

Addendum Sheets

Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee Interim Report

Mr. Steve Giguere, Committee Chair
Maine

300 INTRODUCTION

The S&T Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “committee”) submits its Committee Interim Report for consideration by National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM). This report contains the items published in *NCWM Publication 16 Committee Reports for the 97th Annual Meeting* and this addendum. The report will address the following items in Table A during the Annual Meeting. Table A identifies the agenda items as they appear in *NCWM Publication 16* and page numbers refer to that publication.

Following Table A of this addendum, items are grouped according to item status: **(VC) Voting Consent Calendar:** the committee has grouped these items for a single vote; **(V) Voting Item:** the committee is making recommendations requiring a vote by the active members of NCWM; **(I) Informational Item:** the item is under consideration by the committee but not proposed for Voting; **(D) Developing Item:** the committee determined the item has merit; however, the item was returned to the submitter or other designated party for further development before any action can be taken at the national level; **(W) Withdrawn Item:** the item has been removed from consideration by the committee.

Subject Series List

Introduction	300 Series
NIST Handbook 44 – General Code.....	310 Series
Scales.....	320 Series
Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems	321 Series
Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems	322 Series
Weights.....	323 Series
Automatic Weighing Systems	324 Series
Liquid-Measuring Devices	330 Series
Vehicle-Tank Meters	331 Series
Liquefied Petroleum Gas and Anhydrous Ammonia Liquid-Measuring Devices	332 Series
Hydrocarbon Gas Vapor-Measuring Devices.....	333 Series
Cryogenic Liquid-Measuring Devices.....	334 Series
Milk Meters	335 Series
Water Meters	336 Series
Mass Flow Meters	337 Series
Carbon Dioxide Liquid-Measuring Devices.....	338 Series
Hydrogen Gas-Metering Devices – Tentative Code.....	339 Series
Vehicle Tanks Used as Measures	340 Series
Liquid Measures	341 Series
Farm Milk Tanks	342 Series
Measure-Containers.....	343 Series
Graduates.....	344 Series
Dry Measures	345 Series
Berry Baskets and Boxes.....	346 Series
Fabric-Measuring Devices.....	350 Series
Wire-and Cordage-Measuring Devices	351 Series
Linear Measures	352 Series
Odometers	353 Series
Taximeters.....	354 Series
Timing Devices	355 Series
Grain Moisture Meters	356 Series
Near-Infrared Grain Analyzers.....	357 Series
Multiple Dimension Measuring Devices	358 Series
Electronic Livestock, Meat, and Poultry Evaluation Systems and/or Devices – Tentative Code.....	359 Series
Other Items – Developing Items.....	360 Series

Table A
Table of Contents

Reference Key	Title of Item	NCWM Publication 16 S&T Page
300	INTRODUCTION	
320	SCALES	
320-1	W S.1.7. Capacity Indication, Weight Ranges, and Unit Weights	5
320-2	I S.6.4. Railway Track Scales and Appendix D – Definitions	7
320-3	V N.3.1.2. Interim Approval.....	11
320-4	V UR.1.2. Grain Hopper Scales	13
320-5	I Appendix C – Units of Mass (ton).....	19
320-6	V Appendix D – Definitions (Reference Weight Car).....	23
321	BELT-CONVEYOR SCALE SYSTEMS	
321-1	V S.1.9. Zero Ready Indicator	24
321-2	V UR.1. User Requirements	28
330	LIQUID MEASURING DEVICES	
330-1	V S.1.6.4.1. Unit Price; S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price; S.1.6.6. Agreement Between Indications; S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations; S.1.6.8. Recorded Representations for Transactions Where a Post-Delivery Discount(s) is Provided; UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity; and UR.3.3. Computing Device	32
330-2	V S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price.....	40
330-3	V S.1.6.6. Agreement Between Indications.....	40
330-4	V S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations	40
330-5	V UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity	40
330-6	V UR.3.3. Computing Device	40
330-7	W UR.3.X. Nozzle Color for Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers	40
331	VEHICLE-TANK METERS	
331-1	I T.4. Product Depletion Test.....	42
336	WATER METERS	
336-1	V S.3. Markings.....	46
354	TAXIMETERS	
354-1	D S.5. Provision for Security Seals	47
354-2	D Global Positioning Systems Applications for Taximeters	48
356	GRAIN MOISTURE METERS	
356-1	I UR.3.4. Printed Tickets	48
358	MULTIPLE DIMENSION MEASURING DEVICES	
358-1	V N.1.3.4. Test Objects with Protrusions	50
359	ELECTRONIC LIVESTOCK, MEAT, AND POULTRY EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND/OR DEVICES – TENTATIVE CODE	
359-1	V Tentative Status of Code Section 5.59.....	51
360	OTHER ITEMS – DEVELOPING ITEMS	
360-1	D International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) Report	53
360-2	D G-S.1. Identification. – (Software)	55
360-3	D Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group.....	58
360-4	D Part 3.30. Price Posting and Computing Capability and Requirements for a Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser (RMFD).....	62
360-5	D S.5. Provision for Security Seals	63
360-6	D Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters	65

