

# Managing Healthy Wild Horses and Burros on Healthy Rangelands: Tools and the Toolbox

Callie Hendrickson

The Wild and Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act (WFHBA) of 1971 authorized the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) to manage feral horses (*Equus ferus caballus*) and burros (*E. asinus*) on public lands in the United States. The special issue of Human–Wildlife Interactions, Special Topic: Wild Horse and Burro Management explored, in-depth, the ecological, policy, political, practical, and sociological issues pertinent to the BLM and USFS management of wild horses and burros. In this commentary, I summarize the pros and cons of the available contemporary policy and management options, the tools in the BLM and USFS toolbox, that can contribute to achieving the intent of the WFHBA. Ultimately, it will be up to Congress to choose which options are in the best interest of the American public and our natural resources. Author’s address: White River & Douglas Creek Conservation Districts, Meeker, CO 81641, USA; e-mail: callie.districts@gmail.com. © 2018 AAEP.

## 1. Introduction

The Wild and Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act (WFHBA) of 1971 gave the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) the legal responsibility to manage feral horses (*Equus ferus caballus*) and burros (*E. asinus*) in specific locations on public lands in the United States.<sup>1</sup> These agencies are legally required to manage wild horses and burros (WHBs) in concert with other legal multiple-uses and laws governing the land management agencies.

The BLM and USFS have been arguably successful in managing multiple-uses of public lands, but implementation of the WFHBA has proven to be among the biggest challenges to sustainable management. In 2008, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that “If not controlled, off-the-range holding costs will continue to overwhelm the program.” At that time, there were 30,000 horses in holding facilities.<sup>2</sup>

Today, the BLM alone is struggling to manage approximately 127,000 horses and burros (animals) with designated lands that will only support 27,000 (Table 1). Approximately 45,000 of the animals reside in holding facilities, costing the American taxpayer \$50 million per year and >\$1 billion for the remainder of those 45,000 lives.<sup>3</sup> Currently, the remaining 82,000 are left on the range to compete with the wildlife, livestock, and vegetation for survival.<sup>4</sup>

All public land uses, other than for WHBs, are managed to maintain the balance between the uses and to ensure the land health standards are met. Wildlife are hunted, livestock are regulated and required to use rotational grazing and/or removal, recreation is permitted and restricted, and oil and gas are regulated. After WFHBA was passed, the federal agencies managed WHB populations through gathers and removal. The gathers now are largely contested in the courts, and the costs of holding

---

*This paper first appeared in Human-Wildlife Interactions, Hendrickson, C. 2018. Managing Healthy Wild Horses and Burros on Healthy Rangelands: Tools and the Tool Box. Vol. 12:143–147. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/hwi/vol12/iss1/15>. Reprinted and updated with permission.*

---

## NOTES

**Table 1. Wild Horse and Burro (WHB) Program Data Pulled from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) 2018 Website. Accessed July 27, 2018.<sup>11</sup>**

| Population  | Number  |
|---|---------|
| On-range population (March 2018)                      | 81,951  |
| Off-range population (June 2018)                      | 44,730  |
| Total BLM managed populations                         | 126,681 |
| Ecologically based appropriate management level (AML) | 26,715  |
| Total estimated population above AML                  | 99,966  |

WHBs in off-range facilities consume most of the WHB Program budget.<sup>3</sup>

The papers in the Human-Wildlife Interactions special issue synthesize the science, confirming that the lack of management of WHBs is detrimental to the land, WHBs, wildlife, livestock, and rural communities. Unmanaged WHBs are now causing irreversible damage to fragile western landscapes. The way the current WHB Program is being managed is unsustainable.<sup>3</sup>

**2. Options and Potential Solutions**

Congress, or rather society, has tough decisions to make to address one of the most significant environmental issues threatening U.S. public lands. Will we choose to sacrifice the land, water, native wildlife resources, and the health of the WHBs to allow the unchecked population growth? Will we choose to

accept the exponential growth of WHB numbers over sustainable economies of local communities who work diligently to provide food, fiber, and energy to the American population? Or will we choose to manage WHBs in a sustainable manner that will be in balance with all the required multiple uses as well as maintain a healthy population of horses and burros on public lands? The following is an overview of the basic options, including the pros and cons, to answer the above questions.

**Option #1: Leave Most Horses on the Range**

We gather and remove WHBs only on an emergency basis (imminent starvation and dehydration of horses where visible to the public), leaving the excess horses and burros on the rangelands.

