

III. PROVIDE A SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

General Principles

This section elaborates on the six general community and economic development principles stated in the economic opportunity section at page 3-31.

Government needs to engage in collaborative consensus building practices with the community to solve community problems. Public/private partnerships and community engagement have been the key to Burlington’s success. The city will continue to actively facilitate consensus building among citizens, businesses, and city departments, which have in the past resulted in new traffic calming policies; a new graffiti ordinance; the Abandoned Building ordinance; and changes in the allocation process for the street and sidewalk budget. In addition, the city will continue to rely on partnerships and collaborations, primarily with the non-profit sector, to make progress toward its suitable living environment goals.

Priority Suitable Living Environment Needs

91.215 (e)

The consolidated plan must provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction’s priority non-housing community development needs eligible for assistance under HUD’s community development programs by CDBG eligibility category, in accordable with a table prescribed by HUD.

Table 2B4 below shows the city’s priority suitable living environment needs. As in earlier sections of the Plan, “high” priority means that activities to address this need will be funded by the city with its CDBG funds, either alone or in conjunction with the investment of other public or private funds, during the five-year period beginning July 1, 2008. “Medium” priority means that if CDBG funds are available, activities to address this need may be funded; also, the city will take other actions to help this group locate other sources of funds (i.e., letters of support, facilitation of group applications, etc.). “Low” priority means that the city will not fund activities to address this need with CDBG funds, but will consider certifications of consistency for other entities’ applications for federal assistance. “No need” means either that no need exists or that this need is already substantially addressed.

Table 2B4 Priority Suitable Living Environment Needs	Priority Need Level
Acquisition of Real Property	M
Disposition	M
Clearance and Demolition	M
Clearance of Contaminated Sites	H
Public Facility (General)	H
Youth Centers	M
Neighborhood Facilities	M
Child Care Centers	M
Health Facilities	L
Parks and/or Recreation Facilities	M
Parking Facilities	M
Tree Planting	M*

Fire Stations/Equipment	L
Abused/Neglected Children Facilities	N
Asbestos Removal	M*
Non-Residential Historic Preservation	H*
Other Public Facility Needs	M
Infrastructure (General)	M
Water/Sewer Improvements	L
Street Improvements	H
Sidewalks	M
Solid Waste Disposal Improvements	N
Flood Drainage Improvements	L
Other Infrastructure	L
Public Services (General)	H
Legal Services	L
Youth Services	H
Health Services	H
Crime Awareness	H
Other Services	M

*Principally as part of larger projects

These priorities are incorporated into specific objectives in Table 2C3 on page 3-48.

*91.215(a)(2)
 Describe the basis for
 assigning the priority given to
 each category of priority
 needs.*

Many of bases for the city’s suitable living environment priorities were laid out in the Executive Summary, and are reiterated here. The redevelopment of brownfields is a priority for the city because it meets multiple objectives: it increases the tax base, reduces environmental hazards and, often, allows for the

productive reuse of historic structures. The city also uses CDBG to support public facilities and infrastructure, as well as nonprofit facilities, where there is identified community support for the project and where there are not other sufficient, more appropriate resources. These uses include:

- (a) Large infrastructure and public facility projects where a relatively small investment of CDBG leverages large amounts of state, federal and/or private funding, where the project significantly contributes to community revitalization, and where CDBG can effectively be used for program delivery costs. Over the next five years, such projects may include the College Street Waterfront Access Project and the reuse of the Moran Plant site.
- (b) Small resident-generated projects, which empower residents to come together to improve their neighborhoods. CDBG has been for many years an important resource for resident-generated neighborhood physical improvement projects, and although interest in physical improvements is currently at lower than historic levels, CDBG continues to be a resource around which residents can coalesce to improve parks, playgrounds, community gardens and other neighborhood facilities.
- (c) Both new and improved public and nonprofit facilities, where a relatively small CDBG investment can fill a gap, leverage other funds, meet a renovation need

which cannot be met with other funding, and/or support the continued provision of services which are vital to the community.

