



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 28, 2025 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 at 4:04pm
2. Attendance
 - a. Present: R. Kelsey, M. Baratta, H. Murray, S. Yetter, J. Case, L. Pelotte, J. Whitmore
 - b. Late: M. Sauerbrey
 - c. Invited Guests: S. Zubalsky-Peer, R. Bunce

R. Kelsey and S. Zubalsky-Peer introduced R. Bunce as a prospective new board member invited to see what the TCPDC does; R. Kelsey stated he has known R. Bunce a very long time and would be happy to have him on the Board, stated the Governance Committee would need to make a recommendation

3. Old Business
 - a. Approval of Minutes from April 2025 Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes of the April 9, 2025 Regular Board Meeting as written.

1st S. Yetter
2nd J. Case
In Favor: All
Opposed: 0

- b. Acknowledgement of Financial Reports through April 30, 2025.

R. Kelsey mentioned he had posed a question about how items were recorded, S. Zubalsky-Peer clarified how the accountants record expenses to recognize grant income, not that they are duplicate expenses or multiple checks

Acknowledgement of financial reports through April 30, 2025 as provided.

A PARTNER OF

TEAM TIOGA

1st J. Whitmore
2nd L. Pelotte
In Favor: All

- i. Grant Spreadsheet Update- LBI Phase I Year 3 Funds
- ii. New Grant funds
 - 1. LBI Phase II Amendment
 - 2. LBI Capital Funds

S. Zubalsky-Peer went through the current grant funding spreadsheet explaining remaining funds; have until 8/14/25 to spend operational funds, have a new amendment to the LBI Phase II for acquisition, and the new LBI2 Capital funds have been made available for spenddown, just received the signed grant agreement and approval from the Environmental Assessment Unit at HCR; R. Kelsey requested to have "Capital Funds" notated for the new LBI2 money; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she has been working with the accountant to set up new tracking spreadsheets to breakdown expenditures based on how reporting is now being completed for HCR

c. Project Updates

i. 81 North

S. Zubalsky-Peer went over to 81 North today and got some photos inside; NYSEG has escalated the project to their Municipal Relations Coordinator Erik V.; stated he is also working with Mayor Baratta regarding the fire station since NYSEG needs to coordinate the work; R. Kelsey asked M. Sauerbrey if there would be value in contacting the public service commission if the NYSEG work does not proceed due to the long delay; Board agreed to give them another week to respond; S. Zubalsky-Peer shared the Sentry Alarms monitoring system agreement which will have continuous monitoring and contact directly to the fire station if the alarm goes off- interconnected alarm with a reset panel in the common area hallway; S. Zubalsky-Peer shared that OHPC have issues with the front windows despite the fact that there has been communication with them since February 2025 including the sharing of all SHPO correspondence, the specification sheet for the new replacement windows, and explanation that the stained glass windows that were existing (many were missing behind the plywood) crumbled as soon as the contractor touched them; S. Zubalsky-Peer also sent an email the week the windows were going to be installed and spoke to the OHPC chair on the phone; one OHPC Board Member brought up that TCPDC is in violation of the COA which states the windows were to be restored; S. Zubalsky-Peer met with Owego Code Enforcement who requested copies of the emails; S. Zubalsky-Peer will attend the next OHPC board meeting in person to get a revised COA; also invited OHPC to come see the stained glass pieces from the original windows; J. Whitmore and H. Murray brought up the fact that original stained glass also contained lead; M. Sauerbrey asked who the board member was that had an issue with the windows, S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she was told it was J. Smith; R. Kelsey asked M. Baratta if the Village of Owego Board would have any say in the matter; M. Baratta stated OHPC would need to officially deny the project and then TCPDC could appeal to the Village Board if needed; S. Zubalsky-Peer did not know or think this would be an issue if the situation is explained and felt confident the situation could be resolved and the project could move forward; mentioned that people have stopped on the street multiple times to mention how beautiful the windows are

ii. 247 Main Street

S. Zubalsky-Peer noted that SHPO approved the demolition of all additions of 247 Main Street with retention of the original, front historic part of the house; explained it is a very large house; performed a walk through with two engineers and the construction manager; S. Zubalsky-Peer has reached out to the Historic Society and the County Historian in an effort to track down photos of the original home; earliest photos found were from 2002; the County Historian did find that Robert of Roberts Rules of Order lived in the home before moving to a house on Front Street and at the time he was registered Republican; waiting on proposals from engineers; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she wanted everyone to be prepared for a hefty engineering fee because it is a big

