

Clark County Desert Conservation Program

Public Information and Education (PIE) – Program Assessment

Final Report

Submitted by:
Strategic Solutions
7936 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

702.889.2840

Terry Murphy
President
tmurphy951@aol.com

Sean Ross
Manager
seanross@lvcn.com

Vicki Gonzales
Manager
vickig4@cox.net

Submitted to:
Clark County Desert Conservation Program

August 20, 2004

Table of Contents

Introduction – Explanation of Assessment Process 3 - 4

Summary of Research Findings

Cost Analysis 5 - 6
Environmental Program Comparison 6 - 7
Interviews 7 - 8
Focus Groups 9 - 15
 Teachers 9 - 11
 OHV Enthusiasts 11 - 12
 Rural Community 12 - 14
 Desert Recreation Enthusiasts 14 - 15
Survey Results 15 - 16

Recommendations

Build Upon Success of Mojave Max Program 17 - 24
Continue the Mass Media Approach 24 - 27
Take a Focused Approach with Special Interest Groups 28 - 29
Address Communication Barriers 30 - 31
Provide Consistent Messages / Consider End-User with Products 32 - 33
Continue Assessment 33 - 35
Increase Message Delivery Efficiency 35 - 37
Closing Comments 37 - 38

Appendices

Appendix A: Report: August 5, 2003 – September 5, 2003 39 - 49
Appendix B: Report: September 6, 2003 – October 8, 2003 50 - 65
Appendix C: Report: October 9, 2003 – November 6, 2003 66 - 88
Appendix D: Report: November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 89 - 163
Appendix E: Report: December 6, 2003 – January 2, 2004 164 - 169
Appendix F: Report: January 3, 2004 – February 6, 2004 170 - 177
Appendix G: Report: February 7, 2004 – March 5, 2004 178 - 231
Appendix H: Report: March 6, 2004 – April 2, 2004 232 - 256
Appendix I: Report: April 3, 2004 – May 7, 2004 257 - 294
Appendix J: Report: May 8, 2004 – June 4, 2004 295 - 312

Introduction – Explanation of Assessment Process

Assessment is defined as the systematic collection, review, and use of information,¹ undertaken for the purpose of improvement. As researchers, the principals at Strategic Solutions (referred to in this document as the *assessor*) have aimed to conduct an evaluation and assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) Public Information and Education (PIE) Program in such a manner that the results would be of true *value* to the work of the PIE Committee and their continued efforts to reach their target audiences and accomplish their objectives.

In conducting the assessment, the primary methodology utilized was Process-Based Evaluation, a sound and dynamic research model (emerging in popularity among the research community), which allowed the assessor to look at all aspects of the public information and education process, including the assessment of how project components reach the intended audiences (specific interest groups, children’s groups, or the general public) and meet the Program’s stated objectives:

- Inform the public of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permits
- Encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County
- Through education, increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County’s natural ecosystems.

Through interviewing the key individuals involved with the PIE activities, comparing PIE efforts to known-effective components from other environmental programs, conducting a cost-efficiency analysis of PIE expenditures, and conducting qualitative research with target-audience focus groups, as well as conducting a targeted survey at an event with a traditional DCP presence, the entire process-based evaluation allows essential questions to be answered, including “What are the most effective communication methods to reach target audiences?” The information yielded allows the PIE Committee to determine if project choices offer the potential to maximize budget dollars, to reach target audiences in a method likely to be effective, and to achieve desired results (accomplishment of objectives).

Also, throughout the process-based evaluation process, the assessor communicated the progress of the assessment with both monthly update reports and attendance at PIE Committee meetings. The assessor felt that the evaluation

¹ Palomba, C.A. & Banta, T.W. *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999, p. 4

of existing programs must be done in concert with the PIE Committee, whose decisions have traditionally been based upon consensus. Moreover, a number of extensive interviews were conducted with PIE Committee members.

Utilizing process-based evaluation, the assessor took an in-depth look at the public information and education work as a process. The assessor gathered, evaluated, and analyzed data relating to input (i.e., expenditures), activities (i.e., the Mojave Max Emergence Contest), and outcomes (i.e., if the activity reaches a target audience).

The assessor commenced the process-based evaluation by performing a cost analysis of expenditures by reviewing prices of similar services from a variety of vendors to determine any potential cost-based efficiencies.

Secondly, the assessor researched and identified other Habitat Conservation Plans and environmental education programs throughout the country. In consultation with the PIE committee, five similar programs were selected with which to compare the Clark County effort. Selection was made based upon similarity of inputs, similarity of expected outcomes, and similarity of community and environment.

Simultaneously with this effort, the assessor began a two-month interview process. Interviewees were selected in consultation with members of the PIE committee and included participants in the PIE program and relevant organizations such as the Clark County School District and the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association.

Thirdly, the assessor conducted in-depth focus groups to explore the most effective ways of communicating with target audiences. A target-survey, conducted at a venue with a traditional DCP presence, was written based on focus group results and served to provide further evidence of potentially effective communication components.

Finally, this final report evaluates all the process-based evaluation research as a whole in order to develop some research-based, strategic recommendations on how to best employ the assessment results.

Moreover, the process-based evaluation method is ideally suited for ongoing evaluation. Research results can be utilized when the PIE Committee considers proposals and projects – the proposals can receive evaluation during the consideration process, and prior research will help serve as a valuable predictor of a project's potential to effectively communicate messages to target audiences.

Summary of Research Findings

The following summary of results from the process-based evaluation process provides brief discussions about the research results from each major component of the assessment process (and which have been used by the assessor to formulate the recommendations later discussed in the report); however, these summaries do not provide the full details and discussions more comprehensively presented in the ten reports previously submitted on a monthly basis as *updates* during the assessment process. These reports can be found as appendices A through J of this report.

Cost Analysis

The assessor performed a cost-based analysis of major PIE expenditure categories by identifying, gathering, and reviewing prices of similar services from a variety of vendors. Utilizing comparable market rates for products and services allowed the assessor to address certain cost-based efficiencies (or inefficiencies), if the analysis revealed certain line item expenditures to be significantly above or below market costs. Regarding analysis of expenditures, samples of major expenditure categories (advertising, underwriting, products, printing, and editing/research) were examined, selected on the significance of the expense and the availability (i.e., product quantities) of information needed to conduct a market rate analysis.

Regarding underwriting, the cost-based analysis revealed that the underwriting cost for *Outdoor Nevada* is fairly analogous to the underwriting costs for other comparable programs aired on PBS affiliate stations in the west.

Looking at expenditures on products, the analysis showed that costs were only slightly above market for some products. The disparity in the set-up charges for each purchase demonstrates the flexibility in pricing from one company to another, which the DCP could consider when placing orders.

In regard to printing, the assessor noted that although the DCP is not obligated to use its in-house supplier, if the DCP were to choose to pursue utilization of an outside source, the DCP would need to comply with additional purchasing requirements. For the *Desert News*, the DCP may find that outsourcing this particular printing project may produce enough savings to justify the additional purchasing requirements. This would not be the case for the Mojave Max brochure, which the analysis revealed to be printed for a cost that is \$245.80 below the average market cost.

Concerning editing and research, according to the *Actual Expenditures for Biennium 2001-2003*, \$10,665.00 was expended for the purpose of editing a species guide. The line item expenditure was determined to be below what the DCP would pay using available (operating in the market) technical editing, writing, and research services.

The analysis also discussed public service announcements and advertising. The analysis discussed the proven effectiveness and cost savings of PSAs, and the analysis

revealed significant cost savings by using professional media services and negotiated media packages. The analysis demonstrated that Matteson Media Group reaped significant savings (\$17,376.50) for the DCP on 30-second spots through a negotiated media package.

In all of the expenditure categories, the analyses reveal that the DCP is expending dollars efficiently for public information and education efforts – costs for PIE Program products and services are below, at, or only slightly above market rates for similar services.

Environmental Program Comparison

The assessor researched and compared the DCP's public information and education efforts with five environmental programs selected in conjunction with the PIE Committee:

- Coachella Valley Multiple Species HCP
- San Diego County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP
- Central/Coastal Orange County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP
- Department of Environmental Protection – Montgomery County, Maryland
- Department of the Environment – City and County of San Francisco

Although the selected HCP and county-run programs have not conducted formal program assessments, and thus cannot demonstrate *proven* effective components through quantitative means, the anecdotal, qualitative research demonstrated to the assessor that the programs have experienced both successes and failures in regard to public information, outreach, and educational efforts.

The comparison effort was challenging due to the differences in audiences (and their receptivity to program efforts), as well as budget, operation, and organizational structural differences. However, as a comparison of strictly informational, outreach, and education efforts, these program managers discussed with the assessor what they have learned through years of trial and

error in trying different communication components.

In comparison to the DCP's efforts, many of these programs are conducting similar activities as the DCP, including: establishing a strong school district(s) partnership; producing literature either in the form of a brochure or news piece; operating a website; involving stakeholders; realizing the challenges of reaching the general public and changing behavior; and, faced with limited budgets and staff or volunteers, realizing that all needed outreach and educational efforts cannot be done by the program participants alone.

In our discussions with the program managers of both the HCPs and the county-run environmental department programs, a commonality existed in that these program managers – with limited staff and budgets – have realized a concept that one manager called the “acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept.” This concept is realized in a number of ways: volunteers, partnerships (with agencies, organizations, key opinion leaders, local communities, and school districts), and, perhaps most telling, learning that “teaching the teachers” is a more efficient approach to reaching students than directly reaching the students through program managers, committee members, staff, and/or volunteers.

To address the concept of maximizing limited resources (including limited human resources), the research results emphasized the need to: create and foster partnerships; develop and provide training for teachers so they can conduct lessons and carry program messages on their own to students; take advantage of available opportunities to attach messages to other environmental, educational, and agency programs that already exist; develop stronger media relations; and partner with/utilize local community key opinion leaders and agency officials to help carry program messages to the public.

Interviews

The purpose of conducting interviews with individuals involved with the Clark County Desert Conservation Program was to provide for qualitative research to assist the assessor in evaluating the PIE Program and its activities. The research allowed the assessor to determine if individuals (who have been the most closely involved with the PIE Program) perceive that the Program, both in general as well as in regard to specific activities, is meeting PIE objectives and reaching the Program’s targeted audiences.

Twenty-seven individuals participated in the interview process.

Most of the interviewees were positive about the Desert Conservation Program’s Public Information and Education activities.

Most of the interviewees were exceptionally bullish on the Mojave Max Program – the Education Project and the Emergence Contest. The program is unarguably perceived by the interviewees as the PIE Program’s most successful effort to date.

Beyond the commonality with the Mojave Max responses among interviewees, some themes emerged in the answers. One theme concerns the perceived need for *positive* messages.

Another theme that emerged is for the Program to capitalize on its existing successes, and with the overwhelming positive comments pertaining to the Mojave Max Program,

many interviewees perceive that building upon and expanding this proven component should continually be explored.

When discussing perceptions about effective media, there seemed to be a common perception that media such as television and radio have the potential to be more effective since they reach larger audiences. Moreover, some interviewees discussed the need for a “media mix” and the advice of professionals.

Other questions produced rather overwhelming common responses. The *Desert News* was the clear winner among interviewees when asked to name what they perceive as the most effective literature piece produced by the DCP. Again, the Mojave Max Program was called the “shining star” or variations thereof when interviewees were asked about the most effective activity, as well as when asked about the best elements of the PIE Program, with many interviewees expounding on the dedication, openness, and diversity of the PIE Committee as well.

In regard to interviewees’ perceptions about objectives being met, the first objective pertaining to informing the public about the terms of the Section 10(a) Permit seems separate and apart from the other two objectives in terms of the perceived degree in which it is achieved by the PIE Program and specific activities. Not only do most interviewees perceive it is not being met to the degree that the second and third objectives are met, but, some questioned whether it should be an objective and others questioned if it is an appropriate or achievable objective. The second and third objectives were never questioned in this way.

Likewise, with target audiences, most interviewees perceive that children are targeted and reached by the PIE Program, but the challenges of reaching – and changing the values, attitudes, and behavior – of the general public were expressed by many interviewees, and most interviewees do not perceive that specific interest groups are being targeted and reached to the high degree that children are reached by the DCP’s public information and education efforts.

Focus Groups

Throughout the assessment process, the assessor felt that the most valuable assessment research results would be yielded by talking directly with the DCP’s public information and education audiences.

Focus groups are part of a qualitative research element that is essential to constructing and administering quality survey instruments, designed to achieve research results of the highest value.

The assessor considers focus groups as a valuable research tool because such sessions offers the producer/distributor of information (the DCP) the opportunity to ascertain perceptions, opinions, and suggestions from a *target* audience in a setting which allows for open, unfettered communication. The focus groups conducted by the

assessor yielded suggestions for how to potentially improve methods for reaching an audience, both in terms of message production (referring to the content and tone of messages to address how receptive an audience is to the messages) and delivery (including where and how to reach the target audience) – and if barriers exist in such lines of communication – suggestions are offered as to how to overcome the challenges.

The main purpose of focus group research is to draw upon respondents' attitudes, feelings, beliefs, experiences and reactions in a way in which would not be feasible using other methods, for example observation, one-to-one interviewing, or questionnaire surveys. These attitudes, feelings and beliefs may be partially independent of a group or its social setting, but are more likely to be revealed via the social gathering and the interaction which being in a focus group entails. Compared to observation, a focus group enables the researcher to gain a larger amount of information in a shorter period of time.²

Although focus group research cannot be utilized to generalize findings to a whole population (mainly because of the small numbers of people participating and the likelihood that the participants will not be a representative sample), a multitude of valuable research benefits cannot be produced by any other method other than a focus group.

Teachers

In conducting the teachers' focus group pertaining to the Mojave Max Program (primarily the Mojave Max Emergence Contest), the teachers enthusiastically expressed their positive feelings about the Mojave Max Program. One teacher summed the program as “authentic learning” and others described the excitement that the program builds among both students and teachers.

Interestingly, the teachers also described how the character of Mojave Max has personalized the desert for their students, making them more apt to respect their environment as a result of this “spokes-tortoise.”

A particularly enlightening section of the focus group involved the focus group participants detailing that traditional communication delivery methods aimed at reaching teachers – such as letters, flyers, and other handouts that arrive to their boxes at school – are not necessarily effective at reaching teachers, especially when any one medium is used singularly. Most teachers agreed that a combination of methods would be required to reach Clark County School District teachers, effectively.

The assessor also learned that teachers have a real appetite for receiving species and conservation information to supplement their science, math, and/or social studies curriculum. Moreover, the teachers have very specific methods for how they would like

² Morgan, D.L. *Focus groups as qualitative research*. London: Sage, 1988.

to receive such information from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, including a teachers' resource guide, worksheets, and an activity packet to engage students in conservation education. They expressed that their students learn best with interaction, activities, mixing facts with fun, and having information presented visually whenever possible.

What the assessor learned from this research exercise ties into what the assessor also learned during the recent interview process, wherein the assessor learned from PIE Committee members, including Dr. Karin Hoff and Jane Feldman, that developing a teachers' curriculum had been a PIE Committee task at one point in time, but these interviewees explained to the assessor why this particular task – SCAT [School Curriculum Auxiliary Team] – did not reach fruition. PIE Committee member Jane Feldman argued that the SCAT task should be revisited, and the focus group research supports the assertion that teachers would like to see specific species and conservation information, accompanied by worksheets and activities, come from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program.

According to the focus group participants, teachers are most likely to respond to the Mojave Max Program through word-of-mouth from their respected peers. Also of note: once the teachers learned of the contest from a peer, the focus group participants were highly receptive to the current incentive package, and those incentives should work to bring them into the contest.

Finally, it is important to reiterate the overall positive comments expressed by the teachers about the Mojave Max Program, in terms of the contest and assembly elements, the Mojave Max mascot/spokes-tortoise, and the program's aim to engage students in earth sciences via a fun, interactive, and engaging program.

The results suggest that the program "personalizes" Clark County's desert environment and species and makes students want to respect the desert.

OHV Enthusiasts

The OHV focus group participants indicate that the OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not only a challenging group to reach, but are also challenging in terms of this population's degree of receptiveness to DCP messages, a necessary first step toward achieving a greater respect and protection of the desert environment from this particular population.

However, challenges can be overcome, and the ability for the DCP to reach OHV enthusiasts in Clark County, as well as improving this population's willingness to receive the messages, should not be an exception. To corroborate, the focus group participants offered numerous constructive suggestions for overcoming the challenges that the focus

group participants described to the assessor (such as the OHV community not being receptive to perceived “green” messages distributed by the DCP).

Additionally, the focus group served to clear up a misperception that the assessor had about the OHV enthusiasts audience; the assessor had been using the term OHV *community*, as if this is a cohesive group, but during the conduct of the focus group, the assessor learned that the majority of OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not affiliated with any club and cannot be reached, effectively and efficiently, in any fashion as a collective whole. Rather, OHV enthusiasts were described as being comprised of people of diverse backgrounds – in terms of age, occupation, and location of residency – which means they cannot be reached by a particular radio or television station or any one particular event or through OHV clubs. As the focus group research indicated, perhaps the only points of distribution that this group can be assuredly reached are where they purchase their vehicles or the shops they return to for maintenance, parts, repair, and/or accessories. Importantly, the focus group participants discussed the willingness of such dealers and retailers to distribute educational materials to their customers.

Additionally, the assessor learned in both the interview process and with the OHV enthusiast focus group that perceiving *positive* messages is very important to this population. When some of the later focus group questions were more specifically focused, the focus group participants carried this overall concept into their specific suggestions, such as recommending that: the DCP sponsor a picnic table at on OHV trail entrance, with a posted message stating that “Clark County has enhanced the area for the enjoyment of those recreating on the trail,” followed by a conservation message; the DCP recognize the contributions of the OHV community (i.e., desert cleanups) in the same literature that promotes

responsible recreation and conservation; the DCP sponsor events attended by OHV enthusiasts (especially non-club events to reach those enthusiasts not involved in clubs), wherein the DCP could also distribute messages; and, finally, the DCP could develop maps to provide to OHV enthusiasts to illustrate where OHV enthusiasts can recreate (as opposed to only showing where OHV enthusiasts cannot recreate).

Regarding the latter suggestion, however, the assessor questions if this falls under the purview of the DCP, especially given the fact that such a map would most likely involve trails and areas under federal ownership and oversight. This suggestion, however, might be discussed with the federal partners who participate in the PIE Committee; but it should not be considered an exclusive responsibility of the DCP to pursue a suggestion that the DCP would most likely have little control or ability to develop and implement.

As a final note, the main component of the results, as evaluated by the assessor, appears to be that step one – addressing image and perception – must first be

discussed, worked on, and accomplished before the potential exists to effectively reach this population, and, more importantly, before the potential exists that this population would be receptive to the messages that they receive. Efforts to affect this population's attitudes (i.e., respect for the desert) and behavior (i.e., responsible recreation in the desert) will perhaps prove unsuccessful if the perception/image issue is not first addressed and resolved. As the assessor learned during the Habitat Conservation Plan research, other agencies have realized the *image issue* must be addressed. For instance, James Chien, Deputy Outreach Manager for the San Francisco Department of the Environment, explained how the Department hired a professional public relations firm "to build trust among the public."

Rural Community

Interestingly, one similarity emerged among all the focus groups: the focus group participants indicate that they are more receptive to information delivered to them by their peers and peer groups than perceived "outside" individuals, organizations, and agencies. This finding suggests that one of the PIE Committee's most valuable resources are those individuals who serve on the committee – whose voices on the committee are representative of their communities and whose active participation demonstrates the diverse interests involved in directing and planning the Desert Conservation Program's public information and education efforts. Furthermore, this finding ties into the interview process, wherein many of the interviewees informed the assessor that one of the best aspects of the PIE Committee is the diversity of the participants and how no one is excluded from the DCP's public information and education process.

Despite the openness of the DCP PIE Program (as revealed to the assessor during the qualitative interview research), the rural community focus group results indicate that a perception exists that the applicable government agencies did not invite the input of rural community residents when creating species and desert conservation public policy, particularly at the time the MSHCP was developed (the majority of focus group participants perceive that their lack of input is reflected by road access and land use restrictions).

In ascertaining the perceptions and opinions of the rural community audience, the first half of the focus group established some issues and concerns which create communication barriers between the DCP and this particular audience; and the second half of the focus group discussed how the DCP could potentially overcome these issues and effectively reach the rural community. The end result of the focus group provides viable suggestions for not only improving the delivery of information to the rural community in an effective manner, but, perhaps more importantly, overcoming negative perception barriers and creating an atmosphere wherein the audience would be (potentially) receptive to the messages that they receive.

When the assessor explored whether or not rural residents would accept DCP produced and distributed conservation messages, the participants indicated that for rural residents to accept and potentially be receptive to the messages, two primary issues must be addressed.

First, the focus group participants emphasized that they must feel that they have input into any government-imposed/public-impacted process. If they feel “shut-out” of a program or process, mistrust is created, which, naturally, also creates a communication barrier.

Secondly, the focus group participants indicated that they are more likely to be accepting of and receptive to messages if the messages are delivered by their peers – those individuals or organizations that they perceive as “inside” their community and familiar with their needs and issues.

So how does the DCP overcome these challenges? The focus group participants explained that traditional mass media methods (such as television, radio and metropolitan newspapers) do not necessarily reach all of the residents of the rural communities.

Rather, the focus group participants strongly urge that the DCP conduct an outreach meeting where a representative(s) of the DCP would both talk to and *listen* to the rural community and would present information in an interactive format with a question and answer session offered. The focus group participants emphasized that personal, interactive contact with the rural community would

have the greatest potential in terms of effectively delivering conservation messages.

Also, the results of this focus group suggest that what the PIE Committee is already achieving, such as its partnership with the rural-based Partners in Conservation, is important in order to effectively deliver conservation messages to the rural audience. Again, the focus group results also indicate the value of the PIE Program’s “human resources” – involving active PIE Committee members, such as Ann Schreiber and Elise McAllister, who represent the rural communities and demonstrate the openness of the PIE Committee – that it is not a “shut-off” process.

Desert Recreation Enthusiasts

Conducting a focus group with a diverse group of frequent desert recreation (non-motorized) enthusiasts revealed a similar contention espoused by the OHV enthusiasts: the common perception is that irresponsible or disrespectful desert behavior is more likely to be exhibited by the infrequent or casual (“non-serious”) individual recreating in the desert rather than serious enthusiasts.

Evaluating this result, both positive and negative considerations can be derived. Positively, the focus group participants perceive that *respecting, protecting, and enjoying* the desert is a practiced behavior among frequent desert users. On the negative side, this research result points to the challenge of reaching and changing the behavior of the infrequent desert users in Clark County, who, despite using the desert less, may be the most important target audience if they prove to be the most problematic desert users.

The assessor's evaluation of the focus group results tries to address this split in the desert user audience – serious/frequent users and casual/infrequent users – by identifying how both audiences could potentially be effectively reached.

Methods for reaching both distinct groups of desert users could be achieved twofold. First, the focus group results suggest that the cornerstone of the DCP PIE Program – the Mojave Max Program – reaches those youth who could potentially be using the desert (now or in the future) frequently or infrequently. Focus group participants emphasized that reaching desert users at a younger school-age is likely to be more effective in terms of instilling responsible desert behavior and awareness of the fragility of Clark County's ecosystems if the population is reached when "behavior is learned." Secondly, by conducting outreach in a very focused and targeted manner, desert users are more likely to be reached than by broader/blanket methods targeting the general population. The more specific suggestion to the DCP is to reach desert users at locations where they are recreating or are likely to be recreating (i.e., posting messages at

trailhead points and having a presence at or sponsoring desert activities and outdoor events). However, the latter suggestion involves resource considerations, as the DCP does not have the unlimited resources needed to have a presence at all outdoor/desert activities and events.

Finally, the participants provide sound advice on how to reach frequent desert users, noting various clubs and organizations welcome information and reach large membership bases (i.e., the Las Vegas Trailblazers has over 500 active members), with cost-effective means such as taking advantage of communication vehicles utilized by outdoor recreation clubs, including newsletters (participants recommend submitting articles), websites, email networks and "e-blasts," and speaking engagements at club meetings.

Survey Results

Before discussing the results of the survey, conducted at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004, a revisit of the assessor's initial proposal elucidates why a survey was proposed to be conducted at the Clark County Fair, as opposed to a general, countywide, random telephone survey of Clark County residents.

As the assessor had originally proposed, identification of recipients of collateral material and products produced and distributed by the DCP would prove difficult, if not impossible. Additionally, identifying those who have attended public information events such as the Clark County Fair, Earth Day events, and other public events would have proven equally difficult. Therefore, the method with the highest research value was to conduct a survey at a distribution point wherein Clark County has traditionally distributed messages, and the Clark County Fair was selected (moreover, based on the attendance at the Fair and the fact that the assessor observed consistent interest among attendees in terms of stopping at the DCP area to pick-up informative DCP materials and products with conservation messages, as well as having positive interaction with volunteers, the assessor would recommend that the DCP's traditional presence at the Fair continue). Moreover, in order to assess the impact of the PIE programs on the general public, a general, countywide public opinion survey was not recommended. With a population of approximately 1.6 million people, a high percentage of new residents, and limited public information dollars available to spend, such an undertaking, in the assessor's professional judgment, would not have yielded any useful information. In the assessor's opinion, this type of survey would have also been considerably expensive and not a prudent and cost-effective use of PIE's limited budget dollars.

In conducting a survey at the Clark County Fair, Strategic Solutions enlisted the assistance of PIE Committee volunteers to administer and collect the survey

questionnaires. With the volunteers' help, 458 survey completes were achieved.

The goal of the assessor was to achieve 450 completes – the higher the sample size, the higher the confidence level in the results and the less error and variance in the results. However, please note (and please weigh when considering findings) that the survey results cannot be generalized to a larger population, and the results do not represent the opinions and perceptions of Clark County residents. Moreover, the survey is not a true random population sample (random sample surveys provide an estimate of accuracy of results had all members of a target population been surveyed). Therefore, the assessor cannot provide a margin of error (i.e., +/- 3%) because the formula to calculate the figure requires the total population from which the amount of completes would represent a random sample. In terms of variability of results and margin of error, all survey results are subject to variations or uncertainties.

The following discussion presents the pertinent highlights from the survey results.

Results from three of the survey questions reveal the importance of using mass media, particularly **television**, to convey conservation messages. Television is not only the medium of choice of survey respondents as the "best method of communication to receive public information," but also the primary medium with which to convey

conservation messages, such as *Respect, Protect, and Enjoy* (according to the survey respondents who indicated that they had heard or seen such messages).

Additionally, television was the top choice when survey respondents were asked from which source they most often receive public information.

Another finding is that 92% of survey respondents are very likely (75%) or likely (17%) to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them.

Finally, the survey results reveal the success of the PIE Program among this particular population of survey respondents (again, the results cannot be generalized to the population of Clark County, but, rather, a population attending an event which the DCP has traditionally had a presence – a point of distribution of DCP messages). As evidence of this contention of success: 84% of respondents have a level of awareness about the DCP and/or MSHCP; 53% of survey respondents have heard of the Mojave Max Program; and 94% of survey respondents have heard or seen conservation messages, such as *Respect, Protect, and Enjoy*. When discussing the poll results with the PIE Committee, the assessor provided some comparative examples to demonstrate that awareness-level-type findings – such as *84% of respondents have a level of awareness about the DCP and/or MSHCP* – are unusually high. (*Please see Appendix I for specific examples.*)

Recommendations

Build Upon Success of Mojave Max Program

The assessment research clearly indicates that the Mojave Max Program is an unarguably successful educational outreach effort. The PIE Committee has recognized the importance of reaching children at appropriate age levels, when behavior is learned. The Mojave Max Program continues to receive well-deserved national coverage with major media outlets and was praised by most everyone (interviewees, focus group participants) who participated in the assessment process. The assessment indicates that the Mojave Max Program is considered the most successful element of the PIE Program, and as such, the recommendations contained within this section of the final report suggest opportunities to capitalize on the Mojave Max Program's success.

Additionally, the proven success of the program has, not surprisingly, resulted in expressed interest in expanding/replicating the Mojave Max Program's outreach and educational efforts beyond Clark County (into California); rightfully so, the Mojave Max Program should serve as a model for other conservation areas of the country in order to increase the likelihood of success for other areas' conservation-related outreach and educational efforts. (Note: the PIE Committee has informed the assessor that expanding the Mojave Max concept into California is not taxing on the PIE Committee's resources, and, therefore, the assessor – based on information provided to the

assessor – concludes that providing consultation/advice in regard to expanding the program into other conservation plan areas should be viewed as a positive activity for the DCP). Additionally, as the DCP completes its appropriate protection (copyright, trademark) of Mojave Max elements, the assessor suggests that it is better to cooperate with interested conservation plan areas to help make sure the images and program concepts developed by the DCP are used with the DCP's support and legal permission.

Furthermore, the assessment research indicates that the target audience of children is not only being reached, but the target audience is being reached most effectively (but perhaps not efficiently – a contention that the assessor will discuss in a later section). The Program is described by teachers (who were interviewed by the assessor) as “authentic learning” and thoroughly engaging for students due to the program's emphasis on mixing facts with fun and the interaction with students in both an entertaining and educational manner. The assessor would concur with the teachers' opinions of the Program based on the assessor's own observation of both the Mojave Max Education Project classroom lesson and the Mojave Max Emergence Contest assembly.

Moreover, the assessment indicates that the Mojave Max Program has been designed and implemented to meet PIE Program objectives (specifically: encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County and through education, increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems).

Before discussing some specific recommendations on how to capitalize on the success of the Mojave Max Program, some specific assessment process results are discussed to support the recommendations:

HCP/Environmental Programs Assessment

Similar to the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, the HCP and environmental programs evaluated and compared by the assessor reveal that educational programs – specifically those programs directed at children – are a significant portion of the overall environmental and conservation outreach programs researched by the assessor. However, these programs take very different approaches, and perhaps none of them can be compared to the size and scope of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and Mojave Max Education Project. In other words, the Mojave Max Program should serve as the model for the HCPs that were researched, and not the other way around.

Interviews

Most of the interviewees were exceptionally bullish on the Mojave Max Program – the Education Project and the Emergence Contest. Not all of the adjectives of praise are

included here, but it is unarguably perceived by the interviewees as the PIE Program's most successful public education and information effort to date.

A number of interviewees suggested that the DCP should capitalize on its existing successes, and with the overwhelming positive comments pertaining to the Mojave Max Program, many interviewees perceive that building upon and expanding this component of the DCP PIE Program should continually be explored.

Assessor Observation

The assessor took advantage of opportunities to observe both the Mojave Max Emergence Contest assembly and the Mojave Max Education Project lesson. Based on these observations and the assessor's professional judgment, the assessor witnessed immediate evidence of conservation learning at activities such as the Mojave Max Emergence Contest assembly, which includes a presentation by The Tortoise Group.

For instance, the assessor observed how the presentation encourages desert conservation and protection of the tortoise by explaining threats to the tortoise and the fragility of the tortoise's desert environment. Perhaps equally important to *what* the messages are, is *how* the messages are delivered. The assessor observed the Mojave Max assembly and how students react to learning new terms and concepts while experiencing an interactive and engaging presentation that includes props and verbal quizzing.

Focus Groups

The teachers' focus group pointed to the strong desire among the teachers to participate in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and to receive conservation information from the program. The teachers enthusiastically expressed their positive feelings about the Mojave Max Program. One teacher summed the program as "authentic learning" and others described the excitement that the program builds among both students and teachers. Interestingly, the teachers also described how the character of **Mojave Max has personalized the desert for their students, making them more apt to respect their environment as a result of this "spokes-tortoise."**

Moreover, it is important to reiterate the overall positive comments expressed by the teachers about the Mojave Max Program, in terms of the contest and assembly elements, the Mojave Max mascot/spokes-tortoise, and the program's aim to engage students in earth sciences through a fun, interactive, and engaging program.

In regard to the focus group comprised of desert recreation enthusiasts, when asked to identify challenges that the DCP faces in reaching those people recreating in the desert in Clark County, *communication* was named as the greatest challenge. How to overcome the challenge? Reaching youth through education – the Mojave Max Program – was emphasized as a way to overcome the challenge.

Survey

The survey revealed that 53% of survey respondents have heard of the Mojave Max Program, and of those respondents, 36% of respondents have heard a lot about the program and 43% have heard a little about it. It is important to note that the majority of survey respondents were adults (only 7% were 18 years of age or younger), and given the Mojave Max Program's target of school-age children, the results are skewed given the age demographics. However, the survey does reveal that adults are more likely to have heard of the program if they have children in their household. Also of importance is the fact that 75% of

respondents are very likely to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them.

Specific Recommendations

The contest reflects the idea that when it comes to issues such as long-term protection of the desert environment, habits are formed during childhood. The contest educates the younger generation about desert conditions and wildlife habits, encouraging respect and protection of the county's natural ecosystems. Furthermore, the Mojave Max Emergence Contest is the cornerstone of the PIE Program, and in reviewing the files from 2001 to 2003, the assessor perceives that the contest has begun an evolution from a school-age children's activity to a more broadly recognized community event.

Therefore, the theme of the following recommendations could be described as *building upon existing success*. Also, recognizing budget constraints, the recommendations could be achieved at minimum or no cost.

Mojave Max has become a widely recognized icon in the community, while the character is still in its relative infancy compared to "Punxsutawney Phil." Just as Phil has become the world's most famous groundhog, known well beyond the borders of Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, for predicting the length of seasonal weather conditions, Mojave Max, too, has the potential to gain recognition in a much larger scope, representing the arrival of spring and the importance of desert conservation as the tortoise is a indicator species, linked to the health of the desert.

Again, considering all the components of the Desert Conservation Program, the qualitative research results point to the effectiveness and success of the Mojave Max-related components. Interviewees – those closest to the information and education activities of the PIE Program – expressed that one of the great benefits of the Mojave Max Program is that it educates the population where education efforts "have to start," which is with children, as well as providing opportunities for the DCP's messages to be

delivered in an interactive settings wherein the messages have greater potential to be understood and retained by the audience.

Suggestions for building upon existing success:

- Increase Public Relations Efforts

Not knowing exactly when Mojave Max will emerge presents inherent challenges in planning a press event, but those challenges can be turned into positives. Build-up anticipation for the announcement of the contest winner by using low-cost promotion tools such as public relations efforts with a strategically timed

news release about the contest followed by both periodic media advisories (emergence updates) within the historical window period of when Mojave Max will emerge from his burrow and a media alert announcing a press event after the contest winner is determined.

Each media advisory should contain relevant message points, explaining how the tortoise is an indicator species – reflective of the health of the desert – to encourage respect and protection of the county's ecosystems.

Moreover, the PIE Program has already proven adept at public relations, including news release writing and distribution, as evidenced by national coverage by prestigious media outlets such as CNN.

Public relations efforts should not only be tailored toward community, education, and weather-related news, but stories should be pitched to outdoor and environmental reporters as well. Also, pitch to appropriate editors the idea of doing a series on how the tortoise is tied to the health of the county's ecosystems, with the series timed around the historical window period of when Mojave Max will emerge from his burrow.

- Emphasize the Significance of the Contest

In all Mojave Max Emergence Contest promotional materials, including public relations efforts, ensure that message points convey the PIE Program's objectives.

Illustrate that the contest is more than a school-age event, but also a prime opportunity to establish long-term protection of our desert environment through children; tie-in the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message, as well as the importance of the permit, which allows growth, jobs, and economic stability to continue.

- Consider a "Mojave Max Watch"

Implement a "Mojave Max Watch" during the historical window period of the tortoise's emergence.

Send daily updates so that meteorologists can report messages such as, “Mojave Max is still sleeping, so be careful all of you off-roaders.”

Through the cooperative partnership with the Clark County School District, explore the potential of distributing the alert to schools as well, so that school administration officials can read the “Mojave Max Watch” update (accompanied

by a different, brief education message – “Mojave Max says...”) during a school’s morning PA news announcements each day for two weeks.

The daily “Mojave Max Watch” should be featured and updated on mojavemax.com as well.

- Make the Winner Announcement a Larger Event

Although there are inherent challenges with not knowing when Max will emerge, make the actual announcement of the winner an even larger event than it currently is, such as by holding a press conference-style event and holding the identity of the winning student and school until the event.

Make the event more attractive for media coverage; invite more than just one commissioner, but invite all of the commissioners, the superintendent of the school district, and perhaps a local celebrity or two – while keeping the costumed Mojave Max and the student winner as the focus of media attention.

Invite previous winners, too, to discuss how their values have changed and to explain to reporters how they gained greater respect and enjoyment of the desert as a result of having participated in the contest.

- Establish a Meteorologist Contest

In a previous meeting with PIE Committee members, the assessor had recommended exploring the idea of broadening participation and coverage of the contest by local meteorologists by coordinating the first cross-station competition between meteorologists by having them guess Mojave Max’s emergence as well, and the winning meteorologist could be announced at the same press event as described above. Given the on-air personalities of local meteorologists, this sub-contest should be the talk of the community and great fun, potentially resulting in additional coverage, as well as being the subject of banter among news anchors. The assessor understands that a variation on this idea is already being developed and implemented to the degree that the local television station managers are willing to let their meteorologists participate.

- Explore the Idea of a Mojave Max Club

A potential way for students to continue their involvement, interest, and education regarding the conditions of desert ecosystems and the responses of wildlife on a year-long basis (and after participating in the contest) is to explore the interest level among students of starting a *Mojave Max Club* (serving as the name of a school's environmental/conservation club).

If an appetite exists, these clubs could be chartered and run by interested students, with the PIE Program supplying educational materials, perhaps coordinating a field trip opportunity during the school year and offering a year-end pizza party for the students who served as Mojave Max Club presidents.

- Reach Adults, Too

The Mojave Max Program represents a primary focus of the PIE Committee's efforts, with the majority of PIE dollars dedicated to reaching one of its three target audiences: children.

Therefore, the assessor contends that opportunities may exist for the Mojave Max Program to reach an adult population as well. This is perhaps one of the greatest methods to capitalize on the Program's success. Based on research-based assessment results, parents may be a receptive audience if receiving information from the Program. For instance, the survey indicates that 75% of survey respondents said they are *very likely* to pay attention to information brought home to them by their children, and 17% said they are *likely* to pay attention to information brought home to them by their children – only 1% responded that they are *not likely* to pay attention to information brought home to them by their children.

The assessor recommends tying-in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest with the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message aimed at adults, by providing a handout or assignment to participating teachers that the students could take home and share with their parent(s) or guardian(s). In other words, after the students become educated on desert conditions and wildlife responses, a homework assignment would be designed for the student to teach his or her parent(s)/guardian(s).

In reaching adults, message points can be crafted to meet the objective of informing the public of the Section 10(a) Permit, too; the message can be related to the importance of desert conservation in order to maintain the permit, which allows growth, jobs, and economic stability to continue.

Moreover, the assessor recommends that the PIE Committee continue to produce and distribute messages so that audiences understand the importance of the contest, including the indication that spring has begun and that the tortoise is an indicator

species, explaining how the health and population of the tortoise is connected to the health of the desert. These important message points help the contest meet PIE Program objectives of encouraging respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems and, through education, increasing understanding and awareness of the value of natural ecosystems.

- Further Enhance MojaveMax.Com

One way to enhance and expand environmental education through the Mojave Max Program is to enhance the website (which is already very informative and user-friendly). The assessment indicates that a viable opportunity exists to enhance the website to feature the Mojave Max exhibit at Red Rock Visitor Center by showing real-time images and data of the tortoise's behavior and to provide more interactive, learning material opportunities through the website.

Many of the research process components, including the HCP/environmental comparison and the interview process, demonstrate the importance of maintaining a user-friendly, informative, and education-based website.

For instance, the Montgomery County, Virginia, Department of Environmental Protection Environmental Education Specialist Joe Keyser discussed effective programs with the assessor and said that the Department's current outreach emphasis is concentrated in a few key areas, including an education-based website, which is a "major component" of the Department's education and outreach efforts.

Furthermore, the San Francisco Department of the Environment Deputy Outreach Manager James Chien informed the assessor that providing and distributing information via an information and education-based website is particularly important in the electronic age, where "printing is perceived more and more as archaic, non-effective, and as a waste of both money and resources." The Department directs citizens to the Internet if they want information. (He noted that the "old argument" about people not having access to the Internet is now negated by easy access through public libraries and other facilities.)

Additionally, the survey indicated that the Internet was in the top four sources from which survey respondents receive public information – 29% of survey respondents most often receive their public information from the Internet.

Continue the Mass Media Approach

Throughout the assessment process, the research-based assessment results continually pointed toward the importance of using mass media to deliver conservation messages and to use the advice and services of professionals with expertise in

developing and instituting media campaigns in order to ensure that campaigns are conducted both effectively and efficiently.

Before discussing this recommendation further, please note that the next section of the final report is entitled, “Take a Focused Approach with Special Interest

Groups.” Is it conflicting information to recommend both a mass media campaign effort and a more focused approach with specific audiences? The assessor maintains these recommendations are not in conflict with one another, but, rather, suggest that both recommendations need to be accomplished. The audiences (specific interest groups, children’s groups, and the general public) targeted by the DCP’s education and information program are reached differently with some activities, while other projects may provide messages that reach numerous target audiences. Although various target audiences may receive the consistency of the same messages, such as Respect, Protect, and Enjoy, the communication channels to effectively reach special interest groups with these consistent messages may be very different from one another.

Furthermore, all of the recommendations were formulated after careful evaluation and consideration of target audiences. A mass media campaign is necessary for the PIE Program because one of its target audiences is the general public. The survey research, in particular, indicated the importance of using mass media, especially television.

Additionally, early research in the assessment process discussed the benefits of creating effective PSA campaigns, as well as the cost benefits of strategically planning and executing a media campaign and the importance of utilizing professional services to realize the cost savings produced by negotiated media packages.

In regard to the Public Service Announcement (PSA) aspect of the media campaign, the assessor discussed research, which illustrates the benefits of a strategically planned PSA campaign. According to the *Non Profit Times*, “campaign after campaign has demonstrated that PSAs are effective in getting out messages...what PSAs do best is convey the importance of an issue, work to change attitudes and misconceptions, and, most importantly, compel people to take action.” Although the control of exactly when and where a message can be delivered is forfeited with PSAs (approximately 55% of television PSAs run between 1 a.m. and 8 a.m.), by producing PSAs, the DCP takes advantage of the free space and time available within local media outlets.

Furthermore, the PIE Committee’s PSA campaign planning (using media professionals) includes a number of strategic efforts, such as creating a public service media outline, framework and strategy, and contacting local TV stations to negotiate annual public service campaigns featuring weekly messages.

In regard to the advertising aspect of the media campaign, the assessor researched the cost benefits of the negotiated packages established by Matteson Media Group (through comparison to individual ad placements).

Taking into account market size, Nielsen summary reports (which measure market television viewership), and relative market performance based on cost per point (CPP) and cost per thousand (CPM) data in a total survey area (TSA), Media Market Guide's Service Quality Analytics Data (SQAD) allowed the assessor to determine that placing advertisements on a piecemeal basis would have resulted in costs up to \$17,376.50, about five times the amount paid by the DCP within the negotiated media package.

Furthermore, other research pointed to the importance of instituting a mass media campaign. According to the HCP/environmental programs comparison research, mass media advertising was cited as an "effective" component of environmental programs. For instance, Mr. Joe Keyser, Environmental Education Specialist with the Montgomery County, Virginia, Department of Environmental Protection, explained to the assessor that the Department's current outreach emphasis is concentrated in areas such as print advertising in local newspapers, conveying the Department's environmental messages on popular government access television programs, and utilizing PSA-type opportunities, including "eco-minute" spots marketed to other cable and government access shows where there is no cost for placement. Advertisements were developed and targeted after market research was conducted, and after the mass media advertising campaign (the Department has an annual \$400,000 public outreach budget to reach a population of 873,341); "the Department had measurable demonstration of behavioral change."

Additionally, the interview process indicated that those individuals closest to the PIE process perceive the benefits of a concerted media campaign. When discussing perceptions about effective media, there seems to be a common perception that media such as television, radio, and billboards have the potential to be more effective since they reach larger audiences. Moreover, some interviewees discussed the need for a 'media mix' and the advice of professionals.

Moreover, when the 27 interviewees (those individuals who have been the closest to the DCP PIE Program and the results of its activities) were asked, "What medium do you feel has been or is the most effective in delivering the DCP's messages about conservation," television and/or radio emerged as the most popular answer, as a common perception is that these media have the power to reach the largest audience.

Furthermore, some interviewees explained that advertising expertise is needed for the right media blend, as one medium may not be singularly effective. The PIE Program's contracted media professional consultant, Mr. Dale Matteson, explained to the assessor the importance of the "media mix" with radio targeting children and television reaching parents and educators, as well as the Clark

County School District serving as a “conduit” to the children. Other interviewees expressed that the PSAs developed by Matteson Media Group are attention-grabbing and deliver quick, effective messages.

Moreover, the focus group results, similarly, pointed to the positive aspects of the PIE’s media campaign efforts. The Mojave Max Emergence Contest (MMEC) focus group report indicated that the general perceptions of the teachers about the MMEC are very positive: teachers said that they perceived the contest’s positive results through television coverage. Additionally, about half of the teachers favored radio and television advertising about the MMEC because it reaches the “entire” educational community – teachers, parents, and students – at the same time.

Finally, the survey reaffirmed the importance of using mass media to convey messages. When survey respondents were asked to name the sources that they most often receive public information from, television was cited more than other sources, with 56% of the respondents stating that they most often receive information from television. Respondents also chose other mass media, such as newspapers (48%) and radio (32%).

Likewise, television was clearly the top choice, too, when respondents were asked to name the best method of communication to receive public information. Survey respondents were asked to choose the best method of communication from nine communication choices, and none of the choices were cited by more than 13% of the respondents, except mail (17%), such as receiving a flyer or newsletter through the mail, and television (28%).

Moreover, the survey revealed that 94% of survey respondents have heard or seen conservation messages such as “respect, protect, and enjoy” the desert. Of the 94% who have heard or seen conservation messages, 56% of respondents saw the messages on television, followed by billboards (26%), radio (25%), and the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun* (24%).

Also, all mass media efforts should involve the Spanish speaking population as well since the Spanish speaking population in the Las Vegas Valley exceeds 20 percent and is growing.³

-more-

³ Gonzalez, Polly (anchor). *Clark County Premieres Its First All-Spanish-Speaking TV Program*. KLAS, Channel 8, CBS affiliate.

Take a Focused Approach with Special Interest Groups

As the focus group results indicated, the special interest group target audiences of the DCP are very different, and, consequently, require the PIE Program to address them differently – not necessarily in terms of the *kind* of messages that they receive, but more in terms of how they receive the messages.

To discuss how to undertake a focused approach to effectively deliver DCP messages to target audiences, each audience is discussed separately in terms of what the assessor learned about the potentially most effective methods to reach each audience.

Moreover, this section only discusses the special interest groups (desert recreation enthusiasts, educators, off-road vehicle enthusiasts, rural community residents) wherein qualitative research was conducted, as opposed to the DCP's more broadly defined target audiences: the general public (which is addressed in the section recommending the mass media approach) and children (which is addressed in the section about building upon the success of the Mojave Max Program).

Desert Recreation Enthusiasts

The assessment research indicates that the two most potentially effective ways of reaching desert recreation enthusiasts is to: 1) distribute or post messages at points where enthusiasts commonly recreate in Clark County (i.e., trailhead signage and booth presence or sponsorship messaging at appropriate desert activities and events); and 2) reach youthful enthusiasts through the Mojave Max Program.

Additionally, more frequent desert recreation enthusiasts may be reached via communication channels offered by outdoor/desert recreation clubs and organizations.

Rural Residents

In terms of reaching Clark County's rural communities, traditional mass media methods (such as television, radio and metropolitan newspapers) may not necessarily reach the residents of the rural communities. Due to poor reception, satellite dishes may be required in some of these areas (and some satellite systems do not carry local channels).

Rather, the most potentially effective way to reach the rural residents is by conducting an outreach meeting(s) where a representative(s) of the DCP would both talk to and *listen* to the rural community and would present information in an

interactive format with a question and answer session offered. Assessment research emphasizes that personal, interactive contact with the rural community would have the greatest potential in terms of effectively delivering conservation messages.

Also, the assessment research suggests that what the PIE Committee is already achieving, such as its partnership with the rural-based Partners in Conservation, is important in order to effectively deliver conservation messages to the rural audience.

OHV Users

Despite numerous OHV clubs in existence in Southern Nevada, the research indicates that OHV users are not a *community* per se or a cohesive group, and, thus, cannot be reached, effectively and efficiently, in any fashion as a collective whole. As the research indicated, perhaps the only points of distribution that this group can be assuredly reached are where they purchase their vehicles or the shops they return to for maintenance, parts, repair, and/or accessories. Research also indicates a (perceived) willingness of such dealers and retailers to distribute educational materials to their customers.

Moreover, *who* communicates to OHV users is important, according to the assessment research (the concept of communication barriers and the importance of peer communication are discussed in a later section of the final report). OHV enthusiasts who serve on the PIE Committee already help greatly in this regard, such as having a presence at OHV events (distributing PIE products with conservation messages), attending and speaking at OHV club meetings, and sending email to OHV club leaders and members.

Teachers

A particularly enlightening part of the assessment research revealed that traditional communication delivery methods aimed at reaching teachers – such as letters, flyers, and other handouts that arrive to their boxes at school – are not necessarily effective at reaching teachers, especially when any one medium is used singularly.

Rather, more time and effort may be required of the PIE Program to broadly reach educators working in Clark County, including informing teachers about the Mojave Max Emergence Contest. It may take a combination of efforts (written communication that would arrive in teacher boxes, mass media advertising, and use of the “Interact” intranet system of the Clark County School District) to reach teachers. Research indicates that sole use and reliance on the Interact system may not effectively reach teachers.

Address Communication Barriers

During the course of assessment research, particularly during the focus group research, the assessor discovered that one of the challenges faced by the DCP – in terms of effectively communicating its messages – is that not all message recipients are receptive to listening or seeing the messages.

The focus group participants indicated that they are more receptive to information delivered to them by their peers and peer groups than perceived “outside” individuals, organizations, and agencies. This finding suggests that one of the PIE Committee’s most valuable resources are those individuals who serve on the committee – whose voices on the committee are representative of their communities and whose active participation demonstrates the diverse interests involved in directing and planning the Desert Conservation Program’s public information and education efforts.

Furthermore, this finding ties into the interview process, wherein many of the interviewees informed the assessor that one of the best aspects of the PIE Committee is the diversity of the participants and how no one is excluded from the DCP’s public information and education process.

Despite the openness of the DCP PIE Program (as revealed to the assessor during the qualitative interview research), the rural community focus group results indicate that a perception exists that the applicable government agencies did not invite the input of rural community residents when creating species and desert conservation public policy, particularly at the time the MSHCP was developed (the majority of focus group participants perceive that their lack of input is reflected by road access and land use restrictions).

However, these communication barriers can be overcome. For instance, when the assessor explored whether or not rural residents would accept DCP produced and distributed conservation messages, the participants indicated that for rural residents to accept and potentially be receptive to the messages, two primary issues must be addressed. First, the focus group participants emphasized that they must feel that they have input into any government-imposed/public-impacted process. If they feel “shut-out” of a program or process, mistrust is created, which, naturally, also creates a communication barrier. Secondly, the focus group participants indicated that they are more likely to be accepting of and receptive to messages if the messages are delivered by their peers – those individuals or organizations that they perceive as “inside” their community and familiar with their needs and issues. In many ways, the DCP is already addressing this issue by forming partnerships with rural-based organizations such as Partners in Conservation, and continuing to conduct

business in an open and inviting manner, allowing the rural voices to participate in equal measure with all other special interests and audiences.

In regard to the OHV community focus group results, the OHV focus group participants indicate that the OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not only a challenging group to reach, but are also challenging in terms of this population’s degree of receptiveness to DCP messages.

Again, such challenges can be overcome. The assessor learned from both the OHV users and the teachers that producing and distributing messages is not just about message content and how a message is delivered, but also about *who* is delivering the messages. Just as the teachers indicated how they respond to their peers, so do the OHV enthusiasts. Their current barrier from being receptive to messages is that they feel the messages are being delivered by a “green” organization; one way to overcome this barrier is to clearly depict that messages are not being delivered from a “green” source, but, rather, from a respected peer or role model. Moreover, the DCP already has resources in terms of two active OHV enthusiasts who serve on the PIE Committee.

Therefore, the research results indicate that effective communication to certain DCP target audiences should be peer-based. Efforts to affect OHV users attitudes (i.e., respect for the desert) and behavior (i.e., responsible recreation in the desert) will perhaps prove unsuccessful if the perception issue is not first addressed and resolved.

When the assessor prioritized PIE project proposals, one proposal recognized the importance of peer-to-peer communication in delivering messages to teen OHV users by proposing to have teens deliver responsible OHV use messages in a video format that would be shown in schools. This is one example of how the DCP’s conservation messages could be (potentially) more effectively delivered to target audiences (those audiences exhibiting communication barrier issues).

Additionally, with regard to teachers, the teachers who participated in focus groups are most likely to respond to getting involved with the Mojave Max Program through word-of-mouth from their respected peers.

In summary, each focus group addressed communication barriers and illustrated the importance of peer-to-peer communication. Although these challenges are not easy to overcome, the diverse membership of the PIE Committee is the first step in demonstrating to these audiences that information produced and disseminated from the PIE Program is not just from the “green” community or the dictate of local government, but, rather, is being collaboratively produced and distributed by a group of diverse participants, wherein no one is excluded from the DCP’s public information and education process.

Provide Consistent Messages and Consider End-User with Products

Looking at expenditures on products, the assessment analysis showed that costs were only slightly above market for some products. The disparity in the set-up charges for each purchase demonstrates the flexibility in pricing from one company to another, which the DCP could consider when placing orders.

A number of considerations go into product selection, and the assessor has observed how the product selections seem tied to cost consideration, the ability for the product to carry appropriate messages, and the products’ presumed utility for its intended

audience. The assessment demonstrates that products will have greater potential to be effective in carrying messages to target audiences if the product is actually used (desired) by the end user. For example, the assessor found through research conducted at the Clark County Fair 2004 that almost 50% of the respondents favored clothing items. Although the assessor understands that this is a relatively expensive product to produce, the effectiveness of the message could be greater because of the recipient's likeliness to keep and use the product. In other words, a product's cost should certainly be considered by the DCP, but spending more for products may be a more prudent expense if messages are effectively delivered to target recipients.

