



United States  
Department  
of Agriculture



Forest Service  
Pacific  
Southwest  
Region

# Land Management Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report

## Los Padres National Forest Fiscal Year 2009

February 2011



March, 2011

## Los Padres National Forest Stakeholders

I am pleased to present the Los Padres National Forest's 2009 Monitoring and Evaluation Report. The purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation Report is to determine if plans, projects and activities are implemented as designed and in compliance with the Land Management Plan; evaluate Plan effectiveness relative to species and habitats and the principles of adaptive management; and help identify necessary future Plan adjustments.

In April 2006, the revised Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan was approved. In the Record of Decision, monitoring is emphasized and identified as a key element in all programs to assure the achievement of desired conditions over time.

Recently implemented projects are monitored as well as ongoing activities and programs. This report helps us assess resource status and trends, and evaluate progress toward the Forest's desired conditions. Through monitoring, evaluation, and adapting our management, we aim to further increase effectiveness.

It is important to me to keep you informed of the results of our monitoring. If you are interested in becoming involved in project or other planning, please see our national website <http://www.fs.fed.us/sopa/>. Additional information and opportunities on the Los Padres National Forest may be found on our website at <http://fs.usda.gov/lpnf>.

/s/ Kenneth E. Heffner (for):

PEGGY HERNANDEZ  
Forest Supervisor

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

# Los Padres Land Management Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report

## I. Introduction

---

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Monitoring and Evaluation Report documents the evaluation of selected projects and programs where activities occurred during for the period since adaption of the revised Land Management Plan through FY2008.

The revised Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan (LMP or “Forest Plan”) was signed April 3, 2006. Projects with decisions signed after this date must comply with direction in the revised LMP. Decisions approved prior to this date that are not under contract or permit but continue to be implemented in phases are also expected to be consistent with the revised plan. This report documents the evaluation of activities and the interpretation of monitoring data to determine the effectiveness of the LMP and addresses whether changes in the Plan or in project or program implementation are necessary.

## II. Methodology

---

The monitoring strategy for the Los Padres National Land Management Plan is derived from all parts of the Plan. The monitoring requirements are summarized in LMP Part 3, Appendix C.

Part 1 of the LMP identifies outcome questions that will help to evaluate movement toward the desired conditions over the long-term. Baseline data are used to answer these questions and evaluate progress over time toward desired conditions. A comprehensive evaluation of this movement will be prepared in the fifth year following plan implementation.

Corporate databases track accomplishment of work related to objectives and strategies (LMP Part 2).

Implementation and effectiveness monitoring for Part 3 of the LMP was conducted at the project or activity level. A sample of projects and ongoing activities was randomly selected and visited to review the application and effectiveness of the design criteria. If problems in implementation were detected or if design criteria were determined to be ineffective, then the team recommended corrective actions.

The Forest asked the following questions of each reviewed project or ongoing activity:

1. **Did we accomplish what we set out to do?** Compare planned results to actual results and document findings on the checklist shown below. To evaluate effectiveness the team asked: Have project design criteria been effective at improving environmental conditions as expected?
2. **Why did it happen?** The Forest emphasized and sought out underlying cause-and-effect relationships, not individual performance or behavior.
3. **What are we going to do next time?**
  - a. What activities should be continued to sustain success?

- b. Are changes needed to correct any implementation or effectiveness-related problems?
- c. If change is needed, will it require an amendment or administrative corrections to the Land Management Plan?

Results, conclusions, and recommendations were documented according to this protocol on Los Padres National Forest LMP Monitoring and Evaluation forms. This Report summarizes the results of our effort (see Appendix for examples of these forms).

### **III. Land Management Plan Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects, Activities, and Programs**

---

The following projects were chosen from a stratified sample of projects representing program areas and Districts on the Los Padres National Forest.

<b>Ranger District</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Documentation Reviewed</b>
Santa Lucia	Figueroa Mountain Vegetation Project	Fuels Reduction/ Vegetation Improvement	NEPA documentation, project file
Santa Lucia	Colson Unit Prescribed Burn	Fuels Reduction	NEPA documentation, project file
Ojai	Lion and Beaver Campground Decommission	Campground Decommissioning	NEPA documentation, project file
Santa Lucia	Horse Canyon Dam Removal	Fisheries Management	NEPA documentation, project file
Monterey	Gorda Range Allotment	Range Management	NEPA documentation, project file
Ojai	Squaw Flat Road Restoration Projects	Watershed Stabilization – Emergency Repair	NEPA documentation, project file
Ojai	Piru Creek Tamarisk Removal	Habitat Improvement	NEPA documentation, project file
Santa Barbara	Los Prietos Boys Camp Modular Housing Project	Special Uses Management	NEPA documentation, project file
Santa Lucia	Hi Mountain Lookout	Wildlife Management	NEPA documentation, project file, permit

#### **Figueroa Mountain Vegetation Management**

##### **Project Description**

The Figueroa Mountain Project is located within the Figueroa-Santa Ynez Place of the Santa Lucia District. The purpose is to reduce vegetation density and the severity of fire for protection of a high value recreation area and conifer stands that are at risk of stand-replacing wildfire.

