

PEER Data Portal – Layer Descriptions, download links, and metadata

BLM LAND HEALTH STATUS (2024) (BLM LHS Data 2024.shp)

Description: BLM grazing allotment Land Health Standards evaluation records containing the most current land health status (1997 – 2023) and identifying allotment records that failed to achieve one or more standards and where livestock grazing was determined to have been a significant factor. The BLM does not maintain grazing allotment land health standards evaluation records in electronic format or in any centralized location. This dataset is the product of an effort to compile all allotment land health standards (LHS) evaluation records and to identify the most current evaluation as of 2024.

Three separate datasets were obtained from BLM through FOIA requests since 2008, each containing records from all 21,000 allotments. records obtained from BLM were compiled from scratch by field offices from original data sources in response to each FOIA request. The data were provided in spreadsheet format but were not examined by the agency to determine whether they met agency data quality standards. Once compiled, many records of the same evaluations were available for comparison and to help reconcile errors, omissions, and inconsistencies. Every effort was made to correct these data quality problems to produce a single merged dataset containing the most current land health standards evaluation records for BLM’s 21,000 livestock grazing allotments through 2023.

These data were then joined with the BLM National Grazing Allotment polygon file for spatial exploration. These records were provided by BLM “as is”, and although every effort was made to reconcile errors and inconsistencies The User must be aware that these data may contain errors or omissions. These data are intended just for use for broad scale exploration of livestock grazing impacts on land health, as reflected in BLM’s allotment land health standards evaluation records.

Attributes:

- **objectid:** Internal feature number, a sequential unique whole number that are automatically generated
- **allot_no:** The number that identifies an Allotment which is unique within the BLM administrative state.
- **allot_name:** The name by which the allotment is commonly known.

- **gis_acres:** This is a calculated value of area in units of acres based on the area field created by default within the ESRI Polygon data structure, that includes both public and private lands
- **admin_st:** An administrative unit that identifies the state or geographic area which has administrative jurisdiction over lands, and cases BLM administrative office (which is subordinate to the state office) that has jurisdiction and/or management authority over lands within a geographic area.
- **adm_ofc_cd:** The BLM administrative office that is Administrative Office Code that identifies the Administrative Office which has jurisdiction over the lands.
- **adm_unit_cd:** The BLM administrative unit/office that is a combination of Administrative State Code and Administrative Office Code that fully identifies the geographic area which has jurisdiction over the lands.
- **st_allot:** This is a concatenation of two existing attributes but is not a substitute for having either of those two attributes. It is the existing unique code that allows identification of individual allotments throughout the entire United States.
- **active_dt:** The calendar date on which the boundary of an allotment is established and becomes effective. The format for the date will be MM/DD/YYYY, and will be entered only once for that polygon.
- **globalid:** Software generated value. A field of type UUID (Universal Unique Identifier) in which values are automatically assigned by the geodatabase when a row is created. This field is not editable and is automatically populated when it is added for existing data. This attribute is included for purposes of replication only. It is not used as a unique identifier for relationships between feature classes/tables.
- **created_da:** Date the record is created.
- **last_edi_1:** Date the record is last edited.
- **original_g:** Software generated value. A field of type UUID (Universal Unique Identifier) in which values are automatically assigned by the geodatabase when a row is created. This field is not editable and is automatically populated when it is added for existing data. This attribute is the original global ID and included for purposes of replication only. It is not used as a unique identifier for relationships between feature classes/tables.
- **shape_length:** Length of feature in internal units.
- **shape_area:** Area of feature in internal units squared.
- **publicacre:** Acres of public land within the allotment.
- **last_lheyrr:** The year of the last allotment land health evaluation or determination.
- **determ2020:** The recorded information pertaining to the land health standards determination as received from BLM in the 2020 dataset.
- **causes2020:** The recorded information pertaining the cause of causes of failure to achieve land health standards as received from BLM in 2020.
- **blmcat2020:** The recorded land health standards CATEGORY as received from BLM in the 2020 dataset. CATEGORY A is assigned to allotments that achieve or are

making significant progress towards achievement of land health standards, CATEGORY B and CATEGORY C are assigned to allotments failing to achieve land health standards and identify current livestock grazing as a significant cause of failure, CATEGORY D is assigned to allotments that fail to achieve land health standards where current livestock grazing is not identified as a significant cause, and DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE assigned to allotments that have not had a land health standards evaluation since assessments began in 1997.

