



White Salmon Planning Commission Meeting
A G E N D A
February 25, 2026 – 5:30 PM
119 NE Church Ave and via Zoom Teleconference

Meeting ID: [818 3215 4756](#)
Call in Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 US (Tacoma)

Call to Order/Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

- [1.](#) January 14, 2026 Minutes

Public Comment

Members of the public attending the meeting, either in person or via Zoom, are welcome to provide general public comment. Each speaker will be allotted three minutes.

Discussion Items

- [2.](#) Shared utilities: initial research and discussion

Adjournment



File Attachments for Item:

1. January 14, 2026 Minutes



DRAFT

**White Salmon Planning Commission
MEETING MINUTES**

**January 14, 2026 – 5:30 PM
119 NE Church Ave and Zoom Teleconference**

COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT

Commission Members:

Carl Trabant, Chair
Michael Morneault
Brendan Brown
Erika Price
Nate Loker

Staff:

Rowan Fairfield, City Planner
Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner
Kelly Hickok, Legal Counsel

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chair Carl Trabant called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. A quorum of planning commissioner members was present. Two members of the community attended the meeting in person or via teleconference.

Roll call was conducted by staff:

Chair Carl Trabant — Present
Commissioner Michael Morneault — Present
Commissioner Brendan Brown — Present
Commissioner Nate Loker — Present

Staff confirmed that a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 1. Meeting Minutes – August 13, 2025**
- 2. Meeting Minutes – November 12, 2025**

Moved by Michael Morneault. Seconded by Brendan Brown.

**Motion to approve the meeting minutes from August 13 and November 12, 2025, as presented.
MOTION CARRIES Unanimously (4–0).**

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public provided comment.

PRESENTATIONS

3. Presentation: Affordable Housing at Bethel Church

Presenter: Chris Heald, Bethel Congregational Church (480 NE Jewett Blvd.)

Chair Carl Trabant introduced Chris Heald, who presented a preliminary concept for developing affordable housing on underutilized church property at Bethel Congregational Church. The site is approximately 0.85 acres and located at the corner of Grandview and Pioneer.

Mr. Heald explained that there is roughly 5,400 square feet of land on the property that may be suitable for three small housing units (approximately 400–600 square feet each). The intent is to

explore whether the City’s regulations would allow construction of three accessory dwelling units (ADUs) associated with the church. Mr. Heald emphasized that the proposal is in an exploratory stage and that he does not yet have formal authorization from the church board; he is seeking guidance on feasibility before pursuing the concept further.

Mr. Heald noted that he has spoken with City staff, including the City Planner, and has received general encouragement to explore the idea. He has also consulted with a small-home manufacturer and discussed the possibility of working with a community land trust to maintain long-term affordability. Potential future models could include rental units or ownership through a community land trust structure, though no decisions have been made. The presenter stated that the primary question at this stage is whether such housing could be permitted on the commercially zoned church property.

Commissioners asked clarifying questions regarding property boundaries, current uses on the site (including the makerspace), parking availability, potential occupancy, and possible management or ownership structures. Concerns were raised about parking capacity during peak church events and how additional residential units might affect parking demand. Mr. Heald indicated that parking demand is typically manageable and that options could be explored to designate or reconfigure parking if needed.

City Planner Rowan Fairfield stated that, based on current code, the concept of three ADUs on the property appears feasible through the conditional use permit (Type II) process. ADUs are allowed in the commercial zone with conditional use approval, and nonconforming uses may also have ADUs. The Planner clarified that the Commission was not being asked to make a formal decision at this time; the intent was to introduce the concept and receive preliminary feedback. If pursued, a conditional use permit would be reviewed by the Hearings Examiner following staff analysis and public notice to surrounding property owners.

Commissioners generally expressed support for exploring the proposal further, citing the City’s goal of increasing affordable housing supply. Commissioners encouraged the presenter to continue discussions with church leadership and return with a formal application if the project moves forward.

No formal action was taken.

ACTION ITEMS

4. Finalize the draft 2026 workplan and recommend approval for City Council

Chair Carl Trabant opened the action item to finalize the Planning Commission’s draft 2026 Workplan for recommendation to the City Council. City Planner Rowan Fairfield reviewed the draft workplan, which included seven potential work items for the upcoming year. The Commission was asked to confirm which items should remain on the list and whether any should be removed prior to forwarding the document to Council.

Planner Fairfield explained that the “Shared Utilities” item was carried forward from the prior year and that several additional items had been added in response to issues raised within the past six months. Planner Fairfield recommended removing the item related to private road standards, noting that the topic would likely be more appropriate for staff-level research and analysis rather than a Planning Commission–led work program item.

