

Under Alternative 2 (the Selected Alternative), a minimal increase in air emissions from dual target launches, support facilities construction, and operation of mobile telemetry will 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 will be below the 1-hour Air Force standard, but will 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 NAAQS, Alaska AAQS, and U.S. Air Force standards. Significant air quality impacts due to Ground-Based Interceptor (GBI) launches are not anticipated. Alternative 3 would have the same impacts as Alternative 1.

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 would be 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 will occur due to construction. Fence lines will be altered to avoid impacts to wetlands. Testing impacts will be similar to those noted in the No-Action Alternative. Mobile sensors necessary to support GMD ETR activities will be located on existing disturbed areas with minimal effect to biological resources. Under Alternative 1, the impacts would be the same as Alternative 2, plus additional acreage would be disturbed from GBI silo construction and the addition of dual GBI launches. Alternative 3 would have the same impacts as Alternative 1.

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 single and dual target launch activities and support facilities construction will use small quantities of hazardous materials, which will result in the generation of some hazardous and non-hazardous waste that will be similar to current operations. All hazardous materials and waste will 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. Under Alternative 1, the impacts would be the same as Alternative 2, plus additional construction for IGBI silos and the addition of dual GBI launches. Hazardous materials and hazardous waste handling and potential impacts from the addition of GBI construction and launches would be similar to Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would have the similar impacts as Alternative 1.

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, 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 will include establishing Ground and Launch Hazard Areas, issuing Notices to Airmen and Notices to Mariners, and adherences to program Safety plans. These actions will be in compliance with federal, state, and local health and safety requirements and regulations, as well as Department of Defense and KLC Safety Policy and will result in no significant impacts to health and safety. Due to the same precautions taken above, Alternative 1 and 3 would also result in no significant impacts to health and safety.

e. *Land Use.* Under the No-Action Alternative, publication of availability of KLC's beaches and coastline would continue. Under Alternative 2 (Selected Alternative), minimal impacts will 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 will occur for the Pasagshak Point Road at the KLC site boundary. Under Alternative 1, the proposed activities would result in impacts similar to

Alternative 2, and would not significantly impact the availability of recreational opportunities. Impacts under Alternative 3 would be the same as Alternative 1.

f. *Water Resources.* Under the No-Action Alternative, missile launches would continue to disperse exhaust emission products over a large area. These emissions would not cause a significant water quality impact, and water quality monitoring would continue on an as-needed basis. Under Alternative 2 (Selected Alternative), there is a minor potential for short-term increase in erosion and turbidity of surface waters during construction. Missile launches will disperse exhaust emission products over a large area. These emissions will not cause a significant water quality impact. Water quality monitoring will continue on an as-needed basis. Under Alternative 1, the impacts would be similar as Alternative 2, plus additional construction for GBI silos and the addition of dual GBI launches. Potential impacts from the addition of GBI construction and launches would be similar to Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would have the similar impacts as Alternative 1.

## F. Mitigation Measures and Monitoring

The applicable mitigation measures specified for each of the sites selected will be implemented as part of the GMD ETR action. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan has been developed to assist in tracking and implementing these mitigation measures. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from establishing the GMD ETR considered in this ROD have adopted.

## G. Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The environmentally preferred alternative in the EIS is the No-Action Alternative (not proceeding with the GMD ETR), since there would be no new construction or operation of GMD elements at any of the potential sites. Continuation of current site operations at these locations would result in few additional environmental impacts.

Among the three alternatives in the EIS, Alternative 2 is the environmentally preferred action to establish and operate the GMD ETR. The activities proposed in Alternative 2 for KLC will require less construction and ground disturbance than the other alternatives.