In addition, the assessor observed different messages on the various promotional products that were sampled. Although it appears messages were carefully selected with target audiences in mind (i.e., printing "Stay on Roads" on products distributed to OHV users), the DCP could distribute its message even more effectively by using the same message on all products. The following discussion about message consistency illustrates this contention:

Consistency is a critical part of an organization's ability to build a strong, credible reputation in the community and among those groups of people who have the most impact on your success. Consistency breeds credibility, which breeds success. It's difficult to build a strong identity in the marketplace if you do not consistently communicate a clear, coherent message. Decide what your organization's message is going to be – that is, how you want to be perceived by your target groups. Once you decide on a central message, stick with it. If you constantly communicate a consistent message, in time it will become familiar to your target audiences. Communicating a consistent message over time greatly increases the chance that it will resonate among your target audiences and that you will achieve your communication goals.⁴

Advertising and public relations professionals know that "a marketing message takes a long, painstaking time to build up,"⁵ and printing or broadcasting multiple messages can water down the potency of a consistent and repetitive message.

Continue Assessment

Just as the assessor has conducted a process-model, research-based assessment, such assessment efforts should not cease upon receipt of the assessor's final recommendations report this summer. As with any program, constant monitoring, evaluation, and assessment are required to ensure the program is meeting its stated

⁴ Williams, Frank. *A Pioneer Approach to Public Relations*. The Pioneer Communicator, May 2003.

⁵ St. Maur, Suzan. *Eight ways to help make your company's marketing messages more consistent*. MarketingProfs.com article.

objectives and reaching its target audiences in a meaningful and effective manner. Assessment, however, can be both periodic and adaptive, based on the needs of the program.

The assessor has conducted a mix of both qualitative (interviews, focus groups) and quantitative (survey) elements to evaluate and assess the DCP's public information and education activities. This process is not unique to the Clark County Desert Conservation Program. Conducting surveys to determine the most effective way to communicate with publics is employed by agencies such as the United States Department of Agriculture. The Department's 1998 "Needs Assessment Survey" reflects that determining effective educational outreach methods was deemed critical by the Department in order to "ensure that technology and information are transferred...in a meaningful and accepted manner." Due to the survey, the Department was able to determine that outreach tools such as one- to two-page fact sheets, "How To" informational brochures, and workshops were more effective educational outreach components (for their audiences) than posters, interactive videos, and CD-ROMs. The survey also helped the Department determine that information pieces must be tailored to different audiences (i.e., the survey indicated that certain audiences are more "technically oriented" than other audiences). The Department used the survey results to prioritize educational outreach methods and direct the development of Department-produced informational materials, training, and technology.⁶

Moreover, the interview process made sure that those individuals most closely linked to the Desert Conservation Program, either as participants on the PIE Committee, or as partners or close observers in regard to PIE activities, have had input into the process. The process-oriented research approach has also included assessor-observation of some PIE activities, evaluation of specific

communication pieces, analysis of expenditures, and comparison of other related HCP and environmental programs. Some of PIE's audiences were specifically spoken to as well (in a focus group format) to elicit perceptions, opinions, and suggestions from a *target* audience in a setting which allows for open, unfettered communication. The focus groups yielded suggestions for how to potentially improve methods for reaching an audience, both in terms of message production (referring to the content and tone of messages to address how receptive an audience is to the messages) and delivery (including where and how to reach the target audience) – and if barriers exist in such lines of communication – suggestions are offered as to how to overcome the challenges.

Overall, this process-oriented, research-based assessment, with a mix of both qualitative and quantitative elements, as well as some of the assessor's objective,

⁶ United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry. *Urban Forest Health Needs Assessment Survey: Results and Recommendations*. January 1998. St. Paul, Minnesota.

professional judgments, has allowed for a comprehensive assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education Program, as well as PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium. The assessor recommends that the DCP continue to assess its public information and education activities, at least on a periodic and adaptive basis to ensure that objectives continue to be met, target audiences continue to be reached, and program components are evaluated in terms of effectiveness.

Survey research is perhaps the most common method for assessing the success of public information campaigns. For instance, when assessing the impact on public opinion of a public information program on health care reform in the United States, survey research was the primary research method used to assess the impact of the public information program. The public information campaign, designed and conducted by the Public Agenda Foundation, was intended to inform target audiences (communities) about the condition of the United States health care system, especially reform initiatives being debated by lawmakers. A pre- and post-treatment survey design with controls was used. Surveys were conducted in target communities before and after the public information program was administered in the target cities.⁷

The DCP should also consider assessing the Mojave Max Program in terms of student learning, such as cognition, perception (the process by which people attach meaning to experiences), and retention. Although the assessor does not possess the student learning assessment expertise required to elaborate more on this subject, research indicates that the most valuable student learning assessments are formative – assessing student learning over time – rather than summative in nature. Moreover, in the case of a public information and education program or campaign, the student learning should be measured in terms of the students' progress toward the program's goals and/or expectations. The results

of formative student learning assessments may cause the program administrators to develop and introduce new pedagogies that more effectively develop students' learning in a particular subject matter (i.e., desert conservation) or discipline. Assessment results help answer questions about which kind of pedagogies or educational experiences foster the desired educational outcomes.⁸

Increase Message Delivery Efficiency

The assessment research indicates that beyond a volunteer teaching program (the Mojave Max Education Project), more must be done to put the empowerment of environmental education into the hands of teachers to achieve more efficiency in the

⁷ Daniels, Sally. *Assessment of a Program of Public Information on Health Care Reform*. 1992-1993: [Wichita, Kansas, and Des Moines, Iowa].

⁸ Maki, Peggy. *Developing an Assessment Plan to Learn About Student Learning*. Pre-publication version of article that appears in the *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, January 2002.

delivery of conservation information and the messages of the DCP to achieve program objectives.

To illustrate this point, research of both the Habitat Conservation Plans and the county-run environmental department programs demonstrated that a commonality existed in that these program managers – with limited staff and budgets – have realized a concept that one manager called the “acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept.” All of these managers have realized they simply cannot conduct what they feel to be effective informational, outreach, and educational efforts on their own, and formal steps have been taken to “teach the teachers” to convey the environmental and conservation information to students.

Although the research conducted by the assessor clearly points to the importance of the (school-age) education component in any environmental/conservation program, the assessment research indicates that avenues should be explored for maximizing program resources through realizing a “teaching the teachers” concept. (The recommendation to develop curriculum and teaching materials was previously discussed in this report in the section about building upon the success of the Mojave Max Program.)

To provide some examples of how other HCP programs implement the “teaching the teachers” efficiency concept, the Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard HCP concentrates on providing 4-hour lessons to teachers so they can conduct future lessons and field trips that the HCP would have a limited capability to conduct with a limited staff.

Likewise, the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan’s managers realized that the HCP’s outreach subcommittee members could not achieve the needed informational and educational efforts relying on themselves, so numerous partnerships have been developed, and the HCP takes advantage of each and every opportunity to attach the HCP’s messages to other environmental, educational, and agency programs that already exist. Similarly, the San Francisco Department of the Environment, even with a staff of 62, practices the “teach the teachers” efficiency philosophy, with programs that provide the resources and materials to teachers, as well as offering on-site training for teachers (and the Department has found that most teachers take advantage of the opportunity and appreciate the environmental science training, which includes instructing teachers how to present the science information so it is age/grade-level appropriate).

- Develop Mojave Max Curriculum and Teaching Materials

The SCAT program was previously discussed in this report, and the assessor realizes that the PIE Committee has explored curriculum development in the past through the

SCAT task (but that it failed to come to fruition). However, the assessor recommends that the PIE Committee consider this task (or a variation thereof) once again. Several research processes, including the teachers' focus groups, the HCP/environmental program comparison, and the interview process indicated the importance of developing Mojave Max science-based curriculum and appropriate teacher materials.

For instance, concerning the San Diego MSCP, an inter-jurisdictional committee (comprised of wildlife agencies and different permittees) oversees the Program; for education efforts, the San Diego MSCP Outreach Subcommittee meets once a month to oversee outreach and educational activities, including the development of science curriculum. The MSCP has also partnered with the Department of Education, and the MSCP Outreach Subcommittee has taken an active role in helping the Department to develop environmental science curriculum. Additionally, the subcommittee visits classrooms when committee members can volunteer, but a more formal exercise has been developing the curriculum so teachers can teach the environmental information without the need for outside volunteers. The subcommittee's work at developing curriculum and working directly with teachers is viewed as a more efficient delivery method than the subcommittee directly reaching the children.

Likewise, the results of the interview process indicated that many of those individuals who are closest to the PIE Program believe the Program has opportunities to capitalize on its existing successes, and some interviewees discussed the concept of educating the educators. A step toward realizing this concept is the development of the Mojave Max curriculum and user-friendly

materials (such as education guides and lesson plans) that meet school standards, such as the National Science Standards and the Nevada State Standards for K-12 education.

Moreover, the assessor contends that the development of curriculum should include the appropriate individuals in the conduct of curriculum development, such as teachers who have experience in the development of resource materials for science K-12 curriculum and applicable scientists in respect to ensuring science-accurate information.

Additionally, the focus groups with teachers indicated that teachers have a real appetite for receiving species and conservation information to supplement their science, math, and/or social studies curriculum.

Moreover, the teachers have very specific methods for how they would like to receive such information from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, including a teachers' resource guide, worksheets, and an activity packet to engage students in conservation education. They expressed that their students learn best with interaction, activities, mixing facts with fun, and having information presented visually whenever possible.

What the assessor learned from the research with teachers confirms what the assessor learned during the interview process, including from interviewees Dr. Karin Hoff and Jane Feldman. For instance, during the interview process, Dr. Hoff discussed the need to develop specific curriculum resources for Clark County educators and informed the assessor that educators are aware of Mojave Max and the Mojave Desert, but they want more information for their science curriculum. “Step one is getting the message out, making sure they’re [educators] listening and watching, and that part is developing well since people are working on that in a focused way, but there must be more meat behind Mojave Max. There isn’t a substantial development of resources for them [teachers] to hook into,” said Dr. Hoff.

Closing Comments

The assessment demonstrates that the Clark County Desert Conservation Program’s Public Information and Education Program has not only been a successful program, but that the program could serve as a model for other Habitat Conservation Plans operating public information, education, and outreach efforts in the country.

A myriad of reasons exist for the program’s success. For one, the PIE Committee is comprised of a group of hard working and dedicated volunteers who represent

numerous stakeholders, including OHV enthusiasts, the rural community, the environmental community, the public school system and higher education, and government agencies. This open and inviting structure allows for diverse voices to shape the planning of message development and delivery, even though the consensus-building among these diverse stakeholders is undoubtedly challenging.

Secondly, the program has received national recognition for its Mojave Max Program, which successfully engages thousands of Clark County students each year by mixing fun with science facts through both an appealing and educational tortoise emergence contest and interactive and informative classroom visits through a partnership between Clark County and the Red Rock National Conservation Area.

Third, the PIE Program has realized the importance of seeking help and advice from professional services, such as its strategically planned and coordinated PSA and mass media campaigns, which have also saved the program money through negotiated media packages, as opposed to buying advertising on a piecemeal basis.

The DCP has also formed a number of fruitful partnerships, including with the Red Rock National Conservation Area, the University of Nevada, Reno, Partners in Conservation, and the Clark County School District, to name a few notable examples.

Lastly, through its current strategic planning efforts and recent assessment process, the DCP PIE Program demonstrates that it continues to enhance, adapt, and improve the

components of an already successfully program. As H. Tom Collard was famous for saying, “Success is a journey—not a destination.”

APPENDIX A

Monthly Report
August 5, 2003 – September 5, 2003

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Executive Summary

Charged with reviewing accomplishment reports and reviewing and analyzing expenditures (Tasks A-C of the assessor’s scope of work) of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) Public Information and Education (PIE) Program, Strategic Solutions (the assessor) completed these initial tasks as part of the first step in the assessment process – part of a PIE program’s *input* – within the Process-Based Evaluation methodology, including the Logic Model. This methodology is used to assess PIE projects as a process, serving as a specific step-by-step method to analyze the changes or benefits that a project has had on targeted audiences.

This process includes evaluation of input (which this initial report covers, in part), activities, and output of PIE projects in relation to outcomes (how target audiences are reached and how objectives are met) and impacts for the participants (i.e., an increase in respect for Clark County’s ecosystems).

The purpose for explaining this process is to note that the analyses contained in this report do not yet yield the information required for the assessor to formulate recommendations.

Moreover, the assessor has performed a cost-based analysis of major expenditure categories by identifying, gathering, and reviewing prices of similar services from a variety of vendors. Utilizing comparable market rates for products and services (as reflected on the PIE expenditure reports) allowed the assessor to address certain cost-based efficiencies (or inefficiencies), if the analysis revealed a certain line item expenditure to be significantly above or below market costs.

Regarding analysis of expenditures, samples of major expenditure categories (advertising, underwriting, products, printing, and editing/research) were examined, selected on the significance of the expense and the availability (i.e., product quantities) of information needed to conduct a market rate analysis.

In all of the expenditure categories, the analyses reveal that **the DCP's costs for PIE Program products and services are below, at, or just a little above market rates for similar services.**

Again, further in the assessment process, these inputs can be assessed in relation to *impacts*.

Review and Analyses

Underwriting

The costs spent underwriting KLVX Channel 10 (PBS affiliate) programming is a significant line item expenditure for the DCP's PIE program.

The *Public Information and Education Expenditures FY 95-96* reflects an expenditure of \$20,000 for KLVX *Outdoor Nevada* on 12/08/95; the *Public Information and Education Expenditures FY 96-97* indicated that \$40,000.00 was expended on KLVX *Outdoor Nevada* for the biennium; and the *Actual Expenditures for Biennium 1997-1999* indicates that \$40,000 was spent on KLVX *Outdoor Nevada* (11/30/97 and 01/31/99), and \$21,000 was the line item expenditure for KLVX on 03/22/00.

The half-hour program, broadcast twice per week, features about three segments per program. The PIE accomplishment report for August 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996 discussed *Outdoor Nevada's* pilot year for the program as "quite successful."

A cost-based analysis reveals that the underwriting cost for *Outdoor Nevada* is fairly analogous to the underwriting costs for other comparable programs aired on PBS affiliate stations in the west.

Outdoor Nevada has a weekly underwriting investment of \$300.00 (the current cost was used in order to compare the program's underwriting cost to similar programs). The program airs every Thursday at 7:30 p.m. (a repeat airs Saturday at 5:30 p.m.), reaching 10,766 households. Underwriting benefits include a 15-second announcement at the beginning and ending of each program.

Oregon Field Guide is a similar program featuring "ecological issues, outdoor recreation, natural resources and travel destinations." The show airs weekly on Oregon Public Broadcasting, and the program reaches 52,500 households. The underwriting spots are 10-seconds in length. *Oregon Field Guide* has a yearly underwriting investment of \$28,000 a year (about \$540.00 per week).

PBS affiliate KCET in Southern California offers an annual underwriting cost of \$175,000 (\$3,365.00 per weekly program) for *Visiting with Huell Howser*, which takes the viewer "everywhere in Southern California...uncovers the secrets and history behind Los Angeles' most historic and interesting features." The program reaches about 88,000 households. The underwriter receives opening and closing 30-second messages.

Another example is the program *Main Street Wyoming* on Wyoming Public Television. Although not exclusively an outdoor/environment program, recent topics have included *The Story Behind Wyoming's Public Lands*, *Man and His Environment: Wyoming's Red Desert*, and *Wyoming's Birds*. The underwriting cost is \$1,050.00 per week for the program (airing every Wednesday at 10:30 p.m.), which reaches about 7,500 households.

A cost-based analysis of cost per household impression reveals that the underwriter of *Outdoor Nevada* is paying \$0.03 cents per household impression. Similarly, the underwriter for *Visiting with Huell Howser* reaches each household for \$0.04 cents; on the high end, the underwriter for *Main Street Wyoming* pays \$0.14 cents per impression, and on the low end, the underwriter for *Oregon Field Guide* pays \$0.01 cent per household impression.

Although the underwriting costs for three of the four programs are very similar (in terms of their per household impression cost), the limited sample size should be taken into consideration. The assessor researched other comparable programs throughout the western region (such as *Northwest Outdoors* on KYVE in Washington and *Outdoor Idaho* on Idaho Public Television), but some of these programs were not suitable for comparison for various reasons or the stations' underwriting representatives were less cooperative in supplying the needed data (cost, household viewership) for the purpose of this analysis.

Again, the cost per household impression analysis provides for an underwriting cost comparison – suggesting that the underwriting cost for *Outdoor Nevada* is analogous with similar PBS programs in western markets – but is not related to the outcome and the impact of the program on the target audience, which is a truer assessment of the value of the underwriting cost.

Products

The costs spent on promotional logo item giveaways for the DCP is a considerable line item expenditure. The assessor sampled 10 products that have been produced in the past 3 years. The table below represents market costs supplied by a local, reputable vendor who agreed to provide costs for the sampled items.

Item	Quantity	Amount Paid	Comparison
Zipper Pulls	25,000	\$.25/each	\$.23/each
Wooden Nickels	10,000	\$.21/each	\$.14/each
Flathead Screwdrivers	2,500	\$.48/each	\$.42/each
Phillips Screwdrivers	2,500	\$.72/each	\$.67/each
Rulers*	10,000	\$.20/each	\$.14/each
Pencils – recycled	5,000	\$.18/each	\$.17/each
NV Shaped Magnets	35,000	\$.192/each	\$.18/each
Cardboard Sun Shade	1,000	\$3.35/each	\$2.62/each
Foam Can Holders	1,000	\$1.30/each	\$.77/each

*The comparison cost is for a wooden ruler instead of a plastic ruler.

It was noted that each purchase was charged between \$50 and \$200 for color, printing, set-up, and shipping. The comparison company estimated those charges for the above listed items from \$20 not to exceed \$50.

For the most part, the analysis shows the costs are a little above market. Market prices were paid for some items, while other items such as the wooden nickels or sunshades were above market value resulting in a significant cost to the DCP. The disparity in the set-up charges for each purchase demonstrates the flexibility in pricing from one company to another, which the DCP should consider when placing orders.

Printing

The assumption might be made that what can be performed in-house should be less expensive than outsourcing, but traditional in-house functions could be provided in a more cost-efficient manner by specialist providers for a number of reasons, including economies of scale and specialization, technological developments and investments not

available in an organization's applicable in-house department, the cost of staff time and resources, and simple convenience.

Below are market costs supplied by local, reputable vendors, all of whom agreed to look at *Desert News* and the Mojave Max brochure and provide their costs for producing these materials in the same quantity in which the DCP had previously printed these two pieces for the PIE Program.

However, before sharing these costs, it should be noted that the DCP does not possess the same type of operational flexibility as a private organization would have in seeking vendor bids for printing projects. Although the DCP is not obligated to use its in-house supplier, if the DCP were to choose to pursue utilization of an outside source, the DCP would need to comply with additional

purchasing requirements. The assessor was informed that, depending on the cost, the DCP could be required to seek three competitive bids, go through a request for proposal process, and go to the Clark County Board of Commissioners for approval of the expenditure. The time and resources that would be involved to meet these requirements should be considered if the option to outsource printing is pursued.

Desert News

The *Desert News* was last printed in October of 2000. The cost was \$9,562.00 for a quantity of 30,000.

Three local, reputable printers – Graphics West, Speed-O-Printing and Mailing, and Royal Printing – agreed to provide their costs for printing the *Desert News* in a quantity of 30,000 using the same paper quality/weight, color process, and fold.

These were the costs provided:

Graphics West:	\$6,091.00
Speed-O-Printing:	\$8,250.00
Royal Printing:	\$8,875.94

The average of these three vendor costs: \$7,738.98

The market costs for printing the *Desert News* indicate that the DCP may find that outsourcing this particular printing project may produce enough savings to justify the additional purchasing requirements, but, again, these cost savings would have to be weighed against the time and resources involved in going through the bidding and request for proposal process.

Mojave Max Brochure

The Mojave Max brochure was last printed in January 2003 at a cost of \$1,553.00 for a quantity of 12,000.

Again, the same local, reputable printers – Graphics West, Speed-O-Printing and Mailing, and Royal Printing – agreed to provide their costs for printing the Mojave Max brochure in a quantity of 12,000 using the same paper quality/weight, color process, and fold.

These were the costs provided:

Royal Printing:	\$1,234.80
Graphics West:	\$1,584.00
Speed-O-Printing:	\$2,577.60

The average of these three vendor costs: \$1,798.80.

Therefore, the Mojave Max brochure was printed for a cost that is \$245.80 **below** the average market cost. In this case, it would probably not prove worthy of the time and efforts to pursue outsourcing, given the potential for additional purchasing requirements and the fact that the in-house supplier is delivering the project at or below market cost.

Editing and Research

According to the *Actual Expenditures for Biennium 2001-2003*, \$10,665.00 was expended for the purpose of editing a species guide.

The editing skills and content knowledge required to professionally edit a technical species guide cannot and should not be performed by an editor without applicable expertise; in fact, in addition to technical editing skills, specific scientific knowledge in various fields, such as biology, ecology, and herpetology, might be considered prerequisites for selecting a choice editor. As a trained botanist with experience in environmental services and leadership roles in organizations such as Friends of Nevada Wilderness and Red Rock Audubon Society, Ms. Hermi Hiatt brought applicable experience and expertise to her assignment.

With this understanding, professional services – offering and specializing in technical editing – are available, and their rates are nearly the same, reflecting the current market rate for technical editing services.

The editing vendors generally charge by word or by page. For comparison purposes, the three companies below all charge by page. Although not based in Nevada, these companies offer technical editing expertise nationwide; they guarantee on-time and on-budget delivery; and they offer rates for both technical and non-technical documents.

The fees below are for *technical* editing services, representing the highest rate tier within the companies' rate structures.

Edit Express	\$18 per page
Strategic Solutions, Inc. ⁹	\$15 per page
Clarity of Vision	\$15 per page

The editing costs include content editing, copyediting, and proofreading.

The 300-page species account guide that was edited by Ms. Hiatt is in the process of final draft printing and review with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The market based-cost for editing the 300-page guide would range from \$4,500 to \$5,400.

In addition to editing, Ms. Hiatt provided research, coordinating, and writing services.

Technical writing from an above-referenced vendor (Clarity of Vision) is \$15 per page for re-writing and \$25-\$50 per page for new material.

Research costs vary greatly among vendors, depending on the nature and scope of the research. The following three technical research vendors illustrate the fee schedule range:

PMI	\$50.00 per hour
NYPL Express	\$75.00 per hour
Research and Training Consultancy, Ltd.	\$90.00 per hour

Even taking the lowest market rates (\$50.00 per hour for research, \$15.00 per hour for re-writing, \$25.00 per hour for writing, and \$15 per page for editing), the line item expenditure (\$10,665.00 for Hermi Hiatt – species guide editing – from the *Actual Expenditures for Biennium 2001-2003*) is **below** what the DCP would pay using available (operating in the market) technical editing, writing, and research services, given the length of the document (about 300 pages), the scope of work (writing, coordinating, editing, and research), and the experience and expertise of Ms. Hiatt.

Market-based editing costs, alone, would have consumed about 50% of the DCP's cost in this assignment, had the DCP used one of the above-referenced vendors rather than Ms. Hiatt.

⁹ Strategic Solutions, Inc. is not the same organization as the assessor's organization: 5-Star Strategic Group (Strategic Solutions).

Also, these rates should serve as a market-based indicator of appropriate fees, which the DCP should consider paying for any needed technical editing, writing, and research services in the future.

-more-

Public Service Announcements

The PIE Program has utilized Public Service Announcement (PSA) campaigns, a proven way to reach the same audience as paid advertising, but without the same cost.

According to the *Non Profit Times*, “campaign after campaign has demonstrated that PSAs are effective in getting out messages...what PSAs do best is convey the importance of an issue, work to change attitudes and misconceptions, and, most importantly, compel people to take action.” Although the control of exactly when and where a message can be delivered is forfeited with PSAs (approximately 55% of television PSAs run between 1 a.m. and 8 a.m.), by producing PSAs, the DCP takes advantage of the free space and time available within local media outlets.

According to the accomplishment reports, the PIE Program has a long history with PSAs. The 1995-96 report indicates an organized system of regularly submitting PSAs was established, and the PIE Subcommittee and I&M Committee concluded the PSAs to be “effective.” A continued review of accomplishment reports revealed that the DCP evolved their PSA expenditures to be increasingly targeted and strategic. The July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002 biennium report reflects that the PSA campaign (contracted with Matteson Media Group) planning included a number of strategic efforts, such as creating a public service media outline, framework and strategy, and contacting local TV stations to negotiate annual public service campaigns featuring weekly messages.

Given the proven effectiveness and cost savings of PSAs, the DCP may also want to investigate the feasibility of the Nevada Broadcasters Association’s (NBA) Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement (NCSA) programs, which are available to state and local agencies. Nevada stations participate by donating their best available unsold broadcast time to the program. These ads are not commercials, nor are they PSAs, but, rather, they are only available to non-commercial entities, and the program is not always available to an entity that has previously purchased advertising (but there are occasional exceptions).

The NBA arranges placement of the ads on radio and television stations in markets within Nevada. The average cost is \$5,000.00 per month, but the NBA reports that the value received is “approximately five times that amount of actual documented airtime.”

Advertising

Due to the negotiated packages established by Matteson Media Group, it is difficult to ascertain cost-based comparison for the package as a whole, as

advertising agencies could not be expected to assist the assessor in taking the time it would require to analyze Matteson Media Group’s media package. In other sections of this report, vendors were willing to supply the assessor with information on printing costs, editing services, product prices, and underwriting costs, but advertising packages do not afford the same vendor-comparison opportunity.

However, it is possible to compare individual ad placements, although the negotiated media package does not make an individual ad comparison a reasonable and feasible analytical option, and the limitations are evident to the assessor. That being said, though, the Media Market Guide’s Service Quality Analytics Data (SQAD) shows the cost per point (CPP) and cost per thousand (CPM) for the broadcast media broken down by daypart and market for each quarter. Professional media buyers utilize this resource as a guideline in order to negotiate with a radio or television station or newspaper within a given market. (SQAD is recognized as the industry’s standard media cost source.)

The SQAD allowed the assessor to take a 30-second ad placement sample and compare it to the market cost given a number of variables. Again, this is not a fair cross-comparison considering the volume of placements within a negotiated media package, as well as value-added components within the package, but it does illustrate the benefit of negotiating a package (and hiring an experienced agency such as Matteson Media Group to conduct the negotiation).

Taking into account market size, Nielsen summary reports (which measure market television viewership), and relative market performance based on CPM and CPP data in a total survey area (TSA), SQAD allowed the assessor to determine that within the early fringe (4-7 p.m.), in the Las Vegas market, a media buyer should not have paid more than \$151.10 for a 30-second spot reaching an audience of persons age 12-17 (a standard youth age bracket category for television ratings demographics).

Correspondingly, Matteson Media Group, as part of the negotiated media package, had negotiated for 100 messages on KVWB TV. The actual gross billing was \$3,300.00. Each 30-second ad was billed at a rate of \$100.00. The ads ran Monday through Friday, from 3-5 p.m., during youth programming. (As a value-added component in the

negotiated media package, additional ads were aired during youth programming on KVWB on Saturday during the 7 a.m. hour, without charge.)

Since the analysis revealed that a media buyer should not have paid more than \$151.10 for a 30-second spot placement in the Las Vegas market (for the demographic during that particular daypart), the analysis demonstrates that Matteson Media Group's negotiated package reaped significant savings on the

30-second spots. Within this part of the media package, the DCP PIE Program received 115 thirty-second spots for \$3,300.00 (\$100.00 per ad, exclusive of value-added components) on KVWB. Placing those same ads on a piecemeal basis would have resulted in costs up to \$17,376.50, about five times the amount paid by the DCP within the negotiated media package.

Finally, a true analysis of value – related to television and radio advertising, as well as the PSA campaign – will come later in the assessment process (as outlined in the assessor's work plan), using tried and true research instruments, such as a questionnaire, to assess outcome/impact. As detailed in the assessor's work plan, the assessor will prepare a questionnaire to measure the effectiveness of various PIE efforts, including media initiatives such as PSAs and programs on radio and television.

Other

Other major expenditures were reviewed by the assessor and prompted the assessor to make additional inquiries into three expenditure categories: 1) KNPR; 2) NPS Display; and 3) and outreach events (Mark Trinko).

KNPR

The assessor did not delve deeply into this expense as underwriting for the KNPR program "Along the Way" was discontinued at the direction of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service because the messages were not conservation-based.

Moreover, regarding the Mojave Max contest, KNPR had been involved in advertising the contest, collecting the entries, and assisting with the field trip for the winner. As Clark County DCP Management Analyst Christina Gibson informed the assessor, after KNPR stopped performing these activities, Clark County began contracting with Matteson Media Group for assistance with the contest, as well as development and production of PSAs.

As Clark County took on hosting the contest, the DCP found that the county was "not structured to work well for the DCP" at the time, according to Gibson. Therefore, in 2001, and 2002, KNPR hosted the database and collected the entries. Clark County paid KNPR \$1,000 each year for this service. KNPR also provided a minimal number of random PSAs and announcements for the contest. In 2003, KNPR asked for

participation in the Almanac. At a cost of \$4,500.00, the DCP purchased advertising in the almanac, a series of PSAs and announcements, and hosting of the database.

In 2003, however, the Clark County School District took over the database function. The DCP is finding that the District is the more appropriate entity to host the database function.

NPS Display

The *Actual Expenditures for Biennium 1997-1999* reflected a line item expenditure of \$10,000.00 for a “NPS Display,” which was a significant enough expenditure for the assessor to inquire further. Clark County DCP Management Analyst Christina Gibson informed the assessor that this expenditure was for a kiosk.

Additional details (where the kiosk was used and for what purpose) were not available from Clark County since the county did not specifically coordinate this particular line item. Rather, the kiosk is a federal line item expense (some federal agencies submitted requests for PIE projects as part of one large budget to Clark County), and the federal agencies were each involved in many activities, including law enforcement, research, and public outreach. According to Gibson, Clark County staff is working on increasing the coordination, accountability, and reporting from federal agencies which received funding for PIE projects.

Outreach Events (Mark Trinko)

The Actual Expenditures for Biennium 1997-1999 reflected that Mark Trinko was paid \$16,000.00, but an explanation of the expense was not provided on the line item, and the assessor asked for additional detail. The expense was for coordination and implementation of outreach events to targeted user groups, and to encourage partnering with agencies, according to Clark County DCP Management Analyst Christina Gibson. A contract was entered into with Mr. Trinko that paid him \$1,000 per outreach event. Mr. Trinko coordinated and implemented 16 events. For each event, Mr. Trinko was required to: work with a land management agency; obtain a scope of work from the agency (projects included clean-ups and tree plantings); complete deliverables (each project required a minimum of 240 volunteer hours and 40 hours from Mr. Trinko); and obtain final approval from the coordinating agency that the project was completed.

The assessor’s team members have extensive public outreach and other event experience. Using professional judgment, the assessor determined this was more than a reasonable expense given the hours of Mr. Trinko, his deliverables and scope of work, and the targeted user groups involved.

APPENDIX B

Monthly Report
September 6, 2003 – October 8, 2003

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Executive Summary

The September 6, 2003 – October 8, 2003 monthly report covers a number of assessment components:

- A review of the KNPR Almanac and an evaluation of whether the Desert Conservation Program's (DCP) advertising in the medium is a prudent expense;
- Identification of preliminary suggestions for planning of the 2004 Mojave Max Emergence Contest;
- Discussion of the October 6, 2003, consultation meeting between the PIE Committee and Strategic Solutions (the assessor) regarding Tasks D & E of the PIE assessment, concerning, respectively:
 1. Selection of HCP and environmental programs (with education program components known to be effective) in which to compare with the DCP's PIE Program;
 2. Identification of applicable individuals involved in the PIE program, in which the assessor will interview as part of qualitative research to evaluate the outcome and results of past and ongoing PIE efforts.

KNPR Southern Nevada Almanac 2004 – Evaluation of Audience and Advertisement Cost

When there is evidence that a particular medium is the most efficient – *proven effectiveness* – the choice of where to spend limited advertising dollars is obvious. This

evidence may come from the assessment of previous advertising efforts with a particular medium or from a study of a similar organization’s activities.

In the absence of proven effectiveness, the choice becomes more challenging. But a medium should not be ruled out because it is new and untested, such as the KNPR Southern Nevada Almanac 2004. Last year was the launch of this publication.

In this case, there is the presence of objectives and target audiences (as outlined in the PIE Program) to serve as “standards.” Although the outcome (i.e., whether the advertising in the almanac encourages respect of natural ecosystems in Clark County) is not evaluated here, the medium’s ability to reach a target audience and carry a message that serves the DCP’s objectives for the PIE program can be evaluated.

[With a number of PIE Program activities, outcomes will be evaluated using the methodology of Process-Based Evaluation. Strategic Solutions will prepare a questionnaire to measure the effectiveness of various PIE efforts, including media initiatives such as Public Service Announcements, the Mojave Max Emergence Contest, and the Desert News.]

To evaluate whether advertising in the KNPR Southern Nevada Almanac 2004 is a prudent expense for the DCP, the assessor researched and evaluated a number of factors. The following reflects the important evaluative factors regarding advertising in the almanac:

Price	\$4,500 for full-page advertisement
CPM	\$3.33 (includes almanac, KNPR spots)
Reach	37,500 (almanac only)
Frequency	1 time per year
Value-added Components	Database hosting for contest 50 spots on KNPR Page of editorial
Value	\$6,000
Distribution	50% to KNPR members 50% to points of distribution
Points of Distribution	Clark County Community College Nursery Department of Forestry Desert Demonstration Gardens Las Vegas Review-Journal Office

	Nevada Power Plant World Southern Nevada Water Authority UNLV Cooperative Extension UNLV Master Gardeners
Promotion of Almanac	KNPR – distribution points mentioned during on-air spots
Target Audience	Described as listeners interested in the outdoors, the environment, and gardening and weather conditions
Audience Demographic (KNPR)	38% = college graduates or higher (25%) 44% = household incomes over \$75,000
21% = professional occupations 82% = own homes The age skews high; 23% = 55-64;	20% = 65+

Subjectively, the almanac is a quality publication, filled with interesting and practical information, which is organized in an easy-to-reference and read format. Within the 2003 almanac’s 65 pages, there were 12 ads (11 of them were a full page), which ideally prevents advertising clutter – each message is clearly seen.

In 2003, the DCP chose to use its (value-added) page of editorial content to explain the DCP, including the Section 10(a) permit and the conservation goal of protecting the health of the desert ecosystem, as well as delivering the message of *respect, protect, and enjoy* the desert. The DCP’s advertisement in the almanac promotes the Mojave Max Emergence Contest, aimed at children.

Furthermore, the editorial page seems written at the appropriate age/education level given KNPR’s audience demographic. Also, the target audience for the almanac includes those who are interested in the outdoors. The page seems perfectly appropriate both for KNPR’s demographics and the almanac’s target audience, and, therefore, the DCP should consider using this editorial content again in the 2004 almanac.

Although the almanac does not reach all audiences (specific interest groups, children’s groups, and the general public) targeted by the PIE program, it does have the potential to reach an entirely appropriate audience for the DCP’s message – the almanac is targeted toward those people interested in the outdoors, the weather, the environment, and gardening conditions. The almanac

is a publication designed, in part, to serve outdoor enthusiasts, and given the information contained within the almanac, it would prove useful for such outdoor activities as camping, gardening, hiking, fishing, and recreational vehicle use. Additionally, the almanac is designed to be *used*, not just read, and kept throughout the year.

Important, as well, is that the editorial content helps to meet the PIE Program’s threefold objective of informing the public of the Section 10(a) permit, encouraging *respect, protection, and enjoyment* of natural ecosystems in Clark County, and, through education, increasing the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County’s natural ecosystems.

However, the DCP may want to reconsider the advertisement for the Mojave Max Emergence Contest (that was used in 2003), as it is clearly aimed at children, which is neither a specific target audience for the almanac, nor is it a significant part of KNPR’s demographic breakout, which skews older:

P 18-24	5.5%
P 25-34	17.5%
P 35-44	17%
P 45-54	16.5%
P 55-64	22.9%
P 65+	20.5%

Perhaps the DCP’s advertisement of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest would be better served if the advertisement were aimed at parents or educators, or if the advertisement were reflecting the DCP’s *respect, protect, and enjoy* message, similar to the editorial page, and providing the hotline numbers as well.

The advertisement should be aimed at an outdoor enthusiast – a potential desert visitor. Other advertisers in the 2003 almanac seem to have designed their advertisements with the age demographic of KNPR in mind, as well as consideration of the almanac’s target audience. Two examples: 1) the U.S. Forest Service’s advertisement provides information about the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area, and appears to be aimed at outdoor enthusiasts by promoting outdoor activities that they will enjoy (hiking, camping, skiing, driving, and climbing), and the advertisement states, “Always pack out your trash and waste”; 2) The advertisement of Land Rover Las Vegas targets the recreational vehicle enthusiast, showing a land rover on a desert road with the copy, “Refined elegance meets rugged independence.” Other advertisers include the Las Vegas Springs Preserve, the Clark County Department of Air Quality Management (“...recreational activities that disturb our native desert crust contribute to high amounts of airborne dust...”), the Southern Nevada Water Authority (promoting the Water Smart Landscapes – “Make the biggest difference of all with

xeriscape”), News 13 (promoting “Nate’s no wait weather”), Nevada Power, AZ Dental, and Sierra Nevada College.

Other factors, such as a cost-based analysis, in addition to examining the medium’s audience, reach, and distribution points, and weighing-in value added components offered by KNPR, should all be taken into consideration.

The cost for the DCP to advertise in the almanac is \$4,500.00 for a full-page advertisement. The KNPR Southern Nevada Almanac 2004 reaches 37,500 (15,000 copies times an average of 2.5 household members). The cost per thousand (CPM - “M” for the Latin mille) rate is \$3.33 (includes almanac and value-added KNPR spots), which is at the low end of the CPM range for local Public Broadcasting. According to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the CPM rates for local Public Broadcasting are “assumed to range” from \$2.90 to \$8.50.

The cost-efficiency of the \$3.33 CPM rate is further illuminated when compared to television and radio media:

Medium	Unit	Net Cost	Viewership/ Listeners	CPM
TELEVISION (ABC, NBC, CBS)				
Early Morning (7-9am)	:30 seconds	\$90-150	9-34,000	\$10-4.42
Daytime (9am-4pm)		\$100-300	10-26,000	\$10-11.54
Early Fringe (4-7pm)		\$350-750	26-57,000	\$13.46-13.16
Early News (6-6:30pm)		\$400-750	35-70,000	\$11.43-10.71
Prime Access (7-8pm)		\$550-800	24-68,000	\$22.92-11.76
Prime Time (8-11pm)		\$800-3,000	34-68,000	\$23.53-44.12
Late News (11-11:30pm)		\$450-850	38-57,000	\$11.84-14.91
Cable: Prime Average (8-11pm)		\$50-120	8-13,000	\$6.25-9.23
RADIO (Top Ten Stations)				
Morning Drive	:60 seconds	\$90-190	11-14,000	\$8.18-13.57
Daytime		\$80-150	10-13,000	\$8-11.53
Afternoon Drive		\$90-175	11-13,000	\$8.18-13.46

Sources: Media Market Resources, 4th Qtr. 2001, The Scarborough Report, March 2001

Additional sources indicate the average CPM for other media. The average CPM for online advertising is \$33.64.¹⁰ Concerning preprinted inserts, the CPM cost for single-sheet delivery rates range from \$24.00 CPM to \$39.00 CPM.¹¹ The average CPM rate for newspapers (10-column inches) is \$51.19, and the average CPM rate for Yellow Pages (DTQ process-color) is \$37.04.¹²

Therefore, the almanac reaches more people for less money compared to other media (based on average CPM rates).

Moreover, the discounts or deals that the buyer expects to receive or negotiate should be taken into account. In this case, KNPR would offer a number of value-added components to the DCP, including 50 spots on KNPR (a value of \$2,500), a page of editorial in the almanac (a value of \$2,500), and hosting the database for the Mojave Max Emergence Contest (a value of \$1,000).

Regarding the database hosting (including contest entrants and their guesses as to when Mojave Max will emerge from his burrow), Clark County DCP Management Analyst Christina Gibson informed the assessor that in 2001 and 2002, KNPR hosted the database and collected the entries. Clark County paid KNPR \$1,000 each year for this service. KNPR also provided a minimal number of random PSAs and announcements for the contest. In 2003, KNPR asked for participation in the almanac. At a cost of \$4,500.00, the DCP purchased advertising in the almanac, a series of PSAs and announcements, and hosting of the database. In 2003, however, the Clark County School District took over the database function. According to Ms. Gibson, the DCP is finding that the District is the more appropriate entity to host the database function. Even without the database hosting, however, the editorial page and 50 spots on KNPR are notable value-added components.

Additionally, there is a plethora of research (on the national level) that deliberates on the benefits of Public Broadcasting underwriting. A number of these positive attributes are applicable to the almanac and its valued-added components, such as the 50 KNPR spots. Independent audience research shows that listeners, as benefactors of valued programs, hold Public Broadcasting underwriters in high regard. Public radio listeners are more likely to participate in political activities, write letters to editors, and hold leadership positions in community organizations. These same highly educated individuals tend to be skeptical of commercial advertising. The uncluttered, non-commercial format of underwriting provides business exposure that is perceived as ethical and non-promotional. (*Benchmark/NPR, 1992*)

¹⁰ *Ad Knowledge's Third Quarter 2000 Online Advertising Report*

¹¹ *The Las Vegas Review-Journal*, current rates

¹² *Better Business Web*

In summary, due to the cost-based value (\$3.33 CPM), the value-added components, and the medium's ability to carry messages meeting PIE objectives and reaching a targeted audience, advertising in the KNPR Southern Nevada Almanac 2004 should be deemed a prudent expense of the DCP's PIE budget dollars.

Disclosure: Terry Murphy, president of Strategic Solutions (the assessor), is a member of the KNPR Board of Directors. Ms. Murphy, however, did not participate in this portion of the assessment.

Mojave Max Emergence Contest – Preliminary Planning Suggestions

Each member of the assessor team thoroughly reviewed the Mojave Max Emergence Contest files. The assessor team also held an internal meeting to collectively discuss preliminary suggestions, which the assessor offered and discussed at a special PIE Committee meeting on October 2, 2003, regarding planning for the 2004 Mojave Max Emergence Contest.

The contest reflects the idea that when it comes to issues such as long-term protection of the desert environment, habits are formed during childhood. The contest educates the younger generation about desert conditions and wildlife habits, encouraging respect and protection of the county's natural ecosystems. Furthermore, the Mojave Max Emergence Contest is the cornerstone of the PIE Program, and in reviewing the files from 2001 to 2003, the assessor perceives that the contest has begun an evolution from a school-age children's activity to a more broadly recognized community event.

In identifying preliminary issues and ideas, the main theme of the assessor's suggestions emerged as *building upon existing success*. Also, recognizing budget constraints, the suggestions can be achieved at minimum or no cost.

Mojave Max has become a widely recognized icon in the community, while the character is still in its relative infancy compared to "Punxsutawney Phil." Just as Phil has become the world's most famous groundhog, known well beyond the borders of Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, for predicting the length of seasonal weather conditions, Mojave Max, too, has the potential to gain recognition in a larger, perhaps regional scope, representing the arrival of spring and the importance of desert conservation as the tortoise is an indicator species, linked to the health of the desert.

Suggestions for building upon existing success:

- **Increase Public Relations Efforts**

Not knowing exactly when Mojave Max will emerge presents inherent challenges in planning a press event, but those challenges can be turned into positives.

Build-up anticipation for the announcement of the contest winner by using low-cost promotion tools such as public relations efforts with a strategically timed news release about the contest followed by both periodic media advisories (emergence updates) within the historical window period of when Mojave Max will emerge from his burrow and a media alert announcing a press event after the contest winner is determined.

Each media advisory should contain relevant message points, explaining how the tortoise is an indicator species – reflective of the health of the desert – to encourage respect and protection of the county's ecosystems.

Public relations efforts should not only be tailored toward community, education, and weather-related news, but stories should be pitched to outdoor and environmental reporters as well. Also, pitch to appropriate editors the idea of doing a series on how the tortoise is tied to the health of the county's ecosystems, with the series timed around the historical window period of when Mojave Max will emerge from his burrow. (Reporters may also want to discuss that the tortoise can be adopted as a pet – this would also be an opportunity to highlight message points.)

- **Emphasize the Significance of the Contest**

In all Mojave Max Emergence Contest promotional materials, including public relations efforts, ensure that message points convey the PIE Program's objectives.

Illustrate that the contest is more than a school-age event, but also a prime opportunity to establish long-term protection of our desert environment through children; tie-in the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message, as well as the importance of the permit, which allows growth, jobs, and economic stability to continue.

- **Consider a “Mojave Max Watch”**

Implement a “Mojave Max Watch” during the historical window period of the tortoise's emergence.

Send daily updates so that meteorologists can report messages such as, “Mojave Max is still sleeping, so be careful all of you off-roaders.”

Send the alert to schools as well, so that school administration officials can read the “Mojave Max Watch” update (accompanied by a different, brief education message – “Mojave Max says...”) during a school's morning PA news announcements each day for two weeks.

The daily “Mojave Max Watch” should be featured and updated on mojavemax.com as well.

- **Make the Winner Announcement a Larger Event**

Although there are inherent challenges with not knowing when Max will emerge, make the actual announcement of the winner an even larger event than it currently is, such as by holding a press conference-style event and holding the identity of the winning student and school until the event.

Make the event more attractive for media coverage; invite more than just one commissioner, but invite all of the commissioners, the superintendent of the school district, and perhaps a local celebrity or two – while keeping the costumed Mojave Max and the student winner as the focus of media attention.

Invite previous winners, too, to discuss how their values have changed and to explain to reporters how they gained greater respect and enjoyment of the desert as a result of having participated in the contest.

- **Establish a Meteorologist Contest**

Broaden participation and coverage of the contest by local meteorologists, as well as continuing the strong relationship with Nathan Tannenbaum.

Try to coordinate the first cross-station competition between meteorologists by having them guess Mojave Max’s emergence as well, and the winning meteorologist could be announced at the same press event as described above. Given the on-air personalities of local meteorologists, this sub-contest should be the talk of the community and great fun, potentially resulting in additional coverage, as well as being the subject of banter among news anchors.

- **Explore the Idea of a Mojave Max Club**

A potential way for students to continue their involvement, interest, and education regarding the conditions of desert ecosystems and the responses of wildlife on a year-long basis (and after participating in the contest) is to explore the interest level among students of starting a *Mojave Max Club* (serving as the name of a school’s environmental/conservation club).

If an appetite exists, these clubs could be chartered and run by interested students, with the PIE Program supplying educational materials, perhaps

coordinating a field trip opportunity during the school year and offering a year-end pizza party for the students who served as Mojave Max Club presidents.

- **Reach Adults, Too**

Tie-in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest with the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message aimed at adults, by providing a handout or assignment to participating teachers that the students could take home and share with their parent(s) or guardian(s). In other words, after the students become educated on desert conditions and wildlife responses, a homework assignment would be designed for the student to teach his or her parent(s)/guardian(s).

Continue to craft messages so that audiences understand the importance of the contest, including the indication that spring has begun and that the tortoise is an indicator species, explaining how the health and population of the tortoise is connected to the health of the desert. These important message points help the contest meet PIE Program objectives of encouraging respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems and, through education, increasing understanding and awareness of the value of natural ecosystems.

In reaching adults, message points can be crafted to meet the objective of informing the public of the Section 10(a) Permit, too; the message can be related to the importance of desert conservation in order to maintain the permit, which allows growth, jobs, and economic stability to continue.

In addition to these ideas and suggestions, the only *issue* identified was that the Mojave Max Emergence Contest information does not easily come up through searching the Clark County School District website. This needs to be addressed soon, as those who hear about the contest may seek further information through

a key word search (such as “Mojave Max” or “tortoise contest”) on the District’s website.

Although it’s certainly easier to reach contest information through the main Clark County website, a key word search of “Mojave Max” produces a number of listings, the first of which is a news release (“Local Third Graders to Meet Real Mojave Max”).

Ideally, with both the Clark County website and the Clark County School District website, a keyword search should allow the individual who is searching for contest information to directly reach mojavemax.com.

Also, the assessor team searched key words on major search engines (i.e., Yahoo), and mojavemax.com comes up right away.

Moreover, the assessor team reviewed and evaluated mojavemax.com, which deserves praise for its educational content, audience-appropriate design, and user-friendliness.

Finally, it is important to note again that these are preliminary suggestions and ideas based on the professional experience of the assessor team. Additional data and recommendations pertaining to the Mojave Max Emergence Contest will be yielded through the assessment process.

A questionnaire will be developed to determine the outcomes and impacts of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest by finding out from contest participants how the activity changed their values, awareness, and/or understanding. Focus groups will be used to gather baseline information, including two groups each of students and teachers involved in the Mojave Max Emergence Program.

Comparison of Habitat Conservation Plans and Environmental Programs

A meeting between the assessor and the PIE Committee was held on October 6, 2003, in which the assessor discussed and suggested Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and other environmental programs to compare with the DCP's PIE Program.

Nationwide, as of August 27, 2003, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) had approved 429 HCPs, and the USFWS divided these HCPs into 7 regions (Nevada is in the Pacific Region). The assessor's research indicated that the comparable HCPs would come from either the Pacific or Southwest Regions.

The assessor looked for HCPs that involve a local government, comprise significant acreage, and are older than 5 years (increasing the likelihood that a program's educational components would have been implemented long enough to have potentially been evaluated for effectiveness).

Criteria used for narrowing and selecting other environmental programs with educational components included looking for county-run programs in urban centers which have won an award or multiple awards (prestigious awards from objective, well-known organizations such as the National Association of Counties and the Environmental Protection Agency), indicating to the assessor that a program has met with a certain degree of success with its educational components.

The assessor wants to make sure that the research and comparison of HCPs and environmental programs produces information of value for the DCP. The assessor will identify and describe effective and meritorious educational components of the selected HCPs and environmental programs, which will result in research-based suggestions for

the PIE Committee's consideration.

As presented in the October 6, 2003, special PIE Committee meeting, the assessor recommended the following HCPs (which the assessor will proceed to further research and compare with the PIE Program):

Coachella Valley Multiple Species HCP

- Permitted in 1986
- 199,663 acres located in southeastern California
- Population: 200,000 (expected to double by 2010); one million visitors annually

San Diego County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP

- Permitted in 1998
- 252,132 acres located in southern California
- Population: 2.9 million; 16 million visitors annually

Central/Coastal Orange County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP

- Permitted in 1996
- 208,000 acres located in southern California
- Population: 3 million; 40 million visitors annually

Also, the assessor recommended two county-run, award-winning environmental efforts for comparison:

- **Department of Environmental Protection – Montgomery County, Maryland**

The Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection's program is recommended by the assessor for comparison because of the department's utilization of a number of public education and outreach tools – including public workshops, website development, and print advertising – constructed around strategically planned and timed education messages. Additionally, the program touts its success at achieving "a higher level of sensitivity and receptiveness on the part of the public," attributing this success to the strategic planning of when and how the tailored messages are delivered.

- **Department of the Environment – City and County of San Francisco**

The San Francisco Department of the Environment's program is recommended by the

assessor for comparison due to the department's impressive success in achieving program objectives, such as reducing pesticide use in San Francisco by 50 percent as a result of public education initiatives. The department's environmental agenda is described as "hard-hitting" and its methods as "innovative." Moreover, this renowned program is serving as a model for other cities.

Other Programs

One of the initial programs (Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park) suggested for comparison by the assessor was not chosen after discussion during the October 6, 2003, PIE meeting.

The Wetlands Park program was not selected due to some relevant differences – in terms of project characteristics such as budget and scope – from the DCP's PIE Program.

Other programs were discussed at the meeting, but not selected (including Pima County, Arizona's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan), which will be further discussed in the assessor's November 2003 report, updating the progress of the comparison effort.

Assessment Interviews – Selecting Appropriate Interviewees

Another topic of discussion at the meeting between the assessor and the PIE Committee on October 6, 2003, was selecting appropriate individuals to be interviewed by the assessor as part of the PIE Program assessment process.

The purpose of interviews is to provide for qualitative research to assist the assessor in evaluating PIE projects in relation to outcomes (*how* target audiences are reached and *how* objectives are met) and impacts for the participants (changes in values and increased awareness). As the assessor is required to evaluate the effectiveness of past and present PIE efforts, the assessor recommends that the interviews be utilized, in particular, to determine the effectiveness of past efforts, as it would be impossible to locate targeted populations from several years ago.

The assessor intends for the interviews to focus on the major activities of the PIE Program, particularly past and on-going efforts, including the Mojave Max Emergence Contest, outreach events (and distribution of products and brochures), and education efforts. Questions might be asked about the PIE Program in general terms, as well as questions, if appropriate, regarding other PIE activities such as the *Desert News*, hotlines, website, and low-fee public service announcements, although these activities will be assessed in different ways during the assessment process.

Interviews will also focus on determining how these activities meet the threefold objective of the PIE Program and determining how these activities reach the Program's targeted audiences.

The assessor sought advisement during the October 6, 2003, PIE meeting on how to narrow the list of interviewees to approximately 40 individuals, based on suggested criteria:

- Who are the most appropriate individuals to interview, based on their role in designing/planning, promoting, implementing, and/or participating in PIE Program efforts?
- Who has the greatest knowledge to discuss the outcome and impact/results of major PIE activities such as outreach events, education efforts, and the Mojave Max Emergence Contest?

Moreover, any agency and organization representatives who should provide input into the assessment process and the PIE Program, such as the appropriate

representatives of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, should also be on the final list of interviewees.

The assessor offered the following list of potential questions at the October 6, 2003, PIE meeting:

- What was your (the interviewee) role in the activity?
- What target audience is reached through the activity?
- What objective or objectives are met through the activity?
- Were PIE objectives and target audiences considered in the way the activity was selected, planned, and implemented?
- What are the best elements/aspects of this activity?
- What could be improved (if the activity is ongoing)?
- Did you have concerns with the activity? Perceived challenges or limitations?
- (If aware of budget) Is this activity an appropriate expenditure of PIE dollars?

- Is this activity planned and implemented by the appropriate individuals? Does this activity need more staff or other resources devoted to it?
- Describe how the activity benefits the DCP.
- What message(s) did this activity deliver to the audience?
- Did you perceive any underlying message? (i.e., *conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which equals jobs and economic stability*)
- Describe immediate results (i.e., *students researched desert temperatures and wildlife habits to desert seasons, students estimated when Mojave Max would emerge, and attention was drawn to desert seasons and wildlife responses*).

- Describe outcomes and results (interviewees' perceptions) – Was the activity successful? Would you recommend the activity continue? Did the activity change values (*respect, protect, and enjoy*)? Did the activity increase awareness of Clark County's ecosystems? Was the activity informative (about the importance of desert conservation, the purpose of the Section 10(A) permit, etc.)?

The assessor shall proceed with setting-up and conducting interviews after receiving the final list of interviewees in mid-October, and the assessor anticipates that the interviews will be conducted throughout October and November, with the results described in the monthly report due in December 2003.

