2025

System-Wide Passenger Survey Report

Report prepared by The Office of Performance Management and Innovation in Spring 2026

OPMI

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) regularly surveys our riders to understand who rides the subway or light rail, bus, Commuter Rail, and ferry. The MBTA's rolling System-Wide Passenger Survey, often referred to as the "Rider Census," reflects self-reported information that helps the MBTA understand who our riders are and how they travel around the system. Since 2022, the Rider Census has run on a rolling basis, with surveyors in the field every year from spring through fall. The Rider Census enables the MBTA to meet Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements to evaluate any changes to our service or fare policy to measure whether some people are affected more than others. In addition to supporting equity in transit, the MBTA uses survey results to understand how people travel throughout the system to better plan improvements. This report marks the fourth year of annual surveying and offers data from the last four years as a single, pooled dataset with more station- and route-level disaggregation than previous releases. Each new dataset will typically be available mid-spring of the following year. The documentation included in this summary represents the most current data publication and provides context and guidance to understand and use the rolling Rider Census data. More detailed technical documentation may assist those who are looking to more deeply understand the data calculation and aggregation process. The data is available for download and interactive viewing at mbta.com/rider-census.

Survey Background

Pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in line with guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) circular FTA C 4702.1B, the MBTA must conduct regular evaluations of our system to ensure equity across income levels and race and ethnicity demographics. Additionally, major changes in service or fares must be evaluated to ensure they do not disproportionately impact populations protected on the basis of race or ethnicity, or disparately burden lower income riders (see the MBTA Service and Fare Change Equity Policy for details).

Previous versions of the Rider Census reflected point-in-time snapshots of rider demographics; these were conducted in 1978, 1993-1995, 2008-2009, and 2015-2017. As of 2022, the MBTA conducts an ongoing Rider Census, which collects data annually from around 15,000 MBTA riders. This "rolling" structure allows for a nimbler, more accurate understanding of who travels on rail, bus, and ferry services. For example, a rolling survey format allows riders of new services to be counted sooner, which enables the MBTA to include riders of new or revamped services – like the Green Line Extension or Bus Network Redesign routes – in planning and analysis, rather than waiting up to five years to survey those riders. In addition to Title VI equity analyses, the results of the Rider Census are used across the MBTA in capital planning, service planning, fare policy, and public outreach planning. Among other benefits, this survey model means that pilot programs may be evaluated using demographic data collected through a methodologically consistent effort.

Data Collection and Processsing

To ensure that the MBTA surveyors talk to a sample of transit riders who accurately reflect the people riding specific services and traveling between specific stops or stations, the rolling Rider Census research team developed a sampling plan that allows for accurate representation of the system every five years. This means that, during the first five years of the new rolling Rider Census, data may be summarized at a more aggregate level than that of previous system-wide surveys. With each additional year of data collection, the MBTA will be able to share more granular data, specific to individual routes and stations.

Detailed information about the rolling Rider Census sampling plan and response weighting may be found in the Data Collection section beginning on page 2 of the technical documentation. The rolling Rider Census sampling plan was constructed to allow reporting at a similar level of aggregation to 2015-17 by the end of the first five years of data collection. This means that the collection of rolling Rider Census data collected through calendar year 2026 will provide data aggregated at a similar level as the 2016 Rider Census data release. Prior to the 2026 data release, survey data will be publicly available at a higher level of aggregation than in years past. Specific aggregation by service mode is as follows:

- Heavy Rail (Blue, Orange, and Red lines) will generally be reported by station
- Light Rail (Green and Mattapan lines) will generally be reported by station or small group of stations for the Green Line, and the Mattapan Trolley will be reported for the whole branch
- Bus will be reported individually or in small groups for high-ridership routes and in larger geographic groups for moderate and low-ridership routes
- Commuter Rail reporting is aggregated to the individual line
- Ferry data will be reported in one group, consisting of all routes

Responses to the rolling Rider Census survey are weighted by both ridership (how many people ride that particular service) and transfer rate (how many people make similar transfers as reported in the survey). This ensures that conclusions drawn from survey data are as representative as possible of overall MBTA ridership. It is important to note that all survey research and data collection is exposed to some level of bias and error. The MBTA acknowledges that sampling bias may have been introduced by a series of factors, including but not limited to:

- Primarily weekday-only surveying, between 6:00AM and 8:00PM
- The need to prioritize high- and medium-ridership locations in order to meet minimum response requirements for statistical validity of reporting
- Limited range of languages available (12)
- Survey respondents' potential lack of awareness of available languages

Findings

Findings remain relatively stable over time; see Summary Tables beginning on page 9 for detailed presentation of findings. The four-year pooled dataset indicates that 53% of riders system-wide self-identified as women, with women comprising the majority of riders for the majority of service modes as well. Women ranged from 47% of riders on Silver Line BRT service to 55% of riders on Green Line service. At the system level, 56% of riders surveyed self-identified as being part of a class protected on the basis of race or ethnicity, consistent with findings from previous years.

Starting this year, the public Rider Census dataset includes information on those who didn't answer a given question in an effort to more accurately report questions where a small but occasionally significant percentage of individuals did not select a response. Instead of calculating each measure as a percentage of "all those who answered" a question, the percentages now reflect all those who encountered the question on their survey.

Detailed information about rider demographics may be found in the technical documentation or the interactive web tool.

Next Steps

We expect to repeat this data collection and release cycle on an annual basis. Rider surveying for calendar year 2026 will result in a public data release in spring 2027. If you have any questions or comments, please reach out at opmi@mbta.com.

Introduction

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Title VI Circular (C 4702.1B) requires large transit providers to collect demographic, travel, and fare payment data about their riders using passenger surveys at least every five years. In addition, the Rider Census provides rich information about how riders interact with the system – from the types of trips taken (e.g., to work, from an errand), to how people get to the MBTA (walking, driving); this information offers essential inputs for many different projects across the Commonwealth.

While not a true census, this program receives over 15,000 responses from riders each year, allowing the MBTA to chart patterns of who's using the MBTA, how they're using it, how they're paying for it, and more – all of which helps the MBTA make better decisions across the board, from capital planning to operations, fare policy, public outreach, and long-range planning.

Survey Motivation

The results of the System-wide Passenger Survey are used not just in Title VI analysis (as mandated by the Federal Transit Administration), but across the MBTA in capital planning, service planning, fare policy, and public outreach planning. Travel behavior analyses for both MassDOT and the MBTA benefit from trip-choice data, like mode used to access the MBTA, trip purpose, and alternative ways respondents sometimes make the reported trip.

