UTAH

AIR MONITORING

NETWORK REVIEW 2004

Prepared by the Division of Air Quality

Utah State Department of Environmental Quality

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction
1.1	Current Utah Air Monitoring Network
1.2	Current Network Modification Issues
1.3	Review of Last Year Network Modifications
2.0	Utah Air Monitoring Network
2.1	Sulfur Dioxide
2.2	Nitrogen Dioxide
2.3	Carbon Monoxide
2.4	Ozone
2.5	Lead
2.6	PM_{10}
2.7	PM _{2.5}
2.8	Meteorological Data
2.9	Air Toxics
2.10	Emergency Episode Monitoring
3.0	Network Modification Forms
4.0	Summary and Conclusions
Appendix A	Emissions Inventory
Appendix B	Population Growth In Utah

Section 1.0 Revision 12 Date $\frac{6}{4}$ Page 1

MONITORING NETWORK REVIEW

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The monitoring network has been described in the network reviews from 1982 through 2004. A complete description of each station is located in the station file at the Air Monitoring Center and is available upon request. This network review will focus on the adequacy of the existing network and the changes that are needed.

The existing or proposed monitoring stations are reviewed to see if the objectives are being met. The most recent emissions inventories for each pollutant are reviewed along with ambient data gathered in the area and, when available, a review of current computer air pollution dispersion modeling is also reviewed. The practicality of installing or maintaining a monitoring station at the current or proposed location is then reviewed with respect to the initial monitoring objectives, the available budget for monitoring, and the Division's monitoring priorities. A Network Modification Form is submitted to Region VIII of the Environmental Protection Agency prior to or as part of installing a new station. The network review process follows the requirements of 40 CFR 58.20(d).

1.1 CURRENT UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK

Table 1 lists the stations in Utah's current air monitoring network. The indicated location is the actual location address.

Under the listed parameters, a station may be designated NAMS = National Air Monitoring Station, SLAMS = State and Local Air Monitoring Station, or SPM = Special Purpose Monitor. The monitoring objectives (population exposure, source impact, highest expected concentration or background station) and the spacial scale of representativeness (micro, middle, neighborhood, urban or regional scales) are also designated.

Spacial scale of representativeness is described in terms of the physical dimensions of the air parcel surrounding an air monitoring station, throughout which pollutant concentrations are reasonably homogeneous. The scales of representativeness used for Utah's network in the following ranges:

Micro Scale:	Several meters to about 100 meters
Middle Scale:	About 100 meters to 0.5 kilometers
Neighborhood Scale:	About 0.5 to 4.0 kilometers
Urban Scale:	Overall citywide conditions, usually about 4.0 to 50 kilometers. Requires more than one station to define
Regional Scale:	Defines a rural area, usually of reasonably homogeneous geography, extending for tens to hundreds of kilometers

Section <u>1.1</u> Revision <u>6</u> Date <u>6/4/04</u> Page 1

TT						Page 1
			1	LEAD	DM	DM
-	0	•	NO ₂	LEAD	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
, U		-				
Neigh.		Neigh.				
						SLAMS
-	-	High	^			Population
Neigh.	Neigh.	Neigh.	Neigh.			Neigh.
		SLAMS				SPMS
		Population				Population
						Neighbor
		C				C
	NAMS	NAMS*	SLAMS		NAMS	SLAMS
	Population	Population	High		Population	Population
	*	-	÷		*	Neigh.
	SLAMS*	SLAMS*	SLAMS		SLAMS	SLAMS
	High	High	High		High	Population
	-	U	U		U	Middle
	0	0	0		8	
		SLAMS				SLAMS
						Background
		·				Reg
1		SLAMS*		1		SPMS
						Background
		U U				Reg
	SO ₂ SLAMS A, High Neigh. SLAMS Impact	UTAH AIR MON SO2 CO SLAMS Impact Neigh. Volume SLAMS SLAMS Impact Population Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. Impact Population Neigh. Neigh.	SO2 CO O3 SLAMS SLAMS* High High Neigh. SLAMS* Neigh. SLAMS NAMS* SLAMS SLAMS NAMS* Impact Population Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. SLAMS Neigh. Neigh. SLAMS Neigh. Neigh. NAMS* Population Neigh. NAMS* Population NAMS NAMS* Population NAMS NAMS* SLAMS* SLAMS* High High High High	UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK SO2 CO O3 NO2 SLAMS SLAMS* High SLAMS* High Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS SLAMS SLAMS NAMS* SLAMS Impact Population NAMS* Population Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS Population Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS Population Neigh. NAMS SLAMS Population Neigh. NAMS NAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. SLAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. SLAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. SLAMS* High Neigh. Veigh. SLAMS* High Neigh. SLAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. Image: SLAMS* High Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. SLAMS Population Neigh. Image: SLAMS* High <td>UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK SO2 CO O3 NO2 LEAD SLAMS SLAMS* High High High High Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS* High High High Neigh. Population NAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS Population Neigh. Neigh. Population Neigh. NAMS Population Neigh. Neigh. Population NAMS NAMS NAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. NAMS NAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. Population NAMS NAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. Population Neigh Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. Population Neigh. Neigh. SLAMS* SLAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. Image: SLAMS* SLAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. Population Neigh. SLAMS* High Neigh. Population Neigh. Population</td> <td>UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK SO2 CO O3 NO2 LEAD PM10 SLAMS SLAMS SLAMS* High High</td>	UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK SO2 CO O3 NO2 LEAD SLAMS SLAMS* High High High High Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS* High High High Neigh. Population NAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. SLAMS SLAMS Population Neigh. Neigh. Population Neigh. NAMS Population Neigh. Neigh. Population NAMS NAMS NAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. NAMS NAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. Population NAMS NAMS* SLAMS High Neigh. Population Neigh Neigh. Neigh. Neigh. Population Neigh. Neigh. SLAMS* SLAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. Image: SLAMS* SLAMS* SLAMS Population Neigh. Population Neigh. SLAMS* High Neigh. Population Neigh. Population	UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK SO2 CO O3 NO2 LEAD PM10 SLAMS SLAMS SLAMS* High High

*Indicates Seasonal Monitoring

**Should be re-designated to NAMS

Section 1.1 Revision <u>6</u> Date <u>6/4/04</u> Page 2

Table 1 UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK

STA., LOC., ARIS#, SAROAD#	SO ₂	СО	O ₃	NO ₂	LEAD	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Highland			NAMS*				SPMS
10865 North 6000 West			High				Population
Highland, UT			Neigh.				Neigh.
49-049-5008							
Lindon						NAMS	SLAMS
30 North Main,						Impact	Population
Lindon, UT						Neigh.	Neigh.
49-049-4001 461220001F01							
Logan		SLAMS*	SLAMS*			SLAMS	SPMS
125 West Center Street		Pop	Pop			High	Population
Logan, UT		Neigh.	Neigh.			Neigh.	Neigh.
49-005-0004							
Magna	NAMS				SLAMS	NAMS	SPMS
2935 South 8560 West,	Impact				Impact	High	Population
Magna, UT	Neigh.				Neigh.	Neigh.	Neigh
49-035-1001 460520001F02							
North Provo		SLAMS*	NAMS*	SLAMS		NAMS	SLAMS
1355 North 200 West		Population	Population	High		Population	Population
Provo, UT		Neigh.	Neigh.	Neigh.		Neigh.	Neigh.
49-049-0002 460800002F01							
North Salt Lake #2	SLAMS**					NAMS	SPMS
1795 North 1000 West	High					High	High
Salt Lake City, UT	Middle					Middle	Middle
49-035-0012 460920012F02						Co-Loc	

