

**Public Comments Posted on the Side Guard Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
(as of May 6, 2023)**

Submit Your Comment By June 20, 2023

[Here](#)

1. Underride guards are just another example of fmcsa over reach from people that have never been in a truck. How about the government pay for them if it's going to be mandatory!!!
(Anonymous)
2. Not Only do I think this is not the right answer to prevent accidents. It is not cost effective at all, and it would be very hard to control and check that everyone is using them accordingly. The accidents that these new barriers are supposed to prevent being so fatal, are usually not started by the trucks, they are started by the smaller vehicles from drivers that are not paying attention to the road. Which is where most of the road accidents in general happen, and I think is where all this money and attention should be spent on how to educate everyone to pay attention to the road and respect the rest of the automobiles next to them. (Joe Law)
3. I am opposed to this mandate. There is limited benefit for the extremely high cost. (Jeff Gann)
4. I would vote no on the new mandate especially since I pull pneumatic trailers and need access to valves located under the trailer. The new mandate would hinder access to these valves inhibiting the ability to do my job.(Michael Brennan)
5. The latest research once again indicates there is absolutely no reason to require side underride guards on commercial trucks with NHTSA estimating a \$1.2 billion price tag on a potential mandate. NHTSA's research has consistently shown that the costs of side underrides far exceeds any safety benefits. (Brian Biellier)
6. I pull a flatbed Conastoga trailer. I'm already heavy at 33,780 and by adding these to the trailer, are you going to pay for it? No reason why me or anyone else should have to pay for this unless they are required on all new trailers going forward. But was hoping state needs to up their gross limits to 84,000 lbs. Oregon and Washington you can buy yearly permit la or have it on your cab card. California and most everyone else your limitations are 80,000 max. No company is going to pay you full rate with less product on your truck having these.
7. Maybe, you should start thinking about putting limiter speeds on the motors of all cars, pickup trucks and motorcycles! Those are the one that cause 80% of wrecks as well as break checking trucks. (Anonymous)
8. Please don't mandate side underride guards on commercial semi trailers. Let them be company spec'd ONLY! It is going to cost companies hundreds, if not thousands of dollars, per trailer to install and add unnecessary weight that will cut down profitability. In addition to company costs, trailers with these side underride guards now become issues at railroad crossings, docks that aren't perfectly level from dock door to drive wheels, and other situations where the side underride guards are going to scrape pavement, brush up against curbs, landscaping, etc, which will either damage the equipment, obstacles, or both, In addition, how will drivers and maintenance personnel be able to do proper inspections of equipment when they can't visually see or physically touch crossmembers and other parts of the underside of the vehicle without pulling off the guards. Will these guards be able to withstand the weight of snow and ice in northern climates without compromising structural integrity? If involved in an accident, will these guards create more problems for 1st

responders or make accidents much worse? How many train operators will be hurt or killed when one of these trailers get stuck on a track and the train can't stop in time? These are things to consider when you look into this mandate. (Rebecca Reed)

