

NCPARC

Policy Regulations and Trade Working Group

Meeting Minutes

October 5, 2005
1:00-4:00 UNC Greensboro

(text in blue was written on the agenda and provided to attendees)

Introductions : Dave Woodward (NCSU), Tanith Tyrre (Cape Fear Serpentarium), Zach Orr (crotalid naturalist/researcher), Daron Barnes (NCWRC), Lori Williams (NCWRC), John Groves (NC Zoo), Grover Barfield (herp enthusiast/hairstyle guru), Steve Price (Davidson College), Mike Dorcas (Davidson College), Dennis Herman (NC DOT, Project Bog Turtle), Dave Davenport (EcoQuest Travel), Ann Somers (UNC Greensboro), Sarah Cross (NC PARC/NCWRC)

Welcome and Opening Remarks (Sarah Cross):

Thanks: I'd first like to say thanks to each of you for coming to join us here today! I realize that many of you are taking personal time away from work to participate in this working group, so I sincerely am grateful to you for your willingness to help us improve the policies for amphibians and reptiles in NC. I will do my best to see that our collective progress for herp conservation in NC is well worth the time and expense of your travel to join us here today.

I'd also like to thank Ann Somers for hosting us here at UNCG. These facilities are great, and the logistics of parking and travel to this site worked very well, I think.

What is PARC: Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (**PARC**), is a multi-sector partnership dedicated to the conservation of amphibians and reptiles and their habitats. The key to PARC's success has been the inclusion of **all** individuals, organizations, and agencies with an interest in amphibian and reptile conservation and an interest in the conservation of the habitats they occupy. PARC's strength is its ability to increase communication and cooperation among these many diverse groups. PARC enables each person and group involved to become more aware of national, regional, and state issues confronting amphibians and reptiles. PARC also gives individuals a better idea of how their agency or organization can contribute to conservation of herpetofauna and their habitats. The diversity of participants makes PARC the most comprehensive conservation effort ever undertaken for amphibians and reptiles.

What is the intent of the PR&T Working Group: A bill introduced in the legislature that would "Protect Inherently Dangerous Animals" made the need for this working group dramatically obvious. Although the bill has now been modified significantly from its

original form (which included 8 pages of specifics regarding “dangerous” species, explicit prohibitions on keeping certain animals, and detailed permit and tagging requirements,) and is now a bill that charges DENR to “study” the best way to protect the public from inherently dangerous animals, the bill’s introduction demonstrated the need for pre-emptive recommendations from NCPARC regarding regulations of potentially dangerous herps.

But the potentially dangerous animal issue is just one aspect of herp policy in NC that could benefit from the collaborative, inclusive nature of an NCPARC working group. While in the process of developing NCPARC recommendations to propose to DENR through the Wildlife Resources Commission (WRC) regarding dangerous herps, we will also outline ways we would like to see existing herp laws/regulations modified to better protect the wild herps of our state and protect the interests of responsible herp enthusiasts in NC. This will probably take many meetings, but these can certainly be our long-term goals as a working group.

Needless to say, the existing rules and regulations for herps in this state are antiquated and complicated. Bringing them up to date will certainly be an involved process for the working group. But this responsibility will have a huge impact on the native herps of the state, and potentially the non-native ones as well. Therefore I am grateful to all our participants for their willingness to work together and to bring differing perspectives to the table in an endeavor that will certainly take patience and compromise. I would also remind you that in the all-inclusive spirit of NCPARC, you should feel free to suggest to me other interested and dedicated parties to include in the working group, as we will need many minds with differing perspectives to make our proposed regs as responsible, equitable and enforceable as possible.

