

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Assessing the sensitivity of alpine birds to potential future changes in habitat and climate to inform management strategies

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/139622> since

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.07.036

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

This is an author version of the contribution published on:

Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:

Biological Conservation 167: 127-135, 2013, 10.1016/j.biocon.2013.07.036

The definitive version is available at:

La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006320713002681>

13 **Assessing the sensitivity of alpine birds to potential future changes in habitat**
14 **and climate**

15

16 **D.E. Chamberlain*, M. Negro, E. Caprio and A. Rolando**

17

18 *Dipartimento di Scienze della Vita e Biologia dei Sistemi, Università di Torino, Via Accademia*

19 *Albertina 13, 10123 Torino, Italy*

20

21 *Corresponding author. E-mail: dan.chamberlain99@gmail.com, tel. 0039 0116704534

22 ABSTRACT

23 Climate change has resulted in upward elevational shifts in the distribution of animals and plants in
24 many high altitude areas. The potential consequences of such changes for alpine bird communities
25 were assessed by modelling data on breeding bird distributions along altitudinal gradients at
26 relatively high altitude (c. 1700-3100m) in the European Alps in relation to habitat, topography and
27 temperature. These models were used to assess the sensitivity of species to potential future
28 environmental change by estimating distributions under a range of scenarios of habitat and climate
29 change. Distributions of the majority of forest or shrub nesting species remained stable or increased
30 in response to climate change according to most scenarios as a result of elevational shifts in suitable
31 habitats. However, open habitat species may face a severe decrease in distribution as grasslands are
32 colonised by forest and shrubs, because much of the area considered is not at a sufficient altitude to
33 accommodate further elevational shifts. This may be exacerbated if upward shifts in vegetation are
34 constrained at high altitudes, leading to a habitat 'squeeze' caused by an asymmetric response of
35 vegetation zones to climate change at higher altitudes. Model outcomes suggested that
36 management to maintain open habitats may not be sufficient for a number of species if climate
37 change results in a mismatch between the distribution of suitable climates and suitable habitats. The
38 loss of open habitats due to differential responses of vegetation zones to climate change may
39 therefore present a serious conservation problem for mountain biodiversity in the future.

40

41 Keywords – Altitudinal transect, climate change, grassland, species distribution, treeline, Water Pipit

42

43

44 **1. Introduction**

45 Climate change impacts on the distribution of animal and plants are well documented (e.g.
46 Parmesan and Yohe 2003). Typically, as a result of general increases in temperature, poleward
47 range shifts have been reported for a large number of organisms, including plants, birds and
48 butterflies (e.g. Sturm et al., 2001; Thomas and Lennon, 1999; Settele et al., 2008). Analogously,
49 altitudinal shifts have also been documented, most notably for plants (e.g. Grabherr et al., 1994;
50 Harsch et al., 2009), but also for birds (Maggini et al., 2011; Reif and Flousek, 2012), butterflies
51 (Wilson et al., 2005), and small mammals (Moritz et al., 2008).

52 Predicting impacts of climate change on biodiversity has become a key research topic
53 (Bellard et al. 2012), and has particular importance in identifying, and making provision for, potential
54 future conservation problems. For animals and plants, how their main habitats will change in
55 response to climate change is a key question, and often it is assumed that habitats will shift in
56 tandem with climate, although few models have tried to incorporate both climate and habitat
57 change scenarios (Jeltsch et al. 2011). However, habitats may change for other reasons, particularly
58 due to human intervention, and such changes may have more severe consequences than climate
59 change (Jetz et al. 2007), but they may also interact with, and be amplified by, climate change
60 (Mantyka-Pringle et al. 2012). Furthermore, differential shifts in climate and habitats may lead to a
61 de-coupling of suitable climatic and suitable habitat conditions (e.g. Reif et al. 2010). An
62 understanding of how habitat and climate interact is therefore needed in order to forecast likely
63 future impacts on biodiversity (Barnagaud et al. 2012).

64 High altitude regions are expected to be especially vulnerable to climate change (Brunetti et
65 al., 2009), and have shown a rate of warming approximately double the global average (Beniston et
66 al., 1997; Böhm et al., 2001). The elevational range shifts that will occur as a consequence of climate
67 warming are expected to have serious consequences for biodiversity at relatively high altitude
68 (Sekercioglu et al., 2008; Dirnböck et al., 2011). Shifts in major habitat types, for example advancing

69 tree lines (Harsch et al., 2009), may alter the distribution of habitats, leading to increased
70 fragmentation and eventual loss of habitats at higher altitude (e.g. Peñuelas and Boada, 2003;
71 Gonzalez et al., 2010). However, it should also be acknowledged that the European Alps at least are
72 subject to many pressures, including changes in agriculture, particularly the abandonment of
73 traditional seasonal grazing practices (Laiolo et al., 2004), and increased disturbance from human
74 leisure activities, especially winter sports (e.g. Rolando et al., 2007).

75 Elevational shifts in alpine plant communities in general are well studied ('alpine' here is
76 defined as high altitude mountainous areas at or above the elevational limit of the treeline), and
77 there is evidence that such shifts may not occur at the same rate across different altitudes, nor for
78 different geographical areas. Cannone et al. (2007), in common with many other studies, found
79 recent upward shifts in alpine grassland and shrubland, but they also observed that changes in plant
80 distribution were asymmetrical, and there was little change, and even decreases in vegetation cover,
81 at higher altitudes (<2800m). Recent research has also highlighted the potential negative impacts on
82 soil processes at high altitudes, in particular the likelihood that warmer temperatures could lead to
83 colder soils if snow cover, and its associated insulating properties, are reduced (Edwards et al., 2007;
84 Freppaz et al., 2010). Such an effect would prevent the development of vegetation, and in particular
85 sward-forming grasses, at high altitudes (in accord with Cannone et al., 2007), yet at the same time,
86 this habitat is likely to be lost at lower altitudes due to advancing treelines. There is therefore a
87 potential threat to alpine grasslands due to this differential response of vegetation zones to climate
88 change.

89 Predicting climate impacts on altitudinal distributions is complicated by the variation in
90 climate over small scales due to the steepness of the terrain (typically there is approximately a 0.5°C-
91 0.65°C decrease for every 100m increase in altitude; e.g. Hodkinson, 2005; Colwell et al. 2008), and
92 relatively few studies have attempted to assess likely consequences of environmental (including
93 climate) change on high alpine faunal biodiversity. Altitudinal gradients provide a good basis for

94 studying climate change (Shoo et al., 2006), as the climatic conditions vary over a small spatial scale,
95 thus spatial variations along the gradient provide a substitution for processes over time (Hodkinson,
96 2005), and macroecological influences that may complicate the interpretation of latitudinal studies
97 are reduced (Rahbek, 2005).

98 In this paper, we modelled the altitudinal distributions of breeding alpine bird species at
99 relatively high altitudes (c. 1700-3000m), surveyed along altitudinal transects, in relation to habitat,
100 topography and climate. These models were then used to assess the birds' sensitivity to future
101 climate warming by estimating change in potential breeding distribution according to scenarios of
102 climate and habitat change. Our over-arching goal was to identify species, and habitats with which
103 they are closely associated, that are likely to be sensitive to future environmental changes at high
104 elevations. Whilst elevational shifts due to climate change have typically been assessed at relatively
105 large scales (e.g. Jetz et al., 2007; Sekercioglu et al., 2008; Dirnböck et al., 2011), it is clear that much
106 finer scale-data is needed that more closely matches the climatic variation that occurs over small
107 spatial scales in alpine habitats (Sekercioglu et al. 2008). The extent to which changes in different
108 habitats, and in particular their differential responses to climate change, will affect high altitude
109 faunal distributions associated with the different vegetation zones has not, as far as we are aware,
110 been considered at appropriate spatial scales.

111

112 **2. Methods**

113

114 *2.1 Site and point selection*

115

116 The study area was high altitude habitat (minimum 1700m asl) in the western Italian Alps in
117 the province of Torino (Fig. 1), from the Pellice Valley in the south (44°43'11" N; 7°03'35") to the
118 Orco Valley in the north (45°30'42"N; 7°16'25"). This area is dominated by larch *Larix* spp. at lower

119 altitudes, and shrub species such as Juniper *Juniperus communis* and Alpenrose *Rhododendron*
120 *ferrugium*. Grasslands occur throughout the area, consisting of seasonal pastures and higher
121 altitude alpine grassland. Scree and rocky areas are dominant above c. 2700m.

122 Using land cover data and altitude from a DTM in Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
123 software package, ArcGIS 9.2 (ESRI, 2007), potentially suitable locations for survey sites were
124 identified that had larch-dominated forest at lower altitudes, and where the highest points were at
125 an altitude of at least 2500m. Villages (including tourist developments) and ski-pistes were avoided
126 (a minimum of 330m from the point location). Transects spaced at least 1-km apart were initially
127 selected at random, but due to the difficulty of the terrain, the nearest footpath to the initially
128 selected transect was usually used. Point counts were carried out along the transects with a
129 minimum spacing of 200m between points (or selecting the first suitable location after 200m).
130 Suitable points were those without any obvious disturbance (e.g. occupied human habitation,
131 livestock) or where detectability may have been affected (e.g. large cliffs, noisy streams in spate)
132 within 100m. Sampling took place over three years (2010-2012).

133

134 2.2. Field surveys

135

136 Standard point count methods were carried out (Bibby et al., 2000), using a ten minute
137 count period preceded by a five minute settling period. At each point, the observer (DEC) recorded
138 all birds seen and heard, including their activity using standard activity codes (Bibby et al., 2000). For
139 each registration, the distance from the observer was estimated with the aid of a laser range finder.
140 Simple habitat data were also collected at each point, including the percentage cover of canopy (i.e.
141 above head height) and the number of mature trees (≥ 20 cm in diameter) within a 50m radius. Point
142 counts commenced 1 to 1.5 hours after sunrise and continued until 1300 hrs.

143

144 *2.3 Habitat, topography and climate data*

145

146 The cover of 5 relevant habitat types (i.e. those occurring above 1700m), selected based on
147 the likely ecological importance for the species under consideration (according to standard works
148 such as Snow and Perrins, 1998, and expert knowledge), was extracted from the Piani Forestali
149 Territoriali (PFT) land cover database for the whole province
150 (www.regione.piemonte.it/foreste/cms/foreste/pianificazione): coniferous forest, scrub, pasture
151 (created as a result of human influence, relatively heavily grazed with a continuous and usually
152 relatively dense sward), grass (natural, though often lightly grazed in late summer, interspersed with
153 rocks, usually at higher altitudes) and rock/scree (details in online Appendix, Table A1). The treeline
154 was simply defined as the perimeter of forest habitat within the study area. As the goal was to
155 estimate species distributions at a relatively large scale, land cover data, rather than habitat data
156 collected in the field, was used in the modelling. However, there were strong correlations between
157 forest land cover and the comparable habitat variables canopy cover (Pearson correlation $r_{255} = 0.86$,
158 $P > 0.0001$) and number of mature trees within 50m ($r_{255} = 0.77$, $P > 0.0001$) collected in the field,
159 suggesting that the land cover data provided a good representation of habitat 'on the ground'.

160 Mean, minimum and maximum annual temperature, and mean monthly precipitation at a 1-
161 km square scale were extracted from WorldClim (Hijmans et al., 2005). Topographic data (aspect
162 and slope) were derived from the DTM elevation grid at a 1ha scale. Mean values were calculated for
163 each 100m radius point count location. Easting and northing have been shown to have separate
164 effects on alpine plant and animal distributions (Guisan et al., 1998; Rauter and Reyer, 2000), so
165 both were considered, expressed as an index equal to $-\cos(A)$, where A is the aspect (east or south)
166 expressed in radians (Bradbury et al., 2011). A value of 1 represents facing directly south or east,
167 and -1 represents facing directly north or west. Altitude (expressed in m) at each point was
168 recorded by the GPS in the field to an accuracy of at least ± 20 m (but usually ± 5 m).

