



Effects of urbanization on bird migration

Anne-Sophie Bonnet-Lebrun, Andrea Manica, Ana S.L. Rodrigues

► To cite this version:

Anne-Sophie Bonnet-Lebrun, Andrea Manica, Ana S.L. Rodrigues. Effects of urbanization on bird migration. *Biological Conservation*, 2020, 244, pp.108423. <10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108423>. <hal-03005340>

HAL Id: hal-03005340

<https://hal.science/hal-03005340v1>

Submitted on 23 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Effects of urbanisation on bird migration

Anne-Sophie Bonnet-Lebrun^{*1,2}, Andrea Manica¹, Ana S.L. Rodrigues²,

¹Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EJ UK

²Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive CEFE, CNRS – Univ. de Montpellier – Univ. Paul Valéry Montpellier – EPHE, 34293 Montpellier, France

*Corresponding author: British Antarctic Survey, High Cross, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0ET, UK. anne-sophie.bonnet-lebrun@normale.fr

Abstract

Nearly one in five bird species is migratory, but not all individuals within a migratory species necessarily migrate: in partially migratory species, some do and some do not. Such within-species variability provides a natural experiment for investigating the mechanisms driving bird migration. Previous studies at the species level suggest that migrating provides a way to escape harsh winters, and to secure an increased access to resources, particularly important during the breeding season. Urbanization, by altering local temperatures ('heat island' effect) and resource availability (e.g. through garbage or garden feeders) can buffer the effects of winter harshness and modify breeding-season resource availability, potentially affecting individual migratory strategies. Here, we use ringing data from twelve North American partially migratory bird species to investigate the effects of natural environmental conditions (winter temperature, breeding season resource surplus) and urbanization on the propensity of individuals to migrate. We find strong support for the hypothesis that individuals migrate to avoid harsh winters, with, for eleven species, significantly higher probabilities of residency in areas with milder winters. We also found (significant for five species) that resource surplus in the breeding season reduces the propensity to migrate. Finally, urbanization increased the likelihood that individuals remain year-round in their ranges, avoiding to migrate away from their breeding range (four species) or their wintering areas (eight species), after controlling for climate and resources. Our results thus indicate that bird migratory strategies will respond to global change – in climate and land use – and indeed are already doing so.

Keywords: anthropogenic effects, human population, partial migration, North American passerines, residency

Introduction

Nearly one in five of the world's 10,000 bird species migrate seasonally between breeding and non-breeding ranges (Kirby *et al.* 2008), a global-scale ecological readjustment (Moreau 1952) that radically changes the composition and diversity of bird communities across wide areas of the planet (Somveille *et al.* 2013). In practice, though, the migratory movements are not of species but of individuals. Furthermore, it is not a fixed species trait: in many species, some individuals migrate while others remain in the same region as year-round residents. This includes variation among populations – whereby some populations are resident and some migratory – but also within populations – in which only a fraction of the individuals found in a given region migrate. The term ‘partial migration’ is often applied to the latter (Chapman *et al.* 2011), but here we use it more broadly to refer to within-species variation in migratory-*versus*-resident behaviour.

Partial migration is widespread among animal taxa (e.g. ungulates, Hebblewhite & Merrill 2011; fish, Chapman *et al.* 2012; insects, Dällenbach *et al.* 2018) and very common in bird species. For example, in a review of Australian land birds, Chan (2001) found that among 155 non-passerine and 317 passerines species studied, respectively 44% of and 32% are partial migrants. Partially migratory species provide opportunities for testing hypotheses on the ecological and evolutionary processes underpinning migration itself, by allowing for multiple replicates (i.e., the individuals) while controlling for the wider variation in ecological traits (e.g. trophic level, body size, habitat preferences) observed across species (see Chapman *et al.* 2011 for a review). Furthermore, given that individuals and populations can react faster to environmental changes than entire species, monitoring the responses of partially migratory species to anthropogenic activities can provide early insights into how species respond to global change (Pulido & Berthold 2010; Podhrázký *et al.* 2017).

Conceptually, an individual bird in any given (breeding or non-breeding) location, can either remain in that same location as a resident, or move elsewhere for the following season. Recent studies at the species' level suggest that migration is largely driven by energetic trade-offs, with species migrating when the benefits derived from spending parts of the year in different areas exceed the costs of migration between them (Hurlbert & Haskell 2003; Dalby *et al.* 2014; Somveille *et al.* 2015, 2018a, b). More specifically, these studies suggest that the main driver of migration out of the breeding range is winter harshness, either because of the thermoregulation costs of low temperatures, or because of a reduction in resources during winter, or both (Herrera 1978; Lemoine & Böhning-Gaese 2003; Carnicer & Diaz-Delgado 2008; Schaefer *et al.* 2008; Somveille *et al.* 2015). At the individual level, this should translate into a higher probability of individuals to migrate out of their breeding locations if these locations face harsh winters, and conversely into a higher probability of remaining as resident in locations with mild winters. Accordingly, progressively milder winters linked to climate change have been proposed as a reason for increased rates at which some migratory species are being observed year-round in their breeding areas (e.g. Great Crested Grebes *Podiceps cristatus* in the Netherlands, Adriaensen, *et al.* 1993; blackbirds *Turdus merula* in Europe, Berthold 1993; Main 2000), likely reflecting an increase in the fraction of sedentary individuals in partially migratory populations (e.g. as observed for blackbirds in the Netherlands, Vliet *et al.* (2009); and Denmark, Kristensen & Thorup

(2011)). A relationship between winter harshness and migratory propensity can also explain observations that some previously non-migratory species whose ranges recently expanded into higher latitudes have become migratory there (e.g., European serins *Serinus serinus* spreading into northern Europe, Berthold (1999); House Finch *Carpodacus mexicanus* in eastern North America, Able & Belthoff (1998)).

