

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 (Lower Columbia River 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 319.11). In areas where ordinary high-water line has not been defined, the lateral extent is 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 lake areas is defined by the perimeter of the water body as displayed on standard 1:24,000 scale topographic maps or the elevation of ordinary high water, whichever is greater. See the final rule (70 FR 52630) for descriptions of areas excluded from this critical habitat designation. Excluded Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) 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: -124.049616, E: -121.488634, N: 46.697205, S: 44.828492

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 2003 - 2004. stlcr_chf1.shp 1) Fish distribution data were obtained from ODFW and WDFW. ODFW 2003a, ODFW 2003b, WDFW 2004 2) Preparation of the WDFW data involved analysis and overlay of event data. Event data were exported to Microsoft Access where macros were used to convert the multiple overlapping usetypes into a single continuous fish distribution layer. For more details on this process see the supporting documentation under the section on "Supplemental information". 3) Initial preparation of the ODFW data involved digitizing the 24K fish distribution data and incorporation of the documented observation databases into the fish distribution databases. For more details on this process see the supporting documentation under the section on "Supplemental information". 4) The LCR steelhead DPS is made up of two run-types: winter and summer. The run-types were merged into a single DPS data set. 5) The DPS data were intersected with the REO watersheds (HUC5s). The result was a network of fish distribution that could be grouped by HUC5s. REO 2002 6) The LCR steelhead fish distribution was segmented based on LLID and Fifth Field Watershed (HUC5) boundaries. Unique codes (see HUC5_LLID under attribute definitions) were assigned to each segment allowing for analysis of the data at the watershed scale. This unique identifier can be used to link the Critical Habitat data set to the Habitat Areas data set. 7) The watershed data sets did not match up cleanly with the fish distribution data sets. There were numerous instances where the watershed did not cross the stream network at the correct location. These were often small segments that introduced unnecessary complexity to the data set. We searched for these segments and changed the corresponding HUC5 attribute to match the correct watershed. 8) Data were converted to arc coverage then projected, built and cleaned. 9) The attribute tables were built and attribute accuracy was verified. 2005 In the final stages of the rule making process for critical habitat, we received comments and new information about the distribution of the DPS. During the final review of public comments and new information we revised the distribution of the DPS and made changes to the areas that were excluded from critical habitat. For a more detailed review of the changes between the proposed and final rule please refer to the final determination for critical habitat, and supporting documents. * Note: FRN point lists were generated off the original coverages, not generated from the polylines in the shapefiles. Shapefiles were generated from coverages to post on website for sharing.

- 2019-07-17 00:00:00 - stlcr_chf1.shp (NAD_1927_Albers) geographic transformation, unprojected -> STLCR_ch.shp (GCS_North_American_1983 wkid 4269). Geometry was not edited, attributes were not edited, metadata was edited because it was blank (stored separately as html file "metadata_stlcr_chf1").

- 2021-04-26 00:00:00 - The 2019 version STLCR_ch.shp (GCS_North_American_1983 wkid 4269) was converted into the standardized feature class Steelhead_LowerColumbiaRiverDPS_20050902 (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_stlcr_chf1" that was stored separately from the source data in stlcr_chf1.shp (NAD_1927_Albers).
 Migrated field: "STRM_NAME" into "UNIT" (edited "Eliot Branch, M. Fk. Hood R." to "Eliot Branch"; edited names with a numbering scheme, e.g. "Bear Creek #2" deleted "#2" from names; edited "Hot Springs Fk Collawash Rive" to "Hot Springs Fork"; "Oak Grove Fork Clackamas Rive" to "Oak Grove Fork Clackamas River"; "side channel, Salmon River" to "Salmon River" [nhd error here loses mainstem]; deleted "unnamed" and "unnamed stream")
 Dropped fields: FID, FNODE_, TNODE_, LPOLY_, RPOLY_, LENGTH, STLCR_CHF1, STLCR_CH_1, HUC5_LLID, LLID, ESUCODE, REV_DATE, SUBBASIN, WATERSHED, HUC4, HUC5

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/65335>

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.