

## Brief comments received

| No. | Comment  |
|-----|--|
| 1   | <p>Here is a link to a short note regarding a USA General Motors VP's view on heavy vehicles/road safety/automation/drivers which maybe useful background. I have often suggested we could have specific lanes for automated trucks on long haul routes ie Adelaide to Darwin etc. I suspect more cost effective than heavy rail.</p> <p><a href="https://alum.mit.edu/slice/road-safety-drives-vp-gm">https://alum.mit.edu/slice/road-safety-drives-vp-gm</a></p>   |
| 2   | <p>If you want to increase heavy vehicle productivity, travel efficiency, less breakdowns, less off the road maintenance and repairs time, then eliminate pot holes, uneven surfaces, dangerous animal crossing sections of roads, highways and freeways across Australia and bring Australian road infrastructure closer to northern hemisphere highway, freeway, autobahn standards so all roadworthy transport across Australia can travel safely at 150 - 160 kph on highways and freeways subject to weather, traffic volumes, under the gaze of cameras and variable electronic speed signage.</p>   |
| 3   | <p>The NSW Government's organization "Transport for NSW" has published a series of documents entitled "Freight Policy Reform Consultation Paper", April 2024, "Freight Policy Reform Interim Directions", September 2024 and "Delivering Freight Policy Reform", June 2025". It is evident from these documents that this investigation into the NSW freight industry was thorough, meticulous, and yet compromised by unsupported assumptions about safety and sustainability that were presented as recommendations to the Government in "Delivering Freight Policy Reform" and in the earlier papers. Safety was not included in the terms of reference of any of the Freight Policy Reform documents. Emissions reduction was not included in the terms of reference either despite rising emissions from transport, and neither was cost recovery and nor was there any obvious evidence that acknowledged experts were consulted. Safety was only mentioned in a minor heading in the guiding principles in the initial "Freight Policy Reform Consultation Paper" despite the unending toll of deaths and injuries caused by interminable truck crashes. What is most iniquitous about this situation is that the majority of those killed and injured in truck crashes are other road users. For example, of the people killed in fatal truck crashes in 2021, approximately 50 per cent were travelling in a light vehicle, 25 per cent were other road users (pedestrians, motorcyclists or pedal cyclists) and only 25 per cent were occupants of the truck. The combustion of diesel, petrol and LPG produces approximately 21% of NSW's greenhouse gas emissions yet no mention is made in any of the Freight Policy Reform documents that emissions from diesel, the fuel used in heavy vehicles, are rapidly increasing or that this is most probably the result of the uncontrolled growth in the number of heavy vehicles. Significantly, there is no discussion of any results from models that could have been used to study the effects on safety or emissions or cost recovery resulting from the recommended expansion of road freight. How were the underlying assumptions and the recommendations tested? There are numerous problems with these poorly researched documents and their recommendations. Perhaps the greatest being that the authors are too closely connected with the freight industry and have received support from Transport for NSW, a government agency that gives the appearance of a</p> |

| No. | Comment   |
|-----|---|
|     | compromised regulator that has become a facilitator of the road freight industry. Transport for NSW's Freight Policy Reform papers should properly be regarded as submissions by the road freight industry and not used as a basis of freight reform. |