



White Salmon Planning Commission Meeting
A G E N D A
April 08, 2026 – 5:30 PM
119 NE Church Ave and via Zoom Teleconference

Meeting ID: [863 0049 3672](#)
Call in Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 US (Tacoma)

Call to Order/Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

- [1.](#) February 11, 2025 Meeting Minutes
- [2.](#) February 25, 2026 Meeting Minutes
- [3.](#) March 25, 2026 Workshop Meeting 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

4. Continuing discussion and next steps on Shared Utilities

Adjournment



File Attachments for Item:

1. February 11, 2025 Meeting Minutes



DRAFT

White Salmon Planning Commission MEETING MINUTES

February 11, 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

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chair Carl Trabant called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

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 – January 14, 2026

The January 14, 2026 meeting minutes were not included in the packet and were not reviewed.

Approval was deferred to a future meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public provided comment.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. WSU Senior Capstone Project

Planner Rowan Fairfield provided an overview of a recent visit from Washington State University senior students participating in a dual capstone program in planning and landscape architecture. The students toured White Salmon and met with various local agencies and staff to gain a comprehensive understanding of the community.

The students will be developing both group and individual projects focused on White Salmon.

Staff explained that the City has been asked to provide a “wish list” of potential project ideas.

Key points discussed included:

- Projects may range from **practical, site-specific improvements to long-term visionary concepts.**
- Student work will not be at a professional consultant level but may still provide valuable ideas.

Commissioners were asked to submit project ideas to staff within the next few days.

Staff will compile and forward all suggestions to the university.

3. Annual Work Plan 2026

Chair Trabant reviewed the Planning Commission’s adopted 2026 Work Plan. He noted that the City Council refined the Commission’s draft and prioritized certain items.

The primary topics included in the work plan are

- Shared Utilities
- Short-term rentals in commercial zones
- Downtown Parking
- Pre-approved building plans

Some previously proposed items were not included, as they were determined to fall outside the Commission’s scope of work.

Shared Utilities:

The Planning Commission discussed how to begin work on the shared utilities topic. It was agreed that this effort will be made by Commissioners rather than staff. Commissioner will conduct independent research on comparable jurisdictions. Findings will be submitted to staff for compilation and future discussion.

Pre-Approved Building Plans:

The commission discussed revisiting previous efforts related to pre-approved building plans, including a prior visual preference survey. There was interest expressed in reviewing updated materials or new submissions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Carl Trabant, Chair

Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

File Attachments for Item:

2. February 25, 2026 Meeting Minutes



DRAFT

**White Salmon Planning Commission
MEETING MINUTES**

February 25, 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

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chair Carl Trabant called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Roll call was conducted by staff:

Chair Carl Trabant — Present

Commissioner Erika Price — Present

Commissioner Michael Morneault — Present

Commissioner Brendan Brown — Present (Online)

Commissioner Nate Loker — Present (Online)

Staff confirmed that a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Meeting Minutes – January 14, 2026

One correction was identified regarding the spelling of “Wauna” Street, which will be updated by staff.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

Moved by **Commissioner Michael Morneault**. Seconded by **Commissioner Erika Price**.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public provided comment.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. Shared Utilities: Initial Research and Discussion

The Commission held an initial discussion on shared utilities, focusing on research conducted by Commissioners and staff.

Chair Trabant opened the discussion by summarizing his research into Washington State code and examples from other jurisdictions. Key considerations included shared utility structures, sub-metering, and potential legal and logistical challenges.

Key discussion points included the structure and implications of shared utility systems. The Commission discussed how shared utilities often rely on a master meter with sub-metering, which may create complications related to billing and responsibility among property owners. Concerns were raised about potential conflicts between property owners, particularly in situations involving non-payment or disputes over maintenance responsibilities. Commissioners also noted examples from other jurisdictions where a single delinquent account could result in service shutoffs affecting multiple units.