Chair Trabant provided additional background on two proposed workplan items that he had suggested, including potential updates to municipal code related to refuse container placement and storage (“trash can nuisance”). The Chair described how other Washington jurisdictions have specific requirements governing when refuse containers may be placed at the curb and when they must be removed, and he provided an example from another city with defined timeframes. Commissioners discussed recent confusion in the community regarding changes to Republic Services’ recycling collection schedule and noted that such confusion could make enforcement of any new regulations challenging. Commissioners also discussed the need for public outreach and education if the City were to pursue clearer standards.

Commissioners generally agreed that the list of proposed workplan items represented reasonable topics for consideration in 2026. Some Commissioners noted that certain items, including refuse container regulations, may be more closely related to general municipal code or operational issues rather than strictly land use, and that the City Council should provide direction on whether it wishes the Planning Commission to pursue those topics.

The Commission reached consensus to remove the “private road standards” item from the draft workplan. The Commission also agreed to forward the revised 2026 Planning Commission Workplan to the City Council for review, feedback, and prioritization of work items.

The Planning Commission approved the revised draft 2026 Workplan and recommended that the City Council review, provide direction on priorities, and approve the workplan for the 2026 calendar year.

Moved by Michael Morneault. Seconded by Erika Price.

Motion to finalize the draft 2026 Planning Commission Workplan with removal of the private roads standard item and recommend approval to the City Council

Motion carried unanimously (5-0).

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. Commentary: Should e-bikes be legal for younger riders?

Chair Carl Trabant introduced the discussion item regarding whether e-bikes should be legal for younger riders. The Chair noted that the topic had already been discussed previously as part of the Commission’s workplan considerations and did not require additional discussion at this meeting.

No further comments were made by Commissioners or staff. No action was taken.

Public Comment (Reopened)

After completion of the discussion items and prior to adjournment, staff noted that an attendee had arrived late and requested an opportunity to provide public comment.

Moved by Brendan Brown. Seconded by Nate Loker.

Motion to reopen the public comment period.

Motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Ryan (last name not provided) addressed the Commission regarding pedestrian safety concerns along Jewett Boulevard, specifically near the intersection of Jewett and Wona and in the vicinity of a nearby salon and access to Harvest Market. The speaker described instances where vehicles turning left on Jewett are passed on the right by other drivers, creating a potential hazard for

pedestrians. The speaker suggested installing a physical barrier, such as flexible delineator posts, to discourage vehicles from passing on the right and to improve safety. The speaker noted having witnessed several near-miss incidents involving pedestrians, including children. Chair Trabant thanked the speaker for the comment. City Planner Rowan Fairfield stated that the comment would be shared with appropriate City staff for follow-up. Commissioners discussed jurisdictional considerations for potential improvements at the location. It was noted that portions of Jewett Boulevard fall under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), which would need to be involved in traffic control modifications affecting the roadway. Staff indicated that while WSDOT would be responsible for the travel lanes, the City has responsibility for sidewalks and parking areas. Commissioners and staff briefly discussed potential options, including installation of flexible delineator posts as a lower-cost, short-term measure or future curb extensions (“bump-outs”) as part of longer-term improvements to Jewett Boulevard. No action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:21 p.m.

Carl Trabant, Chair

Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

File Attachments for Item:

2. Shared utilities: initial research and discussion

Chair Trabant's research

State of Washington RCW

- For ULS shared utilities are referenced in 58.17.060 (3)
- For HOAs shared utilities are referenced in 64.90.115
- Water sub-metering is required under Municipal Water Law

Skyway Washington (incorporated in King County) has their own water system, but refers to KCC where I found nothing allowing shared utilities, but they referenced Universal Plumbing Code (UPC). I think you referred to International Plumbing Code for White Salmon.

Ellensburg Washington operates it's own electric utility.

- 9.25.400 (E) is the only place in their Title 9 Utilities where I found anything related to shared utilities and it was a warning that delinquency of one unit can result in shut down of service for all units.

Some attachments included.

Does the state of Washington allow shared utilities for individually owned single family homes and under which RCW number



In Washington state, shared utilities for individually owned homes are generally governed by specific **RCWs** depending on the property type and ownership structure.

- **Common Interest Communities (HOAs/Condos):** For individually owned single-family homes that are part of a common interest community, [RCW 64.90.115](#) allows for easements and covenants where owners of separate parcels share obligations for utilities such as a "well or other similar use". This is common in shared-well or shared-septic arrangements.
- **Unit Lot Subdivisions:** Under [RCW 58.17.060\(3\)](#), "unit lot" subdivisions allow single-family residential buildings on subdivided lots to share common areas and utility infrastructure managed by a homeowners' association.
- **Municipal Water Requirements:** While homes can share private infrastructure, **municipal water suppliers** are required by the [Municipal Water Law](#) to have meters on all individual service connections as of 2017, meaning direct city-service lines typically cannot be shared across separate parcels without specific sub-metering.
- **Rental/Landlord Situations:** If the "individually owned" home contains a separate rental unit (like an ADU), [RCW 59.18.060](#) and related case laws permit "master metered" or shared billing as long as the methodology is disclosed in the rental agreement.

