

Dream Tag Advisory Board  
Minutes for December 14, 2011, meeting

1. Meeting began at 2:37 p.m. Attending the meeting: Advisory Board members: Bill Bradley, Chris MacKenzie, Judi Caron, Dianna Belding, and Jack Robb. CFWN staff: Chris Askin, Tracy Turner. NDOW staff: Kim Jolly, Maureen Hullinger, Patrick Cates. Public: Don Sefton (phone). Guests: NDOW staff John McKay, Teresa Moiola
2. Approve the agenda: Caron moved to approved; MacKenzie seconded. Unanimous in favor.
3. No public comment.
4. Approval of October and November minutes: Correction to October minutes: Item 5, clarification, should read: "Caron questioned if existing law exempts this program from lotteries under NRS462 per AB246 section 7, with regards to previous discussion concerning Gaming Control Board". Caron moved to approve October minutes as corrected and November minutes; MacKenzie seconded. All in favor.
5. Discuss cost of tags and species for which tags are issued. Bradley brought Advisory Board up to speed on program. Bradley asked how Caron & Belding envisioned the program running. Caron: in terms of legislation/ draft language or just meetings? Bradley: in minutes and development of the program. Caron: we are halfway there. Bradley asks Caron to describe Dream Tags as if he knew nothing about it. Caron describes the program as an alternative revenue funding source to a successful State Agency with legislative approval to start, that has the opportunity to conduct a raffle that will improve the habitat and support our department in emergencies. Bradley questions how he would get into this raffle. Caron: what has been created under SB411 is a Resource Enhancement Stamp that has a buy-in amount of \$10, with an administrative cost to run the program. There will be unlimited chances at \$5 which will go into CFWN to be granted out the following year for habitat projects or Department needs. The Advisory Board will have access to programs that come in requesting funding. Bradley: how do I get a stamp? Caron: it will all be electronic. Anyone can purchase/ participate. Sportsman ID number per stamp, with multiple chances. NDOW board has not discussed taking in anything beyond general tags of resident/ non resident. To be issued a tag, must meet all qualifications to legally obtain a license to hunt in Nevada. If coming from out of state, will issue a license only for that species. Hullinger corrects Caron, stating that a hunting license can be used for hunting anything once purchased. Caron: understood. Bradley: can I buy a stamp for my son? Caron: yes, as many unlimited stamps as you want. One RES per individual participating in the draw. Bradley: I can buy each son and daughter a stamp with unlimited chances? Caron: yes, as long as you are checking the box that you acknowledge they meet all hunting requirements. Bradley confirms they must meet requirements at time of issue; Caron confirms. Askin: great job as spokesperson. Caron expresses she's elated that Nevada has the opportunity to develop this program. Discussion moved to cost of tags. Bradley tells his understanding of the costs of tags. Two separate costs, resident and non resident for each eligible species, defined as any species of big game, 50 or more tags issued in the preceding year in the general draw. Bradley questions if the tag is already sold to CFWN. Caron clarifies that it's not sold but allocated to CFWN and not identified as resident/ non resident. Robb states clearly that it's not a tag, but a voucher to obtain a tag. Robb also states that a tag is non-transferrable. MacKenzie

