MINUTES OF THE MEETING
NEVADA COMMISSION ON TOURISM
(NRS 231.8117)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

The Nevada Commission on Tourism was called to order by Lieutenant Governor Anthony at 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 10, 2026, in the Old Assembly Chamber of the Nevada State Capitol, 101 North Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Board Room of the Travel Nevada Office, 4000 South Eastern Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [Exhibit A] and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file with the Division of Tourism (Travel Nevada) and on Travel Nevada's website at https://travelnevada.biz/events/public-meetings/.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lieutenant Governor Stavros Anthony (Chair)
Commissioner Fletch Brunelle
Commissioner Shelly Capurro
Commissioner Mendy Elliott
Commissioner Annette Kerr
Commissioner Jill Rowland-Lagan
Commissioner Mike Larragueta
Commissioner Jane Moon
Commissioner Herb Santos Jr.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Commissioner Rick Murdock (Vice Chair), excused
Commissioner Judith Perez Siegel, excused

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Harry B. Ward, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Rafael Villanueva, Chief Executive Officer, Travel Nevada
Tracie Barnthouse, Chief Communications Officer, Travel Nevada
Keelie Cox, Chief Marketing Officer, Travel Nevada
Nicole Orsua, Chief Industry Development Officer, Travel Nevada
Cortney Bloomer, Destination Development Manager, Travel Nevada
Abigail Bernabe, Industry Development Specialist, Travel Nevada

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT (CONT'D):

Stewart Terry, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs
Kyle Shulz, Research Director, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs
Kelly Benoit, Executive Assistant, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs

OTHERS PRESENT:

Blane Merkley, Industry and Global Trade Coordinator, Nevada's Department of Agriculture
Heather Sheppard, Senior Vice President, Fahlgren Mortine
B.C. LeDoux, Managing Partner and Chief Creative Officer, Noble Studios
Claudia Dattilo, Media Director, Fahlgren Mortine

AGENDA ITEM A—CALL TO ORDER

Chair Anthony:
[*Lt. Governor Anthony called the meeting to order. Roll was taken and a quorum established.*]

AGENDA ITEM B—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Anthony:
[*Lt. Governor Anthony reviewed public comment guidelines and called for public comment.*]

Kelly Benoit, Executive Assistant, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs:
Mesquite has submitted public comments, and they have been added to the record [Exhibits B and C].

Chair Anthony:
Thank you. Anyone else want to do public comment?

Cortney Bloomer, Destination Development Manager, Travel Nevada:
[*Ms. Bloomer came forward to present as a member of the public.*]

Mr. Chair, in February of this year, you stood before a crowd of enthusiastic citizens in Mesquite at our 3D community meeting and gave a heartfelt speech in which you expressed your pride and excitement at their grant. You said, "It's exciting for us when we give out these awards to these towns and cities that have an opportunity to do something different, as far as tourism is concerned." You encouraged communities to reinvent themselves and thanked the community for their participation and challenged other communities to live up to the example set by Mesquite.

I can assure you, Mesquite did do an exemplary job on their project and very much lived up to your praise. And yet, that award is not part of Item L on today's agenda. It was removed after private discussion between one of the Commissioners and Travel Nevada's CEO, Rafael Villanueva.

The decision not to include Mesquite's proposal today deprives this body of the opportunity to make their own unbiased determinations as to the merits of Mesquite's proposal, stymies any input by this Commission, and effectively silences the voices of the many citizens and stakeholders that participated in the process.

It is not for me to say whether or not MORF's (Mesquite Opportunities Regional Fund's) submission would have been approved by this body, but I do know that their commitment and dedication are worthy of an open and transparent discussion in this public forum, not of being quietly shelved or revised behind closed doors.

Trust is earned through respect and honest and open dialogue. Our partners across the state deserve that. My colleagues and I have spent years trying to build trust and cultivate relationships between Travel Nevada and the rural communities across our great state. This 3D Destination Development Program has been a critical part of that effort. This decision has damaged that trust.

Let me say that I am proud of the work that consultant Matthew Landkamer and I did on this plan—with the support of others at Travel Nevada—and I am proud of the contributions from MORF, the Steering Committee, and the citizens of Mesquite. The process was collaborative, transparent, and inclusive of any stakeholders who wanted to participate.

It brings me sadness to announce my resignation as Travel Nevada's Destination Development Manager. Due to this disrespect for the program, disregard for the process, and disdain for the people of Mesquite, my conscience will no longer allow me to serve an organization that [falls] short of its responsibility to our citizens or to a leader that fails to exhibit the transparency and trust that are central to good government.

Serving alongside the people of Nevada has been the honor and privilege of my life. My heart is with the people of rural Nevada and, specifically today, with Mesquite.

Mr. Lt. Governor, I encourage you to call a special session of this board and honor Mesquite's commitment and hard work by approving their grant award as it was referred to this Commission by the 3D Project Working Group. Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Which agenda item were you speaking on?

Ms. Bloomer:
[*Ms. Bloomer clarified off microphone that this was public comment regarding Agenda Item L.*]

Chair Anthony:
Okay, very good. Thank you. Any other public comment?

John Rosen, Vice Chair, Mesquite Opportunities Regional Fund:
Thank you for the opportunity to address this group. It is true that we were surprised—that is a very calm word—to learn, indirectly, that our application would not be included as part of this agenda for this meeting today. As [Ms. Bloomer] mentioned, we were extremely excited to be a part of this program. It is a unique program, of course, and it is an absolutely exceptional program, or collaboration between tourism experts and motivated communities

who want to seriously invest time, energy, effort, financial resources into becoming a primary tourism destination. The grant application process was described to us in detail, that we would have to apply to become a member of this program. It was a unique grant program, and we did spend an enormous number of hours preparing our application to become considered for one of the applicants.

We were thrilled to learn that we had been selected as one of the two applicants for this cohort. We then started working with our consultants, both in data gathering, in listening sessions, in brainstorming sessions. We had a Steering Committee of approximately 25 people, and those 25 people represented a wide variety of constituents from our community. There were the major resorts that were included and represented. There were sports providers that were included. There were members of our municipal government that were included. Our Chamber of Commerce president was included. There were just so many different people represented on that Committee, all of whom were—for one of the first times I can remember in Mesquite—all pulling on the same end of the rope, in terms of trying to develop something that would benefit all of us and would be shared by all of us.

We did the work. [Ms. Bloomer], you said they were impressed with the work product that came out of that. We are grateful for that, but it was not by accident. It was a tremendous amount of contribution by every single member of that Committee.

After approximately four months of work through several sessions, including the listening sessions that were commented on, which were very heavily attended by our community—which is extremely excited about this—we did what we were asked to do, which is to wait for the consultants to gather together all of the information they had gathered and produce for us their recommendation of a ten-year destination plan. We got that ten-year destination plan; the next step in the process was for us to review the plan.

Chair Anthony:
Sir, you have about 30 seconds left in your public comment, if you could wrap it up.

Mr. Rosen:
Thank you. We completed all the steps in the process, waited for outcome, and then learned, by accident, that we were not even going to be included in the agenda for this meeting. In fact, we were not formally notified that we would not be included in the agenda yesterday afternoon, at a little bit before noon. I do not understand why or how that could happen and would very much be interested in learning the background behind this.

Chair Anthony:
Very good. Thank you. Any other public comment?

Amy Bradshaw, Committee Member, Mesquite 3D Steering Committee:
I just want to speak about the impact this 3D Project has had on our community and why the recent removal of the funding item from the board agenda has been both surprising and quite discouraging to many of us who participated in the process.

Over the past year, the 3D grant was more than a planning exercise. It was a community-wide effort that brought together business owners, tourism stakeholders, volunteers, nonprofits, elected officials, and residents who shared a common belief in Mesquite's future as a destination. Collectively, community members contributed more than 750 volunteer hours to meeting surveys, research, and strategic planning. Using Nevada's estimated volunteer hourly value, that represents more than $24,000 of donated time and expertise invested directly into the project.

In addition, nearly $10,000 in administrative support was provided through private funding sources to ensure that our project was properly coordinated. Together, that represents over $34,000 in local investment before considering the countless additional contributions made by participating organizations and businesses.

People showed up because they believed in this effort. They believe this effort mattered. They took time away from their businesses and their families to help create this long-term tourism strategy for Mesquite. They participated in good faith, trusting that the recommendations developed through this process would be honored and serve as a road map for tourism development. The final plan is a result of a hundred conversations, thoughtful analysis, [*inaudible*] community listing, session attendance, and months of collaborative work supported and led by Travel Nevada consultants and staff. For that reason, we were surprised and very dismayed to find out that the funding allocation announcement was removed from the board agenda. After a year of work and significant local investment, there was an expectation that the project would continue moving forward.

Now, this is not simply about funding. It's about honoring the commitments that were made by all of our volunteers, our stakeholders, and our private supporters who invested their time and energy and resources into developing a meaningful, long-term vision for our community. We remain excited about the plan and the opportunities it presents for Mesquite, but more importantly, we remain committed to seeing that the Travel Nevada plan recommendations are implemented. Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you for your comments. Anyone else want to make public comment?

[*There was a brief interruption due to technical difficulties.*]

George Gault, Founder and Chair, MORF:
Everybody has made commitments and spent time and so on. We are left in an awkward position. We have Travel Nevada experts, 3D experts, marketing people saying, "[you] should have," "the solutions include" the destination marketing organization, our own website, and revitalization of Mesquite, and then we come to find out that there apparently is a historic agreement with LVCVA (Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority) that some of those activities will be done by LVCVA. Where the hell do we go? That is our question.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you. Who else is on there for public comment?

Kat Galli, Chair, Frontier Territory:
I am making public comment today because I am concerned about Agenda Items L and I. When reviewing the agenda last week, anxiously awaiting the award of the 3D Program, I was very confused about not seeing Mesquite Opportunities Regional Fund as part of Agenda Item L. I talked with a few other Tourism partners who were equally puzzled. I reached out to MORF to find out what they knew, only to find out they were never notified about the item not being included on the June agenda.

I subsequently reviewed the 3D Grant guidelines linked on TravelNevada.biz, which clearly lists the project timeline under section 2, naming the June 2026 Commission meeting as the award announcement. As the Frontier Territory Chair, I participated in Goldfield Main Street's 3D process and know how much work goes into creating the Destination Development Plan. Various community organizations, local businesses, the county, and private citizens participated in the many meetings over the course of six months and provided feedback and insights, voiced concerns and wishes, and worked together to come up with what would be best for their community and region.

Because we are all a tightknit community in the Main Street and tourism industry across the state, I know Mesquite was equally enthusiastic and involved their community in creating their plan. I know very well how stressed the many volunteers were with the very tight timeline of the due date of the rural marketing grant applications, participating in Rural Roundup in Elko, and the 3D Grant deadline.

I have since read the letter sent by Travel Nevada to MORF explaining why the item was pulled, stating that presenting this grant before achieving alignment across Mesquite partners would be premature and could jeopardize the quality and credibility of our submission. I am honestly confused [as to] what the strategic planning process was for. When one entity chooses not to participate in the process, others volunteer over 650 hours to create a plan. The lead-up applicant submits a grant application tying into the plan. The application is reviewed by staff and a committee of multiple Travel Nevada partner organizations and meant to be awarded by the full Commission; yet one entity has the power to veto the one-year process? This not only concerns me for Mesquite, but also for the entire project and our many rural communities' trust in Travel Nevada processes and whether the work of our partners, much of which is volunteer time, is honored and valued.

As the Chair of Frontier Territory, how do I encourage any of our partners to participate in the program if I, myself, have concerns about the process and fairness? Partners have voiced concerns to me and have indicated they will not be commenting on today's meeting due to worries of being retaliated against. How do we make those protections with our many small partners?

I was also confused to see the back-ups for Item I, stating that MORF's website would compete with that of LVCVA and should, therefore, not be funded. As Territory Chair, I spent many hours preparing for and participating in the Territory Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on May 11th [of 2026], where all chairs agreed with the staff recommendation of fully funding MORF's Rural Marketing Grant application. Decisions disagreeing with the TAC recommendations should be made by the full Commission. Clearly, someone realized this conflict, as the back-up for Item I linked on TravelNevada.biz has since been updated.

Thank you for your time.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you. Anyone else on public comment? [*There was none.*] We will end public comment.

AGENDA ITEM C—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE COMMISSION MEETINGS ON DECEMBER 9, 2025, AND MARCH 4, 2026 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Chair Anthony:
We will take December 9, 2025, minutes [Exhibit D]. Are there any questions or comments on the minutes of that particular meeting? [*There were none.*] Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

Commissioner Santos:
I would move to approve, subjected that all of the Commissioners' corrections have been included. I would also like, since these are being summarized, that in the future, when we receive our minutes, we also receive the transcription of what was actually said so we can compare those.

Chair Anthony:
Okay. We will do that.

> COMMISSIONER SANTOS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON DECEMBER 9, 2025.
>
> COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will now go to the March 4, 2026, minutes [Exhibit E]. Are there any questions or comments about those minutes? [*There were none.*] Is there a motion?

Commissioner Santos:
I would make the same motion I made for the December 9th [minutes].

Chair Anthony:
Very good.

> COMMISSIONER SANTOS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON MARCH 4, 2026.
>
> COMMISSIONER LARRAGUETA SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM D—WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS (DISCUSSION ONLY)

Chair Anthony:
I just want to thank the board for volunteering to be on this Commission and providing your input to make sure we are improving tourism in Nevada.

Some of the things that I have done since our last meeting—I did a tour of northern Nevada; Lovelock Caves, Lovelock Courthouse, Carlin, Unionville, Battle Mountain, Ely. I threw out the first pitch at the Las Vegas Aviators [game] in Las Vegas. I also did the tourism video that is going to be played during the Aviators game, promoting tourism in Nevada, because we have a lot of tourists that come to these games. It is a good way to pitch Nevada.

I welcomed the National Convention of Paralyzed Veterans of America to Planet Hollywood. I welcomed 20,000 leaders in the AI field at the ServiceNow Knowledge [Expo] at the Venetian. I visited the Smith Valley Historical Society with Senator Robin Titus in Lyon County. I threw out the first pitch with my fellow Commissioner Santos at the Reno Aces game. I toured the construction site of the A's stadium, which is going to be an absolutely magnificent addition to making Las Vegas the sports capital of the world.

I was up here for Memorial Day as a keynote speaker at the Northern Nevada Veterans Memorial, and then I was at the Rockin' Rib-Fest at [Casino] Fandango. [It was a] busy couple months' tour of Nevada.

Commissioner Larragueta:
I would just like to advise the Commission and those in attendance of a program that had been developed by the University of Nevada College of Business. Myself and the Lt. Governor, amongst other business leaders in the community, have been asked to sit in an advisory committee for the Tourism Executive Advisory Council. This is part of the program of the University of Nevada College of Business, led by UNR Dean [of the College of Business] Greg Mosier, of starting a tourism minor program in hospitality at the University of Nevada. Obviously, everybody is very familiar with the Hotel School at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas—one of the best in the country, if not the best. And so I applaud northern Nevada and the University of Nevada, Reno, for bringing this to light for northern Nevada.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM E—TRAVEL NEVADA QUARTERLY REPORT (DISCUSSION ONLY)

Rafael Villanueva, Chief Executive Officer, Travel Nevada:
Good afternoon, Commissioners. Before we dive into the Q3 highlights, I would like to take a moment to recognize a few important milestones for our organization. First, I am pleased to introduce you to the newly promoted Chief Marketing Officer Keelie Cox. Keelie has been an integral part of our team and has played a significant role in the results reflected in the report you had a chance to review. Her promotion reflects her exceptional contribution and her competence in her strategic vision for Travel Nevada's future. She will be presenting highlights this morning alongside Chief Communications Officer Tracie Barnthouse and our Chief Industry Development Officer Nicole Orsua.

I also want to update the Commission on two significant organizational accomplishments. After completing a thorough state procurement process, we have finalized our agency of record selection. We are moving forward with Noble Studios and Fahlgren Mortine as our creative and communications partners, and we are confident that both agencies will continue the great work that they have done on behalf of Travel Nevada. Their proven track record and deep alignment with our brand makes them the right partners to help us carry our mission forward.

Additionally, we completed the RFP (request for approval) on market representation in three key markets. Following a competitive review, we will continue our partnership with

Canuckiwi, who will represent us both in Australia and Canada, and Black Diamond, who will lead our efforts in the United Kingdom and Ireland markets. The continuity of these relationships speaks strongly about the work that they have done and what they have delivered on behalf of the state.

As you have had the opportunity to review our full report [Exhibit F], I offer a brief perspective before our team walks through the highlights. At the core of Travel Nevada, our mission is straightforward: to inspire people to travel to Nevada and to enhance the visitor experience so that when they arrive, they will come back. Everything we do is in the service of these two goals. The metrics—the data points in the report—are the tools we use to make sure we are deploying our resources effectively and moving the needle in the right direction. They help us understand whether our message is reaching the right audience, whether the partners are benefiting, and whether we are creating the kind of meaningful connections that turn our first-time visitors into loyal ones.

With that lens in mind, and as you have seen in this report, I am proud of the strong quarter our team has delivered. Despite some headwinds from shifts in the digital search landscape, the quality of the traffic and the audience engagement improved meaningfully. Our *Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold* campaign has been a major highlight, significantly elevating Nevada's profile as an adventure and outdoor destination. And while there are always areas for us to sharpen and improve, the results reflect the team that is focused, strategic, deeply committed to the mission.

With that, I would like to turn it over to Tracie, Nicole, and Keelie to walk you through the highlights.

Keelie Cox, Chief Marketing Officer, Travel Nevada:
Good afternoon. I am going to lead you through the Marketing and Communications portion of our quarterly report [Exhibit G, Slide 3]. Our television show we recently launched with Outside TV—*Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold*—was launched on February 26th of [2026]. So far, the results have been better than we could have hoped for. Since late February, we have received over 1.7 billion earned media impressions, over 4 million watch hours, and—I learned this morning—we now have over 30 million total episode views. The television show was added to Outside's YouTube channel, and you cannot beat the comments that we are reading on there. And I will read a few of them for you aloud.

[*There was a brief discussion about providing the Commissioners with a copy of Travel Nevada's PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit G).*]

As I mentioned previously, we have received amazing YouTube comments, and so I am going to read a few of them out loud to you:

> *"I have never thought too much about Nevada but this series has made me fall in love. Definitely want to spend some time there"*
>
> *"Totally digging this series! Nevada looks like an ultimate playscape. I had no idea there is so much beauty, nature and adventure to experience. These videos totally grabbed a hold of my imagination. Thank you for sharing this."*

We also put together a short testimonial video that we will play for you [Exhibit G, Slide 7]. It features some folks that were in our series and what life has been like since the show's launch.

> *[Transcription of the testimonial video.]*
>
> ***Liz Woolsey, Owner, Stargazer Inn & Bristlecone General Store, Baker, Nevada:***
> *My store was featured in episode four of* Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold*, and ever since the episode aired, I have people coming into the store saying, "I saw the episode! That is why I am here!" or "I was planning my trip through Nevada, and I saw this episode, and I was really excited to be able to plan my trip based on the things that were shown in the show."*
>
> ***Chris Martinez, Climbing Enthusiast, Wild Granites, Nevada:***
> *Alex Honnold and Tommy Caldwell were out here in October with the film crew to film one of the episodes—part of episode two for* Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold*—and since the episode dropped two-and-a-half months ago, this place has gotten busy.*
>
> *I have to qualify that. So, all of last year—the eight months I was out here working off-and-on on stuff—15 new people. Since the episode dropped? Thirty-three new people in a little bit over two months. What is that, over 200-plus percent increase in two months?*
>
> ***Ms. Woolsey:***
> *So, well done, and cheers to everyone on the team!*

Thank you very much. I will now pass it over to Tracie.

