

Finescale ecological niche modeling provides evidence that lactating gray seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) prefer access to fresh water in order to drink.

Authors: Stewart, J.E.<sup>1</sup>, Pomeroy, P.P.<sup>2</sup>, Duck, C.D.<sup>2</sup> and Twiss, S.D.<sup>1</sup>

1. *School of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, Durham University, DH1 3LE, UK.*

2. *Sea Mammal Research Unit (SMRU), Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Fife, KY16 8LB, UK.*

Key words: pinniped, phocid, habitat preference, Ecological Niche Factor Analysis, ENFA, thermoregulation, water balance, water drinking, salinity.

## 12 ABSTRACT

13 Many phocids are capital breeders, relying on stored reserves to sustain energetic  
14 requirements whilst on land. Their large body size, high energy expenditure during lactation,  
15 and the insulative effects of the blubber layer can lead to thermal stress from overheating,  
16 especially in warm and temperate climates. Thermal stress can influence fine-scale site  
17 choice on breeding colonies, and behavioral thermoregulation has been proposed as an  
18 explanation for the clear preferences shown by breeding female gray seals for proximity to  
19 pools of water. However, anecdotal observations suggest that pools of water may also be  
20 preferred for drinking, though water intake is difficult to verify without real-time  
21 physiological monitoring. Here, an alternative approach demonstrates that gray seals also  
22 require access to water for drinking. Using Ecological Niche Factor Analysis to examine fine-  
23 scale physical determinants of pupping site choice at North Rona, Scotland, we found that  
24 lactating mothers showed preference for lower salinity pools. This is most pronounced early  
25 in the season, when ambient temperatures and presumably thermal stress are greatest. Given  
26 that the cooling effect of fresh and salt water should be equivalent, the most parsimonious  
27 explanation for this preference for fresh water pools is that lactating females use these pools  
28 for drinking.

## INTRODUCTION

Many phocids are capital breeders, and therefore fast continuously throughout the breeding period (Riedman 1990). During their time on the breeding colony, postpartum mothers obtain their energy from the metabolism of stored reserves including lipids in their thick blubber layer (Pomeroy *et al.* 1999). These reserves are also mobilized to provision the pup with a lipid-rich milk in a short lactation period (approximately 18 d in the gray seal, *Halichoerus grypus*; Boness and James, 1979; Pomeroy *et al.* 1999). This results in high energy expenditure during lactation, as demonstrated by increased basal metabolic rates (BMR); for example, the BMR of lactating gray seal mothers is typically approximately 2.3 times that of nonlactating females (Reilly *et al.* 1996). This dramatic increase in BMR during lactation can lead to thermal stress from overheating (Twiss *et al.* 2002) as a result of the insulative effects of the blubber layer and large body size, while the burden of lactation can contribute to water stress (Reilly *et al.* 1996). Phocids are unable to pant or sweat (Riedman 1990) and cooling on land is primarily achieved by thermal radiation *via* poorly insulated “thermal windows” such as the flippers (Ronald *et al.* 1977, Øritsland *et al.* 1978, McCafferty *et al.* 2011, Paterson *et al.* 2012). However, this can be insufficient to prevent thermal stress on warm days, generating a requirement for behavioral thermoregulation, for example by seeking shade (Campagna and Le Beouf 1988) or bathing in pools of water (Twiss *et al.* 2002). These behaviors are common in pinnipeds breeding in warm and temperate climates (Gentry 1973, Campagna and Le Beouf 1988, Twiss *et al.* 2002, Wolf *et al.* 2005) and involve individuals actively seeking fine-scale, heterogeneous landscape features, such as shady cliffs or pools of water. Behavioral thermoregulation has been proposed as an explanation for the clear preferences shown by breeding female gray seals for proximity to pools of water (Redman *et al.* 2001, Twiss *et al.* 2002).

It has previously been assumed that gray seals meet their water requirements while hauled out through the metabolism of fat reserves (Schweigert 1993), with no clinical evidence having been found for dehydration during this time (Irving 1935, Kooyman and Drabek 1968, Ortiz *et al.* 1978). However, at the Scottish colony of North Rona (59.10°N, 5.83°W; Fig. 1), lactating female gray seals incur a negative water balance (Reilly *et al.* 1996) and have been observed drinking from pools of water of varying salinities (Reilly *et al.* 1996, Redman *et al.* 2001, PPP and SDT, personal observation). Similar drinking behavior has been observed at other UK colonies, including Donna Nook (53.47°N, 0.15° E, JES, personal observation) and the Isle of May (56.18° N, 2.56° W, PPP and SDT, personal observation). Therefore, it is also possible that proximity to water is important because lactating gray seals may need to drink from pools of water to maintain a positive water balance and avoid the water stress that develops during lactation (Reilly *et al.* 1996, Redman *et al.* 2001). The difference between these observations and those of Schweigert (1993) at Sable Island, Nova Scotia (43.93°N 59.92°W) could be a result of the higher average temperatures (approximately 7°C difference) at North Rona (Redman *et al.* 2001) relative to Sable Island (Schweigert 1993), which may be enough to induce additional water requirements. However, despite behavioral observations showing that seals submerge their mouths and appear to drink (PPP and SDT, personal observation), it is difficult to state conclusively, without real-time physiological monitoring, that free-living seals drink water whilst hauled out. However, an alternative approach is to examine the fine scale habitat preferences of individuals, particularly with regards to proximity to pools and to pool salinity. If seals require pools solely for thermoregulation they should not differentiate between salt and fresh water pools. Therefore, we examined the fine spatial scale terrestrial habitat preferences of adult female gray seals based on preestablished preferences (proximity to access points to the sea and to pools of water; Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2001) and introduced pool

salinity as a new parameter. If gray seal mothers do require access to fresh water for addressing water stress, we predict that proximity to pools and positioning relative to access points to and from the colony will remain key determinants of pupping site choice, but that pool salinity will also contribute substantially to pupping site preferences.

