Access request 2026-581: what the borough's file shows

Executive summary and analysis of the documents released October 9, 2026

Richard Hoge, Côte-des-Neiges–Notre-Dame-de-Grâce – October 9, 2026 (revised October 16)

Published with the source documents at
https://github.com/OpenMobilityData/Terrebonne-access-requests

Summary

On September 11, 2026 I asked the borough of Côte-des-Neiges–Notre-Dame-de-Grâce for the records behind the engineering study it had commissioned on rue de Terrebonne: who asked for it, why, what it was told to examine, what it cost, and what it delivered. The borough answered on October 9 with 508 pages (file 2026-581). The study itself is withheld. What was released is enough to establish the following.

1. **The objective was fixed before the study.** On June 10, 2026 the borough's engineering division wrote to the City's street-design division that the elected officials wished to revisit the 2024 layout "avec l'objectif de redonner la bande de stationnement qui avait été retranchée," that the borough's engineers had *already* issued a technical opinion on the two concepts the councillors had sketched, and that the councillors wanted "un avis officiel, neutre et externe." The mandate eventually given to EXP on August 20 is titled, in part, "évaluer la place du stationnement sur rue, dans le but d'en augmenter le nombre."
2. **The City's own cycling unit warned about safety.** The Service de l'urbanisme et de la mobilité returned an express analysis on June 17; the borough's own summary of it, written five days later, says the options "présentent plusieurs compromis importants sur le plan de la sécurité, du confort des usagers vulnérables et de la cohérence du réseau cyclable." That analysis is withheld. The fire department's opinion of July 13 is redacted in its entirety.
3. **The winter measure is described as transitional; the mandate from the mayor's office was permanent.** On August 13 the borough mayor's chief of staff set the mandate in writing: a bidirectional lane on one side of Terrebonne, from Loyola to Côte-Saint-Luc, "qui respecte les normes minimales prévues par la loi," and "le retour du stationnement d'un côté de la rue." No winter measure appears. The service request a week later added Volet 1, removal of cycling facilities in winter, as "mesure transitoire pour l'hiver 2026–2027," ahead of Volet 2, the permanent bidirectional lane. The winter conversion announced on October 6 is the first step of a year-round reduction of cycling space that has not been disclosed to the public.
4. **The "study" is a six-week, $14,755 technical note with a council date fixed in advance.** Service request August 20; offer August 25; purchase order August 26; kick-off September 3; draft September 17; final due October 2; announcement October 6. Borough staff told the consultant on August 18 that "l'objectif de nos élus est de pouvoir agir sur vos conclusions pour un horizon début octobre" and on September 10 that the draft was needed by the 18th "pour respecter notre calendrier du Conseil d'arrondissement du 5 octobre."

5. **The bicycle counts cited at council rest on the weakest data in the file and understate winter use; the file contained continuous counter data for last winter, documenting average winter usage at least five times higher than the cited figure. The more robust data were disregarded in the councillor's announcement.** The councillor told the meeting that "we have counters everywhere, we have more counters than before. So we know exactly how many people use it, when and how," and that "we go from 700 during the good months to 8 . . . So that's 4 cyclists, right? Including me." The "8," and the "12" he cited in answer to a question from the floor, come from the borough's February 2025 count presentation: not bicycles per day or per hour, but bicycles counted using a temporary camera (Miovision) installed at the Cavendish and Grand intersections over six peak-period hours of a single day, January 29, 2025, in the lane's first winter, when clearing was often delayed, and *a day on which Environment Canada had issued a winter weather advisory and residents were urged to postpone non-essential travel*; the same camera recorded cars on the Terrebonne approaches and pedestrians down by about a quarter from the November count, bicycles by 95%. The slide states none of this. Before the first email in the file (June 10) and the mandate from the mayor's office (August 13), a continuous counter had already recorded every bicycle on the street through the whole of the following winter, a full year more recent; the borough's engineers offered its data to the City on June 10, and its table was in the consultant's hands in August: 4,891 passages over December–March (41 a day; 46 on weekdays) and a second summer at about 700 a day. For the question that bears on safety, exposure, the relevant figure is the total number of winter trips, not the count on one chosen day; that total was in the borough's possession and was not cited at council. The "99%" drop cited at the meeting, 700 against 8, sets the largest number on one slide, Grand in September 2024 counted on all four approaches, against the smallest on the next, Grand in January 2025 on the Terrebonne axis alone; compared like for like, the deck's own slides give 97–98%, label January -95%, and the counter gives about 93% for the seasons entire. The two sources agree that the drop is steep; they differ in the absolute number, and only one of them yields "four people." Whatever the explanation, a measure presented as data-driven rested on six hours of counting on a single day and ignored thousands of hours of more recent counting over an entire winter.
6. **The need for additional winter parking was never measured.** Across the 508 pages there is no inventory of on-street spaces, no occupancy count, no survey of residents, and no estimate of the spaces the conversion would create; the "50 to 60 spaces" the councillor gave the APC-NDG at its consultation meeting, and repeated on CBC *Daybreak* on October 9 ("at least 50 to 60 parking spots," adding that "it's a bit too early" and that "a few rounds during the workshops with the services" remain before "the final number"), appears nowhere in the release. The mandate asks the consultant to count the spaces an arrangement "pourrait permettre de recréer" and to measure "l'amélioration de la disponibilité du stationnement"; the offer promises an analysis of "l'impact sur le nombre de places" and lists no field work; the consultant worked from aerial imagery. Whatever the note says about parking is a count of spaces that could be drawn, not a measurement of whether they are needed. Nothing in the file records how many winter nights parking near Terrebonne is actually full.

