FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR
SOUTH WEST ARKANSAS PROJECT
SWA LITHIUM LLC
LEWISVILLE, ARKANSAS
DOE/EA-2304

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

ACTION: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

SUMMARY: The DOE National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) completed the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for SWA Lithium LLC's (SWA Lithium) South West Arkansas Project (DOE/EA-2304). Based on analyses in the EA, DOE determined that its Proposed Action – providing funding for a portion of the Southwest Arkansas Project (the Proposed Project) – would result in no significant adverse impacts.

BACKGROUND: SWA Lithium received a grant under the DOE Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) DE-FOA-0003099, titled "40207(b) Battery Materials Processing and 40207(c) Battery Manufacturing Grants Round II," which aims to support projects that enhance and strengthen domestic battery manufacturing, critical domestic manufacturing and supply chains, and recycling capabilities. The Proposed Project would produce a nominal 22,500 metric tons per year of battery-quality lithium carbonate in the Smackover region of southwest Arkansas. The Proposed Project would boost job creation and increase domestic lithium production, an identified critical mineral. DOE's Proposed Action would provide $225 million in funding toward the Proposed Project.

Based on the scope of the Proposed Project, DOE prepared an EA to evaluate the potential environmental and socioeconomic consequences of providing financial assistance for the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.).

PURPOSE AND NEED: The overall purpose and need for DOE action pursuant to DE-FOA-0003099 includes expanding U.S. capabilities in advanced battery manufacturing, enhancing national security by reducing reliance on foreign suppliers, ensuring a viable domestic battery supply chain, and ensuring investment in high-quality jobs. The Proposed SWA Project would support these goals by providing a reliable domestic source of battery-quality lithium.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION: The DOE's Proposed Action is to provide $225 million in funding towards the Central Processing Facility (CPF) of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would extract brine from the Smackover Formation via brine production wells at a rate of up to 200,000 barrels per day, extract lithium from the brine, convert it to a saleable battery-quality lithium carbonate product, and reinject the effluent brine back into the Smackover Formation for pressure maintenance via new brine injection wells. The Proposed Project would produce a

nominal 22,500 metric tons per year of battery-quality lithium carbonate over a 20-year operating life.

Project facilities would include the CPF and a supporting wellfield consisting of five well pads containing brine supply and injection wells and pipelines for carrying produced brine, lithium-depleted brine, and sour gas (gas containing some hydrogen sulfide [H_2S]) ,as well as associated infrastructure such as electrical distribution lines and new or improved access roads. DOE's Proposed Action is to provide a financial assistance grant for the CPF. The entire Proposed Project footprint would cover approximately 408 acres. The CPF would be situated on a 118 acre parcel roughly 20 miles west of Magnolia, Arkansas that was cleared for silviculture prior to SWA ownership. The wellfield would lie east of the CPF in an area dominated by active and historic silviculture interspersed with agriculture and early herbaceous habitats associated with utility corridors. Each well pad would house two to four brine production wells and two to four brine injection wells, for a total of 14 production wells and 12 injection wells across the five well pads. Each well pad would also include a freshwater well required for drilling and periodic maintenance. Freshwater supply for CPF operations would come from the Sparta aquifer via four groundwater wells located on the CPF site (three active, one backup). Supporting infrastructure would include ~15 miles of pipeline to carry brine to/from the CPF and sour gas to an existing third-party gas processing plant. Electrical distribution lines to power the wellfield would be collocated within the pipeline corridors or other existing right-of-way (ROW).