Are you looking to set up a new shared utility agreement for a property you own, or are you disputing an existing shared bill?

Utilities

Utility purveyors (cities, special districts, and private purveyors) should have flexible requirements for the design of water, sewer, electrical, and other connections to buildings in unit lot subdivisions. There are advantages and disadvantages to centralized and shared lateral connections and metering, and there may be different ownership arrangements, cost implications, and other reasons that require a variety of approaches.

When developing ULS criteria, utility purveyors should be consulted for best or preferred practices. These practices may vary if a ULS is proposed for a new development or an existing or older developed lot; regardless, it may be beneficial to include an administrative option to deviate from the preferred practice. For example:

- A single-family dwelling with one or two accessory dwelling units should have the flexibility to record a unit lot subdivision without changing the existing utilities.
- A townhouse developer could have an option to choose between a private master meter maintained by a homeowner's association and having separate meters for each unit.

Several municipalities in Washington state allow shared utilities (such as water, sewer, and electric) for individually owned properties, primarily through mechanisms like shared side sewer agreements, accessory dwelling unit (ADU) policies, and common interest ownership regulations. 

Key municipalities with explicit, albeit often conditional, code provisions for shared utilities include:

- **Seattle:** The Seattle Municipal Code allows for shared services, particularly for sewers. **SMC 21.20** authorizes the Director of Seattle Public Utilities to enter into agreements for shared sewage connections with properties outside city limits. Within the city, **SMC 21.16** governs side sewers, allowing for shared connections under specific, approved permits. Furthermore, Seattle allows "third party billing" for master-metered utilities (like water, electric) in multi-family buildings, allowing one account to serve multiple occupied spaces.
- **Tacoma:** The city of Tacoma has specific guidelines for **Shared Side Sewers**, where new connections are allowed for multiple buildings that are under common ownership. The City allows for these when properties are on the same parcel, or allows for the creation of easements if a parcel is divided but the utility is shared.
- **Arlington:** The Arlington Municipal Code provides for shared or multi-family, commercial, and industrial connections to the city's water system, subject to specific, adopted land use and utility policies.
- **Town of Steilacoom:** The Town of Steilacoom's Utility Code (Title 13) allows for comprehensive utility connections (electric, water, sewer) that can be reviewed and authorized by the Director of Public Works, facilitating potential shared configurations if they meet town standards. 

Key Considerations in Washington Municipal Codes:

- **Easements:** When a utility line crosses private property to serve another, cities in Washington generally require a legally recorded easement.
- **Reconstruction Rule:** Many jurisdictions, such as Tacoma, require that if a shared sewer system fails or requires significant repair, it must be separated into individual connections if the property is divided.
- **Common Interest Ownership:** Under the Washington Uniform Common Interest Ownership Act (RCW 64.90), shared utilities are common in HOAs and condominiums. 

Municipalities with Shared Utility Provisions (Water/Sewer/Electric)

- **Seattle:** Allows third-party billing with specific tenant protections, including regulations for water, sewer, garbage, and electricity. Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) allows for shared side sewers under specific municipal code conditions.
- **Bellevue, Issaquah, Kirkland, Redmond, Sammamish Plateau, Skyway, Tukwila:** These areas participate in the **Cascade Water Alliance**, which manages shared municipal utility services.
- **Tacoma & Ellensburg:** Operate their own municipal electric utilities, which have the authority to manage service connections.
- **Kitsap County:** Manages on-site sewage and water systems, which can involve shared systems.
- **Thurston County, Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater:** Coordinate on regional, shared utility infrastructure. 

In Skyway, WA, which is served by the [Skyway Water & Sewer District](#), shared utilities between separate owners generally require formal arrangements like developer extensions or easements. While, in Washington State, utility billing can be managed for multiple units, shared infrastructure must comply with specific district regulations for water and sewer access. 

Key Considerations for Shared Utilities in Skyway:

- **District Regulations:** The Skyway Water & Sewer District governs connections and requires adherence to strict water and sanitary sewer, which likely means shared connections must meet their technical standards, often requiring a "developer extension" process for new, shared, or multi-property connections.
- **Easements:** If one owner's utility lines cross another's property, a legal easement is required to permit this shared access.
- **Sub-metering:** To fairly manage costs, separate owners often use sub-meters to measure individual usage rather than simply splitting a single bill, as seen in broader Washington tenant/owner scenarios. 

