a. Lead Agency: Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO)

b. Preparing Agency: U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command

c. Cooperating Agencies: U.S. Army; U.S. Air Force; U.S. Navy; Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

d. Proposed Action: Deployment of a National Missile Defense System

e. Affected Jurisdictions: Clear Air Force Station (AFS), Denali Borough, Alaska; Eareckson Air Station (AS), Shemya Island, Alaska; Eielson Air Force Base (AFB), Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska; Fort Greely, Alaska; Yukon Training Area, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska; Cavalier AFS, Pembina County, North Dakota; Grand Forks AFB, Grand Forks County, North Dakota; Stanley R. Mickelsen Safeguard Complex (SRMSC) Missile Site Radar, Cavalier County, North Dakota; SRMSC Remote Sprint Launch Site 1, Ramsey County, North Dakota; SRMSC Remote Sprint Launch Site 2, Cavalier County, North Dakota; and SRMSC Remote Sprint Launch Site 4, Walsh County, North Dakota; Beale AFB, California; Cape Cod AFS, Massachusetts.

f. Inquiries on this document may be directed to: Ms. Julia Hudson, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, Attn: SMDC-EN-V, P.O. Box 1500, Huntsville, Alabama 35807-3801, (256) 955-4822

g. Designation: Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)

h. Distribution/Availability: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited (Distribution A)

i. Abstract: This EIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the potential environmental consequences of the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action. The No-action Alternative is not to deploy the NMD system. If the deployment decision made is not to deploy, the NMD program would use the time to enhance the existing technologies of the various system elements. The Proposed Action would be to deploy the NMD system. With the Proposed Action Alternative, NMD elements and element locations would be selected from the range of locations studied in the EIS (see item e above).

This FEIS addresses the potential environmental impacts that would result from activities that would occur under the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action. Environmental resource topics evaluated include air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials and hazardous waste, health and safety, land use and aesthetics, noise, socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, water resources, environmental justice, and subsistence. The potential cumulative effects of each of these resources were also evaluated.