

Road project is a new location east-west roadway within the city limits of the City of Laredo. It is situated about a mile and a half north of IH 69 West and aligned with A.F. Muller Boulevard, directly connecting FM 1472 (Mines Road) with IH 35. The project will be approximately 2.85 miles in length and consist of four travel lanes, two in each direction, and will have a raised concrete median in the center. The actions by TxDOT and Federal agencies and the laws under which such actions were taken are described in the Categorical Exclusion Determination issued on October 2, 2025, and other documents in the TxDOT project file. The Categorical Exclusion Documentation and other documents in the TxDOT project file are available by contacting the TxDOT Laredo District Office at 1817 Bob Bullock Loop, Laredo, TX 78043; telephone: (956) 712-7400.

7. FM 529 from Waller County Line to Katy Hockley Cutoff Road, Harris County, Texas. The project includes widening FM 529 from a two-lane roadway to a four-lane roadway between FM 362 and Katy Hockley Road and from two lanes to six lanes between Katy Hockley Cutoff Road and SH 99. The project is approximately 12 miles long. The actions by TxDOT and Federal agencies and the laws under which such actions were taken are described in the Categorical Exclusion Determination issued on October 2, 2025, and other documents in the TxDOT project file. The Categorical Exclusion Determination and other documents in the TxDOT project file are available by contacting the TxDOT Houston District Office located at 7600 Washington Avenue, Houston, TX 77007; telephone: (713) 802-5000.

8. FM 755 Rehab Super 2 from Starr/Brooks County Line to FM 1017, Starr County, Texas. The project will consist of the reconstruction of the roadway by adding two feet of additional pavement on each side of the road, and the addition of passing lanes. The road footprint will be widened from 40 to 44 feet throughout the project limits. The project is 7.949 miles long. The actions by TxDOT and Federal agencies and the laws under which such actions were taken are described in the Categorical Exclusion Determination issued on October 31, 2025, and other documents in the TxDOT project file. The Categorical Exclusion Determination and other documents in the TxDOT project file are available by contacting the TxDOT Pharr District Office at 600 West Interstate 2, Pharr, TX 78577; telephone: (956) 702-6101.

9. Barbarosa Road/Saur Lane from FM 1101 to Saengerhalle Road, Bexar County, Texas. The project will upgrade the existing roadway to have two travel lanes in each direction with a combination of center turn lane and medians. Turn lanes will be constructed at major intersections. A continuous sidewalk will be provided along the northern side of the roadway between FM 1101 and Westmeyer Road. A shared-use path will be provided between FM 1101 and Saengerhalle Road on the southside of the roadway. The actions by TxDOT and Federal agencies and the laws under which such actions were taken are described in the Categorical Exclusion Determination issued on November 20, 2025, and other documents in the TxDOT project file. The Categorical Exclusion Determination and other documents in the TxDOT project file are available by contacting the TxDOT San Antonio District Office at 4615 NW Loop 410, San Antonio, TX 78229; telephone: (210) 615-1110.

10. 30 East Corridor From I-45 to Ferguson Road, Dallas County, Texas. The project will widen I-30 between I-45 and Ferguson Road from eight mainlanes (four in each direction) to ten mainlanes (five in each direction) and add two reversible managed lanes in the center median. The mainlanes will be depressed to a lower elevation than that of the proposed frontage roads. Access ramps throughout the project will be reconstructed. The project will construct new cross street bridges across the depressed mainlanes. The project length is approximately five miles. The actions by TxDOT and Federal agencies and the laws under which such actions were taken are described in the Final EA, the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) issued on October 24, 2025, and other documents in the TxDOT project file. The EA, FONSI, and other documents in the TxDOT project file are available by contacting the TxDOT Dallas District Office at 4777 E Highway 80, Mesquite, TX 75150; telephone: (214) 320-4480.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)
(Authority: 23 U.S.C. 139(l)(1)).

Issued on: December 18, 2025.

