

**Biden’s Dangerous energy decisions have cost hardworking americans jobs and money**

***Canceling The Keystone XL Oil Pipeline Cost 60,000 Jobs And $3.6. Billion In Wages***

**On his first day in office, Biden revoked the permit of the Keystone XL oil pipeline.** “Construction on the long disputed Keystone XL oil pipeline halted Wednesday as incoming U.S. President Joe Biden revoked its permit on his first day in office. The 1,700-mile (2,735-kilometer) pipeline was planned to carry roughly 800,000 barrels of oil a day from Alberta to the Texas Gulf Coast, passing through Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma.” (Rob Gillies, “Keystone XL pipeline halted as Biden revokes permit,” [Associated Press](https://apnews.com/article/joe-biden-alberta-2fbcce48372f5c29c3ae6f6f93907a6d), 1/20/21)

* **During its construction, Keystone XL created 13,200 jobs. If it had been completed, the pipeline would have created 60,000 jobs and generated $3.6. billion in employment earnings.** (“Resources,” [Keystone XL](https://www.keystonexl.com/about/resources/), Accessed 4/27/21)

***Biden Considered Shutting Down The Line 5 Pipeline In Michigan Which Would Cost 33,755 Jobs, $20.8 Billion In Economic Activity And $2.36 Billion In Wages And Benefits***

**Though they have since walked back from the idea, the Biden Administration was “probing the possible economic impact of shutting down the contentious Line 5 pipeline at the center of a dispute between Michigan and Canada.”** “The Biden administration is probing the possible economic impact of shutting down the contentious Line 5 pipeline at the center of a dispute between Michigan and Canada. Environmentalists, Indigenous groups and Michigan’s Democratic Gov. Gretchen Whitmer have all been calling for the closure of the nearly 70-year-old pipeline, saying it was just one accident away from environmental catastrophe. They have been drawing parallels to the administration’s stonewalling of the then-under-development Keystone XL pipeline — and saying a similar move on Line 5 could show it is serious about transitioning from fossil fuels.” (MATTHEW CHOI, “Green finance promises but no enforcement,” [*Politico*](https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-energy/2021/11/04/green-finance-promises-but-no-enforcement-798664), 11/4/21)

* **A shutdown of Enbridge’s Line 5 would result in a loss of 33,755 jobs, $20.8 billion in economic activity and $2.36 billion in salaries, wages and benefits in the four-state region of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Pennsylvania.** “Even with these limitations and exclusions, the potential economic losses that would likely attend the closure of the Enbridge Line 5 are huge. Based on the modeled business disruptions described, we used the IMPLAN economic input-output model to estimate total regional and state level economic losses. • For the four-state region (MI, OH, IN, PA) total annual economic losses of closing Line 5 are conservatively estimated at: ° $20.8 billion loss in economic activity. ° $8.3 billion reduction in combined Gross State Product ° $2.36 billion foregone labor earnings in salaries, wages and benefits. ° 33,755 lost jobs ° $265.7 million lower annual state tax revenues.” (“2021 The Regional Economic And Fiscal Impacts Of An Enbridge Line 5 Shutdown,” [Consumer Energy Alliance](https://consumerenergyalliance.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/CEA_LINE5_REPORT_2021_DIGITAL_FINAL.pdf), 5/21)

***Biden Has Encouraged Unnecessary Stalling On Pipeline Permits, Resulting In Multiple Project Cancellations And Thousands Of Jobs Lost***

**Biden’s EPA repealed a Trump-era rule that said local entities could not take more than a year to approve or deny permits for utilities and oil and gas pipelines.** “EPA today laid out a path for states and tribes to take more time to negotiate and tackle challenges before signing off on water permits — an attempt to defang a controversial Trump-era rule that allows only a year to approve or deny permits for utilities and oil and gas pipelines. Sources say the move is an attempt by the Biden administration to mitigate the adverse effects of the Trump water rule finalized last year that’s still on the books while showing sensitivity to advocates fighting the proliferation of fossil fuel projects. ‘They’re not completely eliminating the Trump rule, but they’re taking out one of the worst aspects of it,’ said Pat Parenteau, a professor at Vermont Law School. EPA earlier this year announced it was redoing the Trump administration’s so-called 2020 Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification Rule, criticizing the regulation for eroding state and tribal authority (Greenwire, May 27).” (Hannah Northey, “Biden moves to blunt Trump water permitting rule,” [E&E News Greenwire](https://www.eenews.net/articles/biden-moves-to-blunt-trump-water-permitting-rule/), 8/20/21)