questions how quotas on Commission are determined. Hullinger states that Dream Tags are over & above quotas. Essentially add on tags, explaining that it remains a voucher until the resident fee is established; funds are collected and hunter is on the document. Askin requests a letter from NDOW to CFWN that allocates vouchers before conducting raffles. Once winner is chosen, make sure winner is qualified as resident/ non resident with valid license. Cates states that the Commission allocates tags. Hullinger clarifies that it's already established in statute what can be issued. Bradley asks for a description of the weapon & season for the winning tag. Caron: to compliment all open areas; same season structure as PIW tags. Any open season, reflecting the weapon of choice. Bradley confirms the cost of the tag will be determined based on residence of successful winner of the lottery. Is mountain lion a tag? Hullinger: harvest objective, not quota. Bradley: Dream Tag is not for mountain lion. Caron states that most western states allow hunting of mountain lion. 900 residents applied for a mountain lion super tag; might be worth considering for non-resident. Sefton thinks it would be disingenuous to offer Dream Tag mountain lion tag. Caron: understood, but they would be getting a free hunting license. Sefton: does Harvest Objective violate concept of PIW tags? Bradley suggested the Advisory Board hold off on mountain lion issue until kickoff. Vote; the board was unanimous. Bradley asks Caron to clarify the statute on license. Caron: not specified; has not been addressed. Bradley: we need to decide who will pay for the license: Caron: CFWN should buy the license. Bradley questions why. Caron states that it was a strong point of testimony. Are we following through with language taken out of original bill? Bradley: Yes. We need to decide who will buy the license: the hunter or CFWN out of proceeds used to fund habitat emergencies. Caron: strong attraction point that CFWN buys license. Caron suggested making regulations or statutes so the license is limited to species being hunted. Bradley: we cannot make statutes, only recommendations on regulations. Hullinger: I put in legislation that if person didn't have license, CFWN would fund license to go with tag. This would be a standard hunting license, and fits in framework already being done. Like Heritage, once they have it, all that is being funded from auction is tag & application fees. Bradley confirms that money for license would come from Fund at CFWN . Hullinger: yes. Mackenzie: what if someone wants to be reimbursed for license cost? Hullinger points out that there has never been a challenge on Heritage, and technically, all licenses are non-refundable in NAC. Discussion begins regarding issuing license. Askin: will they get license & CFWN reimburse them for it? Hullinger states they should already have it from the Big Game Draw. Bradley assumes they don't. Hullinger: why not issue the same time as tag? Bradley questions how you would issue a license without receiving payment. Hullinger: it would be issued when the form is completed for the Department. Caron: would there be an invoice for the total amount? Hullinger: yes. Askin and Hullinger confirm the procedure as: once winner is chosen, NDOW fills out a voucher form as long as they have all information. CFWN would then know how much to pay NDOW based on resident/ non resident and whether hunter already has a license. Payment is made to NDOW, and vendor issues the tag. Hullinger: statute specifies that vendor issues the tag. Sefton agrees to this procedure.

6. Review revised job descriptions:

Bradley asks the board if there are any changes.

- a. Advisory Board Member- Revised to state they may form subcommittees. Jolly questions how other nonprofit organizations interact with the board when they need to market things. Askin: Board receives the report, asks others who are supportive of the approach, and put together a marketing plan, getting pro bono support. Moiola: how much input would NDOW have with the marketing committee? Askin: huge input. Key

- communications i.e. logo usage. CFWN's Margaret Stewart would be involved, as she is the Communications Director. Bradley: initial marketing would be handled by Askin, Moiola, Stewart, Caron, and Belding. Then branching out to hunting organizations throughout the country. Robb: could get in touch with quarterly newsletters to get information out. Big Game Application brochure? Moiola: based off the prior years' books, there is space and availability to market how we choose. Bradley: would like to see that included in the marketing for the 2012 season. Askin: would like to see marketing committee meet in the next month and come up with press releases, templates, branding, image, etc. Bradley: what would the deadline be for having brochure done? Hullinger: should be done about a week after February commission meeting, to have out by mid March. Cates: committee needs to stay on target in order to launch when ready. McKay: is this pro bono or budget? Askin: all pro bono, no budget. Moiola: would need additional assistance with design efforts from an agency willing to go pro bono. Robb: need to come up with an explanation to distinguish differences between Silver State and Dream Tag, so multiple opportunities are exposed at the shows. Cates: not a big budget, and need to make flyers, brochures, etc. to present at the shows. Moiola: printing is not free; can we find someone to print pro bono?
- b. NDOW: Jolly: Change 4<sup>th</sup> bullet to read: "Deposit any money received by the department from the sale of Resource Enhancement Stamps and Dream Tags in the wildlife account of the state general fund". Change 1<sup>st</sup> bullet to read: "Prior to the offering of raffle ticket to the public, issue one voucher for each species of which 50 or more tags were available under the quota established for the species in the general draw by the commission during the previous year. (Big game means pronghorn antelope, bear, deer, mountain goat, bighorn sheep, or elk). Add bullet to the top which reads: "Develop the Dream Tag voucher form for CFWN and annually assist raffle winners in completing the forms". Change 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet to read: "Develop language, etc., to set up and sell the Resource Enhancement Stamp..." Jolly and Cates add a bullet that reads: "Promulgate and enact any regulations necessary for the program".
- c. Nevada Wildlife Commission: Jolly: Change title to "Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners". All agreed to remove sentence "Based on changes to the legislation, this may not be the responsibility of the commission. Reference NRS 502.219". Discussion begins concerning the involvement of the Board of Commissioners. Jolly explains that before NDOW's first working group meeting, it was confirmed that the Board of Commissioners' involvement was not necessary, but later decided their involvement was needed for the buy-in. Robb: the role as the Commissioners is to set the quota. If above 50, goes to NDOW. Caron states the Commissioners were involved until the Legislative session in 2011, when the Commissioners wording was taken out. Now that we know our tag quotas, and the wording has been changed, I don't think we need this either. Bradley agrees and calls for a motion. Robb makes a motion to strike the Wildlife Commissioners' job description. Bradley called for discussion. Sefton: why not put in the job description stating the Board of Commissioners has no role because of the legislation. Hullinger: one role is that the Vice Chairman is a member of the Advisory Board, should be added as a bullet in the job description. Caron: doesn't Askin have to report as CFWN, to the Commissioners and the Department? It is confirmed that the Commissioners portion was removed from the legislature. In conclusion, Bradley states that the job description of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners is to provide a Vice Chairman as a participating member of the Advisory Dream Tag. MacKenzie

