

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR
STATIONING AND FIELDING THE INDIRECT FIRE
PROTECTION CAPABILITY WEAPON SYSTEM 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 FOR STATIONING AND
FIELDING THE INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY WEAPON SYSTEM 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. This PEA is titled "Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Stationing and Fielding the Indirect Fire Protection Capability Weapon System at Multiple Installations." The Indirect Fire Protection Capability (IFPC) PEA is incorporated by reference in this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and addresses environmental effects of the proposed stationing and fielding of up to nine IFPC battalions (BNs) and up to nine IFPC batteries (BTRYs) at a selection of 14 Army and Joint Base installations. 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 environmental and socioeconomic areas of concern at each of the 14 installations under consideration. The programmatic approach is designed to allow for early planning, coordination, and flexibility throughout implementation of the Army's process of fielding IFPC BNs and BTRYs. Once final fielding decisions are made, potential effects that have not been analyzed in sufficient detail in the PEA would require additional analysis, such as tiering from the PEA with additional NEPA analysis at the installation level.

Before making a final decision regarding where IFPC BNs and BTRYs would be stationed and 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 location will be made by the Department of the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7.

PROPOSED ACTION

The Army plans to field¹ up to nine IFPC BNs and nine IFPC BTRYs to provide soldiers and units with the modernized equipment and capabilities they will need to be effective in contemporary and

¹ "Field" – refers to sending new equipment and technology to an installation(s). As part of the fielding action, soldiers will be stationed at an installation(s) to train with and maintain the IFPC.

future operating environments. The IFPC is a mobile air and missile defense system designed to provide a defensive capability by intercepting cruise missiles, unmanned aircraft systems (UAS), and large-caliber rockets. The PEA addresses the fielding 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 Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER), Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM), US Army Garrison (USAG) Alaska (Fort Wainwright), and USAG Hawaii. Additional training locations were assessed 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. IFPC BNs and BTRYs would not be fielded at any installation. Training and operations at the assessed installations would continue in the current manner and rate. 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 air and missile defense capability of Army fixed and semi-fixed assets.

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 analyzed in the PEA is to field and station both an IFPC BTRY within a Maneuver-Short Range Air Defense (M-SHORAD) (formerly known as “SGT STOUT”) BN assigned to an Army Division together with an IFPC BN at one or more installations. An IFPC BN structure is a headquarters and headquarters battery (HHB), a forward support company (FSC), three IFPC BTRYs, and a counter-small UAS BTRY. Approximately 735 personnel (105 in the HHB, 150 in the FSC, 125 in each IFPC BTRY, and 105 in the counter-small UAS BTRY) would station with an IFPC BN. The IFPC BTRY organization would be similar to that of current Air Defense Artillery BTRYs, consisting of a small headquarters platoon (PLT), a launcher PLT, a fire control/radar PLT, and a system support section, and would add about 125 personnel to the M-SHORAD BN. The IFPC BNs and BTRYs would initially field in a missile and launcher configuration similar to that of the Patriot system.

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 analyzed in the PEA is to field and station up to nine IFPC BNs at up to nine installations.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 analyzed in the PEA is to field and station up to nine IFPC BTRYs at up to nine installations.

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, the increase in training tempo, and the increase in the number of soldiers at the installation. 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 IFPC fielding. In the future, if construction activities were to occur, the protection measures would be implemented at those sites also. Buffers for sensitive resources (biological and cultural) 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 any specific sites assessed in the PEA prevents detailed assessment for other 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 on the US Army Environmental Command (USAEC) website (<https://aec.army.mil/Outreach/NEPA-Documents/>). Electronic copies of the PEA and FONSI are available for download from the USAEC website. 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 "IFPC 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 comment for consideration by Army decision makers. No government-to-government consultations have been initiated related to fielding the IFPC. 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 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 alternatives 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 its implementing regulations 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, Ph.D.
Director for Environmental Compliance and Mission Readiness
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for
Installations, Energy and Environment

Date

FONSI APPENDIX A: Summary of the Effects of 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	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	Long-term, less-than-significant adverse effects	No effects on any resource area would result if IFPC BNs and/or BTRYs are not stationed or fielded at installations. Existing conditions for all resource areas would be unaffected.
Airspace use	No adverse effects from IFPC weapon system training. Less-than-significant adverse effects on nonmilitary airspace users.	No adverse effects from IFPC weapon system training. Less-than-significant adverse effects on nonmilitary airspace users.	No adverse effects from IFPC weapon system training. Less-than-significant adverse effects on nonmilitary airspace users.	
Biological resources	Long-term negligible and less-than-significant adverse effects on flora and fauna. May affect but not likely to adversely affect federally protected species.	Long-term negligible and less-than-significant adverse effects on flora and fauna. May affect but not likely to adversely affect federally protected species.	Long-term negligible and less-than-significant adverse effects on flora and fauna. May affect but not likely to adversely affect federally protected species.	
Cultural resources	No effects	No effects	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	