*Indicates Seasonal Monitoring ** Should be re-designated to NAMS

TABLE 1 UTAH AIR MONITORING NETWORK

Section 1.1 Revision 6 Date 6/4/04 Page 3

STA., LOC., ARIS#, SAROAD#	SO ₂	CO	03	NO ₂	LEAD	PM10	PM _{2.5}
Ogden #2				SLAMS		SLAMS	SLAMS
228 E 32 nd Street				High		High	High
Ogden UT				Neigh.		Neigh.	Neigh.
49-057-0002							
Spanish Fork			SLAMS*				SPMS
50 South Main			Population				Transport
49-049-5010			Neigh.				Regional
State Street #3		NAMS					
1400 South State Street		High					
Salt Lake City, UT		Micro					
49-035-0014							
University Avenue #3		SLAMS					
363 North University Avenue		High					
Provo, UT		Micro					
49-049-0005							
Washington Blvd. #2		SLAMS					
2540 South Washington Blvd,		High					
In Office Bldg. Ogden, UT		Micro					
49-057-0006							
Washington Terrace		SLAMS*	NAMS*				SPMS
4601 South 300 West		Pop	Population				Population
Washington Terrace, UT		Neigh.	Neigh.				Neigh.
49-057-0007							
West Valley		SLAMS*	SLAMS*				SLAMS
3100 South 3275 West		Population	Population				Population
West Valley City, UT		Neigh.	Neigh.				Neigh.
49-035-3007							

*Indicates Seasonal Monitoring ** Should be re-designated NAMS

UTAH DIVISION OF AIR QUALITY

Section <u>1.1</u> Revision <u>9</u> Date 6/4/04Page <u>4</u>

OFFICIAL AND SPECIAL STUDIES MONITORING NETWORK SUMMARY JUNE 2004

	SITE CODE	TELEMETRY	PM 2.5	#PM2.5	PM10	#PM10	СО	03	SO2	NO2	SPAN SOURCE	WIND	TEMP/RH	SR/BP*	SG/DT/PRE*	LEAD	AQI
ANTELOPE ISLAND	AI	CAMPBELL										YES	TEMP&RH		SIGMA ONLY		-
BADGER ISLAND	BI	CAMPBELL										YES	TEMP&RH		PRECIP. ONLY		
BEACH	B4	ESC						*SEASONAL/API	TECO		DYNACAL/API	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		
BOUNTIFUL	BT	ESC	3 DAY	1			*SEASONAL/TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI	TECO	TECO	DYNACAL/DASIBI/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		SO2/CO/O3
BRIGHAM CITY	BR	ESC	3 DAY	1				*SEASONAL/API			DASIBI	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		
COTTONWOOD	CW	ESC	3 DAY	1	3 DAY	1	TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI		TECO	DYNACAL/DASIBI/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP&RH		SIGMA ONLY		03/C0
HARRISVILLE	HV	ESC	3 DAY	1				*SEASONAL/DASIBI			DASIBI	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		
HAWTHORNE	HW	ESC	TEOM & E D	2	TEOM & E D	2	*SEASONAL/ TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI		TECO	DYNACAL/API/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP&RH	SR & BP			TEOM (2.5&10) O3/CO
HERRIMAN	HE	ESC	3 DAY	1				*SEASONAL/DASIBI			DASIBI	YES	TEMP&RH	SOLAR	SIGMA & DT		
HIGHLAND	HG	ESC	3 DAY	1				*SEASONAL/DASIBI			DASIBI	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		
LINDON	LN	ESC	TEOM/CL/ED	3	TEOM & E D	2					N/A	YES	TEMP&RH		SIGMA ONLY		TEOM (PM10/2.5)
LOGAN	L4	ESC	& CL TEOM/3 DAY &	3	3 DAY	1	*SEASONAL/TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI	TECO	TECO	DASIBI/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		TEOM (PM2.5)CO/O3
			CL														
MAGNA	MG	ESC	3 Day		3 DAY	1			TECO		DYNACAL	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY	*HV/CL	802
NORTH PROVO	NP	ESC	3 DAY	1	3 DAY & CL	2	*SEASONAL/TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI		TECO	DYNACAL/DASIBI/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		03/CO
N. SALT LAKE	N2	ESC	3 DAY	1	E/D &CL	2			TECO		DYNACAL	N/A					802
OGDEN #2	02	ESC	TEOM/3 DAY	2	TEOM/ED	2				TECO	DYNACAL						TEOM (PM10/2.5)
SALTAIRE	SA	CAMPBELL										YES	TEMP&RH	SOLAR	SIGMA ONLY		
1400 S. STATE	S 3	ESC					TECO				CYLINDER	N/A					со
SPANISH FORK	SF	ESC	3 DAY	1				*SEASONAL/API			API	YES	TEMP		SIGMA ONLY		
SYRACUSE	SY	CAMPBELL										YES	TEMP&RH		SIGMA ONLY		
UNIVERSITY AVE.	U3	ESC					TECO				CYLINDER	N/A					со
WASH. BLVD	W2	ESC					TECO				CYLINDER	N/A					со
WASH. TERR.	WT	ESC	3 DAY & CL	2			*SEASONAL/TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI			DASIBI/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP&RH		SIGMA ONLY		03/C0
WEST VALLEY	WV	ESC	3 DAY & CL	2			*SEASONAL/TECO	*SEASONAL/DASIBI			DASIBI/CYLINDER	YES	TEMP				
WEST JORDAN	WJ	ESC										YES	TEMP&RH				
SITES	25	25	16		8		10	13	5	6		20	20	3	17	1	12
REPORTING SMPLRS.	•			23		13										1	
CO-LOC SMPLRS.				4		2										1	
SEASONAL SMPLRS.							6	13									
TEOM (PM 2.5 & 10)				4		3											
ISSA (MASCR) ISSA																	

Section <u>1.2</u> Revision <u>8</u> Date <u>6/4/04</u> Page <u>1</u>

CURRENT NETWORK MODIFICATION ISSUES:

The following modifications to the monitoring network are anticipated during the next year.

The State of Utah has experienced severe budget shortfalls the past three fiscal years. In response to the budget shortfalls, the 2003 legislative session decreased the state general fund allocation to the Department of Environmental Quality by \$250,000. The State Legislature has allowed the Division of Air Quality to increase some fees and charges in order to replace the money that was removed from the annual budget because of last year's shortfall. This will allow some stations that were temporarily shut down to begin to operate again.

The following shows the anticipated changes in the monitoring network

- 1. The Washington Terrace ozone will begin to collect data again.
- 2. The Beach ozone will operate the summer of 2004 and the SO2 will start again July 1, 2004.
- 3. The Saltair Meteorological data will be collected again starting July 1, 2004.
- 4. Laboratory services for special air monitoring efforts will be contracted again starting July 1, 2004.

Section <u>1.2</u> Revision <u>8</u> Date <u>6/4/04</u> Page <u>2</u>

Response to change in EPA Focus

EPA has identified an increased focus on monitoring non-criteria pollutants. In so doing, EPA is re-allocating \$6.3 million from existing funds for measuring criteria pollutants to increased monitoring of Air Toxics. The impact on UDAQ is that there will be less monitoring for criteria pollutants and more for air toxics. As EPA changes the monitoring requirements in 40 CFR Part 58 and implements the National Monitoring Policy, the DAQ monitoring efforts will change. What changes occur will be determined at that time.

Response to New or Proposed NAAQS

No new National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) have been promulgated.

DAQ Identified Data Needs

High PM2.5 measurements in Logan indicate additional sampling should be performed. In addition, nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide information is necessary in Logan to help characterize PM2.5 precursors. The information will also be necessary in the event computer modeling is necessary for the Logan area.

Utah has experienced significant population growth over the past 15 years. A table showing the growth rate is attached as Appendix B. New housing starts indicate the growth rate has even continued over the past 3 years. Changes to the monitoring network the past couple of years have addressed some of the population growth. The three cities discussed below deserve consideration for future monitoring.

<u>Draper City</u>: Draper City in southeast Salt Lake County has grown the most since the 1990 census with a growth rate of 248%. That significant growth results in Draper City being the eighteenth largest city in Utah. Draper City is part of the Salt Lake-Ogden Metropolitan Area. Air pollution in the metropolitan area has been addressed for many years. We have indications that the ozone "cloud" will bank or build up in the southeast corner of Salt Lake Valley, in Draper, and then spill over the Traverse Ridge into Utah County. There are times when we see sudden high ozone levels at our Highland site. The thought is that it is coming from Salt Lake Valley. It routinely exceeds the ozone 8 hour standard and concentrations may be higher in the Draper area. We should determine the ozone impact on the public in that area. Draper has a population of 32,145 and is still growing rapidly.

<u>Tooele City:</u> Tooele is contiguous with Salt Lake Valley, is part of the Salt Lake MSA and has a population of almost 48,000 and is subject to the same inversions and summer stagnant conditions as Salt Lake Valley. We may need to collect PM2.5, ozone and meteorological data in Tooele.

