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# 300 INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of the Committee on Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) (hereinafter referred to as the “Committee”) for the 98th Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM). The report is based on the Interim Report offered in the NCWM Publication 16, “Committee Reports,” testimony at public hearings, comments received from the regional weights and measures associations and other parties, the NCWM 2013 Online Position Forum, the addendum sheets issued at the Annual Meeting, and actions taken by the membership at the voting session of the Annual Meeting.

Table A identifies the agenda and appendix items. The agenda items are identified in the report by Reference Key Number, Item Title, and Page Number. The item numbers are those assigned in the Interim Meeting agenda. Voting items are indicated with a “**V**,” or if the item was part of the Voting Consent calendar by the suffix “**VC**” after the item number. Items marked with an “**I**” after the Reference Key Numbers are Information items. Items marked with a “**D**” after the Key Numbers are Developing items. The Developing designation indicates that an item, while it has merit, may not be adequately developed for action at the national level. Items marked “**W**” have been withdrawn from consideration. Items marked with a “**W**” will generally be referred to the regional weights and measures associations because they either need additional development, analysis, and input or did not have sufficient Committee support to bring them before the NCWM. Table B identifies the acronyms for organizations and technical terms used throughout the report, and Table C provides a summary of the results of the voting on the Committee’s items and the report in its entirety.

This report contains recommendations to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 44, 2013 Edition, “Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices.” Suggested revisions are shown in **bold face print** by **~~striking out~~** information to be deleted and **underlining** information to be added. New items proposed for the handbook are designated as such by **underscored bold face print**, and nonretroactive items are indicated in *italics*.

**Note:** The policy of NIST is to use metric units of measurement in all of its publications; however, recommendations received by the NCWM technical committees have been printed in this publication as submitted. Therefore, the report may contain references to inch-pound units.
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| Report on its Entirety | **Voice Vote** | | | | | Adopted |

|  |
| --- |
| Details of All Items *(In order by Reference Key)* |

# 320 SCALES

320-1 VC S.6.4. Railway Track Scales and Appendix D – Definitions

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

Systems Associates, Inc., (2012)

Purpose:

Align NIST Handbook 44 with the most recent version of the AAR Scale Handbook.

Item Under Consideration:

1. Amend NIST Scales Code paragraph S.6.4. Railway Track Scales. as follows:

**S.6.4. Railway Track Scales.** – A railway track scale shall be marked with the maximum capacity of each section of the load-receiving element of the scale. Such marking shall be accurately and conspicuously presented on, or adjacent to, the identification or nomenclature plate that is attached to the indicating element of the scale. ***~~The nominal capacity of a scale with more than two sections shall not exceed twice its rated section capacity. The nominal capacity of a two section scale shall not exceed its rated section capacity.\*~~*** **The nominal capacity marking shall satisfy the following:**

1. **For scales manufactured from January 1, 2002, through December 31, 2013:**
2. **The nominal capacity of a scale with more than two sections shall not exceed twice its rated section capacity.**
3. **The nominal capacity of a two section scale shall not exceed its rated section capacity.**
4. **For scales manufactured on or after January 1, 2014**, t**he nominal scale capacity shall not exceed the lesser of:**
5. **The sum of the Weigh Module Capacities as shown in Table S.6.4.M. or Table S.6.4, or;**
6. **Rated Sectional Capacity (RSC) multiplied by the Number of Sections (Ns) minus the Number of Dead Spaces (Nd) minus 0.5. As a formula this is stated as RSC × (Ns - Nd - 0.5); or**
7. **290 300 kg (640 000 lb).**

***~~[\*Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2002]~~***

(Amended 1988, 2001, **~~and~~** 2002**, and 2013**)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table S.6.4.M.  Railway Track Scale – Weigh Module Capacity | |
| Weigh Module Length (m) | Weigh Module Capacity (kg) |
| **< 1.5** | **36 300** |
| **1.5 to < 3.0** | **72 600** |
| **3.0 to < 4.5** | **108 900** |
| **4.5 to < 7.0** | **145 100** |
| **7.0 to < 9.0** | **168 700** |
| **9.0 to < 10.5** | **192 300** |
| **10.5 to < 12.0** | **234 100** |
| **12.0 to < 17.0** | **257 600** |
| **Note: The capacity of a particular module is based on its length and determined from corresponding capacity values specified in Table S.6.4.M.** | |
| **(Table Added 2013)** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table S.6.4.  Railway Track Scale – Weigh Module Capacity | |
| Weigh Module Length (ft) | Weigh Module Capacity (lb) |
| **< 5** | **80 000** |
| **5 to < 10** | **160 000** |
| **10 to < 15** | **240 000** |
| **15 to < 23** | **320 000** |
| **23 to < 29** | **372 000** |
| **29 to < 35** | **424 000** |
| **35 to < 40** | **516 000** |
| **40 to < 56** | **568 000** |
| **Note: The capacity of a particular module is based on its length and determined from corresponding capacity values specified in Table S.6.4.** | |
| **(Table Added 2013)** | |

1. Add the following definition for the term “weigh module” to NIST Handbook 44, Appendix D:

**weigh module – The portion of a load-receiving element supported by two sections. The length of a module is the distance to which load can be applied. [2.20]**

Background/Discussion:

The nominal capacity of a railway track scale has historically been based on the capacity of the pivots or load cells supporting the various sections of the scale. Since pivots were generally the weakest element, this was logical. With the introduction of load cell technology, the capacity of a section could far outreach the capacity of the weighbridge. Weighbridge design, based on the requirements in the *AAR Scale Handbook*, must be capable of supporting 80 000 lb axles on five foot centers. With the introduction of combined short span weigh modules over multiple sections, the use of the section capacity to determine scale capacity provides both the opportunity for overloaded structures and/or the requirement to overdesign the section. Basing nominal scale capacity on both the section capacity and the structural capacity is the best solution. Additionally, a 640 000 lb limit assures these scales can be calibrated with 12.5 % of capacity using the conventional 80 000 lb test weight equipment.

The changes to the nominal capacity specification were developed by Committee 34 - Scales, of the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) and approved, by unanimous vote, for inclusion in the *AAR Scale Handbook*.

The original proposal to amend paragraph S.6.4. Railway Track Scales recommended: 1) striking out the two nonretroactive sentences in the paragraph, which linked nominal capacity to the number of sections of a railway track scale, and 2) adding new criteria for establishing a scale’s nominal capacity based on the lessor of three considerations as follows:

1. the sum of the weigh module capacities;
2. a scale’s rated sectional capacity multiplied by the number of sections of the scale minus the number of dead spaces minus 0.5; or
3. 640 000 lb.

The original proposal also recommended adding a new definition for “weigh module” and a new Table S.6.4. to NIST Handbook 44. The new table provided various capacity ratings of weigh modules based on weigh module length for use in determining the value of the first of the three considerations shown above.

Eliminating the two nonretroactive sentences in the paragraph as proposed would have had the effect of making the entire paragraph retroactive.

A number of significant changes to the original proposal were agreed to by the Committee relative to this item during the 2012 NCWM Interim and Annual Meetings as follows:

* During the Interim Meeting, the Committee agreed to add “the nominal capacity listed on the CC” to the list of proposed nominal capacity considerations to address concerns about the potential impact the proposal might have on existing equipment, especially equipment manufactured between the dates January 1, 2002, the effective date of enforcement of the nonretroactive portion of the current paragraph proposed for deletion, and the date the proposed changes to the paragraph would take effect. The Committee later agreed, during the Annual Meeting, to reverse that decision based on a concern expressed by OWM that if an NTEP CC corresponding to existing equipment were changed, that equipment may not be able to comply with proposed option of “the nominal capacity listed on the CC.” As an alternative, the Committee agreed to divide the proposal into two parts assigning each part a different enforcement date.
* The Committee agreed, during the Interim Meeting, to amend the definition of “weigh module” originally proposed by deleting the words “single or articulated” as a descriptor in the definition. The Committee later agreed at the Annual Meeting to further modify the proposed definition by deleting the words “of the weighing element” from the proposed definition.
* The Committee also agreed to add a note beneath Table S.6.4. Railway Track Scale – Weigh Module Capacity to make clear that the module capacities are to be based on the length of the module and corresponding capacities specified in the proposed table.

Additionally, OWM commented during the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting that they would likely include equivalent SI values in NIST Handbook 44, if the item were adopted.

In consideration of the number of changes made to the item over the course of the two meetings, the Committee agreed to delete the proposal under Item Under Consideration in 2012 NCWM Publication 16 and replace it with the following:

1. Amend NIST Handbook 44, Scales Code paragraph S.6.4. Railway Track Scales as follows:

**S.6.4. Railway Track Scales.** – A railway track scale shall be marked with the maximum capacity of each section of the load-receiving element of the scale. Such marking shall be accurately and conspicuously presented on, or adjacent to, the identification or nomenclature plate that is attached to the indicating element of the scale. ***~~The nominal capacity of a scale with more than two sections shall not exceed twice its rated section capacity. The nominal capacity of a two section scale shall not exceed its rated section capacity.\*~~***

**The nominal capacity marking shall satisfy the following.**

1. **For scales manufactured from January 1, 2002, through December 31, 20XX:**
2. **The nominal capacity of a scale with more than two sections shall not exceed twice its rated section capacity.**
3. **The nominal capacity of a two section scale shall not exceed its rated section capacity.**
4. **For scales manufactured on or after January 1, 20XX**, t**he nominal scale capacity shall not exceed the lesser of:**
5. **The sum of the Weigh Module Capacities as shown in Table S.6.4, or;**
6. **Rated Sectional Capacity (RSC) multiplied by the quantity of the Number of Sections (Ns) minus the Number of Dead Spaces (Nd) minus 0.5. As a formula this is stated as RSC × (Ns - Nd - 0.5); or**
7. **640 000 lb.**

***~~[\*Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2002]~~***

(Amended 1988, 2001, **~~and~~** 2002**, and 20XX**)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table S.6.4.M.**  **Railway Track Scale – Weigh Module Capacity** | |
| **Weigh Module Length (m)** | **Weigh Module Capacity (kg)** |
| **< 1.5** | **36 300** |
| **1.5 to < 3.0** | **72 600** |
| **3.0 to < 4.5** | **108 900** |
| **4.5 to < 7.0** | **145 100** |
| **7.0 to < 9.0** | **168 700** |
| **9.0 to < 10.5** | **192 300** |
| **10.5 to < 12.0** | **234 100** |
| **12.0 to < 17.0** | **257 600** |
| **Note: The capacity of a particular module is based on its length and determined from corresponding capacity values specified in Table S.6.4.M.** | |
| **(Table Added 20XX)** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table S.6.4.**  **Railway Track Scale – Weigh Module Capacity** | |
| **Weigh Module Length (ft)** | **Weigh Module Capacity (lb)** |
| **< 5** | **80 000** |
| **5 to < 10** | **160 000** |
| **10 to < 15** | **240 000** |
| **15 to < 23** | **320 000** |
| **23 to < 29** | **372 000** |
| **29 to < 35** | **424 000** |
| **35 to < 40** | **516 000** |
| **40 to < 56** | **568 000** |
| **Note: The capacity of a particular module is based on its length and determined from corresponding capacity values specified in Table S.6.4.** | |
| **(Table Added 20XX)** | |

1. Add the following definition for the term “weigh module” to NIST Handbook 44, Appendix D:

**weigh module – The portion of a load-receiving element supported by two sections. The length of a module is the distance to which load can be applied. [2.20]**

During the fall 2012 Regional Association Meetings, the CWMA and SWMA supported the item and recommended it be designated a Voting Item. The WWMA and NEWMA recommended it be an Information Item. Mr.  Darrell Flocken (Mettler-Toledo, LLC), speaking on behalf of the SMA at both the WWMA and SWMA fall 2012 Regional Association Meetings, stated that the SMA supported the concept of the more recent changes that took place during the course of the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting and would review the item at its November 2012 meeting.

See the 2012 Annual Report to review previous language and positions to amend NIST Handbook 44 Scales Code paragraph S.6.4.

During the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings, Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, supported the item.

NIST OWM recommended three additional changes to the proposal as follows:

1. Add a reference to Table S.6.4.M. in proposed new subparagraph S.6.4.(b)(1);
2. Delete the words “the quantity of” from proposed new subparagraph S.6.4.(b)(2) so that it reads as follows:

Rated Sectional Capacity (RSC) multiplied by **~~the quantity of~~** the Number of Sections (Ns) minus the Number of Dead Spaces (Nd) minus 0.5. As a formula this is stated as RSC × (Ns - Nd - 0.5); and

1. Add the metric equivalent of 640 000 lb to proposed new subparagraph S.6.4.(b)(3).

Mr. Rafael Jimenez (Association of American Railroad Transportation Technology Center), speaking on behalf of the AAR, and Mr. Steve Beitzel (Systems Associates, Inc.), supported the item with the changes suggested by OWM.

Based on the comments received during the Open Hearings, the Committee agreed to amend the proposal to include OWM’s three suggested changes to read as shown in the Item Under Consideration and designated the item as a Voting Item.

During the 2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, the Committee received comments from Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, and Mr. Jimenez, speaking on behalf of the AAR, both in support of the item.

There were four positions posted on the NCWM 2013 Online Position Forum; three supported the proposal and the other was neutral to the proposal.

The Committee recommended the item be presented for a vote as shown in the Item Under Consideration.

320-2 W Table 4 – Minimum Test Weights and Test Loads

(This item was withdrawn.)

Source:

Fairbanks Scales, Inc. (2013)

Purpose:

Provide clarification regarding the minimum amount of test weights and test loads required for official tests of floor scales having nominal capacities of 3001 lb and greater.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend Scales Code Table 4. Minimum Test Weights and Test Loads as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4.  Minimum Test Weights and Test Loads1 | | | | | | |
| Devices in Metric Units | | |  | Devices in U.S. Customary Units | | |
| **Device Capacity**  **(kg)** | **Minimums**  **(in terms of device capacity)** | | **Device Capacity**  **(lb)** | **Minimums**  **(in terms of device capacity)** | |
| **Test Weights (greater of)** | **Test Loads2** | **Test Weights**  **(greater of)** | **Test**  **Loads2** |
| 0 to 150 kg | 100 % |  |  | 0 to 300 lb | 100 % |  |
| 151 to 1 500 kg | 25 % or 150 kg | 75 % |  | 301 to 3 000 lb | 25 % or 300 lb | 75 % |
| 1 501 to 20 000 kg | **~~12.5 % or 500 kg~~**  **25 % or 1 250 kg** | 50 % |  | 3001 to 40 000 lb | **~~12.5 % or 1 000 lb~~**  **25 % or 2 500 lb** | 50 % |
| 20 001 kg+ | 12.5 % or 5 000 kg | 25 %3 |  | 40 001 lb+ | 12.5 % or 10 000 lb | 25 %3 |

**Background Discussion:**

Table 4. Minimum Test Weights and Test Loads specifies that the greater of 25 % of device capacity or 300 lb, as the minimum amount of test weight required for testing scales ranging in capacity from 301 to 3000 lb. The 25 % specified in Table 4 corresponds with the amount required by the shift test procedures described in subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b), which allows, as an option, the shift test to be performed using a one‑quarter nominal capacity test load centered as nearly as possible, successively, over each corner of the load‑receiving element.

There is inconsistency in minimum test weight requirements between Table 4 and paragraph N.1.3.7. for scales of other capacities. Consider a 10 000 lb capacity floor scale as an example. Table 4 requires a minimum of only 12.5 % of scale capacity in test weights, which equates to 1250 lb. Subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b) requires 25 % of nominal capacity in test load, or in this example 2500 lb, to perform the shift test. The differences in these two requirements could become an issue in states that enforce NIST Handbook 44. There should be consistency in the minimum test weights required and the weights required in performing a shift test.

One could argue that the shift test can be performed using substitutions along with test weights. However, N.1.3.7.(b) can be interpreted as specifically defining “test loads” as “test weights” for the purpose of that paragraph.

At the fall 2012 NEWMA Meeting, it was reported that some believe this item would be a safety concern (because of the increased amount of test weight that would be needed to test such scales if this proposal were accepted). NEWMA suggested retaining the 12.5 % currently specified in Table 4 and stated that more information would be needed to support the item. NEWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Developing Item.

During the 2013 Interim Meeting Open Hearings, the S&T Committee heard comments from Mr. Lou Straub (Fairbanks Scales) recommending that the item be withdrawn because the changes proposed to Table 4 shown in Item Under Consideration, if accepted, would not solve the problem identified by the submitter as reported on NCWM Form 15. Using a 10 000 lb capacity floor scale as an example to illustrate his point, Mr. Straub explained that Table 4 requires a minimum of 1250 lb in test weight and that subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b) specifies that either a one-third or one-quarter nominal capacity test load be used to conduct the shift test, depending upon the position of the test load on the platform. One-quarter nominal capacity, the lesser of the two fractions specified in subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b) equates to 2500 lb on a 10 000 lb capacity. Thus, it appeared to the Fairbanks technician, who submitted this proposal, that there was a conflict in the amount of test weight required by Table 4 and subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b), to perform an official test.

Mr. Straub further explained to the Committee that, whereas a one-third nominal capacity test load is explicitly defined as “test weight” in subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b), a one‑quarter nominal capacity test load, which is also referenced in the same subparagraph is not. In reviewing past NCWM Conference Reports relating to paragraph N.1.3.7., he concluded that the one-quarter nominal capacity test load referenced in subparagraph (b) was purposely not defined because it was intended for that test load to be comprised of either all test weight or a combination of test weight and substituted material. By not defining the one-quarter nominal capacity shift test load as test weight, one could conduct a shift test on a 10 000 lb capacity scale using a combination of 1250 lb of test weight (i.e., the minimum amount of test weight specified in Table 4 for a 10 000 capacity scale) and a single substitution test load. That is, a substitution test load used in combination with the test weight could create a shift test load equal to 2500 lb (one-quarter nominal capacity). This being the case, there is no conflict concerning the amount of test weight required by the two NIST Handbook 44 requirements.

Mr. Straub also indicated that another factor contributing to his recommendation to withdraw this item is the fact that paragraph N.1.3.7. does not, in any way, preclude someone from conducting the shift test using a one-quarter nominal capacity test load comprised entirely of test weight. In conclusion, he suggested that the Committee may want to consider adding a footnote to subparagraph N.1.3.7.(b) to make clear that the one-quarter nominal capacity test load can be comprised of either test weight entirely or a combination of test weight and substitution test loads.

The Committee also heard comments from Mr. Darrell Flocken (Mettler-Toledo, Inc.), speaking on behalf of the SMA. Mr. Flocken indicated that the SMA was opposed to the item as written because they do not believe the agenda item aligns with the recommendation as written in the original NCWM Form 15.

NIST OWM noted that it is only reasonable to expect that the amount of test weight specified in NIST Handbook 44 for a shift test be not greater than the minimum amount of test weight required to certify a scale. Rather than proposing to increase the amount of test weight required to perform an official test on all scales having capacities between 3001 lb and 40 000 lb, OWM suggested that the submitter might consider amending the Item Under Consideration so that its impact would be limited to only those scales having been identified in the proposal as being of concern, that is, those having capacities between 3001 lb and 10 000 lb. Jurisdictions might also find this to be a more reasonable approach. With regard to the possibility that paragraph N.1.3.7. might be misinterpreted, OWM noted that the paragraph is very clear in defining one-third nominal capacity test load as “test weight.”

In consideration of Fairbanks Scales’ recommendation to withdraw the item and SMA’s opposition to the item, the Committee agreed to withdraw it. The Committee also agreed that it was not necessary to add a footnote to paragraph N.1.3.7.(b) to clarify that a one-quarter capacity test load could be comprised of either test weight entirely or a combination of test weight and substitution test loads because there is already a footnote in Table 4 defining the term “test load.”

During the 2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, and Mr. Straub (Fairbanks Scales) supported withdrawing the item. OWM reiterated the comments it provided during the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting.

No further action was taken by the Committee at the 2013 NCWM Annual Meeting since the Committee had previously agreed to Withdraw the item.

320-3 W T.N.3., Table 6. Maintenance Tolerances

(This item was withdrawn.)

**Source:**

Michigan Department of Agriculture (2013)

**Purpose:**

Provide additional guidance concerning the proper application of NIST Handbook 44, Scales Code, Table 6. Maintenance Tolerances.

**Item Under Consideration:**

Amend Scales Code Table 6. Maintenance Tolerances as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6.**  **Maintenance Tolerances**  **(All values in this table are in scale divisions)** | | | | | | |
| **Tolerance in Scale Divisions** | | | | | | |
|  | **1d** | **2d** | | **3d** | | **5d** |
| **Class** | **Test Load in Divisions** | | | | | |
| I | 0 ‑ 50 000 | 50 001 - | 200 000 | 200 001 + |  |  |
| II | 0 ‑   5 000 | 5 001 - | 20 000 | 20 001 + |  |  |
| III | 0 -    500 | 501 - | 2 000 | 2 001 - | 4 000 | 4 001 + |
| IIII | 0 -      50 | 51 - | 200 | 201 - | 400 | 401 + |
| III L | 0 ‑      500 | 501 - | 1 000 | (Add 1 d for each additional 500 d or fraction thereof) | | |

**Note:**

**In order to determine the number of divisions for any test load; divide the value of the mass standard being applied by the minimum division indicated by the scale.**

**Example: If the scale has a minimum division of 0.1 g and a 1500 g mass standard is applied, the test load is equal to 15 000 divisions.**

**Result: On a Class II scale with a test load between 5001 and 20 000 divisions indicates the tolerance is ± 2 divisions or ± 0.2 g.**

**Background/Discussion:**

2012 CWMA Interim Meeting: Table 6 is located in NIST Handbook 44; however, the instructions for use are located in NIST Handbook 133. This amendment would aid service companies who may be unaware of NIST Handbook 133, or those technicians who may have been told what the tolerances are but not trained on how to determine those numbers. Based on suggestions from regulatory officials, the submitter’s original proposal was modified to add “d” to the column headings and to rewrite the new guidance as a note and include an example. CWMA supported the item as amended and forwarded it to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item.

At the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting, Mr. Darrell Flocken (Mettler-Toledo, Inc.), speaking on behalf of the SMA supported the item, but recommended:

* + - 1. That the term “mass standard” be changed to “test weight(s)” in both the “Note” and the “Example” sentences.
      2. That the two sentences, the first of which follows the word “Example” and the second of which follows the word “Result” in the Item Under Consideration be combined as an example to read:

**Example: ~~If the scale has~~ A Class II scale with a minimum division of 0.1 g and a 1500 g ~~mass standard~~ test weight(s) ~~is~~ applied, the test load is equal to 15 000 divisions, resulting in a tolerance ~~is~~ of ± 0.2 g.**

**~~Result: On a Class II scale with a test load between 5001 and 20 000 divisions indicates the tolerance is ± 2 divisions or ±- 0.2 g.~~**

NIST OWM commented that it would be inappropriate to include the letter “d” after each tolerance multiple as shown in Table 6 of the Item Under Consideration because in cases where the value of d ≠ e (such as on some Class I and II scales, dynamic monorails, etc.) a factor of the value of “e,” rather than “d,” is used to determine the applicable tolerances. Likewise, in the proposed note and associated example, it would be technically incorrect, in some cases, to refer to the division as “minimum” because the minimum division indicated by the scale would be the value of “d” and “d” would not necessarily be used to determine the number of divisions for any test load. In cases where the value of d ≠ e, the number of divisions for any test load would be determined by dividing the test load value by the verification division (e). For these reasons, it is OWM’s opinion that the proposed changes would tend to confuse rather than aid those not very familiar with how the values in Table 6 are to be applied.

Ms. Kristen Macy (California) commented that she agreed with OWM’s comments and that the changes proposed in the Item Under Consideration would only apply in cases where the value of “d” and “e” are equal.

NIST OWM developed the following alternative changes to Table 6 and provided them to the Committee for consideration should the Committee decide that additional clarification of the values in Table 6 were needed:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6.**  **Maintenance Tolerances**  **(All values in this table are in scale divisions)** | | | | | | |
|  | **Tolerance in Scale Divisions (d or e)\*** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | | **5** |
| **Class** | **Test Load in Scale Divisions (d or e)\*** | | | | | |
| I | 0 ‑ 50 000 | 50 001 ‑ | 200 000 | 200 001 + |  |  |
| II | 0 ‑   5 000 | 5 001 ‑ | 20 000 | 20 001 + |  |  |
| III | 0 -    500 | 501 ‑ | 2 000 | 2 001 ‑ | 4 000 | 4 001 + |
| IIII | 0 -      50 | 51 ‑ | 200 | 201 ‑ | 400 | 401 + |
| III L | 0 ‑      500 | 501 ‑ | 1 000 | (Add 1 d for each additional 500 d or fraction thereof) | | |
| **\*In cases where d ≠ e, for example, some Class I and II scales, dynamic monorail scales, etc., the value of “e” is used to determine tolerance and test load. In all other cases the value of “d” is to be used.** | | | | | | |

OWM noted that a somewhat different approach to amending Table 6 in an effort to improve understanding would be to develop and present a separate table in NIST Handbook 44 for each scale accuracy class. An example draft table for Class I scales was developed by OWM and also provided to the Committee to show how these could be used as an alternative to amending Table 6.

The following additional comments and recommendations relating to the Item Under Consideration were also provided by OWM:

* If a note is needed to explain how to calculate the number of scale divisions in the test load, OWM suggests expressing the example as a formula and offers the following for consideration:

*Test Load in Scale Divisions* **=** ****

* With regard to the proposed example, the Committee might wish to consider suggesting that the example be included in a field manual, EPO, or other guidance document, rather than in NIST Handbook 44.
* Should the Committee decide to modify Table 6 by adding additional clarifications concerning which value (“d” or “e”) applies, it might also consider amending various other paragraphs in NIST Handbook 44 where both (d) or (e) could apply, yet, neither is specified, or only one of the two is specified within the paragraph (e.g., paragraphs S.2.1.3.1, S.2.1.3.2., N.1.2.1., T.N.1.2., T.N.7.2., etc.).

In considering this item, the Committee agreed with the comments received from NIST OWM and the State of California that it would be inappropriate to include the letter “d” after each tolerance multiple without also including some explanation of how the values in the table would apply in cases where the value of “d” and “e” are different on a scale. The NIST Technical Advisor pointed out to the Committee that in the United States, the term “scale division” is often used interchangeably to reference both scale division (d) and verification scale division (e) and that, unless the term is further defined, it is unknown which value is being referenced. Adding the letter “d” after each tolerance multiple as proposed in the Item Under Consideration would provide additional clarification by defining the tolerance values as scale division (d) opposed to verification scale division (e). Such clarification would be inappropriate because the tolerances in Table 6 must also be applied to scales having a value of “d” that is different than “e” and in such cases, tolerances must be determined in values of “e.”

The Committee considered how the table might be amended or the information in the table presented to provide a better understanding of how tolerances are to be determined given that the table applies to not only scales where the value of “d” and “e” are the same, but also to scales where the values are different. The Committee considered OWM’s alternative changes to the table and whether or not a separate table in NIST Handbook 44 for each scale accuracy class would make it any easier for those less experienced to understand how to determine and apply tolerances. The Committee concluded that there is no simple means of making the information in the table easier to understand or presenting it in a way that would improve understanding for inexperienced inspectors or service personnel who have not received training. The Committee agreed that regardless of how the table was changed or the information in the table presented, training would still be needed to teach how the values in the table are to be applied. With training comes the understanding that “d” and “e” are not always equal for all classes of scales and how to use those values to determine the tolerance and test loads specified in Table 6. Additionally, the definition in Appendix D for “verification scale division” and paragraph S.1.2.2. Verification Scale Interval clarifies how “d” and “e” are to be applied. In considering OWM’s alternative approach of developing and presenting a table for each scale accuracy class, the Committee preferred that scale tolerances for all scale accuracy classes remain in a single condensed table. The Committee also agreed that examples to make clear how tolerances are to be applied are better included in training material rather than NIST Handbook 44. The Committee indicated that it understood and appreciated the concerns raised by the submitter of this item, but didn’t believe the changes proposed to NIST Handbook 44 would be beneficial, and, therefore, agreed to Withdraw this item.

During the 2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, commented that the SMA opposes the withdrawal of this item and recommends the item be returned to an “Information” status because the SMA believes this item has value in clarifying the use of the information in the table. Once the item becomes “Informational,” the following changes should be considered:

1. Change the term “mass standard” to “test weight(s)” in both the “Note” and the “Example” sentences.
2. Combine the “Example” and “Result” sentences to read:

**Example: ~~If the scale has~~ A Class II scale with a minimum division of 0.1 g and a 1500 g ~~mass standard~~ test weight(s) ~~is~~ applied, the test load is equal to 15 000 divisions, resulting in a tolerance ~~is~~ of ± 2 divisions or ± 0.2 g.**

**~~Result: On a Class II scale with a test load between 5001 and 20 000 divisions indicates the tolerance is ±- 2 divisions or ± 0.2 g.~~**

1. The actual tolerance value in Table 6 should not be identified as “d” because the verification scale interval for a Class I and II instrument is “e”.
2. Add the phrase “(as required by the Instruments Class designation)” after the words “Tolerance in Scale Divisions.”

