

# The importance of seasonal environmental factors in the foraging habitat selection of Alpine Ring Ouzels *Turdus torquatus alpestris*

ARNAUD G. BARRAS<sup>\*1</sup> D SOPHIE MARTI,<sup>1</sup> SARAH ETTLIN,<sup>1</sup> SERGIO VIGNALI,<sup>1</sup> JAIME RESANO-MAYOR,<sup>1</sup> VERONIKA BRAUNISCH<sup>1,2</sup> & RAPHAËL ARLETTAZ<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Conservation Biology, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Baltzerstrasse 6, CH-3012, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup> Forest Research Institute of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Wonnhaldestrasse 4, D-79100, Freiburg, Germany

Species inhabiting mountain ecosystems are expected to be particularly vulnerable to environmental change, yet information on their basic ecology is often lacking. Knowledge from field-based empirical studies remains essential to refine our understanding of the impact of current habitat alterations and for the consequential development of meaningful conservation management strategies. This study focuses on a poorly investigated and vulnerable mountain bird species in Europe, the Ring Ouzel Turdus torquatus. Our aim was to identify the species' key ecological requirements during the crucial period of nestling provisioning in the context of environmental change. We radiotracked and observed Alpine Ring Ouzels in a high-density population, investigating their pattern of foraging habitat selection in 2015 and 2017, and evaluated the transferability of these results over a wider geographical range across the SW Swiss Alps. Foraging birds selected, consistently in space and time, short grass swards (< 10 cm) with interspersed patches of accessible and penetrable soils, at intermediate moisture levels (around 40-65% volumetric water content). In Alpine ecosystems, this microhabitat configuration is typically widespread during the spring snowmelt, but extremely seasonal, with a rapid decrease in its availability over the course of the breeding season. This underlines the high vulnerability of the Ring Ouzel to environmental change: an earlier snowmelt could generate a temporal mismatch between the peak of the breeding effort and optimal foraging conditions; however, abandoning grazing activities on semi-wooded Alpine pastures may further decrease foraging habitat suitability through taller and denser grass swards, and subsequent woody vegetation encroachment. This study provides a mechanistic appraisal of the challenges Ring Ouzels will face in the future, as well as initial guidelines for targeted habitat management within timberline ecotones.

Keywords: alpine birds, conservation, seasonality, snowmelt, soil conditions, timberline.

There is growing awareness that mountain ecosystems are facing steadily increasing threats. Those most commonly identified across mountain ranges are climate change (La Sorte & Jetz 2010, Scridel *et al.* 2018), changes in land-use, in particular farming practices (Laiolo *et al.* 2004, Guo *et al.* 2018), and the increase in anthropogenic

\*Corresponding author. Email: arnaud.barras@iee.unibe.ch Twitter: @AG\_Barras disturbance (Rolando *et al.* 2007, Arlettaz *et al.* 2015). Nevertheless, there is still a paucity of research on how species of higher elevations will be affected. Contrary to the European lowland and forest avifauna, knowledge on the basic ecology and demography of alpine bird species is still lacking (Chamberlain *et al.* 2012, Lehikoinen *et al.* 2019). This precludes both predictions about their response to environmental change and framing management recommendations (Chamberlain *et al.* 2012).

Predictions of future distributions under different scenarios of climate change exist for most European bird species nowadays (Huntley et al. 2008), even combined with land-use change for specific regions (Maggini et al. 2014). These predictions mostly result from species distribution models that rely on coarse-grained environmental data, and therefore do not capture small-scale functional species-habitat associations (Braunisch et al. 2014, Brambilla et al. 2018). This is potentially problematic in alpine ecosystems where coarse-grained predictions are mainly driven by the steep macroclimatic gradient, whereas a very complex topography leading to a high diversity of microclimates and microhabitats may buffer general trends (Beniston 2003, Chamberlain et al. 2016, Brambilla et al. 2018). The harsh environment and remoteness of high-elevation ecosystems have hampered fine-grained empirical studies in the past (Chamberlain et al. 2012), although such studies represent an absolute prerequisite for meaningful predictions of future distributions (Chamberlain et al. 2016, Jähnig et al. 2018) and ought to serve as the basis for conservation management at the local scale (Morris et al. 2001, Arlettaz et al. 2012). In addition to high spatial resolution, information should also be collected at a fine temporal resolution, such that seasonal patterns of habitat selection can be assessed (Brambilla et al. 2017, Resano-Mayor et al. 2019). This is of paramount importance in highly seasonal environments such as temperate mountain ecosystems, where birds are expected to be particularly vulnerable to changes in vegetation phenology (Inouye et al. 2000) but where very few asynchronies have actually been documented (Scridel et al. 2018).

The Ring Ouzel *Turdus torquatus* is a good example of an alpine species for which information on small-scale ecological requirements is still largely lacking across its breeding range. UK uplands represent the exception, as the sharp decline of the subspecies *T. t. torquatus* in the last 50 years and its status of high conservation concern (Wotton *et al.* 2002) have prompted some studies on its autecology and population dynamics (Burfield 2002, Beale *et al.* 2006, Sim *et al.* 2013, 2015). In central and southern Europe, where the subspecies *T. t. alpestris* breeds in a rather different habitat, in semi-open coniferous forests at the timberline, studies on its ecology are scarce (von dem Bussche *et al.* 2008, Ciach & Mrowiec 2013).

Over the whole distribution range, the current population trend appears stable (BirdLife International 2018) but the well-monitored population in Switzerland, which represents around 13% of the European population (Knaus et al. 2018), has decreased by 36% over the period 1990-2018 (Swiss Ornithological Institute 2019). It is hence red-listed in the country, and is one of the seven bird species with the highest priority for the development of a recovery programme (Keller et al. 2010). In addition, its vulnerability index calculated from different large-scale scenarios of landuse and climate change is one of the highest across all Swiss breeding birds (Maggini et al. 2014). Nonetheless, although factors determining habitat selection at the territory and landscape scale in the Alps have been identified to some extent (von dem Bussche et al. 2008), information about the key drivers of local-scale habitat selection during the breeding period is still lacking. Only high-resolution studies may allow the underlying ecological mechanism of the observed decline to be deciphered (Morris et al. 2001). In this way, the vulnerability of the species can be better assessed in order to frame recommendations for future conservation.

One of the main determinants of habitat use during the reproduction period is the selection of feeding grounds, i.e. the foraging habitat selection. Parents must indeed supply large quantities of food to chicks for optimal somatic growth, representing a true energy bottleneck in the species' life-cycle. Feeding grounds providing high prey availabilities represent therefore a sine qua non for successful reproduction (Naef-Daenzer et al. 2000). For ground-foraging insectivorous birds, prey accessibility is often limited by ground vegetation structure (Atkinson et al. 2004, Schaub et al. 2010), whereas soil conditions have a large influence on both the abundance and accessibility of soil-dwelling invertebrates (Peach et al. 2004, Gilroy et al. 2008). Extensive research on the Ring Ouzel in the UK has shown that both adults (Burfield 2002) and fledglings (Sim et al. 2013) indeed favour foraging grounds with high soil pH and short grass swards within a heather-grass mosaic. Moreover, it has been hypothesized that soil conditions, such as soil moisture (Beale et al. 2006) and soil penetrability (Burfield 2002), could also play a key role, as they are known to influence the abundance and activity of earthworms (Oligochaeta; Edwards & Bohlen 1996), the staple food of Ring Ouzel nestlings (von Glutz Blotzheim & Bauer 1988, Burfield 2002, Sim *et al.* 2015).