The Commission further discussed differences between the Uniform Plumbing Code and the International Plumbing Code, noting that additional research may be needed to better understand how these codes apply.

Staff clarified that the City's regulatory authority is primarily limited to water and sewer systems. Other utilities, including electricity, gas, and telecommunications, are controlled by outside providers and are not within the City's jurisdiction.

Planner Rowan Fairfield shared additional research and input from Public Works, noting that shared water systems appear to be less common and may introduce additional complexity. In contrast, shared sewer systems are more widely implemented and may present a more feasible option for consideration. Examples from other jurisdictions were discussed, including cities that allow shared sewer connections through formal code provisions, agreements such as Joint Use and Maintenance Agreements, or case-by-case approvals. Staff also referenced a recent local issue involving a shared sewer system failure, which resulted in significant conflict between property owners and highlighted potential risks.

The Commission discussed the original interest in shared utilities from the development community, particularly related to the cost of installing individual utility connections. It was acknowledged that connection fees and system development charges can be significant, especially for smaller developments. However, staff noted that these fees are based on established studies and methodologies, which limits the City's flexibility in adjusting them. Commissioners also raised concerns about fairness in cost distribution, long-term maintenance responsibilities, and the potential for conflicts between neighbors with differing levels of utility usage.

Commissioner Brown discussed the value of developing clear and detailed standards early in the process. He suggested that more prescriptive requirements and documentation could help reduce uncertainty for applicants and minimize the burden on City staff during project review. The Commission discussed whether developing detailed application materials and processes falls within their scope, with staff clarifying that the Commission would help establish policy direction while staff would likely be responsible for drafting code language and supporting materials.

The Commission considered different methods of outreach, including surveys, interviews, and a potential workshop format that would allow for more open discussion. It was generally agreed that a workshop could be a useful way to gather feedback, provided that discussion topics and questions are clearly defined in advance.

The Commission agreed to continue this work at an upcoming regular meeting, where members will refine a list of questions and discussion topics. A workshop is anticipated to follow, allowing

for broader stakeholder engagement. Staff will coordinate initial outreach efforts and gather input from Public Works and engineering staff to inform future discussions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Carl Trabant, Chair

Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

File Attachments for Item:

3. March 25, 2026 Workshop Meeting Minutes



DRAFT

White Salmon Planning Commission MEETING MINUTES

March 25, 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

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chair Carl Trabant called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Roll call was conducted by staff:

Chair Carl Trabant — Present

Commissioner Nate Loker — Present

Commissioner Brendan Brown — Present (Online)

No quorum was required because this meeting was a workshop.

Workshop Discussion Summary

Four people participated in-person at the Workshop. Four people sent comments via e-mail (two of these were also in-person).

1. Are you in favor of shared utilities? How would that impact your development business?

The group expressed general support for shared utilities as a practical tool, particularly for higher-density projects or for narrow/constrained lots. While shared utilities may not be ideal for homeowners, they could make certain developments feasible. Shared utilities align with other policies that encourage infill density. However, there can be pitfalls, and it's important to how such systems would function in practice, including metering (for water) and long-term maintenance.

2. Have you worked in other cities that allow shared utilities? What was your experience?

Most participants had little to no direct experience with developments using shared utility systems, though there is some exposure through related fields like lending.

3. Given that buyers generally prefer independent maintenance responsibility, would developers choose shared infrastructure in the absence of site constraints?

Homebuyers are motivated by cost more than a preference for independent utility lines. Shared utilities may reduce expensive infrastructure

work, particularly excavation and trenching. While there was some discussion about fees and cost structures, the broader agreement is that savings could come from reduced construction complexity, not necessarily from lower city connection fees or monthly bills, which still apply per unit.

4. Would you propose sharing both Sewer and Water?

Sewer is seen as the more pressing issue. Shared water utilities could also be beneficial, for many of the same reasons, but billing for shared water would be more complicated. Another option for water is “stacked” laterals within the same easement, which can save on space and excavation costs. In either case, a larger lateral may be required (e.g. 6 inches instead of 4 inches) to adequately serve more homes.

