



Town of Troy Board of Abatement

Hearing on May 7, 2026

Minutes

May 15, 2026

Board of Abatement members present in person: Robert Langlands (Acting Chair), Helene Croteau, Sam Douglass, Terri Medley (Town Treasurer and Clerk), Anne Quirion, and Holly Wyllie.

Other attendees present in person: Jessica Murszewski (applicant) and Matthew Krajieski (contracted Town of Troy Assessor, New England Municipal Consultants, Ltd.).

I. **Open the hearing** – Robert opened the Board of Abatement meeting at 5:06 PM and asked for nominations for a temporary chair as the previously elected Chair was unable to attend the hearing.

MOTION by Terri to elect Robert as the Acting Chair, Board of Abatement. **MOTION PASSED.**

Robert continued by reviewing the order of the meeting. He would first open the Hearing, ask the applicant and witness to take an oath, determine if there were any conflicts of interest or *ex parte* communication with / by Board members and that if conflicts of interest existed Board members would need to acknowledge that they existed and decide whether they needed to recuse themselves or not, after which an Inspection Committee would be appointed to view and verify the condition of the property (specifically identified as the attic by Ms. Murszewski and confirmed by Robert) immediately following the Hearing. Ms. Murszewski would then identify the statutory abatement category that the abatement is being made under, to then present her evidence followed by the assessor presenting his evidence. Members of the Board would then ask questions after which the Hearing would be closed and the Board would then enter deliberative session [i.e., site visit by Inspection Committee].

Robert formally opened the Hearing for Jessica Mazerski, 5504 Loop Road, Troy, with SPAN number 654-207-10938.

II. **Witness oath** – Robert asked the two witnesses (Jessica Murszewski and Matthew Krajieski) to take the oath “Under the pains and penalties of perjury, do you solemnly swear that the evidence you give in the cause under consideration shall be the whole truth and nothing but the truth?” Both witnesses responded in the affirmative.

III. Conflict of interest and / or *ex parte* communications – Robert asked Board members to disclose any conflict of interest or *ex parte* communication that has taken place. Specifically, any communication with Ms. Murszewski, with Board members, or any parties or parties that are interested in the outcome of the Hearing. He acknowledged that some members of the Board had discussed details of organizing and coordinating the Hearing. He then asked each Board member whether they had a conflict of interest and / or *ex parte* communication to report. All Board members denied having a conflict of interest and / or *ex parte* communication related to the Hearing [see Attachment 1, 2, and 3 for non-recusal memo for record of Board members specifically named in Case No. 25-CV-05644)].

IV. Questions from applicant – Ms. Murszewski indicated that she had no questions related to the Hearing process when asked by Robert.

V. Appointment of Inspection Committee – Robert explained that the Board needed to appoint an Inspection Committee. That the Inspection Committee needed to be at least three members of the Board to look at the property immediately after the Hearing.

Helene asked for confirmation that the Inspection Committee would view the property immediately after the Hearing and asked if the Board was to decide on the abatement request after the Inspection Committee completed its property inspection (i.e., would Board members not on the Inspection Committee need to wait for their return to continue with deliberation). Robert responded that yes, the Inspection Committee would view the property directly after the Hearing and recess the Hearing to a date and time certain [no, the Board did not need to reconvene after the inspection]. Anne, Terri, and Holly volunteered and were appointed to the Inspection Committee.

VI. Statutory Abatement Category – Robert then asked Ms. Murszewski if she had reviewed the abatement categories. Ms. Murszewski indicated that the letter received only advised her when to make the property available for inspection (she had not seen / reviewed the abatement categories). Robert clarified that her evidence should support one of the abatement categories. Ms. Murszewski further indicated that she had filed with the court for the 2024 and 2025 abatement per 24 V.S.A. § 1535 as affirmed from the court's ruling. She identified the abatement category as being either "taxes or charges in which there is clear or obvious error (24 V.S.A. § 1535(a)(4)) and / or "taxes or charges in which there is a mistake of the listers" (24 V.S.A. § 1535(a)(4)). Her rationale being "taxes or charges in which there is a clear and obvious error" – the top floor is an attic – and "taxes or charges in which there is a mistake of the listers" – the PRC (property record card) lists the top floor as a finished area which brings her total area to over 2400 ft² when her finished area is 1600 ft².

