

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Amos Eno and the staff of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, who funded the early development of the GAP concept. Thanks to John Mosesso and Doyle Frederick of the Biological Resource Division (BRD) Office of Inventory and Monitoring, for their support of the national GAP program, especially during its transition from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to the National Biological Service and then to the U.S. Geological Survey Biological Resources Division. Thanks to Reid Goforth and the staff at the BRD Cooperative Research Units for administering GAP's research phase from headquarters. Without those mentioned above, there could not have been a Gap Analysis Program. Thanks also to the National Gap Analysis Program staff.

Within the state of West Virginia we acknowledge contributions of various federal, state, and private institutions and cooperators who provided valuable input, information and review to this project.

Major cooperation was received at the institutional level from the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources (WVDNR), US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, Marshall University, the Fish and Wildlife Information Exchange at Virginia Tech, the Westvaco Corporation, the West Virginia GIS Technical Center, the Multiple Resolution Land Cover (MRLC) Consortium, The Nature Conservancy, and West Virginia University.

Many individuals throughout the state were instrumental in various aspects of the project. We are especially grateful to Tom Allen (WVDNR), Tom Pauley (Marshall University), Jay Buckelew (Bethany College) and Mark Ford (formerly with Westvaco), for their detailed review and expert knowledge relating to our butterfly, herptile, bird, and mammal data, respectively. We thank Barbara Sargent of the West Virginia Natural Heritage Program for coordinating much of the hexagon of occurrence data generation. Walt Kordek, Sue Olcott, Scott Blackburn, Joel Harrison, Jennifer Wykle, (all with WVDNR), Doug Wood (WVDEP), Bill Tolin (USFWS), Patti Morrison (USFWS), Sally Lane (Westvaco), MaryEtta Hight (Marshall University), Jeff Waldon (Virginia Tech), Tom DeMeo (USFS), Paul Trianosky (TNC), Rodney Bartgis (TNC), Steve Stephenson (Fairmont State College), and Bill Grafton (WVU Extension) also provided their time, assistance, and knowledge.

Much of the work for the WV-GAP project was performed in the Natural Resource Analysis Center of the Davis College of Agriculture, Forestry and Consumer Sciences at West Virginia University with the support of Jerald J. Fletcher and Peter V. Schaeffer of the WVU Division of Resource Management.

The WV-GAP project was greatly enhanced through the graduate work of Ree Brannon, who initiated much of the land cover classification and GIS background work, and Tracie Earl (Hedrick), who initiated the vertebrate habitat relationship database. Robert Coxe and his field crew provided ground truthing points for land cover classification. J.B. Churchill and Will Ravenscroft performed many useful tasks related to land cover

classification and mapping, including analyzing much of the aerial videography data. Graduate students Stuart Welsh, Gary Williams, J.B. Churchill, Ann Steketee, Jerry Steketee, Katie Weakland, Michael Strager, and Bob Ries also contributed. Undergraduate technicians Sandi Schaefer, Julie Swisher, and Sara McVicker deserve special mention.

