Tracking Number: (__**2026-18**__)

To request a change to regulations under the authority of the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), you are required to submit this completed form to: California Fish and Game Commission, (physical address) 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1320, Sacramento, CA 95814, (mailing address) P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090 or via email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Note: This form is not intended for listing petitions for threatened or endangered species (see Section 670.1 of Title 14).

Incomplete forms will not be accepted. A petition is incomplete if it is not submitted on this form or fails to contain necessary information in each of the required categories listed on this form (Section I). A petition will be rejected if it does not pertain to issues under the Commission's authority. A petition may be denied if any petition requesting a functionally equivalent regulation change was considered within the previous 12 months and no information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted. If you need help with this form, please contact Commission staff at (916) 653-4899 or FGC@fgc.ca.gov.

SECTION I: Required Information.

Please be succinct. Responses for Section I should not exceed five pages

1. Person or organization requesting the change (Required)

Name of primary contact person: John Potash, Founder, Owner of Get Rattled – Rattlesnake Avoidance Training for Dogs
Address: [redacted]
Telephone number: 775-234-8844
Email address: GetRattledNV@gmail.com

2. Rulemaking Authority (Required) - Reference to the statutory or constitutional authority of the Commission to take the action requested:

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Commission by Sections 2118, 2120, 2122, and 2150 of the Fish and Game Code to regulate restricted wild animals and establish requirements governing permits for their importation, transportation, and possession. The proposed change would amend the existing restricted species permitting framework established under Section 671.1 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, and any conforming provisions as necessary.

3. Overview (Required) - Summarize the proposed changes to regulations:

Amend Section 671.1 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, and any conforming provisions as necessary, to establish a permitting pathway allowing qualified nonresident exhibitors to temporarily import, transport, and possess native restricted wildlife that is lawfully acquired and possessed outside California for authorized commercial and/or educational exhibition purposes. The animals would remain subject to applicable restricted species permit requirements and conditions and would be required to be removed from California following completion of the authorized activity.

4. Rationale (Required) - Describe the problem and the reason for the proposed change:

California's existing restricted species regulations provide permitting pathways for qualified residents and nonresidents to import, transport, and possess restricted wildlife for commercial and/or educational exhibition purposes. The regulations also establish a separate Native Species Exhibiting permit for California residents to possess and exhibit certain nonreleasable native restricted wildlife originating from the wild in California. However, there does not appear to be a corresponding pathway allowing a qualified nonresident exhibitor to temporarily bring native restricted wildlife that is lawfully acquired and possessed outside California into the state for an otherwise authorized exhibition or educational purpose.

This creates a regulatory gap in which the activity itself may be legitimate and already recognized under California's restricted species permitting framework, and the individual or organization may otherwise meet the qualifications for a permitted exhibitor, but authorization is unavailable solely because the wildlife involved is native to California and the exhibitor is a nonresident.

Much of the regulatory framework necessary to address this issue already exists. Rather than creating an exemption from California's restricted species laws, the proposed change would extend an appropriate permitting pathway to this currently unaddressed circumstance. Qualified nonresident exhibitors would remain subject to applicable permit qualifications, animal welfare, public safety, containment, transportation, reporting, and other requirements established by the Department and Commission. The authorization would be temporary, and the permitted wildlife would be required to leave California following completion of the authorized activity.

There is also a direct parallel in the Commission's current consideration of regulations governing commercial exhibition and use of native rattlesnakes. In discussing that proposal, Commission materials identify the absence of a regulatory pathway for otherwise legitimate activities - including dog aversion training, safe-handling courses, and film use - as a reason for developing a permitting mechanism. The same underlying regulatory issue exists here: legitimate activities involving native wildlife may be prevented not because the activity has been determined inappropriate, but because the existing regulations do not provide a mechanism through which it can be authorized.

The proposed change would also provide tangible public, animal-welfare, educational, and wildlife-conservation benefits. California dog owners have repeatedly expressed interest in wildlife-avoidance training involving species other than rattlesnakes, including native restricted wildlife that can present a risk to dogs. Proper avoidance training can help protect dogs from painful injuries, serious medical complications, or death; protect their owners from potentially significant veterinary expenses and the emotional distress associated with such encounters; and protect the wildlife itself by reducing the likelihood that dogs will pursue, attack, injure, or kill animals they encounter.