**Mountain Valley Pipeline**

**The Mountain Valley Pipeline, a natural gas pipeline from West Virginia to Virginia has been plagued by these kinds of permit delays, boosting its estimated costs to $6.2 billion in the face of legal and regulatory battles against the pipeline’s construction.** “U.S. pipeline company Equitrans Midstream Corp (ETRN.N) said on Tuesday the venture building the Mountain Valley natural gas pipeline from West Virginia to Virginia delayed its startup to the summer of 2022 and boosted its estimated cost to $6.2 billion. That timeline was in line with several analysts' forecasts. Earlier, the Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP) venture expected the project to enter service by the end of 2021 at an estimated cost of $5.8 billion-$6.0 billion. Equitrans said the delay was due to requests by environmental regulators in Virginia and West Virginia to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to extend the 120-day review period to evaluate MVP's water quality certification applications. In anticipation of a lengthy legal battle, MVP in February decided to pull its previously approved Nationwide Permit 12, which allowed the pipeline to cross several waterbodies under one authorization, and instead file some 300 individual stream crossing permits with the Army Corps and states. MVP is one of several U.S. pipelines delayed by regulatory and legal fights with environmental and local groups that found problems with federal permits - like the Nationwide Permit - issued by the Trump administration. When MVP started construction in February 2018, it estimated the 303-mile, 2.0 billion cubic feet per day project would cost about $3.5 billion and enter service by late 2018.” (“Mountain Valley natgas pipeline start delayed to summer 2022,” [Reuters](https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/wv-va-mountain-valley-natgas-pipe-start-delayed-summer-2022-2021-05-04/), 5/4/21)

* **Beyond delivering affordable natural gas to the communities that need it, construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline would sustain about 5,800 jobs, an average wage around $60,000 and $5.9 billion in economic activity.** “Economic Benefits for Our Communities: Direct Spending: With an estimated capital expense of $5.9 billion, the MVP project anticipates direct spending of $520 million in Virginia and $1.58 billion in West Virginia. Labor & Employment: The MVP project is estimated to sustain an average of 2,100 construction jobs in Virginia and 3,700 construction jobs in West Virginia through its targeted completion date. Wages and Benefits: The MVP project has had a positive impact on wages and benefits to the overall economy, supporting an estimated average of $59,800 per person in Virginia and $60,600 per person in West Virginia. Tax Revenue: Construction of the MVP project is expected to generate additional state and local tax revenue of approximately $49 million in Virginia and $82 million in West Virginia. Ad Valorem Taxes: Once the MVP is operational, counties along the route will continue to receive tax revenues, generating an estimated $10 million annually in Virginia and $35 million annually in West Virginia.” (“Local Summaries,” [Mountain Valley Pipeline](https://www.mountainvalleypipeline.info/local-summaries/), Accessed 6/7/21)

**PennEast Pipeline**

**Seven years after it was announced, the PennEast Pipeline was canceled following repeated regulatory and legal setbacks.** “Seven years after it was announced, the PennEast Pipeline has been canceled following repeated regulatory and legal setbacks that have increasingly complicated other natural gas infrastructure projects across the country. PennEast scrapped the project on Monday following what it said was ‘extensive evaluation and discussion’ among its five member companies. The project battled landowners, environmental groups and the state of New Jersey for years. Despite a crucial victory for the pipeline over the summer, ultimately the developers said there were too many regulatory hurdles left, including the need for a water quality certification in New Jersey. The state previously denied the permit.” (Jamison Cocklin, “PennEast Pipeline Canceled After Years of Regulatory, Legal Delays,” [Natural Gas Intelligence](https://www.naturalgasintel.com/penneast-pipeline-cancelled-after-years-of-regulatory-legal-delays/), 9/27/21)

