LAREDO & WEBB COUNTY
AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

POLICY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
November 19, 2025

LIVE WEB LINK: http://laredotx.swagit.com/live
PUBLIC ACCESS CHANNEL: Spectrum TV channel 1300

I. CHAIRPERSON TO CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Mayor Dr. Treviño, Chairperson, called meeting to order at 1:35 P.M.

II. CHAIRPERSON TO CALL ROLL

Graciela S. Briones, MPO Planner III, called roll and verified a quorum existed.

Regular Members Present:

Honorable Dr. Victor D. Treviño, Mayor and LWCAMPO Chairperson
Honorable Tano E. Tijerina, Webb County Judge and LWCAMPO Vice-Chairperson
Honorable Vanessa Perez, District VII – *arrived at 1:39 pm*
Honorable Ricardo "Richie" Rangel Jr. City Councilmember, District II
Honorable Ruben Gutierrez Jr., City Councilmember, District V

Regular Members Not Present:

Honorable Jesse Gonzalez, Webb County Commissioner, Pct. 1
Honorable John Galo, Webb County Commissioner, Pct. 3
Mr. Epigmenio "Epi" Gonzalez, P.E., TxDOT District Engineer
Mr. Jed A. Brown, Member-At-Large

Ex-Officio Members Not Present:

Honorable Judith Zaffirini, State Senator, District 21
Honorable Richard Raymond, State Representative, District 42
Honorable Don McLaughlin, State Representative, District 80

LWCAMPO Staff Present:

Juan S. Mendive, AICP, LWCAMPO Director
Graciela S. Briones, LWCAMPO Planner III
Julio A. Niño, LWCAMPO Planner III
Eduardo Bernal, LWCAMPO Planner III
Adriana A. Vigil, LWCAMPO Administrative Assistant

Others:
Ramon Chavez, COL Assistant City Manager
Joaquin A. Rodriguez, COL Assistant City Attorney
Rodolfo Morales III, COL Assistant City Attorney
Vanessa Guerra, COL Planning
Arnold J. Lozano, COL Economic Development
Andres R. Garcia, COL Mayor's Office
Robert J. Garza, El Metro Transit
Eloisa Mascorro, El Metro Transit
Roberto Rodriguez, TxDOT
Sara Garza, TxDOT
Adelaido Uribe, Webb County Judge's Office
Anthony Garza, Webb County Consultant
Baltazar Avila, LJA Engineering

CM. Gutierrez, made a motion to **excuse** all members not present.

Second: CM. Rangel
For: 4
Against: 0
Abstained: 0

Motion carried unanimously.

III. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Speakers are required to fill out witness cards, which must be submitted to MPO Staff no later than 1:45 PM the day of the meeting. Speakers shall identify themselves at the microphone. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. No more than three (3) persons will be allowed to speak on any side of an issue. Should there be more than three (3) people who wish to speak on a specific issue, they should select not more than three (3) representatives to speak on their behalf. The presiding officer may further limit public on the interest of order or time. Speakers may not transfer their minutes to any other speaker. Comments should be relevant to MPO business and delivered in a professional manner. No derogatory remarks shall be permitted.

IV. ITEMS REQUIRING POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION:

A. Approval of the minutes for the meeting held on October 15, 2025.

CM. Gutierrez, made a motion to **approve** the minutes of October 15, 2025.

Second: CM. Rangel

For: 4
Against: 0
Abstained: 0

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Receive public testimony and initiate a (10) ten-day public review and comment period for the proposed amendment(s) to the 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Mendive, MPO Director, presented the item.

Mayor Treviño, asked whether anyone was present to speak for or against the item.

There were no comments received.