[The need for the Working Group chair\(s\); How Sarah’s position coordinating NCPARC and also working for the Commission necessitates other leadership:](#) I am in the somewhat odd position of representing both the Wildlife Resources Commission and NCPARC in this undertaking. Since the WRC is typically the body that drafts new rules and regulations regarding the state’s native wildlife, and since the Dangerous Animal “study” to be undertaken by DENR requires consultation with the WRC (among other entities), it could be difficult for me to fairly represent the WRC in these responsibilities while also representing the varied membership of PARC in developing herp policy recommendations to present to the WRC. Therefore I would like for us to elect a Working Group chair that can be the official NCPARC voice in policy issues, since the WRC's stance could potentially be slightly different from that of the NCPARC membership.

Realizing this, I asked Dave Davenport to serve in this chairperson role in preparation for and during the meeting today. Later today, we can decide on elected chairs for the committee. But in the meantime, I’ll let Dave take over with the agenda, which you have before you and which we developed collaboratively...although I may pipe up and steer our discussions if I feel that we are straying too far from where I had hoped this meeting would go. Dave runs a pretty tight ship, though, and has a great insight into the needs for

herp policy in NC. He has a great compromisers personality, and also he has a nice strong backbone to stand up for issues when necessary, so I am pretty pleased to have coerced him into taking on this role for now. SO, Dave do you want to take it over from here? ...

Goals for this Working Group and Meeting Goals (* action items):

- 1) Officially form the PR&T Working Group: become ACTIVE with regard to regulations recommendations
- 2) KEEP IT GENERAL: the specifics will come, but today we are forming the WG and planning for the future of the WG. Do NOT get bogged down in the specifics of any current or proposed regulation. Keep it general today and prepare to become more specific at future meetings.
- 3) Give voice to various concerns for wild, native herps and voice to herp enthusiasts and other interest groups
- 4) Long-term goal of making NCPARC recommendations (like the PARC Model State Herp Regs document) to the Commission of ways NCPARC believes herps should/could be regulated in NC (realizing that the specific language and the enforcement/administrative details should be left to Commission staff and legal council to hash out)
- 5) Educate one another on differing perspectives
- 6) * Brainstorm and air the big-picture issues in need of regulations attention
- 7) * Prioritize these as topics for future meetings (where we will develop recommendations to present to WRC staff)
- 8) * Develop goals for the WG for future, more specific regulations initiatives
- 9) * Make plans for (schedule) more focused meetings that will delve into the specifics of particular regs issues (turtles/exotics/collecting/venomous/pet trade/etc)
- 10) * Outline WG structure for voting on the issues: do we involve the entire NCPARC membership in review of our recommendations, re-issue invitations to future WG meetings where the specifics of recommendations are discussed then base our decisions on the opinions of those that participate, require a quorum of this body on decisions, or chose another decision-making method for this WG?

Some general Herp Regs Issues, as I (Sarah) see them (Also see the handout from the NCPARC general membership; the working group will undoubtedly pinpoint others):

- 1) “Inherently Dangerous” herps (both native and non-native): preemptive self-regulation to protect herp folks from uninformed regulation from the legislature.
- 2) Turtle Bill revamping: grandfathering the pet “owners” and making this law (and the future regulation) enforceable and equitable.
- 3) Snappers: should these be considered separately, be given an “open season”?

- 4) Collection of natives (both large-scale and small-scale): what level of collecting is acceptable for a private individual, what level makes one a commercial collector, and what level of licensing/permitting is appropriate for each...or should all collection be banned as some states have done?
- 5) Trade in native herps: wild-caught vs captive bred, how to define “dealers” and how these regulations can be enforceable and equitable (pit-tags, inspections, record-keeping—what is enough, what is too much regulation, what fees are reasonable, what about internet (and other) sales to/from other states?)
- 6) Propagators: where do they fit in? Are they collectors? Are they dealers? Should we regulate them separately?
- 7) Non-native (but “non-dangerous”) pets: to regulate or not to regulate (housing specifications, record-keeping, etc to prevent introductions)
- 8) Educators and Exhibitors: creating an official designation with specific requirements so that true exhibitors may be allowed to keep species that are protected (which will promote improved education and outreach and coordination of such), and to limit the shady folks from sneaking through this loophole.
- 9) Regulation of pet stores: how can /should this be addressed (at least have requirements for educational materials for dissemination with sold animals)
- 10) Reptile shows: are these a different animal? How to/should we regulate a) the sale of herps at these by NC citizens and out-of-state residents, b) the import of herps to these for exhibition only?
- 11) The need for a law forbidding the possession of federally listed species (USFWS can't enforce unless we have a state law too).