Although DOE's Proposed Action would only provide funding towards the CPF, the DOE analyzed impacts associated with construction and operation of the wellfield and associated facilities in the EA because construction and operation of these facilities are a reasonably foreseeable effect and critical component resulting from DOE's Proposed Action.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: In addition to the Proposed Action, DOE considered the No-Action Alternative as required under NEPA. In the absence of DOE funding, SWA Lithium would likely still pursue the Proposed Project. However, it is anticipated that the loss of DOE funding would delay the Proposed Project's planned commercial operations date while replacement funding is sought. For the purposes of the analysis in the EA and to establish a baseline of existing environmental conditions, the No Action Alternative considered that the Proposed Project as proposed would not occur. Without the Proposed Project, the lithium that would be produced would not be available, which would not allow the U.S. to reduce imports of this critical mineral. The jobs and socioeconomic benefits described for the Proposed Action would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES: DOE considered the potential effects of the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative on numerous environmental resource areas in preparation of the EA; however, not all resource areas were evaluated at the same level of detail. DOE determined that Community Resources and Parks and Recreation were not likely to be impacted by the DOE's Proposed Action or the Proposed Project, so these resource areas were dismissed from detailed analysis in the EA. The resource areas

analyzed in detail in this EA include aesthetics and visual resources, land use, air quality , noise, geology and soils, groundwater, surface water, wetlands and floodplains, vegetation and wildlife, regulated waste (solid and hazardous waste), utilities and energy use, transportation and traffic, public and occupational health and safety, socioeconomics, and cultural resources. DOE determined that the Proposed Action would have a minor beneficial impact on socioeconomics. For all other resource areas, DOE determined that the Proposed Action would have no, negligible, or minor potential environmental impacts.

AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES: The Proposed Project would have negligible impacts on aesthetics and visual resources. The only public view of the CPF site is from Arkansas Highway 29 (AR 29). The tallest structure on the CPF would be approximately 115 feet, slightly taller than the approximately 100-foot average height of mature trees in the area, which limits the potential for visibility from AR 29. The nearest residence is approximately 1 mile away from the site and therefore would not be visually impacted by the CPF. The nearest sensitive receptors (rural residences) are at least 0.25 miles away from any area of the wellfield, and most of these receptors are within forested areas that would screen views of equipment and activities in the wellfield.

LAND USE: The Proposed Project would have minor impacts on land use. The Proposed Project would convert land previously used for silviculture to development for the CPF and wellfield with minimal disruption to surrounding land uses. The area of land impacted would be very small relative to the amount of forest and silviculture in the surrounding area, so the Proposed Project would not change the dominant land use in the Project area. The Proposed Project site is not subject to zoning ordinances, so the Proposed Project would not conflict with zoning regulations.

AIR QUALITY: The Proposed Project would have negligible to minor impacts on air quality. Construction of the CPF and the wellfield would generate air emissions from mobile sources as well as dust. During operation, the CPF would be a source of regulated air pollutants, including carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter. Operation of the wellfield would not generate air emissions. The Proposed Project would implement best practice measures for dust suppression (e.g., wetting agents for active earthmoving and site grading operations) throughout the construction phase. In addition, truck tires would be washed as they enter and leave the site and open-top truck beds would be covered to limit particulate emissions and nuisance dust. Additional measures to minimize air emissions at the CPF would include dust collection on product storage bins, non-contact cooling towers, wet scrubbers, equipping boilers with low NOx burners, and installing NOx controls on gas-powered electrical generators. Emissions from the Proposed Project are expected to be below Clean Air Act Major Source thresholds, but operation of the CPF would require a minor source permit from the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). This permit would require venting process emissions through appropriate air pollution control devices, which would limit the Proposed Project's impact on air quality.

Air pollutant emissions associated with construction of the CPF would be minimal and associated with mobile construction vehicles and natural-gas-powered electrical generators, which would be the primary contributor to the Proposed Project's air emissions.

Operation of the CPF would be expected to generate at total of 290,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) annually. Operation of the wellfield would not generate air emissions.