7. **The case for removing a lane rests on a view that the lanes are wider than their bicycle traffic justifies; that view is the councillors' opinion, not the engineers' ruling.** The June 10 email reports the elected officials' concern that the lanes' width was "jugée disproportionnée par rapport au volume de cyclistes observé … selon les élus," and Councillor Teodoresco repeated the point to the APC-NDG at the consultation meeting, though not at the October 6 council meeting. No engineer in the file endorses it. The borough's own engineers describe the alternatives as "une voie de circulation très étroite (moins de 4 mètres)" and "un aménagement bidirectionnel très étroit"; the City's cycling unit found "plusieurs compromis importants"; and the August 13 mandate asks for a design "qui respecte les normes minimales prévues par la loi," which concedes that the June concepts did not. Lane width is set by the cyclist's operating envelope, by passing room and by the snow-clearing equipment, none of which depend on how many people ride; nothing in the file describes the existing lanes as wider than the standard requires.
8. **A storm-only option was within the mandate.** EXP's offer lists among the scenarios to compare "la fermeture en période de déneigement seulement." The councillor told the APC-NDG, at the meeting he later cited at council as his consultation with the Association, that storm-only parking had been ruled out because residents could not be informed of it; the option was not mentioned in his October 6 address, and the analysis on which the ruling-out rests is in the withheld note.
9. **The exercise does not follow the City's own published method for reviewing a bike lane.** On February 10, 2026 the administration launched its audit of the cycling network on the principle "recueillir les données, analyser et corriger au besoin": technical analysis, data collection and field observation through the peak season, led by the Service de l'urbanisme et de la mobilité, with results expected at the end of 2026; the same release names Terrebonne among streets where the City is working with the borough on safety. On Terrebonne the objective was fixed before any analysis, the SUM's analysis was unfavourable and withheld, the mandate was to increase parking, no data were collected, and the change was announced while the City's audit was still under way.
10. **The withholding of the technical report rests on a ground that expires with the decision.** The note and the City's analysis are withheld under section 39, which applies "until a decision is made on the recommendation." On October 6 the councillor said the elected officials were "now ready to give our orientation to the services" and that the seasonal removal "is what we're going to propose"; his signed statement adds that "one thing is certain: residents will see changes before Christmas 2026." The *Montreal Gazette* reported it the next day under the headline "Terrebonne St. will drop to one bike lane in winter to allow more parking, borough says" and the subheading "Councillor justifies decision by noting there's a sharp drop-off in cycling traffic during the winter"; the words are the newspaper's, not the councillor's. On October 9 he said on CBC *Daybreak* that the final study "still need[s] to be submitted to us" and that the change goes to the borough council, to City council and back to the borough. Either the recommendation has been decided and the ground has lapsed, or it has not and the outcome was announced before the decision. A review may be sought from the Commission d'accès à l'information within 30 days, that is by **November 8, 2026**.

1 What was asked and what was received

The request (September 11, 2026; acknowledged September 14 as file 2026-581) had five parts: A, origin and purpose; B, procurement and contract; C, methodology and execution; D, deliverables and review; E, internal handling and communications. The response letter answers each item in turn and attaches eight files. The two substantive bundles are:

- **Bundle 01** (01 Doc_req 2026-581.pdf, 167 pages): the email chains, the service request, EXP's

offer of services, the purchase order, the kick-off meeting form, the February 2025 count-analysis presentation and its 2025 update, the Kensington loop daily totals (July 26, 2025 to August 31, 2026) and the Miovision intersection count tables for 2024–2025.

- **Bundle 02** (02 DOC requis 2026-581.pdf, 341 pages): the public tender for the 2025–2027 framework agreements (59-25-ET-01), the contract-management by-law, the decision file and selection-committee results, and WSP's winning bid for contract 1. Nothing in it concerns Terrebonne specifically; it documents the vehicle under which EXP was retained.

The released files are published as received in the OpenMobilityData/Terrebonne-access-requests repository on GitHub, under `2026-581/raw/`; derived material, including this document, is kept apart under `2026-581/derived/`. The remaining attachments are the council resolution awarding the framework agreements (CA25 170126, June 9, 2025), the notice of recourse, and copies of the sections of the Act relied on (9, 23, 24, 37, 39, 53–59). The response letter is at Request 2026-581; the original request is at Terrebonne study access request.

Items with no documents. The borough found nothing for A2 (external funding), C3 (follow-up meetings), E2 (communication plans) and E3 (design or implementation documents dated before receipt of the final report). C3 is hard to square with the released emails, which schedule working meetings no. 1 and no. 2 on Teams and refer to the consultant's notes of them [01, p. 23–24, 167]; the kick-off form records that "on pourra produire des comptes rendus distincts pour les prochaines rencontres." Either those minutes were not produced or they were not searched for.

