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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Glossary of Acronyms | | | |
| CC | Certificate of Conformance | NTETC | National Type Evaluation Technical Committee |
| DMS | Division of Measurement Standards | OIML | International Organization of Legal Metrology |
| ECR | Electronic Cash Register | OWM | Office of Weights and Measures (NIST) |
| EVFS | Electric Vehicle Fueling Systems | PD | Positive Displacement |
| HB 44 | NIST Handbook 44 “Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices” | Pub 14 | NCWM Publication 14 |
| LMD | Liquid Measuring Devices | RMFD | Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser |
| mA | milliamp | SI | International System of Units |
| MFM | Mass Flow Meters | S&T | Specifications and Tolerances |
| NCWM | National Conference on Weights and Measures | TG | Task Group |
| NIST | National Institute of Standards and Technology | VTM | Vehicle Tank Meter |
| NTEP | National Type Evaluation Program | W&M | Weights and Measures |
| This glossary is meant to assist the reader in the identification of acronyms used in this agenda and does not imply that these terms are used solely to identify these organizations or technical topics. | | | |

# Carry-over Items:

1. Laboratory and Field Evaluation – Clarification of Language

**Source:** NTEP Laboratories

**Background Information:** The NTEP evaluators have experienced confusion when interpreting the “Laboratory or Field Evaluation” section of the LMD checklist. At its 2019 meeting, the Sector reviewed proposed changes from a small task group appointed in 2018 to clarify this portion of the checklist. After some discussion and additional changes, the Sector agreed to recommend changes to this section for inclusion in the 2020 edition of NCWM Publication 14.

At that meeting, the Sector agreed that a future discussion needs to be held to explore the different aspects of “compatibility,” including compatibility of separately evaluated and certified measuring and indicating elements as well as compatibility of changes to metrologically significant components of complete devices.

* + The following individuals agreed to work on this issue of “Compatibility of Components:”
    - Marc Buttler (Emerson)
    - Tina Butcher (NIST Office of Weights and Measures)
    - Craig Cavanaugh (Tuthill Transfer Systems)
    - Allen Katalinic (NCWM NTEP)
    - Dmitri Karimov (Teri G agreed to explore the possibility of LC involvement)
    - Rich Miller (FMC)
    - John Hathaway (Murray Equipment)
  + The group was asked to consider at least the following two key areas relating to “compatibility” and prepare a recommendation for the Sector to consider at its next meeting for addressing these in type evaluation:
    - The case in which individual certified equipment is used to create a metrologically complete, certified system.
    - The case in which an existing, certified system is extended through the addition compatible devices through the addition of certified equipment.
  + The group was also asked to consider how third-party software is to be addressed with regard to compatibility.

At the 2019 Measuring Sector meeting, a small task group of volunteers were tasked with developing more definitive criteria for the current “20-day permanence test” used in the NTEP Field and Permanence Testing phase of evaluating mobile electronic devices and making recommendations to the Sector for possible changes to NCWM Publication 14.  The **20-Day Permanence Criteria Task Group** consisted of the following individuals:

* Tina Butcher (NIST Office of Weights and Measures)
* Craig Cavanaugh (Tuthill Transfer Systems)
* John Hathaway (Murray Equipment)
* Allen Katalinic (NCWM NTEP)
* Dmitri Karimov (LC)
* Rich Miller (FMC)
* Randy Ramsey (NC)
* John Roach (CA DMS)

The task group was asked to develop more specific standards to ensure consistency with items such as duration, road conditions, standards for degree of use, mileage, etc. need to be encompassed in the discussion.

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion:**

Before discussing the charge of the Work Group, it must be noted that the changes in Appendix E of the 2019 MS meeting and agreed to be included in the 2020 edition of Publication 14; did not get put into the publication. The agreed to changes are listed in Appendix A of this agenda.

The Sector will hear updates and consider recommendations from both the “Compatibility of Components Task Group” (See Appendix B for a copy of the task groups recommendation) and the “20-Day Permanence Test for Mobile Electronic Devices Task Group” (See Appendix C for a copy of the task groups recommendation.)

## Provisions to Address Systems Dispensing Diesel Exhaust Fluid (DEF) in the LMD Code – 2019 S&T Committee Agenda Item LMD-3

Background: At its 2019 Annual Meeting, the NCWM adopted changes to the following paragraphs in the LMD Code (along with changes to the “Application” Section and “User Requirements” which do not impact the Pub 14 checklist) in NIST Handbook 44 to better address metering systems used to dispense Diesel Exhaust Fluids and other products. These were considered on the S&T Committee’s Agenda under Item LMD-3 and are shown in the table below for reference.

