

meeting ended on a note that we needed at least one more session to bring our thoughts into final form and again try to resolve differences that were appearing.²⁸

The final meeting of the Oil Shale Board was held in Washington, D.C., beginning on Sunday, January 17, 1965, and continuing through the 18th. It was agreed that we had to get the report in by the 1st of February and this was the target we all set out to reach. Chairman Joseph Fisher was having a rough time getting a consensus, but he never ceased to strive toward it.

V. ISSUES

Against the chronological background we now can begin to develop the issues considered by the Board. At the initial meeting and carrying over into the issues proposed later in writing, three principal questions emerged. They were: First, would present opening of federal oil shale lands to development threaten our existing economy; second, is it in the public interest to proceed with developing an oil shale industry; third, can a method be provided for opening federal oil shale lands to development that affords full protection to all interests. The above was my conception of the basic issues, based on preliminary materials supplied to us and on my own personal experience. Each of the Board Members had agreed to send in a statement of his tentative proposals for the subject matter that the Board would consider. Of the five presented and distributed to the Board, mine was far from the most profound.

However, since it was mine, I feel free to use it. As submitted on July 16, 1964, it read:

Questions and subquestions proposed for resolution by the Advisory Group on Oil Shale are:

- I. Does the "public interest" require control of the development of oil shale production?
 - A. What "public interest"?
 1. Defense needs?
 2. International commitments?
 3. National energy requirements?
 4. National economy:
 - a) Industrial development
 - b) Area development
 - c) Protection of current capital investment
 - (1) Investments in the petroleum industry or the energy supplying industries
 - (2) Investment in oil shale investments
 - (a) Realty and deposits
 - (b) Research investment
 - (c) Improvements
 - d) Prevention of waste of oil shale resources
 - e) Prevention of waste of other resources
 - (i.e., mineral, vegetative, space, recreational, etc.)
 - B. Should control be restrictive or incentive or flexible?
- II. What is the procedural method desirable and possible for federal control of the oil shale resource?
 - A. Availability of federally owned resources for leasing?

[NOTE.—Factual data required with some detail to determine feasibility includes:

 1. What is the true pattern of ownership of the oil shale resources?
 - a) Federal
 - (1) Unencumbered

²⁸ Additional data received at or after the November–December meeting included:

- (1) "Developments at Rifle Oil Shale Plant under Lease Agreement with Colorado School of Mines Research Foundation," (undated, but mailed Dec. 4, 1964), 2 pp.
- (2) East, and Gardner, Oil Shale Mining, Rifle, Colorado 1944–56, U.S. Dep't of the Interior, B. of Mines Bull. 611, 1964, 163 pp.
- (3) Prien, Denver Research Institute, University of Denver, "Oil Shale—Current Status of U.S. Oil Shale Technology,"
- (4) "Shale Oil: Colorado, Utah and Wyoming." Charts and schedules, U.S.G.S., Nov. 30, 1964, 13 pp.
- (5) Stoddard, "Surface Resource Protection—Oil Shale Exploration and Development," prepared by BLM for Oil Shale Advisory Board, (undated, but presented Nov. 29, 1964), 5 pp.