Ecoregion Bassed Data

Ecoregion	Year	Citation	Primary Report Link	Additional Report and Data link
Apache Highlands	2004	Marshall, R.M., D. Turner, A. Gondor, D. Gori, C. Enquist, G. Luna, R. Paredes Aguilar, S. Anderson, S. Schwartz, C. Watts, E. Lopez, P. Comer. 2004. An Ecological Analysis of Conservation Priorities in the Apache Highlands Ecoregion. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy of Arizona, Instituto del Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo Sustentable del Estado de Sonora , Agency and Institutional partners. 152.pp.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Arizona-New Mexico Mountains	1999	Bell, G, J. Baumgartner, J. Humke, A. Laurenzi, P. McCarthy, P. Mehlhop, K. Rich, M. Silbert, E. Smith, B. Spicer, T. Sullivan, and S. Yanoff. 1999. Ecoregional Conservation Analysis of the Arizon-New Mexico Mountains. Arizona-New Mexico Ecoregional Conservation Team. The Nature Conservancy, Santa Fe, New Mexico.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Aspen Parkland	2007	Riley, J.L, S.E. Green and K.E. Brodribb. 2007. A Conservation Blueprint for Canada's Prairies and Parklands. Nature Conservancy of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.	http://support.natureconservancy.ca/pdf/blueprints/Prairies_and_Parklands.pdf?_ga=2.200626025.670120404.1537991172-628480056.1533841894	
Black Hills	2000	Hall, J., H. Marriott, and J. Perot. 2002. Ecoregional Conservation in the Black Hills. The Nature Conservancy. Midwest Conservation Science Center, Minneapolis, MN.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
California North Coast	2001	The Nature Conservancy. 2001. California North Coast Ecoregional Plan. The Nature Conservancy, California Field Office. San Francisco, CA	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Canadian Rocky Mountains	2004	The Nature Conservancy. 2004. Candian Rocky Mountains Ecoregional Assessment. Volume One: Report Version 2.0.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Central Appalachian Forest	2001	Anderson, M.G., A. Olivero, C. Ferree, D. Morse, S. Khanna, and S. Bernstein. 2001. Central Appalachian Forest Ecoregional Plan. The Central Appalachian Ecoregion: Ecoregional Assessment, Conservation Status and Resource CD. The Nature Conservancy. Boston, MA.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/cap/Pages/default.aspx
Central Mixed-Grass Prairie	2003	Steuter Al, Jennifer S. Hall and Mary Lammert Khoury. 2003. Conserving the biological diversity of the Central Mixed-Grass Prairie: A portfolio designed for conservation action. The Nature Conservancy, Nebraska Field Office, Omaha NE.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Central Shortgrass Prairie	2006	Neely, B., S. Kettler, J. Horsman, C. Pague, R. Rondeau, R. Smith, L. Grunau, P. Comer, G. Belew, F. Pusateri, B. Rosenlund, D. Runner, K. Sochi, J. Sovell, D. Anderson, T. Jackson and M. Klavetter. 2006. Central Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregional Assessment and Partnership Initiative. The Nature Conservancy of Colorado and the Shortgrass Prairie Partnership. 124 pp.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Central Tallgrass Prairie	2008	The Nature Conservancy. 2008. Central Tallgrass Prairie Ecoregion Assessment: Update on Biodiversity. The Nature Conservancy, Missouri Field Office, St. Louis, MO.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Chesapeake Bay Lowlands	2003	Samson, D.A., M.G. Anderson et al. 2003. Chesapeake Bay Lowlands Ecoregional Conservation Plan; First Iteration, Edited. The Nature Conservancy, Mid-Atlantic Division, Charlottesville, VA	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/cby/Pages/default.aspx
Chihuahuan Desert	2004	The Nature Conservancy, 2004. Ecoregional Conservation Assessment of the Chichuahan Desert. Second Edition Revised 2004. Pronatura In partnership with The Nature Conservancy and The World Wildlife Fund.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Colorado Plateau	2002	Tuhy, J., P. Comer, G. Bell, D. Dorfman, B. Neely, M. Lammert, S. Silbert, H. Humke, L. Whitham, B. Cholvin, and B. Baker. 2002. A Conservation Assessment of the Colorado Plateau Ecoregion. The Nature Conservancy Colardo Plateau Ecoregional Planning Team. Moab. Utah.	Tuhy, J., P. Comer, G. Bell, D. Dorfman, B. Neely, M. Lammert, S. Silbert, H. Humke, L. Whitham, B. Cholvin, and B. Baker. 2002. A Conservation Assessment of the Colorado Plateau Ecoregion. The Nature Conservancy Colardo Plateau Ecoregional Planning Team. Moab. Utah.	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Columbia Plateau	2003	The Nature Conservancy. 1999 (revised 2003). The Columbia Plateau Ecoregional Assessment: A Pilot Effort in Ecoregional Conservation. The Nature Conservancy's Columbia Plateau Ecoregional Planning Team.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Crosstimbers And Southern Tallgrass Prairie	2009	The Nature Conservancy. 2009. A Conservation Blueprint for the Crosstimbers & Southern Tallgrass Prairie Ecoregion. CSTP Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Cumberlands And Southern Ridge And Valley	2003, 2013 Update in AL, GA, TN & KY.	The Nature Conservancy, 2003. The Cumberlands and Southern Ridge & Valley Ecoregion: A Plan for Biodiversity Conservation. The Nature Conservancy. Arlington, Virginia.; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/cp/Pages/default.aspx
Cypress Upland	2007	J.L. Riley, S.E. Green and K.E. Brodribb. 2007. A Conservation Blueprint for Canada's Prairies and Parklands. Nature Conservancy of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.	http://support.natureconservancy.ca/pdf/blueprints/Prairies_and_Parklands.pdf?_ga=2.200626025.670120404.1537991172-628480056.1533841894	
Dakota Mixed-Grass Prairie	2010	Harkness, Mary, Jennifer S. Hall, Paula Gagnon, Phil Gerla, Meredith W. Cornett, Brian Schreurs, and Sarah Eichhorst. 2010. Conserving the biological diversity of the Dakota MixedGrass Prairie. The Nature Conservancy, Minneapolis MN.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html

