

Wilkes-Barre Terminal Railway Company (WBT), in Luzerne County, Pa. (the Line). The Line consists of the following segments: (1) the Dunmore Secondary Track, between milepost 6.5, at Avoca, Pa., and milepost 8.6, at Rocky Glen, Pa., a distance of 2.1 miles; (2) the Avoca Industrial Track, between milepost 4, at Rock Street, and milepost 6.5, at Avoca, a distance of 2.5 miles, including the connection with the track of RBMN between LB Junction and the switch of the Dunmore Secondary Track, a distance of 0.123 miles, and the Langcliff Connecting Track, between milepost 0.0, at Duryea, Pa., and the connection with Norfolk Southern Railway in the middle of York Avenue, at milepost 0.867, a distance of 0.867 miles; (3) the Suscon Industrial Track, between milepost 154.5, at Suscon, Pa., and milepost 158.7, at Hillside, Pa., a distance of 4.2 miles; (4) the Wilkes-Barre Secondary, between milepost 169.2, at Ashley, Pa., and milepost 185.5, at Pittston, Pa., a distance of 16.3 miles; (5) the GWBP Industrial Track, between milepost 0.0, at Ashley, and milepost 0.5 at Hanover Industrial Track, a distance of 0.5 miles; (6) the Brownsville Industrial Track, between milepost 0.0, at Hillside, and milepost 1.0, at Brownsville, Pa., a distance of 1.0 miles; (7) the Wilkes-Barre Industrial Track, between milepost 59.9, at Ferry Street, and milepost 62.9, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a distance of 3.0 miles; (8) the Kingston Industrial Track, between milepost 142.7, at Pittston Junction, and Railroad Station 8594+58, a distance of 8.1 miles; (9) the D&H Wilkes-Barre Connector, from milepost A-208.08, Hudson Yard, to Conyngham Avenue, City of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a distance of 2.5 miles; and (10) the APC line, between milepost 0.0 and 0.6 in Wilkes-Barre, a distance of 0.6 miles.

According to the verified notice, WBT has agreed to grant trackage rights to RBMN pursuant to a trackage rights agreement (Agreement) for RBMN to operate local service.¹ This transaction is related to a concurrently filed verified notice of exemption in *Wilkes-Barre Terminal Railway—Acquisition & Operation Exemption—Luzerne County Redevelopment Authority & Luzerne County Rail Corp.*, Docket No. FD 36958, in which WBT seeks acquisition and operation authority over approximately 59.65 miles of rail line, including the Line here, in Luzerne County, Pa.²

The transaction may be consummated on or after October 29, 2026, the effective date of the exemption (30 days after the verified notice was filed).

As a condition to this exemption, any employees affected by the acquisition of the trackage rights will be protected by the conditions imposed in *Norfolk & Western Railway—Trackage Rights—Burlington Northern, Inc.*, 354 I.C.C. 605 (1978), as modified in *Mendocino Coast Railway—Lease & Operate—California Western Railroad*, 360 I.C.C. 653 (1980).

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the effectiveness of the exemption. Petitions for stay must be filed by October 22, 2026 (at least seven days before the exemption becomes effective).

All pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 36959, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board either via e-filing on the Board's website or in writing addressed to 395 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on RBMN's representative, Justin J. Marks, Clark Hill PLC, 601 13th Street NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005.

According to RBMN, this action is categorically excluded from environmental review under 49 CFR 1105.6(c) and from historic preservation reporting requirements under 49 CFR 1105.8(b).

Board decisions and notices are available at www.stb.gov.

Decided: October 9, 2026.

By the Board, Anika S. Cooper, Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel.

