DRAFT

Tioga County Property Development Corporation
Regular Board of Directors
Wednesday, June 24th, 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: 4:01 PM
2. Attendance
   a. Roll Call: H. Murray, J. Case, J. Whitmore, R. Bunce, C. Shaver
   b. Excused: L. Pelotte,
   c. Absent: M. Baratta
   d. Invited Guests: S. Zubalsky-Peer, T. Patton, L. Williams, M. Freeze
3. Old Business
   a. Approval of Minutes from Regular Board Meeting May 27th, 2026

Motion to approve Regular Board Meeting Minutes for May 22, 2026, as written (J. Whitmore, J. Case)

Aye: 5 Abstain: 0
Nay: 0 Carried

   b. Acceptance of Financial Reports through April 2026

Motion to approve Financial Statements for April 2026, as written (R. Bunce, J. Whitmore)

Aye: 5 Abstain: 0
Nay: 0 Carried

   c. Project Updates
      i. 81 North Ave- Due to applicants that were selected for tenancy backing out, the tenant review committee chose another candidate for the second-floor unit. The new tenant was informed of selection and is scheduled to move into the unit July 1, 2026. The first-floor tenant has brought awareness of a water leak in the back entrance to the building when it rains. Maintenance was sent to the location and performed flashing work and recommended a roof on top of the entrance to prevent this issue. Currently waiting for rain to see if the flashing work will suffice or placing a roof is needed. All maintenance requests are being tracked in the tenant cloud software, and it is working very well. The washing machine in the third-floor unit has been replaced due to being under warranty.

DRAFT

The property is currently enrolled in the 485b program, but an estimated tax amount for the year was not provided at this time. The Board confirmed that the numbers were not given at the time, S. Zubalsky-Peer is waiting for those numbers to share with the Board. The numbers will be different than expected due to being enrolled in the 485b program. The board then questioned what the 485b program was, and it was explained as a program to help ease them into paying the taxes over a 10-year period due to a higher tax based on the new assessment from all the updates that were put into the building.

ii. 121 Providence- This location is finished and the next steps are signing a realtor to sell the house. S. Zubalsky-Peer and T. Patton met with two realtors and are recommending one for the property. References were called for both realtors and Suzi Powers is more familiar with the Waverly area. The commission is at 6% and the boards agreed to have S. Powers make a recommendation on a listing price and sell the property. Professional pictures of the property are set to take place once a certificate of occupancy is awarded. The board plans on touring the location as well.

iii. 247 Main- A meeting between the Land Bank staff, L2 Architects, LCP group and Construction Management Associates was held to discuss the design details for the property regarding the demolition process. The demolition group, LCP, will be constructing a foundation wall following the demolition of the back portion of the building. This is a cost-saving decision that will maintain smooth workflow and keep the project on schedule. Another meeting was held the morning of the Board meeting to finalize the foundation wall plans. All parties involved are all set to begin the process of demolition and construction of a foundation wall. L2 will be sending S. Zubalsky-Peer the new design documents for the bid portion, taking out the construction of the wall due to LCP constructing this wall. Bid pricing for LCP could change due to the interior. The board questioned how close the bidding was for the project, and it was confirmed the LCP group was the only bidder. Bids for construction will be sent out later in the week. Per last meeting's conversation, a comparison cost of wood and vinyl was presented to the board. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she reached out to the OHPC regarding the public hearing that was held regarding the materials that can be used. Once the bids for construction come out, S. Zubalsky-Peer will follow up. The board reconfirmed LCP being the only bidders for demolition and the renovation bids have not been put out yet. They discussed the material issues presented at the last meeting. H. Murray asked if OHPC was having a meeting regarding the feasibility of using vinyl for the construction and would let the Land Bank know if they could use that instead of composite. S. Zubalsky-Peer confirmed that was the plan and there may be a certificate of appropriateness that needs to be updated to allow the vinyl to be used in place of the composite. H. Murray questioned whether there was a price threshold, or if it was subjective. S. Zubalsky- Peer confirmed it was subjective to the OPHC as they deemed necessary. H. Murray question on the bids for renovations and whether they will wait to send out bids until the OPHC reaches out with the answer to which material needs to be used. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated they will send the bids out first so they can have the actual numbers to show OPHC. It was confirmed that the new bids will be due back by the next board meeting for the renovation portion.

iv. 62-64 North- S. Zubalsky-Peer has been doing direct outreach to two contractors for the property. One has stopped responding and assumes that one is uninterested in going further in the process. The other contractor had met with S. Zubalsky-Peer to go over the plans. The contractor has reached out with questions that were passed along to the owner. They would like to do a site visit before submitting a bid price. Coordination will take place to ensure this happens. It is assumed he will be the only bidder for this

DRAFT

project and if the bid is reasonable, the project will move forward in developing the residential units. H. Murray questioned the owners' other properties and asked if they were up to code. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated those are scheduled to be resolved July 13. It was noted that before work on this property can begin, the other properties need to be up to code. J. Whitmore questioned the issues that the first floor had and asked if it was resolved. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated that was fixed.

v. 39 Railroad Ave- One bid was received for the demolition of the property for $26,000. There were small amounts of asbestos found in the shed and roof of the property. S. Zubalsky-Peer believes this is a good price for demolition. J. Whitmore asked if the town of Berkshire was going to be helping pay some of the costs. H. Murray stated they were to provide in-kind labor. S. Zubalsky-Peer explained due to liability and insurance purposes; it was easier to hire someone to do the demolition than allow someone on the property for the in-kind services. The board concurred this was understood.