More broadly, allowing qualified organizations to provide responsible educational programs involving native wildlife can foster greater public understanding of these species, their ecological importance, and appropriate ways to coexist with them. Direct educational opportunities can help replace fear and misunderstanding with informed respect, encourage responsible behavior around wildlife, and ultimately benefit both wildlife and the communities that encounter it.

Under the existing framework, qualified nonresident providers are unable to offer these programs involving native restricted wildlife in California, requiring interested residents to travel out of state - sometimes hundreds of miles - to obtain training or preventing some educational opportunities from occurring altogether.

Establishing a narrowly tailored permitting pathway would allow the Department to evaluate applicants, animals, proposed activities, and appropriate permit conditions rather than categorically preventing otherwise legitimate activities because no applicable permit category currently exists. This would preserve CDFW oversight and California's wildlife protections while providing a reasonable mechanism for qualified nonresident exhibitors to conduct legitimate educational, exhibition, and public-safety activities.

SECTION II: Optional Information

5. Date of Petition: 9/2/2026

6. Category of Proposed Change

☐ Sport Fishing
☐ Commercial Fishing
☐ Hunting
X Other, please specify: Restricted Species Permitting

7. The proposal is to: (*To determine section number(s), see current year regulation booklet or https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs*)

X Amend Title 14 Section(s): 671.1, and conforming provisions as necessary
☐ Add New Title 14 Section(s): Click here to enter text.
☐ Repeal Title 14 Section(s): Click here to enter text.

8. If the proposal is related to a previously submitted petition that was rejected, specify the tracking number of the previously submitted petition Click here to enter text.
Or X Not applicable.

9. Effective date: If applicable, identify the desired effective date of the regulation.
If the proposed change requires immediate implementation, explain the nature of the emergency:
No specific effective date requested

10. Supporting documentation: Identify and attach to the petition any information supporting the proposal including data, reports and other documents:

See attached supporting documentation. Exhibit A summarizes the existing restricted species permitting framework under Title 14, Section 671.1, including the Nonresident Exhibiting and Native Species Exhibiting permit pathways. Exhibit B provides California Fish and Game Commission and CDFW materials concerning the current native rattlesnake rulemaking and the establishment of a permitting pathway for otherwise legitimate activities. Exhibit C provides CDFW, public-health, veterinary, peer-reviewed, and documented real-world evidence concerning dog-wildlife conflicts and the potential animal-welfare, public-health, educational, and wildlife-conservation benefits of avoidance programs.

11. Economic or Fiscal Impacts: Identify any known impacts of the proposed regulation change on revenues to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, individuals, businesses, jobs, other state agencies, local agencies, schools, or housing:

No significant adverse economic or fiscal impacts are anticipated. The proposed change would utilize the existing restricted species permitting framework and may result in modest additional permit-fee revenue to CDFW from qualified nonresident applicants. It may also provide economic benefits to California individuals, businesses, and organizations by allowing currently unavailable educational, exhibition, and wildlife-avoidance services to be provided within the state. California residents seeking such services could avoid the additional travel costs currently associated with obtaining them outside California. Existing permit and inspection fee structures may offset some or all administrative costs associated with processing additional permits. No known impacts to jobs, other state or local agencies, schools, or housing are anticipated.

12. Forms: If applicable, list any forms to be created, amended or repealed:

Existing restricted species permit application forms may require amendment to accommodate the proposed nonresident native restricted wildlife authorization.

SECTION 3: FGC Staff Only

Date received: **9/2/2026**

FGC staff action:

- ☑ Accept - complete
- ☐ Reject - incomplete
- ☐ Reject - outside scope of FGC authority

Tracking Number

Date petitioner was notified of receipt of petition and pending action: _____

Meeting date for FGC consideration: _____

FGC action:

- ☐ Denied by FGC
- ☐ Denied - same as petition _____
  Tracking Number
- ☐ Granted for consideration of regulation change