169 2.4 Statistical methods

170

171 The presence of singing birds detected within 100m radius of the point count location was
172 used to analyse the breeding distribution of alpine birds. This radius was selected to ensure no
173 adjacent points were overlapping (the minimum distance apart being 200m). A total of 257 points
174 along 33 transects was surveyed over 396 visits, covering an altitudinal range of 1717m to 3056m.
175 Only species that were recorded on at least 35 points were considered for analysis (preliminary
176 analyses suggested model fits were consistently poor below this value).

177 Prior to developing predictive models, points that were in habitats wholly outside a species'
178 normal breeding range were removed ('bad zeros' which may cause model fitting problems whilst
179 providing no useful information; Zuur et al., 2009). In practice, the species considered here can be
180 divided into forest/shrub species and open habitat species. The former are those that require the
181 presence of trees or shrubs for nesting, and wholly unsuitable habitats were hence simply defined as
182 those with zero forest plus shrub cover, leaving a total sample of 150 points. Forest/shrub species
183 with sufficient samples for analysis were Tree Pipit *Anthus trivialis* (singing birds present on 39
184 points), Dunnock *Prunella modularis* (n = 36), Wren *Troglodytes troglodytes* (n = 41), Coal Tit
185 *Parus ater* (n = 46), Willow Tit *Poecile montanus* (n = 39) and Chaffinch *Fringilla coelebs* (n = 93).
186 Open habitat species with sufficient samples for analysis were Skylark *Alauda arvensis* (n = 41),
187 Water Pipit *Anthus spinoletta* (n = 67), Wheatear *Oenanthe oenanthe* (n = 46) and Black Redstart
188 *Phoenicurus ochruros* (n = 49). These species nest on or near the ground, and have been recorded as
189 showing strong preferences for open habitats (Snow and Perrins, 1998), although a universal
190 definition of open habitat was not really possible as such species may show varying levels of
191 tolerance to forest or shrubs. The maximum forest cover of a given point in which the four species
192 were recorded was 40% for Skylark, 4% for Wheatear, 0% for Water Pipit and 71% for Black Redstart.
193 Based on these results, 'open' habitats were defined as those with less than 50% forest cover for

194 Skylark, less than 10% for Wheatear, 0% for Water Pipit and less than 80% for Black Redstart (sample
195 sizes were respectively 197, 156, 170 and 224).

196 As some points were visited more than once (44%), the probability of occurrence was
197 modelled as a vector of presences and absences (i.e. the successes/failures syntax of Crawley, 2007)
198 to account for variation in survey effort, using binomial logistic regression in a general linear mixed-
199 modelling framework with the lmer command in the lme4 package in R. In order to account for
200 potential spatial autocorrelation between points on the same transect, 'site' was fitted as a random
201 term. In order to assess the predictive ability of the models, data were divided into model (70%) and
202 test (30%) data sets.

203 Habitat variables expressed as a proportion were arcsine-square root transformed prior to
204 analysis. This to some extent reduced linear dependence, but there were still some unacceptably
205 high correlations amongst variables, in particular there was very high inter-correlation between all
206 four climate variables (Pearson's correlation $|r| > 0.79$, $P < 0.001$ in each case). In order to reduce
207 the level of collinearity prior to modelling, variance inflation factors (VIFs) were calculated, and the
208 variable with the highest VIF was sequentially removed and VIFs re-calculated (following Zuur et al.,
209 2009) until all variables had a VIF < 2.0 . There was no strong evidence of spatial autocorrelation
210 according Moran's I calculated from model residuals (online Appendix Table A2).

211 Once the final model variable set had been identified, model averaging (Burnham and
212 Anderson 2002) was carried out using the MuMIn package in R (R Core Development Team, 2010),
213 averaged parameter estimates being calculated across the set of models which accounted for 95% of
214 the sum of all model weights. Predictive ability was assessed by calculating two different metrics
215 (reliance on only a single measure of model fit is not recommended – Elith and Graham, 2009)
216 calculated from the averaged models applied to the test data set. These were the area under the
217 receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve (AUC; Fielding and Bell 1997) and the True Skill

218 Statistic (TSS; Allouche et al., 2006). Models that had a predictive ability no better than random,
219 considered as $AUC < 0.60$ or $TSS < 0.10$, were not used subsequently.

220

221 *2.4.1 Scenarios of environmental change*

222

223 Climate, topographic and habitat variables were derived for the whole province, and the
224 mean value or percentage cover as appropriate was calculated for hexagons of 200m width
225 (henceforth 'cell'), hence maintaining the resolution at which the survey data was collected. Using
226 parameter estimates derived from the modelling approach, the current probability of occurrence of
227 each species was estimated for each cell for altitudes above 1700m, with wholly unsuitable habitats
228 (see above) being assigned a zero probability. Different scenarios of habitat and climate change
229 were then applied, and the change in estimated range of each species was calculated for each
230 scenario.

231 To estimate the potential consequences of climate and habitat change, we considered three
232 principal drivers: change in mean temperature, elevational shift in habitats and the response of the
233 upper limit of the vegetation zone, basing scenarios on climate predictions for the year 2080 using
234 the projections derived from the Hadley General Circulation Model (specifically HADCM3) available
235 in WorldClim (Hijmans et al., 2005) for IPCC scenario B2A (medium rate of change). We intentionally
236 adopted a conservative approach in selecting the least extreme projections of climate change
237 available for the scale required. The average increase in temperature by 2080 (calculated at the cell
238 level) for the study area according to B2A projections was 3.3°C.

239 Scenarios were based on logistic regression models to simulate natural variation in habitat
240 cover due to climate and topography. The presence of each of the five habitat types in each cell was
241 modelled separately in relation to topographic and climate variables, and all two way interactions
242 between both linear and quadratic climate terms, for the whole province (i.e. the whole regional

243 climatic range including all altitudes). Data were divided into model and test data sets and multi-
244 model inference was used to derive model averaged parameter estimates, as for the bird data. The
245 resulting estimates of the probability of occurrence for each habitat were used to calculate AUC and
246 TSS from the test data, and to identify optimal thresholds for defining presence using the
247 PresenceAbsence package in R (Freeman, 2007) for the study area ($\geq 1700\text{m}$ in altitude), i.e. a habitat
248 was considered present for a given cell if the estimated probability of occurrence was equal to or
249 greater than the threshold.

250 The above procedure produced separate distributions for each of the five habitats, which
251 partially overlapped one another. The next step was to combine these distributions into a current
252 modelled habitat surface by first applying thresholds to the predicted probabilities for each habitat
253 for each cell (see below), setting area to 0 for any habitat that did not have a probability above the
254 threshold for a given cell. The sum of the probabilities of the remaining habitats was then calculated.
255 The cover of an individual habitat type per cell was then its individual probability of occurrence
256 divided by the total, hence the estimated cover of an individual habitat type was weighted by the
257 probabilities of the other relatively important (i.e. above threshold) habitats in a given cell. In this
258 way, it was possible to have a cell with mixed habitats as long as they had predicted probabilities
259 greater than their respective thresholds. A number of different methods for defining thresholds are
260 available, and we considered three that are considered to be among the best (Liu et al. 2005): the
261 prevalence approach, the sensitivity-specificity sum maximization approach and the sensitivity-
262 specificity equality approach. The combination of thresholds that resulted in the closest match to
263 the observed habitat vertical distribution was identified (specifically the mean altitude was required
264 to be within 100m of the observed altitude for each habitat). The best fit was generally provided by
265 sensitivity-specificity sum maximization approach, although model tuning was necessary by using
266 alternative thresholds for forest and rock.

267 A similar approach was undertaken for future scenarios, using constant topographic
268 variables, but substituting climate variables from the B2A projections for 2080. For the initial
269 scenario of rapid increase in forest extent (scenario 1), the thresholds were applied as for the final
270 current model (online appendix). A second scenario (scenario 2) simply changed the threshold for
271 forest to the highest available of those considered, which increased the cover of shrub and
272 decreased the cover of forest, thus simulating a lag in the response of forest (e.g. Cannone et al.,
273 2007).

274 In scenarios 1 and 2, it was assumed that alpine grassland can respond readily to climate
275 warming and therefore its rate of elevational shift will be proportional to temperature. We consider
276 further scenarios of vegetation development at the interface of the grass/bare rock zone for the
277 open habitat species, assuming that ground vegetation formation is constrained by soil processes
278 (Edwards et al., 2007; Freppaz et al., 2010), and hence no further elevational increase of this zone is
279 possible. We define this zone as areas at or above 2800m, the altitude above which Cannone et al.
280 (2007) found little evidence of vegetation change, and also where the cover of rock is 95% in the
281 study area. Habitat above this altitude remained equal to the current scenario. This effect is applied
282 to both scenarios 1 and 2, producing two further scenarios (scenario 3 and 4 respectively).

283

284 *2.4.2 Estimating species distributions under different scenarios*

285

286 The current distribution of each species was estimated for the whole study area based on
287 model averaged parameter estimates. Species presence was defined as the probability equal to or
288 greater than the threshold that optimised the match between predicted and observed prevalence,
289 using the PresenceAbsence package in R (Freeman, 2007), one of the recommended methods of Lui
290 et al. (2005). For each scenario, the change in distribution was estimated as the percentage change
291 in predicted suitable cells relative to the current modelled habitat.

292 In estimating species distributions according to the scenarios, two assumptions were made.
293 First, it was assumed that both climate and habitat dictate species distributions, hence temperature
294 and habitat variables were included in the modelling procedure ('combined models'). Second, it was
295 assumed that species respond only to habitat change rather than climate change *per se*, hence only
296 habitat variables were included ('habitat models'), i.e. the same modelling approach without climate
297 variables. In addition, we consider the case where species may respond to climate, but habitat cover
298 does not change (which may mimic a situation where current habitat is maintained by management
299 interventions under a changing climate). To estimate species distributions from these 'climate
300 models', only temperature was altered according to the B2A projections for 2080, all other variables
301 being equal to the current estimated values. Therefore, in summary, there were four scenarios for
302 combined models, four scenarios for habitat models, and a single scenario for the climate model,
303 giving a total of nine scenarios considered per species.

304

305 **3. Results**

306

307 Model fits were good for most species ($AUC \geq 0.7$ and $TSS \geq 0.2$), but less so for Wren ($AUC =$
308 0.66 , $TSS = 0.10$). Model fit was no better than random for Black Redstart (both models) and Water
309 Pipit (habitat model) and these were not considered further. A comparison of AIC between full
310 models suggested that combined models were usually better (i.e. $\Delta AIC > 2$) than habitat models for
311 most species. However, there was no difference between models for Wren and Willow Tit ($\Delta AIC <$
312 2), and the habitat model was better for Dunnock. (Full details of model-averaged parameter
313 estimates and measures of model fit are given in the online Appendix, Tables A3 and A4).

