

VETO MESSAGE ON SB 6347-S

March 27, 2002

To the Honorable President and Members,
The Senate of the State of Washington
Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am returning herewith, without my approval as to sections 203(5), Page 4 (Department of Transportation " Public Transportation " Program V); 302(45), Page 20 (Department of Transportation " Improvements " Program I " Mobility and Economic Initiative Improvement Projects); 304(2), Page 23, Line 1 (Department of Transportation " Improvements " Program I " Safety Improvement Projects); 305(2), Page 24, Lines 22 through 24 (Department of Transportation " Improvements " Program I " Environmental Retrofit Improvement Projects); 810, Page 38 (new section added to chapter 47.08 RCW), Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill No. 6347 entitled:

"AN ACT Relating to transportation funding and appropriations;"

Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill No. 6347 is the list of transportation projects that will be funded if voters approve the statewide transportation revenue referendum in November of this year. I strongly support this bill, but for a few portions that were vetoed.

Section 203(5) of the bill would have required Everett Transit and Community Transit to develop an interlocal agreement to serve paratransit and special needs transit as a condition to receiving their share of new state transit funding. Senior Services of Snohomish County is under contract with Community Transit to provide these services to county residents through 2006. While I support local efforts to address coordination between these transit systems, the provisions of this subsection would have the effect of either eliminating new state transit funding for Everett Transit and Community Transit, or negatively impacting the financial status of Senior Services of Snohomish County.

Section 302(45) of the bill provides \$350,000 of the Motor Vehicle Account " State appropriation solely for the middle Washington corridor study. The proviso stipulates that the Department of Transportation, in consultation with local officials and residents of the area, shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of creating a new north-south corridor as an alternative to Interstate 5 and Interstate 405 from the Canadian border to Lewis County. The department would have been required to report to the legislature no later than December 31, 2002 on the feasibility of financing and constructing such a corridor. I have vetoed this subsection because the revenues that would provide the funding for the study would not be available until after the specified reporting date. Additionally, funding was provided to the Legislative Transportation Committee in the supplemental transportation budget (ESHB 2451) to convene a working group to study the same project.

Section 304(2) provides \$9,504,000 of the Motor Vehicle Account " State appropriation for a safety improvement project on State Route 7. The proviso was inadvertently written to state that the entire appropriation was provided for preconstruction

activities alone, instead of construction. In order to restore legislative intent for this project, I have vetoed the preconstruction item from the section.

Section 305(2) provides \$1,250,000 of the Motor Vehicle Account " State appropriation solely for reconstruction of a bridge at Skobob Creek on State Route 106 in Mason County. The proviso stipulates that the project is subject to review and approval by the department, but that the Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group shall manage the project. This provision of the bill would set an undesirable precedent by allowing a local group to manage a project on the Department of Transportation's right of way. For this reason, I have vetoed this item.

Section 810 would have added a new section to chapter 47.08 RCW exempting this bill from that chapter. RCW 47.08.010 provides that funds allocated for the construction or improvement of state highways shall be under the sole charge and direct control of the Department of Transportation. However, funding for highway construction and improvements in this act is appropriated specifically to the department, making the exemption unnecessary.

For these reasons, I have vetoed sections 203(5), Page 4 (Department of Transportation " Public Transportation " Program V); 302(45), Page 20 (Department of Transportation " Improvements " Program I " Mobility and Economic Initiative Improvement Projects); 304(2), Page 23, Line 1 (Department of Transportation " Improvements " Program I " Safety Improvement Projects); 305(2), Page 24, Lines 22 through 24 (Department of Transportation " Improvements " Program I " Environmental Retrofit Improvement Projects); 810, Page 38 (new section added to chapter 47.08 RCW) of Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill No. 6347.

With the exception of the foregoing sections, Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill No. 6347 is approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Gary Locke
Governor