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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Description and Location of Resource
B. Historical Background of Oil Shale Development
   1. Crude oil shortages in Twentieth Century
   2. Bureau of Mines Anvil Points — Naval Oil Shale Reserve

II. OWNERSHIP OF RESOURCE

A. Private Ownership — General Mining Laws
   2. Tosco cases — Whether assessment work was properly performed
B. Patented tracts
C. Public ownership

III. OIL SHALE DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGY

A. Mining Methods
   1. Open pit
   2. Room and pillar
B. Retorting Methods
   1. Surface retorting
   2. Pure in situ
   3. Modified in situ
IV. FEDERAL PROTOTYPE LEASING PROGRAM

B. History of Program
C. Development of Tracts C-a and C-b
   1. Suspension of Operations (September 1, 1976 to September 1, 1977)
   2. Significant Provisions of Oil Shale Lease
D. Present Status of Operations on Prototype Leases

V. LITIGATION

A. Andrus v. Utah, ____ U.S. ____ , 100 S. Ct. 1803 (1980) (In lieu lands suit)
E. Gulf and Standard v. EPA, (U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th Cir., C.A. No. 78-1323, decision October 6, 1978) (Non-attainment suit)

VI. PERMITS AND REGULATORY MATTERS

A. Generally
B. Air
   1. PSD
   2. State air emissions permit
   3. Fugitive dust
   4. ACEN
C. Water
   1. NPDES
   2. Subsurface Disposal -- UIC
   3. Water Quantity Matters -- Water rights -- Ground water

D. Reclamation
   1. Colorado Mined Land Reclamation Board
   2. Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act -- Section 709.

E. Hazardous Waste -- RCRA

F. Safety -- Mine Safety and Health Administration; Colorado Division of Mines.

G. Area Oil Shale Supervisor -- 30 C.F.R. Part 231

H. County Matters
   1. Generally

I. Colorado Joint Review Process -- Local Answer to the Energy Mobilization Board

VII. THE FUTURE

A. President Carter's Goals, July 19, 1979
   1. Expand Prototype Leasing Program
   2. Implement Permanent Leasing Program
   3. Increase Acreage Limitation
   4. Off-tract Siting and Disposal
   5. Multi-Mineral Leasing
   6. Exchanges

D. Energy Mobilization Board -- Streamlining the regulatory process
   1. Status of legislation
   2. Constitutional issues

E. Commercial Production on Tract C-a

F. Other Federal Leases: C-b, U-a and U-b

G. Developers of Privately Held Tracts
   1. Colony Development Corp. (Exxon and Tosco)
   2. Union Long Ridge Project (Union Oil Company)
   3. Superior Oil Company
   4. Geokinetics, Inc.
   5. TOSCO Sand Wash Project (Utah)
   6. Paraho (Utah)
   7. Exxon
   8. Phillips
   9. Sohio
   10. Chevron

H. Socioeconomic Impacts

VIII. CONCLUSION