

Advisory Board on Dream Tags

Minutes for June 17, 2014, meeting

Meeting began at 2:34 p.m. Attending: Advisory Board members: Chris MacKenzie, Dianna Belding, Judi Caron, Jeremy Drew. CFWN staff: Tracy Turner. NDOW: Patrick Cates; Kim Jolly and Teresa Moiola (via phone). Members of the public: Monty Martin, Systems Consultants; Mike Rowan, Friends of Nevada Wilderness; Steve Weaver, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (via phone).

Absent: Bill Bradley

1. MacKenzie called the meeting to order and conducted roll call.
2. The agenda was approved as presented.
3. February 2014 meeting minutes were approved as presented.
4. Fund balance report. Turner presented the report: \$516,751.50; reserves not shown of \$59,000. Actual amount available to grant if \$451,556.50. MacKenzie asked whether a sales comparison was available for 2013 and 2014. Jolly provided some comparison figures that indicate sales are very close to last year. Caron asked about the line item of \$18,295 paid to Systems Consultants (SCI). Turner explained that all raffle sales proceeds via Application Hunt System now go to NDOW directly; as a result SCI must wait to receive its fees per sale. CFWN must wait for NDOW to send the AHS sales money to CFWN; CFWN then cuts a check to SCI for the fees. Cates explained the reasoning behind the new process and stated that it's complicated but follows regulation. Caron questioned whether the money passing through so many hands may not cause questions to be asked about the handling of the money raised through AHS. Belding asked whether the Legislature is supportive of this process.
5. Open Meeting Law: MacKenzie reported on the Board's question presented to Attorney General's office re: whether OML applies to the Advisory Board on Dream Tags. MacKenzie and Bradley had a phone conference with Keith Munroe, Chief Deputy Nevada Attorney General; based upon the facts presented to him, Munroe supported the position that the Dream Tags meetings are not subject to Nevada Open Meeting Law. George Taylor, Deputy Attorney General in charge of Open Meeting Law, has since reported to MacKenzie that he would get an opinion in writing to support that conclusion; Taylor recently advised MacKenzie that he has not quite completed it. When written provisions are provided, MacKenzie will pass them along. Turner will continue to post agendas and past minutes to NVDreamTags website.
6. Review of NDOW fees. Because of Bradley's absence, this item is deferred to the next meeting.
7. NDOW regulation, grant program, and use of Dream Tag funding. Cates explained that NDOW passed a regulation effective March 2014 that is global in nature and not directed at

Dream Tags funding. The regulation established a process for all NDOW funding sources. Historically when the Commission awarded Heritage dollars to subcontractors, they might have to execute a State contract, which was a lengthy process and resulted in delays getting contracts in place. There are some general State regulations about State agencies granting money to other entities. This new regulation changed Heritage projects from contracts to subgrants. Now when NDOW engages with a nonprofit or government organization it can be done as a subgrant, which speeds up the process. The regulation enumerates all possible sources of funding, including Dream Tags. When proposals come to Dream Tags from NDOW and include line items that have a nonprofit/division of forestry doing a portion of the work, any awarded funding will be passed along to that nonprofit/division as a subgrant. The money has to be to a nonprofit/government entity; it has to be an extension of their functions (not janitorial, for example). The new process has been in the works for a long time. Caron: great what you are trying to do. Reading the word “fees” is the confusing part. Sounds like fees for the purchase of the Dream Tags. Someone from the public may read this as a fee coming into NDOW from Dream Tags. Cates: reference to Dream Tags is in there because the \$5 fee is defined in NRS. Should be referencing the Wildlife Trust Fund, which is the fund that receives private dollars/donations. He’ll need to add that; appreciates the catch. NDOW uses subgrants for everything but that still needs to be added. The reason it wasn’t lined out is that the Wildlife Trust Fund is exempt from NRS 300, ... (all state requirements for contracting). Didn’t see the need to define a different process but may need to do that.

8. Marketing report by NDOW. Jolly and Moiola: this year’s sales to date vs. last years: comparable. Two weeks to go on this cycle. As of June 16: \$44,040 in RES sales. Last year \$46,970 as of this time. Raffle sales: \$282,430 as of June 16; in 2013 \$307,715. All things considered, numbers look comparable. Need more info from Bob Haughian. MacKenzie: do we expect any push for last two weeks? Moiola: yes, just completed a Father’s Day promotion; another eblast “last chance” during last week of ticket sales. Got Channel 4 to run 380 additional 15-second spots (even though Nevada Proud is over). Should see uptick in numbers by close of cycle. Added Dream Tags rotator to NDOW website. Marketing committee report includes plans for next cycle. Caron: good report; may need to discuss what to do to increase reach out of state. Would like to see a way to incorporate all winners in one key place where people can see them; bring continuity to all three sites. Moiola: can link to draw results. Jolly: User interface suggestion: when someone is buying tickets, visually disconcerting to purchasers from Dream Tags to SCI. Can SCI make the visual connection? Can NV Dream Tags website say “you are now leaving NV Dream Tags and going to SCI ...” Background color and DT logo on SCI’s site may increase buyer confidence. Belding: was NDOW Marketing team able to find out about obtaining list of people waitlisted for a species? Moiola: yes, we can obtain that. Depends on how easy it is for SCI to query the system. Martin asked Cates: is this something we can do? Cates deferred to Bob Haughian because of sensitivity issues. Martin: can be done but would have to look to Maureen Hullinger/Bob Haughian to see if it can be done. Belding: we just discussed it. Cates: it

