

VETO MESSAGE ON HB 2676-S

April 2, 1992

To the Honorable, the House
of Representatives of the
State of Washington

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, Substitute House Bill No. 2676 entitled:

"AN ACT Relating to economic development related projects of regional or state-wide significance."

Sections 1 through 4 of Substitute House Bill No. 2676 would authorize local governments to identify economic development projects of regional or state-wide significance during their planning activities under the Growth Management Act. Local governments may then seek both state financial assistance to offset the impacts of the project and state technical assistance.

These sections appear to be based on the assumption that the local impacts of significant economic development projects will outweigh the benefits to the local jurisdiction in which the project is sited. Local governments would be ill-advised to site a project that would not provide a future benefit to the area.

These provisions state that a local jurisdiction may seek state financial assistance to mitigate state impacts of economic development projects, but do not provide funds or a process for requesting such assistance. Absent the appropriation of funds or a process for allocating them, these provisions will not result in real help to local jurisdictions.

Section 5 provides a process for local governments planning under the Growth Management Act to site industrial and commercial development outside of urban growth areas.

A major goal of growth management is to make key decisions on the location of jobs, housing, and open space up front, in order to make later siting and building decisions easier. That means our actions should, to the extent possible, encourage planning for growth, rather than continue to make land use decisions on a case-by-case or haphazard basis.

The Growth Management Act establishes an extensive appeals process. If local governments do not provide adequate land for industrial or commercial growth, the issue can be raised at local hearings. If local comprehensive plans do not include enough land, they can be challenged before new regional growth planning hearings boards. The state also has the authority to bring such challenges. We should support the process envisioned in the Growth Management Act, rather than establish a parallel process for industrial and commercial siting.

It is premature to amend the Growth Management Act for this purpose. Local governments have just begun to develop the comprehensive plans required under the Act. Urban growth areas have not yet been set, nor have decisions been made as to how much industrial or commercial development is to be accommodated, or where such activities should be located.

For these reasons, I have vetoed Substitute House Bill No. 2676 in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,

Booth Gardner
Governor