

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:

Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey ESI: ESI (Environmental Sensitivity Index Shoreline Types - Polygons and Lines)

### 1.2. Summary description of the data:

This data set contains vector lines and polygons representing the shoreline and coastal habitats of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, classified according to the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) classification system. This data set comprises a portion of the ESI for Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. ESI data characterize the marine and coastal environments and wildlife by their sensitivity to spilled oil. The ESI data include information for three main components: shoreline habitats, sensitive biological resources, and human-use resources.

### 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:

1999 to 2001

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

W: -74.538987, E: -71.090936, N: 41.8846228, S: 39.993476

### 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:**

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:

- 2001-09-01 00:00:00 - The intertidal shoreline habitats of metropolitan New York and New Jersey were mapped during overflights and ground surveys conducted by

an experienced coastal geologist in November and December 1999. Prior to the field study, some preliminary shoreline classifications and modifications were made using color Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quadrangles (DOQQs) provided by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJ DEP). Images provided in the DOQQ dataset were photos of the coastal zone taken from 1995 to 1997. The ESI mapping overflights were conducted using H-65 helicopters operated by the U.S. Coast Guard, flying at elevations of 400-600 feet and slow air speed. During this work, the ESI ranking of observed intertidal shoreline habitats was denoted directly onto the shoreline depicted on 1:24,000-scale USGS topographic maps. Where appropriate, revisions to the existing shoreline were made and, where necessary, multiple habitats were described for each shoreline segment. Basemaps used in the field were then scanned using a large format scanner. Shoreline classifications mapped during the surveys were transposed onto the digital shorelines provided by NJ DEP and, in the case of New York, created in-house, using a combination of New York State Tidal Wetlands (NYSTW) program data and older Marine Spill Response Corporation data. Original Connecticut ESI maps, published in 1984, were re-examined and fully updated. The intertidal shoreline habitats of Connecticut were mapped during overflights and ground surveys conducted by an experienced coastal geologist in November of 1999. Prior to the field study, some preliminary shoreline classifications were made using black-and-white 12,000 Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quadrangles (DOQQs) provided by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. The vertical photography used in the DOQQs was taken in 1990-1991. The shoreline used in this atlas was digitized from these photos.

Overflights were conducted using an H-60 Helicopter operated by the U.S. Coast Guard, flying at elevations of 400-600 feet and slow air speed. During this work, the ESI ranking of observed intertidal shoreline habitats was denoted directly onto the shoreline depicted on 1:24,000-scale USGS topographic maps. Where appropriate, revisions to the existing shoreline were made and, where necessary, multiple habitats were described for each shoreline segment. Basemaps used in the field were then scanned using a large format scanner, and shoreline classifications mapped during the surveys were transposed onto the shoreline digitized from the DOQQs. Original Rhode Island ESI maps, published in 1983, were re-examined and fully updated. The intertidal shoreline habitats of Rhode Island were mapped during overflights and ground surveys conducted by an experienced coastal geologist in November of 1999. Preliminary classification of portions of the shoreline near inlets was conducted using black and white vertical aerial photography at a scale of 1:12,000 and color oblique photos taken from previous studies. The overflights were conducted using an H-60 helicopter operated by the U. S. Coast Guard, flying at elevations of 400-600 feet and slow air speed. During this work, the ESI ranking of observed intertidal shoreline habitats was denoted directly onto the shoreline depicted on 1:24,000-scale USGS topographic maps. Where appropriate, revisions to the existing shoreline were made and, where necessary, multiple habitats were described for each shoreline segment. Basemaps used in the field were then scanned using a large format scanner, and shoreline classifications

mapped during the surveys were transposed onto the digital shorelines provided by the Narragansett Bay Estuary Program (NBEP, a program of the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management) and the RIGIS database of the University of Rhode Island.

**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/40545>

#### **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:**

<https://response.restoration.noaa.gov/oil-and-chemical-spills/oil-spills/download-esi-maps-and-gis-da>

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

Contact NOAA for distribution options (see Distributor). ESI data are processed into multiple formats to make them useful to a wider community of GIS/mapping users. Distribution formats include ARC export, MOSS and Shape files, and MARPLOT map folders. An ArcView ESI project and ESI\_Viewer product are also included on the distribution CDs for ease of use of the ESI data. The database files are distributed both in the NOAA standard relational database format (see NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS ORCA 115) and in a simplified desktop flat file format. This metadata document includes information on both of these database formats.;

#### **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 - 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.*