

From: [K Elliott](#)
To: [LAFCO Information](#)
Subject: Murrieta FMSR Questions - map confusion and possible typos
Date: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 1:55:28 PM

LAFCO and West Yost-

I wanted to let you know that some of the maps in the study are still causing confusion. I know I brought this up with the RFP etc. but the Study Area/Service Area Maps aren't clear. Perhaps the City of Murrieta and the Water Districts can help clarify who serves what area from a retail customer (not wholesaler and not sewer) perspective so we can avoid the confusion.

Also, as I mentioned in a prior comment, the "blank" area in the south part of the study area (West of Jefferson) is causing questions. What is going on with this area? Aren't there some businesses there getting water? Who are they getting it from? Having an area without any color seems odd.

In reviewing the Study I found a few places where I think there are typos that are more than just grammatical. I have listed the ones that I recorded here:

Page #	Question/Comment
57 & 61	WMWD and EMWD show \$5m investments needed for fire flow improvements but RCWD does not. Why not? Their total \$ for legacy improvements reflects the \$5m.
93	The footnote numbers in Table 8-15 aren't shown above.
102	I assume the footnote in Table 8-19 is EMWD, not RCWD
103	Why does Figure 8-11 only show interest and standby charge income? The revenue total is similar to other ownership scenarios...
106	The second sentence references the Acquisition Balance shown in Table 8-22. But 8-22 shows the project share of EMWD water system cost. Should the reference be 8-24?
App B pg 40 row 541	This is Note 6 but no reference in the table above references Note 6. Row 528, legacy pipe improvements, references Note 5 but Note 5 refers to a reservoir, not legacy pipes. I therefore assume that Note 6 refers to Row 528. Row 527 has no note shown so perhaps Note 6 belongs there.

Thank you-
Kathryn