Kenyatta Clay,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2026-21034 Filed 10-14-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2025-0787]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Request for Comment; Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) User Acceptance and Effectiveness Testing Using Simulator and/or Closed Track Methods

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments on a request for approval of a new collection of information.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) summarized below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden. This document describes a collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval to evaluate driver's acceptance and use of intelligent speed assistance systems. A **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following information collection was published on June 25, 2026. Five comments were received during the comment period. NHTSA has addressed these comments, and there are no resulting changes to this collection based on the comments. However, due to rounding adjustments, the total estimated burden hours were reduced from 311 to 308 hours.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 16, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection, including suggestions for reducing burden, should be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget at www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. To find this particular information collection, select "Currently under Review—Open for Public Comment" or use the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or access to background documents, contact Emily Shull, Office of Vehicle Safety Research, Intelligent Technologies Research Division NSR-320, West Building, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200

¹ A draft copy of the Agreement was included as Exhibit B to RBMN's verified notice of exemption.

² Upon consummation of its acquisition authority in Docket No. FD 36958, WBT will become a Class III rail carrier. The trackage rights authority in this

docket cannot be consummated until WBT has exercised its acquisition authority.

New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590; emily.shull@dot.gov, 202–366–7409. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control Number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), a Federal agency must receive approval from OMB before it collects certain information from the public and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information by a Federal agency unless the collection displays a valid OMB control number. In compliance with these requirements, this notice announces that the following information collection request will be submitted OMB.

Title: Intelligent Speed Assistance User Acceptance and Effectiveness Testing using Simulator and/or Closed Track Methods.

OMB Control Number: New.

Form Number(s): There are multiple forms for this new information collection including

- NHTSA Form 2179: Eligibility Questionnaire
- NHTSA Form 2180: Informed Consent Document 1
- NHTSA Form 2181: Informed Consent Document 2
- NHTSA Form 2267: Intake & Eligibility Confirmation
- NHTSA Form 2182: Wellness Questionnaire
- NHTSA Form 2183: Questionnaire 1
- NHTSA Form 2184: Driving Behavior Assessment [Study 1] and Questionnaire 2
- NHTSA Form 2185: Questionnaire 3
- NHTSA Form 2186: Driving Behavior Assessment [Study 2 and 3] and Questionnaire 4

Type of Request: New.

Type of Review Requested: Regular.

Length of Approval Requested: Three years from date of approval.

Summary of the Collection of Information: The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) will collect information from the public as part of a multi-year research effort to learn about drivers' acceptance and effectiveness of ISA technology.

The overall objective of this research is to advance the state of knowledge regarding the interplay between driver acceptance and effectiveness of different ISA systems and is not immediately intended to inform regulations or policy. All study procedures are approved by the University of Iowa Institutional Review Board. The research will be conducted in three parts, referred to as Study 1, Study 2, and Study 3.

For Study 1, participants will complete an intake and eligibility

procedure, a training presentation, a familiarization drive, wellness questionnaires to assess susceptibility to simulator sickness, five study drives accompanied by a questionnaire after each drive to assess their acceptance and attitudes of ISA, and a questionnaire at the end of the study to measure their driving and speed behaviors.

For Study 2 and Study 3, participants will complete an intake and eligibility procedure, a training presentation, a pre-drive questionnaire to assess their acceptance and attitudes of ISA, a familiarization drive, wellness questionnaires to assess susceptibility to simulator sickness, two study drives, and a post-drive questionnaire to assess their acceptance and attitudes of ISA and their driving and speed behaviors. The NADS–1 simulator will collect vehicle data (e.g., brake inputs, steering wheel angle) and data about the surrounding environment (e.g., distance to surrounding vehicles and lane markings).

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use of the Information: NHTSA's mission is to save lives, prevent injuries, and reduce the economic costs of road traffic crashes through education, research, safety standards, and enforcement activity. As vehicle technologies advance, they have the potential to dramatically reduce the loss of life each day in roadway crashes. Alternatively, the system may not reach this potential if drivers do not accept and do not use the systems. This new information collection supports the department's strategic goal of safety. Speeding contributes to a significant number of fatal motor vehicle crashes each year. ISA technology has the potential to mitigate and prevent speeding-related crashes by alerting the driver of their speed. To evaluate the effectiveness of ISA systems, research is needed to understand to what extent ISA system characteristics influence drivers' speeding behavior, attitudes, and perceptions of the technology.

