

*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:**

AFSC/ABL: Taku chum salmon project diet and energy database

### **1.2. Summary description of the data:**

This study is a cooperative effort between Douglas Island Pink & Chum (DIPAC), the University of Alaska Fairbanks, School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences (UAF, SFOS), the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Auke Bay Lab (ABL), and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G) to determine the potential for interactions between DIPAC hatchery chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) fry and wild chum salmon fry in Taku Inlet, Southeast Alaska. We analyzed patterns in spatial and temporal distribution, size, and condition of juvenile chum salmon collected in the littoral and neritic waters of Taku Inlet in 2004 and 2005. Energy density and diet of wild and hatchery chum salmon fry in Taku Inlet were analyzed and compared to data obtained later in the season for chum salmon stocks caught in Icy Strait. The greatest potential for wild/hatchery interactions was in the outer inlet, directly following early hatchery releases (May 9-11). Peak outmigration for wild chum salmon fry coincided with early hatchery releases; in contrast, most wild chum salmon fry had already emigrated from the estuary by the time of late hatchery fry release (May 22 June 1). In both years, hatchery fry were rare in the inner inlet, but comprised over 95% of the catch in the outer estuary during the peak of outmigration. Hatchery chum salmon were significantly larger than wild fry in both beach and neritic samples. Wild and early hatchery chum salmon were smaller in the littoral than the neritic habitat, indicating that both groups moved from shallow to deeper water with ontogeny. In spite of large differences in abundance, no negative correlation between abundance of hatchery fish and condition of wild fish was identified. Both wild and early hatchery chum salmon fry showed apparent growth through the season, while late hatchery fry appeared to leave the estuary soon after release. Regardless of origin, most chum salmon juveniles emigrated from the study area in late May and early June, indicating a high probability for mixed-stock schools. Hatchery chum salmon juveniles were initially larger and had greater

energy content than wild fish; however, energetic values converged by mid-June in Taku Inlet. In Icy Strait, energetic condition of wild and hatchery chum salmon juveniles

was also similar. Multivariate analysis of 54 prey measures indicated that diets of the two groups were distinctly different throughout the season in all Taku Inlet locations and converged in Icy Strait.

**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:**

2004-04 to 2005-07

**1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:**

W: -134.18695, E: -134.02875, N: 58.31325, S: 58.189317

Taku Inlet, Southeast Alaska

**1.6. Type(s) of data:**

*(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)*  
maps and data

**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:**

Metadata Coordinators MC

**2.2. Title:**

Metadata Contact

**2.3. Affiliation or facility:**

**2.4. E-mail address:**

AFSC.metadata@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:**

Emily A Fergusson

**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?**

Yes

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

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):*

Lineage Statement:

Contact the dataset POC for full methodology

Process Steps:

- not applicable

**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):**

Contact the dataset POC for full QA/QC methodology

**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)
- 7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access

**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/17263>

**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](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:**

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

yes

**7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:**

[https://console.cloud.google.com/storage/browser/\\_details/nmfs\\_odp\\_afsc/ABL/Taku%20chum%20sal](https://console.cloud.google.com/storage/browser/_details/nmfs_odp_afsc/ABL/Taku%20chum%20sal)

**7.3. Data access methods or services offered:**

N/A

**7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:**

unknown

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

no delay

**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):**

Auke Bay Laboratories - Juneau, AK

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

unknown

**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*

IT Security and Contingency Plan for the system establishes procedures and applies to the functions, operations, and resources necessary to recover and restore data as hosted in the Western Regional Support Center in Seattle, Washington, following a disruption.

**9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions**

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