CJAD 800, August 20, 2025: the candidate's statements on the Terrebonne bike path checked against the record

Fact check of the interview with Stéphanie Valenzuela

Richard Hoge, Côte-des-Neiges–Notre-Dame-de-Grâce – October 26, 2026
Published with the transcript at https://github.com/OpenMobilityData/Terrebonne-open-sources

Summary

On August 20, 2025, CJAD 800's afternoon show interviewed Stéphanie Valenzuela, then city councillor for the Darlington district and Ensemble Montréal's candidate for borough mayor of Côte-des-Neiges–Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (elected November 2, 2025), about her priorities, the Terrebonne bike path and a McGill study published the week before. Each statement of fact about the bike path was compared with the public record. In short:

1. **The working committee's recommendations were not « completely disregarded ».** The committee's mandate (resolution CA20 170210, 2020) was to recommend improvements to mobility on rue de Terrebonne, not to design a bike path. Its unanimous recommendation (note of June 13, 2021) was that the City *study* scenario 5 bis, a one-way eastbound Terrebonne between Girouard and Grand, Madison or Benny, together with the Somerled scenarios; it adopted no layout and was itself divided on the western half. The City then commissioned the EXP mobility study (counts in October 2022, report published October 30, 2023), and the 2024 project made Terrebonne one-way. Where the project follows the committee (a one-way street, studied first) and where it goes beyond it (the whole length to Belmore; protected lanes rather than the committee's 4.1 m shared lane) is in the documents. The candidate was not a member of the committee, which the councillor for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce chaired.
2. **« Implemented . . . without consulting the residents » leaves out what the record shows.** Between the 2020 lanes and the 2024 project: the working committee's eight meetings with institutions, school boards and residents (November 2020 to May 2021); the EXP study and its public release of October 30, 2023; a public information session on November 30, 2023; the borough council's vote of February 5, 2024 (3–2, the candidate voting against) and the City council's of February 19, 2024. Whether that consultation was sufficient is a judgement; that there was none is not what the documents show.
3. **The 2020 history is stated correctly:** temporary lanes installed in summer 2020 under the previous administration and removed that September (motion of September 8, 2020).
4. **The audit.** In August 2025 the candidate described her party's proposed audit as looking at the path's « security, . . . implementation, . . . impact on local residents ». What followed is on the record: the City's own audit of the cycling network, launched February 10, 2026 under the principle « recueillir les données, analyser et corriger au besoin », with results due at the end of 2026 and Terrebonne named; and, in the borough, a process documented by access request 2026-581 in which the elected officials' objective of restoring the parking strip was set on June 10, 2026 before any study, the City's street-design service found « plusieurs compromis importants sur le plan de la sécurité » in the borough's options (June 22), no parking or resident data were collected, and the winter removal of one direction was announced on October 6, 2026, before the City's audit reported.
5. **The McGill study is described in terms it does not use.** The study (Romm *et al.*, *Journal of Cycling and Micromobility Research*, 2025, open access) measures road space per traveller by mode and borough and models what doubling the micromobility lanes would do to that allocation;

it finds that even then street space « remains biased in favour of automobiles ». It does not claim to measure « the actual reality of Montrealers when it comes to cycling », and it states its own limits (2018 trip data, borough-scale averages, multi-use paths excluded). The candidate gives no basis for calling it not comprehensive; the host's paraphrase, « double … and it still wouldn't be enough », is close to the study's conclusion.

6. **« Put in different places where it's really questionable … a safe place », and cyclists who « constantly » report blind spots: no place and no source are given,** so the statements cannot be verified. For Terrebonne, the 2024 layout was designed through the EXP study; the City's safety concerns in the 2026 file concern the borough's 2026 options for restoring parking, not the 2024 layout; and the borough's counter recorded 135,276 bicycle passages at Kensington in the lane's first full year of counting (July 26, 2025 to July 25, 2026).
7. **Framing, noted without judgement:** the needs listed are « bike paths or … your vehicle or … public transportation », and the audit is justified because « there *are* people that use … scooters or bicycles » (stress as heard); the host calls Côte-des-Neiges and NDG « boroughs » and is not corrected (they are the two halves of one borough).