Ecoregion Bassed Data

Ecoregion	Year	Citation	Primary Report Link	Additional Report and Data link
East Cascades - Modoc Plateau	2007	Popper, K., G. Wilhere, M. Schindel, D. VanderSchaaf, P. Skidmore, G. Stroud, J. Crandall, J. Kagan, R. Crawford, G. Kittel, J. Azerrad, L. Bach. 2007. The East Cascades - Modoc Plateau and West Cascades Ecoregional Assessments. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife with support from the Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center, Washington Heritage Program, and Natureserve. The Nature	Main Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
East Gulf Coastal Plain	1999, 2013 Update in AL, FL & GA.	The Nature Conservancy. 1999 (revised 2001). East Gulf Coastal Plain Ecoregional Plan. East Gulf Coastal Plain Core Team.; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/egcp/Pages/default.aspx
Edwards Plateau	2004	The Nature Conservancy. 2004. A Biodiversity and Conservation Assessment of the Edwards Plateau Ecoregion. Edwards Plateau Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX, USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Fescue-Mixed Grass Prairie	2007	J.L. Riley, S.E. Green and K.E. Brodribb. 2007. A Conservation Blueprint for Canada's Prairies and Parklands. Nature Conservancy of Canada, Toronto, Ontario. 226 pp. plus DVD-ROM.	http://support.natureconservancy.ca/pdf/blueprints/Prairies_and_Parklands.pdf?_ga=2.200626025.670120404.1537991172-628480056.1533841894	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Florida Peninsula	2005, 2013 Update	A Conservation Blueprint for Canada's Prairies and Parklands.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/flp/Pages/default.aspx
Great Basin	2001	Nature Conservancy of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Great Lakes: US	2000	The Nature Conservancy. 2000. Toward a New Conservation Vision for the Great Lakes Region: A Second Iteration Ecoregional Plan. The Nature Conservancy, Great Lakes Program, Chicago, IL.	Report	
Great Lakes: Canada	2005	Henson, B.L, K.E. Brodribb, and J.L. Riley 2005. Great Lakes Conservation Blueprint for Terrestrial Biodiversity. Vol. 1 and Vol. 2. Nature Conservancy of Canada.	http://support.natureconservancy.ca/pdf/blueprints/Great_Lakes_Terrestrial_Vol1.pdf	http://support.natureconservancy.ca/pdf/blueprints/Great_Lakes_Terrestrial_Vol1.pdf
Gulf Coast Prairies And Marshes	2002	The Nature Conservancy. 2002. The Gulf Coast Prairies and Marshes Ecoregional Conservation Plan. Gulf Coast Prairies and Marshes Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX, USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
High Allegheny Plateau	2004	Zaremba, R., M.G. Anderson, A. Olivero, D. Morse, S. Khanna, and S. Bernstein. 2002. The High Allegheny Plateau Ecoregional Plan: Ecoregional Assessment, Conservation Status and Resource CD. The Nature Conservancy. Boston, MA.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/hap/Pages/default.aspx
Interior Low Plateau	2001, 2013 Update in TN & KY.	The Nature Conservancy. 2001. The Interior Low Plateau Ecoregion: A Conservation Plan. The Interior Low Plateau Eoregional Planning Team.; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/ilp/Pages/default.aspx
Klamath Mountains	2003	Vander Schaaf, D., M. Schindel, D. Borgias, C. Mayer, D. Tolman, G. Kittel, J. Kagan, T. Keeler-Wolf, L. Serpa, J. Hak, K. Popper. 2004. Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Conservation Assessment. The Nature Conservancy. Portland, Oregon.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Lower New England / Northern Piedmont	2003	Anderson, M.G., A. Olivero, D. Morse, S. Khanna and S. Bernstein. 2003. The Lower New England/Northern Piedmont Ecoregion: Ecoregional Assessment, Conservation Status and Resource CD. The Nature Conservancy. Boston, MA.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/lne/Pages/default.aspx
Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain	2001, 2013 Update in SC & NC.	The Nature Conservancy. 2001. Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain Ecoregional Plan. The Core Ecoregional Planning Team and Southeastern Regional Office of The Nature Conservancy. ; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/mac/Pages/default.aspx
Middle Rockies - Blue Mountains	2000	The Nature Conservancy. 2000. Middle Rockies-Blue Mountains Ecoregional Conservation Plan. Middle Rockies – Blue Mountains Planning Team.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Mississippi River Alluvial Plain	2002	The Nature Conservancy. 2002. Conservation Planning in the Mississippi River Alluvial Plain. The Nature Conservancy. Baton Rouge, LA, USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Mojave Desert	2010	Randall, J. M., S.S. Parker, J. Moore, B. Cohen, L. Crane, B. Christian, D. Cameron, J. MacKenzie, K. Klausmeyer and S. Morrison. 2010. Mojave Desert Ecoregional Assessment. Unpublished Report. The Nature Conservancy, San Francisco, California. 106 pages + appendices. Available at: http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/mojave/documents/mojave-desert-ecoregional-2010/@@view.html.	http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/mojave/documents/mojave-desert-ecoregional-2010/@@view.html.	
North Atlantic Coast	2006	Anderson, M.G., C. Ferree, D. Morse, A. Olivero, S. Khanna, and S. Bernstein. 2006. The North Atlantic Coast Ecoregion: Ecoregional Assessment, Conservation Status and Resource CD. The Nature Conservancy. Boston, MA.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/nac/Pages/default.aspx