* S.1.6.10. Pay-at-Pump Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers (LMD Checklist 2019 Edition, Page LMD-85)
* S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, for Retail Motor-Fuel Devices. (No change needed to LMD Checklist 2019 Edition, Page LMD-42)
* S.4. Marking Requirements.
* S.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, for Retail Motor-Fuel Devices

|  |
| --- |
| **A.1. General.** – This code applies to:  (a) devices used for the measurement of liquids, ~~including liquid fuels and lubricants,~~ and  (b) wholesale devices used for the measurement and delivery of agri-chemical liquids such as fertilizers, feeds, herbicides, pesticides, insecticides, fungicides, and defoliants.  (Added 1985)  ***S.1.6.10. Automatic Timeout – Pay-At-Pump for Retail ~~Motor-Fuel~~ Devices.*** ­*–­­ Once a device has been authorized, it must de-authorize within two minutes if not activated. Re-authorization of the device must be performed before any product can be dispensed. If the time limit to de-authorize the device is programmable, it shall not accept an entry greater than two minutes*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2017]*  (Added 2016) **(Amended 20XX)**  S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, **for** Retail **~~Motor-Fuel~~** Devices. **– A device shall be constructed so that:**  (a) after a delivery cycle has been completed by moving the starting lever to any position that shuts off the device, an automatic interlock prevents a subsequent delivery until the indicating elements, and recording elements if the device is equipped and activated to record, have been returned to their zero positions;  (b) the discharge nozzle cannot be returned to its designed hanging position (that is, any position where the tip of the nozzle is placed in its designed receptacle and the lock can be inserted) until the starting lever is in its designed shut-off position and the zero-set-back interlock has been engaged; and  (c) in a system with more than one dispenser supplied by a single pump, an effective automatic control valve in each dispenser prevents product from being delivered until the indicating elements on that dispenser are in a correct zero position.  (Amended 1981**~~, and~~** 1985**, and 20XX**)  ***S.4.4.1. Discharge Rates.***– *On a retail device with a designed maximum discharge rate of 115 L (30 gal) per minute or greater, the maximum and minimum discharge rates shall be marked in accordance with S.4.4.2. Location of Marking Information; Retail* ***~~Motor-Fuel~~*** *Dispensers. The marked minimum discharge rate shall not exceed 20 % of the marked maximum discharge rate.*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1985]*  (Added 1984) (Amended 2003 **and 20XX**)  ***S.4.4.2. Location of Marking Information; for Retail ~~Motor-Fuel~~ Dispensers.***– *The marking information required in the General Code, paragraph G‑S.1. Identification shall appear as follows:*   1. *within 60 cm (24 in) to 150 cm (60 in) from the base of the dispenser* ***for system in a dispenser****;* 2. *either internally and/or externally provided the information is permanent and easily read; and* 3. *on a portion of the device that cannot be readily removed or interchanged (i.e., not on a service access panel).*   **Note:** *The use of a dispenser key or tool to access internal marking information is permitted for retail liquid-measuring devices.*  *[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]*  (Added 2002) (Amended 2004 **and 20XX**)  …  ***S.5. Totalizers for Retail ~~Motor-Fuel~~ Dispensers.*** *–* Retail **~~motor-fuel~~** dispensers shall be equipped with a non-resettable totalizer for the quantity delivered through the metering device.  [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1995]  (Added 1993) (Amended 1994 **and 20XX**)  …  **N.4.2.2. Retail Motor-Fuel and DEF Devices.**  (a) Devices without a marked minimum flow-rate shall have a “special” test performed at the slower of the following rates:  (1) 19 L (5 gal) per minute; or  (2) the minimum discharge rate at which the device will deliver when equipped with an automatic discharge nozzle set at its slowest setting.  (b) Devices with a marked minimum flow-rate shall have a “special” test performed at or near the marked minimum flow rate.  (Added 1984) (Amended 2005 **and 20XX**)  **UR.2.4. Diversion of Liquid Flow.** – A **~~motor-fuel~~** device equipped with two delivery outlets used exclusively in the fueling of trucks shall be so installed that any diversion of flow to other than the receiving vehicle cannot be readily accomplished and is readily apparent. Allowable deterrents include, but are not limited to, physical barriers to adjacent driveways, visible valves, or lighting systems that indicate which outlets are in operation, and explanatory signs.  (Amended 1991 **and 20XX**)  **UR.2.5. Product Storage Identification**.   1. The fill connection for any petroleum product **or other product** storage tank or vessel supplying **petroleum product or other products ~~motor-fuel~~ ~~devices~~** shall be permanently, plainly, and visibly marked as to product contained. |

Recommendation: While the specification sections noted above are currently referenced in the LMD Checklist, these sections are specifically covered under the “Retail Motor-Fuel Dispensers” portion of the checklist. The changes to NIST Handbook 44 were intended to make the references more generic so as to provide the ability to apply criteria to systems dispensing DEF. However, the current Pub14 checklist does not facilitate this.

