Policy Context Scohesive Strategy With Collaboration & Collective Learning FORUMS FOR DIALOGUE + - Using technology - ALL INTERESTED DENOGRAPHIC CHANGE -TRANSPARENT -TPOPULATION - GOOD FAITH -LAND CONVERSION - CHANGES IN 1 STATEC ASPECT - TIME INVESTMENT PERCEPTIONS/ EEGNOMIC VALUE ALLOWED TIME VALUES, FERE ATTITUDES -SERVICE SECTOR JOBSY J Without Collaboration -> Conflict, Gridlock

External The dwill is in the Details (DISCO FALL) Internal Rublic contreach Collective Learning EXPANDED ZONE OF ACREEMENT A understanding three more acres treated + improved resiliency TRUST field trips ~ SHARED UNDERSTANDING THARED LEARNING forest meets a broader suite of ecosystem services -FOREST - STAKE HOLDER VALUES Scalable Collaboration resilient communities STAKE HOLDERS Public +> Agency Exchange · JACLUSJ VE, DYNAMIC institutional memory WILL INGNESS TO FACE Forest ment / rest not reflecting public values CHALLENCES of Litigation and appeals uncoordinated timeffectent The A forest loss to uncharacteristic dist management land scape suffers Freduced w. life hab Incomplete understandings ) less likely to achieve Communities suffer + water quality Competing visions, interests any disired not come well Harrilldelife 11 Sall sorts of conditions decline 2 trec. opps hab. fragmentation Distrust + Disinvestment / fewer acres treated I forest products/ rest by-products: Hidden Agendas Less \$ for management

CARLES CONTRACTOR STATES

MENT Improved Wildlife Habitat HRV Res. lent Landscape

LET BURN policy

ARticulate, healthy communication Integrated, all-lands management LIVING WAGE FOREST-BASED EMPLOYMENT

lace

LNDY Toinst Desired Outcome

BENEFITS

DIACS

and the second division of the second divisio

completions of goals