

Appendix 2a: Monitor adjustment selection, Roadway field studies, 2005-2007 and projected 2020 Design Values

2a.1 Monitor adjustment selection

OAQPS applied several screening techniques in the effort to select monitors within the NO₂ monitoring network that would be appropriate to simulate what a near-road monitor might record. OAQPS used monitor site characteristics and visual inspection using Google Earth geospatial software to determine which of the monitor sites were appropriate to simulate near-road monitors. We then screened that list of monitors so that only those located in Core Based Statistical Areas (CBSAs) with populations of 350,000 or greater, which corresponds to the proposed population threshold in the NO₂ NAAQS and monitoring proposal package, would be scaled-up.

All NO₂ monitoring sites that are used for comparison to the NAAQS report their data to the Air Quality System (AQS). Each monitoring site has a profile in AQS containing metadata pertaining to the monitor, including where the monitor is located, the monitoring objective, the scale of representativeness, and whether it is thought to be influenced by a particular type of emission source, among other data metrics. Although, the metadata in AQS are informative, we must note that AQS metadata should be used with caution as there are no formal requirements for the responsible state and local air monitoring agencies that operate the monitoring network to quality assure or update metadata at any frequency.

In conjunction with the language in the NO₂ NAAQS and monitoring proposal package, this exercise was intended to only use “area-wide” monitors to simulate near-road concentrations. Area-wide monitors are monitors that are not significantly influenced by point, area, or mobile sources, meaning they typically do not represent the maximum concentration that may be attributable to a source or sources. Further, area-wide sites are sited to represent neighborhood, urban, and regional spatially representative scales. To identify which sites in the NO₂ network were suitable to classify as an “area-wide” site, we screened sites utilizing three particular AQS metadata metrics: 1) monitor objective, 2) spatial (measurement) scale, and 3) dominant source.

The monitor objective meta-data field describes what the data from the monitor are intended to characterize. The focus of the data presented is to show the nature of the network in terms of its attempt to generally characterize health effects, photochemical activity, transport, or welfare effects. There are 11 categories of monitor objective for a NO₂ monitor within AQS. The first six categories listed below stem directly from categorizations of site types

within the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). In 40 CFR Part 58 Appendix D, there are seven examples of NO₂ site types:

1. Sites located to determine the highest concentration expected to occur in the area covered by the network (Highest Concentration).
2. Sites located to measure typical concentrations in areas of high population (Population Exposure).
3. Sites located to determine the impact of significant sources or source categories on air quality (Source Oriented).
4. Sites located to determine general background concentration levels (General Background).
5. Sites located to determine the extent of regional pollutant transport among populated areas; and in support of secondary standards (Regional Transport).
6. Sites located to measure air pollution impacts on visibility, vegetation damage, or other welfare-based impacts (Welfare Related Impacts).
7. Sites with unspecified or non-routine monitor objectives (Other).

The remaining four categories available are a result of updating the AQS database. In the more recent upgrade to AQS, the data handlers inserted the available site types for the Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) network. These PAMS site types are spelled out in 40 CFR Part 58 Appendix D:

1. Type 1 sites are established to characterize upwind background and transported ozone and its precursor concentrations entering the area and will identify those areas which are subjected to transport (Upwind Background).
2. Type 2 sites are established to monitor the magnitude and type of precursor emissions in the area where maximum precursor emissions are expected to impact and are suited for the monitoring of urban air toxic pollutants (Max. Precursor Impact).
3. Type 3 sites are intended to monitor maximum ozone concentrations occurring downwind from the area of maximum precursor emissions (Max. Ozone Concentration).
4. Type 4 sites are established to characterize the downwind transported ozone and its precursor concentrations exiting the area and will identify those areas which are potentially contributing to overwhelming transport in other areas (Extreme Downwind).

It should be noted that any particular monitor can have multiple monitor objectives. For this screening exercise, we selected one reported monitor objective based on a hierarchy to represent an individual monitor. The hierarchy used was to select, in order of priority: 1) source oriented, 2) high concentration, 3) population exposure, or 4) general background, if they existed at a site with multiple monitoring objectives. So, for example, any monitor with “source oriented” among multiple objectives was classified as “source oriented”.

The spatial (measurement) scales are also defined in 40 CFR Part 58, Appendix D. This regulation language spells out what data from a monitor can represent in terms of air volumes associated with area dimensions where:

Microscale – Defines the concentration in air volumes associated with area dimensions ranging from several meters up to about 100 meters.

Middle scale – Defines the concentration typical of areas up to several city blocks in size, with dimensions ranging from about 100 meters to 0.5 kilometers.

Neighborhood scale – Defines concentrations within some extended area of the city that has relatively uniform land use with dimensions in the 0.5 to 4.0 kilometers range.

Urban scale – Defines concentrations within an area of city-like dimensions, on the order of 4 to 50 kilometers. Within a city, the geographic placement of sources may result in there being no single site that can be said to represent air quality on an urban scale. The neighborhood and urban scales have the potential to overlap in applications that concern secondarily formed or homogeneously distributed air pollutants.

