Print From

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 #: 2021050599

Project Title: Tijuana Estuary Tidal REstoration Program II Phase I

Lead Agency: California Department of Parks and Recreation

Contact Name: Lorena Warner-Lara

Email: Lorena.Warner-Lara@parks.ca.gov Phone Number: 6195753613 x312

Project Location: Imperial Beach, San Diego County

City *County*

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

TETRP II Phase I has been designed to restore coastal wetlands and associated native uplands in the area surrounding the previously restored Model Marsh. Coastal restoration is proposed to reverse ongoing degradation of coastal resources essential to the long-term survival of migratory birds, fish, and other aquatic resources, while also increasing the Tijuana Estuary's tidal prism to improve water quality. Restoration would involve the excavation of between 521,000 and 585,000 cubic yards (cy) of sediment, depending upon which alternative is implemented. Between 5,000 and 7,000 cy would be reused to establish higher elevation transitional areas within the restoration footprint, while the remaining sediment could be beneficially reused for beach nourishment on-site or transported off-site for beneficial reuse at other project sites or for disposal. Common features of the action alternatives include restoration of predominantly disturbed portions of the southern arm of Tijuana Estuary to tidal wetlands, tidal channel enhancements and new intertidal channel connections to restored habitat areas and the existing Model Marsh, incorporation of transitional habitat areas into the restoration design, and river mouth excavation, as needed, to maintain continued tidal exchange within the estuary.

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

Significant and unavoidable environmental effects relate to the topic areas of Water Quality (within Hydrology and Water Quality analysis), due to the potential for release of bacteria during beach nourishment activities; Biological Resources, due to construction activities and the potential temporary disturbance to wildlife; and Air Quality, due to the potential for fugitive dust emissions during implementation. The DEIR/EIS identifies potentially significant impacts under CEQA requiring mitigation that could be reduced to less than significant for Cultural Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials and Public Safety.

Mitigation measures to reduce temporary significant impacts to biological resources were considered and found infeasible. Mitigation measures Water Quality-1 and 2 would be implemented to minimize the potential for temporary water quality impacts and require soil testing prior to beach nourishment and water quality monitoring during beach nourishment. Mitigation Measure Haz Mat-1 requires notification of the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health and Quality if water quality monitoring conducted for the project identifies water quality violations. Mitigation measures Cultural-1 through 5 require a Monitoring and Discovery Plan, cultural monitoring, training session for construction personnel, actions to take if human remains are discovered, and exclusionary fencing around resources. Mitigation measure AQ-1 requires various emission reduction measures to be implemented during construction.

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

Comments received during the public scoping process did not result in the identification of novel, potentially controversial topics of concern; however, comments raised during scoping did identify the following primary issues of concern: air quality/greenhouse gases/sea level rise, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, recreation and public access, hazardous materials and public safety, cultural/Tribal resources, land use, permitting, and cumulative effects.

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

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, based on its jurisdiction by law and special expertise pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, has agreed to participate in the NEPA review process as a cooperating agency.