2 Timeline established by the record

Date	Event	Source
2022–2023	EXP traffic study for the protected lane (previous mandate); scenario retained: one-way with diverging direction at Cavendish, one parking lane removed.	[01, p. 8]
2024	Redesign built; 2.5 km one-way, unidirectional lanes both sides.	[01, p. 3]
Jul 2024 – Jun 2025	Borough Miovision counts at Cavendish, Grand, Walkley; Telraam at King Edward and Royal.	[01, p. 82–158]
Jan 29, 2025	Single-day Miovision counts at Cavendish and Grand: 18 and 12 bicycles on the Terrebonne axis over 12 hours; 10 and 8 in the two peak periods.	[01, p. 85, 155]
Feb 2025	"Suivi de projet – Analyse des comptages" presentation; updated later in 2025 with January and June counts and the $-95/-96$% figures.	[01, p. 27–73]
Jul 26, 2025	Kensington loop counter in service.	[01, p. 74]
Nov 2025	Municipal election.	—
Jun 10, 2026	Division head (Trottier) to SUM: elected officials want to restore the parking lane; two cross-sections drawn (designated roadway; very narrow bidirectional lane); borough has already issued a technical opinion; councillors want an external one; meeting with the borough mayor set for June 18.	[01, p. 7–8]
Jun 17, 2026	SUM returns its express technical analysis (withheld).	[01, p. 6–7]
Jun 22, 2026	Borough asks SIM for an opinion; summarizes SUM's conclusion as "plusieurs compromis importants" on safety.	[01, p. 5–6]
Jul 13, 2026	SIM replies (body redacted).	[01, p. 5]

Date	Event	Source
Aug 13, 2026	Chief of staff (D'Amours) to the director of urban planning (Admo), cc. borough director, borough mayor and Councillor Teodoresco: the mayor wants a formal external study; mandate: bidirectional lane on one side, Loyola to Côte-Saint-Luc, meeting "les normes minimales prévues par la loi," and return of parking on one side. Forwarded to the engineering division the same day.	[01, p. 1–2]
Aug 18, 2026	Soulière to EXP: the new borough mayor wants a technical note; speed is what matters to the councillors; aim is to act at a council meeting in early October.	[01, p. 21–22]
Aug 20, 2026	Service request 59-26-ET-01_002 to EXP.	[01, p. 3–4]
Aug 25, 2026	EXP offer: $14,755; final note October 2.	[01, p. 9–13]
Aug 26, 2026	Purchase order 1796945, $17,706 with contingency.	[01, p. 15–17]
Aug 28, 2026	Borough sends EXP the 2025 count presentation and the loop-counter table; EXP sends its first interim analysis (south side preferred for a bidirectional lane).	[01, p. 19]
Sep 3, 2026	Kick-off meeting (Teams).	[01, p. 26]
Sep 10, 2026	Borough: draft needed by September 18 "pour respecter notre calendrier du Conseil d'arrondissement du 5 octobre."	[01, p. 23]
Sep 11, 2026	This access request filed.	—
Sep 11 & 14, 2026	Working meetings no. 2 (parking and winter) and comments.	[01, p. 167]
Sep 17, 2026	Preliminary note delivered, watermarked "BROUILLON."	[01, p. 167]
Oct 2, 2026	Final note due. No transmittal for the final version appears in the release.	[01, p. 12, 26]
Oct 6, 2026	Council meeting; winter conversion announced.	—
Oct 8, 2026	Second access request (final note and slides) filed.	—
Oct 9, 2026	Response to this request.	—
Oct 9, 2026	CBC *Daybreak* interview with the councillor; transcript and fact check in the open-sources repository.	—

3 Findings in detail

3.1 The objective was fixed before any analysis

The June 10 email from the head of the borough's technical studies division to the City's street-design division is the earliest document in the release and the most important [01, p. 7–8]:

> "Les élus de l'arrondissement souhaitent revoir l'aménagement cyclable de la rue Terrebonne réalisé en 2024, avec l'objectif de redonner la bande de stationnement qui avait été retranchée. … Les préoccupations exprimées concernent principalement la largeur des aménagements cyclables, jugée disproportionnée par rapport au volume de cyclistes observé. Selon les élus, il serait possible de réduire l'espace consacré aux cyclistes afin de rétablir la deuxième bande de stationnement retirée lors de la reconfiguration de 2024."

> "Vous comprendrez que nous avons déjà émis un avis technique quant à la faisabilité de ces 2 concepts, toutefois, les élus souhaitent obtenir un avis officiel, neutre et externe à l'arrondissement."

Three things follow. The objective, restoring the parking lane, is stated as the elected officials' goal, not as a question. The borough's own engineers had already given an opinion, and the request for an outside one was made because the councillors wanted another; the sentence does not say what the internal

opinion was, but the email's own description of the two concepts ("une voie de circulation très étroite (moins de 4 mètres) coincée entre deux bandes de stationnement"; "un aménagement bidirectionnel très étroit" at 2.4 m with a 0.3 m buffer) and its anticipation that the fire department "pourrait s'y opposer" leave little doubt. And the justification offered for the exercise is the one used in public since: the lane is too wide for the number of cyclists.

The email ends with a postscript that bears on the figures used later: "Nous disposons également d'un compteur permanent Éco-Compteur sur le corridor. Au besoin, nous pourrons vous transmettre les données disponibles" [01, p. 8]. In June 2026 the borough's engineers knew the continuous counter existed, regarded it as the relevant evidence, and offered its data to the City.

The internal "avis technique" was not covered by my request and has not been asked for. It should be.

The next document in sequence is the mayor's office's instruction of August 13 [01, p. 1–2], from the chief of staff to the director of urban planning, copied to the borough director and both elected officials:

> "Après discussion, Mme la mairesse souhaite qu'une étude technique formelle soit réalisée par une firme externe afin d'évaluer la reconfiguration de la piste cyclable sur la rue Terrebonne. Le mandat serait le suivant : évaluer le scénario d'implantation d'une piste cyclable bidirectionnelle d'un côté de la rue Terrebonne (entre le campus Loyola et Côte-Saint-Luc) qui respecte les normes minimales prévues par la loi et le retour du stationnement d'un côté de la rue."

