Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
FORAGE — ALL LOCALITIES — MAP FIGURE 5					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Maintain or improve the total forage resource using techniques that are compatible with the use and development of other resources and that would maintain, meet, or make substantial progress towards meeting Utah BLM Rangeland Health Standards.					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED RMP AND ALL ALTERNATIVES • Monitoring would be used to determine the amount of forage available for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses. Results of monitoring would be used to adapt management strategies to prevent deterioration of rangelands, to achieve desired resource conditions, and to meet other resource objectives. • Any adjustment in forage assignments to either livestock or wildlife would be based on analysis of monitoring data, including long-term vegetation trend, actual use, climate, and utilization. Additionally forage would not be allocated in areas where forage production is less than 25 pounds per acre, which equates to 32 acres per AUM. Areas that are seldom or never grazed by livestock due to physical factors such as slopes greater than 50% and areas that are in excess of four miles from water would not be included in the livestock forage allocation. An exception for areas in excess of four miles of water if water is hauled or the area would be grazed when snow is on the ground. Adjustments would involve permittees and would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or decision. • Increases or reductions associated with joint monitoring of base allocations would be evaluated against the established grazing permits and UDWR herd unit objectives to determine needed adjustments to animal numbers, adjustments in seasons of use, etc. Unless specified elsewhere in the plan, changes in forage allocation would be as follows: o When all other management options have been exhausted and it is determined that rangeland standards are not being met, reductions would be made to the species of grazing animal shown to be causing the problem. o If additional forage is determined to be available, it would be proportionally allocated to grazing animals according to their dietary need or would be allocated to watershed, riparian, or other resource values, unless specified elsewhere in the plan. o Increases in available forage resulting from conservation practices, improved range condition, or development of improvements by the livestock permittee, DWR, or other organizations, would be credited to that entity unless specified elsewhere in the plan. • Should a permittee apply for reinstatement of suspended use, it would only be considered if: o Adjustment of suspended use would follow policy, regulation, and guidelines. o The allotment/s is/are being grazed at full permitted use in order to adequately assess the carrying capacity of the range resource; o Adequate monitoring data is in place to assess AUMs; and o A signed agreement is in place that outlines at least a subsequent five-year monitoring protocol. • AUMs would be adjusted downward for livestock, wildlife, or wild horses (or any combination thereof) when monitoring shows that rangeland objectives are not being met and that the long-term forage availability is not adequate to support the permitted uses. • If it is determined through monitoring that livestock grazing is beneficial to other resource values, it would be allowed on 16 miles of river corridor along the Upper Green River in Brown's Park following an adequate evaluation and assessment. If such use is allowed, it would be of short duration and would not detract from recreation and/or riparian values along the river. • Grazing preference is retired on the following allotments: Red Creek Flat, Taylor Flat, Watson, Rye Grass, Marshall Draw, South Warren Draw, and Sears Canyon. Applications for livestock grazing would only be approved on a non-renewable, short duration basis following an adequate evaluation and assessment to determine if it would enhance wildlife values. • When the Vernal RMP becomes effective, the active AUMs permitted to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) (4,232) and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF) (4,026) would be allocated to wildlife. Ranchers (grazing permittees) other than TNC and RMEF also have permits in the allotments where these AUMS are relinquished; they would continue to graze cattle in accordance with their permitted use. **Note**: Further review of TNC and RMEF grazing permits indicate that TNC's AUMs were actually 7 less (4,239 to 4,232) and RMEF was 1 more (4,025 to 4,026) than the figures stated in the Vernal Draft RMP/EIS. This revision will not impact the management decision.					
Unless otherwise specified by a management plan, up to 50% utilization of forage on uplands would be allowed.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Unless otherwise specified by a management plan, up to 60% utilization of forage on uplands would be allowed.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as the Proposed RMP.
