Colony size and foraging range in seabirds

Roger Jovani¹, Ben Lascelles², László Zsolt Garamszegi¹, Roddy Mavor³,
Chris B. Thaxter⁴, Daniel Oro⁵

¹Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Estación Biológica de Doñana, CSIC,
Seville, Spain.

²BirdLife International, Wellbrook Court, Girton Road, Cambridge CB3 0NA, UK.

³Seabird Monitoring Programme, J.N.C.C., Inverdee House, Baxter Street, Aberdeen, AB11
1QA, UK.

⁴British Trust for Ornithology, The Nunnery, Thetford, Norfolk IP24 2PU, UK

⁵Population Ecology Group, Institut Mediterrani d'Estudis Avançats (IMEDEA), CSIC-UIB,
MiquelMarquès 21, Esporles, Mallorca 07190 Spain.

Corresponding author:

Roger Jovani

Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Estación Biológica de Doñana, CSIC,
Avenida Americo Vespucio s/n, 41092, Seville, Spain

E-mail: jovani@ebd.csic.es

Abstract

The reasons for variation in group size among animal species remain poorly understood. Using “Ashmole’s halo” hypothesis of food depletion around colonies, we predict that foraging range imposes a ceiling on the maximum colony size of seabird species. We tested this with a phylogenetic comparative study of 43 species of seabirds (28,262 colonies), and investigated the interspecific correlation between colony size and foraging ranges. Foraging range showed weak relationships with the low percentiles of colony size of species, but the strength of the association increased for larger percentiles, peaking at the maximum colony sizes. To model constraints on the functional relationship between the focal traits, we applied a quantile regression based on maximum colony size. This showed that foraging range imposes a constraint to species' maximum colony sizes with a slope around 2. This second-order relationship is expected from the equation of the area of a circle. Thus, our large dataset and innovative statistical approach shows that foraging range imposes a ceiling on seabird colony sizes, providing strong support to the hypothesis that food availability is an important regulator of seabird populations.

Key-words: birds, food, group living, marine, sociality, phylogenetic comparative analysis.

Introduction

Colonial living shapes the ecology of 13% of extant bird species (Wittenberger and Hunt 1985, Rolland et al. 1998). Colony size can range from a few pairs up to millions of birds breeding together. Understanding the causes (e.g. conspecific attraction, food availability) and consequences (e.g. negative density dependence, parasitism) of such colony size variation is not only important to understand the ecology of colonial birds (Lack 1954, 1967, Wittenberger & Hunt 1985, Brown et al. 1990, Siegel-Causey & Kharitonov 1990, Rolland et al. 1998, Brown & Brown 2000, 2001, Coulson 2002, Safran 2004, Serrano and Tella 2007), but is also relevant for our interpretations about group living in general (Krause & Ruxton 2002), and to inform conservation policies (Mitchell et al. 2004). This is especially true in seabirds, where most species breed in colonies (Rolland et al. 1998). Accordingly, understanding colony size variation and its implications has been the driver of much research in seabird ecology (Ashmole 1963, Cairns 1989, Furness and Birkhead 1984, Lewis et al. 2001, Coulson 2002, Forero et al. 2002, Ainley et al. 2004, Ballance et al. 2009). However, while much research has been devoted to intraspecific patterns in colony size variation, less has been done at the interspecific level.

In two previous studies, analyzing thousands of colonies of varying sizes for tens of species, we showed (1) a huge variation in colony size within and between seabird species, showing colony size frequency distributions from log-normal to power laws, often spanning from very small to very large colony sizes within species (Jovani et al. 2008). (2) This intraspecific variation does not blur interspecific differences, and some species consistently show much larger median (repeatability analysis: $R=0.73$, 95% CI=0.46-0.93), 95th percentile (0.88 (0.77-0.97)), and maximum (0.80 (0.61-0.95)) colony sizes than others, when comparing populations of the same seabird species in different geographic areas (Jovani et al. 2012). That is,

typical and maximum colony sizes are species-specific traits despite high intraspecific variation. The question we address here is why the colony sizes of seabirds differ so widely between species. To answer this, we focused on foraging distances of seabirds around breeding colonies, and their impact on seabird colony sizes, thus extending the consequences of Ashmole's halo (1963, see below) at an interspecific level.

Seabirds are "central place foragers"; they travel back and forth to the sea (or terrestrial habitats) constrained by the need to regularly gather and deliver food for their nestlings. As happens with colony sizes (Jovani et al. 2008, 2012), foraging distances differ between colonies within species (e.g. Lewis et al. 2001), but also between species (see below). This led to an early classification of seabirds as inshore, offshore and pelagic species (Lack 1954). Over millions of years species have evolved life-history (e.g. small clutch size), morphological (e.g. wing loading), physiological (e.g. oil feeding to chicks), and behavioural (e.g. flight style) adaptations to allow them to exploit food resources most effectively within their available foraging ranges. These characteristics vary across species and set different maximum distances from the breeding colony which species can travel while still allowing effective reproduction. Some species typically exploit resources close to the colony while others may travel hundreds or thousands of kilometers to gather food (Nelson 1980, Coulson 2002, Gaston 2004). Moreover, Gaston et al. (2007) recently showed through a modeling approach that seabird traits such as wing shape or the kind of parental care explain the energetic constraints (of flight and food provisioning) that lead to the formation of Ashmole's halos, and how these species traits lead to interspecific variation on the size of the halo (i.e. the foraging range of species). Thus, while the foraging distance of birds of a given colony is highly dependent on environmental (e.g. distance to the continental shelf; Mitchell et al. 2004), and social factors (e.g. the position of close conspecific

colonies, Wakefield et al. 2013), species differ a lot in their potential maximum foraging ranges due to other species traits such as wing loading or flight speed. In other words, individuals of all species can forage close to their colonies, but only individuals of some species could forage hundreds of kilometers away from the colony and still successfully feed their chicks.

The foraging range (maximum foraging distance) of species and the size of their colonies have been proposed to be mechanistically linked. Storer (1952) and Ashmole (1963) suggested that food availability around colonies (rather than non-reproductive survival; Lack 1967) is the main regulator of seabird populations. They suggested that colony members gradually deplete food around colonies, thus creating a “halo” with low food availability. Intraspecific studies have shown that breeding adults from larger colonies forage farther than from smaller colonies (Lewis et al. 2001, Ainley et al. 2004, Ballance et al. 2009), supporting the idea that food resources are depleted (or prey escape, Hamerik et al. 2014) around colonies (Birt et al. 1987, Elliott et al. 2009).

Interspecifically, early anecdotic research into seabird ecology showed that pelagic species have larger colonies than species that feed inshore (Lack 1967, Nelson 1980). For instance, in six inshore tern (*Sterna*) species a positive correlation was shown between the typical foraging movements and the median colony size of the different species (Erwin 1978). Similarly, studying population size of different species in nine tropical oceanic islands, Diamond (1978) found that pelagic feeders outnumbered inshore feeders. Götmark (1982) also provided anecdotal evidence of a correlation between foraging distance and colony sizes in five gull species. Coulson (1985; cited in Coulson 2002) assessed 15 European seabird species and found that those with larger colonies were the ones with larger foraging distances. Despite these anecdotic data, no study has quantitatively tested the hypothesis of a correlation between the

foraging range of species and their colony sizes. This interspecific correlation is predicted by the Ashmole's halo hypothesis, despite the many factors potentially disrupting it (e.g. patchiness of food abundance, differences in species diet, number of chicks, foraging style). Here we test this hypothesis, grounded on our previous analyses of a large dataset of seabird colony size frequency distributions (Jovani et al. 2008, 2012), taking advantage of unprecedented information on seabird foraging ranges thanks to current telemetry tools, and applying a novel statistical approach using quantile regression under a comparative phylogenetic framework.

Our hypothesis centers on the scenario that foraging range is a constraint for the maximum colony size of species, but not necessarily for their smaller colony sizes. In other words, a species with the potential to conduct long foraging trips could nest in both small and large colonies, but species with a short maximum foraging distance could not nest in large colonies (i.e. successful breeding could not be achieved in a colony of hundreds of thousands of birds if the species could only forage within one kilometer of the colony, as food availability would become a limiting factor). However, it is expected that many species would not achieve the maximum colony sizes that their foraging ranges would potentially allow due to other potential constraints that can limit colony sizes (e.g. low food availability, pollution, nest site availability, disease, predators). Therefore no single model may explain the correlation between a species foraging range and their colony sizes, but several models depending on the additional factors that may constrain colony sizes. An ordinary least-squares (OLS) and the phylogenetic generalized least squares regression (PGLS) would capture the mean conditional effect, $E(y/X)$, where the expected value of the response variable y is conditional on the value of the predictor variable X . However, this mean effect would not determine whether the foraging range of the species imposes a ceiling to the maximum colony size the species can achieve. This is a common

problem in ecology when (as happens here) more than one factor could constrain the response variable. Quantile regression is a straightforward statistical approach in these cases, being increasingly used in ecology and behavioural studies (Koenker and Bassett 1978, Cade and Noon 2003, Chamaillé-Jammes and Blumstein 2012).