The main drive to leave the wintering grounds, on the other hand, seems to be to obtain better access to resources during the breeding season. Indeed, previous studies at the species' level found that the resources available during the breeding season – or, more precisely, the surplus in relation to the resources in the non-breeding season – was the main predictor of the number of breeding migratory birds found in any given region, a pattern explained in terms of reduced competition with resident birds (Dalby *et al.* 2014; Somveille *et al.* 2015). At the individual level, one thus expects that the individuals wintering in areas with high levels of resource surplus in the breeding season have a higher probability of remaining as residents.

Given that anthropogenic activities are affecting both the climate (IPCC, 2014) and the distribution of natural resources (Haberl *et al.* 2014), it is not surprising that there is mounting evidence of human effects on bird migration (Visser *et al.* 2009; Plummer *et al.* 2015; Greig *et al.* 2017). One such major effect is by altering land cover, with urbanization in particular creating habitats that are in many ways radically distinct from natural ones. The resulting changes to local environmental conditions may plausibly affect the migratory decisions of urban birds. First, urban areas are often 'heat islands', multiple degrees warmer than surrounding areas (Collier 2006), which may buffer birds against harsh winter temperatures (Shochat *et al.* 2006) and thus increase their probability of remaining over winter. Second, urban areas can provide particular resources, for example through bird feeders, garbage, and garden flowers and fruits (e.g. Robb *et al.* 2008; Greig *et al.* 2017). These may either buffer populations against the low resources of winter, and thus increase the probability of breeding birds remaining over winter, or provide resources in the breeding season that increase the odds that wintering birds remain to breed. Overall, urbanization is thus expected to increase the propensity to residency among migratory birds.

Previous studies have already found evidence for such an effect, across a range of species. For example, evidence from ring recoveries (Kristensen & Thorup 2011), stable isotopes (Evans *et al.* 2012), and physiological and behavioural studies (Partecke & Gwinner 2007) of European blackbirds (*Turdus merula*) indicates that urban birds have a lower tendency to migrate in relation to their non-urban counterparts. This effect is stronger at the northern part of the range (Evans *et al.* 2012), and seems to have played an important role in the relatively recent northwards expansion of the area in which the species is found year-round (Møller *et al.* 2014). Similarly, analysis of European robins (*Erithacus rubecula*) across different habitats near Antwerp, Belgium, found only 30% of colour-marked breeding birds in a woodland plot remained locally over winter, whereas most birds (including nearly all males) did so in urban garden and urban park plots (Dhondt & Adriaensen 1990). At a multi-species level, a study of wintering bird communities in Poland found higher abundances in urban compared to rural areas (Tryjanowski *et al.* 2015).

Some studies investigated the mechanisms behind changes in migratory behaviour. Among these, some highlighted the role of increasing resources on bird migration. For example, bird feeders were found to increase the frequency of wintering Eurasian blackcaps (*Sylvia atricapilla*) in urban areas in Britain (Plummer *et al.* 2015) and of Carolina wrens (*Thryothorus ludovicianus*) staying after winter at the northern edge of their range in Michigan (Job & Bednekoff 2011). Also, the use of nectar feeders seems to play a key role in the northwards expansion of wintering Anna's hummingbirds (*Calypte anna*) in the United States (Greig *et al.* 2017), whereas overwintering birds in a population of mainly breeding migrant white storks (*Ciconia ciconia*) rely strongly on landfills (Gilbert *et al.* 2016). Some studies' results support the hypothesis that urban areas buffer migratory birds from winter harshness. For example, a study of ringing records of European blackbirds in the Netherlands found that the fraction of birds migrating away from their breeding areas in the winter was inversely correlated with temperature in rural areas, but found no noticeable effect in urban areas (Vliet *et al.* 2009). The urban 'heat island effect' was also considered a factor explaining the above-mentioned winter range expansion of Anna's hummingbirds in the United States, with the interaction between January minimum temperatures and housing densities being a significant predictor of winter presence (Greig *et al.* 2017).

Most of previous studies have however analysed the effects of urbanization on bird migration by focusing on small parts of the range (e.g. Dhondt & Adriaensen 1990; Gilbert *et al.* 2016; Greig *et al.* 2017), and typically only at a specific season (usually winter). Additionally, measures of migratory propensity are oftentimes crude (e.g. contrasts between local bird densities, Tryjanowski *et al.* 2015; fraction of colour-marked birds, Dhondt & Adriaensen 1990; stable isotopes sensitive to only very large differences in migratory distance, Evans *et al.* 2012), and can thus mask important differences in migratory behaviour (e.g. local post-breeding dispersion versus long-term migration).

Here, we take advantage of a continental-scale bird ringing scheme to test the hypothesis that urbanization is affecting bird migrations. Ringing data allow us to identify the precise seasonal locations of individual birds, and therefore unambiguously distinguish residency or short-distance dispersal from long-distance movements. We focus on ten North American partially migratory species for which we were able to obtain ringing recoveries data that cover their entire range. Furthermore, we investigate drivers in the migratory propensity of individuals in both seasons, breeding and non-breeding, when accounting both for natural factors (winter harshness and resource availability) and for anthropogenic factors (urbanization). Specifically, we test four hypotheses: that propensity to remain year-round in the breeding grounds is higher if (1a) winters are milder and (1b) urbanization levels stronger; and that propensity to remain year-round in the wintering grounds is higher if (2a) resource surplus is higher and (2b) urbanization is higher.