The Sector is asked to discuss how to best address this issue so that NTEP evaluators have clear checklist criteria to apply to DEF-dispensing systems. Among possible options for the Sector to consider are:

1. Broaden the “RMFD” Checklist to Refer to “Stationary Retail Dispensing Systems”
2. Create as separate section for DEF dispensing systems, which would mirror many of the RMFD Checklist requirements and, perhaps, include additional guidance relative to DEF dispensing systems.

2019 MS Meeting Discussion: Technical Advisor, Tina Butcher presented the item and reviewed the two possible options noted above and asked if Sector members preferred one or the other of these options. She pointed out there is presently no section in the checklist to address DEF dispensers.

Randy Moses (Wayne Fueling) commented he doesn’t want to see separate checklists, and Allen Katalinic (NCWM NTEP) agreed, noting he doesn’t want to add to the overall size of the checklist.

There was general agreement among Sector members present to lean toward the first option of broadening the RMFD checklist. Mrs. Butcher recommended that, if the Sector decides to pursue the option of broadening the RMFD checklist, the Sector should go back and review the RMFD checklist and develop a proposal to modify the checklist to encompass stationary retail dispensing systems. She also noted there are likely sections of that checklist which may not be appropriate for use with DEF.

Mr. Moses suggested the Sector’s objective should be for Pub 14 to align with NIST Handbook 44. For any gaps identified, the Sector should develop proposed changes to HB 44 and once those are adopted make corresponding recommendations to modify the Pub 14 checklist.

Measuring Sector Chairman, Michael Keilty noted the MFM Code doesn’t include these references to allow recognition for DEF.

The NTEP Laboratories are already applying these requirements, so there shouldn’t be a significant impact on devices already evaluated.

Mrs. Butcher questioned how best to go about broadening current references to “retail motor-fuel dispensers” to include other stationary retail devices. A “search and replace” might be useful in identifying these references, but it would not be appropriate to replace all of them; some references might correctly apply to only RMFDs. The Sector discussed having one or a group of people do such as search to identify the references. Mr. Keilty suggested we include this as a carryover item with regard to these checklist changes.

*Decisions:*

*The Sector agreed to the following corrections to the LMD Checklist:*

* *Correct the reference to “S.1.6.10. Automatic Timeout-Pay-At-Pump for Retail Devices” on pg. LMD-89. It reads S.6.1.10. and it should read S.1.6.10.*
* *Correct the existing reference to S.5. Totalizers on page LMD-45 of Appendix A to the Sector’s Agenda. It reads “S.5.1.” and should read “S.5.”*

***Appendix A to the Sector’s agenda has been revised to include the above corrections and other updates made during the Sector’s meeting. The revised version is included as Appendix A to this summary.***

*The Sector also acknowledged the changes made by the NCWM to broaden the application of the LMD Code to encompass DEF and other devices. This is consistent with what the laboratories have already been doing and will continue to do.*

*The Sector agreed the RMFD section of the checklist needs to be broadened and not limited to “retail motor-fuel.” However, the Sector is reluctant to do a “search and replace” without specifically reviewing the proposed changes to ensure there isn’t an inadvertent problem created by a given change. Consequently, the Sector agreed that NTEP will through the RMFD checklist and do a “search and replace” marking the replacements as proposed changes for Sector review at its next meeting. This effort will include the following tasks and parameters.*

* *The search will include a search for the terms such as the following as well as any terms that are limiting:*
  + *“retail motor-fuel” (with the hyphen)*
  + *“retail motor fuel” (without the hyphen)*
  + *“retail fuel devices”*
  + *“motor-fuel”*
  + *“motor fuel”*
  + *“retail” and “fuel” and motor”*
* *Darrell Flocken will assign Mike Manheim the task of doing a search for and highlighting these terms in the electronic version of Pub 14*
* *The following people agreed to serve on a small task group who will assist by reviewing the marked document:*
  + *Tina Butcher (NIST OWM)*
  + *Michael Keilty (Endress + Hauser)*
  + *Allen Katalinic (NCWM NTEP)*
  + *Brent Price (Gilbarco)*

*These individuals will provide comments back to Darrell Flocken. Darrell will ask Mike to incorporate changes proposed by the task group.*

* *The final proposed changes as identified and agreed to by the task group will be included as a “carryover item” on the Sector’s 2020 Meeting Agenda and presented to the Sector for review and agreement at that meeting.*

2020 MS Meeting Discussion:

Before discussing this agenda, it must be noted that the changes to correct the existing reference to S.5. Totalizers on page LMD-45 of Appendix A of the 2019 Sector’s Agenda was not made. The current code reference reads “S.5.1.” and should read “S.5.”