doesn't sound unreasonable, but Don, Bob, and Maureen have had a lot of discussion on this topic. **Cates will check with Haughian and Hullinger.** Drew: is it duplicative? All those people should be getting email blasts anyway. Moiola: they are. There is duplication depending on what you've applied for. Drew: suggests an email that says "are you on a waiting list?" Turner: is the committee working on \$10K/\$20K/\$30K budgets? Moiola: what numbers are we working with? Cates: we're spending RES on admin expenses; what's left will be spent on marketing. No real accounting until ... MacKenzie: if we have \$45K, are we eating that all up in admin? Cates: no. MacKenzie: can we get a breakdown of admin costs for NDOW for a year? Cates: provided that before. In fiscal year 2013: \$5K in staff; has concerns that staff are forgetting to charge to it. Should be charging indirect costs as well, which is 16%; Cates hasn't ever done that. Spent \$54K in advertising costs; that's really marketing. 10-20% for admin. Most is going to marketing. MacKenzie: questions on whether we're getting good bang for buck spending RES on marketing. Are we getting return on the dollar to sell more Dream Tags raffle tickets? Do we need to take a different approach? Are there other ways to market more effectively? (This discussion continued in item 9.)

9. Discuss improving Dream Tags marketing: Moiola: come up with marketing priorities; create a list. When and if we get RES money, what do we deploy? Focus on nonresident target. Deploy strategies when we know the money available. Caron: in a perfect world, we didn't envision that this (RES) would have to continue. Doesn't see RES as a funding source that goes on year to year. Look at structure; need to keep sight of whether the money is being used wisely, getting most bang for buck. Need to see what it is to conduct a campaign to raise money to restore wildlife habitat in our state. MacKenzie: do we have to keep investing in marketing? Need to continually remind people. Need to still focus on marketing. What ideas do you have for national focus? Focus on states that don't have species we have? Drew: views RES and DT as same pot of money. Are there things that belong under auspices of Dream Tags Advisors vs. marketing committee? Moiola: in long term, might need to look at streamlining. Jolly: other states raffle items to generate sales; Dream Tags advisory board would have to drum up prizes, not NDOW. MacKenzie: should we consider creating a committee on the Advisory Board to help solicit prizes? Cates: lots of free marketing can be done. Paying for billboards, etc. may not return bang for buck. NDOW has media's attention; can put out press releases, eblasts, etc. Chad solicited for Silver State and got good return. Belding: also discussed putting ads in other states' hunt books as another way to get it out to other states. Moiola: other states guides accept advertising; would they consider it competition? Drew: go a different route. Go after guides that target audiences interested in hunting in Nevada. MacKenzie: create a reciprocal agreement with other states. Free advertising to advertise theirs/their ours. Drew: be more specific going forward in targeting our market. **Marketing committee will meet after close in June and in August.** Cates will know by then how much money is available. Caron asked Turner to pass along to Margaret Stewart (CFWN) that she's doing great work on keeping Facebook and the NV Dream Tags website active and up to date.

10. Review grant proposals: Mike Rowan explained overlap of #30 and #31. Burn areas are very close. #30 hasn't been modified. Steve Weaver's group proposed an additional fire. Weaver reduced his proposal because of equipment requested in Friends' proposal. Weaver submitted on behalf of Forest Service. If they had been aware of overlap, they would have submitted a joint proposal.
 - a. #29 From a fire about 10 years ago. Caron: likes the education component. Likes the monitoring aspect. Belding also comfortable with it from an education component. Drew: not so much a fire rehab as a noxious weed treatment. Technically it seems sound with a good education component. Caron: moved to approve as written; Belding seconded. Approved as written.
 - b. #30 Belding not comfortable with amount paid for staff. Rowan: may be able to up volunteer percentage. Might drop BLM piece if it came to pruning the project. Drew: will likely give good exposure to Dream Tags. Would rather go for more immediate fire needs. Good project; may not be the highest return on investment from a habitat standpoint. MacKenzie: can't support the \$8,800 for vehicle. Caron: moved for \$18,542; Belding: seconded. Approved at \$18,542, disallowing the vehicle.
 - c. #31 Questions on whether agreements are in place with owner and whether provisions are in place to protect the plants from deer grazing. Concerns about impact over the long term. Valuable project; technical concern is how to ensure investment is safeguarded to foster establishment of plants. Not a lot of agreement with landowner on grazing plan. Weaver: working very closely with landowner. Considered whether approval of project should be contingent upon agreement with landowner that all will do what needs to be done to protect reseeded efforts. MacKenzie asked whether Weaver is comfortable with this landowner being willing to manage the land and keep restoration viable. Weaver is confident. Acknowledges the risk of having deer come through and take it out; not worried about the cattle. Caron: what is the benefit of manual seeding and aerial seeding; why use both? Drew: aerial=grass; bitterbrush manual seeding = faster reestablishment of plants. Weaver concurs. Caron: moved to fund as written. Belding seconded. Approved as written.
11. Hear updates on funded projects. Turner reported that no reports have been received from Lee Turner on #3, #7, and #27. MacKenzie asked that those be put on next agenda.
12. Hear website updates. Turner noted that Dream Tags website needed updates that couldn't be done in-house; paid \$405 in 2014 for updates. Would like budget for 2015 for \$500 to perform updates. Caron moved to approve \$405 for 2014 updates and \$500 for 2015 updates. Belding seconded. Unanimous.
13. Next meeting Tuesday, Sept. 23 at Bill's