

Advisory Board on Dream Tags
Minutes for August 15, 2012, meeting

Meeting began at 1:11 p.m. Attending: Advisory Board members: Bill Bradley, Dianna Belding, Judi Caron; via phone: Chris MacKenzie, Jeremy Drew. CFWN staff: Chris Askin*, Tracy Turner. NDOW: Patrick Cates, Bob Haughian, Teresa Moiola. Public: Don Sefton, Systems Consultants. *arrived after meeting start/left before meeting ended.

1. Bradley called the meeting to order and conducted roll call.
2. Public comment. Haughian commented that a number of small things cropped up during the raffle sales cycle that need to be addressed before too far into the 2012-13 sales cycle. Most are related to the automated side; he requested a post-mortem of sorts be conducted in order to suggest changes. Sefton concurred. Bradley requested Haughian and Sefton create a list and submit it so that the Committee can review it. Timing for having it as an agenda item: early fall 2012, before sales become brisk.
3. The agenda was approved as presented. Bradley noted that Assemblywoman Debbie Smith might join the meeting later; if so, he requested the Committee entertain reordering some items on the agenda at that point.
4. Approve July 25 minutes. Belding made the motion to approve as written; MacKenzie seconded. Motion carried.
5. Review draft Privacy policy. Question: does it make sense to give Dream Tags raffle ticket purchasers the option to say they don't want their names used for correspondence about Dream Tags raffles? Is that a request we should consider honoring? Discussion: people said they wanted more mailings, more reminders to purchase. Emails from NDOW have an opt-out feature. Very few unsubscribed. Tag holders are a matter of public record at NDOW. CFWN's release form can be revised to clearly state winners' names will be used in publications. Bradley requested a motion regarding the policy. Caron: moved to approve as written. MacKenzie: seconded with a notation of a punctuation correction. Motion carried.
6. Definition of Emergency. Discussion: broad descriptions for committee use during proposal review cover how Committee looks at emergencies, not in any particular order: projects that handle emergencies, projects that bridge short-term risks to wildlife populations such as emergency wildlife relocation and water development, wildlife emergency relocation to prevent disease, starvation, die offs in areas that have lost any of the four basic parts of a healthy habitat (food, water, cover, space), wildfire rehabilitation and restoration, emergency water development. Question: are helicopter problems an emergency need? Survey isn't habitat; but if helicopter has issues, surveys can't be done. Consensus that committee is comfortable with these generally addressing emergent needs. Drew: suggested that projects for wildfire rehabilitation and restoration begin work within 12 months of fire. Regarding emergency water development, this should include water hauls. Suggested adding something that clarifies emergencies for critical surveys. Bradley: can always further define emergencies. For now, may be okay as is so we can get up and running for emergency action. Drew: agreed. Discussion: other events that might require rehabilitation/restoration are overgrazing, flood, wildfire. Question: does "emergent" mean "emergency"? Discussion: example of emergent is existing water development (guzzlers) that can go 60 days without attention but not 90 days. Example of emergency is wildfire situations. Descriptions on request for proposal generally address emergent and emergency needs. Current request for proposal can be amended to include both emergent and emergency requests. Bradley: with these changes, are we okay to let the public know we are open for business for emergent and emergency funding? Turner: yes, contingent upon available funding. Drew: suggest to add "Projects that handle habitat rehabilitation requiring immediate action following a catastrophic event" to categories covering emergencies. Bradley recounted suggestions for changes to broad descriptions for committee use during proposal review and

called for a motion. Mackenzie moved to approve. Caron seconded. Motion carried. Short discussion ensued on emergency request for proposal. Suggestions to post emergency request for proposal on nvdreamtag.org website after August 31 and leave it open all year, to get it in the paper that it's available, to change cover page to distinctly show it is for emergencies and require a letter that demonstrates the emergency and tells when the funding is needed.

