



**TCPDC**

**TIOGA COUNTY PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

607.687.8260 | www.tiogacountyny.com | 56 Main St. Owego NY 13827

**DRAFT**

**Tioga County Property Development Corporation  
Regular Board of Directors  
Wednesday, May 27th, 2026, at 4:00 PM  
Ronald E. Dougherty County Office Building  
56 Main Street, Owego, NY 13827  
Economic Development Conference Room #109**

**Minutes**

- 1. Call to Order 4:08 PM
- 2. Attendance
  - a. Roll Call: H. Murray, J. Case-in at 4:26pm, L. Pelotte, J. Whitmore, R. Bunce
  - b. Excused: M. Baratta
  - c. Invited Guests: S. Zubalsky-Peer, T. Patton, L. Williams
- 3. Old Business

- a. Approval of Minutes from Regular Board Meeting April 8th, 2026.

**Motion to approve Regular Board Meeting Minutes for April 8, 2026, as written (R. Bunce, L. Pelotte)**

**Aye: 3 Abstain: 1  
Nay: 0 Carried**

- b. Acceptance of Financial Reports through April 2026.

**Motion to approve financial reports through April 2026 (J. Whitmore, R. Bunce)**

**Aye: 4 Abstain: 0  
Nay: 0 Carried**

- c. Project Updates
  - i. 121 Providence- S. Zubalsky-Peer states that this property is nearing completion. There is a meeting with realtors scheduled, depending on the stairs being built fully. The meeting with the realtors will determine if they'd like to work with the PDC to sell the property. References will be called to gain insight into the realtor's previous experiences. The board was asked if they would like a tour of the property once it is complete. The board was interested in viewing the work that was done. There were questions regarding market process, and it was noted that the realtor will do an analysis on the property and set that process. It was also noted the HCR had no restrictions on selling the property. The appraisal was discussed and there were questions on whether the appraisal will be higher than the selling price. S. Zubalsky-Peer states she was unsure at this time and once further into the selling process they will know.
  - ii. 247 Main- S. Zubalsky-Peer attended an Owego Historic

**A PARTNER OF**

**TEAM TIOGA**

Preservation Commission (OHPC) with Corey from L2 Architecture, who presented the property plans. SHPO has already reviewed the plans and approved moving forward with the proposed designs. OHPC members stated that they liked the proposed plan overall but noted that vinyl siding is not generally permitted in accordance with their bylaws. OHPC requested that pricing/bids for wood or composite siding be obtained as an alternative material. It was noted that SHPO already approved the submitted plans, which included vinyl siding as it is replacing in-kind the existing vinyl siding. Concerns were discussed regarding the cost of the wood siding, which is anticipated outside the project budget. Additional concerns were made regarding the long-term maintenance requirements associated with this type of material, including ongoing painting and upkeep to maintain historical aspects. Due to past flooding issues, it is unknown the condition of cladding underneath the existing vinyl until demolition begins. The OHPC stated that the project should bid for alternative materials and provide pricing for composite and vinyl siding for further review. They did draft a COA with the term composite siding, but that can be revisited once the final material pricings are acquired. OHPC will need to hold a public hearing at their June meeting because the board voted to consider the project new construction. The board questioned whether it was possible to have the pricing available for them at the next meeting. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she would do her best to have some numbers. Demolition of the back part of the structure has been bid out, and LCP has provided a quote for demolition, asbestos removal, and construction of the foundation wall to avoid temporary.

**Motion to approve LCP's bid in the amount of \$121,400 (including Option B alternatives 1 & 2) for asbestos removal, demolition, and construction of foundation wall at 247 Main St (L. Pelotte, J. Whitmore)**

**Aye: 4 Abstain: 0**

**Nay: 0 Carried**

- iii. 62-64 North- S. Zubalsky-Peer, T. Patton, B. Woodburn, and A. Duda met with the contractor that placed a bid for the property. After discussion with the contractor, the team did not feel it was a responsible bid and decided not to move forward with awarding the contract. The procurement policy has been met with placing the property out for two separate formal bids. S. Zubalsky-Peer and T. Patton will work to secure bid pricing through direct outreach to local contractors to progress the project. The board had questions regarding the contractor being held to the quote. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated a contract would need to be drafted, reviewed and signed. She reiterated that one of the direct outreach contractors expressed interest in the project but needed time to put together a price.
- iv. 39 Railroad Ave- S. Zubalsky-Peer stated the clean-up for this property was complete and the bids for demolition are due at the beginning of June. Asbestos was found in the shed roof but should have minimal impact on pricing. The survey for the property has been completed and provided to the TCPDC.
- v. 81 Hickories Park Road- S. Zubalsky-Peer stated the demolition of the structure is complete. The board discussed future uses and whether an RFP would be the best route, either targeted or just a generic RFP. H. Murray mentioned a daycare had been previously mentioned as a potential route for targeted outreach and S. Zubalsky-Peer stated the interested party did not feel the property fit their needs. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she will reach out to them again and would touch base with B. Woodburn to discuss other childcare options.