## METHODS

### Study Site and Population

North Rona is a small island located 75.5 km NNW of Cape Wrath, Scotland, and covers an area of approximately 1.2 km<sup>2</sup>. The gray seal breeding colony at North Rona is concentrated on the Fianuis peninsula, and forms annually between September and November (Pomeroy *et al.* 1999), with individual females generally remaining ashore for approximately 22 d. The study site is a 287 m<sup>2</sup> area in the south of this peninsula (Fig. 1). Due to the locations of cliffs surrounding the island, that rise up to 108 m, access to the study site from the sea is limited to a series of gullies in the east (Fig. 1), which lead to a relatively low-lying, open and boulder-strewn grassy slope. North Rona experiences a decline in daily air temperature over the breeding season (Fig. 2). Adult females tend to give birth within four days of arriving on North Rona (Pomeroy *et al.* 1999), and the colony typically expands inland, further from access points throughout the season (Pomeroy *et al.* 1994). Due to the distance of pupping sites from the sea, females at North Rona typically do not return to the sea during lactation (Pomeroy *et al.* 1994, 1999). The time spent on the colony prepartum is thought to be spent in site selection before individuals give birth to a single pup (Pomeroy *et al.* 1999). Adult females show both site fidelity, returning to sites within a median distance of 55 m from the previous years' pupping site, and temporal fidelity, pupping within a few days of their pupping date in the previous year (Pomeroy *et al.* 1999).

## Eco-Geographical Variables

The study site was characterized in terms of three key eco-geographical variables (EGVs), chosen for their known or hypothesized influence on seal distribution and behavior (Pomeroy *et al.* 1994; Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2001, 2002, 2007; Redman *et al.* 2001): “cost-distance” to access (CACC), “cost-distance” to nearest pool (CPOOL) and pool salinity. Study site topography was quantified using a submeter-accurate Digital Terrain Model (DTM), previously generated from high resolution aerial photogrammetry (Mills *et al.* 1997, Twiss *et al.* 2000). The DTM was stored as a grid of elevation values across the study site, including information on slope and aspect between neighboring 0.2 m × 0.2 m grid cells, and was integrated with a grid of the same resolution and extent depicting land extent and access point availability to provide the CACC surface. The CACC surface represents a cell-by-cell index of the cumulative “cost” incurred from travelling from any location within the study site to the “nearest” (least “costly”) access point to the sea, where cost is a function of the slope traversed between neighboring grid cells, and is represented as a relative index ranging from zero to 100 (Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2001).

High resolution aerial photographs of the study site (taken by SMRU for the annual pupping census; Hiby *et al.* 1988) were available for four dates, hereafter “focal dates”, during the 2010 breeding season. These focal dates are referred to by the “stage” of the breeding season to which they relate: 30 September 2010 (“Beginning”), 12 October 2010 (“Mid”), 24 October 2010 (“Late”) and 03 November 2010 (“End”). Using a geographic information system (GIS; ArcInfo Version 9.3, Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc., Redlands, CA), digital copies of these aerial photographs were georectified. We then digitized as polygons all pools of standing water across the study site. These polygon coverages were converted to a grid of the same resolution and extent as the study site DTM

and used in conjunction with the DTM to create a CPOOL surface for each focal date. The cost-distance surfaces provide a representation of the potential relative costs incurred by individuals moving across the study site towards access points or nearest pools of water, and do not imply a knowledge of the physiological cost to individuals seals (Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2001). Based on personal observations of the locomotory abilities of adult gray seals (PPP and SDT), the cost-distance maps also assume that any feature (*e.g.*, stone walls) resulting in a 2 m vertical change in elevation between neighboring grid cells act as impassable barriers to movement (Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2001). Separate CPOOL surfaces were generated for each of the four focal dates due to the spatially and temporally variable nature of the pools, which form as a result of variable rainfall and sea spray throughout the season (Twiss *et al.* 2007), though only one CACC surface was generated as the terrain and positions of access points remain unchanged across the season.

Seals have previously been observed drinking from pools of water at North Rona and therefore salinity was quantified to assess whether a preference for less brackish water influenced seal distribution. We recorded pool salinities from seven days of sampling (29 September; 5, 9, 10, 11, 19 and 31 October) during the 2010 breeding season on base maps of pools, providing a map of pool salinities for beginning, mid and late in the 2010 breeding season. Salinity was measured in parts per thousand (‰), based on the refractivity index of the water sample. These salinity maps were transferred to the GIS and the salinity at unmeasured locations was predicted using spatial interpolation of salinity values at known locations for each stage of the 2010 season. Interpolation was carried out using a smoothed inverse exponential distance-weighted (IDW) interpolation. The IDW interpolation method operates using the assumption that locations close to each other are more similar than those that are further apart. Measured points close to the prediction location are therefore assigned a higher weighting than those further away, which have relatively little influence on the

predicted value (Ball and Luk, 1998). The salinity surface for late 2010 was also used for the end of 2010, as salinity patterns were the same for late and end of season. It was important to quantify CPOOL and salinity over a range of dates during the breeding season due to the changing availability and distribution of pools, and the varying contributions of rainwater and seawater spray to the pools. Generally, the most saline areas are in the northwest of the study site and around access points, due to high seawater contributions from sea spray and runoff from seals arriving to the colony (Fig. 3). Though SAL and CACC are therefore negatively correlated across the study site at each stage in the breeding season (Pearson's product moment correlation,  $n = 82,221$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; early,  $r = -0.225$ ; mid,  $r = -0.050$ ; late and end,  $r = -0.178$ ), both variables were retained within the model as the effect sizes were very small.