Data and Methods

Individual bird data

Species' data come from the North American Bird Banding Programme (NABBP), run by the Bird Banding Laboratory of the USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and the Bird Banding Office of

the Canadian Wildlife Service (USGS Bird Banding Laboratory 2016). The programme compiles records of birds captured and marked with a uniquely numbered band or ring, as well as any subsequent recoveries. Ringing localities are recorded in 10-arc minute blocks, which, at 40°N for example, corresponds to 14.2km in longitude and 18.5km in latitude.

We focused on migratory species whose entire life cycle is well covered by the NABBP, i.e., whose breeding and non-breeding ranges (in the Western Hemisphere) fall mainly within the United States and southern Canada. We then searched within each species for individuals seen alive at least twice and in opposite seasons, i.e., one record in the breeding season (May to July), another in the non-breeding season (December to February). Whenever an individual was recorded more than once in a season, we retained only the first record. Using the great circle distance between the breeding and non-breeding locations, we classified each individual into either ‘resident’ (<20km) or ‘migrant’ (>100km; following Fiedler & Pulido (2006); Brown & Miller (2016)). We focused on twelve species for which we were able to obtain a reasonable number of individuals (≥ 50) including a mix of resident and migrant individuals: American Goldfinch (*Spinus tristis*), American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*), Blue Jay (*Cyanocitta cristata*), Brown-headed Cowbird (*Molothrus ater*), Common Grackle (*Quiscalus quiscula*), European Starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), Evening Grosbeak (*Coccothraustes vespertinus*), House Finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), Pine Siskin (*Carduelis pinus*), Purple Finch (*Haemorhous purpureus*), Red-winged Blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*) and White-throated Sparrow (*Zonotrichia albicollis*). The eastern House Finch population has been recently introduced and is mostly resident (Able and Belthoff 1998), so we exclude it from the analysis, by removing all House Finch records east of 95°W. Total number of birds and number of residents are presented in Fig. 1). Records span the 1920-2016 period (Appendix A). Ringing/recovery effort, and thus NABBP records, are spatially clustered in regions of higher human density and those with more nature-friendly habitants, but we have no reason to expect ringing/recovery effort to affect the propensity of individuals to migrate.

Environmental data

Winter harshness

Somveille et al. (2015) found that the diversity of bird species that overwinter in their breeding locations was inversely related to both the winter temperature and to winter resources (measured by mean winter NDVI), with both variables being highly correlated and the former being the best predictor. Accordingly, we focused on winter temperature as an indicator of harshness of conditions during the non-breeding season. For any given location, we measured winter harshness as the mean of the monthly average temperature values from December to February within a 10km buffer around the location. To avoid focusing on an unrepresentative year, we used the Worldclim dataset (Worldclim database at resolution 30’’; Hijmans *et al.* 2005), averaging values across all available years (1970-2000).

Breeding resource surplus

Following Hurlbert & Haskell (2003) and Somveille *et al.* (2015, 2018a, b), we used values of mean monthly Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) as a general indicator of resources (food, nesting sites and roosting sites). For any given location, we first calculated the mean monthly NDVI

in the breeding season (May to July) and in the wintering season (December to February) within a buffer of 10km around the location, and then measured the resource surplus in the breeding season (ΔNDVI) as the difference between the former and the latter. Assuming (in a simple way) that resident species use the same resources year-round, this surplus is a measure of the resources available to migratory species (Somveille *et al.* 2018a, b). We obtained mean monthly NDVI values from NASA's Earth Observatory (2016; resolution 0.1°), again averaging across all available years (May 2000 – February 2016) to create seasonal means.

Urbanization levels

We considered local human population density as a proxy for the level of urbanization. The median ringing/re-sighting year for the pooled species data was 1956 (interquartile: 1946-1968; Appendix A), so we used the closest spatially explicit data on reconstructed population density across North America that we were able to obtain (1970; Center for International Earth Science Information Network – CIESIN – Columbia University, 2017; resolution 30''). We extracted the mean population density in a buffer of 10km around each individual location, and log transformed it using $\log(x+1)$ (Fig. 1C, 1E). A log transformation improved the distribution of this variable, which spans several orders of magnitude.

Testing of hypothesis

We tested four hypotheses: that the probability of an individual remaining year-round at its breeding location is (1) higher if winters are milder (i.e., higher local temperatures during the wintering season) and (2) higher if urbanization levels are stronger (i.e., higher local human density); and that the probability of an individual remaining year-round at its wintering location is (3) higher if breeding resource surplus is higher (i.e., higher local ΔNDVI) and (4) higher if urbanization levels are stronger (i.e., higher local human density).

We tested these hypotheses for each species by fitting a binomial Generalised Linear Model (logit link), with the resident (1) vs. migrant (0) status of each individual bird as a response and local environmental conditions (natural: winter temperature, ΔNDVI ; anthropogenic: human density) as predictors. We tested hypotheses 1 and 2 by focusing solely on the breeding locations, using as predictors local winter temperature and local (log-transformed) human density, and hypotheses 3 and 4 by focusing on the wintering locations, using local breeding resource surplus (ΔNDVI) and local human density as predictors. Note that we did not model the probability of birds being present at a given location, but rather their probability of remaining as residents at a given location, knowing that they were present in a given season.

We standardised variables prior to modelling to allow for the comparison of estimated coefficients, using the following formula: $(x - \text{mean}(x))/\text{sd}(x)$. We used a backwards stepwise selection procedure using AIC to select the best model, and a sequential Bonferroni correction to deal with the large number of repeated tests across species. All analyses were done in R.3.4.2 (R Core Team 2017). Codes are provided in Appendix S4.