project that involves removing the entire back portion of the house and reconstructing the wall and egress; explained the design will have to go through OHPC; there is some debate over the vinyl siding over the original cladding; one of the engineers sat on the Binghamton Historic Commission for a number of years and feels confident he can work with TCPDC and OHPC to make the project historic but also feasible within budget; in conversation with the chair of OHPC, who lives right near 247 Main Street, she had suggested the cladding is quite rotten underneath due to past flooding; J. Whitmore asked for clarification on what the scope of the project is because he missed last meeting and wanted to know if we were putting a design together for someone else to build it out; S. Zubalsky-Peer clarified the design work is being performed for the TCPDC to put grant funds into the property through a bid process to return the property back to the tax rolls and put it into productive use; J. Case asked where on Main Street it is located and the Board clarified for her and she suggested she drive past it ; R. Kelsey asked if it had been divided into apartments into the past and S. Zubalsky-Peer explained the engineers thought at one point it may have been a boarding house based on the interior structure but they had no confirmation which is why they were reaching out for historic resources; R. Kelsey asked for an estimated total rehabilitation cost; S. Zubalsky-Peer said she didn't want to share a cost until the design work and engineer estimates are back; M. Sauerbrey and S. Zubalsky-Peer both said to expect it to be a high number; J. Whitmore asked the square footage without the additions and S. Zubalsky-Peer said she would do the calculations and send it via email to the Board; H. Murray reminded everyone they didn't have a choice on this property because SHPO wouldn't let the Board demolish the whole structure and this is how the Board ends up in these situations; J. Case asked if this is because it is a historic structure; R. Kelsey confirmed; H. Murray emphasized that there is an allowed exemption not to raise the structure but found it ironic the state wants the TCPDC to fix it and not demolish it; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she has spoken to code about floodproofing, there is a historic exemption, but the utilities will be raised and they can look into the possibility of flood vents; H. Murray said the TCPDC should make it as resilient as they can within their constraints

iii. 62-64 North Ave

S. Zubalsky-Peer reminded the Board this is the NYMS project the TCPDC is administering for Alex Duda and Christopher Liu; the RFPs for Environmental Testing were put out and the deadline was extended to accommodate site visits; two engineers attended the site visit and walked through; S. Zubalsky-Peer also explained she completed two revised submissions to SHPO for owner changes to the work scope and was awaiting approval; H. Murray confirmed that TCPDC was just the administrator of the grant and the property was privately owned and financed; she wanted to know if the grant funds covered a specific scope of work; S. Zubalsky-Peer clarified it was to be used for whatever was originally submitted in their application and the owners had to submit their own private financing as part of the application

iv. 103 Liberty Street

S. Zubalsky-Peer met M. Daly on site; the students have not been working on the project throughout the school year, they were working at on-campus projects; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she discussed a deadline of the end of the year to M. Daly; the plan is to bring the students back over for the summer and pay them to complete work; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated they were awaiting a third party electrical inspection and permit renewal; S. Zubalsky-Peer explained she has coordinated with code and a third party inspector to get everything in order for them to proceed with work; R. Kelsey provided context to R. Bunce that this project has been quite lengthy over the period of 3 years; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated she also offered if at any point they feel they can't finish the work, she would be willing to hire a contractor through the TCPDC to complete it; M. Sauerbrey agreed that at some point the work needed to get done

v. Homebuyer Development Grant Application

S Zubalsky-Peer reminded the Board this application is for new construction of single-family homes on Temple/Liberty Streets; stated there is not much to update on this as it's been pushed to the back burner due to the open nature of the application and the on-going projects underway that require more immediate attention; She did reach out to the modular company to get updated pricing; reminded H. Murray she asked to meet to discuss the project and they should set a date to discuss

4. New Business

Motion to enter executive session to discuss negotiations

1st M. Sauerbrey

2nd M. Baratta

In Favor: All

Opposed: 0

- a. 121 Providence, Waverly- Engineering Negotiation
- b. 81 Hickory Road, Owego- Negotiation
- c. 39 Railroad Ave- Negotiation
- d. Company Cam Software