5. Would you propose using a sub-meter to track water usage per household so the residents can split the cost appropriately?

Generally, yes, it is important for people to be accountable for their own usage, but there was some hesitation about requiring it for every project regardless of site-specific context. The most important thing for the city is that it gets paid for water service.

6. How should we ensure that the City is properly paid for its water and sewer services?

Sub-metering or an HOA/CC&R arrangement could work as mechanisms to track usage and payments, but there is concern about who is ultimately responsible if an individual fails to pay.

There was also discussion of proportionality in billing, particularly for accessory dwelling units (ADUs), noting that past practices of charging a fraction of the base rate have shifted to charging full rates, which simplifies administration but raises questions about equity. Various methods were discussed for dividing costs, including meter size, unit count, bedroom count, or distance to infrastructure, though actual water use may differ based on occupancy and irrigation practices.

Staff noted that tiered water rates already exist, which increase charges per gallon with higher usage. Overall, the consensus is that the city should treat shared-use customers as individual accounts for billing purposes, with mechanisms such as sub-metering or a Ratio Utility Billing System to handle shared water.

7. If a ULS (“Unit Lot Subdivision”) is used to divide a lot into two separate individually-owned properties with shared Sewer and separate Water, how would that be billed? (Note: Sewer and Water are typically billed on one statement.)

Discussion centered on meter placement and how to ensure proper billing without involving the city in private disputes. The group generally agreed that the most straightforward approach is to maintain separate water meters at each unit, while sewer charges can remain standard per unit since wastewater is not metered. Moving the meter from the property line to the building was suggested, but concerns were raised about city ownership of meters, access for Public Works, and potential complications with meter reading. A “bank” of meters or other alternative placement on private property could be considered, but sub-

metering should remain a last-resort solution due to the complexity it introduces.

There was also discussion of billing tiers and the potential complications if multiple units share a single water line without separate meters, which could push users into higher usage tiers unfairly.

8. How would you propose the homeowners deal with the cost of repairs on shared lines?

The consensus is that the cost and responsibility for repairs on shared lines should be managed through a private agreement among the property owners, similar to a road maintenance agreement. This agreement should be established at the time of subdivision and recorded on the plat to ensure it is enforceable and clear to all future owners. CC&Rs or an HOA could formalize these obligations, with the HOA's scope potentially limited to shared utility oversight.

9. How would you propose to ensure that shared side sewers do not involve the City in neighbor conflicts?

Clear, upfront disclosure and formalized private agreements are key. Participants emphasized putting the shared sewer arrangement on the face of the plat or in CC&Rs, so that all owners are aware of shared responsibilities from the outset. An HOA or similar mechanism could manage ongoing maintenance and billing disputes.

There was agreement that subjective, case-by-case determinations by staff should be avoided; instead, clear criteria for when shared side sewers are allowed—such as limited frontage or side yard constraints—should guide decisions, with an appeal process in place for fairness.

Overall Summary:

- Participants repeatedly highlighted the need for **formal requirements**, such as maintenance agreements, CC&Rs, or HOAs to clarify responsibility, prevent conflicts, and ensure long-term maintenance.
- **Upfront and clear disclosure** of a shared utility is very important, such as a “shared sewer notice” on the face of the recorded plat, or CC&Rs or a maintenance agreement recorded with the deed.
- There should be **clear and objective standards** for when shared utilities are allowed, such as limited frontage and infill development, and an appeal process.
- The **cost savings**, in terms of connection fees and monthly billing, is unclear or negligible, but there may be other cost savings, due to more units (density) and/or more variety in the housing marking, fewer taps on the main line, reduced infrastructure complexity. One developer gave clear examples of how shared sewer could have changed the math for a townhouse development on NE Washington St.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Carl Trabant, Chair

Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner