

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:

Johnsons Seagrass Critical Habitat

1.2. Summary description of the data:

These data represent the critical habitat for Johnson's Seagrass as designated by Federal Register Vol. 65, No. 66, Wednesday, April 5, 2000, Rules and Regulations.

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:

2003-11-14

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -80.465414, E: -80.042778, N: 27.854603, S: 25.749997

1.6. Type(s) of data:

(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)
Map (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:

Amanda L Frick

2.2. Title:

Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:**2.4. E-mail address:**

amanda.frick@noaa.gov

2.5. Phone number:

727-824-5301

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

- 2011/2012 edits to shapefile: (a) Indian River north Sebastian Inlet: I recreated the polygon according to eCFR 50 CFR 226.213 in 2007. (b) Indian River south Sebastian Inlet: OK (c) Indian River Lagoon - Fort Pierce inlet: OK (d) Indian River Lagoon - St. Lucie Inlet: I included the ICW in the shapefile, and created one solid polygon. I also redigitized the eastern side along the shoreline using Bing Maps as a background in ArcMap. (e) Hobe Sound: The coordinate in the FR is suppose to be at SR 708, but looking at Bing Maps, it is to the south. I edited the shapefile to continue north to SR

708. I also made one big poly that does not depict the ICW exclusion. The polygon shorelines were also edited to follow the Bing Maps background. (f) Jupiter Inlet: I digitized a boundary that followed the shoreline (again, employing heads-up digitizing techniques using Bing Maps). (g) Lake Worth: the original shapefile had a 4 vertice polygon that approximated the shoreline on the south side. I digitized the shoreline along the south side using Bing Maps as a guide. (h) Lake Worth Lagoon - Boynton Inlet: I edited the polygon to go all the way to the coordinates (the shape file does not exclude the ICW). I also redigitized the western edge to follow the Bing Maps shoreline. (i) Lake Wyman: The original shapefile excluded the ICW, so I redigitized the polygon to extend to the published coordinates. This unit did not follow the shoreline on the eastern side, so I redigitized it to follow the Bing Maps shoreline. (j) A portion of Northern Biscayne Bay, FL: I received a new Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve boundary from Florida DEP, Bureau of Survey and Mapping, Division of State Lands (rev. 2010). The boundary is from Section 258.39 (11) Florida Statutes, and Section 258.397. They send me the exterior boundary for the AP. They said that the law for the boundary has not changed, but the boundary is more accurate now. If there are questions about specific sites within the boundary, contact the Title and Land Records Section of the Bureau of Survey and Mapping Division of State Lands (850)245-2788.

- 2003-11-14 00:00:00 - A point layer was created using the coordinates in the Federal Register. Those points were then used to digitize polygons. The polygons were then "clipped" to a detailed shoreline (cb24_det.e00) obtained from St. John's River Water Management District (SJRWMD). Following the clip operation, microstation design files of the ICW and Miami Harbor navigation channels were obtained from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and converted to shapefiles. The final ICW shapefile was created by using a 62.5ft buffer on either side of the centerline and editing that buffer file to match the widening areas in the vicinity of the critical habitat areas. The final Miami Harbor shapefile was created by digitizing a polygon over the channel edge line work in the design file. An Edit Clip was then performed to "punch a hole" through the Critical Habitat areas where they intersected the ICW and the Miami Harbor navigation channel, thus excluding the federally authorized navigation channels from the Critical Habitat areas. Finally, the data in the vicinity of Miami Harbor in Biscayne Bay were edited visually to correspond to the paper maps in the federal register document. Additionally, all data used were reprojected to match the detailed shoreline. (UTM Zone 17, NAD 83, HARN)

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):

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)
- 3.1. Responsible Party for Data Management
- 4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?
- 4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management
- 5.2. Quality control procedures employed
- 7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?
- 7.1.1. If data are not available or has limitations, has a Waiver been filed?
- 7.1.2. If there are limitations to data access, describe how data are protected
- 7.3. Data access methods or services offered
- 7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination
- 8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location
- 8.2. Data storage facility prior to being sent to an archive facility
- 8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility
- 8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?

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/25853>

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?

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 Regional Office (SERO)

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

7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:

https://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/maps_gis_data/protected_resources/critical_habitat/geodata/johnsonsseag

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:

7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:

7.4.1. If delay is longer than latency of automated processing, indicate under what authority data access is delayed:

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)

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):

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

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

9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions

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