Using radiotracking and direct visual observations, we investigated how fine-scale habitat characteristics influence the foraging habitat selection by Ring Ouzels during the nestling provisioning period in the European Alps. For this purpose, we focused on the selection of foraging grounds within the home-range (hereafter home-range scale) and on the resource acquisition within a foraging site (hereafter site scale), which correspond to the third and fourth orders of selection respectively, following the definition of Johnson (1980). Our aim was to identify key drivers of foraging microhabitat selection, and to characterize their seasonality so as to detect changes in the availability of suitable foraging habitat, all this in the perspective of future environmental change.

### METHODS

### **Study area**

The study was conducted in the central Swiss Alps. in the canton of Valais. This region is characterized by a continental climate, with warm and dry summers, and cold and wet winters. The site where radiotracking took place (46°19'50"N, 7°25'40"E), hereafter referred to as Serin, encompassed 205 ha, ranging from 1700 to 2200 m above sea level (asl), at the interface between the subalpine and the alpine belts. The zone is used for summer pasturing, with the continuous presence of cattle between mid-June and mid-September, which is a widespread traditional farming practice at these elevations in the Swiss Alps (Schulz et al. 2018). Extensive pasturing results in a habitat mosaic consisting of open grasslands interspersed with isolated or groups of coniferous trees (predominantly larches Larix decidua and spruce Picea abies). The configuration of these semi-wooded pastures is particularly attractive for breeding Ring Ouzels (von dem Bussche et al. 2008) and the average density at the study area estimated from standardized monitoring is 36 territories/km<sup>2</sup> (our unpubl. data), which is among the highest observed in the country (Knaus et al. 2018).

### **Foraging location sampling**

Ring Ouzels (n = 41) were captured using mist-nets and equipped with radio-transmitters (Holohil

Systems Ltd, Carp, Ontario, Canada, PD-2P, 3.0-3.7 g - corresponding to 3.0-3.7% of the species' mean body mass. lifespan 3-4 months) between mid-April and mid-May: 11 males and 10 females in 2015, and 10 males and 10 females in 2017. The radiotags were mounted with a leg-loop harness (loop span 76 mm, diameter 0.6 mm) made out of stretch-nylon tubes, following the method of Rappole and Tipton (1991). We tracked the birds during the whole breeding period (mid-April to the end of June) with the 'homing-in' technique, i.e. obtaining a series of repeated bearings using a radioreceiver (Australis 26k, Lawnton, Australia) coupled with a three-element hand-held Yagi antenna to approach and visually locate an individual. Each radiotagged individual was located at least twice a week to monitor its breeding status and, if possible, find its nest. From the first observations of adults provisioning chicks (2015, 16 May; 2017, 24 May), we started to track breeding adults more intensively (every 1-3 days per individual) until fledging of the brood occurred. Once a radiotracked bird was visually located, it was carefully approached (at 30-50 m distance), taking care not to influence its behaviour. From that moment, the exact spot of the first observed successful prey capture event was recorded with binoculars and marked with a labelled flag as soon as the bird had left the area. We referred to this visually evidenced prey capture as a 'foraging location'. To avoid, as far as possible, spatio-temporal correlation between the foraging locations, i.e. to achieve data independency, we left a time span of at least 30 min between two recordings from the same individual. This was enough to ensure that the bird had been provisioning nestlings in the meantime and had therefore started a new foraging bout. In 2017, several radiotagged individuals were particularly shy and showed increased flight-initiation distances, so that it was particularly difficult to obtain foraging locations for those birds. To increase our sample size, we therefore also recorded foraging locations of provisioning parents randomly encountered during radiotracking sessions. We are confident that this did not introduce any detection bias in our analysis, as all habitat types and sectors of the study area were visited regularly during the radiotracking sessions.

In 2016, 16 areas situated outside the main study area of Serin were visited once or twice along a predefined transect (1.5–3 km) during the reproductive season (15 May–27 June) to collect additional foraging locations from untagged provisioning individuals. These data, spanning from 1650 to 2200 m asl, served for external model evaluation on a wider area across the Swiss Alps with different climatic conditions (Fig. 1).

### **Habitat measurements**

The habitat selection pattern was assessed by comparing the characteristics of the habitat at actual foraging locations with neighbouring locations, which were assumed to represent less suitable habitat because they were apparently not used for foraging. For that purpose, we randomly selected two pseudo-absences (PA) in the surroundings of a foraging location following a standard procedure. A random bearing ( $\alpha$ : 0–359°) was generated, which defined the direction from the actual foraging location in which two PA locations were placed, the first one at a random distance between 5 and 14 m, and the second between 15 and 50 m. The former range (5–14 m) was chosen so as to investigate habitat selection at the foraging site scale. In effect, these distances from an actual location are within the range of a hopping bird, as typically observed during a single foraging bout (Burfield 2002, A.G. Barras pers. obs.). In contrast, the latter range (15–50 m) is more likely to express foraging habitat selection at the wider scale of the home-range, as the chosen distance is within the typical range of a Ring Ouzel flying



Figure 1. Map of the study region (Valais, Switzerland; shaded in the inset). The area where the radiotracking took place is symbolized with the letter R, and those for the collection of data for model evaluation are numbered from 1 to 16.

from one part of its home-range to another (Burfield 2002). The PA locations were generated instantly after each recorded foraging location, so that the habitat measurements could occur during the same or the next day, and hence accurately reflect the environmental conditions encountered by a foraging bird. This represents a fundamental aspect of the sampling design, as several habitat variables showed strong temporal variations due to the high seasonality of the ecosystem at these elevations, in particular as regards snow cover.

Measurements of predefined habitat variables were taken in the same way at foraging and PA locations and restricted to a plot of 1-m radius around each location, so as to describe the microhabitat. Habitat variables were classified into four main categories: ground cover, topography, vegetation height and soil conditions (Table 1). Ground cover consisted of eight classes: brown grass (dry, i.e. dead annual herbaceous plants from the previous year), green grass (new annual living plants), accessible ground (cover of bare ground and leaf/ needle litter combined; hereafter AG cover), mineral (gravel and rocks), dead wood (lying trunks and branches), snow, woody plants (shrubs and bushes below head height) and mosses. Topographical variables included slope inclination and aspect (as northness and eastness - see Table 1), both measured with a compass, and distance to the nearest snow patch if present within a radius of 50 m. Herbaceous vegetation height was measured for the brown and green grass swards separately. Two soil condition variables were also considered. Soil penetrability was measured with a penetrometer (EL 29-3729; ELE International, Loveland, CO, USA), a device that indicates the force (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>) needed to insert a metal tip into the soil to a depth of 6.35 mm, with high values thus indicating low soil penetrability. For soil moisture, we measured the volumetric water content (VWC) of the soil, calculated from its conductivity using a specific dual probe with two 51-mm rods (SM150; Delta-T, Cambridge, UK). For each soil variable, three measurements were taken within 10 cm of the centre of the plot, i.e. where prey capture occurred, with their means retained for subsequent analyses.