APPENDIX C

**Monthly Report
October 9, 2003 – November 6, 2003**

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Executive Summary

As Strategic Solutions (the assessor) had previously reported in the September 6, 2003 – October 8, 2003 monthly report, the assessor would be engaged, in November 2003, in the process of conducting interviews for the purpose of qualitative assessment research, as well as performing research and analysis pertaining to the HCP and county-run environmental programs that had been selected to compare to the Clark County Desert Conservation Program and its PIE efforts.

Therefore, the October 9, 2003 – November 6, 2003 monthly report is a brief update of the assessor's progress concerning these two qualitative research efforts. The next monthly report from the assessor (to be completed in the first week of December 2003) will discuss the results of these efforts.

Comparison of Habitat Conservation Plans and Environmental Programs

The assessor is currently researching the three HCP programs and the two county-run environmental programs that were selected in conjunction with PIE Committee members during a meeting with the assessor on October 6, 2003, in which the assessor discussed and suggested Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and other environmental programs to compare with the DCP's PIE Program.

As explained at the October 6, 2003, meeting, the assessor looked for HCPs that involve a local government, comprise significant acreage, and are older than 5 years (increasing the likelihood that a program's educational components would have been implemented long enough to have potentially been evaluated for effectiveness). Criteria used for narrowing and selecting other environmental programs with educational components included looking for county-run programs in urban centers that have won an award or multiple awards (prestigious

awards from objective, well-known organizations such as the National Association of Counties and the Environmental Protection Agency), indicating to the assessor that a program has met with a certain degree of success with its educational components.

Through the research conducted to date, the assessor is finding that, in regard to the HCPs, these programs do not specifically have public information programs that are separate (or established as a subcommittee) from the full habitat conservation program. For example, in the case of Coachella Valley Multiple Species HCP, there are a number of educational components, but, interestingly, no line item budget allocation is provided specifically for educational efforts, which suggests, at least in a preliminary sense, that the program manager has succeeded in instituting some very low-cost educational components in the face of limited budget dollars.

Unfortunately, these programs have not conducted a formal assessment of their educational components (such as the assessment which the DCP is currently conducting), nor have quantitative measurements been established. This means that in determining educational components that have demonstrated proven effectiveness, the assessor will have to obtain much of this information through qualitative research (i.e., interviews with program managers to ascertain their perceptions and other anecdotal evidence), rather than being provided more quantitative results on education and outreach efforts that have proven successful (such as stating that X effort reached X amount of people for X amount of dollars, resulting in a X% increase in awareness or understanding of a program's objective-based message).

However, in the case of the two county-run programs, informational material indicates that the programs are reaching goals. In the case of San Francisco, their outreach efforts are resulting in a significant increase in recycling use, as well as a reduction in pesticide use. Therefore, it's worth exploring how these goals are being reached and discussing what education and outreach efforts have proven the most successful in allowing the programs to achieve their goals and objectives. Of course, the assessor must note in some cases where the budget allocation, resources, and audience are

significantly different from the DCP efforts. Despite differences, though, research can indicate what public education and information activities are working well for other programs.

In the month of November, the assessor will be setting up interviews with either directors or managers of these programs, or staff specifically working on public education and outreach components. The results of this qualitative research will be discussed in detail in the December report.

Again (as previously outlined in the last monthly report), these are the five selected programs:

Coachella Valley Multiple Species HCP

- Permitted in 1986
- 199,663 acres located in southeastern California
- Population: 200,000 (expected to double by 2010); one million visitors annually

San Diego County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP

- Permitted in 1998
- 252,132 acres located in southern California
- Population: 2.9 million; 16 million visitors annually

Central/Coastal Orange County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP

- Permitted in 1996
- 208,000 acres located in southern California
- Population: 3 million; 40 million visitors annually

Also, the assessor recommended two county-run, award-winning environmental efforts for comparison:

- **Department of Environmental Protection – Montgomery County, Maryland**

The Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection's program is recommended by the assessor for comparison because of the department's utilization of a number of public education and outreach tools – including public workshops, website development, and print advertising – constructed around strategically planned and timed education messages. Additionally, the program touts its success at achieving “a higher level of sensitivity and receptiveness on the part of the public,” attributing this success to the strategic planning of when and how the tailored messages are delivered.

- **Department of the Environment – City and County of San Francisco**

The San Francisco Department of the Environment's program is recommended by the assessor for comparison due to the department's impressive success in achieving program objectives, such as reducing pesticide use in San Francisco

by 50 percent as a result of public education initiatives. The department's environmental agenda is described as "hard-hitting" and its methods as "innovative." Moreover, this program is serving as a model for other cities.

Other Programs

One of the initial programs (Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park) suggested for comparison by the assessor was not chosen after discussion during the October 6, 2003, PIE meeting. The Wetlands Park program was not selected due to some relevant differences – in terms of project characteristics such as budget and scope – from the DCP's PIE Program.

Other programs were discussed at the meeting, but not selected, including Pima County, Arizona's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. The assessor took a look at the status of the Pima County Multi-Species Conservation Plan (also referred to as the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan).

Pima County voted to develop the concept of a regional HCP in March 1999. The preliminary notice that begins the federal process was filed in the Federal Register on September 7, 2000. The draft plan was published on September 26, 2000. Final approval was expected in December 2002.

On August 27, 2003, the Fish & Wildlife Service showed the plan's permit status as pending. Published in the Federal Register on September 13, 2003, was a "notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement." The notice said: "Pima County is preparing to apply for an incidental take permit through development and implementation of the Pima County Multi-Species Conservation Plan, which will serve as a habitat conservation plan." A public scoping meeting was scheduled for October 4, 2003.

The assessor's research indicates that the planning process has been very public, but the HCP has not yet been fully approved. Consequently, it would have little information for the assessor to compare its educational efforts with the Clark County DCP efforts.

Assessment Interviews – Conducting Qualitative Research

Another topic of discussion at the meeting between the assessor and the PIE Committee on October 6, 2003, was selecting appropriate individuals to be interviewed by the assessor as part of the PIE Program assessment process.

The purpose of interviews is to provide for qualitative research to assist the assessor in evaluating the PIE Program and its activities. The research allows the assessor to determine if individuals (who have been the most closely involved with the PIE Program) perceive that the Program, both in general as well as in regard to specific activities, are meeting PIE objectives and reaching the Program's targeted audiences.

The first part of the assessor's interview asks general questions about the PIE Program, and the second part of the interview allows for activity-specific discussion if the interviewee has been closely involved with an activity (such as planning, participating in, or implementing an activity). Again, the purpose of the qualitative research is to determine if PIE activity planners perceive an activity as meeting the threefold objective of the PIE Program and determining how these activities reach the Program's target audiences. For instance, the assessor can determine if objectives and target audiences were considered in the way an activity was discussed, designed, and implemented.

Appendix A is a copy of the interview questions in the order they are being asked. Please note that if an interviewee has not been closely involved with any specific activity of the PIE Program, only Part I (general questions) is administered. There is also one question that is only asked to those interviewees who have been involved with the PIE Program for more than three years.

As an update as to where the assessor is in the interview process, the following indicates: 1) who has been interviewed to date; 2) who has been scheduled for an interview in November; 3) who has declined to be interviewed; and 4) who has not yet responded to the assessor's initial inquiry to set-up an interview. (Please note that the assessor will make a second attempt next week.)

Interviews Conducted to Date:

- Kathy August, Bureau of Land Management – Red Rock Visitor Center
- Carolyn Boyle, Clark County Comprehensive Planning
- Betty Burge, The Tortoise Group
- Don Dayton, Southern Nevada Off-Road Enthusiasts
- Barry Duncan, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
- Jane Feldman, Sierra Club

- Jennifer Haley, National Park Service – Lake Mead National Rec. Area
- Dr. Karin Hoff

- Callie Le'au Courtright, Desert National Wildlife Refuge Complex
- Gayle Marrs-Smith, Bureau of Land Management
- Dale Matteson, Matteson Media Group
- Irene Porter, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
- Kay Rohde, National Park Service – Lake Mead National Recreation Area
- Ann Schreiber, Moapa Valley Town Advisory Board
- Jan Schweitzer, City of North Las Vegas
- Amy Sprunger-Allworth, United States Fish & Wildlife Service
- Connie Suckling, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
- Mark Trinko, representing OHV community

Interviews Scheduled to be Conducted:

- Holly Johnson, Southern Nevada Water Authority
- Shelly Labay, City of Henderson
- Elise McAllister, Partners in Conservation
- Michael Vermeys, Nevada Division of Agriculture – Wildlife Services

Interviews Declined:

- Leanne Fernald – Ms. Fernald noted that she has only attended a couple of PIE Committee meetings, and she hasn't attended any in over a year, and, therefore, she felt she would not have a lot to offer within the interview process.
- Steve Koon, City of Boulder City – Mr. Koon has not been “closely involved with MSHCP or the PIE Committee” and he suggested that an interview with him “would not be productive.”

-more-

Interviews Not Yet Scheduled (the assessor will make a second attempt at contacting these individuals next week):

- Susan Barrow, United States Forest Service
- Steve Distler, Steve-N-Kids
- Cindy Gates, Clark County Comprehensive Planning
- John Hunt, Conservation District of Southern Nevada
- John Jones, Nevada Division of Forestry
- Dr. Ron Marlow, University of Nevada, Reno
- Glenace Melton, Clark County School District
- Cynthia Pfaendler, Red Rock Canyon Nation Conservation Area (Note: Ms. Pfaendler has contacted the assessor and will be scheduling an interview later in the month)
- Kurt Sawyer, City of Mesquite
- Jerry Schupe, The Tortoise Group
- Elsie Sellars, Nevada Division of Wildlife
- Thomas Smigel, Nevada Division of Agriculture
- Nathan Tannenbaum, KTNV TV-13
- Rick Watson, Las Vegas Valley Water District
- Lori Wohletz, City of Las Vegas Department of Public Works

The assessor aims to have the interview process completed by the last week in November to provide the assessor time to input the answers, analyze the responses, and discuss this qualitative research portion of the assessment in the December monthly report. Therefore, if, upon the second attempt, individuals are still not reached, the above-mentioned individuals may not be a part of this portion of the assessment.

Also, the assessor needs to note that all individuals who have been interviewed or are being scheduled for an interview come from the list that was recommended by and provided by the PIE Committee. The only two exceptions are Irene Porter and Barry Duncan, both with the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association (SNHBA). The

current SNHBA representative on the PIE Committee, Connie Suckling, is a relatively new representative, and she felt that

the assessor would also like to talk with Ms. Porter and Mr. Duncan who had been previous SNHBA representatives either on the Implementation and Monitoring Committee or the PIE Committee or both. The assessor agreed.

Also, the assessor has spoken with Ms. Jeri Krueger, United States Fish & Wildlife Service. The assessor provided an update of the assessment process to Ms. Krueger, answered her questions, and received her input about her expectations for the assessment, including the determination if PIE projects are doing the best job possible with the most efficient use of expenditures, whether PIE is conducting the right projects, and if those projects are accomplishing what PIE expects the projects to accomplish (meeting objectives), and trying to understand if the current direction of PIE and its activities is the “best direction.” The assessor explained that the assessment, as currently being conducted, will serve to provide answers to these inquiries. Ms. Krueger indicated that she will make an effort to attend the PIE Committee meeting on December 18, 2003, to hear the assessor provide the December (monthly) assessment update report, which will discuss the results of the assessor’s qualitative research efforts, including the interviews and the HCP/environmental programs (with educational components) analysis.

-more-

SUB-Appendix A

Interview Questions

Purpose of Interviews

The purpose of conducting interviews is to provide qualitative research to assist the assessor in **evaluating** PIE projects in relation to **outcomes** (*how* target audiences are reached and *how* objectives are met) and **impacts** for the participants (changes in values and increased awareness).

Interviewees were selected in consultation with the PIE Committee.

Interviews will also focus on determining how PIE activities meet the **threefold objective** of the PIE Program:

- Inform the public of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permits
- Encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County
- Through education, increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems

And determining how these activities reach the **targeted audiences**:

- Specific Interest Groups
- Children's Groups
- General Public

Name of Person Interviewed:

Title of Person Interviewed:

Organization / Agency:

Date / Time / Location of Interview:

Questions – (Part I consists of general questions about the PIE Program. Part II is PIE activity-specific.)

Part I – General Questions

- What has been your role in the PIE Program (*i.e., sitting on I&M Committee, or PIE subcommittee, or participating in education efforts or outreach events*)?

- The PIE Program has 3 objectives (*read them*). Is the PIE Program meeting these objectives? Please explain.

- The PIE Program has three targeted audiences (*read them*). Are the activities of the PIE Program reaching these targeted audiences? Please explain.

- The PIE Program has used a number of media in delivering its messages. What medium do you feel has been or is the most effective in delivering the DCP's messages about conservation?

-more-

- The PIE Program conducts a number of activities (*i.e., products and brochures provided at events, hotlines, Mojave Max Education Project, PSAs, etc.*). What activity do you perceive has been the most effective in delivering the DCP messages (*i.e., respect, protect, and enjoy*)?

- Are there any activities that you perceive as not having been effective or are not currently effective?

- In terms of literature distributed by PIE—such as the DCP brochure and Desert News—which do you feel most effectively promotes/explains the DCP's messages about desert conservation?

- How many years have you been involved with the PIE Program? *If interviewee has been involved more than 3 years...* How would you describe the evolution of the PIE Program, perhaps in terms of its scope, direction, and success?

- Let's discuss the group you represent (*i.e., off-roaders, homebuilders, outdoor enthusiasts, land users*). Are the members of your group being reached by PIE activities? If yes, which activities specifically? If not, please explain why.

- What are the main messages being delivered by these activities to your group?

- Do you feel the activities and messages are effective in terms of meeting PIE objectives (*read them again if necessary*)?

- How could efforts to reach your group – and effectively deliver messages to your group – be improved or be enhanced?

Identifying concerns, challenges, improvements, and the best elements of PIE Program:

- Do you have any concerns about the PIE Program? If yes, please name them.

- What are the greatest challenges faced by the PIE Program, and how might those challenges be overcome?

- Do you have any suggestions for improvements or enhancements to the PIE Program in general? If yes, please name them.

- Of the PIE activities you've been involved with, is there one in particular that you would offer some constructive and helpful advice as to how it could be better planned or implemented?

- Please identify what you feel are the best elements of the PIE Program.

Part II – Activity Specific

- Which specific PIE activities have you been involved with, in terms of discussing, designing, planning, promoting, participating in, or implementing? *List the activities or activity listed by interviewee; then ask questions below specific to each activity.*

- What was your role in the activity?

- What target audience was/is reached through the activity?

- What objective or objectives were/are met through the activity?

- Were PIE objectives and target audiences considered in the way the activity was selected, planned, and implemented? Were/are the targeted audiences reached by this activity?

- What were/are the best elements of this activity?

- What could be improved (if the activity is ongoing)?

- Did/do you have concerns with the activity?

- *(If interviewee aware of budget for activity)* Is this activity an appropriate expenditure of PIE dollars?

- Is this activity planned and implemented by the appropriate individuals? Does this activity need more staff or other resources devoted to it?

- Describe how the activity benefits the Desert Conservation Program.

- What message(s) did this activity deliver to the audience(s)?

- Did these messages meet PIE Program objectives (*read again if necessary*)? Did these messages reach targeted audiences? Please identify which targeted audience(s) was reached by the activity.

- Did you perceive that the activity delivered the underlying message of conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which allows jobs and economic stability to continue in the county?

- What (if any) PIE activities are delivering this underlying message – the message which explains the reason behind the creation of the DCP and the PIE Program and the terms/purpose of the Section 10(a) Permit?

- Describe the immediate results of the activity. (*i.e., with the Mojave Max Emergence Contest, immediate results would be that students researched desert temperatures and wildlife habits to desert seasons, students estimated when Mojave Max would emerge, and attention was drawn to desert seasons and wildlife responses*).

- Describe the outcome and/or impact (*interviewees' perceptions*) of the activity. Do you feel that the activity was successful?

- Would you recommend the activity continue?

- Do you feel that the activity changed values (*respect, protect, and enjoy*)?

- Do you feel that the activity increased awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems?

- Was the activity informative about the importance of desert conservation?

- Was the activity informative about the purpose/terms of the Section 10(A) permit?

- Finally, are there any PIE activities that you think the PIE Program should be doing—realistic to limited budget dollars—which the PIE Program is not currently doing?

Thank you for your valuable time.

APPENDIX D

**Monthly Report
November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003**

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

Throughout November 2003, Strategic Solutions (the assessor) was engaged in the process of conducting interviews for the purpose of qualitative assessment research, as well as performing research and analysis pertaining to the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and county-run environmental programs that had been selected to compare to the Clark County Desert Conservation Program and its PIE efforts.

The November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 monthly assessor's report details the results of the research, including some commonality of philosophy among the program managers as to how to best achieve their public outreach and educational goals.

The second part of the report provides the results of the interviews, which were conducted to provide for qualitative research to assist the assessor in evaluating the PIE Program and its activities. The research allowed the assessor to determine if individuals (who have been the most closely involved with the PIE Program) perceive that the Program, both in general as well as in regard to specific activities, is meeting PIE objectives and reaching the Program's targeted audiences.

Finally, it is important to note that this qualitative research will eventually be used to supplement and complement the quantitative research as part of the full, comprehensive assessment process. In other words, this research is not meant to stand alone, but will be part of the larger scope of work that the assessor has been tasked to complete.

Comparison of Habitat Conservation Plans and Environmental Programs

Background

The assessor's previous report discussed how the assessor researched, narrowed, and selected HCP and county-run environmental programs. The three HCP programs and the two county-run environmental programs were selected in conjunction with PIE Committee members during a meeting with the assessor on October 6, 2003, in which the assessor discussed and suggested Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and other environmental programs to compare with the DCP's PIE Program.

As explained at the October 6, 2003, meeting, the assessor looked for HCPs that involve a local government, comprise significant acreage, and are older than 5 years (increasing the likelihood that a program's educational components would have been implemented long enough to have potentially been evaluated for effectiveness). Criteria used for narrowing and selecting other environmental programs with educational components included looking for county-run programs in urban centers that have won an award or multiple awards (prestigious awards from established, well-known organizations such as the National Association of Counties and the Environmental Protection Agency), indicating to the assessor that a program has met with a certain degree of success with its educational components.

Selecting County Environmental Programs

To narrow the search for county-level environmental programs with a public education component, the assessor reviewed the winners of two award programs. For the last five years, Region 9 of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has issued its Environmental Achievement Awards. The agency explains that this award program "acknowledges commitment and significant contributions to the environment in California, Arizona, Nevada, Hawaii, Guam and tribal lands." The National Association of Counties (NACO) has issued its annual Environmental Protection and Energy Achievement Awards for many years; the assessor considered the winners of the past three years.

San Francisco

In 2001, the San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFDOE) was awarded the EPA recognition. Following is a description of the winning program; it was not clear if the EPA or SFDOE staff wrote the description:

"The department helps the Mayor and Board of Supervisors set the environmental agenda for San Francisco, operating hard-hitting environmental programs that serve as models for other cities. The department has reduced pesticide use in San Francisco by 50 percent, and has pioneered innovative non-chemical pest control methods including using goats to control weeds and geckos to control exotic

cockroaches. The city has 10 construction projects on-line designed to incorporate the latest green building techniques, including the \$500 million Laguna Honda Hospital project, which when completed will be the nation's first green hospital. The Clean Air Program has helped the City purchase over 300 alternative fuel vehicles for its fleet, including street sweepers and long-haul garbage trucks. SF Environment has also helped design legislation banning the sale of mercury thermometers in the city, and exchange 5,000 mercury thermometers for digital thermometers."

The web site for SFDOE includes a page listing the department's "victories," which include the following major awards:

Year	Agency	Award
2003	California Resource Recovery Assoc.	Best Urban program
2003	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Energy Star Award: Power Savers Program
2003	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Best Workplaces for Commuters
2002	North America Hazardous Materials Association	Best program: Electronic Waste Collection
2002	North America Hazardous Materials Association	Best program: Used Oil Collection
2002	California Resource Recovery Assoc.	Best program: Electronic Waste Collection
2002	California Environmental Protection Agency	Best program: Electronic Waste Collection
2002	California Environmental Protection Agency	Best program: Used Oil Collection
2001	US Environmental Protection Agency	Environmental Achievement Award.
2001	Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi	Special Congressional Recognition for Service
2001	Senator Barbara Boxer	Certificate of Appreciation for Outstanding Service
2001	California State Assembly/Kevin Shelley	Certificate of Recognition, Commercial Recycling Awards
2001	Board of Supervisors, City & County of San Francisco	Certificate of Honor
2001	California Integrated Waste Management Board	Trashcutters Award: Organics recycling
2000	North America Hazardous Materials Association	Best program: Oil & household hazardous waste
2000	California Resource Recovery Association	Best new recycling program: Fantastic Three
2000	National Association of Counties	Best new recycling program:

		Fantastic Three
1998	California Integrated Waste Management Board	Trashcutters Award: "Shop Smart" campaign
1997	California Resource Recovery Association	Best program: Organics recycling
1996	National Recycling Coalition	Best program: "Shop Smart" campaign
1996	California Resource Recovery Association	Best program: "Shop Smart" campaign
1996	National Association of Counties	Best program: "Shop Smart" campaign
1995	California Resource Recovery Association	Best program: Recycling education in schools
1992	Association of Bay Area Governments	Best program: Hazardous waste collection
1990	National Recycling Coalition	Best Recycling Program

Montgomery County, Maryland

Montgomery County was acknowledged by NACO in 2001 and 2000. Following are those descriptions:

2001: "Montgomery County recently developed a 'Countywide Forest Preservation Strategy' to evaluate forest patch quality and provide a scientific basis for allocating resources to address adopted County goals for forest protection and conservation. The 'Forest Preservation Strategy' report (October 2000) and web pages (askdep.com) provide informative, highly graphic, and easy to understand educational information to make citizens aware of conditions in their neighborhood forests to stimulate their involvement as partners in forest preservation initiatives. The strategy report helps heighten the status of forests and urban tree canopy in difficult budget choices by recognizing their true value as 'green infrastructure', which contributes to the county's beauty, quality of life, and habitat support to urban and rural wildlife. Goals and action items developed and presented in the 'Forest

Preservation Strategy' provide a common basis for focusing interagency coordination and sharing of resources to address forest preservation initiatives on a manageable countywide basis. Montgomery County's Executive Branch, Legislative Branch and responsible agencies to help establish forest conservation priorities, budget and target capital projects, and focus operating program resources to protect Montgomery County's forests will use the Forest Preservation Strategy. Identifying and targeting designated priority forest patches will help foster collaborative

partnerships with County residents, businesses, and environmental groups that are considered essential elements of any effective, long-term forest preservation/conservation effort.”

2000: “The Montgomery County Environmental Lawn Care Program is part of an integrated effort to build on the success of the County’s existing grass-cycling education efforts, while expanding that initiative to cover a wide range of environmental concerns ranging from water conservation, pesticide and nutrient use, Integrated Pest Management, and ecologically-healthy landscaping alternatives. The program utilized colorful and entertaining print advertising, website development, posters, flyers, brochures, public workshops, and media outreach vehicles. The campaign message was also crafted to provide timely and seasonal messages. For example, extensive water conservation tips, publications, demonstrations and resources were released to coincide with one of the worst droughts experience by the region in 100 years, and information regarding lawn fertilization discouraged nutrient applications during the least favorable periods. By tailoring the message to specific activities at specific times of the year, the program ensured a higher level of sensitivity and receptiveness on the part of the public.”

In addition, the website for Montgomery County’s Department of Environmental Protection notes the receipt of the following awards:

Year	Agency	Award and Program
2003	24th Annual Telly Awards	Silver Statue Award Winner: GreenMan Show, "Environmental and Outdoor Education"
2003	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Clean Water Partner for the 21st Century Award
2002	National Association of Counties	Achievement Award: Solar Roofs Program, Radon Survey Program, and Groundwater Protection Strategy
2001	Audubon Naturalist Society	Education Award
2001	National Association of Counties	Achievement Award: Environmental Assessment 2000 West Nile Virus Outreach Campaign
2000	National Association of Counties	Achievement Award: Environmental Lawn Care Campaign Clean Water Partners Campaign
1999	National Association of Counties	Achievement Award: Countywide Stream Protection Strategy Healthy Indoor Painting Practices Campaign
1998	Chesapeake Bay Program	Chesapeake Bay Partner Community, Gold Bay Partner Award

1998	National Association of Counties	Achievement Award: Compost Bin Distribution Program
1997	National Association of Counties	Achievement Award: Ozone Action Days Program VermiLab Program
1996	National Recycling Council	Outstanding Community Program Award
1996	Women in Communications	Clarion Award, Category of Community Service Campaign: Improve Your Pour Performance.
1996	American Advertising Federation	ADDY Awards (11 local and regional awards)
1996	Association of Municipal Recycling Coordinators	National Promotion and Education Award
1996	Natural Resources Defense Council	Award of Excellence - Gold: Oversized Graphics/Interior Oversized Graphics/Exterior Corporate Identity/Logo Award of Excellence - Silver: Newspaper Advertising Posters/Educational Award of Excellence - Special Mention: Television/Local Advertising Public Service/Non-Profit - Television Advertising Public Service/Non-Profit/Television

San Diego

Finally, although the assessor was not considering awards when the HCPs were reviewed, it was later discovered that the San Diego plan had received an award

from NACO in 2002. Following is that description:

“The San Diego Board of Supervisors established the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) as an integral part of the County’s efforts to protect parks and open space. The protection of sensitive plant and animal species by the MSCP eliminates the need to list the species as endangered under Federal and State Endangered Species Acts and reduces the costly permit process for private landowners and public agencies. The goal of the MSCP (a 50-year program) is to maintain and enhance biological diversity in the regional and maintain viable populations of endangered, threatened, and key sensitive species and their habitats. Not only are endangered and threatened species protected

by the MSCP, the residents of the community will benefit from this preservation of the natural environment as well. Planning for the 172,000 acre preserve (101,000 acres are in the unincorporated area) also promotes regional economic viability through streamlining the land use permit process - a significant benefit to landowners. The MSCP is a cooperative effort among the county and other local jurisdictions and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game (the Wildlife Agencies). These public partners are working with various private landowners, conservation groups and community planning groups, developers and other stakeholders in assembling the preserve.”

These are the five selected programs:

Coachella Valley Multiple Species HCP

- Permitted in 1986
- 199,663 acres located in southeastern California
- Population: 200,000 (expected to double by 2010); one million visitors annually

San Diego County Natural Communities Conservation Plan/HCP

- Permitted in 1998
- 252,132 acres located in southern California
- Population: 2.9 million; 16 million visitors annually

Central/Coastal Orange County Natural Communities Conservation HCP

- Permitted in 1996
- 208,000 acres located in southern California
- Population: 3 million; 40 million visitors annually

Department of Environmental Protection – Montgomery County, Maryland

The Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection’s program is recommended by the assessor for comparison because of the department’s utilization of a number of public education and outreach tools – including public workshops, website development, and print advertising – constructed around strategically planned and timed education messages. Additionally, the program touts its success at achieving “a higher level of sensitivity and receptiveness on the part of the public,” attributing this success to the strategic planning of when and how the tailored messages are delivered.

Department of the Environment – City and County of San Francisco

The San Francisco Department of the Environment’s program is recommended by the assessor for comparison due to the department’s impressive success in achieving

program objectives, such as reducing pesticide use in San Francisco by 50 percent as a result of public education initiatives. The Department's environmental agenda is described as "hard-hitting" and its methods as "innovative." Moreover, this program is serving as a model for other cities.

Interviews with Program Managers

Summary of Findings

Although the selected HCP and county-run programs have not conducted formal program assessments, and thus cannot demonstrate *proven* effective components, the anecdotal, qualitative research demonstrates that the programs have experienced, through trial and error (perhaps as Clark County has), both successes and failures in regard to public information, outreach, and educational efforts.

The comparison effort is challenging since one could argue that there exists such a different makeup in audiences (San Diego and San Francisco residents might have distinctly different and potentially more receptive audiences to environmental messages than Clark County), as well as budget and operation and organizational structural differences. But as a comparison of strictly informational, outreach, and education efforts, many of these programs are conducting similar activities as the DCP, including: establishing a strong school district(s) partnership; producing literature either in the form of a brochure or news piece; operating a website; involving stakeholders; realizing the challenges of reaching the general public and changing behavior; and, faced with limited budgets and staff or volunteers, realizing that all needed outreach and educational efforts cannot be done by the program participants alone.

In our discussions with the program managers of both the HCPs and the county-run environmental department programs, a commonality existed in that these program managers – with limited staff and budgets – have realized a concept that one manager called the "acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept." All of these managers have realized they simply cannot conduct what they feel to be effective informational, outreach, and educational efforts on their own. This concept is realized in a number of ways: volunteers, partnerships (with agencies, organizations, key opinion leaders, local communities, and school districts), and, perhaps most telling, learning that "teaching the teachers" is a more efficient approach to reaching students than directly reaching the students. This concept is also addressed in the second part of this report, as some interviewees, such as Ms. Jane Feldman and Dr. Karin Hoff, discussed directly reaching educators.

The Director of the Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard HCP's Preserve, Mr. Cameron Barrows, has concentrated on providing 4-hour lessons to teachers so they can conduct future lessons and field trips that he would have a limited capability to conduct as a staff of one. Likewise, limited staff and a non-existent budget for public information and education, specifically, has left Mr. Barrows to pursue no-cost pursuits, such as media

relations, public relations, and relying on volunteers and school districts bringing students to the Preserve, rather than the Preserve's staff coming to the students.

Likewise, the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan's managers realized that the HCP's outreach subcommittee members could not achieve the needed informational and educational efforts relying on themselves, so numerous partnerships have been developed, and the San Diego HCP takes advantage of each and every opportunity to attach the HCP's messages to other environmental, educational, and agency programs that already exist. They've taken a "don't reinvent the wheel" philosophy as far as they can take it.

Similarly, the San Francisco Department of the Environment, even with a staff of 62, can't extend their resources far enough to achieve their goals, and they credit their partnership efforts with carrying their message, particularly strategies that utilize local community key opinion leaders and local government officials. The Department also takes advantage of media relations, community newspapers, public relations, and editorial writing, and truly practices a "generals recruiting soldiers" philosophy.

Moreover, San Francisco also practices the "teach the teachers" efficiency philosophy, with programs that provide the resources and materials to teachers, as well as offering on-site training for teachers, and the Department has found that most teachers take advantage of the opportunity and appreciate the environmental science training, which includes instructing teachers how to present the science information so it is age/grade-level appropriate.

Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard HCP

Interview with:

**Cameron Barrows, Director of the Coachella Valley Preserve
Center for Natural Lands Management**

Public Outreach Efforts

Visitor's Center

The Coachella Valley Preserve has a visitor's center with approximately 50,000 visitors a year, and between 30 and 50 school groups visit the Preserve each year.

Brochure

The only HCP budget line item that is related to public information or outreach pertains to brochures, which Mr. Barrows feels is an effective, low-cost item (\$2,000 a year) to inform those who visit the area. He says that the HCP follows the same format that many national parks use that is similar to a small, six-page newspaper, and the local

newspaper at Coachella Valley prints 10,000 copies every two year at an at-cost basis. With the limited quantity, the brochures are only distributed at the Preserve's visitor's center. Inside is a self-guided map to the nature trail at the Preserve and information about the species and natural features being protected.

Media Relations

Mr. Barrows states that a no-cost effort is to develop good relationships with environmental beat reporters and provide ideas and updates about four times a year so that reporters will talk about the importance of the conservation mission and increase awareness and garner support for that mission. He said that he has achieved the goal of successfully soliciting three to four articles about the Preserve a year.

Facilitating School District Participation and Public Relations

Mr. Barrows explained that the area's local school districts have been active with pursuing and winning grants for science education, and the districts have chosen to use some of this grant money at the Preserve, and, in turn, Mr. Barrows has facilitated the students' use of the Preserve.

A side benefit of the cooperative education effort with the school districts has been welcomed public relations, in addition to what Mr. Barrows perceives as "community buy-in" to the mission of the HCP and the Preserve.

The facilitation effort with the school districts involves the docent meeting the school groups and providing an overview on the buses before the students disembark. Mr. Barrows utilizes the docent program to set-up learning stations along the trail, and volunteers provide lessons at stations as students move from one station to another.

Mr. Barrows has heard from parents who visit the Preserve that their children took the information home with them after their Preserve field trip, which he believes has achieved a "greater buy-in" of the Preserve and conservation principles. "We need ongoing attitude adjustments that have to be made with the public, and reaching children is the most efficient way, and a better way than heavy-handed law enforcement methods with adults," said Mr. Barrows.

"The effort pays off with their parents and the local community buying into the Preserve and the reason the HCP and Preserve exists. Consequently, it increases the protective envelope around species we're trying to protect."

Mr. Barrows offers evidence of the community buy-in anecdotally when he explains that the fringe-toed lizard depends on active sand dunes for its existence; this habitat

necessitates blowing sand, and those living down wind of the Preserve are recipients of sand. Some of the residents have written editorials complaining about the issue, but people respond back in greater numbers (with editorials) that the Preserve is “more important than sand in their yard.” He adds, “So it is really heartening to see unsolicited, overwhelming public support in this community for the Preserve.”

Educational Efforts

Mr. Barrows makes an effort to visit classrooms monthly. With only one staff person – himself – Mr. Barrows is limited in his ability to conduct personal classroom lessons.

However, the Preserve has established a docent program, and the Preserve’s volunteer has been assigned to go to a class to provide an environmental lesson prior to the class going on a science field trip to the Preserve; the docent program, therefore, is utilized to enrich the students’ Preserve experience.

“Once teachers hear a lesson, they may have enough information in the future to conduct the field trip on their own,” said Mr. Barrows, who explains how he has concentrated on teaching the teachers. Now, groups of teachers come to the

Preserve for about a four-hour discussion of the Preserve and its species. Additionally, Mr. Barrows is now conducting evening presentations to teachers as well because with limited staff, he has learned that it is “more efficient to target the teachers.”

Moreover, Mr. Barrows has also worked to make the Preserve a tourist attraction. He has worked to make sure that tourist groups and resorts know about the Preserve, so if visitors are “looking for things outside of casinos and golf, they are sent to the Preserve.” He has also started public group hikes (offered in the areas where endangered species can be viewed) through the Preserve, which are advertised in the local newspaper about three times a year and have become “very popular.”

Assessment of Program

Mr. Barrows said that there has not been a formal assessment of any education or public outreach efforts conducted by the HCP, nor has the HCP been formal with establishing target audiences and target objectives.

He also indicated that the current HCP in Coachella Valley is being expanded into a multiple species habitat conservation plan, and with that, he anticipates a “larger pot of money.” However, he said he also anticipates the continual challenge to obtain money for public outreach and education efforts. “Buying land is straightforward, but there are more restraints on the management of these sites, so the permit holders of these conservation plans scratch their heads on where management dollars are coming from, and when I talk about wanting to hire a public information coordinator and wanting to reach out to larger demographics, including the expanding Hispanic population, the idea

to hire an extra person breaks the budget and doesn't make the final line. It's the reality," said Mr. Barrows.

Annual Budget

The annual budget for the Coachella HCP is about \$100,000, but no particular line item exists for a public information and education component (except a line item specific for brochure printing).

San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan

Interview with:

**Ms. Trish Boaz, Environmental Resource Manager
County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use
San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program**

and

**Mr. Randy Rodriguez, Associate Planner
City of San Diego** (The city is a sub-area of the regional plan in the county since some topography and species change in the jurisdictions.)
San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program

Education and Public Outreach Efforts

Concerning the San Diego MSCP, an inter-jurisdictional committee (comprised of wildlife agencies and different permittees) oversees the Program; for education efforts, the San Diego MSCP Outreach Subcommittee meets once a month to oversee outreach and educational activities, develop and maintain partnerships, develop science curriculum, create outreach programs, and produce the *MSCP News*, a quarterly publication.

Regarding the *MSHP News*, Ms. Boaz explains that at \$0.50 cents a piece, the *MSCP News* is currently the major portion of the public information budget of the MSCP, along with mailing costs. Therefore, starting this year, a concerted effort is being made to move the news piece to a complete e-format, with 100% email distribution. She reports progress is slow, but all current recipients (over 500) of the *MSHP News* via mail are being asked to provide their email address to convert to an e-format.

Partnerships

Ms. Boaz states that the county and subcommittee have realized they can't conduct all of the outreach activities themselves, so they develop numerous partnerships with other environmental programs and organizations, as well as with state and local agencies, and, in particular, with school districts.

Activities within these partnerships include partnering and coordinating efforts at outreach events, such as fairs, providing links to one another's websites, and utilizing one another's resources, where applicable and available.

Mr. Rodriguez said that Earth Day is the largest event (attended by 65,000 people at Balboa Park on April 27, 2003) in San Diego in terms of public turnout, which is why he believes it is the most effective community outreach venue to reach the general public in a low-cost manner. Again, this involves the MSCP partners, in terms of sharing costs, resources and volunteers to present conservation information and messages, as well as working toward "capturing" public interest in the conservation booths, such as utilizing agencies which can provide live animals as a mechanism to draw people to hear the messages.

The MSCP has also partnered with the City of Sand Diego's community access channel, which produces a MSCP component within their park and recreation program.

The MSCP has also partnered with the Department of Education, and the MSCP Outreach Subcommittee has taken an active role in helping the Department to develop environmental science curriculum. Additionally, the Subcommittee visits classrooms when committee members can volunteer, but a more formal exercise has been develop to teach the teachers. Their work at developing curriculum and working directly with teachers is viewed as a more efficient delivery method than the subcommittee directly reaching the children.

Most Cost-Effective Outreach Methods

Ms. Boaz reiterates that joining existing programs and taking advantage of every opportunity best achieves cost-effectiveness. She provides a number of examples, such as the MSCP finding that the State Parks Department had a program called the Discovery Kit Program, which had been proven successful over the years, so the MSHP asked to be a part of the Discovery Kit by putting in their information and messages, which the students receive on their field trips to state parks.

Another example was partnering with San Diego County's Parks Department, which had partnered with school districts for an annual 6th Grade Kids Camp, where students have a camp experience, learn about the outdoors, and, again, receive a packet of information that includes the MSCP's information and messages.

"Look at what's out there in you're area and see how to build on that, which is key," said Ms. Boaz. "Don't reinvent the wheel, but use other organizations and programs and work through partnerships."

A final example is partnering with local homebuilders and joining their new buyers' packets, as well as what is given at the County's Planning and Land Use counters, which provide information and message points about the MSCP. In fact, San Diego County got copyright permission from Irvine County to develop the same type of brochure so they didn't have to "reinvent the wheel" in the design of a brochure to provide to new homebuyers and new county permittees.

Mr. Rodriguez agrees and states that once an MSCP program develops a well-made piece such as a brochure or news piece, it should be distributed at every opportunity where resource users will visit, including regional nature centers, public open space areas, and federal, state, and local parks, as well as local community centers.

Assessment of Program

Although a formal assessment of the MSCP efforts has not been conducted, Ms. Boaz reports that an annual report is provided to the Board of Supervisors (comprised from the wildlife agencies), as well as an annual report workshop. Both the report and workshop are requirements of the California Fish and Game Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Rodriguez describes the annual report workshop as the largest singular outreach event conducted by the MSCP. Noticing for the event includes a mailing to all stakeholders, a newspaper and local journal advertisement, and notification on the website.

The workshop is primarily a venue for the MSCP Committee and subcommittees to discuss major accomplishments of the reporting year (December to December), the status of the MSCP in terms of conservation objectives and goals, and the status of major projects and grants; the presentation ends with a public question and answer session.

Despite being considered the MSCP's largest annual event, Mr. Rodriguez contends that interest and attendance has been traditionally problematic (the workshops have been conducted since 1997), and attendance is typically around 50 people, usually from the most interested stakeholder groups, including the Sierra Club and the Audubon Society. Mr. Rodriguez also notes that although a news release is sent out announcing the workshop, the major media has chosen not to cover the event.

Therefore, the MSCP Committee and MSCP Outreach Subcommittee will be strategizing on how to garner more interest, attendance, and media coverage, including exploring the idea of having elected officials at the meeting and possibly a well-known speaker open the event.

Also, although a formal assessment of program success has not been instituted, both Ms. Boaz and Mr. Rodriguez, anecdotally, discuss their perceptions of the level of awareness of the MSCP and its mission, and they describe San Diego as two distinct

areas. They contend that the northern area, close to the major resource and coastal areas, is cognizant of the program, whereas the inland areas are not. Mr. Rodriguez said the reason is a matter of personal stake – in the north, a lot of people were involved in the development of the program since they have long-term interests in the project (in many cases, their homes are near the resource areas). The process to develop the MSCP took six years and involved a stakeholder committee consisting of land users, hikers, property owners, and advocacy groups. The Program was adopted in 1997. “Most people we work with on a daily basis were ingrained in its development,” said Mr.

Rodriguez. Ms. Boaz added, “San Diego is an environmental-conscious community so people interested in the MSCP know about it.”

Annual Budget

The San Diego MSCP has a limited budget of \$25,000 a year for public information related line items, including printing and distribution of the *MSCP News* and maintenance of a website. Other funding and resources for public outreach and education is obtained through grants and through utilizing partnerships, particularly with those agencies and organizations that sit on the MSCP Outreach Subcommittee.

Montgomery County, Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

Interview with:

**Mr. Joe Keyser, Environmental Education Specialist
Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection**

Mr. Keyser explained that in 1994, a ban was implemented in Montgomery County against putting yard waste into the landfill. To expand the central composting facility would have cost \$5.4 million, so changing people’s behavior concerning the disposition of their yard waste and general lawn care was considered the primary environmental issue faced by the county and its citizens.

Effective Programs

Montgomery County found that direct mail is the most effective. The pieces contain information about what the public should and shouldn’t do in terms of lawn care and the disposition of waste, as well as details about upcoming workshops (the lawn care workshops were held in different areas around the county, conducted on evenings and weekends, as well as lunch hours at large workplaces). Mr. Keyser contends that the most effective direct mail method is to send the information in an official #10 envelope with the county administrator’s return address and cover letter from the administrator

(which is an elected position in Montgomery County). On the other hand, flyers, brochures, and mailings that include rulers or seed packets are not nearly as effective because they look like junk mail. “The official envelopes look like something important that a person should read,” said Mr. Keyser.

The Department’s current outreach emphasis is concentrated in the following areas:

- Print advertising in local newspapers –
The advertisements always contain an offer so the Department can gauge the response to the advertisements (a recent advertisement offered a key hook to place by a thermostat as a reminder to turn the heat down when leaving the house).
- Web site –
Although the site (www.askdep.com) wasn’t really available in 1994 when the yard waste program started, the site is now a “major” component of the Department’s outreach efforts.
- Cable show --
“The Green Man Show” is part of the county’s general public information cable program, which gets across the Department’s environmental messages. Although the Department has not determined the exact viewership for this program, the anecdotal evidence appears to support the theory that a lot of people watch government access television, according to Mr. Keyser.
- No-cost spots –
The Department utilizes one-minute “eco-minute” spots marketed to other cable and government access shows where there is no cost for placement. The Department also participates in Watershed Radio created by the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center and the Sierra Club, which uses daily one-minute radio spots throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and a website provides text and audio files of the spots.
- Editorial page –
The Department has a monthly editorial page in the local weekly (similar to “The View” community newspaper inserted into *The Las Vegas Review-Journal* and *Las Vegas Sun*). The Department only pays for production costs.
- Other advertising –
The Department also advertises in other venues, such as transit sites, where the cost is only in the production (there is no cost for placement).
- School programs --

The Department has developed a number of school programs, and Mr. Keyser indicated that, “humor is the key element” (as it is with their advertisements, too), as he contends that the Department “concentrates on bringing information in an appealing way.” Programs include:

- Schoolyard Habitats, where the Department provides the information and resources to help interested schools transform an area of schoolyard into an “environmental discovery area” to address biodiversity and resource conservation.
- Stream Teams is a volunteer program for grades 4-12 to teach students both in and out of the classroom about water quality and aquatic habitats.
- VermiLab is a pilot program that sets up Worm and Composting Discovery Gardens, beginning with 35 classrooms (grades 1-5). After four months, both teachers and students prepare a variety of reports about their composting experiences. This program has garnered national media attention, including on Fox News.

Least Effective

When asked what he perceived as the least effective public information or education activity, Mr. Keyser responded that printing thousands of brochures for distribution at public points like libraries is the least effective. Due to a smaller budget, the Department will only print 500 to 1,000 brochures for very pointed distribution with the goal of directing people to the web site. He noted that Montgomery County is “highly wired, and the site does get a lot of attention.”

Assessment

Although a formal assessment of public information programs was not conducted, Mr. Keyser explained that the lawn care and waste disposition program was developed after extensive market research and polling had been conducted to determine what people were doing, why they were doing it, and why they weren’t doing other things. Advertisements were developed and targeted based on these results.

Within a year of beginning the lawn care and waste disposition program, the Department had measurable demonstration of behavioral change, according to Mr. Keyser, who explained that part of the positive behavior change was credited to economic effects – the Department conditioned people to consider different approaches to lawn care, such as leaving their grass clippings on the lawn, by charging \$1.00 for every paper bag (plastic not allowed) left at the curb, which also required the purchase of tag for a grass clipping bag. This system caused people to look for an easier route, which included leaving the clippings on the lawn.

However, Mr. Keyser details that the Department is currently experiencing slippage because of residential growth (20,000 new residents annually), high

turnover (Montgomery County is expensive to live in, so people move out into the developing suburbs that are in different counties), a lack of interest by county management, and budget-forced discontinuation of workshops. He said the workshops made a huge difference, and he believes hands-on programs such as workshops are “very effective.”

Annual Budget

For the first couple of years, after the initiation of the ban, the annual outreach budget was \$400,000. Currently, the public outreach budget is approximately \$90,000 and includes outreach concerning other environmental programs, such as air quality (Montgomery County is in a non-attainment area) and water use.

San Francisco County and City, California

Department of the Environment

Interview with:

Mr. James Chien, Deputy Outreach Manager for the San Francisco Department of the Environment

Nationally Renowned Program

Mr. Chien notes that the Department’s recycling program has become nationally renowned and is “considered the most progressive and successful environmental program in the country,” which is also a reason this program was selected by the assessor. A goal (which is now a state mandate) was set to divert 50 percent of waste away from landfills, and San Francisco not only met the goal, but also surpassed it, achieving a 52 percent diversion rate. That means that the population of San Francisco now recycles more waste than they throw away. (The money used to operate the program comes from the rate for garbage service and not the general fund.)

Due to the size of San Francisco and its population, public outreach for the recycling program is separated into three divisions: commercial (targeting restaurants in particular), residential, and city government.

Each division targets their audiences with different messages and media. “Each message is very audience-specific,” said Mr. Chien, noting that all publications and the recycling hotline are published in English, Spanish, and Chinese, and websites have recently been launched in the latter two languages.

Most Successful Outreach Tools

Partnerships

Mr. Chien explains that even with a staff of 62 people in the Department, the amount of outreach required to run a successful program necessitates forming partnerships.

The Department's program must cover 11 districts, and so the Department has partnered with the local communities and works with applicable district managers, supervisors, and directors in reaching their communities. He said that the local partners know their communities better than the Department's staff, and he credits these partnerships with much of the recycling program's success.

"In educating the general public, we must work with local communities and local community leaders who speak the language and relate to the community audience because they're key opinion leaders, and the message is more effective when delivered in partnership with them," said Mr. Chien.

Professional Public Relations

The Department has also felt it is a prudent expense to hire a professional public relations firm to brand the Department since it is a relatively new department compared to other San Francisco departments. The branding tools have included bus shelter and radio advertisements and neighborhood newspaper advertisements where the Department also has a monthly column.

"The benefit to establishing our Department's brand as progressive and user-friendly is to make the campaigns and messages more effective," said Mr. Chien. The branding campaign is being conducted in two phases, of which the Department is still in the first phase.

The first phase is to build awareness of the Department and that "it is doing a great job," and the second phase is to build trust among the public that they can rely on the Department for environmental concerns and that the Department is user-friendly. The branding campaign also includes the message, "My Home, My City, My Planet," which personalizes the environmental message to make it seem like the audience's responsibility, not government.

Educational Efforts

The Department has established a School Education Team, and they focus on teacher training, as well as going to school assemblies with environmental performers and providing an entertaining lesson. Also, the Department hosts field trips to composting

facilities, and the Department helps interested schools set up composting operations with all materials and provisions.

Again, the Department focuses on teaching teachers, not students. Teachers are trained on how to teach children about environmental issues: composting; three “R”s – Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle; and environmental justice and energy efficiencies.

“Training is not mandatory, but teachers are encouraged and provided teaching materials,” said Mr. Chien, noting that most teachers take advantage of the opportunity. Last year, the teacher training was conducted at a recycling center to show the teachers how the process works. Mr. Chien also explained that teachers are taught “how to approach students, too, depending on the age of students,” further noting that if the lesson is taught at a level over the students’ level of learning, the lesson will serve more to “confuse” than successfully educate.

Cost-Effective Efforts

When asked to recommend effective, low-cost efforts, Mr. Chien offered a lot of advice based on the Department’s success.

“You need to work with the local community, especially community newspapers. They’ll love to have the story, and they’ll run press releases all the time and often word-for-word,” said Mr. Chien, adding, “Establish relations to increase free press coverage and pursue a regular column. Also, work with local contacts and key opinion leaders. A city or county environmental program can’t accomplish it all themselves, so they must establish key opinion leaders, volunteers, and media relations who can help get across the message. It’s the acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept.”

Not Effective

Mr. Chien says in the electronic age, printing is perceived more and more as archaic, non-effective, and as a waste of both money and resources. “The City asked us to stop printing an annual report. We all feel it’s a waste of money. People don’t usually read it all, if they read it at all,” said Mr. Chien, who said the city and county citizens are directed to the Internet if they want information. He noted the old argument was that some people don’t have the Internet, but he said even if people don’t have the Internet, they could access the Internet from a public library.

Assessment

Although the Department has not conducted a formal assessment of their outreach and education efforts, the Department does have a campaign for which the results are measured by the tonnage the city and county has increased. The success is measured by whether goals are met; the Department sets a goal,

such as a monthly goal to increase ten tons of recyclables in a district community. “This type of project has been very successful,” said Mr. Chien. “We also ask merchants to sign-up with our organic green recycling program with a goal. People are more driven if there can be a measurement of their success against goals.”

Orange County

Unfortunately, the managers at Orange County were unresponsive to the assessor’s repeated attempts at contacting them for an interview. The assessor finally spoke with Jane Hendron, Public Affairs Officer for the Carlsbad Office of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. She indicated that there is not much information available on the Orange County Central/Coastal HCP as far as educational programs are concerned. She looked at the final documents on that particular HCP and found that they do not address any requirement for public education, other than the efficient and effective management of the Nature Reserve of Orange County.

Moreover, Ms. Hendron indicated that the San Diego MSCP is a much better model, which she believes is “revolutionary” in its integration of public education with the planning process. She was particularly positive about the web site, noting that it is built and maintained through the use of college interns and paid staff. The printed newsletter, which is sent to a mailing list, is also included on the web site.

As a sidebar, Ms. Hendron is not aware of any formal evaluation of the public education programs for other HCPs.

Assessment Interviews – Clark County Desert Conservation Program

The purpose of conducting interviews with individuals involved with the Clark County Desert Conservation Program is to provide for qualitative research to assist the assessor in evaluating the PIE Program and its activities. The research allows the assessor to determine if individuals (who have been the most closely involved with the PIE Program) perceive that the Program, both in general as well as in regard to specific activities, are meeting PIE objectives and reaching the Program’s targeted audiences.

Appendix A is a copy of the interview questions. Please note that if an interviewee was not closely involved with any specific activity of the PIE

Program, only Part I (general questions) was administered. There was also one question that was only asked to those interviewees who have been involved with the PIE Program for more than three years.

In presenting the interview research for the purpose of this report, not all individual responses are listed under every question. Rather, in many circumstances, common answers and themes are discussed, while, with other questions, individual responses (and direct quotes) are offered, too, as to not exclude more unique, individual responses, as well as to elucidate the points and perceptions made by the interviewees.

The following is a list of the 27 individuals who participated in the interview process:

- Ms. Kathy August, Red Rock Education Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management
- Ms. Carolyn Boyle, Management Analyst II, Clark County Comprehensive Planning
- Ms. Betty Burge, Chairman, Tortoise Group
- Ms. Callie Le'au Courtright, Outdoor Recreation Planner, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- Mr. Don Dayton, Board of Directors Member, Southern Nevada Off Road Enthusiasts
- Mr. Barry Duncan, Government Relations Manager, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
- Ms. Jane Feldman, Conservation Chair, Sierra Club
- Ms. Jennifer Haley, Interagency Partnership Liaison, Inter-Agency of BLM, FS, NPS, and USFWS
- Dr. Karin Hoff, Ph.D. (Member of the Public)
- Ms. Holly Johnson, Environmental Biologist, Southern Nevada Water Authority, Department of Resources
- Mr. John Jones, Southern Regional Forester, Nevada Division of Forestry
- Ms. Shelly Labay, Planner, City of Henderson, Community Development Department
- Ms. Gayle Marrs-Smith, Botanist, Bureau of Land Management
- Mr. Dale Matteson, President, Matteson Media Group

- Ms. Elise McAllister, Administrator, Partners in Conservation
- Ms. Glenace Melton, Project Manager for the Technical Resources Interact, Research, Assessment, and Innovation, Clark County School District
- Ms. Cynthia Pfaendler, Project Coordinator, Mojave Max Education Project from Red Rock Canyon
- Ms. Irene Porter, Executive Director, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
- Ms. Kay Rohde, Chief of Interpretation, Lake Mead National Rec. Area
- Ms. Ann Schreiber, Muddy River Regional Environmental Impact Alleviation Committee
- Ms. Jan Schweitzer, Paralegal, City of North Las Vegas
- Ms. Jerry Schupe, Education Coordinator and Habitat Specialist, Tortoise Group
- Ms. Elsie Sellars, Wildlife Education Coordinator, Nevada Department of Wildlife
- Mr. Thomas Smigel, Regional Manager, Nevada Department of Agriculture
- Ms. Amy Sprunger-Allworth, Refuge Manager, Desert National Wildlife Range
- Ms. Connie Suckling, Government Relations Specialist, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
- Mr. Mark Trinko, Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) Representative (representing sixteen different OHV clubs)

Summary

Most of the interviewees were positive about the Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education activities, and when criticisms were mentioned, the comments were directed toward improving or enhancing the PIE Program and the efforts of the PIE Committee.

Most of the interviewees were exceptionally bullish on the Mojave Max Program – the Education Project and the Emergence Contest. Not all of the adjectives of praise are included here, but it is unarguably perceived by the interviewees as the PIE Program's most successful effort to date.