9. I believe at some point the safety and accountability needs to be put on the general public. The Trucking community keeps putting practices regulations and equipment out to protect other and we just keep adding to our work load and accountability with more backlash. This will be more cost and weight furthering the burden on trucks in an already strained environment (Stephen Gruhlke)
10. They serve no purpose! This is once again government (who know nothing about this industry) making rules just to make rules. This is an over regulated industry and an easy target for bored over paid government officials (Kevin Ranner)
11. I'm opposed to underride guards on trailers (Harold Van Vliet)
12. Oppose! Stop being a revenue government office and start being about safety (David Smith)
13. We are already struggling to survive. The trucking industry is too heavy with rules, regulations and mandates. We can't keep adding more and more costs. (Sindy Twedt)
14. New inexperienced already have issues with running over and hitting items when turning too tight in parking lots and shippers. I can only imagine the extra damage these guards will cause. Not to mention getting hung up over railroad tracks. (Anonymous)
15. As an Owner Operator, I do not see the added benefit of adding underride gaurds. The added cost and added weight will not be beneficial to the owner, not to mention costs due to maintenance and repair. The problem in most Semi/ car accidents are due to the driver of the car not paying attention or driving aggressively. Stop trying to pass added costs on to the trucking companies and independent owner operators that are already feeling the squeeze of over regulations and costs. (Matt Jackson)
16. Really! What is the true benefit of this legislation? We do not need this to pass, please come up with something that makes sense (James M. Rogers)
17. How many of these crashes was the truck at fault versus the other vehicle being at fault ??? Putting the burden on the truck is just STUPIDITY, Cost, fuel mileage, xtra weight, (Jim Creedon)
18. with the rates at an all time low this will put many carriers out of business. It is not up to the carriers and truck drivers to protet cars from their stupidity of not keeping their eyes on the road and their attention on traffic (Rickey Emerson)
19. I oppose Mandatory side Underride Guards (Christal Slater)
20. There's just no reason for it whatsoever, just another political investment. (Devrlo Champagne)
21. I'm strongly against the purposed underride guard proposal.
The Federal regulatory agencies need to move their focus off of truckers, and focus more on educating the motoring public on how to coexist with trucks. To keep pounding regulation after regulation on the industry that actually moves the economy is, to be blunt, stupid and misguided. Every time a new regulation gets force upon us, it just adds massive costs to an already stressed business. Small business especially.
The percentage of accidents involving heavy trucks are overwhelmingly caused by the four wheeler. Yet, the focus and attention is always on the truck side.
Maybe it's time to rethink how we're going about making our highways safe, and start focusing on the REAL problem. The motoring public.

I'm a 38 year, 3 million mile accident free veteran in this business. So, I believe my experience is totally being disregarded by people who know little to nothing about driving a truck and are making the rules and regulations that effect it.

Change how you think or the business will suffer as will our standard of living. (James Sullivan)

22. Side underride guards are a very bad idea for many reasons.

I cross railroad tracks with tall "humps" that will definitely damage or trap low-belly trailers with underride guards.

I also load/unload at docks at entertainment venues that will damage or trap the trailer [high center].

In addition, the cost of the equipment to add underride guards to trailers would be most definitely cost prohibitive, adding unnecessary and unneeded and unrecoverable expense to equipment.

Thank you (David Sweetman)

23. I do not believe these will have an impact on safety whatsoever. The cost of installing these pn fleets will far exceed any safety benefits. (Tammi Alexander)

24. Sorry. I got a little carried away with my comments. Disregard the California comment and the insider trading comment. The rest was spot on. There wouldn't be a benefit for these underride guards. I totally agree with OOIDA....My tare weight is heavy enough. I can't add more to it by installing this. Not to mention I don't have the money to add these. Thank you. (Rodney Janes)

25. A huge part of surviving a car crash isn't what you do but what kind of protection you have.

This makes it extremely important to buy a vehicle that is safe. And cars are not safer:

https://www.huffpost.com/entry/why-car-companies-are-not_b_5019906

Let's ask Einstein! He said "by defining a problem correctly, you also define the solution.

*WHAT ABOUT the cars!!

If people are injured in a crash with a truck, one must ask what happens. The top of the passenger compartment collapses and the passengers are left defenseless. Therefore, by building the passenger compartments crash resistant, 47 lives a year could be saved.

Thanks Albert.

Now, let's look at a brief history of safety at some major car makers:

1. 2001 At GM, internal documents show the company learned of its faulty ignition problem in 2001. <https://time.com/46483/gm-recall-ignition-switch-1/>

For the subsequent 13 years, GM did the unthinkable: it knowingly sold dangerous vehicles to unsuspecting customers. In the same article, Time Magazine cited internal Ford Motor Company documents, which identified problems with Firestone tires during early road tests. The author, an engineer, wrote: "management is aware of the potential risk with P235 tires and has accepted [that] risk."

