TTC 2027 Annual Network Plan

Planning Advisory Group Round One Meeting Summary

Wednesday, August 19, 2026, 2 – 4 pm
Meeting held online via Zoom

Overview

On Wednesday, August 19, 2026, the TTC hosted a Planning Advisory Group meeting as part of the first of two rounds of consultation for its 2027 Annual Network Plan. The purpose of the meeting was to share and seek feedback on the proposed bus route adjustments and improvements, and on the Express Bus Network Review. See Appendix A for the meeting agenda.

A broad range of transit-interested organizations were invited to participate. A total of 27 participants representing 23 organizations attended the meeting, along with staff from the TTC and Third Party Public, the engagement team retained by TTC to support the engagement process for the 2027 Annual Network Plan. Participants came from transit and environmental advocacy organizations, resident and ratepayer associations, business improvement areas, student unions, community and social service agencies, and accessibility advocates. See Appendix B for a full list of participating staff and organizations.

This meeting summary was prepared by Third Party Public. Feedback received both before and after the meeting is also included (see Appendix C). The intent of this summary is to capture the range of feedback shared at the meeting; it is not intended to serve as a verbatim transcript. This summary was subject to participant review before being finalized.

This summary includes two sections:

- Key themes of feedback
- Detailed summary of feedback

Key themes of feedback

The following themes of feedback emerged during and after the meeting:

General support for the direction of the 2027 Annual Network Plan and for the attention being given to the Express Network. Participants thought the methodology was generally on the right track, welcomed the focus on improving express service, and described the thinking behind the review as “ambitious” and “worth continuing”. The proposed routing changes were also generally well received, with the clearest support for the Dupont Corridor and Black Creek proposals, both of which participants said respond to real growth and real gaps in the network.

Regarding the Express Network review, it’s important that the travel time savings are not framed as a trade-off against reliability, comfort, and accessibility, because all are important for a good public transit service. Participants said customers expect good service on an express route, not only a faster one. A route that is consistently 15 or 20 minutes late, or consistently overcrowded, does not deliver the benefit it promises. Speed and reliability were described as the aspects customers value most, including customers with low incomes, which is why the focus on express service was welcomed.

The justification for individual stop removals needs to be clearer and better supported by data, including clarity around how destinations, connections, and safety were taken into consideration. Participants said it is not clear how the factors in the methodology were balanced against each other, which produces results that appear inconsistent — routes that meet the standards are proposed for significant change while a route that does not meet them is left unaddressed. Because any stop removal is likely to be controversial, the reasoning needs to be visible and transparent so customers do not feel their stop was singled out without reason.

Engage affected communities directly, early, and with clearer materials. Participants asked for more time to review changes that affect people with disabilities, and for the difficult changes to be brought forward as openly as the welcome ones. They also asked for stop changes to be shown on maps drawn approximately to scale, and for public notices that make the nearest remaining stop easy to identify.

Appreciation for the consultation. Several participants thanked the TTC and the engagement team for convening the meeting, presenting the work in detail, and seeking feedback at a stage where it can still shape the proposals.

Detailed summary of feedback

Participants shared detailed feedback about the proposed bus route adjustments and improvements, the Express Bus Network review, the engagement process, and related initiatives. This feedback is organized and summarized under their respective sections below.

Feedback about the proposed bus route adjustments and improvements

TTC presented proposed routing changes in five areas — Morningside Heights, Black Creek, the Dupont Corridor, Sherway Gardens, and Islington South — and asked participants what works well, what could be improved further, and what other factors it should consider. Participants were generally supportive of the proposed changes. Their questions focused on the operational feasibility of specific proposals and on whether the routing changes would be matched by service levels. Feedback shared included:

Dupont Corridor

TTC proposed a new peak-only 26B branch on the 26 Dupont, operating between St George Station and Lansdowne Station.

Strong support for the Dupont Corridor proposal, which participants said matches the population growth along the corridor. A Lansdowne terminal is a good solution for the corridor. To realize the full reliability benefit, the routing change should be paired with the City's streetscape and roadway work on Dupont St, with stop improvements woven in. The roadway conditions determine how much of the improvement customers actually experience.

Clarify how the new 26B branch would turn around at Lansdowne. The 47 Lansdowne bus cannot loop at the station, and the diagram in the deck did not make the proposed turnaround clear.

