## Supplemental Online Appendix

Table A1. To assess functional connectivity of Pacific marten (Martes caurina) we identified three stand types of interest (open, simple, complex) but divided these into subclasses (numbers). We used California Wildlife Habitat Relationships ((Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988) to evaluation vegetation classification. Listed CWHR vegetation types include lodgepole pine (LPN, Pinus contorta), ponderosa pine (PPN, P. ponderosa), Jeffery pine (JPN, P. jefferii), red fir (RFR, Abies magnifica), white fir (WFR, A. concolor), pine and fir dominated Sierra mixed conifer (SMC-P, SMC-F respectively), subalpine mixed conifer (SCN), montane riparian (MRI), mixed chaparral (MCH), perennial grassland (PGS), annual grassland (AGS), and barren (BAR). Vegetation sizes include diameter at breast height $(\mathrm{DBH})$ class $1=<2.5 \mathrm{~cm}$, class $2=2.5-15 \mathrm{~cm}$, class $3=15-27 \mathrm{~cm}$, class $4=28-60 \mathrm{~cm}$, class $5=>60$ cm , class $6=>60 \mathrm{~cm}$ with multi-layered canopy. Density classes include sparse ( $10-24 \%$ canopy cover), open ( $25-39 \%$ ) moderate ( $40-$ $60 \%$ ), and dense (>60\%).

|  |  | Management |  | CWHR | CWHR | CWHR |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Event(s) as listed in | Management | Vegetation | Vegetation | Vegetation |  |
| Stand | Description | FACTs | Description | Types | Sizes | Density |  |
| Open | managed (1) | Group selection | acres with <60 sq. | RFR, SCN, | $1-5$ | sparse, open |  |
|  |  |  | Small clearing <2 | LPN, MRI, |  |  |  |
|  | and managed |  |  | ft./acre | SMC-F, SMC- |  |  |


|  | before 2000 <br> (2) | Regenerating clear- <br> cut | Complete tree removal | P, WFR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Overstory removal | Removal of all <br> merchantable trees |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Removal of |  |  |  |
|  |  | Shelterwood harvest | merchantable trees, but retaining select |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | trees for re-seeding |  |  |  |
| Open | Natural openings (3) | NA |  | AGS, BAR, <br> PGS | NA | NA |
|  | Recently |  | Understory plants, |  |  |  |
|  | managed (4) | Fuels reduction | lower limbs, and | LPN, MRI, |  |  |
| Simple | and managed |  | small diameter trees | RFR, SCN, | 3-5 | open, |
|  | before 2000 |  | removed | SMC-F, SMC- |  | moderate |
|  | (5) | Commercial <br> thinning - no | Variable amounts of merchantable trees | P, WFR |  |  |


| biomass | removed |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Merchantable trees |
| Commercial | removed in addition |
| thinning - biomass | to small diameter |
|  | ( $<12$ " dbh) |
|  | Small diameter |
| Pre-commercial | ( $<12$ " dbh) trees and |
| thinning - hand | understory removed |
|  | by hand |
|  | Small diameter |
| Pre-commercial |  |
|  | ( $<12$ " dbh) trees and |
| thinning - | understory removed |
| mechanical | by machines |
|  | Downed trees, logs, |
| Windthrow fuels |  |
|  | and hazards |
| reduction | removed. |



|  | Predicted high |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | quality |  |  |  |  |
|  | reproductive |  |  |  |  |
| Complex |  | Managed includes |  | 4-6 |  |
|  | habitat (see |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | any activity, but we | LPN, MRI, |  |  |
|  | Kirk and |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | envision | RFR, SCN, |  | moderate, |
|  | Zielinski |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | "managed" stands | SMC-F, SMC- |  | dense |
|  | 2009) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | as regenerated | P, WFR |  |  |
|  | managed (9) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | forests |  |  |  |
|  | and |  |  |  |  |
|  | unmanaged |  |  |  |  |
|  | (10) |  |  |  |  |

Table A2. We collected descriptive vegetative metrics collected along food-titration experiments to characterize our stand types (complex, simple, open). We report the average value and standard error ( $\mathrm{x} \pm \mathrm{SE}$ ).

| Metric | Description | Complex | Simple | Open |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overstory | Average canopy cover percent, | $49.6 \pm 1.5$ | $26.7 \pm 2.1$ | $3.0 \pm 0.8$ |
|  | moosehorn coverscope |  |  |  |
|  | Canopy cover standard error | $11.8 \pm 0.2$ | $10.8 \pm 0.5$ | $2.2 \pm 0.5$ |
|  | Basal area of live trees | $217.0 \pm 7.8$ | $127.8 \pm 8.5$ | $37.5 \pm 9.3$ |
|  | Basal area of snags | $24.2 \pm 2.3$ | $10.6 \pm 2.7$ | $4.6 \pm 1.4$ |
|  | Basal area of live trees $>61-\mathrm{cm}$ | $47.4 \pm 3.8$ | $22.2 \pm 4.6$ | $8.9 \pm 2.3$ |
|  | diameter |  |  |  |
|  | Basal area of snags $>61-\mathrm{cm}$ | $9.9 \pm 1.2$ | $3.1 \pm 1.1$ | $1.8 \pm 0.8$ |
|  | diameter |  |  |  |
|  | Percent dwarf-mistletoe | $3.0 \pm 0.5$ | $1.5 \pm 0.2$ | $1.1 \pm 0.3$ |
|  | (Arceuthobium sp.) on live trees |  |  |  |
| Understory | Percent shrub cover | $1.3 \pm 0.5$ | $3.8 \pm 1.1$ | $13.8 \pm 2.3$ |
|  | Percent sapling cover | $6.0 \pm 1.0$ | $1.6 \pm 0.5$ | $1.1 \pm 0.4$ |
|  | Percent understory cover | $7.3 \pm 1.1$ | $5.4 \pm 1.2$ | $15.3 \pm 2.5$ |
|  | (shrub+sapling) |  |  |  |
|  | Average log diameter (cm) in | $32.4 \pm 1.2$ | $29.3 \pm 1.4$ | $34.2 \pm 2.1$ |
|  | Brown (1974) decay class 1-3, |  |  |  |
|  | indicating sound wood |  |  |  |
|  | Number of logs in decay class 1-3 | $2 \pm 0.1$ | $0.9 \pm 0.1$ | $0.6 \pm 0.1$ |