Tracie Barnthouse, Chief Communications Officer, Travel Nevada:
I am here to talk you through our Dariustwin partnership which you might recall from past meetings [Exhibit G, Slide 8]. This is a content creator that the team identified as being a really great fit for Travel Nevada back in Fiscal [Year] (FY) 2024. As part of that, he does light paintings out in rural destinations. We thought it was a really great alignment with Travel Nevada, to get out there. Neon with nature; that is what we do, right? And he was a perfect partner for that.

This was a super integrated project. We wanted to go beyond social media; so, part of the partnership with him was to develop an exhibit at a museum in Nevada. In Q3—this quarter—that took place. We had an art exhibit open in the Nevada State Museum, Las Vegas, and to even further integrate on that, we had our Las Vegas media mission take place at the exhibit. Not only was it a great opportunity for our partners to connect with the Las Vegas media that they have met along the year—we have had, I think, three in-state media missions over the past couple years—those relationships continue to build with our partners, and we think that is a really important opportunity to meet them and continue those relationships and conversations with the media. But it also provided media [with] a way to get into the exhibit and see it before it opened. The event was actually the day before the grand opening. We offered free admission to Nevada residents during Nevada Day.

The exhibit itself saw a 2,000-person increase in visitation year-over-year. We definitely think that the exhibit was a success. We heard from our partners and also Darren [Pearson, also known as Dariustwin]. He was very passionate and very excited. He brought his family; his parents flew in. It was his first domestic art show, and so he was really excited. It was a really great partnership and a really great example of a good, integrated project that we put together at Travel Nevada. We wanted to share those details.

Ms. Cox:
We currently have a campaign running with the Reno Aces where we have taken over their outfield [Exhibit G, Slide 9]. Here on the presentation, you can see some photos of what our branding looks like at the stadium. Among some other branding beyond what is in the photos, we wrapped the drink rail by the HOME Bar, and it allows you to take a tour of Nevada via our ten road trips. It is one of my favorite pieces out there.

There are QR codes throughout the outfield where folks can learn more about what to do in Nevada, or even enter to win some prizes. So, if you guys attend a Reno Aces game this year, I would invite you to venture out there. Check it out. I think it turned out really nice. We also sponsored the foul ball; so, anytime there is a foul ball during the game, the announcer yells, "Well, that ball got a little out there!"

This is more [about] looking ahead—it happened in Q4, not Q3 [Exhibit G, Slide 10]. The team recently traveled to Denver, Colorado, for the Outside Days festival. Travel Nevada staff and partners, we worked our activation in Denver, where we chatted with attendees all about the great things to do in Nevada, and then we invited them to check out our VR and to check out our TV show starring Alex Honnold. You can see in the photos below that a surprise guest made an appearance at our activation—it is Alex Honnold.

I am going to kick it off to Tracie to talk about the media event.

Ms. Barnthouse:
Another great example of an integrated project was Outside Days. Not only did it combine a consumer activation component, it also included a trade and a PR aspect, as well.

Denver is an On Deck market for Travel Nevada. You probably recall hearing that in past Commission meetings. It is PR-led, to start with. We activated our PR media mission in Denver at Outside Days in collaboration with the trade team. They invited some tour operators, as well. It is a very broad, well-rounded attendee group of people who live in the Denver area that we are targeting; not only on the trade side, but also on the PR side. It was really important. We will have more data to share about how many media, how many partners, any coverage that we get, in future Commission meetings, but overall, we think it was super successful for the first time we have done this kind of trifold project. [We are] very excited to share more at the next Commission meeting.

Nicole Orsua, Chief Industry Development Officer, Travel Nevada:
In this quarter, our Global Market Manager attended a mission in Australia [Exhibit G, Slide 12]. She went ahead of the Brand USA Business-to-Business (B2B) event where, with our in-market representation, she and partners traveled to Melbourne, Brisbane, and Sydney, and in total, was able to engage with over 50 travel agents as a result of the mission appointments, where they were able to do educational presentations, as well as the one-on-one appointments at Brand USA.

We also went to Canada in the third quarter [Exhibit G, Slide 13]. It was the Canada Sales Mission and the Calgary Outdoor Adventure Show. Travel Nevada and partners went to three key cities—Toronto, Montreal, and Calgary—and were able to drive awareness and promote Nevada's tourism offerings to our trade partners, as well as consumers, highlighting Nevada is ready [to warmly] welcome Canadians when they come to Nevada. The Outdoor Adventure Show is a two-day consumer show, and it has over 13,000 attendees.

Looking ahead at activities that took place in our fourth quarter, the big one—as you all know, as you were able to join us—was Rural Roundup [Exhibit G, Slide 14]. We would like to thank our partners in Elko at the Elko Visitors and Convention Authority for their amazing partnership and the job well done that their team was able to execute there. At the next Commission meeting, we will go through our survey responses so the Commission can see the responses from our attendees.

In addition, the team got back about a little less than a month ago from IPW 2026, which took place in Fort Lauderdale[, Florida] [Exhibit G, Slide 15]. For the fifth year in a row, Travel Nevada, the LVCVA, and the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA) partnered together for a Nevada welcome breakfast. We do this in the morning, as it is different than many of the other parties that tend to happen, [which] tend to take place at nighttime. We tend to welcome our trade partners and media partners [with] a party breakfast and get ready for the day full of appointments.

Ms. Barnthouse:
We will open it up to questions.

Chair Anthony:
All right, I will open it up. Does anybody here have any questions or comments?

Commissioner Santos:
On the international travel, when you had the opportunity to speak with some of the folks in Canada and Australia, what were some of their concerns about traveling to Nevada? Or, do they have any concerns about traveling to Nevada?

Ms. Orsua:
Concerns to traveling to the United States itself is very dependent on the states that you are in, in Canada. Some are potentially more—the public saying, “I am not going to come.” The biggest outtake from that meeting was learning about the silent travelers. This is something that has been documented by Brand USA and the U.S. Travel Association, as well. Many Canadians are continuing to travel to the United States; they are just not talking about it.

Commissioner Santos:
Was there any concerns with the—some of the concerns I have heard about the high cost of hotels, food—that component of it, compared to what they experienced in the past?

Ms. Orsua:
Exchange rate has always been a high concern when it comes to Canadian travelers. It still ranks in the top reasons for potential barriers, but intent still shows that there is intent to travel, which is why our approach is really to focus on the trade at the moment, because we want to make sure that our agents—the agents there—are ready and prepared to sell the state when people start increasing inquiries.

Also, going to the Adventure Show meant we were able to hit our own niche audience, who want to explore and come and see things that maybe are not on the beaten path. But, exchange rate still is a concern for many countries that have a high exchange rate.

Commissioner Santos:
Was there any discussion from folks that have made alternative plans to go to places other than Nevada, and if so, what was it that made them make the decision to go somewhere other than Nevada?

Commissioner Brunelle:
If I could? What we have been hearing—and we actually have our international offices here in Las Vegas this week. We have a summit where we bring in our office staff from Canada, Mexico, the UK, South Korea, Germany, Australia.

A couple of points that you had brought up—one is, in Canada in particular, the currency exchange rate is actually higher than it has been in some time. What we are hearing is that Canadian travelers are actually moving their trips to Europe. They are going to Japan; they are going to South American. And that is being primarily driven by Canadian carriers who have moved their lift from the U.S.—not just Nevada, but from the U.S. They have redirected their planes now, so that they are now flying to Central America, South America, the Caribbean, more Mexico, Europe, and Asian, and overflying the U.S.

We are seeing a few good signs in terms of flights returning, and I will speak specifically about Las Vegas. Air Canada has actually up-gauged their flights to Las Vegas, starting in November, running from November through the month of March. What we are seeing there is that they will be flat year-over-year, which sounds not as encouraging, but we were going to be down about 24,000 seats year-over-year. So, we are actually seeing some positive moves, but what we are hearing from our offices in Canada is that, at this moment, it is taking time.

And I think the comment that Nicole made about the silent travelers—that is part of what we are hearing in terms of, those that are 50 [years of age] and above are traveling now again [but] just are not saying anything to anybody. They are not posting it on social media.

When we think about Australia, there is a lot of great opportunities when we think about the nonstop flights that are going to start from Sydney to Las Vegas in December and run through the middle part of March.

So, there are positive signs, but there [is] also still quite a bit of friction on the geopolitical side when it comes to Europe and some of those markets. The message is about things to do in Nevada that are beyond gaming and partying. [These] are things that we are hearing travelers want to hear about the state and Las Vegas in particular.

Commissioner Santos:
Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Anyone else here [in Carson City] have any questions? [*There were none.*] Are there any questions in Las Vegas? [*There were none.*]

Commissioner Moon:
I am at the Aces game on Friday, so I will take some pictures for that. I am excited to see it!

AGENDA ITEM F—FINANCE REPORT AND FY2027 BUDGET (DISCUSSION ONLY)

Stewart Terry, Chief Financial Officer, DTCA:
This first thing we are going to go over here is in the same line with what you guys usually see each quarter. You will see in our Category 31—which is our broad special use category that houses the majority of DTCA's activity—overall, we are at about 69 percent spend for the fiscal year, with about 31 percent remaining to spend [Exhibit G, Slide 18]. I would say, around this time of the fiscal year, that is, I think, a little bit better than we were at last year as far as getting timely invoices paid out and everything, but [is] within the realms of what is normal. As you guys have probably heard countless times, July and August—sort of our dual fiscal year period for the state—we have frequent invoices, as well as grant drawdowns, come in right up until the middle of August. So, that is fairly normal there.

Similarly, down in Category 40 for our Rural Grants Program, it is a little less far along, but I would say, the nature of the Rural Grants Program is such that they are naturally more heavily weighted toward coming in late in the fiscal year [Exhibit G, Slide 18]. So, I would also categorize that 50 percent spend being about on track with what we expect to see in mid-June.

This branch is now in discussion about the realities of the economic environment and the downturn in lodging tax revenue. Ultimately, we have a need to balance our expenditures and our revenues around maintaining a 60-day reserve. This is something we have discussed previously, and I actually have a new [PowerPoint presentation] slide that we will get to in a couple minutes to, hopefully, demonstrate the mechanical flow in and out of our reserve calculations. But, ultimately, we are mandated by the Legislature and the Governor's Finance Office to maintain a reserve at a certain level. For us, that is now a 60-day level of reserve.

I am going to use some round numbers here because this ebbs and flows, depending on exactly the expenditure rate. But, a good rule of thumb to have in your head for us departmentally is: we burn about $100,000 in lodging tax per day across the entire Department—so, Division of Tourism, Arts Council, Administration, Museums, et cetera. That naturally follows, then, the 60-day reserve level is about $6 million that we need to make sure we are targeting based on our best projections for the end of a given fiscal year.

Given that lodging tax revenue is coming in pretty substantially below what was projected heading into the last legislative session [in 2025] and last budget bill that we were balanced around, that has resulted in a need to reduce the spend for the subsequent fiscal year by about $4.9 million to maintain that 60-day reserve threshold level. Kyle [Shulz, Research Director, DTCA], in just a few minutes, is going to get into the mechanics of those projections and what those are looking like, those circumstances.

You can see on this current slide here [Exhibit G, Slide 18], we are dropping down from a spend in our Category 31 of about $20.5 million in FY26, down to just over $15.5 million in FY27. Based on our current projections of revenues, this is going to get us right at that minimum 60-day reserve level. So, we are reducing the spend by the absolute lowest amount possible to still maintain our required reserve level. We are monitoring the revenue situation very closely. I can say—and I am speaking a little bit out of my lane here, so, apologies, Kyle, if I get anything wrong. Please correct me if I do. But, from my layman's perspective of the tourism industry, I think we are seeing some hopeful signs out of Las Vegas as far as the effort to enhance affordability a little bit. We have seen some positive trends after our most recent projections. So, we are hoping the situation can soften a little bit, but ultimately, that is where we are right now, and that is why you see that Category 31 for the FY27 plan's spend down by just under $5 million.

Separately from this [presentation], I did put together something we will send to you guys, which is just a demonstration of how the reserves flow [Exhibit G, Slide 22], but I can speak to it in a broad sense real quick here. I am just speaking in round figures here and hypothetically, but let us say we have a balanced budget where we are authorized to get $20 million of revenue to support $20 million of expenditures in a given year. Let us say that those expenditures then come in; we did not spend $3 million that we were originally planning to spend, so the expenditures only came in at $17 million. Similarly, revenues came in lighter, but they came in at $19 million instead of $20 million. So, you can see that we essentially have a net $2 million difference there, or a net $2 million underspend. We spend $3 million less than we were allowed, but we collected $1 million less than we were allowed. That remaining $2 million would then—taking this just as an individual piece—be our reserve level after that Year 1 [of the biennium]. Now, if something similar happened in Year 2, and we either overspent or under-collected—

Commissioner Moon:
—It is in our packet.

Mr. Terry:
Oh! It just was not in the slide show. Right, so what you are looking at is totally correct; the blue and green boxes. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Moon:
You are welcome.

Mr. Terry:
You can see on the right how that can feed into that at a slightly different scenario. We underspent again, in this demonstration, for Year 2, but we also vastly under-collected in revenue, which meant we would then have to tap into the reserve to balance things out going forward.

My hope—and I am totally down for any feedback once you guys have a chance to digest this a little bit—but my hope is to make sure you are all confident and comfortable with the mechanics of the reserves, because that really is what our decisions on throttling our spend a little bit are turning on.

With that, I am happy to entertain any questions you guys have.

Chair Anthony:
Okay. Anyone in here have any questions? Go right ahead.

Commissioner Santos:
On your "FY26 Tourism Category 31 Expenditures as of 06-03-2026" [table] [Exhibit G, Slide 18]—and if you did say this, I apologize I missed it—but the reality is—maybe because I am getting old, my hearing is going, it is hard to really hear in here with the echo, and when people start talking fast, it is hard for me to catch up—but the $254,327, which is "unassigned," is that the reserve?

Mr. Terry:
That is not the reserve. The reserve is calculated at the departmental level, not at the Division of Tourism level. That unassigned amount is what we have in authority from the Legislature for this category that we do not think is actually going to get spent this year. We try to maintain fairly frequent contact with Rafael's staff to make sure we have an idea of what their planned spend is. You know, did something change a little bit? And, in this area, do you think they are going to be spending a little less? And sort of refine those as we come in at the end of the fiscal year. Right now, that $254,000 amount is an amount that we were authorized for [which] we do not think is going to be actualized this fiscal year.

That is a very, very moving target, especially this time of year as we clear out all remaining pending invoices, et cetera, but that is not departmental reserves. That is just an underspend that we already have accounted for.

Commissioner Santos:
Is that amount within the ballpark that you want to be in? To me, that is a lot of money. What happens to that money? At our next Commission meeting, when we see a whole new document, are we going to see where that went? Did it go anywhere, or does it get put on our—they say, "Oh, they did not spend a quarter-of-a-million dollars this year," so is that going to go into your budget this next year? Why would we not be using that for a bunch of TV ads or some other type of marketing?

Mr. Terry:
As far as mechanically where that is going to go—because this is fully funded by lodging tax, we have the authority to, essentially, at the end of the fiscal year, "sweep" the unspent amount back to the lodging tax reserves. So, this $254,000 that is not currently planned to be spent this year is going to buoy the lodging tax reserves going into next year, which essentially is $254,000 less that we need to cut back on next fiscal year, if that makes sense.

As far as where it is seen, the budget account that houses the reserves is not one that we regularly present to the Commission, but I can certainly take that to the Director [of DTCA] and, if she greenlights me on that, I would be happy to present that, as well.

Rafael Villanueva, previously identified:
Also, when we knew there was going to be a substantial budget cut for next fiscal year, I asked our team to take a look at what they are currently spending and, if there are any areas that we could hold back on so we could have money in the reserves so that it could help for next year's budget, we did so. As invoices still keep on trickling in all the way through August, we have to make sure that we do not go over budget either. So, every year, we play with the dollars and making sure we have some money set up about this time of year to make sure that we do not go over the total budget that we have. But fortunately, any of those dollars will then roll into reserve, like Stewart mentioned, and he would have to do a little extra work to make sure that we can then get that money and put back into our budget for next fiscal year. We started that process not knowing it was $4.9 million; we just knew it was going to be substantial. Since the $4.9 million, the team, for the next year's budget, has been already working within those dollars with hope that we will have some additional dollars to help with reserve and help with the 60-day minimum reserve level too; not knowing what might happen.

This is one of the rare times that lodging tax for the state is going to be less than other taxes—because of the visitors, the lower rates, and the drop in visitation. So, we are having to play with the dollars to make sure we are going to have a substantial amount of money the next fiscal year.

Commissioner Santos:
So, when you look at that $254,327, what is the breakdown of where that money came from in terms of—we did not spend $10,000 here and $20,000 there? What is the breakdown? Because if I am approving a budget in the future, and I see that there is a quarter-of-a-million dollars that did not get spent, I might think, "They have overinflated what they want when they sent us the proposed budget." So, I am just curious. When there were some suggestions, it sounds like, to the team to cut different areas, where did that come from? Did that come from *Nevada Magazine*? Did that come from marketing? Did it come from travel? We are looking at that number—where were the funds that were not spent on?

Mr. Villanueva:
In September, we are going to give you the end-of-year [report], and they will be able to tell you exactly how much was left over. At that point, we will tell you that we reduced in these elements—because I seriously believe it will be less than that $254,000—but we will not know until we close everything out. In September, I will break down where the dollars remain. The biggest bucket is on our marketing, on our advertising side, but that also has a [lot] to do with the work our agency does. They usually have a dollar plan, but they also work very hard to make sure we pay less for the media that we buy. And they have negotiated extremely well, but we have to project more just to make sure they do not [go over budget]. So, in September, we will be able to give you more details on that.

Commissioner Santos:
Going back the last five or six years, what is the history of what the unassigned amount was each year?

Mr. Terry:
I do not have [that information], and I am struggling to think of a way that I could reasonably, efficiently gather that information. A part of it is internal control, and how we have reported it has changed a little bit since that time. But I will take that back and give it a think, and if I can put something together that I think makes sense, I will absolutely run it through Rafael up to you guys.

Historically, I think, a more "accurate to the current circumstance" thought, going back five or six years, is the question of the need for the reserve level, which was quite clearly demonstrated with the COVID pandemic when, essentially overnight, revenues dropped off quickly to nothing. That is the reason the reserve exists, essentially. What it is, is a metric saying, "Okay, something catastrophic happens, and you are not getting any more funding starting right now. How long can you maintain your current activity?" That is the standard we are held to, and I think one of the lessons that we learned coming out of COVID, the recovery was very quick and very strong, and so we did our best—and it always lags a little bit with the state bureaucratic authority and whatnot. But, we ratcheted up that spend right as that revenue ratcheted back up. And then, in fairly short order, now 2025/2026, we are seeing a pretty sharp downturn; at least, against what our initial projections were, again, which I think really go to buffer up the need for that reserve level.

As far as the underspend in Category 31, specifically, I think I should be able to piece that together over a number of different Excel files we have in our records. But also, while poking around with that, [I will] work with Rafael and run that up to you guys when we have something that is succinct and makes sense.

Commissioner Santos:
To make sure my question is understood—I am not talking about the reserves. I am talking about this unassigned number and looking at what the history was for the—by the end of the—whether it is September—if that is something that was being provided each year, that there should be a number that says, "At the end of this period, the unspent number was X amount of dollars." From that amount, that can be broken down to these categories under our budget where did not spend as much as we thought.

I just want to have a better understanding as [to] what that number is, what was underspent, and what those categories were, to make sure that [...]. We really should not have a big number like that. To me, if we are budgeted to spend $10, we should spend $10, and [if] it ends up being $9 or $9.50, fine. But, I would just like to have a better understanding of that.

Mr. Terry:
The request is totally understood, and I can envision the reports in my head right now year-over-year. I think we do have that information. Specifically, if you look back to the blue page where we have numbers broken down for Admin, Marketing, Industry development, et cetera, we should be able to tie that back if I just do a little spelunking in our shared files over five or six years. I will work on that, run it up through Rafael.

