

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:

Steelhead (Central California Coast DPS)

1.2. Summary description of the data:

Critical habitat includes the stream channels within the designated stream reaches, and includes a lateral extent as defined by the ordinary high-water line (33 CFR 329.11). In areas where the ordinary high-water line has not been defined, the lateral extent will be defined by the bankfull elevation. Bankfull elevation is the level at which water begins to leave the channel and move into the floodplain and is reached at a discharge which generally has a recurrence interval of 1 to 2 years on the annual flood series. Critical habitat in estuaries is defined by the perimeter of the water body as displayed on standard 1:24,000 scale topographic maps or the elevation of extreme high water, whichever is greater. See the final rule (70 FR 52488) for descriptions of areas excluded from this critical habitat designation. Economic exclusions were clipped out of the data. Military areas ineligible for designation due to qualifying Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans (INRMPs) and excluded 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: -123.342127, E: -121.63008, N: 39.364251, S: 36.953475

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:

- 2005-08-15 00:00:00 - Data creation process 2005. ccc_steelhead_ch_06_2005.shp
Stream segments were identified and assigned attributes by Southwest Region (SWR) biologists using 1:100,000 hydrography data and other basemap information on hard copy maps. SWR biologists divided the routed hydrography into stream segments using the best available information to represent local steelhead distribution and habitat. The segments' upper and lower extents were manually marked onto the basemaps by the biologists. This information was then visually interpreted from the paper maps and entered into a digital format using the "Route Tools" extension provided by CDFG. The resulting event table was then used with the CDFG routed hydrography as the route reference to create routed events based on the biologists' segment determinations. The table containing the accompanying segment attribute information was joined using 'GIS_Link' as the related field, and the shapefile 'CCC_Steelhead_Draft_2004' was created from the routed events. To minimize errors that may have occurred during the process, the completed digital file was compared against the marked maps for consistency. The biologists also reviewed the completed digital file to ensure attribute information was associated with the correct stream segments. Biologists rated each Calwater (California Watershed Map) Hydrologic Sub-area (HSA) based on occupancy and habitat quantity and quality information found in the steelhead distribution shapefile (CCC_Steelhead_Draft_2004). These biological ratings were compared against economic values given to each HSA. Based on whether selected criteria were met, an HSA was determined to be included or excluded from critical habitat. All stream segments were then coded to reflect their HSA's designation. The only exceptions to this occurred when a stream segment was valued as a migration corridor (the segment would be included as critical habitat even if the HSA was excluded) or if there were other overriding biological considerations. Those segments coded as critical habitat were then extracted from the distribution shapefile and placed in the resulting 'CCC_Steelhead_Proposed_Critical_habitat' file. Public comments were received following draft publication of the critical habitat proposed rule in December 2004. These comments were incorporated into the data set and the final critical habitat file 'CCC_Steelhead_CH_06_2005' was created. Data layers from the following were used during this process: California Geospatial Information Data Library, State Coastal Conservancy, California Department of Forestry, US Geological Survey
- 2019-07-17 00:00:00 - ccc_steelhead_ch_06_2005.shp (California_Teale_Albers_NAD83) geographic transformation not necessary, unprojected -> STCCC_ch.shp (GCS_North_American_1983 wkid 4269). Geometry was not edited, attributes were not edited, metadata was edited.
- 2021-04-26 00:00:00 - The 2019 version STCCC_ch.shp (GCS_North_American_1983 wkid 4269) was converted into the standardized feature class

Steelhead_CentralCaliforniaCoastDPS_20050902 (GCS_WGS_84 wkid 4326) using the National Critical Habitat Geodatabase processing protocol. During standardization, geometry was edited (features deleted). Attributes were edited. Metadata was edited and populated using the final rule/CFR and the source ccc_steelhead_ch_06_2005.shp (California_Teale_Albers_NAD83). Migrated fields: "STREAM" into "UNIT" (edited stream/river names to standardize text), "SPAWNHAB" + "REARHAB" + "MIGRAHAB" (populated headers when values were = "Yes") into "NOTES" (values = spawning, rearing, migration) Dropped fields: FID, EVENTID, LLID, BEGFT, ENDFT, COMMENTS, GIS_LINK, ESU, BASIN, WATERSHD, SEGMENT, STAFF, DATE_, PRESENCE, QUALSPWN, QUALREAR, ADULTHLD, QUALMIGR, ESTUAHAB, QUALESTU Notes on geometry edits. The San Francisco Bay and San Pablo Bay lines were not described in the final rule/CFR text (there were bay lines in final rule maps pg 52569 unit 2203, pg 52570 unit 2205, pg 52571 unit 2206, but the rule states that the maps are for general reference only and are not the designation), deleted 8 bay line features from data (and updated metadata thumbnail image). There were tiny segments around the bays (appeared to be errors leftover after economic exclusion clips) that were not described in the final rule/CFR text, deleted 5 tiny features around bay.

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/65333>

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.