

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:

2015 NRCS-MDEQ Lidar DEM: Southeast Mississippi QL2

### 1.2. Summary description of the data:

This report contains a comprehensive outline of the Mississippi QL2 and Tupelo QL3 Lidar Processing task order for the United States Geological Survey (USGS). This task is issued under USGS Contract No. G10PC00057, Task Order No. G14PD01046. This task order requires lidar data to be acquired over approximately 4385 square miles. The lidar was collected and processed to meet a maximum Nominal Post Spacing (NPS) of 0.7 meter. The NPS assessment is made against single swath, first return data located within the geometrically usable center portion (typically ~90%) of each swath. The data is a digital elevation model (DEM) created from the lidar point cloud and includes the application of 2-D breaklines and hydroflattening.

### 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:

2015-01-31 to 2015-03-03

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

W: -90.326075, E: -88.425228, N: 31.894581, S: 30.997494

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

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

### 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:**

NOAA Office for Coastal Management (NOAA/OCM)

**2.2. Title:**

Metadata Contact

**2.3. Affiliation or facility:**

NOAA Office for Coastal Management (NOAA/OCM)

**2.4. E-mail address:**

coastal.info@noaa.gov

**2.5. Phone number:**

(843) 740-1202

**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:

- USGS Contract No. G10PC00057. Task Order No. G12PD000125. Woolpert Order No. 073054
- 2015-01-31 00:00:00 - USGS Contract No. G10PC00057, Task Order No. G14PD01046
- 2012-01-01 00:00:00 - The ALS70 calibration and system performance is verified on a periodic basis using Woolpert's calibration range. The calibration range consists of a large building and runway. The edges of the building and control points along the runway have been located using conventional survey methods. Inertial measurement unit (IMU) misalignment angles and horizontal accuracy are calculated by comparing the position of the building edges between opposing flight lines. The scanner scale factor and vertical accuracy is calculated through comparison of LiDAR data against control points along the runway. Field calibration is performed on all flight lines to refine the IMU misalignment angles. IMU misalignment angles are calculated from the relative displacement of features within the overlap region of adjacent (and opposing) flight lines. The raw LiDAR data is reduced using the refined misalignment angles.
- 2015-02-03 00:00:00 - Once the data acquisition and GPS processing phases are complete, the LiDAR data was processed immediately to verify the coverage had no voids. The GPS and IMU data was post processed using differential and Kalman filter algorithms to derive a best estimate of trajectory. The quality of the solution was verified to be consistent with the accuracy requirements of the project.
- 2015-12-01 00:00:00 - When the sensor calibration, data acquisition, and GPS processing phases were complete, the formal data reduction processes by Woolpert lidar specialists included:
  - Processed individual flight lines to derive a raw "Point Cloud" LAS file. Matched overlapping flight lines, generated statistics for evaluation comparisons, and made the necessary adjustments to remove any residual systematic error.
  - Calibrated LAS files were imported into the task order tiles and initially filtered to create a ground and non-ground class. Then additional classes were filtered as necessary to meet client specified classes.
  - Once all project data was imported and classified, survey ground control data was imported and calculated for an accuracy assessment. As a QC measure, Woolpert has developed a routine to generate accuracy statistical reports by comparisons against the TIN and the DEM using surveyed ground control of higher accuracy. The lidar is adjusted accordingly to meet or exceed the vertical accuracy requirements.
  - The lidar tiles were reviewed using a series of proprietary QA/QC procedures to ensure it fulfills the task order requirements. A portion of this requires a manual step to ensure anomalies have been removed from the ground class.
  - The lidar LAS files are classified into the Default (Class 1), Ground (Class 2), Low Noise (Class 7), Water (Class 9), Ignored Ground (Class 10), Overlap Default (Class 17) and Overlap Ground (Class 18) classifications.
  - FGDC Compliant metadata was developed for the task order in .xml format for the final data products.
  - The horizontal datum used for the task order was referenced to UTM16N North American Datum of 1983 (2011) and UTM15N North American Datum of 1983 (2011). The vertical datum used for the task order was referenced to NAVD 1988, meters, GEOID12A. Coordinate positions were specified in units of meters.
  - Breaklines were compiled defining water bodies

and rivers and then used to perform the hydrologic flattening of water bodies, and gradient hydrologic flattening of double line streams and rivers. Lakes, reservoirs and ponds, at a minimum size of 2-acre or greater, were compiled as closed polygons. The closed water bodies were collected at a constant elevation. Rivers and streams, at a nominal minimum width of 30 meters (100 feet), were compiled in the direction of flow with both sides of the stream maintaining an equal gradient elevation. The following steps were used for this process: 1. Woolpert used the newly acquired lidar data to manually draw the hydrologic features in a 2D environment using the lidar intensity and bare earth surface. Open Source imagery was used as reference when necessary. 2. Woolpert utilizes an integrated software approach to combine the lidar data and 2D breaklines. This process "drapes" the 2D breaklines onto the 3D lidar surface model to assign an elevation. A monotonic process is performed to ensure the streams are consistently flowing in a gradient manner. A secondary step within the program verifies an equally matching elevation of both stream edges. The breaklines that characterize the closed water bodies are draped onto the 3D lidar surface and assigned a constant elevation at or just below ground elevation. 3. The lakes, reservoirs and ponds, at a minimum size of 1-acre or greater and streams at a minimum size of 30 meters (100 feet) nominal width, were compiled to meet task order requirements. Figure 4.1 illustrates an example of 30 meters (100 feet) nominal streams identified and defined with hydrologic breaklines. The breaklines defining rivers and streams, at a nominal minimum width of 30 meters (100 feet), were draped with both sides of the stream maintaining an equal gradient elevation. 4. All ground points were reclassified from inside the hydrologic feature polygons to water, class nine (9). 5. All ground points were reclassified from within a buffer along the hydrologic feature breaklines to buffered ground, class ten (10). 6. The lidar gr

- 2016-11-02 00:00:00 - The NOAA Office for Coastal Management received the DEM files from MARIS (Mississippi Automated Resource Information System) via an FTP site. The data was received in UTM zones 15 and 16 horizontal coordinates in meters with vertical coordinates referenced to NAVD88 in meters. The Digital Coast ingested these files in Imagine format into the Data Access Viewer. No specific metadata was found for the DEM on the MARIS site. This metadata was created based on the point cloud metadata and the project report.

**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:

- 1.7. 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
- 7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination
- 8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location
- 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/49437>

**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?**

**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:**

NOAA Office for Coastal Management (NOAA/OCM)

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

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

<https://coast.noaa.gov/dataviewer/#/lidar/search/where:ID=5166>

[https://noaa-nos-coastal-lidar-pds.s3.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/dem/MDEQ\\_NRCS\\_SE\\_DEM\\_2015\\_5166](https://noaa-nos-coastal-lidar-pds.s3.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/dem/MDEQ_NRCS_SE_DEM_2015_5166)

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

This data can be obtained on-line at the following URL:

<https://coast.noaa.gov/dataviewer/#/lidar/search/where:ID=5166>;

**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):**

Office for Coastal Management - Charleston, SC

**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.*