We acknowledge the support of the West Virginia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, including Becky Nestor, Janine Ostergren, and current Unit Leader Pat Mazik. Petra Bohall Wood, also with the Coop Unit, provided valuable support and advice to the project. Finally, we acknowledge and thank Sue Perry, who served as one of the original Principal Investigators for WV-GAP for several years before taking a position with the National Park Service.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 3 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | 6 |
| CHAPTER 1. Introduction | 15 |
| 1.1 How This Report is Organized | 15 |
| 1.2 The Gap Analysis Concept | 15 |
| 1.3 General Limitations | 18 |
| 1.4 The Study Area | 18 |
| CHAPTER 2. Land Cover Classification and Mapping | 23 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 23 |
| 2.2 Land Cover Classification | 23 |
| 2.3 Mapping Standards | 26 |
| 2.3.1 Positional / Location Standards | 26 |
| 2.3.2 Classification Standards | 26 |
| 2.3.3 Minimum Mapping Unit | 27 |
| 2.4 Methods | 27 |
| 2.4.1 The Land Cover Classification Scheme | 30 |
| 2.4.2 Imagery Used and Classification Procedures | 30 |
| 2.4.3 Habitat Map Development | 36 |
| 2.5 Results | 37 |
| 2.6 Accuracy Assessment | 41 |
| 2.6.1 Introduction | 41 |
| 2.6.2 Methods | 41 |
| 2.6.3 Results | 43 |
| 2.7 Limitations and Discussion | 45 |
| 2.8 Summary and Conclusions | 45 |
| CHAPTER 3. Predicted Vertebrate and Butterfly Species Distributions | 47 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 47 |
| 3.2 Mapping Standards | 48 |
| 3.3 Methods | 48 |
| 3.3.1 Criteria for Wildlife Species Inclusion in WV-GAP | 48 |
| 3.3.2 Range Extent Delineation | 50 |
| 3.3.3 Wildlife Habitat Relationships | 52 |
| 3.3.4 GIS Modeling Methods | 53 |
| 3.3.5 GIS Modeling Methods – Wetland/Riparian Amphibian and Reptile Species | 54 |
| 3.3.6 Expert Review of Species Distribution Models and Maps | 56 |
| 3.3.7 Edgematching Species Distributions with Surrounding States | 57 |
| 3.4 Results | 57 |
| 3.5 Accuracy Assessment | 62 |
| 3.5.1 Methods | 62 |
| 3.5.2 Results | 66 |
| 3.6 Limitations and Discussion | 68 |
| 3.6.1 Hexagon Distribution Maps | 68 |
| 3.6.2 Habitat Associations and Distribution Mapping | 69 |
| 3.7 Summary and Conclusions | 73 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <u>CHAPTER 4. Land Stewardship and Management</u> | 74 |
| <u>4.1 Introduction</u> | 74 |
| <u>4.2 Mapping Standards</u> | 75 |
| <u>4.3 Methods</u> | 75 |
| <u>4.3.1 Land Stewardship Mapping</u> | 75 |
| <u>4.3.2 Management Status Categorization</u> | 76 |
| <u>4.4 Results</u> | 79 |
| <u>4.5 Accuracy Assessment</u> | 84 |
| <u>4.6 Limitations and Discussion</u> | 85 |
| <u>4.7 Summary and Conclusion</u> | 85 |
| <u>CHAPTER 5. Analysis Based on Stewardship and Management Status</u> | 86 |
| <u>5.1 Introduction</u> | 86 |
| <u>5.2 Land Cover Analysis</u> | 87 |
| <u>5.2.1 Description of the Land Cover Analysis Table</u> | 87 |
| <u>5.2.2 Analyzed by Stewardship - Results</u> | 88 |
| <u>5.3 Limitations and Discussion – Land Cover Analysis</u> | 93 |
| <u>5.3.1 Background</u> | 93 |
| <u>5.3.2 Discussion of WV-GAP Cover Types</u> | 93 |
| <u>5.4 Predicted Species Distributions Analysis</u> | 98 |
| <u>5.4.1 Description of the Species Distributions Analysis Table</u> | 98 |
| <u>5.4.2 Analyzed by Stewardship - Results</u> | 98 |
| <u>5.4.3 Analysis of Special Features: Cave Species</u> | 108 |
| <u>5.4.4 Ecoregional Analysis</u> | 112 |
| <u>5.4.5 Analysis of State Endemic Species</u> | 113 |
| <u>5.4.6 Limitations and Discussion</u> | 113 |
| <u>5.5 Summary and Conclusions</u> | 113 |
| <u>CHAPTER 6. Conclusions and Management Implications</u> | 115 |
| <u>6.1 Management Implications of Gap Analysis in West Virginia</u> | 115 |
| <u>6.1.1 Review of Limitations of WV-GAP Analyses and Data</u> | 115 |
| <u>6.1.2 Review of WV-GAP Findings</u> | 116 |
| <u>6.1.3 Implications for Biodiversity Conservation in West Virginia</u> | 117 |
| <u>6.2 Future Directions for Gap Analysis in West Virginia</u> | 117 |
| <u>6.3 Current Directions for Gap Analysis in West Virginia</u> | 118 |
| <u>CHAPTER 7. Product Use and Availability</u> | 121 |
| <u>7.1 How To Obtain the Products</u> | 121 |
| <u>7.1.1 Minimum GIS Required For Data Use</u> | 122 |
| <u>7.2 Disclaimer</u> | 122 |
| <u>7.3 Metadata</u> | 123 |
| <u>7.4 Appropriate and Inappropriate Use of These Data</u> | 124 |
| <u>7.4.1 Scale</u> | 125 |
| <u>7.4.2 Appropriate Uses</u> | 125 |
| <u>7.4.3 Inappropriate Uses</u> | 126 |
| <u>GLOSSARY</u> | 127 |
| <u>LITERATURE CITED</u> | 135 |