As a related side note, the assessor was provided the opportunity to observe a Mojave Max lesson as part of the qualitative research. The assessor observed a presentation provided by a Red Rock National Conservation Area representative at Guy Elementary School, 4028 La Madre Way, on November 6, 2003. The assessor observed how the presentation encourages desert conservation and protection of the tortoise by explaining threats to the tortoise and the fragility of the tortoise's desert environment. Perhaps equally import to *what* the messages are is *how* the messages are delivered. In observing the Mojave Max Education Project lesson and how students react, the retention of the information (at least from the beginning of the presentation to the end) is evident in the way the students learned new terms (such as carapace, plastron, skutes, and gular horn) and remembered the terms later after experiencing an interactive and engaging lesson that included props, verbal quizzing, and participation in learning demonstrations.

Beyond the commonality with the Mojave Max responses among interviewees, some themes emerged in the answers. One theme concerns the perceived need for *positive* messages. For instance, Mr. Duncan exulted that the OHV community needs positive messages in order to be receptive to the messages. "Tell them where they *can* ride instead of where they *can't*," said Duncan. Mr. Trinko and Mr. Dayton expressed similar comments when discussing the OHV community.

Another theme that emerged is for the Program to capitalize on its existing successes, and with the overwhelming positive comments pertaining to the Mojave Max Program, many interviewees perceive that building upon and expanding this proven component should continually be explored. A good way to start is to review some of the comments by interviewees Ms. Jane Feldman and Dr. Karin Hoff, who both seemed to discuss the concept of educating the educators. The assessor recommends further exploration of this concept as it was a common recommendation coming from the HCP/county-run environmental program section as well, as many program managers have realized the efficiency of instructing others to become their messengers.

When discussing perceptions about effective media, there seemed to be a common perception that media such as television, radio, and billboards have the potential to be more effective since they reach larger audiences. Moreover, some interviewees discussed the need for a "media mix" and the advice of professionals.

Other questions produced rather overwhelming common responses. The *Desert News* was the clear winner among interviewees when asked to name what they perceive as the most effective literature piece produced by the DCP. Again, Mojave Max was called the "shining star" or variations thereof when interviewees were asked about the most effective activity, as well as when asked about the best elements of the PIE Program, with many interviewees expounding on the dedication, openness, and diversity of the PIE Committee as well.

Finally, an optimism seems to exist that current processes, including the strategic planning process and assessment process, will help address some of the current concerns.

In terms of concerns and challenges, the assessor recommends that the PIE Committee discuss what is written here, perhaps putting a discussion of this portion of the report on a future PIE Committee agenda, as the assessor perceives that the interviewees' comments in this area are constructive and are aimed to better the Program. Therefore, it would behoove the PIE Committee to not let this portion of the assessor's research become a shelf document, but, rather, to discuss the concerns and challenges, incorporate them into the strategic planning process if they do not already play a part, and work at resolving them or discuss implementing some of the "overcome the challenges" ideas discussed by interviewees.

Finally, the discussions which take place about whether the Program in general, and activities specifically, meet objectives and reach target audiences will supplement and complement the quantitative research that will take place as part of the full, comprehensive assessment process. Again, this qualitative portion of the research is not meant to stand alone without the benefit of more supportable, quantifiable evidence.

However, it should be noted that, clearly and overwhelmingly, the first objective pertaining to informing the public about the terms of the Section 10(a) Permit seems separate and apart from the other two objectives in terms of the perceived degree in which it is achieved by the PIE Program and specific activities. Not only do most interviewees perceive it is not being met to the degree that the second and third objectives are met, but, some question whether it should be an objective and others question if it is an appropriate or achievable objective. The second and third objectives were never questioned in this way.

Likewise, with target audiences, most interviewees perceive that children are targeted and reached by the PIE Program, but the challenges of reaching – and changing the values, attitudes, and behavior – of the general public were expressed by many interviewees, and most interviewees don't perceive specific interest groups being targeted and reached to the high degree that children are reached as well.

Questions and Answers

- **The PIE Program has 3 objectives (*read them*). Is the PIE Program meeting these objectives? Please explain.**

Most of the individuals interviewed agree that the PIE Program is meeting the objective to encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County and the objective to increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of

Clark County's natural ecosystems, but is not fully meeting the objective to inform the public of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permits.

For instance, Ms. August expressed comments similar to the above-stated, but noted that meeting the third objective – informing the public of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permits – is “difficult.”

In her role as Interagency Partnership Liaison, Jennifer Haley is in a position to speak with a number of individuals in the Bureau of Land Management, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and the Forest Service. She said that the feedback she often receives indicates that the PIE Program has made “good starts” in reaching their objectives, “but not a lot of progress” beyond the Mojave Max Program. Ms. Courtright expressed similar comments, noting the “good results and good public feedback” from the Mojave Max Program, but other activities have started without completion.

Ms. Rohde noted that the *respect, protect, and enjoy* objective is met, but she credits the success in meeting this objective, in part, to the fact that it is shared (at least in concept) by the federal agencies and can be found similarly worded in their mission statements.

Ms. Burge points out how the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and *Desert News* should be credited as the primary activities that meet the third objective (through education, increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems), and the Program's association with the Clark County School District's Interact link with schools helps further the Program's education efforts. Ms. Burge indicates, however, that the Section

10(a) Permits are described, sometimes indirectly, in venues such as mojavemax.com and the hotline.

Ms. Porter and Mr. Duncan praise the education elements pertaining to the desert tortoise and “bringing young kids into” the program, but the “public really doesn't understand what's going on,” explaining that the public isn't being informed about the terms of the Section 10(a) Permit and that they would like to see more about what the development industry is doing (and paying) to “ensure the integrity of the environment.” Ms. Sellars points out how the public heard about the Section 10(a) Permit near the time it was first issued, but since that time, she doesn't feel the public fully understands how the Permit, construction, desert conservation, and species protection “all fit into the big picture.”

Ms. Schweitzer also praises the PIE Program for its public education efforts, especially in reaching children. Like most individuals interviewed, she perceives that the PIE Program is meeting its second and third objectives, but isn't sure how the PIE Program achieves the first objective.

Dr. Hoff noted that the PIE Committee doesn't know if objectives are being met or if the Committee is "having a substantial impact [on audiences] external to the Committee and the Program." She indicates that the assessment will help determine the answer.

Mr. Matteson noted that the PIE Program does a "very good job" meeting the second and third objectives in reaching young demographics, but more needs to be done to reach older demographics, as well as the Spanish market. Like most others, he does not believe the first objective – informing the public about the terms of the Section 10(a) Permit – is being met.

Ms. Feldman believes the first objective is "not a good one" since behavior would not be changed, even with knowledge of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permit. The *respect, protect, and enjoy* objective, and the objective to increase awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County's ecosystems, better serve the Program's mission, according to Ms. Feldman.

Mr. Trinko feels that the Program does not have enough funds to educate and change the behavior of 1.5 million people in Clark County. He indicated that the PIE Committee was "forced early on to narrow the target audience," but the Program has not achieved the goal of educating and changing the behavior of all of the target markets.

-more-

- **The PIE Program has three targeted audiences (*read them*). Are the activities of the PIE Program reaching these targeted audiences? Please explain.**

Most individuals interviewed by the assessor agreed that the PIE Program is reaching children, but different opinions were expressed in regard to the Program's reach to the general public and special interest groups.

Ms. Pfaendler was perhaps the most detailed in explaining how children are reached, including the Mojave Max Emergence Contest reaching children and the Mojave Max Education Project from Red Rock Canyon which, in a two-and-a-half month period, reached over 7,600 children, 264 teachers (and had the desert tortoise/conservation message presented over 300 times).

Mr. Trinko agreed that children are reached, but said that there isn't enough money to reach the other two audience categories.

Ms. Boyle explained how all three audiences are reached, including children through the Mojave Max Program; involving special interest groups in the PIE Committee's efforts; and reaching the general public is also achieved by information disseminated by the PIE Program.

Ms. Rohde, too, explained how all three audiences are identified and targeted, but she noted that she doesn't know how effective the Program is at reaching the audiences. She said that the Mojave Max Program reaches students, and the "hope" is that children talking to their parents will carry the information to the general public, too. Moreover, activities such as the PSA campaign, some radio advertising, and the Program's representation at fairs are all designed to reach the general public. Whereas more specific programs and handouts have been "somewhat targeted" toward special interest groups.

Ms. Marrs-Smith notes that it is "harder to measure" the Program's success at reaching the general public, but she recognizes the Program utilizes different media to reach the general public. Like most of those interviewed, she calls the Mojave Max Program a "resounding success" which "gets stronger" every year. "Reaching children is their [the PIE Committee's] greatest strength," said Marrs-Smith.

Mr. Dayton notes that the Program's participation in the Clark County Fair is the "best thing we do to reach the general public." Furthermore, he notes that reaching special interest groups – the OHV community in particular – presents challenges in that there are some groups that are "antagonistic" and "polarized."

Ms. Pfaendler stated that she does not think off road groups or many other specific interest groups are being effectively reached, and she also perceives a need to address construction workers with education and explaining why they need to comply with tortoise pickup protocol.

Ms. Burge said that she is of the belief that short-term campaigns don't work in reaching the general public, and a campaign must really "smother" the public to be effective.

Ms. Schreiber believes that the PIE Program has reached a point where all three audiences are being reached, whereas they weren't at first.

Dr. Hoff said the Program is "certainly reaching part" of the target audiences, but whether behaviors are changed, the Committee doesn't know. She notes the Program is "certainly reaching school age children" and the media campaign and the work of Matteson Media Group indicates what portion of the audiences are being reached by the PIE Program.

Ms. August feels that children are reached, especially through the Mojave Max Program, and the general public is reached “fairly effectively” through Mojave Max and projects such as the PSA campaign and the KNPR Almanac. However, she feels special interest groups are reached “marginally,” except, perhaps, at the Clark County Fair.

Ms. Feldman notes that children are reached, but she would like to see education of the teachers to “teach every class they have until they retire,” which would provide for a more “efficient” reach.

- **The PIE Program has used a number of media in delivering its messages. What medium do you feel has been or is the most effective in delivering the DCP’s messages about conservation?**

Television and Radio

Television and/or radio emerged as the most popular answer (billboards were mentioned a number of times as well), as a common perception is that these media have the power to reach the largest audience. Ms. Porter, Mr. Duncan, and Ms. Suckling mentioned television and billboards as the most effective media in delivering messages. Ms. Labay thinks television has the potential to be the most effective since it reaches a large audience. Ms. Boyle favors television, too, for its potential “broad impact” and that the images may even transcend language barriers. Mr. Jones and Ms. Haley both noted having seen billboards and television advertising, and Ms. Haley added that marketing and advertising

expertise is needed for the right media blend, as one medium may not be singularly effective.

Likewise, Ms. Melton said media “works together,” and Mr. Matteson argues for a “media mix” with radio targeting children and television reaching parents and educators, as well as the Clark County School District serving as a “conduit” to the children. Ms. McAllister noted that although a lot of Las Vegas-based television and radio stations are not received by the rural communities, McAllister feels the PSAs developed by Matteson Media Group are attention-grabbing and deliver quick, effective messages, and Ms. Schupe noted that she hears the PSAs more than any other medium. Ms. Sprunger-Allworth thinks that television and radio are “probably” the most effective media for delivering messages.

Mr. Smigel would like more utilization of Clark County Channel 4, and Ms. Pfaendler also suggested a program on Channel 4 to target the general public. Finally, Dr. Hoff believes radio and television can be “useful” when advertisements are targeted at specific demographics, rather than a general audience. Also, Ms. Sellars advocated for

television or radio “since people spend more time with those media, so it presents a greater opportunity to reach the public.”

Person-to-Person

Ms. Courtright explains that none of the media is a substitute for effective person-to-person contact, so activities such as Mojave Max offers the most effective vehicle for reaching the public. Ms. Feldman labels “one-on-one” contact as the “best” method, and Ms. August echoes this comment as well, naming the personal contact at the Clark County Fair as a specific example. Likewise, Ms. Schweitzer perceives public appearances geared toward children (and utilizing the costumed Mojave Max icon) are the “most successful.” Mr. Dayton also favors person-to-person contact, such as handouts and giveaways at events, but more detailed messages may be needed.

Print

Ms. Johnson, on the other hand, argues that television and radio advertising reach audiences limited to those who watch a particular channel or listen to a particular station at certain times, whereas billboards and major newspaper advertising reaches a wider audience range. Ms. Rohde believes print could be utilized more, but the Program must first know how the target audience receives information, how they learn, and how they connect with the messages. Ms. Marrs-Smith has heard the radio messages and has read articles about PIE activities when they have appeared either in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or the *Las Vegas Sun*.

Kiosks

Mr. Trinko argues that kiosks in public land areas – where people are using the lands – would be the most effective to reach those recreating on the land; and these kiosks would need to relay messages in a *positive* fashion, including recreational suggestions and a map of the area showing where recreation is allowed.

- **The PIE Program conducts a number of activities (*i.e., products and brochures provided at events, hotlines, Mojave Max Education Project, PSAs, etc.*). What activity do you perceive has been the most effective in delivering the DCP messages (*i.e., respect, protect, and enjoy*)?**

Overwhelmingly, almost all interviewees selected the Mojave Max Program – the Education Project and/or the Emergence Contest – as the activity of choice.

Ms. Sprunger-Allworth makes the point that it’s hard to “teach old dogs new tricks” when adults don’t want to learn, which sets Mojave Max apart as it reaches kids, “where you have to start.” Ms. Boyle explained that the Mojave Max Program has received the most publicity, and she perceives that the messages not only reach children, but parents, too. Ms. August said that the Mojave Max Education Project provides an opportunity for the DCP’s messages to be delivered in an interactive setting wherein the messages have

greater potential to be understood and retained. Ms. Schweitzer credits Mojave Max's success with teaching the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message through "enjoyable activities." Ms. Feldman gives credit to the Clark County School District and Matteson Media Group, too, with helping make Mojave Max "tremendously successful."

Mr. Matteson, Mr. Jones, Ms. Haley, Mr. Dayton, Ms. Porter, Mr. Duncan, Ms. Suckling, Ms. Labay, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Rohde, Ms. Courtright, Ms. Marrs-Smith, Mr. Smigel, and Ms. McAllister also named the Mojave Max Program as the most effective activity.

The Clark County Fair was also mentioned a few times. Ms. Schreiber said that the fair allows the DCP's message to get out "to the most people in the shortest amount of time" more so than any other activity. Mr. Dayton and Ms. August both named the Clark County Fair as the most effective activity, in addition to the Mojave Max Program.

Mr. Trinko named the SNORE Tech Inspection Day (wherein PIE had a booth) and a party with the Searchlight Volunteer Fire Department as not only effective activities, but also important opportunities for building/improving relations with target audiences.

Ms. Burge said that the level of effectiveness for the various activities is unknown, and remains a question. Dr. Hoff expressed a similar view, noting that the PIE Committee does not yet know about the effectiveness of public information/education activities as they relate to changing peoples' behavior on public land; however, Dr. Hoff did describe the Clark County Fair as an "intensive" effort involving about 50,000 attendees – although a large number of literature is passed out, Dr. Hoff said she does not know how effective it is once it is put into an event attendee's hands.

- **Are there any activities that you perceive as not having been effective or are not currently effective?**

The answers varied here somewhat. Moreover, a number of interviewees could not think of any examples of ineffective activities, including Mr. Jones, Ms. Haley, Ms. Labay, Dr. Hoff, Ms. Melton, Ms. Schupe, Ms. Pfaendler, and Ms. Boyle.

Improving Activities

A number of interviewees, rather than labeling an activity as ineffective, provided answers that were more centered on improving an activity. Mr. Dayton believes all of the activities have been effective to a degree, but believes the *Desert News* should be updated. Ms. Courtright said that improvement could be made in terms of the Clark County Fair effort, and she noted ideas for improvement have been discussed, including housing the DCP booth under a "conservation tent" with informative programs, rather than the booth remaining in the "commercial tent" as has been the set-up in the past. Ms. Schweitzer would like to see more "visibility" at outreach events such as fairs with more "eye-catching" visuals at the DCP's booth.

Brochures and Giveaway Products

Although a common answer did not fully emerge here, a few interviewees mentioned brochures and the giveaway products distributed by the Program.

Regarding brochures, Ms. Porter and Mr. Duncan named brochures/pamphlets as the least effective, with Mr. Duncan stating that costs are typically high and money could be spent more effectively with other communication tools; Ms. Porter suggested a speakers' bureau – calling for a needed “adult version” of the Mojave Max Program. Ms. Marrs-Smith also noted brochures. She also noted that KLVX Channel 10's *Outdoor Nevada* program was “not truly geared toward the DCP's messages.”

Regarding giveaway products, Ms. August noted that the products are not effective when there is “no information attached to them.” Mr. Matteson

expressed some similar concerns, stating that novelties may be “misguided” at times and there should be a connection between the item and the message. Ms. McAllister said that, from the rural perspective, the benefit of certain giveaway products is not perceived.

Other

Mr. Trinko named billboards and bus stop signs as past efforts, which he perceived as ineffective. Ms. Schreiber also noted the bus stop signs.

Ms. Rohde called the information developed for teachers' curriculum as “good,” but she is unaware of the results of this effort, and whether teachers are using the information.

Going back a number of years, Ms. Feldman notes the desert handbook, which she said lacked educator-consultation in the design process, and, therefore, the handbook was not tailored as a “practical” tool for an educator.

- **In terms of literature distributed by PIE—such as the DCP brochure and Desert News—which do you feel most effectively promotes/explains the DCP's messages about desert conservation?**

The *Desert News* received a number of positive comments and was, overwhelmingly, the most common answer. Ms. August articulates that the *Desert News* has information that “matches the target audience,” as well as providing resources for readers to obtain even more information. “I wish I had more of those to hand out to school groups,” said Ms. August. Ms. Feldman echoed similar comments about the *Desert News*, stating that the piece has been edited so that the “appropriate audience can read it.” Mr. Trinko, too, made comments along similar lines, noting that the *Desert News* is “audience

appropriate” with visuals that “people will look at,” but he added that dissemination could be improved. Mr. Jones described the *Desert News* as “interesting and fun to look at.”

Mr. Matteson, Ms. Pfaendler, Ms. Schupe, Ms. Boyle, and Ms. McAllister also favored the *Desert News*.

Some felt both the DCP brochure and the *Desert News* were equally good. Ms. Schweitzer noted that both the *Desert News* and DCP brochure “have a lot of good information.” Ms. Burge said the “potential is excellent” for both the *Desert News* and the DCP brochure, stating that the brochure presents information “succinctly” and the *Desert News* contains “a lot of easy to understand

information.” Dr. Hoff explained how the *Desert News* and DCP brochure are aimed at very different audiences: the *Desert News* is used a lot in classrooms to inform students of the value of Clark County’s ecosystems, whereas the DCP brochure, which explains the need for the DCP and the Section 10(a) Permit, is “good for taxpayers, builders, and general adult audiences.”

Mr. Dayton favors the DCP brochure, but exults that it needs greater distribution. Ms. Sellars chose the DCP brochure, stating that it “specifically answers questions about the Program and discusses the [Section 10(a)] Permit.” Ms. Marrs-Smith named the Mojave Max brochure since it “utilizes the recognizable icon.”

Mr. Duncan feels that the literature is currently being distributed more to those who already know about the program, and a broader outreach or different distribution needs to be considered.

- **How many years have you been involved with the PIE Program? *If interviewee has been involved more than 3 years...*How would you describe the evolution of the PIE Program, perhaps in terms of its scope, direction, and success?**

Please note that all of the following responses come from interviewees who have had involvement with the PIE Program (which could include hearing reports as part of being on the Implementation and Monitoring Committee) for more than three years.

Evolution = Improvement

A number of praiseworthy comments dominated some interviewees’ answers. Dr. Hoff explains that the PIE Program lacked direction at the start, but then the development of the Mojave Max icon created a “hook that seems to be working extremely well.” She added that the emergence contest has “engaged the members of PIE and their

constituencies.” Dr. Hoff said the PIE Committee has “started to focus” and is now “developing meat behind the promotional material.”

“They’ve [the PIE Committee] done a much better job than what you’d expect given their resources,” said Ms. Schreiber. “They’ve evolved much faster than most programs would have in this length of time.”

Ms. Feldman said that the PIE Committee has “grown to be much bigger” and that the Committee has evolved into implementing activities without necessarily doing the activities themselves, such as hiring Matteson Media Group for the

PSA and advertising efforts. Mr. Trinko’s comments were similar, in that he said the PIE Committee has evolved from being “on-the-ground implementers” to “steering the ship” and contracting with experts such as Matteson Media Group to implement appropriate efforts; “It’s a good approach now,” said Trinko. “If it’s worth doing, it’s worth paying someone to do it.”

Mr. Smigel commented that it “used to take too long to implement activities, but now we make decisions faster.” Mr. Jones said, “I have seen them [PIE Committee] take ideas and really run with them, and they have been successful.”

Finally, Ms. August said that the PIE Committee has matured as a group and has become more accepting of “different ideas and ways of reaching objectives.” She also perceives the recent efforts to become more “formalized” and better define the Committee’s mission as objectives as a “good” direction.

Defining the “Role” of the PIE Committee

A number of interviewees discussed that the role of the PIE Committee and its program, including its mission and responsibilities, must be more tightly defined; the common feeling seems to be that the strategic planning process is addressing this concern and will provide needed focus. Mr. Matteson said that the PIE Committee has tried “to do too much with too little” and decisions must be made in regard to whether PIE should develop content and programs or implement other parties’ public information campaigns (i.e., the BLM’s “Stay on Roads” message). Ms. Marrs-Smith echoes a similar comment, stating that the PIE Committee “needs to capitalize on what they’ve been successful with and maybe not spread themselves out so thin.” Ms. Rohde credits the strategic planning process as an important part of placing the PIE Committee “on the threshold of being effective once we have a clear understanding of PIE’s role.” Ms. Schweitzer observes that the focus is now being achieved, and the PIE Committee came to a realization that they “couldn’t do everything.” Mr. Dayton has also noticed the issue of “going off in too many directions.” Ms. McAllister credits the initiation of the strategic planning process with setting the Committee in a “much better direction,” adding that the PIE Committee is also “more open to partnership opportunities now.”

Other

Ms. Haley said that her position as Interagency (BLM, FS, NPS, and USFWS) Partnership Liaison allows her to receive feedback from a number of federal agency representatives, and a common perception from them is that the PIE Program has demonstrated “really good starts, but hasn’t gone as far as it could.” Ms. Johnson said that the PIE Program’s scope has broadened with the inclusion of new media and interest groups over time, but its direction and success have

remained fairly constant up to this point, except for the success realized with children through the Mojave Max Program. Ms. Porter noted that although attitudes and techniques may have changed over the years, the committee participants and some ideas have not changed significantly.

- **Let’s discuss the group you represent (*i.e.*, *off-roaders, homebuilders, outdoor enthusiasts, land users*). Are the members of your group being reached by PIE activities? If yes, which activities specifically? If not, please explain why. What are the main messages being delivered by these activities to your group? Do you feel the activities and messages are effective in terms of meeting PIE objectives (*read them again if necessary*)? How could efforts to reach your group – and effectively deliver messages to your group – be improved or be enhanced?**

A number of the interviewees’ felt this set of “group” questions were not quite applicable to them. Therefore, the answers below are derived from a smaller set of interviewees.

OHV Community

Mr. Trinko discussed the OHV community. He indicated that the main form of outreach received by the OHV community from the PIE Committee has been from Mr. Trinko’s personal efforts (and he notes that he’s a volunteer with limited hours for his OHV efforts), and he believes that efforts to reach his group can only be improved with money. He perceives that the current PIE budget is primarily allocated for the efforts to reach children, with “no money left over” for efforts to reach PIE’s target audience of specific interest groups. He said the main messages received by the OHV community (which come mainly from Mr. Trinko’s attendance at OHV group meetings and his emails) are to recreate away from Desert Wildlife Management Areas and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

Like Mr. Trinko, Mr. Dayton also indicated that his personal efforts (“I make a lot of noise” at OHV meetings) help reach the OHV community, including handouts/bags that he passes out at OHV events. He said that the OHV community receives the *stay on roads and trails* message, further stating, “Basically it’s about responsible use.” According to Mr. Dayton, efforts to effectively deliver messages to the OHV group can

be improved by providing more “specific” literature that explains to the OHV community where and how they can recreate and by “explaining why the restrictions are there and that the restrictions are needed and make sense.”

Agricultural Interests

Mr. Smigel indicated that he represents land users for agricultural development and end use (and he also used to represent grazing interests, but that group is no longer involved). He believes that the PIE Program, including messages relating to the value of Clark County’s ecosystems, has reached this group. Although this group “respects, protects, and values” the ecosystems, he explains that private parties with valuable ecosystems on their agricultural land have learned that “if they don’t sell it [their land]...it could get taken away.” When asked how to effectively deliver messages to this group, Mr. Smigel responded that a “scientific, defensible reason for doing things” must be delivered to this group.

Public Land Users – Federal

Ms. Marrs-Smith indicated that she represents public land users. When asked if PIE activities reach this group, Marrs-Smith responded that the Mojave Max Program “definitely” reaches this group, and through a strong partnership with the BLM at Red Rock, messages such as *respect, protect, and enjoy* on public land reaches the BLM managers and the publics that use BLM lands. She also said that media – specifically television and radio – reaches them, too. The main messages received by the group include to *not dump in the desert*, to *stay on trails*, and that the tortoise is protected and should not be disturbed. “They’re simple, but effective messages,” said Marrs-Smith. She added that to effectively deliver messages to this group, the PIE Committee needs a better understanding of what publics are land users and what media/methods reach the publics who are engaged in recreational activities in the desert.

Ms. August explained that she represents public land users and federal land managers. She perceives that general recreational land users are being reached through the Mojave Max Education Project and the Mojave Max Emergence Contest, but that the specific groups such as off-roaders and horseback riders are “only being marginally reached.” The main message being received is the importance of protecting the resources and threatened and endangered species. She believes that these messages help the PIE Program meet its objectives related to encouraging respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County and increasing the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County’s natural ecosystems. According to Ms. August, efforts to effectively deliver messages to the public land users could be improved by delivering more “personal” messages (which public land users identify with) at events that public land users attend or via media which public land users read, watch, or listen to, as well as “connecting with businesses” frequented by public land users.

Ms. Sellars, as Wildlife Education Coordinator of the Nevada Department of Wildlife, discussed those groups, such as hunters, anglers, and bird watchers,

who use public land for state wildlife resources, and she said the message that is delivered to these groups (falling under the general public category, according to Sellars) is the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message. She says that although the messages are “targeted and focused,” she doesn’t know how effective the messages are in changing public behaviors and attitudes. To improve efforts in reaching these groups, Ms. Sellars said that other interest groups beyond the OHV community should be targeted, including hikers, campers, anglers, hunters, bird watchers, and sightseers.

Homebuilders

Ms. Porter, Mr. Duncan, and Ms. Suckling explained that, perhaps, their members (of the SNHBA - Southern Nevada Home Builders Association) have seen the DCP’s messages on television or on billboards or through the Mojave Max Program, but, primarily, the messages are delivered when the SNHBA includes them in their *Residential Reader* publication, wherein the messages focus on any impacts on the homebuilding industry, as well as the industry’s positive contributions to conservation efforts. To improve efforts to effectively deliver messages to the homebuilding community, Ms. Porter suggests establishing a speakers’ bureau to deliver messages at numerous speaking opportunities, to deliver more information for the *Residential Reader* publication, and to supply more information for websites and mailings. Again, Ms. Porter, Mr. Duncan, and Ms. Suckling emphasized the importance of delivering positive messages, including informing the community of the positive contributions made toward conservation efforts.

City Residents

Ms. Labay said that she represents the residents of the City of Henderson, and these citizens are reached through the Mojave Max Education Project (children, but not the general adult population). She said that the children are getting the message that conservation is important, and the tortoise is to be valued. She feels that these messages help meet PIE’s objectives. She also said that the messages should be delivered to a wider audience – the general public.

Education Community

Dr. Hoff said that she is “engaged” with the education community, having taught for many years at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and having many colleagues involved in K-12 education. She said that educators have an awareness of the DCP and a “tremendous desire” exists with teachers who take classes at UNLV to “have some local environmental hook into the science curriculum...most teachers aren’t from here so they have very little understanding of deserts and desert ecology.”

“There must be more meat behind Mojave Max,” said Dr. Hoff. “There isn’t a substantial development of resources for them [educators] to hook into...look at curriculum for K-12 to see how desert conservation messages can be linked to requirements for science education.” She noted that the SCAT team “did their work,” but “we have failed to follow-up.” In order to develop specific curriculum resources for teachers, Dr. Hoff recommends writing a contract so that the appropriate people can conduct such a curriculum development – this may include teachers who have experience in the development of resource materials for science curriculum for K-12 in Nevada and working with scientists in respect to ensuring science-accurate information.

Ms. Melton explained that Clark County School District students are reached through the Mojave Max Education Project and the Mojave Max Program, including the Emergence Contest and the schools that are selected every year to receive a presentation in an auditorium setting (presented by Jerry Schupe, Nate Tannenbaum, and Steve Distler as the Mojave Max icon). She detailed the environmental and conservation messages received by the children, adding that after receiving the messages, “students pledge to take care of the environment.” She feels that the messages are “absolutely” effective in meeting PIE objectives. Regarding efforts to enhance efforts to reach the children, Ms. Melton realizes that it would be ideal to have even more school and classroom visits, but she realizes that there are more requests than what can be currently accommodated by the existing volunteers.

Rural Communities

As Administrator for Partners in Conservation (PIC), Ms. McAllister explained that PIC represents rural communities in the northeast part of Clark County, and she said that the northeast rural communities are reached by PIE activities, specifically the Mojave Max Education Project and information delivered through the Clark County School District’s Interact system since it allows rural schools to obtain lesson plans from the District’s website (she noted that the Clark County Fair actually draws more urban attendees than rural attendees even though it is held in Logandale).

When asked what messages these rural communities receive, Ms. McAllister responded that the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message “comes through very strongly.” She added, “They [the rural communities in the northeast] also get the message that a lot of the things that have happened to protect the desert tortoise are necessary...and that positive, active things must be done to protect the species.” She noted that the PIE activities and messages meet PIE objectives.

In terms of improving the effective delivery of messages to the rural communities, Ms. McAllister indicated that efforts must *actively* involve audiences to make them better stewards of environmental resources (she named a tortoise fencing

project that involved rural community groups as an example of soliciting active involvement).

Ms. Schreiber represents the Muddy River Regional Environmental Impact Alleviation Committee (MRREIAC) and was chair of the Moapa Town Advisory Board. She believes her group is primarily reached due to their involvement in the Clark County Fair (since it is located in Logandale). She also credits the PIE education programs in the schools with improving the acceptance of PIE messages, such as the *stay on roads* message. She also has perceived how the knowledge that the students gain from the school programs gets passed onto the parents.

Sierra Club

Ms. Feldman represents the Sierra Club. She said PIE activities don't reach her members as a group, but the members are reached as part of the general public (i.e., from PSAs). The messages targeted at the general public include *respect, protect, and enjoy, no desert dumping, you can't harvest cactus without a permit, and stay on roads*. (However, Ms. Feldman notes that, to a large extent, the Sierra Club membership already understands these messages.) According to Ms. Feldman, efforts to reach the Sierra Club members could be improved by writing and submitting letters to the Sierra Club's newsletter, preparing and sending PIE literature to the Sierra Club's mailing list, and providing speakers to the Sierra Club's general meetings.

Identifying concerns, challenges, improvements, and the best elements of PIE Program:

- **Do you have any concerns about the PIE Program? If yes, please name them.**

Micro-Management / Open-Mindedness

Once again, most interviewees expressed common answers – a number of comments touched upon keeping an open process and fostering fresh ideas, as well as perceptions about a micro-management attitude hampering PIE efforts at times and slowing the speed in which activities are implemented and achieved. Ms. Marrs-Smith said her concern relates to what she has sometimes perceived as a “micro-management mentality” and a “lack of openness for new ideas from new people.” She adds, “The PIE Program has had a fairly consistent membership, and they should allow new ideas and new people and fresh visions into the group to complement what they're doing and expand upon their successes.” Likewise, Ms. Sprunger-Allworth advises that the PIE Committee

should be “more open-minded and have the overall view to achieve the best for everyone.” Ms. Labay says the Committee should not represent any one special interest too much, but, rather, maintain a “more centralized role,” which she credits the Committee with currently maintaining.

Moreover, Ms. August would like to see more participation in PIE, such as from horseback riders and mountain bikers and the businesses associated with those groups. Ms. Haley said some federal agency representatives have expressed that they would like a more respectful atmosphere at times – more of a “let’s all figure this out together” environment rather than a perceived “us versus them” atmosphere.

Ms. McAllister made the same two observations as did Ms. Marrs-Smith about the PIE Committee “spending a long time on minute details” and becoming “closed-off,” but she thinks both issues are currently being worked on and “resolved.” Ms. Rohde, too, said PIE must define their role and decide, “Are we micro-managers who cross the ‘T’s and dot the ‘I’s with the text of a proposed project? Or are we going to be a body that has our own projects or be a granting body?” Others, too, notice that the strategic planning process is addressing previous concerns.

Ms. Courtright sees the strategic planning process as “creating a more productive environment.” Ms. Pfaendler echoes most of these comments, too, as she has witnessed “new ideas beaten almost immediately until the horse is dead and so they never get off the ground.” She quoted song lyrics by summarizing the problem as often being “too much talk and not enough action.”

Other

Most of the other interviewee comments were more unique, so as to not leave out any one individual’s concerns, they are all listed here:

Mr. Matteson’s concern is that “PIE tries to do too much with too little,” and that the Committee is prompted to engage in activities by requests from subgroups so it is “more of a reactive body,” and, therefore, would benefit from having a long-range plan with a formal mechanism on how to respond to inquiries and proposals. Ms. Sellars, too, calls for “focus” since she perceives that the PIE Committee is often “pulled in a lot of directions.”

Dr. Hoff’s concern is that PIE’s activities should result in a *measurable* impact – that an effectiveness assessment of the Program can help the Committee select activities “that are likely to be effective.” Likewise, Ms. Johnson said her only concern would be if PIE were spending their budget dollars on activities that are not reaching their target audiences or are not achieving their objectives, but she

called the assessment of their efforts a “great first step” in addressing this concern. Also, Ms. Courtright would like to see more evaluation given to the products that are given out at events to determine if the products are effectively delivering messages.

Ms. Rohde said a conflict could exist if PIE Committee members receive funds for PIE projects. Ms. Courtright, too, said she would like to see an “independent review” within

the contracting process before the PIE Committee provides funds to a member of the PIE Committee, but, again, she said that the strategic planning process is “changing the way we do business.”

Ms. Porter said her concern is about making sure there is accountability for MSHCP funds to see that the funds are being used “for what it’s intended.”

Ms. Schreiber indicated that she has no concerns about the PIE Program, and that the Committee “works hard to keep it working well,” adding that the assessment is unnecessary since it is clear that the Program is working. Mr. Dayton and Mr. Jones, too, said that they did not have any concerns.

Ms. Feldman would like to see a more “efficient” approach to the education component, including a PDE course providing teachers with the knowledge to teach the desert conservation lesson to their students, which she explains would reach a greater number of students than the Mojave Max Program can reach with its current system of volunteers delivering the lessons to students.

Ms. Burge suggested a need for “quality control” over the information distributed by PIE.

Mr. Trinko is concerned that Clark County staff may override PIE Committee decisions at times.

Mr. Smigel said that he is sometimes concerned by what he describes as “behind and below the scenes bickering that sometimes comes up in meetings.” Ms. Boyle, too, expressed concerns about “infighting.”

Ms. Schweitzer said that her concern relates to the PIE Program’s oversight by the Program’s administrator within Clark County, and she asks, “Is there any reporting to Clark County by a plan administrator?”

-more-

- **What are the greatest challenges faced by the PIE Program, and how might those challenges be overcome?**

Interviewees provided two common answers to this question: one pertains to the PIE Committee working together and achieving buy-in and commitment toward a common mission, and the other challenge pertains to reaching the large general population of Las Vegas, especially with the amount of people moving into the valley and the perceived transient nature of a part of the population.

Commitment to Common Mission

As with the previous question, a number of interviewees credit the strategic planning process with addressing some of the Program's challenges. Ms. Boyle described the greatest challenge as getting all Committee members to "work toward a common goal." Likewise, Ms. Schupe said that reaching consensus through compromise is the most challenging aspect, as it would be for any large, diverse group.

Similarly, Ms. Courtright pointed out that the PIE Committee consists of people from various government agencies and community groups, calling this diversity "one of the best things" about the PIE Committee, but also challenging when members "may have different missions in mind." However, she said this challenge should be overcome through the strategic planning process. Ms. Rohde, too, said that she hopes the strategic planning process will improve how the Committee works as a group, including defining the role of the Committee and providing guidelines for how the Committee operates.

Ms. Porter recognizes that "dealing with a multiplicity of agencies and a wide variety of species...is not an easy task."

Dr. Hoff described the greatest challenge as "finding common ground" considering all of the diverse interests of those involved in the MSHCP.

Ms. Schweitzer described the Committee's challenge as a need to "narrow agendas," recognizing that limitations exist on how much the Committee can accomplish. Ms. McAllister said that the assessment process could provide "new beginnings" and bring "everybody back together" in moving forward." Likewise, Ms. Burge said the Committee needs to know about "the effectiveness of what we do" in order to help the Committee move forward in decision-making.

The General Population of Las Vegas

Mr. Trinko said "changing the behaviors of humans in the desert" is the Program's greatest challenge, and he thinks one way to overcome the challenge is to offer desert users appealing recreational alternatives. Ms. Sprunger-Allworth said the greatest challenge is reaching the general population of Las Vegas and achieving their respect for the desert. Likewise, Mr. Jones said that the greatest challenge is achieving both a public acceptance and commitment toward the concept of desert conservation.

Ms. Marrs-Smith said that the "exploding" population of Las Vegas and the transient nature of part of its population presents challenges. "Figuring out who they are and how

they use public land is critical in determining the effective ways to reach these publics,” said Marrs-Smith.

Ms. Haley, too, described the greatest challenge as the growth in Las Vegas and reaching the segment of the population lacking “environmental values.” Ms. Labay said that overcoming public “apathy” is a difficult challenge.

Limited Funds

Ms. McAllister said that another challenge is limited money, but she said this challenge might be overcome through developing partnerships and working with other organizations that have access to other funding sources. Ms. Johnson, too, made similar comments.

Other

Mr. Matteson discussed the *too many generals and not enough soldiers* concept, and he said that the PIE Committee would benefit from subcommittees, which could be assigned to specific tasks and would report back to the Committee as a whole, rather than the whole Committee taking on too much. Likewise, Ms. Sellars explained that most PIE Committee members have jobs and mandates and PIE can't be their number one priority, and, therefore, more work needs to be contracted out rather than relying on PIE Committee members to conduct the work.

Ms. August describes the coordination between the PIE Program and other existing programs as challenging, particularly in making sure the different programs' messages “mesh” with one another, while remaining separate as well.

Ms. Pfaendler reiterated her concerns when “great” ideas are dropped or blocked, and she provides ideas for a more systematic approach for analyzing the merits of proposals and supporting the “active achievers” (naming Ms. August as an example) of the Committee and paying people to enact positive ideas.

- **Do you have any suggestions for improvements or enhancements to the PIE Program in general? If yes, please name them.**

A number of interviewees answered “no” to this particular question. Ms. McAllister said that the current “set-up” of the PIE Committee is ideal since it is open and “anyone can come to the table, and anybody’s thoughts can be expressed.” Ms. Boyle said despite some arguments, the Committee “really gets the job done.” Ms. Courtright noted that the strategic planning process is a way of improving the Program.

The other answers to this question were quite diverse, so individual responses are detailed:

Ms. Haley recommends the integration of various environmental educational efforts in Southern Nevada, including efforts of the Desert Conservation Program, CHOLLA, Outside Las Vegas, and the Clark County School District. Ms. August offered similar comments, stating that she would like to see “continuing rapport” with the PIE Committee and groups such as Partners in Conservation, the Nevada Resource Education Council, CHOLLA, and Outside Las Vegas.

Ms. Schweitzer recommends narrowing activities to a more manageable scope, which could be done by selecting the activities that are determined to be the most effective and which reach the largest target audiences.

Ms. Marrs-Smith believes the PIE Committee should be focused and should capitalize on successes.

Ms. Johnson asks the PIE Committee to consider adaptive management – setting goals and monitoring and evaluating the Program’s activities.

Ms. Rohde discussed exploring a more “formal structure” for the PIE Committee.

Mr. Matteson said that he “applauds the civil service” attitude of PIE Committee members, but he explained that new members bring “fresh ideas” and that limiting the terms served by Committee members might be considered.

Ms. Burge suggested that items intended for a target audience (such as the size of photographs in PIE-distributed literature intended for children) should be “run by” the target audience to determine if material is audience-appropriate.

Mr. Trinko said more money is needed, and he would also like to see more PIE Committee participation from federal agency representatives “with the authority to make decisions on behalf of their agencies.”

- **Of the PIE activities you’ve been involved with, is there one in particular that you would offer some constructive and helpful advice as to how it could be better planned or implemented?**

Capitalizing on Mojave Max Success

Ms. Marrs-Smith and Ms. Burge recommend capitalizing on the success of Mojave Max. Ms. Marrs-Smith called the Mojave Max Program the “shining star” of the DCP’s PIE efforts. Ms. Burge called the Mojave Max Emergence Contest the “big winner” of the

PIE Program, and she believes it needs to be advertised more, including in the Clark County School District's publication to teachers, rather than just on the District's Intranet (Interact).

Conservation Tent at Clark County Fair

Both Ms. Courtright and Ms. Schreiber believe that the DCP's participation in the Clark County Fair will be improved with a move toward a "conservation tent" concept to house informative programs and foster educational interaction with the public rather than the traditional booth set-up in the "commercial tent." Dr. Hoff thinks the DCP's role at the Clark County Fair could be improved by "focusing on the intent of the Program at the fair – why do we want to go to the fair and what do we want to present and why?" Dr. Hoff also believes the Clark County Fair has "enormous potential for an assessment tool." Ms. Schweitzer also recommends focusing on what can draw people to the DCP's event booth, such as a drawing that would allow the winner to appear on Nate Tannenbaum's weather segment.

Advance Planning

Ms. August said that all activities would benefit from more advanced planning, including planning dates and times, locations, and contracts. Ms. Melton said that with the Mojave Max Program, she suggests moving up the time that information is delivered to teachers, such as the start of the school year (rather than waiting until January).

Other

Mr. Dayton would like to see the a return of the display board used at events, such as Earth Day, because he said that the display helps initiate one-on-one

discussions with members of the public and presents visuals with messages such as showing desert roads (which the public can use) with the message to "stay on roads" to protect species.

Ms. Feldman said that the creation of the DCP flyer was worked on by the whole PIE Committee, and it could have been produced more efficiently by hiring an outside, professional contractor.

Mr. Trinko said that the entities (not through the PIE Program) are conducting desert cleanups, and money should be spent on media to promote these events.

- **Please identify what you feel are the best elements of the PIE Program.**

Mojave Max

The Mojave Max Program was selected by a number of interviewees as the best element of the PIE Program (most interviewees don't make the distinction or specify between the Emergence Contest and school visits and the classroom lessons of the Education Project from Red Rock). "It's only going to receive more attention and success from year to year since it's a relatively new program," said Ms. Courtright.

Dedication of PIE Committee

The other common answer concerned the dedication of the Committee members. Mr. Trinko described the best element of the Program as the "willingness of Committee members to work together," and he noted the "commonality of the goal amongst the long-time Committee members." Likewise, Ms. Johnson praised the "consistency and dedication" of the Committee members, calling them the "greatest asset" of the Program, and Ms. Sellars also mentioned the dedication of Committee members. Ms. Marrs-Smith echoed similar comments about the "commitment" of PIE Committee members. Ms. Pfaendler called the relationships with Committee members the best element. Ms. Rohde said that the best element of the Program is its "potential for bringing together different groups" and offering "opportunities to collaborate." Ms. McAllister discussed the diversity of the group and its open structure, further stating that, "Everyone is passionate about education and public information." "We're trying," Ms. Burge responded to the question, and Ms. Schupe praised the open aspect of the Committee and how compromise is reached.

Clark County Fair

Others, including Ms. Schreiber and Mr. Dayton, noted the Clark County Fair effort, too, in addition to the Mojave Max Program.

Other

Mr. Smigel calls the Committee's attention to important environmental issues as a good element, specifically citing the Committee's attention to the noxious weeds issue once the importance of the issue was realized.

Besides Mojave Max, Dr. Hoff also noted the Species Account Manual, which has the "potential to provide the meat that educators are looking for."

In addition to Mojave Max, Mr. Matteson complemented the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message. "That message is sacred and they haven't fiddled with that, which is a good thing," said Matteson.

Finally, a number of interviewees had kind comments specifically directed toward Christina Gibson. For instance, Irene Porter, Barry Duncan, and Connie Suckling discussed their respect for Ms. Gibson's dedication and hard work.

Part II – Activity Specific

Only 14 of the 27 interviewees felt that they had a close enough involvement with a specific activity to answer the second part of the interview questions. The following represents discussions of a few specific activities that were selected, and the purpose is to ascertain the perceptions of those individuals responsible for planning and implementing activities, specifically to discover if they perceive whether activities are meeting objectives and reaching target audiences. (Please see Appendix A for a list of the questions.)

The objectives will be discussed as the first, second, and third objectives, in the following order:

- Inform the public of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permits
- Encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County
- Through education, increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems

The activities selected are as follows:

Mojave Max Program

- Ms. Carolyn Boyle
- Ms. Cynthia Pfaendler
- Ms. Kathy August (Education Project)
- Ms. Elise McAllister (Education Project)
- Mr. Dale Matteson (Emergence Contest)
- Ms. Jerry Schupe (Emergence Contest)

Clark County Fair

- Ms. Callie Le'au Courtright
- Dr. Karin Hoff
- Ms. Ann Schreiber

Written Materials

- Ms. Betty Burge
- Ms. Elsie Sellars (DCP brochure)

Purchase of Media

- Mr. Mark Trinko

School Curriculum Auxiliary Team (SCAT)

- Ms. Jane Feldman

Use of Display Board

- Mr. Don Dayton

**Activity: Public Information Efforts associated with Mojave Max Program
Interviewee: Ms. Carolyn Boyle, Management Analyst II, Clark County
Comprehensive Planning**

Working as a consultant and advisor in public information efforts associated with the Mojave Max Program, Ms. Boyle said that the Program reaches school children, primarily, and the general public, secondarily; and the second and third objectives are met (she argues the first objective is a complex message for a child and may not be audience-appropriate).

Mr. Boyle describes the best element of the Mojave Max Program as “giving everyone a chance to become actively involved in the Program.”

Her only recommendation for improvement is perhaps providing more information to the teachers.

She believes that the activity benefits the DCP by “imparting awareness of desert conservation to children at an early age, which is important because as they grow up, they will have that mind set.” She said that the messages include that conservation of the desert is important since the desert and species are valuable.

She believes the Program changes values, increases awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County’s ecosystems, and informs about the importance of desert conservation. “I believe that in 20 years from now, we will have voting age residents who have grown up thinking in terms of desert conservation. It should mean changes in the way the public votes on desert conservation issues,” said Ms. Boyle.

**Activity: Mojave Max Program
Interviewee: Cynthia Pfaendler, Project Coordinator, Mojave Max Education
Project from Red Rock Canyon**

Ms. Pfaendler describes the target audience as schoolchildren's groups (including homeschoolers, this year), general community members who volunteered and who saw the recruiting flyers, and special interest groups.

She believes that all three objectives are met through the activity and that both objectives and target audiences were considered in the planning of the activity.

In describing the best elements of the activity, Ms. Pfaendler named interacting with students in the classroom as the best element and said that "getting positive responses from them and their teachers and watching the volunteers and interns meet personal goals" as among the positive elements.

When asked what could be improved, Ms. Pfaendler said that more funding is needed, but she has no concerns with the activity. "It all works, and well," said Ms. Pfaendler.

Additionally, she said that the activity is a benefit to the DCP because it "achieves all goals" and is a "very positive presentation of *respect, protect and enjoy* our deserts." Messages delivered include: "pick up trash," "don't harm desert tortoise homes (habitats)," and what to do when encountering a desert tortoise in the wild or in a neighborhood, as well as the life span of tortoises, anatomy, life cycle, and conservation of land. Moreover, she feels that the messages meet objectives and reach the target audiences.

Finally, in describing the outcome of the activity, Ms. Pfaendler explained the evaluation process and has determined, "Yes! We are effective."

Activity: Mojave Max Education Project

Interviewee: Kathy August, Red Rock Education Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management

Ms. August explains that the Education Project reaches school groups (currently focusing on the 3rd and 6th grades), and that, primarily, the second and third objectives are met through this activity. She notes that both target audiences and objectives are considered in the way the activity is planned, and she identifies the best elements of the activity (beyond educating the children) as involving multiple partners (including Southern California now).

In discussing a way to improve the activity, Ms. August discusses doing more interactive data collection through the Internet, including establishing a weather station specific to the tortoise's habitat with cameras and digital pictures to illustrate data such as soil conditions, temperatures, and humidity.

Ms. August describes the activity benefiting the DCP by including more people in the process of providing information and messages to target audiences – by training volunteers, the Education Project increases the messengers.

Messages delivered by the activity include the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message and promoting the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems, which meets the second and third objectives.

Ms. August also perceives that the activity delivers the underlying message that the Section 10(a) Permit allows growth and economic stability to continue in the county, to an extent. "There is a message that conservation and growth are synonymous, having to do with why the tortoise is listed, which has to do with growth causing habitat reduction, and there is a plan to deal with that conflict," said Ms. August (who also said the DCP brochure delivers this message).

Discussing the (immediate) results of the activity, Ms. August said that she can see that children become aware of threatened/endangered species, what that means, and how it relates to the local environment, as well as the children becoming aware of the desert ecosystem and its fragility.

Finally, when asked if there are other activities that PIE should be doing, Ms. August identified partnering with Tread Lightly and Leave No Trace to either provide workshops and/or information specific to their recreational users.

-more-

Activity: Mojave Max Education Project

Interviewee: Ms. Elise McAllister, Administrator, Partners in Conservation

Ms. McAllister participates in the Education Project by teaching classes to any of the northeast rural schools which request the lesson. She explained that elementary school age children are targeted, and the second and third objectives are "definitely" met through this activity.

Furthermore, she said that the best element of the activity is the interaction with students and the variety of information presented in the lesson plan. She would also like to see the activity offered for a longer length of time, to "reach more kids" (the lesson plan is currently only offered in October and November).

The main message that the Education Project delivers, according to Ms. McAllister, is that "it's everyone's job to protect the desert tortoise...it creates a relationship so that children care about conservation more. It also gives an understanding of how people impact the desert tortoise." Moreover, she believes that these messages reach the target audience and achieve the objectives.

Ms. McAllister believes that the Education Project changes values, increases awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County's ecosystems, and informs about the importance of desert conservation.

Describing the perceived results of the activity, Ms. McAllister offered: "I see the attentiveness and enthusiasm and that they're having fun. And I see them retain the information; such as if I go back to the same class or see kids in the grocery store, they tell me things that indicate their retention of the lesson plan."

Activity: Mojave Max Emergence Contest

Interviewee: Mr. Dale Matteson, President, Matteson Media Group

Regarding the Emergence Contest, Mr. Matteson perceives that the activity reaches children and meets the second and third PIE objectives. He believes that both the target audience and objectives are considered in the planning of the activity.

Mr. Matteson describes the best element of the contest as providing students a chance to learn about conservation and the desert in an engaging, fun, and exciting way, which also causes the students' teachers to learn, too, and pass on the conservation messages to their future classes.

Mr. Matteson recommends starting the contest earlier and to let it run year-round, and he recommends implementing such "wonderful" ideas as instituting the Mojave Max camera and live video feed.

Furthermore, he said that the contest benefits the DCP program by delivering its messages, including the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message, fundamentally, and how students need to co-exist with other species and realize the fragileness of the desert ecosystem. The contest also signals spring has arrived in the desert.

Mr. Matteson feels that the activity achieves the second and third objectives, and reaches the target audience of children's groups.

Moreover, Mr. Matteson said it's hard to quantify the results and value of the activity because students talk and "buzz" about the contest; it has word-of-mouth value, and children tell their parents, neighbors and friends about the contest, too. "You can't buy that sort of exposure," said Mr. Matteson, who describes the messages as positive "do" messages with "long-range legs" because people "remember certain grade school activities, and I think it will effect their behavior in the desert."

Activity: Mojave Max Emergence Contest

Interviewee: Ms. Jerry Schupe

Ms. Schupe participates in the Emergence Contest by delivering the presentation to schools, which educates children on biology, wildlife habits, desert conservation, and tortoise adoption (Mr. Tannenbaum delivers the weather-related portion of the presentation).

Ms. Schupe explains that children are reached, and the second and third objectives are met. She also notes that both target audiences and objectives are considered in the way the activity is planned.

Describing the best elements of the activity, Ms. Schupe said that children learn through fun, and she perceives that the children “truly retain the messages, and they believe it and practice it.”

Moreover, Ms. Schupe said that the messages delivered by the activity include: that the desert plants and animals have “every right to be there and should be left undisturbed, not just for us, but for future generations.”; to respect the desert and not overuse it; and construction can destroy the desert, so the DCP is a way of addressing the issue.

Ms. Schupe perceives that the activity changes values, increases awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County’s ecosystems, and informs about the importance of desert conservation. She describes immediate results as, “Kids are receptive [to the messages], and they participate.”

Activity: Clark County Fair

Interviewee: Callie Le’au Courtright, Outdoor Recreation Planner, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Ms. Courtright discussed that the Clark County Fair reaches the general public target audience, and it meets the objective pertaining to the Section 10(a) Permit since the DCP brochure is handed out, and she feels achieving the second and third objectives will be improved upon with the move to a conservation tent (instead of the commercial tent) concept to “capture” members of the public and convey the messages with a “quick informative program.”

She describes the best element of the activity as the “unified front” between the groups at the Clark County Fair, including Clark County, the federal and state agencies, the community, and the user and non-profit groups. “We’re saying that we’re all here for this message – we’re all under the same banner,” said Ms. Courtright.

Messages delivered at the event include explanation of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permit with the DCP brochure, as well as the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message with giveaway items, although Ms. Courtright said she doesn’t yet know if “people understand that message” and are “comprehending what we’re about.”

In terms of immediate results, Ms. Courtright describes the “good feedback” that she received while staffing the booth at the fair, and she noted that the event provides opportunity to “clear-up misunderstandings” and explains “what is happening in the desert around them.”

Finally, Ms. Courtright feels that the Clark County Fair has the potential to change values and increase the awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County’s natural ecosystems, and the assessment will help determine if the activity is “worthwhile.”

Activity: Clark County Fair

Interviewee: Dr. Karin Hoff, Ph.D.

Dr. Hoff has participated in the Clark County Fair by helping with setup, encouraging volunteer participation, and conducting small surveys in 2001 and 2002. People who responded to the surveys were overwhelmingly adults, and about two-thirds were Las Vegas residents, and most had lived in Las Vegas close to 10 years.