AUMs would be allocated as follows: • 138,402 AUMs for livestock • 104,865 AUMs for wildlife • 2,340 AUMs for wild horses **Note:** The Book Cliffs RMP/EIS ROD did not allocate any AUMs for wild horses in the Bonanza area. The 1,020 AUMs for wild horses in the Bonanza area should not have been carried forward in Alternative D in the Vernal Draft RMP/EIS. The Proposed RMP does not include these AUMs.	AUMs would be allocated as follows: • 137,838 AUMs for livestock • 104,871 AUMs for wildlife • 2,940 AUMs for wild horses	AUMs would be allocated as follows: • 139,163 AUMs for livestock • 104,871 AUMs for wildlife • 0 AUMs for wild horses	AUMs would be allocated as follows: • 77,294 AUMs for livestock • 106,196 AUMs for wildlife • 3,960 AUMs for wild horses	AUMs would be allocated as follows: • 146,161 AUMs for livestock • 96,607 AUMS for wildlife • 2,340 AUMs for wild horses	Same as Alternative C.
FORAGE–BONANZA LOCALITY					
If forage allocation reductions are necessary to make significant progress towards or sustain rangeland health, the following criteria would be followed to make the needed reductions:					

Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
o Demonstrated Conflicts Between Wildlife And Livestock					
• Sheep and/or cattle and pronghorn would be reduced proportionately. • Pronghorn use would not be reduced below 502 AUMs.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	• Pronghorn use would be reduced, but not below 502 AUMs. • Appropriate reductions in big game would be made prior to making needed reductions in livestock numbers.	• Livestock use would be reduced. • Pronghorn use would not be reduced. • Deer or other big game use would not be reduced.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
If additional forage is available and rangeland health is being sustained, or if significant progress is being made towards sustaining rangeland health, increased use would be considered based on the following criteria:					
o Additional Forage Meets the Dietary Needs of Livestock and Wildlife					
• Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game. • Wildlife AUMs that are made available would go to pronghorn and deer.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	• Up to 502 AUMs of forage would be provided for pronghorn and sheep and/or cattle use would be increased in accordance with available forage. • If the additional AUMs are not needed for livestock or pronghorn, any remaining AUMs would be allocated to deer.	• Wildlife use would be increased in accordance with available forage. • Livestock use would not be increased above permitted use.	• Optimum wildlife levels would be provided for where conflicts with livestock do not exist. • Specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels; and specific to pronghorn, habitat would be managed to support increased levels. • Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. • All livestock use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. • When livestock use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. • Any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.	Same as Alternative C.
FORAGE — BONANZA WILD HORSE HERD AREA LOCALITY					
This Herd Area will not be managed for wild horses.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Allocate 1,020 AUMs for wild horses.	Not applicable. Same as Proposed RMP. **Note:** The proposed Bonanza Wild Horse Herd Plan Amendment was rescinded and never implemented.	Same as Alternative C.
If forage allocation reductions are necessary to make significant progress towards or sustain rangeland health, the following criteria would be followed to make the needed reductions:					
o Demonstrated Conflicts between Wildlife and livestock					
Would proportionately reduce sheep and pronghorn use; however, pronghorn use would not be reduced below 239 AUMs.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Wildlife use would be reduced; however, pronghorn use would not be reduced below 239 AUMs nor deer use below 147 AUMs.	• Livestock use would be reduced. • Wildlife use would not be reduced.	• Pronghorn use would not be reduced below 289 AUMs. • Sheep use would be reduced.	Same as Alternative C.
o Demonstrated Conflicts with Wild Horses and Livestock					
This Herd Area will not be managed for	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	• Livestock use would be reduced.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
wild horses.			• Wild horse use would be reduced, but not below 480 AUMs.		
o Demonstrated Conflicts with Wild Horses and Wildlife					
This Herd Area will not be managed for wild horses.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Wild horse and wildlife use would be proportionately reduced.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as Alternative C.
If additional forage is available and rangeland health is being sustained, or if significant progress is being made towards sustaining rangeland health, increased use would be considered based on the following criteria:					
o Additional Forage Meets the Dietary Needs of Livestock and Wildlife					
Sheep and wildlife use would be increased proportionately in accordance with available forage.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Sheep and cattle use would be increased in accordance with available forage.	• Pronghorn and deer use would be increased in accordance with available forage. • Livestock would not be increased above permitted use.	• Pronghorn use would be increased until there are conflicts with sheep. • Sheep use would increase in accordance with available forage.	Same as Alternative C.