Revision 7 Date <u>6/4/04</u> Page <u>3</u>

<u>Park City-Snyderville Basin-Summit County</u>: Summit County and Park City has a high population growth. Meteorology is significantly different than Salt Lake Valley but they do have inversion periods. The inversions are easier to eliminate than the inversions in Salt Lake Valley but they can be persistent. With a population of 34,000, it is an air shed that needs to be evaluated.

PSD Increment Tracking

Normally PSD increments are tracked with computer models. Ambient data used in PSD models is required by the DAQ and is provided by the PSD source requiring modeling. Pre and post PSD monitoring is required as part of the PSD approval process.

Sectio	1.2	
Revis	ion_	7
Date	6/4	/04
Page	3	

Modifications to Meteorological Monitoring Because of Computer Modeling Needs

Computer modeling is a very important part of evaluating air pollution impacts and the results of control strategies and control measures. Meteorological data is necessary to the computer modeling.

The Syracuse wind tower site is not safe due to uneven terrain and holes caused by seeping water. A new safer site needs to be obtained and the site moved.

1.3 <u>REVIEW OF LAST YEAR NETWORK MODIFICATIONS</u>

- 1. The Grantsville monitoring station was closed due to budget cuts to the DEQ budget by the Utah Legislature.
- 2. The South Orem CO monitoring station was closed due to budget cuts to the DEQ budget by the Utah Legislature.
- 3. The Moab PM10 site was closed due to budget cuts.
- 4. The Promontory Point meteorological monitoring site was closed July 1, 2003.
- 5. The Bountiful carbon monoxide monitor was not operated during the winter of 2003-2004, due to budget cuts.
- 6. The Beach SO2 sampling was discontinued on January 1, 2004, due to budget cuts
- 7. The Saltair meteorological monitor was closed January 1, 2004.
- 8. An athelometer was installed at the Bountiful site associated with the Urban Air Toxics monitoring.
- 9. A PM10 sampler was installed at the Bountiful monitoring site to measure heavy metals as part of the Urban Air Toxics program.
- 10. Real time, continuous PM2.5 monitoring using a R&P FDMS sampler began at the Hawthorne station in December 2003 and in at Logan in February 2004.
- 11. The Bountiful Monitoring Station was relocated in July of 2003.

Section	1	2.1
Revisio	on_	15
Date	9/	8/04
Page	1	

2.1 SULFUR DIOXIDE

The sulfur dioxide (SO_2) monitoring sites were installed at their present locations based on the emissions inventory and early computer modeling. Siting has also occurred in response to concerns expressed by the public. Computer modeling was performed as part of the SO₂ State Implementation Plan in the 1980's. EPA Region VIII has offered to perform computer modeling, but that effort has not been completed. The results of the 1980's modeling show areas of expected high SO₂ concentrations at Magna, in Salt Lake County and the area of North Beck Street in Salt Lake County. The Magna and North Salt Lake SO₂ Monitoring sites were installed in response to that computer modeling.

SO2 NETWORK

Salt Lake County

There are three types of major SO_2 sources in Salt Lake County. They are process industries, refineries and electric power generation. The impact of each of these sources is measured by the existing monitoring stations. The monitoring stations located at Magna, North Salt Lake and at the Great Salt Lake Beach State Park are meeting our needs and objectives.

Davis County

The largest SO_2 sources in Davis County are oil refineries. In recent years, the crude oil being processed by the oil refineries has become increasingly more sour, so the refineries have installed sulfur scrubbing systems to reduce their SO2 emissions. Their emissions are adequately monitored by the North Salt Lake Station near the Salt Lake County-Davis County border. The Bountiful monitoring station in Davis County is population oriented. It has been in operation for years and will continue to operate to evaluate population exposure. In the distant past, relatively high SO_2 concentrations have been measured at this station. It is the only SO_2 monitoring station in Davis County and is meeting DAQ needs and

objectives.

Cache County

 SO_2 was initiated in Logan to help identify SO_2 precursors for $PM_{2.5}$. The information will be needed if computer modeling becomes necessary for the Logan area.

Existing Monitoring Network

The existing SO2 monitoring network presently meets the federal requirements and most of existing State needs.

Additional Monitoring

No additional SO₂ monitoring is planned.

Section	n	2.1
Revisi	on	15
Date	9/3	8/04
Page_	2	

Special Studies

No special studies are planned.

Changes To The SO2 Monitoring Network

In response to additional funding through fees, the SO2 monitoring at the Beach site began July 1, 2004.

Section	n <u>2.2</u>
Revisi	on 14
Date	9/8/04
Page_	1

2.2 NITROGEN DIOXIDE

The existing NO_2 monitoring stations were installed at their current locations based on a combination of emissions inventory and population centers. The sites were installed in response to NO_x emissions from automobiles and NO_x 's involvement in the photochemical reaction that produces ozone. Based on that criteria, the sites were located in the center of the major urban areas. EPA's guidance that monitoring should be performed in areas with a population of 200,000 or greater was considered. Even though NO_x monitors are located in cities with populations of less than 200,000, the urban areas have populations over 200,000. The sites were also selected based on the ability to group several different analyzers into one station. Appendix A lists both the point source and area source emissions of NO_x emissions come from automobiles and 65% comes from point source process industries. Sixty percent of point source NO_x emissions are associated with power plants. They are located in rural southern Utah areas and have received Prevention of Significant Deterioration permits. They have also performed post construction monitoring, verifying that the NAAQS is not violated.

The oxidation of NO to NO_2 takes time, therefore, the highest NO_2 concentrations should be located some distance downwind from major NO sources. The ideal location for NO_2 monitors is at the edge of an urban area.

NO₂ NETWORK

Existing Monitoring Network

The existing NO₂ monitoring stations are Ogden, North Provo, Bountiful, Hawthorne, Logan and Cottonwood. The network is meeting the needs and objectives of DAQ.

The Bountiful monitor was relocated in 2003.

Additional Monitoring

No new monitoring for NO₂ has been planned.

Special Studies

No additional studies are necessary.

Changes To The NO2 Monitoring Network

No changes will be made to the NO2 monitoring network.

Section 2.3 Revision 15 Date 9/8/04 Page 1

2.3 CARBON MONOXIDE

The present CO monitoring sites were installed based on emissions from automobiles. Based on that criteria, the sites were located according to traffic patterns and traffic densities. The traffic information used was obtained from the Utah Department of Transportation. The emissions inventory in Appendix A indicates the amount of CO emissions from different sources in the Wasatch Front. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the carbon monoxide emitted is generated by vehicles.

When Utah's CO network was designed, no modeling data was available to assist in site location, so sites were chosen based on traffic volumes and patterns. Since that time, SIP modeling has been done for the Salt Lake-Davis County area and for the Provo-Orem area in Utah County. Models used under predicted the CO concentrations measured at all of the monitoring sites. The models give a rough estimate of the relative concentrations of CO, which indicates areas of expected maximum CO concentrations.

In 1992, a CO Saturation Study was performed. The results of the study indicate the monitoring sites were not at the point of maximum CO concentrations. One of the highest sites identified was near the intersection of 1300 South and State Street in Salt Lake City. Sites with high CO concentrations were also identified along 700 East Street near the 2100 South intersection, 3300 South and 3900 South intersections. The 1400 South State Street microscale CO site was installed as a result of the saturation study. The CO monitoring at the Hawthorne Elementary School is an area the CO saturation study showed to be a high area and is near the central business district.

CO NETWORK

The existing Network CO monitoring stations that operate all year are: Cottonwood, State Street, Washington Blvd., and University Avenue. The CO Monitoring stations that operate seasonally are: Hawthorne, Logan, North Provo, Washington Terrace and West Valley. This network presently meets the needs and objectives of DAQ.

Additional Monitoring

There has been a dramatic decrease in measured CO concentrations since the early 1990's to the point that CO is no longer an environmental concern. As a result no additional CO monitoring is planned.

Section <u>2.3</u> Revision <u>15</u> Date <u>9/8/04</u> Page <u>2</u>

2.3 Carbon Monoxide (Continued)

Changes To The CO Monitoring Network

Due to many years of measuring low CO concentrations, we plan on ending CO monitoring at the Cottonwood monitoring site. The NAMS designation needs to be moved to the Hawthorne CO monitor. No other changes are planned for the CO monitoring network.