Mr. Mendive, reminded the Policy members that, pursuant to federal law, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for their respective planning areas covering a four-year period. This process is conducted in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and public transit providers, including El Metro. All MPO TIP documents are subsequently consolidated to form the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Mr. Mendive, stated that the TIP may be amended by the Policy Committee at any time during its lifecycle. He further noted, that the TIP amendments were considered during the previous meeting as part of the November revision cycle and that preparations were underway for the upcoming February revision. Amendments involving major changes to the TIP require initiation of a public review and comment period, as well as formal action by the MPO Policy Committee, prior to their inclusion in the STIP. Approved amendments are submitted to TxDOT for incorporation into the STIP on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Mendive, further explained that, in accordance with the MPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP), TIP amendments are subject to a ten-day public review and comment period. For the current meeting, Mr. Mendive presented one TIP amendment developed in coordination with TxDOT. The amendment was associated with the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Program in Texas, a grant initiative designed to support the installation, operation, and maintenance of direct current fast-charging stations throughout the state. At this time, the TxDOT NEVI team requested a revision to a previously awarded project located within the Laredo and Webb County Metropolitan Planning Area. The proposed amendment pertained to Project CSJ No. 5000-00-234, identified as a NEVI charging station project. The purpose of the amendment was to revise

project details, including the project description, project sponsor, project location, and federal funding amounts, as requested by TxDOT.

Mr. Mendive, indicated that the amendment would require initiation of the public review and comment process prior to formal adoption by the Policy Committee and subsequent submission for inclusion in the STIP. Mr. Mendive reviewed the changes associated with the proposed TIP amendment as presented during the meeting. He explained that, as reflected in the presentation, the project had originally proposed the installation of a charging station at 619 Crossroads Avenue, with Circle K identified as the project sponsor. He stated that the project description had since been revised to include the installation of seven direct current fast-charging ports along designated electric vehicle corridors, as well as five years of operations and maintenance. He further explained that the project location had been updated to 6627 Avenue, and that the project sponsor had changed to Tesla, Inc. In addition, Mr. Mendive noted that the year-of-expenditure cost had been reduced to $835,484. A map illustrating the revised project location was presented to the Policy Committee for reference.

CM. Gutierrez, asked for clarification regarding the revised project cost. He referenced the updated amount of approximately $800,000 and asked what the original project cost had been prior to the decrease. CM. Gutierrez further sought confirmation that the revised amount reflected a reduction in funding associated with the charging station project.

Mr. Mendive, responded that the charging station would be revised from eight fast-charge ports to seven at the new location. He explained that the decrease in funding ~~was~~ from $1,300,000 to $835,000, reflected the adjusted award amount for the project and was primarily due to the reduction in the number of charging ports. Mr. Mendive, added that this reduction represented one of the main differences in the revised project. He emphasized that the project revisions were being directed by the TxDOT Divisions in Austin, rather than by the local TxDOT district. He explained that because the project involves federal funds, any changes required by TxDOT must be reflected in the MPO's TIP, was the reason for the amendment.

CM. Gutierrez, made a motion to initiate a (10) ten-day public review and comment period for the proposed amendment(s) to the 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Second:	CM. Rangel
For:	5
Against:	0
Abstained:	0

Motion carried unanimously.

C. Receive public testimony and initiate a (10) ten-day public review and comment period for the proposed revision(s) to the 2025-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

Mr. Mendive, presented the item.

Mayor Treviño, asked whether anyone was present to speak for or against the item.

There were no comments received.

Mr. Mendive, proceeded with his presentation, explaining that, similar to amendments made to the TIP, any revisions to federally funded projects also require updates to the MTP. He reminded the Policy Committee that MPOs are required to develop and update the MTP for their respective metropolitan areas, covering a planning horizon of at least 20 years. he MTP serves as an official, comprehensive, intermodal plan that identifies existing and future transportation needs and develops coordinated strategies to provide necessary transportation facilities, essential to maintain mobility and supporting the economic vitality of the region. He further noted that projects included in the MPO's TIP must be consistent with the approved MTP.

Mr. Mendive, stated that the proposed revisions were intended to make necessary updates to the current MTP, specifically Tables 1.1.1, which detailed the program and selected roadway projects for the financially constrained MTP 2050 under Chapter 11, commonly known as the financially constrained project list. These updates were required to incorporate and reflect the amendments to the 2025–2028 TIP discussed in the previous agenda item.

