

## Donna Conkling

---

**From:** Stephen Marchiony <smarchiony@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 29, 2017 11:13 AM  
**To:** Mayor; Clerk's Department; Jane Veron; Marc Samwick; Matthew Callaghan; Deborah Pekarek; Bill Stern; Carl Finger  
**Cc:** Editor@ScarsdaleNews.com  
**Subject:** Please reverse the reval!

My wife and I have been residents for 33 years, raised two sons thru the Scarsdale schools, and are now empty nesters. We have loved our time in Scarsdale and would like to remain for as long as possible.

If the Village Board is unhappy with the performance of Mr. Ryan and is willing to withhold the final \$40,000 from his bill AND if there have been some behind the scenes meetings concerning the conduct of both Ms. Albanese and Mr. Ryan leading up to the June 1 postings, then why is the Village Board so intimidated by the prospect of invalidating the 2016 reval?? Obviously you are concerned enough to take these actions. And, if your concerns are justified, then what is your hesitation to revoke the reval?

It is not just the voices you have heard consistently since the June 1 posting that are seeking the reversal of this reval. There are many of us on smaller properties who have joined this Article 78 proceeding because we feel that this is the only way to get your attention that we are serious.

After the 2014 reval was done, in which every step was publicized and public comment was requested, many of us felt vindicated because it turned out that, for over 40 years, the small landowners were subsidizing the larger ones. Although there were grievances, the entire process was open, explained in detail by Tyler, and no one could say that they were the victim of a reval that was done by the man behind the curtain!

The VB has a fiduciary duty to protect its property owners against unlawful practices. If Mr. Ryan's procedures were not up to the contract which he and the VB agreed to, then the results of his labors should be invalidated.

If parts of the reval were not done as contracted, then the village should not accept the results. There are many people with advanced degrees in math and finance who have spoken to the merits of the Ryan reval and pointed out the deficiencies. These folks have voluntarily spent many hours poring over data and models and yet the Board seems to brush them aside. If the Board indeed has the two concerns listed above, wouldn't it be prudent to enlist the aid of these folks to confirm those concerns?

We urge the Board to re-consider their position and to invalidate the 2016 reval. At the very least, please meet with Mr. Bernstein, our Article 78 attorney, to resolve the differences. It would simply add injury to insult if the Board were to spend more tax money defending itself in court to support their position against invalidation.

Sincerely,

Stephen and Mary-Alice Marchiony

Walworth Ave.