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

Meeting title: Technical Working Group Meeting #3

Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025

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 third 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. **Community Engagement**:
    - The online open house was live from June 12-July 9, 2025. There were a total of 768 active users and 87 surveys submitted (1 was blank). The online open house and survey were offered in both English and Spanish; all responses were in English.
    - Participating in the online open house was promoted by flyering to local businesses and tabling at the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal. Additionally, a press release was also published, the project website was updated, and a flyer and direct link were shared with project partners.

- For the survey question, “Are there any specific locations where bike and pedestrian improvements are especially needed?”, participants showed a strong preference for separated bike facilities, especially on the hill. No new locations were identified.
- Survey questions 4, “How often do you currently walk, bike or roll through this area?” and question 5, “If new pedestrian and bicycle facilities are built, how often do you think you would walk, bike or roll through this area?”, participants indicated there would be a daily or weekly increase for potential future use, while occasional or rare use decreased.
- Participants were invited to respond to optional sociodemographic questions. Of those who shared their age, there was a wide age range with the largest age group being 35-44, followed by 45-54, 65-79, and 55-64. 49% identified as male and 41% identified as female. Less than ten individuals reported having a disability.
- Results show most participants were concentrated in Mukilteo and Everett. There were a few outlier results for Whidbey Island, Ocean Shores, Leavenworth and Kent.
- Survey key takeaways:
    - Lighting for pedestrians
    - Wider sidewalks for Alternative 2 and 3
    - Confirmed identified crossing needs
    - Efficient and safe access at SR 525 and 1st
    - Concerns about construction impacts for the bridge
    - Requests for ferry line cutting enforcement
    - Requests for community beautification

3. **Near-term improvements – Paving and ADA project:**
    - Crossing enhancements including marked crosswalks, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), squaring up of sidewalk corners, curb accessibility, and signage at:
        - 80th Street Southwest
        - 81st Place Southwest
        - 88th Street Southwest
        - Clover Lane
    - Lane narrowing will occur from Paine Field Blvd to 84th St (Segment 1).
    - A new bike lane will be added with a 0-3ft buffer.
    - Improved bicycle level of traffic stress from a 4 to a 3 in Segment 1.
    - The existing turn lanes will remain.
4. **Long-term improvements – Complete Streets Alternatives:**
    - Complete Streets Alternatives – Assumptions:
        - Sidewalk = 6’ per Mukilteo minimum standard
        - Bike lane = 5’ each per WSDOT minimum

    - Bike lane shoulder = 2’ each added for two-way cycle facility, it would be functionally similar to shared-use-path (which require 2’ shoulders)
    - Buffer width = 5’ per Mukilteo minimum standard
    - Lane width = 11’ per WSDOT minimum at 40mph
    - SUP = 12’ per WSDOT desired width, plus 2’ shoulders on each side (16’ effective total width)
- Open house survey question, “Which types of facilities would you like to see in either project? Rank you top 3.” Responses indicated a high ranking for separated shared use paths.
- Open house survey question, “What are your top priorities for the long-term vision for this project? Rank your top 3”, participants showed a need for addressing safety concerns, a desire for wider sidewalks and bike lanes, and safer crossings and lighting.
- Summary of needs for the paving project:
    - Baseline need: failing pavement.
    - Complete streets needs: some curb ramps don’t meet ADA standards, bike facilities don’t meet LTS 2, there is a lack of direction routes for bikes and pedestrians in the corridor.
    - Contextual needs: traffic calming and encourage drivers to follow the posted speed limits, add safe pedestrian crossings at intersections and mid-blocks where possible, build a connected bike lane network, improve Safe Routes to Schools between 76th St SW and 81st Pl SW, improve bike lanes in Midtown Mukilteo, add bike lanes for higher-speed and long-distance cyclists, connect 8600 block of SR 525 to the 92nd St SW Park shared use path, increase transit access.
- Open house survey question, “What are the biggest issues with the existing bridge? Rank your top 3”, participants indicated a need to address safety, the aging bridge and a desire for wider sidewalks and bike facilities.
- Summary of needs for the bridge project:
    - Baseline needs: replace bridge to meet modern structural standards and comply with current railroad clearance requirements. Raise the adjacent roadway to match the new bridge.
    - Complete Streets needs: some curb ramps don’t meet ADA standards. Bike and pedestrian facilities don’t meet LTS 2. There is a lack of direct routes for bikes and pedestrians in the corridor.
    - Contextual needs: improve walking and biking access between 1st Street and Lighthouse Park. Enhance connections between 1st Street and Front Street. Provide a more direct route between the Upland Neighborhood and Mukilteo Lane. Calm traffic and improve comfort by targeting vehicle speeds of 25mph or lower, increase transit access.
- Complete Streets Alternatives Section 1
    - Alternative 1: separated shared-use path to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians.
    - Alternative 2: separated bike lanes and sidewalk at the street-level, with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on each side of SR 525.

