VECHANICAL ENGINEERING Triodyne Inc. (Est. 1969) Officers Palch L. Garnett

Officers
Palph L. Garnett
Dolores Glicen
S. Carl Uzgna, Ph.D.

Mechanical Engineering, Rolph I., Barnott Denne B. Brickman Michael A. Dilich Christopher W. Ferrorse Suzanno A. Giowak John M. Gestelbeeker Audia Gray Crission Haires, Ph.D. Droc Kopisch Woodrow Nelson Cheryl A. Publin, Ph.D. Peter J. Poczyrick Audiana Gray Chill Might B. Swittleke George J. Trezek, Ph.D. S. Calif Urgins, Ph.D. James R. Winglied, Ph.D.

Marria S. Sandari Marria S. Sandari Betty Bellows Dernia Mick. John Knitell Florence Lasky Dornia Spancer Jackie Schwartz Jogoe Stylar

Information Products
Expert Transcript
Center (ETC)
Marna S. Sanders

Graphic Communications Robert Koutny Charles D'Eccles

Training and Editorial Services Paula L. Barnett

Vehicle Laboratory Charles Sinkovits Matthew J. Ulmengtine

Model Laboratory 2721 Alson Lane Wilroette, IL 60091-2101 Bill Brown

Photographic Laboratory 7903 Blockwith Fload Morton Grove, IL 60053 Larry Glood

Business Systems
Ohra Ann Gonates
Oheryl Black
Alta Gurtis
Sandra Prieto
Anita J. Almomany

Facilities Management Peter Warner

SAFETY PRODUCTS

Triodyne Safety Systems, L.L.C. (Est. 1998) 5950 West Toury Avenue Nilles, IL 80714-4510 (847) 677-4750 FAX 9847 9447-5047

Officers/Directors Ralph L. Barnett Paula L. Barnett Joer I. Bernett

President
Pater J. Poczynok
Vice President of Operations
Peter W. Warner
Senior Science Advisor
Treodore Liber Ph.D.

Mechanical Engineering Ralph L. Barrett Peter J. Poczynok

Aquatics Safety Consultant Borald M. Schroader

# SAFETY BULLETIN

January 2002

Volume 10, No. 1

Triodyne Inc.

5950 West Touthy Avenue Niles, IL-50714-4610 (847) 677-4730

FAX: (847) 647-2047 e-mail: infoserv@tnodyne.com

SAFETY PHILOSOPHY

## Tautliner Vans Case Study: Safety Philosophy

By Ralph L. Barnett\* and Christopher Ferrone\*\*



Figure 1 - Tautliner: Loads Like a Flatbed, Protects Like a Van.

#### INTRODUCTION

A tautliner is a flatbed truck, such as shown in Fig. 1, whose deck is enclosed by a simple cartesian framework which supports three components: rear cargo doors, a fiberglass roof panel, and flexible load-bearing side curtains. The weather-proof curtains are manually deployed in the manner of shower curtains; typically they may be closed and latched down in less than two minutes. Three sides of this dedicated vehicle may be completely opened to allow simultaneous loading and unloading of palletized lading using ground level forklifts.

Setting aside functional advantages, the safety of the tautliner derives entirely from the property that no operating personnel ever mount the deck. For example, tarping hazards and falling hazards are eliminated. Since loading docks are not used to gain access to the decks, the commonplace dangers associated with dock plates, falling forklifts, and truck/dock crushing are nonexistent.

#### PRODUCT LIABILITY ACTION

On September 8, 1997, the driver of a tautliner gained access to its deck by either leaning over the platform and swinging his legs up or by using one of the wheels as a climbing aid. After manipulating non-palletized lading, the driver egressed the truck bed by deliberately jumping to the ground. This fifty-three inch drop gave rise to an injury to his right hand which in turn resulted in a product liability lawsuit.

Institute for Advance Safety Studies (Est. 1984)

(ESL 1984) 5050 West Toully Avenue Nies, IL 60714-4610 (847) 647-1101

Paiph L. Burnott Director of Operations

Information Services Marna S. Sanders

AMIRACTURING
Alliance Tool &
Manufacturing Inc.
(Est. 1945)
91 East Wilcox Street
Maywood, N. 69153-239

Officers S. Cort Uzgris, Ph.O.

S. Centregre, PNO Palph L. Barnell

Famosh Gondhi

Plant Manager Bruno Stachon

Founders/Consultant Joseph Garusoz Albert Karakula

CINSTRUCTION

Triodyne-Wangler Construction Company Inc. (Est. 1993)

5950 West Toutry Avenue Niles, IL 60714-4610 (847) 647-8986 FAX: (847) 647-0785

Officers/Directors/Managers Joef I Barnett William A. Wangler Joseph Wangler Ralph L. Barnett

BUILDING MAINTENANCE

Alliance Building Maintenance Corporation

(Est. 1999) 5850 West Tourty Aversue Niles, IL 60714-4610 (847) 647-1379 FAX: 6847) 647-0785

William A.