Special Studies

No special studies are planned.

Saturation Study

No additional saturation studies are being considered at this time.

Section <u>2.4</u> Revision <u>17</u> Date <u>9/8/04</u> Page <u>1</u>

2.4 <u>OZONE</u>

Unlike the other pollutants, ozone is not emitted directly into the atmosphere. It is produced in the atmosphere as precursors, nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons, and reacts in the presence of sunlight to form a number of photochemical compounds. The photochemical reaction takes time to occur; therefore, ozone monitoring should be conducted down wind from the sources of precursors.

The valley setting of the major urban areas along the Wasatch front complicates ozone monitoring. Typical ozone monitoring indicates that the peak ozone stations should be located 5 to 7 hours down wind from the urban area, however, summer wind patterns in Utah result in a typical diurnal up valley down valley wind flow. This situation suggests that after 5 to 7 hours the polluted air mass may be right back over the urban area.

Ozone concentrations at all Division of Air Quality monitoring sites fluctuate seasonally, with higher values measured only during the warmer months. Monitoring at all ozone stations in attainment areas is therefore done seasonally, from May through September.

One and Eight Hour NAAQS

Two time periods have been identified by EPA for evaluating ozone, a one hour average and an eight hour average. The existing monitoring sites are located where the highest hourly ozone concentrations occur. We anticipate the highest 8-hour averages will occur at the same locations. Experience may modify that opinion. The 8 hour NAAQS for ozone does not specifically require any new monitoring sites. The impact of the 8 hour standard has been the occurrence of exceedances at stations in more rural locations that did not exceed the 1 hour standard.

Existing Network

The existing monitoring network for ozone, consists of thirteen monitoring sites located primarily in the populated counties along the Wasatch Front. As noted below, this network is meeting most but not all of the data needs for ozone.

Special Studies

No special studies have been conducted since the summer of 1996. None are planned for this next year.

Additional Monitoring

An additional ozone monitoring station needs to be installed in the east side of the Sandy/Draper area. EPA has suggested that ozone concentrations may be higher in the southeast part of Salt Lake Valley when the afternoon lake breeze pushes the polluted air mass from Salt Lake City into this part of the valley. The mountains partially trap the air mass, allowing the ozone concentrations to build up.

Section	n <u>2.4</u>
Revisio	on 17
Date 9	/8/04
Page	2

2.4 Additional Monitoring (Cont)

The monitoring needs section says Tooele also needs O₃ monitoring

Additional Saturation Studies.

No additional studies are planned.

Changes To The O3 Monitoring Network

Additional funding provided through additional fees resulted in the resumption of ozone monitoring at the Beach and Washington Terrace ozone monitoring stations at the beginning of the ozone monitoring season.

Section <u>2.5</u> Revision <u>12</u> Date <u>7/25/02</u> Page <u>1</u>

2.5 <u>LEAD</u>

Utah has established a SLAMS lead sampler using the regulatory guidelines in 40 CFR Part 58 Appendix D. The station is on a six-day sampling schedule.

LEAD NETWORK

Existing Monitoring Network

Presently, lead monitoring is being performed at the Magna air monitoring station. The Magna sampler is near an industrial source that emits 22 tons of lead per year. Most of the measurements made over the past 5 years have been below the detection limits of the measurement method. Lead monitoring, in reality, is now only necessary near industrial lead sources which emit 5 tons or more of lead a year to the atmosphere. There is only one industrial source in Utah that emits more than 5 tons or more of lead a year.

Additional Monitoring

No additional lead monitoring sites will be installed.

Section	2.6
Revision	10
Date <u>9/8/</u>	04
Page	1

2.6 <u>PM10</u>

The PM_{10} samplers were initially installed at the same sites as the Total Suspended Particulate samplers. TSP monitoring had been performed for many years at those locations and has shown many violations of the TSP standard. Computer modeling was not available to assist in locating the PM_{10} samplers, but has now been completed for the PM_{10} SIP. The modeling primarily dealt with source impact identification. There are two types of PM_{10} particles, which complicates PM_{10} monitoring. Primary PM_{10} particles are released from the source as particles and their concentration decreases from the point of release dependent on dispersion characteristics. Secondary particles are released as gases and become PM_{10} particles through chemical reactions in the atmosphere. Secondary particle concentrations are greater some distance from the source or after some time has elapsed from the time of release. Measured PM_{10} concentrations are a combination of both primary and secondary particles. Establishing monitoring sites to measure both types of particles can be a concern. Historically TSP and PM_{10} sites have been located based on primary particulates.

Existing Monitoring Network (See Table 1)

The existing PM_{10} monitoring network meets the minimum requirements for PM_{10} data for state and federal government needs. The existing network is not keeping pace with population growth.

Additional Monitoring

No additional PM₁₀ monitoring is necessary at this time.

Saturation Studies

No saturation studies are planned for the next year.

Special Studies

No special studies are planned for the next year.

Changes To The PM10 Monitoring Network

No changes are planned in the PM10 monitoring network.

Revision 4 Date 9/8/04 Page 1

<u>PM2.5</u>

On July 18, 1997, the Environmental Protection Agency promulgated a NAAQS for particulate matter measured as PM_{2.5}. Particulate sampling has been conducted first for TSP and then PM₁₀ at several locations in each county. In addition, computer modeling for TSP and PM₁₀ and some limited PM₁₀ saturation sampling have shown the existing particulate sampling sites are located in the areas of high concentrations for particulates. Previous particulate monitoring has also shown the existing locations to have elevated particulate concentrations. There are two types of particles that form PM_{2.5} particles. Primary PM_{2.5} particles are released from the source as particles and their concentration decreases from the point of release dependent on dispersion characteristics. Secondary particles are released as gases and become PM_{2.5} particles through chemical reactions in the atmosphere. Secondary particle concentrations are greater some distance from the source or after some time has elapsed from the time of release. Measured PM_{2.5} concentrations are a combination of both primary and secondary particles. Establishing monitoring sites to measure both types of particles can be a concern. Historically, TSP, PM₁₀ sites have been located based on primary particulates. Initially PM_{2.5} will be located based on concentrations of PM₁₀. The following table shows the locations for the PM2.5 network. IMPROVE samplers are operated by the National Park Service and are included as part of the PM_{25} monitoring network. The IMPROVE samplers are located in the National Parks in Utah.

Section 2.7Revision 3Date 9/8/04Page 2

<u>PM2.5 MONITORING NETWORK:</u>

	PM2.5 Network for 2002-2003										
	Name of Site	AIRS ID	Type of Site	Type of Sampler	Sampling Frequency	Collocation	Speciation	Date of Install	County		
1	West Valley	49-035-3007	Core- population>500,000	Sequential	1 in 3 CY99	FY99	FY99	FY-98	Salt Lake		
2	Ogden	49-057-0001	Core- population>500,000	Sequential	1 in 3 CY99		No	FY-98	Weber		
3	Hawthorne	49-035-3006	Core- population MSA>1,000,000	Sequential	Daily/Continuous	FY98	No	FY-98	Salt Lake		
4	North Provo	49-049-0002	Core- population MSA 200K-500K	Sequential	1 in 3		FY99	FY-98	Utah		
5	Lindon	49-049-4001	Non-core-population MSA 200K	Sequential	Daily CY99	FY99	FY99	FY-98	Utah		
6	Magna	49-045-1001	Non-core-background/transport	Sequential	1 in 3		No	FY-04	Salt Lake		
7	Spanish Fork	49-049-5010	Non-core-background/transport	Sequential	1 in 3		No	FY-98	Utah		
8	North Salt Lake	49-035-0012	Supplemt-high population & emis.	Sequential WS	1 in 3		No	FY-98	Salt Lake		
9	Cottonwood	49-035-0003	Supplemt-discretionary	Sequential WS	1 in 3		No	FY-98	Salt Lake		
10	Bountiful	49-011-0001	Supplemt-discretionary	Manual WS	1 in 3		No	FY-98	Davis		
11	Washington Terrace	49-057-0007	Supplemt-discretionary	Prototype R&P	1 in 3		No	FY-99	Weber		
12	Logan	49-005-0002	Supplemt-discretionary	Manual EMAD	1 in 3		No	FY-99	Cache		
13	Highland	49-049-5008	Supplemt-discretionary	Prototype R&P	1 in 3		No	FY-99	Utah		
14	Brigham City	49-003-0003	Supplemt-discretionary	Prototype R&P	1 in 3		No	FY-99	Box Elder		
15	Harrisville	49-057-1003	Supplemt-discretionary	Manual WS	1 in 3		No	FY-99	Weber		
16	Herriman	49-035-3003	Supplemt-discretionary	Prototype R&P	1 in 3		No	FY-99	Salt Lake		
17	Bryce Canyon	Improve	Improve-reg haze/transport/bckgrnd	Improve	1 in 3		Yes	Existing	Garfield		
18	Canyon Lands	Improve	Improve-reg haze/transport/bckgrnd	Improve	1 in 3		Yes	Existing	Grand		
19	Capitol Reef	Improve	Improve-reg haze/transport/bckgrnd	Improve	1 in 3		Yes	FY-98	Wayne/Garfield		
20	Zion	Improve	Improve-reg haze/transport.bckgrnd	Improve	1 in 3		Yes	FY-98	Washington		