##### **Monitoring Results**

Thinning and mastication were used to reduce heavy brush in the area. Snags and desirable species of sufficient size were left to create a visually desirable stand that is accessible to animals and humans while providing for species diversity. The track-mounted hydraulically-operated masticators move through the

stands while chopping the standing vegetation to a mulch-like layer that was as deep as 6"-12" in places while leaving little damage to the ground or to the remaining standing trees. Some damage could be seen on scattered trees but was within project specification. The most obvious visual impact was the road berm disturbance where the machine left the road to enter the stand. In areas where the treatment had been done the previous season, the layer of treated vegetation had turned a natural grey duff-like color and some sprouting could be seen coming up through the layer. There is some discussion about whether an immediate followup prescription burn would be appropriate or to periodically retreat the area either by mechanical means or by prescribed fire to control resprouting brush.

## **Conclusions**

The project is consistent with the Forest Plan goal to reduce the potential for loss of montane conifer forest; with the Figueroa-Santa Ynez Place emphasis on prescribed fire and vegetation management to maintain vegetation diversity and protection of an area of high recreation value; and finally with the overall strategy to restore forest health. Project documentation contained a comprehensive list of design criteria/mitigation measures and implementation standards that were sampled in the field and found to have been followed. One standard for leaving 5 snags per acres had to be visually confirmed but appeared to have been implemented to standard. Implementation of the project had been delayed to accommodate spotted owl surveys to confirm the bird was not present. Applicable laws and protocols for wildlife and archaeological consultation, air quality, Native American involvement, and application of BMP's had been identified and followed. The overall results of the treatment showed good contract management and monitoring and conscientious work by the contractor. There was a general 12" dbh removal limitation for the treatment and stems larger than 2-4" were removed by hand. The masticator could have removed all trees smaller than 12" dbh more effectively. If the treatment allows felling of trees greater than 12" dbh, those trees would be removed by hand. The treated areas are open with good spacing of remaining trees. If funding and priorities allow, it could be possible to burn the areas periodically to control resprouting shrubs and grasses without resorting to the more expensive treatment of mastication.

## **Colson Unit Prescription Burn**

---

### **Project Description**

The Colson Unit is one of six burn units within the Brookshire Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project. A Decision Memo was written for this project in 2002. The purpose of the project is to reduce fuels buildups that can carry dangerously hot fires toward the adjacent community of Tepusquet. The result should be a mosaic of burned and unburned vegetation distributed in 50-100 acre patches across the landscape. The Colson unit was treated in the fall of 2007.

### **Monitoring Results**

Documentation was examined including the Decision Memo (DM), the Biological Assessment, and the Prescribed Burn Plan. A very complete compilation of resource protection measures identified in the specialist reports is contained in the DM. There is also a thorough discussion of management direction from the Forest Plan and other applicable regulations that apply to the project. The Burn Plan specific to the Colson Burn translates the DM to an executable burning prescription and repeats many, but not all, of the resource protection measures. An extra step was taken to create a two page Summary of Resource Protection Measures for the Brookshire Project as a whole to serve as a ready reference for field operations. Again, it included many, but not all, of the specified protection measures.

In the field, it was found that outside project boundaries, riparian areas, and overall burn intensities had been well controlled. A good balance had been achieved between the relatively hot and complete burns of the south facing slopes and the cooler more patchy burning of the north facing slopes. Project

personnel pointed out that the burn had been carried to the edge of a stock pond wherein the resource protection measures in the DM had specified that no burn or ground disturbing activities would take place within 100' of stock ponds. Project personnel also expressed concern about the potential spread of a noxious invasive, tocolote, which is related to yellow starthistle. Tocolote had flourished along the perimeter road in the spring following the previous fall's burn. The perimeter road had been lightly dozed to allow passage of fire equipment which created a favorable disturbed condition for growth of the plant. Further, if tocolote had been part of the seed bed, it would have been spread by the road treatment. Being an annual, the tocolote had begun to decline and be replaced by native plants at the time of this review. An unknown in this discussion is what the results had been of any pre-treatment surveys which might have indicated the presence and potential seedbed of tocolote and its likely response to road disturbance.