Regional scale – Defines usually a rural area of reasonably homogeneous geography without large sources, and extends from tens to hundreds of kilometers.

Therefore the meta-data records for the NO_x network in AQS indicate what the measurement scale of a particular monitor represents. It is important to note that a monitor can only have one measurement scale, as opposed to the possibility of a single monitor having multiple monitor objectives.

The “dominant source” metric in AQS allows responsible state and local air monitoring agencies to identify, if applicable, what type of emission source may be the dominant source influencing the measurements at a particular site. There are three choices for the dominant source category: 1) Point, 2) Area, and 3) Mobile. It should be noted that not all NO₂ monitor

records have a value in the dominant source field, either because the responsible state and local monitoring agency does not believe any particular type of source is influencing a particular site, or because the information was simply not entered into the database.

For the first screening to identify area-wide NO₂ monitoring sites, we chose to exclude all sites that met one or more of the following criteria based on AQS metadata:

- Any microscale site (measurement scale)
- Any middle scale site (measurement scale)
- Any source oriented site (monitor objective)
- Any site with the following combination of metadata: Highest Concentration, Neighborhood scale, and Point source dominated (monitor objective/measurement scale/dominant source)
- Any site identified as being operated by industry, as these sites are usually micro or middle scale, source oriented sites.

As a result of the first screening, of the original 255 sites used in the area-wide design value calculations in Section 2.3.2.1 of Chapter 2, sixteen were excluded from scaling due to negative design value calculations. For the sixteen sites (eleven counties), the projected 2020 design values were not calculated for the 98th percentile concentrations. Ten of the counties were in California and one in Pennsylvania. These were counties that were in regions that were not forecast to meet the 0.075 ozone standard as described in Chapter 4 of the ozone RIA (U.S. EPA, 2008b). These counties received across the board reductions in NO_x in addition to the reductions included in the 0.070 ozone analysis. In the California counties, the 2020_075 emissions were 20% of the 2020_070 emissions, while in Pennsylvania, the 2020_075 emissions were 13% of the 2020_070 emissions. For more details about the emissions reduction see Chapter 4 of the ozone RIA (U.S. EPA, 2008b). Concentrations could not be calculated because 2020_075 emissions were so low that the methodology described in Section 3.3.1 did not produce reasonable results. Most of the sites in question were already below the lowest alternative standard of 65 ppb in 2005-2007, so these monitors should not have issues with nonattainment. After exclusion of the 16 sites and sites based on AQS metadata (22 sites), 217 sites remained in use for the second screening process.

The second screening process was by visual inspection and geospatial analysis using Google Earth of the top eleven NO₂ sites, ranked by estimated ppb/ton and two other monitor sites located in counties with multiple monitoring sites that had higher estimated ppb/ton values. The analysis reviewed where the site was physically located in an urban area, checked its proximity to major roads (such as interstates, freeways, and major arterial roads), and its proximity to identifiable sources such as industrial complexes and facilities, commercial

facilities (such as trucking depots), or proximity to other area sources (such as airports or shipping ports). As a result, three more sites were excluded from the pool of NO₂ sites that were to be allowed to be scaled-up to simulate near-road monitoring sites.

The final screening was to remove any sites that were not in CBSAs with a population of 350,000 or greater. This was done to match the proposed population-based thresholds that trigger minimum required near-road monitors in the NO₂ NAAQS and monitoring proposal package. This screening removed 41 monitors, leaving 181 monitors to use in the simulation.

2a.2 2005-2007 and 2020 design values

Table 2a-1 lists the CBSAs of monitors used in the analyses. Also listed in Table 2a-1 are population and number of monitors per CBSA. Table 2a-2 lists the CBSAs with populations greater than 350,000 people that do not have monitors in the analyses. The reasons for no monitors is also given. Those with the reason “Monitors excluded due to data completeness” have monitors but the monitors did not meet the completeness criteria discussed in Section 2.3.1 of Chapter 2. Table 2a-3 lists the 2005-2007 design values used in projecting 2020 design values. 2020 design values denoted by “*” were monitors where a projected design value could not be calculated. 2020 design values for various values of the near-road gradient are shown. For monitors that were not justified to scale up, the 2020 design values are equal to the 2020 area-wide design value. Monitors determined to be appropriate for scale up are listed as “SCALE UP” in the scale up column of Table 2a-1. The reasons for no scale up of the 2020 design values are given for the negative design values (“NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE”), visual inspection (“NO SCALE UP: VISUAL NEAR ROAD”), population (“NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K”), and due to AQS metadata (various reasons).

Table 2a-1: Number of monitors per CBSA

CBSA	TYPE	2007 Population	Monitors
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	Metropolitan	19,113,887	8
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	Metropolitan	13,192,758	13
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	Metropolitan	9,747,870	4
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	Metropolitan	6,118,183	8
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	Metropolitan	5,930,083	2
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	Metropolitan	5,620,734	10
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	Metropolitan	5,607,038	3
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	Metropolitan	5,451,302	5
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	Metropolitan	5,322,915	3
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	Metropolitan	4,515,779	5
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	Metropolitan	4,316,905	9
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	Metropolitan	4,163,757	5
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	Metropolitan	4,152,464	7
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	Metropolitan	3,313,789	1
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	Metropolitan	3,064,142	5
St. Louis, MO-IL	Metropolitan	2,833,676	5
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	Metropolitan	2,765,528	4
Denver-Aurora, CO	Metropolitan	2,469,929	1
Pittsburgh, PA	Metropolitan	2,404,190	7
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	Metropolitan	2,150,129	2
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	Metropolitan	2,141,388	6
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	Metropolitan	2,118,580	1
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	Metropolitan	2,098,102	1
Kansas City, MO-KS	Metropolitan	1,997,567	3
San Antonio, TX	Metropolitan	1,985,996	3
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	Metropolitan	1,829,059	1
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	Metropolitan	1,701,870	2
Austin-Round Rock, TX	Metropolitan	1,569,880	1
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	Metropolitan	1,534,473	1
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro, TN	Metropolitan	1,507,461	1
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	Metropolitan	1,247,196	1
Richmond, VA	Metropolitan	1,215,134	2
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	Metropolitan	1,203,355	1
Oklahoma City, OK	Metropolitan	1,198,114	2
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	Metropolitan	1,152,143	1
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	Metropolitan	1,084,072	1
Salt Lake City, UT	Metropolitan	1,073,432	1
Tucson, AZ	Metropolitan	976,521	2
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	Metropolitan	918,315	1
Fresno, CA	Metropolitan	915,824	5
New Haven-Milford, CT	Metropolitan	852,576	1
Albuquerque, NM	Metropolitan	833,634	3
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	Metropolitan	827,163	2
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	Metropolitan	808,151	2
CBSA	TYPE	2007 Population	Monitors
Worcester, MA	Metropolitan	806,147	1
Bakersfield, CA	Metropolitan	796,111	5
Baton Rouge, LA	Metropolitan	762,905	9

El Paso, TX	Metropolitan	751,891	5
Columbia, SC	Metropolitan	719,810	1
Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	Metropolitan	716,099	2
Stockton, CA	Metropolitan	694,530	1
Springfield, MA	Metropolitan	693,880	3
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	Metropolitan	673,404	1
Greenville, SC	Metropolitan	608,312	1
Wichita, KS	Metropolitan	599,959	2
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	Metropolitan	556,812	2
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	Metropolitan	541,258	1
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	Metropolitan	535,228	2
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	Metropolitan	518,302	1
Lancaster, PA	Metropolitan	503,871	1
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	Metropolitan	483,728	1
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	Metropolitan	462,147	1
Lexington-Fayette, KY	Metropolitan	450,105	1
Visalia-Porterville, CA	Metropolitan	431,643	1
Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	Metropolitan	426,952	1
Salinas, CA	Metropolitan	425,924	1
York-Hanover, PA	Metropolitan	422,449	1
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	Metropolitan	422,299	9
Manchester-Nashua, NH	Metropolitan	414,036	1
Springfield, MO	Metropolitan	413,710	1
Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	Metropolitan	392,826	1
Trenton-Ewing, NJ	Metropolitan	371,660	1
Erie, PA	Metropolitan	283,041	1
San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	Metropolitan	267,623	3
Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	Metropolitan	264,678	1
Merced, CA	Metropolitan	256,700	1
Sioux Falls, SD	Metropolitan	221,466	1
Burlington-South Burlington, VT	Metropolitan	211,172	1
Longview, TX	Metropolitan	203,587	1
Las Cruces, NM	Metropolitan	202,485	2
Lake Charles, LA	Metropolitan	199,974	1
Tyler, TX	Metropolitan	196,814	1
Fargo, ND-MN	Metropolitan	194,208	1
El Centro, CA	Metropolitan	170,210	1
Yuba City, CA	Metropolitan	166,165	1
Madera, CA	Metropolitan	149,180	1
Johnstown, PA	Metropolitan	147,230	1
State College, PA	Metropolitan	145,418	1
Napa, CA	Metropolitan	137,087	1
Altoona, PA	Metropolitan	126,760	1
Farmington, NM	Metropolitan	125,916	2
Owensboro, KY	Metropolitan	112,941	1
CBSA	TYPE	2007 Population	Monitors
Cleveland, TN	Metropolitan	111,646	1
Paducah, KY-IL	Micropolitan	97,571	1
New Castle, PA	Micropolitan	92,154	1
Ukiah, CA	Micropolitan	90,385	2

Indiana, PA	Micropolitan	89,830	1
Marshall, TX	Micropolitan	64,971	1
Rutland, VT	Micropolitan	64,432	1
Hobbs, NM	Micropolitan	56,428	1
Carlsbad-Artesia, NM	Micropolitan	51,269	2
Tahlequah, OK	Micropolitan	46,332	1
Gillette, WY	Micropolitan	37,981	1
No CBSA	NA	NA	8

Table 2a-2: CBSAS with populations greater than 350,000 people not included in analyses