Mr. Mendive, emphasized that the project subject to the proposed amendment was already included in the MTP, However, the project information required updating to reflect the revised details. He clarified that this amendment, like the TIP amendment, pertained to the NEVI program. The updates included revised funding amounts, reduced from $1,300,000 to $835,484, and the updated project location, consistent with the TIP amendment.

CM. Gutierrez, made a motion to initiate a (10) ten-day public review and comment period for the proposed revision(s) to the 2025-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

Second: CM. Rangel
For: 5

Against: 0
Abstained: 0

Motion carried unanimously.

V. REPORT(S) AND PRESENTATIONS (No action required).

A. Presentation by MPO staff on the process to expand the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA).

Mr. Mendive, gave a presentation on the process for expanding the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary. Staff noted that at the previous meeting, there had been discussion regarding potential boundary expansion, including questions related to funding for the Columbia Bridge and future growth in the South Bridge 4/5 area. Mr. Mendive, explained that the purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview of the process for expanding the MPA boundary, should the Policy Board wish to explore this option.

The presentation included an overview of the current MPO boundary, the rationale for expansion, key considerations associated with boundary expansion and the procedural steps required to implement a boundary expansion. He also provided an overview of MPO functions, emphasizing the role of the Policy Board in guiding MPO activities.

Mr. Mendive, explained that MPOs are responsible for the comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing (3C) planning process. This process ensures regional transportation planning for urbanized areas with populations of 50,000 or more, reflecting the shared vision of the region's future. Through the 3C planning process, MPOs facilitate regional cooperation and provide a mechanism for local governments to have input on how federal transportation investments are made within their communities.

Mr. Mendive, presented information regarding the Laredo-Webb County MPO as the designated MPO for the Laredo urbanized area. He presented a map illustrating the current MPO boundary, noting that the committee was likely familiar with it from previous presentations. He explained that the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA), also referred to as the MPO boundary, is established by agreement between the MPO and the Governor. Mr. Mendive, stated that, at a minimum, the MPO boundary must encompass the entire urbanized area, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau contiguous areas expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period, in accordance with Federal regulations. He noted that the federal definition has evolved from "urbanized area" to "urban area," now considering household growth in addition to population. The current MPO boundary was described as including the City of Laredo, the City of Rio Bravo,

and portions of Webb County. Mr. Mendive, presented a second map showing the entirety of Webb County, with the MPO boundary highlighted, and noted that significant portions of the county remain outside the MPO boundary. He further explained that, when developing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) or the 25-year long-range plan, the MPO conducts travel demand modeling. He noted that the modeling area boundary extends beyond the current MPO boundary to include areas such as the intersection of I-35 and US-83, the future I-27 corridor, and additional areas to the south to El Cenizo.

Mr. Mendive, explained that the MPO extends its transportation modeling beyond the current MPO boundary due to anticipated future developments, including the planned Bridge 4/5. He noted that when conducting travel demand modeling and evaluating future transportation projects, the MPO considers growth in areas slightly beyond the current boundary to ensure the planning process accounts for projected regional development.

Judge Tijerina, commented that the discussion extended beyond just the Bridge 4/5 project alone. He noted that the loop and its planned expansions were also relevant and not currently encompassed within the MPO boundary. He stated that while most MPOs include the entire county, the existing MPO boundary primarily covers the City of Laredo and certain areas of the county. Judge Tijerina, acknowledged that the MPO had effectively supported the City of Laredo. However, he emphasized that the Bridge 4/5 project, both existing International bridges, and portions of the outer loop were not currently included within the MPO boundary. Judge Tijerina suggested that it would be beneficial for the MPO to consider expanding the boundary to account for the anticipated growth of the City of Laredo.

Mr. Mendive responded by noting that portions of the outer loop are already encompassed within the existing MPO boundary; however, he acknowledged that certain areas, including those connecting to US-255, were not currently part of the MPO boundary. He stated that these areas would require further review should the Policy Committee wish to consider a boundary expansion.