Appendices

| | | |
|--------------|---|-------|
| Appendix 2-1 | The WV-GAP land cover classification | A-1 |
| Appendix 2-2 | Landsat Thematic Mapper (TM) Scenes used by WV-GAP. | A-3 |
| Appendix 2-3 | Descriptions of the 25 WV-GAP land cover types | A-4 |
| Appendix 2-4 | Land cover classification error matrix for comparison of WV-GAP land cover types with US Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) points. | A-5 |
| Appendix 3-1 | Example of a predicted distributional map of one of the 312 vertebrate species mapped by WV-GAP | A-10 |
| Appendix 3-2 | Example of information contained in a wildlife species atlas for each of the 312 vertebrate and 124 butterfly species mapped by WV-GAP. | A-11 |
| Appendix 3-3 | Example of WV-GAP Wildlife Habitat Relationship (WHR) database entry for Canada Warbler. | A-12 |
| Appendix 3-4 | Example of WV-GAP wildlife crosswalk database entry. | A-13 |
| Appendix 4-1 | Flow chart used as an aid in determining land management status categories. | A-14 |
| Appendix 4-2 | Land administrative units mapped by WV-GAP (status 1 and 2 only) | A-15 |
| Appendix 5-1 | Estimated area (ha) of WV-GAP cover types by stewardship category and management status. | A-22 |
| Appendix 5-2 | Estimated area (ha) of WV-GAP wildlife distributions by stewardship category and management status. | A-30 |
| Appendix 5-3 | State and Federal rankings, and habitat area (ha) for each wildlife species modeled by WV-GAP. | A-140 |
| Appendix 7-1 | List of GAP applications and data uses. | A-152 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 2-1. Ancillary data sets used to aid cluster labeling for land cover mapping in West Virginia. | 33 |
| Table 2-2. Human-influenced land cover classes superimposed on classified cluster land cover grid. | 35 |
| Table 3-1. Confidence levels assigned to hexagon occurrence data by WV-GAP. Definitions adapted from Master et al. 1995 for WV-GAP. | 50 |
| Table 3-2. Reference name, source, taxonomic group, number of records, and source date (if available) of data sources used for WV-GAP hexagon of occurrence database. Records from neighboring states (VA, PA, MD) were used for edge-matching purposes. Number of records refers to the number of individual species/hexagon combination records compiled. Date refers to the date the data were received or retrieved from the source. | 51 |
| Table 3-3. TNC Element code and common names of 43 amphibian and reptile species modeled using wetland/riparian habitat model. | 55 |
| Table 3-4. Number of native species modeled by WV-GAP, range, mean, and standard deviation of species richness within 136 WV-GAP hexagons. | 58 |
| Table 3-5. Locations used for accuracy assessment of predicted wildlife species distributions. Area (ha) from WV-GAP stewardship polygons and delineations of areas as described in references. Elevation data from 30m Digital Elevation Model data for WV. | 64 |
| Table 3-6. Accuracy assessment commission errors (CE), omission errors (OE), species correctly modeled (SC), and overall accuracy (SC/N * 100) for wildlife species distribution modeling by WV-GAP. | 67 |
| Table 4-1. Land management status definitions used by WV-GAP (after Scott et al. 1993.) | 77 |
| Table 4-2. Assignment of land stewardship categories to WV-GAP management status categories. All private lands not indicated below were assigned to Status 4b. | 78 |
| Table 4-3. Area (ha) and percent (%) of West Virginia’s land ownership categories. Accuracy discussed in section 4.5. Subtotals for major categories (private, federal, state) are indicated in bold; subtotals for sub categories (Forest Service, Department of Interior, etc.) are indicated in italics. | 83 |
| Table 4-4. Total area (ha) and percentage (%) of lands within WV-GAP management status categories. | 84 |