NOISE: The Proposed Project would have negligible impacts on noise. Construction of the CPF and wellfield would generate temporary noise from heavy machinery, but construction-related noise would be intermittent and temporary, as is typical of new construction activities, and would be below the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) guidelines for protecting noise-sensitive locations. The nearest noise-sensitive areas (NSA) to the Proposed Project are located over 1 mile away from the CPF and 0.25 miles away from the nearest well pad, respectively. These distances and intervening forest would effectively attenuate construction-related noise at the nearest residences to the CPF and wellfield.

Based on acoustic modeling conducted by the DOE, noise associated with operation of the CPF would be less than 40 dBA at all the identified noise sensitive areas in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. This noise level is below the USEPA guidelines for protecting noise-sensitive locations, and below the level recognized by the USEPA as being protective of the public health and welfare from the effects of environmental noise in settings similar to the area surrounding the Proposed Project site. Operation of the wellfield would not generate significant noise.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Impacts on geology would be limited to the footprint of the Proposed Project and would not fundamentally change the physio-chemical attributes of the shallow geology of the Proposed Project area. Construction of the CPF and wellfield would result in minor impacts related to temporary disturbance of native soils within and immediately surrounding the footprint of the Proposed Project's facilities. If necessary to maintain workability and prevent rutting or structural failure of temporary access roads and construction laydown areas, soil stabilization techniques such as the application of lime or cement amendment may be used during the construction phase. Operation of the CPF and wellfield are both expected to have negligible impacts on soils. Induced seismic activity in the south Arkansas region has been low to non-existent with over 60 years of brine production and injection in the region, so the brine production and reinjection activities associated with the Proposed Project are not expected to induce seismic activity.

The Proposed Project would impact soils that are designated by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance, so it is subject to the provisions of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). In accordance with the FPPA, the DOE consulted with the USDA NRCS and determined that although prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance occurs within the footprints of the CPF and wellfield, impacts on these soils from the Proposed Project would not meet the threshold for evaluation of alternative sites. Thus, DOE's determination is that the proposed conversion due to DOE's Proposed Action and the Proposed SWA Project is consistent with the FPPA.

GROUNDWATER: Impacts on groundwater quality from the Proposed Project would be negligible during construction, and minor during operation.

Construction of the Proposed Project would involve primarily shallow excavation and grading, with only a minimal potential need for dewatering during installation of deeper foundations to address precipitation events. Given the absence of any known groundwater contaminants and the limited need for dewatering, any temporary changes to subsurface flow or mobilization of contaminants in exposed soils are unlikely to affect groundwater quality and availability. The Proposed Project would extract an estimated 1,600 gallons per minute (gpm) during initial operation with an increase over the Proposed SWA Project life to approximately 1,700 gpm at peak brine production. Conservative groundwater modeling analyses predict after 20 years of operation, drawdowns in the Sparta aquifer of up to about 36 feet at a distance of 0.5 mile from Proposed Project's wells, 15 feet at a distance of one mile, and under 1 foot at a distance of three miles. These potential drawdowns would represent less than 10 percent of the aquifer's estimated available drawdown at these distances because wells in these zones generally have several hundred feet of available water column. This analysis indicates that the water needs of the CPF can be sustainably supported by the Sparta aquifer.

The Proposed Project has been designed to mitigate overall water demand through recycling of process water streams where practical. Specifically, reverse osmosis equipment would be employed to minimize freshwater demand by recycling approximately 85 percent of the water required to operate the lithium extraction process at the CPF. By recycling water in the lithium extraction circuit, water demand would be reduced from 10,700 gpm to 1,700 gpm (a six-fold reduction in water demand).

SURFACE WATER: Construction and operation of the CPF would have minor impacts on surface water. Construction and operation of the wellfield would have minor or negligible impacts on surface water, respectively. Management measures such as implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan, staged clearing, reseeding, use of horizontal directional drill (HDD) techniques at specific stream crossings, dewatering best practices, and erosion control measures, would help manage impacts on surface water. Operational discharges from the CPF would be regulated through a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, which would provide an additional layer of management of impacts on surface water resources.