Ms. Julie Quinn (Minnesota) supported returning the item to “Informational” status commenting that Table 6 is very confusing and that service technicians, especially, have difficulty understanding the table.

OWM reiterated the comments it provided during the 2013 Interim Meeting.

In discussing this item during its work session, the Committee once again concluded, as it had at the 2013 Interim Meeting, that regardless of how the table was changed or the information in the table presented, training would still be needed to teach how the values in the table are to be applied. The Committee agreed that the best approach to resolving confusion over the application of the table is through training and examples provided in the NIST EPOs. The Committee decided to withdraw the item noting that its decision to do so would not preclude someone or group from proposing a new item to better clarify how the values in Table 6 are to be applied.

320-4 VC Appendix C – Units of Mass (ton)

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

Rice Lake Weighing Systems, Inc. (2012)

Purpose:

Establish uniform abbreviations for “short ton.”

Item Under Consideration:

* + - 1. Amend the Units of Mass Table that appears on pages C-19 and C-20 of NIST Handbook 44 Appendix C to recognize “tn” as an acceptable abbreviation for “net” or “short” ton, and add a footnote to make clear that abbreviations for “net” or “short” ton other than “tn” are considered appropriate for use with older equipment. The following changes are proposed:

| Units of Mass | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 assay ton17 (AT) | 29.167 grams |
| 1 carat (c) | 200 milligrams (exactly)  3.086 grains |
| 1 dram apothecaries (dr ap or 3) | 60 grains (exactly)  3.888 grams |
| 1 dram avoirdupois (dr avdp) | 2711/32 (= 27.344) grains  1.772 grams |
| 1 gamma (γ) | 1 microgram (exactly) |
| 1 grain | 64.798 91 milligrams (exactly) |
| 1 gram (g) | 15.432 grains  0.035 ounce, avoirdupois |
| 1 hundredweight, gross or long18  (gross cwt) | 112 pounds (exactly)  50.802 kilograms |
| 1 hundredweight, gross or short  (cwt or net cwt) | 100 pounds (exactly)  45.359 kilograms |
| 1 kilogram (kg) | 2.205 pounds |
| 1 milligram (mg) | 0.015 grain |
| 1 ounce, avoirdupois (oz avdp) | 437.5 grains (exactly)  0.911 troy or apothecaries ounce  28.350 grams |
| 1 ounce, troy or apothecaries  (oz t or oz ap or ℥) | 480 grains (exactly)  1.097 avoirdupois ounces  31.103 grams |
| 1 pennyweight (dwt) | 1.555 grams |
| 1 point | 0.01 carat  2 milligrams |
| 1 pound, avoirdupois (lb avdp) | 7000 grains (exactly)  1.215 troy or apothecaries pounds  453.592 37 grams (exactly) |
| 1 micropound (µlb) [the Greek letter mu  in combination with the letters lb] | 0.000 001 pound (exactly) |
| 1 pound, troy or apothecaries  (lb t or lb ap) | 5760 grains (exactly)  0.823 avoirdupois pound  373.242 grams |
| 1 scruple (s ap or ℈) | 20 grains (exactly)  1.296 grams |
| 1 ton, gross or long19 | 2240 pounds (exactly)  1.12 net tons (exactly)  1.016 metric tons |
| 1 ton, metric (t) | 2204.623 pounds  0.984 gross ton  1.102 net tons |
| 1 ton, net or short **(tn)x** | 2000 pounds (exactly)  0.893 gross ton  0.907 metric ton |

17 Used in assaying. The assay ton…18 The gross or long ton and hundredweight are used commercially in the United States to only a very limited extent, usually in restricted industrial fields. The units are the same as the British “ton” and “hundredweight.”

19 The gross or long ton…

**xAs of January 1, 2014, “tn” is the required abbreviation for “short ton.” Devices manufactured between January 1, 2008, and December 31, 2013, may use an abbreviation other than “tn” to specify “short ton.”**

*Assign the appropriate footnote sequence number to “x” in the table and footnote shown above and renumber subsequent footnotes in Appendix C.*

1. Amend the abbreviation “t” for 1 ton (20 hundredweights) beneath the Avoirdupois Units of Mass heading on page C-6 of NIST Handbook 44 Appendix C to “tn” and add the same footnote as is proposed for addition in Item Under Consideration 1. above to again make clear that abbreviations for “net” or “short” ton other than “tn” are considered appropriate for use with older equipment. The following changes are proposed:

**Avoirdupois Units of Mass6**

[The “grain” is the same in avoirdupois, troy, and apothecaries units of mass.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 µlb | = 0.000 001 pound (lb) |
| 2711/32 grains (gr) | = 1 dram (dr) |
| 16 drams | = 1 ounce (oz) |
|  | = 437½ grains |
| 16 ounces | = 1 pound (lb) |
|  | = 256 drams |
|  | = 7000 grains |
| 100 pounds | = 1 hundredweight (cwt)7 |
| 20 hundredweights | = 1 ton **~~(t)~~ (tn)x** |
|  | = 2000 pounds7 |

In “gross” or “long” measure, the following values are recognized:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 112 pounds (lb) | = 1 gross or long hundredweight (cwt)7 |
| 20 gross or long hundredweights | = 1 gross or long ton |
|  | = 2240 pounds7 |

6 When necessary to distinguish…

7 When the terms “hundredweight” and…

**xAs of January 1, 2014, “tn” is the required abbreviation for “short ton.” Devices manufactured between January 1, 2008, and December 31, 201,3 may use an abbreviation other than “tn” to specify “short ton.”**

*Assign the appropriate footnote sequence number to “x” in the table and footnote shown above and renumber subsequent footnotes in Appendix C.*

Background/Discussion:

The submitter of this item discovered a difference between United States and Canadian abbreviation requirements that may impact manufacturers that sell products in both countries and NTEP type evaluations under the United States/Canada mutual recognition program. Most units of mass have an abbreviation for SI and U.S. customary units (e.g., kg, lb, g, oz). However, the same abbreviation, the lower case “t,” is used to represent both the metric ton and the short ton (2000 lb). If an indicator is set up to display both SI and U.S. customary units, the operator or customer cannot know what units are being displayed if “t” is the only abbreviation that is acceptable for metric ton. Because of the limited space available on today’s indicators, the words “short ton” or “long ton” are not always an option.

In the Canadian Lab Manual, Part 2, Section Appendix-2A in the table for abbreviations and symbols accepted in Canada, metric ton is abbreviated by “t” and short ton is abbreviated by “tn.” In NCWM Publication14, Appendix C in a table titled “Acceptable Abbreviation/Symbols” there is an abbreviation of “TN” for short ton and “LT” for long ton. In keeping with the Canadian abbreviation, the Committee considered a request that NIST Handbook 44 be amended to use the lower case “tn” and “lt” as the abbreviations for short and long ton respectively.

During the 2012 NCWM Interim Meeting, the original submitter, Mr. Paul Lewis (Rice Lake Weighing Systems, Inc.) requested that the proposal in the Interim Agenda be modified to remove the reference to “long ton” and its associated proposed abbreviation “lt.” Mr. Lewis indicated that the intent of the proposal is to align United States and Canadian requirements and noted that the abbreviation “tn” is an acceptable Canadian abbreviation for “short ton.” The Committee agreed to remove the reference to “long ton” in the Units of Mass table on page C-19 of NIST Handbook 44, Appendix C as was requested by the submitter of the proposal.

See the 2012 Annual Report to review previous language and positions to recognize “tn” as an acceptable abbreviation for “net” or “short” ton in NIST Handbook 44.

Comments received during the Open Hearings of the fall 2012 Regional Weights and Measures Associations were predominantly in support of the item. At the fall 2012 CWMA Interim Meeting, industry requested that the Committee support a change to “short ton” to align with Measurement Canada. The WWMA acknowledged potential conflict with the abbreviation of “tn” for “net” or “short ton” in NCWM Publication 14 BCS-4, yet reported there was no opposition to the item and it appeared that concerns raised in the Background/Discussion had been resolved. Mr. Darrell Flocken (Mettler-Toledo, Inc.), speaking on behalf of the SMA during the WWMA and SWMA, indicated the SMA supported the item. Three of the regional weights and measures associations recommended the item be Voting and NEWMA recommended it remain Informational.

During the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings, NIST OWM commented that conflicts in the abbreviation for “short” or “net” ton in NIST Handbook 44 and NCWM Publication 14 are of continued concern and noted the following:

* NIST Handbook 44 (Appendix C) recognizes the lower case “t” as an acceptable abbreviation for both the U.S. short ton and the metric ton. NIST Handbook 44 does not recognize upper case “T” as an acceptable abbreviation for the U.S. short ton or metric ton, nor does it recognize upper case “LT” as an acceptable abbreviation for the U.S. long ton.
* A table included on page BCS-4 of the 2012 NCWM (NTEP) Publication 14, Belt Conveyor Scales (BCSs) Checklists and Test Procedures indicates the U.S. short ton may be identified as “ton” or upper case “T;” the metric ton as lower case “t;” and the U.S. long ton as upper case “LT.” The following abbreviations appear in the 2012 version of Pub 14 BCSs type evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Unit** | **Abbreviation** |
| pounds | lb or LB |
| U.S. short ton | ton or T |
| U.S. long ton | LT |
| Metric ton | t |
| kilograms | kg |

The word “ton” is not an abbreviation although it is included in the NCWM Publication 14 table as such.

* Because upper case “T” and upper case “LT” are recognized by NTEP as acceptable abbreviations for U.S. short ton and U.S. long ton, respectively, it can only be assumed that there are BCSs currently in commercial service that have been issued an NTEP CC that use these abbreviations.
* By virtue of the fact that paragraph G-S.5.6.1. specifies the locations of where appropriate abbreviations for equipment manufactured as of January 1, 2008, may be found; if a particular defining symbol observed during inspection is not included in those locations, it infers that that particular symbol is inappropriate, disallowed, and would necessitate official rejection. Thus, if an official were to observe the abbreviation “T” or “LT” during an inspection of a BCS that was manufactured as of January 1, 2008, regardless of which “ton” was intended to be identified, they should reject for failure to comply with the provisions of G‑S.5.6.1. even though an active CC may be linked to the device.
* If the proposed change is adopted and “tn” was to become an acceptable abbreviation for U.S. “short ton,” Publication 14 BCSs would be revised to reflect the change. How will officials apply the revised abbreviation to existing equipment that designate short tons using upper case “T” or other abbreviations? Wouldn’t accepting the additional abbreviation “tn” for the U.S. short ton only add to an already existing, and somewhat confusing problem?
* A more reasonable approach it would seem, is to first fix the current problem, perhaps by agreeing on one or maybe two, acceptable abbreviations for each type of ton and then specifying what those agreed upon abbreviations are in both NIST Handbook 44 and NCWM Publication 14. Additionally, it might be agreed that when the word ton is not abbreviated, it must be further qualified by a preface clarifying which ton is being referenced. As OWM has noted before, even if everyone were to agree on different acceptable abbreviations for the U.S. short or net ton, the U.S. long ton, and the metric ton, it would be unlikely that this would completely resolve all the confusion relating to the value of the ton in commercial transactions. The spelled-out version of the word “ton” is often used instead of its abbreviation to identify values displayed or recorded by a commercial device. Thus, unless the word “ton” is further qualified using an appropriate clarifying preface such as “metric,” “short,” “net,” or “long,” it’s unclear as to which ton is being referenced when the word “ton” by itself is used to identify the unit of measure.

As a final comment, OWM recommended that, should the Committee decide to move forward with the proposal, the Committee should consider changing the abbreviation “t” (which refers to 1 ton (short), beneath the heading “Avoirdupois Units of Mass” on page C-6 of the 2012 version of NIST Handbook 44) to “tn” to avoid conflict with the recommended proposal.

The submitter of the proposal, Mr. Lewis, commented that the intent of the proposal is to harmonize the abbreviation for “short ton” with Measurement Canada’s requirements.

Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, indicated that the SMA supported the item.

During its deliberations, the Committee considered how to address concerns regarding how officials are to treat equipment with an existing CC that uses an abbreviation for short ton that differs from the “tn” abbreviation proposed, should this item be adopted. Paragraph G-S.5.6.1. specifies the locations of where appropriate abbreviations for equipment manufactured as of January 1, 2008, may be found and NIST OWM commented during the Open Hearings that if a particular defining symbol observed during inspection is not included in those locations, it infers that particular symbol is inappropriate, disallowed, and would necessitate official rejection. If “tn” is made the acceptable abbreviation for “short ton” and is added to Appendix C of NIST Handbook 44 as proposed, how are officials to apply paragraph G-S.5.6.1. to existing equipment that uses an abbreviation other than “tn” that was manufactured on or after January 1, 2008 [i.e., the enforcement date of G-S.5.6.1.(a)]?

The Committee acknowledged that the change proposed, if adopted, would affect some existing equipment that use an abbreviation for short ton that might currently be considered acceptable, but with this change, would cause that abbreviation to be unacceptable. In consideration of this point, the Committee reported that they were interested in hearing input from those anticipating that this change would be detrimental to their equipment.

The Committee agreed to designate this as a Voting Item and, in an effort to address the concerns raised by OWM regarding the treatment of existing equipment, to add a new footnote to Appendix C in the Units of Mass Table immediately following the abbreviation “tn,” as shown in the Item Under Consideration.

The Committee also agreed with OWM’s suggestion to change the abbreviation “t,” which refers to “1 ton (short),” beneath the heading “Avoirdupois Units of Mass” on page C-6 of the 2013 version of NIST Handbook 44 to “tn” and add the same new footnote immediately following the amended abbreviation as shown in the Item Under Consideration.

During the 2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, the Committee heard comments in support of the item from Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, and Mr. Ripka (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

OWM acknowledged that the footnote added by the S&T Committee during the 2013 Interim Meeting addressed the concern it had previously raised regarding how these abbreviations will be applied to existing as well as newly installed equipment. However, as noted before, should the proposal be adopted it will conflict with existing references in Publication 14; DES Appendix C includes references to “T” and “LT” as acceptable abbreviations. Thus, OWM encouraged each sector to review Publication 14 for any references to abbreviations for consistency with the proposed changes to NIST Handbook 44. The NIST Technical Advisors to the WS and BCS plan to ask those sectors to review Publication 14 for consistency with the abbreviations proposed in the Item Under Consideration.

OWM also expressed continued concern about the use of qualifying terms associated with the word “ton.” The spelled-out version of the word “ton” is often used instead of one of its many abbreviations to identify values displayed or recorded by a commercial device. Unless the word “ton” is further qualified using an appropriate clarifying preface such as “metric,” “short,” “net,” or “long,” it is questionable as to which ton is being referenced when the word “ton” by itself is used to identify the unit of measure.

There were three positions posted on the NCWM 2013 Online Position Forum; one of which supported the proposal and the other two were neutral to the proposal.

The Committee recommended the item be presented for Vote as proposed.

320-5 I Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group

*Note: This item was originally numbered 360-4 in the Committee’s 2013 Interim Report. This item was moved to the 320 Scales Section and renumbered 320-5 during the Committee’s Open Hearings.*

Source:

NIST, OWM, Mr. Richard Harshman, on behalf of the U.S. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (2011)

Purpose:

To provide the U.S. Weights and Measures community (equipment manufacturers, weights and measures officials, truck weight enforcement officials, and other users) with legal metrology requirements to address Weigh-in-Motion (WIM) systems used for vehicle enforcement screening.

Item under Consideration:

Adopt the proposed Section 2.25. Weigh-In-Motion Systems Used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening Code shown in Appendix B as a tentative code in NIST Handbook 44, and adopt the proposed definitions of terms used in the tentative code (also included in Appendix B) into NIST Handbook 44 Appendix D - Definitions.

Background/Discussion:

The Nation’s highways, freight transportation system, and enforcement resources are being strained by the volume of freight being moved and the corresponding number of commercial vehicles operating on its roads. Traditional, static-based vehicle inspection activities simply cannot keep pace with anticipated truck volume increases. Current U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) forecasts project freight volumes to double by 2035 and commercial vehicles to travel an additional 100 billion miles per year by 2020. WIM technology has been targeted by FHWA and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration as a technology capable of supporting more effective and efficient truck weight enforcement programs.

Several DOT efforts are underway and planned for the future to maintain adequate levels of enforcement that ensure equity in the trucking industry market and protection of highway infrastructure. Judicial support for enforcement decisions to apply more intense enforcement actions on specific trucks depends on support from the U.S. legal metrology community. Standards are needed in NIST Handbook 44 to address the design, installation, accuracy, and use of WIM systems used in a screening/sorting application. The implementation of a uniform set of standards will greatly improve the overall efficiency of the Nation’s commercial vehicle enforcement process.

Once adopted by the truck weight enforcement community, these requirements will enhance the accuracy of the Nation’s WIM scale systems; serve as a sound basis for judicial support of next-generation truck weight enforcement programs; and result in fewer legally loaded vehicles being delayed at static weigh station locations, thus reducing traffic congestion and non-productive fuel consumption and improving the movement of freight on our nation’s roadways.

Purpose of the Project:

The FHWA’s Office of Freight Management and Operations recognized a need to encourage uniformity in the design, testing, installation, and performance of WIM technology and subsequently encourage acceptance by prosecution agencies (administrative or judicial) regarding the validity of WIM technology’s role in supporting commercial motor vehicle weight enforcement.

In response to this need and recognizing the value of having a standard included in NIST Handbook 44 because it lends integrity and is more recognizable in legal actions, the FHWA seeks to integrate WIM technology into the Handbook. The FHWA contracted the services of the Texas Transportation Institute—The Texas A&M University System and Battelle (a private company) to begin this process. Additionally, a small oversight Committee was formed by the FHWA, made up of three representatives from the FHWA, a NIST Technical Advisor, and a representative of a U.S. manufacturer of WIM equipment to validate that each contract deliverable is completed according to contract. NIST OWM agreed to provide a technical advisor to the associated work group tasked with development of the proposed code.

The intended application of the proposed new code is for screening purposes only (i.e., for screening/sorting commercial vehicles for possible violations of FHWA vehicle weight requirements).

The dates and descriptions below under the heading “Timeline of Completed Tasks Relating to the Project” are intended to provide an updated summary on the progress of the project since its inception.

**Timeline of Completed Tasks Relating to the Project:**

*December 2010:* A detailed project work plan, intended to guide activities and establish lines of communication from project inception to project completion, is developed. At about this same time, the NCWM and the S&T Committee are contacted and made aware of the project. Members of the NCWM S&T Committee are invited to participate on the USNWG charged with developing WIM standards that is about to be formed.

*April 2011:*  A USNWG is established from the WIM stakeholder community comprised of representatives from state departments of transportation, state law enforcement agencies, weights and measures officials, WIM technology manufacturers and vendors, academic researchers, and others.

*July 2011:* The USNWG holds its first face to face meeting. Mr. Darrell Flocken (Mettler-Toledo, Inc.) accepts the position of WIM USNWG chair, and encourages stakeholders to submit comments to the work group. During the meeting, Mr. Rick Harshman, (NIST OWM) Technical Advisor to the USNWG, presents an overview of the process to develop the technical content of a new WIM Code. He explains how NIST Handbook 44 is organized and how requirements developed by the USNWG will fit into the various sections of a new NIST Handbook 44 code. He also provided an overview of the standards development process and discusses the benefits of the USNWG using an example draft code, which he had already created to develop the new draft code. Mr. Steve Langford (Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Co.) gives a presentation on the NIST Handbook 44 amendment process, which detailed the various steps the USNWG will need to complete to add a new device code to NIST Handbook 44.

Several concerns/questions are raised by participants during the open discussion portion of the meeting. The following are some of the most important concerns/questions discussed:

* The application section of the code is critical. The types of WIM systems in which the code does and does not apply will significantly impact all other sections of the code.
* What tolerance should be specified in the draft code? An important related question is: What degree of accuracy will the judicial system (courts) accept as being sufficiently accurate enough to screen commercial vehicles for possible overweight violations? The degree of accuracy required will have a large impact on the kinds of systems that get included or excluded in the application section of the code.
* There needs to be a separation of requirements. That is, a separation of requirements that apply to virtual weigh stations and those that apply to WIM systems installed at weigh stations having a static scale.
* To adopt a draft code at the national level, two things must happen: 1) A legitimate test procedure is needed to enable states to test these systems; and 2) federal funding is needed to help cover the cost of testing.
* Will NCWM Publication 14type evaluation criteria be needed since these systems are not commercial and are unlike other devices typically covered by NIST Handbook 44?

The USNWG agreed to discuss these concerns/questions and any others brought to their attention during their next meeting.

*November 2011:*  The example draft code developed earlier by Mr. Harshman, along with a checklist developed by Mr. Flocken is distributed to members of the USNWG. Participants are asked to complete the checklist as they review the draft code, identifying sections within the draft code, which they believe need additional work.

*May 2012:*  The first working draft of a WIM Code is developed based on comments received from the draft code and checklist that had been previously distributed in November 2011. A separate draft document containing definitions of terms that may need to be added to Appendix D of NIST Handbook 44 is also developed.

*October 2012:* Following a delay due to funding issues within the FHWA, the first working draft code and draft definitions are distributed to members of the USNWG for discussion at the next face to face meeting, which is scheduled November 2012.

*November 2012:* The USNWG conducts their second face to face meeting. During the meeting, the first working draft WIM Code is reviewed, discussed, and revised. Members of the USNWG agree that the revised draft code and associated definitions should be submitted to the NCWM for review and comment. The revised draft and associated definition documents are forwarded to the Chairman of the 2013 S&T Committee and to the NCWM. NCWM agrees to post these documents onto its website and notifies members of their presence.

See the 2012 Annual Report (S&T Agenda Item 360-3) for additional background information and summary updates of the 2012 Regional Weights and Measures Association Meetings and 2012 NCWM Meetings relating to this item.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings:  Mr. Flocken recommended that the Committee consider moving this item forward as an Information item so that it might be provided a greater level of consideration by the weights and measures community. Mr. Flocken reported that a new Draft WIM Code had recently been developed by members of the USNWG, and, although not perfect, the consensus of the USNWG is that it is ready for an initial review. There are two parts to the draft code, one of which is the draft code itself and the other is a document containing definitions of terms used in the draft code. Both have been posted and are available for review from the NCWM website. The USNWG is requesting feedback from the weights and measures community on both parts of the draft.

Additional comments in support of the draft were heard during the Open Hearings from members of the FHWA’s Project Oversight Committee, the SMA, and a State of Florida DOT enforcement official. Based on the comments in support of this item, the Committee designates the item Informational.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: Mr. Flocken, Chairman of WIM WG, gave an update on the development of the WIM draft code and clarified that its scope is strictly for screening purposes.

OWM encourages further development of the draft code by the Weigh-In-Motion WG and offered the following feedback on the first draft:

1. To ensure that test procedures are applied uniformly, the WG may want to consider including in the draft code procedures for establishing the reference weights of axle loads, axle‑group loads, and gross vehicle weight. The WG may also want to consider specifying the types of scales considered acceptable for use in establishing such test loads and their acceptable degree of accuracy. Currently, Table T.3.1. of the draft code specifies tolerances for axle load, axle group load, and gross vehicle weight. It also specifies that these tolerances be based on a percentage of the applied test load. In order to apply these tolerances, test loads of known value for axle load, axle‑group load, and gross vehicle weight need to be established in advance of dynamic testing of a WIM system using a reference scale suitable for making such determinations. Additionally, in accordance with NIST Handbook 44, Appendix A – Fundamental Considerations, the error and uncertainty of the test loads, if used without correction, must be less than one‑third the applicable tolerance. The draft code does not provide an indication of the types of scales considered acceptable for making such reference weight determinations (e.g., vehicle, axle-load), or the procedures that are to be followed when using those scales to establish the reference weights. OWM notes that the accuracy of the reference scale used for determining gross vehicle weight seems to be adequately addressed in paragraph N.1.3. Reference Scale, which requires each reference vehicle to be weighed on a static scale meeting NIST Handbook 44 maintenance tolerances.
2. The WG may also want to consider including in the draft code specific requirements applicable to the design, installation, and maintenance of the approach and exit aprons of the weigh sensor(s) of a WIM system. OWM questions whether or not it’s possible to obtain accurate and repeatable axle-load, axle‑group-load, and gross vehicle weight determinations from vehicle WIM systems without including such requirements. Such requirements are needed to filter out inconsistent forces such as the following:

* “Wheel hop” (or bounce) causes undesirable accelerated vertical forces to be applied to the weigh sensor(s) of a WIM system as vehicles to be weighed in motion pass over them. Such undesirable forces result when the tires of a vehicle to be weighed in motion pass over an irregular pavement surface on either side of the weigh sensor(s).
* “Force transfer” is the transfer of applied force from one part of a vehicle being weighed in motion to another part. Such transfer of forces occur, for example, when individual axles or tandem axles of a vehicle are weighed individually and are not in the same plane (i.e., the vehicle being weighed is not level).

During development of the draft code, the WIM WG agreed not to include specific requirements for aprons in advance of and beyond the load sensor(s), but rather, agreed to include the following language in paragraph UR.2. User Location Conditions and Maintenance to deal with this issue: “The system shall be installed and maintained as defined in the manufacturer’s recommendation.” While the draft code does include a user requirement intended to address this issue, the draft language alone is not sufficient enough to adequately address this important aspect of a vehicle WIM installation. Based on expert analysis, OWM understands that minimum requirements for apron smoothness, slope, etc. are needed in order to achieve necessary levels of accuracy. Both ASTM E-1318-09 and OIML R 134 include requirements that address the area leading to and from the sensor(s) of a WIM system. For example, the ASTM standard includes requirements for horizontal and longitudinal alignment, cross slope, surface smoothness, etc.

1. NIST, OWM suggests that the WIM WG revisit the idea of including in the draft code additional accuracy classes for WIM’s capable of achieving greater accuracy levels. During the most recent WIM WG meeting, some manufacturers of WIM equipment indicated that their equipment could meet a 6 % gross vehicle weight tolerance, which is significantly less than the 10 % currently specified in the draft code. The WG then considered whether to include different accuracy classes and specify corresponding tolerances for those accuracy classes in the draft code. However, the WG ultimately agreed to a single accuracy class and set of tolerances for the following reasons:
   * The WG felt it was more expedient to simply specify a single accuracy class and set the limit of accuracy for that classification at the lowest end of what it considered an acceptable level of accuracy given the application of the device, and
   * The WG agreed that the tasks performed by a WIM system, whether that WIM system is a “virtual weigh station” or one installed in a ramp at a more permanent site (e.g., a “weigh station” along an interstate highway) is the same.

NIST, OWM noted that tiered accuracy classes are already established in both ASTM E 1318-09 and OIML R 134. History has proven that it is better to establish a framework of tolerances around the various performance capabilities of equipment available in the marketplace early on in the development of the code, rather than designing the code around systems that provide lowest accuracy and then trying to change the code later.

In early discussions with representatives from FHWA, it was stated that one of the FHWA’s main goals for developing the draft code was to improve the accuracy and reliability of WIM systems in order to reduce the number of compliant commercial vehicles (i.e., those within legal load limits), being directed to static scales, which slows the transportation of freight. OWM recognizes the additional work that would be required by the WIM WG if it were to decide to include additional accuracy classes, but by doing so, it would benefit many (e.g., transportation industry, consumers, etc.,) and improve the chances of the FHWA achieving one of its primary goals.

Mr. Dan Middleton, (Texas A&M University) WIM Project Task Manager, speaking on behalf of the U.S. FHWA, voiced support for the item by stating that the new code would improve consistency and legal credibility in the courts. He indicated that the United States does not have enough resources to adequately enforce highway weight requirements. Use and recognition of WIM standards in NIST Handbook 44 will allow better use of enforcement resources. In providing further evidence of the need for the code, he noted that currently less than one percent of vehicles directed to a static scale after being sorted on a WIM System are noncompliant.

Mr. Steve Langford (Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Company) commented that Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Company manufactures a series of WIM scales and encouraged further development of the draft code. He indicated that tiered accuracy classes are not important, nor needed in the code, at this time. The purpose of the WIM is to identify vehicles for enforcement; this is contrary to the application of OIML R 134, which is intended for WIM systems used in trade. ASTM 1318 provides different accuracy classes, but only one of which corresponds with the application of the draft code.

Mr. Tim Chesser (Arkansas) recommended a statement be included in the Application Section of the draft code clarifying that the code is intended for screening/sorting purposes only. *NIST Technical Advisor’s note: It is believed that paragraph A.1. of the draft code already addresses Mr. Chesser’s concern. Paragraph A.1. General. specifies that the code applies to systems used to weigh vehicles, while in motion, for the purpose of screening or sorting the vehicles based on vehicle weight to determine if a static weighment is necessary.*

Ms. Julie Quinn (Minnesota) supported maintaining the “Information” status of the item and encouraged the WG to move quickly to finalize completion of the draft code.

