

examinations using simple tools to establish if a helmet could meet the performance requirements of FMVSS No. 218.

II. Comments Received

NHTSA received 343 comments in response to the NPRM. Comments from individuals represented the overwhelming number of comments. Almost all the individual comments opposed the proposals in the NPRM. These comments, in general, did not reflect consideration of the actual proposals in the NPRM. They largely voiced opposition to State helmet laws, opposed government regulation in general, and expressed concerns that helmet laws or regulations are pretext for harassment of motorcyclists. A motorcycle industry trade group, a helmet manufacturer, various safety organizations, a law enforcement organization, a test facility, and motorcyclist advocacy groups also submitted comments. Except for the motorcyclist advocacy groups, the foregoing entities supported the proposals in the NPRM with some raising either technical or practical concerns about different aspects of the proposals.

The safety organizations and law enforcement organization were supportive of the proposed definition. A motorcycle industry trade group stated support of the proposed definition noting that “the proposed definition makes a critical distinction to close the novelty helmet loophole.” However, one safety organization commented that the amendments would not reduce the sale or use of novelty helmets or help law enforcement, but provided no support for their opinion.

Many commenters, including a helmet manufacturer, were concerned that a proposed energy-absorbing liner thickness standard in the screening requirements would hinder innovation. On the other hand, others acknowledged that thinner liners did not appear to be technically feasible. Some commenters were concerned that compliant helmets would be rendered noncompliant under the new thickness requirements and some indicated that helmet thickness does not correlate to helmet safety.

Several commenters expressed concerns that the tools proposed for the preliminary screening test would be unduly prescriptive and impractical. Other commenters had specific questions about how and where certain measurements would be taken. Finally, one law enforcement organization commented that the proposed screening criteria/tools may hinder enforcement and place police officers at risk.

III. Decision To Withdraw Rulemaking

Based on the comments NHTSA received regarding some of the tools specified in the proposal to evaluate the preliminary screening requirements and the feasibility of the screening criteria, NHTSA has decided to withdraw this rulemaking. NHTSA plans to conduct other activities to identify options and approaches for reducing the use of novelty helmets by highway users, including training law enforcement officers for identifying novelty helmets and recently updating NHTSA’s website with information for the public regarding the safety benefits of certified motorcycle helmets over novelty helmets. NHTSA will also continue to monitor the marketplace to determine if new or innovative technologies are introduced that enable thinner impact attenuating liners to meet the proposed criteria. It may be necessary to perform additional market research on helmet thickness. Furthermore, NHTSA will continue to monitor the safety issues raised by novelty helmet use and consider development of new test methods and tools to meet the NHTSA’s objectives. Accordingly, NHTSA withdraws the proposed amendment of the safety standard for motorcycle helmets because a rulemaking action is not anticipated in the near future.

The NPRM contained in docket number NHTSA–2015–0045, as published in the **Federal Register** on May 21, 2015, at 80 FR 29458, is hereby withdrawn.

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

Peter Simshauser,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2025–09712 Filed 5–27–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0041]

RIN 2127–AM92

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards No. 222; School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection

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

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: NHTSA is proposing to remove obsolete requirements from

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 222, “School bus passenger seating and crash protection.”

DATES: Comments must be received July 29, 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.

Comments on the proposed information collection requirements should be submitted to: 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. It is requested that comments sent to the OMB also be sent to the NHTSA rulemaking docket 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 James Myers (email: James.Myers@dot.gov). For legal issues, you may contact John Piazza at 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 requirements from FMVSS No. 222, School bus passenger seating and crash protection. This proposal removes requirements that are no longer applicable. Several of the obsolete requirements apply to school buses manufactured before a specific date, including: S5(a)(1), for buses manufactured before October 21, 2011; S5(b)(1)(i), for buses manufactured before September 1, 1991; and S5.1.2(a), for buses manufactured before October 21, 2009. In addition, this proposal removes references to dates requirements in S5.1.6 and S5.1.7, which occurred more than a decade ago. We seek comment on all aspects of this proposal. This action does not affect the applicability of 49 U.S.C. 30122, which prohibits certain entities from making inoperative any part of a device or element of design installed in vehicle pursuant to an FMVSS applicable on the date of manufacture.

