

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

Planned Block Development Instructions: Please fill out the information requested and return it by 3/23/24 via email to: copperphillips@cox.net

Upon receipt of your completed questionnaire, you will be contacted to schedule an appointment for an interview with the COGS Board of Directors.

Your complete and unedited responses will be posted on the informational COGS website for public review, along with those of the other candidates. Please keep your answers brief. However, if you need more space the box will expand to accommodate you. If needed, please continue on an additional page.

No.	Question	Response
1.	DEMOGRAPHICS	
1.a.	Name	Tom Durham
1.b.	Home Address	8892 East Buckskin Trail
1.c.	Phone	312-929-6894
1.d.	Years living in Scottsdale	10 as of May 2024
1.e.	When did you register to vote in Scottsdale? Have you failed to vote in any Scottsdale or General Election since you registered?	2015 or 2016 (after we finally left Chicago) I might have failed to vote in 2016 as we transitioned to Scottsdale but have not failed since then.
1.f.	Have you been elected or appointed to City positions including City Task Forces, Boards, Committees or Commissions? If so, please list.	Elected to City Council in 2020
1.g.	Please list any Civic Activities or organizations you belong to.	Cornell College Board of Trustees/Church of the Nativity/Mock trial coach at Sandra Day O'Connor High School
	Education/Training	B.A. from Cornell College J.D. from New York University
1.i.	Current Occupation or Pre-Retirement	Attorney at Mayer Brown LLP
1.j.	Other personal information that you would like to share:	Two boys in Indianapolis and Minneapolis (a software engineer and a city planner); married to Martha for almost 40 years (she is a retired Episcopal Deacon)
2.	CAMPAIGN INFORMATION	
2.a.	Address	8892 East Buckskin Trail, Scottsdale, 85255
2.b.	Phone	312-929-6894
2.c.	Fax	None
2.d.	Web-site address**<i>important</i>*	tomdurham2024.com
2.e.	E-Mail address	thomascdurham@gmail.com
2.f.	Endorsements	

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
3.	Why have you decided to become a candidate for City Council?	<p>I ran for City Council in 2020 after successfully participating in the campaign to stop the Desert Discovery Center. I was the treasurer of the Protect Our Preserve PAC, responsible for filing requirements and complying with campaign finance laws.</p> <p>During this effort, I was not happy with the prior Council, particularly their refusal to hold a public vote on their plans, when the public had voted on the prior taxes.</p> <p>Several people who were active in the Protect Our Preserve movement suggested I run for Council, so I decided to do so.</p> <p>I am running again because I am proud of the work we have done over the last three years on the General Plan, the Preserve Task Force, and cracking down on short term rentals, among others. I am concerned that several of the candidates running for Council are focused on partisan goals and would not carry on this important work. Betty Janik has been an exemplary Council member. I am sorry to see her go.</p>
4.a.	Identify 3 major issues facing the Council.	<p>Scale of development is a constant issue.</p> <p>We will face more budgetary issues as the state shared revenue is reduced and the rental tax disappears. A potential recession added to these two could put pressure on our budget.</p> <p>Water resources, and to a lesser extent, other sustainability issues.</p>
4.b.	Identify 3 major issues facing the City.	Same as those above in 4.a.
5.	If elected, what would you like to accomplish?	<p>I have tried to take a "middle way" on development issues. Every project I have voted for has been heavily negotiated by requiring less height, less density, more open space, more significant bonuses, green construction codes, and better water usage, among other things.</p> <p>We need to balance the need for economic vitality with the need to maintain Scottsdale's character, or "look and feel" as you describe it.</p> <p>We also need to rationalize zoning, especially in the Old Town area, where it is complicated and arcane. One of the improvements I have asked for, which has been implemented, is to require that properties seeking Planned Block Development District ("PBD") status be contiguous. The Collection project was able to combine several separate properties, not located next to each other, to obtain PBD status. My research indicated that this was inappropriate, although not forbidden under our ordinances. As a result of my work, the ordinance was changed to require that PBD properties be contiguous.</p> <p>Finances are a constant concern, although not on most citizens' radar. We will face issues with the reduction of state shared revenue and the elimination of the rental tax. And we will have to continue to deal with cost overruns.</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
6.	<p>Are there matters that may come before the City Council in which you would have a Conflict of Interest?</p> <p>If yes, what would the conflicting issues be?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>I have continued to pledge that I will not take donations from anyone with business before the Council--developers, lawyers, or anyone else seeking action from the Council.</p>
7.	<p>Identify citizen/city processes that you believe need to be:</p>	
7.a.	<p>Created</p>	
7.b.	<p>Improved</p>	<p>One process that could be improved is the notice requirements for notifying surrounding residents of changes in zoning, etc. I suggested to staff that the required radius be extended from 750 feet to 1,250 feet, and that change has been made.</p> <p>But I am concerned that the small postcards used to notify residents are not distinctive enough to provide clear notice. These cards might be mistaken for junk mail. This has created situations when residents claim they did not receive notice, even though mailing records show the cards were mailed to them.</p> <p>I have suggested the use of larger, possibly color, postcards to provide notice. But these would be much more expensive and the staff has not taken up my suggestion.</p>
7.c.	<p>Reduced</p>	<p>I am concerned about the efficacy of the trolley program. While I was collecting signatures at the senior centers, it was common to see two trolleys parked at the senior centers, with no passengers on either one.</p>
7.d.	<p>Eliminated</p>	<p>Off hand, I can't think of any services that need to be eliminated. I think we do a good job of providing service.</p>
8.	<p>Please state your position and/or action on the following zoning and land use issues:</p>	

