

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-