- **notes2020:** Notes made when inconsistencies in BLM record information were noted.
- **causes2007:** The recorded information pertaining the cause of causes of failure to achieve land health standards as received in the first LHS dataset compiled by BLM in response to a FOIA request containing records through 2007.
- **causes2012:** The reconciled cause(s) of failure to achieve land health standards after merging of the first LHS dataset compiled by BLM in response to a FOIA request containing records through 2007 and a second later obtained containing records through 2012. During the process of merging and updating of the LHS data, many errors, omissions, and inconsistencies were identified. Many of these records had been recompiled for the same LHS evaluation and determination reports, but differed in language and materially, in dates, status, and reported causes. Best professional judgment was used in the reconciliation process, however, if reference to livestock grazing was present in the 2007 dataset but absent in the 2012 dataset, the 2012 record was assumed to have been inaccurate and “livestock grazing” was assumed to have been a cause of failure. Similarly, a number of records in the 2012 dataset reported that one or more land health standard had not been achieved but did not report a cause of nonachievement. The cause or causes reported in the 2007 dataset were used to assign land health status. In some cases, a record in one of the two datasets recorded the allotment as achieving all standards while the other reported that one or more standard had not been achieved. In these instances, the allotment was assumed to have not been achieved.
- **fincat2020:** The BLM LHS Category records were not formatted uniformly, nor often filled in or filled in correctly. This attribute just represents a standardization of the 2020 reported BLM LHS Category.
- **eco_i:** Level I Ecological Regions, highlighting major ecological areas and provide the broad backdrop to the ecological mosaic of the continent, putting it in context at global or intercontinental scales.
- **eco_ii:** Level II Ecological Regions, intended to provide a more detailed description of the large ecological areas nested within the level I regions. Level II ecological regions are useful for national and subcontinental overviews of ecological patterns.
- **eco_iii:** Level III Ecological Regions, describes smaller ecological areas nested within level II regions. At level III, the continent currently contains 182 ecological regions. These smaller divisions enhance regional environmental monitoring, assessment and reporting, as well as decision-making. Because level III regions are smaller, they

allow locally defining characteristics to be identified, and more specifically oriented management strategies to be formulated (CEC 1997).

- **last_lhe** : Date of the most recent land health standards evaluation. The format of the original data was inconsistent and incomplete. The attribute **last_lhey**r was used for data reconciliation due to problems with recorded dates.
- **lhs_2020**: (The land health standards status as of 2020 (ALL STANDARDS MET, NOT MET – LIVESTOCK, NOT MET – OTHER, DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE). The reconciled cause(s) of failure to achieve land health standards after merging of the first LHS dataset compiled by BLM in response to a FOIA request containing records through 2007, a second containing records through 2012, and the third containing records through 2019 that was compiled in 2020. During the process of merging and updating the LHS data, many errors, omissions, and inconsistencies were identified. Many of these records had been recompiled for the same LHS evaluation and determination reports, but differed in language and materially, in dates, status, and reported causes. Best professional judgment was used in the reconciliation process, however, if reference to livestock grazing was present in the 2007 or in the 2012 dataset, but absent in the 2020 dataset, the 2020 record was assumed to have been inaccurate and “livestock grazing” was assumed to have been a cause of failure. Similarly, several records in the 2020 dataset reported that one or more land health standard had not been achieved but did not report a cause of nonachievement. The cause or causes reported in the 2007 or 2012 dataset for the same LHS allotment evaluation were used to assign land health status. In some cases, a record in one of the three datasets recorded the allotment as achieving all standards while the other reported that one or more standard had not been achieved for the same land health standards evaluation. In these instances, the allotment was assumed to have not been achieved. The datasets did not always report the most recent land health evaluation. In these cases, the status of the most recent LHE was assigned to the allotment. The 2020 BLM LHS CATEGORY (A, B, C, D, ...) was assumed to be correct, but were reviewed where there was contradictory information. If an allotment was identified as CATEGORY A but the most recent LHS information from any of the three datasets identified the allotment as failing, then the category was overridden. If the information was ambiguous, the recorded BLM CATEGORY was assumed to be correct and coded with the appropriate LHS status (ALL STANDARDS MET, NOT MET – LIVESTOCK, NOT MET – OTHER, DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE). The general protocol applied throughout was that the LHS status was correct unless there was recorded information to suggest that it was not correct, and in those cases, failure overrode “met”, and “livestock” overrode “not livestock”.
- **cat_2020**: The corrected BLM's land health standards categorical status as of 2020. The reconciled cause(s) of failure to achieve land health standards after merging of the first LHS dataset compiled by BLM in response to a FOIA request containing records through 2007, a second containing records through 2012, and the third containing records through 2019 that was compiled in 2020. During the process of