Appendix D is the highlighted version from Mike Manheim showing all references to the term ‘retail motor fuel”.

## Liquefied Petroleum Gas Liquid-Measuring & Anhydrous Ammonia Liquid-Measuring Devices Code Paragraph S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, Stationary and Vehicle Mounted Meters, Electronic – 2019 S&T Committee Agenda Item LPG-2

Background: At its 2019 Annual Meeting, the NCWM adopted a new paragraph S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, Stationary and Vehicle Mounted Meters, Electronic in the Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Liquid-Measuring Devices & Anhydrous Ammonia Liquid-Measuring Devices Code of NIST Handbook 44. Subsequent paragraphs were renumbered accordingly. This was considered on the S&T Committee’s Agenda under Item LPG-2; see the Committee’s 2019 Interim Report for additional details.

*S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, Stationary and Vehicle Mounted Meters, Electronic. - A device shall be so constructed that after an individual or multiple deliveries at one location have been completed, an automatic interlock system shall engage to prevent a subsequent delivery until the indicating and, if equipped, recording elements have been returned to their zero position. For individual deliveries, if there is no product flow for two minutes the transaction must be completed before additional product flow is allowed. The 2-minute timeout shall be a sealable feature on an indicator.*

*(Added 2019) (Nonretroactive as of 2021)*

At its 2019 meeting, the NTEP Measuring Sector agreed to add a “note” to the existing Code Reference S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock that applies to stationary retail motor-fuel LPG and NH3 dispensers to alert manufacturers of the approaching implementation date for this requirement on other stationary devices and vehicle-mounted systems.

The Sector also to include this item as a “carryover item” on the Sector’s 2020 agenda so that proposed changes to reformat this reference as a checklist item; remove the note; and add check boxes can be considered by the Sector.

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

Now that the new paragraph S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back Interlock, Stationary and Vehicle Mounted Meters, Electronic is effective, this note needs to be removed and a new checklist item created to reference the new S.2.5. and to reflect the renumbering and retitling of the prior paragraph titled “S.2.5. Zero-Set-Back-Interlock” to the title of “S.2.6. Zero-Set-Back Interlock for Stationary Retail Motor-Fuel Devices.” Proposed changes to the checklist for the Sector’s consideration are shown in Appendix E.

1. Magnetic Flow Meters – NCWM Pub 14 Technical Policy and Test Procedures

**Background/Discussion:** This item was added as a “walk-on” item during the Sector Meeting in response to a request from the NTEP Evaluating Laboratories and Sector Chairman Michael Keilty.

Mr. Keilty introduced the item, noting that more definitive criteria are needed in NCWM Pub 14 to address magnetic flow meters. Pub 14 includes some criteria in a new Section M. which was added to the Field Evaluation and Permanence Test Section of the LMD Checklist last year. However, there isn’t a lot more in the overall checklist. Some laboratories have questioned whether there is an adequate amount of information in the checklist for evaluating these devices, particularly since NTEP has not evaluated a large number of them.

Mrs. Butcher suggested the Sector begin by considering how to close the gap created by the “exception” in the title of Section M. “Initial Evaluation and Permanence Tests for Magnetic Flow Meters and Ultrasonic Meters (Other Than Vehicle-Mounted and Retail-Motor-Fuel Applications)” For example, the Sector might consider adding a statement such as “For Vehicle-Mounted Magnetic Flow Meters and Vehicle-Mounted Ultrasonic Meters, use the field and permanence test requirements found in Section C.” A similar statement might be considered to address meters used in RMFD applications; for example, “For magnetic flow meters and ultrasonic meters used in Retail Motor-Fuel Applications, use the field and permanence test requirements found in Section A.” If these criteria aren’t appropriate, then the Sector should discuss what criteria are appropriate and specify this in the field and permanence test criteria. Mrs. Butcher suggested a small work group be formed to review these issues and provide suggestions for the Sector to consider and the Sector concurred.

The Sector also acknowledged similar concerns about whether or not Pub 14 includes clear criteria for addressing all applications of ultrasonic meters. The Sector recognized this is an issue that may need to be addressed at some point, including elaborating on the checklist criteria and addressing the technology in the Product Families Table. In the meantime, there is nothing that precludes the submission and evaluation of ultrasonic metering applications.