The following dialogue is transcribed as best as I (Sarah) am capable with my not-so-super typing skills, and, apparently, my tendency to stop typing when I am talking or when some other comment gets me more actively involved in the discussion. Hopefully I have captured the essence of individual's statements, and the general results of the discussions (action items).

DD: Thanks Sarah. And I guess I would like to add a little to what Sarah has said. I am glad that we have initiated the formation of the WG and are about to get started. We want to be inclusive to everyone from all walks of life and all perspectives. We do not want this body to be exclusive, and we feel that this group's diversity should give our recommendations more credence when we present them to the WRC. I'd also like to point out that I agree that there needs to be someone other than Sarah heading up this body, and we can discuss who that should be later. But it is my opinion that the NCPARC recommendations should stand separate from the work of the WRC employees.

So in our initial discussions today we will address Goals 1-5 on the agenda...

John: how will this group be like or interact with the Nongame Wildlife Advisory Committee (NWAC), the WRC and the Herp Scientific Council?

DD: We want to work with all of these, and work as closely as we can, but we may need to sometimes work around them if we decide that the need exists. The reality is that some of what we propose may not be popular with the WRC.

(There follows a discussion of role of NWAC and the Scientific Council (herp) and the observation that several members of this working group also serve on those committees/councils.)

TT: we must also be certain to consider the practicality of the legislative things we propose: who is going to carry them out and who is going to pay for them

DD: our job is to identify the issues, the problems, how could these best be handled, what legislation is necessary, and not to decide the hows of implementation. We can only do so much about dealing with that aspect of the policy issues. However, you are very correct that we need to be cognizant of the practical side of these issues so that we propose policies that will be enforceable and administratively possible.

DH: We should be sure to invite Enforcement folks to these meetings.

AS: Absolutely. We need be sure to get them here...even if most of us can't come, have them pick a date so they will be represented.

TT & DH: we can also set up trainings for the Enforcement officers on herps for the future...once the proposed new herp regulations are put in place –maybe at the serpentarium, DH says he has run some before, and TT has extensive experience working with law enforcement in FL training them on ID and handling, etc.

DD: We must also be certain to publicize what we are doing at these meetings to the NCPARC membership. Putting the recommendations of this group on the web to keep all the NCPARC membership involved and aware is important.

LW: Ok, so What is the goal of the WG, what are our final products we want?

SC: Thanks, Lori. OK, we have here on your agendas the general goals for today, as well as which of these should become action items for the day.

DD: Because there is not a lot on the books, we have the ability to propose sound, well thought out laws that are different from what the legislature would create without our input. We can be pre-emptive. As far as I'm concerned we can come up with guidance for how herps are regulated in this state and we can look at other states, then propose ways to get legislation in place before it is knee-jerk. There are some things out there that do need changing, (turtle rule) but in general, we have an open slate to take the legislature in a direction that represents "the people" and not just different interest groups.

DH: We must also remember that municipality laws will not be superceded by state laws we propose.

DD: Yes, but municipalities make laws because there is no state law regarding an issue on the books, or no guidance from the state. Once ours are there as a template, some municipalities may change their laws, others may join in line.

SC: Some laws we would propose will need to go through, some around the WRC: exotics, for example, are not the WRC's prevue, generally.

DB: However, the WRC may begin dealing with exotics sooner rather than later. We see it coming and it is looking like the WRC will be addressing exotics soon. The term "exotic" just needs to be better defined in the process...*(dialogue continued that I didn't get)*

John: There are now animal rights groups pushing these laws in individual counties, designed for dangerous mammals, not generally herps. The zoo is involved in this, and I think that we are going to find this more and more. The problem w/local laws is that they define exotics as anything that does not occur in their area.