2. 1968 With the exploding Pinto gas tanks, Ford calculated the cost of a few deaths vs the \$11 per vehicle to fix it and didn't fix it. Why did Ford not fix the Pinto?

Simply, Ford's internal "cost-benefit analysis", which places a dollar value on human life, said it wasn't profitable to make changes to the Ford Pinto exploding gas tank sooner. It showed

that it was cheaper to endure lawsuits and settlements than to spend \$11 to remedy the design.

<https://www.tortmuseum.org/ford-pinto>

<https://www.spokesman.com/blogs/autos/2008/oct/17/pinto-memo-its-cheaper-let-them-burn/>

So, how many more potential tragedies are written off due to the “cost benefit analysis” of being sued for 47 deaths with semis vs strengthening the passenger compartments of cars to protect these 47 innocent people from under ride collisions? How many other collisions could have had fewer tragedies if their vehicles protected them better. And what is the cost benefit of car companies pointing the finger to the object its cars hit rather than to take responsibility for their calculated neglect that resulted in these tragedies?

We must demand the NHTSA turn their investigations to the car companies for their lack of safety procedures that are allowing these tragedies to keep occurring. Even one death or injury is too many when the means to safeguard people is easily doable.

And how many more cases of willful negligence are waiting in the wings to be exposed and how many more have been tried that we haven't heard of.....yet.

GO AFTER THE CAR MAKERS – IT'S WHERE THE BLAME LAYS (Anonymous)

26. These would not be needed if the Dept of Motor vehicles would require a class teaching new drivers about driving around semi trucks. We cannot be responsible for the insufficient teaching of new drivers. (Richard Donk)
27. Side underride guards is an unnecessary burden to already struggling trucking businesses. It adds more cost weight and improve zero safety (Simon Maina)
28. This would definitely impact my business cost with no profit in return. (Tony Gonzalez)
29. Under guards are a very foolish idea for multiple reasons, first of which is the fact that they will hinder the inspection of vital safety equipment, inside tires, brake pads, brake air supply lines, cans, and a long list of other components related to the trailer's safety system. During my 35 year long career traveling several million miles i found myself walking around my rig 10 times a day to inspect the tires and safety features on my truck. I suspect some special interests selling these systems for profit have a lot to do with this very foolish idea. I should also mention my credentials , 7 years as a member of Colorado Safety Management Council, chairman Wyoming ,State Truck Driving Championships, 33 A.T.A, safety awards. My experience is quite lengthy so i will stop here.
Sincerely,Kenny Moss
30. Ive worked in the trucking industry for about 30 years ive never had any issue with needing side underride protection.
I have had problems getting in and out of docks and over railroad tracks with pallet racks under the trailer as well as the air deflectors that supposedly help with aerodynamics getting hung up and broken
According to the data there is not enough accidents that involve a vehicle coming under a trailer from the side to justify the costs, the extra weight and the problems that will arise crossing railroad tracks and getting in and out of docks (Martin Ellis)
31. I really can't afford an additional 4-5 thousand per trailer for something that is a easy fix! hold people accountable for there actions and pay attention to their driving. The trucking family is a cash cow for too many insurance companies paying out stupid amounts in law

suits. We are just kicking the can down the road so someone else can step and trip ! (Kevin Hartman)

32. As a car owner, I support mandated side underride guards for trailers and semitrailers. The NHTSA study found that side underride guards would “reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries for passenger vehicle occupants associated with side underride crashes,” and that these guards would have no effect on “port and loading dock operations and freight capacity.” How can we ethically weigh the costs and benefits of whether or not to require side underride guards when human lives are in question? Contrary to NHTSA’s fiscal analysis, I argue that there is no dollar amount we can place on a human life.