#### Seal Location Data

Daily locations (28 September to 3 November) of all seals, including adult females with pups, during the 2010 breeding season were recorded on a fine-scale base map of the study site from a hide overlooking the southern half of Fianuis peninsula (Pomeroy *et al.* 1994). The number of seals observed on focal dates is summarized in Table 1 (see methods below for an explanation of terminology). All data were recorded with submeter accuracy with the aid of a 10 m  $\times$  10 m grid overlay, using the head of each individual as a standard reference point. Resulting maps were digitally transferred to a GIS database and georectified to real-world coordinates. Points depicting seal locations were digitized to form a point coverage within the GIS for each stage of the 2010 breeding season (Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2002). These points were associated with the age, sex, and, where available, identity (Hiby *et al.* 2012) of each individual, allowing coverages to be created depicting the locations of adult females on all focal dates.



## Ecological Niche Factor Analysis (ENFA)

Earlier studies of gray seal pupping site choice (*e.g.*, Anderson and Harwood 1985, Twiss *et al.* 2001) have been based on qualitative habitat descriptions or simplistic models utilizing hierarchical selection procedures, rather than using factor analyses of all variables simultaneously, and none have considered the influence of pool salinity. Ecological Niche Factor Analysis (ENFA) was chosen to further investigate gray seal habitat preferences, including the influence of pool salinity. ENFA requires presence-only rather than presence-absence species location data (*i.e.* a knowledge of species' occurrences within a study area, not whether they are consistently absent from specific locations). Presence-absence techniques such as Generalized Linear Models (GLMs; Gu and Swihart, 2004) are not applicable here, as the absence of seals at a given location on the North Rona colony cannot confidently be assumed to be a result of poor suitability at that location, because the colony is in decline (Pomeroy *et al.*, 2010). Absence from a location could therefore occur simply because not all the breeding space is required. Furthermore, the fine-scale nature of our environmental data means that there are many potential locations for individuals to be "absent" from, and assuming that these "false absences" represent actual absences could bias the predictions of the niche model (Hirzel *et al.* 2002, Kéry 2002, Gu and Swihart 2004).

EGV maps and Boolean seal presence maps were converted and aggregated to 1 m × 1 m grids, to make the resolution of all maps uniform. Boolean seal presence maps indicated simple presence or absence (1/0) rather than the actual number of seals in each cell. All grids were converted to ASCII files and imported into IDRISI32 (Version I32.11; Clark Labs, Worcester, MA) for conversion into raster maps suitable for Ecological Niche Factor Analysis (ENFA) analysis in BioMapper (Version 4.0.7.373; Hirzel *et al.* 2007). For ENFA analyses on all focal dates one adult female seal presence map was used alongside one of each EGV map for the corresponding date.

The ENFA process has been described in detail elsewhere (Hirzel *et al.* 2002) but, in summary, ENFA assesses habitat usage and preferences by comparing the species' distribution on the EGVs (*i.e.*, the values of EGVs at locations with adult female seals present) with the global set of EGV values (the EGV values in all cells of a raster map of the study site). In doing so, it defines the ecological niche in the terms of Hutchinson (1957): an  $n$ -dimensional hypervolume that encompasses the ecological requirements of a species. In order to define habitat preferences, ENFA extracts all information relevant to the species niche from the input EGVs whilst discarding the correlations between these variables. It does so by computing two types of uncorrelated factors from the input set of possibly correlated EGVs (composite "global marginality",  $M$ , and composite "global specialization",  $S$ ). These factors are ecologically relevant in that they formally describe some aspect of the species niche relative to the "global" availability of the modelled set of EGVs. Therefore, these factors are easier to interpret in ecological terms than those produced by traditional factor analyses such as principal components analysis (PCA), another method commonly used to assess habitat preferences (Hirzel *et al.* 2001, 2002). The first factor to be extracted is the marginality,  $M$ , which summarizes the difference between the species and global mean on all EGVs and ranges between 0 and 1; the larger the value of  $M$ , the further the mean of the species distribution lies from average conditions available across the study site.  $M$  is composed of marginality coefficients (*coMs*) for each EGV, which express the degree of correlation between  $M$  and each EGV. EGVs with large *coMs* contribute more to  $M$  than those with small *coMs*; a low *coM* value (close to 0) indicates that the species tends to live in average conditions in relation to that EGV, whilst values closer to  $\pm 1$  indicate a tendency to live in "extreme" habitats. Positive *coMs* indicate that the species prefers EGV values that are higher than the global mean, whilst negative coefficients indicate the opposite.

The marginality factor accounts for all of the marginality and a certain proportion of the specialization; the residual specialization is accounted for by the subsequently extracted global specialization factors ( $S$ ), which describe the species' specialization in relation to the range of available EGVs. The  $v$ - $I$  specialization factors (where  $v$  is the number of EGVs) are extracted according to decreasing amounts of explained variance.  $S$  is composed of specialization coefficients ( $coS$ ) for each EGV which range between 0 and  $\pm 1$ , with a high absolute  $coS$  value indicating a narrow niche breadth relative to the range of available conditions. Note that the sign associated with each  $coS$  is redundant and is simply a product of its computation.  $S$  is not bounded between zero and one but ranges from one to infinity, with any value exceeding unity indicating a degree of specialization. Thus, the higher the absolute value of  $coS$ , the more restricted the species is on the corresponding EGV. As  $S$  ranges between one and infinity, it is difficult to interpret meaningfully. Instead it is easier to define the species niche breadth in terms of the computed tolerance value,  $T$ .  $T$  is simply the inverse of  $S$  and, as such, ranges between 0 and 1, with low values indicating lower tolerance (high specialization) and vice versa. Thus, a species with a high  $T$  value has a particularly wide niche and is generally widespread across the study site.

