

THE SLIPPAGE BETWEEN... MANDATES, PLANS AND PROMISES:

or Why the Safety Provisions in S. 1072 are the Right Solution on Long-Overdue Motor Vehicle Safety Standards

Safety Issue in S. 1072	Title 4 Provisions: Safety for All, By a Date Certain	Current NHTSA Regulatory Plans: Good Intentions, Few Assurances	Past NHTSA Broken Promises: Disappointments, Inaction, and Delay
<p>Vehicle Accident Ejection Protection (§4152)</p>	<p>Rule to prescribe a safety standard or upgrade the existing standard to reduce complete and partial occupant ejection. Safety technologies, such as advanced side glazing, side curtains, and side impact air bags, shall be considered for their ejection mitigation capabilities. NPRM 6-30-2006, FR 6 not later than 18 months following NPRM.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Research</i> pretensioners and side window ejection mitigation.</p>	<p>In 1994, upon terminating its work on developing a rollover propensity standard, NHTSA promised new crashworthiness measures, including examination of potential improvements to window glazing in order to reduce ejections. However, rulemaking on window glazing was terminated in 2002. The agency suggested regulation of side curtain air bags would be more efficient, but no such standard has been proposed to date. Further, while NHTSA contends that some forms of advanced side glazing increase particular neck-load responses on crash dummies, the testing procedure that yielded this finding was problematic and non-conclusive in terms of actual neck injuries. <i>Despite the inaction, NHTSA estimates that 537 to 1,305 lives would be saved annually if sturdier side windows were standard in vehicles!</i></p>
<p>Door Lock and Retention Standard (§4152)</p>	<p>Upgrade of current standard to require manufacturers to make modifications to door locks, door latches, and retention components of doors as the Secretary determines necessary to reduce occupant ejection. NPRM 6-30-2006, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM. \$500,000 appropriated.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Planning</i> to upgrade door lock standard and continue with harmonization efforts currently underway (<i>anticipated</i>: NPRM 2004, FR 2005). The effects of harmonization on standard are unknown.</p>	<p>In 1994, upon terminating its work on developing a rollover propensity standard, NHTSA promised new crashworthiness measures, including potential improvements to door locks. However, the agency has yet to improve standards for door locks and door retention. <i>Despite the inaction, NHTSA estimates that hundreds of the 2,500 annual door-related ejection deaths could be prevented if the door latches standard were updated.</i></p>

<p>Vehicle Backover Avoidance Technology Study (§4153)</p>	<p>Study of effective methods for reducing the incidence of injury and death outside of parked passenger vehicles attributable to movement of the vehicles. Report to be completed within 1 year of enactment and to be presented to Congress within 5 months following enactment.</p> <p>NHTSA may establish a method to collect and maintain the number and types of injuries and deaths involving vehicles (under 10,000 GVWR) in non-traffic, non-accident incidents to assist in analysis on the inclusion of backover prevention technologies.</p>	<p>NHTSA has released only one report using cleansed birth certificates (from 1997) to look at trunk entrapment, hyperthermia deaths and power window strangulations).</p> <p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Compiling</i> death certificates to look at off-road vehicular deaths, including driveway incidents and power window-related child deaths by strangulation. <i>No report has been released yet and there is no deadline for publication of results.</i></p> <p>Final Report NHTSA Pilot Study: Non-Traffic Motor Vehicles Safety Issues (May 6, 2002): NHTSA states that “NHTSA is also responsible, however, for motor vehicle safety when there is not a crash or the event occurs off the public trafficway.”</p>	<p>NHTSA has conducted another study using cleansed birth certificates and media searches to understand the circumstances of non-traffic, non-crash incidents with particular interest focused on hyperthermia, carbon monoxide poisonings, power window strangulations and children being backed over by vehicles. <i>This study was supposed to be released in August of 2003, but has yet to be published.</i></p> <p>Although NHTSA acknowledges its responsibility, it lacks a method to collect data, or an office in which these significant types of injuries and deaths are researched. Yet a 2002 CDC study shows that at least 9,160 children are treated in U.S. emergency rooms every year following involvement in non-traffic, non-crash events related to vehicles.³ The non-profit group, Kids And Cars, documented at least 154 deaths in 2003 due to non-traffic, non-crash events.</p> <p><i>NHTSA is not proactively working to eliminate predictable and preventable child injuries and deaths, such as those caused by power windows, easily prevented with inexpensive safety technology.</i></p>
<p>Vehicle compatibility and aggressivity reduction standard (§4155)</p>	<p>Rule to reduce vehicle incompatibility and aggressivity for vehicles under 10,000 lbs GVWR addressing bumper height, weight, and any other design characteristics necessary to ensure better management of crash forces in frontal and side impact crashes in order to reduce occupant deaths and injuries.</p> <p>Develop a standard rating metric to evaluate compatibility and aggressivity. Create a public information program including vehicle rankings based on risks posed by vehicle incompatibility and aggressivity to occupants,</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Evaluating</i> whether an average height of force (AHOF) compatibility requirement is feasible (decision <i>anticipated</i> 2004) and is pursuing the development of a higher resolution load cell barrier. NHTSA is also <i>planning</i> to upgrade the side impact protection standard (FR 2005), <i>reevaluate</i> the CAFE structure with aggressivity in mind, and <i>planning</i> to change the glare standards to mitigate the risks from high mounted headlights of light trucks (<i>anticipated</i>: NPRM 2004, FR 2005).</p>	<p>In 1998, the auto industry promised the NHTSA Administrator Dr. Ricardo Martinez that it would make modifications to achieve safer designs, mainly by adjusting vehicle suspension, but the industry refused to provide any details of their plans and automakers continue to design larger and more aggressive vehicles. Automakers promised to voluntarily fix aggressivity problems again in 2000, and most recently in a well-publicized but vague voluntary program in 2003. <i>Administrator Martinez announced in 1997 that an estimated 2,000 needless lives are lost</i></p>