WETLANDS AND FLOODPLAINS: Construction of the CPF would have negligible impacts on wetlands and floodplains. The wellfield would have minor impacts on wetlands and floodplains during construction, and negligible impacts on these resources during operation. Impacts on jurisdictional wetlands and floodplains during construction have been minimized to the extent practicable through design optimization and use of horizontal directional drill (HDD) techniques during construction in select locations.

DOE reached out to representatives with the U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) - Vicksburg District regarding the Proposed SWA Project's potential impacts on federally jurisdictional wetlands and waterbodies on 26 September 2025, and also provided wetland delineation reports for the CPF and wellfield areas to the USACE for review. The USACE provided a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination and Approved Jurisdictional Determination regarding the Proposed SWA Project to SWA Lithium and DOE. Based on this Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination and Approved

Jurisdictional Determination, the Proposed Project would be expected to be subject to permitting and regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Impacts that cannot be avoided through design optimization would be permitted and mitigated in accordance with USACE requirements.

VGETATION AND WILDLIFE: A total of 86 acres of disturbed, primarily early successional vegetation would be lost to construct the CPF, and approximately 321 acres of vegetation, most of which is commercial pine forest and pine-hardwood forest or recent clearcut, would be lost or converted to early successional habitat to construct the wellfield. Operation of the Proposed Project would not impact vegetation communities or habitats. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool documented the following federally listed species and species that are proposed or candidates for listing as potentially occurring in and around the CPF site and wellfield: Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), Endangered; Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), Endangered; Tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*), Proposed Endangered; Eastern black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis*), Threatened; Piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), Threatened; Rufa red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), Threatened; Alligator snapping turtle (*Macrochelys temminckii*), Proposed Threatened; Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*), Proposed Threatened.

Of the species listed above, the three bat species (Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, and tricolored bat) have the highest potential to occur within the CPF site based on habitat conditions. On 23 September 2025, DOE reached out to representatives of the USFWS Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office (a field office of the USFWS) to initiate discussions and informal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act regarding the Proposed Project. DOE provided a description of the Proposed Project and followed up with copies of a threatened and endangered species field survey and acoustic bat reports prepared for the Proposed Project, as well as preliminary IPaC species lists and Determination Keys for threatened and endangered species potentially impacted by the Proposed Project. DOE subsequently provided the Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office with updated IPaC species lists and Determination Keys. Based on DOE's review of field survey reports, the USFWS Determination Keys for applicable species, and discussions with the Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office, DOE's initial Determination of Effect for federally designated threatened or endangered species was as follows:

- **May effect:** Indiana bat
- **Not likely to adversely effect:** Northern long-eared bat, Eastern black rail, piping plover, rufa red knot
- **No jeopardy:** Tricolored bat, alligator snapping turtle, monarch butterfly

DOE initiated formal consultation with the Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office due to the "may effect" determination above on 23 January 2026, and the Arkansas Ecological Field Service concurred with DOE's formal consultation initiation via letter on 28 January 2026. In this letter, the USFWS Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office confirmed that forested habitat in the project area was identified as occupied roosting,