The following components will be used to obtain the necessary information to achieve this purpose.

(1) **Eligibility Questionnaire (NHTSA Form 2179):** This questionnaire is necessary for determining respondent suitability for the study based on driving experience and history, ability to adhere to study requirements, general health, sleeping behavior, and ability to safely drive the NADS–1 without concerns.

(2) **Informed Consent Document 1 (NHTSA Form 2180):** This form is necessary for obtaining documented

informed consent from the participant to participate in Study 1. The form describes all study procedures, data storage and use, and potential risks from the study.

(3) **Informed Consent Document 2 (NHTSA Form 2181):** This form is necessary for obtaining documented informed consent from the participant to participate in Study 2 or 3. The form describes all study procedures, data storage and use, and potential risks from the study.

(4) **Intake & Eligibility Confirmation (NHTSA Form 2267):** This process includes completion of the research participant substitute W–9 for payment, review of the driver's license to confirm it is valid by checking the expiration date and confirming age (for eligibility) and sex (for balancing sample) as listed on the license. These procedures are necessary to pay the participant and ensure they meet eligibility requirements before continuing with the experiment.

(5) **Wellness Questionnaire (NHTSA Form 2182):** This form is necessary to measure signs and symptoms of simulator sickness. If sickness scores increase during the drive, participants will be asked to take a break or end the experiment.

(6) **Questionnaire 1 (NHTSA Form 2183):** This form is necessary for Study 1 to assess participants' acceptance and attitudes of ISA. Collecting these data after each of the five study drives in Study 1 will let us measure how exposure to ISA impacts acceptance and attitudes of ISA. It will be administered during the driving behavior assessment.

(7) **Driving Behavior Assessment for Study 1 and Questionnaire 2 (NHTSA Form 2184):** This procedure for Study 1 is necessary to measure the impact of ISA system characteristics on speeding behavior and acceptance of ISA. The participant will drive for 80 minutes in the driving simulator, ample time to briefly experience different ISA systems and form an opinion of different system characteristics. Questionnaire 2 is necessary for Study 1 to measure participants' self-reported driving and speeding behaviors. These data will be used as covariates in the statistical analyses. It will be administered after the driving behavior assessment.

(8) **Questionnaire 3 (NHTSA Form 2185):** This form is necessary for Study 2 and 3 to assess participants' acceptance and attitudes of ISA. It will be administered before the driving behavior assessment.

(9) **Driving Behavior Assessment for Study 2 and 3 and Questionnaire 4 (NHTSA Form 2186):** This procedure is necessary for Study 2 and 3 to measure

the impact of ISA system characteristics on speeding behavior and acceptance of ISA. The participant will drive for 110 minutes in the driving simulator, ample time for prolonged exposure to two different ISA systems. Questionnaire 4 is necessary for Study 2 and 3 to assess participants' acceptance and attitudes of ISA and their driving and speeding behaviors. It will be administered after the driving behavior assessment.

(10) *Driving Behavior Assessment for Study 1*: This procedure for Study 1 is necessary to measure the impact of ISA system characteristics on speeding behavior and acceptance of ISA. The participant will drive for 80 minutes in the driving simulator, ample time to briefly experience different ISA systems and form an opinion of different system characteristics.

(11) *Driving Behavior Assessment for Study 2 and 3*: This procedure is necessary for Study 2 and 3 to measure the impact of ISA system characteristics on speeding behavior and acceptance of ISA. The participant will drive for 110 minutes in the driving simulator, ample time for prolonged exposure to two different ISA systems.

60-Day Notice: A Federal Register notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting public comments on the following information collection was published on June 25, 2026 (91 FR 38469). Five comments were received in response to that notice.

One of the comments was outside the scope of the Paperwork Reduction Act and this collection of information. Therefore, the comment will not be expanded on.