VII. Evidence – Robert indicated that now was Ms. Murszewski's opportunity to express why she is applying for an abatement and the justification in doing so. Ms. Murszewski

responded that she had provided documentation previously on November 21, 2025, to have an Abatement Hearing, in which there were pictures showing that the top floor is unheated, unfloored, and is not finished. That the pictures were submitted into evidence of the court and that the Board of Abatement had been previously provided with the documentation. Specifically asking whether there were questions relating to why the issue (i.e, the unfinished attic) would not be a valid issue to raise. Robert replied that there were no questions as this was her opportunity to give her testimony as to why she requested an Abatement Hearing and to provide the Board with what she is asking for in terms of an abatement.

Ms. Murszewski then read a prepared statement: “For the record, my name is Jessica Murszewski. I'm the owner of 5504 Loop Road. I'm here because the Superior Court has already remanded this matter to the Board. This is not a new issue. This is a longstanding error that should have been resolved months ago using the town's own records. Before I proceed, the record must reflect a significant procedural failure. This hearing, and inspection was scheduled with ill regard for my ability. I was emailed and sent a letter telling me that I'm expected to make my property available today for entry. Just so everyone is aware, I work 12-hour shifts from 8 to 8, by being here now, I am required to forfeit my paid wages, which and, also, potentially jeopardize my job. I have incurred that financial loss because I've committed to resolving this, based on the facts. I expect that moving forward, this board will demonstrate a reciprocal commitment to professional coordination and fundamental fairness mountain substance of the issue at hand. This case is not about valuation, it's not about opinion, it's about factual classification error. The property record card lists 864 square feet of attic space as finished living area. That is a false statement. As the inspection will show, which I'm more than happy to let you in, is not finished, is not heated, and fails every standard of habitable space. This is straightforward data entry error. I submitted a formal request to fix this on November 21, 2025. That request was unheeded. Because of that inaction, I was forced to seek release in superior court and to obtain the hearing that should have occurred 6 months ago. Today's inspection will confirm that the town's record should have already reflected the attic is unfinished. Once that is verified, there is no factual or legal basis to continue classifying it as living area. Accordingly, I am requesting immediate correction of the property record to reflect the attic’s unfinished living space and abatement of the resulting overassessment for the past years 2024 and 2025. Before the inspection proceeds, I want the scope of access clearly stated for the record. The inspection access granted today is limited solely to the attic space that is subject to this abatement request, and the direct access necessary to reach that space. The issue before the board concerns whether the 864 square fee currently classified on the property record card is finished living space is, in fact, unfinished living space. No other portion of the residence is relative to that determination. Accordingly, access is limited to the entry, hallway, staircase, and attic area. Now, the unfinished areas of the home are part of this inspection, and the inspection is limited to observation and documentation of the attic, physical condition, and characteristics. I'm fully cooperating with the inspection and will provide clear access to the board so they may make the determination to the physical facts observed today.”

Robert asked if he could receive a copy but was told that the statement was only for her to read and that there is a recording. He then asked if she had an amount that she is asking the Board of Abatement to abate? Ms. Murszewski replied that it is the differential between the rates, i.e., between the current rate and the rate without the 864 ft² area. That she is requesting to remove the added tax for the 864 ft² from the calculation for 2024 and 2025 because the attic was unfinished in 2024 and 2025. The current tax lists 1600 ft² (first floor) plus 864 ft² for the attic totaling 2464 ft² overall. The differential would equal to approximately 30% - 40%. Robert clarified approximately 30% - 40% of finished space [of the total 2,464 ft²].

Robert asked Ms. Murszewski if there was any other evidence that she wanted to present. She indicated that she did not and asked if there were questions or concerns about anything she said as being true or false? Robert replied that the Board would be in a position to ask questions after hearing from Matt as to his method used to determine the evaluation of the property.

Matt stated that he conducted a townwide reappraisal in 2024. For townwide reappraisals the State requires him to equalize property values to better match today's market value for all properties. Ms. Murszewski's situation is unique in that she purchased the property during the analysis time frame for \$295,000.00 whereas the current assessment is \$303,300.00. That sale was specifically analyzed. He indicated that a key aspect of the evaluation was that neither the previous owner or Ms. Murszewski, up to this point, permitted the assessor to conduct an inspection of property. Stating that the valuation is an obvious error made in terms of valuing the attic area as finished [is concerning] when he had not been able to verify visually the condition of the space. Further he was unable to determine whether or not the photographs submitted are of the actual house or current condition of the space.

