



CITY OF MANITOWOC

WISCONSIN, USA

www.manitowoc.org

MEMO

TO: Public Infrastructure Committee

FROM: Greg Minikel, PE, Engineering Division Manager

DATE: September 2, 2022

RE: South 22nd St. – Franklin to Washington St.
(Item 22-0642)

Members of the Public Infrastructure Committee:

The Committee requested that we look at options and costs for the possible reversion of two-way traffic on South 22nd St. between Franklin St. and Washington St.

There appears to be 3 options to consider:

1. Remove the existing bump-outs on each end to basically put the roadway back to its original condition.
2. Construct a Cul-de-Sac on the Franklin St. end of the street.
3. The Do Nothing Alternative – Leave it as is with one-way northbound traffic.

Option 1. This option would require us to remove the existing bump-outs at Franklin St. and Washington St. and basically return the street to how it was before. This type of work always has a very high unit cost and ultimately a high cost overall. It is all piecemeal and handwork so the costs are very high. We do agree that there are some sight distance or visibility issues on the south side of Franklin St. We would recommend removal of some parking on the south side of Franklin St. if we go with Option 1 or Option 3. The estimated cost for Option 1 is approximately \$50,000.

Option 2. We do not believe that the cul-de-sac option is even feasible or will end up being cost prohibitive. The cul-de-sac would have several negative issues. Two trees will need to be removed. We also believe that a retaining wall would be required for the northern most home on the west side of the street as it sits up so high. There would be a 3-4 foot drop from the property to the sidewalk. This option requires all traffic to enter and exit at Washington St. Part of the reasoning for going to the one-way northbound traffic was the difficulty to make a left turn at Washington St. or to cross Washington St. southbound. We have estimated the cost of Option 2 to be approximately \$150,000. We would have to do more survey and detailed design in order to get a better or more accurate cost estimate for this option.

We do not have a specific recommendation to the PI Committee and Council for this issue. We would support either Option 1 or Option 3. We do not feel that Option 2 is viable and should eliminate this one from the discussions.