

March 9, 2016

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp, Speaker of the House and  
Members of the House of Representatives  
State Capitol Building  
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Honorable Speaker Tripp and Members of the House:

This message addresses my actions on three pieces of legislation—HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL 219, with emergency clause (“capital outlay”); SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL 122, as amended, with emergency clause (“general obligation bonds”); and SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR BILL 172, as amended, with emergency clause (“capital outlay reauthorizations”).

As I have stated many times, I firmly believe that our infrastructure funding should always be used to construct projects that create immediate jobs and lay a stronger foundation for long-term economic growth in New Mexico.

When capital outlay funds are used properly, they can achieve two overriding goals for communities throughout the state. First, they can result in substantial construction projects that put local contractors to work and also lead to the hiring of new employees and the purchase of materials from small businesses. Second, they can represent an investment in critical infrastructure projects that stretch across local jurisdictions and, in many cases, have price tags that local governments would not be able to afford on their own. I also believe that the capital outlay process provides an opportunity for the State to focus substantial resources toward solving infrastructure-related problems that are long-standing, expensive to remedy, capable of disrupting public life, and threatening to public safety.

This philosophy is undoubtedly shared by the people of New Mexico.

It is frustrating and disappointing to watch how the Legislature squanders critical infrastructure funding – choosing to spend money on local pork projects that often do not

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 2

create jobs or develop the economy instead of pooling resources to make long-lasting, impactful infrastructure improvements throughout the state.

This happens year after year, it's irresponsible, and the people of New Mexico pay the price. Sadly, during this past legislative session, this perennial problem went from bad to worse in several ways.

**FIRST:** The Legislature chose to spend an unprecedented share of the State's capital outlay dollars (two-thirds of the available \$120 million) on local pork projects – neglecting regional and statewide infrastructure needs.

This allocation bucks historical precedent. For example, 53% of capital funds were allocated to statewide infrastructure needs in 2013; that figure was 69% in 2010 and a whopping 83% in 2008. The fact that the Legislature chose to allocate only 33% of capital funds to statewide infrastructure needs this year is disgraceful, and puts on display their irresponsible preference to fund things like wrestling mats as opposed to highway re-construction and sod for a driving range instead of critical dam repairs.

Ultimately, a sad legacy of our Legislature is a string of unfunded and unmet infrastructure challenges throughout the state that, if addressed, could have led to job creation and a more dynamic, thriving state.

**SECOND:** The projects that the Legislature chose to fund in the capital outlay bill were plagued with a variety of problems that illustrate just how irresponsibly capital money is spent in New Mexico. Here are some examples of what we found when reviewing this legislation, which serve as the basis for many of my line-item vetoes:

- *Countless projects are woefully underfunded, sometimes at 1/10 or less of the total cost of a meaningful phase of the project.*

In many of these cases, there is also no discernible plan in place for how the balance between the appropriation amount and the total cost of the project can be made up through other funding sources.

This is prevalent in water projects and public buildings, in particular. For example, what good does it do a local community to receive \$30,000 for a water project that costs \$1.2 million to complete? It may be a feel-good appropriation, but it does nothing to actually improve water quality, storage, or delivery.

This penchant for under-funding is also quite prevalent as it relates to appropriations for heavy machinery or large commercial vehicles. Appropriations are often half or less of the cost of the machinery/vehicle, and the local government receiving the funding frequently tells us that they do not have the funding to make up the difference.

Regardless of which example is used, it is simply a fact that this rampant underfunding leads to a string of incomplete projects and wasted infrastructure money. This often results in money having to be “reauthorized” later to another purpose, or for an extended period of time. Many of my vetoes in this year’s capital reauthorization legislation are, in fact, for projects that were underfunded several years ago, have seen little to no expenditure of the appropriation since, and yet were requesting more time to continue holding onto that money.

- *Funding is sometimes given to a local government entity for a project that the city or county does not want or need.*

This not only frustrates me because it shows a complete lack of coordination between lawmakers and local governments in their districts, but it also frustrates local decision makers who understand that every dollar directed toward a legislator’s pet project in their community is a dollar that is not invested in the actual needs faced by their community and region.