Consent Calendar Items

Reference Key	Title of Item	Addendum S&T Page
320	SCALES	6
320-4	VC UR.1.2. Grain Hopper Scales.....	11
320-6	VC Appendix D – Definitions (Reference Weight Car).....	12
321	BELT-CONVEYOR SCALE SYSTEMS	13
321-2	VC UR.1. User Requirements	14
358	MULTIPLE DIMENSION MEASURING DEVICES	18
358-1	VC N.1.3.4. Test Objects with Protrusions	18
359	ELECTRONIC LIVESTOCK, MEAT, AND POULTRY EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND/OR DEVICES – TENTATIVE CODE	19
359-1	VC Tentative Status of Code Section 5.59.....	19

Voting Item(s)

Reference Key	Title of Item	Addendum S&T Page
320	SCALES	6
320-3	V N.3.1.2. Interim Approval.....	8
321	BELT-CONVEYOR SCALE SYSTEMS	13
321-1	V S.1.9. Zero Ready Indicator	13
330	LIQUID MEASURING DEVICES	14
330-1	V Unit Price Posting, Selection, and Display Requirements - S.1.6.4.1. Unit Price; S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price; S.1.6.6. Agreement Between Indications; S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations; S.1.6.8. Recorded Representations for Transactions Where a Post-Delivery Discount(s) is Provided; UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity; and UR.3.3. Computing Device.....	14
330-2	V S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price.....	16
330-3	V S.1.6.6. Agreement Between Indications	16
330-4	V S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations	16
330-5	V UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity	16
330-6	V UR.3.3. Computing Device	16
336	WATER METERS	17
336-1	V S.3. Markings.....	17

Informational Item(s)		
Reference Key	Title of Item	Addendum S&T Page
320	SCALES	6
320-2	I S.6.4. Railway Track Scales and Appendix D – Definitions	6
320-5	I Appendix C – Units of Mass (ton).....	11
331	VEHICLE-TANK METERS	16
331-1	I T.4. Product Depletion Test.....	16
356	GRAIN MOISTURE METERS	18
356-1	I UR.3.4. Printed Tickets	18

Developing Item(s)		
Reference Key	Title of Item	Addendum S&T Page
354	TAXIMETERS	17
354-1	D S.5. Provision for Security Seals	17
354-2	D Global Positioning Systems Applications for Taximeters	17
360	OTHER ITEMS – DEVELOPING ITEMS	19
360-1	D International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) Report	19
360-2	D G-S.1. Identification. – (Software)	19
360-3	D Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group.....	20
360-4	D Part 3.30. Price Posting and Computing Capability and Requirements for a Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser (RMFD)	20
360-5	D S.5. Provision for Security Seals	20
360-6	D Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters	21

Withdrawn Item(s)		
Reference Key	Title of Item	Addendum S&T Page
320	SCALES	6
320-1	W S.1.7. Capacity Indication, Weight Ranges, and Unit Weights	6
330	LIQUID MEASURING DEVICES	14
330-7	W UR.3.X. Nozzle Color for Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers	16

Details of All Items
(In order by Reference Key)

320 SCALES

320-1 W S.1.7. Capacity Indication, Weight Ranges, and Unit Weights

No change.

320-2 I S.6.4. Railway Track Scales and Appendix D – Definitions

Add the following to the Committee’s Report:

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting open hearings, Mr. Darrel Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking on behalf of SMA stated that SMA supports the proposal as written.

The Committee also heard comments from Ms. Juana Williams, speaking on behalf of NIST OWM. OWM notes that bullet (d) of the proposal was added by the Committee during the 2012 NCWM Interim Meeting after it was made known there existed at least one CC (and possibly more) for railway track scales with nominal capacities greater than the lesser of the values corresponding to bullets (a), (b), and (c), which created potential conflicts between the requirement as originally proposed and the information on some existing CCs.

During further analysis of this item, OWM recognized that information on CCs is sometimes amended. If the capacity specified on a CC issued for a railroad scale were changed, it could have an impact on the application of the proposed requirement; perhaps causing a device that once was compliant to be in violation. For this reason, OWM questions whether bullet (d) in the Item Under Consideration should be included as one of the factors to be used in determining whether or not a device complies. If the Committee agrees with this concern, it might, as an alternative to adding bullet (d), consider dividing the Item Under Consideration into two parts and assigning different enforcement dates to those parts. For example, new equipment could be required to comply with the proposed new portion of the paragraph while equipment already in service could continue to have to comply with the existing paragraph.