Ed Burgos-Gomez,

*Acting Director Program Development,
Federal Highway Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2025-23636 Filed 12-22-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-RY-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2024-0255]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Approval of a New Information Collection Request: Study of Warning Devices for Stopped Commercial Motor Vehicles

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FMCSA announces its plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR) described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. This notice invites comments on a proposed information collection titled "Study of Warning Devices for Stopped Commercial Motor Vehicles." It is an experimental study that requires data collection for evaluating whether warning devices meaningfully influence crash-relevant aspects of human performance in the presence of a parked or disabled commercial motor vehicle (PDCMV), and if so, how and to what extent. These data collection efforts are expected to require the participation of 256 drivers. A total of 9 comments were provided in response to the 60-day **Federal Register** notice (91 FR 1591). The total burden hours reported in the 60-day FR published on January 8, 2025, has now been decreased by 128 hours after FMCSA inadvertently included but has now removed the 128 hours from the burden estimate. The 128 hours is the time estimated for respondents to travel to and from the location where the collection of information will occur.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received on or before January 22, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be submitted within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this information collection by selecting "Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments" or by using the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Samuel White, Research Division, DOT, FMCSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590; 202-366-3068; Samuel.White@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Study of Warning Devices for Stopped Commercial Motor Vehicles
OMB Control Number: 2126–00XX.

Type of Request: New ICR.

Respondents: Drivers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 256.

Estimated Time per Response: 2.0 to 2.5 Hours.

Expiration Date: This is a new ICR.

Frequency of Response: Once.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 504.92 hours.

Background

PDCMV on the road negatively impact traffic operations and safety.¹ To increase the conspicuity of PDCMV and mitigate crash risk, FMCSA requires specific warning devices to be carried² on all commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) and, except in the case of necessary traffic stops, be deployed³ near the vehicle whenever it is stopped on the road or shoulder. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations prescribe specific rules⁴ concerning how and where the warning devices must be placed, based on road and traffic attributes (e.g., whether the road is straight or curved, whether the vehicle is stopped in a business or residential district, whether the road is divided or undivided, etc.) as well as the presence of conditions affecting visibility (e.g., time of day, physical obstructions, etc.). These requirements follow from the basic notion that increasing the conspicuity of a PDCMV makes it easier to see and recognize, thereby reducing the risk of a crash involving passing motorists.

In addition, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) prescribes performance and design specifications⁵ for warning devices under 49 CFR 571.125 of the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS). For instance, this standard establishes minimum specifications for factors affecting the conspicuity (including reflectivity, color, luminance) of warning triangles, the

most commonly utilized type of warning device (due to their reusability, shelf life, and fire-risk safety concerns compared to flares or fuses). The purpose of this standard is “to assure that the warning devices can be readily observed during daytime and nighttime lighting conditions, have a standardized shape for quick message recognition, and perform properly when deployed.”⁶

Public interest in warning device requirements for PDCMV has increased in recent years for several reasons. For example, advances in automated driving system (ADS) technology have raised critical questions regarding potential barriers to regulatory compliance with warning device safety standards⁷ and regulations⁸ which reference or require a “driver.” In addition, alternative types of warning devices developed by industry, including those intended to increase driver safety during device deployment, have resulted in multiple applications for exemption from the corresponding safety regulations.^{9 10} These recent issues related to warning device requirements also call attention to the historically unresolved questions of whether the use of such devices improves traffic safety and, if so, how and to what extent.

Past attempts by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)^{11 12} and other researchers¹³ to answer those questions

yielded generally inconclusive or inconsistent results, which possibly influenced NHTSA’s past decision not to pursue conducting its own research on the topic.¹⁴ FMCSA (previously under FHWA) itself has never conducted experimental research on the impact of using warning devices. As the only regulatory authority which still requires CMV operators to use warning devices, the responsibility to answer these questions finally and definitively is best charged to FMCSA.