Describing the fair as an “intensive” effort, which attracts between 50,000 to 60,000 people over a four-day period, Dr. Hoff said that the surveys established

baseline information that revealed “most people didn’t know much about the desert at all.”

Dr. Hoff describes the best element of the fair as an opportunity to reach a large base of people, but she said that the DCP needs to figure out the “intent” in regard to this particular research activity and to “shape what it is we want to do.”

Like Ms. Schreiber and Ms. Courtright, Dr. Hoff recommends developing a better venue to attract specific segments of fairgoers interested in talking and finding information, and the concept of an information-based conservation program tent would be an improvement over the commercial tent.

Dr. Hoff’s perceptions of the activity’s immediate results include an “overwhelming” indication from fairgoers – those who Dr. Hoff has spoken to – that they have been to the fair before and plan to return. Therefore, Dr. Hoff perceives an opportunity exists to “develop a dialogue and make connections with people who habitually go to the event.”

Activity: Clark County Fair

Interviewee: Ann Schreiber, Muddy River Regional Environmental Impact Alleviation Committee

Ms. Schreiber feels that the Clark County Fair reaches the general public, children, and specific interest groups, including specific interest groups such as horseback riders and off-roaders, and she also perceives that the fair achieves all of objectives. She details how target audiences and objectives are considered in the fair's planning, and, like Ms. Courtright, believes that the move from the commercial tent to a conservation tent concept is a way to improve and enhance the activity.

Additionally, Ms. Schreiber feels the DCP's participation at the fair is a benefit to the Program because the *respect, protect, and enjoy* message is not only delivered to target audiences, but also that it "helps kids and adults realize that federal agencies and Clark County are not the enemy, but they're real people."

Also, when asked if the underlying message about the Section 10(a) Permit allowing growth and economic stability to continue in the county is delivered at the fair, Ms. Schreiber perceives that it is delivered, at least in one-on-one personal contact with fair attendees, which provides the opportunity to explain reasons for the Permit and the creation of the Program.

Like Ms. Courtright, Ms. Schreiber describes positive (immediate) results that she perceives at the fair, including how children talk to those staffing the DCP booth,

and they hear messages about the importance of desert conservation, which Ms. Schreiber believes will be reinforced by the Mojave Max Program as the children go through school.

Activity: Written Materials – Desert News and brochures
Interviewee: Ms. Betty Burge, Chairman, Tortoise Group

Ms. Burge has had an active role in the written material created and distributed by the PIE Program, and she explains how the material is written so that an eight-year old can understand the information, but the material is targeted to adults, too, and written so that both children and adults can "read it quickly and capture the information."

Ms. Burge believes all three objectives are met via the PIE Program's written pieces, and she also notes that target audiences and objectives were considered when planning and writing the material.

Describing the best elements of the DCP's publications, Ms. Burge said the distribution potential is "tremendous," particularly in reaching school children and through events.

In terms of improving written material, Ms. Burge notes the importance of running material by the target audience, including how children respond to the graphic material in the *Desert News*, such as white space and the size of photographs.

Ms. Burge believes the *Desert News* benefits the DCP because it “boils down the essence of the Program,” further stating that, “I think it is an excellent idea, and its topics are good.”

In terms of the messages (contained in the written pieces) meeting objectives, Ms. Burge said she receives feedback from people that they’re getting the message, but she doesn’t know about changes to behavior.

Finally, in describing the immediate results, Ms. Burge offered: “Immediately, kids are always happy to get something that has lots of pictures in it, and some teachers use it [*Desert News*] as a work book, and it becomes part of the activities that they do.”

-more-

Activity: DCP Brochure

**Interviewee: Ms. Elsie Sellars, Wildlife Education Coordinator, Nevada
Department of Wildlife**

Ms. Sellars indicated that the general public is targeted with the DCP brochure, which meets the first objective in explaining why the Program exists and where the money goes and why. She also notes that target audiences and objectives were discussed in the planning and creation of the brochure.

She describes the best element of the brochure as being a “focused product” and “answering specific questions,” and it benefits the DCP by answering the “why” questions about the Program.

Ms. Sellars noted she was not familiar with the distribution of the brochure, which prevented her from answering most of the questions. However, she noted that the DCP brochure is informative about the importance of desert conservation and is informative about the purpose/terms of the Section 10(a) Permit, and that it has the “possibility to change attitudes” and, at the very least, can inform.

Activity: Purchase of Media

Interviewee: Mr. Mark Trinko, OHV Representative

Mr. Trinko has had a role in many activities, but selected his advisory role in purchasing media, such as with smaller, rural newspapers.

He feels the target audience was the general public, and the objective was to educate the readers about the purpose of the MSHCP/DCP and the “fact that they exist.”

In terms of their success at reaching target audiences, he believes the rural newspapers are read, but KNPR radio “preaches to the choir.” He describes the best elements of the rural newspaper advertising (as well as specialty publications such as the Blue Ribbon Coalition Newsletter) as being an inexpensive way to successfully reach user groups and the public. Although he notes the audience should not be considered the “general public” in such a broad term because he doubts the achievability of reaching 1.5 million people in the county, but, rather, it should be considered “general public land users.”

His concern with the purchase of media is that it is too costly – based on the current budget limitations of the PIE Program – to use less targeted media such as television, radio, and the major newspapers. “Advertising can’t be one-shot. It must be done over and over, and PIE can’t afford that for all 1.5 million people.”

He said if the proper media tools are utilized, the purchase of media could benefit the DCP by carrying the messages to people who use the desert.

Activity: School Curriculum Auxiliary Team (SCAT)

Interviewee: Ms. Jane Feldman, Conservation Chair, Sierra Club – Local Group

Ms. Feldman was involved in the SCAT process, designed to create educational opportunities to reach target audiences, particularly children, and the team came up with six projects, including the creation of a PDE, which did not end up proceeding from a scope of work into a contract.

Ms. Feldman described the SCAT process as “an internal activity to gather information, identify opportunities, and decide on projects.” The process began with an environmental education inventory, and the PIE Committee heard a number of presentations about what different environmental education projects were about. In terms of identifying opportunities, the team would look for “holes” in environmental education that needed to be filled, as well as identifying “programs up and running well, and how we could robust them, make them synergistic and complimentary to one another.” Some “good results” were achieved, according to Ms. Feldman, with “robusting” the Red Rock and Lake Mead education efforts.

Since SCAT was an internal planning activity (and one that was never fully realized), many of the questions in this section could not be answered as intended.

Describing the best elements of this activity, Ms. Feldman offered that the best element was “coming up with six projects that received PIE Committee buy-in and would make a difference in the right direction.”

Moreover, Ms. Feldman said that the activity could have been improved with follow-through, particularly by Clark County staff with the authority to commission contracts for the projects, including the PDE.

“The six projects need to be re-evaluated, need Committee buy-in, need a timeline, and need a person responsible – designated – to follow-through,” said Ms. Feldman.

Again, as discussed in the earlier portions of the interview process, Ms. Feldman advocates that the “efficiency” of educating the target audience of children would be improved through educating the teachers so that a greater number of students (especially in the longer-term) would be reached. This is why Ms. Feldman believes the PDE “would be a huge contribution to environmental education.”

Activity: Use of Display Board

Interviewee: Mr. Don Dayton, Member of Board of Directors, Southern Nevada Off-Road Enthusiasts

Mr. Dayton was involved with the display board, which was utilized at various events. He said that the board was useful in reaching specific interest groups at their events, as well as the general public at larger events such as Earth Day and the Clark County Fair.

Also, Mr. Dayton said that the board meets the second and third objectives, and the board was planned and created to illustrate message points related to objectives and target audiences.

Mr. Dayton recommends that the board be used more often (including reaching the OHV community), but he recognizes the need for more volunteers to make the increased use of the board a reality.

Mr. Dayton also advocates that the underlying message that the Section 10(a) Permit allows growth and economic stability to continue in Clark County should be a message, and it could be delivered “better.”

Describing the immediate results of the activity, Mr. Dayton said that he perceives that the board “starts people thinking about the desert as a place and it’s worth preserving and saving rather than just something to tear-up,” although he doesn’t “know what direction they’ll go, but at least you’ve provided the direction.”

SUB-Appendix A

Interview Questions

Purpose of Interviews

The purpose of conducting interviews is to provide qualitative research to assist the assessor in **evaluating** PIE projects in relation to **outcomes** (*how* target audiences are reached and *how* objectives are met) and **impacts** for the participants (changes in values and increased awareness).

Interviewees were selected in consultation with the PIE Committee.

Interviews will also focus on determining how PIE activities meet the **threefold objective** of the PIE Program:

- Inform the public of the terms of the Section 10(a) Permits
- Encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County
- Through education, increase the public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems

And determining how these activities reach the **targeted audiences**:

- Specific Interest Groups
- Children's Groups
- General Public

Name of Person Interviewed:

Title of Person Interviewed:

Organization / Agency:

Date / Time / Location of Interview:

Questions – (Part I consists of general questions about the PIE Program. Part II is PIE activity-specific.)

Part I – General Questions

- What has been your role in the PIE Program (*i.e., sitting on I&M Committee, or PIE subcommittee, or participating in education efforts or outreach events*)?

- The PIE Program has 3 objectives (*read them*). Is the PIE Program meeting these objectives? Please explain.

- The PIE Program has three targeted audiences (*read them*). Are the activities of the PIE Program reaching these targeted audiences? Please explain.

- The PIE Program has used a number of media in delivering its messages. What medium do you feel has been or is the most effective in delivering the DCP's messages about conservation?

-more-

- The PIE Program conducts a number of activities (*i.e., products and brochures provided at events, hotlines, Mojave Max Education Project, PSAs, etc.*). What activity do you perceive has been the most effective in delivering the DCP messages (*i.e., respect, protect, and enjoy*)?

- Are there any activities that you perceive as not having been effective or are not currently effective?

- In terms of literature distributed by PIE—such as the DCP brochure and Desert News—which do you feel most effectively promotes/explains the DCP’s messages about desert conservation?

-
- How many years have you been involved with the PIE Program? *If interviewee has been involved more than 3 years...*How would you describe the evolution of the PIE Program, perhaps in terms of its scope, direction, and success?

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
- Let's discuss the group you represent (*i.e., off-roaders, homebuilders, outdoor enthusiasts, land users*). Are the members of your group being reached by PIE activities? If yes, which activities specifically? If not, please explain why.

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
- What are the main messages being delivered by these activities to your group?
-
-
-
-
-
-

- Do you feel the activities and messages are effective in terms of meeting PIE objectives (*read them again if necessary*)?

- How could efforts to reach your group – and effectively deliver messages to your group – be improved or be enhanced?

Identifying concerns, challenges, improvements, and the best elements of PIE Program:

- Do you have any concerns about the PIE Program? If yes, please name them.

- What are the greatest challenges faced by the PIE Program, and how might those challenges be overcome?

- Do you have any suggestions for improvements or enhancements to the PIE Program in general? If yes, please name them.

- Of the PIE activities you've been involved with, is there one in particular that you would offer some constructive and helpful advice as to how it could be better planned or implemented?

- Please identify what you feel are the best elements of the PIE Program.

Part II – Activity Specific

- Which specific PIE activities have you been involved with, in terms of discussing, designing, planning, promoting, participating in, or implementing? *List the activities or activity listed by interviewee; then ask questions below specific to each activity.*

- What was your role in the activity?

- What target audience was/is reached through the activity?

- What objective or objectives were/are met through the activity?

- Were PIE objectives and target audiences considered in the way the activity was selected, planned, and implemented? Were/are the targeted audiences reached by this activity?

- What were/are the best elements of this activity?

- What could be improved (if the activity is ongoing)?

- Did/do you have concerns with the activity?

- *(If interviewee aware of budget for activity)* Is this activity an appropriate expenditure of PIE dollars?

- Is this activity planned and implemented by the appropriate individuals? Does this activity need more staff or other resources devoted to it?

- Describe how the activity benefits the Desert Conservation Program.

- What message(s) did this activity deliver to the audience(s)?

- Did these messages meet PIE Program objectives (*read again if necessary*)? Did these messages reach targeted audiences? Please identify which targeted audience(s) was reached by the activity.

- Did you perceive that the activity delivered the underlying message of conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which allows jobs and economic stability to continue in the county?

- What (if any) PIE activities are delivering this underlying message – the message which explains the reason behind the creation of the DCP and the PIE Program and the terms/purpose of the Section 10(a) Permit?

- Describe the immediate results of the activity. (*i.e., with the Mojave Max Emergence Contest, immediate results would be that students researched desert temperatures and wildlife habits to desert seasons, students estimated when Mojave Max would emerge, and attention was drawn to desert seasons and wildlife responses*).

- Describe the outcome and/or impact (*interviewees' perceptions*) of the activity. Do you feel that the activity was successful?

- Would you recommend the activity continue?

- Do you feel that the activity changed values (*respect, protect, and enjoy*)?

- Do you feel that the activity increased awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County's natural ecosystems?

- Was the activity informative about the importance of desert conservation?

- Was the activity informative about the purpose/terms of the Section 10(A) permit?

Thank you for your valuable time.

APPENDIX E

**Monthly Report
December 6, 2003 – January 2, 2004**

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

The December 6, 2003 – January 2, 2004 monthly report explains the current process by which Strategic Solutions (the assessor) has commenced in preparation for the next phase (Task II) of the assessment. (The November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 report was the final assessor's report pertaining to Task I.)

Also, at the December 18, 2003, PIE Committee meeting, the assessor was asked to include a bullet-format summary (that the assessor had used to discuss the 72-page, November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 monthly assessor's report) in this month's report in order to provide the highlights of the qualitative research results regarding the HCP and environmental program comparison and the interviews with selected individuals involved with the PIE Program.

Focus Groups – Research for Survey Development

In January 2004, Strategic Solutions (the assessor) will be in the process of organizing focus groups, which will be held throughout February and March 2004. (Due to the holidays, December 2003 was not conducive to contacting potential focus group participants.) The next two monthly reports, therefore, will detail the assessor's progress in regard to identifying and recruiting appropriate focus group participants and scheduling and coordinating the logistics of the focus groups.

To date, the assessor has garnered the assistance of PIE Committee members Kathy August, Cynthia Pfaendler, and Mark Trinko in beginning to identify potential focus group participants. Ms. August provided a list of teachers who have participated in the Mojave Max Education Project, and Ms. Pfaendler has offered to help identify and contact teachers who have been involved with the Mojave Max Education Project (particularly those teachers who have been involved with the Project for multiple years) and invite them to participate in the focus groups.

Moreover, Mr. Trinko has provided the assessor the contact information for all Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) organizations' leadership in Southern Nevada. Also, Mr. Trinko

emailed the OHV organizations' leadership to inform them that research (in the form of focus groups) will be conducted as part of the assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education Program and that the assessor is organizing focus groups in January 2004 and will be contacting OHV organizations' leadership to invite their participation (or the participation of another representative from their group).

In his email to the OHV organizations' leadership, Mr. Trinko expressed that, "I hope we can achieve all clubs having at least one rep for these focus groups." To date, the president of the Dunes and Trails ATV Club in Las Vegas and the vice president of the Trail Riding ATV Club of Nevada (TRACON) have expressed an interest in participating in the focus groups.

Purpose of Focus Groups

The focus groups are part of a qualitative research element that is essential to constructing and administering quality survey instruments, designed to achieve research results of the highest value.

Each focus group will be conducted utilizing scripts developed by the assessor. The focus groups will consist of approximately 8 to 12 participants in each group. The time to administer each focus group should be approximately 45 minutes to an hour.

Additionally, advance planning of focus group logistics will be challenging, in terms of accommodating work schedules and determining feasible, accessible locations. Also, as much as possible, the focus groups will be conducted at locations and during hours convenient to participants.

Strategic Solutions will recruit focus group participants with the assistance of appropriate PIE Committee members, as previously described in regard to Ms. August, Ms. Pfaendler, and Mr. Trinko. For identification/recruitment assistance, the assessor will solicit other PIE Committee members where appropriate.

At the conclusion of the focus groups, a detailed summary report will be developed by the assessor to highlight pertinent points relevant to the assessment research. However, the primary purpose of conducting the focus groups is to construct quality survey instruments. Moreover, this qualitative research will be utilized in conjunction with the quantitative research when the assessor formulates recommendations in the final assessment report.

The first survey instrument that will be constructed by the assessor (based on focus group results) will be designed to determine outcomes and impacts of activities such as

public events (i.e., Clark County Fair) by ascertaining such important assessment information as to how (and if) the activity changed values (i.e., respect for ecosystems), awareness, and/or understanding.

Consistent with all assessment research, PIE objectives and target audiences – how objectives are met and which target audiences are reached – will be the central focus of the research.

The first survey instrument will be administered at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, in Logandale, Nevada.

The Process

As identified in the assessor's proposal, Task A will involve the identification of recipients of information provided by the Public Information and Education Program, and the conduct of evaluative research to determine and evaluate the effectiveness of the production and delivery of such information.

Tasks to gather baseline information will include conducting the following focus groups:

- Two groups each of students and teachers involved in the Mojave Max Emergence Program
- Two groups of off road vehicle users not directly involved in the DCP
- Two groups of teachers who actively engage in environmental education (i.e., Mojave Max Education Project)
- Two groups recruited from among visitors to both Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area and Lake Mead National Recreation Area

Identification of recipients of *Desert News* and other collateral material would prove difficult, as would identification of those who have attended public information events such as the Clark County Fair. In order to assess the effectiveness of *Desert News* and public information events, the method with the highest research value would be to conduct interviews at the distribution points on the day of the event and ask respondents permission for further follow-up.

Finally, the February 2004 monthly report from the assessor will provide an update as to the focus group participant recruitment status and the dates and locations of focus groups set-up to be conducted in February and March 2004.


Summary of Previous Assessor's Report

At the December 18, 2003, PIE Committee meeting, the assessor was asked to include a bullet-format summary (that the assessor had used to discuss the 72-page, November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 monthly assessor's report) in this month's report in order to provide the highlights of the qualitative research results regarding the HCP and environmental program comparison and the interviews with selected individuals involved with the PIE Program.

Comparison of Habitat Conservation Plans and Environmental Programs

Key similarities with DCP:

- Establishing a school district partnership;
- Producing literature either in the form of a brochure and/or a news piece;
- Operating a website;
- Involving stakeholders;
- Facing the challenges of reaching the general public / changing behavior;
- Realizing that the program participants, alone, cannot accomplish all efforts.

Methods to Address the Latter Issue: 

- Creating/fostering partnerships (i.e., with agencies, organizations, key opinion leaders, and school districts) and docent/volunteer programs;
- Practicing a "teaching the teachers" concept.

Examples of Partnerships and the "Teaching the Teachers" Concept:

Coachella HCP Preserve

- Providing 4-hour training for teachers so they can conduct lessons and field trips;
- Relying on volunteers and school districts to bring students to the Preserve, rather than the Preserve's staff coming to the students.

San Diego MSCP

- Developing numerous partnerships;
- Taking advantage of every opportunity to attach messages to other environmental, educational, and agency programs that already exist.

-more-

San Francisco Department of the Environment

- Carrying their messages through partners;

- Utilizing local community key opinion leaders and local government officials;
- Developing media relations;
- Writing for community newspapers;
- Hiring a public relations firm;
- Practicing the “teach the teachers” philosophy with programs that provide the resources and materials to teachers and that offer on-site, environmental science training (as well as instructing teachers how to present age/grade-level appropriate science information).

Interviews with Selected Individuals Involved with the PIE Program

- Most interviewees were positive about PIE activities, and when criticisms were mentioned, the comments were directed toward improving or enhancing the PIE Program and the efforts of the PIE Committee.
- Most interviewees were positive about the Mojave Max Program.
- A number of interviewees perceived the need for *positive* messages.
- A number of interviewees suggested that the PIE Committee capitalize on existing successes, such as building upon and expanding the Mojave Max Program, a perceived proven component.
- As discussed with regard to the HCP/environmental program research, some interviewees also discussed the concept of educating the educators. (The concept is one of realizing “efficiency” by instructing others to help deliver conservation messages.)
- In regard to perceptions about effective media, a number of interviewees said that television (with some mentions for radio and billboards, too) has the potential to be more effective due to a larger reach compared to other media. Other interviewees think that television is too expensive given the current PIE budget, and some interviewees discussed a need for a “media mix” and the advice of professionals.
- *Desert News* is perceived by a number of interviewees as the most effective literature piece.

Concerns, Challenges

- Of note: optimism seems to exist that current processes, including the strategic planning process and assessment process, will help address some of the current concerns.
- The assessor’s suggestion is for the PIE Committee to discuss the concerns and challenges, incorporate them into the strategic planning process if they do not already

play a part, and work at resolving them or discuss implementing some of the “overcome the challenges” ideas discussed by interviewees.

Objectives, Target Audiences

- Concerning PIE objectives, the Section 10(a) Permit seems separate and apart from the other two PIE objectives in terms of the perceived (lesser) degree in which it is achieved by the PIE Program and specific activities. (Some question whether it should be an objective and others question if it is appropriate or achievable.)
- Regarding PIE’s target audiences, most interviewees perceive that children are targeted and reached by the PIE Program, but the challenges of reaching – and changing the values, attitudes, and behavior – of the general public were expressed by many interviewees. Also, most interviewees don’t perceive that specific interest groups are being targeted and reached to the high degree that children are reached.

APPENDIX F

Monthly Report
January 3, 2004 – February 6, 2004

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

The January 3, 2004 – February 6, 2004 monthly assessment update report explains the current evaluative research process by which Strategic Solutions (the assessor) will evaluate the production and delivery of information distributed by the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) Public Information and Education (PIE) Program.

Tasks to gather baseline information involve conducting focus groups. In January 2004, Strategic Solutions worked with appropriate PIE Committee members to begin to identify and recruit Mojave Max Education Project and Mojave Max Emergence Contest participants, educators, off-highway vehicle users, and rural county residents. Strategic Solutions would like to attend the February 19, 2004, PIE Committee meeting to update this progress further and discuss the possibility of conducting additional focus groups, potentially with educators not directly involved with DCP activities (but who desire conservation material for their science curriculum) and visitors to Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area and Lake Mead National Recreation Area. If these additional focus groups are desired, the feasibility of conducting these will depend, largely, on the assistance of appropriate PIE Committee members in the identification/recruitment process.

Moreover, the work by the assessor being conducted in February and March 2004 will help the assessor prepare a quality survey instrument to be administered at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, in Logandale, Nevada.

Focus Groups – Research for Survey Development

Strategic Solutions (the assessor) is in the process of organizing focus groups, which will be held throughout February and March 2004. Both this monthly report, as well as the March 2004 report, details the assessor's progress in regard to identifying and recruiting appropriate focus group participants and scheduling and coordinating the logistics of the focus groups.

The identification/recruitment effort by Strategic Solutions is being conducted with the assistance of PIE Committee members, including Kathy August, Cynthia Pfaendler, Mark Trinko, Don Dayton, and Elise McAllister.

The following represents the current status of focus groups:

Off Highway Vehicle Users Focus Group

Scheduled: Tuesday, February 10, 2004, 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., in the Mesa Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway

PIE Committee member Mark Trinko provided the assessor with the email contact information of the leadership for the sixteen off-highway vehicle (OHV) clubs operating in southern Nevada. Invitation (both from Mr. Trinko and from Strategic Solutions, Appendix A) to the OHV leadership and their members to participate in the focus group has met with, unfortunately, little response. However, the assessor finally achieved six commitments to participate (the minimum amount to conduct a quality focus group), and, therefore, Strategic Solutions will proceed ahead with the February 10, 2004, OHV focus group.

Originally, the assessor planned to comprise the group with only those OHV users not directly involved with PIE (which would have excluded the participation of Mr. Trinko and Mr. Dayton), but the assessor has changed course to include Mr. Trinko and Mr. Dayton since the focus group could not be conducted without their participation, and the assessor can hear from both those OHV users involved with PIE, as well as those who are not involved with PIE activities.

Mojave Max Emergence Contest Focus Group

Scheduled: Tuesday, February 17, 2004, 3:30 to 4:30 p.m., in the Library Room, Whitney Elementary School, 5005 Keenan Avenue

Clark County DCP Management Analyst Christina Gibson provided the assessor with a list of previous Mojave Max winners of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest. Although the principal at 2002's winning school, Johnson Middle School, has not returned the assessor's call, the principal and teacher at last year's winning school, Whitney Elementary School, are assisting the assessor in coordinating a focus group.

The assessor crafted a letter (Appendix B) for last year's winning teacher, Ms. Jody Murphy, to share with her colleagues at the school who are participating or are interested in participating in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest to invite their participation in the focus group. Although commitments have not been

received by all of the teachers, the assessor anticipates having at least six teachers participate in the February 17, 2004, focus group, including Ms. Murphy.

Together with the principal (who has subsequently left the school) and teacher, the assessor is exploring the feasibility (i.e., parental permission, locating past winners, possibility of using school time, students' willingness to participate) of doing a focus group with the student participants as well.

Mojave Max Education Project Focus Group

**Scheduled: Tuesday, February 24, 2004, 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., Mesa Conference Room, 3rd Floor,
Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway**

With the assistance of PIE Committee members Kathy August and Cynthia Pfaendler, the assessor has scheduled a focus group comprised of educators who have invited the Mojave Max Education Project into their classrooms. Educators interested and involved in conservation curriculum should prove to be a truly valuable focus group.

This past week, the assessor sent 650 letters (Appendix C) to the teachers who previously participated in the Mojave Max Education Project. (Originally, the assessor was going to send a targeted mailing to about 100 teachers who had filled out post-classroom visit evaluation forms since this group showed a willingness to evaluate the program; however, the assessor decided to draw from as large a pool of past participants as possible to, hopefully, increase the focus group participation level.)

The assessor anticipates that achieving the minimum amount of focus group participants will be challenging (which was why the letter was written to be as *compelling* as possible) given teachers busy schedules, and, unlike the Mojave Max Emergence Contest focus group which will be held on-site at the teachers' school, this focus group will be held at the Clark County Government Center.

Rural Residents Focus Group

Not Scheduled

The assessor is currently in the process of organizing a focus group with rural residents with the assistance of PIE Committee member Elise McAllister.

Ms. McAllister suggested that the assessor contact Ms. Sue Baker, Rural Towns Manager, Clark County Northeast Office, for an unbiased list of possible people to contact to participate in a focus group.

Ms. Baker has agreed to help the assessor but first asked to narrow any identification/recruitment criteria. The assessor responded that, ideally, participants would be recipients of PIE activities, education, or information. (Even if participants haven't received PIE's messages, the assessor can ascertain from them their preferences for production and delivery of conservation information.) Although the assessor would welcome participants from any of the county's rural communities, the assessor believes the best identification/recruitment success will occur in the rural northeast area of the county due, in large part, to the work of Elise McAllister and Partners in Conservation in partnering with the DCP in helping to distribute PIE's messages. (Ms. McAllister is a PIE Committee member, and she teaches the Mojave Max classes in rural northeast communities; works with PIE Committee member Ann Schreiber with the Clark County Fair in Logandale; takes PIC and DCP brochures to events; and has helped teachers in Bunkerville make a courtyard habitat and adopt a tortoise, among other conservation-related activities.)

The December 6, 2003 – January 2, 2004 report briefly discussed the purpose of the focus groups and the research process. This information is expounded upon in this report:

Purpose of Focus Groups

The focus groups are part of a qualitative research element that is essential to constructing and administering quality survey instruments, designed to achieve research results of the highest value.

Each focus group will be conducted utilizing scripts developed by the assessor. The focus groups will consist of approximately 6 to 12 participants in each group. The time to administer each focus group should be approximately 45 minutes to an hour.

Additionally, advance planning of focus group logistics is challenging, in terms of accommodating work schedules and determining feasible, accessible locations. Also, as much as possible, the focus groups will be conducted at locations and during hours convenient to participants.

Strategic Solutions will recruit focus group participants with the assistance of appropriate PIE Committee members who can more easily and efficiently identify appropriate participants and garner focus group participation.

At the conclusion of the focus groups, a detailed summary report will be developed by the assessor to highlight pertinent points relevant to the

assessment research. However, the primary purpose of conducting the focus groups is to construct quality survey instruments. Moreover, this qualitative research will be utilized in conjunction with the quantitative research when the assessor formulates recommendations in the final assessment report.

The first survey instrument that will be constructed by the assessor (based on focus group results) will be designed to determine outcomes and impacts of activities such as public events (i.e., Clark County Fair) by ascertaining such important assessment information as to how (and if) the activity changed values (i.e., respect for ecosystems), awareness, and/or understanding.

Consistent with all assessment research, PIE objectives and target audiences – how objectives are met and which target audiences are reached – will be the central focus of the research.

Again, the first survey instrument will be administered at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, in Logandale, Nevada.

SUB-Appendix A

Good Afternoon:

In December, Mr. Mark Trinko was kind enough to let you know that I would be organizing a focus group as part of an objective assessment of Clark County's Desert Conservation Program, specifically pertaining to their public information and education work.

The opinions of the OHV community are essential to this assessment.

Ideally, we hope to achieve at least one representative from each OHV club for the focus group. However, more than one person from a club may participate. From Mr. Trinko's December email, we have received a commitment from two club representatives to date, but we need many more.

Please let me know if you can participate. And please let me know what date would work best for you: Tuesday, February 10, from 4-5 p.m. or Friday, February 13, from 8-9 a.m.?

If neither of those dates/times work for you, but you still want to participate, please let me know and we'll try to organize another date. Also, if you can't participate, please forward this email to someone else from your leadership or membership who would be able to participate.

The location will be the Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway (near Charleston Blvd. and the I-15), since it is a fairly central location in the valley.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Your opinion is greatly valued.

Sean Ross
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
702.889.2840
cell: 702.497.8585

SUB-Appendix B

January 22, 2004

Teacher
Whitney Elementary School
5005 Keenan Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Whitney Elementary School Teacher:

Thank you for your interest in the Mojave Max Program. Our research firm is currently organizing a focus group through Whitney Elementary School Teacher Jody Murphy as part of an objective assessment of Clark County's Desert Conservation Program (which includes the Mojave Max Emergence Contest), specifically pertaining to their education and public information work.

Your opinions are essential to this assessment. We can't evaluate and improve the education component of the Desert Conservation Program without hearing from you, an educator who has participated in or plans to participate in the Mojave Max Program.

The focus group will be held on **Tuesday, February 17, 2004, from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m.** in the library room of your school, Whitney Elementary School.

Discussion topics may include how you perceive your students best receive and retain information through a program like Mojave Max, what you are looking for in terms of conservation curriculum for your classroom, whether you perceive mojavemax.com as user-friendly and informative, and what made you decide to participate in the Mojave Max Program.

You would be part of a *small* group – between 6 to 12 participants – because we want to hear from you.

Finally, we know your time is limited and very valuable, and, therefore, we would greatly appreciate your willingness to take an hour to improve the education component of Clark County's conservation program. I'm sure you would agree that education is key to making the County's program a success.

I have asked Mrs. Murphy if she will let us know how many teachers will be participating by February 12, 2004. Please call me at (702) 889-2840 with any questions as well. Thank you in advance for your consideration and valuable opinions.

Sincerely,

Sean Ross
Strategic Solutions

SUB-Appendix C

February 3, 2004

Name
Title
School
Address
City, State, Zip Code

Dear Name:

Thank you for your previous participation in the Mojave Max Education Project from Red Rock Canyon, which presented an interactive classroom desert tortoise lesson to your students. We are an independent assessor currently organizing a focus group as part of an objective assessment of Clark County's Desert Conservation Program – which runs the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and sponsors the Mojave Max Education Project –specifically pertaining to their education and public information work.

Your opinions are essential to this assessment. We can't evaluate and improve the Desert Conservation Program without hearing from you, an educator who has invited the Mojave Max Education Project and the program's guest instructor into your classroom.

The focus group will be held on **Tuesday, February 24, 2004, from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m.** in the Mesa Room, 3rd floor of the Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway (near Charleston Boulevard and Interstate-15).

During the focus groups, we will ask for your thoughts on some topics; discussion topics may include the effectiveness of the delivery of information, your perceptions about how your students received and retained the lesson, and if improvements could be made to the conservation curriculum. **You would be part of a *small* group – between 6 to 12 participants – because we want to hear from you.**

Finally, we know your time is limited and very valuable, and, therefore, we would greatly appreciate your willingness to take an hour to improve the education component of Clark County's conservation program. I'm sure you would agree that education is key to making the County's Emergence Contest and Program a success.

Please RSVP by February 12, 2004, to Sean Ross at (702) 889-2840 or seanross@lvcm.com. Please call with any questions as well. Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Sean Ross
Strategic Solutions

APPENDIX G

Monthly Report
February 7, 2004 – March 5, 2004

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

The January 3, 2004 – February 6, 2004 monthly assessment update report explained the evaluative research process by which Strategic Solutions (the assessor) is presently evaluating the production and delivery of information distributed by the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) Public Information and Education (PIE) Program

by utilizing focus groups. This February 7, 2004 – March 5, 2004 monthly assessment report details the results of three of these focus groups.

The assessor thanks PIE Committee members Kathy August, Elise McAllister, Cynthia Pfaendler, and Mark Trinko for assisting in focus group identification and recruitment tasks.

The following three focus groups are discussed in this report (the third focus group did not come to fruition, which is explained within the report):

- **Off Highway Vehicle Users Focus Group (Script: Appendix A)**
Conducted: Tuesday, February 10, 2004, 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., in the Mesa Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway
- **Mojave Max Emergence Contest Focus Group (Script: Appendix B)**
Conducted: Tuesday, February 17, 2004, 3:30 to 4:30 p.m., in the Library Room, Whitney Elementary School, 5005 Keenan Avenue
- **Mojave Max Education Project Focus Group (Script: Appendix C)**
Conducted: Tuesday, February 24, 2004, 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., Mesa Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway

The assessor has included the scripts that were utilized by the assessor in each of these focus groups in order to conduct the groups in a structured, consistent, and focused manner. (Some of the questions near the end of each script were not asked due to the assessor not having time to ask all questions during the one-hour timeframe.)

A fourth focus group comprised of participants from of the rural community is scheduled for Tuesday, March 9, 2004, at 6:00 p.m. at the Moapa Community Center, 320 North Moapa Valley Boulevard. The results of this focus group will be discussed in next month's assessor's report.

The Value of Focus Groups

Focus groups are part of a qualitative research element that is essential to constructing and administering quality survey instruments, designed to achieve research results of the highest value. Moreover, this qualitative research will be utilized in conjunction with the quantitative research when the assessor formulates recommendations in the final assessment report.

The assessor considers focus groups as a valuable research tool because such sessions offers the producer/distributor of information (the DCP) the opportunity to ascertain perceptions, opinions, and suggestions from a *target* audience in a setting which allows for open, unfettered communication. The focus groups conducted by the assessor, to date, have yielded suggestions for how to potentially improve methods for reaching an audience, both in terms of message production (referring to the content and

tone of messages to address how receptive an audience is to the messages) and delivery (including where and how to reach the target audience) – and if barriers exist in such lines of communication – suggestions are offered as to how to overcome the challenges.

Although focus group research cannot be utilized to generalize findings to a whole population (mainly because of the small numbers of people participating and the likelihood that the participants will not be a representative sample), a multitude of valuable research benefits cannot be produced by any other method other than a focus group.

The main purpose of focus group research is to draw upon respondents' attitudes, feelings, beliefs, experiences and reactions in a way in which would not be feasible using other methods, for example observation, one-to-one interviewing, or questionnaire surveys. These attitudes, feelings and beliefs may be partially independent of a group or its social setting, but are more likely to be revealed via the social gathering and the interaction which being in a focus group entails. Compared to observation, a focus group enables the researcher to gain a larger amount of information in a shorter period of time.

Focus group research offers the benefits of interaction and group dynamics, which only this method can offer. Practical considerations and the time it takes to conduct focus group research may discourage many from attempting to collect data using this method. Nevertheless those who participate in this kind of research often find the experience

rewarding. The process of research can be more collaborative than other forms of study, and so focus group research can be an empowering process for participants, and an exciting challenge for social researchers wanting to gain a different perspective on their field of interest. (Morgan D.L. 1988. *Focus groups as qualitative research*. London: Sage.)

Assessor's Evaluation of Focus Group Results

Since the focus group qualitative research will be utilized in conjunction with the quantitative research when the assessor formulates recommendations in the final assessment report, the following discussions should be considered as an evaluation and discussion of results produced by the focus groups, rather than definitive recommendations.

Furthermore, the assessor encourages the PIE Committee to discuss the focus group results as well. Perhaps such a discussion could be placed as an agenda item for a future PIE Committee meeting (after the completion of the focus group process).

OHV Focus Group

The OHV focus group participants indicate that the OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not only a challenging group to reach, but are also challenging in terms of this population's degree of receptiveness to DCP messages, a necessary first step toward achieving a greater respect and protection of the desert environment from this particular population.

However, challenges can be overcome, and the ability for the DCP to reach OHV enthusiasts in Clark County, as well as improving this population's willingness to receive the messages, should not be an exception. To corroborate, the focus group participants offered numerous constructive suggestions for overcoming the challenges that the focus group participants first described to the assessor (such as the OHV community not being receptive to perceived "green" messages distributed by the DCP).

Additionally, the focus group served to clear up a misperception that the assessor had about the OHV enthusiasts audience; the assessor had been using the term *OHV community*, as if this is a cohesive group, but during the conduct of the focus group, the assessor learned that the majority of OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not affiliated with any club and cannot be reached, effectively and efficiently, in any fashion as a collective whole. Rather, OHV enthusiasts were described as being comprised of people of diverse

backgrounds – in terms of age, occupation, and location of residency – which means they cannot be reached by a particular radio or television station or any one particular event or through OHV clubs. As the focus group research indicated, perhaps the only points of distribution that this group can be assuredly reached is where they purchase their vehicles or the shops they return to for maintenance, parts, repair, and/or accessories. Importantly, the focus group participants discussed the willingness of such dealers and retailers to distribute educational materials to their customers.

Moreover, the assessor learned a similar result from both the OHV focus group and the teachers focus group, which is that producing and distributing messages isn't just about message content and how a message is delivered, but also about *who* is delivering the messages. Just as the teachers indicated how they respond to their peers, so do the OHV enthusiasts. Their current barrier from being receptive to messages is that they feel the messages are being delivered by a "green" organization; one way to overcome this barrier is to clearly depict that messages are not being delivered from a "green" source, but, rather, from a respected peer or "role model" as one participant described. To pursue this concept, the DCP already has resources in terms of two active OHV enthusiasts who serve on the PIE Committee who might help in this regard (in fact, both already perform this role, to a certain extent, in terms of attending and speaking at OHV club meetings and sending email to OHV club leaders and members). The specifics on how to accomplish this concept were not delved into during the focus group by the

assessor due to both time constraints and the fact that the assessor *discovered* this concept as a result of the focus group discussions.

Additionally, the assessor learned in both the interview process and with the OHV enthusiast focus group that perceiving *positive* messages is very important to this population. When some of the later focus group questions were more specifically focused, the focus group participants carried this overall concept into their specific suggestions, such as recommending that: the DCP sponsor a picnic table at an OHV trail entrance, with a posted message stating that “Clark County has enhanced the area for the enjoyment of those recreating on the trail,” followed by a conservation message; the DCP recognize the contributions of the OHV community (i.e., desert cleanups) in the same literature that promotes responsible recreation and conservation; the DCP sponsor events attended by OHV enthusiasts (especially non-club events to reach those enthusiasts not involved in clubs), wherein the DCP could also distribute messages; and, finally, the DCP could develop maps to provide to OHV enthusiasts to illustrate where OHV enthusiasts can recreate (as opposed to only showing where OHV enthusiasts cannot recreate).

Regarding the latter suggestion, however, the assessor questions if this falls under the purview of the DCP, especially given the fact that such a map would

most likely involve trails and areas under federal ownership and oversight. This suggestion, however, might be discussed with the federal partners who participate in the PIE Committee; but it should not be considered an exclusive responsibility of the DCP to pursue a suggestion that the DCP would most likely have little control or ability to develop and implement.

As a final note, the main component of the results, as evaluated by the assessor, appears to be that step one – addressing image and perception – must first be discussed, worked on, and accomplished before the potential exists to effectively reach this population, and, more importantly, before the potential exists that this population would be receptive to the messages that they receive. Efforts to affect this population’s attitudes (i.e., respect for the desert) and behavior (i.e., responsible recreation in the desert) will perhaps prove unsuccessful if the perception/image issue is not first addressed and resolved. As the assessor learned during the Habitat Conservation Plan research, other agencies have realized the *image issue* must be addressed. For instance, James Chien, Deputy Outreach Manager for the San Francisco Department of the Environment, explained how the Department hired a professional public relations firm “to build trust among the public.”

Teachers’ Focus Group

In conducting the teachers’ focus group, pertaining to the Mojave Max Program (primarily the Mojave Max Emergence Contest), the teachers enthusiastically expressed

their positive feelings about the Mojave Max Program. One teacher summed the program as “authentic learning” and others described the excitement that the program builds among both students and teachers. Interestingly, the teachers also described how the character of Mojave Max has personalized the desert for their students, making them more apt to respect their environment as a result of this “spokes-tortoise.”

A particularly enlightening section of the focus group involved the focus group participants detailing that traditional communication delivery methods aimed at reaching teachers – the Interact system (Clark County School District’s intranet system) and publications that reach teachers (i.e., the *Hotline* newsletter), as well as letters, flyers, and other handouts that arrive to their boxes at school – are not necessarily effective at reaching teachers, especially when any one medium is used singularly. Most teachers agreed that a combination of methods would be required to reach Clark County School District teachers, effectively.

The assessor also learned that teachers have a real appetite for receiving species and conservation information to supplement their science, math, and/or social studies curriculum. Moreover, the teachers have very specific methods for

how they would like to receive such information from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, including a teachers’ resource guide, worksheets, and an activity packet to engage students in conservation education. They expressed that their students learn best with interaction, activities, mixing facts with fun, and having information presented visually whenever possible.

What the assessor learned from this research exercise ties into what the assessor also learned during the recent interview process, wherein the assessor learned from PIE Committee members, including Dr. Karin Hoff and Jane Feldman, that developing a teachers’ curriculum had been a PIE Committee task at one point in time, but these interviewees explained to the assessor why this particular task did not reach fruition.

For instance, during the interview process, Dr. Hoff discussed the need to develop specific curriculum resources for Clark County educators and informed the assessor that educators are aware of Mojave Max and the Mojave Desert, but they want more information for their science curriculum. “Step one is getting the message out, making sure they’re [educators] listening and watching, and that part is developing well since people are working on that in a focused way, but there must be more meat behind Mojave Max. There isn’t a substantial development of resources for them [teachers] to hook into,” said Dr. Hoff, adding that “SCAT [School Curriculum Auxiliary Team] really did its work, but we have failed to follow-up.” Likewise, Jane Feldman was involved in the SCAT process, designed to create educational opportunities to reach target audiences, particularly children, and the team came up with six projects, including the creation of a Professional Development Education (PDE) credit, which did not end up proceeding from a scope of work into a contract.

PIE Committee member Jane Feldman argued that the SCAT task should be revisited, and the focus group research supports the assertion that teachers would like to see specific species and conservation information, accompanied by worksheets and activities, come from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program.

Again, during the teachers' focus group, the participants expressed that it may not be feasible, practical, cost-effective, or communication-effective to reach teachers through traditional means, such as a mailing or flyer or other form of handout in their school boxes, using the Interact (intranet) system of the Clark County School District, or through advertising.

Rather, these particular focus group participants are most likely to respond to the program through word-of-mouth from their respected peers. (Also of note: once the teachers learned of the contest from a peer, the focus group participants were highly receptive to the current incentive package, and those incentives

should work to bring them into the contest. But the research suggests that they should initially be informed of the contest from a peer.)

To tie this focus group evaluation into previous research, in our discussions with the program managers of both the Habitat Conservation Plans and the county-run environmental department programs, a commonality existed in that these program managers – with limited staff and budgets – have realized a concept that one manager called the “acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept.” All of these managers have realized they simply cannot conduct what they feel to be effective informational, outreach, and educational efforts on their own.

Therefore, the assessor's focus group evaluation points to an opportunity for the DCP to practice the “acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept” by establishing an orientation program and inviting teachers to become “Mojave Max Captains” at their schools. Ideally, these captains would be those teachers who have previously participated in the MMEC or the Mojave Max Education Project so they would have initial knowledge – and hopefully enthusiasm – about the Mojave Max Program. The orientation could then serve to inform the teachers how they can best recruit their peers at their school (perhaps delivering a brief power point presentation, which emphasizes the incentives, in their staff meetings). Moreover, an additional incentive package may need to be developed to encourage “captains” to garner contest participation among their peers; therefore, a prize/incentive might be offered to the captain who achieves the most participation at his or her school – perhaps a pizza party for their class since this seemed to be one of the most appealing aspects of the existing contest incentive package.

This suggested concept was refined further when the assessor discussed the concept with a teacher who had participated in the Mojave Max Education Project. Ms. Margaret Collins explained that teachers within the Clark County School District often move

(whether out-of-state or a school transfer within the School District), and she suggested that a “committee” concept would be more feasible than a “captain” concept. More specifically, Ms. Collins detailed that the responsibility of peer-promoting the Mojave Max Program would be the most effective if assigned to a committee (she thinks most schools have an “Enrichment Committee” that could fulfill such a role). The committee could designate a member to be in charge of Mojave Max Program explanation and promotion for a year, with a successor lined-up to be in charge the next year or to step-in as a replacement if needed.

Finally, it is important to reiterate the overall positive comments expressed by the teachers about the Mojave Max Program, in terms of the contest and assembly elements, the Mojave Max mascot/spokes-tortoise, and the program’s aim to engage students in earth sciences via a fun, interactive, and engaging program.

The results suggest that the program “personalizes” Clark County’s desert environment and species and makes students want to respect the desert.

The Focus Groups

Focus Group – Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) Club Leadership / Members

Conducted on Tuesday, February 10, 2004, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m. at the Clark County Government Center

Participants Background

Eight leaders or representatives of OHV clubs participated in the focus group:

Nate Anderson	Trail Riding ATV Club of Nevada (T.R.A.C.O.N.)
Gary Clinard	Dunes and Trails ATV Club
Don Dayton	Southern Nevada Off Road Enthusiasts (S.N.O.R.E.)
Art Dixon	Nevada Trails Coalition
Ron Loomis	Team Loomis Racing and Tours
Blake Monk	Nevada United Four Wheelers Association
Charles Musan	Self / OHV enthusiast
Mark Trinko	Las Vegas Jeep Club and OHV Representative

Please note: Mr. Anderson is vice president of the Trail Riding ATV Club of Nevada; Mr. Clinard is president of the Dunes and Trails ATV Club; and Mr. Monk is vice president of the Nevada United Four Wheelers Association.

General Impressions

“What do you think of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program?” If you’re not familiar with the program, please state that, too.

Comments from the focus group participants were largely negative in response to this particular question. Three participants said that promises to the OHV community have not been kept over the years; one participant described the Desert Conservation Program as “ineffective,” and another participant said that he is “not seeing much progress.”

-more-

DCP Message Distribution

If you have heard messages from the DCP, where have you seen, heard, or received messages from the DCP? Please discuss what you heard, saw, or received.

Two of the participants could not recall hearing, seeing, or receiving messages distributed by the DCP, and two of the participants recalled receiving “limited” information. Two other participants indicated that most of the information they receive comes from DCP Public Information and Education (PIE) Committee members Mark Trinko and Don Dayton. Finally, one participant recalled receiving messages at the Clark County Fair and seeing the program “Outdoor Nevada” on KLVX Channel 10; finally, Mr. Trinko named nine communication methods utilized by the DCP to distribute messages.

(Please note: PIE Committee members Mr. Trinko and Mr. Dayton were sometimes asked particular questions after all other focus group participants had responded to a question so that the other participants’ answers would reflect unaided recall.)

Do you perceive that the DCP is effective in reaching the OHV community? If no, please explain why you do not think that the DCP is effective in reaching the OHV community.

All eight focus group participants responded “no.”

How might the DCP improve reaching the OHV community with its messages?

A number of ideas about how the DCP can reach the OHV community were proffered by the focus group participants, including: providing information for the OHV clubs’ websites; advertising in off-road magazines and on popular OHV-enthusiast websites such as offroad.com; working with the Clark County School District to emphasize responsible recreation; moving MSHCP meetings to a time at night when more

interested individuals can attend (without work conflicts); hosting events that reach non-club members; and utilizing T21 grant funding for a brochure targeting OHV enthusiasts.

“The problem is that nobody knows who the OHV owners are,” said focus group participant Gary Clinard, who emphasized that most OHV enthusiasts are not members of OHV clubs and, therefore, are hard to reach at any particular point of distribution other than OHV dealerships and related parts/accessories shops. Mr. Clinard noted the existence of 15 OHV dealerships in Las Vegas and a total of 28 in Nevada. Others in the focus group agreed with Mr. Clinard’s appraisal.

Moreover, Mr. Clinard said that his particular club had previously attempted to organize a “free package” that would be distributed to new OHV owners through the dealerships. Mr. Clinard said that his club received “100% participation” commitments from the dealership owners. However, he explained that an educational handout on responsible recreation could not be achieved due to disagreements with the Bureau of Land Management, particularly over inclusion of a map, which would have shown appropriate locations/trails for OHV recreation. The focus group participants expressed how they feel that a map is important to convey where OHV enthusiasts can recreate, not just illustrating where OHV enthusiasts cannot recreate.

**What is the best way for the DCP to reach your particular club?
Would your club be willing to accept information from the DCP?**

The majority of focus group participants said that sending email (via club leadership) is the best method to communicate with OHV club members (also noting that this is a primary way that PIE Committee member Mark Trinko communicates information to the clubs).

Furthermore, the focus group participants expressed an unqualified willingness to accept information from the DCP and distribute information to members, including, but not limited to, welcoming guest speakers to club meetings and distributing handouts.

Focus group participants also recommended that the DCP consider advertising in smaller newspapers, such as newspapers distributed in rural areas close to OHV recreation opportunities, including *Searchlight News*, *Moapa Valley Progress*, and *Pahrump Valley Times*.

DCP Message Content/Tone

If you have heard or seen any messages delivered by the DCP, what message or messages do you recall hearing or seeing?

The focus group participants were unable to recall particular messages that they have heard or seen (with the exception of one participant who recalled seeing a display at Red Rock depicting a “vehicle running over a tortoise,” which has since been removed).

Therefore, the assessor did not ask a series of questions which delved into perceptions about messages.

However, the assessor did ask how messages could be effectively delivered to the OHV community, and the focus group participants resoundingly asked for *positive* messages, a response that the assessor heard during the interview process as well.

Moreover, Mr. Dixon suggested messages might be better received if coming from a “positive role model,” such as a respected peer in the OHV community, rather than someone perceived as being from the government or the “green” community. Mr. Clinard echoed a similar statement when he suggested that “green” messages “don’t make an impression” with the OHV community, but, rather, a combination of conservation messages with safety tips and showing recreation in a “fun,” positive light is effective (he provided the Reno-based “Wild Nevada” program as an example). Mr. Monk, too, provided similar comments, stating that alongside messages emphasizing responsible recreation, the OHV community should be recognized for its contributions to the community and environment.

Literature

Have you seen any literature distributed by the DCP, such as the *Desert News* or the general DCP brochure or any brochure related to Mojave Max?

Where and how did you receive the literature?

After reading the literature, what message or messages do you recall being delivered within this literature?

Do you feel the literature is effective in reaching the OHV community?

Would you like to receive literature from the DCP to distribute to your members?

Do you feel your members would accept and read literature provided by the DCP?

The assessor asked a series of questions pertaining to literature distributed by the DCP; these questions can be grouped as one here since the focus group participants did not have a lot to say about this particular discussion topic.

For one, most focus group participants indicated that they feel that their club members do not read the DCP-produced literature (which has been distributed to them in the past). As Mr. Clinard explained in the previous discussion topic, he perceives that “green” messages are not effective with the OHV community, and members may perceive this literature as disseminating “green” messages. Despite the fact that the majority of focus group participants felt that DCP-distributed literature is not read by

OHV club members, a number of participants mentioned that they have, at least, *received* the literature, including at meetings and races (PIE Committee member Don Dayton has passed out literature at events as part of a larger packet which includes giveaway items), as well as the Clark County Fair and government facilities.

Products

**What free products/giveaways have you received at your OHV events or other events from the DCP?
What message or messages do you recall being on the product?
Did you personally like, use, and/or keep the product?**

The majority of focus group participants recalled receiving numerous products (free giveaways) produced by the DCP, including stickers or decals, t-shirts, magnets, trash bags, and key chains. (Items noted as being kept/used included the t-shirt and refrigerator magnet.) However, they did not recall specific messages printed on these products.

***The assessor took a brief moment to read a list of products produced by the DCP.
Would you like to see the DCP continue to provide products/giveaways?
What is the best product that the DCP has distributed or should distribute and why?***

The majority of focus group participants would like to see the DCP continue to produce giveaway items (except one participant who recommended that the DCP “save money” by not producing products).

Five of the eight focus group participants named large and sturdy trash collection bags (“desert cleanup bags”) as the giveaway item of choice and as a practical product with an implied “conservation message” for recipients.

Some focus group participants also named tools, specifically screwdrivers, oil funnels, and air gauges.

Overcoming Issues/Challenges

**What is the biggest issue facing the DCP in terms of reaching the OHV community?
How might this challenge be overcome?**

Many of the focus group participants conveyed that the DCP’s current “image” – as perceived by the OHV community – is a barrier that potentially prevents OHV community members from being receptive to messages produced and distributed by the DCP.

To overcome the challenge, focus group participants reiterated the concept of delivering “positive” messages, such as encouraging recreation in appropriate areas. Again, the idea of a map illustrating places to recreate, as opposed to illustrating where OHV-enthusiasts *cannot* recreate, was mentioned again.

Mr. Dayton expressed that the OHV community might be receptive to receiving a brochure delivering messages about responsible recreation (“how to recreate”), as long as they were also provided with suggestions of where to recreate.

**In general, do you feel that the DCP has the ability to improve responsible OHV use in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?
In general, what is the best way that the DCP can improve responsible OHV use in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?**

Most of the comments reflected a similar vein to previous responses, as the focus group participants perceive that the DCP has the ability to achieve greater respect and protection of the desert environment among the OHV community, but the OHV community must first perceive a greater “respect” or “courtesy” from the DCP (those words were specifically stated by three focus group participants). Again, the responses demonstrate a perceived “image” of the DCP that seems to create a barrier for the OHV community in terms of being receptive to the DCP’s messages.

One participant, however, emphasized that the current budget appropriation for the DCP to use for public outreach and education (the PIE budget) is not enough to achieve a change in attitude or behavior. Another participant agreed that more money would need to be spent to effectively distribute messages to the OHV-enthusiasts in southern Nevada.

Another focus group participant stated that the DCP has a “duty” to reach Clark County’s OHV-enthusiast population to try to achieve greater respect and protection of the desert environment, citing a statistic (the source was not provided) that an estimated 85% of recreation in Clark County involves the use of motorized vehicles.