Answer provided by the TTC team: We have been discussing this with our engineering colleagues. The turnaround location is potentially Wade Ave and Patton Ave, which would require loading considerations, parking adjustments and changes to the road. That is tentatively what we are looking at, but we need more detail from the engineering and transportation side before this is finalized.

Morningside Heights

TTC proposed adding peak service on the 53A Steeles East to replace the 953 Steeles East Express, removing 953 routing on Steeles Ave East, Staines Rd, Morningside Dr, Oasis Blvd, and Seasons Dr, and adjusting the 939C Finch Express routing.

Confirm that the Morningside Heights changes will not reduce off-peak service.

Answer provided by the TTC team: Exact service levels will be confirmed, but the peak service level will be the same. Only the express routing in the area is being removed; local service in the area is maintained.

Islington South

TTC proposed a new two-way 110C Islington South service between Kipling Loop and Islington Ave at Birmingham St, removing the northbound-only routing on Birmingham St, 12th St, Garnett Janes Rd, and 9th St.

The routing change itself is not a concern, nor is walking to the station from Bloor St to Islington Ave, but 110 Islington South is noticeably less frequent south of Bloor St than north of it.

Answer provided by the TTC team: *The ANP is focused on network and routing adjustments rather than service levels. Service level changes are proposed through our board period cycles, generally every six weeks, based on how each route is performing.*

Black Creek

TTC proposed extending the 84C Sheppard West via Old Weston Rd and Director Ct, and extending the 99 Arrow Rd to Sheppard West Station.

Support for extending the 99 Arrow Rd to Sheppard West Station, with a request for more connections into Finch West. The Arrow Rd area is largely industrial, and workers often take two or three buses to reach it, so more direct connections — including routing on side streets — would reduce transfers. Participants also asked for more frequent service on 165 Weston Rd North and on 99 Arrow Rd near Fenmar Dr, and for better service on the LRT, noting that many workers depend on these routes.

Feedback about the Express Bus Network Review

TTC presented the objectives and methodology for the Express Bus Network Review, along with examples of minor changes, medium changes, and changes intended to create a clearer distinction between express and local service. Participants were asked whether the methodology made sense, what other factors TTC should consider in evaluating opportunities to improve travel times through stop changes, and what other advice they had for the team.

Participants described the methodology as comprehensive and on track, and welcomed the equity weighting being set out explicitly for the first time. Some of the shared concerns focused on the criteria that do not visibly come through in the route examples and on a clearer rationale for stop removals that will need to be made public.

Feedback on the methodology

Make the destinations and trip generators named in the methodology visible in the route examples. Participants said it is not clear from the examples where this factor was applied. Where a stop appears underused, the reasons are often complex, and destinations and population density around a stop matter more than boarding counts alone.

Prioritize students and their destinations as a group in the analysis for both secondary and post-secondary students. Work with data collected through StudentMoveTO – how students travel across the city. Students are an important group because they often travel without access to a car and because travel habits formed early tend to last.

Assess pedestrian safety and collision data before consolidating stops at high-collision intersections. Stops on both sides of an intersection distribute pedestrian and vehicle movements; consolidating to one side concentrates them. Jane St and Sheppard Ave, Jane St and Lawrence Ave, Weston Rd and Lawrence Ave, and Jane St and Wilson Ave were named as intersections with some of the highest pedestrian fatality counts in the city, and the proposed consolidations on the 984 Sheppard West Express were the specific concern. Participants asked whether hospital or EMS collision data had informed these decisions, and said the methodology would benefit from additional research drawing on customer and operator feedback.

Answer provided by the TTC team: *We do not have the specific data behind those stop decisions in front of us. We will take that back and follow up by email with more information on why those stops were reviewed. We would also encourage these comments to be submitted through the survey, which is the best way for us to capture stop-specific feedback.*

Answer provided by the TTC team after the meeting: *Hospital and EMS collision data was not used in developing the methodology for the proposed stop recommendations, as those datasets are not available to us. Before finalizing any stop adjustments, we will carefully review feedback from customers, TTC operators, and other TTC staff and external peers to ensure all relevant perspectives are considered as part of the decision-making process.*

Explain the 25% equity weighting and how that figure was arrived at. Participants welcomed seeing the equity criterion spelled out in the deck for the first time and asked why the weighting is set at 25%.