### **Statistical analyses**

We assessed foraging habitat selection as a function of habitat variables measured at foraging vs. PA

locations, using hierarchical logistic regression, which corresponds to a generalized linear mixedeffects model (GLMM) with a binomial error distribution and a logit link function. The habitat variables were included as fixed effects. Non-independence of the data coming from the same stratum (a triplet consisting of a given actual foraging location and its two associated PA locations) or the same individual was accounted for with nested random effects (Gillies et al. 2006), i.e. stratum nested within individual, as several foraging locations per individual had been recorded. Data from untagged and therefore unidentified individuals were given unique factor values. All analyses were performed using the software R 3.5.1 (R Development Core Team 2018) and logistic models were fitted using the *glmer* function in the R-package *lme4* (Bates et al. 2015).

Prior to model selection, several variables were transformed: marginal ground cover variables (> 90% of zero values) were not considered in the analysis, and those with more than 70% of zero values were transformed to binary presence/absence (1/0) variables. The other ground cover variables were arcsine-square-root transformed, and vegetation height variables were log-transformed. Moreover, all variables were standardized to visualize and compare the effect size directly from the coefficient estimates. We also tested the addition of squared terms to variables for which we hypothesized a hump-shaped relationship in relation to occurrence probability: soil moisture, soil penetrability, AG and green grass cover. Finally, to avoid collinearity, we checked for Pearson's correlation coefficients between the variables, retaining only those with  $|\mathbf{r}| < 0.7$ , and we carefully checked that all variables had a variance inflation factor (VIF) < 3 in all fitted models.

To characterize each order of selection separately, we fitted two different sets of models. First, foraging locations were first compared with PA in the closer range (5–14 m) and then with PA in the wider range (15–50 m). For each analysis, we adopted a model selection approach in two steps. First, for each of the four categories of variables, we generated a list of candidate models from all possible variable combinations and ranked them based on the Akaike information criterion with correction for small samples (AICc) using the function *dredge* of the package *MuMIn* (Bartoń 2018). We defined the set of best-supported models as those within  $\Delta AICc < 2$  from the first-

Ground cover       1       Brown grass       % $12.7 \pm 14.0$ $12.2 \pm 16.4$ 2       Green grass       % $44.6 \pm 28.3$ $50.3 \pm 30.5$ 3       Accessible ground       % $32.4 \pm 25.6$ $25.2 \pm 25.7$ 4       Mineral       % $2.4 \pm 4.2$ $3.6 \pm 8.0$ 5       Dead wood       % $3.2 \pm 5.3$ $3.4 \pm 6.8$ 6       Snow       % $0.9 \pm 5.1$ $1.1 \pm 7.2$ 7       Woody plants       0/1 $155/53$ $165/42$ 8       Moss       0/1 $159/49$ $167/41$	PA (15–50 m)
1Brown grass% $12.7 \pm 14.0$ $12.2 \pm 16.4$ 2Green grass% $44.6 \pm 28.3$ $50.3 \pm 30.5$ 3Accessible ground% $32.4 \pm 25.6$ $25.2 \pm 25.7$ 4Mineral% $2.4 \pm 4.2$ $3.6 \pm 8.0$ 5Dead wood% $3.2 \pm 5.3$ $3.4 \pm 6.8$ 6Snow% $0.9 \pm 5.1$ $1.1 \pm 7.2$ 7Woody plants0/1 $155/53$ $165/42$ 8Moss0/1 $159/49$ $167/41$ Topography	
2Green grass% $44.6 \pm 28.3$ $50.3 \pm 30.5$ 3Accessible ground% $32.4 \pm 25.6$ $25.2 \pm 25.7$ 4Mineral% $2.4 \pm 4.2$ $3.6 \pm 8.0$ 5Dead wood% $3.2 \pm 5.3$ $3.4 \pm 6.8$ 6Snow% $0.9 \pm 5.1$ $1.1 \pm 7.2$ 7Woody plants0/1 $155/53$ $165/42$ 8Moss0/1 $159/49$ $167/41$ Topography	$10.6\pm12.4$
3Accessible ground% $32.4 \pm 25.6$ $25.2 \pm 25.7$ 4Mineral% $2.4 \pm 4.2$ $3.6 \pm 8.0$ 5Dead wood% $3.2 \pm 5.3$ $3.4 \pm 6.8$ 6Snow% $0.9 \pm 5.1$ $1.1 \pm 7.2$ 7Woody plants0/1 $155/53$ $165/42$ 8Moss0/1 $159/49$ $167/41$ Topography	$57.3\pm30.7$
4Mineral% $2.4 \pm 4.2$ $3.6 \pm 8.0$ 5Dead wood% $3.2 \pm 5.3$ $3.4 \pm 6.8$ 6Snow% $0.9 \pm 5.1$ $1.1 \pm 7.2$ 7Woody plants0/1 $155/53$ $165/42$ 8Moss0/1 $159/49$ $167/41$ Topography	$20.7\pm23.9$
5       Dead wood       % $3.2 \pm 5.3$ $3.4 \pm 6.8$ 6       Snow       % $0.9 \pm 5.1$ $1.1 \pm 7.2$ 7       Woody plants       0/1 $155/53$ $165/42$ 8       Moss       0/1 $159/49$ $167/41$ Topography         9       Slope       ° $18.2 \pm 8.0$ $18.4 \pm 0.6$	$\textbf{3.3} \pm \textbf{8.2}$
6         Snow         %         0.9 ± 5.1         1.1 ± 7.2           7         Woody plants         0/1         155/53         165/42           8         Moss         0/1         159/49         167/41           Topography           9         Slope         °         18.2 ± 8.0         18.4 ± 0.6	$3.0\pm7.3$
7         Woody plants         0/1         155/53         165/42           8         Moss         0/1         159/49         167/41           Topography           9         Slope         °         18.2 ± 8.0         18.4 ± 0.6	$0.8\pm8.1$
8 Moss 0/1 159/49 167/41 Topography Slope ° 18.2 + 8.0 18.4 + 0.6	164/44
Topography 9 Slope  • 18.2 + 8.0 18.4 + 0.6	172/36
0 Slope $0$ 182 + 20 194 + 0.6	
$3   0.2 \pm 0.9   10.4 \pm 9.0$	$18.2\pm9.9$
10 Northness $\cos(\operatorname{aspect}^{a})$ $0.5 \pm 0.6$ $0.4 \pm 0.6$	$0.2\pm0.7$
11 Eastness $sin(aspect^a)$ $0.4 \pm 0.5$ $0.5 \pm 0.5$	$0.4\pm0.5$
12 Distance to snow (if < 50 m) m $10.6 \pm 17.2$ $10.4 \pm 13.4$	$14.3\pm17.1$
Vegetation height	
13 Brown grass height cm $2.5 \pm 1.6$ $2.7 \pm 2.0$	$3.1\pm3.2$
14 Green grass height cm $5.9 \pm 3.3$ $7.9 \pm 4.8$	$8.9\pm5.7$
Soil conditions	
15 Soil moisture VWC <sup>b</sup> $49.9 \pm 12.3$ $41.9 \pm 14.3$	$41.1\pm14.4$
16 Soil penetrability kg/cm <sup>2</sup> $0.9 \pm 0.5$ $1.2 \pm 0.7$	$1.3\pm0.6$

Table 1. Habitat variables measured at each foraging and pseudo-absence (PA) plot.