Motion to award the demolition bid for 39 Railroad Ave to LCP for $26,000. (J. Whitmore, R. Bunce)

Aye: 5 Abstain: 0
Nay: 0 Carried

vi. 81 Hickories Park Road- S. Zubalsky-Peer states she will get a draft of a generic RFP to see if anyone is interested in the property for the next meeting. The childcare company that expressed interest is no longer interested. The building is demolished and cleaned up. H. Murray asked how they advertise the RFPs. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated they send them to newspapers, online platforms and by reaching out to developers directly. The board brought up the potential of this property and its flexibility due to its zoning.

vii. 115 Chestnut & 94 Spencer- S. Zubalsky-Peer reached out to surrounding Land Banks and they could not offer suggestions other than fencing the property after paying to get the area cleaned. T. Patton reached out to multiple fencing companies for quotes. S. Zubalsky-Peer reached out to the Owego Police Chief but has not gotten a response yet. Mic from Code Enforcement reached out regarding the "no trespassing" signs being taken down at Chestnut Street. He stated the people should be arrested for trespassing. S. Zubalsky-Peer believes the property should be cleaned up and then fencing be installed. The condition of the property is going to get worse and currently there is no viable use for the property. Neighbors are reaching out regarding rats being found on the property from all the garbage. H. Murray started driving by the property, and it is a hole in the ground that cannot be redeveloped. The suggestion of storm water or urban forest was discussed. Soil and Water was contacted, and it was found that there is a grant to urban tree areas and has some trees that need to be planted. It was agreed that if the urban forest came to fruition, there is still a need for fencing to ensure the trees survive. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated Cornell has a master gardener program that is currently looking for land to do this type of thing. The idea of donation the land to become financially and liability free. The board liked the idea of planting trees, but ultimately believes the property needs to be cleaned up and fenced in to prevent further liability issues from arising.

The Spencer Ave property currently has derby cars placed on the property. The owner of the car received a letter stating the date on which the cars needed to be removed before they were towed. H. Murray brought up a voicemail that was received regarding the unregulated use of this property and the demo cars being used. S. Zubalsky-Peer suggested for Chestnut St having the police deliver letters to neighbors to have their stuff removed by a certain date or it will be thrown in the trash. H. Murray questioned if

DRAFT

the cleaning up will be a bid. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated it will be a bid. The board questioned if the quotes for the fencing were for the whole property or just parts of it. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated the Chestnut property is for the whole property and the Spencer property has a retaining wall that wouldn't require fencing. The board asked about funding the fence and due to it not being built into the project budget, S. Zubalsky-Peer needed to get confirmation to use under the capital funds, because it is not eligible under LBI funding due to ground disturbance and environmental review needed. ARPA funds are currently unrestricted and would be the easiest to use for this project. The board then discussed the quotes received from Budget Fence and Whitmore Fence. Whitmore gave a full proposal, and Budget said the pricing is subject to change due to the terrain but said $9,500-$10,000. The size of the fence was discussed, and it was observed that the 5 foot is the measurements for both quotes. The Spencer property not being completely fenced was discussed. The board asked if that would be sufficient in keeping people/objects off the property. S. Zubalsky-Peer suggested reaching out to get quotes for the whole lot but stated not doing the front in case redevelopment happens. The board discussed the means in which the fence will be placed and possibly putting a temporary fence. It was concluded that the temporary fence wouldn't keep the lot cleaned out. The board noted the fences would be placed 3 feet underground, but they were unsure if it would be concrete. The board asked if underground surveys were completed and S. Zubalsky-Peer is going to follow up with that. The board discussed if the fencing needed to be permanent. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated doing a permanent fence because the tree forest may not happen. It was also brought up that the trees would need support until they were stable enough and not able to be mowed down. H. Murray suggested fencing without footers and expressed concern with only installing fencing on one side of the Spencer property. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated after the previous years' conversation on fencing these properties, the board stated the cost was too high and cost saving tactics were implemented for this year. S. Zubalsky-Peer will reach out to get the pricing for the full perimeter. J. Whitmore agreed that the cost is going to be high, but the liability concerns would be eliminated. The board agreed that the fence was needed. The board also agreed that having three sides on the Spencer property due to the retaining wall would be fine. T. Patton will reach out to have a gate added to the fencing quote as well. The concern about potential redevelopment of the Spencer property was brought up. S. Zubalsky-Peer told the board they would need to get variances. The question of trying to redevelop instead of turning the lot into a tree forest. The board stated the job of the Land bank is to create housing, so if it is possible they would like to build housing. H. Murray expressed concern with selling the property due to the neighborhood. The board brought up grants to help create housing specifically for the property. The board agreed on making a motion to approve the fence installations with a gate being added at Chestnut. They wanted to get the quotes for adding 2 more sides to the Spencer property before approving installation. S. Zubalsky-Peer will follow up via email when those quotes are received. B. Woodburn said that getting the property cleaned up was more important at this time and suggested coming up with a solution now and confirming it at the next meeting. The board agreed on an email vote for the cleanup quotes.