foraging, and commuting habitat for the Indiana bat, and that SWA Lithium's project will require removal of this habitat, which could result in adverse effects to the species. This letter also confirmed SWA Lithium's intent to address the potentially adverse effects through a voluntary contribution to the Arkansas Bat Fund, which is a recovery-focused conservation option in the USFWS Bat Conservation Strategy (BCS) for the State of Arkansas. The USFWS completed a Biological Opinion (BO) that supports the BCS and determined that the Proposed SWA Project is likely to adversely affect the species but is not likely to jeopardize its continued existence. The USFWS determined that the Proposed SWA Project is consistent with the actions evaluated in the BO, and that the proposed contribution to the Arkansas Bat Fund is appropriate to address adverse effects to the species. The USFWS also noted in this letter that the take exemption for the Indiana bat in the BO is applicable to the Proposed SWA Project, and any incidental take of this species from forested habitat removal associated with the Proposed SWA Project is not prohibited. The USFWS also provided a letter to DOE on 13 February 2026 confirming receipt of Standard Lithium's contribution to the Arkansas Bat Fund, and that receipt of this contribution completes the recovery-focused conservation option. In the letters from USFWS dated 28 January 2026 and 13 February 2026, the USFWS also acknowledged DOE's "no jeopardy" determination for the alligator snapping turtle, monarch butterfly, and tricolored bat, confirmed concurrence for all other listed species expected to occur within the action area (based on the USFWS technical assistance letter dated 17 December 2025), and confirmed that Section 7 consultation requirements for all species that are expected to occur in the action area have been met. The USFWS stipulated that reinitiating consultation is required if the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, if new information reveals that the Proposed SWA Project may affect listed species or designated critical habitat not previously considered, if the Proposed SWA Project is modified in a manner that may cause effects to listed species or designated critical habitat, or if a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that the Proposed Project may affect. SWA Lithium and DOE will adhere to these stipulations. Additionally, all brine storage tanks would be covered with a closed roof type design, and any raw water tanks would be covered with a roof or screens to deny access to bats. The USFWS had no further comments on the Draft EA**.**

REGULATED WASTE: Regulated waste impacts are expected to be minor from construction and operation of the CPF and construction of the wellfield, and negligible from operation of the wellfield. The Proposed Project would generate approximately 4,300 tons of non-hazardous solid waste per year, which would be contained and transported by truck to a landfill for final disposal at a permitted facility. Periodic generation of small amounts of hazardous waste that may be generated during non-routine maintenance activities or cleaning would be appropriately handled on a case-by-case basis, should the need arise. Process waste streams that are generated from the brine would be conditioned and returned to the lithium depleted brine stream for reinjection. Any process water that is not recovered for recycling/reuse would be combined with the lithium-depleted brine stream and reinjected.

DOE reached out to the ADEQ to request general permitting guidelines and requirements that would be expected for the Proposed SWA Project. ADEQ responded to DOE with a letter outlining possible permitting and compliance requirements for the Proposed

Project. SWA Lithium would adhere to all applicable permitting requirements for the Proposed Project identified by ADEQ.

UTILITIES AND ENERGY USE: The Proposed Project would have negligible impacts to utilities and energy usage during CPF construction, and minor impacts during operation of the CPF. Impact on utilities and energy use from the wellfield would be negligible during all phases of the Proposed Project. The CPF and wellfield combined would require approximately 40 megawatts (MW) of power. The Proposed Project would self-generate power using natural gas-fueled generators, consuming roughly 3,000 million standard cubic feet of natural gas per year. The natural gas would be supplied by Energy Transfer, which maintains a pipeline that runs approximately 500 feet north of the CPF site and has the capacity to supply the required natural gas volume. Although an interconnection to an electrical grid is not currently planned, the Proposed Project desires to connect to grid power if and when the local transmission network can support the required demand and would continue to pursue and evaluate sources of grid supplied power. No utility-provided water use is anticipated, and no such tie-in is planned. Process water demands at the CPF would be mostly achieved through internal water recycling via the use of reverse osmosis systems, which are expected to achieve an 85 percent recycling rate. The remaining freshwater demand would be 1,600 to 1,700 gallons per minute (gpm), which would be drawn from the Sparta aquifer via freshwater wells.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC: Impacts from the Proposed Project on transportation and traffic are expected to be minor from construction and operation of the CPF and construction of the wellfield, and negligible from operation of the wellfield. The existing road network in the vicinity of the Project site can support the volume and type of truck traffic that construction of the Proposed Project would require. DOE contacted ARDOT to identify any upgrades that may need to be made to the existing road network in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. ARDOT confirmed that the surrounding highways are considered under-utilized, and no issues are expected to arise from the increase in traffic from construction or operation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be required to develop any additional mitigation measures for traffic.