Ecoregion Bassed Data

Ecoregion	Year	Citation	Primary Report Link	Additional Report and Data link
North Cascades	2007	Iachetti, P., J. Floberg, G. Wilhere, K. Ciruna, D. Markovic, J. Lewis, M. Heiner, G. Kittel, R. Crawford, S. Farone, S. Ford, M. Goering, D. Nicolson, S. Tyler, and P. Skidmore. 2006. North Cascades and Pacific Ranges Ecoregional Assessment, Volume 1 - Report. Prepared by the Nature Conservancy of Canada, The Nature Conservancy of Washington, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife with support from the British Columbia Conservation Data Centre, Washington Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, and NatureServe. Nature Conservancy of Canada, Victoria, BC.	Main Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
North Central Tillplain	2003	The Nature Conservancy. 2003. The North Central tillplain Ecoregion: A Conservation Plan. North Central Tillplain Ecoregional Planning Team.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Northern Appalachian / Acadian	2006	Anderson, M.G., B. Vickery, M. Gorman, L. Gratton, M. Morrison, J. Mailet, A. Olivero, C. Ferree, D. Morse, Kehm, G., Rosalska, K., Khanna, S., and S. Bernstein. 2006. The Northern Appalachian / Acadian Ecoregion: Ecoregional Assessment, Conservation Status and Resource CD. The Nature Conservancy. Boston, MA.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/nap/Pages/default.aspx
Northern Great Plains Steppe	1998 (US), 2007 (Canada)	The Nature Conservancy. 1999. Ecoregional Planning in the Northern Great Plains Steppe. Northern Great Plains Steppe Ecoregional Planning Team. ; J.L. Riley, S.E. Green and K.E. Brodribb. 2007. A Conservation Blueprint for Canada's Prairies and Parklands. Nature Conservancy of Canada, Toronto, Ontario	Report	http://support.natureconservancy.ca/pdf/blueprints/Prairies_and_Parklands.pdf?_ga=2.200626025.670120404.1537991172-628480056.1533841894
Northern Tallgrass Prairie	1999	The Nature Conservancy, Northern Tallgrass Prairie Ecoregional Planning Team. 1998. Ecoregional planning in the Northern Tallgrass Prairie ecoregion. The Nature Conservancy, Midwest Regional Office, Minneapolis, MN, USA. 208 pp.+ iv.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Okanagan	2007	Nature Conservancy of Canada and The Nature Conservancy of Washington, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2006. Okanagan Ecoregional Assessment	Executive Summary	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Osage Plains/Flint Hills Prairie	2000	The Nature Conservancy, Osage Plains/Flint Hills Prairie Ecoregional Planning Team. 2000. Ecoregional Conservation in the Osage Plains/Flint Hills Prairie. The Nature Conservancy, Midwestern Resource Office, Minneapolis, MN. 48 pp. + 73 appendices	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Ouachita Mountains	2003	The Nature Conservancy. 2003. Ouachita Mountains Ecoregional Assessment. Ouachita Ecoregional Assessment Team. The Nature Conservancy, Little Rock, AR, Tulsa, OK, USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Ozarks	2003	The Nature Conservancy, Ozarks Ecoregional Assessment Team. 2003. Ozarks Ecoregional Conservation Assessment. Minneapolis, MN: The Nature Conservancy Midwestern Resource Office. USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Pacific Northwest Coast	2006	Vander Schaaf, D., G. Wilhere, Z. Ferdaña, K. Popper, M. Schindel, P. Skidmore, D. Rolph, P. Iachetti, G. Kittel, R. Crawford, D. Pickering, and J. Christy. 2006. Pacific Northwest Coast Ecoregion Assessment. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy, the Nature Conservancy of Canada, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Nature Conservancy, Portland, Oregon	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Piedmont	2005, 2013 Update in AL, GA, SC & NC.	The Nature Conservancy, 2005. The Piedmont Ecoregion: A Plan for Biodiversity Conservation – Draft Implementation Document. The Nature Conservancy. Arlington, Virginia.; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/pmt/Pages/default.aspx
Prairie-Forest Border	2000	The Nature Conservancy. 2000. The Prairie-Forest Border Ecoregion: A Conservation Plan. The Prairie-Forest Border Ecoregion Core Team.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Sonoran Desert	2000	Marshall, R.M., S. Anderson, M. Batcher, P. Comer, S. Cornelius, R. Cox, A. Gondor, D. Gori, J. Humke, R. Paredes Aguilar, I.E. Parra, S. Schwartz. 2000. An Ecological Analysis of Conservation Priorities in the Sonoran Desert Ecoregion. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy Arizona Chapter, Sonoran Institute, and Instituto del Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo Sustentable del Estado de Sonora with support from Department of Defense Legacy Program, Agency and Institutional partners. 146 pp	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
South Atlantic Coastal Plain	2002, 2013 Update in FL, GA, & SC.	The Nature Conservancy. 2002. South Atlantic Coastal Plain Ecoregion Plan. South Atlantic Coastal Plain Ecoregion Plan South Atlantic Coastal Plain Ecoregional Planning Team. ; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/sacp/Pages/default.aspx
Southern Blue Ridge	2000, 2013 Update in NC, TN, GA, & SC.	The Nature Conservancy and Southern Appalachian Forest Coalition. 2000. Southern Blue Ridge Ecoregional Conservation Plan: Summary and Implementation Document. The Nature Conservancy: Durham, North Carolina. ; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/sbr/Pages/default.aspx
Southern Rocky Mountains	2001	Neely, B., P. Comer, C. Moritz, M. Lammert, R. Rondeau, C. Pague, G. Bell, H. Copeland, J. Humke, S. Spackman, T. Schulz, D. Theobald, and L. Valutis. 2001. Southern Rocky Mountains: An Ecoregional Assessment and Conservation Blueprint. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy with support from the U.S. Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Colorado Division of Wildlife, and Bureau of Land Management.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Southern Shortgrass Prairie	2007	The Nature Conservancy. 2007. A Biodiversity and Conservation Assessment of the Southern Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregion. Southern Shortgrass Prairie Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
St. Lawrence - Champlain Valley	2003	Anderson, M.G., C. Ferree, A. Olivero, S. Khanna, and S. Bernstein. 2003. The St. Lawrence Ecoregion: Ecoregional Assessment, Conservation Status and Resource CD. The Nature Conservancy. Boston, MA.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/stl/Pages/default.aspx