Rolling Surveying

A rolling Rider Census allows for more responsiveness in our survey methods, since we can account for, e.g., major changes in service like Bus Network Redesign within a calendar year (CY), rather than waiting up to five years to understand rider makeup, as would be the case with earlier forms of the System-Wide Passenger Survey. As the first agency to shift to a rolling survey format to respond to Title VI requirements, other agencies reach out for advice as they contemplate building their own rolling survey.

Timeline of Fieldwork

Fieldwork typically commences in mid-spring and ends in late fall.

2022 data: 11/29/2021 to 12/11/2022

2023 data: 5/17/2023 to 12/27/2023

2024 data: 7/2/2024 to 12/27/2024

2025 data: 4/3/2025 to 12/2/2025

Data Collection

This section describes our data collection in preparation for the CY25 Rider Census demographic data release. This document summarizes the reporting groups for the CY25 release, the initial sampling plan, and changes to the sampling plan made in response to events impacting response collection.

Survey Content

The survey was designed to obtain the following kinds of information:

- Demographic characteristics, including race, ethnicity, English proficiency, gender, age, and household income
- Non-English languages used at work or home
- Number of usable vehicles in household and vehicles per capita in household
- Trip purpose
- Origin/destination locations
- Modes of access and egress
- Fare and fare payment method
- Frequency of making the reported trip using the MBTA
- Other characteristics as required for federal reporting

The survey was exclusively distributed via an intercept-based tablet survey, meaning surveyors talked with riders on the system and asked riders to complete the survey on a provided tablet. In addition to English, survey forms were available in Arabic, traditional Chinese, simplified Chinese, Cape Verdean Creole, French, Italian, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Just over 2% of surveys (2.1%) were completed in the non-English versions in our pooled survey years (2022-2025). The most common language, other than English, was Spanish (1.9% of responses). The other languages in which more than 10 riders responded were Portuguese, Chinese (simplified), French, and Haitian Creole.

Sampling Plan

General Assumptions

Before we send surveyors out in the field, our team sets targets for the number of responses we aim to collect at each station or stop, based on ridership and the level of reporting for that particular stop, line or mode. We aim for reportability at a minimum of a 90% confidence interval (CI) with a 10% margin of error (MOE), although we are on track to publish data at a higher confidence level for most modes. The equation below is what we use to get our desired sample size, with the average daily ridership as our "population size."

$$n_0 = \frac{z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{e^2}$$

p: the population size
e: the margin of error
z: the z-value, extracted from a z-table

After visiting each survey location for the originally planned number of surveyor-days, the Rider Census team made weekly schedules based on gaps in the initial round of data collection. These schedules were based on the number of responses collected initially and the quality of those responses.

The five-year reporting groups (i.e., groups for which data will be available after 2026) for all modes were constructed to be comparable to reporting groups from the previous Rider Census (2015-2017). The purpose of creating these groups prior to data collection was to ensure that sufficient data is collected each year to eventually meet independent reporting response requirements.

Stations (for the rail system) or routes (for the bus and ferry systems) were grouped into three ridership categories for purposes of creating five-year and one-year reporting groups. These ridership categories were initially developed based on 2021 ridership values but are subject to change based on observed overall changes in MBTA ridership. Services were classified as: low-ridership if they had fewer than 800 average weekday boardings; moderate-ridership if they had between 800 and 3,500 average weekday boardings; and high-ridership if they had over 3,500 average weekday boardings.

The sampling plan was constructed in order to report high-ridership services independently after the first year of data collection and moderate- and high-ridership services independently after the fifth year of data collection. However, based on higher response rates than anticipated, we are able to release some data at its final, five-year aggregation level.

The exact method for construction of these reporting groups depends on mode. Bus groupings used fare transaction data to calculate the proportion of riders on each route who also used other routes in the system and grouped routes likely to be used by the same riders. Light Rail groupings used historical demographics to minimize demographic variation within each reporting group.

Table 1 - Aggregation Levels

Mode	Aggregation Level	Examples
Heavy Rail	Line - Station	Red Line - Downtown Crossing; Orange Line - Stony Brook
Green Line	Line - Stop	Green Line - Arlington
Mattapan Trolley	Mode	Mattapan Trolley
Silver Line	Line	SL1
Bus	Line	111
Commuter Rail	Line	Haverhill Line
Ferry	Mode	Ferry

Conceit by Mode

Heavy Rail and Green Line

For the Blue Line, Red Line, Orange Line, and Green Line, the Rider Census team used ridership by station, direction, and time of day from the MBTA Origin-Destination-Transfer (ODX) model outputs for the previous year to determine how to efficiently allocate surveyor shifts to each station platform and ensure that the team meets the total target number of survey responses for high-confidence reportability at a given station or group of stations.

Mattapan Trolley

For the Mattapan Trolley sampling plan, the Rider Census team used estimates of morning and evening stop-level ridership to calculate the number of responses needed to achieve line-level reportability. We used manual counts of morning and evening stop-level ridership from 2023, scaled up to line-level monthly ridership from 2025. Stops with fewer than 100 riders per day were excluded from the sample to maximize the number of riders a surveyor might intercept.

Bus

For the bus sampling plan, we first identified a set of high-ridership stops served by one or more frequent bus routes to sample every year. Then, we developed a universe of route-stop pairs that met a series of robustness checks to ensure 1) all routes or groups of routes needed for reportability were represented, 2) that surveyors would only go to stops with high enough frequency and ridership to be effective for intercept surveying, and 3) that a stop would have either a bench, a shelter, or both for surveyor comfort. Then, we randomly sampled from this universe of stop-route pairs up to the number of shifts needed to ensure that the team met reportability targets for a route or group of routes, assigning shift time using ridership by time of day.

Commuter Rail

For the Commuter Rail sampling plan, we first identified a set of high-ridership and otherwise key stations to sample every year. Then, we developed a set of stations where trains arrived at most every thirty minutes during surveyor shift times (to ensure efficient allocation of surveyors), and randomly selected surveyor shifts at each station during shift times that met this threshold, up to the number of shifts needed to reach reportability targets for a given Commuter Rail line.

Ferry

All ferry stops and lines are reported together as a single mode. To create the sampling plan, we set a ridership cut-off of 800 riders at the line level to maximize the number of riders a surveyor might intercept. Then, to ensure that we gathered enough survey responses for reportability, we allocated surveyor shifts to docks proportionally by the percentage of riders for the line that use that dock and assigned a shift time based on line-level ridership by time of day.

