BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 6260 • Boston, MA 02116 • 857.702.3700 • bostonmpo.org

Technical Memorandum

DATE: **November 19, 2026**

TO: **Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Board**

FROM: **MPO Staff**

RE: **LRTP Amendment Two and TIP Amendment One Comments**

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) conducted a 30-day public review period from October 2 through November 2, 2026, for Amendment Two to *Destination 2050*, the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan, and Amendment One to the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). These amendments would add the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan to both documents. During the public review period, the MPO received 29 comments. Twenty written comments from 18 commenters were submitted through the MPO's online public comment form and by email, and nine were verbal comments delivered at the October 15, 2026, MPO board meeting.

The input received covered a range of themes. If comments contained questions for project proponents, MPO staff shared the comments with Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) and City of Boston staff. In some cases, MPO staff referred commenters to specific staff at the MBTA and the City of Boston. Below is a summary of the themes from the comments, indicating the types of responses staff provided when referring commenters to other informational resources, and links to those resources shared by the project proponents. Following the summary are the full text of all comments received and responses provided by staff.

1 Comment Themes and Types of Response

Nine comments expressed desire for improvements to be made to Blue Hill Avenue without a center-running bus lane and consideration of additional design options that allow for street improvements without a center-running bus lane.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project webpage.

Eight comments expressed dissatisfaction with the community engagement process conducted by the City of Boston and the MBTA.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to multiple sources describing the engagement process by the City of Boston and the MBTA from 2019 to the current day.

Six comments expressed concern about the safety of street crossings with a center-running bus lane.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to MBTA traffic analyses and studies that demonstrated safety benefits of the design approach.

Five comments expressed concern about the project moving forward without anti-displacement plans in place by the City of Boston.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the City of Boston's 2025 anti-displacement plan for the project.

Five comments expressed concern about the project's impact on businesses along the corridor.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the City of Boston's anti-displacement plan.

Three comments expressed support for the amendments and the project's benefits for safety and more reliable public transit.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project webpage.

Two comments expressed concern about the reduction of bus stops proposed in the Blue Hill Avenue design.

- These comments were verbal and therefore did not receive responses.

One comment expressed support for the amendments and a desire for bike lanes to be added alongside the center-running bus lane.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project webpage.

One comment expressed support for the amendments and the project, directly connected to the inclusion of protected bike lanes, and requested that the bike lanes connect to key destinations.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project webpage.

One comment expressed opposition to the amendment connected in part to the lack of protected bike infrastructure in Mattapan Square.

- Type of response/referral: Acknowledgement, inclusion, and referral to the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project webpage.

2 Informational Resources Provided to Commenters

- City of Boston and MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue Community Engagement Report (2019-2023)
- City of Boston and MBTA's Pre-15% Design Community Engagement Summary (2024)
- City of Boston and MBTA's 15% Design Community Engagement Summary (2024)
- City of Boston's A Place to Thrive: Anti-Displacement Action Plan (2025)
- MBTA's Columbus Avenue Post-Implementation Report (2023)
- MBTA's Columbus Avenue MBTA Phase 1 and Phase 2 Overview (2025)
- MBTA's Center Running Bus Lanes & Street Safety: Columbus Avenue Case Study (2025)
- City of Boston's Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan Community Meeting Presentation (2023)
- City of Boston's RAISE Grant Application (2021)
- City of Boston's Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan Alternative Design Approaches Presentation (2023)
- City of Boston's Announcement About Investment to Transform Blue Hill Avenue (2024)
- City of Boston's Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan: Streets Cabinet Evaluation (2023)
- MBTA's September 2026 Open House Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan Project Boards (2026)
- MBTA's Focus 2050: Planning for the Future of the MBTA

3 Written Comments Received and Responses Provided by MPO Staff

The following written comments were submitted during the 30-day public review period for Amendment Two to *Destination 2050* and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027–31 TIP.

- Comment from Philip Hood, Somerville resident
- Comments in support, from Kristine (NKA), Boston resident
- Comment in opposition from Danielle Williams, Prophetic Resistance Boston
- Letter in opposition from Marie St. Fleur, St. Fleur Communications
- Comment in support from Collen Mahoney, Boston resident
- Comment from Carmen Blyden, Boston resident
- Letter in support from Cole Lewis, TransitMatters
- Comment in opposition from Sally Davidson, Member of the public
- Comment in opposition from Dr Paula Starnes, Member of the public
- Comment in opposition from James Muhammad, Member of the public
- Comment in opposition from Jacqueline Fonseca, Boston resident
- Comment in support from Elijah Evans, Bikes Not Bombs
- Comment in opposition from Anne McKinnon, Boston resident
- Letter in opposition from Jeffrey Sarin, Member of the public
- Comment from Mary Brady, Boston resident
- Letter in opposition from John Smith-St. Cyere, J.L Smith Suicide Prevention Center for Young Black Boys Inc
- Comment in opposition from Jeffrey Ferris, Boston resident
- Letter in opposition from a Boston resident

- Comment from John Smith-St. Cyere, J.L Smith Suicide Prevention Center for Young Black Boys Inc.
- Letter in support from Maha Aslam, LivableStreets Alliance

Philip Hood – Somerville resident

Suggest zero funding item 4 on McGrath Hwy to provide funds for the Blue Hill work. No viable plan has been submitted for McGrath Hwy. Continuing that work as currently conceived is counter productive.

MPO Staff Response to Philip Hood

Hello Philip Hood,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment One to the federal fiscal years 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program and Amendment Two to Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board and the MBTA and the City of Boston. All public comments will also be compiled and shared publicly via the MPO's website after the conclusion of the public comment period.

MPO meetings are virtual and open to the public. You are welcome to attend future meetings and can find more information about when meetings are scheduled on our meeting calendar. Currently, the next action item on the amendments has not been scheduled.

You can find more information about the amendments here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

If your comment includes feedback related to the MBTA's proposed design for Blue Hill Avenue, we encourage you to also share your feedback directly with the MBTA via this link for the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project design feedback form.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments on Amendment One and Amendment Two or other MPO work, and thank you again for your feedback.

MPO Staff Follow-up Response to Philip Hood

Hello Philip,

We wanted to follow up to let you know that the MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

The MPO's current role in the Federal Transit Administration's discretionary funding process is to facilitate the potential inclusion of the project in the Transportation Improvement Program and the Long Range Transportation Plan, not to make a

determination on if and how the project could be funded with federal formula dollars.

In response to your comment requesting the funding for McGrath Highway be re-allocated to the Blue Hill Ave Transportation Action Plan, we would like to clarify that the MPO's role in this decision is to facilitate the potential inclusion of the Blue Hill Ave project in the LRTP and TIP. This addresses a Federal Transit Administration requirement for a discretionary funding pool that is unrelated to the McGrath Boulevard project. Deliberation on federal funding for those types of projects on the LRTP and TIP take place during development of those respective plans. Development of the Federal Fiscal Years 2028–2032 TIP is underway, and funding discussions will take place in Spring 2027.

Your comment will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP, and we are happy to answer any clarifying questions you may have on the project development process for the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan.

Kristine (NKA) – Boston resident

Please move BLHA center bus lane forward while still listening to the community.

Kristine (NKA) – Boston resident

Blue Hill Ave center bus lanes!

Kristine (NKA) – Boston resident

Bike lanes needed alongside center running bus lanes!!

Kristine (NKA) – Boston resident

Add bike lanes to the center running bus lanes

MPO Staff Response to Kristine (NKA)

Hello NKA,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment One to the federal fiscal years 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program and Amendment Two to Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board and the MBTA and the City of Boston. All public comments will also be compiled and shared publicly via the MPO’s website after the conclusion of the public comment period.

MPO meetings are virtual and open to the public. You are welcome to attend future meetings and can find more information about when meetings are scheduled on our meeting calendar. Currently, the next action item on the amendments has not been scheduled.

You can find more information about the amendments here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

If your comment includes feedback related to the MBTA's proposed design for Blue Hill Avenue, we encourage you to also share your feedback directly with the MBTA via this link for the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project design feedback form.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments on Amendment One and Amendment Two or other MPO work, and thank you again for your feedback.

Danielle Williams – Prophetic Resistance Boston

My name is Danielle Williams and I am the executive director of Prophetic Resistance Boston which is a faith based organization of pastors and congregation members who have moved from within the four walls of the church by listening to stories and then move those stories to collective action.

Prophetic Resistance Boston supports investing in Blue Hill Avenue. We support safer streets, better sidewalks, improved lighting, more trees, reliable public transportation, and improvements that strengthen the businesses and neighborhoods along the corridor. Our concern is not with investing in Blue Hill Avenue—it is with the current design and whether the community most directly impacted has had meaningful power in shaping it.

One of our biggest concerns is the proposed center-running bus lanes. The current design continues to include dedicated center-running bus lanes and boarding platforms. PRB believes that major changes to Blue Hill Avenue must carefully consider their impact on residents, small businesses, traffic, parking, emergency access, pedestrians, and the overall quality of life along the corridor.

Residents have raised concerns about reducing travel lanes and center-running bus lanes throughout this process. We believe those concerns deserve serious consideration, particularly when they come from people who have lived and worked along Blue Hill Avenue for decades.

PRB has submitted a written request for a Boston City Council hearing to examine the community engagement process surrounding the Blue Hill Avenue project. We believe greater public examination is especially important because a significant portion of the project's engagement process occurred during the COVID-19 public

health crisis—a period when normal community participation was disrupted and many residents were focused on health, family, employment, housing, and other immediate concerns.

PRB is asking an important question: Who was able to participate during that period, who was not at the table, and how representative was that engagement of the Black and Brown residents and businesses that will live with these changes every day?

We also ask decision-makers to give considerable consideration to residents who say they have 40 or more years of experience living on or around Blue Hill Avenue. Their lived experience is valuable community knowledge. People who have watched Blue Hill Avenue change over several decades understand its traffic patterns, businesses, neighborhoods, safety concerns, transportation needs, and history in ways that should not be dismissed.

We are also concerned about who is being presented as the community voice supporting the project. Organizations speaking in favor of the proposed design should be transparent about their relationship to the corridor. PRB believes decision-makers should distinguish between organizations that are physically based on Blue Hill Avenue or rooted in the surrounding Black and Brown neighborhoods and organizations advocating for the project that are based elsewhere.

This does not mean that organizations outside the corridor should not have a voice. It means that their voices should not substitute for the voices of the people who live, operate businesses, worship, raise families, and travel on Blue Hill Avenue every day.

The City and MBTA have conducted meetings and other engagement activities and have stated that community feedback has influenced the project. PRB's concern is whether that engagement has translated into meaningful community decision-making, particularly on one of the project's defining features: the center-running bus lanes.

There is a difference between asking residents for feedback about parking, trees, lighting, bus-stop locations, and other details and giving residents a meaningful opportunity to determine whether they want the fundamental design itself.

Prophetic Resistance Boston wants investment in Blue Hill Avenue. We want reliable public transportation. We want safer streets. We want beautiful public spaces. And we want the businesses along the corridor to thrive.

But investment should not come at the expense of community voice and community power.

Blue Hill Avenue should not simply be redesigned for the community. It should be redesigned with the community—and the people who will be most directly affected must have a meaningful voice in determining what that future looks like.

We wholeheartedly ask that you put Amendment 2 on pause for all the reasons mentioned above.

Danielle Williams, ED of Prophetic Resistance Boston.

MPO Staff Response to Danielle Williams

Hello Danielle,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board and the MBTA and the City of Boston. All public comments will also be compiled and shared publicly via the MPO's website after the conclusion of the public comment period.

MPO meetings are virtual and open to the public. You are welcome to attend future meetings and can find more information about when meetings are scheduled on our meeting calendar. Currently, the next action item on the amendments has not been scheduled.

You can find more information about the amendments here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

If your comment includes feedback related to the MBTA's proposed design for Blue Hill Avenue, we encourage you to also share your feedback directly with the MBTA via this link for the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project design feedback form.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments on Amendment Two or other MPO work, and thank you again for your feedback.

MPO Staff Follow-up Response to Danielle Williams

Hello Danielle,

MPO staff shared your comments with our colleagues at the MBTA and the City of Boston. They have provided additional information about the community engagement process that we wanted to share back with you.

The Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan has included an ongoing public engagement effort. The engagement conducted between 2019 and 2023 is summarized through the City of Boston's Community Engagement Report (link). The MBTA also summarized community engagement efforts as part of the pre-15% design stage in May, July, November, and December 2024. The decision to advance with a center-running bus lane option occurred in the midst of this public engagement process, stemming from alternatives considered at public meetings in June 2023 (link) and culminating in a formal announcement of a preferred alternative in February 2024 (link). Engagement was conducted across the community, including targeted engagement for seniors and people with disabilities at the Grove Hall Community Center (June 7, 2024), Franklin Field Elderly Commuter Center (June 11, 2024), the City's Disabilities Commission (May 3, 2024 and September 25, 2024), and an Age Strong meeting at the Twelfth Baptist Church (September 3, 2026).

Further decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and City of Boston, and design feedback received through our public comment process has been shared with those partners. For further questions, we encourage you to contact the MBTA directly at bluehillave@mbta.com and the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

We thank you again for your comments, and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Marie St. Fleur - St. Fleur Communications

Dear Boston Region MPO,

Please accept the attached testimony for the public record regarding Destination 2050 Amendment Two and the Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan.

My testimony raises four areas in which the MPO memorandum is not responsive to concerns that have been repeatedly raised by the community:

- The amendment effectively advances one design without presenting a transparent alternatives analysis.
- The memorandum fails to separate the long-overdue reconstruction and infrastructure needs of Blue Hill Avenue from the decision to construct center-running bus lanes.

- The memorandum asserts safety benefits but does not provide the supporting analysis necessary for the public to evaluate those claims.
- The amendment does not address the historical replacement-transit issue or the broader long-term transportation needs of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan.

These are substantive issues that should be addressed before Amendment Two is finally adopted. The community has consistently asked for a fuller examination of alternatives and for answers to questions concerning safety, access, business impacts, traffic operations, and the long-term transportation vision for this corridor.

Please include the attached testimony in the official public record for Amendment Two.

Thank you for your consideration.

(See the attached letter on the next page.)

SFC ST. FLEUR COMMUNICATIONS
From Strategy to Impact

Contact
stfleurcommunications@gmail.com
Boston, MA 02125
stfleurcommunications.com

Marie St. Fleur, JD
Testimony in Opposition to Destination 2050 Amendment Two – Blue Hill Avenue
Boston Region- Metropolitan Planning Organization
October 1, 2026

My name is Marie St. Fleur, JD. Former State Representative and a Blue Hill Avenue neighborhood resident for over 50 Years, and I am opposed to Amendment Two in its current form.

The community is already on record opposing a center-running bus lane on Blue Hill Avenue. Residents have repeatedly raised concerns about safety, access, traffic operations, impacts on businesses, and whether other viable transit options have been fully studied. The engagement process to date has not adequately answered those questions.

Blue Hill Avenue unquestionably needs major investment. Residents deserve safer streets, better sidewalks, improved accessibility, reliable transit, and long-overdue infrastructure improvements. But Amendment Two asks the MPO to advance a specific center-running bus design without first providing the public with a full and transparent comparison of viable alternatives. Before this project is added to the region's long-range transportation plan, the public should see a clear alternatives analysis comparing center-running lanes with side-running or curbside bus priority and other long-term transit options.

