



Drilling in ANWR

- I. Legal
 - a. Refuge created through executive action; the “new” refuge created through legislation
 - b. Secretary of the Interior cannot allow exploitation for oil, but Congress could.
- II. Political
 - a. In Opposition
 - i. Mainly democrats
 - ii. Opposed on basis of environmental issues.
 - iii. 50% to 70% of Americans oppose
 - b. In Favor
 - i. Republicans mainly
 - ii. Stay away from business
 - iii. Drilling is unobtrusive, so who cares?
 - iv. Teamsters are given incentive to support, even though the union is strongly democratic.
 - c. Alaska supports drilling for taxes from the new land
 - i. Increases Jobs
 - ii. Every Alaskan gets a check from oil revenues, so there’s strong incentive
 - iii. Carter locked up big chunks of Alaska as wilderness; not popular with Alaskans
 - d. Kerry opposes ANWR drilling; would rather pursue renewable energy
 - e. Trying to get coal states on board
 - i. Offered retirement packages for miners on revenue from oil production
 - ii. Union stood in opposition
- III. Environmental
 - a. In Opposition
 - i. ANWR was established to preserve an untouched area of the world
 - ii. Drilling will ruin the effect of that untouched land. “It’s not pretty!”
 - iii. ANWR is the only area considered both wetland and desert
 - iv. Two tribes that could be affected
 - 1. Gwich’in. Hunt caribou, so would be indirectly affected
 - 2. Inupiat. See that they’d get money, so support drilling
 - b. In Favor
 - i. Directional drilling would leave the area relatively untouched
 - ii. Would only use 1% of area 1002, or 0.1% of the refuge
 - iii. Nobody wants the land for anything else anyway
 - iv. Not a single animal has been killed as a direct result of drilling
 - v. Caribou have *increased* in number since drilling started in Prudhoe Bay.
 - vi. The only tribe that’s really affected are the Inupiat, who favor drilling.
- IV. Economic
 - a. In Favor
 - i. Could help reduce deficit
 - ii. Could match our input from the Persian Gulf
 - iii. We’d have a reserve supply in the event of burning oilfields
 - iv. Leaves a small footprint
 - v. Creates jobs; 70% of Alaskans are in favor
 - vi. Boots checks to Alaskans through entitlement
 - vii. Disrupts OPEC
 - viii. Could supply oil up to 30 years (opposition says only 6 months)
 - b. In Opposition
 - i. The process is feasible only with high prices
 - ii. Doesn’t create enough jobs to be worth it.
 - iii. OPEC has effectively unlimited supply; can’t ever compete
 - iv. Fuel efficiency would do more good than ANWR drilling ever would.