

second part of the statement regarding attachment by the vehicle belt does not apply.] [For school bus child restraint systems, the statement above in this section does not apply. School bus child restraint systems must use the following statement instead: Secure this school bus child restraint using the child restraint's seat back mount.]

\* \* \* \* \*

S5.9 \* \* \*

(a) Each add-on child restraint system other than a car bed, harness, school bus child restraint system, and belt-positioning seat, shall have components permanently attached to the system that enable the restraint to be securely fastened to the lower anchorages of the child restraint anchorage system specified in Standard No. 225 (§ 571.225) and depicted in Drawing Package SAS-100-1000, Standard Seat Belt Assembly with Addendum A, Seat Base Weldment or in Drawing Package, "NHTSA Standard Seat Assembly; FMVSS No. 213, No. NHTSA-213-2003" (both incorporated by reference, see § 571.5). The components must be attached by use of a tool, such as a screwdriver. In the case of rear-facing child restraints with detachable bases, only the base is required to have the components.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 3. Amend § 571.213a by:

- a. Revising the section heading and paragraph S3;
- b. Adding to S4, in alphabetical order, a definition for "school bus child restraint system";
- c. Revising paragraphs S7.1(a) and S9.1(b); and
- d. Removing paragraphs S9.1(c) and S9.1(d).

The additions, revisions, and deletions read as follows:

**§ 571.213a; Child restraint systems—Side Impact Protection—Mandatory applicability beginning December 5, 2026.**

\* \* \* \* \*

*S3 Application.* This standard applies to add-on child restraint systems that are either recommended for use by children in a weight range that includes weights up to 18 kilograms (40 pounds) regardless of height, or by children in a height range that includes heights up to 1100 millimeters regardless of weight, except for car beds, school bus child restraint systems, and harnesses.

S4 \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

*School bus child restraint system* means an add-on child restraint system (including a harness) manufactured and sold only for use on school bus seats that has a label conforming with

S5.3.1(b) of FMVSS No. 213b (§ 571.213b).

\* \* \* \* \*

S7 \* \* \*

S7.1 \* \* \*

(a) A child restraint that is recommended by its manufacturer in accordance with S5.5 of Standard No. 213 (§ 571.213) for use either by children in a specified mass range that includes any children having a mass greater than 5 kilograms but not greater than 13.6 kilograms, or by children in a specified height range that includes any children whose height is greater than 650 millimeters but not greater than 870 millimeters, is tested with a CRABI 12-month-old test dummy conforming to 49 CFR part 572 subpart R, provided, however, that the CRABI 12-month-old dummy is not used to test a forward-facing child restraint system.

\* \* \* \* \*

S9.1 \* \* \*

(a) \* \* \*

(b) When testing child restraint systems rear-facing, extend the dummy's arms vertically upwards and then rotate each arm downward toward the dummy's lower body until the arm contacts a surface of the child restraint system or the SISA. Ensure that no arm is restrained from movement in other than the downward direction, by any part of the system or the belts used to anchor the system to the SISA sliding seat.

\* \* \* \* \*

- 4. Amend § 571.213b by revising S5(b)(2), S5.5.2(g)(1)(ii), and S5.9(a) to read as follows:

**§ 571.213b Standard No. 213b; Child restraint systems; Mandatory applicability beginning December 5, 2026.**

\* \* \* \* \*

S5 \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(2) Each add-on child restraint system manufactured for use in motor vehicles, that is recommended for children in a weight range that includes weights less than 18 kilograms (40 pounds) regardless of height, or for children in a height range that includes heights less than 1100 millimeters (mm) regardless of weight, shall meet the requirements in this standard and the applicable side impact protection requirements in Standard No. 213a (§ 571.213a). Excepted from Standard No. 213a are harnesses, school bus child restraint systems, and car beds.

\* \* \* \* \*

S5.5.2 \* \* \*

(g) \* \* \*

(1) \* \* \*

(ii) Secure this child restraint with the vehicle's child restraint anchorage

system, if available, or with a vehicle belt. [For car beds, harnesses, and belt positioning seats, the first part of the statement regarding attachment by the child restraint anchorage system is optional.] [For belt-positioning seats, the second part of the statement regarding attachment by the vehicle belt does not apply.] For school bus child restraint systems, the statement above in this section does not apply. School bus child restraint systems must use the following statement instead: Secure this school bus child restraint using the child restraint system's seat back mount.

