

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>

3.4 / 5

Score: 3.4
Comment: The proposal, in seeking to retain, and acquire, younger merchants/entrepreneurs recognizes an untapped resource in the city/surrounding area. The initial costs for the retail building, Incubator Kitchen, and community park seem to be kept to a minimum. Glenwood neighborhood, downtown, and surrounding areas would directly benefit from this plan.

4.3 / 5

Score: 4.3
Comment: This plan takes into account local economic conditions and focuses on existing and potential competitive advantages. It will result most quickly in an economic advantage for the Glenwood neighborhood and then expand into the greater community. The proposal does a good job of describing how the city can leverage current assets and strengths for economic benefit.

4.6 / 5

Score: 4.6
Comment: Clearly demonstrated understanding of the Glenwood neighborhood and how the Plan supports recommendations from the City's Plan and subsequent update. Taps existing resources/strengths to merge "old/traditional" with new entrepreneurial endeavors for neighborhood revitalization. Grassroots opportunity.

3.5 / 5

Score: 3.5
Comment: Proposal would have benefited from more specifics on how project addresses critical economic conditions such as lack of postsecondary educational attainment and unemployment.

4.4 / 5

Score: 4.4
Comment: There are a lot of good local elements in the proposal. Strong local advocates, historic neighborhood, existing redevelopment plans, and a strong understanding of the needs of younger entrepreneurs.

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>

3 / 5

Score: 3.0
Comment: The estimated time frame of 5 years, includes acknowledgement of the need for "outside" grants, as well as investment from the city. this plan repeatedly includes data/information/goals as outlined in City/Glenwood Neighborhood plans.

3.4 / 5

Score: 3.4
Comment: I like the three pronged approach that allows for growth in each area in its own time frame. Each prong can yield practical and concrete results in a realistic time frame. The proposal identifies economic development strategies that are achievable using existing using existing city resources along with grants and private investments.

4 / 5

Score: 4.0
Comment: Includes a kitchen incubator component as a source of revenue for the venture to financially fund a large (if not all) of the O & M costs assoc. with maintaining the incubator. Additionally, the retail component provides tangible benefits by creating jobs and turning \$ back over within the neighborhood. Some concerns re a realistic initial development cost/startup budget/cost to bring project to fruition. Project schedule beyond Year 1 unclear.

2.9 / 5

Score: 2.9
Comment: The proposal could have included more specifics on how it will overcome the financial barriers to implementing the project.

2.7 / 5

Score: 2.7
Comment: Obstacles were identified and strategies were recommended to address them, but it's unclear what level of investment is needed. The project budget didn't add up correctly and only identified \$38,750 in costs for what appears to be Phase one of a 3-Phase plan. No costs for the Grove Incubators Kitchen or the trolley were included in the budget proposal.

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 outline 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

Score: 3.0
Comment: The Incubator Kitchen is unique, and fresh not only to Greensboro, but also to Guilford County as a whole. With regard to revitalizing a neighborhood, this plan is very well thought out. The Neighborhood Encloned Commercial Area approach can utilize under/non use buildings in the area, and create tax revenue for the City.

3.8 / 5

Score: 3.8
Comment: The plan offers a fresh and forward-looking approach that will lead to a clear set of strategically-aligned goals. To my knowledge, the plan does not duplicate any other initiatives. The plan is built upon using city resources in more effective and efficient ways to realize the city's economic development goals.

3.7 / 5

Score: 3.7
Comment: Project supplements the City's previously-developed Plan and subsequent update. Also, serves to improve the subject area near one of the City's biggest assets (i.e., coliseum). Incorporate the trolley line to address mobility and transportation issues also bridge the traditional/old with new development opportunities.

3.1 / 5

Score: 3.1
Comment: The outcomes could have been clearer. For instance, what specific economic outcomes have other cities experienced by initiating similar projects.

2.5 / 5

Score: 2.5
Comment: The proposal builds on existing ideas by adding innovative concepts such as the Incubator Kitchen. It also ties together the need for low-cost entrepreneurial space with the needs of revitalizing a blighted neighborhood. The proposal suggests that success in Glenwood can be replicated in other parts of the city, but it's difficult to see how. This is a great project/vision for the Glenwood neighborhood and for the City, but it needs to be fleshed out further.