

# Fact Sheet

## Reducing the Deficit and Making Government Run Better: A New Way Forward

*How Congress can reduce spending while protecting chimpanzees and avoiding misguided research*

### CHIMPANZEES

**As the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction works to achieve massive cuts in federal spending, one of the ways to reach this goal is to phase out invasive research on chimpanzees and retire the approximately 500 federally-owned chimpanzees – currently languishing in laboratories at great expense – to less costly sanctuaries, saving taxpayers approximately \$300 million over ten years.**

### COST

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) currently spends approximately \$35 million per year to conduct invasive research on chimpanzees and maintain these animals in laboratories. Chimpanzees have largely failed as a research model, so at any given time, about 80 to 90 percent of chimps in U.S. labs are not used in research, but simply warehoused in barren but costly laboratory cages at taxpayer expense. Perpetuating this problem, approximately \$6 million in federal funding has gone toward breeding lab chimps since 2002, despite a moratorium on the breeding of government-owned and supported chimps put in place partly to reduce the government's financial burden. An anticipated \$1.8 million more is slated to be spent through FY12 for further unnecessary breeding. Every federally-owned chimp born into the system can cost the government \$1 million – averaging \$20,000 per chimp annually, and a lifespan of up to 60 years.

Reliance on chimps to study human disease has led to setbacks in biomedical progress and a substantial waste of funding. For example, hundreds of chimps were bred in the 1980s to study HIV/AIDS, but they failed as a model due to differences in immunology and disease progression. Further, the extreme stress of confinement and procedures to which they've been subjected over the years leave chimps physically and psychologically compromised as research subjects. Recently, at NIH's request, the National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine convened a panel to consider the necessity of chimpanzees in biomedical and behavioral research. Several experts gave testimony confirming that chimps are not necessary for research, despite claims otherwise. Many alternatives to chimpanzee research are already in place and additional alternatives are in development – this is the way forward, and no more funds should be wasted on chimpanzee research.

Prompted by a petition filed by diverse stakeholders including The Humane Society of the United States, Jane Goodall Institute, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, and Wildlife Conservation Society, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recently announced that it is undertaking a review of whether all chimpanzees should be listed as endangered, further underscoring how inappropriate it is to fund their use in invasive research.

### SAVINGS

Ending invasive research on chimpanzees, transferring all government-owned chimps to sanctuaries, and discontinuing the federal support for breeding and for privately-owned chimpanzees in labs would save taxpayers an estimated \$30 million per year, totaling \$300 million over the next ten years. Part of the savings results from the lower cost of care at sanctuaries – keeping a chimp in a lab cage averages \$51 per day, compared with \$32 per day to live with other chimps in a natural setting at the national sanctuary (some private sanctuaries are even less).

*(cont'd on next page)*

**PROPOSED LANGUAGE**

*“No funds shall be used for grant agreements or contracts that allow or encourage the breeding, housing, or use of chimpanzees for invasive research.”*

Estimated government savings from ending support of privately-owned chimpanzee colonies and invasive chimpanzee research as well as retiring government-owned chimpanzees to sanctuary

<b>Category of spending</b>	<b>Estimated \$ per year</b>
Government owned chimpanzees in laboratories	\$9,536,041
Privately owned chimpanzees in laboratories	\$3,651,460
Government funded projects involving invasive chimpanzee research (including \$1 million per year for breeding)	\$22,208,028
<b>Total current costs</b>	<b>\$35,395,529</b>
Future costs to retire gov't owned chimpanzees to sanctuary	\$5,840,000
<b>TOTAL SAVINGS</b>	<b>\$29,555,529</b>

# Fact Sheet

## Reducing the Deficit and Making Government Run Better: A New Way Forward

*How Congress can reduce spending while protecting America's wild mustangs*

### WILD HORSES AND BURROS

As the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction works to achieve massive cuts in federal spending, one of the ways to reach this goal is to require the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to utilize technologically advanced, humane alternatives to the costly and wasteful process of rounding-up and removing protected wild horses and burros from our public lands.

#### COST

The BLM is currently holding approximately 41,000 horses and burros in short- and long-term holding pens. In FY10, it cost taxpayers \$36.9 million (plus an additional \$2.1 million in FY09 "carryover" funding) for BLM to care for these animals. For years, the BLM has removed far more wild horses and burros from the range than it could possibly expect to adopt out, and as a consequence, the taxpayer burden associated with caring for these animals off the range has continued to skyrocket. For instance, between 2001 and 2007, the BLM removed approximately 74,000 wild horses from the range, but could only place 3,000 a year for adoption, with the rest kept in holding facilities at taxpayer expense. The annual cost associated with caring for one wild horse in a long-term holding facility is approximately \$500, and the average lifespan of a wild horse in captivity is 30 years.