Ecoregion Bassed Data

Ecoregion	Year	Citation	Primary Report Link	Additional Report and Data link
Superior Mixed Forest	2002	Van Helden, N., K. Bassler, and M. Madsen. 2002. The Superior Mixed Forest Ecoregion: A Conservation Plan. Core Team included The Nature Conservancy, Nature Conservancy of Canada, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, and Manitoba Conservation Data Centre.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Tamaulipan Thorn Scrub	2010	The Nature Conservancy and Pronatura Noreste. 2010. A Conservation Blueprint for the Tamaulipan Thornscrub Ecoregion. Tamaulipan Thornscrub Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX.	The Nature Conservancy and Pronatura Noreste. 2010. A Conservation Blueprint for the Tamaulipan Thornscrub Ecoregion. Tamaulipan Thornscrub Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX.	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Tropical Florida	2005, 2013 Update.	The Nature Conservancy. 2004. Tropical Florida Ecoregional Plan. The Core Technical and Planning Team The Nature Conservancy & The University of Florida Geoplan Center. Tallahassee and Gainesville, Florida. ; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/tfl/Pages/default.aspx
Upper East Gulf Coastal Plain	2003, 2013 Update in AL, GA, TN & KY	The Nature Conservancy & NatureServe, 2003. The Upper East Gulf Coastal Plain: An Ecoregional Assessment. ; 2013 Updated Southeastern U.S. Terrestrial Portfolios. Eastern Conservation Science team of The Nature Conservancy, TNC State Chapter Science and Protection staff of AL, FL, GA, SC, NC, TN, KY.	Report	http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/ecoregional/uegcp/Pages/default.aspx
Upper West Gulf Coastal Plain	2002	The Nature Conservancy. 2002. Upper West Gulf Coastal Plain Ecoregional Plan. Final Implementation Draft Prepared by Dave Gosse, Russell McDowell, Rob Evans and the UWGCP Technical and Planning Teams.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Utah High Plateaus	2006	Comer, P., Tuhy, J. and R. Esselman, 2006. Scenario Building in the Utah High Plateaus Ecoregion. Case Study in Ecoregion Asessments and Biodiverity Vision Toolbox. The Nature Conservancy	Comer, P., Tuhy, J. and R. Esselman, 2006. Scenario Building in the Utah High Plateaus Ecoregion. Case Study in Ecoregion Asessments and Biodiverity Vision Toolbox. The Nature Conservancy	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Utah-Wyoming Rocky Mountains	2001	Noss, R., Wuerthner, G, Vance-Borland, K., and Carroll, C. 2001. A Biological Conservation Assessment for the Utah-Wyoming Rocky Mountains Ecoregion: Report to The Nature Conservancy. Conservation Science, Inc. Corvallis, OR. USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
West Cascades	2006	Popper, K., G. Wilhere, M. Schindel, D. VanderSchaaf, P. Skidmore, G. Stroud, J. Crandall, J. Kagan, R. Crawford, G. Kittel, J. Azerrad, L. Bach. 2007. The East Cascades - Modoc Plateau and West Cascades Ecoregional Assessments. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife with support from the Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center, Washington Heritage Program, and Natureserve. The Nature	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
West Gulf Coastal Plain	2003	The Nature Conservancy. 2003. The West Gulf Coastal Plain Ecoregional Conservation Plan. Wesst Gulf Coastal Plain Ecoregional Planning Team, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio, TX, USA.	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Western Allegheny Plateau	2005	The Nature Conservancy. 2000 Draft Report (Datasets 2005). Ecoregional Plan for the Western Allegheny Plateau. The Nature Conservancy, Ohio Chapter. Dublin, OH	Draft Report.	
Willamette Valley - Puget Trough - Georgia Basin	2004	Floberg, J., M. Goering, G. Wilhere, C. MacDonald, C. Chappell, C. Rumsey, Z. Ferdana, A. Holt, P. Skidmore, T. Horsman, E. Alverson, C. Tanner, M. Bryer, P. Iachetti, A. Harcombe, B. McDonald, T. Cook, M. Summers, D. Rolph. 2004. Willamette Valley-Puget Trough-Georgia Basin Ecoregional Assessment, Volume One: Report. Prepared by The Nature Conservancy with support from the Nature Conservancy of Canada, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Natural Resources (Natural Heritage and Nearshore Habitat programs), Oregon State Natural Heritage Information Center and the British Columbia Conservation Data	Report	http://maps.tnc.org/gis_data.html
Wyoming Basins	2013	Sochi, K., M. Heiner, H. Copeland, A. Pocewicz, and J. Keisecker. 2013. Systematic Conservation Planning in the Wyoming Basins. The Nature Conservancy. Boulder, CO. 134pp.		

