

In the state legislature, Yadira Caraveo sponsored legislation to sharply limit new oil and gas development, which could threaten thousands of energy jobs in Colorado and make America more reliant on foreign energy supply chains in the future.

In 2019, Yadira Caraveo was a “proud prime sponsor” of SB19-181, which she admitted was a “very big, controversial bill” that could fundamentally change how the state of Colorado approaches oil and gas development:

- In 2019, Yadira Caraveo was a prime sponsor of SB19-181, a bill to “Protect Public Welfare Oil and Gas Operations.” (Colorado General Assembly, “SB19-181,” [Sponsors](#), Introduced 3/1/19)

The screenshot shows a legislative bill page for SB19-181. The title is "Protect Public Welfare Oil And Gas Operations". The description states: "Concerning additional public welfare protections regarding the conduct of oil and gas operations, and, in connection therewith, making an appropriation." The session is "2019 Regular Session" and the subject is "Natural Resources & Environment". The bill summary reads: "Oil and gas operations - air quality regulation - local government authority - oil and gas conservation commission - composition - authority - financial assurance requirements - pooling - appropriation. The act prioritizes the protection of public safety, health, welfare, and the environment in the regulation of the oil and gas industry by modifying the oil and gas statutes and by clarifying." On the right side, under "PRIME SPONSORS", there are four entries: Senator Stephen Fenberg, Senator Mike Foote, Representative KC Becker, and Representative Yadira Caraveo. Each entry includes a small circular portrait of the sponsor.

(Colorado General Assembly, “SB19-181,” [Sponsors](#), Introduced 3/1/19)

- In October 2020, Caraveo said that she was a “proud prime sponsor of SB19-181, which fundamentally changes how our state approaches oil and gas development.” “I was a proud prime sponsor of SB19-181, which fundamentally changes how our state approaches oil and gas development so that we are finally prioritizing the health and safety of our communities and our environment. While rule-making is ongoing as of late September, we need to continue to pass bold legislation to address climate change and carry out a just transition to renewable energy.” (The Denver Post Staff, “Colorado State House District 31 candidate Q&A,” [The Denver Post](#), 10/8/20)
- In March 2019, Yadira Caraveo voted for SB19-181.

SB19-181			
HOUSE			
Calendar: 3rd			
Motion: BILL			
Voted on: 3/29/2019 10:02:33 AM			
Total			
Aye :	36	No :	28
Absent :	0	Excused :	1
Member Name		Vote	
Arndt	Y	Linton	N
Bainley	N	Lorraine	Y
Beckman	N	McCluskie	Y
Benavides	Y	McKean	N
Bird	Y	McLachlan	Y
Bockenfeld	N	Melton	Y
Buck	N	Michaelsen Jensen	Y
Buckner	Y	Mullica	Y
Buontello	N	Neville	N
Caraveo	Y	Pelton	N

(Colorado General Assembly, SB19-181, Third Reading of Bill: Passed 36-28-1, [Caraveo Voted Yes](#), 3/29/19)

- In an April 2019 interview, Caraveo acknowledged that SB19-181 was “a very big, controversial bill.” “I was added onto the Speaker’s bill for oil and gas, 181, which was also a very big, controversial bill. And also, I think, to provide a very different perspective on what is really looking at public health and safety, because of work I’ve done in the past around climate issues as a resident.” (Sara Gentzler, “Q&A: Dr. Rep. Yadira Caraveo, Vice Chair of Colorado’s House Health & Insurance Committee,” [State of Reform](#), 4/10/19)

SB19-181 was opposed by the Consumer Energy Alliance, who argued that the measure could curtail new oil and gas development, eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, decrease Colorado tax revenue, and eliminate the bulk of energy cost savings:

- SB19-181 was opposed by the Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA) and Colorado Petroleum Council on the grounds that the measure could be detrimental on ‘a variety of levels.’ “Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA) and Colorado Petroleum Council officials are expressing opposition to the state’s Senate Bill 19-181 legislation, maintaining the measure would be detrimental on a variety of levels.” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)
- According to the Consumer Energy Alliance, SB19-181 could curtail new oil and gas development, eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, decrease Colorado tax revenue, and eliminate the bulk of energy cost savings. “The CEA said the bill would curtail new oil and gas development, eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, decrease Colorado tax revenue and eliminate the bulk of the savings residents and businesses have seen in energy costs in recent years.” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)
- The COO of the Consumer Energy Alliance argued that SB19-181 “threatens to increase household energy expenses and hurt the livelihoods of people across the state by significantly reducing, or all-out eliminating, the production and transportation of safe,

affordable energy made so close to home and the thousands of family-sustaining jobs they carry.” “Colorado is already the leader in air and water regulatory framework in the world,’ CEA Chief Operating Officer Andrew Browning said. ‘This ill-advised bill threatens to increase household energy expenses and hurt the livelihoods of people across the state by significantly reducing, or all-out eliminating, the production and transportation of safe, affordable energy made so close to home and the thousands of family-sustaining jobs they carry.’” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)

