## EXHIBIT 15-B

MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

5 HARRIS COURT, BLDG G
POSTOFFICE BOX 85
MONTEREY CA $93942-0085$ - (831)658-5601
FAX (831) 644-9558 hithi/wwompwodstanas
Please PRINT OR TYPE all information. Applcations must be recenved within twenty-one (21) days after an appealable decision has been made pursuant to District Rule 70. To be considered for an appeal hearing please submit a completed application and include a non-refundable processing fee 8250 for less than half acre-foolof waters $\$ 500$ for talf one acke-foo of water, and $\$ 750$ for more than one acre foot of water) , other information as necessary which may inctude 5 years of water records fom purveyor The Board win support or deny your appeal based on the pertinent information yeu have provided. Submission of an incomplete application may constitute grounds for denlal of your request.

## APPLICATION FOR APPEAL

## ARPLICANT INFORMATION

1. Applicants Full Name: STEVE \& LINDA MCDANNOLD

Mäling Addresss: 2250 S.CENTRAL AVE
City RANCHO DOMINGUEZ
State: CA
Zip: 93940
Phone Number(s): Work ( $310 \quad$ ) 763-2112_ Home ( 310 ) 345-3504
2. Name of Agent(s) to Represent Applicant: ERIC MLLER ARCHITECTS,INC.

Mailig Addresse 157. GRAND AVE SUITE 106


## PRORERTYINFORMATION

1. Full Name of PropertyOWmer: STEVE \& LINDA MCDANNOLD

Mailing Addresse: 2250 S.CENTRAL AVE
City: RANCHO DOMINGUEZ 23940
Phone Number(s): Work ( 310 ) 763-2112
Home ( 310 ) 345-3504
2. Properity Address: ....905. OCEAN VIEW

City: PACIFIC GROVE
State: CA
Zip: 93950
3. Assèssor's Parcel Number: $\qquad$ - $\qquad$ $-\quad 004$
4. Property Area: Acres: $\qquad$ Square Feet: 5,519

Other: $\qquad$
5. Past Land Uses $\qquad$
6 . Present Land Use: $\qquad$
7. Proposed LandUse: $\qquad$
Existing buildings? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Types of uses and square footage: __ SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE $\quad . \quad 2640$ SF

## STATEMENT OF APPEAL REQUEST

 application:

1. From vhich rude(s) or staffs decision(s) are yourequesting an appealt

DECISION TO DENY PROCESSING OF A WATER PERMIT FOR A THIRD BATHROOM RETROFITTING THE INITIAL EXISTING FIXTURES.
2. Deyoufee thendeor stafedecision is applicabletmostases, or co you believelt sould be revokedor clianged
YES IT IS APPLICABLE IN MOST CASES BUT IT SHOULD BE CHANGED FOR PROJECTS THAT ARE UNDER DESIGN DEVELOPMENT AND CITY APPROVAL PROCESS DURING THIS ENTIRE PERIOD (2003-2006)
3. What were the eftiumstances surrouding your decision to appeal?

WE BASED YEARS OF WORK ON ORDINANCE 98 AND WE ARE WILLING TO FURTHER DEED RESTRICT THE FIXTURE UNITS SO THE ADDITIONAL BATHROOM REPRESENTS EFFICIENCY TO HOMEOWNER, WHILE NOT INCREASING THE WATER USE.
4. Please state the special citcunstances that distinguish yourappliction fom all others which aresibject to enforement of his process.
AFTER WORKING CAREFULLY ON THE DESIGN, SUBMITTING IT TO THE PLANNING DEPARMENT, NUMEROUS. PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS, MULTIPLE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MEETINGS AND COMPLEIING THE ENGINEERING AND WORKING DRAWINGS, WE WERE GIVEN THE WATER RELEASE FORM ALONG WITH THE APPROVED DRAWINGS, WE BROUGHT THESE TO WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT AND WERE TOLD THAT ORDINANCE 114 DO NOT ALLOW MORE RETROFIT FIXTURES:
5. What difficulfes or hardships would result if your appeal request is denied?

OUR CLIENT WILL NOT CONTINUE THE PROJECT IF HE CAN NOT INCREASE
THE QUALITY OF LIFE BY ADDING ANOTHER BATH. THIT MEANS THAT 3 YEARS OF HARD WORK AND ALL THE FEES INVOLVED WILL BE LOST
6. What spechic acton are you requesting that he Board take?

EXEMPTION OF DISTRICT RULE 24-C'S PROVISION AND APPROVAL FOR MORE DEED RESTRICTIONS WITHIN THE EXISTING FIXTURE UNITS
7. Please indicate fy you intend to make a statement at the appeal hearing and fist he names of any other thd viduals: whe may speak on your behalf:
ERIC MILLER IS THE PERSON THAT WILL ATTEND THE HEARING AND WILL
MAKE A STATEMENT

## APPLICATION FOR APPEAL

## EXHIBIT 2

## PROJECT INFORMATION

If aiditinal space:is neededfor response:to cmin questons please continue on a separate piece of paper and attach ut to the back on his:
applicaton.