Mean  $\pm$  sd values are displayed for each group, except for woody plants and moss cover, which were transformed into binary factors as they contained > 70% of zero values, with resulting 0/1 counts shown here. Variables in italics were removed from the analysis as they contained too many NAs or zero values (> 90%). <sup>a</sup>Expressed in radians. <sup>b</sup>Volumetric water content.

ranked one, after exclusion of models with uninformative parameters, i.e. models that contained additional parameters compared with betterranked models but that have a higher AICc value (Arnold 2010). We then retained all variables appearing in at least one model of this set. In a second step, retained variables from every category were combined into a single model. The interaction term between AG cover and height of green grass was added to this model, to check for the potentially higher importance of AG cover within high ground vegetation. We then carried out the same model selection procedure as above to identify the set of best-supported models within  $\Delta AICc < 2$ . The AICc weight ( $w_i$ ) of each possible candidate model was calculated, and variable importance was assessed by summing the  $w_i$  of all the models where it appeared (following Burnham & Anderson 2002). To evaluate the performance of the best-ranked model, we calculated R-squared with the function *r.squaredGLMM* from the package MuMIn, as well as the area under the receiver operating curve (AUC) using a five-fold cross-validation. Finally, we assessed model spatial transferability by calculating the AUC on the evaluation data collected in 2016. Plots of occurrence probability against a given habitat variable were based on the best-ranked model, while setting all other retained variables to their empirical mean. The 95% credible intervals around the regression line were drawn from the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles of the posterior distribution, obtained with 10 000 simulations with the package *arm* (Gelman & Su 2018).

Finally, we investigated the seasonal pattern of the best predictors of foraging habitat selection, i.e. those for which a significant relationship was detected in at least one of the two orders of selection. We built linear mixed-effects models with each key predictor as a response variable, using *lmer* from the package *lme4* (Bates *et al.* 2015). When necessary, we transformed the response variable to meet a normal distribution and checked model assumptions looking at standard residual plots (residuals vs. fitted values, QQ-plot of the residuals). As explanatory variables, we included date and year of sampling, as well as plot type, which was either foraging or PA (PAs of both distance ranges were grouped together). In addition, interaction terms between date and year, and date and plot type, were included in all models as fixed effects, and individual identity and stratum as nested random effects; 95% credible intervals were again drawn from simulations.

### RESULTS

In total, we collected 137 foraging locations from 19 radiotagged individuals in 2015, and 71 locations from nine tagged and several untagged individuals in 2017 (ratio 26/45). For 13 radiotagged individuals, we could not record any foraging locations because we lost the signal, they did not breed or the brood failed early on. For model evaluation over a wider range, we collected 53 foraging locations from untagged individuals across 16 different areas (1-11 locations per area). Of the measured habitat variables, only AG cover and green grass cover were strongly correlated (r = -0.75). We excluded the latter, as the mean cover percentage was the highest across all plots, and removing it relaxed the unit-sum constraint of ground cover variables. All variables in our models had a VIF < 3.

# Foraging habitat selection at the site scale

A final set of four models ( $\Delta AICc < 2$ ) was obtained for the analysis of habitat selection at the scale of the foraging site. The best-ranked model explained a relatively low proportion of variance,  $R^2 = 0.19$ , with an AUC  $\pm$  sd from the cross-validation equal to  $0.70 \pm 0.07$ . Performance based on the evaluation dataset was also fairly low (AUC = 0.64). All variables showed consistent coefficient estimates in the four different models. and hence their respective effects were considered to be well represented by the first-ranked model (Table 2). AG cover had a positive effect on  $(\beta \pm se = 0.24 \pm 0.11,$ occurrence probability P = 0.03), but the quadratic term was retained as well, suggesting a hump-shaped relationship (Fig. 2), despite not being significant  $(\beta \pm se = -0.17 \pm 0.11, P = 0.12)$ . For soil moisture, the presence of an optimum was clear (linear:  $\beta \pm se = 0.65 \pm 0.12$ , *P* < 0.001; guadratic:  $-0.33 \pm 0.12$ , P < 0.01) with a peak in occurrence probability at 64% VWC (Fig. 2), whereas soil penetrability had a negative effect  $(\beta \pm se = -0.34 \pm 0.13, P < 0.01)$ , i.e. birds avoided impenetrable soils. These two soil condition variables were ranked as the most important (Table 2). A negative relationship with green grass height was highlighted only in the third-ranked model (Table A1 in the Appendix) and had the lowest variable importance overall (Table 2).

### Foraging habitat selection at the homerange scale

The analysis of foraging habitat selection at the home-range scale yielded a final set of four models. The best-supported model showed a higher performance than the site-scale model for all three evaluation metrics considered:  $R^2 = 0.33$ . crossvalidation AUC  $\pm$  sd = 0.77  $\pm$  0.10 and evaluation dataset AUC = 0.69. All variables showed consistent coefficient estimates in the four models. so that we again considered the first-ranked model to be representative of the set (Table 2). Again, moisture (linear:  $\beta \pm se = 0.49 \pm 0.14$ , soil P < 0.001; quadratic:  $-0.42 \pm 0.12$ , P < 0.001) penetrability  $(\beta \pm se = -0.64 \pm 0.15,$ and P < 0.001) were the most important predictors (Table 2), with, in addition, a potential optimal range of moisture around a peak at 41% VWC (Fig. 3), i.e. somewhat lower than at the foraging site scale. At this order of selection, green grass height ( $\beta \pm se = -0.37 \pm 0.15$ , P = 0.01) was much more important than at the site scale (0.91;Table 2), with a clear selection for short grass swards (Fig. 3). The hump-shaped relationship with AG cover (linear:  $\beta \pm se = 0.22 \pm 0.13$ , P = 0.09: quadratic:  $\beta \pm se = -0.27 \pm 0.12$ . P = 0.03) was more supported than at the site scale (Fig. 3, Table A1 in the Appendix). Finally, we detected a positive effect of northness  $(\beta \pm se = 0.21 \pm 0.12, P = 0.08)$ , indicating a selection for north-facing slopes, and a negative effect of mineral cover ( $\beta \pm se = -0.21 \pm 0.13$ , P = 0.12), although those variables were not significant and ranked among the last in importance (Table 2).

#### Seasonality of key habitat variables

Models of seasonality were fitted only for the key habitat predictors retained in the dual foraging habitat selection analysis, namely AG cover, green grass height, soil moisture and soil penetrability. The type of plot had a significant effect in all four models (Table 3), which means that the difference between foraging and PA plots was consistent throughout the breeding season for all four habitat variables (Fig. 4). The significant effect of date indicated a clear seasonal change in AG cover ( $\beta \pm se = -0.15 \pm 0.08$ , P = 0.05) and soil moisture  $(\beta \pm se = -0.35 \pm 0.07, P < 0.001)$ , both decreasing, whereas grass height ( $\beta \pm se = 0.44 \pm 0.07$ ,

Variable	Estimate $\pm$ se	Ζ	P-value	Importance
Site scale				
AG cover	$0.24\pm0.11$	2.14	0.033	0.85
AG cover <sup>2</sup>	$-0.17 \pm 0.11$	-1.55	0.121	0.51
Soil penetrability	$-0.34\pm0.13$	-2.67	0.008	0.96
Soil moisture	$0.65\pm0.12$	5.24	< 0.001	1.00
Soil moisture <sup>2</sup>	$-0.33\pm0.12$	-2.77	0.006	0.95
GG height	_	_	_	0.51
Home-range scale				
AG cover	$0.22\pm0.13$	1.70	0.089	0.94
AG cover <sup>2</sup>	$-0.27 \pm 0.12$	-2.19	0.028	0.69
Soil penetrability	$-0.64 \pm 0.15$	-4.41	< 0.001	1.00
Soil moisture	$0.49\pm0.14$	3.62	< 0.001	1.00
Soil moisture <sup>2</sup>	$-0.42\pm0.12$	-3.44	< 0.001	1.00
GG height	$-0.37 \pm 0.15$	-2.49	0.013	0.91
Mineral cover	$-0.21 \pm 0.13$	-1.55	0.122	0.49
Northness	$0.21\pm0.12$	1.76	0.078	0.63
GG height x AG cover	-	_	-	0.36

**Table 2.** Variables retained in the set of best models within  $\Delta AICc < 2$ , in the analysis of foraging habitat selection at the site and the home-range scale, respectively.

