

COOK-DUPAGE CORRIDOR OPTION FEASIBILITY STUDY

EVALUATION MATRIX SUMMARY

**Average Scoring
By Goal and Option**

Goal No. 1	Goal No. 2	Goal No. 3	Goal No. 4	Goal No. 5	Goal No. 6 *	Subtotal Score (Goals 1 through 6)	Goal No. 7	Total Score
------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------------------------------	------------	-------------

RANK

MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	5.73	5.10	5.00	4.46	5.40	*	25.69	4.10	29.79	3
	2	5.10	4.59	5.00	5.20	5.41	*	25.29	2.99	28.28	6
	3	3.73	3.17	3.00	4.40	5.89	*	20.18	2.07	22.26	
	4	4.72	4.86	5.00	4.86	5.51	*	24.95	3.89	28.84	5
	5	5.23	4.92	3.00	5.03	5.69	*	23.88	3.48	27.36	
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	8.71	7.55	5.00	7.00	7.86	*	36.11	4.14	40.25	1
	2	5.25	5.14	4.00	5.96	6.83	*	27.18	2.16	29.34	4
	3	5.41	3.99	5.00	5.55	6.88	*	26.83	1.00	27.83	
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	5.72	6.47	5.00	6.11	4.29	*	27.59	3.69	31.27	2
	2	4.39	4.74	4.00	4.56	4.12	*	21.81	4.82	26.64	
	3	2.93	2.72	3.00	4.22	3.84	*	16.71	10.00	26.71	

* Potential environmental impacts for each option are detailed in a separate document entitled Environmental Considerations, dated June 11, 2007; and are not scored in this Goals and Objectives Evaluation Matrix.

Cook-DuPage Corridor Option Feasibility Study

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 1																											
INCREASE AVAILABILITY AND EFFICIENCY OF TRANSIT FOR REVERSE COMMUTERS TO MAJOR SUBURBAN EMPLOYMENT CENTERS																											
Objective 1.1				Objective 1.2				Objective 1.3				Objective 1.4				Objective 1.5				Objective 1.6				Objective 1.7			
Increase transit access to identified Corridor employment centers for current and future Reverse commuters				Increase access to additional potential places of employment				Increase connectivity between employment centers and residential locations of significant existing and future origin density				Increase opportunity to serve multiple or overlapping Corridor travel markets				Increase opportunity to serve other work-related and non-work trips				Increase benefit to users of existing multimodal transportation system				Reduce the number of transfers			
Measure 1.1.1			Measure 1.1.2			Measure 1.2.1			Measure 1.3.1			Measure 1.4.1			Measure 1.5.1			Measure 1.6.1			Measure 1.7.1						
Number of <u>current jobs</u> within the identified Corridor employment centers that are within ½ mile radius of a transit stop / station for service which supports the reverse commute.		Score	Number of <u>future jobs</u> within the identified Corridor employment centers that are within ½ mile radius of a transit stop / station for service which supports the reverse commute.		Score	Number of <u>current jobs not within</u> the identified Corridor employment centers within ½ mile radius of a transit stop / station for service which supports the reverse commute west of Cicero Ave.		Score	Sum of existing and future work trip origins that connect with the identified Corridor employment centers for reverse commuters.		Score	Sum of 2007 and 2030 work trips with origins east of IL 50 (Cicero) and destinations within ½ mile of transit stop / station on a proposed transit option.		Score	Sum of 2007 and 2030 non-work trips with origins east of IL 50 (Cicero Ave.) and destinations within ½ mile of a transit stop / station on a proposed transit option.		Score	Extent of improvement in travel time, etc. for other users of system element affected by proposed option.		Score	Potential for interoperability of services to provide one-seat ride (no transfers) for reverse commuters to multiple employment centers		Score				
Number			Number			Number			Work Trips			Work Trips			Non-Work Trips			Rating: G / M / P			Transfer Reductions						
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	97,022	7.5	117,289	7.7	171,639	5.5	431,105	3.5	28,341	6.1	64,661	2.7	SAA		Good	7.0										
	2	96,399	7.4	116,658	7.6	168,982	5.3	425,361	3.3	27,525	5.7	56,916	1.4	SAA		Moderate	5.0										
	3	75,694	2.6	95,542	3.9	172,918	5.6	371,650	1.0	24,305	3.9	84,868	6.1	SAA		Poor	3.0										
	4	97,082	7.5	117,353	7.7	171,639	5.5	431,105	3.5	25,635	4.6	54,755	1.1	SAA		Poor	3.0										
	5	99,181	8.0	123,651	8.8	168,708	5.3	410,289	2.6	24,189	3.9	54,204	1.0	SAA		Good	7.0										
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	107,727	10.0	130,451	10.0	168,540	5.3	584,744	10.0	35,452	10.0	100,641	8.7	SAA		Good	7.0										
	2	87,766	5.4	106,632	5.8	224,742	10.0	433,870	3.6	26,558	5.1	70,822	3.7	SAA		Poor	3.0										
	3	88,951	5.7	105,963	5.7	120,505	1.2	424,532	3.2	34,589	9.5	81,558	5.5	SAA		Good	7.0										
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	83,454	4.4	97,759	4.3	183,816	6.5	515,197	7.1	22,063	2.7	108,638	10.0	SAA		Moderate	5.0										
	2	68,636	1.0	78,895	1.0	163,205	4.8	511,455	6.9	21,999	2.7	104,863	9.4	SAA		Moderate	5.0										
	3	68,636	1.0	78,895	1.0	118,068	1.0	470,673	5.2	18,964	1.0	98,616	8.3	SAA		Poor	3.0										