- *Severance tax bonds are frequently allocated to items or projects for which bonds should not be used.*

It is vital to remember that we use severance tax bonds to allow the State to assume debt over a period of time in order to fund large projects that cannot be paid for right now and will last at least as long as the debt we are incurring. As a recent *Albuquerque Journal* column pointed out, it would be foolish to mortgage a toaster, but that is exactly what happens in New Mexico’s capital outlay process (and each time it does, we sacrifice jobs that could have been created otherwise, by investing in large-scale infrastructure projects). Examples of this sort of spending abound in this year’s capital outlay bill, including appropriations to buy zoo animals, picture frames, wrestling mats, and musical instruments.

- *Appropriations are often made for less than \$10,000.*

I have vetoed every project in this bill for which less than \$10,000 was allocated because I firmly believe that funding (and usually, under-funding) so many small projects flies in the face of how our severance tax bonds should be spent.

Imagine for one moment what our state might look like if our legislators pooled our capital resources together each year and chose to drastically improve our highway systems, our water storage and transportation networks, our bridges and dams, and our health, public safety, and education facilities. We could have things like state-of-the-art water re-use and water efficiency systems, the best training facilities for our first responders, and high-quality interchanges and highways wherever they’re needed throughout the state.

Instead, these resources are squandered, and certain members of the Legislature have had the audacity to ask New Mexicans to pay higher taxes for the infrastructure projects they refuse to fund.

Furthermore, for many of the projects that received \$10,000 or less, it is worth noting that the simple cost of complying with the issuance process of severance tax bonds could cost the entities receiving these appropriations more than the appropriation itself.

- *A number of projects would send public money to private entities, in direct conflict with the State Constitution.*

For whatever reason, legislators continue to try to earmark public infrastructure money for various private or non-profit organizations, which is prohibited by the anti-donation clause of the New Mexico Constitution. In some cases, legitimate partnerships exist with local governments that make the appropriation legal, but often times, the State Board of Finance and the Attorney General must make the determination that the funding would be illegal (and thus, the money goes unspent). Additionally, numerous appropriations are made to charter schools for improvements to private facilities; this is not allowed, and I have directed staff for the State Board of Finance to stop those appropriations if they are, in fact, an improper use of public funds.

- *Some projects included in the capital outlay bill are already funded in the general obligation bond bill.*

This exemplifies the total lack of coordination and planning in our infrastructure funding processes. Every dollar that is “double-spent” in this way leads to unspent money overall because I have to veto one appropriation or the other.

- *Many projects reflect a piecemeal approach over several years to even cobble together the money necessary to plan and design something, making the prospect of ever securing enough money to actually construct the project very remote.*

Similarly, there are numerous instances where these capital dollars are being allocated solely to environmental impact studies or other feasibility studies, when in fact, a local entity should be paying for these studies first in order to determine the proper scope and cost of the project so that capital funding can be used to actually construct and complete it. Furthermore, simple studies are not a generally permissible use of tax-exempt bond proceeds under IRS rules.

- *Capital funding is often appropriated to projects that could have, and should have, first attempted to be funded using other funding sources.*

For everything from small water projects to public art projects, and tribal projects to forest thinning projects, there are a number of topic-specific funding sources that many of our local communities could use to meet their small-scale community infrastructure needs. Indeed, if we used these other funding mechanisms more often for our low-dollar local projects, then our state infrastructure funding bill could finally be used for its intended purpose – to meet our large-scale regional and statewide infrastructure needs.

It is important to note that in this year's capital outlay bill, I vetoed numerous small projects to improve acequias and ditches throughout the state. These projects tend to appear in each year's capital legislation and are usually funded at levels far lower than what is actually needed to complete the intended work. Unfortunately, acequia funding also tends to be some of the hardest money to get expended in a timely manner. For all of these reasons, I vetoed acequia projects, with the hope that these entities would utilize two funds in state government instead that are specifically designed to support acequia projects and ensure that they are done in a technically sound manner. The two acequia funds are at the Office of the State Engineer Interstate Stream Commission and at the Water Trust Board within the New Mexico Finance Authority, both of which have substantial available funding. I appreciate the importance of acequias to our way of life in New Mexico and believe that utilizing a different funding approach (one that comes with requisite support) will ultimately improve our acequias in more substantial ways.