Restrictions

Student ridership during the summer months is different from that during the school year for certain routes and stops, reflecting lower overall travel and travel more evenly spread throughout the day, day of week, and geographic location within the system. Therefore, we avoided sampling outside the school year at locations where more than 10% of taps were by individuals with a student pass.

As the MBTA continues to conduct major rail maintenance efforts, the sampling plan changes throughout the year to account for multi-day or multi-week shutdowns of rail service. The method for sampling plan revision consists of avoiding stations directly impacted by the diversions, as the percentage of riders who opt to use the shuttle buses replacing rail service is relatively low. Where bus routes intersect with the diverted line (or otherwise have high rates of transfer to the diverted service), efforts are made to limit the amount of data collected on these routes and instead focus efforts on routes that are less impacted by the shutdown. The expected level of impact is determined by looking at the percentage of riders on each bus route (based on fare transaction data) who also took the diverted line over a given time period. Routes and bus stops with lower proportions of riders on the diverted line were prioritized during the shutdown.

Weighting

In line with best practices in survey reporting, we weigh responses to ensure reported values are as representative as possible in two ways: by ridership of specific types of MBTA service (e.g., Silver Line, bus, Commuter Rail) and by transfer rates. Riders of certain services are intercepted at different rates than riders of other services.

To reach a statistically valid sample size for a high-ridership service, it is not necessary to intercept the same proportion of riders as would be necessary on a lower ridership service. In addition, variation in response rate between services results in different numbers of responses, even given the same number of surveyor-days spent at a particular location. These reasons necessitate weighting the survey responses by ridership, which enables the calculation of mode- and system-wide demographics in addition to the calculation of specific reporting group demographics.

The survey distribution has an unavoidable bias towards interacting with transferring riders. This is because riders of a particular service might be intercepted while at a boarding location not associated with that service. For example, we specifically tried to collect survey responses from riders of the 1 bus at several boarding locations for that service, including Nubian Square, Hynes Convention Center, and Central Square. However, those riders might also be intercepted while at a location not directly served by the 1 bus. For example, a rider who boarded the 1 bus at Central Square, transferred to the Orange Line at Massachusetts Avenue, then transferred to the Blue Line at State might be intercepted at Central Square, Massachusetts Avenue, or the Blue or Orange Line platforms at State. However, a similar rider who made a one-segment trip from Central Square to Washington Street could only be intercepted by a surveyor who happened to be at those locations. For this reason, survey responses are also weighted by the transfer rate on each service.

Each survey response contains information on a recent trip taken by the respondent. This information is used to assign respondents to one or more MBTA services. Each respondent's reported trip allows us to assign their demographics to where they boarded and exited MBTA services. Then ridership and transfer weights are assigned to each reported or reversed segment. Following that, weighted counts for each measure are summed to the reporting group level. Then, these reporting group totals are summed to report demographics at the mode and system-wide levels.

Calculation of Ridership Weights

Surveys are nearly always conducted on weekdays, with the exception of a handful of Saturdays. A small proportion of trips (less than 1%) were self-reported as weekend trips. These weekend trips were included in calculations, but due to their relative infrequency, values were weighted using average weekday unlinked passenger trips for the year in which the data was collected. Values should therefore be interpreted as corresponding to weekday demographics. Data sources for ridership vary by mode depending on what is most reliable and available for the given service. Certain time periods are excluded from the calculations for all modes. This is done if service is different enough from typically operated service such that either: 1) ridership patterns were substantially disrupted across modes; or 2) automated data collection was not generally reliable for that time period. Certain time periods are excluded for individual modes if service was disrupted on that mode but unlikely to affect typical behavior on other modes.

Ridership weights are calculated using the formula below:

$$Ridership\ weight = \frac{N}{n}$$

N: average weekday boardings at the level of station and/or route, survey year
n: number of responses by station and/or route, survey year

Calculation of Heavy Rail and Green Line Ridership

Heavy Rail and Green Line ridership data comes from the MBTA Origin-Destination-Transfer (ODX) model outputs. This model processes many of our automated data feeds including Automated Fare Collection (AFC), Automatic Passenger Counters (APC), and Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) data. Using these sources, the model estimates passenger transfers within the transit system. Summaries of these movements provide counts of total boardings at specific locations on specific routes.

Boarding values at each Heavy Rail and Green Line station were averaged across weekdays in 2025, excluding dates on which significant disruptions affected ridership or the automated data collection process. Green Line boardings within the central subway were assigned to stations, rather than assigned to each branch at that station. For example, at Arlington all boardings are grouped together, instead of separating the boardings out to the B, C, D, and E branches.

Calculation of Mattapan Trolley Ridership

Ridership data estimates on the Mattapan Trolley are based on manual counts. Because Mattapan Trolley vehicles are not equipped with APCs, ODX is less reliable for calculating ridership on this service, so manual counts provide the best source for ridership. When weighting the data, we used 2025 manual counts that were conducted after the survey period.

Calculation of Bus and Silver Line Ridership

Bus and Silver Line ridership was derived from APC-based weekday average boardings by route. The initial dataset was available at the week level. Weeks during significant service disruptions were excluded and weekday averages were calculated for the year. Data for contracted bus routes 714 and 716 are calculated separately from other routes. These data are also APC-based, but come from a different source.

Calculation of Commuter Rail Ridership

Ridership estimates on the Commuter Rail are based on manual counts. Manual passenger counts at stations were conducted in 2024 (2025 for South Coast Rail) and scaled based on changes in overall ridership volume in 2025.

Calculation of Ferry Ridership

Monthly ferry ridership was summarized to create a weekday average count of boardings by line.

Calculation of Transfer Weights

Transfer weights were derived from two main sources: ODX data and the survey results themselves. Because ODX can only be run for modes using the AFC system, it was not possible to calculate transfer rates using ODX for Commuter Rail, ferry, or free bus routes (i.e., the 23, 28, and 29). In addition, ODX-based transfer rates would not account for riders making a transfer from an AFC mode to a non-AFC mode (such as a Red Line to Commuter Rail trip). Therefore, ODX-based transfer rates were calculated when possible, then adjusted to account for the proportion of riders making such transfers. The following section explains how transfer rates were calculated for each mode. It is split by whether the ODX-based transfer rate was used (with adjustments) or if transfer rates were calculated using survey results themselves.