o Additional Forage Meets the Dietary Needs of Horses, Sheep, or Pronghorn					
• This Herd Area will not be managed for wild horses. • Sheep and wildlife use would be increased proportionately in accordance with available forage.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	• This Herd Area will not be managed for wild horses. • Sheep and cattle use would be increased in accordance with available forage.	• Would not increase AML. • Would increase pronghorn use until there are conflicts with sheep. • Would increase sheep use in accordance with available forage.	• Would increase pronghorn use until there are conflicts with sheep. • Would increase sheep use in accordance with available forage.	Same as Alternative C.
o Additional Forage Meets the Dietary Needs of Horses and Sheep					
• This Herd Area will not be managed for wild horses. • Sheep would be increased proportionately in accordance with available forage.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Would increase horse use in accordance with available forage.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
FORAGE — BOOK CLIFFS LOCALITY					
CRIPPLE COWBOY					
1,325 unallocated AUMs acquired by acquisition of private lands (Cripple Cowboy) would be reserved for watershed. Although wildlife and livestock would not be excluded from utilizing these lands, no additional AUMs would be allocated.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	1,325 unallocated AUMs acquired by acquisition of private lands (Cripple Cowboy) would be allocated to livestock.	1,325 unallocated AUMs acquired by acquisition of private lands (Cripple Cowboy) would be allocated to wildlife.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
WINTER RIDGE HERD AREA/HILL CREEK HERD MANAGEMENT AREA					
• No long-term management prescriptions for wild horses. No wild horses due to disease (e.g. EIA), trespass of private horses, and manageability of the horses. • Initially wild horses would be authorized in the Winter Ridge HA/Hill Creek HMA and 2,340 AUMs would be allocated until the horses are removed. • The 2,340 AUMs no longer needed for wild horses would be allocated through a future planning process.	• 1,200 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses in the Winter Ridge Herd Area. • 1,740 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses in the Hill Creek HMA.	Forage for wild horses would not be allocated in Winter Ridge Herd Area or Hill Creek HMA.	Same as Alternative A.	2,340 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses in the Hill Creek Herd Management Area.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
If monitoring shows that reductions are necessary in all areas except the Wild Horse Herd Areas because of:					
o Demonstrated Conflicts between Wildlife and Livestock					
Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Big game use would be reduced.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
If monitoring shows that reductions are necessary in the Wild Horse Herd Areas because of:					
o Demonstrated Conflicts between Big Game, Livestock, and Wild Horses					
• No wild horses would be permitted in the Winter Ridge HA and Hill Creek HMA due to disease (e.g., EIA) and trespass of private horses. • Any reductions in grazing due to demonstrated conflicts between livestock and big game would be divided proportionately.	Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock, big game, and wild horses.	• This Herd Area will not be managed for wild horses. • Big game use would be reduced.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
o Demonstrated Conflicts between Big Game and Livestock					
• No wild horses would be permitted in the Winter Ridge HA and Hill Creek HMA due to disease (e.g., EIA) and trespass of private horses. • Any reductions in grazing due to demonstrated conflicts between livestock and big game would be divided proportionately.	Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Big game use would be reduced.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
o Demonstrated Conflicts between Livestock and Wild Horses					
This Herd Area and Herd Management Area will not be managed for wild horses.	Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock and wild horses.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative C.
o Demonstrated Conflicts between Big Game and Wild Horses					
This Herd Area and Herd Management Area will not be managed for wild horses.	Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between wild horses and big game.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified in the current management plans.	Same as Alternative A.
Additional forage would be allocated in areas except wild horse herd areas as follows:					
o Cattle Allotments					
• 60% to reinstate suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. • After restoring all suspended AUMs, allocate additional AUMs proportionately between livestock and wildlife.	• 60% to restore suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. • After restoring all suspended AUMs, allocate any additional forage to livestock.	• 60% to reinstate suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. • After restoring all suspended AUMs, allocate any additional forage to livestock.	• 60% to reinstate suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. • After reinstating all suspended AUMs, allocate additional forage to wildlife.	• Optimum wildlife levels where conflicts with livestock do not exist; specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels. • Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. • All livestock use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. • When livestock use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
				consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. • Any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.	
o Sheep Allotments					
Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Any additional forage would be allocated to sheep.	• Forage increases would be allocated to big game. • If additional forage were not needed by big game, it would be given to livestock. • Big game numbers would be allowed to increase only to the point livestock permitted use would not be reduced.	• Optimum wildlife levels would be provided for where conflicts with livestock do not exist; specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels and increased levels of pronghorn on East Bench. • Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. • All livestock-use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. • When livestock-use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. • Any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.	Same as Alternative C.