Answer provided by the TTC team: The equity lens is set out on page 30 of the Service Standards document and has been applied to our proposals and our post-implementation reviews; this is one of the first times we have spelled it out on a slide, because we wanted to be transparent about it. Its purpose is to protect customers who depend on transit for work, childcare, and shopping when we look at removing service from specific stops or segments, and boardings and alightings at those stops are weighted at 1.25. We are aware of the concern that focusing on Neighbourhood Improvement Areas misses transit-dependent communities elsewhere in the city, and that criterion is being re-evaluated with the City of Toronto.

Push further on what makes express service distinct, beyond simply having fewer stops. Fewer stops on their own can reduce accessibility without delivering a meaningfully different service. There needs to be more ambitious thinking that looks at express routes in terms of the system and the connections between major nodes — customers will travel backwards to reach a node if it connects them to a route that takes 20 minutes off their journey.

Show whether express corridors have bus-only lanes or other roadway priority. Where stop removals alone will not achieve the travel time target, those corridors should be identified and prioritized for transit priority measures rather than relying on stop changes to close the gap.

Route-specific feedback

Explain why the 924 Victoria Park Express is proposed for six stop removals when it meets the travel time savings standard. Participants asked what allows the 924 Victoria Park Express and the 968 Warden Express to meet the standard when most routes do not, and why a route that performs well is proposed for one of the larger sets of changes?

Answer provided by the TTC team: Routes that met the travel time benefit standard generally exhibited characteristics such as wider stop spacing and operating conditions characterized by relatively low congestion. However, meeting the travel time benefit threshold did not exclude a route from further review. As part of the methodology, all express routes were assessed to identify additional opportunities to improve travel times.

Take stop-level network connections into account, including where an express route loops at its outer end. The 925 Don Mills Express is harder to catch southbound at Steeles Ave because of the loop via Townsend Rd and Freshmeadow Dr, unlike other express routes that connect directly north of Steeles Ave.

Answer provided by the TTC team: Stops along that northern loop are taken into account, so customers who rely on those connections can still make them. Stop activity refers to boardings and alightings — the ons and offs at each stop.

Look at whether express buses can be routed around known congestion, including during construction. Where an express route has no intermediate stops, participants asked whether operators could divert around congestion. A specific opportunity was raised at Don Mills Rd and Overlea Blvd on 925 Don Mills Express: the eastbound-to-northbound left turn already loses significant time, and lane reductions for the Overlea Bridge rebuild are expected this fall. Running across Don Mills Rd to Gateway Blvd and around Flemingdon Park Plaza may be the faster path during the construction period.

Answer provided by the TTC team: Our routing is fixed so that service is consistent, and individual operators do not divert from it. Construction diversions are typically used where there is a full road closure rather than a lane reduction, where we maintain coverage in the area. The Overlea suggestion is good feedback, and we will take it back and look at it.

Process feedback and advice

Engage affected communities directly on routing changes, particularly seniors and customers with disabilities. Participants said the Sherway Gardens changes in particular need direct engagement with seniors in the area. More broadly, significantly altered routes carry a different weight for customers with disabilities: 26 Dupont, for example, is used on weekends by seniors with buggies travelling to grocery stores.

Participants also asked that communities and businesses in areas such as St Lawrence, the Distillery District, and the Canary District be engaged directly where changes affect them.

Give participants more time to review changes that affect people with disabilities and bring forward the difficult changes as openly as the welcome ones. The concern raised was that stakeholders are left to find changes in reports and get feedback to the right person before a decision has already been made.

Write public notices so that customers can identify the nearest remaining stop. Notices about stop changes can be confusing, and naming the closest remaining stop would help.

Gratitude for the meeting. Several participants thanked the TTC and the engagement team for the presentation and the discussion.

Comments and questions about related initiatives

Participants raised a number of service, staffing, and transit priority requests that fall outside the scope of the 2027 Annual Network Plan. These will be relayed to the responsible teams, and included:

- Hiring more operators and extending the hours of operation of express routes, including earlier starts, with the Sheppard express named.
- Giving hiring priority to qualified candidates from the local community, and advertising opportunities through a community-based employment portal.
- Implementing the dedicated lanes long promised on Finch Ave and Steeles Ave.
- Alignment between the 2027 Annual Network Plan and the upcoming Ridership Growth Strategy.
- The status of the 901 express between Mount Dennis and Pearson Airport.

Answer provided by the TTC team: Dedicated lanes and transit priority fall under the RapidTO program. A second phase of the Ridership Growth Strategy is expected to be initiated after the 2026 Municipal Election. The 901 is not planned to be implemented in 2026–2027 due to resource requirements. On operator hiring, staffing requirements follow service levels, and we will connect offline to identify the right point of contact.