(Brown 1974)
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Total number of logs } & 2.9 \pm 0.2 & 2.1 \pm 0.5 & 1.1 \pm 0.2\end{array}$
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|  | Female |  |  |  | Male |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Mean $\pm$ SE | Range |  | n | Mean $\pm$ SE | Range |
| Summer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size (km ${ }^{2}$ ) | 5 | $2.01 \pm 0.38$ | $0.99-3.33$ |  | 11 | $4.98 \pm 0.81$ | $1.29-8.93$ |
| \% Complex | 5 | $56.6 \pm 8.5$ | $32.8-75.5$ |  | 11 | $66.5 \pm 2.9$ | $52.9-78.2$ |
| \% Simple | 5 | $33.4 \pm 7.8$ | $16.6-59.2$ |  | 11 | $24.7 \pm 3.3$ | $12.1-42.7$ |
| \% Open | 5 | $10.0 \pm 1.6$ | $7.9-16.4$ |  | 11 | $8.8 \pm 1.6$ | $1.2-17.8$ |
| Winter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size (km ${ }^{2}$ ) | 5 | $3.40 \pm 0.59$ | $1.34-4.69$ |  | 14 | $6.48 \pm 0.61$ | $1.82-11.49$ |
| \% Complex | 5 | $66.4 \pm 6.6$ | $43.0-78.5$ |  | 14 | $62.7 \pm 3.8$ | $32.0-81.4$ |
| \% Simple | 5 | $28.6 \pm 6.7$ | $15.0-51.0$ |  | 14 | $28.1 \pm 3.2$ | $13.1-59.0$ |
| \% Open | 5 | $4.2 \pm 1.1$ | $0.2-6.4$ |  | 14 | $8.6 \pm 1.9$ | $1.0-24.2$ |

Table A3. We report the composition of stand types and range within seasonal marten home range (mean $\pm$ standard errors (SE)). Size differences between winter and summer are largely due to differing individuals between each season - not an expansion or contraction of individual home range size.
n Mean $\pm$ SE Range

Winter

Figure A1. Snow depth in our study area and during data collection. Snow depth (cm) fluctuated between winter seasons at Humbug Summit Weather Station (HMB), Lassen National Forest, California (Ca Department of Water Resources). This station was located at 2010 meters elevation in a southeast-facing opening with <5\% slope. It represents minimum snowfall depth within our study area. A) Smoothed 2-week average snow depth at HMB between January 1983 and May 2014 with our study period represented by the dashed box. B) Snow depth at HMB during our study (Dec 2009-May 2013). We designated the summer and winter field seasons as July-November and December-June, but winter data was only collected with $>20 \mathrm{~cm}$ snow cover.

Figure A2. Raw data from titration experiments. Each row represents an individual titration array. Each column represents a station and a circle within a column represents a visit (4 visits total). Marten detections are indicated by filled circles. Summer detection data were represented as Complex into Simple stands (A, upper left) and Complex into Openings (B, lower left). Winter detection data were Complex into Simple stands (C, upper right) and Complex into Openings ( D , lower right). Stand types were colored for complex (green), border of two stand types (red), and open or simple (blue).

Figure A3. We did not observe differences between male and female patch use $(\mathrm{F}=0.50, \mathrm{P}=$ 0.46 ) within each season with non-incentivized methods (telemetry locations). We display mean (symbol) and 95\% confidence intervals for winter and summer seasons (triangle, circle). Samples sizes differed between winter ( 5 female, 13 male) and summer ( 4 female, 12 male). During summer, one female (F05) contributed a high amount of variance in openings due to the number of locations in talus slopes, which may provide considerable cover. With female F05 included,
the average selection value for open would change to $1.05 \pm 0.67$ (females), overlapping values for complex and simple stands (not displayed).



Figure A2.
A. Summer - Complex (green) into Simple (blue)

B. Summer - Complex (green) into Open (blue)

| 2 | \% |
| :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 8 |
| \% | 8 |
| $\frac{1}{1}$ | \% |
| \% | 8 |
| 1 | $\underline{1}$ |
| \% | \% |
| . | 8 |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{1}$ |
| $\frac{8}{8}$ | $\underline{1}$ |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |

D. Winter - Complex (green) into Open (blue)

| 8 | 8 | 8 | \% | 8 | 8 | \% | \% | : |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | \% | \% | 8 | \% | 8 |  |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | \% |
| 8 | \% | \% | \% | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | \% |
| \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | - |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | - |
| 8 | \% | 8 | \% | \% | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| \% | \% | 8 | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| \% | \% | \% | \% | $\pm$ | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 8 |  |

Figure A3.