**THIRD:** The Legislature nearly immediately killed legislation that would have professionalized and reformed the capital outlay process.

House Bill 307 would have created a legislative oversight committee, a capital planning council, and a small agency of capital planning staff to better prioritize, vet, rank, and allocate money for capital projects each year. It was not a perfect piece of legislation, but it was unquestionably an improvement over our current method, which is devoid of planning and prioritization altogether.

The Legislature dedicated very little time to discussing this bill and exhibited a clear lack of interest or will in reforming the capital outlay process.

**FOURTH:** The Legislature refused to even give a floor vote in either chamber to two pieces of legislation that would have, to some extent, made public each legislator's allocation of capital funds.

If the Legislature is going to allow each individual member to be their own appropriators of infrastructure dollars, the public should know which projects each legislator chose to fund (and how much he/she allocated toward each project).

**FIFTH:** Despite there being an effective, longstanding, and formal process for evaluating and selecting senior center and higher education projects to be included in the general obligation bond bill, legislators still managed to throw projects into the bill that were neither recommended nor fully vetted.

I have vetoed three education projects in the general obligation bond bill that were never recommended for funding through the formal processes that the Legislature and Executive uses in the months prior to a legislative session to review, vet, and identify senior center and higher education projects in New Mexico. Given all the various ways in which the Legislature is rejecting responsible capital spending practices, it would likewise be irresponsible for me to promote or allow legislators to subvert this well-established review process by tossing unapproved, special projects into the general obligation bond bill.

One specific project, for example, would have funded a new health education building on the UNM West campus in Rio Rancho. The Higher Education Department along with the Legislative Finance Committee and the Department of Finance and Administration considered the merits of this project during their summer capital project hearings, and the UNM Health Sciences Center was able to present the project on August 6, 2015 in Socorro. No design drawings, floor plans, or site plan were provided, and as late as January, 2016, the UNM HSC/SRMC president and CEO still said that the official site of the proposed project had yet to be determined. Information was lacking about the purpose and scope of the activities to be conducted at the facility, and very little data was provided to the capital committee concerning enrollment demand for the proposed addition to the main campus. As a result, neither the HED nor LFC nor DFA included the project on the official list of recommended general obligation bond projects, feeling strongly that it was not yet ready to proceed.

One option for the university would have been to utilize other funding, either from Rio Rancho or its own substantial reserves, to finish plan and design work on the proposed facility during 2016, in order to attempt to secure capital funding for the actual construction of the project during the next legislative session. Ironically, using this approach would make funding for construction available on nearly the same timeline that funds become available under the general obligation bond process (given that GO bonds take longer to be approved because they must appear on the ballot before they can be sold). Instead of taking this approach, it was one of only three unapproved and not-fully-vetted projects that was squeezed into the general obligation bond bill during the legislative session after the bill had already been passed without the project in it by the Senate.

It is also important to understand that adding unapproved projects necessarily comes at the expense of other projects that were vetted, reviewed, and ready to proceed. In this case, \$8 million was removed from a senior center project in Rio Rancho that had been

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 7

reviewed, recommended, and vetted throughout the summer of 2015 and was ready to be constructed and begin serving Rio Rancho's large senior citizen population. In fact, as recently as January of 2016, Aging Secretary Myles Copeland met with Rio Rancho city officials in Rio Rancho at what would be the site of the new senior center to eagerly talk about the future of the facility. Sadly, this facility is now underfunded and will undoubtedly need additional funding next year in order to complete the first full phase of its construction.

I must also note that, if we were to go along with the argument that the Rio Rancho senior center did not, in fact, need the \$8 million that was eventually stripped from it, there were a whole host of other senior center projects throughout the state that were submitted and vetted, but simply did not make the cut to be included in the general obligation bond bill this year. It could have been allocated to those projects, rather than to a project that was not yet ready to proceed and had not been recommended to move forward. The selection or identification of statewide higher education or aging needs is not an appropriation to a local government to do with as they please.

**SIXTH:** The Legislature chose not to address and fix the state's prevailing wage law, currently being implemented under court order, which will undeniably drive up the cost of public works projects in New Mexico and lead to significantly less capital investment in the future.