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
8.a	<p>What is your position on citywide rezoning requests, text amendments, and General Plan Amendments that significantly change land use or increase height and/or density, especially in proximity to single family residential neighborhoods?</p>	<p>I discuss this same question to some extent in 8.j. During my time on the Council, we have faced numerous situations in which the current zoning of a parcel is no longer economically viable, or when the property is distressed. This is partially due to the rise in online shopping, which has affected some strip malls (although I understand the Greenbelt 88 project is now on hold). I try to view these issues based on all the facts and circumstances. What is the current zoning of the property? Why is the current zoning no longer viable? Is the project in a growth area?</p> <p>In applying this analysis, one of my most important concerns is the expectations of those living near the affected property. I focus on the expectations of those likely affected by the change; I place less emphasis on those living farther away. When a project is near a neighborhood, we have required lower heights near the border, landscaping, and walls.</p> <p>But as I look back, I don't think we have allowed significant height beyond the zoning as revised, particularly when bonuses are taken into account. I don't particularly like the current bonus system, but since it is part of our law I am obligated to apply it.</p> <p>The tallest projects I have voted for are The Parque and the McDowell Optima Village. I negotiated for lower heights on the Optima Village and it came in well below the bonus height. The Parque was slightly over. These two projects had several things in common. First, neither one of them would be near a residential area. Second, they promised significant open space. Third, they contained significant water conservation measures. Fourth, both were in growth areas. Neither one was located near neighborhoods. The Parque was designed so that taller buildings will be located farther from Scottsdale Road, negating the canyon effect. (I get a lot of complaints about the tall buildings on the west side of Scottsdale from citizens who don't realize this is Phoenix). The Parque promises to be a tech hub and the Optima has beautiful architecture in an important spot.</p> <p>One critical consideration was that the Parque parcel was originally zoned industrial. I thought this was a wildly inappropriate use for this spot, which might have allowed for a warehouse or other use which would have been very traffic intensive. This was similar to the MACK project, which I think will be an inappropriate use of this land. Several people have questioned why the City Council would allow a warehouse for this land, when the truth is that the Council has no power to stop it.</p> <p>On the Parque property, this might be our only chance to stop a warehouse, and for that reason, I thought rezoning was not only appropriate but critical.</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
8.b	<p>Conditional Zoning approvals currently do not have time limits for construction to begin and/or unless the project is amended. Should the approved conditional zoning revert back to the original zoning after a specified time period? Please provide the rationale for your position.</p>	<p>Council member Whitehead pioneered the requirement that construction begin in five years or the property would revert to its original zoning. This requirement has been applied to every major project during my time on the Council, beginning with the Kimsey. It has become a requirement for all development. (In one particular case, I can't remember which one, the requirement was stretched to seven years). I think this requirement is critical because developers should not be able to sit on undeveloped property</p> <p>Our apartment pipeline stretches back well over five years. This is unacceptable. Developers should not leave dirt behind. They should start building or relinquish their rights.</p>
8.c	<p>In "The Outpost" project rezoning case, Rural land was rezoned to commercial adjacent to residential large-lot Rural lands, against staff recommendations, breaking with a longstanding policy prohibiting such rezoning. Another project being proposed is to rezone Rural lands from R-190 (5 acre) to R1-43 (1 acre) for a gated development which prohibits horses, adjacent to rural horse operations and stables.</p> <p>What will be your position on these and similar future rezoning cases?</p>	<p>I am opposed to any rezoning for any commercial or higher density uses which would impinge on nearby neighborhoods. This case was a little before my time, so I am not sure of all the details. I couldn't find the staff report online.</p> <p>But I can see that it did require a Major General Plan Amendment. I would oppose Major Amendments, unless there is a compelling need for one.</p> <p>I would prefer to protect zoning for horse properties. These are an important part of Scottsdale culture and history, and are generally protected by the General Plan. A General Plan amendment would probably be necessary to make this change, and as such, I would oppose it absent a compelling reason.</p> <p>And I generally follow staff recommendations, unless there is a good reason not to.</p>
8.d.	<p>If a Conditional Use Permit holder is not in compliance with ALL of the major CUP conditions and stipulations, how should the city respond?</p>	<p>I am not sure whether this question refers to being out of compliance at the original issuance or being out of compliance down the road, after the issuance. In either case, it is my understanding that a CUP holder must comply with all conditions of the CUP. If someone is out of compliance after the issuance of the permit, I assume referring them to code enforcement would be the first step, with legal action following if they do not comply.</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