	<p>other motorists and combined risks by make and model. NPRM 1-31-07, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM.</p>	<p>NHTSA Compatibility Plan: Proposed initiatives in arena of AHOF, compatibility testing, side impact upgrade, and an upgraded glare standard – <i>no deadlines</i>. NHTSA plans a restructuring of the CAFE program (ANPRM published in 2003). <i>Note: While the ANPRM was issued 12-03, the notice raises the specter of rulemakings that would actually increase vehicle incompatibility hazards, such as a weight-based standard.</i></p> <p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Planning an upgrade of roof crush test and standard (anticipated: NPRM 2004, FR 2005).</i></p> <p>NHTSA 2004-07 Evaluation Plan: <i>Evaluating pretensioners next 2-3 years. Research and testing on head impact injuries for 4+ years. Research on cost and effectiveness of side and head airbags on ejection prevention and injury/fatality risk 2-3+ yrs.</i></p> <p>NHTSA Rollover Plan: Mentions upgrade of roof crush test, but <i>no deadline.</i></p> <p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Research ESC (2004-2005), analysis of benefit cost analysis and decide on next steps (2005). Evaluating the possibility of adding a handling rating to its New Car Assessment Program (NCAP) (2006-2007).</i></p> <p>NHTSA 2004-07 Evaluation Plan: <i>Research on cost and effectiveness of ESC 2-3+ years. Evaluation of Static Stability Factor (SSF) and rollover rates 1 yr.</i></p>	<p><i>each year because of the aggressive design of light trucks.⁴</i></p>
<p>Rollover Crashworthiness Standard (§4156)</p>	<p>Rule to establish rollover crashworthiness standards for passenger vehicles (under 10,000 GVWR). The rule shall be promulgated with the consideration of the prescription of a roof strength performance standard based on dynamic tests that realistically duplicate actual forces.</p> <p>Rulemaking shall consider: improved seat structure and safety belt performance (including seat belt pretensioners), side impact head protection airbags, and roof injury protection measures.</p> <p>NPRM 6-30-04, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM.</p>	<p>In 1994, upon terminating its work on developing a rollover propensity standard, NHTSA promised new crashworthiness measures including improving interior protection safety standards, examining improvements for side window glazing and door latches, and a strengthened roof crush resistance requirements.</p> <p>However, rulemaking on window glazing was terminated in 2002. The agency suggested regulation of side curtain air bags would be more efficient, but no such standard has been proposed.</p> <p><i>The agency has yet to fulfill these promises, despite NHTSA's own estimates which predict that up to 1,500 deaths each year could be saved by a tougher roof-crush standard.⁵</i></p>	<p>As early as April 1973, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a rule for a rollover resistance standard, which was never issued.</p> <p>In September of 1986, Congressman Tim Wirth called on NHTSA to issue a life-saving rollover standard. His petition to the agency was denied.</p> <p>Two years later, in 1988, Consumers Union and the Center for Auto Safety followed in Wirth's footsteps with petitions that were also rejected by NHTSA.</p> <p>In 1991, Congress passed the Intermodal</p>
<p>Rollover Resistance Standard (§4156)</p>	<p>Rule to establish rollover prevention standard to improve on the performance characteristics of passenger motor vehicles (under 10,000 GVWR) to increase their resistance to rollover. Rulemaking shall consider additional technologies to improve handling and reduce the likelihood of vehicle instability and rollovers.</p> <p>NPRM 6-30-04, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM.</p> <p>Study on Electronic Stability Control (ESC) and other technologies designed to improve handling, report to Congress by 12-31-05.</p>	<p>As early as April 1973, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a rule for a rollover resistance standard, which was never issued.</p> <p>In September of 1986, Congressman Tim Wirth called on NHTSA to issue a life-saving rollover standard. His petition to the agency was denied.</p> <p>Two years later, in 1988, Consumers Union and the Center for Auto Safety followed in Wirth's footsteps with petitions that were also rejected by NHTSA.</p> <p>In 1991, Congress passed the Intermodal</p>	<p>As early as April 1973, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a rule for a rollover resistance standard, which was never issued.</p> <p>In September of 1986, Congressman Tim Wirth called on NHTSA to issue a life-saving rollover standard. His petition to the agency was denied.</p> <p>Two years later, in 1988, Consumers Union and the Center for Auto Safety followed in Wirth's footsteps with petitions that were also rejected by NHTSA.</p> <p>In 1991, Congress passed the Intermodal</p>

