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:
Chum Salmon (Hood Canal summer-run ESU) polygon

1.2. Summary description of the data:
In nearshore marine areas, critical habitat includes areas contiguous with the shoreline from the line of extreme high water out to a depth no greater than 30 meters relative to mean lower low water.See the final rule (70 FR 52630) for descriptions of areas excluded from this critical habitat designation. Excluded Dept of Defense (DOD) lands and Indian lands were not clipped out of the data.

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

1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data:

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:
W: -123.187006, E: -122.5631, N: 48.185145, S: 47.329408

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:
Shanna Dunn

2.2. Title:
Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:

2.4. E-mail address:
shanna.dunn@noaa.gov

2.5. Phone number:

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:

- Data creation process 2004 - 2005 cmhcs_nchf1.shp 1) Reclassify Puget Sound DEM. Original elevation measurements were in decimeters. We reclassified the elevation measurements to meters. Finlayson et al. 2000 2) Clip the WA State Saltwater Areas shapefile to the extent of the Puget Sound. WADNR 2001 3) Clip the

Puget Sound DEM to the boundary of the Puget Sound. Finlayson et al. 2000; WADNR 2001 4) Derive the marine portion of the nearshore zone from the DEM. Query the clipped Puget Sound DEM for all values less than or equal to 0 meters and greater than or equal to -30 meters. Convert the results of the query into polygons. Finlayson et al. 2000 5) Edge match the polygons with the Puget Sound shoreline. WADNR 2001 6) Using the NOAA Electronic Navigational Charts (ENCs) to fill in the gap in the DEM. There is a gap of no data in the Puget Sound DEM that lies between the San Juan Islands and Bellingham Bay. We used the NOAA ENCs to estimate the area encompassed by the 30 meter bathymetry line. NOAA 2004 7) Identify units within the Puget Sound. We used watersheds (HUC5s) as our units in the freshwater habitat analysis, and decided that for the nearshore area analysis we would define our units based on groupings of HUC5s. We used WRIA and HUC5 boundaries to identify 19 units within the Puget Sound. Where the WRIAs meet the shoreline of the Puget Sound, we edge matched the WRIA boundaries to the HUC5 boundaries. REO 2002; ECY 2000 8) Divide the nearshore zone into 19 units. Overlay the nearshore zone with the 19 units to create the final data set. 9) Identify the subset of nearshore zones that are used by HCS chum salmon. Delete the areas that are not part of the HCS chum salmon ESU.
- 2019-07-17 00:00:00 - cmhcs_nchf1.shp (NAD_1927_Albers) geographic transformation, unprojected -> CMHCS_ch_poly.shp (GCS_North_American_1983 wkid 4269). Geometry was edited (features deleted), attributes were not edited, metadata was edited because it was blank (stored separately as html file " metadata_cmhcs_nchf1"). Deleted features that were not critical habitat from shapefile CMHCS_ch_poly.shp. Deleted features were those with DESC_ = “Land, not part of nearshore marine area” DESC_ = “Not part of nearshore marine area” Features remaining in shapefile had DESC_ = 'Offshore to a depth of 30 meters' (i.e., only features designated as critical habitat).
- 2021-04-26 00:00:00 - The 2019 version CMHCS_ch_poly.shp (GCS_North_American_1983 wkid 4269) was converted into the standardized feature class SalmonChum_HoodCanalsummerrunESU_20050902_poly (GCS_WGS_84 wkid 4326) using the National Critical Habitat Geodatabase processing protocol. During standardization, geometry was not edited. Attributes were edited. Metadata was edited and populated using the final rule and the 2005 html file " metadata_cmhcs_nchf1" that was stored separately from the source data in cmhcs_nchf1.shp (NAD_1927_Albers). Migrated fields: "NS_ZONE" into "UNIT", " DESC_" into "NOTES" Dropped fields: FID, AREA, PERIMETER, CMHCS_NCHF, CMHCS_NC_1, ESUCODE, WRIANUMB, WRIANAME

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:
- 1.3. Is this a one-time data collection, or an ongoing series of measurements?
- 1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data
- 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
- 7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access
- 7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate
- 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/65301

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:

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

7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:

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):
Portland, OR

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.