Sadly, if our capital dollars are not able to stretch as far because certain skilled workers are receiving artificially inflated wages, we will be able to start and complete fewer construction projects across the state. This unfortunately means there will also be less work available for New Mexicans who are employed in design, engineering, or construction fields.

To recap these six points... despite our numerous statewide infrastructure needs, and the economic benefit we receive as a state when we choose to invest in fixing them:

*During this session, legislators grossly increased their pork barrel spending, chose to spend the money in a number of irresponsible ways, concealed their individual appropriation decisions from the public, slipped unapproved and un-vetted projects into the capital bills, rejected reform of any sort to the capital outlay process, and ignored a problem that is going to lead to even less money being available for infrastructure projects in the future.*

---

Since receiving these three pieces of legislation, I have worked with staff to examine the list of capital project proposals line by line. We spoke with many legislators, sought information from local leaders, and did our best to determine the worthiness of these projects under the time constraints we faced.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 8

Ultimately, I have authorized \$157.8 million worth of projects in the capital outlay bill, while vetoing \$8.2 million worth of projects.

I have also authorized \$52.5 million worth of projects in the capital reauthorization bill, while vetoing \$581 thousand worth of projects.

And, I have authorized \$174.4 million worth of projects in the general obligation bond bill, which will appear on the ballot this November, while vetoing \$10.9 million worth of these projects.

Wherever possible, we worked to ensure that capital projects that remained authorized in these pieces of legislation can be found in communities in nearly every corner of the state, and decisions on funding were made without regard to the party of the legislator who may have pushed for the project.

It is also important to note that, despite the numerous deficiencies in these bills and the processes used to assemble them, my administration used the available funding for statewide infrastructure projects to invest in key, critical areas, including:

- New Pre-K classrooms throughout the state to meet growing demand
- New vehicles for New Mexico State Police officers
- New school buses for students in every corner of the state
- Critical upgrades to correctional, CYFD, and health facilities statewide, including the final phase of the Meadows long-term care facility in Las Vegas
- Construction of a new evidence lab for the Department of Public Safety
- Improvements at National Guard facilities in a number of communities
- Enhancements to the visitor center and meeting rooms at the Border Authority in Santa Teresa, in response to the economic development demands we are experiencing along the border
- Economic development projects through the State's MainStreet program and through its Local Economic Development Act closing fund
- Watershed improvements and forest thinning in order to protect our communities and the environments around them

I would also be remiss if I did not acknowledge that some legislators DID choose to pool their individual capital funding allocations in order to complete large-scale projects of regional importance.

Some examples include the \$3 million wastewater treatment system in Flora Vista in San Juan County, the large investments in improvements to regional airports in places like Roswell and Santa Fe, and the continued collaboration on funding for the Paseo del Volcan interchange in central New Mexico.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 9

Legislators who chose to invest in fewer projects are actually going to accomplish more for the state – it's that simple.

As I indicated at the outset, if we improve the way in which we spend our infrastructure money in New Mexico, we will create more jobs in New Mexico. And, if we focus on making big improvements to our statewide infrastructure networks, we will lay a much stronger foundation for commerce and economic activity.

I urge the Legislature to abandon the narrow, parochial, and irresponsible approach they continue to use when spending our capital funds and choose to put our state's economy and infrastructure needs first.

I have this day SIGNED HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTION FOR HOUSE BILL 219, with emergency clause, enacted during the Fifty-Second Legislature, Second Session, 2016, except the following part or parts, item or items, which I have vetoed pursuant to Article IV, Section 22 of the Constitution of the State of New Mexico:

On page 6, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 17.

On page 6, I have vetoed line 25, and on page 7, I have vetoed all of lines 1 and 2.

On page 7, I have vetoed all of lines 6 through 8.

On page 7, I have vetoed line 12 through the semicolon.

On page 7, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

On page 7, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 19.

On page 7, I have vetoed all of lines 20 and 21, and on line 22, I have vetoed through the word "county".

On page 7, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25, and on page 8, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 7.

On page 13, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 19.

On page 15, I have vetoed all of lines 14 through 25 and on page 16, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 16, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 20.