S Zubalsky-Peer explained she and B. Woodburn attended a demo of this software which can be utilized for project management and grant management to maintain project documents all in one place; explained that when you go out on site, you log in, the project is geotagged and you set up an entire portfolio to house all project pictures, all grant documentation, anything you need contractor signatures on who can sign digitally; she explained it is a cloud based software that can be accessed in the field on a phone app or tablet; the intent is to have the TCPDC utilize the software and if it is well received to expand its use to ED&P as an all inclusive grant management software; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated it would need to be cleared by county IT; the pricing is currently \$2,200 a year and the TCPDC has enough operational funds to cover the cost because there was money put into the operational budget to pay back taxes on foreclosure properties, but no properties were taken during the foreclosure process as a result of the Supreme Court case; in the future, the cost could be split between TCPDC and ED&P; the Board concurred it was a very reasonable cost and would be worth it; M. Sauerbrey emphasized conferring with County IT; H. Murray asked what is the problem we are trying to solve by utilizing this software, what's the inadequacy of the current process of doing things; S. Zubalsky-Peer explained that currently files are stored partially digitally in separate folders on the County network, on different drives, and partially in physical folders; explained the County IT system is a bit cumbersome when multiple people are working on a project and that when she is out on site, very often she has to tell everyone she needs to wait until she's back in the office to log in and access documents to provide answers to questions that come up; S. Zubalsky-Peer summed up that the goal is to streamline processes by having everything for a project in one place and providing access out on site; R. Kelsey reiterated it's for efficiency; M. Sauerbrey stated the county system is all government based, all dollars and cents and kept relatively simple, primarily based in MUNIS; S. Yetter stated if County IT puts its blessing on it and it will integrate without security issues he would fully support it; L. Pelotte stated she thought it was a great idea to have it all in once place and asked if S. Zubalsky-Peer would need a tablet or device to utilize the software; S. Zubalsky-Peer said yes but at this time an actual device had not been identified since it was not formally approved; J. Whitmore asked if the software had any other capabilities; S. Zubalsky-Peer stated they can collaborate with the construction manager to upload a schedule of values and track spending and pricing per project

Motion to approve purchase of Company Cam software contingent on software and device approval by Tioga County IT

1st M Baratta

2nd L. Pelotte

In Favor: All

Opposed: 0

5. Chairman's Remarks

R. Kelsey asked S. Zubalsky-Peer to let R. Bunce know project areas and costs throughout the county; S. Zubalsky-Peer brought up the annual report to show investment throughout Tioga County; R. Kelsey stated the reason R. Bunce had been asked to join the Board was to get representation from other areas of the County; R. Bunce asked if the TCPDC does demolition and sells the vacant lots; R. Kelsey stated yes but the TCPDC did not typically make any money from the sales as they typically were for \$1; H. Murray stated that strategy is not their preference; R. Kelsey explained very often the lots of demolished homes are too tiny to rebuild on due to updated setback requirements; S. Zubalsky-Peer explained data shows there is not much new construction by private developers in Tioga County; R. Bunce asked where the funds come from to do this work and if it was an application each year; S. Zubalsky-Peer explained the primary funding source is Land Bank Initiative Funds through New York State Homes and Community Renewal and the TCPDC goes through an application process when HCR releases RFAs, typically an open round to include all expected projects within a two-year timeframe; explained the eligibility of projects and uses is changing each round of funding and the TCPDC evaluates each year what they are allowed to do, what projects are in the pipeline, and determine what to include in each application; explained the difficulty with the Supreme Court case that impacted how Land Banks acquire properties through county foreclosure processes and currently the TCPDC is currently focusing on private acquisitions; R. Kelsey stated the hope is at some point to create a sustainable operational revenue source through a portfolio big enough to sustain itself; R. Bunce asked if there is in fact revenue from the projects; S. Zubalsky-Peer explained up until this point the TCPDC primarily worked through sale to private developers which typically included very low sale costs and they were currently undertaking their first projects for rehabilitation and sale themselves for unrestricted income; H. Murray stated the intent is to retain 81 North Avenue and rent it out as a revenue for operations

6. Adjournment at 5:34 pm