Coefficient estimates, and *Z*- and *P*-values are from the best-ranked model in each analysis, whereas importance of the variable (from 0 to 1) is the sum of Akaike weights from the models where it appears out of all model combinations. AG cover, accessible ground cover; GG height, green grass height; <sup>2</sup> quadratic term of a variable; x, interaction between two variables).



Figure 2. Values at presence and pseudo-absence plots for all three significant habitat variables at the foraging site scale, with the regression line showing the probability of occurrence from the best-ranked GLMM, along with 95% credible intervals.

P < 0.001) progressively increased (Table 3, Fig. 4). For soil penetrability, the effect of date was positive but marginally significant ( $\beta \pm se =$  $0.12 \pm 0.07$ , P = 0.07). Furthermore, an effect of year on AG cover, soil moisture and soil penetrability was evident, with different intercepts in different years (Table 3), indicating a varying spring phenology. Only for soil moisture did the slope of the regression line differ significantly between 2015 and 2017, as indicated by the interaction between year and date ( $\beta \pm se = 0.35 \pm 0.12$ , P < 0.01; Table 3). Finally, the interaction between the type of plot and date was never significant (P > 0.25 for all variables), which indicates a similar seasonal pattern in both actual foraging and PA plots.

# DISCUSSION

The present study delivers new insights into the fine-grained species-habitat associations of Alpine Ring Ouzel parents during the energetically critical period of nestling provisioning. It sheds light, in particular, on the challenges this emblematic passerine of timberline ecosystems is likely to face in an era of rapid environmental change. Birds preferentially foraged in sites with intermediate soil moisture, high soil penetrability and short ground vegetation interspersed with accessible ground. Our models further emphasize the sheer spatio-temporal variability in these key variables, highlighting in particular the need to match reproductive effort finely with the narrow time window of optimal foraging conditions.

When comparing the two different orders of habitat selection considered here (following Johnson 1980), the model of habitat selection at the foraging site scale was unsurprisingly less accurate than at the home-range scale. An increasing predictive difficulty towards higher orders of selection, i.e. finer scales, is common in studies of habitat use (Fattebert *et al.* 2018) and can be explained by the fact that PA plots that are randomly selected in the close surroundings of the foraging plot are more likely to present habitat characteristics similar to those of the foraging plot itself. Indeed, we cannot rule out that our PA plots, although reflecting true absences at the very



Figure 3. Values at presence and pseudo-absence plots for all four significant habitat variables at the home-range scale, with the regression line showing the probability of occurrence from the best-ranked GLMM, along with 95% credible intervals.

		Response variable				
	Soil moisture	Soil penetrability	Green grass height	AG cover		
Presence	$0.59 \pm 0.06^{****}$	$-0.49 \pm 0.07^{****}$	$-0.46 \pm 0.06^{****}$	0.42 ± 0.06****		
Date	$-0.35 \pm 0.07^{****}$	$0.12 \pm 0.07*$	0.44 ± 0.07****	$-0.15 \pm 0.08^{**}$		
Year 2017	0.30 ± 0.14**	0.42 ± 0.13***	$-0.31 \pm 0.19$	$0.46 \pm 0.17^{***}$		
Date x Year 2017	0.35 ± 0.12***	$-0.15 \pm 0.12$	$0.16\pm0.13$	$-0.17 \pm 0.13$		
Date x Presence	$-0.07\pm0.06$	$-0.03\pm0.07$	$-0.03\pm0.06$	$0.01\pm0.06$		

**Table 3.** Summary table of the coefficient estimates  $\pm$ se from the linear mixed-effect models fitted for each of the four key habitat predictors.

Explanatory variables are type of plot (presence/pseudo-absence), year (2015/2017) and date, as well as their interaction terms. Level of significance: \*P < 0.1, \*\*P < 0.05, \*\*\*P < 0.01, \*\*\*P < 0.001.

time of a given foraging observation, might have been visited by the same bird earlier or later on for foraging. Therefore, the metrics considered for evaluating model predictive performance, which assume no false negatives (i.e. false absences), are usually underrated (e.g. maximum AUC < 1). In addition, as regional evaluation data were collected in a different year (2016) to radiotracking data (2015 and 2017) due to logistical constraints, interannual variability in snowmelt phenology may also have influenced the predictive performance of our models. Taking these limitations into account. as well as the fine scale of our analysis (1-m radius), the overall performance of our models from the cross-validation and on the regional evaluation dataset can be deemed to be fairly good. Therefore, we consider that the significant selection patterns evidenced here are temporally consistent and can be generalized to the western central Alps, which harbour a significant fraction (c. 20%)of the Swiss Alps, if not beyond to the entire Alpine massif.

Soil conditions and ground vegetation cover and structure were the most important predictors of foraging habitat selection in our study. Those parameters have been repeatedly highlighted as crucial for several ground-foraging bird species (Atkinson *et al.* 2004, Gilroy *et al.* 2008, Schaub *et al.* 2010). Most of those studies have shown that these relationships are driven by prey availability, i.e. prey abundance modified by its accessibility. In the case of the Ring Ouzel, prey accessibility is probably driven by both soil penetrability, as prey is extirpated from the upper soil layers via beak probing, and opportunities for terrestrial foraging, which chiefly depends on ground vegetation structure. Even if we did not collect data on invertebrate prey abundance and distribution across our study area, food availability most probably explains the pattern we observed, especially because we restrained our foraging locations to ascertained prey captures.

The two soil condition variables measured here, moisture and penetrability, were the most important predictors of foraging occurrence at both scales considered (site and home-range), with birds selecting soft soils with intermediate moisture levels. Soil moisture is indeed known to influence strongly the biomass and activity of some soil invertebrates. notably earthworms (Edwards & Bohlen 1996, Peach et al. 2004). Most species of terrestrial earthworms favour a clear optimum of soil moisture, and go either deeper into the soil in response to drought or emerge on the soil surface following heavy rainfall (Edwards & Bohlen 1996). Earthworms have been identified as a main component of the diet of Ring Ouzel chicks across the species' breeding range (von Glutz Blotzheim & Bauer 1988, Burfield 2002), which seems to be corroborated by our study area (> 85% of the biomass provisioned by parents at four surveyed nests in 2017 in Serin; our unpubl. data). The avoidance of dry and very moist soils by Ring Ouzels may hence result from reduced earthworm availability under these conditions. This is further supported by a clear avoidance of impenetrable soils that are probably suited neither for earthworms nor for beak probing (Peach et al. 2004, Gilroy et al. 2008).