If the Committee were to decide to divide this paragraph into two parts, it would be necessary to include the two struck out sentences in the Item Under Consideration with the existing (old) portion of the paragraph. OWM offered an example to show how the concerns described in the analysis of this item might be addressed in the language and proposed modifying the requirements to be retroactive in nature.

OWM also pointed out that the current version of the proposed language uses “ton” units in the proposed table and “lb” units in the proposed changes to paragraph S.6.4. The Committee may wish to consider making the units consistent by either using both units for every value [e.g., 640,000 lb (320 ton)] or only use a single unit. Note that the railroad industry has traditionally rated section capacity in tons and nominal capacity in “lb” units. Additionally, OWM will likely include equivalent SI values in HB 44 if this item is adopted.

Mr. Steve Beitzel, SAI, commented that, as the original submitter, he supports the changes proposed by OWM to the item, including: the proposed change to a retroactive status and the proposed change of the values in the table from tons to pounds. He also suggested that the definition for “Weigh Module” be further modified to delete the phrase “of the weighing element” at the end of the first sentence. Mr. Beitzel also agreed with OWM’s suggestion to delete subparagraph S.6.4. (d).

Mr. Rafael Jimenez, AAR, stated that AAR supports the changes outlined by Steve, including those offered by OWM.

The Committee recommends deleting the proposal under “Item Under Consideration” in NCWM Publication 16 and replacing it with the following:

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.

(a) For scales manufactured from January 1, 2002 through December 31, 20XX:

- (1) **The nominal capacity of a scale with more than two sections shall not exceed twice its rated section capacity.**
- (2) **The nominal capacity of a two section scale shall not exceed its rated section capacity.**

(b) For scales manufactured on or after January 1, 20XX, the nominal scale capacity shall not exceed the lesser of:

- (1) **The sum of the Weigh Module Capacities as shown in Table S.6.4, or;**
- (2) **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 $RSC \times (Ns - Nd - 0.5)$; or**
- (3) **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	
<u>Weigh Module Length (m)</u>	<u>Weigh Module Capacity (kg)</u>
<u>< 1.5</u>	<u>36 300</u>
<u>1.5 to < 3.0</u>	<u>72 600</u>
<u>3.0 to < 4.5</u>	<u>108 900</u>
<u>4.5 to < 7.0</u>	<u>145 100</u>
<u>7.0 to < 9.0</u>	<u>168 700</u>
<u>9.0 to < 10.5</u>	<u>192 300</u>
<u>10.5 to < 12.0</u>	<u>234 100</u>
<u>12.0 to < 17.0</u>	<u>257 600</u>
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	
<u>Weigh Module Length (ft)</u>	<u>Weigh Module Capacity (lb)</u>
<u><5</u>	<u>80 000</u>
<u>5 to < 10</u>	<u>160 000</u>
<u>10 to < 15</u>	<u>240 000</u>
<u>15 to < 23</u>	<u>320 000</u>
<u>23 to < 29</u>	<u>372 000</u>
<u>29 to < 35</u>	<u>424 000</u>
<u>35 to < 40</u>	<u>516 000</u>
<u>40 to < 56</u>	<u>568 000</u>
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)

2) 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]

320-3 V N.3.1.2. Interim Approval

Add the following to the Committee’s Report:

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received numerous comments on the proposed changes.

The Committee heard comments from Ms. Kristin Macey who suggested changing the word “may” to “shall” in the first sentence of paragraph N.1.3.2.

NIST OWM noted that there appears to be some disagreement among those who proposed the changes to this paragraph about how the amended paragraph is to be applied. There seems to be some question regarding the

meaning of the word “repair” in the “Item Under Consideration” and whether or not an adjustment to the calibration of a scale would be considered a “repair.”

Several unanswered questions should be considered:

- Under what conditions would it be permissible for a service company to make an adjustment to the calibration of a railway track scale when using only 30 000 lb of test weight?
- What constitutes a “repair”?

OWM also commented that, if the U.S. Railroads and/or S&T Committee might develop some examples to explain how the amended language applies, this may assist weights and measures officials and industry in consistently applying the requirements. The following scenario and associated questions might serve as a good starting point in developing some examples as suggested by OWM.

Scenario: A scale service agency, under contract with a railway track scale owner, discovers the scale out-of-tolerance when testing it using 30 000 lb of test weight.

Considering the changes proposed:

1. Given that the scale is “out-of-tolerance,” would it be permissible for the technician to break the seal and make adjustments to bring the scale’s accuracy closer to zero error?
2. Would it make any difference if the scale was “in tolerance” and the technician only wanted to break the seal to adjust accuracy closer to zero error?
3. Would it make any difference if the service technician had performed a thorough inspection of the scale and could not find any obvious problem(s) to cause it to be out of tolerance?

Should the Committee decide to move forward with this item, OWM suggests amending not only N.3.1.2., but also N.3.1. and N.3.1.1. to make clear the testing that is to be performed and the minimum amount of test weight required for Initial and Subsequent Tests in comparison to an Interim Test, which is only intended to temporarily return a railway track scale to service following repairs. OWM offered specific suggestions for modifying the language for the Committee to consider, noting that these changes were intended to be editorial in nature.