However, in response to truck owner and operator concerns about the financial impact of purchasing and installing guards, as well as impacts to truck maintenance, the NHTSA should consider providing a financial stipend to independent truck owners or small businesses to offset the cost of installing guards. (Anonymous)

33. Dumb idea with no benefits (Gary Johnson)
34. Side underride guards on trailers makes trailers have more square feet for cross wind to blow off vehicle off road. This is common on interstate 80 in Wyoming winter time. (Wayne New)
35. This is a costly mandate to trucking industry that will have an adverse effect on the industry. We have. No idea how many of these accidents there are. Plus there is no real world testing. Not to mention the unintended consequences of these causing center hung on railway, pit docks, or when having to operate off road. (Lewie Pugh)
36. I would like to offer a comment of support to protect people and animals from under deck accidents.
This protection has to be very user friendly for the industry and drivers.
I think we should encourage knew vehicle technology to warn the driver of a potential accident and we protect small motor craft, cyclists, pedestrians and animals from getting underneath semi trailers.
We have a solution that would offer this full length protection while saving fuel and eliminate carbon emissions from the air. (Windyne Fairing Co.)
37. The majority of van trailers already have fiberglass/plastic wind guards on them, which also help protect the undercarriage in case a car decides they want to ride under the trailer. Underride guards will add more weight, causing difficulties at shippers across the nation. They are also very expensive for fleets. They are NOT going to prevent a car traveling at 70+ mph from going under the trailer. Anyone who thinks like this, is out of touch with reality and never drove a truck. (Alarik Wood)
38. If the safe guard are installed on trailers. It must flex otherwise it will become a safety issue to the driver. The trailer manufacturers haven’t come up with a way to fix this problem. I’m opposed of this mandate! (Robert Voss)
39. I haul bulk gasoline and diesel. Some of the trailers from other companies have side underride guards. I have looked at them closely. They are not rugged enough to make any difference. They are purely cosmetic. (Anonymous)
40. NO NO NO to underside guards. More weight, more equipment cost and they will hinder operation of my add on equipment. People need to drive without blaming trucks (Greg Buffenbarger)
41. No cost/benefits there (William Fialho)

42. It would be a lot cheaper to teach the dumb people not to drive underneath trailers (Dale Drabek)
43. There is very little benefit from running underside guards from a safety standpoint. From a maintenance perspective they get very costly when it comes to replacing them. From the fuel efficiency side, again it is of little mpg increase, so I do not see a great benefit of using the underside guards. (Victor Gabris)
44. As a long time, truck driver for over 45 years, I can't understand the safety factor for having them. It seems like it would be more dangerous to have them as well as the cost to have and maintain. (Kenneth Hampton)
45. Why do we need these when better driving is more needed.... (People have forgotten how to merge because all the yield signs in most states are gone) pedestrians don't have right of way any more.... So please enlighten me how this monstrosity is suppose to promote safety (Donald Keifer)
46. in a time when truck rates are so cheap that we cannot move a load, we cannot afford to add the cost of useless under ride to our equipment. Not only the cost but the added weight would prevent us from hauling some of the loads we haul because we would be overweight. Has anyone that is for this proposal ever seen the under ride equipment that has been on a trailer for just a little while? They are flopping in the wind from bolts breaking or fiberglass tearing and then end up in someone's windshield or on the roadway as a hazard (Julia Truver)
47. We operate over 500 semi-trailers, and my family and me are also on the roads every day in our personal cars, so this issue of highway safety is important to me. NHTSA has done a good job on many aspects of traffic safety, and I appreciate being educated by you on the causes of crashes and ideas to reduce them in quantity and severity.
- Every incident and accident has a cause and many times we see that they are a result of some law or mandate. Requiring side underride will force many route changes (will the jurisdictions quickly vet and change truck routes?) on the fly, and drivers will be routed sometimes onto roads with obstacles to these side-underride-guards, either forcing a back up, a hang up, a turnaround, and so on. The lowboy trailer haulers know about this, but the millions of truckers that pull 'regular trailers' have not heretofore had to have this on their radar. It will create significant interruption in routes for coming years. Many docks that we back down into ("wells") have a level-to-angle construction that will prevent these such-equipped trailers from backing down into them, especially since we are so often and needlessly required to slide the tandems to the back of the trailer before loading (creating a longer "bridge" between TSPs (trailer support points)).
- We operate many intermodal chassis, and it is a big economic gain for our shippers to reduce equipment tare weight to maximize cargo weight, so that these manufacturers can be globally competitive in marketing their product. We spend many dollars to eliminate pounds from equipment (including single tires, aluminum components, high tensile steel, and so on). Shippers have for decades shown the benefit to the American economy, American manufacturing base, and consumer prices, for the trucking industry to reach certain plateaus of cargo weight. Adding weight via side underride guards would be a setback within the industry, unless gross-weight tolerances are also mandated by the feds to compensate for the additional weight.

