

today's prices, the additional cost is estimated at \$70 more per unit. The aggregated national cost of the proposed guard installation, per year, was estimated at \$9.89 million (1980 \$'s) for heavy truck, and \$8.84 million (1980 \$'s) for trailers. These figures translate to \$13.85 million (1988 \$'s), and \$12.37 million (1988 \$'s) respectively.

An important component in the cost/benefit analysis is the weight of the guard which adds to fuel cost and replacement of commercial load. NHTSA estimated that, in 1980, the current (ICC) guard weight was about 60 pounds and cost the consumer about \$35 per guard (about \$50 in 1988 \$'s). The proposed device would have weighed 100 pounds and cost the consumer around \$85 per guard (about \$120 in 1988 \$'s). NHTSA projected an added fuel cost of about \$0.5 million per year, in 1980 prices, for the affected fleet of 339,000 vehicles (Because in real terms fuel prices remained about constant during the period 1980-1988 this estimate could be accepted "as is"). The penalty for payload displacement for the affected fleet of 339,000 vehicles was calculated at \$15,000 per year for the fleet listed above (\$21,000 in 1988 dollars).

Comments to NHTSA Proposed Rules

As indicated above, the proposed federal rule on 22" bumpers has not been implemented, in spite of extensive studies by NHTSA showing its effectiveness. The *Federal Register* (1981) is the last official federal document pertaining to this proposed rule. Further information was obtained from NHTSA Docket 10-11 Notice 8, in particular, its (unpublished) "Summary of Comments to Rear Underride Protection," submitted by John Tomassoni, NHTSA, Safety Standard Engineer, on June 1981. This summary provides some insight on the reasons why the rule has not been implemented.

One hundred and ten (110) comments were submitted in response to the rear guard proposed rule. Support for the rule was stated by nine (9), while twenty-two (22) stated or strongly implied an opposition. In other words, opposition overruled support by a ratio of more than 2:1. Moreover, the opposition practically included the entire trucking industry - both manufacturers and haulers. Most responses, 61 of the 110 (55%), came from organizations which asked for exemptions (i. e., cement mixers, refuse and utility vehicles). Nineteen (19) responses favored "improved conspicuity" alternatives, or asked for postponement of the rules until further "conspicuity" research is completed.

The rule was supported by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS), the State of New Jersey (and its Safety Council and its Division of Motor Vehicles, the National Transportation Safety Board, and by three members of the U.S. House of representatives - Peter Rodino, James Howard, and Christopher Smith.