Cook-DuPage Corridor Option Feasibility Study

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 2																											
INCREASE AVAILABILITY AND EFFICIENCY OF TRANSIT FOR INTERSUBURBAN COMMUTERS TO MAJOR SUBURBAN EMPLOYMENT CENTERS																											
Objective 2.1				Objective 2.2				Objective 2.3				Objective 2.4				Objective 2.5				Objective 2.6				Objective 2.7			
Increase transit access to identified Corridor employment centers for current and future commuters of Intersuburban travel markets				Increase access to additional potential places of employment				Increase connectivity between employment centers and residential locations of significant existing and future origin density				Increase opportunity to serve multiple or overlapping Corridor travel markets				Increase opportunity to serve other work-related and non-work trips				Increase benefit to users of existing multimodal transportation system				Reduce the number of transfers			
Measure 2.1.1			Measure 2.1.2			Measure 2.2.1			Measure 2.3.1			Measure 2.4.1			Measure 2.5.1			Measure 2.6.1			Measure 2.7.1						
Number of <u>current jobs</u> within the identified Corridor employment centers that are within ½ mile radius of a transit stop / station for service which supports the intersuburban commute		Score	Number of <u>future jobs</u> within the identified Corridor employment centers that are within ½ mile radius of a transit stop / station for service which supports the intersuburban commute		Score	Number of <u>current jobs not within</u> the identified Corridor employment centers within ½ mile radius of a transit stop / station for service which supports the intersuburban commute		Score	Sum of existing and future work trip origins served that connect with the identified Corridor employment centers for intersuburban commuters		Score	Sum of 2007 and 2030 work trips in identified travel markets with origins and destinations within ½ mile of a transit stop / station on a proposed transit option for intersuburban commuters		Score	Sum of 2007 and 2030 non-work trips with origins and destinations within ½ mile of transit stop / station on a proposed transit option		Score	Extent of improvement in travel time, etc. for other users of system element affected by proposed option		Score	Potential for interoperability of services to provide one-seat ride (no transfers) for intersuburban commuters to multiple employment centers		Score				
Number			Number			Number			Work Trips			Work Trips			Non-Work Trips			Rating: G / M / P			Transfers Reductions						
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	97,022	7.5	117,289	7.7	171,639	5.5	431,105	3.5	70,602	2.5	156,782	1.9	SAA		Good	7.0										
	2	96,399	7.4	116,658	7.6	168,982	5.3	425,361	3.3	67,841	2.3	148,348	1.6	SAA		Good	7.0										
	3	75,694	2.6	95,542	3.9	172,918	5.6	371,650	1.0	54,634	1.0	133,498	1.0	SAA		Good	7.0										
	4	97,082	7.5	117,353	7.7	171,639	5.5	431,105	3.5	61,542	1.7	135,226	1.1	SAA		Good	7.0										
	5	99,181	8.0	123,651	8.8	168,708	5.3	410,289	2.6	58,310	1.3	142,859	1.4	SAA		Good	7.0										
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	107,727	10.0	130,451	10.0	168,540	5.3	584,744	10.0	102,655	5.6	238,804	5.0	SAA		Good	7.0										
	2	87,766	5.4	106,632	5.8	224,742	10.0	433,870	3.6	80,289	3.4	176,826	2.6	SAA		Moderate	5.0										
	3	88,951	5.7	105,963	5.7	120,505	1.2	424,532	3.2	69,953	2.5	175,804	2.6	SAA		Good	7.0										
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	83,454	4.4	97,759	4.3	183,816	6.5	515,197	7.1	149,228	10.0	371,014	10.0	SAA		Poor	3.0										
	2	68,636	1.0	78,895	1.0	163,205	4.8	511,455	6.9	126,967	7.9	333,378	8.6	SAA		Poor	3.0										
	3	68,636	1.0	78,895	1.0	118,068	1.0	470,673	5.2	79,032	3.3	226,853	4.5	SAA		Poor	3.0										