Rafael Jimenez, AAR, supported changes proposed by OWM. Mr. Henry Oppermann, Weights and Measures Consulting, concurred with many of OWM’s points. Mr. Lou Straub, Fairbanks, suggested that the proposed N.1.3.2. (d) in OWM’s proposal would better be presented as a separate note rather than a bullet point.

The Committee heard numerous comments regarding the use of the word “repairs.” Mr. Henry Oppermann noted that the reference to the term is ambiguous. Mr. Bob Feezor, Scales Consulting and Testing, commented that there is not universal agreement on the definition for the term and it is left to the official with statutory authority. Ms. Julie Quinn, MN, commented that the CWMA has expressed concerns about the distinctions between calibrations and repairs since its 2011 Annual Meeting. Mr. Steve Beitzel, SAI, further noted that in the Committee’s 1990 Final Report, the original reference to “repairs” was actually to “emergency repairs.”

The Committee also heard multiple comments agreeing that 30,000 lb isn’t adequate to permanently place a scale back into service and that at least 80,000 lb is required. Many acknowledged that there is limited access to adequate test weight loads, particularly given schedule conflicts that limit the availability of the test units.

Mr. Darrell Flocken, speaking on behalf of SMA, indicated that SMA supports the item. Speaking on behalf of Mettler Toledo, Mr. Flocken expressed concerns about adding the words “temporary service” because this may set a precedence that might overlap to other scales. He also cited similar concerns about the word “repair” and suggested caution in using the term, noting the lengthy discussions that took place within the NCWM during discussions of “repaired” and “remanufactured” equipment and the overlap into other device types.

After considering the many comments received, the Committee acknowledged that the term “repairs” appears in the current version of the language and in other paragraphs in Handbook 44. The Committee agreed that the intent of the term “repairs” was referencing emergency situations such as when a railway track scale is inoperable. The Committee has received some indication that AREMA Committee 34 may be willing to assist the Committee in clarifying the circumstances under which an Interim Test would be appropriate.

The Committee considered the suggestion from Ms. Macey to modify the term “may” in the first sentence of N.3.1.2. to “shall.” While the Committee understands the rationale for Ms. Macey’s suggestion, Committee members believe that the word “shall” is not appropriate because an “Interim Test” is only permitted if there is no access to 80,000 pounds of weight. Using less weight than is normally required to return a scale to service is only permitted when there is no access to 80,000 lb.

The Committee agreed that the language suggested by NIST OWM offers an alternative that is easier to read and apply and helps to clarify the requirements for an Interim Test. The Committee considered Mr. Straub’s suggestion to move N.1.3.2.(d); however, the Committee agreed that the sub paragraphs under N.1.3.2. are all conditions necessary in order to conduct an Interim test. The Committee modified OWM’s original proposal to: (1) add a new subparagraph (a) and renumber the subsequent subparagraphs; and (2) modify the reference to “time period of temporary use” to “length of Interim Use.”

The Committee recommends modifying the proposed paragraph in the Item Under Consideration” as follows.

N.3.1. Minimum Test-Weight Load and ~~Tests Recommended Strain-Load Test~~ for Railway Track Scales.

(Amended 1990 and 2012)

N.3.1.1. Initial and Subsequent Tests Approval. – The test-weight load shall be not less than 35 000 kg (80 000 lb). A strain-load test conducted up to the used capacity of the weighing system is recommended.

(Added 1990) (Amended 2012)

N.3.1.2. Interim Test Approval. – ~~A test weight load of not less than 13 500 kg (30 000 lb) and a strain-load test up to at least 25 % of scale capacity may be used to return a scale into service following repairs.~~

An Interim Test may be used to return a railway track scale into temporary service following repairs that could affect the accuracy of the weighing system provided all of the following conditions are met:

- (a) A test weight load of not less than 13 500 kg (30 000 lb) shall be used;**
- (b) A shift (section) test shall be conducted using a test-weight load of not less than 13 500 kg (30 000 lb);**
- (c) A strain-load test shall be conducted up to at least 25 % of scale capacity;**
- (d) All test results shall be within applicable tolerances; and**
- (e) The official with statutory authority shall be immediately notified when scales are repaired and placed in temporary service with an Interim Test. The length of “Interim Use” is at the discretion of the official with statutory authority.**

(Added 1990) (Amended 2012)

~~Note: The length of time the scale may be used following an interim test is at the discretion of the official with statutory authority.~~

~~(Added 1990)~~

320-4 VC UR.1.2. Grain Hopper Scales

Add the following to the Committee's Report:

At their 2012 Annual Meetings, both NEWMA and CWMA supported this item as a voting item. The CWMA also noted that the proposal provides greater clarification of what is required with regard to accuracy class markings of a hopper scale used to weigh grain.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard no additional comments on this item.