Results

Probability of remaining at the breeding location over winter

We found for eleven out of twelve species a significant positive relationship between the probability that individuals overwinter in their breeding locations and local winter temperature (Fig. 1B, 2A, Appendix B). Human density was significantly positively related with the probability that individuals remain at their breeding locations overwinter for four out of twelve species: American Goldfinch, European Starling, Evening Grosbeak and Purple finch (Fig. 1C, 2B). The effect was positive for five other species, and negative for three but not significantly so after sequential Bonferroni correction (Fig. 2B, Appendix B).

Probability of remaining at the winter location during the breeding season

For five out of twelve species – American Goldfinch, American Robin, Common Grackle, European Starling, and Evening Grosbeak – we found a significant positive effect of the surplus in resources during the breeding season on the probability that individuals remain at their wintering location into the breeding season (Fig. 1D, 2C, Appendix C). This effect was positive but not significant for six other species, and negative but not significant for the remaining species (Red-winged Blackbird) (Fig. 2C, Appendix C). We found a significant effect of local human density on the probability that individuals remain at their wintering location during the breeding season for eight species: American Goldfinch, American Robin, Blue Jay, Common Grackle, European starling, House Finch, Purple Finch, and White-throated Sparrow (Figure 1E, 2D; Appendix C). The effect was non-significant for the other species: positive in two cases, and negative in two (Appendix C).

Discussion

Here we investigated whether natural and anthropogenic conditions affect the propensity of individuals to remain resident in twelve partially migratory North American bird species, using a large scale ringing dataset (USGS Bird Banding Laboratory, 2016).

In all species studied, we found substantial individual variability, with the same conditions under which some individuals migrate apparently tolerated by others year-round. This may reflect true individual variation in migratory strategies within populations. For example, individual differences in propensity to migrate have been related to factors such as sex (Dhondt & Adriaensen 1990; Perez *et al.* 2014), dominance status (Ketterson & Nolan 1979), personality (reaction to a novel object; Nilsson *et al.* 2010), body size (Belthoff & Gauthreaux 1991) and physiology (e.g. basal metabolic rates and cost of thermoregulation; Nilsson *et al.* 2011). Individual strategies can also change over time, for example in response to changing environmental conditions (Shaw & Levin 2011) or age, an effect that we could not disentangle from individual variability, since we only had one pair of observations per individual.

It is also possible that this individual variability arose from limitations in our data, for instance in the environmental axes we considered and their proxies. For example, NDVI as a general measure of

resources does not necessarily capture the specific resources needed for each species. And human density is a crude proxy for anthropogenic effects (e.g. agricultural areas often have low population densities and yet can provide important resources, Foley *et al.* 2011; managed green spaces are often more productive than the surrounding wildlands, Imhoff *et al.* 2009).

Apparent individual variability in the propensity to migrate for apparently similar conditions can also arise from the temporal mismatch between the ringing data (see Appendix B for a distribution of records through time) and the explanatory variables (e.g. temperature averaged over 1970-2000, population density in 1970). Furthermore, data limitations meant we were unable to integrate within-season mobility (e.g. Thorup *et al.* 2017), yearly variation in migratory propensity (e.g. species known for their irruptive migrations: Evening Grosbeak, , Bock & Lepthien 1976; Pine Siskin, Alsop 2002), and the possibility that among our study species there may have been changes in migratory propensity over time (e.g. migratory populations becoming increasingly resident, Adriaensen, *et al.* 1993; Brown & Miller 2016; or the opposite, Berthold 1999).

Despite these limitations, which likely added noise to our data, our results support the predictions that local environmental conditions as we measured them affect the migratory decisions of individuals, in agreement of previous studies at the species level (Somveille *et al.* 2015). In particular, and for all but one species, our results strongly support the hypothesis that winter harshness drives individuals to migrate elsewhere from their breeding locations (Fig 1B, 2A). For most species, we also found support for the hypothesis that high local natural surpluses in summer increase the propensity of individuals to remain as residents in their wintering locations, even if we only found a significant effect in five cases (Fig 1D, 2C).

For nine species, results also support the hypothesis that urbanization (measured through human population density) affects the propensity of individual birds to migrate (Fig. 1C, 1E, 2B, 2D; Appendices B and C): in four species by increasing the probability that individuals stay over winter in their breeding locations, possibly by buffering them against winter harshness; in eight species by increasing the likelihood that individuals remain during the breeding season in their wintering grounds, possibly by increasing local resources. Our analysis thus adds to the existing evidence that urbanization is contributing to sedentarize at least some migratory species, showing that this effect can happen in either the wintering or the breeding portions of species' ranges.

It is not immediately clear why some species appeared in our results to be more responsive to urbanization than others. This could be in part due to limited statistical power, as the species for which we found no effect (Brown-headed Cowbird, Pine Siskin and Red-winged Blackbird) are among the ones with the smallest number of records (respectively 131, 104 and 160; but we found an effect – in the winter only – for the White-throated Sparrow and the House Finch, with respectively 69 and 123 records). Species with irruptive migrations (i.e. which move in irregular patterns in the winter tracking blooms in resources), may be less responsive to human density. Indeed, we found that the two irruptive migrants in our sample, Pine Siskins and Evening Grosbeaks, showed no response to human density in their propensity to remain at their winter location (Fig. 2B). However, Evening Grosbeaks seem to respond to human density in their propensity to remain at their breeding location (Fig. 2B).