Transfer rates are generally calculated using the following formula: $Transfer\ weight = \frac{N}{n}$

N: average % of trips that involve a transfer at the level of station and/or route, survey year
n: % of responses that reported transferring by station and/or route, survey year

ODX-Based Transfer Weights

Transfer rates were calculated using ODX and then adjusted for heavy rail, gated light rail stations, and bus (excluding free routes). The calculation has two parts. First, the percentage of boardings that were or were not part of a multiride trip was calculated for each route-stop pair. Second, this daily value was averaged over the year to result in a single weekday average for every route and stop. Two adjustments then needed to be made. The first adjustment is needed because ODX is better able to impute trip information for transferring riders, so an assessment of the difference between the ODX-based transfer rate and transfer rate based on Rider Census data was conducted for each mode. ODX-based rates differed from Rider Census-based rates for bus. So, a single correction factor was applied to ODX-based rates to adjust for this bias. The second adjustment is needed because ODX-based rates do not account for transfers to modes not on the AFC system. A second correction factor was developed at the stop level for rapid transit and the route level for bus. This correction factor added the percentage of boardings occurring on that route that transferred to a service not in the AFC system and did not also transfer to an AFC service to each stop or route's initial value.

Non-ODX-Based Transfer Weights

Transfer rates for ungated light rail stops, free bus routes, Commuter Rail, and ferry were not calculable from ODX data. For these services, the transfer rates on reported trips for responses collected at boarding locations specific to the service were used. For example, transferring Franklin Line riders are likely overrepresented in the initial survey because they might be intercepted elsewhere on the system. However, transferring Franklin Line riders that were intercepted at a Franklin Line boarding location are not likely to be overrepresented. So, transfer rates were calculated for non-ODX modes based on responses collected at boarding locations specific to those modes.

2025 Updates

Methodological Changes

Starting this year, the public dataset includes information on those who didn't answer the question in an effort to more accurately report questions where a small but occasionally significant percentage of individuals do not select a response. Instead of calculating each measure as percentages of 'all those who answered' a question, the percentages now reflect all those who encountered the question on their survey.

Additional Sampling

One of the benefits of a rolling survey model is our ability to collect additional data while we're in the field that helps the MBTA understand ridership and evaluate changes to the system. This year, we added some supplemental surveying to our usual calendar to collect data that allows for service and policy evaluations.

Bus Network Redesign

As the MBTA continues rolling out its Bus Network Redesign program, we wanted to collect data from before and after the changes are implemented. This helps us continue to understand who's impacted by changes and how travel behavior has changed with the service and route design improvements. In 2025, we surveyed these routes – and will survey them again in 2026, after the Bus Network Redesign changes: 1, 7, 15, 22, 23, 28, 31, 42, 47, 62, 70, 76, 85, 86, 91, 104, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 747 (CT2).

Late-Night

In fall 2025, the MBTA expanded rail service by 59 minutes on Friday and Saturday nights. To help us evaluate travel behavior in the wake of this service extension, we surveyed riders at the Blue and Green Line platforms of Government Center on four Saturdays in October and November.

Saturday

While the Rider Census primarily collects data from weekday riders, who make up the bulk of travel throughout the MBTA's system, we are also interested in understanding how Saturday travel may differ from weekdays. In 2025, we surveyed four Saturdays, from 12-8pm, at the Commuter Rail platforms of North Station.

Summary Tables

The 2025 year of data collection for the System-Wide Passenger Survey generated nearly 15,000 responses. The complete data release is available for use on the MBTA Open Data Portal, and an interactive data explorer tool can be found at mbta.com/ridercensus. Please note that percentages in the following tables may not add to 100% due to rounding. Responses for Race and Alternative Mode will not add to 100%, as respondents could select multiple responses for those questions. Generally, changes in reported percentages in this publication characterize how the 2022-2024 pooled data shifted with the addition of the CY25 survey responses, though it is important to note that there may also be changes due to: 1) data processing updates for some responses and 2) the shift to reporting percentages that include those who didn't answer a given question.

Demographics

Age

According to Rider Census results, 58% of riders are between the ages of 18 and 34 years old. Continuing prior trends, Green Line riders tend to be younger and Ferry passengers tend to be older than the system overall. Twenty-eight percent of Green Line riders are between the ages of 18 and 25, compared to 23% system-wide. Ferry riders are primarily between the ages of 35 and 44 (42%) and the ages of 45 and 64 (29%), with these two age groups represented in much higher proportions than the overall system (25% and 11%, respectively). See Table 2 for more information.

Table 2 - Percent of Riders by Age and Service Mode

Mode	Under 18	18 to 25	26 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 64	65 or older	Did not answer
System-Wide	**3%**	**23%**	**35%**	**25%**	**11%**	**2%**	**1%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	2%	24%	36%	24%	10%	2%	1%
Blue Line	3%	20%	37%	26%	11%	2%	1%
Green Line	1%	28%	37%	23%	8%	2%	1%
Orange Line	3%	23%	34%	25%	12%	2%	1%
Red Line	2%	24%	35%	24%	11%	2%	1%
Mattapan Trolley	5%	19%	36%	22%	14%	3%	1%
Silver Line BRT	1%	17%	37%	29%	13%	1%	1%
Commuter Rail	2%	21%	33%	27%	14%	3%	1%
Bus	5%	20%	34%	24%	13%	3%	1%
Ferry	1%	6%	17%	42%	29%	4%	2%

Gender

Riders self-identifying as female continue to make up the majority of all passengers on the system, with a 53% share, compared to those identifying as male at 43% and non-binary at 1%; this remains consistent with previous Rider Census data. Self-identifying female riders maintain a majority ridership across most modes in the system, with an exception for the Mattapan Trolley and Siver Line BRT. Further, the percentage of riders self-identifying as non-binary is up slightly from last year's results across individual modes. See Table 3 for more information.