merging and updating of the LHS data, many errors, omissions, and inconsistencies were identified. Many of these records had been recompiled for the same LHS evaluation and determination reports, but differed in language and materially, in dates, status, and reported causes. Best professional judgment was used in the reconciliation process, however, if reference to livestock grazing was present in the 2007 or in the 2012 dataset, but absent in the 2020 dataset, the 2020 record was assumed to have been inaccurate and “livestock grazing” was assumed to have been a cause of failure. Similarly, a number of records in the 2020 dataset reported that one or more land health standard had not been achieved but did not report a cause of nonachievement. The cause or causes reported in the 2007 or 2012 dataset for the same LHS allotment evaluation were used to assign land health status. In some cases, a record in one of the three datasets recorded the allotment as achieving all standards while the other reported that one or more standard had not been achieved for the same land health standards evaluation. In these instances, the allotment was assumed to have not been achieved. The datasets did not always report the most recent land health evaluation. In these cases, the status of the most recent LHE was assigned to the allotment. The 2020 BLM LHS CATEGORY (A, B, C, D, ...) was assumed to be correct, but were reviewed where there was contradictory information. If an allotment was identified as CATEGORY A but the most recent LHS information from any of the three datasets identified the allotment as failing, then the category was overridden. If the information was ambiguous, the recorded BLM CATEGORY was assumed to be correct and coded with the appropriate LHS status (ALL STANDARDS MET, NOT MET – LIVESTOCK, NOT MET – OTHER, DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE). The general protocol applied throughout was that the LHS status was correct unless there was recorded information to suggest that it was not correct, and in those cases, failure overrode “met”, and “livestock” overrode “not livestock”. The final categorical 2020 status was translated from the finalized lhs_2020 status into CATEGORY A (all standards met or making significant progress towards being met), CATEGORY B (not met and livestock was a significant cause), CATEGORY C (not met and livestock was a significant cause), and CATEGORY D (not met but current livestock grazing management was not a significant cause), with the addition of NOT MET – CAUSE NOT IDENTIFIED in cases of causal ambiguity, and in instances where the field was left blank, a CATEGORY was assigned based lhs_2020, except in cases of failure due to livestock, an allotment was assigned a status of CATEGORY B).

- **lhs_2024:** (The land health standards status as of 2024 (ALL STANDARDS MET, NOT MET – LIVESTOCK, NOT MET – OTHER, DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE). The reconciled cause(s) of failure to achieve land health standards after merging of the first LHS dataset compiled by BLM in response to a FOIA request containing records through 2007, a second containing records through 2012, the third containing records through 2019 and the fourth containing records through 2023 that was compiled in 2024. During the process of merging and updating of the LHS data,

many errors, omissions, and inconsistencies were identified. Many of these records had been recompiled for the same LHS evaluation and determination reports, but differed in language and materially, in dates, status, and reported causes. Best professional judgment was used in the reconciliation process, however, if reference to livestock grazing was present in the 2007, in the 2012 dataset or 2020 dataset, but absent in the 2024 dataset, the 2024 record was assumed to have been inaccurate and “livestock grazing” was assumed to have been a cause of failure. Similarly, several records in the 2024 dataset reported that one or more land health standard had not been achieved but did not report a cause of nonachievement. The cause or causes reported in the 2007, 2012, or 2020 dataset for the same LHS allotment evaluation were used to assign land health status. In some cases, a record in one of the three datasets recorded the allotment as achieving all standards while the other reported that one or more standard had not been achieved for the same land health standards evaluation. In these instances, the allotment was assumed to have not been achieved. The datasets did not always report the most recent land health evaluation. In these cases, the status of the most recent LHE was assigned to the allotment. The 2024 BLM LHS CATEGORY (A, B, C, D, ...) was assumed to be correct, but were reviewed where there was contradictory information. If an allotment was identified as CATEGORY A but the most recent LHS information from any of the three datasets identified the allotment as failing, then the category was overridden. If the information was ambiguous, the recorded BLM CATEGORY was assumed to be correct and coded with the appropriate LHS status (ALL STANDARDS MET, NOT MET – LIVESTOCK, NOT MET – OTHER, DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE). The general protocol applied throughout was that the LHS status was correct unless there was recorded information to suggest that it was not correct, and in those cases, failure overrode “met”, and “livestock” overrode “not livestock”.