* **The PennEast Pipeline would have created “nearly 12,000 jobs during the pipeline construction period and 2,000 jobs following construction.”** “The PennEast Pipeline will pump nearly one billion cubic feet of gas a day through a five-county path from Luzerne County into New Jersey. ‘The pipelines will create a pipeline of opportunities,’ Susan Kornick, a spokeswoman with PennEast Pipeline said. An economic study on the PennEast Pipeline is expected to create nearly 12,000 jobs during the pipeline construction period and 2,000 jobs following construction, Kornick said.” (“Pennsylvania’s natural gas industry has caused a ripple effect of job creation,” [*Times Leader*](https://www.timesleader.com/business/375680/pennsylvanias-natural-gas-industry-has-caused-a-ripple-effect-of-job-creation), 7/31/15)

**Jordan Cove Energy Project**

**After years of legal and permit delays, the Jordan Cove energy project in Oregon was canceled.** “Jordan Cove was given a key permit in March 2020 by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which included the right of eminent domain. That would have allowed the company to force property owners along the pipeline route to sell land to Pembina. But proceeding with construction under that authorization was contingent on Jordan Cove obtaining required permissions from the State of Oregon. After several rounds of back-and-forth, Pembina was unable to convince Oregon state regulators that the proposal could meet environmental standards. Last May, Jordan Cove officials announced they were ‘pausing’ the project to consider their options. A coalition of affected landowners — plus environmental groups, tribes and the State of Oregon — appealed to FERC to rescind its authorization of the Jordan Cove project. When FERC declined, the group appealed to federal court. A recent ruling in the District of Columbia Circuit sent the case back to FERC, which led the commission to ask all parties to submit updated briefs. In particular, FERC asked Pembina to ‘clarify’ their intentions. In response, Jordan Cove on Wednesday filed a brief effectively pulling the plug on the project, more than a decade in the making.” (Liam Moriarty, “Battle over Jordan Cove energy project is over after developers pull plug,” [Oregon Public Broadcasting](https://www.opb.org/article/2021/12/01/jordan-cove-pipeline-terminal-project-abandoned-by-developers/), 12/1/21)

* **The Jordan Cove Project was “expected to create 6,000 jobs during peak construction” and “generate up to $100 million in state and local tax revenue annually.”** “Moving this project forward has profound economic, energy security, and environmental implications, both at home and abroad. Natural gas production brings needed tax revenues, creates good paying jobs, and lowers energy costs. If built to authorized capacity, the Jordan Cove project is expected to create 6,000 jobs during peak construction and may generate up to $100 million in state and local tax revenue annually.” (“Jordan Cove LNG Export Terminal: Bringing Jobs and Energy Dominance to America’s West Coast,” [Department of Energy](https://www.energy.gov/articles/jordan-cove-lng-export-terminal-bringing-jobs-and-energy-dominance-america-s-west-coast), 7/15/20)

***If Biden’s “Pause” Had Become A Ban On New Oil And Gas Leases, It Would Have Cost 936,000 Jobs And $700 Billion In GDP***

**As another one of his first acts in office, President Biden also issued an executive order to “pause new oil and natural gas leases on public lands or in offshore waters.”** (“Executive Order on Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad,” [The White House](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/27/executive-order-on-tackling-the-climate-crisis-at-home-and-abroad/?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 1/27/21)

**That order was overturned by a federal court during a lawsuit which included over a dozen states and was filed in March by Louisiana Republican Attorney General Jeff Landry. “This is a victory not only for the rule of law, but also for the thousands of workers who produce affordable energy for Americans,” Landry said in a statement.** (Kevin McGill, “Federal judge blocks Biden’s pause on new oil, gas leases,” [Associated Press](https://apnews.com/article/joe-biden-climate-change-environment-and-nature-business-9751c4909a8b1baba28f3bcff9d5fa6e?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 6/16/21)

* **An analysis by the American Petroleum Institute found that a ban on federal leasing and development would cost 936,000 jobs by 2022 and would cause a $700 billion decline in GDP by 2030.** (“The Consequences of a Leasing and Development Ban on Federal Lands and Waters,” [American Petroleum Institute](https://www.api.org/~/media/Files/News/2020/09/Consequences_of_a_Leasing_and_Development_Ban_on_Federal_Lands_and_Waters.pdf), 9/20)

