

WHAT WESTERN VOTERS FROM CO, MT, NV, NM, ND, SD, UT & WY WANT	WHAT THE HNR RECONCILIATION BILL DOES	WHAT SECRETARY BURGUM'S NEW PERMITTING PROCEDURES DO
<p>Public input – More than 2 in 3 voters in every state oppose reducing the review process and opportunities for public input.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HNR bill eliminates or penalizes public input at each stage in the decision-making process for oil and gas development on national public lands. The only opinion that matters is that of oil companies. • At the land use planning stage, where decisions are made about which lands are appropriate for drilling and which are not, the bill would let oil companies pay for the preparation of land use plans and then shield those plans from judicial review. Concerns brought forth by the public for how decisions would affect water resources and wildlife migrations would never receive their day in court. • At the leasing stage, oil companies would have the right to lease any lands that are open to leasing – 200+ million acres at last count – irrespective of any concerns from hunters and anglers, local officials, and private landowners. This includes lands next to over 60 national parks, in sensitive wildlife habitats, and in popular recreation areas. • At the permitting stage, the bill gives oil companies a statutory right to drilling permits under a new “permit by rule” scheme. The public – and private landowners – would have no say when drilling is proposed on national public lands; oil companies could simply start drilling 45 days after self-certifying that they are complying with the rules. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fast-tracks the approval process – to “28 days at most” – for drilling and other oil and gas projects on national public lands. • For smaller-scale projects (that could still have considerable impacts on water resources, wildlife, and private lands), the public can be cut out of the decision-making process entirely. • For larger projects, the public is given about 10 days to provide comments at the outset of the decision-making process. The public has no opportunity to actually comment on the environmental impact statement for the project, however, which is supposed to identify potential impacts on water, wildlife, and other values and identify ways to avoid or mitigate those impacts.

<p>Fees and royalties – Majorities in every state say we should keep the current fees for oil and gas development on national public lands.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The bill reduces the royalty rate – the source of 98% of all revenue from drilling on national public lands – to where it was originally set in 1920 and to half of what the States of New Mexico and Texas collect from drilling on state lands.• For more than a century, the onshore royalty rate languished at 12.5%, costing taxpayers, particularly in Western states, billions in revenue. Congress finally increased the onshore royalty rate to 16.67% in 2022, which raised additional funds for public safety and schools across the West. <table><tr><th>STATE</th><th>REVENUE LOST B/C OF 12.5% RATE (COMPARED TO IF THE 16.67% RATE HAD BEEN IN PLACE) – FY13-22</th></tr><tr><td>Colorado</td><td>\$811 million</td></tr><tr><td>Montana</td><td>\$110 million</td></tr><tr><td>New Mexico</td><td>\$8 billion</td></tr><tr><td>North Dakota</td><td>\$1.2 billion</td></tr><tr><td>Utah</td><td>\$721 million</td></tr><tr><td>Wyoming</td><td>\$3.6 billion</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Now, certain members of Congress want to bring back these outdated industry subsidies. This move would cost taxpayers billions of dollars in revenue.	STATE	REVENUE LOST B/C OF 12.5% RATE (COMPARED TO IF THE 16.67% RATE HAD BEEN IN PLACE) – FY13-22	Colorado	\$811 million	Montana	\$110 million	New Mexico	\$8 billion	North Dakota	\$1.2 billion	Utah	\$721 million	Wyoming	\$3.6 billion	N/A
STATE	REVENUE LOST B/C OF 12.5% RATE (COMPARED TO IF THE 16.67% RATE HAD BEEN IN PLACE) – FY13-22															
Colorado	\$811 million															
Montana	\$110 million															
New Mexico	\$8 billion															
North Dakota	\$1.2 billion															
Utah	\$721 million															
Wyoming	\$3.6 billion															

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would also harm Americans who are struggling with high prices and reduced public services, as states use federal drilling revenues to fund everything from schools to road maintenance to hospitals. • This bill is also completely out-of-step with state oil and gas fiscal policies. In fact, the State of New Mexico just increased its royalty rate for prime, state-owned acreage in the Permian Basin to as high as 25%. And many states have royalty rates on par with or in excess of 16.67%, including Texas (20-25%), Colorado (20%), Wyoming (16.67%), Montana (16.67%), Utah (16.67%) and North Dakota (minimum of 16.67%). 	
<p>Addressing local concerns – More than 3 in 4 voters oppose limiting the ability of federal agencies to respond to local concerns on land management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local communities, hunters and anglers, and landowners value national public lands for providing clean water sources, habitat for big game, and places to hunt, fish, and recreate. And, over the years, BLM has repeatedly, regardless of which political party controls the White House, rejected leases proposed by oil companies because of concerns from local businesses, hunters and anglers, retired park rangers, and Republican governors and other elected officials. • Responding to these local communities, stakeholders, and elected officials would no longer be allowed under the HNR Reconciliation bill. If oil companies want to lease a parcel of public land – next to someone’s ranch, next to a national park, or in a wildlife migration corridor – concerns from local stakeholders would not matter at all. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because public participation is non-existent or significantly reduced under the new permitting procedures, there would be no mechanism for identifying and addressing concerns from local communities, hunters and anglers, elected officials, and other stakeholders.

<p>Impact on private lands – There is overwhelming opposition to the use of eminent domain on private lands to facilitate pipelines from oil and gas on national public lands.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respecting private property rights is a bedrock principle in our country, particularly in western states. And western voters roundly reject giving oil companies free rein over private lands. • Yet, that’s exactly what the HNR bill does. It lets oil companies lease up to 57 million acres of private “split-estate” lands without first obtaining consent or input from landowners. And it gives oil companies a statutory right to drilling permits on private lands. • Further, if landowners are concerned about the impacts of leasing on water resources or their farm/ranch lands, and wish to file a formal protest, the HNR bill would make them pay a several-hundred dollar fee. • This bill is part of a broader effort to give oil companies greater control over private lands, as, in January, federal agencies were encouraged to use “eminent domain” to fast-track oil and gas projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private landowners would have no or very limited ability to identify concerns and possible impacts on water resources and their ranch or farmlands from oil and gas activities on national public lands.
<p>Limiting drilling to productive lands – More than 7 in 10 voters say oil and gas drilling on national public lands should be restricted to areas where there is high likelihood to produce oil and gas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western voters recognize what should be obvious to everyone: that you shouldn’t drill for oil when there isn’t oil to be found. And that’s why they strongly support restricting drilling to the most productive places on national public lands. • Yet, the bill gives oil and gas companies the ability to lease virtually anywhere they please, including on tens of millions of acres that are not – and never will be – oil and gas hotspots. This approach gives another subsidy to the industry, but it will generate little revenue for taxpayers. 	<p>N/A</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moreover, it can impair access to national public lands for recreation, grazing, and other multiple uses. That's because once a lease is issued – even if the likelihood of drilling is low – it becomes a valid existing right that limits the ability to plan and manage for other activities.	
--	--	--