## RESULTS

ENFA showed that female gray seals occupy habitat close to the average of all EGVs (*i.e.*, are only slightly marginal; Table 1) but that they tend to occupy a restricted range of EGV values relative to those which are available (Table 1). That is, females are relatively specialized in terms of their site choice, as shown by  $S$  and  $T$ . The marginality and specialization displayed is a consequence of avoidance of extreme values, with females typically occupying intermediate values for all EGVs, but avoiding both high and low

extreme values (Fig. 4, Table 2). CPOOL contributes the most to female gray seal marginality, and females are typically found closer to pools than would be expected on average (Fig. 4, Table 3).

Table 1 shows that all composite marginality values are greater than zero, though none exceed 0.5. There is an overall decrease in composite marginality (*e.g.*, beginning 2010,  $M = 0.479$ , end 2010,  $M = 0.221$ ; Table 1) and specialization (*e.g.*, beginning 2010,  $S = 5.951$ , end 2010,  $S = 1.434$ ; Table 1) across the season, as individuals are increasingly found in more average locations across a wider range of EGV values (Fig. 4). Female specialization is especially pronounced at the beginning of the season when the first arrivals are selecting sites on the colony; this is also reflected in the lower tolerance ( $T$ ) displayed earlier in the season (Table 1).

All EGVs influenced gray seal habitat selection (Tables 3 and 4); the *coMs* for each EGV indicate that female gray seals prefer sites close to pools of low salinity near to access points. Throughout the season, CPOOL is the EGV on which the female distribution differs most from the study site average, as indicated by the large and negative CPOOL marginality coefficients, which demonstrate a preference for proximity to pools of water (Table 3). Though salinity contributes less to marginality than does CPOOL (Table 4), what is clear is that individuals avoid those areas with the highest salinity (Fig. 4, Table 2). CPOOL contributes the most to specialization during the beginning and middle stages of the season, though later in the season CACC is the EGV with the greatest contribution to  $S$  (Table 4); at the end of the season seals are typically further from access points than earlier in the season, though opt for sites at intermediate rather than extreme high or extreme low CACC and CPOOL values (Fig. 3, Table 2). Salinity contributes more to specialization at the beginning of the season (Table 3), when temperatures are higher (Fig. 2), than does CACC, indicating the importance of pool salinity over CACC to the first females to come ashore at the onset of

the breeding season, and all EGVs have a demonstrable impact on the marginality and specialization of female distribution throughout the season (Table 4). The results presented in Tables 3 and 4 also suggest that low CACC and salinity are less important to females later in the season, when temperatures are typically lower (Fig. 2), as they are found nearer to the study site average over a wider range of CACC and salinity conditions (are less marginal, less specialized, and more tolerant). The change in CACC and salinity *coMs* demonstrate a shift towards higher values of CACC and salinity closer to the study site average as the season progresses, suggesting that females either prefer or are forced into areas of higher salinity and further from access points as the season progresses (Table 3).

## DISCUSSION

### Habitat Preferences

The ENFA has confirmed previous indications that adult female gray seals show a preference for sites near to pools of water at intermediate distances to access points (Pomeroy *et al.* 1994, 2000; Twiss *et al.* 2000, 2002, 2003, 2007; Redman *et al.* 2001, Stephenson *et al.* 2007). Furthermore, there is a clear preference for fresh rather than brackish or seawater pools, particularly early in the season, when temperatures are typically higher; this has been discovered despite the range of salinity values across the study site being deceptively low (0-10‰). The interpolation technique results in lower salinity values across the study site than were actually observed (max. observed = 32‰), meaning that the results presented here are a conservative metric of the avoidance of high salinity areas, which in reality is likely to be more pronounced. It is concluded that, though pools are demonstrably important for thermoregulation (Redman *et al.* 2001, Twiss *et al.* 2002), they are also likely important sources of drinking water, potentially to avoid a negative water balance. Indeed, it may be

that the requirements for thermoregulation mask the requirements for drinking water, with females bathing in any given pool to cool off regardless of the salinity, but showing a preference for lower salinity pools given the option. The water in the more saline pools is more frequently replenished (by sea-spray) than that in less saline pools, and is therefore likely to be relatively cleaner (*e.g.* less concentrated buildup of fecal material). Despite this, individuals show a clear preference for the less saline, potentially more contaminated pools; it may be that amongst these low salinity pools there is a finer scale of selection, with seals avoiding more contaminated pools, though no quantitative data are available to test this.

It is likely that females can actively distinguish between the fresher and more saline pools; Friedl *et al.* (1990) demonstrated that California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*) can discriminate between freshwater and salt water at salinities at least as low as 3.6‰ (0.1M NaCl). Though there are likely some interspecific differences in gustatory threshold, this suggests that gray seals at North Rona are indeed basing their site choices partially on avoidance of high salinity areas, which exhibited salinity readings of over 10‰. Schweigert (1993) suggested that the metabolism of stored lipid reserves was sufficient to offset water losses through lactation, evaporation and urine, and proposed this as an explanation for why a highly concentrated urine or increased osmotic level in blood plasma was not found. However, the oxidation of stored lipids does not contribute to increased urinary water content (Schweigert 1993), further suggesting a likely input from exogenous water to account for additional urinary water output.

The evidence presented here concurs with results of previous studies (Twiss *et al.* 2003) and indicates that females choose sites near to, but not necessarily within, pools as a means of addressing the pup-pool trade-off (Redman *et al.* 2001). This trade-off arises since newborn pups are vulnerable when the mother is absent whilst travelling to and from pools, for example, to attacks from gulls or starvation if permanent mother-pup separation results

(Redman *et al.* 2001) but pups in locations too near to pools may suffer trampling from nearby conspecifics also utilizing the pools (Twiss *et al.* 2003). Similarly, females likely choose sites at intermediate distances to access points to avoid areas directly next to access points which experience greater traffic associated with seals arriving to or leaving the colony, whilst they also avoid greater locomotory costs associated with travelling further inland (Twiss *et al.* 2003, Stephenson *et al.* 2007).