SB19-181 was opposed by the Colorado Petroleum Council, which criticized the bill as a “misguided proposal” that was crafted without proper stakeholder input, further arguing the bill “threatens the viability of entire communities across our state yet continues to be forced through the legislative process at breakneck speed”:

- **SB19-181 was opposed by the Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA) and Colorado Petroleum Council, both of whom argued that the measure could be detrimental on a variety of levels.** “Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA) and Colorado Petroleum Council officials are expressing opposition to the state’s Senate Bill 19-181 legislation, maintaining the measure would be detrimental on a variety of levels.” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)
- **The Colorado Petroleum Council criticized the bill as a ‘misguided proposal loaded with unintended consequences.’** “The Colorado Petroleum Council views the legislation as a misguided proposal loaded with unintended consequences.” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)
- **The Colorado Petroleum Council further argued that the legislation was crafted without proper stakeholder input and subsequently lacked in technical expertise.** “The Colorado Petroleum Council said when such legislation is crafted without proper stakeholder input, it should not be a surprise that it is lacking in technical expertise.” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)
- **According to the Colorado Petroleum Council, SB19-181 “threatens the viability of entire communities across our state yet continues to be forced through the legislative process at breakneck speed” despite the “wide-ranging economic impacts at stake.”** “‘This measure threatens the viability of entire communities across our state yet continues to be forced through the legislative process at breakneck speed,’ Ben Marter, Colorado Petroleum Council spokesman, said. ‘With so many Colorado jobs and such wide-ranging economic impacts at stake, we simply ask that Democratic leadership include proper analysis and a thorough stakeholder process.’” (Douglas Clark, “Organizations oppose Colorado SB 19-181,” [Daily Energy Insider](#), 3/21/19)

SB19-181 was criticized by the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) because it could allow a political appointee to effectively ban the development or extraction of oil and/or gas in Colorado and thus could negatively impact small businesses that support the oil and gas industry, such as local retail and service entities:

- **The National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) opposed SB19-181.** “A ‘No’ vote supports the NFIB position. Passed the Senate 19-16. Passed the House 40-24. Signed by the governor.” (NFIB, “Colorado Voting Record,” [2020 Edition](#), Accessed 5/24/21)

- **According to the NFIB, the bill could allow a political appointee to effectively ban the development or extraction of oil and/or gas in Colorado.** “The passage of SB 181 will possibly have the effect of placing an outright ban on the development or extraction of oil and gas in Colorado at the hands of a Governor’s political appointee. SB 181 also allows local governments to require a larger setback than currently allowed based upon political viewpoint rather than science. Sb 181 will have a significant impact on those small businesses that support the oil and gas industry such as local retail and service entities.” (NFIB, “Colorado Voting Record,” [2020 Edition](#), Accessed 5/24/21)
- **SB19-181 would create an Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, which would consist of seven members, five of whom would be voting members and appointed by the governor with the consent of the Senate.** “(1) THERE IS HEREBY CREATED, IN THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, THE OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION. (2) (a) THE COMMISSION CONSISTS OF SEVEN MEMBERS, FIVE OF WHOM SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH THE CONSENT OF THE SENATE. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS' DESIGNEES, ARE EX OFFICIO NONVOTING MEMBERS. A MAJORITY OF THE VOTING COMMISSIONERS CONSTITUTE A QUORUM FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ITS BUSINESS.” (Colorado State Senate, SB19-181, [Signed Into Law](#), 4/16/19)
- **The other two commission members would be the Executive Director of the Department of Natural Resources and the Executive Director of the Department of Public Health and Environment, both of whom would be Ex Officio non-voting members.** “(1) THERE IS HEREBY CREATED, IN THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, THE OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION. (2) (a) THE COMMISSION CONSISTS OF SEVEN MEMBERS, FIVE OF WHOM SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH THE CONSENT OF THE SENATE. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS' DESIGNEES, ARE EX OFFICIO NONVOTING MEMBERS. A MAJORITY OF THE VOTING COMMISSIONERS CONSTITUTE A QUORUM FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ITS BUSINESS.” (Colorado State Senate, SB19-181, [Signed Into Law](#), 4/16/19)
- **The governor would have the power to designate one member of the commission as chair of the commission and would also have the power to remove an appointed member of the commission at any time.** “e) MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION SHALL BE APPOINTED FOR TERMS OF FOUR YEARS EACH; EXCEPT THAT THE INITIAL TERMS OF TWO MEMBERS ARE TWO YEARS. THE GOVERNOR SHALL DESIGNATE ONE MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION AS CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION. THE CHAIR SHALL DELEGATE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES TO COMMISSIONERS AND

THE DIRECTOR. THE GOVERNOR MAY AT ANY TIME REMOVE ANY APPOINTED MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION, AND BY APPOINTMENT THE GOVERNOR SHALL FILL ANY VACANCY ON THE COMMISSION. IN CASE ONE OR MORE VACANCIES OCCUR ON THE SAME DAY, THE GOVERNOR SHALL DESIGNATE THE ORDER OF FILLING VACANCIES.”