**Unfortunately the Administration’s onslaught on domestic industry continued as they also called for rate hikes for producers on federal lands.** (“Biden calls for higher fees for oil, gas leasing on federal land, stops short of ban,” [*The Associated Press*](https://www.npr.org/2021/11/26/1059398764/biden-calls-for-higher-fees-for-oil-gas-leasing-on-federal-land-stops-short-of-b?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 11/26/21)

**In response, Rep. Bruce Westerman (R-AR), Ranking Member on the House Natural Resources Committee pointed out, “Ultimately, the American consumer will pay the price. Look no further than the skyrocketing prices you are already paying at the gas pump.”** (“Biden calls for higher fees for oil, gas leasing on federal land, stops short of ban,” [*The Associated Press*](https://www.npr.org/2021/11/26/1059398764/biden-calls-for-higher-fees-for-oil-gas-leasing-on-federal-land-stops-short-of-b?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 11/26/21)

* **“Raising the royalty rate to 18.75 percent — the rate charged for drilling in deep waters offshore — would generate an additional $1 billion per year between now and 2050, according to research by Brian Prest, an economist at the think tank Resources for the Future. A royalty rate of 25 percent for both on- and offshore drilling would double that number to nearly $2 billion annually.”** (Sarah Kaplan, “Oil and gas companies should pay more to drill on public lands and waters, Interior Department says,” [*The Washington Post*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2021/11/26/biden-oil-gas-drill-public-lands/), 11/26/21)

***Biden’s Methane Tax Could Cost The American People Over $9 Billion And About 90,000 Jobs***

**Throughout the year we have all heard about**[**President Biden’s Methane Tax**](https://a.crowdskout.com/v1-1/email-click/aHR0cHM6Ly90aGVoaWxsLmNvbS9vcGluaW9uL2VuZXJneS1lbnZpcm9ubWVudC81Nzk1MDAtYS10YXgtb24tbWV0aGFuZS1tYXktYXBwZWFsLXRvLXNvbWUtYnV0LXdvbnQtYWN0dWFsbHktcmVkdWNl?b=eyJjc0lkIjo5ODI0NDcyOTcsImNsaWVudElkIjoyODQ1LCJvcmdhbml6YXRpb25JZCI6IjIwNjIzNzEiLCJzb3VyY2VJZCI6IjIwNjA4IiwiZW1haWxpbmdJZCI6bnVsbCwidjJFbWFpbGluZ0lkIjoxMTkzNSwiZnJvbSI6IjVmMzUxNzcwLTRiNDktNGE0YS1hNzJlLTNjNDRiZDM2OTE4NiJ9)**which thankfully looks like it has been delayed for the time being. Additional taxes and fees only hurt the consumer because the costs would just be “passed along to the homeowners and businesses that ultimately pay for the fuel cost in their energy bills.”** (Bernard L. Weinstein, “A tax on methane may appeal to some — but won't actually reduce emissions,” [*The Hill*](https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/579500-a-tax-on-methane-may-appeal-to-some-but-wont-actually-reduce?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 11/2/21)

* **A methane tax “could cost the American people over $9 billion and about 90,000 jobs across the country.”** “The bill is likely to include a ‘methane fee,’ that is targeted at America’s oil and natural gas workers but amounts to a production tax on the industry that would hurt supply of natural gas and could cost the American people over $9 billion and about 90,000 jobs across the country. This is the epitome of policy being used for political grandstanding – but this policy is truly bad for American families, bad for American jobs, and bad for cleaner energy progress.” (Anne Bradbury, “A ‘Methane Fee’ Puts America’s Progress in Jeopardy,” [American Exploration and Production Council](https://www.axpc.org/2021/09/01/a-methane-fee-puts-americas-progress-in-jeopardy/), 9/1/21)

***An Export Ban On Oil And Gas Considered By The Biden Administration Would Harm Jobs, Economic Growth And Return Us To Hundreds Of Billions In Trade Deficits***

