

## PBS EXP 6 - 2-axle truck 2-axle pig

Approval under section 9(1)(b)(i) of the Heavy Vehicle (General) National Regulation – Non compliance

Approval under section 9(1)(b)(i) of the Heavy Vehicle (General) National Regulation – Non compliance	
The type of heavy vehicle:	2-axle truck 2-axle pig (Level 2)
The standard/s under the Standards and Vehicle Assessment Rules that a vehicle built to the design may not comply with:	Frontal Swing (C8a) Standard: 700mm This vehicle design: 880 mm (exceedance of 180mm)
Reasons why the non-compliance will not pose any additional risk to safety or infrastructure if the particular conditions are imposed and complied with.	<p>The Regulator undertook a risk assessment before determining its support for the design. The Regulator concluded that although a heavy vehicle built to the design would not comply with Frontal Swing (C8a) under the Standards and Vehicle Assessment Rules, it would not pose any greater risk than a heavy vehicle that did comply with the standard for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It exceeds the requirements of Low-Speed Swept Path (C7) in a way that offsets the failure to comply with Frontal Swing (C8a). (Standard: 8.7m; This vehicle: 8.5m)</li><li>• Because of its 200mm margin for Low Speed Swept Path (C7), it will operate comfortably within Level 2, despite its non-compliance with C8a and will require less road space than other vehicles that comply with Level 2 standards.</li><li>• It considerably exceeds the requirements of Maximum of Difference (C8b) in a way that offsets the failure to comply with Frontal Swing (C8a). (Standard: 400mm; This vehicle: 10mm)</li><li>• Because of its 390mm margin for Maximum of Difference (C8b), it will operate comfortably within Level 2, despite its non-compliance with C8a and will have less out swing rear of the driver than other vehicles that comply with Level 2 standards.</li><li>• Because the non-conformance is forward of the driver and in his or her clear line of sight, it will be easier to manage. This is a recognised design principle for reducing risk. (In ergonomic design for example, gauges and controls are placed in an operator's area of attention. Visibility of a risk or a risk indicator are proven to improve safety.)</li><li>• The reason for the non-conformance is the addition of a bull bar which is appropriate for the vehicle's intended area of operation and provides greater protection to the driver and the steering mechanism in case of animal strike.</li></ul>