1. Type of Project: $\qquad$ New Construction $\quad X$ Remodeladdition
2. Proposed New Use: (Pleaserefer to the District's current Fixture UnitUse Categoty sheef for assistance with tits question.)
 Type of Use: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE $\quad$ Square Footage $\quad 2640$ SF
$\qquad$ Other (Specify): $\qquad$
3. Current Zoning Classification: R-1
4. Name of the water company which services the property: CAL-AM.
5. Do you feel this profect will use less water than that calculated by the District? If so, please explain how much you believe the project will use, and the basis on which you make this assumption: INITIAL CREDIT UNITS 10.7, PROPOSED CREDIT UNITS 10.6. THE WATER WILE BE USED MORE EFFICIENTLY BECAUSE ALL THE FIXTURES WILL BE ULTRA LOW FLOW
6. Has this project been approved by the local jutisdiction? If so, please listor attach a copy of all conditions which have been imposed on the project (Attach a copy of these conditions and approvals received. YES, PLANNING AND DESIGN APPROVAL FROM CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PLANNING COMMISION AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITEE
7. Does the applicant intend to obain a municipal or county building permit for the project within ninety ( $\varphi$ ) days following the granting of a water connection permit? If not. when will water be needed at the site? YES

I declare under penalty of perjury that the information in the application and on accompanying atachenentsis correct to: the best of myknouledge and belief:


NOTE TOAPPLICANT: You may attach written findings for the Board to review and consider insupportof the: action you have requested


# Monterey Peninsula Water Management District 

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
(EXPARTE COMMUNICATIONS)
MCDANNOLD RESIDENCE
Name or description of project, action, etc.: 905 OCEAN VIEW, PACIFIC GROVE
Names and addresses of all persons authorized to communicate with the Board of Directors on this matter:

| Name |
| :--- |
| ERIC MILLER |


| Address |
| :---: |
| 157 GRAND AVE., SUITE 106, PACIFIC GROVE |

157 GRAND AVE., SUITE 106, PACIFIC GROVE

This Disclosure Statement is completed in my capacity as $\triangle$ the Applicant for matter referenced in the first line, or as $\mathbb{X}$ an authorized Agent of the Applicant. My signature evidences I am duly authorized to act on behalf of all individuals and/or entities that have an ownership interest in this matter (exceptions shall be noted by checking this box $\square$ and providing a complete explanation as an attachment to this Disclosure Statement).

I understand this Disclosure Statement is required to list the names and addresses of all persons authorized to communicate with the Directors of the Water Management District on this matter. I further understand and agree to revise and amend this Disclosure Statement whenever any other person is authorized to communicate regarding this matter. Oral disclosure of agents shall not satisfy this requirement.
$I$ understand and agree that failure to disclose the name of individuals who shall communicate with the District Board Members on behalf of the applicant shall subject the matter referenced above to immediate review and denial. Further, I understand that if denial is based on failure of either the applicant or of an authorized agent of the applicant to comply with these disclosure requirements, no request for approval of an identical or similar matter shall be granted for a period of twenty-four (24) months from the date this matter is denied.

I declare the foregoing to be true and correct of my own personal knowledge. I have signed this form this 21 day of DECEMPEP. 2006. This form is signed in the City of $\qquad$ , State of $\qquad$ -.



December 1, 2006

## Gabriela Ayala, MPWMD

\#5 Harris Court
Monterey, CA 93940

Re: McDannold project located at 905 Ocean, Pacific Grove

## Dear Gabby:

On February $21^{\text {st }} 2003$ we voluntarily entered into a deed restriction based on Ordinance 98. This ordinance allowed a second bathroom but prohibited any change to it. However, it did not limit the use of the existing water.

With this deed restriction in place, we began to design a major remodel with three bathrooms. This plan, under Ordinance 80, would further deed restrict the property to an ULF dishwasher, ULF toilet and ULF washing machine. With these ULF units in place there would be no increase in water use; but there would be a much needed third bathroom due to the size of the family.

After working carefully on the design, submitting it to the Planning Department, numerous Planning Commission meetings, multiple Architectural Review meetings and completing the Engineering and Working Drawings, we were given the water release form along with the approved drawings.

We brought these to the Water Management District and were told that our deed restriction for special Ordinance 98 would have to be changed to reflect Ordinance 114, which would not allow a third bathroom.

We worked diligently on this project from February 21, 2003 (when we received the deed restriction) to November 15, 2006 (when we were given the water release form). While our project was being designed and processed by the City, Ordinance 114 was adopted by the District.

We based years of work on our Ordinance 98 deed restriction. We are willing to further deed restrict the property so the additional bathroom represents efficiency to the homeowner, while not increasing the water use.
Please do not penalize our client and us because the City has a slow and careful process for planning and building permits on difficult waterfront properties.


Eric Miller, President
Eric Miller Architects, Inc.