#### SAVINGS

The BLM could save nearly \$172 million over the next 10 years by using immunocontraception to manage wild horse and burro populations on the range instead of rounding up these animals and putting them in government holding facilities. By reducing annual removals from 7,600 (the planned figure for FY12) to 3,000 animals, and increasing fertility control from 2,000 (planned level for FY12) to 4,600 mares, the taxpayer savings over 10 years would be \$171,698,050. Immunocontraception to manage wild horse and burro populations in the West is not only more humane, as it would reduce the stress of round-ups and long-term holding in government pens, but it would also help the agency get off the fiscal treadmill of rounding up horses and keeping them on the government dole.

A significant reduction in the number of wild horses and burros gathered and removed from our rangelands annually, coupled with increased contraception, is the much needed solution to a growing fiscal problem. Removing horses from the range without implementing a robust program for preventative herd growth is unsustainable, and simply leads to a continual cycle of round-ups and removals, when the much more cost-efficient and humane management strategy of fertility control through immunocontraception is readily available. Conflicts can be managed on public lands and population numbers can be reduced without costly and inhumane roundups.

#### PROPOSED LANGUAGE

*"No funds shall be used for the roundup of wild horses or burros, except for the purpose of immunocontraceptive population management or for emergency gathers of a limited number of horses due to extreme and immediate horse health or welfare concerns."*

*(cont'd on next page)*

Projected federal government savings from using immunocontraception to manage wild horse and burro populations on the range instead of rounding up these animals and placing them in government holding facilities for the remainder of their natural lives:

Category of spending	Estimated \$ FY12-FY22
Projected holding costs for 46,000* animals (stallions and mares), if removed from the range over 10 years as BLM plans	\$181,248,050.00
Projected contraception costs for 23,000 animals (only mares) over 10 years, if proposed reforms are adopted	- \$9,550,000.00
<b>TOTAL COST SAVINGS OVER 10 YEARS</b>	<b>\$171,698,050.00</b>

\*46,000 is based on BLM's plan to remove from the range approximately 7,600 wild horses and burros each year, and the agency's ability to adopt out at most 3,000 wild horses and burros each year, which would result in an additional 4,600 wild horses and burros being placed in holding facilities annually, and a total of 46,000 over 10 years. This does not include animals already in holding pens (41,000 as of September 2011). Estimated holding costs are based on FY 2008 rates of \$ 5.08 per day (or \$1,854.20 per year) for care of an animal in a short-term holding corral and \$ 1.27 per day (or \$463.55 per year) for care of an animal in a long-term holding pasture. Time periods that the animals spend in short-term holding before they are transported to long-term holding vary, but for purposes of this cost projection, it is assumed that each horse and burro removed from the range spends an average of one year in short-term holding before being transported to a long-term holding pasture. Projected contraception costs include gathering the mares and administering the vaccine three times per mare.

# Fact Sheet

## Making Government Run Better: A New Way Forward

*How Congress can reduce spending while advancing the science of safety testing*

### ANIMAL TESTING

As the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction works to achieve massive cuts in federal spending, one of the ways to reach this goal is to require the National Toxicology Program (NTP) and its individual agency contributors to cease funding unnecessary animal tests and refocus their safety testing research on “21<sup>st</sup> century” approaches advocated by the National Academies, saving at least \$500 million over 10 years.

### COST

Extravagant and wasteful spending is evident throughout many NTP toxicological testing programs:

- Since the 1970s, more than \$2 billion tax dollars have been spent on long-term animal tests to identify rodent carcinogens. Each 2-species test costs approximately \$4 million and takes up to 5 years to design, conduct and analyze – and to date, the NTP has characterized the results of 262 of these individual tests on mice and rats as “inadequate” or impossible to interpret. U.S. and international scientific authorities have long questioned the value of the mouse test and called for it to be abandoned (would have meant past savings of close to \$1 billion). NTP discontinuation of the mouse test could cut its future expenditures in this area by half.
- For many years the NTP has operated a program that has actively invited and encouraged public nominations of chemicals and other substances for toxicological study at the government’s expense. Among the substances that have been subject to costly and intensive testing are ginseng, aloe vera, and numerous other natural products with long histories of safe use.
- The NTP has recently adopted a new study design for reproductive toxicity testing on animals that is even substantially more costly and time consuming than its previous approach – or any equivalent testing procedure in mainstream use by any other U.S. agency or industry.
- The NTP has recently awarded \$30 million in grants toward further testing of the plasticizer Bisphenol A, despite the enormous body of existing test data for this chemical which should already have led to regulatory action.

