EXHIBIT B

SEPTEMBER 23, 2008 PEER REVIEW LETTER FROM CAL ENGINEERING AND GEOLOGY

CE&G
CAL ENGINEERING & GEOLOGY

1870 Olympic Blvd.
Suite 100
Walnut Creek
California 94596

Tel:925.935.9771
Fax:925.935.9773
www.caleng.com

23 September 2008

Mr. Richard Chamberlain
Town of Moraga
329 Rheem Blvd., Suite 2
Moraga, California 94556

RE: Proposed Additions
Hafener Residence
121 Brookline Street
Moraga, California

Dear Mr. Chamberlain:

At your request, we have completed our geologic and geotechnical review of the geotechnical report and the architectural drawings for the proposed additions to the residence located at 121 Brookline Street in Moraga, California. The following documents were reviewed:

1. Geotechnical report titled, *Planned Addition and Deck, 121 Brookline Street, APN 257-541-013, Moraga, California,* prepared by Cundey Geotechnical Consultants, Inc. and Earth Focus Geological Services, dated 10 September 2008.

2. Architectural Drawings titled, "Remodel/Addition for Steven & Laura Hafener, 121 Brookline Street, Moraga, CA. 94556, Sheets A-1, A-2.1, A-3, A-3.1, A-7, A-71., A-8, A-8.1" prepared by J. Allen Sayles, Architect, dated 9 September 2008.

3. Topographic Survey titled "Boundary & Topographic Survey, for Steve Hafener, Lot 184-"Sub.5119" - (219 M 31), 121 Brookline, Moraga, Contra Costa County - California" prepared by Donald Vegvary, dated 1/22/08.

Our work on the proposed project has included the examination of the above referenced materials for pertinent information regarding the technical feasibility of the project. We have also made reconnaissance level observations of the site.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project consists of the construction of an addition and several decks to the existing residence located at 121 Brookline Street in Moraga, California. A two story addition is planned for the northwest corner of the residence. New decks are also proposed along the rear and at the southeast corner of the residence. No other improvements are planned for the property.

REVIEW OF GEOTECHNICAL REPORT AND ARCHITECTURAL PLANS

Our review of the geotechnical report revealed that it is generally complete with respect to the assessment and mitigation of the known geologic and geotechnical constraints of the site. However, we have the following comment regarding the provided plans.

Comment 1

Architectural Plan Set - These plans show the locations and nature of the proposed improvements, however, they do not include the foundation plan and foundation details pertaining to the project. It is recommended that the foundation plans and details for the project be provided for our review and comment.

Comment 2

Architectural Plan Set It is recommended that the foundation plans and foundation details be reviewed by the project geotechnical engineer for conformance with the recommendations of their report. This review should be documented in writing.

CLOSURE

This review has been performed by request of the Town of Moraga. Our role has been to provide technical advice to assist the Town in its discretionary permit decisions, and we are afforded the same protection under state law. Our services have been limited to the review of the documents listed above, and a visual review of the property. We have no control over the future construction on this property and make no representations regarding its future conditions.

We have employed accepted geotechnical engineering and engineering geology procedures, and our professional opinions and conclusions are made in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering and engineering geology principles and practices. This standard is in lieu of all other warranties, either expressed or implied.

Yours truly,

CAL ENGINEERING & GEOLOGY, INC.

Stephen Watry, P.E., G.E.
Senior Engineer

Mitchell Wolfe, P.G., E.G.
Principal Geologist

PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGIST
MITCHELL WOLFE
EG 1487
Exp. 7/31/09
CERTIFIED ENGINEERING GEOLOGIST
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Rich Chamberlain

From: Mitchell Wolfe [MWolfe@caleng.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2008 4:35 PM
To: Rich Chamberlain
Subject: proposed additions 121 Brookline

Rich:

I just got a call from Alan Sayles regarding our comments pertaining to the proposed additions to 121 Brookline. Alan was concerned that he did not want to prepare the foundation plans at the design review stage, as it would cost the client a lot of money especially since he does not have approval for the project or does not know what the ultimate configuration of the project would be. He wants to wait to prepare the foundation plans after the scope of the project has been determined. This seems reasonable to us. I don't see the need to prepare the plans at this stage of the project. We think that the geotechnical report has demonstrated that the project is feasible and the site soil conditions are adequately characterized and suitable for the proposed project. We do not see a need to do further site characterization at this or any other stage of the project assuming that the scope does not change.

We feel that after the scope of the project has been determined by the DRB, PC, or Town Council, then it would be appropriate to prepare the foundation plans at that time. We would then request that the plans be provided for our review and comment as well as review and comment by the project geotechnical engineer.

Sorry for any confusion our review may have caused.

`Mitch

Mitchell D. Wolfe, P.G., C.E.G.
Principal Geologist
mwolfe@caleng.com

CE&G

Cal Engineering & Geology, Inc.
1870 Olympic Boulevard, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, California 94526
www.caleng.com

(925) 935 - 9771 Office
(925) 935-9773 fax

CONFIDENTIAL OR PRIVILEGED This communication contains information intended only for the use of the individuals to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from other disclosure under applicable law If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, printing, copying, distribution or use of the contents is prohibited If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by returning it by reply email and then permanently deleting the communication from your system Thank you