All of these factors diminish the operability and safety of semi-trailers in the USA, where a century of their use has been established without them (thus the roads and docks do not accommodate them).

The more mandates that we receive, the more unintended consequences we are seeing, and the higher the crash rate.

In addition - these will accumulate snow and ice, adding weight and road debris. They will add weight, which will decrease payload and drive costs of goods to consumers up.

Thank you for listening.

I agree that highway safety is important. I hope that until better ideas and designs are set forth for side underride guards, that the current designs will not be mandated. (Danny Schnautz)

48. To expensive and won't stop a car from going underneath (David Riley)

49. NO Underde mandates I will not be able to cross railroad crossings in my area (David Campbell)

50. Why does the NHTSA want to bankrupt and/or financially burden owner-operators and small fleets with this unnecessary mandate The supply chain is already at risk in these inflationary times with high diesel prices, high repair costs, and lack of skilled mechanical workers. Wait times for installation would be a major net loss for owner operators and small fleets.

Why is the current administration so hostile towards the working man, the blue-collar workers that are the backbone of this nation? One would think that lessening hurdles of the supply chain would be the order of the day, not the opposite.

Lord, please help the working class prevail regarding these unnecessary and financially penalizing times. (Jon Rembold)

51. these will not do anything but add weight to the trucks and cut down payload capacity. Not a great idea just another government mandated expense for trucking companies . Most truck accidents are caused by cars rearending us. (Larry White)

52. I fully oppose this because there was not enough research done to even remotely consider this as a possibility. This will affect trailers from being able to enter different manufacturing facilities that have railroad crossings. This will cause severe problems for trucks going in and out of docks at older facilities. It will be affect the amount of cargo that can be hauled requiring more trucks to be on the road to move the same amount of freight. Because of the added weight manufacturers will have to put less product on trailers and turn driving shipping cost up by having to have more trucks on the road cause more pollution. This will further increase the parking problem due to the added number of trucks needed to move the same amount of freight that can currently be moved to meet capacity needs. This will not increase safety as statistics show more than 80% or more of the accidents are caused by inattentive drivers in smaller vehicles. If you want to fix this problem go after the people driving this small cars and pick up trucks they have their heads so buried in their cell phone that they don't know if it's night or day. (Joshua Mulford)

53. All over the Midwest there are too many railroad crossings that are raised higher than the road surface. Once the tractor gets across the set of tracks, the trailer tires are still on the opposite side of the raised Railroad tracks. Therefore, the middle of the trailer has very little to no clearance for any underlying objects attached to the belly of the trailer. (Bryan Jones)

