sideration by any others who may in the future be delving into the oil shale problem.[31]

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Having participated with my fellow board members physically, orally, and composition-wise, and having shared their deep interest in oil shale, their unflagging concern for the public interest, and the pressures and frustrations, I must state basic truths to you who may read these comments:

[31] The proposals were:

(1) Oil shale development is not presently a matter of major concern in the over-all national needs for energy.

(2) Efforts to develop a viable oil shale industry as an alternate source of national energy supplies is in the national interest.

(3) Immediate efforts to develop an oil shale industry do not pose a serious threat to that portion of our national economy represented by the oil industry and other industries supplying our energy requirements.

(4) Parties interested in oil shale development are in various stages of progress toward commencement of a commercial oil shale industry.

(5) The federal government controls some 75% of the total acreage and some 85% of the known reserves of oil shale. An additional 5% of both acreage and reserves may be controlled by the federal government depending on the outcome of pending controversy over the ownership of unpatented mining claims. The remaining ownership of acreage and reserves is in private ownership with some in the states of Wyoming and Utah in state ownership.

(6) At least one company and perhaps others are proceeding to develop known oil shale reserves not in private ownership.

(7) Withdrawing or maintaining the withdrawal of federal reserves from development will not necessarily prevent development of an oil shale industry by those able to acquire private and state lands.

(8) Withholding the federal reserves from access creates a favored position for oil shale development in the hands of the relatively few holders of non-federal lands.

(9) Numerous companies or groups of investors are demonstrating substantial interest and making major investments in efforts to develop an oil shale industry.

(10) Withholding federal lands will not prevent such development, but will restrict competition and may reduce the probabilities of a breakthrough into successful and economically feasible development.

(11) The federal oil shale reserves could be attractive for speculative investment, as contrasted to development investment.

(12) The lands involved have values other than those for oil shale. Conservation standards for protection against waste of the oil shale resource itself, for the protection of surface, other mineral values, scenic values, and other values, and protection against pollution and other damages have not been established.

(13) The federal government can act contractually to achieve such conservation standards as to federal lands but must cooperate with state and local governments and private owners to achieve them as to the remaining area.

(14) If federal government wholly or in part withholds access to the federally owned reserves for development, the federal government will not be participating in the development of conservation standards and inducements to orderly development that is in the best national, regional, and local interests.

(15) The present stage of oil shale development indicates that continuing adjustment and improvement in the techniques of extraction and processing for the oil shale industry is needed to achieve and maintain an economically feasible place in the national energy picture for oil shale.

(16) Development of standards for protection of values other than oil shale requires substantial cooperative efforts by all segments of our society—federal, states, and private. The establishment of such standards that can be observed within economically feasible limits will have major effect on the development of an oil shale industry.

(17) Other considerations, such as depletion and quotas and other factors will also affect the development of an oil shale industry. Such factors are believed to be beyond the scope of this board's mission.

(18) The proceeds received by the federal government from its owned oil shale reserves are distributed under the terms of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 on the basis of 37½% to the state of origin, 52½% to the reclamation fund, and 10% to the General Fund in the U.S. Treasury. The large sums which may be received in the future, costs of administration and possible costs of protecting other public interests in the area without unduly burdening the oil shale industry with such public benefit expenses may require review of the propriety of the above distribution of receipts. Again, this is a problem noted for consideration, but one considered to be beyond the scope of this board's mission.

(19) The current controversy over the ownership of unpatented mining claims creates a situation that allows neither federal nor private—and in some cases state—control of the controverted lands for purposes of development. Until such controversies are resolved the lack of necessary certainty of title in federal or non-federal ownership retards development.

(20) The federal government is receiving no present income either in royalties, rentals, or as tax base from its oil shale reserves and has increasing continuing expenses in their management.

(21) Withholding oil shale reserves from access or granting of access without making such access open to competition can be expected to evoke accusations of "favoritism" against responsible federal officials.