- makes the motion to add one bullet to the job description to read “The Vice Chairman of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board”. Caron seconds. Vote: unanimous Robb: in relation to the draft agenda, meeting is in Las Vegas and as a courtesy would not expect CFWN to travel for report.
- d. CFWN: Askin corrects 1st bullet to read: “Establish and maintain the Dream Tag Charitable Fund”. Askin strikes & changes 6<sup>th</sup> bullet to read “Upon receipt of the completed voucher forms, pay NDOW for raffle winner resident or non resident tag fees & license fees if applicable”. Askin changes 8<sup>th</sup> bullet to read “CFWN to work with the Advisory Board on their desired grant process”.
  - e. Raffle Vendor: Askin changes Item “I” to read: “Following close of sales, conduct raffle and after CFWN verifies completed voucher, deliver tags”.

Bradley suggests to Turner that in the job descriptions, bullet points should be replaced with a letter format. Turner agrees.

- 7. Hear update on Attorney General’s office’s opinion regarding fund vs. nonprofit: Bradley states that it should read “Hear update from Legislative Counsel Bureau on opinion regarding fund vs. nonprofit”. The structure used by CFWN was the legislative intent of the statute.
- 8. Review updated fund agreement: Askin: add that with decision of Legislative Counsel Bureau, we can proceed as a fund. Bradley questions why the agenda items & materials can’t be given to Advisory Board ahead of time, for review. Turner states that under the open meeting law, anything given out ahead of time would have to be posted to the public; CFWN’s website does not have that capability. Caron: over the counter would also be in accordance with the open meeting law. Agenda would state that support material is available at CFWN. Bradley requests footnote #1 on the agenda to include NDOW regional offices. Caron continues to state that under the open meeting law, one can request the agenda from a Department or Board to be added to the mailing list either by mail or email. Jolly: NDOW has the ability to post the information. Askin: would like to have a decision by next month, and sees no way the open meeting law applies to this group. Bradley: This is the only legislatively created Advisory Fund. Askin points out there is no language stating that open meeting law applies to a fund at the Community Foundation; the way legislation is written now, CFWN doesn’t fall under it. Public should still be aware of the program & good being done and will learn this through website & marketing. MacKenzie shares that he spoke to George Taylor, Deputy AG regarding open meeting law, and AB 59 expanded open meeting law requirements. It would be tough not to fall underneath it. Jolly: complying with open meeting law costs more money. Caron moved to postpone for time to review. MacKenzie seconds. Unanimous to postpone. Askin asks that comments and changes on Fund agreement be directed to him in advance.
- 9. Review Agreement for vendor services: Postponed to next meeting.
- 10. Select vendor to conduct raffle: Postponed to next meeting.
- 11. Discuss obstacles to beginning ticket sales in April 2012: Bradley states the obstacle of **getting information in the application book** that provides information on the Dream Tag. Moiola assures information will be in the book. Hullinger: **regulation** may be an obstacle; but if a public hearing can be done to eliminate attending a commission hearing, it would bring it forward without having to wait until February. Cates: **timing for programming for system changes**. We will need to consult with vendor for technical hurdles. Askin asks Sefton what can be done to accelerate the process. Sefton states that any changes to the program parameters will slow things up. Allocation and availability of