Mr. Flocken expressed his appreciation for the comments received and indicated that he would forward them, along with OWM’s feedback, to the WG for consideration.

There were two positions posted on the NCWM 2013 Online Position Forum; both of which supported the proposal.

It is the Committee’s understanding that Mr. Flocken will share OWM’s suggestions with members of the WIM WG prior to their next meeting and the WG will consider whether or not additional revisions to the draft code are necessary prior to proposing the code to the NCWM for adoption.

# 321 BELT-CONVEYOR SCALE SYSTEMS

321-1 VC UR.1.2. Conveyor Installation

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

USNWG Belt-Conveyor Scales (2013)

Purpose:

Remove the current restrictions on minimum and maximum belt lengths.

**Item Under Consideration:**

Delete subparagraph UR.1.2.(h) of UR.1.2. Conveyor Installation and re-letter subsequent subparagraphs as follows:

**UR.1.2. Conveyor Installation.**

1. **Installation - General.** – A belt-conveyor scale shall be so installed that neither its performance nor operation will be adversely affected by any characteristic of the installation, including but not limited to, the foundation, supports, covers, or any other equipment.

(Amended 2002)

.

.

.

(g) **Tripper and Movable Pulleys.** – There shall be no tripper or movable head pulleys in the conveyor.

***~~(h) Conveyor Length. – The conveyor shall be no longer than 300 m (1000 ft) nor shorter than 12 m (40 ft) from head to tail pulley.~~***

***~~[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986~~]***

**(~~i~~h) Conveyor Orientation.** – The conveyor may be horizontal or inclined, but, if inclined, the angle shall be such that slippage of material along the belt does not occur.

**(~~j~~i) Conveyor Stringers.** – Conveyor stringers at the scale and for not less than 6 m (20 ft) before and beyond the scale shall be continuous or securely joined and of sufficient size and so supported as to eliminate relative deflection between the scale and adjacent idlers when under load. The conveyor stringers should be so designed that the deflection between any two adjacent idlers within the weigh area does not exceed 0.6 mm (0.025 in) under load.

.

.

.

**(~~n~~m)** **Belt Alignment.** – The belt shall not extend beyond the edge of the outermost roller of any carry side (top) roller in any area of the conveyor nor touch the conveyor structure on the return (bottom) side of the conveyor.

(Amended 1998 and 2008)

(Amended 2002, **~~and~~** 2012, **and 2013**)

Background/Discussion:

Belt-conveyor scale manufacturers participating in the USNWG on BCS have reported increased demand for shorter conveyor systems in commercial applications. The minimum conveyor length specified in sub-paragraph UR.1.2. (h) and other requirements in the Belt-Conveyor Scales Systems Code that set minimum spacing requirements between components on a belt-conveyor scale system will not currently permit shorter systems. During their February 2012 meeting, the USNWG on BCS concluded that the limit of 40 ft for a conveyor is unrealistic due to the spacing required between components and that this requirement is too prescriptive. In addition, the USNWG agreed that limiting the conveyor length to 1000 ft would be self-regulating to some extent, in that calibration and testing that incorporates the use of whole/full revolutions of the belt would be excessively time consuming. The USNWG also agreed that the performance of the weighing device should be evaluated without regard to conveyor length and that, if there are designs of devices that support acceptable performance using conveyors outside the limits of this requirement, the requirement should be stricken. As an initial step towards removing language in the Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems Code that is prohibitive of shorter belt conveyor system weigh-belts, the USNWG recommends that subparagraph UR.1.2.(h) be deleted. The USNWG plans to continue to develop further proposals to amend additional requirements within the BCS Code to recognize shorter belt-conveyor scale systems.

The elimination of UR.1.2.(h) will further align U.S. standards with the international requirement OIML R 50 Continuous totalizing automatic weighing instruments (belt weighers) in that OIML R 50 does not contain minimum or maximum requirements relating to conveyor length.

During their fall 2012 meetings, all of the Regional Associations supported the proposal as written and recommended it be forwarded to the NCWM for vote. Mr. Bill Ripka (Thermo-Fisher Scientific), speaking on behalf of Thermo-Fisher Scientific and the USNWG on Belt-Conveyor Scales at the WWMA meeting, supported the proposal to eliminate UR.1.2.(h). He stated that the minimum (40 ft) restricts placement of the scale and that such a restriction is not consistent with other codes in NIST Handbook 44. He indicated that the USNWG on BCS is working on a proposal to allow smaller feeders. He has found that excessive belt scale lengths are self-regulating due to the difficulty in testing them. Additionally, weights and measures jurisdictions are easily granting exceptions to the limits currently in NIST Handbook 44, so there is no need for these restrictions.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: Mr. Ripka, speaking on behalf of Thermo-Fisher Scientific and as Chairman of the USNWG on BCS, reiterated the comments he provided during the fall 2012 WWMA Annual Meeting.

NIST OWM stated that calibration and testing of belt-conveyor scale systems with excessively long conveyors could be problematic primarily due to the time needed to complete full revolutions of the conveyor belt. Belt-conveyor scale systems using excessively short conveyor belts may also present challenges in designing those systems to account for difficulties including the location and placement of conveyor components and maintaining proper belt tension during operation. OWM does not believe that it is appropriate for NIST Handbook 44 Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems Code to include a requirement that prescribes limitations on the maximum and minimum length of conveyors associated with belt-conveyor scales if it can be demonstrated that conveyors of a length outside these limits are capable of complying with all applicable performance requirements.

OWM does not anticipate any negative effect with the removal of requirement UR.1.2. (h) Conveyor Length as proposed and acknowledged the point that the elimination of this sub-paragraph serves to further harmonize NIST Handbook 44 Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems Code with OIML R 50.

The Committee agreed with the justification provided by USNWG on BCS and the comments received during the Open Hearings in support of this item and agreed to recommend the item for a vote.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments in support of the item from Mr. Ripka, speaking on behalf of the USNWG on BCS systems and Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA. Mr. Ripka commented that weights and measures officials should evaluate belt-conveyor scale system performance and not prescribe design criteria. OWM reiterated the comments it provided during the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting.

There was one position posted on the NCWM 2013 Online Position Forum in support of the proposal.

The Committee recommended the item be presented for Vote as proposed.

321-2 VC Appendix D – Definitions: Belt Revolution, Belt Load, Integrator, Loading Point, and Master Weight Totalizer

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

U.S. National Work Group on Belt-Conveyor Scales (USNWG BCS) (2013)

Purpose:

Provide clarity of meaning for the use of terms in the Belt-Conveyor Scales Code to avoid confusion or misuse.

**Item Under Consideration:**

Add three new definitions and amend two existing definitions in Appendix D – Definitions associated with the Belt‑Conveyor Scale Systems Code as follows:

**belt load. – The weight of the material carried by the conveyor belt, expressed in terms of weight units per unit of length (e.g., pounds per foot, kilograms per meter. Also called Belt Loading.[2.21]**

**belt revolution. – The amount of conveyor belt movement or travel that is equivalent to the total length of the conveyor belt. Also referred to as “belt circuit.”[2.21]**

**integrator. – A device used with a belt-conveyor scale that combines conveyor belt load (e.g., lb/ft) and belt travel (e.g., feet) to produce a total weight of material passing over the belt-conveyor scale. An integrator may be a separate, detached mechanism or may be a component within a totalizing device. (Also see “master weight totalizer.”)[2.21]**

**loading point.** **–** **~~The~~** **A** location **~~at which material to be conveyed is applied to the conveyor~~ on a conveyor where the material is received by the belt. The location of a hopper, chute, or the discharge of a pre-feed device used to supply material to a conveyor.**[2.21]

**master weight totalizer. – A~~n~~** **primary** indicating element used with a belt-conveyor scale **that incorporates the function of an integrator** to indicate the **totalized** weight of material **~~that was~~** passed over the scale**. ~~The master weight totalizer is a primary indicating element of the belt‑conveyor scale~~. (Also see “integrator.”)**[2.21]

*NIST Technical Advisor’s Note: During their February 2013 meeting, the USNWG BCS agreed to further modify the definition of “loading point” to better clarify the location of the loading point on a conveyor. The USNWG forwarded the following proposed definition to the S&T Committee to replace that shown above in Item Under Consideration:*

**loading point. – ~~The~~****A** location **~~at which material to be conveyed is applied to the conveyor~~ on a conveyor where the material is received by the belt.  The location of the discharge from a hopper, chute or ~~the discharge of a~~ pre-feed device used to supply material to a conveyor. [2.21]**

Background/Discussion:

Certain terms and phrases are used in NIST Handbook 44 and in discussions related to belt-conveyor scale systems that have specific meanings within that context. The terms “belt revolution,” “belt load,” and “integrator” appear in various paragraphs throughout the Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems Code and yet, are not currently defined in NIST Handbook 44. The terms “master weight totalizer” and “loading point” are currently defined in Appendix D. “Master weight totalizer” is frequently used interchangeably with the term “integrator.” The proposed amendment to this definition is intended to distinguish between these two terms while recognizing the interrelated functions of: 1) the integration of belt travel and belt loading and 2) the totalization and display of weight passing over the weighing device. The changes proposed to the definition of “loading point” are intended to improve understanding.

During the fall 2012 Regional Weights and Measures Association Meetings, each of the regions supported the proposal and recommended it be forwarded to NCWM as a Voting Item. Based upon meeting reports received from the various regions, there were few comments made during the meetings regarding the item, with most regions acknowledging their support of the item based on its development and recommendation by the USNWG on BCS. Mr. Bill Ripka (Thermo Fischer Scientific) commented during the WWMA meeting that he supported the addition of the new definitions of “belt revolution,” “belt load,” and “integrator” and the proposed changes to “loading point” and “master weight totalizer.” Mr. Ripka said that he believed it made sense to have a description in NIST Handbook 44 of what these terms mean.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: Mr. Ripka, speaking on behalf of the USNWG on BCS, commented that the USNWG had reviewed and agreed on the definitions of the terms in the proposal and believed they were necessary to include in NIST Handbook 44. The USNWG believes that these definitions will improve understanding of these terms and provide more consistent application of requirements in the NIST Handbook 44 Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems Code where these terms are used.

NIST OWM noted that the definition of “loading point” already existed in Appendix D of NIST Handbook 44 and should not be presented as a new definition, but instead, as an amended definition in the “Item Under Consideration.” OWM provided the Committee an amended version of the definition appearing in Appendix D of NIST Handbook 44 for consideration, which is the same definition included in the original proposal, except that it includes revisions shown in **bold face print** by **~~striking out~~** information to be deleted and **underlining** information to be added to the current definition in NIST Handbook 44.

OWM acknowledged the merits of this proposal, to include providing three new definitions for terms that are used specifically in association with belt-conveyor scale systems as well as the proposed amendments of the existing definitions for “master weight totalizer” and “loading point.” These definitions clarify the meaning of these terms and will assist in the interpretation of the NIST Handbook 44 Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems Code.

The Committee agreed with comments received during the Open Hearings in support of the proposed definitions. The Committee agreed that the proposed definition of ”loading point” should be presented as a modification to the existing definition in NIST Handbook 44 and modified the proposal accordingly as shown in the Item Under Consideration.

Based on the support for these changes, the Committee agreed to designate this as a Voting Item.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee replaced the definition of “loading point” that was originally submitted as part of the proposal, with the modified version proposed by the USNWG on BCS following their February 2013 meeting. The modified version is included above in Item Under Consideration as part of the NIST Technical Advisor’s note.

OWM reiterated the comments it made during the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting and also commented that the changes to the definition of “loading point” proposed by the USNWG on BCS improve the definition of that term by better clarifying the location of each loading point on a BCS system.

The Committee also heard comments in support of the item from Mr. Ripka, who indicated that the information provided by the definitions will be very helpful in understanding terms that are not a part of everyone’s vocabulary. Mr. Ripka also encouraged other groups to review definitions pertinent to their expertise and make recommendations for updates as appropriate.

There was one position posted on the NCWM 2013 Online Position Forum in support of the proposal.

The Committee modified the definition of “loading point” as recommended by the USNWG on BCS and presented the item for a vote as shown in the Item Under Consideration above.

# 330 LIQUID MEASURING DEVICES

330-1 W S.1.6.4.2 (a) Product Identity and UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity

(This item was withdrawn)

Source:

Missouri Department of Agriculture (2013)

Purpose:

Reduce the potential for mis-fueling consumer vehicles.

Item Under Consideration:

The Committee considered the following proposal to amend paragraphs S.1.6.4.2. and UR.3.2. However, as described in the “Background/Discussion” section, the Committee decided to Withdraw this item from its agenda.

**S.1.6.4.2. Product Identity.**

(a) A device shall be able to conspicuously display on each side the identity of the product being dispensed.

(b) A device designed to dispense more than one grade, brand, blend, or mixture of product also shall be able to display on each side the identity of the grade, brand, blend, or mixture being dispensed.

**(c) The term “Gasoline”, “E15Gasoline”, “E85”, or “Flex-Fuel” shall be conspicuously displayed on the dispenser nozzle(s). This subsection applies only to spark-ignition engine fuel dispensers.**

**(Amended 20XX)**

**UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity.**

(a) The following information shall be conspicuously displayed or posted on the face of a retail dispenser used in direct sale:

(1) except for dispensers used exclusively for fleet sales, other price contract sales, and truck refueling (e.g., truck stop dispensers used only to refuel trucks), all of the unit prices at which the product is offered for sale; and

(2) in the case of a computing type or money-operated type, the unit price at which the dispenser is set to compute.

Provided that the dispenser complies with S.1.6.4.1. Display of Unit Price, it is not necessary that all the unit prices for all grades, brands, blends, or mixtures be simultaneously displayed or posted.

(b) The following information shall be conspicuously displayed or posted on each side of a retail dispenser used in direct sale:

(1) the identity of the product in descriptive commercial terms; and

(2) the identity of the grade, brand, blend, or mixture that a multi-product dispenser is set to deliver.

**(c) The term “Gasoline”, “E15Gasoline”, “E85”, or “Flex-Fuel” shall be conspicuously displayed on the dispenser nozzle(s). This subsection applies only to spark-ignition engine fuel dispensers.**

(Amended 1972, 1983, 1987, 1989, 1992, **~~and~~** 1993**, and 20XX**)

**Background/Discussion:**

The level of confusion for consumers fueling vehicles continues to grow with the introduction of new fuels in the marketplace. The proposed changes are intended to ensure proper delivery of the selected product and to reduce the potential of mis-fueling vehicles. Missouri and other states have received complaints from consumers who have fueled their vehicles with inappropriate products. At this time, practically all gasoline dispensers nationwide do not comply with paragraph UR.3.2. or S.1.6.4.2.(a) as they do not display the product identity (i.e., gasoline).

2012 CWMA Interim Meeting: The CWMA proposed that the item be designated as an Informational Item. The CWMA did not support the proposed change to paragraph S.1.6.4.2., but did support the change to UR.3.2. The CWMA recommended review of the item by the NCWM FALS.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Mr. Mahesh Albuquerque (Colorado) opposed this item because it is burdensome and adequate labeling requirements already exist. He noted that consumers need to take ownership and read the labeling to avoid mis-fueling. Mr. Gordon Johnson (Gilbarco) opposed this item because it doesn’t effectively solve the problem. He believes this should not be a specification, but rather a user requirement because 90 % of his company’s dispensers are sold without hoses and nozzles. He questioned how this requirement would even be implemented. Mr. Ron Hassmeyer (Alameda County, California) opposed the item and stated that labeling in S.1.6.4.2. Product Identity is adequate to require a product description. He also questioned how this item would apply to a multi-product dispenser. Mr. Hassmeyer believed this would be an undue burden to the device owner. Mr. Doug Deiman (Alaska) recommended this item be Withdrawn, noting that it is too much of a burden on gas pump owners. Ms. Kristin Macey (California) opposed this item and recommended Withdrawal. The WWMA recognized the lack of support for this proposal and agreed that the product identity section adequately addresses this issue. Additionally, the WWMA did not understand the submitter’s comment that practically all gasoline dispensers nationwide do not comply with paragraphs UR.3.2. or S.1.6.4.2.(a). The WWMA did not forward the item to NCWM.

2012 NEWMA Interim Meeting: Members questioned whether this item should be a weights and measures responsibility. NEWMA believes that this item should be addressed by FALS.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: Mr. Matt Curran (Florida) provided comments on behalf of Mr. Ron Hayes (Missouri). Mr. Hayes noted that the intent of the proposal was not to increase labeling requirements, but to provide an additional point at which a consumer would be informed of the product identity. He had more interest in establishing a user requirement than a specification. Mr. Curran noted that there are stations in Florida that dispense E85 where the attendant specifically asks the consumer whether or not the vehicle can accommodate the fuel. Mr. Steve Benjamin (North Carolina) questioned how the requirement would be applied on a dispenser with a single hose used to dispense multiple products. He noted that the proposal seems to be just another variation on the proposed color-coding requirement considered in the past. Mr. Ed Coleman (Tennessee) supported the proposal, pointing out that more labeling on the dispenser may result in having too much information on the dispenser that no one reads. However, on nozzles, he believes that the labeling would have more visibility. Mr. Johnson opposed the item. Mr. Tim Chesser (Arkansas) opposed the item, noting concern about the impact of requiring new labeling on all existing nozzles. Mr. Bill Studzinski (General Motors) expressed appreciation for the effort to further clarify product identity, but opposed the proposal, noting that there is already a requirement for marking product identity in NIST Handbook 44. He echoed concerns about how the requirement would apply to single hose dispensers with multiple products. The majority of comments received by the SWMA were in opposition to the proposal. The SWMA appreciated the desire to improve consumer understanding but believed the proposal would not fully address mis-fueling incidents. Noting that there were too many questions about how the language would be applied, particularly with single-hose, multi product dispensers, SWMA did not forward the item to NCWM.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: Mr. John Albert (Missouri) gave a presentation which illustrated the types of complaints that Missouri routinely receives. He indicated that this problem has been in existence for a long time, noting that customers associate the color “green” with diesel dispensers and frequently mistake dispensers with green gasoline nozzles for diesel dispensers. Mr. Albert reported that they have received thousands of complaints on this subject and they find that customers frequently make fueling mistakes because their attention is distracted by things such as discount information, station traffic, and other signage on the dispenser, not to mention personal distractions. He noted that octane stickers are not sufficient by themselves to alert distracted customers that the dispenser is dispensing gasoline and not diesel. Mr. Tim Columbus (Steptoe and Johnson), speaking on behalf of the National Association of Convenience Store Operators, expressed concern about the proposal, noting that this affects only a small percentage of customers and many of the customers who mis-fuel their vehicles admit they are not paying attention. He also commented that octane stickers on gasoline dispensers are adequate to alert consumers that the product is gasoline. Mr. Johnson reiterated comments made at the 2012 WWMA Annual Meeting, noting that about 95 % of Gilbarco’s customers do not purchase hoses and nozzles with new dispensers, preferring to put their own on the equipment upon installation. Gilbarco believes that, if the Committee decides to move forward with the proposal, it should be addressed through the addition of a user requirement.

Mr. Hayes, speaking as Chairman of FALS, noted that FALS provided the Committee with alternative language. The alternative proposal eliminates the proposed addition of S.1.6.4.2.(c) and replaces the proposed UR.3.2.(c) with the following:

**(c) The term “Gasoline”, “E15”, “E15 & Gasoline” for multiple product dispenser with single nozzle, “E85”, or “Flex-Fuel” shall be conspicuously displayed on the dispenser nozzle(s). This subsection applies only to spark-ignition engine fuel dispensers. This section satisfies subsection UR.3.2.(b)(1) requirement.**

During its work session, the Committee clarified with Mr. Albert that Missouri believes that the current language in UR.3.2.(b)(1) provides means to require clear identification of the product identity; however, the proposed changes would promote uniformity in the use of terminology, not only for diesel dispensers, but also other fuels and, hopefully, reduce incidents of mis-fueling. Mr. Albert noted that Missouri is not able to enforce the use of specific colors to identify products without changes to NIST Handbooks 44 and 130.

After reviewing the original and alternate proposals and considering the comments received during the Open Hearings, the Committee expressed concerns about the extent of support for the proposal. The Committee is concerned about the potential burden on stations to modify current equipment, particularly when there are questions about whether or not the proposed changes would significantly reduce mis-fueling incidents. Provided a dispenser is clearly labeled with the product identity as required by UR.3.2., the Committee believes that the customer must accept some responsibility to follow instructions and signage during the transaction. While the Committee appreciates the concerns that have been raised by Missouri, the Committee agreed that the proposed marking requirements would not resolve all mis-fueling problems and the Committee does not believe there is a consensus to support the proposal. Consequently, the Committee decided to Withdraw the item.

At their spring 2013 Annual Meetings, NEWMA and the CWMA concurred with the Withdrawal of this item. The Committee received no further comments on the item during its 2013 Annual Meeting Open Hearings.

330-2 VC Table T.2. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Liquid Measuring Devices

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

NIST Office of Weights and Measures (2013)

Purpose:

Resolve inconsistencies in the temperature ranges defined for Heated Products among NIST Handbook 44 Liquid-Measuring Devices, Vehicle-Tank Meters, and Mass Flow Meters Codes.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend Table T.2. follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table T.2. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Liquid Measuring Devices Covered in**  **NIST Handbook 44, Section 3.30** | | | | |
| **Accuracy Class** | **Application** | **Acceptance Tolerance** | **Maintenance Tolerance** | **Special Test Tolerance1** |
| 0.3 | * Petroleum products delivered from large capacity (flow rates greater than 115 L/min or 30 gpm)\*\* devices, including motor-fuel devices * Heated products (other than asphalt) at **~~or~~** **temperatures** greater than 50 °C **(122 °F)** * Asphalt **at temperatures** equal to or below **~~a temperature of~~** 50 °C **(122 °F)** * All other liquids not shown in the table where the typical delivery is over 200 L (50 gal) | 0.2 % | 0.3 % | 0.5 % |
| 0.3A | * Asphalt at temperatures greater than 50 °C **(122 °F)** | 0.3 % | 0.3 % | 0.5 % |
| 0.5\* | * Petroleum products delivered from small capacity (at 4 L/min (1 gpm) through 115 L/min or 30 gpm)\*\* motor-fuel devices * Agri-chemical liquids * All other applications not shown in the table where the typical delivery is ≤ 200 L (50 gal) | 0.3 % | 0.5 % | 0.5 % |
| 1.1 | * Petroleum products and other normal liquids from devices with flow rates\*\* less than 1 gpm. * Devices designed to deliver less than 1 gal | 0.75 % | 1.0 % | 1.25 % |
| \* For test drafts ≤40 L or 10 gal, the tolerances specified for Accuracy Class 0.5 in the table above do not apply. For these test drafts, the following applies:  (a) Maintenance tolerances on normal and special tests shall be 20 mL plus 4 mL per indicated liter or 1 in3 plus 1 in3 per indicated gallon.  (b) Acceptance tolerances on normal and special tests shall be one-half the maintenance tolerance values.  1 Special test tolerances are not applicable to retail motor fuel dispensers.  \*\* Flow rate refers to designed or marked maximum flow rate. | | | | |
| (Added 2002) (Amended 2006 **and 2013**) | | | | |

Background/Discussion:

This item was initiated as a result of discussions at an NTEP measuring labs meeting and forwarded to the Measuring Sector for review in 2011. In reviewing criteria for heated products during discussions at the 2011 annual NTEP Laboratory Meeting, the Measuring Laboratories noted inconsistencies in the way that heated products are referenced in the LMD, VTM, and MFM Codes.

The differentiation between “heated” and “non-heated” products first appeared in NIST Handbook 44 in 2000 as a result of a proposal adopted by the NCWM in 1999 to expand the tolerances applicable to meters use to measure asphalt above 50 °C (see S&T Committee Items 330-6 and 337-4 in the 1999 NCWM S&T Committee Final Report for details). This reference was refined by the Committee in 2001 when changes were adopted to clarify the application of tolerances to asphalt at 50 °C in the LMD and MFM Codes. When the LMD and VTM Codes were modified in 2003 and 2004 to adopt an accuracy class table to mirror the Mass Flow Meter (MFM) Code, inconsistencies first appeared in the way that heated products were referenced among the codes.

This proposal and similar proposals elsewhere in the Committee’s agenda, suggest changes to correct these inconsistencies. A summary of the proposals is listed below.

Section: 3.30. Liquid-Measuring Devices; Table T.2. (S&T Item 330-2)

Section: 3.31. Vehicle-Tank Meters; Table 1. (S&T Item 331-1)

Section: 3.37. Mass Flow Meters; Table T.2. (S&T Item 337-3)

NIST OWM notes that there also may be a need to address hot water meters (for which the American Water Works Association (AWWA) defines a boundary temperature of 90 °F) in NIST Handbook 44.

The proposed changes in these items take into account corresponding references to heated products in NCWM Publication 14, including the “Product Families Table” in Technical Policy C and past discussions at meetings of the NTEP Measuring Sector. Revisions are also proposed to ensure appropriate references to both Fahrenheit and Celsius temperatures.

NEWMA and SWMA supported moving this item forward as a Voting Item at their 2012 Annual Meetings. The SWMA also recommended that this item be consolidated with correlating items in the VTM and MFM during the voting process to help ensure consistency among these codes.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee received comments in writing from NIST OWM reiterating the origin of the proposal and noting that the goal of the proposed changes is to improve consistency in references to heated products among the codes. OWM noted that this item is largely housekeeping and is intended (along with S&T Agenda Items 331-1 and 337-3) to clarify the application of tolerances to different types of heated products and to ensure consistency across several metering codes. The MFM Code does not include any specified temperature threshold that would define “heated products” as is provided in both the LMD and VTM Codes. Since MFMs could be used in the same applications as other meter types covered by the LMD and VTM Codes, it would be logical for the temperature threshold to be the same. Additionally, the current formatting of references to temperature thresholds is inconsistent among LMD, VTM, and MFM Codes. The Committee also heard comments from Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress and Hauser) who agreed with NIST OWM’s comments and further suggested that discussion be taken simultaneously on this item and Items 331-1 and 337-3 for expediency. Hearing no opposition to the proposed changes, the Committee agreed to move this item forward for a vote.

2013 spring NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meetings: NEWMA and the CWMA supported the designation of this item as a Voting Item and agreed with the need to resolve current inconsistencies. Three government representatives indicated support for this item on the NCWM Online Position Forum with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting: The Committee took comments on this item simultaneously with Items 331-1 and 337-3. The Committee heard no comments in opposition to these items. Mr. Dmitri Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation, LLC) stated that this is a good housekeeping item, and he supported considering this item in conjunction with related items in the VTM Code and the MFMs Code. NIST OWM reiterated its comments from the 2013 Interim Meeting and suggested voting on Items 330-2, 331-1, and 337-3 together to avoid any inconsistencies.

330-3 I N.4.2.4. Wholesale Devices

(The status of this item was changed from Voting to Informational.)

Source:

Flint Hills Resources (2013)

Purpose:

To better align wholesale meter testing with current testing procedures, measuring practices and technology changes while maintaining the integrity of the special test.

**Item Under Consideration:**

Amend paragraph N.4.2.4. as follows:

**N.4.2.4. Wholesale Devices.** – “Special” tests shall be madeto develop the operating characteristics of a measuring system and any special associated or attached elements and accessories.

**N.4.2.4.1. Special Test, Type Evaluation. – “**Special” tests shall **be made during type evaluation ~~include a test~~** at the slower of the following rates:

1. 20 % of the marked maximum discharge rate; or
2. The minimum discharge rate marked on the device.

Add a new paragraph N.4.2.4.2. as follows:

**N.4.2.4.2. Special Test, Field Evaluation. – “Special” tests shall be made during field tests at or near the minimum discharge flow rate developed under the conditions of installation, but not less than the minimum discharge rate marked on the device.**

Background/Discussion:

This proposal is intended to clarify that conducting a slow flow test to the marked minimum discharge rate is required for type evaluation and testing to the minimum discharge flow rate developed under the conditions of installation for routine field inspections is appropriate. It would:

1. Remove the rigidity of the current language and provide for flexibility and efficiency while maintaining the requirement to test at different flow rates to determine the accuracy of a measuring system;
2. Differentiate between testing for type evaluation and field verification;
3. Reflect changes in field testing procedures, technology, and industry practices; and
4. Improve meter performance by establishing a meter factor for the slowest preset flow rate.

The current language is very rigid and does not take field installation conditions into consideration. It may not be possible or practicable to achieve the marked minimum discharge rate during field tests without changes to upstream equipment (valves, pumps, etc.), changing the flow computer programmed presets, or changing the idling of other fueling bays during testing.

The code does not allow for any deviation from the **“**shall**”** test at the marked minimum discharge rate. Current loading rack systems generally do not have a discharge nozzle or other physical means downstream of the meter to control or restrict the flow rate. Today, most rely on pumps and valves upstream of the meter and preprogrammed flow rates for specific products with an assigned meter factor for each flow rate and product. The proposed change would still allow for testing at the marked minimum discharge rate when there is a discharge nozzle or other physical means in use downstream of the meter to restrict flow, but would recognize the need to vary from the marked minimum discharge rate for systems not so equipped.