In this study we used, under a comparative phylogenetic approach, two statistical tools to test our hypothesis under this biological scenario. First, we correlated the foraging range of species with their minimum and maximum colony sizes, as well as different colony size percentiles. Then, we used quantile regression between foraging distance and the maximum colony sizes of species.

Methods

Dataset-Colony sizes

We gathered data from 28,262 colonies (a total of 16,602,080 breeding pairs) of 43 colonial nesting seabird species in four distinct geographic regions of the Northern Hemisphere (see Jovani et al. 2008 for a discussion on the concept of colony and analyses on how this does not affect colony size estimates for the purpose of these comparative studies). Data from Britain and Ireland came from the Seabird 2000 project, a collaboration between the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, BirdWatch Ireland, The Seabird Group, Scottish National Heritage, Environment and Heritage Service, English Nature, Countryside Council for Wales, SOTEAG, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government and INTERREG II C (unpublished raw data; details and aggregated data in Mitchell et al. 2004 and Jovani et al. 2008). Data from Western Greenland came from a database maintained by the Department of Arctic Environment, National Environmental Research

Institute (obtained 1 March 2006). Data from the St Lawrence gulf and estuary, Canada, came from the Canadian Wildlife Service (obtained in 19 April 2005; Chapdelaine et al. 2005). Data from Alaska came from the Seabird Colonies 2000 of the Beringian Seabird Colony Catalog, maintained by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service USFWS (obtained in 6 June 2005; Stephensen and Irons 2003).

For each species, we calculated multiple percentile bins: the minimum and maximum colony size and 19 percentiles from 5th to 95th percentile. The 50th percentile is the median of the distribution, the 5th percentile is close to the minimum colony size, and the 95th percentile is closer to the maximum colony size (data available in Supplementary material Appendix 1).

Dataset-Foraging distances

For this study, we retrieved an estimate of the maximum potential foraging distances from the colony (foraging range) of breeding adults for each species. For 22 species, this was sourced from Table 1 from the recent review by Thaxter et al. (2012). Data was updated for five of these species for which we found more recent and better quality data. For our study species not reviewed by Thaxter et al. (2012), we followed their protocol, reviewing a total of 68 studies for 21 species (see Supplementary material Appendix 2 for a detailed account of each study and species). In Thaxter et al. (2012), authors classified data in four quality categories: “Direct” (e.g. radio-tracking VHF devices and GPS tags), “Indirect” (e.g. estimations of travel distance from time away from the colony), “Survey” (e.g. sea line-transects from boats), and “Speculative” (e.g. diet, anecdotal observations). To test the reliability of foraging ranges at the species level, we built a mixed model, in which maximum foraging distance was the response variable and the species identity was used as random effect term, and from which we calculated repeatability

from the estimated inter- and intra-specific variance components (Nakagawa and Schielzeth 2010). Using species for which more than one quality categories provided an estimate, we found that the maximum foraging distance was highly repeatable at the species level ($R=0.731$, 95% CI = $0.570-0.847$, $P<0.001$; confidence interval and significance level were estimated based on parametric bootstrap and by the randomization of data, respectively). To test for potential biases that can emerge when estimating species-specific foraging distance through data of different quality, we built a mixed model that included the underlying method of estimation (i.e. whether estimates came from direct or indirect observation, survey or speculation) as a fixed factor. With the whole dataset (Thaxter et al. 2012 and our new review), this model revealed no significant evidence for data quality biasing estimates of maximum foraging distances ($\text{Chi}^2=2.060$, $\text{df} = 3$, $P = 0.560$; statistical significance was determined by likelihood ratio test comparing the models with and without the categorical predictor). Moreover, repeatability estimates for maximum foraging distance from the model controlling for the underlying methodology was similar to that we obtained above from the null model containing no fixed effect term ($R = 0.720$, 95%CI = $0.528-0.836$, $P < 0.001$). Finally, we found no bias when comparing multiple estimates within species across different methods in paired t-tests (e.g. Direct vs. Indirect; all $P>0.2$). Consequently, following the method used in Thaxter et al. (2012), we selected best quality data available for each species and we used this value as our estimate of the maximum foraging range of species.

Phylogenetic modeling

Interspecific datasets rely on observations that cannot be considered as statistically independent data points, because the focal units of interest, i.e. species, are hierarchically

structured through the underlying common descent. Therefore, when testing for the interspecific relationship between traits, it is necessary to consider the phylogenetic history of species in the statistical analyses. To achieve an appropriate control for the phylogenetic relatedness of species, we used a regression technique based on PGLS (Symonds and Blomberg 2014). For these phylogenetic regressions, we extracted information on the phylogenetic relationship of seabirds from the BirdTree database (Jetz et al., 2012, <http://birdtree.org>). We could not obtain an overwhelmingly supported single phylogenetic tree from this resource, but we could download several equally likely candidate trees. Hence, to account for phylogenetic uncertainty, we fitted models to each available tree and subsequently applied multi-model inference to derive the regression parameters of interest across them (Garamszegi and Mundry 2014, Rubolini et al. 2015). Specifically, we used 1,000 alternative trees for our list of species to calculate phylogenetic regressions based on identical model definition. To define our models we used maximum foraging distance as a predictor and the given percentile bin for colony size as a response. Furthermore, in each model we allowed the phylogenetic signal in the residuals (i.e. λ) being optimized towards its maximum likelihood value. We derived mean and confidence estimates for the intercept and the slope of the regression at hand over the pool of phylogenies via model averaging, in which parameter estimates from each model were weighted based on their relative fit to the data. We repeated this procedure for each percentile bin for colony size, i.e. we fitted and averaged 1,000 models by sequentially using species-specific estimates of colony size from different percentile categories. These exercises were undertaken using the R package ‘caper’ (Orme et al. 2012) for the PGLS modelling, and by following the example codes on <http://www.mpcm-evolution.org/practice/online-practical-material-chapter-12> for the model averaging routines. We opted to handle phylogenetic uncertainty based on

multimodel inference within the information theoretic framework instead of adopting Bayesian approaches, because the latter introduces a considerable uncertainty in parameter estimates when non-informative priors are used (Garamszegi and Mundry 2014).

Quantile regression

Quantile regression allows a generalization of OLS regressions by using conditional quantiles, $Q_y(\tau|X)$, where $\tau \in [0, 1]$ denote the quantiles, such as 100 τ % of the values of the response variable (e.g. maximum colony size) is less or equal to the estimate at the X value (e.g. of foraging ranges). In this way, the fit of the quantile regression at different τ values allows testing of the effect of the predictor variable along different subsets of the response variable for particular X values. Here, we used the ‘quantreg’ R package (Koenker 2015) to analyze the effect of the foraging range of the species and its effect upon the maximum colony sizes of the species (as this was the colony size statistic with higher correlation with foraging range; Table 1). We did so by assessing the slope of the regression model for different values of τ from 0.05 to 0.95.

Unfortunately, ‘quantreg’ has been developed for OLS regressions and thus is unable to incorporate information on the phylogenetic relatedness of species and handle PGLS models. Therefore, to deal with the phylogenetic structure of the data, we developed the following solution. We randomly took 100 phylogenetic trees from the available pool of 1000 trees, and performed the following analyses on each of them. We first rescaled the phylogeny at hand by using a λ transformation to a degree that was estimated by the best-fit PGLS model of maximum colony size (see Fig. 1B; we detected that the phylogenetic signal in the residuals of this model was $\lambda=0.759$). As a next step, we calculated phylogenetic independent contrasts (Felsenstein 1985) in ‘caper’ for both variables under the rescaled phylogeny. Phylogenetic contrasts are

phylogenetically transformed, independent variables that can be supplied to standard regression methods, and when forced through the origin the OLS regression of these contrasts provide equivalent slope estimates with the PGLS results (under certain assumptions). Therefore, by using the independent contrasts (that were thus independent of the phylogeny that were scaled to the best-fit λ), we were able to submit an OLS regression through an origin to the quantile regression analysis that can be considered as a phylogenetically controlled approach. We detected that ‘quantreg’ does not provide estimates for 95% CI when the OLS regression forced through the origin, thus we were unable to obtain such confidence range around our phylogenetic slopes in the quantile regression framework. However, by repeating this series of analyses on 100 phylogenetic trees, we could derive a summary statistics and confidence estimates on them over the pool of results corresponding to different phylogenetic hypotheses. Therefore, we calculated the mean and the 95% CI of the 100 slope estimates over trees to present the phylogenetically controlled results. The 95% CI in this case can be interpreted as the uncertainty in the parameter estimate that is caused by the uncertainty in the phylogenetic hypothesis.

Results

The interspecific correlation between foraging range and colony size changed across the different percentile bins used to describe the within-species frequency distribution of colony sizes (Figure 1, Table 1). While the minimum or the lower percentiles of the distribution were moderately correlated, the strength of the correlation monotonically increased towards the higher percentiles, whereby the median, the 95th percentile, and the maximum colony size of the species strongly correlated with their foraging range (Figure 1, Table 1). Moreover, the

phylogenetic signal in the model residuals (λ) also changed, being zero for lower percentiles of colony sizes but increasing up to a maximum of 0.926 for the 95th percentile (Table 1).

