



Dave Grierson
Planner/Sovereign Lands Coordinator
Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands
1594 W. North Temple, Ste 3520
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5703

November 25, 2009

RE: Air Quality Comparison for Utah Lake Bridge Project

Dear Mr Grierson:

This letter is in response to your request for information regarding the effect the Utah Lake Bridge Project will have on the Mountainland Air Quality model. As per your request, we performed a perfunctory regional emission comparison of our model run with and without a toll bridge in years 2020 and 2030.

It is of utmost importance to understand that this comparison is in NO way an air quality conformity determination. I cannot stress this fact strong enough. The comparison is made solely to determine a magnitude of change in emissions in model runs with and without a toll bridge.

It is our understanding that the proposal entails a two lane (one in each direction) toll bridge in both the 2020 and 2030 time frames. The Travel Model data employed in this comparison consist of the existing officially adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) networks without the bridge and again with the bridge as a tolled facility. Both scenarios employ identical socio/economic and Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) data. The data used was the latest officially adopted data (2007). It is the same data used to prepare the last RTP.

This comparison, however, cannot be construed as a Conformity Determination. Our existing RTP is current and will expire in July 2011. Mountainland Association of Governments will embark on an update of our Plan throughout 2010 for submittal and approval by our Board in early 2011. This process entails rigorous interaction with our local elected officials, the State, various Federal agencies and the public. Since we are a Non-Attainment area for PM10 – our plan has to be fiscally constrained and all projects prioritized and approved by the Mountainland Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Planning Committee. At this juncture there still remain unresolved issues with the logical termini of the bridge, specifically the funding and time frame for those connecting points that do not seem to be covered by the sponsor –we had to assume they are part of the network for the model to provide results.

The results, shown on the table below, indicate that travel demand (in Vehicle Miles Traveled VMT)

and emission differences are within the margin of error of the model. **Emissions on both scenarios remain within the bounds of tolerance or margin of error of the Air Quality model.**

**Lake Crossing - Utah County- 2020 and 2030
Particulate Matter <10 microns (PM 10)
Regional Emission Comparison**

Summary Table				
Alternative Name	Vehicle Miles Traveled	PM 10 ton/day		
		Nox	Direct PM	Total PM
2020 RTP	14,297,752	4.7778	4.1345	8.9123
2020 + Toll Bridge	14,311,398	4.7830	4.1371	8.9201
2030 RTP	17,998,455	3.5791	5.1981	8.7772
2030 + Toll Bridge	18,032,417	3.5900	5.2041	8.7941

Note: Travel Model data based on current determination data. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) concurrence July 2008. Toll alternative as per consultant's requested parameters: 2020 two-lane bridge and 2030 two lane bridge

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information. I may be reached at 801-367-0699 or ajacksonmag@gmail.com

Sincerely,

Andrew K Jackson, AICP
 Planning Director
 Mountainland Association of Governments
 586 East 800 North
 Orem, Utah 84097