

VETO MESSAGE ON HB 2830-S

April 2, 1998

To the Honorable Speaker and Members,

The House of Representatives of the State of Washington
Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am returning herewith, without my approval as to sections 4 and 6, Engrossed Substitute House Bill No. 2830 entitled:

"AN ACT Relating to recommendations of the land use study commission;"

This bill mostly reflects the consensus recommendations of the Land Use Study Commission (LUSC), which consists of representatives from a full spectrum of land use interests, including business, agriculture, local and state government, neighborhood activists and environmentalists. As I have stated before, LUSC provides a great framework for the debate over how best to improve the state's Growth Management Act. I commend the members of LUSC for all of their hard work. LUSC has been extremely effective, and I am disappointed that the Legislature did not authorize its continuation, or authorize another forum within which complex land use and environmental issues can be thoroughly debated and discussed.

When I vetoed HB 1472 last year, I asked LUSC to review the issue of mineral resource lands designations. The Legislature also asked LUSC to review the 120-day permit timeline. This bill reflects LUSC's response to our requests. The bill also makes some technical changes to the GMA annexation provisions.

While ESHB 2830 reflects the consensus recommendations which I support, I cannot sign the bill in its entirety. The language added to sections 4 and 6 amending the goals of the Growth Management Act does not necessarily make bad planning goals, but I am concerned about the implementation of those changes and vague language. For example, would the language in sections 4 and 6 mean that cities and counties who have completed their GMA plans and regulations would have to revisit them to ensure that the new goals are addressed? If so, what is the cost? What does "reasonable commuting distances" mean? In some parts of the country, great distances are acceptable commutes. These two new sections could invite more litigation and create more confusion surrounding GMA. In addition, section 6 makes changes to the same statute amended by HB 1487, which I signed into law on March 27, 1998.

For these reasons, I have vetoed sections 4 and 6 of Engrossed Substitute House Bill No. 2830.

With the exception of sections 4 and 6, Engrossed Substitute House Bill No. 2830 is approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Gary Locke
Governor