

USNWG ON TAXIMETERS
MARCH 4, 2014
WEB-CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Table of Contents

I.	Carry-over items	1
A.	Proposal to add new requirement S.1.1.1. Recording Elements	1
B.	Proposal to amend S.1.9. Recorded Representation	6
C.	Proposal to amend paragraph A.1. General	10
II.	New Items	14
A.	Proposal for a new requirement: S.1.3.3. Customer's Indications.....	14
B.	Proposed amendment for S.2. Basis of Fare Calculations	16
IV.	Attendance	18

I. Carry-over items

A. Proposal to add new requirement S.1.1.1. Recording Elements

This proposal would add a new requirement that a recording element be included as a mandatory component within a taximeter system.

Background:

This proposal was introduced to the USNWG during its meetings in September 2012 and has been considered further as an agenda item for meetings in May – December 2013. The proposed revision of this specification requirement discussed by the USNWG includes changes that give an exemption from providing the passenger a receipt for those taximeters/systems that operate using a simple rate structure to calculate fares. The current draft of this proposal would require that a receipt be provided when the taximeter operates using multiple rates to calculate any *individual* fare.

An additional criterion that a taximeter would need to meet in order to be exempt from providing a receipt is that it would be not be permitted to register extras charges other than

those assessed for additional passengers and the transportation of baggage. This latest draft is shown below.

S.1.1.1. Recording Elements. – A receipt providing information as required in S.1.9. Recorded Representations shall be provided by a taximeter or taximeter system through an integral or separate recording element for all transactions conducted.

This does not apply to taximeters or taximeter systems that are limited to indicating and accumulating charges exclusively for discrete, individual fares calculated at a single rate and, that do not indicate or accumulate extras or additional charges (other than those assessed for transporting additional passengers and baggage),

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., e-mail, text message, computer file).

[Nonretroactive January 1, 201X]

(Added 201X)

During the December 2013 meeting, the work group's discussions indicated that this draft should be revised further. Some of the points made at the meeting regarding this proposal included the following.

- While most if not all taximeters manufactured today are capable of calculating fares using more than one rate, this feature may not be permitted in all regulatory jurisdictions. Therefore this feature would necessarily be a sealable feature and will be programmed appropriately when placed in service.
- The work group expressed the need to consider how the field examination procedure will be affected by whether the calculation of fare using more than one rate is enabled or disabled. It was undetermined if field officials will have the ability to approve a taximeter capable of providing a receipt, but does not do so in a jurisdiction where a receipt is optional.
- The USNWG noted that proposed requirements to address this issue will need to be worded precisely so that it is clear whether the requirement applies to a taximeter that is *capable* of operating with multiple rates or whether it is only applicable to taximeters that are actually *programmed* to operate using multiple rates.

- Some members expressed concern that the wording of this proposal would force the passenger to accept a receipt being provided even when a receipt is not desired by the customer.
- The composition of this requirement specifies that it will only apply to taximeters that will calculate at different rates *during a single transaction*. This notion was not supported by all members, and some members supported the notion that any taximeter capable of calculating fares at multiple rates should be required to supply a receipt even if only one rate is used per transaction.

During the December 2013 USNWG meeting, a draft for a new Users Requirement (shown below) to accompany the above specification requirement was presented to the work group.

Similar to the proposed new specification requirement, S.1.1.1., this new user requirement would distinguish between taximeters that are capable, and programmed to operate in this manner from those that are capable of operating but are not enabled.

This draft for a new user requirement focuses on the manner in which a taximeter is operated rather than the way it is designed. As seen below, the option of an electronic receipt is provided in this requirement as well.

UR.3 Use Requirements

UR.3.1. Recording Element. – Taximeters or taximeter systems that operate by calculating the fare for any individual transaction using more than one rate for distance and/or time, shall issue a printed receipt providing information as required in S.1.9. Recorded Representations.

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., e-mail, text message, computer file).