- **determ2024:** The recorded information pertaining to the land health standards determination as received from BLM in the 2024 dataset.
- **causes2024:** The recorded information pertaining to the cause of failure to achieve land health standards as received from BLM in 2024.
- **cat_2024:** The corrected BLM's land health standards categorical status as of 2024. The reconciled cause(s) of failure to achieve land health standards after merging of the first LHS dataset compiled by BLM in response to a FOIA request containing records through 2007, a second containing records through 2012, the third containing records through 2019, and the fourth containing records through 2023 that was compiled in 2024. During the process of merging and updating the LHS data, many errors, omissions, and inconsistencies were identified. Many of these records had been recompiled for the same LHS evaluation and determination reports, but differed in language and materially, in dates, status, and reported causes. Best professional judgment was used in the reconciliation process, however, if reference to livestock grazing was present in the 2007, 2012 or 2019 dataset, but absent in the 2024 dataset, the 2024 record was assumed to have been inaccurate

and “livestock grazing” was assumed to have been a cause of failure. Similarly, a number of records in the 2024 dataset reported that one or more land health standards had not been achieved but did not report a cause of nonachievement. The cause or causes reported in the 2007, 2012 or 2020 dataset for the same LHS allotment evaluation were used to assign land health status. In some cases, a record in one of the three datasets recorded the allotment as achieving all standards while the other reported that one or more standard had not been achieved for the same land health standards evaluation. In these instances, the allotment was assumed to have not been achieved. The datasets did not always report the most recent land health evaluation. In these cases, the status of the most recent LHE was assigned to the allotment. The 2024 BLM LHS CATEGORY (A, B, C, D, ...) was assumed to be correct, but were reviewed where there was contradictory information. If an allotment was identified as CATEGORY A but the most recent LHS information from any of the three datasets identified the allotment as failing, then the category was overridden. If the information was ambiguous, the recorded BLM CATEGORY was assumed to be correct and coded with the appropriate LHS status (ALL STANDARDS MET, NOT MET – LIVESTOCK, NOT MET – OTHER, DETERMINATION NOT COMPLETE). The general protocol applied throughout was that the LHS status was correct unless there was recorded information to suggest that it was not correct, and in those cases, failure overrode “met”, and “livestock” overrode “not livestock”. The final categorical 2024 status was translated from the finalized lhs_2024 status into CATEGORY A (all standards met or making significant progress towards being met), CATEGORY B (not met and livestock was a significant cause), CATEGORY C (not met and livestock was a significant cause), and CATEGORY D (not met but current livestock grazing management was not a significant cause), with the addition of NOT MET – CAUSE NOT IDENTIFIED in cases of causal ambiguity, and in instances where the field was left blank, a CATEGORY was assigned based lhs_2024, except in cases of failure due to livestock, an allotment was assigned a status of CATEGORY B).

- **notes2024:** Notes made when inconsistencies in BLM record information were noted)

Metadata: [2024-4-Rangeland-Health-Map-Metadata.docx](#)

GIS files: BLM Rangeland Health Standards Mapping Project ([mangomap.com](#))

LHS Failures – Livestock (2024) (BLM LHS Data 2024.shp)

Description: BLM grazing allotment Land Health Standards evaluation records (1997 - 2023) containing the allotments identified as having failed to achieve one or more standard where livestock grazing was determined to have been a significant factor. This layer is BLM LAND HEALTH STATUS (2024) highlighting just those allotments that failed LHS where livestock grazing was a cause of non-achievement.



Regional Significance of Livestock (Level_III_Livestock_Failure_Level.shp)

Description: Significance of livestock grazing as a cause of failure to meet land health standards at the Level III Ecoregional scale. The layer represents the intersection of BLM LAND HEALTH STATUS (2020) and Western Level III Ecoregions. Allotments on Level III ecoregion boundaries are split and the portions within each ecoregion used to calculate the area of allotments within each Level III ecoregion. The calculation of “regional significance” is based on the area of allotments failing due to livestock divided by the total area of allotment assessed through 2019. This metric is used as a coarse reflection of the general sensitivity of the region to the effects of livestock grazing as a stressor or disturbance factor. This metric value was then then applied all allotments within the ecoregion, whether assessed or unassessed. The User should interpret differences at the ecoregional scale, not at an allotment scale.

BLM Allotment Management Category (2021)

(BLM_natl_allot_lhs2020joinMngtStat2021.shp)

Description: This layer is BLM LAND HEALTH STATUS (2020) with the addition of the BLM Management Category obtained from RAS. The categorization process emphasizes ensuring that land health considerations are the primary basis for prioritizing the processing and issuing of grazing authorizations for use of allotments on public lands.