Additional forage would be allocated in the Winter Ridge HA and Hill Creek HMA as follows:					
• This Herd Area and Herd Management Area will not be managed for wild horses. • Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game. • If big game does not need additional forage, it would be given to livestock.	• Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock, big game, and wild horses. • If wild horses or big game do not need additional forage, it would be given to livestock.	• This Herd Area and Herd Management Area will not be managed for wild horses. • Additional forage would be allocated to livestock.	• Forage increases would be divided proportionately between big game and wild horses. • If wild horses or big game do not need additional forage, it would be given to livestock. • Big game and wild horse numbers would be allowed to increase only to the point livestock permitted use would not be reduced.	• Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock-use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. When livestock-use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. • Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations. • Optimum wildlife levels would be	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
				provided for where conflicts with livestock do not exist; specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels.	
FORAGE — BLUE MOUNTAIN LOCALITY					
• If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, livestock permitted use and wildlife use would be reduced proportionately. • The first year livestock reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. • Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	• If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, wildlife use would be reduced to a level at which no livestock/wildlife forage conflict exists. • Any additional necessary reductions would be made to livestock. • Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	• If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, livestock permitted use would be reduced. • Adjustments would be attained by decision or agreement. • The first year reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. • Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	• Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. • All livestock use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. • When livestock use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. • Any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations. • Decreases in livestock forage would be implemented over a five-year period.	Same as Alternative C.
Additional forage would be allocated in the Blue Mountain area as follows:					
Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or livestock-oriented vegetation treatments would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or livestock-oriented vegetation treatments would be assigned to livestock.	Additional AUMs realized through management and/or created from wildlife-oriented vegetation treatment would be provided to wildlife.	• Habitat for deer would be managed to support current levels. • Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. • All livestock-use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. • When livestock-use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. • Any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.	Same as Alternative C.
FORAGE — DIAMOND MOUNTAIN LOCALITY					
• If monitoring indicates that forage assignments cannot be met, then livestock and wildlife use would be reduced proportionately. • The first year livestock reductions	Same as the Proposed RMP.	• If monitoring indicates that forage assignments cannot be met, then wildlife use would be reduced to a level at which no livestock/wildlife forage conflict exists.	• If monitoring indicates that forage assignments cannot be met, then livestock permitted use would be reduced. • Adjustments would be attained by	If monitoring indicates that forage assignments cannot be met, then reductions would be made using the following criteria: • Temporary, nonrenewable livestock	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2.1.6 Proposed RMP and Alternatives - Forage

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. • Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.		• Any additional necessary reductions would be made to livestock.	decision or agreement. • The first year, reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. • Five-year agreements would be developed and signed at the same time outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	AUMs above permitted use would be reduced first. • On wildlife crucial habitat, livestock permitted use would be reduced if there is a conflict between use by livestock and wildlife and if wildlife numbers are within the herd unit or population objective levels. • If there is no conflict and the reduction is necessary because of overuse by either livestock or wildlife, that animal's numbers would be reduced. • On non-crucial wildlife habitat, livestock permitted use and wildlife numbers would be reduced equally. • The first year, there would be an initial 10% adjustment in permitted use. • Five-year agreements would be developed and signed at the same time outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level. • Temporary adjustments in use due to effects of drought would be made to livestock and/or wildlife as needed based on monitoring.	
Additional forage would be allocated in the Diamond Mountain area as follows:					
Additional AUMs would be provided as follows: • In the northern half of the area (Diamond Mountain and Brown's Park), additional AUMs would be provided to livestock until wildlife demands require them. • In the southern half of the area (Ashley Valley and Myton Bench), forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game on non-crucial wildlife areas.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or vegetation treatments would be assigned to livestock.	Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or vegetation treatment would be provided to wildlife or retained for watershed.	• Additional AUMs (over permitted use) would be provided to livestock on a temporary, nonrenewable basis until identified for crucial wildlife needs. • Additional AUMs outside crucial wildlife areas could be assigned to livestock.	Same as Alternative C.