Two things stand out. The mandate as the cabinet framed it is permanent and full-length, a bidirectional lane on one side and parking restored on the other, with no mention of winter. And "qui respecte les normes minimales prévues par la loi" presupposes that the designs considered in June did not: the concepts described on June 10 were a traffic lane under 4 m between two parking rows and a 2.4 m bidirectional lane, the borough's engineers had already given their opinion on them, and the SUM had found "plusieurs compromis importants." The August instruction asks for a version that clears the legal minimum. The winter removal is absent from it; it enters a week later in the service request drafted by staff, as a transitional measure ahead of the permanent one. On October 6 Councillor Teodoresco said of that option: "we try to keep bidirectional one side, putting it on one side of the road, right? It was too complicated and no real upside for anyone." In conversation with the author he has said that the borough's engineers would not endorse a bidirectional lane on Terrebonne, legal though it might be; the record is consistent with both statements, and the question they leave is whether Volet 2 remains the plan.

3.2 The City's cycling unit and the fire department

The SUM's analysis of June 17 [01, p. 6–7] is withheld under sections 37 and 39. Its conclusion survives in the borough's own words, in the June 22 request to the fire department [01, p. 6]:

> "À la demande de l'arrondissement, le Service de l'urbanisme et de la mobilité a procédé à une analyse technique préliminaire des scénarios envisagés. Cette analyse conclut que les options étudiées présentent plusieurs compromis importants sur le plan de la sécurité, du confort des usagers vulnérables et de la cohérence du réseau cyclable par rapport à l'aménagement actuellement en place."

The SUM's cover note asks to be kept informed "des orientations qui seront retenues à la lumière de ces éléments" [01, p. 7]; the release contains no reply. The fire department's answer of July 13 [01, p. 5] is a single introductory sentence followed by a redaction covering the rest of the page. Whatever it says, the

borough asked the question because it expected an objection to a sub-4-metre lane between two rows of parked cars. On October 6 the councillor told the meeting that "we can keep the same capacity, the same level of safety for our kids, and bring back … more parking"; the SUM's analysis is the only safety assessment in the file whose conclusion is known, and it is the one quoted above.

The sequence matters: the City's expert unit flagged safety on June 17; the borough then retained an outside consultant on August 20 with a mandate whose stated purpose was to increase parking. A note written to that mandate is not an independent assessment of whether to remove the lane; it is a design exercise in how.

3.3 The mandate and what it asked for

The service request of August 20 [01, p. 3–4] is explicit about purpose and scope. The title: a technical note to evaluate a bidirectional lane on one side "et voir à évaluer la place du stationnement sur rue, dans le but d'en augmenter le nombre." Among the tasks:

> "Énumérer les mesures à mettre en oeuvre, en deux volets, pour le retrait des aménagements cyclables durant la saison hivernale. Volet 1 – existant : pistes cyclables unidirectionnelles bilatérales (mesure transitoire pour l'hiver 2026–2027). Volet 1 alternatif : maintien et entretien hivernal d'une des deux bandes cyclables, et retrait de l'autre. Volet 2 – faisabilité d'une piste cyclable bidirectionnelle unilatérale."

"Volet 1 alternatif" is the measure announced on October 6, word for word. It appears in the borough's instructions to the consultant six weeks before the consultant reported. And it is labelled transitional: the longer-term plan in the same document is Volet 2, a single bidirectional lane with a parking lane restored on the other side year-round. The council has not been told that the winter measure is the first stage of a permanent reconfiguration, but the mandate says so.

EXP's offer [01, p. 9–13] restates the scope and adds the winter scenarios it would compare:

> "… la fermeture complète de la piste et son remplacement par du stationnement en hiver; la fermeture en période de déneigement seulement; ou, dans le cas des bandes unidirectionnelles actuelles, la fermeture partielle avec une chaussée désignée et du stationnement des deux côtés de façon permanente ou seulement lors des périodes de déneigement durant la saison hivernale."

So the storm-only arrangement the councillor dismissed at the meeting was one of the scenarios the consultant was paid to assess. Whether the note recommends against it, and on what grounds, is exactly what the withheld document would show.

Price: $14,755 in fees plus $2,951 contingency, $17,706 before tax [01, p. 16], at the hourly rates of the framework agreement. Deliverables: two interim emails, a draft note, a final note, and a closing meeting. No field work, no counts, no occupancy survey; the consultant was given the borough's 2025 presentation and the counter table on August 28 and worked from those and from Google aerial imagery, Street View being out of date [01, p. 19].

3.4 A calendar set by the council date

The August 18 email that opens the file [01, p. 21–22]:

> "… la nouvelle mairesse souhaite que nous lui présentions une note technique concernant la faisabilité de réaliser une piste cyclable bidirectionnelle, unilatérale, sur la rue de Terrebonne et voir,

> en plus de cette faisabilité, dans quelle mesure cet aménagement peut augmenter le nombre de cases de stationnement sur rue. … sachez que l'important pour nos élus est que votre proposition puisse se faire très rapidement, ainsi que la réalisation de la note en soi. L'objectif de nos élus est de pouvoir agir sur vos conclusions pour un horizon début octobre, lors d'un conseil d'arrondissement."