On page 19, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 10

On page 20, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 19.

On page 21, on line 3, I have vetoed from the word “music” through the remainder of the line.

On page 22, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 21.

On page 28, I have vetoed all of lines 2 through 6.

On page 43, on line 6, I have vetoed the words “and signage”.

On page 49, on line 22, I have vetoed the words “and signage”.

On page 51, on line 18, I have vetoed the words “and signage”

On page 57, I have vetoed all of lines 6 through 8.

On page 58, I have vetoed all of lines 5 through 7.

On page 58, I have vetoed all of lines 11 through 14.

On page 59, I have vetoed all of lines 9 through 11.

On page 60, I have vetoed all of lines 16 through 19.

On page 62, I have vetoed all of line 25, and on page 63, I have vetoed lines 1 through 4.

On page 64, on line 22, I have vetoed the last occurrence of the word “and”, and on line 23, I have vetoed the word “signage”.

On page 66, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 4.

On page 66, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 11.

On page 67, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 67, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 6.

On page 69, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 17.

On page 69, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 20.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 11

On page 69, I have vetoed all of lines 21 through 23.

On page 69, I have vetoed lines 24 and 25, and on page 70, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 71, I have vetoed all of lines 20 through 22.

On page 71, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25 and on page 72, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 72, I have vetoed all of lines 2 through 4.

On page 74, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 10.

On page 74, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 17.

On page 74, on line 24, I have vetoed the word “water”.

On page 80, I have vetoed all of lines 22 through 25.

On page 81, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 15.

On page 81, I have vetoed all of lines 16 through 18.

On page 82, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 7.

On page 82, on line 14, I have vetoed through the word “to”.

On page 82, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 20.

On page 82, on line 21, I have vetoed the words “to acquire”, and on line 22, I have vetoed through the first occurrence of the word “and”.

On page 83, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 7.

On page 83, I have vetoed all of lines 12 through 14.

On page 83, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 21.

On page 83, on line, 22, I have vetoed the words “to acquire”, and on line 23, I have vetoed through the second occurrence of the word “and”.

On page 84, I have vetoed all of lines 2 through 5.

On page 84, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 12

On page 85, I have vetoed all of lines 16 through 18.

On page 85, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25, and on page 86, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 86, I have vetoed all of lines 2 through 5.

On page 87, I have vetoed all of lines 12 through 17.

On page 87, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 22.

On page 88, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 88, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 20.

On page 88, I have vetoed all of lines 21 through 23.

On page 88, I have vetoed all of lines 24 and 25, and on page 89, I have vetoed lines 1 and 2.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 3 through 5.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 6 through 8.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 9 through 11.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 12 through 15.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 16 through 18.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 19 through 21.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of lines 22 through 24.

On page 89, I have vetoed all of line 25, and on page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 1 and 2.

On page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 3 through 5.

On page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 6 through 9.

On page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 10 through 13.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 13

On page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 14 through 17.

On page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 21.

On page 90, I have vetoed all of lines 22 through 24.

On page 90, I have vetoed all of line 25, and on page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 6.

On page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 7 through 10.

On page 91, on line 13, I have vetoed the semicolon.

On page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 14 through 16.

On page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 19.

On page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 20 through 22.

On page 91, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25.

On page 92, I have vetoed all of lines 1 and 2, and on line 3, I have vetoed through the word "county".

On page 93, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 8.

On page 93, I have vetoed all of lines 9 through 12.

On page 93, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25, and on page 94, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 94, I have vetoed all of lines 9 through 12.

On page 94, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

On page 94, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 20.

On page 94, I have vetoed all of line 25, and on page 95, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 95, I have vetoed all of lines 7 through 11.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 14

On page 95, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25, and on page 96, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 96, I have vetoed all of lines 5 through 7.

On page 96, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 12.

On page 96, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

On page 96, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 19.

On page 97, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 4.

On page 97, I have vetoed all of lines 5 through 8.

On page 98, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 11.

On page 98, I have vetoed all of lines 12 through 15.

On page 98, I have vetoed all of lines 19 through 21.

On page 99, I have vetoed line 25, and on page 100, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 4.

On page 100, I have vetoed all of lines 10 through 12.

