

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:

Northwest Peninsular Florida 2016 ESI BIRDS Polygons

1.2. Summary description of the data:

This data set contains sensitive biological resource data for diving birds, gulls, terns, passerines, pelagic birds, raptors, shorebirds, wading birds, and waterfowl in Northwest Peninsular Florida. Vector polygons in this data set represent bird concentration areas, nesting areas, roosting areas, vulnerable occurrences, wintering areas, and general use areas. Species-specific abundance, seasonality, status, life history, and source information are stored in associated data tables (described below) designed to be used in conjunction with this spatial data layer. This data set is a portion of the ESI data for Northwest Peninsular Florida. 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.

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:

2016 to 2018

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -84.8957, E: -82.2746, N: 30.0422, S: 26.4897

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:

- 2016-12-01 00:00:00 - 1. Selection of species: Bird species are included in this atlas either because of their likelihood of direct or indirect impact by an oil spill or similar incident, their general rarity or imperilment, or their special protection status as threatened or endangered. Migratory or wintering concentration areas, nesting sites and colonies, and protected species are especially emphasized. Bird concentration areas depicted in this atlas are described for various groups of birds below. Colonial waterbirds, shorebirds, and wading birds: Nesting locations for terns, gulls, shorebirds, pelicans, cormorants, anhingas, egrets, herons and storks were mapped using digital polygon data, point locations and accompanying summary spreadsheets obtained from Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), Florida Audubon and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Concentration values were generalized when presented for a range of dates (10s, 100s, 1000s, etc.) or may represent the most recent count data available. When information on nesting concentrations were not provided the concentration value was left blank. In the more remote areas of the Big Bend region, nesting information was provided by U.S Fish and Wildlife Refuge managers and biologists in the form of expert knowledge. When nesting associations were made with habitat types (i.e. wading birds in marshes and mangroves) the concentration value was listed as "potential" to denote the uncertainty in the data. Historical nesting locations were included in the data and noted as such in the concentration field as many colonial waterbird nesting locations are ephemeral in nature but offer prime roosting and loafing areas even when not used for nesting. Historical nesting information was provided by Florida Audubon and the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI). Migratory, roosting, high use concentration areas and overwintering hotspot locations for pelicans, wading birds, terns, and shorebirds (specifically piping plovers and red knots, state and federally threatened, and snowy plovers, state threatened) were mapped using survey data provided by FL FWC, USGS, USFWS, Florida Audubon, expert opinion, and data compiled from Ebird and other sources. Wood stork foraging distributions (state and federally threatened) were provided by the USFWS and cover large areas surrounding known nesting and roosting locations. Concentration values, when presented, represent ranges or generalized values.

- 2016-12-01 00:00:00 - 2. Marsh obligate species: Salt and freshwater marshes are ranked as highly sensitive to oiling due to their biological productivity and the tendency for oil to persist based on low relative expose to wind/wave energy and the difficulties associated with human cleanup activities. Marshes are extremely valuable for a suite of bird species in the region including rails, bitterns, and marsh obligate passerines, and should be prioritized for protection wherever they exist. Due to their cryptic nesting behaviors and the difficulties of surveying in these areas, most mapped nesting locations represent larger habitat associations. General distributions of nesting birds were mapped to habitat associations only in regions where data suggested strongly that nesting occurs. Therefore, not all suitable habitats were mapped as potential nesting habitat Never-the-less, extensive

mangrove and salt marsh habitat fringing the Gulf of Mexico in this region most likely supports large numbers of marsh obligate species. Therefore, an absence of a polygon in a region does not mean a species will not be present in the event of a spill.

Waterfowl: In addition to the shallow protected waters of Tampa Bay, Old Tampa and Hillsborough Bay, the region covered in this ESI is characterized by large expanses of sub-aquatic vegetation that grows on the shallow shelf areas of the Gulf of Mexico. As such, this region supports large aggregations of wintering and migrating waterfowl; even in the offshore regions. Waterfowl distributions were mapped using data collected by the FWC and USFWS as part of an effort to monitor redhead duck populations using the Gulf during the winter months. Aerial surveys were flown during peak abundance from 1972 through 2003. These surveys, although primarily focused on redheads and scaup, did enumerate other aggregations of ducks when they were encountered. Jim Wortham, a pilot biologist from the USFWS familiar with the survey, provided expert knowledge on specific redhead concentration areas and seasonality of wintering ducks in the region. Offshore waters were divided into nearshore and offshore regions to denote the habitat preference of the waterfowl mapped. Concentration values, when populated, indicate a generalized maximum yearly count for that species and unit (100s, 1, 000s, 10,000s, etc.). Additional areas providing critical foraging habitat and refuge areas for migrating and wintering waterfowl were mapped using data from the Atlantic Coast Joint Venture Waterfowl Implementation Plan. There is a lack of information available regarding specific locations of breeding waterfowl in this region. The Florida mottled duck, a Florida endemic species, does breed in upland areas adjacent to wetlands from February through June and undergoes a flightless molting period between July and September during which they commonly congregate on large wetlands (A Conservation Plan for the Florida Mottled Duck, FL FWC). These general life history behaviors are not captured within the database.

- 2016-12-01 00:00:00 - 3. **Raptors:** Nesting locations for bald eagles, osprey (state conservation concern), and swallow-tailed kites were map using data from the FL FWC, Florida Audubon and FNAI. **Seabirds:** No pelagic seabirds nest within this region. Although large data gaps exist regarding seabird distribution and abundance in the Gulf of Mexico (Analyzing the Gaps in Long-term monitoring of the Gulf of Mexico, Ocean Conservancy; <http://www.oceanconservancy.org/>), the Gulf does support scattered populations of resident and wintering seabirds. Recent studies suggest that the Gulf supports a large percentage of the North Atlantic population of juvenile northern gannets in the winter months. Juvenile northern gannets were estimated to be heavily impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil spill of 2010. In addition to northern gannets, the offshore waters in this region support wintering populations of common loons. Roosting locations for frigate birds were mapped using information from Florida Audubon, FNAI and expert knowledge. Although the data is sparse, it should be assumed that all offshore waters of the Gulf of Mexico will support some level of seabirds and sea ducks during all months of the year and owing to their reliance on the marine environment this species group are considered highly sensitive to oil spills. Rare, threatened and endangered

passerines: Nesting locations of rare, threatened or endangered passerines (mainly red-cockaded woodpeckers, state and federally endangered and Florida scrub jays, state and federally threatened) were included as polygons in this atlas even when hydrographically removed from large waterbodies in an effort to make this update more usable in an all hazards context. These data were obtained from FWC and FNAI databases. These species are not generally thought of as at risk from an oil spill itself but their listing status should be taken into consideration when conducting cleanup operations in the vicinity of know nesting locations.

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/54257>

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 content is considered static once published. However, if issues with the Geodatabase linkages or table contents are identified, the Geodatabase and/or the associated Map Document may be updated. Assure most current data is being used by downloading from https://response.restoration.noaa.gov/esi_download and/or comparing modification dates provided at this site.

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.