And on September 10 [01, p. 23]: "Mon gestionnaire m'a rappelé hier qu'il est très important que la note technique préliminaire nous soit acheminée au plus tard le 18 septembre prochain pour respecter notre calendrier du Conseil d'arrondissement du 5 octobre prochain." The consultant's own draft of September 17 carries a "BROUILLON" watermark because "le délai serré ne nous a pas permis de faire faire une relecture attentive" [01, p. 167]. The final note was due October 2, a Friday; the announcement was made the following Tuesday.

3.5 Where the numbers came from

In his address, the councillor said: "if we looked at the official data provided by the borough and we have counters everywhere, we have more counters than before. So we know exactly how many people use it, when and how. So we're able to see that in winter, the volume of traffic diminishes by 99%. We go from 700 during the good months to 8. That's 8 passages, right? So that's 4 cyclists, right? Including me," adding that the borough now had "data for 3 years in a row."[1] In answer to a question from the floor, he referred to the slides and gave a figure of 12 trips at peak hour in January and a figure of 8. The slides are in the release [01, p. 51–73]: the count-analysis presentation of February 2025, updated during 2025. Its bicycle table ("MAJ 2025") gives, for the two three-hour peak periods combined, 12 bicycles at Cavendish and 12 at Grand in all directions in January 2025, and 10 and 8 on the Terrebonne axis, against 347 and 425 in June 2025, labelled -95% and -96% [01, p. 61–62]. The underlying Miovision tables show the January figures are from one day, January 29, 2025 [01, p. 85, 155]; the full twelve-hour totals that day were 18 at Cavendish and 12 at Grand on the Terrebonne axis.

Three observations. First, these are single-day camera counts at two intersections in the lane's first winter, taken before the continuous counter existed; the slide's heading, *aux heures de pointes*, means the eight is the total over the two three-hour peak periods (06:30–09:30 and 15:30–18:30 [01, p. 57]), so it is neither a daily nor an hourly figure, and the slide itself gives no indication that it is one day's count; the reading of 8 passages as 4 cyclists assumes that each rider passed the camera in both peak periods, which the tables do not record. Second, the borough had the continuous counter's record when the measure was announced: the same bundle contains daily totals from July 26, 2025 to August 31, 2026 [01, p. 74–81]; the borough's engineers had offered the counter's data to the City in June [01, p. 8] and sent the table to the consultant on August 28 [01, p. 19]. It shows 4,891 passages between December 1 and March 31 (41 a day; 46 on weekdays; 63 on weekdays over the November 16 to March 31 clearing season) and a second summer at about 700 a day. Third, the "700" and the "8" the councillor set against each other for a "99%" drop are not comparable figures. The 8 is Grand, Terrebonne axis only, six peak hours, January 29, 2025 [01, p. 62]. The only number near 700 on the slides is 707: Grand, September 19, 2024, six peak hours, but *all four approaches*, including bicycles on Grand itself, which the 8 excludes [01, p. 61]; it is also the largest single-intersection count in the presentation. Dividing the smallest number on one slide by the largest on the other gives 98.9%. Compared like for like on the deck's own slides, same intersection, same axis, same six hours, the drop from September 2024 to January 2025 is 98.2% (452 to 8) and from the summer counts on either side of that winter about 97% (283 and 281 to 8); the slides themselves label January -95%. The continuous counter gives about 93% between the whole of summer and the whole of winter. The drop is steep by every measure; "99%" is the one pairing of the

[1] Transcribed from the borough's recording of the meeting of October 6, 2026, https://www.youtube.com/live/0k_KZf9uxTk.

available numbers that reaches it. As to “data for 3 years in a row” (on *Daybreak*: “we have the data for many years”), the bicycle counts in the release run from September 2024 to August 2026 and cover two winters: the first by the camera on a single day, the second by the continuous counter.

On CBC *Daybreak* on October 9 the councillor himself described the 8 as “the sum of all the hours during the rush hour… six hours” [07:03], the reading given here, and put the winter level at “from 40 a day to 30 a day during December to March” [07:34], figures that match the Kensington counter’s monthly means for December, January and February (40.0, 32.7 and 34.9 a day; March was 53.5); he named as the source “the open data website… which is connected directly to Eco-Counter” [07:19]. The City’s *Compteurs cyclistes permanents* dataset lists no Eco-Counter on Terrebonne; the Kensington loop’s data have reached the public only through access requests 2025-697, 2026-300 and this one. The interview is checked statement by statement in the open-sources repository.

The day itself. January 29, 2025 was a Wednesday on which Environment and Climate Change Canada had issued a winter weather advisory for Montréal: five to ten centimetres of snow with blowing snow, the worst conditions expected to last until midday, and residents urged to postpone non-essential travel.[2] The Miovision tables for Grand that day record every mode, not only bicycles [01, p. 82–88]. Over the same six peak hours the camera counted 2,298 cars on the four approaches (617 on the two Terrebonne approaches), 108 buses, 20 trucks and 605 pedestrians, against the 8 bicycles on the Terrebonne axis, three of them in the morning peak and five in the afternoon. Set against the previous count at the same intersection, November 20, 2024 [01, p. 131–137], cars on the Terrebonne approaches were down 23% (802 to 617), pedestrians down 26% (818 to 605) and bicycles on the axis down 95% (154 to 8); against September 19, 2024, cars were down 11%, pedestrians 31% and bicycles 98%. Every mode fell that day; cycling fell furthest, as it does on any snow day, which is the reason a single day is not a measure of a season. The slide from which the 8 was read gives neither the date nor the weather. The counts by mode for every Miovision day in the file are tabulated in derived/miovision_counts_by_mode_2026-581.xlsx.