The Committee is recommending no changes to the "Item Under Consideration."

320-5 I Appendix C – Units of Mass (ton)

Add the following to the Committee's Report:

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, NEWMA supported the item as amended at the 2012 Interim Meeting. NEWMA questioned whether the wrong "Units of Mass" table was included in the NCWM S&T Committee's Interim Report.

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, CWMA recommended that the item remain Informational. The CWMA also recommended changing the abbreviation "t," which refers to a "short ton," to "tn" to avoid conflict with the recommended proposal. At that meeting Darrell Flocken supported "tn" as an acceptable abbreviation for "short ton," but does not support "lt" as the abbreviation for "long ton;" he also suggested that the abbreviation "lt" was erroneously left in the proposal.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee acknowledged that the reference to "lt" is no longer under consideration. Mr. Darrell Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking on behalf of SMA, reiterated the comments he made at the CWMA meeting and supported changing the item to "Informational."

Juana Williams, NIST OWM, shared technical input from NIST OWM regarding the proposed changes. NIST OWM notes that the 2011 Publication 14 Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems type evaluation criteria provides a table on page BCS-4 that 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 2011 version of Pub 14 BCS systems 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 abbreviation “T” for U.S. short ton in Pub 14 conflicts with the acceptable abbreviation for the U.S. short ton specified in Appendix C of Handbook 44, which is “t.” A search of the word “ton” in Appendix C of NIST Handbook 44 revealed that nowhere is upper case “T” used, although lower case “t” appears as an acceptable abbreviation for both the U.S. short (or net) ton (page C-6) and the metric ton (page C-19). OWM is concerned that officials applying paragraph G-S.5.6.1. might be inclined to reject an upper case “T” as an acceptable abbreviation for the U.S. short (or net) ton even though Pub 14 indicates that the upper case “T” is acceptable. Officials might also find it confusing if lower case “tn” were made an acceptable abbreviation for the U.S. short or net ton, given that the table on page BCS-4 of Pub 14 specifies lower case “t” as the acceptable abbreviation for the metric ton.

OWM notes that 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 is not likely 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.

OWM suggested that the Committee 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. OWM also noted that the abbreviation “lt” was erroneously left in the table.

The Committee agreed that the “lt” abbreviation for “1 ton, gross or long” in the table on page S&T 20 of 2012 Publication 16 was erroneously left in the table from the original proposal and should be removed.

The Committee reiterated its request for input from the community on the impact that this item might have on existing scales in the marketplace and asks for input regarding what additional changes might be needed to the proposal prior to moving it forward.

The Committee recommends deleting the reference to “Long Ton” in the “Purpose” so that it reads as follows:

“Purpose: Establish uniform abbreviations for Short Ton.”

The Committee also recommends deleting the reference to “lt” in the “Units of Mass” table in the “Item Under Consideration” so that the reference for “1 ton, gross” reads as follows:

1 ton, gross or long¹⁹

The Committee is recommending no other changes to the “Item Under Consideration.”

320-6 VC Appendix D – Definitions (Reference Weight Car)

Add the following to the Committee’s Report:

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, the CWMA suggested the phrase “uncoupled on both ends” be added to the proposed new sentence to be consistent with AREMA requirements and supported the item, as modified, as a voting item.

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, NEWMA supported the item as written as a voting item.

At the Committee’s 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting open hearings, Mr. Darrell Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking on behalf of the SMA stated that SMA supports this item.

Ms. Juana Williams, speaking on behalf of NIST OWM, offered technical comments for the Committee to consider in its deliberation on this item. OWM notes that weighing a reference weight car, while the car is “coupled” on either end to another railcar or engine could result in binding/friction to the extent that the error and uncertainty in the reference weight car might well exceed the maximum allowable specified in NIST Handbook 44, Appendix A Fundamental Considerations. This section of the Fundamental Considerations specifies that the combined error and uncertainty of any standard used in testing commercial weighing and measuring equipment, when used without correction, must be less than one-third the applicable device tolerance.

OWM also commented that inserting only the word “uncoupled” into the new sentence proposed to be added to the definition of “reference weight car” implies that reference weight cars are to be weighed uncoupled on both ends. Adding the more descriptive phrase “uncoupled on both ends” as suggested by the CWMA removes all doubt concerning how the cars are to be weighed.

Ms. Julie Quinn, MN, supported including the reference suggested by the CWMA.

Mr. Rafael Jimenez, AAR, stated that AAR supports this item, but does not support the inclusion of the reference to “uncoupled on both ends” pending the results of additional testing. Mr. Steve Beitzel, SAI, supports the item, but does not support including procedures (including the statement “uncoupled on both ends”) in the definition.

