Mukilteo SR 525 Complete Streets Pre-Design
Technical Working Group Meeting

Meeting title: Technical Working Group Meeting #2

Date: Monday December 16th, 2024

Time: 11:00-1:00

Location: MS Teams

Attendees:

WSDOT: OT Kedelty, Amber Stanley, Vu Nguyen, Tony Barilla, Richard To, Frank Fielder, Elijah Molohon, Adam Emerson, Carmen Bendixen, Jeff Davies, Aidan Cassidy, April Delchamps, Eric Zackula, Zachary Howard, Mike Crimmins, Joshua Shippy, Sanaz Malaki, Douglas Young, Charles Torres

Invitees: Doug Bender (Tulalip Tribes), Laura Gurley (Port of Everett), Matt Nienhuis (City of Mukilteo), Sabina Araya (Everett Transit), Laura Nugent (Mukilteo School District), Kathryn Boris (Community Transit), Gael Fisk (City of Mukilteo), Ross Bichel (Tulalip Tribes), Eric Widstrand (Sound Transit), Michael Schmieder (City of Everett), Angi Mozer (Port of South Whidbey), Rich White (Boeing), Malcolm Roberts (Island County), Mohammad Uddin (Snohomish County), Nathan Howard (Snohomish County), Chris Simmons (Community Transit), Veronica Schmidt (Snohomish School District)

Summary:

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) hosted the second of four Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings.

1. **Project Overview**:
    - The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) is replacing the bridge over railroad on SR 525 in Mukilteo and repaving and constructing American with Disability Act (ADA) upgrades on SR 525 from SR 525 Spur VIc to Mukilteo Ferry Terminal
    - **Schedule**: Four TWG meetings are anticipated, with two being in-person workshops.
2. **Level of Traffic Stress:**
    - Level of Traffic Stress: Helps improve the comfort and safety of transportation users. More information can be found in the WSDOT Design Manual.
    - The bridge and surrounding areas lack direct sidewalks and connectivity, ADA review and compliance will be conducted as part of the bridge replacement. Pedestrian curb ramps impacted by the paving work will be replaced or altered to meet current ADA standards.

3. **Community Engagement**:

    - Timeline: The project will involve several stages of community outreach, starting with the launch of a website in the summer of 2024 and continuing with TWG and Executive Meetings, online surveys and public meetings in 2025.

3. Updated Baseline, Complete Street & Contextual Needs:

- Projects that are required to incorporate Complete Streets, following the screening process described in Section 1104.04(1), are assumed to have a "Complete Streets need" in addition to the baseline need and contextual needs.

- Criteria that will be used to select the preferred alternatives include cost, vehicle operations, safety, baseline/Complete Streets, and contextual needs. There are two separate projects that are related and adjacent to each other but stand alone. Both projects will undergo their own alternative comparison and evaluation.

Questions and Comments:

- When looking at bicycle facilities in this area, please take into account bus facilities since it can be competing interests on the sides of the roadway. Requesting consideration in planning.
    - Response: Bus pullouts have been identified, more detail between the interaction between the bike path and bus pullouts look like.

- Poll question: Please rank the segments in order of what segment you are most interested in discussing.
    - Response: Segment 8-13, Segment 1, Segment 3, Segment 2, Segment 4, Segment 5

4. **Preliminary Complete Streets Options & Existing and Proposed Crossings:**

    - Segment maps were reviewed. The corridor is divided into 12 segments.

    - Three long-term conceptual options were shared. Option 1: is a Shared Use Path on the west side with existing conditions on Eastside. Option 2: is a sidewalk with a cycle track on the westside and a buffered sidewalk on the eastside. Option 3: Standard Complete Street sidewalk bike lane on both sides of the roadway.

    - Segment 1 conceptual option: Opportunity for this segment include existing Share Use Path that could be widened. There are pinch points that need to be addressed and may require a structure (bridge, retaining wall). Favors toward option 1. Challenges for this segment: Is the crossing improvement at intersections, this is a common theme throughout the corridor. Other challenges throughout the corridor includes pinch points at intersections, and overhead utilities and topography challenges on the eastside.

    - Segment 2 conceptual option: Opportunity: Appears to be a lot of available ROW at the SW corner of 88th Street and SR 525. Challenges: Crossing at intersections, pinch points at intersections, and overhead utilities and possible topography challenges on the eastside that may require a retaining wall if facilities are put in. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor if we have bike facilities on the west side, we would want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor.

    - Segment 3 conceptual option: Opportunity: We believe there is development proposed for the east side of SR 525 in the area, so active transportation facilities could be coming in the near future for the west side. Challenges: crossing at intersections, pinch points at intersections, and overhead utilities and possible topography challenges on the eastside that may require a

retaining wall if facilities are put in. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor if we have bike facilities on the west side, we want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor.

