	7,539	
Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1,711	2,013	726	977	1,997	7,425	
Open Water	702	1,316	1,481	792	6,733	11,023	
Subtotal	12,096	57,304	4,640	8,902	19,026	101,968	
Total by State Political Boundary	295,346	269,735	286,288	314,874	219,830	1,386,073	

### Appendix 2-3. Ecological similarity codes, types, and descriptions for four major types of ecological similarity recognized within the region.

Ecological Similarity Code	Ecological Similarity Type	Ecological Similarity Description						
А	Physiognomic Structure (Map and reference have same NLCD class)	<ul> <li>Where reference and mapped classes share the same NLCD Class, such as:</li> <li>N30 Barren (Includes all Barren Lands)</li> <li>N40 Forest (Includes all Deciduous Forest, Evergreen Forest and Mixed Forest types)</li> <li>N50 Shrubland (Includes all Shrub, Dwarf Shrub and Shrub/Scrub types)</li> <li>N70 Herbaceous (Includes all Grassland, Herbaceous, Savanna and Shrub-Steppe types)</li> <li>Wetlands (Includes all Wetland, Riparian, Emergent Wetlands, Wet Meadows and Greasewood</li> <li>N90 Flats)</li> </ul>						
В	Dominant Species Composition	Where reference and mapped classes share dominant/diagnostic species as specified in concept of Ecological Systems. For example, if systems share <i>dominant</i> or <i>codominant</i> species, then species composition is similar. If systems share species that are only <i>present</i> , then species composition is not similar. Would also apply if the confusion occurs between systems where the dominant/codominant species is common, but has been identified to a different subspecies (i.e. <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> spp.).						
С	Juxtaposition	Where reference and mapped classes commonly form a mosaic, such as where patch or linear systems occur within matrix systems, or where broad ecotonal boundaries between the classes occur with regularity. This often relates to minimum mapping unit (scale) issues with mosaics of similar landcover types. Refrain from using this code when the possibility of juxtaposition is only a rare occurrence.						
D	Special Substrates	<ul> <li>Where reference and mapped classes share substrates with special properties that ecologically define each Ecological System. Apply with the following substrates only:</li> <li>Eolian (sandsheets and dunes)</li> <li>Bedrock (exposed weathering parent material); sparse vegetation (Barren) classes only</li> <li>High Salinity (exposed marine shales, saline overflow /playas)</li> </ul>						

#### Appendix 2-4. Example of an original error matrix for mapping zone UT-5.

This matrix was produced using 20% withheld data. This table and similar tables for other mapping zones can be found at: <a href="http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html">http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</a>

									REI	FEREI	NCE						
	LAND COVED CLASS NAME	alors ando	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	S071	S078	S090	8096	S118	TOTAL	ACCURACY
	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	S009	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	83%
	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	S023	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100%
	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	S028	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100%
	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	S040	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	18	94%
_	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	S050	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100%
ΕI	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	S054	0	0	0	1	0	54	12	2	2	6	3	1	0	81	67%
A P I	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	S055	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	2	1	0	0	0	14	57%
W	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	S065	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	67%
	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	S071	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	18	2	1	1	0	30	60%
	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	S078	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0%
	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	S090	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	75%
	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	S096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	50%
	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	S118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	100%
		TOTAL	6	6	5	18	2	59	25	6	22	9	8	4	6	176	
		ACCURACY	83%	67%	100%	94%	50%	92%	32%	33%	82%	0%	38%	25%	100%		70%

Kappa: 0.603367 Standard error of kappa: 0.0304283 Z-Score for kappa: 19.8291

# Appendix 2-5. Example for UT-5 of ecological type similarity matrix showing the application of recognized similarity codes (Appendix 2-3) to off-diagonal (misclassification) cells from the original error matrix (Appendix 2-4).

This table and similar tables for other mapping zones can be found at: <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</u>

							RE	FEREN	C E					
	CLASS	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	S071	S078	S090	S096	S118
	S009	ABCD						0						
	S023		ABCD											
	S028			ABCD										
	S040				ABCD							С		
	S050					ABCD								
ED	8054				С		ABCD	ABC	AC	BC	BC	С	С	
PP	8055						ABC	ABCD	AC	С	BC			
ΜA	S065							AC	ABCD					
	S071	С	С			AC	BC	С		ABCD	ABC	0	0	
	S078						BC				ABCD		С	
	S090						С					ABCD		
	S096								BCD				ABCD	
	S118													ABCD

# Appendix 2-6. Relative similarity scoring system based on four major ecological similarity types (Appendix 2-3).

Ecological Similarity Code	Relative Similarity Category	Example	Explanation	Relative Similarity Score
No Similarity (0)	INCORRECT	Intermountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub versus Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest & Woodland	No <i>Major Types of</i> <i>Ecological Similarity</i> are shared between these two Ecological Systems. Relationship is Incorrect.	1
А			These two Ecological Systems are nested within the same NLCD Class for	
С	SOMEWHAT SIMILAR	Rocky Mountain Gambel-Oak Mixed Montane Shrubland versus Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	shrub/scrub and therefore share A- Physiognomy. No other <i>Major Type of</i>	2
D		mixeu Sun Deseri Serub	<i>Ecological Similarity</i> is shared. Relationship is Somewhat Similar.	
В				
AB				
AC		Lutan Manutain Daging	These two Ecological Systems are similar in terms	
AD	MODERATELY SIMILAR	Greasewood Flat versus	of C- Juxtaposition and D- Special Substrates	3
BC		Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	Relationship is Moderately	
BD			Similar.	
CD				
ABC			These two Ecological	
ABD		Inter-Mountain West Aspen - Mixed Conifer Forest &	Systems are similar relative to	
ACD	VERY SIMILAR	Woodland versus Rocky	B- Dominant Species	4
BCD	2	Mountain Aspen Forest & Woodland	Composition and C- Juxtaposition.	
ABCD			Relationship is Very Similar.	
Diagonal Cell (blank)	CORRECT	Mogollon Chaparral versus Mogollon Chaparral	The reference and mapped classes are identical. Relationship is Correct.	5

### Appendix 2-7. Example for UT-5 relative similarity scoring matrix showing the application of relative similarity scores to off-diagonal (misclassification) cells of the ecological similarity matrix (Appendix 2-4).

			REFERENCE           S009         S023         S028         S040         S050         S055         S065         S071         S078         S090         S096         S118           5														
	CLASS	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	S071	S078	S090	S096	S118			
	S009	5						1									
	S023		5														
	S028			5													
	S040				5							2					
Q	S050					5											
PE	S054				2		5	4	2	3	3	2	2				
AP	S055						4	5	2	2	3						
M	S065							2	5								
	S071	2	2			2	3	2		5	4	1	1				
	S078						3				5		2				
	S090						2					5					
	S096								4				5				
	S118													5			

This table and similar tables for other mapping zones can be found at: <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</u>

# Appendix 2-8. Revised error matrix: Correct and very similar are considered "correct" (i.e. scores 4 moved to diagonal).

This table and similar tables for other mapping zones can be found at: <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</u>

							REI	EREI	NCE							
	CLASS	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	<b>S055</b>	S065	S071	S078	S090	S096	S118	TOTAL	ACCURACY
	S009	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	83%
	S023	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100%
	S028	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100%
	S040	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	18	94%
D	S050	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100%
E	S054	0	0	0	1	0	56	0	2	2	6	3	1	0	71	79%
P I	S055	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	1	2	1	0	0	0	24	83%
IA	S065	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	75%
N	S071	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	18	0	1	1	0	28	60%
	S078	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	50%
	S090	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	75%
	S096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	50%
	S118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	100%
	TOTAL	6	6	5	18	2	59	25	6	22	9	8	4	6	176	0%
	ACCURACY	83%	67%	100%	94%	50%	95%	80%	50%	82%	22%	38%	25%	100%	0%	80%
# Appendix 2-9. Revised error matrix: Correct, very similar, and moderately similar are considered "correct" (i.e. scores 4 and 3 moved to diagonal).

This table and similar tables for other mapping zones can be found at: <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</u>

			R E F E R E N C E													
	CLASS	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	<b>S071</b>	S078	S090	S096	S118	TOTAL	ACCURACY
	S009	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	83%
	S023	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100%
	S028	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100%
	S040	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	18	94%
Ω	S050	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100%
E	S054	0	0	0	1	0	58	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	63	92%
P I	S055	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	100%
<b>I</b> A	S065	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	100%
N	S071	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	1	1	0	27	82%
	S078	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	10	90%
	S090	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	75%
	S096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	100%
	S118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	100%
	TOTAL	6	6	5	18	2	59	25	6	22	9	8	4	6	176	0%
	ACCURACY	83%	67%	100%	94%	50%	98%	96%	100%	100%	100%	38%	25%	100%	0%	91%

## Appendix 2-10. Revised error matrix: Correct, very similar, moderately similar, and somewhat similar are considered "correct" (i.e. scores 4, 3 and 2 moved to diagonal).

This table and similar tables for other mapping zones can be found at: <u>http://earth.gis.usu.edu/swgap/mapquality.html</u>

							REF	TEREN	NCE							
	CLASS	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	S071	S078	S090	S096	S118	TOTAL	ACCURACY
	S009	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	86%
	S023	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	100%
	S028	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100%
	S040	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	100%
Q	S050	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100%
E	S054	0	0	0	0	0	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	100%
P P	S055	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	100%
V	S065	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	100%
Σ	S071	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	1	1	0	24	92%
	S078	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	9	100%
	S090	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	7	100%
	S096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	100%
	S118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	100%
	TOTAL	6	6	5	18	2	59	25	6	22	9	8	4	6	176	0%
	ACCURACY	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	88%	75%	100%	0%	98%

## Appendix 2-11. Example for UT-5. Summary of user's accuracy for all levels of fuzzy assessment and the original error matrix.

This table and graph summarize map quality given different levels of multiple class membership (expressed by recognized ecological similarities) among classes. For example, recognizing the possibility of multiple class membership between cover class S055 (Great Basin Xeric Sagebrush Shrubland) and other mapped classes at the 'very similar' level, "user accuracy" for S055 increases from 57% to 83%.

USER'S ACCURACY	Land Cover Class													
	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	S071	S078	S090	S096	S118	тот
VrySomewhat Similar	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
VryMod. Similar	83%	100%	100%	94%	50%	92%	100%	100%	82%	90%	75%	100%	100%	91%
Vry. Similar	83%	100%	100%	94%	100%	79%	83%	75%	60%	50%	75%	50%	100%	80%
20% Validation	83%	100%	100%	94%	100%	67%	57%	67%	60%	0%	75%	50%	100%	70%
No. Samples	6	4	5	18	1	81	14	3	30	2	4	2	6	176



## Appendix 2-12. Example for UT-5. Summary of producer's accuracy for all levels of fuzzy assessment and the original error matrix.

This table and graph summarize map quality given different levels of multiple class membership (expressed by recognized ecological similarities) among classes. For example, recognizing the possibility of multiple class membership between cover class S055 (Great Basin Xeric Sagebrush Shrubland) and other mapped classes at the 'very similar' level, "producers accuracy" for S055 increases from 32% to 80%.

PRODUCERS'S ACCURACY	Land Cover Class													
	S009	S023	S028	S040	S050	S054	S055	S065	S071	S078	S090	S096	S118	тот
VrySomewhat Similar	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	88%	75%	100%	98%
VryMod. Similar	83%	67%	100%	94%	50%	98%	96%	100%	100%	100%	38%	25%	100%	91%
Vry. Similar	83%	67%	100%	94%	50%	95%	80%	50%	82%	22%	38%	25%	100%	80%
20% Validation	83%	67%	100%	94%	50%	92%	32%	33%	82%	0%	38%	25%	100%	70%



No. Samples

# Appendix 2-13. Regional summary of land cover area and validation results sorted into 5 validation groups and organized by NLCD land cover classes.

The first validation group contains classes that were not assessed (na) regionally because of limited validation plots (n < 20) or were non-natural classes and not the primary focus of the mapping effort.

	Land	Area	Vali	dation Results	
MAPPED LAND COVER CLASSES (SWReGAP)	Area Sq. Km	Percent Total Area	Number Reference Samples	Producer	User
GRP 1: VALIDATION NOT ASSESSED FOR 5-STATE REGION					
Sparsely Vegetated/Barren Classes	1.2.00	0.100/			
Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	1,360	0.10%	na	na	na
Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	46	0.00%	na	na	na
Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	23	0.00%	na	na	na
North American Alpine Ice Field	23	0.00%	na	na	na
North American Warm Desert Badland	112	0.01%	na	na	na
North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	992	0.07%	na	na	na
Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	123	0.01%	na	na	na
Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	309	0.02%	na	na	na
Evergreen Forest Classes					
Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	795	0.06%	na	na	na
Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2	0.00%	na	na	na
Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	209	0.02%	na	na	na
Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland	106	0.01%	na	na	na
Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	42	0.00%	na	na	na
Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	6	0.00%	na	na	na
Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	7,295	0.53%	na	na	na
Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	10,359	0.75%	na	na	na
Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland	21	0.00%	na	na	na
Shrub/Scrub Classes					
Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	187	0.01%	na	na	na
Coahuilan Chaparral	94	0.01%	na	na	na
Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	110	0.01%	na	na	na
Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	89	0.01%	na	na	na
Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	1,797	0.13%	na	na	na
Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	47	0.00%	na	na	na
Grassland/Herbaceous Classes					
Central Mixedgrass Prairie	120	0.01%	na	na	na
North Pacific Montane Grassland	27	0.00%	na	na	na
Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	0.00%	na	na	na
Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	0.00%	na	na	na

	Land	Area	Validation Results			
MAPPED LAND COVER CLASSES (SWReGAP)	Area Sq. Km	Percent Total Area	Number Reference Samples	Producer	User	
Woody Wetland Classes						
North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	832	0.06%	na	na	na	
Emergent Wetland Classes						
Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	2	0.00%	na	na	na	
Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	2	0.00%	na	na	na	
Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	41	0.00%	na	na	na	
Altered or Disturbed Classes						
Disturbed, Non-specific	93	0.01%	na	na	na	
Disturbed, Oil Well	46	0.00%	na	na	na	
Invasive Perennial Forbland	1	0.00%	na	na	na	
Recently Burned	2,033	0.15%	na	na	na	
Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	689	0.05%	na	na	na	
Other Classes						
Agriculture	75,981	5.48%	na	na	na	
Developed, Medium - High Intensity	7,539	0.54%	na	na	na	
Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	7,425	0.54%	na	na	na	
Open Water	11,023	0.80%	na	na	na	
TOTAL AREA NOT ASSESSED	130,020	9.39%				
GRP 2: VALIDATION RESULTS WITH < 30% AGREEMENT (USER'S PERSPECT.)						
Grassland/Herbaceous Classes						
Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	986	0.07%	28	11%	21%	
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,798	0.13%	82	12%	26%	
Madrean Juniper Savanna	994	0.07%	32	6%	25%	
TOTAL AREA < 30% AGREEMENT	3,778	0.27%				
GRP 3: VALIDATION WITH 30 - 49% AGREEMENT (USER'S PERSPECTIVE)						
Sparsely Vegetated/Barren Classes						
North American Warm Desert Pavement	393	0.03%	21	14%	33%	
Evergreen Forest Classes						
Madrean Encinal	4,358	0.31%	45	51%	44%	
Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	5,733	0.41%	104	42%	46%	
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	801	0.06%	31	13%	44%	
Mixed Forest Class						
Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,439	0.25%	159	30%	49%	
Shrub/Scrub Classes						
Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	31,683	2.29%	215	41%	41%	
Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	27,407	1.98%	174	45%	45%	
Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	4,413	0.32%	45	22%	33%	
Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	5,725	0.41%	59	49%	48%	

	Land	Area	Vali	dation Results	
MAPPED LAND COVER CLASSES (SWReGAP)	Area Sq. Km	Percent Total Area	Number Reference Samples	Producer	User
Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,549	0.18%	23	26%	30%
Grassland/Herbaceous Classes					
Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland	0	0.00%	104	32%	41%
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	33,640	2.43%	392	32%	41%
Woody Wetland Classes	10.6		10	100/	
North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrub	426	0.03%	43	19%	32%
North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	422	0.03%	45	18%	35%
North American Warm Desert Wash	652	0.05%	50	24%	34%
Emergent Wetland Classes	1.056	0.140/	110	2.50/	400/
Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane wet Meadow	1,956	0.14%	118	35%	48%
Altered or Disturbed Classes	8 201	0.00/	174	220/	400/
	8,291	0.60%	1/4	22%	42%
TOTAL AREA 30 - 49% AGREEMENT	131,888	9.52%			
GRP 4: VALIDATION WITH 50 - 70% AGREEMENT (USER'S PERSPECTIVE)					
Sparsely Vegetated/Barren Classes				100/	
Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,421	0.10%	54	19%	56%
Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,873	0.21%	83	43%	64%
Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	3,297	0.24%	59	37%	50%
North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	2,728	0.20%	37	43%	67%
North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	3,568	0.26%	38	53%	67%
North American Warm Desert Playa	1,115	0.08%	20	/0%	64%
Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	761	0.05%	27	48%	59%
Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	2,965	0.21%	143	56%	6/%
Evergreen Forest Classes	07.055	7.0/0/	070	010/	(00)
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	97,855	7.06%	972	81%	69%
Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper woodahad	50,776	3.00%	441	84%	65% 500/
Modean Disup Lunder-Bristecone Pine woodland	21 017	0.05%	21	38%0 710/	549/
Realey Montrin Day Merio Mantena Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	21,917	1.38%	233	/170 520/	570/
Pooley Mountain Diy-Mesic Montaine Mixed Connet Folest and woodiand	8,933 8,764	0.63%	438	52%	5770
Rocky Mountain Longepute File Forest	0,704	1.07%	199	76%	66%
Southern becky Mountain Diverse Unione Woodland	14,014	1.0778	172	7078 64%	63%
Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderses Dise Woodland	50 221	3.62%	785	77%	66%
Shrik/Serk/Jasse	50,221	5.0270	785	///0	0070
Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	13 310	0.96%	106	73%	54%
Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	2 401	0.17%	50	28%	50%
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniner Shruhland	11 535	0.1770	140	61%	57%
Great Basin Semi-Desert Chanarral	162	0.0376	21	130/n	50%
Great Basin Veric Mixed Sagebrush Shruhland	35 434	2 56%	417	47%	55%
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	108.480	7.83%	1394	77%	59%

	Land	Area	Vali	dation Results	
MAPPED LAND COVER CLASSES (SWReGAP)	Area Sq. Km	Percent Total Area	Number Reference Samples	Producer	User
Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	4,130	0.30%	64	55%	51%
Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	79,294	5.72%	826	59%	53%
Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	2,550	0.18%	81	27%	55%
Mogollon Chaparral	11,515	0.83%	169	49%	52%
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	2,823	0.20%	102	44%	68%
Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,393	0.39%	36	36%	50%
Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	7,021	0.51%	81	56%	56%
Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	45,711	3.30%	343	63%	51%
Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	804	0.06%	25	56%	56%
Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	5,590	0.40%	89	36%	51%
Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	40,654	2.93%	781	72%	63%
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	47,618	3.44%	699	38%	52%
Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	2,177	0.16%	120	48%	56%
Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	11,956	0.86%	59	53%	53%
Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	10,294	0.74%	292	58%	64%
Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	5,066	0.37%	135	65%	63%
Woody Wetland Classes					
Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrub	1,360	0.10%	102	60%	68%
Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	23,770	1.71%	405	46%	52%
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	2,226	0.16%	177	45%	67%
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	3,224	0.23%	135	49%	62%
Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	292	0.02%	46	7%	50%
Western Great Plains Floodplain	836	0.06%	66	67%	70%
Emergent Wetland Classes					
North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	1,053	0.08%	64	38%	65%
Altered or Disturbed Classes					
Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	2,638	0.19%	138	17%	52%
Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,839	0.20%	136	38%	67%
Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,609	0.12%	116	59%	66%
Recently Mined or Quarried	1,240	0.09%	23	61%	67%
TOTAL AREA 50 - 70% AGREEMENT	783,005	56.48%			
GRP 5: VALIDATION WITH > 70% AGREEMENT (USER'S PERSPECTIVE)					
Spursery regeniled/Durren Clusses Colorado Plateau Mixed Badrock Canyon and Tableland	24 212	1 750/	240	750/	770%
United Neuron Desing Active and Stabilized Dune	24,313	1./3%	248	1370	710/
Inter-Inter Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	5,103	0.22%	39	44% 200/	/1%0
Intel-iviountain Dasins Flaya Destry Mountain Almins Deducely and Seree	1/,381	1.2/%	81	08%0	//%0
Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	3,863	0.28%	100	81%	84%
Declardous Forest Classes Declardoustin Accounting United States	20.097	1 5 10/	500	010/	740/
Kocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodiand	20,986	1.51%	582	81%	/4%
Kocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	888	0.06%	34	68%	74%

	Land A	Area	Vali	dation Results	
MAPPED LAND COVER CLASSES (SWReGAP)	Area Sq. Km	Percent Total Area	Number Reference Samples	Producer	User
Shrush /Sounds Classon					
Maine Mid Elementica Mined Depart Same	16762	1 210/	169	710/	750/
	10,702	1.21%	108	/170	7370
Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	18,950	1.37%	524	69%	71%
Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	58,760	4.24%	292	68%	76%
Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	39,791	2.87%	280	83%	74%
Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	13,894	1.00%	159	72%	74%
Grassland/Herbaceous Classes					
Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,779	0.20%	68	76%	78%
Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	113,162	8.16%	668	88%	72%
Woody Wetland Classes					
Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,714	0.12%	153	75%	80%
Altered or Disturbed Classes					
Recently Logged Areas	836	0.06%	35	37%	93%
TOTAL AREA > 70% AGREEMENT	337,382	24.32%			
TOTALS FOR 5-STATE REGION	1,386,073	100.00%	17,030		

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
Α	173429	CO	COUCH'S SPADEFOOT	Scaphiopus couchii
A	173438	UT	GREEN FROG	Rana clamitans
A	173440	CO	WOOD FROG	Rana sylvatica
A	173441	NM	BULLFROG	Rana catesbeiana
А	173443	СО	NORTHERN LEOPARD FROG	Rana pipiens
А	173446	NV	RED-LEGGED FROG	Rana aurora
А	173447	NM	RIO GRANDE LEOPARD FROG	Rana berlandieri
А	173448	СО	PLAINS LEOPARD FROG	Rana blairi
А	173451	NM	CHIRICAHUA LEOPARD FROG	Rana chiricahuensis
А	173454	NV	MOUNTAIN YELLOW-LEGGED FROG	Rana muscosa
А	173457	NV	RELICT LEOPARD FROG	Rana onca
А	173458	UT	SPOTTED FROG*	Rana pretiosa
А	173461	AZ	TARAHUMARA FROG*	Rana tarahumarae
А	173462	AZ	YAVAPAI LEOPARD FROG	Rana yavapaiensis
А	173468	СО	GREAT PLAINS NARROWMOUTH TOAD	Gastrophryne olivacea
А	173476	NM	WOODHOUSE'S TOAD	Bufo woodhousii
А	173481	AZ	COLORADO RIVER TOAD	Bufo alvarius
А	173482	CO	WESTERN TOAD	Bufo boreas
А	173484	NM	GREAT PLAINS TOAD	Bufo cognatus
А	173485	NM	GREEN TOAD	Bufo debilis
А	173490	AZ	SOUTHWESTERN TOAD	Bufo microscaphus
А	173491	NM	RED-SPOTTED TOAD	Bufo punctatus
А	173492	AZ	SONORAN GREEN TOAD	Bufo retiformis
А	173493	NM	TEXAS TOAD	Bufo speciosus
А	173510	AZ	CANYON TREEFROG	Hyla arenicolor
А	173513	AZ	MOUNTAIN TREEFROG	Hyla eximia
А	173520	CO	NORTHERN CRICKET FROG	Acris crepitans
А	173525	AZ	WESTERN CHORUS FROG*	Pseudacris triseriata
А	173534	AZ	LOWLAND BURROWING TREEFROG	Pternohyla fodiens
А	173549	AZ	AFRICAN CLAWED FROG*	Xenopus laevis
А	173592	AZ	TIGER SALAMANDER	Ambystoma tigrinum
А	173663	NM	JEMEZ MOUNTAINS SALAMANDER	Plethodon neomexicanus
А	173702	NM	SACRAMENTO MOUNTAIN	Aneides hardii
А	206989	NM	SALAMANDER PLAINS SPADEFOOT	Spea hombifrons
A	206991	CO	GREAT BASIN SPADEFOOT	Spea intermontana
A	206993	AZ	NEW MEXICO SPADEFOOT	Spea multiplicata
A	2007312	UT	BORFAL CHORUS FROG	Pseudacris maculata
A	207312	NV	PACIFIC CHORUS FROG	Pseudacris regilla
A	207724	NM	BARKING FROG	Eleutherodactylus augusti
A	550236	NV	AMARGOSA TOAD	Bufo nelsoni
A	550230	AZ	RAMSEY CANYON LEOPARD FROG*	Rana subaauavocalis
A	550546	UT	COLUMBIA SPOTTED FROG	Rana luteiventris
B	174469	NM	COMMON LOON	Gavia immer
B	174470	CO	YELLOW-BILLED LOON	Gavia adamsii
D	1, 44, 0	20	LEED IN DILLED LOON	Sarra adamon

# Appendix 3-1. List of species reviewed and modeled in Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project (\* Indicates species not modeled in effort).

Taxon Group	oup ITIS Lead		Common Name	Scientific Name
В	174474	СО	RED-THROATED LOON	Gavia stellata
В	174475	СО	PACIFIC LOON	Gavia pacifica
В	174479	СО	RED-NECKED GREBE	Podiceps grisegena
В	174482	UT	HORNED GREBE	Podiceps auritus
В	174485	NM	EARED GREBE	Podiceps nigricollis
В	174503	NM	WESTERN GREBE	Aechmophorus occidentalis
В	174505	NM	PIED-BILLED GREBE	Podilymbus podiceps
В	174684	СО	AMERICAN WHITE PELICAN	Pelecanus ervthrorhynchos
В	174717	UT	DOUBLE-CRESTED CORMORANT	Phalacrocorax auritus
В	174773	NM	GREAT BLUE HERON	Ardea herodias
В	174793	NM	GREEN HERON	Butorides virescens
В	174803	NM	CATTLE EGRET	Bubulcus ibis
В	174813	NM	SNOWY EGRET	Egretta thula
В	174827	NM	LITTLE BLUE HERON	Egretta caerulea
В	174832	NM	BLACK-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON	Nycticorax nycticorax
B	174842	CO	YELLOW-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON	Nyctanassa violacea
B	174846	NM	LEAST BITTERN	Ixobrychus exilis
B	174856	NM	AMERICAN BITTERN	Rotaurus lentiginosus
B	174926	NM	WHITE-FACED IBIS	Plesadis chihi
B	174987	NV	TUNDRA SWAN	Cygnus columbianus
B	174992	CO	TRUMPETER SWAN	Cygnus buccinator
B	174999	NM	CANADA GOOSE	Branta canadensis
B	175011	CO	BRANT*	Branta bernicla
B	175020	NM	GREATER WHITE-FRONTED GOOSE	Anser albifrons
B	175020	NM	SNOW GOOSE	Chen caerulascens
B	175041	NM	ROSS'S GOOSE	Chen rassii
B	175044	1111	RUSSIS GOOSE BLACK BELLIED WHISTLING DUCK	Dandrooyang gutumpalis
B	175063	NM	MALLARD	Anas platurkunghos
B	175068	CO	AMERICAN BLACK DUCK	Anas rubrinos
B	175073	NM	GADWALL	Anas strapara
B	175073	NM	NOPTHEON DINTAIL	Anas gouta
B	175081	NM	GREEN WINGED TEAL	
B	175086	NM	BLUE WINGED TEAL	Anas discors
B	175080	NM	CININA MON TEAL	Anas examontara
B	175002	NV	EUDASIAN WIGEON*	Anas penelope
B	175092	NM	AMERICAN WIGEON	Anas generope
B	175094	NM	NOPTHERN SHOVELER	Anas chineata
Б	175122	NM	WOOD DUCK	Anas crypeala
Б	175122	NM	PEDHEAD	Att sponsa
D	175125	NIM		Ayinya americana
D	175120	NIVI	CANWASDACK	Ayinya couaris
D	175129		CANVASDACK	Ayinya vausinena Ayinya marila
D D	175124	NV	UREATER SCAUP	Ayinya marita
D	175174		LESSER SUAUP	Ayınya ajjınıs Bucanhala alangula
D	175141			Bucephala clangula
B	1/5144		DAKKUW 5 GULDENEYE	Бисерпана Islandica
в	1/5145			Бисерпана albeola
В	175147	00	LUNG-TAILED DUCK	Clangula hyemalis
В	1/5149	0	HAKLEQUIN DUCK*	HISTRIONICUS hISTRIONICUS

Taxon Group	ITIS	Lead State	Common Name	Scientific Name
В	175163	CO	WHITE-WINGED SCOTER	Melanitta fusca
В	175170	CO	SURF SCOTER	Melanitta perspicillata
В	175175	NM	RUDDY DUCK	Oxyura jamaicensis
В	175183	NM	HOODED MERGANSER	Lophodytes cucullatus
В	175185	NM	COMMON MERGANSER	Mergus merganser
В	175187	NM	RED-BREASTED MERGANSER	Mergus serrator
В	175265	NM	TURKEY VULTURE	Cathartes aura
В	175272	AZ	BLACK VULTURE*	Coragyps atratus
В	175274	UT	CALIFORNIA CONDOR	Gymnogyps californianus
В	175282	AZ	WHITE-TAILED KITE	Elanus leucurus
В	175300	NM	NORTHERN GOSHAWK	Accipiter gentilis
В	175304	NM	SHARP-SHINNED HAWK	Accipiter striatus
В	175309	NM	COOPER'S HAWK	Accipiter cooperii
В	175350	NM	RED-TAILED HAWK	Buteo jamaicensis
В	175365	CO	BROAD-WINGED HAWK	Buteo platypterus
В	175367	NM	SWAINSON'S HAWK	Buteo swainsoni
В	175368	AZ	ZONE-TAILED HAWK	Buteo albonotatus
В	175373	NM	ROUGH-LEGGED HAWK	Buteo lagopus
В	175377	СО	FERRUGINOUS HAWK	Buteo regalis
В	175397	AZ	HARRIS'S HAWK	Parabuteo unicinctus
B	175402	AZ	COMMON BLACK-HAWK	Buteogallus anthracinus
B	175407	NM	GOLDEN EAGLE	Aquila chrysaetos
B	175420	CO	BALDEAGLE	Haliaeetus leucocephalus
B	175430	NM	NORTHERN HARRIER	Circus cvaneus
B	175590	NM	OSPREY	Pandion haliaetus
B	175599	CO	GYRFALCON	Falco rusticolus
B	175603	NM	PRAIRIE FALCON	Falco mexicanus
B	175604	CO	PEREGRINE FALCON	Falco neregrinus
B	175610	NM	APLOMADO FALCON	Falco femoralis
B	175613	NM	MERLIN	Falco columbarius
B	175622	NM	AMERICAN KESTREI	Falco sparvarius
B	175700	UT	PUEFED GPOUSE	Ronasa umbellus
B	2	CO	GUNNISON SAGE GROUSE	Controcorcus minimus
B	175827	C0	WHITE TAILED DTADMIGAN	
D	175827	C0	CDEATED DRAIDE CHICKEN	Lagopus teucurus
D	175020	C0 C0	UKEATEK PRAIRIE-UHUKEN	Tympanucnus cupiao
D	175941	C0 C0	CLADD TAILED CROUSE*	Tympanucnus paniaicincius
В	175841	C0 C0	SHARP-TAILED GROUSE	Tympanucnus pnasianeitus
В	1/5848	C0 C0	SHARP-TAILED GROUSE-COLUMBIAN	1. phasianellus columbianus
В В	175852	co	GREATER SAGE-GROUSE	1. phasianeilus jamesi Centrocercus urophasianus
В	175860	NM	BLUE GROUSE	Dendragapus obscurus
В	175863	NM	NORTHERN BOBWHITE	Colinus virginianus
В	175872	NM	SCALED QUAIL	Callipepla squamata
В	175876	NV	CALIFORNIA OUAIL	Callipepla californica
– B	175877	NM	GAMBEL'S QUAIL	Callipepla sambelii
B	175893	NV	MOUNTAIN OUAIL	Oreortyx pictus
B	175900	AZ	MONTEZUMA OUAIL	Cyrtonyx montezumae
B	175905	UT	RING-NECKED PHEASANT	Phasianus colchicus
D	1/5705	01	MING-INDOKED I HEADAINI	i nastanas continuas

#### SWReGAP

Taxon Group	ITIS	Lead State	Common Name	Scientific Name
В	175908	NV	CHUKAR	Alectoris chukar
В	175915	UT	GRAY PARTRIDGE	Perdix perdix
В	176136	NM	WILD TURKEY	Meleagris gallopavo
В	176176	CO	WHOOPING CRANE	Grus americana
В	176177	CO	SANDHILL CRANE	Grus canadensis
В	176177	CO	SANDHILL CRANE	Grus canadensis
В	176209	AZ	CLAPPER RAIL	Rallus longirostris
В	176221	NM	VIRGINIA RAIL	Rallus limicola
В	176221	NM	VIRGINIA RAIL	Rallus limicola
В	176242	NM	SORA	Porzana carolina
В	176263	CO	BLACK RAIL	Laterallus jamaicensis
В	176284	NM	COMMON MOORHEN	Gallinula chloropus
В	176292	NM	AMERICAN COOT	Fulica americana
В	176506	NM	SEMIPALMATED PLOVER	Charadrius semipalmatus
В	176507	CO	PIPING PLOVER	Charadrius melodus
В	176510	CO	SNOWY PLOVER	Charadrius alexandrinus
В	176520	NM	KILLDEER	Charadrius vociferus
В	176522	CO	MOUNTAIN PLOVER	Charadrius montanus
В	176564	UT	AMERICAN GOLDEN-PLOVER	Pluvialis dominica
В	176567	NM	BLACK-BELLIED PLOVER	Pluvialis squatarola
В	176571	СО	RUDDY TURNSTONE	Arenaria interpres
В	176580	СО	AMERICAN WOODCOCK*	Scolopax minor
В	176593	СО	LONG-BILLED CURLEW	Numenius americanus
В	176599	СО	WHIMBREL	Numenius phaeopus
В	176610	СО	UPLAND SANDPIPER	Bartramia longicauda
В	176612	NM	SPOTTED SANDPIPER	Actitis macularia
В	176615	NM	SOLITARY SANDPIPER	Tringa solitaria
В	176619	NM	GREATER YELLOWLEGS	Tringa melanoleuca
В	176620	NM	LESSER YELLOWLEGS	Tringa flavipes
В	176638	NV	WILLET	Catoptrophorus semipalmatus
В	176642	СО	RED KNOT	Calidris canutus
В	176653	СО	PECTORAL SANDPIPER	Calidris melanotos
В	176654	СО	WHITE-RUMPED SANDPIPER	Calidris fuscicollis
В	176655	CO	BAIRD'S SANDPIPER	Calidris bairdii
В	176656	NM	LEAST SANDPIPER	Calidris minutilla
В	176661	NV	DUNLIN	Calidris alpina
В	176667	СО	SEMIPALMATED SANDPIPER	Calidris pusilla
В	176668	NM	WESTERN SANDPIPER	Calidris mauri
В	176669	СО	SANDERLING	Calidris alba
В	176675	СО	SHORT-BILLED DOWITCHER	Limnodromus griseus
В	176679	NM	LONG-BILLED DOWITCHER	Limnodromus scolopaceus
В	176684	СО	<b>BUFF-BREASTED SANDPIPER</b>	Tryngites subruficollis
В	176686	СО	MARBLED GODWIT	Limosa fedoa
В	176700	NM	COMMON SNIPE	Gallinago gallinago
В	176721	NM	AMERICAN AVOCET	Recurvirostra americana
В	176726	NM	BLACK-NECKED STILT	Himantopus mexicanus
В	176735	NV	RED-NECKED PHALAROPE	Phalaropus lobatus
В	176736	NM	WILSON'S PHALAROPE	Phalaropus tricolor
				-

#### SWReGAP

Taxon Group	ITIS	Lead State	Common Name	Scientific Name
B	176808	UT	GLAUCOUS GULL	Larus hyperboreus
B	176824	CO	HERRING GULL	Larus argentatus
B	176828	UT	THAYER'S GULL	Larus thayeri
B	176829	UT	CALIFORNIA GULL	Larus californicus
B	176830	NM	RING-BILLED GULL	Larus delawarensis
B	176838	UT	FRANKLIN'S GULL	Larus ninixcan
B	176839	NM	BONAPARTE'S GULL	Larus philadelphia
B	176866	CO	SABINE'S GULL	Xema sahini
B	176887	C0	FORSTER'S TERN	Sterna forsteri
B	176888	UT	COMMON TERN	Sterna hirundo
B	176923	CO	I FAST TERN	Sterna antillarum
B	176924	NV	CASPIAN TERN	Sterna casnia
B	176959	NV	BLACK TERN	Chlidonias niger
B	177065	NM	BAND TAILED DIGEON	Columba fasciata
D	177071	NM	BAND-TAILED I NEON	Columba jusciaid
D	177121	NM	WHITE WINGED DOVE	Columba livia Zangida asigtiga
D	177125	NIVI	MOURNING DOVE	Zenaida distanca
D	177123		SPOTTED DOVE	Zenataa macroura Staastaa din a binansin
В	177152	01	SPOTTED DOVE*	Streptopella chinensis
В	177162	AZ	COMMON GROUND-DOVE	Columbina passerina
В	177021	AZ	INCA DOVE	
В	177024	AZ	YELLOW-BILLED CUCKOO	Coccyzus americanus
В	177834	20	BLACK-BILLED CUCKOO	Coccyzus erythropthalmus
В	1//836	NM	GREATER ROADRUNNER	Geococcyx californianus
В	177851	NM	COMMON BARN-OWL	Tyto alba
В	177856	0	EASTERN SCREECH-OWL	Otus asio
В	177875	AZ	WHISKERED SCREECH-OWL	Otus trichopsis
В	177878	AZ	FLAMMULATED OWL	Otus flammeolus
В	177884	NM	GREAT HORNED OWL	Bubo virginianus
В	177896	со	SNOWY OWL	Nyctea scandiaca
В	177902	AZ	NORTHERN PYGMY-OWL	Glaucidium gnoma
В	177908	AZ	FERRUGINOUS PYGMY-OWL	Glaucidium brasilianum
В	177912	AZ	ELF OWL	Micrathene whitneyi
В	177925	CO	SPOTTED OWL	Strix occidentalis
В	177932	NM	LONG-EARED OWL	Asio otus
В	177935	UT	SHORT-EARED OWL	Asio flammeus
В	177938	CO	BOREAL OWL	Aegolius funereus
В	177942	NM	NORTHERN SAW-WHET OWL	Aegolius acadicus
В	177946	CO	BURROWING OWL	Athene cunicularia
В	177961	AZ	WHIP-POOR-WILL	Caprimulgus vociferus
В	177966	AZ	BUFF-COLLARED NIGHTJAR	Caprimulgus ridgwayi
В	177979	NM	COMMON NIGHTHAWK	Chordeiles minor
В	177988	NM	LESSER NIGHTHAWK	Chordeiles acutipennis
В	177997	NM	BLACK SWIFT	Cypseloides niger
В	178001	CO	CHIMNEY SWIFT	Chaetura pelagica
В	178002	NV	VAUX'S SWIFT*	Chaetura vauxi
В	178014	NM	WHITE-THROATED SWIFT	Aeronautes saxatalis
В	178030	AZ	LUCIFER HUMMINGBIRD	Calothorax lucifer
В	178033	AZ	BLACK-CHINNED HUMMINGBIRD	Archilochus alexandri

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
B	178035	47	COSTA'S HUMMINGBIRD	Calunta costae
B	178035	AZ	ANNA'S HUMMINGBIRD	Calypte costae
B	178038	AZ	BROAD-TAILED HUMMINGBIRD	Salasphorus platycarcus
B	178040	AZ	RUFOUS HUMMINGBIRD	Selasphorus puties
B	178040	NV	ALLEN'S HUMMINGBIRD	Selasphorus rajus
B	178041	NV	CALLIOPE HUMMINGBIRD	Stellula callione
B	178050	47	MAGNIEICENT HUMMINGBIRD	Fugenes fulgens
B	178054	AZ	BLUE-THROATED HUMMINGBIRD	Lugenes juigens Lampornis clamanciae
B	178065	AZ	BERVI I INF HUMMINGBIRD*	Amazilia hervilina
B	178066	AZ	VIOLET_CROWNED HUMMINGBIRD	Amazilia violicens
B	178060	AZ	WHITE FARED HUMMINGBIRD*	Hylocharis leucotis
B	178003	AZ	READ BILLED HUMMINGBIRD	Comanthus latirostris
D	178006	AZ	ELECANT TROCON	
D	178101	AZ	ELEGANT IROGON	Trogon elegans
В	178101	AZ	EARED IROGON*	Euptions neoxenus
В	1/8112	AZ	GREEN KINGFISHER*	Chloroceryle americana
в	1/8119	NM	BELTED KINGFISHER	Ceryle alcyon
В	1/8154	NM	NORTHERN FLICKER	Colaptes auratus
В	178164	AZ	GILDED FLICKER	Colaptes chrysoides
В	178186	0	RED-HEADED WOODPECKER	Melanerpes erythrocephalus
В	178189	AZ	ACORN WOODPECKER	Melanerpes formicivorus
В	178195	СО	RED-BELLIED WOODPECKER	Melanerpes carolinus
В	178196	NM	LEWIS'S WOODPECKER	Melanerpes lewis
В	178198	AZ	GILA WOODPECKER	Melanerpes uropygialis
В	178208	NM	WILLIAMSON'S SAPSUCKER	Sphyrapicus thyroideus
В	178211	NM	RED-NAPED SAPSUCKER	Sphyrapicus nuchalis
В	178212	NV	RED-BREASTED SAPSUCKER	Sphyrapicus ruber
В	178251	NM	THREE-TOED WOODPECKER	Picoides tridactylus
В	178256	NV	WHITE-HEADED WOODPECKER	Picoides albolarvatus
В	178259	NM	DOWNY WOODPECKER	Picoides pubescens
В	178260	NM	LADDER-BACKED WOODPECKER	Picoides scalaris
В	178261	AZ	STRICKLAND'S WOODPECKER	Picoides stricklandi
В	178262	NM	HAIRY WOODPECKER	Picoides villosus
В	178279	CO	EASTERN KINGBIRD	Tyrannus tyrannus
В	178282	AZ	TROPICAL KINGBIRD	Tyrannus melancholicus
В	178287	NM	WESTERN KINGBIRD	Tyrannus verticalis
В	178288	NM	CASSIN'S KINGBIRD	Tyrannus vociferans
В	178292	AZ	THICK-BILLED KINGBIRD	Tyrannus crassirostris
В	178293	NM	SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER	Tyrannus forficatus
В	178305	AZ	SULPHUR-BELLIED FLYCATCHER	Myiodynastes luteiventris
В	178309	CO	GREAT CRESTED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus crinitus
В	178312	AZ	BROWN-CRESTED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus tyrannulus
В	178316	NM	ASH-THROATED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus cinerascens
В	178319	AZ	DUSKY-CAPPED FLYCATCHER	Myiarchus tuberculifer
В	178329	СО	EASTERN PHOEBE	Sayornis phoebe
В	178330	NM	BLACK PHOEBE	Sayornis nigricans
В	178333	NM	SAY'S PHOEBE	Sayornis saya
В	178340	CO	ALDER FLYCATCHER	Empidonax alnorum
В	178341	СО	WILLOW FLYCATCHER	Empidonax traillii

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
B	178346	NM	DUSKY ELVCATCHER	Empidonar oberholseri
B	178340	NM	GRAV FLVCATCHER	Empidonas wrightii
B	178348		DACIEIC SLODE EL VCATCHED*	Emplaonax wrighti Emplaonax difficilis
B	178352		RUEE REASTED ELVCATCHER	Empidonax fubifrons
B	178356		GDEATED DEWEE	Contonus partinax
B	178360	NM	WESTERN WOOD DEWEE	Contopus sordidulus
B	178371	NM	VEDMILION ELVCATCHED	Porocenhalus rubinus
D	170371	11111	NODTHEDN DE ADDI ESS TVD ANNI II ET	Comptostoma imborba
D	170204	AZ	NORTHERN BEARDLESS-11 KANNOLE1	Rachungunghung galaine
D	170304	AL NM	VIOLET GREEN SWALLOW	Tachyoinata thalassina
D	170427	NM	TDEE SWALLOW	Tachycineta inalassina Tachycineta bioglar
В	1/8431	NM	IREE SWALLOW	Tacnýcineta bicolor
В	1/8430		BANK SWALLOW	Riparia riparia
В	1/8443	NM	NORTHERN ROUGH-WINGED SWALLOW	Stelgidopteryx serripennis
В	1/8448	NM	BARN SWALLOW	Hirundo rustica
В	1/8455	NM	CLIFF SWALLOW	Petrochelidon pyrrhonota
В	178460	NM	CAVE SWALLOW	Petrochelidon fulva
В	178464	NM	PURPLE MARTIN	Progne subis
В	178499	СО	SPRAGUE'S PIPIT	Anthus spragueii
В	178511	NM	NORTHERN SHRIKE	Lanius excubitor
В	178515	NM	LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE	Lanius ludovicianus
В	178529	CO	BOHEMIAN WAXWING	Bombycilla garrulus
В	178532	CO	CEDAR WAXWING	Bombycilla cedrorum
В	178536	NM	AMERICAN DIPPER	Cinclus mexicanus
В	178541	NM	HOUSE WREN	Troglodytes aedon
В	178547	NV	WINTER WREN	Troglodytes troglodytes
В	178562	NM	BEWICK'S WREN	Thryomanes bewickii
В	178581	CO	CAROLINA WREN	Thryothorus ludovicianus
В	178587	AZ	CACTUS WREN	Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus
В	178605	CO	SEDGE WREN	Cistothorus platensis
В	178608	NM	MARSH WREN	Cistothorus palustris
В	178610	NM	CANYON WREN	Catherpes mexicanus
В	178614	NM	ROCK WREN	Salpinctes obsoletus
В	178620	NM	NORTHERN MOCKINGBIRD	Mimus polyglottos
В	178625	NM	GRAY CATBIRD	Dumetella carolinensis
В	178627	CO	BROWN THRASHER	Toxostoma rufum
В	178636	NM	BENDIRE'S THRASHER	Toxostoma bendirei
В	178637	NM	CURVE-BILLED THRASHER	Toxostoma curvirostre
В	178645	AZ	LE CONTE'S THRASHER	Toxostoma lecontei
В	178652	AZ	CRISSAL THRASHER	Toxostoma crissale
В	178654	NM	SAGE THRASHER	Oreoscoptes montanus
В	178759	AZ	VERDIN	Auriparus flaviceps
В	178764	NM	BUSHTIT	Psaltriparus minimus
В	178775	NM	WHITE-BREASTED NUTHATCH	Sitta carolinensis
В	178784	NM	RED-BREASTED NUTHATCH	Sitta canadensis
В	178788	NM	PYGMY NUTHATCH	Sitta pygmaea
В	178803	NM	BROWN CREEPER	Certhia americana
В	178841	AZ	RUFOUS-CAPPED WARBLER*	Basileuterus rufifrons
В	178844	CO	BLACK-AND-WHITE WARBLER	Mniotilta varia

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Gloup		State		
B	178855	CO	TENNESSEE WARDLER	Vermiyora peregrina
B	178856	NM	OR ANGE-CROWNED WARBLER	Vermivora celata
B	178861	NV	NASHVILLE WADDLED	Vermivora cettua
D	170001	IN V NIM	VIDCINIA'S WADDIED	Vermivora vincipita
D	170066		LUCV'S WADDLED	Vermivora virginiae
D	170000	AZ	OLIVE WARDLER	Poucodramus taonistus
D	170074	AL NM	VELLOW WARDLER	Penduciaa potoshia
D	1700/0	NIM	TELLOW WARDLER	Denaroica perecita
D	170000	NIVI	I ELLOW-RUMPED WARDLER	Denaroica coronata
D	170007	INIVI	DLACK-INKOATED GRAT WARDLER	Denaroica nigrescens
D	178002	NIVI	IOWNSEND'S WARDLER	Denaroica iownsenai Dun lucius così duntalis
В	178902		HERMIT WARBLER	Denaroica occidentalis
В	178909	NM	GRACE'S WARBLER	Denaroica graciae
В	178913	00	BLACKPOLL WARBLER	Denaroica striata
В	1/8918	00	PRAIRIE WARBLER	Dendroica discolor
В	1/8921	0	PALM WARBLER	Dendroica palmarum
В	178927	0	OVENBIRD	Seiurus aurocapillus
В	178931	NM	NORTHERN WATERTHRUSH	Seiurus noveboracensis
В	178940	NM	MACGILLIVRAY'S WARBLER	Oporornis tolmiei
В	178944	NM	COMMON YELLOWTHROAT	Geothlypis trichas
В	178964	NM	YELLOW-BREASTED CHAT	Icteria virens
В	178970	AZ	RED-FACED WARBLER	Cardellina rubrifrons
В	178973	NM	WILSON'S WARBLER	Wilsonia pusilla
В	178979	СО	AMERICAN REDSTART	Setophaga ruticilla
В	178986	AZ	PAINTED REDSTART	Myioborus pictus
В	178997	AZ	HUTTON'S VIREO	Vireo huttoni
В	179003	AZ	BELL'S VIREO	Vireo bellii
В	179008	NM	GRAY VIREO	Vireo vicinior
В	179021	CO	RED-EYED VIREO	Vireo olivaceus
В	179023	NM	WARBLING VIREO	Vireo gilvus
В	179032	CO	BOBOLINK	Dolichonyx oryzivorus
В	179034	NM	EASTERN MEADOWLARK	Sturnella magna
В	179039	NM	WESTERN MEADOWLARK	Sturnella neglecta
В	179043	NM	YELLOW-HEADED BLACKBIRD	Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus
В	179045	NM	RED-WINGED BLACKBIRD	Agelaius phoeniceus
В	179060	NV	TRICOLORED BLACKBIRD	Agelaius tricolor
В	179064	CO	ORCHARD ORIOLE	Icterus spurius
В	179070	AZ	HOODED ORIOLE	Icterus cucullatus
В	179079	AZ	STREAK-BACKED ORIOLE	Icterus pustulatus
В	179082	NM	SCOTT'S ORIOLE	Icterus parisorum
В	179083	CO	BALTIMORE ORIOLE	Icterus galbula
В	179094	NM	BREWER'S BLACKBIRD	Euphagus cyanocephalus
В	179104	CO	COMMON GRACKLE	Quiscalus quiscula
В	179109	NM	GREAT-TAILED GRACKLE	Quiscalus mexicanus
В	179112	NM	BROWN-HEADED COWBIRD	Molothrus ater
В	179116	AZ	BRONZED COWBIRD	Molothrus aeneus
В	179124	AZ	NORTHERN CARDINAL	Cardinalis cardinalis
В	179132	AZ	PYRRHULOXIA	Cardinalis sinuatus
В	179139	NM	ROSE-BREASTED GROSBEAK	Pheucticus ludovicianus

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
В	179140	NM	BLACK-HEADED GROSBEAK	Pheucticus melanocephalus
В	179145	NM	BLUE GROSBEAK	Guiraca caerulea
В	179150	NM	INDIGO BUNTING	Passerina cyanea
В	179151	NM	LAZULI BUNTING	Passerina amoena
В	179152	AZ	VARIED BUNTING	Passerina versicolor
В	179156	NM	PAINTED BUNTING	Passerina ciris
В	179165	СО	DICKCISSEL	Spiza americana
В	179173	NM	EVENING GROSBEAK	Coccothraustes vespertinus
В	179186	NV	PURPLE FINCH	Carpodacus purpureus
В	179190	NM	CASSIN'S FINCH	Carpodacus cassinii
В	179191	NM	HOUSE FINCH	Carpodacus mexicanus
В	179205	NM	PINE GROSBEAK	Pinicola enucleator
В	179215	NV	GRAY-CROWNED ROSY-FINCH	Leucosticte tephrocotis
В	179222	UT	BLACK ROSY-FINCH	Leucosticte atrata
В	179223	СО	BROWN-CAPPED ROSY-FINCH	Leucosticte australis
В	179230	СО	COMMON REDPOLL	Carduelis flammea
В	179232	AZ	LAWRENCE'S GOLDFINCH	Carduelis lawrencei
В	179233	NM	PINE SISKIN	Carduelis pinus
В	179234	NM	LESSER GOLDFINCH	Carduelis psaltria
В	179236	NM	AMERICAN GOLDFINCH	Carduelis tristis
В	179259	NM	RED CROSSBILL	Loxia curvirostra
B	179268	UT	WHITE-WINGED CROSSBILL	Loxia leucoptera
В	179293	NM	CANYON TOWHEE	Pipilo fuscus
B	179307	AZ	ABERT'S TOWHEE	Pipilo aberti
B	179310	NM	GREEN-TAILED TOWHEE	Pipilo chlorurus
B	179312	CO	LARK BUNTING	Calamospiza melanocorvs
B	179314	NM	SAVANNAH SPARROW	Passerculus sandwichensis
B	179333	NM	GRASSHOPPER SPARROW	Ammodramus savannarum
B	179339	NM	BAIRD'S SPARROW	Ammodramus bairdii
B	179345	CO	LE CONTE'S SPARROW	Ammodramus leconteii
B	179366	NM	VESPER SPARROW	Pooecetes gramineus
B	179371	NM	LARK SPARROW	Chondestes grammacus
B	179375	AZ	RUFOUS-WINGED SPARROW	Aimonhila carpalis
B	179377	NM	RUFOUS-CROWNED SPARROW	Aimophila ruficeps
B	179390	AZ	BOTTERI'S SPARROW	Aimophila botterii
B	179393	NM	CASSIN'S SPARROW	Aimophila cassinii
B	179395	AZ	BLACK-THROATED SPARROW	Amphispiza bilineata
B	179402	NM	SAGE SPARROW	Amphispiza belli
B	179410	NM	DARK-EYED JUNCO	Junco hvemalis
B	179427	AZ	YELLOW-EYED JUNCO	Junco phaeonotus
B	179432	NM	AMERICAN TREE SPARROW	Snizella arborea
B	179435	NM	CHIPPING SPARROW	Spizella passerina
– B	179439	NM	CLAY-COLORED SPARROW	Spizella pallida
B	179440	NM	BREWER'S SPARROW	Spizella breweri
B	179443	CO	FIELD SPARROW	Spizella pusilla
B	179448	AZ	BLACK-CHINNED SPARROW	Spizella atrogularis
B	179454	CO	HARRIS'S SPARROW	Zonotrichia averula
B	179455	NM	WHITE-CROWNED SPAPROW	Zonotrichia leuconhrus
D	1,7455	1 4141		zonomenia icacopinys