The second comment was submitted by the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). NTSB expressed concern that a simulator-based study "will not address the real-world environment that may affect ISA user acceptance," noting that although assessing ISA user acceptance and effectiveness is important and much research has already been conducted in this area, real-world environmental and social factors are not captured in a simulator setting.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and agrees that a simulator-based study, by design, cannot fully capture the real-world environmental and social factors that influence sustained driver acceptance. This limitation will be documented in the resulting technical report.

NTSB further noted that NHTSA's own 2024 Traffic Safety Facts report on speeding found that "young male drivers were the most likely to be speeding at the time of fatal crashes," and expressed concern that the study's

Eastern Iowa volunteer pool may over-select younger drivers who could be the least accepting of technologies that limit their speed, reducing the applicability of the study's findings.

NHTSA appreciates NTSB's continued engagement in ISA research and its long-standing safety recommendations in this area. NHTSA agrees that a volunteer sample recruited from a single geographic area cannot, on its own, represent the full range of ages, driving experience, and speeding propensity found in the general driving population. NHTSA will document the demographic composition of the enrolled sample in the resulting technical report so that readers can appropriately weigh the generalizability of the findings, and efforts will be made to recruit a broad range of ages and driving experience within the constraints of the study's geographic recruitment area.

Finally, NTSB encouraged NHTSA to assess the limitations of the proposed study to ensure that NHTSA continues moving expeditiously toward requiring as standard equipment in all new vehicles ISA systems that, at a minimum, warn the driver when the vehicle exceeds the speed limit.

NHTSA appreciates NTSB's recommendations over the years. As stated previously, NHTSA will assess the limitations of the study and reduce them where possible. NHTSA notes, however, that this research is intended to advance the state of knowledge regarding driver acceptance and effectiveness of ISA system characteristics and is not immediately intended to inform rulemaking.

The third comment was submitted by the Alliance for Automotive Innovation (Auto Innovators).

Auto Innovators encouraged NHTSA "to distinguish clearly among different ISA system designs and feedback modalities, including warning-based, haptic, and speed-control approaches," noting that driver acceptance may vary significantly depending on how a system communicates with or assists the driver.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and concurs. The driving behavior assessment in Study 1 exposes participants to multiple ISA systems within a single session, and Studies 2 and 3 provide prolonged exposure to two ISA systems per participant. Participants in Study 1 also rank their preference across the visual, auditory, haptic, and speed-limiting ISA variants they experience. The specific systems and feedback modalities evaluated will be described in the resulting technical report. These systems reflect a mix of

designs and feedback modalities—warning-based, haptic, and speed-control approaches—consistent with Auto Innovators' recommendation. NHTSA's research team also intends to draw on accuracy metrics from the earlier ISA project conducted with Exponent ("Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) Assessment of Enabling Technologies and Implementation Approaches") when designing the driving scenarios for this study.

Auto Innovators recommended that NHTSA evaluate ISA acceptance using "measures that go beyond general favorability or perceived usefulness," including driver trust in the accuracy and reliability of speed limit information, nuisance or annoyance associated with alerts, understanding of system limitations, willingness to use the system over time, and the likelihood that drivers could override, disable, or otherwise adapt their behavior in response to the system.

NHTSA appreciates this recommendation and agrees that driver acceptance is a multi-dimensional construct. The study's driver acceptance and attitude questionnaires will assess several of these dimensions: a nine-item semantic differential scale captures both perceived usefulness and the nuisance or annoyance associated with each ISA system, and separate items ask whether participants would use the system regularly and whether they would frequently override it. NHTSA acknowledges that the current instruments do not include an item that isolates driver trust in the accuracy and reliability of speed-limit information specifically, or driver understanding of situations in which an ISA system may fail to perform as expected; these dimensions are currently captured only indirectly, through more general items on system dependability and familiarity. NHTSA will consider adding targeted items addressing these two constructs as the study instruments are finalized.

Auto Innovators also recommended that NHTSA evaluate "drivers' acceptance of the system's default settings, including whether those settings influence drivers' willingness to use ISA over time or their likelihood of overriding or disabling it."