Advice on Reaching the “Non-club” OHV Enthusiasts

If you can estimate, what percentage of southern Nevada OHV enthusiasts are members of OHV clubs?

All of the focus group participants agreed that approximately 90% of all OHV-enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not members of any OHV club.

What would be your advice to the DCP in terms of reaching those OHV enthusiasts not involved or affiliated with any clubs?

Most of the focus group participants expressed different ideas in response to this question (though the participants seemed agreeable to one another's suggestions). Therefore, these suggestions are listed in bullet-format:

- Sponsorship of enhancements at popular OHV recreation areas (such as a picnic table at a trail head with a sign stating that the DCP has sponsored this picnic table for your enjoyment, followed by a conservation/responsible recreation message);
- An active presence at OHV-community "desert cleanup parties" (wherein the OHV enthusiasts are not only talked to, but listened to as well);
- When both the DCP and OHV community are present at events, they should not be separated from the OHV community; having a "co-existence" presence at events would make OHV enthusiasts more receptive to messages they receive from the DCP;
- The DCP should have a kiosk at major sporting events with information; believing that OHV enthusiasts are generally sports and outdoor enthusiasts, some OHV enthusiasts might be reached at major sporting events, as well as gun/hunting trade shows and truck shows;
- The idea of providing an information packet to OHV dealerships and related parts/accessories shows was reiterated;
- Having a presence and/or sponsorship at events likely to be attended by OHV enthusiasts (this suggestion commenced all of the focus group participants to share ideas about events that would potentially be attended by OHV enthusiasts):
 - World's Richest Motor Cross Race (annual, usually held at MGM Grand)
 - Motorcycle Racing Association of Nevada (MRAN) events (eight clubs participate in two monthly races)
 - Gladiators Arena Football Games
 - NASCAR Events
 - Hump-N-Bump in Logandale (annual, November)
 - National Trails Day (annual, June)
 - Clark County Fair (annual, April)

**Teachers' Focus Group –
Mojave Max Emergence Contest**
Conducted on Tuesday, February 17, 2004, 3:30 – 4:30 p.m. at Whitney Elementary School

Participants Background

Five teachers from Whitney Elementary participated in the focus group:

Ms. Anne Bowron	4 th Grade
Ms. Linda Johnson	3 rd Grade
Ms. Jill Kriz	4 th Grade
Ms. Gerri North	4 th Grade
Ms. Sandra Watkins	2 nd Grade

None of the teachers have previously participated in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest (MMEC), but four of the teachers plan to participate this year.

General Impressions

“What do you think of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest Program?”

The general perceptions of the teachers about the MMEC are very positive, particularly due to the fact that their colleague, Ms. Jody Murphy, had participated last year (and was the teacher of the winning class).

Ms. North noted that she perceived the contest’s positive results through television coverage. Ms. Watkins later noted, too, that she has viewed positive television coverage of the MMEC.

More specifically, Ms. Kriz perceived that students “react positively” to the contest, which generates excitement about learning. Ms. Bowron sees the contest as a helpful addition to her 4th grade Nevada history curriculum.

Sadly, Ms. Jody Murphy lost her battle with cancer. Highly respected and regarded by her peers and students, Ms. Murphy was instrumental in bringing teachers to this focus group, and she had wanted to identify students at Whitney Elementary for a focus group comprised of students as well. Comments throughout the focus group were indicative of Ms. Murphy fostering interest in the MMEC with her enthusiasm about the program.

Awareness of / Introduction to MMEC

What aspect of the MMEC did you find the most appealing or interesting to cause you to participate or consider participating in the MMEC?

Ms. Johnson called the MMEC “authentic learning,” which she finds relevant to her instruction about the environment, living in the desert, and how the tortoise is an indicator species, tying in the weather, biology, and the arrival of spring. “There’s a lot of dynamics,” said Ms. Johnson.

Ms. Bowron said witnessing the “excitement from students” due to Ms. Murphy’s participation in the previous year’s contest convinced her to participate, and Ms. Kriz echoed similar comments about seeing the “enthusiasm and curiosity” in the students who participate in the MMEC.

Among your peers, how would you describe the awareness level of the MMEC or Clark County’s Desert Conservation Program (DCP)?

The teachers agreed that a “very low” awareness of the MMEC exists amongst their peers, but Ms. Watkins noted that she has seen positive television coverage about the contest, including both the winning student and teacher being interviewed and explaining the contest. She believes she saw this coverage on KVBC Channel 3 (local NBC affiliate).

What is the best way for the DCP to reach your peers to make them aware of the MMEC?

This was a particularly enlightening section of the focus group, as the teachers detailed that traditional communication delivery methods aimed at reaching teachers – the Interact system (Clark County School District’s intranet system) and publications that reach teachers (i.e., the *Hotline* newsletter), as well as letters, flyers, and other handouts that arrive to their boxes at school – are not necessarily effective at reaching teachers, especially when any one medium is used singularly.

For instance, Ms. Watkins explained that she receives so much material in her box that she has to empty her box up to three times a day. The other teachers agreed that many teachers don’t use Interact and many teachers throw handouts away. Although Ms. Johnson said that she appreciates having a handout (rather than having to utilize Interact) because she takes the time to read her mail and handouts at home.

Ms. Johnson suggested that a video, aimed at teachers, would be a good way to introduce and explain the MMEC since it would stand out among the other types of mail/handouts received by teachers.

Ms. Watkins suggested that the MMEC should be introduced to teachers in an assembly-type format to generate excitement about the contest.

Finally, the teachers came to agreement that word-of-mouth is the strongest way that teachers will become aware of and interested about the MMEC (similar to how this group became aware through Ms. Murphy). The idea of having a

designated teacher at every school in charge of reaching their colleagues seemed to appeal to these focus group participants.

Do you feel that your peers would want to learn of a program such as the MMEC and participate? If yes, please discuss why.
Have you heard from any of your peers that they choose not to participate in the MMEC, and, if so, why?

The teachers noted that at a staff meeting, Ms. Murphy had asked her colleagues if they would be interested in participating in the MMEC, and about 15 of approximately 35 teachers raised their hands. Other than that particular situation, the teachers could not answer these two questions with any certainty.

Best Communication Methods

We'd like to discuss the best approach to reaching the education community. Please list what you perceive as advantages and benefits of each of these delivery methods, as well as any perceived disadvantages or problems:

- **Interact – Clark County School District Intranet**

Revealingly, comments about Interact were primarily negative.

“It takes too much time with Interact, and my time is limited,” said Ms. Johnson.

“I just don't check it too often,” said Ms. Watkins.

“Not everyone has access and there are often technical problems,” said Ms. North.

“It's not really used as a line of communication [by Whitney Elementary],” said Ms. Bowron. “Some use it, some don't.”

The only advantage of Interact identified by a member of the focus group came from Ms. North, who said that Interact reaches Clark County School District teachers “at the click of a button.”

- **Radio/Television Advertising / PSAs**

About half of the teachers favored radio and television advertising about the MMEC because it reaches the “entire” educational community – teachers, parents, and students – at the same time.

However, the teachers also discussed the high cost of television and radio advertising (especially with the perceived need to advertise on multiple stations) and production; some of the teachers suggested public relations should accompany advertising in order to more cost-effectively reach the community. For instance, Ms. Watkins recommended taking advantage of the “community” announcements offered by radio and television stations.

- **Print Advertising**

The teachers did not offer a lot of opinions about print advertising, although Ms. Bowron noted that schools often receive the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* and/or *Las Vegas Sun* and that teachers often read these publications during breaks or lunch.

Moreover, Ms. North noted that some of the smaller publications that she reads, including the *Henderson Home News* and the newsletters from the Nevada State Education Association and the Clark County Education Association (“Viewpoint”).

- **Literature (distributed to teachers)**

As discussed previously, the teachers reiterated that they receive a tremendous amount of material in their boxes each day, and, therefore, a brochure or handout in their box must be “truly eye-catching” to garner much attention among teachers, according to Ms. Kriz.

Ms. Johnson and Ms. Bowron both discussed how a brochure must be strategically planned as to when it is delivered to teachers, both in the sense of being timely (near the time of when teachers may enter the contest) so the information is not forgotten, as well as being provided to teachers during a non-busy time (i.e., not near parent-teacher conferences or report cards) so that teachers will be more likely to read the brochure.

Ms. North felt that a brochure is not a cost-effective means to reach teachers, since a brochure may not be read, or even looked at, by many teachers.

Of all of these information delivery methods we just discussed, please name the best one, in your opinion, and why?

Again, the teachers expressed that one information delivery method/medium, utilized singularly, cannot effectively reach the teachers in the Clark County School District. Most teachers agreed that a combination of methods would most effectively reach teachers; “It may take a little bit of everything,” summed Ms. Watkins.

What is the best way for the DCP to reach students in Clark County, to inform them of the MMEC?

The teachers agreed that the best way to reach students is to first reach the teachers and have the teachers explain the contest to the students. (Ms. Bowron noted that many students are disadvantaged and would not learn about the contest via a website or television.)

Ms. Watkins reiterated that an assembly format helps generate excitement, both for teachers and students.

What is the best way to appeal to students and teachers to enter the contest?

The teachers shared two answers: prizes (especially food – the pizza party) and activities.

Regarding the latter comment, the teachers expressed that an activity or activity packet/book to accompany or be a part of the contest entry form would be an ideal way to introduce the contest to students in an engaging and appealing way. Ms. Kriz felt that if an activity were designed for the student to do on their own (at home), parents might also be introduced to the program.

Ms. Johnson noted that seeing a real desert tortoise excites students, and students visiting the Red Rock Visitors Center and tortoise habitat would likely learn of Mojave Max and want to enter the contest.

Conservation Curriculum

Do you desire species and desert conservation information for your science or math curriculum?

The teachers responded “yes,” resoundingly, to this particular question.

“It’s so important,” responded Ms. Bowron, who noted that species and desert conservation information helps with her social studies curriculum.

“Every grade level does something related to conservation,” indicated Ms. North.

The teachers noted that the conservation information would help supplement their curriculum in the subjects of social studies, math, and particularly science.

What would you like to see provided – in terms of information for your science or math curriculum – from the DCP/MMEC?

Each teacher answered somewhat uniquely to this question.

Ms. Bowron said that she would appreciate a teachers' guide with worksheets, as well as an activity booklet.

Ms. Johnson said that she would like information that would help her class learn species and desert conservation information, but she would like the information to be relevant to the contest, such as average seasonal temperatures and other weather-related information, relevant biological information, and historical emergence data.

Ms. Watkins indicated that she is most interested in species and habitats and would be looking for biology information, primarily, to supplement her science curriculum.

Ms. North responded that she would like information presented as visually as possible, such as graphs or in activity sheets, rather than being too text-heavy.

Best Way for Students to Receive and Retain Information

The MMEC offers an assembly with a co-presentation by a meteorologist and a species/desert conservation expert from The Tortoise Group, as well as a costumed mascot. Students are kept involved by being asked questions during the assembly to repeat back information they've just been told. Is this a good format for students to receive and retain species and desert conservation information?

The teachers' comments revealed that they like the format of the MMEC.

"They [students] retain better through interaction," said Ms. Watkins, expressing positive comments about the assembly format.

"It combines facts with fun," responded Ms. Kriz, who also expressed positive comments about the assembly format.

Ms. Bowron also favored the assembly format, but she said that teachers need more than the contest and assembly – they need information to supplement their applicable

curriculum (social studies, math, and/or science), such as a guide, worksheets, and/or activities.

Considering the contest aspect of the MMEC – guessing when MM will emerge from his burrow – is this a good way to engage students in educational activities relating to the Mojave Desert and desert conservation?

All of the teachers responded “yes.”

Ms. Johnson explained the importance of making assemblies age-appropriate. “Tailor assemblies to the audience. Older gets can get turned-off if it’s not age-appropriate.”

What do you think of the MM mascot as a “spokes tortoise” for the DCP?

The teachers also provided positive comments about the Mojave Max mascot.

“He works well,” said Ms. Kriz.

Ms. North made an insightful observation that Mojave Max personalizes the species and the desert, making conservation lessons/messages seem “real for kids...so they *want* to respect the desert.”

Should the MMEC Program be expanded? If yes, how so?

Again, the teachers express positive comments about the contest elements and assembly format, but they desire information to supplement their curriculum. Specifically, Ms. Johnson requested a resource guide and an activity or activity packet to be included with the contest entry form. “It should be a full, formalized education program,” said Ms. Johnson.

Would it be a good idea for those who participate in the contest to share their participation stories and studies of the tortoise and desert conservation with their peers? In other words, would you be willing to encourage and share with your peers after your participation?

All teachers responded “yes.”

Should MMEC publicity efforts use teachers – would you be more likely to participate in this type of program if the messages came from your peers?

The teachers responded strongly and echoed one another by stating, “Definitely” or “Absolutely, yes.”

In your perception, what part of the program would get your students the most excited and engaged about learning about the desert tortoise and desert conservation?

Please note: the assessor informed the focus group participants of the incentives currently offered by the MMEC Program.

Two teachers said the pizza party, and two teachers said the field trip. The fifth teacher said both the pizza party and the field trip.

And for you as a teacher, which incentives appeal to you the most?

Four out of the five teachers said the prospect of winning a new computer would be their primary incentive. Two of these teachers also said that the national park pass was appealing. One teacher said her only incentive would be for her students to learn and win.

Mojavemax.com

The teachers had not yet visited mojavemax.com, but all of the teachers expressed interest in visiting the website and offered to send any comments about the website to the assessor via email.

Focus Group – Mojave Max Education Project

Conducted on Tuesday, February 24, 2004, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m. at the Clark County Government Center

Please note: the Mojave Max Education Project focus group could not be conducted due to lack of attendance. The assessor sent over 600 letters (*letter: Appendix D*) to those teachers who previously participated in the Mojave Max Education Project from Red Rock Canyon and sponsored by the Clark County Desert Conservation Program. Follow-up calls were also made. The assessor received four commitments for attendance, and the assessor decided to proceed to hold the focus group on the scheduled date, but only one teacher came to the focus group. Since this teacher took the time to come to the Clark County Government Center, the assessor decided to hold a discussion with her, and she offered some constructive thoughts, which are shared in this report.

Participant Background

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>School</u>
Margaret Collins	2 nd	Cunningham Elementary

General Impressions

Now, I'd like to ask you your impression of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program's Mojave Max Program by asking you a very general question, "What do you think of the Mojave Max Program?"

"It's needed," responded Ms. Collins. "Kids don't understand the delicacy of our desert environment, and they [the Mojave Max Education Project] address that issue."

Awareness of / Introduction to MMEP

How did you first become aware of the Mojave Max Education Project (MMEP)?

Ms. Collins said that she heard about the MMEP from a teacher who had taken a field trip to Red Rock Canyon and had learned of the program during the field trip.

What aspect of the MMEP did you find the most appealing or interesting to cause you to participate or consider participating in the MMEP?

Emphasizing the importance of providing "hands-on" experience to students, Ms. Collins said that she appreciates the materials that are utilized and passed around to students during the MMEP lesson.

Moreover, she explained that English is a second language for many of her students, and, therefore, illustrating concepts and vocabulary with pictures and other visual aides is important.

Among your peers, how would you describe the awareness level of the MMEP or Clark County's Desert Conservation Program (DCP)?

Ms. Collins believes that, for the most part, her peers are aware of the program.

Best Communication Methods

What is the best way for the DCP to reach your peers to make them aware of the MMEP?

Ms. Collins stated that she frequently utilizes the Clark County School District intranet ("Interact") system.

Additionally, the assessor asked about other methods (radio, television advertising or PSAs, print advertising, literature, and a handout/flyer or letter), and Ms. Collins reiterated her preference for Interact/email.

Furthermore, Ms. Collins named the worst communication method as letters or handouts in teachers' inboxes/mail slots; she emphasized that teachers "get too much" and, consequently, items "get lost" or are not looked at too closely.

Conservation Curriculum

Do you desire species and desert conservation information for your science, social studies, or math curriculum?

"Yes, very specific information," responded Ms. Collins, who also stated the importance of providing information in Spanish as well.

Do you use the MMEP classroom visit to supplement or enhance a lesson / curriculum related to species, habitat, or desert conservation?

Again, Ms. Collins responded in the affirmative.

Do you feel the MMEP helps provide you the information you are looking for to supplement or enhance your lesson / curriculum?

How could the MMEP be improved to provide you species, habitat, and/or desert conservation information that you are looking for in order to supplement or enhance your science, social studies, or math curriculum?

"Yes, they are providing the information I'm looking for," answered Ms. Collins. Her comments reflected that she is appreciative of the MMEP; however, she did take this question as an opportunity to suggest an improvement.

Ms. Collins reiterated the importance of being visual and demonstrative with students, which she said that the MMEP lesson achieves, yet the lesson could be enhanced further, particularly in regard to vocabulary words. Rather than writing vocabulary words on the blackboard ("like a teacher"), she suggested creating a large, laminated poster with pictures of the vocabulary words. Next to the pictures would be blank velcro-spaces that the instructor could then place the actual word and definitions onto the poster (next to the corresponding picture) as the students are being taught about the vocabulary

words. Ms. Collins feels that simply writing a word on a blackboard is not visual enough for the students to learn and retain the knowledge.

Furthermore, Ms. Collins said that the information that is most needed to supplement her earth sciences curriculum includes explanation of how species interact with the environment, including species' living conditions and needs, as well as specific lifecycle and ecosystem information. "Kids need to learn how they could interfere and upset the balance of the desert," said Ms. Collins.

Best Way for Students to Receive and Retain Information

The MMEP lesson encourages desert conservation and protection of the tortoise by explaining threats to the tortoise and the fragility of the tortoise's desert environment. Students learn new terms and experience an interactive lesson that includes props, verbal quizzing, and participation in learning demonstrations.

**Considering these aspects of the MMEP, is this a good way to engage students in educational activities relating to the Mojave Desert and desert conservation?
Do you feel your students retain the information that they learn during the MMEP classroom visit?**

Ms. Collins responded in the affirmative, and further reiterated how she perceives that her students are more likely to retain information if the information is presented with the use of visuals and props or other "hands-on" materials.

Did you conduct any type of follow-up discussion, quiz, or activity related to the tortoise, habitat, species, and/or desert conservation after you received the MMEP classroom visit?

Ms. Collins said that she conducts a follow-up written assignment after her students receive the MMEP lesson.

If you previously invited the MMEP into your classroom, what was the most valuable element for you as a teacher, and what was the most valuable element for your students?

Ms. Collins named the earth sciences-curriculum supplemental information, such as lifecycle information, as the most valuable element for her as a teacher.

In regard to her students, Ms. Collins expressed that her students "love the quiz" during the course of the MMEP lesson. "They love to be challenged," added Ms. Collins. Additionally, she said that her students also respond well to the part of the MMEP lesson wherein a student is dressed in a tortoise costume, as well as when a ping pong ball is used to demonstrate the size and fragility of a tortoise egg.

In your perception, what is the best way your students should receive and could learn/retain information delivered by the DCP?

“It needs to be hands-on for students,” reiterated Ms. Collins. “They see what they’ve been reading about.”

In terms of retention, Ms. Collins also explained that student retention is achieved through a multi-information, “multi-sensory” process, which may include not only the MMEP lesson, but pre- and post-lesson, students may learn about species and desert conservation through reading, quizzing, writing, watching a video, etc.

What do you think of the MM mascot as a “spokes tortoise” for the DCP?

“They love Mojave Max,” said Ms. Collins, who added that her students want to immediately go online and visit mojavemax.com after receiving the MMEP lesson.

**In your perception, how aware are your students of Mojave Max?
Again, in your perception, what do your students think of Mojave Max? Do they relate the character to protection of the species and/or desert?**

Ms. Collins responded that her students stay aware of Mojave Max, “from year-to-year,” but she doesn’t know if her students “connect the Mojave Max character to the fragility of the environment.”

MMEP Classroom Visit Elements

What do you think of the format and elements of the MMEP classroom lesson?

Again, Ms. Collins is positive about the format and elements of the MMEP lesson.

Would you suggest any improvements or enhancements be made to this lesson?

“The only missing element is seeing the live tortoise in action,” said Ms. Collins, who suggested a “traveling video” could be produced that goes to each of the Clark County School District libraries for a period of time, providing an opportunity for teachers to show the video in their classrooms. She suggested it could depict the tortoise doing activities that students don’t realize tortoises do, such as “aggressively eating” or coming in or out of its burrow.

What do you hear from your students – in your perception, how do most students react to the MMEP classroom visit?

Reiterating her previous comments about conducting a follow-up writing assignment after her students receive the MMEP lesson and providing a video depicting a live tortoise and its habitat, Ms. Collins said such a multi-process is necessary for student learning and retention because the MMEP lesson on its own would be “out of sight, out of mind” for her students once the lesson is finished.

Would it be a good idea for those teachers who participate in the MMEP to share their participation stories and studies of the tortoise and desert conservation with their peers? In other words, would you be willing to share with your peers and encourage them to also participate in the MMEP? If yes, how so?

“Personally, I’d be willing to share,” responded Ms. Collins. She said that the primary opportunity to discuss and promote the Mojave Max Program with her peers would be on “professional staff development day.”

In your perception, what part of the program gets your students the most excited and engaged about learning about the desert tortoise and desert conservation?

Ms. Collins expressed that her students become particularly excited over seeing the empty tortoise shell, as well as the demonstration (during the MMEP) of the different sizes of tortoise shells to illustrate how the tortoise is a “growing animal,” and the students relate to that aspect.

-more-

Teacher Involvement

Would you be willing to become more involved with the Mojave Max Program in terms of discussing and introducing the program at your school, to your colleagues/peers?

Ms. Collins responded in the affirmative.

The assessor explored a concept with Ms. Collins based on an assessor’s recommendation derived from a previous focus group held with teachers becoming involved with the Mojave Max Emergence Contest.

If a 4-hour orientation were provided for school “team captains,” who would be designated to inform their colleagues of the Mojave Max Program and encourage their participation in the Mojave Max Contest, would you be willing to become a “captain” if an incentive were to be provided?

What kind of incentive would appeal to you?

Ms. Collins seemed receptive to this concept. However, she explained that teachers within the Clark County School District often move (whether out-of-state or a school transfer within the School District). Ms. Collins said that a “committee” concept would be more feasible than a “captain” concept.

More specifically, Ms. Collins detailed that the responsibility of peer-promoting the Mojave Max Program would be the most effective if assigned to a committee (she thinks most schools have an “Enrichment Committee” that could fulfill such a role). The committee could have a committee member put specifically in charge of the Mojave Max Program promotion for a year, with a successor lined-up to be in charge the next year or to step-in as a replacement if needed.

In terms of providing an incentive to a teacher(s) to accept the responsibility of encouraging Mojave Max Program participation among his or her peers, Ms. Collins feels that “it wouldn’t take much,” and she suggested that the incentive should be tied with species and desert conservation learning, such as providing a set of wildlife encyclopedias for the school library or videos.

Mojavemax.com

Have you had the opportunity to visit and utilize mojavemax.com?

Ms. Collins said that she has allowed her students to “go online quite a bit” to learn about species and desert conservation and learn more about the Mojave Max Emergence Contest. She noted that her students get particularly excited about visiting mojavemax.com and learning about the Mojave Max Emergence Contest *after* they receive the MMEP lesson.

What is your general impression of the site?

“They love it and learn from it,” stated Ms. Collins, noting that the more sources students can learn about species and desert conservation the better because “

SUB-Appendix A

Focus Group Script – OHV Community Leadership

**Tuesday, February 10, 2004, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Clark County Government Center, Mesa Room**

Introductions

I'm Sean Ross, and with me today is Vicki Gonzales. We're with a company called Strategic Solutions and we are conducting an objective assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, specifically related to the Program's public information and education work.

Purpose

This focus group is a major part of the assessment process, which involves identifying recipients of information provided by the Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education activities and conducting evaluative research to determine and assess the effectiveness of the production and delivery of such information.

Disclosure

I first want to tell you that we will include in our report the names of those who participated today and what clubs you represent to show that we have talked with the leadership of Southern Nevada's OHV community, but, for the most part, we won't always be sharing any information that is identified to specific individuals. In other words, we'll develop a report that summarizes the focus group to provide the Desert Conservation Program with an idea of how they might improve the way they communicate with the OHV community. The report may state, "One OHV community leader perceives that..." or, "The majority of focus group participants expressed that..."

Also, if it's OK with everyone here, I'd like to audio record the focus group just to make it easier for our company in our reporting. This audiotape would be for Strategic Solutions, not Clark County. Additionally, Vicki will be taking notes, as well as helping me conduct the focus group.

We may also use the results of all of the focus groups that we conduct to aid us in crafting a survey instrument that would be used at events such as the Clark County Fair.

Process

The focus group will take about an hour, and if you need to, the restrooms are located to your right as you exit into the hallway. Please help yourself to the water bottles.

I'd like to go over a couple of ground rules before we proceed. Really, the only one is that we ask you to please not talk over each other or interrupt each other as we go. We'll go around the table on each question to make sure we hear from everyone, and if

you have something to say out of turn, please raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you.

Participants Background

Before we get started with our questions, I'd like to ask everyone to introduce yourself and tell us what club you represent and what your role is in the club (i.e., president, board member, etc.) and how long you've been an OHV enthusiast in southern Nevada.

General Impressions

Now, I'd like to ask you your general impressions of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program by asking you a very general question, "What do you think of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program?" If you're not familiar with the program, please state that, too.

DCP Message Distribution

If you have heard messages from the DCP, where have you seen, heard, or received messages from the DCP? Please discuss what you heard, saw, or received.

Do you perceive that the DCP is effective in reaching the OHV community? If no, please explain why you do not think that the DCP is effective in reaching the OHV community.

How might the DCP improve reaching the OHV community with its messages?

What is the best way for the DCP to reach your particular club?

Would your club be willing to accept information from the DCP?

DCP Message Content/Tone

If you have heard any messages delivered by the DCP, what message or messages do you recall hearing or seeing?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in changing the behavior of the OHV community? In other words, do the messages increase protection of the desert?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in changing the values of the OHV community? In other words, do the messages increase respect for the desert?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in regard to increasing awareness in the OHV community, in terms of the importance of desert conservation?

What was your impression of the message(s), both in terms of content – the way the message is worded – and delivery?

How could the messages be improved?

Literature

Have you seen any literature distributed by the DCP, such as the *Desert News* or the general DCP brochure or any brochure related to Mojave Max?

If yes...

Where and how did you receive the literature?

After reading the literature, what message or messages do you recall being delivered within this literature?

Do you feel the literature is effective in reaching the OHV community?

Would you like to receive literature from the DCP to distribute to your members?

Do you feel your members would accept and read literature provided by the DCP?

Products

What free products/giveaways have you received at your OHV events or other events from the DCP?

What message or messages do you recall being on the product?

Generally speaking, did your members like the product? Do you feel they used and/or kept the product?

Did you personally like, use, and/or keep the product?

Do you feel the product effectively delivers a message about the importance of desert conservation?

Would you like to see the DCP continue to provide products/giveaways?

Let me take a brief moment to mention the products that the DCP has produced and distributed: litter bags, can coolers, hats, magnets, desert tortoise patrol cards, rulers, screwdrivers, stickers, sun shades, water bottle holders, and zipper pulls.

What is the best product that the DCP has distributed or should distribute and why?

Radio / Television / Print

Have you seen or heard any Public Service Announcements or advertisements from the DCP on television or radio?

If yes...

What television or radio station or program did you see or hear the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

What message or messages do you recall being delivered in the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

Do you feel that the PSA(s) or advertising delivers a message or messages about the importance of desert conservation?

What about print advertising? Should the DCP print advertisements in newspapers? If yes, what kinds of newspapers are preferable: large circulation newspapers such as the *Review-Journal* or *Sun* or smaller, targeted newspapers such as community or rural newspapers?

Overcoming Issues/Challenges

What is the biggest issue facing the DCP in terms of reaching the OHV community?

How might this challenge be overcome?

What is the biggest issue in terms of the DCP being able to change the behavior and/or values of OHV enthusiasts?

How might this challenge be overcome?

In general, do you feel that the DCP has the ability to improve responsible OHV use in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?

In general, what is the best way that the DCP can improve responsible OHV use in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?

Advice on Reaching the “Non-club” OHV enthusiasts

How many OHV community members would you say, approximately, are reached by distributing information to the clubs?

If you can estimate, what percentage of southern Nevada OHV enthusiasts are members of OHV clubs?

What would be your advice to the DCP in terms of reaching those OHV enthusiasts not involved or affiliated with any clubs?

Are there certain OHV events (such as races or other competitions) that draw a large enough crowd that you would recommend the DCP have a presence at such events? If so, please provide details.

What is the ideal way for the DCP to distribute information at such events; should they have a presence such as a booth or is it better for information to come from DCP PIE Committee members such as Mark Trinko and Don Dayton? *This question is not asked to Mr. Dayton or Mr. Trinko.*

Best Delivery Methods

We'd like to discuss the best approach to reaching the OHV community. Please list what you perceive as advantages and benefits of each of these delivery methods, as well as any perceived disadvantages or problems:

- Products?
- Radio/Television Advertising or PSAs?
- Print Advertising?
 - Large Newspapers – Review-Journal or Sun
 - Small Newspapers – community or rural newspapers
 - OHV Club newsletters
- Literature?
- Event display booth – interaction with DCP representatives?
- Kiosks in the public land areas where people are using public lands

Of all of these information delivery methods we just discussed, please name the best one, in your opinion?

Is there any other type of delivery method or tool that the DCP should be using to reach the OHV community but currently isn't producing or using?

Should the DCP be forging relationships with off-road vehicle dealers to distribute information at the time someone purchases a vehicle – would that be an effective point of distribution?

(If still time in the one hour) Section 10(a) Permit

Are you familiar with why the DCP was created?

Are you familiar with the Section 10(a) Permit?

Read:

The Desert Conservation Program is responsible for the implementation of the provisions of Section 10(a) Incidental Take Permit, issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service,

pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Clark County administers the plan by assuming responsibility for the collection of mitigation fees and ensuring adherence to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which is intended to promote a balance between economic stability and environmental integrity in Clark County.

Would you agree or disagree with the statement that conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which equals jobs and economic stability? Please discuss.

Does the purpose of the DCP and the terms of the Permit need to be explained to the OHV community – would this information make the OHV community more receptive to conservation messages? Please discuss.

Final Thoughts

Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel might help the DCP better reach or effectively communicate with the OHV community?

Thank you for taking your valuable time today. We truly appreciate your consideration and extremely valuable input.

SUB-Appendix B

Teachers' Focus Group – Mojave Max Emergence Contest

**Tuesday, February 17, 2004, 3:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Whitney Elementary School, Library Room**

Introductions

I'm Sean Ross, and with me today is Vicki Gonzales. We're with a company called Strategic Solutions and we are conducting an objective assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, specifically related to the Program's public information and education work. This work includes the Mojave Max Emergence Contest.

Purpose

This focus group is a major part of the assessment process, which involves identifying recipients of information provided by the Desert Conservation Program's Public

Information and Education activities – including the Mojave Max Emergence Contest – and conducting evaluative research to determine and assess the effectiveness of the production and delivery of such information.

Disclosure

I first want to tell you that we will include in our report the names of those who participated today, including your school and what grade you teach, but, for the most part, we won't always be sharing information in the report that is identified to specific individuals. In other words, we'll develop a report that summarizes the focus group to provide the Desert Conservation Program with an idea of how they might improve the Mojave Max Program. The report may state, "One teacher who participated in the focus group perceives that..." or, "The majority of focus group participants expressed that..."

Also, if it's OK with everyone here, I'd like to audio record the focus group just to make it easier for our company in our reporting. This audiotape would be for Strategic Solutions, not Clark County. Additionally, Vicki will be taking notes, as well as helping me conduct the focus group.

We may also use the results of all of the focus groups that we conduct to aid us in crafting a survey instrument.

Process

The focus group will take about an hour, and if you need to, please feel free to use the restrooms and please help yourself to the water bottles.

I'd like to go over ground rules before we proceed. Really, the only one is that we ask you to please not talk over each other or interrupt each other as we go. We'll go around the table on each question to make sure we hear from everyone, and if you have something to say out of turn, please raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you.

Participants Background

Before we get started with our questions, I'd like to ask everyone to introduce yourself and tell us what grade you teach, the subject or subjects you teach if that is applicable, and tell us if you have participated in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest (MMEC) in the past, or if you are currently participating in the MMEC, or if you are considering participating in the MMEC.

General Impressions

Now, I'd like to ask you your general impressions of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program's MMEC by asking you a very general question, "What do you think of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest Program?"

Awareness of / Introduction to MMEC

How did you first become aware of the MMEC?

What aspect of the MMEC did you find the most appealing or interesting to cause you to participate or consider participating in the MMEC?

Among your peers, how would you describe the awareness level of the MMEC or Clark County's Desert Conservation Program (DCP)?

What is the best way for the DCP to reach your peers to make them aware of the MMEC?

Do you feel that your peers would want to learn of a program such as the MMEC and participate? If yes, please discuss why.

Have you heard from any of your peers that they choose not to participate in the MMEC, and if so, why?

Best Communication Methods

We'd like to discuss the best approach to reaching the education community. Please list what you perceive as advantages and benefits of each of these delivery methods, as well as any perceived disadvantages or problems:

- Interact – Clark County School District Intranet
- Radio/Television Advertising or PSAs?
- Print Advertising?
 - Large Newspapers – Review-Journal or Sun
 - Small Newspapers – community or rural newspapers
 - Education-specific publications
- Literature (brochure, *Desert News*)

- Other (i.e., mailing)

Of all of these information delivery methods we just discussed, please name the best one, in your opinion, and why?

Is there any other type of delivery method or tool that the DCP should be using to reach the education community but currently isn't producing or using?

What is the best way for the DCP to reach students in Clark County, to inform them of the MMEC?

What is the best way to appeal to students and teachers to enter the contest?

Conservation Curriculum

Do you desire species and desert conservation information for your science or math curriculum?

If yes...

Do you feel the MMEC helps provide you the information you are looking for?

If no...

What would you like to see provided – in terms of information for your science or math curriculum – from the DCP/MMEC?

What is the best format to deliver such information?

Best Way for Students to Receive and Retain Information

The MMEC offers an assembly with a co-presentation by a meteorologist and a species/desert conservation expert from The Tortoise Group, as well as a costumed mascot. Students are kept involved by being asked questions during the assembly to repeat back information they've just been told. Is this a good format for students to receive and retain species and desert conservation information?

Considering the contest aspect of the MMEC – guessing when MM will emerge from his burrow – is this a good way to engage students in educational activities relating to the Mojave Desert and desert conservation?

What do you think of the MM mascot as a “spokes tortoise” for the DCP?

In your perception, how aware are your students of Mojave Max?

Again, in your perception, what do your students think of Mojave Max? Do they relate the character to protection of the species and/or desert?

If you previously participated in MMEC, what was the most valuable element for you as a teacher, and what was the most valuable element for your students?

Do you have any criticisms or suggestions for improvement?

In your perception, what is the best way your students should receive and could learn/retain information delivered by the DCP?

Contest Elements

Read...

- **School Assembly (directed at children ages 6-18) with a weather personality (typically Nathan Tannenbaum of Channel 3), the Mojave Max costumed-mascot, and lessons about real tortoises provided by Jerry Schupe of the Tortoise Group**
- **A county representative discusses incentives to enter MMEC, including a field trip for the entire class of the winning student and prizes for winning student, class, teacher, and school**

What do you think of the format and elements of the MMEC Program Assembly?

Would you suggest any improvements or enhancements be made to these program elements?

Should the MMEC Program be expanded? If yes, how so?

What kind of activities result from this contest? If you haven't yet participated, what kinds of activities might result in your classrooms after you participate?

Would it be a good idea for those who participate in the contest to share their participation stories and studies of the tortoise and desert conservation with their peers? In other words, would you be willing to encourage and share with your peers after your participation?

Should MMEC publicity efforts use teachers – would you be more likely to participate in this type of program if the messages came from your peers?

In your perception, what part of the program gets your students the most excited and engaged about learning about the desert tortoise and desert conservation?

Contest Incentives

Pass-out 8 ½ x 11 handout listing MMEC incentives:

Winning student will receive:

- **A commemorative plaque**
- **A family park season pass**
- **A Golden Eagle National Park Pass**

Winning class will receive:

- **A tour of local TV or radio studio led by Mojave Max and station management**
- **An all expense paid field trip to Mojave Max's habitat at Red Rock including bus ride and pizza party**
- **A Mojave Max t-shirt**
- **A Mojave Max Olympic-style medal**
- **A one-day family park pass**
- **A music CD**

Winning teacher will receive:

- **A brand new personal computer**
- **A Golden Eagle National Park Pass**

Winning school will receive:

- **A large traveling trophy to be housed in the winning school's trophy case**

Were any of these incentives the reason you decided to participate in the MMEC, and if so, please name the incentive or incentives?

In your perception, which incentive or incentives are the most appealing for an educator?

In your perception, which incentive or incentives are the most appealing for students?

Are there any incentives which you think are not appealing or do not make a significant difference in whether teachers or students become interested in the MMEC?

Is there a better or more appealing incentive you might recommend that the DCP consider adding to their list of incentives, realistic to the county's limited budget dollars?

Mojavemax.com

Have you had the opportunity to visit and utilize mojavemax.com?

If yes...

What is your general impression of the site?

Does the site offer desert conservation or other information that you would find useful for your classroom curriculum?

Is the site user-friendly?

How might the site be improved?

Would you like to see more technologies or resources connected to mojavemax.com such as a real-time video covering the tortoise's burrow and the tortoise's habitat?

DCP/MMEC Message Content/Tone

If you have seen, heard, or received any messages delivered by the DCP, what message or messages do you recall hearing or seeing?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in causing educators to become interested in entering the MMEC?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in regard to increasing awareness in terms of the importance of desert conservation?

What was your impression of the message(s), both in terms of content – the way the message is worded – and delivery?

How could the message or messages be improved?

Literature

Have you seen any literature distributed by the DCP, such as the *Desert News* or the general DCP brochure or any brochure related to Mojave Max?

If yes...

Where and how did you receive the literature?

What was your impression of the literature in terms of content, style, and reader-friendliness/audience appropriateness?

After reading the literature, what message or messages do you recall being delivered within this literature?

Radio / Television / Print

Have you seen or heard any Public Service Announcements or advertisements from the DCP on television or radio?

If yes...

What television or radio station or program did you see or hear the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

What message or messages do you recall being delivered in the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

Do you feel that the PSA(s) or advertising delivers a message or messages about the importance of desert conservation?

Do you feel these media – television and/or radio – are a good way to reach educators and/or students to get them involved in the MMEC and desert conservation? Please explain.

What about print advertising? Should the DCP print advertisements in newspapers? If yes, what kinds of newspapers are preferable: large circulation newspapers such as the *Review-Journal* or *Sun* or smaller, targeted newspapers such as community or rural newspapers? Education-specific publications?

(If still time in the one hour) Section 10(a) Permit

Are you familiar with why the DCP was created?

Are you familiar with the Section 10(a) Permit?

Read:

The Desert Conservation Program is responsible for the implementation of the provisions of Section 10(a) Incidental Take Permit, issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Clark County administers the plan by assuming responsibility for the collection of mitigation fees and ensuring adherence to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which is intended to promote a balance between economic stability and environmental integrity in Clark County.

Would you agree or disagree with the statement that conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which equals jobs and economic stability? Please discuss.

Does the purpose of the DCP and the terms of the Permit need to be explained to the education community? Please discuss.

Final Thoughts

Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel might help the DCP better reach or effectively communicate with the education community in Clark County?

Thank you for taking your valuable time today. We truly appreciate your consideration and extremely valuable input.

SUB-Appendix C

Teachers' Focus Group – Mojave Max Education Project

Tuesday, February 24, 2004, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Clark County Government Center, Mesa Room

Introductions

I'm Sean Ross, and with me today is Vicki Gonzales. We're with a company called Strategic Solutions and we are conducting an objective assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (which I'll refer to as the DCP from this point forward), specifically related to the Program's public information and education work. Among program activities, the DCP sponsors the Mojave Max Education Project from Red Rock Canyon and runs the Mojave Max Emergence Contest.

Purpose

This focus group is a major part of the assessment process, which involves identifying recipients of information provided by the Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education activities – including the sponsorship of the Mojave Max Education Project – and conducting evaluative research to determine and assess the effectiveness of the production and delivery of such information.

Disclosure

I first want to tell you that we will include in our report the names of those who participated today, including your school and what grade you teach, but, for the most part, we won't be sharing information in the report that is identified to specific individuals. In other words, we'll develop a report that summarizes the focus group to provide the Desert Conservation Program with an idea of how they might improve the

Mojave Max Program. The report may state, “One teacher who participated in the focus group perceives that...” or, “The majority of focus group participants expressed that...”

Also, if it's OK with everyone here, I'd like to audio record the focus group just to make it easier for our company in our reporting. This audiotape would be for Strategic Solutions, not Clark County. Additionally, Vicki will be taking notes, as well as helping me conduct the focus group.

We may also use the results of all of the focus groups that we conduct to aid us in crafting a survey instrument.

Process

The focus group will take about an hour, and if you need to, please feel free to use the restrooms and please help yourself to the water bottles.

I'd like to go over ground rules before we proceed. Really, the only one is that we ask you to please not talk over each other or interrupt each other as we go. We'll go around the table on each question to make sure we hear from everyone, and if you have something to say out of turn, please raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you.

Participants Background

Before we get started with our questions, I'd like to ask everyone to introduce yourself and tell us what grade you teach, the subject or subjects you teach if that is applicable, and tell us if you have previously participated in the Mojave Max Education Project – which presented an interactive classroom desert tortoise lesson to your students – or if you will be inviting the Mojave Max Education Project into your classroom, or if you are interested in doing so.

General Impressions

Now, I'd like to ask you your general impressions of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program's Mojave Max Program by asking you a very general question, “What do you think of the Mojave Max Program?”

Awareness of / Introduction to MMEP

How did you first become aware of the Mojave Max Education Project (MMEP)?

By raise of hand, are any of you aware of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest?

By raise of hand, have any of you participated in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest? *To those who raise their hand...*How did you hear about the contest and what did you think of the contest?

Back to discussing the MMEP – What aspect of the MMEP did you find the most appealing or interesting to cause you to participate or consider participating in the MMEP?

Among your peers, how would you describe the awareness level of the MMEP or Clark County's Desert Conservation Program (DCP)?

What is the best way for the DCP to reach your peers to make them aware of the MMEP?

Do you feel that your peers would want to learn of a program such as the MMEP and participate? If yes, please discuss why.

Have you heard from any of your peers that they choose not to participate in the MMEP, and if so, why?

Best Communication Methods

We'd like to discuss the best approach to reaching the education community. Please list what you perceive as advantages and benefits of each of these delivery methods, as well as any perceived disadvantages or problems:

- Interact – Clark County School District Intranet
- Radio/Television Advertising or PSAs?
- Print Advertising?
 - Large Newspapers – Review-Journal or Sun
 - Small Newspapers – community or rural newspapers
 - Education-specific publications
- Literature (brochure, *Desert News*)
- Other (i.e., mailing)

Of all of these information delivery methods we just discussed, please name the best one, in your opinion, and why?

Is there any other type of delivery method or tool that the DCP should be using to reach the education community but currently isn't producing or using?

Conservation Curriculum

Do you desire species and desert conservation information for your science, social studies, or math curriculum?

Do you use the MMEP classroom visit to supplement or enhance a lesson / curriculum related to species, habitat, or desert conservation?

If yes...

Do you feel the MMEP helps provide you the information you are looking for to supplement or enhance your lesson / curriculum?

If no...

How could the MMEP be improved to provide you species, habitat, and/or desert conservation information that you are looking for in order to supplement or enhance your science, social studies, or math curriculum?

Best Way for Students to Receive and Retain Information

The MMEP lesson encourages desert conservation and protection of the tortoise by explaining threats to the tortoise and the fragility of the tortoise's desert environment. Students learn new terms and experience an interactive lesson that includes props, verbal quizzing, and participation in learning demonstrations.

Considering these aspects of the MMEP, is this a good way to engage students in educational activities relating to the Mojave Desert and desert conservation?

Do you feel your students retain the information that they learn during the MMEP classroom visit?

Did you conduct any type of follow-up discussion, quiz, or activity related to the tortoise, habitat, species, and/or desert conservation after you received the MMEP classroom visit?

If you previously invited the MMEP into your classroom, what was the most valuable element for you as a teacher, and what was the most valuable element for your students?

Do you have any criticisms or suggestions for improvement?

In your perception, what is the best way your students should receive and could learn/retain information delivered by the DCP?

What do you think of the MM mascot as a “spokes tortoise” for the DCP?

In your perception, how aware are your students of Mojave Max?

Again, in your perception, what do your students think of Mojave Max? Do they relate the character to protection of the species and/or desert?

MMEP Classroom Visit Elements

What do you think of the format and elements of the MMEP classroom lesson?

Would you suggest any improvements or enhancements be made to this lesson?

Should the MMEP Program be expanded? If yes, how so?

Do any activities or additional learning result from this classroom visit?

What do you hear from your students – in your perception, how do most students react to the MMEP classroom visit?

Would it be a good idea for those teachers who participate in the MMEP to share their participation stories and studies of the tortoise and desert conservation with their peers? In other words, would you be willing to share with your peers and encourage them to also participate in the MMEP? If yes, how so?

In your perception, what part of the program gets your students the most excited and engaged about learning about the desert tortoise and desert conservation?

Teacher Involvement

Would you be willing to become more involved with the Mojave Max Program in terms of discussing and introducing the program at your school, to your colleagues/peers?

If yes...

If a 4-hour orientation were provided for school “team captains,” who would be designated to inform their colleagues of the Mojave Max Program and encourage their participation in the Mojave Max Contest, would you be willing to become a “captain” if an incentive were to be provided?

What kind of incentive would appeal to you? *Allow for discussion time and open ideas.*

Mojavemax.com

Have you had the opportunity to visit and utilize mojavemax.com?

If yes...

What is your general impression of the site?

Does the site offer desert conservation or other information that you would find useful for your classroom curriculum?

Is the site user-friendly?

How might the site be improved?

Would you like to see more technologies or resources connected to mojavemax.com such as a real-time video covering the tortoise’s burrow and the tortoise’s habitat?

DCP Message Content/Tone

If you have seen, heard, or received any messages delivered by the DCP, what message or messages do you recall hearing or seeing?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in regard to increasing awareness in terms of the importance of desert conservation?

What was your impression of the message(s), both in terms of content – the way the message is worded – and delivery?

How could the message or messages be improved?

Literature

Have you seen any literature distributed by the DCP, such as the *Desert News* or the general DCP brochure or any brochure related to Mojave Max?

If yes...

Where and how did you receive the literature?

What was your impression of the literature in terms of content, style, and reader-friendliness/audience appropriateness?

After reading the literature, what message or messages do you recall being delivered within this literature?

Radio / Television / Print

Have you seen or heard any Public Service Announcements or advertisements from the DCP on television or radio?

If yes...

What television or radio station or program did you see or hear the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

What message or messages do you recall being delivered in the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

Do you feel that the PSA(s) or advertising delivers a message or messages about the importance of desert conservation?

Do you feel these media – television and/or radio – are a good way to reach educators and/or students to get them involved in desert conservation activities/learning? Please explain.

What about print advertising? Should the DCP print advertisements in newspapers? If yes, what kinds of newspapers are preferable: large circulation newspapers such as the *Review-Journal* or *Sun* or smaller, targeted newspapers such as community or rural newspapers? Education-specific publications?

(If still time in the one hour) Section 10(a) Permit

Are you familiar with why the DCP was created?

Are you familiar with the Section 10(a) Permit?

Read:

The Desert Conservation Program is responsible for the implementation of the provisions of Section 10(a) Incidental Take Permit, issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Clark County administers the plan by assuming responsibility for the collection of mitigation fees and ensuring adherence to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which is intended to promote a balance between economic stability and environmental integrity in Clark County.

Would you agree or disagree with the statement that conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which equals jobs and economic stability? Please discuss.

Does the purpose of the DCP and the terms of the Permit need to be explained to the education community? Please discuss.

Final Thoughts

Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel might help the DCP better reach or effectively communicate with the education community in Clark County?

Thank you for taking your valuable time today. We truly appreciate your consideration and extremely valuable input.

February 3, 2004

Name
Title
School
Address
City, State, Zip Code

Dear Name:

Thank you for your previous participation in the Mojave Max Education Project from Red Rock Canyon, which presented an interactive classroom desert tortoise lesson to your students. We are an independent assessor currently organizing a focus group as part of an objective assessment of Clark County's Desert Conservation Program – which runs the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and sponsors the Mojave Max Education Project –specifically pertaining to their education and public information work.

Your opinions are essential to this assessment. We can't evaluate and improve the Desert Conservation Program without hearing from you, an educator who has invited the Mojave Max Education Project and the program's guest instructor into your classroom.

The focus group will be held on **Tuesday, February 24, 2004, from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m.** in the Mesa Room, 3rd floor of the Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway (near Charleston Boulevard and Interstate-15).

During the focus groups, we will ask for your thoughts on some topics; discussion topics may include the effectiveness of the delivery of information, your perceptions about how your students received and retained the lesson, and if improvements could be made to the conservation curriculum. **You would be part of a *small* group – between 6 to 12 participants – because we want to hear from you.**

Finally, we know your time is limited and very valuable, and, therefore, we would greatly appreciate your willingness to take an hour to improve the education component of Clark County's conservation program. I'm sure you would agree that education is key to making the County's Emergence Contest and Program a success.

Please RSVP by February 12, 2004, to Sean Ross at (702) 889-2840 or seanross@lvcm.com. Please call with any questions as well. Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Sean Ross
Strategic Solutions

APPENDIX H

Monthly Report
March 6, 2004 – April 2, 2004

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

The March 6, 2004 – April 2, 2004 assessor's report provides updates regarding the survey to be conducted at the Clark County Fair and the prioritization of proposals for PIE-related projects. The report also details the results of a focus group conducted to ascertain the opinions and perceptions of the rural community, with particular emphasis on exploring how the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) PIE Committee could most effectively deliver messages to this particular audience.

Survey

The assessor is preparing to conduct a survey at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004. The survey is the final component of the assessment, and the results of the survey will be a key research product needed for the assessor to make final recommendations.

Also, the results of the focus groups (conducted by the assessor to date) have been utilized in developing the survey instrument (please see *Appendix A*).

The results of the survey will be discussed in the assessor's May 2004 report.

Moreover, a meeting has been set for Monday, April 5, 2004, from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Clark County Government Center to discuss consistent administration of the survey instrument with PIE Committee volunteers who will be helping the assessor administer the survey at the Clark County Fair.

Prioritization of Proposals

The assessor is in the process of reviewing and evaluating the Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan 2003-2005 biennium budget proposals submitted for PIE-related projects.

In order to recommend prioritization of these proposals, the assessor is utilizing existing research, including: the review and analysis of PIE expenditures; the comparison of the DCP to selected HCP and environmental programs; the results of the interview process, which provide for a qualitative evaluation of the outcome and results of past and ongoing PIE efforts; and, finally, the results of the focus groups, which provide perceptions, opinions, and suggestions from target audiences. Also, since the survey will soon be conducted, the survey results may also be used in the prioritization effort. Other research, if needed and applicable, may also be conducted.

The assessor plans to discuss the progress of the prioritization effort at the April 2004 PIE Committee meeting.

Focus Group

The February 7, 2004 – March 5, 2004 monthly report discussed the results of focus groups with teachers and off-highway vehicle enthusiasts. The March 6, 2004 – April 2, 2004 monthly report discusses the results of a focus group conducted with members of Clark County's rural communities.

Interestingly, one similarity emerged among all the focus groups: the focus group participants indicate that they are more receptive to information delivered to them by their peers and peer groups than perceived "outside" individuals, organizations, and agencies. This finding suggests that one of the PIE Committee's most valuable resources are those individuals who serve on the committee – whose voices on the committee are representative of their communities and whose active participation demonstrates the diverse interests involved in directing and planning the Desert Conservation Program's public information and education efforts. Furthermore, this finding ties into the interview process, wherein many of the interviewees informed the assessor that one of the best aspects of the PIE Committee is the diversity of the participants and how no one is excluded from the DCP's public information and education process.

Despite the openness of the DCP PIE Program (as revealed to the assessor during the qualitative interview research), the rural community focus group results indicate that a perception exists that the applicable government agencies did not invite the input of rural community residents when creating species and desert conservation public policy, particularly at the time the MSHCP was developed (the majority of focus group participants perceive that their lack of input is reflected by road access and land use restrictions).

In ascertaining the perceptions and opinions of the rural community audience, the first half of the focus group established some issues and concerns which

create communication barriers between the DCP and this particular audience; and the second half of the focus group discussed how the DCP could potentially overcome these issues and effectively reach the rural community. The end result of the focus group provides viable suggestions for not only improving the delivery of information to the rural community in an effective manner, but, perhaps more importantly, overcoming negative perception barriers and creating an atmosphere wherein the audience would be (potentially) receptive to the messages that they receive.

When the assessor explored whether or not rural residents would accept DCP produced and distributed conservation messages, the participants indicated that for rural residents to accept and potentially be receptive to the messages, two primary issues must be addressed.

First, the focus group participants emphasized that they must feel that they have input into any government-imposed/public-impacted process. If they feel “shut-out” of a program or process, mistrust is created, which, naturally, also creates a communication barrier.

Secondly, the focus group participants indicated that they are more likely to be accepting of and receptive to messages if the messages are delivered by their peers – those individuals or organizations that they perceive as “inside” their community and familiar with their needs and issues.

So how does the DCP overcome these challenges? The focus group participants explained that traditional mass media methods (such as television, radio and metropolitan newspapers) do not reach the residents of the rural communities.

Rather, the focus group participants strongly urge that the DCP conduct an outreach meeting where a representative(s) of the DCP would both talk to and *listen* to the rural community and would present information in an interactive format with a question and answer session offered. The focus group participants emphasized that personal, interactive contact with the rural community would have the greatest potential in terms of effectively delivering conservation messages.

Also, the results of this focus group suggest that what the PIE Committee is already achieving, such as its partnership with the rural-based Partners in Conservation, is important in order to effectively deliver conservation messages to the rural audience. Again, the focus group results also indicate the value of the PIE Program’s “human resources” – involving active PIE Committee members, such as Ann Schreiber and Elise McAllister, who represent the rural communities and demonstrate the openness of the PIE Committee – that it is not a “shut-off” process.

Focus Group – Residents of Rural Communities

Conducted on Tuesday, March 9, 2004, 6:00 – 7:00 p.m. at the Moapa Community Center

Script

Please see *Appendix B* for the script used by the assessor to conduct the rural community focus group. Due to the interest of time, the assessor was not able to ask all intended questions.

