

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action Alternative, the DOE would not contribute funds to support construction and initial operation of the GTL fuels production plant. Due to the substantial share (44%, or \$16 million) of project costs that would not be provided by DOE under a No Action decision, the industrial participants would not be expected to continue near-term plans for the proposed project. As a result, development of the 10-acre property to accommodate the proposed project at the Tulsa Port of Catoosa Industrial Park would not occur. Site conditions would remain unchanged until the Port leases the property to another industrial user. Site development would subsequently occur to accommodate the needs of the new tenant.

Under the No Action Alternative, ICRC and Syntroleum would pursue other sources of funding for construction and operation of the proposed fuels production facility. If successful, operation of the facility would be expected to result in environmental consequences similar to those identified in this EA. Impacts from construction would be based on the characteristics of the new site for the proposed project.

A No Action decision would delay the ability to prepare ultra-clean transportation fuels for comparative testing and of operability and environmental performance.