That in 2024, when he issued a change of appraisal notice as a result of the reappraisal, Ms. Murszewski was legally warned that she could have appealed the reevaluation in a statutory time period and could have requested an inspection at that point. That he would have been happy to go out [to the property] and correct the data. That did not happen. Ms. Murszewski contacted his office after the appeal period [2025], asking him to make a change, claiming it was a manifest error that he had made. Matt asked how he could have made an error when he was not able to see the inside of the property – that he assesses what he is able to see? If he is unable to inspect the interior of a home, potentially, there will be assumptions made. He indicated that her assessment (reappraisal) is equitable in terms of the sales analysis time period conducted in 2024 [having made assumptions about the interior of the property]. That there is nothing erroneous about the value. The value is not being erroneously assessed as a result of this [abatement] process, that [the property assessment] is an equitable answer under the 2024 townwide reappraisal and the sales analysis that was conducted.

Ms. Murszewski interjected that she was not arguing the appraisal. Matt continued that he was unsure how the expectation that he should have known that that upper floor was unfinished could be made. That he needed to view the area to confirm that it was unfinished.

Matt continued that another aspect of the inspection is Ms. Murszewski's decision to only show the Inspection Committee the specific portion of the house (i.e., attic). That there may be other incorrect data that potentially leads to a higher assessed value. That we do not know the interior characteristics of the home unless he is permitted to inspect it. Matt concluded that he believed that the assertion that he made an error, that the assessment is erroneous, and that he should have known that the attic space was unfinished is categorically incorrect.

Helene asked if Matt was saying that if the Inspection Committee finds that the attic is unfinished that it would not change the valuation because the valuation matches what properties are selling for? Matt replied that no, finished versus unfinished space will yield a different tax. That Ms. Murszewski's request for relief of taxes is not a difference in opinion through the assessment. Unfinished space is going to be valued at less than finished space. That he did not believe that Ms. Murszewski is necessarily making an argument that the property is necessarily worth any less. Objectively, the attic area needs to be identified as unfinished because Ms. Murszewski is testifying that it is.

Ms. Murszewski suggested that it is the finished space that dictates what the taxes are calculated to be – that there is a differential of 1,600 ft² versus over 2,400 ft² at a higher [tax] rate. That the tax is about \$5,000 because it is based on approximately 2,400 ft² (of finished space). That there is a differential in the overall tax between 1600 ft² and 2400 ft² - roughly 40%. Ms. Murszewski indicated that she understood that the differential would not equate to a 40% reduction in taxes but would be based on the calculation of the tax rate. That she is requesting abatement of the differential because it is an unfair tax burden as she is being taxed for finished space that does not exist.

Matt replied that removing the attic space as an unfinished area may not level off the assessment when combined with the valuation of other areas in the house. Which is not not an equitable answer. Ms. Murszewski pointed out that the Abatement Hearing is for the explicit purpose of the attic. Matt then clarified that she is requesting a specific release (i.e., amount of tax abatement). Ms. Murszewski replied that she was not provided with that direction [to calculate the specific amount of tax relief for abatement]. Matt replied that there are rules of engagement when it comes to an Abatement Hearing in the State and that she could have researched what those rules were.

Helene then indicated that she thought that when coming before a Board of Abatement the Board is allowed to look at the entire property, even though they are focused on a specific area. Matt replied that he agreed with the statement.

Matt stated that he is the contracted assessor for Troy. That there is a quorum for the Board of Abatement Hearing and that he was abstaining from the vote. That he was trying to present information to the Board as objectively as he could and that he would leave it up to community [i.e., Board] to decide on the request. Asserting that he was not a participating member in terms of a voting interest.

Helene clarified that he is one of two people providing testimony to the Board. That the Hearing is quasi-judicial. That once the Board is presented with the testimony and completed its inspection it is not allowed to look at anything else. Reiterating that the Board must decide based on the testimony given. Which is why she asked earlier about wanting him to clarify that legally the Board has the right to see the entire property. Matt replied that through a Board of Civil Authority process the Board has the right to see the entire property. That inspection requirements for an abatement request may be different. He suggested that a Board of Abatement establishing whether an area is unfinished needs a threshold. Are there missing pieces of information or is the decision based solely on one area? It is difficult in the sense of unfinished space affecting the fair market value. Clarifying that the Hearing is not an appeal of the fair market value. In his opinion Ms. Murszewski is supposed to request a specific amount of relief off her tax bill. She should not make a request to change an aspect of the assessment, i.e., change the space from finished to unfinished, and base her relief on that change – that is an assessment request. That requires input into the assessment system to be able to get that answer. Specifically, that the procedure for an Abatement Hearing is that she is to say of my \$5,000.00 tax bill I am requesting \$1,000 of relief (or \$2,000 of relief), based on my calculation that this is this percentage of the square footage of the unfinished space. [She should] not state that if the assessment is calculated with different finished and unfinished areas, whatever that comes out to, is what she is asking for relief – that is not a specific request. Further, had Ms. Murszewski been timely in her filing of a grievance with him, he could have worked out that the space is unfinished by doing an inspection. That he would have objectively removed the space off his calculation of finished square footage. That is what happens as a result of a grievance notice. That whatever the new assessment was determined to be that she could continue her appeal to the Board of Civil Authority, Superior Court, State, Hearing officer, or appraiser if she chose to do so.