8.e.	Should the city government have any role in the unaffordable housing costs that are resulting in essential city workers and young families not being able to live within city limits?	<p>Yes. This is a very tough issue, because Scottsdale is a highly desirable place to live. That means that land values are very high, which means housing is expensive. During my tenure on the Council, we have made some small steps by including workforce housing in several projects. But these small steps have not been enough. I have been in favor of the City buying properties for rental to lower income residents, but it is hard to find such properties. And, as a government entity, the City moves slowly and often gets beat out in buying such properties.</p> <p>In my answer to the next question (8.f) I discuss the problems presented by essential workers and young families who cannot afford to live in Scottsdale.</p> <p>Funding is obviously a major problem. We need to leverage all forms of federal, state, county, and private funding we can.</p> <p>Our hotel program has been extremely successful in helping temporarily bridge people to longer term housing. It has a great record with no significant crime issues (contrary to what Representative Gress claims).</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
8.f.	<p>How would you describe the effects upon the city with the addition of numerous multi-family apartment complexes citywide and the rezoning of any parcels into multi-use (apartments plus small business complex) parcels? Please discuss positive and negative impacts such as housing costs, tourism, traffic congestion, parking, Look and feel of the Scottsdale, etc.</p>	<p>Scottsdale is unaffordable for many people. 70% of our fire, police and many other essential workers live outside of Scottsdale because they cannot afford to live inside of it. This concerns me for several reasons. First, they may decide to find employment nearer their homes, reducing our workforce. Our reputation for healthcare depends upon dedicated and skilled workers (nurses). If they choose to work nearer to where they live, our reputation could slide.</p> <p>Second, if a worker lives in Mesa, Tempe, or Chandler, they will necessarily be on the 101 every day, increasing congestion, and air pollution. Some people claim that apartments add to traffic. But a worker who lives in an apartment on Scottsdale Road will contribute much less to traffic congestion than a worker who drives in from Tempe or Mesa every day.</p> <p>All other things being equal, an apartment will provide less expensive housing than a single-family home. In many cases, apartments are the only way younger workers and essential workers can establish a foothold in Scottsdale. We have an aging population, and without an influx of younger residents, I have concerns about our future economic vitality.</p> <p>I have also mentioned earlier in this questionnaire that several apartment projects have been scheduled to replace failing or defunct strip malls. This is a better use of scarce land.</p> <p>Apartments also place lower demands on our resources. On a per capita basis, apartments are much more water efficient than single family homes. This is especially true as the Council has imposed green construction codes.</p> <p>Our traffic has remained relatively stable over the last few years, despite the addition of more apartments. This could be attributable to increased working from home, following COVID. Shopping patterns have also changed with Amazon, etc. I have seen no signs that increased apartments will change our tourism economy. For the reasons I stated above, apartments may reduce traffic on the 101. But it is hard to judge the overall effect.</p> <p>I don't think parking is an issue since the Council has taken steps to increase parking at apartments.</p> <p>The biggest issue with the increase of apartments is the look and feel of Scottsdale. As compared to the prior Council, this Council has insisted on lower heights, better design standards, more green space, and green construction codes. We have recently acted to reduce maximum heights on Old Town. We have insisted on greater public benefits for increased bonus height, as in trading bonus height on the Kimsey for renovation of the Triangle Building.</p> <p>Some citizens have pointed to the length of the apartment "pipeline" but it is likely that many of the projects in this pipeline will never be built. The latest pipeline report states that 2,100 units received DRB approval prior to 2010. My guess it is unlikely that these units will ever be built.</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
8.g.	<p>Would you support a designated Bar/Entertainment District with its own unique Noise and Event Ordinances? Please explain why or why not.</p>	<p>We already have a de facto entertainment district. And we are working on noise ordinances that will affect that district. So it would make sense to apply separate noise requirements to this area.</p> <p>Not sure what is meant by "Event" ordinances with respect to the entertainment district. Most of those "events" happen inside. We have been discussing noise ordinances for the renovated Civic Center Plaza, which may need separate guidance with the addition of more concerts.</p>
8.h.	<p>Do you support complete control of short term rentals reverting back to cities? The legislature has refused to hear any of the proposed bills to restrict STRs in this session.</p> <p>Do you have solutions to share regarding the neighborhood impact of some short term rentals?</p>	<p>Yes, I support complete local control. I worked with our lobbyists and City officials to form the recently passed revisions, and I support further revisions, such as a cap on STRs and density restrictions.</p> <p>We have added police officers dedicated to STR enforcement.</p> <p>Absent further loosening of the legislative requirements, I think we have done everything permitted by the legislature to control STRs. We are currently soliciting opinion on some possible new measures, which I fully support.</p>
8.i.	<p>Should all new projects be required to meet Green Building standards? Should bonuses (increased height, density, etc.) be offered if Green Building standards are met?</p> <p>Should such bonuses be given as a matter of routine or to truly exceptional additions to projects that outweigh the value of the bonuses?</p>	<p>Yes, all commercial buildings should be required to meet Green Building standards. Since this should be required, no bonuses should attach.</p> <p>I have opposed providing bonuses for routine improvements, such as better trashcans or bricks in pedestrian crossings. The prior Council gave bonuses for these items. I generally don't approve of the bonus system but as long as it is part of the law I have tried to apply it, while requiring more significant bonuses, such as workforce housing, the renovation of the Triangle Building, more open space, etc.</p> <p>In the recent changes to the Old Town Character Area Plan, we have lowered bonus heights and have also made clear that more significant infrastructure improvements will be necessary to claim the lower bonus heights.</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