**Though they claim it is now off the table, the Administration and democratic leaders were considering banning exports of crude oil and liquid natural gas.** (Steve Holland and Timothy Gardner, “White House declines to comment on Granholm remark on possible crude oil export,” [*Reuters*](https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/white-house-declines-comment-granholm-remark-possible-crude-oil-export-2021-10-06/?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 10/6/21; RACHEL FRAZIN, “Energy chief: We are 'not considering' oil export ban,” [*The Hill*](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/585799-energy-chief-we-are-not-considering-oil-export-ban?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 12/14/21)

* **“Exports mean jobs and economic growth. Exporting oil, petroleum products and natural gas directly supports thousands of U.S. jobs in engineering, manufacturing – including refining – construction, and operation of the export infrastructure, as well as others indirectly along the equipment supply chain.”**  (Mark Green, “Q&A: Crude Oil Exports Help Allies, Support U.S. Jobs and Production,” [American Petroleum Institute](https://www.api.org/news-policy-and-issues/blog/2021/11/22/qa-crude-oil-exports-help-allies-support-us-jobs-and-production), 11/22/21)
* **“Exports also mean increased government revenue, without tax increases that can slow economic growth. The additional production associated with exports generates billions of dollars annually in much needed federal and state government revenue.”** (Mark Green, “Q&A: Crude Oil Exports Help Allies, Support U.S. Jobs and Production,” [American Petroleum Institute](https://www.api.org/news-policy-and-issues/blog/2021/11/22/qa-crude-oil-exports-help-allies-support-us-jobs-and-production), 11/22/21)
* **When the former export ban was lifted a few years ago on “petroleum and products, the trade deficit fell in real terms from $431 billion in 2008 to $217.6 billion in 2015 to being balanced in 2020.”** “So, allowing crude oil exports in 2016 unlocked growth for U.S. producers, stimulating the economy through investment across the energy and manufacturing value chains while simultaneously reducing the U.S. trade deficit. For petroleum and products, the trade deficit fell in real terms from $431 billion in 2008 to $217.6 billion in 2015 to being balanced in 2020, according to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.” (Mark Green, “Q&A: Crude Oil Exports Help Allies, Support U.S. Jobs and Production,” [American Petroleum Institute](https://www.api.org/news-policy-and-issues/blog/2021/11/22/qa-crude-oil-exports-help-allies-support-us-jobs-and-production), 11/22/21)

***Biden Reversed A Policy That Would Have Allowed Oil And Gas Development In Alaska, Which Could Create Up To 130,000 Jobs In The State***

**Biden reversed a “Trump-era policy that opened up vast swathes of Arctic Alaska land to new oil development.”** “The Biden administration announced on Monday that it will reverse a Trump-era policy that opened up vast swathes of Arctic Alaska land to new oil development. The U.S. Department of the Interior said it will scrap the Trump administration's decision that authorized expanded leasing and development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, or NPR-A. Even though Trump took several steps to try to boost oil-and-gas development in Alaska, production in the state fell to a 43-year low in 2020, as drillers focus their attention in Texas and other lower 48 states.” (Yereth Rosen, “Biden administration to scrap Trump plan for wider Alaska oil drilling,” [Reuters](https://www.reuters.com/markets/commodities/biden-administration-scrap-trump-plan-wider-alaska-oil-drilling-2022-01-11/), 1/10/22)

* **“Opening a small portion of ANWR to energy production would create tens of thousands of American jobs and contribute to significant economic growth. Studies have shown ANWR job creation ranging from 55,000 to 130,000 jobs.”** “Creating American Jobs, Growing the Economy. Opening a small portion of ANWR to energy production would create tens of thousands of American jobs and contribute to significant economic growth. Studies have shown ANWR job creation ranging from 55,000 to 130,000 jobs.” (“ANWR: Producing American Energy And Creating American Jobs,” [House Committee on Natural Resources](https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/anwr/), Accessed 1/26/22)

***Biden’s Contradictory Stalling On A Mine Necessary For His Own Green-At-Any-Cost Agenda Could Cost Minnesota Over 2,000 Jobs And $3 Billion For Schools***