We also need the underlying safety analysis, particularly for pedestrians, school children, seniors, turning movements, intersections, and access to center platforms.
The MPO should require clear data showing how much of the claimed travel-time savings actually come from center-running lanes, rather than from signal priority, stop improvements, intersection changes, and other measures that could be implemented without this design.

There are also unresolved questions about the $164.5 million project cost, federal funding assumptions, and the fact that this project stops at Grove Hall rather than addressing the broader connection to Nubian Square.
Residents should not be forced to choose between accepting a design they have opposed and losing long-overdue investment.

Contact
stfleurcommunications@gmail.com
Boston, MA 02125
stfleurcommunications.com

The MPO Memo is not responsive to concerns that have been repeatedly raised by the community:

1. The amendment effectively advances one design without presenting a transparent alternatives analysis.
2. The memorandum fails to separate the long-overdue reconstruction and infrastructure needs of Blue Hill Avenue from the decision to construct center-running bus lanes.
3. The memorandum asserts safety benefits but does not provide the supporting analysis necessary for the public to evaluate those claims.
4. The amendment does not address the historical replacement-transit issue or the broader long-term transportation needs of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan

Further, I was troubled by the way one member invoked the history of racial equality and gay marriage to justify the view that policymakers should not simply follow the loudest voices or even the majority. I agree that majority opinion, standing alone, should not determine public policy, particularly where fundamental rights are at stake. However, as a Black woman, I found that comparison deeply troubling in this context and dismissive of the residents who appeared, participated, and placed substantive concerns on the public record. These were not simply "loud voices" resisting change. Nor were the community's objections merely expressions of preference. They raised unresolved questions about safety, business impacts, pedestrian access, traffic operations, and the failure to consider or fully evaluate viable alternatives.

The issue is not whether the MPO should automatically follow majority opinion. The issue is whether it has exercised the level of due diligence required before advancing a major, long-term transportation investment. Where alternatives have not been fully considered and significant community questions remain unanswered, minimizing those voices does not strengthen the decision-making process; it underscores the need for additional review. The MPO has an obligation not merely to hear the community, but to demonstrate through analysis and evidence that the concerns raised have been seriously examined before moving this amendment forward.

For those reasons, I oppose Amendment Two as presently proposed and ask the MPO not to adopt it until the outstanding questions raised by the community are fully answered, viable alternatives are fairly evaluated, and the public is given a genuine opportunity to review that analysis. Thank you.

MPO Staff Response to Marie St. Fleur

Hello Marie St. Fleur,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board and the MBTA and the City of Boston. All public comments will also be compiled and shared publicly via the MPO's website after the conclusion of the public comment period.

MPO meetings are virtual and open to the public. You are welcome to attend future meetings and can find more information about when meetings are scheduled on our meeting calendar. Currently, the next action item on the amendments has not been scheduled.

You can find more information about the amendments here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

If your comment includes feedback related to the MBTA's proposed design for Blue Hill Avenue, we encourage you to also share your feedback directly with the MBTA via this link for the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project design feedback form.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments on Amendment Two or other MPO work, and thank you again for your feedback.

MPO Staff Follow-up Response to Marie St. Fleur

Hello Marie,

MPO staff shared your comments with our colleagues at the MBTA and the City of Boston. They have provided additional information about the alternatives evaluation and safety improvements incorporated into the Blue Hill Avenue project.

The locally preferred alternative for the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan emerged from two concepts advanced by the City of Boston in Summer 2023 (link). The concepts were evaluated using a decision matrix in Fall 2023 (link), and in February 2024, the City announced its decision to advance a center-running bus lane option as part of the corridor improvements (link). The MBTA also presented traffic analyses for the current design at the September 2026 Open Houses, which are available here (link). These analyses were informed in part by additional studies conducted by the MBTA in 2023 (link) and 2025 (link) that demonstrated a connection between increased safety along the Columbus Avenue corridor following implementation of the bus lanes compared to other similar roadways in the neighborhood, including Blue Hill Avenue.

Lastly, regarding the transit-replacement item noted in your original comment, we wanted to share that the MBTA is developing its next Program for Mass Transportation, Focus 2050. While the Blue Hill Avenue project is focused on improvements to the avenue itself, further investments in rail that could reinforce these bus improvements may be advocated for as part of this process. You may do so by contacting the MBTA at focus2050@mbta.com.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

We thank you again for your comments, and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Collen Mahoney – Boston resident

Please proceed to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Plan in the TIP and LRTP! This plan is vital to increasing safety along Blue Hill Ave and providing faster transit service to a major transit corridor.

MPO Staff Response to Collen Mahoney

Hello Collen Mahoney,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment One to the federal fiscal years 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program and Amendment Two to Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board and the MBTA and the City of Boston. All public comments will also be compiled and shared publicly via the MPO's website after the conclusion of the public comment period.

MPO meetings are virtual and open to the public. You are welcome to attend future meetings and can find more information about when meetings are scheduled on our meeting calendar. Currently, the next action item on the amendments has not been scheduled.

You can find more information about the amendments here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

If your comment includes feedback related to the MBTA's proposed design for Blue Hill Avenue, we encourage you to also share your feedback directly with the MBTA via this link for the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue project design feedback form.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments on Amendment One and Amendment Two or other MPO work, and thank you again for your feedback.

MPO Staff Follow-up Response to Collen Mahoney

Hello Colleen,

We wanted to follow up to let you know that the MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP.

We thank you again for your comments, and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Carmen Blyden – Boston resident

As a Mattapan resident and homeowner for over 13 years, I am proud to call this community home. Purchasing a home in Mattapan was an important milestone for me and my family, and while I am grateful to have had that opportunity, I am deeply disappointed by the lack of investment in a community that so many families have called home for generations.

For far too long, residents of Mattapan have had to navigate transportation infrastructure that makes it challenging to move throughout our neighborhoods and the city safely, efficiently, and joyfully.

As someone who drives, cycles, and uses public transportation, I experience these challenges firsthand. The lack of safe, well-connected cycling infrastructure puts cyclists and drivers at risk every day. Unreliable public transportation creates additional barriers for residents who are simply trying to get to work, school, medical appointments, and other important destinations on time.

Transportation should connect people to opportunities, not create additional obstacles in their lives. When residents cannot depend on safe and reliable transportation, it impacts their economic mobility, physical and mental well-being, and overall quality of life.

While I strongly believe that Mattapan deserves greater investment in transportation infrastructure, I am also concerned about what these improvements could mean for the families who have been the heart and soul of this community for

generations.

We cannot talk about improving our neighborhoods without also talking about protecting the people who live in them.

Too often, historically underserved communities experience years of disinvestment, only to face rising housing costs and displacement when long-overdue improvements finally arrive. We must be intentional about ensuring that transportation investments do not contribute to pushing out the very residents who have spent decades advocating for safer streets, reliable transportation, and healthier neighborhoods.

As we plan for 2050, I encourage decision-makers to prioritize equitable investments in Mattapan, including protected and connected bike lanes, safer streets for pedestrians, and more reliable public transportation. These improvements must be accompanied by meaningful community engagement and coordinated efforts to protect housing affordability and prevent displacement.

MPO Staff Response to Carmen Blyden

Hello Carmen,

MPO staff shared your comments with our colleagues at the MBTA and the City of Boston. They have provided additional information about the safety improvements incorporated into the Blue Hill Avenue project and resources on the City of Boston's current anti-displacement efforts.

The MBTA conducted and presented on traffic analyses for the current design at the September 2026 Open Houses, which can be found here (link). These analyses were informed in part by additional studies conducted by the MBTA in 2023 (link) and 2025 (link) that demonstrated a connection between increased safety along the Columbus Avenue corridor following implementation of the bus lanes compared to other similar roadways in the neighborhood, including Blue Hill Avenue. These safety improvements were witnessed across all transportation modes on Columbus Avenue, while Blue Hill Avenue unfortunately witnessed an increase in vulnerable road user injuries during the same period.

The Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan will also include bidirectional bike lanes and a shared use path to support low-stress connections to other existing trails and greenways in Franklin Park and the Neponset River Greenway by way of Cummins Highway. These connections are detailed further in the 2026 open house presentation (link).

Further decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and City of Boston, and design feedback received through our public comment process has been shared with those partners. For further questions about the project design, we encourage you to contact the MBTA directly at bluehillave@mbta.com and the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

The City of Boston published an Anti-Displacement Action Plan in 2025 outlining their current plans to address displacement. Further questions about how the City intends to align this plan with this specific project can be directed to the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

We thank you again for your comments, and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Cole Lewis – TransitMatters

I have attached TransitMatters' comment letter in support of incorporating the Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan into the MPO's Destination 2050 LRTP and TIP below. Thank you for your consideration.

(See the attached letter on the next page.)

TRANSITMATTERS

Boston Region MPO

October 20, 2026

Dear Boston Region MPO Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit public comment regarding the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan. TransitMatters is writing in support of incorporating the Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan into the MPO's Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program.

Plans to redesign Blue Hill Ave. provide an opportunity to make buses faster and more reliable for community members making over 20,000 bus trips on the corridor every day – many of whom rely on the bus to get to work, school, childcare, appointments, and other commitments. Installing a center-running bus lane on Blue Hill Ave. will provide a near-term improvement for riders who today cannot be sure about when their bus will arrive and must account for far too much extra time in their everyday commute to ensure they are not late. A center-running lane will ensure that the tens of thousands of bus riders using the road daily will not be chronically caught in traffic or blocked by double-parked cars.

Buses using Blue Hill Ave. are vitally in need of dedicated space today. Currently, buses travel between Grove Hall and Harambee Park at an average speed of 3.5 miles per hour or slower, and have an average speed of 3.5-4.3 miles per hour between Mattapan Square and Morton St. A center-running bus lane is estimated to reduce rush hour travel times by 10-15 minutes from Grove Hall to Mattapan, a trip which today takes 37 minutes on average.

Providing dedicated space to buses to ensure they are not delayed by traffic or double-parked cars would also substantially improve reliability for bus riders using Blue Hill Ave. Routes 22, 31, and 28 are 6th, 7th, and 11th most unreliable buses in the MBTA. 1 in 8 buses on route 22 and 31 arrive bunched, and less than half of route 22 and 28 buses arrive on time. Bus riders deserve a near-term intervention that would allow them to trust and rely on their buses.

The project also presents a chance to reshape Blue Hill Ave. as a corridor that seniors and youth do not have to fear crossing. More crosswalks, shorter crossings, and pedestrian refuge islands open the door for easier local neighborhood use of the corridor, increasing foot traffic for businesses. These improvements point towards a Blue Hill Ave. that further fosters community in the neighborhood, rather than one that geographically splits it in two.

The Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan also presents the opportunity to invest in quality roads and beautiful streets for a community that has lacked true investment for decades. Streets and sidewalks all along the corridor are in poor condition today, and a lack of street trees contribute to extreme temperatures in the

neighborhood. Residents of Mattapan, Dorchester, and Roxbury deserve new roads, more street trees and greenspace, and safer streets no matter what mode they are using.

There has been a marked lack of public feedback in this process from those who depend on Blue Hill Ave. buses to travel up and down the corridor – a group which makes up over half of those using the corridor during rush hour. There has also been an absence of limited English proficiency speakers whose primary language is Spanish, Haitian Creole, or Cape Verdean Creole – groups which constitute a significant portion of the communities surrounding Blue Hill Ave. What we've learned is that many of those who ride buses on the corridor do not even know the project exists at all, and are therefore unable to participate.

Along with Mattapan Food and Fitness Coalition and LivableStreets Alliance, we initiated conversations with bus riders along the Blue Hill Ave. corridor in May of this year in order to collect feedback from community members and share information about the project. We asked about what improvements they would like to see to their bus service and gathered their opinions on the redesign plan. Mattapan Food and Fitness Coalition's Vigorous Youth ambassadors conducted video interviews with 29 bus riders in English and Haitian Creole, while volunteers and staff from the three organizations surveyed 47 riders at bus stops in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole. These are some insights we gathered:

- Of the 20 video-interviewees we asked, **19 (or 95%) did not know about the project to redesign Blue Hill Ave.**
- Out of 23 riders who were asked about their opinions of the Blue Hill Ave. redesign in video interviews, 18 **(78%) expressed support**, 2 interviewees expressed mixed feelings about the project, and 3 interviewees were opposed.
- Corridor riders are highly transit-dependent. **Most respondents are from Dorchester, Mattapan, and Roxbury,** and about 70–75% ride the bus 5+ days per week, indicating heavy reliance on bus service for daily needs.
- **Top issues: crowding, unreliability, and slow service**. The most common problems were overcrowding, unreliable service, and slow travel times, often worsened by traffic congestion, double parking, and bus bunching.
- **Top priorities: frequency, speed, and reliability.** Riders overwhelmingly want more frequent service, faster trips, and better on-time performance, along with improvements to comfort, safety, and infrastructure like bus lanes and real-time information.
- **Low awareness of the project but growing support for improvements.** Many riders were unfamiliar with the Blue Hill Ave. project, but responses were generally neutral to supportive once informed – especially for bus lanes and safer crossings. Riders also emphasized the importance of affordability, feeling heard, and safer, less congested streets.

We urge the MPO to advance this transformational change to the Blue Hill Avenue corridor. Along with neighborhood residents and our partner community organizations, we support this redesign, which will improve quality of life for those who depend on Blue Hill Avenue buses and create a much safer streetscape for residents walking and biking around their own communities. Thank you for your consideration.

MPO Staff Response to Cole Lewis

Hello Cole,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The MPO Board will decide whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Your comment will be part of the record the MPO Board considers in making that decision.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston. Design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with the MBTA and the City of Boston. We encourage you to contact the MBTA project team directly at bluehillave@mbta.com if you have feedback or questions about the design. More information about the Blue Hill Avenue project is available on the MBTA's project page.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar. You can find details on Amendment Two to the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the related Amendment One to the Transportation Improvement Program here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Sally Davidson – Member of the public

My name is Sally Davidson and I am submitting a public comment regarding the Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan.

I am extremely concerned about the serious danger of the proposed center bus lane. The center bus lane will require that young children, youth and our elders must cross the busy roadway to reach the buses, and I believe that the risks to their safety are significant and unacceptable.

Other highly trafficked areas of Boston are served by the T and Blue Hill Avenue deserves the same.

Why hasn't a feasibility report been done to assess the viability of rail to serve the communities of Roxbury, Dorchester and Mattapan?"

I would appreciate a reply.

Thank you.

MPO Staff Response to Sally Davidson

Hello Sally,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Programs. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and the City of Boston.

The development of the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan focused on the Blue Hill Avenue corridor. The City of Boston explored and evaluated two concepts in the development of this project, with alternatives presented in a public meeting on June 27, 2023 (link). These alternatives were chosen from among an evaluation matrix (link), and the City advanced the center-running option as part of a public announcement on February 28, 2024. This evaluation was conducted in parallel to analysis conducted by the MBTA on the safety benefits derived from the Columbus Avenue Bus Lane project, the report for which can be found here (link). In a further analysis in 2025, the MBTA and City of Boston found that Columbus Avenue witnessed a 7% greater reduction in annual roadway injuries per mile than other similar Boston roadways following implementation of the project. Columbus Avenue witnessed an overall 27.63% reduction in injuries, Warren Street 20.19%, and Hyde Park Avenue 11.9% while Blue Hill Avenue saw no reduction in injuries during that same period. This reduction applied to people walking, using a bike, and driving, helped in part by increased rates of vehicles obeying the speed limits despite a modest delay in overall vehicle travel time by 20-40 seconds.