314

315 *3.1 Habitat change*

316

317 Model averaged parameter estimates (online Appendix Table A5) for habitat showed good
318 fit in terms of AUC and TSS (online Appendix Table A6). The estimated current habitat map gave a
319 good match to the observed habitat cover (Table 1) and location of the treeline (Fig. 2), and the
320 mean altitudes of observed and predicted habitats were in good agreement (all within 100m; online
321 Appendix Table A7). The change in habitat cover relative to the current scenario is summarised in
322 Table 1 for scenario 1 to 4. Under scenario 1, the area of forest more than doubles and there is a
323 smaller increase in shrub cover, whilst under scenario 2, the increase in shrub and forest are more
324 equitable and above 50%. Pasture increases relatively modestly in all scenarios. Under scenarios 1
325 and 2, cover of rock is lost because much of the study area is not high enough to accommodate
326 habitat shifts, and also because other habitats are able to replace high altitude rock. Under scenario
327 3 and 4, where high altitude rock cannot be replaced, the decrease in rock cover is less marked, and
328 as a consequence the loss of grass is greater as this habitat is squeezed between advancing tree and
329 shrub habitats and an immovable rock zone (Table 1).

330

331 *3.2 Estimated changes in species distribution*

332

333 The estimated changes in distribution of forest/shrub species are given in Fig. 3. Coal Tit and
334 Chaffinch showed estimated increases under each scenario, sometimes of considerable magnitude,
335 due to a positive influence of both temperature and habitat. Willow Tit and Wren showed estimated
336 increases in all except the climate scenario, suggesting that temperature increases that are not
337 accompanied by habitat shifts would be detrimental to these species. However, there was a
338 different pattern for Tree Pipit and Dunnock, where there were increases estimated by habitat
339 models (an exception being Tree Pipit under scenario 2), but decreases or little difference for the
340 combined models.

341 In contrast to forest/shrub species, decreases in the distribution of open habitat species
342 were estimated under the majority of scenarios (Fig. 4). To a large extent, this was due to loss of
343 open areas as they were encroached upon by forest and shrub. However, for Water Pipit, there was
344 an additive effect of temperature in the combined models, indicating that some open habitats were
345 climatically unsuitable under these scenarios. By contrast Skylark and Wheatear increased under
346 warmer conditions, as shown by the estimated distribution under the climate model. For Wheatear,
347 this was not enough to offset decreases caused by habitat loss under combined models. The model
348 outcomes for Skylark were largely dependent on whether there was a greater upward shift in forest
349 (resulting in declines) or shrub (resulting in increases). Including the further assumption that habitat
350 would not change at high altitudes due to effects on soil processes (scenarios 3 and 4) led to a
351 further loss in estimated distribution of c. 15% for Skylark, 7% for Wheatear (habitat models) and
352 10% for Water Pipit (combined model), although for the former two species, this effect was reversed
353 under the combined model, with decreases respectively 10% and 15% less than under the habitat
354 model.

355

356 **4. Discussion**

357

358 The goal of this study was to describe statistically the distribution of alpine bird species
359 along an altitudinal gradient, and to use this information to assess the sensitivity of these species to
360 potential habitat change induced by climate change. For the majority of species nesting in forest or
361 in the transition zone between forest and alpine grasslands, their distribution remained constant or
362 expanded according to the scenarios, because the amount of suitable habitat is likely to remain
363 stable or increase in the study area in response to climate change at high altitude as a result of
364 elevational shifts in forest and shrubs. However, open habitat species showed a decrease in
365 distribution under most scenarios, suggesting that these species are facing a potentially severe loss

366 of habitat as alpine grasslands are colonised by forest and shrubs. This is illustrated using as an
367 example the change in the estimated distribution of Water Pipit (under a combined scenario) in
368 Figure 5. The loss is exacerbated as much of the area considered is not at an altitude high enough to
369 accommodate further elevational shifts – in effect, many mountain tops and ridges currently
370 covered by grass are likely to be colonised by shrub or forest over the next century. The result is a
371 much reduced and fragmented distribution of potentially suitable habitat (Fig. 5). Such effects will
372 be even more pronounced if colonisation of higher unvegetated areas by grasslands is not possible
373 due to constraints on soil formation (e.g. Freppaz et al., 2010). The effects of this ‘squeeze’ on
374 natural grassland may therefore have potentially serious consequences for this habitat in the future.

375 A range of scenarios were considered under two main assumptions: that species respond
376 only to changes in habitat type (habitat models), and that they respond to changes in both climate
377 and habitat type (combined models). Whilst there was little difference in model estimates for most
378 species under these two assumptions, there were two that showed markedly different estimates
379 depending on whether temperature was included in the models. Tree Pipit and Dunnock mostly
380 showed declines in distribution under combined models due to a mismatch between suitable
381 climate conditions and suitable habitat, but clear increases under habitat models. The extent to
382 which climate in addition to habitat determines bird distribution is therefore crucial in assessing
383 potential sensitivity to environmental change for these species. Certainly for many species,
384 temperature accounted for additional variation in the models, suggesting that its effects are likely to
385 reflect finer-scale variations in habitat or resources, or both, which themselves may well be directly
386 limited by climate, and that are important determinants of bird distribution. However, there is some
387 evidence that climate may directly affect Water Pipit distribution (Rauter and Reyer, 2000; Rauter et
388 al., 2002). The extent to which climate *per se* may be important for the other species considered
389 warrants further research.

390

391 *4.1 Model predictions*

392

393 Model fits were generally good, exceptions being Black Redstart and Water Pipit (habitat
394 model), suggesting key variables were not considered in the model for the former species, and that
395 the latter species' distribution could not be predicted from habitat and topography alone. For the
396 other species, model performance strongly suggested that distributions could be adequately
397 predicted by a combination of habitat cover, temperature and topography. We used the smallest-
398 scale climate data available (1km²), which was larger than the unit of analysis (100m radius).
399 Although the addition of smaller scale topographic variables will to some extent have effectively
400 provided finer-scale adjustments, there is evidence that there is significant climatic variation at
401 smaller scales which has a major influence on plant distribution (e.g. Scherrer et al. 2011) and
402 invertebrate, though not bird, diversity (Viterbi et al., 2013). Furthermore, for five species (Skylark,
403 Water Pipit, Wheatear, Coal Tit and Chaffinch), substituting altitude for temperature in our models
404 improved model fit ($\Delta AIC > 2$). Altitude was strongly correlated with both temperature and
405 precipitation ($r_{255} = -0.79$ and 0.83 respectively, $P < 0.001$), but it was measured at a much finer scale
406 than climate variables, and its effects are likely to reflect finer-scale variations in habitat or
407 resources, or both, which themselves may be directly limited by climate. Although models were
408 generally good in terms of predictive ability, it is likely that finer-scale measures of habitat or climate
409 would prove even better tools for some species. Further detailed autecological studies to identify
410 the key resources of the species of interest would be necessary for such approaches.

411 In modelling species responses to climate, it is advisable to consider as much as possible of a
412 species' range (Barbet-Massin et al., 2010). This would be major logistical challenge at the scales
413 considered, i.e. those appropriate in considering altitudinal shifts. For higher altitude habitats, the
414 conclusions of this study should not be affected by the restricted altitudinal range if the assumptions
415 of forest and shrub advancement used in the scenarios are confirmed (see below) – there is little

416 doubt that the strong negative effects of forest in particular will lead to loss of suitable areas for
417 open habitat species. There is also an assumption in the approach that the upper limit of the
418 distribution was sampled, and that birds would not breed in habitats and/or climates at higher
419 altitudes. This is probably reasonable for the species considered – maximum altitudes for open
420 habitat species (Skylark = 2574m, Water Pipit = 2861m, Wheatear = 2754m) were somewhat lower
421 than the maximum altitude surveyed (3058m).

422 The extent of species range sampled is more of an issue with forest/shrub species, because
423 the models predict climates for the lower areas (larch-dominated forest at c. 1700m-2000m) for
424 2080 that are outside of the current study area. However, suitable climate for broadleaf forest
425 (especially Beech *Fagus sylvaticus*) would likely occur at the altitudes considered under future
426 scenarios. Several species considered are also commonly found in broadleaved forests, such as
427 Wren and Chaffinch, although Coal Tit and Willow Tit are much more widespread in alpine
428 coniferous forests (Snow and Perrins, 1998). These two species in particular may have had
429 overestimated increases due to the restricted study area, and consequently habitat, considered in
430 the scenarios.

431

432 *4.2 Scenario development*

433

434 In constructing the scenarios of future change, we have intentionally adopted a relatively
435 simple approach as our goal was to produce scenarios against which to test the sensitivity of
436 different species to potential climate change-induced habitat shifts. Nevertheless, the approach
437 adopted predicted well the current habitat distribution. Given the levels of uncertainty in both
438 potential responses of habitat to climate change, and in the projections of climate change
439 themselves, we feel that this is an appropriate approach to take, and that the results are very likely
440 to reflect the relative sensitivity of alpine birds (and their habitats) to potential climate change,

441 although we stress that the estimates of change should be taken as a relative guide to potential
442 sensitivity, rather than predictions of actual change.

443 The scenarios were developed to incorporate natural variation in habitat cover due to
444 climate and topography. The estimated annual rate of forest advance until 2080 relative to the
445 current modelled habitat varied between 2.43m and 2.81m for the different scenarios, which are
446 within the range of observed rates of treeline shifts for the European Alps: 0.28 m per year (Paulsen
447 et al. 2000) to 3.16 m per year (Gehrig-Fasel et al., 2007) respectively. Our scenarios therefore
448 represent plausible rates of forest expansion based on published estimates. Whether treelines shift
449 in response to climate change, and the rate of that change, depend on several factors (Gehrig-Fasel
450 et al., 2007; Harsch et al., 2009). In our study area, the abandonment of traditional grazing practices
451 is increasingly common (Laiolo et al., 2004), and is a factor that is likely to have increased the rate of
452 treeline shift over the past few decades in addition to climate effects (Gehrig-Fasel et al., 2007).
453 Furthermore, the trend towards increased urbanisation and development of ski resorts may well
454 increase in the future, bringing further detrimental effects (e.g. Caprio et al., 2011). Whilst it is
455 difficult to formally incorporate such effects in the scenario development (indeed, developed
456 habitats were specifically not included), it should be noted that all of these anthropomorphic
457 impacts are likely to negatively impact on high alpine habitats, especially open grasslands. This, and
458 the use of B2A climate projections, means our scenario outcomes are as a consequence
459 conservative.

460

461 *4.3 Conservation implications*

462

463 The results presented here suggest strongly that open habitat species will be most sensitive
464 to habitat shifts induced by climate change, especially Water Pipit and Wheatear, which showed
465 estimated declines in all scenarios for both habitat and combined models. The loss of open

466 grassland habitats may therefore present a serious conservation problem in the future, which could
467 be even more marked if climate change progresses at rates in line with other, possibly more likely,
468 projections than the relatively conservative ones used here. Of those species predicted to be most
469 sensitive to climate change, Water Pipit is likely to represent the biggest potential conservation
470 problem as it is very much a mountain specialist throughout most of Europe, and it also seems
471 completely intolerant of forest, and was most sensitive to potential differential shifts in habitats in
472 response to climate change. Clearly this is a species that may be at particular risk and is therefore
473 worthy of further investigations.

474 Effects of successional changes caused by climate change may be ameliorated by direct
475 management intervention, which in this case would consist of maintaining open areas (e.g. by
476 clearing trees and shrubs and/or increasing grazing intensity) at threat of shrub and forest
477 encroachment. The extent to which this may be successful depends on whether species are
478 sensitive to climate (directly or indirectly) in addition to habitat. The outcomes of the climate
479 models, whereby current habitat is maintained but the temperature changes according to the
480 projections, show estimated declines for a number of species (Figs 3 and 4), suggesting that even if
481 open habitats are maintained at the current level, the climatic conditions will become less
482 favourable. This again includes Water Pipit, and also Tree Pipit, Dunnock, Wren and Willow Tit.
483 Management intervention to maintain current habitat cover may therefore not be sufficient for
484 several species.