Ms. Murszewski replied that a tax abatement and tax appraisal are two separate processes with different statutory mandates. Matt agreed.

Robert asked Ms. Murszewski if she had a specific amount requested for abatement off her tax bill as the Hearing is not for a reappraisal? Ms. Murszewski indicated that she did not. Robert explained that her request would then be difficult to consider because the Board did not have a specific requested amount. The Board could determine whether the attic area is finished but could not determine what an accurate, new, assessed value would be in order to determine the amount to abate from her taxes as she had described earlier.

Helene asked if the Board used the assessment system to determine the new assessment and Ms. Murszewski cannot access the system how would she determine the amount to be abated? Matt replied that Ms. Murszewski is correct in that the abatement process is different from an assessment appeal. The solution would be for Ms. Murszewski to appeal the assessment in a timely fashion through the process of grievance. That he would then conduct an inspection to determine the physical attributes of the building and make the adjustments, if required, with the resulting grievance letter ultimately yielding the difference in assessed value. Helene indicated that that opportunity for grievance is gone. Matt replied that is correct, in terms of the past, but not for the next 2026 tax year.

Robert posited that if Ms. Murszewski could get an accurate assessment of her house with Matt conducting an inspection of the inside of the house for 2026 she could withdraw the current abatement request and elect to file for an abatement after having a new assessment. Helene clarifying that she could request abatement for the same two years but using the new assessment as the basis of the request. Matt suggested that was ultimately a decision that Ms. Murszewski would have to make. Robert asked Ms. Murszewski if that was a possible way forward. Matt added that while not part of the abatement process, that Ms. Murszewski was going to receive a change of appraisal notice prior to the 2026 grand list being filed alerting her to the grievance period for 2026 (because of an active building permit for an outbuilding).

Robert then asked Ms. Murszewski that given this information how she would you like to proceed?

Ms. Murszewski replied that if the Board is wanting a specific amount, then she would want to identify the amount of the differential that was agreed upon for the 2024 and 2025 tax years. That she was not finding any resolution to her [abatement] request. That moving forward whatever the tax is a differential of 40% is what she is being taxed for space identified as a finished area – which it is not. Robert reiterated that it is important for Ms. Murszewski to determine the amount to be abated as a specific request of the Board. Helene asked that if Ms. Murszewski identified an amount to be abated and the Board disagrees with that amount, could the Board decide to abate a lesser amount or is the decision to agree to her amount yes or no? Robert replied that the Board of Abatement has many options as we have seen in the past. The Board could decide not to abate the total amount requested.

Matt agreed that the Board has discretion to determine, as an example, that if Ms. Murszewski was asking for \$2,000.00 worth of relief from a roughly \$5000.00 tax bill, to abate \$1,000.00 of the \$2,000.00 request. Helene replied that she was wondering how accurate her [abatement] amount was going to be.

Ms. Murszewski replied that for the record the tax totals \$5,079.98. Of that tax, the municipal tax is \$1,947.19. She wondered if she determined the amount of the abatement request and that amount differed from a new assessment after an inspection. For example,

if she assumed that the assessment would be ~ \$3800.00 but after Matt's reassessment (i.e., after inspection) was \$3600.00, how would the difference be addressed? Would the Board relook the request. Robert clarified that the requested amount to be abated would be addressed at this Hearing and that Matt's reassessment is separate from this Hearing. That it [i.e., a reassessment] is separate from this Hearing because that is not something the Board can consider at this Hearing. Ms. Murszewski indicated that she understood. Robert indicated that the Board would consider the information available at the Hearing.