		<p>NHTSA Rollover Plan: Assessing the feasibility of a handling consumer information program, ESC rulemaking actions, rollover sensor performance tests, and a window curtain standard – <i>no deadline or solid commitment.</i> Plans to implement a marketing plan to increase consumer knowledge about NCAP ratings, now only on NHTSA’s web site – <i>no deadline.</i></p>	<p>Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, which required NHTSA to address means of protecting motorists from “unreasonable risk of rollovers” in passenger vehicles. But in 1994, the agency terminated work on a rollover propensity standard.</p>
<p>Frontal Impact Standards (§4156)</p>	<p>Rule to improve frontal impact protection for vehicles under 10,000 GVWR. Evaluate additional barriers and measurements of occupant head impact and neck injuries and measures of head and neck injuries and a review frontal impact criteria, including those established by the IIHS. NPRM 6-30-04, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: Planning to improve crash-test dummies. Evaluating performance of integrated seats (anticipated: NPRM 2003, FR or termination 04). Evaluating frontal offset test, request comments, determination 2003-2004. Advanced airbag rule work <i>planned</i> (respond to petitions 2003, additional research 2003+).</p>	
<p>Side Impact Standards and Tests (§4156)</p>	<p>Rule to upgrade current standard to improve side impact protection to occupants of vehicles under 10,000 GVWR. Evaluation of additional barriers and measurements of head and neck injuries, consideration of the need for new dummies for full range of occupants and a review side impact criteria, including those established by IIHS. NPRM 6-30-04, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: Planning to improve crash-test dummies. Planning a full upgrade of FMVSS 214 that would address light trucks and narrow objects (poles) as well as upgraded injury criteria and data from second generation side impact dummies. <i>Note – this test will have no ejection mitigation requirement.</i> The proposal will also consider performance requirements for head protection and evaluate possible harm from side airbags and to monitor their performance. (anticipated: NPRM 2004, FR 2005.)</p> <p>NHTSA 2004-07 Evaluation Plan: Researching upgrade FMVSS 214 – <i>analyzing</i> NCAP and FARS data relating to 214 in two stages, one that will take 2-3 years and one that will take 4-5 years.</p>	<p>In October 1999, NHTSA granted a petition from Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety on improving side impact standards, but no rulemaking has occurred to date. <i>This is despite a recent study showing that side air bags can reduce side impact crash fatalities by up to 50 percent.</i>⁶</p>