Motion to approve contract with Whitmore fencing to install fencing at 115-117 Chestnut Street and 94-98 Spencer Avenue, contingent upon satisfactory updated pricing based on site visit and to include whole property perimeter, 6' fence height, gates, and clarification on whether fence posts will have concrete footers. (J. Whitmore, J. Case)

DRAFT

Aye: 5 Abstain: 0
Nay: 0 Carried

48-50 Lake Street-The Land Bank staff met with L2 and Construction Management Associates on location to discuss the property. LaBella has given a price for a conditions report. Nick from L2 is drafting a proposal for the roof replacement and is scheduled to meet on location with a mason to receive their input on the work that must be done in part with the roof work including the parapet replacement and façade inspection. H. Murray questioned reaching out to other masons to get their opinions as well. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated L2 is drafting a proposal on the drawings and specifications, so they can make comparisons. Construction Management Associates provided a rough cos estimate for the first-floor space. S. Zubalsky-Peer informed the board that asbestos testing will need to take place on the roof, and it is confirmed there is asbestos in the pipes. S. Zubalsky-Peer believes there will be asbestos in the roof membrane. A quote for just the roof is being drafted by Steve Tiffany, once that is received it will be passed along to the board members. H. Murray question if encapsulating was an option but S. Zubalsky-Peer explained due to the deterioration it must be replaced. A quote for survey and elevation certificate has been obtained by Willian and Edsell. T. Patton has reached out to NYSEG regarding the roof work that will be taking place. S. Zubalsky-Peer explained to the board that the ESD wants the money to go through, and it will be very close this year, although there is no official deadline. B. Woodburn told the board the team is working to get the information needed for the incentive proposal, and once this is obtained it will be shared with the board members. Project progress is currently dependent on receiving the finalized incentive proposal and no additional work can move forward. The proposal is not expected until approximately October, which would most likely push major construction into the next construction season. It was noted that the head of Empire State Development regional office is under pressure to have the funding spent, which is contributing to urgency surrounding the proposal. Depending on the inspection findings, the roof replacement is feasible to complete this year. The roof is not expected to be a significant issue, and masonry work is anticipated to be more of a challenge due to the limited availability of masons, many of whom are already booked out.

Motion to approve William & Edsall in the amount of $2,500 for a survey and elevation certificate. (J. Whitmore, C. Shaver)

Aye: 5 Abstain: 0
Nay: 0 Carried

4. New Business
    a. VRP- Tioga County Land Bank was awarded the Vacant Rental Improvement Program. S. Zubalsky-Peer and T. Patton have been attending the HCR required training sessions for this program. The public facing documents are being drafted and once complete they will be sent to the board to review and approve. H. Murray wanted clarification on the amount awarded and if those funds could be used for 48-50 Lake St property. S. Zubalsky-Peer said it was possible to use the funding for the property but is dependent on multiple things such as timeline for residential unit completion. The award was in total $750,000.
    b. NYLBA Director's Symposium-S. Zubalsky-Peer attended the NYLBA Director's Symposium on June 9th. During the symposium, attendees collaborated on two primary initiatives. The first is the development of a catalog of strategies, case studies, and examples of property pipeline solutions following the Hennepin Case. The second is the creation of an interim report between editions of the "State of Land Banking" report that will focus on highlighting the impact and

DRAFT

successes of land banks. The report will include one-page summaries for each Land Bank to use during advocacy meetings. J. Whitmore questioned the funding, discernment date and amount awarded. S. Zubalsky- Peer stated there has been no notification on this information. The concern about the increasing number of Land Banks forming decreasing each of their funding was brought up.

5. Chairman's Remarks H. Murray questioned if a second round of women's classes were going to be held. S. Zubalsky-Peer stated they are hoping to schedule one for the fall and all the individuals on the waitlist have been informed. H. Murray also questioned the OACSD and whether it will be completed by the end of summer. S. Zubalsky-Peer states that it is the plan as of right now. The idea for the house once completed is to sell it, splitting the money with the school district and then using the portion acquired for the Land Bank into other projects. The question was brought up regarding doing this type of project on the Spencer Ave property. S. Zubalsky-Peer believes it could be an option. H. Murray also asks if a Director's Evaluation is currently due. B. Woodburn confirmed that it is coming due. The next step would be to have the Chair of the governance committee send out the evaluation form to the board members to complete. C. Shaver asked where to find the by-laws and if there is any paperwork she will need to complete as a new board member. S. Zubalsky- Peer informed C. Shaver that the by-laws are on the PDC website and there are paperwork and ABO training that needs to be completed.
6. Adjournment 5:02 PM