



CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
COST ESTIMATE

August 28, 2003

H.R. 1006
Captive Wildlife Safety Act

As ordered reported by the House Committee on Resources on July 15, 2003

SUMMARY

H.R. 1006 would amend current law to prohibit interstate and foreign trade of certain species of animals. CBO estimates that implementing the bill would cost about \$4 million annually, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. The bill could increase direct spending and revenues, but we estimate that any such changes would be minimal and largely offsetting.

H.R. 1006 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The bill would impose a private-sector mandate, but CBO estimates that the direct costs of the mandate would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$117 million in 2003, adjusted annually for inflation) in any of the next five years.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1006 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars				
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008

CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION

Estimated Authorization Level	4	4	4	4	4
Estimated Outlays	4	4	4	4	4

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

H.R. 1006 would amend current law to make it illegal to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase species of lion, tiger, leopard, cheetah, jaguar, cougar, and certain hybrids. Violators of the proposed prohibition on interstate and foreign trade of such animals would be subject to criminal and civil penalties. The bill specifies certain types of individuals and institutions that would be exempted from the proposed prohibition.

Based on information from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1006 would cost about \$4 million annually, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. That amount includes \$3.5 million for additional staff to conduct the kinds of inspections and investigations that the bill would require and up to \$500,000 for administrative costs to issue permits to individuals and institutions that would be exempted from the proposed prohibition.

H.R. 1006 could increase revenues from civil and criminal fines. Based on information from the USFWS and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service about the relatively small number of cases likely to occur, however, CBO estimates that any such increase would be less than \$500,000 annually. Moreover, such changes would be fully offset by increases in direct spending from the Crime Victims Fund (where criminal fines are deposited) or the resource management account of the USFWS (where civil fines are deposited and used for rewards to informers and for other program costs).

ESTIMATED IMPACT ON STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

H.R. 1006 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

ESTIMATED IMPACT ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR

H.R. 1006 would require individuals who participate in interstate or foreign import, export, transport, sale, receipt, acquisition, or purchase of any live lion, tiger, leopard, cheetah, jaguar, or cougar, or any hybrid of a lion species and tiger species to have expertise, knowledge, and experience with respect to the care of that species and to be licensed and inspected by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), be an accredited wildlife sanctuary, or have custody of the animal solely for the purpose of transporting the animal to an exempted individual. Under current law, interstate and foreign trade of certain cats listed under the bill is prohibited. Information provided by APHIS and representatives of wildlife sanctuary associations indicates that there would be no significant activity in new

licensing or accreditations as a result of the bill. In addition, CBO estimates that the costs to transporters to comply with the mandate would not be substantial. Thus, CBO estimates that the costs of the mandate to the private sector would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$117 million in 2003, adjusted annually for inflation).

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:

Federal Costs: Megan Carroll

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller

Impact on the Private Sector: Cecil McPherson

ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:

Peter H. Fontaine

Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis