Please provide the following information, and submit to the NOAA DM Plan Repository.

Reference to Master DM Plan (if applicable)

As stated in Section IV, Requirement 1.3, DM Plans may be hierarchical. If this DM Plan inherits provisions from a higher-level DM Plan already submitted to the Repository, then this more-specific Plan only needs to provide information that differs from what was provided in the Master DM Plan.

URL of higher-level DM Plan (if any) as submitted to DM Plan Repository:

1. General Description of Data to be Managed

1.1. Name of the Data, data collection Project, or data-producing Program:

ALLDATAFORPUBALL28AUG12 and Lengths for AnalysisALL28AUG12 (effort, catch, and environmental data)

1.2. Summary description of the data:

Coastal shark community structure was quantified across 10 geographic areas in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico using fishery-independent gillnet data from 2003-2011. A total of 3,205 sets were made in which 14,244 carcharhiniform sharks, primarily juveniles, were caught comprising 11 species from three families. Atlantic sharpnose sharks (Rhizoprionodon terraenovae) were the most abundant species overall followed by bonnethead (Sphyrna tiburo) and blacktip sharks (Carcharhinus limbatus). Two-way crossed analysis of similarity (ANOSIM) found geographic area to significantly influence shark species-life stage assemblages while season did not. Resemblance matrices between environmental data and shark community assemblage found the two were significantly correlated with the combination of salinity and turbidity producing the highest spearman rank correlation value. Species diversity varied by geographic area, but was generally highest in areas with the greatest amount of fresh and saltwater fluctuations. The mean size of the three most abundant species differed across geographic areas whereas, those species in lower abundances also differed across regions, but exhibited no discernible pattern. Our results suggest geographic area is important for juvenile sharks and some areas may be considered important nursery areas for many species. Atlantic sharpnose and blacktip shark were not restricted to any specific geographic area but species such as bull (C. leucas), spinner (C. brevipinna), blacknose (C. acronotus), finetooth (C. isodon), sandbar (C. plumbeus) and scalloped hammerhead (S. lewini) sharks were only consistently captured within a single area or over a select group of areas.

1.3. Is this a one-time data collection, or an ongoing series of measurements?

One-time data collection

1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data:

2003 to 2011

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:
W: -88.811, E: -82.053, N: 29.925, S: 27.561
Gulf Of Mexico

1.6. Type(s) of data:
(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)
Table (digital)

1.7. Data collection method(s):
(e.g., satellite, airplane, unmanned aerial system, radar, weather station, moored buoy, research vessel, autonomous underwater vehicle, animal tagging, manual surveys, enforcement activities, numerical model, etc.)

1.8. If data are from a NOAA Observing System of Record, indicate name of system:

1.8.1. If data are from another observing system, please specify:

2. Point of Contact for this Data Management Plan (author or maintainer)

2.1. Name:
John Carlson

2.2. Title:
Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:

2.4. E-mail address:
John.Carlson@noaa.gov

2.5. Phone number:
850-234-6541 x221

3. Responsible Party for Data Management
Program Managers, or their designee, shall be responsible for assuring the proper management of the data produced by their Program. Please indicate the responsible party below.

3.1. Name:
John Carlson

3.2. Title:
Data Steward

4. Resources
Programs must identify resources within their own budget for managing the data they produce.

4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?

No

4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management (specify percentage or "unknown"):

0

5. Data Lineage and Quality

NOAA has issued Information Quality Guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information which it disseminates.

5.1. Processing workflow of the data from collection or acquisition to making it publicly accessible

(describe or provide URL of description):

Process Steps:

- Methods Gear and set specifications The survey was modeled after methods developed by Carlson and Brusher (1999). A monofilament gillnet consisting of six different stretched-mesh size panels was used for sampling in all areas by all institutions. Stretched-mesh sizes ranged from 7.6 (3.0) to 14.0 cm (5.5) in steps of 1. 3 cm (0.5). Each panel was 3.0 m (10 ft) deep and 30.5 m (100 ft) long. Panel specifics can be found in Baremore et al. (2012). The six panels were strung together and fished as a single gear (i.e., set). The survey was conducted monthly April October in coastal bays, estuaries, and around barrier islands (out to three nautical miles) from 2003 to 2011, covering more than 550 km of coastline (Fig. 1). Gillnet sets were chosen randomly and the gear was fished either perpendicular to shore or with the wind. Set soak time was defined from the time the gear entered the water to the time the gear was removed completely from the water. Haul back typically started 0. 51.0 h after the gear first entered the water. After haul back, the gear was moved to a different location, beginning a new set. All gillnet sets were made during daylight hours (07:0018:00). For each set, mid-water temperature (C), salinity, and dissolved oxygen (mg l-1) were recorded. Average depth (m) was calculated using gear start and end points recorded from the vessels depth finder, and water clarity (depth of the photic zone, cm) was measured by secchi disc. At times, not all environmental parameters were recorded due to logistics. Not all institutions sampled in all years due to funding. The two longest running data sets were from the NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Panama City Laboratory (St. Andrew Bay to Apalachicola Bay, FL 20032011) and University of Southern Mississippi Gulf Coast Research Laboratory (Mississippi Sound and sets made outside the Mississippi barrier islands 20032009). The remaining datasets were: the Florida Museum of Natural History at the University of Florida (Suwannee Sound to Waccasassa Bay, FL 20072011), the Dauphin Island Sea Laboratory (Mobile Bay and Alabama and sets around western Florida barrier islands 20072011), and the Florida State University Coastal and Marine Laboratory (St. George Sound to Anclote Key, FL 20082011). 1234 Environ Biol Fish (2015) 98:12331254

5.1.1. If data at different stages of the workflow, or products derived from these data, are subject to a separate data management plan, provide reference to other plan:

5.2. Quality control procedures employed (describe or provide URL of description):
Findings from this dataset are published in a peer-reviewed journal. This is a static data set that has undergone rigorous QA/QC prior to publication.

6. Data Documentation
The EDMC Data Documentation Procedural Directive requires that NOAA data be well documented, specifies the use of ISO 19115 and related standards for documentation of new data, and provides links to resources and tools for metadata creation and validation.

6.1. Does metadata comply with EDMC Data Documentation directive?
No

6.1.1. If metadata are non-existent or non-compliant, please explain:
Missing/invalid information:
- 1.7. Data collection method(s)

6.2. Name of organization or facility providing metadata hosting:
NMFS Office of Science and Technology

6.2.1. If service is needed for metadata hosting, please indicate:

6.3. URL of metadata folder or data catalog, if known:
https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/24915

6.4. Process for producing and maintaining metadata
(describe or provide URL of description):
Metadata produced and maintained in accordance with the NOAA Data Documentation Procedural Directive: https://nosc.noaa.gov/EDMC/DAARWG/docs/EDMC_PD-Data_Documentation_v1.pdf

7. Data Access
NAO 212-15 states that access to environmental data may only be restricted when distribution is explicitly limited by law, regulation, policy (such as those applicable to personally identifiable information or protected critical infrastructure information or proprietary trade information) or by security requirements. The EDMC Data Access Procedural Directive contains specific guidance, recommends the use of open-standard, interoperable, non-proprietary web services, provides information about resources and tools to enable data access, and includes a Waiver to be submitted to justify any approach other than full, unrestricted public access.

7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?
Yes

7.1.1. If the data are not to be made available to the public at all, or with limitations, has a Waiver (Appendix A of Data Access directive) been filed?

7.1.2. If there are limitations to public data access, describe how data are protected from unauthorized access or disclosure:

7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access:
Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC)

7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate:
Yes

7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:
Access via URL when available

7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:
365

7.4.1. If delay is longer than latency of automated processing, indicate under what authority data access is delayed:
This data is currently wavered under the current NOAA guidelines for relational databases.

8. Data Preservation and Protection
The NOAA Procedure for Scientific Records Appraisal and Archive Approval describes how to identify, appraise and decide what scientific records are to be preserved in a NOAA archive.

8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location:
(Specify NCEI-MD, NCEI-CO, NCEI-NC, NCEI-MS, World Data Center (WDC) facility, Other, To Be Determined, Unable to Archive, or No Archiving Intended)
TO_BE_DETERMINED

8.1.1. If World Data Center or Other, specify:

8.1.2. If To Be Determined, Unable to Archive or No Archiving Intended, explain:

8.2. Data storage facility prior to being sent to an archive facility (if any):
Southeast Fisheries Science Center - Miami, FL

Location Of The Main Office Of The South East Fisheries Science Center

8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility:

365

8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?

Discuss data back-up, disaster recovery/contingency planning, and off-site data storage relevant to the data collection

The data resides on a secure government network requiring multi-factor authentication for network access.

9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions

Line and Staff Offices may extend this template by inserting additional questions in this section.