\* \* \* \* \*

S5.9 \* \* \*

(a) Each add-on child restraint system other than a car bed, harness, school bus child restraint system, and belt-positioning seat, shall have components permanently attached to the system that enable the restraint to be securely fastened to the lower anchorages of the child restraint anchorage system specified in Standard No. 225 (§ 571.225) and depicted in NHTSA Standard Seat Assembly; FMVSS No. 213, No. NHTSA-213-2021, Parts List and Drawings, NHTSA Standard Seat Assembly; FMVSS No. 213, No. NHTSA-213-2021, Child Frontal Impact Sled, March 2023 (incorporated by reference, see § 571.5). The components must be attached by use of a tool, such as a screwdriver. In the case of rear-facing child restraint systems with detachable bases, only the base is required to have the components.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95, 501.4, and 501.5.

Peter Simshauser,  
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2025-09750 Filed 5-27-25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

**49 CFR Part 585**

[Docket No. NHTSA-2025-0030]

RIN 2127-AM82

**Removing Obsolete Directives From Phase-In Reporting Requirements**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** NHTSA is proposing to remove obsolete directives from the phase-in reporting requirements.

**DATES:** Comments must be received within 60 days of May 30, 2025.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments must be submitted through the Federal rulemaking portal at <http://www.regulations.gov> and should reference the docket number and the date and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register**. NHTSA strongly prefers comments be submitted electronically. However, written comments may be submitted (*i.e.*, postmarked) via mail to 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. All comments submitted in response to this document will be included in the record and will be made available to the public. Please be advised that any information submitted with your comment will be made public, without change, on the internet at the address provided above. A plain language summary of this document is available at <https://www.regulations.gov> in the docket for this rulemaking.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For technical issues, you may contact James Myers (email: [James.Myers@dot.gov](mailto:James.Myers@dot.gov)). For legal issues, you may contact John Piazza at [John.Piazza@dot.gov](mailto:John.Piazza@dot.gov). You can reach these officials by phone at 202–366–1810. Address: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Washington, DC 20590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** NHTSA is proposing to remove obsolete directives from its phase-in reporting requirements that only pertain to vehicles manufactured in prior years. A phase-in is a mechanism by which a final rule specifies a certain percentage of a vehicle manufacturer's vehicles that must comply with the requirements in a final rule in successive model years until all vehicles to which the standard applies comply with the new requirements. Some phase-ins are accompanied by reporting requirements, and Part 585 contains a number of such requirements, many of which have long since expired.

The phase-in reporting requirements that the proposed amendments would delete are the advanced air bag phase-in reporting requirements (subpart B); the rear inboard lap/shoulder belt phase-in reporting requirements (subpart C); the fuel system integrity phase-in reporting requirements (subpart E); the reporting requirements for tires for motor vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 10,000 pounds or less (subpart F); the tire pressure monitoring system phase-in reporting requirements (subpart G); the side impact protection phase-in

reporting requirements (subpart H); the electronic stability control system phase-in reporting requirements (subpart I); the head restraints phase-in reporting requirements (subpart J); the ejection mitigation phase-in reporting requirements (subpart K); the roof crush resistance phase-in reporting requirements (subpart L); and the rear visibility improvements reporting requirements (subpart M). The proposed rule would eliminate those directives while maintaining other directives in 49 CFR part 585 that pertain to vehicles that are being manufactured or will be manufactured. We seek comment on all aspects of this proposal.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, 30166.

### Regulatory Analyses

#### Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

This proposed rule does not meet the criteria of a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866, as amended by Executive Orders 14215 and 13563. Therefore, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not reviewed this proposed rule under those orders. This regulation is not an E.O. 14192 regulatory action.

#### Promoting International Regulatory Cooperation

The policy statement in section 1 of Executive Order 13609 provides that the regulatory approaches taken by foreign governments may differ from those taken by the United States to address similar issues, and that in some cases the differences between them might not be necessary and might impair the ability of American businesses to export and compete internationally. It further recognizes that in meeting shared challenges involving health, safety, and other issues, international regulatory cooperation can identify approaches that are at least as protective as those that are or would be adopted in the absence of such cooperation and can reduce, eliminate, or prevent unnecessary differences in regulatory requirements.

In addition, section 24211 of the Infrastructure, Investment, and Jobs Act, Global Harmonization, provides that DOT “shall cooperate, to the maximum extent practicable, with foreign governments, nongovernmental stakeholder groups, the motor vehicle industry, and consumer groups with respect to global harmonization of vehicle regulations as a means for improving motor vehicle safety.”<sup>1</sup>

Because the proposed changes are deleting obsolete regulatory text, they do not implicate any issues regarding international regulatory cooperation.

#### Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601–612) (as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) of 1996; 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), agencies must prepare and make available for public comment a regulatory flexibility analysis that describes the effect of the rulemaking on small entities (*i.e.*, small businesses, small organizations, and small government jurisdictions). No regulatory flexibility analysis is required, however, if the head of an agency or an appropriate designee certifies that the rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. NHTSA has concluded and hereby certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities; therefore, an analysis is not included. This proposed rule will only remove directives that are no longer needed.

#### Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

This proposed rule does not contain Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local and Tribal governments, or the private sector of \$100 million or more in any one year. Thus, the rulemaking is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of the UMRA.

#### Executive Order 13175

Executive Order 13175 requires Federal agencies to consult and coordinate with Tribes on a government-to-government basis on policies that have Tribal implications, including regulations, legislative comments or proposed legislation, and other policy statements or actions that have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian Tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. NHTSA has assessed the impact of this proposed rule on Indian tribes and determined that this rulemaking would not have tribal implications that require consultation under Executive Order 13175.

#### Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to

<sup>1</sup> H.R. 3684 (117th Congress) (2021).

respond to, a collection of information, unless the collection displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. This proposed rule is deregulatory and so would not impose any additional information collection requirements.

### **E-Government Act Compliance**

NHTSA is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, 2002 to promote the use of the internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

### **Executive Order 13132; Federalism Summary Impact Statement**

NHTSA has examined this proposed rule pursuant to Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255; Aug. 10, 1999) and concluded that no additional consultation with States, local governments, or their representatives is mandated beyond the rulemaking process. The agency has concluded that the proposed rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant consultation with State and local officials or the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement. The proposed rule does not have “substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.”

NHTSA rules can have a preemptive effect in two ways. First, the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act contains an express preemption provision: When a motor vehicle safety standard is in effect under this chapter, a State or a political subdivision of a State may prescribe or continue in effect a standard applicable to the same aspect of performance of a motor vehicle or motor vehicle equipment only if the standard is identical to the standard prescribed under this chapter. 49 U.S.C. 30103(b)(1). It is this statutory command by Congress that preempts any non-identical State legislative and administrative law address the same aspect of performance.

The express preemption provision described above is subject to a savings clause under which “[c]ompliance with a motor vehicle safety standard prescribed under this chapter does not exempt a person from liability at common law.” 49 U.S.C. 30103(e). Pursuant to this provision, State common law tort causes of action against motor vehicle manufacturers that might otherwise be preempted by

the express preemption provision are generally preserved. However, the Supreme Court has recognized the possibility, in some instances, of implied preemption of State common law tort causes of action by virtue of NHTSA’s rules—even if not expressly preempted.

This second way that NHTSA rules can preempt is dependent upon the existence of an actual conflict between an FMVSS and the higher standard that would effectively be imposed on motor vehicle manufacturers if someone obtained a State common law tort judgment against the manufacturer—notwithstanding the manufacturer’s compliance with the NHTSA standard. Because most NHTSA standards established by an FMVSS are minimum standards, a State common law tort cause of action that seeks to impose a higher standard on motor vehicle manufacturers will generally not be preempted. However, if and when such a conflict does exist—for example, when the standard at issue is both a minimum and a maximum standard—the State common law tort cause of action is impliedly preempted. See *Geier v. American Honda Motor Co.*, 529 U.S. 861 (2000).

Pursuant to Executive Order 13132, NHTSA has considered whether this proposed rule could or should preempt State common law causes of action. The agency’s ability to announce its conclusion regarding the preemptive effect of one of its rules reduces the likelihood that preemption will be an issue in any subsequent tort litigation.

To this end, the agency has examined the nature (*e.g.*, the language and structure of the regulatory text) and objectives of this proposed rule and does not foresee any potential State requirements that might conflict with it. NHTSA does not intend that this proposed rule preempt state tort law that would effectively impose a higher standard on motor vehicle manufacturers than that established by this proposed rule. Establishment of a higher standard by means of State tort law would not conflict with the standards proposed in this NPRM. Without any conflict, there could not be any implied preemption of a State common law tort cause of action.

### **National Environmental Policy Act**

NHTSA believes this proposed rule, if finalized, would not have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment. The public is invited to comment on the impact of the proposed agency action.