Table 3 - Percent of Riders by Gender and Service Mode

Mode	Female	Male	Non-Binary	Other	Prefer not to say	Did not answer
System-Wide	**53%**	**43%**	**1%**	**1%**	**<1%**	**2%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	53%	43%	2%	1%	<1%	1%
Blue Line	53%	43%	1%	<1%	<1%	2%
Green Line	55%	40%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Orange Line	53%	43%	1%	<1%	<1%	1%
Red Line	52%	44%	2%	1%	<1%	1%
Mattapan Trolley	48%	51%	<1%	<1%	--	1%
Silver Line BRT	47%	49%	2%	<1%	<1%	1%
Commuter Rail	49%	47%	2%	<1%	1%	2%
Bus	53%	43%	1%	<1%	<1%	2%
Ferry	51%	46%	<1%	--	--	3%

Annual Household Income

Household income brackets used in this survey are calculated as a percentage of Area Median Income (AMI) available through the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) five-year datasets. They are updated each year using the latest available ACS dataset, and this year to include New Bedford and Fall River as part of the opening of South Coast Rail. In addition to the annual update of the AMI value used, in CY23 the MBTA's Service and Fare Change Equity Policy was updated and changed the cutoff for a rider to be considered "low-income" from 60% of the AMI in the MBTA service area to 80% of the AMI in the MBTA service area. In CY24, the survey began to collect income data based to household size, in accordance with standard methodologies used for other income evaluations, like the Federal Poverty Limit definition used in the new low-income fare program. The AMI for CY25 ranged from $53,000 to $198,000 depending on household size, while the low-income threshold ranged between $42,000 to $158,000 (Table 4). For the CY23 data release, the service area AMI was $102,000, and the low-income threshold was $81,000 (irrespective of household size).

Sixty-five percent of riders system-wide self-identified as low-income in the current Rider Census. While this is a lower number than was reported in previous years, it is now reflective of the 11% of individuals who declined to answer the question; the trends remain the same. Most modes continue to have a majority of riders who identify as low-income. Ferry service has the lowest percentage of riders identifying as low-income at 50%. See Table 5 for more details.

Table 4 - Average Household Income Thresholds by Household Size, and Low-Income Thresholds (80% AMI) by Household Size (2025)

Household Size	80% AMI	100% AMI
1	$42,000	$53,000
2	$102,000	$127,000
3	$125,000	$156,000
4	$150,000	$187,000
5	$150,000	$188,000
6	$151,000	$189,000
7	$158,000	$198,000

Table 5 - Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Low-Income by Service Mode

Mode	Yes
System-Wide	**65%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	64%
Blue Line	67%
Green Line	64%
Orange Line	64%
Red Line	62%
Mattapan Trolley	78%
Silver Line BRT	58%
Commuter Rail	59%
Bus	70%
Ferry	50%

Populations Protected on the Basis of Race or Ethnicity

The MBTA Service and Fare Change Equity Policy defines Populations Protected on the Basis of Race or Ethnicity as people who self-identify as a race other than white or who self-identify as Hispanic or Latine. System-wide, 56% of respondents were classified as protected on the basis of race or ethnicity based on responses to questions pertaining to race and ethnicity. This is consistent with the last publication and now reflects the nearly 10% of individuals who decline to answer the question. All modes except Commuter Rail and ferry report at least 50% of riders who identify as a race other than white or self-identify as Hispanic or Latine. See Table 6 for more details.

In terms of race, respondents could select multiple answers; 53% of respondents self-identified as a race other than white, 2% of respondents preferred not to self-identify their race, and 6% chose not to select any answer to the question. System-wide, respondents self-identifying as a race other than white made up the majority of riders on the Red Line, Orange Line, Mattapan Trolley, and bus services. Consistent with previous years, the Mattapan Trolley was the only service where the majority of respondents self-identified as Black or African American. See Table 7 for more details.

Table 6 - Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Minority by Service Mode

Mode	Yes
System-Wide	**56%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	54%
Blue Line	54%
Green Line	50%
Orange Line	57%
Red Line	56%
Mattapan Trolley	72%
Silver Line BRT	57%
Commuter Rail	45%
Bus	62%
Ferry	24%

Table 7 - Proportion of Self-Identified Race and Ethnicity by Service Mode

Mode	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Middle Eastern or North African	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	White	Other	Prefer not to say	Did not answer
System-Wide	**3%**	**13%**	**26%**	**4%**	**2%**	**48%**	**6%**	**2%**	**6%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	3%	14%	22%	4%	2%	50%	6%	2%	5%
Blue Line	3%	7%	15%	4%	2%	55%	10%	4%	8%
Green Line	3%	16%	17%	4%	2%	57%	5%	2%	4%
Orange Line	3%	14%	26%	5%	1%	43%	7%	2%	7%
Red Line	3%	15%	27%	4%	2%	48%	5%	2%	4%
Mattapan Trolley	1%	5%	62%	2%	<1%	27%	5%	1%	4%
Silver Line BRT	3%	13%	23%	5%	2%	52%	5%	2%	5%
Commuter Rail	2%	10%	22%	3%	1%	57%	6%	2%	4%
Bus	4%	11%	34%	4%	1%	40%	7%	2%	6%
Ferry	2%	5%	7%	3%	2%	77%	3%	1%	8%

Language

Information about language usage of survey respondents was determined through both the languages in which the survey was completed and a question on the survey that asked respondents if they speak another language at home or at work. The vast majority of surveys were completed in English (98%), but more than 30% of respondents systemwide reported that they spoke a language other than English at home or at work. The most commonly spoken language was Spanish (16%), followed by Chinese (4%, including Cantonese and Mandarin), Portuguese, Haitian Creole, and Arabic (all 2%). See Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8 - Survey Responses by Survey Language

Survey Language	Number of Responses
English	52,597
Spanish	1,030
Portuguese	101
Chinese (Simplified)	36
French	33
Haitian Creole	13
Chinese (Traditional)	3
Italian	2
Russian	2
Vietnamese	2
Arabic	1
Cape Verdean Creole	1

Table 9 - Language Besides English Spoken at Home or Work

Language	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses (Unweighted)	Percent of Responses (Weighted)
Spanish	41,696	16%	16%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	8,492	3%	4%
Portuguese	4,610	2%	2%
Haitian Creole	4,622	2%	2%
Arabic	3,677	1%	2%
Hindi	3,021	1%	1%
French	3,307	1%	1%
Two or More Languages	3,313	1%	1%
Vietnamese	1,497	1%	<1%
Urdu	1,016	<1%	<1%

Vehicles per Household

Overall, a plurality of riders—42%—report that their household does not own a vehicle. When breaking down by service mode, this remains consistent, with the exception of Commuter Rail and ferry riders, who more often report some level of access to a vehicle in their household. See Table 10 for more information.