Mr. Villanueva:
I will share it immediately.

Commissioner Santos:
Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Okay, good. So, Commissioner Santos and you will work together on that and get that information to us before the next meeting in September, and then we will have it on the agenda for public discussion at that point. Is that good, Mr. Santos?

Commissioner Santos:
Yes, sir.

Chair Anthony:
Okay, great. Any other questions or comments here [in Carson City]?

Commissioner Moon:
I may have asked this in the past. The Tourism grants—the $1.5 million Tourism grants—Travel Nevada has done a great job in increasing knowledge capacity and expertise throughout our rural areas, specifically through the Grants Road Show, the 3D trainings, territory leaders retreats and trainings. So, the capacity that sometimes I bring up in terms of the volunteers who need that training to be able to apply for a grant, it has truly increased in the past two years. Last year was the record number of grant applications, and this year, if I remember correctly, was slightly lower. As we move forward, those grant applications will increase. That is just where we are, but there is no movement in that $1.5 million. Now, I realize that we do have large budget cuts here, but in the future, what can we do to move that needle along to increase what is available for rural grants?

Mr. Terry:
Mechanically, that would flow as a part of the—because that is housed in its own category granted authority and the amount by the Legislature every two years. On an even-numbered year—actually, this summer, we are in the middle of this right now—but as you mentioned, it is a tough time to be addressing that because of the revenue downturn. How that would work is, you guys could make that suggestion to Rafael and then, from my seat, I would see that flow up in the course of the budget bill process in the spring/early summer of an even-numbered year, and then that would get presented to the Department Director with prioritization among all the requests from all the different divisions for her to then prioritize and to submit to the Governor's Finance Office at the end of the summer on the even-numbered year, which then goes through their process, and they agree, disagree, negotiate, et cetera, to then roll up to the Governor's recommended budget to present to [the] Legislature.

It is a long way of saying it would just be an enhancement request that I would need to see from Rafael and Rafael's team, and it would flow through the process that way.

Commissioner Moon:
I really would be interested in learning more about that process and helping move that total, to increase that total. Thank you.

Commissioner Elliott:
Just building on Commissioner Santos's comments, I think from the perspective of the $254,327, I also wanted to know why. Why is there remaining funds? As you start looking at the categories—it is categorical. I know that is a cumulative number, right? So, why do we have [remaining funds]? Why were they not spent? It is all just from my perspective. And we start talking about the reserves—and the numbers you were throwing out, that is a whole department budget, right? Because we are just a percentage of that. Because those were big numbers. I quickly added in my head, and I am going, "Well, that is certainly not—we are not responsible for the entire reserves." Which brings me to the question of, "Well, what is the amount of reserves that we are required?"

Mr. Terry:
The reserve calculation requirement for us is done at a departmental level. Travel Nevada and the Division of Tourism is just a piece of it, but the rough number, again, as a department, we burn about $100,000 a day—near as makes no difference. So, roughly, that $6 million figure is the bottom, the absolute minimum that we can have in our reserves. That can be a little bit of a challenging figure to project over time because, as we ratchet back up our spend, then we are averaging more than $100,000 a day; so that is more that we would be required to have in the reserves.

Commissioner Elliott:
Building on that—you have $100,000 a day, and you have some reserves. What is the responsibility of Travel Nevada as it relates to the percentage of the reserves, from a Department perspective? Because, evidently, we are—let us say we are 25 percent of the budget, right? Are we responsible for 25 percent of the reserves? I do not know what the run rate is in that particular requirement of Travel Nevada. Does that make sense?

Mr. Terry:
Absolutely, yes. It is not normally the perspective which we view it from; so, I am trying to piece it together a little bit to handle that, specifically. A good example is: our total Department lodging tax that we are authorized to collect in revenue for the year—this is what we are going to under-collect on. Just, part of the environment we are in. But we are authorized to collect up to $36 million of lodging tax in FY26, as a Department. Travel Nevada and the Division of Tourism gets $26 million of that $36 million. So, it is certainly more than 25 percent. It is over half.

The question of the responsibility for the reserves is a difficult one to partition out specifically to the Division of Tourism itself, because that is a responsibility that is taken specifically as an entire Department picture. Now, the nature of our budgets and the things that our money, that that lodging tax goes to support in our Department is such that it can be difficult to find—

when we identify this, "Hey, revenues were coming in lower, so we need to drop spend in FY27 by $4.9 million." It is difficult to go to, let us say, the Lost City Museum out in the middle of the state and say, "Hey, we need you guys to find savings to chip into this." Because all of their spend, or the overwhelming majority of their spend, is just keeping the lights on. That is not really something we can ratchet up or down to respond to revenue. The only area that we really can ratchet up and down to respond to revenue like that is Category 31; because they are not hard obligations, and it is not a matter of keeping the lights on. That is why that $4.9 million is being shouldered by the Division of Tourism. There is nowhere else for it to go where it would not break a hard obligation or shut something down entirely.

Mr. Villanueva:
To add and to clarify what I said earlier—during this whole process, we were told we were going to have a reduction. Not knowing what that was, I asked the team to look at places where we can tighten up. Knowing that tax collections were less, we may have to be told to cut budget immediately during the process; so we started to try to take advantage of it. The good thing is those dollars will then roll over to next year. The bad thing is we could have used it for other opportunities.

There is about an $80,000 expense—and it is not included in here—that we are going to have to incur because we are participating in a program in Washington, D.C., at the end of the year called The Great American State Fair, and we have to cover staffing for 16 days, 12 hours a day. The estimates we have calculated is about $80,000 to cover just the lodging. We are very fortunate that the Governor reached out to the LVCVA to incur the majority of the cost and build a booth, but their dollars are in excess of $200,000 to $300,000. Fortunately, we are going to be able to have those dollars, which we would not have had if we spent it all going forward.

It is not the best way for us to do things. I would prefer to spend it all and make sure we are doing the job that we are supposed to be doing and driving the attention of the state out there, but this was a time that we were slightly concerned. So, the reason we cut back on certain elements was because I was trying to take a very conservative view and making sure that we were not going to be put in a position at the end of the year that we would have to eliminate a lot of things that we were not planning on.

Commissioner Kerr:
In regards to the $254,000 on the "unassigned," I can totally understand with the room tax revenues down the year-to-date through, I think it was March—was down by 7 to 8 percent—and you have contracts and commitments out there, and not knowing what the rest of the months are going to be, coming in. So, I am not too concerned with the $254,000 as a result of it being unassigned and rolling over. I think that is a conservative approach, and I think that

having a reserve there is fiscally responsible. I think the fact that it is not a zero-based budget and all the way gone—I think that would have been irresponsible.

I, as a Commissioner from the rural areas, am glad that we do have that cushion there to make sure that any unannounced contracts or anything that we were not seeing and the fact that room tax revenues are down is very fiscal, and I would like to thank the Nevada Commission on Tourism and the finance committees to take a look at that.

I understand Commissioner Santos's concerns, but again, I think being fiscally responsible and conservative in this type of market right now is definitely beneficial to the Commission on Tourism. Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Any comments in Las Vegas? [*There were none.*] Thank you.

Kyle Shulz, Research Director, DTCA:
Piggybacking off of what Stewart just presented, we also wanted to present the projections and the thoughts and process that led into that budget amount that Stewart just went over. Needless to say, predictions can be tricky. I wanted to start us off with that sentiment.

To illustrate that point, I thought it would be prescient to look at some past predictions from very smart, very knowledgeable people in their fields that maybe did not turn out to be so well. The first: "Stocks have reached what looks like a permanently high plateau." That was infamously said by Irving Fisher, an economist in the 20th century, in 1929, right before the stock market crashed and plunged us into the Great [Depression].

Next one: "Before man reaches the moon, your mail will be delivered within hours from New York to Australia by guided missiles. We stand on the threshold of rocket mail." That was said by the U.S. Postmaster General in 1959. We have electronic mail now that goes much faster than missiles, but still no missile-guided mail. So, that one did not turn out to be accurate, as well.

Next one: "Television won't be able to hold onto any market it captures after the first six months. People will soon get tired of staring at a plywood box every night." That was a studio executive from Twentieth Century Fox in 1946. [That] also did not turn out to be right. We all carry mini televisions in our phones, where we can, essentially, stream anything 24 hours a day.

So, at the risk of me looking foolish, here is our process and our projections through FY27.

Chair Anthony:
Great way to make the financial report interesting!

Mr. Schulz:
Yes! Thank you.

We wanted to first share the process that we go through when it comes to building projections. Currently, our projections are based off of a regression model, which takes in multiple variables—and in order to make predictions, you need past historical data. What you are really looking for in the past data is kind of a linear relationship—variables that can help to explain something where, if one variable goes up, it seems like the other variable is going up.

It might be a little bit hard to see here, but on the x-axis here [Exhibit H, Slide 4] is "Employment Change"—that is U.S. employment change. Basically, how many jobs the U.S. is adding or subtracting each month. On the y-axis is "Las Vegas Room Demand." We seasonally adjust that because other metrics that we look at are seasonally adjusted. You can see there, there is a rough linear relationship. So, as employment goes up in the U.S., as the U.S. tends to add jobs, Las Vegas room demand also tends to increase. There is a bit of variability in there, as well, but there is a linear relationship.

Another variable that goes into the projections that we use is the "Expected Change in Unemployment." This is a sentiment indicator from the University of Michigan. We lagged that data by three months so it, basically, gets time for sentiment to lead into actual room demand. But again, you can see that there is a linear relationship there. So, basically, what this means is, as sentiment around employment goes up, Las Vegas room demand tends to go up, as well. As sentiment goes down, Las Vegas room demand tends to go down, as well.

Again, we are using Las Vegas here just for pure simplicity terms. We have more or less most of these same variables for different parts of the state, too, but just because the Las Vegas data is the easiest to work with, this is what we are presenting to you all today.

Another thing that we look at for different areas across the state is room inventory and how that is growing or subtracting over time. We do not necessarily think that higher levels of room and inventory cause higher levels of room demand, but there is some semblance of, if room inventory is growing, that means properties developers are more optimistic about an area that they can recoup some profits from the property that they are developing. Same thing goes with disinvestment. If there is disinvestment in an area from inventories lessening, you can probably expect room demand to lower just because of the base for the rooms and the capacity for a destination to hold visitors.

You can see here [Exhibit H, Slide 5], Las Vegas room inventory and room demand generally track pretty well. As new rooms come on board, that generally seems to lead to higher levels of room demand in Las Vegas in particular. [That is] not always the case, obviously, but especially when there is new, bigger resorts coming or new sports projects with hotels coming up around that, that can help to drive demand because there will be some marketing efforts that go along with that. There will be some PR buzz and all of that. So, we look at room inventory, as well, for different parts of the state for some of these projections.

Another component of the projections is average daily rate (ADR) [Exhibit H, Slide 6]. We have looked at this different ways over the last few years. This is just one way that we have looked at it and one way that we are looking at it now. This is kind of an affordability measure. This is ADRs divided by the average hourly earnings ratio. That is, basically, the average earnings from an average U.S. consumer. You can think of this as—if the ratio is five, it takes the average worker five hours of work to afford one room night in a given location. So, you can see how this has ebbed and flowed over time.

In Las Vegas, prior to the Great Recession, this measurement hovered between six and seven. So, it took an average worker, if we are using quotes, between six and seven hours of work to afford one room night in Las Vegas. During the Recession, this dropped down to about four, and it trickled back up and hovered around five for a good while before the pandemic. The pandemic hits; it drops down to two, and it props back up fairly quickly after the state reopens. After the state reopens, there is a lot of pent-up demand. There is a lot of stimulus dollars, so that ratios go between five and six. It hits seven during some of the big events that happened in Las Vegas—Formula 1, the Super Bowl—but since then, it has kind of trickled back down, and it is gradually getting to a ratio of five. Again, which is more or less where it was before the pandemic.

Similar with Washoe County—Washoe County, after the Great Recession, was hovering around three, in terms of their ratio. They trickled back up until the pandemic, dropped back down, shot back up after the pandemic. And again, Washoe County is coming back down towards its longer run average.

Here is what the rest of the state looks like for areas that we have data for—Mesquite, Laughlin, Lake Tahoe, “All Other Counties” [Exhibit H, Slide 7]. You can see the data for Lake Tahoe is pretty noisy. We get that data from Douglas County; that is the South Lake area, the casino area of Lake Tahoe, and so that data can be a little bit noisy from month to month. But, generally speaking, some of our more rural areas—Mesquite, Laughlin, “All Other Counties”—that ratio tends to be less because these areas are more affordable or rates are not as expensive.

One other thing that we do when we review our forecast—because they are economic-based for the most part in nature, we try to look at how other forecasters are projecting the economy to perform over the next 12 to 24 months. This is just a sample of some of the companies whose forecasts we looked at [Exhibit H, Slide 8]. We looked at probably about 12 to 15 in total, but we look at forecasts from organizations like Forbes, J.P. Morgan, Deloitte, Tourism Economics, Wells Fargo, TD Bank, et cetera. Generally, what we are looking for is, we are trying to get an overall consensus view of how these forecasters are expecting the economy to play out over the next 24 months, to give our assumptions a basis moving forward. Essentially, the general consensus when we looked at these back in February—and most of these forecasts were done [in] late 2025—was slower but still positive growth, economically. So, slower but still positive GDP (gross domestic product) growth, slower but still positive job growth, slower but still positive real consumer spending growth, and an unemployment rate that fluctuates between 4 and 5 percent, which is historically low, and an inflation rate between 2.5 and 3 percent. These were the general consensus overview of what these forecasts look like.

So, we plugged those assumptions of "slow but still positive" growth into what we call our "mid-level" projections. We have upside scenarios, downside scenarios, just so we try to be on our feet if things change relatively quickly. It is a little bit hard to see here, but the bright blue line, the teal is historical data [Exhibit H, Slide 10]. The purple line is our projections for how certain economic variables will play out into our model. Again, we are looking at slower but still positive growth in terms of employment change in the U.S., average hourly earnings. For some of the sentiment data that goes into the forecast, we are more or less expecting these to stabilize in an upside scenario. These jump up relatively quickly.

In terms of the average daily rate to average hourly earnings ratio, we have this "moderate slightly" [Exhibit H, Slide 12]—coming back down to its longer term average, which is the trend these are mostly going on, currently. You will also notice there is quite a bit of variability in the historical data for these ratios, whereas the projections moving forward are more linear. We re-seasonalize these when we put these back into our projections, so the room tax model behaves like you would expect average daily rates to behave based on seasonal patterns.

Here is what that ratio looks like for our projections for other parts of the state. Again, we have these stabilizing and/or moderating [Exhibit H, Slide 13].

So, all of that taken into account, here is what those actually mean in terms of projections through FY27 [Exhibit H, Slide 15]. We have three metrics here: room tax collections, room demand, and ADR. These are the metrics that largely make up the room tax—the main metrics we look at when we are doing these projections.

In FY26, we are projecting—at least back in February—$32.6/$32.7 million collections. [In] FY27, about $32 million. Room demand we have increasing slightly from around $53 million in FY26 to around $54 million in FY27, based off of those assumptions. Average daily rates, we have going from about $172 [million in FY26] to $174 [million in FY27].

You will notice that, even though we have room demand and average daily rates increasing from FY26 to FY27, there is a slight decrease in room tax collections. That is because of that big spike you see in July of 2025. In June of 2025, when we closed FY25, Taxation did not give us—some of the deposits for certain jurisdictions did not hit our account until July of 2025. They came to us after the close of the fiscal year. So, even though they were collected in June, they were placed into July's revenue. That is why you see that spike there. Without that spike, without that kind of artificial inflation, if you will, in terms of the collections for July 2025, we would be projecting a slight increase in tax collections from FY26 to FY27.

So, we made these projections back in February. This is how those projections have performed so far, since we have about four months of data [Exhibit H, Slide 16]. Be aware that this data always lags by a couple of months because of room tax collections and visitation data that we get on a lagged basis. The purple line here is what the mid-level projection was; the dashed blue line is what actual collections have come in at. I will use "actual" in quotes here; we do not have full collections for March and April yet, but we do have the visitation data from Washoe and Clark Counties; so, we have a pretty good idea of where we should end up for the urban areas based off of the visitation data.

You can see here [Exhibit H, Slide 16], actual collections have come in—or should come in—a bit better than what the projections were from back in February. This is largely due to average daily rates being higher, particularly in Las Vegas. There has been some big events in Las Vegas the last few months. WrestleMania was in April, a NASCAR event in March, the CONEXPO show rotated in March, as well. So, average daily rates are what is propelling these actual collections to be ahead of projections.

I do want to note a couple of points of caution. Models—any sort of statistical model that you are looking at is always going to be more or less a simplified version of reality. This is no different. We are really only looking at a couple of different variables and plugging them into these models. Moving forward, we may want to expand this projection, make it a little bit more robust, take into account some more economic characteristics and economic data. There are also many other ways to forecast; so, we may want to look at adjusting methods in the future and seeing if those are more accurate based on historical data. Also, any forecast is going to be wrong; it is just a matter of how wrong. This forecast was updated in February of 2026, before the cost of energy started to rise. So, there are no assumptions about how that might affect travel in here.

We started off with a quote. We started off with the sentiment that predictions can be tricky. I figured we would end on a quote that had that same sentiment. It is from the great Yogi Berra: “It is tough to make predictions, especially about the future.” That is where I will leave you, and I will be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Okay, go right ahead.

Commissioner Elliott:
Thank you for your presentation. I am curious—does this information get rolled up into the Economic Forum?

Mr. Shulz:
This does not, currently. I do not know if Stewart has any more insight into the Economic Forum. I think our budget levels are so low that it does not—

Commissioner Elliott:
—I mean, as it relates to the entire overall [...]. Instead of answering my own question, I wanted to make sure because, obviously, I have listened to the Economic Forum.

Mr. Shulz:
We have presented to the Economic Forum in the past about our expectations for tourism. I do not think we did that last Economic Forum; I think two Forums ago. But, these projections do not actually go to the Forum, no.

Commissioner Elliott:
Thank you.

Commissioner Santos:
First, can we get copies of all those? I do not think they are in here [in our packet], are they?

Mr. Villanueva:
We will send a copy.

Commissioner Santos:
Okay, cool. How far back does the data go in terms of when you guys started doing this? Or is this something that someone else does that the data goes far back?

Mr. Shulz:
I started doing these around 2020, which was a very difficult time to forecast. So, my projections go back that far. Before me, it was our previous Research person and previous [Research] Director, Dave Peterson. He did those until, I think, 2019. I think we have the data from his projections. I am not positive, but I, at least, have the ones that I have done.

Commissioner Santos:
So, if you pushed a button on your computer, would you be able to generate these same tables and graphs going back [from] 2019 to the present?

Mr. Shulz:
I could look at building something out like that, yeah.

Commissioner Santos:
And that would sort of show us how things have changed in terms of cost for a hotel room back then, all the way up to today?

Mr. Shulz:
Yeah. We should have data from the average daily rates compared to average hourly earnings back to 2006, at least for Las Vegas, which is not here, because that is when average hourly earnings really started to be tracked by the BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics). For other areas of the state, it is a little bit later, but yeah, we can certainly provide all of those historical "cost of rooms" metrics.

Commissioner Santos:
If it is not a big deal, just pushing a couple of buttons.

Mr. Shulz:
Yes, we can certainly do that.

Commissioner Santos:
Just say, "Herb, it is too much. We are not going to do it."

Chair Anthony:
He said he can do it.

Mr. Shulz:
[*Joking*] I will ask AI to do it.

Commissioner Santos:
I appreciate it, thank you.

Mr. Shulz:
We can certainly do that.

Commissioner Kerr:
Kyle, thank you for your presentation. I have two questions, and one builds on the other. Does your projections include the tourism that is leaking from hotels to Airbnbs?

