

dispatched agents to Houston because the taxidermist had directly contacted Smith, Adams acknowledged in the affirmative, although he added that he did not feel the taxidermist got special treatment because of his friendship with Smith.

Adams explained that he gets calls of this nature from time to time. When asked how these calls are typically handled, Adams said he would normally refer the phone call to someone in the appropriate region, which, in this case, had been the supervisory FWS law enforcement official. Adams said he would then leave it up to the region to decide how to handle the situation. However, in the taxidermist's case, he admitted that he personally directed the two FWS law enforcement officials to meet with the taxidermist. Again, he was asked what the difference was, and again he stated that since the call had gone directly to Smith, he thought a meeting was warranted.

Adams was asked if sending the two FWS law enforcement officials to Houston had been his idea or if he had been directed to send them to Houston by David Smith. Adams said it had been his own idea. Again, when asked if Smith had any input in sending anyone to Houston, Adams stated that Smith did not micromanage and that it had been solely Adams' idea. However, when Adams was asked to supply agents with a written statement to this effect, Adams said he could not sign a simple "yes" or "no" statement because he was not sure whose idea it had been to send them to Houston, although he was pretty sure it had been his idea and not Smith's. "My statement will be what it is," Adams advised. "I cannot recall one way or another." When asked how many other taxidermists the supervisory FWS law enforcement official had been requested to meet with since his meeting with the taxidermist, Adams advised that he did not believe the FWS law enforcement official had met with any others.

A wildlife inspector was interviewed by the OIG concerning the port designation. The inspector had been involved in the designation of Houston process. According to him, Memphis, Louisville, and Houston were all being considered for designation around the same time. With Memphis and Louisville, there was congressional interest, and a proposal was presented from FWS to Congress detailing how much money they would need to open both ports. According to both the wildlife inspector and a FWS regulation specialist, they required money from Congress to do this because neither Memphis nor Louisville had any personnel. This was different than Houston, explained the wildlife inspector, because Houston was already staffed prior to designation and, therefore, would not require any additional funding from Congress to designate the port. The wildlife inspector stated that it also made sense to designate Houston because of the large number of trophies shipped through there. Designation, he stated, would expedite the import of these trophies since the port would be open 24 hours a day and there would always be people on staff to assist in the importation.

The wildlife inspector stated that a non-designated port requires importers to go through a process that involves the issuance of a 2-year license in advance and \$100 for authorization. Over and above, importers are charged \$95 per shipment as well as a \$55 administration fee upon entry. There is also a \$20 per-hour inspection fee. He also advised that inspections take typically 2 hours, totaling \$40 per inspection.

However, for a designated port, the wildlife inspector maintained that all fees are waived except a \$55 import/export licensing fee charged only to commercial importers. According to him, in this sense, Houston is technically losing money. However, he reiterated that it is not the mission of FWS to make money but instead to expedite and oversee wildlife imports as well as maintain customer