**NATIONAL HORSE & BURRO RANGELAND MANAGEMENT COALITION**  
Advocating for commonsense, ecologically-sound approaches to managing horses and burros to promote healthy wildlife and rangelands for future generations
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**TAXPAYER DOLLARS**
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**Wild Horse and Burro Facts**

- BLM rangelands can support <27,000 horses and burros.
- There are currently >72,000 horses and burros on BLM ranges.
- Horse populations double every 4 years.
- There are >46,000 horses and burros in BLM off-range holding facilities.
- Taxpayers pay about $50 million per year to care for horses and burros in holding.
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**BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program Fiscal Year 2016 Expenses**

- **Adoptions:** 9.4%
- **Gathers & Removals:** 3.9%
- **Off-Range Holding Costs:** 63.1%
- **Other Activities:** 23.5%
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The biggest cost to the American public is leaving horses and burros on the range because of their long-term, negative environmental impacts. However, funding for on-range management continues to decrease.
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In 2016, each horse or burro adopted into private care cost BLM an average of >$2,500 in program costs.

Each animal kept in holding costs the BLM nearly $50,000 over its lifetime.
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In 2016, off-range holding costs amounted to nearly $50 million.
Between Fiscal Years 2012-2016...

- Off-range holding costs have increased by $6.5 million
- Gathers and removals spending has decreased by $5 million
- Increasing funding for off-range holding fails to address the core issue of rangeland overpopulation.

Overpopulation of on-range horses and burros results in substantial financial costs to public land managers and private landholders, limiting multi-use yields (Bastian 1999).

In 2015, BLM spent about $100,000 on implementing population growth suppression measures on 469 animals.

BLM is investing $11 million over 5 years to research longer-lasting fertility control methods, including safe and humane spay/neuter methods.

**Modeling Study: How Much do Various Management Scenarios Cost?**

Simulations of a variety of management scenarios find that fertility control treatments reduce program costs, but only as long as removal rates were maintained. When fertility control treatments were utilized in conjunction with a decrease in removals, overall costs went up.

Overall, there was an inverse correlation between cost-effectiveness and average annual population sizes – cheaper management options corresponded to smaller population growth.

Contraceptive use did not eliminate the need to remove wild horses and burros from the range in any of the scenarios (Barthalow 2007).
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