

**Appendix F: Record of Decision (ROD)**

## RECORD OF DECISION

[Project Name]

DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION  
AGENCY/UNITED STATES  
STRATEGIC COMMAND CENTER FOR  
COMBATING WEAPONS OF MASS  
DESTRUCTION (DTRA/SCC-WMD)

[Project Location]

[County, State]

## Decision

Based on my review of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), I have decided to implement Alternative [X], which [insert description of selected alternative. Include any permits, licenses, grants, or authorizations needed to implement the decision. Also include any mitigation and monitoring actions related to the decision.]

## Background

[Provide a brief description of the purpose and need for action.]

## Decision Rationale

[Describe the reasons for the decision. Specifically, discuss the following:

How the selected action/alternative best meets the purpose and need and why other alternatives were not selected.

How significant issues and environmental impacts were considered and taken into account.

Any factors other than environmental effects considered in making the decision.

Discuss how the above factors influenced the decision (are some more important than others?)

State whether all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternative have been adopted and if not, why not.]

The [Project Name] EIS documents the analysis and conclusions upon which this decision is based.

## Public Involvement

A notice of intent to prepare an EIS was published in the **Federal Register**

on [date] ([Cite **Federal Register** volume and beginning page number (*i.e.* 73 FR 43084)]. People were invited to review and comment on the proposal through [insert public notice methods and dates such as mailings, news releases, phone calls, etc.]. The EIS lists agencies, organizations, and people who received copies on page [X].

The following issues were identified from scoping comments and were used to determine the scope of the analysis. [Briefly describe the significant issues used in the analysis]. A full description of issues significant to the proposed action appears in the EIS on page [X].

A draft EIS was published for review and comment on [date of publication of EPA's notice of availability in the **Federal Register**].

## Alternatives Considered

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered [X] other alternatives, which are discussed below. A more detailed comparison of these alternatives can be found in the EIS on pages [X–X].

Alternative 1—[insert a brief description of the alternative; identify which is considered to be environmentally-preferable.]

Alternative 2 —[insert a brief description of the alternative]  
[Repeat for each alternative.]

## Mitigation

[State (a) which mitigation measures have been adopted; (b) whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize have been adopted, and if not why they were not; and (c) whether monitoring and enforcement programs are adopted, and if so summarize them.]

## Implementation Date

[Describe the expected date(s) of implementation].

## Contact

For additional information concerning this decision, contact: [contact name, title, office, mailing address, phone number, and email]

Concurrence:

[Name]

Project/Program Manager

Date

Director, J4E

Date

Approval:

Director, DTRA/SCC-WMD

Date

[FR Doc. 2016–10376 Filed 5–4–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P****DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE****Office of the Secretary****[Transmittal No. 16–07]****36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification**

**AGENCY:** Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated July 21, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Heather N. Harwell, DSCA/LMO, (703) 697–9217.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives,

Transmittal 16–07 with attached Policy Justification and Sensitivity of Technology.

Dated: May 2, 2016.

**Aaron Siegel,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P**



## DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-5408

The Honorable Paul D. Ryan  
Speaker of the House  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

APR 21 2016

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-07, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Qatar for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$260 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J. W. Rixey  
Vice Admiral, USN  
Director

## Enclosures:

1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification
3. Sensitivity of Technology
4. Regional Balance (Classified Document Provided Under Separate Cover)



## BILLING CODE 5001-06-C

Transmittal No. 16-07

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as Amended

(i) *Prospective Purchaser:* Government of Qatar

(ii) *Total Estimated Value:*

Major Defense Equipment *	\$ 227 million
Other .....	\$ 33 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 260 million</b>

(iii) *Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:*

*Major Defense Equipment (MDE):*

Two-hundred and fifty-two (252) RIM 116C Rolling Airframe Tactical Missiles

Two (2) RIM 116C-2 Rolling Airframe Telemetry Missiles

Also included are the following non-MDE items; support equipment, publications, technical documentation, personnel training, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical

and logistics support services, live fire test event support, and other related integration elements. The estimated cost is \$260 million.