While the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan focuses on improving the safety, accessibility, and connectivity of the avenue itself, interest in other complementing transit investments such as rail may be considered as part of the MBTA's next Program for Mass Transportation, Focus 2050. We encourage you to contact focus2050@mbta.com to advocate for additional rail investments.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Dr. Paula Starnes – Member of the public

Good morning,
The following submission is my public comment regarding the Blue Hill Transit Action Plan:

My concern is that the proposed Center bus lane poses a danger to elders and young children attempting to cross the street. There also hasn't been any environmental impact report released or discussed.

My question is what environmental report has been produced to show the potential impact to all who work and live in the community?

MPO Staff Response to Dr. Paula Starnes

Hello Paula,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The development of the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan focused on the Blue Hill Avenue corridor. The City of Boston explored and evaluated two concepts for this project, with alternatives presented at a public meeting on June 27, 2023 (link). These alternatives were chosen from among an evaluation matrix (link), and the City advanced the center-running option as part of a public announcement on February 28, 2024 (link).

This evaluation ran in parallel with the MBTA's analysis of the safety benefits of the Columbus Avenue Bus Lane project, the report for which is available here (link). In a further analysis in 2025, the MBTA and the City of Boston found that Columbus Avenue saw a 7% greater reduction in annual roadway injuries per mile than other similar Boston roadways after the project's implementation. Columbus Avenue witnessed an overall 27.63% reduction in injuries, Warren Street 20.19%, and Hyde Park Avenue 11.9%, while Blue Hill Avenue saw no reduction in injuries during that same period (link). This reduction applied to people walking, biking, and driving, helped in part by increased rates of vehicles obeying speed limits.

Regarding your question about the environmental analysis for the Blue Hill Avenue corridor, the City of Boston conducted an environmental analysis for its RAISE grant application. We recommend sharing your feedback with the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

The MPO board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar. You can find details on Amendment Two to the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the related Amendment One to the Transportation Improvement Program here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

James Muhammad – Member of the public

My name is James Muhammad and I'm submitting a public comment regarding the Blue Hill Transit Action Plan.

My concern is that the proposed Center bus lane poses a danger to elders and young children attempting to cross the street.

My question is why haven't a feasibility report been done to determine the benefit of rail over a running bus lane as promised to Roxbury, Dorchester, Mattapan.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

MPO Staff Response to James Muhammad

Hello James,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and the City of Boston.

The development of the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan focused on the Blue Hill Avenue corridor. The City of Boston explored and evaluated two concepts for this project, with alternatives presented at a public meeting on June 27, 2023 (link). These alternatives were chosen from among an evaluation matrix (link), and the City advanced the center-running option as part of a public announcement on February 28, 2024 (link).

This evaluation ran in parallel with the MBTA's analysis of the safety benefits of the Columbus Avenue Bus Lane project, the report for which is available here (link). In a further analysis in 2025, the MBTA and the City of Boston found that Columbus Avenue saw a 7% greater reduction in annual roadway injuries per mile than other similar Boston roadways after the project's implementation. Columbus Avenue witnessed an overall 27.63% reduction in injuries, Warren Street 20.19%, and Hyde Park Avenue 11.9%, while Blue Hill Avenue saw no reduction in injuries during that

same period (link). This reduction applied to people walking, biking, and driving, helped in part by increased rates of vehicles obeying speed limits.

While the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan focuses on improving the safety, accessibility, and connectivity of the Avenue itself, interest in other complementary transit investments such as rail may be considered as part of the MBTA's next Program for Mass Transportation, Focus 2050. We encourage you to contact focus2050@mbta.com to advocate for additional rail investments.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Jacqueline Fonseca – Boston resident

Dear MPO Members,

My name is Jacqueline Fonseca. I am a lifelong Boston resident, law abiding taxpayer and registered voter, currently residing in the 02121 area of Dorchester. For the past 20 years I have taken public transportation via the MBTA nearly everyday as my primary mode of transportation. I also walk, drive and take ride share options occasionally.

I am submitting a public comment regarding the Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan. I am deeply concerned regarding the lack of community engagement for input on community transportation needs BEFORE the middle bus lane project was proposed. I am concerned about the traffic congestion the middle bus lane project will cause, but most importantly I am writing today terrified at the safety concerns the middle bus lane will increase.

I am strongly opposed to a middle bus lane on Blue Hill Avenue because the frequency of walking into traffic is scarier to me than the length of a single trip across the street. My neighbors, who I have personally spoken to from Egleston Square all the way to Mattapan Square agree that curbside pickup and drop off is a safer option; for me, my child, my community members, that consist of families with small children, elderly and disabled people traveling alone. Every time a community member has to cross vehicles to get to and from the bus stop, the risk of falling, and being hit by motor vehicles increases as well.

I want you to think about your elderly mother crossing the street with her small grandchildren on a busy Saturday morning on a rainy day. She may not be able to hold all the children’s hands. She may have a walker, or holding groceries. There is

no safer option then to wait, onboard or depart the bus from the curb. Waiting for the bus in the middle of two way traffic is a major safety concern. Children will need more supervision and rain puddles will force commuters to run for cover along a narrow walkway. I am pleading with the city and MBTA to pause the current Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan because lives are at risk! Serious injury and/or death is increased when a middle bus lane is forced on a community that never asked for it and does not need it.

My question is: How many community members from the Dorchester, Roxbury and Mattapan neighborhoods specifically asked for or suggested a middle bus lane, before this design was proposed to our community? Where is the community data that supports this design?

Please listen to our transportation plans and collaborate with community experts that have lived and worked on and around Blue Hill Ave that know what is best for our communities.

Thank You,
Jacqueline Fonseca

MPO Staff Response to Jacqueline Fonseca

Hello Jacqueline,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan has included an ongoing public engagement effort. The engagement conducted between 2019 and 2023 is summarized through the City of Boston's Community Engagement Report (link). The MBTA also summarized community engagement efforts as part of the pre-15% design stage in May, July, November, and December 2024. The decision to advance with a center-running bus lane option occurred in the midst of this public engagement process, stemming from alternatives considered at public meetings in June 2023 (link) and culminating in a formal announcement of a preferred alternative in February 2024 (link). Engagement was conducted across the community, including targeted engagement for seniors and people with disabilities at the Grove Hall Community Center (June 7, 2024), Franklin Field Elderly Commuter Center (June 11, 2024), the City's Disabilities Commission (May 3, 2024 and September 25, 2024), and an Age Strong meeting at the Twelfth Baptist Church (September 3, 2026).

Regarding safety along the corridor, following implementation of the Columbus Avenue Bus Lanes project, the MBTA conducted analyses of safety impacts along the corridor that - in addition to safety data - also included feedback from bus riders and operators. Their findings appear in a 2023 report (link) and a 2025 case study (link) that found that Columbus Avenue has seen a 7% greater decrease in annual roadway injuries than other similar roads across the City following project implementation. This is facilitated in part by shorter crossing distances, slower vehicle speeds, and mitigations to cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets from directed speed hump installation.

Further decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and City of Boston, and design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with those partners. For further questions, we encourage you to contact the MBTA directly at bluehillave@mbta.com and the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Elijah Evans – Bikes Not Bombs

I am writing on behalf of Bikes Not Bombs to express our strong support for the proposed Blue Hill Avenue amendments.

As we plan for the future of transportation in our communities, it is essential that we prioritize investments in safe, accessible cycling infrastructure, particularly in historically underserved neighborhoods.

Protected bike lanes do more than improve safety for cyclists. They create pathways to economic mobility, greater independence, and improved quality of life for residents of all ages, especially youth, low-income families, and individuals who rely on alternative forms of transportation. For many residents, transportation remains a significant barrier to accessing employment, education, healthcare, and other essential services. Expanding a connected network of protected bike lanes can help eliminate some of these barriers by providing safer, more affordable, and reliable transportation options.

We must also ensure that these lanes are connected to the places people need to go, including schools, employment, public transportation, healthcare facilities, and

community resources. Without these connections, we limit the ability of cycling infrastructure to serve as a meaningful tool for economic mobility and transportation equity.
For young people in particular, access to safe cycling infrastructure can open doors to after-school programs, job opportunities, internships, and other experiences that contribute to their personal and professional development. It also provides greater independence, builds confidence, and gives them the freedom to navigate their communities safely.
As we develop transportation plans that will shape our cities for decades to come, young people must also have a seat at the table. Their voices, experiences, and transportation needs should be reflected in the planning and decision-making process.

Investments in protected bike lanes also have the potential to improve the overall well-being of our communities by encouraging physical activity, reducing transportation costs, improving access to essential services, and creating safer, healthier neighborhoods.

As we look toward 2050, we must recognize that transportation planning directly impacts economic opportunity, public health, community connectivity, and quality of life. I encourage the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan to prioritize a connected network of protected bike lanes, with equitable investments in historically underserved communities and meaningful engagement of residents, including youth, throughout the planning process.

We support these amendments because they reflect the urgent reality on the ground. We ask the MPO to vote in favor of these changes, prioritizing the safety and future mobility of the youth and families who depend on Blue Hill Avenue every single day.

Sincerely,
Elijah Evans
Bikes Not Bombs

MPO Staff Response to Elijah Evans

Hello Elijah,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The MPO Board will decide whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Your comment will be part of the record the MPO Board considers in making that decision. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar. You can find details on Amendment Two to the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the related Amendment One to the Transportation Improvement Program here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston. Design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with the MBTA and the City of Boston. We encourage you to contact the MBTA project team directly at bluehillave@mbta.com if you have feedback or questions about the design. More information about the Blue Hill Avenue project is available on the MBTA's project page.

The Boston Region MPO has worked over the last few years to expand its research and resources to support expanding the region's protected bike lane network. The Active Transportation Gap Analysis and Needs Assessment is an ongoing project that identifies the highest priority gaps in the biking and walking networks within the region and each municipality. Later this fiscal year, the MPO will kick off the development of its Active Transportation Regional Plan, which will examine how to address physical gaps in the network, bikeshare, bike lane maintenance, bike parking, and opportunities to collaborate to improve active transportation policy.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Anne McKinnon – Boston resident

The MPO should not endorse TIP Amendment 1 and Long-Range Transportation Plan Amendment 2, the "Blue Hill Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project." Although the proponent is not seeking MPO money for the project and the project is not rated as others would be, the MPO has an obligation as "stewards for federal funding" and with a goal to "promote a transparent public process through collaboration" to endorse projects that meet high standards.

The Blue Hill Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project "planning" process was a bag job from the beginning. The consultant the MBTA ultimately selected included this in its proposal:

"The planning and design assessment will evaluate the feasibility, benefits, and impacts of the following project elements, as appropriate:
Through concept design, multiple transit priority options, including:

Exclusive center median bus lanes and center median bus
Side running bus lanes and enhanced boarding areas."

But there was never a serious analysis of any improvement other than the center busway. Multiple requests have been made by the community for the analysis of other alternatives and none has ever been provided. The public process was manipulated to speed the center busway along and secure FTA permission to enter Project Development. The lack of real planning, meaningful public involvement and true analysis of alternatives should make the MPO pause this project. The MBTA and the City should not be rewarded for essentially doing the same thing the 1960s highway engineers did: claim they have one solution to the congestion problem and never study anything else. NEPA requires that "all reasonable alternatives…be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated" and the MPO should require nothing less. Alternatives for Blue Hill Avenue weren't studied in detail; the proponent should be asked to do this now before the MPO endorses this project.

The MBTA has not shown that it has done the work with the community to ensure the proposed project is the right project for the corridor. The Amendments should not be endorsed.

MPO Staff Response to Anne McKinnon

Hello Anne,

MPO staff shared your comments with our colleagues at the MBTA and the City of Boston. They have provided additional information about the alternatives evaluation and safety improvements incorporated into the Blue Hill Avenue project.

The locally preferred alternative for the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan emerged from two concepts advanced by the City of Boston in Summer 2023 (link). The concepts were evaluated using a decision matrix in Fall 2023 (link), and in February 2024, the City announced its decision to advance a center-running bus lane option as part of the corridor improvements (link). The MBTA also presented traffic analyses for the current design at the September 2026 Open Houses, which are available here (link). These analyses were informed in part by additional studies conducted by the MBTA in 2023 (link) and 2025 (link) that demonstrated a connection between increased safety along the Columbus Avenue corridor following implementation of the bus lanes compared to other similar roadways in the neighborhood, including Blue Hill Avenue.

Further decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and City of Boston, and design feedback received through our public comment process has been shared with those partners. For further questions and

comments about the project design, we encourage you to contact the MBTA directly at bluehillave@mbta.com and the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

We thank you again for your comments, and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Jeffrey Sarin – Member of the public

To Boston Region MPO:

I am herein requesting that the Boston Region MPO not approve the pending amendments that would adopt the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan into the LRTP and the TIP.

Please see the attached file for my comments/questions.

Thank you very much,
Jeffrey Sarin, P.E.

(See the attached letter on the next page.)

I am in full opposition to the center-running bus lane project that the City of Boston and MBTA (the "Sponsors") are proposing. Therefore, **I am herein requesting that the Boston Region MPO <u>not</u> approve the pending amendments that would adopt the MBTA's Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan into the LRTP and the TIP.**

My opposition is based on several fundamental concerns not only with the design and public engagement processes that have occurred to date but also with the design basis itself.

<u>Please have the Sponsors provide written response to the below set of comments/questions.</u>

1. <u>Conceptual Design and Small Starts Process</u>
   A. The Sponsors have not performed a full feasibility and planning study that evaluates the proposed center-running bus lanes in conjunction with other transit options -- such as light rail and heavy rail -- and in turn provides guidance for the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative. Instead, with the center-running bus lanes as the sole project concept under evaluation, the Sponsors elected to move forward and designate the center-running bus lanes as the Locally Preferred Alternative.
   B. The Sponsors requested entry into Project Development (PD) – and FTA approved the request – even though the Sponsors had failed to initiate a feasibility and planning study as required under the Small Starts process.
   C. FTA does not consider Small Starts PD complete until the project sponsor accomplishes a number of required tasks, including adoption of the proposed project into the LRTP. The completion of PD coincides with a sponsor's request for a project rating. Given that the adoption into the LRTP is still outstanding, it is unclear why the MBTA elected to request a project rating in August 2025.

2. <u>Public Engagement</u>
   A. There was no opportunity for the community to provide input on a preferred transit concept. The Sponsors began the public engagement process with center-running bus lanes as the only option.
   B. Since the early phases of public engagement occurred during COVID, much of the community was unaware that virtual meetings were taking place or that a transit project was even being proposed for Blue Hill Ave.
   C. The September 2026 public meetings all occurred on weekday evenings, thereby precluding participation from a large segment of the neighborhood population that is comprised of shift workers. The Sponsors should have scheduled some of the meetings for weekends and/or daytime weekday hours.
   D. The September 2026 public meetings did not include ample time for public comment, as not everyone who signed up to speak was given an opportunity to speak, and those who did speak were limited to two minutes. Further, at the 9/30/26 meeting, there was an option to submit written comments that would in turn be read and responded to

during the meeting. However, time constrains prevented many of the written comments from being recognized. Yet there was no acknowledgement by the Sponsors that they would endeavor to publicly post responses to the unread comments. This is inconsistent with a public engagement process that is purported to be fair and fully transparent.