CBSA	TYPE	2007 Population	Reason for no monitoring
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	Metropolitan	4,561,522	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	Metropolitan	3,327,901	Not currently monitored
Baltimore-Towson, MD	Metropolitan	2,699,671	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	Metropolitan	2,162,868	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	Metropolitan	1,893,507	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Columbus, OH	Metropolitan	1,780,581	Not currently monitored
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	Metropolitan	1,691,070	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	Metropolitan	1,639,860	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	Metropolitan	1,621,635	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Jacksonville, FL	Metropolitan	1,359,173	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	Metropolitan	1,307,699	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	Metropolitan	1,115,659	Not currently monitored
Rochester, NY	Metropolitan	1,054,376	Not currently monitored
Raleigh-Cary, NC	Metropolitan	1,023,620	Not currently monitored
Tulsa, OK	Metropolitan	919,698	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	Metropolitan	861,146	Not currently monitored
Dayton, OH	Metropolitan	848,761	Not currently monitored
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	Metropolitan	842,715	Not currently monitored
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	Metropolitan	788,817	Not currently monitored
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	Metropolitan	732,166	Not currently monitored
Akron, OH	Metropolitan	707,682	Not currently monitored
Greensboro-High Point, NC	Metropolitan	691,871	Not currently monitored
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	Metropolitan	684,296	Not currently monitored
Knoxville, TN	Metropolitan	675,798	Not currently monitored
Toledo, OH	Metropolitan	667,360	Not currently monitored
Syracuse, NY	Metropolitan	653,964	Not currently monitored
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	Metropolitan	634,375	Not currently monitored
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	Metropolitan	628,187	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Colorado Springs, CO	Metropolitan	616,432	Not currently monitored
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	Metropolitan	590,887	Not currently monitored
Boise City-Nampa, ID	Metropolitan	587,526	Not currently monitored
Lakeland, FL	Metropolitan	581,653	Not currently monitored
Madison, WI	Metropolitan	557,650	Not currently monitored
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	Metropolitan	557,320	Not currently monitored
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	Metropolitan	540,397	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
CBSA	TYPE	2007 Population	Reason for no monitoring
Jackson, MS	Metropolitan	539,724	Not currently monitored
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	Metropolitan	529,286	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Modesto, CA	Metropolitan	529,038	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	Metropolitan	517,851	Not currently monitored
Chattanooga, TN-GA	Metropolitan	508,709	Not currently monitored
Provo-Orem, UT	Metropolitan	489,312	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Durham, NC	Metropolitan	477,119	Not currently monitored
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	Metropolitan	469,278	Not currently monitored
Winston-Salem, NC	Metropolitan	464,838	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Spokane, WA	Metropolitan	453,859	Not currently monitored
Flint, MI	Metropolitan	448,530	Not currently monitored
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	Metropolitan	438,460	Not currently monitored

Corpus Christi, TX	Metropolitan	428,222	Not currently monitored
Reno-Sparks, NV	Metropolitan	425,289	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL	Metropolitan	422,461	Not currently monitored
Fort Wayne, IN	Metropolitan	412,381	Not currently monitored
Canton-Massillon, OH	Metropolitan	411,749	Not currently monitored
Mobile, AL	Metropolitan	409,542	Not currently monitored
Asheville, NC	Metropolitan	407,274	Not currently monitored
Reading, PA	Metropolitan	406,222	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	Metropolitan	395,867	Not currently monitored
Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	Metropolitan	393,854	Not currently monitored
Salem, OR	Metropolitan	383,801	Not currently monitored
Huntsville, AL	Metropolitan	380,907	Not currently monitored
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	Metropolitan	380,003	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Peoria, IL	Metropolitan	375,672	Not currently monitored
Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX	Metropolitan	374,779	Not currently monitored
Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC	Metropolitan	364,397	Not currently monitored
Montgomery, AL	Metropolitan	363,598	Not currently monitored
Tallahassee, FL	Metropolitan	362,802	Not currently monitored
Fayetteville, NC	Metropolitan	353,650	Not currently monitored
Evansville, IN-KY	Metropolitan	351,661	Monitors excluded due to data completeness
Rockford, IL	Metropolitan	350,085	Not currently monitored

Table 2a-3: NO₂ 2005-2007 and 2020 gradient adjusted (30%, 65%, and 100%) projected 98th percentile design values (ppb)