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 3																													
IMPROVE ROADWAY AND TRANSIT SERVICE QUALITY IN I-290 TRAVEL CORRIDOR																													
Objective 3.1										Objective 3.2				Objective 3.3		Objective 3.4		Objective 3.5		Objective 3.6									
Reduce travel times on I-290 (eastbound and westbound) for auto and transit users										Reduce travel times on other key transportation system elements (facilities and services) relied upon by Intersuburban and Reverse commuters				Reduce adverse impacts on users of the existing multimodal transportation system		Reduce travel times for multi-modal/multi-vehicle trips		Increase use of traffic / transportation management techniques and technology strategies		Improve travel experience and safety of transportation system users									
Measure 3.1.1			Measure 3.1.2			Measure 3.1.3			Measure 3.1.4			Measure 3.2.1		Measure 3.2.2		Measure 3.3.1		Measure 3.4.1		Measure 3.5.1		Measure 3.6.1							
Extent option improves travel efficiency on I-290 for eastbound automobile travel in the AM peak		Score	Extent option improves travel efficiency on I-290 for westbound automobile travel in the AM peak		Score	Extent option improves travel efficiency on I-290 for eastbound transit users in the AM peak		Score	Extent option improves travel efficiency on I-290 for westbound transit users in the AM peak		Score	Extent option improves travel time on existing arterials, expressways, bus services and rail services identified in the <i>Travel Market Analysis</i> as key system elements in the I-290 travel corridor		Score	Extent to which option provides an alternative routing that diverts transit and auto travelers from congested links in the home to work path now available		Score	Extent of users whose travel experience may be degraded as a result of the proposed option.		Score	Reduction in number of forced intermodal plus intramodal transfers for travelers using the I-290 travel corridor		Score	Number of instances where Transportation System Management (TSM) is utilized to improve the I-290 travel corridor flow		Score	Extent option improves comfort, convenience, safety and reliability for users.		Score
Rating: G / M / P			Rating: G / M / P			Rating: G / M / P			Rating: G / M / P			Travel time savings			Rating: G / M / P			Rating: G / M / P			Number			Number			Millions \$'s		
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	2	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Good	7.0	Good	7.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	3	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	4	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	5	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	2	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	3	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Good	7.0	Good	7.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	2	Poor	3.0	Moderate	5.0	Poor	3.0	Moderate	5.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	
	3	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0	SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA		SAA	