- vi. 115 Chestnut & 94 Spencer- The board discussed two properties own by the Land Bank that are experiencing the dumping of unwanted items. S. Zubalsky-Peer updated the Board that the Chestnut Street property has accumulated trash from a neighboring property, including garbage, a trampoline, and cars. S. Zubalsky-Peer and T. Patton have previously posted No Trespassing signs on the property, but they have been removed by an unknown source. The board discussed ways to prevent this from continuing such as putting up a fence or selling the property. The board felt installation of fencing would be costly, but J. Whitmore wanted pricing. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated that pricing had been secured via quotes last year in an attempt to address this issue but that the Board voted against fencing at the time; she stated she would work with T. Patton to have the quotes updated. S. Zubalsky-Peer explained she and T. Patton had been in contact with OPD and Village code for over a year regarding the Chestnut Street property and were recently contacted by code regarding the Spencer Ave property to have the TCPDC resolve the issue. She explained she and T. Patton had also been in contact multiple times with an officer from OPD. She explained both agencies told them there was nothing else they could do at this time to prevent the issues other than having the cars towed and impounded at owner expense. J. Case and J. Whitmore expressed frustration that there was not more Village of Owego code or police could do regarding the situation and asked S. Zubalsky-Peer to contact the police chief directly. S. Zubalsky-Peer explained that the Spencer Ave property had three derby cars parked on the property. The individual who owns the cars had been in contact with the TCPDC and had come into the ED&P office on multiple occasions and expressed he was not trying to do anything wrong and wanted to be cooperative with the TCPDC. The individual proposed a lease agreement with the Land Bank to store his derby cars on the property as it was a hobby he did with his son. The individual also stated there was tension with surrounding neighbors that had resulted in calls to OPD regarding the calls. The board discussed this request and determined they did not want to pursue a lease arrangement. The board discussed potential future uses for the properties, and if housing was possible. S. Zubalsky-Peer explained the ED&P office had discussed both properties multiple times over the past year and feel that a house may be feasible, with local approvals, on the Spencer Ave property but a fence would still be recommended for any future property owner. Additional discussion was held regarding enforcement challenges related to unauthorized dumping and property misuse. She explained the Chestnut Street property has basically no redevelopment potential due to its topography and location in the floodplain. Board members expressed concerns about the consistency of enforcement actions and the difficulty preventing reoccurring violations. The Board requested S. Zubalsky-Peer ask other Land Banks what they do in such situations and report back next meeting with this information, with outreach to the police chief, and updated fencing quotes.

#### 4. New Business

- a. Recommendation of Christine Shaver for the Board- S. Zubalsky-Peer stated Governance committee met before the board meeting to discuss recommending Christine Shaver as a board member to the legislature for approval.

**Motion to approve recommending Christine Shaver as a new Board member for the Legislature to approve (J. Whitmore, R. Bunce)**

**Aye: 5**

**Abstain: 0**

**Nay: 0 Carried**

- b. Approval of 81 North Avenue Residential Tenants- S. Zubalsky-Peer thanked the tenant selection committee for their timely responses and stated the committee reviewed, scored, and approved applicants for the residential units located at 81 North Ave. T. Patton had compiled the scores and provided the top scoring applicant for each unit the opportunity to pursue a lease. It was noted one selected candidate withdrew, and the committee proceeded with the next qualified applicant. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated the attorney is in the process of preparing the lease agreement, which needs to be completed by June 1. While leases have not been finalized, the selected applicants have been informally notified of their anticipated tenancy status.

**Motion to approve the recommended tenant selections made by the Tenant Selection Committee for the available rental units at 81 North Ave, Owego (L. Pelotte, J. Whitmore)**

**Aye: 5 Abstain: 0**

**Nay: 0 Carried**

- c. Assessment for 81 North Ave- S. Zubalsky-Peer reaffirmed the information provided email to the board from the previous week, indicating the new assessment for 81 North Avenue at a little over \$395,000, which was an increase of \$120,000. She stated that based on the tax rate she and B. Woodburn calculated the annual taxes at an estimated \$25,000. J. Whitmore and R. Bunce expressed concern regarding the significant increase and questioned whether the rental income generated by the units would be sufficient to support the operating expense and tax associated with the property. S. Zubalsky-Peer reminded the board this project was never meant to provide a large profit, but to get the TCPDC experience with retaining a building for rental income and provide sustainable income to support operations if the TCPDC lost LBI operational funds. S. Zubalsky-Peer reminded the Board they had approved, via email due to deadline constraints, the submission of the 485-b application to help offset and ease the financial impact of the increased taxes. The board discussed concerns that assessment appeared high in comparison to the property’s income potential. S. Zubalsky-Peer noted that the tax rate is an estimate and will receive confirmation on the exact numbers. J. Whitmore mentioned the possibility challenging the assessment; however, J. Case raised concerns regarding the complexity and length of the grievance process. J. Whitmore also discussed concerns about the long-term marketability of the property due to the projected tax burden in relation to rental income. J. Whitmore asked S. Zubalsky-Peer to bring up certain properties on the county Real Property system to show comparisons of 81 North with other local rental properties with greater number of units with a comparatively lower tax burden. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she would contact the Assessor’s office to obtain clarification regarding the methodology used to determine the assessment.

