

# A Landscape Connectivity Analysis for the Coastal Marten (*Martes caurina humboldtensis*) –

## List of Figures



### Suggested Citation

Schrott, G.R. and J. Shinn. May 2020. A Landscape Connectivity Analysis for the Coastal Marten (*Martes caurina humboldtensis*). U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA. 123 pp.

### Document Availability

This report and associated spatial data are available online at:

<https://www.fws.gov/arcata/shc/marten>

The following is a list of figures included in the full connectivity analysis report cited above. This list is provided as a supplement to a zipped collection of high resolution (500dpi) map figures from the full report. Please refer to the report for a more complete description and additional context for these figures.

## List of Figures

<b>Figure 1.</b> Historical range of the coastal marten ( <i>Martes caurina humboldtensis</i> ), with the four known remnant populations.....	6
<b>Figure 2.</b> Descriptive maps showing ecological conditions and management status of the coastal marten’s historical range. ....	8
<b>Figure 3.</b> Summary of our approach to modeling habitat connectivity.....	10
<b>Figure 4, Part 1.</b> The habitat and serpentine layers used to produce the resistance surface, along with a reference map. ....	17
<b>Figure 4, Part 2.</b> The road and river layers used to produce the resistance surface, and the final composite resistance surface used in the connectivity model.....	18
<b>Figure 5.</b> Relationship between pixels within the coastal marten’s historical range classified as old growth forest and resistance value “bins” of old-growth structure index.....	19
<b>Figure 6.</b> The habitat value raster surface used to delineate the habitat cores for the coastal marten connectivity model.....	24
<b>Figure 7.</b> Illustration of the process used to delineate habitat cores.....	25
<b>Figure 8.</b> Examples of how least-cost corridor width can be varied based on how the Linkage Mapper mosaic output is visualized.....	26
<b>Figure 9.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores identified using our model parameters.....	30
<b>Figure 10.</b> Modeled habitat cores and least-cost corridors for the coastal marten. ....	31
<b>Figure 11.</b> Distance equivalents of habitat core pair linkages assessed with three different metrics.. ....	33
<b>Figure 12.</b> Results of the secondary model treating the four known existing coastal marten populations as habitat cores .....	35
<b>Figure 13.</b> Clustering of coastal marten habitat cores connected by $\leq 45$ cost-weighted km. ....	44
<b>Figure 14.</b> Coastal marten least-cost corridors classified as well connected ( $\leq 15$ km), moderately connected ( $\leq 45$ km), or poorly connected ( $> 45$ km) based on cost-weighted km.....	38
<b>Figure 15.</b> Development and outcome of the timber harvest scenario .....	40
<b>Figure 16.</b> Development and output of the habitat restoration scenario. ....	42
<b>Figure 17.</b> Distribution of per pixel moving window average habitat values reveals variation in habitat quality within cores and across the landscape .....	48
<b>Figure 18.</b> Locations of habitat cores smaller than our 1500ha threshold for inclusion in the final model, but large enough to potentially support at least one coastal marten territory ( $> 300$ ha) .....	49
<b>Figure 19.</b> Perimeters of wildfires that affected coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors from 2012-2018.....	52
<b>Figure A2.1.</b> Resistance values based on habitat types derived from the GNN.....	90
<b>Figure A2.2.</b> Resistance modifications based on potentially suitable habitat on serpentine soils within 30km of the coast.....	91
<b>Figure A2.3.</b> Resistance values based on roads .....	92
<b>Figure A2.4.</b> Resistance values based on rivers, lakes, reservoirs, and estuaries.....	93

<b>Figure A2.5.</b> The final resistance surface .....	94
<b>Figure A3.1.</b> Effects of varying the minimum mean habitat value used in mapping habitat cores on the percentage of the coastal marten’s historical range that was mapped as being within a habitat core.....	98
<b>Figure A3.2.</b> Effects of varying the minimum mean habitat value used in mapping habitat cores on mean habitat core size and the total number of habitat cores.....	99
<b>Figure A3.3.</b> Examples of habitat cores produced in the sensitivity analysis for minimum mean habitat value used in the moving window .....	100
<b>Figure A3.4.</b> Examples of differences in the least-cost paths between the primary model and some of the sensitivity analyses conducted by modifying the resistance surface.....	106
<b>Figure A3.5.</b> Examples of differences in the least-cost corridors between the primary model and some of the sensitivity analyses conducted by modifying the resistance surface.....	107
<b>Figure A4.1.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores identified using our model parameters ( <i>duplicate of Fig. 9</i> ) .....	110
<b>Figure A5.1.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with land management boundaries derived from the USGS’ Protected Areas Database of the United States .....	115
<b>Figure A5.2.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with land use allocation boundaries derived from the Northwest Forest Plan .....	116
<b>Figure A5.3.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with USGS GAP status categories of conservation management .....	117
<b>Figure A5.4.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with the serpentine soils layer used in the model .....	118
<b>Figure A6.1.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores connected by least-cost corridors classified as “well connected” ( $\leq 15\text{km}$ ) or moderately connected ( $\leq 45\text{km}$ ) based on the Euclidean distance metric, with longer “poorly connected” cores omitted.....	120
<b>Figure A6.2.</b> Coastal marten least-cost corridors classified as well connected ( $\leq 15\text{km}$ ), moderately connected ( $\leq 45\text{km}$ ), or poorly connected ( $> 45\text{km}$ ) based on Euclidean distance.....	121
<b>Figure A6.3.</b> Coastal marten habitat cores connected by least-cost corridors classified as “well connected” ( $\leq 15\text{km}$ ) or moderately connected ( $\leq 45\text{km}$ ) based on the cost-weighted distance metric, with longer “poorly connected” cores omitted.....	122
<b>Figure A6.4.</b> Coastal marten least-cost corridors classified as well connected ( $\leq 15\text{km}$ ), moderately connected ( $\leq 45\text{km}$ ), or poorly connected ( $> 45\text{km}$ ) based on cost-weighted km ( <i>duplicate of Fig. 14</i> ) .....	123