

1576-S

Sponsor(s): House Committee on Government Reform & Land Use (originally sponsored by Representatives Sherstad, Cairnes, Mulliken, Reams, Koster, Mielke, Dunn, McMorris, Pennington, Sheahan and Thompson)

Brief Title: Modifying buildable lands under growth management.

**HB 1576-S.E - DIGEST**

(DIGEST AS PASSED LEGISLATURE)

Finds and declares local governments planning under chapter 36.70A RCW need to analyze whether sufficient available land for development exists in order to provide for both residential and nonresidential needs of the population in those jurisdictions. Merely regulating land so as to allow for the development is insufficient. Specifically, local jurisdictions planning under chapter 36.70A RCW must inventory lands available for development and adjust plans or development regulations if insufficient land is available to meet the population projections for the following twenty years.

Requires annual updates of the inventory of lands.

Provides that the act shall be null and void if appropriations are not approved.

VETO MESSAGE ON HB 1576-S

April 25, 1997

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, Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1576 entitled:

"AN ACT Relating to buildable Lands;"

The issue of land availability within the urban growth areas established by the Growth Management Act has been addressed by the Land Use Study Commission. The Commission spent a great deal of time gathering input from a wide variety of interest groups, reviewing the options, and finally reaching a consensus on buildable lands, among other issues.

As I have previously stated, I value the work of the Commission and support the legislation that was developed as a result of its work. Approval of this bill would undermine the consensus process established by the Commission by allowing one group to achieve its objectives, without balancing the interests of others.

I am particularly troubled by the exclusionary definitions in section 4 and the prescriptive language in section 5. I have proposed legislation at the recommendation of the Land Use Study Commission that provides more flexibility for local government decision makers in implementing the Growth Management Act. Sections 4 and 5 of this bill steer the land use planning process in the opposite direction.

For these reasons, I have vetoed Engrossed Substitute House  
Bill 1576 in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gary Locke  
Governor