#### Change in Preferences Across the Season

The decrease in composite marginality values across the season may be informative, and is due to females being found in increasingly average sites as the season progresses. Later in the season, maps of females are likely to contain some females in late lactation that are moving to seek mating opportunities or are in the act of departing from the island. These females are likely to be less influenced by pool proximity or salinity, though we expect their contribution to the decrease in marginality values to be minimal. This is because females on North Rona typically depart rapidly after weaning, and only a small proportion (<10%) of females exhibit movements outside the home range of their local male to seek matings (Twiss *et al.* 2006).

The decrease in composite marginality may therefore be interpreted in one or more of three ways: (1) as the season progresses, more females choose sites with EGV values closer to the average available across the study site; (2) as the season progresses, more females are forced into more average areas by the presence of females at preferred sites; or (3) as the season progresses, fewer sites with more extreme EGV values are available (for EGVs that vary across the season *i.e.* salinity and CPOOL), with each site having EGV values closer to the global average; as a result the range of sites that females can choose from is less variable.

These alternative interpretations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, though for salinity there was generally greater variability, with larger variances and greater spread of values later in the season (Fig. 4, Table 2) so explanation (3) seems unlikely with regards to salinity. Furthermore, the minimum EGV values across the study area did not increase between stages within the breeding season, whilst at no point in the season did the maximum EGV values in occupied areas approach the maximum values seen across the study site, suggesting that a change in availability of preferred sites has not necessitated female movement into less preferred areas. This suggests that the decrease in marginality over each season is due to female choice or exclusion from more preferred sites, rather than declining availability of preferred sites as a result of EGV changes.

#### Broader Implications for Gray Seal and Wider Mammalian Reproductive Ecology

Throughout its range, the gray seal breeds on a variety of substrates. Given the preference for proximity to low salinity pools demonstrated here it is interesting to note that many of these substrates, such as the porous sands of Donna Nook, do not support extensive or widespread pool formation, whilst those pools that do form may be more ephemeral and spatially unpredictable than those at North Rona. This highlights the fact that these are really habitat preferences, as opposed to immutable requirements. The ability to address water deficits by drinking seawater (mariposia) has been recorded in otariids (Gentry 1981, Costa and Trillmich 1988) and phocids, including harp seals, *Pagophilus groenlandicus* (Storeheier and Nordøy 2001, How and Nordøy 2007), hooded seals, *Cystophora cristata* (Skalstad and Nordøy 2000) and harbor seals, *Phoca vitulina* (Hedd *et al.* 1995). Therefore, it is intriguing that this current study demonstrates a preference for freshwater among lactating gray seals. It is possible that, given the option, addressing a water deficit by drinking freshwater is



377 physiologically less costly, and therefore preferable. It is interesting to question what the  
378 effects are of a lack of freshwater pools on female distribution, behavior, and physiology (and  
379 therefore reproductive success), especially at sites with similar weather patterns to those at  
380 North Rona. Conditions at such sites are known to induce thermal stress (Twiss *et al.* 2002),  
381 though even gray seals in colder climates may exhibit similar habitat preferences. For  
382 example, water ingestion has even been observed at sites such as Sable Island, where gray  
383 seals eat snow and drink from tide pools (SDT, personal observation; D. J. Boness, personal  
384 communication<sup>1</sup>). Records of pinnipeds specifically ingesting freshwater are rare (*e.g.*  
385 Antarctic fur seal, *Arctocephalus gazella*, Lea *et al.* 2002), but such findings raise the  
386 question of why seals would choose to breed at sites with limited freshwater availability, and  
387 what, if any, advantages are conferred to those that drink freshwater during lactation  
388 compared to those that have access only to salt water.

Acknowledgements

JES was funded by the Grevillea Trust Scholarship at Durham University, UK. SMRU's gray seal aerial survey program is funded by NERC. Original development of the North Rona GIS was carried out during a NERC Research Fellowship to SDT (GT59401MS), and fieldwork was supported by grants from NERC (NE/G008930/1 to PPP, Lex Hiby and SDT) and the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation (08-1037 to PPP). Thanks to Gordon Smith and Bill Giles of Giles Aviation Ltd. for piloting their Piper Aztec aircraft. PPP would like to thank all involved in fieldwork. Thanks also to two anonymous reviewers and both the Editor and Associate Editor for providing valuable comments on the initial draft.

<sup>1</sup>Personal communication from Daryl J. Boness, University of New England, Department of Marine Science, c/o Green Acres Road, Hartford, ME, October 2013.

## Literature Cited

- Anderson S. and J. Harwood. 1985. Time budgets and topography: how energy reserves and terrain determine the breeding behaviour of grey seals. *Animal Behaviour* 33: 1343-1348.
- Ball, J. E. and K. C. Luk. 1998. Modeling spatial variability of rainfall over a catchment. *Journal of Hydrological Engineering* 3: 122-130.
- Boness, D. J. and H. James. 1979. Reproductive behaviour of the grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) on Sable Island, Nova Scotia. *Journal of Zoology* 188: 477-500.
- Campagna, C. and B. J. Le Boeuf. 1988. Thermoregulatory behaviour of southern sea lions and its effect on mating strategies. *Behaviour* 107: 72-90.
- Costa, D. P. and F. Trillmich. 1988. Mass changes and metabolism during the perinatal fast: a comparison between Antarctic (*Arctocephalus gazella*) and Galapagos fur seals (*Arctocephalus galapagoensis*). *Physiological Zoology* 61: 160-169.
- Friedl, W.A., P.E. Nachtigall, P.W.B. Moore, N.K.W. Chun, J.E. Haun, R.W. Hall and J.L. Richards. 1990. Taste reception in the pacific bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus gilli*) and the California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*). Pages 447-454 in J.A. Thomas and R. Kastelein, eds. *Sensory abilities of cetaceans*. Plenum Press, New York, USA.
- Gentry, R. L. 1973. Thermoregulatory behaviour of eared seals. *Behaviour* 46: 73-93.
- Gentry, R. L. 1981. Seawater drinking in eared seals. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A* 68: 81-86.
- Gu, W. and R. K. Swihart. 2004. Absent or undetected? Effects of non-detection of species occurrence on wildlife habitat models. *Biological Conservation* 116: 195-203.
- Hedd, A., R. Gales and D. Renouf. 1995. Use of temperature telemetry to monitor ingestion by a harbour seal mother and her pup throughout lactation. *Polar Biology* 15: 155-160.
- Hiby, A. R., D. Thompson and A. J. Ward. 1988. Census of grey seals by aerial photographs. *Photogrammetric Record* 12: 589-594.