[Nonretroactive January 1, 201X]

(Added 201X)

It was pointed out during the December 2013 meeting that this user requirement did not include the exemption allowed for taximeters that does not register extras charges other than additional passengers or luggage. If the work group reaches a decision to support the proposal of this user requirement, that omission may need to be corrected.

Further discussions during the December 2013 meeting indicated that the work group would generally support a requirement that specifies that all taximeters and taximeter systems

provide a receipt for each transaction. It was agreed that, if this would become the proposal from the USNWG, any such requirement would need to be non-retroactive and that taximeters already in service would not be required to comply.

The discussion concluded on this item with no consensus among the work group. It was therefore decided that a ballot be circulated among the entire USNWG to determine a direction to follow in the effort to draft a proposal. The ballot (shown below) was sent via email to the entire USNWG. The work group was asked to respond by February 10, 2014.

Members of the USNWG are asked to select one of the options for revising this draft from the list provided.

- a) Retain the latest revision of S.1.1.1. which includes two criteria required for an exemption. These criteria are that the taximeter operates by calculating fares at only a single rate during any individual transaction, and that the taximeter does not register extras charges, other than those for additional passengers and luggage;
- b) Amend the latest draft by eliminating the exemption for applying only a single rate/individual fare but retain an exemption for the limited use of certain extras charges;
- c) Amend the latest draft by eliminating the exemption from a required receipt for taximeters with extras limited only to those for additional passengers and luggage but retain the exemption for taximeters that operate using only one rate per transaction;
- d) Amend the latest draft by retaining both parameters for exempt status but revise the bullet point (b) to state that an exemption is provided for those taximeters that are limited to only a small number (e.g. 2-3) of extras charges and do not specify what type of extras charges; or
- e) Amend the latest draft by eliminating all exemptions nonretroactively (i.e., all newly manufactured taximeters must be generate a receipt).
- f) Other. Please specify

Please respond by indicating:

“With regard to item I.B., I support option _____”

(Insert letter for your selection)

The results of the ballot will be used to further develop the proposed S.1.1.1. and possibly an accompanying user requirement (UR.3.1.) if determined to be necessary.

Discussion:

During the March 4 2014 meeting, the USNWG was presented with a revised proposal for a new requirement S.1.1.1. as shown below.

S.1.1.1. Recording Elements. – A receipt providing information as required in S.1.9. Recorded Representations shall be available from a taximeter or taximeter system through an integral or separate recording element for all transactions conducted.

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., e-mail, text message, electronic file).

[Nonretroactive January 1, 201X]

(Added 201X)

This revision was based on the responses received from the ballot sent out to the work group following its previous meeting in December 2013. This proposed requirement would specify that all taximeters or taximeter systems be capable of producing a printed receipt for all transactions. The requirement would be nonretroactive and apply only to new equipment installed after the effective date of the requirement. It also provides an option for producing an electronic form of receipt rather than a printed one.

Ms. Tina Butcher pointed out to the USNWG that there currently is an item up for consideration by the NCWM Specification and Tolerance Committee which would add a statement in the HB44 General Code requirement G-S.5.6. Recorded Representations to provide the option for an electronic form of receipt for all types of commercial weighing and measuring devices. If this item is approved by the NCWM, this would render other similar statements found in the specific device codes unnecessary (including the language being proposed in S.1.1.1.) The S&T Committee may then elect to amend those statements in specific device codes by deleting the wording associated with permitting electronic forms of receipts.

The NIST Technical Advisor recommended that the work group also consider the impact that the addition of a new S.1.1.1. would have on the existing Taximeters Code requirement S.1.1. General. This specification requirement establishes that a recording element *may* be included as an option for a taximeter and is shown below.

S.1.1. General. – A taximeter shall be equipped with a primary indicating element and may be equipped with a recording element.

(Amended 1988)

The NIST Technical Advisor suggested to the work group that because the current S.1.1. provides an option for a recording element, this would be in conflict with a newly proposed S.1.1.1. that makes a printed receipt a requirement for new devices. Therefore, further amendment of the existing S.1.1. such as deleting the last portion of that requirement may be needed to eliminate any conflict. This possible amendment is shown below.

