

Normalized Scores 43.3

JUDGING CRITERION # 1: LOCAL (0-5)

Does the Proposal/Plan take into account local economic conditions, focusing on existing and potential competitive advantages, in its recommended solutions? Is the Proposal/Plan expected to result in direct economic benefits to the city and its surrounding area? Does the Proposal/Plan identify local assets, economic strengths and weaknesses, and describe how the city can leverage assets and strengths to result in economic benefits?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Failed to recognize any unique conditions in the City; recommendations could have applied to anywhere...</i>	<i>Paid basic attention to general conditions but not based on any specific City need.</i>	<i>Recognized local conditions and demonstrated an understanding of the economic climate.</i>	<i>Paid attention to specific City needs and focused on targeted economic issues.</i>	<i>Grounded by a detailed understanding of the needs of the City and its people.</i>

4.1 / 5

Score: 4.1
Comment: The proposal considers economic conditions unique to Greensboro and utilizes resources already present in the area.

3 / 5

Score: 3.0
Comment: The proposal is for economic development coming from expanded public transportation. However, it discussed local business activity where local dollars circulate within the local economy generating wealth - a theory that I don't believe works. In addition the proposal describes a branding need for Greensboro that is a separate subject.

3.5 / 5

Score: 3.5
Comment: The proposal essentially calls for a serious overhaul of our mass transit system by modifying existing fixed routes to serve certain epicenters. The proposal does a good job of focusing on existing and potential competitive advantages - specifically, our various destinations. The proposal also does a good job of focusing on local assets and describes how we can leverage those assets. Unfortunately, the proposal only focuses on epicenters located in downtown and west Greensboro, none in East Greensboro, where a sizeable proportion of the people use mass transit.

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: This proposal presents a really "nice to have" quality. However, it does not provide convincing evidence of significant economic development potential.

2.5 / 5

Score: 2.5
Comment: This proposal will not provide direct economic benefits and will cause a significant increase in costs for a service that currently doesn't cover its cost.

JUDGING CRITERION # 2: FEASIBLE (0-5)

Can the Proposal/Plan yield practical and concrete results in a realistic timeframe that justify the level of required investment, addressing likely obstacles, such as resources available to the city? Does the Proposal/Plan identify economic development strategies that are achievable using existing city resources, or propose ways in which the city can utilize nonexisting/currently unidentified resources to implement these economic development strategies? Does the Proposal/Plan outline a timeline by which the city can develop actionable strategies to implement the ideal contained in the Proposal/Plan?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Misguided by an optimistic understanding of obstacles and underestimated the effort required to deliver results.</i>	<i>Addressed basic obstacles to general recommendations but not with specific or realistic tasks.</i>	<i>Demonstrated a realistic and efficient level of effort and attention to detail.</i>	<i>Addressed specific obstacles with recommendations tied to detailed, measurable and cost effective tasks.</i>	<i>Guided by practical and concrete recommendations; considered timing, funding, return on investment and measurable outcomes.</i>

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: The proposal suggests using existing bus routes and vehicles to implement the initiative. The program is enhanced using a smart phone and/or computer application

1.8 / 5

Score: 1.8
Comment: I do not believe the proposal will generate much regarding economic development. It would provide a better quality of life for residents and possibly more business access to needed skilled workers.

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: The proposal does a good job of identifying and addressing biases against public transportation; however, I still believe it underestimates how strong the bias is against public transportation for the demographic it is trying to attract. In light of the recent defeat of the 1/4 cents sales tax, I certainly question the likelihood of a 1/2 cents sales tax for mass transportation. I also question the assertion that the changes "will not harm or take anything away from other activity centers in the city."

2.8 / 5

Score: 2.8
Comment: Comments same as criterion 1. I have nothing further to add.

2.1 / 5

Score: 2.1
Comment: Didnot realistically address the basic obstacles to the proposal, public perception and lack of funding.

JUDGING CRITERION # 3: INNOVATIVE (0-5)

Is the Proposal/Plan offering a fresh and forward-looking approach that will lead to a clear set of strategically-aligned goals that other economic development initiatives have failed to deliver? Are the ideas and strategies submitted in the Proposal/Plan duplicative of existing plans or strategies being utilized by the city? Does the Proposal/Plan outlay strategies that propose to utilize city resources in more effective and efficient ways to realize the city's economic development goals?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Promoted style over substance or lacked new and original methods with not enough practical thinking.</i>	<i>Raised novel and interesting concepts but failed to tie approach to clear outcomes.</i>	<i>Delivered new and different methods with focus on concrete goals and improving outcomes.</i>	<i>Raised creative and new ideas that offer a clear roadmap to improved conditions.</i>	<i>Introduced ground breaking and advanced thinking that exceeds the promise of any previous approach.</i>

3.5 / 5

Score: 3.5
Comment: The proposal is highly innovative and skillfully utilizes City resources that are already in place. Development of the app obviously is a necessary step in implementation.

2.5 / 5

Score: 2.5
Comment: I don't believe this idea will have significant economic development impact.

3.1 / 5

Score: 3.1
Comment: The proposal was fresh and forward-looking, but I question how successful the expansion of mass transit can be in Greensboro when it is so relatively easy to get around and parking is rarely an issue, even in downtown. I also would have liked for the proposal to address the challenges posed by low-cost options like Uber which are now available in the City (with three people splitting the cost, Uber is less expensive and more convenient than the proposed bus fares to travel within some of the epicenters discussed).

3.5 / 5

Score: 3.5
Comment: Comments same as criterion 1. I have nothing further to add.

2.2 / 5

Score: 2.2
Comment: This is a proposal to change the public transportation system that is weakly tied to economic development.