

Normalized Scores 43.8

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

Failed to recognize any unique conditions in the City; recommendations could have applied to anywhere...

1 - 2

Paid basic attention to general conditions but not based on any specific City need.

2 - 3

Recognized local conditions and demonstrated an understanding of the economic climate.

3 - 4

Paid attention to specific City needs and focused on targeted economic issues.

4 - 5

Grounded by a detailed understanding of the needs of the City and its people.

4.2 / 5

Score: 4.2

Comment: The proposal identifies an opportunity to brand Greensboro that has been discussed, but not really pursued. It identifies resources and programs already in place that could be used to execute this vision. It is rather shallow on the costs and funding to develop the assets/programs to support the brand.

1.6 / 5

Score: 1.6

Comment: Great concepts, but in my opinion this is something that could be done in many locations. It is also something that will take many many years just to get people on board with the concept. Plus its not in line with the current regional targets to promote new business brands. This disconnect may cause problems since its not in line with current regional visions.

4.2 / 5

Score: 4.2

Comment: The proposal does an excellent job of describing Greensboro's current local economic conditions. The proposal also does a great job of our identifying one of our major economic development issues- attracting and maintaining a skilled and educated workforce. The entire proposal is tied to rebranding Greensboro as a green city and hub for green industry, by building on existing resources.

3.1 / 5

Score: 3.1

Comment: Clearly understands revitalization efforts focused on downtown. Targets econ. dev. opportunities using green culture and tech. However, while the tourism and culture, education and workforce development components capitalize on these existing strengths, the entrepreneurial innovation and support component of the proposal could be strengthened with more research on how to capitalize on these existing assets. SWOT analysis identifies positives and negatives clearly and succinctly.

3.1 / 5

Score: 3.1

Comment: This proposal is correct that Greensboro definitely needs branding. Indeed, there is a respected community group currently working on developing a brand for us. The proposal outlines costs but is lacking on data to support a positive economic outcome.

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

Misguided by an optimistic understanding of obstacles and underestimated the effort required to deliver results.

1 - 2

Addressed basic obstacles to general recommendations but not with specific or realistic tasks.

2 - 3

Demonstrated a realistic and efficient level of effort and attention to detail.

3 - 4

Addressed specific obstacles with recommendations tied to detailed, measurable and cost effective tasks.

4 - 5

Guided by practical and concrete recommendations; considered timing, funding, return on investment and measureable outcomes.

2.8 / 5

Score: 2.8

Comment: The proposal is weak on specifics required to execute the vision.

1.3 / 5

Score: 1.3

Comment: I do feel this is a long term concept. It impacts large amounts of funding, required changes in education focus, and change in the regions current industry focus. I have heard of new branded industries as taking years just to get to the point that they can be considered a branded industry for a location. Again great ideas for support for Green, but timeline may not be clear.

3.3 / 5

Score: 3.3

Comment: The proposal sets forth a green brand based on education, tourism and business development through a three step process: (1) a campus; (2) green museum; and (3) start-up lab. Besides the costs concerns (which are significant), I am also skeptical over the proposed site, a portion of which constitutes some of Lincoln Financial's surface parking lot. While there may be alternatives to make the site work (shared parking garage for Lincoln's employees), these alternatives could involve increased costs. The proposal could be strengthened by identifying specific federal or state grants to alleviate the financial burden in implementing the proposal.

2.4 / 5

Score: 2.4

Comment: With annual O & M costs exceeding \$3 million, the role of the public sector may be critical during implementation. With a five (5) year development window, can both public and private resources be garnered with other City initiatives currently in que? Long-term sustainability and funding source? Realistic timeline with capital investment required?

3.3 / 5

Score: 3.3

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

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

Promoted style over substance or lacked new and original methods with not enough practical thinking.

1 - 2

Raised novel and interesting concepts but failed to tie approach to clear outcomes.

2 - 3

Delivered new and different methods with focus on concrete goals and improving outcomes.

3 - 4

Raised creative and new ideas that offer a clear roadmap to improved conditions.

4 - 5

Introduced ground breaking and advanced thinking that exceeds the promise of any previous approach.

3.3 / 5

Score: 3.3

Comment: This proposal recognizes the void in the Southeast of cities branded around Green Technology and Sustainability. This has been discussed in Greensboro, but without a decision to move forward to develop a plan. The idea has merit, but past discussions have not led to action.

1.7 / 5

Score: 1.7

Comment: Seems like there are some thoughts, but I would not be sure they could or would be successful. There are many moving parts in a plan like this. Each of those moving parts require support and input from external groups (education, business, politics, etc...).

3.6 / 5

Score: 3.6

Comment: The proposal is very fresh and forward-looking. The proposal does a good job of combining an idea that includes (i) the renewed focus and energy in downtown, (ii) our universities and colleges (iii) the arts and (iv) workforce development, together with a focus on an up and coming industry that could become the City's brand. The concept of a downtown campus is not in and of itself unique, but I think the combination of the museum and the start-up, is unique for the City.

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9

Comment: Clearly, looking forward by embracing tech. innovation and associated jobs/job creation opportunity. Also focuses on partnerships. Is this something that the City envisions being downtown or more closely associated with other related efforts re physical proximity.

3 / 5

Score: 3.0

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