The slope of the regression increased from values below 0.5 for lower percentile colony sizes of the species to a slope of 1.096 (CI = 0.529-1.662) for the maximum colony sizes (Figure 1). A further analysis of the relationship between foraging range and the maximum colony size by using a quantile regression (Figure 2A) showed that the effect of foraging range was not homogeneous for different portions of the response variable (maximum colony size). Instead, the slope of the model increased at increasing τ values, from values below 1 to values around 2 (Figure 2B). The quantile regression with phylogenetic correction showed an even clearer shift in the slope along τ , with values around 2 for $\tau > 0.7$, and reaching slopes of 3 for largest τ . This pattern was highly consistent across different phylogenetic trees considered for the analysis.

Discussion

The colony size frequency distribution of seabirds was contrastingly shaped by the foraging range of the species. While the minimum colony sizes of species was little affected by foraging range, larger percentile bins for colony sizes were strongly correlated with the maximum foraging distances. The slope of the regression was largest at larger percentiles of the within-species frequency distribution of colony size with values around 1 for the maximum colony size. Note, however, that this slope refers to the rates of change in the mean of the distribution of colony size as a function of foraging distance. Interestingly, a quantile regression of the relationship between the maximum colony size and their foraging range (investigating other parts of the distribution in the response variable) showed that the foraging range imposed a ceiling to

colony size. In particular, the slope of the regression for species with larger colony sizes relative to their foraging ranges was close to 2.

The slope being close to 2 is interesting because it is the slope expected according to the equation of the area (A) of a circle ($A=\pi r^2$). Taking logarithms at both sides of the equation, $\log(A)=\log(\pi r^2)$, then $\log(A)=2\log(r)+\log(\pi)$, resulting in a lineal relationship with a slope of 2 between the logarithm of maximum foraging radius (foraging range, hereafter) of species and the logarithm of foraging area, and thus, of potential maximum colony size. Thus, our results show that the maximum colony size of seabird species increases lineally with the potential sea area available for foraging for each species.

Interestingly, similar claims have been made previously. For instance, Storer (1952) stated “Thus, in an area suitable to the existence of murres and guillemots, the limiting factor for the guillemots, nesting sites, is a linear one; and that for the murres, food supply, is two-dimensional. Consequently, the size of a population of murres in such an area is roughly the square of that of the guillemots”. Within species, Gaston et al. (2007) predicted “Because the potential foraging area (A) increases as the square of foraging range ($A=\pi r^2$), foraging range should be proportional to the square root of the [colony] population size.”. Indeed, this has been reported in northern gannets (Lewis et al. 2001). Here we report that this also holds at the interspecific level as a constraint to maximum colony size of species.

Many seabirds do not breed in locations with foraging areas equally available all around the colony, meaning a simple circle may be not the best model for mapping the foraging area of many species. In fact, Birkhead and Furness (1985) showed for Alaskan seabird colonies that those on isolated islands were larger than those in the mainland. Also, it could be argued that conspecific birds breeding in neighbouring colonies do not overlap in their foraging areas

(Masello et al. 2010; Wakefield et al. 2013), or that seabirds could share their colonies with other seabird species with similar diets (Croxall et al. 1980, Ballance et al. 1997), and thus that foraging radius misleadingly suggests larger foraging areas than those really available. However, the slope of the relationship between A and r holds for any portion of a circle. For instance, the area of a semicircle (something more acceptable for many seabirds breeding along the continental coastlines) would be $\log(A)=1/2\log(\pi r^2)$, and thus $\log(A)=2\log(r)+\log(\pi)+\log(1/2)$, i.e. $\log(A)=2\log(r)+0.197$, thus only affecting the intercept but not the scaling slope of the relationship. Hence, from a pure mathematical point of view, any circumstance consistently shaping the foraging area available for a species given a certain foraging range would introduce noise to the correlation between foraging range and foraging area available, but the same slope of 2 would hold.

The much lower mean slope for lower τ values suggests that there are other factors that constrain colony growth. These could be due to both external factors (e.g. pollution, nest site availability, disease, predators) and species traits such as preferred diet (with varying calorific values of different prey items), feeding methods, and digestive capabilities (capacity to digest food at sea and deliver a nutritive stomach oil to chicks). These factors could depart species from showing the same/expected response to foraging distance.

Our data show that short-distance foraging species never have large colonies, and that the maximum colony sizes a species could potentially achieve scale as the square root of their foraging radius around colonies. This also supports Ashmole's (1963) hypothesis because no species could hold large colonies without a large foraging range.

Evolutionary considerations

Colony size and foraging distance are both dynamic patterns that highly depend on the prevailing social and environmental conditions in any given location, thus justifying the ecological approach adopted in this study (while statistically controlling for phylogenetic non-independence of species). However, these traits could be seen, at least partially, as evolutionary adaptations of species, thus our correlative findings could also support a causal evolutionary scenario in which colony size and foraging distance affect each other.

Different scenarios could be at play. First, larger foraging ranges could be adaptive per se (e.g. allowing the exploitation of a larger amount of food resources), or could be a by-product of other adaptations such as particular wing shapes used for long-distance migration. Large colony sizes could then be the ecological consequence of having the potential to forage far from colonies, and thus increasing the carrying capacity of colonies. An alternative scenario could be that some species favour breeding in larger colonies to reduce the chances of predation. This would impose a selective pressure to increase foraging distances of individuals, leading to the evolution of the morphological, behavioural, and physiological traits needed to increase foraging range and leading to the foraging range-colony size correlation reported here.

Finally, a mixed scenario would include a positive evolutionary feedback (Crespi 2004) between foraging range and colony size where larger colony sizes select for traits favoring larger foraging ranges (e.g. because food depletion around colonies select for individuals able to find more distance foraging areas) and larger foraging ranges increase the adaptive value of larger colony sizes (e.g. reduced risk of predation). Unfortunately, based on the correlative nature of our data, it is impossible to discriminate between these causal alternatives.

Why species differ so much in their group sizes is still little understood. Here, we have shown that 26% of the variance in maximum colony sizes is explained by foraging range (Table

1). Thus, we have shown that key individual behaviours (foraging distance) of species could be a simple yet powerful mechanistic explanation of why species from different bird families and with contrasting natural histories differ so widely in their collective patterns (colony sizes) at broad geographic scales.

Acknowledgments

Jean-François Rail and Shawn W. Stephensen kindly sent us (and answered our questions about) the data from Gulf of St Lawrence and Alaskan colonies, respectively. David Martin Boertmann helped with the Greenland seabird colony files and Ian Mitchell with the Seabird 2000 dataset. R.J. is supported by a Ramón y Cajal research contract (RYC-2009-03967) from the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación. L.Z.G was supported by funds from the Spanish government within the frame of the “Plan Nacional” program (ref. no. CGL2012- 38262, and CGL2012-40026-C02-01). We thank the constructive suggestions of two anonymous reviewers.

Literature Cited

- Ainley, D. G., Ribic, C. A., Ballard, G., Heath, S., Gaffney, I., Karl, B. J., Barton, K. J., Wilson, P. R. and Webb, S. 2004. Geographic structure of Adélie penguin populations: overlap in colony-specific foraging areas. – *Ecol. Monogr.* 74: 159–178.
- Ashmole, N. P. 1963. The regulation of numbers of tropical oceanic birds. – *Ibis* 103: 458–473.
- Ballance, L. T., R. L. Pitman, and Reilly, S. B. 1997. Seabird community structure along a productivity gradient: importance of competition and energetic constraint. - *Ecology* 78: 1502–1518.

381 Ballance, L. T., Ainley, D. G., Ballard, G. and Barton, K. 2009. An energetic correlate between
382 colony size and foraging effort in seabirds, an example of the Adélie penguin *Pygoscelis*
383 *adeliae*.— J. Avian Biol. 40: 279–288.

384 Birkhead, T. R. and Furness, R. W. 1985. The regulation of seabird populations. — In: Sibly, R.
385 M. and Smith, R. H. (eds.), Behavioural Ecology. Blackwell, Oxford. pp. 145-167.

386 Birt, V. L., Birt, T. P., D., G., Cairns, D. K. and Montevecchi, W. A. 1987. Ashmole's halo:
387 direct evidence for prey depletion by a seabird. — Marine Ecol. Progr. Series, 40: 205–208.

388 Brown, C. R. and Brown, M. B. 2000. Heritable basis for choice of group size in a colonial bird.
389 - Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA. 97: 14825e14830.

390 Brown, C. R. and Brown, M. B. 2001. Avian coloniality. — Curr. Ornithol. 16: 1–82.

391 Brown, C. R., Stutchbury, B. J. and Walsh, P. 1990. Choice of colony size in birds. — Trends
392 Ecol. Evol. 5: 398–403.

393 Cade, B. S. and Noon, B. R. 2003. A gentle introduction to quantile regression for ecologists. —
394 Front. Ecol. Environ. 1: 412-420.