- Alternative 3: separated sidewalk and two-way bike lanes, are sidewalk level with directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on the southbound side of SR 525.

- Complete Streets Alternatives Section 2
  - Alternative 1: separated shared-use path that accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians.
  - Alternative 2: separated sidewalk and bike lanes at the street level with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on each side of SR 525.
  - Alternative 3: separated sidewalk and two-way bike lanes at the sidewalk level with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on the southbound side of SR 525.

- Complete Streets Alternatives Section 3
  - Alternative 1: separated shared-use path that accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians.
  - Alternative 2: separated sidewalk and bike lanes at the street level with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on each side of SR 525.
  - Alternative 3: separated sidewalk and two-way bike lanes at the sidewalk level with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on the southbound side of SR 525.

- Complete Streets Alternatives Section 4
  - Alternative 1: separated shared-use path that accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians.
  - Alternative 2: separated sidewalk and bike lanes at the street level with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on each side of SR 525.
  - Alternative 3: separated sidewalk and two-way bike lanes at the sidewalk level with a directional buffer between bicyclists and pedestrians on the southbound side of SR 525.

- Complete Streets Alternatives – Bridge Project, Section 4B
  - Alternative 1:
    - All alternatives are preliminary concepts, the design are not final and may change based on feedback and evaluations.
    - All options aim to preserve existing bioretention stormwater facilities that look like planter strips along 1st Street to avoid impacting and relocating stormwater facilities as much as possible.
    - We are actively coordinating with Washington State Ferries to ensure a smooth integration design with their existing operations.
    - Alternatives 1 (Shared Use Path) and 3 (Two-Way Bike Lanes) have similar right-of-way (ROW) impacts. ROW impacts are expected along the north side of 1st street. We are trying to avoid impacts on the south side
    - The bridge will be expanded westward to accommodate new pedestrian and bike facilities. ROW impacts are expected along the west side of SR 525. We are trying to avoid impacts to the east side of SR 525.
    - The expansion along 1st Street will impact stormwater retention pond and require reconstruction of the north-side retaining wall.

        - New lane configuration allows for a wide buffer space currently shown located between the ferry lane and eastbound through lane on 1st Street. We are still deciding what to do with this space. Any decision made will be coordinated closely with WSF

- Alternative 2:
    - The bridge will be expanded west and eastward to accommodate new pedestrian and bike facilities.
    - The expansion along 1st Street will impact stormwater retention pond and require reconstruction of the north-side retaining wall.
    - This design will also add an EB bike lane towards the ferry.
- Alternative 3:
    - Alternative 3 (Two-Way Bike Lanes) had similar ROW impacts to Alternative 1 (Shared Use Path). One difference is the addition of a sidewalk along the Two-Way Bike Lanes, this will use more ROW space.
    - The bridge will be expanded westward to accommodate new pedestrian and bike facilities.
    - The expansion along 1st Street will impact stormwater retention pond and require reconstruction of the north-side retaining wall.
    - New lane configuration allows for a buffer between the ferry lane and eastbound through lane on 1st Street.
- Preliminary recommendations for further study by section:
    - Section 1 is its own special case and includes the near-term improvements, plus filling the shared-use path to meet LTS 2. Ideally, the same facilities from the other sections would be beneficial here if feasible. However, there may be trade-offs to a hybrid approach.

5. Discussion questions:

- Do you agree or disagree with the preliminary results? Why?
- Are there any surprises to you about the survey results or preliminary screening?
- Do you have any other interpretations of the results?
- Are there new or refined alternatives?
- Is there something we missed?

3. **Items needing further study:**

- Major intersections: eastbound turning compared to westbound turning at 92nd Street, 88th Street, 84th Street, 80th Streets, 76th Street, 5th Street, and 3rd Street.
- Bus stop location modifications
- Olympic Middle School pick-up/drop-off
- Alternative bike lane transition locations

- Fish barrier corrections
- Effects of raising the bridge to meet BNSF requirements
- Coordination with State Ferries

7. **Other long-term improvements**
    - Signalized crossings
    - Remove bus stop pullout (convert to in-lane stop)
    - Enhanced driveways
    - Enhanced lighting
    - Truck Aprons at skewed intersections
    - Landscaping/Trees
    - Community beautification
8. **Discussion questions:**
    - Any feedback on identified long-term improvements?
    - Any other issues for further study?
    - Any long-term improvements not identified?
9. **Next Steps:**
    - WSDOT to review TWG feedback on results.
    - WSDOT to finish long-term alternatives analysis and prepare for preferred alternative recommendation.
    - TWG members to provide feedback on results, community based organizations and community events by September 26th.