

WHAT IF...

Energy Production Was Banned on Federal Lands in Wyoming?

Energy production on federal lands is vitally important to Wyoming and the nation as a whole. Forty percent of America's coal comes from Wyoming. The state is number one for federal onshore natural gas production and number two in federal onshore oil production. 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 in Wyoming.



"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

SIERRA CLUB

"President Obama needs to halt all new fossil fuel leasing on federal public lands."

Connie Wilbert
Director of Sierra Club Wyoming Chapter

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

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

32,500



JOBS

\$9.3 BILLION



IN ANNUAL GDP

\$886 MILLION



IN STATE ROYALTIES

ACCORDING TO OUR ANALYSIS:



"Wyoming in particular would be forced to confront a difficult economic situation if energy production were to come to a halt on federal acreage."

Report: What If Energy Production Was Banned on Federal Lands and Waters? p. 30



"The ability of the state to deliver on its public-education related priorities would be negatively and disproportionately affected by any decrease in federal royalty revenues."

Report: What If Energy Production Was Banned on Federal Lands and Waters? p. 30

READ THE FULL REPORT HERE: WWW.ENERGYXXI.ORG

ENERGY ACCOUNTABILITY SERIES