| Table 5-1. Estimated area (hectares) and percent of predicted distribution for WV-GAP cover types within 6 management status classes. | 89 |
| Table 5-2. Estimated area (hectares) and percent of mapped land cover types by stewardship status. Reservoirs are included in Private/Other category. Percent indicates percent of land cover's total area managed by different land stewards. | 89 |
| Table 5-3. Estimated area (hectares) and percent of predicted distribution for WV-GAP cover types within status 1 and 2. Only cover types discussed in text (section 5.2.2) are listed. | 91 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <u>Table 5-4. Estimated area of WV-GAP land cover types within status 1 and 2 areas. Percents indicate proportion of status 1 or 2 lands composed of particular land cover types.</u> | 92 |
| <u>Table 5-5. Number (N) and percent (%) of wildlife species with 0%, 0-1%, 1-2%, 2-10%, 10-50%, and 50-100% of habitat contained in management status 1&2 lands in West Virginia.</u> | 99 |
| <u>Table 5-6. Range, rankings, and habitat area of butterfly species with less than 1% or 12,500 ha of habitat within management status 1&2 lands.</u> | 100 |
| <u>Table 5-7. Range, rankings, and habitat area of wetland and riparian herptile species with less than 1% or 1250 ha of habitat within management status 1 & 2 lands.</u> | 103 |
| <u>Table 5-8. Range, rankings, and habitat area of amphibian and reptile species with less than 1% or 12,500 ha of habitat within management status 1&2 lands.</u> | 104 |
| <u>Table 5-9. Range, rankings, and habitat area of bird species with less than 1% or 12,500 ha of habitat within management status 1&2 lands.</u> | 106 |
| <u>Table 5-10. Number (N) and percent (%) of bird species in habitat guilds and categories of migratory status with zero, <1, 1-2, 2-10, and 10-50 percent of their modeled habitat within status 1 and 2 lands in West Virginia.</u> | 107 |
| <u>Table 5-11. Range, rankings, and habitat area of mammal species with less than 1% or 12,500 ha of habitat within management status 1&2 lands.</u> | 108 |
| <u>Table 5-12. Gap management status, number of caves, cave stewardship, and level of cave access assigned to caves mapped for WV-GAP analyses.</u> | 110 |
| <u>Table 5-13. Gap analysis for species utilizing cave habitats. Total caves indicates number of caves species may be found in (see text), status 1&2 indicates number of these caves within management status 1 or 2.</u> | 111 |
| <u>Table 5-14. Total area (ha) of subsections, total area and percent of each subsection within status 1 and 2 management status.</u> | 112 |
| <u>Table 7-1. Metadata Data Element Categories:</u> | 123 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 1-1 Major physiographic and human features of West Virginia | 21 |
| Figure 2-1. WV-GAP Alliance Group development framework | 25 |
| Figure 2-2. WV-GAP remote sensing classification methodology | 28 |
| Figure 2-3. WV-GAP land cover classification framework | 29 |
| Figure 2-4. Landsat TM scenes used for WV-GAP land cover classification .. | 32 |
| Figure 2-5. Land Cover for West Virginia | 39 |
| Figure 3-1. Wildlife species richness frequency distribution within 136 equal area hexagons for WV | 58 |
| Figure 3-2. Total butterfly species richness within WV-GAP hexagons | 60 |
| Figure 3-3. Total reptile and amphibian species richness within WV-GAP hexagons .. | 60 |
| Figure 3-4. Total bird species richness within WV-GAP hexagons | 61 |
| Figure 3-5. Total mammal species richness within WV-GAP hexagons | 61 |
| Figure 3-6. Total vertebrate species richness within WV-GAP hexagons | 62 |
| Figure 3-7. Accuracy assessment locations used for WV-GAP animal distribution mapping | 63 |
| Figure 4-1. WV-GAP Land Stewardship | 80 |
| Figure 4-2. Management Status for West Virginia | 82 |
| Figure 5-1. Locations of 532 mapped caves (triangles) within West Virginia’s ecological subsections | 109 |