Mr. Mendive, explained that the outer loop is included along the eastern boundary and in parts of the southern boundary, though adjustments would still be necessary. He added that while some MPOs have expanded their boundaries to encompass entire counties, those MPOs are often located in more urbanized counties. Mr. Mendive, emphasized that, although there are areas that could be considered for expansion, he would recommend against expanding the MPO boundary to cover the entire county.

Judge Tijerina, requested clarification, asking Mr. Mendive, to explain his position.

Mr. Mendive, explained that any proposed expansion of the MPO boundary would require justification for all areas under consideration and emphasized that he was prepared to present the relevant information during the meeting.

Mr. Mendive, continued his presentation, noting that he would cover the slide regarding MPO boundary expansion considerations later in the presentation. He explained that expanding the MPO boundary could improve regional cooperation, particularly in developing areas currently outside the boundary, and could improve the efficiency of the transportation planning and system, citing examples such as the congestion management process and areas of traffic growth that are outside the current boundary. However, Mr. Mendive, cautioned that expanding the boundary would not necessarily bring additional funding, as the same federal funds would need to be distributed over a larger geographic area. He noted that boundary expansion could also create additional administrative and procedural requirements for projects currently classified as rural, as inclusion in the MPO boundary would trigger TIP and MTP amendment requirements, along with associated approvals.

Mr. Mendive, further noted that Webb County is the sixth-largest county in the state in terms of land area and includes significant rural areas. He suggested that coordination with TxDOT regarding potential expansion along the southern county line and the future I-27 corridor would be necessary to ensure that existing rural funds are preserved before any expansion occurs.

Mr. Mendive, explained the rationale required for expanding MPO boundaries. He emphasized that any proposed expansion must be supported by a comprehensive and clearly documented justification, as a recommendation must be submitted to the Governor for his approval. He stated that potential justifications include urbanized areas extending beyond the current MPO boundary, current MPO boundary and Policy Board composition hindering coordinated transportation planning, and areas projected to be urbanized based on 20-year growth projections. He stressed that boundary expansions should follow a holistic approach rather than on a project-specific basis.

Mr. Mendive, also discussed funding considerations presenting the twelve funding categories applicable to the Laredo District from the 2026 Unified Transportation Program (UTP), noting that MPOs have discretion over Category 7 funds, which total approximately $80 million over a 10-year period, and also discussed Category 2 funds, and Category 4 funds, which include both urban and rural funding. He explained that expanding the boundary could affect competition for funding, particularly for formula-based Category 4 urban projects, while Category 4 rural projects could potentially be

accessed more directly if areas were outside the boundary. He emphasized that these funding considerations should be evaluated as part of the decision-making process.

Mr. Mendive then outlined the process required to expand the MPO boundary. He explained that a new boundary should be developed based on projected urbanization over the next 20 years, considering future land use, development patterns, population projections, and traffic growth. He stated that any proposed changes must be justifiable and that the MPO is required by the Texas Administrative Code to provide TxDOT and the Governor with appropriate documentation and rationale for recommended boundary changes. He identified the required components for submission, including an MPO cover letter, a Policy Board resolution, updated bylaws if necessary, Policy Board minutes showing discussion and adoption of the proposed boundary, supporting justification, letters of support from affected jurisdictions, a TxDOT description, GIS layers for the existing and proposed boundaries, and associated maps.

Mr. Mendive, noted that a redesignation of the MPO would likely not be required, as the current composition of the Laredo-Webb County MPO would still represent the majority of the affected population.

Mr. Mendive, concluded by stating that, the purpose of the presentation was to provide the Committee with an overview of the boundary expansion process, and the requirements involved should the Policy Board wish to purse the option. He requested direction from the Committee regarding whether further research and analysis should be conducted to identify potential areas suitable for expansion and establish the necessary justifications.

Mayor Treviño, addressed the committee regarding public communication about the MPO boundary discussion. He explained that the City of Laredo's extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) extends five (5) miles from the existing city limits. He noted that the ETJ encompasses unincorporated land surrounding the city, allowing the City of Laredo to regulate certain planning and development activities before the land is eventually annexed.