The Committee recognizes the importance of proper testing procedures, but agreed that the definition is not the place for procedures to be specified. The Committee encourages the collection of data by AAR and looks forward to seeing it when available.

The Committee recommends no changes to the “Item Under Consideration.”

321 BELT-CONVEYOR SCALE SYSTEMS

321-1 V S.1.9. Zero Ready Indicator

Add the following to the Committee’s Report:

At their 2012 Annual Meetings, NEWMA and CWMA supported the item as a voting item. NEWMA also acknowledged the need to renumber the paragraph should Item 321-2 pass.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from Juana Williams, speaking on behalf of NIST OWM, who noted that adding a Specification requirement that defines a proper zero-load balance condition on a belt-conveyor scale system and an associated User Requirement that requires operators to start each commercial weighment with the scale on zero (i.e., in a proper zero-balance condition) would make the Belt Conveyor Scales Systems Code more consistent with other device codes in NIST Handbook 44 and likely improve the accuracy of the measurement process.

With regard to the proposed paragraph S.1.9. Zero Ready Indicator, OWM commented that the words “permanent means” seems to be confusing. OWM suggested that the Committee consider whether or not the first two sentences might be consolidated into a single sentence which better describes how the zero ready indicator is intended to operate and offered a suggestion for the Committee to consider.

Mr. Bill Ripka, Thermo Fisher Scientific supported the item with OWM’s proposed changes and commented that he believed the remainder of the Belt Scale Work Group would also support the changes. Mr. Ripka also suggested establishing a nonretroactive date of 2014.

Mr. Darrell Flocken, speaking on behalf of SMA, supported the original proposal, noting that he would like to review OWM's proposal in more detail before commenting on it one way or the other.

Based on comments received and general support for OWM's proposed modifications, the Committee agreed to replace proposed S.1.9. as shown in the "Item Under Consideration" in the Committee's Interim Report with the following and to specify a nonretroactive date of 2014:

S.1.9. Zero Ready Indicator. - A belt conveyor scale shall be equipped with a zero ready indicator that produces an audio or visual signal when the zero is within +/- 0.12% of the rated capacity of the scale during an unloaded belt condition. The type of indication (audio or visual) shall be determined by the individual installation.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2014]

The Committee recommends no changes to the remaining proposals in the "Item Under Consideration."

321-2 VC UR.1. User Requirements

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, the CWMA supported the proposed changes in the "Item Under Consideration" as a voting item and agreed that a reorganization of the paragraphs is appropriate and would make finding specific paragraphs in the code easier.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, Juana Williams, NIST OWM echoed the CWMA's comments and also heard support from Mr. Bill Ripka, Thermo Fisher Scientific, and from Mr. Darrell Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA.

The Committee recommends no changes to the "Item Under Consideration."

330 LIQUID MEASURING DEVICES

S&T Committee Note: Proposals under Items 330-1 through 330-6 of the committee's 2012 Interim Agenda were consolidated by the committee into a single item, 330-1. An explanation of the committee's rationale is provided under Item 330-1.

330-1 V Unit Price Posting, Selection, and Display Requirements - S.1.6.4.1. Unit Price; S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price; S.1.6.6. Agreement Between Indications; S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations; S.1.6.8. Recorded Representations for Transactions Where a Post-Delivery Discount(s) is Provided; UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity; and UR.3.3. Computing Device

Add the following to the Committee's Report:

During its open hearings, the Committee heard suggestions to establish an effective date for the requirements, with suggestions of 2014 or 2015 as possibilities. The Committee saw no merit to establishing an effective date. The Committee noted that the current requirements in Handbook 44 do not permit systems to offer post-delivery discounts. The changes proposed by the Task Group would establish the option for a system to be used to offer post-delivery discounts, provided the system meets certain requirements to provide the customer with information about how the discounts are applied. The Committee recognized that the criteria outlined by the Task Group

includes important provisions that should be in place in order to take advantage of the option to offer post-delivery discounts and maintained that these are essential for all systems where post-delivery discounts are to take place. However, the proposed changes are permissive; thus, an effective date is unnecessary. A system is not required to meet the new requirement unless the device owner decides to offer post-delivery discounts.

The Committee considered suggested clarifications to the language offered by OWM. OWM suggested changes to paragraph S.1.6.7. to require clear identification of transaction information on the receipt. Additionally, OWM suggested changes to S.1.6.8. that would require information related to the fuel transaction to be grouped together and to clearly designate the required information on the receipt, with the goal of assisting the customer in interpreting the transaction information. OWM also provided examples of possible receipt formats that could be incorporated into guidance documents such as NCWM Publication 14. However, the Committee agreed that the proposed language is adequately clear as proposed and noted that any deficiencies that might be discovered in the language as it is implemented, can be identified and addressed in the future.