For completeness: the presentation contains no Kensington data, nor could it, the loop having entered service on July 26, 2025, after the deck’s last update (June 2025). Its methods slide does list the Eco-Counter, “utilisé par le SUM depuis 2013”, as one of the three count sources alongside Miovision and Telraam [01, p. 29, 53]; the deck’s only continuous data are the citizen Telraam sensors on King-Edward and Royal, which give about 242 bicycles a day [01, p. 65]. The counter table reached the consultant as a separate attachment to the same August 28 email as the presentation [01, p. 19]. The consultant therefore had both documents from the first week of the mandate, and the borough had known since at least June which was the better source [01, p. 8]; which of them the note relies on cannot be known until it is released.

3.6 What the file contains on parking

The stated purpose of the exercise is more parking, so it is worth recording what the release contains on that side. The June 10 email states the objective and gives one geometric figure, the sub-4-metre traffic lane between two parking rows [01, p. 8]; nothing on demand. The service request asks EXP to “mesurer … le nombre de cases de stationnement que cet aménagement pourrait permettre de recréer” and to measure “l’amélioration de la disponibilité du stationnement sur de Terrebonne” [01, p. 3–4]: questions put to the consultant, not answers. EXP’s offer promises “une analyse de l’impact sur le nombre et l’accessibilité des espaces de stationnement” and a deliverable “incluant l’impact sur

[2] Jessica Barile, “Montrealers urged to delay non-essential travel as snowstorm hits, up to 10 cm possible,” CityNews Montreal, January 29, 2025, 9:13 a.m., https://montreal.citynews.ca/2025/01/29/montrealers-urged-to-delay-non-essential-travel-as-snowstorm-hits-up-to-10-cm-possible/.

le nombre de places de stationnement sur rue"; its list of services contains no occupancy survey and no count of any kind [01, p. 10–11]. The August 28 email shows the first interim analysis concerned which side of the street should carry a bidirectional lane, with the parking analysis to follow, and that the consultant was working from aerial imagery [01, p. 19]; the kick-off form schedules "Analyse de côté de rue du stationnement et aménagement hivernal" for September 11 [01, p. 26]. The count presentation contains no parking slide. The response to item C2 of the request, which asked for the data collection behind the study "including locations, dates, seasons and hours of counts," is "the attached documents include presentations," and the presentations are bicycle and vehicle counts at intersections.

The release therefore contains no measured parking figure of any kind: no inventory, no occupancy, no survey, no estimate of spaces created. The "50 to 60 spaces" the councillor gave the APC-NDG at the meeting he later cited at council as his consultation with the Association, and repeated on CBC *Daybreak* on October 9, is not in it. Whatever the withheld note says about parking will be a geometric count of spaces that could be marked, which is what the mandate asked for; nothing in the mandate or the deliverables would produce a measurement of whether, or on how many nights, those spaces are needed.

3.7 What was withheld, and on what grounds

- **Section 39** (a study prepared in connection with a recommendation, "until a decision is made on the recommendation"): the EXP note in all versions, the SUM analysis, and the comments exchanged on deliverables.
- **Section 37** (recommendations or opinions less than ten years old, including a consultant's): the same documents, plus the SIM opinion.
- **Section 9, second paragraph** (drafts and preliminary notes are not documents held by a public body): the interim deliverables and the preliminary note.
- **Sections 23–24** (third-party commercial information): portions of the tender documents and EXP's offer; the hour-and-fee breakdown attached to the offer is not in the release.
- **Sections 53–59**: personal information, applied to names and contact details in emails; in practice staff names are left visible.

Section 39 is the ground that carries the weight, and it is time-limited by its own terms. The councillor announced the measure on October 6, saying the elected officials were "now ready to give our orientation to the services, and the services will tell you how the mechanics of what the adjustment will happen during this winter," and that the seasonal removal "is what we're going to propose. It's going to be a test." His statement to the Gazette on October 7 said that "one thing is certain: residents will see changes by Christmas 2026," while also saying the change "still need[s] to go through several steps"; the newspaper ran the report under the headline "Terrebonne St. will drop to one bike lane in winter to allow more parking, borough says" and the subheading "Councillor justifies decision by noting there's a sharp drop-off in cycling traffic during the winter," words that are the Gazette's, not his.[3] A signed statement posted to his social-media page in the days after the meeting puts both halves in his own words: "The solution we are currently developing with experts is to maintain the bike lane as is during the summer and remove it on one side only during the winter season. Several steps remain before this proposal can be implemented, including consideration by the city's decision-making bodies, namely the borough council and City Council. One thing is certain: residents will see changes before Christmas 2026." On CBC *Daybreak* on October 9 he said that "the final study by the services and the experts still need to be submitted to us" [00:38]. The borough cannot have it both ways: if the recommendation has been

[3] Jesse Feith, *Montreal Gazette*, October 7, 2026, updated 6:11 p.m.

decided, section 39 no longer applies and the note must be released subject only to section 37, which is discretionary and does not cover factual content; if it has not been decided, the public announcement of a decided outcome was premature. Section 14 of the Act requires that factual content be severed and released where an exception covers only part of a document; the response does not do this for the note.

The section 9 ground is weak for the September 17 draft. It was a deliverable under contract, transmitted to the client for review, and the borough's comments on it shaped the final version. "Brouillon" on the watermark does not make it a personal draft within the meaning of section 9, and the Commission has said so in comparable cases.