Ms. Murszewski stated that she was asking \$1,500.00 for tax abatement. Robert asked if that was the total for both years (2024 and 2025)? Ms. Murszewski replied that although she felt that it was higher in 2024, that if easy for everybody, she would agree to \$1500.00 off for both years. Clarifying, Robert asked if the amount was \$1,500.00 off per year – for a total of \$3,000.00 for tax years 2024 and 2025? Ms. Murszewski agreed. Robert added that the rationale is based on the condition of the attic being unfinished, and it being a certain percentage of the total square footage. Ms. Murszewski agreed adding that the finished footage on the PRC is over 2,400 ft². Anne indicating that it would be ~38% with Ms. Murszewski adding that 864 ft² is classified as finished.

VIII. Questions from the Board – Robert then asked if the Board had any other questions?

Helene asked about the 40% differential that in Matt's view, is Ms. Murszewski going from the unfinished to zero tax for the unfinished area - unfinished does not mean the tax for the area goes to zero. Matt replied that is correct, that the space does have value. Helene asked if Ms. Murszewski identifies 40% of the finished space as really being unfinished space, it does not mean that she gets 40% as a tax abatement. Matt agreed. Ms. Murszewski also agreed that she understood that an unfinished area carries a value because it is under a roof. That the unfinished space does not carry a zero value. But at the same time, in the 864 ft² there is insulation, no wall, and bare studs. That the 2464 ft² is truly not all finished – that there is ~40% differential that should not be included as finished ft² that it should be included as unfinished space.

IX. Close the hearing – Robert recessed the hearing at 5:44 PM by general consent and explained that the Board would enter into a deliberative session and would issue a written decision within 30 days of the hearing. That the Board needs to reconvene, to continue the deliberative session, to hear from the Inspection Committee before rendering its decision.

Respectively submitted,



Gaston Bathalon



Town of Troy
142 Main Street
North Troy, VT 05859

Memo for the Record

From: Terri Medley
To: Town of Troy Selectboard
Date: May 13, 2026

RE: Non-Recusal Statement – Board of Abatement Hearing (May 7, 2026)

1. As per 24 V.S.A. § 1992, the Town of Troy Selectboard understands its duty to avoid conflicts of interest (whether real or perceived). The undersigned wishes to address a perceived conflict of interest by an applicant for a Board of Abatement Hearing directly by submitting a non-recusal statement per 24 V.S.A. § 1992.

2. The applicant for the Board of Abatement Hearing held on May 7, 2026, Jessica Murszewski, was the plaintiff in a lawsuit against the Town of Troy (Case No. 25-CV-05644). The lawsuit specifically identified members of the Selectboard and Town Treasurer / Town Clerk who also serve as members of the Board of Abatement. In a recent email to the Town Clerk (dated April 23, 2026) Ms. Murszewski asked specifically about the potential conflict of interest of members of the Board of Abatement, named as defendants, and requested “clarification as to whether any members intend to recuse themselves or how the Board intends to address potential conflicts to ensure a fair and impartial proceeding.”

3. As per 24 V.S.A. § 1992(b)(2)(A) the undersigned has determined that there was good cause to continue as a member in the Board of Abatement Hearing held on May 7, 2026. The perceived conflict of interest raised by Ms. Murszewski is speculative and delegation of Board of Abatement member duties is impracticable. Specifically, the ability to convene a timely quorum of the Board of Abatement if three Board members recused themselves would be an undue hardship on the Town. Further, to not have the experience and knowledge of key members of the Board of Abatement (i.e., Selectboard, Town Clerk / Town Treasurer) in deliberations would place the Town at a disadvantage in terms of rendering a fair decision for the applicant and community members. Finally, a member of the Board of Abatement being named in a lawsuit by a plaintiff who is a person with an action before the Board of Abatement does not automatically create an actual “conflict of interest” as that term is contemplated in State statute.

4. The undersigned attests that non-recusal will not affect their ability to render a fair and unbiased review of the facts.