E. I am aware of one person who was told that they could not sign up to provide public comment at the 9/30/26 public meeting because they were not a Boston resident. This would appear to violate applicable public meeting laws.

F. The Sponsors are proposing to reduce the number of bus stops between Mattapan Square and Grove Hall by fifty percent. This is a significant change that reflects a total paradigm shift in bus service delivery along the corridor. Yet the sponsors did not publicly acknowledge this fundamental service change until the 9/30/26 public meeting and only did so when an attendee directly pressed them on the subject during the public comment period. (*The written materials and presentations to date had only spoken to the number of proposed bus stops rather than affirmatively indicating that this represents a fifty percent reduction from the existing service delivery*.) This lack of full transparency undermines the credibility of the engagement process.

G. There has been a lack of transparency regarding the federal funding for the project. In fact, the Sponsor's presentation materials for the September 2026 meetings include a slide with a project timeline indicating that the $80.3M Small Starts Grant has been "*awarded*". To date, however, the said funds have only been *allocated* by Congress.

H. The community has expressed resounding opposition to the project for quite some time, and this opposition was reiterated during the September 2026 public meetings. Councilors Culpepper and Worrell, who represent the very districts impacted by the subject project, have similarly been unwavering in their opposition to the project for many years.

I. Nearly every public comment expressed during the 10/1/26 Boston Region MPO Board Meeting was in full opposition to the project. The only favorable comments came from individuals representing non-profit advocacy groups, many of whom likely do not live in the neighborhoods of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan

3. <u>Basis of Design</u>

A. The Sponsors are projecting that the project will result in a 10 to 15-minute shorter bus trip along Blue Hill Ave between Mattapan Square and Grove Hall; however, many members of the public, including myself, are of the opinion that the overall time savings will be markedly less. Accordingly, the entire basis of the project is questionable if the time savings for the average rider is actually closer to 5 minutes. Why spend scarce taxpayer money and saddle small businesses with several years of significant construction impacts if the time savings is only marginal? The basis for questioning the time savings is summarized below:

I. The higher end of the projected time savings (i.e. 15 minutes) is likely applicable to a southbound trip from Grove Hall to Mattapan Square, since the proposed roadway upgrades will allow a bus to turn left directly into Mattapan Station rather than having to proceed further southbound over the river and then make a U-turn as is the case today. *This 5-minute time savings via a new left-turn lane for buses could alternatively be realized as part of a near-term, standalone safety improvement project*.

II. Since the proposed project will reduce the number of bus stops by fifty percent, many riders will have to travel significantly further to reach a bus stop, thereby increasing their non-bus travel times even though the actual trip times on the bus may be shorter.

B. The Sponsors are effectively replacing the existing local bus service with Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) given the major reduction in the number of bus stops. As indicated above, this forces riders to walk further to reach a bus stop and will negatively impact our elderly and disabled populations. Have the Sponsors directly engaged these populations and specifically requested their comments in regard to the reduction in bus stops?

C. The proposed center-running bus lanes will require passengers to typically cross two lanes of vehicular traffic. This is particularly dangerous for our students as well as our elderly and disabled populations. Have the Sponsors directly engaged these populations and specifically requested their comments in regard to crossing two lanes of traffic?

D. The proposed design includes at least two travel lanes for thru traffic along seventy percent of the corridor but only one travel lane for thru traffic along the remaining thirty percent of the corridor. Thirty percent is not insignificant in the context of a dense, urban corridor, and as such, traffic congestion is a major concern in these areas of single-lane thru-traffic. Will the sponsors release the traffic analysis?

E. While school buses will continue to pick up and drop off at curbside, the Sponsors have indicated that school buses will use the proposed center bus lanes when traveling between the curbside stops. Allowing school buses to constantly enter and exit the bus lanes is a dangerous policy.

F. The Sponsors have stated that the proposed design "does not preclude future rail." However, examination of the current design reveals that it does not incorporate reasonable provisions for a future light rail project at grade -- one of many transit options that the Sponsors should have considered from the start as part of a feasibility and planning study. Examples of these design exclusions include platform locations and configurations that do not properly accommodate light rail vehicles. Accordingly, a future light rail project would then have to incur additional construction activities that would not be necessary if the currently-proposed project had incorporated the said provisions into its design.

G. The general safety concerns surrounding center-running bus lanes are not merely hypothetical, as there is actual supporting evidence in this regard – accident data and neighborhood complaints -- from the Columbus Ave center-running bus lane project. In fact, in late September of this year the Sponsors actually acknowledged in a 1-page primer that there are design shortcomings in the Columbus Ave project and that they are incorporating these 'lessons learned' into the subject Blue Hill Ave project. One should ask why they didn't get it right the first time and how they can be sure that they'll get it right the second time. Notwithstanding, the recent announcement that the planned Phase 2 of the Columbus Ave bus lane project will now pivot from center-running to curb-running bus lanes leads one to reasonably conclude that there are indeed inherent problems with center-running bus lanes in a dense, urban corridor.

H. The project fails to address the immediate need for safety improvements along the Blue Hill Ave corridor. The community simply cannot wait until the project is completed – likely at least four years from now – for safety improvements. The Sponsors should have taken a more proactive approach to safety by developing an early construction package solely for safety improvements that could be advertised well in advance of the balance of the project scope.

I. As indicated above, the Sponsor failed to evaluate the feasibility of other transit alternatives. In addition to the aforementioned examples of light rail and heavy rail, consideration should have been given to the addition of limited-stop side-running service and express-stop side-running service for several of the bus routes that travel along Blue Hill Ave. These types of service additions would 1) likely result in similar, if not better, time savings, 2) incur a fractional amount of the capital costs, and 3) have minimal construction impacts on traffic and area businesses.

(As a point of comparison, it should be noted that the travel time from Mattapan Square to Ruggles via an extension of the Orange Line is estimated to take only 17 minutes, whereas the existing Route 28 bus currently takes approximately 51 minutes during the morning rush hour.)

4. <u>Next Steps</u>

A. In light of the concerns and opposition highlighted herein, I am respectfully advocating for the Sponsors to pause the project to allow for the funding and execution of a feasibility study that evaluates center-running bus lanes in conjunction with other transit options that include, but are not limited to, light rail service at grade, light rail service in a tunnel, and heavy rail service in a tunnel (as has been proposed by Councilors Culpepper and Worrell). Time is of the essence to implement a pause, as it is estimated that the monthly spend rate for the project's engineering consultant is several hundred thousand dollars.

B. Further, I am respectfully advocating that the Sponsors implement the following near-term actions for the Blue Hill Ave Corridor:

I. Implement safety improvements, traffic signal priority for buses, a dedicated left-turn lane into Mattapan Station for southbound buses, and incremental beautification updates. This will likely comprise a combination of a standalone construction package for advertisement, self-performed work, and subcontracted work through existing contracts.
II. Enforce regulations prohibiting double-parking.
III. Enforce speed limits.
IV. Consider the addition of limited-stop side-running bus service and express-stop side-running bus service.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter.

MPO Staff Response to Jeffrey Sarin

Hello Jeffrey,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The MPO Board will decide whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Your comment will be part of the record the MPO Board considers in making that decision.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston. Design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with the MBTA and the City of Boston.

Since your comment letter requested written responses to questions directed at the MBTA and the City of Boston, we have copied staff from the MBTA and the City of Boston on this email. Copied on this message are Yarlennys Villaman, Director of Capital and Community Relations at the MBTA, and City of Boston Transportation Department staff leading the Blue Hill Ave project. Yarlennys and City of Boston staff will follow up with you on responses to your other questions.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments about the MPO process, and thank you again for your feedback.

Mary Brady – Boston resident

First priority is to provide safety and comfort features along the streets traveled that include improved and expanded lighting, crosswalk lights, covered areas when waiting for transportation,

Speed bumps, enforcement against double parking, and supports for businesses during construction. People who rent or own their home in the greater surrounding area must receive protections against increased rents and taxes due to gentrification when the transportation is improved.

Let's do it correctly, building upon the neighborhood and retaining its residents!

MPO Staff Response to Mary Brady

Hello Mary,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The MPO Board will decide whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Your comment will be part of the record the MPO Board considers in making that decision.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston. Design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with the MBTA and the City of Boston. We encourage you to contact the MBTA project team directly at bluehillave@mbta.com if you have feedback or questions about the design. More information about the Blue Hill Avenue project is available on the MBTA's project page.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar. You can find details on Amendment Two to the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the related Amendment One to the Transportation Improvement Program here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

John Smith-St. Cyere – J.L Smith Suicide Prevention Center for Young Black Boys Inc

See attached file

(See the attached letter on the next page.)

Blue Hill Avenue Public Comment

Request to defer Destination 2050 Amendment Two and TIP Amendment One

I request that the Boston Region MPO Board defer approval of Destination 2050 Amendment Two and FFYs 2027–31 TIP Amendment One concerning Blue Hill Avenue. Please enter this submission into the public-comment record for both amendments.

Before voting, please provide written responses to the following questions and make the supporting documents publicly available.

1. What independent evaluation has the MPO conducted to determine whether this project should advance? If approval is being treated as a procedural requirement, what authority makes it mandatory? What findings would justify withholding approval?

2. When did center-running bus lanes become a condition of the proposed project or its funding? During subsequent community engagement, could residents still influence the choice between center-running lanes and other configurations, or only details within the selected design? Please provide the dated decision record.

3. What evidence distinguishes community support for investment in Blue Hill Avenue from support specifically for center-running bus lanes? Please release the underlying surveys, questions, and response data. Explain how objections raised before and during the COVID-era engagement process were incorporated into the final recommendation.

4. What analysis established that center-running lanes were preferable to curbside lanes or targeted transit-priority improvements? Please publish the alternatives comparison, including costs and neighborhood impacts. How were requests for rail investment evaluated, and would this construction preserve or complicate future rail options?

5. Has FTA issued a written determination that changing the center-running configuration would cause the loss of the $15 million RAISE grant? If so, please publish it. If not, has a scope amendment been formally requested, and on what basis have alternative designs been described as jeopardizing funding?

6. FTA's October 27, 2026 response to FOIA request FY26-00216 states that it could not locate a categorical-exclusion worksheet or checklist and does not believe one exists. What specific evidence supports the environmental determination, and what findings from the TrAMS record justify advancing the current project? Please identify the exclusion provision used, the project scope reviewed, and the impacts evaluated. If the MPO has not reviewed these records, explain the basis for proceeding without them.

7. What changes have occurred between the project reviewed in 2022 and the current proposal? Has FTA determined whether the original environmental clearance remains valid for the current design? Please provide that determination and any supporting reevaluation.

8. What is the documented basis for the project's status under MEPA? Please identify any filing or determination addressing applicable review requirements, including environmental-justice provisions. If no filing was required, please provide the written basis for that conclusion.

9. What studies support the claims that this design will improve traffic conditions, reduce emissions, and accelerate emergency response? Please publish the full traffic analysis, including projected intersection delays and diversion onto residential streets. What assumptions were made about bus frequency and future fleet electrification, and are those assumptions supported by funded commitments?

10. What analysis evaluates access to center platforms for children, older adults, and people with disabilities? Please identify the proposed crossing times, accessibility findings, and safety assessment. How were the experiences of people who would use these crossings incorporated?

11. The MPO's October 1 memorandum lists $80.3 million in Small Starts funding as requested, while the City has stated that more than $124 million in project funding is secured. Please reconcile these statements. For each funding source, identify the amount and whether it is requested, recommended, awarded, or obligated. What supports the finding of fiscal constraint if anticipated funding is unavailable, and who is responsible for cost overruns?

12. What assessment addresses residential displacement, commercial displacement, and business losses during construction? Which protections have committed funding and an accountable implementing agency? Please distinguish funded commitments from pending legislation, bond authorizations, or proposals.

13. Which sidewalk repairs, safer crossings, and streetscape improvements can proceed independently while the center-running configuration receives further review? What specific funding restrictions prevent separating those improvements, and has an alternative funding approach been evaluated?

14. How will the MPO demonstrate that it considered and responded to substantive objections raised during this comment period, including testimony at the October 1 meeting? Will the Board publish its responses before voting and provide additional review time if essential studies or materially revised information become available after the deadline?

I request written responses to each numbered question, supported by identifiable records. Where another agency holds the information, please identify that agency and obtain its response before the Board acts.

Please defer both amendments until these issues are addressed and the public has a meaningful opportunity to review the supporting information. If a funding deadline is offered as a reason against deferral, please identify the exact deadline and publish the document establishing it.

Please distribute this complete submission to every MPO Board member and confirm its inclusion in the public-comment records for both amendments.

MPO Staff Response to John Smith-St. Cyere

Dear John,

Thank you for your comment letter regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Below are responses to your questions asked of the MPO and on matters the MPO is involved in.

1. What independent evaluation has the MPO conducted to determine whether this project should advance? If approval is being treated as a procedural requirement, what authority makes it mandatory? What findings would justify withholding approval?

- The MPO Board is considering whether to add the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan to the MPO's LRTP and TIP. In order for a transportation project to receive federal funding from any source, it is required that the project be listed in both plans. Since the Blue Hill Avenue project is not seeking funds through the MPO's regionally prioritized program at this time, we do not apply our project scoring methodology that guides decisions about investments of MPO-directed funding. The MPO includes federally funded projects in the LRTP and TIP if they are consistent with the agency's goals and objectives as outlined in the LRTP.

2. FTA's October 27, 2026 response to FOIA request FY26-00216 states that it could not locate a categorical-exclusion worksheet or checklist and does not believe one exists. What specific evidence supports the environmental determination, and what findings from the TrAMS record justify advancing the current project? Please identify the exclusion provision used, the project scope reviewed, and the impacts evaluated. If the MPO has not reviewed these records, explain the basis for proceeding without them.

- This question references an FTA process that is independent of the MPO's processes for inclusion in the LRTP and TIP. It is the FTA's to determine eligibility, compliance, and necessary milestones for projects within their program. The MBTA completed an environmental review process in 2022 and received a categorical exclusion determination for the Project, but the MPO does not require the environmental determination through the FTA process to be included in the LRTP and TIP process at this stage. For more information about the FTA process, please refer to their website and contact information or the contact that you already have with the FTA.

11. The MPO's October 1 memorandum lists $80.3 million in Small Starts funding as requested, while the City has stated that more than $124 million in project funding is secured. Please reconcile these statements. For each funding source, identify the amount and whether it is requested, recommended, awarded, or obligated. What supports the finding of fiscal constraint if anticipated funding is unavailable, and who is responsible for cost overruns?

- The project cost estimate cited in the MPO's October 1 memorandum reflects information provided to the FTA from the MBTA as project proponents in April 2026, representing the most recent cost estimate. This cost estimate includes the $80.3 million appropriated by Congress from the FTA's Core Capacity Small Starts program, $15 million from the FHWA under the RAISE grant in FFY 2021, $18.2 million from the City of Boston, $11 million in capital revenue from the MBTA, and $40 million requested from the Commonwealth Federal Matching and Debt Reduction Fund. This cost estimate is generated excluding expenses incurred prior to entry into the Small Starts program due to eligibility limitations. The submittal to the FTA is available at this link. Project proponents are responsible for identifying funding sources if a project exceeds its allocated amounts. Per regulation, a project is considered "fiscally constrained" if it is reasonably anticipated that funding can be identified to support the project.