395 Cairns, D. K. 1989. The regulation of seabird colony size: a hinterland model. — Am. Nat. 134:
396 141–146.

397 Chamaillé-Jammes, S. and Blumstein, D. 2012. A case for quantile regression in behavioral
398 ecology: getting more out of flight initiation distance data. — Beh. Ecol. Sociobiol. 66: 985-
399 992.

400 Chapdelaine, G., Brousseau, P. and Rail, J. -F. 2005. Banque informatisée des oiseaux marins du
401 Québec (BIOMQ). Database. Last update 1 April 2005. — Environment Canada, Canadian
402 Wildlife Service, Québec region.

403 Coulson, J. C. 1985. Density regulation in colonial seabird colonies. Proceedings of the XVIII
404 International Ornithological Congress, Moscow 783–791.

405 Coulson, J. C. 2002. Colonial breeding in seabirds. –In:Schreiber, E. A. and Burger, J. (eds.),
406 Biology of marine birds. CRC Press.pp: 87–113.

407 Crespi, B. J. 2004. Vicious circles: positive feedback in major evolutionary and ecological
408 transitions. Trends Ecol. Evol. 19: 627–633.

409 Croxall, J. P., and P. A. Prince. 1980. Food, feeding ecology and ecological segregation of
410 seabirds at South Georgia. Biol. J. Linnean Soc. 14: 103–131.

411 Diamond, A. W. 1978. Feeding strategies and population-size in tropical seabirds. – Am. Nat.
412 112: 215-223.

413 Elliott, K. H., Woo, K. J., Gaston, A. J., Benvenuti, S., Dall'Antonia, L. and Davoren, G. K.
414 2009. Central-place foraging in an arctic seabird provides evidence for Storer-Ashmole's
415 halo. – The Auk 126: 613–625.

416 Erwin, R. M. 1978. Coloniality in terns: the role of social feeding. – Condor 80: 211–215.

417 Felsenstein, J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. Am. Nat. 125: 1-15.

418 Forero, M. G., Tella, J. L., Hobson, K. A., Bertelloti, M. and Blanco, G. 2002. Conspecific food
419 competition explains variability in colony size: a test in Magellanic penguins. – Ecology 83:
420 3466–3475.

421 Furness, R. W. and Birkhead, T. R. 1984. Seabird colony distributions suggest competition for
422 food supplies during the breeding season. – Nature 311: 655–656.

423 Garamszegi, L. Z. and Mundry, R. 2014. Multimodel-inference in comparative analyses, In:
424 Garamszegi, L. Z. (ed.), Modern phylogenetic comparative methods and their application in
425 evolutionary biology: concepts and practice. Springer, Heidelberg, pp. 305-331.

426 Gaston, A. J. 2004. Seabirds. A Natural History. – Yale University Press.

427 Gaston, A. J., Ydenberg, R. C. and John Smith, G. E. 2007. Ashmole's halo and population
428 regulation in seabirds.– Marine Ornithol. 35: 119–126.

429 Götmark, F. 1982. Coloniality in five *Larus* gulls: a comparative study. – Ornis Scand. 13: 211–
430 224.

431 Hemerik, L., van Opheusden, M. and Ydenberg, R. 2014. Ashmole's halo as the outcome of a
432 predator-prey game. – Marine Ornithol. 42: 125-136.

433 Jetz, W., Thomas, G. H., Joy, J. B., Hartmann, K., Mooers, A. O. 2012. The global diversity of
434 birds in space and time. – Nature 491: 444-448.

435 Jovani, R., Mavor, R. and Oro, D. 2008. Hidden patterns of colony size variation in seabirds: a
436 logarithmic point of view. – Oikos, 117: 1774–1781.

437 Jovani, R., Schielzeth, H., Mavor, R. and Oro, D. 2012. Specificity of grouping behaviour:
438 comparing colony sizes for the same seabird species in distant populations. – J. Avian Biol.
439 43: 397–402.

440 Koenker, R. 2015. quantreg: Quantile Regression (R package version 5.11.).

441 Koenker, R. and Bassett, G. 1978. Regression quantiles. – Econometrica 46: 33–50.

442 Krause, J. and Ruxton, G. D. 2002. Living in groups. – Oxford Univ. Press.

443 Lack, D. 1954. The Regulation of Animal Numbers, London, Oxford University Press.

444 Lack, D. 1967. Interrelationships in breeding adaptations as shown by marine birds. – In: Proc.
445 XIV. International Ornithological Congress (1966), pp. 3-42. Oxford. UK.

446 Lewis, S., Sherratt, T. N., Hamer, K. C. and Wanless, S. 2001. Evidence of intra-specific
447 competition for food in a pelagic seabird. – Nature 412: 816–819.

448 Masello, J. F., Mundry, R., Poisbleau, M., Demongin, L., Voigt, C. C., Wikelski, M. and
449 Quillfeldt, P. 2010. Diving seabirds share foraging space and time within and among
450 species. *Ecosphere* 1: art19.

451 Mitchell, P. I., Newton, S. F., Ratcliffe, N. and Dunn, T. E. 2004. Seabird populations of Britain
452 and Ireland. – T and A D Poyser.

453 Nelson, B. 1980 *Seabirds. Their Biology and Ecology*. – Hamlyn.

454 Nakagawa, S. and Schielzeth, H., 2010. Repeatability for Gaussian and non-Gaussian data: a
455 practical guide for biologists. – *Biol. Rev.* 85: 935-956.

456 Orme, D., Freckleton, R., Thomas, G., Petzoldt, T., Fritz, S., Isaac, N., Pearse, W. 2012. caper:
457 Comparative Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R (R package version 3.1-104).

458 Rolland, C., Danchin, E. and Fraipont, M. 1998. The evolution of coloniality in birds in relation
459 to food, habitat, predation, and life-history traits: a comparative analysis. – *Am. Nat.* 151:
460 514–529.

461 Rubolini, D., Liker, A., Garamszegi, L. Z., Møller, A. P., Saino, N. 2015. Using the BirdTree.org
462 website to obtain robust phylogenies for avian comparative studies: a primer. *Current*
463 *Zool.* 61, in press.

464 Safran, R. J. 2004. Adaptive site selection rules and variation in group size of Barn swallows:
465 individual decisions predict population patterns. – *Am. Nat.* 164: 121–131.

466 Serrano, D. and Tella, J. L. 2007. The role of despotism and heritability in determining
467 settlement patterns in the colonial lesser kestrel. - *Am. Nat.* 169: E53eE67.

468 Siegel-Causey, D. and Kharitonov, S. P. 1990. The evolution of coloniality. – *Curr. Ornithol.* 7:
469 285–330.

470 Stephensen, S. W. and Irons, D. B. 2003. Comparison of colonial breeding seabirds in the eastern
471 Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska. – Mar. Ornithol. 31: 167–173.

472 Storer, R. W. 1952. A comparison of variation, behavior and evolution in the sea bird genera
473 *Uria* and *Cepphus*. University of California Publications in Zoology 52: 121-222.

474 Symonds, M. R. E. and Blomberg, S. P. 2014. A primer on phylogenetic generalised least
475 squares (PGLS), - In: Garamszegi, L. Z. (ed.), Modern phylogenetic comparative methods
476 and their application in evolutionary biology: concepts and practice. Springer, Heidelberg,
477 pp. 105-130.

478 Thaxter, C. B., Lascelles, B., Sugar, K., Cook, A. S. C. P., Roos, S., Bolton, M., Langston, R. H.
479 W. and Burton, N. H. K. 2012. Seabird foraging ranges as a preliminary tool for identifying
480 candidate Marine Protected Areas. – Biol. Cons. 156: 53-61.

481 Wakefield, E. D., Bodey, T. W., Bearhop, S., Blackburn, J., Colhoun, K., Davies, R., Dwyer, R.
482 G., Green, J., Grémillet, D., Jackson, A. L., Jessopp, M. J., Adam Kane, R., Langston, H.
483 W., Lescroël, A., Murray, S., Nuz, M. L., Patrick, S. C., Peron, C., Soanes, L. M., Wanless,
484 S., Votier, S. C. and Hamer, K. C. 2013. Space partitioning without territoriality in gannets.
485 - Science 341: 68-70.

486 Wittenberger, J. F. and Hunt, G. L. Jr. 1985. The adaptive significance of coloniality in birds. –
487 In: Avian Biology. VIII, pp. 1–78. Academic Press.

488

Table 1. Phylogenetic correlation coefficients (r) and their low (r.lb) and high (r.ub) 95%CI, and phylogenetic signals (λ) as estimated from the PGLS models for different percentile bins for colony size (see also Figure 1A that presents the regression slopes from the same models).