1 What was checked, and how

The interview. CJAD 800 (Bell Media), afternoon show, clip « Ensemble Montréal's Stephanie Valenzuela is running for CDN-NDG borough mayor », published August 20, 2025, 8 min 28 s; host Aaron Rand. The transcript published with this document was drafted by machine and then checked passage by passage against the audio.

Sources. The 2020 council motions and the working committee's note of June 13, 2021 (this repository); the 2023 EXP mobility study; the 2024 council records (CA24 170018, CM24 0179, CA24 170131); the City's release of February 10, 2026 on the cycling-network audit; access request 2026-581 (borough response of October 9, 2026, bundle 01, cited by page); the Kensington counter's daily table (2026-581, pp. 74–81); the McGill study (Romm *et al.*, 2025); the 2021 Census.

Terms. *Consistent* means the record supports the statement as made; *cannot be verified* that the record does not bear on it. A statement can be accurate in its terms and still leave out what the record also shows; the summary says what was left out.

2 Findings in detail

2.1 The Terrebonne history and the working committee

[03:34] « If anybody knows the history of Terrebonne, in the last mandate, under the last administration, they had implemented it and then they had removed it. »

Consistent. Temporary lanes were installed on Terrebonne in the summer of 2020 under the « rues, secteurs et corridors à vocation familiale et active » programme (council file of June 22, 2020) and removed after the motion of September 8, 2020 (documents).

[03:34] « And they created this working group where you had institutions and people that were part of this discussion to see how can we put a bike path and how can we get it to work for the residents and for the people that want to use it. And it was completely, you know, disregarded when they decided to re-implement a bike path. »

Not what the record shows. Resolution CA20 170210 (October 5, 2020) created « un groupe de travail

. . . ayant pour mandat de proposer des recommandations qui visent l'amélioration de la mobilité sur la rue de Terrebonne », chaired by the councillor for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, with borough staff, the school boards, the street's religious institutions, the HLM and residents; its mandate was mobility on the street, not « how can we put a bike path ». The committee met eight times from November 19, 2020 to May 19, 2021. Its note of June 13, 2021 [committee note, June 13, 2021, p. 5] recommends unanimously that the council ask the City to study scenario 5 bis (rue de Terrebonne one-way eastbound between Girouard and, to the west, Grand, Madison or Benny, with the effect on neighbouring streets taken into account), « en conjonction et en complément » with the Somerled scenarios; by majority, that scenario 1 also be studied. Three members had serious reservations about any change west of Grand; three others and the chair wanted the lane to reach Benny. The committee recommended a study; it adopted no layout.

What followed: the City commissioned EXP's mobility study, with counts at 17 intersections in October 2022 and a report published on October 30, 2023 (documents); the borough council approved the 2024 project on February 5, 2024 (CA24 170018, 3–2) and the City council on February 19, 2024 (CM24 0179); the ordinance of June 3, 2024 (OCA24 17042) made Terrebonne one-way « en vue d'ajouter un aménagement cyclable protégé » (documents). The 2024 project follows the committee in making the street one-way after a study, and goes beyond it in extent (the whole length from Girouard to Belmore) and in form (protected one-way lanes on both sides rather than the 4.1 m shared lane of scenario 5 bis). The candidate was not a member of the committee.

2.2 « Without consulting the residents »

[03:34] « And the real issue here is the way that the administration went about and implemented it without consulting the residents. »

Leaves out what the record shows. The steps listed above: the committee (institutions, school boards, residents), the study and its public release, a public information session on November 30, 2023 (recorded in the borough's decisional file 1246880002), and two council votes. The candidate voted against the project at the borough council on February 5, 2024. Whether those steps amounted to adequate consultation is a judgement on which the record is silent.