S.1.1. General. – A taximeter shall be equipped with a primary indicating element ~~and may be equipped with a recording element.~~

(Amended 1988 and 20XX)

Ms. Tina Butcher suggested that the work group review other specific HB44 Codes (e.g., the Vehicle Tank Meter Code) to compare wording used in requiring receipts/recording elements. The work group may wish to consider adopting similar language in the revision of S.1.1.

Conclusion:

The USNWG agreed with the revision of S.1.1.1. and indicated their support for eliminating exemptions that were previously included in this proposed requirement. The work group also acknowledged that the language used makes it clear that the passenger is not obligated to accept a receipt.

There was no consensus among the work group regarding the amendment of S.1.1. at this time. The NIST Technical Advisor informed the USNWG that this topic will be discussed again at the group's next meeting.

Due to the association of the two requirements S.1.1. and S.1.1.1., the submission of a proposal to amend S.1.1.1. will be tabled until the USNWG has fully considered options for any amendment to S.1.1.

B. Proposal to amend S.1.9. Recorded Representation

This proposal would amend the existing specification requirement S.1.9. Recorded Representation by amending three of the current bulleted items in the existing requirement and adding three new bulleted items. In addition, two new notes would be added to this requirement to state that the recording element may be an integral component within a taximeter or a separate element in a system and to provide an option for electronic forms of receipts. The addition of the note stating that the recording element may either be housed within the taximeter or exist as a separate component will eliminate the need for the analogous statement now found in the main paragraph of the existing requirement.

Background:

Consideration of changes to the bullet points in this existing requirement by the work group began during its September 2012 meeting. Further discussion on these changes by the USNWG took place during the July 10, 2013 meeting. The item was again considered during the December 2013 USNWG meeting.

The revisions to the initial draft discussed in these meetings are incorporated into the draft proposal as shown below.

S.1.9. Recorded Representation. – A printed receipt issued from a taximeter, ~~whether through an integral or separate recording element~~, shall include the following:

- (a) date;
- (b) unique vehicle identification number, such as the medallion number, taxi number, vehicle identification number (VIN) or permit number;*
- (c) start and end time of trip;*
- (d) distance traveled, maximum increment of 0.1 kilometer (0.1 mile);*
- (e) fare in \$;
- (f) ~~for multi-rate taximeters~~, each rate at which fare was computed and the associated fare at that rate;*
- (g) additional charges in \$ where permitted such as extras (except those for additional passengers and luggage), surcharge, ~~telephone~~ ~~use~~ telecommunications, tip and tax shall be identified and ~~may be~~ itemized when required under local jurisdiction.* ~~and~~
- (h) total fare charge for service in \$ (~~total charge~~ sum of fare, extras, and all additional charges);*
- (i) any credits or discounts in \$ applied to the fare**
- (j) trip number, if available** and
- (k) telephone number (or other contact information) for customer assistance**

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1989] *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2000] **[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]

(Added 1988) (Amended 1999 and 201X)

Notes:

The recording element may be an integral element housed within the taximeter or it may be a separate component in a taximeter system.

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., e-mail, text message, computer file).

During the December 11, 2013 meeting the proposed changes shown in the above draft were discussed and agreed to by the work group. While these changes were accepted, it was suggested by some USNWG members that one additional piece of information be included in the proposal. Some members supported adding the identity of the company/owner as required information on a printed receipt. Others stated that this was not needed. Those not supporting the addition of the company's identification maintained that this information was already available through other identifiers such as the medallion or permit number. In support of the addition of this information, Mr. Stan Toy pointed out that not all jurisdictions will require medallions and that this information is a critical component to assist in identifying a particular taxi.

To determine the support of the various amendments discussed among the work group, a ballot (shown below) was circulated with the summary of the December 2013 meeting. The USNWG members were asked to make a selection indicating their choice regarding changes to the above draft.

