vicinity of Mosul, Iraq in 2004 (e.g., 1–24 Infantry Battalion). The data collected from the survey will be used to compare the health of current and former U.S. Army personnel after their initial deployment in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) to that of a subset of Millennium Cohort Study participants. This evaluation is being conducted at the request of the Army Chief of Staff.

Affected public: Individuals or Households.

Annual burden hours: 3,500.

Number of respondents: 3,500.

Responses per respondent: 1.

Annual responses: 3,500.

Average burden per response: 60 minutes.

Frequency: One time.

Respondents are former soldiers who deployed in support of OIF. The post-deployment health survey will record self-reported health topics, including medical conditions, health behaviors, and exposures that may have affected the health of soldiers and veterans. The data from the completed survey will be used to compare the health status of members of the 1–24 Infantry Battalion (1–24 IN) who deployed to Mosul, Iraq in 2004–2005 and a similar exposure group consisting of other personnel in the 1st Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) to a comparable set of soldiers and veterans participating in a separate and not related Millennium Cohort Study. A deployment and environmental health surveillance investigation conducted by the APHC in 2014 was unable to discern etiologic elements connecting the multitude of health conditions and symptoms experienced by a small subset of the 1–24 IN. Deployment-associated environmental exposures which may have increased the risk of developing these conditions were not identified; however, a comprehensive comparative evaluation that includes self-reported data and all former members of the 1–24 IN who served in Mosul has not been conducted.

Dated: March 8, 2018.

Aaron Siegel,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.
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experienced increased customer wait times, insufficient loading bays, workload and productivity imbalances between sites, aging facilities, and a lack of process optimization since DLA Distribution and DLA Disposition Services merged materiel receipt, storage, and distribution functions.

**Proposed Action and Alternatives:** Under the Proposed Action, DLA would: (1) Redesign the DLA Disposition Services mid-Atlantic disposal network. This will divert incoming excess military property from DLA Disposition Services at Fort Meade, Fort Bragg, Norfolk, and Susquehanna to DLA Disposition Services at Richmond. (2) Expand DLA Disposition Services at Richmond to a full-service operation (i.e., receive, store, distribute, and sell excess military equipment; documentation of hazardous materials management; demilitarization; and scrap operations). The expansion increases the warehouse footprint from 60,000 to 340,000 square feet (an addition of 280,000 square feet) and increases the outdoor storage area footprint from 34 to 60 acres (an addition of 26 acres). (3) Create an operational test bed for research, development, testing, and evaluation of standardized disposal practices at DLA Disposition Services at Richmond. 

**Description of the No Action Alternative:** The No Action Alternative avoids relocation, or expansion of DLA Disposition Services at Richmond. DLA Disposition Services would continue to operate with extensive customer wait times, insufficient loading bays, workload and productivity imbalances between sites, aging facilities, and a lack of process optimization. The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

**Potential Environmental Impacts:** No significant effects on environmental resources are expected from the Proposed Action. Insignificant, adverse effects on land use, e.g., noise, air quality, geological resources, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, infrastructure and transportation, hazardous materials and wastes, and health and safety are to be expected. Insignificant and beneficial effects on infrastructure and socioeconomics are also to be expected. The EA covers details of the environmental consequences, which is hereby incorporated by reference. 

**Determination:** DLA has determined that implementation of the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. DLA interprets the human environment as the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. DLA based this determination on an analysis of uncertain or controversial impacts; unique or unknown risks; and cumulative impacts of the proposed action. Implementation of the Proposed Action will not violate any Federal, State, or local laws. 

Mr. Phillip R. Dawson, Acting Director, DLA Installation Management, concludes that implementing the Proposed Action at the Defense Supply Center Richmond does not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the environment within the context of NEPA. This decision is based on the results of the analyses performed during the EA preparation as well as comments received from the public.

Therefore, an environmental impact statement for the Proposed Action is not required.

Dated: March 8, 2018.

Aaron Siegel, 
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.