*Pros*

1. Financial burdens (of gathers and holding) are reduced.
2. Horses would remain free-roaming.

*Cons*

1. Animals (including horses and burros) will die of thirst and starvation because unmanaged populations double every 4–5 years, causing irreparable range degradation and desertification, which will become the norm (Fig. 1).<sup>3</sup>



**Fig. 1. Animals (including horses [*Equus ferus caballus*] and burros [*E. asinus*]) will die of thirst and starvation because unmanaged populations double every 4–5 years, causing irreparable range degradation and desertification, which will become the norm (photos courtesy of the Bureau of Land Management and Savannah Sturm).**



Fig. 2. Current costs are approximately \$2 per day per horse (*Equus ferus caballus*) in long-term holding (pastures) and \$5 per day per horse in short-term holding (corrals). Current holding facility capacity is 59,748 (Rock Springs, Wyoming Holding Facility; photo courtesy of the Bureau of Land Management).<sup>11</sup>

2. Excess horses negatively impact native species such as the greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*).<sup>5</sup>
3. Horses and burros will expand further beyond legal boundaries, negatively impacting even more rangelands.
4. Single-use management of federal land and disregard for the economies of local communities will occur.
5. There would be a violation of Congressional mandates for responsible management of public resources.

Option #2: Gather and Place Excess Horses and Burros in Holding Facilities for the Remainder of Their Lives

Conduct massive roundups to remove all excess WHBs (those above the Appropriate Management Level [AML]) from the rangelands within the next 2 years and place them in short- or long-term holding facilities. Current costs are approximately \$2 per day per horse in long-term holding (pastures) and \$5 per day per horse in short-term holding (corrals).<sup>4</sup> Current holding facility capacity is 59,748 (Fig. 2). Additional capacity would likely cost more per horse due to demand. The BLM estimates the cost of

holding 47,000 horses over the remainder of their lives would be over \$1 billion without any additional horses or burros brought into the holding system.<sup>3,6,11</sup>

#### Pros

Removal of excess WHBs would protect rangeland health and reduce competition and stress on wildlife and other multiple uses of the federal lands.

#### Cons

1. The cost to taxpayers for feeding and caring for 100,000 excess horses until each dies of natural causes would be an average of \$30,000 (lifetime) for each animal and would be approximately \$3 billion over the next 20 years.
2. Horses would have to be living in confinement rather than in their typical habitat.
3. Demand for feed consumed by 100,000 excess horses could increase the cost of feed for livestock, increasing the cost of food to the American public.
4. Continued cost and stress of gathers would occur.<sup>3,6</sup>

**Option #3: Increase Adoptions**

The adoption demand over the past 5 years has averaged 2,700 per year.

*Pros*

1. Fewer horses would be in holding, saving taxpayer dollars.
2. Fewer horses would be on the range, so they would not be contributing to the degradation.
3. Individuals could enjoy the animals, and most adopted animals would have a good home.

*Cons*

1. Demand does not meet the current and growing supply (2,700 adopted annually versus current supply of 100,000 excess WHBs).
2. Continued cost and stress of gathers would occur.
3. FY2016 adoption efforts cost the taxpayer \$7,375,000 to adopt 2,912 animals, which is \$2,532 per horse/burro.<sup>3,6</sup>

**Option #4: Fertility Control**

Including all short- and long-term fertility control tools would likely require significant gathers to treat animals.

*Pros*

1. Porcine zona pellucida (PZP) and other short-term vaccines may reduce the reproduction rate in small herds that receive treatment on an annual basis.
2. Sterilization would eliminate the need for additional gathers and treatments of that animal.
3. When a Herd Management Area (HMA) is within the AML, fertility control will help to maintain that number.<sup>7</sup>

*Cons*

1. The current 2 year or more vaccines are unreliable.
2. Although fertility control may reduce population growth if used on the majority of mares, it does not reduce populations, which is currently required to save the ecosystem from degradation and some horses from starvation/dehydration.
3. It is impractical to administer the short-term vaccines on a meaningful scale with large land masses, elusive horses, undocumented horses, and lack of funding and manpower.<sup>6,8,9</sup>
4. Impacts to the habitat of native species continue.

**Option #5: Remove Livestock from the HMAs**

Livestock grazing has already been curtailed in some HMAs, and emergency gathers have continued because the horses are starving.<sup>10</sup>

*Pros*

There would be forage for more horses in the short-term.