Another explanation may come from species' level of association with anthropogenic resources and infrastructures. Although a review by Archer *et al.* (2019) found strong support for most species in our sample being synanthropic (medium support for the American Goldfinch, low support for the American Robin, and a lack of data about the White-throated Sparrow), there are known differences between species. For example, North-American populations of European Starlings are highly associated with cities (Alsop 2002), and we found a significant positive effect of human density on the propensity to remain as resident in both seasons (Fig. 1C, 1E, 2B, 2D; Appendices B and C). Similarly, American Goldfinches are common in suburbs, parks and backyards, and tend to visit garden feeders (Alsop 2002), and we found for this species a higher propensity to be resident (in both seasons) in densely human-populated areas (Fig. 2B, 2D). And House Finches in the east of North American are common in human-created habitats (Hill 2002) and were found to have a higher propensity to remain in their wintering location over the summer in densely human-populated areas (Fig. 2D). In contrast, we found no effect of human density for Red-winged Blackbirds, whose main habitats (marshes and agricultural fields) are outside densely populated areas (Alsop 2002).

A higher propensity to remain year-round in urban areas does not obviate the fact that urbanization itself often has substantial impacts on bird diversity, resulting in poorer communities (Lee *et al.* 2004; Biamonte *et al.* 2011). In particular, a meta-analysis showed a lower passerine fledging success in urban areas (Chamberlain *et al.* 2009). Nonetheless, our results suggest that, at least for some bird species that can cope well with anthropogenic habitats, urban areas can provide conditions that are beneficial enough to outweigh the costs of migration. However, it is possible that the benefits of urban areas only stand up to a certain level of urbanization, in the same way as Tratalos *et al.* (2017) found a hump-shaped relationship between bird species richness or abundances and household densities in Britain. Sample sizes for some of our study species were too small to allow us for the inclusion of non-monotone effects in our models, so we were unable to test for this additional hypothesis.

Additionally, it is unclear whether individual choices to remain in urban areas rather than migrating translate into positive effects at the population level. Indeed, urban areas may be acting as ecological traps – i.e. when organisms choose poor-quality habitats above better alternatives (Gilroy and Sutherland 2006). Urban resources may appear more attractive yet result in worse outcomes; for example, great tits have been shown to prefer larger nesting cavities in urban areas despite this leading to lower fledging success (Demeyrier *et al.* 2016). Concerns have also been raised about the nutritional value of anthropogenic food (Jones and Reynolds, 2008), the increased risk of disease spread around anthropogenic food sources (Robb *et al.* 2008; Jones and Reynolds, 2008). Previous studies suggest complex effects: for example, for garden feeders, a review by Robb *et al.* (2008a) found mostly positive effects on the breeding performance of supplementary-fed birds (e.g. Robb *et al.* 2008b), but Plummer *et al.* (2013) found a negative effect of feeders on the breeding performance of blue tits. To estimate whether remaining as resident in urban areas is actually beneficial would require data on population trends for migratory versus non-migratory individuals, or monitoring their breeding performance, which we did not have access to in this study.

Our results also indicate that, for some species, the effects of urbanization on the propensity to migrate are of similar orders of magnitude as those of variation in natural environmental conditions (as

measured by the standardised coefficients of the regressions; Fig 2). This suggests that recent human activities are changing environmental conditions at scales comparable to those naturally experienced by species over longer-term evolutionary-ecological processes. Based on our results, we predict that the combination of climate change (leading to an increase in average temperatures) and urbanization will converge to decrease the propensity of individuals of many migratory bird species across their current range in temperate areas. But for many of those, it will also lead to their expansion into new higher-latitude breeding grounds. Furthermore, the effects of climate change are spatially and temporally complex, as even though average temperature increase, some areas may experience a higher frequency of extremely cold winters. Climate change can also affect the spatial and temporal distribution of local resources, in particular through the interactions between temperature and precipitation on local primary productivity, which may increase in some areas and decline in others. Finally, humans are affecting the distribution of local resources through land use change, including not only urbanization but also other habitat changes at continental scales (Foley *et al.* 2005). Overall, our results add to the body of evidence that bird migration is not a fixed behaviour in bird populations, and that it is already being shaped by human activities.

References

- Able, K.P. & Belthoff, J.R. (1998). Rapid 'evolution' of migratory behaviour in the introduced house finch of eastern North America. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 265, 2063–2071.
- Adriaensen, F., Ulenaers, P. & Dhondt, A.A. (1993). Ringing recoveries and the increase in numbers of European Great Crested Grebes *Podiceps cristatus*. *Ardea*, 81, 59–70.
- Alsop, F.J. (2002). *Smithsonian Handbooks: Birds of New England*. DK, New York.
- Archer, J.-M. J., M. E. Hostetler, G. Acomb, and R. Blair. 2019. A systematic review of forest bird occurrence in North American forest fragments and the built environment. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 185:1–23.
- Belthoff, J.R. & Gauthreaux, S.A. (1991). Partial migration and differential winter distribution of House Finches in the eastern United States. *Condor*, 374–382.
- Berthold, P. (1993). *Bird Migration: A General Survey*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Berthold, P. (1999). A comprehensive theory for the evolution, control and adaptability of avian migration. *Ostrich*, 70, 1–11.
- Biamonte, E., Sandoval, L., Chacón, E. & Barrantes, G. (2011). Effect of urbanization on the avifauna in a tropical metropolitan area. *Landscape Ecol*, 26, 183–194.
- Bock, C.E. & Lepthien, L.W. (1976). Synchronous Eruptions of Boreal Seed-Eating Birds. *The American Naturalist*, 110, 559–571.
- Brown, D. & Miller, G. (2016). Band recoveries reveal alternative migration strategies in American Robins. *Animal Migration*, 3, 35–47.

Carnicer, J. & Diaz-Delgado, R. (2008). Geographic Differences between Functional Groups in Patterns of Bird Species Richness in North America. *Acta Oecologica*, 33, 253–264.

Center for International Earth Science Information Network - CIESIN - Columbia University. 2017. Global Population Density Grid Time Series Estimates. Palisades, NY: NASA Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC). <https://doi.org/10.7927/H47M05W2>. Accessed 01 October 2017

Chamberlain, D. E. et al. Avian productivity in urban landscapes: a review and meta-analysis. *Ibis* 151, 1–18 (2009).