PUBLIC AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY: The impacts of the Proposed Project on public and occupational health and safety are expected to be minor. Numerous regulatory permitting requirements and planned management measures would address factors relevant to public and occupational health and safety. The Proposed Project would follow all regulatory requirements, obtain all required permits, and implement a comprehensive project-specific Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS). The ESMS would include health and safety plans related to chemical safety, hazard communication, energy isolation, hot work, and confined space entry and would evaluate the need for additional safety plans prior to and during operations. SWA Lithium would develop a project-specific Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan for the Proposed Project and implement systems for continuously monitoring the pipeline, conducting routine maintenance, and robust recordkeeping. SWA Lithium or its

contractors would validate personnel competency and provide targeted Health, Safety, Security, and Environment training, and ensure that contractors maintain programs that are aligned with SWA Lithium's standards.

SOCIOECONOMICS: The Proposed Project would result in a minor, beneficial impact on socioeconomics during construction and operations. The Proposed Project is estimated to create 300 temporary jobs during construction, and 100 permanent jobs during operations. Construction of the Proposed Project would generate an estimated $10.2 million in local tax revenues and an estimated overall $257.7 million in tax revenue including sub county, county, state, and federal taxes. Construction of the CPF site is anticipated to support additional indirect jobs in Lafayette County that are not directly related to the Proposed Project but arise because of socioeconomic changes owing to the Proposed Project. During operations, the CPF site would generate roughly $10.5 million in local taxes during the 20-year operations and contribute $551.4 million to Lafayette County's gross domestic product over this period. The Proposed Project would aim to maximize local hiring of the construction workforce. As the Proposed Project is within a reasonable commuting distance for the larger towns in these counties, local workers would remain at their residences and would not require accommodation.

CULTURAL RESOURCES: The Proposed Project would have no impact on cultural resources. Desktop records review identified no previously recorded archaeological sites, cultural resources surveys, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed or -eligible sites, or Arkansas Historic Preservation Properties within the direct or indirect Area of Potential Effect for either the CPF or the wellfield. Field investigations documented no cultural resources at the CPF site. Ten archaeological sites, including 6 isolated occurrences, were identified within the direct APE for the wellfield along with 12 historic buildings within the indirect APE for the wellfield, but none of these resources were found eligible for inclusion on the NRHP.

DOE initiated consultation with the Division of Arkansas Heritage (DAH) on 27 May 2025. On 11 September 2025, DOE received a Determination of Effect letter from the DAH stating that there would be no historic properties affected as a result of the proposed construction and operation of the CPF. A second Determination of Effect letter was received on 12 November 2025 stating that there would be no historic properties affected as a result of the construction and operation of the wellfield portion of the Proposed Project.

DOE provided notice of the Proposed Project to Tribes with potential interest in the Project area, including the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, the Delaware Nation – Oklahoma, the Osage Nation, and the Quapaw Nation throughout May and June of 2025. Copies of cultural resource studies for the CPF and wellfield cultural resource studies were subsequently mailed to Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) and Tribal leaders of these tribes in August and September of 2025. DOE also submitted copies of the cultural resource studies to two additional tribes (the Shawnee Tribe and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians) on 24 November 2025 in response to guidance received from DAH. Copies of

the Draft EA were submitted to the DAH, and THPOs and Tribal Leaders of the eight Tribal Nations noted above for review and comment. The Shawnee Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office responded and confirmed that the project is out of the Shawnee Tribe's area of interest, and the Osage Nation Historic Preservation Office responded with a request to review the two cultural resource survey reports completed by Switchgrass Archaeology in 2025 with an intent to comment. The Osage Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office subsequently commented that the Proposed SWA Project "most likely will not adversely affect any sacred properties and/or properties of cultural significance to the Osage Nation" and provided a "No Properties" determination, with a stipulation that work cease immediately and the Osage Nation Historic Preservation Office be contacted if artifacts or human remains are discovered during project construction. DOE and SWA Lithium will adhere to this stipulation. No further comments were received by the DAH or other THPOs or Tribal Leaders on the Draft EA.

