

quality control program, phase-in, and in the event of contingency, perform all required tasks to include cooking to ensure continued service.

#### Deletion

The following service is proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:

#### Service

##### Service Type/Location: Facilities

Maintenance, Yakima Training Center (YTC) and Multipurpose Range Complex, Multipurpose Training Range, Yakima, WA.

NPA: Skookum Educational Programs, Bremerton, WA.

Contracting Activity: Dept of the Army, W6QM MICC-JB Lewis-MC Chord, Fort Lewis, WA

**Barry S. Lineback,**

*Director, Business Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2013-01028 Filed 1-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Notice of Intent To Prepare An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) On the Proposal To Relocate the 18th Aggressor Squadron From Eielson Air Force Base (EAFB), Alaska to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER), Alaska and Rightsizing the Remaining Wing Overhead/Base Operating Support at Eielson AFB, AK

**AGENCY:** Pacific Air Forces, United States Air Force, DOD.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), and Air Force policy and procedures (32 CFR part 989), the Air Force is issuing this notice to advise the public of its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) considering a proposal to relocate the 18th Aggressor Squadron from Eielson AFB to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson and rightsizing the remaining Wing Overhead/Base Operating Support at Eielson.

*Proposed Action:* The Air Force proposes to relocate the 18th Aggressor Squadron (18 AGRS) from Eielson AFB (EAFB) to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER); 18 AGRS consists of 18 assigned F-16 aircraft and 3 back-up F-16s. This proposed relocation includes removing 623 military personnel from EAFB, transferring approximately 542 positions to JBER,

and eliminating 81 positions. The Air Force proposes to reduce military and civilian authorizations at EAFB appropriate to the command structure required for the remaining operations. Current planning estimates call for an end-state of approximately 769 appropriated funds personnel at EAFB after FY15 (559 military and 210 civilian personnel).

EAFB will continue to host Red Flag and Distant Frontier training exercises with the 18 AGRS operating out of JBER under one of two possible alternatives:

*Alternative 1:* 18 AGRS would deploy to EAFB for the duration of the Red Flag exercises.

*Alternative 2:* The 18 AGRS F-16 aircraft would fly to and from the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC) Military Operations Areas (MOAs) in the vicinity of EAFB on a daily basis during exercises, requiring aerial refueling. The participating F-16 aircraft would not routinely land at EAFB for refueling.

Both Alternatives would operate in the same air space as currently used for Red Flag and Distant Frontier exercises. Transient aircraft and personnel from outside of Alaska participating in these exercises would continue to deploy to and operate out of EAFB.

This EIS will also evaluate the impacts of the No Action Alternative: Keeping the 18 AGRS stationed at EAFB.

*Scoping:* In order to effectively define the full range of issues to be evaluated in the EIS, the Air Force will determine the scope of the analysis by soliciting comments from interested local, state and federal agencies, as well as interested members of the public.

The Air Force intends to hold scoping meetings as follows:

Dates	Locations
February 4-5, 2013	Anchorage and Mat-Su Boroughs, AK.
February 6-7, 2013	Fairbanks and North Pole, AK.

All meetings will be held from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., AST. Specific dates, times, and locations for the scoping meetings will be published in local media a minimum of 15 days prior to the scoping meeting dates.

Public scoping comments will be accepted either verbally or in writing at the scoping meetings. Additional scoping comments will be accepted at any time during the EIS process. However, in order to ensure the Air Force has sufficient time to consider public input, scoping comments should arrive at the address below by March 1, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Allen Richmond, AFCEC/CZN, 2261 Hughes Ave., Ste. 155, Lackland AFB, TX 78236-9853, Telephone: (210) 395-8555.

**Tommy W. Lee,**

*Acting Air Force Federal Register Officer, DAF.*

[FR Doc. 2013-01013 Filed 1-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-10-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Availability of the Draft Finding of No Significant Impact and Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Army announces the availability of the draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) and final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for Army force structure realignments that may occur from Fiscal Years (FYs) 2013-2020. The Army must achieve force reductions as it transitions from major combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, while reducing spending without sacrificing critical national defense capabilities. The draft FNSI considers a proposed action under which the Army's active duty end-strength would be reduced from 562,000 at the end of FY 2012 to 490,000 by FY 2020. The PEA analyzes two action alternatives: Alternative 1: Implement force reductions by inactivating a minimum of eight Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) and realign other combat, combat support, and service support units between FY 2013 and FY 2020; and Alternative 2: Implement Alternative 1, inactivate additional BCTs, and reorganize remaining BCTs by adding an additional combat maneuver battalion and other units. The PEA also analyzes a No Action alternative under which the Army would not reduce the size of the force. The draft FNSI incorporates the PEA which does not identify any significant environmental impacts associated with either alternative, with the exception of socioeconomic impacts at some installations where a BCT is inactivated and smaller organizations realigned. The draft FNSI concludes that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required. Final decisions as to which installations will see BCTs inactivated or units realigned have not been made. Additional site-