Mr. Shulz:
That is a good question. Not on the room demand side. Those are just hotels. Airbnb and short-term rentals really only became a thing a few years ago, and so we do not have great historical data for that. I can look at building those into the projection models, to include Airbnb into the room demand models. But, we do have ratios and certain things in the back end for a given level of room demand and a given level of average daily rates. What has that actually translated to in terms of room tax revenue? We plug those in at the back end to try to account for some stuff like that. Same thing with resort fees. We do not collect data on resort fees explicitly, but with those ratios, we can kind of get at that.

Short answer, Annette, is no, but longer answer is, we can look at building those into the projections.

Commissioner Kerr:
Okay, and I know that your "Other Counties" is as good as data—whatever you get, whatever goes in is […] comes out, so—but again, if you could continue to maybe see what kind of modeling for the rurals […]. It is very difficult for me, for example, to do northern Nevada, northeastern Nevada, to say, "Here are the numbers, but they are only Vegas or Washoe, or even Mesquite." Nothing is comparing for the rurals other than "Other Counties" is all linked together.

I know that is very difficult because getting responses back from those counties can sometimes […]. They are not a large enough data sample, but if you could continue to possibly look at some more in-depth modeling for rurals, that would be very [appreciated] because we do have Airbnbs, as well. I am just trying to balance hotels that are […], such as like in Winnemucca, that are now with the lithium mines. They are building their own housing. So, they are not using hotels. As well as, tourism side of things, is going out to Airbnbs as well in the rurals. So, I would appreciate that.

Mr. Shulz:
Absolutely. I can look into that. Thanks, Annette.

Chair Anthony:
Any other questions in this room?

Commissioner Elliott:
Do you integrate with DETR (the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation) and the economists there? Do you have conversations relative to the jobs?

Mr. Shulz:
Yeah, we have a […].

Commissioner Elliott:
Network?

Mr. Shulz:
Yeah, I forget what the exact name is called. It is, I think, the Governor's Economic Council. It sounds much more fancy than it is. But, we meet every month. Our meeting is tomorrow, actually. I am on that call, DETR is on that call, GOED (Governor's Office of Economic Development) leads that call, and there are a lot of other state agencies that all share how we are all looking at our data, what we are thinking about the future. Yes.

Commissioner Elliott:
So, you massage the numbers based on that conversation.

Mr. Shulz:
Yeah, they help to inform some of our assumptions.

Commissioner Elliott:
Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Any questions in Las Vegas? Comments? [*There were none.*]

AGENDA ITEM G—AGRICULTURAL TOURISM PLAN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Nicole Orsua, previously identified:
You are getting handed material that arrived after the meeting was posted [Exhibit I]. Copies have been made for each of you, as well as copies [for the] public in the Carson City office, and will be posted [online] after the meeting.

A year ago from almost today, the Lieutenant Governor requested that Travel Nevada put together a plan for agricultural tourism in northern Nevada. After that ask, Travel Nevada partnered with the Department of Agriculture, as well as had representation from the Lieutenant Governor's Office, to create an informal working group. I would like to recognize and thank Blane Merkley, the Industry and Local Trade Coordinator for Nevada's Department of Agriculture, who participated and is here in the room today.

One of the first questions that came up was, "What actually is 'agricultural tourism'? How do we define it, as a state?" We looked towards the National Agricultural Law Center as a place to start. We also quickly determined that there were more questions than we had answers to, and thus, hired a consultant to assist us with a feasibility study. The findings of that study are what we will go through today.

Oregon State University's recent study showcased the economic impacts of agricultural tourism in the Willamette Valley. From that study, they created the agricultural tourism—"agritourism"—ecosystem, which broke down the different varieties of offerings that could be within the scope [Exhibit I, Slide 3]. That was also used in the methodology for this report.

Examples of agritourism in Nevada [are] things like Tarantula Ranch, where it is a farm stay. We have seasonal attractions—Lotspeich Farm out in Deeth—[and] "you pick" opportunities like Lattin Farms out in Fallon, and many more. There are experiences where people can cut their own flowers, cut your own Christmas trees, sheep shearing demos, recreation that goes into corn mazes or, potentially, wellness tourism, and of course, special events, depending on growth seasons. This is a wide scope.

So, why agricultural tourism? It has been recognized as a possible way to strengthen rural economies by introducing new income streams to the agricultural families and industry. It is a way to preserve culture, deepen understanding [of] the land, and also a way to share the agriculture of your state to its visitors.

The purpose of this study was to identify if there were opportunities for growth, if there were barriers that would have to be uncovered in order to move forward, and then, also to look to see what partnerships would need to be made in order to create growth in the state. Much like the industry itself—agriculture—you often start with the idea, then you start adding in the fertilizer, and it takes time to grow. And that is what we found through this study. There are a lot of steps that may need to be reached in order to move forward.

How this information came about was interviews with participants, including farmers, ranchers, academics, government agencies, and legislators. This was used through recommendation, as well as a snowball method; whereas, participants were able to recommend other people for the consultant to speak to.

This information was combined with existing information—programs of Nevada, as well as our previous reports, academic studies, past agritourism surveys, [and] national and international resources. As well, we were able to get an asset inventory, create benchmarking against competitor states, create an audience alignment, and market potential.

Going into the study findings [Exhibit I, Slide 10]—those that responded to the survey indicated that a larger amount of the agriculture in Nevada, currently, are crop farms and also "value-added." Value-added, I will remind you, in the scope of agriculture tourism, are the smaller things, like farm stands or having a corn maze added to your farm where you normally do other things throughout the year, and then you do that during seasonal.

From there, there are ranchers, and then it breaks down into smaller types that are currently existing [Exhibit I, Slide 11]. When asked if many of them already had agricultural tourism offerings, most said no. That was a 56 percent answer, which showcases there were not very much, currently, in the state. When asked if, out of those types of agritourism activities that they currently offer—"Events" was the highest [Exhibit I, Slide 12]. So, that is farm-to-table dinners, weddings, or events happening at the ranch itself. Next up was "Education"; so, farm tours, workshops, and classes.

Barriers related to risk and regulation [Exhibit I, Slide 13]—throughout the study, themes start to emerge. One of the themes that came to the forefront was the need for workaround liability. Liability [protections], insurance, and also regulatory clarity were things that the respondents indicated were some of the things that would hold them back.

As you can see in the next slide [Exhibit I, Slide 14], "permitting" was number one, [then] "cost," followed by "insurance."

A few quotes that I pulled from the report, as it is more extensive:

> "I think we're one of six states that does not have that law to protect farmers for Agritourism [...]. We could have lost our whole farm over an incident. So that's a big risk right there."
>
> "We were [...] dropped by our insurance company [...] simply because we were getting into having people on our ranch and tourism on there."
>
> "Insurance is big and it's very expensive, and we still carry all of our insurance [...]. And actually, [we] were just talking the other day, going, 'Man, do we do enough business to warrant $18,000 worth of insurance?'"

Opportunities for technical assistance and capacity building [Exhibit I, Slide 16]—creating a centralized resource for farmers and ranchers was another theme that emerged. Whereas, the people in the agricultural industry are experts in their field, there are skills that do not necessarily always translate to the skills needed for tourism. Many of them indicated marketing as one.

So, when asked what supports or assistive programming would be most valuable in enabling their participation in agricultural tourism, many said legal assistance, financial assistance, followed by networking and event coordination [Exhibit I, Slide 17]. They indicated that, like many Nevadans before, they have to pioneer their own way, but it would be very helpful if someone helped match [them] with resources that would be able to make it easier. Some sort of mentorship program was indicated, as there is a lot to learn.

Marketing, storytelling, and consumer awareness gaps was the next theme. There is a broad support for state-level marketing of agritourism assets, but there is also recognition that individual operators would need education and training to bolster their own marketing and allow us to increase it.

So, what support or assistive programming would be most valuable in enabling your participation? This is the same slide we saw before, but now highlighted on it is the answer "marketing assistance," which is the fourth highest [answer] [Exhibit I, Slide 20].

> "Marketing is very expensive and not knowing how to do it—if somebody really wants to do this, that would probably be the biggest thing you could do, is help them with marketing."

> "Marketing and helping with the marketing side—a lot of farmers don't understand it because they're so caught up in the process and the growing that they don't have that creative aspect."

Finance and access to capital [Exhibit I, Slide 22]—agritourism is seen as a way to stabilize farm and ranch income and reduce dependency on commodity prices, but access to capital is still a significant constraint for some. So, when asked how challenging have each of the following been to developing their agricultural tourism offerings, many indicated that "built/physical infrastructure," followed by "political and governance" and then "financial," were the major barriers [Exhibit I, Slide 23]. One quote that I thought was important was that:

> "I think there's some role there for the private farm and agricultural lending institutions—can we build capacity within them so that their lending officers know how to work with Agritourism operations?"

The final theme was "connecting a network of farms." Because Nevada is vast and we have a varied geography, finding opportunities to connect and cross-promote agritourism operations is an important need. It may include strategies such as connecting festivals, trails, and/or passports. So, networking and event coordination was the third barrier when asked what supports or assistive programming would be the most valuable to them.

Respondents recommended that an ultimate goal could be the creating of a map to have "a couple weekends a year where everyone agrees to be open," where [those weekends] can be promoted, but the hardest part is if people do not know when they are open. The other thing, too, is making "pockets [where] geography makes sense—the Carson Valley, Yerington-Fallon, maybe Pahrump Valley where visitors are leaving Las Vegas for a day or two. Statewide trails don't make much sense, but there could be regional clusters."

And of course, as we do already know, we have the Department of Agriculture's craft beverage passport. A respondent said:

> "We've partnered with the Department of Agriculture to create this fun little passport. It's got some 72 breweries, distilleries, tap houses, all throughout the state. So you can kind of see the map. And then every establishment gets its stamp. Every year, by April, we get somebody turning in the whole state, which just blows my mind. Every year. That's a lot of miles, and we have them in every corner of the state."

The next part would be "competitor benchmarking: Nevada versus peer states." This is when the consultant took a framework of evaluating Nevada against Oregon, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado [Exhibit I, Slide 30]. Looking at the categories of: statutory and regulatory framework; state agency roles and coordination; insurance availability and accessibility; technical assistance and capacity building; marketing and promotion infrastructure; enabling legislation (beyond liability); financing and incentives; industry organization and network development; and scale and economic impact. The scale, you can see—4 being the highest, which is a state that would be considered [to be] leading in this area, down to a 1, [which] currently does not exist. Up against our peer states, there is a lot of areas that Nevada—we are not as far along as many of our peers states are in this process.

So then, the framework. Taking all of those themes that emerged, this will start to give us the infrastructure of items that need to be addressed in order to build and grow agritourism in the state of Nevada [Exhibit I, Slide 32]. As you can see here, there are a lot of different themes, and there are a lot of different departments and issues that are beyond what Travel Nevada would be able to do alone. And for that, comes our plan, which is a phase approach, which starts with the creation of a Nevada Agritourism Working Group [Exhibit I, Slide 34]. This Working Group could bring in agencies that are representative of the various themes that emerged in that framework, who could then work together to help address the needs and gaps that were found in the study.

My thought process is, on phase one, like I said, the Working Group is defined and created. And then, we work through the barriers that are presented. In addition to that, Travel Nevada can take the asset audit that is an appendix in our report and compare that against who we currently have in our partner database and start building relationships with the existing agritourism offerings out in the state that we might not have been aware of and be able to extend to them the current programs that we have available that might be able to assist them at this time.

A phase two approach would be then addressing the framework barriers to close those gaps that are identified in the study, and from there, we can build, as a Working Group, educational programming that guides agricultural businesses on how to diversify into agritourism. We can create educational programming assets—like a handbook and/or a toolkit—which we can design and publish and then start to execute to our rural partners.

Phase three would then be—I said it took quickly. Then, we would take all the educational programming, launch it, and take it out to our partners in a roadshow format that has proven to be beneficial to our rural partners when we have done it for our grants.

Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Blane, from the Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA), do you want to add anything to this? Come on up. You have been working on this. I appreciate what you are doing in this area; so, if you just want to pipe in with whatever you want to pipe in with.

Blane Merkley, Industry and Global Trade Coordinator, NDA:
Yeah, this is an exciting project to be a part of. Growing up in Fallon, where we just did school visits to Lattin Farms, the you-pick operation, it hits close to home, but also, in my current role as the Industry and Global Trade Coordinator, to create diversified revenue streams for our farming and ranching communities—and a lot of these folks are already doing this kind of work, or they are running into a lot of barriers or challenges, as the report has said, with getting their operation off the ground and inviting the public onto their place, including ADA accessibility. In the report, obviously, she talked about access to capital, and a lot of that has to do with the security measures to be able to have an operation that allows the public to come onto your place, such as accessibility or sanitation type infrastructure on your actual place.

This was, like I said, a great project to be a part of. The NDA fully supports the Working Group moving forward and continuing to build out a program and a guide that will help our "agri" operations across Nevada to be able to, again, diversify their income and increase the capacity to serve Nevada residents that are interested in having a connection to their food. Thank you.

Commissioner Capurro:
Thank you. I thought that was a great presentation. And, I know you were at the Rural Roundup. We had quite a conversation on this issue at the Rural Roundup. I feel there is a lot of people that were in that room that would want to be part this stakeholder group.

On the barrier page, you got permitting, cost, and insurance [Exhibit I, Slide 14]. I feel like the cost of the insurance was the biggest thing that I walked away with from that. There was a lot of discussion on what other states have done in terms of that; so, I think that really needs to be a focus—the cost of the insurance—because that is what a lot of people's feedback was.

Question for you: [what is] the timing on the stakeholder group?

Ms. Orsua:
Once our budget is approved today, we will be able to make sure [...]. Well, starting after this meeting, in order to, hopefully, be prepared and put together by the start of the fiscal year.

Commissioner Capurro:
Okay, that would be great. I just—there was so much passion in that room. I would like to be involved.

Ms. Orsua:
Thank you, Shelly. Yes, the attendees at Rural Roundup [are] definitely helping create the list of who we want to reach out to.

Chair Anthony:
Just to piggyback on Commissioner Capurro—I am looking at this graph here about the most valuable [...] [Exhibit I, Slide 17]. Legal issues, like liability, permitting, insurance—those are probably legislative issues. Financial assistance—that is probably legislative issues. Introduce a bill to try to get some money allocated, specifically to this. Networking and event coordination—we can do that. Policy advocacy—we can do that. Marketing assistance—we can definitely do that. Technical assistance—we can help with that. So, some of this stuff we can do; some we cannot do.

Going back to the phase one, two, and three [Exhibit I, Slide 34]. The point of today's agenda item is asking for the board's input, any questions, and then, hopefully, getting this approved, which means Nevada would have an actual agriculture tourism program for our state. I think there [are] 11 states that do not have one; now, [that] would be 10 states. We would have an official one, and then we could piggyback on it later.

Going from phase one to phase three, how long is that going to take? As you started, it has been a year. So, it is time to you-know-what, or get off the pot. I have no problem getting a Working Group together, but I would like to have phase three in, like, 30 days. We have been talking about this for a year, so we need to get this going. I would like to have—when can we have an official launch of the Nevada Agritourism Development Program that we can send out to the ranchers and farmers in the state and say, "These are the issues we are going to work on legislatively. These are the issues we are going to work on here. These are the areas we can start helping you today."? When can we do that?

Ms. Orsua:
Thank you for clarifying, Lt. Governor. Once approved, I would be able to share that information with the agricultural and tourism industry. As for how long it would take, many factors depend, like you said, on legislative [process], and those are items that Travel Nevada

is not able to do but are able to provide education for. Part of the process throughout it was confirming that, hopefully, we put a lot in the report that would be able to help that process. But there are things that will have to come out of that, that I cannot say timewise. Therefore, the Working Group would start to form and work through them, but there are things that are—

Chair Anthony:
—When can we have a website up that farmers and ranchers can look at? When can we have a couple of documents that we can make available for ranchers and farmers and say, "This is Travel Nevada, and we are here to help in these areas."? When can we start? Because ranchers and farmers do not know—they do not follow this meeting. They are not attending this meeting. So, how do we get the word out to them that we have this program, and this is how we can help today and this is what we are looking for to help you in the future?

Rafael Villanueva, previously identified:
Again, this is multiple phases. It will take some time to get to that point—collecting all the data that we need to have and providing the appropriate resources. We will not be able to really start this, once we approve this phase from the Commission, until July 1—start the process of getting the Working Group together. And, within FY27, get to the point of, we can have—it all depends on the detail and data that we can get from the Working Group, when we get to that point. It is going to take a substantial amount of time; anywhere from six months to the end of the next fiscal year.

Chair Anthony:
Six months to a year?

Mr. Villanueva:
Yes.

Chair Anthony:
It is not going to take that long. September 1st, we should be [in] phase three [...] June, July, and August. September 1st, we should be able to launch the Nevada Agritourism Development Program. It is not going to take six months.

Mr. Villanueva:
What we will do is we will work with our team, get the [Working] Group together, look at how we can get into the websites. In a few minutes, we are going to be talking about our marketing plan. Our agencies that will be doing anything digital would not be able to do anything until August 1st, just doing that, because their contract ends in 20 days. Then, we are taking the month of July off of anything we can do on our website; so, we can then work with the agency starting August 1st and see when we can at least develop a page, then we can start developing some assets and start growing from there.

Chair Anthony:
All right. I am going to make a motion, and then we will open up for discussion. My motion will be to authorize an Agriculture Tourism Plan, and it will start with phase one, and by September 1, we will have phase three in place with an official Nevada Agritourism Development Program that ranchers and farmers have access to and that we have provided all this information to them so they can start with things like networking, marketing, policy advocacy, technical assistance; and then, financial and legal issues will have to wait for the legislative process.

Any questions or input from the board? We will start in this room [in Carson City].

Commissioner Moon:
I have major concerns about that timeline. That is a very, very fast timeline that we would be looking at in terms of, first of all, budgeting. Secondly, where would you assess and allocate the workflow for that, and who would take over the website and the communications? This is a huge project. That is why it has taken—in what is perceived right now—taken this long to get here, to get the research done. But, in my opinion, we are not even done with the research end of it.

I think if you were to launch something, it would be something along this document, in terms of where you are right now. There is more conversations to be had with the farmers, with the ranchers, with rural Nevada. Rural Nevada is a very independent set of individuals, and [they] are happy to collaborate, but their input and their stakeholding has to be truly upheld.

So, I do have concerns, Lt. Governor, about that—the speed of what would be proposed in that motion.

Chair Anthony:
I appreciate that. Again, we have been working on this for a year. We spent, what was it, $10,000 or $20,000 on a study? We have all this information here. I think that 90 percent of the work is done. So, I am very comfortable that Rafael and his people can do this by September 1st.

Any other questions or comments?

Commissioner Santos:
I am behind this agritourism 100 percent, minus one little component. I would like to throw my hat in the ring also to be a member of the Working Group, and that is in terms of the liability issues. I think my background is something that would provide what I think is very important information to all the stakeholders, so that when there is informed decisions on how it is going to go forward as to that aspect—and dealing with insurance companies [...]. I think I would be able to provide some meaningful thoughts and counsel.

I do agree that you have been doing this for a long time. I would like to see something done quick. On the same point, I want to make sure that we do it on a timeline that does not risk not considering certain things. If the consensus from everyone is that we can get this done by September, then I am willing to roll up my shirtsleeves and do what I can to help. I want to make sure that we have a very good product, because I think that this is an important thing for Nevada.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you for volunteering. I appreciate it.

Commissioner Elliott:
Just building on what Commissioner Santos just said—and our Chair—I am always thinking, we have got a legislative session coming up [in] February. If we need to have a bill or a sponsor ready to go in February, or at least have the tenets of what it might look like, depending on Oregon, Utah, looking at the states that have legislation already in place. That is the first thing. Second of all, there is already components from a financial perspective I think that we can certainly leverage that are already in place. We have contracts with the Small Business Development Center and with Cooperative (the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension), but the USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture) and the Rural Nevada Development Corporation, as well as the SSBCI (State Small Business Credit Initiative) program that is being run through GOED. There is all these different financial components that nobody knows about, right? Unless you know about them.