### SAVINGS

Savings of at least \$500 million over 10 years could be realized by curtailing extravagant and unnecessary testing by the NTP and its individual agency contributors by realigning their activities with the National Academies’ vision of “Toxicity Testing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.” For 1/5 the cost of a multi-year NTP carcinogenicity study, the NIH Chemical Genomics Center reports that it is able to screen up to 1000 chemicals in 200 different robot-automated cell or gene tests in as little as 2 weeks (click [here](#) for more information). Our nation’s leading science advisors have called for a wholesale paradigm shift away from classical animal tests toward molecular, cellular and computational tools. Although these tools cannot yet fully replace conventional test methods, many authorities – including federal agencies – believe they hold the key to cheaper, faster and more human-relevant safety testing for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### PROPOSED LANGUAGE

*No funds shall be used by the NTP or individual contributors to the program in their respective programs for 1) rodent carcinogenicity testing; 2) animal-based testing for reproductive toxicity using a method other than the OECD “extended one-generation” study; 3) animal-based testing of plant-derived substances or extracts; 4) solicitation of public nominations of substances for animal-based testing or animal-based testing of substances so nominated; or 5) animal-based re-testing of substances in place of regulatory action. Funding of the NTP High Throughput Screening Initiative shall be maintained at current levels for the remainder of fiscal year 2012.*



**THE HUMANE SOCIETY**  
OF THE UNITED STATES

[humanesociety.org](http://humanesociety.org)

# Fact Sheet

## Reducing the Deficit and Making Government Run Better: A New Way Forward

*How Congress can reduce spending on government-funded lethal predator control*

### WILDLIFE SERVICES

**As the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction works to achieve massive cuts in federal spending, one of the ways to reach this goal is to stop subsidizing the annual killing of more than 100,000 wild mammals in a costly, ineffective subsidy for private livestock ranchers, and save at least \$110 million over 10 years.**

### COST

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services (WS) program spent \$78 million of taxpayer dollars on operations in FY10 to address wildlife conflicts, much of which was spent on killing our nation's wild animals. In FY10 alone, WS used these subsidies to kill 5 million animals, including 112,781 mammalian carnivores such as wolves, coyotes, bobcats, cougars, badgers and bears that were killed primarily to protect privately-owned livestock grazing on America's public lands. The methods used to kill these animals include shooting from helicopters and airplanes, trapping, poisoning, and denning (poisoning pups in their dens and/or dragging them out of dens and bludgeoning them to death).

Because WS's lethal control methods are indiscriminate, often failing to even target the species responsible for damage to livestock and agriculture, let alone the individual animal(s) responsible for said damage, and because other predators simply move into the vacant territory, the tax dollars spent on lethal control are wasted, along with the lives of countless animals. Many non-target wild animals such as bald eagles, California condors, and wolves, in addition to domestic animals such as pet dogs and cats, have been killed by WS' indiscriminate lethal approach. WS data show that only a small percentage of cattle or sheep are actually killed by predators. For instance, according to a USDA report in 2010, less than a quarter of one percent, 0.23%, of the American cattle inventory was lost to native carnivores.

### SAVINGS

Livestock producers – not U.S. taxpayers – should be financially responsible for protecting their property from damage attributed to wildlife, especially if their livestock are grazing on our public lands at a subsidized rate. If taxpayers must continue footing the bill, WS should employ humane methods that can do a better job at lower cost. Altering livestock husbandry practices and adopting non-lethal strategies – such as the use of guard animals (e.g., llamas and dogs), lighting, and penning – have been shown to be far more cost-efficient than indiscriminate lethal programs and could more effectively reduce or even eliminate livestock losses associated with predators over the long term. To that end, we propose language that would save \$110 million over 10 years and prohibit lethal methods for the purpose of protecting livestock, in order to force the agency to focus its resources on more effective and cost-efficient non-lethal livestock protection approaches. This would begin to shift the agency toward a more balanced approach of solving wildlife conflicts, but still retain funding for critical non-lethal methods research and human health and safety programs.

### PROPOSED LANGUAGE

***“The Wildlife Services program under the USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service shall be reduced by \$11,000,000 annually from its fiscal year 2011 level, and no funds may be used by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to conduct lethal wildlife control activities under the Wildlife Services program for the purpose of protecting livestock.”***