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

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–2025–0041, 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 rulemaking 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.”¹

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 proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

¹ H.R. 3684 (117th Congress) (2021).

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 rescission 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 proposed rule 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 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 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.

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, as described in the system of records notice, DOT/ALL-14 FDMS, accessible through 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. 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.

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 for more information.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 571

Buses, Motor vehicles, Motor vehicle safety.

For the reasons set forth above, NHTSA proposes to amend 49 CFR part 571 as follows:

PART 571—FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

■ 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.

■ 2. Amend § 571.222 by revising paragraphs S5(a), S5(b)(1), S5.1.2, introductory text of S5.1.6, and introductory text of S5.1.7 to read as follows:

§ 571.222 Standard No. 222; School bus passenger seating and crash protection.

* * * * *

S5. * * *

(a) *Large School Buses.* Each school bus with a gross vehicle weight rating of more than 4,536 kg (10,000 pounds) shall be capable of meeting any of the requirements set forth under this heading when tested under the conditions of S6 of this standard or § 571.210. However, a particular school bus passenger seat (*i.e.*, a test specimen) in that weight class need not meet further requirements after having met S5.1.2 and S5.1.5, or having been subjected to either S5.1.3, S5.1.4, S5.1.6 (if applicable), or S5.3. If S5.1.6.5.5(b) is applicable, a particular test specimen need only meet S5.1.6.5.5(b)(1) or (2) as part of meeting S5.1.6 in its entirety. Each vehicle with voluntarily installed Type 1 seat belts and seat belt anchorages at W seating positions in a bench seat, voluntarily installed Type 2 seat belts and seat belt anchorages at Y seat belt positions in a fixed occupancy seat, or voluntarily installed Type 2 seat belts and seat belt anchorages at Y and Y + 1 seat belt positions in a flexible occupancy seat, shall also meet the requirements of:

(1) S4.4.3.2 of Standard No. 208 (49 CFR 571.208);

(2) Standard No. 209 (49 CFR 571.209), as they apply to school buses; and,

(3) Standard No. 210 (49 CFR 571.210) as it applies to school buses with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 10,000 pounds.

(b) * * *

(1) The requirements of S4.4.3.2 of § 571.208 and the requirements of §§ 571.207, 571.209 and 571.210 as they apply to school buses with a gross vehicle weight rating of 4,536 kg or less; and,

* * * * *

S5.1.2 *Seat back height, position, and surface area.* Each school bus passenger seat must be equipped with a seat back that has a vertical height of at least 610 mm (24 inches) above the seating

reference point. The minimum total width of the seat back at 610 mm (24 inches) above the seating reference point shall be 75 percent of the maximum width of the seat bench. Each school bus passenger seat must be equipped with a seat back that, in the front projected view, has front surface area above the horizontal plane that passes through the seating reference point, and below the horizontal plane 610 mm (24 inches) above the seating reference point, of not less than 90 percent of the seat bench width in millimeters multiplied by 610.

* * * * *

S5.1.6 *Quasi-static test of compartmentalization and Type 2 seat belt performance.* This section applies to school buses with a gross vehicle weight rating expressed in the first column of Tables 2 through 4, and that are equipped with Type 2 seat belt assemblies.

* * * * *

S5.1.7 *Buckle side length limit.* This section applies to rear passenger seats on school buses that are equipped with Type 1 or Type 2 seat belt assemblies. All portions of the buckle/latchplate assembly must remain rearward of the limit plane defined in S5.1.7.1 when tested under the conditions of S5.1.7.2.

* * * * *

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

Peter Simshauser,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2025–09746 Filed 5–27–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0038]

RIN 2127–AM89

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards No. 214, Side Impact Protection

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

SUMMARY: NHTSA is proposing to remove obsolete requirements from Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 214, Side impact protection.

DATES: Comments must be received by July 29, 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