State Based Data

State Name	State Based Assessment	State & plan date, Title of map	Comments & link to the plan and dataset if publicly posted Abbreviations: SWAP = State Wildlife Action Plan, COA = Conservation Opportunity Areas, SCGN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need, TNC= The Nature Conservancy
Alabama	Y	Alabama (2017). SWAP.	SWAP areas based on TNC Original Portfolio.
Arizona	Y	Arizona (2004). Native Grasslands in high quality	No Statewide SWAP available. Used portions of statewide grasslands study: http://azconservation.org/downloads/category/grassland_assessment A GIS data set depicting the results of a two-year study to delineate grasslands and evaluate their ecological condition in Arizona, southwestern New Mexico, and northern Mexico. This study was completed with the assistance of resource professionals from U.S. and Mexico universities and public agencies. We extracted class "A", "B", "A&B", these are native grasslands based on this statewide field survey. The Nature Conservancy. Arizona. 2004.
Arkansas	N	Arkansas (2015): None.	In the plan they rank the ecoregions by number of SGCN (Fig 3.3 in the SWAP), but do not present mapped priorities at more local scales. www.wildlifearkansas.com
California	Y	California Bird Species Richness Index from Modeling Bird Distribution Responses to Climate Change. 2010. Point Blue Conservation Science.	Recognized Biodiversity Value is based on the species richness index for the historic time period and includes the areas with the top 10% richness index in the state and the top 5% richness index within each ecoregion. http://climate.calcommons.org/dataset/14
California	Y	California Amphibian and Reptile Richness from Wright et al. 2013. California Amphibian and Reptile Species of Future Concern: Conservation and Climate Change. California Department of Fish and Wildlife.	Recognized Biodiversity Value is based on species richness for the historic time period and includes the top 10% richest areas in the state and the top 5% richest areas within each ecoregion for each taxa. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83972
California	Y	California Mammal Richness Index from Stewart et al. 2016. A Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment for Twenty California Mammal Taxa. California Department of Fish and Wildlife.	Recognized Biodiversity Value is based on a species richness index calculated from the Species Distribution Models described in this report, but for all mammals in CA using the methodology described in 'A Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment for Twenty California Mammal Taxa'. Recognized Biodiversity Value is based on species richness for the historic time period and includes the top 10% richest areas in the state and the top 5% richest areas within each ecoregion for each taxa. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=135825&inline
California	Y	Plant Species Richness Index and Range-restricted Endemic Species Richness Index from Kling et al. 2018. Facets of phylodiversity: evolutionary diversification, divergence and survival as conservation targets. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences.	Recognized Biodiversity Value is based on a species richness index and a range-restricted endemic species richness index and includes the areas with the top 20% of values in the state and the top 5% values within each ecoregion for each dataset. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rstb.2017.0397
California	Y	Rarity-weighted Occurrence Density based on observation from the California Natural Diversity Database. 2018. California Department of Fish and Wildlife.	Recognized Biodiversity Value is based on the top 80% of values from rarity weighted recent occurrence density within 1km of observations. https://wildlife.ca.gov/data/cnddb
Colorado	Y	Colorado (2015): Crucial Habitat for Tier 1 Terrestrial Animal and Plant SGCN (Figure 21).	The state was mapped into 5 priority levels for crucial habitat for SGCN, and we incorporated the two highest levels into our composite SWAP map. Details on the map methodology are in Chapter 8 of the Colorado plan. http://cpw.state.co.us/aboutus/Pages/StateWildlifeActionPlan.aspx
Connecticut		Connecticut (2019). Natural Diversity Areas.	Natural_Diversity Areas. The State of Connecticut, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. June 2019. The Natural Diversity Database Areas is a 1:24,000-scale, polygon feature-based layer that represents general locations of endangered, threatened and special concern species and significant natural communities. The layer includes state and federally listed species and significant natural communities. It does not include Natural Area Preserves, designated wetland areas or wildlife concentration areas. These data are recognized by the State of Connecticut supporting biodiversity and was used for this purpose in the state's SWAP.
Delaware	N		
District of Columbia	N		

