

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:

Maine and New Hampshire 2016 HYDRO Polygons

1.2. Summary description of the data:

This data set contains vector polygons representing the coastal shoreline and hydrography used in the creation of the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) for Maine and New Hampshire. As a whole, the ESI data characterize the marine and coastal environments and wildlife by their sensitivity to spilled oil, and include information for three main components: shoreline habitats, sensitive biological resources, and human-use resources. See also the HYDROL (Hydrography Lines), ESIL (ESI Shoreline Types - Lines), ESIP (ESI Shoreline Types - Polygons) data layer for additional shoreline/hydrography information.

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:

2014 to 2016

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -71.0981, E: -66.8576, N: 45.1917, S: 42.8061

This reflects the extent of all land and water features included in the overall Maine and New Hampshire ESI study region. The bounding box for this particular feature class may vary depending on occurrences identified and mapped.

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:**

ESI Program Manager

2.2. Title:

Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:**2.4. E-mail address:**

orr.esi@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:

ESI Program 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:

- 2016-01-01 00:00:00 - The shoreline and classifications were fully updated using the sources and methods described below. The shoreline and intertidal habitats were delineated using a mapped sequence of Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) and high resolution digital orthophotography datasets. The LiDAR data was obtained from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic LiDAR: LiDAR for the North East program (2011) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Topographic LiDAR: Cumberland and York Counties, Maine program (2006). The base shoreline was compiled at Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) first by LiDAR extraction, then refined within a Geographic Information System (GIS) utilizing high resolution digital orthophotos. After the shoreline was delineated, digital orthoimagery from various sources was used to classify shoreline segments using the nationally, standardized ESI scale (see below). Imagery from the Maine Office of Geographic Information Systems (2014), USDA-FSA Aerial Photography Field Office (2014), and the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership (2013), as well as various imagery sources for Google Earth and Bing Maps (2014) was used during the classification phase. Imagery was produced by Woolpert as part of the ESI data collection effort; however, schedules dictated that shoreline classification must occur prior to the completion of imagery collection and processing. Therefore, the new imagery was not used for the shoreline classification. Shoreline features of 10 meters (m) or greater in length were classified. In addition, wetland polygon datasets originally created by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory (NWI) were modified and updated to be used in conjunction with the ESI shoreline. The data was visually reviewed and classified against the aerial imagery and adjusted where necessary to allow for proper classification. All classifications were determined by the specifications outlined in the Environmental Sensitivity Index Guidelines version 3.0 (2002). Where necessary, multiple types were described for each shoreline segment. GIS quality control measures were implemented to ensure that all data met the required specifications.

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
- 7.4. 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/40376>

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:

https://response.restoration.noaa.gov/esi_download

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:

Data can be accessed by downloading the zipped ArcGIS geodatabase from the Download URL (see Distribution Information). Questions can be directed to the ESI Program Manager (Point Of Contact).

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 Response and Restoration - Seattle, WA

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.