The Committee was made aware of a potential negative financial impact on device owners as a result of the proposed changes to UR.3.2. to require a reversion of the unit price to the highest unit price available. Even with a phase in period or grace period, older equipment may never be able to comply, including equipment that doesn't participate in post-delivery discounting. Consequently, the Committee is recommending the changes to paragraph UR.3.2. in the "Item Under Consideration." The proposed changes will read as follows:

Amend *NIST Handbook 44*, Liquid Measuring Devices Code Paragraphs UR.3.2. as follows:

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 unit prices resulting from any post-delivery discount and 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.(Amended 1972, 1983, 1987, 1989, 1992, ~~and~~ 1993, and 2012)

The remaining proposals in the "Item Under Consideration" remain as shown in the Committee's original proposal in the 2012 NCWM Publication 16.

330-2 V S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price

No change.

330-3 V S.1.6.6. Agreement Between Indications

No change.

330-4 V S.1.6.7. Recorded Representations

No change.

330-5 V UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity

No change.

330-6 V UR.3.3. Computing Device

No change.

330-7 W UR.3.X. Nozzle Color for Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers

No change.

331 VEHICLE-TANK METERS

331-1 I T.4. Product Depletion Test

Add the following to the Committee's Report:

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, NEWMA expressed its support for moving this item ahead as a "Voting" item in the next NCWM cycle. At its 2012 Annual Meeting, CWMA supported the item as "Informational."

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, Mr. Dmitri Karimov, Liquid Controls, speaking on behalf of the Meter Manufacturers Association, commented that, while MMA is aware that the Committee did not support MMA's proposed "Option 3," the MMA supports "Option 2" recommended by the Committee.

The Committee asks the Regional Weights and Measures Associations and industry for input regarding whether or not the proposed changes are ready for adoption in the next NCWM cycle.

336 WATER METERS

336-1 V S.3. Markings

Add the following to the Committee's report:

As the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from Ms. Kristin Macey, CA, suggesting modifications to the proposed language to change the reference from "may" to "shall."

The Committee also heard comments from Mr. Andre Noel, Neptune, who expressed support for the proposal and agreed with Ms. Macey's suggested change.

Mr. Dmitri Karimov, Liquid Controls, speaking on behalf of the Meter Manufacturers Association, stated that MMA supports the proposal.

Committee Chairman, Steve Giguere, Maine, reported that the Committee also received letters of support from Mr. Alex Watson, Elster AMCO, and Mr. Scott Swanson, Sensus.

The Committee recommends modifying the proposed paragraph in the Item Under Consideration" to read as follows. The changes include changing the word "may" to "shall" and consolidating the language to eliminate redundancies in the language.

S.3. Markings

*S.3.1. Location of Marking Information; Utility Type Meters. – All required markings, including those required by G-S.1. Identification, shall be either on the meter body or primary indicator.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2013]*

354 TAXIMETERS

354-1 D S.5. Provision for Security Seals

No change.

354-2 D Global Positioning Systems Applications for Taximeters

No change.

356 GRAIN MOISTURE METERS

356-1 I UR.3.4. Printed Tickets

Add the following to the Committee's report:

In its 2012 annual report, NEWMA suggested that this item remain informational, noting little experience within NEWMA on grain moisture meters. The CWMA also supported the item remaining informational, citing the need for additional input on the modifications to the proposal.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard no additional comments during its open hearings. The Committee reiterates its request for input on the modifications to the proposal, particularly from the original submitter and any regional weights and measures association that has not had an opportunity to review the modifications.

The Committee is recommending no changes to the "Item Under Consideration."

358 MULTIPLE DIMENSION MEASURING DEVICES

358-1 VC N.1.3.4. Test Objects with Protrusions

Add the following to the Committee's report:

At their 2012 Annual Meetings, NEWMA and CWMA supported this item as a voting item.

At its open hearings during the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from Darrell Flocken, speaking on behalf of SMA, supported the proposed changes. Mr. Flocken reiterated that the proposed changes were essentially "housekeeping" in nature.

The Committee is recommending no changes to the "Item Under Consideration."

359 ELECTRONIC LIVESTOCK, MEAT, AND POULTRY EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND/OR DEVICES – TENTATIVE CODE

359-1 VC Tentative Status of Code Section 5.59.

Add the following to the Committee’s report:

At their Spring 2012 Annual Meetings, NEWMA and CWMA supported the item as a “voting” item, noting that another regulatory agency needs the ability to enforce this code.

At 2012 Annual Meeting, Mr. Richard Suiter, Richard Suiter Consulting, referenced comments received by the Committee from weights and measures jurisdictions who were concerned about not having the testing equipment or knowledge to test these devices. Mr. Suiter pointed out that Section 5.59 includes requirements for the device owner to provide traceable test standards, thus removing any burden on the jurisdiction to provide them. Mr. Suiter also noted that testing these devices may require an additional investment of time; however, the devices are typically located in facilities where other devices under weights and measures regulation are located and the amount of additional time required should not be significant.