(Colorado State Senate, SB19-181, [Signed Into Law](#), 4/16/19)

- **The NFIB argued that SB19-181 could have a “significant impact on those small businesses that support the oil and gas industry such as local retail and service entities.”** “The passage of SB 181 will possibly have the effect of placing an outright ban on the development or extraction of oil and gas in Colorado at the hands of a Governor’s political appointee. SB 181 also allows local governments to require a larger setback then currently allowed based upon political viewpoint rather than science. Sb 181 will have a significant impact on those small businesses that support the oil and gas industry such as local retail and service entities.” (NFIB, “Colorado Voting Record,” [2020 Edition](#), Accessed 5/24/21)

In an op-ed, State Senator Larry Crowder argued that the effects of SB19-181 were “extreme and far reaching,” and alleged that there had been a loss of nearly 90,000 good-to-high-paying jobs in the oil and gas sector since the bill was enacted:

- **In an op-ed, State Senator Larry Crowder argued that the effects of SB19-181 were “extreme and far reaching.”** “There are always two sides of any issue affecting Colorado, and this is an opinion against SB19-181. Colorado had a robust oil and gas extraction until 181 came into play and the ramifications of this bill are extreme and far reaching. Following are just a few of the detrimental effects of this bill.” (Larry Crowder, “Here’s the other side of Senate Bill 19-181,” [Op-Ed](#), *The Pueblo Chieftain*, 11/21/20)
- **Crowder claimed that prior to the bill’s enactment, there were 232,900 jobs supported by oil and gas, and that as of July 2020, there had been a loss of nearly 90,000 good-to-high-paying jobs.** “A) Prior to SB 181, there were 232,900 jobs supported by oil and gas. As of July 2020, there has been a loss of just under 90,000 jobs which were good to high paying jobs.” (Larry Crowder, “Here’s the other side of Senate Bill 19-181,” [Op-Ed](#), *The Pueblo Chieftain*, 11/21/20)
- **He further argued that if they were to shut down 50% of oil and gas operations by 2030, there could be 120,000 additional jobs lost and \$8 billion lost in tax revenue.** “B) If legislation were to shut down 50% by 2030, there would be 120,000 additional jobs lost and \$8 billion in lost tax revenue.” (Larry Crowder, “Here’s the other side of Senate Bill 19-181,” [Op-Ed](#), *The Pueblo Chieftain*, 11/21/20)
- **Crowder listed several other detrimental impacts of SB19-181, including that it could devastate the Southern Colorado region due to the lack of employment opportunities.** “C) 50% of downtown businesses are leased by oil and gas and with their demise this will lead to real estate disaster for that area. D) 2 1/2% percent of oil and gas is in Southern Colorado and over 90% in Weld County. With a lack of employment opportunities in Southern Colorado, this will be devastating to this region. E) SB-181 was an open dismissal of the will of Colorado voters, who overwhelmingly voted to reject Prop 112 with 57% voting against extending further setbacks. F) Severance tax payments to counties will definitely be impacted negatively. G) Even the Pueblo steel mill opposed 181 with their

rebuking opinion page as they realized the effects of 181 to their future operating and employment opportunities. Another huge problem is this entire bill was based on current technologies on controlling Greenhouse Gasses (GHG) as future technologies developed. We can clean the environment even more without sacrificing jobs and economy.” (Larry Crowder, “Here’s the other side of Senate Bill 19-181,” [Op-Ed](#), *The Pueblo Chieftain*, 11/21/20)

- **Crowder also speculated that any cut in Colorado’s production would be filled by global supply.** “Colorado cannot achieve its GHG emissions reduction goals by cutting production because the global market will simply replace any lost supplies. California Governor Gavin Newsom recently noted that oil production in his state had declined 60 percent since 1985, but the state has only seen a modest 4.4 percent decrease in demand.” (Larry Crowder, “Here’s the other side of Senate Bill 19-181,” [Op-Ed](#), *The Pueblo Chieftain*, 11/21/20)

Reducing domestic energy production will increase the need to get energy from other sources:

- **Talking about energy production trends in 2015, the United States Energy Information Administration found that increasing domestic oil production would decrease the need for imports.** “Increasing levels of domestic crude oil production through 2020 have two effects: lower crude oil imports and higher throughput at U.S. refineries. Higher refinery throughput increases production and net exports of refined petroleum products like motor gasoline and diesel fuel. Together, lower crude oil imports and higher product exports reduce net imports of petroleum and other liquids, which in 2013 provided 33% of total U.S. consumption (product supplied).” (Michael Ford, “Increasing domestic production of crude oil reduces net petroleum imports,” [Energy Information Administration](#), 4/21/15)