Joseph Wangler David J. Smith Joef I. Bornett Rulph L. Barnett

CINSULTANTS
Richard M. Bilot, Ph.D.
Electromagnicis Compatability
Richard M. Hosens-Saless Chem.

Information Science David W. Lavinson, Ph.D. Senior Metallungical Advisor

Stoven R. Schmid, Ph.D. Food Processing Equipment Diane Mostrman

Chemical/Environmer Engineering Harry Smith Electrical Engineering

Kim M. Mniszewski Fire and Explosion

<sup>\*</sup> Professor, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL; Chairman, Triodyne Inc., Niles, IL

<sup>\*\*</sup> Senior Mechanical Engineer, Triodyne Inc., Niles, IL.

Experts for the plaintiff driver took the position that the plaintiff's activities constituted a reasonably foreseeable use of the tautliner and that this use imposes a duty on the manufacturer of the tautliner to incorporate a proper ingress/egress system to the truck bed.

#### SAFETY PHILOSOPHY

Each technical work of humankind may be exposed to intended use, extended use, and misuse. In the special case of engineered products, their safety falls within the purview of the First Canon of Engineering Ethics, "Engineers shall hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public in the performance of their professional duties." (Ref. 1) Classically, "professional duties" includes only intended and extended uses, not misuses. Misuse is addressed in product liability doctrine. A manufacturer is required to design for reasonably foreseeable uses which include intended uses, extended uses, and misuses.

Foreseeable uses form a pattern; they are not random. The word reasonable may refer either to the magnitude of the pattern or to the propriety or appropriateness of the foreseeable use (Ref. 2). In the final analysis, the judgement of reasonableness rests with juries who weigh many factors including the nature of the danger.

The various manufacturers of tautliners have produced dozens of brochures and catalogs which clearly establish that only palletized loads are intended for this specialized truck. Consequently, the plaintiff's misuse is easy to demonstrate. Hundreds of photographs are available which depict the loading and unloading activities at many sites and for many industries. None show personnel on the tautliner bed and none illustrate anything other than palletized loads. This evidence is enough to establish that the plaintiff's activities are not foreseeable and are certainly not reasonably foreseeable.

Assume for the sake of argument that the plaintiff's misuse of the tautliner was reasonably foreseeable. The standard approach of the plaintiff's bar would be to embrace an alternate design (Ref. 3) which would incorporate an ingress/egress system to make jumping from the bed unlikely and unattractive. The standard response of the tautliner manufacturer would be to demonstrate that every proposed and existing ingress/egress system introduces new dangers and incompatibilities with the intended loading and unloading protocols. For example, all stair, ramp, and ladder systems that provide "three point contact" for stabilizing climbers, invade the space above the deck that is traversed by pallets and forks. The plaintiff's proposals would be criticized by invoking the Dangerous Safeguard Consensus (Ref. 4) which says in effect that "safeguarding one hazard should not create an additional hazard."

There is an unconventional defense that is also available to the tautliner manufacturer and this one is applicable even when a satisfactory ingress/egress system is obtainable. Here, one appeals to the Dependency Hypothesis (Ref. 5) that states, "Every safety system gives rise to a statistically significant pattern of user dependence." This implies that any ingress/egress device placed on the truck will *invite* a foreseeable number of people onto the deck. This will expose them to moving pallets and forks and their associated crushing and impact hazards. Further, decktop personnel may fall from and onto the truck platform through slip and trip mechanisms that are ungovernable. Once again, the Dangerous Safeguard Consensus has been violated. This defense posture raises the general question, *Is it proper to compromise the safety of an intended design in order to provide protection against reasonably foreseeable misuses?* 

#### **REFERENCES**

- American Society of Mechanical Engineers, ASME Code of Ethics for Engineers, June, 1998.
- Barnett, Ralph L., "Reasonably Foreseeable Uses," <u>Safety Engineering and Risk Analysis</u>, SERA Vol. 8, American Society of Mechanical Engineers International Mechanical Engineering Congress, New York, November, 1998.
- 3. American Law Institute, Restatement of the Law Third: Restatement of the Law, Torts-Products Liability, Washington, D.C., American Law Institute, May, 1997.
- Barnett Ralph L., and Schmid, Steven R., "Safeguard Evaluation Protocol A Decision Tree for Standardizing, Optimizing, Prohibiting, Ignoring, Enhancing or Characterizing Safeguards." <u>Triodyne Safety Bulletin</u>, Vol. 1, No. 1, May, 1995.
- Barnett, R.L., G.D. Litwin, and P. Barroso, Jr., "The Dependency Hypothesis," <u>American Society of Agricultural Engineers</u>, Paper # 85-1624, December, 1985.

### SAFETY BULLETIN

January 2002 - Volume 10, No. 1

Editor: Paula L. Barnett
Illustrated and Produced by

Triodyne Graphic Communications Group

Copyright © 2002 Triodyne Inc. All Rights Reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced by any process without written permission of Triodyne, Inc., 5950 West Touhy Avenue, Niles, IL 60714-4610 (847) 677-4730. Direct all inquiries to: *Library Services*.