State Based Data

State Name	State Based Assessment	State & plan date, Title of map	Comments & link to the plan and dataset if publicly posted Abbreviations: SWAP = State Wildlife Action Plan, COA = Conservation Opportunity Areas, SCGN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need, TNC= The Nature Conservancy
Florida	Y	Florida (2016) Priority 1 and 2 CLIP V.4 Biodiversity Resource Category Priorities Model	The Florida biodiversity layer is from: Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP) Version 4.0 Biodiversity Resource Category Priorities Model. The CLIP version 4.0 model combines conservation priorities from the SHCA, Vertebrate Richness, FNAIHAB, and Priority Natural Communities Core Data layers. For the TNC Recognized Biodiversity Value Analysis, we included only Priority 1 and 2 land (highest conservation priority). Credits: Florida State University - Florida Natural Areas Inventory, and University of Florida - Center for Landscape Conservation Planning. Credit: Florida Natural Areas Inventory, Florida State University (Jon Oetting) and Center for Landscape Conservation Planning, University of Florida (Tom Hoctor and Michael Volk). https://www.fnai.org/pdf/CLIP_v4_technical_report.pdf
Georgia	Y	Georgie (2006). SWAP Priority Conservation Areas.	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources Priority Conservation Areas 2006. In Georgia SWAP 2015 report.
Idaho	N		
Illinois	Y	Illinois (2016): COAs currently recognized through the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan (Figure 1).	Defined as "areas with significant existing or potential wildlife and habitat resources; places where partners are willing to plan, implement, and evaluate conservation actions; where financial and human resources are available, and where conservation is motivated by an agreed-upon conservation purpose and set of objectives" Centered on dataset of state's key blocks of habitat & the corridors that connect them. We removed polygons identified as rivers. https://www.dnr.illinois.gov/conservation/iwap/pages/default.aspx
Indiana	Y	Indiana (2015): Indiana conservation opportunity areas (Figure 5-22).	COAs were designated based on SGCN distribution data, unique habitat communities, assessment of long term viability, current conservation actions and partnerships, threat assessment, and connectivity/potential to reconnect, and likelihood of obtaining funding. We used just the terrestrial polygons. https://www.in.gov/dnr/fishwild/7580.htm
Iowa	Y	Iowa (2015): High Opportunity Areas for Cooperative Conservation Actions (Map 8-25).	This map sums the priorities from 22 terrestrial and aquatic assessments from field staff and many partners. Values range from 1-12, indicating the number of plans that highlighted each pixel. We selected areas that scored 4 or above (i.e. were identified in four or more of the component maps). The sources and methods are in Chapter 8. http://www.iowadnr.gov/Conservation/Iowas-Wildlife/Iowa-Wildlife-Action-Plan
Kansas	Y	Kansas (2016): Terrestrial Ecological Focal Areas (Chapter 2, Figure 3B).	Designated "Ecological Focus Areas" – landscapes where conservation actions can be applied for maximum benefit to all Kansas wildlife (Ch. 2, p. 8). Each includes a suite of SCGN and priority habitats, and a "unique set of conservation actions designed to address the specific resource concerns facing these species and habitats." Data layers include large natural areas & connectivity from the CHAT. https://ksoutdoors.com/Services/Kansas-SWAP
Kentucky	N		
Louisiana	Y	Louisiana (2019) Conservation Opportunity Areas.	LA Wildlife & Fisheries. Conservation Opportunity Areas COAS April 2019
Maine	Y	Maine Focus Areas (2010)	Maine Department of Conservation, Maine Natural Areas Program
Maryland	Y	Maryland (2016) Bionet	Maryland Biodiversity Conservation Network (Bionet). 2016 Tier 1-3 sites. Those sites described in Tiers as Critically (1), Extremely (2), Highly Significant (3) for biodiversity.
Massachusetts	Y	Massachusetts (2010) BioMap2	Woolsey, H., et al. 2010. BioMap2: Conserving the Biodiversity of Massachusetts in a Changing World. MA Department of Fish and Game/Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program and The Nature Conservancy/Massachusetts Program. 6 Feature types were extracted from BioMap2: Forest Cores, Priority Natural Communities, Species of Conservation Concern, Biomap2 Wetlands,Vernal Pool Core,and Landscape Blocks.
Michigan	Y	Michigan: Biodiversity Stewardship areas	Not from the SWAP but recommended and shared by the SWAP coordinator as the most appropriate dataset for Michigan. Developed through an intensive statewide process to develop a map of high priority areas for protecting biodiversity approximately 10 years ago. Informed the current SWAP, but map not presented in the 2015 plan.
Minnesota	Y	Minnesota (2015): The Wildlife Action Network map, terrestrial components (Fig 1.3)	The Wildlife Action Network incorporates SGCN populations and sites with high SGCN richness, as well as viability. It serves three purposes: 1) addresses large-scale habitat stressors such as climate change, fragmentation, and invasive species; 2) increase the efficiency of actions by the conservation community; 3) prioritize and focus conservation through an additional step of identifying Conservation Focus Areas (a prioritization for the next 10 years). https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/mnwap/index.html https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/env-mnwap-wildlife-action-netwrk
Mississippi	Y	Mississippi (2015) Mississippi Conservation Opportunity Areas	Mississippi Conservation Opportunity Areas: Geospatial Data Presentation Form: vector digital data https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/5849874be4b06d80b7b094fa
Missouri	Y	Missouri (2015): 2015 Conservation Opportunity Areas separated by habitat systems (Fig. 4)	In the MO SWAP, COAs were divided by type (grassland, forest, river, etc.) and each had a different set of scoring criteria. For grasslands, the criteria include a pre-settlement prairie layer, current land condition from NLCD, and community records from the Heritage Program database. We used just the terrestrial system COAs. https://mdc.mo.gov/sites/default/files/downloads/SWAPopt.pdf
Montana	Y	Montana (2015): Tier 1 Terrestrial Focal Areas (Fig. 133)	The plan delineates habitat (plant communities) of most critical conservation need as well as SGCN, emphasizing SGCN with state ranks of S1 or S2. The plan notes differences in the process east and west of Continental Divide; the east focused more on intact landscapes, while teams in the west focused more on connectivity between protected areas. http://fwp.mt.gov/fishAndWildlife/conservationInAction/actionPlan.html
Nebraska	Y	Nebraska (2015): Nebraska Natural Legacy Project: Biologically Unique Landscapes and Demonstration Sites	Identified Biologically Unique Landscapes (BULs) – based on key habitats, Heritage Program data on locations of natural communities, and at-risk species. Incorporated a fine filter of Tier 1 and Tier 2 species; the list includes vertebrates, mollusks, insects, and plants (768 species). Incorporated Spatial Analysis Optimization Tool (SPOT) and Natural Heritage Program Hotspot analysis but did not attempt to capture corridors/connectivity. Map also includes Natural Legacy demonstration sites. We removed rivers and streams. http://outdoornebraska.gov/naturallegacyproject/
Nevada	Y	Nevada (2017) Wildlife Action Plan.	Focal areas identified in the Nevada Wildlife Action Plan (2012) as discrete landscape units that provide a framework for evaluating the WAP in a statewide context. Feature Layer by cvandellen Created: Mar 13, 2017 Updated: Mar 13, 2017