54. Board members, This mandate will be a huge burden with little actual benefit to anyone. NHTSA studies have shown the cost far exceeds the safety benefits. The law of unintended consequences will be in full force here. As a flabed owner I will be forced to put my dunnage, v boards, ladders and other equipment I currently store under the trailer between the frame rails, out of sight, to storing it all up on the trailer and that will reduce the loading space on the trailer, and will invite theft. Not to mention the added weight on a truck that needs the lightest weight possible to serve my customers.
55. The guards will cause more truck train collisions as they will high center trucks on sloped crossings even more than what happens now. Docks with sloped approaches that currently catch, bend and scrape the aero shields will become unusable at many small locations causing untold costs to shippers and receivers as they try to find new ways to send or receive their product. I still see rear underride crashes like one that happened in front of me 2 years ago with 2 fatalities, and they are more common, so the laws in place already are not doing much to stop people's growing distracted driving. I have been a driver for over 48 years and do not see this as a need at all. thank you, Norm Lassen
56. Card speed limit, better education for people, on how to go around a truck, and active presence of police on the road. Is the key to avoid accidents go under the trailer. STOP babysitting the people driver the cars over speed, careless drivers. (Angel Pellot)
57. I do not believe these will have an impact on safety whatsoever. The cost of installing these pn fleets will far exceed any safety benefits. (Curt Nielsen)
58. The underride guards DO NOT provide any safety at all. They cause blindspot issues & damages to customer property & damage to trucks & cars when they become tore up. These DO NOT work on every trailer and are a huge waste of money...and frankly truckers are not automatic cash machines for your liberal agendas from people who don't even work in my profession. These will not absolve people in cars from being responsible for their own actions! (Greg Beksel)
59. The "Angel Wing" can and should be used. HOWEVER, not at the cost of small businesses that happen to own trucks. I believe that it should be up to the owner of the company, without a guilt trip from the government (which shouldn't be as involved in the industry as much as they are. "Angel Wing" should be added at no additional cost on FUTURE equipment. Not currently operating equipment. (Perry Merriel)
60. I've been involved in trucking for 40 years. The addition of underride guards that I have seen directly and negatively effect a trailers maneuverability. The impact on ground clearance is inevitable as railroad crossings, embankments....cause trailer with guards to bottom out damaging both guards and the trailer. Instead of trying to procure more money from truckers, why not invest in educating the public on how to drive around us. Truckers are for the most part some of the safest drivers....we inspect our vehicles multiple times throughout the course of a day....can't say the same about the motoring public and the many unsafe vehicles that hot the road every day. (John Settineri)
61. more weight=less profit. more weight =less hauling , more danger to motoring public when they do a dumb & go under them, possibly causing death, dismemberment etc. UNNECESSARY!! Sounds like a drug induced idea (Earl Adams)
62. I disagree with the mandating owners to install underside guards on trucks because of the additional weight ,cost and maintenance. The safety analysis is insufficient to make it justified (Kevin Johnson)

63. I strongly oppose side underride guards. Total waste of money and just another regulation in an industry that is so over regulated already. (Kenneth Sime)
64. I oppose this mandate. This mandate is only going to cost the trucking industry billions and do nothing to help. Where is the data on how many of these accidents there even is. There isn't any. Also how do you mandate something that there is no real world testing. Maybe you should be mandating larger carriers to train their driver. (Jill Myers)
65. Putting underride guards on trailers will end up costing everyone more money in the end. 1. Ground clearance will be challenge not every entrance to a business is flat, routing around some railroad crossing, intersection more fuel and time used up. 2. Dry van now is \$56,000, Reefer \$105,000, Flatbed \$75,000. That going raise price up \$4500 per trailer. 3. Weight factor that's going knock down what we can haul. I can see the shipper already dropping rate because they can't ship 46,000lbs. I my opinion if you want to stop cars going under trailers start cracking down on distracted and wreckless driving. As truckers we can only do so much for safety. If the cars don't want drive under the trailers they need to learn how to be safe around us. If you pass this then maybe every new car sold should have a fee tacted on to absorb the cost of the underride guards. It's their turn to start paying for safety on the road and not have it all on the trucking industry. Guess next thing is you all will want us in bubble wrap to protect the stupid people on the highway. (Larry Willhite)
66. Please teach public to stay away from all sides of the big truck. (William Tow)
67. Please make the Side Underride Guards proposed rule a regulation! The NHTSA long ago abdicated its duty to update US safety standards and the EU has left us far behind. This regulation could save many lives. The NHTSA needs to get its act together and pass new regulations quickly. Why is AEB not mandated on all new semi trucks? Why is AEB not mandated on all new cars? Why hasn't the NCAP been updated in years? Please mandate this regulation. It is a small step, but an important one. And get to the other ones! (Zain Imam)
68. Side underrides limit a driver's ability to easily inspect equipment located under the trailer . Underride guards create challenges for trucks navigating Rail Road and other grade crossings and high curbs, backing in to sloped loading docks. NHTSA's research has consistently shown that the costs of side underrides far exceeds any safety benefits. This would boost the cost of a new trailer by approximately \$3,740 to \$4,630. NHTSA did not take into consideration the practicability and feasibility of side underride guards on trailer and semitrailer operations. Per usual the agency did not include the cost and weight of strengthening the beams, frame rails, and floor of the trailer to accommodate side underride guards.