Quantile	λ	r	r.lb	r.ub	P
min	0	0.230	-0.076	0.496	0.139
Q5	0.584	0.401	0.115	0.626	0.008
Q10	0	0.466	0.192	0.672	0.002
Q15	0	0.374	0.083	0.607	0.013
Q20	0	0.362	0.069	0.597	0.017
Q25	0	0.350	0.056	0.589	0.021
Q30	0	0.346	0.051	0.586	0.023
Q35	0	0.353	0.059	0.590	0.020
Q40	0	0.352	0.058	0.590	0.021
Q45	0	0.348	0.053	0.587	0.022
Q50	0	0.356	0.062	0.593	0.019
Q55	0	0.370	0.079	0.604	0.015
Q60	0	0.381	0.091	0.611	0.012
Q65	0	0.409	0.124	0.632	0.006
Q70	0	0.415	0.130	0.636	0.006
Q75	0	0.418	0.135	0.638	0.005
Q80	0	0.431	0.150	0.648	0.004
Q85	0.044	0.432	0.151	0.648	0.004
Q90	0.45	0.429	0.148	0.646	0.004
Q95	0.926	0.402	0.115	0.627	0.008
max	0.759	0.509	0.247	0.702	0.000

Figure Legends

Figure 1. (A) Slopes (with 95% confidence limits) of the relationship between the $\log_{10}$ (maximum foraging distance) and the $\log_{10}$ (Xth percentile) of the colony size frequency distribution of the species as estimated from the most appropriate PGLS models. (B-D) Examples of the relationship between the $\log_{10}$ (maximum foraging distance) and different the $\log_{10}$ (Xth percentile). Solid lines are estimated regression lines, while dashed lines correspond to slope = 2.

Figure 2. (A) Slopes of the quantile regression for different τ 's without phylogenetic control based on the species-specific raw data (black dots, grey area for 95% CI) and quantile regression with phylogenetic control based on phylogenetically independent contrasts (white dots, area bounded with dashed lines for 95% CI over 100 phylogenetic trees). (B) The relationship between maximum colony size and maximum foraging distance (see Figure 1B) when investigated with quantile regressions for τ from 0.05 to 0.95 (without phylogenetically independent contrasts).

Appendix 1. Summary table for foraging distance and colony size statistics for each species.

F.R.= foraging range (the maximum foraging distance, in Km, of breeding birds from the colony). N_col = number of colonies.

N_nests = number of nests. Min. and Max. = minimum and maximum colony sizes. Percentiles of the colony size frequency distribution from percentiles 5th to 95th are also shown.

Species	F.R.	N_col	N_nests	min.	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	max.
<i>Aethia cristatella</i>	80	39	1,449,004	5	12	55	129	1,150	1,563	1,800	2,500	2,550	5,018	8,500	10,950	14,900	15,000	22,332	48,193	61,110	82,886	104,610	154,300	407,195
<i>Aethia psittacula</i>	50	172	203,566	1	2	4	5	8	13	15	20	24	25	32	40	50	64	84	150	252	525	1,000	5,000	75,000
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	95	33	2,764,382	10	20	50	533	1,899	6,875	8,063	11,025	13,373	20,227	40,000	41,625	50,902	69,150	116,400	147,496	150,000	180,785	208,215	293,137	580,000
<i>Aethia pygmaea</i>	50	31	3,357	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	5	5	8	10	11	25	93	160	1,200	1,500
<i>Alca torda</i>	312 ^b	1,143	169,674	1	1	2	3	4	5	7	9	12	15	19	25	34	46	60	81	121	174	295	596	11,384
<i>Alle alle</i>	110	12	1,123	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	6	9	11	13	13	15	18	22	26	32	325	904	1,000
<i>Catharacta skua</i>	265 ^c	726	9,635	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	5	7	10	15	30	2,293
<i>Cephus columba</i>	50	753	24,110	1	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	8	9	10	13	18	23	28	40	50	85	138	1,250
<i>Cephus grylle</i>	7	2,282	54,101	1	1	1	2	3	3	4	5	6	8	10	11	14	16	20	24	30	39	50	85	1,107
<i>Cerorhinca monocerata</i>	164	16	85,048	4	7	15	15	15	18	22	25	25	64	190	330	420	580	705	875	1,450	4,780	23,019	45,390	54,000
<i>Fratercula arctica</i>	200 ^a	557	620,285	1	1	2	3	4	6	8	11	17	20	25	33	44	73	99	131	215	444	739	3,068	59,471
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	53	647	1,157,691	1	3	5	10	14	17	25	30	50	62	100	127	150	240	400	568	1,000	1,945	3,246	7,659	81,658
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	180	568	469,925	1	1	2	3	4	5	7	10	15	18	24	30	40	50	80	100	160	252	576	2,000	125,000
<i>Fulmarus glacialis</i>	580 ^a	3,041	1,345,829	1	2	3	4	6	8	11	14	19	24	31	40	52	69	93	125	173	248	389	823	250,000
<i>Hydrobates pelagicus</i>	65 ^a	98	82,818	1	2	2	5	7	12	17	23	36	52	59	79	100	111	160	288	487	866	1,742	4,866	27,297
<i>Larus argentatus</i>	92 ^a	3,030	191,411	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	14	17	22	29	37	51	74	114	225	10,129
<i>Larus canus</i>	50 ^a	1,620	56,890	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	5	6	7	9	11	14	18	22	30	43	84	11,219
<i>Larus fuscus</i>	181 ^a	1,165	124,925	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	5	7	9	13	17	24	33	44	64	108	210	19,487
<i>Larus glaucescens</i>	100	757	128,242	1	3	5	9	12	15	20	25	30	35	45	56	70	88	107	150	184	250	400	726	6,300
<i>Larus hyperboreus</i>	15	733	20,003	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	5	6	8	10	10	14	20	25	28	40	50	100	1,000
<i>Larus marinus</i>	60	2,224	20,597	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	5	6	9	13	20	37	983
<i>Larus ridibundus</i>	40 ^a	681	141,888	1	1	1	2	3	4	6	7	10	12	15	21	29	37	50	70	100	175	300	800	14,575
<i>Morus bassanus</i>	709 ^d	25	336,628	3	91	147	317	844	1,114	1,244	1,722	1,905	2,358	2,552	3,872	6,577	10,032	16,386	24,796	29,744	34,541	44,110	55,561	61,340
<i>Oceanodroma leucorhoa</i>	120 ^a	80	1,824,388	5	19	50	100	131	175	250	380	500	584	750	1,000	1,191	1,750	2,391	3,678	5,375	10,000	31,352	75,866	850,000
<i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i>	17 ^a	1,392	32,222	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	12	14	17	21	26	34	48	84	1,720
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	47	168	27,006	1	1	3	4	6	8	10	12	16	22	27	36	55	75	112	147	250	347	509	750	1,806
<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	35 ^a	432	17,356	1	1	1	2	3	5	7	9	10	12	16	20	24	29	36	43	52	66	96	160	675
<i>Phalacrocorax pelagicus</i>	9	381	22,219	1	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	10	13	15	18	21	25	34	42	50	64	101	226	3,790
<i>Phalacrocorax urile</i>	20	193	24,440	1	1	2	4	5	8	10	12	15	18	21	30	31	42	51	77	107	174	321	692	2,500
<i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i>	95	36	236,472	2	22	25	30	50	63	115	200	200	250	450	500	1,000	1,450	1,750	3,100	6,500	12,503	22,700	50,000	50,000
<i>Puffinus puffinus</i>	330 ^e	53	332,272	1	2	5	5	7	10	19	25	33	40	61	141	230	628	1,006	1,815	2,987	3,521	7,002	41,697	120,000
<i>Rissa brevirostris</i>	150	7	104,426	14	14	40	86	131	150	159	168	180	193	206	340	473	876	2,889	4,902	15,403	47,121	78,840	96,965	96,965
<i>Rissa tridactyla</i>	231 ^f	1,262	1,264,848	1	5	12	20	30	45	55	75	100	124	156	200	250	345	430	600	854	1,214	2,190	4,907	61,960
<i>Somateria mollissima</i>	80 ^a	332	13,700	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	4	5	6	8	10	13	15	19	24	31	51	77	166	1,293
<i>Stercorarius parasiticus</i>	75 ^a	667	2,327	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	6	12	107
<i>Sterna albifrons</i>	11 ^a	119	2,093	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	4	5	8	10	12	13	15	19	20	29	47	85	220
<i>Sterna aleutica</i>	70	57	6,457	1	2	3	4	6	10	12	13	19	20	25	25	30	36	40	56	91	148	235	808	1,500
<i>Sterna hirsundo</i>	30 ^a	424	13,859	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	5	6	8	11	14	17	22	31	42	68	122	1,033
<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>	30 ^a	1,277	73,899	1	1	2	2	3	4	6	8	10	12	15	18	23	28	34	44	54	75	100	200	4,000
<i>Sterna sandvicensis</i>	54 ^a	38	13,977	1	1	2	5	7	12	17	27	52	72	78	89	140	274	316	340	440	517	929	1,844	4,200
<i>Synthliboramphus antiquus</i>	75	57	109,386	1	2	9	50	63	100	100	150	200	250	275	350	500	500	850	1,250	1,500	1,500	4,500	11,500	30,000
<i>Uria aalge</i>	340 ^g	834	1,904,969	1	4	9	17	26	41	60	87	111	154	229	306	409	626	877	1,269	1,778	3,024	5,021	10,284	100,957
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	168	100	1,114,632	1	6	16	27	66	91	157	195	326	525	688	884	1,240	1,693	2,078	3,068	4,959	8,078	15,742	32,817	549,300

^aForaging range as in Thaxter et al. (2012)

^bSpecies with data on foraging range in Thaxter et al. (2012), but updated with “Direct” quality data from <http://atlanticarea.ccdr-n.pt/news/docs/fame-article>

^cSpecies with data on foraging range in Thaxter et al. (2012), but updated with “Direct” quality data from Thaxter et al. (2013).