Chan, K. (2001). Partial migration in Australian landbirds: a review. *Emu - Austral Ornithology*, 101, 281–292.

Chapman, B.B., Brönmark, C., Nilsson, J.-Å. & Hansson, L.-A. (2011). The ecology and evolution of partial migration. *Oikos*, 120, 1764–1775.

Chapman, B.B., Hulthén, K., Brodersen, J., Nilsson, P.A., Skov, C., Hansson, L.-A., et al. (2012). Partial migration in fishes: causes and consequences. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 81, 456–478.

Collier, C.G. (2006). The impact of urban areas on weather. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 132, 1–25.

Dalby, L., McGill, B.J., Fox, A.D. & Svenning, J.-C. (2014). Seasonality drives global-scale diversity patterns in waterfowl (Anseriformes) via temporal niche exploitation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23, 550–562.

Dällenbach, L.J., Glauser, A., Lim, K.S., Chapman, J.W. & Menz, M.H.M. (2018). Higher flight activity in the offspring of migrants compared to residents in a migratory insect. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 285, 20172829.

Demeyrier, V., M. M. Lambrechts, P. Perret, and A. Grégoire. 2016. Experimental demonstration of an ecological trap for a wild bird in a human-transformed environment. *Animal Behaviour* 118:181–190.

Dhondt, A. & Adriaensen, F. (1990). Population Dynamics and Partial Migration of the European Robin (*Erithacus rubecula*) in Different Habitats. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 59, 1077–1090.

Evans, K.L., Newton, J., Gaston, K.J., Sharp, S.P., McGowan, A. & Hatchwell, B.J. (2012). Colonisation of urban environments is associated with reduced migratory behaviour, facilitating divergence from ancestral populations. *Oikos*, 121, 634–640.

Fiedler, W. & Pulido, F. (2006). S19-3 Bird ringing as a means for studying the evolution of avian migration — potentials, limits and prospects. *Current Zoology(formerly Acta Zoologica Sinica)*, 52(Supp. issue 201), 345–349.

Foley, J.A., Defries, R., Asner, G.P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S.R., et al. (2005). Global consequences of land use. *Science*, 309, 570–574.

Foley, J.A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K.A., Cassidy, E.S., Gerber, J.S., Johnston, M., et al. (2011). Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, 478, 337–342.

Gilbert, N.I., Correia, R.A., Silva, J.P., Pacheco, C., Catry, I., Atkinson, P.W., et al. (2016). Are white storks addicted to junk food? Impacts of landfill use on the movement and behaviour of resident white storks (*Ciconia ciconia*) from a partially migratory population. *Movement Ecology*, 4, 7.

- Greig, E.I., Wood, E.M. & Bonter, D.N. (2017). Winter range expansion of a hummingbird is associated with urbanization and supplementary feeding. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 284, 20170256.
- Haberl, H., Erb, K.-H. & Krausmann, F. (2014). Human Appropriation of Net Primary Production: Patterns, Trends, and Planetary Boundaries. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 39, 363–391.
- Hebblewhite, M. & Merrill, E.H. (2011). Demographic balancing of migrant and resident elk in a partially migratory population through forage–predation tradeoffs. *Oikos*, 120, 1860–1870.
- Herrera, C. (1978). On the breeding distribution pattern of European migrant birds: MacArthur’s theme reexamined. *Auk*, 3, 496–509.
- Hijmans, R.J., Cameron, S.E., Parra, J.L., Jones, P.G. & Jarvis, A. (2005). Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol.*, 25, 1965–1978.
- Hill, G. E. 2002. A red bird in a brown bag: the function and evolution of colorful plumage in the House Finch. Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- Hurlbert, A.H. & Haskell, J.P. (2003). The Effect of Energy and Seasonality on Avian Species Richness and Community Composition. *The American Naturalist*, 161, 83–97.
- IPCC, 2014: *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp.
- Job, J. & Bednekoff, P.A. (2011). Wrens on the edge: feeders predict Carolina wren *Thryothorus ludovicianus* abundance at the northern edge of their range. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 42, 16–21.
- Jones, D. N., and S. J. Reynolds. 2008. Feeding birds in our towns and cities: a global research opportunity. *Journal of Avian Biology* 39:265–271.
- Ketterson, E.D. & Nolan, V. (1979). Seasonal, Annual, and Geographic Variation in Sex Ratio of Wintering Populations of Dark-Eyed Juncos (*Junco hyemalis*). *The Auk*, 96, 532–536.
- Kirby, J.S., Stattersfield, A.J., Butchart, S.H.M., Evans, M.I., Grimmett, R.F.A., Jones, V.R., *et al.* (2008). Key conservation issues for migratory land- and waterbird species on the world’s major flyways. *Bird Conservation International*, 18, S49–S73.
- Kristensen, M. & Thorup, K. (2011). Urbanization effects on migration behaviour of short-distance migratory birds.
- Lee, P.-F., Ding, T.-S., Hsu, F.-H. & Geng, S. (2004). Breeding bird species richness in Taiwan: distribution on gradients of elevation, primary productivity and urbanization. *Journal of Biogeography*, 31, 307–314.
- Lemoine, N. & Böhning-Gaese, K. (2003). Potential Impact of Global Climate Change on Species Richness of Long-Distance Migrants. *Conservation Biology*, 17, 577–586.
- Main, I.G. (2000). Obligate and facultative partial migration in the Blackbird (*Turdus merula*) and the Greenfinch (*Carduelis chloris*): uses and limitations of ringing data. *Die Vogelwarte*, 40, 286–291.