(iv) *Military Department:* U.S. Navy (AAD)

(v) *Prior Related Cases, if any:* None

(vi) *Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid:* None

(vii) *Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:* See Attached Annex

(viii) *Date Report Delivered to Congress*: 21 April 2016

\* as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

#### **POLICY JUSTIFICATION**

##### ***Qatar—RIM-116C and RIM-116C-2 Rolling Airframe Missiles***

The Government of Qatar has requested a possible sale of two-hundred and fifty-two (252) RIM-116C Rolling Airframe Tactical Missiles, and two (2) RIM 116C-2 Rolling Airframe Telemetry Missiles. Also included are support equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, live fire test event support, and other related integration elements. The total estimated value of MDE is \$227 million. The overall total estimated value is \$260 million.

This proposed sale contributes to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country. Qatar is an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Persian Gulf region. This proposed sale will provide Qatar with military capabilities to protect its naval forces and nearby oil/gas infrastructure from air and missile threats. Qatar will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment, services, and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems in Tucson, Arizona. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require multiple trips by U.S. Government and contractor representatives to participate in program and technical reviews, system integration, as well as training and maintenance support in country for a period of thirty-six (36) months.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

Transmittal No. 16-07

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as Amended Annex

Item No. vii

(vii) *Sensitivity of Technology*: The RIM-116C Rolling Airframe Missile is an autonomous (*i.e.*, “fire and forget”) lightweight, supersonic,

surface-to-air tactical missile for ship self-defense against current and evolving anti-ship cruise missile threats. Advanced technology in the RIM-116C includes dual-mode RF/IR (radio frequency/infrared) guidance with IR all-the-way capability for non-emitting threats. The highest classification of the hardware, embedded software, and maintenance is CONFIDENTIAL. The RIM-116C-2 is a non-tactical telemetry round, used primarily for test and training purposes; it includes an unclassified telemeter which replaces the warhead section. The data set, generated by RIM-116C-2 is UNCLASSIFIED.

The Rolling Airframe Missile (RAM) is a product of a cooperative program with Germany and has been executed, since 1976, under a series of governing Memoranda of Understanding/Memoranda of Agreements (MOU/MOAs) for the development, production, and in-service support between the United States and Germany.

A determination has been made that the Government of Qatar can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Qatar.

[FR Doc. 2016-10551 Filed 5-4-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001-06-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

### **Office of the Secretary**

#### **Charter Renewal of Department of Defense Federal Advisory Committees**

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Renewal of Federal Advisory Committee.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Defense (DoD) is publishing this notice to announce that it is renewing the charter for the Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board (“the Board”).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jim Freeman, Advisory Committee Management Officer for the Department of Defense, 703-692-5952.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Board’s charter is being renewed in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 (5

U.S.C., Appendix, as amended) and 41 CFR 102-3.50(d). The Board’s charter and contact information for the Board’s Designated Federal Officer (DFO) can be found at <http://www.facadatabase.gov/>.

The Board provides the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, through the Secretary of the Army, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), and the Chief of Engineers, with independent advice and recommendations on matters relating to the two distinct component programs of the United States Army Corps of Engineers—the Military Program, which supports Army war fighters, and the Civil Works Program, which manages many of the water resources of the Nation.

The Board is composed of no more than 10 members who are eminent authorities in the fields of natural (*e.g.* biology, ecology), social (*e.g.* anthropology, community planning), and related sciences. All members of the Board are appointed to provide advice on behalf of the Government on the basis of their best judgment without representing any particular point of view and in a manner that is free from conflict of interest. Except for reimbursement of official Board-related travel and per diem, Board members serve without compensation.

The DoD, as necessary and consistent with the Board’s mission and DoD policies and procedures, may establish subcommittees, task forces, or working groups to support the Board, and all subcommittees must operate under the provisions of FACA and the Government in the Sunshine Act. Subcommittees will not work independently of the Board and must report all recommendations and advice solely to the Board for full deliberation and discussion. Subcommittees, task forces, or working groups have no authority to make decisions and recommendations, verbally or in writing, on behalf of the Board. No subcommittee or any of its members can update or report, verbally or in writing, directly to the DoD or any Federal officers or employees.

The Board’s DFO, pursuant to DoD policy, must be a full-time or permanent part-time DoD employee, and must be in attendance for the duration of each and every Board/subcommittee meeting. The public or interested organizations may submit written statements to the Board membership about the Board’s mission and functions. Such statements may be submitted at any time or in response to the stated agenda of planned Board. All written statements must be submitted to the Board’s DFO who will ensure the