485 The approach here is restricted to the European Alps of the province of Torino. The extent
486 to which the inferences arising from this work can be applied to alpine habitats in general is
487 unknown. Large-scale biogeographic effects, and local habitat conditions, may influence
488 distributions, in effect causing significant region by habitat/climate interactions, resulting in a
489 species having different sensitivities in different areas. If such models are to have wider
490 applicability, especially from a conservation perspective, then they need to be tested in different

491 regions (Whittingham et al., 2007). We therefore urge similar work to be carried out in other alpine
492 regions in order to determine whether species sensitivities to potential climate change are
493 consistent across larger areas. Nevertheless, the processes of habitat shifts illustrated here,
494 especially when there are differential responses of vegetation zones to climate change, are likely to
495 be highly relevant to any mountain areas with analogous altitudinal zonation of habitats and their
496 associated animal communities.

497

498 **5. Conclusions**

499

500 Here, we have used birds to illustrate how possible changes in habitats and climate may
501 affect species distributions in high alpine habitats in the future. The results are in accord with those
502 of Dirnböck et al. (2011) who predicted that areas of endemism for vascular plants and several
503 invertebrate groups were at high risk of future habitat loss due to forest expansion. Therefore, in a
504 more general sense, open habitat bird species illustrate the potential threat to wider biodiversity of
505 alpine grasslands which are likely to host a high diversity of a number of groups, such as flowers,
506 carabid beetles, dung beetles and butterflies (e.g. Nagy et al., 2003; Tocco et al., 2013), not to
507 mention other high altitude specialist bird species which were recorded too infrequently for analysis
508 (e.g. Ptarmigan *Lagopus muta*, Alpine Accentor *Prunella collaris*, Snow Finch *Fringilla montifringilla*).
509 The potential for loss of alpine grassland under future climate change seems high, especially if
510 upward shifts are constrained, either due to a lack of higher altitude areas or due to a habitat
511 ‘squeeze’ caused by an asymmetric response of vegetation zones to climate change at higher
512 altitudes. Continued monitoring and research should be prioritised for this potentially threatened
513 habitat, in particular at the interface between the grassland and bare rock habitats at higher
514 altitudes where soil responses may be crucial for vegetation communities and consequently possible
515 distributional shifts of alpine fauna.

516 Whilst we believe our modelling approach was fit for purpose in terms of assessing likely
517 sensitivity of alpine birds to environmental change, we also acknowledge that there are many other
518 potential approaches which could be worth considering, especially if additional data in the form of
519 repeat visits could be obtained (e.g. use of hierarchical state-space models; Buckland et al., 2004).
520 More broadly, such ‘static’ species distribution models (including those used in this paper) have a
521 number of limitations in estimating the true niche of a species, and hence in making predictions for
522 potential future impacts of environmental change (Schurr et al., 2012), as they cannot incorporate
523 more complex processes such as dispersal, biotic interactions and range dynamics (Pearson and
524 Dawson, 2003; Holt, 2009), nor indeed can they account for the potential adaptation of species to
525 novel conditions (Pearson and Dawson, 2003). In order to address such issues and therefore better
526 understand the actual demographic processes underlying species’ distributions, the adoption of a
527 process-based dynamic range modelling framework would be ideal (Schurr et al., 2012). However,
528 such complex models require complex data in terms of spatio-temporal demographic rates. The
529 paucity of such data for the European Alps (Chamberlain et al., 2012), and for mountain regions in
530 general, currently precludes such approaches, but detailed demographic monitoring should be made
531 a priority for the future if we are to better understand factors determining bird species distributions
532 at high altitude, and therefore make improved predictions on impacts of environmental change.

533

534 **Acknowledgements**

535

536 We are grateful to Michele Freppaz for discussion on effects of climate change on soil
537 processes at high altitudes and to Alison Johnston for comments on the analytical approach. The
538 paper was greatly improved through the constructive comments of three anonymous referees and
539 Vincent Devictor. DEC was funded by a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship.

540

541 **References**

- 542 Allouche, O., Tsoar, A. and Kadmon, R., 2006. Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models:
543 prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *J. Appl. Ecol.* 43, 1223-1232.
- 544 Barbet-Massin, M., Thuiller, W. and Jiguet, F., 2010. How much do we overestimate future local
545 extinction rates when restricting the range of occurrence data in climate suitability models?
546 *Ecography* 33, 878-886.
- 547 Barnaguad, J.-Y., Devictor, V., Jiguet, F., Barbet-Massin, M., Le Viol, I. and Archaux, F., 2012. Relating
548 habitat and climatic niches in birds. *PLoS ONE* 7, e32819.
- 549 Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W. and Courchamp, F., 2012. Impacts of climate
550 change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecol. Lett.* 15, 365-377.
- 551 Beniston, M., Diaz, H.F. and Bradley, R.S., 1997. Climate change at high elevation sites: An overview.
552 *Clim. Change* 36, 233-251.
- 553 Bibby, C.J., Burgess, N.D., Hill, D.A. and Mustoe, S.H., 2000. *Bird Census Techniques*. 2nd Edn.
554 Academic Press, London.
- 555 Böhm, R., Auer, I., Brunetti, M., Maugeri, M., Nanni, T. and Schöner, W., 2001. Regional temperature
556 variability in the European Alps; 1769-1998 from homogenized instrumental time series. *Int. J.*
557 *Climatol.* 21, 1779-1801.
- 558 Bradbury, R.B., Pearce-Higgins, J.W., Wotton, S., Conway, G.J. and Grice, P.V., 2011. The influence of
559 climate and topography in patterns of territory establishment in a range-expanding bird. *Ibis* 153,
560 336-344.
- 561 Brunetti, M., Lentini, G., Maugeri, M., Nanni, T., Auer, I., Böhm, R. and Schöener, W., 2009. Climate
562 variability and change in the Greater Alpine Region over the last two centuries based on multi-
563 variable analysis. *Int. J. Climatol.* 29, 2197-2225.
- 564 Buckland, S.T., Newman, K.B., Thomas, L. and Koesters, N.B., 2004. State-space models for the
565 dynamics of wild animal populations. *Ecol. Model.* 171, 157-175.

566 Burnham, K.P. and Anderson, D.R., 2002 Model selection and multimodel inference. A practical
567 information-theoretic approach, 2nd edn. Springer-Verlag, New York, USA.

568 Caprio, E., Chamberlain, D.E., Isaia, M. and Rolando, A., 2011. Landscape changes caused by high
569 altitude ski-sites affect bird species richness and distribution in the Alps. *Biol. Conserv.* 144,
570 2958-2967.

571 Cannone, N., Sgorbati, S. and Guglielmin, M., 2007. Unexpected impacts of climate change on alpine
572 vegetation. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 5, 360-364.

573 Chamberlain, D., Arlettaz, R., Caprio, E., Maggini, R., Pedrini, P., Rolando, A. and Zbinden, N., 2012.
574 The altitudinal frontier in avian climate change research. *Ibis* 154, 205-209.

575 Colwell, R.K., Brehm, J., Cardelús, C.L., Gilman, A.C. and Longino, J.T., 2008. Global warming,
576 elevational range shifts, and lowland biotic attrition in the wet tropics. *Science* 322, 258-261.

577 Crawley, M.J., 2007. *The R Book*. Wiley, Chichester.

578 Dirnböck, T., Essl, F. and Babitsch, W., 2011. Disproportional risk for habitat loss of high-altitude
579 endemic species under climate change. *Global Change Biol.* 17, 990-996.

580 Edwards, A.C., Scalenghe, R. and Freppaz, M., 2007. Changes in the seasonal snow cover of alpine
581 regions and its effects on soil processes: A review. *Quatern. Int.* 162-163, 172-181.

582 Elith, J. and Graham, C.H., 2009. Do they? How do they? WHY do they differ? On finding reasons for
583 differing performances of species distribution models. *Ecography* 32, 66-77.

584 ESRI, 2007. *ArcGIS Desktop: Release 9.3*. Environmental Systems Research Institute, 722 Redlands,
585 CA.

586 Fielding, A.H. and Bell, J.F., 1997. A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in
587 conservation presence/absence models. *Environ. Conserv.* 24, 38-49.

588 Freeman, E., 2007. *PresenceAbsence: An R Package for Presence-Absence Model Evaluation*. USDA
589 Forest Service, Ogden, USA.

590 Freppaz, M., Filippa, G., Caimi, A., Buffa, G. and Zanini, E., 2010. Soil and plant characteristics in the
591 alpine tundra (NW Italy). In: Gutierrez, B. and Pena, C. (Eds), *Tundras: Vegetation, Wildlife and*
592 *Climate Trends*. Nova Science Publishers, New York, pp 81-110.

593 Gehrig-Fasel, J., Guisan, A. and Zimmermann, N.E., 2007. Tree line shifts in the Swiss Alps: Climate
594 change or land abandonment? *J. Veg. Sci.* 18, 571-582.

595 Gonzalez, P., Neilson, R.P., Lenihien, J.M. and Drapek, R.J., 2010. Global patterns in the vulnerability
596 of ecosystems to vegetation shifts due to climate change. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* 19, 755-768.

597 Grabherr, G., Gottfried, M. and Pauli, H., 1994. Climate effects on mountain plants. *Nature* 369, 448.

598 Guisan, A., Theurillat, J.-P. and Kienast, F., 1998. Predicting the potential distribution of plant
599 species in an alpine environment. *J. Veg. Sci.* 9, 65-74.

600 Harsch, M.A., Hulme, P.E., McGlone, M.S. and Duncan, R.P., 2009. Are treelines advancing? A global
601 meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. *Ecol. Lett.* 12, 1040-1049.

602 Hijmans, R.J., Cameron, S.E., Parra, J.L., Jones, P.G. and Jarvis, A., 2005. Very high resolution
603 interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol.* 25, 1965-1978.

604 Hodgkinson, I.D., 2005. Terrestrial insects along elevational gradients: species and community
605 responses to altitude. *Biol. Rev.* 80, 489-513.

606 Holt, R.D., 2009. Bringing the Hutchinsonian niche into the 21st century: ecological and evolutionary
607 perspectives. *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 106, 19659-19665.

608 Jeltsch, F., Moloney, K.A., Schwager, M., Körner, K. and Blaum, N., 2011. Consequences of
609 correlations between habitat modifications and negative impact of climate change for regional
610 species survival. *Agr. Ecos. Env.* 145, 49-58.

611 Jetz, W., Wilcove, D.S. and Dobson, A.P., 2007. Projected impacts of climate and land-use change on
612 the global diversity of birds. *PLoS Biol.* 6, e157.

613 Laiolo, P., Dondero, F., Ciliento, E. and Rolando, A., 2004. Consequences of pastoral abandonment
614 for the structure and diversity of the alpine avifauna. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 41, 294-304.

615 Lui, C., Berry, P.M., Dawson, T.P. and Pearson, R.G. 2005. Selecting thresholds of occurrence in the
616 prediction of species distributions. *Ecography* 28, 385-393.

617 Maggini, R., Lehmann, A., Kéry, M., Schmid, H., Beniston, M., Jenni, L. and Zbinden, N., 2011. Are
618 Swiss birds tracking climate change? Detecting elevational shifts using response curve shapes.
619 *Ecol. Model.* 222, 21-32.

620 Mantyka-Pringle, C.S., Martin, T.G. and Rhodes, J.R., 2012. Interactions between climate and habitat
621 loss effects on biodiversity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Global Change Biol.* 18, 1239-
622 1252.