The selection for intermediate levels of accessible ground, as provided here by patches of bare soil surfaces and vegetation litter, underlines the importance of small-scale substrate heterogeneity in the foraging microhabitat. Similar requirements were evidenced for a variety of ground-foraging,



Figure 4. Relationship between each of the four key predictors and date during two different breeding seasons (2015 and 2017) at foraging (black) and pseudo-absence plots (light grey) from the respective fitted linear-mixed model, along with 95% credible intervals.

insectivorous farmland birds (Atkinson et al. 2004, Schaub et al. 2010, Arlettaz et al. 2012) but also for some alpine specialists such as the Whitewinged Snowfinch Montifringilla nivalis (Brambilla et al. 2017, Resano-Mayor et al. 2019). The preference for a heterogeneous microhabitat mosaic has already been demonstrated for foraging Ring Ouzels in the UK (Burfield 2002, Sim et al. 2013). The likely mechanism at play is that dense grass swards host a greater abundance of aboveand below-ground invertebrates (Atkinson et al. 2004), including earthworms (Edwards & Bohlen 1996), and that walking birds profit from the interspersed open-ground patches, which enhance prey detectability and accessibility (Schaub et al. 2010). Yet, the strong selection for short grass swards evidenced in this and other studies on the Ring Ouzel (Burfield 2002, Sim et al. 2013) indicates that prey accessibility may be traded-off against prey abundance during foraging. Interestingly, the importance of vegetation height was only clearly detected at the larger home-range scale, suggesting that, in the hierarchical process of selection, birds first elect to forage at sites with predominantly short grass, and suitable prey extraction sites are secondarily chosen within the grassy matrix.

Three of the four key habitat variables driving Ring Ouzel foraging dramatically changed with season: soil moisture and AG cover gradually decreased, whereas ground vegetation height increased. At treeline elevation in the Alps (c. 1800-2300 m), the depth and temporal duration of the snow cover constitute the main environmental drivers (Beniston 2003). In addition to its insulation property in winter, which is appreciated by overwintering Alpine wildlife (Arlettaz et al. 2015), the snowpack plays another crucial ecological role in spring, when its melt provides much of the water supply in subalpine and alpine ecosystems (Beniston 2003, Klein et al. 2016). First, the water supply resulting from snow, mirrored in our measurements of 2015, showed a progressive seasonal decrease in both average soil moisture and penetrability, whereas snow was almost fully melted at the study site when the first broods hatched. In 2017, despite a similar snowmelt phenology, both soil condition variables were much more constant across the season, probably as a result of regular precipitation and/or reduced soil desiccation during the entire breeding season. Secondly, the snowmelt also triggers the onset of the

annual vegetation cycle (Inouve et al. 2000), thus defining the timing of vegetation growth. Ring Ouzels essentially foraged in very short grass swards, with 90% of the selected foraging sites offering ground vegetation shorter than 10 cm. According to our seasonality model, the mean green grass height in PA plots had already exceeded this value on 5 and 8 June, in 2015 and 2017, respectively. This points to a fairly brief period with suitable foraging conditions, and is supported by our own field observations: parents left the breeding grounds to move towards higher elevations as soon as the brood had fledged, most probably to track suitable feeding grounds. However, we could not collect foraging information after this abrupt change in their whereabouts, as tagged birds became highly mobile and some rapidly left the study area.

Altogether, it appears that highly seasonal variables drive the foraging microhabitat selection of Ring Ouzels in the Alps. As a consequence, the availability of optimal foraging habitat progressively decreases across the period of nestling provisioning, resulting in a restricted time window with suitable conditions for breeding. High- elevation specialists are adapted to such extreme environments (Martin & Wiebe 2004), but global environmental change, in particular climate change, represents a new challenge for matching the reproductive period with optimal environmental conditions. Climatic changes are particularly marked in the spring in the Alps, with higher solar radiation and ambient temperatures causing an earlier snowmelt (Klein et al. 2016), thereby potentially affecting the breeding success of alpine birds (Martin & Wiebe 2004). In the case of the Ring Ouzel, there is a risk of phenological mismatch due to a possible discordance between the spring peak in prey availability and the timing of breeding, as already predicted for other temperate mountain birds such as the American Robin Turdus migratorius (Inouve et al. 2000), another species of thrush. However, it is as yet unknown to what extent the Ring Ouzel may adapt to such changes by advancing its breeding phenology or by moving to higher elevations. We can expect that the migration schedule of the species, as a short-distance migrant, could be shifted so as to arrive earlier in the Alps. Moreover, an elevational shift of the breeding population has been observed in Switzerland in recent decades (Knaus et al. 2018). This process may nonetheless be limited by the growth of trees,

in which most Alpine Ring Ouzels build their nests (von Glutz Blotzheim & Bauer 1988), and, higher up, by the formation of suitable soils, which is a very slow process at high elevations (Chamberlain *et al.* 2012).

Nevertheless, if, as suggested by our results, prey accessibility is vital, adaptive habitat management may to some extent buffer these detrimental effects if not compensate for them (Braunisch et al. 2014, Brambilla et al. 2018). Initial measures should consist of maintaining a variegated habitat mosaic, which would be beneficial not only for the Ring Ouzel (von dem Bussche et al. 2008), but also for other emblematic species of the Alpine timberline (Jähnig et al. 2018), notably the Black Grouse Lyrurus tetrix (Patthey et al. 2012, Braunisch et al. 2016). In effect, habitat heterogeneity guarantees the retention of suitable foraging sites, which probably explains the close association observed between the Ring Ouzel and the highly diverse and finely structured habitat matrix of the timberline ecotone in the Alps. In this respect, traditional extensive grazing practices, still widespread today in the Alps (Laiolo et al. 2004, Schulz et al. 2018), are expected to benefit this species as well as other ground-foraging birds, notably by reducing the grass sward height and by increasing the availability of patches of bare ground through livestock trampling (Pittarello et al. 2016). Traditional pasturing would also limit the risk of encroachment by the woody vegetation of these valuable semi-open wooded grasslands (Laiolo et al. 2004, Schulz et al. 2018). Another risk of habitat degradation stems from the progressive intensification of grasslands through slurry application, which results in a more homogeneous grass sward growing high and dense earlier in the season (Andrey et al. 2014). Finally, the development of ski infrastructure could also represent an additional threat, as the use of artificial snow and snow-grooming machines have wide-ranging negative effects on soil characteristics (Rixen et al. 2004) and their biodiversity (Rolando et al. 2007). All this points to a high vulnerability of the Ring Ouzel to the prevailing scenarios of climate and land-use change, which may act either singly or synergistically. In this context, the extent to which suitable alpine breeding habitat can be maintained via management, e.g. targeted grazing, needs further investigations which should optimally consider the potential evolution of agricultural practices and be carried out in controlled

experimental setups. Additionally, whether other sympatric species with similar ecological requirements benefit from such practices should be evaluated, as habitat management recommendations formulated here may have far-reaching positive effects for the biodiversity of timberline ecosystems.

We thank Chloé Berclaz, Ivan Candolfi and Clément Jourdan for their help in conducting fieldwork. The permit for bird capturing was delivered by the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (F044-0799) and authorization for radiotracking by the Swiss Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office. We are grateful to Catriona Morrison and two anonymous referees for their valuable comments on an earlier draft of the manuscript.

# DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in figshare at https://doi.org/ 10.6084/m9.figshare.8963384.v1

# REFERENCES

- Andrey, A., Humbert, J.Y., Pernollet, C. & Arlettaz, R. 2014. Experimental evidence for the immediate impact of fertilization and irrigation upon the plant and invertebrate communities of mountain grasslands. *Ecol. Evol.* **4**: 2610– 2623.
- Arlettaz, R., Maurer, M.L., Mosimann-Kampe, P., Nusslé, S., Abadi, F., Braunisch, V. & Schaub, M. 2012. New vineyard cultivation practices create patchy ground vegetation, favouring Woodlarks. J. Ornithol. 153: 229–238.
- Arlettaz, R., Nusslé, S., Baltic, M., Vogel, P., Palme, R., Jenni-Eiermann, S., Patthey, P. & Genoud, M. 2015. Disturbance of wildlife by outdoor winter recreation: allostatic stress response and altered activity–energy budgets. *Ecol. Appl.* 25: 1197–1212.
- Arnold, T.W. 2010. Uninformative parameters and model selection using Akaike's information criterion. J. Wildl. Manage. 74: 1175–1178.
- Atkinson, P.W., Buckingham, D. & Morris, A.J. 2004. What factors determine where invertebrate-feeding birds forage in dry agricultural grasslands? *Ibis* **146**: 99–107.
- Bartoń, K. 2018. MuMIn: Multi-model Inference. R package version 1.42.1. Available at: https://CRAN.R-project.org/pac kage=MuMIn (accessed 01 December 2018).
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using Ime4. *J. Stat. Softw.* 67: 1–48.
- Beale, C.M., Burfield, I.J., Sim, I.M.W., Rebecca, G.W., Pearce-Higgins, J.W. & Grant, M.C. 2006. Climate change may account for the decline in British Ring Ouzels *Turdus torquatus. J. Anim. Ecol.* **75**: 826–835.
- Beniston, M. 2003. Climatic change in mountain regions: a review of possible impacts. *Clim. Change.* **59**: 5–31.

- BirdLife International 2018. Turdus torquatus. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T22708768A132075671 (accessed 2 January 2019).
- Brambilla, M., Cortesi, M., Capelli, F., Chamberlain, D., Pedrini, P. & Rubolini, D. 2017. Foraging habitat selection by Alpine White-winged Snowfinches *Montifringilla nivalis* during the nestling rearing period. J. Ornithol. **158**: 277–286.
- Brambilla, M., Resano-Mayor, J., Scridel, D., Anderle, M., Bogliani, G., Braunisch, V., Capelli, F., Cortesi, M., Horrenberger, N., Pedrini, P., Sangalli, B., Chamberlain, D., Arlettaz, R. & Rubolini, D. 2018. Past and future impact of climate change on foraging habitat suitability in a highalpine bird species: management options to buffer against global warming effects. *Biol. Conserv.* 221: 209–218.
- Braunisch, V., Coppes, J., Arlettaz, R., Suchant, R., Zellweger, F. & Bollmann, K. 2014. Temperate mountain forest biodiversity under climate change: compensating negative effects by increasing structural complexity. *PLoS ONE* 9: e97718.
- Braunisch, V., Patthey, P. & Arlettaz, R. 2016. Where to combat shrub encroachment in alpine timberline ecosystems: combining remotely-sensed vegetation information with species habitat modelling. *PLoS ONE* 11: e0164318.
- **Burfield, I.J.** 2002. The breeding ecology and conservation of the Ring Ouzel Turdus torquatus in Britain. 160. PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. 2002. Model Selection and Multimodel Inference. New York: Springer.
- von dem Bussche, J., Spaar, R., Schmid, H. & Schröder,
   B. 2008. Modelling the recent and potential future spatial distribution of the Ring Ouzel (*Turdus torquatus*) and Blackbird (*T. merula*) in Switzerland. *J. Ornithol.* 149: 529–544.
- Chamberlain, D., Arlettaz, R., Caprio, E., Maggini, R., Pedrini, P., Rolando, A. & Zbinden, N. 2012. The altitudinal frontier in avian climate impact research. *Ibis* 154: 205–209.
- Chamberlain, D., Brambilla, M., Caprio, E., Pedrini, P. & Rolando, A. 2016. Alpine bird distributions along elevation gradients: the consistency of climate and habitat effects across geographic regions. *Oecologia* **181**: 1139–1150.
- Ciach, M. & Mrowiec, W. 2013. Habitat selection of the Ring Ouzel *Turdus torquatus* in the Western Carpathians: the role of the landscape mosaic. *Bird Study* **60**: 22–34.
- Edwards, C.A. & Bohlen, P.J. 1996. Biology and Ecology of Earthworms. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Fattebert, J., Michel, V., Scherler, P., Naef-Daenzer, B., Milanesi, P. & Grüebler, M.U. 2018. Little owls in big landscapes: informing conservation using multi-level resource selection functions. *Biol. Conserv.* 228: 1–9.
- Gelman, A. & Su, Y.-S. 2018. arm: Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models. R package version 1.10-1. Available at: https://CRAN.R-project.org/pac kage=arm (accessed 01 December 2018).
- Gillies, C.S., Hebblewhite, M., Nielsen, S.E., Krawchuk, M.A., Aldridge, C.L., Frair, J.L., Saher, D.J., Stevens, C.E. & Jerde, C.L. 2006. Application of random effects to the study of resource selection by animals. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **75**: 887–898.
- Gilroy, J.J., Anderson, G.Q.A., Grice, P.V., Vickery, J.A., Bray, I., Watts, P.N. & Sutherland, W.J. 2008. Could soil degradation contribute to farmland bird declines? Links

between soil penetrability and the abundance of Yellow Wagtails *Motacilla flava* in arable fields. *Biol. Conserv.* **141**: 3116–3126.