Section <u>2.7</u> Revision <u>4</u> Date <u>9/8/04</u> Page <u>1</u>

EXISTING PM2.5 MONITORING NETWORK

The existing PM2.5 monitoring network is adequate and meets the needs of DAQ and EPA.

ADDITIONAL STUDIES

No special or additional studies are planned.

Changes To The PM2.5 Monitoring Network

Additional funding from fees will allow the PM2.5 sampler to continue to operate at the Washington Terrace site.

Section <u>2.8</u> Revision <u>12</u> Date <u>9/8/04</u> Page <u>1</u>

2.8 <u>METEOROLOGICAL DATE</u>

By measuring surface wind speed and direction, one can attempt to determine where a pollutant-laden air mass has come from and where it is going. This information is essential any time an attempt is made to determine the cause of high pollution periods.

The wind patterns in the mountainous terrain of Utah can be very difficult to analyze. Winds affected by geographical features can, and often do, control air mass movement in the mountain valleys where most industrial and urban activities are concentrated.

Because of these complex wind patterns, it has been the policy of the Division of Air Quality that many major air monitoring stations of middle scale or larger should record meteorological data. Each station must be evaluated separately because of the complex micrometeorology in Utah. Because the terrain produces the complex wind patterns, there are not enough monitoring sites that measure meteorological parameters.

Existing Monitoring (See Network Summary Table)

The importance of measuring meteorological parameters has increased as a result of more complex computer modeling. Modifications to the meteorological monitoring network have occurred as a result of a report prepared by the Technical Analysis Section. A computer model called Urban Airshed Model requires an extensive amount of meteorological information. Some sites have been discontinued because they were redundant and new sites have been installed in locations where no data were available.

Additional Monitoring

No additional meteorological monitoring is planned.

Changes To The Meteorological Monitoring Network

Additional funding through fees will allow the meteorological monitoring at the Beach site, Washington Terrace site and the Saltair site to continue.

Relocate the Syracuse wind tower to a safer location.

Section 2.9 Revision 10 Date 9/8/04 Page 1

2.9 <u>AIR TOXICS</u>

The category of toxic air pollutants encompasses literally thousands of different compounds, including organic and inorganic particulate compounds and volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds. It would be an impossible task to monitor for every known toxic compound. The list of known toxic compounds is growing, with dozens of compounds being added yearly.

The Clean Air Act of 1990 identified 189 toxic air pollutants, which are now the immediate focus of the toxic monitoring program. That list has since been modified to 188 Toxic Air Pollutants. EPA has chosen 33 toxic air pollutants to focus on in its Integrated Urban Air Toxics Strategy.

Sampling Locations

Specific sources of toxic pollutants have been identified using SARA 313 information and a toxic air pollution survey conducted by Radian for the Division. Toxic monitoring at these sources was not isolated for the initial sampling phase of the program; rather a general survey of the air contaminants was initiated. Monitoring near specific sources is being performed based on identified need. Historic sampling has been performed at Salt Lake City station, Lindon, and North Provo. In January 1997, a continuous chlorine analyzer was installed in the Grantsville monitoring station. The continuous chlorine analyzer augmented the sampling for HCl in Grantsville using manual collection methods. In May 1998 chlorine monitoring ended so the analyzer could be converted to a continuous hydrogen chloride analyzer. The continuous hydrogen chloride analyzer. The data collection was intermittent due to analyzer problems. Other samples for toxic air pollution were performed on a complaint basis. An EPA funded Urban Air Toxics Monitoring Program site was installed at West Valley in October 1999. Samples were collected every 6 days for speciated hydrocarbon analysis and carbon analysis. These samples were analyzed for 19 of the 33 Urban Air Toxics Strategy Target Compounds. At the beginning of 2002 a TSP sampler was installed at the West Valley site to measure heavy metals.

Existing monitoring

In January 2003 the air toxics monitoring was moved to the Bountiful monitoring so Urban Air Toxics equipment will be co-located with the PM2.5 speciation equipment. This should give a more complete evaluation of the air mass being monitored. In addition, an Athelometer to measure ambient carbon particles was purchased with EPA funds and located at the Bountiful monitoring site.

Section 2.9 Revision 10 Date 9/8/04 Page 2

Additional Monitoring

EPA has indicated a desire to increase monitoring for non-criteria pollutants. EPA is re-allocating \$6.3 million from existing funds for measuring criteria pollutants to increased monitoring of Air Toxics. As more guidance comes from EPA that information will be used to assess needed changes in air toxics monitoring.

Additional Studies

No additional studies are planned for next year.

Changes to the Air Toxics Monitoring Network

EPA has recommended adding ambient monitoring for chromium-6 as part of the Urban Air Toxics effort. DAQ will review the recommendations and monitoring methods and implement monitoring for chromium-6 based on available funding from EPA.

2.9 EMERGENCY EPISODE MONITORING

One of the responsibilities of the Division is to assure that the public is protected from air pollution concentrations that will cause immediate damage or impact to their health. Section 5.1 of the Utah Air Conservation Regulations establishes emergency response criteria in accordance with Subpart H and Appendix L of 40 CFR 51. Whenever air pollution concentrations meet or exceed the Alert, Warning, or Emergency levels, an Emergency Episode is determined to exist and actions are taken to reduce the emissions of air pollutants. It is the responsibility of the monitoring section to collect the air pollution data used to determine when an Emergency Episode exists. The data collection telemetry system is alarmed and the monitoring staff is alerted whenever the Alert, Warning, or Emergency levels are approached. The monitoring staff has the primary responsibility to notify the director of the Division that an emergency episode exists. This is a critical function that is required by State and federal law. The telemetered stations along the Wasatch Front are included in the Emergency Episode network.

No changes have been identified in the emergency episode monitoring effort.

Section	3.0
Revision	7
Date	9/8/04
Page	1

3.0 NETWORK MODIFICATION FORMS

Network modification forms have been prepared for submittal to EPA Region VIII for Washington Terrace, Promontory Point, Washington Blvd, State Street, Beach, Saltair monitoring sites.

 $\begin{array}{r} \text{Section} \underline{4.0} \\ \text{Revision} \underline{4} \\ \text{Date} \underline{9/8/04} \\ \text{Page} \underline{1} \end{array}$

4.0 <u>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</u>

The minimum monitoring requirements identified by federal regulation are being met with the existing monitoring network in Utah. The procedures that are being used and the instruments that are being operated meet the standards that have been established by EPA.

The monitoring network provides, with the exceptions noted, the data necessary to meet the needs of the Utah Division of Air Quality.

Section: <u>Appendix A</u> Revision <u>3</u> Date <u>9/16/04</u> Page <u>1</u>

APPENDIX A EMISSIONS INVENTORY

The completed Emissions Inventory for 1999 is included in this appendix. It is the most recent revision of the Emissions Inventory available.