623 Moritz, C. Patton, J.L., Conroy, C.J., Parra, J.L., White, G.C. and Beissinger, S.R., 2008. Impact of a
624 century of climate change on small-mammal communities in Yosemite National Park, USA.
625 *Science* 322, 261-264.

626 Nagy L., Grabherr, G., Körner, C., Thompson, D.B.A. (eds.), 2003. *Alpine Biodiversity in Europe.*
627 *Ecological Studies* 167 XXXI, Springer Verlag, Berlin.

628 Parmesan, C. and Yohe, G., 2003 A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across
629 natural systems. *Nature* 421, 37-42.

630 Paulsen, J., Weber, U.M. and Körner, C., 2000. Tree growth near treeline: Abrupt or gradual
631 reduction with altitude? *Arc. Ant. Alp. Res.* 32, 14-20.

632 Pearson, R.G. and Dawson, T.P., 2003. Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution
633 of species: are bioclimatic envelope models useful? *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* 12, 361-371.

634 Peñuelas, J. and Boada, M., 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains
635 (NE Spain). *Global Change Biol.* 9, 131-140.

636 R Development Core Team, 2010. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* R
637 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

638 Rahbek, C., 2005. The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness
639 patterns. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 224-239.

640 Rauter, C.M. and Reyer, H.-U., 2000. Thermal and energetic consequences of nest location and
641 breeding times in Water Pipits (*Anthus spinoletta*). J. Orn. 141, 391-407.

642 Rauter, C.M., Reyer, H.-U. and Bollmann, K., 2002. Selection through predation, snowfall and
643 microclimate on nest-site preferences in the Water Pipit *Anthus spinoletta*. Ibis 144, 433-444.

644 Reif, J. and Flousek, J., 2012. The role of species' ecological traits in climatically driven altitudinal
645 range shifts of central European birds. Oikos 121, 1053-1060.

646 Reif, J., Št'astný, K. and Bejček, V., 2010. Contrasting effects of climatic and habitat changes on birds
647 with northern range limits in central Europe as revealed by an analysis of breeding bird
648 distribution in the Czech Republic. Acta Orn. 45, 83-90.

649 Rolando, A., Caprio, E., Rinaldi, E., and Ellena, I., 2007. The impact of high-altitude ski-runs on alpine
650 grassland bird communities. J. Appl. Ecol. 44, 210-219.

651 Scherrer, D., Schmid, S. and Körner, C., 2011. Elevational species shifts in a warmer climate are
652 overestimated when based on weather station data. Int. J. Biometeorol. 55, 645-654.

653 Schurr, F.M., Pagel, J., Cabral, J.M., Groenevald, J., Bykova, O., O'Hara, R.B., Hartig, F., Kissling, W.D.,
654 Linder, H.P., Mldgley, G.F., Schröder, B., Singer, A. and Zimmermann, N.E., 2012. How to
655 understand species' niches and range dynamics: a demographic research agenda for
656 biogeography. J. Biogeogr. 29, 2146-2162.

657 Sekercioglu, C.H., Schneider, S.H., Fay, J.P. and Loarie, S.R., 2008. Climate change, elevational range
658 shifts and bird extinctions. Cons. Biol. 22, 140-150.

659 Settele, J. et al. (15 others) 2008. Climate Risk Atlas of European Butterflies. Pensoft, Sofia.

660 Shoo, L.P., Williams, S.E. and Hero, J.-M., 2006. Detecting climate change induced range shifts:
661 Where and how should we be looking? Austral. Ecol. 31, 22-29.

662 Sturm, M., Racine, C. and Tape, K., 2001. Climate change – Increasing shrub abundance in the arctic.
663 Nature 411, 546-547.

664 Thomas, C.D. and Lennon, J.J., 1999. Birds extend their ranges northward. Nature 399, 213.

665 Tocco C., Negro M., Rolando A., and Palestrini C., 2013. Does natural reforestation represent a
666 potential threat to dung beetle diversity in the Alps? *J. Insect Conserv.* 17: 207-217.

667 Viterbi, R., Cerrato, C., Bassano, B., Bionda, R., von Hardenberg, A., Provenzale, A. and Bogliani, G.,
668 2013. Patterns of biodiversity in the northwestern Italian Alps: a multi-taxa approach.
669 *Community Ecol.* 14, 18-30.

670 Whittingham, M.J., Krebs, J.R., Swetnam, R.D., Vickery, J.A., Wilson, J.D. and Freckleton, R.P., 2007.
671 Should conservation strategies consider spatial generality? Farmland birds show regional not
672 national patterns of habitat association. *Ecol. Lett.* 10, 25-35.

673 Wilson, R.J., Gutiérrez, D., Gutiérrez, J., Martínez, D., Agudo, R. and Monserrat, V.J., 2005. Changes
674 to the elevational limits and extent of species ranges associated with climate change. *Ecol. Lett.*
675 8, 1138-1146.

676 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A. and Smith, G.M., 2009. *Mixed Effects Models and*
677 *Extensions in Ecology with R.* Springer, New York.


678

679 **Table 1**

680 The percentage of observed cover and current modelled cover of each habitat type in the study area
 681 $\geq 1700\text{m asl}$, and the percentage change in cover according to each scenario relative to the current
 682 model (so a 100% increase would indicate a doubling in area covered). Scenario 1 represents a rapid
 683 response of forest extent to climate change (based on the B2A projections), scenario 2 represents a
 684 slower response of forest with greater subsequent shrub expansion. Scenarios 3 and 4 are the same
 685 as scenarios 1 and 2 respectively, except that vegetation development is constrained at high
 686 altitudes, therefore habitat cover is equal to the current scenario above 2800m for both.

Class	Observed	Current	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Forest	18	19	+136	+85	+133	+84
Shrub	12	16	+27	+59	+18	+50
Past	20	20	+22	+37	+13	+28
Grass	18	19	-55	-49	-65	-59
Rock	32	26	-94	-94	-72	-72

687



688

689

Fig. 1. Location of the study area in northern Italy, showing the area considered (altitude $\geq 1700\text{m}$) in grey and locations of survey transects (black triangles). The extent of the study area was 1331 km^2 .





Fig. 2. Land cover predicted from modelling the presence of five habitat types (forest, shrub, pasture, grass and rock) in relation to temperature, aspect and slope. Predictions were made in 42398 hexagonal cells of 200m width for the Province of Torino at altitudes $\geq 1700\text{m}$. The observed treeline ('treeline_curr') estimated from PFT data is also shown.

Change in distribution






Scenario

Fig. 3. Change in the distribution of forest/shrub bird species at high altitude ($\geq 1700\text{m}$) in the western Italian Alps estimated from various scenarios of future environmental change by 2080. The climate model (TEMP) assumes habitat stays constant, but species respond to temperature changes; SC1-SC4 are derived from scenarios 1 to 2 (Table 1) for combined models where species respond to both habitat and temperature changes; HAB1- HAB4 are derived from scenarios 1 to 2 for habitat models where species respond only to change in habitat. Change is expressed as the proportion of the current estimated distribution relative to the distribution estimated under each scenario (so values <1 indicate a decrease and values >1 indicate an increase). Note that for presentational purposes, increases greater than 3 are not shown for HAB1-HAB4 for Willow Tit (respective values = 5.96, 4.93, 5.91 and 4.90) and Coal Tit (respective values = 6.22, 5.03, 6.19 and 5.00).

693
694
695

Change in distribution



Scenario

Fig. 4. Change in the distribution of open habitat bird species at high altitude ($\geq 1700\text{m}$) in the western Italian Alps estimated from various scenarios of future environmental change by 2080. Estimated changes are based on the climate model (TEMP), scenarios 1 to 4 from combined models (SC1-SC4) and habitat models (HAB1-HAB4). No valid habitat model was produced for Water Pipit. Other details are as per Fig. 3. Note that for presentational purposes, increases > 2 are not shown for Skylark (TEMP, change = 5.29).

696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707




Fig. 5. Change in the predicted distribution of Water Pipit between the current predicted distribution and that under scenario 3 (combined model, rapid response of forest to temperature increase, no expansion of vegetation above 2800m). Grey areas indicate predicted absences in both current and future scenarios.

708 Table and figure legends

709

710 **Table 1**

711 The percentage of observed cover and current modelled cover of each habitat type in the study area
712 $\geq 1700\text{m}$ asl, and the percentage change in cover according to each scenario relative to the current
713 model (so a 100% increase would indicate a doubling in area covered). Scenario 1 represents a rapid
714 response of forest extent to climate change (based on the B2A projections), scenario 2 represents a
715 slower response of forest with greater subsequent shrub expansion. Scenarios 3 and 4 are the same
716 as scenarios 1 and 2 respectively, except that vegetation development is constrained at high
717 altitudes, therefore habitat cover is equal to the current scenario above 2800m for both.

718 **Fig. 1.** Location of the study area in northern Italy, showing the area considered (altitude $\geq 1700\text{m}$) in
719 grey and locations of survey transects (black triangles). The extent of the study area was 1331 km^2 .

720 **Fig. 2.** Land cover predicted from modelling the presence of five habitat types (forest, shrub,
721 pasture, grass and rock) in relation to temperature, aspect and slope. Predictions were made in
722 42398 hexagonal cells of 200m width for the Province of Torino at altitudes $\geq 1700\text{m}$. The observed
723 treeline ('treeline_curr') estimated from PFT data is also shown.

724 **Fig. 3.** Change in the distribution of forest/shrub bird species at high altitude ($\geq 1700\text{m}$) in the
725 western Italian Alps estimated from various scenarios of future environmental change by 2080. The
726 climate model (TEMP) assumes habitat stays constant, but species respond to temperature changes;
727 SC1-SC4 are derived from scenarios 1 to 2 (Table 1) for combined models where species respond to
728 both habitat and temperature changes; HAB1- HAB4 are derived from scenarios 1 to 2 for habitat
729 models where species respond only to change in habitat. Change is expressed as the proportion of
730 the current estimated distribution relative to the distribution estimated under each scenario (so
731 values < 1 indicate a decrease and values > 1 indicate an increase). Note that for presentational
732 purposes, increases greater than 3 are not shown for HAB1-HAB4 for Willow Tit (respective values =
733 5.96, 4.93, 5.91 and 4.90) and Coal Tit (respective values = 6.22, 5.03, 6.19 and 5.00).

734 **Fig. 4.** Change in the distribution of open habitat bird species at high altitude ($\geq 1700\text{m}$) in the
735 western Italian Alps estimated from various scenarios of future environmental change by 2080.
736 Estimated changes are based on the climate model (TEMP), scenarios 1 to 4 from combined models
737 (SC1-SC4) and habitat models (HAB1-HAB4). No valid habitat model was produced for Water Pipit.
738 Other details are as per Fig. 3. Note that for presentational purposes, increases > 2 are not shown
739 for Skylark (TEMP, change = 5.29).

740 **Fig. 5.** Change in the predicted distribution of Water Pipit between the current predicted distribution
741 and that under scenario 3 (combined model, rapid response of forest to temperature increase, no
742 expansion of vegetation above 2800m). Grey areas indicate predicted absences in both current and
743 future scenarios.