No.	Question	Response
8.j.	Up-zoning increases the intensity of land use and density. Under what conditions do you support Up-zoning?	<p>I generally don't support upzoning beyond the normal standards.</p> <p>The bigger question arises when current zoning is no longer appropriate due to changes in economic conditions and we are asked to change zoning. As a result of online shopping trends, some stores are closing. We have faced this a number of times for shopping centers which have outlived their economic usefulness. In these cases, a change in zoning may be necessary. These cases include the apartments at Scottsdale and Gold Dust, which would replace a mostly vacant shopping center. Our most recent case involved a vacant lot at Frank Lloyd Wright and 100th Street. This area was zoned for commercial use, but it hasn't drawn any interest for that use. And there is a strong commercial area just across the street. The owner proposed a senior living apartment, which in my view was a good complement to the Belmont community located close by. Any commercial development would have increased traffic in what is already a busy area, with a school nearby.</p> <p>I try to look at all the facts and circumstances in making these decisions. Is the current zoning outdated? Why is it outdated? Will the proposed new zoning benefit Scottsdale? Is the proposed new zoning consistent with the General Plan and similar guidance? In answering these questions, one of my main goals is not to impinge on any nearby neighborhoods.</p> <p>I have already pointed to the rezoning of the Parque project. I think industrial zoning was inappropriate for that highly visible spot, and so supported rezoning.</p>