Section: Appendix A Revision <u>4</u> Date <u>9/16/04</u> Page <u>2</u>

99 State Summary of Emissions by Source (tons/year)

County		СО	Nox	PM10	PM2.5	Sox	VOC
Beaver	Area Source	2,778.60	739.84	952.84	NA	71.90	9,564.29
	On-Road Mobile	7,801.64	1,369.90	280.45	NA	33.02	431.31
	Point Source	9.53		19.02	9.72	2.10	1.94
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,985.67
	Total	10,589.77	2,133.19	1,252.31	9.72	107.02	18,983.21
Box Elder	A man C annual	17 (5()7	1 259 (1	4 129 04		220 77	12 020 97
	Area Source	17,656.37	1,358.61	4,138.04	NA	220.77	12,029.87
	On-Road Mobile	32,166.12	5,180.24	1,186.47	NA	134.04	1,782.89
	Point Source	1,935.74	545.58	1,079.80	565.49	91.46	608.14
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,555.68
	Total	51,708.23	7,084.43	6,404.31	565.49	446.27	22,976.58
Cache							
	Area Source	18,120.77	1,384.61	3,035.77	NA	444.81	16,156.44
	On-Road Mobile	26,303.32	2,126.34	1,056.29	NA	94.12	1,970.15
	Point Source	58.71	88.48	53.76	14.76	59.96	144.15
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,282.25
	Total	44,482.80	3,599.43	4,145.82	14.76	598.89	30,552.98
Carbon							
	Area Source	2,625.10	838.91	483.28	NA	146.88	11,590.67
	On-Road Mobile	1,1678.01	1,001.22	481.61	NA	43.59	844.62
	Point Source	248.30	3,612.34	455.84	202.97	5,491.96	88.07
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,915.10
	Total	14,551.41	54,52.47	1,420.73	202.97	5,682.43	23,438.46
Daggett							
Duggett	Area Source	529.14	20.56	252.47	NA	4.78	4,653.56
	On-Road Mobile	811.33	115.98	35.61	NA	4.05	56.90
	Point Source	67.41	772.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	65.94
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,487.32
	Total	1,407.88	908.60	288.08	0.00	8.83	9,263.72
.							
Davis		1505400	1 50 4 50	1 051 05		71 01	0.004.07
	Area Source	15,054.93	1,504.72	1,371.05	NA	74.84	8,894.87
	On-Road Mobile	57,269.20	6,101.23	1,680.07	NA 202.00	236.51	3,848.09
	Point Source	1,685.02	2,278.44	489.10	203.08	2,112.24	1,576.48
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,647.19
	Total	74,009.15	9,884.39	3,540.22	203.08	2,423.59	16,966.63

						Section Revisio Date_9 Page	0/16/04
		CO	Nox	PM10	PM2.5	SOx	VOC
Duchesne	Area Source	8,388.95	461.71	1,902.65	NA	74.92	31,115.58
	On-Road Mobile	6,319.97	550.80	254.91	NA	23.38	426.00
	Point Source	722.30	1,418.30	5.41	0.74	2.50	360.34
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	29,327.45
	Total	15,431.21	2,430.54	2,162.97	0.74	100.80	61,229.37
Emery							
2	Area Source	2,108.88	410.19	1,101.14	NA	72.06	9,958.51
	On-Road Mobile	12,372.13	1,598.43	472.77	NA	49.19	760.98
	Point Source	1,801.69	32,949.19	1,945.40	352.39	18,985.77	220.05
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,349.50
	Total	16,282.70	34,957.81	3,519.31	352.39	19,107.02	20,289.05
Garfield							
	Area Source	8,371.01	293.21	1,652.19	NA	27.85	29,632.20
	On-Road Mobile	4,600.86	415.83	184.49	NA	17.24	295.80
	Point Source	1.76	3.06	1.06	0.27	0.95	1.12
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27,618.52
	Total	12,973.63	712.10	1,837.74	0.27	46.04	57,547.64
Grand							
	Area Source	3,499.95	408.54	633.96	NA	63.28	11,957.83
	On-Road Mobile	9,831.36	1,598.93	373.70	NA	41.99	615.10
	Point Source	410.69	526.22	19.03	5.37	7.84	72.46
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,981.26
	Total	13,742.00	2,533.69	1,026.69	5.37	113.11	23,626.65
Iron							
	Area Source	6,848.11	1,326.66	1,745.65	NA	229.90	18,898.18
	On-Road Mobile	20,386.07	3,183.61	747.07	NA	83.40	1,191.52
	Point Source	9.32	33.76	6.34	1.95	6.18	138.63
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,232.64
	Total	27,243.50	4,544.03	2,499.05	1.95	319.48	37,460.97
Juab							
	Area Source	10,038.39	1,093.92	2,202.47	NA	93.69	9,101.56
	On-Road Mobile	12,262.13	2,116.59	451.18	NA	52.35	681.08
	Point Source	13,364.13	1,397.78	183.20	137.51	40.03	78.53
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,155.46
	Total	35,664.65	4,608.28	2,836.85	137.51	186.07	17,016.62

Section: Appendix A
Revision 4
Date 9/16/04
Page 4

Kane		СО	Nox	PM10	PM2.5	Sox	VOC
	Area Source	2,064.37	80.35	892.89	NA	31.13	11,666.87
	On-Road Mobile	4,088.31	378.74	174.04	NA	16.14	290.06
	Point Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,091.51
	Total	6,152.68	459.09	1,066.93	0.00	47.27	23,048.44
Millard							
	Area Source	7,438.65	843.37	2,472.73	NA	96.29	15,294.33
	On-Road Mobile	15,181.16	2,483.89	557.84	NA	63.52	857.14
	Point Source	1,754.34	25,471.18	525.65	257.05	4,170.46	281.99
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,274.53
	Total	24,374.16	28,798.44	3,556.22	257.05	4,330.27	29,708.00
Morgan							
0	Area Source	4,183.70	195.89	661.03	NA	36.72	8,112.95
	On-Road Mobile	4,332.52	762.80	154.68	NA	18.25	232.43
	Point Source	1,547.90	1,280.55	247.89	63.12	278.29	4.50
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,144.43
	Total	10,064.12	2,239.24	1,063.60	63.12	333.26	15,494.31
Piute							
	Area Source	3,490.15	46.15	281.67	NA	11.22	6,833.93
	On-Road Mobile	1,048.21	90.73	42.58	NA	3.89	73.43
	Point Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,380.37
	Total	4,538.36	136.88	324.25	0.00	15.11	12,287.73
Rich							
	Area Source	6,055.27	188.73	1,226.65	NA	14.31	6,451.47
	On-Road Mobile	1,736.75	148.36	65.63	NA	6.08	103.12
	Point Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,762.95
	Total	7,792.02	337.09	1,292.28	0.00	20.39	11,317.54
Salt Lake							
	Area Source	84,596.78	20,691.99	4,156.99	NA	777.83	32,028.44
	On-Road Mobile	188,740.98	18,452.70	6,405.24	NA	832.67	13,991.01
	Point Source	3,385.52	8,676.12	3,119.62	1,128.42	4,939.23	2,621.96
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,581.04
	Total	276,723.28	47,820.60	13,681.85	1,128.42	6,549.73	58,222.45

						Revision Date <u>9</u> /	
G I		CO	Nox	PM10	PM2.5	Sox	VOC
San Juan	Area Source	4,480.60	299.55	1,205.64	NA	77.15	24,462.02
	On-Road Mobile	8,429.03	774.26	358.57	NA	33.12	595.81
	Point Source	646.10	596.13	17.19	6.10	1,367.47	132.28
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23,009.92
	Total	13,555.73	1,669.94	1,581.40	6.10	1,477.74	48,200.03
Sanpete							
	Area Source	6,678.19	355.05	1,458.01	NA	111.58	26,305.99
	On-Road Mobile	7,856.38	683.92	321.29	NA	29.39	559.00
	Point Source	11.90	26.48	46.32	20.90	2.32	2.05
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24796.03
	Total	14,546.47	1,065.45	1,825.62	20.90	143.29	51,663.07
Sevier							
	Area Source	9,321.59	414.29	1,566.65	NA	93.37	21,986.16
	On-Road Mobile	13,980.08	2,167.83	511.51	NA	57.01	814.93
	Point Source	56.49	134.62	152.09	64.52	7.74	11.87
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19,988.97
	Total	23,358.16	2,716.74	2,230.25	64.52	158.12	42,801.93
Summit							
	Area Source	8,051.32	520.32	1,201.58	NA	143.93	35,624.25
	On-Road Mobile	22,355.46	3,480.43	796.29	NA	89.72	1,245.19
	Point Source	349.78	659.16	54.34	30.86	104.94	304.80
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	34,024.26
	Total	30,756.56	4,659.91	2,052.21	30.86	338.59	71,198.50
Tooele							
	Area Source	10,809.73	3,453.54	2,424.07	NA	384.98	9,355.29
	On-Road Mobile	22,602.97	3,500.52	862.23	NA	94.69	1,396.19
	Point Source	702.97	1,699.93	1,723.99	916.08	169.58	619.10
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,262.40
	Total	34,115.67	8,653.99	5,010.29	916.08	649.25	17,632.98
Uintah							
	Area Source	12,547.05	548.90	2,504.73	NA	126.22	16,168.12
	On-Road Mobile	9,468.50	801.59	379.61	NA	34.50	668.26
	Point Source	180.61	200.45	73.81	28.68	8.14	104.88
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,616.32
	Total	22,196.16	1,550.94	2,958.15	28.68	168.86	30,557.57