744

745 **Online Appendix**

746

747 **Further details on habitat variables, bird and habitat models and scenario development**

748 **1. Habitat variables**

749 The five habitat variables were based on 15 relevant land cover types (i.e. those occurring
750 above 1700m) extracted from the Piani Forestali Territoriali (PFT) land cover database for the whole
751 province (www.regione.piemonte.it/foreste/cms/foreste/pianificazione). PFT data are backed-up by
752 a high level of ground-truthing and they provided a much better visual fit when overlaid on Google
753 Earth images of the study area compared to the commonly used CORINE (CO-ordination of
754 INformation on the Environment) land cover database. Variable definitions are given in Table A1.
755 PFT was therefore considered more suitable for a study of medium-low geographical scale. For each
756 point, the percentage cover of these five variables was extracted in ArcGIS 9.3 (ESRI, 2008). The
757 approximate location of the current treeline (Fig. A1) was estimated as the perimeter of forest
758 habitat within the study area, although small patches (<10h) and relatively small gaps between areas
759 of forest (<400m) were ignored.

760 As the goal was to estimate species distributions at a relatively large scale, land cover data,
761 rather than habitat data collected in the field, was used in the modelling. For the latter, some simple
762 data (estimated 'by eye') were collected at each point, including the percentage cover of canopy (i.e.
763 above head height) and the number of mature trees (≥ 20 cm in diameter) within a 50m radius.
764 However, there were strong correlations between forest land cover and the comparable habitat
765 variables canopy cover (Pearson correlation $r_{255} = 0.86$, $P > 0.0001$) and number of mature trees
766 within 50m ($r_{255} = 0.77$, $P > 0.0001$) collected in the field, suggesting that the land cover data
767 provided a good representation of habitat 'on the ground'.

768

770 **Table A1**

771 Definitions and summary statistics of variables (including land cover categories used to define
 772 habitats) used in the analysis. Code is used to identify variables in the models (Table A3). The mean
 773 value was calculated from the total sample of points (n = 257). The description includes the data
 774 source where GPS = field reading from Geographical Positioning System, PFT = Piani Forestali
 775 Territoriali land cover database, DTM = Digital Terrain Model (www.mais.sinanet.isprambiente.it),
 776 WC = WorldClim database (summarised at 1-km² scale). CORINE land cover classes were also
 777 considered, but visual overlays of land cover classes on GoogleEarth images of the study points
 778 found a much better concordance with PFT than with CORINE.

Variable	Code	Mean ± sd	Description
Altitude (m)	ALT	2231 ± 317	Altitude of the point above sea level (GPS)
Rock (%)	ROC	16.35 ± 31.46	Rock, scree and areas devoid of vegetation (PFT)
Pasture (%)	PAS	32.96 ± 38.21	Alpine meadows with a continuous sward, seasonally grazed pasture and abandoned pastures (PFT)
Alpine grassland (%)	GRA	14.62 ± 28.97	Semi-natural grassland, intermediate rock/grassland mosaic, comprising rocky and stony areas interspersed with sparse grass cover or other ground vegetation (PFT)
Shrubs (%)	SHR	13.49 ± 28.69	Sub-alpine shrubs, scrub, pioneer or regenerating forest and dwarf trees (including <i>Pinus uncinata</i>) (PFT)
Forest (%)	FOR	22.54 ± 34.84	<i>Larix</i> spp, <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> and <i>P.cembra</i> (PFT)
Slope (°)	SLO	23.81 ± 8.29	Gradient of the slope at a 1 ha scale (DTM)
South-facing aspect (index)	aspectS	0.46 ± 0.64	Direction that a point faces at a 1 ha scale, expressed as an index between 1 (facing directly south) and -1 (facing directly north) (DTM).
East-facing aspect (index)	aspectE	0.35 ± 0.61	Direction that a point faces at a 1 ha scale, expressed as an index between 1 (facing directly east) and -1 (facing directly west) (DTM).
Temperature (°C)	TEMP	2.32 ± 1.89	Mean annual temperature (calculated as mean

			of monthly means) at 1-km ² scale (WC).
Maximum temperature (°C)	TMAX	5.32 ± 1.98	Maximum temperature at 1-km ² scale (WC).
Minimum temperature (°C)	TMIN	-1.59 ± 1.43	Maximum temperature at 1-km ² scale (WC).
Precipitation (mm)	RAIN	121.70 ± 13.88	Mean annual precipitation (calculated as mean of monthly mean accumulated precipitation) at 1-km ² scale (WC).

779

780

781

782 **2. Details of bird distribution models**

783 In order to assess the predictive ability of the models (see below), data were divided into
784 model (70%) and test (30%) data sets. The probability of the occurrence of singing birds (which were
785 therefore assumed to be potential breeders) from the model data set was modelled using binomial
786 logistic regression in a general linear mixed-modelling framework with the lmer command in the
787 lme4 package in R. In order to account for potential spatial autocorrelation between points on the
788 same transect, 'site' was fitted as a random term. Some points (44%) were subject to more than one
789 visit, so to account for variation in survey effort, bird occurrence per points was expressed as a
790 vector of presences and absences (i.e. the successes/failures syntax of Crawley, 2007). All predictor
791 variables initially considered are shown in Table A1.

792 Habitat variables expressed as a proportion were arcsine-square root transformed prior to
793 analysis. There were some high correlations amongst variables, in particular there was very high
794 inter-correlation between all four climate variables (Pearson's correlation $|r| > 0.79$, $P < 0.001$ in
795 each case). Prior to modelling, the degree of collinearity was assessed by calculating variance
796 inflation factors (VIFs). Following the procedure of Zuur et al. (2009), we calculated VIFs for all linear
797 variables. The variable with the highest VIF was sequentially removed and VIFs re-calculated
798 (following Zuur et al., 2009) until all variables had a VIF < 2.0 . Quadratic terms were included if
799 scatter plots of species occurrence per point (the proportion presence/visits) indicated possible non-
800 linear effects. As a final check, variables that had been removed in the VIF procedure were
801 substituted for closely correlated variables (in particular mean temperature, maximum temperature
802 and precipitation, rock and pasture cover, and forest and shrub cover) and models were compared
803 with AIC. Cases where the model with the substituted variable had a lower AIC, and where VIF for
804 each was less than 2, were used as the final full models. The resulting model, which included a set of
805 variables, including climate variables, with a low degree of collinearity, was termed the full

806 combined model. The procedure was repeated without climate variables, and the resulting model
807 was termed the full habitat model.

808 To assess the level of spatial autocorrelation in the data, Moran's I was calculated on the
809 residuals from the full combined model for each species at various scales. There was no evidence of
810 significant autocorrelation with the exception of Black Redstart (Table A2), where Moran's I was
811 significant at larger scales, even though the magnitude of the effects were very small. Such a result
812 may suggest large-scale geographic variation which may be accounted for by including an
813 appropriate additional variable in the model (Zuur et al., 2009) We defined a further factor 'region'
814 which comprised three groups based on the main valleys in the study area, Chisone, Susa and Lanzo,
815 which was specified as a random factor in the model. Addition of this factor improved the fit ($\Delta AIC =$
816 -7.92) and Moran's I was no longer significant (Table A2). The model including region was therefore
817 subsequently used for Black Redstart.

818 Multi-model inference (Burnham and Anderson, 2002) was used to derive model averaged
819 parameter estimates based on the full models, whereby the suite of models containing all
820 combinations of variables were determined, and model weights were calculated (which express the
821 weight of evidence that a given model is likely to be the best predictive model). Model averaged
822 parameter estimates were calculated across the set of models which accounted for 95% of the sum
823 of all model weights (Table A3).

824 Thresholds for bird presence were defined according to the prevalence approach (Liu et al.,
825 2005), i.e. a bird was considered present if its estimated probability exceeded the predefined
826 threshold for the species. (Note that whilst threshold choice affected the actual magnitude of
827 predicted change in the number of cells in which a species was present, the proportional change did
828 not vary greatly according to the method of threshold derivation selected). In order to assess the
829 predictive ability of the models, AUC and TSS were calculated based on how well the models derived
830 from the model data sets predicted observed presence in the test data sets. In general model fits

831 were good ($AUC \geq 0.70$ and $TSS \geq 0.20$; Table A4), although they were less good for Wren, and poor
832 for Black Redstart and Water Pipit (habitat model). In the latter two cases, predictive ability was
833 considered no better than random ($AUC < 0.60$ and $TSS < 0.10$) and so they were not considered for
834 assessing scenario outcomes.

835

836 **Table A2**

837 Moran's I statistic calculated from residuals derived from the full combined model for each species
 838 at various scales. Values in bold indicate significance ($P < 0.05$). 'Black Redstart (reg)' is Moran's I for
 839 the model including the three level factor 'region' specified as a random effect.

840

Species	10km	20km	30km	40km	50km
Skylark	-0.022	-0.013	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001
Water Pipit	0.004	0.007	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001
Tree Pipit	0.011	0.003	-0.003	> 0.001	> 0.001
Wheatear	-0.022	-0.013	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001
Black Redstart	0.018	0.004	0.004	-0.001	-0.006
Black Redstart (reg)	0.017	0.006	0.006	-0.007	-0.005
Dunnock	-0.027	-0.005	-0.015	-0.001	> 0.001
Wren	-0.036	0.002	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001
Willow Tit	0.017	-0.008	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001
Coal Tit	0.011	-0.018	-0.013	-0.001	> 0.001
Chaffinch	-0.037	-0.027	-0.012	-0.001	> 0.001

841

842

844 **Table A3**

845 Model averaged parameter estimates (Est.) for the probability of occurrence of alpine birds along
 846 point transects. Upper and lower 95% confidence limits (UCL and LCL respectively) and model
 847 weights (*W*) for the model set comprising 95% of total model weights are also presented. A multi-
 848 model inference approach (Burnham & Anderson, 2002) was used to derive estimates and weights
 849 from binomial logistic regression models of climate, topography and habitat (combined models), and
 850 topography and habitat only (habitat models), on species presence, specifying random site effects. In
 851 addition, the three-level factor 'region' was fitted as a random factor for the Black Redstart model.
 852 Variables considered were selected for modelling based on VIFs, and vary according to species.
 853 Temperature was expressed in degrees centigrade, aspect as an index from 1 (directly facing the
 854 aspect in question) to -1 (directly opposite to the aspect in question), slope in angular degrees and
 855 habitat cover (forest, scrub, sparse vegetation and rock) as arcsine-square root transformed
 856 proportions. – indicates a variable not considered in the modelling procedure for a given species (or
 857 not applicable in the case of *W* for intercepts).