State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	2020		
						30%	65%	100%
AZ	Maricopa	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	19	SCALE-UP	68.0	37.0	47.0	57.0
AZ	Maricopa	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	3002	SCALE-UP	70.3	36.6	46.4	56.3
AZ	Maricopa	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	3003	SCALE-UP	60.3	27.5	34.9	42.3
AZ	Maricopa	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	3010	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	83.3		41.9	
AZ	Maricopa	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	9997	SCALE-UP	64.0	33.3	42.3	51.3
AZ	Pima	Tucson, AZ	1011	SCALE-UP	47.0	25.1	31.9	38.6
AZ	Pima	Tucson, AZ	1028	SCALE-UP	46.6	22.8	29.0	35.1
AR	Pulaski	Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	7	SCALE-UP	50.0	26.0	33.0	40.0
CA	Alameda	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	7	SCALE-UP	48.3	3.2	4.1	5.0
CA	Alameda	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	1001	SCALE-UP	49.0	17.6	22.4	27.1
CA	Contra Costa	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	2	SCALE-UP	38.6	0.4	0.5	0.6
CA	Contra Costa	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	1002	SCALE-UP	33.0	3.3	4.2	5.1
CA	Contra Costa	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	1004	SCALE-UP	43.6	13.6	17.3	21.0
CA	Contra Costa	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	3001	SCALE-UP	43.6	14.4	18.2	22.1
CA	Fresno	Fresno, CA	7	SCALE-UP	62.6	25.1	31.9	38.6
CA	Fresno	Fresno, CA	8	SCALE-UP	62.3	22.1	28.0	34.0
CA	Fresno	Fresno, CA	242	SCALE-UP	44.6	8.1	10.3	12.5
CA	Fresno	Fresno, CA	4001	SCALE-UP	45.0	10.9	13.8	16.8
CA	Fresno	Fresno, CA	5001	SCALE-UP	59.8	25.7	32.7	39.6
CA	Imperial	El Centro, CA	5	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	75.0		8.0	
CA	Kern	Bakersfield, CA	7	SCALE-UP	42.6	16.4	20.9	25.3
CA	Kern	Bakersfield, CA	10	SCALE-UP	65.3	31.9	40.5	49.1
CA	Kern	Bakersfield, CA	14	SCALE-UP	63.3	30.9	39.3	47.6
CA	Kern	Bakersfield, CA	5001	SCALE-UP	38.0	8.0	10.1	12.3
CA	Kern	Bakersfield, CA	6001	SCALE-UP	64.3	41.9	53.2	64.5
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	2	SCALE-UP	82.3	15.7	19.9	24.1
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	16	SCALE-UP	77.3	14.7	18.7	22.6
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	113	SCALE-UP	63.1	37.7	47.8	58.0

						30%	65%	100%
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	1002	SCALE-UP	75.0	7.4	9.4	11.5
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	1103	SCALE-UP	83.6	24.3	30.9	37.5
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	1201	SCALE-UP	60.6	23.2	29.5	35.8
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	1301	SCALE-UP	79.0	44.3	56.2	68.1
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	1701	SCALE-UP	79.6	8.4	10.7	13.0
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	2005	SCALE-UP	73.0	6.7	8.5	10.3
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	4002	SCALE-UP	74.0	51.5	65.4	79.3
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	6012	SCALE-UP	61.3	0.9	1.2	1.5
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	9033	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	57.0		6.8	
CA	Madera	Madera, CA	4	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	41.3		*	
CA	Marin	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	1	SCALE-UP	45.0	25.4	32.3	39.1
CA	Mendocino	Ukiah, CA	8	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	31.6		*	
CA	Mendocino	Ukiah, CA	9	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	27.3		0.1	
CA	Merced	Merced, CA	3	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	43.0		4.0	
CA	Monterey	Salinas, CA	1003	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	37.0		*	
CA	Napa	Napa, CA	3	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	41.3		10.6	
CA	Orange	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	5001	SCALE-UP	73.3	33.4	42.4	51.5
CA	Placer	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	6	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	57.0		*	
CA	Riverside	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	5001	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	50.0		*	
State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	2020		

						30%	65%	100%
State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	2020	2020	2020
						30%	65%	100%
CA	Riverside	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	8001	SCALE-UP	64.3	21.3	27.0	32.8
CA	Riverside	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	9001	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	53.0		8.1	
CA	Sacramento	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	6	SCALE-UP	47.0	5.6	7.1	8.6
CA	Sacramento	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	10	SCALE-UP	54.3	19.9	25.3	30.6
CA	Sacramento	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	12	SCALE-UP	35.0	2.9	3.7	4.5
CA	Sacramento	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	13	SCALE-UP	55.6	21.5	27.3	33.1
CA	San Bernardino	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	1	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	72.0		*	
CA	San Bernardino	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	306	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	65.6		*	
CA	San Bernardino	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	2002	SCALE-UP	80.0	0.3	0.4	0.5
CA	San Bernardino	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	9004	SCALE-UP	70.6	2.9	3.7	4.5
CA	San Diego	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	1	SCALE-UP	60.6	12.4	15.8	19.1
CA	San Diego	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	6	NO SCALE UP: HIGHESTNC; NEIGHBORHOOD; POINT	61.1		11.5	
CA	San Diego	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	1002	SCALE-UP	59.6	6.2	7.9	9.6
CA	San Diego	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	1006	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	42.6		*	
CA	San Diego	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	1008	SCALE-UP	62.3	9.4	11.9	14.5
CA	San Francisco	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	5	SCALE-UP	54.6	29.4	37.4	45.3