Mr. Keilty also questioned why a previously-included category of “normal liquids” category no longer appears in the Product Families Table and questioned whether it was inadvertently eliminated. Sector Technical Advisor, Tina Butcher, referenced the 2006 Measuring Sector Summary during which the Sector agreed to add the criteria and column to Pub 14 to address magnetic flow meters. The two separate tests listed in today’s (2019) edition under this category were added at that time. Thus, the current separate “tests” were intentional. This doesn’t mean the criteria cannot be revisited; however, the current references were not the result of a mistake in the editing of the table and the Sector would need to review the item and past when considering consider how or if to propose redefining the testing.

Mr. Keilty questioned whether there is a need for something specific that states ultrasonic and magnetic flow meters. Sector Technical Advisor Tina Butcher noted there is no specific language in NIST HB H44 that references magnetic flow meters since HB 44 is not design-specific. Type evaluation criteria are established based on H44. In the case where NTEP begins looking at a different technology than has been evaluated before, it is necessary to establish minimum amounts of testing. In the past, NTEP has typically started with stating a number of tests over what range of conditions. For different technologies, NTEP may look at the need to test under different conditions based on the technology of the device and how the technology is affected by certain characteristics of the product being measured such as viscosity. As NTEP gets applications for technologies that haven’t been dealt with before in NTEP evaluations, it is necessary to ensure specifics are established in the checklist for permanence testing and relevant code references are identified and specified in appropriate sections of the Pub 14 checklist.

The Sector discussed questions of: What are the gaps in the checklist right now? Do we add (in addition to the new Section M added to the field and permanence tests section in 2018) a section to include “Magnetic Flow Meters” criteria or do we reference existing sections with instructions such as “for magnetic flow meters, use the procedures and checklist criteria found in section x?”

The Sector also needs to look at the Product Families Table as it pertains to magnetic flow meters to ensure we can minimize the amount of testing needed to demonstrate confidence in the device and its performance. In general, manufacturers describe the maximum conductivity for products measured by a magnetic flow meter. For hydrocarbons a conductivity is not typically specified. For organics, one may find values specified. The Sector set the criteria for “Test F” and “Test D.”

For many products, conductivity values aren’t available and, therefore, not specified in the table. Mr. Keilty commented he doesn’t recall the language in the “Test D” criteria to be what was to be added.

John Roach (CA DMS, NTEP Lab) noted he had raised questions in the past year regarding how milk fits into the existing Product Families table, particularly for a magnetic flow meter. Does this product qualify as a beverage with regard to the table? Is its conductivity different from that of the products covered in the product category of “water?” Does milk fit into an established product category or should another category specifically for “milk” be added? Mr. Keilty also noted a question arose regarding were “sludge” would fall in the table. NTEP Director Darrell Flocken noted sludge would likely have some conductivity, but it is unclear how much conductivity it would have or how the conductivity would vary in the product.

The Sector agreed a small work group might be appropriate to address these issues surrounding the Product Families table and this might be the same group proposed for reviewing the mass flow meter and ultrasonic meter criteria.

***Decisions: The Sector established a small work group to take on a set of tasks related to refining type evaluation criteria for magnetic flow meters. The work group consists of the following:***

* ***Marc Buttler***
* ***Allen Katalinic***
* ***Michael Keilty***
* ***Randy Ramsey***
* ***John Roach***

***The work group is asked to review NCWM Pub 14 and complete the following tasks and bring recommendations for changes to Pub 14 back to the Sector for review at its 2020 annual meeting:***

* ***Identify how to close the gaps created by the exceptions in the title of “Section M. Initial Evaluation and Permanence Tests for Magnetic Flow Meters and Ultrasonic Meters (Other Than Vehicle-Mounted and Retail-Motor-Fuel Applications)”***
* ***Review other sections of Pub 14 to ensure there are adequate criteria to address magnetic flow meters and their applications.***
* ***Make recommendations on how to best address the gaps, including referencing other existing sections of the checklist or creating new language to be considered by the Sector.***
* ***Review the criteria and tests specified for magnetic flow meters in Product Families to determine if changes are needed and, if so, make recommendations on what those changes should be.***