PUBLIC AVAILABILITY: The Draft EA was released for public review and comment on 11 March 2026. DOE advertised its release and invitation for comment in the *Lafayette County Press, Banner News, Texarkana Gazette, and Magnolia Reporter*. The Draft EA was published online on DOE's NETL EA website (https://netl.doe.gov/node/6939) and the DOE NEPA EA website (https://www.energy.gov/nepa/doe-environmental-assessments). In addition, DOE sent one hard copy of the Draft EA for public review to the Lafayette County Library in Lewisville, Arkansas. The public was invited to provide oral, written, or e-mailed comments on the Draft EA to DOE during the comment period, which occurred from 11 March 2026 through 9 April 2026. Copies of the Draft EA were also distributed to cognizant federal and state agencies and Tribal Nations.

During development of the Draft EA, and prior to the public comment period, DOE initiated consultations with the following federal government agencies: USDA NRCS, USFWS – Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office, and USACE Vicksburg District. DOE also initiated consultations with the following state and local government agencies: the Arkansas Department of Energy and Environment – Division of Environmental Quality, Arkansas Department of Agriculture – Division of Natural Resources, and the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, which serves as the Arkansas state historic preservation office. DOE also initiated consultations with the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma, Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, Delaware Nation – Oklahoma, Osage Nation, Quapaw Nation, and the Shawnee Tribe. Through these consultations, DOE provided information about the Proposed Project and solicited input for consideration prior to finalizing and releasing the Draft EA for public comment.

COMMENTS RECEIVED: Comments were received during the public comment period from two members of the public. DOE also received comments from the USACE - Vicksburg District and Arkansas Department of Agriculture – Division of Natural Resources. The U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office and United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) confirmed that they did not have comments on the Draft EA. The Osage Nation Historic Preservation Office responded with a request that they receive and review copies of the two cultural

resource surveys completed by Switchgrass Archeology in 2025. The Osage Nation Historic Preservation Office subsequently responded with a "No Properties" determination, and the Shawnee Tribe commented that the Proposed SWA Project is out of its area of interest. Additional comments were received from the Arkansas Department of Energy and Environment – Division of Environmental Quality, the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, USACE Vicksburg District, the USFWS – Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office, Arkansas Department of Agriculture – Division of Natural Resources, and the Quapaw Nation as part of consultation prior to issuance of the Draft EA. DOE acknowledges receipt of these comments, and all comments received are included in Appendices B and F and/or addressed throughout the Final EA.

MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS: No additional mitigation measures beyond those established during agency consultation or contained in permits obtained or to be obtained by SWA Lithium from the appropriate permitting authorities are required. Mitigation associated with wildlife has been completed and is discussed above in the Vegetation and Wildlife section of this document.

DETERMINATION: Based on information presented in the Final EA (DOE/EA-2304), DOE finds that the Proposed Action to provide a grant to SWA Lithium LLC would not significantly affect the quality of the physical, biological, or human environment. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required, and DOE is issuing this FONSI.

Copies of the Final EA and this FONSI are available at DOE's NETL EA website at: https://netl.doe.gov/node/6939.

Copies of the Final EA and FONSI can also be obtained by sending a request to:

Mr. Stephen Witmer
NEPA Compliance Officer
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
626 Cochran Mill Road, M/S 921-227
Pittsburgh, PA 15236
412-386-7589
stephen.witmer@netl.doe.gov

SEAN PLASYNSKI

Digitally signed by SEAN PLASYNSKI
Date: 2026.05.12 16:45:26 -04'00'

Sean I. Plasynski, Ph.D.
Director, National Energy Technology Laboratory (Acting)