- CATEGORY "I" (Improve) Allotments where current livestock grazing management or level of use on public lands is, or is expected to be, a significant causal factor in the nonachievement of land health standards, or where a change in mandatory terms and conditions in the grazing authorization is or may be necessary.
- CATEGORY M (Maintain) Allotments where land health standards are met or where livestock grazing on public lands is not a significant causal factor, or where current management is in conformance with guidelines. Allotments where an evaluation of land health standards has not been completed, but existing monitoring data indicates that resource conditions are satisfactory.
- CATEGORY C (Custodial) Allotments where public lands produce less than 10% of the forage or are less than 10% of the land area.

BLM Mgnt Category I (IMPROVE) (2021)

(BLM_natl_allot_lhs2020joinMngtStat2021.shp)

Description: Allotments identified by BLM in 2021 as “IMPROVE” Management status . CATEGORY "I" is applied to allotments where current livestock grazing management or level of use on public lands is, or is expected to be, a significant causal factor in the



non-achievement of land health standards, or where a change in mandatory terms and conditions in the grazing authorization is or may be necessary.

BLM Land Health Status and FLPMA Auth 2023

(BLMNatlGrazingAllot2024F2_ForExport.shp)

Description: This polygon feature class represents the spatial extent and boundaries for BLM Grazing Allotments. This dataset is a subset of the official national dataset, containing features and attributes intended for public release and has been optimized for online map service performance. The Implementation Guide represents the official national dataset from which this dataset was derived. This dataset is a subset of the official national dataset, containing features and attributes intended for public release and has been optimized for online map service performance. The Implementation Guide represents the official national dataset from which this dataset was derived.

LHS Failures due to Livestock (USGS) (LHS_Draft_Selection.shp)

Description: This layer is provided for the purposes of comparison with the current map of rangeland health. It was compiled independently from the first of the raw datasets used in our compiled dataset. The protocol that we used was similar to but independent of these data. It is the USGS coding of a BLM LHS dataset compiled in response to a FOIA request by a private organization in 2008. This layer identified allotments that fail to meet any standard due to livestock. (Note: this dataset is only current through 2007). Please see: Kari E. Veblen, David A. Pyke, Cameron L. Aldridge, Michael L. Casazza, Timothy J. Assal, Melissa A. Farinha, Monitoring of Livestock Grazing Effects on Bureau of Land Management Land, Rangeland Ecology & Management, Volume 67, Issue 1, 2014, Pages 68-77, ISSN 1550-7424, <https://doi.org/10.2111/REM><https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-12-00178.1>[D-12-00178.1](https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-12-00178.1).

Online: USGS CROSS-WALK OF DATA 2008 dataset:

Readme: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/690/downloads/00Readme.txt>

Metadata: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/690/downloads/metadata/>

Tabular data: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/690/downloads/Datafiles/Tables/>

GIS files: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/690/downloads/Datafiles/>

GRSG Breeding Bird Density (25%) (Range-wide_Breeding_Bird_Densities_BreedingDensity25.shp)

GRSG Breeding Bird Density (50%) (Range-wide_Breeding_Bird_Densities_BreedingDensity50.shp)



GRSG Breeding Bird Density (75%) (Range-wide_Breeding_Bird_Densities_BreedingDensity75.shp)

GRSG Breeding Bird Density (100%) (Range-wide_Breeding_Bird_Densities_BreedingDensity100.shp)

Description: “ESRI file geodatabase of greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) range-wide breeding densities at 25% (BreedingDensity25), 50% (BreedingDensity50), 75% (BreedingDensity75) and 100% (BreedingDensity100) of breeding population. The objective of this BLM project is to map high breeding densities of greater sage-grouse for use in conservation planning. This completion report provides two deliverables: 1) The analytical framework for evaluating options on where partners can deliver actions that will yield the highest return on their conservation investment, and 2) The GIS shapefiles delineating high breeding densities of sage-grouse for use by conservation planners. Maps developed here provide a largescale view of the distribution and abundance of sage-grouse, but risks and opportunities vary widely. State game and fish agencies responsible for sage-grouse conservation and management can provide additional knowledge of sage-grouse habitat needs. We encourage federal agencies and other partners to consult with their respective state wildlife agencies before implementing sage-grouse conservation actions. A major goal in greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) conservation is to spend limited resources conserving large and functioning populations efficiently. We used lek-count data (n = 4,885) to delineate high abundance population centers that contain 25, 50, 75, and 100% of the known breeding population for use in conservation planning. Findings show sage-grouse breeding abundance is highly clumped from range-wide to province and state-wide analysis scales. Breeding density areas contain 25% of the known population within 3.9% (2.92 million ha) of the species range, and 75% of birds are within 26.9% of the species range (20.4 million ha). Breeding bird abundance varies by Sage-grouse Management Zones, with Zones I, II, and IV containing 83.7% of all known sage-grouse. Zone II contains a particularly high density of birds which includes 40% of the known population and at least half of the highest density breeding areas range-wide. Despite high bird abundance in Zones I, II, and IV, maintaining current distribution of sage-grouse depends upon effective conservation in each U.S. state and Canadian province. For example, each of the 11 states that contain sage-grouse have: 1 landscape with enough breeding birds to meet the 75% breeding density threshold. Federal, state and private lands all play a role in sage-grouse conservation. On average, surface ownership within 75% breeding areas was 58.59% Federal, 35.99% privately owned, and 5.39% State lands. Diversity in surface and subsurface (e.g., mineral rights) ownership within states and provinces will play a major role in the approach used to maintain and enhance priority populations. Maps developed here provide a vision for decision makers to spatially prioritize conservation targets, but risks and opportunities vary dramatically in each state and province. More importantly, state and provincial game and fish agencies responsible for sage-grouse conservation and management have