- Segment 4 conceptual option: Opportunity: Existing pedestrian facilities that could possibly just need to be widened to meet LTS 2, but we would still need bike facilities. Challenges: crossing at intersections, pinch points at intersections, and overhead utilities on the eastside. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor. If we have bike facilities on the west side, we want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor.
- Segment 5 conceptual option: Opportunity: The existing pedestrian facilities could possibly just need to be widened to meet LTS 2. In addition, bike facilities looks like they can be fitted in on the westside if we use the parking area, or planting strip area. Challenges: crossing at intersections, overhead utilities and topography on the east side. And if there are other challenges you can think of, please note them in the chat. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor. If we have bike facilities on the west side, we want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor.
- Segment 6 conceptual option: Opportunity: The existing pedestrian facilities that could possibly just need to be widened to meet LTS 2. In addition, bike facilities looks like they can be fitted in on the westside. Challenges: crossing at intersections, overhead utilities on the eastside, traffic changes due to school, and increase in foot student and foot traffic during the start and the end of the school day. Any other challenges? If so, please note them in the chat. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor. If we have bike facilities on the west side, we want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor.
- Segment 7 conceptual option: Opportunity: we couldn't find any opportunity to take advantage of except for the wide shoulder on some section on the westside. Challenges: This is probably the most challenging segment to add active transportation facilities due to limited RW and topography. In addition, data shows there is an uncorrected Fish Barrier located here near the intersection of East Horizon Drive of SR 525 and SR 525 and Goat Trail. Any dimensional changes to the corridor here could trigger the correction. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor. If we have bike facilities on the west side, we want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor.
- Segment 8 conceptual option: Opportunity: The existing pedestrian facilities could possibly be widened to meet LTS 2. Challenges: crossing improvements and traffic for mixed destinations ferry. Also, it is desired to have uniformity throughout the corridor. If we have bike facilities, we want to try to keep that continuous throughout the corridor, but for the rest for SR 525, it may make sense to have bike and ped facilities on both sides of the road.
- Segment 9-10 conceptual option: Details are similar to segment 8.
- Segment 11 conceptual option: Segment 11 is the bridge; need to define the cross section for the bridge replacement. The replacement bridge will need to match the corridor on the north end and south end.
- Segment 12 conceptual option: This is the last segment for this project, the lane configuration will tie back into the bridge replacement project. To meet the BLTS requirement, we would need to add a buffered bike lane to the eastbound traffic. But again, we will need to tie back into the bridge replacement project.

Questions and Comments:

- Bicyclists who travel at higher speeds don't prefer a shared use path due to the congestion of other pedestrians. This could be a potential challenge.
    - Response: The project team saved the image shared when referring to an area with a future shared path and documented this comment.
- Community Transit routes 103 and 117 both travel the length of the corridor, connecting the Mukilteo waterfront with the community and continuing on to Lynnwood and light rail. We want to be sure that this project takes the opportunity to improve bus stops higher on our priority list to accommodate higher passenger loads and/or provide stop areas that are more accessible by pedestrians.
    - Response: WSDOT project team asked a clarifying question: if bus pull outs are still preferred?
        - Buss pullout preference is contingent on speed limits and roadway geometry. Design review is needed; Community Transit will share the priority bus stop list with WSDOT team; WSDOT will coordinate a meeting with Community Transit to discuss further and to discuss preferences for bus stop configuration with cycle tracks vs. separated bike lanes.
    - The City of Mukilteo receives requests for a light at Goat Trail for cars and pedestrians.
        - Response: WSDOT project team documented the comment.
- If you end up with a cycle track only on one side of the roadway at the bridge, please carefully consider how bicyclists would cross the roadway to get to the ferry. Same for bicyclist coming off the ferry heading south.
    - Response: WSDOT team documented the comment and noted that in the downtown area, planning for more of a standard cross section with bike lanes on both sides.
- Who will maintain planter strips?
    - Response: An agreement could be made with the City of Mukilteo or WSDOT may maintain.
- Bike lanes on both sides are preferred, but there will still be the desire to cross to get to/from the ferry.
    - Response: The WSDOT team documented this comment.

- The Goat Trail location is significant due to the high residential area that feeds into this location. There are also bus stops; there is no crossing close by making it a challenge to cross. Would like to find a resolution for this area.
    - Response: The WSDOT team documented this comment.

5. **Existing and Planned Crossings:**

- Adding a crossing at 88th Street Intersection. Traffic needs to determine if existing turn pockets are necessary. LT pockets should likely remain; enhancement may not be able to include crossing island.

- Mukilteo BTW plan identified a crossing at 86th street. There is no intersection at 86th so need to verify with City of Mukilteo. Desire to discuss more with the City of Mukilteo; a "mid-block" crossing may accommodate a crossing island depending on location.

- Crossing improvements at 81st Street. Identified as high priority in BTW plan. LT pockets should likely remain; enhancement may not be able to include crossing island. Desire to discuss more with City; a "mid-block" crossing may accommodate a crossing island depending on location

- Crossing improvements at 80th Street. Identified as high priority in BTW plan.

- Poll question: Please rank the segments in order what existing crossings you want to discuss the most.

        - Response: E1, E4, E6, E3, E2, E5
    - Poll question: Please rank in order what planned crossings you want to discuss the most.
        - Response: P1, P2, P5, P3, P4

6. **Next Steps:**
    - Develop corridor level complete streets alternatives
    - Screen corridor level complete streets alternatives
    - Community engagement
    - Schedule Executive Working Group Meeting #1
    - Schedule Technical Working Group Meeting #3

7. **Action Items:**
    - WSDOT to coordinate meeting with Community Transit re: bus stop pullout preference and preferences for bus stop configuration with cycle tracks vs. separated bike lanes.