To resolve this issue, members of the USNWG are asked to select one of the options for revising the above draft proposal from the following list.

a) Include the company or owner's name as a separate bulleted item under S.1.9.

b) Include the company or owner's name in conjunction with other identifiers listed under S.1.9.(b) as follows:

*(b) unique vehicle/company identification-~~number~~, such as the medallion number, taxi number, vehicle identification number (VIN) or permit number;**

c) Do not include the company or owner's name as a required data point

d) Other, please specify

Please respond by indicating:

"With regard to item I.B., I support option _____"

(Insert letter for your selection)

Discussion:

The results of the ballot sent to work group members following the December 2013 meeting was discussed at the March 2014 meeting. The work group was informed that the responses from the ballot did not indicate any firm agreement within the USNWG on this issue. Some members expressed the belief that the company/owner of the vehicle needs to be identified on a receipt while others do not.

During the March 2014 meeting, MR. Stan Toy stated that when a field official is assigned to perform an inspection/test on a particular taxi/taximeter and that device is located among many other taxis, the task of identifying an individual vehicle is onerous. This process can be streamlined if the company name or owner of the taxi is known. This information can then be used to identify vehicles belonging to that company.

Mr. Byron Corcoran explained that in general, a taximeter manufacturer will design a device that is capable of providing a certain, limited number of data lines or spaces that will be available for use on a printed receipt. The space provided can then be programmed to meet

the specific needs of the regulatory jurisdiction(s) where the taximeter is placed into service. It is therefore largely up to taxi owners/companies to obtain the specific information needed on receipts from the regulatory agency in the jurisdiction where the taximeter will operate. Because of this, it was recommended that only that information that will be universally prescribed by all jurisdictions be included in this requirement.

Ms. Tina Butcher pointed out that the proposal the work group is discussing is addressing a specification requirement and (pursuant to the information provided by Mr. Corcoran) as such, the focus of that requirement should address the manufacturer's design of that device rather than the way that it may be programmed to fit the need of specific users.

While some work group members suggested that wording be added to the draft proposal to indicate that local authorities will determine what information is needed on a receipt, others in the USNWG noted that local regulatory officials implicitly have the ability to impose additional requirements on owners/operators of commercial equipment under their regulatory authority. Based on this notion, the NIST Technical Advisor suggested that if additional specific information is needed on a printed receipt, it can be addressed through enforcement of local regulations.

A compromise was suggested by incorporating the company or owner's name under bullet point (b) in this requirement as a specific piece of information that can be provided on a receipt to assist in the identification of a particular vehicle. There was no consensus among the USNWG members attending the March 2014 meeting for inserting this additional data in the proposal for amending S.1.1.1.

Conclusion:

The NIST Technical Advisor informed the work group that this draft proposal will be revised to clarify the intent that local regulatory agencies have authority to require additional data on receipts issued under their jurisdiction. This draft will be presented at the next USNWG meeting for the member's review and comment.

C. Proposal to amend paragraph A.1. General

This proposal would add a statement to paragraph A.1 General in the HB44 Taximeters Code as shown below.

A.1. General. – This code applies to taximeters; that is, to devices that automatically calculate at a predetermined rate or rates and indicate the charge for

hire of a vehicle. **These calculations are based on time and distance measuring devices located on or in the vehicle.**

(Amended 20XX)

The added statement would serve multiple purposes. In addition to bringing U.S. standards and international standards published by the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) into closer alignment, the changes as shown would make it inappropriate to apply the existing HB44 Taximeters Code to devices that, in some instances are being used as commercial distance and time measurement devices but are not permanently installed in the vehicle.

Background:

This proposed amendment was developed during a meeting conducted in August 2011 and is derived from language found in the international standard, OIML R21 (*Taximeters*). The basis of the proposed new language shown above can be found in clause **1.2 Principle of operation** (excerpt shown below) in OIML R21 (2007 edition).

1.2 Principle of operation

A distance measurement transducer (2.2.4) installed in the taxi provides the taximeter with distance information. The taximeter receives the output signal(s) from the distance measurement transducer and the time measuring ...