14. How will the MPO demonstrate that it considered and responded to substantive objections raised during this comment period, including testimony at the October 1 meeting? Will the Board publish its responses before voting and provide additional review time if essential studies or materially revised information become available after the deadline?

- Written comments received during the public review period (October 2 to November 2), as well as responses to those comments, will be compiled and shared with the MPO Board in a document to be posted on the MPO calendar prior to the November 19 meeting when the Board is expected to take action on the amendments. Because the MPO's role in this process is limited to deciding whether to include the project in the LRTP and TIP, not matters of the project design or development process, we do not anticipate an extension of the public review period.

Since your comment letter requested written responses to questions directed at the MBTA and the City of Boston, we have copied staff from the MBTA and the City of Boston on this email.

Copied on this message are Yarlennys Villaman, Director of Capital and Community Relations at the MBTA, and City of Boston Transportation Department staff leading

the Blue Hill Ave project. Yarlennys and City of Boston staff will follow up with you on responses to your other questions.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Jeffrey Ferris – Boston resident

30 October 2026

To The Boston MPO:

The Blue Hill Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project is clearly not ready for the MPO to support it going forward for many reasons. My list of reasons follows.

The so-called community engagement over the last few years was severely flawed and was at best a “check-the box” process.

The community along this corridor is tired of so-called experts in City Hall trying to tell them what is good for them.

Today there is very little community support for the center bus lanes but there is a lot of opposition. The community of course supports the many safety and beautification perks that are also a part of this proposal. They can all be done with some other type of bus improvements.

There was not an open or thorough or transparent alternatives analysis. Alternatives need to include curbside bus lanes, express buses, center running street cars, underground subway, and more. The alternatives need to be looked at for both short term and long term options. For example bus lanes now and subway planning for down the road.

When it comes to complete streets, this project fails significantly with regard to bicycles. There is no specific bike accommodation through Mattapan Square; a section that maybe needs the most improvement in this whole corridor.

It also fails as a complete street with zero attempt to accommodate the needs of the growing micromobility sector - small powered vehicles that are faster than bikes but slower than cars.

The platforms for center bus lanes use too much space on the street. This is part of why there are not continuous bike lanes on both sides of the corridor. With curbside bus lanes the sidewalk efficiently provides this.

There is no thought given to how to get drivers out of cars. A rail solution would do this best.

A project of this magnitude should be thought of as what will be best here for the next 50 years. This means bicycles, micromobility, transit and motor vehicles all need to be accommodated. This proposed project falls far short.

The biased approach to selecting the LPA will doom the corridor with inadequate and unsafe bike facilities and little ability to attract new transit riders. Please do not approve this.

Jeffrey Ferris
Jamaica Plain

MPO Staff Response to Jeffrey Ferris

Hello Jeffrey,

MPO staff shared your comments with our colleagues at the MBTA and the City of Boston. They have provided additional information about the alternatives evaluation process for the Blue Hill Avenue project.

The locally preferred alternative for the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan emerged from two concepts advanced by the City of Boston in Summer 2023 (link). The concepts were evaluated using a decision matrix in Fall 2023 (link), and in February 2024, the City announced its decision to advance a center-running bus lane option as part of the corridor improvements (link). The MBTA also presented traffic analyses for the current design at the September 2026 Open Houses, which are available here (link). These analyses were informed in part by additional studies conducted by the MBTA in 2023 (link) and 2025 (link) that demonstrated a connection between increased safety along the Columbus Avenue corridor following implementation of the bus lanes compared to other similar roadways in the neighborhood, including Blue Hill Avenue.

Blue Hill Avenue will include bidirectional bike lanes and a shared use path to support low-stress connections to other existing trails and greenways in Franklin Park and the Neponset River Greenway by way of Cummins Highway. These connections are detailed further in the 2026 open house presentation (link). Improvements to Mattapan Square were originally incorporated as part of a separate, albeit coordinated project funded through the federal Reconnecting Communities Grant Program under “Centering the RISE: Connecting People to a Healthy, Vibrant Mattapan Square”. The United States Department of Transportation rescinded this grant in 2025. We encourage you to reach out to City

of Boston staff at btd@boston.gov if you have questions as to the status of that project or other micromobility accommodations along the broader Blue Hill Avenue corridor.

Further decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and City of Boston, and design feedback received through our public comment process has been shared with those partners. For further questions and comments about the project design, we encourage you to contact the MBTA directly at bluehillave@mbta.com and the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

Your comments will be part of the record that the MPO Board considers in deciding whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's LRTP and TIP. The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

We thank you again for your comments, and please let us know if you have any further questions.

Name withheld at the commentor's request – Boston resident

Good evening,

I am a Blue Hill Avenue resident, and I wanted to share an essay and supporting addenda I prepared regarding the proposed Blue Hill Avenue project. I will be candid: I do not believe this project, as currently presented, is truly about neighborhood investment. In my opinion, it is more about Mayor Wu's legacy and how this project will be remembered during her administration. The problem is that changing the roadway does not automatically change the conditions people that live in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan face every day.

I understand that the City may still intend to move forward with the project. If that is the case, I believe there needs to be meaningful contingencies and commitments in place to protect the residents and businesses who will be affected. A few of my proposals include:

Transit Service Accountability: Establish measurable service standards for bus frequency and travel-time improvements, with public reporting and consequences when the promised service is not delivered. Any penalties or fees should be reinvested in the affected neighborhoods.
Resident Parking Solutions: Conduct a comprehensive parking study and establish free parking hubs for residents and businesses where existing curbside parking is removed or significantly reduced.
Local Business Participation: Give qualified businesses in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan meaningful opportunities to compete for project contracts and

subcontracting work, with transparent reporting on local business participation and hiring.
Construction Impact and Community Oversight: Require a clear plan to address construction-related disruptions, including business access, deliveries, parking, noise, and safety. Residents should also have a meaningful role in monitoring the project's commitments and how community benefits are delivered.

The attached essay and addenda provide the supporting information behind these concerns, including public safety, housing affordability, poverty, wages, employment, education, and local economic conditions. My position is simple: we should not have to choose between better transportation and better neighborhoods. We deserve both. I hope you will take the time to review the materials and consider these recommendations as the project moves forward.

I am submitting this as a concerned resident and respectfully request that my identity remain confidential. If any of the information or recommendations are used in future discussions, reports, or public statements, please identify the source only as a concerned resident of Boston or an anonymous Blue Hill Avenue resident, without disclosing my name or employment affiliation.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
A Concerned Blue Hill Avenue Resident

(See the attached letter on the next page.)

BLUE HILL AVENUE: A TRANSPORTATION PROJECT IS NOT A NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT

A Resident's Perspective on Accountability, Economic Opportunity, and the Future of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan

#MeninoWouldNevah

To the Mayor of Boston, Members of the Boston City Council, Massachusetts State Legislators, the MBTA Board of Directors, and other public officials responsible for decisions affecting the Blue Hill Avenue corridor:

I am writing as a concerned resident who believes that the future of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan deserves considerably more than a roadway reconstruction project presented as a generational investment in our neighborhoods.

The proposed Blue Hill Avenue project, extending from Warren Street in Grove Hall to River Street in Mattapan Square, has been promoted as a transformative investment intended to improve transportation, pedestrian safety, accessibility, beautification, bicycle infrastructure, and economic opportunity. Mayor Michelle Wu has described the project as a once-in-a-generation opportunity that will improve quality of life and create economic opportunities for residents and small businesses.

Those are admirable objectives. However, an important question remains unanswered: How does reconstructing a roadway address the underlying economic, educational, housing, employment, and public safety challenges that have affected these neighborhoods for generations?

A transportation improvement is not automatically a neighborhood investment. A more attractive street does not necessarily translate into more affordable housing, safer neighborhoods, better schools, sustainable employment, or economic mobility for the families who live here.
We should not confuse improvements to the physical appearance of a neighborhood with improvements to the lives of the people who call that neighborhood home.

I. WHAT THE CITY PROMISES: FIVE PRINCIPAL BENEFITS

The City and MBTA have presented several principal reasons for moving forward with the Blue Hill Avenue redesign:

1. Faster and more reliable public transportation.

The proposed center-running bus lanes are intended to reduce delays caused by general traffic and improve travel times for bus passengers. Mayor Wu has publicly discussed significantly

shorter travel times and more frequent bus service, including intervals of approximately three to six minutes.

2. Improved pedestrian safety and accessibility.

The proposed reconstruction includes new sidewalks, accessible curb ramps, crosswalks, traffic signals, and other improvements intended to make the corridor safer for pedestrians and individuals with disabilities.

3. Beautification and neighborhood improvements.

The updated proposal includes approximately 200 new street trees, new street lighting, reconstructed sidewalks, and other streetscape improvements.

4. Improved bicycle infrastructure.

The proposal includes a separated, sidewalk-level bicycle path intended to connect neighborhood cyclists with Franklin Park and improve bicycle access.

5. Economic support for businesses and commercial activity.

The City has promoted the project as an opportunity to support small businesses, improve commercial accessibility, and enhance the overall economic environment along Blue Hill Avenue.

I do not dispute that these improvements could provide benefits. What I dispute is the suggestion that these benefits, standing alone, constitute a comprehensive investment in the communities being affected.

Saving a commuter several minutes on a bus ride is beneficial. But what does saving ten or fifteen minutes accomplish for a resident who cannot find employment, is struggling to afford housing, is concerned about neighborhood violence, or has limited access to educational and vocational opportunities?

A reconstructed sidewalk does not resolve housing insecurity. Additional streetlights do not replace comprehensive violence-prevention programs. A bicycle path does not create career opportunities for young adults who need marketable skills and access to employment. These issues are not unrelated to neighborhood investment. They are central to it.

II. THE UNDERLYING ISSUES DESERVE THE SAME LEVEL OF INVESTMENT

Before committing more than $160 million to a transportation redesign, the City should be equally prepared to demonstrate how it is addressing the underlying conditions affecting the communities along this corridor.

Consider the following areas:

Housing affordability and residential stability

The City of Boston's 2025 Community Health Needs Assessment, using 2019–2023 American Community Survey data, identifies substantial housing cost burdens in the affected neighborhoods.

Approximately 57.3% of Roxbury renters, 54.5% of renters in parts of Dorchester, and 65.1% of Mattapan renters spend at least 30% of their household income on housing.
These figures demonstrate that housing affordability is not a peripheral concern. It is a major economic pressure facing residents.

What additional investment is being made to preserve affordable housing, prevent displacement, support first-time homeownership, and protect long-term residents from being priced out of their own neighborhoods?

Employment and economic opportunity

The City should be able to identify the number of residents in these neighborhoods who are unemployed, underemployed, or seeking opportunities to enter skilled trades and higher-paying occupations.

What investments are being made in vocational education, apprenticeships, professional certifications, workforce development, and partnerships with employers?

If public officials expect residents to become increasingly self-sufficient, they must also ensure that meaningful pathways to employment exist.

Education and opportunities for young people

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education reported that Boston Public Schools had a four-year graduation rate of 81.3% for the 2025 graduating cohort, compared with 89.3% statewide.

This is a citywide comparison, not a claim that every school in Roxbury, Dorchester, or Mattapan performs identically. However, it demonstrates why educational opportunity must remain part of any serious conversation about neighborhood investment.

What are we doing to strengthen public schools, improve access to career and technical education, expand after-school opportunities, and connect students to apprenticeships and employment?

Public safety and violence prevention

Residents deserve safe streets, safe homes, and safe commercial districts. That requires more than physical reconstruction.

What measurable investments are being made in violence prevention, youth intervention, community-based organizations, employment programs for at-risk young adults, and neighborhood-based public safety initiatives?

Public safety must be addressed through both accountability and prevention. Residents should not have to choose between attractive infrastructure and meaningful efforts to make their neighborhoods safer.

Economic stability and small-business development

The businesses along Blue Hill Avenue are part of the economic and cultural fabric of these neighborhoods.

What protections, financial assistance, construction mitigation, and economic development opportunities will be available to businesses that may experience reduced access, construction disruptions, or loss of customers during a project expected to take several years?

These are the questions that should accompany any announcement of a generational neighborhood investment.

III. WHERE IS THE MONEY GOING, AND WHO BENEFITS ECONOMICALLY?

The project has been publicly described as costing approximately $164 million, supported by a combination of federal, state, City of Boston, and MBTA funding.

According to reporting published by The Boston Globe in October 2026, the funding package includes approximately $95 million in federal grants, $40 million in state funding, $18 million in City funding, and $11 million from the MBTA.

That is a substantial public investment.

But residents should not be expected to accept a total project cost without knowing how the economic benefits of that expenditure will be distributed.

Who will receive the construction contracts? Which companies will perform the paving, electrical work, landscaping, tree planting, carpentry, masonry, glass installation, traffic signal work, accessibility improvements, and other services required to complete this project?

How many of those businesses are located in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan?

How many Boston residents will be hired? How many apprenticeships will be created? How many contracts will go to small, minority-owned, women-owned, and locally established businesses?

If the City is serious about neighborhood investment, it should make every reasonable effort to ensure that the money being spent in these neighborhoods also creates economic opportunities within them.

I propose the establishment of a **Blue Hill Avenue Local Business and Workforce Participation Initiative**.

Under this initiative:

1. The City and MBTA should conduct a comprehensive inventory of qualified, licensed, and appropriately insured businesses operating in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan.

2. Local businesses should receive advance notice of upcoming procurement opportunities, subcontracting opportunities, and project requirements.

3. Qualified local businesses should receive priority consideration where legally permissible, through transparent procurement procedures and appropriately structured evaluation criteria.

4. Construction contractors should be required to demonstrate meaningful outreach to qualified neighborhood businesses before awarding subcontracting opportunities elsewhere.

5. Local residents should have access to job training, apprenticeships, certifications, and employment opportunities connected directly to the project.

6. The City should publish quarterly reports identifying the dollar amount of contracts awarded to local businesses, the number of neighborhood residents hired, the number of apprenticeships created, and the percentage of project expenditures retained within the affected communities.

The work involved in this project extends well beyond heavy construction. Tree planting, landscaping, maintenance, carpentry, electrical work, signage, cleaning, glass installation, painting, masonry, accessibility improvements, and other specialized services may present opportunities for qualified local businesses.

The City already has an Equitable Procurement Initiative and a Boston Residents Jobs Policy. These existing programs demonstrate that public contracting can be used as a tool for economic mobility.

The question is why those principles should not be applied as comprehensively as legally possible to this particular investment.

Public money should create public opportunity.

IV. CONSTRUCTION DISRUPTION MUST NOT BECOME ANOTHER BURDEN PLACED ON RESIDENTS

The updated project is expected to begin construction no earlier than 2028, with construction potentially lasting up to three years.

Three years is not an insignificant inconvenience.

For residents, business owners, employees, customers, delivery drivers, emergency responders, and individuals who rely on the corridor every day, construction could create substantial disruption.

The City must explain how it intends to maintain access to businesses, residential properties, places of worship, schools, medical facilities, and other community institutions throughout construction.