9.	There are not enough Preserve tax funds remaining to allow acquisition of all the remaining land within the voter approved McDowell Sonoran Preserve Boundary. Please state your position on ending the current sales tax or extending it at the same or a different rate and for what period of years. Why or why not?	<p>I strongly support the Preserve Task Force recommendations, which include extending the current tax at a slightly lower rate. Past generations, through their foresight, have created two jewels in Scottsdale: the Preserve and the Greenbelt. It is now our responsibility to take care of these for future generations. The current taxes do not allow funds for maintenance of the Preserve. I ride my bike regularly down the Greenbelt to Tempe, and the condition of the parks noticeably deteriorates the farther south, which is because the parks are older farther south.</p> <p>Any land acquisitions in the Preserve should be tactical, focusing on the most important goals. These may include a land bridge across Dynamite.</p> <p>We may face budgetary constraints in the future, with the reduction of shared tax revenue and the elimination of the rental tax. Parks sometimes end up with the short end of the stick in such circumstances and we need to make sure that doesn't happen.</p>
----	---	---

10.	Please explain your position on these city issues:
-----	---

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

10.a.	<p>What is your vision for the city? What should Scottsdale look like in 10, 20, or 30 years from now?</p>	<p>I think my record over the last three years shows my vision; lower heights and less density than those proposed by the prior council. But some growth in growth areas will be necessary, especially as older properties deteriorate and reach the end of their useful life. Neighborhood will remain pretty much as is, without commercial intrusion. I would like to see more vibrancy in Old Town and the Kimsey and Museum Square will help in this regard, if they are ever built. For the most part, I love Scottsdale as it is and hope it will stay that way, taking into account inevitable growth and change.</p>
10.b.	<p>What is your position on the location of the new bond-funded parking garage in the Downtown area? Please explain why you have chosen the location you chose.</p>	<p>I would wait for the next parking study, which I hope will be carried out next year. I was disappointed that one was not undertaken this spring. The previous study identified the North East quadrant, but fluctuations in the utilization of the Galleria make this study complex. I would like the latest data.</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

<p>11.a.</p>	<p>1. The concept of Fiscal Sustainability involves managing the annual operating budget by balancing income with expenses. Do you identify any of the city decisions as creating a negative impact on long-term fiscal sustainability?</p> <p>2. Focus your opinions on the city infrastructure, such as roads, city owned facilities, water and sewer, and public services, i.e., public safety, emergency response, communications. Do you support using bond funds on any of the above expenses? Why or why not?</p> <p>3. There are thousands of approved apartments in the pipeline. Please describe how you think these developments will impact the city's operating budget. Please include facts to support your position.</p>	<p>1. I would hope that none of our decisions would create a negative impact on long-term fiscal sustainability. We have an excellent Treasurer who keeps her eyes on such issues. As a result of her vigilance, we will be seeking an increase in the expenditure limitation, which is necessary for long term stability. She also briefs us regularly on challenges to our stability, such as the reduction in state shared revenue and elimination of the rental tax. She budgets conservatively, which I agree with. I think we are doing our best to keep things humming for the long term. We propose modest tax increases, as necessary, which some people (and some council members) disagree with, but which I think are fiscally responsible and necessary.</p> <p>2. We are still in the middle of bond funding, which addressed many of these concerns, especially public safety, emergency response, and communications. One area where I might approve of bond funding is more city owned solar facilities. These are expensive, but will produce a long term economic benefit and savings. Some have proposed a solar farm on our water campus, which is our most intensive use. At our last meeting, I advocated for speeding up the City's solar plan.</p> <p>3. The apartment pipeline is not as big as one might think. Due to changes in interest rates, etc., some of the more recent projects are on hold and may not be built. Of the projects approved in my tenure, only one has broken ground. The latest pipeline report states that more than 2,000 units were approved before 2010. (I understand that both the Kimsey and Greenbelt 88 are on hold due to financial considerations). Many, perhaps most of these, will never be built. (This is one of the reasons I support the five-year deadline for developing a property, explained above).</p> <p>Apartment dwellers produce additional tax revenue, but they also require additional services, in terms of fire, police, etc. Many apartment dwellers will be younger and will contribute to job and economic growth. Apartments, especially newer apartments, will consume significantly less water on a per capita basis. Some people worry about the effect of more apartments on traffic, but I am not sure what the net effect will be. A driver living at Scottsdale and Gold Dust will have less mileage than a worker living in Mesa. It is hard to judge the bottom line of all these factors, but I think bringing in younger workers and families is important to our future.</p>
<p>11.b.</p>	<p>Currently, the city allocates funds for events that are not within the City of Scottsdale, e.g., Final Four that is held in Glendale. What is your position on continuing such funding and why/why not?</p>	<p>I approve of such funding because it brings large amounts of funds to Scottsdale and also raises the profile of Scottsdale. The recent Super Bowl is a great example. Scottsdale hotels were filled, bringing in tourism revenue. And ESPN built their prime location in Old Town Scottsdale. This type of publicity helps to maintain our preeminent spot in tourism. (Coincidentally, we have friends from Chicago who will be staying with us during the Final Four. They will be spending in Scottsdale, as well as Glendale).</p>