Traditional type taximeter systems receive a distance measurement signal from a transducer (e.g., a vehicle speed sensor) or more recently from the vehicles computer control module through the “on board diagnostic” (OBD) connection. Both of these sources of distance measurements are installed as integral components on the vehicle.

In recent years, the use of the Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) system has also been considered as a source of distance/time information that can be used to calculate vehicle-for-hire fares. Addressing the potential use of GPS technology, the USNWG agreed in general during its September 2012 meeting that the NIST Handbook 44 Taximeters Code should not include any requirements which would exclude the use of distance and time measurements as determined by the GPS system.

Currently, it is not known if any taximeter manufacturer is producing taximeters designed to receive time and distance measurements from the GPS system. It is however, being reported that some vehicle-for-hire service providers are determining passenger fares using equipment

that receives distance and time measurement from the GPS system. These reports specifically state that mobile “smart” telephones (which are not permanently installed in the vehicle) are used to gather measurement data from the GPS system and then, to calculate passenger fares.

The mobile telephones are GPS enabled and use software applications (“apps”) that calculate fare charges based on the GPS measurements and a rate(s) programmed into the software. This type of system is being used to facilitate commercial transactions and take the place of a traditional taximeter. These types of “virtual” taximeter systems have been identified by regulatory officials and are being used as commercial devices in select areas of the U.S.

The portability of these “smart” telephones and the fact that they are not “installed” in the vehicle are contributing factors to concerns about the metrological integrity of this equipment. The security of the software applications being used in these transactions is also a concern.

Because the proposed amendment can be interpreted in such a way that would require the time and distance measuring device to be *installed* in a vehicle, a conventional mobile telephone would not likely be considered to be a device that would readily comply with this requirement. Other specification requirements, related to the display of transaction information that already exists in NIST HB44 Taximeters Code would most likely preclude the application of that code to the use of a typical mobile telephone as a commercial device.

The USNWG was presented with this proposal and asked to comment on it during their September 2013 meeting. At that time it was noted that the draft of the proposed amendment does not clearly specify that the measurement device must be *installed* in the vehicle, only that it be located on or in the vehicle.

It was also noted during this meeting that existing requirements allow taximeters to be installed in a manner (using slide-mounted brackets) that permit the taximeter to easily be removed from the vehicle. The point was made however, that while the taximeter may be removed; there is no provision allowing for the removal of the transducer supplying the distance measurement.

No conclusions were arrived at when this item was discussed during the September 2013 meeting and the work group will be asked to consider this proposal further. While this item appeared on the December 2013 meeting agenda, time did not permit the work group to discuss it at that time. Specific questions to be answered by the USNWG are as follows.

- Acknowledging that this proposal may preclude the use of typical “smart phones” being used in some transactions and which are not “installed” in the vehicle; does the USNWG believe this proposed change to be appropriate and necessary?

- If this proposal is supported by the work group, does the wording need to be amended so that it is clear that the device supplying a distance measurement for use in calculating fares is to be permanently installed in/on the vehicle?

Discussion:

At the March 2014 USNWG meeting, the NIST Technical Advisor reminded USNWG members that existing requirements would preclude the application of the HB44 Taximeters Code to regulate a typical smart phone being used as a “virtual taximeter.” This being the case, the work group was advised to thoroughly consider the significant effect proposing this type of amendment to A.1. could have.

Ms. Tina Butcher clarified language used in the description of this item within an agenda for the USNWG’s March 2014 meeting by stating that this proposed language would not preclude the use of a device not permanently installed in a vehicle however, it would preclude the use of the HB44 Taximeters Code to regulate that type of device.

Although a number of general concerns have been expressed by members of the USNWG regarding the security and preservation of the metrological integrity of smart phones (if used as a commercial measuring device), the work group acknowledges that HB44 requirements should not stifle new technology by being overly prescriptive the design of commercial devices.

Ms. Joanne Rausen added that the work group should exercise caution in developing requirements that could possibly prohibit any particular type of technology used in the design of taximeters including the use of smart phones.

