

HVNL Draft Policy Feedback

13/11/2024

Fatigue and work Diaries:

My view is that too much importance is put on this record keeping. This is not managing fatigue but rather managing compliance and sometimes over zealously. This over the top checking of this is driving many good operators out of our business/industry. How can not putting the record keepers address in the front of a Workdiary add to fatigue. We recently had a driver that had a new Workdiary and had failed to complete that section, which I must say is an easy error, he had his old Workdiary with him that had the information in it so was readily available but was fined nearly a \$1,000 for that. I can not see how failure to complete that can be classed as a major fatigue breach. That to me should be a clerical error and should be treated as such. The officer that issued that fine also issued a defect for the truck for a stone chip in the windscreen (no wonder with the current state of the roads) and he omitted to fill in details such as the make of truck, model etc but he receives NO PENALTY ??

There is no good reason to go back more than 14 days when checking a Workdiary for compliance. 14 days is the maximum recording period. If you made an error prior to that it should be a historical event and not classed as a current fatigue breach, the potential for a fatigue related event is well passed.

I STRONGLY believe if the authorities are serious about fatigue they would address issues that they know about like drivers working all day as an Uber or Taxi driver and then drive all night as a truck driver, often on a change over with a tight schedule. The NHVR are well aware of this but it is too hard for them to monitor, we also have drivers who drive a couple of hours to a mine drive a heavy vehicle for 12 hours, grab a couple of cans and drive home. These are TRUE FATIGUE issues but seemingly all too hard to tackle.

The state of our roads seriously adds to fatigue and I can't see any mention of that ! would we get a better outcome if we fixed the surface of the roads before we fitted tracking cameras that for some reason think fatigue only relates to heavy vehicles.

Minimum standards for rest areas need to be addressed, when a driver stops surely they need at least a toilet with hand washing facilities, comfortable seating, a table, drinking water and adequate lighting.

There should be a maximum distance apart for rest areas and rest areas should accommodate the larger vehicles on many of the highways now.

Increased Vehicle Dimensions:

It is my view that semis should certainly go to 20 mts and B Doubles 27 Mts and 4.6 mts high on appropriate roads. We already have 4.6mt high vehicles and the need for the NHVR to asses each type seems a little late ??? We have stock crates 4.6 mts with very high unstable and semi restrained loads and car carriers with the top deck having a high centre of gravity just to mention a couple.

As for concerns around stacking at intersections that is as ridiculous as I have heard too, should the authorities limit the ever increasing size of cars too ? Should they insist cars park closer together at intersections to alleviate stacking lengths. Surely larger vehicles would ultimately end up reducing the number of vehicles required to completed a task ?

NHVR :

It is my view and the view of MANY others who won't take the time to participate in this that the NHVR is a total waste of time. They OFTEN interpret laws incorrectly, are only consistent at being inconsistent, have a vested interest in reaping the rewards of fining people, (they get half the fine plus court costs) rather than genuinely educating people who are trying to do the very best and lastly and importantly need to change their name. They are not national, some smart states and territories don't want to know them either.