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

12.	Please state your position and/or action on the following transportation questions:	
12.a.	<p>The Transportation Master Plan was approved by city council at the April 2022 hearing. What decisions in that document would you encourage to change in the future?</p>	<p>Some people are claiming that the inclusion of certain streets as candidates for "road diets" means it is a foregone conclusion that they will be subject to "road diets." This is not the case. It is important to plan ahead. While these roads might be candidates in the future, they are not at the moment. I wish there were a way of making this clearer.</p>
12.b	<p>Within the Downtown area, the city has approved under-parked projects by charging in-lieu parking fees at the last rate approx. \$13,000/space which is under current value of \$50,000-\$60,000 to construct.</p> <p>This fund was to be used to build public parking facilities in the future. Staff reported that funds have been used for non-garage funding and is too small an amount for land purchase or garage construction.</p> <p>How do you propose dealing with Downtown parking issues and the use of in-lieu parking fees?</p>	<p>The in-lieu system is confusing and is in a mess currently. I would hope that the next parking study (I would hope next spring) will help in bringing some rationality to the situation. If a new parking garage is built in the NE quadrant, the need for in-lieu funding might disappear and any remaining funds could be put towards a new garage.</p> <p>One of my favorite axions on this subject was contained in the last parking report, which stated that "Parking can be free, it can be convenient, and it can be plentiful. But you can only have two of these three." We have chosen for parking to be free, but that means we have to give up on either convenient parking or plentiful parking. I think we have plentiful parking, but it is not always convenient. I have suggested some measures, such as more wayfinding, banners marking garages, and other measures to make parking more convenient.</p>
14.	Identify city services that you believe need to be:	
14.a.	Created I think we have a wide array of valuable city services. As indicated above, I worry about the utility of the trolley system on a cost/benefit basis.	
14.b.	We have a good system for performing residential water audits, but I am not sure it is sufficiently well known. More publicity might help	
14.c.	Reduced	
14.d.	Eliminated	
15	Identify city revenue sources that should be:	
15.a	<p>Created</p> <p>As explained, I am in favor of the proposed extension of the Preserve tax, at a slightly slower rate.</p>	
15.b.	<p>Increased</p> <p>We may have to increase City taxes to account for the reduction of state shared revenue and the loss of the rental tax. It is not clear whether we will need to or not. If tourism continues at the current rate, we will be OK. We have also increased cash reserves, which will protect us in case of a downturn. If a tax increase were necessary, it would probably be in the sales tax, which is currently one of the lowest in the valley.</p>	
15.c.	Reduced	

COGS Candidate Questionnaire

15.d.	Eliminated	
16.	Other city issues/perspectives you would like to share a position on?	
17.	Additional Comments:	

Signature _____ Tom Durham _____

_____ March 23, 2024 Date

Please type your name for your electronic signature. Thank you for your time and careful consideration of each response. Please email your completed questionnaire by March 23, 2024, to: copperphillips@cox.net

ALL completed candidate's questionnaires will be posted on the COGS website at <https://coalitionofgreaterscottsdale.org>

Thank you for taking your valuable time to complete this questionnaire.

The COGS-Coalition of Greater Scottsdale—Board of Directors

Andrew Scheck, Jim Davis, Howard Myers, Marilyn Robinson, Chris Schaffner,

Stan Morganstern, Cathy McKeever, Copper Phillips, and Sonnie Kirtley