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Supplement. Estimated tern abundance, as compared to censused populations (Table S1), mapped covariate data layers (Fig. S1), plotted detection functions (Fig. S2), and plotted relationships among tern abundance and covariates (Fig. S3).

Table S1. Sampled, estimated, and actual (censused) abundance of common terns *Sterna hirundo* and roseate terns *S. dougallii* in Massachusetts (MA), USA. Distance sampling abundance calculations of common, roseate, and/or mixed terns (‘CRMT’) across 2 or 3 surveys, are compared to 2010–2011 mean MA breeding population sizes (right column, calculated from Mostello 2011, 2012). For each cluster of tern observations (Obs.), the detection function (see Fig. S2) computes detection probabilities (p) over the distance range. These probabilities are used to calculate the estimated abundance (Estim. Abund.) of tern clusters and individuals (Ind.) over the entire study area (6750 km²), based on the percentage of area covered by the sampled abundance of terns (N). The density-surface models (see Table 1 in the main text) fit N to the covariates, then predict abundance over the study area, based on the average of those covariates across surveys. Spr: spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRMT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0–500</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>1517.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14643.2</td>
<td>55043.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0–300</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>956.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15389.5</td>
<td>53818.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2 – spr</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0–300</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>944.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>21585.1</td>
<td>75871.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>2 – spr</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0–300</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1493.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>34116.7</td>
<td>78026.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. S1 (a)

Fig. S1. Tern habitat and prey covariate data layers for the 3 inshore surveys. For details on the study area, refer to Fig. 2 in the main text. Transect effort (black line), during the spring 2011 (left), spring 2010 (center), and fall 2010 (right) is overlapped by counts of observed common, roseate, and mixed terns (circles), and interspersed with prey sampling stations (small black dots). (a) Bathymetry, top row, delineates the 30 sampled grid cells (each 15 km \times 15 km) used in the density-surface modeling; white cells indicate missing covariate data. The 3 habitat covariate layers depict depth, sea surface temperature (SST), and chlorophyll concentration. (b) The 3 prey covariate layers depict counts of sandlance, herring, and anchovy (<16 cm length). The grid cell between MV and Buzzards Bay is outlined to highlight its persistent sandlance abundance and roseate tern observations in spring 2010 and 2011.
Fig. S1 (b)
Fig. S2. Detection function plots. Detection probabilities (lines with points) and frequency histogram (number of observations per distance band) of (a) common terns *Sterna hirundo*, roseate terns *S. dougallii*, and mixed terns across all 3 surveys using conventional distance sampling (CDS); and across the 2 spring surveys: (b) common terns (CDS) and (c) roseate terns, using visibility in multiple covariate distance sampling (MCDS)
Fig. S3. Relationships among the response variables and covariates across all 3 inshore surveys. This ‘pairplot’ (Zuur et al. 2012) shows histograms of each variable on the diagonal, pairwise Spearman rank correlation coefficients (font size proportional to value), and scatterplots with a LOESS smoother, axes labeled alternately (x at top or bottom, y at left or right). The response variables are in the top rows and left columns (n = 52), common terns *Sterna hirundo* (‘CT’), roseate terns *S. dougallii* (‘RT’), or mixed terns (‘MT’); prey covariates are sandlance (‘Sl’), herring (‘Hg’), and anchovy (‘An’), and habitat covariates are sea surface temperature (SST), chlorophyll concentration (‘Chl’), and depth.
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