For specific, legal, or existing shared utility setups, you should contact the Skyway Water & Sewer District directly to ensure compliance with their specific, detailed, and current regulations.

Commissioner Brown's research

Here are some initial findings from looking into the following examples of municipalities (and one county) who have supported shared utilities. I identified key features that enable success across these contexts and defined 3 categories: infrastructural capacity and engineering standards; ownership and obligation records; and integrated application, inspection, and enforcement authority. I also included a list of documents that I anticipate will need to be drafted.

Examples

Spokane

Olympia

Langley

Port Townsend

Elma

Tacoma

Kitsap County

Key features of successful schemes

Infrastructural capacity and engineering standards

Capacity verification for shared private system and upstream/downstream public infrastructure

Published engineering guidelines with clear thresholds across water, sewer, stormwater, electrical conduit, and communications conduit

Recorded engineering approval

Ownership and obligation records

Ownership clarity

Billing clarity

Recorded joint maintenance agreements + maintenance reporting obligations

Recorded easements

Recorded CCRs

Binding successors

Integrated application, inspection, and enforcement authority

Integrated planning+utilities review+inspection authority

Defined enforcement leverage

Fee schedule that supports the infrastructure necessary for all of the above

Documents to prepare/update

Ordinance

Application

Engineering guidelines with clear thresholds for each of the categories of water, sewer, stormwater, electrical conduit, and communications conduit

Utility maintenance reporting guidelines

Easement boilerplate/template

CCR boilerplate/template

Joint Maintenance agreement boilerplate/template

Billing allocation agreement boilerplate/template

Utility ownership agreement boilerplate/template

Binding successors boilerplate/template

Shared utilities application fee schedule

Shared Water Research

Mostly not a thing, but can be possible on multi-dwelling lots, with a master meter and then sub-metering.

Shared Sewer Research

City of Portland – ?

(Allegedly) used to allow shared utilities but not anymore... why?

City of Tacoma – Executive Directive ESD25-001

<https://cms.tacoma.gov/enviro/wastewater/esd25-001%20side%20sewer%20manual%20-%20shared%20side%20sewers.doc.pdf>

Allows for shared side sewers with a recorded JUMA (Joint Use and Maintenance Agreement).

City of Spokane – Administrative Policy RES 2025-0078

<https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/opendata/policies/2025/rule-4310-25-02.pdf>

Specifically makes an exception for “inadequate frontage on a right-of-way, such as a Unit Lot Subdivision”, among other things.

City of Mt. Angel – Sewer Design Standards

<https://www.ci.mt-angel.or.us/files/documents/PWDesignStandards-SanitarySewerDivision47033057100323PM.pdf>

Allows shared sewer laterals on a case-by-case, non-precedent basis, “approved by PW director and City Engineer, based on findings that separate laterals are not feasible or possible given the specific and unique conditions at the site, and that extension of a public sewer main through the property to serve additional upstream properties in the future is not necessary or possible”

City of Seattle – Codified Ordinance

<https://www.seattle.gov/utilities/your-services/sewer-and-drainage/side-sewers#shared>

Chapter 21.16 - SIDE SEWERS

21.16.250 - Easements and agreements

A.

Before a new side sewer may be located on property other than the property being served by the new side sewer, and before the Director of Seattle Public Utilities issues a side sewer permit, the owner of the new side sewer must secure a written easement from the owner of the property to be crossed. The easement shall be acknowledged and grant the right to occupy the property for side sewer or utility purposes. The easement shall be recorded with the King County Recorder's Office, and the permit applicant shall provide a copy of the recorded easement to the Director of Seattle Public Utilities before a permit is issued.

B.

Notwithstanding the requirements in Section [21.16.230](#), before the Director of Seattle Public Utilities may issue a side sewer permit authorizing a connection to an existing or new side sewer used by another building or dwelling unit, **an instrument that identifies all properties served by the shared side sewer and that saves harmless and indemnifies the City** from any damage or injury resulting from the installation, operation, and maintenance of the shared side sewer **must be executed by the property owners** of the new or converted buildings or dwelling units. The Director of Seattle Public Utilities shall approve the form of the instrument. The instrument **shall be recorded** with the King County Recorder's Office against all properties identified on the permit application. The permit applicant must **provide a copy** of the recorded instrument to the Director of Seattle Public Utilities before a permit is issued.

C.

Before the Director of Seattle Public Utilities may issue a side sewer permit authorizing a side sewer line to serve more than one property, a **joint use and maintenance agreement must be executed by owners of all properties** that will be subject to the approved side sewer permit. The instrument **shall be recorded** with the King County Recorder's Office against all properties identified in the permit application. The permit applicant must **provide a copy** of the recorded instrument to the Director of Seattle Public Utilities before a permit is issued.