

AFB, RTS or PMRF and the construction of two GBI silos or one GBI launch pad, and an additional target launch pad that could accommodate GBI launches if needed, and associated support facilities at KLC. There would also be target pad modifications at KLC and RTS along with the installation of a COMSATCOM at KLC. Placement of small mobile telemetry units and mobile C-band radar at KLC and at one or two of the following locations: Pasagshak Point, Kenai, Homer, Soldotna, King Salmon, Adak, Cordova, and Pillar Mountain, Alaska; Pillar Point, California; Bremerton, Washington; Makaha Ridge and PMRF, Hawaii. The other components described in Alternative 2 would remain the same.

#### 4. Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would include activities proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2. This would include GBI launches from KLC, RTS, and Vandenberg AFB, and construction of the required support facilities for dual launches of GBI and target missiles at each location.

5. SBX Primary Support Base Decision. Encompassed within all three alternatives was a proposal to construct and operate the SBX. Six potential sites for a primary support base for the SBX were analyzed in the EIS.

### E. Environmental Impacts of Alternatives

The GMD ETR EIS analyzed the environment in terms of 14 resource areas: air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials and hazardous waste, health and safety, land use, noise, socioeconomic, transportation, utilities, visual and aesthetic resources, and water resources. Subsistence resources were also considered for potential sites in Alaska. Environmental Justice was addressed separately. Each resource area was discussed at each location as applicable. The potential for cumulative impacts was also evaluated in the EIS.

The impacts of the various alternatives are summarized in depth in Tables ES-1A, ES-1B, and Tables ES 2 through ES 11 in the Final ETR EIS (available on the MDA Internet site: <http://www.acq.osd.mil/bmndo/>). The following is a short comparison of the potential impacts of the alternatives, including the no-action alternative:

#### 1. Kodiak Launch Complex

a. *Air Quality.* Under the No-Action alternative, single target and commercial launches would continue. Under Alternative 2 (the Selected Alternative), a minimal increase in air emissions

from target launch and support facilities construction and operation of mobile telemetry would not affect the region's current attainment status. The results of modeling a dual Peacekeeper target launch to determine exhaust emissions of aluminum oxide, hydrogen chloride, and carbon monoxide show that the level of hydrogen chloride would be below the 1-hour Air Force standard, but would exceed the peak hydrogen chloride standard for a short duration. Other emissions were determined to be within National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and Alaska Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). A single Peacekeeper target launch would be within NAAQS, Alaska AAQS, and U.S. Air force standards. Significant air quality impacts due to target launches are not anticipated. Under Alternative 1, the impacts would be the same as Alternative 2 with the addition of GBI silo construction and GBI launches. The results of modeling to determine exhaust emissions of aluminum oxide, hydrogen chloride, and carbon monoxide show that concentrations produced by dual launches of a Ground-Based Interceptor would remain within National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), Alaska Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS), and U.S. Air Force standards. Significant air quality impacts due to Ground-Based Interceptor launches are not anticipated. Alternative 3 would have the same impacts as both Alternatives 1 and 2.

b. *Biological Resources.* Under the No Action Alternative, temporary effects to vegetation from emissions, discoloration and foliage loss and temporary, short-term startle effects from noise to wildlife and birds are possible during testing. Although a remote possibility, individual animals close to the water's surface could be hit by debris. Under Alternative 2 (the Selected Alternative), loss of small amounts of mainly upland vegetation could occur due to construction. Fence lines would likely be altered to avoid impacts to wetlands. Testing impacts would be similar to those noted in the No Action Alternative. Mobile sensors necessary to support Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range activities would be located on existing disturbed areas with minimal effect to biological resources. Alternatives 1 and 3 would have the same impacts as Alternative 2.

c. *Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste.* Under the No Action Alternative, continued handling and use of limited quantities of hazardous and toxic materials related to pre-launch, launch and post-launch activities would generate small quantities of hazardous

waste. Under Alternative 2 (Selected Alternative), the target launch activities and support facilities construction would use small quantities of hazardous materials, which would result in the generation of some hazardous and non-hazardous waste that would be similar to current operations. All hazardous materials and waste would be handled in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. No impact from short-term operation of mobile sensors at existing gravel pad areas are expected. Alternatives 1 and 3 would have the same impacts as Alternative 2.

d. *Health and Safety.* Under the No Action Alternative, planning and execution of target and commercial launches would continue. Ground and Launch Hazard Areas, Notices to Airmen and Notices to Mariners, and program Safety plans would protect workers and the general public. Under Alternative 2 (Selected Alternative), planning and execution of single and dual target launches would include establishing ground and Launch hazard Areas, issuing Notices to Airmen and Notices to Mariners, and adherence to program Safety plans. These actions would be in compliance with federal, state, and local health and safety requirements and regulations, as well as Department of Defense and Kodiak Launch Complex Safety Policy and would result in no impacts to health and safety. Due to the same precautions taken above, Alternatives 1 and 3 would also result in no impacts to health and safety.

e. *Land Use.* Under the No Action Alternative, Publication of availability of KLC's beaches and coastline will continue. Under Alternative 2 (Selected Alternative), minimal impacts would occur as a result of site preparation and new construction. This activity will limit the use of a small portion of the overall land available for livestock grazing. Only temporary closures during the transportation of missile components to the launch facilities and up to a full day closure on launch days would occur for the Pasagshak Point Road at the KLC site boundary. Under Alternative 1, the proposed activities would not significantly impact the availability of recreational opportunities. Impacts under Alternatives 1 and 3 would be the same as Alternative 2.

f. *Water Resources.* Under the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 (Selected Alternative), and Alternatives 1 and 3, there is a minor potential for short-term increase in erosion and turbidity of surface waters during construction. Missile launches would disperse exhaust emission products over