

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:

2005 Puget Sound LiDAR Consortium (PSLC) Topographic LiDAR: Olympic Peninsula

1.2. Summary description of the data:

Terrapoint collected Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data for the Olympic Peninsula project of 2005, totaling approximately 114.59 sq mi: 24.5 for Clallam County, 64.09 sq mi for Olympic DNR, and 26 sq mi Wash DOT. The field data collection took place on February 18, 2005, February 22 - 23, 2005. The control network and check point surveys were performed on February 23, 2005.

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:

2005-02-18, 2005-02-22, 2005-02-23

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -124.51249995, E: -124.03749997, N: 48.29058803, S: 48.07623251

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:

- Point Generation. The points are generated as Terrascan binary Format using Terrapoint's proprietary Laser Postprocessor Software. This software combines the Raw Laser file and GPS/IMU information to generate a point cloud for each individual flight. All the point cloud files encompassing the project area were then

divided into quarter quad tiles. The referencing system of these tiles is based upon the project boundary minimum and maximums. This process is carried out in Terrascan. The bare earth is subsequently extracted from the raw LiDAR points using Terrascan in a Microstation environment. The automated vegetation removal process 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 upon low points selected by a roaming window and are assumed to be ground points. The size of this roaming window is determined by the building size parameter. These 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 (fig. 1). This process is repeated until no additional points are added within an iteration. There is also a maximum terrain angle constraint that determines the maximum terrain angle allowed within the model.

Multiple process dates.

Collection. Two Navajo twin-engine aircraft (C-FVZM & C-GQVP) were used for this project. The aircrafts were based out of Astoria and Kelso Municipal Airport. The two Navajo were typically flying at an altitude of 3500 feet AGL (above ground level) for the duration of the survey.

Sensors Used: Two systems were used in parallel to accomplish data collection, both Terrapoint's 40 kHz ALTM (Airborne Laser Terrain Mapping System), flying at an optimum height of 3500 ft AGL at 140 knots (C-FVZM & C-GQVP). The systems consist of a 36 degree full angle laser, a Trimble 4700 GPS receiver and a Honeywell H764 IMU unit.

The nominal flight line spacing was 1070 feet, providing overlap of 50% between flight lines.

Processing.

1. Flight lines and data were reviewed to ensure complete coverage of the study area and positional accuracy of the laser points.
2. Laser point return coordinates were computed using the REALM survey suite and PosPac based on independent data from the LiDAR system, IMU, and aircraft.
3. The raw LiDAR file was assembled into flight lines per return with each point having an associated x, y, and z coordinate.
4. Visual inspection of swath to swath laser point consistencies within the study area were used to perform manual refinements of system alignment.
5. Custom algorithms were designed to evaluate points between adjacent flight lines. Automated system alignment was computed based upon randomly selected swath to swath accuracy measurements that consider elevation, slope, and intensities. Specifically, refinement in the combination of system pitch, roll and yaw offset parameters optimize internal consistency.
6. Noise (e.g., pits and birds) was filtered using REALM software tools based on known elevation ranges and included the removal of any cycle slips.
7. Using TerraScan and Microstation, ground classifications utilized custom settings appropriate to the study area.
8. The corrected and filtered return points were compared to the RTK ground survey points collected to verify the vertical and horizontal accuracies.
9. Points were broken into processing bins and output areas and output as laser points, TINed and GRIDed surfaces. Bare earth DEMs meet PSLC specifications.

- 2013-10-01 00:00:00 - The NOAA Office for Coastal Management (OCM) downloaded topographic files in .txt format from PSLC's website. The files contained lidar elevation, intensity, return number, class, scan angle and GPS time measurements.

The data were received in Washington State Plane North Zone 4601, NAD83 coordinates and were vertically referenced to NAVD88 using the Geoid03 model. The vertical units of the data were feet. OCM performed the following processing for data storage and Digital Coast provisioning purposes: 1. The All-Return ASCII txt files were parsed to convert GPS Week Time to Adjusted Standard GPS Time. 2. The All-Return ASCII files were converted from txt format to las format using LASTools' txt2las tool and reclassified to fit the OCM class list, 3=2 (ground), 5=3 (vegetation). 3. The las files were converted from orthometric (NAVD88) heights to ellipsoidal heights using Geoid03. 4. The las files' vertical units were converted from feet to meters. 5. The las files were converted from a Projected Coordinate System (WA SP North) to a Geographic Coordinate system (NAD83) 6. The las files' horizontal units were converted from feet to decimal degrees and converted to laz format.

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/50150>

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=2584>
<https://noaa-nos-coastal-lidar-pds.s3.amazonaws.com/laz/geoid18/2584/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=2584>

;

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.