Certainly, I am happy to participate and bring some of these financial elements to the discussion if we need gap financing, if we need whatever. I appreciate that we are trying to be expeditious getting this off the ground. We have been talking about [it] a long time, and I am really looking at Commissioner Capurro, knowing that we have this session coming up, and we do not want to wait another two [or] three years to get a bill moving forward. If there is something, we need to identify a sponsor and figure out, “What is it that Nevada […]”—and working with Commissioner Santos—“What is it that we need in a piece of legislation, if anything, in order to protect from a liability perspective?” That is my two cents in that, and thank you.

Chair Anthony:
That is actually a good […], because one of my bill draft requests is going to be this, and those have to be submitted when? October? And the budget for the Governor, I think, needs to be submitted October. So, we need to get this done by September 1st if we are going to have a bill draft request and actually submit for finances to run this. So, I appreciate you bringing that up.

Any questions or comments in Las Vegas?

Commissioner Brunelle:
Listening to Commissioner Moon and thinking about timeline, I would like to propose that we have the staff of Travel Nevada, between now and September, make sure that they have got the information in place so that they can determine what level of information to be posted on the Travel Nevada website. Perhaps it goes to the end of what Commissioner Moon talked about, which is, “Here is what our plan is, and here is what our phases are.”

I know that there are many priorities that the Travel Nevada staff has as we move into the next fiscal year, including moving forward on August 1st with launching the marketing plan, et cetera. So, I would like to propose that, when we look at September as a launch, it would be a launch, Lt. Governor, of the Program that there is information on the website. But, I do not think you are going to be able to get to each one of these different components in phase one [and] phase two, to have a fully baked or fully committed Program. I am guessing you are going to have to get with ranchers and farmers to see who wants to participate. You have to make sure that they are on board, making sure that all of those resources are there for them.

I think September is a really doable date in terms of having ready in terms of resources, but do not know if it is going to be able to be a fully marketing-heavy Program that talks about how great it would be to come to the state of Nevada, specifically for agritourism.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you. Anyone else in Las Vegas?

Commissioner Capurro:
In the emails from the Rural Roundup, are you able to—for the stakeholder group, for all of those people—do you have all that? Because I do think that that could kick off that stakeholder group in kind of an easy fashion; time efficient for you guys. Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Moon:
To be perfectly clear, I think this is so valuable. I commend you for pushing this with all your might, Lt. Governor, and I am there for you. My only concern is the timeline. I thank the staff and the consultants for the research that has been done. It is good information. I think, where we are is a good launching point. My only concern is the timeline, but I will, again, reiterate that I will help you in any way, however you need that help. Even with the bill, the standing group, whatever you need, please do call on me. You can see Fallon is really doing this, right? They also have concerns. We also have concerns in Churchill County, in terms of being able to share these opportunities from a legal standpoint, from a monetary standpoint, from a

marketing standpoint; everything that the research has pointed to. So, we want to make sure that everyone has that support.

So, I thank you for that, and my only concern is the timeline. I will work with you with whatever you need, and as fast as we can.

Chair Anthony:
I appreciate that. I know it is a tight timeline, but that is how we get things done, is to put a timeline on it. I am very confident we can get to phase three by September 1st.

CHAIR ANTHONY MOVED TO AUTHORIZE AN AGRITOURISM PLAN.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. COMMISSIONER MOON OPPOSED.

AGENDA ITEM H—GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH RSCVA (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Rafael Villanueva, previously identified:
We were very fortunate to have a very successful Governor's Conference last December. A lot of it had to do with our partnership with the RSCVA and the way they were willing to work with us in not only hosting, but sourcing, contracting, and helping us select the right venues. We were trying to work that out with our partners in the south, but as you are aware, the LVCVA has got some major programs that they are doing right now. To get this in place, it was taking just a little bit longer than we had expected.

After talking to Commissioner Brunelle, we asked if it was okay if we return [GovCon] to Reno. We would love to do a pattern of two years in Reno, one year in Las Vegas. It also is fitting with our budget cuts. We can do a lot more things; not only because of the pricing with the partner, but there is a lot of other partners in the state to generate more attendance and partnerships.

On that note, we are asking the Commission to support and agree and approve an interlocal agreement with Travel Nevada and RSCVA [Exhibit G, Slide 63]. The responsibilities are, basically, helping us source the properties by using their staff who are—as we realized and saw this last year—very good at their job, helping us not only contract with them, and then receive the invoices of which we will then reimburse the RSCVA. Our goal is not to exceed $150,000. Just for a frame of reference, last Governor's Conference fell way below the $100,000 mark, but we just want to make sure we are covering ourselves in making sure that we do not put the RSCVA in a position where they would have to cover some of our expenses. We want to make sure we have enough resources in there to cover any expenses they do on our behalf. In return, Travel Nevada will do all the marketing. We will do all the content with a lot of consulting with our partners in the north, especially the RSCVA. With our team, and working with the RSCVA, then we would select the property. They would then negotiate the contracts and move forward.

This is still also pending not only our approval, but Commissioner Larragueta will need to present it to [the RSCVA] for approval. We are hoping it will be in the month of June. And I am asking the Commission to approve us doing the interlocal with the RSCVA.

Chair Anthony:
Okay, thank you. Any questions or comments on Mr. Villanueva's recommendation for the next Governor's Conference on Tourism?

Commissioner Larragueta:
Unrelated to the motion, but I would just like to go on record saying that we are happy to obviously support Rafael and the team and [are] excited about bringing the Governor's Conference back to the north for two years in a row. But, I would like to go on record saying that: one, Mr. Brunelle owes me one, and two, Rafael needs to get a new water bottle.

Commissioner Santos:
As the 2020 UNLV Outstanding Alumnus of the Year, I like your packet.

Chair Anthony:
Oh, we are starting to fight here. Our DAG (Deputy Attorney General) is over there looking at us. This fight is not on the agenda. Let us stick with the agenda.

Commissioner Elliott:
Mr. Chair, I am happy to make a motion that we create [an] interlocal agreement with the RSCVA, not to exceed $150,000, for the Governor's Conference on Tourism for 2026.

Chair Anthony:
We have a motion. Are there any questions or comments?

Commissioner Moon:
Big thanks to Mr. Larragueta and RSCVA for the support for Travel Nevada. Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Any other questions or comments? [*There were none.*]

> COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT MOVED TO CREATE AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE RSCVA, NOT TO EXCEED $150,000, FOR THE 2026 GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON TOURISM.
>
> COMMISSIONER LARRAGUETA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM I—FY2027 RURAL MARKETING GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Abigail Bernabe, Industry Development Specialist, Travel Nevada:
Good afternoon, Lt. Governor Anthony and the members of our Commission. I am excited to be here today and go over our Rural Marketing Grant Program for FY27 [Exhibit G, Slide 64]. Today, I will present a quick overview of our Rural Marketing Grant Program and the steps taken to get our industry partners prepared for the fiscal year.

Fiscal Year '27 will continue to have one grant cycle. Each year, upon the Commission's approval, Travel Nevada awards $1.5 million to our rural partners for a variety of marketing projects. The Rural Marketing Grant helps Nevada communities [to] market their destination to potential visitors to generate overnight stays. The Program is intended to help drive visitation to our rural areas.

All grant applications are processed through our submittable platform. The system enables users to create an account [and] access the Rural Marketing Grant application directly. The platform facilitates comprehensive reviews, allows for reimbursement submissions, fulfills quarterly reports, and enables applicants to submit all their project deliverables. This streamlined process ensures direct communication between the applicants and our team, enhancing collaboration efficiency throughout the application and review stages.

Applications open January 16 and close March 13 at 5 p.m. Before the application period opened on January 16th, I conducted a webinar to prepare our partners for the FY27 Rural Marketing Grant Program. The session attracted 38 participants and provided a comprehensive overview of the Program, including eligibility, criteria, application details, [and] review or scoring priorities. We highlighted the importance of the required budget template and project timeline template and the essential grant writing tips.

This fiscal [year], I implemented a lot of the Travel Nevada Strategic Plan and listened to the partners and streamlined the application process, making the questions more efficient and less cumbersome while still having a high standard of the application program. We allow nonprofit organizations to be eligible to reduce the match contributions between 50 to 20 percent, depending on their staffing and budget size. This allows nonprofits to undertake projects that might otherwise be financially unfeasible, ensuring that they make it a meaningful impact without the burden of a high match contribution.

Our review panel consists of InDe (Industry Development), PR (Public Relations), and Marketing. The grading rubric is scored 0 to 5 and evaluates the scoring priorities of each applicant. Our scoring priority consists of the proposed scope of work, evaluation plan, target audience, support for inclusivity, quality of creative content, their project budget, letters of support, project work plan, and alignment with Travel Nevada's strategic initiative. Not all applications are the same, as marketing needs are endless, and the reviewers like to focus on the applicants' achievable goals and objectives for each media type for consideration.

I emphasize the significance of the territory organizations and how our territories are structured to support rural communities across Nevada based on criteria such as [encouraging] participation from underserved or less affluent regions, areas with limited financial resources to support development and growth. As you may know, reviewing Travel Nevada's Strategic Plan, our focus is on strengthening connections with our partners, which starts with these territory organizations.

We introduced a new requirement: Applicants must be active members of their designated territory. Additionally, each applicant must include a minimum of three letters of support from their organizations, businesses, or partners, one of which must be [their] territory chair. This letter confirms the positive relations with the territories.

Quarterly reporting and mid-year check-ins—all awarded recipients are required to complete the mid-year check-ins along with submitting their quarterly reports. This enables me to assess their progress, identify any challenges, provide guidance and support, and improve communication throughout the process. Final evaluations are completed through the submittable platform, allowing recipients to submit all of their deliverables and report their completed projects.

Our office received a total of 42 applications [Exhibit G, Slide 66]. Our Evaluation Committee recommended 34 applications to the Territory Advisory Committee. Total amount requested was $2,711,724. The total award amount available to distribute is $1.5 million.

During the evaluation process, our review panel representing our InDe, PR, and Marketing [units] assessed our applications. Our focus was understanding the specific marketing needs of each applicant and how well the proposed projects align with those needs. In the event of funding constraints, we review the applicant's budget, whether the project can be implemented without assistance of the grant funding, as well as taking into consideration applicants' priority funding items that they put in their budget.

Keeping in mind our commitment to supporting our rural communities, events, and attractions—out of the 42 applications received, 34 were recommended for awards to the Territory Advisory Committee, which convened on May 11th. This Committee consists of our territory chairs, each of the six territories, the Rural Commissioner Jane Moon, and myself.

The Territory Advisory Committee came to a consensus and approved the recommended awards presented to you today.

With that, I have provided the Commission a spreadsheet breakdown of each individual organization ask and what their projects are for [Exhibit J]. Respectfully, we are seeking a motion to approve FY27 Rural Marketing Grants as presented. Thank you for allowing me the time to present our Rural Marketing Grants Program. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

[*There was confusion about public comment, as a member of the public tried to ask a question.*]

Nicole Orsua, previously identified:
We have combined the request amounts to be voted on by territory [Exhibit G, Slide 68]. We can start with the Cowboy Country Territory. The requested amount was $417,724, and the recommended amount, pending approval, is $168,225.

Chair Anthony:
Okay. Before we do that, are there any questions or comments, in general, from the Commission? Go right ahead.

Commissioner Elliott:
This is a comment. Rafael and I had this conversation. I apologize; I am a fiscal person, bottom line number. Kyle and I are buddies. When I looked at these, and I started reading, the one thing that I did not see is, what is the [...], what is it going to do? Where are they now, from a benchmarked perspective? So, if they have 200 visitors now—what are these grants going to do? What is the lift? [...] What is it going to do in order to improve visitation, right? Because that is what a lot of this is all about: visitation. But I had no idea what the baseline is, and maybe that is not something—I mean, obviously from a marketing perspective, and someone that thinks outside the box, which we do not, because we are very linear when we think [...]. But when I was reading these, I was trying to think, "Well, where are they now? What is this going to do? What is this investment going to do for them, which would, in turn, have a positive impact on room nights, or whatever it might be?" And maybe I am missing something, and I apologize if I am missing something, but I could not really visualize what—and I am sure they are going to do wonderful things. I am not trying to dispel any of that, but I was just trying to figure out, "What will they do, and how it will help?" Getting billboards and putting ads in a magazine and—even in the magazine, what is the distribution of the magazine? How many people is it touching? Ten, fifteen thousand? I did not know. And so, it is just my observation, and I appreciate the time. And maybe, moving forward, you and I can have this conversation, but Mr. Chair, I just was trying to figure out how the overarching

picture of this $1.5 million investment was going to benefit the bottom line of Travel Nevada. Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Did you want to respond to that?

Ms. Bernabe:
Yeah. A lot of our organizations tend to be first timers, right? So, it is really taking a leap of faith, in that they are going to accomplish these projects, which is why I have those mid-year check-ins; those quarterly reports. And at the final evaluation, I have them put in those metrics. How well did your billboard do? From your estimated amount of visitor visitation, did you accomplish your goal? What can you do better next time? So, I really work with those organizations, and we ensure we have those metrics at the end.

Ms. Orsua:
I will also add to that, that the Review Committee will bring their areas of expertise, because it is not always easy. We ask for numbers, but also [...]. Part of the application process, they do include that information—what numbers they are anticipating—and then we look to our reviewers for their areas of expertise to analyze whether or not that seems like it is within the realm of reasonability. That is part of the review process.

Commissioner Elliott:
And I appreciate that. Then, that would be helpful for us, if you are gathering this information. Especially, we have a baseline, and so when you are coming back with your quarterly reports and the annual reports, we can see what kind of lift this $1.5 million actually generated. I think that that is what I do not see in this matrix. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Commissioner Moon:
So, when organizations apply, Abby does a fine job of making sure—full disclosure, for Visit Fallon, it is a grantee and an applicant, at this time—she does a great job at making sure those questions are answered for us. There is also a rubric when we put that application in, as well as possible quotes that we put in, in terms of reach, in terms of how much. So, that is done prior to the application, and then the applications go to Abby to sort out, and then there is an internal review that the Travel Nevada does with their areas of expertise. Their recommendations then go to the TAC—the Territory Advisory Committee—which I sit on as a nonvoting person; only advisement. And that work is put in by the territory chairs, who are volunteers. So, there is a lot of volunteer work that continues to happen throughout the state, and I am very thankful for that.

I believe, since having been involved in the application process for the grants with Travel Nevada, as a grantee and on this side of the table, that you have really streamlined it as best as can be, so far. I mean, there is always room for improvement, right? But I have not seen it in a better structure, better capacity, and streamlining. Thank you. Thank you for everything you all do for the grants.

Chair Anthony:
Let me just see if there is anyone in Las Vegas. Do you have any questions? Commissioner Kerr, or anyone? [*There were none in Las Vegas or Elko.*]

Commissioner Santos:
Again, thank you so much for the incredible work that your team does and putting this together. I have consistently complained about there not being enough money for us to provide to folks.

The lettering is already pretty small. I was wondering perhaps if there could be one more column that […], where the stakeholder could put in what their perceived or estimated reach would be—or, the estimated increased reach? Some of these are from—are advertisement things. So, I know they have professionals that are helping them with their advertising, but maybe that could answer some questions. If the person said, "Here is our projected increased reach that we expect to get with the help from this grant." But, other than that, you guys do a great job, and I just wanted to thank you publicly for that.

Ms. Bernabe:
Thank you, Commissioner.

With that, because there are so many different media types and requests that come to us, is there any specific items that you would like for those estimated reach [data]? Whether it is print materials, just their socials? There is just so many things where it would be great to have a specific understanding so I can advise my recipients in the future.

Commissioner Santos:
Right. So, I think anyone that is submitting it should be able to articulate that, "We are asking for this because here is what we think this will increase," whether it is heads in beds, people coming to the location, anything that shows what they think this is going to increase what they are already doing. They have their baseline; this is going to increase it by what?

Commissioner Elliott:
Even if it is zero, right? Even if it is ten. I just think that when we are reviewing this—and I know some of them are *de minimis*. This is the amount because it is a small organization, but it still gives us an opportunity to look to see what that investment has done for that organization. Maybe this year it is a real *de minimis* amount, but then maybe next year, because you see—and maybe you already have this information, as Commissioner Moon already said—that you see, "My goodness, that $30,000 actually generated, from [an] ROI

(return on investment), $200,000 for the organization." So, maybe that is something that we leverage next year.

I do not want to dissuade. You guys have done a great job, and I appreciate the improvement over the several years I have been on the Commission. I want to compliment you because I can actually follow it, for somebody that is not really good in marketing. So, from that perspective, I do want to compliment you. But, it would be just one more thing that we want, right? Thank you.

Commissioner Rowland-Lagan:
I am wondering, is there a possibility of just having in your summary [...]. In your decision summary, is there a possibility of just having an overall lift number that is presented there so that we can understand? Maybe instead of having to have it calculated for each and every one of these grant applications—that is already some of the information that is included or that is requested from us—but instead of having each one evaluated, is there a possibility of just having it in that summary, so that we can see year-over-year the amount of lift that that $1.5 million is helping or benefiting to the state? It might give us the information that we are looking for to know that it is creating an improvement, but it does not require it on a line item for each and every one.

Ms. Orsua:
We can do that, Commissioner Rowland-Lagan.

Commissioner Larragueta:
First of all, great job. I appreciate it. You guys always are very thorough.

To piggyback on what Commissioner Elliott and Commissioner Santos's recommendations is, perhaps what we look at moving forward—and I am not saying, obviously, for today's action item—but is to create almost like a sales and marketing performance matrix, right? To where there is a template that we provide each territory so that they have to track and monitor the performance of what those metrics are. So then, we come back the next year, and they are submitting a request for additional funding; we can truly see whether this funding contributed to their website visits, average daily rate, visitor counts, room revenue, whatever it may be, whatever those metrics are determined [to be]. But, I think there is something to be said about creating a template that we utilize, for when the funding comes in, as part of the application process, so that we can actually track our ROI on a year-to-year basis.

Commissioner Moon:
So, maybe just some explanation on that end—not too complicated. I do not assume everyone wants something complicated. That would be easy, as far as, if it is just a request

for print ads or digital ads—those are easy to capture. You can just put those numbers in there. But in terms of, let us say, a website redo, research, and strategic planning, which are grantable items, as well—those are harder to put numbers to. So, maybe just a small narrative on that. The things that you can actually get the numbers for—ROIs and such—put those in there, but in terms of the infrastructures that need to be built to get those ROIs, just how that benefits that grantee.

Chair Anthony:
Okay. So, I believe we are going to vote on each territory separately, right?

Ms. Orsua:
Correct. We have divided up the voting per territory [Exhibit G, Slide 68]. That way, any Commissioners that need to recuse themselves are able to.

Chair Anthony:
Very good. All right.

Cowboy Country Territory

COMMISSIONER MOON MOVED TO APPROVE $168,225 FOR THE COWBOY COUNTRY TERRITORY.

COMMISSIONER SANTOS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. COMMISSIONER KERR ABSTAINED.

Frontier Territory

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT MOVED TO APPROVE $324,249 FOR THE FRONTIER TERRITORY.

COMMISSIONER KERR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Nevada's Indian Territory

COMMISSIONER LARRAGUETA MOVED TO APPROVE $171,108 FOR NEVADA'S INDIAN TERRITORY.

COMMISSIONER MOON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

[*There was discussion under the voting for the Las Vegas Territory.*]

Commissioner Brunelle:
As I look at the different components, the MORF request for regional funding—is that still listed on there, Rafael, or is it not listed?

Mr. Villanueva, previously identified:
Yes. It is still listed.