### **Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform)**

With respect to the review of the promulgation of a new regulation, section 3(b) of Executive Order 12988, “Civil Justice Reform” (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996) requires that Executive agencies make every reasonable effort to ensure that the regulation: (1) Clearly specifies the preemptive effect; (2) clearly specifies the effect on existing Federal law or regulation; (3) provides a clear legal standard for affected conduct, while promoting simplification and burden reduction; (4) clearly specifies the retroactive effect, if any; (5) adequately defines key terms; and (6) addresses other important issues affecting clarity and general draftsmanship under any guidelines issued by the Attorney General. This document is consistent with that requirement.

Pursuant to this Order, NHTSA notes as follows. The issue of preemption is discussed above in connection with E.O. 13132. NHTSA notes further that there is no requirement that individuals submit a petition for reconsideration or pursue other administrative proceeding before they may file suit in court.

### **Rule Summary**

As required by 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(4), a summary of this proposed rule can be found at [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0030, in the **SUMMARY** section of this proposed rule.

### **National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act**

Under the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA) (Pub. L. 104–113), “all Federal agencies and departments shall use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies, using such technical standards as a means to carry out policy objectives or activities determined by the agencies and departments.” Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (*e.g.*, materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies, such as SAE (formerly, the Society of Automotive Engineers). The NTTAA directs this agency to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards. Because the proposed changes are deleting obsolete regulatory text, they do not implicate any issues regarding consensus standards.

## Plain Language

Executive Order 12866 and E.O. 13563 require each agency to write all rules in plain language. Application of the principles of plain language includes consideration of the following questions:

- Have we organized the material to suit the public's needs?
- Are the requirements in the rule clearly stated?
- Does the rule contain technical language or jargon that isn't clear?
- Would a different format (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing) make the rule easier to understand?
- Would more (but shorter) sections be better?
- Could we improve clarity by adding tables, lists, or diagrams?
- What else could we do to make the rule easier to understand?

If you have any responses to these questions, please include them in your comments on this proposal.

## Regulation Identifier Number (RIN)

The Department of Transportation assigns a regulation identifier number (RIN) to each regulatory action listed in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations. The Regulatory Information Service Center publishes the Unified Agenda in April and October of each year. You may use the RIN contained in the heading at the beginning of this document to find this action in the Unified Agenda.

## Privacy Act

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), as described in the system of records notice, DOT/ALL-14 FDMS, accessible through [www.dot.gov/privacy](http://www.dot.gov/privacy). In order to facilitate comment tracking and response, we encourage commenters to provide their name, or the name of their organization; however, submission of names is completely optional. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal**

**Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78).

## Public Participation

### *How do I prepare and submit comments?*

Your comments must be written and in English. To ensure that your comments are correctly filed in the Docket, please include the docket number indicated in this document in your comments.

Your comments must not be more than 15 pages long. (49 CFR 553.21). We established this limit to encourage you to write your primary comments in a concise fashion. However, you may attach necessary additional documents to your comments. There is no limit on the length of the attachments.

If you are submitting comments electronically as a PDF (Adobe) file, NHTSA asks that the documents be submitted using the Optical Character Recognition (OCR) process, thus allowing NHTSA to search and copy certain portions of your submissions.

Please note that pursuant to the Data Quality Act, in order for substantive data to be relied upon and used by the agency, it must meet the information quality standards set forth in the OMB and DOT Data Quality Act guidelines. Accordingly, we encourage you to consult the guidelines in preparing your comments. OMB's guidelines may be accessed at <https://www.transportation.gov/regulations/dot-information-dissemination-quality-guidelines>.

### *How can I be sure that my comments were received?*

If you wish the Docket to notify you upon its receipt of your comments, enclose a self-addressed, stamped postcard in the envelope containing your comments. Upon receiving your comments, the Docket will return the postcard by mail.

### *How do I submit confidential business information?*

You should submit a redacted “public version” of your comment (including redacted versions of any additional documents or attachments) to the docket using any of the methods identified under **ADDRESSES**. This “public version” of your comment should contain only the portions for which no claim of confidential treatment is made and from

which those portions for which confidential treatment is claimed has been redacted. See below for further instructions on how to do this.

You also need to submit a request for confidential treatment directly to the Office of Chief Counsel. Requests for confidential treatment are governed by 49 CFR part 512. Your request must set forth the information specified in part 512. This includes the materials for which confidentiality is being requested (as explained in more detail below); supporting information, pursuant to § 512.8; and a certificate, pursuant to § 512.4(b) and part 512, appendix A.

