

**From:** sherry berkowitz <[sherryberkowitz@gmail.com](mailto:sherryberkowitz@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 7, 2016 11:50 AM

**To:** Mayor

**Cc:** [marc.samwick@verizon.net](mailto:marc.samwick@verizon.net); [debpekarekbot@gmail.com](mailto:debpekarekbot@gmail.com); [jveron.villagetrustee@gmail.com](mailto:jveron.villagetrustee@gmail.com); [MJC49C@gmail.com](mailto:MJC49C@gmail.com); Robert Cole; Steve Pappalardo; Bill Stern; Wayne Esannason

**Subject:** 2016 Ryan Reval Comparable Sales Data Question

Dear Mr. Mayor,

Below is an excerpt of a letter I sent you on August 10th questioning the comparable sales data used in the Ryan reval. I questioned Nanette about this in the beginning of June, and wrote down this question on an index card during the 8/17 Ryan meeting hoping to finally get an answer from John Ryan.

On June 2nd I read Nanette Albanese's 8/20/15 press release with the "[Important Things to Know about the 2016](#)

Reassessment". <http://scarsdale.com/Portals/0/Assessor/2016%20PRESS%20RELEASE.PDF>

The third bullet point reads "The sales used to value all properties for the June 1, 2016 tentative assessment roll will include valid transactions that transpired over the 2 year period. [July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015.](#)", however, Ryan's final report states they used comparable sales data from [7/1/14-9/25/15](#).

Why did Ryan use a different sales base then originally noted in the Village press release? I'm sure you would agree there's a big difference between using sales data for a 15 month period vs a 24 month period, not to mention the fact that Ryan used only a "subset" of the 15 month period.

As of today, I have still not received a clear answer to this question from anyone.

Sincerely,  
Sherry Berkowitz