Table 10 - Percentage of Vehicles per Household by Service Mode

Mode	0	Between 0 and 0.5	Between 0.5 and 1	1 or more	Other	Did not answer
System-Wide	**42%**	**26%**	**3%**	**7%**	**1%**	**7%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	43%	24%	3%	8%	1%	7%
Blue Line	46%	24%	2%	7%	1%	7%
Green Line	42%	24%	3%	7%	1%	8%
Orange Line	43%	25%	2%	7%	1%	7%
Red Line	43%	24%	3%	8%	1%	7%
Mattapan Trolley	47%	29%	2%	4%	1%	8%
Silver Line BRT	42%	21%	4%	11%	1%	5%
Commuter Rail	25%	27%	5%	12%	4%	8%
Bus	45%	28%	2%	4%	1%	8%
Ferry	12%	32%	3%	11%	6%	8%

Travel Behavior

Trip Purpose and Frequency by Service Mode

Trip purpose was determined by the answers to the questions "Where did this trip start?" and "Where did this trip end?" Trips that started or ended at home were classified as home-based trips, with the trip purpose determined by the type of place at the non-home end of their trip. Trips that neither started nor ended at home were classified as non-home-based trips.

Overall, trip purpose remained mostly unchanged from prior years. System-wide, the vast majority (85%) of trips were home-based, consistent with previous years, and home-based work trips are the most common trip purpose for all modes. Overall, the Blue Line and the Silver Line BRT are the two modes where home-based work trips are most common, both at 52%. Trips for home-based social activity held steady at around 14% of trips, maintaining the gains in trip purpose share that were reported in last year's publication. See Table 11 for more information.

The most often reported trip frequency type are trips that occur five days per week (40%), consistent with previous data. This year, trips occurring 3-4 days per week fell for every single mode – 3% systemwide and as much as 7% for Silver Line BRT. This decrease seems to have mostly been absorbed by less-frequent trips (trips occurring 1-2 days per week ticked up at least 2% for all modes). That said, in the case of Silver Line BRT, trips occurring 5 days per week increased by 5% as well, perhaps a reflection of the divergence of flexible/hybrid and fully in-person work schedules that we will continue to monitor.

Table 11 - Trip Purpose by Service Mode

Mode	Home-based Work	Home-based School	Home-based Social Activity	Home-based Other	Non-Home-Based	Did not answer
System-Wide	**46%**	**9%**	**14%**	**16%**	**10%**	**4%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	46%	10%	14%	16%	11%	4%
Blue Line	52%	6%	13%	16%	9%	4%
Green Line	45%	12%	16%	14%	10%	3%
Orange Line	46%	10%	11%	17%	11%	5%
Red Line	44%	9%	14%	15%	12%	4%
Mattapan Trolley	46%	9%	11%	21%	7%	6%
Silver Line BRT	52%	3%	8%	19%	14%	4%
Commuter Rail	46%	9%	18%	16%	8%	5%
Bus	45%	9%	13%	18%	10%	5%
Ferry	46%	1%	29%	13%	6%	5%

Table 12 - Trip Frequency by Service Mode

Mode	6 to 7 days per week	5 days per week	3 to 4 days per week	1 to 2 days per week	1 to 3 days per month	Less than once per month	Did not answer
System-Wide	**4%**	**40%**	**21%**	**15%**	**10%**	**10%**	**1%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	4%	40%	22%	15%	9%	10%	1%
Blue Line	5%	44%	19%	12%	9%	10%	1%
Green Line	3%	38%	25%	17%	8%	8%	1%
Orange Line	4%	42%	20%	13%	10%	10%	1%
Red Line	3%	38%	22%	16%	9%	10%	1%
Mattapan Trolley	3%	39%	20%	19%	13%	5%	1%
Silver Line BRT	3%	39%	24%	9%	8%	16%	1%
Commuter Rail	2%	32%	20%	17%	12%	16%	1%
Bus	5%	42%	19%	15%	10%	7%	2%
Ferry	1%	39%	11%	21%	12%	15%	1%

Alternate Means of Travel

Of riders who reported use of an alternative service to make the same trip as surveyed, the most common alternative reported was taxi or rideshare company at 43%; this is up from 35% last year and 27% in 2023. Contrarily, taking a different MBTA service has continued to drop from a 29% share to 16%, making it less common than alternatives like walking, driving alone, and carpooling. Taxi or rideshare remains the most popular option across all modes except for Commuter Rail and ferry, with the majority opting to drive alone at 51% and 58%, respectively. See table 13 for more information.

Table 13 - Proportions of Alternate Means of Travel by Service Mode

Mode	Different MBTA Service	Drive Alone	Taxi or Rideshare Company	Walk	Drive or Ride in a Carpool	Bike, Scooter, or Other Micromobility	Private Shuttle or Other Transit	Other
System-Wide	**16%**	**25%**	**43%**	**20%**	**23%**	**3%**	**2%**	**<1%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	15%	23%	47%	22%	21%	3%	2%	<1%
Blue Line	13%	24%	46%	22%	24%	1%	3%	<1%
Green Line	15%	21%	54%	19%	16%	2%	2%	<1%
Orange Line	16%	21%	44%	23%	25%	3%	3%	<1%
Red Line	14%	25%	44%	23%	23%	6%	2%	<1%
Mattapan Trolley	21%	27%	39%	14%	34%	2%	1%	<1%
Silver Line BRT	11%	21%	55%	17%	18%	3%	6%	<1%
Commuter Rail	20%	51%	19%	6%	23%	1%	3%	<1%
Bus	18%	18%	45%	23%	25%	3%	2%	<1%
Ferry	38%	58%	6%	12%	14%	1%	1%	<1%

Special Sampling

In 2025, our team oversampled certain stops on weekends and late-nights to better understand the travel behaviors of people that are using transit outside of the typical 9-5 commute cycle.

We sent surveyors out for nine weekends in total, from September 13 (after MBTA Extended Hours started) to November 15, 2025. The weekend surveying was conducted at North Station and Government Center. Late-night surveying only happened at Government Center.

We collected 238 Saturday responses (including after-midnight responses). For late-night analysis, we included anyone that said they took their trip between 10pm-3am resulting in 290 late-night responses; this can include individuals from previous years that told us about a late-night trip they took, although we did not explicitly survey late-night until 2025.

We also sent surveyors out for extra shifts along the new Fall River/New Bedford Line (formerly the Middleborough/Lakeville Line). We have collected a total of 620 responses along the entire line since 2022, and 118 of those responses were recorded at the newly opened stations in 2025.

Late-Night

These responses were recorded primarily at Government Center during the oversampling period. Surveyors were in the station from 6pm-2am during the late-night shifts.