The submitter notes that it is more productive to verify that the system is operating properly when used in its intended manner and set-up rather than alter the system for test-purposes and then return it to its “as-used condition.” Adjusting the system to flow at the marked minimum discharge rate by making changes to the system when that flow rate is not used introduces variables into the system not normally seen and adds little to no value.

Even if the system can achieve the marked minimum discharge rate (for example, through the use of a discharge nozzle), it is not always practical or possible to hit it exactly when testing. The variables involved with proving while multiple bays are operating at a loading rack can make achieving the target flow rate difficult. It is not really necessary to test exactly at the marked minimum flow rate to develop the operating characteristics of a meter. However, NIST Handbook 44 offers no room for deviation. Today, a wholesale meter tested “near,” but not exactly “at,” the marked minimum discharge rate is not being tested in accordance with the requirements of NIST Handbook 44. This problem may never be an issue, but it might (the history regarding the change to NIST Handbook 44, Introduction section illustrates why the language in the handbook must match the application of it in the field). Amending the current language as proposed will remove this risk, however, slight.

In the LMD Code, retail motor-fuel devices with a marked minimum flow rate are tested “at or near the marked minimum flow rate,” but are not required to be tested at exactly the marked minimum. If this is acceptable for a retail motor-fuel dispenser, then it should be acceptable for a wholesale meter. The proposal would make testing more uniform and consistent among different but similar device types.

The purpose of this proposal is not to do away with a special test but to make the test more reasonable. The proposal would allow the integrity of the test process to be maintained while providing both industry technicians and weights and measures officials the flexibility to test the meter in a manner that is more reflective of actual field testing and device use. It is designed to test meters not at the *design* flow rate but at the flow rate at which they are actually used. It does not preclude a weights and measures inspector from testing at the marked minimum flow rate; it just removes the mandate to conduct it at that flow rate

The submitter points out the following supporting arguments:

* The marked minimum and maximum discharge rates are design parameters, not operational parameters.
* The Mass Flow Meters Code does not require testing at the marked minimum discharge rate. It requires, at a minimum, that one test be conducted at the minimum flow rate of the installation.
* The principle of testing as used and not to the design parameters is present in other codes and testing. It exists for scales since scales are not required to be tested to their design parameters; they are only tested as set up and used. A scale may be rated at a capacity range of 100 000 lb to 200 000 lb and a scale division of 20 lb or 50 lb, but it will only be tested based on its conditions of installation regardless of how it could be used.
* NIST Handbook 44 does not require that a measuring system be tested at the marked maximum discharge rate because it recognizes the measuring system may not be able to achieve the marked maximum discharge rate due to the conditions of installation.
* There is no regulation requiring a meter to be able to discharge at its marked minimum discharge flow rate; the marked minimum discharge flow rate is a design parameter not a use requirement.
* Not all tests in the test notes section are required to be conducted in the field as is noted in NIST Handbook 44, Introduction, Section S. Using the handbook, which states, “Since some sections are designed to be applied to tests performed under laboratory conditions, it would be impractical or unrealistic to apply them to field tests. Not all tests described in the “Notes” section of the handbook are required to be performed in the field as an official test.” Based on this section, it could be argued that a “special” test is not even required; however, the submitter believes that the special test has value and is not seeking to eliminate the test entirely.

The proposal doesn’t specify the exact flow rate, but requires a test at the minimum flow rate based on the system and the establishment of a meter factor at that flow rate. The added flexibility and establishment of a meter factor during the test is important for both industry technicians and weights and measures officials.

The proposed change is similar to the recommended tests described in API Manual of Petroleum Measurement Standards (MPMS), Chapter 6.2. Loading Rack Metering Systems – “When using electronic presets with multiple flow rate configurations, the establishment of multiple meter factors may be required. This is particularly true when low flow start-up and shutdown sequences are employed to prevent system shock and static electricity generation (see API RP 2003).”

A potential argument in opposition to the proposal is that, even if the system is not being used at the marked minimum discharge rate at the time of test, it could be used later; thus, it is important to not only test as found, but as it could be used. While there is some merit to this argument, it is not consistently applied since many systems are tested as found, not as they *could be* used. There is also no incentive for a fuel terminal to not test their system as used. Further, the current practice is to set a calibration factor for all flow rates, so it is unlikely that the system would be changed after testing without additional testing and establishment of a calibration factor.

Based on comments received at its 2012 Interim Meeting, the CWMA amended the original proposal to reflect language that was applicable to field practices and current with technology. The language was also amended to maintain special tests as a requirement during type evaluation, but optional for other examinations. CWMA supported the item as amended and forwarded the item to NCWM; recommending it as a Voting Item. The proposal submitted by the CWMA is as follows:

**N.4.2.4. Wholesale Devices.** – “Special” tests shall be made **during type evaluation** to develop the operating characteristics of a measuring system and any special associated or attached elements and accessories. “Special” tests shall include a test at the slower of the following rates:

1. 20 % of the marked maximum discharge rate; or
2. The minimum discharge rate marked on the device.

**N.4.2.5. Wholesale Devices; Other Tests. – Other tests may be made during field tests at or near the minimum discharge flow rate developed under the conditions of installation for all wholesale devices.**

**(a) For devices equipped with electronic preset flow rates, tests may be conducted at any electronic preset flow rate used, including the slowest flow rate, when multiple flow rate configurations are used to deliver product.**

**(b) “Normal” applicable tolerances shall apply to tests conducted.**

**U.R.3.6.4. Wholesale Devices; Electronic Preset Flow Rates – A meter factor shall be established for all electronic preset flow rates used to deliver product.**

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee heard comments from Mr. Ross Andersen (New York, retired) who suggested if the concern is that there is not enough flexibility in the reference to “20 % of the marked maximum,” the focus should be placed on modifying this reference rather than making other proposed changes. He provided alternative language for the Committee to consider. The Committee also received written and verbal comments from NIST, OWM noting that the proposed language would not consider any test conducted at lower flow rates to be ‘normal” tests and, therefore, such tests would be required to meet “normal” test tolerances.

OWM commented that it is important to verify the performance of a meter over the range of flow rates for which it is designed to operate. The “normal” test (as described in N.4.1. Normal Tests) combined with a “slow flow” test (as described in N.4.2.4. Wholesale Devices) allows an inspector or serviceperson to verify the performance of a meter over the range in which it is typically used under the conditions of its installation. For positive displacement meters with single point calibration, the results of both tests can be used to determine whether or not a particular meter is providing accurate measurement over the complete range of operating speeds associated with its installation and whether the meter is in good operating condition. Product discharge rates are affected by installation particulars (e.g., the diameter of the piping, pump speed), and these can be changed after installation, thus, affecting meter performance. For these reasons, OWM recommends the slow-flow test remain a required part of an official test as was originally intended by the original submitter of this item. As a general rule, OWM recommends that test procedures considered part of an official examination of a commercial weighing or measuring device not be made elective because, as such, they create the potential for inconsistent enforcement of legal requirements amongst weights and measures jurisdictions.

The proposed new paragraph N.4.2.5. Wholesale Devices; Other Tests allows for a test at the minimum discharge rate marked on the device but would have the effect of eliminating the application of the “Special Test” tolerance, which currently applies to the results of a test conducted at flow rates below a certain point. Since the test would no longer be considered a “Special Test,” basic tolerances (i.e., 0.3 % maintenance and 0.2 % acceptance) would apply and these tolerances are more stringent than the current “Special Test” tolerance of 0.5 % specified in NIST Handbook 44. OWM is concerned about the impact this change may have on existing in-service wholesale equipment that might currently be able to comply with the “Special Test” tolerance, but may not be able to comply if that tolerance were tightened. For example, in instances where the minimum discharge flow rate developed under the conditions of installation (i.e., the test condition specified in proposed new paragraph N.4.2.5. Wholesale Devices; Other Tests) for a wholesale device already in service, is equivalent to the lesser of the two rates specified in N.4.2.4., the flow rate for the test, whether applying proposed paragraph N.4.2.5. or existing paragraph N.4.2.4., would be the same, yet a more stringent tolerance would apply under proposed paragraph N.4.2.5.

An additional concern is that if the parameters of the test were changed from those currently specified in (a) and (b) of paragraph N.4.2.4. to the proposed “at or near the minimum discharge flow rate developed under the conditions of installation” the change would provide device owners the latitude of being able to try and extend the service life of a meter by compensating for badly worn or otherwise defective parts simply by increasing the minimum flow rate of product through it. Although such action would constitute a violation of G-UR.4.3. Use of Adjustments, it might be very difficult for officials to recognize and enforce.

For these reasons, OWM proposed alternate language (which combines elements of the original proposal and the CWMA alternative) as a means to provide more flexibility in conducting special tests, while retaining the original intent of the special test as a tool for verifying the condition of the meter.

OWM also commented that additional work is needed to develop minimum testing requirements for equipment with multi-point calibration capability to ensure consistency in inspection and testing of these systems.

Mr. Henry Oppermann (Weights and Measures Consulting) echoed OWM’s concerns regarding the need to conduct special tests as a means to assess the condition of the meter. He acknowledged that the current language in NIST Handbook 44 may not provide the same flexibility that is provided for other meter types (for which tests can be “at or near” the marked minimum); however, he expressed concern about backing off of a proper test for what appears to be primarily convenience. Mr. Constantine Cotsoradis (Flint Hills Resources) pointed out with many current systems, there frequently is not a way to restrict the flow rate. Mr. Richard Suiter (Richard Suiter Consulting) further commented that the location where flow is restricted (e.g., before vs. after the meter) during special tests can also affect the results of testing, and this should be considered in constructing the final language (and associated test procedures) for any proposed change.

Mr. Dmitri Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation, LLC), speaking on behalf of the MMA, noted that the proposal has the effect of 1) providing some flexibility in establishing a flow rate near the marked minimum flow rate rather than at the minimum; 2) changing the tolerances that would apply to tests conducted at slower flow rates; and 3) specifying the establishment of meter factors for preset flow rates. Of these three facets, MMA only supports the first. He noted that some registers may use different types of calibration factors and addressing these variations in a single paragraph would be difficult. He further noted, if changes are made to the test conditions in the LMD Code, similar changes should be made to other measuring codes as needed to ensure consistency.

Ms. Julie Quinn (Minnesota) noted that Minnesota believes that it is necessary to conduct testing at every flow rate where the device is configured; however, the factors at these various points do not need to be different.

The Committee acknowledged the comments in support of maintaining the requirement for conducting special tests during routine field inspections, but modifying paragraph N.4.2.4. to provide for some flexibility in the rate at which a special test is conducted. In recognition of limitations which may prevent some systems from being tested exactly at the marked minimum flow rate, the Committee agreed that modification to the language to be more consistent with other measuring devices is appropriate. Based on the support heard for the language proposed by OWM with respect to N.4.2.4.1. Special Test, Type Evaluation and N.4.2.4.2. Special Tests, Field Evaluation, the Committee agreed to recommend this alternative language as shown in the Item Under Consideration above for a Vote.

In reviewing the remaining portion of the proposed changes, the Committee noted the considerable debate regarding the inclusion of the User Requirement regarding the establishment of meter factors for preset flow rates. Based on this opposition, the Committee considered splitting this proposal into two items: 1) to address the proposed changes to the Notes; and 2) to address the proposed changes to the User Requirements. However, there was very limited support for the proposed changes to the User Requirement. Thus, the Committee decided to eliminate the proposed paragraph U.R.3.6.4. Wholesale Devices; Electronic Preset Flow Rates from the Item Under Consideration.

2013 NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meetings: NEWMA and the CWMA supported the item as a Voting Item and commented that they believe the concerns stated by OWM and others at the NCWM Interim Meeting have been sufficiently addressed by the NCWM S&T Committee.

Two Government representatives indicated a position of support on the NCWM Online Position Forum. Another Government representative, Mr. Randy Jennings (Tennessee) indicated opposition to the proposal and, noting that the item appeared on only one regional weights and measures association agenda, expressed concern that the item requires more vetting. Mr. Jennings expressed concern about the phrase “developed under the conditions of the installation,” and noted that this may be interpreted to mean that, if a system can be installed to run at maximum flow rates other than “start-up” and “shut-down,” then an official cannot request that the system be “chocked” to reduce the flow. He further commented that the reduced flow test has always been effective in detecting and diagnosing wear in the meter. He also noted that Tennessee has a valve on its prover that can be used to reduce the flow rate during a slow-flow test. Mr. Jennings proposed the following alternative changes to paragraph N.4.2.4.1. Special Test, Type Evaluation that would make the current requirement less restrictive; yet achieve a compromise to help all stakeholders:

**N.4.2.4.1. Special Test, Type Evaluation. – “**Special” tests shall include a test at the slower of the following rates:

* + - * 1. **Approximately** 20 % of the marked maximum discharge rate; or
        2. The **approximate** minimum discharge rate marked on the device.

During its Open Hearings at the 2013 Annual Meeting, the Committee received a proposed modification to the Item Under Consideration by the original submitter Mr. Cotsoradis. In addition to the other changes proposed in the Item Under Consideration, Mr. Cotsoradis proposed replacing the new paragraph N.4.2.4.2. with the following:

**N.4.2.4.2. Special Test, Field Evaluation. – A “Special” test shall be made during field tests at or near the minimum discharge flow rate developed under the conditions of installation, but not less than the minimum discharge rate marked on the device. Additional “Special” tests may be conducted at flow rates down to and including the maximum discharge rate marked on the device.**

Mr. Jennings supported this proposed modification by Mr. Cotsoradis.

Mr. Cotsoradis further noted that the current language in NIST Handbook 44 is very restrictive. Even in systems where the flow can be reduced, it is difficult to set the flow and maintain it at the target flow rate over the course of an entire test.

OWM noted that, according to the 1949 NCWM S&T Committee Report, requirements to conduct “Special Tests” were established in 1949. The report states that “Special” tests are not defined in detail except that such tests shall include tests at specified minimum discharge rates; other details of “Special” tests are left to the judgment of the official. The primary purpose of the “Special” test is to determine the condition of the meter and determine whether or not the user is maintaining the equipment in proper operating condition. As noted in comments during the 2013 Interim Meeting, the results of a “Special” test, conducted at a slow flow rate, when compared with the result of a “Normal” test can indicate the condition of the meter. In general, the greater the difference between meter errors observed for the “Normal” and “Special” test, the stronger the indication that the meter is in need of reconditioning. It is questionable whether or not two tests conducted at flow rates that are not appreciably different will provide adequate information about the condition of a meter. If the features of a particular installation do not permit testing at the slower rates as currently required in paragraph N.4.2.4.Wholesale Devices, paragraph G‑UR.4.4. Assistance in Testing Operations may be applied to facilitate a proper test. OWM also pointed out that when this requirement was first added the dominant meter technology was positive displacement meters. Since that time a number of different technologies have been developed and it may be necessary to reassess what minimum testing is necessary. OWM also noted that in training provided by NIST on testing of these systems, OWM recommends running tests at slightly above the targeted flow rate; this helps to prevent the flow rate from dropping below the meter’s marked minimum flow rate and, thus, helps to ensure a fair test of the metering system. OWM also reiterated comments it made during the 2013 Interim Meeting concerning the need to develop testing requirements for equipment with multi-point calibration capability.

Mr. Andersen suggested that the specifics of what testing is required would best be addressed in the NIST EPOs. Mr. Karimov expressed concern about testing at flow rates which create pressures exceeding the rated pressure of the meter. The Committee heard additional comments from conference members expressing confusion over what minimum testing should be required.

Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress + Hauser), chairman of the NTEP Measuring Sector, recommended that the item be moved to an information status. He suggested asking the Sector to review this issue and provide suggestions to the Committee on how to best address special tests on wholesale devices. This suggestion was supported by several other NCWM members.

The Committee agreed to ask the Measuring Sector to review and provide suggestions on this issue. Consequently, it changed the status of this item from “Voting” to “Informational” to allow for additional input from the Sector and other interested parties.

330-4 I UR.3.3. Computing Device.

Source:

NCWM Task Group on Retail Motor Fuel Dispenser Price Posting and Computing Capability (2013)

Purpose:

Refine the criteria in the LMD Code related to price posting and computing capability of RMFDs for post-delivery discounted transactions to more clearly reflect the recommendations of the NCWM Task Group on RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability for the indication of the highest unit price.

Item under Consideration:

Amend paragraph UR.3.3.(c) as follows to: 1) add the underlined text; and 2) modify the alignment of the statement regarding electronic receipts following paragraph UR.3.3.(c)(2) such that it aligns with parts (a), (b), and (c):

**UR.3.3. Computing Device.** – Any computing device used in an application where a product or grade is offered for sale at one or more unit prices shall be used only for sales for which the device computes and displays the sales price for the selected transaction.

(Added 1989) (Amended 1992)

The following exceptions apply:

(a) Fleet sales and other price contract sales are exempt from this requirement.

(b) A truck stop dispenser used exclusively for refueling trucks is exempt from this requirement provided that:

(1) all purchases of fuel are accompanied by a printed receipt of the transaction containing the applicable price per gallon, the total gallons delivered, and the total price of the sale; and

(Added 1993)

(2) unless a dispenser complies with S.1.6.4.1. Display of Unit Price, the price posted on the dispenser and the price at which the dispenser is set to compute shall be the highest price for any transaction which may be conducted.

(Added 1993)

(c) A dispenser used in an application where a price per unit discount is offered following the delivery is exempt from this requirement, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) the unit price posted on the dispenser and the unit price at which the dispenser is set to compute **prior to the application of any discount** shall be the highest unit price for any transaction;

(2) all purchases of fuel are accompanied by a printed **or electronic** receipt **upon purchaser demand** recorded by the system for the transaction containing:

1. the product identity by name, symbol, abbreviation, or code number;
2. transaction information as shown on the dispenser at the end of the delivery and prior to any post-delivery discount including the:
3. total volume of the delivery;
4. unit price; and
5. total computed price of the fuel sale prior to post-delivery discounts being applied.
6. an itemization of the post-delivery discounts to the unit price; and
7. the final total price of the fuel sale.

For systems equipped with the capability to issue an electronic receipt, the customer may be given the option to receive the receipt electronically (e.g., via cell phone, computer, etc.)

(Added 2012)

(Added 1998) (Amended 1992, 1993, and 2012)

Background/Discussion:

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The NCWM Task Group (TG) on RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability met to review examples of receipts and scenarios for compliance with language adopted into NIST Handbook 44 in 2012 to address systems that are used to offer post-delivery discount pricing in retail motor-fuel dispensing applications. During that review, the TG noted that the language in paragraph UR.3.3.(c)(1) could be incorrectly interpreted to prohibit the application of both pre- and post-delivery discounts in a single transaction; the TG develop proposed changes to the paragraph to address this concern. The current language in (c)(1) states that, in order to qualify for the exemptions offered for post-delivery discounts, the unit price posted on the dispenser and the unit price at which the dispenser is set to compute shall be the highest unit price for any transaction. In instances where a customer elects to receive a discount prior to the delivery (i.e., a “pre-delivery” discount), this might create an unintended conflict. For example, if a customer elects to pay in cash at the start of the transaction, the dispenser might display and compute at a lower, cash unit price. Since UR.3.3.(c)(1) stipulates posting and computing at the highest unit price, some might interpret this to mean that this dispenser may not also participate in post-delivery discount pricing or be entitled to the exemptions in U.R.3.3.(c). The original intent of the changes proposed by the TG and adopted by the NCWM was not to restrict systems from participating in both pre- and post-delivery discounting. Consequently, the TG proposes changes as outlined in UR.3.3.(c)(1) in the Item Under Consideration above.

The TG also developed proposed changes to UR.3.3.(c)(2) as shows in the Item Under Consideration to acknowledge that: 1) the system must be able to provide a receipt to the customer, but the customer can be given an option of receiving the receipt or not; and 2) an electronic receipt is an acceptable alternative to a hard copy receipt if the purchaser agrees to an electronic receipt in lieu of, or in addition to, a hard copy. The Task Group believes that, should a customer prefer not to receive a receipt or prefer to receive it electronically, this should be permissible.

Lastly, the TG recommended changing the vertical alignment of the statement following UR.3.3.(c)(2) regarding the option of an electronic receipt so that it clearly applies to UR.3.3.(a), (b), and (c) rather than just part (c). As presently shown in NIST Handbook 44, this statement would apply only to UR.3.3.(c). The text shown in the Item Under Consideration above aligns that statement such that it would apply to UR.3.3.(a), (b), and (c).

The Committee agreed to add this item to its agenda to address these changes proposed by the TG. The Committee believes the proposed changes have merit and believe they simply clarify the original intent of the language developed by the TG and adopted by the NCWM. However, because the proposed changes were not available for publication and review in NCWM Publication 15, the Committee agreed that the item should be designated as an Informational item to allow adequate opportunity for the review and comment by all stakeholders potentially affected by the proposed changes. The Committee also believes this will provide an opportunity for input on the specific language to ensure that it clearly and adequately addresses the concerns identified by the TG.

The Committee agreed to retain Item 360-3 as a Developing Item while the TG continues work to develop guidelines and examples on how the changes made to the LMD Code in 2012 will apply to receipts for post‑delivery discounted transactions. See Item 360-3 for additional background information on this work.

2013 NEWMA Annual Meeting: NEWMA recommended this item be designated as a “Voting” Item on the NCWM Agenda in the 2014 NCWM cycle. NEWMA believes that the proposed changes will help clarify the intent of the WG’s original suggestion.

2013 CWMA Annual Meeting: The CWMA recommended the item be designated as an “Information” Item.

Two government representatives supported the proposed changes and one government representative indicated a neutral position on the item in the 2013 NCWM Online Position Forum.

2013 Annual Meeting: The Committee heard comments from OWM suggesting that the proposed modifications to UR.3.3.(c)(2) are unnecessary given that the paragraph already includes the following statement permitting the use of electronic receipts.

For systems equipped with the capability to issue an electronic receipt, the customer may be given the option to receive the receipt electronically (e.g., via cell phone, computer, etc.).

Similar provisions are included in paragraphs S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations and S.1.6.8. Recorded Representations for Transactions Where a Post-Delivery Discount(s) is Provided. NIST, OWM also noted that the proposed wording in UR.3.3.(c)(2) inadvertently requires that the system be capable of providing an electronic receipt upon customer demand, regardless of whether or not the system is capable of providing one. The Committee heard multiple comments in support of eliminating the proposed revisions to UR.3.3.(c)(2). The Committee also heard comments from multiple weights and measures jurisdictions expressing the need to retain the requirement for a hard copy receipt for those consumers who do not have access to an electronic version. Mr. Ross Andersen (New York, retired) noted the need to consider any requirements at the state level that apply to electronic records.

Comments received during the Open Hearings indicated that, in applications where receipts are required, the following principles should apply:

* A printed receipt must be made available to the customer.
* If a customer doesn’t want a receipt, it is not necessary to provide one.
* The customer may be given the option of receiving an electronic receipt in lieu of a printed receipt.

The Committee also heard comments from both weights and measures jurisdictions and industry representatives suggesting that a provision be added to the General Code recognizing the acceptance of electronic receipts. Mr. Matt Curran (Florida) commented that identifying and defining different types of discounts, such as “rebates,” would be helpful for consumers as well as officials in understanding how these requirements apply.

# 331 VEHICLE-TANK METERS

331-1 VC Table 1. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

NIST, Office of Weights and Measures (2013)

Purpose:

Resolve inconsistencies in the temperature ranges defined for Heated Products among NIST Handbook 44, Liquid-Measuring Devices, Vehicle Tank-Meters, and Mass Flow Meters Codes.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend Table 1 as follows:

| **Table 1.**  **Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accuracy Class** | **Application** | | **Acceptance Tolerance** | **Maintenance Tolerance** | **Special Test Tolerance** |
| 0.3 | * Petroleum products delivered from large capacity (flow rates over 115 L/min or 30 gpm)\*\* devices, including motor-fuel devices * Heated products (other than asphalt) at **~~or~~ temperatures** greater than 50 °C **(122 °F)** * Asphalt **at temperatures** equal to or below **~~a temperature of~~** 50 °C **(122 °F)** * All other liquids not shown in the table where the typical delivery is greater than 200 L (50 gal) | | 0.15 % | 0.3 % | 0.45 % |
| 0.3A | * Asphalt at temperatures greater than 50 °C **(122 °F)** | | 0.3 % | 0.3 % | 0.5 % |
| 0.5\* | * Petroleum products delivered from small capacity (at 4 L/min (1 gpm) through 115 L/min or 30 gpm)\*\* motor-fuel devices * Agri-chemical liquids * All other applications not shown in the table where the typical delivery is ≤ 200 L (50 gal) | | 0.3 % | 0.5 % | 0.5 % |
| 1.1 | * Petroleum products and other normal liquids from devices with flow rates\*\* less than 4 L/min (1 gpm) and * Devices designed to deliver less than 4 L (1 gal) | | 0.75 % | 1.0 % | 1.25 % |
| 1.5 | * Water | Overregistration | 1.5 % | 1.5 % | 1.5 % |
| Underregistration | 1.5 % | 1.5 % | 5.0 % |
| **\***  For 5 gal and 10 gal test drafts, the tolerances specified for Accuracy Class 0.5 in the table above do not apply. For these test drafts, the maintenance tolerances on normal and special tests for 5 gal and 10 gal test drafts are 6 in3 and 11 in3, respectively. Acceptance tolerances on normal and special tests are 3 in3 and 5.5 in3.  \*\* Flow rate refers to designed or marked maximum flow rate. | | | | | |
| (Added 2002) **(Amended 2013)** | | | | | |

Background/Discussion:

This item was initiated as a result of discussions at an NTEP measuring labs meeting and forwarded to the Measuring Sector for review in 2011. In reviewing criteria for heated products during discussions at the 2011 annual NTEP Laboratory Meeting, the Measuring Laboratories noted inconsistencies in the way that heated products are referenced in the LMD, VTM, and MFM Codes.

The differentiation between “heated” and “non-heated” products first appeared in NIST Handbook 44 in 2000 as a result of a proposal adopted by the NCWM in 1999 to expand the tolerances applicable to meters used to measure asphalt above 50 °C (see S&T Committee Items 330-6 and 337-4 in the 1999 NCWM S&T Committee Final Report for details). This reference was refined by the Committee in 2001 when changes were adopted to clarify the application of tolerances to asphalt at 50 °C in the LMD and MFM Codes. When the LMD and VTM Codes were modified in 2003 and 2004 to adopt an accuracy class table to mirror the MFM Code, inconsistencies first appeared in the way that heated products were referenced among the codes.

This proposal and similar proposals elsewhere in the Committee’s agenda, suggest changes to correct these inconsistencies. A summary of the proposals is listed below.

Section: 3.30. Liquid-Measuring Devices; Table T.2. (S&T Item 330-2)

Section: 3.31. Vehicle-Tank Meters; Table 1. (S&T Item 331-1)

Section: 3.37. Mass Flow Meters; Table T.2. (S&T Item 337-3)

NIST OWM notes that there also may be a need to address hot water meters (for which the American Water Works Association (AWWA) defines a boundary temperature of 90 °F) in NIST Handbook 44.

The proposed changes in these items take into account corresponding references to heated products in NCWM Publication 14, including the “Product Families Table” in Technical Policy C and past discussions at meetings of the NTEP Measuring Sector. Revisions are also proposed to ensure appropriate references to both Fahrenheit and Celsius temperatures.

NEWMA and SWMA supported moving this item forward as a Voting Item at their 2012 Annual Meetings. The SWMA also recommended that this item be consolidated with correlating items in the VTM and MFM during the voting process to help ensure consistency among these codes.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee received comments in writing from NIST, OWM as outlined in Item 330-2 and heard a synopsis of these comments from Ms. Juana Williams (NIST, OWM) during the Open Hearings. The Committee heard comments from Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress + Hauser), who agreed with NIST, OWM’s comments and further suggested that discussion be taken simultaneously on this item and Items 330-2 and 337-3 for expediency. Hearing no opposition to the proposed changes, the Committee agreed to move this item forward for a Vote.

2013 spring NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meetings: NEWMA and the CWMA supported the designation of this item as a Voting Item and agreed with the need to resolve current inconsistencies. Three government representatives indicated support and one government representative indicated a neutral position for this item on the NCWM Online Position Forum with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting: The Committee took comments on this item simultaneously with Items 330-2 and 337-3. See Item 330-2 for additional details.

331-2 VC T.4. Product Depletion Test

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (2009 Developing Items Part 3.31., Vehicle-Tank Meters - Item 1.)

Purpose:

Enable more consistent application of the tolerances between older and newer meters and address an unintentional gap that allows an unreasonably large tolerance for smaller meters.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend paragraph T.4. and delete Table T.4 as show below. Note that this option was identified as “Option 2” in the Committee’s 2012 Final Report.