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

# New Items:

## **Proposal to change S.3. Markings of the Water Meter Code, Proposal Submitted to the S&T Committee**

**Source:** Clark Clooney, California Department of Food and Agriculture, Division of Measurement Standards

The California Department of Measurement Standards has submitted the proposal, shown below, to the Regional Weights and Measures Association for possible inclusion into the National S&T Committee Agenda. CA has asked for this item to be added to the meeting agenda as a general discussion item.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Information** | | | | | | |
| **1. Date:** | **2. Regional Association(s):** (Not applicable for proposals to the Board of Directors or NTEP Committee) | | | | | |
| 08/06/2019 | X Central (CWMA) X Northeastern (NEWMA) X Southern (SWMA) X Western (WWMA) | | | | | |
| **3. Standing Committee:** | | | | | | |
| \_\_ Laws & Regulations \_x\_ Specifications & Tolerances \_\_ Professional Development \_\_ Board of Directors \_\_ NTEP Committee | | | | | | |
| **4. Submitter’s Name:** | | | **Submitter’s Organization:** | | | |
| Clark Cooney | | | California Department of Food and Agriculture, Division of Measurement Standards | | | |
| **5. Address:** | | | | | | |
| 6790 Florin Perkins Road, Suite 100 | | | | | | |
| **6. City:** | | | **7. State:** | | **8. Zip Code:** | **9. Country:** |
| Sacramento | | | CA | | 95828-1812 | USA |
| **10. Phone Number:** | | **11. Fax Number:** | | **12. Email Address:** | | |
| 916-229-3000 | | 916-229-3055 | | clark.cooney@cdfa.ca.gov | | |
| **Proposal Information** | | | | | | |
| **13. Purpose:** Concise statement as to the intent or purpose of this proposal, such as problem being fixed. **(Do not include justification here.)** | | | | | | |
| Adding meter size and water flow direction indication marking requirements to NIST Handbook 44, Section 3.36. Water Meters S.3. Markings. | | | | | | |
| **14. Document to be Amended:** | | | | | | |
| X NIST Handbook 44 NIST Handbook 130 NIST Handbook 133 \_\_ NCWM Guidance Document  \_\_ NCWM Bylaws \_\_ NTEP Administrative Policy | | | | | | |
| **15. Cite portion to be Amended:** Please file a separate Form 15 for each code, model law or regulation to be amended. | | | | | | |
| NIST Handbook 44, Section: 3.36. Water Meters, Specifications S.3. Markings. | | | | | | |
| **16. Proposal:** Please use **~~strikeout~~** to show words to be deleted and **underline** to show new words. **(Do not use track changes.)** | | | | | | |
| Add subparagraph: **S.3.2. Meter Size and Directional Flow Marking Information.** A water meter shall be clearly and indelibly marked with the following information:   1. meter size on the indicator face plate; and 2. water flow direction designated by an arrow cast or stamped into the body of the meter. | | | | | | |
| **17. Justification:** Please include national importance, background on the issue, and reference to supporting data or documents. | | | | | | |
| Meter size must be identified to select the suitable device for the application. (NIST H-44 G-UR.1. Selection Requirements.)  Water flow direction must be identified to help ensure the device is installed correctly. (NIST H-44 G-UR.2. Installation Requirements.) | | | | | | |
| **18. Possible Opposing Argument’s:** Please demonstrate that you are aware and have considered possible opposition. | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendments, if adopted, would require additional marking and may impact manufacturing processes. | | | | | | |
| **19. Requested Action if Considered for NCWM Agenda:** | | | | | | |
| X Voting Item Developing Item Informational Item Other (Please Describe): | | | | | | |
| **20. List of Attachments:** | | | | | | |
| **None** | | | | | | |