Given the increasing focus on ADS, questions surrounding the safety of CMV drivers when deploying warning devices, and the availability of new technology and alternative devices since these questions were last explored in the 1980s, there is a need to thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of warning devices under current regulations. In addition, advanced research instruments unavailable or not in use at the time of all past research on this topic are now in common use and would permit far more sophisticated analyses of the effects of warning devices on driver behavior. This includes sensors which can precisely measure and record the location of vehicles (e.g., differential Global Positioning System), eye-tracking devices which allow the researcher to determine the precise moment when a driver first glanced at a PDCMV, and instrumented vehicles which record accurate, high-frequency data related to drivers’ interactions with a vehicle’s controls.

FMCSA plans to implement these modern tools in a controlled experiment at a closed-course, state-of-the-art driving research facility that will allow the most comprehensive examination of the effects of warning devices to date. The results of the study may support future rulemaking related to warning devices and provide baseline data necessary to inform Agency decisions on exemption applications for alternative warning device products.

FMCSA published the 60-day **Federal Register** notice on January 8, 2025, and the comment period closed on March 10, 2025 (90 FR 1591). A total of nine comments were received from the public. These comments revolved around nine themes: regulatory considerations and impact, environment or condition-based study factors, study factors for other devices, automated vehicle considerations, safety benefits of

¹ Roberts, G. L., & Lynn, C. (2003). Passenger vehicle crashes into stationary large trucks: incidence and possible countermeasures (No. VTRC 03–CR17). Virginia Transportation Research Council.

² 49 CFR 393.95. (2024). Emergency equipment on all power units. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/section-393.95>.

³ 49 CFR 392.22. (2024). Emergency signals; stopped commercial motor vehicles. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/section-392.22>.

⁴ Placement of warning devices—Special rules. 49 CFR 392.22(b)(2) (1998). [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/part-392#p-392.22\(b\)\(2\)](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/part-392#p-392.22(b)(2)).

⁵ FMVSS no. 125; Warning devices. 49 CFR 571.125 (2012). <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/subtitle-B/chapter-V/part-571/subpart-B/section-571.125>.

⁶ FMVSS; Warning devices, 58 FR 27514 (May 10, 1993). https://archives.federalregister.gov/issue_slice/1993/5/10/27507-27517.pdf#page=8.

⁷ Kim, A., Perlman, D., Bogard, D., & Harrington, R. (2016). Review of federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS) for automated vehicles. John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, for NHTSA and USDOT Intelligent Transportation Systems Joint Program Office. <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/12260>.

⁸ Perlman, D., Bogard, D., Epstein, A., Santalucia, A., & Kim, A. (2018). Review of the federal motor carrier safety regulations for automated commercial vehicles: Preliminary assessment of interpretation and enforcement challenges, questions, and gaps (FMCSA–RRT–17–013). John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center. <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/35426>.

⁹ Parts and accessories necessary for safe operation; Pi Variables, Inc; Application for an exemption, 88 FR 40920 (June 22, 2023). <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2023-06-22/pdf/2023-13205.pdf>.

¹⁰ Parts and accessories necessary for safe operation; Exemption application from Waymo LLC, and Aurora Operations, Inc., 88 FR 13489 (Mar. 3, 2023). <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2023-03-03/pdf/2023-04385.pdf>.

¹¹ Lyles, R. W. (1980). Effective warning devices for parked/disabled vehicles (No. FHWA–RD–80–65 Final Rpt.). University of Maine, Orono, for Federal Highway Administration.

¹² Knoblauch, R.L., & Tobey, H.N. (1980). Safety aspects of using vehicle hazard warning lights, Volume 2 (No. FHWA/RD–80–102). Biotechnology, Inc., for Federal Highway Administration.

¹³ Allen, M.J., Miller, S.D., & Short, J.L. (1973). The effect of flares and triangular distress signals on

highway traffic. *Optometry and Vision Science*, 50(4), 305–315.

¹⁴ Federal motor vehicle safety standards; Warning devices, 59 FR 49586 (September 29, 1994). https://archives.federalregister.gov/issue_slice/1994/9/29/49585-49591.pdf#page=2.

and effectiveness of warning devices, and risks or challenges with warning devices. These are all important comments for FMCSA to consider while conducting the study or when making decisions based on the results of the study. However, none of the comments directly address the proposed information collection or its associated costs/impacts. As such, FMCSA summarizes the comments but provides no response. Many comments touched on multiple issues; however, the comments below are organized based on the primary feedback provided.