						Section <u>: A</u> Revision Date9/16/ Page 6	4
		СО	Nox	PM10	PM2.5	<u>rage</u> 0	VOC
Utah		CO	INUX	1 11110	1 112.5	50X	VUC
	Area Source	26,598.16	2,748.52	3,536.93	NA	141.22	41,900.60
	On-Road Mobile	71,675.89	8,379.79	2,463.25	NA	343.96	5,852.33
	Point Source	8,733.99	2,142.09	885.78	394.43	952.12	1,359.39
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32,754.31
	Total	107,008.04	13,270.40	6,885.96	394.43	1,437.30	81,857.63
Wasatch							
() ubuten	Area Source	2,979.59	285.83	499.97	NA	79.25	28,012.30
	On-Road Mobile	8,296.58	746.52	337.91	NA	31.35	552.24
	Point Source	2.89	16.54	7.52	0.17	0.02	0.02
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27,067.25
	Total	11,279.06	1,048.89	845.40	0.17	110.62	55,631.81
Washington							
w asinington	Area Source	19,427.79	983.15	1,191.95	NA	442.72	16,055.88
	On-Road Mobile	29,030.04	3,860.62	1,191.95	NA	118.12	2,172.79
	Point Source	48.86	222.35	28.35	18.90	10.83	2,172.79
	Biogenics	40.00 0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,271.22
	Total	48,506.69	5,066.12	2,357.05	18.90	571.67	30,527.57
Wayne	A	020 19	56.29	502 (1		12.14	7 205 70
	Area Source On-Road Mobile	929.18	56.38	503.61	NA	13.14.	7,205.70
	Point Source	1,339.71 0.00	$\begin{array}{c} 120.08\\ 0.00\end{array}$	56.83 0.00	NA 0.00	5.21 0.00	101.85 0.00
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,934.95
	Total	2,268.89	176.46	560.44	0.00	18.35	14,242.50
		,					,
Weber							
	Area Source	13,779.20	2,686.00	1,451.71	NA	148.63	13,441.07
	On-Road Mobile	42,061.63	3,977.63	1,342.39	NA	170.47	3,042.67
	Point Source	2,513.96	589.32	429.31	300.70	21.14	218.49
	Biogenics	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,412.35
	Total	58,354.79	7,252.95	3,223.41	300.70	340.24	25,114.58
Statewide Totals							
	Area Source	319,451.52	44,239.28	46,708.31	NA	4,255.37	494,458.93
	On-Road Mobile	653,976.34	76,169.51	23,171.25	NA	2,760.97	45,452.89
	Point Source	40,249.91	85,363.30	11,569.81	4,724.18	38,833.28	9,044.85
	Biogenics						409,901.88
	Totals	1,013,677.78	205,772.09	81,449.38	4,724.18	45,849.62	958,858.54

Section: Appendix A Revision <u>4</u> Date <u>9/16/04</u> Page <u>7</u>

%	<u>CO</u>	Nox	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>SOx</u>	VOC
Area Source	31.51%	21.50%	57.35%	NA	9.28%	51.57%
On-Road Mobile	64.52%	37.02%	28.45%	NA	6.02%	4.74%
Point Source	3.97%	41.48%	14.20%	100.00%	84.70%	0.94%
Biogenics	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.75%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

M:\secretar\1999 State Summary of Emissions by Source.doc

Section <u>Appendix B</u> Revision <u>3</u> Date <u>7/25/02</u> Page <u>1</u>

APPENDIX B

POPULATION GROWTH IN UTAH

This table of population growth in Utah shows the areas.						
2000 Census	Since 1990	# Monitoring Stations In Area				
898,387	+24%	8 (5)*				
368,536	+40%	6 (9)				
238,994	+27%	1				
196,533	+24%	5				
91,391	+30%	1				
25,224	+14%	(1)				
42,745	+17%	1 (1)				
40,735	+53%	1 (1)				
90,354	+86%	2 (1)				
33,779	+63%	(3)				
20,422	+1%	(1)				
14,413	+14%	1 (2)				
14,371	+14%	(1)*				
	Population 2000 Census 898,387 368,536 238,994 196,533 91,391 25,224 42,745 40,735 90,354 33,779 20,422 14,413	Population 2000 Census% Change Since 1990 $898,387$ $+24\%$ $368,536$ $+40\%$ $238,994$ $+27\%$ $196,533$ $+24\%$ $91,391$ $+30\%$ $25,224$ $+14\%$ $42,745$ $+17\%$ $40,735$ $+53\%$ $90,354$ $+86\%$ $33,779$ $+63\%$ $20,422$ $+1\%$ $14,413$ $+14\%$				

*() *Indicates monitoring done in the past.-

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Section <u>Appendix B</u> Revision <u>2</u> Date <u>7/25/02</u> Page <u>2</u>