Participants Background

Nine residents of rural communities in Clark County participated in the focus group:

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Community</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
Robert Bunker	Bunkerville	Dairy Farmer
Lola Egan	Moapa	Accountant
Larry Goettsche	Logandale	Chairman of the Board, Overton Senior Center
Duane Magoon	Bunkerville	Self-Employed Welder
Elise McAllister	Moapa	Administrator, Partners In Conservation (PIC)
Rusty Moore	Logandale	Ironworker Field Superintendent
Eric Ogren	Moapa	Teacher
Anna Perkins	Warm Springs	
David Perkins	Warm Springs	Grading Contractor

Please note: Since Ms. McAllister and Ms. Egan are involved with Partners in Conservation (PIC), which partners with the Clark County Desert Conservation Program for certain activities, both Ms. McAllister and Ms. Egan have more knowledge of DCP activities than the other participants. Therefore, the assessor structured the focus group to receive responses from Ms. McAllister and Ms. Egan, during each discussion topic, only after the other participants had the opportunity to respond in order to ensure that the other participants' responses would reflect unaided recall.

-more-

General Impressions

“What do you think of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program?” If you’re not familiar with the program, please state that, too.

Two of the focus group participants associated the DCP with government-imposed/environmental-related actions, such as the closing of roads and areas that were previously accessible to the rural community, and one of these two individuals expressed that he thinks that the only reason for the DCP is to allow urban Clark County to continue to “grow,” resulting in a negative impact for the rural communities since residents were “disallowed [land] uses” which they previously enjoyed prior to the establishment of the MSHCP/DCP.

One of the focus group participants was familiar with the Mojave Max Program and another participant (not including Ms. McAllister and Ms. Egan) was familiar with the conservation-related work of Partners in Conservation (PIC).

The remaining focus group participants said that they did not have any knowledge of the DCP.

DCP Message Distribution

If you have heard messages from the DCP, where have you seen, heard, or received messages from the DCP? Please discuss what you heard, saw, or received.

One of the focus group participants expressed that he hears children report to him what they have learned in school through the Mojave Max Program, particularly about the importance of protecting species. This generated a discussion among the focus group participants, some of whom reiterated that rural residents perceive that the County’s conservation program has resulted in restrictions (i.e., road closures) for rural community residents – for the purpose of allowing urban Clark County to grow – and, therefore, these rural residents may associate species protection with land use restrictions, which they oppose.

The focus group participant who is a teacher in the Clark County School District said that he perceives the Mojave Max Program is “getting kids hooked into” species and desert conservation, but he, too, sees the Program “at odds” with rural community residents (adults).

One participant noted that the conservation messages that he receives come from PIC, and he also noted that he has been aware of conservation-related projects (i.e., a fencing project) that PIC had worked on in the rural communities.

The majority of the focus group participants expressed that they had not heard, seen, or received conservation messages.

Do you perceive that the DCP is effective in reaching the rural community? If no, please explain why you do not think that the DCP is effective in reaching the rural community.

The majority of the focus group participants expressed that they do not feel that the DCP has been effective in reaching the rural community, but they emphasized that urban-based mass media (television, radio, and print media) does not effectively reach the rural community. For instance, television and radio reception was described as “poor” in the rural communities and local channels may not necessarily be available to those who own satellite systems.

One participant expressed that he would read messages in the local newspaper, the *Moapa Valley Progress*. Two other rural-based newspapers were later mentioned: *Mesquite Tribune* and *Desert Valley Times*. Another participant noted that she had seen the Mojave Max cartoon and the “respect, protect, and enjoy” message in the *Moapa Valley Progress*.

Finally, a participant stated that she got involved with the DCP because she “wanted to have a voice in the process” in order to represent the rural interests. Also, she stated that she perceived that there was “no connection” between conservation messages and the actual conservation plan (MSHCP/DCP).

Another participant, too, had expressed that although he may be aware of the county having a conservation program (again, perceiving that the program has resulted in land use restrictions), he has never been aware of “why the plan exists” and why land access was diminished for rural residents. He expressed that the rural community needs more explanation of *why* the conservation plan exists and the necessity behind the plan, the restrictions, and the call for conservation.

**Do you feel that members of your community are or would be willing to accept information produced and distributed by the DCP?
Along similar lines, but taking the last question a step further, do you feel that members of your community are or would be *receptive* to information produced and distributed by the DCP?**

These particular questions – if rural residents would accept messages and potentially be receptive to the messages – produced a lengthy discussion among the focus group participants.

The results of this discussion indicate that in order for rural residents to accept and potentially be receptive to conservation messages, two primary issues must be addressed.

First, the discussion suggested that rural residents desire input into any process that may impact their rural lifestyle (i.e., decisions which would result in land use and access restrictions). If they perceive that a program is a “done deal” or that they are being “talked down to” instead of being listened to, such a negative perception – of being “shut-out” of a program or process – creates mistrust, a barrier that may not only prevent this particular audience from potentially being receptive to messages, but may also create an inclination to oppose what is produced and distributed by the program.

Furthermore, the participants indicated that they might become involved in processes and programs (that impact their lifestyle) if given the opportunity, and some of them have done this, such as Mr. Magoon, who served on the Virgin River Conservation Committee, and Ms. McAllister, who serves on the PIE Committee and one of the two Clark County Growth Task Force Technical Committees (but as an example of the perception of being “shut-out” of a process, Ms. McAllister noted that a rural representative was not asked to serve on the Clark County Environmentally Sensitive Lands Committee).

Secondly, the focus group participants indicated that they are more likely to be accepting of and receptive to messages if the messages are delivered by their peers – those individuals or organizations that they perceive as “inside” their community and familiar with their needs and issues. Just as the assessor learned from the focus groups comprised of OHV enthusiasts and teachers that these audiences would potentially be more receptive to receiving conservation information from their peers, perhaps this concept holds even more true with the rural community audience given that they perceive the county-run program as resulting in land-use restrictions and that they would potentially mistrust information that they would receive from a source (a committee, program, or plan) in which they feel that they have not had participation or representation.

“Before I listen to information, I ask, ‘Who told me?’” said Mr. Goettsche, who said that if he were being informed by a “government bureaucrat,” he would “listen with closed ears.”

(Although the DCP PIE Committee invites interested parties to participate, and the PIE Committee has rural representation from members such as Ann Schreiber and Elise McAllister, the perception of some focus group participants is that they were not invited “to the table” when the MSHCP plan was developed – which they perceive as the time that land use restrictions were created – and that they perceive the program as “outside” their community. Additionally, the focus group discussions suggest that the participants do not always perceive a

difference or choose to make a distinction between Clark County and federal agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management, including in terms of land use and access restrictions; any government agency is referred to and perceived as *government*.)

Overcoming Issues/Challenges

**What is the biggest issue facing the DCP in terms of effectively reaching the rural communities in Clark County?
How might this challenge be overcome?**

Since the biggest issues facing the DCP in terms of effectively reaching the residents of rural communities in Clark County were revealed and discussed in the last discussion topic, the focus here was primarily to address *how to overcome the challenges*.

One participant reiterated his previously mentioned points about the need to explain the MSHCP/DCP program by presenting the “overall picture” to people in terms of why the program was created and why conservation messages are needed. He suggested that the Clark County Fair might be one venue to discuss the program, show maps, and discuss “ramifications.”

Other focus group participants said that an even better venue for such a presentation about the program would be the town board meetings, but, to make such a presentation to the rural communities effective, the majority of the focus group participants emphasized that public outreach (a mass mailing or flyers tied on doorknobs) would be needed to invite residents to a town board meeting where such a presentation would be given. Secondly, the letter or flyer inviting people to this meeting must emphasize how the topic of discussion is one that impacts rural residents. Finally, the focus group participants reiterated their previous points about wanting to be *heard* and to have the opportunity for input, and, therefore, such a presentation must also be interactive, with a question and answer format included. One focus group participant added that the person making the presentation must have the ability and authority to be responsive to questions, rather than responding to questions with, “I’ll have to look into that and get back with you.”

Ms. McAllister added to the suggestion for a town board presentation (which seemed to garner consensus among the focus group participants) by providing a positive example that she witnessed at a Bunkerville Town Board meeting, wherein Clark County Public Works presented the audience with seven different options for a project, listened to people, and then acted on the advice.

Potential Barriers

Based on what the assessor learned from the OHV enthusiasts’ focus group, this particular section explores if potential communication barriers exist – if rural residents have negative perceptions about government and if those perceptions create a communication barrier between Clark County and rural residents.

**How do you feel about information coming from a government agency, such as Clark County?
Does information coming from a government agency affect how receptive you are in terms of
listening to the message and accepting the message?**

As described above, the assessor had planned to explore if information coming from a source perceived as a government body or committee would affect how receptive the rural audience would be to messages. However, this barrier had already been revealed and discussed under a previous discussion topic, which had explored if the focus group participants would be receptive to information produced and distributed by the DCP.

Since this barrier had already been determined, the assessor turned the discussion topic into exploring how to overcome this challenge.

The answer was made clear by the participants, who reiterated their points about wanting to be listened to and to have opportunities to provide input, but they also emphasized how they would be more apt to listen to messages if coming from a trusted source (such as a source perceived as being a locally-based individual or organization).

A few quotes illustrate the importance of this concept:

“I’m more likely to believe people who bring me back information if they’re a fellow motorcyclist,” said Mr. Bunker, who said he is an OHV enthusiast who has received conservation information from fellow OHV enthusiasts.

“I’d want to hear from local people,” said Mr. Goettsche, who explained the importance of having knowledge of local problems.

“It’s a no-brainer. I would be more receptive to an insider,” said Mr. Perkins. “People from a far don’t know the community.”

Although Mr. Magoon said that he would be more likely to listen to a local individual or locally based organization, he stated that he would not accept any conservation messages on face value, but, rather, he would “still investigate.”

Mr. Moore said that he has a “tendency to believe locals,” but he reiterated that he wants to know the “why” behind the program and its messages.

Advice on Reaching Rural Community Residents

How could efforts by the DCP to reach you be improved or enhanced?

The focus group participants reiterated that traditional mass media methods – television, radio and metropolitan newspapers – would not reach the residents of the rural communities.

Rather, the best way to reach the rural communities is either a mass mailing (preference was noted for one participant's suggestion of a quarterly newsletter) or outreach meetings (as detailed during a prior discussion topic), such as a presentation at a town board meeting – presented in an interactive format with a question and answer session offered as well. The majority of the focus group participants favored the latter suggestion, advising that personal, interactive contact with the rural community should have the greatest potential in terms of effectively delivering conservation messages.

In your perception, what's the most important conservation-related information that the rural communities need to receive?

The focus group participants agreed that a need for conservation-information in the rural communities exists, but the need is for a small minority, not the majority of rural residents. The participants explained that they perceive their friends and neighbors in the rural community as people who care about the land and exhibit responsible behavior and respectful attitudes concerning the desert environment.

"If they're true rural people, they do respect the desert. They respect where they live," said Ms. Perkins.

"Yes, there is a need [for conservation information]," said Mr. Perkins, but he said that most rural residents learn about responsible recreation at home, and respect for the desert is passed down from generation to generation with "home training."

Mr. Bunker agreed, and he expressed that there is a need for conservation messages, but the messages are needed more for children and should be taught at schools. He said that the OHV enthusiasts who recreate in or near the rural areas "love the desert," and he said that he has witnessed OHV enthusiasts stop teenagers who are not using trails and tell them why they should stay on trails. "We don't want our rights taken away."

Mr. Magoon said that it is not just youth, but a small minority of people who cause conservation-related problems in the desert. "We have a small minority percentage that are idiots, but the other 90% of us get punished, too. Just fix the

problems with the problem people. Don't punish upstanding citizens," said Mr. Magoon.

Mr. Ogren concurred and expressed that closing access to rural lands due to a small minority of land abusers is analogous to shutting down Interstate 15 because 1% of drivers go behind the wheel while intoxicated.

“We have concerns, too, because this is not a wasteland,” said Mr. Moore, who said that rural residents are concerned about abusive behavior toward the desert, particularly “desert dumping.”

Ms. McAllister and Ms. Egan concurred as well that the majority of rural residents conduct themselves responsibly in the desert. “Education is needed. It’s a better approach than law enforcement. Information is necessary to let people know what is going on, but it should be more than just ‘you cannot,’ but it should be more ‘this is *why* you cannot,’” said Ms. Egan.

SUB-Appendix A

Clark County Desert Conservation Program - Survey Instrument for the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004

**Note: The survey administrator’s script is *italicized*.
The survey administrator’s instructions are in CAPS.**

Hello. We're conducting a survey to evaluate and improve a desert conservation public information and education program. Your opinions are very valuable to this process. We are not selling anything and will not ask your name. If you live here in Clark County, could I please take about 3 to 4 minutes of your time? Your opinions are very valuable to us. >>>>>>IF YES, CONTINUE

>>>>>>>IF NO: Thank you. Have a good time at the fair.

SCREENER QUESTION:

Q1. Do you live in Clark County?

1 – Yes

[12 – Don't Know]

2 – No

[13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF PERSON LIVES IN CLARK COUNTY, PROCEED:

Thank you. Please answer each of the following questions to the best of your ability. As a survey administrator, I will not be able to explain questions further than how they are written on the survey.

Q2. How important is it to you to respect and protect the desert in Clark County?

READ CHOICES

1 - Very Important

2 - Important

3 - Somewhat Important

[12 – Don't Know]

4 - Not Important

[13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q3. Which source do you receive information from the most?

READ CHOICES. THE RESPONDENT MAY CHOOSE MORE THAN ONE.

1 - Events, such as the Clark County Fair

2 - Internet

3 - Mail

4 - Newspaper

5 - Radio

6 - Television

7 - Other

[12 – Don't Know]

8 - None of the above

[13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERED "NEWSPAPER," ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

Q3. (a) What kind of newspaper do you receive information from?

READ CHOICES

- 1 – A metropolitan newspaper, such as the *Las Vegas Review Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*
- 2 – A small, community, and/or rural newspaper
- 3 – Other [12 – Don't Know]
- 4 – None of the above [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q4. I'm going to name different sources of information. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rank how much you trust each source. "5" means that you trust it very much and "1" means that you do not trust it at all.

READ AND MARK EACH ITEM ONE AT A TIME AND MARK THE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO THE LEFT OF EACH ITEM. (MARK A "12" FOR "DON'T KNOW" OR A "13" IF THE RESPONDENT DOES NOT ANSWER OR REFUSES TO ANSWER.)

- _____ Academic source, such as a scientist or college professor
- _____ Clark County
- _____ A community-based organization
- _____ Federal government agency
- _____ Internet, including a website
- _____ Local television news
- _____ Metropolitan newspaper – *Las Vegas Review Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*
- _____ Peer or colleague, such as a neighbor or co-worker
- _____ Small, community, and/or rural newspaper
- _____ State government
- _____ Town Board or Citizen Advisory Council

Q5. Please rate your awareness level of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program and/or the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan? Would you say that you are... READ CHOICES

- 1 – Very aware
- 2 – Aware
- 3 – Somewhat aware [12 – Don't Know]
- 4 – Not aware [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q6. Have you ever heard of the Mojave Max Program?

- | | |
|---------|---------------------------|
| 1 – Yes | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 2 – No | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS “YES,” ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

Q6 (a). Have you heard...

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1 – A lot about it | |
| 2 – A little about it | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 3 – Or you just remember hearing about it | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

Q7. Have you heard or seen messages that encourage conservation, such as to “respect, protect, and enjoy” the desert?

- | | |
|---------|---------------------------|
| 1 – Yes | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 2 – No | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS “YES,” ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

Q7 (a). Where do you remember seeing or hearing those messages?

READ CHOICES. THE RESPONDENT MAY CHOOSE MORE THAN ONE.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1 - Billboard | |
| 2 - Event, such as the Clark County Fair | |
| 3 - Internet / Website | |
| 4 - Mailing | |
| 5 - Metropolitan newspaper, such as the <i>Las Vegas Review Journal</i> or <i>Las Vegas Sun</i> | |
| 6 - School | |
| 7 - Small, community, or rural newspaper | |
| 8 - Television | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 9 - Other | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

Q8. Please name the best method of communication for you to receive information? Name the best choice out of the following...READ CHOICES

- 1 - Billboard
- 2 - Events, such as the Clark County Fair
- 3 - Face-to-face presentation, such as a town hall meeting
- 4 - Internet / Website
- 5 - Mailing, such as receiving a flyer or newsletter

- 1 - 18 years of age or younger
- 2 - 19 to 35 years of age
- 3 - 36 to 54 years of age [12 – Don't Know]
- 4 - 55 + years of age [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF RESPONDENT IS 18 YEARS OF AGE OR YOUNGER, ASK THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS:

Q12 (a). _____ **What grade are you in?** WRITE IN ANSWER

Q12 (b). **Do you attend public school in the Clark County School District?**

- 1 – Yes [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – No [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT IS OVER THE AGE OF 18, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

Q12 (c). **Do you have a child or children who currently live with you?**

- 1 – Yes [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – No [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS “YES,” ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

Q12 (d). **Does the child or one or more of the children in your household attend public school in the Clark County School District?**

- 1 – Yes [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – No [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Those are all of our questions. Thank you so much for your time. Have a nice day/evening.

PLEASE FILL OUT NEXT PAGE AFTER FINISHING WITH RESPONDENT.

FOR SURVEY ADMINISTRATOR TO FILL OUT:

RECORD GENDER – CIRCLE ONE: 1 – Male 2 – Female

DATE OF INTERVIEW: April _____, 2004

APPROXIMATE TIME OF INTERVIEW: _____ AM / PM

NAME OF SURVEY ADMINISTRATOR: _____

LOCATION (AT FAIR) OF SURVEY
ADMINISTRATION – CHECK ONE:

Near Clark County DCP booth

Near Dept. of Agriculture booth

SUB-Appendix B

Focus Group Script – Rural Community

**Tuesday, March 9, 2004, 6:00 – 7:00 P.M.
Moapa Community Center, 320 North Moapa Valley Boulevard**

Introductions

I'm Sean Ross, and with me today is Vicki Gonzales. We're with a company called Strategic Solutions and we are conducting an objective assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, specifically related to the Program's public information and education work.

Purpose

This focus group is a major part of the assessment process, which involves identifying recipients of information provided by the Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education activities and conducting evaluative research to determine and assess the effectiveness of the production and delivery of such information.

Disclosure

I first want to tell you that we will include in our report the names of those who participated today, but we won't always be sharing information that is identified to specific individuals. In other words, we'll develop a report that summarizes the focus group to provide the Desert Conservation Program with an idea of how they might improve the way they communicate with Clark County's rural communities.

Also, if it's OK with everyone here, I'd like to audio record the focus group just to make it easier for our company in our reporting. This audiotape would be for Strategic Solutions, not Clark County. Additionally, Vicki will be taking notes, as well as helping me conduct the focus group.

We may also use the results of all of the focus groups that we conduct to aid us in crafting a survey instrument that would be used at events such as the Clark County Fair.

Process

The focus group will take about an hour. Please help yourself to the water bottles.

I'd like to go over a couple of ground rules before we proceed. Really, the only one is that we ask you to please not talk over each other or interrupt each other as we go. We'll go around the table on each question to make sure we hear from everyone, and if you have something to say out of turn, please raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you.

Participants Background

Before we get started with our questions, I'd like to ask everyone to introduce yourself and tell us what community you live in, how long you've lived in this community, and your occupation, if you wouldn't mind telling us.

General Impressions

Now, I'd like to ask you your general impressions of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program by asking you a very general question, "What do you think of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program?" If you're not familiar with the program, please state that, too.

DCP Message Distribution

If you have heard messages from the DCP, where have you seen, heard, or received messages from the DCP? Please discuss what you heard, saw, or received. *Explore what are the main messages being delivered and received by the rural community.*

Do you perceive that the DCP is effective in reaching the rural community? If no, please explain why you do not think that the DCP is effective in reaching the rural community.

Exploring how to effectively reach this population will be explored in detail in a following discussion section.

Do you feel that members of your community are or would be willing to accept information produced and distributed by the DCP?

Along similar lines, but taking the last question a step further, do you feel that members of your community are or would be *receptive* to information produced and distributed by the DCP?

DCP Message Content/Tone

If you have heard any messages delivered by the DCP, what message or messages do you recall hearing or seeing?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in changing the behavior of people who reside in the rural communities? In other words, do the messages increase protection of the desert?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in changing the values of people who reside in the rural communities? In other words, do the messages increase respect for the desert?

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in regard to increasing awareness in the rural communities, in terms of the importance of desert conservation?

What was your impression of the message(s), both in terms of content – the way the message is worded – and delivery?

Could the messages be improved? If yes, how so?

Overcoming Issues/Challenges

What is the biggest issue facing the DCP in terms of effectively reaching the rural communities in Clark County?

How might this challenge be overcome?

What is the biggest issue in terms of the DCP being able to change the behavior and/or values of people who reside in rural communities in Clark County?

How might this challenge be overcome?

In general, do you feel that the DCP has the ability to improve responsible outdoor recreation – use of the desert – in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?

In general, what is the best way that the DCP can improve responsible outdoor recreation – use of the desert – in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?

Potential Barriers

Based on what the assessor learned from the OHV enthusiasts' focus group, this particular section will explore if potential communication barriers exist – if rural residents have negative perceptions about government and if those perceptions create a communication barrier between Clark County and rural residents.

How do you feel about information coming from a government agency, such as Clark County? Does information coming from a government agency affect how receptive you are in terms of listening to the message and accepting the message?

Are you more receptive and accepting of messages from a non-governmental agency such as Partners in Conservation? *Explore if the DCP is perceived as being an “outsider” to the rural residents, whereas Partners in Conservation is perceived as part of the rural community since the organization is rural-based.*

How could efforts by the DCP to reach you – and more importantly, communicate messages to you effectively in terms of you being receptive to listening to the messages – be improved or enhanced?

Advice on Reaching Rural Community Residents

What would be your advice to the DCP in terms of reaching those residents of rural communities who recreate in the desert?

Could you give us a sense of *who* the DCP’s audience is in the rural community – discussing you and your family and your friends and neighbors – in terms of being desert users? *Explore if the focus group participants perceive their community members as being frequent desert users, such as desert/outdoor enthusiasts.*

How would you characterize this group you just described (family, friends, neighbors) as far as their current level of conservation, in terms of respecting and protecting the desert and species of the desert? *Explore if the participants and their peers have a current awareness of DCP messages, such as staying on roads because straying from roads can destroy habitats, and if they practice (stay on roads) such conservation concepts.*

In your perception, what’s the most important conservation-related information that the rural communities need to receive?

Are there certain events held in the rural communities that draw a large enough attendance that you would recommend the DCP have a presence at such events? If so, please provide details.

If yes...

What is the ideal way for the DCP to distribute information at such events?

Reaching children of rural communities...

By raise of hands, are you aware of the Mojave Max Program, either the Mojave Max Emergence Contest or the Mojave Max Education Project?

Describe this program, briefly, if any participants are unfamiliar with the MM Program.

How do you feel about the Mojave Max Program, in terms of the Program being utilized by the DCP to reach children who live in rural communities and inform them about the importance of species and desert conservation?

What is the best way to effectively communicate with the children who live in the rural communities?

Best Delivery Methods

We'd like to discuss the best approach to reaching people who reside in rural communities. Please list what you perceive as advantages and benefits of each of these delivery methods, as well as any perceived disadvantages or problems:

- Radio/Television Advertising or PSAs?
- Print Advertising?
 - Large Newspapers – Review-Journal or Sun
 - Small Newspapers – rural newspapers
- Literature? Brochure (DCP brochure), Newsletter (*Desert News*)
- Event display booth – interaction with DCP representatives? Products given away at events?
- Kiosks in the public land areas where people are using public lands

Of all of these information delivery methods we just discussed, please name the best one, in your opinion?

Is there any other type of delivery method or tool that the DCP should be using to reach rural community residents, but currently isn't producing or using?

Clark County Fair (held in Logandale, a rural area)

How do you feel about the Clark County Fair in Logandale in terms of being a location for the DCP to have a presence and distribute its messages to the rural community? Is it important for the DCP to have a presence at this venue?

Considering the DCP's traditional involvement at the Fair, could you provide advice as to how the DCP's presence could be enhanced or improved in terms of effectively providing conservation information at the Fair?

Literature

Have you seen any literature distributed by the DCP, such as the *Desert News* or the general DCP brochure or any brochure related to Mojave Max?

If yes...

Where and how did you receive the literature?

After reading the literature, what message or messages do you recall being delivered within this literature?

Do you feel the literature is effective in reaching the rural community?

Would you like to receive literature from the DCP? Would you read it?

Products

Have you received any free products/giveaways that were produced and distributed by the DCP?

If yes...

What message or messages do you recall being on the product?

Generally speaking, did you like the product? Do you use and/or keep the product?

Do you feel that product effectively delivers a message about the importance of desert conservation?

Would you like to see the DCP continue to provide products/giveaways?

Let me take a brief moment to mention the products that the DCP has produced and distributed: litter bags, can coolers, hats, magnets, desert tortoise patrol cards, rulers, screwdrivers, stickers, sun shades, water bottle holders, and zipper pulls.

What is the best product that the DCP has distributed or should distribute and why?

Radio / Television / Print

Have you seen or heard any Public Service Announcements or advertisements from the DCP on television or radio?

If yes...

What television or radio station or program did you see or hear the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

What message or messages do you recall being delivered in the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

Do you feel that the PSA(s) or advertising delivers a message or messages about the importance of desert conservation?

Do you feel these media – television and radio – are a good way to reach the rural community? Please explain.

What about print advertising? Should the DCP print advertisements in newspapers? If yes, what kinds of newspapers are preferable: large circulation newspapers such as the *Review-Journal* or *Sun* or smaller, targeted newspapers, such as rural newspapers. *If a preference for rural newspapers is expressed, ask participant(s) to specifically name the rural newspaper(s).*

(If still time in the one hour) Section 10(a) Permit

Are you familiar with why the DCP was created?

Are you familiar with the Section 10(a) Permit?

Read:

The Desert Conservation Program is responsible for the implementation of the provisions of Section 10(a) Incidental Take Permit, issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Clark County administers the plan by assuming responsibility for the collection of mitigation fees and ensuring adherence to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which is intended to promote a balance between economic stability and environmental integrity in Clark County.

Would you agree or disagree with the statement that conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which equals jobs and economic stability? Please discuss.

Does the purpose of the DCP and the terms of the Permit need to be explained to the OHV community – would this information make the OHV community more receptive to conservation messages? Please discuss.

Final Thoughts

Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel might help the DCP better reach or effectively communicate with people who reside in Clark County's rural communities?

Thank you for taking your valuable time today. We truly appreciate your consideration and extremely valuable input.

APPENDIX I

Monthly Report
April 3, 2004 – May 7, 2004

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

The April 3, 2004 – May 7, 2004 assessor's report discusses the results of the survey conducted at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004. This report also discusses the

assessor's prioritization of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium. Both the survey results and the prioritization of PIE project proposals were presented and discussed by the assessor during the PIE Committee meeting on April 22, 2004. A PowerPoint presentation of the survey results was also delivered. Moreover, at the April 22, 2004, PIE Committee meeting, an outline version (*Appendix B*) of the prioritization of the PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium was provided and used to present the highlights of the report. Also in this report, the assessor makes a note about a recommendation for continued assessment, which will be discussed in further detail in the final report.

Survey

Before discussing the results of the survey, conducted at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004, a revisit of the assessor's initial proposal elucidates why a survey was proposed to be conducted at the Clark County Fair, as opposed to a general, countywide, random telephone survey of Clark County residents.

As the assessor had originally proposed, identification of recipients of collateral material and products produced and distributed by the DCP would prove difficult, if not impossible. Additionally, identifying those who have attended public information events such as the Clark County Fair, Earth Day events, and other public events would have proven equally difficult. Therefore, the method with the highest research value is to conduct a survey at a distribution point(s) wherein Clark County has traditionally distributed messages, such as the Clark County Fair. Moreover, in order to assess the impact of the PIE programs on the general

public, a general, countywide public opinion survey was not recommended. With a population of approximately 1.6 million people, a high percentage of new residents, and limited public information dollars available to spend, such an undertaking would, in the assessor's professional judgment, not yield any useful information. In the assessor's opinion, this type of survey would have also been considerably expensive and not a prudent and cost-effective use of PIE's limited budget dollars.

Alternatively, the assessor had proposed that a survey of those likely to receive information through PIE activities, such as attendees at the Clark County Fair, be conducted. Strategic Solutions proposed enlisting the assistance of agency staff and volunteers to administer and collect the survey questionnaires.

Survey Instrument

The assessor created the survey instrument with consideration of the results of previous assessment research (i.e., the focus group results indicated the importance of developing an information source **trust-level** section of the survey), as well as receiving input from PIE Committee members during a special survey-administration meeting

conducted on April 5, 2004. One aspect of creating a survey instrument is to achieve a proper survey administration time (being able to administer the survey in about 4-6 minutes), which limits the length and amount of questions included on a survey instrument. The assessor believes that this ideal administration time was achieved.

(Please see Appendix A for the survey instrument).

Survey Construct, Administration, and Methodology

The assessor thanks the numerous volunteers who participated in administering the survey instrument at the Clark County Fair. Each volunteer was trained on how to administer the survey either at the fair or during the special survey administration meeting conducted on April 5, 2004. Moreover, given the multiple choice format of the survey, the italicized script, and the detailed instructions clearly written on the survey instrument, the assessor concluded that the survey instrument was administered in a consistent and uniform fashion by all survey administrator volunteers. Additionally, at least one member of the assessor team was present at the Clark County Fair during all times that the survey was administered.

Moreover, without the assistance of volunteers, the assessor team, alone, would not have been able to achieve 458 survey completes. Please note that the amount of survey completes was inaccurately stated as N=466 in the report discussed during the PIE Committee meeting on April 22, 2004. This was due to

the fact that 466 surveys were handed-in, but eight were not tallied in running the tabulation software due to these particular surveys not being completely filled-out. Some surveys were not fully complete if the respondent was too young (generally under the age of 10), as the assessor and volunteers discovered that some respondents under the age of 10 did not fully comprehend the trust section of the survey.

The goal of the assessor was to achieve 450 completes – the higher the sample size, the higher the confidence level in the results and the less error and variance in the results. However, please note (and please weigh when considering findings) that the survey results cannot be generalized to a larger population, and the results do not represent the opinions and perceptions of Clark County residents. Moreover, the survey is not a true random population sample (random sample surveys provide an estimate of accuracy of results had all members of a target population been surveyed). Therefore, the assessor cannot provide a margin of error (i.e., +/- 3%) because the formula to calculate the figure requires the total population from which the amount of completes would represent a random sample. In terms of variability of results and margin of error, all survey results are subject to variations or uncertainties.

Survey Results

The following discussion presents the pertinent highlights from the survey results. Again, the results were discussed by the assessor at the PIE Committee meeting on April 22, 2004, with use of illustrative graphs in a color PowerPoint presentation. *(If you were not able to attend this presentation and would like to view the PowerPoint version of the results – to see the full survey results and to see results illustrated in graph form – please email the request to seanross@lvcm.com.)*

Respect for Desert

- 80% of respondents believe it is very important to respect and protect the desert in Clark County.

Sources of Information

- When asked, “From which sources do you most often receive public information,” the respondents identified television as their top choice at 56%.
- Respondents also chose other mass media, such as newspapers (48%) and radio (31%).
- Of the 48% of respondents who get their public information from a newspaper, 72% are receiving information from one of two metro newspapers: *The Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*. (“Other” was chosen by 15% of respondents; anecdotally, the assessor heard many people state that they read newspapers which are national in reach and scope, such as *The Wall Street Journal*, *USA Today*, and *The New York Times*.)

Trust Levels

- Survey administrators named different sources of information (federal government, state government, Clark County, Town Board, community-based organization, Clark County School District, academic source, local television news, *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*, community newspaper, Internet, and a peer/colleague). On a scale of 1 to 5, respondents were asked to rank how much they trust each source.
- The highest levels of trust were exhibited for **academic sources** (24% of respondents ranked academic sources with the highest level of trust), **community-based organizations** (19% of respondents ranked community-based organizations with the highest level of trust), and **peers/colleagues** (16% of respondents ranked peers/colleagues with the highest level of trust).

- The lowest levels of trust were exhibited for the **federal government** (15% of respondents ranked the federal government with the lowest level of trust), **Clark County School District** and **the Internet/email** (about 14% of respondents ranked the Clark County School District and the Internet/email with the lowest level of trust).

Awareness of Programs and Messages

- 84% of respondents have a level of awareness about the Clark County Desert Conservation Program and/or the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (the majority of respondents were “somewhat aware” at 41%). Only 16% had no awareness of either program.
- The survey results reveal that 53% of survey respondents have heard of the Mojave Max Program. (It is important to note and weigh that the majority of survey respondents were adults – only 7% were 18 years of age or younger – and given that the Mojave Max Program’s target is school-age children, the results are skewed given the age demographics.)
- Of the respondents who had heard of the Mojave Max Program, 43% had heard “a little about it,” 36% had heard “a lot about it,” and 21% “just remembered hearing about it.”
- 94% of survey respondents have heard or seen conservation messages, such as *Respect, Protect, and Enjoy*.
- Mirroring the results of the public information question, respondents primarily heard conservation messages through mass media choices, with television (56%) significantly ahead of other choices. Billboards (26%), radio (24.5%), and *The Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun* (24%) distantly follow.

Best Method of Communication

- Once again, television (28%) was named the top choice when respondents were asked to name the best method of communication to receive public information. Television was followed by mailing (17%), and the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun* (13%).

Giveaway Items

- Respondents were asked to name the free giveaway item provided at an event (with a conservation message printed on the item) that they would most likely use and keep.

- Although probably the most expensive item (among the choices) to produce, clothing items (46%) were clearly the top choice of survey respondents, distantly followed by can cooler/bottle buddy items (13%), tools (11%), and magnets (10%).

Respondents with Children

- 44% of respondents indicated that they currently have a child or children who currently live with them.
- Interestingly, 92% of survey respondents are very likely (75%) or likely (17%) to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them.

Demographics

- Achieving a fairly even mix in terms of gender, 56% of survey respondents were female and 44% were male.
- Again, a fairly even age mix was achieved among adult respondents: 43% were age 36-54; 29% were age 55 or over; 20% were age 19-35; but only 7% were age 18 or younger. (Anecdotally, the assessor found children were both less likely to agree/want to take the survey, and again, as previously stated, children under the age of 10, generally speaking, were less likely to comprehend the survey questions, particularly the trust section.)
- Interestingly, 74% of survey respondents reside in an urban area of Clark County (i.e., the cities of Las Vegas, Henderson, and North Las Vegas), and only 26% of survey respondents reside in rural areas of Clark County (i.e., Logandale, Bunkerville, Moapa, and Overton). The fair is held in Logandale.

Cross-tabulations

Typically with survey results, the assessor will use statistical software to run cross-tabulations to determine if respondents are more or less likely to answer a certain way given their responses to other interrelated questions.

The assessor ran 17 cross-tabulations; however, few of these results produced any significant findings. For instance, the assessor cross-tabulated the first question (“How important is it to you to respect and protect the desert in Clark County?”) with the awareness-level-type questions, such as “Please rate your awareness level of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program and/or the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan?” and “Have you heard of the Mojave Max Program?” These particular cross-tabulations did not reveal that those who were most likely to say that *it is very important*

to respect and protect the desert have a higher level of awareness of conservation programs or are more likely to have heard conservation messages.

Moreover, the assessor also hypothesized that respondents who indicated that they *have a child or children who currently reside with them* and are *very likely to pay attention to information brought home to them by their child/children* would have a higher awareness level of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) and the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). However, the assessor was surprised to learn that this was not the case (at least not in a significant sense – those who stated that they are *very likely to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them* were only about 2% more likely to *have a high awareness level of the DCP or MSHCP* than state that they are *not aware of either the DCP or MSHCP* and only about 4% more likely to state that they *have heard of the Mojave Max Program.*)

However, if respondents stated that they *have a child or children who currently reside with them*, they are about 8% more likely to state that they *have heard of the Mojave Max Program*. Additionally, if the respondent stated that they *have a child or children who currently reside with them*, than they are about 15% more likely to have stated that they have heard *a lot about the Mojave Max Program* as opposed to stating that *they just remember hearing about the Mojave Max Program*.

Finally, cross-tabulations between the age demographic question and the awareness-level-type questions reveal that those respondents in the 36-54 age category appear to have a greater awareness level of conservation programs and are more likely to have heard conservation messages than those respondents in the other age categories (18 years of age or younger; ages 19-35; and age 55 and over).

More specifically, those respondents who are age 36-54 are 6% more likely to state that they are *very aware of the DCP and/or MSHCP* than those respondents who are age 55 and over; 34% more likely than those respondents who are age 19-35; and 40% more likely than those respondents who are 18 years of age or younger.

Furthermore, those respondents who are age 36-54 are 14% more likely to have stated that they *have heard or seen conservation messages such as Respect, Protect, and Enjoy* than those respondents who are age 55 and over; 22% more likely than those respondents who are age 19-35; and 36% more likely than those respondents who are age 18 or younger.

Discussion

Results from three of the survey questions reveal the importance of using mass media, particularly television, to convey conservation messages. Television is not only the medium of choice of survey respondents as the “best method of communication to

receive public information,” but also the primary medium with which to convey conservation messages, such as *Respect, Protect, and Enjoy* (according to the survey respondents who indicated that they had heard or seen such messages).

Additionally, television was the top choice when survey respondents were asked from which source they most often receive public information. (This finding is further discussed, along with other assessment research concerning television and other mass media, in the *Prioritization of Proposals* section of the report.)

Also, given the finding that 92% of survey respondents are very likely (75%) or likely (17%) to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them

is one that the assessor plans to discuss and reference in the final report, as the assessor will formulate a recommendation(s) based on this survey result, coupled with qualitative research findings. As discussed in the *Prioritization of Proposals* section of the report, in the formulation of final assessment recommendations, the assessor may discuss opportunities to reach certain adult target audiences through children and the Mojave Max Program. (Likewise, the assessment research results reveal the success of the Mojave Max Program and the opportunities to capitalize on its success by enhancing and/or expanding the program.)

Finally, the results of the survey reveal the success, to date, of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program’s Public Information and Education Program among this particular population of survey respondents (again, the results cannot be generalized to the population of Clark County, but, rather, a population attending an event which the DCP has traditionally had a presence – a point of distribution of DCP messages). The results are worth repeating to illustrate this contention of success: 84% of respondents have a level of awareness about the DCP and/or MSHCP; 53% of survey respondents have heard of the Mojave Max Program; and 94% of survey respondents have heard or seen conservation messages, such as *Respect, Protect, and Enjoy*.

During the April 22, 2002, PIE Committee meeting, when discussing the poll results, the assessor provided some comparative examples to demonstrate that awareness-level-type findings such as *84% of respondents have a level of awareness about the DCP and/or MSHCP* are unusually high. To illustrate that the survey awareness-level findings (in percentage terms) are comparatively high, the assessor conducted some brief research to show some awareness levels of terms, concepts, political figures, and issues, as revealed by other surveys:

- According to a July 2002 survey conducted for the Review-Journal and reviewjournal.com by pollster Mason-Dixon Polling & Research, 49% of registered voters did not recognize 30-year State Senator Joe Neal, the Democratic candidate for Governor of the State of Nevada.

- The University of Vermont’s Center for Rural Studies conducted a statewide public opinion poll in 2002 to determine if Vermont residents viewed sprawl as a serious issue facing the state. The poll revealed 70% of respondents had familiarity with the concept of “sprawl.”
- 55% of Americans have knowledge about autism, according to a poll conducted by Global Strategy Group in conjunction with Widmeyer Communications in 2003.
- 64% of Americans who are cable or satellite subscribers are aware of the pay-per-view or video-on-demand services that they have available to them, according to a December 2002 nationwide poll conducted by epoll.com.
- Given the “constant media frenzy” surrounding the “Y2K bug” in 1999, a poll found that 85% of Americans had an awareness level (“some or a great deal”) of the year 2000 compute issue, according to a nationwide telephone poll, done in partnership with the National Science Foundation and *USA Today*.
- A 2002 incumbent awareness poll by The Field Institute, revealed that Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante was known by 66% of registered voters in the State of California; Attorney General Bill Lockyer was known by 62% of voters; Republican State Senator Tom McClintock was known by 45% of voters; 26% knew of State Senator Jack O’Connell; and 36% knew of State Treasurer Phil Angelides.

Although the above examples are really “apples-to-oranges” comparisons with the awareness levels of the DCP program and messages (and the DCP survey findings cannot be generalized to a larger population), these examples are illustrative of the difficulty of achieving high awareness and knowledge levels, even with seemingly well-known political figures such as senators and gubernatorial candidates and terms and concepts such as the “Y2K bug,” “sprawl,” “autism,” and pay-per-view services.

Prioritization of Proposals

In prioritizing the Clark County Desert Conservation Program Public Information and Education (PIE) projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium, the assessor reviewed and prioritized the following five proposals:

- 2003-Clark County-373-P
- 2003-Clark County-377-P
- 2003-PIC-319-P
- 2003-PIC-348-P
- 2003-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P

The prioritization of PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium reflects assessment/research-based recommendations, as well as a degree of professional judgment on the part of the assessor.

Again, the assessment process has been conducted as a research process-oriented approach (Process-Based Evaluation methodology/"Logic Model"), and,

therefore, each prioritization recommendation reflects several steps of the assessment process, including: input assessment (review and analysis of expenditures); assessment of specific communication pieces; research and comparison of other HCP and environmental program efforts; the detailed interview process – qualitative research to evaluate the outcome and results of past and ongoing PIE efforts; focus group research – the ascertainment of perceptions and suggestions of target audiences, designed to improve methods for reaching an audience, both in terms of message production and delivery; and quantitative research – the results of the survey (N=458 completes), conducted at the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004.

Also, part of the assessor's charge is to identify advantages and disadvantages of a proposal's components. Disadvantages, if any, are specifically identified, whereas advantages are part of the overall recommendation discussions, which include detailed analysis of how (and if) research-based assessment results support a recommendation for priority funding for a proposal.

The prioritization report lists the assessor recommendations in priority order.

1. 2003-Clark County-373-P

The Clark County MSHCP Proposal (2003-Clark County-373-P) represents a total funding request of \$384,000, with \$140,000 requested for media; \$100,000 for the Mojave Max Emergence Contest; \$50,000 for printing; \$30,000 for outreach/events; \$30,000 for the production of maps; \$20,000 for ad specialties; \$9,000 for the Clark County Fair; \$4,000 for the USFS brochure printing; and \$1,000 for the hotline/toll free numbers.

Based on the assessment, the 2003-Clark County-373-P proposal should be considered a top priority among the PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium. The research-based evaluation of the proposal's activities indicates the importance of both the media campaign and the Mojave Max Emergence Contest (MMEC) in particular. Other expenditures of the 2003-Clark County-373-P proposal are necessary components in terms of the PIE Program's ability to continue to convey objective-achieving messages to target audiences.

Media Campaign

The research conducted by the assessor indicates that the media campaign should be considered a priority component of the 2003-Clark County-373-P proposal.

Expenditure Assessment

According to the August 5, 2003 – September 5, 2003 expenditure assessment, the assessor described the cost benefits of the strategically planned and executed media campaign (and the importance of utilizing professional services to realize the cost savings produced by negotiated media packages).

In regard to the Public Service Announcement (PSA) aspect of the media campaign, the assessor discussed research, which illustrates the benefits of a strategically planned PSA campaign. According to the *Non Profit Times*, “campaign after campaign has demonstrated that PSAs are effective in getting out messages...what PSAs do best is convey the importance of an issue, work to change attitudes and misconceptions, and, most importantly, compel people to take action.” Although the control of exactly when and where a message can be delivered is forfeited with PSAs (approximately 55% of television PSAs run between 1 a.m. and 8 a.m.), by producing PSAs, the DCP takes advantage of the free space and time available within local media outlets.

The July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002 biennium report reflects that the PSA campaign (contracted with Matteson Media Group) planning included a number of strategic efforts, such as creating a public service media outline, framework and strategy, and contacting local TV stations to negotiate annual public service campaigns featuring weekly messages.

In regard to the advertising aspect of the media campaign, the assessor researched the cost benefits of the negotiated packages established by Matteson Media Group (through comparison to individual ad placements).

Taking into account market size, Nielsen summary reports (which measure market television viewership), and relative market performance based on cost per point (CPP) and cost per thousand (CPM) data in a total survey area (TSA), Media Market Guide’s Service Quality Analytics Data (SQAD) allowed the assessor to determine that placing advertisements on a piecemeal basis would have resulted in costs up to \$17,376.50, about five times the amount paid by the DCP within the negotiated media package.

HCP/Environmental Programs Assessment

According to the November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 HCP/environmental programs comparison research, mass media advertising was cited as “effective” components of environmental programs.

For instance, Mr. Joe Keyser, Environmental Education Specialist with the Montgomery County, Virginia, Department of Environmental Protection, explained to the assessor that the Department's current outreach emphasis is

concentrated in areas such as print advertising in local newspapers, conveying the Department's environmental messages on popular government access television programs, and utilizing PSA-type opportunities, including "eco-minute" spots marketed to other cable and government access shows where there is no cost for placement. Advertisements were developed and targeted after market research was conducted, and after the mass media advertising campaign (the Department has an annual \$400,000 public outreach budget to reach a population of 873,341), "the Department had measurable demonstration of behavioral change."

Interviews

The interview process also indicated that those individuals closest to the PIE process perceive the benefits of a concerted media campaign. The following paragraph appears in the November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 report discussing the results of the interview process: "When discussing perceptions about effective media, there seemed to be a common perception that media such as television, radio, and billboards have the potential to be more effective since they reach larger audiences. Moreover, some interviewees discussed the need for a 'media mix' and the advice of professionals."

Moreover, when the 27 interviewees (those individuals who have been the closest to the DCP PIE Program and the results of its activities) were asked, "What medium do you feel has been or is the most effective in delivering the DCP's messages about conservation," television and/or radio emerged as the most popular answer, as a common perception is that these media have the power to reach the largest audience.

Furthermore, some interviewees explained that advertising expertise is needed for the right media blend, as one medium may not be singularly effective. The PIE Program's contracted media professional consultant, Mr. Dale Matteson, explained to the assessor the importance of the "media mix" with radio targeting children and television reaching parents and educators, as well as the Clark County School District serving as a "conduit" to the children. Other interviewees expressed that the PSAs developed by Matteson Media Group are attention-grabbing and deliver quick, effective messages.

Focus Groups

The focus group results, similarly, pointed to the positive aspects of the PIE's media campaign efforts. The Mojave Max Emergence Contest (MMEC) focus group report indicated that the general perceptions of the teachers about the MMEC are very positive – teachers said that they perceived the contest's positive results through television coverage. Additionally, about half of the teachers

avored radio and television advertising about the MMEC because it reaches the “entire” educational community – teachers, parents, and students – at the same time.

Survey

Finally, the survey reaffirmed the importance of using mass media to convey messages. When survey respondents were asked to name the sources that they most often receive public information from, television was cited more than other sources, with 56% of the respondents stating that they most often receive information from television. Respondents also chose other mass media, such as newspapers (48%) and radio (32%).

Likewise, television was clearly the top choice, too, when respondents were asked to name the best method of communication to receive public information. Survey respondents were asked to choose the best method of communication from nine communication choices, and none of the choices were cited by more than 13% of the respondents, except mail (17%), such as receiving a flyer or newsletter through the mail, and television (28%).

Moreover, the survey revealed that 94% of survey respondents have heard or seen conservation messages such as “respect, protect, and enjoy” the desert. Of the 94% who have heard or seen conservation messages, 56% of respondents saw the messages on television, followed by billboards (26%), radio (25%), and the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun* (24%).

Disadvantages

Disadvantages pertain to the high cost of television and other mass media choices when being used to reach the general public, which, again, emphasizes the importance of negotiated media packages and concerted, focused advertising efforts to reach target audiences in order to maximize limited budget dollars. Some audiences, particularly in the rural communities, won't necessarily be reached by mass media efforts, and the recommendations report from Strategic Solutions will address solutions to reaching such audiences.

Mojave Max Emergence Contest

HCP/Environmental Programs Assessment

Similar to the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, the HCP and environmental programs evaluated and compared by the assessor reveal that educational programs – specifically directed at children – are a significant portion

of the overall environmental and conservation outreach programs researched by the assessor. However, these programs take very different approaches, and perhaps none of them can be compared to the size and scope of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and Mojave Max Education Project.

Interviews

The following paragraph appears in the November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 report discussing the results of the interview process: “Most of the interviewees were exceptionally bullish on the Mojave Max Program – the Education Project and the Emergence Contest. Not all of the adjectives of praise are included here, but it is unarguably perceived by the interviewees as the PIE Program’s most successful effort to date.”

A number of interviewees suggested that the DCP should capitalize on its existing successes, and with the overwhelming positive comments pertaining to the Mojave Max Program, many interviewees perceive that building upon and expanding this component of the DCP PIE Program should continually be explored.

Assessor Observation

The assessor has also taken advantage of opportunities to observe both the Mojave Max Emergence Contest assembly and the Mojave Max Education Project lesson. Based on these observations and the assessor’s professional judgment, the assessor has commented in previous assessment reports about immediate evidence of conservation learning at activities such as the Mojave Max Emergence Contest assembly, which includes a presentation by The Tortoise Group.

For instance, the assessor observed how the presentation encourages desert conservation and protection of the tortoise by explaining threats to the tortoise and the fragility of the tortoise’s desert environment. Perhaps equally important to *what* the messages are, is *how* the messages are delivered. The assessor observed the Mojave Max assembly and how students react to learning new terms and concepts while experiencing an interactive and engaging presentation that includes props and verbal quizzing.

Focus Groups

According to the February 7, 2004 – March 5, 2004 monthly assessor’s report, the teachers’ focus group pointed to the strong desire among the teachers to participate in the Mojave Max Emergence Contest and to receive conservation information from the program. The teachers enthusiastically expressed their

positive feelings about the Mojave Max Program. One teacher summed the program as “authentic learning” and others described the excitement that the program builds among

both students and teachers. Interestingly, the teachers also described how the character of Mojave Max has personalized the desert for their students, making them more apt to respect their environment as a result of this “spokes-tortoise.”

Moreover, it is important to reiterate the overall positive comments expressed by the teachers about the Mojave Max Program, in terms of the contest and assembly elements, the Mojave Max mascot/spokes-tortoise, and the program’s aim to engage students in earth sciences via a fun, interactive, and engaging program. The results suggest that the program “personalizes” Clark County’s desert environment and species and makes students want to respect the desert.

Survey

The survey revealed that 53% of survey respondents have heard of the Mojave Max Program, and of those respondents, 36% of respondents have heard a lot about the program and 43% have heard a little about it. It is important to note that the majority of survey respondents were adults (only 7% were 18 years of age or younger), and given the Mojave Max Program’s target of school-age children, the results are skewed given the age demographics. However, the survey does reveal that adults are more likely to have heard of the program if they have children in their household. Also of importance is the fact that 75% of respondents are very likely to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them. Therefore, in the formulation of final assessment recommendations, the assessor may discuss opportunities to reach adult target audiences through children and the Mojave Max Program.

Disadvantages

The assessor has not determined any disadvantages with the Mojave Max Program. However, the assessor’s final recommendations report may include additional recommendations on how to expand and/or enhance the Mojave Max Program (which the assessor has already done, in part, in the September 6, 2003 – October 8, 2003 monthly assessor’s report in the section: “Identification of preliminary suggestions for planning of the 2004 Mojave Max Emergence Contest”). The Mojave Max Program represents a primary focus of the PIE Committee’s efforts, with the majority of PIE dollars dedicated to reaching one of its three target audiences: children.

Therefore, the assessor is in the process of formulating a recommendation as to how the Mojave Max Program can reach an adult population as well, based on research-based assessment results, particularly results from the survey (75% of

survey respondents said they are *very likely* to pay attention to information brought home to them by their children, and 17% said they are *likely* to pay attention to information brought home to them by their children – only 1% responded that they are *not likely* to pay attention to information brought home to them by their children). Again, the details of this recommendation will appear in the assessor’s final report.

Additionally, although the research conducted by the assessor clearly points to the importance of the (school-age) education component in any environmental/conservation program, the HCP/environmental programs assessment suggest avenues should be explored for maximizing program resources through realizing a “teaching the teachers” concept that will be more greatly explored in the final recommendations report. In short, The Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard HCP concentrates on providing 4-hour lessons to teachers so they can conduct future lessons and field trips that the HCP would have a limited capability to conduct with a limited staff.

Likewise, the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan’s managers realized that the HCP’s outreach subcommittee members could not achieve the needed informational and educational efforts relying on themselves, so numerous partnerships have been developed, and the HCP takes advantage of each and every opportunity to attach the HCP’s messages to other environmental, educational, and agency programs that already exist. Similarly, the San Francisco Department of the Environment, even with a staff of 62, practices the “teach the teachers” efficiency philosophy, with programs that provide the resources and materials to teachers, as well as offering on-site training for teachers (and the Department has found that most teachers take advantage of the opportunity and appreciate the environmental science training, which includes instructing teachers how to present the science information so it is age/grade-level appropriate).

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends priority funding for the Clark County MSHCP Proposal (2003-Clark County-373-P), and within that proposal, recommends priority funding for the media (\$140,000) and Mojave Max Program (\$100,000) components.

(Please note: some specific aspects of the proposal – including the “production of maps” component (\$30,000) and USFS brochure printing (\$4,000) – have not been evaluated by the assessor during the course of the research-based assessment process.)

2. 2003-Clark County-377-P

The assessment research suggests that the Clark County PIE – Mojave Education Project proposal (2003-Clark County-377-P) should also be considered a priority for funding among PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium.

2003-Clark County-377-P proposes a number of related elements designed to enhance and expand environmental education through the Mojave Max Program.

Proposal elements include enhancement of the website to feature the Mojave Max exhibit at Red Rock Visitor Center to show real-time images and data of the tortoise's behavior and to provide more interactive, learning material opportunities through the website; expansion of the Mojave Max Emergence Contest; expanding the reach of the Mojave Max Program by establishing virtual field trips to reach students who may not have the opportunity to go on actual field trips; assist in the development of Mojave Max curriculum and provide more teacher-friendly materials that meet applicable standards; and reviewing and improving materials such as teaching kits and educational props.

The primary components of 2003-Clark County-377-P have been supported by research-based assessment results.

Website Enhancement and Development of Virtual Field Trips

Many of the research process components, including the HCP/environmental comparison and the interview process, demonstrate the importance of maintaining a user-friendly, informative, and education-based website.

For instance, the Montgomery County, Virginia, Department of Environmental Protection Environmental Education Specialist Joe Keyser discussed effective programs with the assessor and said that the Department's current outreach emphasis is concentrated in a few key areas, including an education-based website (www.askdep.com), which is a "major component" of the Department's education and outreach efforts.

Furthermore, the San Francisco Department of the Environment Deputy Outreach Manager James Chien informed the assessor that providing and distributing information via an information and education-based website is particularly important in the electronic age, where "printing is perceived more and more as archaic, non-effective, and as a waste of both money and resources." The Department directs citizens to the Internet if they want information. (He noted that the "old argument" about people not having access to the Internet is now negated by easy access through public libraries and other facilities.)