## **Conclusions**

The project had been well planned, documented, organized, and executed. In the case of allowing the burn to go to the edge of a stock pond, it was noted that the protection measure which had been placed in the DM was not carried over to the Burn Plan nor to the Summary of Resource Protection Measures. It appears that an effort was made to identify those protection measures that were of most interest to the burning operation but the filtering process left out that particular measure. The tocolote situation arose as a post-treatment issue. If the plant and its implications had been identified prior to the treatment there appears to be no mechanism by which it was brought forward and considered. Nor is there any indication in any of the documents of a monitoring plan that would look for and measure invasive plants over time or even if the project as a whole is moving toward a desired condition.

A monitoring plan is lacking. Such issues as treatment effects when tocolote is present should be documented for future consideration. More importantly, much thought is given to the larger strategy of fuels management when locations and treatments are proposed for treatment. Yet there is no visible provision for evaluation of recovery rate by plant species to verify that a desired condition is being met for a period of time and that a favorable plant species mix is being retained that maintains or even restores an ecological balance without danger of type conversion.

## **Lion and Beaver Campground Decommission**

---

### **Project Description**

Lion and Beaver are separate campgrounds 8 miles apart and were decommissioned as 2 separate projects but are united in one proposed action which also established a new trailhead and parking area. The two campgrounds are located in the Rose Valley area of the Ojai District along a stretch of Sespe Creek that has been a favored camping area since the 1930's. More recently the Arroyo toad (ARTO) was federally listed as a TES species and Sespe Creek was found to contain prime habitat with breeding populations of ARTO in the vicinity of Lion and Beaver Campgrounds. Prior to the Appendix D adoption mitigation protocol in the Revised Forest Plan, successive measures of public exclusion were attempted ranging from fencing off reaches of the stream to seasonal closures of the campgrounds to finally permanently closing the facilities and redirecting the public away from the prime ARTO habitat to a new trailhead/parking lot. This sequence of rising levels of protection that is now specified in Appendix D of the Forest Plan had already been implemented culminating in the DN and FONSI for this project.

### **Monitoring Results**

The team visited three sites: the new trailhead/parking area, the decommissioned Lion Campground, and the decommissioned Beaver Campground. The new trailhead is well designed with a parking loop, interpretive signing, and an improved trail that fords the Sespe Creek and continues into the Sespe Wilderness. The improved trail and ford is consistent with the Comprehensive River Management Plan for the Sespe Wild and Scenic River which requires maintenance of river crossings bearing concentrated

foot traffic. The trailhead is located beyond the Beaver and Lion Campgrounds on the same road and is designed to draw people past the two campgrounds and provide improved access to a trail that formerly wound its way past the Lion Campground and was close to Sespe Creek and known ARTO populations. Evidence that the trailhead is successful is the existence of only a few volunteer trails leading from the road down to the former Lion Campground. As prime ARTO habitat, this stretch of the Sespe is regularly monitored. The biologist states that no evidence of human disturbance has been found nor cases of incidental take although the Biological Opinion does allow for incidental take of one adult and two metamorphs. This result conforms with Plan direction in the Highway 33 Corridor Plan to emphasize recreation but resolve TES species conflicts.

The decommissioning of Lion Campground looks well done. The entrance road and loops were ground up and removed and all facilities removed from the site. Natural regrowth of native vegetation has taken place to the point that very little evidence remains of the campground. The regrowth of vegetation makes it easier to watch for signs of volunteer trails from the road down to Sespe Creek. It is under consideration by the District to place signs along the road discouraging the public from hiking down from the road through the old campground to get to the creek. While such signs might reduce the possibility of public intrusion, there has been minimal disturbance along the edges of the creek.

The last stop was at the decommissioned Beaver Campground. It is immediately apparent from the main road where the entry road to Beaver branches off that the roads have not been fully removed. A high dirt berm blocks entry to vehicles but it can be seen where trail bikes have been going over the edges of it. It was also necessary to replace a barrier to the side of the road where OHV's and vehicles had gone through. There are shotgun hulls and brass casings indicating recreational shooting activity and there is an area of lithic scatter that has been disturbed by public use. District personnel stated that funds had run out before the road removal was completed.

