



March 11, 2016

VIA EMAIL

Aslam Shareef, Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program
Department of Toxic Substances Control
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

**SUBJECT: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED FOR PHASE I ESA,
PROPOSED CIVITA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (SITE CODE: 404936)**

Dear Mr. Shareef,

On February 25, 2016, BRG Consulting, Inc. received your request for additional information for the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the proposed Civita Elementary School (Ninyo & Moore, October 19, 2015). The following presents the questions received and our responses:

1. **Page 20, Summary of Aerial Photographs, Table 6:** The Phase I indicates that the Site was possibly used for Agricultural purposes in the past. Please clarify if the Proposed ES Site was ever used for Agricultural purposes.

RESPONSE: *During the aerial photograph review, Agricultural rows were observed on properties to the south of the site in 1949 and 1953, but they were not observed on the Proposed Elementary School Site. (Table 6, Page 20).*

2. **Page 27, Section 8.3, Aboveground water and fuel storage tanks:** The Phase I indicates “Seven ASTs were previously removed from the property addressed 5745 Mission Center Road, which historically included the site.” Please clarify if the AST/USTs/LUSTs were ever present at the Site.

RESPONSE: *The seven above ground storage tanks (ASTs) were reportedly associated with a historical address for the quarry, which included the site. The exact locations of the seven ASTs referenced are not known; however, evidence of ASTs on the site was not observed during the review of aerial photographs or topographic maps.*

Additionally, evidence of USTs and LUSTs on the Site was not found during the assessment.

3. **Page 21, Section 4.3.5, Historical Topographic Maps:** The Phase I indicates “The presence of a quarry at the site and vicinity presents a potential environmental concern due to the potential presence of USTs, batch plants, use of heavy equipment, and potential to be backfilled with unknown fill sources”. Please clarify if the Quarry Falls/mining operations are at or within the vicinity of the Proposed School Site.

RESPONSE: *According to a review of aerial photographs and topographic maps, the Site is located within the boundaries of the former quarry. The former quarry also included properties located adjacent to the north, south, east, and west of the Site.*

4. **Page 8, Section 3.8, Previous Reports for the Site:** The Phase I indicates “the majority of the former quarry was to be filled in with engineered fill composed of mining tailings generated at the quarry, to a maximum depth of 80 feet below ground surface (bgs). Please clarify if Engineered fill was ever placed at the Proposed ES School Site. If fill was placed onsite, provide detailed information on fill source, depth and location.

RESPONSE: *The information regarding potential fill soil at the site was obtained from a previous geotechnical report (Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report Quarry Falls, April 2005). A copy of the geotechnical report was provided in Appendix B of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment report. The preliminary geotechnical investigation described the proposed backfilling of the former quarry using mining tailings from the former quarry, which includes the site. Additional information was not found. Ninyo & Moore did not find documentation indicating that fill soils were placed at the site.*

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please contact Tony Raso (San Diego Unified School District) at 619.770.0293/traso@sandi.net or myself at 619.298.7127 x 102/christina@brginc.net.

Sincerely,
BRG CONSULTING, INC.



Christina Willis
Vice President

Enclosure:

cc: Tony Raso, San Diego Unified School District
Erich Lathers, BRG Consulting, Inc.
Steven A. Fry, Ninyo & Moore
Shahir Hassad, DTSC