Mayor Treviño, noted that information had been received indicating that the Bridge 4/5 area does not wish to be included in the City's ETJ, but does wish to be included within the MPO boundary. He reported that this matter had been discussed at a City Council meeting, and, indicated that additional dialogue and conversation would be necessary before any final decisions were made.

CM. Perez, noted that letters had been received from certain developments requesting to be removed from the ETJ, which raised concerns regarding long-term planning. She

further explained that other developments outside the MPO boundary had also removed themselves from the ETJ, including areas near US-255 and I-35.

CM. Perez, expressed concern that infrastructure planning efforts and allocation of funds based on population could be affected in areas no longer included in the city's ETJ. She asked whether other MPOs had encountered similar situations and inquired about available processes to address areas that have removed themselves from the ETJ but still impact regional transportation and have active projects within those areas.

Judge Tijerina, stated that many areas currently outside the ETJ, as well as some within the ETJ from Gateway to locations along US-35, had already excluded themselves from the ETJ. He noted that, under state law, developments can choose to align with either the City or the County, and that many were opting to align with the County. He emphasized that while the discussion had focused on Bridge 4/5, there are numerous other ongoing developments and construction projects that have not yet been addressed, and careful consideration is needed when determining which areas to focus on.

Judge Tijerina highlighted that, regardless of whether areas are part of the City or the County, regional transportation planning should ensure coordination to maintain the area's competitiveness, particularly regarding port infrastructure. He affirmed agreement with Mr. Mendive's professional opinion that expansion of the MPO boundary to the entire county is not necessary.

Mayor Treviño, addressed the Committee regarding the city's extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) and its role in planning and zoning for areas surrounding the city. He explained that areas outside the ETJ are not subject to city ordinances, which could affect land use, such as the placement of truck stops near daycares. He noted that this concern had been raised at City Council and emphasized that it requires further discussion, as it could impact the city's future planning and zoning.

Mayor Treviño, further also highlighted that the area in question includes an international bridge serving as a port of entry, which is a major land port in the Western Hemisphere, underscoring the importance of continued evaluation and discussion regarding planning and development in this area.

CM. Gutierrez, expressed concern regarding the potential expansion of the MPO boundary. He noted that expanding the MPO while maintaining the same funding levels would spread resources over a larger area, potentially reducing funds available to address existing transportation issues. He highlighted ongoing challenges on I-35, US-255, and US-83, including high volumes of tractor-trailer traffic.

CM. Gutierrez, emphasized that the MPO currently does not extend to all areas experiencing these issues, and he expressed concern that focusing on future growth areas before fully addressing current transportation needs could disadvantage the residents of Laredo.

Judge Tijerina, asked for clarification regarding the relationship between the city's extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) and the MPO boundaries. He requested an explanation of how the ETJ and the MPO boundaries interact, noting that he was seeking to better understand the connection between the two.

CM. Perez, stated that the Committee had received an application from a development requesting to be excluded from the city's ETJ, which had been discussed at the last City Council meeting. She noted that the committee was trying to understand the implications of this request in relation to potential MPO boundary expansion, including whether funding levels would remain the same.

CM. Perez, suggested that it might be more appropriate to consider rural funding for the area in question, as these funds would be more applicable to developments in rural areas, and questioned whether including an area that had specifically requested exclusion from the ETJ would be in the city's best interest.

Judge Tijerina, agreed with CM. Perez's points and noted that he was seeking clarification because he had not been aware of the prior City Council discussion regarding the development's ETJ request. He emphasized that the county's participation in the MPO has historically supported projects benefiting the City of Laredo, and he highlighted the importance of ensuring that decisions regarding boundary expansion or project funding do not adversely affect the people of Webb County.

Mayor Treviño, noted that a representative from the City Attorney's office was present and asked if he could clarify the relationship between the ETJ and the MPO boundaries.

Mr. Joaquin Rodriguez, Assistant City Attorney, explained that there is limited direct interaction between the ETJ and MPO boundaries. He stated that being within the city's ETJ primarily provides the city with authority over permitting and land use for structures, but it does not affect MPO participation or funding. Mr. Rodriguez noted that under Texas law, landowners controlling more than 50% of a parcel have the right to petition to be excluded from the ETJ. He emphasized that whether an area excluded from the ETJ should be included within the MPO boundary is a decision for the MPO policy committee and must be justified according to the Texas Administrative Code, with approval from the governor.