**The Administration also dealt their own green-at-any-cost agenda a serious blow by ordering a burdensome environmental review of a proposed Minnesota mine that could restrict access to domestic rare earth minerals critical for components in solar panels and electric vehicles.** (“Biden Administration Delivers Serious Blow to Minnesota Mine,” [U.S. News and World Report](https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/minnesota/articles/2021-10-20/biden-administration-delivers-serious-blow-to-minnesota-mine?cs-from=5f351770-4b49-4a4a-a72e-3c44bd369186), 10/20/21)

* **The Twin Metals mine is expected “will bring more than 750 direct full-time jobs and 1,500 new spinoff jobs to the residents of northeast Minnesota.”** “We’re focused on designing, constructing and operating an underground copper, nickel, cobalt and platinum group metals mine, located about nine miles southeast of Ely and 11 miles northeast of Babbitt. We’re targeting the minerals within the Maturi deposit, which is part of the Duluth Complex geologic formation.  Our project will bring more than 750 direct full-time jobs and 1,500 new spinoff jobs to the residents of northeast Minnesota – an unprecedented economic impact that has the potential to revitalize an entire region.” ([Twin Metals Minnesota](https://www.twin-metals.com/meet-twin-metals/about-the-project/), Accessed 1/24/22)
* **The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources “estimates that copper-nickel mining projects will generate approximately $3 billion for the Minnesota Permanent School Trust Fund, providing revenue for the education of nearly 900,000 K-12 students across every school district in Minnesota.”** “In fact, the Department of Natural Resources estimates that copper-nickel mining projects will generate approximately $3 billion for the Minnesota Permanent School Trust Fund, providing revenue for the education of nearly 900,000 K-12 students across every school district in Minnesota.” (“Jobs & Economic Impact,” [Jobs for Minnesotans](http://jobsforminnesotans.org/jobs/), Accessed 1/24/22)

***Biden Allowed A Fracking Ban To Take Hold In The Delaware River Basin, A Nationwide Ban Would Cost 19 Million Jobs And $7.1 Trillion***

**Despite a pile of campaign promises that he would not ban fracking, the Biden administration let a fracking ban take hold in the Delaware River Basin that covers Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey and Delaware.** “The Delaware River Basin Commission on Thursday approved a permanent ban on hydraulic fracturing of natural gas wells along the river, doubling down in the face of new legal challenges. The DRBC’s vote maintains the status quo — it formally affirms a drilling moratorium imposed in 2010 by the commission, the interstate agency that manages water use in the vast Delaware watershed. But environmentalists hailed the frack ban as historic. The commission said it had the authority to ban fracking in order to control future pollution, protect the public health, and preserve the waters in the Delaware River Basin. For more than debate, environmental activists have rallied substantial public opposition in the basin to pressure the commission to enact the ban. The formal ban came a month after a federal judge set an October trial date to hear a challenge from landowners to the drilling moratorium, which is now a permanent ban. Pennsylvania Republican lawmakers, along with Damascus Township in Wayne County, also filed a separate federal legal action last month alleging that the moratorium illegally usurps state legislators’ authority to govern natural resources. Representatives of the governors of four states that are drained by the river — Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and New York, all governed by Democrats — voted in favor of the ban. The fifth commission member, a federal government representative from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, abstained because he said the corps needed additional time to ‘coordinate’ with the new Biden administration.” (Andrew Maykuth, “Amid lawsuits, Delaware River Basin Commission makes fracking ban permanent,” [*The Philadelphia Inquirer*](https://www.inquirer.com/business/fracking-ban-delaware-river-permanent-drbc-20210225.html), 2/25/21)

**A full ban on fracking in the United States “would eliminate 19 million jobs and reduce U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by $7.1 trillion” by 2025.** “Simply put, a ban on fracking in the United States would be catastrophic for our economy. Our analysis shows that if such a ban were imposed in 2021, by 2025 it would eliminate 19 million jobs and reduce U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by $7.1 trillion. Job losses in major energy producing states would be immediate and severe; in Texas alone, more than three million jobs would be lost. Tax revenue at the local, state, and federal levels would decline by nearly a combined $1.9 trillion, as the ban cuts off a critical source of funding for schools, first responders, infrastructure, and other critical public services.” (“What if hydraulic fracturing was banned?,” [U.S. Chamber of Commerce Global Energy Institute](https://www.globalenergyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/hf_ban_report_final.pdf), 12/19)