Mr. Bill Fishman pointed out that there are a number of existing requirements in the Taximeters Code that a typical smart phone would not comply with as a commercial device. These existing requirements include specifications that are related to the visibility of passenger’s indications by declaring a minimum size for those indications.

Mr. Stan Toy asked the work group if there was any consideration given to whether the passenger’s smart phone (assuming they would have one) could be considered as a supplemental display in a taximeter system if the same app is activated on the passenger’s smart phone. While no definitive conclusion was arrived at, the work group generally agreed that if all smart phones were permitted to be used as a component in taximeter systems, regulation would be practically impossible.

Ms. Jen Ghaussy stated that her employer, Uber does not use smart phones as described above. She informed the work group that Uber typically supplies an app to service providers to use in conjunction with traditional type of taximeters and that the smart phone/app is not used to calculate a fare based on distance and/or time. Instead the app is used only used to

make a request for a vehicle, dispatch a vehicle, and produce a record of the trip details and associated charges.

Mr. Amos Tanam stated that he shares concerns over the use of certain software applications due to an insufficient level of security for the devices and systems they are used with.

Conclusion:

There is no consensus within the USNWG on the disposition of this item. The work group agrees that this item should continue to be developed and that no resolution of the many issues involved with the item will be reached at this time. The item will be tabled for further discussion and consideration at future meetings.

II. New Items

A. Proposal for a new requirement: S.1.3.3. Customer's Indications.

The proposal for this new requirement is based on the emergence of supplemental indicating devices within a taximeter system such as passenger information monitors (PIMs) and an obligation to assure that these devices provide sufficient transaction information for the passenger.

S.1.3.3. Customer's Indications. – A point-of-sale system's indicating element positioned in the passenger compartment shall clearly display:

(a) indications for all fees; and

(b) values that are in agreement with indicated values on all other displays.

(Added 201X)

Background:

This proposed new requirement was developed during a meeting of regulatory officials in August 2011 with the intent of providing a passenger with information regarding a transaction involving a taximeter. This technology is appearing in the form of a "Passenger Information Monitor" or PIM. Since this type of display will be installed in a location where it is easily viewed by the passenger, this initial proposal focused on making available all relevant information about a trip to the customer.

Discussion:

AT the March 2014 meeting, the NIST Technical Advisor introduced the proposed new requirement to the USNWG and presented the work group members with issues related to it that should be addressed. These issues include:

- Whether or not it is appropriate to use the term “point-of-sale system” in the proposal or should this be replaced by the term “taximeter system”. This is in consideration of the lengthy debates that this group has had in previous meetings over the term “point-of-sale” and its definition;
- Does the work group believe that the term “passenger compartment” used in the proposal needs to be clarified/defined;
- Determining if the charges mentioned in the proposal would need to be itemized as is required on printed receipts (see HB44 Taximeters Code paragraph S.1.9.g); and
- Recognizing that this type of equipment will likely be used to display information or advertisements for other products/services that may be purchased along with the taxi service and how the display of that additional information could affect the display of required information related to the taxi service.

The NIST Technical Advisor asked the work group if they were aware of situations where these types of devices are installed exclusively for displaying advertisements or other information not associated with taxi services. It was suggested that if the devices are installed and used in such a way that they are completely disassociated with the taxi service, then there would appear to be no justification to apply HB44 requirements in those cases.

Responses from the members with experience with these devices indicated that they will be used to display information or charges associated with the taxi service and/or to facilitate electronic payment for taxi service.

Mr. Bill Fishman stated that it is likely that this type of device could serve to provide the passenger with information regarding charges or trip information and to also display advertisements for other services or products. In those cases, regulation is needed to ensure that the information regarding the commercial transaction does not become obstructed from the passenger’s view.

Ms. Joanne Rausen posed the following question to the group: “If a PIM is used to enter an amount for a tip at the conclusion of a trip, will the total gross charge (including the tip) need to be displayed on the primary display (i.e., the taximeter). Some members in the work group responded that presumably, because the taximeter at this point would not register the total charges (including the tip), the charges displayed on the PIM would not match exactly those displayed on the taximeter. The charges displayed on the taximeter would not reflect

the addition of a tip that would be displayed on a PIM. Because of this type of situation, the USWNG suggested that any agreement between displays in a system should be stated in terms of specific types of charges incurred.