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

## **Proposal to change UR.3.3. of the Mass Flow Meter Code, Submitted to the S&T Committee**

**Source:** Andrew Burke, Restaurant Technologies, Inc.

The following proposal, shown below, was submitted to the Regional Weights and Measures Association for possible inclusion into the National S&T Committee Agenda. It is included here as information and possible discussion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Information** | | | | | | |
| **1. Date:** | **2. Regional Association(s):** (Not applicable for proposals to the Board of Directors or NTEP Committee) | | | | | |
| 4/14/2020 | X Central (CWMA) X Northeastern (NEWMA) X Southern (SWMA) X Western (WWMA) | | | | | |
| **3. Standing Committee:** | | | | | | |
| \_\_ Laws & Regulations \_X\_ Specifications & Tolerances \_\_ Professional Development \_\_ Board of Directors \_\_ NTEP Committee | | | | | | |
| **4. Submitter’s Name:** | | | **Submitter’s Organization:** | | | |
| Andrew Burke | | | Restaurant Technologies, Inc. | | | |
| **5. Address:** | | | | | | |
| 2250 Pilot Knob Road, Suite 100 | | | | | | |
| **6. City:** | | | **7. State:** | | **8. Zip Code:** | **9. Country:** |
| Mendota Heights | | | MN | | 55120 | USA |
| **10. Phone Number:** | | **11. Fax Number:** | | **12. Email Address:** | | |
| (612) 469-9629 | |  | | aburke@rti-inc.com | | |
| **Proposal Information** | | | | | | |
| **13. Purpose:** Concise statement as to the intent or purpose of this proposal, such as problem being fixed. **(Do not include justification here.)** | | | | | | |
| Allow customers the option of receiving a digital ticket (emailed) in lieu of a printed ticket at time of delivery. | | | | | | |
| **14. Document to be Amended:** | | | | | | |
| X NIST Handbook 44 NIST Handbook 130 NIST Handbook 133 \_\_ NCWM Guidance Document  \_\_ NCWM Bylaws \_\_ NTEP Administrative Policy | | | | | | |
| **15. Cite portion to be Amended:** Please file a separate Form 15 for each code, model law or regulation to be amended. | | | | | | |
| Section 3.37, paragraph UR.3.3. | | | | | | |
| **16. Proposal:** Please use **~~strikeout~~** to show words to be deleted and **underline** to show new words. **(Do not use track changes.)** | | | | | | |
| Change Section 3.37, paragraph UR.3.3 to read as follows:  **UR.3.3 Ticket Printer: Customer Ticket**. – Vehicle-mounted metering systems shall be equipped with a ticket printer which shall be used for all sales where product is delivered through the meter. A copy of the ticket issued by the device shall be left with the customer at the time of delivery or as otherwise specified by the customer. **For systems equipped with the capability of issuing an electronic receipt, ticket, or other recorded representation, the customer may be given the option to receive any required information electronically (e.g., via email, cell phone, website, etc.) in lieu of a hard copy.** | | | | | | |
| **17. Justification:** Please include national importance, background on the issue, and reference to supporting data or documents. | | | | | | |
| 1. Our customers are requesting receipt of delivery ticket via email. 2. We deliver bulk cooking oil to restaurants, often during non-operating hours. When nobody from the restaurant is present to receive the delivery ticket, it is stuck in or taped to the back door, and often ends up lost. Our customers are requesting that we **do not** leave a hard copy behind. 3. All of our sales are private contract sales; we do not sell to the public. Therefore, the need for a hard copy delivery ticket is not as critical as would be in a public sale setting. 4. In addition to electronic receipts, our customers are granted access to a website that shows their daily usage of cooking oil and contains direct links to electronic delivery tickets. This website will allow the customer to view all of their delivery tickets to date, and is in addition to the emailed delivery ticket. 5. Our metering system is NTEP certified and in full compliance of Handbook 44. All required delivery ticket content, per Section 3.37, is captured in electronic format.   Language similar to what is being proposed above was added in 2014 to Section 1.10, Paragraph G-S.5.6 in an attempt to allow electronic delivery tickets. While this change was intended to apply to all sections of the code, it conflicts with existing language in the General Code (ref. Code Application, G-A.2) that does not allow the language in the General Code to supersede the requirements of the specific code. So in the case of Section 3.37, the code language requiring a hard copy ticket takes precedent. | | | | | | |
| **18. Possible Opposing Argument’s:** Please demonstrate that you are aware and have considered possible opposition. | | | | | | |
| Assuming no arguments as this proposal is similar, in language and intent, to what was added in 2014 to Section 1.10, Paragraph G-S.5.6. | | | | | | |
| **19. Requested Action if Considered for NCWM Agenda:** | | | | | | |
| X Voting Item Developing Item Informational Item Other (Please Describe): | | | | | | |
| **20. List of Attachments:** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

