



Chapter 4

Relationship to Land Use Plans Policies and Controls

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Alternatives to the proposed action include:

- o Not develop a National Training Center.
- o Utilize Fort Irwin but alter the project description to decrease the amount of personnel permanently stationed at the base.
- o Develop a National Training Center at a different location.

The benefits, costs and risks of the proposed alternatives are considered as they impact on the human environment. Detailed tactical, fiscal and inter-service interoperability considerations of alternative sites are discussed in "National Training Center - Alternative Site Analysis", by the United States Army Forces Command.

5.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would eliminate the National Training Center as a mechanism for training armored and mechanized battalions.

The benefits of this alternative would be that the adverse environmental and socioeconomic impacts listed in Chapter 3 would not occur. The resources planned to be expended would be diverted to other defense needs or government programs or would not be expended. A major commitment of labor, materials, natural and cultural resources need not be undertaken. An increase in adverse impacts on wildlife, vegetation, water and archaeological resources would be avoided. The environmental factors of air, water, land, ecology and sound, and socioeconomic factors would remain in their present state. These factors relate to the present use of Fort Irwin as a training site for the Reserve and Active Components. The possible impacts (i.e., increased employment, tax base, etc.) of the proposed action would not be realized.

The specific environmental risks involved in this alternative are minimal. The type of training envisioned to take place at the National Training Center cannot be conducted at present division stations because of restrictions imposed by Federal Communications Commission regulations, lack of land and air space, and environmental considerations.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES WHICH UTILIZE FORT IRWIN

There are three proposed alternatives which use the Fort Irwin site:

- o Option 1 - Eliminate from the proposed program those combat units to be permanently stationed at the base (the "opposing force") and substitute for them a contractor supplied force of 300 civilians to act the part of the Army's opposing force. Direct employment would be approximately 2,095.
- o Option 2 - Eliminate from the proposed program those combat units permanently stationed at the base as the opposing force with rotating brigades supplying their own opposing force. Direct employment would be approximately 1,795.
- o Option 3 - Maintain the status quo with the State of California in control of the Fort. A support agreement with the California National Guard would provide maintenance of the equipment pool. Approximately 140 additional maintenance personnel would be added to the current work force. An active Army force on 30 (+) days temporary duty would operate ranges for the active Army rotational forces. The strength of this force would be about 25 officers and 100 enlisted personnel. Direct employment would be approximately 468.

All three of these options would substantially reduce the number of personnel permanently stationed at Fort Irwin as well as reduce the demand for goods and services envisioned in the preferred program. Table 2 compares the projected employment and housing requirements for these three options.

Impacts concerning the use of the reservation for military exercises would remain the same under all three options. Housing requirements within the cantonment area would be reduced from the proposed program by 25% under Options 1 and 2 and by 92% under Option 3. This, combined with a decrease in employment of 22% under Option 1, 33% under Option 2, and 82% under Option 3, would lengthen the time estimates for years of water remaining within current resources.

Housing demands within the Barstow Area would decrease relative to the proposed program by 12% under Option 1, 41% under Option 2 and 68% under Option 3. All options would lessen the degree of impact on the Barstow Area housing market with Option 3 again presenting the least critical alternative. Primary civilian employment within the Barstow

Proposed Employment and Housing Requirements
of Options 1, 2 and 3; Alternatives Which
Utilize Fort Irwin

Employment	Officers and Warrant Officers		Enlisted	Subtotal Military	Other Support	Civilian	Total
	116	1,158					
<u>Housing</u>				(1,274)	203 ^a	618	2,095
Family/Mobile	105	485		(590)	4 ^b		594
BOQ/BEQ	11	579		(590)	4		594
On-Post	116	1,064		(1,180)	8		1,188
Off-Post		94		(94)	195	618	907
<u>Total Housing</u>	116	1,158		(1,274)	197 ^c	618	2,089
<u>Employment</u>	116	1,158		(1,274)	203 ^a	318	1,795
<u>Housing</u>				(590)	4 ^b		594
Family/Mobile	105	485		(590)	4		594
BOQ/BEQ	11	579		(590)	4		594
On-Post	116	1,064		(1,180)	8		1,188
Off-Post		94		(94)	195	318	607
<u>Total Housing</u>	116	1,158		(1,274)	197 ^c	318	1,789
<u>Employment</u>	25 ^d	100 ^d		(125)	343 ^a		468
<u>Housing</u>				-	4 ^b		4
Family/Mobile	25	100		(125)	4		129
BOQ/BEQ	25	100		(125)	8		133
On-Post				-	329		329
Off-Post				-	337 ^c		462
<u>Total Housing</u>	25	100		(125)	337 ^c		462
<u>Employment</u>	164	2,007		(2,171)	203 ^a	318 ^a	2,692
<u>Housing</u>				(594)	0		594
Family/Mobile	78	516		(594)	0		594
BOQ/BEQ	33	912		(945)	57		1,002
On-Post	111	1,428		(1,539)	57	64	1,596
Off-Post	53	579		(631)	146	254	1,031
<u>Total Housing</u>	164	2,007		(2,171)	203	254 ^c	2,628

- a) Includes 147 mobilization and training equipment site personnel, 52 ARNG staff, 3 post exchange managers and one club systems manager.
- b) Assumes colonel already has house, 3 mobilization and training equipment site personnel are in one house.
- c) Assumes 6 of the ARNG jobs are held by dependents; 58 other civilians are dependents.
- d) Long-term TDY (30 days) personnel from active Army.

OPTION 1

OPTION 2

OPTION 3

BASE CASE