## **Conclusions**

The larger strategy of removing human disturbance from a critical stretch of ARTO habitat along the Sespe is being met based on monitoring of the critical habitat. This may be jeopardized by continued unauthorized use of the decommissioned Beaver Campground and potential unauthorized use if overland access is allowed to Lion Campground. Removal of remaining roads and vegetation regrowth would lessen the appeal of Beaver Campground to unauthorized entry and undesirable activities as well as improving scenic value because the remaining loops are visible from some distance. Continued signing and placement of barriers along the road adjacent to Lion Campground could also lessen impacts.

## **Horse Canyon Dam Removal**

---

### **Project Description**

A Decision Memo for removal of a concrete dam in Horse Canyon just above the Sisquoc River was signed in October of 2006. The dam had originally been constructed by Santa Barbara County Flood Control following the Wellman fire in the 1960's. It had become completely silted in and no longer served its purpose. Moreover, Horse Creek may have historically served as spawning habitat for southern steelhead trout which is a listed TES species. The proposal was to remove the dam using explosives to break up the structure into pieces small enough to be moved downstream by normal water flows. Other associated structures including rebar, a gauging station, and a barbed wire fence were to be removed by hand with portable tools. Because of concerns relating to Red Legged frogs (RLF) and an adjoining archeological site, a variety of resource protection measures were specified in the DM including wildlife, archaeological, and 11 BMP restrictions on the project. Goals 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.2, 2.1 were identified plus Strategies WL1, WL2, IS1, WAT1, and WAT2. LMP standards 49 and 47 apply directly to the

project. The 5 step screening process for RCA was followed for the steelhead BA and referenced in the DM.

### **Monitoring Results**

Monitoring and relocation of Red Legged frogs (RLF) was necessary and accomplished with a biologist present. There was no incidental take of RLF as allowed by the programmatic BO. The FWS required a report within 90 days and recommended monitoring for 3 years of which 2 years have been accomplished with 1 year remaining. An historic chimney in the vicinity was not damaged nor was a gravesite in the area disturbed. A post project survey was conducted by Stoeker Ecological in July of 2007 which concluded that with a significant rain flow event the channel will establish a 2-3% slope allowing for unimpeded steelhead trout migration.

### **Conclusions**

The project was adequately documented with clearly stated proposed action, tied well to Forest direction, and clearly specified resource protection measures. Project execution is shown to have been successfully carried out with adequate follow up and monitoring to fulfill FWS requirements and to verify that the project goals were met. A notable exception is the absence of a discussion of public scoping.

## **Gorda Range Allotment**

---

This project was scheduled for review but was cancelled because of fire in the vicinity and unavailability of personnel.

## **Squaw Flat Road Restoration Projects**

---

### **Project Description**

The winter of 2005 produced damaging floods on Squaw Flat Road on the Ojai District. The area is geologically spectacular but unstable and the road serves the Sespe oil field requiring it to be kept open and repaired. Application was made for emergency repair of federally owned road (ERFO) funding to repair stream crossings, restore stream channels, and construct retaining walls. For this type of work, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) prepares the decision document and may do the design work. FHWA may also contract and administer the work or the Forest Service may contract and administer the work. Throughout the process the Forest Service reviewed the documentation and designs and specified clauses to be included in the contracts. Forest Service specialists did the basic resource evaluations and consultations needed to comply with regulations.

### **Monitoring Results**

Three projects were examined in the field. CN16-7 was a channel rip rap project designed and contracted by the Forest. CN16-20 and CN16-25 were stream crossings that were designed and contracted by FWHA. All projects were monitored by the Forest. LMP guidance was not identified in the decision document. Nor were the BMP's or mitigations from the wildlife and archaeological consultations included in the document. The general requirements for conformance with wildlife and archeological mitigations are in the contract to be addressed as part of contract administration. Also included in the contract are compliance requirements for BMP's; reporting and cleanup requirements for hazardous spills and control of water polluting materials and machinery; and equipment wash down and inspection requirements to control of noxious weeds and oil, gasoline, and anti-freeze leaks. It is a usual practice to address these items in the contract and depend on contract administration to ensure compliance. Based on what was observed on Squaw Flat road, this practice is effective, although obscurely tied to the planning documents. To expand on this theme, a BA/BE was prepared that related wildlife findings to sites with

geographic coordinates that did not directly correlate with project designations in the decision document. It appeared that damage survey reports were missing for some sites for which there was a project so a biological determination may not have been made. However, no affects to wildlife were identified that would have been applicable to any of the projects along the road so better coordination would not have made a difference.