NHTSA appreciates this comment. The study's questionnaires will include an item asking whether participants would find it acceptable for the ISA system to be active by default at the start of every trip, directly addressing this recommendation. The experimental design supports the comparison of within-subject experiences with different ISA systems. This foundational work will provide insights for potential

future longitudinal studies where willingness to use ISA can be assessed over time.

In addition, Auto Innovators recommended that the research “include realistic scenarios that reflect the complexity of speed limit identification in real-world driving, including temporary speed limits, work zones, school zones, variable speed limits, obscured or missing signs, ramps, adjacent roads with different posted limits, and situations where map-based and sign-based information may conflict.”

NHTSA appreciates this comment. All three studies ask participants to rate expected ISA effectiveness separately by road type, including school zones and construction zones. The questionnaire items align with what they will experience in the driving simulator scenarios. The acceptance and effectiveness of ISA systems will be assessed using output from the questionnaire and driving simulator. NHTSA will consider incorporating additional scenario elements identified by Auto Innovators, such as temporary or variable speed limits and obscured signage, into the simulator scenario design as the studies are finalized.

Auto Innovators cautioned that “simulator studies cannot fully replicate the motivations, contextual cues, perceived risk, and repeated-use dynamics that influence driver behavior outside the research setting,” and recommended that any simulator-based findings “be treated as complementary to, rather than a substitute for, real-world or naturalistic data on sustained driver acceptance, adaptation, and ISA use.” Auto Innovators further recommended that NHTSA study additional factors affecting real-world ISA use, including false positive and false negative alerts, alert timing and frequency, and the potential for habituation or alert fatigue over time.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and agrees. The ISA systems used in the simulator-based study drives are not modeled as 100% accurate; participants will encounter instances of imperfect system performance during the study drives, allowing NHTSA to collect acceptance and effectiveness data under conditions that reflect the error-prone performance of ISA systems currently deployed on public roads rather than an idealized system. NHTSA agrees that simulator-based findings should be treated as complementary to, rather than a substitute for, real-world and naturalistic data, and will characterize this limitation in the technical report.

Auto Innovators encouraged NHTSA “to draw from Europe’s experience with

ISA while recognizing important differences between the European and U.S. regulatory and operating environments,” noting that ISA has been mandatory in the EU since 2022 for new vehicle types and since July 2024 for all new vehicles, but that publicly available post-mandate data on real-world user acceptance and disablement rates remains limited.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and will consider available European research and post-mandate data, where relevant, in the design and interpretation of this study.

Finally, Auto Innovators encouraged NHTSA “to continue exploring speeding solutions that go beyond vehicle-based technology, consistent with the Safe System approach.”

NHTSA appreciates this comment and notes that ISA is one of several speeding countermeasures NHTSA is pursuing as part of a broader Safe System approach to reducing speeding-related crashes.

The fourth comment was submitted anonymously. The commenter argued that measuring driver acceptance in a simulator creates a “false acceptance” bias because participants do not experience the real-world social or physical consequences of maintaining a lower speed, such as pressure from surrounding traffic to exceed the posted limit. The commenter recommended that NHTSA inject operational stressors, such as aggressive tailgating and tight merge maneuvers, into the simulator scenarios to measure driver behavior under more realistic conditions.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and acknowledges that a simulator environment cannot fully replicate the social and physical pressures of real-world driving. This limitation will be documented in the resulting technical report. NHTSA will consider the commenter’s recommendation regarding surrounding traffic behavior as the simulator scenarios are finalized.