Could you please apply common sense to your study based in the real world of operating a Truck on our Great Nations Highways ! Just once , Please ! (Andrew Curtis)

69. The problem isn't the trailers it's the FMCSA letting the big carriers put all these inexperienced untrained drivers on the road try regulating those issues first and the numbers will change even better than putting a bunch of metal on trailers. If government would address the right issues that would make our roads safer instead of implementing rules that are making our roads more dangerous that's the only thing that's going to change the numbers for the better. The numbers don't lie and they are worse than they ever have been. The numbers don't lie is the thing and nobody is doing the right thing to change the numbers

so people will die and this all is a waste of our time and the people's money. Somebody needs to step up and do the right thing is the bottom line. Right lol isn't gonna happen nobody does that anymore. (Mike Smith)

70. This proposed mandate is another example of bureaucrats pushing completely unnecessary cost onto small operations like me. They are responding to a lobbying group that continues to try and put small trucking out of business by creating another cost point. The real tragedy is this modified equipment will do next to nothing in preventing injury or death to motorist who are intent on smashing into a commercial vehicle. The general motoring public cannot be wrapped in bubble wrap in order to protect them. Better education, alert drivers, no drinking and driving, following the road laws will completely protect them far greater than making me responsible for their poor driving choices. (Tony Terentowicz)
71. You idiots in Congress work for the people, why do you allow these burdens to keep being passed onto us, especially by unelected people at the EPA or FMCSA, I'm hanging on by the skin of my teeth, yet you keep piling on like I'm an endless supply of money, to paraphrase a movie leave us alone Mel Brooks. (Fred Van Weerd)
72. side override requirements would boost the cost of a new trailer by approximately \$3,740 to \$4,630. Small trucking companies can not afford any more costs.
73. Side overrides limit a driver's ability to easily inspect equipment located under the trailer, including critical safety systems. (Thomas Alumbaugh)
74. I do not believe that the transportation industry should be the bearer of these costs. We are one of the most regulated industries within our country. Costs are excessive already, and if this is required, based on retrofitting costs, you would be adding about 30 billion in costs without additional revenue being created with this safety regulation. The problem I see is that you have so many distracted drivers on the roadways. The public aren't professionals drivers, I know, but why do the costs of people being careless with their lives become the responsibility of those that share the roads with them. Can I go into a manufacturing plant, start wandering around aimlessly, walk into a machine, and then sue them because I was clueless? That is in essence what you are saying, but with the added caveat that our industry puts guards around our stuff, at our cost, to keep the crazies out. It doesn't make sense. How many of the 17.2 lives that will be saved, will be lives that are saved from their own incurred demise. I have never seen a truck jump sideways... In my opinion this isnt the correct solution to help people stay alive around trucks. (Comment From My Own Opinion)
- 75.