Conclusion:

The concerns about the present draft of the proposal prompted the work group to conclude that this proposal is not fully developed. The NIST Technical Advisor will draft a revision for this proposal to be considered at a future meeting of the USNWG.

B. Proposed amendment for S.2. Basis of Fare Calculations

This proposed change to the existing S.2. addresses the lack of any reference in the requirement to a fare charge that is based on a flat rate or negotiated flat rate when either distance traveled or time elapsed has not occurred at the time the rate is determined. The recommended changes are shown below.

S.2. Basis of Fare Calculations. – A taximeter shall calculate fares only upon the basis of:

- (a) distance traveled;
- (b) time elapsed; ~~or~~
- (c) a combination of distance traveled and time elapsed; or
- (d) a negotiated flat rate.**

(Amended 1977 and 20XX)

Background:

This proposed amendment was developed during a meeting of regulatory officials in August 2011 and has not been addressed previously by the USNWG. It is intended to acknowledge the use of (where permitted) a flat rate or negotiated flat rate. In these transactions a flat rate is entered into the taximeter and the result is a display of a fare charge. This display of a fare could be considered as being in violation of the existing S.2. due to the charge not being generated from either distance traveled or time elapsed.

Discussion:

During the March 2014 meeting the USNWG was presented this item and asked for comments. The NIST Technical Advisor asked the work group whether the proposal is justified and whether the amendment (as shown above) is appropriate. A recommendation was made that the amendment be revised by adding the wording “a flat rate or”... to the beginning of bullet point (d).

Ms. Joanne Rausen stated that the wording proposed in the amendment should be expanded to indicate that not only negotiated flat rates could be entered but that “established” flat rates could also be entered as fare charges. The use of the term “established” was noted and Mr. Bill Fishman added that this type of charge would be required to be posted on a statement of rates (see UR.3. in HB44 Taximeters Code). Mr. Fishman also noted that definition may be necessary to distinguish between the two terms (negotiated flat rate and flat rate).

The group was presented with the edited version of the proposed amendment during the March 2014 meeting. There were no objections heard to the revised version shown below.

S.2. Basis of Fare Calculations. – A taximeter shall calculate fares only upon the basis of:

- (a) distance traveled;
- (b) time elapsed; ~~or~~
- (c) a combination of distance traveled and time elapsed; or
- (d) an established flat rate or negotiated flat rate.**

(Amended 1977 **and 20XX**)

Conclusion:

The USNWG agreed to support the proposed amendment to S.2. as revised and shown above. This proposal will be submitted for consideration at the Regional Weights and Measures Associations.

IV. Attendance

John Barton	NIST OWM (USNWG Technical Advisor)	john.barton@nist.gov
Tina Butcher	NIST OWM	Tina.butcher@nist.gov
Bill Fishman	Retired NY Bureau of W/M	bfishman@nycap.rr.com
Aileen Fox Keith Walsh	NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission - Legal Unit	foxa@tlc.nyc.gov Walshke@tlc.nyc.gov
Joanne Rausen Ryan Wanttaga	NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission - Policy & External Affairs department	Rausenj@tlc.nyc.gov wanttajar@tlc.nyc.gov
Amos Tamam	VeriFone	Amos_T1@VERIFONE.com
Viktor Gruber	City and County of San Francisco	viktor.gruber@sfdph.org
Jen Ghaussy	Uber Technologies	
Taila Martin	Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf, LLP	tmartin@windelsmarx.com
Stan Toy	Santa Clara Weights and Measures	stan.toy@aem.sccgov.org
Ray Cunningham	Town of Brookline, MA	rcunningham@brooklinema.gov
Byron Corcoran	Centrodyne	byron@centrodyne.com
Kevin McDonald	City of Chicago	Kevin.McDonald@cityofchicago.org