

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility Final Rule
23 CFR 630 Subpart J**

Questions and Answers (Updated: April 27, 2026)

Except for the statutes and regulations cited, the contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the States or the public in any way. This document is intended only to provide information regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies.

Q: Is this Rule an entirely new regulation?

A: No. This is an update to the existing 23 CFR 630 Subpart J regulation that was published on September 9, 2004.

Q: Why did the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) update the 23 CFR 630 Subpart J regulations?

A: The Rule was updated to:

- Ensure consistency with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Pub. L. No. 117-58 §§ 11302, 11303(a) & (b))
- Improve overall work zone safety and mobility.

Q: What was the rulemaking process?

A: The [Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#) was published on September 20, 2023, at 88 FR 64836.

The [Final Rule](#) was published on November 1, 2024, at 89 FR 87282, after revisions based on comments received on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Q: What are the key components of the updated Rule?

A: Key changes in the updated Rule include the following:

Definitions

- Added definition for “Agency” and “State”.
- Updated definition for “Safety” to remove superfluous language.
- Moved the definition of “Transportation Management Plan” from § 630.1012(b) to the Definitions section.

- Updated definition of “Work Zone Crash” to be consistent with Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria.
- Updated the definition of “Work Zone Impacts” to better list the factors affecting work zone impacts.
- Added the definition of “Work Zone Programmatic Reviews” to emphasize the intent of the review to improve the State's overall work zone management program.

Work Zone Safety and Mobility Policy

- § 630.1006(b): Added new “shall” condition for State departments of transportation (DOTs) to define safety and mobility performance measures in their policy.

State-Level Processes and Procedures

- § 630.1008(b): Changed “should” to “shall” on existing provision for State DOTs to develop and implement work zone assessment and management procedures; added the notion of addressing impacts to all highway workers and anticipated road users.
- § 630.1008(c): Added safety surrogate data and exposure data to the list of data sources that States shall use to monitor and manage work zone impacts for specific projects during implementation. Added requirement for State DOTs to use work zone data to perform their programmatic reviews. Provided examples for each data source.
- § 630.1008(e): Changed reporting period for Process Reviews from 2 years to 5 years consistent with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act § 11302; reframed process reviews to programmatic reviews to emphasize the importance of reviewing all aspects of a State DOT’s work zone program.
- § 630.1008(e)(1): Added new “shall” condition to incorporate data-driven assessment of safety and mobility performance in work zone programmatic reviews and to document the approach used for project selection.
- § 630.1008(e)(2): Added new “shall” condition detailing the contents of WZPR reports (i.e., performance, improvement areas, action items, responsible persons, and implementation timeframe).
- § 630.1008(e)(4): Added a “shall” condition for State DOTs to include examination of efforts across various State divisions or offices into work zone programmatic reviews.

Significant Projects

- Changed significant project requirements for interstate projects and added clarifications for non-interstate projects to comply with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act § 630.1010(c) and (d).

Q: How does the updated Rule differ from the former regulation?

A: While there are a number of differences from the former regulation, these differences can be captured under the following three “umbrellas”:

(1) The updated Rule requires States to identify safety and mobility performance measures in their work zone safety and mobility policy. The Rule provides examples of performance measures to consider including number of fatal and injury crashes occurring in a work zone, percent of projects that exceed a preestablished crash rate in the work zone, number of highway worker fatalities and injuries experienced, highway worker fatality and injury rate per hours worked, percent of projects that experience queues above a predefined threshold, and percent of time when speeds in a work zone drop below a predefined threshold. Moreover, the Rule specifies that the performance measures identified in the work zone safety and mobility policy must be used during work zone programmatic review assessments.

(2) The Rule updates the work zone programmatic review reporting period from once every 2 years to once every 5 years to comply with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. Another notable change is the shift from Process Reviews to Programmatic Reviews, emphasizing the importance of evaluating all aspects of the work zone management program. The Rule requires States to include a data-driven assessment of the safety and mobility performance of the State’s work zones. At a minimum, the review should include a representative sample of the State’s significant work zones over the 5-year period being reviewed. States are required to document the approach used for selecting the representative projects. The Rule requires work zone programmatic review reports to include an assessment of the work zone safety and mobility performance occurring since the last review was performed, systematic identification and assessment of the States’ work zone management processes and procedures to be improved, action items to be taken to achieve improvement, State divisions or offices responsible for implementing the actions, and estimated timeline for implementation. The Rule mandates States to develop and implement work zone assessment and management procedures. The Rule also requires work zone programmatic review to include examination of efforts across State divisions or offices affecting work zone safety and mobility management, including but not limited to project planning, project design, project implementation, maintenance activities, transportation operations and management, permitting (e.g., utilities, oversize/overweight, lane closures, sidewalk closures), training, and public information and outreach.

(3) The Rule updates the significant project requirements for interstates, now requiring intermittent or continuous lane closures on three or more consecutive days. It also clarifies that it does not require States to develop Transportation Operations and Public Information and Outreach components of a Transportation Management Plan for non-interstate projects that are not deemed significant by the State.

These changes reflect a concerted effort to enhance work zone safety and mobility considerations and ensure that States adhere to more comprehensive and effective practices in managing work zones on their roadways.