resources is another issue. It can be done, but can't wait until February. Needs to be settled with current regulation. Stamp will be for sale outside of and within the draw. Hullinger confirms with Sefton the programming with NWDS to implement the sale of Resource Enhancement Stamp. Askin would like to set the next meeting in the second week of January. Askin and Sefton will have a draft contract put together. Acting quickly would give the board time to get the required work done. McKay: **Hunter Education** a potential obstacle. McKay goes on to clarify how Nevada Hunter Ed. works and eligibility requirements. Bradley questions **timing from when the winner is selected** to the opening of the season. Turner: raffle drawing is the first Monday in July, and opening season is August 1<sup>st</sup>. McKay offers adding & advertising a class in that time frame if needed, or just as an added incentive. Bradley confirms that the marketing of the tag in the hunter application book will need to reflect that the winner must present proof of hunter education from Nevada or residing state, prior to hunt. Moiola: what if the winner chose not to hunt, as a conservation effort? Bradley: eligibility requirements would have to be met. Hullinger: anyone can buy a stamp & not participate in the raffle. Moiola states her point that as a conservation effort, they would want to participate in the raffle to save their animal. Hullinger: everyone is required to take Hunter Ed. Caron makes the point that before 1960, a person is not required to take Hunter Ed. Bradley: Hunter is required to submit a harvest questionnaire. Is this required for Dream Tag? Hullinger: yes. Caron states the **need for a 10-day window to pick up the tag & show proof**, in the event the winner wants to hunt "any legal weapon". Bradley: we will need to check with Sefton for an absolute time frame. McKay: every state's Hunter Ed. statute is different, so be prepared for those who have never been required to take Hunter Ed.

12. Discuss forming a committee responsible for creating and implementing marketing strategies for Dream Tag raffle sales: Bradley volunteered Moiola to head up committee. Askin volunteered Margaret Stewart (CFWN). Caron & Belding volunteered to participate. Bradley & Askin suggested bringing someone in from a professional marketing standpoint. Bradley states that the committee needs to get up & going without waiting for another person to join. Moiola: we have a small & mighty team ready to go, but would need the Board to assist in finding pro bono resources such as graphic artist/ printer willing to donate services. Bradley: our goal should be to have something in print by January 19<sup>th</sup>. MacKenzie will reach out to Daryl Harwell for printing.
13. Review CFWN draft report / update to Nevada Wildlife Commissioners: Askin: no report yet, due February 1<sup>st</sup>. Reviewed notes from November meeting & recap with dates of board formation, meetings and what was accomplished, specifics about work recently completed (Resource Enhancement Stamp), glowing report on NDOW and the work of the Advisory Board, and stating we are on track to launch in spring of 2012. Report will be in letter format and will circulate in the next packet. Bradley suggests adding an actual description of the process like Caron described; essentially a flow chart. Askin agrees. Jolly suggests including "fund" in legislation (CFWN Fund).
14. Review vendor protocol for selecting alternate raffle winners: Postpone to next meeting.
15. Duplicate item.
16. Review draft NAC: Hullinger: draft language is at LCB. Any changes restarts the 30 day clock. Caron: can we pull that? Hullinger: if there are changes, they can be submitted off line. Advisory committee makes the following changes: Section 4: "Person that obtains a RES is not required to purchase or possess raffle chances in the Dream Tag drawing" Section 5 a.) "To participate in the Dream Tag raffle, a person must purchase or possess a Resource Enhancement Stamp" b.) "Purchase or possess one or more chances". Section 6: "At the

time a raffle chance is purchased the purchaser will specify the species that the purchase is for and indentify the client ID of the recipient of the raffle chance. If the raffle winner elects for the tag not to be issued, the tag shall not be issued and not be awarded to an alternate. If the recipient is successful in obtaining a Dream Tag from the raffle and cannot subsequently hunt, the tag may be returned to the Dept. and will be awarded to an alternate if returned. The return of the Dream Tag must occur before the opening day of the season of the Dream Tag. Section 8: "Each Dream Tag season will be in compliance with the season dates and weapon designations established by the commission for each management unit or unit group for that species in the year that the Dream Tag is issued" Section 9: "Unless his/ her hunting privilege is revoked, any person may obtain a Dream Tag" Section 14: "The nonprofit will inform the Dept. of the successful Dream Tag raffle winners and provide the information necessary for the Dream Tags to be issued at the time the nonprofit purchases the Dream Tags. For the Dream Tag to be issued and except as otherwise provided in this regulation the Dream Tag recipient must meet the Department's requirements." Section 15: "After the designation of the person on the raffle chance, the raffle chance is non-transferable". Robb questions non-consumptive users as previously brought up by Moiola. Are we pushing away potential proceeds from non-consumptive users? Caron: what about a section in the application asking if the purchaser hunts, or is it just donation? Robb: we should give the public a chance to participate in a non-consumptive fashion. Caron: make the program favorable to a broader audience.

17. Discuss research on applicability of open meeting rules: Covered earlier in meeting.
18. Review proposed Advisory committee calendar: reviewed and accepted.
19. Set next meeting of Advisory Committee: Next meeting Thursday, January 12, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. at CFWN.
20. Public comment: none.
- 21: Meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.