2.3 The audit

[03:34] « So there's a lot of work that needs to be done in the audit in terms of looking at its security, looking at its implementation, looking at its impact on local residents. And that's where we stand when it comes to at least the bike path on Terrebonne. » [04:46] « . . . that's why we go back to the fact that we do need this audit . . . »

A statement of intent at the time; what followed is on the record. The City's audit of the cycling network was launched by the new administration on February 10, 2026: a technical analysis led by the Service de l'urbanisme et de la mobilité, data collection and field observation through the peak season, results expected at the end of 2026, Terrebonne named among the streets where the City works with the borough on safety (release and timeline). In the borough, the file released under access request 2026-581 shows: on June 10, 2026 the borough's engineering division wrote to the City that the elected officials wished to revisit the 2024 layout « avec l'objectif de redonner la bande de stationnement qui avait été retranchée » [2026-581, p. 8]; the City's street-design service returned an express analysis on June 17, which the borough's own summary of June 22 describes as finding that the options « présentent plusieurs compromis importants sur le plan de la sécurité, du confort des usagers vulnérables et de la cohérence du réseau cyclable » [2026-581, p. 6]; the analysis itself was withheld; no parking inventory, occupancy count or resident survey appears in the 508 pages; and on October 6, 2026 the borough

announced the winter removal of one direction, before the City's audit reported. Looking at « security, implementation, impact on local residents » is what the audit was said to be for; the file shows the borough fixing the parking objective first and collecting no data on those three points.

2.4 The McGill study

[04:46] Host: « that study from McGill … suggested Montreal could, in fact, double the number of bike paths we have, and it still wouldn't be enough. » Candidate: « I find it very interesting. You know, there's a lot of studies that come out that come in favor or that come against the implementation of bike paths. … I understand that the study came out recently, but I don't think it's a comprehensive study on the actual reality of Montrealers when it comes to cycling. »

The study, as published. Daniel Romm, José Arturo Jasso Chávez, Lexi Kinman, Pegah Salsabilian, Grant McKenzie and Kevin Manaugh (Department of Geography, McGill University), « The cars are going to be alright: Examining micromobility infrastructure space allocation and potential improvement scenarios in Montréal », *Journal of Cycling and Micromobility Research* 5 (2025) 100071, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcmr.2025.100071, online June 7, 2025, open access (CC BY-NC). It measures, per borough, the road space allocated to automobiles and to micromobility per traveller of each mode (trip data from the 2018 origin–destination survey, infrastructure of 2022), defines an Equal Infrastructure Allocation score with parity at zero, and models two scenarios: doubling the Bixi stations and doubling the area of dedicated micromobility lanes. Its conclusion: « even with MI improvements at a scale dramatically larger than anything now proposed, such as doubling all existing dedicated micromobility lanes, street space allocation remains biased in favour of automobiles » (p. 12), with « almost no discernable effect » on automobile space (p. 9). The host's paraphrase is close to that sentence. The study's own limitations section (4.4) lists borough-scale averages, 2018 trips against 2022 infrastructure, no separation of bus space, commercial transport omitted and multi-use paths excluded.

The candidate's assessment cannot be verified. The study does not set out to measure « the actual reality of Montrealers when it comes to cycling »; it measures space allocation. No basis is given for calling it not comprehensive. « A lot of studies … in favor or … against the implementation of bike paths » is said of a study that takes no position on whether bike paths should exist. Press coverage: McGill Newsroom, « Study finds Montreal cycling infrastructure doesn't match demand »; CTV News Montreal, August 18, 2025, « Should Montreal double its number of bike paths? One study says 'yes' » (micromobility users about 5 % of commuters, their infrastructure about 2 % of road space).