State Based Data

State Name	State Based Assessment	State & plan date, Title of map	Comments & link to the plan and dataset if publicly posted Abbreviations: SWAP = State Wildlife Action Plan, COA = Conservation Opportunity Areas, SCGN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need, TNC= The Nature Conservancy
New Hampshire	N		
New Jersey	Y	New Jersey (2017). SWAP Conservation Focal Areas.	Conservation Focal Areas Version 1.0 All Landscape Regions (2017). State Wildlife Action Plan Dept of Enviornmantal Protection.
New Mexico	Y	New Mexico (2016): Conservation Opportunity Areas (Fig. 11)	Defined as areas considered to have superior potential for conserving SGCN. Incorporates priority habitats from assessments with the New Mexico CHAT tool. This priority habitat layer was intersected with 5 other GIS layers, including SCGN point locations, species distribution model polygons for SCGN, large intact blocks from CHAT. The weighting scheme included availability of funding. Clusters with scores in the top 10% were selected as COAs. http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/conservation/state-wildlife-action-plan/
New York	Y	New York (2019 TNC Portfolio update)	June 2019 Update to polygon shapes for Portfolio Species and Community Element Occurrences: Port_species_poly_int100m_woEOID.shp, Port_comms_poly_int100m_woEOID.shp Updated Matrix Forest Blocks: Matrix Update: 11 new or boundary revised blocks: Matrix_Forest_Blocks_2006_pGLny_2012_NYNHP = THIS is the NY-only version that includes the 2006 matrix blocks PLUS the Great Lakes blocks but NOT the 2011 expansion of matrix blocks in the Catskills and Hudson Highlands. It includes Tier 1 and Tier 2 matrix forest blocks. THIS is our (TNC NY) preference for use as the matrix forest block product if evaluating/analyzing within and across NY - better consistency AND what we have built our subsequent data products around (including the "Biodiversity and Wind Energy Siting in New York" web map tool (2014) and the "Natural Resource Navigator" web map tool (2017).
North Carolina	Y	North Carolina (2015) State Wildlife Action Plan	Theses NC SWAP Conservation Opportunity Area ShapeFiles were appended and included for the confirmed diversity layer/analysis. COASTAL PLAIN: Blackwater_Floodplains, Brownwater_Floodplains, Caves_Mines, Dry_LL_Pine_Forest, Estuarine_Wetlands, FW_Tidal_Wetlands, Low_Elev_Rocks, Maritime_Grasslands, Maritime_Upland_Forests, Maritime_Wetland_Forests, Mesic_Forests, Nonalluvial_Mineral_Wetlands, Pocosins, Upland_Pools_Depressions, Upland_Seeps_Spray_Cliffs, Wet_Pine_Savannas MOUNTAINS: Bogs_Fens, Caves_Mines, Cove_Forest, Dry_Coniferous_Woodlands, Grass_Heath_Balds, GW_Springs_Cavewaters_coldwater, High_Elev_Cliffs_Rocks, Inland_Floodplains, Low_Elev_Rocks, Mafic_Glades_Barrens, Montane_Oak_Forest, Northern_HW_Forest, Spruce_Fir_Forest, Upland_Pools_Depressions, Upland_Seepages_Spray_Cliffs PIEDMONT: Caves_Mines, Dry_Coniferous_Forest, Dry_LL_Pine_Forest, Low_Elev_Rocks, Mafic_Glades_Barrens, Mesic_Forests, Upland_Pools_Depressions, Upland_Seepages_Spray_Cliffs SANDHILLS: Brownwater_Floodplains, Caves_Mines, Dry_LL_Pines, Inland_Floodplains, Mesic_Forest, Nonalluvial_Mineral_Wetlands, Pocosins, Upland_Pools_Depressions, Wet_Pine_Savannas
North Dakota	Y	North Dakota (2015): North Dakota State Wildlife Plan focal areas (Figure 7)	The plan notes that "focus areas typically exhibited unique or easily identifiable differences in vegetation, soils, topography, hydrology, or land use. Focal areas are highly variable in size and often represent an area of native vegetation or a natural community type rare to North Dakota." We removed the river and stream focal areas. https://gf.nd.gov/wildlife/swap
Ohio	Y	Ohio (2015): COAs in individual maps – for example, Appalachian Foothills Forest COA (Fig 11).	A set COAs were developed by habitat type. "The idea is to concentrate efforts and resources to provide all the necessary habit requirements in a few, relatively large landscapes of major habitat types, along with the remnants of several unique habitats, for species that are of limited distribution or have low populations." COAs tend to connect nearby public lands/protected areas. We obtained a shapefile with all terrestrial COAs from the plan coordinator. http://wildlife.ohiodnr.gov/ohioswap
Oklahoma	N	Oklahoma (2015): None.	Focus area delineation is in progress.
Oregon			
Pennsylvania	Y	Pennsylvania (2011). Conservation Opportunity Areas.	Pennsylvania Conservation Opportunity Areas from https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/584991a4e4b06d80b7b0954b Terrestrial sites (freshwater sites removed). This layer displays Conservation Opportunity Areas (COA's), which are places in Pennsylvania that represent clusters of Species, as well as most critically imperiled plants and their associated habitats where collaborative conservation action should be targeted. The COAs are intended to complement, not replace, other conservation planning efforts, by providing specific recommendations focused on Species and their habitats. Credits Pennsylvania DCNR, 2011
Rhode Island	Y	Rhode Island (2019). Natural Heritage Areas. TNC Portfolio Update	1. Natural Heritage Element Occurrence Concentration Areas Citation: RIGIS, 2019. Rhode Island Natural Heritage Areas; natHeritage19. EO_concentrations. Rhode Island Geographic Information System (RIGIS) Data Distribution System, URL: http://www.rigis.org, Environmental Data Center, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island (last date accessed: 6 August 2019). Description: The Natural Heritage Areas were developed from a kernel density analysis of Heritage data element occurrences (EO). The calculation, based on a 30 meter pixel size, determines the mean number of EOs per square kilometer for each pixel. Element Occurences are discreet observations of a community or nesting site of State or Federally listed rare or threatened species OR species deemed noteworthy by the State. These data are recognized by the State of Rhode Island as places supporting biodiversity. This layer was used for this purpose in the state's SWAP. 2. Recognized Biodiversity: The Nature Conservancy in Rhode Island's Whole System Portfolio. Citation: Kevin Ruddock, GIS Manager, The Nature Conservancy in Rhode Island. It identifies examples of common habitats (matrix forest) and complementary rare habitats (patch systems). of roadless blocks identified as the best opportunity to provide connectivity between the "Borderlands" matrix forest
South Carolina	N		SWAP map covers most of the state so not precise enough to use.
South Dakota	Y	South Dakota (2015): Map of terrestrial conservation opportunity areas (Fig. 6.6).	Terrestrial and aquatic COAs were proposed to encourage voluntary ecosystem restoration with an emphasis on the occurrence of SGCN and intact native habitats (101 SCGN were identified). Used NRCS Major Land Resource Areas as framework, then within each, attempted to meet the goal of maintaining more than or restoring at least 10% of primary historical ecological ecosystems for each ecological site type. Incorporated large intact blocks from CHAT model, species richness data & other sources. https://gfp.sd.gov/wildlife-action-plan/