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
В	179461	NV	GOLDEN-CROWNED SPARROW	Zonotrichia atricapilla
В	179462	NM	WHITE-THROATED SPARROW	Zonotrichia albicollis
В	179464	NM	FOX SPARROW	Passerella iliaca
В	179484	NM	LINCOLN'S SPARROW	Melospiza lincolnii
В	179488	NM	SWAMP SPARROW	Melospiza georgiana
В	179492	NM	SONG SPARROW	Melospiza melodia
В	179525	СО	MCCOWN'S LONGSPUR	Calcarius mccownii
В	179526	СО	LAPLAND LONGSPUR	Calcarius lapponicus
В	179530	NM	CHESTNUT-COLLARED LONGSPUR	Calcarius ornatus
В	179532	UT	SNOW BUNTING	Plectrophenax nivalis
B	179628	NM	HOUSE SPARROW	Passer domesticus
B	179637	NM	EUROPEAN STARLING	Sturnus vulgaris
B	179667	NM	GRAY JAY	Perisoreus canadensis
B	179680	CO	BLUE JAY	Cvanocitta cristata
B	179685	NM	STELLER'S IAY	Cvanocitta stelleri
B	179707	47	MEXICAN IAY	Aphelocoma ultramarina
B	179720	NM	BLACK-BILLED MAGPIE	Pica hudsonia
B	179725	NM	COMMON RAVEN	Corvus corax
B	179730	NM	CHIHUAHUAN RAVEN	Corvus cryptoleucus
B	179731	NM	AMERICAN CROW	Corvus brachyrchos
B	170748	NM		Corrus brachymynchos
B	170750	NM		Nucifrana columbiana
B	179750	NM	AMERICAN ROBIN	Turdus migratorius
B	170773	NV	VADIED THDUSH	Turaus magraiorius
B	170777	CO	WOOD THRUSH	Hylocichla musteling
B	170770	NM	HEDMIT THRUSH	Catharus auttatus
B	170788	NM	SWAINSON'S THRUSH	Catharus ustulatus
B	170703	CO	GPAV CHEEKED THRUSH	Catharus minimus
B	170706	C0	VEEDV	Catharus fuscescens
B	170801	NM	EASTEDN BI LIERIND	Sialia sialis
D	170806	NM		Sialia merioana
D	170011	NM		Sialia aumuooidee
D	170924	NM	TOWNSEND'S SOLITAIDE	Mua dastas tournaan di
B	170853	NM	BLUE GDAV GNATCATCHED	Poliontila caerulea
B	179855	1111	BLOE-GRAT GNATCATCHER	Polioptila melanura
B	170863	AZ	BLACK-TAILED GNATCATCHER*	Polioptila nigricans
D	170965	AL NM	GOLDEN CROWNED VINCLET	Populus saturana
D	170870	NM	DUDY CDOWNED VINCLET	Regulus salandula
D	170877	NM	RUBI-CROWNED RINGLEI	Regulus calenaula
D	170992	NM	WESTEDN TANACED	Pinanag ludoviciang
D	170994	NM	HEDATIC TANAGER	Piranga flava
В	170000	NIM	SUMMED TANAGED	i nungu juwa Piranga rubra
В	1/2000		ELAME COLODED TANACED*	i tranga ravia Piranga hidantata
В	55/027	AL NV	CLARK'S CRERE	A achmonhorus alarkii
В	554027	1 1 1	EIVE STRIDED SDARDOW	Aimophila quinquestriete
B	554030	AL NM	AMEDICAN DIDIT	Anthus rubescens
D D	554127	INIVI	AWERICAN FITI	Anthus rubescens
D D	554128	INIVI	WESTERN SCRUDJAT	Apheiocoma caujornica
В	554135	INIM	GKEA1 EGKE1	Ardea alba

Taxon Group	ITIS	Lead State	Common Name	Scientific Name
^				
В	554137	AZ	GRAY HAWK	Asturina nitida
В	554139	NM	JUNIPER TITMOUSE	Baeolophus ridgwayi
В	554141	AZ	BRIDLED TITMOUSE	Baeolophus wollweberi
В	554145	СО	STILT SANDPIPER	Calidris himantopus
В	554146	AZ	CRESTED CARACARA	Caracara plancus
В	554221	NM	OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER	Contopus cooperi
В	554254	NM	HAMMOND'S FLYCATCHER	Empidonax hammondii
В	554255	NM	CORDILLERAN FLYCATCHER	Empidonax occidentalis
В	554256	NM	HORNED LARK	Eremophila alpestris
В	554267	NM	BULLOCK'S ORIOLE	Icterus bullockii
В	554268	NM	MISSISSIPPI KITE	Ictinia mississippiensis
В	554375	AZ	NEOTROPIC CORMORANT	Phalacrocorax brasilianus
В	554376	СО	RED PHALAROPE	Phalaropus fulicaria
В	554380	NM	SPOTTED TOWHEE	Pipilo maculatus
В	554382	СО	BLACK-CAPPED CHICKADEE	Poecile atricapilla
В	554385	NM	MOUNTAIN CHICKADEE	Poecile gambeli
В	554388	AZ	MEXICAN CHICKADEE	Poecile sclateri
В	554456	NV	CASSIN'S VIREO	Vireo cassinii
B	554477	NM	PLUMBEOUS VIREO	Vireo plumbeus
B	555388	AZ	WESTERN SCREECH-OWL	Otus kennicottii
B	555544	NM	COMMON POOR WILL	Phalaenoptilus nuttallii
M	-3	NM	ARIZONA MYOTIS	Myotis occultus
M	179921	CO	VIRGINIA OPOSSUM	Didelnhis viroiniana
M	179929	C0	MASKED SHREW	Sorex cinereus
M	179932	UT	VAGRANT SHREW	Sorex vagrans
M	179933	NM	NORTHERN WATER SHREW	Sorex vagrans
M	179939	Δ7	ARIZONA SHREW	Sorex prinsins
M	179946	CO	PYGMY SHREW	Sorex havi
M	179949	NM	MERRIAM'S SHREW	Sorex merriami
M	179950	NM	MONTANE SHREW	Sorar monticolus
M	179951	NM	DWARE SHREW	Sorar nanus
M	179954	UT	PREBLE'S SHREW	Sorar preblei
M	179955	NV	INVO SHREW	Sorex predier
M	179956	NV	TROWBRIDGE'S SHREW	Sorex trowbridgii
M	179969	CO	FLUOT'S SHORT-TAILED SHREW	Blarina hylophaga
M	179971	C0	I FAST SHREW	Cryptotis parva
M	179973	NM	DESERT SHREW	Notiosorex crawfordi
M	170070	CO	FASTERN MOLE	Scalopus aquaticus
M	170081	NV	BROAD FOOTED MOLE	Scanopus latimanus
M	170088	NM	LITTLE BROWN BAT	Mustis lucifucus
M	170000	NM	LONG LEGGED MYOTIS	Myotis volans
M	170001	NM	CALIFORNIA MVOTIS	Myous vouns Myotis californicus
M	170002	Δ7	SOUTHWESTERN MYOTIS	Myons cunjornicus Myotis auriculus
M	170005	NM	LONG-FARED MYOTIS	Myotis auticulus
M	170000	CO	WESTERN SMALL FOOTED MVOTIS	Myous evous Myotis laihii
M	180002	NM	FRINGED MYOTIS	Myous iciou Myotis thysanodas
M	180002	NM	CAVE MYOTIS	Myous mysanoues Myotis velifer
M	180003	NM		Myous veujer Myotis yumanansis
111	180004	INIVI		wiyous yumanensis

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
М	180006	NM	PALLID BAT	Antrozous pallidus
М	180008	NM	BIG BROWN BAT	Eptesicus fuscus
М	180010	UT	SPOTTED BAT	Euderma maculatum
М	180012	AZ	ALLEN'S BIG-EARED BAT	Idionycteris phyllotis
М	180014	NM	SILVER-HAIRED BAT	Lasionycteris noctivagans
М	180016	UT	WESTERN RED BAT	Lasiurus blossevillii
М	180017	NM	HOARY BAT	Lasiurus cinereus
М	180018	AZ	SOUTHERN YELLOW BAT	Lasiurus ega
М	180024	NM	WESTERN PIPISTRELLE	Pipistrellus hesperus
М	180062	AZ	MEXICAN LONG-TONGUED BAT	Choeronycteris mexicana
М	180068	NM	MEXICAN LONG-NOSED BAT	Leptonycteris nivalis
М	180071	AZ	CALIFORNIA LEAF-NOSED BAT	Macrotus californicus
М	180080	AZ	WESTERN MASTIFF BAT	Eumops perotis
М	180081	AZ	UNDERWOOD'S MASTIFF BAT	Eumops underwoodi
М	180085	AZ	POCKETED FREE-TAILED BAT	Nyctinomops femorosaccus
М	180086	NM	BIG FREE-TAILED BAT	Nyctinomops macrotis
М	180088	NM	BRAZILIAN FREE-TAILED BAT	Tadarida brasiliensis
М	180103	NM	NINE-BANDED ARMADILLO	Dasypus novemcinctus
М	180109	СО	AMERICAN PIKA	Ochotona princeps
М	180112	CO	SNOWSHOE HARE	Lepus americanus
М	180114	AZ	ANTELOPE JACK RABBIT	Lepus alleni
М	180115	NM	BLACK-TAILED JACK RABBIT	Lepus californicus
М	180116	NM	WHITE-SIDED JACK RABBIT	Lepus callotis
М	180118	NM	WHITE-TAILED JACK RABBIT	Lepus townsendii
М	180122	NM	DESERT COTTONTAIL	Sylvilagus audubonii
М	180124	NM	EASTERN COTTONTAIL	Sylvilagus floridanus
М	180126	NM	MOUNTAIN COTTONTAIL	Sylvilagus nuttallii
М	180133	NV	MOUNTAIN BEAVER	Aplodontia rufa
М	180140	NM	YELLOW-BELLIED MARMOT	Marmota flaviventris
М	180147	UT	UINTA GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus armatus
М	180148	NV	CALIFORNIA GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus beecheyi
М	180149	NV	BELDING'S GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus beldingi
М	180152	CO	WYOMING GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus elegans
М	180154	NM	GOLDEN-MANTLED GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus lateralis
М	180155	NM	MEXICAN GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus mexicanus
М	180159	NM	SPOTTED GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus spilosoma
М	180160	AZ	ROUND-TAILED GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus tereticaudus
М	180161	NV	TOWNSEND'S GROUND SQUIRREL*	Spermophilus townsendii
М	180162	СО	THIRTEEN-LINED GROUND SQUIRREL	Spermophilus tridecemlineatus
М	180163	NM	ROCK SQUIRREL	Spermophilus variegatus
М	180166	NM	RED SQUIRREL	Tamiasciurus hudsonicus
М	180167	NV	DOUGLAS' SQUIRREL	Tamiasciurus douglasii
М	180169	UT	NORTHERN FLYING SQUIRREL	Glaucomys sabrinus
М	180172	CO	FOX SQUIRREL	Sciurus niger
М	180173	NM	ABERT'S SQUIRREL	Sciurus aberti
М	180174	AZ	ARIZONA GRAY SQUIRREL	Sciurus arizonensis
М	180176	NV	WESTERN GRAY SQUIRREL	Sciurus griseus
М	180177	AZ	NAYARIT SQUIRREL	Sciurus nayaritensis

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
М	180179	47	HARRIS' ANTELOPE SOUIRREI	Ammospermonhilus harrisii
M	180180	NM	TEXAS ANTELOPE SOURREL	Ammospermophilus interpres
M	180181	NM	WHITE-TAILED ANTELOPE SOUIRREL	Ammospermophilus leucurus
M	180184	NM	GUNNISON'S PRAIRIE DOG	Cynomys gunnisoni
M	180185	CO	WHITE-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG	Cynomys leucurus
M	180186	C0	BLACK-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG	Cynomys ludovicianus
M	180187	UT	LITAH PRAIRIE DOG	Cynomys natvidens
M	180190	NV	VELLOW-PINE CHIPMUNK	Cynomys parviaens Tamias amoenus
M	180191	NM	GRAY-FOOTED CHIPMUNK	Tamias canines
M	180192	Δ7	GRAV-COLLARED CHIPMUNK	Tamias cinereicollis
M	180192	NM	CLIEF CHIPMINK	Tamias dorsalis
M	180195	NM		Tamias uorsans
M	190109	NIV	DALMED'S CHIDMUNK	Tamias nalmori
IVI M	180100	IN V	PALMER 5 CHIFMONK	Tamias paimen
IVI M	180200		LONG EARED CHIDMUNK	Tamias panamininus
M	180200	NV	LONG-EARED CHIPMUNK	Tamias quadrimaculatus
M	180201			Tamias quadrivittatus
M	180203	NV	ALLEN'S CHIPMUNK	Tamias senex
M	180206	NV	LODGEPOLE CHIPMUNK	Tamias speciosus
М	180208	NV	TOWNSEND'S CHIPMUNK*	Tamias townsendii
М	180209	NV	UINTA CHIPMUNK	Tamias umbrinus
М	180212	NM	BEAVER	Castor canadensis
М	180215	NM	DESERT POCKET GOPHER	Geomys arenarius
М	180216	CO	PLAINS POCKET GOPHER	Geomys bursarius
М	180220	NM	YELLOW-FACED POCKET GOPHER	Pappogeomys castanops
М	180222	NM	BOTTA'S POCKET GOPHER	Thomomys bottae
М	180225	UT	IDAHO POCKET GOPHER	Thomomys idahoensis
М	180227	NV	MOUNTAIN POCKET GOPHER	Thomomys monticola
М	180228	NM	NORTHERN POCKET GOPHER	Thomomys talpoides
М	180229	NV	TOWNSEND'S POCKET GOPHER	Thomomys townsendii
М	180230	AZ	SOUTHERN POCKET GOPHER	Thomomys umbrinus
М	180236	UT	DESERT KANGAROO RAT	Dipodomys deserti
М	180241	NM	MERRIAM'S KANGAROO RAT	Dipodomys merriami
М	180242	UT	CHISEL-TOOTHED KANGAROO RAT	Dipodomys microps
М	180244	NM	ORD'S KANGAROO RAT	Dipodomys ordii
М	180245	NV	PANAMINT KANGAROO RAT	Dipodomys panamintinus
М	180246	NM	BANNER-TAILED KANGAROO RAT	Dipodomys spectabilis
М	180252	NV	DARK KANGAROO MOUSE	Microdipodops megacephalus
М	180253	NV	PALE KANGAROO MOUSE	Microdipodops pallidus
М	180256	AZ	ARIZONA POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus amplus
М	180260	CO	OLIVE-BACKED POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus fasciatus
М	180261	NM	PLAINS POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus flavescens
М	180262	NM	SILKY POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus flavus
М	180267	NV	LITTLE POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus longimembris
М	180269	NV	GREAT BASIN POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus parvus
М	180276	NM	DEER MOUSE	Peromyscus maniculatus
М	180278	NM	WHITE-FOOTED MOUSE	Peromyscus leucopus
М	180282	NM	BRUSH MOUSE	Peromyscus boylii
М	180284	AZ	CANYON MOUSE	Peromyscus crinitus
				•

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
М	180286	17	CACTUS MOUSE	Daromysque aramique
M	180280	AZ	BLACK-FARED MOUSE*	Peromyscus melanotis
M	180287	AZ	MERRIAM'S MOUSE	Peromyscus meriami
M	180289	NM	WHITE-ANKI ED MOUSE	Peromyscus nectoralis
M	180207	NM	PINON MOUSE	Peromyscus truei
M	180294	NM	SOUTHERN RED-BACKED VOLE	Clethrionomys ganneri
M	180294	CO	MEADOW VOLE	Microtus pannsylvanicus
M	180299	NM	LONG-TAILED VOLE	Microtus Iongicaudus
M	180310	NM	MONTANE VOLE	Microtus montanus
M	180312	CO	PRAIRIE VOLE	Microtus achrogaster
M	180315	UT	WATER VOLE	Microtus vichardsoni
M	180318	NM	MUSKRAT	Ondatra zibethicus
M	180341	AZ	FULVOUS HARVEST MOUSE	Reithrodontomys fulvescens
M	180343	NM	WESTERN HARVEST MOUSE	Reithrodontomys megalotis
M	180344	NM	PLAINS HARVEST MOUSE	Reithrodontomys montanus
M	180347	AZ	ARIZONA COTTON RAT	Sigmodon arizonae
M	180348	AZ	TAWNY-BELLIED COTTON RAT	Sigmodon fulviventer
M	180349	A7	HISPID COTTON RAT	Sigmodon hispidus
M	180350	A7	VELLOW-NOSED COTTON RAT	Sigmodon achrograthus
M	180359	CO	HEATHER VOLE	Phenacomys intermedius
M	180366	NM	HOUSE MOUSE	Mus musculus
M	180368	AZ	NORTHERN PYGMY MOUSE	Rajomys taylori
M	180370	NM	WHITE-THROATED WOODRAT	Neotoma albigula
M	180371	NM	BUSHY-TAILED WOODRAT	Neotoma cinerea
M	180372	CO	FASTERN WOODRAT	Neotoma floridana
M	180374	NV	DESERT WOODRAT	Neotoma lenida
М	180375	NM	MEXICAN WOODRAT	Neotoma mexicana
М	180376	NM	SOUTHERN PLAINS WOODRAT	Neotoma micropus
М	180377	AZ	STEPHENS' WOODRAT	Neotoma stephensi
М	180381	NM	MEARNS' GRASSHOPPER MOUSE	Onychomys arenicola
М	180382	NM	NORTHERN GRASSHOPPER MOUSE	Onychomys leucogaster
М	180383	AZ	SOUTHERN GRASSHOPPER MOUSE	Onvchomvs torridus
М	180386	СО	MEADOW JUMPING MOUSE	Zapus hudsonius
М	180387	NM	WESTERN JUMPING MOUSE	Zapus princeps
М	180393	NM	PORCUPINE	Erethizon dorsatum
М	180543	СО	BROWN BEAR	Ursus arctos
М	180544	NM	AMERICAN BLACK BEAR	Ursus americanus
М	180549	СО	RIVER OTTER	Lontra canadensis
М	180551	СО	WOLVERINE	Gulo gulo
М	180553	СО	MINK	Mustela vison
М	180555	UT	ERMINE	Mustela erminea
М	180556	NM	LONG-TAILED WEASEL	Mustela frenata
М	180557	СО	BLACK-FOOTED FERRET	Mustela nigripes
М	180559	СО	MARTEN	Martes americana
М	180560	UT	FISHER	Martes pennanti
М	180562	NM	STRIPED SKUNK	Mephitis mephitis
М	180563	AZ	HOODED SKUNK	Mephitis macroura
М	180565	NM	BADGER	Taxidea taxus

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
М	180568	AZ	HOG-NOSED SKUNK	Conepatus mesoleucus
M	180570	CO	EASTERN SPOTTED SKUNK	Spilogale putorius
M	180575	NM	RACCOON	Procyon lotor
M	180577	NM	RINGTAIL	Bassariscus astutus
M	180582	NM	BOBCAT	Lynx rufus
М	180585	CO	LYNX	Lynx canadensis
М	180593	NM	JAGUAR	Panthera onca
М	180596	СО	GRAY WOLF	Canis lupus
М	180599	NM	COYOTE	Canis latrans
М	180604	NM	RED FOX	Vulpes vulpes
М	180606	СО	KIT FOX	Vulpes macrotis
М	180607	СО	SWIFT FOX	Vulpes velox
М	180609	NM	GRAY FOX	Urocyon cinereoargenteus
М	180695	NM	WAPITI	Cervus elaphus
М	180698	NM	MULE DEER	Odocoileus hemionus
М	180699	NM	WHITE-TAILED DEER	Odocoileus virginianus
М	180703	UT	MOOSE	Alces alces
М	180711	NM	BIGHORN SHEEP	Ovis canadensis
М	180713	CO	MOUNTAIN GOAT	Oreamnos americanus
М	180717	NM	PRONGHORN	Antilocapra americana
М	180719	NM	BARBARY SHEEP	Ammotragus lervia
М	203452	NM	TOWNSEND'S BIG-EARED BAT	Corynorhinus townsendii
М	203618	CO	BISON	Bos bison
М	552462	AZ	WHITE-NOSED COATI	Nasua narica
М	552464	AZ	SOUTHERN LONG-NOSED BAT	Leptonycteris curasoae
М	552466	UT	WESTERN SPOTTED SKUNK	Spilogale gracilis
М	552470	AZ	OCELOT*	Leopardus pardalis
М	552479	CO	MOUNTAIN LION	Puma concolor
М	552480	NM	MOGOLLON VOLE	Microtus mogollonensis
М	552482	NV	LONG-TAILED POCKET MOUSE	Chaetodipus formosus
М	552483	NM	HISPID POCKET MOUSE	Chaetodipus hispidus
М	552484	AZ	ROCK POCKET MOUSE	Chaetodipus intermedius
M	552486	AZ	DESERT POCKET MOUSE	Chaetodipus penicillatus
M	552487	AZ	SPINY POCKET MOUSE*	Chaetodipus spinatus
M	552488	NM	MERRIAM'S POCKET MOUSE	Perognathus merriami
M	552490	NV	SAGEBRUSH VOLE	Lemmiscus curtatus
M	552494		ARIZONA WOODRAT	Neotoma devia
M	552495	NM	DOCK MOUSE	Peromyscus gratus
M	552490	NIV	MEDDIAM'S COOLIND SOLIDDEL	Spormonkilus canus
M	552499		HODI CHIPMI NK	Spermophuus cunus Tamias rufus
M	552503	UT	PILITE GROUND SOUIRREI	ramas rajas Spermophilus mollis
M	552512	NM	EASTERN RED BAT	Lasiurus horealis
M	552512	AZ	BAILEY'S POCKET MOUSE	Chaetodinus bailevi
M	552520	NV	PYGMY RABBIT	Brachylagus idahoensis
M	552761	AZ	COLLARED PECCARY	Pecari tajacu
М	555657	NM	NEW MEXICO SHREW	Sorex neomexicanus

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
М	555658	NM	DAVIS MOUNTAIN COTTONTAIL	Silvilagus robustus
M	625180	NM	ORYX	Orvy gazella
R	-1	CO	TRIPLOID CHECKERED WHIPTAIL	Cremidonhorus neotesselatus
D	172752	NM		Chaludag as manting
к	173752	NM CO	SNAPPING TURTLE	Chelyara serpentina
к	1/3/00	17	YELLOW MUD TURTLE	Kinosternon flavescens
к D	172774	AL	SONOKAN MUD TURTLE	Kinosiernon sonoriense
к D	172779		OPNATE DOX TUDTLE	Clemmys marmorala
к D	1/3//6	NIM		Chrusennus nista
К D	1732010	NM		Trachemus serinta
К D	172856		DESERT TOPTOISE	Conhomus agagizii
К D	173850	NM	EASTEDN EENCE LIZADD	Soolonomus un dulatus
К D	173869		CLADV'S SDINVLIZADD	Sceloporus alarkii
К D	173808	AL NM	CLARR 5 SFINT LIZARD	Sceloporus cuarku
К D	173870		VADDOW'S SDINV LIZADD	Sceloporus graciosus
к D	172072	AZ	I ARROW S SPINT LIZARD	Sceloporus jurrovii Sceloporus magistar
к D	172075	AZ	WESTERN EENCE LIZARD	Sceloporus mugister
к D	172070	NM	WESTERN FENCE LIZARD	Sceloporus occidentatis
к D	172870		DUNCH CRASS LIZARD	Sceloporus poinseitu
К D	172001	AZ	STDIDED DI ATEAULUZADD	Sceloporus virgatus
к D	172006	AL	ZEDDA TAILED LIZADD	Sceloporus Virgalus
к D	172010		CREATED EADLESS LIZADD	Cantisaurus araconoides
к D	172012	NIM	COLLARED LIZARD	Coprosaurus texanus
к D	172021		COLLARED LIZARD	Dingga gunua dangalia
К D	173921	AL CO	LONG NOSED LEODADD LIZADD	Cambalia wielizanii
К D	173924	NM	LONG-NOSED LEOFARD LIZARD	Gambella wisilzenii
R D	173038	CO	TEVAS HOPNED LIZARD	Phromosoma cornutum
R D	1730/1	47		Phrynosoma mogilii
R	173941	NM	ROUND-TAILED HORNED LIZARD	Phrynosoma medastum
R	1739/3	NV	DESERT HORNED LIZARD	Phrynosoma nlatyrhinos
R	173944	47	REGAL HORNED LIZARD	Phrynosoma solare
R	1730/0	AZ	COLORADO DESERT ERINGE-TOED	I mynosoma solare Uma notata
R	175747	112	LIZARD	Oma notata
R	173950	AZ	MOJAVE FRINGE-TOED LIZARD	Uma scoparia
R	173952	AZ	LONG-TAILED BRUSH LIZARD	Urosaurus graciosus
R	173954	AZ	TREE LIZARD	Urosaurus ornatus
R	173956	NM	SIDE-BLOTCHED LIZARD	Uta stansburiana
R	173964	AZ	MOUNTAIN SKINK	Eumeces callicephalus
R	173966	NV	GILBERT'S SKINK	Eumeces gilberti
R	173967	NM	MANY-LINED SKINK	Eumeces multivirgatus
R	173968	NM	GREAT PLAINS SKINK	Eumeces obsoletus
R	173970	NV	WESTERN SKINK	Eumeces skiltonianus
R	173971	NM	FOUR-LINED SKINK	Eumeces tetragrammus
R	174014	CO	SIX-LINED RACERUNNER	Cnemidophorus sexlineatus
R	174015	AZ	CANYON SPOTTED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus burti
R	174016	NM	GRAY-CHECKERED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus dixoni
R	174017	NM	CHIHUAHUAN SPOTTED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus exsanguis
R	174018	AZ	GILA SPOTTED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus flagellicaudus

Taxon	ITIS	Lead	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
D	174010	NM	TEYAS SPOTTED WHIDTAIL	Cromidophorus gularis
R P	174019	1111	LITTLE STRIDED WHITTAIL	Chemidophorus guiaris
R P	174021	NM	NEW MEXICO WHIDTAIL	Chemidophorus normatus
К D	174024		NEW MEARCO WHIFTAIL	Chemidophorus neomexicanus
К D	174025	AL CO	CHECKEDED WHIDTAIL	Chemidophorus tosseletus
К D	174020	NM	TEXAS DANDED GECKO	Colorny bravis
К D	174038		WESTERN BANDED GECKO	Coleonyx brevis
К D	174041	AL	DESERT NIGHT LIZADD	Vantusia viailis
К D	174092		CIL A MONSTER	Haladarma suspectum
К D	174113	AL NM	COMMON CAPTED SNAKE	Thempophie sizedie
К D	174130	NIV	WESTEDN AQUATIC CADTED SNAKE	Thampophis souchii
К D	174140	NM	DI ACV NECVED GADTED SNAKE	Thampophis couchi Thampophis autopsis
К D	174141	NM	WESTEDN TEDDESTDIAL CADTED	Thampophis clogans
ĸ	1/4142	INIVI	SNAKE	Inamnophis elegans
R	174143	AZ	MEXICAN GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis eques
R	174144	NM	CHECKERED GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis marcianus
R	174146	NM	WESTERN RIBBON SNAKE	Thamnophis proximus
R	174147	CO	PLAINS GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis radix
R	174148	AZ	NARROW-HEADED GARTER SNAKE	Thamnophis rufipunctatus
R	174155	NM	WESTERN HOG-NOSED SNAKE	Heterodon nasicus
R	174158	NM	RING-NECKED SNAKE	Diadophis punctatus
R	174169	NM	RACER	Coluber constrictor
R	174175	NM	CORN SNAKE	Elaphe guttata
R	174187	NM	MILK SNAKE	Lampropeltis triangulum
R	174192	AZ	SONORAN MOUNTAIN KINGSNAKE	Lampropeltis pyromelana
R	174202	NM	GLOSSY SNAKE	Arizona elegans
R	174210	AZ	BANDED SAND SNAKE	Chilomeniscus cinctus
R	174212	AZ	WESTERN SHOVEL-NOSED SNAKE	Chionactis occipitalis
R	174213	AZ	SONORAN SHOVEL-NOSED SNAKE	Chionactis palarostris
R	174230	NM	WESTERN HOOK-NOSED SNAKE	Gyalopion canum
R	174233	NM	NIGHT SNAKE	Hypsiglena torquata
R	174237	AZ	SONORAN WHIPSNAKE	Masticophis bilineatus
R	174238	NM	COACHWHIP	Masticophis flagellum
R	174240	NM	STRIPED WHIPSNAKE	Masticophis taeniatus
R	174244	NM	PLAIN-BELLIED WATER SNAKE	Nerodia erythrogaster
R	174251	CO	NORTHERN WATER SNAKE	Nerodia sipedon
R	174258	AZ	BROWN VINE SNAKE	Oxybelis aeneus
R	174260	AZ	SADDLED LEAF-NOSED SNAKE	Phyllorhynchus browni
R	174261	AZ	SPOTTED LEAF-NOSED SNAKE	Phyllorhynchus decurtatus
R	174267	NM	LONG-NOSED SNAKE	Rhinocheilus lecontei
R	174269	NM	BIG BEND PATCH-NOSED SNAKE*	Salvadora deserticola
R	174270	NM	MOUNTAIN PATCH-NOSED SNAKE	Salvadora grahamiae
R	174271	AZ	WESTERN PATCH-NOSED SNAKE	Salvadora hexalepis
R	174275	AZ	GROUND SNAKE	Sonora semiannulata
R	174282	AZ	SOUTHWESTERN BLACK-HEADED	Tantilla hobartsmithi
R	174283	NM	PLAINS BLACK-HEADED SNAKE	Tantilla nigriceps
R	174288	AZ	CHIHUAHUAN BLACK-HEADED SNAKE	Tantilla wilcoxi
R	174289	AZ	YAQUI BLACK-HEADED SNAKE	Tantilla yaquia

Taxon Group	ITIS	Lead State	Common Name	Scientific Name
Group		State		
R	174291	AZ	WESTERN LYRE SNAKE	Trimorphodon biscutatus
R	174293	NM	LINED SNAKE	Tropidoclonion lineatum
R	174304	СО	MASSASAUGA	Sistrurus catenatus
R	174310	NM	WESTERN DIAMONDBACK RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus atrox
R	174311	AZ	SIDEWINDER	Crotalus cerastes
R	174312	NM	ROCK RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus lepidus
R	174313	AZ	SPECKLED RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus mitchellii
R	174314	AZ	BLACK-TAILED RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus molossus
R	174315	AZ	TWIN-SPOTTED RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus pricei
R	174317	AZ	MOJAVE RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus scutulatus
R	174318	AZ	TIGER RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus tigris
R	174319	СО	WESTERN RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus viridis
R	174320	AZ	RIDGE-NOSED RATTLESNAKE	Crotalus willardi
R	174326	NV	RUBBER BOA	Charina bottae
R	174336	CO	TEXAS BLIND SNAKE	Leptotyphlops dulcis
R	174337	NV	WESTERN BLIND SNAKE	Leptotyphlops humilis
R	174352	AZ	WESTERN CORAL SNAKE	Micruroides euryxanthus
R	208657	NM	BIG BEND SLIDER	Trachemys gaigeae
R	208677	NM	SMOOTH SOFTSHELL TURTLE	Apalone mutica
R	208680	NM	SPINY SOFTSHELL TURTLE	Apalone spinifera
R	208791	UT	MOJAVE BLACK-COLLARED LIZARD	Crotaphytus bicinctores
R	208896	СО	VARIABLE SKINK*	Eumeces gaigeae
R	208940	AZ	WESTERN WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus tigris
R	208947	AZ	DESERT GRASSLAND WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus uniparens
R	208948	AZ	PLATEAU STRIPED WHIPTAIL	Cnemidophorus velox
R	209008	NV	NORTHERN ALLIGATOR LIZARD	Elgaria coerulea
R	209017	AZ	MADREAN ALLIGATOR LIZARD	Elgaria kingii
R	209247	СО	COMMON KINGSNAKE	Lampropeltis getula
R	209266	NM	GRAY-BANDED KINGSNAKE	Lampropeltis alterna
R	209400	NM	BULLSNAKE	Pituophis catenifer
R	209455	NM	TRANS-PECOS RAT SNAKE	Bogertophis subocularis
R	209458	AZ	GREEN RAT SNAKE	Senticolis triaspis
R	551766	NM	RIO GRANDE RIVER COOTER	Pseudemys gorzugi
R	563907	AZ	ROSY BOA	Charina trivirgata
R	563909	AZ	THORNSCRUB HOOK-NOSED SNAKE	Gyalopion quadrangulare
R	563910	СО	SMOOTH GREEN SNAKE	Liochlorophis vernalis
R	564567	NV	PYGMY SHORT-HORNED LIZARD	Phrynosoma douglasii
R	564571	AZ	BLACK SPINY-TAILED IGUANA*	Ctenosaura hemilopha
R	564574	NM	SAND DUNE LIZARD	Sceloporus arenicolus
R	564594	NV	GREATER SHORT-HORNED LIZARD	Phrynosoma hernandesi
R	564596	AZ	COMMON CHUCKWALLA	Sauromalus ater

### Appendix 3-2. Decision Rules for Taxa inclusion

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-2.pdf

### **Appendix 3-3. Habitat Modeling Protocol**

This appendix summarizes the major habitat modeling components included in the Wildlife Habitat Relationships database and associated user interface, for the SWReGAP project. The complete protocol and instructions on the user interface are available at <a href="http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-3.pdf">http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-3.pdf</a>

**Model Description**: This is the description of the model and includes any information regarding the assumptions used within the creation of the model including information regarding seasonality of model or restricted range of model.

**Life History:** This is available to enter information regarding life history traits or other important information about the species that may be useful in modeling. It may be important to identify plant species or vegetation/landscape features that a taxon is associated with.

**Description Changes:** This field provides information regarding the modifications that have been made to the database. We want information regarding the modifications of the model including general attributes that were changed.

**Weighted Overlay**: We are interested in pursuing weighted overlay modeling. Please indicate if factors such as expert knowledge, data, and literature are sufficient to pursue a weighted model. If there are sufficient data of high quality check this box.

**Sensitive Data**: This entry is to identify if the data or work presented is sensitive and should be handled differently than other data.

**Patch Size:** Patch size refers to the minimum habitat patch size in hectares. This information filters patches too small to be used by a taxon. Patch size information may not be available for many species, if it is indicate that it is available and the minimum size applicable. Patch size is an important species specific modeling consideration and we should view patch size in a metapopulation context. Hollings (1992) examines the relationship of home-range size to body mass.

**Slope:** Check if data information is available. Slope should be entered in degrees with minimum and maximum values. If only a maximum value is present include that value and indicate there is no minimum value with a (0).

**Aspect:** Check if this is identified as a factor or is not known to be a factor. If this is identified then aspect categories, in degrees, associated with the taxa should be checked. If all aspects are used check only the Aspect All box and if flat aspects are used check Aspect Flat.

**Elevation:** If elevation data is available, elevation should be entered in meters with both the minimum and maximum indicated appropriately. Elevation is a constraining layer.

**Landform:** The landform coverage provided by USU may contain certain associations that can be identified for use in modeling. If this information is available check the land form available box. Check all that are appropriate.

**Hydrology:** Proximity to hydrological features can be an important modeling factor. We want to include several features including the type of hydrological feature the taxon is associated with and at what distance is the taxon associated with water. Check for each feature which this applies. If any feature is checked then the distance to water feature must be assigned a value in meters.

Hydrological Feature Description	
Stream/riparian buffer	Species has an affinity to streams or riparian areas that can be identified
Lakes/Ponds	Species has an affinity to lakes or ponds that can be identified
Reservoirs	Species has an affinity to reservoirs that can be identified
Springs/Seeps	Species has an affinity to springs/seeps that can be identified.
Wetlands	Species has an affinity to wetlands that can be identified.
Intermittent Waters	Species has an affinity to intermittent streams that can be identified.
Distance to water (in meters)	Species has an affinity to water and a distance to water function can be derived for the species.

Land Cover: WHR's were built using associations with the Ecological Systems.

**Soil Type Categories:** Soil Type refers to the predominant soil particle size. Use the soil types below to identify the associations. Be as specific as possible.

[Choices available: Clay, Silt, Sand, Loam, Gravel, Cobble, Stone, Boulder, Rocky]

**Soil Depth Class**: Depth Class is an indication of the depth to bedrock. This is particularly helpful when modeling fossorial species. Information should be input; if minimum depth to bedrock is available. This should be provided in centimeters (cm) if available, if not use categories below

Shallow – less than 50 cm Pan – Restrictive root zone Deep – greater than 50 cm

**Percent Rock Outcrop:** The Percent Rock Outcrop may be helpful with certain species associating to rock outcrops. Association information should be identified by the below categories.

< 15 % 15 - 30 % 30 - 65 % > 65%

### **Appendix 3-4.** Example habitat modeling data form

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-4.pdf

### **Appendix 3-5.** Complete list of references used in creating habitat models.

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-5.pdf

### Appendix 3-6. List of Animal Habitat Model external reviewers.

The following experts reviewed our habitat models and provided expertise and comments to modify the models. Habitat modelers took this information and modified the model based on the regional aspect of the project. We appreciate the comments made by the reviewers. All errors remain the responsibility of SWReGAP. A = Amphibians, B = Birds, M = Mammals, R = Reptiles.

Name	Affilitation	State	А	В	Μ	R
Abele, Steve	Abele Inc.	Region		х		
Abele, Susan	The Nature Conservancy	NV			Х	
Alexander, Lois	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	NV, Region			х	
Ammon, Elisabeth	Great Basin Bird Observatory	NV		х		
Armstrong, Dave	University of Colorado	CO, Region			Х	
Baldino, Cristi	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	NV, NM			х	
Bauman, Bradley	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV		х	Х	
Beier, Paul	Northern Arizona University	AZ			х	
Blair, Kathleen	USFWS - Bill Williams River National Wildlife Refuge	AZ, Region	х		х	х
Bogan, Michael	USGS	AZ,NM			х	
Boydston, Erin	USGS	NV, Region			Х	
Boyle, Steve	BIO-Logic Environmental	CO, Region		х		
Bunnell, Kevin	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	UT			х	
Burroughs, Michael	USFWS	NV, Region	х			х
Catalano, David P.	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV			х	х
Chung-MacCoubrey, Alice	USDA Forest Service	NM			х	
Corman, Troy	Arizona Game and Fish Department	AZ		х		
Dewey, Tanya	University of Michigan Museum of Zoology	Region			х	
Eidel, Jim	Great Basin Bird Observatory					
Fellows, Suzanne	USFWS	Region		х		
Frey, Jennifer	New Mexico State University	NM, Region			х	
Gammonley, Jim	Colorado Division of Wildlife	Region		х		
Ganey, Joseph	USDA Rocky Mountain Research Station	Region		х		
Hafner, John C.	Occidental College	Region			х	
Hall, Derek	US Department of Energy	NV			х	
Hall, Linnea	Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology	Region		х		
Hammerson, Geoff	The Nature Conservancy - Nature Serve	Region	х			
Hayes, Chuck	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Region			х	
Heindl, Alex	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	NV				х
Hickman, Gerald	BLM	AZ, NV		х		
Hodson, Ron	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	UT			х	
Jackson, Tina	Colorado Division of Wildlife	СО	х			х
Jeffers, Jennifer	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV			х	
Jezkova, Tereza	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	Region			х	
Jones, Cheri	University of Colorado, Denver	СО			х	
Jones, Stephanie L.	USFWS	AZ, CO, Region		х		
Klinger, Christina	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV				х
Klute, Dave	Colorado Division of Wildlife	СО		х		

Name	Affilitation	State	A	В	М	R
Kritz, Kevin	USFWS	NV		х		
Lambeth, Ron	BLM	СО		х		
Leukering, Tony	Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory	СО		х		
Levad, Rich	Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory	СО		х		
Livo, Lauren	University of Colorado, Boulder	CO, Region	х			х
Loeffler, Chuck	Retired - Colorado Division of Wildlife	CO	х			х
Mantooth, Stacy	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	NV			х	
Marlow, Ron	University of Nevada at Reno	NV				х
Maxfield, Brian	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	UT			х	
Medica, Philip	USGS/Biological Resources Division	Region				х
Mitchell, Dean	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	UT		х		
Navo, Kirk	Colorado Division of Wildlife	СО			х	
Neel, Larry	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV, UT, Region		х		
Newmark, Jennifer	Nevada Natural Heritage Program	NV			х	
NM CWCS Review	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	NM	х	х	х	х
Nowak, Erika	USGS Colorado Plateau Research Station	AZ, Region	х			х
Oliver, George	Utah Natural Heritage Program, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	UT	Х		X	x
Painter, Charles	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	NM	х			х
Prather, John	Northern Arizona University	Region		х		
Rickart, Eric	Utah Museum of Natural History, University of Utah	NV, UT, Region			х	
Schnurr, Pam	Colorado Division of Wildlife	CO			х	
Schorr, Rob	Colorado Natural Heritage Program/Colorado State University	СО			X	
Schwalbe, Cecil	USGS, Southwest Biological Science Center	AZ	х			
Seglund, Amy	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	Region			х	
Shaul, Anita	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV	х			х
Stoner, David	Utah State University	UT			х	
Stuart, Jim	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	NM			х	
Swett, John	US Bureau of Reclamation	NV		х		
Tomlinson, Cris	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV		х	х	
Toolen, John	Colorado Division of Wildlife	CO, Region		х		
Utah Natural Heritage Program		UT			х	х
Van Pelt, Bill	Arizona Game and Fish Department	AZ			х	
Wasley, Tony	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV			х	
Williams, Jason	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NV, Region			х	

<sup>1</sup>NM CWCS Review – New Mexico Department of Game and Fish provided land cover associations reviews of draft species habitat models. <sup>2</sup>Utah Natural Heritage Program- Heritage staff provided review of models

## **Appendix 3-7. Examples of model documents including Model Report, Range, and Model**

Model reports for all species are available from the SWReGAP web Site (<u>http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/habitatreview/Review.asp</u>) Below is a link to an example set for the Nothern Flying Squirrel (*Glaucomys sabrinus*).

#### **Report**

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/habitatreview/TextModels/180169.pdf

**Range** 

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/habitatreview/Range/180169.pdf

#### **Model**

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/habitatreview/Models/180169.pdf

### Appendix 3-8. Review Documentation for Habitat Models

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-8.pdf

### Appendix 3-9. Example Vertebrate Habitat Distribution Metadata

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/habitatreview/swregaphabitatmodelmetadata.htm

#### **SWReGAP Vertebrate Habitat Distribution Models**

Metadata also available as **Metadata:** 

- <u>Identification\_Information</u>
- Data\_Quality\_Information
- <u>Spatial\_Data\_Organization\_Information</u>
- <u>Spatial\_Reference\_Information</u>
- <u>Entity\_and\_Attribute\_Information</u>
- <u>Distribution\_Information</u>
- <u>Metadata\_Reference\_Information</u>

#### Identification\_Information:

Citation: Citation\_Information: Originator: New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Publication Date: 20050930 Title: SWReGAP Vertebrate Habitat Distribution Models Edition: 1.0 Geospatial\_Data\_Presentation\_Form: raster digital data Publication\_Information: Publication\_Place: Las Cruces, NM Online Linkage: <a href="http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/">http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/></a> *Larger\_Work\_Citation:* Citation Information: Originator: USGS GAP Analysis Program Publication\_Date: 20050930 Publication Time: Unknown Title: Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project: Final Report Other\_Citation\_Details: <a href="http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/>">http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/></a> Online\_Linkage: <a href="http://www.gap.uidaho.edu/">http://www.gap.uidaho.edu/</a> Description:

Abstract:

Mapping of terrestrial vertebrates focuses on linking a spatial representation of species-habitat matrices to geographic distribution. Each model is a combination of distribution from regional and state references in association with contiguous appropriate habitats. Ranges for all species were based on 8-digit HUCs. Habitats were based on a raster SWReGAP 1 acre MMU land cover data set, with hydrology habitats added in from USGS NHD dataset directly or through modeling. Habitat association information was obtained from various state, regional, and national references with updates from scientific literature. This portion of the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project produced predicted habitat distribution maps for 820 species. *Purpose:* 

The digital dataset was created for the creation of habitat models for a regional biodiversity assessment. These data are not intended to be used at scales larger than 1:100,000. This data was prepared in compliance with the National GAP effort. Distributions of 37 amphibians, 132 reptiles, 436 birds and 215 mammals were predicted by 8-digit HUC using a variety of sources. Most (650 of 820)models benefitted from review by taxa experts throughout the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project area. Habitat relationships for all terrestrial vertebrates were taken from various databases and most recent published scientific literature on each taxa, with review of collected relationships by species experts. These habitat relationships were cross-linked to one or several of the 52 land cover/vegetation types delineated on the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project land cover map. Predicted distribution maps were produced for each species based on county of occurrence and habitat affinities *Supplemental Information:* 

Species List including ITIS CODE, Common Name and Scientific Name; -3 ARIZONA MYOTIS Myotis occultus -2 GUNNISON SAGE-GROUSE Centrocercus minimus -1 TRIPLOID CHECKERED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus neotesselatus 173429 COUCH'S SPADEFOOT Scaphiopus couchii 173438 GREEN FROG Rana clamitans 173440 WOOD FROG Rana sylvatica 173441 BULLFROG Rana catesbeiana 173443 NORTHERN LEOPARD FROG Rana pipiens 173446 RED-LEGGED FROG Rana aurora 173447 RIO GRANDE LEOPARD FROG Rana berlandieri 173448 PLAINS LEOPARD FROG Rana blairi 173451 CHIRICAHUA LEOPARD FROG Rana chiricahuensis 173454 MOUNTAIN YELLOW-LEGGED FROG Rana muscosa 173457 RELICT LEOPARD FROG Rana onca 173458 SPOTTED FROG Rana pretiosa 173461 TARAHUMARA FROG Rana tarahumarae 173462 YAVAPAI LEOPARD FROG Rana yavapaiensis 173468 GREAT PLAINS NARROWMOUTH TOAD Gastrophryne olivacea 173476 WOODHOUSE'S TOAD Bufo woodhousii 173481 COLORADO RIVER TOAD Bufo alvarius 173482 WESTERN TOAD Bufo boreas 173484 GREAT PLAINS TOAD Bufo cognatus 173485 GREEN TOAD Bufo debilis 173490 SOUTHWESTERN TOAD Bufo microscaphus 173491 RED-SPOTTED TOAD Bufo punctatus 173492 SONORAN GREEN TOAD Bufo retiformis 173493 TEXAS TOAD Bufo speciosus 173510 CANYON TREEFROG Hyla arenicolor 173513 MOUNTAIN TREEFROG Hyla eximia 173520 NORTHERN CRICKET FROG Acris crepitans 173525 WESTERN CHORUS FROG Pseudacris triseriata 173534 LOWLAND BURROWING TREEFROG Pternohyla fodiens 173549 AFRICAN CLAWED FROG Xenopus laevis 173592 TIGER SALAMANDER Ambystoma tigrinum 173663 JEMEZ MOUNTAINS SALAMANDER Plethodon neomexicanus 173702 SACRAMENTO MOUNTAIN SALAMANDER Aneides hardii 173752 SNAPPING TURTLE Chelvdra serpentina 173766 YELLOW MUD TURTLE Kinosternon flavescens 173768 SONORAN MUD TURTLE Kinosternon sonoriense 173774 WESTERN POND TURTLE Clemmys marmorata 173778 ORNATE BOX TURTLE Terrapene ornata 173783 PAINTED TURTLE Chrysemys picta 173819 COMMON SLIDER Trachemys scripta 173856 DESERT TORTOISE Gopherus agassizii 173865 EASTERN FENCE LIZARD Sceloporus undulatus 173868 CLARK'S SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus clarkii 173870 SAGEBRUSH LIZARD Sceloporus graciosus 173872 YARROW'S SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus jarrovii 173873 DESERT SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus magister 173875 WESTERN FENCE LIZARD Sceloporus occidentalis 173878 CREVICE SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus poinsettii 173879 BUNCH GRASS LIZARD Sceloporus scalaris 173881 STRIPED PLATEAU LIZARD Sceloporus virgatus 173906 ZEBRA-TAILED LIZARD Callisaurus draconoides 173910 GREATER EARLESS LIZARD Cophosaurus texanus 173912 COLLARED LIZARD Crotaphytus collaris 173921 DESERT IGUANA Dipsosaurus dorsalis 173924 LONG-NOSED LEOPARD LIZARD Gambelia wislizenii 173927 LESSER EARLESS LIZARD Holbrookia maculata 173938 TEXAS HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma cornutum 173941 FLAT-TAILED HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma mcallii 173942 ROUND-TAILED HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma modestum 173943 DESERT HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma platyrhinos 173944 REGAL HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma solare 173949 COLORADO DESERT FRINGE-TOED LIZARD Uma notata 173950 MOJAVE FRINGE-TOED LIZARD Uma scoparia 173952 LONG-TAILED BRUSH LIZARD Urosaurus graciosus 173954 TREE LIZARD Urosaurus ornatus 173956 SIDE-BLOTCHED LIZARD Uta stansburiana 173964 MOUNTAIN SKINK Eumeces callicephalus 173966 GILBERT'S SKINK Eumeces gilberti 173967 MANY-LINED SKINK Eumeces multivirgatus 173968 GREAT PLAINS SKINK Eumeces obsoletus 173970 WESTERN SKINK Eumeces skiltonianus 173971 FOUR-LINED SKINK Eumeces tetragrammus 174014 SIX-LINED RACERUNNER Cnemidophorus sexlineatus 174015 CANYON SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus burti 174016 GRAY-CHECKERED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus dixoni 174017 CHIHUAHUAN SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus exsanguis 174018 GILA SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus flagellicaudus 174019 TEXAS SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus gularis 174021 LITTLE STRIPED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus inornatus 174024 NEW MEXICO WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus neomexicanus 174025 SONORAN SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus sonorae 174026 CHECKERED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus tesselatus 174038 TEXAS BANDED GECKO Coleonyx brevis 174041 WESTERN BANDED GECKO Coleonyx variegatus 174092 DESERT NIGHT LIZARD Xantusia vigilis 174113 GILA MONSTER Heloderma suspectum 174136 COMMON GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis sirtalis 174140 WESTERN AQUATIC
GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis couchii 174141 BLACK-NECKED GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis cyrtopsis 174142 WESTERN TERRESTRIAL GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis elegans 174143 MEXICAN GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis eques 174144 CHECKERED GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis marcianus 174146 WESTERN RIBBON SNAKE Thamnophis proximus 174147 PLAINS GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis radix 174148 NARROW-HEADED GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis rufipunctatus 174155 WESTERN HOG-NOSED SNAKE Heterodon nasicus 174158 RING-NECKED SNAKE Diadophis punctatus 174169 RACER Coluber constrictor 174175 CORN SNAKE Elaphe guttata 174187 MILK SNAKE Lampropeltis triangulum 174192 SONORAN MOUNTAIN KINGSNAKE Lampropeltis pyromelana 174202 GLOSSY SNAKE Arizona elegans 174210 BANDED SAND SNAKE Chilomeniscus cinctus 174212 WESTERN SHOVEL-NOSED SNAKE Chionactis occipitalis 174213 SONORAN SHOVEL-NOSED SNAKE Chionactis palarostris 174230 WESTERN HOOK-NOSED SNAKE Gyalopion canum 174233 NIGHT SNAKE Hypsiglena torquata 174237 SONORAN WHIPSNAKE Masticophis bilineatus 174238 COACHWHIP Masticophis flagellum 174240 STRIPED WHIPSNAKE Masticophis taeniatus 174244 PLAIN-BELLIED WATER SNAKE Nerodia erythrogaster 174251 NORTHERN WATER SNAKE Nerodia sipedon 174258 BROWN VINE SNAKE Oxybelis aeneus 174260 SADDLED LEAF-NOSED SNAKE Phyllorhynchus browni 174261 SPOTTED LEAF-NOSED SNAKE Phyllorhynchus decurtatus 174267 LONG-NOSED SNAKE Rhinocheilus lecontei 174269 BIG BEND PATCH-NOSED SNAKE Salvadora deserticola 174270 MOUNTAIN PATCH-NOSED SNAKE Salvadora grahamiae 174271 WESTERN PATCH-NOSED SNAKE Salvadora hexalepis 174275 GROUND SNAKE Sonora semiannulata 174282 SOUTHWESTERN BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla hobartsmithi 174283 PLAINS BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla nigriceps 174288 CHIHUAHUAN BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla wilcoxi 174289 YAQUI BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla vaguia 174291 WESTERN LYRE SNAKE Trimorphodon biscutatus 174293 LINED SNAKE Tropidoclonion lineatum 174304 MASSASAUGA Sistrurus catenatus 174310 WESTERN DIAMONDBACK RATTLESNAKE Crotalus atrox 174311 SIDEWINDER Crotalus cerastes 174312 ROCK RATTLESNAKE Crotalus lepidus 174313 SPECKLED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus mitchellii 174314 BLACK-TAILED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus molossus 174315 TWIN-SPOTTED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus pricei 174317 MOJAVE RATTLESNAKE Crotalus scutulatus 174318 TIGER RATTLESNAKE Crotalus tigris 174319 WESTERN RATTLESNAKE Crotalus viridis 174320 RIDGE-NOSED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus willardi 174326 RUBBER BOA Charina bottae 174336 TEXAS BLIND SNAKE Leptotyphlops dulcis 174337 WESTERN BLIND SNAKE Leptotyphlops humilis 174352 WESTERN CORAL SNAKE Micruroides euryxanthus 174469 COMMON LOON Gavia immer 174470 YELLOW-BILLED LOON Gavia adamsii 174474 RED-THROATED LOON Gavia stellata 174475 PACIFIC LOON Gavia pacifica 174479 RED-NECKED GREBE Podiceps grisegena 174482 HORNED GREBE Podiceps auritus 174485 EARED GREBE Podiceps nigricollis 174503 WESTERN GREBE Aechmophorus occidentalis 174505 PIED-BILLED GREBE Podilymbus podiceps 174684 AMERICAN WHITE PELICAN Pelecanus erythrorhynchos 174717 DOUBLE-CRESTED CORMORANT Phalacrocorax auritus 174773 GREAT BLUE HERON Ardea herodias 174793 GREEN HERON Butorides virescens 174803 CATTLE EGRET Bubulcus ibis 174813 SNOWY EGRET Egretta thula 174827 LITTLE BLUE HERON Egretta caerulea 174832 BLACK-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON Nycticorax nycticorax 174842 YELLOW-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON Nyctanassa violacea 174846 LEAST BITTERN Ixobrychus exilis 174856 AMERICAN BITTERN Botaurus lentiginosus 174926 WHITE-FACED IBIS Plegadis chihi 174987 TUNDRA SWAN Cygnus columbianus 174992 TRUMPETER SWAN Cygnus buccinator 174999 CANADA GOOSE Branta canadensis 175011 BRANT Branta bernicla 175020 GREATER WHITE-FRONTED GOOSE Anser albifrons 175038 SNOW GOOSE Chen caerulescens 175041 ROSS'S GOOSE Chen rossii 175044 BLACK-BELLIED WHISTLING-DUCK Dendrocygna autumnalis 175063 MALLARD Anas platyrhynchos 175068 AMERICAN BLACK DUCK Anas rubripes 175073 GADWALL Anas strepera 175074 NORTHERN PINTAIL Anas acuta 175081 GREEN-WINGED TEAL Anas crecca 175086 BLUE-WINGED TEAL Anas discors 175089 CINNAMON TEAL Anas cyanoptera 175092 EURASIAN WIGEON Anas penelope 175094 AMERICAN WIGEON Anas americana 175096 NORTHERN SHOVELER Anas clypeata 175122 WOOD DUCK Aix sponsa 175125 REDHEAD Aythya americana 175128 RING-NECKED DUCK Aythya collaris 175129 CANVASBACK Aythya valisineria 175130 GREATER SCAUP Aythya marila 175134 LESSER SCAUP Aythya affinis 175141 COMMON GOLDENEYE Bucephala clangula 175144 BARROW'S GOLDENEYE Bucephala islandica 175145 BUFFLEHEAD Bucephala albeola 175147 LONG-TAILED DUCK Clangula hyemalis 175149 HARLEQUIN DUCK Histrionicus histrionicus 175163 WHITE-WINGED SCOTER Melanitta