Commissioner Brunelle:
Okay. So, I would like to not have that approved at this meeting, but defer that to September when we have time to review the pertinent web assets, also the other print media, videography, other materials that are already available by the LVCVA, so that we are not spending money on something that is not going to be useful in terms of promoting the destination. Because we already have quite a bit of assets for the destination, and I do not know if, in the process, that the team at MORF and the rest of the community in Mesquite was aware of what assets were already available to them.

Commissioner Moon:
Point of clarification—the Rural Grants Program is different from the 3D Program. Different agenda item.

Commissioner Brunelle:
I understand, but when we think about this website creating something that is another tourism website, and we have already got those assets and actually a live website that refers traffic to properties so they can make bookings and stay in that destination, it seems like a conflict.

Mr. Villanueva:
The Commission would need to be open to make a modification on the motion to remove the $34,000 that they have allocated at the moment and then re-present it back at the Commission meeting in September, or continue the motion the way they believe they should.

Chair Anthony:
Okay. I guess I am not understanding. Why would we take it out?

Mr. Villanueva:
As Commissioner Brunelle just mentioned, there is $34,000 that they had in that Rural Marketing Grant, which is different than the 3D Grant we will have a conversation on. It was for a website and for all the materials and assets needed for that website. As Commissioner Brunelle brought up, the group in Mesquite may not have been aware of all the assets that the LVCVA has already done—as they are the DMO for Mesquite—made available for them.

Chair Anthony:
Is Mesquite requesting that—

Mr. Villanueva:
—Mesquite is the one that is requesting the $34,000 as part of the territory—

Chair Anthony:
—Mesquite is requesting that. Okay. So, somebody get your calculator out and tell me what the amount would be.

Mr. Villanueva:
Give me a second to clarify that.

Commissioner Moon:
I apologize, Commissioner Brunelle. I confused the two. There is another grant request in here for more. I apologize.

Commissioner Capurro:
Can we amend the motion, or does it have to be put off until September?

[*There was no audible response.*]

Chair Anthony:
Okay. So, Mesquite is requesting this, which, I want to go with Mesquite. The total would be $190,050.

Commissioner Santos:
That money that we just took out, will that sit there until September and that will be reconsidered? Where does that money go?

Mr. Villanueva:
Yes. It would. What actually will happen is those dollars go reserve. Because we have dollars allocated for the next fiscal year, we can go back into those funds, and then while our fiscal team goes back and work-programs those dollars back in to make sure, in June, when we bring in FY28 Rural Marketing Grants, we have the full budget.

Commissioner Santos:
So, we will have one million five hundred and thirty-something thousand dollars? Or is it still going to be […].

[*There was a comment made off microphone.*]

No, because we did not spend it.

Mr. Villanueva:
To clarify, what we will do is we would bring to the Commission—make sure we have all the data and an opportunity for Mesquite to get their $34,174 in September. We will then remove that from the $1.5 million, and that is what we would pay those funds from. And then, between September and June, when we reallocate funds, our fiscal team will go back and request the reserves. That dollar [amount] that we left this year will be there to replenish the $1.5 million. So, in June, it will be back to $1.5 million we are allocating.

Commissioner Santos:
Gotcha. I just want to make sure Mesquite is not losing that money right now. We are just putting it on hold.

Mr. Villanueva:
That is correct.

Commissioner Santos:
Okay.

Chair Anthony:
Any other questions on the motion?

Commissioner Brunelle:
For the group's knowledge—right now, the LVCVA in this fiscal year has spent $127,500 on the Mesquite website. So, to my point, when we take a look at deferring, we have got assets. We have got a program in place that has SEO (search engine optimization), SEM (search engine marketing); the entire process is there. So, I wanted to assure them—I have got Mesquite individuals here in the room with us—so that they are aware that there is funding and there are websites and are adequate amounts of funds, and this is not to say we are not going to do something. It is to make sure that we are aligning and not doing something that is duplicative of what is already being done by the LVCVA for Mesquite's destination. Just wanted to make that for the record for the Commission.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you for taking care of Mesquite.

Mr. Villanueva:
Even with the $34,000—it may not have to be allocated for the website, but because we did pull it out, we want to give them the time—because they were not aware of this stuff—the time to be able to request how to better spend those $34,000.

Chair Anthony:
Okay.

<u>Las Vegas Territory</u>

COMMISSIONER CAPURRO MOVED TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDED AWARD AMOUNT AND APPROVE $190,050 FOR THE LAS VEGAS TERRITORY.

COMMISSIONER SANTOS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. COMMISSIONER ROWLAND-LAGAN ABSTAINED.

<u>Pony Express Territory</u>

COMMISSIONER KERR MOVED TO APPROVE $284,429 FOR THE PONY EXPRESS TERRITORY.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. COMMISSIONER MOON ABSTAINED.

<u>Reno-Tahoe Territory</u>

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT MOVED TO APPROVE $327,939 FOR THE RENO-TAHOE TERRITORY.

COMMISSIONER CAPURRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM L—3D DESTINATION DEVELOPMENT COHORT 4 GRANT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

[*This agenda item was taken out of order.*]

Nicole Orsua, previously identified:
I would like to go through some 3D Project cohort updates for Cohorts 1 through 3 [Exhibit G, Slide 113]. So, Cohort 1 are complete in their period of their grant funding—which is Lincoln County, Friends of High Rock-Black Rock, and White Pine County. I want to give them a big congratulations, in the sense that, the end of this fiscal year marks the end of their two-year grant period that was funded through the EDA (U.S. Economic Development Administration) federal grant.

Lincoln County has launched a new tour operator—the Lincoln County Excursions—where they put together a variety of tours that will take visitors out to explore their region in different capacities, whether it be adventure-based, alien intrigue, or even archeology. The Friends of High Rock-Black Rock used their funding to launch new tours, including their Outdoor Air Art Gallery walking tour, as a result of additional murals, including their mobile visitors center, which also has bikes for bike tours, hiking, as well as camping overnight group excursions. White Pine County has worked through their educational interpretation trail signs, with partner stakeholders in that project, and the trail signs are currently going through installation and should be completed by Summer 2026.

Cohort 2—they have got one more quarter to go. That includes Boulder City and the Dust and Wonder Trail. Boulder City has had great success with their Best Dam 411 Infomobile and their LED welcome signs. And, the Dust and Wonder Trail, aka "cultural corridor"—so, the "Dust and Wonder Trail" is their new moniker—they have reported platform development, organizational development, as well as art installations.

Cohort 3 is through their halfway point of their two-year grant process [...]. I apologize. I just realized that on my slide, I have "Dust and Wonder" two times. The Cohort 3 participants are the Walker River Basin, as well as the Friends of Sutro Tunnel. Friends of Sutro Tunnel have initiated the Dayton Tourism Collaborative, have installed their ticket tailor, and are now targeting July 1, 2026, [for] opening the site to the public, with their new site coordinator, and they will have volunteers at least four days out of their week. They also started their tour season this spring, with their tour operating day on April 18, 2026. These tours will be available through September.

Walker Basin [Conservancy] hired Brice Esplin as their new Tourism and Marketing Manager to lead the 3D Project. Since he has come on board, they are finalizing the design and purchase of the entrance sign for the public access side of the Sutton Ranch. They coordinated and unveiled the new mural in Yerington. And, most exciting, the new kayak rental station will be opened at the end of this month, just in time for Walker Lake Days, which will be June 29th and 30th.

Moving forward to 3D Project Cohort 4 grant recommendation [Exhibit G, Slide 114]—a quick review of what gets us to this place. The consultation period took place between October 2025 through March 2026. There were monthly meetings with [the] Steering Committee and project leads. There were two community meetings conducted in Goldfield, where community members were able to give their feedback and insight into the process. Site visits are also conducted by the consultants along with the partners, and on this project, Deb Brown, Maree Forbes Gaughan of the National Travel Center, and Carl Ribaudo of SMG Consulting were part of this project.

The process—the 3D Projects are selected by Travel Nevada's Working Group, as well as the Commission here. The Working Group, just as a quick reminder, are representatives of the: University Center for Economic Development; Nevada Division of Outdoor Recreation; Nevada Small Business Development Center; Nevada Arts Council; Bureau of Land

Management; and the Governor's Office of Economic Development. [They] review the grant proposals and make recommendations to the Commission. The Commission then do the awards, and then, from there, the grantees will get their contract, and then we start the consultation process, after which there is the development of the plan process, which then is distributed to the community who use that as their guidance on their grant application.

So, the plan highlights for Goldfield Main Street, who is the applicant here [Exhibit G, Slide 117]—the Goldfield 3D Project will boost visitor experiences by enhancing the appearance of downtown and working with the Nevada Land Trust to prepare the site of the historic Gans-Nelson Fight and Goldfield Railroad Depot and transitioning that to a heritage park. There is going to be augmentation of the International Car Forest by improving ingress/egress and "planting" additional cars. Also, [there will be] the creation of a historic walking tour voiced by Radio Goldfield, "the Voice of the Old West," and developing a committee to foster local collaboration and providing a stipend to a project manager to oversee the implementation of this project and the required reporting.

For the participants, Goldfield Main Street, their grant application asked for $591,767. The Working Group reviewed the application and identified the aspects that they felt were best to be funded with the amount of funds that were available for this project—which, as a reminder, we have $1 million set aside. The recommended amount is $436,315.

Rafael Villanueva, previously identified:
To clarify—and I think we have reviewed it several times—we were originally planning to bring in two grants for you that we have been working with, including Goldfield and Mesquite. After reviewing the plan, I did not feel comfortable to be […] and to do justice for Mesquite and for Travel Nevada on some of the elements in there—especially as Commissioner Brunelle mentioned, there was a lot of elements that the LVCVA has available to Mesquite, as they are tasked by Clark County to be the official DMO—and they are, Visit Mesquite—to make sure that we were doing it the right way and proper way. I asked for it to be paused for us to re-look at it in September to give a chance for Mesquite and the LVCVA and, of course, Travel Nevada to work together to make sure they are working alongside each other and there is no conflict.

I take the blame—Travel Nevada does, and especially me, as I am the most knowledgeable person at Travel Nevada on how the LVCVA works, and I did not enter this process until towards the end. I still did not want to bring something to the Commission that would have conflict with a partner and a Commissioner that is very valuable to us. We still plan on bringing it to the Commission in September for the full scope of the dollars that they requested—or that the team has allotted for them—but we just felt that we needed to clarify certain items before that was brought to the Commission.

So, at the moment, we are asking for approval of the Goldfield Main Street ask on the 3D [Project] of $436,315. And then, in September, we will bring the remainder of that $1 million and present that to the Commission for approval.

Chair Anthony:
I just want to understand this. So, the total is $1 million. This [$436,315] is the recommended amount for Goldfield. What you are saying is that the relationship between Mesquite and the LVCVA and Travel Nevada needs to be tweaked in order to determine how much of the remaining $1 million is going to go to Mesquite, or all the remaining $1 million is going to go to Mesquite but what it is going to be used for is different. If I am hearing this correctly, Mesquite is a member of the Cohort 4, but you just want to wait. You are going to bring it back in September with more specifics on the amount and what it is going to be used for, as you talk to the LVCVA. Is that what I am hearing?

Mr. Villanueva:
Not [that] the relationship needs to be tweaked; it is just the plan. We do not want it to eliminate any of the funds that the Committee was going to [be] recommending. We just want to make sure—there are lots of elements and assets in there that they are looking to do that the LVCVA, like Commissioner Brunelle just mentioned, [have] available to them. The funds could be better used in other elements out there. And, unfortunately, as one gentleman in one of the public comments mentioned, [he] was not aware of the relationship, of what the LVCVA has to do with Mesquite. But, considering when we do a 3D Program, the success of the 3D Program is the entire community—meaning not only the political officials, the community itself, but the hotel and lodging partners are also heavily involved in the decisions and the plan and the programming. We just want to make sure that is done. It should have been, on our part, done sooner, and this would not have this issue, but unfortunately, I did not step in and take a look, and that was my fault.

Chair Anthony:
Commissioner Brunelle, do you want to pipe in?

Commissioner Brunelle:
For the Commission, when we take a look at the LVCVA budgets specific to Mesquite, our budget for FY26, $965,000. When we take a look at those different elements: sales team, $245,000; advertisement promotion, roughly $340,000; website that I mentioned already, over $127,000; PR efforts, and then also funding that we do through Las Vegas Events [...]. So, we fund the Mesquite Nevada Open in the amount of $40,000, the Mesquite Super Run for $50,000, and then we also have a reserve with Las Vegas Events, so that when other things pop up—whether or not it is the Mesquite BBQ or whether or not it is the Balloon Race—those are things that we actually have an aside budget of another $160,000 that we

were able to tap into for this fiscal year. So, I want to make sure that, again, the group, the Commission knows that we have a significant budget for the destination. We have sales individuals in place. We have marketing assets that are in place for the destination. We collaborate with the hotel owners and ownership. We actually met with them about a month ago and presented them with the plan of their current campaign, which is currently running in Las Vegas, as well as running in Utah.

So, know that when we get back in September, there will be a very good plan as we look at how to collaborate and make sure that all assets are running on the same cylinder.

Chair Anthony:
So, how much did Mesquite request? Or did you get that far?

Mr. Villanueva:
We will check the numbers, but it is about in excess of $500,000.

Commissioner Elliott:
$563,685.

Mr. Villanueva:
Thank you.

[*There was cross talking off microphone.*]

Chair Anthony:
I just want to make sure that the people listening in from Mesquite—they understand they are going to be part of Cohort 4, all the work they put into it, and they did put a lot of work into it. I was out there. There was a couple hundred people there; they were very excited about this. They want to be part of this Cohort. They will be part of this Cohort; it is just recommending that you wait until September 1st so the LVCVA and you and Mesquite can work out the details, and they will receive funding as a Cohort 4 member.

Mr. Villanueva:
Yes. It was never a doubt that they were going to get funds. We just wanted to make sure it aligns with all the players in the community.

Chair Anthony:
Okay, great. Okay. Questions from the Commission?

Commissioner Santos:
First, I think this is one of the first meetings where it is not that much public comment. Again, it is very echoey when some of the folks were talking. I could tell that some of them were reading from notes. I would ask that those—if they would submit those notes and then they

be provided to us. I know there is a record, but whether or not the recording is going to take it correctly, I would like [...]. Cortney, Ms. Miller, if she is willing to provide her written statement so that we can look at that; also, the other folks that spoke, if they were speaking from notes, if that could be provided to become part of the record and also to the Commissioners. [*Mesquite provided Exhibits B and C, and the Frontier Territory later provided Exhibit K*.]

It sounds like there is a question on whether or not there would be duplication of funds that were submitted. Do we have any idea—out of the remaining $560,000 that is left over after, if we agree with the Goldfield Main Street [recommendation]—how much of their request in their presentation may have some duplication on funds they receive from other sources?

Mr. Villanueva:
That is why we need the additional time—to work through it and make sure that certain elements that the LVCVA may [have] available to them [...]. And then, also give the Steering Committee the opportunity to make the necessary adjustments, because the last thing we want to do is reduce the total amount that we were planning to grant them, or request the Commission to grant them. But, we need that additional time to make sure that everything is in alignment and any adjustments that need to be made are made during that process.

So, I cannot go itemize, at the moment, but there are certain elements that, one, are already provided by the LVCVA or are in their purview to be responsible for, and we just want to make sure that all that information is brought forth. The plan is, adjust it enough but without reducing the funds that we planned on allocating for them.

Commissioner Santos:
And my second question would be, in looking at the different items that they requested, if it is put off to September, would that place them in any type of irreparable harm for any projects or any things that they need to start before September?

Mr. Villanueva:
To be honest, I do not know. But when the 3D Program was done, they developed and wrote a ten-year strategic plan, and then the grant is during a two-year process. So, I am hoping that the three-month delay—knowing the Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 and how their timeline of expenditures happened—that it should not affect it, but unfortunately, we just felt that this was the best route to go to make sure everyone is in alignment.

Commissioner Santos:
Since there is folks from Mesquite—I think they are down with Commissioner Fletch—is it appropriate for any of them to provide an answer to that question? Is that something that is appropriate or not?

Chair Anthony:
We passed the public comment; so, it is strictly the Commissioners.

Commissioner Santos:
Okay.

Chair Anthony:
And the Commissioners are down there [in Las Vegas]. If they want to speak on their behalf, they can do that, but public comment beyond the Commissioners, we are done with that.

Commissioner Santos:
Understood. I do not know, Commissioner Brunelle, is that something you could answer that question for me?

Commissioner Brunelle:
I am going to defer to Rafael's comments.

Commissioner Santos:
Thank you.

Chair Anthony:
Let us keep the comments on Mesquite, and then, once we are done with Mesquite, we can go to Goldfield, then make any comments on Goldfield because that is what we are going to be voting on today.

So, any comments on Mesquite?

Commissioner Larragueta:
Just a quick question, Rafael; just for my education. So, the situation with Mesquite, I understand, is falling under LVCVA as their DMO. Would this be a similar situation with Laughlin, as they fall under the LVCVA, as well? If there was a similar request, is what I am saying.

Mr. Villanueva:
Yes, but fortunately, going through this process, if Laughlin was requesting a 3D [Grant], we would do everything possible to make sure that the LVCVA was brought to the table from the beginning.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Got it. So, to add a question—similar, but completely different—in the north, we do not have any other entities that fall under the RSCVA. They are all their own individual DMOs; however, per statute, 50 percent of the room tax that is generated out of Travel North Tahoe Nevada,

we revert back to them, which represents about 95 percent of their budget. Would they be eligible for submitting a request for grants?

Mr. Villanueva:
All rural communities have an opportunity to request to participate in this process. We would sit there and take a look at it. If they were going to do elements—and maybe we would have a conversation of, "Are these things that the RSCVA are already doing in that space?" They are a little bit different than Mesquite, because Mesquite has not had their own DMO, other than what the LVCVA has been doing. I mean a separate DMO from what the LVCVA is doing. So, that would be unique, but the fact that [Travel North Tahoe Nevada]—if they came back [with a request], we would have to take a look at that, if there are certain elements. But, it is a very unique thing, especially with Clark County, and I am pretty sure many people on this Committee who has put all this time and effort were not aware that the LVCVA was Visit Mesquite and they were tasked by Clark County to do so.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Thank you. I appreciate it.

Chair Anthony:
Any questions in Las Vegas, or comments?

Commissioner Rowland-Lagan:
I am wondering, would it be possible—is it legally possible for us to amend this request to still be able to approve it today with the idea in mind that, in the next three months or however much—30 days, 60 days—that MORF and LVCVA were able to come together, determine what is the best traction that they need to have with this application, but would still allow them […]. Or, if we approve it now, it allows the money to be expended at the time after they have that meeting, so that we do not have to wait until September's Commission meeting? That, once that meeting takes place, once they fix their application, if we give the approval for staff, to now go ahead and allocate it once that meeting takes place, so that they do not have to wait—is that a possibility?

Chair Anthony:
I am sure, legally, we could do it, but I guess, from my standpoint, why would we authorize money today when we do not know how much to authorize and what to authorize it for? And even if we authorize it today, they would not get the money until we […]. We would have to clean it up in September, so I do not see any reason for […]. I am, personally, I am fine with the direction we are going here because we have it on the record that Mesquite will receive funding as a Cohort 4 member. So, they do not have to worry about that. It is just making sure that there is no duplication with the LVCVA. The LVCVA has already piped in saying they like

that avenue. Our CEO says he likes that avenue. So, I would feel more comfortable punting this until September because I know Mesquite will be taken care of. That is my own personal opinion. [If] anybody has an opinion, please go right ahead.

Anybody else in Las Vegas has any comments?

Commissioner Brunelle:
I concur with you, L.G.

Chair Anthony:
Thank you. Any other in Las Vegas on the Mesquite issue?

Commissioner Moon:
Lt. Governor, I do not think we could act on Mesquite anyway, since it is not on the agenda, correct? I am referring to DAG [Harry B. Ward].