A comprehensive construction mitigation plan should include:

- Clearly identified pedestrian routes and accessible pathways.
- Continued access for emergency vehicles.
- Designated loading and delivery arrangements for businesses.
- Advance notification of street closures and parking restrictions.
- Coordination with schools, community organizations, and places of worship.
- Construction schedules that minimize unnecessary disruption.
- Financial assistance or other appropriate relief for qualifying businesses experiencing demonstrable construction-related hardship.
- A designated community liaison responsible for receiving, documenting, and resolving resident and business complaints.

Residents should not have to spend three years navigating an increasingly inaccessible neighborhood while being told that the inconvenience is necessary for future improvements.

The people who live and work here deserve meaningful protections during the construction process, not simply promises about what the corridor will look like afterward.

V. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS MUST BE ACCOUNTABLE TO ALL COMMUTERS

The City's transportation argument places considerable emphasis on bus reliability and travel-time improvements.

However, the MBTA is not a feasible transportation solution for every commuter, and not every person traveling along Blue Hill Avenue is a bus passenger.

There are residents who drive to work, transport children, provide care to family members, work outside public transportation service hours, operate businesses, make deliveries, and travel to locations that are not adequately served by the MBTA.

Their transportation needs deserve equal consideration.

The City should publish independently verifiable traffic studies comparing existing and projected travel times for motorists, buses, and other roadway users.

Furthermore, if improved bus frequency is a principal justification for this project, the City and MBTA should establish measurable service commitments.

I propose a **Transit Performance and Community Accountability Agreement** requiring:

1. Publicly established minimum bus-frequency standards.

2. Monthly reporting of actual bus arrival intervals.

3. Reporting of missed and cancelled trips.

4. Measurement of scheduled versus actual travel times.

5. Public reporting of passenger ridership and service reliability.

6. Independent annual reviews of whether the promised improvements have materialized.

Where the MBTA repeatedly fails to meet agreed performance standards, predetermined financial remedies should apply through an enforceable agreement.

Any resulting financial remedies, credits, or agreed contributions should benefit the affected neighborhoods through a dedicated community reinvestment fund rather than simply becoming general municipal revenue.

That fund should be overseen by a community board with members selected through a transparent process involving residents of the affected neighborhoods.

The City should not be permitted to advertise a transportation benefit as a primary justification for a $160-million-plus investment without accepting responsibility for measuring whether that benefit is actually delivered.

VI. PARKING AND RESIDENTIAL ACCESS MUST BE PROTECTED

The updated design has been promoted as providing a net increase in parking spaces. However, an overall increase does not automatically mean that residents and businesses will have adequate access to the parking they currently depend on.

The City must evaluate where those spaces are located, when they are available, and whether they adequately address the parking needs of the people who live and work along the corridor.

A comprehensive parking impact assessment should include:

- An inventory of existing Blue Hill Avenue parking.
- Identification of residential properties without driveways, garages, or other off-street parking.
- An assessment of commercial parking demand.
- An assessment of parking on surrounding residential streets.
- Identification of potential spillover parking impacts.
- Evaluation of accessible parking requirements.
- Identification of suitable replacement parking areas.

I recommend examining at least three representative residential side streets in Dorchester and three in Mattapan, in addition to the Roxbury portion of the corridor where appropriate.

The purpose should be to understand how the removal, relocation, or restriction of existing parking could affect people who live beyond Blue Hill Avenue itself.

If vehicles are displaced from the avenue, they do not simply disappear. They move somewhere else.

Residents should not be forced into competition with displaced commuters, employees, delivery drivers, and business customers for the limited parking available on their residential streets.

Where the assessment demonstrates a need for replacement parking, the City should identify designated, accessible, and preferably free parking solutions for affected residents and businesses.

VII. NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT MUST INCLUDE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AND OPPORTUNITY

There is an additional issue that makes this conversation particularly important.
Federal policy changes have expanded work-related requirements for certain recipients of public assistance.

Massachusetts already administers SNAP work requirements for certain eligible adults. Beginning January 1, 2027, certain MassHealth members will also be subject to new federal community-engagement requirements, including qualifying employment, education, volunteer service, or approved training activities.

These changes make access to employment and workforce development programs even more important.

If residents are expected to meet additional employment and training requirements to maintain eligibility for public benefits, what is being done to ensure that they have realistic opportunities to satisfy those requirements?

The City should expand partnerships with community colleges, vocational schools, union apprenticeship programs, employers, and community-based organizations to create accessible pathways into skilled employment.

I propose that a portion of the broader community investment associated with this project be directed toward:

- Trade and vocational certification programs.
- Construction and infrastructure apprenticeships.
- Electrical, plumbing, carpentry, masonry, and other skilled trades.
- Commercial landscaping and horticultural training.
- CDL and transportation-related employment programs.
- Technology and administrative certification programs.
- Youth employment and summer workforce opportunities.
- Small-business development and entrepreneurship.
- Career placement and job-retention assistance.

These programs should prioritize residents of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan and should be designed to connect training directly with actual employment opportunities.

A resident should not have to leave their neighborhood to find a meaningful pathway to economic independence when public investment is already taking place in their own community.

VIII. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT MUST MEAN MORE THAN COUNTING ATTENDEES

The City has cited years of community engagement and public feedback as evidence that the project reflects neighborhood priorities.

However, public participation should not be measured solely by the number of meetings held, surveys distributed, or people who attended.

The City must demonstrate that it adequately reached the residents who will experience the most significant consequences of the project.

A citywide survey is not necessarily representative of the people who live directly along Blue Hill Avenue.

A person who lives in another part of Boston may have an opinion about the project, but that person does not necessarily experience the same parking limitations, business access concerns, construction disruption, or daily transportation conditions as someone living in the affected corridor.

I therefore request a geographically specific public-engagement report identifying:

1. How many respondents actually live within the project corridor and its surrounding neighborhoods.

2. How many respondents live elsewhere in Boston.

3. Whether respondents primarily drive, use public transportation, walk, or bicycle.

4. Whether respondents are homeowners, renters, or business owners, where voluntarily disclosed.

5. The concerns raised by residents and businesses.

6. Which concerns resulted in design changes.

7. Which concerns remain unresolved.

Public engagement must be more than an exercise in documenting that a meeting occurred. It must demonstrate that residents had a meaningful opportunity to influence decisions affecting their daily lives.

Residents who work long hours, have childcare responsibilities, or cannot attend evening meetings should not be effectively excluded from the decision-making process.
Online participation, accessible written submissions, multilingual outreach, and neighborhood-based engagement should remain available throughout the planning and construction process.

IX. WHAT A TRUE NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT SHOULD LOOK LIKE

I am not suggesting that sidewalks should remain deteriorated, streets should remain poorly lit, or transportation infrastructure should not improve.

Those improvements are needed.

However, I am challenging the notion that a roadway reconstruction should be presented as a substitute for the broader investments these neighborhoods deserve.

A genuine neighborhood investment should produce measurable improvements in several areas simultaneously:

- More affordable and stable housing.
- Greater access to sustainable employment.
- Stronger public schools and educational opportunities.
- Expanded vocational and trade programs.
- Effective violence-prevention initiatives.
- Stronger small businesses and local ownership.
- Accessible and reliable transportation.
- Safer and more accessible streets.
- Economic opportunities for existing residents.
- Meaningful community participation and accountability.

These goals should not be treated as competing interests.

A neighborhood can have improved sidewalks and still struggle with housing insecurity. It can have beautiful landscaping and still lack adequate employment opportunities. It can have faster buses and still have residents who cannot afford to live there.

We must stop treating the physical appearance of a neighborhood as the primary measure of its success.

The people who live in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan deserve more than an attractive corridor. They deserve opportunities to build wealth, raise families, obtain an education, establish businesses, and remain in the communities they helped build.

X. MY REQUEST TO CITY AND STATE LEADERSHIP

If the City and MBTA intend to proceed with the Blue Hill Avenue project, I urge elected officials to demand more than assurances that the finished roadway will be safer, more attractive, and more efficient for transit riders.

Before moving forward, residents deserve:

1. A transparent accounting of all project funding, contracts, subcontractors, and expenditures.

2. A meaningful local business procurement and participation initiative.

3. Enforceable local workforce development and employment commitments.

4. A comprehensive construction mitigation plan.

5. A residential and commercial parking impact assessment.

6. Measurable transportation performance standards and independent reporting.

7. A community reinvestment mechanism with resident oversight.

8. A public report addressing the broader economic, educational, housing, and public safety needs of the affected neighborhoods.

If this project is truly a generational investment, then its benefits should extend beyond the roadway itself.

The City should be able to demonstrate not only how many trees were planted, how many sidewalks were reconstructed, or how many minutes were removed from a bus trip, but also how many local businesses received contracts, how many residents secured employment, how many individuals obtained certifications, and how much economic opportunity remained within these neighborhoods.

We should not have to choose between better transportation and better neighborhoods. We deserve both.

The people of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan are not simply commuters passing through a transportation corridor. We are residents, homeowners, renters, parents, workers, business owners, taxpayers, and members of communities with longstanding needs that cannot be resolved through cosmetic improvements alone.

If public officials are prepared to invest more than $160 million in reconstructing our avenue, they should also be prepared to invest in the people who live along it.

A neighborhood is not transformed simply because its streets look different.

It is transformed when the lives of the people who live there improve.

Respectfully,

A Concerned Resident of the Blue Hill Avenue Community

#MeninoWouldNevah

ADDENDUM A

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT

Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan | Boston Police Districts B-2, B-3, and C-11 | 2024–2025

Purpose

This addendum supports Sections II, IX, and X of Blue Hill Avenue: A Transportation Project Is Not a Neighborhood Investment by examining reported crime trends and community safety concerns in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan.

The objective is not to portray these neighborhoods negatively or disregard improvements in public safety. Rather, it is to demonstrate why sustained violence prevention, youth development, and measurable public safety investments should remain part of any comprehensive neighborhood improvement strategy.

1. Reported Crime Trends in the Affected Communities

The Boston Police Department (BPD) publishes district-level Part One Crime statistics covering major violent and property offenses.

Its December 28, 2025, report provides the following comparisons:

Police district	2024	2025	Change
B-2: Roxbury	2,056	2,124	+3%
B-3: Mattapan	1,400	1,567	+12%
C-11: Dorchester	2,194	1,962	-11%

Source: *Boston Police Department, Part One Crime and Firearm Overview, December 28, 2025. [1]*

2. Firearm Violence and Community Safety

According to the BPD's December 2025 shooting report, Boston recorded 122 shooting victims in 2025, compared with 127 during the corresponding 2024 reporting period, a decrease of approximately 4%. These are citywide figures and reflect progress in reducing firearm violence. [2]

The Boston Public Health Commission's 2025 Community Health Needs Assessment provides important additional context.

Although violence ranked sixteenth among concerns across community survey respondents overall, it ranked more prominently among respondents in **Roxbury** and **Mattapan**. Lower crime and violence also ranked among the five leading factors identified by Black and Latinx respondents as important to improving quality of life and health. [3]

3. Public Safety as a Neighborhood Investment

A comprehensive neighborhood investment strategy should consider:

- Violence prevention: Sustained support for community-based intervention, conflict resolution, and violence-prevention organizations.
- Youth development: Expanded mentorship, recreational programs, after-school activities, and summer employment.
- Workforce opportunities: Apprenticeships, vocational training, and employment pathways for young adults, including individuals at increased risk of involvement in violence.
- Community partnerships: Coordination among residents, schools, local organizations, public health agencies, and law enforcement.
- Accountability: Public reporting of neighborhood-level safety trends, prevention funding, program participation, and measurable outcomes.

4. Recommended Requests to City Leadership

To ensure that public safety remains a measurable component of neighborhood investment, residents should request that the City of Boston:

1. Publish consistent neighborhood-level crime data. Provide comparable 2023–2025 statistics for B-2, B-3, and C-11, including shootings and other violent offenses, with geographic information identifying conditions along and near the Blue Hill Avenue corridor.

2. Disclose public safety and prevention expenditures. Identify existing and proposed funding for violence prevention, youth intervention, community-based organizations, and related programs serving Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan.

3. Report participation and outcomes. Publish available information on the number of neighborhood residents served by youth employment, mentorship, violence-prevention, and workforce development programs, together with measurable outcomes where appropriate.

4. Establish ongoing public accountability. Provide annual neighborhood-level updates on public safety conditions, investments, and progress, with opportunities for residents to identify concerns and evaluate results.

These requests are not intended to redirect transportation funding in violation of applicable grant restrictions. Rather, they seek transparency regarding the City's broader investments and priorities in the communities affected by the proposed reconstruction.

Sources and References

[1] *Boston Police Department. Part One Crime and Firearm Overview, December 28, 2025. District-level Part One Crime statistics and violent offense comparisons.*

https://police.boston.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Pages-from-Weekly-Crime-Overview_-12-28-25.pdf

[2] *Boston Police Department. Persons Shot Incidents, December 28, 2025. Citywide fatal and nonfatal shooting victim comparisons.*

https://police.boston.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Pages-from-Weekly-Crime-Overview_-12-28-25-2.pdf

[3] *Boston Public Health Commission / Boston Community Health Collaborative. 2025 Boston Community Health Needs Assessment, community safety and violence findings, p. 96.*

https://www.boston.gov/sites/default/files/file/2025/07/2025%20Boston%20CHNA-Final%20Report_6.27.25.pdf

ADDENDUM B

LOCAL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION, PUBLIC PROCUREMENT, AND ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT

Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan

Purpose

Section III of the accompanying essay, ***Blue Hill Avenue: A Transportation Project Is Not a Neighborhood Investment***, raises a fundamental question: Where is the money going, and who benefits economically?

With approximately $164 million proposed for the reconstruction of Blue Hill Avenue, residents deserve to know whether that investment will create meaningful economic opportunities for the businesses and workers in the neighborhoods most directly affected.

I. EXISTING PROCUREMENT POLICIES AND ECONOMIC DISPARITIES

The City of Boston already recognizes public procurement as a means of expanding economic opportunity through its Equitable Procurement Initiative and Department of Supplier Diversity. [2]

The City's 2020 Disparity Study, examining contracts awarded between 2014 and 2019, identified significant differences between business availability and actual contracting participation: [1]

- Minority- and women-owned businesses were estimated to be available for approximately 16.9% of City contract and procurement dollars.
- Those businesses received approximately 11% of discretionary contracting dollars.
- Minority-owned businesses received approximately 2.5%.
- Black-owned businesses received approximately 0.4%.

These figures demonstrate that the availability of qualified businesses does not necessarily translate into equitable contracting opportunities.

On June 30, 2026, Mayor Michelle Wu signed an executive order extending the City's equitable procurement goals and supporting an updated disparity study. The extension allows the City to continue establishing contract-specific minority- and women-owned business participation goals on applicable construction projects. [3]

However, an important distinction remains: A contract awarded to a minority- or women-owned business does not necessarily mean that the business is located in Roxbury, Dorchester, or Mattapan.

The City should therefore examine geographic participation separately from existing supplier diversity classifications.

The relevant question is not simply whether diverse businesses receive contracts, but whether qualified businesses operating within the affected communities have meaningful opportunities to participate.

II. PROPOSED BLUE HILL AVENUE LOCAL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE

As recommended in **Section III** of the original essay, I propose establishing a project-specific initiative with the following components.

1. Identify qualified neighborhood businesses.

Before major procurement decisions are finalized, the City and MBTA should develop an inventory of businesses located in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan that may be qualified to perform project-related work.

