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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 92</td>
<td>Last Paragraph - What exact environmental and economic impacts are you mentioning? Also, are these areas commercial and/or part of connecting Downtown corridors that are contributing to the issue? If it just be helpful to expand slightly to avoid questions.</td>
<td>Change: Edited section for overall clarity and deleted reference to economic and environmental impacts of congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 97</td>
<td>First Paragraph - Where did the city of Lawrence energy goal come from? Is there a plan available to link its strategies?</td>
<td>Change: Added link to Ordinance 9744 which set goal (and updated year to 2035, not 2030).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 106</td>
<td>112 – It also be good to see a map that has the EJ areas overlaid with the rail tracks.</td>
<td>Change: Added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 109</td>
<td>112 – It also be good to see a map of the EJ areas overlaid with crashes.</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 122</td>
<td>Paragraph 1, Sentence 1 - Is this sentence incomplete? It is confusing.</td>
<td>Change: Sentence was correct but paragraphs were out of order so the context made it confusing.</td>
<td>Updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 172</td>
<td>Paragraph 4, Sentence 4 - Should “an” be “and”?</td>
<td>Change: Sentence added about potential new funding sources that cities could explore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 179</td>
<td>Lecompton has O&amp;M shortfall even during the first 4 year timeband. Do you know how they plan to address this?</td>
<td>Change: Lecompton indicated expenditures will be cut to match revenue, so tables were adjusted</td>
<td>Updated to reflect expenditure reduction in the first band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 184</td>
<td>The table looks great, but it may be advantageous to make an overall percentage of all programmed project funds that will be going to projects within the EJ areas.</td>
<td>Change: Added text about percent of funds spent in EJ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 187</td>
<td>Are Figures 7.1 &amp; 7.2 copies of each other?</td>
<td>Change: Yes; deleted duplicate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Changes**

- Remove project 133 from Figure 6.10; Table 7.1; Table 7.3; Figure 7.7; Figure 7.8; Figure 7.9. Project was mistakenly included and has already been completed.
- Transportation Demand Model Maps were updated to match existing map style but content unchanged.
- Table of Contents updated.
- Page 205 of Transportation 2040 Public Comment Report updated; range of years in financial projections for 2025-2025 and 2020-2025 to 2023-2026 and 2027-2030.