

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:

2012 USGS Lidar: Central Virginia Seismic (Louisa County)

1.2. Summary description of the data:

USGS Contract: G10PC00013

Task Order Number: G12PD00264

Prepared for USGS,

Prepared by: Dewberry, 1000 Ashley Blvd., Suite 801, Tampa, Florida 33602-3718

The LiDAR data were processed to a bare-earth digital terrain model (DTM). Detailed breaklines and bare-earth Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) were produced for the project area. Deliverables were produced in both UTM and State Plane coordinates. The data was formatted according to tiles with each UTM tile covering an area of 1,000 meters by 1,000 meters and each State Plane tile covering an area of 2,500 feet by 2,500 feet. A total of 797 UTM tiles and 1,338 State Plane tiles were produced for the project encompassing an area of approximately 277 sq. miles. Classified points include: Class 1 (unclassified), Class 2 (ground), Class 7 (noise), Class 9 (water), Class 10 (ignored ground due to breakline proximity).

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:

2012-03-09 to 2012-03-12

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -78.14545, E: -77.71609, N: 38.13649, S: 37.7704

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:

- 2012-08-03 00:00:00 - Report completed: August 03, 2012; used as process date below. LiDAR mass points were produced to LAS 1.2 specifications, including the following LAS classification codes: Class 1 = Unclassified, and used for all other features that do not fit into the Classes 2, 7, 9, or 10, including vegetation, buildings, etc.; Class 2 = Ground, includes accurate LiDAR points in overlapping flight lines; Class 7 = Noise, low and high points; Class 9 = Water, points located within collected breaklines; Class 10 = Ignored Ground due to breakline proximity. The data was processed using GeoCue and TerraScan software. The initial step is the setup of the GeoCue project, which is done by importing a project defined tile boundary index encompassing the entire project area. The acquired 3D laser point clouds, in LAS binary format, were imported into the GeoCue project and tiled according to the project tile grid. Once tiled, the laser points were classified using a proprietary routine in TerraScan. This routine classifies any obvious outliers in the dataset to class 7. After points that could negatively affect the ground are removed from class 1, the ground layer is extracted from this remaining point cloud. The ground extraction process encompassed in this routine takes place by building an iterative surface model. This surface model is generated using three main parameters: building size, iteration angle and iteration distance. The initial model is based on low points being selected by a roaming window with the assumption that these are the ground points. The size of this roaming window is determined by the building size parameter. The low points are triangulated and the remaining points are evaluated and subsequently added to the model if they meet the iteration angle and distance constraints. This process is repeated until no additional points are added within iterations. A second critical parameter is the maximum terrain angle constraint, which determines the maximum terrain angle allowed within the classification model. The following fields within the LAS files are populated to the following precision: GPS Time (0.000001 second precision), Easting (0.003 meter precision), Northing (0.003 meter precision), Elevation (0.003 meter precision), Intensity (integer value - 12 bit dynamic range), Number of Returns (integer - range of 1-4), Return number (integer range of 1-4), Scan Direction Flag (integer - range 0-1), Classification (integer), Scan Angle Rank (integer), Edge of flight line (integer, range 0-1), User bit field (integer - flight line information encoded). The LAS file also contains a Variable length record in the file header that defines the projection, datums, and units.

- 2012-08-03 00:00:00 - Once the initial ground routine has been performed on the data, Dewberry creates Delta Z (DZ) orthos to check the relative accuracy of the LiDAR data. These orthos compare the elevations of LiDAR points from overlapping flight lines on a 1 meter pixel cell size basis. If the elevations of points within each pixel are within 5 cm of each other, the pixel is colored green. If the elevations of

points within each pixel are between 5 cm and 10 cm of each other, the pixel is colored yellow, and if the elevations of points within each pixel are greater than 10 cm in difference, the pixel is colored red. Pixels that do not contain points from overlapping flight lines are colored according to their intensity values. DZ orthos can be created using the full point cloud or ground only points and are used to review and verify the calibration of the data is acceptable. Some areas are expected to show sections or portions of red, including terrain variations, slope changes, and vegetated areas or buildings if the full point cloud is used. However, large or continuous sections of yellow or red pixels can indicate the data was not calibrated correctly or that there were issues during acquisition that could affect the usability of the data. The DZ orthos for Louisa, Virginia showed that the data was calibrated correctly with no issues that would affect its usability. The figure below shows an example of the DZ orthos. Dewberry utilized a variety of software suites for data processing. The LAS dataset was received and imported into GeoCue task management software for processing in Terrascan. Each tile was imported into Terrascan and a surface model was created to examine the ground classification. Dewberry analysts visually reviewed the ground surface model and corrected errors in the ground classification such as vegetation, buildings, and bridges that were present following the initial processing conducted by Dewberry. Dewberry analysts employ 3D visualization techniques to view the point cloud at multiple angles and in profile to ensure that non-ground points are removed from the ground classification. After the ground classification corrections were completed, the dataset was processed through a water classification routine that utilizes breaklines compiled by dewberry to automatically classify hydro features. The water classification routine selects ground points within the breakline polygons and automatically classifies them as class 9, water. The final classification routine applied to the dataset selects ground points within a specified distance of the water breaklines and classifies them as class 10, ignored ground due to breakline proximity.

- 2014-07-22 00:00:00 - The NOAA Office for Coastal Management (OCM) received the topographic/bathymetric files in LAS format from the University of William and Mary's Center for Geospatial Analysis. A number of LAS files were found to have corrupt GPS times and other unknown factors affecting header information. The files contained lidar easting, northing, elevation, intensity, return number, etc. The data was received in UTM coordinates, zone 18 North, referenced to the NAVD88 for vertical using the Geoid09 model. OCM performed the following processing for data storage and Digital Coast provisioning purposes: 1. The LAS files were converted to geographic horizontal coordinates and ellipsoidal vertical coordinates. 2. The LAS files were cleared of error points and variable length records removed.

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/50131>

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:

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=2620>

<https://noaa-nos-coastal-lidar-pds.s3.amazonaws.com/laz/geoid18/2620/index.html>

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=2620>;

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.