The Committee also heard from Mr. Alan Christian, USDA, GIPSA Packers and Stockyards Program, who reiterated comments made by GIPSA at the 2012 Interim Meeting. He cited the importance of changing the status of the code to “permanent,” noting that a vast number of producers are paid based, not only on the weight of the animal, but also on other quality factors. The lack of enforceable standards can result in significant harm to sellers who rely on the accuracy of these measurements for fair payment.

The Committee maintains its support of the proposed change and recommends the removal of the “tentative” status from the code.

The Committee is recommending no changes to the “Item Under Consideration.”

360 OTHER ITEMS – DEVELOPING ITEMS

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

No change.

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

No change.

360-3 D Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group

Add the following to the Committee’s report:

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, NEWMA recommended that the status of this item remain as “Developing.” NEWMA maintains a neutral position on this item and is awaiting further proposals from the WG. At its 2012 Annual Meeting, the CWMA did not take a position on this item. At both the NEWMA and CWMA meetings, Mr. Darrell Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking as Chairman of the WIM Work Group, provided an update on the progress of the WG, noting that work has been delayed pending the resolution of funding issues within the FHWA.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual meeting, the Committee heard an update from the WG Chairman, Mr. Flocken, who noted that the WG had not been able to meet due to funding issues, but those issues have been resolved and the WG will now be able to move ahead with its work.

Mr. Steve Langford, Cardinal Scale, spoke as a member of the WG Oversight Committee. He apologized for the delays in being able to progress with this work, citing factors outside of the WG’s control, but echoed Mr. Flocken’s assurances that the work is once again progressing.

The Committee expresses its appreciation for updates on this issue and looks forward to further progress by the WG.

360-4 D Part 3.30. Price Posting and Computing Capability and Requirements for a Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser (RMFD)

Add the following to the Committee’s report:

The Committee notes that, should the proposed changes in Item 330-1 be adopted, the work of the Task Group may be completed. Should questions arise regarding the application of the proposed changes, the Committee hopes that it may call on individual members of the Task Group to assist in responding to those questions.

360-5 D S.5. Provision for Security Seals

Add the following to the Committee’s report:

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, the CWMA took no position on this item. At its 2012 Annual Meeting, NEWMA maintained a neutral position on this item and designated this item as “Developmental.” Mrs. Tina Butcher, NIST OWM, reported that NIST has formed a work group on taximeters and that group will hold its first meeting in May. NEWMA looks forward to the work of the NIST Taximeter Work Group and any proposals that are generate from that group.

At the 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard an update from Ms. Juana Williams, NIST OWM, regarding the formation of a NIST Work Group on Taximeters. Ms. Williams reported that NIST OWM issued a Federal Register notice in April 2012 announcing formation of a NIST US National Working Group (USNWG) on Taximeters. Mr. John Barton, NIST OWM, is the contact for this USNWG. Anyone interested in participating in the Work Group should contact Mr. Barton by e-mail at john.barton@nist.gov or by telephone at 301-975-4002. The USNWG held a preliminary web-based meeting in May 2012 to establish the working structure, review the USNWG charter, and lay out tasks to be completed. NIST distributed proposed revisions to the existing Taximeters Code as a “strawman” for the USNWG to consider. The revisions were based on a meeting with NTEP laboratories and other legal metrology experts. Comments were due to Mr. Barton by June 30, 2102. After addressing the

comments in the proposed revisions, Mr. Barton will distribute a revised draft to work group members and interested observers. The USNWG plans to hold its next meeting in September 2012.

The Committee expressed appreciation to OWM for the update and looks forward to future recommendations from the Work Group.

360-6 D Global Positioning Systems for Taximeters

Add the following to the Committee's report:

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, CWMA received no comments on this issue and took no position on it.

At its 2012 Annual Meeting, NEWMA maintained a neutral position on this item and designated it as "Developing." Mrs. Tina Butcher, NIST OWM, reported that NIST has formed a work group on taximeters and that group will hold its first meeting in May. NEWMA looks forward to the work of the NIST Taximeter Work Group and any proposals that are generate from that group.

At the Committee's 2012 NCWM Annual Meeting Open Hearings, Ms. Juana Williams, reiterated the comments offered by NIST OWM on Item 360-5 and noted that these comments also apply to this item.

The Committee expressed appreciation to OWM for the update and looks forward to future recommendations from the Work Group.



Mr. Steve Giguere, Maine | Committee Chair
Mr. Kenneth Ramsburg, Maryland | Member
Mr. Paul Moyer, Nebraska | Member
Mr. Brett Gurney, Utah | Member
Mr. Mahesh Albuquerque, Colorado | Member
Mr. Ted Kingsbury, Measurement Canada | Canadian Technical Advisor
Ms. Tina Butcher, NIST, OWM | NIST Technical Advisor
Mr. Rick Harshman, NIST, OWM | NIST Technical Advisor

Specifications and Tolerances Committee