## **Conclusions**

As observed in the field, the road repairs are well designed and implemented. Contract administration looks to be effective. In the case of one of the crossings, extra work was required to protect the road from flows from an additional stream that conjuncted just above the crossing.

The Squaw Flat road repairs are being well executed in a geologically challenging area but there is potential for environmental harm because of gaps in the planning process leading to indirect and vague resource protections being implemented in the field. In effect, common protection measures are being adhered to but site specific protections that might have been needed were not placed in the decision document to be incorporated into implementation. This is at least partly due to the difficulties of inter-agency cooperation. The difficulty of relating the BA/BE to project sites along the road is yet another indicator of incomplete coordination which in this case is an internal issue. The links from specialist and consultation reports to the document and from the document to implementation need to be strengthened.

## **Piru Creek Tamarisk Removal**

---

### **Project Description**

Members of the group Habitat Works have voluntarily worked to remove tamarisk, a noxious plant, from a stretch of Piru Creek going upstream from Half Moon campground to the vicinity of the Sespe Wilderness, a distance of approximately 3 miles. The group has repeatedly traversed this section of the creek using labor intensive manual methods of cutting or pulling out the tamarisk. Repeated treatments are necessary because the plant is a deeply rooted, vigorous sprouter.

### **Monitoring Results**

After hiking approximately 1.5 miles up the creek, no tamarisk had been found. Moreover, the creek appeared very healthy with well spaced native riparian plants that allowed easy access to the creek without impeding water flows. There is no decision document existing that allows the application of an herbicide which limits the activity to manual methods of removing the plant. However, the Hungry Valley-Mutau place program emphasis from the Forest Plan is to manage the upper Piru Creek Corridor to preserve wild and scenic river qualities and sensitive riparian habitats. Both emphases are served by reduction or elimination of tamarisk. Further, the LMP, Part 3, p 124 in Appendix M, Weed Mgmt Strategy, specifically directs the Los Padres to coordinate with Habitat Works of southern California volunteers to control tamarisk in Piru Creek.

A BA/BE was written for this activity which identifies the riparian species likely to be affected and which determines no effect to the Least Bell's vireo and Southwester willow flycatcher. There is, however, identified effect to the Arroyo toad (ARTO) and Red Legged frog (RLF). ARTO and RLF must be identified and relocated from the project area requiring handling by qualified personnel. The BO allows take of two adults per year from this activity. On the Piru, this work has been done by Habitat Works on a volunteer basis and no ARTO or RLF have been found in the stretch where they have been working. Habitat Works personnel have been trained to recognize these animals and handle them appropriately. The BA/BE needs to be updated because it identifies specific persons as qualified to handle the animals who are no longer available. The BA/BE needs to be redefined and expanded to include other qualified people with proper training.

## **Conclusions**

Tamarisk had been completely removed from the stretch of the Piru that was examined in this review. No other damage or consequence from this activity was observed. The removal of the tamarisk was the result of successive visits over a number of years to pull sprouting tamarisk by hand until it was completely gone. If herbicides were available as a treatment we anticipate that fewer treatments and more complete eradication would result. Herbicides would be particularly advantageous in remote locations where repeated treatments are difficult.

## **Los Prietos Boys Camp Modular Housing Project**

---

### **Project Description**

The Los Prietos Boys Camp (LPBC) is a county facility operated under special use permit. It is a detention camp for juvenile boys that was originally located between Paradise Road and the Santa Ynez River near the first crossing. Because that location was better suited for day use recreation and to better isolate the camp from the heavy public use of the Santa Ynez Recreation Area, it was moved to the other side of the road and uphill away from the public. Housing for LPBC staff had been retained at the original site until the housing was demolished to make way for the First Crossing Day Use Area. An EA was written to authorize construction of 4 units of modular housing at LPBC for resident staff to provide the required 24 hour presence of staff and meet the 30 minute California state-required response time to emergencies and other camp needs. This EA was signed in June of 2006, and construction had been completed when this review was conducted in May of 2008.

### **Monitoring Results**

Given that the Boys Camp facility has historically existed in the Santa Ynez recreation area there was no overall change with the context of the Forest Plan. The purpose of adding four modular homes for staff housing to an existing special use site was clear, allowing a focused proposed action.

The BA/BE specified that a biologist be present for 20' of trenching and the digging of post holes to check for possible disturbance of the legless lizard, particularly if the ambient temp was less than 70 degrees. That requirement was expressed in the decision document and it was carried out. The archaeological consultation determined that a site monitor be present during ground disturbances which was specified in the DN and which was also complied with.