Regulatory Considerations and Impact

There is widespread recognition that regulatory gaps and complexities hinder effective deployment and use of warning devices. Commenters noted that current rules do not adequately address the overuse of warning lights, and that knowledge gaps continue to weaken the regulatory framework's effectiveness. Additionally, legal loopholes and the complexity of implementing regulations were seen as barriers to the adoption of improved safety measures. Nonetheless, many comments supported FMCSA's ongoing regulatory efforts and encouraged further research to improve and modernize safety rules.

Environment or Condition-Based Study Factors

Environmental factors were a consistent theme, with many comments highlighting how visibility issues—compounded by driver inattention, curves in the road, and lack of rumble strips—reduce the effectiveness of warning devices. Visibility varies significantly across road types, making it essential for studies to account for these conditions. Several comments advocated for studies to explicitly consider how different environmental scenarios impact both warning device performance and driver response.

Study Factors for Other Devices

The public expressed concerns about the reliability and effectiveness of alternative warning devices. Some noted that excessive or competing lights, such as flashing beacons, can confuse drivers and reduce recognition of genuine hazards. Others raised the issue of power failure risks in beacons and the failure of some warning devices in real-world conditions. There was strong support for the evaluation of new warning technologies and a call to remain open to innovative solutions that might enhance safety outcomes.

Automated Vehicle Considerations

With deployment nearing of driver-out ADS-equipped CMVs, commenters raised important questions about how these technologies interface with existing safety requirements. Many pointed out that automated vehicles (AVs) lack the ability to deploy warning devices which introduces new regulatory challenges. Concerns included the need for AVs to have redundant safety systems and the potential mismatch between other driver expectations and AV capabilities. The comments emphasized the need for additional human-factors research, particularly regarding how drivers maintain attention and readiness to assume control of ADS-equipped CMVs. There was also a call for developing specific safety solutions for ADS-equipped CMVs and addressing gaps in AV breakdown procedures.

Safety Benefits of and Effectiveness of Warning Devices

Despite some concerns, many commenters acknowledged the critical role of warning devices in preventing accidents. Proper use of these devices was praised for offering early hazard detection and for being simple yet effective. The comments reinforced the idea that even basic tools can provide significant safety benefits when deployed correctly. Public feedback also urged FMCSA to validate the effectiveness of these tools through research and ensure that any new safety technologies meet or exceed this benchmark.

Risks or Challenges With Warning Devices

The misuse or overuse of warning devices was a key concern, as it can reduce their clarity and effectiveness in signaling real hazards. Inattentive drivers, outdated devices, and the risk of device placement on the roadside were all cited as challenges. Some commenters also mentioned that certain warning devices may be dangerous, especially when their deployment puts drivers at risk. These concerns underscore the need for updated regulations and evaluations that reflect current and emerging road conditions and technologies.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) whether the proposed collection is necessary for the performance of FMCSA's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways for FMCSA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected

information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information.

Issued under the authority of 49 CFR 1.87.

Jonathan Mueller,

Acting Associate Administrator, Office of Research and Registration.

[FR Doc. 2025–23762 Filed 12–22–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

[FTA Docket No. FTA 2025–0237]

Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review: All Stations Accessibility Program (ASAP)

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice of request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the intention of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve a request for an extension without change to an existing information collection: All Stations Accessibility Program (ASAP).

DATES: Comments must be submitted before February 23, 2026.

ADDRESSES: To ensure that your comments are not entered more than once into the docket, submit comments identified by the docket number by only one of the following methods:

1. **Website:** <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the U.S. Government electronic docket site. All electronic submissions must be made to the U.S. Government electronic docket site at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Commenters should follow the directions below for mailed and hand-delivered comments.

2. **Fax:** 202–366–7951.

3. **Mail:** U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

4. **Hand Delivery:** U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: You must include the agency name and docket number for this notice at the beginning of your comments. Submit two copies of your