CM. Perez, asked whether industrial development in areas excluded from the ETJ would affect urbanization calculations and subsequent MPO funding.

Mr. Rodriguez, deferred the question to Mr. Mendive.

Mr. Mendive, explained that the 2020 Census revised the urban area definition, increasing the minimum population threshold to 5,000 or an alternative based on housing units and housing density. He clarified that industrial or commercial areas without residential units are not considered urbanized, and therefore would not affect MPO funding, which is based on population or households for certain funding categories. He also noted that some funding categories, such as Category 2 and Category 7, consider additional factors like vehicle miles traveled, but population is the primary determinant for urban area-based funding.

CM. Rangel, inquired about the current MPO boundary and its historical extent.

Mr. Mendive, responded that the existing boundary has remained largely unchanged since 2015, and that further research would be needed to determine potential expansion areas to the north, east, or south based on growth and urbanization projections. He noted that any proposed expansion would require supporting data and justification, and approval from the Governor. He further, explained that certain areas, such as along State Highway 255 and the future I-27 corridor, could be considered for MPO expansion, but rural funding attached to some projects would need to be evaluated to avoid impacts. He emphasized that even if the MPO boundary were expanded countywide, overall funding would remain largely unchanged, though some funding categories like Category 4 rural funds may be affected, as those are project-specific and only available within areas considered rural.

CM. Perez, asked whether inclusion within the MPO boundary would impact rural funding eligibility.

Mr. Mendive, confirmed that areas incorporated into the MPO boundary would generally no longer qualify for rural funds, but could still apply for other grant programs. He noted that Category 7 funding could still be used in expanded areas, while Category 4 rural funds may become ineligible for new areas included in the MPO boundary.

CM. Perez, also asked about specific areas, such as El Cenizo and Rio Bravo, and whether including them in the MPO boundary would require additional representation on the Policy Committee.

Mr. Mendive, stated that further research was needed to determine if additional representation would be required, but the County representatives might continue to represent those areas. He confirmed that the population in El Cenizo is under 5,000, which is below the urban area threshold.

Mayor Trevino, asked whether inclusion of areas such as the international bridge and Bridge 4/5 within the MPO boundary would provide access to federal funding.

Mr. Mendive, confirmed that federal funding access would not change, though some funding categories could be affected. He emphasized that expanding the MPO boundary would give the Policy Committee greater control over transportation planning in those areas, but would not impact land use authority, which remains under city or county jurisdiction.

Mayor Trevino, stated that further discussion on the MPO boundary expansion was warranted.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Committee. Policy Committee members thanked Mr. Mendive, for his presentation.

B. Status report by the Regional Mobility Authority (RMA).

Mr. Baltazar Avila, P.E., LJA Engineering, introduced himself to the Committee and made himself available to answer any questions regarding the following report that was included in the meeting packet:

WC-CL RMA November 2025 Status Report to LWCAMPO

1. **Vision Zero Webb Laredo Safety Action Plan (Safe Streets for All)**- See supplemental memorandum.
2. **The Vallecillo Road Project** – See supplemental memorandum.
3. **Vallecillo Overpass** – This project is being led by the TxDOT Laredo District Office (LRD). It has an estimated construction cost of $130M and is programmed for an FY 2030 letting per the Draft 2026 UTP. To date, the project is not fully funded for construction. The MPO has allocated $16M of Category 2 funds to the construction of the project; thus, the project still has a $114M funding gap. The TxDOT LRD hosts a quarterly meeting with the City of Laredo, WC-CL RMA, Webb County, and the Killam Company to discuss the status of progress of the various sections of Vallecillo Road that is ongoing. At the last quarterly meeting that occurred on the week of August 19, 2025, TxDOT LRD is on track for PS&E to commence of FY 2030. The next quarterly meeting is scheduled for November 2025.
4. **Springfield Phase IV** – Project is complete.