Demographics

A higher percentage of late-night riders self-identified as minority (70%) as compared to system-wide numbers (56%). The number of riders identifying as low-income are comparable to the system-wide numbers.

Table 14 - Late-Night: Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Minority

	Yes		No		Did not answer	
Reporting Group	Percentage	Margin of Error	Percentage	Margin of Error	Percentage	Margin of Error
System-Wide	**56%**	**0.2%**	**35%**	**0.2%**	**10%**	**0.1%**
Late-Night	70%	4%	22%	4%	8%	3%

Table 15 - Late-Night: Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Low-Income

	Yes		No		Did Not Answer	
Reporting Group	Percentage	Margin of Error	Percentage	Margin of Error	Percentage	Margin of Error
System-Wide	**65%**	**0.2%**	**24%**	**0.2%**	**11%**	**0.1%**
Late-Night	65%	5%	18%	4%	17%	4%

Travel Behavior

The most common trip type for late-night riders was a "Home-based Work" trip (40%), similar but slightly less than the overall system-wide statistics (46%). This implies that there is a big percentage of late-night riders on the weekend that rely on the T for their commutes. The distribution of trip types is generally similar to system-wide, although there is a notably higher percent of people that did not answer this question (9% compared to 4% system-wide).

We looked at respondents' access mode to Government Center and found that the top three most common access modes are similar to the average across all modes—subway or light rail, walked, and carpool or dropped off by a personal vehicle—though the distribution is very different both when comparing to weekdays at the station and to the system-wide statistics. Overall, more people access Government Center through another subway or light rail service, though less do so on a Saturday night (55% compared to 75%). There are more individuals walking to the station on a weekend night (40%) than during the week (22%), which could be that more individuals are nearby for leisure activities.

Table 16 - Late-Night: Trip Purpose

	Home-based Work		Home-based Other		Home-based Social Activity		Non-Home-based		Home-based School		Did Not Answer	
Reporting Group	PCT*	MOE**	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
System-Wide	**46%**	**0.2%**	**16%**	**0.1%**	**14%**	**0.1%**	**10%**	**0.1%**	**9%**	**0.1%**	**4%**	**0.1%**
Late-Night	40%	5%	17%	4%	16%	4%	8%	3%	9%	3%	9%	3%

*PCT = Percentage
**MOE = Margin of Error

Table 17 - Late-Night: Access Mode

	Walked		Subway or Light Rail		Other	
Reporting Group	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
System-Wide	**59%**	**0.2%**	**21%**	**0.2%**	**20%**	**0.2%**
Weekday - Govt Center	22%	1%	75%	1%	3%	1%
Late-Night - Govt Center	40%	9%	55%	9%	5%	4%

Weekend

We surveyed riders on Saturdays at Government Center and North Station – the following findings are broken down by these two stations and compared to the weekday demographics and travel patterns at the same stations. We collected 158 responses at Government Center, and 91 responses at North Station.

Demographics

There was not a large difference in riders that identify as a minority (59% on weekends versus 52% on weekdays) or as low-income (between 67%-68%) at Government Center. At North Station however, there was a much higher proportion of riders that identify as low income on weekends (87%) compared to weekdays (59%), and slightly fewer people that identify as a minority (31% on weekends versus 45% on weekdays).

Table 18 - Weekend: Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Minority

Reporting Group	Service Board	Yes		No		Did Not Answer	
		PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
Weekday	Government Center	52%	2%	37%	2%	11%	1%
Weekend	Government Center	59%	6%	37%	6%	4%	3%
Weekday	North Station	45%	1%	44%	1%	10%	1%
Weekend	North Station	31%	8%	68%	8%	1%	1%

Table 19 - Weekend: Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Low-Income

Reporting Group	Service Board	Yes		No		Did Not Answer	
		PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
Weekday	Government Center	67%	1%	22%	1%	11%	1%
Weekend	Government Center	68%	6%	29%	6%	3%	2%
Weekday	North Station	59%	1%	28%	1%	13%	1%
Weekend	North Station	87%	6%	11%	5%	2%	3%

Travel Behavior

Trip Purpose

Although the stations are half a mile from each other, the trip purpose break-down varies significantly. While the top trip purpose at North Station is "Home-based Social Activity" at 51% (likely due to events at TD Garden), "Home-based Work" is the most common trip purpose at Government Center (57%), and home-based social activity only accounts for 26% of trips there.

During the weekday, both stations have similar trip purpose responses, though Government Center still has more respondents taking home-based work trips (53% compared to 46% at North Station).

Table 20 - Weekend: Trip Purpose

Reporting Group	Service Board	Home-based Work		Home-based Social Activity		Home-based Other		Non-Home-based		Home-based School		Did Not Answer	
		PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
Weekday	Government Center	53%	2%	14%	1%	13%	1%	10%	1%	7%	1%	3%	1%
Weekend	Government Center	57%	6%	25%	6%	18%	5%	0.1%	0.5%	--	--	--	--
Weekday	North Station	46%	1%	17%	1%	14%	1%	9%	1%	10%	1%	5%	1%
Weekend	North Station	22%	7%	51%	9%	26%	8%	1%	1%	--	--	--	--

True Access Mode

Both stations are central transfer points (over 80% of trips at both stations involved a transfer). This is reflected in the ways in which respondents accessed the station on the weekend. Two thirds of North Station riders accessed it via Commuter Rail (35%) or subway or light rail (35%), while the rest of respondents walked (29%).

Interestingly, the access modes on weekdays for North Station are quite different from weekend behavior; riders most commonly walked (42%) or took the subway or light rail (42%), and only 9% of respondents said they accessed the station via the Commuter Rail.

At Government Center, about 65% of riders accessed the station via subway or light rail, and 30% walked. Less than 5% of riders accessed the stations via other modes. This is similar to weekday patterns, though more weekday riders reported accessing the station via subway or light rail (75%).

Table 21 - Weekend: Access Mode

	Subway or Light Rail		Walked		Other		Commuter Rail	
Reporting Group	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
Weekday - Goverment Center	75%	1%	22%	1%	3%	1%	0.2%	0.1%
Weekend - Goverment Center	65%	6%	30%	6%	4%	2%	1%	1%
Weekday - North Station	42%	1%	42%	1%	8%	1%	9%	1%
Weekend - North Station	35%	7%	29%	6%	--	--	35%	7%

South Coast Rail

The following analysis compares the new Fall River/New Bedford line stops to the stations that were existing previously as part of the Middleborough/Lakeville line. These include:

- Middleborough[1]
- East Taunton
- Freetown
- Church Street
- New Bedford
- Fall River/Fall River Depot

Demographics

The new stations appear to have fewer people identifying as a minority (47% compared to 54% at existing stations), though these numbers are similar to the rest of the Commuter Rail. The proportion of low-income riders are comparable across the line and across all Commuter Rail.