- Møller, A.P., Jokimäki, J., Skorka, P. & Tryjanowski, P. (2014). Loss of migration and urbanization in birds: a case study of the blackbird (*Turdus merula*). *Oecologia*, 175, 1019–1027.
- Moreau, R.E. (1952). The Place of Africa in the Palaearctic Migration System. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 21, 250.
- NASA's Earth Observatory. *Global maps* (NASA, 2016). Available at <http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/GlobalMaps> (downloaded 10 June and 12 July 2016).
- Nilsson, A., Nilsson, J.-A., Alerstam, T. & Bäckman, J. (2010). Migratory and resident blue tits *Cyanistes caeruleus* differ in their reaction to a novel object. *Die Naturwissenschaften*, 97, 981–5.
- Nilsson, A.L.K., Nilsson, J.-Å. & Alerstam, T. (2011). Basal metabolic rate and energetic cost of thermoregulation among migratory and resident blue tits. *Oikos*, 120, 1784–1789.
- Partecke, J. & Gwinner, E. (2007). Increased Sedentariness in European Blackbirds Following Urbanization: A Consequence of Local Adaptation? *Ecology*, 88, 882–890.
- Perez, C., Granadeiro, J.P., Dias, M.P., Alonso, H. & Catry, P. (2014). When males are more inclined to stay at home: insights into the partial migration of a pelagic seabird provided by geolocators and isotopes. *Behavioral Ecology*, 25, 313–319.
- Plummer, K. E., S. Bearhop, D. I. Leech, D. E. Chamberlain, and J. D. Blount. 2013. Winter food provisioning reduces future breeding performance in a wild bird. *Scientific Reports* 3:1–6.
- Plummer, K.E., Siriwardena, G.M., Conway, G.J., Risely, K. & Toms, M.P. (2015). Is supplementary feeding in gardens a driver of evolutionary change in a migratory bird species? *Glob Change Biol*, 21, 4353–4363.
- Podhrázký, M., Musil, P., Musilová, Z., Zouhar, J., Adam, M., Závora, J., *et al.* (2017). Central European Greylag Geese *Anser anser* show a shortening of migration distance and earlier spring arrival over 60 years. *Ibis*, 159, 352–365.
- Pulido, F. & Berthold, P. (2010). Current selection for lower migratory activity will drive the evolution of residency in a migratory bird population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107, 7341–7346.
- R Core Team (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Robb, G.N., McDonald, R.A., Chamberlain, D.E. & Bearhop, S. (2008a). Food for thought: supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 6, 476–484.
- Robb, G. N., R. A. McDonald, D. E. Chamberlain, S. J. Reynolds, T. J. E. Harrison, and S. Bearhop. (2008b). Winter feeding of birds increases productivity in the subsequent breeding season. *Biology Letters* 4:220–223.
- Schaefer, H.-C., Jetz, W. & Böhning-Gaese, K. (2008). Impact of climate change on migratory birds: community reassembly versus adaptation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 17, 38–49.
- Shaw, A.K. & Levin, S.A. (2011). To breed or not to breed: a model of partial migration. *Oikos*, 120, 1871–1879.

- Shochat, E., Warren, P.S., Faeth, S.H., McIntyre, N.E. & Hope, D. (2006). From patterns to emerging processes in mechanistic urban ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 21, 186–191.
- Somveille, M., Manica, A., Butchart, S.H.M. & Rodrigues, A.S.L. (2013). Mapping global diversity patterns for migratory birds. *PLoS ONE*, 8, 1–10.
- Somveille, M., Manica, A. & Rodrigues, A.S.L. (2018a). Where the wild birds go: explaining the differences in migratory destinations across terrestrial bird species. *Ecography*, 41, 1–12.
- Somveille, M., Rodrigues, A.S.L. & Manica, A. (2015). Why do birds migrate? A macroecological perspective. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, n/a-n/a.
- Somveille, M., Rodrigues, A.S.L. & Manica, A. (2018b). Energy efficiency drives the global seasonal distribution of birds. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2, 962.
- Thorup, K., Tøttrup, A.P., Willemoes, M., Klaassen, R.H.G., Strandberg, R., Vega, M.L., *et al.* (2017). Resource tracking within and across continents in long-distance bird migrants. *Science Advances*, 3, e1601360.
- Tryjanowski, P., Sparks, T.H., Biaduń, W., Brauze, T., Hetmański, T., Martyka, R., *et al.* (2015). Winter Bird Assemblages in Rural and Urban Environments: A National Survey. *PLOS ONE*, 10, e0130299.
- USGS Bird Banding Laboratory. 2016. North American bird banding and band encounter data set. Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, MD. 08/06/2016.
- Visser, M.E., Perdeck, A.C., Van BALEN, J.H. & Both, C. (2009). Climate change leads to decreasing bird migration distances. *Global Change Biology*, 15, 1859–1865.
- Vliet, J.V., Musters, C.J.M. & Keurs, W.J.T. (2009). Changes in migration behaviour of Blackbirds *Turdus merula* from the Netherlands. *Bird Study*, 56, 276–281.




Figure 1: Geographic and environmental distribution of bird records, for each of the twelve species

analysed. A) Geographical distribution of individuals: residents (in orange) are represented by a single dot. Migrant individuals are represented by two dots: one at their winter location (in blue), another at their breeding location (in red). Numbers indicate sample sizes: number of residents / total number of birds. B) to E) Environmental conditions experienced by individuals, represented as density curves (area under the curve equals one). Each graph indicates the frequency distribution of two sets of individuals: residents (in orange) and migrants (blue for winter migrants; red for summer migrants). B) and C) correspond to environmental conditions in the breeding locations; D) and E) to conditions in the wintering locations. Hence, for example, for the American Robin: in B a strong negative deviation of the red curve (migrants) in relation to the orange curve (residents) indicates that individual birds that migrate away from their breeding locations (i.e. summer migrants, thus in red) tend to be found in locations that experience lower temperatures in the winter than the those occupied by individuals that remain year round (residents, in orange). This is then reflected in Figure 2A by a significant positive effect of the winter temperature at the breeding location on the propensity of individuals to migrate.