You are required to submit to the Office of Chief Counsel one unredacted “confidential version” of the information for which you are seeking confidential treatment. Pursuant to § 512.6, the words “ENTIRE PAGE CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION” or “CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN BRACKETS” (as applicable) must appear at the top of each page containing information claimed to be confidential. In the latter situation, where not all information on the page is claimed to be confidential, identify each item of information for which confidentiality is requested within brackets: “[.]”

You are also required to submit to the Office of Chief Counsel one redacted “public version” of the information for which you are seeking confidential treatment. Pursuant to § 512.5(a)(2), the redacted “public version” should include redactions of any information for which you are seeking confidential treatment (i.e., the only information that should be unredacted is information for which you are not seeking confidential treatment).

NHTSA is currently treating electronic submission as an acceptable method for submitting confidential business information to the agency under part 512. Please do not send a hardcopy of a request for confidential treatment to NHTSA's headquarters. The request should be sent to Dan Rabinovitz in the Office of the Chief Counsel at [Daniel.Rabinovitz@dot.gov](mailto:Daniel.Rabinovitz@dot.gov). You may either submit your request via email or request a secure file transfer link. If you are submitting the request via email, please also email a courtesy copy of the request to John Piazza at [john.piazza@dot.gov](mailto:john.piazza@dot.gov).

*Will the agency consider late comments?*

We will consider all comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above under **DATES**. To the extent possible, we will also consider comments that the docket receives after that date. If the docket receives a comment too late for us to consider in developing a final rule (assuming that one is issued), we will consider that comment as an informal suggestion for future rulemaking action.

*How can I read the comments submitted by other people?*

You may read the comments received by the docket at the address given above under **ADDRESSES**. The hours of the docket are indicated above in the same location. You may also see the comments on the internet. To read the comments on the internet, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets.

Please note that even after the comment closing date, we will continue to file relevant information in the docket as it becomes available. Further, some people may submit late comments. Accordingly, we recommend that you periodically check the Docket for new material. You can arrange with the docket to be notified when others file comments in the docket. See [www.regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) for more information.

#### List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 585

Motor vehicle safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth above, NHTSA proposes to amend 49 CFR part 585 as follows:

#### PART 585—PHASE-IN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- 1. The authority citation for part 571 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, and 30166; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95.

#### Subparts B, C, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, and M [Removed and Reserved]

- 2. Remove and reserve subparts B, C, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, and M.

Issued under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95, 501.4, and 501.5.

**Peter Simshauser,**  
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2025–09751 Filed 5–27–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### 49 CFR Part 599

[Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0031]

RIN 2127–AM83

#### Removing Obsolete Procedures From the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** NHTSA is proposing to remove obsolete regulations related to the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009.

**DATES:** Comments must be received within 60 days of May 30, 2025.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments electronically to the docket identified in the heading of this document by visiting the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Alternatively, you can file comments using the following methods:

- **Mail:** Docket Management Facility: U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- **Hand Delivery or Courier:** West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 366–9826 before coming.
- **Fax:** (202) 493–2251.

Regardless of how you submit your comments, you should mention the docket number identified in the heading of this document.

**Instructions:** All submissions must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the Public Participation heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

**Docket:** For access to the docket to read background documents or

comments received, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. You may also access the docket at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. Telephone: 202–366–9826.

**Confidential Business Information:** If you claim that any of the information in your comment (including any additional documents or attachments) constitutes confidential business information within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) or is protected from disclosure pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1905, please see the detailed instructions given under the Public Participation heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**Privacy Act:** Please see the Privacy Act heading under the Regulatory Analyses section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For technical issues, you may contact Ian MacIntire (email: [ian.macintire@dot.gov](mailto:ian.macintire@dot.gov)). For legal issues, you may contact John Piazza at [John.Piazza@dot.gov](mailto:John.Piazza@dot.gov). You can reach these officials by phone at 202–366–1810. Address: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Washington, DC 20590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** NHTSA is proposing to remove obsolete regulatory procedures related to the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009, because that program has ended. The rule proposed removes 49 CFR part 599. We seek comment on all aspects of that proposal.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, 30166

#### Regulatory Analyses

##### Rule Summary

As required by 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(4), a summary of this proposed rule can be found at [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), Docket NHTSA–2025–0031, in the **SUMMARY** section of this proposed rule.

##### Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

This proposed rule does not meet the criteria of a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866, as amended by Executive Orders 14215 and 13563. Therefore, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not reviewed this proposed rule under those orders.

This regulation is not an E.O. 14192 regulatory action.