fusca 175170 SURF SCOTER Melanitta perspicillata 175175 RUDDY DUCK Oxyura jamaicensis 175183 HOODED MERGANSER Lophodytes cucullatus 175185 COMMON MERGANSER Mergus merganser 175187 RED-BREASTED MERGANSER Mergus serrator 175265 TURKEY VULTURE Cathartes aura 175272 BLACK VULTURE Coragyps atratus 175274 CALIFORNIA CONDOR Gymnogyps californianus 175282 WHITE-TAILED KITE Elanus leucurus 175300 NORTHERN GOSHAWK Accipiter gentilis 175304 SHARP-SHINNED HAWK Accipiter striatus 175309 COOPER'S HAWK Accipiter cooperii 175350 RED-TAILED HAWK Buteo jamaicensis 175365 BROAD-WINGED HAWK Buteo platypterus 175367 SWAINSON'S HAWK Buteo swainsoni 175368 ZONE-TAILED HAWK Buteo albonotatus 175373 ROUGH-LEGGED HAWK Buteo lagopus 175377 FERRUGINOUS HAWK Buteo regalis 175397 HARRIS'S HAWK Parabuteo unicinctus 175402 COMMON BLACK-HAWK Buteogallus anthracinus 175407 GOLDEN EAGLE Aquila chrysaetos 175420 BALD EAGLE Haliaeetus leucocephalus 175430 NORTHERN HARRIER Circus cyaneus 175590 OSPREY Pandion haliaetus 175599 GYRFALCON Falco rusticolus 175603 PRAIRIE FALCON Falco mexicanus 175604 PEREGRINE FALCON Falco peregrinus 175610 APLOMADO FALCON Falco femoralis 175613 MERLIN Falco columbarius 175622 AMERICAN KESTREL Falco sparverius 175790 RUFFED GROUSE Bonasa umbellus 175827 WHITE-TAILED PTARMIGAN Lagopus leucurus 175834 GREATER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN Tympanuchus cupido 175838 LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN Tympanuchus pallidicinctus 175841 SHARP-TAILED GROUSE Tympanuchus phasianellus 175848 SHARP-TAILED GROUSE-COLUMBIAN Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus 175852 SHARP-TAILED GROUSE-PLAINS Tympanuchus phasianellus jamesi 175855 GREATER SAGE-GROUSE Centrocercus urophasianus 175860 BLUE GROUSE Dendragapus obscurus 175863 NORTHERN BOBWHITE Colinus virginianus 175872 SCALED QUAIL Callipepla squamata 175876 CALIFORNIA QUAIL Callipepla californica 175877 GAMBEL'S QUAIL Callipepla gambelii 175893 MOUNTAIN QUAIL Oreortyx pictus 175900 MONTEZUMA QUAIL Cyrtonyx montezumae 175905 RING-NECKED PHEASANT Phasianus colchicus 175908 CHUKAR Alectoris chukar 175915 GRAY PARTRIDGE Perdix perdix 176136 WILD TURKEY Meleagris gallopavo 176176 WHOOPING CRANE Grus americana 176177 SANDHILL CRANE Grus canadensis 176177 SANDHILL CRANE Grus canadensis 176209 CLAPPER RAIL Rallus longirostris 176221 VIRGINIA RAIL Rallus limicola 176221 VIRGINIA RAIL Rallus limicola 176242 SORA Porzana carolina 176263 BLACK RAIL Laterallus jamaicensis 176284 COMMON MOORHEN Gallinula chloropus 176292 AMERICAN COOT Fulica americana 176506 SEMIPALMATED PLOVER Charadrius semipalmatus 176507 PIPING PLOVER Charadrius melodus 176510 SNOWY PLOVER Charadrius alexandrinus 176520 KILLDEER Charadrius vociferus 176522 MOUNTAIN PLOVER Charadrius montanus 176564 AMERICAN GOLDEN-PLOVER Pluvialis dominica 176567 BLACK-BELLIED PLOVER Pluvialis squatarola 176571 RUDDY TURNSTONE Arenaria interpres 176580 AMERICAN WOODCOCK Scolopax minor 176593 LONG-BILLED CURLEW Numenius americanus 176599 WHIMBREL Numenius phaeopus 176610 UPLAND SANDPIPER Bartramia longicauda 176612 SPOTTED SANDPIPER Actitis macularia 176615 SOLITARY SANDPIPER Tringa solitaria 176619 GREATER YELLOWLEGS Tringa melanoleuca 176620 LESSER YELLOWLEGS Tringa flavipes 176638 WILLET Catoptrophorus semipalmatus 176642 RED KNOT Calidris canutus 176653 PECTORAL SANDPIPER Calidris melanotos 176654 WHITE-RUMPED SANDPIPER Calidris fuscicollis 176655 BAIRD'S SANDPIPER Calidris bairdii 176656 LEAST SANDPIPER Calidris minutilla 176661 DUNLIN Calidris alpina 176667 SEMIPALMATED SANDPIPER Calidris pusilla 176668 WESTERN SANDPIPER Calidris mauri 176669 SANDERLING Calidris alba 176675 SHORT-BILLED DOWITCHER Limnodromus griseus 176679 LONG-BILLED DOWITCHER Limnodromus scolopaceus 176684 BUFF-BREASTED SANDPIPER Tryngites subruficollis 176686 MARBLED GODWIT Limosa fedoa 176700 COMMON SNIPE Gallinago gallinago 176721 AMERICAN AVOCET Recurvirostra americana 176726 BLACK-NECKED STILT Himantopus mexicanus 176735 RED-NECKED PHALAROPE Phalaropus lobatus 176736 WILSON'S PHALAROPE Phalaropus tricolor 176808 GLAUCOUS GULL Larus hyperboreus 176824 HERRING GULL Larus argentatus 176828 THAYER'S GULL Larus thayeri 176829 CALIFORNIA GULL Larus californicus 176830 RING-BILLED GULL Larus delawarensis 176838 FRANKLIN'S GULL Larus pipixcan 176839 BONAPARTE'S GULL Larus philadelphia 176866 SABINE'S GULL Xema sabini 176887 FORSTER'S TERN Sterna forsteri 176888 COMMON TERN Sterna hirundo 176923 LEAST TERN Sterna antillarum 176924 CASPIAN TERN Sterna caspia 176959 BLACK TERN Chlidonias niger 177065 BAND-TAILED PIGEON Columba fasciata 177071 ROCK DOVE Columba livia 177121 WHITE-WINGED DOVE Zenaida asiatica 177125 MOURNING DOVE Zenaida macroura 177134 SPOTTED DOVE Streptopelia chinensis 177152 COMMON GROUND-DOVE Columbina passerina 177162 INCA DOVE Columbina

inca 177831 YELLOW-BILLED CUCKOO Coccyzus americanus 177834 BLACK-BILLED CUCKOO Coccyzus erythropthalmus 177836 GREATER ROADRUNNER Geococcyx californianus 177851 COMMON BARN-OWL Tyto alba 177856 EASTERN SCREECH-OWL Otus asio 177875 WHISKERED SCREECH-OWL Otus trichopsis 177878 FLAMMULATED OWL Otus flammeolus 177884 GREAT HORNED OWL Bubo virginianus 177896 SNOWY OWL Nyctea scandiaca 177902 NORTHERN PYGMY-OWL Glaucidium gnoma 177908 FERRUGINOUS PYGMY-OWL Glaucidium brasilianum 177912 ELF OWL Micrathene whitneyi 177925 SPOTTED OWL Strix occidentalis 177932 LONG-EARED OWL Asio otus 177935 SHORT-EARED OWL Asio flammeus 177938 BOREAL OWL Aegolius funereus 177942 NORTHERN SAW-WHET OWL Aegolius acadicus 177946 BURROWING OWL Athene cunicularia 177961 WHIP-POOR-WILL Caprimulgus vociferus 177966 BUFF-COLLARED NIGHTJAR Caprimulgus ridgwayi 177979 COMMON NIGHTHAWK Chordeiles minor 177988 LESSER NIGHTHAWK Chordeiles acutipennis 177997 BLACK SWIFT Cypseloides niger 178001 CHIMNEY SWIFT Chaetura pelagica 178002 VAUX'S SWIFT Chaetura vauxi 178014 WHITE-THROATED SWIFT Aeronautes saxatalis 178030 LUCIFER HUMMINGBIRD Calothorax lucifer 178033 BLACK-CHINNED HUMMINGBIRD Archilochus alexandri 178035 COSTA'S HUMMINGBIRD Calypte costae 178036 ANNA'S HUMMINGBIRD Calypte anna 178038 BROAD-TAILED HUMMINGBIRD Selasphorus platycercus 178040 RUFOUS HUMMINGBIRD Selasphorus rufus 178041 ALLEN'S HUMMINGBIRD Selasphorus sasin 178048 CALLIOPE HUMMINGBIRD Stellula calliope 178050 MAGNIFICENT HUMMINGBIRD Eugenes fulgens 178054 BLUE-THROATED HUMMINGBIRD Lampornis clemenciae 178065 BERYLLINE HUMMINGBIRD Amazilia beryllina 178066 VIOLET-CROWNED HUMMINGBIRD Amazilia violiceps 178069 WHITE-EARED HUMMINGBIRD Hylocharis leucotis 178073 BROAD-BILLED HUMMINGBIRD Cynanthus latirostris 178096 ELEGANT TROGON Trogon elegans 178101 EARED TROGON Euptilotis neoxenus 178112 GREEN KINGFISHER Chloroceryle americana 178119 BELTED KINGFISHER Ceryle alcyon 178154 NORTHERN FLICKER Colaptes auratus 178164 GILDED FLICKER Colaptes chrysoides 178186 RED-HEADED WOODPECKER Melanerpes erythrocephalus 178189 ACORN WOODPECKER Melanerpes formicivorus 178195 RED-BELLIED WOODPECKER Melanerpes carolinus 178196 LEWIS'S WOODPECKER Melanerpes lewis 178198 GILA WOODPECKER Melanerpes uropygialis 178208 WILLIAMSON'S SAPSUCKER Sphyrapicus thyroideus 178211 RED-NAPED SAPSUCKER Sphyrapicus nuchalis 178212 RED-BREASTED SAPSUCKER Sphyrapicus ruber 178251 THREE-TOED WOODPECKER Picoides tridactylus 178256 WHITE-HEADED WOODPECKER Picoides albolarvatus 178259 DOWNY WOODPECKER Picoides pubescens 178260 LADDER-BACKED WOODPECKER Picoides scalaris 178261 STRICKLAND'S WOODPECKER Picoides stricklandi 178262 HAIRY WOODPECKER Picoides villosus 178279 EASTERN KINGBIRD Tyrannus tyrannus 178282 TROPICAL KINGBIRD Tyrannus melancholicus 178287 WESTERN KINGBIRD Tyrannus verticalis 178288 CASSIN'S KINGBIRD Tyrannus vociferans 178292 THICK-BILLED KINGBIRD Tyrannus crassirostris 178293 SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER Tvrannus forficatus 178305 SULPHUR-BELLIED FLYCATCHER Myiodynastes luteiventris 178309 GREAT CRESTED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus crinitus 178312 BROWN-CRESTED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus tyrannulus 178316 ASH-THROATED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus cinerascens 178319 DUSKY-CAPPED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus tuberculifer 178329 EASTERN PHOEBE Sayornis phoebe 178330 BLACK PHOEBE Sayornis nigricans 178333 SAY'S PHOEBE Sayornis saya 178340 ALDER FLYCATCHER Empidonax alnorum 178341 WILLOW FLYCATCHER Empidonax traillii 178346 DUSKY FLYCATCHER Empidonax oberholseri 178347 GRAY FLYCATCHER Empidonax wrightii 178348 PACIFIC-SLOPE FLYCATCHER Empidonax difficilis 178352 BUFF-BREASTED FLYCATCHER Empidonax fulvifrons 178356 GREATER PEWEE Contopus pertinax 178360 WESTERN WOOD-PEWEE Contopus sordidulus 178371 VERMILION FLYCATCHER Pyrocephalus rubinus 178376 NORTHERN BEARDLESS-TYRANNULET Camptostoma imberbe 178384 ROSE-THROATED BECARD Pachyramphus aglaiae 178427 VIOLET-GREEN SWALLOW Tachycineta thalassina 178431 TREE SWALLOW Tachycineta bicolor 178436 BANK SWALLOW Riparia riparia 178443 NORTHERN ROUGH-WINGED SWALLOW Stelgidopteryx serripennis 178448 BARN SWALLOW Hirundo rustica 178455 CLIFF SWALLOW Petrochelidon pyrrhonota 178460 CAVE SWALLOW Petrochelidon fulva 178464 PURPLE MARTIN Progne subis 178499 SPRAGUE'S PIPIT Anthus spragueii 178511 NORTHERN SHRIKE Lanius excubitor 178515 LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE Lanius ludovicianus 178529 BOHEMIAN WAXWING Bombycilla garrulus 178532 CEDAR WAXWING Bombycilla cedrorum 178536 AMERICAN DIPPER Cinclus mexicanus 178541 HOUSE WREN Troglodytes aedon 178547 WINTER WREN Troglodytes troglodytes 178562

BEWICK'S WREN Thryomanes bewickii 178581 CAROLINA WREN Thryothorus ludovicianus 178587 CACTUS WREN Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus 178605 SEDGE WREN Cistothorus platensis 178608 MARSH WREN Cistothorus palustris 178610 CANYON WREN Catherpes mexicanus 178614 ROCK WREN Salpinctes obsoletus 178620 NORTHERN MOCKINGBIRD Mimus polyglottos 178625 GRAY CATBIRD Dumetella carolinensis 178627 BROWN THRASHER Toxostoma rufum 178636 BENDIRE'S THRASHER Toxostoma bendirei 178637 CURVE-BILLED THRASHER Toxostoma curvirostre 178645 LE CONTE'S THRASHER Toxostoma lecontei 178652 CRISSAL THRASHER Toxostoma crissale 178654 SAGE THRASHER Oreoscoptes montanus 178759 VERDIN Auriparus flaviceps 178764 BUSHTIT Psaltriparus minimus 178775 WHITE-BREASTED NUTHATCH Sitta carolinensis 178784 RED-BREASTED NUTHATCH Sitta canadensis 178788 PYGMY NUTHATCH Sitta pygmaea 178803 BROWN CREEPER Certhia americana 178841 RUFOUS-CAPPED WARBLER Basileuterus rufifrons 178844 BLACK-AND-WHITE WARBLER Mniotilta varia 178855 TENNESSEE WARBLER Vermivora peregrina 178856 ORANGE-CROWNED WARBLER Vermivora celata 178861 NASHVILLE WARBLER Vermivora ruficapilla 178864 VIRGINIA'S WARBLER Vermivora virginiae 178866 LUCY'S WARBLER Vermivora luciae 178874 OLIVE WARBLER Peucedramus taeniatus 178878 YELLOW WARBLER Dendroica petechia 178891 YELLOW-RUMPED WARBLER Dendroica coronata 178896 BLACK-THROATED GRAY WARBLER Dendroica nigrescens 178897 TOWNSEND'S WARBLER Dendroica townsendi 178902 HERMIT WARBLER Dendroica occidentalis 178909 GRACE'S WARBLER Dendroica graciae 178913 BLACKPOLL WARBLER Dendroica striata 178918 PRAIRIE WARBLER Dendroica discolor 178921 PALM WARBLER Dendroica palmarum 178927 OVENBIRD Seiurus aurocapillus 178931 NORTHERN WATERTHRUSH Seiurus noveboracensis 178940 MACGILLIVRAY'S WARBLER Oporornis tolmiei 178944 COMMON YELLOWTHROAT Geothlypis trichas 178964 YELLOW-BREASTED CHAT Icteria virens 178970 RED-FACED WARBLER Cardellina rubrifrons 178973 WILSON'S WARBLER Wilsonia pusilla 178979 AMERICAN REDSTART Setophaga ruticilla 178986 PAINTED REDSTART Myioborus pictus 178997 HUTTON'S VIREO Vireo huttoni 179003 BELL'S VIREO Vireo bellii 179008 GRAY VIREO Vireo vicinior 179021 RED-EYED VIREO Vireo olivaceus 179023 WARBLING VIREO Vireo gilvus 179032 BOBOLINK Dolichonyx oryzivorus 179034 EASTERN MEADOWLARK Sturnella magna 179039 WESTERN MEADOWLARK Sturnella neglecta 179043 YELLOW-HEADED BLACKBIRD Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus 179045 RED-WINGED BLACKBIRD Agelaius phoeniceus 179060 TRICOLORED BLACKBIRD Agelaius tricolor 179064 ORCHARD ORIOLE Icterus spurius 179070 HOODED ORIOLE Icterus cucullatus 179079 STREAK-BACKED ORIOLE Icterus pustulatus 179082 SCOTT'S ORIOLE Icterus parisorum 179083 BALTIMORE ORIOLE Icterus galbula 179094 BREWER'S BLACKBIRD Euphagus cyanocephalus 179104 COMMON GRACKLE Quiscalus quiscula 179109 GREAT-TAILED GRACKLE Quiscalus mexicanus 179112 BROWN-HEADED COWBIRD Molothrus ater 179116 BRONZED COWBIRD Molothrus aeneus 179124 NORTHERN CARDINAL Cardinalis cardinalis 179132 PYRRHULOXIA Cardinalis sinuatus 179139 ROSE-BREASTED GROSBEAK Pheucticus ludovicianus 179140 BLACK-HEADED GROSBEAK Pheucticus melanocephalus 179145 BLUE GROSBEAK Guiraca caerulea 179150 INDIGO BUNTING Passerina cyanea 179151 LAZULI BUNTING Passerina amoena 179152 VARIED BUNTING Passerina versicolor 179156 PAINTED BUNTING Passerina ciris 179165 DICKCISSEL Spiza americana 179173 EVENING GROSBEAK Coccothraustes vespertinus 179186 PURPLE FINCH Carpodacus purpureus 179190 CASSIN'S FINCH Carpodacus cassinii 179191 HOUSE FINCH Carpodacus mexicanus 179205 PINE GROSBEAK Pinicola enucleator 179215 GRAY-CROWNED ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte tephrocotis 179222 BLACK ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte atrata 179222 BLACK ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte atrata 179223 BROWN-CAPPED ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte australis 179223 BROWN-CAPPED ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte australis 179230 COMMON REDPOLL Carduelis flammea 179232 LAWRENCE'S GOLDFINCH Carduelis lawrencei 179233 PINE SISKIN Carduelis pinus 179234 LESSER GOLDFINCH Carduelis psaltria 179236 AMERICAN GOLDFINCH Carduelis tristis 179259 RED CROSSBILL Loxia curvirostra 179268 WHITE-WINGED CROSSBILL Loxia leucoptera 179293 CANYON TOWHEE Pipilo fuscus 179307 ABERT'S TOWHEE Pipilo aberti 179310 GREEN-TAILED TOWHEE Pipilo chlorurus 179312 LARK BUNTING Calamospiza melanocorys 179314 SAVANNAH SPARROW Passerculus sandwichensis 179333 GRASSHOPPER SPARROW Ammodramus savannarum 179339 BAIRD'S SPARROW Ammodramus bairdii 179345 LE CONTE'S SPARROW Ammodramus leconteii 179366 VESPER SPARROW Pooecetes gramineus 179371 LARK SPARROW Chondestes grammacus 179375 RUFOUS-WINGED SPARROW Aimophila carpalis 179377 RUFOUS-CROWNED SPARROW Aimophila ruficeps 179390 BOTTERI'S SPARROW Aimophila

botterii 179393 CASSIN'S SPARROW Aimophila cassinii 179395 BLACK-THROATED SPARROW Amphispiza bilineata 179402 SAGE SPARROW Amphispiza belli 179410 DARK-EYED JUNCO Junco hyemalis 179427 YELLOW-EYED JUNCO Junco phaeonotus 179432 AMERICAN TREE SPARROW Spizella arborea 179435 CHIPPING SPARROW Spizella passerina 179439 CLAY-COLORED SPARROW Spizella pallida 179440 BREWER'S SPARROW Spizella breweri 179443 FIELD SPARROW Spizella pusilla 179448 BLACK-CHINNED SPARROW Spizella atrogularis 179454 HARRIS'S SPARROW Zonotrichia querula 179455 WHITE-CROWNED SPARROW Zonotrichia leucophrys 179461 GOLDEN-CROWNED SPARROW Zonotrichia atricapilla 179462 WHITE-THROATED SPARROW Zonotrichia albicollis 179464 FOX SPARROW Passerella iliaca 179484 LINCOLN'S SPARROW Melospiza lincolnii 179488 SWAMP SPARROW Melospiza georgiana 179492 SONG SPARROW Melospiza melodia 179525 MCCOWN'S LONGSPUR Calcarius mccownii 179526 LAPLAND LONGSPUR Calcarius lapponicus 179530 CHESTNUT-COLLARED LONGSPUR Calcarius ornatus 179532 SNOW BUNTING Plectrophenax nivalis 179628 HOUSE SPARROW Passer domesticus 179637 EUROPEAN STARLING Sturnus vulgaris 179667 GRAY JAY Perisoreus canadensis 179680 BLUE JAY Cyanocitta cristata 179685 STELLER'S JAY Cyanocitta stelleri 179707 MEXICAN JAY Aphelocoma ultramarina 179720 BLACK-BILLED MAGPIE Pica hudsonia 179725 COMMON RAVEN Corvus corax 179730 CHIHUAHUAN RAVEN Corvus cryptoleucus 179731 AMERICAN CROW Corvus brachyrhynchos 179748 PINYON JAY Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus 179750 CLARK'S NUTCRACKER Nucifraga columbiana 179759 AMERICAN ROBIN Turdus migratorius 179773 VARIED THRUSH Ixoreus naevius 179777 WOOD THRUSH Hylocichla mustelina 179779 HERMIT THRUSH Catharus guttatus 179788 SWAINSON'S THRUSH Catharus ustulatus 179793 GRAY-CHEEKED THRUSH Catharus minimus 179796 VEERY Catharus fuscescens 179801 EASTERN BLUEBIRD Sialia sialis 179806 WESTERN BLUEBIRD Sialia mexicana 179811 MOUNTAIN BLUEBIRD Sialia currucoides 179824 TOWNSEND'S SOLITAIRE Myadestes townsendi 179853 BLUE-GRAY GNATCATCHER Polioptila caerulea 179857 BLACK-TAILED GNATCATCHER Polioptila melanura 179863 BLACK-CAPPED GNATCATCHER Polioptila nigriceps 179865 GOLDEN-CROWNED KINGLET Regulus satrapa 179870 RUBY-CROWNED KINGLET Regulus calendula 179877 PHAINOPEPLA Phainopepla nitens 179882 WESTERN TANAGER Piranga ludoviciana 179884 HEPATIC TANAGER Piranga flava 179888 SUMMER TANAGER Piranga rubra 179891 FLAME-COLORED TANAGER Piranga bidentata 179921 VIRGINIA OPOSSUM Didelphis virginiana 179929 MASKED SHREW Sorex cinereus 179932 VAGRANT SHREW Sorex vagrans 179933 NORTHERN WATER SHREW Sorex palustris 179939 ARIZONA SHREW Sorex arizonae 179946 PYGMY SHREW Sorex hoyi 179949 MERRIAM'S SHREW Sorex merriami 179950 MONTANE SHREW Sorex monticolus 179951 DWARF SHREW Sorex nanus 179954 PREBLE'S SHREW Sorex preblei 179955 INYO SHREW Sorex tenellus 179956 TROWBRIDGE'S SHREW Sorex trowbridgii 179969 ELLIOT'S SHORT-TAILED SHREW Blarina hylophaga 179971 LEAST SHREW Cryptotis parva 179973 DESERT SHREW Notiosorex crawfordi 179979 EASTERN MOLE Scalopus aquaticus 179981 BROAD-FOOTED MOLE Scapanus latimanus 179988 LITTLE BROWN BAT Myotis lucifugus 179990 LONG-LEGGED MYOTIS Myotis volans 179991 CALIFORNIA MYOTIS Myotis californicus 179992 SOUTHWESTERN MYOTIS Myotis auriculus 179995 LONG-EARED MYOTIS Myotis evotis 179999 WESTERN SMALL-FOOTED MYOTIS Myotis leibii 180002 FRINGED MYOTIS Myotis thysanodes 180003 CAVE MYOTIS Myotis velifer 180004 YUMA MYOTIS Myotis yumanensis 180006 PALLID BAT Antrozous pallidus 180008 BIG BROWN BAT Eptesicus fuscus 180010 SPOTTED BAT Euderma maculatum 180012 ALLEN'S BIG-EARED BAT Idionycteris phyllotis 180014 SILVER-HAIRED BAT Lasionycteris noctivagans 180016 WESTERN RED BAT Lasiurus blossevillii 180017 HOARY BAT Lasiurus cinereus 180018 SOUTHERN YELLOW BAT Lasiurus ega 180024 WESTERN PIPISTRELLE Pipistrellus hesperus 180062 MEXICAN LONG-TONGUED BAT Choeronycteris mexicana 180068 MEXICAN LONG-NOSED BAT Leptonycteris nivalis 180071 CALIFORNIA LEAF-NOSED BAT Macrotus californicus 180080 WESTERN MASTIFF BAT Eumops perotis 180081 UNDERWOOD'S MASTIFF BAT Eumops underwoodi 180085 POCKETED FREE-TAILED BAT Nyctinomops femorosaccus 180086 BIG FREE-TAILED BAT Nyctinomops macrotis 180088 BRAZILIAN FREE-TAILED BAT Tadarida brasiliensis 180103 NINE-BANDED ARMADILLO Dasypus novemcinctus 180109 AMERICAN PIKA Ochotona princeps 180112 SNOWSHOE HARE Lepus americanus 180114 ANTELOPE JACK RABBIT Lepus alleni 180115 BLACK-TAILED JACK RABBIT Lepus californicus 180116 WHITE-SIDED JACK RABBIT Lepus callotis 180118 WHITE-TAILED JACK RABBIT Lepus townsendii 180122 DESERT COTTONTAIL Sylvilagus audubonii 180124 EASTERN COTTONTAIL Sylvilagus floridanus 180126

MOUNTAIN COTTONTAIL Sylvilagus nuttallii 180133 MOUNTAIN BEAVER Aplodontia rufa 180140 YELLOW-BELLIED MARMOT Marmota flaviventris 180147 UINTA GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus armatus 180148 CALIFORNIA GROUND SOUIRREL Spermophilus beechevi 180149 BELDING'S GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus beldingi 180152 WYOMING GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus elegans 180154 GOLDEN-MANTLED GROUND SOUIRREL Spermophilus lateralis 180155 MEXICAN GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus mexicanus 180159 SPOTTED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus spilosoma 180160 ROUND-TAILED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus tereticaudus 180161 TOWNSEND'S GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus townsendii 180162 THIRTEEN-LINED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus tridecemlineatus 180163 ROCK SQUIRREL Spermophilus variegatus 180166 RED SQUIRREL Tamiasciurus hudsonicus 180167 DOUGLAS' SQUIRREL Tamiasciurus douglasii 180169 NORTHERN FLYING SQUIRREL Glaucomys sabrinus 180172 FOX SQUIRREL Sciurus niger 180173 ABERT'S SQUIRREL Sciurus aberti 180174 ARIZONA GRAY SOUIRREL Sciurus arizonensis 180176 WESTERN GRAY SOUIRREL Sciurus griseus 180177 NAYARIT SOUIRREL Sciurus navaritensis 180179 HARRIS' ANTELOPE SOUIRREL Ammospermophilus harrisii 180180 TEXAS ANTELOPE SQUIRREL Ammospermophilus interpres 180181 WHITE-TAILED ANTELOPE SQUIRREL Ammospermophilus leucurus 180184 GUNNISON'S PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys gunnisoni 180185 WHITE-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys leucurus 180186 BLACK-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys ludovicianus 180187 UTAH PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys parvidens 180190 YELLOW-PINE CHIPMUNK Tamias amoenus 180191 GRAY-FOOTED CHIPMUNK Tamias canipes 180192 GRAY-COLLARED CHIPMUNK Tamias cinereicollis 180193 CLIFF CHIPMUNK Tamias dorsalis 180195 LEAST CHIPMUNK Tamias minimus 180198 PALMER'S CHIPMUNK Tamias palmeri 180199 PANAMINT CHIPMUNK Tamias panamintinus 180200 LONG-EARED CHIPMUNK Tamias quadrimaculatus 180201 COLORADO CHIPMUNK Tamias quadrivittatus 180203 ALLEN'S CHIPMUNK Tamias senex 180206 LODGEPOLE CHIPMUNK Tamias speciosus 180208 TOWNSEND'S CHIPMUNK Tamias townsendii 180209 UINTA CHIPMUNK Tamias umbrinus 180212 BEAVER Castor canadensis 180215 DESERT POCKET GOPHER Geomys arenarius 180216 PLAINS POCKET GOPHER Geomys bursarius 180220 YELLOW-FACED POCKET GOPHER Pappogeomys castanops 180222 BOTTA'S POCKET GOPHER Thomomys bottae 180225 IDAHO POCKET GOPHER Thomomys idahoensis 180227 MOUNTAIN POCKET GOPHER Thomomys monticola 180228 NORTHERN POCKET GOPHER Thomomys talpoides 180229 TOWNSEND'S POCKET GOPHER Thomomys townsendii 180230 SOUTHERN POCKET GOPHER Thomomys umbrinus 180236 DESERT KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys deserti 180241 MERRIAM'S KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys merriami 180242 CHISEL-TOOTHED KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys microps 180244 ORD'S KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys ordii 180245 PANAMINT KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys panamintinus 180246 BANNER-TAILED KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys spectabilis 180252 DARK KANGAROO MOUSE Microdipodops megacephalus 180253 PALE KANGAROO MOUSE Microdipodops pallidus 180256 ARIZONA POCKET MOUSE Perognathus amplus 180260 OLIVE-BACKED POCKET MOUSE Perognathus fasciatus 180261 PLAINS POCKET MOUSE Perognathus flavescens 180262 SILKY POCKET MOUSE Perognathus flavus 180267 LITTLE POCKET MOUSE Perognathus longimembris 180269 GREAT BASIN POCKET MOUSE Perognathus parvus 180276 DEER MOUSE Peromyscus maniculatus 180278 WHITE-FOOTED MOUSE Peromyscus leucopus 180282 BRUSH MOUSE Peromyscus boylii 180284 CANYON MOUSE Peromyscus crinitus 180286 CACTUS MOUSE Peromyscus eremicus 180287 BLACK-EARED MOUSE Peromyscus melanotis 180288 MERRIAM'S MOUSE Peromyscus merriami 180289 WHITE-ANKLED MOUSE Peromyscus pectoralis 180291 PINON MOUSE Peromyscus truei 180294 SOUTHERN RED-BACKED VOLE Clethrionomys gapperi 180297 MEADOW VOLE Microtus pennsylvanicus 180299 LONG-TAILED VOLE Microtus longicaudus 180310 MONTANE VOLE Microtus montanus 180312 PRAIRIE VOLE Microtus ochrogaster 180315 WATER VOLE Microtus richardsoni 180318 MUSKRAT Ondatra zibethicus 180341 FULVOUS HARVEST MOUSE Reithrodontomys fulvescens 180343 WESTERN HARVEST MOUSE Reithrodontomys megalotis 180344 PLAINS HARVEST MOUSE Reithrodontomys montanus 180347 ARIZONA COTTON RAT Sigmodon arizonae 180348 TAWNY-BELLIED COTTON RAT Sigmodon fulviventer 180349 HISPID COTTON RAT Sigmodon hispidus 180350 YELLOW-NOSED COTTON RAT Sigmodon ochrognathus 180359 HEATHER VOLE Phenacomys intermedius 180366 HOUSE MOUSE Mus musculus 180368 NORTHERN PYGMY MOUSE Baiomys taylori 180370 WHITE-THROATED WOODRAT Neotoma albigula 180371 BUSHY-TAILED WOODRAT Neotoma cinerea 180372 EASTERN WOODRAT Neotoma floridana 180374 DESERT WOODRAT Neotoma lepida

180375 MEXICAN WOODRAT Neotoma mexicana 180376 SOUTHERN PLAINS WOODRAT Neotoma micropus 180377 STEPHENS' WOODRAT Neotoma stephensi 180381 MEARNS' GRASSHOPPER MOUSE Onvchomys arenicola 180382 NORTHERN GRASSHOPPER MOUSE Onvchomys leucogaster 180383 SOUTHERN GRASSHOPPER MOUSE Onychomys torridus 180386 MEADOW JUMPING MOUSE Zapus hudsonius 180387 WESTERN JUMPING MOUSE Zapus princeps 180393 PORCUPINE Erethizon dorsatum 180543 BROWN BEAR Ursus arctos 180544 AMERICAN BLACK BEAR Ursus americanus 180549 RIVER OTTER Lontra canadensis 180551 WOLVERINE Gulo gulo 180553 MINK Mustela vison 180555 ERMINE Mustela erminea 180556 LONG-TAILED WEASEL Mustela frenata 180557 BLACK-FOOTED FERRET Mustela nigripes 180559 MARTEN Martes americana 180560 FISHER Martes pennanti 180562 STRIPED SKUNK Mephitis mephitis 180563 HOODED SKUNK Mephitis macroura 180565 BADGER Taxidea taxus 180568 HOG-NOSED SKUNK Conepatus mesoleucus 180570 EASTERN SPOTTED SKUNK Spilogale putorius 180575 RACCOON Procyon lotor 180577 RINGTAIL Bassariscus astutus 180582 BOBCAT Lynx rufus 180585 LYNX Lynx canadensis 180593 JAGUAR Panthera onca 180596 GRAY WOLF Canis lupus 180599 COYOTE Canis latrans 180604 RED FOX Vulpes vulpes 180606 KIT FOX Vulpes macrotis 180607 SWIFT FOX Vulpes velox 180609 GRAY FOX Urocyon cinereoargenteus 180695 WAPITI Cervus elaphus 180698 MULE DEER Odocoileus hemionus 180699 WHITE-TAILED DEER Odocoileus virginianus 180703 MOOSE Alces alces 180711 BIGHORN SHEEP Ovis canadensis 180713 MOUNTAIN GOAT Oreamnos americanus 180717 PRONGHORN Antilocapra americana 180719 BARBARY SHEEP Ammotragus lervia 203452 TOWNSEND'S BIG-EARED BAT Corynorhinus townsendii 203618 BISON Bos bison 206989 PLAINS SPADEFOOT Spea bombifrons 206991 GREAT BASIN SPADEFOOT Spea intermontana 206993 NEW MEXICO SPADEFOOT Spea multiplicata 207312 BOREAL CHORUS FROG Pseudacris maculata 207313 PACIFIC CHORUS FROG Pseudacris regilla 207724 BARKING FROG Eleutherodactylus augusti 208657 BIG BEND SLIDER Trachemys gaigeae 208677 SMOOTH SOFTSHELL TURTLE Apalone mutica 208680 SPINY SOFTSHELL TURTLE Apalone spinifera 208791 MOJAVE BLACK-COLLARED LIZARD Crotaphytus bicinctores 208896 VARIABLE SKINK Eumeces gaigeae 208940 WESTERN WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus tigris 208947 DESERT GRASSLAND WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus uniparens 208948 PLATEAU STRIPED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus velox 209008 NORTHERN ALLIGATOR LIZARD Elgaria coerulea 209017 MADREAN ALLIGATOR LIZARD Elgaria kingii 209247 COMMON KINGSNAKE Lampropeltis getula 209266 GRAY-BANDED KINGSNAKE Lampropeltis alterna 209400 BULLSNAKE Pituophis catenifer 209455 TRANS-PECOS RAT SNAKE Bogertophis subocularis 209458 GREEN RAT SNAKE Senticolis triaspis 550236 AMARGOSA TOAD Bufo nelsoni 550241 RAMSEY CANYON LEOPARD FROG Rana subaquavocalis 550546 COLUMBIA SPOTTED FROG Rana luteiventris 551766 RIO GRANDE RIVER COOTER Pseudemys gorzugi 552462 WHITE-NOSED COATI Nasua narica 552464 SOUTHERN LONG-NOSED BAT Leptonycteris curasoae 552466 WESTERN SPOTTED SKUNK Spilogale gracilis 552470 OCELOT Leopardus pardalis 552479 MOUNTAIN LION Puma concolor 552480 MOGOLLON VOLE Microtus mogollonensis 552482 LONG-TAILED POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus formosus 552483 HISPID POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus hispidus 552484 ROCK POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus intermedius 552486 DESERT POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus penicillatus 552487 SPINY POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus spinatus 552488 MERRIAM'S POCKET MOUSE Perognathus merriami 552490 SAGEBRUSH VOLE Lemmiscus curtatus 552494 ARIZONA WOODRAT Neotoma devia 552495 OSGOOD'S MOUSE Peromyscus gratus 552496 ROCK MOUSE Peromyscus nasutus 552499 MERRIAM'S GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus canus 552503 HOPI CHIPMUNK Tamias rufus 552504 PIUTE GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus mollis 552512 EASTERN RED BAT Lasiurus borealis 552520 BAILEY'S POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus bailevi 552521 PYGMY RABBIT Brachylagus idahoensis 552761 COLLARED PECCARY Pecari tajacu 554027 CLARK'S GREBE Aechmophorus clarkii 554030 FIVE-STRIPED SPARROW Aimophila quinquestriata 554127 AMERICAN PIPIT Anthus rubescens 554128 WESTERN SCRUB-JAY Aphelocoma californica 554135 GREAT EGRET Ardea alba 554137 GRAY HAWK Asturina nitida 554139 JUNIPER TITMOUSE Baeolophus ridgwayi 554141 BRIDLED TITMOUSE Baeolophus wollweberi 554145 STILT SANDPIPER Calidris himantopus 554146 CRESTED CARACARA Caracara plancus 554221 OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER Contopus cooperi 554254 HAMMOND'S FLYCATCHER Empidonax hammondii 554255 CORDILLERAN FLYCATCHER Empidonax occidentalis 554256 HORNED LARK Eremophila alpestris 554267 BULLOCK'S ORIOLE Icterus bullockii 554268 MISSISSIPPI KITE Ictinia mississippiensis 554375 NEOTROPIC CORMORANT Phalacrocorax brasilianus 554376 RED

PHALAROPE Phalaropus fulicaria 554380 SPOTTED TOWHEE Pipilo maculatus 554382 BLACK-CAPPED CHICKADEE Poecile atricapilla 554385 MOUNTAIN CHICKADEE Poecile gambeli 554388 MEXICAN CHICKADEE Poecile sclateri 554456 CASSIN'S VIREO Vireo cassinii 554477 PLUMBEOUS VIREO Vireo plumbeus 555388 WESTERN SCREECH-OWL Otus kennicottii 555544 COMMON POORWILL Phalaenoptilus nuttallii 555657 NEW MEXICO SHREW Sorex neomexicanus 555658 DAVIS MOUNTAIN COTTONTAIL Silvilagus robustus 563907 ROSY BOA Charina trivirgata 563909 THORNSCRUB HOOK-NOSED SNAKE Gyalopion quadrangulare 563910 SMOOTH GREEN SNAKE Liochlorophis vernalis 564567 PYGMY SHORT-HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma douglasii 564571 BLACK SPINY-TAILED IGUANA Ctenosaura hemilopha 564574 SAND DUNE LIZARD Sceloporus arenicolus 564594 GREATER SHORT-HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma hernandesi 564594 GREATER SHORT-HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma hernandesi 564596 COMMON CHUCKWALLA Sauromalus ater 625180 ORYX Oryx gazella Time Period of Content: *Time\_Period\_Information:* Single Date/Time: Calendar Date: REOUIRED: The year (and optionally month, or month and day) for which the data set corresponds to the ground. Currentness\_Reference: publication date Status: Progress: Complete Maintenance\_and\_Update\_Frequency: None planned Spatial\_Domain: Bounding Coordinates: West\_Bounding\_Coordinate: -122.066986 East\_Bounding\_Coordinate: -100.746328 North Bounding Coordinate: 44.182132 South Bounding Coordinate: 28.940260 Keywords: Theme: Theme\_Keyword\_Thesaurus: None Theme\_Keyword: Habitat Modeling Theme Keyword: Amphibians Theme\_Keyword: Birds Theme\_Keyword: Mammals Theme\_Keyword: Reptiles Theme Keyword: Predicted Habitat Place: Place Keyword Thesaurus: None Place\_Keyword: Southwest United States Place\_Keyword: Arizona Place Keyword: Colorado Place\_Keyword: New Mexico Place\_Keyword: Nevada Place Keyword: Utah Access\_Constraints: None; public domain Use Constraints: This database in not intended for site-specific analyses. Interpretations derived from its use are suited for regional and planning purposes only. Acknowledgment of Southwest Regional Gap Analsysi Project is appreciated. See limitations and disclaimers in Larger Work Citation, on national GAP home page(http:www.gap.uidaho.edu), or New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit (<http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap>). *Point\_of\_Contact:* Contact\_Information: Contact\_Organization\_Primary: Contact\_Organization: New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit

Contact\_Person: Ken Boykin Contact Position: Research Specialist Contact Address: Address Type: mailing and physical address Address: Box 30003, MSC 4901 City: Las Cruces State\_or\_Province: New Mexico Postal\_Code: 88003 Country: USA Contact\_Voice\_Telephone: 505-646-6303 Contact\_Facsimile\_Telephone: 505-646-1281 Contact Electronic Mail Address: kboykin@nmsu.edu Data Set Credit: Arizona: USGS Southwest Biological Science Center, Colorado Plateau Field Station, Northern Arizona University, P.O. Box 5614, Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5614, Principle Investigator: Kathryn Thomas, Habitat Modelers: Charles Drost, J. Judson Wynne . Colorado: Colorado Division of Wildlife, Habitat Resources Section, 6060 N. Broadway, Denver, CO 80216, Principle Investigators: Don Schrupp, Lee O'Brien,

Habitat Modelers: Tammy Hamer, Katy Oakes, Chris Mettinbrink.

Nevada: US EPA, National Exposure Research Lab - ESD/LEB, P.O. Box 25047, Las Vegas, NV 89193-3478, Principle Investigators: Bruce Jones, Bill Kepner, David Bradford, Habitat Modelers: David Bradford, Chad Cross, Bruce Jones.

New Mexico: New Mexico Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit, New Mexico State University, P.O. Box 30003, MSC 4901, Las Cruces, NM 88003, Principle Investigators: Bruce Thompson, Ken Boykin, Database Creator: Robert Deitner, Habitat Modelers: Susanne Propeck-Gray, Jennifer Puttere, Cynthia King, Zachary Schwenke,

Utah: RS/GIS Laboratory, College of Natural Resources, UMC 5275, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-5275, Principle Investigators: Doug Ramsey, John Lowry, Habitat Modelers: Wendy Rieth.

NatureServe: NatureServe, 2400 Spruce St., Suite 201, Bolder, CO 80302, Vegetation Ecologists: Keith Schulz, Pat Comer.

USGS/Biological Resources Discipline: P.O. Box 30003, MSC 4901, Las Cruces, NM 88003, SWReGAP Project Coordinator: Julie Prior-Magee.

Security\_Information: Security\_Classification: Unclassified Native\_Data\_Set\_Environment: Microsoft Windows XP Version 5.1 (Build 2600) Service Pack 2; ESRI ArcCatalog 9.1.0.722

*Data\_Quality\_Information:* 

Attribute\_Accuracy:

Attribute\_Accuracy\_Report:

We received 1000+ reviews throughout the region on 650 species. Although models were reviewed and modified based on information from taxa experts, any errors in modeling remain the responsibility of SWReGAP. Habitat modelers made final judgments regarding model attributes. *Logical\_Consistency\_Report:* Not applicable for raster data *Completeness Report:* 

Distributions of 37 amphibians, 132 reptiles, 436 birds and 215 mammals were predicted by 8-digit HUC using a variety of sources. All cells within the Southwest regional boundary (AZ, CO, NV, NM and UT) have an attributed CODE. See Process Description for more details. Lineage: Process Step: Process Description: Habitat models were completed using a gmd file included within the downloaded zip file. For a full description of the procedures involved in constructing this database please refer to the SWReGAP Final Report chapter on "Predicted Animal Distributions and Species Richness" at the URL: <http://www.gap.uidaho.edu/> Process\_Date: 20050930 Process Contact: Contact Information: Contact\_Organization\_Primary: Contact Organization: New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Contact Person: Ken Boykin Contact Position: Research Specialist Contact Address: Address\_Type: mailing and physical address City: Las Cruces State\_or\_Province: New Mexico Postal\_Code: 88003 Country: USA Contact Voice Telephone: 505-646-6303 Contact Facsimile Telephone: 505-646-1281 Contact\_Electronic\_Mail\_Address: kboykin@nmsu.edu Process Step: Process Description: Metadata imported. Source\_Used\_Citation\_Abbreviation: C:\swregap.xml

Spatial\_Data\_Organization\_Information:

Direct\_Spatial\_Reference\_Method: Raster Raster\_Object\_Information: Raster\_Object\_Type: Pixel Row\_Count: 48964 Column\_Count: 55872 Vertical\_Count: 1

Spatial\_Reference\_Information:

Horizontal\_Coordinate\_System\_Definition: Planar: Map Projection: Map\_Projection\_Name: Albers Conical Equal Area *Albers\_Conical\_Equal\_Area:* Standard Parallel: 29.500000 Standard Parallel: 45.500000 Longitude of Central Meridian: -96.000000 Latitude of Projection Origin: 23.000000 False Easting: 0.000000 False Northing: 0.000000 *Planar\_Coordinate\_Information:* Planar\_Coordinate\_Encoding\_Method: row and column Coordinate Representation: Abscissa\_Resolution: 30.000000 Ordinate\_Resolution: 30.000000 Planar\_Distance\_Units: meters

Geodetic\_Model: Horizontal\_Datum\_Name: North American Datum of 1983 Ellipsoid\_Name: Geodetic Reference System 80 Semi-major\_Axis: 6378137.000000 Denominator\_of\_Flattening\_Ratio: 298.257222

#### Entity\_and\_Attribute\_Information:

Detailed\_Description: Entity\_Type: Entity\_Type\_Label: Layer 1 Attribute: Attribute Label: ObjectID Attribute Definition: Internal feature number. Attribute\_Definition\_Source: ESRI Attribute Domain Values: Unrepresentable Domain: Sequential unique whole numbers that are automatically generated. Attribute: Attribute\_Label: Value Attribute: Attribute\_Label: Count Attribute: Attribute\_Label: Red Attribute: Attribute\_Label: Green Attribute: Attribute Label: Blue Attribute: Attribute\_Label: Class names Detailed Description: Entity\_Type: *Entity\_Type\_Label:* Class\_names Entity\_Type\_Definition: Range Coding Attribute: Attribute\_Domain\_Values: Enumerated Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K12 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: Known or Probable occurrence, breeding, wintering Enumerated Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K13 Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Known or probable occurrence, breeding, summering Enumerated\_Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K14 Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Known or probable occurrence, breeding, winter and summering Enumerated Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K21 Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, migratory Enumerated Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K22 *Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition:* Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, wintering Enumerated\_Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K23 Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, summering Enumerated\_Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K24

Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Known or probable occurrence, breeding, wintering and summering Enumerated Domain: Enumerated Domain Value: K33 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: Known or probable occurrence, both breeding and non-breeding, summering Enumerated Domain: Enumerated\_Domain\_Value: K34 Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Known or probable occurrence, both breeding and non-breeding, witner and summer Enumerated Domain: Enumerated Domain Value: P34 Enumerated Domain Value Definition: Potential occurrence, both breeding and non-breeding, witner and summer Enumerated Domain: Enumerated Domain Value: X34 Enumerated\_Domain\_Value\_Definition: Extirpated, both breeding and non-breeding, witner and summer Attribute Measurement Frequency: None planned **Overview** Description: Entity\_and\_Attribute\_Detail\_Citation: The following fields are present in the dataset

Distribution\_Information:

Distributor: Contact Information: Contact Organization Primary: Contact\_Organization: New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Contact Person: Ken Boykin Contact Address: Address\_Type: mailing and physical address Address: 2980 South Espina City: Las Cruces State\_or\_Province: New Mexico Postal Code: 88003 Country: USA Contact Voice Telephone: 505-646-6303 Contact Facsimile Telephone: 505-646-1281 Contact Electronic Mail Address: kboykin@nmsu.edu Hours\_of\_Service: 8:00am-5:00pm Mountain Time Zone Resource Description: SWReGAP Vertebrate Habitat Distribution Models Digital Dataset Distribution Liability: The digital data described by this metadata report were prepared by the Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project. Neither the States involled nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, make any warranty, for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed in this report or media or represent that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference therein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the States. Any views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the States involved. Data on this media may have been derived from federal agencies or from other external sources or from data developed by the agencies involved . In those cases where data has been translated from one format to another or initially developed from map or other sources the agencies involved has made all reasonable efforts to preserve the data quality as originally developed, however no warranty, expressed or implied, is made by the agencies involved as to the completeness or accuracy of the data and related materials. The act of distribution does not constitute any such warranty, and no responsibility is assumed by the agencies involved in the use of this data, or related materials. Standard\_Order\_Process: Digital\_Form:

Digital\_Transfer\_Information: Format\_Name: "ERDAS" ERDAS image files (ERDAS Corporation) or ArcInfo GRID format (ESRI) Format\_Version\_Number: 8.7 File\_Decompression\_Technique: Compression type \*.zip. For windows use WinZip. Transfer\_Size: 0.000 Fees: None

Metadata\_Reference\_Information:

Metadata\_Date: 20051003 Metadata\_Contact: Contact Information: Contact Organization Primary: Contact\_Organization: New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Contact Person: Ken Boykin Contact Address: Address\_Type: mailing and physical address Address: 2980 South Espina Street City: Las Cruces State\_or\_Province: New Mexico Postal\_Code: 88003 Country: USA Contact\_Voice\_Telephone: 505-646-6303 Contact Facsimile Telephone: 505-646-1281 Contact Electronic Mail Address: kboykin@nmsu.edu Metadata\_Standard\_Name: FGDC Content Standards for Digital Geospatial Metadata Metadata Standard Version: FGDC-STD-001-1998 Metadata\_Time\_Convention: local time Metadata\_Security\_Information: Metadata Security Classification: Unclassified Metadata\_Extensions: Online\_Linkage: <a href="http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/>">http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/></a> Profile\_Name: NPS NR and GIS Metadata Profile Metadata Extensions: Online\_Linkage: <a href="http://www.esri.com/metadata/esriprof80.html">http://www.esri.com/metadata/esriprof80.html</a> Profile Name: ESRI Metadata Profile

Generated by mp version 2.8.6 on Fri Oct 21 08:36:47 2005

## Appendix 3-10. Database Description

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_HM-10.pdf

### Appendix 3-11. Species Richness by Land Cover Type

Species richness for each each land cover type mapped in Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project by taxon group. Species richness is biased toward the high side, as habitat selection could identify broad categories (e.g. grasslands) with the idea that use of HUCs would constrain habitat models to grasslands within the known range. A = Amphibians, B = Birds, M =Mammals, R = Reptiles.

Code	Land Cover Description	А	В	М	R	Total
D01	Disturbed, NON-SPECIFIC		19	4		23
D02	Recently Burned		8	5		13
D03	Recently mined or quarried		3	2	1	6
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	4	45	24	3	76
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	1	24	8	1	34
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland		11	2		13
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	1	21	8		30
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland		10	3	1	14
D10	Recently Logged Areas		11	7	1	19
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	1	12	8	5	26
D14	Disturbed, oil well		1	2	1	4
N11	Open water	7	125	13	11	156
N21	Developed, Low Intensity		118	37	8	163
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity		57	18	2	77
N31	Barren Lands		3	13	3	19
N80	Agriculture	2	165	49	12	228
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field		3	1		4
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	1	7	11		19
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree		3	3	1	7
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	1	7	12	6	26
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff and Canyon	2	82	61	24	169
S007	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon		20	13	5	38
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	1	22	18	16	57
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	3	63	40	36	142
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	3	71	46	44	164
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland		9	10	11	30
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dunes	1	15	33	16	65
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	2	22	52	29	105
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	3	18	41	14	76
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	2	29	40	13	84
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	3	34	50	43	130
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland		4	6	8	18
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	2	17	33	26	78
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland		10	18	13	41
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	4	60	56	22	142
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement		8	6	9	23
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	4	19	16	11	50

Code	Land Cover Description	А	В	М	R	Total
	•					
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	3	79	55	13	150
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	2	50	52	11	115
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	1	39	57	7	104
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	2	42	64	10	118
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	4	54	57	10	125
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Woodland	1	17	17	4	39
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	5	63	61	9	138
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	2	49	29	6	86
S032	Rocky Mountain Montane Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	5	102	90	17	214
S033	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1	34	23	5	63
S034	Rocky Mountain Montane Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	5	95	81	19	200
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	4	148	94	61	307
S036	Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	3	101	95	30	229
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	3	107	90	53	253
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	4	100	87	53	244
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	4	100	59	47	210
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland Complex	2	81	51	10	144
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland		20	14	1	35
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	2	15	22	11	50
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	3	96	66	24	189
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	2	49	41	13	105
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	3	36	53	26	118
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	2	30	31	13	76
8051	Madrean Encinal	2	89	81	48	220
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	4	101	71	41	217
8053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	1	54	25	17	97
8054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	3	70	79	23	175
8055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	3	57	48	18	126
8056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	3	48	46	13	110
8057	Mogolion Chaparral	1	66	6/	25	159
8058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	1	96	74	62	239
8059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon Tea Shrubland	1	30	61	25	117
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	3	56	45	28	132
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	6	46	69	39	160
S062	Chihuahuan Creosotebush, Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	9	65	90	42	206
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	3	64	68	49	184
8065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	3	44	76	16	139
S068	Chinuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	5	17	30	17	69
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	7	48	74	47	176
S070	Sonora-Mojave Desert Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	3	41	28	12	84
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	4	61	70	17	152

Code	Land Cover Description	А	В	М	R	Total
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	4	80	72	46	202
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	3	72	64	45	184
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Piedmont Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	8	106	100	69	283
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1	53	52	12	118
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub Steppe	3	74	104	27	208
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	5	52	62	21	140
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	1	18	29	2	50
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	2	28	32	8	70
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	3	61	52	11	127
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	6	79	49	25	159
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	3	88	49	22	162
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	9	87	74	44	214
S089	Western Great Plains Sandhill Prairie	3	46	51	23	123
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	7	84	96	43	230
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	7	89	47	13	156
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	6	117	85	16	224
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	10	219	96	36	361
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	8	206	74	46	334
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	6	147	45	25	223
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	3	46	61	13	123
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	7	228	74	58	367
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	11	143	56	48	258
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	11	168	50	13	242
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	5	108	45	16	174
S103	Temperate Pacific Montane Wet Meadow	1	29	11	4	45
S105	Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	1	14	4	2	21
S108	Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	3	47	6	3	59
S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland	7	61	66	32	166
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	4	91	70	18	183
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	4	122	89	61	276
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	4	50	55	14	123
S114	Sonora-Mojave-Baja Semi-Desert Chaparral	1	40	20	15	76
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	2	70	74	57	203
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2	40	58	33	133
S117	Coahuilan Chaparral		26	15	11	52
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	7	161	49	18	235
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain Herbaceous Wetland	8	170	70	27	275
S121	Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland		27	23	3	53
S122	Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland		28	21	1	50
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland		29	24	3	56
S125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	2	72	63	31	168
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	1	18	25	7	51
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	2	41	44	26	113

Code	Land Cover Description	А	В	М	R	Total
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	2	46	42	18	108
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	2	17	12	2	33
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	2	14	20	8	44
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	2	12	14	8	36

				Land Management Descriptor	
1000	Federal Lan	ıd			
	1100	Bureau of Land Management (B	LM)		
			1101	Area of Critical Environmental Concern (BLM)	
			1102	Globally Important Bird Area (BLM)	
			1103	National Conservation Area (BLM)	
			1104	National Monument (BLM)	
			1105	National Natural or Historic Landmark (BLM)	
			1106	National Outstanding Natural Area (BLM)	
			1107	National Recreation Area (BLM)	
			1108	National Scenic Research Area (BLM)	
			1109	Research Natural Area (BLM)	
			1110	Significant Cave & Cave System (BLM)	
			1111	Wild, Scenic & Recreation River (BLM)	
		111		Wilderness Area (BLM)	
			1113	Wilderness Study Area (BLM)	
			1114	World Heritage & Biosphere Site (BLM)	
			1189	Special Management Area (BLM)	
			1190	Bureau of Land Management Public Land (BLM)	
			1193	Botanical Reserve (BLM)	
			1194	Archaeological Area (BLM)	
			1195	Wildlife Habitat Area (BLM)	
			1196	Special or Extensive Recreation Management Area (BLM)	
			1197	Historical Area (BLM)	
			1198	Fossil Area (BLM)	
			1199	Scenic Area (BLM)	
	1200	Bureau of Reclar (BOR)	mation		
			1201	National Recreation Area (BOR)	
			1202	Wildlife/Recreation Management Area (BOR)	
			1290	Other Bureau of Reclamation Land (BOR)	
	1300 Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)		e Service		
			1301	1301 National Wildlife Refuge (FWS)	
			1302	Waterfowl Production Area (FWS)	
			1303	Wilderness Area (FWS)	
			1304	Conservation Easement (FWS)	
			1391	Research Natural Area (FWS)	
<u> </u>			1392	Wildlife Management Area (FWS)	
			1393	Federal Fish Hatchery (FWS)	
			1394	National Wildlife Refuge Overlay (FWS/DOD)	

# Appendix 4-1. Management coding system for land stewardship.

1400	Forest Service (USFS)		
		1401	Archaeological Area (USFS)
		1402	Botanical Reserve (USFS)
		1403	Geological Area (USFS)
		1404	Municipal Watershed (USFS)
		1405	National Game Refuge (USFS)
		1406	National Monument (USFS)
		1407	National Primitive Area (USFS)
		1408	National Recreation Area (USFS)
		1409	National Scenic Research Area (USFS)
		1410	Research Natural Area (USFS)
		1411	Wild, Scenic & Recreation River (USFS)
		1412	Wilderness Area (USFS)
		1413	Wilderness Study Area (USFS)
		1487	National Preserve (USFS)
		1488	Demonstration Area (USFS)
		1489	Environmental Study Area (USFS)
		1490	Forest Service Public Land (USFS)
		1491	National Natural or Historic Landmark (USFS)
		1492	Historical Area (USFS)
		1493	Habitat Protection Area (USFS)
		1494	Biosphere Reserve (USFS)
		1495	Experimental Forest (USFS)
		1496	National Grassland (USFS)
		1497	Scenic Area (USFS)
		1498	Other Congressionally Designated Area (USFS)
		1499	Zoological Area (USFS)
1500	Department of Defe (DOD) and Departm	ense nent of	
	Energy (DOE)	1501	Ecological Reserve (DOD)
		1503	Special Resources Area/Research Natural Area (DOD)
		1550	Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)
		1560	Department of Energy (DOE)
		1590	Military Reservation (DOD)
1600	National Park Service		
		1601	International Historic Site (NPS)
		1602	National Battlefield (NPS)
		1603	National Battlefield Park (NPS)
		1604	National Battlefield Site (NPS)
		1605	National Historical Park (NPS)
		1606	National Historic Site (NPS)

Appendix 4-1. Management coding system for land stewardship (continued).