^dSpecies with data on foraging range in Thaxter et al. (2012), but updated with “Direct” quality data from Wakefield et al. (2013)

^eSpecies with two potential foraging ranges in Thaxter et al. (2012). Here we selected the 330Km foraging range instead of the 32Km foraging range because, as explained in Thaxter et al. (2012), the 32Km estimates was for maintenance rafting behaviour around colonies, and the 330Km estimate was obtained by tracking individuals with GPS while on foraging trips from the colony.

^fSpecies with data on foraging range in Thaxter et al. (2012), but updated with “Direct” quality data from <http://atlanticarea.ccdr-n.pt/news/docs/fame-article>

^gSpecies with data on foraging range in Thaxter et al. (2012), but updated with “Direct” quality data from <http://atlanticarea.ccdr-n.pt/news/docs/fame-article>

Literature Cited

Thaxter, C. B., Lascelles, B., Sugar, K., Cook, A. S. C. P., Roos, S., Bolton, M., Langston, R. H. W. and Burton, N. H. K. 2012. Seabird foraging ranges as a preliminary tool for identifying candidate Marine Protected Areas. *Biological Conservation*, 156: 53-61.

Thaxter, C.B., Ross-Smith, V.H., Clark, N.A., Conway, G.J., Johnson, A., Wade, H.M., Masden, E.A., Bouten, W. & Burton, N.H.K. (2013) Measuring the Interaction Between Marine Features of Special Protection Areas with Offshore Wind Farm Development Sites Through Telemetry: Final Report to DECC. BTO Research Rport No. 649.

Wakefield, E.D., Bodey, T.W., Bearhop, S., Blackburn, J., Colhoun, K., Davies, R., Dwyer, R.G., Green, J., Grémillet, D., Jackson, A.L., Jessopp, M.J., Kane, A., Langston, R.H., Lescroël, A., Murray, S., Le Nuz, M., Patrick, S.C., Péron, C., Soanes, L., Wanless, S., Votier, S.C. & Hamer, K.C. 2013. Space partitioning without territoriality in gannets. *Science*, DOI: 10.1126/science.1236077

Appendix 2. Review on the foraging ranges of species not reviewed in Thaxter et al. (2012)

Scientific name	Max foraging distance (Km)	Data quality	Area	Ref.
<i>Aethia cristatella</i>	80	Survey	St. Lawrence Island, Alaska	57
<i>Aethia cristatella</i>	75	Survey	Shelikhov Gulf, Yamskiye Islands, Russia	64
<i>Aethia psittacula</i>	50	Survey	Kuril Islands, Russia	6
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	65	Survey	St. Lawrence Island, Alaska, US	32
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	75	Survey	King Island, Alaska, US	32
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	10	Survey	St. George Island, Alaska, US	33
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	56	Survey	St. Lawrence Island, Alaska, US	51
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	5	Survey	St. Matthew Island, Alaska, US	51
<i>Aethia pusilla</i>	95	Survey	St. Lawrence Island, Alaska, US	57
<i>Aethia pygmaea</i>	50	Survey	Kuril Islands, Russia	6
<i>Aethia pygmaea</i>	43	Survey	Commander Islands, Russia	7
<i>Aethia pygmaea</i>	16	Survey	Alaska, US	12
<i>Aethia pygmaea</i>	10	Survey	Alaska, US	17
<i>Alle alle</i>	150	Survey	Spitsbergen, Norway	13
<i>Alle alle</i>	32	Survey	Horse Head Island, Greenland	20
<i>Alle alle</i>	76	Indirect	East Greenland, Greenland	27
<i>Alle alle</i>	110	Direct	Spitsbergen, Norway	35
<i>Alle alle</i>	100	Survey	Spitsbergen, Norway	39
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	2	Survey	Santa Barbara Island, California, US	10
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	5	Survey	California, US	10
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	6	Speculative	Mandarte Island, British Columbia, Canada	18
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	7	Survey	General	21
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	4	Speculative	Prince William Sound, Alaska, US	31
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	2	Survey	Santa Barbara Island, California, US	42
<i>Cepphus columba</i>	50	Indirect	Commander Islands, Russia	44
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	4	Survey	Papa Westray, Scotland, UK	9
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	7	Survey	Rockabill, Ireland	9
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	15	Survey	Eastern Canadian Arctic, Canada	9

<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	13	Survey	Hudson Bay, Canada	11
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	5	Survey	Hudson Bay, Canada	14
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	10	Speculative	UK	24
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	5	Survey	Caithness, Scotland, UK	46
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	7	Survey	Atlantic (Northwest)	49
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	55	Survey	North West Territories, Canada	50
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	1	Direct	Bay of Fundy, Canada	56
<i>Cepphus grylle</i>	6.5	Direct	Papa Westray, UK	60
<i>Cerorhinca monocerata</i>	164	Indirect	Teuri Island, Japan	36
<i>Cerorhinca monocerata</i>	50	Survey	Strait of Juan de Fuca, Washington, US	67
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	30	Survey	Kuril Islands, Antsiferova Island, Russia	6
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	20	Survey	Kuril Islands, Ekarma Island, Russia	6
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	50	Survey	Commander Islands, Russia	7
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	50	Speculative	Tauyskaya Bay, Russia	26
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	52.9	Direct	Middleton Island, Gulf of Alaska, US	40
<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	100	Speculative	General	54
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	150	Survey	General	26
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	110	Survey	Chisik Island, Lower Cook Inlet, Alaska, US	52
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	50	Survey	Bering Shelf and Alaska Coast	53
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	120	Survey	Cape Thompson, Chukchi Sea, Alaska, US	55
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	180	Survey	Sea of Okhotsk, Russia	65
<i>Fratercula corniculata</i>	60	Survey	Buldir Island, Canada	68
<i>Larus glaucescens</i>	25	Survey	Commander Islands, Russia	7
<i>Larus glaucescens</i>	100	Survey	British Columbia, Canada	45
<i>Larus hyperboreus</i>	15	Speculative	Karrak Lake, Canada	59
<i>Larus marinus</i>	10	Speculative	UK	24
<i>Larus marinus</i>	60	Survey	Belgium	63
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	70	Speculative	Farallon Islands, US	3
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	47.2	Direct	East Sand Island, Columbia River Estuary, US	5
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	14.2	Direct	Oneida Lake, New York, US	15
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	40	Direct	Cat Island, Green Bay, US	16
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	30	Speculative	Massachusetts, US	29
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	6.7	Direct	Beaver Archipelago, Lake Michigan, US	62

<i>Phalacrocorax pelagicus</i>	15	Speculative	Farallon Islands, US	4
<i>Phalacrocorax pelagicus</i>	9	Direct	Middleton Island, Gulf of Alaska, US	41
<i>Phalacrocorax urile</i>	20	Survey	Pribilof Islands, Alaska	61
<i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i>	95	Direct	Channel Islands, California, US	1
<i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i>	137	Survey	Farallon Islands, US	2
<i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i>	90	Direct	Triangle Island, British Columbia	58
<i>Rissa brevirostris</i>	110	Survey	Pribilof Islands, Alaska	30
<i>Rissa brevirostris</i>	150	Survey	Pribilof Islands, Alaska	34
<i>Sterna aleutica</i>	11	Survey	Seward Peninsula, Alaska, US	37
<i>Sterna aleutica</i>	50	Survey	Alaska, US	38
<i>Sterna aleutica</i>	30	Indirect	Sakhalin Island, Russia	47
<i>Sterna aleutica</i>	70	Indirect	Russia	48
<i>Synthliboramphus antiquus</i>	60	Survey	Raikoke islands, Russia	6
<i>Synthliboramphus antiquus</i>	75	Survey	Matua Island, Russia	6
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	168	Direct	Latrabjarg, Iceland	8
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	95	Indirect	Coats Island, Nunavut, Canada	19
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	119.9	Indirect	Hakluyt Island, Greenland	22
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	62.3	Indirect	Hakluyt Island, Greenland	22
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	137.8	Indirect	Coburg Island, Canada	22
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	47	Direct	Hakluyt Island, Greenland	23
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	150	Direct	Digges Island, Nunavut, Canada	25
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	120	Direct	St. George, Bering Sea, Alaska, US	28
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	60	Direct	St. Paul, Bering Sea, Alaska, US	28
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	50	Direct	Bogoslof, Bering Sea, Alaska	28
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	126	Survey	Svalbard, Norway	43
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	110	Survey	Shelikhov Gulf, Russia	64
<i>Uria lomvia</i>	150	Indirect	Wrangel Island, Russia	66