858

Species	Variable	Combined models				Habitat models			
		<i>W</i>	Est.	LCL	UCL	<i>W</i>	Est.	LCL	UCL
Skylark	Intercept	–	-3.430	-5.970	-0.879	–	-1.880	-4.040	0.287
	East	0.51	0.386	-0.661	1.430	0.30	0.064	-0.758	0.885
	Forest	1.00	-6.760	-12.000	-1.560	1.00	-5.230	-9.560	-0.891
	Grass	0.59	0.686	-0.872	2.240	0.32	0.146	-0.664	0.955
	Rock	–	–	–	–	0.87	-1.480	-3.370	0.417
	Shrub	0.84	-1.510	-3.560	0.538	0.56	-0.654	-2.260	0.952
	Slope	0.36	-0.019	-0.121	0.084	0.32	-0.016	-0.126	0.093
	Slope ²	0.34	-0.0002	-0.002	0.002	0.30	-0.00003	-0.002	0.002
	South	–	–	–	–	0.83	1.170	-0.484	2.820
	Temp	1.00	1.270	-0.055	2.600	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.65	-0.122	-0.368	0.125	–	–	–	–
Water Pipit	Intercept	–	0.458	-2.600	3.510	–	0.243	-2.700	3.190
	East	0.30	0.073	-0.474	0.621	0.28	0.070	-0.403	0.542
	Grass	0.24	-0.019	-0.453	0.416	0.26	0.056	-0.391	0.504

	Rock	0.45	-0.340	-1.400	0.719	0.42	-0.248	-1.050	0.550
	Shrub	0.49	-0.380	-1.440	0.674	0.61	-0.502	-1.590	0.582
	Slope	0.43	-0.070	-0.320	0.181	0.46	-0.067	-0.300	0.167
	Slope ²	0.41	0.001	-0.004	0.006	0.41	0.001	-0.003	0.006
	South	0.60	0.470	-0.551	1.490	0.48	0.277	-0.519	1.070
	Temp	0.64	0.391	-0.451	1.230	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.99	-0.196	-0.413	0.020	–	–	–	–
Tree Pipit	Intercept	–	-9.850	-20.700	0.990	–	-4.130	-12.800	4.550
	East	0.52	0.539	-0.654	1.730	0.41	0.254	-0.629	1.140
	Grass	0.26	0.178	-0.946	1.300	0.21	0.007	-0.763	0.778
	Pasture	0.44	0.390	-0.811	1.590	0.29	0.132	-0.597	0.861
	Rock	0.29	-0.380	-2.430	1.660	0.35	-0.562	-2.910	1.790
	Shrub	0.98	-2.570	-5.070	-0.075	1.00	-3.270	-5.680	-0.863
	Slope	0.47	0.201	-0.469	0.872	0.56	0.261	-0.476	0.997
	Slope ²	0.44	-0.004	-0.017	0.010	0.52	-0.005	-0.020	0.010
	Temp	0.92	3.020	-0.766	6.810	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.86	-0.343	-0.810	0.125	–	–	–	–
Dunnock	Intercept	–	-3.520	-10.700	3.660	–	-3.550	-10.500	3.430
	East	0.30	-0.101	-0.676	0.474	0.30	-0.101	-0.675	0.473
	Grass	0.48	-0.756	-3.010	1.500	0.47	-0.706	-2.890	1.480
	Pasture	0.25	-0.072	-0.773	0.629	0.26	-0.077	-0.793	0.639
	Rock	0.95	-76.900	-41000	40800	0.97	-78	-41400	41300
	Shrub	0.28	0.093	-0.482	0.668	0.30	0.107	-0.478	0.693
	Slope	0.47	0.173	-0.421	0.766	0.46	0.164	-0.415	0.743
	Slope ²	0.46	-0.003	-0.015	0.008	0.46	-0.003	-0.015	0.008
	Temp	0.26	-0.032	-0.477	0.414	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.25	-0.002	-0.064	0.060	–	–	–	–
Wren	Intercept	–	-11.400	-22.500	-0.277	–	-10.600	-20.900	-0.281

	East	1.00	-3.430	-5.310	-1.550	1.00	-3.400	-5.260	-1.550
	Forest	0.79	1.580	-0.820	3.980	0.79	1.430	-0.753	3.620
	Grass	0.60	1.480	-1.760	4.730	0.61	1.510	-1.730	4.760
	Pasture	0.80	-1.980	-4.820	0.871	0.82	-2.010	-4.790	0.772
	Rock	0.27	-0.279	-2.740	2.180	0.27	-0.323	-2.810	2.160
	Slope	0.93	0.677	-0.131	1.480	0.93	0.647	-0.135	1.430
	Slope ²	0.91	-0.012	-0.026	0.003	0.90	-0.011	-0.025	0.003
	Temp	0.33	0.328	-1.580	2.240	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.37	-0.060	-0.342	0.223	–	–	–	–
<hr/>									
Wheatear	Intercept	–	-0.682	-4.120	2.760	–	-0.401	-3.210	2.410
	East	0.34	-0.162	-0.852	0.527	0.37	-0.183	-0.901	0.535
	Forest	0.78	-7.450	-19.200	4.320	0.73	-6.170	-17.200	4.850
	Grass	0.23	-0.003	-0.516	0.511	0.23	-0.011	-0.526	0.504
	Rock	0.28	-0.020	-0.779	0.739	0.38	-0.230	-1.090	0.629
	Shrub	0.46	-0.388	-1.540	0.769	0.36	-0.226	-1.150	0.704
	Slope	0.50	-0.075	-0.317	0.166	0.45	-0.056	-0.256	0.145
	Slope ²	0.42	0.001	-0.003	0.005	0.38	0.001	-0.003	0.004
	South	0.24	-0.033	-0.565	0.500	0.23	-0.004	-0.492	0.484
	Temp	0.78	0.798	-0.553	2.150	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.72	-0.166	-0.469	0.137	–	–	–	–
<hr/>									
Black Redstart	Intercept	–	-2.750	-4.970	-0.526	–	-3.220	-5.710	-0.722
	East	0.23	-0.007	-0.343	0.330	0.26	-0.051	-0.487	0.384
	Forest	0.60	-0.777	-2.510	0.952	0.87	-1.540	-3.430	0.355
	Grass	0.32	0.129	-0.510	0.769	0.36	0.179	-0.604	0.961
	Rock	0.34	0.168	-0.595	0.931	0.36	0.193	-0.653	1.040
	Shrub	0.42	0.239	-0.564	1.040	0.46	0.305	-0.641	1.250
	Slope	0.61	0.042	-0.076	0.160	0.65	0.057	-0.097	0.210

	Slope ²	0.50	0.0003	-0.002	0.002	0.48	-0.00002	-0.003	0.003
	Temp	0.40	-0.077	-0.355	0.202	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.27	0.001	-0.044	0.046	–	–	–	–
Willow Tit	Intercept	–	-1.050	-3.740	1.650	–	-0.763	-1.960	0.437
	East	0.24	-0.032	-0.451	0.387	0.24	-0.034	-0.456	0.389
	Grass	0.92	-2.410	-5.180	0.357	0.94	-2.380	-5.010	0.256
	Pasture	0.29	-0.131	-0.869	0.608	0.29	-0.135	-0.884	0.613
	Rock	0.40	-0.684	-3.210	1.840	0.40	-0.671	-3.160	1.820
	Shrub	0.96	-1.470	-2.820	-0.112	0.97	-1.420	-2.700	-0.145
	Slope	0.23	-0.001	-0.055	0.053	0.24	-0.002	-0.056	0.053
	Slope ²	0.24	-0.0001	-0.001	0.001	0.24	-0.0001	-0.001	0.001
	Temp	0.36	0.256	-1.080	1.590	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.40	-0.043	-0.229	0.143	–	–	–	–
Coal Tit	Intercept	–	-4.450	-7.520	-1.370	–	-2.950	-4.330	-1.560
	East	0.28	-0.104	-0.632	0.424	0.28	-0.082	-0.547	0.384
	Forest	1.00	1.630	0.616	2.630	1.00	1.970	1.060	2.890
	Grass	0.28	-0.211	-1.550	1.130	0.28	-0.222	-1.540	1.100
	Pasture	0.26	-0.100	-0.888	0.688	0.23	0.049	-0.598	0.697
	Rock	0.34	0.439	-1.420	2.300	0.37	0.509	-1.390	2.410
	Slope	0.26	-0.008	-0.088	0.072	0.24	-0.001	-0.052	0.050
	Slope ²	0.28	0.0002	-0.001	0.002	0.25	0.0001	-0.001	0.001
	Temp	0.74	0.574	-0.840	1.990	–	–	–	–
	Temp ²	0.50	-0.015	-0.192	0.163	–	–	–	–
Chaffinch	Intercept	–	-3.680	-6.180	-1.170	–	-2.510	-4.290	-0.725
	East	0.43	0.291	-0.630	1.210	0.41	0.255	-0.602	1.110
	Forest	1.00	2.930	1.770	4.090	1.00	3.610	2.500	4.720
	Grass	0.24	-0.077	-0.908	0.754	0.28	-0.151	-1.100	0.803

Pasture	0.40	0.336	-0.836	1.510	0.66	0.817	-0.729	2.360
Rock	0.37	-0.683	-3.310	1.950	0.33	-0.478	-2.650	1.690
Slope	0.30	0.005	-0.070	0.080	0.27	0.006	-0.050	0.063
Slope ²	0.33	0.0003	-0.001	0.002	0.28	0.0002	-0.001	0.001
Temp	0.70	0.471	-0.546	1.490	–	–	–	–
Temp ²	0.46	0.014	-0.128	0.157	–	–	–	–

859

860

861

862 **Table A4**

863 Measures of model performance, based on predicting the probability of species presence in a test
864 data set (30% of the sample) using models derived from a model data set (70% of the sample).
865 Model performance was measured as the area under the ROC curve (AUC) and the True Skill Statistic
866 (TSS). The subscript 'comb' indicates combined models including topography, habitat cover and
867 temperature, 'hab' indicates habitat models including only topography and habitat. ΔAIC =
868 difference in AIC between the full combined model and the full habitat model (i.e. so minus indicates
869 the combined model is better). AUC is given \pm sd derived from the PresenceAbsence package in R
870 (Freeman, 2007).

871

Species	AUC _{comb}	AUC _{hab}	TSS _{comb}	TSS _{hab}	ΔAIC
(a) Forest/shrub					
Tree Pipit	0.79 \pm 0.08	0.74 \pm 0.09	0.31	0.44	-7.35
Dunnock	0.77 \pm 0.08	0.75 \pm 0.08	0.32	0.37	3.57
Wren	0.65 \pm 0.09	0.66 \pm 0.09	0.10	0.10	1.15
Willow Tit	0.83 \pm 0.07	0.81 \pm 0.08	0.52	0.43	1.30
Coal Tit	0.81 \pm 0.07	0.78 \pm 0.08	0.50	0.50	-5.99
Chaffinch	0.93 \pm 0.04	0.93 \pm 0.04	0.62	0.81	-3.41
(b) Open habitat					
Skylark	0.82 \pm 0.06	0.81 \pm 0.06	0.18	0.30	-7.40
Water Pipit	0.70 \pm 0.08	0.52 \pm 0.09	0.39	0.13	-6.63
Wheatear	0.78 \pm 0.07	0.70 \pm 0.08	0.24	0.51	-5.06
Black Redstart	0.62 \pm 0.09	0.58 \pm 0.10	-0.16	-0.12	0.44

872

873

874

875

876

877 **3. Habitat modelling and scenario development**

878 A range of approaches have been used to model vegetation responses to climate change in
879 alpine environments, but these typically are undertaken at relatively small scales, consider individual
880 species, and have not as far as we are aware yet included predictions for responses of high altitude
881 soils to climate change. Land cover data are available over a large area and for the most part define
882 general structural vegetation types rather than individual species (with the exception of some
883 mature tree species), which are nonetheless likely to be appropriate for predicting altitudinal
884 distributions of bird species. Scenario development was a two stage process described in detail
885 below. In summary, the first stage was to estimate the probability of occurrence of each habitat
886 type per cell using logistic regression models in relation to climate and topography. In the second
887 stage, the model outputs were then combined into a continuous surface for each cell by (i)
888 eliminating habitats with predicted probabilities of occurrence lower than pre-defined thresholds
889 (Liu et al. 2005) and (ii) calculating the sum of probabilities of all remaining habitats, and defining
890 habitat cover as the proportion made up by each individual habitat for a given cell.