<p>15-Passenger Vans: Rollover Testing Program and FMVSS Safety Standards (§4157)</p>	<p>Rule to include 15-passenger vans** under 10,000 GVWR in NHTSA’s dynamic rollover testing program and require them to comply with all existing and prospective FMVSS Safety Standards for occupant protection and vehicle crash avoidance that are relevant to such vehicles. FR 9-31-05.</p> <p>----- ** Exclusions for all 15-passenger vans provisions include: ambulances, tow trucks or vehicles designed primarily for transportation of property or special purpose equipment.</p>	<p>Action Plan for 15-Passenger Vans: Issue further warnings on dangers of 15 Passenger Vans and add information about vans on Agency’s Rollover site (10-03) – <i>as of February 2004 this has not happened.</i> NHTSA issued an NPRM (8-03) on including lap and shoulder belts in all seating positions in all vehicles under 10,000 lbs, including 15-passenger vans (planned FR 12-04). Include 15-passenger vans in upgrade of roof crush rule – only to test front seating positions (<i>anticipated</i> NPRM for upgrade 2004). Countermeasure research on doing rear seat testing as well (2-04).</p>	<p><i>Despite recommendations from the National Transportation Safety Board given to the Agency two years ago, the Action Plan for 15-Passenger Van Safety presented by NHTSA in September, 2003, fails to address a number of safety standards from which 15-passenger vans are currently exempt, including Occupant Protection in Interior Impact, Head Restraints, and Door Locks and Door Retention Components.</i> In NHTSA’s Action Plan for 15-passenger Van Safety, the agency will only test NCAP rollover resistance maneuvers on two 15-passenger vans. In August, 2003, FMCSA ruled that 15-passenger vans must comply with the same safety regulations that apply to buses, <i>but there are few safety rules for large buses and the rule only applied to those vans carrying passengers long distances and cross state or international borders.</i></p>
<p>15-Passenger Vans: NCAP (§4157)</p>	<p>Inclusion of 15-passenger van under 10,000 GVWR in NCAP programs. FR 9-31-05.</p>	<p>Action Plan for 15-Passenger Vans: In NHTSA’s Action Plan for 15-passenger Van Safety, the agency will only test NCAP rollover resistance maneuvers on two 15-passenger vans, <i>and the results will not be published as part of the NCAP program.</i></p>	<p><i>NHTSA has not plans to include 15-passenger vans tests in its NCAP program.</i></p>

<p>15-Passenger Vans: Vehicle Control Technology (§4157)</p>	<p>Evaluation and testing of potential technological systems to assist drivers in controlling 15-passenger vans under 10,000 GVWR.</p>	<p>Action Plan for 15-Passenger Vans: Planned testing (12-03) and report (2-04) on evaluation of ESC in 15-passenger vans.</p>	<p>In November, 2002, the National Transportation Board requested that NHTSA test electronic stability control systems on 15-passenger vans. However, in response, NHTSA performed J-Turn and fishhook rollover resistance maneuvers on only one 15-passenger van with an electronic stability control system. <i>Neither Ford nor General Motors, the two producers of 15-passenger vans, currently provide electronic stability control systems for this vehicle type, and Ford has no intention of providing such systems on their 15-passenger vans.</i></p>
<p>Tire Safety Upgrade (§4158)</p>	<p>Rule to upgrade tire safety standard, to improve strength and road hazard protection safety performance criteria for light vehicle tires (criteria not addressed in rules mandated by TREAD) NPRM 6-30-05, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM Rule upgrade to enhance resistance to bead unseating and aging safety performance criteria (also not addressed following TREAD). NPRM 12-31-05, FR not later than 18 months following NPRM Reconsider use of shearography analysis and determine cost effective methods of using such technology. Report to Senate Commerce Committee within 2 years following enactment.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: Issued final rule on tires (mandated by TREAD) in 6-03. <i>Continue to research tire strength and will begin researching tire aging (2003-2004). “Decision on next step” for tire safety (2005).</i></p>	<p>In June, 2003, in response to directives in the 2000 TREAD Act, NHTSA issued a ruling updating safety performance standards for tires. However, counter to Congressional intent, NHTSA left serious holes in the updated standard. <i>Despite the clear mandate, the new rule failed to adequately address tire strength and road hazard protection, or to establish minimum standards for bead unseating resistance and aging.</i></p>
<p>Safety Belt Minders (§4159)</p>	<p>Rule to address alternate means to encourage increased belt usage in vehicles under 10,000 GVWR. Rule should consider alternative means to encourage increased usage including intermittent or continuous audible or visual reminders, features to prevent operation of convenience or entertainment features, and</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Study effectiveness of belt minders and evaluate possible rulemaking (2003-2005). NAS is currently working on a study.</i> NHTSA Rollover Plan: <i>Support voluntary installation of minder</i></p>	<p>Current law limits audible belt minders to 8 seconds. Thus, despite evidence that enhanced belt reminder systems such as Ford’s BeltMinder™ system can increase belt use by five percent, and in spite of the National Academy of Sciences’ recommendation that such systems be standard in all new vehicles,</p>