Literature Cited

- Ref. 1. Adams, J., Takekawa, J. Y. and Carter, H. R. 2004. Foraging distance and home range of Cassin's Auklets nesting at two colonies in the California Channel Islands. *The Condor* 106(3), 618. (doi:10.1650/7428).
- Ref. 2. Ainley, D. G., L. B. Spear, and S. G. Allen. 1996. Variation in the diet of Cassin's Auklet reveals spatial, seasonal, and decadal occurrence patterns of euphausiids off California, USA. *Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.* 137: 1-10.
- Ref. 3. Ainley, D.G. and Boekelheide, R.J. eds. 1990. Seabirds of the Farallon Islands. Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, CA.
- Ref. 4. Ainley, D.G. and Sanger, G.A. 1979 Trophic relationships of seabirds in the northeastern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea. Pp. 95-122. in *Conservation of marine birds of northern North America* (J.C. Bartonek and D.N. Nettleship, eds.). U.S. Dept. of Int., Fish and Wildl. Serv., Wildl. Res. Rept. 11.
- Ref. 5. Anderson, C. D., Roby, D. D. & Collis, K. 2004 Foraging patterns of male and female Double-crested Cormorants nesting in the Columbia River estuary. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 82(4), 541-554. (doi:10.1139/z04-019).
- Ref. 6. Artukhin, Yu. B., 2003. The distribution and abundance of seabirds during summer in coastal areas of South Kamchatka and the Kurile Islands. (in Russian), In Artukhin, Yu. B., and Gerasimov, Yu. N., eds., *Biologiya i okhrana ptits Kamchatki*. (The biology and conservation of the birds of Kamchatka): Moscow, Izdatelstvo Tsentra okhrany dikoy prirody, vol. 5, p. 13-26.
- Ref. 7. Artukhin, Yu. B., 2006, Distribution and abundance of seabirds over the Commander Islands, In Artukhin, Yu. B., and Gerasimov, Yu. N., eds., *Biologiya i okhrana ptits Kamchatki*. (The biology and conservation of the birds of Kamchatka): Moscow, Izdatelstvo Tsentra okhrany dikoy prirody, vol. 7, p. 76-94.
- Ref. 8. Benvenuti, S., Bonadonna, F., Dall'Antonia, L. & Gudmundsson, G. A. 1998 Foraging flights of breeding Thick-Billed Murres (*Uria lomvia*) as revealed by bird-borne direction recorders. *Auk* 115, 57-66.
- Ref. 9. BirdLife International. 2000. The Development of Boundary Selection Criteria for the Extension of Breeding Seabird Special Protection Areas into the Marine Environment. OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic. Vlissingen (Flushing).
- Ref. 10. Briggs, K. T., Tyler, W. B., Lewis, D. B. & Carlson, D. R. 1987 Bird communities at sea off California, 1975–1983. *Studies in Avian Biology* 11, 1–74.
- Ref. 11. Butler, Ronald G. and Daniel E. Buckley. 2002. Black Guillemot (*Cepphus grylle*), *The Birds of North America Online* (A. Poole, Ed.).
- Ref. 12. Byrd, G.V. and Gibson, D.D. 1980. Distribution and population status of Whiskered Auklet in the Aleutian Islands, Alaska. *West. Birds* 11: 135-140.
- Ref. 13. Byrkjedal I, Alendal E, Lindbergg OF 1974. Counts of sea-birds between Norway and Spitzbergen in the summer 1973. *Arbok Norsk Polarinstitut*, Oslo (1974); 265-269
- Ref. 14. Cairns, D.K., Bredin, K.A. and Montevecchi, W.A. (1987) Activity budgets and foraging ranges of breeding common murres. *Auk* 104:218-224.
- Ref. 15. Coleman, J. T. H., Richmond, M. E., Rudstam, L. G. & Mattison, P. M. 2005 Foraging Location and Site Fidelity of the Double-crested Cormorant on Oneida Lake, New York. *Waterbirds* 28, 498-510.
- Ref. 16. Custer, T. W. & Bunck, C. 1992 Feeding flights of breeding Double-crested Cormorants at two Wisconsin colonies. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 63, 203–211.

- Ref. 17. Day, R.H. and Byrd, G.V. 1989. Food habits of the Whiskered Auklet at Buldir Island, Alaska. *Condor* 91: 65-72.
- Ref. 18. Drent, R. H. 1965 Breeding biology of the pigeon guillemot, *Cepphus columba*. *Ardea* 53, 99-159.
- Ref. 19. Elliott, K. H., Woo, K. J., Gaston, A. J., Benvenuti, S., Dall'Antonia, L. & Davoren, G. K. 2009 Central-place Foraging in an Arctic Seabird Provides Evidence for Storer-Ashmole's Halo. *The Auk* 126(3), 613-625. (doi:10.1525/auk.2009.08245).
- Ref. 20. Evans PGH (1981) Ecology and behaviour of the little auk *Alle alle* in West Greenland. *Ibis* 123:1-18
- Ref. 21. Ewins, P.J. 1993. Pigeon Guillemot (*Cepphus columba*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 49 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- Ref. 22. Falk, K. B., S., Dall'Antonia, L., Gilchrist, G. & Kampp, K. 2002 Foraging behaviour of thick-billed murres breeding in different sectors of the North Water polynya: an inter-colony comparison. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 231, 293-302.
- Ref. 23. Falk, K., Dall'Antonia, L. & Benvenuti, S. 2001 Mapping pre- and post-fledging foraging locations of thick-billed murres in the North Water polynya. *Ecography* 24, 625-632.
- Ref. 24. Furness, R.W. & Tasker, M.L. 2000. Seabird-fishery interactions: quantifying the sensitivity of seabirds to reductions in sandeel abundance, and identification of key areas for sensitive seabirds in the North Sea. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 202: 253-264.
- Ref. 25. Gaston, A. J., Elliott, K. H., Ropert-Coudert, Y., Kato, A., Macdonald, C. A., Mallory, M. L. and Gilchrist, H. G. 2013. Modeling foraging range for breeding colonies of thick-billed murres *Uria lomvia* in the Eastern Canadian Arctic and potential overlap with industrial development. - *Biological Conservation*, 168: 134-143.
- Ref. 26. Golubova, E. Y. and Nazarkin, M. V. 2010 Feeding ecology of the tufted puffin (*Lunda cirrhata*) and the horned puffin (*Fratercula corniculata*) in the northern Sea of Okhotsk. *Russian Journal of Marine Biology* 35(7), 593-608. (doi:10.1134/s1063074009070086).
- Ref. 27. Harding, A. M. A., Egevang, C., Walkusz, W., Merkel, F., Blanc, S. & Grémillet, D. 2009 Estimating prey capture rates of a planktivorous seabird, the little auk (*Alle alle*), using diet, diving behaviour, and energy consumption. *Polar Biology* 32(5), 785-796. (doi:10.1007/s00300-009-0581-x).
- Ref. 28. Harding, A., Paredes, R., Suryan, R., Roby, D., Irons, D., Orben, R., Renner, H., Young, R., Barger, C., Dorresteijn, I., et al. Does location really matter? An inter-colony comparison of seabirds breeding at varying distances from productive oceanographic features in the Bering Sea. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* (0). (doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2013.03.013).
- Ref. 29. Hatch, J.J. and Weseloh, D.V. 1999. Double-crested Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*). No 441. (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). *The Birds of North America*, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- Ref. 30. Hatch, S. A., G. V. Byrd, D. B. Irons, and G. L. Hunt Jr. 1993. Status and ecology of kittiwakes (*Rissa tridactyla* and *R. brevirostris*) in the North Pacific. Pages 140-153 in K. Vermeer, K. T. Briggs, K. H. Morgan, D. Siegel-Causey (eds.). *The status, ecology, and conservation of marine birds of the North Pacific*. Can. Wildl. Serv. Spec. Pub. Ottawa, Canada.
- Ref. 31. Hayes D.L. 1995. A comparison of the breeding and feeding ecology of pigeon guillemots at Naked and Jackpot Islands in Prince William Sound. *Finnal Report of the Project APEX: Guillemots* 00163-F
- Ref. 32. Hunt G.L. Jr., Harrison N.M. and Cooney R.T. (1990). The influence of hydrographic structure and prey abundance on foraging of least auklets. *Studies in Avian Biology* 14: 7-22

