

This document is a translation of the original assessment in Swedish by SHK of the response to the recommendation. In case of discrepancies between this translation and the Swedish original text, the Swedish text shall prevail in the interpretation of the assessment.

Leif Löfgrens åkeri
Kastebovägen 85
815 95 Månkarbo

The Swedish Accident Investigation Authority's report RJ 2018:01

On 14 December 2018, the Swedish Accident Investigation Authority (SHK) published the report RJ 2018:01 on the collision between a freight train and a timber lorry with trailer in Hökmora, Västmanland County, on 1 February 2018.

The report contained a total of five recommendations, of which one was for Leif Löfgrens Åkeri AB. The haulage contractor was recommended to find a suitable way to ensure that the employees receive information regarding the proposed route prior to an assignment, regardless of whether or not the vehicle involved is equipped with a cab terminal (RJ 2018:01 R5).

In its response to the recommendation, Leif Löfgrens Åkeri AB has stated that the owner has issued a verbal instruction to all drivers to verify the proposed route before starting a run. This can be done in one of several different ways. The drivers can receive the information from a colleague with a cab terminal in their vehicle, or they can have the loader send the information to their smartphone or tablet. The loader is the party that ensures that the goods are loaded onto the lorry.

According to the owner, the drivers have now started checking the proposed route to a greater extent than before.

It is certainly positive that the drivers are currently checking the proposed route to a greater extent than before. However, as stated, the new procedures are based on a verbal instruction from the owner to the drivers to verify the route independently. SHK finds it questionable whether the new procedure is sufficiently robust to guarantee that the drivers will always obtain or receive the information. According to SHK, it would be preferable for the new procedures to entail the drivers receiving information on the proposed route together with other information about the assignment, without having to request such information separately before each assignment. A purely verbal directive is also at risk of being forgotten with time.

With this in mind, SHK finds that the recommendation can only be considered to have been partially implemented and the reply can only be considered partially satisfactory.

Best regards,

Helene Arango Magnusson
Chair Accident Investigations