*Cons*

1. In 4 years, there will be double the number of horses on the HMAs, filling the void from livestock, and 4 years later, the number will have doubled again with a need for removals of a much greater number of horses.
2. Yearlong (unmanaged) grazing of horses replaces managed grazing by livestock, therefore causing significant impacts on the habitat of threatened and endangered species.
3. In times of drought, the BLM will not be able to rely on reducing livestock animal unit months to support horses and wildlife.
4. There is significant reduction of already scarce water resources for the horses without ranchers hauling water and/or maintaining water structures at personal expense.
5. There are negative economic impacts to the rural and state economies because ranching is a primary economic driver.
6. Wildlife and other multiple uses would be negatively impacted by more horses.<sup>3,6,10</sup>

**Option #6: The Full Toolbox—Full Implementation of the WFHBA**

Each HMA is unique and should be managed accordingly. This option would allow the agencies to use the most appropriate “tool in the toolbox” for each HMA, ensuring approximately 27,000 WHBs remain free-roaming on the designated rangelands with good forage and water. The full toolbox option includes removals of all excess WHBs from the range, offering excess animals for adoption, and those that are not adopted to good homes would be sold without restrictions or euthanized. Fertility control, including sterilization of mares and stallions, would continue to be researched and implemented on a larger scale once the numbers are down to the AML within the respective HMA.

*Pros*

1. The number of excess horses and burros on the range would be significantly reduced, and the rangeland could begin to recover for the benefit of all uses.
2. Holding costs of approximately \$50 million per year would be eliminated and could be used to rehabilitate some of the degraded rangelands.

3. Individuals/groups wishing to protect the horses could purchase and care for them with their personal financial resources.
4. Entrepreneurial opportunities would exist for large landowners to care for privately owned WHBs.
5. The WHBs that are not purchased by those wanting to protect them could provide protein to people in need or people who choose to use them for those purposes.
6. All these tools are in accordance with and in the spirit of the WFHBA as written.
7. Humane euthanization would replace suffering from starvation and dehydration of WHBs on the rangelands.

#### Cons

1. There would be public outcry from those who do not believe in unrestricted sale and/or euthanasia.
2. Some adopted and sold horses may not receive the best of care in the hands of well-intentioned but uninformed individuals who adopt or purchase them.

Which options/tools will Congress and an informed public choose? I remain hopeful they will provide the full toolbox to honor the legacy of the WHB by ensuring they are treated humanely and with dignity, the ecosystem can thrive while supporting all the multiple uses, and tax payer dollars are prudently expended.<sup>3,6</sup>

#### Acknowledgments

#### Conflict of Interest

The Author has no conflicts of interest.

#### References

1. Public Law 92-195. 1971. The Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971. Authenticated U.S. Government Information, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Available from: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-85/pdf/STATUTE-85-Pg649.pdf>. Accessed on April 4, 2018.
2. Government Accountability Office (GAO). 2008. Effective long-term options needed to manage unadoptable wild horses. Report to the Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, GAO-09-77. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., USA. Available from: <https://www.gao.gov/highlights/d0977high.pdf>. Accessed on April 4, 2018.
3. Garrott RA. Wild horse demography: implications for sustainable management within economic constraints. *Human Wildl Interact* 2018;12:46–57.
4. Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2018. Report to Congress: management options for a sustainable wild horse and burro program. Available from: [https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/wildhorse\\_2018ReporttoCongress.pdf](https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/wildhorse_2018ReporttoCongress.pdf). Accessed on July 5, 2018.
5. Beever EA, Aldridge CL. Influences of free-roaming equids on sagebrush ecosystems, with focus on greater sage-grouse. *Stud Avian Biol* 2011;38:273–292.
6. Jakus PM. A review of economic studies related to the Bureau of Land Management's Wild Horse and Burro program. *Human Wildl Interact* 2018;12:58–74.
7. Kane AJ. A review of contemporary contraceptives and sterilization techniques for feral horses. *Human Wildl Interact* 2018;12:111–116.
8. Bechert US, Fraker MA. Twenty years of SpayVac® research: potential implications for regulating feral horse and burro populations in the United States. *Human Wildl Interact* 2018;12:117–130.
9. Nuñez C. Consequences of PZP immunocontraception to feral horses. *Human Wildl Interact* 2018;12:131–142.
10. Danvir RE. Multiple-use management of western U.S. rangelands: wild horses, wildlife, and livestock. *Human Wildl Interact* 2018;12:5–17.
11. Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2018. Program data. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., USA. Available from: <https://www.blm.gov/programs/wild-horse-and-burro/about-the-program/program-data>. Accessed April 4, 2018.