[*The response was given off microphone.*]

Chair Anthony:
That makes it easier. Okay. Okay, so, I think everybody seems comfortable about Mesquite. Mesquite should feel comfortable about what we are doing here.

So now, let us go to the agenda item, which is Goldfield. Any questions or comments on the recommended amount of $436,315 to Goldfield Main Street as part of the 3D Cohort 4 Grant funding recommendation under Agenda Item L? Any questions or comments?

[*There were none.*]

> COMMISSIONER MOON MOVED TO APPROVE THE 3D PROJECT COHORT 4 GRANT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION OF $436,315 FOR GOLDFIELD MAIN STREET.
>
> COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM J—FY2027 Q1 MARKETING PLAN AND MEDIA BUDGET (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

[*This agenda item was taken out of order.*]

Keelie Cox, previously identified:
Today, I am going to kick off our presentation for Travel Nevada's Marketing and Communication Plan for Q1. As it was mentioned earlier, we officially wrapped up our RFP process not too long ago. This caused a slight delay in contract approval. So, today, we are

going to show you our plan for Q1, and then we will be back in September to present the rest of our year's plan—and confirming that we are seeking approval on this Q1 plan.

Our agenda for today, we are going to start by going over some of the reflections from last year, and then we will dive into our Hero Campaigns for Q1, and then our Q1 paid media recommendations and the earned media recommendations.

Heather Sheppard, Senior Vice President, Fahlgren Mortine:
Starting looking at FY26 [Exhibit G, Slide 72]—the year is not over, so caveat on that. So far, we have really focused on driving visitation to the state, focused on increasing length of stay and spend, and doing that by shifting perceptions so that people know all of the things that Nevada has to offer. Again, the year is not over, but early indicators, specifically from the IME (integrated marketing engagement) [study], suggest that we are seeing a positive lift on those perceptions and on those important goals. Those who have been exposed to Nevada's integrated marketing communications efforts have taken 38 percent more trips, stayed 19 percent longer, and spent 15 percent more.

Looking ahead to FY27 [Exhibit G, Slide 74], we are so honored to have the opportunity to continue to share Nevada's stories and build on the successes that we have seen this year, like those that the Travel Nevada team shared in the quarterly report earlier, but we want to talk about the plans for doing that, and specifically, in the first quarter.

B.C. LeDoux, Managing Partner and Chief Creative Officer, Noble Studios:
As Heather just mentioned, our brand is doing its work. Research shows it is successful. Get a Little Out There is pushing people to the rurals. It is changing perception. But, we want to go in even further. We want Nevada to be known as an adventure state, especially as Adventure Centers role out, and the good news is, the economic impact of outdoor recreation is big, according to NDOR (Nevada's Division of Outdoor Recreation). It is $24 billion; 40 percent of that is happening in the rurals. So, there is a lot of potential for us to push forward.

But, we do not just want to focus on outdoor recreation [Exhibit G, Slide 75]. We cannot out-"outdoor recreate" Utah and Colorado; so, we need to win by offering a broader, more unique sense of adventure, which is where our brand comes into play.

Nevada is not an outdoor adventure state; it is an "Out There" adventure state. In Nevada, adventure is more than just that outdoor recreation; it is what you discover on the way. It is all those literal experiences, but it is all those figurative experiences, too—the ghost towns, the alien oddities, the frontier lore. Those things together create Nevada adventure and create that Out There adventure state that we are.

So, what we need to press forward and do in FY27 is: spark curiosity with our Get a Little Out There brand; make the rurals easier to choose by offering up the Adventure Centers as on-ramps to our 60 million acres of land and adventure out there; build belief by defining adventure as an Out There proposition that includes outdoor recreation, as well as all those other things; and then drive trip value, using Las Vegas and Reno as launch pads into the rural areas.

Ms. Cox, previously identified:
Our FY27 market approach is going to be the same as last year. If you recall, we updated and regrouped our markets last year. So, this would just be year two of that grouping.

On the current slide [Exhibit G, Slide 78], you can see what markets we have defined as: Core; Warm Leads; Momentum; and On Deck. Below that, you can see those markets, specific consumer behavior, and our messaging approach to them—confirming that the On Deck markets are for earned media only.

Going into what our targeted audience mindset will be [Exhibit G, Slide 79]—we are going to start with the foundation of someone who has an Out There adventure state of mind. And then, within that mindset, we will target folks who identify as a: cultural traveler; outdoor recreationalist; or unexpected experiences enthusiast. Layering onto that, we will have some sub-campaigns we will run, where we will target, for example, an outdoor recreationalist who is also a family, a cultural traveler who is also an urban visitor. Those will be our subset targets for this year.

Ms. Sheppard:
Our ultimate goal is to drive a positive economic impact in the state, but that takes time to see travel planning. It takes time to see the impact of our work. So, we are really intentional to measure the progress and the potential impacts toward that goal along the entire traveler journey [Exhibit G, Slide 80].

So, looking at the "Planning" and "Dreaming" phases of travel journey—what is our program doing for brand lift and for our perception and reputation? All the way through to "Booking"—what are we seeing from a conversion perspective? To "Loyalty"—what are people sharing on social? So, we are really intentional to measure KPIs (key performance indicators) all along that journey, evolving with the way that people are planning their trip. [That] includes looking at what LLMs—large language models—and AI are doing for the traveler journey. So, how is Travel Nevada showing up? How is Nevada showing up when people are going to those—Claude, ChatGPT—to ask where they should be going for Dark Skies, or where can they go for adventure? So, we have layered in some KPIs specific to AI within those metrics along the travel planner's journey.

So, looking at our integrated Hero programs [Exhibit G, Slide 81]—I think we attribute some of the success of the work that we have done, so far this year and in the past two years, to how integrated and cohesive the teams have become. So, we are putting all our fire power behind these really important programs.

With a budget constraint year, we have really narrowed our focus in two primary areas that support this Out There adventure state positioning, both from the Adventure Centers coming online and from the work that we have done with Alex Honnold (professional adventure rock climber).

Mr. LeDoux:
In looking at how we message the Adventure Centers [Exhibit G, Slide 83]—what we wanted to do is tie the brand in very closely. The brand is doing a lot of work. It is doing great for us when it comes to the research. So, we came up with the line: "Out There Starts Here." It is both a rallying cry and a rallying point. We are inviting people to use these Adventure Centers as launch pads and on-ramps into Nevada to find those different types of Out There adventure.

These are a few sample ads that we have put together and that will act as our way to message the Adventure Centers as they launch. So, it is a way to show people, say, in Boulder City, what you can do from nearby—kayaking, Hoover Dam, mountain biking, hiking [Exhibit G, Slide 84]. Or, close by to Carson City, a big image of Tahoe, showing the inspiration, but also mentioning that you could do stargazing as well as hot springs when you are doing showshoeing and skiing [Exhibit G, Slide 85].

And when it comes to how we are going to break this out [Exhibit G, Slide 86]—in the work that we do, in an integrated fashion, when it comes to "owned and content," we are going to launch a new website; we are going to create SEO and AI discoverability. We are going to make sure that that is—like Heather said—super optimized. We are going to come up with content updates. We are working on videos to introduce the Centers, and we are also going to work on partner toolkits and onboarding for them as they come into the Centers as vendors.

Claudia Dattilo, Media Director, Fahlgren Mortine:
In addition to owned content, we know that it is really important to put paid dollars behind promoting these Adventure Centers. There is a lot of investment that has gone into building these. So, we were thinking about, not just Q1, but how we are going to replicate this in both Carson City and Boulder City, looking at events and activations that we can do that are in each of those markets. So, we are working with a partner to do a gear demo that would drive traffic to the Adventure Centers and gain visibility and intrigue. And then, also, working with

a vendor—like an "iHeart," for example—who can help do a pop-up studio and have interviews and help us get content from the tenants and get stories that we can then use as ad placements to then reach some of our core markets to drive, again, more interest and more visitation to these new Adventure Centers.

Beyond that, we know that with the launch, we need programs leading up to opens, to make sure that people know that they are open, to get excited and get them to those markets. So, making sure that we have a plan there that could include directional out-of-home [boards], additional placements with paid social, partnerships with local broadcasts—whether that is in Vegas or in Reno—and then also working with influencers to have amplification there, as well.

Ms. Sheppard:
And finally, on this slide [Exhibit G, Slide 86], we are mostly talking about our overarching plan for Adventure Centers, but in Q1, specifically, we will be preparing for the opening of the Boulder City Adventure Center. And so, from earned and PR perspective, we want to use that as an opportunity to bring media there right off the rip, so that they can experience and see what the tenants are offering and what this is doing for Nevada from an outdoor recreation perspective and beyond—from an economic impact perspective. And then, we also want to bring media to Nevada to experience that with what we are calling "Adventure Centered" FAMs (familiarizations), where they can go out and take those trips. We will develop all the toolkits and messaging to make sure that all the audiences can benefit from Adventure Centers, understand what is most important to them, and have alignment across the board, so that we have one cohesive story that we are telling about Adventure Centers.

Mr. LeDoux:
As Keelie mentioned, the *Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold* [show] is doing extremely well. The results are impressive and probably beyond what we even thought they would be. Not only that, Alex's celebrity continues to grow. He is going to show up in a movie at the Sphere in early 2027. So, we ask ourselves, "What do we need to do to further this; not only for season one, but into the future?" Let us take a look [Exhibit G, Slide 88].

Ms. Dattilo:
So, as B.C. mentioned, we want to make sure that we capture the momentum of season one. We have exclusivity with our partner Outside into August, but once that time frame is ended, we have the opportunity to take some of that longform content, build that, build new assets from that content to be able to use that in other places to extend the life of season one, which is hosted on the Travel Nevada website. So, we are able to leverage other partners to drive traffic there, as well, to expand that overall reach.

We want to make sure that we are distributing this content, having a paid YouTube program, leveraging connected TV—again, to drive people to watch the season one—using technology such as ACR Retargeting, which is audio content recognition retargeting—which is, essentially, understanding what we are listening [to]. It is kind of a creepy technology, but we are able to target people based on watching Taipei 101 [*Skyscraper Live*], watching *Free Solo*, watching the show itself, and leveraging that to re-message them with additional ads.

Mr. LeDoux:
So, when it comes to continuing to promote season one, like Claudia was mentioning, Keelie brought up the fact that hundreds and hundreds of comments on YouTube and social media are glowing about this series. So, we developed some sample ads that use these comments and help us with trust signals for people that have already seen the show. This one says, "I had no idea there is so much beauty, nature and adventure to experience" [Exhibit G, Slide 90]. [Others say,] "I could watch 12 seasons of this" [Exhibit G, Slide 89], "This is heart warming and fun to watch" [Exhibit G, Slide 91]. There are hundreds of these that we can repurpose for these ads.

Additionally, we will also repurpose longform content, as well as more of those comments for social media, as well as the website. We will make sure that people know, on the website, what places were featured in season one, and we will include itineraries, as well.

So, what does *Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold 2.0* look like [Exhibit G, Slide 93]? We know that we are successful; we know that his celebrity is rising. We know that he wants to have a long-term relationship with Travel Nevada. He has told us he would like us to be one of his main sponsors, like North Face or Rolex. So, first of all, in Q1, we want to maximize our existing agreement, continue to promote season one through the advertising that we just showed you, as well as—he owes us one appearance, which he will fulfill. And then, we are going to start, in Q1, working on the new agreement that we would like to map out, which would include him being an Always-On Ambassador, him promoting Adventure Centers, him possibly promoting the Qantas Flight coming in directly to Las Vegas from Australia, a season two shoot. We want to negotiate a number of these things, extend his current agreement, and create a new agreement, and we have been having a lot of luck in the conversations with him, knowing that our budget has been reduced. They appear to be very flexible, and as a team, we are going to keep working on that because the results and the returns seem really, really strong and promising.

Ms. Dattilo:
[I am going to] talk about paid media, and we are going to start by talking about an overall FY27 approach [Exhibit G, Slide 95]. This remains very similar to what we have done in the past and really is still rooted in shifting perceptions to encourage people to spend more and

stay longer in Nevada. We want to make sure that we are reaching people, as Heather mentioned, everywhere throughout that journey. So, inspiring them with "Dreaming" tactics, to make sure that they are reaching them with sight and sound, and reaching them during their planning, through curiosity, and converting that into a commitment to get them to book a trip and getting them to come to visit Nevada, visit the rurals. So, again, this is an overarching approach that would be applicable to all of FY27, but specifically, we are going to talk about Q1 budget allocation right now.

So, for Q1, our recommendation, knowing our current budget scenarios, is to focus on two pillars: building the brand with our Dreaming phase and capturing the booking—to make sure that we can continue to build awareness at scale but also capture active demand. So, making sure that we are helping to inspire audiences, but being visible while people are actively looking for a trip to book. And I will call out that these two numbers [Exhibit G, Slide 96], the 40 percent and the 30 percent, do not add up to 100 percent, and that is because the other 30 percent is to be used for the Hero programs that we just talked about. So, that is where that budget allocation goes. Again, there is a little bit of overlap also with the 40 percent of the Dreaming bucket going towards some of the other elements, as well.

As we look at the MKT02 budget for Q1 only, looking at $715,000—80 percent of that would be media dollars, supporting domestic and in-state, as well as influencer programs, with the additional portions going towards strategic and account management, as well as reporting and analytics [Exhibit G, Slide 97].

Mr. LeDoux:
All right, let us talk about digital in Q1 [Exhibit G, Slide 99]. The thing about digital is it is always on, and so, we are not only going to be working on these things in Q1, we are actually working on these things right now. We will be working on them in Q1; we will be working on them throughout FY27. Digital continues to be the connective tissue between the storytelling that we have in brand, media, and public relations that eventually drives visitor behavior. So, it is extremely important. We are going to be looking at site enhancements, like accessibility, site speed. We are going to be building the Adventure Center website, as we mentioned, and onboarding the tenants, then we are going to expand discovery. We are going to focus a lot on AI discoverability and SEO. It is on all of our minds, and it is something that needs to be attended to constantly. We have teams working on that right now to make sure that, just like Heather said, we are discoverable on all the things—Claude, Gemini, ChatGPT, and all the other ways to search, because there are a lot of them.

Then, we are going to continue deepening engagement with multimedia content, UX (user experience) enhancements, and just further engaging aspects to the website, and we are going to continue to look at measuring and optimizing, based on the strategic plan, measurement framework, making sure that we are driving partner referrals, making sure that we are getting Adventure Guide downloads, and all the KPIs that we look to over time.

Tracie Barnthouse, previously identified:
I just wanted to say that the start of a new fiscal year is always an exciting time for us because it gives us an opportunity to look back at our KPIs and adjust and see where we might be adding to our KPIs. It is always a great opportunity to do that. It also allows us the time to look at travel trends and how Travel Nevada can maybe fit into those narratives with the earned media that we are pitching. So, with that, I am going to turn it on over to Heather to share our earned media strategy for FY27.

Ms. Sheppard:
We follow Tracie's vision. So, everything that Tracie said applies here, but speaking more "executionally," the evolutions of the PR program, there are two primary ones [Exhibit G, Slide 101]. So, we have talked a lot in the past that PR has helped validate; it has also helped aggregate messages, which is incredibly important in this day and age when those messages are what resonate and come to the top, and when earned media and non-paid sources represent 95 percent of what is coming up in LLMs. Where we show up is incredibly important, and I will give a couple of examples in a minute about how we have incorporated this into our program in planning and how we will throughout the year.

We have always really focused on doing audience-centric work, but specifically, with domestic and in-state visitors. Because the programs that we are working on throughout the year have impacts to residents and stakeholders and partners and members of the industry—another shift of our program this year is that every single program that we put together will have a plan and a strategy for each of those audiences at the get.

I mentioned I would talk about how AI has impacted our planning. We have a media target list every year that we thoroughly vet to make sure that it is reaching the audiences that we want to talk to, that it is reaching our Out There adventurers, and we categorize those in five buckets: National Travel; National Consumer; National Trade; Regional; and In-State [Exhibit G, Slide 102]. This year, a layer that we have added is that we are not just looking at these pubs from an audience perspective, but how often are they cited in these LLMs? How is the messaging from these pubs showing up in ways that are beneficial to our new and our expanded audience? So, we have made some tweaks. This is obviously not a comprehensive list, but we have made some tweaks to make sure that we are accounting for that.

A few Commission meetings ago, you heard that Travel Nevada has made a partnership with MICHELIN, amongst the other southwest states. And so, in Q1, this will be a really big focus [Exhibit G, Slide 103]. This program will have integrated support, but towards almost a little bit halfway through Q1 is when the *MICHELIN Guide* announcements will be made in Las Vegas. At that point, and leading up to that, we want to make sure that those who are hearing those announcements are just aware that they are coming, know that there is a positive economic impact from participation in MICHELIN that lifts—it is a kind of "rising tide lifts all boats." So, some of our work on the Comms side will be making sure that message is clear. And then, we have a lot of ideas. This whole table and our teams back in the offices are supporting us with ways to amplify the stories that can be told after that announcement is made.

Just a couple more. We talk about the importance of getting media in-state and to help tell deeper stories [Exhibit G, Slide 104]. So, in Q1, we want to execute a couple different media FAMs—one focused on "set-jetting." This is a trend that has existed for a little while, but it is still really prominent. People want to travel to places they have seen on TV? Well, we put the place on TV, and now we want to make it really easy for media to understand how they can go experience that so their readers can go experience that. So, we will do a *Get a Little Out There with Alex Honnold* themed FAM, where we can invite media to go do the things he did, meet with the people he met with, and experience the things he experienced.

We also want to have a "See Your Sign" astrological FAM. This is very relevant to Gen Z-ers and younger Millennials. Astrology is on the rise again, and in Nevada, it might be the only place that some of our target markets can actually see the stars that are in their astrological sign. So, we want to target media based on those signs and invite them to come see them in real life.

And then, we want to do four media missions again this year, but we, in Q1, will focus on the Las Vegas market because we want to tie into the Boulder City Adventure Center grand opening [Exhibit G, Slide 105]. So, we want to invite media to come to that [and] see, again, what all they have to offer. This also will give partners the opportunity to engage with media and influencers and build buzz and excitement for that grand opening.

And then, finally, we broke out just the Q1 budget [Exhibit G, Slide 106]. This is really, if we look at the whole year knowing our contract starts in August, this is actually only two months of the budget. And, without going line by line, the primary point here is that most of our dollars, our focus is in consumer media relations—so, talking to those journalists—and then the other largest bucket—though small, about one-fifth—is media missions—so, supporting [the] Boulder City grand opening for the Adventure Center.

Ms. Cox:
In closing, I want to thank everyone for their time. We welcome any questions you may have, and just a reminder that we are hoping you will vote "approved" on this.

[*Chair Anthony had left the meeting during the presentation. Commissioner Larragueta stepped in as Acting Chair.*]

Commissioner Larragueta:
Stepping in for the L.G. momentarily here. Before we open to questions, comments, and feedback as it relates to the Q1 Marketing Plan and Budget Recommendation—I am going to kick it off here with a few questions, and then I will let the Commissioners take it from there.

My first question was pertaining to Alex—30 percent of the budget being allocated towards this program. The assumption is, due to the increase in his popularity—obviously it is performing extremely well—his cost[s] have obviously gone up. Correct? Is that a fair assumption?

Ms. Dattilo:
To clarify, the 30 percent of the $581,000 would be for promotion of season one allocation of our current season—in Q1—and also things we would do at the Adventure Centers.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Q1 of next fiscal year?

Ms. Dattilo:
Of FY27, correct.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Right, but his costs are built into your approved budget.

Ms. Dattilo:
All of the current efforts are in existing budget.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Oh, they are? Okay.

Ms. Dattilo:
Yes.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay. Got it. Great.

Ms. Dattilo:
For him.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Second question—you mentioned Alex to promote the new Qantas flight, which is great. Fair assumption to say that is due to his popularity in Australia, not that we are using influencers to promote air service in one market?