additional knowledge of seasonal habitat needs outside the breeding season and other data useful in decision-making. We encourage federal agencies and other partners to consult states before implementing sage-grouse conservation actions. Additionally, users are encouraged to contact their state game and fish agencies for similar state-level planning maps. States have additional planning information to help users make informed local-scale decisions prior to project implementation.” Compressed ESRI file geodatabases of Sage-Grouse range-wide 25%, 50% 75% and 100% breeding densities. Reference: Doherty, K., D. E. Naugle, H. Copeland, A. Pocewicz, and J. M. Kiesecker. 2010. Energy development and conservation trade-offs: Systematic planning for sage-grouse in their eastern range. *Studies in Avian Biology*. Available on-line at: <http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/monograph.aspx> (paper #22).

Dataset:

<https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/Pages/sagegrouse.aspx>

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (2020) (acac_desg_poly_w_tbl_joins.shp)

Description: This is an aggregate national dataset describing the geographic boundaries of the ACEC within the BLM managed public lands. The designated ACECs are areas within the public lands where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources or other natural systems of processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. Modified for the GRSG CEA analysis effort by including PAD-US GAP_STATUS_CODES to determine level of protection and selecting only those equal to 1 or 2. These data are used when making management decisions and are intended to assist in the protection of the resources the ACEC was designated to protect. The documents where ACECs are located.

Dataset: https://gis.blm.gov/EGISDownload/LayerPackages/BLM_National_ACEC.zip

National Conservation Areas (NLCS) (2020)

(nlcs_wo_Monuments_NCSs+SimilarDesignations2015.shp)

Description: This layer shows the BLM National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) National Monuments, National Conservation Areas, Cooperative Management and Protection Areas, Forest Reserves, National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, and Outstanding Natural Areas. This dataset is a subset of the official national dataset, containing features and attributes intended for public release. The Implementation Guide represents the official national dataset from which this dataset was derived.



Cold Deserts Level II Ecoregion (2020) (western_level_iii_ecoregions.shp)

Description: Level II Cold Deserts ecoregions

Western Level III Ecoregion (2020) (western_level_iii_ecoregions.shp)

Description: Western Level III ecoregions

Greater Sage-grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas

(GRSG_PHMAsFeb2020.shp)

Description: Greater Sage-grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMAs) from each individual BLM ARMP and ARMPA/Record of Decision (ROD), and for subsequent updates. This dataset represents the consolidated submissions of GRSG habitat management areas from each individual BLM ARMP & ARMPA/Records of Decision (ROD) and for subsequent updates. These data were submitted to the BLM's Wildlife Habitat Spatial Analysis Lab in March 2016 and were updated for UT in April of 2017, WY in October of 2017, and CO in February of 2020. All of the data used to create this file was submitted by the EIS. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) employed by the Wildlife Habitat Spatial Analysis lab was limited to: ensuring that the submitted data did not span the EIS boundary and ensuring that the submitted habitat data did not contain overlaps between various habitat management area designations. The EIS is solely responsible for the content and quality of submitted data used to create this file. The habitat data submitted by an EIS was identified by the EIS name and alternative through the addition and calculation of the EIS_HAB field. The EIS_HAB field calculation was performed according to the following template: For Priority habitat: "EIS Name"_"PH"_"ROD". For General habitat: "EIS Name"_"GH"_"ROD" or "EIS Name"_"IH"_"ROD" (representing Idaho's Important Habitat Management Areas). Restoration Habitat management Areas (RHMA) for Montana, Linkage Connectivity Habitat Management Areas (LCHMAs) for NWCO, Other Habitat management Areas (OHMAs) for NVCA and Anthro Mountain for Utah were also included and calculated within the EIS_HAB field. The updated habitat delineations for NWCO include Undesignated Habitat (UDH) to address concerns surrounding the management of privately held irrigated agricultural lands. The BLM's NWCO Sage-Grouse Plan has no management decisions associated with this habitat designation. The Hab_Type field was calculated from the EIS_HAB field, and includes the following: PHMA, GHMA, IHMA, RHMA, OHMA, LCHMA, Anthro Mtn, and UDH. Features were dissolved to the EIS_HAB and Hab_Type fields and geometry was repaired. See the Details section of this metadata record for a description of the updates made to the original dataset.