Finally, the city will continue to support the provision of public services by local profits. In particular, CDBG funding for youth, health and public safety services has been important in meeting community priorities and filling gaps in funding and services.

*91.215(a)(3)
Identify any obstacles to
meeting underserved needs.*

Here, as in every other section of the Plan, insufficient resources are an obstacle to meeting community needs. Here, as in every other section of the Plan, insufficient resources are an obstacle to meeting community needs. Brownfields funding from the

Environmental Protection Agency is shrinking. At the same time, new EPA requirements that in order to meet the dictates of Section 106, the State Historic Preservation Office must investigate every site that the city's Brownfields Program is involved with – including all privately-owned sites – for archeological and historical significance will detract from the incentives for private owners to remediate and redevelop such sites. In addition, under current EPA rules, city assets with contamination are not eligible for EPA cleanup funding. Thus the Moran Plant, Urban Reserve, Gosse Court Armory, Street Department building, and other city properties must be cleaned up with general fund capital improvement or other local funding sources.

The city's AmeriCorps*VISTA program is facing cuts that may force the elimination of the program. At a minimum, the program is losing 50% of its VISTA members. Proposed cuts in program administration funding may make it impossible to run the program at all.

Many youth providers have no consistent, sustainable funding sources.

91.215 (i)

- Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan, including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.*
- Assess the strengths and gaps in the delivery system.*

Implementation of the city's suitable living environment strategies includes the agencies, organizations and groups described in the section of the Plan describing factors affecting a suitable living environment. Implementation also includes residents, who initiate neighborhood improvement projects and serve as volunteers in support of a number of initiatives. The redevelopment of brownfields involves city staff, the state and the property owner (private sector or nonprofit). A full description of the institutional structure through which the city's affordable housing and community development initiatives are implemented

appears later in the Consolidated Plan.

Gaps in the service delivery structure include the capacity of local nonprofits to meet the needs of refugee youth who arrive with little or no English and, often, with significant trauma histories.

91.215(f)
 This community development component of the plan must state the jurisdiction's specific long-term and short-term community development objectives

The table below outlines specific objectives, together with target dates for completion and estimated funding. Other funding includes federal, state and private monies.

Funding amounts are only estimates; actual amounts will be determined on the basis of project/program applications.

TABLE 2C3 Suitable Living Environment Objectives	Estimated Year of Completion	People Served	New Facilities	Renovated Facilities	New Affordable Housing Units	New Commercial Space	Contaminated Acreage Mitigated	CDBG Funds	Other Funds
PROVIDE PUBLIC SERVICES TO STABILIZE LIVING SITUATIONS; ENHANCE HEALTH, SAFETY AND QUALITY OF LIFE; AND IMPROVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT									
Objective SL-1.2 Food Security	Annually	2,000						\$10,000	\$550,000
Objective SL-1.3 Youth Services	Annually	400						\$15,000	\$200,000
Objective SL-1.4 Health and Public Safety Services	Annually	400						\$13,600	\$575,000
IMPROVE PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO FOSTER LIVABLE NEIGHBORHOODS AND ACCESS TO AMENITIES									
Objective SL-3.1 Improved public facilities	5-Year Target		10					\$175,000	\$100,000
Objective SL-3.2: Improved public infrastructure	5-Year Target	39,815						\$100,000	\$9,500,000
REDEVELOP BROWNFIELDS INTO PRODUCTIVE USE									
Objective SL-3.3: Brownfields	5-Year Target		3	3	61	6	61.2	\$226,000	\$40,000,000
88 King Street	2008				20		2.3		
Gosse Court Armory	2010		1				0.5		
Moran Plant	2011		1			1	2.5		
134 Archibald Street	2011				3	1	0.05		
Browns Court	2011				30		0.35		
South End Transit Center	2011		1				2.5		
Urban Reserve (new park space)	2012			1			40		
151 So. Champlain	2012				8		2		
Airport Building 890	2012			1		3	5		
Blodgett	2012			1		1	6		
TOTAL ESTIMATED 5-YEAR FUNDS								\$694,000	\$141,725,000