Mr. LeDoux:
I missed that last part.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Oh, I said my assumption is that you are using Alex to support the Qantas flight because of his popularity in Australia, not because we are now—[not because] Travel Nevada is using influencers to promote air lift to one market.

Mr. LeDoux:
Correct. And we are just exploring this, at this point.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay. Next question—trying to get a few. This is always my favorite part. You guys are used to this. Should never leave me in charge of the mic.

The $715,000 for the budget—is that the entire buy, or are your media fees baked into that amount?

Ms. Dattilo:
Eighty percent of that—so, $581,000—is out-of-pocket media cost to go towards the actual buy. Eighty percent of that is working media dollars.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay, so $581,000 is the true buy.

Ms. Dattilo:
Yes.

Commissioner Larragueta:
In terms of media value.

Ms. Dattilo:
For Q1. Only for August and September.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Right. I just want to—so, $715,000—I want to make sure the Commissioners understand that it is really not $715,000.

The *MICHELIN Guide* and culinary support slide [Exhibit G, Slide 103] stated we will "execute a multi-pronged program that celebrates Nevada's participation in the southwest *MICHELIN Guide* and recognizes the state's culinary scene." However, this is only being featured in Las Vegas, correct? It is not a "state" [...]. I know there is a plan to eventually make it a "state," but is this not, in Q1, just Las Vegas?

Rafael Villanueva, previously identified:
The plan—it has always been, initially, for the state. The event itself that will announce the winners [is] being held in Las Vegas and paid 100 percent by the LVCVA. Our budget was allocated to bring the MICHELIN program to the state of Nevada, to have the opportunity for our restaurants throughout the state to have an opportunity to be able to be MICHELIN—whether it is year one, year two, year three, because that is the length of our relationship with MICHELIN. But, the event in Las Vegas is 100 percent paid for by the LVCVA.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay. Last question—as it pertains to the media mission, the core market meeting mission being in Las Vegas in conjunction with the Adventure Centers, which is great—is there a plan to do the same as a core media mission when the north one in the Carson City opens?

Ms. Sheppard:
Correct, yes.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay, great. The same amount, right?

Ms. Sheppard:
Yeah.

Commissioner Larragueta:
All right. Happy to open this up to the Commissioners' questions.

Commissioner Santos:
Okay, so, I am looking at this guy right here. [*Commissioner Santos held up a printout of the "FY27 Q1 MKT02 Budget ($715K)" slide (Exhibit G, Slide 97).*] All right? Does that mean that—and I got 80 percent of the $715,000 is $572,000—and, out of that, "domestic paid media," that means TV commercials?

Ms. Dattilo:
That means, in this instance, going with OTA (online travel agency) partnerships, as well as, potentially, CTV (connected TV) partnerships, as well as audio partnerships.

[*There was a comment made off microphone for clarification.*]

Oh, like, Expedia or Priceline, to make sure that we are in those booking platforms, so that audiences can book [...], or we are visible while they are booking. So, it is not all just TV, specifically, but it is a multimedia, multi-channel program. [...] In our key market areas.

Commissioner Santos:
So, if we are only spending $383,000—in our budget for marketing, we have got $15 million—how do we ever get there? Or, what am I missing?

Ms. Dattilo:
This is just Q1. This is only August and September.

Commissioner Santos:
Is it going to be the same each quarter?

Ms. Dattilo:
No.

Commissioner Santos:
Okay. So, there is going to be one that is going to show maybe $5 million?

Ms. Sheppard:
Yeah. So, at the beginning of the year, because our contract starts on August 1, there is a ramp-up period to get things live. We have to have the creative ready and everything tagged and tracked. So, that first two months, it will not be equal month to month. It will be lower because it takes us a little bit of time to get those up and running.

Commissioner Santos:
Okay, that sort of makes sense, because I was sitting here going, “$715,000 times 4—where is the rest of the money going?”

Mr. Villanueva:
So, this long procurement process we went through put us in the position that the contracts with the agencies will not go to BOE (the Board of Examiners) until July. So, unfortunately, we will not be able to have their [...]—because they are doing the work—after June 30th until August 1st. So, we asked them to just work on the first quarter, and then, in September, they will present the breadth of the remainder of the year campaign, which will have the remainder of the total budget we have allocated to them.

Commissioner Santos:
Gotcha. So, not being an expert in this area at all [...]. I can explain immunity laws until you guys got bored, but that is for another day. I just get frustrated when I keep seeing how tourism is down. When does all this start showing that it is increasing our tourism numbers

to where we realize that—and I do not say this to attack or anything [but] to make sure we have the right team getting the right message to folks to come to Nevada.

Ms. Sheppard:
While we have seen some [...]. We are not the keepers of the data, but what we have seen from 2025 data so far—like, if we look at LVCVA's visitation data—we are seeing a decline, but, in part, that is attributed to international visitation being down. Our focus is domestic. From a domestic perspective, according to U.S. Travel data, we are really on par with where a lot of other states are performing. And, in looking at LVCVA's data at their rural communities—those rural communities are actually up year-over-year from Las Vegas proper. So, we are seeing some positive lifts in the rurals compared to, nationally, what is going on. But I totally hear your point, and I think that is why our point earlier about measuring along the traveler's journey to see, "How are we lifting interest on things like OTAs, where people are doing that booking—if they are spending more time with our content?" Those are indicators that they are trying to book. And the IME data also shows that, when we are reaching them with our information versus when they are not seeing it, they are inclined to come more often, spend more money, and stay longer.

Mr. Villanueva:
Yes, visitation is down, but if you look at different areas, that is in the south. We are fortunate that Reno and Washoe County has had positive increases. I think, if you have seen the recent FOX5 interview with Commissioner Larragueta, it is extremely positive there. But, we look at things—anything with marketing and visitation, we have to inspire people to come, but we also need to make sure we keep our share of the business. And, as visitation as a whole to the United States has been going up and down, we have to make sure we are at least keeping the share that is [...]—our concern will be, once our share falls below the average around the country. Unfortunately, that is the environment that we are in currently, but that will adjust and change. We do everything possible to drive the entire state, but we are also very dependent on our support from RSCVA in the Washoe County area and the LVCVA in the south. When will we see this is a great question, but we have to make sure that we keep what is ours.

Commissioner Santos:
My big thing is, is the gatekeeping cities of Las Vegas and Reno. People will flow—if we market with the rural areas, people are going to go to those areas, but I am just so concerned that those numbers go down and [...]. I just want to make sure that what we are marketing and how we are marketing is going to complement and get folks to go to the gateway cities because then, in turn, we are educating them to extend, to be able to go to the rural areas. And so, it is like I said, when do we start questioning, "Do we go a different direction, in terms

of our message, if we do not see the numbers going back up?" And I thought part of our marketing was to the international market. Am I wrong there?

Mr. Villanueva:
Our advertising efforts are all domestic. That said, we take a look at those things, but we do not have the bandwidth to be able to advertise internationally. We use the agencies that we mentioned earlier today to do a lot of work in working with the trade partners to get that message across and make sure.

One note on the Qantas flight—that is one of the rare unique markets in the world that we know that, when they arrive in Las Vegas, they are going to go somewhere else because they are not going to spend only three days or four days in Las Vegas. They are going to go east or west. Our goal is to get them to go north, because they will go on to California, and they go to other places. Our job, and the reason we want to invest and do things with Qantas, is to capture them to go to the rural communities. But it is really important to leverage against our anchors to drive to that because, in most cases, unless the drive market—which has been very successful for Washoe and for the RSCVA—is Las Vegas is a huge flying market, and we need to make sure we can get them in a rent-a-car or other ways to start making their way north. So, that is why you see a lot of the programming that we have done—and you will see, in September, some of the programming we are doing in-state—is not only for the southern Nevada visitor, but for the millions of visitors that are still coming to Las Vegas.

The shift has been to domestic, and until those things change, we will continue in that direction.

Commissioner Santos:
Then, are we showing what our statistics are for domestic? So we can—when people talk about the fact that tourism is down in Nevada, well, it is down internationally, but on a domestic front, we are [...] level? Not as much down? Above? Where are we?

Mr. Villanueva:
We could probably get additional details to that. We have to, unfortunately, talk to visitation as a whole—the people who stay in the hotel rooms, who are coming, whether they are domestic or international—but we do know, and we can get that data and send it over to you [...]. Oh, here is the guy that could do it right now. He is just going to push a couple of keys in and get us that number.

Commissioner Santos:
Key pusher.

Kyle Shulz, previously identified:
Yeah, I think what everyone has said here is kind of how we look at things. So, when we are talking about the national or international macro travel environment, if travel is down internationally or domestically, there is not a whole lot that a $15 million media buy can do to go from, say, negative 10 percent to positive 5 percent. So, the main metrics that we look at are things like Heather was saying here, where we look at people who were exposed to our advertising versus those who were not and seeing what those differences are.

We have seen so far this fiscal year a lot of our—at least, from some of our surveys—those being on par with what they have been in the past. So, those who were being exposed to our ads, traveling or having the intent to travel at the same or higher levels, staying and spending—spending has been a little bit squished lately. But, length of stay has been about on par with what it has been in the past, in terms of those who are aware versus those who are unaware.

That is mostly how we look at it. We look at it in terms of what the overall travel environment is and how we fit into there. In terms of domestic and international—international has always been a very tough data set to get. The data—we get our estimates annually. So, it is really hard to say on a month-to-month basis, if four million travelers came to the state, what percentage of those were international. We have some estimates for that that we get from places like the U.S. Travel Association. We look at flight data to see what international flights are doing. International flights are starting to pick up in the latter half of the year, especially from Europe to Las Vegas, but there is not, like, a month-to-month gauge that we have of, "Here is the exact international travelers that we have versus domestic." So, we kind of have to look at proxies for each of those.

I do not know if any of that answers your question at all.

Commissioner Santos:
I think, when I look at it, I am just being very simplistic. We spend money to get people to come here, and the results that are going to be meaningful to me is that the amount of people visiting here has increased, the amount of money they are spending has increased [...]. When I see those benchmarks, then I can say, "Okay, we are doing the right thing as a group. We are doing everything right." And when we see that the numbers are going down, then it is like, "Okay, we have got to figure out how to make it so those numbers go north."

Mr. Villanueva:
I just wanted to answer one of your other questions. When we start questioning [...]. Actually, the team and the agency questions it all the time. You have heard them reference IME studies that we do. We are constantly looking to make sure our message is getting to the right people

and if it is resonating or not. And if it is not, they can make adjustments because they are a data-driven, media-buying team that looks at these numbers that are available to us to make those decisions and make those changes when they are necessary.

Mr. Shulz:
If I could say one more thing. We can provide some of those metrics that we were talking about, in terms of the IME study, the aware versus the unaware numbers. I will also say, it is hard to prove the counterfactual. If we are not advertising, how low would the numbers be? Especially for rural Nevada—will they drop further? And we also—unlike the LVCVA and the RSCVA, they have robust sales teams and convention teams. We do not operate conventions. We know that is one reason why Washoe County has done very well so far this year, why Las Vegas has started to bounce back—because there has been some shows that have rotated into the area. So, we are really the marketing piece for the rural part of the state, specifically. So, when we are talking about a statewide impact, it is hard for us to attack the statewide numbers [...]. So, we have not only the IME survey data, some geolocation data, but also rural data, too. But, we can provide all of that information.

Commissioner Santos:
Thank you. I guess part of it is my personality can be very competitive. I like the way that your mentality [...]. And so, that is it, I guess. I will turn my mic off for the rest of the day.

Commissioner Larragueta:
All right. Any comments or questions from the Commissioners in Las Vegas?

Commissioner Brunelle:
I wanted to recognize the Marketing Committee members, as well as the individuals from Travel Nevada and the agencies. We had a meeting back on Wednesday, May 27th. Committee members include individuals throughout the state—Christina Erny, Ed Estipona, Kyle Horvath, Bobby Stiehler, and Scott Voeller—and, as we went through the process and looked at what they were budgeting, we plotted the gap budget that they are doing for August and September. I think the work is—the quality and measurements that they are using from a media perspective—are on spot. And, again, I just wanted to congratulate the team on putting together this plan to get moving in August and September. Thank you.

Commissioner Capurro:
Two quick questions. When one of you said that Alex would like Travel Nevada to be one of his main sponsors along with Rolex, maybe North Face—did that involve he wears the Travel Nevada logo? Like, what does that involve?

Mr. LeDoux:

It would not involve wearing the Travel Nevada logo because his clothing sponsorship is with North Face, but it would be—it is an ambassadorship. So, if he is out doing an interview at whatever talk show, he plugs points that Tracie and Heather and the team give him to talk about Nevada, whether he is talking about season one or season two or the fun things to do in the Out There Adventure Centers.

Commissioner Capurro:

Thank you. And then, you said that he is obligated one more appearance?

[*The answer was given off microphone.*]

And what is that going to be? Oh, am I not supposed to [...]?

Mr. Villanueva:

A couple of things—one, the Adventure Center ribbon cutting, or the Governor's Conference. The Governor's Conference will be an audience of 250 to 300. The Adventure Center will be media that his message would resonate and probably be a lot further. So, we are looking at that. We are also looking at scheduling timing. That is another thing of urgency—getting the date for the Governor's Conference. That was the plan. So, the media for outdoor rec that will attend our ribbon cutting for the Adventure Center, I think, would be huge numbers for us. So, that is what we are leaning toward, and then we will see if there is an opportunity for him at the Governor's Conference. It was brought to my attention recently that his last ask to be a keynote somewhere was in excess of $200,000. So, we want to make sure we take advantage of his stuff without having to pay that amount, at the moment.

Commissioner Capurro:

Thank you.

Commissioner Moon:

Love the "Out There Starts Here" [Exhibit G, Slide 83]; that is great. I mean, just playing golf on what we already have. Adventure Centers FAM—so, what does that look like? So, you bring them into the Adventure Centers, and they actually would go on the different options?

Ms. Sheppard:

Yeah. So, that would be our goal. Part of what is especially interesting for domestic travelers who are coming to explore the state is, often they are readers who are doing this on their own. They are flying into Reno or Las Vegas, and then, a lot of them have questions about, "How do I get out to do those things?" The Adventure Centers now make that very easy for them. So, we want to create an opportunity for media to experience that firsthand so that they can write about it so their readers know exactly what to do. It really streamlines that process. But yes, then they would go and experience all of the things that are offered.

We have done versions of that in the past, but it was all coordinated, and it was a little bit more that they have to do that research ahead of time. This, really, you can show up and pick from the plethora of options.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay. Any other questions or discussion?

Commissioner Elliott:
So I am real clear—this is a two-month budget, right? You have—and I think Commissioner Brunelle talked about this—just a two-month budget. So, when we come back to our next meeting, are we going to see the rest of the year budget, and you are going to have a plan, you are going to walk us through what this is going to look like, [...] how we are going to use AI, and all that? Correct? And we are going to understand the leveraging, and the marketing people here can tell me if it is good or not?

Commissioner Santos:
Let the record reflect that everyone was nodding their heads.

Ms. Cox:
Yes.

Commissioner Elliott:
A question for Kyle, since he is here—are you integrated in some of these discussions as it relates to the benefits? Just so that we can understand what this plan is next quarter, what the expectation might be?

Mr. Shulz:
Yeah. We certainly pass along all of the data that we get. This team is also integrated into a lot of the data that we get. Yeah, there is a lot of data sharing.

Commissioner Elliott:
Okay, Kyle. I just want to make sure that we are just not throwing money. These are taxpayer dollars, and we are just not throwing money at the wall making sure that it sticks. We really are strategic in how we are making these investments. That is my job, but anyway. Thank you.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Okay. If there are no additional discussion or questions [...].

Commissioner Rowland-Lagan:
I have another comment. I apologize. It is hard to be seen down here [in Las Vegas].

I just wanted to thank [the] team. This is an amazing plan and an easy recommendation to review. I am super impressed with all of the information and, of course, loving everything about the Adventure Centers. And so, I just wanted to make it a little easier on the budget and volunteer the Best Dam Podcast studio for one of your pop-up studios to make it a little easier. It is right there at the Boulder City Adventure Center; so, that will make things even easier for your team. Thank you guys so much.

I also want to make sure that each of the Commissioners do save October 7th as a date that they can make their way down to be at that Adventure Center opening. I think this is such a tremendous opportunity, being not only a federal grant program but also so well-supported by the state and all of our partners in the region.

So, very excited for this, and I sure hope everyone is able to make it. Thank you guys so much for this great plan. I cannot wait for Alex to be at the ribbon cutting at the Boulder City Adventure Center.

Commissioner Larragueta:
Thank you, Commissioner. I appreciate the comments.

Okay, let us try this again. First of all, great job; great presentation. Very thorough; I appreciate that.

> COMMISSIONER MOON MOVED TO APPROVE THE FY27 Q1 MARKETING PLAN AND BUDGET RECOMMENDATION.
>
> COMMISSIONER KERR SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

At the request of the CEO, we are going to table and postpone Agenda Item K. We will do that in September.

AGENDA ITEM M—PUBLIC COMMENT

Commissioner Larragueta:
Do we have any public comment?

John Rosen, previously identified:
We just need to—we feel very strongly—to correct two things that were discussed in the earlier conversations and make it clear. When we first started the 3D Grant Program, we formed a Steering Committee; met with them. The LVCVA was, in fact, invited to be a part of that Steering Committee. She did not choose to, nor did she allocate anyone from her staff to serve in that role. So, I wanted to be clear that the LVCVA was invited to every event that we did—every listening session, every videoconference, every live meeting with the [*inaudible*] office—every step that we did in this process. It is our understanding that Rafael

was on the 3D Working Committee, which, in fact, reviewed and approved the recommendations that were to be submitted to the Commissioners. Therefore, it is extremely surprising for us it was only yesterday that we learned that he has serious concerns about what was, in fact, in these recommendations.

In terms of the website, Meg McDaniel [of the LVCVA] herself refers to the LVCVA website vendor, knowing that we were thinking of developing our own website. I am very confused about the 120-some-thousand dollars that was spent on the LVCVA website, since that same vendor gave us a quote which came in somewhere around $35,000 to $45,000. That is to create an entire website. The vendor—some of you also contacted LVCVA to confirm that there would be no conflict in working with us before they did something to even give us a bid. So, it is very disingenuous to say that somehow the DMO did not know what was going on here. The reason we did not know we had the DMO was because we have never had any response from them or any active engagement in anything that we have done over the past several months.

I am very pleased that this Commission has decided to—in fact, we will be able to count on the funds that we would have otherwise been granted during this process. But, I did want to correct some of the impressions that were left, in terms of how this all unfolded and how avoided this all could have been. Thank you

Commissioner Larragueta:
Thank you, sir. Do we have any additional public comment? [*There was none.*]

AGENDA ITEM N—ADJOURNMENT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Commissioner Larragueta:
Do I have a motion to adjourn?

> COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT MOVED TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 10, 2026, MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM.
>
> COMMISSIONER SANTOS SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

[*The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.*]

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
Exhibit A	Agenda for the June 10,2026, NCOT meeting
Exhibit B	Public Comment from MORF for Agenda Item I
Exhibit C	Public Comment from MORF for Agenda Item L
Exhibit D	Draft minutes of the December 9, 2025, NCOT meeting (for approval)
Exhibit E	Draft minutes of the March 4, 2026, NCOT meeting (for approval)
Exhibit F	Travel Nevada's Quarterly Report for Q3 (FY26)
Exhibit G	Travel Nevada's master presentation for the June 10, 2026, meeting
Exhibit H	DTCA's projections update presentation
Exhibit I	Travel Nevada's Agritourism Feasibility Study presentation
Exhibit J	Travel Nevada's FY27 Rural Marketing Grant Brief by Territory
Exhibit K	Public Comment from Frontier Territory for Agenda Item B