Dataset:

https://gis.blm.gov/GRSGEISDownload/LayerPackages/BLM_WesternUS_GRSG_ROD_HabitatMgmtAreas_Feb2020.lpk



Greater Sage-grouse General Habitat Management Areas

(GRSG_GHMAsFeb2020.shp)

Description: Greater Sage-grouse General Habitat Management Areas (GHMAs) from each individual BLM ARMP and ARMPA/Record of Decision (ROD), and for subsequent updates. This dataset represents the consolidated submissions of GRSG habitat management areas from each individual BLM ARMP & ARMPA/Records of Decision (ROD) and for subsequent updates. These data were submitted to the BLM's Wildlife Habitat Spatial Analysis Lab in March 2016 and were updated for UT in April of 2017, WY in October of 2017, and CO in February of 2020. All of the data used to create this file was submitted by the EIS. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) employed by the Wildlife Habitat Spatial Analysis lab was limited to: ensuring that the submitted data did not span the EIS boundary and ensuring that the submitted habitat data did not contain overlaps between various habitat management area designations. The EIS is solely responsible for the content and quality of submitted data used to create this file. The habitat data submitted by an EIS was identified by the EIS name and alternative through the addition and calculation of the EIS_HAB field. The EIS_HAB field calculation was performed according to the following template: For Priority habitat: "EIS Name"_"PH"_"ROD". For General habitat: "EIS Name"_"GH"_"ROD" or "EIS Name"_"IH"_"ROD" (representing Idaho's Important Habitat Management Areas). Restoration Habitat management Areas (RHMA) for Montana, Linkage Connectivity Habitat Management Areas (LCHMA) for NWCO, Other Habitat management Areas (OHMA) for NVCA and Anthro Mountain for Utah were also included and calculated within the EIS_HAB field. The updated habitat delineations for NWCO include Undesignated Habitat (UDH) to address concerns surrounding the management of privately held irrigated agricultural lands. The BLM's NWCO Sage-Grouse Plan has no management decisions associated with this habitat designation. The Hab_Type field was calculated from the EIS_HAB field, and includes the following: PHMA, GHMA, IHMA, RHMA, OHMA, LCHMA, Anthro Mtn, and UDH. Features were dissolved to the EIS_HAB and Hab_Type fields and geometry was repaired. See the Details section of this metadata record for a description of the updates made to the original dataset.

Dataset:

https://gis.blm.gov/GRSGEISDownload/LayerPackages/BLM_WesternUS_GRSG_ROD_HabitatMgmtAreas_Feb2020.lpk

Greater Sage-grouse Management Zones (sageGrouseMgmtZones.shp)

Dataset:

https://map.sagegrouseinitiative.com/wildlife/reference?ll=41.3155,-115.4041&overlay=ecosystem_rr&opacity=0.50&z=10&basemap=hybrid&data=pacRef



Layer,mgmtZonesRefLayer115.4041&overlay=ecosystem_rr&opacity=0.50&z=10&base
[map=hybrid&data=pacRefLayer,mgmtZonesRefLayer](#)

Wilderness Areas (NLCS) (2024) (BLM_Natl_NLCS_Wilderness_Areas_Polygons.shp)

Description: This dataset contains the polygons that define the boundaries of the BLM National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) Wilderness Areas and Other Related Lands. In June 2000, the BLM responded to growing concern over the loss of open space by creating the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS). The NLCS brings into a single system some of the BLM's premier designations. The Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, and Other Related Lands represent three of these eleven premier designations. By putting these lands into an organized system, the BLM hopes to increase public awareness of these areas' scientific, cultural, educational, ecological and other values. The data standard for these boundaries will assist in the management of all eleven designations within the NLCS. Particularly, NLCS data pertains to the following BLM groups and their purposes: Land Use Planners, GIS Specialists, NLCS team leads, BLM managers, and public stakeholder groups.