With respect to other mitigations, the site plan for placement of the modulares would have presented an opportunity to evaluate BMP's relative to drainage of the site. Being a county facility, the county prepared the site plan and septic system layout. The site visit disclosed no obvious drainage nor septic problems. While the site plan and septic layout are quite sufficient, the coordination required with another agency did not extend to specification of the appropriate BMP's. It was observed that some damage occurred to oak trees during transit of the wide modules to the site. The camp had done a neat job of trimming the damage. The document did not anticipate this possibility but maintenance of the oaks within the compound is in the terms of the permit.

### **Conclusions**

Operational controls were present and effective. After a winter of normal rainfall there was no evidence of washouts. Nor was there excessive residual visual evidence of damage to trees from maneuvering the modules into the compound along a tree lined route, although some damage did occur and was later corrected. No legless lizards were disturbed nor were any historic artifacts found during excavation of dirt. The modules and the associated compound are neat and consistent with the rest of the camp. Management of the camp and administration of the permit appear to be good. There is a good relationship between the District and camp personnel.

## Hi Mountain Lookout

---

### Project Description

The Hi Mountain Lookout is located on the Santa Lucia District within the Cuesta Place. Although it is no longer a fire lookout, it now serves as a platform for condor tracking and research in support of the condor recovery plan. The site is also an active provider of public education and information.

### Monitoring Results

No decision document is required for this operational facility and administrative site. There is an MOU with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service condor recovery group and volunteer agreements with Morro Coast Audubon Society, California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo (CalPoly), and other interested groups for management of the activities. These activities include daily operations to track condors using radio telemetry and to monitor a local historic condor nest and an active peregrine nest. California Polytechnic State University is doing long term ecological monitoring from the site. Public visitation is encouraged with a visitation center, a website, and organized hiking tours.

The existence and operation of this condor research and observation station falls under the forest plan Wildlife Goal 3.1 and Strategies WL1 and WL2 regarding the establishment of cooperative partnerships and agreements and to provide for public education, information, and interpretation. The program emphasis defined in the Cuesta Place (Part 2, pg. 51) supports the continued emphasis on cooperative efforts for wildlife observations and studies at the lookout.

In addition, this site and the associated operations fall under the Forest Plan, Part 3, Appendix H, Item 1. to follow guidance found in the recovery plan for CA condors.

The Hi Mountain Lookout Volunteer User Manual ensures that partners and volunteers conduct daily operations according to defined procedures. Condor movements are monitored with radio telemetry. There is an historic condor nest site in the vicinity as well as an active peregrine nest that is being monitored. There is long term ecological monitoring being done by CalPoly for plants, mammals, birds, and amphibians because of a confluence of ecotypes in the area. Public education is prominent through open public visitation with a public visitation center and a volunteer organized website. Tours for birding, plants, geology, and astronomy are organized. The lookout is on the national register of lookouts and will become a historic place in the near future. The possibility of using it as a condor feeding site has been discussed. Pinnacles National Monument (US Park Service) and the Ventana wildlife society utilize the lookout to track released condors.

### Conclusions

As currently managed, the lookout performs a variety of functions, both scientific and educational, and is well suited for the purpose. Access to the site is via the Pozo-Arroyo Grande, Hi Mountain, and Hi Mountain Lookout roads, all of which are level 2 high clearance roads. At this time, the Pozo-Arroyo Grande road is not maintained. It is San Luis Obispo county jurisdiction and access is potentially a limiting factor.

# APPENDIX – Monitoring and Evaluation Forms

Results, conclusions, and recommendations were documented according to protocol on Los Padres National Forest LMP Monitoring and Evaluation forms, examples of which are attached here.

## Project Implementation Monitoring Form 1

Monitoring Question per LMP Protocol for Review of Projects and Ongoing Activity Sites	Identify how the monitoring question was either addressed or deficient.
Were LMP goals, desired conditions and standards incorporated into decision documents, operational plans (i.e. burn plans, allotment plans, facility master plan, etc.), and implemented? Includes Parts 1, 2 and 3 of the Plan.	
Were NEPA mitigation measures or LMP project design criteria implemented as designed?	
Were requirements from biological assessments/ evaluations and heritage evaluations (ARRs) and watershed assessments implemented?	
Were legal and other requirements identified as applicable to the project or site addressed?	
Were operational controls effective at protecting the environment as intended?	

See next page for Project Implementation Monitoring Form 2