**T.4. Product Depletion Test.** – The difference between the test result for any normal test and the product depletion test shall not exceed **~~tolerance shown in Table T.4.~~ 0.5 % of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated higher than 380 Lpm (100 gpm) or 0.6 % of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated 380 Lpm (100 gpm) or lower.** Test drafts shall be of the same size and run at approximately the same flow rate.

**Note:** The result of the product depletion test may fall outside of the applicable test tolerance as specified in Table 1. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters.

Delete current Table T.4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Table T.4.~~  ~~Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters on Product Depletion Tests, Except Milk Meters~~ | |
| **~~Meters Size~~** | **~~Maintenance and Acceptance Tolerances~~** |
| **~~Up to, but not including, 50 mm (2 in)~~** | **~~1.70 L (104 in~~~~3~~~~)~~~~1~~** |
| **~~From 50 mm (2 in) up to, but not including, 75 mm (3 in)~~** | **~~2.25 L (137 in~~~~3~~~~)~~~~1~~** |
| **~~75 mm (3 in) or larger~~** | **~~3.75 L (229 in~~~~3~~~~)~~~~1~~** |
| **~~Based on a test volume of at least the amount specified in N.3. Test Drafts.~~** | |

Background/Discussion:

This item was submitted to NEWMA at its 2008 Interim Meeting to propose an alternative to existing product depletion test tolerances which are based on the size of the meter. The Committee has agreed with the concept of basing the product depletion test tolerances on the marked maximum flow rate of the meter rather than on the marked meter size and considered several proposals for modifying the tolerances since this item was introduced in 2008. Details of these proposals and associated discussion can be found in the Committee’s 2009-2012 final reports.

While recognizing that one goal of the original proposal was to reduce what the submitter considered an unreasonably large tolerance for smaller meters, the Committee expressed concern about the impact the proposal would have on these meters based on comments from Meter Manufacturers Association (MMA). From 2009 to 2011, the Committee repeatedly requested data from industry and weights and measures officials to support or oppose the proposals under consideration. In late 2011, nine county jurisdictions submitted field test data to the Committee for review.

2012 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee considered three options for modifying NIST Handbook 44. A summary of how the three options would apply is outlined in the following table. A second table illustrating examples of tolerances for common meter sizes and maximum flow rates is also included.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of Product Depletion Tolerance Options Considered | | |
|  | Marked Maximum Flow Rate or Meter Size | Tolerance  (% of Marked Max Flow Rate) |
| **Current** | Up to but not including 2 in | 104 in3 |
|  | 2 in up to but not including 3 in | 137 in3 |
|  | 3 in and larger | 229 in3 |
| **Option 1:** | All Maximum Flow Rates | 0.5 % |
| **Option 2:** | Marked Max ≤ 100 gpm | 0.6 % |
|  | Marked Max > 100 gpm | 0.5 % |
| **Option 3:** | Marked Max ≤ 60 gpm | 0.8 % |
|  | Marked Max > 60 gpm up to and including 100 gpm | 0.6 % |
|  | Marked Max > 100 gpm | 0.5 % |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Examples of Product Depletion Tolerance Options for Different Meter Sizes/Flow Rates | | | | | |
| Size | Marked Maximum Flow Rate (gpm) | Current Tolerance | Option 1  (0.5 % max) | Option 2  (0.6 % max) (0.5 % max) | Option 3  (0.8 % max) (0.6 % max) (0.5 % max) |
| 1-1/2 in | 60 gpm | 104 in3 | 69 in3 | 83 in3 | 111 in3 |
| 2 in | 100 gpm | 137 in3 | 115 in3 | 139 in3 | 139 in3 |
| 2 in | 150 gpm | 137 in3 | 173 in3 | 173 in3 | 173 in3 |
| 3 in | 150 gpm | 229 in3 | 173 in3 | 173 in3 | 173 in3 |
| 3 in | 200 gpm | 229 in3 | 231 in3 | 231 in3 | 231 in3 |
| 3 in | 300 gpm | 229 in3 | 346 in3 | 346 in3 | 346 in3 |
| 3 in | 350 gpm | 229 in3 | 404 in3 | 404 in3 | 404 in3 |

The Committee requested and received product depletion test data from multiple weights and measures jurisdictions. A summary of the data for each jurisdiction can be viewed in the Committee’s 2012 Final Report. The following table provides a summary of the data for all jurisdictions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total  Meters | Failed Current Tolerance | Failed Option 1 | Failed Option 2 | Failed Option 3 | Marked Maximum Flow Rate |
| Summary of All Jurisdictions | 156 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 60 gpm |
| 1463 | 53 | 91 | 52 | 52 | 100 gpm |
| 222 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | > 100 gpm |
| 81 | 26 | 26 | 20 | 20 | No Info |
| Totals | **1922** | **94** | **141** | **93** | **87** |  |

While acknowledging that the data was not obtained under controlled conditions or as part of a structured study, the Committee noted that the data was extremely valuable in assessing the relative impact of the three options proposed. The Committee agreed that Option 2 represented a reasonable compromise between the original proposal, Option 1, and the MMA’s proposal, Option 3. The Committee proposed this option as an Informational Item to allow time for any additional input with the intent of moving the item to Voting in 2013.

2012 fall regional NCWM Annual Meeting: ¨The Committee heard comments from MMA supporting the proposal.

2012 fall regional meetings: The weights and measures associations supported proposing Option 2 as a Voting Item in 2013. At the fall 2012 SWMA meeting, Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress + Hauser) reported on behalf of the Measuring Sector that the Sector thoroughly discussed this issue at its October 2012 meeting and agreed that Option 2 should be proposed for a Vote.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments from Mr. Ross Andersen (New York, retired) and Mr. Dmitri Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation, LLC) supporting the proposed changes and encouraging the Committee to finalize the language. Hearing no opposition to the proposal, the Committee agreed to move it forward for a Vote.

2013 NEWMA and the CWMA Annual Meetings: Comments were heard indicating that the expression of the tolerance as it applies to a “volume delivered in one minute” may be confusing to some.

To address this concern, NEWMA proposed including a table illustrating common examples of meter flow rates (similar to the table shown earlier in this item) be added to the NIST EPOs to assist field officials and industry in understanding the intended application of the requirements. The CWMA proposed the following changes to paragraph T.4. Product Depletion Test shown in Item Under Consideration:

* **T.4. Product Depletion Test.** – The difference between the test result for any normal test and the product depletion test shall not exceed **~~tolerance shown in Table T.4.~~ 0.5 % of ~~the volume delivered in one minute at~~ the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated higher than 380 Lpm (100 gpm) or 0.6 % of ~~the volume delivered in one minute at~~ the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated 380 Lpm (100 gpm) or lower.** Test drafts shall be of the same size and run at approximately the same flow rate.

Both NEWMA and the CWMA recommended the item be designated as a Voting Item.

Two government representatives indicated support and two government representatives indicated a neutral position for this item on the NCWM Online Position Forum with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting: The Committee considered the additional revisions proposed by the CWMA to remove the reference to “the volume delivered in one minute.” OWM noted that this would result in a tolerance expressed in gallons per minute. The phrase “the volume delivered in one minute” may seem a bit unwieldy; however, the flow rate marked on most meters is expressed in terms of a quantity per time such as “liters per minute” or “gallons per minute.” If the reference to the time period of “one minute” were deleted from the paragraph as suggested by the CWMA, the application of the tolerance would result in a “quantity per minute” rather than a finite “quantity in liters” or “quantity in gallons.”

For example, if a meter were marked with a maximum flow rate of 100 gpm, the tolerance would be applied as follows:

0.6 % × 100 gal/min = 0.6 gal/min

In contrast, applying the tolerance to that same meter as specified in the Item Under Consideration would result in a tolerance expressed in gallons as illustrated below:

Amount delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter =

1 min × 100 gal/min = 100 gal

Tolerance = 0.6 % × 100 gal = 0.6 gal

Thus, OWM believes that it would be incorrect to remove the phrase “the volume delivered in one minute” from the paragraph. The suggestion provided by NEWMA may provide a more palatable alternative to help illustrate how the tolerance is applied and OWM could include such examples in both the NIST EPOs and training materials.

Consequently, the Committee agreed with the Item Under Consideration as originally proposed. The Committee concurred with NEWMA’s suggestion to include examples in the NIST EPOs and training materials.

# 336 WATER METERS

336-1 V UR.3. Installation Requirements

(This item was returned to Committee.)

Source:

Neptune Technology Group Inc. (2013)

Purpose:

Establish installation requirements in the Water Meters Code.

Item Under Consideration:

Add a new paragraph UR.3. as follows:

### UR.3. Installation Requirements.

UR.3.1. Manufacturer’s Instructions. – A water meter shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions. For utility type water meters, the installation shall be sufficiently secure and rigid to maintain this condition.

**Background/Discussion:**

There are no installation requirements for utility type meters in the Water Meters Code of NIST Handbook 44. The submitter proposed the following new paragraph be added to Section 3.36.:

### UR.3. Installation Requirements.

### UR.3.1. Manufacturer’s Instructions. – A utility type water meter shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions, and the installation shall be sufficiently secure and rigid to maintain this condition.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Mr. Andre Noel (Neptune) indicated that Neptune, Badger, Sensus, Elster-AMCO, and Master Meter support this item. Mr. Ron Hassmeyer (Alameda County, California) supported the item, but voiced concerns related to installation such as meter visibility. Ms. Kristin Macey (California) advised that there may be possible conflicts with other code language coming from other organizations such as AWWA and the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The WWMA found it reasonable that the manufacturer’s instructions would be the basis for such installations. This proposal is similar to language used in NIST Handbook 44, LMD Code paragraph UR.2.1.; MFM Code paragraph UR.2.1.; and Hydrogen Gas-Measuring Devices Code paragraph UR. 2.1. The WWMA also noted that UR.2. Accessibility of Customer Indications already addresses the issues of visibility. WWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee heard comments in support of the proposal from Mr. Noel, who indicated that he also spoke on behalf of Badger, Sensus, Elster-AMCO, and Master Meter and noted that the proposed change would mirror similar paragraphs in other NIST Handbook 44 measuring device codes. Mr. Jim Byers (San Diego County, California) stated that he agreed with the proposed requirement, but notes that the General Code already addresses these requirements. He suggested that, if the language in the General Code is not sufficient, then that language should be reviewed and revised rather than including additional language in the specific code. Ms. Kristin Macy (California) stated that California agrees with Mr. Byers and believes that the language in the General Code is sufficient. Ms. Juana Williams (NIST, OWM) also acknowledged the similarity with language in other codes.

While the Committee acknowledged comments regarding the redundancy of the proposed paragraph with current General Code requirements, the Committee believes the proposal has merit in helping to ensure proper installation of water meters. The Committee believes the requirement in the first sentence of the proposed paragraph regarding compliance with the manufacturer’s instructions should apply to all water meters, not just utility type meters. Consequently, the Committee modified the language to restrict only the second sentence to utility type water meters and agreed to propose the modified paragraph (as shown in the Item Under Consideration above) for a Vote.

2013 Annual Meetings: NEWMA and the CWMA recommended this item be designated as Voting.

One government representative indicated support; one government representative indicated a neutral position; and one government representative indicated opposition for this item on the NCWM Online Position Forum. The opposing comment was accompanied by a statement indicating that paragraph G-UR.2.1. is adequate to address this concern and that paragraph is also more complete and better articulates the requirements.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, the Committee heard comments in opposition to this item from Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress & Hauser Flowtec AG, USA) and Ms. Macey suggesting that the adding of requirements to address installation would be redundant. Mr. Keilty expressed concern that the absence of specific requirements such as these in *all* specific device codes might cause confusion about how or if the General Code paragraph would apply in those cases. Ms. Macey also expressed opposition to distinguishing between non-utility type and utility type water meters. NIST, OWM commented that the proposed language is consistent with that appearing in other device codes in NIST Handbook 44 and intended for the same purpose. The Committee received letters of support from Badger Meter; Elster AMCO Water, LLC; Sensus; Master Meter, Inc.; and Neptune Technology Group. Mr. Dmitri Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation), speaking on behalf of the companies who were unable to attend this meeting and the Meter Manufacturers Association, also expressed support for this item.

# 337 Mass Flow METERS

337-1 I Appendix D – Definitions: Diesel Liter and Diesel Gallon Equivalents (DLE, DGE)

Source:

Clean Vehicle Education Foundation (2013)

Purpose:

Enable consumers to make cost and fuel economy comparisons between diesel fuel and natural gas.

Item Under Consideration:

Add the following definitions to Appendix D – Definitions:

**Diesel Liter Equivalent (DLE). - means 0.756 kg of natural gas.**

**Diesel Gallon Equivalent (DGE). - means 2.863 kg (6.312 lb) of natural gas.**

**Background/Discussion:**

The gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE) unit was defined by NIST/NCWM in 1994 (See Appendix A) to allow users of natural gas vehicles to readily compare costs and fuel economy of light-duty natural gas vehicles with equivalent gasoline powered vehicles. For the medium and heavy duty natural gas vehicles in widespread use today, there is a need to officially define a unit (already in widespread use) allowing a comparison of cost and fuel economy with diesel powered vehicles. Also natural gas is sold as a vehicle fuel as either Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) or Liqufied Natural Gas (LNG) and each method of sale is measured in mass. Therefore, the generic term, natural gas is proposed to be used in NIST Handbooks 44 and 130 with out the existing term "compressed." The mathematics justifying the specific quantity (mass) of natural gas in a DLE and DGE is included in Appendix A.

The official definition of a DLE and a DGE will likely provide justification for California, Wisconson, and any other state to permit retail sales of LNG for heavy-duty vehicles in these convenient units.

2012 Interim Meeting: CWMA supported putting definitions of diesel liter equivalent and diesel gallon equivalent for natural gas into NIST Handbook 44, provided that FALS confirms the conversion factor prior to voting. CWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Williams, NIST Technical Advisor advised that there are corresponding L&R Items 232-1&237**-**1,and suggested that the S&T and L&R Committees need to work on these items in tandem. The Committee believed this item has merit. The WWMA expressed concerns with the source of equivalency values derived, noting it would like validation as to whether the values accurately represent the actual value of various types of natural gas products. The WWMA realized there are different compositions and sources. For example, LNG has a higher methane composition. There may be a possibility of additional conversion factors based on BTUs from different sources. The WWMA S&T Committee acknowledged meeting with the WWMA L&R Committee regarding this item. The two committees differed in their recommendations, between Informational and Developmental Item Status on the NCWM agenda. WWMA forwarded the item to NCWM recommending it as a Developing Item.

2012 Interim Meeting: NEWMA agreed to forward the item to NCWM, recommending it as an Informational Item.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress + Hauser) noted some confusion about the values designated in the proposal. He also commented that there appears to be confusion about what the dispenser will display, particularly for dispensers that will serve vehicle types that run on gasoline as well as vehicle types that could run on diesel. He asked whether the units will display in both GLE/GGE and DLE/DGE and how the dispenser will display this information. He suggested that this item be designated as a Developing Item to allow additional time to address these concerns. The SWMA reported that it did not believe that the proposal had been adequately developed with regard to the application of the proposed definitions, including aspects such as vetting of these values within the industry relative to actual gas supplies; explanation of how this will be applied consistently; and provisions for ensuring clear and understandable value comparisons by consumers (particularly given variations in gas supplies); and how this will apply to dispensers that may be used to fuel vehicles conventionally fueled by gasoline or diesel. The SWMA questioned whether it might be more appropriate for the community to consider establishing mass as the method of sale for natural gas and providing educational information through mechanisms such as pump toppers that would enable the consumer to compare the fuel costs with gasoline- or diesel-powered vehicles. This approach would eliminate concerns about designating equivalent values that may not accurately represent the product being sold through a specific dispenser. SWMA unanimously agreed to forward the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Developing Item with development assigned to the submitter.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee heard multiple comments in opposition to the proposal. Mr. Keilty opposed the proposal, noting that a truck running on LNG would be dedicated to that type of fuel; thus, there is no need to make comparisons with diesel fuel on an ongoing basis. He believes natural gas should be sold in units of mass. Ms. Williams reviewed the following points prepared by OWM and suggested that the Committee consider these points in its deliberations on the proposals for this Item and Item 337-2. A copy of these points was also provided to the S&T Committee and the L&R Committee in writing in advance of the Interim Meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Collaborative Work Effort***  Work in joint session with the NCWM L&R Committee on corresponding L&R Agenda Items 232-1 (a proposal to recognize the diesel volume equivalent MOS for vehicle fuel) and 237-1 (a proposal to define the diesel volume equivalent unit in relation to mass) which specify the allowable unit of measurement for advertising and sale of natural gas. This collaboration between Committees will ensure that the proposed volume equivalent unit for a delivery is properly indicated and calculated by a natural gas dispenser.  ***Facilitate Marketplace-Value Comparisons***  A dispenser might serve vehicles that are powered by diesel or gasoline fuel. Therefore, which volume equivalent unit (the DGE or GGE) is appropriate to avoid confusing the consumer? What is the most appropriate means to provide sufficient information to customers attempting to make a comparison of fuel offered by the DGE and GGE, whether at the same station or stations on adjacent street corners? Today’s value comparisons are made to petroleum products, but as other alternative fuels proliferate how easy will it be for consumers to make comparisons to other fuels such as electricity or hydrogen?  An alternative that would provide more flexibility for comparison with other fuels and which would potentially create less confusion than permitting multiple different “equivalent” values as “units” of measure is to require the sale of all natural gas in mass units (kg or lb) as suggested by the SWMA. With this approach, customers could still be provided with supplemental information through mechanisms such as pump toppers that provide information about estimated equivalent units of measurement for deliveries indicated in mass as well as information on web sites such as those that already provide information about fuel economy. This approach might also reduce complaints from some suppliers about the accuracy of equivalent values relative to their product.  Another point that has been raised by some in the community and should be considered by the Committee is whether or not “equivalent values” are as necessary as they might have been at one time to encourage consumer acceptance of natural gas as an alternative fuel. For example, the SWMA questioned whether, once a consumer has purchased a vehicle he or she has the need to make ongoing value comparisons or whether this information is more useful prior to purchasing a vehicle. Given the concerns about consumer confusion with a potential proliferation of “equivalent” values at the dispenser, perhaps requiring mass units on the dispenser (with supplemental information about equivalents) is a more appropriate approach.  ***Compliance of Existing Approved Equipment-Indications***  As noted above, NIST OWM suggests the Committee consider SWMA’s recommendation for equipment to indicate in a mass unit of measurement. Currently, there are two LNG dispensers with NCWM NTEP Certificates of Conformance (CC). They are NCWM CC 02-075A2\* (Chart Industries) and NCWM CC 04-073A1 (NorthStar, Inc.), which specify these dispensers display in mass. How will the proposal apply to this equipment that may not have the capability to display in units other than mass?  ***Earlier S&T Committee Positions***  Does the S&T Committee plan to revisit its 1999 recommendation where it requested data on LNG be submitted prior to the recognition of this product in a metering application? The Committee might also recall that the S&T Committee took a position in 2008 on a related proposal to recognize the “DGE” recommending that a consensus between stakeholders exist on any single energy value used as a conversion factor. NIST OWM notes that several CNG suppliers have raised concerns about the use of 5.660 lb of CNG for each GGE commenting that this value is too low for the fuel they are providing to customers. OWM asks are other Sectors, which rely on the accurate accounting of vehicle motor fuel sales, aware of and in agreement with the proposed mass to volume equivalent unit being proposed as a conversion factor value for natural gas (CNG and LNG)?  The data for the heating values cited in Table B.4. “Heat Content for Various Fuels” in the Transportation Energy Data Book Edition 30 (June 2011) was not developed as part of an NCWM study, but represents an account of work by a government sponsored agency to characterize transportation activity and other factors that influence transportation energy use. The book includes a disclaimer which states “in any attempt to compile a comprehensive set of statistics on transportation activity, numerous instances of inadequacies and inaccuracies in the basic data are encountered;” points out that “an appendix is included to document the estimation procedures;” and notes that “neither ORNL nor DOE endorses the validity of these data.” |

Ms. Kristin Macey (California) opposed the proposal and urged the Committee to stop the proliferation of “equivalent units.” She noted that mass units are perfectly good for routine transactions and echoed comments that comparisons with other fuels are only relevant when making a purchase decision. Ms. Carol Hockert (NIST, OWM) further suggested that, during its deliberations, the Committee should consider how the establishment of artificial units would affect metrological traceability. Mr. Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation, LLC), speaking on behalf of MMA, agreed with Ms. Hockert, noting that extensive work is done by companies to establish and maintain metrological traceability and the establishment of what amounts to arbitrary values is counterproductive. Mr. Dan Peterson (Yokogawa Corporation of America) echoed all of the statements made in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Curtis Williams (CP Williams Energy Consulting) stated that he has had concerns about the use of the GGE and GLE for some years and he is glad that some are questioning the need to reconsider the use of equivalent units. As a participant in the U.S. National Working Group on Hydrogen, he was grateful that the associated code for that alternative fuel established requirements for mass units. He suggested that the Committee also consider examining the potential use of mass units for other fuels and noted that the use of mass units also eliminates questions about temperature compensation.

Ms. Judy Cardin (Wisconsin) acknowledged the need for the L&R Committee and the S&T Committee to work together on this and related items. She cited two main tasks to be addressed as: 1) What is the right conversion value for the proposed units?; and 2) Should units for the sale of natural gas be in “equivalent” units or mass units?

The Committee heard no comments in support of the proposal during its Open Hearings.

During its work sessions at the Interim Meeting, the S&T Committee met with the L&R Committee to discuss this item and related items on the two Committees’ agendas; the corresponding items on the L&R Committee Agenda are Items 232-1 and 237-1. During the joint meeting, the L&R Committee advised the S&T Committee that it had decided to make the related item on their agenda “Informational” to allow additional time for the community to study the issue and hear from other stakeholders in the community. A proposal was made to ask the FALS to deliberate on an appropriate equivalent value for each of the proposed “units.” However, the two Committees recognized that before asking the FALS to expend resources on further definition, the questions and concerns raised in the Open Hearings regarding the appropriateness of recognizing such units should first be addressed. The Committees agreed to recommend to the NCWM Chairman that a small task group be established to further study this issue. The Committees each agreed to develop a list of tasks that they would ask such a task group to take on and to recommend possible members of the group to ensure balanced representation of stakeholders.

After discussion with the L&R Committee, the S&T Committee reviewed and summarized key comments made during the Open Hearings for S&T Committee Agenda Items 337-1 and 337-2:

* Are equivalent units necessary to promote consumer acceptance of this fuel?
* Is there a significant need for continued comparison to other fuels once you have purchased a vehicle? Does this justify the proliferation of “equivalent” values?
* The intent is to add this for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles such as trucks that operate on LNG. Trucks that operate on LNG are generally dedicated fuel vehicles that run only on a single fuel.
* Is the dispenser the appropriate place to make comparisons with other fuels or is a better place to make those comparisons via mechanisms such as pump toppers, websites, etc.?
* Striking the word “compressed” (in the changes proposed in Item 337-2) expands the proposal to LNG.
* California’s approval of LNG meters indicating in mass units was correct.
* What will the impact be on existing approval of LNG dispensers currently indicating in mass?
* There is much opposition to the proliferation of “equivalent units” for various types of fuels.
* The current recognition of GGE and GLE units has led to complaints about equivalent values from both industry and regulatory officials.
* Mass units should be considered for natural gas and other fuels.
* Will the establishment of equivalent values provide traceability to SI units?
* The community expends significant resources to achieve good meter performance and establishing “fuzzy” equivalent values seems to undermine these efforts.
* The factor for any “equivalent unit” will represent only an “estimate” of an equivalent value.
* There is disagreement amongst the industry regarding the appropriate equivalent value in this proposal. The report containing the data that is referenced as the basis for the proposal includes a disclaimer from Oakridge National Laboratory and U.S. Department of Energy regarding its validity for other than general use in the transportation industry.
* The S&T Committee only heard comments in opposition to the proposal.
* Harmonization with OIML requirements should be considered in the method of sale and associated device requirements.

With respect to Items 337-1 and 337-2, the Committee agreed to work collaboratively with the L&R Committee and to develop a small work group to decide: 1) whether or not DLE and DGE should be considered an acceptable method of sale for natural gas; and 2) if so, what should the factor be to determine their equivalents to gasoline. The Committee agreed that the above list of key points and questions heard during its Open Hearings should be considered, along with other Open Hearing comments, by the chairs of both the L&R and S&T Committee in the development of a list of points to be addressed by the Task Group.

2013 Annual Meeting: NEWMA recommended this item be withdrawn and commented that item that does not belong in NIST Handbook 44. NEWMA believes the consumer would be better served with comparisons or equivalents being made available through other sources more readily utilized by consumers (e.g., consumer websites or perhaps on new vehicle window stickers).

2013 Annual Meeting: CWMA recommended the item be withdrawn in consideration of comments made in opposition to the item during the 2013 Interim Meeting.

On the NCWM Online Position Forum one government representative indicated support; one government representative indicated a neutral position; and one government representative indicated opposition for this item. The neutral position was accompanied by a comment suggesting the establishment of a joint Task Group and encouraging a final recommendation that would clarify whether the proposed units are or are not permitted. The opposing position was accompanied by a comment indicating opposition to artificial units of measure.

Prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting, NCWM Chairman, Mr. Steve Benjamin, appointed the “NCWM Natural Gas Steering Committee,” which will be chaired by Mr. Mahesh Albuquerque (Colorado). The primary charge of the Committee is to educate the membership regarding: the technical issues surrounding this application; the rationale for the proposed changes; the anticipated impact of the proposed changes and issues related to their implementation. The Committee was asked to identify and address questions raised during the 2013 Interim Meeting as well as other venues in an effort to enable NCWM members to make informed decisions about proposals under consideration in this area.

Also prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting, the Committee received a proposal from Mr. Douglas Horne (Clean Vehicle Education Foundation) to modify the Item Under Consideration. Mr. Horne proposed separate definitions for CNG and LNG gallon equivalent values. The Committee suggested he work with the steering committee to further refine the proposal and suggest changes to the item as appropriate. Mr. Horne’s proposals will be posted on the NCWM website with other documents relative to the Committee’s final report. While submitted in an NCWM Form 15 template, Mr. Horne’s proposal is not addressing a new issue, but rather providing comments on a current item (Item 337-1) on the Committee’s agenda.

During its 2013 Annual Meeting Open Hearings, the Committee heard an update from Steering Committee Chairman, Mr. Albuquerque. He reported that the Steering Committee met for the first time on Sunday, July 14 at the beginning of the Annual and gathered input from those in the audience. Comments indicated that consumers may find gallon equivalent information to be helpful, but the most equitable method for measuring and selling the product is based on mass measurement.

The S&T Committee heard overwhelming comments opposing the use of gallon equivalents and favoring the use of mass as the method of sale. The Committee also heard multiple comments indicating concern about the establishment of a value that would be an approximation of the actual equivalent for a given transaction. Mr. Horne reported that some states have already or are in the process of enacting defined “gasoline equivalent” values; some adopted earlier versions of the equivalent and some are considering new values as outlined in Mr. Horne’s most recent proposal.

Ms. Macey noted that the NCWM successfully adopted a method of sale for hydrogen fuel based on mass and suggested that the natural gas be held to the same standard. Mr. Keilty commented that sale of natural gas as a vehicle fuel has proliferated globally and those sales are based on mass units.

NIST, OWM acknowledged appreciation of the establishment of the Steering Committee to further study this issue. NIST, OWM encourages the S&T Committee, the Steering Committee, and the weights and measures community to consider the points raised by OWM during the 2013 Interim Meeting as well as the following in their deliberations of Items 337-1 and Item 337-2:

In addition to discussing the proposals in Items 337-1 and 337-2, OWM requests that the Task Group specifically discuss and consider whether or not the continued use of the terms “GLE” and “GGE” are appropriate for commercial CNG metering applications. NIST, OWM makes this request based on many of the same points made by OWM at the 2013 Interim Meeting and also given that:

1. this market is well established and consumer confidence and acceptance of CNG and other alternative fuels is not contingent upon continued comparisons with gasoline;
2. there are other methods for comparing relative efficiency and costs with gasoline;
3. experience with feedback from the community indicates problems with the application and validity of these units with changing gas supplies;
4. the proposal in Items 337-1 and 337-2 proposes language which would address natural gas as a whole and it is, therefore, appropriate to raise the discussion of whether or not the continued use of non-traceable units is appropriate. Additionally, OWM suggests that a proposal to eliminate the use of the terms “GLE” and “GGE” in favor of indications in mass units be developed and considered by the NCWM to ensure commercial transactions for natural gas are based on NIST traceable units of measure; and
5. as the number of viable alternative fuel options increase, providing a relatively static comparison with only one alternative fuel will not serve the broad needs of consumers and will make it unlikely that the dispenser is the appropriate location to provide comparison information.

The Committee also heard a comment from Mr. Karimov suggesting that volume units be permitted as a method of sale for LNG.