## **Proposal to change S.2.2. of the Water Meter Code, Submitted to the L&R Committee**

**Source:** Moises Sztajnwore, TREXUS CORP..

The following proposal, shown below, was submitted to the Regional Weights and Measures Association for possible inclusion into the National L&R Committee Agenda. It is included here as information and possible discussion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Information** | | | | | | |
| **1. Date:** | **2. Regional Association(s):** (Not applicable for proposals to the Board of Directors or NTEP Committee) | | | | | |
| 02/10/2020 | X Central (CWMA) X Northeastern (NEWMA) X Southern (SWMA) X Western (WWMA) | | | | | |
| **3. Standing Committee:** | | | | | | |
| X Laws & Regulations \_\_ Specifications & Tolerances \_\_ Professional Development \_\_ Board of Directors \_\_ NTEP Committee | | | | | | |
| **4. Submitter’s Name:** | | | **Submitter’s Organization:** | | | |
| **Moises Sztajnworc** | | | **TREXUS CORP.** | | | |
| **5. Address:** | | | | | | |
| **10305 NW 41Street Unit 223** | | | | | | |
| **6. City:** | | | **7. State:** | | **8. Zip Code:** | **9. Country:** |
| DORAL | | | FL | | 33178 | USA |
| **10. Phone Number:** | | **11. Fax Number:** | | **12. Email Address:** | | |
| 305-363 5944 | |  | | msb@waterprofit.com | | |
| **Proposal Information** | | | | | | |
| **13. Purpose:** Concise statement as to the intent or purpose of this proposal, such as problem being fixed. **(Do not include justification here.)** | | | | | | |
| Amend Section 3.2.2.1 by including water meters measure system | | | | | | |
| **14. Document to be Amended:** | | | | | | |
| X NIST Handbook 44 NIST Handbook 130 NIST Handbook 133 \_\_ NCWM Guidance Document  \_\_ NCWM Bylaws \_\_ NTEP Administrative Policy | | | | | | |
| **15. Cite portion to be Amended:** Please file a separate Form 15 for each code, model law or regulation to be amended. | | | | | | |
| Section: 3.36 Water Meters  Paragraph: S.2.2. | | | | | | |
| **16. Proposal:** Please use **~~strikeout~~** to show words to be deleted and **underline** to show new words. **(Do not use track changes.)** | | | | | | |
| S.2.2.              ~~Batching Measuring Systems Only~~Air/Vapor Elimination.  **S.2.2.1.     ~~Air/Vapor Elimination, Batching Measuring Systems Only~~.** – **Water meters and ~~B~~batching** measuring systems shall be equipped with an effective air/vapor eliminator or other automatic means to prevent the passage of air/vapor through the meter.  Vent lines from the air/vapor eliminator shall be made of appropriate non-collapsible material.  (Amended 2017 **and 20XX**)  **S.2.2.2. Directional Flow Valves.** – Valves intended to prevent reversal of flow shall be automatic in operation. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **17. Justification:** Please include national importance, background on the issue, and reference to supporting data or documents. | | | | | | |
| Failure of water meters is demonstrated by not discriminating air from water. The water meter does not count in a similar way a turbulent fluid to a laminar fluid; therefore, the measurement is not realistic and the consumer has to pay for the air that the meter counts and not for the water. | | | | | | |
| **18. Possible Opposing Argument’s:** Please demonstrate that you are aware and have considered possible opposition. | | | | | | |
| Hydraulic engineers argue that when transporting a fluid through a pipeline this generates turbulence due to the atmosphere, therefore air bubbles are generated in the system. This argument is physically acceptable, however the technology shows that the measurement is unrealistic and when compressing the air that passes through the counter avoid wrong measurement so the consumer will not have to pay for the air that will evaporate when using the Water, he will only pay for the water consumed. | | | | | | |
| **19. Requested Action if Considered for NCWM Agenda:** | | | | | | |
| X Voting Item Developing Item Informational Item Other (Please Describe): | | | | | | |
| **20. List of Attachments:** | | | | | | |
| White Paper technically explaining the measurement error, Water Bill before and after installed the corrective  Explanatory videos demonstrating the measurement error | | | | | | |

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

# Closing Items:

1. Changes in Meeting Documentation Development Process

Source:

NTEP Administrator

Background:

The responsibility for the development of the meeting agenda and summary documents has changed. Beginning with the 2021 meeting a member of the Measuring Sector, with the help of NTEP personnel, will assume this responsibility. This change is based on direction from the NTEP Committee and the NCWM Board of Directors and aligns the responsibility with the current action of other Sectors, Work Groups, and Task Groups.

The NTEP Administrator will create a meeting summary report, for the 2020 Measuring Sector Meeting and will distribute to the Sector Members, at a later date.

In addition to the assignment of the individual or individuals responsible for these documents, I would encourage the Sector to develop a timeline document to assist the individual in the ability to develop a meeting agenda in a timely manner and with the least impact to their current responsibilities. Due to meeting time constraints, I would offer my assistance to develop this timeline document offline, with the distribution, review, and acceptance of the document to occur within six months from the adjournment of this meeting. A few items to be addressed in this timeline document would include:

* + 1. A deadline for the submittal of new proposals, and reports from subgroups with specific assigned tasks,
    2. A deadline for the distribution of the agenda and summary documents.

I would suggest that the timeline document be placed on the Measuring Sector’s home page on the NCWM Web Site.

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

1. Meeting Location and Date of 2021 Measuring Sector Meeting

**Background:** This Item is included on the Sector’s agenda to allow for input from Sector members on future meetings and to allow NTEP Administration to apprise the Sector of dates that have already been set.

**(Note:** The members of the Weighing Sector recommended meeting locations of Annapolis, Maryland; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; or Minneapolis, Minnesota.)

**2020 MS Meeting Discussion**

1. Meeting Attendees

The following individuals participated in the 2020 Measuring Sector meeting.

Measuring Sector Members:

Other Participants: