

evaluated in the NMD Deployment EIS, the MDA prepared the VOC EA. Based on its Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) from the analysis in the VOC EA, the MDA decided to construct the VOC GBI test site at Fort Greely. MDA subsequently prepared the Supplemental VOC EA and resulting FONSI to evaluate security and other upgrades at the designated VOC GBI test site at Fort Greely. Concurrently, MDA began preparation of the ETR EIS to examine the effects of more realistic GBI flight-testing in the Pacific region.

On December 17, 2002, following a number of flight test successes, President Bush announced plans to build and field an IDO capability, building on the capabilities of existing and planned test components. This ROD implements that decision, with the main focus of this initial capability at the Fort Greely GBI VOC test site. An additional IDO capability at VAFB has been proposed, which could be used independently of the Fort Greely components. It would provide more protection for the U.S. as the BMDS develops and matures. Development of an IDO capability at VAFB was not part of the NMD Deployment EIS and would require additional NEPA analysis. That capability is not included in this ROD.

The NMD Deployment EIS preferred alternative examined the effects of deploying up to 100 GBI missiles and related facilities and infrastructure at Fort Greely. This ROD implements a limited subset of that alternative. Under this ROD, the Fort Greely portion of the GMD IDO capability selectively integrates existing and planned assets into a system that would provide a limited, operational missile defense capability as a first step to a more robust, future GMD deployment described and analyzed in the NMD Deployment EIS. As such, this ROD implements actions that are within the scope of the activities analyzed in the NMD Deployment EIS. The following existing and planned BMDS assets would be fielded and/or integrated to make up the Fort Greely GMD IDO capability:

- Six silos and GBI missiles, BMC2, Defense Satellite Communication System (DSCS), one IDT, support facilities and infrastructure, and FOC at Fort Greely, AK, which are part of the GMD VOC test bed currently under construction.

- Up to forty missile silos, equipped with GBI missiles, one additional IDT, supporting facilities (including backup power plant), infrastructure, and FOC communication links at Fort Greely, AK. MDA currently plans only a maximum of 20 GBI missiles at Fort Greely, but

this ROD documents a total of 40 silos equipped with GBI missiles in order to provide maximum flexibility for maintenance and future operational needs.

- Upgrades to the EWRs at Beale AFB, CA and the Cobra Dane radar at Eareckson Air Station (AS) Shemya AK, and an IDT, DSCS, BMC2 and FOC at Eareckson AS, that are part of the GMD VOC test bed currently under construction.

- Existing GMD BMC2 nodes throughout the U.S., which are a part of the GMD VOC test bed. These nodes include Cheyenne Mountain Complex, CO; Shriever AFB, CO; and Peterson AFB, CO.

NEPA Process

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for the deployment of the NMD system was published in the **Federal Register** on November 17, 1998, initiating the public scoping process. Public scoping meetings were held in December 1998 in communities perceived to be affected by the NMD system. The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the NMD Deployment Draft EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on October 1, 1999. This initiated a public review and comment period for the Draft EIS. Seven public hearings were held from October 26 through November 9, 1999 in the same locations as the public scoping meetings. Subsequently, a supplement to the Draft EIS was prepared to evaluate the potential impacts of upgrading existing EWRs for use by the NMD system. A public hearing was held in Bourne, MA, for the Supplement. Comments on the Draft EIS and the Supplement to the Draft EIS were considered in the preparation of the Final EIS. The NOA for the Final EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on 21 July 2000, initiating an additional 30-day comment period. Comments were considered in the decision process, culminating in this ROD.

Alternatives Considered

No-Action Alternative

As required by the CEQ regulations, the NMD Deployment EIS evaluated a No-action Alternative. Under this alternative, the GMD deployment decision would be deferred, while development and testing of GMD technologies and architectures would continue. Since they are a subset of the proposed action, the activities that are described in this ROD would not be implemented under the No-action Alternative. Non-GMD activities

currently occurring or planned at potential fielding sites would continue.

Proposed Action

The proposed action analyzed in the NMD Deployment EIS was to field a fixed, land-based, non-nuclear missile defense system with a land and space-based detection system capable of responding to limited strategic ballistic missile threats to the U.S. The NMD system analyzed in the Deployment EIS consisted of GBIs, BMC2, XBR, IDTs, satellite detection system, EWRs, and FOC. The initial space-based detection capability would be the existing Defense Support Program early-warning satellites to be replaced by Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) satellites currently being developed by the U.S. Air Force. Since the NMD Deployment EIS was completed, the NMD system architecture has evolved into the BMDS multi-layered approach that does not distinguish between national and theater threats. The BMDS consists of the same components, at the same preferred locations, as the NMD system analyzed in the NMD Deployment EIS. As noted, this ROD implements a subset of the activities in the proposed action described above.

Environmental Impacts of Alternatives

The NMD Deployment EIS analyzed the environment in terms of 15 resource areas including: air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials and wastes, health and safety, land use and aesthetics, noise, socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, water resources, environmental justice, and subsistence. Each resource area with a foreseeable impact at the respective alternative sites was addressed in the EIS. The analysis in the EIS was commensurate with the importance of the potential impacts. Where it was determined through initial evaluation that no impacts would occur to resources at certain sites, these resources were not analyzed in the EIS. The potential for cumulative impacts was also evaluated in the EIS.

No-Action Alternative—Environmental Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative described in the EIS, only the locations and environmental resources discussed below were anticipated to have environmental impacts from continued ongoing operations.

Eielson AFB. There would be potential impacts in the areas of land use and noise from continued U.S. Air Force operations. The presence of residential units in the community of Moose Creek within the Clear and