	<p>other technologies described in NAS report.</p> <p>NPRM 12 months following enactment, FR 24 months following enactment.</p> <p>Provisions also include a change to the current buzzer limit law.</p> <p>Establishment of a grant incentive program that encourages states to enact laws mandating booster seat use for children too big for child safety seats. The grants will be allotted proportionately on the basis of state population and will be split by the state between education and dissemination programs.</p> <p>Appropriations (in millions) out of the Highway Trust Fund: \$18 for FY 2006, \$20 for FY 2007, \$25 for FY 2008 and \$30 for FY 2009.</p>	<p>systems.</p> <p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: Establishing <i>performance requirements</i> for child restraint systems for larger children per Anton's Law (<i>anticipated</i>: NPRM 2004, FR 2005). <i>Planned</i> development of a 10-year-old crash dummy (<i>anticipated</i>: NPRM 2004, FR 2005).</p> <p>NHTSA 2004-07 Evaluation Plan: <i>Survey</i> on effectiveness of booster seats – 2005.</p>	<p>NHTSA cannot now require improvements extending the existing and like systems.</p>
<p>Booster Seat Incentive Grants (§4161)</p>	<p>Rule to increase utilization of child dummies in safety tests, including crash tests that will lead to understanding of crash dynamics with respect to children and measurably improved child safety.</p> <p>Rulemaking within 2 years of enactment.</p> <p>Report published on implementation within 1 year of enactment.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Research</i> (2003-04) on new three-year-old dummy, Q3S, for side impact, and Hybrid III 10-year-old dummy (<i>anticipated</i> NPRM on HIII 10yr in 2004, FR required in 2005). <i>Research</i> on pediatric thorax, head and neck injuries to improve child dummy development (2004). A child injury tolerance <i>investigation</i> through case reconstruction to improve injury assessment reference values for use with child dummies (2004). Testing to improve vehicle side crash performance of child restraint systems, including developing a sled test procedure (2006). Testing, evaluation and harmonization of side impact dummies — new child Q series and child HIII series (2006+).</p> <p><i>There are no current agency plans regarding child safety in rollovers.</i></p>	<p>As part of the requirements of Anton's Law, NHTSA has developed a weighted six-year-old dummy but has yet to develop a ten-year-old dummy, as mandated by Anton's Law, which required the extension of the child restraint standard to children heavier than 50 lbs.</p>
<p>Child Safety in Rollovers (§4173)</p>	<p>Implement a consumer information program relating to child safety in rollover crashes.</p> <p>Within two years following enactment.</p>	<p>June 2003 NHTSA publishes Rollover Report <i>but it makes no mention of child safety in rollovers.</i></p>	<p>June 2003 NHTSA publishes Rollover Report <i>but it makes no mention of child safety in rollovers.</i></p>

