

NEW POLL: Nevada Voters Strongly Reject Congressional and Executive Branch Proposals that Will Cost Taxpayers Money, Eliminate Public Participation, and Remove Safeguards for Wildlife, National Public Lands and Waters While Encouraging Expansive Oil and Gas Development

Nevada voters – including MAGA supporters and rural Nevadans – overwhelmingly reject [Congressional](#) and [Executive Branch](#) proposals that would let oil and gas companies exploit our national public lands without paying fair market rates and that would reduce local community input and safeguards for wildlife habitat, recreation (including hunting and fishing), and drinking water resources. The voters also oppose leaving taxpayers – and not oil companies – on the hook for cleanup after development. The values that unite Nevadans against repeal of these essential safeguards could not be clearer, with near-universal agreement across geography and ideology that the **most important uses of national public lands are: helping to keep air and water clean (90%), conserving natural areas for future generations (84%), providing a place for wildlife to live (83%), protecting historic sites (82%), and providing a place for outdoor recreation (82%)**. Just 36% of Nevadans felt the same about providing land to be leased for oil and gas development.

They know what they're talking about too – nine out of ten Nevada voters say they've spent time on national public lands in the past year, and one-in-three have visited 6 times or more. That's all according to a new poll of 400 Nevada voters conducted by New Bridge Strategy for the National Wildlife Federation, part of a first-of-its-kind [survey](#) of 3,200 voters in eight western states – CO, MT, NV, NM, ND, SD, UT, and WY – for their views on oil and gas development on national public lands.

The survey further demonstrates broad, bipartisan support for specific wildlife, recreation, local community, and drinking water safeguards, as well as fiscal reforms that put taxpayers first in the development and subsequent clean up of public lands. This support runs counter to several of the recent Congressional and Administrative proposals that subsidize oil and gas companies at the expense of hardworking Americans and our shared national public lands:

- **An overwhelming majority (91%) of Nevadans** want to keep the current requirements that oil and gas companies, rather than taxpayers, pay for all of the clean-up and land restoration costs after drilling is finished.
- **Nearly three-in-four Nevadans** say we should keep the fees that oil and gas companies pay to lease and develop publicly owned resources at their current levels.
- **More than three-in-four Nevada voters, regardless of political party**, are opposed to eliminating the \$5 per acre fee that oil and gas companies who want to drill on national public lands must pay, which helps cover the cost to review whether those are appropriate for development or whether they should be prioritized for wildlife habitat, outdoor recreation, or other uses.
- **Nearly three-in-four Nevadans** say drilling should be restricted to areas where there is a high likelihood of producing oil and gas. This is of particular importance because the vast majority of Nevada's public lands have little or no potential for oil and gas

development. While current standards limit speculative leasing practices, 870,000 acres of Nevada's public lands are still burdened with speculative leases that pre-date those standards. In the past, speculative leasing proposals by oil companies threatened some of Nevada's most beloved areas, including the [Ruby Mountains](#), which support critical big-game migration corridors, camping, fishing, hunting, and other recreational uses.

- **Majorities of voters in Nevada, across party lines**, oppose reducing the review process and opportunities for public input regarding decisions about what takes place on national public lands, including potential oil and gas development.
- **Nevadans across party lines** want to be cautious when it comes to oil and gas development on national public lands, including by avoiding development near rivers and streams that could risk drinking water sources, or in wildlife migration areas.

You can access the full polling results [here](#) and a point-by-point contrast between current Administrative and Congressional proposals against westerners' views [here](#).