Additionally, the survey indicated that the Internet was in the top four sources from which survey respondents receive public information – 29% of survey respondents most often receive their public information from the Internet.

Development of Mojave Max Curriculum and Teaching Materials and Expansion of the Mojave Max Program

Several research processes, including the teachers' focus groups, the HCP/environmental program comparison, and the interview process indicated the importance of developing Mojave Max science-based curriculum and appropriate teacher materials.

For instance, concerning the San Diego MSCP, an inter-jurisdictional committee (comprised of wildlife agencies and different permittees) oversees the Program; for education efforts, the San Diego MSCP Outreach Subcommittee meets once a month to oversee outreach and educational activities, including the development of science curriculum. The MSCP has also partnered with the Department of Education, and the MSCP Outreach Subcommittee has taken an active role in helping the Department to develop environmental science curriculum. Additionally, the subcommittee visits classrooms when committee members can volunteer, but a more formal exercise has been developing the curriculum so teachers can teach the environmental information without the need for outside volunteers. The subcommittee's work at developing curriculum and working directly with teachers is viewed as a more efficient delivery method than the subcommittee directly reaching the children.

Likewise, the results of the interview process indicated that many of those individuals who are closest to the PIE Program believe the Program has opportunities to capitalize on its existing successes (and with the overwhelming positive comments pertaining to the perceived success of the Mojave Max Program, many interviewees perceive that building upon and expanding this proven component should continually be explored).

Some interviewees, such as Ms. Jane Feldman and Dr. Karin Hoff, both discussed the concept of educating the educators. A step toward realizing this concept is the development of the Mojave Max curriculum and user-friendly materials (such as education guides and lesson plans) that meet school standards, such as the National Science Standards and the Nevada State Standards for K-12 education.

Moreover, the assessor believes the development of curriculum should include the appropriate individuals in the conduct of curriculum development, such as teachers who have experience in the development of resource materials for

science K-12 curriculum and applicable scientists in respect to ensuring science-accurate information.

Again, considering all the components of the Desert Conservation Program, the qualitative research results point to the effectiveness and success of the Mojave Max-related components. For instance, the November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 assessor's report shares the responses of 27 interviews, who, when asked what aspect of the PIE Program has been the most effective in delivering the DCP's messages about conservation, overwhelmingly, interviewees selected the Mojave Max Program as the activity of choice. Interviewees – those closest to the information and education activities of the PIE Program – expressed that one of the great benefits of the Mojave Max Program is that it educates the population where education efforts "have to start," which is with children, as well as providing opportunities for the DCP's messages to be delivered in an interactive settings wherein the messages have greater potential to be understood and retained by the audience.

Additionally, the focus groups with teachers indicated that teachers have a real appetite for receiving species and conservation information to supplement their science, math, and/or social studies curriculum.

Moreover, the teachers have very specific methods for how they would like to receive such information from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program, including a teachers' resource guide, worksheets, and an activity packet to engage students in conservation education. They expressed that their students learn best with interaction, activities, mixing facts with fun, and having information presented visually whenever possible.

What the assessor learned from this research exercise ties into what the assessor also learned during the interview process, wherein the assessor learned from PIE Committee members, including Dr. Karin Hoff and Jane Feldman. For instance, during the interview process, Dr. Hoff discussed the need to develop specific curriculum resources for Clark County educators and informed the assessor that educators are aware of Mojave Max and the Mojave Desert, but they want more information for their science curriculum. "Step one is getting the message out, making sure they're [educators] listening and watching, and that part is developing well since people are working on that in a focused way, but there must be more meat behind Mojave Max. There isn't a substantial development of resources for them [teachers] to hook into," said Dr. Hoff.

The 2003-Clark County-377-P proposes to build on and enhance the environmental education aspects of the Mojave Max Program. Additionally, besides being supported by the research-based results of the assessment, the 2003-Clark County-377-P proposal bases its primary activities/components on

the work of a subcommittee, which was appointed to research and evaluate environmental education programs offered to teachers, and, after a lengthy review and analysis of the programs, offered recommended priorities for the PIE Committee. The 2003-Clark County-377-P proposal components are designed to assist in the implementation of the recommended priorities.

Disadvantages

The research-based results do not suggest disadvantages in regard to the proposed components of 2003-Clark County-377-P. The assessor's recommendations, however, will reflect that beyond a volunteer teaching program, more must be done to put the empowerment of environmental education into the hands of teachers to achieve more efficiency in the delivery of conservation information and the messages of the DCP to achieve program objectives.

To illustrate this point, research of both the Habitat Conservation Plans and the county-run environmental department programs demonstrated that a commonality existed in

that these program managers – with limited staff and budgets – have realized a concept that one manager called the “acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept.” All of these managers have realized they simply cannot conduct what they feel to be effective informational, outreach, and educational efforts on their own, and formal steps have been taken to “teach the teachers” to convey the environmental and conservation information to students.

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends priority funding for the Clark County PIE – Mojave Education Project proposal (2003-Clark County-377-P), and within that proposal, recommends priority funding for the development of the volunteer teaching program, including development of lesson plans, teaching guides, classroom supplies, and curriculum to meet applicable standards (\$30,000), development of additional education components (\$50,000) designed to expand the Mojave Max Program, and development of website components (\$10,000 for development of site and \$40,000 for monitoring/updating website).

By developing the volunteer teaching program, such an activity benefits the DCP as a whole by including more people in the process of providing information and messages to target audiences – by training volunteers, the volunteer teaching program increases the messengers, which, in turn, further assists the DCP in meeting its objectives and expanding the reach to its target audience of children. By enhancing the website, the interactive learning experiences are improved,

such as having real-time images illustrate data such as soil conditions, temperatures, and humidity.

Most importantly, the qualitative research data indicates how these activities are perceived as increasing the awareness and understanding of the value of Clark County’s ecosystems, and informing the recipient audiences about the importance of desert conservation.

3. 2003-PIC-319-P

Based on the assessment, “Development of Intensive PIE Program Targeting Pre-teen and Teenage OHV Users” (2003-PIC-319-P) proposal should be considered a top priority among the PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium.

The detailed scope of work, procedures and deliverables of 2003-PIC-319-P proposes to focus on a special interest group of rural, teenage OHV users with an audience-tailored communication strategy to change the behavior of the audience, which the proposer (Partners in Conservation) has identified as creating “the most damage in the

desert.” The proposal involves creating a video (“of teenagers, by teenager”) as the anchor of a public education program, which would also include both pre- and post-program questionnaire/survey of the target audience, classroom presentation (including video presentation and appropriate speakers), actual demonstrations of appropriate behavior and conservation habits in the desert, and hands-on involvement in restoration projects.

The results of the OHV community and rural community focus groups support the concept of the 2003-PIC-319-P proposal.

In regard to the OHV community focus group results, the OHV focus group participants indicate that the OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not only a challenging group to reach, but are also challenging in terms of this population’s degree of receptiveness to DCP messages, a necessary first step toward achieving a greater respect and protection of the desert environment from this particular population. However, such challenges can be overcome.

Additionally, the OHV focus group served to clear up a misperception that the assessor had about the OHV enthusiasts audience; the assessor had been using the term OHV *community*, as if this is a cohesive group, but during the conduct of the focus group, the assessor learned that the majority of OHV enthusiasts recreating in Clark County are not affiliated with any club and cannot be reached, effectively and efficiently, in any fashion as a collective whole.

Moreover, the assessor learned a similar result from both the OHV focus group and the teachers focus group, which is that producing and distributing messages isn’t just about message content and how a message is delivered, but also about *who* is delivering the messages. Just as the teachers indicated how they respond to their peers, so do the OHV enthusiasts. Their current barriers from being receptive to messages can be overcome by making sure the messages are coming from their peers.

The 2003-PIC-319-P proposal is supported largely by research-based results, especially the “kids talking to kids” aspect, which brings in the effect of peer pressure and meets the research-based recommendation that effective communication to the OHV audience should be peer-based.

As the assessor stated in the February 7, 2004 – March 5, 2004 monthly assessor’s report, efforts to affect OHV users attitudes (i.e., respect for the desert) and behavior (i.e., responsible recreation in the desert) will perhaps prove unsuccessful if the perception issue is not first addressed and resolved.

Likewise, the March 6, 2004 – April 2, 2004 monthly assessor’s report discussed how a similarity emerged among all the focus groups: the focus group participants indicate that they are more receptive to information delivered to them by their peers and peer groups than perceived “outside” individuals, organizations, and agencies.

When the assessor explored whether or not rural residents would accept DCP produced and distributed conservation messages, the participants indicated that they are more likely to be accepting of and receptive to messages if the messages are delivered by their peers – those individuals or organizations that they perceive as “inside” their community and familiar with their needs and issues.

Moreover, the rural community focus group participants explained that traditional mass media methods (such as television, radio and metropolitan newspapers) do not reach the residents of the rural communities.

The March 6, 2004 – April 2, 2004 monthly assessor’s report also states that partnerships, such as the partnership with the rural-based Partners in Conservation, is important in order to effectively deliver conservation messages to the rural audience. The proposer of 2003-PIC-319-P is Partners in Conservation.

In the case of 2003-PIC-319-P, a project is being proposed that would overcome the research-identified challenges by having a communication piece “by

teenagers, for teenagers.” Therefore, the communication barrier issues would (or should) not be an issue given the project’s peer communication concept.

In addition to the peer communication piece (the video), the other components of 2003-PIC-319-P also meet with research-based assessment results, including the classroom presentation (including video presentation and appropriate speakers), actual demonstrations of appropriate behavior and conservation habits in the desert, and hands-on involvement in restoration projects. When the assessor explored with the rural community focus group participants about the best, effective methods of communication to this audience, the focus group participants strongly urged that the DCP conduct outreach (rather than communication via mass media) and present information in an interactive format. The focus group participants emphasized that personal, interactive contact with the rural community would have the greatest potential in terms of effectively delivering conservation messages.

Therefore, 2003-PIC-319-P meets both the recommendation for peer-to-peer (“kids talking to kids”) communication for OHV users and the interactive, hands-on presentation format (rather than the use of mass media) to reach the rural audience.

Disadvantages

The assessor did not determine any disadvantages with 2003-PIC-319-P.

However, the assessor suggests that one aspect of the proposal could be removed/consolidated, which could potentially reduce the funding amount. The proposal

states that two videos would be produced, one for Moapa Valley youth and one for Virgin Valley youth, and videos would be alike except for the use of local youth. Given the costs of video production, one video should be sufficient to achieve the goals of the project. Youth from both Moapa Valley and Virgin Valley could participate in a single video project, rather than having two separate videos scripted, produced, edited, and copied.

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends priority funding for the “Development of Intensive PIE Program Targeting Pre-teen and Teenage OHV Users” (2003-PIC-319-P) proposal (total request of \$77,000.00, which could be reduced by the assessor’s recommendation to remove one of two proposed video productions).

4. 2003-PIC-348-P

Based on the assessment, the “Development of Desert Conservation Week as Educational Pilot Program” (2003-PIC-348-P) proposal should be considered by the PIE Committee as a PIE project to be funded for the 2003-2005 biennium. However, the assessor would suggest some modifications to the proposal, based on research results.

The concept of the proposal is that elementary schools (in the rural communities, as a pilot program) would devote a week to desert conservation learning, which would encompass an assembly, speakers, displays and exhibits, contest, and potentially a field trip. The research-based assessment results support the specific goal of 2003-PIC-348-P, which is to “produce a booklet of appropriate, scientifically-approved and scholastically-approved activities, lessons, and projects for teachers to use to supplement Desert Conservation Week.”

Research results from almost every assessment-process – including the HCP/environmental program comparison, the teachers’ focus group, the survey, and the interview process – support this goal.

HCP/Environmental Comparison Research

The HCP/environmental comparison research supports the concept of both children-targeted conservation education and developing teaching materials and activities.

Cameron Barrows, Director of the Coachella Valley Center for Natural Lands Management and Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard HCP, explained to the assessor that science education has been a focus of the HCP, and the HCP managers believe

they achieve greater “community buy-in” of HCP mission and conservation with the adult population through targeting the student/children population.

The following paragraph is taken from the November 7, 2003 – December 5, 2003 monthly assessor’s report: Mr. Barrows has heard from parents who visit the Preserve that their children took the information home with them after their Preserve field trip, which he believes has achieved a “greater buy-in” of the Preserve and conservation principles. “We need ongoing attitude adjustments that have to be made with the public, and reaching children is the most efficient way, and a better way than heavy-handed law enforcement methods with adults,” said Mr. Barrows. “The effort pays off with their parents and the local community buying into the Preserve and the reason the HCP and Preserve exists. Consequently, it increases the protective envelope around species we’re trying to protect.”

Furthermore, the HCP/environmental program supports efforts to develop and provide teaching materials to teachers, and not just rely on the DCP’s volunteers to conduct the teaching/speaking engagements. In our discussions with the program managers of both the HCPs and the county-run environmental department programs, a commonality existed in that these program managers – with limited staff and budgets – have realized a concept that one manager called the “acting as generals and recruiting soldiers concept.” All of these managers have realized that they simply cannot conduct what they feel to be effective informational, outreach, and educational efforts on their own.

Again, the stated goal of “Development of Desert Conservation Week as Educational Pilot Program” (2003-PIC-348-P) is to produce appropriate, scientifically-approved and scholastically-approved activities, lessons, and projects for teachers to use to teach species and desert conservation (and incorporate DCP messages).

Once developed, approved, and produced, these types of teaching materials can be used by the teachers without requiring the volunteers of the PIE Program to deliver the DCP’s messages. In other words, this type of activity benefits the DCP as a whole by including more people in the process of providing information and messages to target audiences – by providing teaching materials to teachers and allowing them to implement lessons and activities directly to their students (without the reliance of volunteers to teach DCP messages), this increases the DCP’s messengers, which, in turn, further assists the DCP in meeting its objectives and expanding the reach to its target audience of children.

Teachers’ Focus Group and Survey Results

One of the primary results of the teachers’ focus group research was that teachers have a real appetite for receiving species and conservation information to supplement their science, math, and/or social studies curriculum. The teachers also expressed specific desires for species and desert conservation-related teaching materials, including a

teachers' resource guide, worksheets, and an activity packet to engage students in conservation education. They expressed that their students learn best with interaction, activities, mixing facts with fun, and having information presented visually whenever possible.

The survey results also support the importance of receiving species and desert conservation information through settings as proposed in 2003-PIC-348-P. The survey revealed that 94% of respondents had seen or heard messages that encourage conservation, including "respect, protect, and enjoy." Of these respondents, 18% had heard or seen these messages at school, which should seem high in the context that only 7% of the survey respondents were school-

age. Also of important note, 92% of respondents are very likely (75%) or likely (17%) to pay attention to information their children bring home to them.

Interview Process

The interview process also revealed a desire to develop more species and desert conservation materials for teachers, and some interviewees discussed that the School Curriculum Auxiliary Team (SCAT) was an important process that commenced, but did not reach fruition. Perhaps 2003-PIC-348-P is an opportunity to continue this pursuit. PIE Committee member Dr. Karin Hoff discussed developing more resources for "teachers to hook into." Dr. Hoff explained that the SCAT group "really did its work, but failed to follow-up." Likewise, PIE Committee member Jane Feldman was involved in the SCAT process, designed to create educational opportunities to reach target audiences, particularly children. Ms. Feldman argued that the SCAT task should be revisited, and the focus group research supports the assertion that teachers would like to see specific species and conservation information, accompanied by worksheets and activities, come from the Clark County Desert Conservation Program.

Moreover, the impetus behind 2003-PIC-348-P appears to be the SCAT process. The proposal makes note of the PIE Committee efforts, which were devoted to the SCAT Program and determining how species and ecosystem conservation could best be incorporated into Clark County's education system.

Potential Modifications to the Proposal

As previously stated, the research-based assessment results support the concept and specific goal of 2003-PIC-348-P, but the assessor would also suggest some modification to the proposal. For one, the proposal states that the funding request (a total of \$20,500) includes money to hire a professional to select lessons and activities to be made into a booklet for teachers to use at their discretion.

Rather than a contracted professional, the research-based assessment results suggest the best way to select and develop audience-appropriate activities and materials is to

involve the audience in such development. In the case of developing the teaching materials, as proposed in 2003-PIC-348-P, the assessor recommends involving educators in the creation of these materials, but also involving appropriate scientists to ensure science-accurate information, as well as PIE Committee members to ensure that desired DCP messages are incorporated into the materials and activities. In other words, rather than using an outside contractor to develop the teaching materials, it is better to involve a work group/team/committee of individuals who would have the most valuable input into the process in order to create a marriage between meeting the needs of

educators (and creating *user-friendly* materials and *desired* materials, such as lesson plans, worksheets, handouts, and specific activities), ensuring science-accurate information, and incorporating DCP messages to meet DCP-stated objectives. This same committee can also help develop and/or recommend the Conservation Week activities, such as exhibits and displays.

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends that the PIE Committee consider funding the “Development of Desert Conservation Week as Educational Pilot Program” (2003-PIC-348-P) proposal (total request of \$20,500.00, which could be reduced by the assessor’s recommendation to utilize a work group/committee rather than an outside contractor to help develop activities and materials).

5. 2003-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P

Of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium, the assessor has provided research-based reasons to recommend prioritization of each proposal and/or components of the proposals. The only PIE project proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium that the assessor cannot recommend for priority funding is Wetlands Park Interpretive Exhibits (2002-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P) as the research-based results have not produced information to suggest the main component of this proposal – designing, producing, and installing interpretive exhibits within the Clark County Wetlands Park – is a prudent method of communicating DCP messages to target audiences. The 2002-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P has a total budget of \$73,500.00 (and a matching grant would be submitted by Clark County to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation).

Advantages

The proposal does state and explain that the purpose of the exhibits would be to encourage respect, protection, and enjoyment of natural ecosystems in Clark County; and through education, to increase public understanding and awareness of the value of Clark County’s natural ecosystems.

Disadvantages

In careful review and analysis of all research-based assessment results, including the interview process, HCP/environmental program comparison, focus groups, and survey results, the assessor could not determine any research-based reasons to recommend interpretive exhibits. The HCP/environmental program comparison research did not demonstrate this type of project as a

potentially “effective” public information or outreach method, and the interview process, focus groups, and survey research did not indicate a (perceived) need for this type of public information tool.

Moreover, the charge of the assessor has been to identify program components known to be effective (HCP/environmental program research), analyzing the effectiveness of PIE efforts (interview process, focus groups, and surveys), and using that information in the review of public information and education proposals. Based on this charge and the results of the assessment research, the assessor cannot recommend priority funding for the expenditure of \$73,500.00 on the design, production, and installation of interpretive exhibits at the Clark County Wetlands Park as a PIE-project. On face value, the proposal certainly exhibits educational merit (for Wetlands Park visitors), and the assessor recommends that the proposer investigate and seek funding from other sources.

Final Note – Recommendation for Continued Assessment

Just as the assessor has conducted a process-model, research-based assessment, such assessment efforts should not cease upon receipt of the assessor’s final recommendations report this summer. As with any program, constant monitoring, evaluation, and assessment are required to ensure the program is meeting its stated objectives and reaching its target audiences in a meaningful and effective manner.

Perhaps the most important research-based results from the assessor will not be the evaluation of past or existing activities, but a more forward-based direction to the DCP and its partners as to the best public outreach methods which the DCP and its partners should be employing to most effectively reach their target audiences.

The assessor has recommended and conducted a mix of both qualitative (interviews, focus groups) and quantitative (survey) elements to evaluate and assess the program to produce results which can be implemented in directing future program activities and helping to identify proposals and proposal components worth funding.

This process is not unique to the Clark County Desert Conservation Program. Conducting surveys to determine the most effective way to communicate with publics is employed by agencies such as the United States Department of Agriculture. The

Department's 1998 "Needs Assessment Survey" reflects that determining effective educational outreach methods was deemed critical by the Department in order to "ensure that technology and information are

transferred...in a meaningful and accepted manner." Due to the survey, the Department was able to determine that outreach tools such as one- to two-page fact sheets, "How To" informational brochures, and workshops were more effective educational outreach components (for their audiences) than posters, interactive videos, and CD-ROMs. The survey also helped the Department determine that information pieces must be tailored to different audiences (i.e., the survey indicated that certain audiences are more "technically oriented" than other audiences). The Department used the survey results to prioritize educational outreach methods and direct the development of Department-produced informational materials, training, and technology.¹³

Moreover, the interview process made sure that those individuals most closely linked to the Desert Conservation Program, either as participants on the PIE Committee, or as partners or close observers in regard to PIE activities, have had input into the process. The process-oriented research approach has also included assessor-observation of some PIE activities, evaluation of specific communication pieces, analysis of expenditures, and comparison of other related HCP and environmental programs. Some of PIE's audiences were specifically spoken to as well (in a focus group format) to elicit perceptions, opinions, and suggestions from a *target* audience in a setting which allows for open, unfettered communication. The focus groups yielded suggestions for how to potentially improve methods for reaching an audience, both in terms of message production (referring to the content and tone of messages to address how receptive an audience is to the messages) and delivery (including where and how to reach the target audience) – and if barriers exist in such lines of communication – suggestions are offered as to how to overcome the challenges.

The final component of the assessment will be the final report, with recommendations formulated and based upon the research-based results. Moreover, the assessor has been asked to participate in finalizing some of PIE's strategic planning efforts. Overall, this process-oriented, research-based assessment, with a mix of both qualitative and quantitative elements, as well as some of the assessor's objective, professional judgments, has allowed for a comprehensive assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program's Public Information and Education Program, as well as PIE projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium. The assessor recommends that the DCP continue to assess its public information and education activities, at least on a periodic (perhaps annual) basis to ensure that objectives continue to be met, target

¹³ United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry. *Urban Forest Health Needs Assessment Survey: Results and Recommendations*. January 1998. St. Paul, Minnesota.

audiences continue to be reached, and proposals with proven effective components are evaluated and funded accordingly.

SUB-Appendix A

Survey Instrument - For the Clark County Fair, April 8-11, 2004

**Note: The survey administrator's script is *italicized*.
The survey administrator's instructions are in CAPS.**

Hello. We're conducting a survey to evaluate and improve a desert conservation public information and education program. Your opinions are very valuable to this process. We are not selling anything and will not ask your name. If you live here in Clark County, could I please take about 3 to 4 minutes of your time? >>>>>>IF YES, CONTINUE >>>>>>>IF NO: Thank you. Have a good time at the fair.

SCREENER QUESTION:

Q1. Do you live in Clark County?

- | | |
|---------|---------------------------|
| 1 – Yes | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 2 – No | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

IF PERSON LIVES IN CLARK COUNTY, PROCEED:

Thank you. Please answer each of the following questions to the best of your ability. As a survey administrator, I will not be able to explain questions further than how they are written on the survey.

**Q2. How important is it to you to respect and protect the desert in Clark County?
READ CHOICES**

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 - Very Important | |
| 2 - Important | |
| 3 - Somewhat Important | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 4 - Not Important | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

**Q3. From which sources do you most often receive public information?
READ CHOICES. THE RESPONDENT MAY CHOOSE MORE THAN ONE.**

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 - Public events and/or meetings | |
| 2 - Internet and/or email | |
| 3 - Mail | |
| 4 - Newspaper | |
| 5 - Radio | |
| 6 - Television | |
| 7 - Other | [12 – Don't Know] |
| 8 - None of the above | [13 – Refuse / No Answer] |

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERED “NEWSPAPER,” ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

**Q3. (a) What kind of newspaper do you receive information from?
READ CHOICES**

- 1 – *Las Vegas Review Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*
- 2 – A small, community, and/or rural newspaper
- 3 – Other [12 – Don’t Know]
- 4 – None of the above [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q4. I’m going to name different sources of information. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rank how much you trust each source. “5” means that you trust it very much and “1” means that you do not trust it at all.

READ AND MARK EACH ITEM ONE AT A TIME.

- _____ Federal Government [12 – Don’t Know]
[13 – Refuse / No Answer]
- _____ State Government
- _____ Clark County
- _____ Town Board or Citizen Advisory Council
- _____ Community-based organization
- _____ Clark County School District
- _____ Academic source, such as a scientist or college professor
- _____ Local television news
- _____ *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*
- _____ Small, community, and/or rural newspaper
- _____ Internet and/or email
- _____ Peer or colleague, such as a neighbor or co-worker

Q5. Please rate your awareness level of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program and/or the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan? Would you say that you are... READ CHOICES

- 1 – Very aware
- 2 – Aware
- 3 – Somewhat aware [12 – Don't Know]
- 4 – Not aware [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q6. Have you ever heard of the Mojave Max Program?

- 1 – Yes [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – No [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS “YES,” ASK THE QUESTION:

Q6 (a). Have you heard...

- 1 – A lot about it
- 2 – A little about it [12 – Don't Know]
- 3 – Or you just remember hearing about it [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q7. Have you heard or seen messages that encourage conservation, such as to “respect, protect, and enjoy” the desert?

- 1 – Yes [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – No [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS “YES,” ASK THE QUESTION:

Q7 (a). Where do you remember seeing or hearing those messages?

READ CHOICES. RESPONDENT MAY CHOOSE MORE THAN ONE.

- 1 - Billboard
- 2 - Public events and/or meetings
- 3 - Internet and/or email
- 4 - Mailing
- 5 - *Las Vegas Review Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*
- 6 - School
- 7 - Small, community, or rural newspaper
- 8 - Radio
- 9 - Television [12 – Don't Know]

10 - Other

[13 – Refuse / No Answer]

Q8. Please name the best method of communication for you to receive public information? Name the best choice out of the following...

READ CHOICES. CIRCLE ONLY ONE.

- 1 - Billboard
- 2 - Public events
- 3 - Face-to-face presentation, such as a town hall meeting
- 4 - Internet and/or email
- 5 - Mailing, such as receiving a flyer or newsletter
- 6 - *Las Vegas Review Journal* or *Las Vegas Sun*
- 7 - Radio Advertisements or Public Service Announcements
- 8 - Small, community, or rural newspaper
- 9 - Television Advertisements or Public Service Announcements

[12 – Don't Know]

[13 – Refuse/No Answer]

Q9. If you were to receive a free giveaway item at an event with a conservation message printed on the item, what kind of item would you most likely keep and use?

READ CHOICES. CIRCLE ONLY ONE. IF "OTHER" IS CHOSEN, ASK WHAT THE "OTHER ITEM" IS AND WRITE THE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER.

- 1 - Clothing items such as a t-shirt or hat
- 2 - Can cooler or bottle buddy
- 3 - Tools such as a screwdriver or ruler
- 4 - Litterbag
- 5 - Magnet
- 6 - Car sunshade
- 7 - Zipper pull
- 8 - Other: _____

[12 – Don't Know]

[13 – Refuse / No Answer]

We're almost finished. I just need to ask a few demographic questions.

Q10. _____ What city or town within Clark County do you live in? WRITE THE CITY OR TOWN IN THE BLANK SPACE TO THE LEFT OF THE QUESTION.

-more-

Q11. What is your age? READ AGE CATEGORIES.

- 1 - 18 years of age or younger
- 2 - 19 to 35 years of age
- 3 - 36 to 54 years of age [12 – Don't Know]
- 4 - 55 + years of age [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT IS OVER THE AGE OF 18, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

Q11 (a). Do you have a child or children who currently live with you?

- 1 – Yes [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – No [13 – Refuse / No Answer]

IF THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS “YES,” ASK THE QUESTION:

Q11 (b). How likely are you to pay attention to information your child or children bring home to you?

- 1 – Very likely [12 – Don't Know]
- 2 – Likely [13 – Refuse / No Answer]
- 3 – Somewhat likely
- 4 – Not likely

Those are all of our questions. Thank you so much for your time. Have a nice day/evening.

PLEASE FILL OUT AFTER FINISHING WITH RESPONDENT:

RECORD GENDER – CIRCLE ONE: 1 – Male 2 – Female

DATE OF INTERVIEW: April _____, 2004

APPROXIMATE TIME OF INTERVIEW: _____ AM / PM

NAME OF SURVEY ADMINISTRATOR: _____

SUB-Appendix B

Prioritization of Clark County Desert Conservation Program PIE Projects Proposed for the 2003-2005 Biennium

Outline Version of Report

In prioritizing the Clark County Desert Conservation Program Public Information and Education (PIE) projects proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium, the assessor reviewed and prioritized the following five proposals:

2003-Clark County-373-P
2003-Clark County-377-P
2003-PIC-319-P
2003-PIC-348-P
2003-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P

This outline version of the prioritization report lists the assessor recommendations in priority order:

1. 2003-Clark County-373-P

Media Campaign

- Produces cost benefits in reaching target audiences with strategically planned and executed media campaign and negotiated media packages.
- Research demonstrates that PSAs are effective in getting out messages.
- HCP/environmental programs research: mass media advertising was cited as “effective” component of programs.
- Interviewees perceive the benefits of a concerted media campaign (the majority said that television and radio were the most effective media in delivering the DCP’s messages about conservation).
- The focus group results: teachers’ perceived the Mojave Max Program’s positive results through television coverage.
- The survey reaffirmed the importance of using mass media to convey messages – 56% of the respondents stated that they most often receive information from television, followed by newspapers (48%), radio (32%).

Mojave Max Emergence Contest

- HCP/environmental programs research reveals benefits of educational activities – specifically directed at children.
- Interviewees were exceptionally bullish on the Mojave Max Program – many suggested capitalizing on its success and expanding the program.

- Assessor observation: immediate evidence of conservation learning at activities (engaging presentations that include props and verbal quizzing).
- Teachers' Focus Groups – MM Program perceived as “authentic learning” and “personalizing” the desert for students, making them more apt to respect their environment as a result of the Program.
- Survey: 53% of survey respondents (93% of whom were adults) have heard of the MM Program; adults are more likely to have heard of the program if they have children in their household. Also of importance is the fact that 75% of respondents are very likely to pay attention to information that their children bring home to them.

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends priority funding for the Clark County MSHCP Proposal (2003-Clark County-373-P), and within that proposal, recommends priority funding for the media (\$140,000) and Mojave Max Program (\$100,000) components.

2. 2003-Clark County-377-P

Website Enhancement and Development of Virtual Field Trips

- Many of the research process components, including the HCP/environmental comparison and the interview process, demonstrate the importance of maintaining a user-friendly, informative, and education-based website (*see full report for details*).

Development of Mojave Max Curriculum and Teaching Materials and Expansion of the Mojave Max Program

- Several research processes, including the teachers' focus groups, the HCP/environmental program comparison, and the interview process indicated the importance of developing Mojave Max science-based curriculum and appropriate teacher materials. (*see full report for details*)

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends priority funding for the Clark County PIE – Mojave Education Project proposal (2003-Clark County-377-P), and within that proposal, recommends priority funding for the development of the volunteer teaching program, including development of lesson plans, teaching guides, classroom supplies, and curriculum to meet applicable standards (\$30,000), development of additional education components (\$50,000) designed to expand the Mojave Max Program,

and development of website components (\$10,000 for development of site and \$40,000 for monitoring/updating website).

3. 2003-PIC-319-P

- The results of the OHV community and rural community focus groups support the concept of the 2003-PIC-319-P proposal.
- 2003-PIC-319-P meets both the recommendation for peer-to-peer (“kids talking to kids”) communication for OHV users and the interactive, hands-on presentation format to reach the rural audience.

Recommendation

Based on the research-based assessment results, the assessor recommends priority funding for the “Development of Intensive PIE Program Targeting Pre-teen and Teenage OHV Users” (2003-PIC-319-P) proposal (total request of \$77,000.00, which could be reduced by the assessor’s recommendation to remove one of two proposed video productions).

4. 2003-PIC-348-P

- HCP/environmental research supports the concept of both children-targeted conservation education and developing teaching materials.
- Focus groups results: teachers have a need/desire for receiving species and desert conservation-related teaching materials.
- The survey results also support the importance of receiving species and desert conservation information through settings as proposed in 2003-PIC-348-P (*see full report for details*).
- Interviewees discussed that the School Curriculum Auxiliary Team (SCAT) was an important process that commenced, but did not reach fruition. The impetus behind 2003-PIC-348-P appears to be the SCAT process.

Recommendation

The assessor recommends that the PIE Committee consider funding the “Development of Desert Conservation Week as Educational Pilot Program” (2003-PIC-348-P) proposal (total request of \$20,500.00, which could be reduced by the assessor’s recommendation to utilize a work group/committee rather than an outside contractor to help develop activities and materials).

5. 2003-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P

The only PIE project proposed for the 2003-2005 biennium that the assessor cannot recommend for priority funding is Wetlands Park Interpretive Exhibits (2002-CC-Parks_Rec-391-P) as the research-based results have not produced information to suggest the main component of this proposal is a prudent method of communicating DCP messages to target audiences. (*see report for details*)

APPENDIX J

Monthly Report
May 8, 2004 – June 4, 2004

Prepared by:
Strategic Solutions
3275 S. Jones Blvd., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89146
(702) 889-2840

Summary

As the assessor has begun working on the final assessment report (a working draft will be ready for the July 2004 PIE Committee meeting, and the final version is anticipated by August 2004), this report is the last monthly update report and details the final focus group, comprised of desert recreation enthusiasts. The focus group was held on May 27, 2004, at 6:00 p.m. at the Clark County Government Center. Nine desert recreation enthusiasts, representing various interests such as hiking, camping, fishing, running, and horseback riding, participated in the focus group.

The assessor began the focus group session by inquiring about the participants' backgrounds, their use of the desert and their perceptions of other desert users, and their knowledge of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP) and its activities and messages.

The assessor established that the focus group participants are frequent desert users, many of whom stated that they often recreate with friends or in groups, such as with members of outdoor recreation clubs.

When the discussion turned toward perceptions about other desert users (what the participants witness while recreating in the desert), the focus group participants expressed that the infrequent or casual ("non-serious") individual recreating in the desert is more likely to exhibit irresponsible behavior (such as littering or leaving off-trail tracks) in the desert than frequent outdoor recreation enthusiasts. Focus group participants emphasized that serious enthusiasts are responsible and respectful desert users. All of the participants agreed that the further out from major roads (typically a mile or more) in the desert one recreates, the less likely that the sight of litter or vandalism would appear. The focus group participants perceive that desert-damaging problems result from the behavior of infrequent, irresponsible desert users, not frequent, serious desert recreation enthusiasts.

Regarding the discussion about DCP activities and messages, the assessor ascertained that most participants support what the DCP is currently doing in terms of reaching children (“when behavior is learned”) with the Mojave Max Program. A number of participants were familiar with the Mojave Max Program and its conservation education-related outreach efforts targeting Clark County youth, and they also seemed to support and encourage these efforts.

As with all of the focus groups conducted for the assessment, the assessor concentrated the discussions on how to best communicate with the target audience, as the assessor believes this aspect is the most valuable and useful information that can be yielded from these focused research sessions. With the desert recreation enthusiast focus group, participants suggested numerous ways to reach desert users (*please see pages 7-8 for details*). In evaluating these suggestions, the assessor found participants’ ideas to be constructive and sound, as well as focused on the target audience of desert users, and, for the most part, not likely to be onerous or costly for the DCP to implement. At the very least, these suggestions are certainly worth discussion and consideration by the PIE Committee.

Although numerous ideas were offered and discussed by the focus group participants, the prevalent ideas and suggestions for effectively and efficiently communicating with desert users are: 1) reaching desert users at an early (school) age – through conservation education and outreach – during the critical stages of life when “behavior is learned”; 2) conducting outreach in a very focused and targeted manner – reaching desert users at locations where they are recreating or are likely to be recreating (i.e., at trailhead points and during desert activities and outdoor events); and 3) implementing cost-effective means such as taking advantage of communication vehicles utilized by outdoor recreation clubs, including newsletters (participants recommend submitting articles), websites, email networks and “blasts,” and speaking engagements at club meetings (according to the focus group participants, most outdoor recreation clubs would welcome information and/or involvement from the DCP).

Furthermore, when asked to identify challenges that the DCP faces in reaching those people recreating in the desert in Clark County, *communication* was named as the greatest challenge. How to overcome the challenge? Reaching youth through education – the Mojave Max Program – was emphasized as a way to overcome the challenge. Also, the focus group participants described desert users as a very *targeted/specific* audience, and, therefore, focus group participants suggested that targeting the general, adult Clark County population might prove to be an ineffective and inefficient method of reaching desert users in Clark County.

Participants Background

Nine desert recreation enthusiasts (residing and primarily recreating in Clark County) participated in the focus group:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Primary Desert Recreation Interests</u>
Edward Dodrill	Horseback Riding
Fred Ehrlich	Multi-use, Fishing, Hiking
Marcia Forkos	Hiking
Lou Godino	Horseback Riding, Camping
J.R. Hanson	Fishing, Camping
Janet Jackson	Hiking, Backpacking
David McNeill	Running
Jack Sawyer	Skiing (cross-county, downhill), Hiking, Camping
Peppe Sotomayor	Camping, Hiking

Please note: Focus group participants were recruited from various outdoor-recreation clubs or organizations operating in southern Nevada (a similar recruitment method was used for the previously conducted OHV focus group). The assessor used lists of clubs that had been printed in previous *Living* sections (the “Out There” feature) in *The Las Vegas Review-Journal* and the outdoor groups listed in the newspaper’s online *Community Link*. Undoubtedly, there are some clubs that were not contacted because the assessor was unfamiliar with them and/or the clubs were not contained on the lists referenced by the assessor. However, as reflected below, numerous clubs representing varied outdoor recreation interests were contacted, providing a sufficient recruitment base. The following clubs or organizations were invited to participate (those in bold had a representative(s) participate in the focus group):

- Archaeo-Nevada Society
- Around the Bend Friends (age 50+ interested in outdoor activities)
- Bass Fishing Central
- Cactus Bandits Camping Club
- Camping Coyotes
- Color Country Equestrian Club (Utah-based, but with Nevada members)
- **Horse Council of Nevada**
- Lake Mead Boat Owners Association
- **Las Vegas Fly Fishing Club**
- Las Vegas Mountaineers Club
- Las Vegas Ski and Sports Club
- Las Vegas Track Club

- **Las Vegas Trailblazers**
- Las Vegas Valley Bicycle Club
- Nevada Chapter of Family Campers and Rvers

- Red Rock Audubon Society
- **Sierra Club (Outings Group)**
- Southern Nevada Gem and Mineral Society
- **Southern Nevada Regional Trails Partnership**
- Vegas Bass
- Vegas Hobos (camping)

Participants' Background / Desert Recreation Use

- Do you often recreate in the desert alone, with family or friends, or with groups and/or club members?
- How often would you say that you recreate in the desert – daily, weekly, once a month?
- Please let us know how long you have been an outdoor recreation enthusiast in southern Nevada.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Alone or Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>How Long in S. NV</u>
Edward Dodrill	Group	2-4 times a month	32 years
Fred Ehrlich	-	2-3 times a month	42 years
Marcia Forkos	Friends	Once a week	33 years
Lou Godino	-	2-3 times a week	12 years
J.R. Hanson	Group	70-80 days a year	42 years
Janet Jackson	Friends/Group	Twice a week	8 years
David McNeill	Group & alone	Twice a week	1.5 years
Jack Sawyer	Club members	Weekly	36 years
Peppe Sotomayor	Leading hikes	3-4 times a week	32 years

- In terms of desert conservation, how would you describe your recreation use of the desert, such as any steps you take to recreate in the desert responsibly or respectfully?

[Using a focus group research technique, the assessor had all participants write down their answers before they responded.]

Typical answers from the focus group participants were “pack it in, pack it out,” “leave no trace,” “do not disturb [the desert],” and “stay on trails” or “follow trails.”

Additionally, two of the focus group participants emphasized that they pass on what they know, in terms of the importance of desert conservation, to other outdoor recreation enthusiasts. Sharing an anecdote, Mr. Godino explained how he and other horseback enthusiasts have scolded someone caught littering. He implied that it is the

few, not the many, who irresponsibly litter in the desert. Mr. Sotomayor said that he teaches others to keep the desert “clean and natural,” and Ms. Forkos stated that those recreating in the desert should “learn a little botany” and become aware of the fragility of the desert ecosystem.

Finally, the focus group participants provided very specific examples of conservation-related projects and activities that they participate in, including working on improving trail systems, conducting desert cleanups, removing vehicle tracks, assisting government agencies with signage, picking up others’ trash, checking water holes for wild horses, using weed-free feed when horseback riding (and picking up manure where it is posted to do so), and participating in conservation trips, re-vegetations programs, volunteer opportunities, wash cleanups, adopt-a-highway, and more.

- Now that you have described your personal use in a conservation sense, describe your perceptions of other outdoor desert users in terms of how they use and recreate in the desert. In a conservation sense, do they practice responsible use and/or respect of the desert environment? If yes, how so?

The focus group participants seemed to reach a general consensus in their answers to this particular question. The focus group participants contend that the further one recreates from the road, the more responsible use of the desert is evident. In other words, it appears that the more serious desert recreation enthusiasts (the people more likely to be recreating a considerable distance from the roads) display a greater respect and appreciation of the desert environment.

General Impressions and DCP Message Distribution

- Now, I would like to ask you your general impressions of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program by asking you a very general question, “What do you think of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program?” If you are not familiar with the program, please state that, too.
- Have you heard, seen, or read messages produced or distributed by the DCP?

Although the focus group participants were not familiar with the program name, The Clark County Desert Conservation Program, and, therefore, did not have

general impressions to share, many of the focus group participants were familiar with the Mojave Max Program.

Five of the focus group participants discussed the Mojave Max Program. Mr. Sotomayor was familiar with how the Mojave Max Program targets school-age children and teaches

them about the importance of desert conservation. Ms. Jackson became familiar with the Mojave Max Program at the Red Rock Visitor's Center. Mr. Sawyer was familiar with Mojave Max as a school program, as well as from the Red Rock Visitor's Center and from KNPR Radio. Moreover, he knew of the Program's "parallel with Punxsutawney Phil" and how the tortoise's emergence is tied to the coming of spring. Mr. McNeill said that he had been the recipient of Mojave Max products (including a key chain, a sticker, and a zipper pull), and he recalled that these particular products had messages printed on them that conveyed a "protect your environment" type of message.

Mr. Hanson indicated that he was familiar with Clark County's conservation efforts from watching Clark County Cable Channel 4, and he remembered hearing messages that asked people to "protect and preserve" the desert. He could not remember the exact phrase, "Respect, Protect, and Enjoy," but it was apparent to the assessor that he was trying to recall this particular message.

Two of the participants could not recall hearing about any DCP activities or programs or hearing or seeing any DCP-produced/distributed messages or any other local conservation messages for that matter.

- In your opinion, how might the DCP improve reaching desert recreation enthusiasts with its messages?
[Using a focus group research technique, the assessor had all participants write down their answers before they responded.]

The focus group participants spent a couple of minutes thinking about their responses and wrote down their answers before sharing their ideas – this process seemed to produce a myriad of constructive suggestions.

The most common suggestion was for the DCP to utilize communication materials produced and distributed by the numerous outdoor recreation clubs operating in southern Nevada. These communication vehicles include newsletters, magazines, websites, chat forums, email, information sheets, and bulletins. The assessor asked if the clubs and their leadership would be receptive to receiving and printing information from the DCP, and the focus group participants agreed that the clubs would be receptive (and, in fact, are usually looking for material). But the exception to this contention was Mr. McNeill, part of

the leadership of Las Vegas Trailblazers (with over 500 members), who imparted that the Trailblazers leadership is "skeptical" and carefully reviews and considers material before distributing information to members. However, Mr. McNeill offered that he could accept information from the DCP and present it to the club's leadership for them to make a decision on whether or not to distribute the information to club members.

Also, focus group participants expressed that it is important to reach desert users where they are recreating or where they are likely to be recreating (i.e., posting messages near trail head signs, sponsoring outdoor recreation activities, and practicing public relations by having a presence at outdoor events and desert cleanup-type activities). “Sponsor what desert users are interested in,” said Mr. McNeill. Additionally, Mr. Godino suggested reaching desert users at appropriate events, such as reaching approximately 9,000 youthful desert enthusiasts at Farm Day at Horseman’s Park in September 2004.

Three of the focus group participants indicated that the DCP is already doing what it should be doing in terms of having a school outreach program – the Mojave Max Program. One participant said that students should be reached at the younger elementary school level, while another participant said that all school levels should be targeted.

Moreover, three of the focus group participants had PSAs on their list of suggestions. Mr. Dodrill suggested that radio PSAs are more effective than television PSAs (which are “aired too late at night”); Ms. Forkos stated that PSAs must be clever to garner attention; and Mr. Sawyer suggested that PSAs would be effective if they featured testimonials from “responsible desert users.”

Other advisements: Mr. Godino suggested advertising in the community newspapers (*The View*) inserted into *The Las Vegas Review-Journal* and *Las Vegas Sun*; Mr. Dodrill said that the Clark County website was a good source for information, and Mr. Hanson said the same about Clark County Cable Channel 4; and both Mr. Hanson and Mr. Dodrill suggested that outdoor recreation clubs and organizations typically welcome guest speakers at their meetings.

Overcoming Issues/Challenges

- In your opinion, what is the biggest issue facing the DCP in terms of reaching Clark County residents who recreate in the desert?

All focus group participants agreed that “communication” is the biggest challenge faced by the DCP.

- How might this challenge that you identified be overcome?

Although there was consensus among the focus group participants that “communication” was the greatest challenge, their ideas on how to overcome this challenge were diverse.

Some participants suggested that beyond performing outreach to schools, the DCP should be involved in developing “conservation curriculum” as part of elementary school-level science education. “You have to reach people at the point when they learn behavior,” said Mr. Hanson.

Ms. Jackson expressed a similar contention when she expressed that for the DCP to achieve “long-term” success, the DCP must have a “continuous” presence in the school system to “instill” in youth an “awareness of their ecosystem.”

Some focus group participants emphasized that the DCP would probably not be effective or efficient by spending money reaching the general, adult Clark County population since many Clark County residents are not desert users and perhaps never venture into the desert. Rather, focus group participants expressed that desert users are a specific, target audience and should be treated as such (further suggesting that the DCP should utilize targeted communication vehicles as previously identified and discussed by the focus group participants).

Finally, some participants indicated that people might not know the difference between responsible use of the desert and irresponsible use; they recommended that the DCP should demonstrate responsible use. (Mr. Sawyer previously suggested that PSAs or advertisements should feature testimonials and/or demonstrations by responsible desert users.)

SUB-Appendix A

Focus Group – Desert Recreation Enthusiasts

**Thursday, May 27, 2004, 6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
Clark County Government Center, Mesa Room**

Introductions

I'm Sean Ross, and with me today is Vicki Gonzales. We are with a company called Strategic Solutions, and we are conducting an objective assessment of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program (DCP), specifically related to the Program's public information and education work.

Purpose

This focus group is a major part of the assessment process, which involves conducting evaluative research to determine and assess the effectiveness of the DCP's production and delivery of conservation messages and information.

Disclosure

I first want to tell you that we will include in our report the names of those who participated today and what clubs you represent to show that we have talked with a diverse group of desert recreation enthusiasts, but for much of the report, we will not be sharing any information that is identified to specific individuals. In other words, we will develop a report that summarizes the focus group to provide the Desert Conservation Program with an idea of how they might improve the way they communicate with those people who enjoy recreating in the desert.

Also, if it is OK with everyone here, I would like to audio record the focus group just to make it easier for our company in our reporting. This audiotape would be for Strategic Solutions, not Clark County. Additionally, Vicki will be taking notes, as well as helping me conduct the focus group.

Also, in case you are wondering why we do not have any motorized-recreation enthusiasts in this group, it is because we have previously held an off-highway vehicle enthusiasts' focus group since the amount of people interested in participating necessitated holding a separate focus group.

Process

The focus group will take about an hour, and if you need to, the restrooms are located between this outside hallway and the elevators. Please help yourself to the water bottles.

The notepads are for you to use to write down your thoughts as I ask questions so that we can obtain your personal, initial thoughts on every question. With some questions, I

will give everyone time to write down their answers before we ask you to read what you have written down.

I would like to go over ground rules before we proceed. Really, the only one is that we ask you to please not talk over each other or interrupt each other as we go. We will go around the table on each question to make sure we hear from everyone, and if you have something to say out of turn, please raise your hand and wait until I acknowledge you.

Participants' Background / Desert Recreation Use

I would like to begin by asking everyone to:

Q-1.

- Introduce yourself;
 - Tell us what type of desert recreation you are mostly involved in, such as hiking, mountain biking, camping, horseback riding, etc.;
- and*
- Do you often recreate in the desert alone, with family or friends, or with groups and/or club members?

Just a few more questions about how you use the desert...

Q-2.

- How often would you say that you recreate in the desert – daily, weekly, once a month?
 - Let us know if you are a member of an outdoor recreation-type club and, if so, tell us which club(s);
- and*
- Please let us know how long you have been an outdoor recreation enthusiast in southern Nevada.

Now that we have established how you use the desert in terms of recreation, I now want to find out how you use the desert in terms of desert conservation...

Q-3.

[Have all participants write down answer before asking for their answers.] In terms of desert conservation, how would you describe your recreation use of the desert, such as any steps you take to recreate in the desert responsibly or respectfully?

Q-4.

Now that you have described your personal use in a conservation sense, describe your perceptions of your peers – other outdoor recreation enthusiasts – in terms of how they use and recreate in the desert. In other words, in a conservation sense, do they practice responsible use and/or respect of the desert environment? If yes, how so?

General Impressions

Q-5.

Now, I would like to ask you your general impressions of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program by asking you a very general question, “What do you think of the Clark County Desert Conservation Program?” If you are not familiar with the program, please state that, too.

DCP Message Distribution

Q-6.

Have you heard, seen, or read messages produced or distributed by the DCP?

If yes...

Q-7.

Where have you seen, heard, or read messages from the DCP? Please discuss what you heard, saw, or read.

Q-8.

Do you perceive that the DCP is effective in reaching Clark County residents who recreate in the desert? If no, please explain why you do not think that the DCP is effective in reaching Clark County residents who recreate in the desert.

Q-9.

[Have all participants write down answer before asking for their answers.] In your opinion, how might the DCP improve reaching desert recreation enthusiasts with its messages?

Q-10.

If you are a member of a club, what is the best way for the DCP to reach your particular club?

If yes...

Q-11.

Do you think that your club (leadership) would be willing to accept information from the DCP and distribute to the membership?

DCP Message Content/Tone

Q-12.

If you have heard or seen messages delivered by the DCP, what message or messages do you recall hearing or seeing?

If have heard or seen messages...

Q-13.

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in changing the behavior of those people who may not currently be responsibly recreating in the desert? In other words, do the messages increase **protection** of the desert?

Q-14.

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in changing the values of those individuals who recreate in the desert? In other words, do the messages increase **respect** for the desert?

Q-15.

Do you perceive that the message or messages are effective in regard to increasing awareness, in terms of the importance of desert conservation?

Q-16.

What was your impression of the message(s), both in terms of content – the way the message is worded – and delivery?

Q-17.

How could the messages be improved (if you think that the messages could be improved)?

Literature

Q-18.

Have you seen any literature distributed by the DCP, such as the *Desert News* or the general DCP brochure or any brochure related to Mojave Max?

If yes...

Q-19.

Where and how did you receive the literature?

Q-20.

After reading the literature, what message or messages do you recall being delivered within this literature?

Q-21.

Do you feel the literature is effective in reaching your particular group of desert recreation enthusiasts?

Q-22.

Would you like to receive literature from the DCP? If yes, how would you like to receive it?

Radio / Television / Print

Q-23.

Have you seen or heard any Public Service Announcements or advertisements from the DCP on television or radio?

If yes...

Q-24.

What television or radio station or program did you see or hear the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

Q-25.

What message or messages do you recall being delivered in the PSA(s) or advertisement(s)?

Q-26.

Do you feel that the PSA(s) or advertising delivers a message or messages about the importance of desert conservation?

Q-27.

Do you feel these media – television and radio – are a good way to reach your particular group of desert recreation enthusiasts? Please explain.

Q-28.

What about print advertising? Should the DCP print advertisements in newspapers? If yes, what kind of newspaper is preferable: large circulation newspapers such as the *Review-Journal* or *Sun* or smaller, targeted newspapers such as community or rural newspapers?

Overcoming Issues/Challenges

Q-29.

[Have all participants write down answer before asking for their answers.]

In your opinion, what is the biggest issue facing the DCP in terms of reaching Clark County residents who recreate in the desert?

Q-30.

How might this challenge that you identified be overcome?

Q-31.

What is the biggest issue in terms of the DCP being able to change the behavior and/or values of people who might not be currently recreating in the desert in a responsible or respectful manner?

Q-32.

How might this challenge be overcome?

Q-33.

In general, do you feel that the DCP has the ability to improve responsible use of the desert in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?

Q-34.

In general, what is the best way that the DCP can improve responsible use of the desert in terms of achieving greater respect and protection of the desert environment?

Best Delivery Methods

Q-35.

We would like to discuss the best approach to reaching desert recreation enthusiasts. Please list what you perceive as advantages and benefits of each of these delivery methods, as well as any perceived disadvantages or problems:

- **Q-35 (a)** Radio/Television Advertising or PSAs?
- **Q-35 (b)** Print Advertising?
 - Large Newspapers – *Review-Journal* or *Sun*
 - Small Newspapers – community or rural newspapers
 - Club newsletters and/or websites
- **Q-35 (c)** Literature?
 - *Desert News*
 - Brochure
- **Q-35 (d)** Event display booth – interaction with DCP representatives?
 - Distributing products with conservation messages printed on them
- **Q-35 (e)** Kiosks in the public land areas where people are using public lands

Q-36.

Of all of these information delivery methods we just discussed, please name the best one to effectively reach you and communicate information to you. Why?

Q-37.

Is there any other type of delivery method or tool that the DCP should be using to reach desert recreation enthusiasts, but currently is not producing or using?

Q-38.

Should the DCP be forging relationships or partnerships with desert recreation clubs, such as the Las Vegas Valley Bicycle Club, Las Vegas Mountaineers Club, Around the Bend Friends, Las Vegas Trailblazers, etc.? Are these clubs effective points of distribution for conservation information?

(If still time in the one hour) Section 10(a) Permit

Q-39.

Are you familiar with why the DCP was created?

Q-40.

Are you familiar with the Section 10(a) Permit?

Read:

The Desert Conservation Program is responsible for the implementation of the provisions of Section 10(a) Incidental Take Permit, issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Clark County administers the plan by assuming responsibility for the collection of mitigation fees and ensuring adherence to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which is intended to promote a balance between economic stability and environmental integrity in Clark County.

Q-41.

Would you agree or disagree with the statement that conservation is necessary to keep the Section 10(a) permit to allow growth to continue, which equals jobs and economic stability? Please discuss.

Final Thoughts

Q-42.

Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel might help the DCP better reach or effectively communicate with desert recreation enthusiasts?

Thank you for providing your valuable time today. We truly appreciate your consideration and extremely valuable input.

###