

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF ARMY HIGH POWER
DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPON SYSTEMS FIELDING, OPERATION, AND
MAINTENANCE AT MULTIPLE INSTALLATIONS

Prepared by

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
TULSA DISTRICT

Prepared for

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

July 2026

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
UNITED STATES ARMY**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF ARMY HIGH POWER
DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPON SYSTEMS FIELDING, OPERATION, AND
MAINTENANCE AT MULTIPLE INSTALLATIONS**

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 US Code Section 4321 *et seq.*) requires Federal agencies to consider potential environmental effects prior to undertaking a major Federal action. The Department of the Army (Army) prepared a Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) in compliance with NEPA; the Department of Defense (DoD) NEPA Implementing Procedures issued 30 June 2025; Army Regulation 200-1, *Environmental Protection and Enhancement*; and applicable Army NEPA guidance. The PEA is titled "Programmatic Environmental Assessment of Army High Power Directed Energy Weapons System Fielding, Operation, and Maintenance at Multiple Installations." The High Power Directed Energy (HP-DE) PEA is incorporated by reference in this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and addresses environmental effects of the proposed fielding, operation, and maintenance of the weapon systems consisting of 300-kilowatt (-kW) high-energy laser (HEL) and the high-power microwave (HPM) for the Direct Energy Indirect Fire Protection Capability (DE IFPC) system and a 50-kW laser for the Maneuver-Short Range Air Defense Increment 2 Directed Energy (M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE) system. These three weapon systems are collectively known as the HP-DE systems. The HEL and HPM weapon systems would be fielded to Indirect Fire Protection Capability battalions (BNs) or batteries (BTRYs) and the M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems would be fielded to M-SHORAD BNs. The intent of the fielding is to support the Army's air and missile defense capabilities in accordance with the 2021 Army Modernization Strategy.

The PEA provides a broad and programmatic analysis to determine potential effects on the human environment at each of the 14 installations under consideration for IFPC-HEL and IFPC-HPM and seven of those 14 installations for M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE. The programmatic approach is designed to allow for early planning, coordination, and flexibility throughout implementation of the Army's process of fielding HP-DE weapon systems. Only the effects of the HP-DE weapons are assessed in the PEA. Potential effects that have not been analyzed in sufficient detail in the PEA would require additional analysis, such as tiering from the PEA at the installation level.

Before making a final decision regarding which installations HP-DE weapon systems would be fielded, or to implement the No Action Alternative, the Army will consider other relevant information, such as deployment time, cost, and strategic implications. Authority to approve the analysis of the environmental effects of this action is delegated to the Headquarters Department of the Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, ASA(IE&E). The final decision on fielding installation will be made by the Department of the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7.

PROPOSED ACTION

The Army plans to initially field¹ four IFPC-HEL and four IFPC-HPM weapon systems to the same or separate kinetic IFPC BNs or BTRYs and M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems to a M-SHORAD or Division Air Defense (DIVAD) BN to provide soldiers and units with the modernized equipment and capabilities they will need to be effective in contemporary and future operating environments. The IFPC-HEL and IFPC-HPM platoon soldiers would transition from IFPC kinetic energy systems with no growth of the BN or BTRY associated with fielding the IFPC-HELs and IFPC-HPMs. The M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems would replace kinetic weapon SGT STOUT systems with no growth of the BN. The PEA addresses the fielding of IFPC-HEL and IFPC-HPM at 14 installations in more detail: Fort Bliss, Fort Campbell, Fort Carson, Fort Hood (formerly known as Fort Cavazos), Fort Drum, Fort Knox, Fort Bragg (formerly known as Fort Liberty), Fort Riley, Fort Sill, Fort Stewart, Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM), Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER), US Army Garrison (USAG) Alaska (Fort Wainwright), and USAG Hawaii. The PEA also assesses the fielding of M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE at Fort Bliss, Fort Carson, Fort Hood, Fort Bragg, Fort Riley, Fort Sill, and Fort Stewart. Additional training locations were assessed for fielding at Fort Bliss (White Sands Missile Range), Fort Carson (Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site), JBLM (Yakima Training Center), and JBER and USAG Alaska (Donnelly Training Area).

ALTERNATIVES

The PEA analyzed three action alternatives and a No Action Alternative. The alternatives considered and analyzed in the PEA were:

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Army would not implement the proposed action. The HP-DE systems would not be fielded permanently to any location. The United States would not be able to respond to or compete as effectively with current warfare strategies used by US near-peer adversaries. Nevertheless, the No Action Alternative represents baseline conditions against which potential consequences of implementing the proposed action can be compared. This would not meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action or the objectives of the 2021 Army Modernization Strategy and would fail to begin the process of enhancing the Army's air and missile defense capability.

Alternative 1

The Army proposes to field, operate, and maintain four IFPC-HEL, four IFPC-HPM, and four M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems to a single installation with a kinetic IFPC BN and M-SHORAD BN, where they would form an IFPC-HEL and IFPC-HPM platoon within one or two BTRYs and a M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE capability within a M-SHORAD BN. The Army expects that additional IFPC-HEL, IFPC-HPM, and M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems would be fielded to other installations in the future.