DB: That problem is statewide because the WRC needs a good definition of exotic too.

LW: how long does the process take; getting a new recommendation into regulation?

SC: that depends on how you go about it and on other factors as well...

DD: The turtle rule, as an example, went really fast

SC: But that was an emergency rule that did not go through the normal regulations proposal process.

DB: generally it takes 2 years from start to finish. Next year is short legislative session...*(dialogue continued that I didn't get)*

DB: The turtle bill is awaiting a WRC regulation, which is in review.

DH: Would that be something for this group, then? The turtle bill?

DD: I think it would be good to have total herp package to present to the WRC and the legislature. Let's not piecemeal it. For one thing, we don't want to get old to the Legislature by handing them a herp thing too often, so that we become an annoyance.

LW: The WRC's Wildlife Action Plan outlines that this is certainly a need for the future since regulations updates are in the plan.

DH: What is the timeline the WRC will need for them to get it through to the legislature?

DB: depends on how well it is thought out already, how much editing is required, how controversial it is, what all is in there, etc. *(dialogue continued that I didn't get)*

TT: It could be very cost effective to involve people already trained, especially veterinarians, when it comes to venomous laws. Have the vets sign off instead of training up the enforcement officers...*(dialogue continued that I didn't get)*

DD: What we give to the WRC needs to be specific without being overly complicated.

DH: Ideally, we could present to the WRC something as complete as possible.

DB: and also be prepared to have to eliminate parts of the all-encompassing bills, in order to get the things that you require.

DD: so that jumps us into "Priorities" (I think we have covered 1-5 on the Goals list):

SC: Yes, so if you will notice I included on your agenda a list of 11 things that I think are probably important issues regarding herp regulation in NC. Of course, now you can overrule me and add others to that list or whatever. Also notice the other papers I handed you which are the brainstormed topics of the entire body of the NCPARC membership at the Inaugural meeting. They were asked to provide us with what they felt were North Carolina's needs for herp regulations and issues regarding trade. I grouped them into categories, so take a minute to look over that list too.

Brainstorm priorities:

- Inherently dangerous animals (venomous): crocs, monitors, big constrictors, etc. And we should address these first since these are likely brushfires that will take off at a moment's notice.
- Problems with the turtle bill (SC may be able to check to see what versions of it the WG should weigh in on so that we do not start from scratch if the process is already well on the way with the WRC)
- Another brushfire may be a simple law about commercialization of herps: petshops, collectors, trade,
- Snappers and that they are food, and that they may carry heavy mercury loads...maybe under the turtle bill (DH) so perhaps it should feed into the turtle bill before it goes up. Mercury is a health advisor issue, perhaps (MD).

(discussion of the urgency and prioritization of these ensued, with the following conclusions)

At the next meeting, we will address 1-3 on the agenda page of Sarah's suggested herp regulations issues. Sarah will pass out info to the group that will fill in the gaps of detail regarding these: (other state's regs, the Action Plan's priority, the current turtle bill, the proposed turtle rule, the latest versions of the Inherently Dangerous Animal bill, etc).

Dave wants us to bring things up at other meetings as well if they are not on this list.

(DH): One thing, commercial collecting needs to be defined as separate from collecting for personal collection and breeding –that is herpetoculture.

(DB): Collecting for research is also something we need to address. Some folks request that they be allowed to collect ridiculous numbers of animals. “Research” needs to also be defined. *(discussion of this ensued, in concurrence with Daron’s suggestion)*

DD: Chairs of the WGs should sit on the Executive Council of NCPARC so that the overlap between the WGs can be known to the related WGs, like this research example Daron brings up, which certainly relates closely to our WG

DB: we make allowances of our regulations for certain entities (research, education) and there needs to be published policy for how those allowances should be made and to whom.

