

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2025040060

Project Title: Border Field State Park Resilience, Access, and Habitat Restoration Project

Lead Agency: California Department of Parks and Recreation

Contact Name: Lucas Serna

Email: Lucas.Serna@parks.ca.gov

Phone Number: (619) 924-605

Project Location: San Diego, Imperial Beach

San Diego

City

County

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Project proposes to improve and relocate portions of Monument Road to address seasonal flooding of the existing roadway, plan for and establish resilience against the future effects of sea level rise (SLR), and restore wetland habitats. California Department of Parks and Recreation proposes a new alignment of Monument Road, elevating portions of the roadway, installing box culverts and headwall systems, and removing approximately 2,300 feet of existing asphalt road. The Proposed Project would address the main entrance road flooding and SLR resilience and improve public access to Border Field State Park (BFSP) and Monument Mesa. As previously identified, the existing alignment and elevation of the roadway is subjected to seasonal flooding in several locations caused by storm runoff flows from Goat Canyon and Yogurt Canyon which convey flows from Tijuana, Mexico northerly into the United States. These flows result in both the north-south and east-west portions of the roadway remaining flooded, preventing public access to BFSP and Monument Mesa.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The Proposed Project would result in potential impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils (paleontological resources), and tribal cultural resources; however, all impacts would be less than significant with mitigation measures. Impacts to biological resources would be less than significant and impacts would be further reduced with the implementation of Standard Project Requirements (SPR) BIO-1 through BIO-3, BIO-6, and BIO -7 and Project Specific Requirements (PSR) BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-8, and BIO-9. These SPRs and PSRs require fencing of environmentally sensitive areas, environmental awareness training, pre-construction surveys and monitoring, construction best practices, specific work windows where and when work may occur, and avoidance of sensitive areas where feasible. Impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant and impacts would be further reduced with implementation of SPRs CUL-1, CUL-4, and CUL-6, and PSR CUL-3. Potentially significant impacts to subsurface cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2. These measures outline requirements for the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources during construction, environmental sensitive area fencing, excavation limits, personnel training, monitoring and requirements for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during construction. Impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 which requires that all onsite workers complete a Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program. Impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and impacts would be further reduced with implementation of SPRs TCR-3, TCR-4, and TCR-7 and PSRs TCR- 1, TCR-5, and TCR-6.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

During the NOP public review period, comment letters were received from agencies and the public. Many commenters expressed support of the Proposed Project and requested expedited action to restore year-round access to BFSP. The primary issues raised were related to biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, public services, and recreation.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife #5
Native American Heritage Commission
Regional Water Quality Control Board #9
California Coastal Commission
Office of Historic Preservation