- Ref. 33. HUNT, G. L., B. MAYER, W. RODSTROMA, ND R. SQUIBB. 1978. Reproductive ecology, foods, and foraging areas of seabirds nesting on the Pribilof Islands, p: 570- 775. In Environmental assessment of the Alaskan Continental Shelf, Vol. 1. NOAA/OCSEAP, Boulder, CO.
- Ref. 34. Hunt, G. L., Eppley, Z. Jr., Burgeson, B., and Squibb, R. 1981. Reproductive ecology, foods, and foraging areas of seabirds nesting in the Pribilof Islands, 1975-1979. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA; OCSEAP Final Rep. 12: 1-258.
- Ref. 35. Jakubas, D., Iliszko, L., Wojczulanis-Jakubas, K. and Stempniewicz, L. 2012 Foraging by little auks in the distant marginal sea ice zone during the chick-rearing period. *Polar Biology* 35, 73-81. (doi:10.1007/s00300-011-1034-x).
- Ref. 36. Kato, A., Watanuki, Y. and Naito, Y. 2003 Foraging behaviour of chick-rearing rhinoceros auklets *Cerorhinca monocerata* at Teuri Island, Japan, determined by acceleration-depth recording micro data loggers. *Journal of Avian Biology* 34, 282-287.
- Ref. 37. Kessel, B. 1989. *Birds of the Seward Peninsula, Alaska*. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks.
- Ref. 38. Kessel, B. and Gibson, D.D. 1978. Status and distribution of Alaska birds. *Stud. Avian Biol.* 1: 1-100.
- Ref. 39. Kolthoff G. 1903. Bidrag till Kännedom om Norra Polartrakternas Däggdjur och Foglar. Kungliga Svenska Vetenskapsakademiens Handlingar 36. 103 pp
- Ref. 40. Kotzerka, J. 2011 Identification of foraging behaviour and feeding areas of three seabird species breeding sympatrically in a highly productive regime, the northern Gulf of Alaska. Dissertation. Christian-Albrechts-Universität. <http://d-nb.info/1020401915/34>
- Ref. 41. Kotzerka, J., Hatch, S. A. & Garthe, S. 2011 Evidence for Foraging-Site Fidelity and Individual Foraging Behavior of Pelagic Cormorants Rearing Chicks in the Gulf of Alaska. *The Condor* 113(1), 80-88. (doi:10.1525/cond.2011.090158).
- Ref. 42. Mason, J.W., McChesney, G.J., McIver, W.R., Carter, H.R., Takekawa, J.Y., Golightly, R.T., Ackerman, J.T., Orthmeyer, D.L., Perry, W.M., Yee, J.L., Pierson, M.O. & McCrary, M.D. (2007). At-sea distribution and abundance of seabirds off southern california: a 20-year comparison. *Studies in Avian Biology* No. 33.
- Ref. 43. Mehlum, F., Hunt , G. L. J., Decker, M. B. & Norlund, N. 1998 Hydrographic features, cetaceans and the foraging of Thick-Billed Murres and other marine birds in the Northwestern Barents Sea. *Arctic* 51, 243-252.
- Ref. 44. Mikhtar'yants, E. A., 1974, Breeding biology of the pigeon guillemot (*Cepphus columba kaiurka*). (in Russian), In Materialy 6 Vsesoyuznoy ornitologicheskoy konferentsii. (Proceedings of the 6th all-union ornithological conference): Moscow, Izd. MGU, part 2, p. 87-88.
- Ref. 45. Morgan , K.H., Vermeer, K. and McKelvey, R.W. 1991. Atlas of pelagic birds of western Canada. Occas. Pap. No. 72., Can. Wildl. Serv., Ottawa.
- Ref. 46. Mudge, G.P. and Crooke, C.H. (1986) Seasonal changes in the numbers and distribution of seabirds in the Moray Firth, northeast Scotland. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh B* 91, 81-104.
- Ref. 47. Nechaev, V. A., 1991, Ptitsy ostrova Sakhalin. (Birds of the Sakhalin Island). (in Russian): Vladivostok, DVO AN SSSR, 748 p.
- Ref. 48. Nechaev, V. A., and Lobkov, E. G., 1988, Kamchatian tern. (in Russian), In , Ptitsy SSSR. Chaikovy. (Birds of the USSR. Larids): Moscow, Nauka, p. 348-356.
- Ref. 49. Nettleship D.N. and Birkhead T.R. (1985). *The Atlantic Alcidae. The evolution, distribution and biology of the auks inhabiting the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent water areas*. Academic Press. London.

- Ref. 50. Nettleship, D.N. and Gaston, A.J. (1978) Patterns of pelagic distribution of seabirds in western Lancaster Sound and Barrow Strait, Northwest Territories, in August and September 1976. Canadian Wildlife Service Occasional Papers No. 39.
- Ref. 51. Obst, B. S., Russell, R. W., Hunt, G. L., Jr, Eppley, Z. A., and Harrison, N. M. 1995. Foraging radii and energetics of least auklets (*Aethia pusilla*) breeding on three Bering Sea islands. *Physiological Zoology*, 68: 647–672
- Ref. 52. Piatt, J. F. & Kitaysky, A. S. 2002 Horned Puffin (*Fratercula corniculata*). In *The Birds of North America*, No 603 (eds. Poole A., Gill F.), The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- Ref. 53. Piatt, J. F., A. Pinchuk, A. Kitaisky [sic], A. M. Springer, and S. A. Hatch. 1992. Foraging distribution and feeding ecology of seabirds at the Diomed Islands. Final Rep. for Minerals Management Service (OCS Study MMS 92-041). Anchorage, AK.
- Ref. 54. Piatt, J. F., and A. S. Kitaysky. 2002. Tufted Puffin (*Fratercula cirrhata*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 708 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- Ref. 55. Piatt, J. F., J. L. Wells, A. MacCharles, and B. Fadely. 1990c. The distribution of seabirds and their prey in relation to ocean currents in the southeastern Chukchi Sea. *Can Wildl. Serv. Occas. Pap.* 68: 21–31.
- Ref. 56. Ronconi, R. A., St. Clair, C. C. 2002. Management options to reduce boat disturbance on foraging black guillemots (*Cepphus grylle*) in the Bay of Fundy . *Biological Conservation* 108(3): 265-271.
- Ref. 57. Russell, R. W., Harrison, N. M. & Hunt, G. L. (1999) Foraging at a front: hydrography, zooplankton and avian planktivory in the northern Bering Sea. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 182: 77-94
- Ref. 58. Ryder, J. L., W. S. Boyd, S. G. Shisko, and D. F. Bertram. 2001. At-sea foraging distributions of radio-marked Cassin's Auklets breeding at Triangle Island, B.C., 2000. Technical Report Series No. 368 Canadian Wildlife Service, Pacific and Yukon Region, BC, Canada.
- Ref. 59. Samelius, G., and Alisauskas, R.T. 1999. Diet and growth of glaucous gulls at a large Arctic goose colony. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:1327–1331.
- Ref. 60. Sawyer, T.R. (1999) Habitat use and breeding performance in an inshore foraging seabird, the black Guillemot *Cepphus grylle*. PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow.
- Ref. 61. Schneider D. and Hunt G.L.Jr. (1984). A comparison of seabird diets and foraging distribution around the Pribilof Islands, Alaska. In Nettleship D.N., Sanger G.A., and Springer P.F. (Editors) (1984). *Marine Birds: Their Feeding Ecology and Commercial Fisheries Relationships*. Proceedings of the Pacific Seabird Group Symposium Seattle, Washington, 6-8 Jan 1982. Special Publication, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada.
- Ref. 62. Seefelt, N. F. & Gillingham. 2006 Foraging locations of Double-crested cormorants in the Beaver Archipelago of Northern Lake Michigan: potential for impacts on Smallmouth Bass. *Waterbirds* 29, 473-480.
- Ref. 63. Seys, J., Offringa, H., Van Waeyenberge, J. Meire, P., Vincx, M. , Kuijken, E., 2001. Distribution patterns of seabirds in Belgian marine waters. In Seys, J. (ed). *Het gebruik van zee- en kustvogelgegevens ter ondersteuning van het beleid en beheer van de Belgische kustwateren*. pp. 22-39
- Ref. 64. Shuntov, V. P., 1997, New data on seabirds in offshore waters of the North-Eastern Sea of Okhotsk in summer. (in Russian): *Zoologicheskii Zhurnal*. (Zoological Journal), vol. 76, no. 6, p. 718-725.

- Ref. 64. Shuntov, V. P., 1997, New data on seabirds in offshore waters of the North-Eastern Sea of Okhotsk in summer. (in Russian): Zoologicheski Zhurnal. (Zoological Journal), vol. 76, no. 6, p. 718-725.
- Ref. 65. Shuntov, V. P., 1998, Ptitsy dalnevostochnykh morey Rossii. (Seabirds of the Far East seas of Russia). (in Russian): Vladivostok, TINRO, 423 p.
- Ref. 66. Velizhanin, A. G., 1965, Notes on the terrestrial vertebrates of Wrangel Island. (in Russian): Zapiski Primorskogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva SSSR. (Proceedings of the Primorie Branch of the Geographic Society of the USSR), vol. 24, no. 1, p. 67-78.
- Ref. 67. Wahl, T.R. and Speich, S.M. 1994. Distribution of foraging Rhinoceros Auklets in the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Washington. Northwest. Nat. 75: 63-69.
- Ref. 68. Wehle, D. H. S. 1976. Summer food and feeding ecology of Tufted and Horned puffins on Buldir Island, Alaska, 1975. Master's thesis, Univ. of Alaska, Fairbanks.