SC: what Daron needs is regulatory or policy backing for the judgments he makes in these allowances.

MD: Also there are two realms: animal welfare issues, and wild animal protection. Once an animal is out of the wild, it is “dead” from a population standpoint. It becomes an animal welfare situation. Looking at a wild population, there is actually no difference between me collecting a rattlesnake, and me killing one. Once it is out of the wild and in my collection, it is dead to the population. Collecting is actually more dangerous because I could release it and introduce disease or screw up genetics in a local population, or extend the range of a species or put it where it might impact the native populations.

DD: Back up to animal welfare: animal rights folks are very organized, and are currently moving in the direction of wanting no captive reptiles. We need to at least discuss this, even if we do not decide to address animal welfare. There are those out there that want to see no herps in captivity.

JG: There is a difference between animal rights and animal welfare. The AZA just formed an animal welfare group that is going to take the stance that it is ok to have pets, *(dialogue continued that I didn’t get)*

MD: this might be something that we have a stance/policy on, but not a regulation. Also maybe this is something for the education/outreach working group. They could tackle getting our stance out there to the public... *(dialogue continued that I didn’t get)*

DD: So, now to item 10 on the Goals, we need to establish a chair: He/she needs to take on the role of leading meetings, facilitating meetings, agendas, etc with input and help from Sarah, but they will guide the group.

(Some time for nominations was allowed, and several suggested that Dave continue in his role.)

DD: I will agree to do it, but my presence is in question sometimes, so there are periods of time when I am unavailable.

MD: but with that known, can't we just schedule meetings for when you WILL be available?

DD: Sure. I just want folks to know that I am out of the country a lot. I guess I'd like a co-chair for continuity when I can't be available...

(John volunteers to co-chair, so that he can help facilitate meetings, etc. and the WG agrees that these two will be our co-chairs).

DD: another point: The gap between the professionals in herpetology and the herpetoculture folks is one that this group must bridge. The last thing PARC wants to be accused of is excluding any particular group. Be sure to reach out to those folks and include them any way we can.

DW: be sure to put announcements on the NC Herp Society (NCHS) website and the newsletter and announce this group's formation/meetings at the NCHS meeting in Raleigh in November. Be sure to get Dave or Sarah to speak at the Business Meeting there.

MD: we can post announcements on the website, and maybe set up a listserv too.

AS: Also don't forget the issue of how to get Enforcement here. (Sarah will be sure to speak with the Lt. about this)

LW: How about animal control, wildlife rehabbers, animal damage control agents? Do we need to reach out to them too? *(dialogue continued that I didn't get... but we decided to also consider how to involve voices from these groups.*

Rehabbers need to be another issue for us to tackle. We should give them direction and rules of what to do with the animals that are brought to them. And the ADC agents too.

DD: Now, also for the structure of the Working Group (#10 on the agenda): How do we want to decide things? Who votes on issues? Do we need a quorum?

Discussion ensued. The decision was:

Since the people here are not the only folks interested in this issue, and since we have outlined various others we want to involve, Sarah will work to get others on the WG that wish to be between now and the next meeting. An acceptance email back from those interested in this WG is needed so that we can have an official Working Group membership. Those members will be the ones that vote. We will then deal with the quorum as those that are present. There will be no proxy vote. Only those on the WG will

have a vote, but we will solicit input from everyone in NCPARC so that we avoid the issue of others thinking that we made decisions for them. Anyone that wants to can come to the meetings, but official members can vote.

So Mike will put the info to be voted on by the WG on the website. Sarah will also send it in emails to the full membership. Maybe we will set up a listserv (Sarah will check with Matt Godfrey about this, and Tanith also volunteered to help since she has list serve experience). We will then provide a 30 day comment period on issues we present to the NCPARC membership.

Sarah will work to get any other people that want to be a “member” of the voting WG to be on the list of attendees at the next meeting. She will be sure to point out that what we develop will be RECOMMENDATIONS not laws.

