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## How Integrated is our Floodplain Management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHARED VISION</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES</th>
<th>COLLABORATION</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ No shared vision or very general shared vision</td>
<td>+ Some interests have clearly articulated needs and goals, others may not</td>
<td>+ Collaborative efforts are unstructured and ad-hoc</td>
<td>+ Collaboration may result in mutual support for individual actions</td>
<td>+ Actions are defined by one or two agencies with multiple interests in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++ Multi-interest shared vision not yet tightly linked to actions</td>
<td>++ All interests have needs and goals that are known by other interests</td>
<td>++ Efforts are staffed, structures are clear, and decision-making is defined</td>
<td>++ Mutual support for actions coordinated on the landscape</td>
<td>++ A variety of stakeholders are at the table and participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+++ Multi-interest shared vision directly linked to actions</td>
<td>+++ All interests have needs and goals that are integrated and actively shared</td>
<td>+++ Collaboration is institutionalized with organizational support</td>
<td>+++ Multi-benefit and individual interest actions coordinated on landscape</td>
<td>+++ All people affected by the decision are participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL STUDIES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>CLIMATE IMPACTS</th>
<th>MEASURING SUCCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ No understanding of the river system dynamics</td>
<td>+ Package of site-specific individual interest actions; may or may not conflict</td>
<td>+ Actions are coordinated at the site-scale only, at one or more discrete sites</td>
<td>+ Watershed-specific climate impacts are not understood or addressed</td>
<td>+ No tracking in place to assess change over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++ Technical studies have been done but don't yet lead to integrated and prioritized actions</td>
<td>++ Package of individual interest actions that don't conflict</td>
<td>++ Actions are coordinated at a large-site or small-reach scale</td>
<td>++ Climate impacts may be addressed in individual project designs</td>
<td>++ Limited ability to measure success within certain interests, actions, or reaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+++ Technical studies have led to integrated actions and sequencing</td>
<td>+++ Package of single interest and multi-benefit actions that don't conflict</td>
<td>+++ Actions are coordinated at a reach or watershed scale</td>
<td>+++ Climate projections addressed through location, sequence, and design of durable projects</td>
<td>+++ Sophisticated ability to measure success across landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tracking Progress Toward Shared Goals for Integrated Floodplain Management in the Puyallup River Watershed
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PIERCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT
Conserving Pierce County's Natural Resources Since 1949
We are learning how our communities interact with land in the floodplain.

Fish & Habitat
Flood Risk Reduction
Agricultural Viability
Climate

We are tracking outcomes and benefits in the floodplain.

We are making capital investments in integrated floodplain management.

Overall Floodplain Status

Built Environment in Floodplain

Climate
Accessible Silvian Miles
Connected Floodplain
Actively Farmed Land
Floodplain Development

At-Risk Structures Removed
Conserved Farmland
Salmon Recovery Actions
Use of Climate Projections
Restored Habitat

Farm Businesses
Farm Revenue
Farm Drainage
$5 of Flood Damage
Salmonid Abundance
Annual data call (early JAN)

PCD staff check-in (mid-JAN to mid-FEB)

FFTF Partners with metrics responsibility submit data (by FEB 15)

Draft results and web content complete (by MAR 30)

Results Summit (APR)

Updates to metrics information (MAY)

Monitoring update and integrated metrics are complete; monitoring website is updated (by JUN 30)

FFTF IMG meeting on the monitoring results (JUN)
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