891 *3.1 Logistic regression*

892 The presence of each of five habitat types (forest, shrub, pasture, grass and rock; see Table
893 A1 for full definitions) in each cell was modelled separately in relation to topographic and climate
894 variables (slope, aspect (east), aspect (south), mean, minimum and maximum temperature and
895 precipitation, and the quadratic of each climate variable). Models were derived from the whole
896 province (i.e. the whole regional climatic range including all altitudes), and data were randomly
897 divided into model (70%) and test (30%) data. Prior to modelling, the degree of collinearity was
898 assessed by calculating variance inflation factors (VIFs) in the same way as for the bird data (see
899 above). In the event, all climate variables were highly correlated so the final variable set only ever

900 had a single climate variable. However, these variables were interchangeable in the models (i.e.
901 there were no effects on the VIFs of topographic variables), so models were compared with each
902 climate variable in turn. All models also included all two way interactions between both linear and
903 quadratic climate terms. Models were compared using AIC and the model with the lowest AIC
904 (termed the full model) was used to make predictions of the probability of presence of each habitat
905 type per cell. The full model for each habitat type was used as the basis for model averaging in order
906 to derive averaged parameter estimates, as for the bird data (see above). These are given in Table
907 A5. The performance of the resulting models derived from the model data set were then assessed
908 using the test data set by calculating AUC and TSS. Model fits were good (AUC > 0.70 and TSS > 0.20)
909 showing that they had good predictive ability (Table A6).

910 *3.2 Combining model outputs*

911 The above procedure produced separate distributions for each of the five habitats, which
912 partially overlapped one another. The next step was to combine these distributions into a current
913 modelled habitat surface that best approximated to the observed current habitat distribution. The
914 estimates of the probability of occurrence from the logistic regression models for each habitat were
915 used to identify optimal thresholds for defining habitat presence using the PresenceAbsence
916 package in R (Freeman, 2007) for the study area ($\geq 1700\text{m}$ in altitude), i.e. a habitat was considered
917 present for a given cell if the estimated probability of occurrence was equal to or greater than the
918 threshold. This package provides a range of methods for identifying optimal thresholds – in this
919 case, three methods were used which gave a relatively broad range of values, the prevalence
920 approach, the sensitivity-specificity sum maximization approach and the sensitivity-specificity
921 equality approach, all of which were among those recommended by Liu et al. (2005). These were
922 used as the basis for fitting the current predicted habitat cover.

923 Habitat cover per cell was determined by first omitting any habitat whose probability of
924 occurrence was lower than the threshold for that habitat. The sum of the probabilities of the

925 remaining habitats was then calculated. The cover of an individual habitat type per cell was then its
926 individual probability of occurrence divided by the total, e.g. if a cell had three habitat types with
927 probabilities above their specified thresholds, and if each had an estimated probability of 0.5, then
928 the cover of each habitat in the cell would be $0.5/1.5 = 0.33$. This procedure allows for the
929 simulation of mixed cell habitats, the proportion of which is weighted by the probabilities of other
930 habitats also occurring in that cell. It therefore creates a more realistic landscape in particular for
931 ecotone species such as Tree Pipit and Dunnock which are characteristic of transitional treeline
932 habitats.

933 The model was tuned by varying the combinations of thresholds available from the three
934 methods until the mean altitude of all habitats was within 100m of that observed. The best fit was
935 generally provided by sensitivity-specificity sum maximization approach, although model tuning was
936 necessary by using alternative thresholds for two habitats, forest and rock (thresholds are given in
937 Table A6). Following this process, there were 257 (0.6%) cells unclassified due to low estimated
938 probabilities for all habitat in a given cell. In these cases, all thresholds were lowered by 50% and
939 the process re-applied, which resulted in all cells being classified. This gave a very good fit to the
940 current data in terms of both altitude (Table A7), area covered (main paper, Table 1) and the
941 approximate location of the treeline (Fig. A1).

942 *3.3 Future scenarios*

943 The probability of occurrence of each habitat type was estimated from the logistic
944 regression models under a future scenario of moderate climate change based on the IPCC4 B2A
945 scenario (based on a relatively moderate rate of global population increase and intermediate levels
946 of economic development). This was the most conservative scenario available at the scales
947 necessary (1km^2), which was in keeping with our goal of assessing sensitivity against scenarios of less
948 extreme climate change. Climate values used in the current model were substituted for values for
949 the 2080s under the B2A scenario (topographic variables were constant), and probabilities for each

950 cell were calculated. The process of combining the habitat types based on thresholds was applied
951 exactly as before which produces a general elevational shift in habitat types which were in line with
952 those already observed, e.g. the mean altitude of forest was predicted to increase by 197m by the
953 2080s, a rate of 2.81m per year, which is within the minimum (0.28m per year, Paulsen et al., 2000)
954 and maximum (3.16m per year, Gehrig-Fasel et al., 2007) rates already observed for treeline shifts in
955 the European Alps. This was scenario 1. Scenario 2 simulated a situation where forest developed
956 less rapidly, but instead there was greater shrub development. This scenario was constructed by
957 substituting the best fitting forest threshold for the highest available threshold of those considered.
958 This had the effect of constraining the spread of forest, and increasing the area of shrub. Scenario 3
959 and 4 were analogous to scenario 1 and 2 respectively, except that due to soil forming processes it
960 was assumed that there would be no further vegetation development above 2800m, hence habitat
961 cover above this height was held equal to that in the current model.

962

964 **Table A5**

965 Parameter estimates (Est.) and lower and upper 95% confidence limits (LCL and UCL respectively) for
 966 the effects of environmental variables on the probability of occurrence of different habitat types
 967 derived from model averaging of binomial logistic regression models based on climate and
 968 topographic variables. Model averaging (Burnham & Anderson, 2002) was based on the set of
 969 models that contributed 95% of total model weight, with the exception of shrub, where there was a
 970 single outstanding model (the full model, which accounted for 98% of model weight, and $\Delta AIC =$
 971 12.53 compared to the next best model). W is the model weight for each variable derived for the
 972 model set comprising 95% of total model weights (- indicates not applicable). Variables considered
 973 were selected for modelling based on VIFs (Zuur et al., 2009), and vary according to habitat. Mean
 974 temperature (Temp) and maximum temperature (Tmax) were expressed in degrees centigrade,
 975 aspect as an index from 1 (directly facing the aspect in question) to -1 (directly opposite to the
 976 aspect in question), considering both southerly (S) and easterly (E) aspects, and slope in angular
 977 degrees.

Habitat type	Variable	W	Est.	LCL	UCL
Forest	E	1.00	-0.379	-0.442	-0.316
	S	1.00	-0.318	-0.433	-0.203
	SLOPE	1.00	-0.010	-0.019	-0.001
	Temp	1.00	1.720	1.610	1.820
	Temp*E	0.34	0.003	-0.009	0.015
	Temp*S	1.00	-0.125	-0.175	-0.075
	Temp*SLOPE	1.00	-0.009	-0.013	-0.005
	Temp ²	1.00	-0.171	-0.181	-0.161
	Temp ² *E	0.27	0.0002	-0.001	0.001
	Temp ² *S	1.00	0.018	0.013	0.023
	Temp ² *SLOPE	1.00	0.001	0.001	0.002
Intercept	-		-3.030	-3.270	-2.800
Shrub	E	-	-0.398	-0.592	-0.204
	S	-	-0.277	-0.465	-0.088

	SLOPE	-	-0.035	-0.049	-0.021
	Tmax	-	0.445	0.353	0.537
	Tmax*E	-	0.125	0.074	0.176
	Tmax*S	-	-0.146	-0.194	-0.097
	Tmax*SLOPE	-	0.015	0.011	0.018
	Tmax ²	-	-0.029	-0.034	-0.023
	Tmax ² *E	-	-0.006	-0.009	-0.003
	Tmax ² *S	-	0.015	0.012	0.018
	Tmax ² *SLOPE	-	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
	Intercept	-	-3.133	-3.501	-2.765
Pasture	E	1.00	-0.168	-0.221	-0.114
	S	1.00	0.230	0.175	0.285
	SLOPE	1.00	-0.043	-0.047	-0.039
	Temp	1.00	0.635	0.586	0.683
	Temp*E	1.00	0.041	0.016	0.066
	Temp*S	1.00	0.079	0.053	0.104
	Temp*SLOPE	1.00	-0.008	-0.010	-0.006
	Temp ²	1.00	-0.066	-0.070	-0.061
	Temp ² *E	0.46	-0.001	-0.004	0.002
	Temp ² *S	1.00	-0.011	-0.013	-0.008
	Temp ² *SLOPE	1.00	0.001	0.0003	0.001
	Intercept	-	0.063	-0.045	0.170
Grass	E	1.00	0.147	0.024	0.270
	S	1.00	-0.085	-0.228	0.057
	SLOPE	1.00	-0.052	-0.062	-0.043
	Tmax	1.00	-0.061	-0.158	0.036

	Tmax*E	1.00	0.032	-0.009	0.074
	Tmax*S	1.00	0.154	0.103	0.205
	Tmax*SLOPE	0.79	0.021	0.017	0.024
	Tmax ²	1.00	-0.031	-0.039	-0.023
	Tmax ² *E	0.42	0.001	-0.003	0.004
	Tmax ² *S	1.00	-0.006	-0.010	-0.002
	Tmax ² *SLOPE	1.00	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
	Intercept	-	-0.062	-0.324	0.200
Rock	E	1.00	-0.247	-0.413	-0.081
	S	1.00	-0.416	-0.532	-0.300
	SLOPE	1.00	0.024	0.015	0.033
	Tmax	1.00	-0.888	-0.957	-0.820
	Tmax*E	1.00	0.109	0.062	0.157
	Tmax*S	0.34	0.078	0.050	0.105
	Tmax*SLOPE	1.00	0.0005	-0.002	0.003
	Tmax ²	1.00	0.023	0.019	0.028
	Tmax ² *E	1.00	-0.006	-0.009	-0.003
	Tmax ² *S	0.29	-0.0002	-0.002	0.001
	Tmax ² *SLOPE	1.00	0.0003	0.0001	0.0005
	Intercept	-	3.020	2.770	3.270

978

979

980

981 **Table A6**

982 Model performance of predictive habitat models according to AUC and TSS for the study area
983 (>1700m). Thresholds used to define habitat presence are also presented. For forest, the threshold
984 used for Scenarios 2 and 4 is given in parentheses.

985

Habitat	AUC	TSS	Threshold
Forest	0.85±0.003	0.56	0.28 (0.46)
Shrub	0.79±0.005	0.32	0.22
Pasture	0.71±0.005	0.32	0.36
Grass	0.72±0.005	0.26	0.39
Rock	0.85±0.003	0.56	0.34

986

987

988 **Table A7**

989 Mean altitude (m) ± SD of each class per scenario. OBS = Observed data, CURRENT = current
990 modelled habitat cover, Scenario 1 represents a rapid response of forest extent to climate change
991 (based on the B2A projections), scenario 2 represents a slower response of forest with greater
992 subsequent shrub expansion. Scenarios 3 and 4 are the same as scenarios 1 and 2 respectively,
993 except that vegetation development is constrained at high altitudes, therefore habitat cover is equal
994 to the current scenario above 2800m for both.

Class	OBS	CURRENT	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Forest	1962±170	1998±201	2196±299	2175±271	2181±284	2168±263
Shrub	2074±229	2054±239	2256±304	2243±309	2250±272	2219±277
Past	2121±255	2083±247	2278±318	2262±325	2241±285	2226±291
Grass	2281±279	2246±288	2562±306	2558±310	2475±254	2471±258
Rock	2563±315	2609±250	2930±314	2900±361	2928±213	2916±242

995

996




Fig. A1. Land cover predicted from modelling the presence of five habitat types (forest, shrub, pasture, grass and rock) in relation to temperature, aspect and slope. Predictions were made in 42398 hexagonal cells of 200m width for the Province of Torino at altitudes $\geq 1700\text{m}$. The observed treeline ('treeline_curr') estimated from PFT data is also shown.