While many people expressed an understanding of the need for consumers to make comparisons with gasoline, comments indicate that such comparisons would typically be made prior to the purchase of a vehicle and possibly for a short time while becoming accustomed to the vehicle. The Committee heard comments indicating that weights and measures officials would be amenable to permitting the posting or displaying of supplemental information regarding gallon equivalent values.

Additional Contacts: Clean Energy, Seal Beach, CA, NGVAmerica, Washington, DC, Clean Vehicle Education Foundation, Acworth, GA

337-2 I S.1.2. Compressed Natural Gas Dispensers, S.1.3.1.1. Compressed Natural Gas Used as an Engine Fuel, S.5.2. Marking of Gasoline Volume Equivalent Conversion Factor

**Source:**

Clean Vehicle Education Foundation (2013)

Purpose:

Enable consumers to make cost and fuel economy comparisons between diesel fuel and natural gas.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend paragraphs S.1.2., S.1.3.1.1., and S.5.2. as follows:

**S.1.2. ~~Compressed~~ Natural Gas Dispensers.** – Except for fleet sales and other price contract sales, a **~~compressed~~** natural gas dispenser used to refuel vehicles shall be of the computing type and shall indicate the quantity, the unit price, and the total price of each delivery. The dispenser shall display the mass measured for each transaction either continuously on an external or internal display accessible during the inspection and test of the dispenser, or display the quantity in mass units by using controls on the device.

(Added 1994)

**S.1.3.1.1. ~~Compressed~~ Natural Gas Used as an Engine Fuel.** – When **~~compressed~~** natural gas is dispensed as an engine fuel, the delivered quantity shall be indicated in**:** **~~“gasoline liter equivalent (GLE) units” or “gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE) units” (see definitions).~~**

**(a) "gasoline liter equivalent (GLE) units" or gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE) units",**

**(b) "diesel liter equivalent (DLE) units" or "diesel gallon equivalent (DGE) units" (see definitions).**

(Added 1994)

**S.5.2. Marking of Diesel and Gasoline Volume Equivalent Conversion Factor.** – A device dispensing **~~compressed~~** natural gas shall have**:** **~~either the statement “1 Gasoline Liter Equivalent (GLE) is Equal to 0.678 kg of Natural Gas” or “1 Gasoline Gallon Equivalent (GGE) is Equal to 5.660 lb of Natural Gas” permanently and conspicuously marked on the face of the dispenser according to the method of sale used.~~**

**(a) either the statement "1 Gasoline Liter Equivalent (GLE) is Equal to 0.678 kg of Natural Gas" or "1 Gasoline Gallon Equivalent (GGE) is Equal to 5.660 lb of Natural Gas",**

**(b) either the statement "1 Diesel Liter Equivalent (DLE) is Equal to 0.756 kg of Natural Gas" or "1 Diesel Gallon Equivalent (DGE) is Equal to 6.312 lb of Natural Gas" permanently and conspicuously marked on the face of the dispenser according to the method of sale used.**

(Added 1994)

**Background/Discussion:**

The gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE) unit was defined by NIST/NCWM in 1994 (see Appendix A) to allow users of natural gas vehicles to readily compare costs and fuel economy of light-duty natural gas vehicles with equivalent gasoline powered vehicles. For the medium and heavy duty natural gas vehicles in widespread use today, there is a need to officially define a unit (already in widespread use) allowing a comparison of cost and fuel economy with diesel powered vehicles. Also natural gas is sold as a vehicle fuel as either Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) or Liqufied Natural Gas (LNG) and each method of sale in measure in mass. Therefore, the generic term “natural gas” is proposed to be used in NIST Handbooks 44 and 130 with out the existing term "compressed". The mathematics justifying the specific quantity (mass) of natural gas in a DLE and DGE is included in Appendix A.

The official definition of a DLE and a DGE will likely provide justification for California, Wisconsin, and any other state to permit retail sales of LNG for heavy-duty vehicles in these convenient units.

2012 CWMA Interim Meeting: The CWMA supported putting definitions of diesel liter equivalent and diesel gallon equivalent for natural gas into NIST Handbook 44, provided that FALS confirms the conversion factor prior to voting. CWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item with this provision.

2012 NEWMA Interim Meeting: NEWMA recommended that this item be forwarded to the NCWM as an Informational Item and suggested it be assigned to the FALS.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Williams (NIST Technical Advisor) advised that there is corresponding L&R Items 232-1and237**-**1and S&T and L&R need to work on these items in tandem. The WWMA believed this item has merit. The WWMA has expressed concerns with the source of equivalency values derived and reported it would like validation as to whether the values accurately represent the actual value of various types of natural gas products. The WWMA realized there are different compositions and sources. For example, LNG has a higher methane composition. There may be a possibility of additional conversion factors based on BTUs from different sources. The WWMA S&T Committee met with the WWMA L&R Committee regarding this item, but differed on their recommendations regarding whether the status of the related items on their agendas should be Informational or Developmental. The WWMA forwarded this item to NCWM, recommending it as a Developing Item.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: Mr. Michael Keilty (Endress + Hauser) noted that there appears to be confusion about what the dispenser will display, particularly for dispensers that will serve vehicle types that run on gasoline as well as vehicle types that could run on diesel. He asked whether the units will display in both GLE/GGE and DLE/DGE and how the dispenser will display this information. He suggested that this item be designated as a “Developing” item to allow additional time to address these concerns. The SWMA reported that it did not believe that the proposal had been adequately developed with regard to the application of the proposed code changes, including aspects such as vetting of the referenced values within the industry with relative to actual gas supplies; explanation of how these requirements will be applied consistently; and provisions for ensuring clear and understandable value comparisons by consumers (particularly given variations in gas supplies); and how this will apply to dispensers that may be used to fuel vehicles conventionally fueled by gasoline or diesel. The Committee questioned whether it might be more appropriate for the community to consider establishing mass as the method of sale for natural gas and providing educational information through mechanisms such as pump toppers that would enable the consumer to compare the fuel costs with gasoline or diesel powered vehicles. This approach would eliminate concerns about designating equivalent values that may not accurately represent the product being sold through a specific dispenser. SWMA unanimously agreed to forward the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Developing Item with development assigned to the submitter.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: the Committee heard comments from Mr. Keilty who expressed concern about the adoption of the proposed equivalent value as a unit of measure. He noted that the intent of this item is not to allow the user to toggle between mass units and equivalent units at the push of a button. He also noted that, if the units are set as “DLE” or “DGE,” the customer cannot also view units in “GLE” or “GGE.” Mr. Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation, LLC), indicated opposition to the proposal to strike the work “compressed.” Ms. Williams referenced NIST, OWM’s comments made in association with Agenda Item 337-1 and suggested that the Committee consider those same comments in their deliberations of this item.

The Committee heard no comments in support of the proposal during its Open Hearings. See Item 337-1 for details regarding the S&T Committee’s collaborations with the NCWM L&R Committee on Items 337-1 and 337-2 on the S&T Committee’s agenda and Items 232-1 and 237-1 on the L&R Committee’s agenda.

2013 NEWMA Annual Meeting: It was recommended the item be Withdrawn and commented that item that does not belong in NIST Handbook 44. NEWMA believes the consumer would be better served with comparisons or equivalents being made available through other sources more readily utilized by consumers (e.g., consumer websites or perhaps on new vehicle window stickers).

2013 CWMA Annual Meeting: The CWMA recommended the item be withdrawn in consideration of comments made in opposition to the item during the 2013 Interim Meeting.

On the NCWM Online Position Forum, two government representatives indicated a neutral position and one government representative indicated opposition for this item. The neutral position was accompanied by a comment suggesting the establishment of a Joint Task Group and encouraging a final recommendation that would clarify whether the proposed units are or are not permitted. The opposing position was accompanied by a comment indicating opposition to artificial units of measure and noting that establishment of DGE and DLE values perpetuate the use of artificial units.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting:  The Committee heard comments on Item 337-1 and Item 337-2 jointly. Details of comments are included in Item 337-1.

Additional Contacts: Clean Energy, Seal Beach, California, NGVAmerica, Washington, DC, Clean Vehicle Education Foundation, Acworth, Georgia.

337-3 VC Table T.2. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Mass Flow Meters

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

NIST, Office of Weights and Measures (2013)

Purpose:

Resolve inconsistencies in the temperature ranges defined for Heated Products among NIST Handbook 44, Liquid-Measuring Devices, Vehicle Tank-Meters, and Mass Flow Meters Codes.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend Table T.2. as follows:

| **Table T.2.**  **Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Mass Flow Meters** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accuracy Class** | **Application or Commodity**  **Being Measured** | **Acceptance Tolerance** | **Maintenance Tolerance** | **Special Tolerance** |
| 0.3 | * Large capacity motor-fuel dispensers (maximum discharge flow rates greater than 100 L/min or 25 gal/min) * Heated products **(other than asphalt) equal to temperatures greater than 50 °C (122 °F)** * Asphalt **at temperatures** at or below **~~a temperature of~~** 50 °C **(122 °F)** * Loading rack meters * Vehicle-tank meters * Home heating oil * **~~Asphalt at or below 50 °C~~** * Milk and other food products * All other liquid applications not shown in the table where the minimum delivery is at least 700 kg (1500 lb) | 0.2 % | 0.3 % | 0.5 % |
| 0.3A | * Asphalt at temperatures greater than 50 °C **(122 °F)** | 0.3 % | 0.3 % | 0.5 % |
| 0.5 | * Small capacity (retail) motor-fuel dispensers * Agri-chemical liquids * All other liquid applications not shown in the table where the minimum delivery is less than 700 kg or 1500 lb | 0.3 % | 0.5 % | 0.5 % |
| 1.0 | * Anhydrous ammonia * LP Gas (including vehicle-tank meters) | 0.6 % | 1.0 % | 1.0 % |
| 2.0 | * Compressed natural gas as a motor-fuel | 1.5 % | 2.0 % | 2.0 % |
| 2.5 | * Cryogenic liquid meters * Liquefied compressed gases other than LP Gas | 1.5 % | 2.5 % | 2.5 % |
| (Added 1994) (Amended 1999**, ~~and~~** 2001 **and 2013**) | | | | |

Background/Discussion:

This item was initiated as a result of discussions at an NTEP measuring labs meeting and forwarded to the Measuring Sector for review in 2011. In reviewing criteria for heated products during discussions at the 2011 annual NTEP Laboratory Meeting, the Measuring Laboratories noted inconsistencies in the way that heated products are referenced in the LMD, VTM, and MFM Codes.

The differentiation between “heated” and “non-heated” products first appeared in NIST Handbook 44 in 2000 as a result of a proposal adopted by the NCWM in 1999 to expand the tolerances applicable to meters used to measure asphalt above 50 °C (see S&T Committee Items 330-6 and 337-4 in the 1999 NCWM S&T Committee Final Report for details). This reference was refined by the Committee in 2001 when changes were adopted to clarify the application of tolerances to asphalt at 50 °C in the LMD and MFM Codes. When the LMD and VTM Codes were modified in 2003 and 2004 to adopt an accuracy class table to mirror the MFM Code, inconsistencies first appeared in the way that heated products were referenced among the codes.

This proposal, and similar proposals elsewhere in the Committee’s agenda, suggests changes to correct these inconsistencies. A summary of the proposals is listed below.

Section: 3.30 Liquid-Measuring Devices; Table T.2. (S&T Item 330-2)

Section: 3.31 Vehicle-Tank Meters; Table 1. (S&T Item 331-1)

Section: 3.37 Mass Flow Meters; Table T.2. (S&T Item 337-3)

NIST, OWM notes that there may also be a need to address hot water meters (for which the American Water Works Association (AWWA) defines a boundary temperature of 90 °F) in NIST Handbook 44.

The proposed changes in these items take into account corresponding references to heated products in NCWM Publication 14, including the “Product Families Table” in Technical Policy C and past discussions at meetings of the NTEP Measuring Sector. Revisions are also proposed to ensure appropriate references to both Fahrenheit and Celsius temperatures.

2012 NEWMA and SWMA Annual Meeting: The associations supported moving this item forward as a Voting Item. The SWMA also recommended that this item be consolidated with correlating items in the VTM and MFM during the voting process to help ensure consistency among these codes.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee received comments in writing from NIST, OWM as outlined in Item 330-2 and heard a synopsis of these comments from Ms. Juana Williams (NIST, OWM) during the Open Hearings. Hearing no opposition to the proposed changes, the Committee agreed to move this item forward for a Vote.

2013 NEWMA and the CWMA Annual Meetings: The associations supported the designation of this item as a Voting Item and agreed with the need to resolve current inconsistencies. Three government representatives indicated support and one government representative indicated a neutral position for this item on the NCWM Online Position Forum with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting: The Committee took comments on this item simultaneously with Items 330-2 and 331-1. See Item 330-2 for additional details.

# 354 Taximeters

354-1 D Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters

*Note: At the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee considered a proposal to amend Section 5.54. in NIST Handbook 44 to make it specifically apply to Global Positioning System (GPS) system applications used commercially to compute fares based upon distance and/or time measurements. There was no specific language proposed for consideration. That item (Item 354-1) has been combined with 2013 Agenda “Item 360-5, S.5. Provision for Security Seals” and “Item 360-6 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters” to create a new, consolidated Developing Item. The consolidated Developing Item is designated as “Item 360-5 titled “USNWG on Taximeters – Taximeter Code Revisions and Global Positioning Systems for Time and Distance Measurement.” See Item 360-5 for details.*

# 356 GRAIN MOISTURE METERS

356-1 VC Table S.2.5. Categories of Device and Methods of Sealing

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

NTEP Grain Analyzer Sector (2013)

Purpose:

Clarify that the requirements of Category 3 apply whether accessed manually using the keyboard or accessed by remote means, and that these requirements apply to all the subcategories of Category 3.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend Table S.2.5. as follows:

| ***Table S.2.5.***  ***Categories of Device and Methods of Sealing*** | |
| --- | --- |
| ***Categories of Device*** | ***Methods of Sealing*** |
| ***Category 1:****No remote configuration capability.* | *Seal by physical seal or two event counters: one for calibration parameters (000 to 999) and one for configuration parameters (000 to 999). If equipped with event counters, the device must be capable of displaying, or printing through the device or through another on-site device, the contents of the counters.* |
| ***Category 2:****Remote configuration capability, but access is controlled by physical hardware.*  *A device shall clearly**indicate that it is in the remote configuration mode and shall not be capable of operating in the measure mode while enabled for remote configuration.* | *The hardware enabling access for remote communication must be at the device and sealed using a physical seal or two event counters: one for calibration parameters (000 to 999) and one for configuration parameters (000 to 999). If equipped with event counters, the device must be capable of displaying, or printing through the device or through another on-site device, the contents of the counters.* |
| ***Category 3:****Remote configuration capability access may be unlimited or controlled through a software switch (e.g., password).*  *When accessed* ***~~remotely~~*** *for the purpose of modifying sealable parameters, the device shall clearly indicate that it is in the configuration mode and shall not be capable of operating in the measuring mode.* | *An event logger is required in the device; it must include an event counter (000 to 999), the parameter ID, the date and time of the change, and the new value of the parameter (for calibration changes consisting of multiple constants, the calibration version number may be used rather than the calibration constants). A printed copy of the information must be available through the device or through another on-site device. The event logger shall have a capacity to retain records equal to twenty-five (25) times the number of sealable parameters in the device, but not more than 1000 records are required. (Note: Does not require 1000 changes to be stored for each parameter.)* |
| ***Category 3a:****No remote capability, but operator is able to make changes that affect the metrological integrity of the device (e.g., slope, bias, etc.) in normal operation.*  ***\*When accessed for the purpose of modifying sealable parameters, the device shall clearly indicate that it is in the configuration mode and shall not be capable of operating in the measuring mode.*** | *Same as Category 3* |
| ***Category 3b:****No remote capability, but access to metrological parameters is controlled through a software switch (e.g., password).*  ***\*When accessed for the purpose of modifying sealable parameters, the device shall clearly indicate that it is in the configuration mode and shall not be capable of operating in the measuring mode.*** | *Same as Category 3* |

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1999 and \*January 1, 2014]*

Background/Discussion:

All of the grain moisture meters (GMMs) in Categories 3, 3a, and 3b of Table S.2.5. use an electronic method of sealing, and most of them also offer access to the configuration mode thorough a keyboard entered password. In this mode, sealable parameters can also be changed locally through the keyboard. Category 3 of Table S.2.5. currently includes the following requirement:

When accessed remotely for the purpose of modifying sealable parameters, the device shall clearly indicate that it is in the configuration mode and shall not be capable of operating in the measuring mode.

At its 2011 Grain Analyzer Sector Meeting the Sector agreed that the following changes to Table S.2.5. of §5.56.(a) of NIST Handbook 44 should be forwarded to the S&T Committee for consideration:

* Add a note to Table S.2.5. to recognize the expanded scope of remote capability.
* Delete “remotely” from the second paragraph of Category 3 requirements that begins, “When accessed remotely …” to make it clear that the requirements of Category 3 apply whether accessed manually using the keyboard or accessed by remote means.
* Add the modified second paragraph of Category 3 requirements to Categories 3a and 3b to make it clear that these requirements apply to all the subcategories of Category 3.

After additional review of this item, NIST, OWM recommended that the changes to Table S.2.5. approved by the Sector in 2011 be separated into two independent proposals, one dealing with the changes to Category 3 and its subcategories (as shown in this proposal), and the other recommending a modification of the definition of remote configuration capability appearing in Appendix D of NIST Handbook 44 to recognize the expanded scope of remote capability, instead of adding a note to the bottom of Table S.2.5. to expand the definition of remote configuration for grain moisture meters. A change to the definition of remote configuration capability will apply to other device types.

2012 Grain Analyzer Sector Meeting: The Sector agreed to separate its original proposal into two separate proposals and that the following changes to Table S.2.5. of §5.56.(a) of NIST Handbook 44 should be forwarded to the S&T Committee for consideration:

* Delete “remotely” from the second paragraph of Category 3 requirements that begins, “When accessed remotely …” to make it clear that the requirements of Category 3 apply whether accessed manually using the keyboard or accessed by remote means.
* Add the modified second paragraph of Category 3 requirements to Categories 3a and 3b to make it clear that these requirements apply to all the subcategories of Category 3.

This proposal is consistent with the philosophy of sealing for grain moisture meters. Item 4 of the NTEP, Grain Analyzer Sector August 2012 Meeting Summary covers this subject and will be available on NCWM’s Website November 2012.

2012 CWMA Interim Meeting: CWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Juana Williams (NIST, OWM) expressed general support for the intent of this item; that the device should indicate when it is in configuration mode and not be capable of operating in the measuring mode. The Committee acknowledged the proposed recommendation from the NTEP Grain Analyzer Sector to add a note to Table S.2.5. to expand the scope of remote capability by modifying its definition for remote configuration capability as shown in S&T Item 356-3. The Committee did not support that item. WWMA forwarded this item to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: There were no comments. The Committee acknowledged that the proposal is supported by the NTEP Grain Sectors. Recognizing the expertise of the Sector members, the Committee believed it is appropriate to support the proposal as recommended by the Work Group. SWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Voting Item.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments from Ms. Williams (NIST, OWM) who noted that OWMagrees withthe Sector’s decision to separate their original proposal into two parts. OWM also agreed with the elimination of the note originally proposed for Table S.2.5. OWM also believes the proposed change to require Category 3 devices, including these classified as subcategories 3a and 3b devices clearly indicate when they are in the configuration mode and not be capable of operating in the measuring mode is appropriate. These proposed changes are generally consistent with the sealing requirements for all similar tables in Section 3 of NIST Handbook 44. The Committee may wish to consider proposing similar changes where appropriate in other NIST Handbook 44 device codes. The Committee heard no other comments on this item. Hearing no opposition to the proposed changes, the Committee agreed to recommend the proposal for a Vote.

2013 Annual Meetings of NEWMA and the CWMA: The associations supported this item as a Voting Item. On the NCWM Online Position Forum, one government representative supported the proposal, with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard no comments in opposition to this item. NIST, OWM reiterated its comments from the 2013 Interim Meeting.

356-2 VC UR.3.4. Printed Tickets

(This item was adopted.)

Source:

Grain and Feed Association of Illinois (2012)

Purpose:

Change the mandatory printing of tickets from grain moisture meters to an on demand at the time of transaction printing and remove the requirement of printing the calibration version identification. Note that the Committee did not agree with proposed removal of the requirement to print the calibration version identification; this position is reflected in the version of the proposal currently under consideration by the Committee.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend paragraph UR.3.4. as follows:

**UR.3.4. Printed Tickets.**

1. Printed tickets shall be free from any previous indication of moisture content or type of grain or seed selected.
2. The customer shall be given a printed ticket **at the time of the transaction or as otherwise specified by the customer. The printed ticket shall include ~~showing~~** the date, grain type, grain moisture results, test weight per bushel, and calibration version identification. The ticket **information** shall be generated by the grain moisture meter system.

(Amended 1993, 1995, **~~and~~** 2003**, and 2013**)

Background/Discussion:

According to the submitter, the user requirement to provide a printed ticket for every single load is unrealistic in the country elevator industry. Traffic patterns at country elevators do not lend themselves to providing a printed ticket to all customers and customers really don’t want them. As the speed and capacity increases in the industry, outbound scales are being located at a distance from the inbound scale and the scale house where the moisture tester is located to alleviate traffic bottlenecks. When the outbound scale is located away from where the ticket is printed, the truck driver must circle back around to pick up the ticket, thus, causing logistical problems. In addition, since meters are sealed, inspected, and required to have the correct calibration, there is no need for the calibration version identification to be printed on the ticket. Also, most customers are not going to know if it is the correct calibration version identification or not. There have been problems getting the information from the grain moisture meter to the grain accounting system – especially the calibration version identification. Some grain accounting systems have to be “hard coded” for calibration version identification which must be changed whenever the calibration changes. The change will be at an added cost for the industry.

When a consumer pays at a gas pump, they have the option of a receipt on demand at the time of transaction or not receiving a receipt. There would be a cost savings to moisture meter users as they would save on paper and filing space, and in the situation where the calibration version identification is “hard coded,” there will be a cost savings of the expense to have the grain accounting software provider make those changes.

Since moisture meters are capable of printing the ticket, some would argue that they should just go ahead and print them and provide them to the customer. In addition, the requirement does not say when the ticket shall be given to the customer; thus, the printed tickets could be saved for weeks, months, or even years in case the customer had a concern at some point. Printing the calibration version identification ensures the correct calibration is being used.

The submitter proposed amendments to paragraph UR.3.4. Printed Tickets which would allow the customer to dictate whether or not a printed ticket is needed for a given transaction but would not require printing of the calibration version identification on the ticket. In 2011 and 2012, the Committee received comments supporting changes to the language that would allow the customer to specify whether or not he or she wanted a printed ticket. However, the Committee heard opposition from the NTETC Grain Sector and others to deleting the calibration version information from the ticket. Consequently, the proposal was revised to maintain the reference to calibration version information as shown in the Item Under Consideration. Additional details can be found in the Committee’s 2011 and 2012 Final Reports.

2012 CWMA Interim Meeting: It was recommended that the item be Withdrawn; however, the association supported the item as a Voting Item at its 2013 Annual Meeting.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: The association received no comments on this item. The WWMA believed the intent in the amended proposed language is similar to other codes in NIST Handbook 44 and sufficiently gives options of how printed tickets are provided to the customer. WWMA supported the item and recommended that it be a Voting Item.

2012 NEWMA Interim Meeting and 2013 Annual Meeting: NEWMA supported this item as a Voting Item at both meetings.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: The SWMA received no comments. The Committee recognized that the NCWM S&T Committee designated this as an Information Item to allow additional time for the weights and measures community, including the original submitter, to review the changes made to the proposal during the 2012 NCWM Interim Meeting. The Committee believes that adequate time has elapsed to allow for comment. The Committee noted that the NTEP Grain Analyzer Sector has also reviewed the proposal, as modified, and has expressed no opposition. SWMA recommended that the item be a Voting Item.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments from Ms. Juana Williams (NIST, OWM) who noted that OWM believes the suggested changes to UR.3.4. Printed Tickets are appropriate and notes that the language is similar to other codes in NIST Handbook 44. OWM agrees with the Grain Analyzer Sector’s decision to retain the requirement for recording the “calibration version identification.” NIST, OWM noted that while “Category 3” devices would require the printing of the calibration version identification information, not all grain moisture meters are “Category 3” devices. Having this information printed on receipts provides customers and officials with the means to verify that correct calibration settings are being used for a given transaction. The Committee received no other comments on this item. Hearing no opposition to the proposed changes, the Committee agreed to recommend the proposal for a Vote.

On the 2013 NCWM Online Position Forum, one government representative opposed the proposal, with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard no comments in opposition to this item. NIST, OWM reiterated its comments from the 2013 Interim Meeting.

356-3 D Appendix D – Definitions: Remote Configuration Capability

*Note: Following deliberations at the NCWM 2013 Interim Meeting, the Committee designated this item as a Developing Item. It has been moved to the Developing Items section of the agenda and designated as Item 360-7.*

# 360 OTHER ITEMS – DEVELOPING ITEMS

360-1 D International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) Report

Many issues before the OIML, the Asian-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum, and other international groups are within the purview of the Committee. Additional information on OIML activities will appear in the NCWM Board of Directors agenda, interim and final meeting reports, and on the OIML website at www.oiml.org. NIST, OWM staff will provide the latest updates on OIML activities during the Open Hearings at NCWM meetings. For more information on specific OIML related device activities, contact the NIST, OWM staff listed in the table below. The list below of OIML projects only represents active projects.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NIST Office of Weights and Measures**  **Staff Contact List for International Activities** | | | | |
| **Contact Information** | | **Responsibilities** | | |
| **Mr. John Barton – LMDP**  Phone: (301) 975-4002  Email: [john.barton@nist.gov](mailto:john.barton@nist.gov) | | * R 21 *Taximeters* * R 50 *Continuous Totalizing Automatic Weighing Instruments (Belt Weighers)* * R 60 *Metrological Regulations for Load Cells* * R 106 *Automatic Rail‑weighbridges* | | |
| **Mr. Kenneth Butcher – LMP**  Phone: (301) 975-4859  Email: [k.butcher@nist.gov](mailto:k.butcher@nist.gov) | | * TC 6 *Prepackaged Products* | | |
| **Dr. Charles Ehrlich – ILMP**  Phone : (301) 975-4834  Email : [charles.ehrlich@nist.gov](mailto:charles.ehrlich@nist.gov) | | * International Committee of Legal Metrology Member for the U.S. * V1 *International Vocabulary of Terms in Legal Metrology* * V2 *International Vocabulary of Basic and General Terms in Metrology* * B 3 *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments* * B 6 *OIML Directives for the Technical Work* * B 10 *Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement* *on OIML Type Evaluations* * TC 3/SC 5 *Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement in Legal Metrology Applications, Guidelines for the Application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the Assessment of Laboratories Performing Type Evaluation Tests* * TC 3 *Metrological Control* * ISO/IEC *Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement* | | |
| **Mr. Richard Harshman – LMDP**  Phone: (301) 975-8107  Email: [richard.harshman@nist.gov](mailto:richard.harshman@nist.gov) | | * R 51 *Automatic Catchweighing Instruments* * R 61 *Automatic Gravimetric Filling Instruments* * R 76 *Non-automatic Weighing Instruments* * R 107 *Discontinuous Totalizing Automatic Weighing Instruments* (totalizing hopper weighers) * R 134 *Automatic Instruments for Weighing Road Vehicles In‑Motion and Measuring Axle Loads* | | |
| **Ms. Diane Lee – LMDP**  Phone: (301) 975-4405  Email: [diane.lee@nist.gov](mailto:diane.lee@nist.gov) | | * R 59 *Moisture Meters for Cereal Grains and Oilseeds* * R 92 *Wood Moisture Meters – Verification Methods and Equipment* * TC 17/SC 8 *Protein Measuring Instruments for Cereal Grains and Oil Seeds* | | |
| **Mr. Ralph Richter – ILMP**  Phone: (301) 975-3997  Email: [ralph.richter@nist.gov](mailto:ralph.richter@nist.gov) | | * D 11 *General Requirements for Measuring Instruments – Environmental Conditions* * R 35 *Material Measures of Length for General Use* * R 49 *Water Meters* (Cold Potable Water and Hot Water Meters) * R 71 *Fixed Storage Tanks* * R 80 *Road and Rail Tankers* (static measurement) * R 85 *Automatic Level Gauges for Measuring the Level of Liquid in Fixed Storage Tanks* * R 95 *Ship’s Tanks* * R 117 *Measuring Systems for Liquids Other Than Water* (all measuring technologies) * R 118 *Testing Procedures and Test Report Format for Pattern Examination of Fuel Dispensers for Motor Vehicles* * TC 3/SC 4 *Verification Period of Utility Meters Using Sampling Inspections* * R 137 *Gas Meters* (all measuring technologies) * R 140 *Measuring Systems for Gaseous Fuel* (i.e., large pipelines) * ISO TC 30/SC 7 *Water Meters* | | |
| **Dr. Ambler Thompson – ILMP**  Phone: (301) 975-2333  Email: [ambler@nist.gov](mailto:ambler@nist.gov) | | * V1 *International Vocabulary of Terms in Legal Metrology* * D 16 *Principles of Assurance of Metrological Control* * D 19 *Pattern Evaluation and Pattern Approval* * D 20 *Initial and Subsequent Verification of Measuring Instruments and Processes* * D 27 *Initial Verification of Measuring Instruments Using the Manufacturer’s Quality Management System* * D 31 *General Requirements for Software Controlled Measuring Instruments* * R 34 *Accuracy Classes of Measuring Instruments* * R 46 *Active Electrical Energy Meters for Direct Connection of Class 2* | | |
| **Ms. Juana Williams – LMDP**  Phone: (301) 975-3989  Email:  [juana.williams@nist.gov](mailto:juana.williams@nist.gov) | | * R 81 Dynamic Measuring Devices and Systems for Cryogenic Liquids * R 139 Compressed Gaseous Fuels Measuring Systems for Vehicles | | |
| **List of Acronyms** | | | | |
| B | Basic Publication | | LMDP | Legal Metrology Devices Program |
| CIML | International Committee of Legal Metrology | | P | Project |
| D | Document | | R | Recommendation |
| ILMP | International Legal Metrology Program | | SC | Subcommittee |
| LMP | Laws and Metrics Program | | TC | Technical Committee |

The WWMA and the SWMA support these issues and the related device activities as an Informational Item. At the 2012 NEWMA Interim Meeting it was noted that Dr. Charles Ehrlich (NIST, OWM) does a great job at annual and interim meetings explaining OIML issues. NEWMA supports the efforts of NIST to harmonize with OIML wherever possible to create a marketplace that reflects the global marketplace of today.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Carol Hockert (NIST, OWM) reported that OIML will be meeting in Bucharest, Romania, in October of 2012. The Committee looks forward to any future report updates following this meeting. WWMA recommended that the item remain as a Developing Item.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: SWMA unanimously recommended that the item remain as a Developing Item.