- von, Glutz Blotzheim, U.N. & Bauer, K.M. 1988. Turdus torquatus Linnaeus 1758 - Ringdrossel, Ringamsel. In von Glutz Blotzheim, U.N. (ed.) Handbuch der Vögel Mitteleuropas. 11/II: 801–838. Wiesbaden: AULA-Verlag.
- Guo, F., Lenoir, J. & Bonebrake, T.C. 2018. Land-use change interacts with climate to determine elevational species redistribution. *Nat. Commun.* 9: 1315.
- Huntley, B., Collingham, Y.C., Willis, S.G. & Green, R.E. 2008. Potential impacts of climatic change on European breeding birds. *PLoS ONE* **3**: e1439.
- Inouye, D.W., Barr, B., Armitage, K.B. & Inouye, B.D. 2000. Climate change is affecting altitudinal migrants and hibernating species. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 97: 1630– 1633.
- Jähnig, S., Alba, R., Vallino, C., Rosselli, D., Pittarello, M., Rolando, A. & Chamberlain, D. 2018. The contribution of broadscale and finescale habitat structure to the distribution and diversity of birds in an Alpine forest-shrub ecotone. J. Ornithol. 159: 747–759.
- Johnson, D.H. 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource preference. *Ecology* 61: 65–71.
- Keller, V., Gerber, A., Schmid, H., Volet, B. & Zbinden, N. 2010. Rote Liste Brutvögel. In *Gefährdete Arten der Schweiz, Stand 2010.* **1019**, 53. Bern & Sempach: Bundesamt für Umwelt BAFU & Schweizerische Vogelwarte.
- Klein, G., Vitasse, Y., Rixen, C., Marty, C. & Rebetez, M. 2016. Shorter snow cover duration since 1970 in the Swiss Alps due to earlier snowmelt more than to later snow onset. *Clim. Change.* **139**: 637–649.
- Knaus, P., Antoniazza, S., Wechsler, S., Guélat, J., Kéry, M., Strebel, N. & Sattler, T. 2018. Swiss Breeding Bird Atlas 2013–2016. Distribution and Population Trends of Birds in Switzerland and Liechtenstein. Sempach: Swiss Ornithological Institute.
- La Sorte, F.A. & Jetz, W. 2010. Projected range contractions of montane biodiversity under global warming. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 277: 3401–3410.
- Laiolo, P., Dondero, F., Ciliento, E. & Rolando, A. 2004. Consequences of pastoral abandonment for the structure and diversity of the alpine avifauna. J. Appl. Ecol. 41: 294–304.
- Lehikoinen, A., Brotons, L., Calladine, J., Campedelli, T., Escandell, V., Flousek, J., Grueneberg, C., Haas, F., Harris, S., Herrando, S., Husby, M., Jiguet, F., Kålås, J.A., Lindström, Å., Lorrillière, R., Molina, B., Pladevall, C., Calvi, G., Sattler, T., Schmid, H., Sirkiä, P.M., Teufelbauer, N. & Trautmann, S. 2019. Declining population trends of European mountain birds. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 25: 577–588.
- Maggini, R., Lehmann, A., Zbinden, N., Zimmermann, N.E., Bolliger, J., Schröder, B., Foppen, R., Schmid, H., Beniston, M. & Jenni, L. 2014. Assessing species vulnerability to climate and land use change: the case of the Swiss breeding birds. *Divers. Distrib.* 20: 708–719.
- Martin, K. & Wiebe, K.L. 2004. Coping mechanisms of Alpine and Arctic breeding birds: extreme weather and limitations to reproductive resilience. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 44: 177–185.
- Morris, A.J., Whittingham, M.J., Bradbury, R.B., Wilson, J.D., Kyrkos, A., Buckingham, D.L. & Evans, A.D. 2001.

Foraging habitat selection by Yellowhammers (*Emberiza citrinella*) nesting in agriculturally contrasting regions in lowland England. *Biol. Conserv.* **101**: 197–210.

- Naef-Daenzer, L., Naef-Daenzer, B. & Nager, R.G. 2000. Prey selection and foraging performance of breeding Great Tits *Parus major* in relation to food availability. *J. Avian Biol.* 31: 206–214.
- Patthey, P., Signorell, N., Rotelli, L. & Arlettaz, R. 2012. Vegetation structural and compositional heterogeneity as a key feature in Alpine Black Grouse microhabitat selection: conservation management implications. *Eur. J. Wildl. Res.* 58: 59–70.
- Peach, W.J., Denny, M., Cotton, P.A., Hill, I.F., Gruar, D., Barritt, D., Impey, A. & Mallord, J. 2004. Habitat selection by song thrushes in stable and declining farmland populations. J. Appl. Ecol. 41: 275–293.
- Pittarello, M., Probo, M., Lonati, M. & Lombardi, G. 2016. Restoration of sub-alpine shrub-encroached grasslands through pastoral practices: effects on vegetation structure and botanical composition. *Appl. Veg. Sci.* **19**: 381–390.
- **R Development Core Team** 2018. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available at: http://www.r-project.org/ (accessed 01 December 2018).
- Rappole, J.H. & Tipton, A.R. 1991. New harness design for attachment of radio transmitters to small passerines. J. Field Ornithol. 62: 335–337.
- Resano-Mayor, J., Korner-Nievergelt, F., Vignali, S., Horrenberger, N., Barras, A.G., Braunisch, V., Pernollet, C.A. & Arlettaz, R. 2019. Snow cover phenology is the main driver of foraging habitat selection for a high-alpine passerine during breeding: implications for species persistence in the face of climate change. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 28: 2669–2685.
- Rixen, C., Haeberli, W. & Stoeckli, V. 2004. Ground temperatures under ski pistes with artificial and natural snow. Arct. Antarct. Alp. Res. 36: 419–427.

- Rolando, A., Caprio, E., Rinaldi, E. & Ellena, I. 2007. The impact of high-altitude ski-runs on alpine grassland bird communities. J. Appl. Ecol. 44: 210–219.
- Schaub, M., Martinez, N., Tagmann-loset, A., Weisshaupt, N., Maurer, M.L., Reichlin, T.S., Abadi, F., Zbinden, N., Jenni, L. & Arlettaz, R. 2010. Patches of bare ground as a staple commodity for declining ground-foraging insectivorous farmland birds. *PLoS ONE* 5: e13115.
- Schulz, T., Lauber, S. & Herzog, F. 2018. Summer farms in Switzerland: profitability and public financial support. *Mt. Res. Dev.* 38: 14–23.
- Scridel, D., Brambilla, M., Martin, K., Lehikoinen, A., lemma, A., Matteo, A., Jähnig, S., Caprio, E., Bogliani, G., Pedrini, P., Rolando, A., Arlettaz, R. & Chamberlain, D. 2018. A review and meta-analysis of the effects of climate change on Holarctic mountain and upland bird populations. *Ibis* 160: 489–515.
- Sim, I.M.W., Ludwig, S.C., Grant, M.C., Loughrey, J.L., Rebecca, G.W. & Redpath, S. 2013. Seasonal variation in foraging conditions for Ring Ouzels *Turdus torquatus* in upland habitats and their effects on juvenile habitat selection. *Ibis* 155: 42–54.
- Sim, I.M.W., Wilkinson, N.I., Scridel, D., Anderson, D. & Roos, S. 2015. Food supplementation does not increase demographic rates in a passerine species of conservation concern. *Nature Conserv.* **10**: 25–43.
- Swiss Ornithological Institute 2019. Breeding population indices. Available at: https://www.vogelwarte.ch/en/birds/bird s-of-switzerland/ring-ouzel/maps-and-charts (accessed 31 August 2019).
- Wotton, S.R., Langston, R.H.W. & Gregory, R.D. 2002. The breeding status of the Ring Ouzel *Turdus torquatus* in the UK in 1999. *Bird Study* **49**: 26–34.

Received 11 April 2019; revision accepted 18 July 2019. Associate Editor: Catriona Morrison.

### **APPENDIX**

**Table 4.** Set of best-ranked models from the model selection process within  $\Delta AICc < 2$ , at site and home-range scale, respectively.

No.	Model	df	AICc	∆AICc	Weight
Site so	ale				
1	AGC + AGC <sup>2</sup> + SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen	8	529.79	0.00	0.37
2	AGC + SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen	7	530.13	0.34	0.31
3	SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen + GrGH	7	531.38	1.59	0.17
4	SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen	6	531.70	1.91	0.14
Home-	range scale				
1	AGC + AGC <sup>2</sup> + SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen + GrGH + MinCov + North	11	482.67	0.00	0.35
2	AGC + AGC <sup>2</sup> + SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen+ GrGH + North	10	483.03	0.36	0.29
3	AGC + AGC <sup>2</sup> + SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen + GrGH	9	483.63	0.96	0.22
4	AGC + SMoist + SMoist <sup>2</sup> + SPen + GrGH + MinCov + North + GrGH x AGC	11	484.62	1.95	0.13

AGC, accessible ground cover; GrGH, green grass height; MinCov, mineral cover; North, northness; SMoist, soil moisture; SPen, soil penetrability; <sup>2</sup> quadratic term; x, interaction.