				1 \ /		
			1607	National Lakeshore (NPS)		
			1608	National Memorial (NPS)		
			1609	National Military Park (NPS)		
			1610	National Monument (NPS)		
			1611	National Park (NPS)		
			1612	National Preserve (NPS)		
			1613	National Recreation Area (NPS)		
			1614	National Reserve (NPS)		
			1615	National River & Wild & Scenic Riverway (NPS)		
		1616		National Seashore (NPS)		
		1617		Wilderness Area (NPS)		
		1618		National Cemetery (NPS)		
		1619		National Parkway (NPS)		
			1620	Other NPS Protected Areas (NPS)		
			1621	NPS Affiliated Areas (NPS)		
			1690	National Trail (NPS)		
			1691	Research Natural Area (NPS)		
			1692	Cave Protection Area (NPS) (Only one 04/06/06)		
		Natural Resource	es .			
	1700	Conservation Ser	vice			
		(INCO)	1701	Conservation Easement (NRCS)		
			1702	Conservation Reserve Program Land (NRCS)		
			1703	Wetland Reserve Program Land (NRCS)		
			1704	Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program Land (NRCS)		
	1750	Agricultural Rese	earch			
	1750	Service (ARS)				
			1751	Experimental Range (ARS)		
	1800	Bureau of Indian (BIA)	Affairs			
			1801	Wildlife Reserve (BIA)		
		National Oceanic	and			
	1900	Atmospheric				
		Administration (1	1901	National Estuarine Research Reserve (NOAA)		
	1050	Department of Co	ommerce			
	1950	(DOC)				
			1951	National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)		
2000	Tribal Land	- <b>-</b>				
	2200	Tribal Land				
			2201	Native American Reservation		
			2202	Tribal Park		
			2203	Indian Allotment		
I		1				

Appendix 4-1. Management coding system for land stewardship (continued).

3000	State Land		
	3100	State Park & Recreation Areas	
		310	l State Park
		310	2 State Recreation Area
		310	3 State Historical Park
		310-	4 State Historic Site
		310	5 State Natural Area
		310	5 State Resort Park
	3200	State Land Board	
		320	1 State Trust Land
		3202	2 State Stewardship Trust Land
	3300	State Wildlife Reserve	
		330	l State Wildlife Reserve
		3302	2 State Habitat Area
		330	3 State Fishing Unit
		330-	4 State Wildlife Recreation Area
		330	5 State Wildlife Administration Building
	3306		6 State Fish Hatchery
	3400	Other State Land	
		340	1 Other State Land
		3402	2 State Sovereign Land
4000	Regional Go	overnment Land	
	4100	Regional Government Land	
		419	Regional Park
		419	l Regional Open Space
5000	Local Gover	nment Land	
	5100	City Land	
		5190	) City Park
		519	City Open Space
		5192	2 City Facility
	5200	County Land	
		5290	County Facility
		529	County Park
		5292	2 County Playground
		5293	County Open Space
		5294	County Conservation Easement

Appendix 4-1. Management coding system for land stewardship (continued).

6000	0 Non-Governmental Organization Land			
	6100	Audubon Societ	у	
			6101	Audubon Society Preserve
	6200	Local Land Trus Preserve/Easem	st ent	
			6201	Local Land Trust Preserve/Easement
	6300	The Nature Con (TNC)	servancy	
			6301	Nature Conservancy Easement (TNC)
	6302		6302	Nature Conservancy Preserve (TNC)
			6303	Nature Conservancy Cooperative Managed Property (TNC)
7000	000 Private Land			
	7100	Private Conservation Easement/Conservation Deed Restriction		
			7101	Private Conservation Easement/Conservation Deed Restriction
	7200	Private Institution Managed for Bio	on- odiversity	
			7201	Private Institution - Managed for Biodiversity
	7300 Private Unrestricted for Development/No Known Restriction		cted for Known	
			7301	Private Land - No Known Restriction
8000	0 Water			
	8100	Water		
			8101	Water
9000	Unknown			
	9100	Unknown		

Appendix 4-1. Management coding system for land stewardship (continued).

# Appendix 4-2. Standardized questionnaire used to interview land mangers to guide determination of biodiversity management state codes.

### GAP STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE

Date:
Agency:
Parcel Name:
Approximate Size of Parcel:
Contact Name:
Contact Position:
Phone Number:
What is the primary management objective for this land tract?
Does this land tract have a written agency or institutional documentation that guides the management of the land, (i.e. management plan)?
Is the land tract subject to forcible protection from land conversion through legislation, deed restrictions, or easements?
If so, is this protection intended for permanent status? How long does it last?
Is this area open to visitor use?:

What types of activities do the visitors participate in?

To what extent of the area is impacted by visitor use?\_\_\_\_\_

What are the general guiding principles for natural resource management?\_\_\_\_\_

Are natural processes, such as fire, flooding or affects from insects, suppressed or allowed through active management?\_\_\_\_\_

Are activities such as livestock grazing, mineral extraction, or harvesting/cultivation allowed on this land tract at any time?

Other comments:

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management
Bureau of Land Management	111 Ranch ACEC/RNA; Bear Springs Badlands ACEC; Bowie Mountains Scenic ACEC; Dos Cabezas Peaks ACEC; Eagle Creek Bat Cave ACEC; Guadalupe Canyon ACEC/ONA; San Rafael ACEC/RNA; St. David Cienega ACEC/RNA; Table Mountain ACEC/RNA; Turkey Creek Riparian ACEC; Willcox Playa ACEC/NNL; Dos Cabezas Mountains Wilderness; Fishhooks Wilderness; North Santa Teresa Wilderness; Redfield Canyon Wilderness	Final Safford District Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement 08/1991
Bureau of Land Management	Aubrey Peak Bighorn Sheep Habitat ACEC; Black Mountains ACEC; Burro Creek Riparian and Cultural ACEC; Carrow-Stephens Ranches ACEC; Hualapai Mountain ACEC/RNA; Joshua Tree Forest-Grand Wash Cliffs ACEC; McCracken Desert Tortoise Habitat ACEC; Poachie Desert Tortoise Habitat ACEC; Three Rivers Riparian ACEC; White-Margined Penstemon Reserve ACEC; Wright-Cottonwood Creeks Riparian-Cultural ACEC; Arrastra Mountain Wilderness; Aubrey Peak Wilderness; Mount Nutt Wilderness; Mount Tipton Wilderness; Mount Wilson Wilderness; Tres Alamos Wilderness; Upper Burro Creek Wilderness; Wabayuma Peak Wilderness; Mount Nutt Wilderness; Upper Burro Creek Wilderness; Tres Alamos Wilderness; Upper Burro Creek Wilderness; Warm Springs Wilderness	Record of Decision for the Approval of the Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan 03/1995; Kingman Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 01/1992
Bureau of Land Management	Coffeepot Botanical ACEC; Gila River Cultural ACEC; Vekol Valley Grassland ACEC	Final Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and Environemental Impact Statement Phoenix District, Arizona 08/1995

# **Appendix 4-3. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Arizona.**

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan		
Bureau of Land Management	Fort Pierce ACEC; Johnson Spring ACEC; Little Black Mountain ACEC; Lost Spring Mountain ACEC; Marble Canyon ACEC; Moonshine Ridge ACEC; Nampaweap ACEC; Pakoon ACEC; Virgin River Corridor ACEC; Virgin Slope ACEC; Witch Pool ACEC; White-Margined Penstemon Reserve ACEC; Wright-Cottonwood Creeks Riparian-Cultural ACEC; Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness; Kanab Creek Wilderness	Proposed Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Statement 12/1990		
Bureau of Land Management	Perry Mesa ACEC; Tanner Wash ACEC; Waterman Mountains ACEC; White Canyon ACEC; Big Horn Mountains Wilderness; Harquahala Mountains Wilderness; Hassayampa River Canyon Wilderness; Hells Canyon Wilderness; Hummingbird Springs Wilderness; North Maricopa Mountains Wilderness; Sierra Estrella Wilderness; Signal Mountain Wilderness, South Maricopa Mountains Wilderness; Tabletop Wilderness; Woolsey Peak Wilderness	Proposed Phoenix Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 12/1988		
Bureau of Land Management	Gila Box Riparian NCA	Gila Box Management Plan, Environmental Assessment and Decision Record 01/1998		
Bureau of Land Management	Las Cienegas NCA	Approved Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 07/2003		
Bureau of Land Management	San Pedro Riparian NCA; Agua Fria NM; Grand Canyon- Parashant NM; Ironwood Forest NM; Sonoran Desert NM; Vermillion Cliffs NM	Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monuments and BLM National Conservation Areas 10/2001		
Bureau of Land Management	Eagletail Mountains Wilderness; Muggins Mountains Wilderness	Record of Decision for the Yuma District Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement 04/1987; Final Amendment 01/1992; Final Amendment 03/1996		

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Baboquivari Peak Wilderness; Coyote Mountains Wilderness; Harcuvar Mountains Wilderness; Needle's Eye Wilderness; Rawhide Mountains Wilderness; Swansea Wilderness; Trigo Mountains Wilderness; White Canyon Wilderness	Wilderness Management Policy 09/1981
Bureau of Land Management	Baker Canyon WSA, Cactus Plain WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/1995
Bureau of Land Management	Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness	Wilderness Management Plan Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness 02/1988
Bureau of Land Management	Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness; Paiute Wilderness	Final Wilderness Management Plan Paiute and Beaver Dam Mountains 06/1990
Bureau of Land Management	Cottonwood Point Wilderness	Wilderness Management Plan for the Cottonwood Point Wilderness 09/1991
Bureau of Land Management	East Cactus Plain Wilderness	East Cactus Plain Wilderness Management Plan, Environmental Assessment, and Decision Record 09/1994
Bureau of Land Management	Gibraltar Mountain Wilderness	Gibraltar Mountain Interdisciplinary Management Plan and Environmental Assessment 03/2001
Bureau of Land Management	Mount Logan Wilderness; Mount Trumbull Wilderness	Wilderness Management Plan Mt. Trumbull Wilderness Mt. Logan Wilderness 12/1990
Bureau of Land Management	Mount Tipton Wilderness; Wabayuma Peak Wilderness	Wabayuma Peak and Mount Tipton Wilderness Management Plan, Environmental Assessment, and Decision Record 08/1995
Bureau of Land Management	Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness	Final Wilderness Management Plan Paria Canyon-Vermillion Cliffs 03/1986

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Peloncillo Mountains Wilderness	Peloncillo Mountains Wilderness Management Plan, Environemental Assessment, and Decision Record 06/1995
Bureau of Land Management / U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	New Water Mountains Wilderness	Kofa National Wildlife Refuge & Wilderness and New Water Mountains Wilderness Interagency Management Plan and Environmental Assessment 10/1996
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge	Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan 09/2003
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge	URL: http://www.fws.gov/southwest/r efuges/arizona/cabeza.html
U.S. Forest Service	Apache NF (MA 18); Blue Range Primitive Area (MA 8); Escudilla Wilderness (MA 13); Hayground RNA (MA 10); Phelps Cabin RNA (MA 10); Sitgreaves NF (MA 16); Wildcat RNA (MA 10)	Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest Plan 1987; Amendment No. 6. 07/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Arizona Bugbane Botanical Area (MA 6); Franks Lake Geologic-Botanical Area (MA 20); Kendrick Mountain Wilderness (MA 4); Saddle Mountain Wilderness (MA 19); Sycamore Canyon Wilderness (MA 1)	Kaibab National Forest Land Management Plan 04/1988; Amendment No. 5. 02/2003
U.S. Forest Service	Chiricahua Wilderness (MA 9); Coronado NF (MA 2A & MA 2B); Elgin Research Ranch (MA 8); Galiuro Wilderness (MA 9); Miller Peak Wilderness (MA 9); Mt. Graham WSA (MA 9); Mt. Wrightson Wilderness (MA 9); Pajarita Wilderness (MA 9); Pusch Ridge Wilderness (MA 9); Rincon Mountain Wilderness (MA 9); Santa Teresa Wilderness (MA 9); South Fork of Cave Creek Botanical Area (MA 14); Wild Chili Botanical Area (MA 15-1 & MA 15-4 & MA 15-7)	Coronado National Forest Plan 1986; Forest Plan Change Notice No. 3 06/1999

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	Coconino NF (MA 4 & MA 8); Fossil Springs Wilderness (MA 1); Kachina Peaks Wilderness (MA 1); Kendrick Mountain Wilderness (MA 1); Mazatzal Wilderness (MA 1); Mount Elden ESA (MA 18); Munds Mountain Wilderness (MA 1); Red Mountain Geological Area (MA 17); Red Rock- Secret Mountain Wilderness; Verde Scenic River Area (MA 1); West Clear Creek Wilderness (MA 1); Wet Beaver Wilderness (MA 1)	Coconino National Forest Plan 08/1987; Amendment No. 17. 12/2002
U.S. Forest Service	Four Peaks Wilderness (MA 3D & MA 6I); Four Peaks Wilderness (MA 6I); Hellsgate Wilderness (MA 4C & MA 5B); Mazatzal Wilderness (MA 1B & MA 3A & MA 4A); Pine Mountain Wilderness (MA 1A); Salome Wilderness (MA 5C & MA 6H); Salt River Canyon Wilderness (MA 2B & MA 6G); Sierra Ancha Wilderness (MA 5A); Sierra Anche Experimental Forest (MA 5E); Superstition Wilderness (MA 2A & MA 2A & MA 3B & MA 3C & MA 6B); Tonto NF(3H& 4E& 6C); Verde National Wild River (MA 1C & MA 4B)	Tonto National Forest Plan 10/1985; Amendment No. 22. 06/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Granite Mountain Wilderness (MA 6C); Pine Mountain Wilderness (MA 6H); Sycamore Canyon Wilderness (MA 6E); Verde National Wild River (MA 7)	Prescott National Forest Plan 11/1986; Amendment No. 11. 03/2000
National Park Service	Tuzigoot NM	Statement for Management Tuzigoot National Monument 01/1986
National Park Service	Tumacacori NHP	General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Tumacacori National Historical Park 09/1996
National Park Service	Chiricahua NM	Draft Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan Chiricahua National Monument 12/1999
National Park Service	Coronado National Memorial	Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Coronado National Memorial 01/2004

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management Plan
National Park Service	Canyon de Chelly NM	Joint Management Plan Canyon de Chelly National Monument 10/1989
National Park Service	Casa Grande Ruins NM	Master Plan of Casa Grande Ruins National Monument 09/1964
National Park Service	Montezuma Castle NM	Final Master Plan Montezuma Castle - Tuzigoot National Monuments 10/1975
National Park Service	Navajo NM	Final General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement Navajo National Monument 12/2003
National Park Service	Pipe Spring NM	Statement for Management Pipe Spring National Monument 02/1987
Native American Lands	Monument Valley Navajo Tribal Park	Interviewed Navajo Reservation Zoologist: David Mikesic - 02/2004
Department of Defense	Crater Range SRMA; Gran Desierto Dunes ACEC; Mohawk Mountains & Sand Dunes ACEC; Sentinel Plain Lava Flow SRMA; Tinajas Atlas Mountains ACEC	Draft Environmental Impact Statement Proposed Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan Barry M. Goldwater Range 02/2003
Arizona Game & Fish Department	Roper Lake State Park; Arlington Wildlife Area; Base & Meridian Wildlife Area; Bear Springs; Becker Lake Wildlife Area; Black River Lands; Bog Hole Wildlife Area; Chevelon Canyon Ranch; Chevelon Canyon Wildlife Area; Cluff Ranch Wildlife Area; Concho Lake and Land; Cunningham Tracts; Fool Hollow Lake and Land; Gila River Wildlife Area; Grasslands Wildlife Area; Green Dove Nesting Area; House Rock Ranch; Lee Valley; Luna Lake Wildlife Area; Manhatten Claims; May Memorial Wildlife Area; Mittry Lake Wildlife Area; Nelson Lake; Picacho Reservoir/McFarland; Powers Butte Wildlife Area; Quigley Wildlife Area; Robbins Butte Wildlife Area; Roper Lake; Sipe White Mountain Wildlife Area; Sunflower Flats; Texas Hill; Topock Marsh; Upper Verde River Wildlife Area; Veit Ranch; Wenima Wildlife Area; Whitewater Draw Wildlife Area; Wilcox Playa Wildlife Area	URL: http://www.azgfd.gov/ outdoor_recreation/watchable_w ildlife. shtml

Land	Name of Status 2 Area in Arizona	Source of Management
Steward		Plan
Arizona Game & Fish Department	Sonita Creek State Natural Area; State Trust Land; Alamo Lake Wildlife Area; Painted Rock Wildlife Area; San Rafael Ranch State Park	URL: http://www.azgfd.gov/outdoor_r ecreation/watchable_wildlife.sht ml
Local Land Trust	Cascabel Hermitage Association Land Trust	Interviewed Secreatry of Cascabel Hermitage Association Land Trust: Daniel Baker - 04/2005
The Nature Conservancy	Aravaipa Canyon Preserve; Baboquivari; Bingham Cienega; Bingham Cienega Nature Preserve; Buehman Canyon; Cascabel; Desert Foothills Land Trust; Dudleyville-Cook's Lake;Escondido Falls; Fern Mountain; Hartwell Canyon; Holy Joe; Muleshoe Ranch Cooperative Management Area; O'Donnell Creek; Upper San Pedro Partnership	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherewe work/ northamerica/states/arizona/pres erves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Black's Gulch ACEC; Coal Draw ACEC; Coal Oil Rim ACEC; Deer Gulch ACEC; Duck Creek ACEC; Dudley Bluffs ACEC; East Douglas Creek ACEC; Lower Greaswood Creek ACEC; Moosehead Mountain ACEC; Oil Spring Mountain ACEC; Raven Ridge ACEC; Ryan Gulch ACEC; South Cathedral Bluffs ACEC; Yanks Gulch/Upper Greasewood Creek ACEC; White River Riparian ACEC	White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan 07/1997
Bureau of Land Management	Adobe Badlands ACEC/ONA; Escalante Canyon ACEC; Needle Rock ACEC/ISA/ONA	Uncompahgre Basin Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 07/1989
Bureau of Land Management	American Basin ACEC; Dillon Pinnacles ACEC; Redcloud Peak ACEC; Slumgullion Earthflow National Natural Landmark ACEC; South Beaver Creek ACEC; West Antelope Creek ACEC	Gunnison Resource Area Record of Decision, Approved Resource Management Plan, and Rangeland Program Summary 02/1993
Bureau of Land Management	Gunnison Sage-Grouse ACEC/IBA; Native Plant Community ACEC/ONA; Gunnison Gorge NCA; Gunnison Gorge Wilderness	Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Approved Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 11/2004
Bureau of Land Management	Anasazi Culture Multiple Use Area ACEC; Tabeguache Creek ONA	San Juan/San Miguel Planning Area Resource Management Plan 09/1985
Bureau of Land Management	Arkansas Canyonlands ACEC; Beaver Creek ACEC; Browns Canyon ACEC; Cucharas Canyon ACEC; Droney Gulch ACEC; Garden Park Fossil Area National Natural Landmark ACEC; Grape Creek ACEC; Phantom Canyon ACEC	Royal Gorge Resource Area Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan 05/1996
Bureau of Land Management	Badger Wash ACEC; Gunnison Gravels ACEC/RNA; Rough Canyon ACEC/RNA; The Palisade ACEC/ONA; Unaweep Seep ACEC/RNA	Grand Junction Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 01/1987

# **Appendix 4-4. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Colorado.**

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Blanca Wildlife Habitat Area ACEC; Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad Corridor ACEC; Elephant Rocks ACEC; Los Mogotes ACEC; Ra Jadero Canyon ACEC; Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC; Sand Castle ACEC; San Luis Hills/Flattop ACEC; Trickle Mountain ACEC	San Luis Resource Area Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan 12/1991
Bureau of Land Management	Blue Hill Archaeological District ACEC; Bull Gulch ACEC; Glenwood Springs Debris Flow Hazard Zone ACEC; Deep Creek ACEC; Lower Colorado River Cooperative Management Area ACEC	Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan Glenwood Springs Resource Area (Revised 1988)
Bureau of Land Management	Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC; Irish Canyon ACEC; Limestone Ridge ACEC/RNA; Lookout Mountain ACEC; Ace in the Hole BA; Hells Canyon BA; G Gap BA; Vermillion Creek BA; Vermillion Bluffs BA; Horse Draw BA	Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 06/1989
Bureau of Land Management	San Miguel River ACEC	1993 - Amendment for San Miguel River ACEC, Recreation, Riparian, & Visual Resources
Bureau of Land Management	Adobe Badlands WSA; American Flats WSA; Ant Hills WSA; Beaver Creek WSA; Bill Hare Gulch WSA; Black Canyon WSA; Black Mountain WSA; Browns Canyon WSA; Bull Canyon WSA; Bull Gulch WSA; Cahone Canyon WSA; Camel Back WSA; Castle Peak WSA; Chew Winter Camp WSA; Cold Spring West WSA; Cross Canyon WSA; Cross Mountain WSA; Demaree Canyon WSA; Diamond Breaks WSA; Dinosaur Adjacent North WSA; Dolores River Canyon WSA; Dominguez Canyon WSA; Eagle Mountain WSA; Grape Creek WSA; Hack Lake WSA; Handies Peak WSA; Little Book Cliffs WSA; Lower Grape Creek WSA; McIntyre Hills WSA; McKenna Peak WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/1995
Bureau of Land Management (continued)	Menefee Mountain WSA; Oil Spring Mountain WSA; Peterson Draw WSA; Platte River Contigous; Powderhorn ISA; Redcloud Peak WSA; San Luis Hills WSA; Sand Castle WSA; Sewemup Mesa WSA; Skull Creek WSA; Squaw/Papoose Canyon WSA; Tabeguache Creek WSA; Tepee Draw WSA; The Palisade WSA; Troublesome WSA; Upper Grape Creek WSA; Vale of Tears WSA; Weber Mountain WSA; West Cold Springs WSA; Willow Creek WSA; Windy Gulch WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/1995

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness; McInnis Canyons NCA	Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Colorado Canyons NCA and Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness 10/2003
Bureau of Land Management	Canyons of the Ancients NM	Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monuments and BLM National Conservation Areas 10/2001
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Arapaho National Wildlife Refuge	Arapaho National Wildlife Refuge Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment 09/2003
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Two Ponds National Wildlife Refuge	Two Ponds National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Management Plan 09/1997
National Park Service	Black Canyon of the Gunnison NP	General Management Plan Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and Curecanti National Recreation Area 12/1997
The Nature Conservancy	5 Card Draw; Aiken Canyon Preserve; Antelope Canyon; Bohart Ranch & Preserve; Bohart Ranch & Preserve; Cap Rock; Carpenter Ranch & Preserve; Fox Ranch & Preserve; Medano-Zapata Ranch & Preserve; Phantom Canyon Preserve; San Miguel Canyon Preserve; South Fork Preserve; Tabeguache Creek Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/wherewew ork/northamerica/states/colorado/ preserves/
Colorado State Land Board	State Stewardship Trust Land	Interviewed Colorado State Land Board GIS Specialist: Bill Martin - 06/2005
Tribal Lands	Ute Mountain Tribal Park	URL: http://www.utemountainute.com/ tribalpark.htm

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	West Stoneham Archeological District SIA (MA 3.1); Grays Peak SIA (MA 3.1); Pawnee Buttes SIA (MA 3.1); Todd Gulch Fen SIA (MA 3.1); Arapaho NRA (MA 3.1); Bowen Gulch RNA (MA 2.2); Hell Canyon RNA (MA 2.2); Pennock Creek RNA (MA 2.2); West Creek RNA (MA 2.2); Cache La Poudre Wild and Scenic River (MA 1.5); Cache La Poudre Wilderness (MA 1.1); Comanche Peak Wilderness (MA 1.1); Indian Peaks Wilderness (MA 1.1); James Peak Wilderness (MA 1.1); Mount Evans Wilderness (MA 1.1); Neota Wilderness (MA 1.1); Never Summer Wilderness (MA 1.1); Rawah Wilderness (MA 1.1); Prairie Ecosystem Demonstration Area SIA (MA 3.1); Arapaho NF (MA 1.2); Roosevelt NF (MA 1.2); Roosevelt NF (MA 1.41 & MA 1.5); Homestead Meadows SIA (MA 3.1); Stuck Creek Splash Dam SIA (MA 3.1); Bowen Gulch Protection Area SIA (MA 3.1); James Peak SIA (MA 3.1); Rist Canyon SIA (MA 3.1); Niwot Ridge Biosphere Reserve (MA 3.1); Fraser Experimental Forest (MA 5.31); Central Plains Experimental Range	1997 Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland
U.S. Forest Service	Dry Mesa Dinosaur Quarry Paleontological Site SIA (MA 10C); Ophir Needles SIA (MA 10C); Grand Mesa NF (MA 10E); Collegiate Peaks Wilderness (MA 8B); Fossil Ridge Wilderness (MA 8B); La Garita Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Lizard Head Wilderness (MA 8B); Maroon Bells- Snowmass Wilderness (MA 8B); Mount Sneffels Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Powderhorn Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Raggeds Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Uncompahgre Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); West Elk Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Slumgullion Earthflow NNL (MA 10C); Alpine Tunnel Historic District SIA (MA 10C); Roubideau Special Management Area OCD; Tabeguache Special Management Area OCD	Amended Land and Resource Management Plan Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests 1991
U.S. Forest Service	Pike NF (MA 10E); San Isabel NF (MA 10E); Byers Peak Wilderness (MA 1.1); Buffalo Peaks Wilderness (MA 8B); Collegiate Peaks Wilderness (MA 8C); Greenhorn Mountain Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Holy Cross Wilderness (MA 8C); Lost Creek Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Mount Evans Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Mount Massive Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); Sangre de Cristo Wilderness (MA 8B & MA 8C); CSU Southeastern Branch Exp. Station (MA 10B); Manitou Experimental Forest (MA 10B); Picture Canyon Zoological Area (MA 10C); Vasquez Peak Wilderness (MA 1.1)	Land and Resource Management Plan Pike and San Isabel National Forest; Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands 1984; Amendment No. 24. 04/1992
Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
------------------------	--	---
U.S. Forest Service	Elephant Rocks Botanical Area (MA 3.1); Elephant Rocks SIA (MA 3.1); Ripley Milkvetch SIA (MA 3.1); Blowout Pass SIA (MA 3.1); Chama Basin Landslide Geologic Area (MA 3.1); Devil's Hole Geologic Area (MA 3.1); La Garita Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Sangre de Cristo Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Rio Grande NF (MA 1.5); John Charles Fremont SIA (MA 3.1); Wagon Wheel Gap Watershed Experiment Station SIA (MA 3.1)	Revised Land and Resource Management Plan Rio Grande National Forest 11/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Little Snake SIA (MA 2.1); California Park SIA (MA 2.1); Windy Ridge SIA (MA 2.1); Routt NF (MA 3.23); Flat Tops Wilderness (MA 1.13); Mount Zirkel Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Neota Wilderness (MA 1.12); Never Summer Wilderness (MA 1.12); Platte River Wilderness (MA 1.13); Sarvis Creek Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Routt NF (MA 1.5); Encampment River SIA (MA 2.1); Teller City SIA (MA 2.1); Black Mountain SIA (MA 2.1); Camp Creek SIA (MA 2.1)	Revised Forest Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Routt National Forest 2001
U.S. Forest Service	Chimney Rock Archeological Area SIA (MA 10C); Falls Creek Archeological Area SIA (MA 10C); Lizard Head Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Piedra Area (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); South San Juan Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Weminuche Wilderness (MA 1.11A & MA 1.12 & MA 1.13)	Amended Land and Resource Management Plan San Juan National Forest 04/1992; Amendment No. 20 08/1998
U.S. Forest Service	Quandry Peak SIA (MA 2.1); Dead Horse Creek SIA (MA 2.1); Collegiate Peaks Wilderness (MA 1.12); Eagles Nest Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Flat Tops Wilderness (MA 1.12); Holy Cross Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Hunter-Fryingpan Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wilderness (MA 1.12 & MA 1.13); Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness (MA 1.12); Raggeds Wilderness (MA 1.12); White River NF (MA 1.13 & MA 1.2 & MA 1.5); Continental Divide Land Bridge & Porcupine SIA (MA 2.1); Main Elk SIA (MA 2.1); Mitchell Creek SIA (MA 2.1); Warren Lakes SIA (MA 2.1)	2002 Revision for Land and Resource Management Plan White River National Forest

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Colorado Department of Wildlife	63 Ranch SWA; Adams SWA; Adobe Creek Reservoir SWA; Alberta Park Reservoir SWA; Alma SWA; Almont Triangle SWA; Andrew's Lake SWA; Antero Reservoir SWA; Apishapa SWA; Arkansas River SWA; Atwood SWA; Badger Basin SWA; Bailey Lake SWA; Banner Lakes SWA; Basalt SWA; Bear Lake Reservoir SWA; Beaver Creek Reservoir SWA; Beaver Creek SWA; Beaver Lake SWA; Beaver Reservoir SWA; Bel Aire SWA; Bellaire Lake SWA; Bergen Peak SWA; Big Creek Reservoir SWA; Big Meadows Reservoir SWA; Big Thompson Ponds SWA; Billy Creek SWA; Bitter Brush SWA; Black Lakes SWA; Blacktail Easement SWA; Blanca SWA; Blinberry Gulch SWA; Bliss SWA; Blue River SWA; Bodo SWA; Boedecker Reservoir SWA; Bosque Del Oso SWA; Boyd Ponds SWA; Brackenbury SWA; Bravo SWA; Brower SWA; Brown Lakes SWA; Brush Hollow SWA; Brush Prairie Ponds SWA; Brush SWA; Buena Vista SWA; Burchfield SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Cabin Creek SWA; Centennial SWA; Centennial Valley SWA; Chance Gulch SWA; Cherokee SWA; Chipeta Lakes SWA; Christina SWA; Chuck Lewis SWA; Cimarron SWA; Clear Creek Reservoir SWA; Coalbed Canyon SWA; Cochetopa SWA; Coke Oven SWA; Coller SWA; Colorado River Island SWA; Columbine SWA; Cottonwood Creek SWA; Cottonwood SWA; Cowdry Lake SWA; Crystal River Ranch SWA; Dan Noble SWA; De Weese Reservoir SWA; Deadman SWA; Delaney Butte Lakes SWA; Delta SWA; Devil Creek SWA; Diamond J SWA; Dixon Lake SWA; Douglas Reservoir SWA; Dowdy Lake SWA; Dry Creek Basin SWA; Duck Creek SWA; Dumont Lake SWA; Dune Ridge SWA; Dutch Gulch SWA; Eagle River SWA; Echo Canyon Lake SWA; Elkhead Lake SWA; Fish Creek SWA; Flagler Reservoir SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Forks SWA; Frank SWA; Franklin Island SWA; Frenchman Creek SWA; Frying Pan River SWA; Garfield Creek SWA; Georgetown Reservoir SWA; Goose Lake SWA; Granada SWA; Grandview Ponds SWA; Granite SWA; Grieves Easement SWA; Groundhog Reservoir SWA; Gunnison SWA; Gypsum Ponds SWA; Hahn's Peak Reservoir SWA; Hallenbeck Ranch SWA; Haviland Lake SWA; Heckendorf SWA; Higel SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Hohnholz Lakes SWA; Holyoke SWA; Holbrook Reservoir SWA; Holly SWA; Holyoke SWA; Home Lake SWA; Horse Creek Reservoir SWA; Horse Thief Canyon SWA; Hot Creek SWA; Hot Sulphur Springs SWA; Hot Sulphur Springs SWA; Hut SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Idaho Springs Reservoir SWA; Indian Run SWA; Irvine SWA; Jackson Lake SWA; James M. John SWA; James Mark Jones SWA; Jensen SWA; Jerry Creek Resevoir SWA; Joe Moore Reservoir SWA; John Martin Reservoir SWA; Johnson Village SWA; Julesburg SWA; Jumbo Reservoir SWA; Junction Butte SWA; Karval Reservoir SWA; Kemp- Breeze SWA; Knight-Imler SWA; Knudson SWA; Kodak Watchable SWA; La Jara Creek Ranch SWA; La Jara Reservoir SWA; La Jara SWA; Lake Avery SWA; Lake Beckwith SWA; Lake Dorothey SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Lake Fork of the Gunnison River SWA; Lake John SWA; Las Animas City Pond SWA; Lathrop SWA; Leaps Gulch SWA; Lennartz SWA; Little Snake SWA; Loma Boat Launch SWA; Lon Hagler SWA; Lone Dome SWA; Lonetree Reservoir SWA; Lowell Ponds SWA; Manhattan Creek SWA; Manville SWA; Marcum SWA; Mason Family SWA; McCluskey SWA; Meadow Creek Reservoir SUP; Meeker Pasture SWA; Meredith Reservoir SWA; Mesa Lake SWA; Messex SWA; Mike Higbee SWA; Mitani-Tokoyasu SWA; Mogensen Ponds SWA; Monument Lake SWA; Mount Evans SWA; Mount Werner SWA; Mountain Home Reservoir SWA; Murphy SWA; Nakagawa SWA; Narraguinnep Reservoir SWA; North Fork SWA; North Lake SWA; North Sterling Reservoir SWA; North Sterling Reservoir SWA; Olney Springs SWA; Overland Trail SWA; Owl Mountain SWA; Ox Bow SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Paonia SWA; Parachute Ponds SWA; Parvin Lake SWA; Pastorius Reservoir SWA; Perins Peak SWA; Piceance SWA; Pikes Peak SWA; Pioneer Park SWA; Plateau Creek SWA; Playa Blanca SWA; Poage Lake SWA; Pony Express SWA; Poudre River SWA; Prewitt Reservoir SWA; Puett Reservoir SWA; Purgatoire River SWA; Queens SWA; Radium SWA; Ralph White SWA; Ralston Creek SWA; Ramah Reservoir SWA; Red Dog SWA; Red Lion SWA; Regan Lake SWA; Richard SWA; Rio Blanco Lake SWA; Rio Grande River SWA; Rio Grande SWA; Rito Hondo Reservoir SWA; Road Canyon Reservoir SWA; Roaring Fork River SWA; Rock Creek SWA; Rocky Ford Pond SWA; Rocky Ford SWA; Rocky Ford West SWA; Rosemont Reservoir SWA; Runyon/Fountain Lakes SWA; Russel Lakes SWA; Saint Charles SWA; San Miguel SWA; Sanchez Reservoir SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Sand Creek SWA; Sand Draw SWA; Sandsage SWA; Sandy Bluffs SWA; Sawhill Ponds SWA; Sawhill Ponds-City Open Space; Schuck SWA; Seaman Reservoir SWA; Sedgwick Bar SWA; Seeley Reservoir SWA; Sego Springs SWA; Service Creek SWA; Setchfield SWA; Seymour Lake SWA; Sharptail Ridge SWA; Sheets Lake SWA; Silver Creek SWA; Simmons SWA; Simpson Ponds SWA; Skaguay Reservoir SWA; Smith Reservoir SWA; South Republican SWA; Spanish Peaks SWA; Spinney Mountain SWA; Spring Creek Reservoir SWA; Stalker Lake SWA; Steamboat Lake SWA; Summit Reservoir SWA; Swede Lake SWA; Tamarack Ranch SWA; Tarryall Reservoir SWA; Taylor River SWA/MOU	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Terrance Reservoir SWA; Teter Wetlands SWA; Thurston Reservoir SWA; Tilman Bishop SWA; Timpas Creek SWA; Tomahawk SWA; Totten Reservoir SWA; Trout Lake SWA; Trujillo Meadows Reservoir SWA/SUP; Turk's Pond SWA; Twin Hills SWA; Twin Sisters SWA; Two Buttes Reservoir SWA; Upper Stillwater SWA; Vail Deer Underpass SWA; Vaughn Reservoir SWA; Verner SWA; Wahatoya SWA; Walker SWA; Ward Pond SWA; Watson Divide SWA; Watson Lake SWA; Webster SWA; Wellington Reservoir #4 and Smith Lake SWA; Wellington SWA; West Lake SWA; West Rifle Creek SWA; Wheeler SWA; White Horse SWA; White River SWA; Williams Creel Reservoir SWA; Windy Gap WWA; Woodhouse SWA; Young Gulch SWA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Adobe Ridge SHA; Akey SHA; Berry Creek SHA; Bollinger SHA; Coaldale Ponds SHA; Copper Spur SHA; Cover Mountain SHA; Crites SHA; Cyprus Yampa Valley SHA; D & T Ranch SHA; Elk Valley Estates SHA; Fadenrecht SHA; Flatiron Mesa SHA; Grizzly T Gulch SHA; Hawxhurst Ranch SHA; Hay Press Lake SHA; Hereford Haven Ranch SHA; Kaichen SHA; Love Meadows Easement SHA; Maggard SHA; Meserve SHA; Minton SHA; Musgrave SHA; Orr SHA; Payne Mesa SHA; Pheasant Habitat Leases SHA; Pinon Mesa - Glade Point SHA; Rush Creek SHA; Saffer SHA; Salt Wash SHA; Shutt SHA; Skylark Creek SHA; Stone SHA; Thunder Mountain SHA; Vermejo Park SHA; Viking Valley SHA; Whittington SHA; Witte SHA	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Colorado	Source of Management Plan
Colorado Department of Wildlife (continued)	Bellvue SFU; Buena Vista SFU; Chalk Cliffs SFU; Crystal River SFU; Durango SFU; Finger Rock SFU; Glenwood Springs SFU; Las Animas SFU; Mount Ouray SFU; Mount Shavano SFU; Pitkin SFU; Poudre River SFU; Rifle Falls SFU; Roaring Judy SFU; Spicer SFU; Watson Lake SFU; Wray SFU	http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWa ter/StateWildlifeAreas/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Nevada	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Arden Historic Sites ACEC; Armagosa Mesquite ACEC; Arrow Canyon ACEC; Big Dune ACEC; Bird Spring ACEC; Coyote Springs Valley ACEC; Crescent Townsite ACEC; Devil's Throat ACEC; Gold Butte ACEC - Part A; Gold Butte ACEC - Part B; Gold Butte ACEC - Part C/ Virgin Mountains ACEC; Gold Butte Townsite ACEC; Hidden Valley ACEC; Keyhole Canyon ACEC; Mormon Mesa ACEC - Las Vegas; Piute/ Eldorado Valley ACEC; Rainbow Gardens ACEC; Red Rock Springs ACEC; River Mountains ACEC; Sloan Rock Art District ACEC; Stump Springs ACEC; Virgin River ACEC; Whitney Pockets ACEC; Arrow Canyon Wilderness; Jumbo Springs Wilderness; La Madre Mountain Wilderness; Lime Canyon Wilderness; Mount Charleston Wilderness; Muddy Mountains Wilderness; North McCullough Wilderness; Wee Thump Joshua Tree Wilderness	Record of Decision for the Approved Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 10/1998
Bureau of Land Management	Beaver Dam Slope ACEC; Kane Springs ACEC; Mormon Mesa ACEC - Ely	Draft Caliente Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement 1993
Bureau of Land Management	Incandescent Rocks ACEC; Steamboat Hot Springs ACEC	Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Lahontan Resource Area 1984
Bureau of Land Management	Osgood Mountains Milkvetch ACEC	Paradise-Denio and Sonoma-Gerlach Management Framework Plan: Approved Lands Amendment and Decision Record 1999
Bureau of Land Management	Salt Lake ACEC	Record of Decision Wells Resource Management Plan 06/1985
Bureau of Land Management	Carson Wandering Skipper ACEC; Pah Rah Basin Petroglyph ACEC; Virginia Range Williams Combleaf Habitat ACEC	Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan 05/2001

Appendix 4-5. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Nevada.

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Nevada	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	High Rock Canyon ACEC; Soldier Meadow ACEC; Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area; Big Rocks Wilderness; Calico Mountains Wilderness; East Fork High Rock Canyon Wilderness; High Rock Canyon Wilderness; High Rock Lake Wilderness; Little High Rock Canyon Wilderness; North Black Rock Range Wilderness; North Jackson Mountains Wilderness; Pahute Peak Wilderness; South Jackson Mountains Wilderness	Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area (NCA) and Associated Wilderness, and Other Contiguous Lands in Nevada 09/2003
Bureau of Land Management	Alder Creek WSA; Antelope Range WSA; Antelope WSA; Augusta Mountains WSA; Bad Lands WSA; Blue Eagle WSA; Blue Lakes WSA; Bluebell WSA; Buffalo Hills WSA; Burbank Canyons WSA; Cedar Ridge WSA; China Mountain WSA; Clan Alpine Mountains WSA; Desatoya Mountains WSA; Disaster Peak WSA; Dry Valley Rim WSA; Fandango WSA; Five Springs WSA; Fox Range WSA; Gabbs Valley Range WSA; Goshute Canyon ISA; Goshute Canyon WSA; Goshute Peak WSA; Grapevine Mountains WSA; Heusser Mountain Bristlecone Pine ISA; Job Peak WSA; Kawich WSA; Lahontan Cutthroat Trout ISA; Little Humboldt River WSA; Marble Canyon WSA; Mount Grafton WSA; Mount Limbo WSA; Mount Stirling WSA; Mountain Meadow ISA; N. Fork of the Little Humboldt River WSA; Owyhee Canyon WSA; Palisade Mesa WSA; Park Range WSA; Pigeon Spring WSA; Pinyon Joshua ISA; Pole Creek WSA; Poodle Mountain WSA; Pueblo Mountains WSA; Queer Mountain WSA; Rawhide Mountain WSA; Red Spring WSA; Resting Springs WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/1995
Bureau of Land Management (continued)	Riordan's Well WSA; Roberts Mountain WSA; Rough Hills WSA; Selenite Mountains WSA; Sheldon Contiguous WSA; Shoshone Ponds ISA; Shoshone Pygmy Sage ISA; Silver Peak Range WSA; Simpson Park WSA; Skedaddle WSA; South Egan Range WSA; South Fork Owyhee River WSA; South Pequop WSA; South Reveille WSA; Stillwater Range WSA; Sunrise Mountain ISA; Swamp Cedar ISA; The Wall WSA; Tobin Range WSA; Twin Peaks WSA; Virgin Mountain ISA; Wall Canyon WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/95
Bureau of Land Management	Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area	Proposed General Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area 12/2000

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Nevada	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area	Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monuments and BLM National Conservation Areas 10/2001
Bureau of Land Management	Clover Mountains Wilderness; Delamar Mountains Wilderness; Far South Egans Wilderness; Fortification Range Wilderness; Meadow Valley Range Wilderness; Mormon Mountains Wilderness; Mount Irish Wilderness; Parsnip Peak Wilderness; South Pahroc Range Wilderness; Tunnel Spring Wilderness; Weepah Spring Wilderness; White Rock Range Wilderness; Worthington Mountains Wilderness	Public Law 108-424 - 11/2004; Wilderness Management Policy 09/1981
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Stillwater WMA; Fallon NWR; Stillwater NWR	Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge Complex Comprehensive Conservation Plan 06/2003
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Ruby Lake NWR	Interviewed Refuge Manager: Martha Collins - 10/2004
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Desert National Wildlife Range	URL: http://www.fws.gov/deser tcomplex/
U.S. Forest Service	Alta Toquima Wilderness; Arc Dome Wilderness; Currant Mountain Wilderness; Mount Rose Wilderness; Table Mountain Wilderness	Land and Resource Management Plan Toiyabe National Forest 1986
U.S. Forest Service	Boundary Peak Wilderness	Land and Resource Management Plan Inyo National Forest 1988
U.S. Forest Service	Spring Mountains NRA (MA 11& MA 13& MA 14); Mount Stirling WSA (MA 14)	General Management Plan For the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area: An Amendment to the Land and Resource Management Plan, Toiyabe National Forest 1996

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Nevada	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	Humboldt NF (MA 11); East Humboldts Wilderness; Grant Range Wilderness (MA 15); Jarbidge Wilderness (MA 6); Mount Moriah Wilderness (MA 8); Quinn Canyon Wilderness; Ruby Mountains Wilderness (MA 4); Santa Rosa - Paradise Peak Wilderness	Humboldt National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 1996
National Park Service	Lake Mead NRA	Final General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement Lake Mead National Recreation Area 12/1986
Nevada Department of Wildlife	Alkali Lake WMA; Fernley WMA; Franklin Lake WMA; Humboldt WMA; Key Pittman WMA; Mason Valley WMA; Overton WMA; Railroad Valley WMA; Scripps WMA; Steptoe Valley WMA; Wayne E. Kirch WMA	URL: http://www.ndow.org/wil d/habitat/wma/
The Nature Conservancy	Gottfredson/Condor Canyon; McCarran Ranch; River Fork Ranch	URL: http://www.nature.org/wh erewework/ northamerica/states/nevad a/preserves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Adams Canyon ACEC; Angel Peak ACEC; Archuleta River Tract; Ashiih Naa'a ACEC; Bald Eagle ACEC; Beechatuda Tongue Geological Formation; Betonnie Tsosie Fossil Area; Bi Yaazh ACEC; Blanco Mesa ACEC; Blanco Star Panel ACEC; Bohanon Canyon Fossil Complex; Cagle's Site ACEC; Canyon View Ruin ACEC; Carson Fossil Pocket Fossil Area; Cereza Canyon Wildlife Area; Casa del Rio Archaeological Protection Site ACEC; Cedar Hill ACEC; Chacra Mesa Complex ACEC; Cho'li'i (Gobernador Knob) ACEC; Christmas Tree Ruin ACEC; Crow Canyon ACEC; Crownpoint Steps and Herradura ACEC; Deer House ACEC; Delgadita/Pueblo Canyons ACEC; Delgadita/Pueblo Canyons SMA; Devil's Spring Mesa ACEC; Dzil'na'oodlii ACEC; Frances Mesa ACEC; Gould Pass Camp ACEC; Gobernador and Cereza Canyon Fossil Area; Greenlee Ruin Archaeological Protection Site ACEC; Hummingbird ACEC; Hummingbird Canyon ACEC; Kachina Mask ACEC; Kin Yazhi ACEC; Kiva ACEC; Kutz Canyon Paleontological Area; La Jara ACEC	Record of Decision Farmington Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 09/2003
	Lake Valley Archaeological Protection Site ACEC; Largo Canyon Star Ceiling ACEC; Lybrook Fossil Area; Martinez Canyon ACEC; Mexican Spotted Owl ACEC; Moss Trail ACEC; Munoz Canyon ACEC; North Road ACEC; Old Road River Tract; Pinon Mesa Fossil Area; Pointed Butte ACEC; Pork Chop Pass ACEC; Pregnant Basketmaker ACEC; Pretty Woman ACEC; Prieta Mesa ACEC; Rincon Largo District ACEC; Rincon Rockshelter ACEC; River Tracts; San Rafael Canyon ACEC; Santos Peak ACEC; Shield Bearer ACEC; Star Rock ACEC; Star Spring/Jesus Canyon ACEC; String House ACEC; Superior Mesa ACEC; Tapacito and Split Rock ACEC; The Hogback ACEC; Truby's Tower ACEC	Record of Decision Farmington Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement 09/2003
Bureau of Land Management	Fort Stanton ACEC; Mescalero Sands ACEC/ONA; North Pecos River ACEC; Overflow Wetlands ACEC	Record of Decision Proposed Roswell Resource Management Plan 10/1997
Bureau of Land Management	Black Mesa ACEC; Copper Hill ACEC; La Cienega ACEC; Lower Gorge ACEC; Ojo Caliente ACEC; Rio Chama Wild and Scenic River; San Antonio Gorge ACEC; Sombrillo ACEC; Winter Range ACEC	Approved Taos Resource Management Plan 10/1988

# **Appendix 4-6. Documentation of Status 2 lands in New Mexico.**

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Alamo Hueco Mountains ACEC; Apache Box ACEC; Big Hatchet Mountains ACEC; Central Peloncillo Mountains ACEC; Cooke's Range ACEC; Dona Ana Mountains ACEC; Florida Mountains ACEC; Gila Lower Box ACEC; Granite Gap ACEC; Kilbourne Hole NNL; Los Tules ACEC; Northern Peloncillo Mountains ACEC; Old Town ACEC; Organ/Franklin Mountains ACEC; Rincon ACEC; Robledo Mountains ACEC; San Diego Mountain ACEC; Uvas Valley ACEC	Las Cruces District Office- Mimbres Resource Area - Mimbres Resource Management Plan 12/1993
Bureau of Land Management	Agua Fria ACEC; Horse Mountain ACEC; Ladron Mountain ACEC; Sawtooth ACEC; Soaptree ACEC; Harvey Ecological Plot SMA; San Lorenzo Canyon SMA; San Pedro ACEC; Tinajas ACEC; The Box SMA	Final Soccorro Resource Management Plan 08/1989
Bureau of Land Management	Blue Spring Riparian Habitat ACEC; Chosa Draw Caves Complex ACEC; Dark Canyon ACEC; Pecos River/Canyons Complex ACEC	Approved Carlsbad Resource Management Plan 09/1988
Bureau of Land Management	El Malpais NCA; Cebolla Wilderness; West Malpais Wilderness	El Malpais Plan: A Resource Management Plan 09/2001
Bureau of Land Management	Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks NM	Interim Management Policy for BLM National Monuments and BLM National Conservation Areas 10/2001
Bureau of Land Management	Alamo Mountain ACEC; Alkali Lakes ACEC; Cornudas Mountain ACEC; Sacramento Escarpment ACEC; Three Rivers Petroglyph ACEC; Wind Mountain ACEC	Otero County Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Resource Management Plan Amendment Caballo Resource Area 08/1997
Bureau of Land Management	Ball Ranch ACEC/RNA; Big Bead Mesa NHL; Bluewater Canyon ACEC; Cabezon Peak ACEC; Canon Tapia ACEC; Elk Springs ACEC; Jones Canyon ACEC; Ojito ACEC; Pronoun Cave Complex ACEC/RNA; San Luis Mesa Raptor Area ACEC; Torrejon Fossil Fauna ACEC	Final Rio Puerco Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 11/1986
Bureau of Land Management	Bisti Wilderness	Final Wilderness Management Plan Bisti Wilderness 07/1986

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	De-Na-Zin Wilderness	Final De-Na-Zin Wilderness Management Plan 08/89
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Bitter Lake NWR	Bitter Lake National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan 09/1998
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Bosque Del Apache NWR	URL: http://www.fws.gov/south west/refuges/ newmex/bosque/
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Grulla NWR	Muleshoe and Grulla National Wildlife Refuges Comprehensive Conservation Plan 07/2004
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Las Vegas NWR	Las Vegas National Wildlife Refuge Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan 06/2004
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Maxwell NWR	Maxwell National Wildlife Refuge Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment 12/2005
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	San Andres NWR	Final San Andres National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan 09/1998
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Sevilleta NWR	Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan 07/2000
U.S. Forest Service	Gallinas Creek Watershed (MA J); Santa Fe Watershed (MA O); Rio Chama River Canyon Wild and Scenic River (MA C); Chama River Canyon Wilderness (MA H); Dome Wilderness (MA H); Pecos Wilderness (MA H); San Pedro Parks Wilderness (MA H); Santa Fe NF (MA L); Pecos Wild and Scenic River	Santa Fe National Forest Plan 07/1987; Amendment Change Notice No. 1. 09/1994
U.S. Forest Service	Valles Caldera National Preserve	Valles Caldera National Preserve Draft Framework and Strategic Guidance for Comprhensive Management 2003

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	Gila NF (MA 7D & MA 4D & MA 7C); Aldo Leopold Wilderness (MA 2E & MA 5B & MA 5C); Blue Range Wilderness (MA 3A); Gila Wilderness (MA 2A & MA 2B & MA 4A & MA 4B & MA 5A & MA 6B & MA 7E & MA 7F & MA 7G & MA 8A & MA 5B); Gila WSA (MA 2G& MA 5C & MA 5D); Hells Hole WSA (MA 4C); Lower San Francisco WSA (MA 4B & MA 4C)	Gila National Forest Plan 09/1986; Amendment No. 9 11/2002
U.S. Forest Service	Apache Kid Wilderness (MA 3); Manzano Mountain Wilderness (MA 3); Sandia Mountain Wilderness (MA 1); Withington Wilderness (MA 3)	Cibola National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan 07/1985; Amendment No. 8. 11/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Capitan Mountains Wilderness (MA 1C); White Mountain Wilderness (MA 1F); South Guadalupe Escarpment WSA (MA 3A)	Lincoln National Forest Plan 1986; Amendment No. 9. 06/1996
U.S. Forest Service	Guadalupe Canyon Zoological Area (MA 14)	Coronado National Forest Plan 08/1986; Forest Plan Change Notice No. 3. 06/1999
National Park Service	Chaco Culture NHP	General Management Plan Development Concept Plan Chaco Culture National Historical Park 09/1985
National Park Service	Pecos NHP	Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement Pecos National Historical Park 08/1995
National Park Service	Aztec Ruins NM	Aztec Ruins General Management Plan Development Concept Plan 09/1989
National Park Service	El Malpais NM	General Management Plan Wilderness Suitability Study El Malpais National Monument 10/1990
National Park Service	Petroglyph NM	Summary of Final General Management Plan Development Concept Plan Environmental Impact Statement Petroglyph National Monument 11/1996
National Park Service	El Morro NM	El Morro National Monument Statement For Management 05/1992

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in New Mexico	Source of Management Plan
National Park Service	Salinas Pueblo Missions NM	General Management Plan Development Concept Plan Salinas National Monument 10/1984
National Park Service	Lechuguilla Cave Protection Area	Lechuguilla Cave Protection Act of 1993
Audubon Society Preserve	Randall Davey Audubon Preserve	URL: http://nm.audubon.org/iba/ ibawriteups/ rdactnc.html
Local Land Trust Preserve/Ease ment	Malpai Borderlands Group (Animas Foundation/Gray Ranch); Malpai Borderlands Group (Bio-Research Ranch); Malpai Borderlands Group (Family Lands Ltd.)	URL: http://www.malpaiborderla ndsgroup.org/about.asp
The Nature Conservancy	Corrales Bosque Mngmt. Agreement; Gila NF (Headwaters Ranch - TNC Grazing Allotment); Gray Ranch; Lama Canyon Preserve; Milnesand Prairie Preserve; Ortiz Mountains-Todilto Limestone Cons. Area; Lichty Ecological Research Center; Sabo Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/whe rewework/ northamerica/states/newme xico/ preserves/
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Sugarite Canyon SP	Interviewed Natural Resource Planner New Mexico State Parks Department: Steve Cary - 05/2005
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Claudell; Fenton Lake Fishing Area (and dam); Brantley Wildlife Area; Colin Neblett WMA; Edward Sargent WMA; Elliott Barker WMA; Huey Wildlife Area; Jackson Lake WMA; Marquez WMA; Picacho Bosque Tract; Red Rock WMA; Rio Chama WMA; Rio de los Pinos Wildlife Area; Urraca WMA; Wagon Mound WMA; Water Canyon Wildlife Area; William A. Humphries Wildlife Management Area; Antelope Flats; Belen Waterfowl Management Area; Bernardo Waterfowl Management Area; Black Hills; Bledsoe; Casa Colorada Waterfowl Area; Crossroads #1; Crossroads #2; Crossroads #3; Crossroads #4; Crossroads #5; East Bluit; Farmers Home; Gallinas Wells #1; Gallinas Wells #1A; Gallinas Wells #1B; Gallinas Wells #2; Gallinas Wells #3; Gallinas Wells #4; Gallinas Wells #5; Gallinas Wells #6; La Joya Waterfowl Management Area; Liberty; Little Dipper; Marshall; Milnesand; North Bluitt; Pitchfork; South Bluitt; Tatum; Wayside; Bear Canyon Lake (and dam); Eagle Nest Lake; Heart Bar WMA	URL: http://www.wildlife.state.n m.us/ conservation/index.htm