430 Hiby, L., W. D. Paterson, P. Redman, J. Watkins, S. D. Twiss and P. Pomeroy. 2012.  
 431 Analysis of photo-ID data allowing for missed matches and individuals identified from  
 432 opposite sides. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, DOI: 10.1111/2041-210x.12008

433 Hirzel, A. H., V. Helfer and F. Metral. 2001. Assessing habitat-suitability models with a  
 434 virtual species. *Ecological Modelling* 145: 111-121.

435 Hirzel, A. H., J. Hausser, D. Chessel and N. Perrin. 2002. Ecological-niche factor analysis:  
 436 How to compute habitat-suitability maps without absence data? *Ecology* 83: 2027-2036.

437 Hirzel, A. H., J. Hausser and N. Perrin. 2007. Biomapper 4.0. Laboratory for Conservation  
 438 Biology, Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, Switzerland. URL:  
 439 <http://www2.unil.ch/biomapper>.

440 How O. J. and E. S. Nordøy. 2007. Seawater drinking restores water balance in dehydrated  
 441 harp seals. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* 177: 535-542.

442 Hutchinson, G. E. 1957. Concluding remarks. *Cold Spring Harbour Symposium on*  
 443 *Quantitative Biology* 22: 415-427.

444 Irving, L., K. C. Fisher, and F. D. MacIntosh. 1935. The water balance of a marine mammal,  
 445 the seal. *Journal of Cellular and Comparative Physiology* 6: 387-391.

446 Iverson, S. J., Bowen, W.D., Boness, D.J. and Oftedal, O.T. (1993). The effect of maternal  
 447 size and milk energy input on pup growth in grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*). *Physiological*  
 448 *Zoology* 66: 61-88.

449 Kéry, M. 2002. Inferring the absence of a species—a case study of snakes. *Journal of*  
 450 *Wildlife Management* 66: 330–338.

451 Kooyman, G. L. and C. M. Drabek. 1968. Observations on milk, blood, and urine  
 452 constituents of the Weddell seal. *Physiological Zoology* 41: 187-194.

453 Lea, M. A., F. Bonadonna, M. A. Hindell, C. Guinet and S. D. Goldsworthy. 2002. Drinking  
 454 behaviour and water turnover rates of Antarctic fur seal pups: implications for the estimation

455 of milk intake by isotopic dilution. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A* 132: 321-  
 456 331.

457 McCafferty, D. J., C. Gilbert, W. Paterson, P. P. Pomeroy, D. Thompson, J. I. Currie and A.  
 458 Ancel. 2011. Estimating metabolic heat loss in birds and mammals by combining infrared  
 459 thermography with biophysical modelling. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, A*  
 460 158: 337-345.

461 Mills, J. P., I. Newton and S. D. Twiss. 1997. Photogrammetry from archived digital imagery  
 462 for seal monitoring. *Photogrammetric Record* 15: 715-724.

463 Øritsland, N. A., D. M. Lavigne and K. Ronald. 1978. Radiative surface temperatures of harp  
 464 seals. *Comparative Biochemical Physiology* 61: 9-12.

465 Ortiz, C. L., D. Costa and B. J. Le Boeuf. 1978. Water and energy flux in elephant seal pups  
 466 fasting under natural conditions. *Physiological Zoology* 51: 166-178.

467 Paterson, W., C. E. Sparling, D. Thompson, P. P. Pomeroy, J. I. Currie and D. J. McCafferty.  
 468 2011. Seals like it hot: Changes in surface temperature of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) from  
 469 late pregnancy to moult. *Journal of Thermal Biology* 37: 454-461.

470 Pomeroy, P. P., S. S. Anderson, S. D. Twiss and B. J. McConnell. 1994. Dispersion and site  
 471 fidelity of breeding females grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) on North Rona, Scotland.  
 472 *Journal of Zoology* 233: 429-447.

473 Pomeroy, P. P., M. A. Fedak, P. Rothery and S. Anderson. 1999. Consequences of maternal  
 474 size for reproductive expenditure and pupping success of grey seals at North Rona, Scotland.  
 475 *Journal of Animal Ecology* 68: 235-253.

476 Pomeroy, P. P., S. D. Twiss and C. D. Duck. 2000. Expansion of a grey seal (*Halichoerus*  
 477 *grypus*) breeding colony: changes in pupping site use at the Isle of May, Scotland. *Journal of*  
 478 *Zoology* 250: 1-12.

479 Pomeroy, P. P., S. Smout, S. Twiss, S. Moss and R. King. 2010. Low and delayed  
 480 recruitment at two grey seal breeding colonies in the UK. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic*  
 481 *Fisheries Science* 42: 125-133.

482 Redman, R., P. P. Pomeroy and S. D. Twiss. 2001. Grey seal maternal attendance patterns are  
 483 affected by water availability on North Rona, Scotland. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 79:  
 484 1073 – 1079.

