

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:

SalmonChinook_SnakeRiverspringsummerrunESU_19991025

1.2. Summary description of the data:

Critical habitat includes the water, waterway bottom, and adjacent riparian zone of specified lakes and river reaches. Adjacent riparian zones are defined as those areas within a horizontal distance of 300 feet (91.4 m) from the normal line of high water of a stream channel (600 feet or 182.8 m, when both sides of the stream channel are included) or from the shoreline of a standing body of water. Critical habitat includes the Columbia River from a straight line connecting the west end of the Clatsop jetty (south jetty, Oregon side) and the west end of the Peacock jetty (north jetty, Washington side) and including all Columbia River estuarine areas and river reaches proceeding upstream to the confluence of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; all Snake River reaches from the confluence of the Columbia River upstream to Hells Canyon Dam. Critical habitat also includes river reaches presently or historically accessible (except reaches above impassable natural falls (including Napias Creek Falls) and Dworshak and Hells Canyon Dams) to Snake River spring/summer-run Chinook salmon in the following hydrologic units: Hells Canyon, Imnaha, Lemhi, Little Salmon, Lower Grande Ronde, Lower Middle Fork Salmon, Lower Salmon, Lower Snake-Asotin, Lower Snake-Tucannon, Middle Salmon-Chamberlain, Middle Salmon-Panther, Pahsimeroi, South Fork Salmon, Upper Middle Fork Salmon, Upper Grande Ronde, Upper Salmon, Wallowa.

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: -124.083015, E: -113.046168, N: 46.703183, S: 43.81243

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:

Shanna Dunn

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:

- 2023-07-14 12:00:00 - Data creation process 2023.

FINAL_CH_SNRspsuChk_POST_PROCESSED_v2.shp Snake River (SNR) spring/summer-run Chinook data were developed as part of an effort to interpret and depict several salmonid critical habitat designations completed in the 1990s that relied on text-based descriptions but lacked GIS data. Critical habitat areas were identified based on the following: - The regulatory definition of ESA critical habitat for this ESU found at 50 CFR 226.205 (b) and the supporting final rule (58 FR 68543, December 28, 1993) and revision (64 FR 57399, October 10, 1999); - United States Geological Survey (USGS) high resolution National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) downloaded February 2018; - Intrinsic Potential (IP) data developed by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC); - Technical Recovery Team (TRT) fish population data developed by the NWFSC; - National Elevation Data and Digital Topographic Maps; - Oregon Fish Passage Barriers Geodatabase (ODFW_44_5_ofpbds_gdb, published 2020-05-28); - Washington Fish Passage Barriers Geodatabase (WdfwFishPassage.gdb, published 2021-03-15); - Idaho Fish Passage Barriers shapefile (downloaded 2021-03-18); - StreamNet Generalized Fish Distribution, Summer Chinook (January 2012); - StreamNet Generalized Fish Distribution, Spring Chinook (January 2012); - Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) data (critfc_chinook_extent_May2020.shp) historic and current spring chinook salmon distribution in the Grande Ronde River basin; - United States Forest Service (USFS) and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) juvenile Chinook density model output (FDAT_Phase2_Chinook_StreamSegmentScenarios_DensityResults.shp published 2020-04-30); - Snake River steelhead DPS critical habitat data (2005-08-15) used as a proxy; - The professional judgment of biologists from NMFS West Coast Region (Interior Columbia Basin Office and Protected Resources Division). Spatial analysis steps to produce data: 1) Clipped the NHD to the text description from the critical habitat designation. 2) Partitioned the NHD into 100 meter segments. 3) Calculated the gradient of each 100 meter segment using a 10 meter USGS digital elevation model (DEM). 4) Used the NHD's flow direction and a geometric network to analyze gradient, removed segments upstream of 7% gradients. 5) Retained segments downstream of 7% gradients that were too small (<= 20 meters) to rely on the gradient value (i.e., 1 to 2 pixels in the DEM) or were artificial paths (NHD FCode 55800) to maintain network connectivity. 6) Removed intermittent and ephemeral streams, canals/ditches, and pipelines according to NHD FCodes. 7) Retained segments that overlapped with StreamNet chinook distribution data (field observations) and/or NWFSC intrinsic potential data (model). 8) Removed segments

upstream from total natural barriers, Napias Ck falls, Dworshak Dam, Hells Canyon Dam. 9) Removed segments identified by NMFS biologists as not being accessible to or suitable habitat for Chinook salmon. 10) Retained segments identified by NMFS biologists as being flagged for inclusion as critical habitat (e.g., NHD errors where streams were disconnected from mainstems, presumed historical habitat above 7% gradient breaks, etc.). 11) The output was FINAL_CH_SNRspringsummerChinook.shp (final critical habitat footprint in 100 meter segments) which was then post processed and exported into FINAL_CH_SNRspsuChk_POST_PROCESSED_v2.shp. Post processing involved using the final source data to clip the 2018 NHD Flowline, i.e., remove 100 meter segments to reduce number of vertices and capture the critical habitat footprint on the original 2018 Flowline. Process captured in FINAL_POST_PROCESSING_SNRspsuCHK_ch.gdb.

- 2023-07-14 17:00:00 - Converted source data

FINAL_CH_SNRspsuChk_POST_PROCESSED_v2.shp (GCS_North_American_1983) into standardized feature class

SalmonChinook_SnakeRiverspringsummerrunESU_19991025 (GCS_WGS_84 wkid 4326) using the West Coast Region Critical Habitat Geodatabase processing protocol.

During standardization, geometry was not edited. Attributes were edited. Metadata was edited and populated using the final rules/CFR and the source

FINAL_CH_SNRspsuChk_POST_PROCESSED_v2.shp (GCS_North_American_1983).

Migrated field: "GNIS_Name" into "UNIT". Dropped fields: OBJECTID,

Permanent_Identifier, FDate, Resolution, GNIS_ID, LengthKM, ReachCode, FlowDir,

WBArea_Permanent_Identifier, FType, FCode, MainPath, InNetwork, VisibilityFilter,

Shape_Length.

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)

- 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/70297>

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.