specific NEPA analysis may be required at some installations, depending on the size of the force realignment.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before February 19, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to: Public Comments USAEC, Attention: IMPA-AE (Army 2020 PEA), 2450 Connell Road (Bldg 2264), Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234-7664; or by email to [USARMY.JBSA.AEC.MBX@mail.mil](mailto:USARMY.JBSA.AEC.MBX@mail.mil).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** (210) 466-1590 or email: [USARMY.JBSA.AEC.MBX@mail.mil](mailto:USARMY.JBSA.AEC.MBX@mail.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Implementation of Army force realignment will occur over the course of several years to arrive by 2020 at an optimally configured force, reduced from an FY 2012 authorized end strength of 562,000 to 490,000. Reductions in Army Soldiers will also be accompanied by some reduction in civil service employees. These actions are being undertaken to reshape the Army's forces to meet more effectively national security requirements while reducing the Army's end-strength. Force realignment and some level of force reduction will impact most major Army installations. The implementation of this force rebalancing is necessary to allow the Army to operate in a reduced budget climate, while ensuring the Army can continue to support the nation's critical defense missions.

The PEA, upon which the draft FNSI is based, evaluates the largest potential force reduction scenarios, as well as growth scenarios from BCT restructuring, that could occur at select installations as a result of Army force restructuring. This range of potential installation reduction and growth (ranging from maximum losses of 8,000 military personnel to maximum increases of 3,000 at the Army's largest installations) was chosen for the environmental analysis to provide flexibility as future force structure realignment decisions are made; the specific locations where changes will occur have not been decided.

The PEA provides information to decision makers concerning potential environmental impacts, to include socioeconomic impacts, associated with stationing actions as these decisions are made in the coming years. The PEA analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts that may occur at 21 installations. These stationing sites were included in the PEA as they are sites that could experience a change in Soldiers and civilians that exceeds a total of 1,000

military personnel. The PEA analyzes the environmental impact of two Action alternatives to implement force reduction and realignment: Alternative 1: Implement Army force reductions and restructuring of BCTs, combat support units, and civilian support between FY 2013 and FY 2020; and Alternative 2: Implement Alternative 1, inactivate additional BCTs and also restructure remaining BCTs by adding an additional combat maneuver battalion and/or an engineer battalion. Force reductions that may occur as part of the proposed action include the inactivation of BCTs and combat support and combat service support units at Army and joint base installations. This reduction would include the inactivation of at least eight BCTs. In addition to these alternatives, the Army also evaluated a No Action alternative. The No Action alternative continues current force structure, and retains the active Army at the FY 2012 authorized end strength of 562,000. The No Action alternative allows for a comparison of baseline conditions with the environmental impacts of each of the two Action alternatives.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the two Action alternatives include impacts to air quality; airspace; cultural and biological resources; noise; soil erosion; wetlands; water resources; facilities; socioeconomic; energy demand; land use; hazardous materials and waste; and traffic and transportation. No significant environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of implementing either alternative associated with the proposed action, with the exception of socioeconomic impacts. Socioeconomic impacts are of particular concern to the Army because they affect communities around Army installations. Therefore, the PEA has a comprehensive analysis of the socioeconomic impacts to inform the decision makers and communities. Impacts could include reduced employment, income, regional population, and sales, and some of these impacts could be significant. An EIS is not required, however, when the only significant impacts are socioeconomic.

The draft FNSI finds that there are no significant environmental impacts with either Action alternative. Final decisions as to which alternative will be implemented or which installations will see reductions or unit realignments have not been made. Those decisions will be made based on mission-related criteria and other factors in light of the information contained in the PEA.

An electronic version of the PEA and draft FNSI is available for download at:

<http://aec.army.mil/usaec/nepa/topics00.html>.

**Brenda S. Bowen,**  
Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.  
[FR Doc. 2013-01003 Filed 1-17-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710-08-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Training Mission and Mission Support Activities at Fort Campbell, KY

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.  
**ACTION:** Notice of Intent.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Army announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to evaluate the impacts of current and future training and mission-related activities at Fort Campbell, Kentucky (portions of Fort Campbell are also located in Tennessee). The PEIS is being completed to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the environmental impacts of proposed alternatives for implementing the training and mission support activities at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. The PEIS will assess range construction, associated training and land management activities, and adjustments to military airspace to support Fort Campbell's training requirements. This PEIS analyzes portions of the Range Complex Master Plan which has been developed to address training and training facility requirements over the next 10 years.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send written comments to Mr. Gene Zirkle, NEPA/Wildlife Program Manager, Environmental Division, Building 2159 13th Street, Fort Campbell, KY 42223; or by email to [gene.a.zirkle.civ@mail.mil](mailto:gene.a.zirkle.civ@mail.mil).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Gene Zirkle at (270) 798-9854, during normal working business hours Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. C.S.T.; or by email to [gene.a.zirkle.civ@mail.mil](mailto:gene.a.zirkle.civ@mail.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Fort Campbell must provide modernized live-fire ranges, quality maneuver training areas, the airspace necessary for the training of Army aviation units and unmanned aerial systems (UAS), and modern training facilities. The requirement to provide quality training support to Soldiers and units will continue into the future as mission requirements, military preparedness,