

Advisory Board on Dream Tags

Minutes for October 14, 2015, meeting

Meeting began at 2:32 p.m. Attending: Advisory Board members: Bill Bradley, Judi Caron, Dianna Belding; Chris Mackenzie, Grant Wallace via phone. CFWN staff: Tracy Turner. NDOW: Liz O'Brien, Jack Robb, Kim Jolly. Members of the public: Don Sefton, Systems Consultants.

1. Bradley called the meeting to order and conducted roll call.
2. The agenda was approved as presented.
3. May 2015 meeting minutes were approved as presented.
4. Fund balance report. Turner presented the report: amount available to grant of \$644,407.32. Bradley suggested that the amount awarded, amount of match, and number of grants awarded be added to the report to Legislature.
5. SCI's report on 2014-15 sales: Sefton provided a brief review and noted the change in sales (no more sales via Application Hunt System) resulted in a 21% drop in sales that equated to \$66,000. He noted that the standalone website sales were up—largely due to NDOW marketing.

Discussion ensued regarding the surge in RES sales. Sefton noted that the placement of the RES purchase may have confused some people into buying the RES. Nearly 5,000 bought RES but did not buy raffle chances. Bradley suggested that NDOW director sit down with Licensing to figure out placement. Discussion explored various placement options and their pros/cons.

Sefton reiterated that RES was not only envisioned as a source of marketing revenue for Dream Tags; it was also envisioned as a vehicle for non-consumptive users to support the program. Jolly commented that perhaps RES purchase wouldn't bother people if the money was used for on-the-ground work, not marketing; Mackenzie agreed. Jolly noted that the RES has been used for marketing and staff costs; she asked when can stop and when that conversation will take place. Caron quoted a section from NDOW's website: *"For those not interested in hunting, the Resource Enhancement Stamp can be purchased by anyone that wants to contribute to the preservation, protection, management and restoration of game and its habitat."* As worded, that seems to convey RES dollars are being used for wildlife habitat projects. She suggested that as NDOW administers the DT program, possibly the Director's report at State meeting could include a report on RES dollars and projects that have benefitted from Dream Tags funding.

Sefton suggested that different verbiage on NDOW's website may help address the situation. Any language changes must be approved by NDOW. If the confusion remains after language changes, another solution will need to be sought. Robb noted that placement is a big issue; he also noted that feedback he's received doesn't clearly state what the Dream Tags program is and how it differs from Silver State. Robb noted, too, that Silver State was up \$70,000; so he thinks sales in the state are about equal. Belding disagreed since historically the big push for Dream Tags was after the big draw and via AHS.

Bradley noted several concerns: whether stamp is appropriately named, whether placement of the RES at the front of the purchasing process is confusing hunters, that name change would require Legislative change—may need to address in Legislature how money is being handled. He then asked whether the Advisory Board members are content with the language changes for the 2015-16 sales cycle? What is Advisory Board's direction to NDOW?

Further discussion took place about whether to request from NDOW a fixed budget for marketing from RES—with the remainder going to projects. Mackenzie noted that we need more money for marketing now that raffle chances are not being sold via AHS. Mackenzie also noted that we need to figure out a way to satisfy Revenue people at the State so that raffle chances can be sold via AHS. O'Brien commented that Treasurer's Office will not change its mind. Bradley asked who specifically—so this person can be personally spoken with. Jolly mentioned Dan Schwartz.

Bradley said he and Mackenzie would get working on trying to see whether the AHS-sales obstacle can be overcome; the choice seems to be compliance with law vs. compliance with accounting principles. Which prevails?

Sefton noted that there will be a cost to Dream Tags, not NDOW, for any changes to website; NDOW will need to approve these changes.

Mackenzie moved to explore opportunities with NDOW to work with Sefton to find better placement for purchase of RES—to help clarify what RES is for. Sefton noted that he'll need a decision before January. If NDOW directs, NDOW will work with Sefton to make a proposal for this. Sefton can do a test site so we can see how it is now/how it could be. Jolly and O'Brien want PR professionals involved. Bradley noted that if NDOW finds a better way to do it, the Advisory Board will need to meet before December 1, 2015, to review proposal and potentially approve the work. Caron seconded Mackenzie's motion. Unanimous in favor.

Bradley noted that Dream Tags program needs to either comply with or amend statute. Bradley and Mackenzie will handle this.

(Back to SCI's report) Because resident unique clients totaled 987 and total number of unique clients who bought RES totaled 7,867, Caron asked whether we (Dream Tags program) are communicating better to residents or nonresidents. Sefton noted that nonresidents are typically 4 years older, in higher income brackets, can afford to travel. Caron commented that it's likely that our 2015 target marketing to nonresidents worked.

Discussion on various points in the report took place for clarification. Mackenzie noted that the fact sales dropped only \$66,000 means marketing is working.

6. Review project proposals—none to review. Turner commented on open deadline potentially being the problem. With no firm deadline, it may be that no sense of urgency is being created. Mackenzie said we need to maintain a reserve for responding to fire emergencies. Advisory Board agreed to changing to two deadlines (matching the Truckee River Fund cycles). When we do hear about fires, we can request proposals. Facebook pages may be a good source of getting the word out in these instances.
7. Updates on funded projects—Turner reviewed the supplied report.
8. Current options for accounting for receipt of raffle changes and lack of AHS sales—covered under Item 5.
9. Discussion of RES sales—covered under Item 5.
10. Marketing report—O'Brien said she is releasing \$49,000 of RES for marketing for the 2015-16 sales cycle. This is a 25% increase. Moiola and her staff have new ideas, including more social media. Jolly noted that NDOW and the Advisory Board never know how much funding will be available for marketing. Need Google Analytics to figure out what's making a difference. Turner will check on the availability of these. Caron noted lots of email blasts in the 2013 sales cycle with lots of sales as a result of Black Friday emails. She didn't see any of those for the 2014-15 sales cycle. Bradley asked whether it's possible to do emails for various holidays. Jolly said Moiola will need to respond to that. Bradley requested a marketing meeting take place before December. He requested Jolly go back to Moiola to get clarification about email blasts. Where does Dream Tags fit in on NDOW's marketing calendar?
11. Development of Dream Tags winners press release—Bradley noted there was a press release on Dream Tags' website but not NDOW's. Discussion resulted in determining that Bob Haughian needs to tell NDOW who winners are when he tells Turner. Jolly requested that the Foundation share its press release with NDOW so NDOW can also post. Caron suggested using the Duck Stamp press

release model for Dream Tags and Foundation coordinating with NDOW and RGJ to post press release.

12. Hear and review projected budget for Dream Tags/RES program marketing campaign for 2015-16 cycle—covered under Item 10.
13. Status of reappointment of Advisory Board members—Bradley will get reappointments taken care of before 12/31/15.
14. Review of Foundation's draft letter to Legislature—feedback from committee due to Turner by 12/15/15.
15. Next meeting 2:30 p.m. Wednesday, December 8, 2015, at 6900 S. McCarran Blvd., Suite 2000, Reno. Agenda will include 1) review and possibly approve changes to positioning of sale and description of RES and 2) review of project proposals (if any).
16. Other business—none.
17. Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.