Next steps

The TTC team thanked participants for their time and feedback and noted that Round One engagement will continue through August and September with an online public survey, a meeting with the Advisory Committee on Accessible Transit, Youth Ambassador consultations, and TTC pop-up events. TTC will review all Round One feedback, update the proposals, and hold Round Two engagement in November 2026, with the final 2027 Annual Network Plan presented to the TTC Board in early/mid 2027.

The facilitation team said a draft summary of the discussion would be circulated for participant review before being finalized. They noted that additional written feedback could be sent to the engagement team by Wednesday, August 26 for inclusion. Finally, the facilitation team told participants that the online survey would launch the following week, and asked participants to share it with their networks so that TTC can hear from more customers.

Appendix A. Agenda

TTC 2027 Annual Network Plan
Round One Planning Advisory Group Meeting

Wednesday, August 19, 2026, 2:00 - 4:00 pm
Meeting held virtually via Zoom

Proposed agenda

2:00 **Land acknowledgement, welcome, introductions, agenda review**
Jasmine Eftekhari, TTC
Yulia Pak, Facilitator, Third Party Public

2:10 **Presentation & Facilitated Discussion**
Jordan Langlois, TTC
All

Part 1: Overview of Round One proposals for bus routes

a. *What are your thoughts on the draft proposed service routing improvements? What works well? What could be improved further?*
b. *Are there any other factors TTC should consider in planning these adjustments (e.g., travel patterns, connections, etc.)?*
c. *Any other feedback or advice for the TTC team as they refine their draft proposals?*

Part 2: Express Bus Network Review

a. *Does the methodology make sense to you? What works well? concerns?*
b. *Are there any other factors TTC should consider in evaluating to improve travel times via stop changes?*
c. *Any other feedback or advice for the team?*

3:55 **Wrap up and next steps**

4:00 **Adjourn**

Meeting purpose

- To share and seek feedback on draft proposed changes to select bus routes in Morningside Heights, Black Creek, Dupont Corridor, Sherway Gardens, and Islington South
- To share and seek feedback on the methodology for the proposed Express Bus Network stop changes

Appendix B. Participants

Advisory Group organizations

365 Bloor Management Inc.
Agincourt Village Community Association
Annex Residents' Association
Centre for Spanish Speaking Peoples
CodeRedTO
Community Living Toronto
East Scarborough Storefront
Emery Village BIA
Leaside Residents Association
Leaside Towers Tenants Association of Thorncliffe Park
pointA
Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities
Scarborough Renewal Organizations (SCRO)
Student Association of George Brown College
Toronto Community Benefits Network
Toronto Environmental Alliance
TTCriders
University of Toronto Graduate Students' Union
University of Toronto Students' Union
Walk Toronto
WomanACT
Yonge North York BIA
YNOT Services

TTC

Jasmine Eftekhari
Jordan Langlois
Andrea Mikkila

Third Party Public

Khly Lamparero
Yulia Pak

Appendix C. Pre- and post-meeting written feedback

The engagement team received the following written feedback before and after the meeting. Personal details have been omitted. Other than minor formatting changes, the feedback has not been edited.

Email from Steve Munro, stevemunro.ca, received August 19, 2026

Re Dupont corridor:
The deck does not indicate what the peak period service design will be with the new 26B Lansdowne service. Will that be a net addition, or will service be cut west of Lansdowne? It is already infrequent. Operationally, there will be a question of reliability. By analogy to the split service on 94 Wellesley, it is very common for the through service to Ossington and the short turn service to Wellesley Station to run with little sense of a "blended" service so that although the frequency east of Yonge is, on paper, twice as good as to the west, bunching and big gaps are common.

There is a general operating problem with branched services on "inbound" trips where the branches merge, but not necessarily reliably, so that the advertised and actual services are quite different.

Re Sherway:
The deck mentions potential service reduction on the southwest end of the route. For public discussion this should be quantified so people know what you are proposing.

Re Express routes generally:
I am amused that riders want more stops. Info about these requests should be included in the review.

The issue of travel time saving for very small changes in the stop count is a red herring on a few counts. First, only rides that travel past the deleted stop(s) benefit from the change. Please don't tell us that 10,000 riders will have a faster trip if only 1,000 of them are actually on buses passing the affected stops.