Potential categories include construction, masonry, electrical services, landscaping, tree maintenance, carpentry, painting, signage, printing, equipment rental, transportation, and site cleaning.

The City's Certified Business Directory and Massachusetts Supplier Diversity Office resources could serve as starting points, supplemented by direct neighborhood outreach. [4][5]

2. Provide advance contracting opportunities.

Local businesses should receive accessible information about anticipated contracts, subcontracting packages, project schedules, licensing requirements, insurance requirements, and bidding deadlines.

Where practical and legally permissible, larger contracts should be structured to allow qualified smaller businesses to compete for appropriate portions of the work.

3. Establish measurable local participation targets.

The City should assess available neighborhood business capacity and establish a publicly reported local participation target before applicable construction contracts are awarded.

Contractors should document outreach efforts, subcontracting opportunities offered, and the reasons qualified local businesses were or were not selected.

Any geographic preferences, evaluation criteria, or participation requirements must comply with applicable procurement laws and funding conditions.

4. Connect contracts to neighborhood employment.

Consistent with **Section VII** of the original essay, the initiative should also connect qualified residents to employment, apprenticeships, and vocational training associated with the project.

Partnerships with union apprenticeship programs, vocational institutions, community colleges, and workforce organizations should begin before construction, allowing residents time to obtain necessary qualifications.

III. PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT

The City should not measure the economic success of this project solely by the number of contracts awarded or the amount spent.

It should measure how much of that spending directly benefits the communities experiencing the construction.

I recommend quarterly public reporting that identifies:

- Total project expenditures and contracts awarded.
- Dollar value and percentage of contracts and subcontracts awarded to businesses located in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan.
- Participation by certified minority-owned, women-owned, small, and small local businesses.
- Number of neighborhood residents hired.
- Number of apprenticeships, training placements, and certifications supported.
- Progress toward established local business and workforce participation targets.

Reporting should distinguish between businesses physically located in the affected neighborhoods, businesses owned by neighborhood residents, and businesses qualifying under existing supplier diversity certifications.

The City and MBTA should also clarify which entity controls each procurement and which City, state, federal, or MBTA contracting requirements apply.

This is particularly important because the project involves multiple public funding sources and potentially different contracting authorities.

IV. QUESTIONS CITY AND STATE LEADERSHIP SHOULD ANSWER

Before major construction contracts are awarded, residents deserve clear answers to the following:

1. Contract opportunities: What prime contracts and subcontracting packages are anticipated, and what is their estimated dollar value?

2. Local business capacity: How many qualified businesses operating in Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan have been identified, and how will additional businesses be invited to participate?

3. Procurement commitments: What legally permissible local business participation targets, subcontracting requirements, and outreach standards will apply?

4. Workforce development: How many employment, apprenticeship, and training opportunities are projected for residents of the affected neighborhoods?

5. Economic accountability: How will the City publicly document the percentage of project spending retained within Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan?

These questions should be answered before procurement decisions eliminate opportunities for meaningful neighborhood participation.

Neighborhood investment should be measured not only by what is constructed, but also by who receives the economic opportunity to construct it.

SOURCES AND REFERENCES

[1] City of Boston, 2020 Disparity Study, BBC Research & Consulting, published 2021.
https://www.boston.gov/sites/default/files/file/2021/02/2020%20City%20of%20Boston%20Disparity%20Study%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

[2] City of Boston, Equitable Procurement Initiative.
https://content.boston.gov/departments/procurement/equitable-procurement-initiative

[3] City of Boston, 2020 Disparity Study: A Tool Towards Equitable Procurement, including June 30, 2026 executive order information.
https://www.boston.gov/government/cabinets/economic-opportunity-and-inclusion/disparity-study-tool-towards-equitable-procurement

[4] City of Boston, Supplier Diversity and Certification Resources.
https://search.boston.gov/permitting/permits/supplier-diversity-certification?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[5] Massachusetts Supplier Diversity Office, Certified Diverse Business Dashboard.
https://www.mass.gov/info-details/sdo-certified-diverse-business-dashboard

ADDENDUM C

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS, HOUSING AFFORDABILITY, AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan

Purpose

The proposed Blue Hill Avenue reconstruction is being presented as a major investment in the surrounding communities. However, improvements to transportation infrastructure should not be mistaken for improvements in residents' overall economic conditions.

This addendum summarizes publicly available data on poverty, household income, housing affordability, employment, education, and community-identified priorities. These findings provide a foundation for evaluating whether the project represents meaningful neighborhood investment beyond roadway improvements.

1. Poverty and Household Income

The City of Boston Planning Department's Boston in Context: Neighborhoods 2025 reports the following poverty figures: [1]

Area	Residents in Poverty	Poverty Rate
Roxbury	14,561	27.8%
Dorchester	24,193	19.9%
Mattapan	3,778	15.8%
Boston overall	118,866	17.8%

The 2025 Boston Community Health Needs Assessment, using American Community Survey data from 2019–2023, reports the following median household incomes: [2]

Area	Median Household Income
Roxbury	$47,921
Dorchester (02121/02125)	$58,681
Dorchester (02122/02124)	$80,598
Mattapan	$67,206

Boston overall	$94,755

Note: Dorchester income figures reflect the ZIP-code groupings used in the assessment.

For comparison, the 2026 Boston-area median family income benchmark for a four-person household is $164,600. This regional Area Median Income (AMI) figure is used in housing-program calculations and should not be confused with actual neighborhood median household income. [3]

These figures demonstrate why neighborhood-specific economic conditions must be considered when discussing investment, affordability, and displacement.

2. Housing Affordability

According to the 2025 Boston Community Health Needs Assessment, the following percentages of renter households spend at least 30% of their income on housing: [2]

Area	Cost-Burdened Renters
Roxbury	57.3%
Dorchester (02121/02125)	55.6%
Dorchester (02122/02124)	54.5%
Mattapan	65.1%
Boston overall	50.2%

These figures demonstrate that housing affordability remains a significant concern, particularly in Mattapan, where nearly two-thirds of renter households are considered housing-cost burdened.

The City should provide current neighborhood-level information on rental costs, affordable housing availability, housing instability, and potential residential or commercial displacement associated with construction and subsequent development.

3. Employment and Economic Opportunity

The City of Boston Planning Department reports the following labor-force participation rates among residents age 16 and older: [1]

Area	Labor-Force Participation

Roxbury	61.6%
Dorchester	68.4%
Mattapan	68.4%
Boston overall	69.4%

Labor-force participation measures the share of residents who are employed or actively seeking employment. It is not the unemployment rate.

These findings reinforce the importance of ensuring that public construction spending creates meaningful economic opportunities for neighborhood residents.

The City and its project partners should establish measurable commitments for local hiring, workforce training, sustainable wages, neighborhood business contracting, and the amount of project spending retained within Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan.

4. Educational Opportunity

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education data show that Boston Public Schools' four-year graduation rates remain below the statewide averages: [4]

Year	Boston Public Schools	Massachusetts
2023	80.5%	89.2%
2024	79.7%	88.4%
2025	81.3%	89.3%

These are districtwide figures and do not represent graduation rates for individual schools or students residing specifically within the Blue Hill Avenue communities.

The City and school officials should provide neighborhood-relevant information concerning graduation outcomes, career and technical education, workforce development, and postsecondary opportunities for young residents.

5. Community-Identified Priorities

The 2025 Boston Community Health Needs Assessment surveyed 1,737 respondents about their community concerns. The leading concerns included: [2]

Community Concern	Respondents
Housing quality and affordability	39.8%

Alcohol and substance misuse	37.0%
Mental health	34.7%
Economic insecurity and employment	32.2%
Chronic stress	25.1%

Environmental concerns, including air quality, traffic, and noise, were identified by 22.6% of respondents. [2]

Transportation affordability was separately identified as a difficulty by 17.1% of respondents overall, including 23.8% of Black respondents and 22.8% of Latinx respondents. [2]

Transportation remains an important community concern. However, these findings demonstrate that residents also face significant challenges involving housing, economic security, health, and overall quality of life.

6. Recommended Measures of Neighborhood Investment

If the Blue Hill Avenue reconstruction is intended to represent a generational investment, the City should establish measurable neighborhood outcomes alongside its transportation goals.

These measures should include:

1. Housing Stability: Monitor rent trends, displacement risks, affordable housing availability, and protections for existing residents.
2. Employment and Workforce Development: Report local hiring, wages, apprenticeship participation, training opportunities, and job placement outcomes.
3. Small Business Participation: Track neighborhood contract awards, construction-related business impacts, financial assistance, and local economic reinvestment.
4. Educational Opportunity: Identify partnerships supporting career and technical education, graduation outcomes, and pathways to employment.
5. Public Accountability: Publish regular progress reports identifying project commitments, funding allocations, neighborhood beneficiaries, and measurable results.

These recommendations are intended to supplement, rather than replace, transportation performance measures and the more detailed public safety and procurement recommendations addressed in the accompanying addenda.

Sources and References

[1] City of Boston Planning Department. Boston in Context: Neighborhoods 2025. Poverty and labor-force participation data.
https://www.bostonplans.org/documents/research/population-and-demographics/2025/boston-in-context-2025

[2] Boston Public Health Commission / Boston Community Health Collaborative. 2025 Boston Community Health Needs Assessment. Household income, housing-cost burden, and community survey findings. https://www.boston.gov/sites/default/files/file/2025/09/9.19.25%20CHNA%20Final%20Report_1.pdf

[3] MassHousing. 2026 Income and Rent Limits – Boston Area. Regional Area Median Income benchmarks. https://www.masshousing.com/-/media/Files/Developers/Income-Rent-Limits/2026/2026-WFH-FMR-BOSTON-AREA.pdf

[4] Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Graduation Rate Reports, 2023–2025. Boston Public Schools and statewide four-year cohort graduation rates. https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/grad/grad_report.aspx

MPO Staff Response to Boston resident

Hello [name withheld at the commentor's request],

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The MPO Board will decide whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Your comment will be part of the record the MPO Board considers in making that decision.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston. Design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with the MBTA and the City of Boston.

Since your comment letter included several questions directed at the City of Boston and the MBTA regarding community engagement and procurement, we have copied staff from the City and the MBTA on this email. Copied on this message are Yarlennys Villaman, Director of Capital and Community Relations at the MBTA and City of Boston Transportation Department staff leading the Blue Hill Ave project. Yarlennys and City of Boston staff will follow up with you on responses to your other questions.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

John Smith-St. Cyere – J.L Smith Suicide Prevention Center for Young Black Boys Inc

Hi,

Here are my questions for the public comment period. Please put these on the record before the board.

1) How was the center-running design selected as the "locally preferred alternative"? Provide the decision record, alternatives evaluated, and evidence showing how residents' objections affected the selection.

2) What analysis addresses displacement of residents and small businesses?

Identify funded protections, the agencies responsible, and whether those protections will be in place before construction.

3) Given that Boston is suing the Trump administration over withdrawn transportation funding, what assessment has the MPO conducted of similar risks to Blue Hill Avenue's federal funding?

4) Which alternatives were evaluated before selecting center-running bus lanes? Provide the comparison of costs, transportation benefits, and adverse impacts. Identify whether curbside lanes, signal improvements, or improvements without dedicated lanes were evaluated.

MPO Staff Response to John Smith-St. Cyere

Hello John,

Thank you for your questions regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston, and feedback about the design received through our public comment process will be shared with them. We encourage you to contact the MBTA project team directly at bluehillave@mbta.com if you have feedback or questions about the design. More information about the Blue Hill Avenue project is available on the MBTA's project page.

Regarding the locally preferred alternative for the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan, the City of Boston evaluated two concepts as part of the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in Summer 2023 (link). The concepts were evaluated using a decision matrix in Fall 2023 (link), and in February 2024, the City announced its decision to advance a center-running bus lane option as part of the corridor improvements (link). The MBTA also presented traffic analyses for the current design at the September 2026 Open Houses, which are available here (link, slide 4). This information may also help to answer your fourth question regarding alternatives analysis.

Regarding anti-displacement efforts, the City of Boston published an Anti-Displacement Action Plan in 2025. Further questions about how the City intends to align this plan with this specific project can be directed to the City of Boston at btd@boston.gov.

The Boston Region MPO is not a party to the litigation involving the City of Boston and the United States Department of Transportation.

The Blue Hill Avenue Transit Action Plan is proposed for inclusion in the LRTP due to requirements from the FTA's Capital Investment Grant Small Starts program. It is the responsibility of the FTA to evaluate project eligibility and progress, prior to entering the project development phase and again before beginning construction. Should conditions change regarding the project's funding plan, the inclusion of the project in the LRTP is subject to reevaluation during the next development period.

Once again, thank you for your questions.

Maha Aslam – LivableStreets Alliance

(See the attached letter on the next page.)

LivableStreets
Connecting People + Places

11th November 2026

Subject: Inclusion of the Blue Avenue Transit Action Plan in TIP

For decades, Blue Hill Avenue has been neglected and underserved. The Blue Hill Avenue Redesign is about more than faster buses; it is an opportunity to transform Mattapan Square and Grove Hall into vibrant community and neighborhood destinations. This project represents an investment in working-class families and residents of Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan, providing them with the beautiful, safe, and dignified infrastructure they have long been denied.

Over the last six years, LivableStreets Alliance has spoken with thousands of bus riders along Blue Hill Avenue. We have consistently heard one message: residents want buses that are faster and more reliable. These are people who depend on transit every day to get to work, school, grocery stores, and essential appointments. Yet, these same riders are often underrepresented in public meetings, and their immediate needs can get drowned out by more car-centric perspectives or longer-term proposals, such as rapid rail. Blue Hill Avenue bus riders deserve shorter, more reliable commutes now, not years down the road.

This is why LivableStreets Alliance strongly supports including the Blue Hill Avenue Redesign in the Long-Range Transportation Plan. The project represents a significant and long-overdue investment in these communities, prioritizing pedestrian safety, transit mobility, and streetscape improvements that will make the corridor safer and more welcoming for everyone.

It is also critical that we move through the MPO process in a timely manner. Delays can jeopardize access to federal transportation funding, as we have seen with projects such as the Allston I-90 project and the Roxbury Resilient Corridors projects.

Residents of Mattapan, Dorchester, and Roxbury have waited long enough for safe, reliable, and dignified transportation infrastructure. We urge the MPO to keep this project moving and ensure that these communities receive the investment they deserve.

MPO Staff Response to Maha Aslam

Hello Maha,

Thank you for your comment regarding Amendment Two to the Destination 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan and Amendment One to the FFYs 2027-31 Transportation Improvement Program. We will ensure that your comment is shared with the MPO Board, as well as the MBTA and City of Boston.

The MPO Board will decide whether to include the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. Your comment will be part of the record the MPO Board considers in making that decision.

Decisions about the Blue Hill Avenue project's design will be made by the MBTA and the City of Boston. Design feedback received through our public comment process will be shared with the MBTA and the City of Boston. We encourage you to contact the MBTA project team directly at bluehillave@mbta.com if you have feedback or questions about the design. More information about the Blue Hill Avenue project is available on the MBTA's project page.

The MPO Board is expecting to vote on the amendments at the November 19 MPO meeting; more details will be posted on our meeting calendar. You can find details on Amendment Two to the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the related Amendment One to the Transportation Improvement Program here: https://tinyurl.com/27-tip-a1-d2050-lrtp-a2.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments, and thank you again for your feedback.

