

Normalized Scores 44.2

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>

3.5 / 5

Score: 3.5
Comment: Information shared paid attention to specific city needs and focused on targeted economic issues

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: The proposal is relying mainly on one factor (transportation system) to connect the local workers with job opportunities within one hour radius commute, which in turn depends on developing local transit systems and improved education-social-cultural sectors to attract professional workers to live in Greensboro, focusing on the millennial generation.

3.3 / 5

Score: 3.3
Comment: The proposal does an excellent job of incorporating the existing assets that are unique to Greensboro. As opposed to focusing on specific needs (e.g., infill development in East Greensboro, jobs, etc.), the proposal focuses on an overarching strategy - rising tides lifting all boats, if you will. Suggestions in the proposal would include much broader enhancements that would trigger addressing some City-specific needs sooner rather than later.

3.1 / 5

Score: 3.1
Comment: Yes, the proposal takes into account local economic conditions relatively well.

2.7 / 5

Score: 2.7
Comment: The proposal suggested that there are multiple issues facing the city that could be solved by establishing an "Innovation Hub", however the solution that was presented only effectively addressed one approach and ignored the remainder of the issues that were cited as problems.

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 measureable outcomes.</i>

3.4 / 5

Score: 3.4
Comment: Addressed specific obstacles with recommendations

2.6 / 5

Score: 2.6
Comment: The first cost of the Innovation Hub Rail is significantly high with return within 15 years. It is important to make any project self sustained with quicker returns.

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: The proposal included cost estimates for complete execution, breaking out direct costs to the City of Greensboro. Because the costs associated with this proposal are heavily tied to infrastructure, cost estimates can potentially be underestimated and heavily impacted by external forces. The timeline projected in the proposal is not unrealistic, but does not appear to factor in the time to coordinate all of the political and logistical hurdles before financial investments are made.

2.5 / 5

Score: 2.5
Comment: Extremely expensive, relying heavily on the kind of state and federal funding that's hardly likely to come from the next General Assembly and Congress. The proposal has a high degree of complexity as well.

2.1 / 5

Score: 2.1
Comment: The proposal is centered around developing a public transportation link to Greensboro that would allow knowledge workers to easily commute to the city from both Raleigh and Charlotte. It did not make a good case for why the commuters would be coming to Greensboro by not addressing the appropriate business development opportunities that would be needed to make the area attractive. It also did not consider that the rail lines that are proposed could just as easily carry knowledge workers away from Greensboro to more established high-tech areas such as Raleigh and Charlotte, thus leaving Greensboro in a worse economic position that it currently is in.

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>

3.8 / 5

Score: 3.8
Comment: Conversations in the past has occurred regarding the transportation hub and our city being part of a regional plan for growth. I did see that described here in this plan.

2.1 / 5

Score: 2.1
Comment: The proposal is based on previous and current plans to expand the rail system but it fell short on providing details of the other systems that to sustain the main idea.

3.7 / 5

Score: 3.7
Comment: This criterion is where the proposal truly shines. It is absolutely forward-thinking, as it recognizes the significance of regionalism, global economic trends and changing demographics (i.e., the preferences of the millennial generation). Concepts within this proposal might frighten current leaders and individuals content with the status quo, but will energize those who have vision and understand changing trends. The concept of this proposal would require an "all in" mentality with regard to accepting changing trends. However, the reward for making the investment could pay huge dividends through the re-branding of the region for years to come.

2.7 / 5

Score: 2.7
Comment: Leveraging Greensboro's proximity to RTP and Charlotte is not a new idea. The plan's dependence on such large numbers of workers traveling feels more backward-looking than looking forward to a future even more digital-centric than today. Creating "a globally recognized Greensboro brand" based on its rail infrastructure is unrealistic and unnecessary.

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: The proposal was one-dimensional focusing entirely on a costly and tenuous infrastructure improvement and ignoring building a basis for advancement in Greensboro.