CA	San Joaquin	Stockton, CA	1002	SCALE-UP	58.0	20.0	25.4	30.8
CA	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	3001	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	35.3		6.4	
CA	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	4002	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	30.3		2.9	
CA	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	8001	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	44.3		6.4	
CA	San Mateo	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	1001	SCALE-UP	50.0	28.3	36.0	43.6
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	8	SCALE-UP	31.6	6.3	8.1	9.8
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	1013	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	8.0		*	
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	1014	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	6.6		*	
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	1018	NO SCALE UP: INDUSTRIAL	26.0		2.7	
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	1021	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	19.6		*	
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	1025	NO SCALE UP: INDUSTRIAL	14.6		2.7	
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	2004	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	30.0		*	
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	2011	SCALE-UP	37.0	18.5	23.5	28.5
CA	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	4003	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	8.3		*	
CA	Santa Clara	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	5	SCALE-UP	57.3	33.9	43.0	52.1
CA	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	3	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	24.3		*	
CA	Solano	Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	4	SCALE-UP	43.0	18.3	23.2	28.1
CA	Sonoma	Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	3	SCALE-UP	39.3	6.8	8.6	10.5
CA	Sutter	Yuba City, CA	3	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	50.1		*	
CA	Tulare	Visalia-Porterville, CA	2002	SCALE-UP	58.6	11.1	14.1	17.1
CA	Ventura	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	2002	SCALE-UP	47.6	0.9	1.2	1.5
CA	Ventura	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	3001	SCALE-UP	40.6	1.4	1.7	2.1
CA	Yolo	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	4	SCALE-UP	37.6	7.0	8.9	10.8
CO	Adams	Denver-Aurora,	3001	SCALE-UP	74.3	64.6	82.0	99.5
CT	Fairfield	Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	9003	SCALE-UP	56.6	3.4	4.4	5.3
CT	Hartford	Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	1003	SCALE-UP	51.8	13.6	17.3	21.0
CT	New Haven	New Haven-Milford, CT	27	SCALE-UP	68.3	24.1	30.6	37.1
DC	Washington	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	25	SCALE-UP	56.0	26.5	33.6	40.8
State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	2020		

							30%	65%	100%
DC	Washington	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	41	SCALE-UP	63.0	27.0	34.3	41.6	
DC	Washington	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	43	SCALE-UP	60.6	26.0	33.0	40.0	
FL	Broward	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	8002	SCALE-UP	54.0	34.5	43.8	53.1	
FL	Escambia	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	4	SCALE-UP	33.6	20.3	25.8	31.3	
FL	Hillsborough	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	81	SCALE-UP	33.0	23.8	30.2	36.6	
FL	Hillsborough	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	1065	SCALE-UP	38.6	31.2	39.6	48.0	
FL	Hillsborough	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	3002	SCALE-UP	32.0	19.1	24.3	29.5	
FL	Manatee	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	4012	SCALE-UP	31.3	12.3	15.6	19.0	
FL	Miami-Dade	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	27	SCALE-UP	48.0	22.3	28.3	34.3	
FL	Orange	Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	2002	SCALE-UP	44.3	17.1	21.7	26.3	
FL	Palm Beach	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	1004	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	46.0		20.5		
FL	Pinellas	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	18	SCALE-UP	39.6	21.1	26.8	32.5	
FL	Sarasota	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	1006	SCALE-UP	27.6	12.0	15.2	18.5	
GA	Fulton	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	48	SCALE-UP	73.0	34.7	44.1	53.5	
GA	Paulding	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	3	SCALE-UP	25.0	13.3	16.9	20.5	
GA	Rockdale	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	1	SCALE-UP	29.6	16.6	21.1	25.6	
IL	Cook	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	63	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	100.0		17.8		
IL	Cook	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	76	SCALE-UP	63.6	12.4	15.8	19.1	
IL	Cook	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	3103	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	74.6		37.9		
IL	Cook	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	4002	SCALE-UP	68.3	17.3	22.0	26.6	
IL	St Clair	St. Louis, MO-IL	10	SCALE-UP	50.3	33.1	42.0	51.0	
							2020		
State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	30%	65%	100%	
IN	Hendricks	Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	2	NO SCALE UP: INDUSTRIAL	41.0		7.4		
IN	Marion	Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	73	SCALE-UP	47.6	26.2	33.2	40.3	