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Bonneville Salt Flats ACEC; Horseshoe Springs ACEC	Record of Decision for the Pony Express Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary for Utah County 01/1990
Bureau of Land Management	Browns Park Complex ACEC; Lower Green River ACEC; Nine Mile Canyon ACEC; Pariette Wetlands ACEC; Red Creek ACEC; Red Mountain/Dry Fork Complex ACEC	Diamond Mountain Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision 12/1994
Bureau of Land Management	Butler Wash ACEC; Cedar Mesa ACEC; Hovenweep ACEC; Indian Creek ACEC; U-95 Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC; Shay Canyon ACEC	San Juan/San Miguel Planning Area Resource Management Plan 09/1985
Bureau of Land Management	Canaan Mountain ACEC; Little Creek Mountain ACEC; Lower Virgin River ACEC; Red Bluff ACEC; Red Mountain ACEC; Santa Clara-Gunlock ACEC; Santa Clara River-Land Hill ACEC; Upper Beaver Dam Wash ACEC; Warner Ridge/Fort Pearce ACEC	St. George Field Office Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan 03/1999
Bureau of Land Management	Copper Globe ACEC; Dry Lake Archaelogical District ACEC; Highway I-70 Scenic Corridor ACEC; Muddy Creek ACEC; Lower San Rafael Canyon ACEC; Middle San Rafael Canyon ACEC; Upper San Rafael Canyon ACEC; San Rafael Reef South ACEC; Segers Hole ACEC; Sids Mountain ACEC; Swazey Cabin ACEC; Temple Mountain Historic District ACEC; Muddy Creek/Tomsich Butte Emphasis Area ACEC	San Rafael Final Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary 05/1991
Bureau of Land Management	Crystal Peak ONA/ACEC; Fossil Mountain Historic Site/ACEC; Notch Peak NNL/ACEC; Pavant Butte ACEC	Warm Springs Resource Area Resource Management Plan Record of Decision Rangeland Program Summary 04/1987

# Appendix 4-7. Documentation of Status 2 lands in Utah.

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Deep Creek Mountains ONA/ACEC; Gandy Mountain Caves ACEC; Grandy Salt Marsh ACEC; Rockwell ONA/ACEC	House Range Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary 1987
Bureau of Land Management	Donner Creek/Bettridge Creek ACEC; Old Central Pacific Railroad Grade ACEC; Salt Wells Wildlife Habitat Area ACEC	Record of Decision and Rangeland Program Summary for the Box Elder Resource Management Plan 1986
Bureau of Land Management	Gilbert Badlands ACEC/RNA	Henry Mountain Parker Mountain and Mountain Valley Management Framework Plans Approved Amendments and Record of Decision 1982
Bureau of Land Management	Laketown Canyon ACEC	Decision Statement Randolph Management Framework Plan 06/1980
Bureau of Land Management	Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; Deer Creek Recreation Site	Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Management Plan 02/2000
Bureau of Land Management	Paria Canyon-Vermillion Cliffs Wilderness	Final Wilderness Management Plan Paria Canyon-Vermillion Cliffs 03/1986
Bureau of Land Management	Beartrap Canyon WSA; Behind the Rocks WSA; Black Ridge Canyons WSA; Book Cliffs ISA; Bull Canyon WSA; Bull Mountain WSA; Burning Hills WSA; Butler Wash WSA; Canaan Mountains WSA; Carcass Canyon WSA; Cedar Mountains WSA; Cheese Box Canyon WSA; Coal Canyon WSA; Conger Mountain WSA; Cottonwood Canyon WSA; Cougar Canyon WSA; Crack Canyon WSA; Cross Canyon WSA; Daniels Canyon WSA; Dark Canyon Complex ISA; Death Ridge WSA; Deep Creek Mountains WSA; Deep Creek WSA; Desolation Canyon WSA; Devils Canyon WSA; Diamond Breaks WSA; Dirty Devil WSA; Escalante Canyons Tract 5 ISA; Fiddler Butte WSA; Fiftymile Mountain WSA; Fish Creek Canyon WSA; Fremont Gorge WSA; French Spring-Happy Canyon WSA; Goose Creek Canyon WSA; Grand Gulch Complex ISA (Bullet Canyon); Grand Gulch Complex ISA (Pine Canyon); Grand Gulch ISA Complex (Shieks Flat) WSA; Horseshoe Canyon (North) WSA; Horseshoe Canyon (South) WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/1995

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
Bureau of Land Management	Howell Peak WSA; Indian Creek WSA; Jack Canyon WSA; King Top WSA; La Verkin Creek WSA; Link Flats ISA; Little Rockies WSA; Lost Spring Canyon WSA; Mancos Mesa WSA; Mexican Mountain WSA; Mill Creek Canyon WSA; Moquith Mountain WSA; Mount Ellen-Blue Hills WSA; Mount Hillers WSA; Mount Pennel WSA; Mud Spring Canyon WSA; Muddy Creek WSA; Mule Canyon WSA; Negro Bill Canyon WSA; North Escalante Canyons/The Gulch ISA; North Fork Virgin River WSA; North Stansbury Mountains WSA; Notch Peak WSA; Orderville Canyon WSA; Paria/Hackberry 202 WSA; Paria/Hackberry WSA; Parunuweap WSA; Red Butte WSA; Red Mountain (202) WSA; Red Mountain WSA; Road Canyon WSA; Rockwell WSA; San Rafael Reef WSA; Scorpion WSA; Sids Cabin WSA; Sids' Mountain WSA; South Needles WSA; Spring Creek Canyon WSA; Spruce Canyon WSA; Squaw and Papoose Canyon WSA; Steep Creek WSA; The Blues WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/95
Bureau of Land Management (continued)	The Cockscomb WSA; The Watchman WSA; Turtle Canyon WSA; Wah Wah Mountains WSA; Wahweap WSA; Westwater Canyon WSA; White Rock Range WSA; Winter Ridge WSA	Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review 07/1995
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Bear River NWR	Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge Comprehensive Management Plan 04/1997
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Ouray NWR	Ouray National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan 07/2000
U.S. Forest Service	Logan Canyon Botanical Area (MA 2.6 & MA 2.7); Deseret Peak Wilderness (MA 1.2); High Uintas Wilderness (MA 1.2); Lone Peak Wilderness (MA 1.2); Mount Naomi Wilderness (MA 1.2); Mount Olympus Wilderness (MA 1.2); Twin Peaks Wilderness (MA 1.2); Wellsville Mountain Wilderness (MA 1.2); Wasatch-Cache NF (MA 1.2 & MA 2.6); Ben Lomond Peak SIA (MA 2.7); Willard Basin SIA (MA 2.7); T.W. Daniel Experimental Forest (MA 2.7)	Revised Forest Plan Wasatch-Cache National Forest 02/2003
U.S. Forest Service	Sheep Creek Geologic Area (MA E & MA N);High Uintas Wilderness (MA I)	Land and Resource Management Plan for Ashley National Forest 10/1986

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
U.S. Forest Service	Dixie NF (MA 10B); Ashdown Gorge Wilderness (MA 8A); Box- Death Hollow Wilderness (MA 8A); Pine Valley Mountain Wilderness (MA 8A)	Land and Resource Management Plan for the Dixie National Forest 09/1986
U.S. Forest Service	Fishlake NF (MA 10E & MA 3B)	Land and Resource Management Plan Fishlake National Forest 1986
U.S. Forest Service	Manti-La Sal NF (MA - Municipal Water Supply); Dark Canyon Wilderness (MA - Wilderness); Manti-La Sal NF (MA - Watershed Protection and Improvement)	Land and Resource Management Plan for Manti-La Sal National Forest; Amendment No. 2. 09/1990
U.S. Forest Service	Lone Peak Wilderness (MA 1.4); Mount Nebo Wilderness (MA 1.4); Mount Timpanogos Wilderness (MA 1.4); Uinta NF (MA 1.5)	2003 Land and Resource Management Plan Revision Unita National Forest 05/2003
National Park Service	Golden Spike NHS	Statement for Management Golden Spike National Historic Site 09/1988
National Park Service	Rainbow Bridge NM	General Management Plan/ Development Concept Plan/Resource Management Plan/ Interpretive Prospectus and Environmental Impact Statement Rainbow Bridge National Monument 07/1990
National Park Service	Capitol Reef NP	Final Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan Development Concept Plan Capitol Reef National Park 09/1988
National Park Service	Timpanogos Cave NM	Environmental Impact Statement General Management Plan Development Concept Plan Timpanogos Cave National Monument 08/93
The Nature Conservancy	Deep Creek Mountains; Provo River Corridor; South Shore; Dugout Ranch Preserve	URL: http://www.nature.org/wher ewework/ northamerica/states/utah/pre serves/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
Utah State Parks & Recreation	Antelope Island SP	Interviewed Conservation Data/GIS Coordinator for Utah Division of Wildlife Resources: Mike Canning - 06/2005
Utah Department of Wildlife	Annabella WMA; Avintaquin WMA; Bear River Bottoms WMA; Beaver County WMA; Bicknell Bottoms WMA; Black Canyon WMA; Blue Lake WMA; Book Cliffs WMA; Brigham Face WMA; Brown's Park WMA; Bud Phelps WMA; Burraston Ponds/Nephi WMA; Carr Fork WMA; City Creek WMA; Clear Lake WMA; Coldwater Canyon WMA; Currant Creek WMA; Desert Lake WMA; Diamond Mountain WMA; East Canyon/Red Rock WMA; East Fork Little Bear River WMA; Emery Farm Castle Dale WMA; Emery Farn Harvey Place WMA; Farmington Bay WMA; Gordon Creek WMA; Goshen Warm Springs WMA; Hardware Ranch WMA; Harold S. Crane WMA; Heber WMA - Wallsburg Unit; Heber WMA - West Hills Unit; Henefer-Echo WMA; Hixon Canyon WMA; Hobble Creek WMA; Howard Slough WMA; Indian Canyon WMA; Indian Peaks WMA; James Walter Fitzgerald WMA	URL: http://www.wildlife.utah.go v/habitat/
Utah Department of Wildlife (continued)	Kamas WMA; L Cook WMA; Lake Fork WMA; Layton Wetlands Preserve; Little Montes Creek WMA; Locomotive Springs WMA; Lower Fish Creek WMA; Lower Huntington Canyon WMA; Lower San Rafael River WMA; Lyne Orme WMA; Mallard Springs WMA; Manti Meadows WMA; Marysvale WMA; Middle Fork WMA; Millard County WMA;Mills Meadow WMA; Millville Face; Monroe Mountain WMA; Morgan WMA; Nash Wash WMA; Nephi WMA; North Nebo WMA - Fountain Green Unit; North Nebo WMA - Loafer Mountain Unit; North Nebo WMA - Mona Bench Unit; North Nebo WMA - Santaquin Unit; North Nebo WMA - Spencer Fork Unit; Northwest Manti WMA - Birdseye/Lake Fork Unit; Northwest Manti WMA - Dairy Fork Unit; Northwest Manti WMA - Hilltop Unit; Northwest Manti WMA - Lasson Draw Unit; Northwest Manti WMA - Starvation Unit; Ogden Bay WMA;	URL: http://www.wildlife.utah.go v/habitat/

Land Steward	Name of Status 2 Area in Utah	Source of Management Plan
Utah Department of Wildlife (continued)	Pahvant WMA; Parowan Canyon WMA; Parowan Front WMA; Powell Slough WMA; Public Shooting Grounds WMA; Richfield WMA; Richmond WMA; Salt Creek WMA; Salt Creek WMA; South Nebo WMA - Deep Creek Unit; South Nebo WMA - Levan Unit; South Nebo WMA - Maple Canyon Unit; South Nebo WMA - Triangle Ranch Unit; Southwest Manti WMA - Ephraim Unit; Southwest Manti WMA - Manti Unit; Southwest Manti WMA - Mayfield Unit; Stewart Lake WMA; Stoddard Slough WMA; Strawberry River WMA; Swan Creek WMA; Tabby Mountain WMA; Taylor Flat WMA; Three Corners WMA; Timpanogos WMA; Timpie Springs WMA; Topaz Marsh WMA; Topaz Slough WMA; Upper Huntington Canyon WMA; Upper San Rafael River WMA; Weber Face WMA; Willard Bay Upland Game WMA; Willow Creek WMA; Yankee Meadows WMA; Cedar City Upland Game Sanctuary; Hat Island SHA; Lee Kay Center & Wildife Conservation Area; Roosevelt Game Farm; Vernal Game Farm; Henefer Fishing Access	URL: http://www.wildlife.utah.go v/habitat/
Agricultural Research Service	Desert Experimental Range	URL: http://www.fs.fed.us/rmrs/e xperimental-forests/desert- experimental-range/
Utah State Land Board	State Sovereign Lands	Utah Lake Comprehensive Management Plan: Introduction Document on Sovereign Land Management 06/2005

# Appendix 5-1. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the SWReGAP project area.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
BARR	EN LANDS																						
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	24,313	38.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	0.1%	4.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	3,103	34.8%	0.1%	2.8%	0.5%	10.6%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.1%	4.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	17.5%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,873	69.5%	0.0%	1.5%	14.4%	2.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	17,581	49.0%	0.9%	1.7%	0.0%	28.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	3.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	10.3%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	3,297	53.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	26.6%	0.0%	7.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	1,360	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.8%	0.0%	31.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	46	30.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	0.0%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	45.3%
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	23	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	74.0%	24.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	23	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.1%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	2,728	26.1%	0.4%	8.2%	0.0%	47.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	5.3%
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	112	17.8%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	59.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	2.1%	0.1%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	3,568	45.3%	0.3%	16.0%	9.2%	3.0%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.6%	4.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.6%	7.4%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	393	40.0%	1.3%	1.2%	0.3%	3.5%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%	9.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	22.1%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	1,115	25.3%	0.1%	14.2%	0.8%	28.0%	14.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%	12.5%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	992	40.1%	0.8%	2.4%	1.4%	18.3%	9.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	2.1%	11.7%	4.0%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	3,863	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	84.4%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	5.5%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	761	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	84.8%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.2%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	2,965	19.3%	0.0%	0.1%	50.5%	0.2%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%	2.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	15.9%
S007	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	123	37.1%	0.0%	0.0%	32.7%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	19.6%
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	309	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	75.1%
EVER	GREEN FOREST																						
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	97,855	29.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.6%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	24.9%	0.1%	6.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	18.1%
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	50,776	64.9%	0.0%	0.7%	20.2%	2.7%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	1.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	666	18.1%	0.0%	2.4%	69.4%	0.4%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	1.2%
S051	Madrean Encinal	4,358	14.3%	0.0%	0.2%	42.4%	0.8%	1.7%	0.1%	0.0%	2.3%	0.1%	14.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.6%	0.1%	18.7%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	5,733	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	58.7%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	30.9%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	21,918	6.8%	0.0%	0.2%	42.1%	2.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	21.1%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	18.1%
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	795	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	71.3%	0.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%
S033	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	88.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	209	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.5%
S121	Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland	106	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	78.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	42	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	96.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	8,953	8.8%	0.0%	0.5%	62.5%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.2%	2.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%	17.0%
S125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	6	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.3%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	8,764	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	79.5%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	11.2%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	7,295	10.4%	0.0%	0.4%	57.5%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.2%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	22.1%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	14,814	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	86.4%	0.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	6.7%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	10,359	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	84.0%	0.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	8.0%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	801	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	64.3%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	1.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.4%	20.0%
S122	Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland	20	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	85.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	15,305	13.7%	0.0%	0.4%	18.1%	1.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	0.3%	7.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.7%	50.0%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	50,221	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	58.6%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.2%	1.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.3%	18.7%
DECI	DUOUS FOREST																						
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	20,985	5.0%	0.0%	0.1%	62.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.3%	1.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	27.0%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	888	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.1%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	59.0%
MIXE	DFOREST																						
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,439	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	71.7%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	17.9%
SHRU	B/SCRUB																						
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	31,685	23.2%	0.1%	0.9%	12.1%	1.2%	0.1%	1.1%	0.0%	7.6%	0.1%	25.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	28.0%
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	27,409	41.4%	0.3%	0.7%	1.3%	7.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	1.5%	0.2%	22.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	1.8%	21.6%
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	4,413	29.3%	0.0%	0.7%	9.1%	12.0%	1.7%	0.2%	0.0%	6.1%	0.1%	19.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	20.0%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	5,726	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	1.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	12.2%
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	187	32.8%	0.0%	0.2%	7.9%	1.4%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%	28.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	20.2%
S117	Coahuilan Chaparral	93	16.9%	0.0%	0.0%	43.1%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	13,310	42.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	36.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	2,401	42.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.2%	13.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.4%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	11,535	70.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.2%	6.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.8%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	163	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	76.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	35,433	78.4%	0.0%	2.2%	5.7%	3.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	108,476	64.8%	0.0%	1.1%	2.8%	2.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%	0.1%	2.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.0%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	4,130	75.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.1%	10.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	79,294	65.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.9%	6.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	11.0%	0.1%	3.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	12.4%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	2,550	40.6%	0.0%	2.4%	45.4%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.5%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	11,515	19.2%	0.0%	0.2%	45.4%	1.2%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	0.1%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	11.8%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	16,763	52.3%	0.0%	13.7%	2.8%	9.6%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.1%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	109	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	99.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	18,950	13.7%	0.0%	0.0%	29.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.5%	2.5%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.3%	45.6%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	2,823	27.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	0.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.2%	4.6%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	52.8%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	58,763	40.8%	0.5%	8.7%	0.1%	14.8%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.4%	7.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,549	28.1%	0.0%	15.2%	0.1%	13.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	0.2%	4.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.5%
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	89	11.9%	0.0%	6.0%	80.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,393	45.5%	0.0%	0.4%	9.9%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	18.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	39,792	34.4%	0.4%	7.2%	6.8%	5.4%	2.5%	0.2%	0.0%	18.6%	0.3%	14.4%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	7,021	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	84.9%	0.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	1,797	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	12.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	86.9%
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	13,894	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	15.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	69.5%
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	47	77.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%
GRAS	SLAND/HERBACEOUS																						
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	45,714	28.8%	0.0%	1.8%	4.9%	6.5%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	2.0%	0.1%	20.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.5%	2.1%	30.5%
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	120	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	9.6%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.7%
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	804	7.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	65.8%	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.5%
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	986	26.0%	0.1%	0.8%	0.8%	14.2%	1.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	18.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	9.5%	25.1%
S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,797	51.1%	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.1%	1.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.1%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	5,590	11.4%	0.0%	0.4%	2.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.1%	0.0%	19.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	36.7%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	40,652	32.3%	0.0%	1.1%	29.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.1%	3.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	30.0%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	33,640	16.1%	0.0%	0.5%	3.0%	0.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	34.7%	0.1%	11.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	32.3%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	47,618	31.5%	0.0%	1.3%	2.4%	2.9%	1.3%	0.1%	0.0%	25.8%	0.0%	10.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	23.3%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	994	22.6%	0.0%	0.2%	23.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	33.3%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	27	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	80.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	6.7%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,779	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	83.7%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	5.8%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	2,177	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	72.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	1.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	22.6%
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	11,956	4.7%	0.0%	0.2%	4.3%	1.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.1%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	70.5%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	10,293	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	34.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.5%	5.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.7%	42.3%
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	5,066	1.4%	0.0%	0.2%	3.2%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	5.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	83.6%
S089	Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.7%
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	113,162	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	79.4%
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.9%	27.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57.0%
wooi	DY WETLAND																						
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,360	18.5%	0.4%	0.7%	13.7%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.6%	0.9%	2.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	56.6%
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	23,770	48.7%	1.6%	0.9%	0.1%	3.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%	0.1%	4.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	25.7%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	426	15.0%	0.0%	0.7%	24.7%	1.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%	0.4%	9.7%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.4%	3.6%	31.0%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	832	9.9%	0.3%	2.8%	4.7%	0.3%	0.9%	0.1%	0.0%	47.5%	0.3%	11.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.0%	19.1%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	422	19.2%	1.2%	5.5%	11.3%	1.8%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.6%	9.2%	3.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	25.8%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	652	44.3%	2.5%	1.6%	1.7%	2.0%	2.5%	0.1%	0.0%	7.9%	0.6%	8.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	27.0%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	2,226	11.5%	0.0%	0.7%	11.5%	0.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%	1.0%	2.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	52.1%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	3,224	3.3%	0.0%	0.2%	71.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	19.2%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	292	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	45.7%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	1.7%	1.4%	1.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.4%	35.5%
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain	836	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	2.7%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	90.6%
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,713	2.5%	1.8%	2.7%	1.4%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	10.9%	1.0%	3.3%	3.8%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.4%	67.6%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND																						
S105	Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	2	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	98.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	1,053	8.8%	4.3%	9.6%	0.9%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.2%	2.3%	9.8%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	40.4%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	1,956	2.6%	0.0%	1.1%	60.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.2%	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%	28.9%
S103	Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	2	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%	26.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.9%
S108	Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	41	19.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%
ALTE	RED or DISTURBED																						
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	93	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	90.7%
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	46	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	5.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	75.7%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	2,638	45.1%	0.2%	0.4%	1.7%	1.1%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	2.4%	0.1%	4.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	43.6%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	8,291	57.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	2.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.6%	2.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.9%
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland	1	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	67.4%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,839	9.3%	0.0%	1.1%	2.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	1.3%	0.4%	2.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	1.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	79.5%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,609	18.5%	1.5%	2.8%	0.7%	0.3%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	18.9%	0.8%	3.4%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	40.4%
D02	Recently Burned	2,033	29.1%	0.0%	1.1%	23.2%	3.1%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.6%	25.6%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	689	54.8%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	10.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.7%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	836	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	90.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	1,240	19.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.1%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.3%
DEVE	LOPED and AGRICULTURE																						
N80	Agriculture	75,977	0.8%	0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.1%	2.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	93.0%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	7,540	2.2%	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%	1.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	90.2%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	7,425	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	3.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.2%	1.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	90.3%
OTHE	R COVER TYPES																						
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,421	18.0%	0.2%	0.8%	0.2%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56.5%	0.3%	4.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%
N11	Open Water	11,023	1.8%	1.2%	0.4%	1.3%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.3%	0.5%	1.0%	2.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.7%
	TOTAL	1,386,073	30.5%	0.1%	1.3%	14.3%	3.2%	1.7%	0.1%	0.0%	9.5%	0.2%	7.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	30.2%
	* For Land Stewardship headings: BLM = Bureau o Research Service, Dept. of Com. = Dept. of Commo	f Land Mana erce, Nativ A	gement, BO mer = Nati	OR = Burea ve America	u of Recla an Lands,	amation, F Reg. Gov.	WS= U.S. = Regiona	Fish and al Govern	Wildlife S ment, Auc	Service, US I = Audubo	FS = U.S. n, TNC =	Forest Ser The Nature	vice, DOD/ e Conservat	DOE = De ncy, Priv-B	pt. of Defe ioDiv = Pr	nse/Dept. ivate Land	of Energ ls Mana	gy, NPS = ged for Bio	U.S. Natio diversity	onal Park S	ervice , A	RS = Agric	ultural

# Appendix 5-2. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status in the SWReGAP project area.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	Stat	tus 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statı	1s 3	Stat	us 4	Status	:1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
BARRE	N LANDS											
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	24,321	1,887	7.8%	5,529	22.7%	14,836	61.0%	2,020	8.3%	7,416	30.5%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	3,103	100	3.2%	282	9.1%	1,938	62.4%	777	25.0%	383	12.3%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,889	48	1.7%	711	24.6%	1,820	63.0%	293	10.1%	759	26.3%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	17,586	625	3.6%	1,266	7.2%	12,759	72.6%	2,483	14.1%	1,891	10.8%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	3,301	42	1.3%	348	10.5%	2,347	71.1%	559	16.9%	390	11.8%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	1,360	96	7.1%	423	31.1%	573	42.1%	267	19.6%	519	38.2%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	46	0	0.0%	2	4.4%	22	47.4%	22	46.4%	2	4.4%
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	39	0	0.0%	17	42.3%	7	16.7%	0	0.3%	17	42.3%
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	23	5	23.4%	16	69.4%	1	6.2%	0	1.0%	22	92.8%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	2,845	260	9.1%	267	9.4%	1,750	61.5%	452	15.9%	526	18.5%
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	113	3	2.7%	50	44.0%	50	44.4%	9	7.9%	53	46.7%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	3,635	435	12.0%	1,210	33.3%	1,443	39.7%	477	13.1%	1,645	45.3%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	399	26	6.5%	73	18.3%	162	40.6%	125	31.3%	99	24.8%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	1,146	240	21.0%	111	9.7%	577	50.3%	166	14.5%	352	30.7%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	995	45	4.5%	303	30.4%	393	39.5%	252	25.3%	347	34.9%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	3,863	801	20.7%	1,591	41.2%	1,239	32.1%	219	5.7%	2,392	61.9%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	761	164	21.6%	310	40.7%	255	33.5%	32	4.2%	474	62.3%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	2,971	252	8.5%	523	17.6%	1,595	53.7%	586	19.7%	774	26.1%
S007	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	134	0	0.0%	6	4.5%	92	68.7%	25	18.4%	6	4.5%
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	315	0	0.0%	3	0.9%	41	13.0%	265	84.2%	3	0.9%
EVERG	REEN FOREST											
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	97,894	2,470	2.5%	11,148	11.4%	57,617	58.9%	26,584	27.2%	13,618	13.9%
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	51,234	1,127	2.2%	9,224	18.0%	35,332	69.0%	5,090	9.9%	10,351	20.2%
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	670	156	23.2%	274	41.0%	228	34.1%	8	1.2%	430	64.2%
S051	Madrean Encinal	4,406	79	1.8%	616	14.0%	2,196	49.8%	1,466	33.3%	695	15.8%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	5,737	96	1.7%	863	15.0%	4,297	74.9%	478	8.3%	959	16.7%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	21,930	165	0.8%	2,382	10.9%	13,562	61.8%	5,806	26.5%	2,547	11.6%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	Stat	us 1	Statu	is 2	Statu	is 3	Stat	us 4	Status	1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	811	13	1.6%	150	18.5%	592	73.1%	40	4.9%	163	20.1%
S033	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2	0	0.0%	1	32.0%	1	62.3%	0	3.4%	1	32.0%
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	236	0	0.0%	24	10.1%	146	62.1%	39	16.6%	24	10.1%
S121	Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland	114	0	0.0%	24	20.6%	74	64.8%	8	6.8%	24	20.6%
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	53	0	0.0%	25	47.0%	16	29.9%	1	2.8%	25	47.0%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	8,970	454	5.1%	1,619	18.0%	5,055	56.4%	1,821	20.3%	2,073	23.1%
S125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	6	0	1.9%	0	1.3%	1	8.1%	5	81.7%	0	3.1%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	8,876	434	4.9%	1,215	13.7%	6,089	68.6%	1,023	11.5%	1,649	18.6%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	7,297	326	4.5%	1,136	15.6%	4,037	55.3%	1,795	24.6%	1,462	20.0%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	14,846	1,473	9.9%	3,467	23.4%	8,798	59.3%	1,059	7.1%	4,941	33.3%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	10,365	1,120	10.8%	2,255	21.8%	6,097	58.8%	886	8.6%	3,375	32.6%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	802	13	1.6%	193	24.1%	406	50.7%	188	23.4%	207	25.8%
S122	Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland	21	0	0.0%	4	19.1%	15	72.4%	1	6.3%	4	19.1%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	15,311	90	0.6%	950	6.2%	4,926	32.2%	9,334	61.0%	1,040	6.8%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	50,241	1,494	3.0%	4,189	8.3%	32,837	65.4%	11,686	23.3%	5,683	11.3%
DECIDU	JOUS FOREST											
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	21,050	456	2.2%	2,219	10.5%	12,395	58.9%	5,909	28.1%	2,675	12.7%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	898	33	3.7%	69	7.7%	250	27.9%	534	59.5%	103	11.4%
MIXED	FOREST											
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,445	82	2.4%	308	8.9%	2,379	69.0%	669	19.4%	390	11.3%
SHRUB/	SCRUB											
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	32,060	114	0.4%	1,557	4.9%	13,072	40.8%	16,914	52.8%	1,671	5.2%
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	27,891	141	0.5%	1,219	4.4%	13,353	47.9%	12,680	45.5%	1,359	4.9%
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	4,448	99	2.2%	207	4.6%	2,353	52.9%	1,746	39.3%	306	6.9%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	5,891	80	1.4%	59	1.0%	4,176	70.9%	1,410	23.9%	138	2.3%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	Stat	tus 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	1s 3	Stat	us 4	Status	\$ 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%						
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	189	4	2.2%	9	4.6%	84	44.5%	90	47.6%	13	6.8%
S117	Coahuilan Chaparral	96	27	27.8%	12	13.0%	45	47.2%	9	9.7%	39	40.7%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	13,310	651	4.9%	2,018	15.2%	9,567	71.9%	1,061	8.0%	2,669	20.1%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	2,401	2	0.1%	156	6.5%	1,174	48.9%	1,069	44.5%	158	6.6%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	11,536	389	3.4%	3,790	32.9%	5,652	49.0%	1,702	14.8%	4,179	36.2%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	169	1	0.3%	56	33.3%	85	50.1%	21	12.7%	57	33.7%
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	35,631	672	1.9%	3,357	9.4%	27,902	78.3%	3,496	9.8%	4,030	11.3%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	109,699	1,297	1.2%	6,256	5.7%	75,102	68.5%	25,773	23.5%	7,553	6.9%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	4,155	17	0.4%	254	6.1%	3,031	73.0%	827	19.9%	271	6.5%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	79,498	594	0.7%	3,996	5.0%	61,601	77.5%	13,009	16.4%	4,589	5.8%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	2,569	139	5.4%	587	22.9%	1,616	62.9%	209	8.1%	726	28.3%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	11,518	284	2.5%	1,869	16.2%	6,664	57.9%	2,698	23.4%	2,153	18.7%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	16,864	2,706	16.0%	4,514	26.8%	7,606	45.1%	1,936	11.5%	7,220	42.8%
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	109	13	11.8%	75	68.4%	21	19.3%	0	0.4%	88	80.2%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	18,960	190	1.0%	1,212	6.4%	8,139	42.9%	9,404	49.6%	1,402	7.4%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	2,872	38	1.3%	160	5.6%	1,006	35.0%	1,616	56.3%	199	6.9%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	59,616	5,605	9.4%	10,585	17.8%	29,651	49.7%	12,883	21.6%	16,190	27.2%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,571	172	6.7%	327	12.7%	1,045	40.6%	1,005	39.1%	499	19.4%
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	89	30	34.0%	55	61.6%	3	3.0%	1	1.4%	85	95.6%
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,395	38	0.7%	1,202	22.3%	2,110	39.1%	2,043	37.9%	1,240	23.0%
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	40,079	3,656	9.1%	5,122	12.8%	20,783	51.9%	10,212	25.5%	8,778	21.9%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	7,021	55	0.8%	188	2.7%	6,281	89.5%	496	7.1%	244	3.5%
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	1,898	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	13	0.7%	1,780	93.8%	3	0.2%
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	14,088	21	0.2%	346	2.5%	2,727	19.4%	10,790	76.6%	368	2.6%
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	54	4	6.8%	9	16.9%	31	56.9%	4	7.1%	13	23.7%
GRASS	LAND/HERBACEOUS											
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	46,038	302	0.7%	2,987	6.5%	18,247	39.6%	24,151	52.5%	3,289	7.1%
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	123	0	0.0%	3	2.7%	16	13.1%	100	81.2%	3	2.7%
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	805	150	18.7%	3	0.4%	588	73.1%	61	7.6%	154	19.1%
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	1,050	17	1.6%	27	2.6%	412	39.3%	528	50.3%	44	4.2%
S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,851	10	0.6%	35	1.9%	940	50.8%	812	43.9%	45	2.4%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	Stat	tus 1	Statu	is 2	Statı	1s 3	Stat	us 4	Status	1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	5,615	12	0.2%	135	2.4%	2,211	39.4%	3,228	57.5%	147	2.6%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	41,190	593	1.4%	3,238	7.9%	23,505	57.1%	13,305	32.3%	3,831	9.3%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	33,693	312	0.9%	1,207	3.6%	15,121	44.9%	16,968	50.4%	1,519	4.5%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	47,668	647	1.4%	2,806	5.9%	27,246	57.2%	16,882	35.4%	3,453	7.2%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	995	6	0.6%	48	4.8%	479	48.1%	460	46.3%	54	5.5%
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	32	0	0.0%	4	11.4%	22	68.3%	2	5.7%	4	11.4%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,779	446	16.0%	1,001	36.0%	1,162	41.8%	169	6.1%	1,447	52.1%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	2,178	71	3.3%	321	14.7%	1,271	58.3%	511	23.5%	392	18.0%
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	11,968	23	0.2%	156	1.3%	1,368	11.4%	10,405	86.9%	179	1.5%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	10,346	104	1.0%	1,077	10.4%	4,565	44.1%	4,511	43.6%	1,181	11.4%
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	5,096	7	0.1%	114	2.2%	551	10.8%	4,391	86.2%	121	2.4%
S089	Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	17	94.1%	0	0.0%
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	114,340	48	0.0%	726	0.6%	12,012	10.5%	100,220	87.7%	774	0.7%
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	0	0.0%	0	25.8%	0	14.1%	0	53.4%	0	25.8%
WOOD	YWETLAND											
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,387	8	0.6%	91	6.6%	447	32.2%	796	57.3%	99	7.1%
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	23,842	598	2.5%	1,130	4.7%	14,753	61.9%	7,124	29.9%	1,728	7.2%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	427	9	2.0%	67	15.6%	153	35.9%	192	44.9%	75	17.7%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	847	17	2.0%	62	7.3%	455	53.7%	291	34.4%	79	9.3%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	461	36	7.8%	48	10.4%	125	27.1%	195	42.3%	84	18.2%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	657	19	2.9%	76	11.5%	316	48.1%	239	36.3%	95	14.4%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	2,236	39	1.7%	184	8.2%	679	30.4%	1,308	58.5%	223	10.0%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	3,240	340	10.5%	783	24.2%	1,449	44.7%	643	19.8%	1,124	34.7%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	294	5	1.7%	46	15.8%	134	45.7%	106	36.1%	51	17.5%
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain	842	0	0.0%	31	3.7%	31	3.6%	766	91.0%	31	3.7%
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,720	2	0.1%	138	8.0%	121	7.0%	1,439	83.6%	140	8.1%
EMERG	ENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND											
S105	Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	2	0	0.0%	1	45.8%	1	50.7%	0	0.0%	1	45.8%
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	1,074	59	5.5%	189	17.6%	171	15.9%	453	42.2%	248	23.1%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	1,962	183	9.3%	439	22.4%	719	36.7%	604	30.8%	622	31.7%
S103	Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	3	0	0.0%	0	1.7%	1	40.2%	1	28.0%	0	1.7%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in region	Stat	tus 1	Statu	ıs 2	Statu	is 3	Stat	us 4	Status	1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
S108	Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	41	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	8	19.1%	12	30.2%	0	0.5%
ALTER	ED or DISTURBED											
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	93	0	0.0%	6	6.4%	2	2.0%	84	90.7%	6	6.4%
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	52	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	7	14.4%	38	72.4%	1	1.7%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	2,649	17	0.6%	69	2.6%	1,311	49.5%	1,236	46.7%	86	3.2%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	8,347	21	0.2%	253	3.0%	4,957	59.4%	3,052	36.6%	274	3.3%
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland	1	0	31.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.6%	0	67.4%	0	31.0%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,869	4	0.1%	46	1.6%	438	15.3%	2,346	81.8%	49	1.7%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,666	106	6.4%	161	9.7%	518	31.1%	777	46.6%	267	16.0%
D02	Recently Burned	2,033	125	6.1%	180	8.9%	1,029	50.6%	699	34.4%	305	15.0%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	689	1	0.2%	67	9.8%	454	65.9%	167	24.2%	68	9.9%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	855	26	3.0%	29	3.3%	734	85.9%	46	5.4%	55	6.4%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	1,240	1	0.1%	6	0.5%	480	38.7%	733	59.1%	7	0.5%
DEVEL	OPED and AGRICULTURE											
N80	Agriculture	77,813	59	0.1%	581	0.7%	2,605	3.3%	72,632	93.3%	639	0.8%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	7,600	3	0.0%	36	0.5%	425	5.6%	7,066	93.0%	38	0.5%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	7,463	2	0.0%	17	0.2%	366	4.9%	7,012	94.0%	19	0.3%
OTHER	COVER TYPES											
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,437	10	0.7%	55	3.8%	1,070	74.5%	275	19.1%	65	4.5%
N11	Open Water	11,220	102	0.9%	219	2.0%	1,003	8.9%	972	8.7%	322	2.9%
	TOTAL	1,396,584	36,690	2.6%	123,493	8.8%	688,818	49.3%	526,365	37.7%	160,183	11.5%

# Appendix 5-3: Area (in square kilometers) of each land cover type summarized by land steward and GAP Management Status in the SWReGAP project area.

# BARREN LANDS

# S010 Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	281	0	0	71	0	1536	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	4407	0	2	289	0	586	214	<1	8	20	0	0	<1	0	0
3	4624	<1	0	381	<1	2147	7651	18	3	<1	3	0	5	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	252	0	970	0	0	<1	0	4	793

#### S012 Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	4	0	1	<1	0	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	160	1	85	<1	0	7	9	0	1	6	0	0	13	0	0
3	917	1	0	16	328	150	522	4	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	0	144	0	0	<1	0	2	542

#### S009 Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Private
1	3	0	29	10	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	539	<1	<1	163	0	0	9	0	<1	0	<1	<1	0
3	1454	<1	15	241	61	0	0	46	<1	1	0	<1	<1
4	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	<1	0	20	0	0	263

#### S015 Inter-Mountain Basins Playa

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	579	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	759	106	255	<1	0	2	0	1	0	137	2	0	0	0	6	0
3	7273	45	<1	7	5071	0	123	1	21	<1	156	0	0	42	21	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	669	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	1812

#### S011 Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	4	0	0	<1	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	291	0	1	5	0	28	7	<1	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1480	0	0	15	1	11	833	1	4	0	2	0	0	<1	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	38	0	234	0	0	<1	<1	0	<1	286

#### S013 Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Schl	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	35	0	61	0	0	0	0
2	53	<1	6	0	364	0	0	0	0
3	218	0	310	<1	0	44	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	5	116	<1	145

#### S014 Inter-Mountain Basins Wash

Status	BLM	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	TNC	Private
1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	0	<1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	<1	0
3	14	<1	0	6	<1	<1	0	0	<1	0
4	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	21

#### S003 Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	Private
1	0	0	0	0
2	0	17	0	0
3	<1	<1	6	0
4	0	0	0	<1

#### S001 North American Alpine Ice Field

Status	USFS	NPS	State Park	Private
1	5	<1	0	0
2	16	0	0	0
3	1	0	<1	0
4	0	0	0	<1

# S018 North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	216	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	62	0	7	<1	198	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0
3	650	<1	0	<1	1097	0	<1	1	0	0	<1	0	0
4	0	10	0	0	0	0	<1	0	104	0	0	191	146

# S017 North American Warm Desert Badland

Status	BLM	BOR	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	County	TNC	Private
1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	8	0	0	35	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
3	12	7	<1	28	<1	2	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	9

#### S016 North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	24	0	312	11	0	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	751	0	261	96	20	68	0	0	<1	<1	5	0	0	9	<1	0	0
3	841	10	0	223	85	87	<1	173	22	<1	0	0	0	1	<1	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	2	0	0	15	0	171	0	<1	<1	0	0	22	266

# S021 North American Warm Desert Pavement

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	1	0	4	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	36	0	<1	<1	0	34	0	0	0	<1	0	0	1	<1	0	0
3	119	5	0	1	14	18	4	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	<1	<1	0	0	<1	87

#### S022 North American Warm Desert Playa

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	17	0	62	<1	0	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	11	0	96	4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	254	<1	0	5	311	<1	<1	<1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	15	0	<1	<1	<1	0	10	140

# S019 North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	15	0	21	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0
2	254	0	3	3	0	41	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
3	129	<1	0	10	182	48	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0
4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	116	39

# S002 Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	8	0	611	181	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	88	0	1484	15	0	0	1	2	0	<1	0	0
3	48	<1	1165	0	2	16	<1	0	0	7	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	<1	0	4	211

# S004 Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	NPS	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	1	0	115	48	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	12	0	294	3	0	<1	<1	0	0	0
3	15	<1	236	0	3	<1	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	32

# S006 Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	3	<1	187	0	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	118	3	350	0	10	0	0	1	40	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	452	<1	960	7	5	157	3	3	<1	<1	0	0	6	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	76	0	0	<1	<1	0	6	472

#### S007 Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon

Status	BLM	BOR	USFS	DOD/DO E	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
3	43	<1	36	9	3	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	24

#### S008 Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	2	0	<1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	16	<1	<1	13	3	0	0	<1	6	0	0	0	0	<1	0	3
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	0	<1	<1	<1	0	<1	229

# EVERGREEN FOREST

#### S039 Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	163	0	0	287	0	2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
2	8632	0	21	981	0	464	406	0	51	591	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	20453	<1	<1	14987	46	172	21704	101	95	<1	<1	0	0	54	0	3
4	0	1	0	0	<1	0	2240	0	6505	4	0	<1	2	0	135	17698

# S040 Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	18	0	359	116	0	634	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	7620	0	14	1486	0	<1	24	0	10	32	38	0	0	0	0	<1	0
3	25326	<1	<1	8657	1064	0	0	261	22	0	<1	1	0	0	<1	<1	<1
4	0	0	0	0	330	0	0	26	0	773	0	<1	1	<1	2	0	3956

# S026 Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Wldlf	TNC	Private
1	<1	16	93	0	47	0	0	0	0
2	71	0	203	0	0	0	<1	<1	0
3	50	0	167	3	0	9	0	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

#### S051 Madrean Encinal

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	7	2	3	0	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	3	0	0
2	244	6	196	0	6	0	0	3	<1	1	0	0	0	147	14	0	0
3	372	0	1651	33	2	4	101	2	6	0	0	0	0	14	12	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	644	<1	4	<1	0	0	0	2	815

#### S035 Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	76	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	33	<1	826	0	<1	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	3	<1	0	0
3	49	0	2467	7	0	1773	<1	0	<1	0	0	<1	<1	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	123	0	<1	0	0	0	<1	354

#### S112 Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	8	0	4	89	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	4	0	0
2	368	0	50	1898	0	5	0	0	<1	<1	6	0	0	0	0	49	6	0	0
3	1107	0	0	7248	581	<1	4	4591	1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	5
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	1800	<1	1	<1	<1	0	0	0	17	3964

#### S111 Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Schl	Land Trust	Private
1	0	3	0	9	0	0	0	0
2	2	143	0	<1	0	0	5	0
3	1	420	4	0	167	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	3	0	37

# S033 Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland

Status	USFS	State Park	Reg. Gov	County	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	0	0	0	0
3	<1	<1	0	0	0
4	0	0	<1	<1	<1

# S123 Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	USFS	Nativ Amer	State Park	Other State	Reg. Gov	County	TNC	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	<1	122	0	18	6	0	0	<1	0
4	0	0	<1	0	0	<1	2	0	37

#### S121 Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland

Status	USFS	State Park	Other State	Reg. Gov	County	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	24	0	0	0	0	0
3	59	15	<1	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	<1	<1	7

# S029 Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland

Status	BLM	USFS	State Park	Other State	Private			
1	0	0	0	0	0			
2	0	25	0	0	0			
3	<1	16	<1	<1	0			
4	0	0	0	0	1			

#### S032 Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	1	43	234	0	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	244	<1	1247	0	19	<1	<1	<1	13	94	0	0	0	0	<1	0	1	0	0
3	541	<1	4111	2	4	0	311	13	18	<1	<1	0	0	<1	0	<1	23	0	32
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	0	154	0	0	<1	7	5	0	0	0	50	1489

# S125 Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland

	Status	BLM	USFS	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Private		
	1	0	<1	0	0	0	0		
ſ	2	0	0	0	<1	<1	0		
[	3	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0		
ſ	4	0	0	0	0	0	5		

# S031 Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	187	0	248	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	24	<1	1153	0	2	0	0	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	276	3	5630	<1	<1	22	124	27	<1	2	0	0	<1	<1	7	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	8	1	14	0	0	4	977

# S034 Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland

Statu	s BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
	1	25	233	0	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
	2 20	<1	787	0	13	<1	<1	2	16	109	0	0	0	0	<1	0	1	0	0
	3 55	0 0	3176	3	10	0	184	14	27	<1	<1	0	0	<1	0	<1	30	0	46
	4	) 0	0	0	0	0	58	0	70	0	0	<1	17	21	0	0	0	60	1565

# S028 Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland

Statu	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
	<1	0	0	1227	0	244	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
	2 120	0	1	3286	0	15	0	0	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
	3 254	<1	2	8285	10	<1	128	65	12	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	11	0	31
	4 0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	32	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	27	960
#### S030 Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	0	938	0	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	126	0	<1	2078	0	14	0	0	6	31	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	232	<1	3	5686	6	<1	95	32	15	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	13	0	16
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	23	0	0	<1	<1	1	0	0	24	810

#### S025 Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	13	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	10	158	0	4	0	0	4	17	0	<1	0	0
3	23	344	<1	0	26	<1	7	0	<1	<1	0	5
4	0	0	0	0	11	0	3	0	0	0	19	155

#### S122 Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	State Park	County	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	4	0	0	0	0
3	<1	14	<1	1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	1

#### S038 Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	3	10	0	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	435	0	57	307	0	29	<1	<1	30	78	0	0	<1	<1	11	0	0
3	1663	<1	0	2455	239	<1	251	39	196	2	0	0	0	<1	40	0	41
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	571	0	894	0	3	2	0	0	0	254	7611

#### S036 Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	1	2	982	0	508	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	518	4	3276	0	25	0	7	5	33	317	0	0	0	0	<1	0	5	0	0
3	863	1	25155	115	4	0	6163	78	139	2	<1	0	0	1	0	<1	52	0	261
4	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	625	0	632	<1	0	3	50	86	0	0	0	1153	9137

#### DECIDUOUS FOREST

S023 Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	27	395	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	200	1	1754	0	30	<1	0	53	180	0	0	0	0	<1	1	0	0
3	854	<1	10902	5	2	428	63	90	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	36	0	17
4	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	198	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	32	5647

#### S024 Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	City	County	TNC	Private
1	0	33	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	40	0	<1	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0
3	9	237	<1	0	<1	3	0	<1	0	0	<1	0
4	0	0	<1	0	0	0	10	0	<1	<1	0	524

#### MIXED FOREST

#### S042 Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	61	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	49	<1	227	14	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	147	0	2179	<1	26	1	6	<1	0	0	0	<1	16	0	3
4	0	0	0	0	8	0	38	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	11	611

#### SHRUB/SCRUB

#### S058 Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	23	0	43	23	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
2	561	0	239	644	<1	8	0	0	10	8	45	0	0	0	0	15	27	0	0
3	6754	31	1	3153	357	<1	338	2351	19	31	<1	0	0	<1	0	18	18	0	0
4	0	1	0	0	24	0	0	62	0	7872	<1	1	10	9	0	0	0	63	8869

#### S062 Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub

	Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
ſ	1	33	0	56	<1	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	<1	0	0
ſ	2	960	0	142	24	0	3	0	0	2	2	54	0	0	0	12	19	0	0
ſ	3	10349	71	<1	322	1944	<1	124	407	64	15	0	0	0	0	43	12	0	0
ſ	4	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	<1	0	6265	<1	2	4	0	0	0	485	5913

#### S116 Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	21	0	2	1	0	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	0
2	93	0	28	52	0	<1	0	0	2	<1	20	0	0	0	2	9	0	0
3	1180	<1	<1	349	528	<1	7	270	3	7	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	852	<1	4	1	0	0	0	3	885

#### S068 Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	<1	0	0	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	51	0	1	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	<1	6	0	0
3	2188	3	0	1	1968	0	7	6	1	<1	0	0	0	1	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	700	0	<1	<1	0	0	12	697

#### S061 Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	5	0	<1	2	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
3	55	<1	0	12	3	<1	<1	12	<1	1	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	52	<1	<1	0	0	<1	38

#### S117 Coahuilan Chaparral

Status	BLM	USFS	NPS	State Schl	Private
1	<1	<1	27	0	0
2	6	5	1	0	0
3	10	35	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	6	3

### S059 Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	County	TNC	Private
1	28	0	15	0	608	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	1849	0	<1	0	32	124	<1	7	3	0	0	3	0
3	3777	0	10	<1	1147	4626	5	<1	<1	3	0	<1	0
4	0	<1	0	0	0	44	0	735	0	0	<1	0	281

#### S056 Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	120	<1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	<1	35	0	0	0
3	900	0	20	<1	0	246	6	<1	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	322	0	0	<1	729

#### S052 Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	TNC	Private
1	96	0	0	6	287	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	3584	0	2	14	132	<1	<1	<1	53	0	4	0
3	4475	0	<1	139	289	726	18	2	0	<1	3	0
4	0	<1	0	0	0	50	0	747	0	0	0	905

#### S053 Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	Other State	Reg. Gov	County	Private
1	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	9	68	<1	0	1	4	1	0	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	21

#### S055 Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	3	0	617	2	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	3058	0	151	95	0	<1	45	0	<1	0	7	0	0	0	0	<1	0
3	24707	<1	5	1912	1052	0	0	216	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	<1
4	0	0	0	0	118	0	0	10	0	296	0	<1	<1	<1	1	0	3070

#### S054 Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	34	0	815	36	0	412	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	5279	<1	219	68	0	89	4	66	10	72	443	<1	0	0	0	8	0	0
3	64977	20	143	2940	1827	104	0	4485	62	521	2	<1	0	0	0	25	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	307	0	0	400	0	2291	<1	2	6	2	13	0	1	22753

#### S045 Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	TNC	Private
1	4	0	0	<1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	237	0	<1	<1	0	15	0	<1	<1	2	0	0	0
3	2878	0	0	7	5	79	27	2	26	<1	6	<1	0
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	6	0	389	0	0	0	432

#### S065 Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	330	0	56	3	0	205	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	3579	87	59	4	0	41	79	51	1	20	73	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
3	47694	124	21	725	4745	150	0	7927	80	58	<1	6	0	0	4	64	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	40	0	0	765	0	2332	0	<1	<1	<1	2	0	9	9860

#### S050 Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	County	TNC	Private
1	4	60	14	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	280	0	297	0	0	<1	0	0	0	8	0	0	2	0
3	752	0	847	<1	0	0	16	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	<1	<1	0	191

#### S057 Mogollon Chaparral

Stat	tus	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
	1	3	0	2	134	0	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	2	0	0
	2	467	0	23	1343	0	3	0	0	<1	<1	3	0	0	0	0	22	7	0	0
	3	1747	0	0	3747	136	<1	2	1017	11	<1	0	0	0	0	0	2	<1	0	<1
	4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1322	<1	<1	<1	2	0	0	0	18	1355

#### S060 Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	County	TNC	Private
1	23	0	1329	60	0	1291	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
2	3143	0	962	394	0	4	0	0	11	<1	0	0	0
3	5608	<1	0	16	1368	10	589	14	0	<1	0	<1	0
4	0	0	0	0	249	0	72	0	280	<1	<1	0	1336

#### S043 Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland

Status	USFS	Nativ Amer	State Schl	Private
1	13	0	0	0
2	75	0	0	0
3	21	<1	0	0
4	0	0	<1	<1

#### S046 Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	5	0	<1	84	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	388	0	3	293	0	29	7	18	43	428	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	2205	<1	<1	5132	69	21	460	82	104	<1	0	0	0	<1	38	0	27
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	185	0	335	<1	<1	6	12	0	0	249	8617

### S047 Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	<1	3	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	71	0	<1	13	0	1	0	<1	<1	7	63	0	0	0	4	0	0
3	696	<1	<1	212	3	2	0	24	6	55	<1	0	0	<1	8	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	<1	4	0	69	0	2	15	35	0	<1	1490

#### S069 Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	165	0	3922	<1	0	1513	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
2	7584	0	1183	7	796	887	0	0	0	63	64	0	0	0	0	<1	0
3	16213	101	0	56	7714	1400	4	3901	252	0	4	0	0	0	<1	2	<1
4	0	205	0	0	185	0	0	1076	0	4284	<1	<1	53	12	12	0	7057

#### S070 Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
					_										
1	13	0	141	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	77	0	246	1	<1	<1	0	0	<1	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	626	<1	0	<1	294	2	117	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	38	0	277	0	115	0	<1	<1	<1	0	574

#### S114 Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	State Schl	Private
1	0	5	25	0	0
2	8	0	47	0	0
3	3	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	<1	1

#### S129 Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	FWS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Private
1	1	0	2	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1031	0	166	<1	<1	2	0	0	0	1	<1	0	0	0	<1	1	0
3	1424	0	367	6	<1	0	5	302	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	<1	0
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	985	0	5	<1	17	0	0	1030

#### S063 Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Private
1	15	0	2621	7	0	1010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
2	3807	0	248	644	224	<1	0	0	<1	172	21	0	0	0	1	4	0
3	9850	0	0	2056	1944	0	93	6717	101	6	9	0	0	1	<1	4	0
4	0	159	0	0	0	0	0	691	0	5544	<1	390	106	135	0	0	3187

#### S136 Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland

Status	BLM	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	County	TNC	Private
1	<1	0	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	157	<1	1	9	0	20	<1	0	0	<1	0
3	339	1	16	5918	6	0	0	<1	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	31	0	170	<1	0	<1	0	295

#### S138 Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	<1	2	<1	0	0
3	5	0	0	3	<1	3	<1	0	0	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	218	0	0	<1	1562

#### S048 Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	2	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0
2	16	0	<1	12	0	<1	<1	69	105	0	0	0	146	0
3	1622	<1	<1	166	15	9	11	903	<1	0	0	0	<1	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	20	0	0	1111	0	<1	<1	<1	0	9659

#### S128 Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland

Status	BLM	USFS	NPS	State Schl	State Wldlf	Private
1	0	0	4	0	0	0
2	9	0	0	0	<1	0
3	28	<1	<1	3	0	0
4	0	0	0	1	0	3

GRASSLAND/HERBACEOUS

#### S077 Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	85	0	64	2	0	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	<1	0	0
2	1291	0	754	115	0	18	0	0	11	11	11	0	0	0	631	146	0	0
3	11795	9	<1	2122	2962	<1	44	931	36	33	0	0	0	0	232	80	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	0	1	0	9245	<1	5	3	0	0	0	946	13951

#### S087 Central Mixedgrass Prairie

Status	USFS	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	0	<1	3	<1	0
3	0	5	11	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	100

#### S080 Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	<1	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	58	<1	0	<1	529	0	<1	0	0	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	9	28

#### S113 Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	7	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	18	0	<1	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	8	<1	0	0
3	237	<1	0	7	140	<1	23	1	1	0	0	2	<1	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	186	0	0	0	94	248

#### S109 Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland

Status	State Schl	Private
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	<1	<1

### S078 Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	County	TNC	Private
1	<1	10	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	27	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0
3	891	<1	19	<1	0	23	2	0	3	0	<1	0
4	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	29	0	<1	0	775

#### S075 Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	<1	<1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	91	22	<1	0	2	0	0	14	5	0	0	0	0
3	548	0	141	1	<1	1500	1	19	0	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	128	0	1045	<1	<1	0	4	2051

#### S071 Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	5	0	414	101	0	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	1360	0	26	1240	0	13	<1	0	<1	99	494	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
3	11757	<1	0	10447	62	23	0	849	56	263	2	<1	0	0	0	40	0	3
4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	51	0	1065	0	<1	<1	<1	1	0	<1	12185

#### S090 Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	13	0	70	1	0	228	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	861	<1	103	36	0	64	3	21	15	54	46	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
3	4528	12	<1	956	123	18	0	9417	15	28	0	3	0	0	0	20	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	2218	0	3848	0	<1	<1	<1	3	0	46	10852

#### S079 Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	20	0	122	8	0	494	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
2	1849	0	478	29	0	94	46	51	3	47	51	0	0	0	0	0	158	0	0
3	13113	<1	<1	1093	1268	54	1	11419	12	151	<1	<1	0	0	0	2	130	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	131	0	0	834	0	4803	<1	0	<1	<1	2	0	0	7	11106

#### S115 Madrean Juniper Savanna

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	0	<1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	26	0	2	18	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	1	<1	0	0
3	198	<1	0	214	9	<1	<1	56	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	128	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	1	330

#### S134 North Pacific Montane Grassland

Status	BLM	USFS	DOD/DO E	State Park	Other State	TNC	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	3	0	0	0	<1	0
3	2	19	<1	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

#### S081 Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	4	0	341	100	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	76	0	910	11	0	0	1	3	<1	0	0
3	65	<1	1076	0	<1	9	<1	0	10	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	8	160