On page 101, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 101, I have vetoed all of lines 7 through 9.

On page 102, I have vetoed all of lines 21 through 25.

On page 103, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 5.

On page 103, I have vetoed all of lines 6 through 10.

On page 103, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 17.

On page 104, on line 8, I have vetoed the words “and install signage for”.

On page 104, I have vetoed all of lines 11 through 14.

On page 104, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 18.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 15

On page 105, I have vetoed all of lines 3 through 5.

On page 105, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 19.

On page 107, I have vetoed all of lines 20 through 23.

On page 109, I have vetoed all of lines 5 through 7.

On page 109, I have vetoed all of lines 19 through 21.

On page 110, I have vetoed all of lines 18 and 19.

On page 111, I have vetoed all of lines 23 and 24.

On page 112, I have vetoed all of lines 9 through 11.

On page 112, I have vetoed all of lines 12 through 14.

On page 112, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 17.

On page 112, I have vetoed all of lines 22 through 24.

On page 113, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 6.

On page 113, on line 22, after the word “vehicles” I have vetoed the remainder of the line, and I have vetoed all of line 23, and on line 24, I have vetoed the word “infrastructure.”.

On page 114, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 17.

On page 116, I have vetoed all of lines 9 through 13.

On page 116, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25.

On page 117, I have vetoed all of lines 1 through 3.

On page 117, I have vetoed all of lines 7 through 11.

On page 117, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 17.

On page 117, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 21.

On page 118, I have vetoed all of lines 11 through 13.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 16

On page 119, I have vetoed all of lines 2 through 4.

On page 120, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 6.

On page 121, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 11.

On page 121, I have vetoed all of lines 19 through 22.

On page 122, I have vetoed all of lines 20 through 23.

On page 124, I have vetoed all of lines 8 and 9.

On page 124, I have vetoed line 25, and on page 125, I have vetoed lines 1 and 2.

On page 126, I have vetoed all of lines 23 through 25, and on page 127, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 127, on line 12, I have vetoed the words “and signage”.

On page 127, I have vetoed all of lines 14 through 17.

On page 128, I have vetoed all of lines 4 through 8.

On page 128, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

On page 130, I have vetoed all of lines 8 through 10.

On page 130, I have vetoed all of lines 15 through 17.

On page 130, I have vetoed lines 24 and 25, and on page 131, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 131, I have vetoed all of lines 14 through 16.

On page 131, I have vetoed all of lines 17 through 20.

On page 131, I have vetoed line 25, and on page 132, I have vetoed lines 1 and 2.

On page 132, I have vetoed all of lines 3 through 6.

On page 132, I have vetoed all of lines 7 through 9.

On page 132, I have vetoed all of lines 18 through 20.

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 17

On page 132, I have vetoed all of lines 21 through 23.

On page 133, I have vetoed all of lines 13 through 16.

On page 133, I have vetoed lines 24 and 25, and on page 134, I have vetoed line 1.

On page 134, I have vetoed all of lines 6 through 8.

On page 134, I have vetoed all of lines 12 through 15.

On page 134, I have vetoed all of lines 16 through 19.

On page 135, I have vetoed all of lines 7 through 10.

On page 135, I have vetoed all of lines 21 through 23.

On page 136, I have vetoed all of lines 16 through 18, and on line 19, I have vetoed through the semicolon.

On page 141, on line 8, I have vetoed the semicolon and the word “and”.

On page 141, I have vetoed all of lines 9 and 10, and on line 11, I have vetoed through the word “county”.

On page 143, on line 18, I have vetoed the words “signage and”.

On page 143, I have vetoed all of line 25, and on page 144, I have vetoed lines 1 and 2.

On page 145, on line 12, I have vetoed the semicolon and the word “and”.

On page 145, I have vetoed all of lines 13 and 14, and on line 15, I have vetoed through the word “county”.

Respectfully yours,

Susana Martinez  
Governor

HOUSE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE NO. 150

The Honorable Don L. Tripp

March 9, 2016

Page 18

RECEIVED FROM THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Time: \_\_\_\_\_ a.m. p.m.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 2016

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary of State

Time: \_\_\_\_\_ a.m. p.m.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 2016

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Clerk of the House