We will soon find that we need to be working closely with the other working groups, so that we are complementing the work of one another.

DD: Finally, lets schedule the next meeting where we will specifically discuss turtle rule issues first, then the Dangerous Animal Bill if we get to that.

November 16th at 1pm here at UNCG was set as the date. Anne will reserve us a room and then let us know the specifics of how to find the room, park, etc.

Adjournment.

Attached are the handouts from the meeting:

- *The PRT Meeting Agenda*
- *The brainstormed ideas for the PRT Working Group from the NCPARC Inaugural Meeting’s attendees*

NCPARC

Policy Regulations and Trade Working Group Meeting

October 5, 2005
1:00-4:00 UNC Greensboro

Introductions : (who we are and why we are here)

Opening remarks:

- Welcome and Thanks
- What is PARC
- What is the intent of the PR&T Working Group
- The need for the WG chair(s): how Sarah's position coordinating NCPARC and also working for the Commission necessitates other leadership

Goals for this Working Group and Meeting Goals (* action items):

- 1) Officially form the PR&T Working Group: become ACTIVE with regard to regs recommendations
- 2) KEEP IT GENERAL: the specifics will come, but today we are forming the WG and planning for the future of the WG. Do NOT get bogged down in the specifics of any current or proposed regulation. Keep it general today and prepare to become more specific at future meetings.
- 3) Give voice to various concerns for wild, native herps and voice to herp enthusiasts and other interest groups
- 4) Long-term goal of making NCPARC recommendations (like the PARC Model State Herp Regs document) to the Commission of ways NCPARC believes herps should/could be regulated in NC (realizing that the specific language and the enforcement/administrative details should be left to Commission staff and legal council to hash out)
- 5) Educate one another on differing perspectives
- 6) * Brainstorm and air the big-picture issues in need of regulations attention
- 7) * Prioritize these as topics for future meetings (where we will develop recommendations to present to WRC staff)
- 8) * Develop goals for the WG for future, more specific regulations initiatives
- 9) * Make plans for (schedule) more focused meetings that will delve into the specifics of particular regs issues (turtles/exotics/collecting/venomous/pet trade/etc)
- 10) * Outline WG structure for voting on the issues: do we involve the entire NCPARC membership in review of our recommendations, re-issue invitations to future WG meetings where the specifics of recommendations are discussed then base our decisions on the opinions of those that participate, require a quorum of this body on decisions, or chose another decision-making method for this WG?

Some general Herp Regs Issues, as I (Sarah) see them (Also see the handout from the NCPARC general membership; the working group will undoubtedly pinpoint others):

- 1) “Inherently Dangerous” herps (both native and non-native): preemptive self-regulation to protect herp folks from uninformed regulation from the legislature.
- 2) Turtle Bill revamping: grandfathering the pet “owners” and making this law (and the future regulation) enforceable and equitable.
- 3) Snappers: should these be considered separately, be given an “open season”?
- 4) Collection of natives (both large-scale and small-scale): what level of collecting is acceptable for a private individual, what level makes one a commercial collector, and what level of licensing/permitting is appropriate for each...or should all collection be banned as some states have done?
- 5) Trade in native herps: wild-caught vs captive bred, how to define “dealers” and how these regulations can be enforceable and equitable (pit-tags, inspections, record-keeping—what is enough, what is too much regulation, what fees are reasonable, what about internet (and other) sales to/from other states?)
- 6) Propagators: where do they fit in? Are they collectors? Are they dealers? Should we regulate them separately?
- 7) Non-native (but “non-dangerous”) pets: to regulate or not to regulate (housing specifications, record-keeping, etc to prevent introductions)
- 8) Educators and Exhibitors: creating an official designation with specific requirements so that true exhibitors may be allowed to keep species that are protected (which will promote improved education and outreach and coordination of such), and to limit the shady folks from sneaking through this loophole.
- 9) Regulation of pet stores: how can /should this be addressed (at least have requirements for educational materials for dissemination with sold animals)
- 10) Reptile shows: are these a different animal? How to/should we regulate a) the sale of herps at these by NC citizens and out-of-state residents, b) the import of herps to these for exhibition only?
- 11) The need for a law forbidding the possession of federally listed species (USFWS can’t enforce unless we have a state law too).