#### S083 Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	66	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	12	<1	292	0	4	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	30	<1	1208	<1	<1	11	4	15	<1	0	0	<1	2	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	13	0	<1	<1	0	0	6	492

#### S074 Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	City	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	0	5	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	93	0	24	19	0	11	0	0	1	5	0	2	0	0
3	474	<1	0	490	211	0	5	7	166	0	0	13	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	703	0	1268	0	<1	0	9	8425

#### S085 Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	<1	71	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
2	238	0	<1	548	0	8	1	<1	1	90	187	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	980	<1	0	2906	4	<1	0	217	45	375	2	<1	0	0	0	1	27	0	6
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	70	0	0	<1	<1	2	0	0	69	4347

#### S086 Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland

Sta	tus	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
	1	0	0	<1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	9	1	7	0	<1	<1	0	0	1	37	31	0	0	0	25	0	0
	3	59	10	155	97	0	0	0	1	14	192	<1	0	0	0	19	0	3
	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	16	0	41	0	4	37	23	0	30	4231

#### S089 Western Great Plains Sand Prairie

Status	State Schl	Private
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	0
4	0	17

#### S088 Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	25	0	<1	10	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0
2	16	0	31	64	0	7	51	0	0	7	299	142	0	0	0	110	0	0
3	2994	16	<1	2645	1050	29	0	0	8	44	4963	<1	0	0	0	210	0	53
4	0	4	0	0	90	0	0	<1	<1	0	10056	0	1	6	5	0	281	89777

#### S132 Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie

Status	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Private
1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	<1	0
3	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	<1

### WOODY WETLAND S118 Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	<1	0	6	<1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	42	0	3	11	0	<1	0	2	0	32	0	0	0	0	1	0
3	209	6	<1	176	6	0	43	7	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	<1
4	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	0	12	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	770

#### S096 Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	425	0	113	<1	0	49	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
2	538	142	65	<1	0	20	8	19	7	7	144	<1	0	0	0	0	178	0	0
3	10609	243	36	16	832	43	0	2796	19	138	<1	9	0	0	4	<1	9	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	15	0	0	104	0	888	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	<1	6114

#### S094 North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	23	0	<1	28	0	2	0	0	<1	8	0	0	0	6	1	0	0
3	41	<1	0	74	4	0	32	2	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	3	0	41	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	15	132

#### S098 North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Private
1	3	0	10	<1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	21	0	13	8	<1	4	0	0	<1	<1	9	0	0	0	<1	4	0
3	58	<1	0	30	2	0	1	359	2	1	<1	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0
4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	36	0	91	<1	<1	<1	3	0	0	159

#### S097 North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	22	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	17	0	<1	16	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	13	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
3	64	<1	<1	31	8	3	<1	16	3	<1	<1	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	4	0	0	<1	0	0	41	0	38	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	2	109

#### S020 North American Warm Desert Wash

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	8	<1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	67	0	3	<1	0	3	0	0	<1	<1	2	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
3	221	16	<1	11	13	3	<1	46	4	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	0	6	0	55	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	1	176

### S093 Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	City	County	Aud	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	7	0	1	3	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	82	0	13	24	0	6	13	<1	1	40	0	0	0	<1	5	0	0
3	167	<1	<1	230	10	9	232	20	3	<1	<1	0	0	0	5	0	2
4	0	<1	0	0	0	0	94	0	49	<1	0	<1	2	0	0	5	1157

#### S091 Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	1	4	274	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	27	2	718	0	6	0	0	6	24	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	78	1	1310	<1	<1	20	19	13	<1	1	0	0	0	<1	8	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	0	0	1	<1	1	0	0	7	619

#### S092 Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	5	<1	35	0	<1	0	<1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	23	0	97	<1	0	2	5	3	<1	1	0	0	0	<1	3	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	1	103

#### S120 Western Great Plains Floodplain

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	<1	5	25	0	0	0	<1	0
3	<1	<1	<1	7	<1	0	5	17	<1	0	0	0	<1	0
4	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	6	3	0	757

#### S095 Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland

Sta	atus	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
	1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	14	0	44	6	0	<1	<1	0	0	<1	6	65	0	0	0	4	0	0
	3	29	30	3	18	16	<1	0	0	<1	16	8	<1	0	0	0	<1	0	<1
	4	0	<1	0	0	1	0	0	<1	187	0	44	0	1	16	7	0	25	1158

EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND S105 Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen

Status	BLM	USFS	Private
1	0	0	0
2	0	1	0
3	<1	1	0
4	0	0	<1

#### S100 North American Arid West Emergent Marsh

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	57	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	11	15	44	3	0	<1	0	0	10	<1	104	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	81	31	<1	6	20	<1	<1	14	3	<1	<1	8	0	0	0	<1	6	0	<1
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	0	2	0	23	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	<1	426

#### S102 Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	17	164	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	15	3	389	8	0	<1	3	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	36	<1	632	<1	33	3	11	<1	0	0	0	<1	4	0	<1
4	0	0	0	0	4	0	14	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	21	565

#### S103 Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow

Status	BLM	USFS	State Park	Private
1	0	0	0	0
2	0	<1	0	0
3	<1	<1	<1	0
4	0	0	0	1

#### S108 Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland

Status	BLM	FWS	State Park	State Schl	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	<1	0	0	0
3	8	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	4	8

#### ALTERED or DISTURBED

D01 Disturbed, Non-specific

Status	BLM	NPS	State Park	State Wldlf	Private
1	0	<1	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	5	0
3	2	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	84

#### D14 Disturbed, Oil Well

Status	BLM	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Private
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	5	1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	<1	0
4	0	0	0	<1	0	3	0	0	35

#### D09 Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Private
1	<1	0	7	<1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	44	2	3	2	0	3	3	2	1	<1	3	<1	0	0	0	0	5	0
3	1145	2	<1	42	27	5	0	53	<1	34	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	1	0
4	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	10	0	72	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	1150

#### D08 Invasive Annual Grassland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	2	0	2	<1	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0
2	187	<1	7	1	0	3	<1	<1	42	1	11	0	0	0	0	<1	0
3	4541	7	<1	57	208	8	0	117	4	11	<1	<1	0	0	0	1	<1
4	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	40	0	186	0	<1	<1	<1	2	0	2807

#### D07 Invasive Perennial Forbland

Status	FWS	State Park	State Schl	Private
1	<1	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0
3	0	<1	<1	0
4	0	0	0	<1

#### D06 Invasive Perennial Grassland

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	<1	3	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	6	<1	4	0	<1	8	0	0	1	5	21	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	259	32	55	12	<1	0	0	37	11	31	<1	<1	0	0	0	2	0	0
4	0	0	0	8	0	0	2	<1	0	26	0	0	4	31	18	0	1	2256

#### D04 Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Private
1	2	0	39	<1	0	62	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
2	85	12	6	<1	<1	8	4	<1	1	43	0	0	0	0	<1	1	0
3	212	7	0	11	4	37	219	13	12	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	1	0
4	0	5	0	0	<1	0	81	0	41	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0	649

#### D02 Recently Burned

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	City	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	12	0	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	46	22	68	0	0	24	0	1	<1	0	0	18	<1	0	0
3	545	0	392	63	<1	20	<1	4	0	<1	0	2	<1	0	1
4	0	0	0	<1	0	19	0	148	0	0	<1	0	0	13	519

### D11 Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas

Status	BLM	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	<1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	54	1	<1	0	0	0	12	<1	0	0
3	324	129	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	1	0	71	0	0	<1	95

### D10 Recently Logged Areas

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	<1	26	<1	0	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0
3	19	0	706	<1	2	6	1	0	<1	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	<1	46

#### D03 Recently Mined or Quarried

Status	BLM	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	City	County	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	3	<1	1	0	0	<1	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	0	0
3	242	<1	18	3	0	162	<1	4	0	51	0	0	<1	0	0
4	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	9	0	0	<1	<1	0	<1	723

#### DEVELOPED and AGRICULTURE

N80 Agriculture

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	46	5	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	153	1	47	26	0	2	8	0	<1	<1	47	241	<1	0	0	0	0	54	0	0
3	427	11	32	499	61	15	0	0	588	53	879	2	3	0	0	0	2	34	0	3
4	0	29	0	0	9	0	0	<1	926	0	836	<1	2	10	44	97	0	0	4	70674

#### N22 Developed, Medium - High Intensity

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Widlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	2	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	24	<1	2	3	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	6	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0
3	143	<1	3	71	141	<1	<1	44	8	12	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	4	0	0	33	0	0	49	<1	105	<1	<1	5	55	11	0	0	0	6	6798

#### N21 Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO	NPS	ARS	Dept.	Nativ	State	State	State	Other	Reg.	City	County	Aud	Land	TNC	Priv-	Private
					E			of	Amer	Park	Schl	Wldlf	State	Gov				Trust		BioDiv	
								Com.													
1	<1	0	<1	<1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	2	0	<1	1	0	4	<1	0	0	<1	<1	8	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0
3	73	1	<1	23	189	4	<1	0	46	11	4	<1	15	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	0	0
4	0	4	0	0	82	0	0	<1	45	0	82	<1	<1	5	56	27	0	0	0	4	6708

#### OTHER COVER TYPES

N31 Barren Lands, Non-specific

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	TNC	Private
1	<1	0	10	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	35	1	<1	<1	6	<1	<1	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	220	1	<1	3	49	<1	791	4	<1	<1	0	0	0	<1	<1	0
4	0	<1	0	0	<1	0	11	0	50	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	213

#### N11 Open Water

Status	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DO E	NPS	ARS	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wldlf	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Private
1	<1	0	16	10	0	75	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
2	29	7	33	25	0	6	<1	2	<1	3	109	1	0	0	0	<1	5	0	0
3	168	123	1	114	26	46	0	139	139	14	<1	235	0	0	0	<1	3	0	<1
4	0	2	0	0	<1	0	0	36	0	41	<1	<1	28	6	3	0	0	3	855

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDi v	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
BARR	EN LANDS																						
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	6,973	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	72.7%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	352	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	85.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	730	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	70.3%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	573	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	16.1 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.0%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	82.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,017	0.1%	1.0%	20.5%	0.0%	76.6 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	34	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	84.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	761	25.2%	0.0%	5.3%	24.4%	9.8%	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	0.1%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.4%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	45	15.8%	0.0%	0.5%	2.4%	0.1%	40.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	48	52.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.6%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	205	36.7%	4.0%	11.0%	6.5%	0.1%	23.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	11.3 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	5.9%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	92	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	82.9%	0.0%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
EVER	GREEN FOREST																						
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	32,495	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	45.3%	0.0%	9.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.7%
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	3,414	82.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
S051	Madrean Encinal	3,008	8.3%	0.0%	0.3%	51.8%	0.9%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	3.4%	0.2%	16.8 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	15.5%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	4,008	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	64.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	28.4%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	13,163	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	48.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	30.6%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	8.5%
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	123	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	87.9%	3.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,030	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	67.7%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	439	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	71.5%	0.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	223	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.9%	0.0%	11.3%	0.0%	0.0%	29.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	120	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.6%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	52.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## Appendix 5-4. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the state of Arizona.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDi v	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	1	40.6%	0.0%	0.0%	30.7%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.9 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	16,240	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	64.7%	0.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
DECI	DUOUS FOREST																						
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	443	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	39.8%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.7%
SHRU	B/SCRUB																						
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	16,547	13.4%	0.0%	1.2%	22.8%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	14.3%	0.1%	27.9 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	18.7%
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	6,319	19.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.9%	1.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%	43.5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	23.8%
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,816	32.5%	0.0%	0.3%	14.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	9.6%	0.1%	25.1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	16.3%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	187	37.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	38.7 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	109	25.3%	0.0%	0.3%	12.1%	0.7%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	34.5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	13.7%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	4,036	14.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	74.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	489	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	32.8 %	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.5%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	353	48.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	40.9%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	5,200	32.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	46.7%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	6.3%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	75	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	7,005	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	56.2%	0.1%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	13.9%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	9,637	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	48.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.1%	13.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	11.2%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	5,416	41.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	20.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.9%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.3%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	128	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51.5%	0.0%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	29.2%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	38,922	29.9%	0.5%	8.1%	0.1%	19.1 %	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	0.2%	10.8 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,011	6.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	38.8%	0.2%	11.2	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.7%
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,391	45.5%	0.0%	0.4%	9.9%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	18.3 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	39,791	34.4%	0.4%	7.2%	6.8%	5.4%	2.5%	0.2%	0.0%	18.6%	0.3%	14.4 %	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	6,073	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	89.3%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%
GRAS	SLAND/HERBACEOUS																						
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	11,354	7.7%	0.0%	1.3%	10.6%	1.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	7.5%	0.1%	30.2 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.0%	39.1%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOF	NPS	ARS	Dept. of	Nativ Amer	State Park	State	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDi	Priv
		AL					DOL			com.	Antei	Iaik	Jein	wiidi	State					Trust		v	
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	16	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	17.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	23.3 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	51.3%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	4,002	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	30.8%	0.0%	22.3 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.2%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	1	49.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.7%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	11,250	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	39.0%	0.1%	21.3 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.6%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	15,474	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	49.4%	0.0%	15.7 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	23.6%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	336	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	41.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%	0.0%	18.1 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	9.4%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	587	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.6%	0.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	9.0%
wooi	DY WETLAND																						
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	1,237	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	86.3%	0.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	180	7.4%	0.0%	0.1%	41.3%	0.2%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.3%	6.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	29.3%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	801	8.5%	0.3%	2.6%	4.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	49.3%	0.3%	11.5 %	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	18.8%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	283	14.1%	1.5%	7.9%	15.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.6%	8.6%	3.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	22.7%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	153	19.6%	0.2%	0.6%	5.6%	0.8%	7.5%	0.2%	0.0%	8.8%	0.2%	12.5 %	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	41.3%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	24	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	66.6%	0.0%	2.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND																						
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	32	13.0%	0.0%	20.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	0.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	10.1 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	30.0%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	74.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ALTE	RED or DISTURBED																						
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	127	23.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	0.0%	15.1 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	19.5%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	72	47.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	26.2%	0.0%	11.2 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	13	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.4%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	483	16.3%	0.8%	7.8%	2.1%	0.2%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	0.7%	4.8%	2.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%
D02	Recently Burned	168	2.5%	0.0%	13.1%	65.2%	0.0%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	470	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	72.7%
DEVE	LOPED and AGRICULTURE																						
N80	Agriculture	5,634	0.7%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.2%	0.1%	8.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	75.4%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	4,048	1.2%	0.1%	0.0%	1.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	91.5%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/	NPS	ARS	Dept. of	Nativ	State	State	State	Other	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land	TNC	Priv-	Priv
		AL					DOF			Com.	Amer	Рагк	Schi	wiidi	State					1 rust		v v	
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1,711	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	4.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	88.7%
OTHE	R COVER TYPES																						
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,119	9.6%	0.1%	0.7%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.9%	0.3%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.6%
N11	Open Water	701	1.2%	0.2%	0.8%	2.3%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	0.4%	0.8%	1.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	TOTAL	295,347	17.0%	0.1%	2.3%	15.3%	3.8%	3.2%	0.1%	0.0%	27.5%	0.1%	12.6 %	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	17.2%
	* For Land Stewardship headings: BLM = Bureau of	of Land Ma	nagement,	BOR =	Bureau of F	Reclamation	n, FWS=	= U.S. Fish	and W	ildlife Servi	ce, USFS =	U.S. Fores	st Servio	e, DOD/DO	DE = Dept.	of Defense/	Dept. of E	nergy, NPS	S = U.S.	National Pa	rk Service	, ARS :	=
	Agricultural Research Service, Dept. of Com. = De	pt. of Com	merce, Na	tiv Amer	= Native A	American L	ands, R	eg. Gov. =	Region	al Governm	ent, Aud =	Audubon,	TNC =	The Nature	Conservan	cy, Priv-Bic	Div = Priv	ate Lands l	Manageo	l for Biodiv	ersity		

# Appendix 5-5. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Arizona.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Stat	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
BARRI	EN LANDS											
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	6,965	761	10.9%	698	10.0%	5,275	75.7%	231	3.3%	1,459	20.9%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	350	0	0.0%	19	5.6%	324	92.5%	7	1.9%	19	5.6%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	83.2%	1	16.8%	0	0.0%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	729	28	3.9%	13	1.8%	561	77.0%	126	17.2%	42	5.7%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	573	93	16.2%	6	1.0%	282	49.3%	192	33.5%	98	17.2%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	4	0	0.0%	1	14.9%	3	84.4%	0	0.7%	1	14.9%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,017	203	19.9%	204	20.0%	582	57.2%	29	2.8%	406	40.0%
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	34	0	1.1%	4	11.4%	29	85.4%	1	2.2%	4	12.5%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	760	68	9.0%	233	30.6%	345	45.4%	114	15.0%	301	39.6%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	45	1	1.1%	5	11.0%	21	47.5%	18	40.4%	5	12.1%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	48	0	0.0%	0	0.3%	25	51.9%	23	47.8%	0	0.3%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	205	23	11.3%	9	4.2%	130	63.4%	43	21.1%	32	15.5%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	5	0	0.0%	5	95.9%	0	4.1%	0	0.0%	5	95.9%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	91	1	0.7%	4	4.4%	84	91.7%	3	3.2%	5	5.1%
EVER	REEN FOREST											
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	32,482	1 2 1 8	3 7%	1 506	4.6%	21 563	66.4%	8 195	25.2%	2.724	8 4%
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	3 414	363	10.6%	2 051	60.1%	862	25.2%	138	4 1%	2,721	70.7%
S051	Madrean Encinal	3 008	64	2.1%	2,001	9.7%	1 680	55.8%	972	32.3%	357	11.9%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	4,008	81	2.0%	715	17.8%	2,999	74.8%	213	5.3%	796	19.9%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	13 161	113	0.9%	1 730	13.1%	9 218	70.0%	2 101	16.0%	1 842	14.0%
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	,			-,,			,, .	_,		-,	
		123	9	7.6%	87	70.7%	26	21.2%	1	0.5%	96	78.3%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and											
	Woodland	1,029	153	14.9%	72	7.0%	803	78.0%	2	0.2%	225	21.8%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and											
	Woodland	439	27	6.0%	47	10.7%	364	82.9%	1	0.3%	74	16.8%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and											
<u> </u>	woodiand	223	33	14.9%	22	10.1%	167	74.9%	0	0.1%	56	24.9%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and											
	woodiand	120	13	11.0%	10	8.3%	97	80.7%	0	0.1%	23	19.2%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Stat	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine											
	Woodland	2	0	3.0%	1	73.2%	0	23.8%	0	0.0%	2	76.2%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	1	0	0.0%	0	4.3%	1	68.8%	0	26.8%	0	4.3%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	16,233	422	2.6%	907	5.6%	14,018	86.4%	887	5.5%	1,328	8.2%
DECID	UOUS FOREST											
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	442	21	4.8%	72	16.3%	345	78.1%	4	0.8%	93	21.1%
SHRUE	B/SCRUB											
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	16,539	63	0.4%	1,306	7.9%	7,463	45.1%	7,707	46.6%	1,369	8.3%
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	6,318	26	0.4%	189	3.0%	1,861	29.5%	4,241	67.1%	215	3.4%
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,814	39	1.4%	114	4.0%	1,497	53.2%	1,165	41.4%	153	5.4%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub											
		187	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	76	40.3%	110	58.8%	2	0.9%
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	109	2	2.1%	4	3.7%	51	46.4%	52	47.9%	6	5.7%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	4,033	208	5.2%	375	9.3%	3,236	80.3%	214	5.3%	583	14.4%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	489	0	0.1%	5	1.0%	52	10.7%	431	88.3%	5	1.1%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	353	6	1.7%	17	4.7%	310	87.8%	20	5.8%	23	6.4%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	0	0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	5,199	213	4.1%	355	6.8%	4,017	77.3%	613	11.8%	568	10.9%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	75	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	70	93.8%	5	6.1%	0	0.1%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	6,995	84	1.2%	85	1.2%	5,286	75.6%	1,540	22.0%	169	2.4%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	9,636	195	2.0%	1,488	15.4%	5,619	58.3%	2,335	24.2%	1,683	17.5%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	5,416	1,178	21.7%	1,001	18.5%	1,829	33.8%	1,408	26.0%	2,179	40.2%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	128	20	15.8%	10	7.8%	95	74.1%	3	2.3%	30	23.6%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub											
		38,909	3,913	10.1%	4,022	10.3%	20,416	52.5%	10,558	27.1%	7,935	20.4%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,011	12	1.2%	19	1.9%	187	18.5%	793	78.5%	31	3.1%
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	5,390	38	0.7%	1,201	22.3%	2,109	39.1%	2,042	37.9%	1,239	23.0%
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	39,773	3,656	9.2%	5,122	12.9%	20,783	52.3%	10,212	25.7%	8,778	22.1%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	6,073	49	0.8%	139	2.3%	5,473	90.1%	412	6.8%	188	3.1%
GRASS	LAND/HERBACEOUS											
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe											
		11,346	44	0.4%	552	4.9%	2,915	25.7%	7,834	69.1%	596	5.3%
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	16	0	0.2%	0	2.5%	3	22.2%	12	75.0%	0	2.7%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	3,998	11	0.3%	46	1.2%	1,434	35.9%	2,507	62.7%	57	1.4%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Stat	us 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	1	0	0.0%	0	26.9%	1	71.4%	0	1.7%	0	26.9%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	11,245	198	1.8%	101	0.9%	5,075	45.1%	5,872	52.2%	298	2.7%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	15,465	264	1.7%	296	1.9%	8,814	57.0%	6,091	39.4%	560	3.6%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	336	1	0.3%	22	6.5%	220	65.5%	93	27.6%	23	6.8%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	563	11	2.0%	11	1.9%	482	85.6%	59	10.5%	22	3.9%
WOOD	Y WETLAND											
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	1,235	3	0.2%	10	0.8%	1,115	90.3%	107	8.7%	13	1.0%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	180	4	2.0%	29	16.2%	82	45.4%	65	36.3%	33	18.3%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	795	14	1.8%	54	6.8%	443	55.8%	282	35.5%	69	8.6%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	269	25	9.2%	37	13.9%	76	28.3%	131	48.6%	62	23.1%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	152	9	6.1%	22	14.3%	35	23.3%	85	56.2%	31	20.5%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	24	0	0.4%	0	1.6%	18	76.4%	5	21.6%	0	2.0%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND											
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	24	6	25.1%	2	6.5%	3	13.8%	13	54.6%	8	31.6%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	96.8%	0	3.2%	0	0.0%
ALTER	ED or DISTURBED											
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	127	5	4.0%	5	3.6%	73	57.6%	44	34.8%	10	7.5%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	72	0	0.3%	1	1.4%	53	73.7%	18	24.7%	1	1.7%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	94.5%	1	5.5%	0	0.0%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	473	60	12.7%	20	4.2%	195	41.2%	199	42.0%	80	16.9%
D02	Recently Burned	168	21	12.4%	71	42.1%	75	44.9%	1	0.6%	91	54.5%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	467	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	121	26.0%	345	73.9%	0	0.1%
DEVEI	OPED and AGRICULTURE											
N80	Agriculture	5,629	8	0.1%	14	0.2%	99	1.8%	5,509	97.9%	21	0.4%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	4,046	1	0.0%	11	0.3%	180	4.4%	3,854	95.3%	12	0.3%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1,710	1	0.0%	3	0.2%	127	7.4%	1,580	92.4%	3	0.2%
OTHE	COVER TYPES					r						
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	1,118	8	0.7%	41	3.7%	870	77.8%	200	17.8%	49	4.4%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in AZ	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	15 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
N11	Open Water	220	44	20.0%	10	4.7%	71	32.4%	94	43.0%	54	24.7%
	TOTAL	284,218	14,135	5.0%	25,524	9.0%	162,831	57.3%	92,165	32.4%	39,659	13.5%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
BAR	REN LANDS																						
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	675	55.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	20.8%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	130	4.8%	0.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	11.0%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	4	65.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	46	1.4%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	44.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%	33.7%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	258	63.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%	1.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	20	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	85.2%
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.8%	0.0%	26.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.2%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.8%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	2,888	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	81.8%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	6.4%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	584	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	80.3%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	5.5%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	989	21.3%	0.0%	0.0%	52.3%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	23.1%
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	88	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.9%
EVE	RGREEN FOREST																						
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	15,136	61.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	0.1%	0.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.6%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.3%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,152	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.4%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	26.4%
S125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	6	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.3%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	6,940	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	76.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	13.0%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,603	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	50.5%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.1%	29.4%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	10,189	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	88.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.2%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	8,151	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	86.4%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	6.4%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	369	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	64.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	22.9%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	4,836	23.5%	0.0%	0.1%	9.0%	2.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	4.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	57.6%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	10,792	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	39.2%	0.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.5%	1.6%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.7%	43.8%

## Appendix 5-6. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the state of Colorado.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DEC	IDUOUS FOREST																						
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	11,436	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	64.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	27.0%
MIX	ED FOREST																						
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,951	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	70.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.1%	21.2%
SHR	UB/SCRUB																						
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	9	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.4%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	97	51.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	41.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	66	54.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.2%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.3%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	1,765	81.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	13,383	49.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	4.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	40.2%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	1,019	75.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	2.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.0%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,324	48.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.8%	0.3%	2.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	27.6%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	1	86.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	10,229	17.8%	0.0%	0.0%	23.3%	0.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.4%	1.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	51.5%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	2,305	27.8%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	54.8%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	13	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.6%
S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	8,682	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	11.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	83.9%
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	43	79.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%
GRA	SSLAND/HERBACEOUS																						
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	120	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	9.6%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.7%
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	281	74.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.5%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	8,504	25.3%	0.0%	0.3%	18.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	4.3%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	48.5%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	863	38.7%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	50.1%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub- Steppe	3,354	25.9%	0.0%	0.5%	1.1%	0.6%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	4.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	5.2%	0.0%	54.7%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	86.3%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,447	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	82.4%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	6.0%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	1,507	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	72.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	22.7%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	2,149	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	7.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	81.3%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	7,252	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	28.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	6.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	47.2%
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	4,365	1.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.9%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	5.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	86.6%
S089	Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.7%
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	45,651	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	2.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	11.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	80.4%
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.9%	27.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57.0%
woo	DDY WETLAND																						
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	2,281	19.8%	0.0%	1.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.1%	6.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	60.4%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	84.4%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	569	9.9%	0.0%	0.6%	4.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.7%	0.7%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	71.6%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	2,820	3.3%	0.0%	0.3%	74.5%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	17.2%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	215	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%	1.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	43.6%
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain	836	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	2.7%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	90.6%
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	859	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	6.1%	0.0%	0.1%	1.9%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	84.0%
EME	RGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND																						
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	45	1.5%	0.0%	35.9%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	1.6%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	50.9%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	1,331	2.1%	0.0%	1.5%	63.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	29.4%
ALTI	ERED or DISTURBED																						
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	2	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	<1	34.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	44.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	634	7.4%	0.0%	0.6%	6.0%	1.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	5.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	76.9%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	372	31.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.0%	3.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	59.1%
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland	1	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	67.4%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,083	1.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	1.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	1.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	89.2%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	493	4.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%	2.7%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	84.3%
D02	Recently Burned	313	24.0%	0.0%	0.1%	10.0%	19.2%	28.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.9%	0.1%	1.6%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	6.4%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	231	64.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.1%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	541	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	89.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	89	12.3%	0.0%	0.1%	6.2%	2.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	5.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	68.7%
DEV	ELOPED and AGRICULTURE																						
N80	Agriculture	52,899	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	1.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	95.2%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,074	1.4%	0.0%	0.2%	1.2%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	1.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	91.8%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	2,013	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.0%
отн	ER COVER TYPES																						
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	11	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.3%	6.6%	17.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51.2%

Cod	e Land Cover Type	Area in CO	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
N11	Open Water	1,316	2.8%	0.0%	0.6%	4.9%	0.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	5.4%	1.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	26.3%
	TOTAL	269,735	12.5%	0.0%	0.1%	21.7%	0.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	4.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	56.6%
	* For Land Stewardship headings: BLM = Bure ARS = Agricultural Research Service, Dept. of	eau of Land Com. = De	Manager pt. of Co	ment, BO	OR = Bur , Nativ A	reau of R Amer = N	eclamation, FV ative American	VS= U.S n Lands,	. Fish a Reg. G	nd Wildlife ov. = Regio	Service, U onal Govern	SFS = U.S nment, Au	S. Forest So d = Audub	ervice, DO on, TNC =	D/DOE = I The Natur	Dept. of e Conser	Defense rvancy,	/Dept. of l Priv-BioD	Energy, iv = Pri	NPS = U. vate Lands	S. Nation s Manage	al Park Ser d for Biodiv	vice , versity

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%						
BARRI	EN LANDS											
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	674	52	7.7%	202	29.9%	229	34.0%	192	28.4%	253	37.6%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	129	93	71.5%	18	14.0%	4	3.3%	14	11.1%	111	85.5%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	4	0	0.0%	0	8.5%	4	90.5%	0	1.1%	0	8.5%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	44	3	5.8%	5	10.5%	21	48.2%	16	35.5%	7	16.3%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	258	3	1.2%	30	11.7%	144	55.9%	80	31.2%	33	12.9%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	20	0	0.0%	1	3.9%	1	7.3%	18	88.7%	1	3.9%
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	2	1	29.6%	1	49.1%	0	10.0%	0	11.3%	2	78.8%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.2%	0	66.8%	0	0.0%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	2.878	668	23.2%	1.066	37.0%	958	33.3%	185	6.4%	1.734	60.3%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	584	140	24.0%	214	36.7%	198	33.9%	32	5.5%	354	60.7%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	981	123	12.6%	174	17.8%	455	46.4%	229	23.3%	298	30.3%
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	88	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	19	22.2%	68	77.2%	1	0.7%
EVER	REEN FOREST											
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	15 134	561	3 7%	2.452	16.2%	8 2 3 7	54 4%	3 883	25.7%	3 014	19.9%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12.7%	0	87.3%	0	0.0%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and											
		3,150	101	3.2%	323	10.3%	1,866	59.2%	859	27.3%	425	13.5%
\$125	Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	6	0	2.0%	0	1.4%	1	8.7%	5	87.9%	0	3.4%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	6,939	376	5.4%	926	13.3%	4,709	67.9%	927	13.4%	1,302	18.8%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	3,603	99	2.8%	376	10.4%	2,011	55.8%	1,116	31.0%	475	13.2%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	10,179	1,264	12.4%	2,298	22.6%	6,083	59.8%	534	5.2%	3,563	35.0%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	8,150	1,036	12.7%	1,753	21.5%	4,834	59.3%	527	6.5%	2,789	34.2%

# Appendix 5-7. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Colorado.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine											
	Woodland	369	8	2.3%	48	12.9%	228	61.7%	85	23.1%	56	15.2%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	4,834	28	0.6%	358	7.4%	1,652	34.2%	2,795	57.8%	386	8.0%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	10,790	132	1.2%	697	6.5%	4,705	43.6%	5,256	48.7%	829	7.7%
DECID	DUOUS FOREST											
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	11,432	258	2.3%	1,079	9.4%	7,003	61.3%	3,092	27.0%	1,337	11.7%
					,				- ,		<u> </u>	
MIXEI S042	) FOREST											1
5042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conner Forest and Woodiand	1.051		• • • • •		0.50/		(= 20)		21.20/		11 50/
		1,951	57	2.9%	167	8.5%	1,312	67.3%	415	21.3%	224	11.5%
SHRUI	B/SCRUB											
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	9	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	2	16.5%	8	83.4%	0	0.1%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	97	0	0.2%	36	36.8%	17	17.2%	45	45.9%	36	37.0%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	66	0	0.0%	8	11.5%	32	49.0%	26	39.6%	8	11.5%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	1,764	39	2.2%	510	28.9%	937	53.1%	278	15.7%	549	31.1%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	13,378	136	1.0%	888	6.6%	6,806	50.9%	5,548	41.5%	1,024	7.7%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	1,019	2	0.2%	70	6.9%	727	71.4%	219	21.5%	72	7.1%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	2,324	5	0.2%	264	11.4%	1,066	45.9%	989	42.6%	269	11.6%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	1	0	10.00/	0	12.00/	1	72.00/	0	2.70/	0	24.40/
\$046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shruhland	10.22(	0	10.6%	0	13.8%	1	/2.9%	5 504	2.7%	0	24.4%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	10,226	6/	0.7%	551	5.4%	4,105	40.1%	5,504	53.8%	618	6.0%
\$136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	2,303	35	1.5%	141	6.1%	808	35.1%	1,319	57.3%	176	7.6%
\$130	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shruhland	13	0	0.0%	0	2.3%	0	0.0%	13	97.7%	0	2.3%
5138	Western Great Plains Soudbill Shruhland	10	0	0.0%	0	2.8%	1	13.5%	8	83.7%	0	2.8%
S129	Wyoming Paging Low Sagebrush Shruhland	8,679	0	0.0%	258	3.0%	1,128	13.0%	7,292	84.0%	259	3.0%
5126	wyonning Basins Low Sageorush Shruoland	43	3	8.0%	8	18.4%	30	69.0%	2	4.6%	11	26.4%
GRASS	SLAND/HERBACEOUS											
S087	Central Mixedgrass Prairie	120	0	0.0%	3	2.7%	16	13.5%	100	83.7%	3	2.7%
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	281	0	0.0%	7	2.3%	226	80.2%	49	17.5%	7	2.3%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	8,498	48	0.6%	625	7.4%	3,701	43.6%	4,124	48.5%	673	7.9%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	862	6	0.7%	63	7.3%	333	38.6%	460	53.4%	69	8.0%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	3,350	171	5.1%	369	11.0%	915	27.3%	1,895	56.6%	540	16.1%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	13.7%	1	86.3%	0	0.0%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	2,446	418	17.1%	910	37.2%	968	39.6%	149	6.1%	1,328	54.3%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Status	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	1,504	57	3.8%	194	12.9%	911	60.5%	343	22.8%	251	16.7%
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	· · · ·										
		2,149	0	0.0%	6	0.3%	396	18.4%	1,747	81.3%	6	0.3%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	7,245	80	1.1%	607	8.4%	3,130	43.2%	3,429	47.3%	687	9.5%
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	4,362	0	0.0%	102	2.3%	405	9.3%	3,854	88.4%	102	2.3%
S089	Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	17	94.7%	0	0.0%
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	45,615	10	0.0%	625	1.4%	8,185	17.9%	36,796	80.7%	634	1.4%
S132	Western Great Plains Tallgrass Prairie	1	0	0.0%	0	27.7%	0	15.1%	0	57.3%	0	27.7%
WOOD	Y WETLAND											
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	2,276	44	1.9%	294	12.9%	526	23.1%	1,412	62.1%	337	14.8%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	1	0	0.0%	0	0.7%	0	14.9%	1	84.4%	0	0.7%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	566	5	1.0%	48	8.5%	78	13.7%	434	76.8%	54	9.5%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	2,812	335	11.9%	738	26.3%	1,252	44.5%	487	17.3%	1,073	38.1%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	215	3	1.3%	22	10.1%	95	44.4%	95	44.2%	24	11.4%
S120	Western Great Plains Floodplain	828	0	0.0%	31	3.8%	31	3.7%	766	92.6%	31	3.8%
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	849	0	0.0%	61	7.2%	40	4.7%	747	88.1%	61	7.2%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND											
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	44	10	21.7%	10	22.8%	1	2.5%	23	53.0%	19	44.5%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	1,327	160	12.1%	328	24.7%	445	33.5%	394	29.7%	488	36.8%
ALTEI	RED or DISTURBED											
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	2	0	0.5%	1	49.9%	1	49.2%	0	0.4%	1	50.4%
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	0	0	0.0%	0	14.8%	0	19.2%	0	66.0%	0	14.8%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	633	6	1.0%	14	2.1%	122	19.3%	491	77.6%	20	3.2%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	372	6	1.6%	15	4.1%	127	34.1%	224	60.2%	21	5.7%
D07	Invasive Perennial Forbland	1	0	31.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.6%	0	67.4%	0	31.0%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	2,079	1	0.1%	24	1.1%	134	6.5%	1,920	92.3%	25	1.2%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	486	1	0.3%	25	5.2%	38	7.8%	421	86.7%	27	5.5%
D02	Recently Burned	313	89	28.4%	50	16.1%	147	47.0%	27	8.5%	139	44.5%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	231	1	0.4%	18	7.9%	165	71.5%	46	20.1%	19	8.4%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	540	26	4.8%	26	4.9%	458	84.8%	30	5.6%	52	9.6%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	87	1	0.7%	3	4.0%	20	22.9%	63	72.3%	4	4.7%
DEVEI	LOPED and AGRICULTURE											
N80	Agriculture	52,820	40	0.1%	478	0.9%	1,700	3.2%	50,602	95.8%	518	1.0%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in CO	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Stat	us 3	Stat	us 4	Status	s 1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,068	1	0.1%	8	0.7%	53	5.0%	1,006	94.2%	8	0.8%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	2,010	0	0.0%	3	0.1%	22	1.1%	1,985	98.8%	3	0.1%
OTHE	R COVER TYPES											
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	10	0	0.0%	2	21.5%	2	20.7%	6	57.8%	2	21.5%
N11	Open Water	607	24	4.0%	58	9.6%	164	27.0%	361	59.4%	82	13.5%
	TOTAL	268,761	6,837	2.5%	20,692	7.7%	85,144	31.7%	156,088	58.1%	27,529	10.2%

# Appendix 5-8. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the state of New Mexico.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
BARR	EN LANDS																						
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	2,466	20.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	59.5%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	12.2%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	735	8.4%	0.0%	11.5%	2.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	60.8%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	2	31.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68.1%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	481	42.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	38.3%	0.0%	6.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	470	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	77.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	3	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	79.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.4%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,695	41.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.1%	30.4%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.3%	8.2%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	838	32.9%	0.0%	0.2%	12.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	11.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%	2.7%	22.1%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	180	53.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.6%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	13.4%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	535	8.9%	0.1%	0.5%	1.6%	43.5%	30.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	6.7%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	700	42.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	25.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	2.9%	16.6%	3.0%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	7	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.3%	38.9%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.2%	35.6%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	417	26.7%	0.0%	0.7%	30.6%	1.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	4.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.4%	20.6%
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	221	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	74.3%
EVER	GREEN FOREST																						
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	27,864	20.4%	0.0%	0.1%	19.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	0.2%	7.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	25.9%
S051	Madrean Encinal	1,350	27.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	1.0%	0.2%	25.9%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	1,725	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	45.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	8,754	10.5%	0.0%	0.6%	32.9%	6.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	32.5%
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	672	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	68.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2,864	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	77.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	0.1%	0.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.7%	13.6%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	7	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	29.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.7%	19.2%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,610	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	73.6%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.1%	0.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	3.6%	15.9%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	982	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	59.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%	0.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	26.0%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	640	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	19.5%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	376	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	61.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	0.7%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	18.0%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	10,468	9.2%	0.0%	0.5%	22.3%	1.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	0.2%	8.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	2.4%	46.5%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	21,163	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	62.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.9%	0.1%	1.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	5.1%	18.2%
DECID	UOUS FOREST																						
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	1,483	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	19.4%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	67.8%	0.0%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MIXED	FOREST																						
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	182	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	61.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	0.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	23.5%
SHRUB	/SCRUB																						
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	15,137	33.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.3%	2.0%	0.1%	1.7%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	21.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	38.1%
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	21,080	47.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.5%	8.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	16.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	2.3%	20.9%
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,597	23.8%	0.0%	1.4%	0.3%	32.2%	3.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	9.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	26.7%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	5,538	39.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.5%	1.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	11.9%
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	78	43.3%	0.0%	0.1%	2.0%	2.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	19.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%	29.2%
S117	Coahuilan Chaparral	93	16.9%	0.0%	0.0%	43.1%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	141	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	65.9%	0.0%	2.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	329	33.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%	0.0%	7.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	3,934	23.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	26.4%	0.4%	6.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	3,791	12.2%	0.0%	0.5%	1.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	51.8%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	25.5%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	870	14.9%	0.0%	2.6%	32.1%	14.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	6.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.3%	2.0%	22.3%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	1,888	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.6%	5.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.9%	44.4%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	266	9.0%	0.1%	0.1%	1.3%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	72.8%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	<1	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.5%
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	2	47.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	29.2%
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	<1	68.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	79	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	84.4%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	1,787	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	12.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.0%
S048 GRASS	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland LAND/HERBACEOUS	5,212	30.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	45.6%
S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe	34,357	35.8%	0.0%	1.9%	3.0%	8.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.4%	2.8%	27.7%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	804	7.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	65.8%	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.5%
S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	970	26.3%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	14.4%	1.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	9.7%	24.7%
S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	1,298	20.4%	0.0%	1.7%	4.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	30.4%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	283	14.1%	0.0%	0.7%	14.7%	4.8%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	0.0%	4.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	45.2%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	16,400	12.7%	0.0%	0.6%	3.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	42.8%	0.0%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	30.9%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	14,486	22.4%	0.0%	0.2%	3.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	29.3%	0.0%	10.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.0%
S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	657	25.7%	0.0%	0.3%	14.2%	1.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.1%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	45.4%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	19	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.4%	63.5%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	147	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	43.6%
S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna	9,808	5.7%	0.0%	0.2%	4.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.1%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	68.1%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	1,859	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	0.3%	1.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	3.7%	33.2%
S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	701	2.2%	0.0%	0.2%	17.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.5%	5.9%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	64.6%
S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	67,510	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	78.7%
WOOD	Y WETLAND																						
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	2,269	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	60.5%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	194	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.1%	14.6%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.2%	7.9%	29.2%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	3	19.3%	0.0%	0.4%	1.7%	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	41.0%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	125	32.2%	0.7%	0.5%	2.7%	5.0%	8.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	11.5%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	31.6%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	199	22.3%	0.7%	1.7%	1.3%	5.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	17.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.7%	47.5%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	787	7.5%	0.0%	0.5%	15.3%	1.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	24.1%	0.4%	3.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%	44.9%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	103	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.8%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.6%	0.0%	5.9%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	6.1%	34.2%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	5	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.9%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.3%	57.4%
S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	855	5.0%	3.6%	5.2%	2.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.8%	0.1%	5.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.9%	51.1%
EMERG	ENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND																						
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	86	20.5%	1.4%	0.6%	5.8%	0.7%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	6.5%	0.4%	19.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	42.9%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	136	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	22.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.1%	0.0%	1.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.7%	42.3%
S108	Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	41	19.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/D OE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ALTERED or DISTURBED																							
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	48	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	4.3%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	78.6%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	30	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	2.9%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	27	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.3%
D02	Recently Burned	806	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	26.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	1.6%	47.8%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	<1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	88.6%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	8	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	70.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	26.3%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	182	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%
DEVELOPED and AGRICULTURE																							
N80	Agriculture	6,025	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	3.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	88.7%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,108	1.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.1%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	89.9%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	977	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	4.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	88.6%
OTHER COVER TYPES																							
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	54	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	86.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
N11	Open Water	792	4.9%	14.0%	1.3%	0.8%	2.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	2.3%	1.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	20.2%
	TOTAL	314,870	17.3%	0.1%	0.5%	12.0%	3.3%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	10.4%	0.1%	11.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	1.4%	42.0%
	* For Land Stewardship headings: BLM = Bureau of Land Management, BOR = Bureau of Reclamation, FWS= U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USFS = U.S. Forest Service, DOD/DOE = Dept. of Defense/Dept. of Energy, NPS = U.S. National Park Service , ARS = Agricultural Research Service, Dept. of Com. = Dept. of Commerce, Nativ Amer = Native American Lands, Reg. Gov. = Regional Government, Aud = Audubon, TNC = The Nature Conservancy, Priv-BioDiv = Private Lands Managed for Biodiversity													icultural									

## Appendix 5-9. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status in the state of New Mexico.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	Area in NM Status 1		Status 2		Status 3		Status 4		Status 1&2	
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
BARR	EN LANDS											
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	2,465	11	0.4%	214	8.7%	1,694	68.7%	546	22.1%	225	9.1%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	735	0	0.0%	89	12.1%	80	10.8%	566	77.0%	89	12.1%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	31.9%	1	68.1%	0	0.0%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	481	1	0.2%	78	16.3%	322	67.0%	80	16.5%	79	16.5%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	470	0	0.0%	414	88.1%	17	3.6%	39	8.3%	414	88.1%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	3	0	0.0%	0	1.1%	2	85.3%	0	13.6%	0	1.1%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	1,695	54	3.2%	59	3.5%	1,160	68.4%	422	24.9%	113	6.7%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	838	3	0.4%	58	6.9%	469	56.0%	308	36.7%	61	7.3%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	173	16	9.1%	16	9.1%	90	52.1%	51	29.7%	32	18.2%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	515	162	31.4%	9	1.8%	284	55.2%	60	11.7%	171	33.2%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	700	14	2.0%	250	35.7%	235	33.5%	202	28.8%	264	37.6%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.9%	6	94.1%	0	0.0%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	36.2%	0	63.8%	0	0.0%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	417	13	3.1%	64	15.4%	199	47.8%	141	33.8%	77	18.4%
S008	Western Great Plains Cliff and Outcrop	221	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	22	9.8%	198	89.2%	2	1.0%
FVFR	CREEN FOREST											
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	27.849	156	0.6%	2,195	7.9%	14,896	53.5%	10.602	38.1%	2.351	8.4%
S051	Madrean Encinal	1.350	15	1.1%	324	24.0%	516	38.2%	495	36.7%	339	25.1%
S035	Madrean Pine-Oak Forest and Woodland	1.725	15	0.9%	148	8.6%	1.297	75.2%	265	15.3%	163	9.5%
S112	Madrean Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	8.754	52	0.6%	653	7.5%	4.346	49.6%	3,703	42.3%	705	8.1%
S111	Madrean Upper Montane Conifer-Oak Forest and Woodland	- ,					)		- )			
		672	3	0.5%	63	9.4%	566	84.3%	39	5.8%	66	9.9%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland											
		2,864	65	2.3%	902	31.5%	1,365	47.7%	532	18.6%	967	33.8%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	7	0	0.0%	1	8.2%	2	22.0%	5	69.8%	1	8.2%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland											
		1,610	90	5.6%	424	26.4%	780	48.5%	315	19.6%	514	31.9%
Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	15 3	Stat	us 4	Status	3 1&2
-------	---	-----------------	-----------------	--------	-----------------	--------	-----------------	--------	-----------------	-------	-----------------	--------
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland											
		982	5	0.5%	354	36.1%	330	33.6%	292	29.8%	359	36.6%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland											
		640	18	2.9%	257	40.2%	207	32.4%	158	24.6%	275	43.0%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland											1
		376	0	0.0%	129	34.4%	152	40.5%	95	25.1%	129	34.4%
S038	Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	10,465	62	0.6%	592	5.7%	3,273	31.3%	6,539	62.5%	654	6.2%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	21,160	869	4.1%	2,428	11.5%	12,520	59.2%	5,342	25.2%	3,297	15.6%
DECID	VIOUS FODEST											
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	1 483	99	6.7%	422	28.5%	618	41 7%	343	23.1%	522	35.2%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	1,405	0	32.2%		30.4%	010	37.4%	0	0.0%	0	62.6%
		Ů	Ū	52.270	0	50.170	0	57.170	0	0.070	0	02.070
MIXE	) FOREST	1	1			1					1	
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland											ł
		182	1	0.3%	32	17.8%	91	50.2%	58	31.7%	33	18.1%
SHRUI	B/SCRUB											
S058	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	15,120	51	0.3%	251	1.7%	5,608	37.1%	9,210	60.9%	302	2.0%
S062	Chihuahuan Mixed Desert and Thorn Scrub	21,066	115	0.5%	1,029	4.9%	11,491	54.5%	8,431	40.0%	1,144	5.4%
S116	Chihuahuan Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,590	60	3.8%	93	5.8%	856	53.8%	581	36.5%	153	9.6%
S068	Chihuahuan Stabilized Coppice Dune and Sand Flat Scrub	,										
		5,537	80	1.4%	57	1.0%	4,101	74.1%	1,300	23.5%	136	2.5%
S061	Chihuahuan Succulent Desert Scrub	78	2	2.4%	5	6.0%	33	43.0%	38	48.5%	7	8.5%
S117	Coahuilan Chaparral	93	27	28.4%	12	13.3%	45	48.3%	9	10.0%	39	41.7%
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	141	0	0.1%	5	3.7%	106	75.0%	30	21.3%	5	3.8%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	329	0	0.0%	42	12.7%	118	36.0%	168	51.2%	42	12.8%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	3.929	1	0.0%	116	3.0%	2.027	51.6%	1.785	45.4%	118	3.0%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	3.777	1	0.0%	160	4.2%	1.957	51.8%	1.660	43.9%	161	4.3%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	870	18	2.1%	132	15.1%	454	52.2%	266	30.6%	150	17.2%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	1,888	12	0.7%	135	7.1%	615	32.6%	1,126	59.6%	147	7.8%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	266	0	0.0%	4	1.6%	27	10.3%	234	88.1%	4	1.7%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub											
		0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.5%	0	89.5%	0	0.0%
S129	Sonoran Mid-Elevation Desert Scrub	2	0	0.0%	0	10.7%	1	44.7%	1	44.6%	0	10.7%
S063	Sonoran Paloverde-Mixed Cacti Desert Scrub	0	0	0.0%	0	66.3%	0	4.2%	0	29.5%	0	66.3%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	79	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	67	84.7%	11	14.1%	1	1.2%
S138	Western Great Plains Mesquite Woodland and Shrubland	1,787	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	12	0.7%	1,772	99.2%	3	0.2%

