Flagler Corridor Modeling Methodology Comments:  
  
 \*   The Study Corridor partially overlaps in the west with the East-West Corridor of the SMART Plan and the document refers to the Study as part of the East-West corridor. This may be confusing since the East-West corridor is described as along the Dolphin Expressway in the SMART Plan. Recommend removing the East-West corridor reference since the Flagler St corridor is its own standalone corridor in the SMART Plan as one of the BERT corridors.  
 \*   Please clarify how the Reversible Lanes components will be used/studied instead of and/or in coordination with premium transit, as part of this transit study.  
 \*   Existing conditions are referred for 2016 and 2015 in most places. 2010 is the current SERPM 7.0 base year. Please identify if the model is being updated and revalidated as part of this project or is it being done in another project?  
    \*   Document states that 2015 conditions will be modeled as the base by FDOT and validated. Please identify if a current 2015 SE dataset or network for the SERPM is already developed.  
 \*   Document says up to 10 alternatives would be tested, but lists Build Alternatives as (3) in the table. Please provide clarification on the number of alternatives / model runs that are being proposed.  
 \*   Document describes how the methodology will follow PD&E and FTA processes. Suggest more detail on agency coordination through this process for internal (locally) and external (review agencies FTA and FHWA) agencies.  
 \*   Recommend chapter/more information on ridership details for the region and history of the ridership changes/needs for this corridor and the concerns of local leaders to help state the Purpose and Need for the study.  
 \*   Recommend identifying why the SERPM 7.0 is to be used for the study (current model using the latest technology) and how this model differs from past models being an ABM based model.  
 \*   With OD travel data from AirSage, please clarify if there is data for comparison of the transit mode split to that of the observed transit ridership data?  Also for consistency, recommend addressing the shift in time periods to those of the SERPM.  
 \*   Recommend addressing consistency between the SERPM validation using the “ACS data for 2015” and the STOPS model which uses the 2000 CTPP that will be used as a comparison.  Consider addressing how the forecasts may differ.  
 \*   Consider removing/modifying reference to the STOPS model as being a more “conservative ridership estimate” since we don’t yet know the forecasts.  
 \*   Recommend identifying what and how special markets (colleges, malls, etc.) are to be handled in the corridor by both the SERPM and STOPS models to get the best forecasts for comparison.