5. The undersigned requests that the non-recusal statement be recorded with the Board of Abatement minutes (i.e., as an attachment) per 24 V.S.A. § 1992.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Terri Medley". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Terri Medley
Town Clerk and Delinquent Tax Collector



Town of Troy
142 Main Street
North Troy, VT 05859

Memo for the Record

From: Robert Langlands
To: Town of Troy Selectboard
Date: May 13, 2026

RE: Non-Recusal Statement – Board of Abatement Hearing (May 7, 2026)

1. As per 24 V.S.A. § 1992, the Town of Troy Selectboard understands its duty to avoid conflicts of interest (whether real or perceived). The undersigned wishes to address a perceived conflict of interest by an applicant for a Board of Abatement Hearing directly by submitting a non-recusal statement per 24 V.S.A. § 1992.
2. The applicant for the Board of Abatement Hearing held on May 7, 2026, Jessica Murszewski, was the plaintiff in a lawsuit against the Town of Troy (Case No. 25-CV-05644). The lawsuit specifically identified members of the Selectboard and Town Treasurer / Town Clerk who also serve as members of the Board of Abatement. In a recent email to the Town Clerk (dated April 23, 2026) Ms. Murszewski asked specifically about the potential conflict of interest of members of the Board of Abatement, named as defendants, and requested “clarification as to whether any members intend to recuse themselves or how the Board intends to address potential conflicts to ensure a fair and impartial proceeding.”
3. As per 24 V.S.A. § 1992(b)(2)(A) the undersigned has determined that there was good cause to continue as a member in the Board of Abatement Hearing held on May 7, 2026. The perceived conflict of interest raised by Ms. Murszewski is speculative and delegation of Board of Abatement member duties is impracticable. Specifically, the ability to convene a timely quorum of the Board of Abatement if three Board members recused themselves would be an undue hardship on the Town. Further, to not have the experience and knowledge of key members of the Board of Abatement (i.e., Selectboard, Town Clerk / Town Treasurer) in deliberations would place the Town at a disadvantage in terms of rendering a fair decision for the applicant and community members. Finally, a member of the Board of Abatement being named in a lawsuit by a plaintiff who is a person with an action before the Board of Abatement does not automatically create an actual “conflict of interest” as that term is contemplated in State statute.

4. The undersigned attests that non-recusal will not affect their ability to render a fair and unbiased review of the facts.

5. The undersigned requests that the non-recusal statement be recorded with the Board of Abatement minutes (i.e., as an attachment) per 24 V.S.A. § 1992.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive 'R' followed by a long horizontal line that tapers to the right.

Robert Langlands
Chair, Selectboard



Town of Troy
142 Main Street
North Troy, VT 05859

Memo for the Record

From: Anne Quiron
To: Town of Troy Selectboard
Date: May 13, 2026

RE: Non-Recusal Statement – Board of Abatement Hearing (May 7, 2026)

1. As per 24 V.S.A. § 1992, the Town of Troy Selectboard understands its duty to avoid conflicts of interest (whether real or perceived). The undersigned wishes to address a perceived conflict of interest by an applicant for a Board of Abatement Hearing directly by submitting a non-recusal statement per 24 V.S.A. § 1992.

2. The applicant for the Board of Abatement Hearing held on May 7, 2026, Jessica Murszewski, was the plaintiff in a lawsuit against the Town of Troy (Case No. 25-CV-05644). The lawsuit specifically identified members of the Selectboard and Town Treasurer / Town Clerk who also serve as members of the Board of Abatement. In a recent email to the Town Clerk (dated April 23, 2026) Ms. Murszewski asked specifically about the potential conflict of interest of members of the Board of Abatement, named as defendants, and requested “clarification as to whether any members intend to recuse themselves or how the Board intends to address potential conflicts to ensure a fair and impartial proceeding.”

3. As per 24 V.S.A. § 1992(b)(2)(A) the undersigned has determined that there was good cause to continue as a member in the Board of Abatement Hearing held on May 7, 2026. The perceived conflict of interest raised by Ms. Murszewski is speculative and delegation of Board of Abatement member duties is impracticable. Specifically, the ability to convene a timely quorum of the Board of Abatement if three Board members recused themselves would be an undue hardship on the Town. Further, to not have the experience and knowledge of key members of the Board of Abatement (i.e., Selectboard, Town Clerk / Town Treasurer) in deliberations would place the Town at a disadvantage in terms of rendering a fair decision for the applicant and community members. Finally, a member of the Board of Abatement being named in a lawsuit by a plaintiff who is a person with an action before the Board of Abatement does not automatically create an actual “conflict of interest” as that term is contemplated in State statute.

4. The undersigned attests that non-recusal will not affect their ability to render a fair and unbiased review of the facts.

5. The undersigned requests that the non-recusal statement be recorded with the Board of Abatement minutes (i.e., as an attachment) per 24 V.S.A. § 1992.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anne Quiron". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anne Quiron
Vice Chair, Selectboard