Dataset: <https://gbp-blm-egis.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/BLM-EGIS::blm-natl-nlcs-wilderness-areas-polygons/explore?location=0.001505%2C65.615642%2C0.00>

Wilderness Study Areas (NLCS) (2024)

(BLM Natl NLCS Wilderness Study Areas Polygons.shp)

Description: This dataset contains the polygons that define the boundaries of the BLM National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) Wilderness Study Areas and Other Related Lands. In June 2000, the BLM responded to growing concern over the loss of open space by creating the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS). The NLCS brings into a single system some of the BLM's premier designations. The Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, and Other Related Lands represent three of these eleven premier designations. By putting these lands into an organized system, the BLM hopes to increase public awareness of these areas' scientific, cultural, educational, ecological and other values. The data standard for these boundaries will assist in the management of all eleven designations within the NLCS. Particularly, NLCS data pertains to the following BLM groups and their purposes: Land Use Planners, GIS Specialists, NLCS team leads, BLM managers, and public stakeholder groups.

Dataset: <https://gbp-blm-egis.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/BLM-EGIS::blm-natl-nlcs-wilderness-study-areas-polygons/explore?location=0.002223%2C50.088441%2C0.00>

Wild Horse and Burro Herd Mgmt Areas (2024)

(BLM_Natl_Wild_Horse_and_Burro_herd_Mgmt_Area_Polygons_2024.shp)

Description: This dataset defines the boundaries for Wild Horse and Burro (WHB) Herd Areas (designated in The Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971 as areas that wild horses and burros appeared to be inhabiting) and Herd Management Areas (Congressionally designated area of land to which specific laws and regulations pertaining to the management of wild horses and burros are applied).

Dataset: <https://gbp-blm-egis.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/BLM-EGIS::blm-natl-wild-horse-and-burro-herd-mgmt-area-polygons/explore?location=0.001498%2C65.512601%2C0.00>

BLM Natl AIM TerrADat (2024) (BLM_Natl_AIM_TerrADat_Hub.shp)

Description: This point feature class shows the data from the terrestrial Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring (AIM) program. This dataset was created to monitor the status, condition and trend of national BLM resources in accordance with BLM policies. The methodology used for the collection of these data can be found on landscapetoolbox.org and the Monitoring Manual for Grassland, Shrubland and Savanna Ecosystems, 2nd Edition. These data should not be used for statistical or spatial inferences without knowledge of how the sample design was drawn or without calculating spatial weights for the points based on the sample design.

Dataset: <https://gbp-blm-egis.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/BLM-EGIS::blm-natl-aim-terradat-hub/explore>

BLM Natl AIM AquADat Lotic (2024) (BLM_Natl_AIM_AquAdat_Lotic.shp)

Description: This dataset was created to monitor the status, condition and trend of national BLM resources in accordance with BLM policies. The methodology used for the collection of these data can be found in TR 1735-2 (AIM National Aquatic Monitoring Framework: Field Protocol for Wadeable Lotic System). These data should not be used for statistical or spatial inferences without knowledge of how the sample design was drawn or without calculating spatial weights for the points based on the sample design.

Dataset: <https://gbp-blm-egis.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/BLM-EGIS::blm-natl-aim-lotic-indicators-hub/explore>



US Drought Monitor Map 9/19/2023 (US Drought Monitor 20230919.shp)

Description: This layer was included just as a backdrop just to explore other layers against a backdrop of a snapshot of ongoing drought conditions (circa 9/19/2023). The Cold Desert Level II Ecoregion has some of the highest livestock related failure levels of grazing lands under BLM management. As drought conditions worsen, both resistance and resilience in this ecoregion can be expected to decrease and become more susceptible to impacts of grazing as an ecosystem stressor and disturbance factor.

Dataset: <https://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/DmData/GISData.aspx>

Drought Frequency 2019 to 2023 (DroughtFrequency2019_2023.shp)

Description: This layer includes a count of years each county experienced drought classified by the FSA as D3+ between 2019 - 2023.

Dataset: <https://arcg.is/1aLS5j2>

Old Spanish NHT (Old Spanish NHT.shp)

Description: This is a vector line showing the designated trail alignment of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail. The coordinates for this dataset were gathered from a variety of sources at a variety of scales. Some source materials were large-scale, while others were small-scale and included 1:100,000 or even 1:500,000 material. The purpose of this feature service is to show the location of designated trail alignment of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail. The intended use of all data in the trail GIS library is to support diverse trail administration activities including planning, management, maintenance, research, and interpretation. To view additional metadata and to download the shapefile, please visit the National Park Service, Integrated Resource Management Application (IRMA) website:

<https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/Reference/Profile/2244633>

Dataset: <https://arcg.is/OWGrS>