**Motion to approve the submission of a 485-b application for the 81 North Ave property (J. Whitmore, R. Bunce)**

**Aye: 5 Abstain: 0**

**Nay: 0 Carried**

- d. HOME Homebuyer Development Application- S. Zubalsky-Peer presented the grant application in the amount of \$500,000 to assist with the construction of two single-family homes on Temple Street in Owego. She reminded the board this application was previously approved but the TCPDC pulled their application due the capacity constraints and needing to choose an

organization with whom to enter an MOU for the required housing counseling since ED&P does not have a HUD certified counselor on staff. It was also pulled because another round of LBI funding had been released that was much more flexible to work with and would come with a lower administration burden if used for the construction of homes. The HOME grant is being revised because the TCPDC did not receive that LBI grant award. H. Murray raised the possibility of utilizing tiny homes, but S. Zubalsky-Peer explained the grant requirements specify construction of single-family homes and that Village of Owego will not approve tiny homes. It was also noted that the homes must be elevated due to floodplain requirements, and that a site work contractor provided quotes related to necessary foundation work. Additional program requirements were reviewed, including that the homes must be sold to income-qualified, first-time homebuyers who complete the required counseling. The board was informed that the income restrictions would be in place for roughly 10 years. The proposed homes would be ranch-style modular homes. It was reported that current quotes for the modular structure is approximately \$174,000 per unit for the house portion only. The board discussed whether the home could realistically be completed with all associated costs for \$250,000 per unit. It was acknowledged that meeting that budget would be very tight. The board also discussed the anticipated market value of the completed homes; however, it was noted that a formal market analysis has not been completed and would need to be conducted as part of the application. Questions were raised regarding project funding and how the remaining project costs would be covered. It was reported that efforts are currently underway to sell several properties to assist. H. Murray asked if current staff capacity would be sufficient to manage the project. S. Zubalsky-Peer felt the staff would be able to administer and oversee the project if awarded and expressed that T. Patton would primarily be responsible for project management. T. Patton also confirmed she felt she had the capacity. The board expressed interest in obtaining market analysis information before final project commitment and reiterated a preference to keep costs below \$250,000 per home if feasible, while acknowledging the final cost may exceed that amount. The board also discussed whether receiving grant approval and later deciding not to proceed with the project, or withdrawing the application, would negatively impact future opportunities. S. Zubalsky-Peer informed the board that it would not.

**Motion to approve application to the HOME Homebuyer Development program in the amount of \$500,000 for the construction of two single-family homes on Temple Street (J. Whitmore, J. Case)**

**Aye: 5 Abstain: 0**

**Nay: 0 Carried**

- e. 48-50 Lake Street- S. Zubalsky-Peer summarized the documents provided to the Board via email for review, including the co-developer agreement between the TCPDC, IDA, and County. She explained this agreement was currently under review by the respective agency attorneys and was not yet formally ready for approval. The Board discussed under the proposed agreement the county would be responsible for grant administration, the IDA would provide financial assistance for the project and the TPDC would serve as the property owners and oversee property related matters such as project management and construction. The board discussed whether to approve the agreement contingent upon the review and approval by counsel or postpone until the review is complete. The Chair expressed the opinion that there may be provisions within the agreement that should be first reviewed by legal counsel prior to board approval. The board discussed recent quotes received for radon testing and Phase 1

environmental assessment for the property. It was noted that completing these evaluations early in the process would allow any necessary mitigation measures to be incorporated into the project plans if needed. A motion to approve the quotes was not needed due to the existing term contract. The board agreed to allow O'Rourke to complete these assessments.

5. Chairman's Remarks- H. Murray stated she would like to know what properties are owned by the PDC. S. Zubalsky-Peer noted the information is public information posted on the website per ABO requirements and that this list is updated any time a project is acquired or dispose. H. Murray requested preparation of a simplified spreadsheet showing which properties need a plan moving forward. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated the only properties currently without a clear plan are those on Chestnut Street, Spencer Ave, and 81 Hickories Park Rd. S. Zubalsky-Peer agreed to prepare a spreadsheet for next meeting.
6. **Adjournment- 5:24PM (J. Whitmore, R. Bunce)**

**Aye: 5 Abstain: 0  
Nay: 0 Carried**