

In My Opinion: Alternative energy and wild versus feral horses

MAY 30, 2008

[Read Comments\(1\)](#)

[Recommend](#)

[Print this page](#)

[E-mail this article](#)

SHARE THIS ARTICLE:

[Del.icio.us](#)

[Facebook](#)

[Digg](#)

[Reddit](#)

[Newsvine](#)

[What's this?](#)

Alot of squawking is going on among the environmentalists about the 'hard-headed' attitude of Lyon County folks towards their wilderness land grab.

ADVERTISEMENT

If those folks were to capitulate and concede to the desires of these wilderness people, we stand to lose any ability to have a say in what may or may not be done with the affected land. For instance, if our Commissioners were to back a wind farm on some of those lands, would that not be a good thing? If our Congressional delegation were to give federal lands to the County to lease for the purpose of building wind generators, could not the monies generated back up the County coffers, reducing tax demands? Would not our Congressional delegation benefit from a lessened demand for federal funding?

There are several great locations in Lyon where the wind seems to be a permanent fixture, but an idea like this will have people crawling out of the wood work in opposition, even if they, themselves, will benefit by the lessened demand of unrenewable resources. I can hear them now: claims of visual pollution, noise (even if wind towers are virtually silent), danger to wildlife, etc. This kind of obstructionism will go on even though producing electricity this way will help prevent global warming. Let's see, the only benefits I see are a much needed revenue source for the County or local governments; developing a nonpolluting alternative energy production source; lessening the need for nonrenewable energy; placing a minimal impact on the ecology of the area; and stopping soaring costs of electrical energy. And there are no demands for drilling present (as when developing geothermal sources); and no corrosive byproducts.

The drawbacks are having to see the windmills in action (and the towers do stand out); but to me, there is no question as to the possibilities of huge benefits to the local governments and the people now paying property taxes, energy fees and transportation costs.

Do you think our Congressional delegation would support enabling this to happen instead of removing the land for any possible public benefit? We could even use their hot air when the wind's not blowing, and regardless, being technologically progressive in a way that least affects the land sure appeals to me.

* * * * *

A great way to stir the pot...

The wild horse versus the feral horse issue just may be heating up as the price of feed continues to escalate. Some \$17-\$23 per bale has many marginal horse owners on the ropes. A horse will consume from one to one-and-a-half bales a week, which amounts to at least \$75 a month, to have what amounts to a big pet standing around in a pen. When you have two, three or more horses and tack on veterinary bills, the costs really mount up. I suppose you're not supposed to believe everything you hear, but I recently have heard of some of those big pets being turned out.

The question then becomes, how do you separate the "wild" from the feral? Brands, of course, but if the state folks are rounding the feral horses up, how do you keep the people with no experience with brands, and watching from afar, from screaming foul?

Another complication is the fact wild horses do not discriminate against feral horses, which become part of a wild group. Are the progeny of feral horses and wild horses deemed any special designation? Some people who don't have any concept of the realities of leading a wild existence scream bloody murder when wild horses starve. People who do know, know wild things are subject to the whims of nature and accept the fact. There are no easy solutions to the wild horse issue, and when you throw in the fact Nevada is generally not ideal habitat for horses and people who don't accept that fact, it becomes a nightmare for everyone concerned.