

2830-S

Sponsor(s): House Committee on House Government Reform & Land Use
(originally sponsored by Representatives Reams, Romero and Lantz;
by request of Land Use Study Commission)

Brief Title: Implementing recommendations of the land use study
commission.

HB 2830-S.E - DIGEST

(DIGEST AS ENACTED)

Implements recommendations of the land use study commission.

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