Draper city7,27525,220247,501South Jordan city12,22029,437140,92Lehi city8,47519,028124,53Riverton city11,26125,011122.14Syracuse city4,6589,398101.85Spanish Fork city11,27220,24676.66St. George city28,50249,66374.27Pleasant Grove city13,47623,46874.18Tooele city13,88722,50262.09West Jordan city42,89268,33659.310Clinton city7,94512,58558.411Cedar City city13,44320,52752.712Springville city13,95020,42446.413Kaysville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orrem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126<	CITIES > 9,000	1990 CENSUS	2000 CENSUS	PERCENT CHANGE 1990-2000	RANK
Lehi city $8,475$ $19,028$ 124.5 3 Riverton city $11,261$ $25,011$ 122.1 4 Syracuse city $4,658$ $9,398$ 101.8 5 Spanish Fork city $11,272$ $20,246$ 76.6 6 St. George city $28,502$ $49,663$ 74.2 7 Pleasant Grove city $13,476$ $23,468$ 74.1 8 Tooele city $13,476$ $23,468$ 74.1 8 Cole city $13,487$ $22,502$ 62.0 9 West Jordan city $7,945$ $12,585$ 58.4 11 Cedar City city $13,443$ $20,527$ 52.7 12 Springville city $13,950$ $20,424$ 46.4 13 Kaysville city $13,961$ $20,351$ 45.8 14 Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15 American Fork city $15,696$ $21,941$ 39.8 16 Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.8 17 Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 <td< td=""><td>Draper city</td><td>7,275</td><td>25,220</td><td>247.50</td><td></td></td<>	Draper city	7,275	25,220	247.50	
Riverton city11,26125,011122.14Syracuse city4,6589,398101.85Spanish Fork city11,27220,24676.66St. George city28,50249,66374.27Pleasant Grove city13,47623,46874.18Tooele city13,88722,50262.09West Jordan city42,89268,33659.310Clinton city7,94512,58558.411Cedar City city13,44320,52752.712Springville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city41,78458,47439.915American Fork city15,69621,94133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city15,936181,74313.6 <td>South Jordan city</td> <td>12,220</td> <td>29,437</td> <td>140.9</td> <td></td>	South Jordan city	12,220	29,437	140.9	
Syracuse city $4,658$ $9,398$ 101.8 5 Spanish Fork city $11,272$ $20,246$ 76.6 6 St. George city $28,502$ $49,663$ 74.2 7 Pleasant Grove city $13,476$ $23,468$ 74.1 8 Tooele city $13,887$ $22,502$ 62.0 9 West Jordan city $42,892$ $68,336$ 59.3 10 Clinton city $7,945$ $12,585$ 58.4 11 Cedar City city $13,443$ $20,527$ 52.7 12 Springville city $13,950$ $20,424$ 46.4 13 Kaysville city $13,961$ $20,351$ 45.8 14 Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15 American Fork city $15,696$ $21,941$ 39.8 16 Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Orgen city $63,909$ $77,226$ 18.9 27 South Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Salt Lake City city $15,936$ $181,743$ <td>Lehi city</td> <td>8,475</td> <td>19,028</td> <td>124.5</td> <td>3</td>	Lehi city	8,475	19,028	124.5	3
Spanish Fork city $1,272$ $20,246$ 76.6 6 St. George city $28,502$ $49,663$ 74.2 7 Pleasant Grove city $13,476$ $23,468$ 74.1 8 Tooele city $13,887$ $22,502$ 62.0 9 West Jordan city $42,892$ $68,336$ 59.3 10 Clinton city $7,945$ $12,585$ 58.4 11 Cedar City city $13,443$ $20,527$ 52.7 12 Springville city $13,950$ $20,424$ 46.4 13 Kaysville city $13,961$ $20,351$ 45.8 14 Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15 American Fork city $15,696$ $21,941$ 39.8 16 Farmington city $9,028$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Satt Lake City city $15,096$ $181,743$ 13.6 30 Bountiful city $36,659$ $41,301$ 12	Riverton city	11,261	25,011	122.1	
St. George city $28,502$ $49,663$ 74.2 7 Pleasant Grove city $13,476$ $23,468$ 74.1 8 Tooele city $13,887$ $22,502$ 62.0 9 West Jordan city $42,892$ $68,336$ 59.3 10 Clinton city $7,945$ $12,585$ 58.4 11 Cedar City city $13,443$ $20,527$ 52.7 12 Springville city $13,950$ $20,424$ 46.4 13 Kaysville city $13,961$ $20,351$ 45.8 14 Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15 American Fork city $15,696$ $21,941$ 39.8 16 Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.8 17 Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 <	Syracuse city	4,658	9,398	101.8	5
Pleasart Grove city13,47623,46874.18Tooele city13,88722,50262.09West Jordan city42,89268,33659.310Clinton city7,94512,58558.411Cedar City city13,44320,52752.712Springville city13,95020,42446.413Kaysville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city41,78458,47439.915American Fork city15,69621,94139.816Farmington city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111	Spanish Fork city	11,272	20,246	76.6	6
Tooele city13,88722,50262.09West Jordan city42,89268,33659.310Clinton city7,94512,58558.411Cedar City city13,44320,52752.712Springville city13,95020,42446.413Kaysville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city41,78458,47439.915American Fork city15,69621,94139.816Farmington city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	St. George city	28,502	49,663	74.2	
West Jordan city $42,892$ $68,336$ 59.3 10 Clinton city $7,945$ $12,585$ 58.4 11 Cedar City city $13,443$ $20,527$ 52.7 12 Springville city $13,950$ $20,424$ 46.4 13 Kaysville city $13,961$ $20,351$ 45.8 14 Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15 American Fork city $15,696$ $21,941$ 39.8 16 Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.8 17 Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ 32.885 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 South Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Sat Lake City city $159,936$ $181,743$ 13.6 </td <td>Pleasant Grove city</td> <td>13,476</td> <td>23,468</td> <td>74.1</td> <td>8</td>	Pleasant Grove city	13,476	23,468	74.1	8
Clinton city7,94512,58558.411Cedar City city13,44320,52752.712Springville city13,95020,42446.413Kaysville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city41,78458,47439.915American Fork city15,69621,94139.816Farmington city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Tooele city	13,887		62.0	9
Cedar City city13,44320,52752.712Springville city13,95020,42446.413Kaysville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city41,78458,47439.915American Fork city15,69621,94139.816Farmington city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	West Jordan city	42,892	68,336	59.3	10
Springville city13,950 $20,424$ 46.4 13Kaysville city13,961 $20,351$ 45.8 14Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15American Fork city15,696 $21,941$ 39.8 16Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.8 17Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Salt Lake City city $159,936$ $181,743$ 13.6 30 Bountiful city $36,659$ $41,301$ 12.7 31 Brigham City city $15,644$ $17,411$ 11.3 32	Clinton city	7,945	12,585	58.4	11
Kaysville city13,96120,35145.814Layton city41,78458,47439.915American Fork city15,69621,94139.816Farmington city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Cedar City city	13,443	20,527	52.7	12
Layton city $41,784$ $58,474$ 39.9 15 American Fork city $15,696$ $21,941$ 39.8 16 Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.8 17 Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Salt Lake City city $159,936$ $181,743$ 13.6 30 Bountiful city $36,659$ $41,301$ 12.7 31 Brigham City city $15,644$ $17,411$ 11.3 32	Springville city	13,950	20,424	46.4	13
American Fork city15,69621,94139.816Farmington city9,02812,08133.817Payson city9,51012,71633.718Roy city24,60332,88530.719Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Kaysville city	13,961	20,351	45.8	14
Farmington city $9,028$ $12,081$ 33.8 17 Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $63,909$ $77,226$ 18.9 27 South Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Salt Lake City city $159,936$ $181,743$ 13.6 30 Bountiful city $36,659$ $41,301$ 12.7 31 Brigham City city $15,644$ $17,411$ 11.3 32	Layton city	41,784	58,474	39.9	15
Payson city $9,510$ $12,716$ 33.7 18 Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $63,909$ $77,226$ 18.9 27 South Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Salt Lake City city $159,936$ $181,743$ 13.6 30 Bountiful city $36,659$ $41,301$ 12.7 31 Brigham City city $15,644$ $17,411$ 11.3 32	American Fork city	15,696	21,941	39.8	16
Roy city $24,603$ $32,885$ 30.7 19 Logan city $32,762$ $42,670$ 30.2 20 North Ogden city $11,668$ $15,026$ 28.8 21 Centerville city $11,500$ $14,585$ 26.8 22 West Valley City city $86,976$ $108,896$ 25.2 23 Orem city $67,561$ $84,324$ 24.8 24 Clearfield city $21,435$ $25,974$ 21.2 25 Provo city $86,835$ $105,166$ 21.1 26 Ogden city $63,909$ $77,226$ 18.9 27 South Ogden city $12,105$ $14,377$ 18.8 28 Sandy city $75,058$ $88,418$ 17.8 29 Salt Lake City city $159,936$ $181,743$ 13.6 30 Bountiful city $36,659$ $41,301$ 12.7 31 Brigham City city $15,644$ $17,411$ 11.3 32	Farmington city	9,028	12,081	33.8	17
Logan city32,76242,67030.220North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Payson city	9,510	12,716	33.7	18
North Ogden city11,66815,02628.821Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Roy city	24,603	32,885	30.7	19
Centerville city11,50014,58526.822West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Logan city	32,762	42,670	30.2	20
West Valley City city86,976108,89625.223Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	North Ogden city	11,668	15,026	28.8	21
Orem city67,56184,32424.824Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Centerville city	11,500	14,585	26.8	22
Clearfield city21,43525,97421.225Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	West Valley City city	86,976	108,896	25.2	23
Provo city86,835105,16621.126Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Orem city	67,561	84,324	24.8	24
Ogden city63,90977,22618.927South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Clearfield city	21,435	25,974	21.2	25
South Ogden city12,10514,37718.828Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Provo city	86,835	105,166	21.1	26
Sandy city75,05888,41817.829Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Ogden city	63,909	77,226	18.9	27
Salt Lake City city159,936181,74313.630Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	South Ogden city	12,105	14,377	18.8	28
Bountiful city36,65941,30112.731Brigham City city15,64417,41111.332	Sandy city	75,058	88,418	17.8	29
Brigham City city 15,644 17,411 11.3 32	Salt Lake City city	159,936	181,743	13.6	30
	Bountiful city	36,659	41,301	12.7	31
Murray city 31,282 34,024 8.8 33	Brigham City city	15,644	17,411	11.3	32
	Murray city	31,282	34,024	8.8	33

CENSUS 2000 CITY PERCENT POPULATION CHANGE 1990 TO 2000