

 $5-$ min observations were done each day. There each day $\mathcal{L}_\mathbf{X}$ were always at least 5 min between observations of the second state of the second state of the second state of periods. We a empted to record the timing of $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} \end{bmatrix}$ we later $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} \end{bmatrix}$ nized the frequency distribution of arrivals into $t_{\rm{max}}=100$ minimize the intervals to minimize the intervals to minimize the influence the influence the influence of measurement error associated with observ $e^{\alpha/2}$ delayed reaction times being a significant cantaction times being a significant cantaction times α fraction of a second. $E = \frac{1}{2}$ in the slope was classified w an "approach" if the bird turned back before the tide (∼0 m between slope and tide line). Each fl ight in which the bird crossed the tide line and came to within 30 m of the cliff was classifi ed as a fl ight approach. The fl is a fl ight approach in the fl ight approach. The fl is a fl ight a to be classifi ed as a "landing," the bird had to s_{max} stand on several occasions, birds occasion came within a few centimeters of the slope and appeared to be preparing to land, but then turned back. These fluid is well in the classical contribution \mathcal{M} \circ and \circ logged \circ because birds landing on the slope usually did not spend much time time the subsequently \mathbb{R}^n continued repeated fl y-in behavior. Each fl y-in was classifi ed into one of three $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}$ as occurring (1) when each easy of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{A})$ when each present recently (with \mathbf{v}_eff $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ diring and properties $\frac{1}{2}$ during a prediction $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ during a prediction $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and free period (no eagles period (no eagles period ρ effects) and a final set of ρ $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{M}}$, in the south bay of Triangle \mathbb{R}^n is not possible to separate the effects of equation \mathbb{R}^n of each presence, by the falconic presence, both \mathfrak{g}_0 presence, both rapid \mathfrak{g}_0 to species almost always of the species almost always of the species \mathcal{A} rarely observed eagles fl ying in the bay without falcons chasing them, and we never saw falcons \mathbf{r} in the bay when eagles were not present. Eagle presence is therefore a surrogate for raptor presence, and is used in the analysis as a single φ and a recording each prediction ρ and φ and φ only when eagles are visible in fl ight above the observer, we have used a conservative measure of predation danger, because some activities actually different dength of α \mathcal{N} as \mathbf{e} as \mathbf{e} as occurring in safe periods, \mathbf{e} thus diminishing the eff ect of eagle absence. *Statistics.*—If fl y-in and departure events are $r_{\rm e}$ randomly time distribution ρ is a transitive distribution of ρ \mathbb{R}^n inter-event intervals in \mathbb{R}^n $\frac{1}{2}$ time interval from $\frac{1}{2}$ $\$ event to the next—follows an exponential distribution: the exponential distribution is a special case of the gamma probability distribution having its standard deviation (σ) equal to its $m \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$ (we can be also expected by \mathcal{M}). Alternatively, if ϵ_0 ^e ϵ_0 T = ϵ_0 (al. particle 32479₀ T_o = ϵ_0 (al. particle 3223₉ T_o 3222₉ To 32223₉ To 32223₉ To 3223₉ To 3223₉

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{C})$ $\sim_{\rm 12}$ \bar{t} γ $\pmb{\mathrm{y}} = \pm$ $\pmb{\mathrm{v}}$ $\ddot{}$

 $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ $\pmb{\mathcal{F}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\ddot{}$ \circ

$\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$

as considered approaches to the slope and landing α than it was for less dangerous activities, such as $f_{\rm eff}$ for approaches to the slope and dependent of the slope and departures and departures and departures and departures and departure slope and departure and departure and departure and departure and departure and dep \bullet the slope \bullet in seabirds. Murres (*Uria* spp.; Daan and $T_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$

 $T_{\rm eff}$ and bursts of activity rates and bursts of activity rates and bursts of activity $T_{\rm eff}$ $t_{\rm eff} = \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta$ occurred when θ occurs were not predicted with θ resulted in more birds circling, and thus larger $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{P}}$ group sizes, during these low-risk periods. This period these low-risk periods. This period is $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{P}}$ reflexive temporal avoidance of predators by α p and a make it difficult to distinguish control \mathcal{M} synchrony of arrival times from a "group size" eff ect. Our GOF tests and subsequent *ĉ* adjustments facilitated statistical partitioning of the eff ects of group synchrony by and arrival synchrony by and arrival synchrony by and arrival synchrony by and identifying the degree to which birds tend to $\begin{array}{ccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet\end{array}$ to group to a regular contract group $\begin{array}{ccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet\end{array}$ size during low-risk periods results in a conservative test of $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ synchrony during high-risk periods when c^2 compared with c^2 and c^2 and c^2 and c^2 and c^2 birds being engaged in this activity would tend to bias our data toward a decrease in the length of inter-event intervals.

A puffi n is most vulnerable to a ack on cose approaches to and landing on the slope of the slope o because a puffi n over water has an available escape route in $\left(-1, 1, 2, \ldots, 1 \right)$. $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$ switching to an approximation of $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{w}$ eagles are present, puffi ns retain an escape route and are able to continue their activity at a safet distance from potential danger. Also, puf ns can evaluate danger levels by circling over \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^n before a empty substitution to land on the slope. Departing birds have the advantage of being able to assess danger from the burrow entrance of the burrow entrance of the burrow entrance of the burrow entr
Second to assess the burrow entrance of the burrow entrance of the burrow entrance of the burrow entrance of t before taking off into dangerous airspace and, furthermore, and flying directly to safety upon \mathcal{A} α and so may not not need to alter this so may not need to alter the so may not need to alter this so may not need to alter the so activity when each present \mathbf{a} Mitigation of danger by synchronization of arrival times dilutes the risk of predation for t_{c} individual and may also t_{c} and may also t_{c} p^{max}

predictions of an action of p^{max}

predictions of an action (2 ± 9) and P and P and P and P and P and P activities has previously been demonstrated by \mathbb{R}^n

 $\frac{2}{3}$