Another issue for express vs local service is wait time for a bus to show up versus time saved enroute. This is compounded by irregularity in express bus headways. Too much emphasis is put on time saving through stop eliminations versus regularly spaced service.

There should be a way of showing the demand profile on the routes and stops to get a sense of the magnitude of affected groups of riders.

The 2026 ASP feedback is interesting because of two comments: "… provided that local service coverage and accessibility are maintained" and "Time savings are valued, but reliability and comfort matter just as much."

The questions on page 22 for route review are not reflected on the maps of express routes. Also considerations about major destinations and connections might make it impossible to achieve the stop spacing target on parts of some routes. Be careful of using average spacings over the full route as opposed to recognition of areas where more stops are justified to serve this type of stop.

From the chart it is clear that NONE of the routes meet the stop spacing standard. Maybe the problem lies with the standard.

Re 925 Don Mills:
The only proposed change is the stop at Van Horne. This will only "benefit" riders originating north of this point, and no "improvement" should be claimed for riders between this point and Broadview Station.

Re 929 Dufferin:
Similarly to the 925, there is only one stop removal proposed at Dufferin Mall. This will provide a small time saving only for riders south of Bloor. This is also a good example of a route where the street grid and demand pattern simply does not fit with a standard much more attuned to the suburban pattern of widely spaced arterials.

Re 984 Sheppard West:
You need to show the stop activity level to make sense of the stops to be removed. "Numerous stops" are below the threshold. What is that threshold? Are some low activity stops retained?

The situation where there are both nearside and farside stops is an issue across the system for local and express services. These double stops exist in part to simplify transfer connections at wide intersections.

Re 924 Vic Park:
You propose removing stops at transfer points, and you do not show the connection with Line 5. This does not make sense.

Re 953 Steeles East:
Historically, there is a reason why some express routes turn into locals in their outer areas, and this made sense in the context of the service design when the route was created. You say that stop activity decreases east of McCowan. That suggests that most riders will not be affected by the deleted stops and will see no travel time saving. This is definitely a case where the ridership profile and benefits, if any, need to be broken out for different sections of the route.

Dare I mention the 960 Steeles West that runs local west of Pioneer Village Station?

Re 954 Lawrence East:
This is another route where the outer end runs local due to historic service patterns. Again, the review needs to show the effect and benefit by route segment. Obviously this change has no effect on the western part of the route or riders who only travel there.

TTC response to Steve Munro, sent September 1, 2026

Thank you for reviewing the deck presentation and for sending us your questions. We're hoping that these replies will offer some clarity to our proposals in the 2027 Annual Network Plan. Some of these were discussed with participants who attended the Planning Advisory Group meeting as well.

26 Dupont:
The proposed 26B Dupont branch is currently planned as a net addition to the route, with service frequencies matching the existing 26 Dupont service during the morning and afternoon peak periods. However, the service design has not yet been finalized and will be confirmed closer to implementation.

The two branches would operate as a blended service between St. George Station and Lansdowne Avenue, effectively doubling service frequency on the common segment between Lansdowne Avenue and St. George Station. Agreed with your point about theoretical vs. observed service levels due to operational issues, bunching and gapping, etc.

We are also aware of the existing operational challenges along the Dupont corridor that can affect service reliability. As the proposal moves forward, we will continue working with internal and City colleagues to identify opportunities to improve operating conditions and support more reliable service along the corridor.

Sherway Gardens:
Service frequencies for the proposed Sherway Gardens network are still being finalized. The frequencies assumed in this proposal have been developed based on current observed travel demand on the existing route branches.

Current ridership patterns, supported by modelling forecasts, indicate that travel demand between Kipling Station and Long Branch Loop, Kipling Station and Sherway Gardens, and Long Branch Loop and Sherway Gardens varies between sections of the route and throughout periods of the week.

While the proposed service reductions on Brown's Line are relatively modest, they would be offset by additional service on North Queen Street, better aligning service levels with observed and forecasted travel demand patterns. It was important to acknowledge that some customers along Brown's Line may experience less frequent combined service during certain periods of the week — as well as customers travelling directly between Sherway Gardens and Long Branch.

Service frequencies have not yet been officially confirmed and will be finalized closer to implementation based on observed ridership at that time and Service Standards.