7. Proposal review process: Turner recounted what has taken place so far with the request for proposal and what next steps will be in terms of receiving the proposals and getting them to the Committee for review. Asked whether Committee wanted proposers to attend the review meeting to field questions. Discussion: conscientious proposers will be there regardless. Should attend if genuinely interested. Not bad to set an expectation of attendance. General agreement. Caron: should invite them. It's buy-in for our state. The more people the better. Discussion: no time for presentations. Just attend to answer questions Committee may have. Meeting space? MacKenzie: need to accommodate those not in Reno. Cates: possible to use NDOW conference room. MacKenzie: have we resigned to the fact of being subject to open meeting law? Bradley: followed up with Assemblywoman Smith. Not resigned to it. Until Committee gets an opinion, operating cautiously. Bradley: motion to approve the proposed review process? Caron: moved to approve. Belding: seconded. Motion carried.
8. Dream Tags 2012-13 marketing budget: Askin joined the meeting. Question: NDOW is to market; is Committee to provide direction as to what NDOW does with the RES money? Committee isn't approving budget item, correct? Discussion: Committee and NDOW have been partnering on marketing. Bradley: question on marketing budget funding to Askin, is Committee planning to supplement NDOW's marketing with Dream Tags money? Askin: need to determine what's available, if any, from RES to apply toward marketing expense other than any direct expenses the Committee has. Committee plans marketing budget; can't really budget for next year. Committee has theoretical 2013 budget that it is working on for fund. Within that budget, Committee needs to know what if any is needed to apply for marketing out of the fund. Figuring whether there's any money left from RES this year that could be applied next year. Ask the question now—plenty of time to think about and answer for next year. Bradley: if drawing lines, NDOW markets RES. Committee markets tags. Askin: not strictly defined but needs to be. Moiola: NDOW undertook all marketing for RES and raffle ticket. Can't see how to separate them. Askin: would be a good thing to agree on that they can't be separated. Moiola: gifts from NBU and anonymous donor and NDOW stepping up with time and money; question going forward: does NDOW want to be source of marketing effort. Or is Committee thinking someone else is taking over that effort. Askin: may have been some thinking when legislation was put together. If there had been, that's a starting point. If hadn't been, that's established and go from there. Discussion on NDOW's marketing budget shared in May's meeting, which includes suggested expenses. At this time, advertisement with Wild Sheep Foundation newsletter is going on because of their publication schedule. \$2K ad buy started in August. Bradley: covering Elk and Sheep but not yet Mule Deer. Moiola: can reallocate and do that now. Cates: can add some to do that. Sefton: sounds like entire purpose of proceeds of RES is to market Dream Tag and RES. Is that a true statement? Bradley: Smith's expectation is that she wanted it used for marketing. Caron: how it was sold to the public—both consumptive and nonconsumptive—was \$5 was on the ground; \$10 was to support the program with overhead so nonconsumptive user would see benefit of buying the stamp by seeing year after year improvements to resources of the state of Nevada. That we would get as much money as possible for emergency fire treatment on the ground. Separated for ease of reporting overhead and projects. Bradley: appreciates NDOW's marketing efforts; would like to see extra spent to advertise with Mule Deer. Sefton: saw immediate impact of efforts of ads, email blasts, etc. Sales increased within 12 hours of each effort. Caron: anything we put on the ground is beneficial to Nevada's wildlife and our resources. No one wants to waste any money; everyone wants a

successful program. Wanted to see 50% of RES come for marketing to take care of the \$13K/year for software. It's expenses to administer the program; can't administer it without the software. Askin: defined in legislation that CFWN was to hire vendor. Sefton: Smith wanted CFWN to pay for software. Askin: administrative expenses are to be paid by CFWN; marketing was excluded, but with the income source going with that responsibility. Bradley: with adding Mule Deer ad, won't be much leftover. Agenda item isn't to see who has responsibility for developmental costs; it's just to review NDOW's marketing plan and offer suggestions. Cates: it's a new program, and we're trying to figure out our costs. Others have invested a lot of time that hasn't been charged. NDOW has 18% indirect cost charged to all programs, which hasn't been looked at yet. Belding: when shows are going on, will NDOW have a booth where there could be a computer to sell RES? Moiola: Already set up with computer system to sell licenses and RES; has a promo item associated with it. Onsite registration is already built in. Cates: as long as there's a reasonable marketing plan with funding to support it, NDOW will support it. Bradley: could Committee provide laptop to use at shows so public can purchase RES/raffle tickets? Moiola: other states offer second and third place prizes. Possible to put together a group of volunteers to solicit additional awards? Good second place prizes generate sales. Caron: good idea; need to wait a year or two to get the system smooth. Belding: good plan to keep it growing. Committee appreciates NDOW's marketing plan.

9. Website map development: Committee reviewed bid from MeshCreative. Discussion on proposal and competitiveness of bid. Committee decided to postpone the discussion until Milan Sperka with MeshCreative could meet with the Committee. Cates: NDOW can provide a list of vendors. Bradley: by September meeting, Committee should review NDOW's and Truckee River Fund's website to get ideas of what we like.
10. Next meeting of Advisory Committee was set for September 19, 2012, at 2:15 p.m. Location to be determined.
11. Public comment: none.
12. No other business.
13. The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.