

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

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

Figure A2.5. The final resistance surface	94
Figure A3.1. 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
Figure A3.2. 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
Figure A3.3. Examples of habitat cores produced in the sensitivity analysis for minimum mean habitat value used in the moving window	100
Figure A3.4. 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
Figure A3.5. 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
Figure A4.1. Coastal marten habitat cores identified using our model parameters (<i>duplicate of Fig. 9</i>)	110
Figure A5.1. 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
Figure A5.2. Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with land use allocation boundaries derived from the Northwest Forest Plan	116
Figure A5.3. Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with USGS GAP status categories of conservation management	117
Figure A5.4. Coastal marten habitat cores and least-cost corridors overlaid with the serpentine soils layer used in the model	118
Figure A6.1. 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
Figure A6.2. 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
Figure A6.3. 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
Figure A6.4. 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