Express Network:

With respect to the overall Express Network review methodology, the recommendations were developed through a comprehensive assessment and were not based on any single factor. The review began with an evaluation of both scheduled and observed travel times for each express route relative to its local counterpart to determine whether the TTC's minimum Service Standard of 15% travel time savings was being achieved. This analysis was done at the node level, which enabled us to identify underperforming route segments where there may be opportunities to improve travel times through stop adjustments.

Following the travel time analysis, a stop-level review was undertaken using a structured flow-chart process that considered multiple factors, including stop spacing, stop activity, network connectivity, major destinations and trip generators, and equity considerations.

The first step was reviewing stop spacing. Express stops are intended to be spaced between 800 and 1,200 metres as per TTC Service Standards, and consecutive stops below the 800-metre minimum stop spacing standard were flagged for further review. These flagged stops were then assessed using stop activity data (boardings and alightings) to determine whether activity at the stop was below the route average. Even though there is not a defined threshold as per our Service Standards, the route average was used as a screening threshold to help identify underutilized stops. In the interest of brevity, these figures weren't included in the survey and, as mentioned above, stop activity was one of the many considerations used to flag a stop for potential removal. If a low-usage (relative to the route average) express stop did not meet the other review factors, it was not advanced for further consideration.

Equity considerations were then incorporated through the TTC Service Standards. For stops located within or in proximity to a City of Toronto Neighbourhood Improvement Area, a 25% weighting was applied to stop activity.

Stops that continued through the review process were then evaluated for network connectivity. Specifically, we assessed whether a stop provided a unique transfer opportunity that was not otherwise available elsewhere along the route. We also reviewed whether the stop served a major destination or trip generator, for example, a hospital or other trip generators. In the case a stop didn't meet the other criteria and if its major trip generator was a school, priority will be given to meet this demand via the local service (or a designated school trip) given the special and seasonal nature of this type of demand. This mimics the service we currently provide to schools such as Lawrence Park Collegiate Institute and Cedarbrae Collegiate Institute.

Stops that met these preliminary screening conditions were identified as candidates for either removal or consolidation. However, the process did not end there. All candidate stops were subsequently reassessed in the broader context of the route, including local geography, spacing between the remaining stops, operating considerations, and the cumulative effect of all proposed changes.

As part of this holistic review, we also re-evaluated the resulting express stop spacing after all proposed changes were applied, recognizing that recommendations cannot be assessed in isolation. This review helped ensure that the final stop pattern remained appropriate and that new stop spacings remained reasonable for the corridor being evaluated.

Major destinations and trip generators were also reassessed at this stage. For example, where a proposed stop adjustment affected a hospital, community facility, or other key destination, we reviewed whether that destination would continue to remain within a reasonable walking distance of the nearest remaining express stop. This final review helped ensure that route-specific context was appropriately considered before recommendations were finalized.

As such, the factors outlined above were intended to guide the review rather than serve as rigid criteria. Some recommendations did not meet every individual factor, while other stops that met several of the screening criteria were ultimately retained due to route-specific context and operational considerations.

929 Dufferin: Following the Planning Advisory Group meeting, the stop proposal was not carried forward and was therefore not included in the survey.

984 Sheppard West: As mentioned in the methodology, the threshold is defined by the average stop activity across the route. However, a stop with activity below that threshold does not automatically become a candidate

for removal. Several other factors are considered before a stop recommendation is proposed. As a result, some stops that fell below the activity threshold are retained.

924 Victoria Park: As outlined in our methodology, stops that serve as transfer points can still be recommended for change, provided that the same route connection remains available elsewhere along the corridor.
The stop at Gordon Baker Rd provides a connection to the 39C Finch East. While removal of this stop would eliminate that specific transfer location, customers would still be able to transfer between the routes at Victoria Park Ave and Finch Ave East. Customers also have the opportunity to transfer between the 39C Finch East and 924 Victoria Park Express further north at Victoria Park and McNicoll (although a very short walk to cross the intersection is required).
Although the stop at Consumers Rd/Meadowacres Dr provides connections to the 167A Pharmacy North and the 24 Victoria Park, customers would still be able to transfer to the 167A Pharmacy North at Victoria Park Ave and Sheppard Ave East, and to the 24 Victoria Park at multiple locations along the Victoria Park Ave corridor.

953 Steeles East & 954 Lawrence East: One of the key objectives of the Express Network Review was to create a clearer distinction between routes intended to operate as express services and those providing local service. As a result, proposals involving routes that currently operate as a combination of local and express service required more extensive consideration and a broader range of potential adjustments. Despite the greater scope of changes evaluated for these routes, all proposals were assessed and developed using the same methodology.