Table 22 - South Coast Rail: Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Minority

		Yes		No		Did Not Answer	
Reporting Group	Stop	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
All Commuter Rail		45%	1%	47%	1%	8%	0.4%
South Coast Rail	Existing Station	54%	4%	38%	3%	8%	2%
South Coast Rail	New Station	47%	7%	44%	7%	9%	4%

1 The former Middleborough/Lakeville station is now the Lakeville station and only serves the Cape-FLYER service

Table 23 - South Coast Rail: Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Low-Income

Reporting Group	Stop	Yes		No		Did Not Answer	
		PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
All Commuter Rail		59%	1%	29%	1%	12%	0.4%
South Coast Rail	Existing Station	62%	3%	26%	3%	12%	2%
South Coast Rail	New Station	59%	7%	39%	7%	2%	2%

Travel Behavior

Both new and existing stations had "Home-based Work" as the top reason for their trip (35% and 36% respectively), but respondents from the new stations had a higher percentage of "Home-based Social Activity" trips (23% at the newer stations compared to 17% at the older ones). While "Home-based School" is the second most common trip type for existing stations (18% of trips), only 7% of trips at the new stations were school related and this was the least common type of trip.

Respondents who took South Coast Rail generally accessed the station by walking (37% for new stations, 48% for existing stations). Besides walking, the next most common access modes vary greatly when comparing new and existing stations. The second most common access mode for new stations was "Drove Alone" (24%, compared to 4% for existing stations), then "Carpooled or Dropped off by Personal Vehicle" (14% versus 9% at existing stations). This is likely due to the fact that the new stations are further out and are not near subway or light rail stops (which is the second most common access mode for existing stations), or other Commuter Rail lines (third most common for existing stations).

Compared to the rest of the Commuter Rail system, fewer people accessed the new South Coast Rail stations by foot (37% compared to 48% for all Commuter Rail).

Table 24 - South Coast Rail: Trip Purpose

Reporting Group	Stop	Home-based Work		Home-based Social Activity		Home-based Other		Home-based School		Non-Home-based		Did Not Answer	
		PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
All Commuter Rail		46%	1%	18%	1%	16%	0.5%	9%	0.4%	8%	0.4%	5%	0.3%
South Coast Rail	Existing Station	36%	3%	17%	3%	16%	3%	18%	3%	9%	2%	5%	2%
South Coast Rail	New Station	35%	7%	23%	6%	18%	6%	7%	4%	12%	5%	5%	3%

Table 25 - South Coast Rail: Access Mode

Reporting Group	Walked		Bike, Scooter, or Other Micromobility		Subway or Light Rail		The RIDE		Commuter Rail	
	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
All Commuter Rail	48%	1%	4%	0.3%	12%	0.4%	2%	0.2%	1%	0.1%
South Coast Rail - Existing Station	48%	2%	4%	1%	14%	2%	1%	1%	9%	1%
South Coast Rail - New Station	37%	7%	8%	4%	--	--	7%	4%	--	--

Reporting Group	Carpooled or Dropped off by Personal Vehicle		Drove Alone		Taxi or Rideshare Company		Other	
	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE	PCT	MOE
All Commuter Rail	13%	0.4%	8%	0.4%	7%	0.3%	6%	0.3%
South Coast Rail - Existing Station	9%	1%	4%	1%	3%	1%	8%	1%
South Coast Rail - New Station	14%	5%	24%	6%	8%	4%	1%	1%

Appendix

Service Mode Definitions

The MBTA's rapid transit system includes its heavy rail and light rail services, described below.

Heavy Rail: The MBTA operates three heavy rail lines—the Red Line, the Blue Line, and the Orange Line—that provide core subway services.

Light Rail: The MBTA's primary light rail system, the Green Line, provides local service in outlying areas via its surface operations and core subway services in and around the Boston city center. In addition, the MBTA operates the Mattapan Line, which serves as a Red Line extension from Ashmont Station to Mattapan Station via light rail.

Bus: All rubber-tire vehicles regardless of the vehicle's power source.

Commuter Rail: Long-haul, commuter-oriented services that link the outer portions of the region with Downtown Boston.

Ferry: Inner Harbor Ferry services for travel between destinations in Boston, and Commuter Ferry services from the South Shore to Downtown Boston and Logan Airport.

Additional Data Tables

Table A1 - Proportion of Fare Type by Service Mode

Mode	Monthly Pass	Pay-as-you-go	7-day Pass	Student Pass (M7)	Semester Pass	1-day Pass	Other	Did not answer
System-Wide	**35%**	**41%**	**12%**	**2%**	**1%**	**1%**	**1%**	**6%**
Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit	39%	39%	13%	2%	1%	1%	1%	4%
Blue Line	34%	33%	16%	2%	<1%	1%	<1%	14%
Green Line	42%	40%	13%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%
Orange Line	38%	40%	13%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Red Line	40%	41%	12%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%
Mattapan Trolley	31%	46%	13%	6%	<1%	1%	1%	2%
Silver Line BRT	39%	43%	12%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	2%
Commuter Rail	24%	65%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Bus	31%	38%	15%	3%	1%	1%	<1%	12%
Ferry	24%	64%	4%	<1%	--	4%	1%	4%

Table A2 - Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Minority for Frequent Bus Routes by Survey Edition

Line	2022-2025 Percent Minority
System-Wide	**56%**
1	62%
104	62%
111	66%
114, 116, & 117	60%
15	75%
22	79%
23	79%
28 & 29	77%
32	71%
39	56%
43 & SL5	62%
57	48%
66	57%
67 & 77	47%
71	54%
73	49%
SL1	50%
SL2	46%
SL3	68%
SL4	60%

Table A3 - Percent of Riders Self-Identifying as Low-Income for Frequent Bus Routes by Survey Edition

Line	2022-2025 Percent Low-Income
System-Wide	**65%**
1	58%
104	81%
111	68%
114, 116, & 117	76%
15	83%
22	75%
23	76%
28 & 29	67%
32	79%
39	63%
43 & SL5	75%
57	65%
66	70%
67 & 77	63%
71	73%
73	64%
SL1	51%
SL2	50%
SL3	66%
SL4	65%