**Contact Point:** See contacts listed in the table above for specific technical areas.

360-2 D G-S.1. Identification. – (Software)

Source:

This item originated from the NTEP Software Sector and first appeared on NCWM S&T Committee’s 2007 agenda as Developing Item Part 1, Item 1 and in 2010 as Item 310-3.

Purpose:

Provide marking requirements that enable field verification of the appropriate version or revision for metrological software, including methods other than “permanently marked,” for providing the required information.

Item Under Consideration:

Amend NIST Handbook 44*:* G S.1. Identification and G S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-for-Purpose, Software-Based Devices as follows:

**G-S.1. Identification.** – All equipment, except weights**,** **~~and~~** separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect, ***and software-based devices covered in G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information\****, shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:

***[\*Nonretroactive as of January 1, 20XX]***

(Amended 20XX)

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

*(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word “Model,” “Type,” or “Pattern.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word “Model” shall be “Mod” or “Mod.” Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]*

(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

*(c) a non-repetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts* ***~~and not built-for-purpose software-based software device~~****;*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]*

(Amended 2003 **and 20XX**)

1. *The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986]*

1. *Abbreviations for the word “Serial” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “S,” and abbreviations for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.).*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]*

1. *the current software version or revision identifier for* ***~~not-built-for-purpose~~******software-based electronic*** *devices;*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]*

(Added 2003) **(Amended 20XX)**

1. *The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]*

(Added 2006)

1. *Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]*

(Added 2006)

*(e) an NTEP CC number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC. The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms “NTEP CC,” “CC,” or “Approval.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.)*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]*

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device.

(Amended 1985, 1991, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, **~~and,~~** 2006**, and 20XX**)

***G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for ~~Not-Built-For-Purpose~~ all Software-Based Devices.*** *– For* ***~~not-built-for-purpose,~~*** *software-based devices, either:*

1. *The required information in G S.1. Identification.* ***~~(a), (b), (d), and (e)~~*** *shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or*
2. *The Certificate of Conformance (CC) Number shall be:*
3. *permanently marked on the device;*
4. *continuously displayed; or*
5. *accessible through* ***~~an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, “Help,” “System Identification,” “G S.1. Identification,” or “Weights and Measures Identification.”~~******one or, at most, two levels of access.***
6. ***For menu based systems, “Metrology,” “System Identification,” or “Help.”***
7. ***For systems using icons, a metrology symbol “(M)”, “(SI),” or a help symbol (“?,” “i,” or an “i" within a magnifying glass).***

***Note:*** *For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G S.1. (a), (b), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.*

*[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]*

(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 **and 20XX**)

Background/Discussion:

Among other tasks, the NTEP Software Sector was charged by the NCWM Board of Directors to recommend NIST Handbook 44 specifications and requirements for software incorporated into weighing and measuring devices, which may include tools used for software identification. During its October 2007 meeting, the Sector discussed the value and merits of required markings for software, including possible differences in some types of software-based devices and methods of marking requirements. After hearing several proposals, the Sector agreed to the following technical requirements applicable to the marking of software:

1. The NTEP CC Number must be continuously displayed or hard-marked;
2. The version must be software-generated and shall not be hard-marked;
3. The version is required for embedded (Type P) software;
4. Printing the required identification information can be an option;
5. Command or operator action can be considered as an option in lieu of a continuous display of the required information; and
6. Devices with Type P (embedded) software must display or hard-mark the device make, model, and serial number to comply with G S.1. Identification.

In 2008, the Software Sector developed and submitted a proposal to the NCWM S&T Committee to modify G-S.1. and associated paragraphs to reflect these technical requirements. Between 2008 and 2011, this item appeared on the S&T Committee’s main agenda and the Committee and the Sector received numerous comments and suggestions relative to the proposal. The Sector developed and presented several alternatives based on feedback from weights and measures officials and manufacturers. Among the key points and concerns raised during discussions over this period were how to address the following:

1. **Limited Character Sets and Space.** – How to address devices that have limited character sets or restricted space for marking.
2. **Built-for-Purpose vs. Not-Built-for-Purpose.** - Whether or not these should be treated differently.
3. **Ease of Access.** – Ease of accessing marking information in the field.

* Complexity of locating the marking information
* Use of menus for accessing the marking information electronically
* Limits on the number of levels required to access information electronically
* Possibility of single, uniform method of access

1. **Hard Marking vs. Electronic.** – Whether or not some information should be required to be hard marked on the device.
2. **Continuous Display.** – Whether or not required markings must be continuously displayed.
3. **Abbreviations and Icons.** – Establishment of unique abbreviations, identifiers, and icons and how to codify those.
4. **Certificate of Conformance Information.** – How to facilitate correlation of software version information to a CC, including the use of possible icons.

Further details on the alternatives considered can be found in the Committee’s Final Reports from 2008 to 2011.

2011 NCWM Interim Meeting: The S&T Committee concurred with the Software Sector Chair that this item is not ready to move forward as a Voting Item. The Committee recommended the Sector review a number of specific comments and points (see the Committee’s 2011 Final Report for details.)

2011 NCWM Annual Meeting: The Committee heard support for the continued work of the Sector. The 2011 S&T Committee designated this item as a Developing Item to provide the Software Sector additional time to more fully develop the item. The Committee looked forward to considering the Sector’s future recommendations.

2011 fall Regional Meetings: The regional weights and measures associations noted the importance of this work. All regional associations recommended that the item remain as a Developing Item to allow the Sector to further develop the issue. The regional associations also reported a desire to receive an update on the progress of the Software Sector regarding this item. Three of the regions recommended the item remain Developing. NEWMA recommended the item be Withdrawn unless new information is introduced.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: No comments were received relative to this item during the Open Hearings. In considering the item, the Committee questioned whether or not the Software Sector was still actively working the item. It was reported that the Software Sector believed they had developed the item as much as possible, yet the different stakeholders affected by the proposal could not agree on the changes that the Sector had proposed. Based upon that update, the Committee agreed to add to its report a request that the Software Sector work with the Weighing Sector and Measuring Sector to identify which portions of the proposal need to be modified in order that they might be accepted by the entire community. The Committee acknowledges and appreciates the efforts of the Software Sector and looks forward to being able to consider a proposal that addresses both the identification of software and how it may be accessed.

The following draft update from the Software Sector regarding this item was forwarded to the Committee just prior to the 2013 NCWM Annual Meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **Software Sector Meeting - March 2013:** The Sector considers this item sufficiently developed.  During the 2013 Meeting, the Sector agreed to modify slightly the previously language to address some of the concerns received via feedback from other sectors and interested parties. The following changes to that language are proposed:  *NIST Handbook 44 – Proposed changes:*  **G-S.1. Identification.** – All equipment, except weights and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect**,** shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:  (a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;  (b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;  *(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word “Model,” “Type,” or “Pattern.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word “Model” shall be “Mod” or “Mod.” Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]*  (Added 2000) (Amended 2001)  (c) *a nonrepetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts and* ***~~not-built-for-purpose software-based software devices~~ software****;*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]*  (Amended 2003)   * 1. *The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.*   *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986]*   * 1. *Abbreviations for the word “Serial” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “S,” and abbreviations for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.).*   *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]*   1. *the current software version or revision identifier****~~for not-built-for-purpose software-based electronic devices~~****, which shall be directly linked to the software itself;*   *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]*  (Added 2003) **(Amended 20XX)**   1. *The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.*   *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]*  (Added 2006)   1. *Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).*   *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]*  (Added 2006)  ***(3) The version or revision identifier shall be accessible via the display. Instructions for displaying the version or revision identifier shall be described in the CC. As an exception, permanently marking the version or revision identifier shall be acceptable under the following conditions:***   1. ***The user interface does not have any control capability to activate the indication of the version or revision identifier on the display, or the display does not technically allow the version or revision identifier to be shown (analog indicating device or electromechanical counter) or*** 2. ***the device does not have an interface to communicate the version or revision identifier.***   (e) an NTEP CC number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC.  *(1) The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms “NTEP CC,” “CC,” or “Approval.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.)*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]*  The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device. (Amended 1985, 1991, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, **~~and,~~** 2006 **and 20XX**)  ***G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for ~~Not-Built-For-Purpose~~ All Software-Based Devices.*** *– For* ***~~not-built-for-purpose,~~*** *software-based devices, either:*  *(a) The required information in G-S.1. Identification. (a), (b),* ***~~(d),~~*** *and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or*  *(b) The CC Number shall be:*  *(1) permanently marked on the device;*  *(2) continuously displayed; or*  *(3) accessible through an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, “Help,” “System Identification,” “G-S.1. Identification,” or “Weights and Measures Identification.”*  ***Note:*** *For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G-S.1. (a), (b), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]*  (Added 2003) (Amended 2006 **and 20XX**)  The Sector reported that the new language in G-S.1.1 reflects that the Sector reached consensus on the following positions:   * The software version/revision should (with very few exceptions – see D-31, 5.1.1.) be accessible via the user interface. * The means by which the software version is accessed must be described in the Certificate of Conformance (CC).   The Sector noted that since the 2012 meeting, the Sector has attempted to promote this item via several means to try and address the concerns of other interested parties. A presentation was generated and shared with the S.M.A. at their 2012 meeting. Most of the regions had access to this information prior to their meetings, as it was posted on the NCWM website. Unfortunately, based on the comments in the 2013 NCWM Publication 15, Item 360-2, some regions were not aware that this information had been made available. The Sector also noted that they may want to consider more direct methods, in other words, designating a representative to address the regional groups or other sectors at their meetings. The Annual Meeting may be an appropriate venue for a presentation. To move this forward, someone should address the regional groups. There are five to six potential venues for presentations. The last slide from the current presentation should be eliminated, to avoid confusing matters, for the time being. The two regional meetings in the fall (Western and Southern) and the Interim Meeting are probably more critical than the ones in May. Dr. Thompson was asked to relay that we have a presentation available and would like to push our proposal as a Voting Item in 2014.  After removing the “and inseparably” terminology from the proposal, the concerns on the possibility of controversy were reduced.  The Sector’s opinion on the interpretation of “directly linked” is that it means that you can’t change the version/revision without changing the software.  In addition, it was noted that it may be desirable to evaluate options that would lead to fully eliminating G-S.1.1. It was noted that this would be a more invasive modification to the existing Handbook and perhaps should be put off until the first step of addressing software in all devices (not just standalone) was accomplished.  The one response to our request for review/comment that contained negative feedback was undeniably vague and non-constructive. The issue seems to be more one of communication/understanding than disagreement with the intent or wording.  It was recommended that a couple examples be added to the current slide presentation, to illustrate the intent of the proposed changes. One example might be supermarket-specific software designed to run upon a cash register. Another example might be, after a software change, noting that the new software version/revision number is no longer the same, and the operator was not prompted to enter a version/revision number. |

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard a comment from Mr. Tim Tyson (Kansas), who recognized the Sector’s work on this item and suggested that consideration be given to changing the status of the item to Informational status. In considering this suggestion during its work session, the Committee agreed that the change might be appropriate; however, decided instead to seek input from the NTEP Sectors and industry associations before making that decision. Consequently, the Committee requested that the Sectors and industry associations review the Software Sector’s latest proposal at their next meetings.

360-3 D Part 3.30. Price Posting and Computing Capability and Requirements for a Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser (RMFD)

Source:

NIST, OWM and the Regional Weights and Measures Associations (2008)

Purpose:

Review and update criteria in the LMD Code related to price posting and computing capability of RMFDs to reflect current market practices.

Item under Consideration:

The NCWM Task Group on RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability developed specific proposals for modifying the LMD Code to address price posting and computing requirements for RMFDs. These proposals were adopted by the NCWM in 2012 and published in the 2013 NIST Handbook 44; they are being revisited at the request of the NCWM S&T Committee who has asked the Task Group to complete its review of sample receipts and provide guidance on applying the new criteria. Item 360-3 is being retained as a Developing Item pending any additional assignments that may be given by the Committee to the Task Group relative to the implementation of new code requirements that may be adopted. Comments or inquiries may be directed to NIST Technical Advisor, Ms. Juana Williams, at (301) 975-3989 or juana.williams@nist.gov.

Background/Discussion:

In the early 1990s, various sections of the LMD Code in NIST Handbook 44 were modified to address multi-tier pricing applications in instances where the same product is offered at different unit prices based on the method of payment (such as cash or credit) or other conditions of the sale. Since that time, marketing practices have evolved to include the addition of new practices, such as frequent shopper discounts and club member discounts. Numerous questions have been posed to NIST OWM and weights and measures officials regarding the requirements for posting unit prices, calculation of total price, customer-operated controls, and other related topics, such as definitions for associated terminology. It is clear from these questions that changes are needed to NIST Handbook 44 to ensure the requirements adequately address current marketplace conditions and practices. The Committee agreed that changes are needed to the LMD Code relative to these issues, and in 2010 the Committee established a task group to further develop this issue and present an alternative recommendation for its consideration.

Additional details on this item can be found in the Committee’s 2008 - 2012 Final Reports.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Williams reported that the NCWM Task Group (TG) on RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability recently reviewed and approved NIST editorial changes to NIST Handbook 44, Section 3.30. Liquid-Measuring Devices, paragraph S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price. The TG Chair, Ms. Fran Elson‑Houston (Ohio), continues to communicate with the NCWM S&T Committee Chairman and the NCWM Chairman to determine if the TG has any remaining assignments. Mr. Kurt Floren (Los Angeles County, California) encouraged feedback and input after everyone reviews the six paragraphs that will go into NIST Handbook 44 January 2013. He also suggested reviewing how these changes affect real life applications. The WWMA suggested the TG remain in place for at least a year after implementation of these six new requirements because it has the best knowledge of this issue to deal with any implementation issues that surface. WWMA recommended that the item remain as a Developing Item.

2012 NEWMA Interim Meeting: The association supported the efforts of the working group and recommended that the item remain as a Developing Item.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: The NCWM S&T Chairman reported that the NCWM S&T Committee has asked the RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability TG to continue developing guidelines and examples, including sample receipt layouts, to illustrate how the changes to the LMD Code adopted in July 2012 are intended to be implemented. The SWMA looks forward to the TG’s development of these guidelines. SWMA unanimously recommended that the item remain as a Developing Item while the TG continues its work.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard a suggestion from Ms. Elson‑Houston, speaking as Chair of the TG on RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability on a TG proposal, to further modify paragraph UR.3.3. Computing Device. Ms. Elson-Houston reported that the TG had met and agreed: 1) to develop sample receipts for transactions where motor fuel pricing is discounted after the delivery; 2) the Chair would provide input on the “Do’s and Don’ts” for complying with the requirements that went into effect January 2013 for posting on *The Oil Express* web newsletter; and 3) to recommend additional amendments to paragraph UR.3.3., which were provided to the Committee. During its deliberations, the Committee reviewed the proposed changes recommended by the TG and agreed to establish a new Informational Item to address those modifications. The Committee also agreed to retain Developing Item 360-3 while the TG continues work to develop guidelines and examples on how the changes made last year to the LMD Code will apply to receipts for post‑delivery discounted transactions. The above new information item established by the Committee is available in S&T Agenda Information Item 330-4 and is included in the section of this report that addresses Liquid-Measuring Devices Code requirements.

2013 NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meetings: Both associations supported this as a Developing Item. During the NEWMA meeting, Ms. Tina Butcher reported that Ms. Elson-Houston, Chairman of the Task Group, had been in contact with the NCWM S&T Committee Chair, Mr. Ken Ramsburg. Ms. Elson-Houston advised NIST that Mr. Ramsburg (Maryland, NCWM S&T Committee Chairman) is planning to suggest that the S&T Committee ask the NTEP Measuring Sector to develop further guidelines for use in type evaluation and, should additional assistance be needed after that point, to re-establish the Task Group at that time. NEWMA defers to the national S&T Committee to determine the continued need for this item.

On the 2013 NCWM Online Position Forum, one government representative indicated support for this item with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting: The Committee heard comments from Ms. Williams who emphasized the importance of continuing to develop guidelines and information to assist regulatory officials and industry in interpreting and applying requirements relative to pre- and post-delivery discounts. NIST OWM is working on the development of guidelines and examples that could be included in NIST EPOs and training materials and has already received positive feedback from members of the Task Group on the examples developed thus far. This information may also be of use to NTEP in the further development of checklist criteria for inclusion in NCWM Publication 14. OWM will continue to develop this information and make it available in updates to EPOs and course materials and would appreciate additional input from the community.

Ms. Beth Treseder (API) indicated that API and others within industry would appreciate copies of acceptable receipts as they become available.

The Committee believes that additional work is needed to develop examples and information that will enable consistent and uniform application of the requirements adopted in 2012 and encourages OWM’s continued work on such examples. The Committee asks that the Task Group continue its work by developing and providing additional examples of acceptable receipts to assist regulatory officials and industry in interpreting and applying these requirements. The Committee believes that examples of receipts from deliveries that include both pre- and post-delivery discounts in a single transaction are needed.

360-4 I Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group

*Note: This item was originally numbered Item 360-4 in the Committee’s 2013 Interim Report. This item was moved to the 320 Scales Section and renumbered Item 320-5 during the Committee’s Open Hearings.*

360-5 D USNWG on Taximeters – Taximeter Code Revisions and Global Positioning System-Based Systems for Time and Distance Measurement

*Note: This item was originally titled “Item 360-5 S.5. Provision for Security Seals” in the Committee’s 2013 Interim Agenda. At the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee combined that item with “Item 354-1 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters” and “Item 360-6 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters” to create this new, consolidated item to address the development of recommendations on multiple topics related to taximeters and GPS-based time and distance measuring systems.*

Source:

NIST USNWG on Taximeters

Purpose:

Develop recommendations for modifying the existing Taximeters Code to reflect current technology (including requirements for sealing, display requirements, and other features) and to examine GPS-based time and distance measuring systems to determine how to best address these measuring systems in NIST Handbook 44 to ensure accuracy and transparency for passengers and businesses.

Item Under Consideration:

This item is under development. Comments and inquiries may be directed to Mr. John Barton (NIST OWM) at (301) 975‑4002 or [john.barton@nist.gov](mailto:john.barton@nist.gov).

The USNWG is considering proposals to modify the sealing requirements in the Taximeters Code to reflect more advanced sealing methods (see 2012 NCWM Final S&T Report); to amend the Taximeters Code to specifically recognize GPS-based time and distance measuring systems; and to amend other sections of the Taximeters Code to reflect current technology and business practices while ensuring accuracy and transparency for customers and a level playing field for transportation service companies.

Background/Discussion:

In January 2012, the Committee considered a proposal from Frias Transportation Infrastructure, LLC to modify Taximeters Code paragraph S.5. Provision for Security Seals to recognize more advanced methods of sealing. See Item 360-5 in the Committee’s 2012 Final Report for details. This item appeared as “Item 360-5 S.5. Provision for Security Seals” in the Committee’s 2013 Interim Agenda.

In January 2013, the Committee also considered a proposal from the City of Seattle’s Consumer Affairs to amend NIST Handbook 44, Section 5.54. Taximeters to make it specifically apply to Global Positioning System (GPS) system applications used commercially to compute fares based upon distance and/or time measurements. See Item 360-6 in the Committee’s 2012 Final Report for details; this item appeared as “Item 360-6 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters” in the Committee’s 2013 Interim Agenda.

In April 2012, in response to requests from the NCWM and members of the weights and measures community, NIST, OWM formally established a USNWG on Taximeters. The purpose of the USNWG was to continue work already in progress at NIST to develop proposed changes to the Taximeters Code to reflect current technology and to provide a forum in which stakeholders could work together to address issues such as those outlined in Items 360-5 and 360-6 on the Committee’s 2012 Agenda. The USNWG includes participants from the taxi/vehicle-for-hire industry (owners & operators), manufacturers and developers of taximeters and taximeter systems, regulatory officials, and technical experts.

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Williams submitted a status report for NIST USNWG on Taximeters. Ms.  Kristin Macey (California) expressed strong interest in the issue of GPS system applications being used to compute fares based upon distance and/or time. Currently, California DMS is the only NTEP type approval lab and while they look forward to having a device submitted, they wouldn’t know what to do with the request. She opposed the carryover item (Item 360-6 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters on the NCWM S&T Committee’s Agenda) and asked that it be withdrawn, stating that it might be better considered under a new, separate code section. Mr. John Gaccione (Westchester County, New York) expressed other consumer concerns, such as access to receipts, the need of expensive smart phones, and that currently there is no regulatory oversight, whereas there are over 13,000 taxis now operating in that jurisdiction. Mr. Miguel Monroy (San Francisco, California), echoed Ms. Macey’s concern that there was no regulatory oversight and that GPS systems have been active in his jurisdiction for two years. The WWMA concluded that it didn’t have enough information on metrological accuracy of GPS in measurement of distance and time, and there may be other metrological parameters that will be part of the charges.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Tina Butcher (NIST, OWM) submitted a status report for the NIST USNWG on Taximeters.

All of the regional weights and measures associations support the efforts of the USNWG. The WWMA and the SWMA further recommended that the NCWM S&T Committee consider consolidating the related items on Taximeters and GPS-based systems into a single item and designating the contact point as the USNWG.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting: The Committee considered another proposal from the City of Seattle’s Consumer Affairs to amend NIST Handbook 44, Section 5.54. Taximeters to make it specifically apply to Global Positioning System (GPS) system applications used commercially to compute fares based upon distance and/or time measurements. This proposal was designated as Item 354-1 in the Committee’s Interim Agenda. No proposed language modifying the current Taximeters Code was submitted. At its fall 2012 Annual Meeting, the WWMA considered this item; this item was not submitted to the other regional associations. The WWMA noted that this item is similar to Item 360-6 in the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2012 Final Report; like that item, it seeks to develop the Taximeter Code to apply specifically to GPS applications inputs and software programming in smart phone applications used commercially to compute fares based upon distance and/or time measurements. The WWMA forwarded the item to NCWM S&T Committee and recommended that it be combined with the item designated in the NCWM S&T Committee’s Final Report as Developing “Item 360-6, Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters” and be addressed by the NIST USNWG on Taximeters; however, this item was designated as Item 354‑1 on the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2013 Interim Agenda.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments under Item 354-1 in support of work to further develop requirements to address GPS-based systems and to continue work on proposed revisions to the Taximeter Code to reflect current technology. NIST OWM provided the following update on the progress of the USNWG:

|  |
| --- |
| The USNWG on Taximeters held its first face-to-face meeting at NIST’s Gaithersburg facility September 24 ‑ 26, 2012. To provide the USNWG with necessary input and analysis regarding the capability of the GPS system, expertise in that area was solicited. A staff member from the NIST Time and Frequency Division has agreed to assist the USNWG in matters related to GPS and act as an observing member of the USNWG. While the September 2012 meeting was very productive, a great deal of work remains to be completed. Additional meetings are anticipated; the next meeting is scheduled via web conference for March 13, 2013, from 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST. The direction of the USNWG’s continuing work will take place in the form of two concurrent projects.  The main body of the work group will target the completion of updating the existing Taximeters Code so that specifications and requirements apply to devices and technologies currently in use in this industry. The work of the USNWG will result in proposals to amend the Taximeters Code and NCWM Publication 14 where needed. Those proposals will then be submitted for consideration by the NCWM.  In addition to the work in updating the existing Taximeters Code, a Subcommittee is being formed and will specifically work towards the development of standards and requirements that will address the use of GPS as a source of commercial time and distance measurements. The work will involve amendment as needed of existing specification and performance requirements and the possible development of new requirements that will encompass the use of GPS.  This Subcommittee will also develop the necessary standards and test procedures for the evaluation of transportation-for-hire services that have recently been introduced using mobile telephone applications (apps) in the process of requesting, dispatching, and the calculation of fares for these services. |

Mr. James Cassidy (City of Cambridge, Massachusetts), a member of the USNWG, rose in support of these efforts, and to encourage others with interest and expertise to participate in the work. The Committee also heard comments from Mr. Ross Andersen (New York, retired) who reflected on differences between standard length-measuring devices such as steel tapes and GPS-based systems. He also noted the need to address electronic receipts in any proposed revisions to the language.

The Committee heard no comments on Items 360-5, S.5. Provision for Security Seals; or 360-6 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters during its Open Hearings. After considering the summary of the work being done by the USNWG; the comments heard during its Open Hearings; and comments from the regional associations regarding the overlap among these related items, the Committee decided to consolidate Item 354-1 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters; Item 360-5 S.5. Provision for Security Seals; and Item 360-6 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters into a single Developing Item, and to designate the USNWG on Taximeters as responsible for the item’s development.

2013 NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meetings: Both associations supported this as a Developing Item. NEWMA heard updates from NIST and USNWG Members on the USNWG. NEWMA also heard comments from a member about whether or not GPS-based systems could ever provide comparable measurements to conventional taxi meters given how GPS systems work as they do not recognize changes in elevation. NEWMA noted the immediate need by some jurisdictions for this item and supports the work of the USNWG to move this item forward.

On the 2013 NCWM Online Position Forum, two government representatives supported continued development of the proposal by the USNWG. One government representative indicated a neutral position, noting that these devices are not regulated by the weights and measures authority in his state. ***Technical Advisor’s note:*** *The results and comments from the Forum reflect the combined positions and comments for S&T agenda Items 354-1 and 360-5, which were combined at the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting to create this new consolidated agenda item.*

2013 Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard an update on the work of the USNWG from Ms. Williams. She noted that the USNWG held a teleconference on July 10 and has established a Subcommittee to address GPS-based time and distance measuring systems. The USNWG meets about every other month via either web or in-person meetings. Mr. John Barton (NIST OWM) Chair and Technical Advisor to the USNWG further noted that the USNWG includes an expert in GPS measurements from NIST’s Time and Frequency Division, Mr. Mike Lombardi.

The Committee heard comments from Mr. Andersen, who questioned whether or not GPS-based systems account for variations in elevation. Other members commented that many GPS based devices do have the capability to account for these changes.

The Committee encourages the continued work of the USNWG and looks forward to continued developments in this area.

360-6 D Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters

***Note: At the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee combined this item with “Item 354-1 Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters” and “Item 360-5, S.5. Provision for Security Seals” to create a new, consolidated Developing Item. The consolidated Developing Item is designated as “Item 360-5 USNWG on Taximeters – Taximeter Code Revisions and Global Positioning Systems for Time and Distance Measurement.” See Item 360-5 for details.***

360-7 D Appendix D – Definitions: Remote Configuration Capability

Source:

NTEP Grain Analyzer Sector (2013)

Purpose:

Expand the scope of definition to cover instances where the “other device,” as noted in the current definition, may be necessary to the operation of the weighing or measuring device or which may be considered a permanent part of that device.

Item Under Consideration:

This item is under development. Comments and inquiries may be directed to NIST Office of Weights and Measures.