485 Reilly, J. J., M. A. Fedak, D. H. Thomas, W. A. A. Coward and S. S. Anderson. 1996. Water  
 486 balance and the energetics of lactation in grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) as studied by  
 487 isotopically labelled water methods. *Journal of Zoology* 238: 157-165.

488 Riedman, M. 1990. The Pinnipeds. Seals, sea lions and walruses. University of California  
 489 Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, USA.

490 Ronald, K., R. McCarter and L. J. Selley. 1977. Venous circulation in the harp seal  
 491 (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*). Pages 235-270 in R.J. Harrison, ed. *Functional anatomy of*  
 492 *marine mammals*. Volume 3. Academic Press, London, UK.

493 Schweigert, F. J. 1993. Effects of fasting and lactation on blood chemistry and urine  
 494 composition in the grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*). *Comparative Biochemistry and*  
 495 *Physiology A* 105: 353-357.


496 Skalstad, I. and E. S. Nordøy. 2000. Experimental evidence of seawater drinking in juvenile  
 497 hooded (*Cystophora cristata*) and harp seals (*Phoca groenlandica*). *Journal of Comparative*  
 498 *Physiology B* 170: 395–401.

499 Stephenson, C. M., J. Matthiopoulos and J. Harwood. 2007. Influence of the physical  
 500 environment and conspecific aggression on the spatial arrangement of breeding grey seals.  
 501 *Ecological Informatics* 2: 308-317.

502 Stewart, J. E. 2013. Fine scale determinants of female grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*)  
 503 pupping site and habitat preferences at North Rona, Scotland. MSc thesis, Durham  
 504 University, Durham, U.K. 229 pp. Available at <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7296>.  
 505 Storeheier, P. V. and E. S. Nordøy. 2001. Physiological effects of seawater intake in adult  
 506 Harp seals during phase I of fasting. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology* 128A: 307–  
 507 315.  
 508 Twiss, S. D., A. Caudron, P. P. Pomeroy, C. J. Thomas and J. P. Mills. 2000. Finescale  
 509 topographical correlates of behavioural investment in offspring by female grey seals,  
 510 *Halichoerus grypus*. *Animal Behaviour* 59: 327-338.  
 511 Twiss, S. D., C. J. Thomas and P. P. Pomeroy. 2001. Topographic spatial characterization of  
 512 grey seal *Halichoerus grypus* breeding habitat at a sub-seal size spatial grain. *Ecography* 24:  
 513 257-266.  
 514 Twiss, S. D., N. C. Wright and N. Dunstone. 2002. Behavioural evidence of thermal stress  
 515 from overheating in UK breeding seals. *Marine Mammal Science* 18: 455-468.  
 516 Twiss, S. D., C. D. Duck and P. P. Pomeroy. 2003. Grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) pup  
 517 mortality not explained by local breeding density on North Rona, Scotland. *Journal of*  
 518 *Zoology* 259: 83-91.  
 519 Twiss, S. D., P. P. Pomeroy, J. A. Graves and V. F. Poland. 2006. Finding fathers – spatio-  
 520 temporal analysis of paternity assignment in grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*). *Molecular*  
 521 *Ecology* 15: 1939-1953.  
 522 Twiss, S. D., C. J. Thomas, V. F. Poland and J. A. Graves. 2007. The impact of climatic  
 523 variation on the opportunity for sexual selection. *Biology Letters* 3: 12-15.

524 Wolf, J. B. W., G. Kauermann and F. Trillmich. 2005. Males in the shade: habitat use and  
525 sexual segregation in the Galápagos sea lion (*Zalophus californianus wolfebaeki*). Behavioral  
526 Ecology and Sociobiology 59: 293-302.





**Figure 1:** (A) An outline of the Study Site at North Rona; asterisks (\*) indicate the location of the main access gullies to and from the sea (B) Location of the Study Site in relation to the rest of North Rona and (C) relative to the rest of the United Kingdom, indicated by crosshairs at 59.1° N, 5.83° W. Areas of land shaded gray. A: outline of Digital Terrain Model of the study site (Stewart, 2013), B: adapted from Google Maps outline view of North Rona (Stewart, 2013), C: adapted from a shapefile of the UK coastline (Stewart, 2013).






Figure 2: Change in air temperature (°C) over the 2010 breeding season. Day 1 = 28 September. Spearman's rank correlation demonstrates a negative correlation between air temperature and day of breeding season ( $r = -0.746$ ,  $n = 36$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).



**Figure 3:** Distribution of salinity values (‰) across the study site on 03 November 2010 (“End” 2010). Dark shades represent high salinity whilst the lower values are represented by lighter shades. Pools are present across the study site, and are not restricted to colored areas.



**Figure 4:** CACC, CPOOL and salinity (%) values at female locations and across the study site in all four stages of the 2010 breeding season. The horizontal dashed line represents the study site (global) median for all focal dates in 2010, whilst the solid horizontal line represents the median across all four focal dates for female locations. Outliers have been included as these represent real measurements from within the study site at locations accessible to seals.

Table 1: Numbers of females in the study site on focal dates, and composite marginality, specialization and tolerance values for females on all focal dates.

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Stage of Breeding Season</b>	
<b>Number of females</b>	Beginning	48
	Mid	135
	Late	176
	End	106
<b>Marginality (M)</b>	Beginning	0.479
	Mid	0.472
	Late	0.355
	End	0.221
<b>Specialization (S)</b>	Beginning	5.951
	Mid	1.856
	Late	1.557
	End	1.434
<b>Tolerance (T)</b>	Beginning	0.168
	Mid	0.539
	Late	0.642
	End	0.697

**Table 2:** Summary statistics for CACC, CPOOL and salinity values at female locations and across the study site in all four stages of the 2010 breeding season; CACC = “Cost-distance” to nearest access; CPOOL = “Cost-distance” to nearest pool; SAL = Salinity.