<p>Child Dummy Development (§4173)</p>	<p>Develop a child dummy to be used in simulated rollover crashes. Report to Congress within 1 year of enactment and again within 3 years of enactment.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Research</i> (2003-04) on new three-year-old dummy, Q3S, for side impact, and Hybrid III 10-year-old dummy (<i>anticipated</i> NPRM on HIII 10yr in 2004, FR required in 2005). <i>Research</i> on pediatric thorax, head and neck injuries to improve child dummy development. A child injury tolerance <i>investigation</i> (finishing in 2004) through case reconstruction to improve injury assessment reference values for use with child dummies. Testing, evaluation and harmonization of side impact dummies — new child Q series and child HIII series (2006+).</p>	<p>NHTSA has developed a weighted six-year-old dummy but has yet to develop a ten-year-old dummy, as mandated by Anton’s Law, which required the extension of the child restraint standard to children heavier than 50 lbs. June 2003 NHTSA publishes Rollover Report <i>but it makes no mention of child safety in rollovers.</i></p>
<p>Child-Safe power windows (§4173)</p>	<p>Report on technologies designed to prevent and reduce the number of injuries and deaths of children because of automatic windows. Report to Congress within 2 years of enactment. Complete rulemaking within 180 days of enactment that would require window switches be designed to reduce the accidental closing by children of power windows and issue performance-based regulations that take effect by 9-1-2006 that child-safe switches or related technologies be designed to prevent accidental closing.</p>	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: <i>Compiling</i> death certificates to look at off-road vehicular deaths, including driveway incidents and power window-related child deaths by strangulation. <i>No report has been released yet and there is no deadline for publication of results.</i></p> <p>Final Report NHTSA Pilot Study: Non-Traffic Motor Vehicles Safety Issues (May 6, 2002): NHTSA states that “NHTSA is also responsible, however, for motor vehicle safety when there is not a crash or the event occurs off the public trafficway.”</p>	<p>April 1991 NHTSA issues FR adopting FMVSS 118 to minimize risks from accidental operation of power windows, partitions, and roof panels. <i>But evidence increases that children nevertheless continue to be injured and entrapped.</i> Sept. 1995 NHTSA receives petition to open rulemaking to prevent inadvertent power window closings and adopt power window automatic reversal safety features. August 1996, NHTSA proposes amending FMVSS No. 118 to permit, but not require, infrared detection systems to stop power windows, partitions and roof panels from closing when there is an intervening object. NHTSA also questions but does not offer regulatory proposals concerning the safety of “express up” power window functions. November 1996, NHTSA proposes a rule to make it more difficult for children to inadvertently trigger a power window switch, but safety organizations point out in docket comments that the design is not sufficient to stop children from activating the switches with their elbows. <i>To date, no further rulemaking is conducted by the agency.</i></p>

Child belt report (§4173)	Report on technologies designed to improve the performance of safety belts with respect to the safety of children between 4 and 8. Report to Congress within 2 years of enactment.	<p>NHTSA 2003-06 Priority Plan: Establishing performance requirements for child restraint systems for larger children per Anton's Law (anticipated: NPRM 2004, FR required 2005). In fulfillment of Anton's Law, NRPm to require rear center lap/shoulder belts in passenger vehicles with GVWR less than 10,000 lbs. (Agency planned to issue NRPM in 2003, but it has not been issued to date. FR due in 2004.)</p> <p><i>There are no current agency plans regarding safety labeling.</i></p>	January 2003, the Zoie Foundation petitions NHTSA to change the power switches on passenger vehicles to prevent children from being crushed by power windows. <i>No reply from the agency has been received to date.</i> September 2003, national safety organizations petition NHTSA to change the standard to prevent power window closing by changing the power switch operations and also to require automatic reversal systems to prevent deaths and injuries. <i>To date, no action has been taken on the merits of this petition.</i>
Safety Labeling Requirement (§4172)	Require vehicle disclosure stickers to include a "Government Safety Information" disclaimer that provides, when available, the NCAP ratings for frontal, side, and rollover ratings for a vehicle as well as an explanation of what those ratings mean. Regulation prescribed requiring label by 1-1-2005. Changes must take place by 9-1-2006.	<p>Agency planned to issue an NPRM in 2003 to require rear center lap/shoulder belts in passenger vehicles with GVWR less than 10,000 lbs., but no rulemaking has taken place to date. In their 2003-2006 Priority Plan, NHTSA announced a planned 2003 report to Congress on child restraint standard issues not included in its 2003 final regulatory action, but no such report has been issued to date..</p> <p>Although the New Car Assessment Program (NCAP) was started in 1978, NCAP vehicle crash test ratings are still only available on the NHTSA website, not on the vehicles at the dealers where they will be used the most.</p>	

Glossary of Abbreviations Used

- AHOF - Average Height of Force
- ANPRM - Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
- CAFE - Corporate Average Fuel Economy
- DOT - Department of Transportation
- FMCSA - Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
- FR - Final Rule
- IIHS - Insurance Institute for Highway Safety
- NAS - National Academy of Sciences
- NHTSA - National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
- NPRM - Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
- TREAD Act - Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability and Documentation Act

End Notes

¹ Plungis, Jeff. "Lax auto safety rules cost thousands of lives." *Detroit News* 3 March 2002.

² *Id.*

³ CDC "Injuries and Deaths among Children Left Unattended in or Around Motor Vehicles," *Morbidity and Mortality Report* Vol. 51. No. 26. July 5, 2002.

⁴ *Referring to* Hans C. Joksch, "Vehicle Design versus Aggressivity," (April 2000), DOT HS 809 194. p. 40-42

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Insurance Institute for Highway Safety Status Report, 6-28-2002.