The anonymous commenter also argued that real-world ISA systems, which rely on camera-based sign recognition and GPS map data, are subject to error, citing June 2026 real-world testing published by Thatcham Research finding that event-based accuracy at speed-limit transitions can be substantially lower than overall distance-based accuracy. Similar to the Auto Innovators, the commenter expressed concern that a simulator study using error-free, pristine ISA performance would measure driver acceptance of a theoretical, flawless technology rather than the error-prone systems currently deployed on public roads, and recommended that NHTSA

adopt event-based rather than distance-based accuracy metrics.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and agrees that ISA performance should not be modeled as error-free. The ISA systems used in the simulator-based study drives will not be modeled as 100% accurate; participants will encounter instances of imperfect system performance during the study drives, providing data on driver responses under conditions that reflect the error-prone performance of ISA systems currently deployed on public roads. NHTSA will consider the commenter’s recommendation regarding event-based accuracy metrics in the design of the study’s performance measures. NHTSA also notes that accuracy metrics from the earlier ISA project conducted with Exponent, referenced in an earlier response, may help inform this effort.

This anonymous commenter also raised concerns regarding the susceptibility of camera-based sign-recognition systems to physical adversarial attacks, such as altered or perturbed signage, and recommended that NHTSA test ISA responses to degraded or adversarially altered signs.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and agrees this is an important consideration for the underlying technology. However, this driver acceptance and effectiveness study is focused on driver response to ISA system behavior rather than the robustness of any particular manufacturer’s computer-vision algorithm. Therefore, this study will not include the evaluation of camera-based sign-recognition systems exposed to adversarial attacks.

Finally, the anonymous commenter argued that recruiting participants from the DSRI volunteer registry in Eastern Iowa risks oversampling younger, more technology-familiar drivers, and noted that the study as described does not evaluate the unique risks faced by older drivers who are less familiar with driver-assistance technologies or by drivers who use adaptive driving controls, such as hand-operated accelerator and brake controls. The commenter recommended that NHTSA broaden recruitment beyond the university-affiliated volunteer pool to include dedicated cohorts of older and less technology-familiar drivers, and evaluate compatibility with adaptive driving controls.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and acknowledges that a volunteer sample recruited from a single geographic area will not fully represent the national driving population. NHTSA will document the demographic composition of the final sample, including age, in the resulting technical report. Stratification

will be used to balance the sample by age. The database that will be used to recruit participants for this study includes individuals across the lifespan, most of whom are not enrolled as students.

NHTSA agrees that the needs of drivers who use adaptive driving controls and other special populations are important considerations for ISA research and will consider these populations in the design of future studies; potential participants are screened for health factors and simulator safety limitations, most of which are contraindications for participating in the motion-based driving simulator used in these studies.

The fifth comment was submitted by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS). IIHS expressed support for NHTSA's planned study and recommended that the research include analysis of driver eye-glance behavior, de-emphasize measures of ISA effectiveness on speeding, and focus on addressing knowledge gaps about ISA acceptance.

IIHS also recommended that NHTSA include analysis of driver eye-glance behavior, referencing their recent report detailing a simulator study (Reagan et al., 2026). Reagan and colleagues (2026) found that ISA warnings were associated with more frequent but shorter glances to the instrument cluster compared with similar instances of speeding without ISA, a pattern that held for both visual-only and visual-plus-audible warnings. IIHS noted that drivers' visual reaction to cautionary displays like ISA is understudied.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and has reviewed the accompanying report. The simulator that will be used for this data collection can record driver eye-glance behavior. NHTSA will consider incorporating eye-glance metrics into the driving behavior assessments as the study protocol is finalized.

IIHS noted that though its own study found decreases in speeding behavior associated with ISA, it placed little value on these findings because simulators poorly replicate the motivational factors that compel drivers to speed in the real world, which severely limits the external validity of speeding outcomes. IIHS encouraged NHTSA to adopt a similar perspective and to rely on field data to the extent the relationship between advisory ISA and speeding behavior is of equal or greater importance than the relationship between advisory ISA and acceptance.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and agrees that simulator-based speeding outcomes should be interpreted with caution given the limits on external

validity that IIHS describes. The IIHS report indicates that speeding metrics were reduced in each ISA condition compared with not driving with ISA. This suggests that although performed in a simulator, the within-subject comparisons provide support for the effectiveness of ISA systems. Consistent with NHTSA's responses to other comments in this notice, NHTSA will characterize simulator-based findings, including any observed changes in speeding behavior, as complementary to rather than a substitute for real-world and naturalistic data, and will prioritize the study's driver acceptance measures accordingly.

