

## Deleterious Exotic Rulemaking Meeting May 20, 2021

### Attendees:

Lloyd Knight, ISDA  
Dallas Burkhalter, ISDA  
Cheryl Anderson  
Katy Devries, ISDA

Chanel Tewalt, ISDA  
Randy Fox, ICL  
Scott Leibsle, DVM, ISDA  
Tricia Hebdon, IDFG

Scott Barnes, ISDA  
Debra Lawrence, DVM, ISDA

Lloyd Knight welcomed the attendees and introduced the meeting. This was the second meeting regarding IDAPA 02.04.27 "Rules Governing Deleterious Exotic Animals." This meeting was to review previous comments and changes; additional comments would be accepted until June 20, 2021.

Before starting the rule discussion, Dr. Scott Leibsle showed attendees how to navigate to the appropriate information on the ISDA website. The plan for the current meeting was a brief review of the points discussed at the meeting on April 22, 2021. Additional comments could be brought up as-needed.

Section 4.1 updates the incorporated document, and section 4.2 was removed as it is no longer used. Definition 10.2 strikes "hybrid" to allow more ownership options.

Section 100.2(c) changes the requirement for breeding facilities to only those AZA accredited. 101.1(n) removes the pharmaceutical option for birth control. This option is difficult to enforce, so the only option would be surgical sterilization. There were no questions or comments to this point.

Section 111 was removed as redundant (covered in the import rule). 121 clarifies that possession permits must be obtained by the receiving party prior to any transfer of deleterious exotic animals. Sections 200 and 201 were combined to cover construction and confinement in the same point. Section 300 – the only acceptable form will be the form made available on the ISDA website. No comments or questions to this point.

Section 403 regarding Cervidae was removed, as the only allowed Cervidae are elk, fallow deer and reindeer as "Domestic Cervidae" is defined in IDAPA 02.04.19 "Rules Governing Domestic Cervidae."

The new section 403, regarding Felidae makes the change that any facility confining these animals must be AZA accredited. This is because AZA facilities have significant confinement requirements already in place which are not set by the state. The removal of "hybrid" from the definition at 10.2 applies in this section, especially toward cats like the savannah, a serval hybrid. That removal, however, necessitated the addition of tiger hybrids to cover animals such as ligers.

Section 406 has a notable change in the way primates are handled. The four animals listed in 406 (a-d) are ones which pose little to no risk to humans or public safety. Most people owning these are obtaining them when they are too young to spay or neuter, as required in section 100.

Dr. Debra Lawrence referred back to the discussion surrounding servals. She said there are currently three full-blooded servals privately owned in the state. She said a lot of savannah owners keep servals for breeding. She asked how these animals would be handled – should serval be removed from the list, or would those owners be grandfathered in? Dr. Leibsle asked if servals merited the same level of

concern as the other felids. Dr. Lawrence deferred to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), saying she believed they were not problematic.

Randy Fox asked if the reason for excluding savannah cats could be explained. He said although they might be easy to transport and care for, they are not indigenous and questioned the potential environmental impact. Dr. Leibsle explained that savannahs are common house cats, which most states have no health regulations on as they pose little risk to public safety. The risk with servals comes from the concern that one could be turned loose. This was the first time it was suggested to remove them from the list – they just need to figure out how to regulate the servals already in the state legally.

Dr. Lawrence said servals have become popular and people like to breed and sell them as pets. Removing them from the list means there are less administrative hoops for owners to jump through. She added that she's sure there are some that come in illegally. She said they have not ever had issues with one, because they're expensive; it's unlikely an owner would let one loose. There have not been complaints or reports of one being loose. She felt that removal of servals from the list would likely not be an issue.

Tricia Hebdon spoke up with the viewpoint from IDFG. She said savannahs would have the same impact as all other house cats, but she wasn't sure about servals. She was unsure if they could breed with bobcats but said cougars would eat them. The fact they run fast could cause issues, and though they are small they are still predators. Dr. Lawrence asked how viable they were in the wild; how much of a threat they would be. Ms. Hebdon said that they are pretty much house cats from Africa, but they are still cats. Though the interaction with bobcats is unknown, she didn't think one or two in the wild would be an issue. Dr. Leibsle said if there were concerns about servals, they could just add a grandfather clause to address those owned before a certain date.

Randy Fox said if there were any questions about the impact and/or the interbreeding possibility, servals should be left on the list. He felt the grandfather method would be most appropriate for the three legal owners. He said he was concerned about taking them off the list without knowing the potential impacts. Dr. Lawrence agreed that if there was an unknown risk removal wasn't a good idea. She then suggested moving servals to their own category where they wouldn't need to be an AZA facility, but would have to be sterilized without a propagation option. Dr. Leibsle said that could be a "small Felidae" section with a permit requirement, then asked for other thoughts. Ms. Hebdon said she looked it up and bobcats and servals can crossbreed.

Dr. Leibsle moved back to section 406 primates. He said anything other than the four specifically listed would be required to go to an AZA accredited facility. There were no further comments at this point.

Section 408 had previous discussion about removing mouflon sheep. IDFG was concerned about potential genetic interference. Section 410 – IDFG previously expressed that they would like prairie dogs to remain on the list. Having reached the end of the list, Dr. Leibsle asked if there were any comments or other issues. There were none. He reminded the group the next meeting is June 17<sup>th</sup> at 1:30pm. He said that they would try to have a final rule available for that meeting, and comments could be submitted until June 20<sup>th</sup>. Lloyd Knight thanked everyone in attendance and ended the meeting.