## Maintenance Cost of Rest Areas in Michigan

S. M. CARDONE, Senior District Engineer, Michigan State Highway Department, Lansing

A half-century of Michigan roadside rest area development is outlined through completion of 98 opened or planned installations on Interstate and arterial freeways. Facilities and services offered at these rest areas are discussed, as well as desirable maintenance practices. Rest area maintenance costs are analyzed in terms of volume of use by freeway motorists. From the standpoint of unit cost per vehicle, investment in flush-toilet rest rooms, rather than chemical-type toilets, appears to be justified.

•MICHIGAN is believed to have pioneered the idea of rest stops or roadside parks some 45 years ago, starting with a few picnic tables and picnic stoves placed along the right-of-way in 1919. From this small beginning, the idea spread throughout the state and nation. To these roadside picnic parks were eventually added parking areas, toilet facilities, and drinking water fountains. During the evolutionary period before the advent of the Interstate System, these parks had reached a level of development comparable to the standards of the rest areas now being provided on our Interstate and arterial freeways.

The justification for expenditure of highway purpose revenues for such service facilities as rest areas has been discussed extensively at various levels of government, and definite policies and laws have been established. Nevertheless, the question often recurs, and although this subject falls outside the scope of this discussion, we may include one quotation from Subsection C of Section 1 of the Federal Highway Act of 1938, as amended by Section 11 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940:

Hereafter the construction of highways by the States with the aid of Federal funds may include such roadside and landscape development, including such sanitary and other facilities as may be deemed reasonably necessary to provide for the suitable accommodation of the public, all within the highway right of way and adjacent to publicly owned or controlled recreational areas of limited size and for provision for convenient and safe access thereto by pedestrian and vehicular traffic, as may be approved by the Public Roads Administration (Bureau of Public Roads).

Although the primary function of roadside parks has been the rest, relaxation, and enjoyment of tourists, the basic service of the rest areas, or safety stops as they are sometimes called, is accident prevention through minimizing fatigue and driver mesmerism.

In initial planning for construction of a system of rest areas on Michigan's Interstate System, a Citizens' Advisory Committee was formed to arrive at an economical formula for these facilities. The Chief Maintenance Engineer served on the committee as the Department's representative. During the committee's discussions, he was asked to estimate the maintenance cost of these facilities. The committee was given an estimate of \$25,000 annually per rest area, based on the operation of movable bridges, the only related operation for which cost experience was available at that time.

This \$25,000 per rest area included the provision for flush-type toilet facilities with attendants on duty around the clock.

The Committee recommended construction of approximately 100 of these rest areas. Later, it was decided that the anticipated annual maintenance expenditure of \$25,000 on each of these areas was too costly, and a decision was made to construct a less-costly facility making use of chemical toilets housed in unheated, inexpensive structures, equipped with hand-operated drinking fountains, and providing attendants intermittently only as required.

In the fall of 1960, Michigan placed three rest areas in operation on the Interstate System, all located on I-94, a route connecting Detroit and Chicago. These rest areas had additional facilities, such as telephones and night lighting, which had not been used at any of Michigan's roadside parks before this time.

Current Michigan planning envisions the construction of approximately 2,000 mi of arterial and Interstate freeways to be completed by 1972. On this system, a total of 98 rest areas are planned, of which 46 had been completed and placed in operation by the end of the 1964 construction season. When the program is completed there will be 58 rest areas on the Interstate System and 40 on state arterial freeways. Of the total, some 14 will be operated as combination tourist information stations and rest areas (Fig. 1).




Figure 1. Locations of Michigan rest areas and information stations.




Figure 2. Freeway and rest area use data (based on 1961 Michigan survey).



Figure 3. Aerial view of typical Michigan rest area, showing access ramp, parking areas, and distribution of user facilities.



Figure 4. Typical landscaping of rest area, including State Historical Commission markers.

In 1961 Michigan conducted a rest area survey to determine motorist desires, and a report was subsequently published. Rest areas at that time were in their infancy and there was very limited experience in their operation. However, notwithstanding the relatively small sampling made, certain trends of usage were reported. Certain data from that report are shown in Figure 2, indicating the type of usage that the rest areas were receiving.

Before considering the scope of maintenance for these rest areas, a few basic design features should be understood. The areas vary in size from 8 to 28 acres (Fig. 3). In Michigan, the maximum size in which the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads will participate is 8 acres. The facilities include two separate chemical-type toilets, one or two drinking fountains, one or two telephones, a map board, from 5 to 10 picnic stoves, 20 to 25 picnic tables, and parking spaces for 50 cars and 24 trucks. There are from 2 to 4 acres of lawn-type grass areas and varying amounts of trees and shrubs. Our latest design makes use of much less shrubbery than the earlier areas constructed (Fig. 4).

The parking areas are 300 by 56 ft for passenger cars and 700 by 96 ft for trucks. With the accelerating and decelerating ramps, each 1,000 ft long, the rest areas stretch out over a distance of 3,200 ft. The latest design requires portland cement concrete for parking areas, instead of the bituminous concrete formerly specified. The cost of the latest design is the neighborhood of \$175,000 per rest area (having chemical-type toilets).

Although our latest standard for design calls for chemical toilets, as has been stated, Michigan has built and placed in operation two rest areas making use of flush-type toilets. This was done after 2 years of experience with chemical-type facilities to obtain comparison of both capital outlay and maintenance cost. The first 2 years




Figure 5. Typical toilet enclosures: (a) chemical-type; and (b) flush-type.

had indicated a motorist tolerance of the chemical toilet as at best being better than no facility at all. In some of the complaints the thought was expressed, in referring to the odoriferous character of chemical toilets, that we are now providing the motorist with a 20th century highway and an 18th century privy. Providing flush toilets increases the initial cost from \$175,000 to approximately \$190,000 per rest area. The additional \$15,000 covers the cost of a masonry and steel building, heating facility, and pressure water system. Typical appearance of facilities of each type is shown in Figure 5.

One major difference between operation of roadside parks on uncontrolled-access trunklines and rest areas on the limited-access freeways is that the roadside parks are closed at the end of the summer tourist season, but most of the rest areas are operated throughout the year. In four or five instances, we have closed rest areas during some winter months for economic reasons due to lack of use.

Maintenance routine calls for an attendant to visit a rest area at least once daily, even at infrequently used areas. In some cases, two or three men may be occupied at least part of day in performing various duties such as rubbish disposal, grass cutting, minor maintenance, and general cleanup. Figure 6 reproduces an attendant's checklist and indicates the frequency and character of maintenance performed.

Regrettably for the purpose of this report, Michigan does not keep maintenance cost

CHIGAN STATE HIGHWAT DEPARTMENT OFFICE OF MAINTENANCE				ATTENDANTS' CHECK LIST								1	Ferm 4291	
NOTE: Farm to be m Original copy												artor	med.	
Bi-Wee	kly I	Peri	od _											- 0
	15	M	TT	×	Y	F	3	1	M	Ť	¥	T	F	
DAILY														
1. Agitate tanks.			Г						П				П	
2. Pick up debris.						7							٦	70
J. Sweep.			Г										T	
4. Hose			Г	Г		-	П		Г				T	7
5 Wash bowls, replace seats, etc.	T		Г										1	7
6 Mop		Г	Г				П	Г	Г				T	7~
7. Fill dispensers			Г				П	Г					T	
8 Remove writing				Г				Г					T	7
9. Spray insects.							П	Г	Г					
10 Check lights.	Г	T	Г				П	Т	Т			-	1	7
11. Agitate lanks.	Г	Г					П						T	7
		Г	Г				П	Т	П		П		T	7
	Г	Г	Г					П					T	7
WEEKLY				Т			П		Г				T	1
1. Add deodorant		Г	Г					Т					7	$\neg$
2. Check tank	Г	Г											1	7
				Г									1	1
BI-WEEKLY													1	$\neg$
t. Check for required													1	7
2. Check vent gipes.		Г											7	
													7	

_	Fe= #20
0	ATTENDANTS' CHECK LIST INSTRUCTIONS FOR TOILET
	DAILY
0	1. Agitate tonks upon arrival (10 revolutions minimum).
$\bigcirc$	2 Pick up and dispose of debris in building
	Sweep toilet buildings. (Floors, walls and ceilings)     Mose down toilet buildings. (Floors, walls and ceilings)
	5 West toiler hand made and antide and toiler hand cleaner, with all creas
$\bigcirc$	fig. shock halfar and the clocks and lamps littings. When halfar years can not be clooned properly because of extension was, they should be replaced. Seat should be maked with districtions and diseas.
$\cup$	6 Mop and squeegee floors dry.
	<ol> <li>Fill paper dispensers, being careful to interlack new supply with that remaining in dispensers. If dispensers are inoperative, repair or replace.</li> <li>Remove withing from walls.</li> </ol>
	9. Spray for insects as required.
	16. Check lights, including yard light and replace burned out bulbs.
	Agitate tanks before leaving (10 revolutions minimum).
	MEEKTA
	1. Add deadarant as called for in charging instructions.
	<ol><li>Check lank for pumping and if tank is full ar ador from tank is particularly offensive, have tanks pumped.</li></ol>
	DI-VEEKCY
	I. Check buildings for painting, feats in soul and other necessary maintenance.
	2. Check vent pipe and replace when required
0	TANK CHARGING PROCEDURE
0	1. Pump tank and clean completely.
	2. Place a minimum of 8" of water in the tank.
0	3. Add one god of crystals (45 lbs.) of the time of charging. The crystals shall be in whiching the model. An additional 45 lbs. of crystals in subscipp) shall be subscipped to the control of the crystals and the control of the crystals and the control of the crystals become of the control of the crystals become of the crystals because o
	4 Fee gallons of deadorant shall be mixed with few gallons of water and added to the task when the tank is changed. One quart of deadorant mixed with one quart of water shall be added to be such seak seak.
0	WARNING — WHEN MIXING THE SOLUTION, WATER SHALL BE ADDED TO THE SANI-SEPTIC TO THE WATER,
	NOTE: Attendant shall complete form an reverse side of sheet.

Figure 6. Rest area attendant's checklist.

TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF MICHIGAN REST AREA ANNUAL COST AND USE DATA

		Thousand	Contract	Maintenance Costs								
	Location	Vehicles Stopping	or Direct Maintenance	Labor	Equipment	Materials	Power (Lights)	Total	Per Vehicle			
1.	Ypsilanti	490	C			****	****	\$ 6,862	\$0,014			
2,	Novi	399	C				0.00	11,096	0.028			
3.	Grass Lake	303	C	\$6,156	\$3,240	\$1,080	\$324	10,800	0.035			
4.	Ann Arbor	300	C	****		-		8,046	0.026			
5.	Clare*	268	C	*****		****	-	14,800*	0.046			
6.	Oshtemo	267	D	6,298	2,645	2,539	748	12,131	0.045			
7.	Monroe*	264	C			*****	***	13,740*	0.043			
8.	Battle Creek	238	D	3,021	861	1,733		5,615	0.024			
9.	Jackson	225	C	6.045	3,181	954	424	10,605	0.047			
10.	Galesburg	218	D	3,460	1,305	501	106	5,996	0_028			
11.	Marshall	196	D	4.413	953	2.887	168	8,258	0_042			
12.	Watervliet	181	D	****	*****	*****		8,835	0.049			
13.	Grand Rapids	159	C	*****		-		8,581	0.053			
14.	Lansing	127	D	*****		*****		9,208	0.072			
15.	Ithaca	124	C	****	0.000			6,435	0.052			
16.	Alma	119	C	*****				6,290	0.053			
17-	Otsego	118	D	****				10,427	0.088			
18.	Cascade	115	C	*****		*****		6.084	0-053			
19.	Fruitport	107	C	****	A marine	****		5,831	0_053			
20.	Grayling	104	C		*****		-	5,359	0.052			
21.	Houghton	78	C			*****		5.052	0.062			
22.	Frederic	77	C			*****		4,510	0.060			
23.	Higgins	76	C	****				5,330	0.084			
24.	Vanderbilt	63	C	-				4.390	0-069			
25,	Gaylord	62	C		2244		0.000	5,292	0.085			
26.	Mullett	40	C	*****	****			3,902	0.097			
							Average	\$7,826	\$0.052			
						Average, flush toilets			\$0-044			