IIHS reported that in a representative survey of U.S. drivers, only about a third agreed that an ISA system with audible and visual warnings at 1–2 mph over the speed limit would be acceptable, while 79 percent would accept a system intervening at 10 mph over the limit. IIHS recommended that NHTSA validate this self-reported finding using the simulator study, and noted that many other parameters likely influencing acceptance, such as warning timing, have received little research attention.

NHTSA appreciates this comment. The study's questionnaires will include items asking whether participants would find ISA intervention acceptable at 1–2 mph, 5 mph, and 10 mph over the posted speed limit, which will allow NHTSA to compare simulator-based acceptance ratings at each threshold against IIHS's survey findings. In Study 1, drivers will experience different speed limit thresholds, allowing us to better understand drivers' acceptance after experiencing these systems. NHTSA agrees that other parameters affecting acceptance, such as warning timing, warrant further study and will consider them as the study protocol is finalized.

IIHS also reported that in its own study, visual-only ISA warnings ranked higher in acceptance than warnings paired with audible cues, and suggested this effect may be magnified by the false alert rate, since conditions with false alerts would better reflect the accuracy levels of current ISA implementations. IIHS recommended that NHTSA examine the influence of speed limit detection accuracy on acceptance, noting that real-world ISA performance is imperfect and that no study has systematically manipulated the false alert rate of speed warnings while measuring acceptance.

NHTSA appreciates this comment and agrees that the interaction between alert accuracy and display modality is an important research gap. As noted in

NHTSA's response to other comments in this notice, the ISA systems used in the simulator-based study drives are not modeled as 100% accurate; participants will encounter instances of imperfect system performance across the ISA systems and modalities evaluated, which will allow NHTSA to examine how alert accuracy interacts with acceptance of different display types.

IIHS commented that in its study, early exposure to audible cues led participants to glance at the instrument cluster and reduce speed before the onset of the audible alert, suggesting behavioral adaptation to avoid the alert, and cited other literature describing similar longer-term adaptations, such as drivers maintaining speed just below alert thresholds to avoid repeated warnings. IIHS recommended deeper exploration of these learning effects.

NHTSA appreciates this comment. NHTSA agrees that behavioral adaptation to repeated ISA alerts is an important consideration. Studies 2 and 3 involve prolonged, within-subject exposure to two ISA systems, which may surface some early adaptation effects; however, a single-visit study cannot capture the longer-term learning effects IIHS describes. NHTSA will consider this a priority area for potential future longitudinal ISA research.

Furthermore, IIHS recommended that NHTSA examine relative differences in acceptance among visual-only, visual-auditory, and visual-haptic ISA displays, noting that a reliable acceptance advantage for haptic over auditory warnings has been observed in other crash-avoidance contexts, such as lane departure warning, but has not been studied for ISA. IIHS noted that this research gap may partly reflect European law's prohibition on haptic ISA warnings unless delivered through the accelerator pedal, a restriction that would not apply to U.S. vehicles.

NHTSA appreciates this comment. The ISA systems evaluated in Study 1 include a haptic variant alongside visual and auditory systems, allowing NHTSA to compare acceptance across modalities, including the visual-haptic comparison IIHS highlights. NHTSA will ensure this comparison is addressed in the resulting technical report.

Affected Public: Individuals 18 and older from Eastern Iowa and the surrounding areas who have volunteered to take part in driving studies or who have opted to receive research-related emails from the University of Iowa mass email system. Respondents must meet specific eligibility criteria to be included in this information collection. Businesses are

ineligible for the sample and will not be contacted.

Estimated Number of Respondents: We estimate 700 respondents will initiate the eligibility questionnaire. We anticipate 475 respondents will complete the eligibility questionnaire. To account for dropout or missing data, we anticipate enrolling up to 300 respondents to reach our target sample of 240 drivers.