Verbal Comments Received

The following verbal comments were delivered at the October 15 MPO Board meeting. These are transcribed from the meeting recording and may contain errors or sections of paraphrasing.

- Comment in opposition from John Smith, Member of the public
- Comment in opposition from Tia Washington, Member of the public
- Comment in opposition from Christopher Worrell, Massachusetts State Representative
- Comment in opposition from Mac Hudson, Boston resident
- Comment in opposition from Phoenix, Member of the public

- Comment in opposition from Dr. Paula Armstrong, Boston resident
- Comment in opposition from Iana King, Member of the public
- Comment in opposition from Jacqueline Fonseca, Boston resident
- Comment in opposition from Dianne Wilkerson, Grove Hall Neighborhood Development Corporation

John Smith – Member of the public

Do not move forward with sending Amendment 2 to Destination 2050. Use this testimony to incorporate into the public comment feedback.

First, I want to address the board's responsibility during the public comment period. The public comment period is not a procedural formality, and under federal regulations, the MPO board is required to demonstrate explicit consideration of and response to public input during the development of the LRTP and TIP. The standard is not just whether the public was given an opportunity to speak, but whether the concerns raised were actually considered and how the MPO board responded to them.

I also wanted to remind the board that the MPO is currently undergoing a federal certification review which examines whether the MPO's planning process is being carried out in federal compliance, including requirements governing public participation. How this board handles public input matters. If residents raise concerns during the public comment period, that input cannot simply be received, documented, and placed into the record while the underlying decision remains unchanged without meaningful consideration. We are asking the board to evaluate what residents are saying, respond to the concerns being raised, and, where public testimony identifies legitimate problems with the process, the evidence, or the decision itself. We are asking the board to demonstrate those concerns were meaningfully considered before final action is taken. You are not required to agree with every public comment, but you are required to demonstrate explicit consideration and response. If the MPO is under federal review, this board should take this process seriously.

I do not believe the board should move forward with incorporating the Blue Hill Ave Transit Plan into the Destination 2050 in its current form. We need to be very clear about what we are doing when we are making major public investments in historically Black communities. For generations, communities like Dorchester, Roxbury, and Mattapan have experienced disinvestment. Then when government finally decides to make substantial investments, those investments can increase development pressure, increase the desirability of the area, and contribute to

conditions that make it harder for existing residents and small businesses to remain. If the people who endured the disinvestment are displaced before they can benefit from the investment, that is not racial equity. That is just a transfer of public benefit. The community bears the burden of decades of neglect, then the government invests hundreds of millions of dollars, property becomes more valuable, development follows, and the people survive the neglect and are increasingly unable to afford to remain. So when that pattern occurs in a predominantly Black community, and a government knows that displacement is a foreseeable consequence but moves forward without meaningful protections, we have to be willing to call it what it is. That is a racist outcome produced through public policy. Racism does not require someone to stand here and announce its intent. A policy can appear neutral in its face while imposing its burdens disproportionately on Black residents and transferring its benefits away from them. This is particularly important here because your own Destination 2050 transportation equity goal says this organization should make investments related to transportation disparities borne by disadvantaged communities. So you cannot claim to eliminate disparities while approving an investment that may contribute to displacement of the very population the investment is supposed to benefit.

The answer is not to deny Blue Hill Ave investment. We have been denied investment for far too long. The answer is to make sure the investment comes without displacement. So before incorporating Amendment 2 into Destination 2050, the board should ask what protections are in place for current renters, homeowners, and small businesses. The answer is none. What analysis has been done to determine who actually benefits from this investment over the long term? The answer is none. What happens when the communities receiving this investment are no longer able to afford to live there? Transportation equity cannot mean improving the transportation system for a community and then pricing the community out of their own neighborhood. If the generations waiting for equitable investments are not here to benefit from it, then we have not corrected the inequity. Thank you.

Tia Washington – Member of the public

Good morning. To piggyback on what John was saying, I do also not agree with Amendment 2 moving forward and being incorporated into Destination 2050. I was a part of the last meeting that the MPO had and on that meeting everyone from the community, members of the community opposed Amendment 2 being pushed forward, which shows that there is reasonable outcry and objection to this amendment moving forward. The people being impacted the most, the community that is showing up to the town halls, MPO meetings, and every opportunity we can to say that we do not agree with this have been speaking out. We have been saying that we do not agree with this. So, in part, at that meeting last time, and as in today,

all the board members are not people who represent the community. All the board members are outside of Boston, the city that is impacted by this, and so having you guys represent and speak for us and make decisions based on who is here, and you do not represent us, is not meaningful consideration. That is not appropriate, and it just continues to perpetuate the cycle of what has been happening to us, with this disinvestment in our communities, and to me, it's unacceptable. I feel like this is something that should be considered. Our voices should be considered, and we matter. We are part of this process, and we do not give our explicit consent to this moving forward as the people who would be impacted day to day. We need representation. The MPO does not represent the people who are impacted by this. To have you guys making the decision for the people who are being impacted by this is an injustice in my eyes. We have raised legitimate concerns, and we have not been given meaningful consideration in regard to this proposed amendment moving forward to the Destination 2050. I vehemently oppose this, and so does our community, and we ask for meaningful consideration. Thank you.

Christopher Worrell – Massachusetts State Representative

Good morning, everyone. Representative Christopher Worrell, I represent the 5th Suffolk District. That is, Dorchester and Roxbury. I am going to be quick because I know a lot of you have other things to do. Again, I share the sentiment of Tia Washington and John Smith. A no vote on advancing this. This is my community, this is where I grew up, this is where I am from, this is where I represent. We are going to continue to come to these MPO meetings to let you know how this affects the Black and Brown community. The 5th Suffolk is the fourth most diverse district in the country, in this nation. So we have a melting pot of culture, a melting pot of small businesses. I did a video where I walked up and down Blue Hill Ave, with business owners, residents, and bus riders. They shared the same sentiment, not moving forward with the center running bus lanes. They do want to see investment. So no vote is just really looking at this center running lanes. What a travesty this could do to Black and Brown communities across my district and across Dorchester, Roxbury, and Mattapan. That's all.

Mac Hudson – Member of the public

I, too, oppose and request that my testimony be included in the 30-day public comment period for Destination 2050 Amendment 2 and be considered before final approval. I live on Blue Hill Ave, and I, like many others in correlation to what Representative Worrell had just explained, had never been talked to, confronted by, never participated in any of these processes in which the Mayor's office has indicated had took place. No evidence of community meetings in which the City has talked about this. More than half the room had stood and given time and complete baffle-ness that they did not know anything about this project. Our voice has not been heard on this issue. There has been no feasibility test on the things we actually

asked for, which is real. There's been no test on the environmental impact, which is that the district and folks that live around here are greatly impacted by asthma and [inaudible]. We have not seen anything by way of the process in which these things are held. So I am asking that this do not forward. This is not done with our consent. We voiced this. It has been ignored. I, too, testify at the Boston MPO with these very same concerns. I am now asking you to include my comments on the record.

Phoenix – Member of the public

Good morning, everybody. I am a community organizer in Mattapan. I just want to say since of the couple last meetings, we have been asking who backed these surveys. Who are the community that was spoken to. I still have not seen anything about that. From what I have seen in our conversation, this community, with residents, with youth, with everybody saying no or have an alternative. That has to be taken into consideration. I hope that we are not just moving forward. I hope we have considered this process and recognizing that community was really only spoken during the ending of this process. So that is clearly that needs to be changed. That always seems to be the problem. I notice that is not what happens on the other side of town. That needs to be fixed. I do not believe we should be moving forward. I also believe that we should be listening to the people coming to these meetings, the people who do not get heard, and the people who cannot attend these meetings because they are at work, school, or whatever. I hope that you know that we can find some common ground to be able to move forward not just with this, letting this be an eye opener. That community needs to be centered in these dialogues and not after you all make a decision.

Dr. Paula Armstrong – Boston resident

I want to duplicate everything that the previous speakers have said. I am a resident of the Grove Hall area, the beginning of where the center lane will run through. I have not had any notices. But on a professional level, I do have patients in the area and I am a physician in the area. I am concerned about what studies have been done, as far as this is something they will benefit from. Is this something they will agree with? This does seem to be a thing, a point of stress for my patients because they come and talk about it. So I ask that we do consider these folks when we make these decisions and not move forward with it.

Iana King – Boston resident

My name is Iana King and I request my testimony be included in the 30-day public comment period for Destination 2050 Amendment Two and be considered before final approval. I am a resident of Mattapan, and I live right near the Blue Hill Ave area near Morton, and I believe that creating a center bus lane will definitely not be good for the residents and the community. It's going to impact businesses. The

businesses are important to the community. We already don't get enough outside visitors, tourists, and everything in the community. The fact that a center running bus lane is trying to make its way into our community is going to impact the local businesses. How are they going to get people to go to their businesses and things like that? The center running bus lane, safety crossing, things like that. Those things should be considered, and it's not fair for the people in the community who have grown up and been around for years. People who are outside the community they don't know what it's like to live in Boston at all if they have not been born or raised in Boston. Outside community feedback is not an indicator for why this center bus lane should be a priority, especially if Blue Hill Ave should be considered some type of highway. If it's considered a highway, that is going to block people from getting in and out and accessing where people need to go. It's going to take more than 20 minutes to get to where they need to go, especially with Boston already being congested. This is how I feel about how this will impact our community.

Jacqueline Fonseca – Boston resident

Good morning, everyone. I just want to add my [inaudible] I just want to agree with everything I have heard so far, in opposition to the project. I appreciate everyone organizing around this because our voices matter, as the young lady said previous to me. As those of us who are from the community do business in the community, and have grown up in the community, and pay taxes in the community. I have spent all morning in Egleston Square, speaking to people that have experienced the middle bus lane here, and 100% of the people I have spoken to and handed flyers to have cringed at the idea of this design continuing on Blue Hill Ave. No one thinks it's safe, they have a lot of concerns, I hope some of them are on this call with us now. Having elderly people, children, and disabled people going into the middle of the street every time they have to get on and off the bus is a major safety concern. We are asking that this project be stopped and that reconsider the community's comments and feedback for safer and efficient way to travel. I am someone that drives up and down Blue Hill Ave, I am a resident of Dorchester. I am someone that takes the bus, someone that bikes as well, and there is no way this design is safe for me or my child that uses the bus without my supervision at times. I am asking that my public comment be taken into consideration, as well as the others, and that we continue to ask for public feedback and consideration before the project takes place. 100% of the people I've spoken to today in Egleston Square were never asked or told about the project in Egleston Square. We continue to see a pattern of taxpayers being left out of the conversation. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Dianne Wilkerson – Grove Hall Neighborhood Development Corporation

I didn't get a chance last week to say how much I appreciate how you have been managing and handling all of this process in the last meetings. Making sure everyone who wants to speak gets to speak is allowed to speak, it's not easy. My name is Dianne Wilkerson. I am a, next year will be 50 years in Roxbury and Dorchester. I'm not sure it's 30 seconds from Harvard Street to Blue Hill Ave. It is literally a road I probably traverse every single day, several times a day. I just want to make two points in my testimony. Last night, I had some of the people who have spoken, had an opportunity yet another information session hosted, actually it was a hearing by the Boston City Council. A majority of the city councilors were present, meaning 8 of the 13 members were present. We learned from Councilor Culpepper that he and Councilor Worrell had met with the FTA. It turns out that much of the information these essential part of the information has been, we have been misled. I am going to say, in the way that I understand it, the city has been lying to us. We don't have money. We haven't met all the criteria that they are requiring, the feds are requiring us to submit to receive the money. So all this talk about the money that they can't take it back, we don't have it because we haven't completed the process. That to me is significant for this reason. I want it to be on record because I am not sure that has been said. For you to understand the level of emotion that people are coming to you with. For me, what is so striking is the sheer lunacy and [?] of this process. We literally are in a position to ask both the state and that is the State Department of Transportation and City of Boston as an official government, this very same entities that by obligation are supposed to be vetting proposals for the people bring to you, to bring to the city. What happens when the proposers are the people that you have to convince to oppose you? MassDOT, through the secretary who is running all over our community, selling this project, and the mayor then have a majority of representation on the very body that we are speaking before, asking you to halt a project that is really your project. We just want you to be mindful of the conflict that presents to us. Who is supposed to be vetting on that level for us when you are the proponents of the project. How can it ever be a neutral presentation that you are going to hear? We live here. We have been inundated with presentations from people, employees from the Secretary of Transportation who walked into Grove Hall a month ago and said we want to meet with you to talk about this project and just so before we start we need to understand that we're going to present on some of the, they amended the project, and we were supposed to beautify and make our roads safer. He said in no uncertain terms, the discussion of middle lane is off the table. We are not even going to discuss that piece with you. We can talk about trees, we can talk about curb cuts, we can talk about stops, but we are not going to discuss the very point that has raised so much opposition. So now the city, if marshaling their assets, is asking you, who is a partner with them in this project, to vote. We are very clear, we want to be on the record, but we recognize that you all

think that this is, you making the case you have gotten letters of support, the survey, none of that exists. The city is requiring its employees to attend the meeting. If you doubt me, look at the video from the mayor's appearance yesterday on our local show, when she actually said that at the Morning Star meeting on September 10, they had tried to convince for the tenth or fifty times. We keep saying no. We've said it every language that we know. You cannot convince us that reducing the number of stops from Mattapan to Grove Hall from nineteen stops to ten is better for us. This is just ludicrous. All that means is that you've extended the distance that people have to walk to get on the bus. The folks with disabilities, the carriages, the elderly, the people pushing their walkers are supposed to be grateful? Of course the buses will move faster, because you've cut the stops in half. But this thing is just moving along from a whole group of people who don't live here, don't even know, and have no familiarity. People keep trying to us how to behave. We are angry. This is a very emotional issue for us because our lives are changing before our faces. You have got to have some to stop and get off the bus. To have you literally, pun intended. It's not that we just don't support it. We are scared of the death of it. The public safety aspect has not been addressed at all. So giving me more trees, I love it, but that is not the point. This is a public safety issue, this is a public safety hazard. The day after your meeting, the city announced it was scrapping plans to extend the middle bus lane one mile to Columbus Avenue. No discussion, no information. We know why. Two dead seniors later, and in the last two years. Hundreds of accidents in their experiment. And rather than give us the reports for over a year, they scrapped it. But you're being asked to vote on another one around the corner. Please go some place else and experiment because we've really had enough. I thank you for the time and ask you to pause your activity on this Amendment Two and make sure all of these are on the record.

Civil Rights Notice to the Public

Welcome. Bem Vinda. Bienvenido. Akeyi. 欢迎. 歡迎



You are invited to participate in our transportation planning process, free from discrimination. The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is committed to nondiscrimination in all activities and complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin (including limited English proficiency). Related federal and state nondiscrimination laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex, disability, and additional protected characteristics.

For additional information or to file a civil rights complaint, visit www.bostonmpo.org/mpo_non_discrimination.

To request this information in a different language or format, please contact:

Boston Region MPO Title VI Specialist
State Transportation Building
10 Park Plaza, Suite 6260
Boston, MA 02116
Phone: 857.702.3700
Email: civilrights@bostonmpo.org

For people with hearing or speaking difficulties, connect through the state MassRelay service, www.mass.gov/massrelay. Please allow at least five business days for your request to be fulfilled.