<sup>\*</sup> Flush toilets

records on rest areas in such a way that all of the various cost elements can be easily summarized. Costs are recorded by control sections and activity codes. There is an activity code, "Maintenance of Tourist Facilities," to which only those functions are charged that do not fall within other standard activities. For example, the major portion of snow and ice control work performed in the rest area is charged to the activity code of "Snow and Ice Control" for the particular section on which the rest area is located. Grass cutting is charged to a standard activity code of "Roadside Mowing" for each road section. Under this system it was necessary to average, prorate, and estimate some of the detailed expenditures that make up the overall maintenance costs.

Of the 38 rest areas areas operating in August 1964, only 26 are reported in Table 1 due to lack of a full year's operation or difficulty in obtaining reliable maintenance expenditure data. However, we were successful in obtaining a breakdown of total expenditures into labor, equipment, materials, and power for six of these areas.

It should be pointed out that the rest areas reported in this table include some of the earliest design and some of the most recent. Consequently, they vary considerably in acreage, number of lights, amount of landscaping, types of equipment used by various contract organizations, distance from maintenance garage to the rest area, level of maintenance as performed by different organizations, climatic conditions, and classes and rates of labor. Maintenance is performed either directly by state forces or by contract with counties or cities. For example, the common labor rate can range from an hourly low of \$1.56 to a high of \$2.31, and at times semi-skilled classes such as truck drivers are used with a top hourly pay of \$2.77, not including social benefits. This makes direct comparison of expenditures almost an impossibility.

Table 1 shows that annual expenditures for operating the 26 rest areas vary from a low of \$3,902 to a high of \$14,800, the average being \$7,826. However, an interesting relationship becomes apparent when the expenditure per vehicle is plotted against the total number of vehicles using the rest areas, as shown in Figure 7.

Although these expenditures do not fall into a neat pattern or a mathematical function, something of a pattern can be detected when these data are plotted graphically. After allowing for scatter of the individual points, the line drawn appears to be reason-




Figure 7. Rest area maintenance costs per vehicle.

able. There appears to be an inverse relationship between the total number of vehicles and the expenditure per vehicle. Although from the data available it is not possible to extend this curve with any degree of accuracy, it is entirely possible that the curve may become asymptotic to a line paralleling the horizontal axis at a point representing \$0.015/veh. This point could be reached at an attendance figure of approximately 1,500,000 veh. The annual maintenance expenditure per rest area would then become approximately \$25,000.

The writer, along with management, has been concerned about the anticipated high cost of operation of flush-type toilet facilities as compared to the less desirable chemical type. However, the data in this report seem to dispel those fears. It will be noted in Figure 7 and Table 1 that the unit expenditure for the two rest areas having flush-type toilets falls within the general trend of the expenditure for the chemical toilet installations. These data point to at least two major conclusions:

1. Although there is a considerable scatter in unit expenditures for each rest area, the trend curve seems fairly accurate, considering that all rest areas are not of identical design and that maintenance is performed by widely varying routines.

2. The unit cost of rest areas having flush-type toilets is in line with the unit cost of chemical-type installations.