KS	Sedgwick	Wichita, KS	10	SCALE-UP	46.5	29.6	37.6	45.6
KS	Sumner	Wichita, KS	2	SCALE-UP	27.0	16.1	20.4	24.8
KS	Wyandotte	Kansas City, MO-KS	21	SCALE-UP	57.0	29.4	37.4	45.3
KY	Daviess	Owensboro, KY	5	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	34.6		15.2	
KY	Fayette	Lexington-Fayette, KY	12	SCALE-UP	53.0	32.9	41.8	50.6
KY	Jefferson	Louisville-Jeffersonunty, KY-IN	1021	SCALE-UP	51.5	16.1	20.4	24.8
KY	Mc Cracken	Paducah, KY-IL	1024	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	43.5		14.7	
LA	Ascension	Baton Rouge, LA	4	SCALE-UP	43.0	41.1	52.2	63.3
LA	Calcasieu	Lake Charles, LA	8	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	39.3		35.8	
LA	East Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge, LA	3	SCALE-UP	56.3	49.0	62.2	75.5
LA	East Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge, LA	9	SCALE-UP	58.0	52.5	66.6	80.8
LA	East Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge, LA	13	NO SCALE UP: MICROSCALE	22.3		16.4	
LA	East Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge, LA	1001	SCALE-UP	42.0	37.8	47.9	58.1
LA	Iberville	Baton Rouge, LA	7	SCALE-UP	27.6	24.9	31.6	38.3
LA	Iberville	Baton Rouge, LA	9	SCALE-UP	30.6	27.9	35.4	43.0
LA	Iberville	Baton Rouge, LA	12	SCALE-UP	40.3	37.7	47.8	58.0
LA	Jefferson	New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	1001	SCALE-UP	52.0	40.6	51.5	62.5
LA	West Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge, LA	1	SCALE-UP	53.0	49.2	62.5	75.8
MA	Essex	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	2006	SCALE-UP	43.3	29.0	36.8	44.6
MA	Essex	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	5005	SCALE-UP	40.6	24.2	30.8	37.3
MA	Hampden	Springfield, MA	8	NO SCALE UP: HIGHESTNC; NEIGHBORHOOD; POINT	43.3		26.3	
MA	Hampden	Springfield, MA	16	SCALE-UP	46.6	28.7	36.4	44.1
MA	Hampshire	Springfield, MA	4002	SCALE-UP	32.6	19.3	24.6	29.8
MA	Suffolk	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	2	NO SCALE UP: MICROSCALE	57.0		31.8	

State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	2020		
						30%	65%	100%
MA	Suffolk	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	42	SCALE-UP	50.3	30.4	38.6	46.8
MA	Worcester	Worcester, MA	23	SCALE-UP	45.0	28.2	35.8	43.5
MN	Anoka	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	1002	SCALE-UP	44.0	34.0	43.1	52.3
MO	Clay	Kansas City, MO-KS	5	SCALE-UP	39.0	25.6	32.5	39.5
MO	Greene	Springfield, MO	36	SCALE-UP	52.0	31.8	40.4	49.0
MO	Jackson	Kansas City, MO-KS	34	SCALE-UP	59.6	36.7	46.6	56.5
MO	St Charles	St. Louis, MO-IL	1002	SCALE-UP	37.0	18.8	23.9	29.0

MO	Ste Genevieve		5	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	19.6		13.0	
MO	St Louis	St. Louis, MO-IL	4	SCALE-UP	45.0	24.5	31.2	37.8
MO	St Louis	St. Louis, MO-IL	3001	SCALE-UP	49.3	26.4	33.5	40.6
MO	St Louis	St. Louis, MO-IL	86	SCALE-UP	62.0	43.9	55.8	67.6
NH	Hillsborough	Manchester-Nashua, NH	20	SCALE-UP	44.3	28.3	36.0	43.6
NH	Rockingham	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	14	SCALE-UP	39.0	22.2	28.1	34.1
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NJ	Essex	Island, NY-NJ-PA	1003	SCALE-UP	74.0	24.3	30.9	37.5
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NJ	Hudson	Island, NY-NJ-PA	6	SCALE-UP	69.3	32.9	41.8	50.6
NJ	Mercer	Trenton-Ewing, NJ	5	SCALE-UP	48.6	17.1	21.7	26.3
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NJ	Middlesex	Island, NY-NJ-PA	11	SCALE-UP	55.6	23.7	30.1	36.5
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NJ	Morris	Island, NY-NJ-PA	3001	SCALE-UP	41.6	17.8	22.6	27.5
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NJ	Union	Island, NY-NJ-PA	4	SCALE-UP	80.6	40.4	51.2	62.1
NM	Bernalillo	Albuquerque, NM	23	SCALE-UP	56.0	40.6	51.5	62.5
NM	Bernalillo	Albuquerque, NM	24	SCALE-UP	48.0	34.7	44.1	53.5
NM	Dona Ana	Las Cruces, NM	21	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	49.6		30.5	
NM	Dona Ana	Las Cruces, NM	22	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	44.0		25.2	
NM	Eddy	Carlsbad-Artesia, NM	1004	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	30.3		28.6	
NM	Eddy	Carlsbad-Artesia, NM	1005	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	22.6		20.3	
NM	Lea	Hobbs, NM	8	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	45.3		43.9	
NM	Sandoval	Albuquerque, NM	1003	SCALE-UP	46.6	32.8	41.6	50.5
NM	San Juan	Farmington, NM	9	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	42.3		40.8	

State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	2020		
						30%	65%	100%
NM	San Juan	Farmington, NM	1005	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	47.3		42.4	
				NO SCALE UP: VISUAL NEAR				
NY	Erie	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	5	ROAD	79.0		44.7	
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NY	New York	Island, NY-NJ-PA	56	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	78.3		22.9	
		New York-Northern New Jersey-Long						
NY	Queens	Island, NY-NJ-PA	124	SCALE-UP	68.6	25.2	32.0	38.8