4 What the record does and does not establish

4.1 On the decision process

The record shows a goal set by the elected officials in the spring; an internal technical opinion already given by the borough's own engineers, after which an external one was sought; a safety analysis from the City's cycling unit received in June and not mentioned in public; a mandate written in August whose stated purpose was to increase parking, with a council date already chosen; and a presentation of counts that set aside the borough's continuous counter data in favour of a one-day count from the previous winter, and no measurement of parking demand at all. Whether the councillors are right to want more parking is a separate question; what the documents establish is the sequence in which the decision and its justification were produced, and that sequence differs from the account given at the October 6 meeting.

4.2 On the storm-only alternative

The borough paid for an assessment that included "la fermeture en période de déneigement seulement" and told the APC-NDG, at the meeting he later cited at council as his consultation with the Association, that the option was ruled out because residents could not be informed of it; the option was not mentioned in the October 6 address. The reasoning, if there is more to it, is in the withheld note.

4.3 On what is planned beyond this winter

The mayor's office asked on August 13 for a permanent bidirectional lane with parking restored; "mesure transitoire pour l'hiver 2026–2027" and Volet 2 together describe the winter conversion as a first step toward it. That is a different measure from the one announced, with a different safety profile: the SUM's "compromis importants" concerned exactly these cross-sections. It has not been disclosed to the public. The councillor's statement that the lane will be maintained "as is during the summer" is the first public remark bearing on it; it does not say whether the bidirectional option has been abandoned, and the question should be put directly. In his address the councillor described the bidirectional option as "too complicated and no real upside for anyone," the winter removal as "a test" ("We're going to see the data this year, and hopefully try to make it even better after"), and the whole as "part of a longer term, more sophisticated bike plan … for next year." The measure thus carries four descriptions on the record: "mesure transitoire pour l'hiver 2026–2027" in the service request, "seasonal" and "a test" in the address, and, on CBC *Daybreak* three days later, "so for now, we're looking at it in a way that will make it permanent" [12:22], to be looked at again "if there's really a big change in the data and the behavior… winter traffic doubles for bikers." The same statement names City Council among the bodies that must consider the proposal, and on *Daybreak* the councillor described the steps as "we vote here at the borough, then a vote at the Conseil Municipal, then it comes back to the borough" [08:19], the route

the 2024 project followed in three votes (CA24 170018, February 5; CM24 0179, February 19; CA24 170131, June 3, 2024, the one-way ordinance); that places the City's own street-design service, author of the June 17 analysis, on the path to approval.

4.4 Against the City's own review method

Two mandates. The lane itself was built after a different kind of study. The administration elected in 2021 had been transparent in its campaign about its commitment to expand the cycling network, and the 2023 EXP study it commissioned on Terrebonne was due diligence along the way to implementing that commitment: a feasibility and design study for a project already decided, whose task was to confirm there was no obstacle and to settle the layout, and whose limitations, which opponents of the lane pointed out at the time, were those of a design study. In regard to cycling infrastructure, the campaign of the administration elected in 2025 rested on a commitment to base decisions on studies: not on removing lanes but on "a comprehensive audit of all Montreal cycling infrastructure within the first 100 days," to "review, secure or remove cycling infrastructure where necessary," with the leader describing herself as "pro-bikes." The councillor's own account of that commitment, on October 6, was of one made at the doors: "when you do door knocking on 1000s of doors, and you see the most important issue for people there … the bike path that has become such a synonym of not being consulted … we have made a commitment and we have to act on this promise."[4] A study that is to decide whether a lane stays carries a weight that a design study does not, and the administration set out what such a study involves on February 10, 2026.

The administration's standard for reviewing a bike lane is on the public record. The City's press release of February 10, 2026 launching its audit of the cycling network describes the method as "recueillir les données, analyser et corriger au besoin," with "analyse technique, collecte de données et observation terrain" on four existing lanes (Rachel, Côte-Sainte-Catherine, de la Commune, Meilleur) through the peak season, led by the Service de l'urbanisme et de la mobilité, results expected toward the end of 2026, and a revision of the Plan vélo to set "des critères clairs, cohérents et harmonisés"; the mayor's stated reason was that "les documents qu'on nous a remis ne répondaient pas aux préoccupations exprimées sur le terrain," so the City would collect its own data first. The same release lists Terrebonne, with Hochelaga, Gouin and Henri-Bourassa, among streets where the City is working with the borough on safety.[5] That audit is the first of its kind. On November 10, 2025 the City's deputy director general for urban planning, mobility and infrastructure wrote to the director general that "aucun audit de sécurité n'a été réalisé à proprement parler pour l'ensemble du réseau," the standing practice being that the Service de l'urbanisme et de la mobilité "assure une veille du bon fonctionnement des nouveaux aménagements cyclables sur une période déterminée et l'historique des accidents"; the City's response to access request 2025-12847 identified that note and its annexes as the documents relating to the audit by the SUM to which the borough mayor had referred at the council meeting of November 26, 2025, and none of them mentions Terrebonne. The one safety audit by the SUM that the note offers as an example, the

[4] CBC News, "How do Montreal's top mayoral candidates compare on election issues?" (platform comparison, October 2025), https://newsinteractives.cbc.ca/features/2025/montreal-municipal-election/; CBC News, "Are Montreal bike paths a boon or burden? See what mayoral hopefuls are promising," https://www.cbc.ca/1.7648562; La Presse, "Martinez Ferrada veut revoir l'ensemble du réseau cyclable," August 11, 2025, https://www.lapresse.ca/actualites/grand-montreal/2025-08-11/elections-municipales/martinez-ferrada-veut-revoir-l-ensemble-du-reseau-cyclable.php.