On showing the demand profile on the routes and stops: We thank you for this suggestion. We will take it back and consider it for the 2nd round of public consultation and in the final report.

On the stop spacing chart: The column labelled “Stop Spacing” displays whether an individual stop spacing falls below our 800m stop spacing standard. This is not a stop spacing average of the route, but whether individual stops meet that standard. This could mean that a route has an average spacing of 1km, but with some stops that are spaced below 800m. This was mentioned during the planning advisory group meeting.

Email from CodeRedTO, received August 21, 2026

Thanks again for the presentations and discussion at Wednesday’s meeting.

I think the only thing I would add to my comments on the express bus plan is that for the presentation, it would help to have more clarity about which stops are being removed — ideally on a map that is somewhat to scale. It is hard to understand the current diagrams and get a sense of the changes.

Email from University of Toronto Students’ Union and University of Toronto Graduate Students’ Union, received August 25, 2026

The University of Toronto Students’ Union (UTSU) and the University of Toronto Graduate Students’ Union (UTGSU) have submitted this feedback in collaboration with each other. The UTSU represents 40,000 undergraduate students on the St. George Campus of the University of Toronto. The UTGSU represents 22,000 graduate students across the University of Toronto’s campuses. The following feedback reflects the transit experiences of our membership and is submitted as part of Round One of the TTC Annual Network Plan Review.

Consistency of Stop Removal on Express Network

The justification for the removal of certain stops from the express bus network is not clear. While it was explained that several factors were involved in the decision-making process, it is unclear how those factors were balanced or weighted. This leads to several inconsistencies, for example:

- **The 924 Victoria Park Express** was recommended for stop changes despite meeting time standards, equity standards, and service distinction standards. Why was this route recommended for changes if it was one of the only routes to meet the time standards and the only route to meet all three thresholds? Furthermore, it has 6 stops removed from it, which is one of the more significant route changes. It is unclear why this major change is being proposed.

- **The 938 Highland Creek Express** does not meet the time standards and is the only route (included in the review) where no stop changes were recommended. Why not change a stop when it is not meeting the standard? Are we accepting a route being unable to meet the standard and not acting on it?
- **For 929 Dufferin,** it is mentioned that "activity is quite high across all stops along the corridor," which makes the removal of stops confusing. If all the stops are already too busy, why should we remove some instead of adding any? Is there also not likely to be more traffic given the connections that the new Line 5 provides?

Given that any stop removal is likely to be controversial and inconvenience customers that use that stop, the justification for their removal needs to be clear and transparent so that customers do not feel like "their" stop was "targeted" without reason. The current selection criteria are unclear, with well-performing routes being targeted while underperforming routes are being unaddressed. This dichotomy could result in customers having a more negative reaction to stop changes as the current criteria is opaque, convoluted, and counterintuitive.

Morningside Heights Routes

There is some further confusion on the changes proposed to the Morningside Heights Route. If 53A Steeles East replaces 953 Steeles East Express, but a 53B bus already exists to go to Passmore avenue, why not simplify it to one bus that goes around Passmore and then to the end of 53A to increase the number of buses along that route?

It is also important to note that the name changes may confuse some bus riders in this area. People who originally took the old 953 may be confused by the name change, they may not know to take the 53A instead and might just take the new Steeles East Express route which is on a different path.

Email from Toronto Environment Alliance, received August 28, 2026

Understanding that I'm a little late here, I'd like to make the following comments specifically on the Express Lanes:

(1) I support reducing the number of stops for express buses, starting with those that do not meet at major intersections. I also think it's okay if express buses don't stop at every intersection where there's a connecting route.

(2) We need to jumpstart the RapidTO bus lanes. We should be having way more RapidTO bus lanes by now.

(3) Once the express buses are actual express buses, their branding needs to be significantly improved so that other road users can very easily see that these are express buses. That means the buses themselves need to be branded differently, including coloured a different colour that can be seen from road users at all angles. When I lived in Vancouver, you could tell a (what was then a B-line) express bus because it was the only elongated bus and it wasn't running off the overhead lines.

It could be as simple as painting the top part of the TTC express bus (above the windows) green, perhaps patterned or striped to help people living with colour blindness.

Branding the bus so that people know that it's express versus a local service should supersede commercial branding on the bus or any kind of 'announcement' branding on the bus (such as those decals that declare the bus to be a hybrid or fully BEV).