PA	Montgomery	Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	13	SCALE-UP	54.0	11.9	15.1	18.3	
PA	Northampton	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	25	SCALE-UP	47.3	7.6	9.7	11.8	
PA	Perry	Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	301	NO SCALE UP: NEGATIVE	24.0		*		
PA	Washington	Pittsburgh, PA	5	SCALE-UP	43.0	27.0	34.3	41.6	
PA	Washington	Pittsburgh, PA	5001	SCALE-UP	29.6	17.7	22.5	27.3	
PA	Westmoreland	Pittsburgh, PA	8	SCALE-UP	43.0	28.4	36.1	43.8	
PA	York	York-Hanover, PA	8	SCALE-UP	57.3	4.4	5.6	6.8	
				NO SCALE UP: SOURCE					
SC	Aiken	Augusta-Richmondunty, GA-SC	3	ORIENTED	23.3		8.8		
				NO SCALE UP: NON-					
SC	Greenville	Greenville, SC	9	REGULATORY	43.6		20.5		
SC	Richland	Columbia, SC	7	SCALE-UP	49.6	15.3	19.5	23.6	
SD	Jackson		1	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	7.6		4.8		
SD	Minnehaha	Sioux Falls, SD	7	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	33.0		17.8		
TN	Bradley	Cleveland, TN	102	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	37.3		16.8		
TN	Davidson	Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro, TN	11	SCALE-UP	55.6	21.2	26.9	32.6	
TX	Bexar	San Antonio, TX	46	NO SCALE UP: MICROSCALE	54.6		32.2		
TX	Bexar	San Antonio, TX	52	SCALE-UP	25.0	13.3	16.9	20.5	
				NO SCALE UP: SOURCE					
TX	Bexar	San Antonio, TX	59	ORIENTED	33.6		16.5		
TX	Brazoria	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	1016	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	26.3		3.9		
TX	Dallas	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	69	SCALE-UP	58.0	34.2	43.4	52.6	
TX	Dallas	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	75	SCALE-UP	45.0	25.3	32.1	39.0	
TX	Denton	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	34	SCALE-UP	38.6	21.0	26.6	32.3	
							2020		
State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	30%	65%	100%	
TX	El Paso	El Paso, TX	37	SCALE-UP	64.0	58.3	74.1	89.8	
				NO SCALE UP: VISUAL NEAR					
TX	El Paso	El Paso, TX	44	ROAD	66.6		56.1		
TX	El Paso	El Paso, TX	55	SCALE-UP	68.3	62.2	79.0	95.8	
TX	El Paso	El Paso, TX	57	SCALE-UP	58.0	41.7	52.9	64.1	
TX	El Paso	El Paso, TX	58	SCALE-UP	50.6	42.4	53.9	65.3	
TX	Gregg	Longview, TX	1	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	29.3		18.9		
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	26	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	52.0		34.5		

TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	29	SCALE-UP	35.6	16.4	20.9	25.3
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	47	SCALE-UP	60.3	28.9	36.7	44.5
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	75	SCALE-UP	61.8	43.4	55.1	66.8
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	1034	SCALE-UP	56.3	42.3	53.7	65.1
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	1035	SCALE-UP	58.3	43.8	55.6	67.5
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	1039	SCALE-UP	46.6	27.3	34.6	42.0
TX	Harris	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	1050	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	34.0		22.1	
TX	Harrison	Marshall, TX	2	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	23.0		15.9	
TX	Hunt	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	1006	SCALE-UP	34.3	15.7	19.9	24.1
TX	Jefferson	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	22	SCALE-UP	29.6	15.0	19.1	23.1
TX	Kaufman	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	5	SCALE-UP	31.3	17.7	22.5	27.3
TX	Montgomery	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	78	NO SCALE UP: MIDDLE SCALE	37.3		19.9	
TX	Smith	Tyler, TX	7	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	25.3		14.9	
TX	Tarrant	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	1002	SCALE-UP	59.6	30.9	39.3	47.6
TX	Tarrant	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	3009	SCALE-UP	43.6	28.4	36.1	43.8
TX	Tarrant	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	3011	SCALE-UP	46.3	25.2	32.0	38.8
TX	Travis	Austin-Round Rock, TX	20	SCALE-UP	28.3	13.3	16.9	20.5
UT	Davis	Ogden-Clearfield, UT	4	SCALE-UP	65.0	39.0	49.5	60.0
UT	Salt Lake	Salt Lake City, UT	3006	SCALE-UP	63.6	57.8	73.4	89.0
VT	Chittenden	Burlington-South Burlington, VT	14	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	44.4		27.0	
VT	Rutland	Rutland, VT	2	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	44.5		19.6	
VA	Charles City	Richmond, VA	2	SCALE-UP	61.0	49.1	62.4	75.6

							2020		
State	County	CBSA	Site	Scale up	2005-07	30%	65%	100%	
VA	Fairfax	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	1005	SCALE-UP	51.6	25.3	32.1	39.0	
VA	Fairfax	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	5001	SCALE-UP	53.6	24.0	30.5	37.0	
VA	Richmond	Richmond, VA	24	SCALE-UP	59.5	38.0	48.2	58.5	
WI	Milwaukee	Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	26	SCALE-UP	51.0	5.4	6.8	8.3	
WY	Campbell	Gillette, WY	123	NO SCALE UP: POP < 350K	11.6		9.3		