

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:

California Ocean Uses Atlas: Industrial sector

### 1.2. Summary description of the data:

This dataset is a result of the California Ocean Uses Atlas Project: a collaboration between NOAA's National Marine Protected Areas Center and Marine Conservation Biology Institute. The Project was designed to enhance ocean management through geospatial data on the full range of significant human uses of California's ocean environment from the shoreline to the 200 nm EEZ boundary. Data was gathered from regional ocean experts and users through participatory GIS methods. For more information on the project scope, background and related data products, please visit [www.mpa.gov](http://www.mpa.gov).

### 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:

2010-03-03

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

W: -129.005271, E: -116.299841, N: 42.09755, S: 30.415166

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

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

### 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:**

MPA Data Manager

**2.2. Title:**

Metadata Contact

**2.3. Affiliation or facility:**

**2.4. E-mail address:**

mpainventory@noaa.gov

**2.5. Phone number:**

831-647-6462

**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:**

MPA Data Manager

**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:

- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - Data were digitized by workshop participant groups in 4

subregions of California (Southern, Central, North Central, and Northern). The workshops were held between November 2008 and July 2009.

- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - Data from each group were reviewed following the workshop to:
  - a. Detail any instructions from participants to add/remove areas in post-processing
  - b. Review GIS technician and facilitator workshop notes for any relevant data-editing comments
  - c. Discuss any areas that might require special attention or follow up.
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - Data were processed by Project GIS Specialist to clean artifacts created during the live, participatory mapping process.
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - All polygons were clipped to the appropriate California Atlas sub-region to remove land and any marine areas outside the scope of the workshop.
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - Use-specific procedures were performed based on participant input. This involved removing areas that were stated as not occurring beyond a certain depth or distance from shore
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - A polygon-in-polygon analysis was run for each use using one nautical mile microblocks as the zonal layer to determine the number of groups that identified a use in each grid cell.
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - Data normalized for each use. For the footprint and future use aspects, an analysis cell with any number greater than 0 became a 1. For dominant, if the number of workshop groups who mapped a cell as dominant was at or greater than 50% of the groups who mapped that use, the value became a 1. All other cells became a 0, so that the final field values are binary (1= Yes, 0 = No)
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - After the previous steps were complete for every workshop region and use, the regions were merged into one statewide dataset.
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - Merged regional data was analyzed for completeness and consistency. For areas where boundary patterns did not agree, contextual edits were made based on reviewing workshop notes and making logical edits where appropriate. In the case of "underwater cables", the workshop participants mostly only confirmed the existing GIS data, so the existing data was absorbed into the dataset. In the case of "shipping", the data with reviewed by one of the participants familiar with statewide shipping patterns.
- 2009-01-01 00:00:00 - The microblock polygons were dissolved for each use, retaining only the blocks where the use occurred. All dissolved polygons were then re-clipped to the study region and added to final geodatabase dataset.

**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)
- 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
- 8.3. 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/39995>

**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:**

**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):**

Office of National Marine Sanctuaries - Silver Spring, MD

**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.*