km²     km² <th>Code</th> <th>Land Cover Type</th> <th>Area in NM</th> <th>Stat</th> <th>tus 1</th> <th>Stat</th> <th>us 2</th> <th>Statu</th> <th>15 3</th> <th>Stat</th> <th>us 4</th> <th>Statu</th> <th>s 1&amp;2</th>	Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	Stat	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	15 3	Stat	us 4	Statu	s 1&2
State     Western Great Philes Sandhill Shubhand     5,208     21     0.4%     58     1.7%     1,600     30.7%     3,499     67.2%     109     2.1%       CR.SSLAND/HERRACEOUS     S     0.8%     2.436     7.1%     15,311     44.0%     16,318     47.5%     2.604     7.8%       S071     Apschränz-Chhuhung Semiz-Desert Grassland and Steppe     803     510     17.7%     2.78     40.0%     0.4%     2.436     7.1%     15,311     44.0%     16,318     47.5%     2.604     7.8%       S113     Chhuahuna Stynophuloss Grassland and Steppe     803     10     0.4%			km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%						
GRASSLAND/IERBACEOUS       S077     Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe     34,343     228     0.8%     2,436     7.1%     15,331     44.6%     16,318     47.5%     2,604     7.8%       S100     Chihuahuan Grypsophilous Grassland and Steppe     803     150     18.7%     3     0.4%     588     7.3%     61     7.0%     154     19.1%       S110     Chihuahuan-SonoyTana Desert Botomland and Swele Grassland     0     0     0.0%	S048	Western Great Plains Sandhill Shrubland	5,208	21	0.4%	88	1.7%	1,600	30.7%	3,499	67.2%	109	2.1%
\$8077     Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe     34,343     258     0.8%     2,436     7.1%     15,331     44.6%     16,318     47.5%     2.049     7.8%       5080     Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe     80.3     150     18.7%     3     0.4%     588     73.3%     61     7.5%     154     19.1%       5113     Chihuahuan Sonora Desert Rottonland and Swel Grassland     0     0     0.0%     0     <	GRASS	SLAND/HERBACEOUS											
9490     Chhuahaan Gyspophilous Grassland and Steppe     94333     258     2436     71%     1531     44.0%     16,18     47.5%     2,694     7.8%       S109     Chhuahaan Gyspophilous Grassland     960     17     1.7%     22     2.8%     409     42.2%     517     53.3%     44     45%       S109     Chhuahaan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland     0     0     0.0% <td< td=""><td>S077</td><td>Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	S077	Apacherian-Chihuahuan Semi-Desert Grassland and Steppe											
5080     Chihahuan Gyopphilous Grassland and Steppe     603     150     18.7%     3     0.4%     588     73.3%     61     7.6%     154     19.1%       S113     Chihaahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland     0     0     0.0%     0			34,343	258	0.8%	2,436	7.1%	15,331	44.6%	16,318	47.5%	2,694	7.8%
S113     Chihuabuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland     969     17     1.7.%     2.7     2.8%     409     42.2%     517     53.3%     44     4.5%       S109     Chihuabuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland     0     0     0.0%     0	S080	Chihuahuan Gypsophilous Grassland and Steppe	803	150	18.7%	3	0.4%	588	73.3%	61	7.6%	154	19.1%
S109     Chibuahaan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland     0	S113	Chihuahuan Sandy Plains Semi-Desert Grassland	969	17	1.7%	27	2.8%	409	42.2%	517	53.3%	44	4.5%
op     0     0     0.9%     0     <	S109	Chihuahuan-Sonoran Desert Bottomland and Swale Grassland											
S075     Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna     1,297     0     0.9%     82     6.3%     543     41.8%     673     51.8%     82     6.3%       S0701     Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe     228     1     0.5%     23     8.1%     75     26.7%     183     64.7%     24     8.6%       S0701     Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Strub-Steppe     14.466     8     0.1%     566     3.9%     6.822     47.2%     7.071     48.9%     574     4.0%       S115     Madrean Juniper Savanna     657     5     0.8%     26     4.0%     529     39.4%     367     55.8%     32     4.8%       S081     Rocky Mountain Dury Turdra     19     0     0.0%     27     18.3%     51     34.4%     70     47.3%     27     18.3%       S074     Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna     9.803     23     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8.659     83.3%     173     1.8%     53     9.668			0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	0	0.0%
S071     Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrash Steppe     282     1     0.5%     23     8.1%     75     26.7%     183     64.7%     24     8.6%       S090     Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland     16,300     11     0.1%     652     4.0%     7.154     43.6%     8.573     52.3%     663     4.0%       S011     Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland     657     5     0.8%     26     4.0%     259     39.4%     367     55.5%     32     4.8%       S011     Rocky Mountain Dy Tundra     10     0     0.0%     0     0.0%     1     4.1%     18     95.9%     0     0.0%       S013     Rocky Mountain Dup Tundra     147     0     0.0%     0     0.0%     1     4.1%     18     95.9%     0     0.0%       S037     Southern Rocky Mountain Subalpine Grassland     1.555     5     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8.598     83.3%     173     18%       S088     Western Great Plain	S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	1,297	0	0.0%	82	6.3%	543	41.8%	673	51.8%	82	6.3%
5000     Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland     16,390     11     0.1%     652     4.0%     7,154     43,6%     8,573     52,3%     663     4.0%       S079     Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe     14,466     8     0.1%     566     3.9%     6,522     47.2%     7,071     48,9%     574     4.0%       S081     Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra     19     0     0.0%     0     0.0%     1     4.1%     18     95.9%     0     0.0%       S083     Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra     19     0     0.0%     0     0.0%     1     4.1%     18     95.9%     0     0.0%       S074     Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savana     -	S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	282	1	0.5%	23	8.1%	75	26.7%	183	64.7%	24	8.6%
5079     Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe     14,466     8     0.1%     566     3.9%     6.822     47.2%     7,071     48.9%     574     4.0%       S115     Madrean Juniper Savana     657     5     0.8%     26     4.0%     259     39.4%     307     55.8%     32     4.8%       S081     Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra     19     0     0.0%     0     1.1%     118     95.9%     0     0.0%       S083     Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodlan and Savana     147     0     0.0%     27     18.3%     51     34.4%     70     47.3%     27     18.3%       S074     Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodlan and Savana     9,803     23     0.2%     426     2.9%     689     37.2%     73.5     39.6%     430     23.2%       S085     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     426     2.9%     680     37.2%     73.5     39.6%     430     23.2%       S086     Western Great Plains Shorgrass Pr	S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	16,390	11	0.1%	652	4.0%	7,154	43.6%	8,573	52.3%	663	4.0%
S115     Madrean Juniper Savanna     657     5     0.8%     26     4.0%     259     39.4%     367     55.8%     32     4.8%       S081     Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra     19     0     0.0%     0     0.0%     1     4.1%     18     95.9%     0     0.0%       S083     Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow     147     0     0.0%     27     18.3%     51     34.4%     70     47.3%     27     18.3%       S074     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8,659     88.3%     173     1.8%       S085     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     701     7     1.0%     12     1.6%     146     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S086     Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland     701     7     1.0%     12     1.6%     1.46     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S096     Inter	S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	14,466	8	0.1%	566	3.9%	6,822	47.2%	7,071	48.9%	574	4.0%
S081     Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra     19     0     0.0%     1     4.1%     18     95.9%     0     0.0%       S083     Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow     147     0     0.0%     27     18.3%     51     34.4%     70     47.3%     27     18.3%       S074     Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna     9,803     23     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8.659     88.3%     173     1.8%       5085     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     426     2.9%     6689     37.2%     735     39.6%     430     23.2%       6308     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67,399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3330     5.7%     63,429     94.1%     140     0.2%       8096     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1.494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       8094     North American Warm Deser	S115	Madrean Juniper Savanna	657	5	0.8%	26	4.0%	259	39.4%	367	55.8%	32	4.8%
S083     Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow     147     0     0.0%     27     18.3%     51     34.4%     70     47.3%     27     18.3%       S074     Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna     9,803     23     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8,659     88.3%     173     1.8%       S085     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     426     2.2.9%     689     37.2%     735     39.6%     430     23.2%       S086     Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland     701     7     1.0%     112     1.6%     146     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S088     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67,399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3,830     5.7%     63,429     94.1%     140     0.2%       S094     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     14.0%     14.8%     1     20.9%     103.7%     1	S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.1%	18	95.9%	0	0.0%
Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna     9,803     23     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8,659     88.3%     173     1.8%       S085     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     426     22.9%     689     37.2%     735     39.6%     430     23.2%       S086     Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland     701     7     1.0%     12     1.6%     144     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S088     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67,399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3,830     5.7%     63,429     94.1%     140     0.2%       WOODY WETLAND     5096     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1,494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     1.5%     60     31.4%     10     52.5%     31 </td <td>S083</td> <td>Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow</td> <td>147</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>27</td> <td>18.3%</td> <td>51</td> <td>34.4%</td> <td>70</td> <td>47.3%</td> <td>27</td> <td>18.3%</td>	S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	147	0	0.0%	27	18.3%	51	34.4%	70	47.3%	27	18.3%
9,803     23     0.2%     150     1.5%     971     9.9%     8,659     88.3%     173     1.8%       S085     Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     426     22.9%     689     37.2%     735     39.6%     430     23.2%       S086     Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland     701     7     1.0%     12     1.6%     146     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S088     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67.399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3,830     5.7%     63.429     94.1%     140     0.2%       WOODY WETLAND       50.2%     91     4.0%     1.494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Moodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     15.5%     60     31.4%     100     52.5%     31     16.1%       S094     North American Warm Desert Riparian Moodland and Shrubla	S074	Southern Rocky Mountain Juniper Woodland and Savanna											
Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland     1,855     5     0.2%     426     22.9%     689     37.2%     735     39.6%     430     23.2%       S086     Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland     701     7     1.0%     12     1.6%     146     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S088     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67,399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3,830     5.7%     63,429     94.1%     140     0.2%       WOODY WETLAND      50%     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1,494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     15.5%     60     31.4%     100     52.5%     31     16.1%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     68%			9,803	23	0.2%	150	1.5%	971	9.9%	8,659	88.3%	173	1.8%
S086     Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland     701     7     1.0%     12     1.6%     146     20.8%     537     76.6%     18     2.6%       S088     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67,399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3,830     5.7%     63,429     94.1%     140     0.2%       WOODY WETLAND     S096     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1,494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     1     30.7%     1     48.4%     1     20.9%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     11     30.7%     14     48.4%     1     20.9%       S020     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     55     7.9%     132     67.0%     10     5.1% <t< td=""><td>S085</td><td>Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland</td><td>1,855</td><td>5</td><td>0.2%</td><td>426</td><td>22.9%</td><td>689</td><td>37.2%</td><td>735</td><td>39.6%</td><td>430</td><td>23.2%</td></t<>	S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	1,855	5	0.2%	426	22.9%	689	37.2%	735	39.6%	430	23.2%
S088     Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie     67,399     38     0.1%     102     0.2%     3,830     5,7%     63,429     94,1%     140     0.2%       WOODY WETLAND     S096     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1,494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     15.5%     60     31.4%     100     52.5%     31     16.1%       S098     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     1     30.7%     1     48.4%     1     20.9%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     10     8.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     16.8%       S020     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     197     3     1.3%     8     3.8%     55     27.9%     132	S086	Western Great Plains Foothill and Piedmont Grassland	701	7	1.0%	12	1.6%	146	20.8%	537	76.6%	18	2.6%
WOODY WETLAND       S096     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1,494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     15.5%     60     31.4%     100     52.5%     31     16.1%       S098     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     1     30.7%     1     48.4%     1     20.9%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     10     8.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     16.8%       S020     North American Warm Desert Wash     197     3     1.3%     8     3.8%     55     27.9%     132     67.0%     10     5.1%       S093     Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     783     3     0.3%     41     5.2%     288     36.7%     45	S088	Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	67,399	38	0.1%	102	0.2%	3,830	5.7%	63,429	94.1%	140	0.2%
S096     Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat     2,264     5     0.2%     91     4.0%     1,494     66.0%     674     29.7%     97     4.3%       S094     North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     15.5%     60     31.4%     100     52.5%     31     16.1%       S098     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     1     30.7%     1     48.4%     1     20.9%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     10     8.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     16.8%       S020     North American Warm Desert Wash     197     3     1.3%     8     3.8%     55     27.9%     132     67.0%     10     5.1%       S093     Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     783     3     0.3%     41     5.2%     288     36.7%     452     57.7%     43	WOOD	DY WETLAND											
S094     North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     191     1     0.6%     29     15.5%     60     31.4%     100     52.5%     31     16.1%       S098     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     1     30.7%     1     48.4%     1     20.9%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     10     8.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     16.8%       S020     North American Warm Desert Wash     197     3     1.3%     8     3.8%     55     27.9%     132     67.0%     10     5.1%       S093     Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     783     3     0.3%     41     5.2%     288     36.7%     452     57.7%     43     5.5%       S091     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland     103     0     0.0%     15     14.9%     38     37.2%     49     48.0%     15	S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	2,264	5	0.2%	91	4.0%	1,494	66.0%	674	29.7%	97	4.3%
S098     North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque     3     0     0.0%     1     20.9%     1     30.7%     1     48.4%     1     20.9%       S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     10     8.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     16.8%       S020     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     197     3     1.3%     8     3.8%     55     27.9%     132     67.0%     10     5.1%       S093     Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     783     3     0.3%     41     5.2%     288     36.7%     452     57.7%     43     5.5%       S091     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland     103     0     0.0%     15     14.9%     38     37.2%     49     48.0%     15     14.9%       S092     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland     5     0     0.0%     1     10.0%     0     6.4%     4     83.6%     1	S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	191	1	0.6%	29	15.5%	60	31.4%	100	52.5%	31	16.1%
S097     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     122     11     8.9%     10     8.0%     46     37.5%     56     45.7%     21     16.8%       S020     North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     197     3     1.3%     8     3.8%     55     27.9%     132     67.0%     10     5.1%       S093     Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     783     3     0.3%     41     5.2%     288     36.7%     452     57.7%     43     5.5%       S091     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland     103     0     0.0%     15     14.9%     38     37.2%     49     48.0%     15     14.9%       S092     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     5     0     0.0%     1     10.0%     0     6.4%     4     83.6%     1     10.0%       S092     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     851     2     0.2%     77     9.0%     81     9.5%     691     81.3%	S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	3	0	0.0%	1	20.9%	1	30.7%	1	48.4%	1	20.9%
S020   North American Warm Desert Wash   197   3   1.3%   8   3.8%   55   27.9%   132   67.0%   10   5.1%     S093   Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland   783   3   0.3%   41   5.2%   288   36.7%   452   57.7%   43   5.5%     S091   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland   103   0   0.0%   15   14.9%   38   37.2%   49   48.0%   15   14.9%     S092   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland   5   0   0.0%   1   10.0%   0   6.4%   4   83.6%   1   10.0%     S092   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland   5   0   0.0%   1   10.0%   0   6.4%   4   83.6%   1   10.0%     S095   Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland   851   2   0.2%   77   9.0%   81   9.5%   691   81.3%   78   9.2%     EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND     S100   North American Arid West Emergent Marsh <td>S097</td> <td>North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland</td> <td>122</td> <td>11</td> <td>8.9%</td> <td>10</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>46</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>56</td> <td>45.7%</td> <td>21</td> <td>16.8%</td>	S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	122	11	8.9%	10	8.0%	46	37.5%	56	45.7%	21	16.8%
S093   Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland   783   3   0.3%   41   5.2%   288   36.7%   452   57.7%   43   5.5%     S091   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland   103   0   0.0%   15   14.9%   38   37.2%   49   48.0%   15   14.9%     S092   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland   5   0   0.0%   1   10.0%   0   6.4%   4   83.6%   1   10.0%     S095   Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland   851   2   0.2%   77   9.0%   81   9.5%   691   81.3%   78   9.2%     EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND     S100   North American Arid West Emergent Marsh   85   0   0.4%   3   3.4%   27   32.1%   54   64.1%   3   3.8%     S102   Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow   136   0   0.0%   11   7.8%   43   31.4%   83   60.8%   11   7.8%     S108   Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetl	S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	197	3	1.3%	8	3.8%	55	27.9%	132	67.0%	10	5.1%
S091   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland   103   0   0.0%   15   14.9%   38   37.2%   49   48.0%   15   14.9%     S092   Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland   5   0   0.0%   1   10.0%   0   6.4%   4   83.6%   1   10.0%     S095   Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland   851   2   0.2%   77   9.0%   81   9.5%   691   81.3%   78   9.2%     EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND     S100   North American Arid West Emergent Marsh   85   0   0.4%   3   3.4%   27   32.1%   54   64.1%   3   3.8%     S102   Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow   136   0   0.0%   11   7.8%   43   31.4%   83   60.8%   11   7.8%     S108   Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland   20   0   0.0%   0   1.0%   8   38.4%   12   60.6%   0   1.0%	S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	783	3	0.3%	41	5.2%	288	36.7%	452	57.7%	43	5.5%
S092     Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland     5     0     0.0%     1     10.0%     0     6.4%     4     83.6%     1     10.0%       S095     Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     851     2     0.2%     77     9.0%     81     9.5%     691     81.3%     78     9.2%       EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND     S100     North American Arid West Emergent Marsh     85     0     0.4%     3     3.4%     27     32.1%     54     64.1%     3     3.8%       S102     Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow     136     0     0.0%     11     7.8%     43     31.4%     83     60.8%     11     7.8%       S108     Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland     20     0     0.0%     0     1.0%     8     38.4%     12     60.6%     0     1.0%	S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	103	0	0.0%	15	14.9%	38	37.2%	49	48.0%	15	14.9%
S095     Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland     851     2     0.2%     77     9.0%     81     9.5%     691     81.3%     78     9.2%       EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND     S100     North American Arid West Emergent Marsh     85     0     0.4%     3     3.4%     27     32.1%     54     64.1%     3     3.8%       S102     Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow     136     0     0.0%     11     7.8%     43     31.4%     83     60.8%     11     7.8%       S108     Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland     20     0     0.0%     0     1.0%     8     38.4%     12     60.6%     0     1.0%	S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	5	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	6.4%	4	83.6%	1	10.0%
EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND       S100     North American Arid West Emergent Marsh     85     0     0.4%     3     3.4%     27     32.1%     54     64.1%     3     3.8%       S102     Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow     136     0     0.0%     11     7.8%     43     31.4%     83     60.8%     11     7.8%       S108     Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland     20     0     0.0%     0     1.0%     8     38.4%     12     60.6%     0     1.0%	S095	Western Great Plains Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	851	2	0.2%	77	9.0%	81	9.5%	691	81.3%	78	9.2%
S100     North American Arid West Emergent Marsh     85     0     0.4%     3     3.4%     27     32.1%     54     64.1%     3     3.8%       S102     Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow     136     0     0.0%     11     7.8%     43     31.4%     83     60.8%     11     7.8%       S108     Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland     20     0     0.0%     0     1.0%     8     38.4%     12     60.6%     0     1.0%	EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND											
S102   Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow   136   0   0.0%   11   7.8%   43   31.4%   83   60.8%   11   7.8%     S108   Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland   20   0   0.0%   0   1.0%   8   38.4%   12   60.6%   0   1.0%	S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	85	0	0.4%	3	3.4%	2.7	32.1%	54	64.1%	3	3.8%
S108     Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland     20     0     0.0%     0     1.0%     8     38.4%     12     60.6%     0     1.0%	S100	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	136	0	0.0%	11	7.8%	43	31.4%	83	60.8%	11	7.8%
	S102	Western Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	20	0	0.0%	0	1.0%	8	38.4%	12	60.6%	0	1.0%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NM	Stat	us 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	is 3	Statu	ıs 4	Status	1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
ALTEI	RED or DISTURBED											
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	48	0	0.0%	3	6.5%	5	10.0%	40	83.5%	3	6.5%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	29	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	27	91.8%	2	8.1%	0	0.1%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	27	0	0.0%	1	3.4%	17	61.2%	10	35.4%	1	3.4%
D02	Recently Burned	806	13	1.6%	32	4.0%	211	26.2%	549	68.2%	45	5.6%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.3%	0	89.7%	0	0.0%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	8	0	0.0%	0	2.6%	5	70.0%	2	27.5%	0	2.6%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	177	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	74	41.7%	103	58.3%	0	0.0%
DEVE	LOPED and AGRICULTURE											
N80	Agriculture	6,026	0	0.0%	25	0.4%	343	5.7%	5,658	93.9%	25	0.4%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,107	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	61	5.6%	1,043	94.1%	3	0.3%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	975	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	59	6.0%	913	93.6%	3	0.3%
OTHE	R COVER TYPES											
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	54	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	48	88.8%	5	9.7%	1	1.5%
N11	Open Water	438	2	0.4%	34	7.9%	211	48.2%	191	43.5%	36	8.3%
	TOTAL	314,189	2,678	0.9%	17,230	5.5%	114,723	36.5%	179,559	57.1%	19,908	6.3%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
BARR	EN LANDS																						
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	2	98.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	79	46.1%	3.2%	0.6%	0.2%	18.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.7%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,487	70.0%	0.0%	1.7%	15.6%	2.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	6,234	75.5%	2.4%	2.6%	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	18	79.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	17.2%
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	23	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	74.0%	24.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	16	73.9%	0.0%	17.5%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	78	20.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	48.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	2.9%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	1,842	57.6%	0.5%	28.8%	1.5%	1.6%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	168	32.3%	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	3.2%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.8%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	527	39.6%	0.0%	29.5%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	14.6%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	78	30.9%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	4.5%	62.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	148	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	84.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
S007	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	123	37.1%	0.0%	0.0%	32.7%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	19.6%
EVER	GREEN FOREST																						
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	36,376	63.7%	0.0%	1.0%	24.6%	3.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	635	15.7%	0.0%	2.5%	72.9%	0.4%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
S033	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	88.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	209	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.5%
S121	Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland	105	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	78.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	42	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	96.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	196	15.6%	0.0%	21.7%	56.6%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	216	19.5%	0.0%	11.6%	58.5%	0.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	190	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	82.8%	3.2%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	175	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	81.4%	3.3%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	14	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	88.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
S122	Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland	20	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	85.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%

### Appendix 5-10. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the state of Nevada.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	7	91.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DECIE	UOUS FOREST																						
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	1,289	19.4%	0.0%	2.1%	62.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	1	9.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.1%
MIXE	FOREST																						
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	84	21.8%	0.0%	0.0%	54.9%	0.0%	21.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
SHRU	3/SCRUB																						
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	162	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	76.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	31,798	78.6%	0.0%	2.4%	6.2%	3.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	66,018	76.1%	0.0%	1.7%	2.8%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.1%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	50,646	76.0%	0.4%	0.2%	1.2%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
3030	Woodland and Shrubland	1,924	45.076	0.078	J.170	44.070	0.076	3.170	0.076	0.076	0.170	0.076	0.078	0.076	0.070	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.078	0.078	0.078	0.078	4.076
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	425	98.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	10,520	56.6%	0.0%	21.8%	3.9%	15.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	108	97.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	19,031	62.6%	0.5%	10.2%	0.0%	6.5%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,528	42.3%	0.0%	24.9%	0.1%	20.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.9%
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	86	9.2%	0.0%	6.2%	83.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
GRAS	SLAND/HERBACEOUS																						
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,275	61.3%	0.0%	0.8%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.5%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	1	58.8%	0.0%	32.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	17,816	49.6%	0.0%	2.3%	30.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.6%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	3,113	42.8%	0.4%	2.2%	5.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.9%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	5,974	63.8%	0.0%	9.2%	1.6%	21.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	27	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	80.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	6.7%
5081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra Posky Mountain Subalpina Masia Maadaw	20	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	89.5%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2 29/	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
S085	Southern Bocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine	24	90.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5005	Grassland	-	201070	0.070	0.070	9.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.170	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070
wooi	Y WETLAND																						
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,068	17.6%	0.6%	0.8%	13.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.6%	0.0%	1.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	59.1%
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	10,673	66.3%	3.6%	1.6%	0.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.2%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	32	20.3%	0.0%	8.6%	6.6%	4.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	49.2%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	25	53.6%	0.5%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	19.0%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	5	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%	66.3%	0.7%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	288	72.5%	5.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	3	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	88.7%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	68	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	76.1%	0.1%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.9%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND																						
S105	Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	2	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	98.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	409	10.6%	10.9%	9.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.6%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	37.4%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	10	49.4%	0.0%	7.1%	22.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.8%
S103	Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	2	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%	26.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.9%
ALTE	RED or DISTURBED																						
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	1,134	65.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	4,611	67.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	187	75.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.7%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	149	12.8%	13.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.2%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.6%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	38.1%
D02	Recently Burned	574	81.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	322	56.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	41.8%
DEVE	LOPED and AGRICULTURE																						
N80	Agriculture	2,223	3.2%	0.5%	0.9%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	91.4%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	210	18.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.8%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	726	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.6%
OTHE	R COVER TYPES																						
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	195	57.9%	1.3%	1.6%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%
N11	Open Water	1,481	0.7%	1.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
	TOTAL	286,281	67.2%	0.4%	3.3%	8.2%	4.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
	* For Land Stewardship headings: BLM = Bureau of Research Service, Dept. of Com. = Dept. of Comm	of Land Manag erce, Nativ An	ement, B ner = Nat	OR = Bure ive Ameri	eau of Rec can Lands	lamation, , Reg. Gov	FWS= U /. = Regio	.S. Fish an onal Gove	nd Wildlif rnment, A	e Service, aud = Aud	USFS = U ubon, TNC	.S. Forest S = The Nat	ervice, DC ure Conser	DD/DOE = vancy, Priv	Dept. of De -BioDiv =	fense/Dep Private La	t. of Energ nds Mana	gy, NPS = ged for Bio	U.S. Nat odiversity	ional Park	Service,	ARS = Agri	cultural

# Appendix 5-11. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Nevada.

		Area in NV	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	ıs 3	Stat	us 4	Status	s 1&2
Code	Land Cover Type	km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
BARR	EN LANDS											
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	2	0	0.0%	2	96.1%	0	1.8%	0	2.1%	2	96.1%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	79	1	0.6%	3	3.5%	61	77.1%	15	18.8%	3	4.1%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	2,486	41	1.7%	601	24.2%	1,638	65.9%	207	8.3%	642	25.8%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	6,082	589	9.7%	886	14.6%	4,079	67.1%	528	8.7%	1,475	24.3%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	18	0	0.0%	1	3.4%	14	79.4%	3	17.2%	1	3.4%
S003	Mediterranean California Alpine Bedrock and Scree	23	0	0.0%	17	71.3%	7	28.2%	0	0.5%	17	71.3%
S018	North American Warm Desert Active and Stabilized Dune	16	3	17.5%	5	27.9%	8	49.5%	1	5.1%	7	45.4%
S017	North American Warm Desert Badland	78	3	3.5%	46	58.6%	21	27.3%	8	10.6%	48	62.1%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	1,842	364	19.8%	869	47.2%	573	31.1%	36	1.9%	1,233	67.0%
S021	North American Warm Desert Pavement	168	10	5.8%	52	31.2%	51	30.2%	55	32.8%	62	36.9%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	526	79	14.9%	102	19.3%	267	50.8%	78	14.9%	180	34.3%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	78	8	9.7%	44	56.3%	27	34.0%	0	0.0%	52	65.9%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	148	41	28.0%	56	37.8%	49	32.9%	2	1.2%	97	65.8%
S007	Sierra Nevada Cliff and Canyon	123	0	0.0%	6	4.9%	92	75.0%	25	20.1%	6	4.9%
FVFR	2REEN FOREST											
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	36,374	620	1.7%	5,869	16.1%	27,350	75.2%	2,535	7.0%	6,489	17.8%
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	635	156	24.5%	254	40.0%	218	34.4%	7	1.1%	409	64.5%
S033	Mediterranean California Dry-Mesic Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	2	0	0.0%	1	32.7%	1	63.8%	0	3.5%	1	32.7%
S123	Mediterranean California Ponderosa-Jeffrey Pine Forest and Woodland	209	0	0.0%	24	11.4%	146	69.9%	39	18.7%	24	11.4%
S121	Mediterranean California Red Fir Forest and Woodland	106	0	0.0%	24	22.4%	74	70.3%	8	7.4%	24	22.4%
S029	Northern Pacific Mesic Subalpine Parkland	42	0	0.0%	25	59.0%	16	37.5%	1	3.5%	25	59.0%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	196	88	45.0%	52	26.7%	49	25.1%	6	3.2%	140	71.7%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	216	63	29.3%	64	29.6%	84	38.9%	5	2.3%	127	58.8%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	190	20	10.6%	77	40.4%	90	47.5%	3	1.5%	97	51.0%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in NV	Stat	us 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	is 3	Stat	us 4	Status	\$ 1&2
Coue	Lanu Cover Type	km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and											
	Woodland	175	13	7.7%	58	33.0%	98	56.3%	5	3.0%	71	40.7%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone											
	Pine woodland	14	1	4.3%	6	39.0%	7	52.2%	1	4.5%	6	43.3%
S122	Sierra Nevada Subalpine Lodgepole Pine Forest and Woodland											
5026	Couthorn Destro Mauricia Denderses Dire Westland	20	0	0.0%	4	19.5%	15	74.0%	1	6.4%	4	19.5%
5030	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine woodland	7	0	3.6%	6	93.3%	0	3.1%	0	0.0%	7	96.9%
DECID	UOUS FOREST											
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	1,289	38	3.0%	326	25.3%	764	59.3%	161	12.5%	364	28.3%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	1	0	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.9%	0	89.1%	0	1.0%
		•		•								
MIXEI S042	JFOREST											
5012	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	84	10	22.2%	25	30.3%	30	46.1%	1	1.4%	44	52 5%
	woodrand		1)	22.270	25	50.570	57	40.170	1	1.470		52.570
SHRUI	B/SCRUB	r				1						
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	4	0	0.0%	3	89.6%	0	10.4%	0	0.0%	3	89.6%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	162	0	0.2%	56	34.6%	84	52.0%	21	13.2%	57	34.8%
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	31,792	672	2.1%	3,052	9.6%	25,283	79.5%	2,785	8.8%	3,724	11.7%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	65,988	842	1.3%	3,324	5.0%	51,509	78.1%	10,314	15.6%	4,165	6.3%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	50,604	373	0.7%	2,717	5.4%	42,401	83.8%	5,113	10.1%	3,090	6.1%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland											
0057	and Shrubland	1,924	124	6.4%	502	26.1%	1,221	63.4%	77	4.0%	626	32.5%
8057	Mogollon Chaparral	425	0	0.0%	133	31.3%	291	68.4%	2	0.4%	133	31.3%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	10,521	1,524	14.5%	3,428	32.6%	5,254	49.9%	315	3.0%	4,952	47.1%
5040	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	108	0	0.1%	38	35.6%	68	62.8%	2	1.4%	39	35.8%
5069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert	10.010		0.00/	( ) (	22.494	0.000	17 10/	1.074	10.407	0.000	10.00/
\$070	Scrub	19,013	1,691	8.9%	6,346	33.4%	9,003	47.4%	1,974	10.4%	8,036	42.3%
S114	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	1,528	160	10.5%	307	20.1%	856	56.0%	205	13.4%	467	30.6%
5114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	86	30	35.2%	55	63.6%	0	0.1%	1	1.1%	85	98.8%
GRASS	SLAND/HERBACEOUS											
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	1,274	10	0.8%	26	2.1%	789	61.9%	448	35.2%	37	2.9%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	1	0	32.0%	0	3.4%	1	55.4%	0	9.2%	0	35.4%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	17,813	466	2.6%	1,877	10.5%	12,509	70.2%	2,960	16.6%	2,344	13.2%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	3,101	68	2.2%	127	4.1%	1,457	47.0%	1,449	46.7%	195	6.3%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	5,973	167	2.8%	863	14.5%	4,660	78.0%	283	4.7%	1,030	17.2%
S134	North Pacific Montane Grassland	27	0	0.0%	4	13.3%	22	80.0%	2	6.7%	4	13.3%

Cala	Land Carry Trees	Area in NV	Stat	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	is 3	Stat	us 4	Status	\$ 1&2
Code	Land Cover Type	km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	20	7	34.4%	7	35.7%	5	27.6%	0	2.3%	14	70.1%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	24	2	8.0%	12	51.2%	8	33.0%	2	7.8%	14	59.2%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	2	0	0.0%	0	6.7%	2	93.3%	0	0.0%	0	6.7%
WOOL	<b>Y WETLAND</b>											
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	1,059	8	0.7%	64	6.1%	345	32.6%	642	60.6%	72	6.8%
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	10,550	500	4.7%	511	4.8%	7,043	66.8%	2,496	23.7%	1,011	9.6%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	30	4	13.0%	4	13.9%	6	20.4%	16	52.6%	8	26.9%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	25	3	10.5%	7	27.2%	11	43.3%	5	19.1%	9	37.6%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	5	0	0.0%	1	18.1%	0	1.7%	4	80.2%	1	18.1%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	288	7	2.4%	46	15.9%	221	76.5%	15	5.1%	53	18.3%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	3	0	0.0%	1	30.2%	2	65.4%	0	4.4%	1	30.2%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	67	2	3.2%	23	34.1%	36	53.8%	6	8.9%	25	37.3%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND											
S105	Mediterranean California Subalpine-Montane Fen	2	0	0.0%	1	47.4%	1	52.5%	0	0.0%	1	47.4%
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	311	30	9.7%	42	13.5%	85	27.2%	154	49.6%	72	23.2%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	10	2	21.0%	3	26.9%	3	34.4%	2	17.7%	5	47.9%
S103	Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow	2	0	0.0%	0	2.4%	1	57.6%	1	40.1%	0	2.4%
ALTE	RED or DISTURBED											
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	1,131	4	0.4%	23	2.1%	744	65.8%	359	31.8%	27	2.4%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	4,610	3	0.1%	115	2.5%	3,096	67.2%	1,396	30.3%	118	2.6%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	187	0	0.0%	3	1.5%	142	75.7%	43	22.8%	3	1.5%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	126	2	1.3%	36	28.3%	26	20.5%	63	50.0%	37	29.6%
D02	Recently Burned	574	2	0.4%	26	4.6%	457	79.7%	88	15.4%	28	4.9%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	319	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	184	57.8%	134	42.2%	0	0.0%
DEVE	LOPED and AGRICULTURE											
N80	Agriculture	2,222	8	0.4%	24	1.1%	145	6.5%	2,044	92.0%	33	1.5%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	210	0	0.0%	5	2.5%	41	19.3%	164	78.2%	5	2.5%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	724	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	2.1%	709	97.9%	0	0.0%
OTHE	R COVER TYPES											
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	186	2	1.2%	11	5.8%	111	59.7%	62	33.4%	13	7.0%
N11	Open Water	129	5	3.9%	19	14.8%	74	57.3%	31	24.0%	24	18.7%

<i>a</i> .	<b>.</b>	Area in NV	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	is 3	Stat	us 4	Status	1&2
Code	Land Cover Type	km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
	TOTAL	284,387	8,876	3.1%	33,342	11.7%	204,049	71.8%	38,120	13.4%	42,218	14.8%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
BARR	EN LANDS																						
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	14,197	56.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	23.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.2%	0.1%	5.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	1,808	53.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.1%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%	0.1%	6.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	382	66.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	1.3%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	11,284	34.6%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	41.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	0.9%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	11.4%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	1,828	74.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.1%	9.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	317	46.5%	0.0%	0.0%	40.8%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	88.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	21	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	127	68.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	4.2%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	5.0%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	6	13.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	3.8%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	76.6%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	8	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.8%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	815	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	94.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	177	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	1,467	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	57.2%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	0.1%	3.8%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	10.7%
EVER	GREEN FOREST																						
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	22,362	53.3%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	0.1%	6.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	10.8%
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	10,982	63.5%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	6.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.1%
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	32	66.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,710	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	48.5%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	7.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	17.2%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	1,816	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	93.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,427	15.6%	0.0%	0.0%	52.3%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.1%	4.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	20.7%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	3,230	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	90.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	1,273	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	79.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.1%	1.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	13.8%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber- Bristlecone Pine Woodland	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	2,019	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	74.8%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	2.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.9%
DECI	DUOUS FOREST																						
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	6,334	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.4%	3.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	33.5%

### Appendix 5-12. Percent distribution of each land cover type among 22 land stewards in the state of Utah.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	887	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.1%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	59.0%
MIXE	D FOREST																						
S042	Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland	1,222	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	77.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	3.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
SHRU	B/SCRUB																						
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	9,033	55.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	1,517	56.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	0.4%	9.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	9,418	69.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	0.2%	7.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.1%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	<1	74.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	3,634	76.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	1.9%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	19,939	53.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.1%	8.9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	28.6%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	3,037	75.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.1%	12.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	15,526	65.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	3.7%	1.9%	0.5%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	9.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.2%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	626	25.3%	0.0%	0.0%	49.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	2.8%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	18.2%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	583	29.8%	0.0%	0.0%	42.5%	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.4%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	826	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%	1.4%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	7.8%
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	109	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
8046	Shrubland	6,597	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	40.9%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.7%	3.5%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	38.5%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	252	40.7%	0.0%	0.0%	23.2%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	11.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	809	53.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	25.2%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	10	35.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	50.2%
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	3	91.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	856	36.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	53.0%	0.5%	6.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	4	49.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.1%
GRAS	SLAND/HERDACEOUS																						1
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	523	26.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	5.5%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	64.0%
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	9	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.2%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	14,048	14.9%	0.0%	0.0%	34.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	0.2%	7.5%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	35.5%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	2,014	53.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	3.3%	2.8%	0.1%	0.0%	7.8%	0.8%	6.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	23.8%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	8,330	74.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.2%	1.4%	0.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.1%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	293	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
		km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	499	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	76.9%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	2.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.9%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	594	21.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.1%	0.3%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.2%	4.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	43.7%
wooi	DY WETLAND																						
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	292	21.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.6%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	47.7%
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	7,310	51.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	9.2%	1.1%	0.1%	0.0%	3.5%	0.1%	9.3%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	23.8%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	20	41.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	3.2%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.6%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	3	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.1%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	10	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	26.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	10	50.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.1%	19.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.0%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	847	16.2%	0.0%	0.9%	13.1%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	1.7%	2.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	46.6%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	298	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	58.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.1%	1.9%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	33.6%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	4	36.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	41.8%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	15.3%
EMERGENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND																							
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	482	5.6%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2.1%	0.8%	19.2%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	42.1%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	479	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	65.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.2%	2.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	23.9%
ALTE	RED or DISTURBED																						
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	90	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	93.0%
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	46	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	5.9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	76.1%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	695	53.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	7.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.3%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	3,236	45.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	6.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	1.3%	5.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	526	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	4.8%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	67.2%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	456	39.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	21.2%	0.0%	3.8%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	14.7%
D02	Recently Burned	172	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	59.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	458	50.2%	0.0%	0.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	15.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	287	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	92.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	177	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	28.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.4%
DEVE	LOPED and AGRICULTURE																						
N80	Agriculture	9,196	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	94.6%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,099	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	5.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	2.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	86.4%
N21	21 Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity		2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	6.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	1.7%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	85.4%
OTHE	OTHER COVER TYPES																						
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	42	77.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	1.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
N11	Open Water	6,733	1.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.8%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%
	TOTAL	219,826	41.9%	0.0%	0.1%	14.9%	3.3%	3.6%	0.1%	0.0%	4.5%	0.2%	6.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	20.9%

Co	ode	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	BLM	BOR	FWS	USFS	DOD/ DOE	NPS	ARS	Dept. of Com.	Nativ Amer	State Park	State Schl	State Wildl	Other State	Reg. Gov	City	County	Aud	Land Trust	TNC	Priv- BioDiv	Priv
			km <sup>2</sup>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		* For Land Stewardship headings: BLM = Bureau or Research Service, Dept. of Com. = Dept. of Comm	of Land Ma erce, Nativ	nagement, E Amer = Na	BOR = Bur tive Amer	reau of Re ican Land	clamation s, Reg. Go	, FWS=1 ov. = Reg	U.S. Fish a gional Gov	and Wildl ernment,	ife Service, Aud = Aud	USFS = U ubon, TNO	U.S. Forest S C = The Nat	Service, DO ture Conser	DD/DOE = 1 rvancy, Priv	Dept. of De y-BioDiv = 1	fense/Dep Private La	t. of Ene nds Man	rgy, NPS = aged for Bi	U.S. Nat odiversity	ional Park	Service , A	ARS = Agri	cultural

# Appendix 5-13. Area and percent distribution of each land cover type represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status in the state of Utah.

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	Sta	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	15 3	Stat	us 4	Status 1&2	
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
BARRE	EN LANDS											
S010	Colorado Plateau Mixed Bedrock Canyon and Tableland	14,164	1,063	7.5%	4,413	31.2%	7,637	53.9%	1,051	7.4%	5,476	38.7%
S012	Inter-Mountain Basins Active and Stabilized Dune	1,804	7	0.4%	153	8.5%	1,469	81.4%	175	9.7%	160	8.9%
S009	Inter-Mountain Basins Cliff and Canyon	382	7	1.7%	110	28.9%	179	46.8%	86	22.6%	117	30.6%
S015	Inter-Mountain Basins Playa	10,998	33	0.3%	376	3.4%	8,653	78.7%	1,937	17.6%	408	3.7%
S011	Inter-Mountain Basins Shale Badland	1,827	9	0.5%	226	12.3%	1,319	72.2%	273	14.9%	235	12.9%
S013	Inter-Mountain Basins Volcanic Rock and Cinder Land	316	4	1.2%	3	0.9%	274	86.6%	36	11.4%	7	2.1%
S014	Inter-Mountain Basins Wash	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	92.3%	0	7.7%	0	0.0%
S001	North American Alpine Ice Field	21	5	22.8%	15	71.4%	1	5.8%	0	0.0%	20	94.2%
S016	North American Warm Desert Bedrock Cliff and Outcrop	127	0	0.0%	50	39.8%	56	44.5%	20	15.6%	51	39.9%
S022	North American Warm Desert Playa	6	0	1.2%	0	5.1%	1	12.7%	4	81.0%	0	6.3%
S019	North American Warm Desert Volcanic Rockland	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.9%	6	81.1%	0	0.0%
S002	Rocky Mountain Alpine Bedrock and Scree	813	92	11.3%	464	57.1%	231	28.5%	25	3.1%	556	68.4%
S004	Rocky Mountain Alpine Fell-Field	177	24	13.5%	96	54.2%	57	32.2%	0	0.0%	120	67.8%
S006	Rocky Mountain Cliff, Canyon and Massive Bedrock	1,466	115	7.9%	280	19.1%	858	58.5%	213	14.5%	395	27.0%
EVER	REEN FOREST											
S039	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	22,356	534	2.4%	4,995	22.3%	12.921	57.8%	3.906	17.5%	5,530	24.7%
S040	Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	10,986	144	1.3%	1,305	11.9%	7,120	64.8%	2,417	22.0%	1,449	13.2%
S026	Inter-Mountain Basins Subalpine Limber-Bristlecone Pine	,					,				,	
	Woodland	32	0	0.2%	21	65.2%	10	32.2%	1	2.4%	21	65.4%
S032	Rocky Mountain Dry-Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and											
	Woodland	1,710	46	2.7%	270	15.8%	972	56.8%	422	24.7%	316	18.5%
S031	Rocky Mountain Lodgepole Pine Forest	1,815	58	3.2%	288	15.9%	1,379	76.0%	90	5.0%	346	19.1%
S034	Rocky Mountain Mesic Montane Mixed Conifer Forest and											
	Woodland	1,427	47	3.3%	225	15.8%	798	55.9%	357	25.0%	272	19.1%
S028	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Dry-Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	3 224	150	4 7%	716	22.2%	2 128	66.0%	230	7 1%	867	26.9%
S030	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Spruce-Fir Forest and Woodland	5,224	100	1.770	,10	22.270	2,120	00.070	230	7.170	007	20.770
		1,273	39	3.0%	178	14.0%	860	67.6%	197	15.4%	216	17.0%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	Sta	tus 1	Stat	Status 2		ıs 3	Status 4		Status 1&2	
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%	km <sup>2</sup>	%
S025	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Limber-Bristlecone Pine Woodland	39	4	10.8%	9	24.3%	18	46.9%	7	18.0%	14	35.1%
S036	Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	2.019	71	3.5%	150	7.4%	1.598	79.1%	201	9.9%	221	10.9%
DECID	UOUS FOREST						,					
S023	Rocky Mountain Aspen Forest and Woodland	6,334	38	0.6%	320	5.1%	3,665	57.9%	2,310	36.5%	359	5.7%
S024	Rocky Mountain Bigtooth Maple Ravine Woodland	887	33	3.8%	69	7.8%	250	28.2%	534	60.2%	103	11.6%
MIXEI S042	<b>) FOREST</b> Inter-Mountain Basins Aspen-Mixed Conifer Forest and Woodland											
50.2		1 222	6	0.5%	84	6.9%	936	76.6%	196	16.0%	90	7 3%
SHRUI	B/SCRUB	-,						,, .				
S059	Colorado Plateau Blackbrush-Mormon-tea Shrubland	9,021	443	4.9%	1,600	17.7%	6,207	68.8%	772	8.6%	2,042	22.6%
S056	Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	1,517	2	0.1%	102	6.7%	971	64.0%	443	29.2%	103	6.8%
S052	Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Shrubland	9,414	344	3.7%	3,263	34.7%	4,404	46.8%	1,403	14.9%	3,607	38.3%
S053	Great Basin Semi-Desert Chaparral	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	95.5%	0	4.5%	0	0.0%
S055	Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	3,635	0	0.0%	305	8.4%	2,619	72.0%	710	19.5%	305	8.4%
S054	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	19,935	104	0.5%	1,574	7.9%	10,744	53.9%	7,513	37.7%	1,678	8.4%
S045	Inter-Mountain Basins Mat Saltbush Shrubland	3,036	15	0.5%	184	6.1%	2,234	73.6%	603	19.9%	199	6.6%
S065	Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	15,499	132	0.8%	770	5.0%	10,891	70.3%	3,707	23.9%	901	5.8%
S050	Inter-Mountain Basins Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	626	15	2.4%	85	13.5%	395	63.1%	131	21.0%	100	15.9%
S057	Mogollon Chaparral	583	71	12.1%	117	20.0%	300	51.5%	95	16.4%	187	32.1%
S060	Mojave Mid-Elevation Mixed Desert Scrub	826	3	0.3%	85	10.3%	525	63.6%	213	25.8%	88	10.6%
S043	Rocky Mountain Alpine Dwarf-Shrubland	109	13	11.8%	75	68.5%	21	19.3%	0	0.4%	88	80.3%
S046	Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	6,596	90	1.4%	478	7.2%	3.258	49.4%	2.771	42.0%	568	8.6%
S047	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	252	3	1.2%	15	6.1%	170	67.6%	63	25.1%	18	7.3%
S069	Sonora-Mojave Creosotebush-White Bursage Desert Scrub	808	3	0.4%	218	27.0%	235	29.1%	351	43.5%	222	27.4%
S070	Sonora-Mojave Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	10	0	0.1%	0	2.6%	3	33.5%	7	63.8%	0	2.7%
S114	Sonora-Mojave Semi-Desert Chaparral	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	91.9%	0	8.1%	0	0.0%
S136	Southern Colorado Plateau Sand Shrubland	855	6	0.7%	49	5.7%	740	86.6%	60	7.0%	55	6.4%
S128	Wyoming Basins Low Sagebrush Shrubland	4	0	5.4%	1	28.6%	1	21.0%	2	44.9%	1	34.0%
GRASS	LAND/HERBACEOUS	· · ·			<u> </u>							
S078	Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	522	0	0.0%	8	1.6%	151	28.8%	363	69.6%	8	1.6%
	A									-	-	

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT	Stat	tus 1	Stat	us 2	Status 3		Status 4		Status	;1&2
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
S075	Inter-Mountain Basins Juniper Savanna	9	0	0.0%	0	0.9%	9	98.2%	0	0.9%	0	0.9%
S071	Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	14,046	77	0.5%	713	5.1%	7,218	51.4%	6,038	43.0%	790	5.6%
S090	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland	2,011	29	1.5%	265	13.2%	1,102	54.8%	615	30.6%	294	14.6%
S079	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	8,329	37	0.4%	711	8.5%	6,037	72.5%	1,543	18.5%	748	9.0%
S081	Rocky Mountain Dry Tundra	293	21	7.0%	84	28.8%	188	64.0%	1	0.3%	105	35.8%
S083	Rocky Mountain Subalpine Mesic Meadow	499	13	2.6%	88	17.6%	301	60.3%	97	19.5%	101	20.2%
S085	Southern Rocky Mountain Montane-Subalpine Grassland	593	9	1.4%	34	5.7%	262	44.3%	288	48.6%	42	7.1%
WOOD	Y WETLAND											
S118	Great Basin Foothill and Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and											
	Shrubland	283	0	0.1%	26	9.4%	102	36.1%	154	54.4%	27	9.5%
S096	Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat	7,280	46	0.6%	224	3.1%	4,576	62.9%	2,434	33.4%	270	3.7%
S094	North American Warm Desert Lower Montane Riparian Woodland	,					,					
	and Shrubland	20	0	0.0%	4	19.3%	6	27.6%	11	53.1%	4	19.3%
S098	North American Warm Desert Riparian Mesquite Bosque	3	0	0.0%	0	0.7%	0	1.5%	3	97.9%	0	0.7%
S097	North American Warm Desert Riparian Woodland and Shrubland											
		8	0	5.7%	0	0.2%	3	37.4%	5	56.7%	0	5.9%
S020	North American Warm Desert Wash	10	0	0.0%	1	8.1%	5	43.3%	5	48.6%	1	8.1%
S093	Rocky Mountain Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and											
	Shrubland	837	30	3.6%	95	11.3%	296	35.4%	416	49.7%	125	14.9%
S091	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Shrubland	298	6	2.0%	29	9.7%	157	52.8%	106	35.6%	35	11.7%
S092	Rocky Mountain Subalpine-Montane Riparian Woodland	4	0	0.1%	1	28.5%	2	55.1%	1	16.3%	1	28.6%
EMER	GENT HERBACEOUS WETLAND											
S100	North American Arid West Emergent Marsh	409	13	3.2%	133	32.5%	55	13.4%	208	50.9%	146	35.7%
S102	Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow	472	21	4.4%	98	20.7%	228	48.3%	126	26.6%	118	25.1%
ALTER	ED or DISTURBED											
D01	Disturbed, Non-specific	90	0	0.0%	5	5 3%	1	0.7%	84	93.9%	5	5 3%
D14	Disturbed, Oil Well	46	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	7	16.2%	37	82.0%	1	1.8%
D09	Invasive Annual and Biennial Forbland	695	1	0.2%	24	3.5%	367	52.9%	302	43.5%	25	3.7%
D08	Invasive Annual Grassland	3.231	11	0.4%	123	3.8%	1.682	52.1%	1.415	43.8%	134	4.1%
D06	Invasive Perennial Grassland	526	3	0.5%	19	3.7%	124	23.5%	380	72.3%	22	4.1%
D04	Invasive Southwest Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	450	43	9.6%	79	17.6%	243	54.0%	85	18.8%	122	27.2%
D02	Recently Burned	172	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	138	80.1%	34	19.7%	0	0.2%
D11	Recently Chained Pinyon-Juniper Areas	458	0	0.0%	49	10.7%	289	63.1%	120	26.2%	49	10.7%
D10	Recently Logged Areas	287	0	0.1%	2	0.7%	271	94.3%	14	4.8%	2	0.8%

Code	Land Cover Type	Area in UT Status 1		tus 1	Stat	us 2	Statu	is 3	Status 4		Status 1&2	
		km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	%								
D03	Recently Mined or Quarried	171	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	82	47.7%	87	51.2%	2	1.1%
DEVEL	OPED and AGRICULTURE											
N80	Agriculture	9,183	2	0.0%	40	0.4%	318	3.5%	8,823	96.1%	42	0.5%
N22	Developed, Medium - High Intensity	1,098	0	0.0%	9	0.8%	89	8.1%	999	91.0%	9	0.9%
N21	Developed, Open Space - Low Intensity	1,978	1	0.1%	8	0.4%	143	7.2%	1,826	92.3%	9	0.5%
OTHEI	R COVER TYPES											
N31	Barren Lands, Non-specific	42	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	40	94.2%	2	5.7%	0	0.1%
N11	Open Water	904	27	3.0%	98	10.8%	483	53.5%	295	32.7%	125	13.8%
	TOTAL	213,417	4,165	2.0%	26,709	12.5%	122,089	57.2%	60,455	28.3%	30,874	14.5%

## Appendix 5-14A. Percent distribution of each modeled species within 22 Land Stewardship categories by state and region.

#### http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_5-14A.pdf

## Appendix 5-14B. Area distribution of each modeled species within 22 Land Stewardship categories by state and region.

http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_5-14B.pdf

Value	Code	Description
17	k12	Known or probable occurrence, breeding, wintering
18	k13	Known or probable occurrence, breeding, summering
19	k14	Known or probable occurrence, breeding, winter and summering
21	k21	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, migratory
22	k22	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, wintering
23	k23	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, summering
24	k24	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, winter and summer
29	k34	Known or probable occurrence, breeding and non-breeding, winter and summer
38	p13	Potential occurrence, breeding, summering
41	p21	Potential occurrence, non-breeding, migratory
42	p22	Potential occurrence, non-breeding, wintering
49	p34	Potential occurrence, breeding and non-breeding, winter and summer
61	x21	Extirpated, non-breeding, migratory
62	x22	Extirpated, non-breeding, wintering
69	x34	Extirpated, breeding and non-breeding, winter and summer

Map and Analysis Range Coding for use with Appendix 5-14A and 5-14B.

# Appendix 5-15. Area and percent distribution of each modeled species represented within the four levels of GAP Management Status by state and region.

#### http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/report/Appendix\_5-15.pdf

Map and Analysis Range Coding for use with Appendix 5-15.

Map	Code	Description
Number		
17	k12	Known or probable occurrence, breeding, wintering
18	k13	Known or probable occurrence, breeding, summering
19	k14	Known or probable occurrence, breeding, winter and summering
21	k21	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, migratory
22	k22	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, wintering
23	k23	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, summering
24	k24	Known or probable occurrence, non-breeding, winter and summer
29	k34	Known or probable occurrence, breeding and non-breeding, winter and summer
38	p13	Potential occurrence, breeding, summering
41	p21	Potential occurrence, non-breeding, migratory
42	p22	Potential occurrence, non-breeding, wintering
49	p34	Potential occurrence, breeding and non-breeding, winter and summer
61	x21	Extirpated, non-breeding, migratory
62	x22	Extirpated, non-breeding, wintering
69	x34	Extirpated, breeding and non-breeding, winter and summer

### **Appendix 7-1. List of Example GAP Applications**

#### Businesses and Non-government Organizations:

The following are some examples of applications of GAP data by the private sector:

- The New Mexico Natural Heritage Program is using the SWReGAP stewardship layer for New Mexico to update and add detail to their Managed Areas Database.
- Sustainable Energy Solutions at Northern Arizona University used SWReGAP land cover data to perform an analysis of land suitable for wind energy development on the Navajo Nation.
- The Nature Conservancy in Arizona aggregated 98 land cover types from SWReGAP data into 21 potential natural vegetation types (PNVTs). The PNVTs were then assigned a fire return interval (FRI) and a map of historic FRIs for Arizona and New Mexico was prepared. Stewardship data was used to conduct analyses of FRIs by land tenure.
- The Nevada Natural Heritage Program used 17,000 plots of SWReGAP ground data to map invasive annual grasses across Nevada.
- The Grand Canyon Wildlands Council used SWReGAP land cover data to analyze the distribution of more than 70 ecosystems that provide habitat for 2,577 species in the Grand Canyon ecoregion.
- Researchers with the Craighead Environmental Research Institute and the Wildlands Project used Montana GAP vertebrate data to determine the best routes for grizzly bear, elk and cougar, moving across the core protected areas of the Northern Rockies -- the Salmon-Selway, Northern Continental Divide, and Greater Yellowstone Ecosystems. Potential movement corridors were analyzed to find those with habitat most suitable for a wide variety of species. The analysis helped to identify high priority conservation areas.
- Researcher at the University of Georgia with the Georgia Land Use Trends (GLUT) program, have used GAP data to help identify threats to biodiversity at the landscape scale. GLUT has mapped land cover change in Georgia from 1974 to the present. Currently, the project has mapped land cover for 1974, 1985, 1992, and 1998. These land use change data are being integrated with GAP data to develop an assessment of threats to areas of high species richness, land stewardship areas, and key natural communities. Georgia GAP land cover data show significant natural communities. Georgia GAP stewardship data shows which areas are protected. GLUT researchers used GAP and GLUT data to assess land use change within species richness hexagons and various buffer distances around conservation lands and key community types.
- Researchers at Cornell used Gap state data, along with satellite imagery, GIS, and Breeding Bird Atlas data to develop landscape-level habitat models for the Interior Low Plateaus. Their goals were to identify areas of species richness, identify and prioritize areas for potential acquisition or partnerships, identify areas with high restoration potential, identify areas where nesting bird management is a priority, and identify areas that require more intensive inventories.
- The Wyoming Natural Heritage Program (a private non-government organization) transformed the endangered and sensitive species database into a spatially referenced digital geographic information system using the GAP digital base map and other GAP spatial data.
- Weyerhaeuser Corp. is using the Arkansas GAP data in managing their lands in Arkansas.

• Researchers at Michigan's Land Policy Institute used GAP data in the development of a framework for prioritizing the extent farmland at risk of conversion to development in the state.

#### County and City Planning:

Some other examples of the use of GAP by local governments are:

- In Nevada, the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan identified 37 species that were previously modeled by SWReGAP. Existing SWReGAP models for these species were revised based on additional research and included finer scale datasets that were not available at a regional scale. Revised models were then reanalyzed by intersection with stewardship data.
- The California Coastal Conservancy used a modified Gap Analysis approach, supplemented with groundtruthing and additional data, to select a suite of priority communities in the San Francisco Bay area for management plans to focus on. The results were used to educate the regional conservation community about the successes and limitations of the current conservation reserve system. The Coastal Conservancy encouraged the development of a comprehensive regional conservation planning process, which would build upon the results of this gap analysis to improve the conservation of ecoregional diversity in the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Pierce County planners used GAP and other data to designate a Biodiversity Management Network within their open space maps. Pierce County adopted this revised open space map into their Comprehensive Plan and is currently using the Biodiversity Network information in the community planning process (Dvornich et al. 2005). GAP predicted species lists, augmented by Natural Heritage locations and other data (such as fish and butterfly data) were instrumental in the identification of the BMAs.
- CA-GAP biological data were combined with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) land ownership data to show which ownerships and jurisdictions were needed for joint conservation planning and management of a particular natural community or species, maximizing efficiency and minimizing the potential for yet another conservation crisis.
- In California, county and city planners of several jurisdictions, wildlife agencies, developers of the 4S Ranch property, and the state Natural Communities Conservation Planning program used the GAP regional data, as well as more detailed information, to conserve 1,640 acres of habitat within a 2,900-acre planned development.
- County planners in Piute County, Utah, used GAP data to optimize the siting of a proposed sawmill for aspen with respect to the distribution of aspen stands.
- The City of Bainbridge Island, Washington, used GAP data to assist them in development of a watershed planning project.

#### State Uses:

The following are some examples of uses of GAP data by state agencies.

- The Nevada Department of Wildlife used SWReGAP data in the development of their State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP). Specifically, land cover and stewardship data were used to analyze patterns of biodiversity and land use to identify species of conservation priority and their key habitats. Ecological systems from SWReGAP land cover were organized into 27 key habitat types.
- The Nevada Department of Wildlife used SWReGAP stewardship data to plan implementation of the Nevada SWAP by summarizing land ownership and management for each key habitat and identifying primary partners for conservation in each habitat.
- The Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands chose to employ SWReGAP data in their Forest Stewardship Program (FSP) Spatial Analysis Project. The data was used to help identify privately owned forested lands with the greatest potential to benefit from FSP practices.
- The New Mexico Department of Game and Fish used SWReGAP data in the development of their SWAP. Specific uses include: 1) species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) were associated with land cover types to provide a method to identify key habitats; 2) the stewardship data layer provided an assessment of conservation prioritization.
- The Colorado Division of Wildlife used SWReGAP wildlife habitat relationship models to identify key habitats for SGCN.
- The Utah Fire Assessment Project used GAP land cover data to help identify general hazard areas at a state-wide level for fire management. The assessment defined, and then ranked risks, values, and hazards and assigned a final analysis rating based on a combination of these factors. Risk, defined as the potential for fire occurrence, was based upon historical fire occurrence, fire size, and ignition source. Values, also called "social concerns" were based on features to be protected. Hazard was defined as areas with the potential for extreme fire behavior based upon present vegetation. The vegetation map was produced from modified Utah GAP Analysis data.
- The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN-DNR) assembled species richness maps of priority bird species by compiling the GAP range extent maps of all priority bird species into a statewide hypercoverage for all priority birds by bird habitat groups (open, water, and forest). They discovered that Sherburne Wildlife Refuge lies within an Ecological Classification System with the highest species richness levels, thus managing the refuge for bird conservation would make an important contribution to conservation efforts in the state. The area in which Sherburne lies is rich for bird species that have Oak Savannah as their priority habitat type. They then used GAP land cover classes to identify potential oak savanna within the private lands work area of Sherburne NWR.
- GAP products are incorporated into the Michigan Department of Natural Resources' Integrated Forest Monitoring and Prescription (IFMAP) project. The IFMAP GIS-based decision-support system brings GAP products to the desktop of DNR land managers throughout Michigan. IFMAP addresses all lands in Michigan, so that decisions that once were made only within the context of State land can now be made in concert with other land management agencies and the public. This tool supports sound decision making on timber sales, so that the State of Michigan forest remains a renewable resource.
- GAP land cover imagery was used by the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA) for locating particular habitat types. Information on the locations of these habitat types is

provided by TWRA to the public for a wide variety of public service functions, from education to cooperative resource management. GAP data have been used by the Tennessee Forestry Stewardship Program to help develop a district program for nine conservation planning districts, outlining Best Management Practices (BMPs) for biological conservation on private lands.

- The Wyoming Department of Fish and Game used GAP data to assist them in transforming the Wildlife Observation System database into a spatially referenced geographic information system.
- The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and the Bear River Water Conservancy District used the Utah GAP land cover map in a resource management assessment for mitigating conflicts between a proposed groundwater withdrawal project and the maintenance of an elk calving area in the Uinta Mountains.
- The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and Sheik Safari International used the Utah GAP land cover map to identify critical elk habitat. The environmental profile of these areas was then used to identify other similar areas for elk habitat enhancement.
- The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources used the Utah GAP land cover map for a rapid ecological assessment of the Echo Henefer Wildlife Management Area.
- The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife uses GAP data from Eastern Washington to assist with an innovative program that brings the forest products industry, state agency biologists, non-government organizations, and tribal biologists together in the field to jointly determine the appropriate management practices for any particular site of concern (Timber, Fish & Wildlife Program).
- The Idaho Department of Fish and Game used GAP data to evaluate the impact from expanded military training activities on public lands in Southern Idaho.
- The Idaho Department of Fish and Game uses GAP data for regional planning efforts on a regular basis.

#### State Wildlife Action Plans:

Each state in the U.S. was mandated to submit a State Wildlife Action Plan to the federal government by October 2005. Each plan included information on species of greatest conservation need (SGCN), SGCN habitats, threats to species and habitat, research needs, necessary plan actions, and conservation priorities. GAP land cover, species and habitat distribution models, and maps were an important component of this planning process. Twenty-two states used GAP land cover data extensively. The vegetation classifications, predicted vertebrate distribution maps, aquatic, stewardship, ownership and species richness data, species lists, and habitat descriptions were also often used in plan development.