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 4 INCREASE COMMUNITY AND CORRIDOR BENEFITS																											
Objective 4.1 Reduce adverse impacts on and promote positive benefits on existing communities, neighborhoods and people										Objective 4.2 Enhance economic development / redevelopment opportunities					Objective 4.3 Consider extent of and minimize adverse impacts of land acquisition		Objective 4.4 Maximize achievement of Corridor Planning Standards (supplemental criteria that reflect shared local values and preferences)										
Measure 4.1.1		Measure 4.1.2		Measure 4.1.3		Measure 4.1.4		Measure 4.1.5		Measure 4.2.1		Measure 4.2.2		Measure 4.2.3		Measure 4.2.4		Measure 4.3.1		Measure 4.4.1		Measure 4.4.2		Measure 4.4.3			
Minimize extent of new or further division of well-defined communities or neighborhoods.	Score	Extent and severity of incidences where access to and/or circulation within a community or neighborhood are degraded	Score	Extent and number of businesses or community facilities dislocated or rendered less accessible	Score	Extent and number of residences dislocated or rendered less accessible	Score	Number of at grade rail crossings added	Score	Area of brownfield sites within ½ mile of a major capital project (transit or highway)	Score	Area of existing and proposed employment centers within ½ mile of a transit stop / station or point-of-access to a new or improved roadway	Score	Number of targeted redevelopment sites accessed	Score	Number of centers of projected new development accessed	Score	Classification of land impacted and area of new right-of-way required (includes related parking roadway and traffic improvements)	Score	CPS Measure 1.1.1: Number of households within 1/2 mile radius of a transit stop / station matched to suitable employment opportunities based on level of education needed.	Score	Promote seamless mode choice	Score	Provide new or improved flexibility and efficiency of trips beyond traditional work hours.	Score		
Rating: G / M / P		Rating: G / M / P		Number & Rating		Number & Rating		Number		Acres		Acres		Number		Number		Acres		Households		G / M / P		G / M / P			
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	Moderate	5.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,575	6.0	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		112,296	1.3	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0
	2	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,563	6.0	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		109,947	1.0	Moderate	5.0	Good	7.0
	3	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,167	4.9	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		119,153	2.1	Moderate	5.0	Poor	3.0
	4	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,575	6.0	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		112,369	1.3	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0
	5	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,863	6.8	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		112,786	1.3	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	Moderate	5.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		5,985	10.0	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		183,488	10.0	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0
	2	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,474	5.7	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		143,203	5.1	Good	7.0	Moderate	5.0
	3	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		4,714	6.4	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		137,342	4.4	Moderate	5.0	Moderate	5.0
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		3,286	2.4	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		176,872	9.2	Good	7.0	Moderate	5.0
	2	Moderate	5.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		2,804	1.0	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		157,302	6.8	Good	7.0	Poor	3.0
	3	Good	7.0	CDLU		CDLU		CDLU		Design		CDLU		2,804	1.0	CDLU		CDLU		CPS to Measure		159,936	7.1	Poor	3.0	Poor	3.0

Cook-DuPage Corridor Option Feasibility Study

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 5																			
INCREASE REGIONAL BENEFITS																			
Objective 5.1				Objective 5.2				Objective 5.3					Objective 5.4						
Increase use of and integration with regional transportation system				Ensure consistency with regional goals presented in the 2030 RTP and 2040 Regional Framework Plan				Reduce negative impacts on environmental justice communities / populations					Increase access to disadvantaged communities / populations						
Measure 5.1.1		Measure 5.1.2		Measure 5.2.1		Measure 5.3.1		Measure 5.3.2		Measure 5.3.3		Measure 5.4.1		Measure 5.4.2		Measure 5.4.3			
Extent of interconnectivity of option with all other elements of existing transportation systems for all travel markets	Score	Total number of persons (2000 Census) within a ½ mile radius of a transit stop/station or point-of-access to a new or improved roadway	Score	Total number of 2030 RTP and 2040 Regional Framework Plan goals consistent with option	Score	Number of housing units adversely impacted by noise, vibration, or visual intrusion	Score	Number of environmental justice Census Tracts within 100 feet of a major capital project's alignment	Score	Number of environmental justice homes or businesses dislocated	Score	Number of disadvantaged persons within a ½ mile radius of a transit stop/station or point-of-access to a new or improved roadway	Score	Number of Households with zero vehicles within a ½ mile radius of a transit stop/station or point-of-access to a new or improved roadway	Score	Number of households at poverty level within a ½ mile radius of a transit stop/station or point-of-access to a new or improved roadway	Score		
	Rating: G / M / P		Number		Number		Number		Number		Number		Number		Number				
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	Good	7.0	269,731	1.0	Good	7.0	Design		62	2.0	CDLU		204,414	6.2	17,056	6.7	42,582	8.0
	2	Good	7.0	266,177	0.8	Good	7.0	Design		60	2.7	CDLU		202,557	6.0	16,858	6.5	42,366	7.9
	3	Good	7.0	289,592	2.4	Good	7.0	Design		63	1.7	CDLU		211,696	6.7	18,284	7.8	44,680	8.6
	4	Good	7.0	269,835	1.0	Good	7.0	Design		60	2.7	CDLU		204,528	6.2	17,065	6.7	42,600	8.0
	5	Good	7.0	278,743	1.6	Good	7.0	Design		59	3.1	CDLU		203,095	6.1	17,217	6.8	43,524	8.3
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	Good	7.0	399,481	10.0	Good	7.0	Design		65	1.0	CDLU		254,273	10.0	20,625	10.0	49,164	10.0
	2	Good	7.0	334,497	5.5	Good	7.0	Design		62	2.0	CDLU		232,407	8.3	19,187	8.7	46,947	9.3
	3	Good	7.0	340,912	5.9	Good	7.0	Design		63	1.7	CDLU		233,243	8.4	19,494	8.9	46,628	9.2
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	Moderate	5.0	329,583	5.2	Moderate	5.0	Design		39	10.0	CDLU		151,276	2.1	11,498	1.5	21,099	1.3
	2	Good	7.0	311,093	3.9	Moderate	5.0	Design		39	10.0	CDLU		137,664	1.0	10,950	1.0	20,154	1.0
	3	Moderate	5.0	311,093	3.9	Moderate	5.0	Design		39	10.0	CDLU		137,664	1.0	10,950	1.0	20,154	1.0