Q: How can I find out more about the Rule on Work Zone Safety and Mobility?

A: The FHWA Work Zone Safety and Mobility Rule website (<https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/wz/resources/policy.htm>) serves as the primary source of information regarding the Rule. The site provides links to the NPRM and the Final Rule on the Federal Register website. In addition, a number of informational materials will be made available on FHWA's website. These materials provide more information about the key changes in the updated Rule. FHWA will also conduct outreach at select conferences and workshops across the country.

Q: How can I find out more about work zone management?

A: The FHWA Work Zone Management Program and the National Work Zone Safety Information Clearinghouse websites provide a vast amount of information about work zone management topics. These sites are available at <https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/wz/index.asp> and <https://workzonesafety.org/>, respectively.

Q: Does the Rule require the use of the example performance measures provided in § 630.1006(b)? Can agencies choose other performance measures?

A: The safety and mobility performance measures included in this section are examples and are not mandatory. States may choose performance measures that are best suited to their work zone conditions and impacts.

Q: What is the minimum number of performance measures required under the updated Rule?

A: States can comply with this requirement by identifying at least one safety and one mobility performance measure, but they are encouraged to use as many performance measures as needed to manage the performance of their work zones.

Q: Does the updated Rule require States to include any additional information in the Work Zone Safety and Mobility policy?

A: FHWA requires States to identify safety and mobility performance measures that will be used to manage work zone performance.

Q: How will programmatic review requirements in the new Rule differ from the work zone process reviews? What changes should States incorporate to conduct the programmatic reviews??

A: The updated Rule requires States to conduct programmatic reviews of their work zones or a representative sample of work zones (§ 630.1008(e)). The Rule previously required agencies to review randomly selected projects. The updated Rule encourages States to perform comprehensive review of work zone performance using a well-documented approach. The updated Rule also requires use of performance measures identified in the work zone safety and mobility policy to conduct data-driven assessment of the work zone performance. The programmatic review shall include examination of efforts across State divisions or offices affecting work zone safety and mobility management, including but not limited to project planning, project design, project implementation, maintenance activities, transportation operations and management, permitting (e.g., utilities, oversize/overweight, lane closures, sidewalk closures), training, and public information and outreach. Finally, the frequency of work zone programmatic reviews is reduced from once every 2 years to once every 5 years.

Q: What is the timeframe of data to be included in the 5-year work zone programmatic review?

A: The review period for each work zone programmatic review report should include selection and review of work zones from 5 calendar years prior to the year of the report. For example, work zone programmatic review reports submitted in 2030 should include a review period of January 1, 2025, to December 31, 2029.

Q: When are the new work zone programmatic review reports due?

A: The next work zone programmatic review is due December 31, 2030.

Q: Does FHWA require States to involve FHWA division offices in selection of efforts for work zone programmatic review assessment?

A: The Rule encourages States to involve FHWA Division offices in selecting efforts, but it is not mandatory. States should select the Work Zone Programmatic Review topic areas based on their work zone safety and mobility performance.

Q: What is a significant project?

A: The Rule defines a significant project as “is one that, alone or in combination with other concurrent projects nearby, is anticipated to cause sustained work zone impacts (as

defined in § 630.1004) that are greater than what is considered tolerable based on State policy and engineering judgment.” (§ 630.1010)

Q: Is there a change to the requirement of significant project compared to the previous rule?

A: The rule revised § 630.1010(c) in response to directives included in the IJA. The updated Rule specifies that all Interstate system projects within the boundaries of a designated Transportation Management Area (TMA) that require intermittent or continuous lane closures for 3 or more consecutive days shall be considered as significant projects. Simply stated, a significant project is a project that an agency expects will cause a relatively high level of disruption. The rule updated the requirement from “more than three days of intermittent or continuous lane closures” to “3 or more consecutive days of intermittent or continuous lane closures.”

The rule also added a new provision (§ 630.1010(e)) to clarify that non-interstate system projects with less than 3 consecutive days of intermittent or continuous lane closures do not require the transportation operations or public information and outreach components of a transportation management plan.

Q: Which agencies would be responsible for developing TMPs for projects outside the State DOT’s jurisdiction?

A: An agency (State or local) that receives Federal-aid highway funds for their work zone projects is responsible for developing and implementing TMPs and managing impacts of those projects.

Q: Does the Rule include any requirements regarding the use of roadside safety hardware?

A: For all projects, a TMP must include a Temporary Traffic Control (TTC) Plan. Section 630.1012 (Project-Level Procedures) states that this plan must be consistent with the provisions under [Part 6 \(Temporary Traffic Control\) of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways \(MUTCD\)](#). Furthermore, this section of the Rule states that in developing and implementing the TTC plan, pre-existing roadside safety hardware must be maintained at an equivalent or better level than existed prior to project implementation.

Note: The updated Rule removed the requirement that TTC plans be consistent with the work zone hardware recommendations in Chapter 9 of the 2011 American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Roadway Design Guide (RDG). Despite this change in mandatory requirement, agencies are encouraged to consider the work zone hardware recommendations in the AASHTO RDG when preparing their TTC plans.

Q: When do I have to comply with this Rule?

A: The Rule compliance date is December 31, 2026.