Policy, Regulation, and Trade

Individuals' Brainstormed Ideas from the NCPARC Inaugural Meeting Break-out Groups

Question:

What are North Carolina's needs for herp regulations and issues regarding trade?

Administrative

- Need automatically closed season for herps
- Replacement costs for all herps
- More extensive records on herp buyers/dealers
- Anonymous tip lines
- Add the sensitive species to the actual hunting/ fishing regulations digest

Collection

- Establish bag limits for collection and for food hunting of herps.
- Distinguish between herpetoculture and commercial collection for trade
- Regulate the bait industry
- Bag limits on snakes (promotes turning in poachers if you had legally purchased you permit)
- Size limits on collection
- Sustainable harvest only
- No take of salamander egg masses
- Prove long-term sustainability of a species in the face of collection pressure before making the collection legal
- Do not prohibit a child from collecting a pet
- Prohibit all collection of rare herps and sensitive populations
- Prohibit collection for direct sale of all species of herps: it is not sustainable, require biological data (i.e. demonstrate sustained yield) for exceptions
- Prohibit breeders from collecting more than a certain # of herps per year for breeding stock
- Ban commercial collection
- Regulate turtle collection
- Stricter regs on who can collect
- Harsher penalties for illegal collection
- Establish collection protocols to be used statewide

Education/Outreach

- Publicize protected species
- links to regs on herp websites
- Put regs on internet with Q&A sections and FAQs
- Educate shoppers at pet stores and retailers of herp needs and requirements
- Justify laws to the public-easier to get folks to comply if they understand WHY
- Educate pet owners not to release

- Outreach to herp hobbyists with non-traditional education @ shows, etc
- Disseminate info re regs and laws to zoos, parks, etc so public learns of laws
- Build an online email network to keep people informed about legislation
- Make public aware of laws and regs regarding collection/possession and breeding of herps
- Inform the public re policy and responsibility: 1) pet ownership of herps; 2) why the rules are as they are; 3) why are herps collected; 4) who is eating/keeping them; 5) who is benefiting economically

Enforcement

- Need legal resources to prosecute offenders (ie draining wetlands)
- Maybe a separate section of enforcement officers to deal with nongame issues
- Educate game wardens and law enforcement of laws/regs
- Need funding for strict enforcement
- Need consistent interpretation of regs by regulators/biologists/LEO's
- Enforce existing herp laws
- Train officers on herp ID and collection techniques
- What to do with confiscated animals: enforcement needs/feasibility, regs on keeping before sale, concern of release of animals in non-native areas
- Need MORE trained folks to enforce existing laws
- Greater penalties for violators: make penalties EXPENSIVE
- Encourage and enable the enforcement of the regulations
- Improve effectiveness of penalties

Exotics

- Prevent release of exotics
- Monitor exotic species trade
- Limit # of non-natives allowed/sold in NC
- More education and regulation on invasives
- Restrict possession of exotic species

General

- Make sure existing regs are sensible
- Research effectiveness of laws that pertain to E/T/S species (have the laws helped the populations?)
- Avoid knee jerk reactions in protection
- Need a grandfather clause for the turtle law
- Push for laws against intentional killing of herps
- Confer with other states: what are they regulating; why; what works; what doesn't, then make sure that NC laws are consistent and no less stringent
- Be knowledgeable of international trends and demands on herp species as food or pets
- Protect ALL native herps- not just t/e/sc
- Need comprehensive review and revision of regs and laws
- Work with legislators to change existing local and state laws re herps that are impractical and that promote harm to herps
- Regs for amphibians similar to turtles
- Think of similar to fisheries- "stocks"
- Base regs on biological data