#### Federal Agency Applications:

Some examples of applications of GAP data by federal agencies follow:

- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is using SWReGAP data to formulate conservation objectives in the Lower Colorado River watershed. The conservation objectives include: 1) coarse-filter objectives based on prioritized ecological systems and 2) objectives based on habitat requirements of priority species.
- The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has used SWReGAP land cover data to modify drafts and final versions of Level 3 and 4 ecoregions in Colorado. In New Mexico, SWReGAP data were examined in developing the initial draft of New Mexico ecoregions, mapped at 1:250,000 scale. The EPA plans to use the data for ecoregion mapping in Arizona also.
- The Bureau of Land Management state fire management officers in Utah and Nevada used SWReGAP land cover data to categorize vegetation layers into fire regimes and condition classes (FRCCs). The resulting analysis will assist in fire management planning and with establishing hazardous fuels project priorities.
- The LANDFIRE project maps existing vegetation and structure and used SWReGAP field data to train decision-tree models for the project.
- The USDA-Agricultural Research Service, U.S. EPA, and University of Arizona developed the Automated Geospatial Watershed Assessment (AGWA) tool to facilitate modeling runoff at different spatial and temporal scales. SWReGAP land cover data were used in the AGWA tool for watershed assessment.
- The Sagebrush Vegetation Mapping Project, an effort of USGS and Oregon State University, used SWReGAP land cover data as one source of data in their mapping of sagebrush and steppe vegetation in the Western U.S.
- GAP data are being supplied to all military installations in the Great Basin ecoregion for integrated management of the natural resources. These installations constitute a very large amount of land area. Much of it is of high value for native species.
- The Ouachita National Forest used the Arkansas GAP data to help them develop an ecosystem management plan.
- The Wyoming GAP data were used by NASA to calibrate a model that predicts vegetation types based on climate and soil variables.
- The potential contributions to biodiversity conservation of four different options proposed for new wilderness designation in Idaho were quantified by the Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit in cooperation with the Park Studies Unit.
- The potential contributions to biodiversity conservation of four different options proposed for new national park designation in Idaho were quantified by the Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regularly uses the GAP data for Southern California for habitat evaluation and management.
- The U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Park Service are using the GAP data for a wide variety of natural resource management operations in Utah. For example, the entire Utah GAP database is directly linked with existing National Park Service databases for use by National Parks.
- The U.S. Forest Service used the Utah GAP data to help assist them in evaluating humaninduced impacts to forested lands surrounding ski resorts in central Utah.

- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Delaware used GAP data to help identify potential habitat for the federally endangered Delmarva fox squirrel. These maps were displayed and served as a catalyst for bringing together people with a stake in the issue.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service used the Indiana GAP data as part of a biological assessment for the base closure of the Jefferson Proving Grounds and its conversion to a National Wildlife Refuge. This 58,000-acre installation has restricted human access due to unexploded ordinance and contains some of the highest-quality natural habitat in Indiana.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Louisiana used GAP data to avoid conflict over the designation of critical habitat of the federally endangered Louisiana black bear.
- The U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in New Mexico is using GAP clustered imagery as a base for their land cover mapping activities.
- The Department of Defense developed an electronic environmental information system for the Mojave ecoregion, which used GAP data as a foundation or base layer of information. The system will link 29 DOD installations to a common source of environmental information.

-3 ARIZONA MYOTIS Myotis occultus,

-2 GUNNISON SAGE-GROUSE Centrocercus minimus,

-1 TRIPLOID CHECKERED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus neotesselatus,

173429, COUCH'S SPADEFOOT Scaphiopus couchii,

173438 GREEN FROG Rana clamitans,

173440 WOOD FROG Rana sylvatica,

173441 BULLFROG Rana catesbeiana,

173443 NORTHERN LEOPARD FROG Rana pipiens,

173446 RED-LEGGED FROG Rana aurora,

173447 RIO GRANDE LEOPARD FROG Rana berlandieri,

173448 PLAINS LEOPARD FROG Rana blairi,

173451 CHIRICAHUA LEOPARD FROG Rana chiricahuensis,

173454 MOUNTAIN YELLOW-LEGGED FROG Rana muscosa,

173457 RELICT LEOPARD FROG Rana onca,

173458 SPOTTED FROG Rana pretiosa,

173461 TARAHUMARA FROG Rana tarahumarae,

173462 YAVAPAI LEOPARD FROG Rana yavapaiensis,

173468 GREAT PLAINS NARROWMOUTH TOAD Gastrophryne olivacea,

173476 WOODHOUSE'S TOAD Bufo woodhousii,

173481 COLORADO RIVER TOAD Bufo alvarius,

173482 WESTERN TOAD Bufo boreas,

173484 GREAT PLAINS TOAD Bufo cognatus,

173485 GREEN TOAD Bufo debilis,

173490 SOUTHWESTERN TOAD Bufo microscaphus,

173491 RED-SPOTTED TOAD Bufo punctatus,

173492 SONORAN GREEN TOAD Bufo retiformis,

173493 TEXAS TOAD Bufo speciosus,

173510 CANYON TREEFROG Hyla arenicolor,

173513 MOUNTAIN TREEFROG Hyla eximia,

173520 NORTHERN CRICKET FROG Acris crepitans,

173525 WESTERN CHORUS FROG Pseudacris triseriata,

173534 LOWLAND BURROWING TREEFROG Pternohyla fodiens,

173549 AFRICAN CLAWED FROG Xenopus laevis,

173592 TIGER SALAMANDER Ambystoma tigrinum,

173663 JEMEZ MOUNTAINS SALAMANDER Plethodon neomexicanus,

173702 SACRAMENTO MOUNTAIN SALAMANDER Aneides hardii,

173752 SNAPPING TURTLE Chelydra serpentina,

173766 YELLOW MUD TURTLE Kinosternon flavescens,

173768 SONORAN MUD TURTLE Kinosternon sonoriense,

173774 WESTERN POND TURTLE Clemmys marmorata,

173778 ORNATE BOX TURTLE Terrapene ornata,

173783 PAINTED TURTLE Chrysemys picta,

173819 COMMON SLIDER Trachemys scripta,

173856 DESERT TORTOISE Gopherus agassizii,

173865 EASTERN FENCE LIZARD Sceloporus undulatus,

173868 CLARK'S SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus clarkii,

173870 SAGEBRUSH LIZARD Sceloporus graciosus,

173872 YARROW'S SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus jarrovii, 173873 DESERT SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus magister, 173875 WESTERN FENCE LIZARD Sceloporus occidentalis, 173878 CREVICE SPINY LIZARD Sceloporus poinsettii, 173879 BUNCH GRASS LIZARD Sceloporus scalaris, 173881 STRIPED PLATEAU LIZARD Sceloporus virgatus, 173906 ZEBRA-TAILED LIZARD Callisaurus draconoides, 173910 GREATER EARLESS LIZARD Cophosaurus texanus, 173912 COLLARED LIZARD Crotaphytus collaris, 173921 DESERT IGUANA Dipsosaurus dorsalis, 173924 LONG-NOSED LEOPARD LIZARD Gambelia wislizenii, 173927 LESSER EARLESS LIZARD Holbrookia maculata, 173938 TEXAS HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma cornutum, 173941 FLAT-TAILED HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma mcallii, 173942 ROUND-TAILED HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma modestum, 173943 DESERT HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma platyrhinos, 173944 REGAL HORNED LIZARD Phrynosoma solare, 173949 COLORADO DESERT FRINGE-TOED LIZARD Uma notata, 173950 MOJAVE FRINGE-TOED LIZARD Uma scoparia, 173952 LONG-TAILED BRUSH LIZARD Urosaurus graciosus, 173954 TREE LIZARD Urosaurus ornatus, 173956 SIDE-BLOTCHED LIZARD Uta stansburiana, 173964 MOUNTAIN SKINK Eumeces callicephalus, 173966 GILBERT'S SKINK Eumeces gilberti, 173967 MANY-LINED SKINK Eumeces multivirgatus, 173968 GREAT PLAINS SKINK Eumeces obsoletus, 173970 WESTERN SKINK Eumeces skiltonianus, 173971 FOUR-LINED SKINK Eumeces tetragrammus, 174014 SIX-LINED RACERUNNER Cnemidophorus sexlineatus, 174015 CANYON SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus burti, 174016 GRAY-CHECKERED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus dixoni, 174017 CHIHUAHUAN SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus exsanguis, 174018 GILA SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus flagellicaudus, 174019 TEXAS SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus gularis, 174021 LITTLE STRIPED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus inornatus, 174024 NEW MEXICO WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus neomexicanus, 174025 SONORAN SPOTTED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus sonorae, 174026 CHECKERED WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus tesselatus, 174038 TEXAS BANDED GECKO Coleonyx brevis, 174041 WESTERN BANDED GECKO Coleonyx variegatus, 174092 DESERT NIGHT LIZARD Xantusia vigilis, 174113 GILA MONSTER Heloderma suspectum, 174136 COMMON GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis sirtalis, 174140 WESTERN AQUATIC GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis couchii, 174141 BLACK-NECKED GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis cyrtopsis, 174142 WESTERN TERRESTRIAL GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis elegans, 174143 MEXICAN GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis eques,

174144 CHECKERED GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis marcianus,

174146 WESTERN RIBBON SNAKE Thamnophis proximus,

174147 PLAINS GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis radix,

174148 NARROW-HEADED GARTER SNAKE Thamnophis rufipunctatus,

174155 WESTERN HOG-NOSED SNAKE Heterodon nasicus,

174158 RING-NECKED SNAKE Diadophis punctatus,

174169 RACER Coluber constrictor,

174175 CORN SNAKE Elaphe guttata,

174187 MILK SNAKE Lampropeltis triangulum,

174192 SONORAN MOUNTAIN KINGSNAKE Lampropeltis pyromelana,

174202 GLOSSY SNAKE Arizona elegans,

174210 BANDED SAND SNAKE Chilomeniscus cinctus,

174212 WESTERN SHOVEL-NOSED SNAKE Chionactis occipitalis,

174213 SONORAN SHOVEL-NOSED SNAKE Chionactis palarostris,

174230 WESTERN HOOK-NOSED SNAKE Gyalopion canum,

174233 NIGHT SNAKE Hypsiglena torquata,

174237 SONORAN WHIPSNAKE Masticophis bilineatus,

174238 COACHWHIP Masticophis flagellum,

174240 STRIPED WHIPSNAKE Masticophis taeniatus,

174244 PLAIN-BELLIED WATER SNAKE Nerodia erythrogaster,

174251 NORTHERN WATER SNAKE Nerodia sipedon,

174258 BROWN VINE SNAKE Oxybelis aeneus,

174260 SADDLED LEAF-NOSED SNAKE Phyllorhynchus browni,

174261 SPOTTED LEAF-NOSED SNAKE Phyllorhynchus decurtatus,

174267 LONG-NOSED SNAKE Rhinocheilus lecontei,

174269 BIG BEND PATCH-NOSED SNAKE Salvadora deserticola,

174270 MOUNTAIN PATCH-NOSED SNAKE Salvadora grahamiae,

174271 WESTERN PATCH-NOSED SNAKE Salvadora hexalepis,

174275 GROUND SNAKE Sonora semiannulata,

174282 SOUTHWESTERN BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla hobartsmithi,

174283 PLAINS BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla nigriceps,

174288 CHIHUAHUAN BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla wilcoxi,

174289 YAQUI BLACK-HEADED SNAKE Tantilla yaquia,

174291 WESTERN LYRE SNAKE Trimorphodon biscutatus,

174293 LINED SNAKE Tropidoclonion lineatum,

174304 MASSASAUGA Sistrurus catenatus,

174310 WESTERN DIAMONDBACK RATTLESNAKE Crotalus atrox,

174311 SIDEWINDER Crotalus cerastes,

174312 ROCK RATTLESNAKE Crotalus lepidus,

174313 SPECKLED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus mitchellii,

174314 BLACK-TAILED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus molossus,

174315 TWIN-SPOTTED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus pricei,

174317 MOJAVE RATTLESNAKE Crotalus scutulatus,

174318 TIGER RATTLESNAKE Crotalus tigris,

174319 WESTERN RATTLESNAKE Crotalus viridis,

174320 RIDGE-NOSED RATTLESNAKE Crotalus willardi,

174326 RUBBER BOA Charina bottae,

174336 TEXAS BLIND SNAKE Leptotyphlops dulcis, 174337 WESTERN BLIND SNAKE Leptotyphlops humilis, 174352 WESTERN CORAL SNAKE Micruroides euryxanthus, 174469 COMMON LOON Gavia immer, 174470 YELLOW-BILLED LOON Gavia adamsii, 174474 RED-THROATED LOON Gavia stellata, 174475 PACIFIC LOON Gavia pacifica, 174479 RED-NECKED GREBE Podiceps grisegena, 174482 HORNED GREBE Podiceps auritus, 174485 EARED GREBE Podiceps nigricollis, 174503 WESTERN GREBE Aechmophorus occidentalis, 174505 PIED-BILLED GREBE Podilymbus podiceps, 174684 AMERICAN WHITE PELICAN Pelecanus erythrorhynchos, 174717 DOUBLE-CRESTED CORMORANT Phalacrocorax auritus, 174773 GREAT BLUE HERON Ardea herodias, 174793 GREEN HERON Butorides virescens, 174803 CATTLE EGRET Bubulcus ibis, 174813 SNOWY EGRET Egretta thula, 174827 LITTLE BLUE HERON Egretta caerulea, 174832 BLACK-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON Nycticorax nycticorax, 174842 YELLOW-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON Nyctanassa violacea, 174846 LEAST BITTERN Ixobrychus exilis, 174856 AMERICAN BITTERN Botaurus lentiginosus, 174926 WHITE-FACED IBIS Plegadis chihi, 174987 TUNDRA SWAN Cygnus columbianus, 174992 TRUMPETER SWAN Cygnus buccinator, 174999 CANADA GOOSE Branta canadensis, 175011 BRANT Branta bernicla, 175020 GREATER WHITE-FRONTED GOOSE Anser albifrons, 175038 SNOW GOOSE Chen caerulescens, 175041 ROSS'S GOOSE Chen rossii, 175044 BLACK-BELLIED WHISTLING-DUCK Dendrocygna autumnalis, 175063 MALLARD Anas platyrhynchos, 175068 AMERICAN BLACK DUCK Anas rubripes, 175073 GADWALL Anas strepera, 175074 NORTHERN PINTAIL Anas acuta, 175081 GREEN-WINGED TEAL Anas crecca, 175086 BLUE-WINGED TEAL Anas discors, 175089 CINNAMON TEAL Anas cyanoptera, 175092 EURASIAN WIGEON Anas penelope, 175094 AMERICAN WIGEON Anas americana, 175096 NORTHERN SHOVELER Anas clypeata, 175122 WOOD DUCK Aix sponsa, 175125 REDHEAD Aythya americana, 175128 RING-NECKED DUCK Aythya collaris, 175129 CANVASBACK Aythya valisineria, 175130 GREATER SCAUP Aythya marila,

175134 LESSER SCAUP Aythya affinis, 175141 COMMON GOLDENEYE Bucephala clangula, 175144 BARROW'S GOLDENEYE Bucephala islandica, 175145 BUFFLEHEAD Bucephala albeola, 175147 LONG-TAILED DUCK Clangula hyemalis, 175149 HARLEQUIN DUCK Histrionicus histrionicus, 175163 WHITE-WINGED SCOTER Melanitta fusca, 175170 SURF SCOTER Melanitta perspicillata, 175175 RUDDY DUCK Oxyura jamaicensis, 175183 HOODED MERGANSER Lophodytes cucullatus, 175185 COMMON MERGANSER Mergus merganser, 175187 RED-BREASTED MERGANSER Mergus serrator, 175265 TURKEY VULTURE Cathartes aura, 175272 BLACK VULTURE Coragyps atratus, 175274 CALIFORNIA CONDOR Gymnogyps californianus, 175282 WHITE-TAILED KITE Elanus leucurus, 175300 NORTHERN GOSHAWK Accipiter gentilis, 175304 SHARP-SHINNED HAWK Accipiter striatus, 175309 COOPER'S HAWK Accipiter cooperii, 175350 RED-TAILED HAWK Buteo jamaicensis, 175365 BROAD-WINGED HAWK Buteo platypterus, 175367 SWAINSON'S HAWK Buteo swainsoni, 175368 ZONE-TAILED HAWK Buteo albonotatus, 175373 ROUGH-LEGGED HAWK Buteo lagopus, 175377 FERRUGINOUS HAWK Buteo regalis, 175397 HARRIS'S HAWK Parabuteo unicinctus, 175402 COMMON BLACK-HAWK Buteogallus anthracinus, 175407 GOLDEN EAGLE Aquila chrysaetos, 175420 BALD EAGLE Haliaeetus leucocephalus, 175430 NORTHERN HARRIER Circus cyaneus, 175590 OSPREY Pandion haliaetus, 175599 GYRFALCON Falco rusticolus, 175603 PRAIRIE FALCON Falco mexicanus, 175604 PEREGRINE FALCON Falco peregrinus, 175610 APLOMADO FALCON Falco femoralis, 175613 MERLIN Falco columbarius, 175622 AMERICAN KESTREL Falco sparverius, 175790 RUFFED GROUSE Bonasa umbellus, 175827 WHITE-TAILED PTARMIGAN Lagopus leucurus, 175834 GREATER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN Tympanuchus cupido, 175838 LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN Tympanuchus pallidicinctus, 175841 SHARP-TAILED GROUSE Tympanuchus phasianellus, 175848 SHARP-TAILED GROUSE-COLUMBIAN Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus, 175852 SHARP-TAILED GROUSE-PLAINS Tympanuchus phasianellus jamesi, 175855 GREATER SAGE-GROUSE Centrocercus urophasianus, 175860 BLUE GROUSE Dendragapus obscurus, 175863 NORTHERN BOBWHITE Colinus virginianus,

175872 SCALED QUAIL Callipepla squamata, 175876 CALIFORNIA QUAIL Callipepla californica, 175877 GAMBEL'S QUAIL Callipepla gambelii, 175893 MOUNTAIN QUAIL Oreortyx pictus, 175900 MONTEZUMA QUAIL Cyrtonyx montezumae, 175905 RING-NECKED PHEASANT Phasianus colchicus, 175908 CHUKAR Alectoris chukar, 175915 GRAY PARTRIDGE Perdix perdix, 176136 WILD TURKEY Meleagris gallopavo, 176176 WHOOPING CRANE Grus americana, 176177 SANDHILL CRANE Grus canadensis, 176177 SANDHILL CRANE Grus canadensis, 176209 CLAPPER RAIL Rallus longirostris, 176221 VIRGINIA RAIL Rallus limicola, 176221 VIRGINIA RAIL Rallus limicola, 176242 SORA Porzana carolina, 176263 BLACK RAIL Laterallus jamaicensis, 176284 COMMON MOORHEN Gallinula chloropus, 176292 AMERICAN COOT Fulica americana, 176506 SEMIPALMATED PLOVER Charadrius semipalmatus, 176507 PIPING PLOVER Charadrius melodus, 176510 SNOWY PLOVER Charadrius alexandrinus, 176520 KILLDEER Charadrius vociferus, 176522 MOUNTAIN PLOVER Charadrius montanus, 176564 AMERICAN GOLDEN-PLOVER Pluvialis dominica, 176567 BLACK-BELLIED PLOVER Pluvialis squatarola, 176571 RUDDY TURNSTONE Arenaria interpres, 176580 AMERICAN WOODCOCK Scolopax minor, 176593 LONG-BILLED CURLEW Numenius americanus, 176599 WHIMBREL Numenius phaeopus, 176610 UPLAND SANDPIPER Bartramia longicauda, 176612 SPOTTED SANDPIPER Actitis macularia, 176615 SOLITARY SANDPIPER Tringa solitaria, 176619 GREATER YELLOWLEGS Tringa melanoleuca, 176620 LESSER YELLOWLEGS Tringa flavipes, 176638 WILLET Catoptrophorus semipalmatus, 176642 RED KNOT Calidris canutus, 176653 PECTORAL SANDPIPER Calidris melanotos, 176654 WHITE-RUMPED SANDPIPER Calidris fuscicollis, 176655 BAIRD'S SANDPIPER Calidris bairdii, 176656 LEAST SANDPIPER Calidris minutilla, 176661 DUNLIN Calidris alpina, 176667 SEMIPALMATED SANDPIPER Calidris pusilla, 176668 WESTERN SANDPIPER Calidris mauri, 176669 SANDERLING Calidris alba, 176675 SHORT-BILLED DOWITCHER Limnodromus griseus, 176679 LONG-BILLED DOWITCHER Limnodromus scolopaceus,

176684 BUFF-BREASTED SANDPIPER Tryngites subruficollis, 176686 MARBLED GODWIT Limosa fedoa, 176700 COMMON SNIPE Gallinago gallinago, 176721 AMERICAN AVOCET Recurvirostra americana, 176726 BLACK-NECKED STILT Himantopus mexicanus, 176735 RED-NECKED PHALAROPE Phalaropus lobatus, 176736 WILSON'S PHALAROPE Phalaropus tricolor, 176808 GLAUCOUS GULL Larus hyperboreus, 176824 HERRING GULL Larus argentatus, 176828 THAYER'S GULL Larus thayeri, 176829 CALIFORNIA GULL Larus californicus, 176830 RING-BILLED GULL Larus delawarensis, 176838 FRANKLIN'S GULL Larus pipixcan, 176839 BONAPARTE'S GULL Larus philadelphia, 176866 SABINE'S GULL Xema sabini, 176887 FORSTER'S TERN Sterna forsteri, 176888 COMMON TERN Sterna hirundo, 176923 LEAST TERN Sterna antillarum, 176924 CASPIAN TERN Sterna caspia, 176959 BLACK TERN Chlidonias niger, 177065 BAND-TAILED PIGEON Columba fasciata, 177071 ROCK DOVE Columba livia, 177121 WHITE-WINGED DOVE Zenaida asiatica, 177125 MOURNING DOVE Zenaida macroura, 177134 SPOTTED DOVE Streptopelia chinensis, 177152 COMMON GROUND-DOVE Columbina passerina, 177162 INCA DOVE Columbina inca, 177831 YELLOW-BILLED CUCKOO Coccyzus americanus, 177834 BLACK-BILLED CUCKOO Coccyzus erythropthalmus, 177836 GREATER ROADRUNNER Geococcyx californianus, 177851 COMMON BARN-OWL Tyto alba, 177856 EASTERN SCREECH-OWL Otus asio, 177875 WHISKERED SCREECH-OWL Otus trichopsis, 177878 FLAMMULATED OWL Otus flammeolus, 177884 GREAT HORNED OWL Bubo virginianus, 177896 SNOWY OWL Nyctea scandiaca, 177902 NORTHERN PYGMY-OWL Glaucidium gnoma, 177908 FERRUGINOUS PYGMY-OWL Glaucidium brasilianum, 177912 ELF OWL Micrathene whitneyi, 177925 SPOTTED OWL Strix occidentalis, 177932 LONG-EARED OWL Asio otus, 177935 SHORT-EARED OWL Asio flammeus, 177938 BOREAL OWL Aegolius funereus, 177942 NORTHERN SAW-WHET OWL Aegolius acadicus, 177946 BURROWING OWL Athene cunicularia, 177961 WHIP-POOR-WILL Caprimulgus vociferus, 177966 BUFF-COLLARED NIGHTJAR Caprimulgus ridgwayi,

177979 COMMON NIGHTHAWK Chordeiles minor, 177988 LESSER NIGHTHAWK Chordeiles acutipennis, 177997 BLACK SWIFT Cypseloides niger, 178001 CHIMNEY SWIFT Chaetura pelagica, 178002 VAUX'S SWIFT Chaetura vauxi, 178014 WHITE-THROATED SWIFT Aeronautes saxatalis, 178030 LUCIFER HUMMINGBIRD Calothorax lucifer, 178033 BLACK-CHINNED HUMMINGBIRD Archilochus alexandri, 178035 COSTA'S HUMMINGBIRD Calypte costae, 178036 ANNA'S HUMMINGBIRD Calypte anna, 178038 BROAD-TAILED HUMMINGBIRD Selasphorus platycercus, 178040 RUFOUS HUMMINGBIRD Selasphorus rufus, 178041 ALLEN'S HUMMINGBIRD Selasphorus sasin, 178048 CALLIOPE HUMMINGBIRD Stellula calliope, 178050 MAGNIFICENT HUMMINGBIRD Eugenes fulgens, 178054 BLUE-THROATED HUMMINGBIRD Lampornis clemenciae, 178065 BERYLLINE HUMMINGBIRD Amazilia beryllina, 178066 VIOLET-CROWNED HUMMINGBIRD Amazilia violiceps, 178069 WHITE-EARED HUMMINGBIRD Hylocharis leucotis, 178073 BROAD-BILLED HUMMINGBIRD Cynanthus latirostris, 178096 ELEGANT TROGON Trogon elegans, 178101 EARED TROGON Euptilotis neoxenus, 178112 GREEN KINGFISHER Chloroceryle americana, 178119 BELTED KINGFISHER Ceryle alcyon, 178154 NORTHERN FLICKER Colaptes auratus, 178164 GILDED FLICKER Colaptes chrysoides, 178186 RED-HEADED WOODPECKER Melanerpes erythrocephalus, 178189 ACORN WOODPECKER Melanerpes formicivorus, 178195 RED-BELLIED WOODPECKER Melanerpes carolinus, 178196 LEWIS'S WOODPECKER Melanerpes lewis, 178198 GILA WOODPECKER Melanerpes uropygialis, 178208 WILLIAMSON'S SAPSUCKER Sphyrapicus thyroideus, 178211 RED-NAPED SAPSUCKER Sphyrapicus nuchalis, 178212 RED-BREASTED SAPSUCKER Sphyrapicus ruber, 178251 THREE-TOED WOODPECKER Picoides tridactylus, 178256 WHITE-HEADED WOODPECKER Picoides albolarvatus, 178259 DOWNY WOODPECKER Picoides pubescens, 178260 LADDER-BACKED WOODPECKER Picoides scalaris, 178261 STRICKLAND'S WOODPECKER Picoides stricklandi, 178262 HAIRY WOODPECKER Picoides villosus, 178279 EASTERN KINGBIRD Tyrannus tyrannus, 178282 TROPICAL KINGBIRD Tyrannus melancholicus, 178287 WESTERN KINGBIRD Tyrannus verticalis, 178288 CASSIN'S KINGBIRD Tyrannus vociferans, 178292 THICK-BILLED KINGBIRD Tyrannus crassirostris, 178293 SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER Tyrannus forficatus, 178305 SULPHUR-BELLIED FLYCATCHER Myiodynastes luteiventris, 178309 GREAT CRESTED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus crinitus, 178312 BROWN-CRESTED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus tyrannulus, 178316 ASH-THROATED FLYCATCHER Myiarchus cinerascens, 178319 DUSKY-CAPPED FLYCATCHER Mylarchus tuberculifer, 178329 EASTERN PHOEBE Sayornis phoebe, 178330 BLACK PHOEBE Sayornis nigricans, 178333 SAY'S PHOEBE Sayornis saya, 178340 ALDER FLYCATCHER Empidonax alnorum, 178341 WILLOW FLYCATCHER Empidonax traillii, 178346 DUSKY FLYCATCHER Empidonax oberholseri, 178347 GRAY FLYCATCHER Empidonax wrightii, 178348 PACIFIC-SLOPE FLYCATCHER Empidonax difficilis, 178352 BUFF-BREASTED FLYCATCHER Empidonax fulvifrons, 178356 GREATER PEWEE Contopus pertinax, 178360 WESTERN WOOD-PEWEE Contopus sordidulus, 178371 VERMILION FLYCATCHER Pyrocephalus rubinus, 178376 NORTHERN BEARDLESS-TYRANNULET Camptostoma imberbe, 178384 ROSE-THROATED BECARD Pachyramphus aglaiae, 178427 VIOLET-GREEN SWALLOW Tachycineta thalassina, 178431 TREE SWALLOW Tachycineta bicolor, 178436 BANK SWALLOW Riparia riparia, 178443 NORTHERN ROUGH-WINGED SWALLOW Stelgidopteryx serripennis, 178448 BARN SWALLOW Hirundo rustica, 178455 CLIFF SWALLOW Petrochelidon pyrrhonota, 178460 CAVE SWALLOW Petrochelidon fulva, 178464 PURPLE MARTIN Progne subis, 178499 SPRAGUE'S PIPIT Anthus spragueii, 178511 NORTHERN SHRIKE Lanius excubitor, 178515 LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE Lanius ludovicianus, 178529 BOHEMIAN WAXWING Bombycilla garrulus, 178532 CEDAR WAXWING Bombycilla cedrorum, 178536 AMERICAN DIPPER Cinclus mexicanus, 178541 HOUSE WREN Troglodytes aedon, 178547 WINTER WREN Troglodytes troglodytes, 178562 BEWICK'S WREN Thryomanes bewickii, 178581 CAROLINA WREN Thryothorus ludovicianus, 178587 CACTUS WREN Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus, 178605 SEDGE WREN Cistothorus platensis, 178608 MARSH WREN Cistothorus palustris, 178610 CANYON WREN Catherpes mexicanus, 178614 ROCK WREN Salpinctes obsoletus, 178620 NORTHERN MOCKINGBIRD Mimus polyglottos, 178625 GRAY CATBIRD Dumetella carolinensis, 178627 BROWN THRASHER Toxostoma rufum, 178636 BENDIRE'S THRASHER Toxostoma bendirei, 178637 CURVE-BILLED THRASHER Toxostoma curvirostre, 178645 LE CONTE'S THRASHER Toxostoma lecontei,

178652 CRISSAL THRASHER Toxostoma crissale, 178654 SAGE THRASHER Oreoscoptes montanus, 178759 VERDIN Auriparus flaviceps, 178764 BUSHTIT Psaltriparus minimus, 178775 WHITE-BREASTED NUTHATCH Sitta carolinensis, 178784 RED-BREASTED NUTHATCH Sitta canadensis, 178788 PYGMY NUTHATCH Sitta pygmaea, 178803 BROWN CREEPER Certhia americana, 178841 RUFOUS-CAPPED WARBLER Basileuterus rufifrons, 178844 BLACK-AND-WHITE WARBLER Mniotilta varia, 178855 TENNESSEE WARBLER Vermivora peregrina, 178856 ORANGE-CROWNED WARBLER Vermivora celata, 178861 NASHVILLE WARBLER Vermivora ruficapilla, 178864 VIRGINIA'S WARBLER Vermivora virginiae, 178866 LUCY'S WARBLER Vermivora luciae, 178874 OLIVE WARBLER Peucedramus taeniatus, 178878 YELLOW WARBLER Dendroica petechia, 178891 YELLOW-RUMPED WARBLER Dendroica coronata, 178896 BLACK-THROATED GRAY WARBLER Dendroica nigrescens, 178897 TOWNSEND'S WARBLER Dendroica townsendi, 178902 HERMIT WARBLER Dendroica occidentalis, 178909 GRACE'S WARBLER Dendroica graciae, 178913 BLACKPOLL WARBLER Dendroica striata, 178918 PRAIRIE WARBLER Dendroica discolor, 178921 PALM WARBLER Dendroica palmarum, 178927 OVENBIRD Seiurus aurocapillus, 178931 NORTHERN WATERTHRUSH Seiurus noveboracensis, 178940 MACGILLIVRAY'S WARBLER Oporornis tolmiei, 178944 COMMON YELLOWTHROAT Geothlypis trichas, 178964 YELLOW-BREASTED CHAT Icteria virens, 178970 RED-FACED WARBLER Cardellina rubrifrons, 178973 WILSON'S WARBLER Wilsonia pusilla, 178979 AMERICAN REDSTART Setophaga ruticilla, 178986 PAINTED REDSTART Myioborus pictus, 178997 HUTTON'S VIREO Vireo huttoni, 179003 BELL'S VIREO Vireo bellii, 179008 GRAY VIREO Vireo vicinior, 179021 RED-EYED VIREO Vireo olivaceus, 179023 WARBLING VIREO Vireo gilvus, 179032 BOBOLINK Dolichonyx oryzivorus, 179034 EASTERN MEADOWLARK Sturnella magna, 179039 WESTERN MEADOWLARK Sturnella neglecta, 179043 YELLOW-HEADED BLACKBIRD Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus, 179045 RED-WINGED BLACKBIRD Agelaius phoeniceus, 179060 TRICOLORED BLACKBIRD Agelaius tricolor, 179064 ORCHARD ORIOLE Icterus spurius, 179070 HOODED ORIOLE Icterus cucullatus,
179079 STREAK-BACKED ORIOLE Icterus pustulatus, 179082 SCOTT'S ORIOLE Icterus parisorum, 179083 BALTIMORE ORIOLE Icterus galbula, 179094 BREWER'S BLACKBIRD Euphagus cyanocephalus, 179104 COMMON GRACKLE Quiscalus quiscula, 179109 GREAT-TAILED GRACKLE Quiscalus mexicanus, 179112 BROWN-HEADED COWBIRD Molothrus ater, 179116 BRONZED COWBIRD Molothrus aeneus, 179124 NORTHERN CARDINAL Cardinalis cardinalis, 179132 PYRRHULOXIA Cardinalis sinuatus, 179139 ROSE-BREASTED GROSBEAK Pheucticus ludovicianus, 179140 BLACK-HEADED GROSBEAK Pheucticus melanocephalus, 179145 BLUE GROSBEAK Guiraca caerulea, 179150 INDIGO BUNTING Passerina cyanea, 179151 LAZULI BUNTING Passerina amoena, 179152 VARIED BUNTING Passerina versicolor, 179156 PAINTED BUNTING Passerina ciris, 179165 DICKCISSEL Spiza americana, 179173 EVENING GROSBEAK Coccothraustes vespertinus, 179186 PURPLE FINCH Carpodacus purpureus, 179190 CASSIN'S FINCH Carpodacus cassinii, 179191 HOUSE FINCH Carpodacus mexicanus, 179205 PINE GROSBEAK Pinicola enucleator, 179215 GRAY-CROWNED ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte tephrocotis, 179222 BLACK ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte atrata, 179222 BLACK ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte atrata, 179223 BROWN-CAPPED ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte australis, 179223 BROWN-CAPPED ROSY-FINCH Leucosticte australis, 179230 COMMON REDPOLL Carduelis flammea, 179232 LAWRENCE'S GOLDFINCH Carduelis lawrencei, 179233 PINE SISKIN Carduelis pinus, 179234 LESSER GOLDFINCH Carduelis psaltria, 179236 AMERICAN GOLDFINCH Carduelis tristis, 179259 RED CROSSBILL Loxia curvirostra, 179268 WHITE-WINGED CROSSBILL Loxia leucoptera, 179293 CANYON TOWHEE Pipilo fuscus, 179307 ABERT'S TOWHEE Pipilo aberti, 179310 GREEN-TAILED TOWHEE Pipilo chlorurus, 179312 LARK BUNTING Calamospiza melanocorys, 179314 SAVANNAH SPARROW Passerculus sandwichensis, 179333 GRASSHOPPER SPARROW Ammodramus savannarum, 179339 BAIRD'S SPARROW Ammodramus bairdii, 179345 LE CONTE'S SPARROW Ammodramus leconteii, 179366 VESPER SPARROW Pooecetes gramineus, 179371 LARK SPARROW Chondestes grammacus, 179375 RUFOUS-WINGED SPARROW Aimophila carpalis, 179377 RUFOUS-CROWNED SPARROW Aimophila ruficeps,

179390 BOTTERI'S SPARROW Aimophila botterii, 179393 CASSIN'S SPARROW Aimophila cassinii, 179395 BLACK-THROATED SPARROW Amphispiza bilineata, 179402 SAGE SPARROW Amphispiza belli, 179410 DARK-EYED JUNCO Junco hyemalis, 179427 YELLOW-EYED JUNCO Junco phaeonotus, 179432 AMERICAN TREE SPARROW Spizella arborea, 179435 CHIPPING SPARROW Spizella passerina, 179439 CLAY-COLORED SPARROW Spizella pallida, 179440 BREWER'S SPARROW Spizella breweri, 179443 FIELD SPARROW Spizella pusilla, 179448 BLACK-CHINNED SPARROW Spizella atrogularis, 179454 HARRIS'S SPARROW Zonotrichia querula, 179455 WHITE-CROWNED SPARROW Zonotrichia leucophrys, 179461 GOLDEN-CROWNED SPARROW Zonotrichia atricapilla, 179462 WHITE-THROATED SPARROW Zonotrichia albicollis, 179464 FOX SPARROW Passerella iliaca, 179484 LINCOLN'S SPARROW Melospiza lincolnii, 179488 SWAMP SPARROW Melospiza georgiana, 179492 SONG SPARROW Melospiza melodia, 179525 MCCOWN'S LONGSPUR Calcarius mccownii, 179526 LAPLAND LONGSPUR Calcarius lapponicus, 179530 CHESTNUT-COLLARED LONGSPUR Calcarius ornatus, 179532 SNOW BUNTING Plectrophenax nivalis, 179628 HOUSE SPARROW Passer domesticus, 179637 EUROPEAN STARLING Sturnus vulgaris, 179667 GRAY JAY Perisoreus canadensis, 179680 BLUE JAY Cyanocitta cristata, 179685 STELLER'S JAY Cyanocitta stelleri, 179707 MEXICAN JAY Aphelocoma ultramarina, 179720 BLACK-BILLED MAGPIE Pica hudsonia, 179725 COMMON RAVEN Corvus corax, 179730 CHIHUAHUAN RAVEN Corvus cryptoleucus, 179731 AMERICAN CROW Corvus brachyrhynchos, 179748 PINYON JAY Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus, 179750 CLARK'S NUTCRACKER Nucifraga columbiana, 179759 AMERICAN ROBIN Turdus migratorius, 179773 VARIED THRUSH Ixoreus naevius, 179777 WOOD THRUSH Hylocichla mustelina, 179779 HERMIT THRUSH Catharus guttatus, 179788 SWAINSON'S THRUSH Catharus ustulatus, 179793 GRAY-CHEEKED THRUSH Catharus minimus, 179796 VEERY Catharus fuscescens, 179801 EASTERN BLUEBIRD Sialia sialis, 179806 WESTERN BLUEBIRD Sialia mexicana, 179811 MOUNTAIN BLUEBIRD Sialia currucoides, 179824 TOWNSEND'S SOLITAIRE Myadestes townsendi,

179853 BLUE-GRAY GNATCATCHER Polioptila caerulea, 179857 BLACK-TAILED GNATCATCHER Polioptila melanura, 179863 BLACK-CAPPED GNATCATCHER Polioptila nigriceps, 179865 GOLDEN-CROWNED KINGLET Regulus satrapa, 179870 RUBY-CROWNED KINGLET Regulus calendula, 179877 PHAINOPEPLA Phainopepla nitens, 179882 WESTERN TANAGER Piranga ludoviciana, 179884 HEPATIC TANAGER Piranga flava, 179888 SUMMER TANAGER Piranga rubra, 179891 FLAME-COLORED TANAGER Piranga bidentata, 179921 VIRGINIA OPOSSUM Didelphis virginiana, 179929 MASKED SHREW Sorex cinereus, 179932 VAGRANT SHREW Sorex vagrans, 179933 NORTHERN WATER SHREW Sorex palustris, 179939 ARIZONA SHREW Sorex arizonae, 179946 PYGMY SHREW Sorex hoyi, 179949 MERRIAM'S SHREW Sorex merriami, 179950 MONTANE SHREW Sorex monticolus, 179951 DWARF SHREW Sorex nanus, 179954 PREBLE'S SHREW Sorex preblei, 179955 INYO SHREW Sorex tenellus, 179956 TROWBRIDGE'S SHREW Sorex trowbridgii, 179969 ELLIOT'S SHORT-TAILED SHREW Blarina hylophaga, 179971 LEAST SHREW Cryptotis parva, 179973 DESERT SHREW Notiosorex crawfordi, 179979 EASTERN MOLE Scalopus aquaticus, 179981 BROAD-FOOTED MOLE Scapanus latimanus, 179988 LITTLE BROWN BAT Myotis lucifugus, 179990 LONG-LEGGED MYOTIS Myotis volans, 179991 CALIFORNIA MYOTIS Myotis californicus, 179992 SOUTHWESTERN MYOTIS Myotis auriculus, 179995 LONG-EARED MYOTIS Myotis evotis, 179999 WESTERN SMALL-FOOTED MYOTIS Myotis leibii, 180002 FRINGED MYOTIS Myotis thysanodes, 180003 CAVE MYOTIS Myotis velifer, 180004 YUMA MYOTIS Myotis yumanensis, 180006 PALLID BAT Antrozous pallidus, 180008 BIG BROWN BAT Eptesicus fuscus, 180010 SPOTTED BAT Euderma maculatum, 180012 ALLEN'S BIG-EARED BAT Idionycteris phyllotis, 180014 SILVER-HAIRED BAT Lasionycteris noctivagans, 180016 WESTERN RED BAT Lasiurus blossevillii, 180017 HOARY BAT Lasiurus cinereus, 180018 SOUTHERN YELLOW BAT Lasiurus ega, 180024 WESTERN PIPISTRELLE Pipistrellus hesperus, 180062 MEXICAN LONG-TONGUED BAT Choeronycteris mexicana, 180068 MEXICAN LONG-NOSED BAT Leptonycteris nivalis,

180071 CALIFORNIA LEAF-NOSED BAT Macrotus californicus, 180080 WESTERN MASTIFF BAT Eumops perotis, 180081 UNDERWOOD'S MASTIFF BAT Eumops underwoodi, 180085 POCKETED FREE-TAILED BAT Nyctinomops femorosaccus, 180086 BIG FREE-TAILED BAT Nyctinomops macrotis, 180088 BRAZILIAN FREE-TAILED BAT Tadarida brasiliensis, 180103 NINE-BANDED ARMADILLO Dasypus novemcinctus, 180109 AMERICAN PIKA Ochotona princeps, 180112 SNOWSHOE HARE Lepus americanus, 180114 ANTELOPE JACK RABBIT Lepus alleni, 180115 BLACK-TAILED JACK RABBIT Lepus californicus, 180116 WHITE-SIDED JACK RABBIT Lepus callotis, 180118 WHITE-TAILED JACK RABBIT Lepus townsendii, 180122 DESERT COTTONTAIL Sylvilagus audubonii, 180124 EASTERN COTTONTAIL Sylvilagus floridanus, 180126 MOUNTAIN COTTONTAIL Sylvilagus nuttallii, 180133 MOUNTAIN BEAVER Aplodontia rufa, 180140 YELLOW-BELLIED MARMOT Marmota flaviventris, 180147 UINTA GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus armatus, 180148 CALIFORNIA GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus beechevi, 180149 BELDING'S GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus beldingi, 180152 WYOMING GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus elegans, 180154 GOLDEN-MANTLED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus lateralis, 180155 MEXICAN GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus mexicanus, 180159 SPOTTED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus spilosoma, 180160 ROUND-TAILED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus tereticaudus, 180161 TOWNSEND'S GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus townsendii, 180162 THIRTEEN-LINED GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus tridecemlineatus, 180163 ROCK SQUIRREL Spermophilus variegatus, 180166 RED SQUIRREL Tamiasciurus hudsonicus, 180167 DOUGLAS' SQUIRREL Tamiasciurus douglasii, 180169 NORTHERN FLYING SQUIRREL Glaucomys sabrinus, 180172 FOX SQUIRREL Sciurus niger, 180173 ABERT'S SQUIRREL Sciurus aberti, 180174 ARIZONA GRAY SQUIRREL Sciurus arizonensis, 180176 WESTERN GRAY SQUIRREL Sciurus griseus, 180177 NAYARIT SQUIRREL Sciurus nayaritensis, 180179 HARRIS' ANTELOPE SQUIRREL Ammospermophilus harrisii, 180180 TEXAS ANTELOPE SQUIRREL Ammospermophilus interpres, 180181 WHITE-TAILED ANTELOPE SQUIRREL Ammospermophilus leucurus, 180184 GUNNISON'S PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys gunnisoni, 180185 WHITE-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys leucurus, 180186 BLACK-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys ludovicianus, 180187 UTAH PRAIRIE DOG Cynomys parvidens, 180190 YELLOW-PINE CHIPMUNK Tamias amoenus, 180191 GRAY-FOOTED CHIPMUNK Tamias canipes, 180192 GRAY-COLLARED CHIPMUNK Tamias cinereicollis,

180193 CLIFF CHIPMUNK Tamias dorsalis, 180195 LEAST CHIPMUNK Tamias minimus, 180198 PALMER'S CHIPMUNK Tamias palmeri, 180199 PANAMINT CHIPMUNK Tamias panamintinus, 180200 LONG-EARED CHIPMUNK Tamias quadrimaculatus, 180201 COLORADO CHIPMUNK Tamias guadrivittatus, 180203 ALLEN'S CHIPMUNK Tamias senex,, 180206 LODGEPOLE CHIPMUNK Tamias speciosus, 180208 TOWNSEND'S CHIPMUNK Tamias townsendii,, 180209 UINTA CHIPMUNK Tamias umbrinus,, 180212 BEAVER Castor canadensis, 180215 DESERT POCKET GOPHER Geomys arenarius, 180216 PLAINS POCKET GOPHER Geomys bursarius, 180220 YELLOW-FACED POCKET GOPHER Pappogeomys castanops, 180222 BOTTA'S POCKET GOPHER Thomomys bottae, 180225 IDAHO POCKET GOPHER Thomomys idahoensis, 180227 MOUNTAIN POCKET GOPHER Thomomys monticola, 180228 NORTHERN POCKET GOPHER Thomomys talpoides, 180229 TOWNSEND'S POCKET GOPHER Thomomys townsendii, 180230 SOUTHERN POCKET GOPHER Thomomys umbrinus, 180236 DESERT KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys deserti, 180241 MERRIAM'S KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys merriami, 180242 CHISEL-TOOTHED KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys microps, 180244 ORD'S KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys ordii, 180245 PANAMINT KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys panamintinus, 180246 BANNER-TAILED KANGAROO RAT Dipodomys spectabilis, 180252 DARK KANGAROO MOUSE Microdipodops megacephalus, 180253 PALE KANGAROO MOUSE Microdipodops pallidus, 180256 ARIZONA POCKET MOUSE Perognathus amplus, 180260 OLIVE-BACKED POCKET MOUSE Perognathus fasciatus, 180261 PLAINS POCKET MOUSE Perognathus flavescens, 180262 SILKY POCKET MOUSE Perognathus flavus, 180267 LITTLE POCKET MOUSE Perognathus longimembris, 180269 GREAT BASIN POCKET MOUSE Perognathus parvus, 180276 DEER MOUSE Peromyscus maniculatus, 180278 WHITE-FOOTED MOUSE Peromyscus leucopus, 180282 BRUSH MOUSE Peromyscus boylii, 180284 CANYON MOUSE Peromyscus crinitus, 180286 CACTUS MOUSE Peromyscus eremicus, 180287 BLACK-EARED MOUSE Peromyscus melanotis, 180288 MERRIAM'S MOUSE Peromyscus merriami, 180289 WHITE-ANKLED MOUSE Peromyscus pectoralis, 180291 PINON MOUSE Peromyscus truei, 180294 SOUTHERN RED-BACKED VOLE Clethrionomys gapperi, 180297 MEADOW VOLE Microtus pennsylvanicus, 180299 LONG-TAILED VOLE Microtus longicaudus, 180310 MONTANE VOLE Microtus montanus,

180312 PRAIRIE VOLE Microtus ochrogaster, 180315 WATER VOLE Microtus richardsoni, 180318 MUSKRAT Ondatra zibethicus, 180341 FULVOUS HARVEST MOUSE Reithrodontomys fulvescens, 180343 WESTERN HARVEST MOUSE Reithrodontomys megalotis, 180344 PLAINS HARVEST MOUSE Reithrodontomys montanus, 180347 ARIZONA COTTON RAT Sigmodon arizonae, 180348 TAWNY-BELLIED COTTON RAT Sigmodon fulviventer, 180349 HISPID COTTON RAT Sigmodon hispidus, 180350 YELLOW-NOSED COTTON RAT Sigmodon ochrognathus, 180359 HEATHER VOLE Phenacomys intermedius, 180366 HOUSE MOUSE Mus musculus, 180368 NORTHERN PYGMY MOUSE Baiomys taylori, 180370 WHITE-THROATED WOODRAT Neotoma albigula, 180371 BUSHY-TAILED WOODRAT Neotoma cinerea, 180372 EASTERN WOODRAT Neotoma floridana, 180374 DESERT WOODRAT Neotoma lepida, 180375 MEXICAN WOODRAT Neotoma mexicana, 180376 SOUTHERN PLAINS WOODRAT Neotoma micropus, 180377 STEPHENS' WOODRAT Neotoma stephensi, 180381 MEARNS' GRASSHOPPER MOUSE Onychomys arenicola, 180382 NORTHERN GRASSHOPPER MOUSE Onychomys leucogaster, 180383 SOUTHERN GRASSHOPPER MOUSE Onychomys torridus, 180386 MEADOW JUMPING MOUSE Zapus hudsonius, 180387 WESTERN JUMPING MOUSE Zapus princeps, 180393 PORCUPINE Erethizon dorsatum, 180543 BROWN BEAR Ursus arctos, 180544 AMERICAN BLACK BEAR Ursus americanus, 180549 RIVER OTTER Lontra canadensis, 180551 WOLVERINE Gulo gulo, 180553 MINK Mustela vison, 180555 ERMINE Mustela erminea, 180556 LONG-TAILED WEASEL Mustela frenata, 180557 BLACK-FOOTED FERRET Mustela nigripes, 180559 MARTEN Martes americana, 180560 FISHER Martes pennanti, 180562 STRIPED SKUNK Mephitis mephitis, 180563 HOODED SKUNK Mephitis macroura, 180565 BADGER Taxidea taxus, 180568 HOG-NOSED SKUNK Conepatus mesoleucus, 180570 EASTERN SPOTTED SKUNK Spilogale putorius, 180575 RACCOON Procyon lotor, 180577 RINGTAIL Bassariscus astutus, 180582 BOBCAT Lynx rufus, 180585 LYNX Lynx canadensis, 180593 JAGUAR Panthera onca, 180596 GRAY WOLF Canis lupus,

180599 COYOTE Canis latrans,
180604 RED FOX Vulpes vulpes,
180606 KIT FOX Vulpes macrotis,
180607 SWIFT FOX Vulpes velox,
180609 GRAY FOX Urocyon cinereoargenteus,
180695 WAPITI Cervus elaphus,
180698 MULE DEER Odocoileus hemionus,
180699 WHITE-TAILED DEER Odocoileus virginianus,
180703 MOOSE Alces alces,
180711 BIGHORN SHEEP Ovis canadensis,
180713 MOUNTAIN GOAT Oreamnos americanus,
180717 PRONGHORN Antilocapra americana,

180719 BARBARY SHEEP Ammotragus lervia

203452 TOWNSEND'S BIG-EARED BAT Corynorhinus townsendii

180599 COYOTE Canis latrans 180604 RED FOX Vulpes vulpes 180606 KIT FOX Vulpes macrotis 180607 SWIFT FOX Vulpes velox 180609 GRAY FOX Urocyon cinereoargenteus 180695 WAPITI Cervus elaphus 180698 MULE DEER Odocoileus hemionus 180699 WHITE-TAILED DEER Odocoileus virginianus 180703 MOOSE Alces alces 180711 BIGHORN SHEEP Ovis canadensis 180717 PRONGHORN Antilocapra americana 180719 BARBARY SHEEP Ammotragus lervia 203452 TOWNSEND'S BIG-EARED B Corynorhinus townsendii 203618 BISON Bos bison 206989 PLAINS SPADEFOOT Spea bombifrons 206991 GREAT BASIN SPADEFOOT Spea intermontana 206993 NEW MEXICO SPADEFOOT Spea multiplicata 207312 BOREAL CHORUS FROG Pseudacris maculata 207313 PACIFIC CHORUS FROG Pseudacris regilla 207724 BARKING FROG Eleutherodactylus augusti 208657 BIG BEND SLIDER Trachemys gaigeae 208680 SPINY SOFTSHELL TURTLE Apalone spinifera 208791 MOJAVE BLACK-COLLARED Crotaphytus bicinctores 208940 WESTERN WHIPTAIL Cnemidophorus tigris 208947 DESERT GRASSLAND WHIP Cnemidophorus uniparens 208948 PLATEAU STRIPED WHIPTA Cnemidophorus velox 209008 NORTHERN ALLIGATOR LIZ. Elgaria coerulea 209017 MADREAN ALLIGATOR LIZA Elgaria kingii 209247 COMMON KINGSNAKE Lampropeltis getula 209266 GRAY-BANDED KINGSNAKE Lampropeltis alterna 209400 BULLSNAKE Pituophis catenifer 209455 TRANS-PECOS RAT SNAKE Bogertophis subocularis 209458 GREEN RAT SNAKE Senticolis triaspis 550236 AMARGOSA TOAD Bufo nelsoni 550546 COLUMBIA SPOTTED FROG Rana luteiventris 551766 RIO GRANDE RIVER COOTE Pseudemys gorzugi 552462 WHITE-NOSED COATI Nasua narica 552464 SOUTHERN LONG-NOSED E Leptonycteris curasoae 552479 MOUNTAIN LION Puma concolor 552482 LONG-TAILED POCKET MOI Chaetodipus formosus 552483 HISPID POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus hispidus 552484 ROCK POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus intermedius 552486 DESERT POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus penicillatus 552488 MERRIAM'S POCKET MOUS Perognathus merriami 552490 SAGEBRUSH VOLE Lemmiscus curtatus 552494 ARIZONA WOODRAT Neotoma devia

552495 OSGOOD'S MOUSE Peromyscus gratus 552496 ROCK MOUSE Peromyscus nasutus 552499 MERRIAM'S GROUND SQUI Spermophilus canus 552503 HOPI CHIPMUNK Tamias rufus 552504 PIUTE GROUND SQUIRREL Spermophilus mollis 552512 EASTERN RED BAT Lasiurus borealis 552520 BAILEY'S POCKET MOUSE Chaetodipus baileyi 552521 PYGMY RABBIT Brachylagus idahoensis 552761 COLLARED PECCARY Pecari tajacu 554027 CLARK'S GREBE Aechmophorus clarkii 554030 FIVE-STRIPED SPARROW Aimophila quinquestriata 554127 AMERICAN PIPIT Anthus rubescens 554128 WESTERN SCRUB-JAY Aphelocoma californica 554135 GREAT EGRET Ardea alba 554137 GRAY HAWK Asturina nitida 554139 JUNIPER TITMOUSE Baeolophus ridgwayi 554141 BRIDLED TITMOUSE Baeolophus wollweberi 554145 STILT SANDPIPER Calidris himantopus 554146 CRESTED CARACARA Caracara plancus 554221 OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER Contopus cooperi 554254 HAMMOND'S FLYCATCHER Empidonax hammondii 554256 HORNED LARK Eremophila alpestris 554267 BULLOCK'S ORIOLE Icterus bullockii 554268 MISSISSIPPI KITE Ictinia mississippiensis 554375 NEOTROPIC CORMORANT Phalacrocorax brasilianus 554376 RED PHALAROPE Phalaropus fulicaria 554380 SPOTTED TOWHEE Pipilo maculatus 554382 BLACK-CAPPED CHICKADEE Poecile atricapilla 554385 MOUNTAIN CHICKADEE Poecile gambeli 554388 MEXICAN CHICKADEE Poecile sclateri 554456 CASSIN'S VIREO Vireo cassinii 554477 PLUMBEOUS VIREO Vireo plumbeus 555388 WESTERN SCREECH-OWL Otus kennicottii 555544 COMMON POORWILL Phalaenoptilus nuttallii 555657 New Mexico shrew Sorex neomexicanus 555658 DAVIS MOUNTAIN COTTON Sylvilagus robustus 563907 ROSY BOA Charina trivirgata 563909 THORNSCRUB HOOK-NOSE Gyalopion quadrangulare 563910 SMOOTH GREEN SNAKE Liochlorophis vernalis 564567 PYGMY SHORT-HORNED LI: Phrynosoma douglasii 564574 Sand dune lizard Sceloporus arenicolus 564594 GREATER SHORT-HORNED Phrynosoma hernandesi 564596 COMMON CHUCKWALLA Sauromalus ater 625180 ORYX Oryx gazella