¹ "Field" – refers to sending new equipment and technology to an installation(s). As part of the fielding action, soldiers already stationed at an installation(s) would train with and maintain the HP-DE weapon systems.

Alternative 2

The Army proposes to field, operate, and maintain four IFPC-HEL systems and four IFPC-HPM systems to the same or separate kinetic IFPC BNs at one or two installations. The four IFPC-HEL and four IFPC-HPM prototypes would be assigned to form an IFPC-HEL platoon or IFPC-HPM platoon, respectively, within one or two BTRYs. The Army expects that additional IFPC-HEL and IFPC-HPM systems would be fielded to other kinetic IFPC BNs in the future.

Alternative 3

The Army proposes to field four M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems to an M-SHORAD BN at an installation for operations and maintenance. The Army expects that additional M-SHORAD Inc 2 DE systems would be fielded to other installations with M-SHORAD BNs in the future.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

All adverse effects on the environment as a result of implementing the proposed action as proposed in the PEA are anticipated to be less than significant. Each of the resource areas identified in the appendix to this FONSI was analyzed for potential effects resulting from implementing the proposed action and known combined actions. Potential effects were broken down into the following categories: beneficial effects, no effects, and potential adverse effects (none, negligible, less than significant, significant but mitigable, or significant). These effects are summarized in Appendix A.

Adverse effects are anticipated to be minimized through avoidance and the implementation of existing environmental protection measures. Avoidance strategies depend on the installation selected. Environmental protection measures such as erosion and stormwater controls, maintaining vehicles and equipment, and sustaining vegetation cover on the training sites are routinely practiced at Army installations. Currently, no construction activities are planned to support the HP-DE fielding. In the future, if construction activities were to occur, the protection measures would be implemented at those sites also. Buffers for sensitive resources would be employed during construction and training, depending on the requirements of the installation. For the proposed action, no new mitigation measures will be needed nor have any been identified. The Army will continue to adhere to legal and regulatory requirements and continue to implement its approved management plans, standard operating procedures, and best management practices.

Implementing the proposed action would not be expected to result in significant adverse effects on the human environment. The lack of specific sites assessed in the PEA prevents detailed assessment for effects such as construction or operational noise.

PUBLIC REVIEW AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

The PEA and FONSI are available for public, agency, Tribal, and Native Hawaiian Organization (NHO) (USAG Hawaii only) review. Electronic copies of the PEA and FONSI are available for download from the US Army Environmental Command (USAEC) NEPA Documents website (<https://aec.army.mil/Outreach/NEPA-Documents/>). Printed copies are available by emailing a

request to usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.nepa@army.mil or calling the USAEC Public Affairs Office at 520-684-3758 to request a copy.

Comments may be submitted to:

ATTN: Mail Stop 112 (NEPA)
Public Comments
Commander USAEC
2455 Reynolds Rd
JBSA-Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7588

or by email to: usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.nepa@army.mil using the subject "HP-DE Public Comments."

Before the public comment period, notices were sent to federally recognized Native American Tribes affiliated with the assessed installations and NHOs affiliated with USAG Hawaii. They were invited to review the documents and provide comments for consideration by Army decision makers. No government-to-government consultations have been initiated related to fielding the HP-DE systems. Comments received will be appended to the FONSI and considered by receiving installations when completing supplemental NEPA documentation.

CONCLUSION

Based on a careful review of the PEA, I have determined that all effects on the human environment resulting from implementing the proposed action at each of the 14 installations would be less than significant. The Army concludes that the proposed action and No Action Alternative are not major Federal actions that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment per Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA; an environmental impact statement is not required and will not be prepared. My decision is based on the PEA's analysis of potential environmental effects associated with the action alternatives and No Action Alternative. This decision meets the requirements of NEPA and has been made after taking into account all submitted information and considering a full range of reasonable alternatives and all environmental effects. The content of this PEA has been tailored to ensure that the environmental analysis remains focused on the most relevant issues and critical considerations, consistent with the intent of the page-limit guidance and the agency's professional judgment. Accordingly, I certify that this EA satisfies NEPA's procedural requirements within the prescribed timeline and demonstrates compliance with applicable page-limit standards. This concludes the NEPA process for this action.

David Guldenzopf

David Guldenzopf, Ph.D.

Director for Environmental Compliance and Mission Readiness

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for

Installations, Energy and Environment

July 8, 2026

Date

FONSI APPENDIX A: Summary of the Effects from Each Alternative

Summary of the Potential Effects of Implementing the Evaluated Alternatives

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action Alternative
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, negligible adverse effects	No effects
Airspace Use	No effects or short- or long-term less-than-significant adverse effects on nonmilitary airspace users	No effects or short- or long-term less-than-significant adverse effects on nonmilitary airspace users	No effects or short- or long-term less-than-significant adverse effects on nonmilitary airspace users	No effects
Biological Resources	Long-term, negligible adverse effects. May affect but not likely to adversely affect federally protected species.	Long-term, negligible adverse effects. May affect but not likely to adversely affect federally protected species.	Long-term, negligible adverse effects. May affect but not likely to adversely affect federally protected species.	No effects
Hazardous and Toxic Materials and Waste	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	No effects
Human Health and Safety	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	No effects