A proposal to modify the definition for “remote configuration capability” as follows is under consideration:

**remote configuration capability.** **–** The ability to adjust a weighing or measuring device or change its sealable parameters from or through some other device that **~~is not~~** **may or may not** itself **be** necessary to the operation of the weighing or measuring device or **~~is not~~** **may or may not be** a permanent part of that device.[2.20, 2.21, 2.24, 3.30, 3.37, 5.56(a)]

(Added 1993) **(Amended 20XX**)

**Background/Discussion:**

Removable digital storage devices can be used in GMMs either as data transfer devices that are not necessary to the operation of the GMM or as data storage devices that are necessary to the operation of the GMM. If removal data storage devices are necessary to the operation of the device, they are not covered by the current definition of remote configuration capability.

A USB flash drive is most likely to be used as a data transfer device. In a typical data transfer application, the USB flash drive is first connected to a computer with access to the GMM manufacturer’s web site to download the latest grain calibrations that are then stored in the USB flash drive. The USB flash drive is removed from the computer and plugged into a USB port on the GMM. The GMM is put into remote configuration mode to copy the new grain calibration data into the GMM’s internal memory. When the GMM has been returned to normal operating (measuring) mode, the USB flash drive can be removed from the GMM.

Although a Secure Digital (SD) memory card could also be used as a data transfer device it is more likely to be used as a data storage device. In a typical “data storage device” application, the SD memory card stores the grain calibrations used on the GMM. The SD memory card must be plugged into an SD memory card connector on a GMM circuit card for the GMM to operate in measuring mode. To install new grain calibrations the GMM must be turned “off” or put into a mode in which the SD memory card can be safely removed. The SD memory card can either be replaced with an SD memory card that has been programmed with the new grain calibrations or the original SD memory card can be re-programmed with the new grain calibrations in much the same way as that described in the preceding paragraph to copy new grain calibrations into a USB flash drive. In either case, the SD memory card containing the new calibrations must be installed in the GMM for the GMM to operate in measuring mode. In that regard, the SD memory card (although removable) can be considered a permanent part of the GMM in that the GMM cannot operate without it.

**Note:**  In the above example, the SD memory card could be any removable flash memory card such as the Secure Digital Standard-Capacity, the Secure Digital High-Capacity, the Secure Digital Extended-Capacity, and the Secure Digital Input/Output, which combines input/output functions with data storage. These come in three form factors: the original size, the mini size, and the micro size. A Memory Stick is a removable flash memory card format, launched by Sony in 1998, and is also used in general to describe the whole family of Memory Sticks. In addition to the original Memory Stick, this family includes the Memory Stick PRO, the Memory Stick Duo, the Memory Stick PRO Duo, the Memory Stick Micro, and the Memory Stick PRO‑HG.

At its 2011 Grain Analyzer Sector Meeting the Sector agreed by consensus that the following changes to Table S.2.5. of Section 5.56.(a) of NIST Handbook 44should be forwarded to the S&T Committee for consideration:

* Add a note to Table S.2.5. to recognize the expanded scope of remote capability.
* Delete “remotely” from the second paragraph of Category 3 requirements that begins, “When accessed remotely…” to make it clear that the requirements of Category 3 apply whether accessed manually using the keyboard or accessed by remote means.
* Add the modified second paragraph of Category 3 requirements to Categories 3a and 3b to make it clear that these requirements apply to all the subcategories of Category 3.

After additional review of this item, NIST, OWM recommended that the changes to Table S.2.5. approved by the Sector in 2011 be separated into two independent proposals: one dealing with the changes to Category 3 and its subcategories; and one recommending a modification of the definition of “remote configuration capability” appearing in Appendix D of NIST Handbook 44to recognize the expanded scope of remote capability, instead of adding a note to the bottom of Table S.2.5. to expand the definition for remote configuration for grain moisture meters (as shown in this proposal). A change to the definition of remote configuration capability will apply to other device types.

At its 2012 Meeting, the Grain Analyzer Sector agreed to separate its original proposal into two separate proposals and agreed to forward this proposal to change the definition of “remote configuration capability” to the S&T to Committee for consideration. (See also August 2012 NTEP Grain Analyzer Sector Summary, Item 5.)

2012 WWMA Annual Meeting: Ms. Juana Williams (NIST, OWM) supported the intent. She talked about this item in conjunction with Item 356-1, S.2.5. Categories of Device and Methods of Sealing. This is a complex item affecting multiple other devices; therefore, the proposal requires further consideration. The language in the proposal to amend the definition of remote configuration capability is confusing. The Committee believes the current definition already allows the use of remote configuration devices and allows the flexibility desired. The ramifications of changing the definition could affect other devices in NIST Handbook 44. WWMA did not forward this item to NCWM.

2012 SWMA Annual Meeting: There were no comments. After reviewing the proposal and considering the potential impact on other device types, the Committee recommended this as a Developing Item. The Committee asks that the Sector continue to obtain input on the definition and the impact the changes would have on other device types. SWMA forwarded the item to NCWM, recommending it as a Developing Item and assigning its development to the Grain Analyzer Sector.

2013 NCWM Interim Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments from Ms. Williams. NIST, OWM suggested the Committee consider this item as a Developing Item to allow other sectors to discuss how a change to the definition may affect other device types of similar design and to consider changes, if needed. NIST, OWM recognizes that the current definition for “remote configuration capability” may not address those grain moisture meters (GMMs) that can only be operated with a removable data storage device, containing, among other things, the grain calibrations intended for use with the GMM, inserted in the device (as was described by the Grain Analyzer Sector). As such, OWM noted that current sealing requirements were developed at a time when such technology likely didn’t exist, nor could be envisioned, and are based on the current definition of remote configuration capability. Because the current definition was never intended to apply to this “next generation” technology, NIST, OWM suggested that those charged with further development of this item may wish to revisit the five philosophies of sealing and consider whether a new paragraph, completely separate from current sealing requirements, might be appropriate and a better option, than the one currently proposed. The five philosophies of sealing are included in the 1992 Report of the 77th National Conference on Weights and Measures (Report of the Specifications and Tolerances Committee). Another option, preferred over the changes currently proposed, would be to add a separate statement to the current definition of “remote configuration capability” to address removable storage devices. For example, the following sentence might be considered as an addition to the current definition for “remote configuration capability:”

**Devices which are programmed using removable media (such as SD cards, flash drives, etc.) that may or may not be required to remain with the device during normal operation are also considered to be remotely configured devices.**

The Committee also heard comments from Mr. Dmitri Karimov (Liquid Controls Corporation, LLC), speaking on behalf of the MMA, who made two points: 1) Flow computers may already have these capabilities, thus it may be more appropriate to consider adding requirements to the General Code so that the requirements will be uniformly applied to all device types; and 2) the Committee should look ahead and consider other capabilities that may or already have emerged such as wireless communication and configuration.

The Committee acknowledged the comments indicating that the current definition of “remote configuration capability” was developed at a time when certain technologies, such as blue tooth, SD storage devices, flash drives, and other media didn’t exist. The Committee recognized that it may be difficult to modify the existing definition and associated requirements to be flexible enough to address emerging and future technologies without having a significant (and possibly detrimental impact) on existing devices. Consequently, rather than modifying the current definition, the Committee concluded that a better approach might be to develop an entirely separate set of security requirements that would apply to emerging technologies. The Committee believes that additional work is needed to develop proposed definition(s) and associated requirements and decided to designate the item as Developmental. The Committee requests other sectors review the Grain Sector’s proposed modification to the definition as well as NIST, OWM’s suggestions and provide input.

2013 NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meetings: Both associations supported this as a Developing Item. NEWMA heard from NIST who encouraged members to consider this work as it applies to all device types.

On the 2013 NCWM Online Position Forum, one government representative indicated a neutral position on this item with no additional comments.

2013 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings: The Committee heard comments from Ms. Williams who reiterated NIST, OWM’s comments from the 2013 Interim Meeting, suggesting that it may be appropriate to develop separate requirements to address new and future technologies that can be remotely configured with removable media. NIST, OWM plans to develop draft language and ask for input from the various Sectors at their upcoming meetings. Ms. Williams also noted the suggestion made at the 2013 NCWM Interim Meeting by Mr. Karimov speaking on behalf of the MMA, that a provision might be added to the General Code to address this type of equipment.

Ms. Julie Quinn (Minnesota) agreed with NIST, OWM’s comments and indicated support for possibly including requirements in the General Code to address newer and emerging technologies. Mr. Karimov, speaking on behalf of MMA, concurred with this suggestion.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
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**Specifications and Tolerances Committee**

**Appendix A**

**Items 337-1 and 337-2: Background and Justification for Handbook 44 Definition of “Diesel Gallon Equivalent (DGE)” of Natural Gas as a Vehicular Fuel**

**Clean Vehicle Education Foundation**

Development of the “Gasoline Gallon Equivalent” by NCWM[[2]](#footnote-2)\*

In 1993, under the auspices of the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM), a Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Working Group came together to determine the way in which CNG would be sold to the public at retail as a motor fuel. .

The working group focused on three issues:

1. How to provide the Natural Gas Vehicle (NGV) industry a method of sale that would be familiar and acceptable to consumers
2. How to provide weights and measures officials a verifiable and quantifiable means to determine the accuracy of natural gas dispensers; and
3. How to meet these requirements with a uniform, national standard.

NCWM considered three proposals for the method of sale of CNG:

1. joules, the unit of energy measurement in SI units
2. mass
3. the Gasoline Gallon Equivalent (GGE)

The Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition (now NGVAmerica) recommended that the Gasoline Gallon Equivalent be adopted as the method of sale for CNG, and that it be based on the energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline. The use of the GGE was recommended primarily for the convenience of the retail customer comparing the cost and fuel economy of a natural gas vehicle to a comparable gasoline vehicle. During the discussion, a proposal was made to eliminate the reference to energy content of CNG and replace it with a fixed conversion factor based on mass, with the fixed mass of CNG being equal to a gallon of gasoline. Measurement of mass in the retail dispenser and verification by W&M officials is easier and less costly than measurement of energy content.

Since the energy content of a unit measure of CNG (standard cubic foot - scf) and gasoline (gallon) vary widely depending on the sample of fuel measured, the reference gallon of gasoline was determined to be Indolene, the gasoline used by EPA to certify emissions and fuel economy, with an energy content (lower heating value) of 114,118 BTU/gal. Work conducted by the Institute of Gas Technology and the Gas Research Institute (now combined into the Gas Technology Institute) surveyed 6811 samples of natural gas nationwide and concluded that the “average” natural gas in the US had an energy content (lower heating value) of 923.7 BTU/scf, and a density of 0.0458172 lbs/cubic foot. This translates 20,160.551 BTU/lb. Dividing gasoline’s 114.118 BTU/gal by natural gas’s 20,160.551 BTU/lb gives 5.660 lbs of natural gas = 1 GGE. Similar calculations determined that a gasoline liter equivalent of natural gas equals 0.678 kg of natural gas.

At its 79th annual meeting in July of 1994, NCWM adopted resolutions that:

“All natural gas kept, offered or exposed for sale or sold at retail as a vehicle fuel shall be in terms of the gasoline liter equivalent (GLE) or gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE), and

All retail natural gas dispensers shall be labeled with the conversion factor in terms of kilograms or pounds. The label shall be permanently and conspicuously displayed on the face of the dispenser and shall have either the statement “1 Gasoline Liter Equivalent (GLE) is equal to 0.678 kg of Natural Gas” or “1 Gasoline Gallon Equivalent (GGE) is equal to 5.660 lbs of Natural Gas” according to the method of sale used.”

These statements can be found in NIST Handbook 130[[3]](#footnote-3)\*, along with the definition of “natural gas” which seems to apply only to Compressed Natural Gas, not to Liquefied Natural Gas. Handbook 130, §§3.11 and 3.12 (Engine Fuels, Petroleum Products, and Automotive Lubricants Regulations) confirm that these requirements are for CNG, rather than LNG. Similar requirements and definitions are found in Handbook 44.

During the discussions it was recognized that, although diesel and gasoline are both sold in gallon units, a gallon of diesel fuel has substantially more energy content than a gallon of gasoline. While it is convenient to use the Gasoline Gallon Equivalent unit when comparing the cost and fuel economy of gasoline-powered light-duty vehicles to equivalent natural gas vehicles, a Diesel Gallon Equivalent unit would be more useful for operators of medium and heavy-duty (usually diesel powered) vehicles. However, in 1994, the NCWM working group “agreed to defer development of a “Diesel Gallon Equivalent” until the issues related to the ‘Gasoline Gallon Equivalent’ were decided by the NCWM and agreed to meet again if additional work is necessary.”[[4]](#footnote-4)\*\* The issue of the formal definition a Diesel Gallon Equivalent (DGE) unit has not come before NCWM from that time until today, although the DGE is often used in the industry, defined as 6.31 lbs of natural gas.

Need for a Definition of a “Diesel Gallon Equivalent” Unit

Today there are an increasing number of commercial vehicles using natural gas as a fuel, to lower emissions and Greenhouse Gases, decrease America’s use of petroleum, and lower fuel costs (U.S. DOE Clean Cities Alternative Fuel Price Report for April 2012 shows in Table 2 ‘Overall Average Fuel Price on Energy-Equivalent Basis’ that diesel is priced at $4.12/gal and CNG at $2.32/gal <http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/pdfs/afpr_apr_12.pdf> ).

Since the NCWM’s working group deferred development of a DGE unit in 1994, there has been little call by the natural gas vehicle industry for the formalization of that unit in the sale of **Compressed** Natural Gas. However the use of **Liquefied** Natural Gas (LNG) as a motor fuel has been growing and there is significant interest in using the DGE as a unit for the sale of that fuel.

LNG as a motor fuel is used almost exclusively by commercial vehicles, most of which view diesel as the conventional alternative. Using the same logic as was used for the development of the GGE unit, the convenience of the retail customer comparing the cost and fuel economy of a natural gas vehicle to a comparable conventional vehicle, it makes sense for NCWM to now “officially” define the DGE.

Other than §3.12. Liquefied Natural Gas, in the Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation section of Handbook 130, we find no specific provisions in either Handbook 44 or Handbook 130 for the retail sale of LNG as a motor fuel. However LNG is sold in California and other states on a mass basis (by the pound), which allows for easy confirmation by weights and measures authorities. An “official” definition of the DGE as a specific mass of natural gas would allow states to easily move from retail sale by pound to retail sale by DGE, simplifying the sale process for the retail customer used to dealing with “gallons of diesel” as a fuel measure.

Therefore, at this time we are asking for a definition of the Diesel Gallon Equivalent (and Diesel Liter Equivalent) units by NCWM.

Justification of the Definition of a DGE as 6.312 Pounds of Natural Gas

Handbook 130 contains the following definitions of natural Gas as a vehicle fuel[[5]](#footnote-5)\*:

**Gasoline liter equivalent (GLE).** – Gasoline liter equivalent (GLE) means

0.678 kg of natural gas.

**Gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE).** – Gasoline gallon equivalent (GGE) means

2.567 kg (5.660 lb) of natural gas.

As the NCWM working group recognized during its deliberations in 1993 on the Gasoline Gallon Equivalent unit, both gasoline and natural gas can vary in their BTU content from sample to sample. The working group determined the gasoline gallon (energy) equivalent based on a gallon of Indolene (114,118 BTU/gal – lower heating value) and a survey of 6811 natural gas samples nationwide with an average of 923.7 BTU/scf (lower heating value) and a density of 0.0458172 lbs/cubic foot. This equates to 20,160.551 BTU/lb. Dividing gasoline’s 114.118 BTU/gal by natural gas’s 20,160.551 BTU/lb gives 5.660 lbs of natural gas = 1 GGE. Similar calculations determined that a gasoline liter equivalent of natural gas equals 0.678 kg of natural gas.

Starting with 5.660 lbs of natural gas = 1 GGE and 0.678 kg of natural gas = 1 GLE, we can calculate the mass of natural gas necessary to make a DGE and a DLE by comparing the amount of energy in a gallon of diesel fuel to the amount of energy in a gallon of gasoline fuel and apply that ratio to scale up the masses of natural gas calculated for the GGE and GLE units.

Unfortunately it is no easier today than it was in 1993 to set one energy value as representative of a unit for all gasoline, (or diesel) fuel. EPA’s certification fuel has likely changed in energy content since 1993, as both gasoline and diesel fuels have been modified for improved emissions.

We recommend using the most recent Department of Energy *Transportation Energy Data Book[[6]](#footnote-6)\**, as an authoritative reference for both gasoline and diesel fuel energy values. Taking further surveys or basing our calculations on today’s EPA certification fuel only delays our action, substantially increases costs, and, in the end, provides a limited potential increase in accuracy based on one point in time. Table B.4 of the *Transportation Energy Data Book,* on the heat content of fuels <http://cta.ornl.gov/data/tedb30/Edition30_Full_Doc.pdf> lists the net energy of gasoline as 115,400 BTU/Gal, and diesel as 128,700 BTU/Gal.

Therefore a Diesel Gallon Equivalent of natural gas is:

(128,700/115,400) X 5.660 = 6.312 lb (2.863 kg)

and a Diesel Liter Equivalent of natural gas is:

(128,700/115,400 X 0.678 = 0.756 kg

Prepared by:

Clean Vehicle Education Foundation

<http://www.cleanvehicle.org>

**Appendix B**

**Item 360-4 Draft Tentative Code Applicable to Weigh-In-Motion Systems Used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening**

**Section 2.25.** **Weigh-In-Motion Systems used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening – Draft Code**

1. **Application**

**A.1. General. –** This code applies to systems used to weigh vehicles, while in motion, for the purpose of screening and sorting the vehicles based on the vehicle weight to determine if a static weighment is necessary.

**A.2.** The code does not apply to weighing systems intended for the collection of statistical traffic data.

**A.3.** The code is intended for field enforcement use only.

**A.4. Additional Code Requirements.** – In addition to the requirements of this code, Weigh-In-Motion Screening Systems shall meet the requirements of Section 1.10. General Code.

**S. Specifications**

**S.1. Design of Indicating and Recording Elements and of Recorded Representations.**

**S.1.1. ReadyIndication.** – The system shall provide a means of verifying that the system is operational and ready for use.

**S.1.2. Value of System Division Units.** – The value of a system division “d” expressed in a unit of weight shall be equal to:

1. 1, 2, or 5; or
2. a decimal multiple or submultiple of 1, 2, or 5.

**Examples**: divisions may be 10, 20, 50, 100; or 0.01, 0.02, 0.05; or 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, etc.

**S.1.2.1. Units of Measure.** – The system shall indicate weight values using only a single unit of measure.

**S.1.3. Value of Other Units of Measure.**

**S.1.3.1. Speed.** – Vehicle speeds shall be measured in miles per hour or kilometers per hour.

**S.1.3.2. Axle-Spacing (Length).** – The center-to-center distance between any two successive axles shall be measured in feet and/or inches, or meters.

**S.1.3.3. Vehicle Length.** – If the system is capable of measuring the overall length of the vehicle, the length of the vehicle shall be measured in feet and/or inches, or meters.

**S.1.4. Capacity Indication.** – An indicating or recording element shall not display nor record any values greater than 105 % of the specified capacity of the load receiving element.

**S.1.5. Identification of a Fault.** *–* Fault conditions shall be presented to the operator in a clear and unambiguous means. The following fault conditions shall be identified:

(a) Vehicle speed is below the minimum or above the maximum speed as specified.

(b) The maximum number of vehicle axles as specified has been exceeded.

1. A change in vehicle speed greater than that specified has been detected.

**S.1.6. Recorded Representations.**

**S.1.6.1. Values to be Recorded.** – At a minimum, the following values shall be printed and/or stored electronically for each vehicle weighment:

1. transaction identification number;
2. lane identification (required if more than one lane at the site has the ability to weigh a vehicle in-motion);
3. vehicle speed;
4. number of axles;
5. weight of each axle;
6. identification and weight of axles groups;
7. axle spacing;
8. total vehicle weight;
9. all fault conditions that occurred during the weighing of the vehicle;
10. violations, as identified in paragraph S.2.1., that occurred during the weighing of the vehicle; and
11. time & date.

**S.1.7. Value of the Indicated and Recorded System Division.** – The value of the system’s division size as recorded shall be the same as the division value indicated.

**S.2. System Design Requirements.**

**S.2.1. Violation Parameters.** – The instrument shall be capable of accepting user entered violation parameters for the following items:

1. single axle weight limit;
2. axle group weight limit;
3. gross vehicle weight; and
4. bridge formula load.

The instrument shall display and or record violation conditions when these parameters have been exceeded.

**S.3. Design of Weighing Elements.**

**S.3.1. Multiple Load-Receiving Elements.** – An instrument with a single indicating or recording element, or a combination indicating-recording element, that is coupled to two or more load‑receiving elements with independent weighing systems, shall be provided with means to prohibit the activation of any load-receiving element (or elements) not in use, and shall be provided with automatic means to indicate clearly and definitely which load-receiving element (or elements) is in use.

**S.4. Design of Weighing Devices, Accuracy Class.**

**S.4.1. Designation of Accuracy.** – WIM Systems meeting the requirements of this code shall be designated as accuracy Class A.

**S.5. Marking Requirements.** – In addition to the marking requirements in G‑S.1. Identification (except G.S.1.(e)), G‑S.4. Interchange or Reversal of Parts, G‑S.6. Marking Operational Controls, Indications, and Features, G‑S.7. Lettering, and G‑UR.2.1.1. Visibility of Identification. The system shall be marked with the following information:

(a) Accuracy Class;

(b) Value of the System Division “d”;

(c) Operational Temperature Limits;

(d) Number of Lanes;

(e) Minimum and Maximum Vehicle Speed;

(f) Maximum Number of Axles per Vehicle;

(g) Maximum Change in Vehicle Speed during Weighment; and

(h) Minimum and Maximum Load.

**S.5.1. Location of Marking Information.** – The marking information required in G‑S.1. Identification of the General Code and S.5. shall be visible after installation. The information shall be marked on the system or recalled from an information screen.

**N. Notes**

**N.1. Test Procedures.**

**N.1.1. Selection of Test Vehicles. –** All dynamic testing associated with the procedures described in each of the subparagraphs of N.1.5 shall be performed with a minimum of two test vehicles.

1. The first test vehicle may be a two axle, six tire, single unit truck; a vehicle with two axles with the rear axle having dual wheels. The vehicle shall have a maximum Gross Vehicle Weight of 10 000 lbs.
2. The second test vehicle shall be a five axle, single trailer truck with a maximum Gross Vehicle Weight of 80,000 lbs.

**Note:** Consideration should be made for testing the systems using vehicles which are typical to the systems daily operation.

**N.1.1.1. Weighing of Test Vehicles.** – All test vehicles shall be weighed on a reference scale before being used to conduct the dynamic tests.

**N.1.2. Test Loads.**

**N.1.2.1. Static Test Loads.** – All static test loads shall use certified test weights.

**N.1.2.2. Dynamic Test Loads.** – Test vehicles used for dynamic testing shall be loaded to 85 % to 95 % of their maximum Gross Vehicle Weight. The “load” shall be non-shifting and shall be positioned to present as close as possible, an equal side-to-side load.

**N.1.3. Reference Scale. –** Each reference vehicle shall be weighed on a static scale meeting NIST Handbook 44, Class III L maintenance tolerances.

**N.1.3.1. Location of a Reference Scale. –** The location of the Reference Scale must be considered as vehicle weights will change due to fuel consumption.

**N.1.4. Test Speeds. –** All dynamic tests shall be conducted within 20 % below or at the posted speed limit.

**N.1.5. Test Procedures.**

**N.1.5.1. Dynamic Load Test.** – The dynamic test shall be conducted using the test vehicles defined in N.1.1. The test shall consist of a minimum of 20 runs for each test vehicle at the speed as stated in N.1.4. Test Speeds. The tolerance for each run shall be based on the percentage values specified in Table T.3.1. Tolerances for Accuracy Class A.

**N.1.5.2. Axle Spacing Test**. – The axle spacing test is a review of the displayed and/or recorded axle spacing distance of the test vehicles. The tolerance value for each distance shall be based on the tolerance value specified in T.3.2. Axle Spacing Tolerance.

**N.1.5.3. Position of Vehicle during Test Runs**. – During the conduct of the dynamic testing the vehicle shall adjust its position along the width of the sensor from one run to the next but ensuring that the vehicle stays within the defined roadway. The test shall be conducted with 10 runs in the center, 5 runs on the right side, and five runs on the left side. All weighments shall be within tolerance.

**T. Tolerances**

**T.1. Principles.**

**T.1.1. Design.** – The tolerance for a weigh-in-motion system is a performance requirement independent of the design principle used.

**T.2. Tolerance Application.**

**T.2.1. General.** – The tolerance values are positive (+) and negative (‑). No more than 5% of each test shall be outside the applicable tolerances

**T.3. Tolerance Values for Accuracy Class A.**

**T.3.1. Tolerance Values for Dynamic Testing.** – The tolerance values applicable during dynamic load testing are as specified in Table T.3.1. Tolerances for Accuracy Class A.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table T.3.1. – Tolerances for Accuracy Class A** | |
| **Load Description** | **Tolerance as a Percentage of Applied Test Load** |
| Axle Load | 20 % |
| Axle Group Load | 15 % |
| Gross Vehicle Weight | 10 % |

**T.3.2. Axle Spacing Tolerance.** – The tolerance value applied to the axle spacing measurement shall be ± 0.5 ft (0.15 m).

**T.4. Influence Factors.** – The following factors are applicable to tests conducted under controlled conditions only.

**T.4.1. Temperature.** – Systems shall satisfy the tolerance requirements under all operating temperature unless a limited operating temperature range is specified by the manufacturer.

**T.5. Radio Frequency Interference (RFI) and Other Electromagnetic Interference Susceptibility.** – The difference between the weight indication due to the disturbance and the weight indication without the disturbance shall not exceed the tolerance value as stated in Table T.3.1. Tolerances for Accuracy Class A.

**UR. User Requirements**

**UR.1. Selection Requirements.** – Equipment shall be suitable for the service in which it is used with respect to elements of its design, including but not limited to, its capacity, number of scale divisions, value of the scale division or verification scale division and minimum capacity.

**UR.2. User Location Conditions and Maintenance.** – The system shall be installed and maintained as defined in the manufacturer’s recommendation.

**UR.2.1. System Modification.** – The dimensions (e.g., length, width, thickness, etc.) of the load receiving element of a system shall not be changed beyond the manufacturer’s specifications, nor shall the capacity of a scale be increased beyond its design capacity by replacing or modifying the original primary indicating or recording element with one of a higher capacity, except when the modification has been approved by a competent engineering authority, preferably that of the engineering department of the manufacturer of the system, and by the weights and measures authority having jurisdiction over the system.

**UR.2.2. Foundation, Supports, and Clearance.** – The foundation and supports shall be such as to provide strength, rigidity, and permanence of all components.

On load‑receiving elements which use moving parts for determining the load value, clearance shall be provided around all live parts to the extent that no contacts may result when the load‑receiving element is empty, nor throughout the weighing range of the system.

**UR.2.3. Access to Weighing Elements.** – If necessary, adequate provision shall be made for inspection and maintenance of the weighing elements.

**UR.3. Maximum Load.** – A system shall not be used to weigh a load of more than the marked maximum load of the system.

**The following are proposed definitions to be added to NIST Handbook 44, Appendix D to support the Weigh-In-Motion Systems used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening – Draft Code.**

**weigh-in-motion** **(WIM).** – A process of estimating a moving vehicle’s gross weight and the portion of that weight that is carried by each wheel, axle, or axle group, or combination thereof, by measurement and analysis of dynamic vehicle tire forces.

**axle.** – The axis oriented transversely to the nominal direction of vehicle motion, and extending the full width of the vehicle, about which the wheel(s) at both ends rotate.

**axle-group load.** – The sum of all tire loads of the wheels on a group of adjacent axles; a portion of the gross-vehicle weight.

**axle load.** – The sum of all tire loads of the wheels on an axle; a portion of the gross-vehicle weight.

**axle spacing. –** The distance between the centers of any two axles. When specifying axle spacing, you also need to identify the axles used.

**single-axle load.** – The load transmitted to the road surface by the tires lying on the same longitudinal axis (that axis transverse to the movement of the vehicle and about which the wheels rotate).

**tandem-axle load.** – The load transmitted to the road surface by the tires of two single-axles lying on the same longitudinal axis (that axis transverse to the movement of the vehicle and about which the wheels rotate).

**triple-axle load.** – The load transmitted to the road surface by the tires of three single-axles lying on the same longitudinal axis (that axis transverse to the movement of the vehicle and about which the wheels rotate).

**Weigh-in-Motion Screening Scale. –** A WIM system used to identify potentially overweight vehicles.

**wheel weight.** – The weight value of any single or set of wheels on one side of a vehicle on a single axle.

**WIM System.** – A set of sensors and supporting instruments that measure the presence of a moving vehicle and the related dynamic tire forces at specified locations with respect to time; estimate tire loads; calculate speed, axle spacing, vehicle class according to axle arrangement, and other parameters concerning the vehicle; and process, display, store, and transmit this information. This standard applies only to highway vehicles.
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