

# WHAT IF...

## Energy Production Was Banned on Federal Lands in Colorado?

Energy production on federal lands is critically important to Colorado. More than 1.5 million acres of federal land in Colorado currently produces oil, natural gas and coal, and this energy development is particularly important to the rural economies of the Western Slope. So why would we ever want to shut it down?

Unfortunately, that's exactly what some leading political figures and special interest groups have called for this election season. In a new report, we take them at their word, and quantify the impacts of their "keep it in the ground" approach to energy production on federal lands.



"No future extraction [on federal lands]. I agree with that."

**Hillary Clinton**  
Presidential candidate



"In the future, federal land – the land that is owned by all of us – will not be used for the extraction of fossil fuel: Coal, oil or gas."

**Bernie Sanders**  
Former presidential candidate

**350.org**

"We must keep fossil fuels in the ground — starting with public lands."

**Micah Parkin**  
350 Colorado

THEY BELIEVE COLORADO WOULD BE BETTER OFF WITHOUT ENERGY FROM FEDERAL LANDS.  
**BUT THEY'RE WRONG.**

IN COLORADO ALONE, A BAN ON FEDERAL ENERGY PRODUCTION COULD COST:

**50,000**



**JOBS**

**\$8.3 BILLION**



**IN ANNUAL GDP**

**\$124 MILLION**



**IN STATE ROYALTIES**

ACCORDING TO OUR ANALYSIS:



"Roughly half [of federal royalties to the state], or about \$62 million in 2015, was earmarked by the state to be spent on education programs. Approximately 40 percent, or \$50 million last year, was distributed to local governments. Education systems and local governments would need to quickly identify alternative funding sources to be made whole."

Report: What If Energy Production Was Banned on Federal Lands and Waters? p. 28

**READ THE FULL REPORT HERE: [WWW.ENERGYXXI.ORG](http://WWW.ENERGYXXI.ORG)**

**ENERGY ACCOUNTABILITY SERIES**