- Focus laws and regs on core problems
- Do herps not deserve the same protection as birds?
- Do not prohibit individuals from handling/photographing wild herps
- Strike a balance between herpetoculture and conservation
- Treat nongame animals like game animals relative to education and enforcement
- If animals have economic value and endure collection pressure, treat them as such
- Need regs that protect wild pops while maintaining responsible access to the resource
- Establish broad authority to regulate herps: WRC only can reg listed species
- Protect common herps to keep them common
- Sustained use policies: limits to commercial use; licensing for hobbyists; captive propagation laws for T/E
- Review the existing regulations; make sure they're sensible and that they result in good herp conservation
- NCPARC should be the facilitator between those making laws and those impacted
- Maybe PARC could have a ranking of scores different companies receive that we publicize" eco-friendly companies get good scores and good publicity
- Incentives to people reporting wildlife

Habitat

- True ecological costs paid for habitat degradation and destruction
- Regulate development
- Stricter regs for pesticide use: who gets to use them and where
- Regs for road building: put in herp tunnels and mandate mitigation
- Make developers pay a price for the lost habitat for herps
- Regulate agricultural run-off impacting amphibian habitat and wetlands
- Destruction of habitat should be more illegal than the take of an individual animal
- Incorporate habitat conservation for rare species-not just individual animals
- More protection of ephemeral wetlands
- Require evaluation of sites prior to development
- Better habitat protection, especially associated with new construction projects.
- Emphasize restriction of construction not mitigation at important sites
- Wetland/stream regs
- Mitigation laws
- Make destruction of habitat illegal if collection of critter that needs that habitat is illegal

Introductions/Release

- Regs against release of non-natives
- Release of pet herps
- Find a way to keep captive bred animals from being released into the wild-educate about proper ways to get rid of animals

Permits

- Provide workable levels of permitting dependent on type of activities requested
- Mandatory permitting and reporting process needed
- Have \$\$ from permits, penalties go to herp conservation
- Permit system needs to be implemented where permits are not too difficult to get or prohibitively costly

- Permit guidelines/ regulations need to be stricter

Pet Shops

- Tighten control of pet stores/sales
- Inspectors for pet stores, entertainment industry
- Who has authority over pet stores?
- Communicate with and educate pet shops- don't alienate them

Politics/Strategy

- Benefits for property owners and businesses who make steps toward conservation
- Educate legislators and provide "wise use" solutions for protection
- ID legislators and their views on issues on a website
- Develop a political action committee to inform and speak for PARC members
- Try not to alienate factions from whom we will need help with the legislation: make peace with the pet industry
- Educate/ cultivate/ influence legislators

Propagation

- Do not prohibit captive breeding
- Insure captive bred are captive bred
- Allow an outlet for progeny of captive herps
- Captive breeding should be promoted and regulated: not made illegal
- Determining captive bred or wild caught: regs for breeders
- Restrict trade of wild herps through captive breeder registration

Science/Research

- Study how collection for food and pet trade affects populations
- Legislation should be based on current species abundance and should be modified as more info is available after research
- Need good research to ID the value of a salamander
- Need more data to guide regulatory decisions- PARC could put inventory groups together to do this- where are the information gaps?

Trade

- Allow trade of captive-bred species with appropriate permits
- Work WITH herpetoculturalists to explore ways of minimizing wild herp harvest and monitoring the pet trade
- Reward system for dealers who screen buyers using a screening system we devise
- Do not ride the fence: PARC needs to know and state their position on trade
- Register herp dealers
- No importation of herps for trade
- Prohibition of commercialization of amphibians and reptiles
- Stop black market herp trade and internet sales
- Have a pet trade quota on yearly take, reduce quotas in subsequent years once breeding stock is available
- Regulate sites where herps are sold: websites, pet stores, private sellers
- Stop the sale of all wild caught herps (food, pets, education, etc)
- Allow trade of only captive bred individuals
- Discourage herp pets

Venomous

- License venomous species possession