Frequency: This study will be conducted once during the three-year period for which NHTSA is requesting approval.

Estimated Number of Responses: We estimate 3,000 total responses. The estimated number of responses reflects the number of respondents anticipated at each component of this information collection request.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: The total estimated burden for this information collection is 931 hours. The annual burden is 308 hours.

The individual form and procedure burden contributions are outlined in the below text and tables (Table 1).

- **Eligibility Questionnaire (NHTSA Form 2179):** We estimate 700 respondents will initiate a response to the online eligibility questionnaire one time, with 475 respondents completing the questionnaire. Respondents that

initiate but do not complete the questionnaire (four minutes) and respondents that complete the entire questionnaire (15 minutes), this results in an average of approximately 12 minutes for 700 respondents, with a single response each.

- **Informed Consent Document (NHTSA Form 2180):** We expect 50 participants to complete this form prior to their participation. Participants will take approximately 15 minutes to complete the form one time.

- **Informed Consent Document (NHTSA Form 2181):** We expect 250 participants to complete this form prior to their participation. Participants will take approximately 15 minutes to complete the form one time.

- **Intake & Eligibility Confirmation (NHTSA Form 2267):** We expect 300 participants to complete this block of procedures one time with a duration of five minutes.

- **Wellness Questionnaire (NHTSA Form 2182):** We expect 300 participants to take approximately two minutes to complete this form three times for a total burden of six minutes.

- **Questionnaire 1 (NHTSA Form 2183):** We expect it will take six minutes for completion. 50 respondents will complete this form five times.

- **Driving Behavior Assessment [Study 1] and Questionnaire 2 (NHTSA Form 2184):** We expect 50 participants to complete the behavior assessment and Questionnaire 2 once. Participants will take 85 minutes to complete the block of procedures. The procedures include a pre-drive PowerPoint training and simulator orientation of approximately five minutes, a familiarization drive of approximately 15 minutes, five study drives of approximately 12 minutes each, and a post-drive questionnaire of approximately five minutes.

- **Questionnaire 3 (NHTSA Form 2185):** We expect it will take 10 minutes for completion. 250 respondents will complete this form once.

- **Driving Behavior Assessment [Study 2 and 3] and Questionnaire 4 (NHTSA Form 2186):** We expect 250 participants to complete the driving behavior assessment and Questionnaire 4 once. Participants will take 125 minutes to complete the block of procedures. The procedures include a pre-drive PowerPoint training and simulator orientation of approximately five minutes, a familiarization drive of approximately 15 minutes, two study drives of approximately 45 minutes each, and a post-drive questionnaire of approximately 15 minutes.

TABLE 1—BURDEN ESTIMATES

NHTSA Form No.	Information collection	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Time per response (minutes)	Burden hours
2179	Eligibility Questionnaire	700	1	12	140
2180	Informed Consent Document 1	50	1	15	13
2181	Informed Consent Document 2	250	1	15	63
2267	Intake & Eligibility Confirmation	300	1	5	25
2182	Wellness Questionnaire	300	3	2	30
2183	Questionnaire 1	50	5	6	25
2184	Driving Behavior Assessment [Study 1] and Questionnaire 2	50	1	85	71
2185	Questionnaire 3	250	1	10	42
2186	Driving Behavior Assessment [Study 2 and 3] and Questionnaire 4	250	1	125	522
Total					931

Estimated Total Annual Burden Cost: \$0.

Respondents will not incur any reporting or recordkeeping costs from the information collection. The only cost respondents will incur is a one-time cost for local travel to and from DSRI. The costs are minimal and are expected to be offset by the monetary compensation that will be provided to all participants who enroll.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspects of this information collection, including (a) whether the proposed collection of

information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological

collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; 49 CFR 1.49; and DOT Order 1351.29A.

Cem Hatipoglu,

Associate Administrator, Vehicle Safety Research.

[FR Doc. 2026–21054 Filed 10–14–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P