State Based Data

State Name	State Based Assessment	State & plan date, Title of map	Comments & link to the plan and dataset if publicly posted Abbreviations: SWAP = State Wildlife Action Plan, COA = Conservation Opportunity Areas, SCGN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need, TNC= The Nature Conservancy
Tennessee	Y	Tennessee (2015) SWAP Terrestrial Habitat Priorities High and Very High.	Tennessee SWAP 2015. Terrestrial Habitat Priorities. Category 4 High and 5 Very High
Texas	Y	Texas (2012, revising now):	Texas in in the process of revising their plan and has two types of assessments that were appropriate for this application, but only one was complete at the time of our compilation. We have incorporated an assessment a CHAT product, which incorporates SCGN distributions, but is primarily intended to identify sensitive resources and direct development away from them. This map draws information from an aggregated biodiversity value metric that is not yet complete for the state. The CHAT map uses these terrestrial maps as input, prioritizing areas that have confirmed presence and high-quality habitats. These "in progress" products were shared directly by the plan developers and are not in the current SWAP.
Utah	N		
Vermont	Y	Vermont (2019) Natural communities and species.	Natural communities and species. Vermont Natural Heritage Inventory, VT ANR, F&W. 2-27-2019. RTE and Significant Natural Communities at http://geodata.vermont.gov/datasets/VTANR::rte-and-significant-natural-communities; This is the most recent version (2/27/2019) of the RTE species and state significant natural communities available for the State of Vermont. The Vermont State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) adopts a coarse filter /fine filter strategy and relies upon this dataset for the fine filter component of the plan. As such, it is the best representation of field-verified biodiversity in the state. It is also intended to represent the natural community component of Vermont's ecoregional portfolio sites.
Virginia	Y	Virgina (2018). Conserve Virginia	Conserve Virginia NatHabitat (2018). VaNLA Cores YES high priority ConservationVision Ecological Cores are included NH Conservation Site YES- high priority Natural Heritage Conservation Sites are included
Washington			
West Virginia	N		Focus areas that covered most of the state in its SWAP so not precise enough to use.
Wisconsin	Y	Wisconsin 2015: Wisconsin Conservation Opportunity Areas (multiple regional maps).	COAs were defined as places on the landscape that contain significant ecological features, natural communities, or SCGN habitat for which WI has responsibility. These were ranked by global, continental, Upper Midwest, and state priority. The report presents separate terrestrial and aquatic COAs. We incorporated all these levels. https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/wildlifehabitat/actionplan.html A compiled statewide map is here: https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/documents/MapCOA_statewide.pdf
Wyoming	Y	Wyoming (2010): No map in the 2017 revision, but we incorporated SGCN priority areas from the 2010 plan.	Wyoming defined COAs in the 2010 SWAP based on a MARXAN analysis of priority habitats for SCGN for a suite of habitat types (input maps are shown in Figs 1-10 and 15 in the 2010 plan). This prioritization was not included in the 2017 SWAP revision, as stakeholders in Wyoming preferred access to input datasets on overlap in SCGN ranges, landscape intactness, etc., rather than the final prioritization product. We included this 2010 product but note that this is not a product that WY is currently using to guide implementation. Links to the 2017 and the 2010 plan: https://wgfd.wyo.gov/Habitat/Habitat-Plans/Wyoming-State-Wildlife-Action-Plan

Additional Biodiversity Data Sources

Name	Source(s)	Notes
GAP 1 and 2 Lands	Protected lands in GAP Status 1 or 2 as compiled from Protected Areas Database PAD-US V2 (2018) augmented by TNC's Eastern Secured Lands Dataset 2020.	This dataset included polygons from our PADV2/TNC augmented secured lands layer which represented areas of high biodiversity management and value. This included all GAP 1 and 2 Land, National Park Service National Parks and Wilderness Areas, USFS Research Natural Areas, Wilderness, Proposed Wilderness, and National Forest Roadless Areas; USFWS Wilderness, National Wildlife Refuge; BLM Wilderness areas, Research Natural Areas, National Monuments (selected for outstanding geodiversity); and The Nature Conservancy fee and easement lands. GAP1 level lands have little human interference and a mandated management plan in operation to maintain a natural state within which disturbance events can proceed without interference or are mimicked through management. GAP 2 lands have as their intent "Nature conservation, with heavy management where needed" (In some TNC Ecoregional portfolios GAP 1 and 2 ewere excluded because they were already protected.)
Confirmed Biodiversity Sites - Eastern US	State Natural Heritage Species and Natural Community Element Occurrences from 22 Eastern US states. Used with permission.	A-C quality rare species locations and A-C quality community occurrences which which were not captured in the ecoregion or state based recognized biodiversity values. The analysis also included largest resilient patch of each geophysical setting if not already captured by the the ecoregion of state-based datasets, which restricted the actual additions to a few rare and underrepresented geophysical settings.
Confirmed Biodiversity Sites - Central US	State Natural Heritage Species and Natural Community Element Occurrences from Midwestern US states. Used with permission.	One highly converted geophysical setting (Clay/Silt in the Northern Tallgrass Prairie), was not represented in the ecoregion and state-based biodiversity plan . For this setting we identified some sites of confirmed biodiversity by overlaying the natural heritage element occurrences on the areas of above-average resilience and adding in contiguous patches of resilience on this setting if they contained an A or B ranked natural community.
Greater Sage-grouse Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs)	Sage-Grouse Conservation Objectives Team (COT) 2013, USFWS. https://my.usgs.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Catalog/555a2939e4b0a92fa7ea13f6/MapServer/0	This polygon data set represents all sage-grouse Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs) identified in the 2013 Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Objectives Team (COT) Report. PACs represent areas identified as essential for the long-term conservation of the sage-grouse. The COT determined that the PACs are key for the conservation of the species range wide.