



City of Prescott

Council Subcommittee on General Plan Review

February 25th, 2026 | 2:00 PM
201 N. Montezuma Street
Council Chambers, 1st Floor
Prescott, AZ 86301

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Cathey Rusing called the meeting to order at 3:06pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Cathey Rusing - Mayor
Mary Frederickson – Councilwoman
Patrick Grady – Councilman

3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Presentation & Discussion Regarding Consultant Scope of Work and Draft Project Timeline

Community Development Director Chelsea Walton presented the proposed consultant scope of work and draft project timeline. She explained that staff prepared the scope based on prior Subcommittee direction and distributed it to nine firms with general plan experience in Arizona. She noted that refinements could be made if needed and that proposals would include consultant-developed timelines.

Ms. Walton reviewed the draft timeline, including options for placement of the General Plan on either the July 2027 or November 2027 ballot. She explained statutory requirements, including the 60-day public review period and related deadlines, and outlined differences in process depending on whether the consultant contract exceeds \$50,000.

Discussion included:

- Ballot timing and advantages of the November 2027 election to allow additional review time.
- Statutory requirements related to the 60-day review period.
- Outreach to neighboring jurisdictions and public agencies.
- Clarification from legal counsel regarding statutory requirements tied to population thresholds of 50,000 residents.
- Consideration of whether to include optional statutory elements in anticipation of future population growth.
- Placement and timing of preparation of the Executive Summary.

Public Comment:

Robert Shegog addressed the Subcommittee and stated that he supports retaining the non-discrimination language within the General Plan. He expressed concern that any consultant selected should respect and preserve that language. He noted that the City had previously worked to adopt the language through civil discourse and urged careful consideration during consultant selection to ensure the statement is not removed or weakened.

Jim Helbling addressed the Subcommittee regarding the non-discrimination language in the General Plan. He referenced the March 11, 2025 Council meeting at which the language was adopted by a 6–1 vote and stated that he was disappointed the matter continues to be discussed. He noted that residents have previously spoken in support of retaining the language and described it as important to members of the community. He provided a written handout responding to prior objections and requested an opportunity to meet with Subcommittee members to further discuss the issue.

This item was for discussion only. No action taken.

B. Review & Discussion Regarding the First Three Chapters of the June 24, 2025 Draft General Plan:

1. Introduction
2. Chapter 1: Resiliency and Sustainability
3. Chapter 2: A Community Connected

The Subcommittee began reviewing the Introduction and Chapter 1.

This item was for discussion only. No formal action taken.

1B) Introduction

Discussion included:

- Updating references to the 2025 ballot and prior public participation process.
- Consideration of formatting, layout, graphics, and photographs.
- Whether to reorganize the document to more closely align with Arizona Revised Statutes § 9-461.05 and explicitly reference required statutory elements.
- Maintaining livability goals versus restructuring strictly by statutory elements.
- Inclusion and placement of Prescott's Vision, Mission, and Values statements.
- Clarification of hyperlinks and long-term functionality of referenced external websites.
- Inclusion of full-size maps in the appendices, with thumbnail maps retained for reference.

Non-Discrimination Language

The Subcommittee discussed the diversity and non-discrimination language contained in the Introduction.

Vice Chair Grady expressed support for retaining the non-discrimination language, stating that prior public input reflected strong community support for its inclusion and that he believes it aligns with the City's adopted Vision and Mission.

Committee Member Frederickson stated that she does not believe the non-discrimination clause is appropriate within a land use planning document. She noted that federal law already prohibits discrimination and expressed concern that the language implies the City has a systemic issue. She stated that the initial language affirming that Prescott welcomes all residents is sufficient and that she would strike the language beginning with "As such," including the list of protected characteristics.

Chair Rusing clarified that questioning the inclusion of the clause does not equate to support for discrimination and stated that discrimination is both morally wrong and illegal. She emphasized the importance of considering how the language may affect voter approval of the General Plan and suggested obtaining consultant input regarding how other Arizona jurisdictions have addressed similar language.

This item was for discussion only. No formal action taken.

2B) Chapter 1 – Resiliency and Sustainability

Chair Rusing initiated discussion on Chapter 1 and suggested that certain terminology within the chapter be revised to make the language clearer and more accessible to the general public. She recommended incorporating more direct references to Arizona Revised Statutes throughout the document to clearly identify required elements and strengthen transparency. She also suggested emphasizing drought conditions more explicitly within the resiliency language, noting that the region has experienced prolonged drought conditions and that planning for long-term water security is critical.

Vice Chair Grady stated that he supported retaining the overall structure of the chapter as organized under the livability goals framework but agreed that referencing specific statutory requirements within sections would be helpful. He emphasized the importance of maintaining substantive content while avoiding unnecessary reductions in detail.

Committee Member Frederickson commented that the organization of certain sections, including the Fire Department content, could be clarified. She suggested that public safety-related material be consolidated for better readability while still addressing wildfire mitigation and environmental planning components. Ms. Walton noted that some of the Fire Department language had been drawn from the department's strategic plan and that placement adjustments could be made as directed.

The Subcommittee discussed the water resources section at length. Chair Rusing emphasized the importance of clearly identifying policies related to annexation, water service area boundaries, and intergovernmental agreements. She also recommended highlighting the City's water budget practices and ensuring that references to developing a long-term water management plan reflect that the process is currently underway. Ms. Walton confirmed that the long-term water management plan is in progress and that language would be updated accordingly.

Additional discussion included updating demographic data, ensuring references to voter-approved measures and funding sources are current, and clearly identifying required statutory elements such as conservation, water resources, public facilities, and cost of development within the chapter.

3B) Climate & Energy Section

The Subcommittee discussed terminology within the Climate section, including simplifying the phrase “climate adaptation” to more plain language. Chair Rusing suggested using terminology that is easily understood by the general public while still accurately reflecting planning efforts.

Vice Chair Grady recommended maintaining reference to the regional climate profile study while clarifying that the study represents third-party research and does not necessarily reflect adopted City policy. Senior Assistant City Attorney Alane Moore confirmed that the hyperlink to the study remains active.

The Subcommittee discussed energy goals and strategies, including the potential inclusion of language encouraging electric vehicle infrastructure to support tourism and economic competitiveness. Vice Chair Grady expressed support for including EV infrastructure as a strategy, noting regional comparisons. Chair Rusing agreed that tourism impacts could be referenced but suggested simplifying language for clarity.

The Subcommittee also discussed including reference to APS as the City’s primary energy provider and identifying any applicable conservation programs.

Maps

The Subcommittee discussed the format and legibility of maps included in the draft. Chair Rusing expressed concern that several maps were difficult to read in their current format and recommended including full-size, detailed versions within the appendices. Ms. Walton stated that thumbnail maps could remain for reference with links or direction to larger versions.

The Subcommittee agreed that a future agenda item should be dedicated to a comprehensive review of all maps, particularly the General Land Use Map.

Due to time constraints, review of Chapter 2 (A Community Connected) was deferred to the next meeting. The Subcommittee completed its review of the draft through page 40.

This item was for discussion only. No formal action taken.

4. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM STAFF

Ms. Walton noted that the Subcommittee would continue review of Chapters 2, 3, and 4 at the next meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT

4. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM STAFF

Ms. Walton noted that the Subcommittee would continue review of Chapters 2, 3, and 4 at the next meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Committee Member Cathey Rusing adjourned the meeting at 5:03pm.

Mayor Cathey Rusing, Chair

Mayor Cathey Rusing, Chair 3/12/26

Lizzett Enriquez

Lizzett Enriquez, Board Secretary