2.5 Safety of the bike paths

[04:46] « But the bike paths that have been put under this administration have been put in different places where it's really questionable to what extent it's actually a safe place to put them in. There's cyclists that tell us constantly that we don't use that bike path because it's actually really not safe. There's a lot of blind spots when you use that bike path. There's actually a lot of drivers that don't see us when we're passing by there. »

Cannot be verified: no place, count or source is named. For Terrebonne, the 2024 layout followed the EXP study's design work [EXP 2023, p. 51]; the City's expressed safety concerns in the 2026 file bear on the borough's 2026 options for restoring parking (a designated roadway and a narrow bidirectional lane), not on the 2024 layout [2026-581, p. 6]; the borough's counter at Kensington recorded 135,276 bicycle passages in the year from July 26, 2025 (2026-581, pp. 74–81), and the borough's own Plan local de déplacements 2024–2034, adopted unanimously on May 6, 2024 with the candidate present and voting, treats protected lanes as a safety measure for vulnerable users (documents).

2.6 Other statements

[01:44] « it's the most populous borough on the island of Montreal »: **consistent**; Côte-des-Neiges–Notre-Dame-de-Grâce is the most populous of the City's nineteen boroughs (2021 Census).

[01:44] Taxes « increased . . . significantly », services « diminishing », rats, parks, permits, a tree « earmarked to be cut . . . four years »: outside the scope of this check (not about the bike path); not examined.

[06:10] Host: « in the Côte-des-Neiges borough . . . in the NDG borough »: Côte-des-Neiges and Notre-Dame-de-Grâce are the two halves of one borough, with five districts (Darlington, Côte-des-Neiges, Snowdon, Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Loyola); the candidate answers without correcting the host. Noted without judgement.

2.7 Framing

Noted as observations on wording, not on intent. [04:46] The mobility needs listed are « using bike paths or, you know, your vehicle or using public transportation »; the sentence addresses the listener as a car owner and leaves out households without a car and people who walk. City-wide in 2016, by main mode of commuting: 367,533 car drivers, 22,656 passengers, 274,575 public transit, 57,390 walking, 30,278 bicycle (Census). [04:46] « there *are* people that use, you know, scooters or bicycles »: the stress, as heard on the audio, falls on « are ».

3 What followed

The candidate was elected borough mayor on November 2, 2025. On October 6, 2026 the borough announced its orientation to convert one direction of the Terrebonne lane to parking each winter, with the vote expected on December 7, 2026; the file behind it is the subject of access request 2026-581 (summaries and documents). Her later radio statements (CBC *Daybreak*, November 6, 2025 and May 20, 2026) are being transcribed and will be checked separately.

4 What this check does not establish

It compares statements with records. It does not establish why any statement was made, and it draws no conclusion about intent. The City's analysis of June 2026 and the consultant's note are withheld; the City's audit had not reported when this check was written.

5 Sources

Source	Where
Interview	CJAD 800, August 20, 2025: Omny clip page (Montreal Now with Aaron Rand feed); transcript: this folder
2020 lanes	Council file of June 22, 2020; motion of September 8, 2020
Working committee	Resolution CA20 170210; note of June 13, 2021; file 1215284005; vote results
EXP 2023	Étude de mobilité – rue de Terrebonne (p. 51 on the bidirectional option)
2024 approvals	CA24 170018, CM24 0179, CA24 170131; public information session of November 30, 2023 (file 1246880002)
PLD 2024–2034	Plan local de déplacements (CA24 170089, May 6, 2024)

Source	Where
City audit	Release of February 10, 2026 and the Réalisons Montréal timeline
Request 2026-581	Borough response of October 9, 2026, bundle 01: PDF (pp. 6, 8, 74–81); summaries in the access-requests repository
McGill study	Romm *et al.*, 2025, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcmr.2025.100071; McGill Newsroom release; CTV News Montreal, August 18, 2025
Census	Statistics Canada, Census of Population 2016 and 2021, Ville de Montréal, main mode of commuting; borough populations