Figure 2: Migratory response of individuals to environmental conditions, analysed through binomial Generalised Linear Models (GLMs) modelling the propensity of individuals to remain as resident as function of local conditions. Values correspond to estimated coefficients of the GLMs for each species with 95% confidence intervals, with positive values indicating a higher propensity to remain as resident, and negative values a higher propensity to migrate. Transparency: significance after Bonferroni correction, with coefficients significantly different from 0 in dark. A) Effects of winter temperatures at the breeding locations. B) Effects of urbanisation at the breeding locations. C) Effects of breeding resource surplus at the wintering locations. D) Effects of urbanisation at the wintering locations.

Supplementary materials



Appendix A: Temporal distribution of ringing / re-sighting events for each species. House finch records correspond to only the Eastern population (East of 95°W). Purple: migrants; orange: residents.

Appendix B: Results of the model predicting the probability of individuals remaining year-round at their breeding locations. The model is a binomial GLM (logit link) with the resident (1) versus migrant (0) status of each individual as a response variable and local environmental conditions (winter temperature and human population density) as predictors. The table presents estimated coefficients and p-values for the two predictor variables, with p-values in bold whenever the effect is significant after a sequential Bonferroni correction, and percentage of deviance explained by the model with the two variables.

Species	Winter temperature		Human population density		Percentage of deviance explained
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value	
American Goldfinch	0.25	2.98e-01	1.00	7.07e-06	12.2
American Robin	3.27	1.06e-12	0.05	8.26e-01	39.1
Blue Jay	0.97	1.26e-03	0.44	4.90e-02	8.2
Brown-headed Cowbird	1.46	2.57e-06	-0.43	1.29e-01	24.8
Common Grackle	1.29	2.69e-08	0.52	1.25e-02	19.8
European Starling	1.15	3.77e-12	1.41	2.21e-22	33.5
Evening Grosbeak	0.79	1.49e-05	0.76	2.07e-08	17.6
House Finch	2.42	1.59e-03	-0.33	3.32e-01	8.5
Pine Siskin	1.25	7.95e-04	0.55	9.00e-02	18.8
Purple Finch	0.94	2.30e-04	1.15	1.29e-07	25.7
Red-winged Blackbird	4.89	4.17e-07	-0.23	5.43e-01	65.1
White-throated Sparrow	3.56	1.41e-03	1.82	3.50e-02	60.1


Appendix C: Results of the model predicting the probability of individuals remaining year-round at their wintering locations. The model is a binomial GLM (logit link) with the resident (1) versus migrant (0) status of each individual as a response variable and local environmental conditions (breeding resource surplus and human population density) as predictors. The table presents estimated coefficients and p-values for the two predictor variables, with p-values in bold whenever the effect is significant after a sequential Bonferroni correction, and percentage of deviance explained by the model with the two variables.

Species	Breeding resource surplus		Human population density		Percentage of deviance explained
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value	
American Goldfinch	0.70	4.39e-06	0.76	2.91e-05	11.6
American Robin	1.07	7.32e-05	1.81	1.52e-13	41.4
Blue Jay	-0.02	9.18e-01	1.05	5.23e-10	14.3
Brown-headed Cowbird	0.26	2.45e-01	-0.38	8.18e-02	3.2
Common Grackle	0.90	4.09e-04	1.69	2.76e-10	27.8
European Starling	0.62	7.82e-08	1.07	3.72e-24	18.2
Evening Grosbeak	0.30	5.37e-03	-0.02	8.69e-01	1.0
House Finch	0.13	6.64e-01	1.40	3.93e-06	17.3
Pine Siskin	0.30	1.70e-01	0.51	7.64e-02	4.3
Purple Finch	0.34	1.40e-02	0.60	3.58e-05	5.7
Red-winged Blackbird	-0.64	2.30e-02	0.41	3.98e-02	6.1
White-throated Sparrow	0.30	4.98e-01	1.52	4.82e-04	21.8

Erratum

In this analysis, each individual bird was classified into either ‘resident’ or ‘migrant’ based on thresholds in the distance between its breeding and non-breeding locations. In the published article, we defined these thresholds as: residents <20km, migrants >100km. However, a subsequently detected coding error means that the thresholds that were in practice used in the analyses were: residents <51.8km, migrants >259.0km.

No main results or conclusions were affected by these changes. The figure below corresponds to what Figure 2 would have been for thresholds of 20/100 km (as initially stated). As can be seen by comparing this with Figure 2 in the published article (where thresholds correspond to 51.8/259.0 km), even though some of the estimates are not exactly the same (because the individuals selected are not exactly the same), there are no changes in either the direction of the effects or the significance, for any of the analysed species.



New Fig. 2. Migratory response of individuals to environmental conditions, analysed through binomial Generalised Linear Models (GLMs) modelling the propensity of individuals to remain as resident as function of local conditions. Values correspond to estimated coefficients of the GLMs for each species with 95% confidence intervals, with positive values indicating a higher propensity to remain as resident, and negative values a higher propensity to migrate. Transparency: significance after Bonferroni correction, with coefficients significantly different from 0 in dark. A) Effects of winter temperatures at the breeding locations. B) Effects of urbanization at the breeding locations. C) Effects of breeding resource surplus at the wintering locations. D) Effects of urbanization at the wintering locations.