Cook-DuPage Corridor Option Feasibility Study

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 6											
REDUCE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS											
Objective 6.1			Objective 6.2			Objective 6.3			Objective 6.4		
Ensure all applicable air quality standards are met			Avoid / reduce adverse impacts to wetlands, floodplains, and critical habitats			Reduce operating noise and vibration levels			Avoid / reduce adverse impacts to sensitive land uses, historic properties and open spaces		
Measure 6.1.1		Measure 6.2.1		Measure 6.3.1		Measure 6.4.1		Measure 6.4.2			
Does option improve compliance with current air quality standards?		Wetlands and floodplains within 100 feet of a major capital project's alignment		Sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals) potentially subjected to increased noise and vibration impacts		Parklands or public open space within 100 feet of a major capital project's alignment		National historic landmarks within 100 feet of a major capital project's alignment			
Number of Reductions		Acres		Number		Acres		Number			
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	EA/EIS		47		9		80		3	
	2	EA/EIS		45		5		66		0	
	3	EA/EIS		45		9		81		3	
	4	EA/EIS		45		6		68		2	
	5	EA/EIS		48		5		103		0	
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	EA/EIS		135		9		155		7	
	2	EA/EIS		120		4		26		0	
	3	EA/EIS		28		8		148		4	
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	EA/EIS		165		0		211		10	
	2	EA/EIS		137		0		208		10	
	3	EA/EIS		144		0		213		10	

Cook-DuPage Corridor Option Feasibility Study

EVALUATION MATRIX

GOAL No. 7													
INCREASE COST EFFECTIVENESS													
Objective 7.1		Objective 7.2				Objective 7.3		Objective 7.4		Objective 7.5			
Increase system value by balancing costs and benefits		Reduce construction costs				Reduce long-term operating costs		Increase potential benefits		Increase compatibility with and capacity of existing, local, state, and federal funding sources for both capital and operating costs			
Measure 7.1.1		Measure 7.2.1		Measure 7.2.2		Measure 7.3.1		Measure 7.4.1		Measure 7.5.1			
Divide option's effectiveness (as computed in the evaluation matrix for goals 1 thru 6) by the option's total annual costs (capital + operating --in billions)		Score	Total construction costs	Score	Annualized construction costs (all modal components)	Score	Annual operating costs (all transit components)	Score	Option's effectiveness (as computed in the evaluation matrix for goals 1 thru 6)	Score	Option's horizon year cash surplus (through a cash-flow model, which incorporates both capital costs and operating costs with reasonable expectation of revenues from all fund sources).		Score
CE Factor (x 100)			Millions \$'s		Millions \$'s		Millions \$'s		Effectiveness Factor		Millions \$'s		
MAIN LINE SYSTEM	1	3.61	4.1	\$5,264		\$517		\$194		25.69		SAA	
	2	3.09	3.0	\$6,477		\$610		\$207		25.29		SAA	
	3	2.67	2.1	\$5,338		\$519		\$237		20.18		SAA	
	4	3.52	3.9	\$5,251		\$514		\$196		24.95		SAA	
	5	3.32	3.5	\$5,302		\$527		\$191		23.88		SAA	
CONCENTRIC SYSTEM	1	3.63	4.1	\$8,283		\$779		\$215		36.11		SAA	
	2	2.71	2.2	\$8,321		\$778		\$225		27.18		SAA	
	3	2.17	1.0	\$12,395		\$994		\$245		26.83		SAA	
RADIAL RELIANT SYSTEM	1	3.42	3.7	\$5,780		\$510		\$297		27.59		SAA	
	2	3.95	4.8	\$3,062		\$261		\$291		21.81		SAA	
	3	6.36	10.0	\$1,127		\$104		\$159		16.71		SAA	