[5] Ville de Montréal, "10 actions en 100 jours : la Ville de Montréal annonce un état des lieux pour une mobilité planifiée," February 10, 2026, https://montreal.ca/communiques-de-presse/10-actions-en-100-jours-la-ville-de-montreal-annonce-un-etat-des-lieux-pour-une-mobilite-planifiee; Journal Métro, "Montréal lance son audit des pistes cyclables," February 10, 2026, https://journalmetro.com/actualites/politique/3208452/montreal-lance-son-audit-des-pistes-cyclables/.

follow-up plan for the REV Bellechasse, measured parking around the lane: capacity block by block, and occupancy read by licence-plate cameras over three evenings and compared with a count made before the lane was built.[6] The February 2026 audit is still under way. Besides the audit, the City held an online consultation on the cycling network in June and July 2026; its own timeline places the analysis of the results and a further public consultation ("détails à venir") in the fall of 2026, feedback to the public in spring–summer 2027, and a new bike plan in the fall of 2027.[7] Measured against that method, the Terrebonne file shows the objective set before analysis, the SUM's analysis unfavourable and withheld, a mandate whose purpose was parking, no data collection of any kind, and an announcement made while the City's audit, consultation and plan were still in progress. Whether the two processes are formally connected is a question for the administration; the contrast in method, and the order of the dates, are matters of record.

4.5 What the record does not establish

The SUM's conclusion is known only as the borough summarized it; the SIM's opinion is unknown; the content of EXP's note is unknown, and it may well recommend against the narrower options and for the winter measure as the least bad. "Disproportionnée" is staff's report of the councillors' view, not a finding. None of the quotations above should be stretched past what they say. They establish the sequence and the purpose; they do not establish what the consultant concluded, which is the reason to get the note.

5 Document index

Page numbers refer to the PDF page of each released bundle.

Document	Content	Location
Response letter	Item-by-item answers; grounds for refusal; notice of recourse.	Request 2026-581, 8 pp.
Bundle 01		01 Doc_req, 167 pp.
Mayor's office instruction	Aug 13 email from the chief of staff setting the mandate (bidirectional lane, return of parking), forwarded Aug 13–14.	pp. 1–2
SIM / SUM chain	Jun 10 request to SUM; Jun 12, 17 replies; Jun 22 request to SIM; Jul 13 SIM reply (redacted).	pp. 5–8
Service request	Aug 20, 2026, mandate 59-26-ET-01_002.	pp. 3–4
EXP offer	Aug 25, 2026; scope, scenarios, schedule, $14,755.	pp. 9–13
Purchase order	Aug 26, 2026, no. 1796945, $17,706.	pp. 15–17
EXP email chain	Aug 18–28: mandate, work plan, inputs, first interim analysis.	pp. 19–22
Kick-off	Sep 3 meeting form, deliverables and dates; Sep 10 emails on the Oct 5 council deadline.	pp. 23–26
Count presentation	"Suivi de projet – Analyse des comptages," Feb 2025, and "MAJ 2025" update.	pp. 27–49; 51–73

[6] Ville de Montréal, response to access request 2025-12847 (January 6, 2026): note from the Direction générale adjointe, Urbanisme, mobilité et infrastructures, to the Director General, "Réseau cyclable – Audits correctifs et préventifs," November 10, 2025, p. 1; annex 1.12, "Plan de suivi – REV dans l'axe Bellechasse" (October 2021), pp. 29–41. The documents are reproduced in this repository under `2025-12847/`. The request quoted the borough mayor's words at the council meeting of November 26, 2025: "on a dernièrement eu accès à l'audit qui a été fait par le SUM, qui a été demandé par la dernière administration."

[7] Ville de Montréal, Réalisons Montréal, "La place du vélo à Montréal," project timeline, https://realisons.montreal.ca/projects/place-du-velo (consulted October 13, 2026); CBC News, "Montreal cyclists question objectivity, privacy in city's survey on bike lanes," July 1, 2026.

Document	Content	Location
Loop counter	Kensington daily totals, bicycles and motor vehicles, Jul 26, 2025 – Aug 31, 2026.	pp. 74–81
Miovision tables	Intersection counts by 15-minute period and class: Grand, Cavendish, Walkley, Royal; Jul 2024 – Sep 2025; Jan 29, 2025 at pp. 82–88 and 152–158.	pp. 82–164
Draft delivered	Sep 17, 2026 transmittal of the preliminary note.	p. 167
Bundle 02	Framework-agreement tender 59-25-ET-01, by-law, decision file (pp. 169–177), evaluation grid, WSP bid.	02 DOC requis, 341 pp.
Resolution	CA25 170126, Jun 9, 2025: framework agreements to WSP ($1.60M) and EXP ($1.70M).	03 Résolution, 2 pp.
Act extracts	ss. 9, 23–24, 37, 39, 53–59; notice of recourse.	act_extracts/, 5 files
Derived	Kensington daily totals parsed to CSV from pp. 74–81.	CSV
Derived	Miovision counts by mode (cars, buses, trucks, bicycles, pedestrians), six peak hours and 12 h, all approaches and Terrebonne axis, every count day, from pp. 82–164; Jan 29, 2025 at Grand broken out.	XLSX, CSV