Females (used habitat)					Study Site (available habitat)			
	Max.	Min.	Median	IQR	Max.	Min.	Median	IQR
<b>(a) CACC</b>								
<b>Beginning</b>	46.28	9.25	23.17	9.52	100.00	0.00	26.17	31.66
<b>Mid</b>	68.38	6.76	25.39	15.57	100.00	0.00	26.17	31.66
<b>Late</b>	83.92	2.64	23.73	12.98	100.00	0.00	26.17	31.66
<b>End</b>	71.42	6.06	27.69	18.51	100.00	0.00	26.17	31.66
<b>(b) CPOOL</b>								
<b>Beginning</b>	7.62	0.00	3.08	2.86	100.00	0.00	9.92	13.82
<b>Mid</b>	27.26	0.00	2.90	6.05	81.28	0.00	13.57	17.09
<b>Late</b>	33.65	0.00	5.14	8.16	81.71	0.00	12.90	16.33
<b>End</b>	28.26	0.00	4.01	7.29	68.48	0.00	7.71	10.63
<b>(c) SAL</b>								
<b>Beginning</b>	1.17	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	7.00	0.00	0.02	0.12
<b>Mid</b>	3.47	0.04	0.25	0.45	7.00	0.00	0.26	0.54
<b>Late</b>	8.67	0.02	0.27	0.45	10.00	0.00	0.25	0.81
<b>End</b>	9.63	0.01	0.27	0.51	10.00 <sup>†</sup>	0.00	0.25	0.81

<sup>†</sup>The maximum value for salinity was not equal to the maximum measured value (32.00) due to the interpolation technique used to create the salinity surface, which reduced the maximum salinity across the study site.

**Table 3:** Coefficients of Eco-Geographical Variables (EGVs) on each ENFA (Ecological Niche Factor Analysis) factor for female gray seals on each focal day. The marginality factors (M) explain 100% of the marginality and a certain amount of specialization; “%S” indicates the amount of specialization (S) accounted for by each factor; CACC = “Cost-distance” to nearest access; CPOOL = “Cost-distance” to nearest pool; SAL = Salinity. Bold numbers indicate the EGV with the largest coefficient value on each factor.

Stage of Breeding Season	ENFA Output	EGV			
		CACC <sup>3</sup>	CPOOL <sup>3</sup>	SAL	(% S)
<b>Beginning</b>	<i>coM</i> <sup>1</sup>	-0.402	<b>-0.843</b>	-0.357	60
	<i>coS1</i> <sup>2</sup>	0	0.376	<b>0.926</b>	31
	<i>coS2</i> <sup>2</sup>	<b>0.872</b>	0.472	0.132	9
<b>Middle</b>	<i>coM</i> <sup>1</sup>	-0.269	<b>-0.963</b>	0	49
	<i>coS1</i> <sup>2</sup>	<b>0.957</b>	0.271	0.104	39
	<i>coS2</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.148	0	<b>0.989</b>	12
<b>Late</b>	<i>coM</i> <sup>1</sup>	-0.365	<b>-0.921</b>	-0.138	34
	<i>coS1</i> <sup>2</sup>	<b>0.928</b>	0.371	0	46
	<i>coS2</i> <sup>2</sup>	0	0.16	<b>0.987</b>	20
<b>End</b>	<i>coM</i> <sup>1</sup>	-0.131	<b>-0.973</b>	-0.191	37
	<i>coS1</i> <sup>2</sup>	<b>0.991</b>	0.132	0	46
	<i>coS2</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.133	-0.209	<b>0.969</b>	16

<sup>1</sup> Positive marginality coefficients indicate that the species was found in locations with higher than average values whilst negative coefficients indicate lower than average EGV values at species locations. A value of 0 indicates no significant differentiation from the global mean.

<sup>2</sup> Specialization factors (S) one and two (S1 and S2) convey niche breadth. There are two specialization factors because one factor is extracted for each of the three EGVs, one of which is the marginality factor. S will be > 0 whenever female seals were found to occupy a narrower range of conditions than was available across the study site; the greater the absolute value of the coefficient, the more restricted the females' range on the corresponding EGV.

<sup>3</sup> Avoidance of large values of “cost-distance” to a feature (indicated by negative marginality coefficients) may be understood as a preference for proximity to this feature.

**Table 4:** Eco-Geographical Variable (EGV) contributions to female composite marginality and specialization throughout 2010. CACC = Cost-distance to nearest access; CPOOL = Cost-distance to nearest pool; SAL = Salinity. Bold numbers indicate the EGV with the largest contribution to each factor. Absolute values only reported, sign is unimportant to interpretation.

Stage of Breeding Season	ENFA Output	EGV		
		CACC	CPOOL	SAL
Beginning	$M^1$	0.402	<b>0.843</b>	0.357
	$S^2$	35.111	<b>70.527</b>	54.634
Middle	$M^1$	0.269	<b>0.963</b>	0.029
	$S^2$	5.416	<b>5.969</b>	1.792
Late	$M^1$	0.365	<b>0.921</b>	0.138
	$S^2$	<b>4.037</b>	3.770	1.847
End	$M^1$	0.131	<b>0.973</b>	0.191
	$S^2$	<b>3.268</b>	2.836	1.431

<sup>1</sup> Absolute values for EGV contributions to marginality have been reported; a higher  $coM$  indicates a greater contribution to  $M$  by that EGV whilst a value of 0 indicates no significant difference between the mean at occupied sites and the global mean.

<sup>2</sup> Specialization factor, which indicates how narrow the range of conditions occupied by the species is (essentially niche width).  $S$  varies between 1 and infinity and will exceed unity whenever female gray seals were found to occupy a narrower range of conditions than was available across the study site; the higher this value, the more restricted the females' range on the corresponding EGV.