5. **Concord Hills (Wormser Road/ Lomas Del Sur to Los Presidentes)** – The RMA has committed $1 million to the development of a new location 1.3 mile, 2-lane minor arterial roadway extension from Los Presidentes to Wormser Road/ Lomas Del Sur within a nominal ROW width of 90' in partnership with the City. The project will provide a parallel route to Cuatro Vientos and provide additional access to the new Laredo Sports Complex and the Municipal Water Park. The ROW acquisition is ongoing. The draft parcel plats have been submitted to the City and the City is moving forward with the landowner coordination for acquisition. The City is coordinating a meeting with the property owners to advance the donation agreement. The design is greater than 90% complete.
6. **North Laredo Transportation Reinvestment Zone (TRZ)** - The North Laredo TRZ Study ILA is fully executed and in effect as of February 19, 2025. The WC-CL RMA is working with the City of Laredo to commence the next steps.
7. **Cuatro Vientos Transportation Reinvestment Zone (TRZ)** - Regarding the Cuatro Vientos TRZ, the City would like to commence the process of implementing the TRZ with support from the WC-CL RMA. The Cuatro Vientos TRZ ILA was executed as of 3/19/2025. The WC-CL RMA and the City of Laredo conducted an implementation kick-off meeting on 6/12/2025. On 6/24/2025, the WC-CL RMA Team individually met with staff from various departments of the City of Laredo including Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Traffic, Economic Development, Finance, Budget and the Tax Departments to explain the implementation process and describe the roles of each department in the process. The project is anticipated to be complete in the Spring of 2026.
8. **Other Items**:
    - The WC-CL RMA will conduct their next Board meeting in TBD.

There were no questions from the Policy Committee on this report.

C. TxDOT Project Updates

Mr. Roberto Rodriguez, TxDOT, noted that construction updates were not available at this time as the project staff were attending a training.

Mr. Rodriguez, reported that Commissioner Alejandro "Alex" Meade will be in town that week for a tour of the CBP facilities at the World Trade Bridge on Thursday, followed by a meeting on Friday from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Texas offices to discuss projects of regional importance affecting the area.

VI. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Director's Report November 19, 2025

Mr. Mendive, MPO Director, presented the following report, which was included in the meeting packet:

1. **Meeting Attendance:**

- TxDOT and MPO Senior Leadership Meeting was held in Austin, Texas on November 4th. Key topics discussed included an overview of the federal and state funding outlook, overview of projects and lettings, and TxDOT/MPO priorities for federal reauthorization.
- The Texas Association of MPOs (TEMPO) Executive Directors Meeting will be held on December 4th and 5th in Austin, Texas.

2. **MPO Staff Updates:**
   - MPO Director will be participating on the Steering Committee and South Segment Working Group for TxDOT's I-35 Texas Corridor Study: A Path to 2050 from the Oklahoma to Mexico borders. (First meeting held virtually on November 18th)

3. **Texas Transportation Commission Meetings**:

   - December 16, 2025
   - 2025 schedule not yet available

   The calendar invite for the upcoming Texas Transportation Commission meeting was sent by email.

   Upcoming Texas Transportation Commission meetings and agendas can be found at the following link: https://www.txdot.gov/about/leadership/texas-transportation-commission/meeting-dates-agendas.html

4. **Upcoming regularly scheduled MPO meetings:**

   - We will not hold a Policy Committee meeting in December unless a special meeting is needed.
   - Active Transportation Committee – December 3, 2025
   - Technical Committee – January 13, 2026
   - Policy Committee – January 21, 2026

   There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, the discussion concluded.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS

CM. Gutierrez, wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving and encouraged all to spend time with their families and to stay safe.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

CM. Gutierrez, made a motion to **adjourn** the meeting at 2:23 P.M.

Second: CM. Rangel

For: 5
Against: 0
Abstained: 0

Motion carried unanimously.

Juan S. Mendive, AICP
LWCAMPO Director

Mayor Dr. Victor D. Treviño
LWCAMPO Chairperson